

## NOTE ON COMPACT HYPERSURFACES IN A UNIT SPHERE $S^{2n+1}$

By Jae Kyu Lim and Yeong-Wu Choe

### § 0. Introduction

Recently, K. Yano and M. Okumura [5] have defined the concept of an  $(f, g, u, v, \lambda)$ -structure in an even-dimensional Riemannian manifold. Hypersurfaces in an almost contact metric manifold or submanifolds of codimension 2 in an almost Hermitian manifold admit an  $(f, g, u, v, \lambda)$ -structure (cf. [5] etc.).

H. Suzuki [4] studied the integrability conditions of this structure.

In terms of this structure, D.E. Blair, G.D. Ludden and K. Yano [1], and M. Nakagawa and I. Yokote [3] have proved

**THEOREM 0.1.** *If  $M^{2n}$  is a complete orientable submanifold with constant scalar curvature satisfying  $Kf+fK=0$  and  $\lambda \neq \text{constant}$ , where  $K$  denotes the second fundamental tensor on  $M^{2n}$ , then  $M^{2n}$  is a natural sphere  $S^{2n}$  or  $S^n \times S^n$ .*

In the present paper we investigate the necessary and sufficient condition of antinormal  $(f, g, u, v, \lambda)$ -structure in a Sasakian manifold and study compact hypersurfaces with antinormal  $(f, g, u, v, \lambda)$ -structure in a unit sphere.

### § 1. Preliminaries

We consider a  $C^\infty$  differentiable manifold  $M$  with an  $(f, g, u, v, \lambda)$ -structure, that is, a Riemannian manifold with metric tensor  $g$  which admits a tensor field  $f$  of type  $(1,1)$ , two 1-forms  $u$  and  $v$  (or two vector fields associated with them), and a function  $\lambda$  satisfying

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} f_j^t f_t^h &= -\delta_j^h + u_j u^h + v_j v^h, & f_j^t f_i^s g_{ts} &= g_{ji} - u_j u_i - v_j v_i, \\ u_t f_i^t &= \lambda v_i \text{ or } f_i^h u^i = -\lambda v^h, & v_t f_i^t &= -\lambda u_i \text{ or } f_i^h v^i = \lambda u^h, \\ u_i u^i &= v_i v^i = 1 - \lambda^2, & u_i v^i &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Such an  $M$  is even-dimensional ([5]).

We put

$$(1.2) \quad [f, f]_{ji} = f_j^t \nabla_t u_i - f_i^t \nabla_t u_j - (\nabla_j f_i^t - \nabla_i f_j^t) u_t + \lambda (\nabla_j v_i - \nabla_i v_j),$$

$\nabla_j$  denoting the operator of covariant differentiation with respect to the Riemannian connection. If the tensor  $[f, f]_{ji}$  vanishes, the  $(f, g, u, v, \lambda)$ -structure is said to be *antinormal* (cf. [4]).

## § 2. Hypersurfaces in a Sasakian manifold

Let  $M$  be an orientable hypersurface of a Sasakian manifold  $\tilde{M}^{2n+1}$ . Then there is an  $(f, g, u, v, \lambda)$ -structure induced in  $M$ , which has the following properties;

$$(2.1) \quad \nabla_j f_i^h = -g_{ji} u^h + \delta_j^h u_i - k_{ji} v^h + k_j^h v_i,$$

$$(2.2) \quad \nabla_j u_i = f_{ji} - \lambda k_{ji},$$

$$(2.3) \quad \nabla_j v_i = -k_{ji} f_i^t + \lambda g_{ji},$$

$$(2.4) \quad \nabla_j \lambda = k_{jt} u^t - v_j,$$

where  $k_{ji}$  is the component of second fundamental tensor of the hypersurface  $M$  relative to  $\tilde{M}^{2n+1}$  ([1], [5]).

Since (2.2) implies that  $\{x \in M; \lambda^2(x) = 1\}$  is bordered set, we may only consider  $1 - \lambda^2 \neq 0$  on  $M$ .

Substituting (2.1)~(2.4) into (1.2), we find

$$(2.5) \quad [f, f]_{ji} = (\nabla_i \lambda) v_j - (\nabla_j \lambda) v_i.$$

Thus, we have

LEMMA 2.1. *Let  $M$  be an orientable hypersurface of a Sasakian manifold. In order that the induced  $(f, g, u, v, \lambda)$ -structure be antinormal it is necessary and sufficient that it satisfies  $\nabla_j \lambda = A v_j$ ,  $A$  being certain differentiable function on  $M$ .*

We now assume that

$$(2.6) \quad \nabla_j \lambda = A v_j,$$

$A$  being non-zero differentiable function on  $M$ . Then we have from (2.4)

$$(2.7) \quad k_{jt} u^t = (A+1) v_j.$$

Differentiating (2.6) covariantly and using (2.3), we find

$$\nabla_k \nabla_j \lambda = (\nabla_k A) v_j - A (-k_{kt} f_j^t + \lambda g_{kj}),$$

from which,

$$(2.8) \quad (\nabla_k A)v_j - (\nabla_j A)v_k + A(k_{jt}f_k^t - k_{kt}f_j^t) = 0.$$

Transvecting (2.8) with  $v^j$  and using (1.1) and (2.7), we get

$$(2.9) \quad (1 - \lambda^2)\nabla_k A = (v^t \nabla_t A)v_k + \lambda A(A + 1)v_k - Ak_{st}v^s f_k^t.$$

Substituting (2.9) into (2.8), we obtain

$$(2.10) \quad (1 - \lambda^2)(k_{jt}f_k^t - k_{kt}f_j^t) = k_{st}v^s(v_j f_k^t - v_k f_j^t)$$

because of  $A \neq 0$ .

Transvecting (2.10) with  $f_i^k$  and using (2.7), we find

$$(1 - \lambda^2)\{-k_{ji} - (k_{jt}v^t)v_i - k_{st}f_i^s f_j^t\} = -(k_{it}v^t)v_j + (k_{st}v^s v^t)v_j v_i + \lambda k_{st}v^s f_j^t u_i,$$

from which, taking the skew-symmetric part,

$$(1 - \lambda^2)\{(k_{jt}v^t)v_i - (k_{it}v^t)v_j\} = -(k_{it}v^t)v_j + (k_{jt}v^t)v_i + \lambda k_{st}v^s(f_j^t u_i - f_i^t u_j).$$

Transvecting this with  $v^i$  and using  $\lambda \neq 0$  and (2.7), we find

$$(2.11) \quad k_{jt}v^t = (A + 1)u_j + Bv_j,$$

where  $B = (k_{st}v^s v^t)/(1 - \lambda^2)$ .

Substituting (2.11) into (2.9) and (2.10), we have respectively

$$(2.12) \quad \nabla_j A = Cu_j + Dv_j,$$

$$(2.13) \quad (1 - \lambda^2)(k_{jt}f_k^t - k_{kt}f_j^t) = \lambda B(u_j v_k - u_k v_j),$$

where, we have put

$$(2.14) \quad C = \frac{\lambda AB}{1 - \lambda^2}, \quad D = \frac{v^t \nabla_t A}{1 - \lambda^2}.$$

Differentiating (2.12) covariantly and taking account of (2.2) and (2.3), we find

$$\nabla_k \nabla_j A = (\nabla_k C)u_j + (\nabla_k D)v_j + C(f_{kj} - \lambda k_{kj}) + D(-k_{kt}f_j^t + \lambda g_{kj}),$$

from which, substituting (2.13),

$$(2.15) \quad (\nabla_k C)u_j - (\nabla_j C)u_k + (\nabla_k D)v_j - (\nabla_j D)v_k + 2Cf_{kj} + \frac{\lambda B}{1 - \lambda^2}(u_j v_k - u_k v_j) = 0.$$

Transvecting (2.15) with  $u^k v^j$  and  $f^{kj}$ , we have respectively

$$-v^t \nabla_t C + u^t \nabla_t D - \lambda B - 2C\lambda = 0,$$

$$\lambda(v^t \nabla_t C - u^t \nabla_t D + \lambda B) + 2C(n - 1 + \lambda^2) = 0.$$

Thus, last two equations imply  $C = 0$  and consequently  $\lambda AB = 0$ . So we have  $B = 0$  because of  $A \neq 0$  and (2.6). Therefore (2.11), (2.12) and (2.13) become

respectively

$$(2.16) \quad \nabla_j A = Dv_j,$$

$$(2.17) \quad k_{jt} v^t = (A+1)u_j,$$

$$(2.18) \quad k_{jt} f_k^t - k_{kt} f_j^t = 0.$$

Conversely, if (2.18) satisfied on  $M$ , by transvecting  $f_i^k$ , we find

$$k_{jt} (-\delta_i^t + u_i^t + v_i^t) - k_{st} f_i^s f_j^t = 0.$$

Taking the skew-symmetric part of this equation, we have

$$(2.19) \quad (k_{jt} u^t) u_i - (k_{it} u^t) u_j + (k_{jt} v^t) v_i - (k_{it} v^t) v_j = 0.$$

Transvecting (2.19) with  $u^i$  and putting  $\bar{A}(1-\lambda^2) = k_{ts} u^t u^s$ ,  $\bar{B}(1-\lambda^2) = k_{ts} u^t v^s$ , we get

$$(2.20) \quad k_{jt} u^t = \bar{A} u_j + \bar{B} v_j.$$

Differentiating (2.20) covariantly and using (2.2) and (2.3), we find

$$(\nabla_k k_{jt}) u^t + k_{jt} (f_k^t - \lambda k_k^t) = (\nabla_k \bar{A}) u_j + (\nabla_k \bar{B}) v_j + \bar{A} (f_{kj} - \lambda k_{kj}) + \bar{B} (-k_{kt} f_j^t + \lambda g_{kj}),$$

from which, taking the skew-symmetric part with respect to  $k$  and  $j$ ,

$$(2.21) \quad (\nabla_k k_{jt} - \nabla_j k_{kt}) u^t = (\nabla_k \bar{A}) u_j - (\nabla_j \bar{A}) u_k + (\nabla_k \bar{B}) v_j - (\nabla_j \bar{B}) v_k + 2\bar{A} f_{kj}$$

because of (2.18).

On the other hand, differentiating (2.4) covariantly and substituting (2.3), we get

$$\nabla_k \nabla_j \lambda = (\nabla_k k_{jt}) u^t - (\lambda g_{kj} - k_{kt} f_j^t),$$

from which, using (2.18),

$$(\nabla_k k_{jt} - \nabla_j k_{kt}) u^t = 0.$$

Thus, (2.21) becomes

$$(2.22) \quad (\nabla_k \bar{A}) u_j - (\nabla_j \bar{A}) u_k + (\nabla_k \bar{B}) v_j - (\nabla_j \bar{B}) v_k + 2\bar{A} f_{kj} = 0.$$

Transvecting (2.22) with  $u^j v^k$  and  $f^{kj}$ , we have respectively

$$(1-\lambda^2)(v^t \nabla_t \bar{A} - u^t \nabla_t \bar{B}) + 2\bar{A} \lambda (1-\lambda^2) = 0$$

and

$$\lambda(v^t \nabla_t \bar{A} - u^t \nabla_t \bar{B}) + \bar{A} \{2n - 2(1-\lambda^2)\} = 0,$$

from which,  $\bar{A} = 0$ . Consequently (2.4) and (2.20) imply that  $\nabla_j \lambda = (\bar{B} + 1)v_j$ .

Hence, using Lemma 2.1, we have



**THEOREM 2.2.** *Let  $M$  be an orientable hypersurface of a Sasakian manifold such that the function  $\lambda$  is not constant. In order that the induced  $(f, g, u, v, \lambda)$ -structure be antinormal it is necessary and sufficient that  $Kf + fK = 0$ , where  $K$  is the second fundamental tensor of  $M$  with respect to Sasakian manifold.*

**§ 3. Compact hypersurface in a unit sphere**

Let  $M$  be a hypersurface immersed in a unit sphere  $S^{2n+1}(1)$  with canonical almost contact structure. Then there is an  $(f, g, u, v, \lambda)$ -structure induced in  $M$ , which satisfies (2.1)~(2.4).

We now denote by  $R_{kji}^h$ ,  $R_{ji}$  and  $R$  components of the Riemannian curvature tensor, the Ricci tensor and the scalar curvature of  $M$ . The equation of Gauss for the hypersurface  $M$  is written as

$$(3.1) \quad R_{kji}^h = \delta_k^h g_{ji} - \delta_j^h g_{ki} + k_k^h k_{ji} - k_j^h k_{ki},$$

and the equation of Codazzi is given by

$$(3.2) \quad \nabla_k k_{ji} - \nabla_j k_{ki} = 0.$$

From (3.1) it follows easily that

$$(3.3) \quad R_{ji} = (2n-1)g_{ji} + k_t^t k_{ji} - k_{jt} k_i^t,$$

$$(3.4) \quad R = 2n(2n-1) + (k_t^t)^2 - k_{st} k^{st}.$$

We prove the following (cf. [3])

**THEOREM 3.1.** *Let  $M$  be a compact hypersurface with antinormal  $(f, g, u, v, \lambda)$ -structure in a unit sphere  $S^{2n+1}(1)$ . If  $\lambda$  is not constant, then  $M$  is congruent to  $S^{2n}(1)$  or  $S^n(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}) \times S^n(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})$  imbedded naturally in  $S^{2n+1}(1)$ .*

**PROOF.** Since  $M$  has antinormal  $(f, g, u, v, \lambda)$ -structure, (2.7), (2.16), (2.17) and (2.18) are valid on  $M$ . From (2.18) we can easily prove that

$$(3.5) \quad k_t^t = 0.$$

Differentiating (2.17) covariantly, we find

$$(\nabla_k k_{jt})v^t + k_{jt} \nabla_k v^t = (\nabla_k A)u_j + (A+1)\nabla_k u_j,$$

from which, using (2.2), (2.3), (2.18) and (3.2),

$$(3.6) \quad 2k_k^t k_{ts} f_j^s = (\nabla_k A)u_j - (\nabla_j A)u_k + 2(A+1)f_{kj}.$$

Transvecting (3.6) with  $u^j$  and taking account of (2.7), (2.16) and (2.17),

we have

$$(3.7) \quad (1-\lambda^2)\nabla_k A = -2\lambda(A+1)(A+2)v_k.$$

Substituting (3.7) into (3.6), we get

$$(1-\lambda^2)k_k^t k_{ts} f_j^s = \lambda(A+1)(A+2)(v_j u_k - v_k u_j) + (1-\lambda^2)(A+1)f_{kj},$$

from which, transvecting  $f^{kj}$  and using (2.7) and (2.17),

$$(3.8) \quad k_{st} k^{st} = 2(A+1)(A+2-n).$$

Since  $M$  is compact, from (3.2), (3.5), (3.6) and (3.7), we can prove that  $(A+1)(A+2)=0$  (See [2], [3]). Thus, (3.5) and (3.8) imply that  $R$  is constant. Taking account of Theorem 0.1, Theorem 3.1 is proved.

Kyungpook University

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Blair, D.E., G.D. Ludden and K. Yano, *Hypersurfaces of odd-dimensional spheres*. J. of Diff. Geom. 5(1971), 479—486.
- [2] Ishihara S. and U-Hang Ki, *Complete Riemannian manifold with  $(f, g, u, v, \lambda)$ -structure*. to appear in J. of Diff. Geom.
- [3] Nakagawa and I. Yokote, *Compact hypersurfaces in an odd-dimensional sphere*. to appear in Kōdai Math. Sem. Rep.
- [4] Suzuki, H., *Notes on  $(f, U, V, u, v, \lambda)$ -structures*. to appear in Kōdai Math. Sem. Rep.
- [5] Yano, K. and M. Okumura, *On  $(f, g, u, v, \lambda)$ -structures*. Kōdai Math. Sem. Rep. 22 (1970), 401—423.