# Conformal submanifolds, distinguished submanifolds, and integrability

### Sean N. Curry, A. Rod Gover, Daniel Snell

#### Abstract

For conformal geometries of Riemannian signature, we provide a comprehensive and explicit treatment of the core local theory for embedded submanifolds of arbitrary dimension. This is based in the conformal tractor calculus and includes a conformally invariant Gauss formula leading to conformal versions of the Gauss, Codazzi, and Ricci equations. It provides the tools for proliferating submanifold conformal invariants, as well as for extending to conformally singular Riemannian manifolds the notions of mean curvature and of minimal and CMC submanifolds.

A notion of distinguished submanifold is defined by asking the tractor second fundamental form to vanish. We show that for the case of curves this exactly characterises conformal geodesics, also called conformal circles, while for hypersurfaces it is the totally umbilic condition. For other codimensions, this unifying notion interpolates between these extremes, and we prove that in all dimensions this coincides with the submanifold being weakly conformally circular, meaning that ambient conformal circles remain in the submanifold. We prove that submanifolds are conformally circular, meaning submanifold conformal circles coincide with ambient conformal circles, if and only also a second conformal invariant also vanishes. We give a number of examples to show that both situations occur commonly in familiar conformal structures.

We then provide a very general theory and construction of quantities that are necessarily conserved along distinguished submanifolds. This first integral theory thus vastly generalises the results available for conformal circles in [68]. We prove that any normal solution to an equation from the class of first BGG equations yields such a conserved quantity, and we show that it is easy to provide explicit formulae for these.

Finally we prove that the property of being distinguished is also captured by a type of moving incidence relation and apply this to show that the distinguished submanifold condition is forced for zero loci associated with solutions of certain natural geometric partial differential equations.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 53C18, 53B25, 53A55; Secondary: 37K10, 53B15, 53B21

*Key words and phrases.* Differential geometry, conformal geometry, submanifolds, conformal geodesics, first integrals, BGG operators, symmetries, invariants.

S.C. is supported in part by the Simons Foundation Grant MPS-TSM-00002876. A.R.G. and D.S. gratefully acknowledge support from the Royal Society of New Zealand via Marsden Grants 19-UOA-008 and 24-UOA-005.

## Contents

1	Introduction	3
	1.1 Main results and a technical overview	5
<b>2</b>	Conventions and conformal geometry	9
	2.1 Conventions for Riemannian geometry	10
	2.2 Conformal geometry	11
	2.3 The tractor connection and calculus	12
	2.4 The scale tractor	15
	2.5 Form tractors	16
3	Submanifold geometry and submanifold tractors	17
	3.1 Basic Riemannian submanifold theory	18
	3.2 Conformal Submanifolds	19
	3.3 Submanifold tractors	21
	3.4 Conformal submanifolds of dimension $m \ge 3$	28
	3.5 Low-dimensional conformal submanifolds	32
	3.6 Normal forms	35
	3.7 The proof of Theorem 1.1	38
	3.8 Submanifold invariants	39
4	Characterising and generalising mean curvature, and applications	40
<b>5</b>	Distinguished submanifolds and conformal circularity	<b>44</b>
	5.1 Background on conformal circles	44
	5.2 Weak conformal circularity of submanifolds	46
	5.3 Strong conformal circularity	52
	5.4 Examples	55
6	First integrals	63
	6.1 Review of relevant BGG theory	63
	6.2 The First Integral Theorem	65
	6.3 First integrals from a normal conformal Killing-Yano form	66
7	Distinguished submanifolds from curved orbits	68
	7.1 Distinguished submanifolds via a moving incidence relation	68
	7.2 Curved orbits and generalisations	70

## 1 Introduction

Submanifolds are one of the fundamental objects of study in any class of differential geometric structures. They play a crucial role in geometric analysis and a variety of other areas including several complex variables, and the study of functional analytic inequalities. Their local theory is essential for the study of many global questions in differential geometry. In the special case of Riemannian geometry, submanifold theory is a classical area and the basic local theory is well understood and is founded in the celebrated equations of Gauss, Codazzi, and Ricci, see, e.g., [90, 100].

Conformal manifolds  $(M, \mathbf{c})$  are structures where a smooth n manifold M is equipped not with a metric, but rather with just an equivalence class of smooth metrics  $\mathbf{c}$ , where  $g, \hat{g} \in \mathbf{c}$  means that  $\hat{g} = e^{2\omega}g$  for some smooth function  $\omega$ . There is currently a growing interest in the study of conformal submanifolds, and conformally distinguished curves, including the relationships between these objects [32, 37, 55, 76, 85, 87, 88, 96, 97]. Some of these developments have been inspired and driven by the links to physics [54, 78], the discovery that there are higher dimensional analogues of the classical Willmore energy and invariant [82, 70, 112, 75, 71, 76, 116], and the development of a holographic approach to submanifolds (see [69, 71, 73]) that is an analogue of Fefferman and Graham's holographic approach to intrinsic conformal geometry as in [47, 48].

In the conformal setting there is no distinguished connection on the tangent bundle, so even the local theory of submanifolds provides a challenge. Toward resolving this, a logical step is to use the conformal Cartan/tractor connection of [29, 109, 7, 27], and for the special case of *hypersurfaces*, meaning embedded submanifolds of codimension one, an effective approach was initiated in [7]. With a view to various applications, this hypersurface theory was extended in the works [14, 79, 107, 63, 112] and this approach has proved to be central in a number of further extensions and applications [4, 13, 69, 70, 71, 74, 73, 87]. Rather separately from the general consideration of submanifolds, the *distinguished curves* in conformal manifolds known as *conformal circles* or *conformal geodesics* have been studied classically (see, e.g., [50, 98, 99, 114, 115]) and from various modern perspectives recently [56, 6, 7, 110, 104, 68, 45, 80, 84, 19].

In the first part of our work here we develop a comprehensive basic local theory for conformal submanifolds of all proper codimensions. This is based in the conformal tractor calculus, and by construction is conformally invariant. It builds on the mentioned approach to hypersurfaces from [7, 14, 79, 112, 41] and its extension into higher codimension by the first and third named authors in [42] and [105]. There are also links to the somewhat more abstract theory developed in the preprint [16] (cf. Remark 3.18 below and also the discussion in [42]). The result is a theory and collection of explicit calculational tools that treats curves and higher dimensional submanifolds, embedded in conformal manifolds, by a single uniform approach. These tools may be used to directly proliferate submanifold invariants, including for curves. Thus they provide a basic machinery that may solve the conformal submanifold analogue of Fefferman's parabolic invariant theory programme [46, 47, 8], and we touch on this in Section 3.8. Since the first draft of this article, an application of these tools to a simple direct construction of higher Willmore energies has been provided in [2]. We also use these tools to effectively capture, via tractors, the mean curvature, and with it the notions of minimal, constant mean curvature, and parallel mean curvature submanifolds. This leads immediately to a generalisation of these notions that is applicable for the study of conformally singular geometries (such as Poincaré-Einstein geometries, and more generally conformally compact structures). See Section 4.

The point of view that we develop here leads us to introduce the notion of a *distinguished* submanifold of arbitrary codimension. By definition this means that an object called the tractor second fundamental form vanishes (a list of equivalent conditions is given in Theorem 1.1). In the case of curves this coincides precisely with the unparametrised conformal circle equation, see Theorem 1.2, whereas for hypersurfaces it recovers the usual condition of total umbilicity [7]. Thus the notion interpolates between these. Interestingly, in all codimensions greater than one the condition is stronger than total umbilicity; distinguished submanifolds must be umbilic, but there are umbilic submanifolds that are not distinguished (though, when the geometry of the ambient manifold is special, it often turns out that umbilic submanifolds are forced to be distinguished; see Section 5.4 for a list of detailed examples). In the conformally flat setting the notions of umbilic and distinguished submanifolds coincide, and part of our motivation in introducing the notion of distinguished submanifold is that (unlike the notion of umbilic submanifold in general codimension) it allows us to simultaneously generalise certain key results from the codimension one case of umbilic submanifolds and the dimension one case of conformal circles. These applications form the second main objective of this work.

It has long been known that Killing tensors and Killing-Yano tensors may be used to provide first integrals for geodesics [30, 52, 101, 106, 113], and this is used for a host of applications [3, 31, 33, 57, 58, 89, 86]. Conformal circles are governed by a higher order equation than geodesics. so an analogous theory has been lacking aside from certain specific examples [110]. However, in [68] this was solved and a very general theory of first integrals was developed by understanding a characterisation of conformal circles as a parallel condition on a fundamental tractor 3-form that one can associate to any non-null curve. Using this, it was established that essentially any normal solution of a class of equations known as first BGG equations (see [26, 28], or Section 6.1, for the meaning of these terms) can provide, or contribute to, such conserved quantities; in fact in many cases more general solutions produce first integrals. See [80] for some applications of this perspective. The conformal Killing equations on tensors and the conformal Killing-Yano equations are all first BGG equations. But in fact the class of first BGG equations is vastly wider than this suggests. In Section 3.7 we show that, just as for curves, higher dimensional distinguished submanifolds can be characterised by a parallel condition on a tractor form. Then, as an application, we obtain a theory of first integrals for distinguished submanifolds of all codimensions in a form that includes the case of conformal circles as special case. See Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.4.

In another direction, an important question for submanifolds of dimension 2 or greater is characterising the conformal analogue of the notion of being totally geodesic; that is, to capture some sense of "total conformal circularity". This was touched on in [7] for hypersurfaces, and treated for submanifolds in general by Belgun [9]. We show in Section 5 that our tools give efficient new proofs these results, and show that Belgun's results have an elegant interpretation in this tractor picture. See Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 5.9 below. We also introduce a new notion called *conformal circularity*, and show that property holds in many situations where the strongest notion conformal circularity fails.

Finally, in Section 7 we show that distinguished submanifolds can also be characterised by a very simple moving incidence relation, see Theorem 7.1, or its paraphrasing in Theorem 1.5. As an application we prove that the zero locus of suitable overdetermined PDE solutions are necessarily distinguished submanifolds; see Theorem 7.3. This shows how distinguished submanifolds fit into the *curved orbit* theory of [25, 26] and, along with Proposition 7.5, is a first step toward understanding how to generalise the holography approach of [4, 13, 70, 71, 72, 74, 73] to higher

codimensions.

#### 1.1 Main results and a technical overview

Now we give the approach and results with more technical detail. We use lower case abstract indices  $a, b, c, \ldots$  for ambient tensors and indices  $i, j, k, \ldots$  from later in the alphabet for submanifold tensors; we also use the corresponding capital letters as abstract indices for ambient and submanifold tractors, respectively. The dimension of our ambient manifold M will always be denoted n, and the submanifold dimension will be denoted m. In the theorems below  $n \ge 3$ , but the results continue to hold when n = 2 provided M is endowed with a Möbius structure (in the sense of [18]). The first step in developing a calculus for hypersurfaces in a Riemannian manifold is the observation that any oriented hypersurface is equipped with a canonical unit conormal field  $n_a$ . Similarly it was established in [7] that each hypersurface  $\Sigma$  in a Riemannian signature conformal manifold determines canonically a basic conformally invariant tractor field  $N_A$  that plays an analogous role at a tractor level. For example its failure to be parallel along the hypersurface is captured by a tractor second fundamental form  $\mathbb{L}$ . In particular one obtains, in a simple explicit way, conformal analogues of the Gauss-Codazzi-Ricci theory, see [41] and references therein. Moreover the normal tractor has a remarkable link to other objects in, for example, Poincaré-Einstein manifolds and related structures, that has led to some deep results (e.g., that link the so-called conformal volume anomaly to higher Willmore invariants [75, 4, 71]).

Central to our approach to higher codimension submanifold theory is the fact that one higher codimension analogue of the normal tractor is a conformally invariant alternating tractor form  $N_{A_1\cdots A_d}$ , where d = n - m is the codimension of the submanifold. An equivalent object to  $N_{A_1\cdots A_d}$ is its tractor Hodge-star, that we denote  $\star N^{A_1A_2\cdots A_{m+2}}$ , see (2.27). For a submanifold  $\Sigma$  (of any non-trivial codimension), the intrinsic tractor bundle  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$  can be identified with the annihilator in  $\mathcal{T}M$  of  $N_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}$ , see Section 3.3. (This is still true when  $\Sigma$  has dimension 1 or 2, though in this case it is less obvious if one starts with the jet bundle construction of  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$ ; see the discussion in Section 3.5 which treats, from our point of view here, the natural Möbius structures induced on low dimensional submanifolds, cf. [18]). Thus one has an orthogonal decomposition of the ambient tractor bundle  $\mathcal{T}M$ ,

$$\mathcal{T}M|_{\Sigma} = \mathcal{T}\Sigma \oplus \mathcal{N},$$

which also defines the normal tractor bundle  $\mathcal{N}$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{N}_B^A$  the projection  $\mathcal{T}M|_{\Sigma} \to \mathcal{N}$  (using abstract index notation). There is also a projector  $\mathcal{T}M|_{\Sigma} \to \mathcal{T}\Sigma$ , and thus (provided dim  $M \ge 3$ so that the conformal structure on M determines a canonical Cartan/tractor connection) one has a tractor Gauß formula which defines a tractor second fundamental form,  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^C$ ; see (3.22) and its refinement (3.42) (cf. [16, 42]). By definition,  $\mathbb{L}$  measures the failure of  $\mathcal{N}$  (or, equivalently, of  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{T}M|_{\Sigma}$ ) to be parallel.

Using these tools we develop and present explicitly the fundamental conformal submanifold calculus in Section 3.4, and, in particular, the conformal Gauss-Codazzi-Ricci equations (3.43), (3.44), (3.45). Also, the normal forms, and their equivalents, may be combined with standard conformal tractor calculus, and ideas for using this to construct conformal manifold invariants (as in, e.g., [60]), to manufacture submanifold invariants. This is the subject of Section 3.8. This is a powerful application, as without such objects the construction of submanifold invariants is complicated. Based on the ideas in [60] it seems likely that most, if not all, conformal invariants will arise using the tools developed here.

Although the tractor approach is conformal, scale-dependent quantities such as the mean curvature can be nicely described by introducing an object called the *scale tractor*, I, see Section 2.4. In particular minimal submanifolds are seen to be exactly those submanifolds whose tractor normal form is orthogonal to the scale tractor, see Corollary 4.2, and constant mean curvature notions are similarly captured, see Proposition 4.4. This means that these concepts generalise to Poincaré-Einstein, and more generally conformally compact manifolds, with the submanifold extending to the conformal infinity, as discussed in Section 4.

The definition here of a submanifold being *distinguished* is that  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^C = 0$ , i.e. the vanishing of the tractor second fundamental form. A key result is that this may be alternatively captured as in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let  $(M, \mathbf{c})$  be a conformal manifold and  $\Sigma \hookrightarrow M$  a conformal submanifold of codimension d. Then the following are equivalent:

- 1.  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^{C} = 0;$
- 2.  $\nabla_i N_{A_2}^{A_1} = 0;$
- 3.  $\nabla_i N_{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_{d-1} A_d} = 0;$
- 4.  $\nabla_i \star N^{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_{m+2}} = 0,$

where  $\nabla_i$  indicates the pullback to  $\Sigma$  of the ambient tractor connection.

A hypersurface has  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^{C} = 0$  if and only if it is totally umbilic, meaning the trace-free second fundamental form vanishes, but for higher codimension it means a certain conditional invariant must also vanish. (When the trace-free second fundamental form vanishes this conditional invariant becomes Belgun's  $\mu$  invariant [9], and the relationship between  $\mu$  and  $\mathbb{L}$  is discussed in Section 5.2). Thus for codimensions greater than one, a distinguished submanifold is necessarily totally umbilic, but the converse is not true in general. Moreover, in the case of 1-dimensional submanifolds (where the totally umbilic condition becomes vacuous) the vanishing of  $\mathbb{L}$  precisely characterises conformal circles. That is, in our current terminology, 1-dimensional conformally distinguished submanifolds are exactly unparametrised conformal circles:

**Theorem 1.2.** Let  $(M, \mathbf{c})$  be a conformal manifold and  $\gamma \hookrightarrow M$  a curve. Then  $\gamma$  is an unparametrised conformal circle if, and only if,  $\mathbb{L} = 0$ , or equivalently any one of the conditions in Theorem 1.1 holds. In particular,  $\mathbb{L} = 0$  if and only if  $\mu = 0$ , where  $\mu$  is the conformal curvature.

*Proof.* Proposition 4.13 from [68] asserts that the unparametrised conformal circle equation is equivalent to a certain 3-tractor being parallel along the curve, and equation (5.13) of Section 5.1 below asserts that this 3-tractor is precisely  $\star N^{A_1A_2A_3}$ . The theorem therefore follows from the equivalence of items 1 and 4 in Theorem 1.1.

For the convenience of the reader we discuss Proposition 4.13 from [68] in Section 5.1 on conformal circles below.

Next we observe that combining Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 leads naturally to a generalisation of Theorem 1.2 that characterises distinguished submanifolds in terms of their relation to the ambient conformal circles: **Theorem 1.3.** A submanifold  $\Sigma$  is distinguished  $(\mathbb{L} = 0)$  if, and only if, it is weakly conformally circular (equivalently,  $\mathring{H} = 0$  and  $\mu = 0$ ).

Here, adapting terminology from [9], weakly conformally circular means that an ambient conformal circle with tangential initial conditions remains in the submanifold for some time, cf. [7] for the case of hypersurfaces. Since  $\mathbb{L} = 0$  can be seen to be equivalent to  $\mathring{\Pi} = 0$  and  $\mu = 0$  by direct calculation, this recovers Belgun's [9, Theorem 5.4(2)].

There is an alternative natural notion of conformal circularity for submanifolds, namely that any submanifold conformal circle is also an ambient conformal circle. This is stronger than the previous notion and we refer to such a submanifold as *conformally circular*. It turns out that for this property, in addition to any of the requirements of Theorem 1.1, one also requires that the trace-free part of the Fialkow tensor vanishes; see Theorem 5.10. Examples of conformally circular submanifolds include a factor trivially included in an Einstein product or any umbilic submanifold in a complex projective space (see Section 5.4). Taking into account parametrisations gives rise to yet another notion of conformal circularity, which we refer to as being *strongly conformally circular*. This was considered in [9] and our Theorem 5.10 should be contrasted with the analogous result Theorem 5.9 (which recovers Belgun's [9, Theorem 5.4(3)]) for projectively parametrised conformal circular submanifolds arise a lot less commonly than conformally circular ones, though they include the standard umbilic submanifolds in the conformal sphere and any factor trivially included in a special Einstein product.

In Section 5.4 we clarify by way of a number of examples that, outside of edge cases in the codimension (i.e. the cases of curves and of hypersurfaces), the notions of umbilic, distinguished, conformally circular and strongly conformally circular submanifolds are distinct. On the other hand, we show that when the geometry of (M, c) is special then often umbilic submanifolds are automatically distinguished. For example, any umbile submanifold in real, complex or quaternionic space form is forced to be distinguished. In support of our contention that the distinguished submanifold condition is a more natural conformal analog of the totally geodesic condition in Riemannian geometry than the totally umbilic condition, we also observe (in Theorems 5.19 and 5.20) that we have the following conformal analog of the classical de Rham-Wu theorem in Riemannian geometry: A conformal manifold (M, c) is locally the conformal structure of a product manifold if and only if (M, c) possesses a pair of complementary orthogonal foliations by distinguished submanifolds.

Another advantage that distinguished submanifolds posses over (merely) umbilic ones is that points 2.–4. of Theorem 1.1 characterise distinguished submanifolds in a way that immediately allows the proliferation of conserved quantities. As mentioned above, Killing tensors, Killing-Yano tensors and their conformal analogues are well-established as tools for providing first integrals for geodesics. These are each examples of solutions to first BGG equations, a large class of overdetermined natural equations [28, 17]. For such equations, there is a class of solutions called *normal* solutions that are in one-to-one correspondence with parallel sections of the corresponding tractor bundle [26]. In particular, on conformally flat manifolds, all solutions to first BGG equations are normal. Let us state our result rather informally as follows.

**Corollary 1.4.** Suppose a conformal manifold admits a BGG normal solution corresponding to a parallel tractor S, and  $\Sigma$  is a distinguished submanifold. Let

 $\langle \otimes^{\ell} S, \otimes^{k} N \rangle$ 

denote a scalar quantity constructed from linear combinations of tensor powers of S and linear combinations of tensor powers of the normal tractor form N and with contractions using the conformal tractor metric and possibly the tractor volume form. Then  $\langle \otimes^{\ell} S, \otimes^{k} N \rangle$  is a first integral for the distinguished submanifold.

This result generalises the large family of conformal circle first integrals constructed in [68] to the case of distinguished submanifolds of arbitrary dimension. We should say that rather than using the tractor normal form in the Corollary 1.4 above one may equally alternatively (or additionally use)  $\star N$ , or  $N_B^A$ . Precise statements can be found in Section 6.2, where we also show that it is easy to compute explicit examples.

Towards another key application, we show that there is yet another characterisation of distinguished conformal submanifolds that takes the form of a moving incidence relation. For this we need the first elements of conformal tractor calculus. On any smooth manifold, one has the bundle of conformal 1-densities that we call  $\mathcal{E}[1]$ , which is a root of the squared canonical bundle, see Section 2. Its 2-jet bundle  $J^2 \mathcal{E}[1]$  admits the exact sequence at 2-jets,

$$0 \to S^2 T^* M[1] \to J^2 \mathcal{E}[1] \to J^1 \mathcal{E}[1] \to 0, \tag{1.1}$$

where  $\mathcal{V}[w] := \mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{E}[w]$  for any vector bundle  $\mathcal{V}$  and any  $w \in \mathbb{R}$ .

The introduction of a conformal structure determines a canonical splitting of  $S^2T^*M[1]$  as  $S_0^2T^*M[1] \oplus \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \mathcal{E}[-1]$ , where  $\boldsymbol{g} \in \Gamma(S^2T^*M[2])$  is the conformal metric. The standard conformal cotractor bundle  $\mathcal{T}^*$  (or  $\mathcal{T}^*M$ ) is the quotient of  $J^2\mathcal{E}[1]$  by the image of  $S_0^2T^*M[1]$  and so has a filtration as given by the exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{E}[-1] \xrightarrow{X} \mathcal{T}^* \to J^1 \mathcal{E}[1] \to 0.$$
(1.2)

(In the case that M is of dimension one then  $S_0^2T^*M[1]$  is trivial and  $\mathcal{T}^* = J^2\mathcal{E}[1]$ .) There is canonically a conformally invariant metric h on the bundle  $\mathcal{T}^*$ , and hence  $\mathcal{T}^*$  is identified with its dual  $\mathcal{T}$ , which we call the *tractor bundle*. The bundle injection X which maps  $\mathcal{E}[-1] \to \mathcal{T}^*$  is typically viewed as a section  $X \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}^*[1])$ , and called the *canonical tractor*. This invariantly encodes information about position on the manifold and plays a very important role in our developments here.

A well known feature of  $\mathcal{T}^*$  is that, in the case where dim  $M \ge 3$ , it is naturally equipped with the canonical conformally invariant tractor connection [7], which is equivalent (see [22]) to the normal Cartan connection as in [29]. This preserves the tractor metric. Using this object and language we have the following result.

**Theorem 1.5.** Let  $\Sigma$  be an embedded submanifold of codimension d in a conformal manifold  $(M, \mathbf{c})$ . Then  $\Sigma$  is distinguished if, and only if, either (equivalently both) of the following holds

- there exists a nontrivial  $\Psi \in \Gamma(\Lambda^d \mathcal{T}^*)$  such that  $X \sqcup \Psi = 0$  and  $\nabla_i \Psi = 0$  along  $\Sigma$ , or
- there exists a nontrivial  $\star \Psi \in \Gamma(\Lambda^{n+2-d}\mathcal{T}^*)$  such that  $X \wedge \star \Psi = 0$  and  $\nabla_i \star \Psi = 0$  along  $\Sigma$ .

Again this generalises a result for non-null conformal circles from [68]. If either of the above conditions hold, then  $\Psi$  is necessarily (up to locally constant factor) the tractor normal form of the submanifold. This will be proved in Section 7. Note that in the model case of the conformal sphere, viewed as the projectivised null cone of a Minkowski space  $\mathbb{M}$  of two higher dimensions, the distinguished submanifolds all arise from cutting the null cone with a subspace (and projectivising); in this case the tractor  $\star \Psi$  corresponding to a distinguished submanifold  $\Sigma$  is constant and simple (it is the wedge product of vectors that span the corresponding subspace of the Minkowski space) and, identifying the canonical tractor X with the position vector in  $\mathbb{M}$ , the condition  $X \wedge \star \Psi = 0$ is precisely the incidence relation saying that X is a point in the subspace corresponding to  $\star \Psi$ .

Theorem 1.5 is a useful result in that it allows us to immediately conclude that certain zero loci of normal solutions of appropriate BGG equations are distinguished submanifolds. Recall that on a Riemannian manifold, an alternating tensor k of degree d is a conformal Killing form if the trace-free part of  $\nabla k$  is completely alternating. For a suitable conformal weight, this condition is conformally invariant, see Section 6.3. Combining the curved orbit theory of [26] with Theorem 1.5 we obtain the following, where the operator L is explained in (6.9) (and Theorem 6.1).

**Theorem 1.6.** Suppose k is a normal solution of the conformal Killing form equation on (M, c) of degree d-1 such that the parallel tractor  $\mathbb{K} = L(k) \in \Gamma(\Lambda^d \mathcal{T}^*)$  is simple. Then the zero locus of k is either empty, an isolated point, or a distinguished submanifold of codimension d.

**Remark 1.7.** (i) The hypothesis that the parallel tractor  $\mathbb{K}$  be simple is natural in that only in this case can  $\mathbb{K}$  be a multiple of the tractor normal form of a codimension d submanifold. Without the simplicity condition, higher than codimension d zero loci are possible. (ii) If d = 1, then  $\sigma = k$  is a weight 1 conformal density and the theorem still holds if we regard the hypothesis on  $\sigma = k$  as saying that  $\sigma$  is an almost-Einstein scale in the sense of [63] and interpret  $\mathbb{K} = L(k) \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}^*)$  as the corresponding parallel scale tractor I. In this case  $X \sqcup \mathbb{K} = \sigma$ , and the conclusion is a known result about the zero locus of an almost-Einstein scale [63, 41]. (iii) When d = 1, 2, k does not need to be normal; see Section 7.2.

In fact finer information about the zero locus is available, see Theorem 7.3. This is an analogue for normal Killing solutions of the results for almost Einstein scales found in [61, 63, 41]. Those results for Einstein scales (and their generalisations to so-called ASC scales in [63]) were key in the previously mentioned development of a holographic approach to hypersurfaces via a singular Yamabe problem in [4, 13, 70, 71, 73], as well as a boundary calculus of asymptotically hyperbolic manifolds [69]. We believe the results in Theorem 7.3 should provide one of the key insights for the analogous treatment of submanifolds of higher codimension (which need not be distinguished). Indeed, toward this end we provide a simple direct proof of a similar zero locus result, for fields satisfying weaker (than normal Killing-Yano) conditions, in Proposition 7.5.

## 2 Conventions and conformal geometry

Often we will use the standard abstract index notation of Penrose. For example we may write  $\mathcal{E}^a$  for the tangent bundle TM of a manifold M and  $v^a$  for a vector field on M. Similarly  $\mathcal{E}_a$  denotes the cotangent bundle  $T^*M$ , and  $\omega_a \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}_a)$  a 1-form field. Then we write  $v^a\omega_a$  for the canonical pairing between vector fields and 1-forms. We denote by the Kronecker delta  $\delta^b_a$  the identity section of the bundle End(TM) of endomorphisms of TM. Indices enclosed by round (respectively by square) brackets indicate symmetrisation (respectively skew-symmetrisation) over the enclosed indices. For example, if  $T_{ab}$  is a rank 2 tensor then

$$T_{(ab)} = \frac{1}{2}(T_{ab} + T_{ba})$$
 and  $T_{[ab]} = \frac{1}{2}(T_{ab} - T_{ba}).$ 

We also use this notation for bundles. For example,  $\mathcal{E}_{[a_1a_2\cdots a_d]}$  denotes the bundle of *d*-forms. When tractor bundles are introduced these will also be adorned with abstract indices when convenient, with the same convention for symmetrisation and skew-symmetrisation.

For simplicity of exposition we assume throughout that the basic manifold M studied is connected.

#### 2.1 Conventions for Riemannian geometry

A Riemannian manifold is a pair  $(M^n, g)$ , consisting of a manifold M and a positive definite metric g. We assume that the dimension n (of M) is at least 2. All structures are assumed smooth, meaning  $C^{\infty}$ . This is to simplify the discussion. For all the theory a much lower level of regularity is required, but this varies throughout and at any point is easily calculated by the reader. We will also typically assume for convenience that M is oriented, with volume form  $\epsilon_{a_1a_2\cdots a_n}$  normalised by  $\epsilon^{a_1a_2\cdots a_n}\epsilon_{a_1a_2\cdots a_n} = n!$ , where indices are raised using the inverse of the metric g.

Writing  $\nabla$  for the Levi-Civita connection, the *Riemannian curvature tensor*  $R_{ab}{}^{c}{}_{d}$  is defined by

$$R_{ab}{}^{c}{}_{d}v^{d} = [\nabla_{a}, \nabla_{b}]v^{c}. \qquad v^{a} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}^{a}),$$

$$(2.1)$$

in the abstract index notation.

In dimensions  $n \ge 3$ , this decomposes into trace-free and a trace part:

$$R_{abcd} = W_{abcd} + 2 g_{c[a} P_{b]d} - 2 g_{d[a} P_{b]c}$$

where  $W_{ab}{}^{c}{}_{d}$  is the Weyl tensor and  $P_{ab}$  is the Schouten tensor. Equivalently, the Schouten tensor is characterised by

$$R_{ab} = (n-2)P_{ab} + Jg_{ab}, (2.2)$$

where  $R_{ab} := R_{ca}{}^c{}_b$  is the Ricci tensor, and  $J := g^{ab}P_{ab}$ . The Weyl tensor is totally trace free, and satisfies the algebraic Bianchi identities. In dimension 3 this implies that the Weyl tensor is zero.

The *Cotton* tensor (also for  $n \ge 3$ ) is defined by

$$C_{abc} := 2\nabla_{[a} P_{b]c}. \tag{2.3}$$

In dimension 2, it is easy to show that the Riemannian curvature is pure trace:

$$R_{abcd} = K(g_{ik}g_{jl} - g_{il}g_{jk}),$$

where K is the Gaußian curvature. Hence the Ricci tensor is also pure trace, and the Weyl curvature is zero.

Later, we will need to consider 1-dimensional submanifolds  $\Sigma$  equipped with a Riemannian metric. On a 1-dimensional manifold  $\Sigma$ , a Riemannian metric  $g_{\Sigma}$  takes the form  $u \otimes u$ , where uis a non-vanishing 1-form, and requiring u to be the volume form corresponding to  $g_{\Sigma}$  and the orientation fixes the sign of u. Thus there is a unique connection preserving this metric, namely the connection D that preserves u. We will term this the Levi-Civita connection for  $(\Sigma, g_{\Sigma})$ . The curvature of any such connection is clearly zero.

### 2.2 Conformal geometry

Two metrics  $g, \hat{g}$  are said to be *conformally related* if

$$\widehat{g} = \Omega^2 g, \tag{2.4}$$

where  $\Omega \in C^{\infty}(M)$  is a positive function. Then c denotes an equivalence class of conformally related metrics, i.e. if  $g, \hat{g} \in c$ , then they are related according to (2.4) for some smooth  $\Omega$ , and we may write c = [g]. A conformal manifold is then a pair (M, c).

Recall that on a manifold M, for any  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , one has the bundle of  $\alpha$ -densities. This is the associated bundle to the linear frame bundle of M via the 1-dimensional  $\operatorname{GL}(n)$ -representation  $A \mapsto |\det(A)|^{-\alpha}$ . Sections of this bundle are called  $\alpha$ -densities. There is a correspondence between 1-densities and sections of  $\Lambda^n T^*M$  when M is oriented, or in general between the square of these bundles; e.g., if M is oriented then, given a local oriented frame field  $(e_1, \ldots, e_n)$ , the function representing a (local) section v of  $\Lambda^n T^*M$  as a 1-density is simply  $v(e_1, \ldots, e_n)$ .

Separately, we have the bundle of conformal densities of weight w, which we denote by  $\mathcal{E}[w]$ , and which are defined by

$$\mathcal{E}[w] := \mathcal{Q} \times_{\rho_w} \mathbb{R},\tag{2.5}$$

where  $\mathcal{Q}$  is the ray bundle of conformally related metrics and  $\rho_w$  is the 1-dimensional  $\mathbb{R}_+$ -representation  $\rho_w(s)(t) := s^{-\frac{w}{2}}t$ . The bundles  $\mathcal{E}[w]$  are evidently oriented and we write  $\mathcal{E}_+[w]$  for the ray subundle of positive elements. As detailed in, e.g., [23], the conformal densities of weight w are in bijective correspondence with densities of weight  $\left(-\frac{w}{n}\right)$ . In particular, this means that 1-densities also correspond to conformal densities of weight -n, and so together with the discussion of the previous paragraph we have an isomorphism  $(\Lambda^n T^* M)^2 \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{E}[-2n]$ , and dually  $(\Lambda^n TM)^2 \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{E}[2n]$ . If  $\mathcal{B}$  is a vector bundle on M we will write  $\mathcal{B}[w]$  as a shorthand for  $\mathcal{B} \otimes [w]$ .

If M is oriented, as we henceforth assume, we write  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{a_1a_2\cdots a_n} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{[a_1a_2\cdots a_n]}[n])$  for the canonical map  $\Lambda^n TM \to \mathcal{E}[n]$ , given by contraction, and call  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{a_1a_2\cdots a_n}$  the conformal volume form or weighted volume form. Since  $\mathcal{E}[w]$  is an associated bundle, its sections may be thought of as equivariant functions  $f : \mathcal{Q} \to \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f(s^2g_x) = s^w f(g_x)$ . So we may think of a section of  $\mathcal{E}[w]$  as an equivalence class of pairs (g, f), where  $(g, f) \sim (\Omega^2 g, \Omega^w f)$ . The conformal volume form can therefore similarly be thought of as the equivalence class of  $(g, \epsilon)$  for any  $g \in \boldsymbol{c}$ , where  $\epsilon$  is the Riemannian volume form of g and  $(g, \epsilon) \sim (\Omega^2 g, \Omega^n \epsilon)$ .

Corresponding to  $g \in c$  there is evidently a corresponding section  $\sigma_g \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}[1])$ , represented by the pair (g, 1). It follows that the conformal structure c determines a tautological section  $g \in \Gamma(S^2T^*M \otimes \mathcal{E}_+[2])$  that is given by

$$\boldsymbol{g} = (\sigma_g)^2 g, \tag{2.6}$$

for any metric  $g \in c$  (but which is independent of this choice); equivalently, the tautological section  $g \in \Gamma(S^2T^*M \otimes \mathcal{E}_+[2])$  may be thought of as the equivalence class of (g,g) for any metric  $g \in c$ , where  $(g,g) \sim (\Omega^2 g, \Omega^2 g)$ . This is called the *conformal metric*. We will henceforth typically use the conformal metric to raise and lower indices, even when a choice of  $g \in c$  has been made (thus raising and lowering indices typically introduces a density bundle weight). For example the Riemann curvature with indices all down  $R_{abcd}$  will now be considered to have weight 2 as it is

$$R_{abcd} = \boldsymbol{g}_{ec} R_{ab}{}^{e}{}_{d} ,$$

the Weyl-Schouten decomposition of the Riemann curvature becomes

$$R_{abcd} = W_{abcd} + 2 \,\boldsymbol{g}_{c[a} P_{b]d} - 2 \,\boldsymbol{g}_{d[a} P_{b]c}$$

for dimensions  $n \ge 3$ , and J will mean  $g^{ab}P_{ab}$  From (2.6) we see that if we use  $\sigma_g$  to trivialise density bundles, then the conformal metric g becomes g. However, usually we will avoid trivialising density bundles. This becomes significant when we write down conformal rescaling laws, since then there are two different metrics that could be used to trivialize the density bundles (and correspondingly two different flat connections on sections of density bundles) and many formulae are simplified when we work with weighted objects.

Each metric  $g \in c$  determines a corresponding Levi-Civita connection  $\nabla$ . This naturally acts on sections of density bundles and, tautologically from the construction above, preserves  $\sigma_g$ . Thus as well as preserving g, the Levi-Civita connection  $\nabla$  preserves g and  $\epsilon$  (cf. [41]). Under a change to  $\hat{g} = \Omega^2 g \in c$  we have

$$\widehat{\nabla}_a u^b = \nabla_a u^b + \Upsilon_a u^b - \Upsilon^b u_a + \Upsilon_c u^c \delta^b_a, \quad \text{on } u^b \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}^b),$$
(2.7)

$$\nabla_a \omega_b = \nabla_a \omega_b - \Upsilon_a \omega_b - \Upsilon_b \omega_a + \Upsilon^c \omega_c \boldsymbol{g}_{ab}, \quad \text{on } \omega_b \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}_b), \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$\widehat{\nabla}_a \tau = \nabla_a \tau + w \Upsilon_a \tau \qquad \text{on } \tau \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}[w]),$$
(2.9)

where  $\Upsilon_a := \Omega^{-1} \nabla_a \Omega$ .

The Weyl curvature  $W_{ab}{}^{c}{}_{d}$  is conformally invariant, while the Schouten tensor transforms according to,

$$\widehat{P}_{ab} = P_{ab} - \nabla_a \Upsilon_b + \Upsilon_a \Upsilon_b - \frac{1}{2} \Upsilon_c \Upsilon^c \boldsymbol{g}_{ab}.$$
(2.10)

Equations (2.7) and (2.8) still hold when M has dimension 1, although the final two terms of both equations cancel. Equation (2.10) only holds when dim  $M \ge 3$ , since in lower dimensions the Schouten tensor is not defined.

#### 2.3 The tractor connection and calculus

Recall from the introduction, the tractor bundle is recovered from jets of the conformal density bundle  $\mathcal{E}[1]$ . The inverse of the conformal metric maps  $S^2T^*M[1] \to \mathcal{E}[-1]$ , with kernel  $S_0^2T^*M[1]$  and hence we have a decomposition

$$S^2T^*M[1] = S_0^2T^*M[1] \oplus \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \mathcal{E}[-1].$$

Then the bundle  $\mathcal{T}^*$  (that we also denote  $\mathcal{E}_A$  in the abstract index notation) is  $J^2 \mathcal{E}[1]$  modulo the image of  $S_0^2 T^* M[1]$  under the map  $S^2 T^* M[1] \to J^2 \mathcal{E}[1]$  of the jet exact sequence at 2-jets (1.1). Thus we obtain (1.2). From the jet exact sequence at 1-jets

$$0 \to T^* M[1] \to J^1 \mathcal{E}[1] \to \mathcal{E}[1] \to 0, \qquad (2.11)$$

we then see that  $\mathcal{T}^*$  has the composition series

$$\mathcal{T}^* = \mathcal{E}[1] \oplus T^*M[1] \oplus \mathcal{E}[-1].$$

Here the semidirect sum notation  $\oplus$  simply encodes the information of the exact sequences (cf. [7]). Note that this construction still applies when M has dimension 1 or 2, but in dimension 1,  $S_0^2 T^* M[1]$  is trivial and hence  $\mathcal{T}^*$  is simply  $J^2 \mathcal{E}[1]$ . Recall that we denote by  $X_A \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}_A[1])$  the canonical tractor which provides the embedding  $\mathcal{E}[-1] \to \mathcal{E}_A$ . Let us also note that by the definition of the tractor bundle, there is an invariant differential operator  $\mathbb{D} : \Gamma(\mathcal{E}[1]) \to \Gamma(\mathcal{T}^*)$ , where  $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{D}$  is the differential operator corresponding to the linear map  $J^2 \mathcal{E}[1] \to \mathcal{T}^*$ .

Let us now fix  $n \ge 3$ . Given a choice of metric  $g \in c$ , the formula

$$\sigma \mapsto \frac{1}{n} [\mathbb{D}_A \sigma]_g := \begin{pmatrix} \sigma \\ \nabla_a \sigma \\ -\frac{1}{n} (\Delta + J) \sigma \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (2.12)$$

where  $\Delta = \nabla^a \nabla_a$ , gives a second-order differential operator on  $\mathcal{E}[1]$  which is a linear map  $J^2 \mathcal{E}[1] \rightarrow \mathcal{E}[1] \oplus \mathcal{E}_a[1] \oplus \mathcal{E}[-1]$  that clearly factors through  $\mathcal{T}^*$  and so determines an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{T}^* \xrightarrow{\sim} [\mathcal{T}^*]_g = \mathcal{E}[1] \oplus \mathcal{E}_a[1] \oplus \mathcal{E}[-1], \qquad (2.13)$$

and hence the sequences (1.2) and (2.11) split, as discussed in, e.g., [21, 41]. When using a choice of metric g to split the tractor bundle we will typically indicate this by writing  $\stackrel{g}{=}$  rather than applying the bracket notation  $[\cdot]_g$  to the object we are breaking up into slots.

In the subsequent discussions, we will use (2.13) to split the tractor bundles without further comment. Thus, given  $g \in c$ , an element  $V_A$  of  $\mathcal{E}_A$  may be represented by a triple  $(\sigma, \mu_a, \rho)$ , or equivalently by

$$V_A = \sigma Y_A + \mu_a Z_A^a + \rho X_A. \tag{2.14}$$

The last display defines the algebraic splitting operators  $Y : \mathcal{E}[1] \to \mathcal{T}^*$  and  $Z : T^*M[1] \to \mathcal{T}^*$  (determined by the choice  $g \in \mathbf{c}$ ) which may be viewed as sections  $Y_A \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}_A[-1])$  and  $Z_A^a \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}_A^a[-1])$ . We call these sections  $X_A, Y_A$  and  $Z_A^a$  tractor projectors. Note that with this convention, (2.12) is, tautologically, an explicit formula for the invariant operator  $\mathbb{D}$ , in terms of the splitting given by the choice of metric g.

While  $X_A$  is conformally invariant, a change of tractor splitting given by (2.4) determines the transformations

$$\hat{Z}_A^a = Z_A^a + \Upsilon^a X_A, \qquad \hat{Y}_A = Y_A - \Upsilon_a Z_A^a - \frac{1}{2} \Upsilon^a \Upsilon_a X_A$$
(2.15)

where, as usual,  $\Upsilon_a = \Omega^{-1} \nabla_a \Omega$ . These transformations mean that the tractor triples transform by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\sigma} \\ \hat{\mu}_a \\ \hat{\rho} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \Upsilon^b & \delta^b_a & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}\Upsilon^c\Upsilon_c & -\Upsilon_a & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma \\ \mu_b \\ \rho \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (2.16)

One then observes that the symmetric tractor field given by

$$h^{AB} := 2X^{(A}Y^{B)} + g^{ab}Z^{A}_{a}Z^{B}_{b}$$
(2.17)

is invariant under (2.15), and so determines a conformally invariant metric on  $\mathcal{T}^*$ . We will hence use this and its inverse  $h_{AB}$  (called the *tractor metric*) to identify  $\mathcal{T}^*$  and its dual, the *standard tractor bundle*, which we denote by simply  $\mathcal{T}$ . Using this we obtain

$$X^A Y_A = 1, \qquad Z^a_A Z^A_b = \delta^a_b, \tag{2.18}$$

and all other (tractor-index) pairings of the splitting operators give a zero section. For example  $X^A X_A = 0$ .

The canonical conformally invariant (normal) tractor connection on  $\mathcal{T}$  will also be denoted  $\nabla_a$ , or sometimes  $\nabla_a^{\mathcal{T}}$  for emphasis. It can be coupled to the Levi-Civita connection of any metric  $g \in c$ , and its action on the tractor projectors is then given by

$$\nabla_a X^A = Z_a^A, \qquad \nabla_a Z_b^A = -P_{ab} X^A - \boldsymbol{g}_{ab} Y^A, \qquad \nabla_a Y^A = P_a{}^b Z_b^A. \tag{2.19}$$

In fact, these formulae determine the tractor connection as the general action on a section of a tractor bundle follows from the Leibniz rule. It is easily verified that the tractor connection is conformally invariant and preserves the tractor metric. The latter means that the tractor connection agrees with its dual. It extends in the obvious way to tensor powers of the tractor bundle and these extensions are all referred to as the tractor connection. The coupled tractor-Levi Civita connection will always be denoted simply  $\nabla$  and will be used, usually without comment, according to context.

As with any linear connection,  $\nabla = \nabla^{\mathcal{T}}$  has a curvature. The *tractor curvature*  $\Omega_{ab}{}^{C}{}_{D}$  of the tractor connection is defined by  $\Omega_{ab}{}^{C}{}_{D}\Phi^{D} := 2\nabla_{[a}\nabla_{b]}\Phi^{C}$ , for any  $\Phi^{A} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T})$ . In the splitting determined by a choice of metric  $g \in \mathbf{c}$  it is given explicitly by the formula

$$\Omega_{abCD} = W_{abcd} Z_C{}^c Z_D{}^d - 2C_{abc} X_{[C} Z_{D]}{}^c.$$
(2.20)

A conformal structure is said to be *(locally)* flat if this tractor curvature vanishes as this happens if and only if, locally, there is a metric in the conformal class that is flat.

The tractor objects developed above form the initial objects of a conformal tractor calculus that can be used, for example, to construct conformal invariants [59, 60]. We will not discuss this in detail, but one particularly important object is the *Thomas operator*  $\mathbb{D}$  that extends (2.12) to a conformally invariant operator between weighted tractor bundles,

$$\mathbb{D}_A: \Gamma(\mathcal{E}^{\Phi}[w]) \to \Gamma(\mathcal{E}_A \otimes \mathcal{E}^{\Phi}[w-1]),$$

where  $\mathcal{E}^{\Phi}$  indicates any tensor power of  $\mathcal{E}^{A}$ , or SO(h)-invariant part thereof. It is given, with respect to  $g \in \mathbf{c}$ , by the formula

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{E}^{\Phi}[w]) \in V \mapsto \mathbb{D}_A V \stackrel{g}{=} \begin{pmatrix} (n+2w-2)wV\\ (n+2w-2)\nabla_a V\\ -(\Delta V+wJV) \end{pmatrix}.$$
(2.21)

where (as usual)  $\nabla$  is the coupled tractor-Levi-Civita connection and  $\Delta$  the corresponding Laplacian.

All of the above has a clear geometric interpretation in the case of the model, the conformal *n*-sphere. This should be thought of as the ray projectivisation of  $\mathcal{C}_+$ , where  $\mathcal{C}_+$  is the future directed part of the null quadric  $\mathcal{C} := \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2} \mid h(X, X) = 0\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}$  equipped with a fixed symmetric non-degenerate bilinear form *h* of signature (n+1,1) and a time-orientation. The resulting resulting manifold  $M := \mathbb{P}_+(\mathcal{C}_+) \cong S^n$  is acted on transitively by  $G := \mathrm{SO}_0(h) \cong \mathrm{SO}_0(n+1,1)$ , where the 0 here denotes taking the connected component of the identity, and the stabiliser of a point is a parabolic subgroup that we denote P (so  $M \cong G/P$ ). Moreover, it is straightforward to verify that *h* induces a Riemannian metric on each section of the map  $\mathcal{C}_+ \to M$ , and different sections result in conformally related metrics. Thus M is equipped canonically with a conformal structure,

and clearly the group G acts on M by conformal isometries, see, e.g., [41, 63] for a more detailed discussion of this model.

From this point of view the standard tractor bundle for the model is  $T\mathbb{R}^{n+2}|_{\mathcal{C}_+}/\sim$ , where the equivalence relation is  $U_p \sim V_q$  if one is mapped to the other by standard  $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}$  parallel transport (i.e., from the affine structure of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ ) along a null ray. The tractor metric is then induced in an obvious way from the ambient Minkowski signature metric h, and parallel tractor fields are equivalent to vector fields in  $\Gamma(T\mathbb{R}^{n+2}|_{\mathcal{C}_+})$  that are constant along  $\mathcal{C}_+$ . Moreover the parallel tensor fields on connected regions of  $\mathcal{C}_+$  may all be viewed as arising from the restriction of tensor fields parallel on  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1,1}$ , and these give the parallel sections of the corresponding tensor powers of the tractor bundle. Finally, in this picture, the canonical tractor  $X^A$  is identified with the Euler vector field of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}$  along  $\mathcal{C}_+$ .

The Thomas operator  $\mathbb{D}_A$  also has a concrete geometric interpretation in the model. Sections of the weight w conformal density bundle on the model can be identified with functions on  $\mathcal{C}_+$  that are homogeneous of degree w with respect to the  $\mathbb{R}_+$ -action. Weighted tractors on the model can therefore be identified with tensor fields along  $\mathcal{C}_+$  of the appropriate homogeneity. The Thomas operator  $\mathbb{D}_A$  on such sections is then given (up to an overall factor) by formally extending such tensor fields off  $\mathcal{C}_+$  to be "harmonic" with respect to the ambient Minkowski metric h and then taking the directional derivative (at points along  $\mathcal{C}_+$ ) in the flat ambient space  $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ ; see, [23].

#### 2.4 The scale tractor

Recall that, from Section 2.2, a metric  $g \in c$  is equivalent to a section  $\sigma_g \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}_+[1])$  by the relation

$$g = \sigma_g^{-2} g$$

Given any section  $\sigma \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}[1])$  we can form

$$I_A := \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{D}_A \sigma,$$

and we will term this a scale tractor if  $I_A$  is nowhere zero. In this case  $\sigma$  is clearly non-vanishing on an open dense subset of M, on which it determines a metric  $g := \sigma^{-2}g$  from the conformal class. So for a scale tractor  $I_A$  we will term  $\sigma = X^A I_A$  a generalised scale – or sometimes simply a scale. Following [63], a conformal manifold  $(M, \mathbf{c})$  equipped with a scale tractor will said to be an almost-Riemannian manifold (since it has a metric almost everywhere). Given a Riemannian metric  $g = \sigma_g^{-2}g$ , we term  $I_A := \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{D}_A\sigma_g$  the scale tractor of g.

It follows easily from (2.19) that if a tractor  $I_A \neq 0$  is parallel then it is a scale tractor and  $g := \sigma^{-2} g$  is Einstein; see [65, 63]. In this case we say (M, c, I) is almost Einstein.

An important example of almost-Riemannian manifolds arise in connection with conformally compact manifolds: A complete Riemannian manifold (M, g) is *conformally compact* if M is the interior of a manifold with boundary  $\overline{M}$ , and on  $\overline{M}$  there is a metric  $\overline{g}$  (so a metric that is smooth up to the boundary) such that on M

$$g_{ab} = r^{-2}\overline{g}_{ab}$$

for some smooth defining function r for the boundary  $\partial M$  (meaning that r > 0 on M,  $\partial M$  is the zero locus of r, and dr is nowhere zero on  $\partial M$ ). A conformally compact manifold is said to asymptotically hyperbolic if  $|dr|_{\overline{g}} = 1$  along  $\partial M$  (which is equivalent to requiring that the sectional curvatures of g all tend to -1 as one approaches  $\partial M$ ) and *Poincaré-Einstein* if g is Einstein. It is easily verified that in the latter case the scalar curvature is negative. If the Poincaré-Einstein metric is normalised so that

$$Sc^g = -n(n-1)$$

(as is usually assumed) then the manifold is necessarily asymptotically hyperbolic. These structures have been the subject of sustained interest; see, e.g., [34, 35, 36, 77, 81, 92, 111] and the many references therein.

It is easily verified that a conformal compactification of a manifold (M, g) is the same as a conformal manifold with boundary  $(\overline{M}, \mathbf{c})$ , with interior M, and equipped with a scale tractor  $I_A$ with the following properties: the zero locus  $Z(\sigma) = \sigma^{-1}(0)$  of  $\sigma := X^A I_A$  is  $\partial M$ , and along  $\partial M$  the 1-jet  $j^1 \sigma$  (of  $\sigma$ ), is nowhere zero (we say that  $\sigma$  is a *defining density* for  $\partial M$ ). Thus the conformal compactification is almost-Riemannian; in the following we will therefore think of a conformally compact manifold as an almost-Riemannian manifold for which  $\sigma$  is a defining density for  $\partial M$ . Such a manifold is asymptotically hyperbolic if  $I^A I_A = 1$  along  $\partial M$ , and Poincaré-Einstein if  $I_A$  is parallel. If  $I^A I_A = 1$  on  $\overline{M}$  then  $\mathrm{Sc}^g = -n(n-1)$ . See, e.g., [63, 73] for more details.

There are many structures such as certain notions of asymptotically flat manifolds that can be similarly be understood in terms of almost-Riemannian structures. So this notion provides a uniform framework for approaching a range of singular geometries [41].

#### 2.5 Form tractors

We will use the term *form tractor* to describe sections of the exterior powers of the tractor bundle [15, 66]. It is useful to introduce some notation for form tractors. From the composition series for the standard tractor bundle, one sees that for the k-th exterior power of the standard tractor bundle, one has the composition series

$$\mathcal{E}_{[A_1A_2\cdots A_{k-1}A_k]} = \mathcal{E}_{[a_2\cdots a_k]}[k] \oplus \bigoplus_{\substack{\mathcal{E}_{[a_1a_2\cdots a_{k-1}a_k]}[k]}} \bigoplus_{\substack{\mathcal{E}_{[a_2\cdots a_k]}[k-2]}} \bigoplus_{$$

The tractor projectors for the standard tractor bundle induce tractor projectors on the bundles of tractor forms. Since these will be very important for us, we introduce dedicated notation for these:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{Y}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k-1}A_{k}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{k-1}a_{k}} &:= Y_{[A_{1}}Z_{A_{2}}^{a_{2}}\cdots Z_{A_{k-1}}^{a_{k-1}}Z_{A_{k}}^{a_{k}}] &\in \mathcal{E}_{[A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k-1}A_{k}]}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{k-1}a_{k}}[-k] \\
\mathbb{Z}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k-1}A_{k}}^{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{k-1}a_{k}} &:= Z_{[A_{1}}^{a_{1}}Z_{A_{2}}^{a_{2}}\cdots Z_{A_{k-1}}^{a_{k-1}}Z_{A_{k}]}^{a_{k}} &\in \mathcal{E}_{[A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k-1}A_{k}]}^{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{k-1}a_{k}}[-k] \\
\mathbb{W}_{A_{1}A_{2}A_{3}\cdots A_{k-1}A_{k}}^{a_{3}\cdots a_{k-1}a_{k}} &:= X_{[A_{1}}Y_{A_{2}}Z_{A_{3}}^{a_{3}}\cdots Z_{A_{k-1}}^{a_{k-1}}Z_{A_{k}]}^{a_{k}} &\in \mathcal{E}_{[A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k-1}A_{k}]}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{k-1}a_{k}}[-k+2] \\
\mathbb{X}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k-1}A_{k}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{k-1}a_{k}} &:= X_{[A_{1}}Z_{A_{2}}^{a_{2}}\cdots Z_{A_{k-1}}^{a_{k-1}}Z_{A_{k}]}^{a_{k}} &\in \mathcal{E}_{[A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k-1}A_{k}]}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{k-1}a_{k}}[-k+2]
\end{aligned}$$

$$(2.23)$$

For example,  $\mathbb{Y}_{A_1A_2\cdots A_{k-1}A_k}^{a_2\cdots a_{k-1}A_k}$  gives the injection

$$\mathbb{Y}_{A_1A_2\cdots A_{k-1}A_k}^{a_2\cdots a_{k-1}a_k}: \mathcal{E}_{[a_2\cdots a_k]}[k] \to \mathcal{E}_{[A_1A_2\cdots A_{k-1}A_k]},$$

determined by a choice of metric  $g \in c$ . Similarly  $\mathbb{X}_{A_1A_2\cdots A_{k-1}A_k}^{a_2\cdots a_{k-1}a_k}$ 

$$\mathbb{X}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k-1}A_{k}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{k-1}a_{k}}:\mathcal{E}_{[a_{2}\cdots a_{k}]}[k-2]\to\mathcal{E}_{[A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k-1}A_{k}]},$$
(2.24)

but in this case the map is not dependent on any choice of metric in c. For  $1 \le k \le n+2$  and a choice of scale, one has

$$\nabla_{b} \mathbb{Y}_{A_{1}A_{2}A_{3}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{2}a_{3}\cdots a_{k}} = P_{ba_{1}} \mathbb{Z}_{A_{1}A_{2}A_{3}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{1}a_{2}a_{3}\cdots a_{k}} + (k-1)P_{b}^{a_{2}} \mathbb{W}_{A_{1}A_{2}A_{3}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{3}\cdots a_{k}} 
\nabla_{b} \mathbb{Z}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} = -k \cdot P_{b}^{a_{1}} \mathbb{X}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} - k \cdot \delta_{b}^{a_{1}} \mathbb{Y}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} 
\nabla_{b} \mathbb{W}_{A_{1}A_{2}A_{3}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{3}\cdots a_{k}} = -g_{ba_{2}} \mathbb{Y}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} + P_{ba_{2}} \mathbb{X}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} 
\nabla_{b} \mathbb{X}_{A_{1}A_{2}A_{3}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{2}a_{3}\cdots a_{k}} = g_{ba_{1}} \mathbb{Z}_{A_{1}A_{2}A_{3}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{1}a_{2}a_{3}\cdots a_{k}} - (k-1)\delta_{b}^{a_{2}} \mathbb{W}_{A_{1}A_{2}A_{3}\cdots A_{k}},$$
(2.25)

where sequentially labeled indices are alternating, and any term involving the alternation of n + 1 or more tensor (i.e. lower case) indices should be interpreted as zero.

In particular, we observe that  $\mathbb{W}_{A_1A_2A_3\cdots A_{n+2}}^{a_3\cdots a_{n+2}}$  is parallel in any scale, and hence there is a distinguished parallel section of the top exterior power of the standard tractor bundle, which we term the *tractor volume form* 

$$\epsilon_{A_1A_2A_3\cdots A_{n+2}} := (n+2)(n+1)\epsilon_{a_3\cdots a_{n+2}} \mathbb{W}_{A_1A_2A_3\cdots A_{n+2}}^{a_3\cdots a_{n+2}},$$
(2.26)

where  $\epsilon_{a_3\cdots a_{n+2}} \in \mathcal{E}_{[a_3\cdots a_{n+2}]}[n]$  is the weighted volume form of Section 2.2 (note that our normalisation is such that  $\epsilon^{A_1A_2A_3\cdots A_{n+2}}\epsilon_{A_1A_2A_3\cdots A_{n+2}} = -(n+2)!$ ). That this is parallel now follows from the fact that  $\epsilon_{a_3\cdots a_{n+2}}$  is parallel for any Levi-Civita connection in the conformal class. Of course, the existence of the tractor volume form also reflects the fact that the conformal tractor connection is equivalent to an SO(n + 1, 1)-Cartan connection.

Finally in this section we need the tractor Hodge-star. For a tractor k-form  $\Psi_{A_1\cdots A_k}$  this is

$$\star \Psi_{B_1 \cdots B_{n+2-k}} = \frac{1}{k!} \epsilon^{A_1 \cdots A_k}{}_{B_1 \cdots B_{n+2-k}} \Psi_{A_1 \cdots A_k}.$$
(2.27)

This satisfies  $\star \star = -(-1)^{k(n-k)}$ , since the tractor metric has Lorentzian signature. Note also that this tractor Hodge-star operation commutes with the tractor covariant derivative:

$$\nabla_a \star \Psi_{B_1 \cdots B_{n+2-k}} := \frac{1}{k!} \epsilon^{A_1 \cdots A_k}{}_{B_1 \cdots B_{n+2-k}} \nabla_a \Psi_{A_1 \cdots A_k}.$$

## **3** Submanifold geometry and submanifold tractors

Given a smooth *n*-manifold M, a submanifold will mean a smooth embedding  $\iota : \Sigma \to M$  of a smooth *m*-dimensional manifold  $\Sigma$ , where  $1 \leq m \leq n-1$ , and the image has codimension d := n - m. Typically we will suppress explicit mention of the embedding map and identify  $\Sigma$  with its image  $\iota(\Sigma) \subset M$ . We refer to M as the *ambient* manifold.

Regarding abstract indices, we adopt the convention that Latin letters from the start of the alphabet (a, b, c, ...) will denote ambient tensor indices, while indices from later in the alphabet (i, j, k, ...) will denote submanifold tensor indices. So, for example,  $\mathcal{E}^a$  is the usual tangent bundle TM,  $\mathcal{E}^i$  is the tangent bundle of the submanifold  $T\Sigma$ , and  $\mathcal{E}^a_i$  denotes the bundle  $T^*\Sigma \otimes TM|_{\Sigma}$ . Note that indices alone will not distinguish sections of TM and  $TM|_{\Sigma}$ , so  $v^a$  could be a section of either  $\mathcal{E}^a$  or a section of  $\mathcal{E}^a|_{\Sigma}$ , where  $\mathcal{E}^a|_{\Sigma} \to \Sigma$  is the pullback bundle  $\iota^*TM$ .

Given a submanifold  $\iota: \Sigma \to M$ , its derivative  $T\iota: T\Sigma \to TM$  will be written  $\Pi_i^a$  and viewed as a section of  $T^*\Sigma \otimes TM|_{\Sigma}$ . We frequently identify  $T\Sigma$  with its image in  $TM|_{\Sigma}$  under this map. Note that  $\Pi_i^a$  also gives the canonical map  $\Pi_i^a: \mathcal{E}_a|_{\Sigma} \to \mathcal{E}_i$ , which is dual to  $T\iota$ . We will temporarily use the notation  $T_{M/\Sigma}$  for the normal bundle  $TM|_{\Sigma}/T\iota(T\Sigma)$ , and  $(T_{M/\Sigma})^* \subset T^*M|_{\Sigma}$  for the conormal bundle.

#### 3.1 Basic Riemannian submanifold theory

We now move to the setting of a submanifold  $\Sigma$  in a Riemannian manifold (M, g) (cf. discussions in, e.g., [90, 100]). In the Riemannian setting, we only require that dim  $M \ge 2$ , and  $\Sigma$  satisfies  $1 \le m = \dim \Sigma \le n - 1$ . The exact sequence defining the normal bundle  $T_{M/\Sigma}$  then splits

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^{i} \xrightarrow{\Pi^{i}_{a}} \mathcal{E}^{a}|_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow T_{M/\Sigma} \longrightarrow 0, \qquad (3.1)$$

where  $\Pi_a^i$  is the orthogonal projection map  $TM|_{\Sigma} \to T\Sigma$ . We may then identify  $T_{M/\Sigma}$  with the kernel  $N\Sigma$  of  $\Pi_a^i$ , via the splitting, and we denote the orthogonal projection onto this by  $N_a^b: \mathcal{E}^a|_{\Sigma} \to N\Sigma^b$ . The complementary projection is  $\Pi_b^a = \delta_b^a - N_b^a = \Pi_i^a \Pi_b^i$  which is the orthogonal projection onto  $T\Sigma$  viewed as submanifold of  $TM|_{\Sigma}$ .

The Riemannian metric g on M induces a Riemannian metric  $g_{\Sigma}$  on  $\Sigma$  by restriction, which we call the *induced metric*. We usually omit the explicit reference to  $\Sigma$  when abstract indices are used. So the induced metric will be denoted by  $g_{ij}$ . Note that

$$g_{ij} = \Pi^a_i \Pi^b_j g_{ab}. \tag{3.2}$$

Next we observe that (3.1) can be used to decompose the ambient Levi-Civita connection. First and most simply, we have the *normal connection*  $\nabla^{\perp}$  which is a connection on the bundle  $N\Sigma \to \Sigma$ defined by

$$\nabla_i^{\perp} \nu^a := \mathcal{N}_b^a \nabla_i \nu^b, \tag{3.3}$$

where  $\nabla_i$  denotes the pullback connection of the ambient Levi-Civita connection (meaning, in this context, its restriction to differentiating along vectors tangent to  $\Sigma$ ). Complementary to this, we also have induced a connection  $D_i$  on  $T\Sigma \to \Sigma$  defined by

$$D_i V^j := \Pi_b^j \nabla_i \left( \Pi_k^b V^k \right). \tag{3.4}$$

It is elementary to verify that both (3.3) and (3.4) define connections. Indeed, it is also straightforward to verify that D is torsion-free and preserves the induced metric, and so is in fact the Levi-Civita connection of  $(\Sigma, g_{\Sigma})$ . The fundamental ingredient of submanifold calculus, in this setting, is the *Gauß formula* which, for a section  $V \in \Gamma(T\Sigma|_{\Sigma})$ , provides the decomposition of  $\nabla_i V^c = \nabla_i(\Pi_i^c V^j)$  into its tangential and normal parts:

$$\nabla_i V^c = \Pi_j^c D_i V^j + \Pi_{ij}{}^c V^j, \qquad (3.5)$$

and this defines  $II_{ij}^c \in \Gamma(S^2T^*\Sigma \otimes N\Sigma)$ , which is the second fundamental form of  $\Sigma$  in (M, g). We also define the mean curvature

$$H^c := \frac{1}{m} g^{ij} \Pi_{ij}{}^c \tag{3.6}$$

and set  $\mathring{H}_{ij}{}^c := \Pi_{(ij)_0}{}^c$ , the trace-free part of the second fundamental form. Thus one has

$$II_{ij}{}^{c} = II_{ij}{}^{c} + g_{ij}H^{c}. aga{3.7}$$

Using (3.5), one can derive

$$R_{ijkl} = R_{ijkl}^{\Sigma} + 2g_{cd} II_{l[i}{}^{c} II_{j]k}{}^{d}, \qquad (3.8)$$

$$R_{ij}{}^{c}{}_{k}N^{d}_{c} = 2D_{[i}II_{j]k}{}^{d}, aga{3.9}$$

and

$$R_{ij}{}^{a}{}_{b}N^{c}_{a}N^{b}_{d} = R^{\perp}{}_{ij}{}^{c}{}_{d} - 2g^{kl}\Pi_{k[i}{}^{c}\Pi_{j]ld}, \qquad (3.10)$$

where  $R_{ijkl} := \Pi_i^a \Pi_j^b \Pi_k^c \Pi_l^d R_{abcd}$  is the curvature of the ambient Levi-Civita connection restricted to  $\Sigma$ ,  $R_{ijkl}^{\Sigma}$  is the intrinsic Riemann curvature tensor (i.e. the curvature of the connection D), D is the intrinsic Levi-Civita connection coupled to the normal connection and  $R^{\perp}{}_{ij}{}^c{}_d$  is the curvature of the normal connection  $\nabla_i^{\perp}$ . All these formulae are derived by substituting the Gauß formula (3.5) into equation (2.1) which defines the curvature of the pullback connection  $\nabla_i$ , as follows. Using the decomposition  $TM|_{\Sigma} = T\Sigma \oplus N\Sigma$ , we may write a section  $V^c \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}^c|_{\Sigma})$  as a tuple ( $\Pi_d^c V^d, N_d^c V^d$ ). Since  $\Pi_d^c V^d$  is a tangent vector to  $\Sigma$ , we abuse notation slightly and typically write the tuple as  $(V^k, N_d^c V^d)$  where  $V^k = \Pi_d^k V^d$ . Computing the action of the Riemann curvature  $R_{ij}{}^c{}_d$  on such a tuple, we see that

$$\begin{split} &(\nabla_{i}\nabla_{j} - \nabla_{j}\nabla_{i}) \begin{pmatrix} V^{k} \\ N_{d}^{c}V^{d} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} R^{\Sigma}{}_{ij}{}^{k}{}_{l}V^{l} - 2D_{[i}\left(II_{j]}{}^{k}{}_{d}V^{d}\right) - 2g_{ef}II^{k}{}_{[i}{}^{f}II_{j]}{}_{l}{}^{e}V^{l} - 2II_{[i}{}^{k}{}_{|e|}\nabla_{j]}^{\perp}\left(N_{d}^{e}V^{d}\right) \\ &2II_{k[i}{}^{c}\left(D_{j]}V^{k}\right) - 2g^{kl}II_{k[i}{}^{c}II_{j]ld}V^{d} + 2\nabla_{[i}^{\perp}\left(II_{j]k}{}^{c}V^{k}\right) + R^{\perp}{}_{ij}{}^{c}{}_{d}V^{d} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} R^{\Sigma}{}_{ij}{}^{k}{}_{l} + 2g_{cd}II_{l[i}{}^{c}II^{k}{}_{j]}{}^{d} & -2D_{[i}II_{j]}{}^{k}{}_{d} \\ &2D_{[i}II_{j]}{}^{c}{}^{c} & R_{ij}^{\perp}{}^{c}{}_{d} - 2g^{kl}II_{k[i}{}^{c}II_{j]ld} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} V^{l} \\ N_{e}^{d}V^{e} \end{pmatrix}, \end{split}$$

and the equations (3.8), (3.9) and (3.10) all follow from this by simply projecting the appropriate entry of the matrix.

Note that in dimension m = 1, the trace-free part of the second fundamental form is zero. Also, in dimension m = 1 equations (3.8)-(3.10) are valid, but trivial in that in each case both sides are identically zero.

#### **3.2** Conformal Submanifolds

Consider now a submanifold  $\Sigma$  satisfying  $1 \leq \dim \Sigma \leq n-1$  in a conformal manifold  $(M, \mathbf{c})$ . Observe that the conformal structure is sufficient to determine an orthogonal complement of  $T\Sigma \subset TM$  and so the splitting of (3.1) is in fact conformally invariant. We carry over to this setting the same notation for the normal projection  $\mathbb{N}_b^a$  and the orthogonal projection  $\Pi_a^i$ . Since each  $g \in \mathbf{c}$  induces a Riemannian metric on  $\Sigma$  by restriction, it follows immediately that  $\mathbf{c}$  induces a conformal structure on  $\Sigma$  that we denote  $\mathbf{c}_{\Sigma}$ . We therefore have intrinsic to  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{c}_{\Sigma})$  density bundles  $\mathcal{E}_{\Sigma}[w]$ . In fact, for any  $w \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\Sigma}[w] = \mathcal{E}[w]|_{\Sigma},$$

which can be seen immediately from the interpretation of densities as equivalence classes of a metric and a function, see the discussion of Section 2.2. From these observations, it follows immediately that the conformal metric  $g_{\Sigma}$  is simply the restriction to  $\otimes^2 T\Sigma$  of the ambient conformal metric g. Using these, it is straightforward to see that the orthogonal projection may be thought of as a composition  $g_{\Sigma}^{-1} \circ \Pi \circ g$ , meaning

$$\Pi_a^i = \boldsymbol{g}^{ij} \Pi_j^b \boldsymbol{g}_{ab}, \tag{3.11}$$

where we are raising and lowering indices using the conformal metric (and we omit the subscript  $\Sigma$  when the indices imply that we are using  $g_{\Sigma}$  or its inverse). Since this involves g and  $g^{-1}$ , the resulting section still has conformal weight zero. When a metric  $g \in c$  is chosen we have as usual the Gauß, Codazzi and Ricci equations ((3.8), (3.9) and (3.10)), but it will be convenient to work with weighted versions of these, with the ambient or intrinsic conformal metrics replacing any instances of their scale-dependent counterparts. For example the weighted version of the Gauß equation is

$$R_{ijkl} = R_{ijkl}^{\Sigma} + 2\boldsymbol{g}_{cd} \boldsymbol{H}_{l[i}{}^{c} \boldsymbol{H}_{j]k}{}^{d},$$

where now  $R_{ijkl}$  and  $R_{ijkl}^{\Sigma}$  have weight 2 (and the second fundamental form naturally has conformal weight 0).

Coupling the normal connection (3.3) to the Levi-Civita connection on the bundle  $\mathcal{E}_{\Sigma}[-1]$  yields a connection on  $N\Sigma[-1]$ , which we shall also denote  $\nabla^{\perp}$ . It is easily verified using (2.7) and (2.9) that this is conformally invariant. In fact, more generally, on sections of  $N\Sigma[w]$  the transformation law is

$$\widehat{\nabla}_i^{\perp} \nu^a = \nabla_i^{\perp} \nu^a + (w+1) \Upsilon_i \nu^a \tag{3.12}$$

when  $\hat{g} = \Omega^2 g$  and  $\Upsilon_i = \Omega^{-1} \nabla_i \Omega$ . The conformal metric g induces a bundle metric on  $N\Sigma[-1]$ , and this is preserved by  $\nabla^{\perp}$ .

Since the Levi-Civita connection changes under a conformal rescaling, the Gauß formula is not conformally invariant. Using (2.7), we conclude that under a conformal transformation,

$$\widehat{II}_{ij}{}^c = II_{ij}{}^c - g_{ij} \mathcal{N}_d^c \Upsilon^d.$$
(3.13)

Since this transformation is by pure trace, it follows immediately that  $\mathring{H}_{ij}{}^c$  is conformally invariant:

$$\widehat{\mathring{H}}_{ij}{}^c = \mathring{H}_{ij}{}^c.$$

Thus the transformation (3.13) is entirely due to the transformed mean curvature, whence

$$\hat{H}^c = H^c - \mathcal{N}_d^c \Upsilon^d. \tag{3.14}$$

Note that the mean curvature is now defined using the conformal metric:  $H^c := \frac{1}{m} g^{ij} II_{ij}^c$ . As a consequence of (3.14) we have the following very useful proposition [14, 63, 42]:

**Proposition 3.1.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a submanifold of a conformal manifold  $(M, \mathbf{c})$ . Then any metric  $g_{\Sigma}$  in the induced conformal class of metrics on  $\Sigma$  can be extended to a metric  $g \in \mathbf{c}$  such that the mean curvature of  $\Sigma$  with respect to g vanishes.

Proof. Let  $g_{\Sigma}$  be as in the proposition, and let  $g \in c$  be any extension of  $g_{\Sigma}$ . We look for a rescaled metric  $\hat{g}$  satisfying the requirements of the proposition. Set  $\hat{g} = e^{2\omega}g$  with  $\omega$  to be determined. Since we require  $\hat{g}|_{\Sigma} = g_{\Sigma}$  we set  $\omega = 0$  along  $\Sigma$ . Now, by (3.14),  $\hat{H}^c = 0$  if, and only if,  $H^c = N_d^c \nabla^d \omega$  along  $\Sigma$ . Since the latter merely amounts to specifying the normal derivatives of  $\omega$  along  $\Sigma$ , such an  $\omega$  clearly exists (unique modulo functions that vanish and have vanishing differential along  $\Sigma$ ). This proves the proposition.

We refer to a metric  $g \in c$  such that  $H^c = 0$  as a *minimal scale* for  $\Sigma$ . The freedom to work in a minimal scale when computing conformally invariant quantities helps to simplify many calculations.

**Remark 3.2.** In the case of a 1-dimensional submanifold a minimal scale g is easily seen to be one for which the curve is an unparametrised geodesic, since in this case, after parametrising the curve by arc length, the mean curvature vector can be identified with the acceleration of the curve. Moreover, in the case where the curve  $\gamma$  in  $(M, \mathbf{c})$  is already parametrised one can take  $g_{\Sigma}$  to be the "metric" on  $\gamma$  corresponding to the parametrisation and extend  $g_{\Sigma}$  to  $g \in \mathbf{c}$  as in Proposition 3.2 to obtain a metric g for which  $\gamma$ , with its original parametrisation, is a parametrised geodesic.

#### 3.3 Submanifold tractors

As a conformal manifold in its own right,  $(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{c}_{\Sigma})$  possesses its own standard tractor bundle, which we will call the *intrinsic tractor bundle*, and denote by  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$ , or  $\mathcal{E}^{I}$  in abstract indices, carrying over our convention that later Latin letters will be used for sections of submanifold bundles, with upper case indices for tractor bundles. We now wish to relate this to the corresponding ambient tractor bundle,  $\mathcal{T}M$ , which will continue to denote by  $\mathcal{T}$ .

As we have already seen in Section 3.1, the Gauß formula plays a central role in the setting of Riemannian submanifold geometry. Crucially, the Gauß formula uses that  $T\Sigma$  may be identified with a subbundle of TM. In fact, there is an analogous notion for the intrinsic and ambient tractor bundles, and this explains our abstract index notation for submanifolds being similar to that for ambient tractors.

First, there is a mapping  $N\Sigma[-1] \to \mathcal{T}$  defined by

$$n^{a} \mapsto N^{A} = N_{a}^{A} n^{a} \stackrel{g}{=} \begin{pmatrix} 0\\ n^{a}\\ n_{c} H^{c} \end{pmatrix}.$$
(3.15)

This is easily seen to be conformally invariant using the transformation laws for the tractor projectors (2.15) and the mean curvature (3.14):

$$\begin{split} \hat{N}^A &= \hat{n}^a \hat{Z}_a^A + \hat{n}_a \hat{H}^a \hat{X}^A \\ &= n^a (Z_a^A + \Upsilon_a X^A) + n_a (H^a - \Upsilon^b \mathbf{N}_b^a) X^A \\ &= n^a Z_a^A + n^a \Upsilon_a X^A + n_a H^a X^A - n_b \Upsilon^b X^A \\ &= n^a Z_a^A + n_a H^a X^A \\ &= N^A. \end{split}$$

Thus the image of the injective map (3.15) defines, along  $\Sigma$ , a subbundle of  $\mathcal{T}$  which is canonically isomorphic to  $N\Sigma[-1]$ . We call this the *normal tractor bundle* and denote this  $\mathcal{N}$ , or  $\mathcal{N}^A$  with indices. We summarise, as follows.

**Lemma 3.3.** The map (3.15) defines a conformally invariant isomorphism

$$N_a^A : N\Sigma[-1] \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{T}|_{\Sigma}.$$
(3.16)

The bundle  $\mathcal{N}$  admits an orthogonal complement in  $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{N}^{\perp}$ , and so  $\mathcal{T}|_{\Sigma}$  decomposes as

$$\mathcal{T}|_{\Sigma} = \mathcal{N}^{\perp} \oplus \mathcal{N}.$$

Write  $\Pi_B^A : \mathcal{E}^B \to \mathcal{N}^{\perp A}$  and  $\mathbf{N}_B^A : \mathcal{E}^B \to \mathcal{N}^A$  for the orthogonal projections onto the respective factors of this decomposition. So  $\delta_B^A = \Pi_B^A + \mathbf{N}_B^A$ . Note that for any  $N^B \in \Gamma(\mathcal{N}^B)$ , one has  $h_{AC}N^C\Pi_B^A = 0$  since  $\Pi_B^A$  is valued in  $\mathcal{N}^{\perp A}$ . Thus,  $h_{AC}\mathbf{N}_B^A\Pi_D^C = 0$ . Substituting  $\Pi_D^C = \delta_D^C - \mathbf{N}_D^C$ , it follows that

$$\mathbf{N}_{BC} = \mathbf{N}_B^A \mathbf{N}_D^C h_{AC}$$

So  $N_{AB}$  and  $\Pi_{AB}$  are symmetric, where in each case an index has been lowered with the tractor metric, and  $\Pi_B^A$  and  $N_B^A$  give the orthogonal decomposition of the cotractor bundle  $\mathcal{E}_A$ .

Note that

$$N_a^A N_B^a = N_B^A \quad \text{and} \quad N_B^a N_b^B = N_b^a, \tag{3.17}$$

where  $N_A^a$  is the inverse to (3.16). From the symmetry of  $N_{AB}$ , and corresponding observation of symmetry for  $N_{ab}$ , it follows that  $N_A^a$  is obtained from  $N_b^B$  by raising and lowering indices using the tractor and conformal metrics.

A straightforward direct calculation shows that the isomorphism (3.16) intertwines the tractor and normal Levi-Civita connections in the sense of the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.4.** For any section  $n^a \in \Gamma(N\Sigma[-1])$  we have

$$N_b^C \nabla_i^\perp n^b = N_B^C \nabla_i (N_b^B n^b).$$

*Proof.* This follows immediately from the definitions if we work in a minimal scale.

We note here that  $\mathcal{N}$  is a rank d = n - m vector bundle, and hence  $\mathcal{N}^{\perp}$  has rank (n+2) - d = m+2, which coincides with the rank of  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$ . This is not a coincidence, and it turns out that there is an isomorphism of vector bundles  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma \to \mathcal{N}^{\perp}$ . Let us initially understand this in submanifold dimensions  $m \geq 3$ .

**Theorem 3.5.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a submanifold of dimension  $m \ge 3$  in a conformal manifold  $(M, \mathbf{c})$ . The intrinsic tractor bundle  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$  is canonically isomorphic to the orthogonal complement  $\mathcal{N}^{\perp}$  of the normal tractor bundle via a bundle isomorphism which preserves both the metric and the filtration. We denote this isomorphism  $\Pi_{I}^{A}$ . Explicitly, in a general ambient scale  $g \in \mathbf{c}$ , it is given by

$$\mathcal{T}\Sigma \ni V^{I} \stackrel{g_{\Sigma}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma \\ \mu^{i} \\ \rho \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{\Pi^{A}_{I}}{\longmapsto} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma \\ \mu^{a} - H^{a} \sigma \\ \rho - \frac{1}{2} H^{a} H_{a} \sigma \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{g}{=} V^{A} \in \mathcal{N}^{\perp},$$
(3.18)

where  $\mu^a = \prod_i^a \mu^i$ .

The map  $\Pi: \mathcal{T}\Sigma \to \mathcal{N}^{\perp}$  is a filtration and metric preserving isomorphism.

*Proof.* Fix a scale  $g_{\Sigma} \in \mathbf{c}_{\Sigma}$ , and let  $g \in \mathbf{c}$  be a scale that satisfies  $\iota^* g = g_{\Sigma}$ . The map is clearly injective, and the image is also clearly annihilated by any section of  $\mathcal{N}$ . We need to show that the map (3.18) is unchanged if we replace g by some conformally related  $\hat{g} = \Omega^2 g$ , and  $g_{\Sigma}$  by

 $\widehat{g_{\Sigma}} = \Omega^2 g_{\Sigma}$ . (In the latter  $\Omega$  is restricted to  $\Sigma$  – this is clear by context and so we do introduce additional notation.) Equivalently, we need to show that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E}^{I} \end{bmatrix}_{g_{\Sigma}} \xrightarrow{\Pi_{I}^{A}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E}^{A} \end{bmatrix}_{g} |_{\Sigma} \\ \downarrow \qquad \qquad \downarrow \\ \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E}^{J} \end{bmatrix}_{\widehat{g_{\Sigma}}} \xrightarrow{\Pi_{I}^{B}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E}^{B} \end{bmatrix}_{\widehat{g}} |_{\Sigma}$$

$$(3.19)$$

where the vertical maps are conformal change of tractor splitting, as given in (2.16), and the horizontal maps are (3.18) in the appropriate scale.

Write  $\Upsilon_a = \Omega^{-1} \nabla_a \Omega$ , and  $\Upsilon_i = \Omega^{-1} D_i \Omega$ . Note that  $\Upsilon_i = \Pi_i^a \Upsilon_a$ . Applying  $\Pi_I^A$  and then rescaling is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \Upsilon^b & \delta^b_a & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}\Upsilon^c\Upsilon_c & -\Upsilon_a & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -H^a & \Pi^a_i & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}H^cH_c & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \Upsilon^b - H^b & \Pi^b_i & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}\Upsilon^c\Upsilon_c + H^a\Upsilon_a - \frac{1}{2}H^cH_c & -\Upsilon_i & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

while first rescaling and then applying  $\Pi_{I}^{B}$  corresponds to the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\hat{H}^b & \Pi_j^b & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}\hat{H}^c\hat{H}_c & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \Upsilon^j & \delta_i^j & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}\Upsilon^k\Upsilon_k & -\Upsilon_i & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\hat{H}^b + \Pi_j^b\Upsilon^j & \Pi_i^b & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}\hat{H}^c\hat{H}_c - \frac{1}{2}\Upsilon^k\Upsilon_k & -\Upsilon_i & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using equation (3.14), we see that

$$-\hat{H}^b + \Pi^b_j \Upsilon^j = -H^b + N^b_c \Upsilon^c + \Pi^b_j \Upsilon^j = -H^b + \Upsilon^b$$

and

$$\begin{split} -\frac{1}{2}\hat{H}^{c}\hat{H}_{c} - \frac{1}{2}\Upsilon^{k}\Upsilon_{k} &= -\frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c} + H^{e}\Upsilon_{e} - \frac{1}{2}\left(\Upsilon^{k}\Upsilon_{k} + N^{cd}\Upsilon_{c}\Upsilon_{d}\right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c} + H^{e}\Upsilon_{e} - \frac{1}{2}\Upsilon^{c}\Upsilon_{c}, \end{split}$$

whence the above two matrix products are equal. Hence the map is conformally invariant.

It is easily verified that the map  $\Pi_I^A$  is metric preserving and sends  $X^I$  to  $X^A$ , and so is filtration preserving. An easy calculation shows that it is metric preserving, cf. Remark 3.6 below.

**Remark 3.6.** Note that the calculations in the above proof and hence the existence of the canonical metric and filtration preserving map  $\Pi : \mathcal{T}\Sigma \to \mathcal{N}^{\perp}$  are greatly simplified if we choose to work only with minimal scales ( $g \in \mathbf{c}$  with  $H^c = 0$ , cf. Proposition 3.2); in a minimal scale, the map  $\Pi_I^A$  simply maps  $(\sigma, \mu_i, \rho) \mapsto (\sigma, \mu_a, \rho)$  and it is clear that this map preserves the metric and the filtration.

Motivated by the result in Theorem 3.5 above, for the cases of dimensions m = 1, 2 we (for now) define  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$  to be  $\mathcal{N}^{\perp}$ . (Then Theorem 3.5 again applies, and is effectively just changing the splitting to give triples that transform in the usual way.) In Section 3.5 below we will then show that in dimension m = 1 and m = 2 it is still that case that  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$  is canonically  $J^2 \mathcal{E}[1]/S_0^2 T^* \Sigma[1]$ (where in the m = 1 case  $S_0^2 T^* \Sigma[1]$  is the "zero vector bundle"), consistent with the discussion given in the introduction.

For convenience, we will say that sections of  $\mathcal{N}^{\perp}$  are tractors *tangent* to the submanifold, and similarly, sections of  $\mathcal{N}$  are tractors *normal* to the submanifold.

It will also be convenient to record the relationship between the submanifold and ambient splitting tractors corresponding to the isomorphism in Theorem 3.5, namely:

$$X^{I} = \Pi^{I}_{A} X^{A}, \quad Z^{I}_{i} = \Pi^{I}_{A} \Pi^{a}_{i} Z^{A}_{a}, \quad \text{and} \quad Y^{I} = \Pi^{I}_{A} (Y^{A} - H^{a} Z^{A}_{a} - \frac{1}{2} H^{a} H_{a} X^{A})$$
(3.20)

along  $\Sigma$ , where  $\Pi_A^I$  can be interpreted as the inverse of the map  $\Pi_I^A$  given by Theorem 3.5 or, better, as the orthogonal projection from  $\mathcal{T}$  to  $\mathcal{N}^{\perp}$  followed by the isomorphism  $\mathcal{N}^{\perp} \to \mathcal{T}\Sigma$  (this is completely analogous to our use of the notation  $\Pi_a^i$  applied to tangent vectors, see (3.1)).

We have already mentioned that there is a tractor Gauß formula, namely a decomposition of the ambient tractor connection which is compatible with the decomposition  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{N}^{\perp} \oplus \mathcal{N}$ . Define the "checked" connection  $\check{\nabla}$  on  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$  by

$$\check{\nabla}_i V^J := \Pi^J_B \nabla_i \left( \Pi^B_K V^K \right), \tag{3.21}$$

where  $\nabla_i$  on the right-hand side is the (pullback of the) ambient tractor connection. This is essentially the tangential part of the ambient connection. We may then define the *tractor second* fundamental form  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^C$  analogously to the Riemannian case, namely as the 1-form with values in maps  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma \to \mathcal{N}$  which characterises the normal part of the ambient connection:

$$\nabla_i V^B = \Pi^B_J \check{\nabla}_i V^J + \mathbb{L}_{iJ}{}^B V^J, \qquad (3.22)$$

where  $V^B = \prod_J^B V^J$  is a section of the ambient tractor bundle which is tangent to the submanifold. The linear operator  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^B$  is well defined by this since both  $\iota^* \nabla$  and  $\check{\nabla}$  satisfy the Leibniz rule. We call (3.22) the tractor Gauß formula.

The ambient tractor connection also induces a connection on the normal tractor bundle in the obvious way:

$$\nabla_i^{\mathcal{N}} N^A := \mathcal{N}_B^A \nabla_i N^B, \tag{3.23}$$

where  $N^A$  is a section of  $\mathcal{N}$ . Such  $N^A$  are of the form  $N^A \stackrel{g}{=} (0, n^a, n_c H^c)$ , where  $n^a \in \Gamma(N\Sigma^a[-1])$ . As a tractor with zero in the top slot, it follows from (2.15) that the middle slot of  $\nabla_i^{\mathcal{N}} N^A$  is necessarily conformally invariant. But this exactly recovers the invariant connection on  $N\Sigma[-1]$ discussed in Section 3.2 (cf. Lemma 3.4). In summary, we have the following.

**Proposition 3.7.** The canonical isomorphism  $N\Sigma[-1] \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{N}$  preserves the invariant parallel transports defined on each bundle.

Essential to our direction in this article is that the tractor fundamental form may be captured in several equivalent ways, the first of which we give here. **Proposition 3.8.** The tractor second fundamental form is given by

$$\mathbb{L}_{iK}{}^B = \Pi_K^C \mathbb{N}_A^B \nabla_i \Pi_C^A, \tag{3.24}$$

or equivalently,

$$\mathbb{L}_{iK}{}^B = -\Pi_K^C \mathcal{N}_A^B \nabla_i \mathcal{N}_C^A. \tag{3.25}$$

*Proof.* Let  $N^A$  be a section of the normal tractor bundle  $\mathcal{N}$ . Note that  $\Pi^A_C N_A = 0$ , and hence

$$0 = \nabla_i (\Pi_C^A N_A) = (\nabla_i \Pi_C^A) N_A + \Pi_B^A \nabla_i N_A,$$

whence

$$\Pi_C^A \nabla_i N_A = -N_A \nabla_i \Pi_C^A. \tag{3.26}$$

As a consequence of the tractor Gauß formula (3.22),

$$N_B \mathbb{L}_{iK}{}^B V^K = N_B \nabla_i V^B = -V^B \nabla_i N_B = -V^K \Pi^B_K \nabla_i N_B$$

for all  $V^K \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}^K)$ , and therefore

$$N_B \mathbb{L}_{iK}{}^B = -\Pi_K^B \nabla_i N_B = -\Pi_K^C \Pi_C^A \nabla_i N_A.$$

Combining this with (3.26), we have that

$$N_B \mathbb{L}_{iK}{}^B = -\Pi_K^C \left( -N_A \nabla_i \Pi_C^A \right) = N_B \Pi_K^C N_A^B \nabla_i \Pi_C^A,$$

and this must hold for any section  $N^B$  of the normal tractor bundle, whence the result follows. Substituting  $\Pi_C^A = \delta_C^A - N_C^A$  into (3.24) and using that  $\delta_C^A$  is parallel for the tractor connection then gives the second equality of the proposition.

It will be convenient to have a second (equivalent) object that we also term the *tractor second* fundamental form, which we denote by  $\overline{\mathbb{L}}$  and which is the section of  $T^*\Sigma \otimes \mathcal{N}^{\perp *} \otimes \mathcal{N}$  defined by

$$\overline{\mathbb{L}}_{iA}{}^B = \Pi^J_A \mathbb{L}_{iJ}{}^B. \tag{3.27}$$

Since  $\Pi_A^J$  is an isomorphism  $\mathcal{T}^*\Sigma \to \mathcal{N}^{\perp*}$ , this is clearly equivalent to the original tractor second fundamental form (and eventually when there is no possibility of confusion we will simply denote both objects by  $\mathbb{L}$ ). The gain of using  $\overline{\mathbb{L}}$  is that both its tractor indices are ambient tractor indices, as we shall see shortly.

It is useful to observe that  $\overline{\mathbb{L}}$  arises naturally in several different ways.

**Lemma 3.9.** The *B* index of  $N_A^C \nabla_i N_B^A$  is tangential, i.e., for any  $N^B \in \Gamma(\mathcal{N}^B)$ , one has

$$N^B \mathbf{N}_A^C \nabla_i \mathbf{N}_B^A = 0.$$

*Proof.* Let  $N^B \in \Gamma(\mathcal{N}^B)$ . We calculate  $\nabla_i(\mathcal{N}^A_B N^B)$  in two different ways. On the one hand, one has

$$\nabla_i (\mathbf{N}_B^A N^B) = \nabla_i N^A,$$

while on the other

$$\nabla_i (\mathbf{N}_B^A N^B) = \mathbf{N}_B^A \nabla_i N^B + N^B \nabla_i \mathbf{N}_B^A$$

Hence

$$N^B \nabla_i \mathcal{N}^A_B = \nabla_i N^A - \mathcal{N}^A_B \nabla_i N^B.$$

Thus

$$N^{B}N^{C}_{A}\nabla_{i}N^{A}_{B} = N^{C}_{A}(\nabla_{i}N^{A} - N^{A}_{B}\nabla_{i}N^{B}) = N^{C}_{A}\nabla_{i}N^{A} - N^{C}_{B}\nabla_{i}N^{B} = 0.$$

Thus we see that the  $\Pi_K^C$  of equation (3.25) is merely identifying the already tangential C index with a submanifold tractor index. Thus we see the following.

#### Proposition 3.10.

$$\overline{\mathbb{L}}_{iB}{}^C = -\mathbb{N}_A^C \nabla_i \mathbb{N}_B^A. \tag{3.28}$$

*Proof.* By equation (3.25) we have

$$\overline{\mathbb{L}}_{iB}{}^C = -\Pi_B^K \Pi_K^D \mathcal{N}_A^C \nabla_i \mathcal{N}_D^A = -(\delta_B^D - \mathcal{N}_B^D) \mathcal{N}_A^C \nabla_i \mathcal{N}_D^A,$$

and so the result follows from the previous lemma.

**Remark 3.11.** Note that (3.28) is equivalent to  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^{C} = -\Pi_{J}^{B} \mathcal{N}_{A}^{C} \nabla_{i} \mathcal{N}_{B}^{A}$ . A similar argument shows that

$$II_{ij}{}^c = -\Pi^b_j \mathcal{N}^c_a \nabla_i \mathcal{N}^a_b.$$

**Lemma 3.12.** Let  $N_B^C$  be the normal tractor projector. Then

$$\nabla_i \mathcal{N}_B^C = -\overline{\mathbb{L}}_i{}^C{}_B - \overline{\mathbb{L}}_{iB}{}^C, \qquad (3.29)$$

where

$$\overline{\mathbb{L}}_i{}^C{}_B = h^{CD} h_{AB} \overline{\mathbb{L}}_{iD}{}^A.$$

*Proof.* Noting that  $N_B^C = N_A^C N_B^A$ , we have

$$\nabla_i \mathbf{N}_B^C = \mathbf{N}_B^A \nabla_i \mathbf{N}_A^C + \mathbf{N}_A^C \nabla_i \mathbf{N}_B^A$$

The second term is exactly the negative of equation (3.28). Using that the normal projector is symmetric, the first term is clearly a transpose of this (so for example on this term, the C index is tangential).

We now use this result to compute an explicit formula for the tractor second fundamental form. We first prove a lemma about the tractor normal projector.

**Lemma 3.13.** For a choice of scale, the tractor normal projector is given by

$$N_B^A = N_b^a Z_a^A Z_B^b + H^a Z_a^A X_B + H_b X^A Z_B^b + (H^d H_d) X^A X_B$$
(3.30)

where the  $H^c$  is the mean curvature vector in the chosen scale.

*Proof.* The right-hand side of (3.30) defines a conformally invariant bundle map  $\mathcal{E}^A \to \mathcal{N}^B$  which moreover acts as the identity on sections of  $\mathcal{N}^A$  as defined in following (3.15). The latter is easily verified by working in a minimal scale.

Alternatively, (3.30) follows immediately from (3.17), as in any scale

$$N_B^a = N_b^a Z_B^b + H^a X_B,$$

and  $\mathbf{N}_B^A = N_a^A N_B^a$ .

**Theorem 3.14.** The tractor second fundamental form is given by

$$\mathbb{L}_{iJ}{}^{C} = \mathring{\Pi}_{ij}{}^{c}Z_{J}{}^{j}Z_{c}^{C} + N_{a}^{c} \left(P_{i}^{a} - \nabla_{i}H^{a}\right) X_{J}Z_{c}^{C} + H_{c}\mathring{\Pi}_{ij}{}^{c}Z_{J}{}^{j}X^{C} + H_{a} \left(P_{i}^{a} - \nabla_{i}H^{a}\right) X_{J}X^{C}.$$
(3.31)

**Remark 3.15.** Note that, in particular,  $\mathbb{L} = 0$  if and only if  $\mathring{H} = 0$  and  $N_a^c (P_i^a - \nabla_i H^a) = 0$ . For later use when computing examples it is useful to note that also that  $N_a^c (P_i^a - \nabla_i H^a) = \frac{1}{n-2}N_a^c \operatorname{Ric}_i{}^a - \nabla_i^{\perp} H^c$ .

*Proof.* We compute  $N_A^C \nabla_i N_B^A$  using the formula from Lemma 3.13. We then apply  $\Pi_J^B$ , the formula for which is given in Theorem 3.5 to complete the proof.

First, differentiating (3.30) gives

$$\begin{split} \nabla_{i} \mathbf{N}_{B}^{A} &= \left(\nabla_{i} \mathbf{N}_{b}^{a}\right) Z_{a}^{A} Z_{B}^{b} + \mathbf{N}_{b}^{a} \left(-P_{ia} X^{A} - \boldsymbol{g}_{ia} Y^{A}\right) Z_{B}^{b} + \mathbf{N}_{b}^{a} Z_{a}^{A} \left(-P_{i}^{b} X_{B} - \Pi_{i}^{b} Y_{B}\right) \\ &+ \left(\nabla_{i} H^{a}\right) Z_{a}^{A} X_{B} + H^{a} \left(-P_{ia} X^{A} - \boldsymbol{g}_{ia} Y^{A}\right) X_{B} + H^{a} Z_{a}^{A} Z_{Bi} \\ &+ \left(\nabla_{i} H_{b}\right) X^{A} Z_{B}^{b} + H_{b} Z_{i}^{A} Z_{B}^{b} + H_{b} X^{A} \left(-P_{i}^{b} X_{B} - \Pi_{i}^{b} Y_{B}\right) \\ &+ 2 (H^{d} \nabla_{i} H_{d}) X^{A} X_{B} + H^{d} H_{d} Z_{i}^{A} X_{B} + H^{d} H_{d} X^{A} Z_{Bi} \\ &= \left(\nabla_{i} \mathbf{N}_{b}^{a} + H^{a} \boldsymbol{g}_{ib} + H_{b} \Pi_{i}^{a}\right) Z_{a}^{A} Z_{B}^{b} \\ &+ \left(-\mathbf{N}_{b}^{a} P_{ia} + \nabla_{i} H_{b} + H_{d} H^{d} \mathbf{g}_{ib}\right) X^{A} Z_{B}^{b} \\ &+ \left(-\mathbf{N}_{b}^{a} P_{i}^{b} + \nabla_{i} H^{a} + H_{d} H^{d} \Pi_{i}^{a}\right) Z_{a}^{A} X_{B} \\ &+ \left(-H^{a} P_{ia} - H_{b} P_{i}^{b} + 2H^{d} \nabla_{i} H_{d}\right) X^{A} X_{B}, \end{split}$$

where, recall,  $g_{ia}$  means  $\Pi_i^b g_{ba}$ . From (3.30), it follows that

$$\mathbf{N}_A^C Z_a^A = \mathbf{N}_a^c Z_c^C + H_a X^C \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{N}_A^C X^A = 0.$$

Hence

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{N}_{A}^{C} \nabla_{i} \mathbf{N}_{B}^{A} &= \left( \nabla_{i} \mathbf{N}_{b}^{a} + H^{a} \boldsymbol{g}_{ib} + H_{b} \Pi_{i}^{a} \right) \left( \mathbf{N}_{a}^{c} Z_{c}^{C} + H_{a} X^{C} \right) Z_{B}^{b} \\ &+ \left( -\mathbf{N}_{b}^{a} P_{i}^{\ b} + \nabla_{i} H^{a} + H_{d} H^{d} \Pi_{i}^{a} \right) \left( \mathbf{N}_{a}^{c} Z_{c}^{C} + H_{a} X^{C} \right) X_{B} \\ &= \left( \mathbf{N}_{a}^{c} \nabla_{i} \mathbf{N}_{b}^{a} + H^{c} \boldsymbol{g}_{ib} \right) Z_{B}^{b} Z_{c}^{C} + \mathbf{N}_{a}^{c} \left( \nabla_{i} H^{a} - P_{i}^{a} \right) X_{B} Z_{c}^{C} \\ &+ H_{a} \left( \nabla_{i} \mathbf{N}_{b}^{a} + H^{a} \boldsymbol{g}_{ib} \right) Z_{B}^{b} X^{C} + H_{a} \left( \nabla_{i} H^{a} - P_{i}^{a} \right) X_{B} X^{C}. \end{split}$$

All that remains is to apply the tangential tractor projector  $\Pi_{J}^{B}$ . According to (3.18),

$$\Pi_J^B Z_B^b = \Pi_j^b Z_J^j \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_J^B X_B = X_J.$$
(3.32)

Therefore

$$\begin{split} \Pi_{J}^{B} \mathbf{N}_{A}^{C} \nabla_{i} \mathbf{N}_{B}^{A} &= \Pi_{j}^{b} \left( \mathbf{N}_{a}^{c} \nabla_{i} \mathbf{N}_{b}^{a} + H^{c} \boldsymbol{g}_{ib} \right) Z_{J}^{j} Z_{c}^{C} + \mathbf{N}_{a}^{c} \left( \nabla_{i} H^{a} - P_{i}^{a} \right) X_{J} Z_{c}^{C} \\ &+ H_{a} \Pi_{j}^{b} \left( \nabla_{i} \mathbf{N}_{b}^{a} + H^{a} \boldsymbol{g}_{ib} \right) Z_{J}^{j} X^{C} + H_{a} \left( \nabla_{i} H^{a} - P_{i}^{a} \right) X_{J} X^{C} \\ &= \left( -\Pi_{ij}^{c} + H^{c} \boldsymbol{g}_{ij} \right) Z_{J}^{j} Z_{c}^{C} + \mathbf{N}_{a}^{c} \left( \nabla_{i} H^{a} - P_{i}^{a} \right) X_{J} Z_{c}^{C} \\ &+ H_{c} \left( -\Pi_{ij}^{c} + H^{c} \boldsymbol{g}_{ib} \right) Z_{J}^{j} X^{C} + H_{a} \left( \nabla_{i} H^{a} - P_{i}^{a} \right) X_{J} X^{C} \\ &= -\mathring{\Pi}_{ij}^{c} Z_{J}^{j} Z_{c}^{C} + \mathbf{N}_{a}^{c} \left( \nabla_{i} H^{a} - P_{i}^{a} \right) X_{J} Z_{c}^{C} \\ &- H_{c} \mathring{\Pi}_{ij}^{c} Z_{J}^{j} X^{C} + H_{a} \left( \nabla_{i} H^{a} - P_{i}^{a} \right) X_{J} X^{C}. \end{split}$$

where we note that  $H_a \nabla_i N_b^a = H_c N_a^c \nabla_i N_b^a$ , and we have used the observation from Remark 3.11 to replace  $\prod_i^b N_a^c \nabla_i N_b^a$  with  $-I_{ij}^c$ .

Finally, applying  $\Pi_J^B$  to equation (3.29) shows that  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^C$  is equal to negative of the above, from which the claim in the theorem follows.

## **3.4** Conformal submanifolds of dimension $m \ge 3$

For submanifold dimensions  $m \ge 3$  the conformal structure of  $\Sigma$  determines a tractor connection Dand compatible tractor metric  $h_{\Sigma}$  on  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$ . We refer to these as the *intrinsic* tractor connection and metric for  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$ . We continue to use abstract indices from the later part of the alphabet to distinguish submanifold objects from their ambient analogues, so, e.g., we write  $h_{\Sigma}$  as  $h_{IJ} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{(IJ)})$ .

Unlike the Riemannian case, the checked connection is not exactly the intrinsic tractor connection.

**Proposition 3.16.** Along a submanifold  $\Sigma$  of dimension  $m \ge 3$  the checked and intrinsic tractor connections are related by

$$\check{\nabla}_i V^J = D_i V^J + \mathsf{S}_i{}^J{}_K V^K, \qquad (3.33)$$

with  $D_i$  the intrinsic submanifold tractor connection and

$$\mathsf{S}_{iJK} := 2\left(P_{ij} - p_{ij} + H_c \mathring{\Pi}_{ij}{}^c + \frac{1}{2}H_c H^c \boldsymbol{g}_{ij}\right) Z^j_{[J} X_{K]}, \qquad (3.34)$$

where  $\Pi_{ij} := \Pi_i^a \Pi_j^b P_{ab}$  is the restriction of the ambient Schouten tensor to the submanifold and  $p_{ij}$  is the intrinsic Schouten tensor.

*Proof.* Fix metrics  $g \in \mathbf{c}$  and  $g_{\Sigma} \in \mathbf{c}_{\Sigma}$  such that  $\iota^* g = g_{\Sigma}$  to facilitate calculation. The inverse isomorphism of (3.18) is the map  $\mathcal{N}^{\perp} \to \mathcal{T}\Sigma$  given by the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -H^a & \Pi_i^a & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}H^c H_c & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (3.35)

Using this we have

$$\begin{split} \check{\nabla}_{i}V^{J} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Pi_{b}^{j} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c} & -H_{b} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \nabla_{i} \begin{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -H^{b} & \Pi_{b}^{k} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c} & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma \\ \mu^{b} - H^{b}\sigma \\ \rho - \frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c} & -H_{b} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Pi_{b}^{j} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c} & -H_{b} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \nabla_{i} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma \\ \mu^{b} - H^{b}\sigma \\ \rho - \frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c}\sigma \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Pi_{b}^{j} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c} & -H_{b} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_{i}(\mu^{b} - H^{b}\sigma) + P_{i}^{b}\sigma + \Pi_{i}^{b}(\rho - \frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c}\sigma) \\ \nabla_{i}(\rho - \frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c}\sigma) - P_{ic}(\mu^{c} - H^{c}\sigma) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Pi_{b}^{j} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c} & -H_{b} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_{i}\mu^{b} - (\nabla_{i}H^{b})\sigma - H^{b}\nabla_{i}\sigma + P_{i}^{b}\sigma + \Pi_{b}^{b}\rho - \frac{1}{2}\Pi_{b}^{b}H^{c}H_{c}\sigma \\ \nabla_{i}\rho - (H^{c}\nabla_{i}H_{c})\sigma - \frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c}\nabla_{i}\sigma - P_{ic}\mu^{c} + P_{ic}H^{c}\sigma \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \Pi_{b}^{j}(\nabla_{i}\mu^{b} - (\nabla_{i}H^{b})\sigma - H^{b}\nabla_{i}\sigma + P_{i}^{b}\sigma + \Pi_{b}^{b}\rho - \frac{1}{2}\Pi_{b}^{b}H^{c}H_{c}\sigma \\ \nabla_{i}\rho - (H^{c}\nabla_{i}H^{b})\sigma - H^{b}\nabla_{i}\sigma + P_{i}^{b}\sigma + \Pi_{b}^{b}\rho - \frac{1}{2}\Pi_{b}^{b}H^{c}H_{c}\sigma \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \Pi_{b}^{j}(\nabla_{i}\mu^{b} - (\nabla_{i}H^{b})\sigma - H^{b}\nabla_{i}\sigma + P_{i}^{b}\sigma + \Pi_{b}^{b}\rho - \frac{1}{2}\Pi_{b}^{b}H^{c}H_{c}\sigma \\ -\frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c}(\nabla_{i}\sigma - \mu_{i}) - H_{b}(\nabla_{i}\mu^{b} - (\nabla_{i}H^{b})\sigma - H^{b}\nabla_{i}\sigma - P_{i}c\mu^{c} + P_{i}b^{c}\sigma + \Pi_{b}^{b}\rho - \frac{1}{2}\Pi_{b}^{b}H^{c}H_{c}\sigma \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix}$$

Using the agreement of the intrinsic Levi-Civita connection with the pullback of the ambient Levi-Civita connection then gives

$$\begin{split} \check{\nabla}_{i}V^{J} &= \begin{pmatrix} D_{i}\sigma - \mu_{i} \\ D_{i}\mu^{j} + P_{i}^{j}\sigma + \delta_{i}^{j}\rho - (\Pi_{b}^{j}\nabla_{i}H^{b})\sigma - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{i}^{j}H^{c}H_{c}\sigma \\ D_{i}\rho - P_{ic}\mu^{c} + \frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c}\mu_{i} - H_{b}\nabla_{i}\mu^{b} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} D_{i}\sigma - \mu_{i} \\ D_{i}\mu^{j} + p_{i}^{j}\sigma + \delta_{i}^{j}\rho - (-\mathring{\Pi}_{i}^{j}b - \delta_{i}^{j}H_{b})H^{b}\sigma - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{i}^{j}H^{c}H_{c}\sigma + (P_{i}^{j} - p_{i}^{j})\sigma \\ D_{i}\rho - p_{ic}\mu^{c} + \frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c}\mu_{i} - H_{b}(\mathring{\Pi}_{ij}^{b} + g_{ij}H^{b})\mu^{j} + (P_{i}^{j} - p_{i}^{j})\mu^{j} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} D_{i}\sigma - \mu_{i} \\ D_{i}\mu^{j} + p_{i}^{j}\sigma + \delta_{i}^{j}\rho \\ D_{i}\rho - p_{ic}\mu^{c} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ (P_{i}^{j} - p_{i}^{j} + H_{b}\mathring{\Pi}_{i}^{jb} + \frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c}\delta_{i}^{j})\sigma \\ - (P_{ij} - p_{ij} + H_{b}\mathring{\Pi}_{ij}^{b} + \frac{1}{2}H_{b}H^{b}g_{ij})\mu^{j} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= D_{i}^{T\Sigma} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma \\ \mu^{j} \\ \rho \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \mathcal{F}_{i}^{j} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathcal{F}_{ij} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma \\ \mu^{j} \\ \rho \end{pmatrix}. \end{split}$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_{ij} := P_{ij} - p_{ij} + H_b \mathring{\Pi}_{ij}{}^b + \frac{1}{2} H_b H^b \boldsymbol{g}_{ij}.$$
(3.36)

We call the tensor  $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$  given in (3.36) the *Fialkow tensor* (since this quantity seems to have appeared first in the work of Fialkow [51], cf. [87, 112]). Since the checked connection, the intrinsic tractor connection and  $Z_{[J}^{j}X_{K]}$  are all conformally invariant, it follows that the Fialkow tensor is also conformally invariant. Proposition 3.16 tells us that the Fialkow tensor measures the failure of the induced tractor connection  $\check{\nabla}$  to be *normal* (in the sense of corresponding to a normal Cartan connection [22]).

There is an alternative formula for the Fialkow tensor which is manifestly conformally invariant. To derive it, one substitutes the Weyl-Schouten decomposition of the ambient and intrinsic Riemann tensors into the Gauß formula, and then applies the map

$$T_{ijkl} \mapsto \frac{1}{m-2} \left( T_{ikj}^{\ k} - \frac{T_{kl}^{\ kl}}{2(m-1)} \boldsymbol{g}_{ij} \right)$$
(3.37)

to both sides (to take the "submanifold Schouten" part). After writing the second fundamental form as  $\mathring{I}_{ij}{}^c + g_{ij}H^c$  and rearranging, one finds that the Fialkow tensor (3.36) is equal to

$$\mathcal{F}_{ij} = \frac{1}{m-2} \left( W_{icjd} N^{cd} + \frac{W_{abcd} N^{ac} N^{bd}}{2(m-1)} \boldsymbol{g}_{ij} + \mathring{\boldsymbol{H}}_{i}{}^{kc} \mathring{\boldsymbol{H}}_{jkc} - \frac{\mathring{\boldsymbol{H}}_{klc} \mathring{\boldsymbol{H}}^{klc}}{2(m-1)} \boldsymbol{g}_{ij} \right).$$
(3.38)

All objects on the right-hand side are conformally invariant. Since the Fialkow tensor has already been observed to be conformally invariant, it it sufficient to establish the formula (3.38) in a minimal scale. Let  $g \in c$  be a minimal scale and  $g_{\Sigma} = \iota^* g$ . Thus  $II = \mathring{I}$ . Applying the submanifold and ambient Weyl-Schouten decompositions in the Gauss equation we obtain

$$W_{ijkl} + P_{ik}\boldsymbol{g}_{jl} - P_{jk}\boldsymbol{g}_{il} - P_{il}\boldsymbol{g}_{jk} + P_{jl}\boldsymbol{g}_{ik} = w_{ijkl} + p_{ik}\boldsymbol{g}_{jl} - p_{jk}\boldsymbol{g}_{il} - p_{il}\boldsymbol{g}_{jk} + p_{jl}\boldsymbol{g}_{ik} + \boldsymbol{g}_{cd}\Pi_{li}{}^{c}\Pi_{ik}{}^{d} - \boldsymbol{g}_{cd}\Pi_{lj}{}^{c}\Pi_{ik}{}^{d}$$

where  $W_{ijkl}$  denotes the full projection  $\Pi_i^a \Pi_j^b \Pi_k^c \Pi_l^d W_{abcd}$  of the ambient Weyl curvature,  $P_{ij} = \Pi_i^a \Pi_j^b P_{ab}$ , and  $w_{ijkl}$  denotes the submanifold intrinsic Weyl tensor. Applying the map  $T_{ijkl} \mapsto \frac{1}{m-2} \left( T_{ikj}^{\ k} - \frac{T_{kl}^{\ kl}}{2(m-1)} g_{ij} \right)$  on both sides of the above display we get

$$-\frac{1}{m-2}\left(W_{icjd}N^{cd} + \frac{W_{acbd}N^{ab}N^{cd}}{2(m-1)}\boldsymbol{g}_{ij}\right) + P_{ij} = p_{ij} + \frac{1}{m-2}\left(\mathring{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_{i}{}^{kc}\mathring{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_{jkc} - \frac{\mathring{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}^{klc}\mathring{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_{klc}}{2(m-1)}\boldsymbol{g}_{ij}\right),$$

noting that  $\boldsymbol{g}^{kl}W_{ikjl} = \boldsymbol{g}^{kl}\Pi_k^c\Pi_l^dW_{icjd} = -N^{cd}W_{icjd}$  since  $W_{abcd}$  is trace free, and similarly  $W_{kl}^{kl} = W_{acbd}N^{ab}N^{cd}$ . The result then follows from (3.36).

**Remark 3.17.** In the m = 2 case  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{c}_{\Sigma})$  we do not have an (intrinsicaly defined) Schouten tensor for a metric  $g_{\Sigma} \in \mathbf{c}_{\Sigma}$ , and the map (3.37) does not make sense. Crossing off the  $\frac{1}{m-2}$  in (3.37) does not help, as when m = 2 the map  $T_{ijkl} \mapsto T_{ikj}{}^k - \frac{T_{kl}{}^{kl}}{2(m-1)}g_{ij}$  is easily seen to be equal to the zero map. Since in two dimensions the space of algebraic curvature tensors is one dimensional, when m = 2 the Gauss equation is equivalent to the scalar equation given by its "double trace." If K denotes the Gaussian curvature of  $g_{\Sigma} \in \mathbf{c}_{\Sigma}$  then contracting the Gauss equation twice gives

$$K = \boldsymbol{g}^{ij} P_{ij} + \frac{1}{2} W_{ijkl} \boldsymbol{g}^{ik} \boldsymbol{g}^{jl} + 2|H|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\Pi|^2.$$
(3.39)

We'll make use of this in Section 3.5 below when we show that the conformal embedding of  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{c}_{\Sigma})$ into  $(M, \mathbf{c})$  determines a canonical (extrinsically defined) Schouten tensor  $p_{ij}$  for a metric  $g_{\Sigma} \in \mathbf{c}_{\Sigma}$ . Recall that along  $\Sigma$  we may decompose the ambient standard tractor bundle  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}M$  as  $\mathcal{T}|_{\Sigma} = \mathcal{T}\Sigma \oplus \mathcal{N}$ . If  $V \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}|_{\Sigma})$  is given by  $(V^{\top}, V^{\perp})$  with respect to this decomposition, then by (3.22), (3.23), (3.33) and the fact that  $\nabla$  preserves the ambient tractor metric we have

$$\nabla_X V = \begin{pmatrix} D_X + \mathsf{S}(X) & -\mathbb{L}(X)^T \\ \mathbb{L}(X) & \nabla_X^{\mathcal{N}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} V^\top \\ V^\perp \end{pmatrix}$$
(3.40)

for any  $X \in \mathfrak{X}(\Sigma)$ , where  $\mathbb{L}(X)^T$  is the transpose of  $\mathbb{L}(X)$  with respect to the ambient tractor metric (cf. Proposition 3.8). We therefore write

$$\iota^* \nabla = \begin{pmatrix} D + \mathsf{S} & -\mathbb{L}^T \\ \mathbb{L} & \nabla^{\mathcal{N}} \end{pmatrix}$$
(3.41)

on  $\mathcal{T}|_{\Sigma} = \mathcal{T}\Sigma \oplus \mathcal{N}$ . We will most often make use of the above display in the case where V is a section of  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$  ( $V^{\perp} = 0$ ). In this case we obtain the following form of the *tractor Gau formula*:

$$\nabla_i V^B = \Pi^B_J \left( D_i V^J + \mathsf{S}_i{}^J{}_K V^K \right) + \mathbb{L}_{iK}{}^B V^K, \qquad (3.42)$$

for any section V of  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$ . For a section

By computing the curvature of  $\iota^*\Omega$  of  $\iota^*\nabla$  using the decomposition (3.41) one may easily obtain conformal tractor analogues of the Riemannian Gauss, Codazzi, and Ricci equations (cf. the derivation of the Riemannian Gauß-Codazzi-Ricci equations in Section 3.1):

$$\Omega_{ijKL} = \Omega^{\Sigma}{}_{ijKL} + 2D_{[i}\mathsf{S}_{j]KL} + 2\mathsf{S}_{[i|KM}\mathsf{S}_{j]}{}^{M}{}_{L} + 2\mathbb{L}_{[i|L}{}^{C}\mathbb{L}_{[j]KC}$$
(3.43)

$$\Omega_{ij}{}^{E}{}_{L}\mathbf{N}_{E}^{C} = 2D_{[i}\mathbb{L}_{j]L}{}^{C} + 2\mathbb{L}_{[i|K}{}^{C}\mathbf{S}_{|j]}{}^{K}{}_{L}$$
(3.44)

$$\Omega_{ij}{}^{A}{}_{B}\mathbf{N}_{A}^{C}\mathbf{N}_{D}^{B} = \Omega^{\mathcal{N}}{}_{ij}{}^{C}{}_{D} - 2g^{KL}\mathbb{L}_{[iK}{}^{C}\mathbb{L}_{j]LD}, \qquad (3.45)$$

where indices between bars are exempt from antisymmetrisation,  $\Omega_{ijKL} = \Omega_{ijCD} \Pi_K^C \Pi_L^D$  for  $\Omega_{ijCD}$  the curvature of the pullback connection, and  $\Omega^N$  is the curvature of the normal tractor connection, characterised by

$$\Omega^{\mathcal{N}}{}_{ij}{}^{C}{}_{D}N^{D} = \left(\nabla^{\mathcal{N}}_{i}\nabla^{\mathcal{N}}_{j} - \nabla^{\mathcal{N}}_{j}\nabla^{\mathcal{N}}_{i}\right)N^{C},\tag{3.46}$$

for any section N of the normal tractor bundle  $\mathcal{N}$ .

**Remark 3.18.** In [16] Burstall and Calderbank define a 'Möbius reduction' to be a rank (m + 2)subbundle  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $\mathcal{T}|_{\Sigma}$  containing the rank m + 1 subbundle spanned by the canonical tractor  $X^A$  and its covariant derivatives in submanifold tangential directions (with respect to the ambient tractor connection coupled with the Levi-Civita connection of some, equivalently any, metric  $g \in \mathbf{c}$ ). One then decomposes the ambient tractor connection along  $\Sigma$  as (using notation similar to the above)

$$\iota^* \nabla = \left( \begin{array}{cc} \nabla^{\mathcal{V}} & -(\mathbb{L}^{\mathcal{V}})^T \\ \mathbb{L}^{\mathcal{V}} & \nabla^{\mathcal{V}^{\perp}} \end{array} \right)$$

on  $\mathcal{T}|_{\Sigma} = \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathcal{V}^{\perp}$ . The definition of 'Möbius reduction' implies that  $\mathbb{L}^{\mathcal{V}}{}_{iJ}{}^{C}X^{J} = 0$  and  $\mathbb{L}^{\mathcal{V}}{}_{iJ}{}^{C}X_{C} = 0$ , so that there is a well-defined projection  $\Pi^{\mathcal{V}}{}_{ij}{}^{c} := \mathbb{L}^{\mathcal{V}}{}_{iJ}{}^{C}Z_{j}{}^{J}Z_{c}{}^{C}$  of  $\mathbb{L}^{\mathcal{V}}{}_{iJ}{}^{C}$ . Burstall and Calderbank then define the unique 'canonical Möbius reduction'  $\mathcal{V}_{\Sigma}$  by imposing an algebraic normalisation condition on

$$\left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & -(\mathbb{L}^{\mathcal{V}})^T \\ \mathbb{L}^{\mathcal{V}} & 0 \end{array}\right)$$

similar to the algebraic normalisation condition imposed on the curvature of the normal Cartan/tractor connection [27, 22], see Section 9.3 of [16]. This algebraic normalisation condition amounts to the requirement that  $\mathbf{g}^{ij}\Pi^{\mathcal{V}}{}_{ij}{}^{c} = 0$ . Since by Theorem 3.14 the tractor second fundamental form has invariant projection  $\mathring{\Pi}_{ij}{}^{c} = \mathbb{L}_{iJ}{}^{C}Z_{j}{}^{J}Z_{c}{}^{C}$  the 'canonical Möbius reduction'  $\mathcal{V}_{\Sigma}$  is the same as the orthogonal complement  $\mathcal{N}^{\perp}$  of the normal tractor bundle and hence gives an abstract characterization of this bundle (equivalently of the normal tractor bundle  $\mathcal{N}$ ). Our approach differs in that we explicitly construct  $\mathcal{N}$ , and then further explicitly identify  $\mathcal{N}^{\perp}$  with the intrinsic tractor bundle  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$ .

#### 3.5 Low-dimensional conformal submanifolds

In this section we treat submanifolds  $\Sigma$  such that dim $(\Sigma)$  is m = 1 or m = 2. Note that Section 3.3 has no restriction on the submanifold dimension m. However in Section 3.4, just above, we make the restriction to  $m \ge 3$  to discuss the intrinsic tractor connection then available. When m = 1, 2 the conformal structure on  $\Sigma$  is not sufficient to determine a canonical connection on  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$ . The purpose of this section is to observe that in these dimensions the conformal embedding does determine distinguished tractor connections on  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$ , and then using this we get analogues of the results from Section 3.4.

First recall that Equation (3.21) defines a connection  $\check{\nabla}$  on the bundle  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$  also when dim  $\Sigma$  is 1 or 2.

Riemannian manifolds of dimension 1 or 2 are not naturally equipped with an (intrinsically determined) Schouten tensor. However conformal submanifolds of these dimensions inherit a natural replacement, as follows. First recall that for submanifolds of dimension at least 3, the difference tractor of is equivalent to the Fialkow tensor of the submanifold according to expressions (3.34) and (3.36). In dimensions 1 and 2, we will, in essence, turn this around and use the formula (3.36) to determine a submanifold Schouten tensor (for a given  $g_{\Sigma} \in \mathbf{c}_{\Sigma}$ ). In these dimensions all terms in (3.36) are well defined, as usual, except the submanifold Schouten  $p_{ij}$  and the Fialkow tensor  $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$ . Note that fixing one of these two determines the other via (3.36). Moreover, from the conformal transformation formulae of the terms in (3.36), it follows that any natural conformally invariant choice of  $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$  determines a submanifold tensor  $p_{ij} \in S^2T^*\Sigma$  that transforms conformally according to (2.10). From a conformal geometry point of view it makes sense to define  $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$  first (in a conformally invariant fashion) and view the definition of the Schouten tensor  $p_{ij}$  of a metric  $g_{\Sigma} \in \mathbf{c}_{\Sigma}$ as a consequence of this. Such a Schouten tensor  $p_{ij}$  then yields a conformally invariant tractor connection D on  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$  (in a choice of scale) according to the usual formula, namely

$$D_{i} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma \\ \mu_{j} \\ \rho \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} D_{i}\sigma - \mu_{i} \\ D_{i}\mu_{j} + p_{ij}\sigma + \mathbf{g}_{ij}\rho \\ D_{i}\rho - p_{ij}\mu^{j} \end{pmatrix},$$
(3.47)

where D on the right-hand side is the intrinsic Levi-Civita connection. Equivalently the tractor connection is determined by formula (3.33) with

$$\mathsf{S}_{iJK} := 2\mathcal{F}_{ij}Z^{j}_{[J}X_{K]}.$$

Thus it remains to specify an invariant  $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$ , or equivalently a  $p_{ij}$  that transforms according to (2.10). Recall that in all dimensions we have the conformally invariant tractor connection  $\check{\nabla}$  on

 $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$ . It is given by

$$\check{\nabla}_{i}V^{J} = \begin{pmatrix} D_{i}\sigma - \mu_{i} \\ D_{i}\mu^{j} + \left(P_{i}^{j} + H_{b}\mathring{\Pi}_{i}^{jb} + \frac{1}{2}H^{c}H_{c}\delta_{i}^{j}\right)\sigma + \delta_{i}^{j}\rho \\ D_{i}\rho - \left(P_{ij} + H_{b}\mathring{\Pi}_{ij}^{b} + \frac{1}{2}H_{b}H^{b}\boldsymbol{g}_{ij}\right)\mu^{j} \end{pmatrix},$$
(3.48)

where we have computed using a choice of ambient scale  $g \in \mathbf{c}$ , and  $V^J \stackrel{g_{\Sigma}}{=} (\sigma, \mu^j, \rho)$ . Note that although the terms  $P_{ij}$  and  $H^a$  appearing on the right hand side in the above display depend on the extension  $g \in \mathbf{c}$  of  $g_{\Sigma}$ , the right hand side itself does not (by the conformal invariance of the  $\check{\nabla}$  and the fact that  $g_{\Sigma}$  is sufficient to determine the tractor bundle splitting); in particular, the quantity  $P_{ij} + H_b \mathring{\Pi}_{ij}{}^b + \frac{1}{2}H_b H^b \mathbf{g}_{ij}$  is independent of the extension g of  $g_{\Sigma}$ . Moreover, from the conformal invariance of  $\check{\nabla}$  it can be shown that  $P_{ij} + H_b \mathring{\Pi}_{ij}{}^b + \frac{1}{2}H_b H^b \mathbf{g}_{ij}$  transforms in the same way as a Schouten tensor when  $g_{\Sigma}$  is rescaled conformally. In particular, if we define

$$p_{ij} := \left( P_{ij} + H_b \mathring{\Pi}_{ij}{}^b + \frac{1}{2} H_b H^b \boldsymbol{g}_{ij} \right) - \mathcal{F}_{ij}, \qquad (3.49)$$

for any (decreed to be) conformally invariant  $\mathcal{F}_{ij} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{(ij)})$ ,  $p_{ij}$  depends only on  $g_{\Sigma}$  (and the conformal embedding of  $\Sigma$  in  $(M, \mathbf{c})$ ), (3.36) holds, and  $p_{ij}$  has conformal transformation

$$\hat{p}_{ij} = p_{ij} - D_i \Upsilon_j + \Upsilon_i \Upsilon_j - \frac{1}{2} g_{ij} \Upsilon^k \Upsilon_k.$$
(3.50)

This formula is also easily checked directly. When such a choice of submanifold Schouten tensor has been made we will denote its trace by

$$j := \boldsymbol{g}^{ij} p_{ij}. \tag{3.51}$$

Then under conformal change

$$\hat{\jmath} = \jmath - D_i \Upsilon^i + (1 - \frac{m}{2}) \Upsilon^i \Upsilon_i.$$
(3.52)

In dimension 1 we will simply set  $\mathcal{F}_{ij} := 0$ . Thus given any submanifold scale  $g_{\Sigma}$  and any extension  $g \in \mathbf{c}$  one has

$$p_{ij} := P_{ij} + \frac{1}{2} H_b H^b \boldsymbol{g}_{ij}, \qquad (3.53)$$

since, for a curve, the trace-free second fundamental form is trivially zero. In this case, of course,  $p_{ij} = jg_{ij}$  where  $j := g^{ij}p_{ij}$ . Note that the extension  $g \in c$  can be chosen such that  $H^b = 0$  and then one simply has  $p_{ij} := P_{ij}$ .

In dimension 2 we shall set  $\mathcal{F}_{(ij)_0} = 0$ . We are not free to set  $g^{ij}\mathcal{F}_{ij}$  equal to zero, though, as we require that our corresponding Schouten tensor (for  $g_{\Sigma} \in \mathbf{c}_{\Sigma}$ ) satisfy

$$R_{ijkl}^{g_{\Sigma}} = 2g_{k[i}p_{j]l} - 2g_{l[i}p_{j]k}.$$
(3.54)

(This condition on  $p_{ij}$  is natural by analogy with higher dimensions, but also from the point of view of Cartan geometry/tractor calculus. Specifically, requiring (3.54) is equivalent to requiring that the submanifold tractor connection D be *normal*, in the sense of [22]; this is ultimately because it amounts to vanishing of the "middle slot" of the curvature of the tractor connection D, the slot where the Weyl curvature sits in dimensions four and higher, as can be seen by an easy calculation using (3.47).) Equation (3.54) normalizes the trace of  $p_{ij}$ , and hence of  $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$ . Indeed, (3.54) is equivalent to the requirement that the trace  $j = \mathbf{g}^{ij}p_{ij}$  equals the Gaussian curvature of  $g_{\Sigma}$ :

$$j = \boldsymbol{g}^{ij} p_{ij} := \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{g}^{ij} \operatorname{Ric}_{ij}^{g_{\Sigma}} = K, \qquad (3.55)$$

where  $K = K^{g_{\Sigma}}$  is viewed as as section of  $\mathcal{E}[-2]|_{\Sigma}$  in the natural way. With the trace of  $p_{ij}$  normalized in this way, the trace of  $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$  is therefore given by (tracing (3.36) or (3.49)):

$$g^{ij}\mathcal{F}_{ij} = g^{ij}P_{ij} - K + |H|^2.$$
 (3.56)

Using the (twice contracted) Gauss equation (3.39) for K we have, equivalently,

$$\boldsymbol{g}^{ij}\mathcal{F}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{\Pi}|^2 - |\boldsymbol{H}|^2 - \frac{1}{2}W_{ijkl}\boldsymbol{g}^{ik}\boldsymbol{g}^{jl} = \frac{1}{2}|\mathring{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}|^2 - \frac{1}{2}W_{ijkl}\boldsymbol{g}^{ik}\boldsymbol{g}^{jl}.$$
(3.57)

Writing the submanifold total trace  $W_{ijkl}g^{ik}g^{jl}$  of the ambient Weyl curvature as  $\operatorname{tr}^2 \iota^* W$  the Fialkow tensor for m = 2 is therefore defined to be

$$\mathcal{F}_{ij} = \frac{1}{4} \left( |\mathring{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}|^2 - \operatorname{tr}^2 \iota^* W \right) \boldsymbol{g}_{ij}.$$
(3.58)

The Schouten tensor  $p_{ij}$  of  $g_{\Sigma}$  defined by (3.49) then satisfies (3.54).

With the conventions we have just established for m = 2, the curvature of the tractor connection D is then given by

$$\Omega_{ijKL}^{\Sigma} = -2c_{ijk}X_{[K}Z_{L]}^{\ k},$$

where  $c_{ijk} := 2D_{[i}p_{j]k}$ . This should be compared with (2.20) in the three dimensional case where the Weyl tensor term vanishes. Note that, while in three and higher dimensions the Cotton tensor is trace free, since we are in two dimensions the tensor  $c_{ijk}$  can be written as

$$c_{ijk} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ij} c_k$$

where  $c_k = \epsilon^{ij} c_{ijk}$  and hence  $c_{ijk}$  is determined by its trace

$$c_{ijk}\boldsymbol{g}^{jk} = \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{ij}c^j = D_i\boldsymbol{\jmath} - D^j\boldsymbol{p}_{ij}.$$

In the 2-dimensional case, the choice of  $p_{ij}$  for each scale (with the trace part normalized by setting  $g^{ij}p_{ij}$  to be the Gauß curvature) is equivalent to a choice of Möbius structure on  $\Sigma$  in the sense of [18]. The invariant  $c_{ijk}$ , which we refer to as the *Cotton tensor* in this setting, is precisely the curvature of this Möbius structure and vanishes if and only if  $\Sigma$  (with the Möbius structure just defined) is locally equivalent to the conformal Möbius sphere (i.e. comes from a system of local coordinates on  $\Sigma$  related by Möbius transformations); see [18] for more details. Note that the Möbius structure we have just defined on 2-dimensional submanifolds  $\Sigma$  agrees with the notion of *induced conformal Möbius structure* in [16].

In both dimensions 1 and 2 we then have that, in any scale  $g \in c$ , and with  $g_{\Sigma} = g|_{T\Sigma}$ , the tractor connection on  $[\mathcal{T}\Sigma]_{g_{\Sigma}}$  is given by (3.47). We note that this formula exactly agrees with the formula for the usual tractor connection, as defined by (2.19) (but has  $p_{ij}$  as defined here).

This connection in turn defines a Thomas-D operator  $\mathbb{D} : \mathcal{E}[1] \to \mathcal{T}\Sigma$  via the usual BGG splitting operator characterisation (see e.g. [26]), namely that, for any  $\sigma \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}[1])$ ,  $D_i \mathbb{D}_I \sigma$  must be 0 in the top slot and be trace-free in the middle slot. Thus, in a scale  $g_{\Sigma} \in c_{\Sigma}$ , this takes the form

$$\frac{1}{m} \mathbb{D}_K \sigma \stackrel{g_{\Sigma}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma \\ D_k \sigma \\ -\frac{1}{m} \left( \boldsymbol{g}^{i\ell} D_i D_\ell + j \right) \sigma \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.59}$$

(cf. (2.12)). It follows at once that (as in higher dimensions m) any parallel standard tractor I is necessarily in the image of  $\frac{1}{m}\mathbb{D}$ . Moreover we have that, for any  $\sigma \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}[1])$ , and on the set where  $\sigma$  is non-vanishing, the scale tractor

$$I := \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{D}c$$

satisfies that

$$h^{KL}I_KI_L = -\frac{2}{m}\jmath\,\sigma^2 = -\frac{2}{m}\jmath^{g_\Sigma}$$

where  $j^{g_{\Sigma}} = j\sigma^2$  is the (weight zero true) *J*-curvature for the scale  $g_{\Sigma}$ , and this is thus constant if *I* is parallel. (E.g., for surfaces the scale tractor parallel being implies the corresponding metric has constant Gauß curvature.) So this fits with the situation in higher dimensions.

Finally observe that the Thomas-D formula (3.59) evidently provides a conformally invariant isomorphism

$$J^2 \mathcal{E}_{\Sigma}[1] / S_0^2 T^* \Sigma[1] \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{T} \Sigma,$$

cf. (2.13). Thus our description of the tractor bundle from the introduction still applies in dimensions m = 1 and m = 2, where we identify  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$  with  $\mathcal{N}^{\perp}$ .

**Remark 3.19.** In dimension m = 1 parallel transport using (3.47) is equivalent in an obvious way to a third order linear ODE along the curve. In dimension m = 2 parallel tractors, with the top slot  $\sigma \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}[1])$  non-vanishing, correspond to solutions of

$$D_{(i}D_{j)_0}\sigma + p_{(ij)_0}\sigma = 0 (3.60)$$

that also satisfy that the conformal invariant  $c_{ij}{}^j = D_i j - D^j p_{ij}$  is zero (if (3.60) alone holds then following the usual prolongation argument one can easily show that  $I^K = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{D}^K \sigma$  satisfies  $D_j I^K = \sigma (D^i p_{ij} - D_j j) X^K$ , cf. [41, Section 3.4]); it follows from the above discussion that nontrivial parallel tractors only exist when the Möbius structure is locally flat, in which case they define a metric of constant Gaussian curvature on the open dense set where  $\sigma \neq 0$ .

#### 3.6 Normal forms

Since dim  $N^*\Sigma = d$ ,  $\Lambda^d N^*\Sigma$  is a line bundle. Moreover,  $\Sigma$  is oriented and it thus follows that there is a unique section  $N_{a_1a_2\cdots a_d}$  of  $\Lambda^d N^*\Sigma[d]$  which is compatible with the orientations of  $\Sigma$  and M, and such that

$$N^{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_d} N_{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_d} = d!$$
;

here by compatible with the orientations we mean that

$$\epsilon_{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_m}^{\Sigma} \wedge N_{a_{m+1} \cdots a_n} = \epsilon_{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n},$$

where  $\epsilon^{\Sigma}$  and  $\epsilon$  are the weighted volume forms for  $\Sigma$  and M respectively. We call  $N_{a_1a_2\cdots a_d}$  the *Riemannian normal form* for the submanifold  $\Sigma$ . It is not hard to show that this contains the same data as the normal projector  $N_b^a$ . Indeed, one can obtain the latter from the former via  $N_b^a = \frac{1}{(d-1)!} N^{aa_2\cdots a_d} N_{ba_2\cdots a_d}$ , cf. Proposition 3.20.

This object also has a tractor analogue. Recall that the normal tractor bundle  $\mathcal{N}^*$  is isomorphic to  $N^*\Sigma[1]$ . Thus it follows that, for any k such that  $1 \leq k \leq \operatorname{codim}\Sigma$ , one has  $\Lambda^k \mathcal{N}^* \cong \Lambda^k N^*\Sigma[k]$ . Explicitly, for  $\nu_{a_1a_2\cdots a_k} \in \Lambda^k N^*\Sigma[k]$ , the isomorphism is given by

$$\nu_{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_k} \mapsto \nu_{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_k} \mathbb{Z}^{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_k}_{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_k} + k \cdot \nu_{b a_2 \cdots a_k} H^b \mathbb{X}^{a_2 \cdots a_k}_{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_k}, \tag{3.61}$$

by taking the k-th exterior power of (3.15). (Note that in the case k = 1 this map is simply the map  $N^*\Gamma[1] \to \mathcal{N}^*$  of (3.15).) Invariance of this map may independently be checked via the transformation formulae for the tractor form projectors and the mean curvature:

$$\begin{split} \hat{\nu}_{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} \widehat{\mathbb{Z}}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} + k \cdot \hat{\nu}_{ba_{2}\cdots a_{k}} \widehat{H}^{b} \widehat{\mathbb{X}}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} \\ &= \nu_{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} \left( \mathbb{Z}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} + k \cdot \Upsilon^{a_{1}} \mathbb{X}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} \right) \\ &+ k \cdot \nu_{ba_{2}\cdots a_{k}} \left( H^{b} - \mathcal{N}_{a_{1}}^{b} \Upsilon^{a_{1}} \right) \mathbb{X}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} \\ &= \nu_{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} \mathbb{Z}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} \\ &+ k \cdot \left( \nu_{ba_{2}\cdots a_{k}} H^{b} + \nu_{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} \Upsilon^{a_{1}} - \nu_{ba_{2}\cdots a_{k}} \mathcal{N}_{a_{1}}^{b} \Upsilon^{a_{1}} \right) \mathbb{X}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} \\ &= \nu_{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} \mathbb{Z}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{k}} + k \cdot \nu_{ba_{2}\cdots a_{k}} H^{b} \mathbb{X}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{k}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{k}}. \end{split}$$

In particular, it follows that there is a distinguished section of the line bundle  $\Lambda^d \mathcal{N}^*$ , where  $d = \operatorname{codim}\Sigma$ , given by the image of the Riemannian normal form under this isomorphism. We write  $N_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}$  for this section and call it the *tractor normal form* for the submanifold  $\Sigma$ . From the above isomorphism, one has

$$N_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d} = N_{a_1a_2\cdots a_d} \mathbb{Z}_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}^{a_1a_2\cdots a_d} + d \cdot N_{ba_2\cdots a_d} H^b \mathbb{X}_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}^{a_2\cdots a_d},$$
(3.62)

and hence

$$\begin{split} N_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d} N^{A_1A_2\cdots A_d} &= N_{a_1a_2\cdots a_d} N^{b_1b_2\cdots b_d} \mathbb{Z}_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}^{a_1a_2\cdots a_d} \mathbb{Z}_{b_1b_2\cdots b_d}^{A_1A_2\cdots A_d} \\ &= N_{a_1a_2\cdots a_d} N^{a_1a_2\cdots a_d} \\ &= d!, \end{split}$$

since all other contractions of the X and Z projectors are zero, and where the indices of  $N^{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}$  have been raised with the tractor metric.

Given a local orthonormal basis  $\{N_A^1, \ldots, N_A^d\}$  for the normal tractor bundle, which may be constructed from a local orthonormal basis of  $N^*\Sigma[1]$ , one sees that

$$d! \cdot N^{1}_{[A_{1}} \cdots N^{d}_{A_{d}]} = N^{1}_{A_{1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge N^{d}_{A_{d}}$$
(3.63)

is clearly a section of  $\Lambda^d \mathcal{N}^*$  and satisfies the above normalisation condition. If the chosen basis is compatible with the orientation, then (3.63) recovers the tractor normal form  $N_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}$ . By construction one then has that

$$\epsilon_{A_1A_2\cdots A_{m+2}}^{\Sigma} \wedge N_{A_{m+3}\cdots A_{n+2}} = \epsilon_{A_1A_2\cdots A_{n+2}},$$
where  $\epsilon^{\Sigma}$  and  $\epsilon$  are the tractor volume forms of  $\Sigma$  and M respectively.

Our task is now to relate the tractor normal form and its derivative to the other tractor objects introduced, namely, the tractor normal projector and the tractor second fundamental form. These relationships will lay the foundation for the notion of distinguished submanifold that we will introduce in the following chapter.

First, we express the tractor normal projector in terms of the normal tractor form. Note that the normal tractor can be thought of as a "volume form" for the normal bundle. Recall that for the volume form  $\epsilon$  on M we have the following identity

$$\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{a_1\cdots a_k b_{k+1}\cdots b_n} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{b_1\cdots b_k b_{k+1}\cdots b_n} = k! (n-k)! \delta^{[a_1}_{b_1}\cdots \delta^{a_k]}_{b_k}, \qquad (3.64)$$

which can be thought of as an index notation version of the standard identity  $\star \star = (-1)^{k(n-k)}$ on k-forms (since it is equivalent to  $\frac{1}{(n-k)!} \epsilon^{b_1 \cdots b_{n-k}} c_1 \cdots c_k \frac{1}{k!} \epsilon^{a_1 \cdots a_k} b_1 \cdots b_{n-k} = (-1)^{k(n-k)} \delta^{[a_1}_{c_1} \cdots \delta^{a_k]}_{c_k}$ ). Since the tractor metric is positive definite when restricted to  $\mathcal{N}$ , the same algebraic identity applies to the tractor normal form, giving

$$N^{A_1 \cdots A_k B_{k+1} \cdots B_d} N_{B_1 \cdots B_k B_{k+1} \cdots B_n} = k! (d-k)! N^{[A_1}_{B_1} \cdots N^{A_k]}_{B_k},$$
(3.65)

for  $k \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ . In particular, we have:

**Proposition 3.20.** The tractor projector  $N_B^A$  is equal to

$$N_B^A = \frac{1}{(d-1)!} N^{AB_2 \cdots B_d} N_{BB_2 \cdots B_d}.$$
 (3.66)

Differentiating the formula obtained in the above display leads to a relationship between the tractor second fundamental form and the derivative of the tractor normal form. An alternative route to this is via the following lemma, which we record for completeness.

**Lemma 3.21.** The derivative of the tractor normal form expressed in the tractor projector notation is

$$\nabla_{i} N_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d-1}A_{d}} = \left[ \nabla_{i} N_{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{d-1}a_{d}} + d \cdot N_{ba_{2}\cdots a_{d-1}a_{d}} H^{b} \boldsymbol{g}_{ia_{1}} \right] \mathbb{Z}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{d}} + d \cdot \left[ \nabla_{i} \left( N_{ba_{2}\cdots a_{d-1}a_{d}} H^{b} \right) - N_{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{d-1}a_{d}} P_{i}^{a_{1}} \right] \mathbb{X}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}}.$$
(3.67)

Proof. Recall

$$N_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d} = N_{a_1a_2\cdots a_d} \mathbb{Z}_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}^{a_1a_2\cdots a_d} + d \cdot N_{ba_2\cdots a_d} H^b \mathbb{X}_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}^{a_2\cdots a_d}.$$

Differentiating this,

$$\begin{split} \nabla_{i} N_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d-1}A_{d}} &= \left(\nabla_{i} N_{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{d}}\right) \mathbb{Z}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{d}} \\ &+ N_{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{d}} \left(-d \cdot P_{i}^{a_{1}} \mathbb{X}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}} - d \cdot \delta_{i}^{a_{1}} \mathbb{Y}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}}\right) \\ &+ d \cdot \nabla_{i} \left(N_{ba_{2}\cdots a_{d}} H^{b}\right) \mathbb{X}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}} \\ &+ d \cdot N_{ba_{2}\cdots a_{d}} H^{b} \left(\boldsymbol{g}_{ia_{1}} \mathbb{Z}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{d}} - (d-1) \cdot \delta_{i}^{a_{2}} \mathbb{W}_{a_{1}a_{2}a_{3}\cdots a_{d}}^{A_{3}\cdots A_{d}}\right) \\ &= \left[\nabla_{i} N_{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{d-1}a_{d}} + d \cdot N_{ba_{2}\cdots a_{d-1}a_{d}} H^{b} \boldsymbol{g}_{ia_{1}}\right] \mathbb{Z}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{d}} \\ &+ d \cdot \left[\nabla_{i} \left(N_{ba_{2}\cdots a_{d-1}a_{d}} H^{b}\right) - N_{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{d-1}a_{d}} P_{i}^{a_{1}}\right] \mathbb{X}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}, \end{split}$$

where we use the fact that any terms where the i index is contracted into the normal form will vanish, since i is a tangential index.

## 3.7 The proof of Theorem 1.1

Here we give a proof of the equivalence of conditions 1–4 in Theorem 1.1. This is fairly straightforward (in the end all four conditions are equivalent to normal bundle  $\mathcal{N}$  being parallel). In establishing the result, however, we will make some calculations which are of independent interest. Henceforth we will only use indices to distinguish  $\overline{\mathbb{L}}$  and  $\mathbb{L}$  which (as sections of different bundles) represent the same object, i.e. we will write  $\mathbb{L}_{iA}^B = \Pi_A^J \mathbb{L}_{iJ}^B$  instead of (3.27).

Toward Theorem 1.1, first observe that Proposition 3.10 and Lemma 3.12 together give equivalence of 1 and 2 in that theorem. The following theorem shows that 1 implies 3.

**Theorem 3.22.** The derivative of the tractor normal form is given in terms of the tractor second fundamental form by

$$\nabla_i N_{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_{d-1} A_d} = -d \cdot \mathbb{L}_{i[A_d}{}^C N_{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_{d-1}]C}.$$
(3.68)

*Proof.* Recall that by (3.66) we have

$$\nabla_i \mathcal{N}_B^C = -\mathbb{L}_{iB}{}^C - \mathbb{L}_i{}^C{}_B. \tag{3.69}$$

In order to utilize the above formula we recall also that

$$\frac{1}{d!} N^{A_1 \cdots A_d} N_{B_1 \cdots B_d} = N_{B_1}^{[A_1} \cdots N_{B_d}^{A_d]}.$$
(3.70)

Differentiating both sides of the above display we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{d!} (\nabla_i N^{A_1 \cdots A_d}) N_{B_1 \cdots B_d} + \frac{1}{d!} N^{A_1 \cdots A_d} \nabla_i N_{B_1 \cdots B_d} 
= -\mathbb{L}_{iB_1} {}^{[A_1} N^{A_2}_{B_2} \cdots N^{A_d]}_{B_d} - N_{B_1} {}^{[A_1} \mathbb{L}_{iB_2} {}^{A_2} \cdots N^{A_d]}_{B_d} - \dots - N_{B_1} {}^{[A_1} N^{A_2}_{B_2} \cdots \mathbb{L}_{iB_d} {}^{A_d]} 
- \mathbb{L}_i {}^{[A_1} N^{A_2}_{B_2} \cdots N^{A_d]}_{B_d} - N_{B_1} {}^{[A_1} \mathbb{L}_i {}^{A_2} B_2 \cdots N^{A_d]}_{B_d} - \dots - N_{B_1} {}^{[A_1} N^{A_2}_{B_2} \cdots \mathbb{L}_i {}^{A_d]}_{B_d}.$$

Note that, since  $\mathbb{L}_{iB}^{C}$  is tangential in the second index and normal in the third, in the right hand side of the above display the top line is proportional to  $N^{A_1 \cdots A_d}$  and has zero contraction with  $N^{B_1 \cdots B_d}$ , whereas the bottom line is proportional to  $N_{B_1 \cdots B_d}$  and has zero contraction with  $N_{A_1 \cdots A_d}$ . Note also that  $N^{A_1 \cdots A_d} N_{A_1 \cdots A_d} = d!$  implies that  $N^{A_1 \cdots A_d} \nabla_i N_{A_1 \cdots A_d} = 0$ . Contracting the above display with  $N_{A_1 \cdots A_d}$  therefore gives

$$\nabla_i N_{B_1 \cdots B_d} = -\mathbb{L}_{iB_1}{}^{A_1} N_{A_1 B_2 \cdots B_d} - \mathbb{L}_{iB_2}{}^{A_2} N_{B_1 A_2 \cdots B_d} - \dots - \mathbb{L}_{iB_d}{}^{A_d} N_{B_1 B_2 \cdots A_d}$$
  
=  $-d \cdot \mathbb{L}_{i[B_d}{}^{A_d} N_{B_1 B_2 \cdots B_{d-1}]A_d},$ 

and the result follows by relabeling indices.

We now invert the relationship between  $\nabla N$  and  $\mathbb{L}$  to see that 3 implies 1 in Theorem 1.1.

**Theorem 3.23.** The tractor second fundamental form is given in terms of the derivative of the tractor normal form by

$$N^{CA_2\cdots A_d}\nabla_i N_{BA_2\cdots A_d} = -(d-1)! \cdot \mathbb{L}_{iB}{}^C.$$

$$(3.71)$$

**Remark 3.24.** The formula (3.71) can be obtained from Theorem 3.22 by contracting both sides of (3.68) with the tractor normal form on d-1 indices and using (3.66), but it is also easy to obtain directly and so we do this below. One can also obtain (3.68) from (3.71) by taking the appropriate product with a normal form and using (3.65) for k = 1.

*Proof.* Recall from (3.66) that  $N_B^C = \frac{1}{(d-1)!} N^{CA_2 \cdots A_d} N_{BA_2 \cdots A_d}$ . Differentiating both sides of this identity and using (3.29) on the left hand side we obtain that

$$-\mathbb{L}_{iB}{}^{C} - \mathbb{L}_{i}{}^{C}{}_{B} = \frac{1}{(d-1)!} \left( (\nabla_{i} N^{CA_{2}\cdots A_{d}}) N_{BA_{2}\cdots A_{d}} + N^{CA_{2}\cdots A_{d}} \nabla_{i} N_{BA_{2}\cdots A_{d}} \right).$$
(3.72)

Note that if we project to the normal tractor bundle in the index C in the above displayed equation, then the left hand side becomes  $-\mathbb{L}_{iB}{}^C$  (the  $\mathbb{L}_i{}^C{}_B$  term projects to zero since  $\mathbb{L}$  is tangential in the second index). We'd like to see that one of the two terms on the right hand side also drops out when we do this. To this end, note that since  $N^{A_1 \cdots A_d} \nabla_i N_{A_1 \cdots A_d} = 0$  it follows that if  $N_1^A, \ldots, N_d^A$  are normal tractor fields then  $N_1^A \cdots N_d^A \nabla_i N_{A_1 \cdots A_d} = 0$ . In particular, if  $N^A$  is a normal tractor field then  $N^C N^{BA_2 \cdots A_d} \nabla_i N_{CA_2 \cdots A_d} = 0$ . In other words,  $(\nabla_i N^{CA_2 \cdots A_d}) N_{BA_2 \cdots A_d}$  is tangential in the Cindex. Thus projecting (3.72) to the normal tractor bundle in the index C gives the result.  $\Box$ 

Theorem 1.1 follows easily from the above observations:

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* As remarked above, the equivalence of 1 and 2 follows from Proposition 3.10 and Lemma 3.12. The equivalence of 1 and 3 follows from Theorems 3.22 and 3.23 above. The equivalence of 3 and 4 is a trivial consequence of the definition of the Hodge- $\star$  (see (2.27)), the fact that the volume tractor (see (2.26)) is parallel, and that  $\star\star$  is  $\pm$  the identity.

**Remark 3.25.** Many of the results concerning submanifold tractors that were derived in the above sections used nothing more than a local orthonormal basis for the normal bundle and the Gauß formula. Since the normal tractor bundle is isomorphic to the usual normal bundle, and we have a Gauß formula in both cases, such proofs of these results may be repeated mutatis mutandis for the Riemannian objects to yield analogous statements and formulae; the one caveat being that one should keep in mind that the connection  $\check{\nabla}$  on  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$  induced from the ambient tractor connection differs in general from the submanifold tractor connection D by (3.33) when going from the Riemannian to the conformal setting.

#### 3.8 Submanifold invariants

We have seen above that trace-free second fundamental form arises from using the (ambient) tractor connection acting on  $N_B^A$ . More generally the tools we have developed can be used to proliferate submanifold invariants in obvious ways. We sketch some routes.

Let us fix some submanifold  $\Sigma$ , as usual of dimension  $1 \leq m \leq n-1$  and codimension d, in a conformal manifold  $(M, \mathbf{c})$ . Let us write  $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$  for the Thomas operator of the intrinsic conformal structure  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{c})$ . This is given by the formula (2.21) except that we couple the tractor connection  $\nabla^{\mathcal{T}\Sigma}$  to the intrinsic Levi-Civita connection  $D_i$  and replace n with m. Also in dimensions m = 1, 2we replace J with j as described in Section 3.5. In fact it is straightforward to verify this formula (2.21) provides a conformally invariant operator if we couple the Levi-Civita connection to any invariant connection on any vector bundle. (The key point is that verifying its conformal invariance does not involve commuting any derivatives.) To exploit this observation, we will write  $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$  also for the conformally invariant operator given by the same formula, but where the intrinsic Levi-Civita connection is coupled to any invariant connection. In practice here, the latter will be the ambient tractor connection as well as also the intrinsic tractor connection on  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$ . For example, along  $\Sigma$ ,  $\overline{\mathbb{D}}_B N_D^C$  is well defined and conformally invariant, as is  $\overline{\mathbb{D}}_A \overline{\mathbb{D}}_B N_D^C$ . Similarly we may instead use the normal form  $N_{F_1 \cdots F_d}$ . And this comes to the main point. The collection

$$N_{F_1\cdots F_d}, \ \overline{\mathbb{D}}_E N_{F_1\cdots F_d}, \ \overline{\mathbb{D}}_C \overline{\mathbb{D}}_E N_{F_1\cdots F_d}, \ \overline{\mathbb{D}}_B \overline{\mathbb{D}}_C \overline{\mathbb{D}}_E N_{F_1\cdots F_d}, \cdots$$

embeds the jets of the submanifold into sections of tractor bundles in a conformally invariant way, up to any desired order. These objects can then be contracted or partially contracted to produce non-linear invariants. For example

$$(\overline{\mathbb{D}}^C \overline{\mathbb{D}}^E N_B^A) (\overline{\mathbb{D}}_C \overline{\mathbb{D}}_E N_A^B)$$

is a non-trivial scalar conformal invariant of submanifolds for most dimensions m. Similarly (for  $m \ge 4$ ) we may form

$$\overline{W}^{CDEF}(\overline{\mathbb{D}}_D\overline{\mathbb{D}}_F N_B^A)(\overline{\mathbb{D}}_C\overline{\mathbb{D}}_E N_A^B),$$

where  $\overline{W}$  is the W-tractor, as defined in [60], but for the intrinsic geometry of the submanifold  $\Sigma$ . In the parlance of invariant theory such obvious complete contractions are called scalar Weyl invariants [8]. A slightly more subtle construction uses the idea of quasi-Weyl invariants, as in [60], but this will still proceed using the tools developed here. Indeed the results from [60] (for conformal invariants) suggest it is likely that these techniques would, in a suitable sense, produce almost all scalar invariants.

The construction of tensor-valued invariants is slightly more complicated, and involves ideas as here plus the use of differential splitting operators that map (in a conformally invariant way) between tensor and tractor bundles (see, e.g., Theorem 6.1 and (6.9) in Section 6). Some applications of these for the construction of hypersurface invariants are given in [13].

# 4 Characterising and generalising mean curvature, and applications

Our aim in this section is to show that the tractor formalism leads to natural generalizations of the notions of mean curvature and various conditions on the mean curvature from the Riemannian to the almost-Riemannian setting. The basic idea is that the mean curvature captures (and is captured by) the relation of the scale tractor I of the Riemannian metric to the submanifold tractor bundle, which gives a way of talking about mean curvature that generalizes immediately to the almost-Riemannian setting. In particular, one gets a notion of "mean curvature tractor" that is well-defined and smooth up to the conformal infinity.

To motivate this definition we begin with the Riemannian case. Note that for a given submanifold  $\Sigma$ , in a Riemannian manifold (M, g), its mean curvature vector  $H^a = \frac{1}{m} g^{ij} \Pi^a_{ij} \in \Gamma(N\Sigma[-2])$  can equivalently be captured by the mean curvature tractor

$$H^A := \sigma N^A_a H^a \in \Gamma(\mathcal{N})$$

via the isomorphism of Lemma 3.3, where  $\sigma \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}[1])$  is the scale giving g, meaning  $g = \sigma^{-2}g$ . With this terminology and notation, we can state the following result.

**Proposition 4.1.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a submanifold in a Riemannian manifold (M, g). Then

$$H^A = N^A_B I^B. (4.1)$$

*Proof.* In the scale of the metric  $g = \sigma^{-2}g$  the scale tractor takes to form  $I^A = \sigma Y^A + \rho X^A$ , for some weight density  $\rho$ , or weight -1. So from formula (3.30) in Lemma 3.13, we see that  $N_B^A X^B = 0$  and

$$N_B^A I^B = \sigma H^a Z_a^A + \sigma (H^b H_b) X^A.$$
(4.2)

But, from (3.15), this is exactly  $H^A$ .

Thus minimal submanifolds, meaning those with  $H^a = 0$ , are nicely captured by orthogonality of the scale tractor to the normal tractors, as follows (as was known in the case of hypersurfaces [64]).

**Corollary 4.2.** In a Riemannian manifold (M, g), let I denote the scale tractor of g. A submanifold  $\Sigma$ , of dimension m, is minimal if and only if, one of the following equivalent conditions holds

- 1.  $I^A N^B_A = 0$ ;
- 2.  $I^{A_1}N_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d} = 0;$
- 3.  $I^{[A_0} \star N^{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_{m+2}]} = 0;$
- 4.  $I \in \Gamma(\mathcal{N}^{\perp});$
- 5.  $H^A I_A = 0$ .

**Remark 4.3.** (i) Corollary 4.2 here generalizes Theorem 2 from [67], as a minimal 1-dimensional submanifold in a Riemannian manifold is exactly a geodesic. (ii) Note also that the corollary shows that for a minimal submanifold  $\Sigma$  the ambient scale tractor  $I_A$  can, along  $\Sigma$ , be identified with a section of the intrinsic tractor bundle  $T\Sigma$  via (3.18) of Theorem 3.5.

It is natural to say that a Riemannian submanifold has *constant mean curvature* (CMC) if the function

$$\sigma^2 H^a H_a \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}[0]|_{\Sigma})$$

is constant on  $\Sigma$ , where  $\sigma$  is the scale of the metric g used to calculate the mean curvature (the reader is cautioned that this is only standard terminology for the case of hypersurfaces; in higher codimension there are other possibilities for the definition of CMC). We will say that a  $\Sigma$  has parallel mean curvature if

$$\nabla_i^{\perp} H^b = 0.$$

or equivalently  $\nabla_i^{\perp}(\sigma H^b) = 0$ ; clearly this is stronger than the CMC condition. These notions are also usefully captured by tractors.

**Proposition 4.4.** In a Riemannian manifold (M, g), let I denote the scale tractor of g. A submanifold  $\Sigma$ :

• is CMC if and only if

 $N_{AB}I^AI^B$ , or equivalently,  $H^AI_A$ 

is constant along  $\Sigma$ ;

• has parallel mean curvature if and only if

 $\nabla_i^{\mathcal{N}} H^B = 0, \quad or \; equivalently, \quad N_B^A \nabla_i H^B = 0.$ 

*Proof.* Continuing in notation and choices of the Proof of Proposition 4.1, the first statement follows by contracting  $I_A = \sigma Y^A + \rho X^A$  into (4.2). The second is immediate from Lemma 3.4.

**Remark 4.5.** Note that if a submanifold  $\Sigma$  in (M, g) has parallel mean curvature, then it is CMC as, in the scale of the metric  $g = \sigma^{-2}g$ ,

$$\nabla_i(\sigma^2 H^a H_a) = 2\sigma^2 H^a \nabla_i^{\perp} H_a.$$

The converse does not hold. For example in Euclidean 3-space a round 2-circle (say in the x - y-plane) has is parallel mean curvature (and so is also CMC). But a regular spiral is CMC (by dint of its invariance under the obvious group action) but does not have parallel mean curvature.

Note that the stronger notion of parallel mean curvature

$$\nabla_i(\sigma H^a) = 0$$

implies CMC also. Thus  $|\sigma H| = \sqrt{\sigma^2 H^a H_a}$  is constant and  $\sigma H^a = |\sigma H| \hat{n}^a$  for some a unit normal along  $\Sigma$  that must be parallel. Such a parallel unit normal means that the acceleration of any curve in  $\Sigma$  is orthogonal to  $\hat{n}$ , so the second fundamental form and  $H^a$  are orthogonal to  $\hat{n}$ . But the latter obviously means  $H^a = 0$ .

Part of the importance of Proposition 4.1, Corollary 4.2, and Proposition 4.4, is that in means that these quantities and notions at once extend to the setting of almost-Riemannian manifolds (as defined in Section 2.4). For emphasis we make this a definition.

**Definition 4.6.** Let  $(M, \mathbf{c}, I)$  be an almost-Riemannian manifold with degeneracy locus  $\mathcal{Z}(\sigma)$ . We say that an embedded submanifold  $\Sigma$  of M is an *almost-Riemannian submanifold* of  $(M, \mathbf{c}, I)$  if  $\Sigma \setminus \mathcal{Z}(\sigma)$  is dense in  $\Sigma$ . We say that such a submanifold  $\Sigma$  is, respectively, *CMC* or has *parallel mean curvature* (in the almost-Riemannian sense) if one of the conditions displayed in Proposition 4.4 holds. Similarly we say that it is *minimal* (in the almost-Riemannian sense) if any one of the equivalent conditions of Corollary 4.2 holds.

For an almost-Riemannian manifold (M, c, I), the zero locus  $\mathcal{Z}(\sigma)$ , of  $\sigma := X^A I_A$ , is (closed and) nowhere dense. Thus, by continuity, the notions in the definition extend those on  $M \setminus \mathcal{Z}(\sigma)$ , as in the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.7.** Let  $(M, \mathbf{c}, I)$  be an almost-Riemannian manifold and  $\sigma := X^A I_A$ . Then an almost-Riemannian submanifold  $\Sigma$  is minimal, CMC, or mean curvature parallel in the sense of Definition 4.6 if and only if satisfies the corresponding condition (in the non-generalised sense) on  $M \setminus \mathcal{Z}(\sigma)$  for the metric  $g := \sigma^{-2}g$ .

This perspective enables an easy recovery of the following result, which is well-known from other perspectives.

**Proposition 4.8.** On a conformally compact manifold, any minimal submanifold that extends smoothly to the boundary meets the boundary orthogonally.

*Proof.* On a conformally compact manifold  $\partial M = \mathcal{Z}(\sigma)$ ,

$$I^{A}|_{\partial M} = (\nabla^{a}\sigma)Z_{a}^{A} - \frac{1}{n}\Delta\sigma X^{A}, \qquad (4.3)$$

and  $\nabla_a \sigma$  is nowhere-zero along the boundary. See Section 2.4. Thus if  $\Sigma$  meets  $\partial M$  then we have

$$I_A N_B^A = N_B^a \nabla_a \sigma \quad \text{along } \Sigma,$$

(using (3.30)) and so  $\Sigma$  minimal, meaning  $I_A N_B^A = 0$ , implies  $N_B^a \nabla_a \sigma = 0$  and hence

$$N_b^a \nabla_a \sigma = 0.$$

That is  $\nabla_a \sigma$  (the conormal to the boundary  $\partial M$ ) is orthogonal to the normal projector of  $\Sigma$ .  $\Box$ 

Suppose now that  $(M, \mathbf{c}, I)$  is an almost-Einstein manifold. If  $\Sigma$  is minimal then, as observed above,  $I_A$  may be identified with a submanifold tractor. Since  $I_A$  is parallel for the standard tractor connection, and  $I_A$  is a submanifold tractor,  $I_A$  is also parallel for the connection  $\check{\nabla}$ :

$$\check{\nabla}_i I_J = \Pi_J^A \nabla_i \left( \Pi_A^K I_K \right) = \Pi_J^A \nabla_i I_A = 0,$$

as defined in (3.21). Therefore, from the decomposition (3.33), one sees that  $I_J$  is parallel for the submanifold tractor connection if, and only if,  $S_{iK}^J I^K = 0$ .

Choosing a background scale to split the tractor bundles, we have that

$$\begin{split} \mathsf{S}_{i}{}^{J}{}_{K}I^{K} &= \mathcal{F}_{ij}\left(Z^{Jj}X_{K} - Z^{j}_{K}X_{J}\right)\left(\sigma Y^{K} + \nabla_{k}\sigma Z^{Kk} - \frac{1}{n}\left(\Delta + \mathsf{J}\sigma\right)X^{K}\right) \\ &= \mathcal{F}_{ij}\left(\sigma Z^{Jj} - \nabla^{j}\sigma X^{J}\right). \end{split}$$

Recall that on almost-Einstein manifolds the 1-jet  $j^1\sigma$  can only vanishes at isolated points (see the discussion of Section 2.4, and references therein, for details). Therefore away from these points we must have  $\mathcal{F}_{ij} = 0$ , and then also at those points by continuity. Thus we have the following result.

**Proposition 4.9.** Let  $\Sigma \hookrightarrow M$  be a minimal almost-Riemannian submanifold of an almost-Einstein manifold (M, c, I). Then  $\sigma = X^A I_A$  defines an almost-Einstein scale on  $\Sigma$  if, and only if,  $\mathcal{F}_{ij} = 0$ .

By (3.14) distinguished submanifolds are necessarily totally umbilic. Thus, in a Riemannian manifold, if  $\Sigma$  is distinguished and minimal then it is totally geodesic. This has a converse if the Riemannian manifold is Einstein; a totally geodesic submanifold in an Einstein manifold is both minimal and distinguished. Moreover, if we say that an almost-Riemannian submanifold in an almost-Riemannian manifold is *totally geodesic* (in the almost-Riemannian sense) if it is minimal (in the sense that  $N_A^B I^A = 0$ ) and totally umbilic, then the proof generalises without change to the almost-Einstein setting:

**Proposition 4.10.** Let (M, c, I) be an almost-Einstein manifold, and  $\Sigma$  an almost-Riemannian submanifold. If  $\Sigma$  is totally geodesic (in the almost-Riemannian sense), then  $\Sigma$  is a distinguished submanifold.

Proof. We must show any of the equivalent conditions of Theorem 1.1. That  $\Sigma$  is minimal implies that  $H^B = 0$  on  $\Sigma$ . Since also  $\Sigma$  is totally umbilic it follows that on  $\Sigma \setminus \mathcal{Z}(\sigma)$  we have that it is totally geodesic, and hence  $\nabla_i N_{a_1 a_2 \dots a_d} = 0$ . The almost-Einstein condition implies that  $N_{ba_2 \dots a_d} P_i^{b} = 0$ on  $M \setminus \mathcal{Z}(\sigma)$ , where we calculate in the scale of the metric  $g = \sigma^{-2}g$ , with  $\sigma := X^A I_A$ . Combining these observations and using formula (3.68) we have that  $\nabla_i N_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_d} = 0$  on  $M \setminus \mathcal{Z}(\sigma)$ . But then by continuity  $\nabla_i N_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_d} = 0$  on  $\Sigma$ , as  $Z(\sigma)$  is nowhere dense.

Thus if our ambient space is almost-Einstein, for submanifolds that totally geodesic (in the generalised/almost-Riemannian sense) first integrals may be proliferated using Corollary 1.4 (and the theory to be developed in Section 6). These conserved quantities will extend to/across singularity sets of these geometries where they exist.

# 5 Distinguished submanifolds and conformal circularity

We fix some notational conventions for this chapter. We will denote by  $\gamma$  a smooth curve in a conformal manifold  $(M, \mathbf{c})$ . By this we will here mean a smooth, regular curve  $\gamma : I \to M$  (for some interval I). We will often identify  $\gamma$  with its image and we typically assume that this an embedded submanifold.

The symbols  $u^b$  and  $a^b$  will denote, respectively, the velocity and acceleration the curve  $\gamma$ , so  $a^b = u^a \nabla_a u^b$ . Note that the acceleration  $a^b$  depends on a choice of metric  $g \in \mathbf{c}$  and is not conformally invariant; it is easy to check that if  $\hat{g} = \Omega^2 g$  then  $\hat{a}^b = a^b - u_a u^a \Upsilon^b + 2u^a \Upsilon_a u^b$ , where  $\Upsilon_a = \Omega^{-1} \nabla_a \Omega$ . We also define  $u := \sqrt{g_{ab} u^a u^b} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}[1]|_{\gamma})$ . For some connection  $\nabla$ , we will also use the notation  $\frac{d^{\nabla}}{dt}$ , or  $\frac{d}{dt}$  when the meaning is clear by context, to mean  $u^a \nabla_a$ . The connection  $\nabla$  may be a Levi-Civita connection or the standard tractor connection; this should be unambiguous from context. Sometimes we will prefer to work with weighted versions of the velocity and acceleration vectors. These will be denoted by  $\mathbf{u}^b := u^{-1} u^b \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}^b[-1]|_{\gamma})$  and  $\mathbf{a}^b := \mathbf{u}^c \nabla_c \mathbf{u}^b \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}^b[-2]|_{\gamma})$  respectively.

### 5.1 Background on conformal circles

A smooth curve  $\gamma$  is said to be a *(projectively parametrised) conformal circle* if, with respect to some (equivalently any) choice of  $g \in c$ , its velocity and acceleration satisfy [6]

$$u^{c}\nabla_{c}a^{b} = u^{2}u^{c}P_{c}^{\ b} + 3u^{-2}\left(u_{c}a^{c}\right)a^{b} - \frac{3}{2}u^{-2}\left(a_{c}a^{c}\right)u^{b} - 2u^{c}u^{d}P_{cd}u^{b},$$
(5.1)

where  $u^2 = u \cdot u = u_a u^a$  here should be understood to be *unweighted*. Equation (5.1) is a third order, conformally invariant analog of the geodesic equation in Riemannian geometry and solutions of (5.1) are sometimes referred to as *conformal geodesics* [56]. As with the geodesic equation  $u^c \nabla_c u^b = 0$ , equation (5.1) can be broken up into its tangential and normal components along the curve and any curve in M can be parametrized so that the tangential part of (5.1) holds; such a parametrisation is determined up to the action of  $PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$  and a curve with such a parametrisation is said to be *projectively parametrised* [6]. (The existence of such a parametrisation, and likely the notion of conformal circles also, goes back to Élie Cartan; see [29]. For early treatments of conformal circles, see [50, 56, 98, 99, 103, 114, 115]. In the literature conformal circles are sometimes taken to be parametrised by arclength with respect to chosen metric g rather than projectively parametrised, and in this case they satisfy a slightly different equation; see, e.g. [115, Chapter VII, §2].) Asking only that the normal (to the curve) part of (5.1) holds gives a notion of conformal circles that does not depend on the parametrisation, and any such curve can be reparametrised so that (5.1) holds.

Note that a geodesic for a metric  $g \in \mathbf{c}$  need not be a conformal circle; indeed, this could not be the case since any curve  $\gamma$  in M is locally an affinely parametrised geodesic for some choice of metric  $g \in \mathbf{c}$  (see Remark 3.2). Following this line of thought, however, one sees as a direct consequence of (5.1) that a curve  $\gamma$  is a projectively parametrized conformal circle if and only if there is a metric  $g \in \mathbf{c}$  with respect to which  $\gamma$  is an affinely parametrized geodesic and  $u^c P_c^b = 0$ [6]. Note also that in the special case where one has an Einstein metric g in the conformal class it follows from (5.1) that geodesics for g are conformal circles, though the unit speed parametrization is not a projective parametrization except in the Ricci flat case.

The notion of conformal circles arises naturally from the Cartan geometric description of conformal structures in dimensions  $n \ge 3$  (and Möbius conformal structures in two dimensions) and as such it is natural that they can be simply described using tractor calculus (the corresponding calculus of associated bundles). With this in mind we now introduce some important tractor fields associated to the curve  $\gamma$ . Recall that the canonical tractor  $X^B$  can be viewed as a section of  $\mathcal{E}^B[1]$ . Hence  $u^{-1}X^B$  is an unweighted tractor along the curve and so the tractor covariant derivative of  $u^{-1}X^B$  along the curve is well defined (conformally invariant). Following [7], we define

$$U^B := u^a \nabla_a \left( u^{-1} X^B \right) \tag{5.2}$$

and

$$A^B := u^a \nabla_a U^B, \tag{5.3}$$

which we call the *velocity* and *acceleration tractors* respectively. Explicitly, one has

$$U^{B} \stackrel{g}{=} \begin{pmatrix} 0\\ u^{-1}u^{b}\\ -u^{-3}\left(u_{c}a^{c}\right) \end{pmatrix}$$
(5.4)

and

$$A^{B} \stackrel{g}{=} \begin{pmatrix} -u \\ u^{-1}a^{b} - 2u^{-3}(u_{c}a^{c})u^{b} \\ -u^{-3}\left(u_{c}\frac{da^{c}}{dt}\right) - u^{-3}a_{c}a^{c} + 3u^{-5}(u_{c}a^{c})^{2} - u^{-1}P_{cd}u^{c}u^{d} \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (5.5)

It is easily checked that

$$U^{B}U_{B} = 1, \qquad U^{B}A_{B} = 0 \tag{5.6}$$

and that

$$A^{B}A_{B} = 3u^{-2}a_{b}a^{b} + 2u^{-2}u_{b}u^{c}\nabla_{c}a^{b} - 6u^{-4}(u_{c}a^{c})^{2} + 2P_{ab}u^{a}u^{b}.$$
(5.7)

Consequently, a curve  $\gamma : I \to M$  is projectively parametrised if, and only if,  $A^B A_B = 0$ . It was then shown in [7] that a projectively parametrised curve  $\gamma : I \to M$  is a conformal geodesic if, and only if,

$$\frac{d^{\nabla}A^B}{dt} = 0. \tag{5.8}$$

More recently, it was shown by the second and third named authors and Taghavi-Chabert [68] that a curve  $\gamma$  is an unparametrised conformal circle if, and only if,  $d^{\nabla}A^B/dt$  is zero modulo  $U^B$ 

and  $X^B$ ; given the definitions of the velocity and acceleration tractors this is equivalent to saying that  $\gamma$  is an unparametrised conformal circle if, and only if, the 3-tractor

$$\Phi^{ABC} := 6u^{-1} X^{[A} U^{B} A^{C]} \tag{5.9}$$

is covariantly constant along  $\gamma$ . To see this we note the following: Firstly,

$$\Phi^{ABC} = 6\mathbf{u}^{c}X^{[A}Y^{B}Z^{C]}_{c} + 6\mathbf{u}^{b}\mathbf{a}^{c}X^{[A}Z^{B}_{b}Z^{C]}_{c}, \qquad (5.10)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}^c = u^{-1}u^c$  (so that  $g_{ab}\mathbf{u}^a\mathbf{u}^b = 1$ ) and  $\mathbf{a}^c = \mathbf{u}^b\nabla_b\mathbf{u}^c = u^{-2}a^c - u^{-4}(u_ba^b)u^c$ . It is then easy to show that

$$u^{d}\nabla_{c}\Phi^{ABC} = 6\left(\mathbf{u}^{d}\nabla_{d}\mathbf{a}^{c} - \mathbf{u}^{d}P_{d}^{c}\right)\mathbf{u}^{b}X^{[A}Z_{b}^{B}Z_{c}^{C]}.$$
(5.11)

On the other hand, the requirement that the normal (to the curve) part of (5.1) holds can be written in terms of the weighted velocity and acceleration as [68, Lemma 4.9]

$$\left(\mathbf{u}^{d}\nabla_{d}\mathbf{a}^{[b]}\right)\mathbf{u}^{c]} = \mathbf{u}^{d}P_{d}^{[b}\mathbf{u}^{c]},\tag{5.12}$$

from which the claim follows.

Note that from (5.10) one can easily check that  $\Phi^{ABC}\Phi_{ABC} = 6$ , and that  $\Phi_{ABC}N^A = 0$  for any section  $N^A$  of the normal tractor bundle to  $\gamma$  (the easiest way to see the latter is to compute in a minimal scale g for  $\gamma$ , equivalently, a scale for which  $\mathbf{a}^c = 0$ ). It follows that

$$\Phi_{ABC} = \star N_{ABC}^{\gamma \hookrightarrow M}, \tag{5.13}$$

the Hodge star of the tractor normal form of  $\gamma$  as a submanifold of M.

This observation combined with the result from [68] described in the preceding paragraph shows that Theorem 1.2 follows from Theorem 1.1.

# 5.2 Weak conformal circularity of submanifolds

With this background established we begin our discussion of conformal circularity.

**Definition 5.1.** A submanifold  $\Sigma$  is weakly conformally circular if any *M*-conformal circle, whose 2-jet at a point lies in  $\Sigma$ , remains in  $\Sigma$ . That is, if  $\gamma$  is an *M*-conformal circle whose 2-jet at some point p lies in  $\Sigma$  (with  $\gamma(0) = p$ ), then  $\gamma(t) \in \Sigma$  for all t.

In the model case of the conformal sphere (see Section 2.3) both conformal circles and totally umbilic submanifolds arise (by ray projectivisation) from the intersections of suitable linear subspaces with the forward null cone. Thus the conformal circles are all given by (transverse) intersections of totally umbilic submanifolds, and a submanifold of the conformal sphere is weakly conformally circular if and only if it is totally umbilic. It is natural to ask to what extent these facts generalize to the curved setting. In this case one quickly sees that the condition of being totally umbilic must be replaced with the stronger condition of being a distinguished submanifold (in the conformally flat case for submanifolds of dimension greater than one the vanishing of  $\mathring{H}$  is equivalent to the vanishing of the tractor second fundamental form  $\mathbb{L}$ , but this is no longer true in general conformal manifolds; see the examples in Section 5.4). If two distinguished submanifolds intersect transversally in a 1-dimensional submanifold  $\gamma$  then, since the wedge product of the two corresponding normal tractors must be parallel along  $\gamma$ ,  $\gamma$  must be a conformal circle (but, due to the sparsity of distinguished submanifolds in the curved setting, conformal circles no longer arise this way in general). An extension of this idea shows that a submanifold is weakly conformally circular if, and only if, it is distinguished. That is the content of the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.2.** A submanifold  $\Sigma \hookrightarrow M$  is weakly conformally circular if, and only if,  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^C = 0$ .

*Proof.* A one dimensional submanifold  $\Sigma$  is weakly conformally circular if, and only if, it is a conformal circle. Thus in the one dimensional case the result follows immediately from Theorem 1.2, which states that a curve is a conformal circle if, and only if, when viewed as a submanifold its tractor second fundamental form  $\mathbb{L}$  vanishes.

Suppose now that  $\Sigma$  has dimension at least 2, and is weakly conformally circular. Let  $\gamma$  be an M-conformal circle whose 2-jet at  $p \in \Sigma$  lies in  $\Sigma$ . Then by assumption  $\gamma$  remains in  $\Sigma$ . We need to introduce some notation. Let

- $N_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}^{\Sigma \hookrightarrow M}$  be the normal form of  $\Sigma \hookrightarrow M$ ,
- $N_{A_1A_2\cdots A_{n-1}}^{\gamma \hookrightarrow M}$  be the normal form of  $\gamma \hookrightarrow M$ , and
- $N_{A_1A_2\cdots A_{m-1}}^{\gamma \hookrightarrow \Sigma}$  be the normal form of  $\gamma \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ , where we are identifying the tractor bundle of  $\Sigma$  with  $\mathcal{N}^{\perp}$ , and hence this form is a section of  $\Lambda^{m-1}\mathcal{T}M|_{\Sigma}$ .

First we note some important relations between these various normal forms. First, since the curve  $\gamma$  lies in the submanifold  $\Sigma$ , we have

$$N^{A_1B_2\cdots B_{m-1}}_{\gamma \hookrightarrow \Sigma} N^{\Sigma \hookrightarrow M}_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d} = 0.$$
(5.14)

Second, by using the discussion surrounding equation (3.63), one can easily show that

$$N_{A_1A_2\cdots A_{m-1}}^{\gamma \hookrightarrow \Sigma} \wedge N_{A_m \cdots A_{n-1}}^{\Sigma \hookrightarrow M} = N_{A_1A_2 \cdots A_{n-1}}^{\gamma \hookrightarrow M}.$$
(5.15)

Finally, since  $\gamma$  is an *M*-conformal circle, it follows from Theorem 1.2 that

$$u^i \nabla_i N^{\gamma \hookrightarrow M}_{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_{n-1}} = 0.$$

Therefore, using the above,

$$\left(u^{i}\nabla_{i}N_{[A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{m-1}]}^{\gamma \to \Sigma}\right)N_{A_{m}\cdots A_{n-1}]}^{\Sigma \to M} + N_{[A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{m-1}]}^{\gamma \to \Sigma}\left(u^{i}\nabla_{i}N_{A_{m}\cdots A_{n-1}]}^{\Sigma \to M}\right) = 0$$

and hence

$$\left(u^{i}\nabla_{i}N_{[A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{m-1}]}^{\gamma\hookrightarrow\Sigma}\right)N_{A_{m}\cdots A_{n-1}]}^{\Sigma\hookrightarrow M} + N_{[A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{m-1}]}^{\gamma\hookrightarrow\Sigma}\left(-d\cdot u^{i}\mathbb{L}_{iA_{n-1}}{}^{A_{0}}N_{A_{m}\cdots A_{n-2}]A_{0}}^{\Sigma\hookrightarrow M}\right) = 0$$

by Theorem 3.22, where  $\mathbb{L}$  is the tractor second fundamental form of  $\gamma$ . Since the downstairs tractor index on  $\mathbb{L}_{iA_{n-1}}^{A_0}$  is "tangential to  $\Sigma$ " it is easy to see that the two terms on the left hand side of the above displayed equation lie in complementary subspaces of the bundle of tractor (n-1)-forms (the first term is in the ideal generated by  $N^{\Sigma \to M}$  and the second term is in the orthogonal complement to this ideal) and hence both terms must vanish. Thus, in particular,

$$N_{[A_1A_2\cdots A_{m-1}}^{\gamma \hookrightarrow \Sigma} u^i \mathbb{L}_{iA_{n-1}} A_0 N_{A_m\cdots A_{n-2}]A_0}^{\Sigma \hookrightarrow M} = 0.$$

Contracting the above display with  $N_{\Sigma \hookrightarrow M}^{A_m \cdots A_{n-2}B}$  (cf. the proof of Theorem 3.23) then gives

 $N_{[A_1A_2\cdots A_{m-1}}^{\gamma \hookrightarrow \Sigma} u^i \mathbb{L}_{iA_{n-1}}]^B = 0,$ 

which is equivalent to

$$u^{i}\mathbb{L}_{iA}{}^{B}\Pi^{\gamma \to \Sigma}{}^{A}_{C} = 0, \qquad (5.16)$$

where  $\Pi^{\gamma \hookrightarrow \Sigma}$  is the projector onto the rank 3 tractor bundle of the 1-manifold  $\gamma$ , viewed as a subbundle of the ambient tractor bundle along  $\gamma$ . Therefore it follows that

$$u^i \mathbb{L}_{iA}{}^B U^A = 0$$

where  $U^A$  is the velocity tractor of the curve (note that  $U^A$  may be viewed as a section of the intrinsic standard tractor bundle of  $\gamma$ ; one can easily check this by working in a minimal scale for  $\gamma$ , where  $u_b a^b = 0$ ). Using Theorem 3.14 we now see that, in particular,  $\mathring{H}_{ij}{}^c u^i u^j = 0$ . But the above must hold for any *M*-conformal circle  $\gamma$ , and hence  $\mathring{H}_{ij}{}^c u^i u^j = 0$  for all  $u^i \in \Sigma(\mathcal{E}^i)$ , whence  $\Sigma$  is totally umbilic by polarization.

Since we have already seen that  $\mathring{H}_{ij}{}^c = 0$ , it suffices to show that  $N_b^c \left( P_i{}^b - \nabla_i H^b \right) = 0$ . Returning to (5.16), if we contract this with  $Y^A$  (or  $\Pi_I^A Y^I$ , cf. (3.20)) this gives

$$u^{i} \mathcal{N}_{b}^{c} \left( P_{i}^{b} - \nabla_{i} H^{b} \right) Z_{c}^{B} + u^{i} H_{b} \left( P_{i}^{b} - \nabla_{i} H^{b} \right) X^{B} = 0,$$

by Theorem 3.14, since the other slots of  $\mathbb{L}$  have already been shown to be zero. Since, again, this must hold for all  $u^i \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}^i)$  we obtain the result.

For the converse, let us consider a curve  $\gamma$  in  $\Sigma$  that satisfies

$$u^{i}\check{\nabla}_{i}N^{\gamma \hookrightarrow \Sigma}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{m-1}} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad A^{B}A_{B} = 0$$
(5.17)

where we have used the connection  $\check{\nabla}$ . Then,

$$\left(u^i \nabla_i N^{\gamma \to \Sigma}_{[A_1 A_2 \cdots A_{m-1}]}\right) N^{\Sigma \to M}_{A_m \cdots A_{n-1}]} = 0.$$

Suppose now that  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^C = 0$ . Then,

$$\left(u^{i}\nabla_{i}N_{\left[A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{m-1}\right]}^{\gamma\hookrightarrow\Sigma}\right)N_{A_{m}\cdots A_{n-1}}^{\Sigma\hookrightarrow M} + N_{\left[A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{m-1}\right]}^{\gamma\hookrightarrow\Sigma}\left(-d\cdot u^{i}\mathbb{L}_{iA_{n-1}}A_{0}N_{A_{m}\cdots A_{n-2}}^{\Sigma\hookrightarrow M}\right) = 0$$

and so

$$u^i \nabla_i N^{\gamma \hookrightarrow M}_{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_{n-1}} = 0.$$

That is, if  $\gamma$  in  $\Sigma$  satisfies (5.17) and  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^{C} = 0$  then  $\gamma$  is a conformal circle for  $(M, \mathbf{c})$ . Now, it is straightforward to check that a curve satisfying (5.17) that is further projectively parametrised with respect to the conformal structure on M (meaning its M-acceleration tractor satisfies  $A^{B}A_{B} = 0$ ) is determined by its 2-jet in  $\Sigma$  at any point on its path. This follows because, by construction, a projectively parametrised curve satisfying (5.17) is characterised by a third order ordinary differential equation in any local coordinate chart (analogous to how the  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{c}_{\Sigma})$ -conformal circle equation is equivalent to the requirement that the curve be  $\Sigma$ -projectively parametrised and satisfy  $u^{i}D_{i}N_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{m-1}}^{\gamma \hookrightarrow \Sigma} = 0$ , and the  $(M, \mathbf{c})$ -conformal circle equation is equivalent to the requirement that the curve be M-projectively parametrised and satisfy  $u^{a}\nabla_{a}N_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{n-1}}^{\gamma \hookrightarrow M} = 0$ ; cf. Remark 5.3 below). Now, suppose  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^C = 0$ . Then, given any 2-jet of a curve in  $\Sigma$ , the corresponding M-projectively parametrised solution of (5.17) is also an M conformal circle. Moreover, since a conformal circle in  $(M, \mathbf{c})$  is determined by its 2-jet at any point on its path, all conformal circles corresponding to two jet initial data lying in  $\Sigma$  arise this way; in particular, all such curves lie in  $\Sigma$ . That is,  $\Sigma$  is weakly conformally circular.

**Remark 5.3.** Here we give a version of the proof that  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^C = 0$  implies weak conformal circularity that avoids the use of tractor calculus. (This is along the lines of a proof of a similar result in [9], to an extent the tractor picture provides a conceptual basis for the idea.) For convenience, we work in a minimal scale g. Rather than considering curves  $\gamma$  in  $\Sigma$  solving (5.17) we will consider the curves  $\gamma$  in  $\Sigma$  solving the "adapted conformal circle equation"

$$\frac{d^D a^j}{dt} = u^2 \cdot u^i P_i^{\ j} + 3u^{-2} \left( u_k a^k \right) a^j - \frac{3}{2} u^{-2} \left( a_k a^k \right) u^j - 2u^k u^l P_{kl} u^j, \tag{5.18}$$

where as usual  $P_i{}^j$  and  $P_{kl}$  denote the restriction of the ambient Schouten tensor to the intrinsic tangent and cotangent bundles, and  $\frac{d^D}{dt}$  denotes  $u^i D_i$  where D is the intrinsic Levi-Civita connection for the pullback  $g_{\Sigma}$  of the ambient scale g. We say that  $\gamma$  is an "adapted conformal circle" if it satisfies this equation. (That equation (5.18) is equivalent to (5.17) should be clear from what follows, but we do not need this for the argument given in this remark.) Note that equation (5.18) is a third order ODE on  $\Sigma$ , and therefore the initial value problem with given 2-jet initial data has a unique solution on  $\Sigma$  for some interval centered at 0. This solution may also be viewed as a curve in M, and one may ask whether it solves a related ODE there. Since the 2-jet of  $\gamma$  is initially tangential and  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^C = 0$  implies in particular that  $\mathring{\Pi}_{ij}{}^c = 0$ , it follows that in our minimal scale  $\Pi_j^b u^j = u^b$ ,  $\Pi_j^b a^j = a^b$  and  $\Pi_j^b \frac{d^D a^j}{dt} = \frac{d^{\nabla} a^b}{dt}$  (the last two identities being consequences of the Gauss formula with  $\Pi = 0$ ). Thus  $u_k a^k = u_c a^c$ ,  $a_k a^k = a_c a^c$  and  $u^k u^l P_{kl} = u^c u^d P_{cd}$ . Moreover,  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^C = 0$ also implies (again for the minimal scale) that  $N_b^c P_i^{-b} = 0$ , and thus one easily sees that, as a curve in M,  $\gamma$  satisfies

$$\frac{d^{\nabla}a^{b}}{dt} = u^{2} \left( \Pi_{j}^{b}u^{i}P_{i}^{j} \right) + 3u^{-2} \left( u_{c}a^{c} \right)a^{b} - \frac{3}{2}u^{-2} \left( a_{c}a^{c} \right)u^{b} - 2u^{c}u^{d}P_{cd}u^{b}$$
$$= u^{2} \cdot u^{c}P_{c}^{\ b} + 3u^{-2} \left( u_{c}a^{c} \right)a^{b} - \frac{3}{2}u^{-2} \left( a_{c}a^{c} \right)u^{b} - 2u^{c}u^{d}P_{cd}u^{b},$$

which is exactly the (projectively parametrized) *M*-conformal circle equation. So if  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^C = 0$ , and  $\gamma$  is an adapted conformal circle, then it is an *M*-conformal circle, and by the uniqueness of solution to an initial value problem, the curve  $\gamma$ , which lies in  $\Sigma$ , is the unique *M*-conformal circle with the given initial conditions. Hence any *M*-conformal circle whose 2-jet at a point  $p \in \Sigma$  is tangential will remain in  $\Sigma$ , i.e.  $\Sigma$  is weakly conformally circular.

For his approach to submanifold circularity, Belgun [9] introduced a conformal invariant  $\mu \in \Gamma(T^*\Sigma \otimes N\Sigma[-2])$  given by

$$\mu_i^{\ c} := \mathcal{N}_b^c \left( P_i^{\ b} - \nabla_i H^b + \frac{1}{m-1} D^j \mathring{H}_{ij}^{\ b} \right), \tag{5.19}$$

when  $m \neq 1$  and where the intrinsic Levi-Civita connection D is coupled to the normal connection  $\nabla^{\perp}$  (Belgun terms this the *mixed Schouten-Weyl tensor* since the main term is the tangentialnormal part of the ambient Schouten tensor, which he calls the Schouten-Weyl tensor). In the m = 1 case (i.e. when  $\Sigma$  is a curve) Belgun defines  $\mu$  to be the *conformal curvature* of the curve  $\Sigma$ ,

$$\mu_i^c := \mathcal{N}_b^c \left( P_i^b - \nabla_i H^b \right) \quad \text{when } m = 1.$$
(5.20)

When dim  $\Sigma = 1$ ,  $\mathring{H}_{ij}{}^c = 0$ , so that  $N_b^c \left( P_i{}^b - \nabla_i H^b \right)$  can be obtained from  $\mathbb{L}$  by an invariant projection and therefore must be conformally invariant. The conformal invariance of  $\mu$  in the  $m \neq 1$  case can be shown by direct calculation, or by substituting the Weyl-Schouten decomposition of the ambient curvature tensor into the Codazzi equation to obtain [105]

$$\mu_i^{\ c} = \frac{1}{m-1} W_{ij}^{\ dj} \mathcal{N}_d^c. \tag{5.21}$$

From the above displayed formula it is also clear that  $\mu = 0$  when  $\Sigma$  is a hypersurface (since  $W_{ij}{}^{dj}N_d^c = -W_{ia}{}^d{}_bN^{ab}N_d^c$  and the normal bundle has rank 1). In [9] Belgun characterises weakly conformal circular submanifolds (termed *weakly conformal geodesic* in [9]) as those for which  $\mathring{H} = 0$  and  $\mu = 0$ . Inspecting (3.31), in Theorem 3.8, one sees immediately that this is equivalent to the vanishing of  $\mathbb{L}$ .

**Proposition 5.4.** Let  $\Sigma \hookrightarrow M$  be a submanifold in a conformal manifold with  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^C$  its tractor second fundamental form. Then  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^C = 0$  if, and only if,  $\mathring{H}_{ij}{}^c = 0$  and  $\mu_i{}^c = 0$ .

In fact the invariant  $\mu$  arises naturally from  $\mathbb{L}$ . The projecting part of  $\mathbb{L}$  is necessarily invariant and this is  $\mathring{H}$ . An obvious question is whether conversely  $\mathbb{L}$  is then image of a natural linear differential operator acting  $\mathring{H}$ , in which case they would be equivalent. (For example as the tractor curvature is the image of the Weyl curvature in dimensions at least 4.) This leads us to the following lemma, which exhibits a conformally invariant differential operator between the relevant bundles:

**Lemma 5.5.** There is an invariant map  $\mathbb{M}: S_0^2 T^* \Sigma \otimes N\Sigma \to T^* \Sigma \otimes \mathcal{T}^* \Sigma \otimes \mathcal{N}$ . Written in tractor projectors, this takes the form

$$\omega_{ij}{}^{c} \mapsto \mathbb{M}(\omega)_{ij}{}^{C} := \omega_{ij}{}^{c}Z_{J}^{j}Z_{c}^{C} - \frac{1}{m-1}D^{j}\omega_{ij}{}^{c}X_{J}Z_{c}^{C} + H_{c}\omega_{ij}{}^{c}Z_{J}^{j}X^{C} - \frac{1}{m-1}H_{c}D^{j}\omega_{ij}{}^{c}X_{J}X^{C},$$

$$(5.22)$$

where again the intrinsic Levi-Civita connection D is coupled to the normal Levi-Civita connection  $\nabla^{\perp}$  when acting on  $\omega$ .

*Proof.* Given  $\omega_{ij}^{c} \in \Gamma(S_0^2 T^* \Sigma \otimes N\Sigma)$ , using (2.8) and (3.12), one computes that

$$\widehat{D}^{j}\omega_{ij}{}^{c} = D^{j}\omega_{ij}{}^{c} + (m-1)\Upsilon^{j}\omega_{ij}{}^{c} - \Upsilon_{i}\omega_{kl}{}^{c}\boldsymbol{g}^{kl} = D^{j}\omega_{ij}{}^{c} + (m-1)\Upsilon^{j}\omega_{ij}{}^{c}$$
(5.23)

since  $\omega_{ij}^{c}$  is trace-free over the pair of indices (i, j).

Therefore, using the above together with equations (3.14) and (2.15), and that the X tractor

is conformally invariant,

$$\begin{split} \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \widehat{Z}_{J}^{j} \widehat{Z}_{c}^{C} &= \frac{1}{m-1} \widehat{D}^{j} \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \widehat{X}_{J} \widehat{Z}_{c}^{C} + \widehat{H}_{c} \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \widehat{Z}_{J}^{j} \widehat{X}^{C} - \frac{1}{m-1} \widehat{H}_{c} \widehat{D}^{j} \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \widehat{X}_{J} \widehat{X}^{C} \\ &= \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \left( Z_{J}^{j} + \Upsilon^{j} X_{J} \right) \left( Z_{c}^{C} + \Upsilon_{c} X^{C} \right) \\ &- \frac{1}{m-1} \left( D^{j} \omega_{ij}{}^{c} + (m-1) \Upsilon^{j} \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \right) X_{J} \left( Z_{c}^{C} + \Upsilon_{c} X^{C} \right) \\ &+ \left( H_{c} - N_{c}^{d} \Upsilon_{d} \right) \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \left( Z_{J}^{j} + \Upsilon^{j} X_{J} \right) X_{C} \\ &- \frac{1}{m-1} \left( H_{c} - N_{c}^{d} \Upsilon_{d} \right) \left( D^{j} \omega_{ij}{}^{c} + (m-1) \Upsilon^{j} \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \right) X_{J} X^{C} \\ &= \omega_{ij}{}^{c} Z_{J}^{j} Z_{c}^{C} - \frac{1}{m-1} D^{j} \omega_{ij}{}^{c} X_{J} Z_{c}^{C} + \left( H_{c} \omega_{ij}{}^{c} - \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \Upsilon_{c} + \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \Upsilon^{j} \Upsilon_{c} - \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \Upsilon^{j} \Upsilon_{c} \right) \\ &+ \left( -\frac{1}{m-1} H_{c} D^{j} \omega_{ij}{}^{c} - H_{c} \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \Upsilon^{j} + \frac{1}{m-1} \Upsilon_{c} D^{j} \omega_{ij}{}^{c} + \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \Upsilon^{j} \Upsilon_{c} - \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \Upsilon^{j} \Upsilon_{c} \right) \\ &- \frac{1}{m-1} \Upsilon_{c} D^{j} \omega_{ij}{}^{c} + H_{c} \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \Upsilon^{j} - \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \Upsilon^{j} \Upsilon_{c} + \omega_{ij}{}^{c} \Upsilon^{j} \Upsilon_{c} \right) X_{J} X^{C} \end{split}$$

which verifies the claimed conformal invariance of the operator  $\mathbb{M}_{cJ}{}^{jC}$ .

Asking whether  $\mathbb{L}$  is the image of H under  $\mathbb{M}$  then immediately leads to the  $\mu$  invariant:

**Theorem 5.6.** The tensor  $\mu_i^c$  is equal to the projecting part of the tractor

$$\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^{C} - \mathbb{M}(\mathring{H})_{iJ}^{C}. \tag{5.24}$$

In particular,  $\mu_i^c$  is a conformal invariant of the embedding.

*Proof.* By inspection, one sees that (5.24) has zero in the  $Z_J^j Z_c^C$  slot (since  $Z_j^K Z_D^c \mathbb{L}_{iK}^D = \mathring{H}_{ij}^c$ ) and hence projecting out the  $X_J Z_c^C$  slot must yield a conformally invariant object. Such projection is accomplished by contraction with  $Y^J Z_c^c$ , and from equations (3.31) and (5.22) one sees that this projection is equal to

$$Y^{J}Z_{C}^{c}\left(\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^{C} - \mathbb{M}(\mathring{H})_{iJ}^{C}\right) = N_{b}^{c}\left(P_{i}^{b} - \nabla_{i}H^{b}\right) + \frac{1}{m-1}D^{j}\mathring{H}_{ij}^{c},$$
(5.25)

which is exactly  $\mu_i^c$  as defined in (5.19) (since the *c* index of  $D^j \mathring{\Pi}_{ij}^c$  is already normal).

In fact, the data  $(\mathring{H}_{ij}{}^c, \mu_i{}^c)$  is equivalent to the tractor second fundamental form. We have seen how to obtain  $\mathring{H}_{ij}{}^c$  and  $\mu_i{}^c$  from  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}{}^C$ . For the reverse direction, note that  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}{}^C$  may be constructed from  $(\mathring{H}_{ij}{}^c, \mu_i{}^c)$  according to

$$(\mathring{I}_{ij}{}^{c},\mu_{i}{}^{c}) \mapsto \mathring{I}_{ij}{}^{c}Z_{J}^{j}Z_{c}^{C} + \left(\mu_{i}{}^{c} - \frac{1}{m-1}D^{j}\mathring{I}_{ij}{}^{c}\right)X_{J}Z_{c}^{C} + H_{c}\mathring{I}_{ij}{}^{c}Z_{J}^{j}X^{C} + H_{c}\left(\mu_{i}{}^{c} - \frac{1}{m-1}D^{j}\mathring{I}_{ij}{}^{c}\right)X_{J}X^{C}.$$
(5.26)

### 5.3 Strong conformal circularity

Unlike the situation for geodesics in Riemannian geometry, in conformal geometry if a submanifold is weakly conformally circular the submanifold conformal circles need not be ambient conformal circles. This leads to the following two stronger notions of conformal circularity.

**Definition 5.7.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a submanifold in a conformal manifold M. Then  $\Sigma$  is strongly conformally circular if any projectively-parametrised  $\Sigma$ -conformal circle is also a projectively-parametrised M-conformal circle. For the cases of submanifolds of dimensions 1 and 2, recall that the intrinsic conformal structure does not determine a conformal circle equation, however, the induced Möbius structures defined in Section 3.5 do determine a conformal circle equation (the usual conformal circle equation (5.1) with the Schouten tensor being as defined in Section 3.5), and that is the notion we are using here.

**Definition 5.8.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a submanifold in a conformal manifold M. Then  $\Sigma$  is conformally circular if any unparametrised  $\Sigma$ -conformal circle is also an unparametrised M-conformal circle.

Definition 5.7 appears in [9], where the term strongly conformally geodesic is used. In the following two theorems we characterise these two notions of conformal circularity in terms of the basic tractor invariants  $\mathbb{L}$  and S of the conformal submanifold  $\Sigma$ . The first theorem below is easily seen to be equivalent to [9, Theorem 5.4(3)], but we include proofs of both theorems for completeness.

**Theorem 5.9.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a submanifold in a conformal manifold M. Then  $\Sigma$  is strongly conformally circular if, and only if  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^C = 0$  and  $\mathsf{S}_{iJK} = 0$  (i.e.  $\mathcal{F}_{ij} = 0$ ).

**Theorem 5.10.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a submanifold in a conformal manifold M. Then  $\Sigma$  is conformally circular if, and only if  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^{C} = 0$  and  $\mathsf{S}_{iJK} \propto \mathbf{g}_{ij} Z^{j}_{[J} X_{K]}$  (i.e.  $\mathcal{F}_{ij} \propto \mathbf{g}_{ij}$ ).

Note that following our conventions for the Fialkow tensor in Section 3.5, these results still hold when  $\Sigma$  is a submanifold of dimension 2. The  $\Sigma$ -conformal circle equation is then the usual conformal circle equation (either the projectively parametrized equation (5.1) or the parametrizationindependent weighted equation (5.12)) with the Schouten tensor defined in Section 3.5 playing the role of the usual Schouten tensor. For a 1-dimensional submanifold, weakly conformally circular and strongly conformally circular are equivalent (and the Fialkow tensor is defined to be zero), so in this case Theorems 5.9 and 5.10 reduce to the fact that a conformal circle is characterized by  $\mathbb{L} = 0$ .

Proof of Theorem 5.9. First suppose that  $\Sigma$  is strongly conformally circular. Since  $\Sigma$  is then also weakly conformally circular, we must have  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^{C} = 0$  by Theorem 5.2. In particular,  $\Sigma$  is totally umbilic  $(\mathring{H}_{ij}^{c} = 0)$ . Now, suppose that  $\gamma$  is a projectively parametrised  $\Sigma$ -conformal circle with initial data a given 2-jet at  $p \in \Sigma$ . Then by assumption  $\gamma$  is also an *M*-conformal circle with the same initial data, now viewed as the 2-jet of a curve in *M*. Let  $g \in c$  be a minimal scale for  $\Sigma$ . The curve  $\gamma$  must satisfy the intrinsic and ambient versions of the conformal circle equation, namely

$$\frac{d^{D}a^{j}}{dt} = u^{2} \cdot u^{i} p_{i}{}^{j} + 3u^{-2} \left( u_{k}a^{k} \right) a^{j} - \frac{3}{2}u^{-2} \left( a_{k}a^{k} \right) u^{j} - 2u^{k}u^{l} p_{kl}u^{j}$$
(5.27)

and

$$\frac{d^{\nabla}a^{b}}{dt} = u^{2} \cdot u^{c}P_{c}^{\ b} + 3u^{-2}\left(u_{c}a^{c}\right)a^{b} - \frac{3}{2}u^{-2}\left(a_{c}a^{c}\right)u^{b} - 2u^{c}u^{d}P_{cd}u^{b}$$
(5.28)

respectively. From the Gauß formula (3.5) and the fact that  $\Sigma$  is totally geodesic with respect to g, we have that

$$a^b = u^i \nabla_i u^b = \Pi^b_j u^i D_i u^j + II_{ij}{}^b u^i u^j = \Pi^b_j a^j$$

and

$$\frac{d^{\nabla}a^b}{dt} = \Pi^b_j \frac{d^D a^j}{dt},$$

where  $a^j = \frac{d^D u^j}{dt}$ , i.e. the acceleration of the curve calculated intrinsically. Therefore, applying  $\Pi_b^j$  to (5.28) and subtracting (5.27) from the result, we see that

$$u^{2} \cdot u^{k} P_{k}{}^{j} - 2u^{k} u^{l} P_{kl} u^{j} = u^{2} \cdot u^{k} p_{k}{}^{j} - 2u^{k} u^{l} p_{kl} u^{j},$$

where we have used that  $\Pi_b^j u^b = u^j$ ,  $\Pi_b^j a^b = a^j$ ,  $u_c a^c = u_k a^k$  (which follows from the Gauß formula without the need for g to be a minimal scale since  $u^c$  is tangent to the submanifold  $\Sigma$ ), and  $a^c a_c = a^k a_k$  (since  $\Sigma$  is totally geodesic with respect to g). Contracting the above display with  $u_j$  yields

$$u^{2} \cdot u_{j}u^{k}P_{k}{}^{j} - 2u^{k}u^{l}P_{kl} \cdot u^{2} = u^{2} \cdot u_{j}u^{k}p_{k}{}^{j} - 2u^{k}u^{l}p_{kl} \cdot u^{2},$$

and hence

$$(P_{ij} - p_{ij}) u^i u^j = 0. (5.29)$$

Since  $\Pi_{ij}{}^c = 0$ , the term in parentheses in the above display is exactly the Fialkow tensor  $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$  from (3.36). Now, at any point  $p \in \Sigma$ , any  $u \in T_p \Sigma$  can arise as the velocity of a conformal circle, and hence (5.29) must hold for all  $u^i \in \mathcal{E}^i$ . Hence  $\mathcal{F}_{ij} = 0$ . Together with our earlier observation that strong conformal circularity implies weak conformal circularity, this establishes that  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}{}^C = 0$  and  $\mathsf{S}_{iJK} = 0$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^C = 0$  and  $\mathsf{S}_{iJK} = 0$ . Let  $\gamma$  be a projectively parametrized  $\Sigma$ conformal circle. Then the intrinsic acceleration tractor  $A^J$  of  $\gamma$  satisfies  $\frac{d^D A^J}{dt} = 0$ . We must also
show that  $\gamma$  satisfies the ambient (projectively parametrized) conformal circle equation.

For any parametrized curve in  $\Sigma$ , writing  $U^J$  for its velocity tractor, we see from explicit form of the velocity tractor (5.4) and the formula (3.18) for the isomorphism  $\Pi_J^B$  that  $U^B = \Pi_J^B U^J$ , where again we use the tangentiality of  $u^c$  together with the Gauß formula to conclude that  $u_c a^c = u_k a^k$ . Then applying the tractor Gauß formula (3.42) shows that the ambient acceleration tractor is given by

$$A^B = \frac{d^{\nabla} U^B}{dt} = \Pi^B_J (u^i D_i U^J + \mathsf{S}_i{}^J{}_K U^K) + u^i \mathbb{L}_{iJ}{}^B U^J = \Pi^B_J \frac{d^D U^J}{dt} = \Pi^B_J A^J,$$

since  $\mathbb{L} = 0$  and S = 0. Similarly, it follows that

$$\frac{d^{\nabla}A^B}{dt} = \Pi^B_J \frac{d^D A^J}{dt}$$

So if moreover  $\gamma$  satisfies  $d^D A^J/dt = 0$ , then also  $d^{\nabla} A^B/dt = 0$ . Finally, recall that the isomorphism  $\Pi_J^B$  is also metric-preserving, and so

$$A^B A_B = A^J A_J = 0,$$

since  $A^B = \prod_J^B A^J$  and we assumed  $\gamma$  is  $\Sigma$ -projectively parametrised. Thus, by the characterisation from [7],  $\gamma$  is a projectively-parametrised *M*-conformal circle, and therefore  $\Sigma$  is strongly conformally circular. We next prove the parametrization-independent version of Theorem 5.9, namely Theorem 5.10. As this theorem is a statement about unparametrised conformal circles, we use the 3-tractor  $\Phi$  (which equals the Hodge-star of the normal tractor form) discussed in Section 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.10. First, suppose that  $\Sigma$  is conformally circular, that is, every unparametrised  $\Sigma$ -conformal circle is an unparametrised *M*-conformal circle. Let  $\gamma$  be a  $\Sigma$ -conformal circle. In the previous proof, we observed that strong conformal circularity implies weak conformal circularity. Parametrisation was not used at all in this part of the proof and hence we may employ the same argument here. Thus  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^{C} = 0$  by Theorem 5.2.

As described in Section 5.1,  $\gamma$  determines an intrinsic 3-tractor  $\phi^{IJK} \in \mathcal{E}^{[IJK]}$  which satisfies  $X^{[I}\phi^{JKL]} = 0$  and  $u^i D_i \phi^{IJK} = 0$ , where  $X^I$  is the intrinsic canonical tractor and  $D_i$  is the intrinsic tractor connection. Explicitly,

$$\phi^{IJK} = 6u^{-1}X^{[I}U^JA^{K]},$$

with  $U^J$  and  $A^K$  defined as in equations (5.2) and (5.3) respectively, using the intrinsic position tractor and tractor connection.

On the other hand, viewing  $\gamma$  as an ambient curve also defines a 3-tractor,

$$\Phi^{ABC} = 6u^{-1}X^{[A}U^{B}A^{C]}.$$

where  $X^A$  is the ambient position tractor and  $U^B$  and  $A^C$  are the velocity and acceleration tractors of  $\gamma$  as a curve in  $(M, \mathbf{c})$  (note that while  $U^B = \prod_J^B U^J$ , we are abusing notation slightly in that the ambient acceleration tractor  $A^C$  need not equal  $\prod_K^C A^K$ , as can be seen from the tractor Gauß formula). Since  $\Sigma$  is conformally circular,  $\gamma$  is an *M*-conformal circle and so  $\Phi$  must be parallel along the curve, i.e.  $u^a \nabla_a \Phi^{ABC} = 0$ .

Fix a reference metric  $g \in c$ . By (5.11) the derivatives of the intrinsic and ambient 3-tractors are

$$\mathbf{u}^{i}D_{i}\phi^{IJK} = 6\left(\mathbf{u}^{i}D_{i}\mathbf{a}^{k} - \mathbf{u}^{l}p_{l}^{k}\right)\mathbf{u}^{j}X^{[I}Z_{j}^{J}Z_{k}^{K]},$$

and

$$\mathbf{u}^{i}\nabla_{i}\Phi^{ABC} = 6\left(\mathbf{u}^{i}\nabla_{i}\mathbf{a}^{c} - \mathbf{u}^{d}P_{d}^{c}\right)\mathbf{u}^{b}X^{[A}Z_{b}^{B}Z_{c}^{C]},$$

respectively. Both of the above displays are zero and hence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \Pi_A^I \Pi_B^J \Pi_C^K \left( \mathbf{u}^i \nabla_i \Phi^{ABC} \right) - \mathbf{u}^i D_i \phi^{IJK} \\ &= 6 \left[ \left( \mathbf{u}^i D_i \mathbf{a}^k - \mathbf{u}^l P_l^k \right) - \left( \mathbf{u}^i D_i \mathbf{a}^k - \mathbf{u}^l p_l^k \right) \right] \mathbf{u}^j X^{[I} Z_j^J Z_k^{K]} \\ &= -6 \mathbf{u}^l \left( P_l^k - p_l^k \right) \mathbf{u}^j X^{[I} Z_j^J Z_k^{K]}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (3.32) and the Gauß formula in going from the first to second lines. It follows that the antisymmetric part of  $\mathbf{u}^l \left( P_l^k - p_l^k \right) \mathbf{u}^j$  equals zero. Thus

$$\mathbf{u}^l \left( P_l^k - p_l^k \right) \propto \mathbf{u}^k.$$

Since we have already seen that  $\mathring{H}_{ij}{}^c = 0$ , this means that

$$\mathbf{u}^{l}\mathcal{F}_{l}^{k} = \mathbf{u}^{l}\left(P_{l}^{k} - p_{l}^{k} + H_{c}\mathring{\Pi}_{l}^{kc} + \frac{1}{2}H_{c}H^{c}\delta_{l}^{k}\right) \propto \mathbf{u}^{k}.$$

Now, since the (weighted) velocity of a  $\Sigma$ -conformal circle passing through a point  $p \in \Sigma$  can be any unit vector of  $T_p \Sigma[-1]$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{F}_l^k$  must equal  $f \delta_j^k$  for some smooth weight -2 density on  $\Sigma$ , and hence  $\mathcal{F}_{ij} = f g_{ij}$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $\mathbb{L}_{iJ}^{C} = 0$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{ij} = f \mathbf{g}_{ij}$  for some -2 density on  $\Sigma$ , and let  $\gamma$  be a  $\Sigma$ conformal circle. The  $\Sigma$ -conformal circle  $\gamma$  determines an intrinsic 3-tractor  $\phi^{IJK} = 6u^{-1}X^{[I}U^{J}A^{K]}$ which is parallel along  $\gamma$  for the intrinsic tractor connection. To show that  $\gamma$  is an M-conformal
circle, we need to show that the ambient 3-tractor  $\Phi^{ABC} = 6u^{-1}X^{[A}U^{B}A^{C]}$  satisfies these same
properties. We show this by using the conditions on the tractor second fundamental form and the
difference tractor to relate the ambient X, U and A tractors to their intrinsic counterparts.

From the isomorphism of Theorem 3.5 (cf. the proof of Theorem 5.9), it follows that  $X^A = \Pi_I^A X^I$  and  $U^B = \Pi_J^B U^J$ , where  $X^I$  and  $U^J$  are the intrinsic submanifold canonical tractor and velocity tractor of  $\gamma$  respectively. From the tractor Gauß formula (3.42) we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} A^B &= u^i \nabla_i U^B = u^i \nabla_i (\Pi^B_J U^J) \\ &= \Pi^B_J \left[ u^i D_i U^J + u^i f \boldsymbol{g}_{ij} \left( Z^{Jj} X_K - Z^j_K X^J \right) U^K \right] \\ &= \Pi^B_J \left( A^J - u f X^J \right) \\ &= \Pi^B_J A^J - u f X^B, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$u^{i} \nabla_{i} A^{C} = u^{i} \nabla_{i} (\Pi_{J}^{C} A^{J}) - u^{i} \nabla_{i} (uf X^{C})$$
  

$$= \Pi_{J}^{C} (u^{i} D_{i} A^{J} + f u^{i} (Z_{i}^{J} X_{K} - Z_{iK} X^{J}) A^{K})$$
  

$$- u^{i} \nabla_{i} (uf) X^{C} - u f u^{c} Z_{c}^{C}$$
  

$$= \Pi_{J}^{C} (u^{i} D_{i} A^{J}) - 2u f u^{c} Z_{c}^{C} + \rho X^{C}, \qquad (5.30)$$

where we have collected all the terms in the bottom slot into  $\rho$  (the exact form of  $\rho$  will not be important). Now, recall that  $U^B = u^i \nabla_i (u^{-1} X^B)$  and  $A^B = u^i \nabla_i U^B$ . Hence, using the skew-symmetry,

$$u^{i}\nabla_{i}\Phi^{ABC} = u^{i}\nabla_{i}\left(6u^{-1}X^{[A}U^{B}A^{C]}\right) = 6u^{-1}X^{[A}U^{B}(u^{i}\nabla_{i}A^{C]})$$

Substituting (5.30) for the derivative of the acceleration into the above it is easy to see that the  $-2ufu^c Z_c^C + \rho X^C$  terms drop out due to the skewing with  $X^A$  and with  $U^B$  (which is proportional to  $u^b Z_b^B$  modulo the canonical tractor) and thus we obtain,

$$u^i \nabla_i \Phi^{ABC} = u^i \Pi^A_I \Pi^B_I \Pi^C_K D_i \phi^{IJK}.$$
(5.31)

Finally, the right-hand side of (5.31) is zero, since  $\gamma$  is a  $\Sigma$ -conformal circle. Thus  $\gamma$  is an M-conformal circle.

#### 5.4 Examples

We collect here some elementary examples of distinguished submanifolds in conformal manifolds.

**Example 5.11. (The Model Case.)** Let  $(S^n, c)$  be the standard conformal sphere (additionally endowed with its standard Möbius conformal structure if n = 2, which is induced by the standard

embedding  $S^2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ ). When  $m = \dim \Sigma > 1$  the invariant  $\mu$  is given by (5.21), and hence is trivial due to the vanishing of the ambient Weyl curvature (when  $m = \dim \Sigma = 1$  this formula does not apply and the vanishing of  $\mu$  characterizes conformal circles). Also, from the vanishing of the ambient Weyl curvature together with (3.38) and (3.58) it follows that  $\mathcal{F}_{ij} = 0$  for umbilic submanifolds. Therefore, in the model case, the notions of strongly conformally circular, conformally circular, and weakly conformally circular (i.e. distinguished) submanifolds are all equivalent; the distinguished submanifolds of  $S^n$  are precisely the umbilic ones when m > 1 and conformal circles when m = 1.

**Remark 5.12.** The equivalence of all these conditions to  $\mathbb{L} = 0$  in the model case leads to a very simple proof of the classical characterisation of umbilic submanifolds in the sphere: The condition  $\mathbb{L} = 0$  on  $\Sigma \subseteq S^n$  implies that the tractor bundle of  $\Sigma$  is parallel in the (flat) ambient tractor bundle and hence corresponds to a fixed subspace V of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1,1}$ ; viewing  $S^n$  as the ray projectivisation of the forward null cone  $C_+$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1,1}$  it follows that  $\Sigma$  must be a piece of the subsphere  $\mathbb{P}_+(V \cap C_+) \subset S^n$ , which corresponds to the intersection of  $S^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  with an affine subspace of dimension dim  $\Sigma + 1$ . The simplicity of this, and related arguments, is one of the reasons we believe the distinguished submanifold condition should be seen as fundamental in conformal geometry.

Consideration of the model case leads us to ask whether the various notions of conformal circularity defined above are independent in general. Note that when m = 1 umbilicity is a trivial condition (satisfied by any curve) and the notions of strong, weak, and conformal circularity are all equivalent to being a conformal circle. When m = 2 the notions of weak conformal circularity and conformal circularity are equivalent (as we have required  $\mathcal{F}_{(ij)_0}$  to be zero when defining the induced Möbius structure on  $\Sigma$ ). Also, note that when  $\Sigma$  is a hypersurface (and  $n \ge 3$ ) then the invariant  $\mu$  is trivial, and hence being weakly conformally circular (distinguished) is equivalent to being umbilic. Outside of these cases, however, these notions are distinct, as shown by the following examples:

Example 5.13. (Extending  $(\Sigma, c_{\Sigma})$  with prescribed  $\mathring{I}$ ,  $\mu$ , and  $\mathcal{F}$ .) Let  $(\Sigma, c_{\Sigma})$  be an *m*dimensional conformal manifold and  $M = \Sigma \times \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $d \ge 1$  (or, more generally, let M be a rank d vector bundle over  $\Sigma$ ). By considering the freedom in the 2-jet along  $\Sigma$  of an arbitrary extension g of  $g_{\Sigma} \in \mathbf{c}_{\Sigma}$  to M one can show that the geometric quantities  $\mathring{I}$ ,  $\mu$ , and  $\mathcal{F}$  can be freely prescribed along  $\Sigma$  by an appropriate choice of extension, where the trace free tensor  $\mathring{I}$  is trivially zero if  $m = 1, \mu$  must be zero if d = 1 (unless m also equals 1 and M is taken to have a conformal Möbius tructure) and  $\mathcal{F}$  must be pure trace if m = 2 and zero if m = 1; see, [9, Theorem 4.22]. (Note that when m > 2 our  $\mathcal{F}$  is equivalent to the relative Schouten-Weyl tensor  $\rho$  in [9], but we when m = 2 or 1 we do not assume that  $\Sigma$  has its own Möbius/Laplace structure, and hence we define  $\mathcal{F}$  differently from  $\rho$  in [9].)

It follows that when m > 2 and d > 1 being strongly conformally circular ( $\mathring{H} = 0, \mu = 0$  and  $\mathcal{F} = 0$ ) is a stronger notion than being conformally circular ( $\mathring{H} = 0, \mu = 0$  and  $\mathring{\mathcal{F}} = 0$ ), which is itself a stronger notion than being weakly conformally circular ( $\mathring{H} = 0$  and  $\mu = 0$ , equivalently,  $\mathbb{L} = 0$ ), and this in turn is a stronger notion than being umbilic.

We can also easily see these inequivalences by considering simple examples.

Example 5.14. (A factor in a product of Einstein metrics.) If  $(M_1, g_1)$  and  $(M_2, g_2)$  are Einstein manifolds and  $\Sigma = M_1 \times \{p_2\}$  then  $\Sigma$  is totally geodesic in the Riemannian product (M, g)of  $M_1$  and  $M_1$ , hence  $\mathring{H} = 0$ . Moreover, since the Ricci curvature of the product metric is the sum of the Ricci curvatures of the factors it is readily seen that  $N_b^c P_i^{\ b} = \prod_i^a N_b^c P_a^{\ b} = 0$  (when computing with respect to g), hence  $\mu = 0$ . Similarly, it follows that the Fialkow tensor must be pure trace since (if m > 2)  $\mathcal{F}_{ij} = P_{ij} - p_{ij}$  in the scale g and both  $P_{ij}$  and  $p_{ij}$  must be proportional to  $g_{ij}$  (the metric on  $\Sigma$ ). However, since the formula for  $P_{ij}$  involves both the ambient scalar curvature and the ambient dimension, it will typically differ from  $p_{ij}$ . For example, if  $\Sigma = S^m \times \{p\}$  in  $S^m \times S^k$  with m > 2 and k > 1 then it is readily checked that  $\mathcal{F} = c_{m,k}g_{\Sigma}$  with  $c_{m,k} \neq 0$ . If m = 2 we find the same result using the formula (3.58) for  $\mathcal{F}$  instead, since the Weyl curvature is readily computed in terms of Kulkarni-Nomizu products of  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  from which one can easily check that  $\mathrm{tr}^2 \iota^* W \neq 0$ . Thus, in these cases  $\Sigma = S^m \times \{p\}$  is conformally circular, but not strongly conformally circular.

It is possible to characterize the Einstein products for which the submanifolds of the form  $M_1 \times \{p_2\}$  and  $\{p_1\} \times M_2$  are strongly conformally circular. A special Einstein product is the Riemannian product (M, g) of a pair of Einstein manifolds  $(M_1, g_1)$  and  $(M_2, g_2)$  with the property that  $\operatorname{Ric}^{g_1} = (n_1 - 1)\lambda g_1$  and  $\operatorname{Ric}^{g_2} = -(n_2 - 1)\lambda g_2$  for some constant  $\lambda$ , where  $n_i = \dim M_i$ , see e.g. [64]. (The simplest example of such a product is  $S^m \times H^d$  with the standard product metric.) Given a general product of  $(M_1, g_1)$  and  $(M_2, g_2)$  with  $\operatorname{Ric}^{g_1} = (n_1 - 1)\lambda g_1$ , a straightforward calculation shows that a submanifold of the form  $M_1 \times \{p_2\}$  has  $\mathcal{F} = 0$  if and only if  $\operatorname{Ric}^{g_2} = -(n_2 - 1)\lambda g_2$ . Thus we have:

**Theorem 5.15.** Let (M, g) be a product of Einstein manifolds  $(M_1, g_1)$  and  $(M_2, g_2)$ . The submanifolds of the form  $M_1 \times \{p_2\}$  (or, equivalently, those of the form  $\{p_1\} \times M_2$ ) are strongly conformally circular if and only if (M, g) is a special Einstein product.

On the other hand, a factor in a generic product will typically only be weakly conformally circular:

**Example 5.16.** (A factor in a generic product.) Let  $(M,g) = (M_1,g_1) \times (M_2,g_2)$  and  $\Sigma = M_1 \times p_2$ , where  $m = \dim \Sigma > 2$  and  $(M_1,g_1)$  is not Einstein. Then,  $\Sigma$  is again totally geodesic and by the product formula for the Ricci curvature one still has that  $N_b^c P_i^{\ b} = \prod_i^a N_b^c P_a^{\ b} = 0$ , when computing with respect to g. Hence we have the conformally invariant conditions  $\mathring{H} = 0$  and  $\mu = 0$ . On the other hand, with respect to g we have  $\mathcal{F}_{ij} = P_{ij} - p_{ij}$  and this will not typically be proportional to the metric  $g_{ij}$  on  $\Sigma$ . For a concrete example that is easy to compute, take, say,  $M_1 = S^2 \times S^1$  with the product metric and  $M_2 = \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $d \ge 1$ , with the Euclidean metric. Let h denote the pullback of the round metric on  $S^2$  to  $M_1 = S^2 \times S^1$  and let  $d\theta^2$  denote the pullback of the metric on  $S^1$ . The Ricci curvature of  $g_1 = h + d\theta^2$  on  $M_1$  is then h and the Ricci curvature of  $M_2$  is zero. It follows that  $p = \frac{3}{4}h - \frac{1}{4}d\theta^2$ , but  $\iota^* P = \frac{2d+3}{2(d+1)(d+2)}h - \frac{1}{2(d+1)(d+2)}d\theta^2$  and hence  $\mathcal{F} = \iota^* P - p$  is never proportional to  $g_{\Sigma} = h + d\theta^2$ . Thus,  $\Sigma$  is weakly conformally circular (distinguished) but not conformally circular.

Similar examples can be found by considering factors in warped product metrics, or doubly warped products, since these are conformal to Riemannian products. On the other hand, twisted products are not typically conformal to a Riemannian product and give a new class of examples. In what follows we will abuse notation by writing  $g_i$  for the pullback  $\pi_i^* g_i$  of a metric on  $M_i$  via the projection to the *i*th factor  $\pi_i : M_1 \times M_2 \to M_i$ . Let  $(M_1, g_1)$  and  $(M_2, g_2)$  be Riemannian manifolds. A *doubly warped product* metric on  $M = M_1 \times M_2$  is a metric of the form  $g = f_2g_1 + f_1g_2$ , where  $f_i : M_i \to \mathbb{R}_+$  is a smooth function for i = 1, 2; such a doubly warped product g is conformal to the product metric  $\tilde{g} = \tilde{g}_1 + \tilde{g}_2$ , where  $\tilde{g}_1 = f_1^{-1}g_1$  and  $\tilde{g}_2 = f_2^{-1}g_2$ . Hence the two natural foliations of a doubly warped product manifold are foliations by distinguished submanifolds (we will call such foliations distinguished). If (M, g) is a warped product  $(f_2 = 1)$  then the fact that these foliations are distinguished can also easily be seen by computing in the scale g, since the submanifolds of the form  $M_1 \times \{p_2\}$  are totally geodesic, the submanifolds of the form  $\{p_1\} \times M_2$  are umbilic with parallel mean curvature, and the mixed part of the Ricci tensor vanishes. For a general doubly warped product, however, then fact that these foliations are distinguished is less obvious from a Riemannian point of view since computing  $\mu$  or  $\mathbb{L}$  in the scale g becomes nontrivial:

**Example 5.17.** (A doubly warped product.) Let  $M = \mathbb{R}^4 = \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$  with the doubly warped product metric

$$g = e^{2x_3}(dx_1^2 + dx_2^2) + e^{2x_1}(dx_3^2 + dx_4^2).$$

We know that the two natural foliations of M are distinguished, but we wish to show this from the point of view of the metric g. Consider, say,  $\Sigma = \mathbb{R}^2 \times \{(0,0)\}$ . Clearly  $\Sigma$  is umbilic. Indeed, in the standard coordinates  $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$  the second fundamental form of  $\Sigma$  is given in terms of the Christoffel symbols by  $\Pi_{ij}{}^c = \Gamma^c{}_{ij}$  for  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $c \in \{3, 4\}$ , where  $\Gamma^4{}_{ij} = 0$  and  $\Gamma^3{}_{ij} = -e^{2x_3-2x_1}\delta_{ij} = -e^{-2x_1}g_{ij}$  for  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ . Thus,  $\Sigma$  has mean curvature vector  $H = -e^{-2x_1}\partial_3$ . Using that  $\Gamma^1{}_{13} = \Gamma^3{}_{13} = 1$  and  $\Gamma^2{}_{13} = \Gamma^4{}_{13} = 0$  it follows that  $\nabla_{\partial_1}H = 4e^{-2x_3}\partial_3 - 2e^{-2x_3}(\partial_1 + \partial_3) =$  $2e^{-2x_3}\partial_3 - 2e^{-2x_3}\partial_1$ . A straightforward calculation also shows that  $\operatorname{Ric}_{13} = 2$ . Thus, from the formula for  $\mu$  and the definition of the Schouten tensor, we compute that  $\mu_1{}^3 = P_1{}^3 - \nabla_1 H^3 =$  $\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Ric}_1{}^3 - \nabla_1 H^3 = e^{-2x_1} - e^{-2x_1} = 0$ . The other "mixed" components of the Schouten tensor and the other components of  $\nabla^{\perp} H$  are all zero. Hence,  $\mu = 0$  and  $\Sigma$  is a distinguished submanifold.

As noted above, we can get away from examples that are conformal to products by considering generic twisted products. Again let  $(M_1, g_1)$  and  $(M_2, g_2)$  be Riemannian manifolds. A *doubly twisted product* metric on  $M = M_1 \times M_2$  is a metric of the form  $g = h_1g_1 + h_2g_2$ , where  $h_i :$  $M_1 \times M_2 \to \mathbb{R}_+$  is a smooth function for i = 1, 2; such a doubly twisted product metric is clearly conformal to the twisted product metric  $g_1 + fg_2$ , where  $f : M_1 \times M_2 \to \mathbb{R}_+$  is given by  $h_2/h_1$ , but such a metric is not typically conformally equivalent to a product metric on  $M_1 \times M_2$ . The conformal structures arising from twisted products give rise to umbilic but not distinguished foliations:

**Example 5.18.** (A twisted product.) Let  $M = \mathbb{R}^4 = \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$  with the twisted product metric

$$g = dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + e^{2x_1x_3}(dx_3^2 + dx_4^2)$$

and let  $\Sigma = \mathbb{R}^2 \times \{(a, b)\}$ . Then  $\Sigma$  is totally geodesic for g, and hence umbilic. Thus  $\mu$  is given by the mixed part of the Schouten tensor. By the diagonal form of the metric, this is precisely half of the mixed part of the Ricci tensor. But by a straightforward calculation we find that  $R_{13} = -1 \neq 0$ and hence  $\mu_1^3 \neq 0$ . Therefore  $\Sigma$  is umbilic, but not distinguished.

In fact, the distinguished submanifold condition characterises precisely when a doubly twisted product metric is conformal to a product metric. Since doubly twisted product are conformal to twisted products, we need only consider the latter. One of the two natural foliations of a twisted product manifold is distinguished if and only if both are, and this is equivalent to the twisted product metric being a warped product and hence conformal to a product:

**Theorem 5.19.** Let  $(M_1, g_1)$  and  $(M_2, g_2)$  be Riemannian manifolds of dimension at least two,  $f: M_1 \times M_2 \to \mathbb{R}_+$  a smooth function and  $g = g_1 + fg_2$  a twisted product metric on  $M = M_1 \times M_2$ . Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) The umbilic submanifolds  $M_1 \times \{p_2\}$  are distinguished for every  $p_2 \in M_2$ ;
- (ii) The umbilic submanifolds  $\{p_1\} \times M_2$  are distinguished for every  $p_1 \in M_1$ ;
- (iii) The function  $f: M_1 \times M_2 \to \mathbb{R}_+$  can be written as a product  $f = f_1 f_2$  of functions  $f_i: M_i \to \mathbb{R}_+, i = 1, 2$ .
- (iv) g is a warped product metric  $g_1 + f_1 \tilde{g}_2$  for some metric  $\tilde{g}_2$  conformal to  $g_2$ .
- (v) g is conformal to a product metric  $\tilde{g}_1 + \tilde{g}_2$  on  $M_1 \times M_2$ .

Proof. We first note that the equivalence of (iii) and (iv) is obvious, and that these clearly imply (v). To see that (v) implies (iv) we note that if  $g_1 + fg_2 = \lambda(\tilde{g}_1 + \tilde{g}_2)$  for some smooth function  $\lambda : M_1 \times M_2 \to \mathbb{R}_+$ , then (from  $g_1 = \lambda \tilde{g}_1$ ) it follows that  $\lambda$  must be independent of the  $M_2$  factor and hence  $g = g_1 + f_1 \tilde{g}_2$  where  $f_1 = \lambda$ . From the discussion above we also know that (v) implies (i) and (ii). To establish the result it is therefore enough to show that (i) implies (iii) and that (ii) implies (iii).

Suppose (i) holds. Let  $n = \dim M$  and  $n_i = \dim M_i$ . For i = 1, 2, let  $X_i$  be a vector field on  $M = M_1 \times M_2$  tangent to the *i*th factor. Then the mixed-part of the Ricci tensor is given by (see, e.g., [49])

$$\operatorname{Ric}(X_1, X_2) = (1 - n_2) X_1 X_2 \log(f).$$

But the submanifolds of the form  $M_1 \times \{p_2\}$  are totally geodesic in (M, g) and hence for these submanifolds  $\mu$  is given by the mixed-part of the Schouten tensor, which (due to the diagonal form of the metric with respect to the product decomposition  $M = M_1 \times M_2$ ) is  $\frac{1}{n-2}$  times the mixed-part of the Ricci tensor. Thus, since (i) holds we must have  $X_1X_2\log(f) = 0$  for any pair of vector fields  $X_1, X_2$ , with  $X_1$  tangent to the first factor and  $X_2$  tangent to the second factor. It follows easily that  $\log(f)$  is the sum of a function on  $M_1$  and a function on  $M_2$ , and hence (iii) holds.

Since the distinguished submanifold condition is conformally invariant, the fact that (ii) also implies (iii) follows from the same argument we just used but now applied to the conformally related metric  $f^{-1}g_1 + g_2$  (with the roles of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  interchanged). This proves the result.

The classical de Rham-Wu theorem states that a Riemannian manifold (M, g) possessing a pair of complementary orthogonal totally geodesic foliations is locally a product Riemannian manifold, and this holds globally if (M, g) is complete and simply connected. An analogue of this result for twisted products is given in [102]: A Riemannian manifold (M, g) possessing a totally geodesic foliation and a complementary orthogonal totally umbilic foliation is locally a twisted product manifold. This result easily implies the following conformally invariant result: A Riemannian manifold (M, g) possessing a pair of complementary orthogonal totally umbilic foliations is locally a doubly twisted product manifold. To see this one merely rescales g to make one of the umbilic foliations totally geodesic (which can always be done locally), and then applies the result of [102] to conclude that the rescaled metric is a twisted product. Combining these observations with Theorem 5.19 we readily obtain the following conformal extension of the (local version) of the de Rham-Wu theorem:

**Theorem 5.20.** A conformal manifold (M, c) is locally the conformal structure of a product manifold if and only if (M, c) possesses a pair of complementary orthogonal foliations by distinguished submanifolds. **Remark 5.21.** In fact, as can easily be seen from Theorem 5.19, it suffices to know that one of the foliations is distinguished and the other is umbilic (as it is then forced to be also distinguished).

The above considerations suggest that the "generic" umbilic hypersurface will not be distinguished. On the other hand, there are many situations in which the geometry of the ambient manifold (M, g) forces any umbilic submanifold to be distinguished, as we will see below. Towards this end, it is helpful to introduce Nomizu and Yano's notion of extrinsic spheres: A submanifold  $\Sigma$  in a Riemannian manifold (M, g) is called an *extrinsic sphere* if it is umbilic and has parallel mean curvature vector (for the connection on the normal bundle). We then have the following easy observation:

**Theorem 5.22.** An extrinsic sphere in an Einstein manifold is conformally distinguished.

**Remark 5.23.** If  $\Sigma$  is an umbilic hypersurface in an Einstein manifold (M, g) then by contracting the Codazzi equation one readily finds that  $\Sigma$  has parallel mean curvature vector (equivalently, constant mean curvature) [39, 91] and hence is an extrinsic sphere. Of course, umbilic hypersurfaces are all distinguished so the above theorem teaches us nothing new in this case. On the other hand, the fact that umbilic hypersurfaces are all distinguished, together with the definition of  $\mu$ , furnishes an easy proof that an umbilic hypersurface in an Einstein manifold is an extrinsic sphere: in the Einstein scale one finds that  $\mu_i^{\ c} = \nabla_i^{\perp} H^c$  (and  $\mu$  is zero).

Returning to Example 5.11, we note that since (real) Riemannian space forms are conformally flat it follows that any umbilic submanifold of a real space form is a distinguished submanifold. The same holds for complex space forms (the simply connected examples of which are complex projective spaces, complex Euclidean spaces and complex hyperbolic spaces):

**Example 5.24. (Umbilic submanifolds in complex space forms.)** An inspection of the classification of umbilic submanifolds in complex space forms in [40] shows that all are extrinsic spheres (counting totally geodesic submanifolds as extrinsic spheres). Hence, since complex space forms are Einstein, every umbilic submanifold in a complex space form is conformally distinguished.

To be more concrete, we discuss the example of complex projective space in more detail and compute the Fialkow tensor of the umbilic submanifolds:

**Example 5.25.** (Conformal circularity of umbilic submanifolds in  $\mathbb{CP}^n$ .) Let  $(M,g) = (\mathbb{CP}^n, g_{FS})$ , where  $g_{FS}$  is the Fubini-Study metric. Let J denote the complex structure on M and let  $J_{ab} = g_{ac}J^c{}_b$ . With our conventions, the curvature tensor of g is  $g_{ac}g_{bd} - g_{ad}g_{bc} + J_{ac}J_{bd} - J_{ad}J_{bc} + 2J_{ab}J_{cd}$ . The (real) Ricci tensor is Ric = (2n+2)g and the Schouten tensor is  $P = \frac{n+1}{2n-1}g$ . It follows that the Weyl curvature is given by  $W_{abcd} = \frac{-3}{2n-1}(g_{ac}g_{bd} - g_{ad}g_{bc}) + J_{ac}J_{bd} - J_{ad}J_{bc} + 2J_{ab}J_{cd}$ . Following the classification in [40] the umbilic submanifolds are of three kinds. The first case is when  $\Sigma$  is a totally geodesic  $\mathbb{CP}^m$  in  $\mathbb{CP}^n$  (m < n). In this case one readily computes that the Fialkow tensor is given by  $\mathcal{F} = (\frac{n+1}{2n-1} - \frac{m+1}{2m-1})g_{\Sigma}$  when m > 1 and it turns out that the same formula holds when m = 1 (since in the latter case the ambient Weyl curvature pulls back to  $\Sigma = \mathbb{CP}^1$  as  $W_{ijkl} = (\frac{-3}{2n-1} + 3)(g_{ik}g_{jl} - g_{il}g_{jk})$  so that  $\operatorname{tr}^2 \iota^* W = 12\frac{n-1}{2n-1}$  and  $\mathcal{F} = -3\frac{n-1}{2n-1}g_{\Sigma} = (\frac{n+1}{2n-1} - 2)g_{\Sigma})$ . So, a totally geodesic  $\mathbb{CP}^m$  in  $\mathbb{CP}^n$  is conformally circular, but not strongly conformally circular. The second case is when  $\Sigma$  is a totally real and totally geodesic  $\mathbb{RP}^n$  in  $\mathbb{CP}^n$  or a totally geodesic  $\mathbb{RP}^m$ 

in such a totally real and totally geodesic  $\mathbb{RP}^n$  (note that such an embedded  $\mathbb{RP}^m$  necessarily has parallel mean curvature in  $\mathbb{RP}^n$  and in  $\mathbb{CP}^n$ ); in this case the induced metric has constant sectional curvature K > 1 and the mean curvature squared is given by  $|H|^2 = K - 1$  (when K = 1 we are back in the second case). Interestingly, in either the second or the third case we find that when dim  $\Sigma > 2$  the Fialkow tensor is given by  $\mathcal{F} = \frac{3}{4n-2}g_{\Sigma}$  (the dependence on the intrinsic sectional curvature K of  $\Sigma$  drops out). When dim  $\Sigma = 2$  in either the second or the third case the ambient Weyl tensor pulls back to  $\Sigma$  as  $W_{ijkl} = \frac{-3}{2n-1}(g_{ik}g_{jl} - g_{il}g_{jk})$  so that  $\operatorname{tr}^2 \iota^* W = \frac{-6}{2n-1}$  and once again finds that  $\mathcal{F} = \frac{3}{4n-2}g_{\Sigma}$ . Hence for a totally real umbilic submanifold  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{CP}^n$  (of dimension at least two) the Fialkow tensor is universally given by  $\mathcal{F} = \frac{3}{4n-2}g_{\Sigma}$ . It follows that the umbilic submanifolds of  $\mathbb{CP}^n$  are all conformally circular, but none are strongly conformally circular.

Note that in the above example we have only described the conformally distinguished submanifolds of  $\mathbb{CP}^n$  of dimension at least two. The 1-dimensional distinguished submanifolds in complex projective spaces have been characterised in [1] (strictly speaking, the paper is concerned with "Riemannian" circles in  $\mathbb{CP}^n$ , but since the Fubini-Study metric  $g_{FS}$  is Einstein these are precisely the conformal circles of  $(\mathbb{CP}^n, [g_{FS}])$  parametrized by arclength with respect to  $g_{FS}$ ); see also [45], where the results of [1] are recovered for  $\mathbb{CP}^2$  using the first integrals arising from the conformal Killing-Yano tensors on  $\mathbb{CP}^2$  (a construction which we generalise in Section 6 below). The notion of

Having discussed the umbilic submanifolds in complex space forms (Kähler manifolds with constant holomorphic sectional curvature) it is natural to next consider the quaternionic Kähler analogues:

**Example 5.26. (Umbilic submanifolds in quaternionic space forms.)** Umbilic submanifolds in quaternionic space forms are classified in [38], and all are extrinsic spheres (again, we are counting totally geodesic submanifolds as extrinsic spheres). Since quaternionic space forms are Einstein, it follows that every umbilic submanifold in a quaternionic space form is conformally distinguished.

Summarizing what we have learned from Examples 5.11, 5.24 and 5.26 we have the following theorem:

#### **Theorem 5.27.** An umbilic submanifold in a real, complex or quarternionic space form is a confomally distinguished submanifold.

The various kinds of space forms we discussed above were Einstein (and the umbilics were all extrinsic spheres). Sasakian space forms, however, are typically only " $\eta$ -Einstein" (meaning that eigenvalues of the Ricci tensor in the horizontal and characteristic directions are two, possibly different, constants). Nevertheless, in most cases the umbilic submanifolds are still forced to be distinguished:

**Example 5.28.** (Umbilic submanifolds in Sasakian space forms.) Let (M, g) be a Sasakian space form of dimension 2n+1 and  $\phi$ -sectional curvature c. Let  $\xi$  denote the characteristic direction of g and  $\eta$  the corresponding 1-form (the underlying contact form of the Sasakian structure). The Ricci curvature of g is given by Ric  $= \frac{1}{2}(n(c+3)+c-1)g - \frac{1}{2}(n+1)(c-1)\eta \otimes \eta$  [11]. Given any submanifold  $\Sigma$  of M we may decompose the characteristic direction  $\xi$  along  $\Sigma$  as  $\xi = \xi^{\top} + \xi^{\perp}$ , where  $\xi^{\top}$  is tangent and  $\xi^{\perp}$  is normal to  $\Sigma$ . Writing  $\eta^{\top}$  and  $\eta^{\perp}$  for the corresponding 1-forms, the mixed part of the Schouten tensor is  $-\frac{n+1}{2(2n-1)}(c-1)\eta^{\top} \otimes \eta^{\perp}$ , or  $-\frac{n+1}{2(2n-1)}(c-1)\eta^{\top} \otimes \xi^{\perp}$  when viewed as a

normal bundle valued 1-form on  $\Sigma$ . On the other hand, when  $\Sigma$  is umbilic it is shown (by contracting the Codazzi equation) in [12] that  $\nabla^{\perp} H = -\frac{1}{4}(c-1)\eta^{\top} \otimes \xi^{\perp}$ . Combining these observations gives that, for an umbilic hypersurface in (M, g),  $\mu = -\frac{3(c-1)}{4(2n-1)}\eta^{\top} \otimes \xi^{\perp}$ . In the classification of umbilic submanifolds in Sasakian space forms in [12] there are four classes of examples. In classes (i)–(iii)  $(c-1)\eta^{\top} \otimes \xi^{\perp} = 0$ ; indeed, (i) corresponds precisely to the case when  $\eta^{\top} = 0$  ( $\Sigma$  is everywhere tangent to ker  $\eta$ ), (ii) to the case when  $\xi^{\perp} = 0$  ( $\xi$  is tangent to  $\Sigma$ ) and (iii) to the case when c = 1(in which case (M, g) is a real space form). Thus, umbilic submanifolds in classes (i)–(iii) are all distinguished. Class (iv), on the other hand, corresponds precisely to those umbilic submanifolds for which  $\mu \neq 0$ ; it is shown in [12] that these occur when c < -3, equivalently, when g has strictly negative sectional curvatures in the ordinary Riemannian sense.

In particular, we have:

**Theorem 5.29.** Let (M,g) be a Sasakian space form of  $\phi$ -sectional curvature  $c \ge -3$ , then every umbilic submanifold of (M,g) is conformally distinguished. When c < -3 there are umbilic subamnifolds in (M,g) that are not conformally distinguished.

We conclude with an example that motivated the definition and consideration of the invariants  $\mathbb{L}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$ :

**Example 5.30.** (Conformal infinities of Poincaré-Einstein manifolds.) Let (M, g) be a Poincaré-Einstein manifold with conformal infinity  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{c}_{\Sigma})$ . Then  $\Sigma$  is a strongly conformally circular submanifold in  $\overline{M}$ . This follows from [63, Theorem 4.5] where it is shown that the tractor bundle  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$  is parallel as a subbundle of the standard tractor bundle of  $\overline{M}$  (which is equivalent to  $\mathbb{L} = 0$ ) and the ambient tractor connection induces the standard submanifold tractor connection on  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$  (which is equivalent to  $\mathcal{F} = 0$ ). The key observation behind this result is that the scale tractor  $I^A$  corresponding to the Einstein metric g on M extends continuously to  $\overline{M}$  to give the normal tractor  $N^A$  to  $\Sigma$  on  $\Sigma$ ; the vanishing of  $\mathbb{L}$  then immediately follows from the fact that  $I^A$ is parallel, and the fact that  $\mathcal{F} = 0$  can be seen from the fact that  $\nabla_{[a} \nabla_{b]} I^C = 0$  (since from this one can deduce that the induced tractor connection  $\check{\nabla}$  on  $\mathcal{T}\Sigma$  is normal and therefore must agree with the submanifold one).

One of our motivations for the consideration of  $\mathbb{L}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  in the hypersurface case (in which case  $\mathbb{L}$  is equivalent to  $\mathring{H}$ ) is that if (M, g) is a conformally compact manifold with conformal infinity  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{c}_{\Sigma})$  then the trace-free second fundamental form  $\mathring{H}$  of  $\Sigma$  represents the first order obstruction to the existence of a (formal) Poincaré-Einstein metric on M in the conformal class of g, and  $\mathcal{F}$  represents the next order obstruction (recall that in the Poincaré-Einstein case one obtains that  $\mathring{H} = 0$  from  $\nabla_a I^B|_{\Sigma} = 0$  and that  $\mathcal{F} = 0$  from  $\nabla_a \nabla_b I^C|_{\Sigma} = 0$ ); see [13] for further development of this idea in the hypersurface case.

While we have given many examples above of distinguished submanifolds and of conformally circular manifolds above, we are just as much interested in situations where these conditions fail (as measured by the nontriviality of  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathbb{L}$ ). For hypersurfaces, we can interpret this failure either in terms of the difference between intrinisic and ambient conformal circles or in terms of the failure to be (formally) the conformal infinity of a Poincaré-Einstein metric to a given order. The conformal circles interpretation of course holds in all codimensions, and it seems natural to ask whether these invariants are also related to the possibility of realising a general codimension submanifold  $\Sigma$  as a zero locus associated to a (formally) parallel tractor field along  $\Sigma$ . We will return to this idea in Section 7, after considering the interaction between distinguished submanifolds and parallel tractors in Section 6.

# 6 First integrals

Here we show that a class of solutions to a very large collection of linear differential equations provide first integrals for distinguished submanifolds. This provides a uniform framework which generalises to submanifolds (of any proper codimension) the advance for conformal circles in [68]. In [68] it is explained in detail how the ideas there extend the usual construction of first integrals for geodesics, using for example solutions of the Killing equation, Killing tensors, and Killing-Yano tensors. So we do not repeat that here.

#### 6.1 Review of relevant BGG theory

The class of equations that we interested are the so-called (conformal) first BGG equations. This is a very large class of conformally invariant linear overdetermined PDE. It includes the conformal Killing equation, more generally the conformal Killing tensors equations of any rank, the conformal Killing-Yano equations. To understand this infinite class of equations we recall here some elements of the BGG theory. To put this into context we first recall the homogeneous model for conformal geometry, discussed in Section 2.3. The model for oriented conformal geometries of Riemannian signature is conformal *n*-sphere ( $S^n, c$ ) viewed as the ray projectivisation of the forward null cone in (n + 2)-dimensional Minkowski space. The group  $G = SO_0(n + 1, 1)$  acts on the forward null cone and descends to an action by conformal isometries of  $S^n$ ; the conformal *n*-sphere is therefore naturally viewed as a homogeneous geometry on  $G/P \cong S^n$ , for P an appropriate (parabolic) subgroup of G. Again, see, e.g., [41, 63] for a more detailed discussion.

Generalising from the model case, it is well known that a conformal manifold  $(M, \mathbf{c})$  (of dimension  $n \ge 3$ ) determines a canonical *Cartan bundle and connection* (the additional choice of a Möbius structure is required for this in dimension n = 2). This consists of a *P*-principal bundle  $\mathcal{G} \to M$  equipped with a canonical *Cartan connection*  $\omega$  which is a suitably equivariant  $\mathfrak{g}$ -valued 1-form that provides a total parallelisation of  $T\mathcal{G}$ . Here  $\mathfrak{g}$  denotes the Lie algebra of G. In the case of the model,  $\mathcal{G} = G$  and  $\omega$  is the Maurer-Cartan form.

For any representation  $\mathbb{U}$  of P, one has a corresponding associated bundle  $\mathcal{G} \times_P \mathbb{U}$ . For example it follows from the equivariance properties of  $\omega$  that the tangent bundle TM can be identified with  $\mathcal{G} \times_P (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p})$  where  $\mathfrak{p}$  is the Lie algebra of P, and the P action is induced from its adjoint action on  $\mathfrak{g}$ .

The tractor bundles are the associated bundles  $\mathcal{W} := \mathcal{G} \times_P \mathbb{W}$  where  $\mathbb{W}$  is a linear representation space of G (and hence also of P by restriction). On each of these the Cartan connection induces a linear connection  $\nabla^{\mathcal{W}}$  and this the tractor connection for the given bundle. In particular the standard tractor bundle  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $\mathcal{W} := \mathcal{G} \times_P \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ , with  $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}$  denoting the defining representation of G. From the latter (for example) the Cartan bundle  $\mathcal{G}$  can be recovered as an adapted frame bundle and, on this, the Cartan connection  $\omega$  can be recovered from the tractor connection, see [22].

Now recall the bundle embedding (2.24) (with k = 2)

$$\mathbb{X}: T^*M \to \Lambda^2 \mathcal{T} \subset \operatorname{End}(\mathcal{T}),$$

where the tractor metric is used in the obvious way to identify elements of  $\Lambda^2 \mathcal{T}$  with skew elements of  $\operatorname{End}(\mathcal{T})$ . Sections of  $\operatorname{End}(\mathcal{T})$  act on tractor bundles in the obvious tensorial way and so, via each respective X, we have a canonical action of  $T^*M$  on any tractor bundle  $\mathcal{V}$  and this induces a sequence of invariant bundle maps

$$\partial^* : \Lambda^k T^* M \otimes \mathcal{V} \to \Lambda^{k-1} T^* M \otimes \mathcal{V}, \quad k = 1, \cdots, n+1.$$
(6.1)

This is the (bundle version of the) Kostant codifferential for conformal geometry and satisfies  $\partial^* \circ \partial^* = 0$ ; so it determines subquotient bundles  $\mathcal{H}_k(M, \mathcal{V}) := \ker(\partial^*) / \operatorname{im}(\partial^*)$  of the  $\mathcal{V}$ -valued tractor bundles  $\Lambda^k T^* M \otimes \mathcal{V}$ .

Now, for each tractor bundle  $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{G} \times_P \mathbb{V}$ , with  $\mathbb{V}$  irreducible for G, there is a canonical differential BGG-sequence [28, 17],

$$\mathcal{H}_0 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_0^{\mathcal{V}}} \mathcal{H}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_1^{\mathcal{V}}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_{n-1}^{\mathcal{V}}} \mathcal{H}_n.$$

Here  $\mathcal{H}_k = \mathcal{H}_k(M, \mathcal{V})$  and each  $\mathcal{D}_i^{\mathcal{V}}$  is a linear conformally invariant differential operator. We are, in particular, interested in the operator  $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{V}} = \mathcal{D}_0^{\mathcal{V}}$ , which defines an overdetermined differential system. The parabolic subgroup  $P \subset G$  determines a filtration on  $\mathbb{V}$  by P-invariant subspaces. Denoting the largest proper filtration component by  $\mathbb{V}^0 \subset \mathbb{V}$ , it is straightforward to show that  $\mathcal{H}_0$  is the quotient  $\mathcal{V}/\mathcal{V}^0$ . Here,  $\mathcal{V}^0$  is the corresponding associated bundle for  $\mathbb{V}^0$ , and we write  $\pi: \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{H}_0$  for the natural projection. We recall here the construction of the first BGG operators  $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{V}}$ , as summarised in [24], and also the definition of the special class of so called normal solutions (cf. [93]) for these operators.

**Theorem 6.1** ([24]). Let  $\mathbb{V}$  be an irreducible *G*-representation and let  $\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{G} \times_P \mathbb{V}$ . There is a unique invariant differential operator  $L: \mathcal{H}_0 \to \mathcal{V}$  such that  $\pi \circ L$  is the identity map on  $\mathcal{H}_0$  and  $\nabla \circ L$  lies in ker $(\partial^*) \subset T^*M \otimes \mathcal{V}$ . For  $\sigma \in \Gamma(\mathcal{H}_0)$ ,  $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{V}}\sigma$  is given by projecting  $\nabla(L(\sigma))$  to  $\Gamma(\mathcal{H}_1)$ , *i.e.*  $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{V}}\sigma = \pi(\nabla(L(\sigma))).$ 

Furthermore the bundle map  $\pi$  induces an injection from the space of parallel sections of  $\mathcal{V}$  to a subspace  $\mathfrak{N}(\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{V}})$  of  $\Gamma(\mathcal{H}_0)$  which is contained in the kernel of the first BGG operator

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{V}}: \mathcal{H}_0 \to \mathcal{H}_1 \,. \tag{6.2}$$

The operator L restricts to an isomorphism from  $\mathfrak{N}(\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{V}})$  to the space of parallel tractors in  $\Gamma(\mathcal{V})$ .

The differential operator  $L: \mathcal{H}_0 \to \mathcal{V}$ , in the Theorem, is called a *BGG splitting operator*. We sometimes denote this  $L^{\mathcal{V}}$  to emphasise the particular tractor bundle involved. Using the notation and setting of the Theorem, we also use the following terminology:

**Definition 6.2.** Elements of the subspace  $\mathfrak{N}(\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{V}}) \subset \Gamma(\mathcal{H}_0)$  are called *normal* solutions to the BGG equation  $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{V}}\sigma = 0$ .

By definition normal solutions to (6.2) are in 1-1 correspondence with parallel sections of the corresponding tractor bundle  $\mathcal{V}$ . On geometries which are conformally flat all solutions are normal, and clearly there is  $\dim(\mathbb{V})$ -parameter family of such normal solutions locally.

For the standard tractor bundle the corresponding first BGG equation is the equation

$$\nabla_{(a}\nabla_{b)_0}\sigma + P_{(ab)_0}\sigma = 0, \tag{6.3}$$

on sections  $\sigma \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}[1])$ , and all solutions are normal (on any conformal manifold admitting such solutions). However, this is not typical. In general, for solutions  $\sigma \in \Gamma(\mathcal{H}_0)$  of  $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{V}}(\sigma) = 0$ ,  $\nabla L(\sigma)$ is given by curvature terms acting on  $L(\sigma)$  (see, e.g., [20, 62, 66, 83]). Normal solutions, for which these curvature terms necessarily annihilate  $L(\sigma)$ , often correspond to interesting geometric conditions on the underlying manifold.

## 6.2 The First Integral Theorem

We work on an arbitrary conformal manifold  $(M^n, \mathbf{c})$ . Let  $\Sigma$  be an embedded submanifold of codimension d. Recall that  $\Sigma$  determines its normal form  $N_{A_1 \cdots A_d} \in \Gamma(\Lambda^d \mathcal{N})$ . This is parallel if (and only if)  $\Sigma$  is distinguished. Thus if the manifold  $(M^n, \mathbf{c})$  is equipped with a parallel tractor S that can be contracted non-trivially into say  $m_0$  copies of  $N_{A_1 \cdots A_d}$  to yield a function, then this scalar is necessarily constant if  $\Sigma$  is distinguished. Thus we obtain a first integral for such  $\Sigma$ . In general the parallel tractor S would not necessarily itself come from a G-irreducible representation, but rather a tensor product of such. Thus we have the following result.

As earlier, view  $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}$  as the defining representation for  $G := SO(h) \cong SO(p+1, q+1)$ . Define

$$\mathbb{W}(d) := \Lambda^d \mathbb{R}^{n+2} \qquad d = 1, \cdots, n-1.$$

For each d, this is also a representation space for G. Then we have:

**Theorem 6.3.** Let  $\mathbb{V}_1, \dots, \mathbb{V}_k$  be irreducible representation spaces of G,  $\mathcal{V}_i = \mathcal{G} \times_P \mathbb{V}_i$ , and  $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{V}_i}$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  the corresponding respective first BGG operators.

For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , suppose that  $\sigma_i$  is a normal solution to the first BGG equation

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{V}_i}\sigma_i = 0,\tag{6.4}$$

and  $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Then for each copy of the trivial G-representation  $\mathbb{R}$  in

$$(\odot^{m_0} \mathbb{W}(d)) \otimes (\odot^{m_1} \mathbb{V}_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes (\odot^{m_k} \mathbb{V}_k)$$
(6.5)

there is a corresponding distinguished first integral for submanifolds of codimension d.

*Proof.* The proof is an easy consequence of the reasoning above. Otherwise the formal proof is a trivial adaption of the proof of Theorem 6.1 in [68], which treats the case of curves.  $\Box$ 

The theorem has used the normal form  $N_{A_1 \cdots A_d}$  as the basis for producing first integrals. One can equivalently use its Hodge dual  $\star N_{A_1 \cdots A_{m+2}}$ , or the normal projector  $N_B^A$ , or any combination of these, as by Theorem 1.1 any of these are parallel for distinguished submanifolds.

Note that to apply (6.5) of the Theorem for a given  $\Sigma$  we require normal solutions to k first BGG equations. For case of curves, several examples are given in [68], as is also the explanation of how this is linked to familiar first integrals for geodesics as obtained from Killing vectors and Killing tensors (which are solutions of projective BGG equations). Given that resource we treat just one example here.

#### 6.3 First integrals from a normal conformal Killing-Yano form

We give an example to show how this machinery yields conserved quantities for distinguished submanifolds. It is easy to follow the ideas here to produce other examples, see [68] for the case of m = 1.

The space  $\mathcal{E}_{a_1[a_2\cdots a_d]}[w] = \mathcal{E}_{a_1} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{[a_2\cdots a_d]}[w]$  is completely reducible under the action of O(g), and has the decomposition

$$\mathcal{E}_{a_1[a_2\cdots a_d]}[w] = \mathcal{E}_{[a_1a_2\cdots a_d]}[w] \oplus \mathcal{E}_{\{a_1[a_2\cdots a_d]\}_0}[w] \oplus \mathcal{E}_{[a_3\cdots a_d]}[w-2], \tag{6.6}$$

where  $\mathcal{E}_{\{a_1[a_2\cdots a_d]\}_0}[w]$  consists of tensors  $s_{a_1\cdots a_d} \in \mathcal{E}_{a_1[a_2\cdots a_d]}[w]$  which are, metric trace-free, completely skew on the indices  $a_2, \ldots a_d$ , and for which  $s_{[a_1a_2\cdots a_d]} = 0$ . A (d-1)-form  $k_{a_2\cdots a_d} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{[a_2\cdots a_d]}[d])$  is said to be a *conformal Killing-Yano form* or simply *conformal Killing form* if it satisfies

$$\nabla_{a_1} k_{a_2 \cdots a_d} = \phi_{a_1 \cdots a_d} + \boldsymbol{g}_{a_1 [a_2} \nu_{a_3 \cdots a_d]}, \tag{6.7}$$

where  $\phi_{a_1\cdots a_d} \in \mathcal{E}_{[a_1\cdots a_d]}[d]$  and  $\nu_{a_3\cdots a_d} \in \mathcal{E}_{[a_3\cdots a_d]}[d-2]$ . Equivalently,

$$\nabla_{\{a_1} k_{a_2 \cdots a_d\}_0} = 0, \tag{6.8}$$

where the braces and subscript zero denote projection onto the middle factor of (6.6). This equation can be checked to be conformally invariant, and is moreover a first BGG equation (which in this context implies conformal invariance). Thus solutions to this equation correspond bijectively to a class of sections of a certain tractor bundle. To understand this, we proceed as follows. For this equation, it is shown in [66] that the corresponding tractor bundle is  $\Lambda^d \mathcal{T}$ , and it follows from the formulae there that the BGG splitting operator  $L: \mathcal{E}_{[a_2 \cdots a_d]}[d] \to \mathcal{E}_{[A_1 \cdots A_d]}$  is:

$$L(k_{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}}) = k_{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}} \mathbb{Y}_{A_{1}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}} + \frac{1}{d} \nabla_{a_{1}} k_{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}} \mathbb{Z}_{A_{1}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{1}\cdots a_{d}} + \frac{d-1}{n-d+2} \nabla^{c} k_{ca_{3}\cdots a_{d}} \mathbb{W}_{A_{0}A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{3}\cdots a_{d}} - \left(\frac{1}{n(d-1)} \nabla^{b} \nabla_{\{b} k_{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}\}_{0}} - \frac{1}{n-d+2} \nabla_{[a_{2}]} \nabla^{b} k_{b|a_{3}\cdots a_{d}]} - P_{[a_{2}]}^{b} k_{b|a_{3}\cdots a_{d}]}\right) \mathbb{X}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}}.$$

$$(6.9)$$

The general theory immediately gives us the following.

**Proposition 6.4.** Let  $k_{a_1\cdots a_{d-1}} \in \mathcal{E}_{[a_1\cdots a_{d-1}]}[d]$  be a normal solution to the conformal Killing-Yano equation and  $\Sigma$  a distinguished submanifold of codimension d, with corresponding tractor normal form  $N_{A_1\cdots A_d}$ . Let  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1\cdots A_d} := L(k_{a_1\cdots a_{d-1}}) \in \mathcal{E}_{[A_1\cdots A_d]}$  be the image of  $k_{a_1\cdots a_{d-1}}$  under the BGG splitting operator L of (6.9). Then the scalar function

$$\mathbb{K}_{A_1\cdots A_d} N^{A_1\cdots A_d} \tag{6.10}$$

is constant along  $\Sigma$ .

**Remark 6.5.** (i) Here  $d \ge 2$ , but the result still holds in the case where d = 1 of we understand the hypothesis in this case to mean that  $\sigma = k \in \mathcal{E}[1]$  satisfies the almost-Einstein equation (6.3) and take L to be the corresponding BGG splitting operator. (ii) Note that one can of course use  $\star N$ rather than N to construct conserved quantities, and in this case we obtain a conserved quantity  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1 \cdots A_{m+2}} \star N^{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_{m+2}}$  when  $k_{a_1 \cdots a_{m+1}}$  is a normal solution to the conformal Killing-Yano equation (this is the approach used to construct first integrals for conformal circles in [68, Theorem 6.8]). However, since the Hodge- $\star$  operator takes conformal Killing forms to conformal Killing forms, we obtain the same first integrals this way. *Proof.* Since  $k_{a_1\cdots a_{d-1}}$  is a normal solution, we have that  $\nabla_i \mathbb{K}_{A_1\cdots A_d} = 0$ . Moreover, since  $\Sigma$  is a distinguished submanifold,  $\nabla_i N^{A_1\cdots A_d} = 0$  by Theorem 1.1. Hence the scalar quantity  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1\cdots A_d} N^{A_1\cdots A_d}$  is constant.

We show the non-triviality of the first integral quantity (6.10) by calculating it directly. From the explicit forms of  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1\cdots A_d}$  and  $N_{A_1\cdots A_d}$ , we see that

$$\mathbb{K}_{A_{1}\cdots A_{d}}N^{A_{1}\cdots A_{d}} = d \cdot k_{a_{1}\cdots a_{d-1}}N^{cb_{1}\cdots b_{d-1}}H_{c} \cdot \mathbb{Y}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}}\mathbb{X}_{b_{1}\cdots b_{d-1}}^{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}} + \frac{1}{d}\left(\nabla_{a_{1}}k_{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}}\right)N^{b_{1}b_{2}\cdots b_{d}} \cdot \mathbb{Z}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{d}}\mathbb{Z}_{b_{1}b_{2}\cdots b_{d}}^{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}} = k_{a_{1}\cdots a_{d-1}}N^{ca_{1}\cdots a_{d-1}}H_{c} + \frac{1}{d}\left(\nabla_{a_{1}}k_{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}}\right)N^{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{d}},$$

$$(6.11)$$

which verifies non-triviality.

For the case of d = n - 1, meaning curves, it was seen in [68] that, for many examples, normality of the BGG solution is actually not required in order to obtain a first integral. In the general codimension case, however, when the BGG solution is not normal we may or may not obtain a conserved quantity depending on the situation. The condition required for (6.10) to give rise to a conserved quantity is weaker than the normality of  $\mathbb{K}$ , and depends on the submanifold  $\Sigma$ , which we see as follows: If  $\Sigma$  is distinguished then  $N^{A_1 \cdots A_d}$  is parallel for the tractor connection and we have

$$\nabla_i \left( \mathbb{K}_{A_1 \cdots A_d} N^{A_1 \cdots A_d} \right) = \left( \nabla_i \mathbb{K}_{A_1 \cdots A_d} \right) N^{A_1 \cdots A_d},$$

where  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1 \cdots A_d} = L(k)$  for a general rank (d-1) conformal Killing-Yano form k. Theorem 3.9 of [66] gives

$$\left(\nabla_c - \Psi_c\right) \mathbb{K}_{A_1 \cdots A_d} = 0,$$

where  $\nabla_c$  is the standard tractor connection and  $\Psi_c : \mathcal{E}_{[A_1 \cdots A_d]} \to \mathcal{E}_{c[A_1 \cdots A_d]}$  is defined by

$$\Psi_{c}(\mathbb{K}_{A_{1}A_{2}A_{3}\cdots A_{d}}) := -\frac{1}{2} W_{a_{1}a_{2}c}{}^{e} k_{ea_{3}\cdots a_{d}} \mathbb{Z}_{A_{1}A_{2}A_{3}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{1}a_{2}a_{3}\cdots a_{d}} + \phi_{ca_{3}\cdots a_{d}} \mathbb{W}_{A_{1}A_{2}A_{3}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{3}\cdots a_{d}} + \xi_{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}} \mathbb{X}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}},$$

$$(6.12)$$

where only the explicit form of the  $\mathbb{Z}$  slot will be important. Therefore one has

$$\nabla_{i} \left( \mathbb{K}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}} N^{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}} \right) = \left( \nabla_{i} \mathbb{K}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}} \right) N^{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}} \\
= \Psi_{i} \left( \mathbb{K}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}} \right) N^{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}} \\
= -\frac{1}{2} W_{a_{1}a_{2}i}{}^{e} k_{ea_{3}\cdots a_{d}} N^{b_{1}b_{2}b_{3}\cdots b_{d}} \cdot \mathbb{Z}_{A_{1}A_{2}A_{3}\cdots A_{d}}^{A_{1}A_{2}A_{3}\cdots A_{d}} \\
= -\frac{1}{2} W_{a_{1}a_{2}i}{}^{e} k_{ea_{3}\cdots a_{d}} N^{a_{1}a_{2}a_{3}\cdots a_{d}}, \qquad (6.13)$$

the vanishing of which is a weaker condition than normality.

To see that (6.13) may indeed be zero or not zero when k is not normal, we consider the following simple examples:

**Example 6.6.** (Non-normal BGG solutions and conserved quantities.) Let  $M = S^2 \times S^2$ , equipped with the standard product metric g and let  $g_i$ , i = 1, 2, denote the pullback of the standard

round metric on  $S^2$  by the projection on the *i*th factor (so  $g = g_1 + g_2$ ). Then the Weyl tensor of g is given in terms of the Kulkarni-Nomizu products of  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  by  $W = \frac{1}{3}(g_1 \otimes g_1 - g_1 \otimes g_2 + g_2 \otimes g_2)$ . When the codimension d is 2 (so d - 1 = 1) the BGG solutions k appearing in (6.13) are just the conformal Killing fields of (M, [g]), of which there are many (e.g., the trivial lift of a Killing field of one of the round  $S^2$  factors). From the formula for the Weyl tensor it is easy to see that none of the conformal Killing fields on (M, [g]) are normal (as the map  $k^a \mapsto k^a W_{abcd}$  is injective). In this case, given a distinguished submanifold  $\Sigma$ , the quantity in (6.13) becomes simply  $-\frac{1}{2}W_{abic}k^c N^{ab}$ . From the formula for W it is easy to see that this always gives zero in the case where  $\Sigma$  is  $S^2 \times \{p\}$  or  $\{p\} \times S^2$  for some  $p \in S^2$  (since then  $W_{abic} N^{ab} = W_{abec} \Pi_i^e N^{ab} = 0$ ). Thus, in these cases  $\mathbb{K}_{AB} N^{AB}$ is a conserved quantity (i.e. is constant) along  $\Sigma$  for any conformal Killing vector field k. On the other hand, if  $\Sigma$  is the diagonal submanifold in  $M = S^2 \times S^2$  then only for a subset of the conformal killing fields do we obtain a conserved quantity in this way. To see this, let  $(p,p) \in \Sigma$ , let  $\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}$ normal vectors to  $\Sigma$  at (p,p) with projection on the first factor given by  $X, Y \in T_p S^2$  respectively, let Z be a tangent vector to  $\Sigma$  at (p,p) with projection on the first factor given by  $Z \in T_p S^2$ , and let k be a conformal Killing vector field on M with components in the direction of the first and second factors at (p, p) given by  $k_1, k_2 \in T_p S^2$ , respectively. Then, noting that  $\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}$  and  $\tilde{Z}$  are all determined by their components in the direction of the first factor, a straightforward calculation shows that at (p,p),  $W(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}, k) = \langle X, Z \rangle (\langle Y, k_1 \rangle + \langle Y, k_2 \rangle) - \langle Y, Z \rangle (\langle X, k_1 \rangle + \langle X, k_2 \rangle)$ , where  $\langle , \rangle$  denotes the round metric on  $S^2$ . From this we see that  $\mathbb{K}_{AB}N^{AB}$  is constant along  $\Sigma$  when k is orthogonal to  $\Sigma$  (i.e. when  $k_2 = -k_1$  at each point  $(p, p) \in \Sigma$ ) but not otherwise.

# 7 Distinguished submanifolds from curved orbits

In this section we show that distinguished submanifolds arise naturally as *curved orbits*, in the sense of [26], in the presence of certain Cartan holonomy reductions of the conformal structure. We then show (without using the curved orbit theory of [26]) that the same continues to hold under weaker hypotheses. Before coming to the curved orbit theory result and its generalisation, however, we prove Theorem 1.5, as this will be needed in the discussion that follows.

#### 7.1 Distinguished submanifolds via a moving incidence relation

Recall that a conformally embedded submanifold, of codimension d, determines the fundamental and equivalent objects  $N_B^A$ ,  $N_{A_1 \cdots A_d}$ , and  $\star N^{A_1 \cdots A_{m+2}}$  and then we have Theorem 1.1. For our purposes, however, it is important to have a characterisation of distinguished submanifolds that does not use an initial knowledge of these. Theorem 1.5 gives us such a characterisation, which we state more explicitly here:

**Theorem 7.1.** Let  $\Sigma \hookrightarrow M$  be a submanifold of codimension d in a conformal manifold  $(M, \mathbf{c})$ . Then  $\Sigma$  is distinguished if, and only if, there exists a nowhere-zero  $\Psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d} \in \Gamma(\Lambda^d \mathcal{T}^*|_{\Sigma})$  such that  $\Psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d} X^{A_1} = 0$  and  $\nabla_i \Psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d} = 0$  along  $\Sigma$ .

**Remark 7.2.** From the proof we will see that such a tractor field  $\Psi$  must be a (locally) constant multiple of the tractor normal form along  $\Sigma$ , and is therefore simple. This observation will become relevant when we connect certain BGG solutions with distinguished submanifolds in Section 7.2.

*Proof.* If  $\Sigma$  is distinguished, then by Theorem 1.1, the tractor normal form is parallel in tangential directions. Moreover, it is clear from the definition of the tractor normal form (3.62) that  $N_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}X^{A_1} = 0$ . Thus we may take  $\Psi_{A_1\cdots A_d}$  to be the tractor normal form.

Conversely, suppose that we have  $\Psi \in \Gamma(\Lambda^d \mathcal{T}^*|_{\Sigma})$  which satisfies  $\Psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}X^{A_1} = 0$  and  $\nabla_i \Psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d} = 0$  along  $\Sigma$ . From (2.22), we know that, in a background scale,  $\Psi$  can be written

$$\Psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d} = \sigma_{a_2\cdots a_d} \mathbb{Y}_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}^{a_2\cdots a_d} + \nu_{a_1a_2\cdots a_d} \mathbb{Z}_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}^{a_1a_2\cdots a_d} + \phi_{a_3\cdots a_d} \mathbb{W}_{A_1A_2A_3\cdots A_d} + \rho_{a_2\cdots a_d} \mathbb{X}_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}^{a_2\cdots a_d}.$$

But the condition  $\Psi_{A_1 \cdots A_d} X^{A_1} = 0$  together with (2.18) implies that  $\sigma_{a_2 \cdots a_d} = 0$  and  $\phi_{a_3 \cdots a_d} = 0$ .

Moreover, if  $u^i \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}^i)$ , the incidence relation  $\Psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}X^{A_1} = 0$  together with the parallel condition means that

$$0 = u^i \nabla_i \left( X^{A_1} \Psi_{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_d} \right) = u^i Z_i^{A_1} \Psi_{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_d}$$

so  $u^i Z_i^{A_1} \Psi_{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_d} = 0$  for all  $u \in \Gamma(T\Sigma)$ . Expanding this, again using (2.18) and the linear independence of the X and Z projectors, one sees that  $\nu_{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_d} u^{a_1} = 0$  and  $\rho_{a_2 \cdots a_d} u^{a_2} = 0$ . Since  $u^i$  was an arbitrary submanifold tangent vector, we conclude that  $\nu \in (\Lambda^d N^*\Sigma)[d]$  and  $\rho \in (\Lambda^{d-1}N^*\Sigma)[d-2]$ . Thus in particular  $\nu_{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_d} = f N_{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_d}$ , where  $N_{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_d}$  is the Riemannian normal form of  $\Sigma$  and f is a function on  $\Sigma$ .

Now note that, since  $\Psi$  is parallel,  $\Psi^{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}\Psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}$  is constant along  $\Sigma$ . On the other hand,

$$\Psi^{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}\Psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d} = \nu^{a_1a_2\cdots a_d}\nu_{a_1a_2\cdots a_d} = f^2 N^{a_1a_2\cdots a_d} N_{a_1a_2\cdots a_d} = f^2 \cdot d!,$$

and therefore the function f is locally constant and nowhere-zero. Thus on each connected component of  $\Sigma$ ,  $\nu_{a_1a_2\cdots a_d}$  is a constant multiple of the Riemannian normal form.

From equation (2.25), we calculate

$$0 = \nabla_{i} \Psi_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}} = (f \nabla_{i} N_{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{d}} + \rho_{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}} g_{ia_{1}}) \mathbb{Z}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{d}} + (\nabla_{i} \rho_{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}} - f \cdot d \cdot N_{a_{1}a_{2}\cdots a_{d}} P_{i}^{a_{1}}) \mathbb{X}_{A_{1}A_{2}\cdots A_{d}}^{a_{2}\cdots a_{d}}.$$
(7.1)

Now, note that the same argument that yielded equation (3.68) may be repeated replacing normal *tractors* with normal *vectors* (as per Remark 3.25) to give

$$\nabla_i N_{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_d} = -d \cdot II_{i[a_d}{}^c N_{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_{d-1}]c}.$$
(7.2)

Substituting this into (7.1) gives that in particular

$$-f \cdot d \cdot \Pi_{i[a_d}{}^c N_{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_{d-1}]c} + g_{i[a_1} \rho_{a_2 \cdots a_{d-1} a_d]} = 0.$$
(7.3)

Contracting the above with  $g^{ia_1} = \prod_b^i g^{ba_1}$  allows us to express  $\rho_{a_2 \cdots a_d}$  explicitly. Since the expression  $\prod_{ia_d} {}^c N_{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_{d-1} c}$  is already skew in the indices  $a_1 a_2 \cdots a_{d-1}$  we have:

$$g^{ia_1} \Pi_{i[a_d}{}^c N_{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_{d-1}]c} = \frac{1}{d} g^{ia_1} \left( \Pi_{ia_1}{}^c N_{ca_2 \cdots a_{d-1} a_d} + \Pi_{ia_2}{}^c N_{a_1 c \cdots a_{d-1} a_d} + \cdots + \Pi_{ia_d}{}^c N_{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_{d-1} c} \right)$$
$$= \frac{m}{d} H^c N_{ca_2 \cdots a_{d-1} a_d}.$$

Similarly, since  $\boldsymbol{g}^{ia_1}\rho_{a_1\cdots a_{d-1}}=0,$ 

$$\boldsymbol{g}^{ia_1}\boldsymbol{g}_{i[a_1}\rho_{a_2\cdots a_d]} = \frac{1}{d}\boldsymbol{g}^{ia_1}\left(\boldsymbol{g}_{ia_1}\rho_{a_2\cdots a_d} - \boldsymbol{g}_{ia_2}\rho_{a_1a_3\cdots a_d} - \cdots - \boldsymbol{g}_{ia_d}\rho_{a_2\cdots a_{d-1}a_1}\right)$$
$$= \frac{m}{d}\rho_{a_2\cdots a_d}.$$

Thus

$$\Psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d} = f N_{a_1a_2\cdots a_d} \mathbb{Z}_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}^{a_1a_2\cdots a_d} + f\left(d \cdot H^b N_{ba_2\cdots a_d}\right) \mathbb{X}_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}^{a_2\cdots a_d}$$
$$= f N_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d},$$

where  $N_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}$  is the tractor normal form.

Since the function f is locally constant and nowhere-zero,  $\nabla_i \Psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d} = 0$  implies that the tractor normal form is parallel. Thus  $\Sigma$  satisfies ones of the equivalent conditions of Theorem 1.1, and is therefore a distinguished submanifold.

Note that Theorem 1.5 follows as the tractor Hodge- $\star$  operation (2.27) commutes with the tractor covariant derivative.

#### 7.2 Curved orbits and generalisations

The following result shows one way in which distinguished submanifolds arise as *curved orbits*, in the sense of [26]. It generalises [68, Proposition 7.1]. Before stating the theorem we introduce some terminology: we shall say that a tractor (or vector)  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1 \cdots A_d}$  is *timelike* if  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1 \cdots A_d} \mathbb{K}^{A_1 \cdots A_d}$  is negative, *spacelike* if this is positive and *null* if it is zero.

**Theorem 7.3.** Suppose  $k_{a_1\cdots a_{d-1}}$  is a normal solution of the conformal Killing form equation on  $(M, \mathbf{c})$  such that the parallel tractor  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1\cdots A_d} = L(k_{a_1\cdots a_{d-1}})$  is simple. Then the zero locus of k is either empty, an isolated point, or a distinguished conformal submanifold of codimension d. Moreover, writing  $\mathcal{Z}(k)$  for this zero locus:

- if  $\mathbb{K}$  is timelike, then  $\mathcal{Z}(k)$  is necessarily empty;
- if  $\mathbb{K}$  is null,  $\mathcal{Z}(k)$  consists only of isolated points;
- if K is spacelike, then Z(k) is either empty or is a distinguished submanifold of codimension d.

**Remark 7.4.** (i) In the proof we will observe that in all cases  $\mathcal{Z}(k) = \mathcal{Z}(X \sqcup \mathbb{K})$ . In particular, fixing any metric  $g \in \mathbf{c}$ , when d > 1 we find that  $\mathcal{Z}(k) = \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{K})$  where  $\mathcal{K} := (k_{a_1 \cdots a_{d-1}}, \nabla^c k_{ca_2 \cdots a_{d-1}})$ . (ii) The result still holds in the d = 1 case if we take  $\sigma = k$  to be an almost-Einstein scale and  $\mathbb{K} = L(k)$  to be the corresponding scale tractor (cf. [63, 41] and Example 5.30).

Proof. Suppose  $k_{a_1 \cdots a_{d-1}} \in \mathcal{E}_{[a_1 \cdots a_{d-1}]}[d]$  is a normal solution to (6.7) such that  $\mathbb{K} = L(k)$  is simple. Fix any metric  $g \in \mathbf{c}$ . Note that from equation (6.9), at a point where k = 0 we have

$$\mathbb{K}_{A_1\cdots A_d} \mathbb{K}^{A_1\cdots A_d} = \frac{1}{d^2} \|\phi\|^2 + \|\nu\|^2,$$
(7.4)

where  $\phi_{a_1a_2\cdots a_d} = \nabla_{[a_1}k_{a_2\cdots a_d]}$  and  $\nu_{a_3\cdots a_d} = \frac{d-1}{n-d+2}\nabla^c k_{ca_3\cdots a_d}$ . In particular, if  $\mathbb{K}$  is timelike then k clearly cannot have any zero and if  $\mathbb{K}$  is null then at any zero of k we must have  $\nabla k = 0$  (moreover, these results hold without needing the simplicity of  $\mathbb{K}$ ). Now, our goal is to apply the curved orbit theory of [26], and to this end we note that from (6.9) one sees that k = 0 at the point  $p \in M$  if, and only if,  $X \sqcup \mathbb{K} = 0 \mod X$  (note that a term of the form  $\nu_{a_3 \cdots a_d} X^{A_0} \mathbb{W}_{A_0 A_1 A_2 \cdots A_d}^{a_3 \cdots a_d} = 0$  $-\frac{1}{d+1}\nu_{a_3\cdots a_d}\mathbb{X}_{A_1A_2\cdots A_d}^{a_3\cdots a_d}$  is zero mod X). In particular, the condition k=0 determines a P-type, in the language of [26] and so Theorem 2.6 of that article applies. It will be more convenient, however, to consider the simpler condition  $X \perp \mathbb{K}$ , which also determines a *P*-type. From (6.9) one sees that  $X \sqcup \mathbb{K} = 0$  at some point  $p \in M$  if, and only if,  $(k_{a_1 \cdots a_d}, \nabla^c k_{ca_2 \cdots a_d}) = 0$  at the point p, i.e. k = 0and  $\nu = 0$  at the point p. Let  $K := X \sqcup \mathbb{K}$ . From the preceding discussion, if  $\mathbb{K}$  is timelike or null then clearly  $\mathcal{Z}(K) = \mathcal{Z}(k)$  (without the need for K to be simple). On the other hand, in the case when when K is spacelike, it is easily checked that k = 0 implies K = 0 due to the simplicity of K (this fails when  $\mathbb{K}$  is not simple); to see this one merely writes  $\mathbb{K}$  at a point as a wedge product of orthogonal spacelike tractor 1-forms  $I^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge I^d$  and examines the resulting expression K to see that  $K = 0 \mod X$  only if K = 0 (since X is null); in this case the zero locus of k turns out to be  $\mathcal{Z}(\sigma_1,\ldots,\sigma_d)$  where  $\sigma_i = X \sqcup I^i$ . Thus, in all cases  $\mathcal{Z}(k) = \mathcal{Z}(K)$  and we can consider the zero locus of  $K := X \sqcup \mathbb{K}$  instead of k. Apart from the distinguished submanifold property in the third bullet point (which will follow afterward from Theorem 1.5/Theorem 7.1) by Theorem 2.6 of [26] this reduces to an elementary consideration of the model case.

Recall that in the model case parallel tractors correspond to constant tensor fields on  $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ and the canonical tractor  $X^A$  is identified with the position vector field of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}$  along  $\mathcal{C}_+$ . Hence, in the model case, if  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1\cdots A_d}$  is a parallel simple *d*-cotractor and  $X \sqcup \mathbb{K}$  is zero at some point p, then  $X \sqcup \mathbb{K}$  is zero along a submanifold p, given as follows. The form  $\mathbb{K}$  determines in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}$  a unique (m+2)-plane through p (as usual m = n - d and (m+2)-plane means a linear subspace of that dimension) consisting of the vectors  $X^A$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}$  that are in the nullity of  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1\cdots A_d}$ . The submanifold is then the ray projectivisation of the intersection of this hyperplane with the null quadric for the Minkowski signature inner product on  $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ .

We now treat the three cases in the statement of the theorem by considering the distinct ways that this hyperplane can intersect the null cone. First, if  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1 \cdots A_d}$  is simple and timelike, then non-zero vectors in the nullity of  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1 \cdots A_d}$  are spacelike. No non-zero vector in their span is null or timelike. Therefore in this case the (m + 2)-plane has no intersection with  $C_+$ . Thus the zero locus  $\mathcal{Z}(K)$  is empty (of course, we had already seen this). For the second case, note that if  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1\cdots A_d}$  is null, then, using the Minkowski signature, it follows that the simple d-tractor  $\mathbb{K}$  can be obtained as the exterior product of covectors that are spacelike except for exactly one which is null. Dually, this implies that there is a collection of vectors which span the nullity (m+2)-hyperplane that consists of a single null vector and m + 1 spacelike vectors. Thus the hyperplane is tangent to the null cone, and after ray projectivisation the intersection descends to an isolated point. Finally, suppose that  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1\cdots A_d}$  is spacelike. Then the hyperplane defined by vectors in the nullity of  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1\cdots A_d}$ can be spanned by one timelike vector and m + 1 spacelike vectors. Such an (m + 2)-plane meets the null cone  $\mathcal{C}_+$  transversely, and hence, under ray projectivisation, will descend to a submanifold  $\mathcal{Z}(K)$  of  $S^n$  of codimension d. Now by Theorem 2.6 of [26] it then follows that on M the zero locus of the simple d-tractor  $\mathbb{K}$  will take the same form as on the model. Thus the three bullet points follow from the analysis just done, of the corresponding cases on the model, save for the very final statement that if  $\mathcal{Z}(K)$  is nonempty and does not just consist of isolated points, then the codimension d submanifold  $\mathcal{Z}(K)$  is distinguished. But this follows from Theorem 1.5.  We note that such simple parallel tractors  $\mathbb{K}$  have arisen in the study of holonomy and generalisations of almost Einstein structures [5, 94, 95]. In particular, in the presence of multiple (independent) almost-Einstein scales  $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_d$  with scale tractors  $I^1 \cdots I^d$ , such a simple parallel tractor  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1 \cdots A_d}$  is given by  $d!I^1_{[A_1} \cdots I^d_{A_d]}$  and arises from the conformal Killing form  $k_{a_2 \cdots a_d} = \sum_{s \in S_n} \operatorname{sign}(s) \sigma_{s(1)} \nabla_{a_2} \sigma_{s(2)} \cdots \nabla_{a_d} \sigma_{s(d)}$ . In this case, when  $\mathbb{K}$  is spacelike one finds that  $\mathcal{Z}(K) = \mathcal{Z}(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_d)$ , which was our motivation for considering this zero locus.

In the case of the model, meaning  $S^n$  with its usual conformal structure, all solutions to first BGG equations are normal (and all cases arise in all codimensions d, which is the idea behind the proof). Moreover, it is easily seen that, in this setting, the space of solutions to the conformal Killing-Yano equation (6.7), of a given rank, is spanned by solutions k with L(k) satisfying the conditions of the Theorem above. It is interesting and valuable to determine the extent to which similar results hold in more general settings (see, e.g., [10, 43, 44, 53] for some related results in the case of conformal Killing fields). The first and third bullet point of Theorem 7.3 generalise quite easily, as we see in the following proposition.

**Proposition 7.5.** Let  $k_{a_1\cdots a_{d-1}} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{[a_1\cdots a_{d-1}]}[d])$  and  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1\cdots A_d} = L(k_{a_1\cdots a_{d-1}})$ . Then

- 1. If  $\mathbb{K}$  is timelike, then  $\mathcal{Z}(k)$  is necessarily empty.
- 2. If  $\mathbb{K}$  is spacelike and simple, and k satisfies (6.7) along  $\mathcal{Z}(k)$ , then  $\mathcal{Z}(k)$  is either empty or is a submanifold of codimension d.
- 3. If K is spacelike, simple, and satisfies  $\nabla K = 0$  at all points of  $\mathcal{Z}(k)$ , then  $\mathcal{Z}(k)$  is either empty or is a distinguished submanifold of codimension d.

**Remark 7.6.** As in Theorem 7.3 above, fixing any  $g \in c$ , we find in all of the above cases that  $\mathcal{Z}(k) = \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{K})$  where  $\mathcal{K} := (k_{a_1 \cdots a_{d-1}}, \nabla^c k_{ca_2 \cdots a_{d-1}}).$ 

*Proof.* From (2.22), (2.23), and (2.17) it follows that any tractor *d*-form K satisfying  $X \sqcup \mathbb{K} = 0$  at  $p \in M$  has  $\mathbb{K}_{A_1 \cdots A_d} \mathbb{K}^{A_1 \cdots A_d} \ge 0$  at p. This proves 1.

We now consider 2. For convenience, we fix  $g \in c$  and use g to trivialise the density bundles. Let  $I^1, \ldots, I^d$  be a collection of orthogonal spacelike tractor 1-forms such that  $\mathbb{K} = I^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge I^d$ and let  $\sigma_i = X \sqcup I^i$  (which we think of as functions). It follows that k takes the form

$$\sigma_1 \omega_1 + \dots + \sigma_d \omega_d \tag{7.5}$$

where the  $\omega_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , are each simple (d - 1)-forms. Moreover, as argued in the proof of Theorem 7.3 above, from the simplicity of  $\mathbb{K}$  we have that k = 0 implies  $X \sqcup \mathbb{K} = 0$  (again this is comes from examining the for K in terms of the spacelike tractors  $I^1, \ldots, I^d$  and using that Xis null to see that  $K = 0 \mod X$  only if K = 0). It follows that  $\mathcal{Z}(k) = \mathcal{Z}(K) = \mathcal{Z}(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_d)$ , where the last inequality follows from the expression for K in terms of  $I^1, \ldots, I^d$  and their linear independence. Since  $\nu = 0$  when k = 0 and  $\mathbb{K}$  is spacelike, it follows that  $\phi \neq 0$  at any point where k = 0. From this and the formulae for  $\phi$  and  $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_d$  in terms of the components of  $I^1, \ldots, I^d$  it follows that the (d - 1)-forms  $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_d$  are linearly independent at any point where k = 0 (and hence in a neighborhood of  $\mathcal{Z}(k)$ ). Moreover, from the equation (6.7) we have that, along  $\mathcal{Z}(k)$ ,

$$\nabla k = \phi. \tag{7.6}$$
The above display puts conditions on the  $\sigma_i$  and their relation to the  $\omega_j$ . In particular one easily concludes that, at each point in Z(k), the equation (7.6) implies that  $\{d\sigma_1, \dots, d\sigma_d\}$  is a linearly independent set. Thus from the constant rank theorem it follows that Z(K) is either empty or is a submanifold of codimension d. This establishes 2.

Item 3 then follows from 2 together with Theorem 1.5, since if  $\nabla \mathbb{K} = 0$  at all points of  $\mathcal{Z}(K)$  then  $k_{a_1 \cdots a_{d-1}}$  satisfies (6.7) along  $\mathcal{Z}(K)$ .

Proposition 7.5 shows that in fact no hypothesis on k is needed for the first bullet point of Theorem 7.3 to hold, and that the third bullet point holds under much weaker hypotheses. In particular, in the d = 2 case (where k is a conformal Killing vector field) Proposition 7.5 shows that normality is not required for the third bullet point to hold, since at points where k = 0 the prolonged conformal Killing equation  $\nabla \mathbb{K} = k \,\lrcorner\, \Omega$  reduces to  $\nabla \mathbb{K} = 0$ . For a simple example of non-normal conformal Killing vector field that gives rise to a codimension 2 distinguished submanifold, consider  $\mathbb{CP}^n$  equipped with the Fubini-Study metric: the 1-parameter family of maps  $[z_0, z_1 \cdots, z_n] \mapsto$  $[z_0, e^{it}z_1, \cdots, e^{it}z_n]$  corresponds to a Killing vector field that vanishes on the totally geodesic  $\mathbb{CP}^{n-1}$ given by  $\{z_0 = 0\}$ . One can also show that when d = 2 the second bullet point of Theorem 7.3 continues to hold without the assumption of normality. To see this, note that, fixing any  $q \in c$ , the hypothesis that K is null implies that the components  $\phi$  and  $\nu$  of  $\mathbb{K} = L(k)$  are zero on  $\mathcal{Z}(k)$ . Hence, at such points k and  $\nabla k$  vanish. But since  $\mathbb{K} \neq 0$  we must have  $\nabla_a \nabla^b k_b \neq 0$  at such points and it follows that any point of  $\mathcal{Z}(k)$  is an essential point of k; see, e.g., [44, Theorem 3.4]. But such essential points are isolated [10] and hence the result follows. Thus the assumption of normality is not required in Theorem 7.3 when d = 1 or d = 2 (cf. Remark 7.4(ii) for the d = 1 case). We leave it as an open question whether one can also drop the normality condition when d > 2.

Although one of the themes of this article has been that of distinguished submanifolds, we are interested in developing conformal submanifold theory in general. From this point of view a key message of this section is that it is natural for codimension d submanifolds to arise as the zero locus of a weighted (d-1)-form k, and that we can make geometric conclusions about this submanifold by considering the behavior of the corresponding form tractor  $\mathbb{K}$  along the submanifold. The results above are highly suggestive of a holographic approach to higher codimension submanifold theory generalising the approach of [4, 13, 70, 71, 72, 74, 73] from the hypersurface case, where the role of the scale  $\sigma$  and scale tractor I are played by a weighted form k and the corresponding tractor form  $\mathbb{K}$ , but we leave this to be taken up elsewhere.

## References

- T. Adachi, S. Maeda, and S. Udagawa. Circles in a complex projective space. Osaka J. Math. 32(3):709–719, 1995.
- [2] B. Allen, and R. Gover. Higher Willmore Energies from tractor coupled GJMS operators. arXiv:2411.01835
- [3] L. Andersson and P. Blue. Hidden symmetries and decay for the wave equation on the Kerr spacetime. Ann. of Math. (2), 182(3):787–853, 2015.
- [4] C. Arias, A. R. Gover, and A. A. Waldron, Conformal geometry of embedded manifolds with

boundary from universal holographic formulæ. Adv. Math. **384**, Paper No. 107700, 75 pp., 2021.

- [5] S. Armstrong, and F. Leitner. Decomposable conformal holonomy in Riemannian signature. Math. Nachr. 285, no.2-3, 150–163, 2012.
- [6] T. N. Bailey and M. G. Eastwood. Conformal circles and parametrizations of curves in conformal manifolds. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 108(1):215–221, 1990.
- [7] T. N. Bailey, M. G. Eastwood, and A. R. Gover. Thomas's structure bundle for conformal, projective and related structures. *Rocky Mountain J. Math.*, 24(4):1191–1217, 1994.
- [8] T. N. Bailey, M. G. Eastwood, and C. R. Graham. Invariant theory for conformal and CR geometry. Ann. of Math. (2) 139, no.3, 491–552, 1994.
- [9] F. Belgun. Geodesics and submanifold structures in conformal geometry. J. Geom. Phys., 91:172–191, 2015.
- [10] F. Belgun, A. Moroianu and L. Ornea. Essential points of conformal vector fields. J. Geom. Phys. 61(3):589–593, 2011.
- [11] D. E. Blair. Riemannian geometry of contact and symplectic manifolds. Second edition. Progr. Math., 203. Birkhäuser Boston, Ltd., Boston, MA, 2010. xvi+343 pp.
- [12] D. E. Blair and L. Vanhecke. Umbilical submanifolds of Sasakian space forms. J. Differential Geometry 13 (1978), no. 2, 273–278.
- [13] S. Blitz, A. R. Gover, and A. Waldron. Conformal fundamental forms and the asymptotically Poincaré–Einstein condition. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 72(6):2215–2284, 2023.
- [14] T. Branson and A. R. Gover. Conformally invariant non-local operators. Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 201(1):19–60, 2001.
- [15] T. Branson and A. R. Gover. Conformally invariant operators, differential forms, cohomology and a generalisation of Q-curvature. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **30**, no.10–12: 1611–1669, 2005.
- [16] F. E. Burstall and D. M. J. Calderbank. Conformal submanifold geometry I-III. arXiv:1006.5700
- [17] D. M. J. Calderbank and T. Diemer. Differential invariants and curved Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand sequences. J. Reine Angew. Math., 537:67–103, 2001.
- [18] D. M. J. Calderbank. Mobius structures and two dimensional Einstein-Weyl geometry. Journal f
  ür die reine und angewandte Mathematik, 504:37–53, 1998.
- [19] P. Cameron, M. Dunajski, and P. Tod Conformal Geodesics Cannot Spiral J. Differential Geom. 128(2):557–581, 2024.

- [20] A. Cap. Infinitesimal automorphisms and deformations of parabolic geometries. J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 10(2):415–437, 2008.
- [21] A. Cap and A. R. Gover. Tractor bundles for irreducible parabolic geometries. In Global analysis and harmonic analysis (Marseille-Luminy, 1999), volume 4 of Sémin. Congr., pages 129–154. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 2000.
- [22] A. Cap and A. R. Gover. Tractor calculi for parabolic geometries. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 354(4):1511–1548, 2002.
- [23] A. Cap and A.R. Gover. Standard tractors and the conformal ambient metric construction. Ann. Global Anal. Geom. 24:231–259, 2003.
- [24] A. Cap, A. R. Gover, and M. Hammerl. Normal BGG solutions and polynomials. International Journal of Mathematics, 23(11):1250117, 2012.
- [25] A. Cap, A. R. Gover, and M. Hammerl. Projective BGG equations, algebraic sets, and compactifications of Einstein geometries. J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2), 86(2):433–454, 2012.
- [26] A. Cap, A. R. Gover, and M. Hammerl. Holonomy reductions of Cartan geometries and curved orbit decompositions. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 163(5):1035–1070, 2014.
- [27] A. Cap and J. Slovák. Parabolic Geometries I: Background and general theory. Volume 154 of Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2009.
- [28] A. Cap, J. Slovák, and V. Souček. Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand Sequences Annals of Math., Second Series, 154(1):97–113, 2001.
- [29] É. Cartan. Les espaces à connexion conforme. Polonaise de Math. (2):171–202, 1923.
- [30] B. Carter. Global structure of the Kerr family of gravitational fields. *Physical Review*, 174(5):1559, 1968.
- [31] B. Carter. Hamilton-Jacobi and Schrodinger separable solutions of Einstein's equations. Commun. Math. Phys. 10(280), 1968.
- [32] J. S. Case, C. R. Graham, and T.-M. Kuo. Extrinsic GJMS operators for submanifolds. arXiv:2306.11294v1
- [33] S. Chandrasekhar. The solution of Dirac's equation in Kerr geometry. Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A. 349(571), 1976.
- [34] S.-Y. A. Chang. Conformal geometry on four manifolds—Noether lecture. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2018, 119–146.
- [35] S.-Y. A. Chang and Y. Ge. On conformally compact Einstein manifolds. Rev. Un. Mat. Argentina 64(1):199–213, 2022.

- [36] S.-Y. A. Chang, Y. Ge and J. Qing. Compactness of conformally compact Einstein 4-manifolds II. Adv. Math. 373, 107325, 33 pp., 2020.
- [37] S.-Y. A. Chang, S. E. McKeown, P. Yang. Scattering on singular Yamabe spaces. Rev. Mat. Iberoam. 38(7):2153–2184, 2022.
- [38] B.-Y. Chen. Totally umbilical submanifolds of quaternion-space-forms. J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A 26(2):154–162, 1978.
- [39] B.-Y. Chen. Totally umbilical submanifolds. Soochow J. Math. 5:9–37, 1979.
- [40] B.-Y. Chen and K. Ogiue. Two theorems on Kaehler manifolds. Michigan Math. J. 21:225– 229, 1974.
- [41] S. N. Curry and A. R. Gover. An introduction to conformal geometry and tractor calculus, with a view to applications in general relativity. In *Asymptotic analysis in general relativity*, London Mathematical Society lecture note series; 443, 2018.
- [42] S. N. Curry. Submanifolds in Conformal and CR Manifolds and Applications. PhD thesis, The University of Auckland, 2016.
- [43] A. Derdzinski. Zeros of conformal fields in any metric signature. Classical Quantum Gravity 28, no. 7, 075011, 23 pp., 2011.
- [44] A. Derdzinski. Two-jets of conformal fields along their zero sets. Cent. Eur. J. Math. 10(5):1698–1709, 2012.
- [45] M. Dunajski and P. Tod. Conformal geodesics on gravitational instantons. Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 173(1):123–154, 2022.
- [46] C. L. Fefferman. Parabolic invariant theory in complex analysis. Adv. in Math. 31(2):131–262, 1979.
- [47] C. L. Fefferman and C. R. Graham. Conformal invariants. Astérisque (1985), 95–116.
- [48] C. L. Fefferman and C. R. Graham. The Ambient Metric. Annals of mathematics studies ; no. 178. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 2012.
- [49] M. Fernández-López, E. García-Río, D. N. Kupeli and B. Unal. A curvature condition for a twisted product to be a warped product. *Manuscripta Math.* 106(2):213–217, 2001.
- [50] J. Ferrand. Les géodésiques des structures conformes. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math., 294(18):629–632, 1982.
- [51] A. Fialkow. Conformal differential geometry of a subspace. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 56(2):309–433, 1944.
- [52] R. Floyd. The dynamics of Kerr fields. PhD Thesis, London University, 1973.
- [53] C. Frances. Local dynamics of conformal vector fields. *Geom. Dedicata* **158**:35–59, 2012.

- [54] H. Friedrich. Einstein equations and conformal structure: existence of anti-de Sitter-type space-times. J. Geom. Phys. 17(2):125–184, 1995.
- [55] H. Friedrich. Sharp asymptotics for Einstein-λ-dust flows. Comm. Math. Phys. 350(2):803– 844, 2017.
- [56] H. Friedrich and B. G. Schmidt. Conformal geodesics in general relativity. Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A, 414(1846):171–195, 1987.
- [57] V. P. Frolov, P. Krtouš, and D. Kubizňák. Black holes, hidden symmetries, and complete integrability. *Living Reviews in Relativity*, 20(1):6, Nov 2017.
- [58] G. W. Gibbons, T. Houri, D. Kubizňák, and C. M. Warnick. Some spacetimes with higher rank Killing-Stäckel tensors. *Phys. Lett. B*, 700(1):68–74, 2011.
- [59] A. R. Gover. Aspects of parabolic invariant theory. The 18th Winter School "Geometry and Physics" (Srní, 1998) Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo (2) Suppl., no.59, 25–47, 1999.
- [60] A. R. Gover. Invariant theory and calculus for conformal geometries. Adv. Math., 163(2):206– 257, 2001.
- [61] A. R. Gover. Almost conformally Einstein manifolds and obstructions. In Proceedings, 9th International Conference on Differential Geometry and Its Applications: Prague, Czech Republic, August 30-September 3, 2004, pages 247–260, 2005.
- [62] A. R. Gover. Laplacian operators and Q-curvature on conformally Einstein manifolds. Math. Ann., 336(2):311–334, 2006.
- [63] A. R. Gover. Almost Einstein and Poincaré-Einstein manifolds in Riemannian signature. J. Geom. Phys., 60(2):182–204, 2010.
- [64] A. R. Gover and F. Leitner A class of compact Poincaré–Einstein manifolds: properties and construction Commun. Contemp. Math. 12(4):629–659, 2010.
- [65] A. R. Gover and P. Nurowski. Obstructions to conformally Einstein metrics in n dimensions. J. Geom. Phys. 56(3):450–484, 2006.
- [66] A. R. Gover and J. Šilhan. The conformal Killing equation on forms—prolongations and applications. *Differential Geom. Appl.*, 26(3):244–266, 2008.
- [67] A. R. Gover and D. Snell. Distinguished curves and first integrals on Poincaré-Einstein and other conformally singular geometries. Abel Symp., 16 Springer, Cham, 2022, 79–92.
- [68] A. R. Gover, D. Snell, and A. Taghavi-Chabert. Distinguished curves and integrability in Riemannian, conformal, and projective geometry. Adv. Theor. Math. Phys., 25(8), 2055– 2117, 2021.
- [69] A. R. Gover and A. A. Waldron. Boundary calculus for conformally compact manifolds. Indiana University mathematics journal, 63(1):119–163, 2014.

- [70] A. R. Gover and A. A. Waldron. Submanifold conformal invariants and a boundary Yamabe problem. Trends Math. Res. Perspect. CRM Barc., 3 Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2015, 21–26. arXiv:1407.6742
- [71] A. R. Gover and A. A. Waldron. Renormalized volume. Communications in mathematical physics, 354(3):1205–1244, 2017.
- [72] A. R. Gover and A. A. Waldron. Renormalized volume with boundary Commun. Contemp. Math., 21, no. 2, 1850030, 31 pp., 2019.
- [73] A. R. Gover and A. A. Waldron. Conformal hypersurface geometry via a boundary Loewner–Nirenberg–Yamabe problem. *Communications in analysis and geometry*, 29(4):779– 836, 2021. arXiv: 1506.02723
- [74] A. R. Gover and A. A. Waldron. A calculus for conformal hypersurfaces and new higher Willmore energy functionals Adv. Geom. 20(1):29–60, 2020.
- [75] C. R. Graham. Volume renormalization for singular Yamabe metrics. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 145(4):1781–1792, 2017.
- [76] C. R. Graham and N. Reichert. Higher-dimensional Willmore energies via minimal submanifold asymptotics. Asian J. Math. 24(4):571–610, 2020.
- [77] C. R. Graham and M. Zworski. Scattering matrix in conformal geometry. Inventiones mathematicae, 152(1):89–118, 2003.
- [78] C. R. Graham and E. Witten. Conformal anomaly of submanifold observables in AdS/CFT correspondence. Nuclear Phys. B 546, no.1-2, 52–64, 1999.
- [79] D.H. Grant. A conformally invariant third order neumann-type operator for hypersurfaces. MSc thesis, University of Auckland, 2003.
- [80] J. Gregorovič, L. Zalabova, First BGG Operators on Homogeneous Geometries, Classical Quantum Gravity 40, no.6, Paper No. 065010, 48 pp., 2023.
- [81] M. J. Gursky, Q. Han and S. Stolz. An invariant related to the existence of conformally compact Einstein fillings. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 374(6):4185–4205, 2021.
- [82] J. Guven. Conformally invariant bending energy for hypersurfaces J. Phys. A 38, no. 37, 7943–7955, 2005.
- [83] M. Hammerl, P. Somberg, V. Souček, and J. Šilhan. Invariant prolongation of overdetermined PDEs in projective, conformal, and Grassmannian geometry. Annals of Global Analysis and Geometry, 42(1):121–145, 2012.
- [84] W. Kryński. The Schwarzian derivative and Euler-Lagrange equations J. Geom. Phys. 182, Paper No. 104665, 7 pp., 2022.
- [85] J. Fine and Y. Herfray. An ambient approach to conformal geodesics. Commun. Contemp. Math. 24(3), Paper No. 2150009, 27 pp., 2022.

- [86] T. Houri, K. Tomoda, and Y. Yasui. On integrability of the Killing equation. Classical Quantum Gravity, 35(7):075014, 22, 2018.
- [87] A. Juhl. Families of conformally covariant differential operators, Q-curvature and holography. Progr. Math., 275, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2009. xiv+488 pp.
- [88] A. Juhl, B. Ørsted Residue families, singular Yamabe problems and extrinsic conformal Laplacians Adv. Math. 409, Paper No. 108634, 158 pp., 2022.
- [89] E. G. Kalnins, J. M. Kress, and W. Miller, Jr. Separation of Variables and Superintegrability : The symmetry of solvable systems IOP Publishing Ltd., 2018.
- [90] S. Kobayashi and K. Nomizu. Foundations of differential geometry. Vol. II. Interscience Tracts in Pure and Applied Mathematics, No. 15, Vol. II. Interscience Publishers John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York-London-Sydney, 1969, xv+470 pp.
- [91] O. Kowalski. Properties of hypersurfaces which are characteristic for spaces of constant curvature. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3) 26:233-245, 1972.
- [92] D. A. Lee and A. Neves. The Penrose inequality for asymptotically locally hyperbolic spaces with nonpositive mass Comm. Math. Phys. 339(2):327–352, 2015.
- [93] F. Leitner. Normal conformal Killing forms. arXiv preprint arXiv:math/0406316, 2004.
- [94] F. Leitner. The collapsing sphere product of Poincaré-Einstein spaces. J. Geom. Phys. 60(10):1558-1575, 2010.
- [95] F. Leitner. Multiple almost Einstein structures with intersecting scale singularities. Monatsh. Math. 165(1):15–39, 2012.
- [96] C. Lübbe and J. A. Valiente Kroon. A conformal approach for the analysis of the non-linear stability of radiation cosmologies. Ann. Physics 328:1–25, 2013.
- [97] M. Minucci and J. A. Valiente Kroon. A conformal approach to the stability of Einstein spaces with spatial sections of negative scalar curvature. *Classical Quantum Gravity* 38(14): Paper No. 145026, 40 pp., 2021.
- [98] Y. Mutô. On the equations of circles in a space with a conformal connection. Tensor 2:50–52, 1939.
- [99] K. Ogiue. Theory of conformal connections. Kodai Math. Sem. Rep. 19:193–224, 1967.
- [100] B. O'Neill. Semi-Riemannian geometry, volume 103 of Pure and Applied Mathematics. Academic Press, Inc., New York, 1983. With applications to relativity.
- [101] R. Penrose. Naked Singularities. Ann. NY Acad. Sci. **224**(1):125–134, 1973.
- [102] R. Ponge and H. Reckziegel. Twisted products in pseudo-Riemannian geometry. Geom. Dedicata 48(1):15-25, 1993.

- [103] J. A. Schouten. Ricci-calculus, an introduction to tensor analysis and its geometrical applications. Springer-Verlag, 1954.
- [104] J. Šilhan and V. Žádník. Conformal theory of curves with tractors. Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 2019.
- [105] D. Snell. Distinguished curves and submanifolds in conformal geometry. PhD thesis, The University of Auckland, 2022.
- [106] P. Sommers. On Killing tensors and constants of motion. J. Mathematical Phys., 14:787–790, 1973.
- [107] R. Stafford. Tractor calculus and invariants for conformal sub-manifolds. Master's thesis, The University of Auckland, 2006.
- [108] S. Tachibana. On conformal Killing tensor in a Riemannian space. Tôhoku Math. J. (2), 21:56–64, 1969.
- [109] T. Y. Thomas. On conformal geometry. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 12(5):352–359, 1926.
- [110] P. Tod. Some examples of the behaviour of conformal geodesics. J. Geom. Phys., 62(8):1778– 1792, 2012.
- [111] A. Vasy. Microlocal analysis of asymptotically hyperbolic and Kerr-de Sitter spaces (with an appendix by Semyon Dyatlov) *Invent. Math.* 194(2):381–513, 2013.
- [112] Y. Vyatkin. Manufacturing Conformal Invariants of Hypersurfaces. PhD thesis, The University of Auckland, 2013.
- [113] M. Walker and R. Penrose. On quadratic first integrals of the geodesic equations for type 22 spacetimes. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 18, 1970.
- [114] K. Yano. Sur les circonférences généralisées dans les espaces à connexion conforme. Proc. Imp. Acad., 14(9):329–332, 1938.
- [115] K. Yano. The theory of Lie derivatives and its applications. North-Holland, 1957.
- [116] Y. Zhang, Graham-Witten's conformal invariant for closed four-dimensional submanifolds. J. Math. Study 54(2):200-226, 2021.

S. N. C., DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY, MATHEMATICS, STATIS-TICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE 401, STILLWATER, O 74075, USA *E-mail address*, S. N. C. : sean.curry@okstate.edu

A. R. G., DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND, PRIVATE BAG 92019, AUCKLAND 1142, NEW ZEALAND

E-mail address, A. R. G. : r.gover@auckland.ac.nz

D. S., DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND, PRIVATE BAG 92019, AUCKLAND 1142, NEW ZEALAND

*E-mail address*, D. S. : daniel.snell@auckland.ac.nz