

MORSE INDEX OF MINIMAL PRODUCTS OF MINIMAL SUBMANIFOLDS IN SPHERES

CHANGPING WANG, PENG WANG

ABSTRACT. Tang-Zhang [30], Choe-Hoppe [6], showed independently that one can produce minimal submanifolds in spheres via Clifford type minimal product of minimal submanifolds. In this note, we show that the minimal product is immersed by its first eigenfunctions (of its Laplacian) if and only if the two beginning minimal submanifolds are immersed by their first eigenfunctions. Moreover, we give estimates of Morse index and nullity of the minimal product. In particular, we show that the Clifford minimal submanifold $(\sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n}}S^{n_1}, \dots, \sqrt{\frac{n_k}{n}}S^{n_k}) \subset S^{n+k-1}$ has index $(k-1)(n+k+1)$ and nullity $(k-1)\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} (n_i+1)(n_j+1)$ (with $n = \sum n_j$).

Keywords: Minimal product; Index; Nullity; Clifford minimal submanifold.

MSC(2020): 53C40, 53A31, 53A30

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of minimal submanifolds in spheres plays an important role in the global differential geometry and geometric analysis and has a close relation with spectral geometry. It turns out to be a challenging problem for the study of global properties of minimal submanifolds in spheres, see for instance [2, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 30, 33] and reference therein.

Recently Tang-Zhang [30], Choe-Hoppe [6] showed independently that one can produce minimal submanifolds in spheres via Clifford type product of minimal submanifolds. Moreover, Tang and Zhang used this construction for isoparametric hypersurfaces to discuss area-minimizing properties of minimal submanifolds [30].

It is natural to discuss further geometric and analytic properties of minimal products of minimal submanifolds from several directions. The first one concerns the spectrum properties of (the Laplacian of) them in view of Yau's conjecture and a problem proposed recently by Tang and Yan [26]. Recall that for minimal hypersurfaces, the well-known Yau's conjecture states that an embedded, closed minimal hypersurface in S^{n+1} has $\lambda_1 = n$ with λ_1 being the first eigenvalue of its Laplacian. We refer to [2], [7] and [26] for recent progress on this topic. On the other hand, an n -dimensional minimal submanifold is called immersed by its first eigenfunctions if $\lambda_1 = n$, which appears naturally in many important geometric problems, for instance, Willmore conjecture [18, 20, 10] and λ_1 -extremal metrics [9]. It is therefore natural to ask whether the minimal product of minimal submanifolds immersed by first eigenfunctions is also immersed by first eigenfunctions, which turns out to be true (see Theorem 3.1). In this way, one can construct many new examples of minimal submanifolds immersed by first eigenfunctions of any dimension and any co-dimension greater than 2, oriented or non-oriented. Moreover, it is not surprising that one can also construct examples of embedded minimal submanifolds *not* immersed by first eigenfunctions of higher co-dimension, which was first proposed as a problem in [26, p. 526], concerning the influence of dimension and co-dimensions on embedded minimal submanifolds *immersed or not immersed* by first eigenfunctions. Examples in terms of minimal products of some focal submanifolds in [26, Proposition 1.1] and totally geodesic spheres give embedded

minimal submanifolds of dimension $\geq n + k + 2$ and of co-dimension $\geq k + 2$ for any $n \geq 1$ and $k \geq 3$. We refer to Section 3 for more details.

Then we focus on the estimate of Morse index and nullity of minimal submanifolds. It is well-known that the seminal work of J. Simons [25] showed that all oriented closed minimal submanifolds in spheres are *not* stable. Then he gave a lower bound estimate of the Morse index and nullity of minimal submanifolds in spheres, which turn out to be of great importance in the study of the geometric and analytical properties of minimal submanifolds. For example, the index characterization of Morse index of Clifford torus [32] is one of the starting points in Marques and Neves' proof of the famous Willmore conjecture in S^3 [19]. Recently, Kapouleas and Wiygul computed the Morse index and nullity of the Lawson minimal surface $\xi_{g,1}$ [12]. We focus on estimates of the Morse index and nullity for minimal products in Section 4. In particular, we compute the Morse index and nullity of all Clifford minimal submanifolds in Proposition 4.9 and 4.11.

Finally, we consider the estimate of the length of the second fundamental form of minimal products, including the famous Simons' inequality and Chern's conjecture/problem [25, 5]. We refer to [8, 11, 28, 29] for recent progress on this topic. For minimal products, we will derive a Simon's type inequality and discuss briefly Chern's problem for submanifolds.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 contains the geometry of products of submanifolds. In Section 3 we consider the first eigenvalue estimate of minimal product. Then in Section 4 the index and nullity estimates of minimal product are provided, as well as the index and nullity of all Clifford minimal submanifolds. In Section 5 we give some estimate of the square of the length of the second fundamental form of a minimal product. We end this paper with an appendix for a proof of an index estimate of an n -dimensional minimal submanifold in S^{n+p+1} .

2. THE GEOMETRY OF PRODUCTS OF SUBMANIFOLDS IN SPHERES

In this section we will collect some basic setup for products of submanifolds in spheres.

2.1. The basic setup. First we will recall briefly the geometry of products of submanifolds in spheres, following basically the treatment in Section 4.1 of [30] (here we use slightly different notations). Note that although they consider product of minimal submanifolds in [30], the computations work for products of arbitrary submanifolds in spheres.

Let $f_1 : M_1 \rightarrow S^{n_1+p_1}$ and $\hat{f}_1 : \hat{M}_1 \rightarrow S^{\hat{n}_1+\hat{p}_1}$ be two submanifolds of dimension n_1 and $\hat{n}_1$ respectively. Set $n = n_1 + \hat{n}_1$ and $p = p_1 + \hat{p}_1 + 1$. Then $f = (c_1 f_1, \hat{c}_1 \hat{f}_1) : M = M_1 \times \hat{M}_1 \rightarrow S^{n+p}$, with $c_1^2 + \hat{c}_1^2 = 1$ and $c_1 \hat{c}_1 \neq 0$, is called a *product* of f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$.

Let $\{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{p_1}\}$ and $\{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{\hat{p}_1}\}$ denote the local orthonormal basis of the normal bundle of f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ around a point respectively. Then an orthonormal basis of the normal bundle of f is

$$(\sigma_1, 0), \dots, (\sigma_{p_1}, 0), (0, \tau_1), \dots, (0, \tau_{\hat{p}_1}), \eta,$$

where

$$\eta := (\hat{c}_1 f_1, -c_1 \hat{f}_1)$$

is a global unit normal vector field of f . Let A^f , A^{f_1} and $A^{\hat{f}_1}$ denote the shape operators of f , f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ respectively. Then we have (Here we split the tangent bundle of M : $TM = TM_1 \times T\hat{M}_1$.)

$$(2.1) \quad A_{(\sigma_i, 0)}^f = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{c_1} A_{\sigma_i}^{f_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$(2.2) \quad A_{(0, \tau_j)}^f = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\hat{c}_1} A_{\tau_j}^{\hat{f}_1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

For η , we have

$$(2.3) \quad A_\eta^f = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\hat{c}_1}{c_1} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{c_1}{\hat{c}_1} I_{\hat{n}_1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let

$$H = \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(A^f), \quad H_1 = \frac{1}{n_1} \text{tr}(A^{f_1}) \text{ and } \hat{H}_1 = \frac{1}{\hat{n}_1} \text{tr}(A^{\hat{f}_1})$$

denote the mean curvature vectors of f , f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ respectively. Let S , S_1 and $\hat{S}_1$ denote the square length of the second fundamental form of f , f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ respectively. It is direct to obtain

Lemma 2.1.

(1) The mean curvature H and the square length S satisfy

$$(2.4) \quad H = \frac{1}{n} \left(\frac{n_1}{c_1} H_1, \frac{\hat{n}_1}{\hat{c}_1} \hat{H}_1 \right) + \frac{1}{n} \left(-\frac{n_1 \hat{c}_1}{c_1} + \frac{\hat{n}_1 c_1}{\hat{c}_1} \right) \eta,$$

and

$$(2.5) \quad S = |A^f|^2 = \frac{n_1 \hat{c}_1^2}{c_1^2} + \frac{\hat{n}_1 c_1^2}{\hat{c}_1^2} + \frac{S_1}{c_1^2} + \frac{\hat{S}_1}{\hat{c}_1^2}.$$

(2) Let $\nabla^\perp$, $\nabla^{\perp, f_1}$ and $\nabla^{\perp, \hat{f}_1}$ denote the normal connection of f , f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ respectively. Then

$$(2.6) \quad \nabla^\perp \eta \equiv 0.$$

Let $X \in \Gamma(TM)$ such that $X = X_1 + \hat{X}_1$ with $X_1 \in \Gamma(TM_1)$ and $\hat{X}_1 \in \Gamma(T\hat{M}_1)$. Then

$$(2.7) \quad \nabla_{f_*(X)}^\perp (\sigma_i, \tau_j) = \left(\frac{1}{c_1} \nabla_{f_{1*}(X_1)}^{\perp, f_1} \sigma_i, \frac{1}{\hat{c}_1} \nabla_{\hat{f}_{1*}(\hat{X}_1)}^{\perp, \hat{f}_1} \tau_j \right).$$

Proof. (1) comes from the expression of A^f in terms of A^{f_1} and $A^{\hat{f}_1}$ as above.

Consider (2.6). We have

$$d\eta = \left(\hat{c}_1 df_1, -c_1 d\hat{f}_1 \right) \perp \{(\sigma_i, \tau_j), 1 \leq i \leq p_1, 1 \leq j \leq \hat{p}_1\}$$

since $df_1 \perp \sigma_i$ and $d\hat{f}_1 \perp \tau_j$. (2.6) follows then. The equation (2.7) of (2) comes from the choice of the basis of normal bundle and the fact that $f_*(X) = \frac{1}{c_1} f_{1*}(X_1) + \frac{1}{\hat{c}_1} \hat{f}_{1*}(\hat{X}_1)$. $\square$

2.2. Geometric properties of product of submanifolds. Lemma 2.1 leads to the following

Theorem 2.2. [30, 6] Let $f_1 : M_1 \rightarrow S^{n_1+p_1}$ and $\hat{f}_1 : \hat{M}_1 \rightarrow S^{\hat{n}_1+\hat{p}_1}$ be two submanifolds of dimension n_1 and $\hat{n}_1$ respectively. Set $n = n_1 + \hat{n}_1$ and $p = p_1 + \hat{p}_1 + 1$. The $f = (c_1 f_1, \hat{c}_1 \hat{f}_1) : M = M_1 \times \hat{M}_1 \rightarrow S^{n+p}$ is a minimal submanifold if and only if both f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ are minimal and

$$(c_1, \hat{c}_1) = \left(\sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n}}, \sqrt{\frac{\hat{n}_1}{n}} \right).$$

Moreover, we have the following result which could be known before. We refer to [31] for the study of submanifolds with flat normal bundle.

Theorem 2.3. *We retain the notion as above. Then*

- (1) *f is a submanifold with parallel mean curvature vector if and only if both f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ are with parallel mean curvature vector.*
- (2) *f is a submanifold with flat normal bundle if and only if both f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ have flat normal bundle.*

Proof. The combination of (2.4), (2.7) and (2.6) yields (1).

For (2), we already see by (2.6) that η is parallel. By (2.7), we see that f has flat normal bundle if and only if both f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ are of flat normal bundle. $\square$

Example 2.4. Since hypersurfaces of spheres are automatically with flat normal bundles, products of them give many submanifolds of spheres with flat normal bundles.

- (1) If we assume the hypersurfaces being minimal, we obtain many examples of minimal submanifolds with flat normal bundle in spheres. Repeating this procedure, one can produce more examples of minimal submanifolds with flat normal bundle in spheres.
- (2) If we assume the hypersurfaces being of constant mean curvature, then any product of them gives a submanifold with both parallel mean curvature vector and flat normal bundle. Repeating this procedure, one can produce many examples of submanifolds with both parallel mean curvature vector and flat normal bundle. To be concrete, let $f_j : M_j^{n_j} \rightarrow S^{n_j+1}$, $1 \leq j \leq k$, be constant mean curvature hypersurfaces, and let $c_j \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, be constants with $\sum c_j^2 = 1$. Then

$$f := (c_1 f_1, \dots, c_k f_k) : M_1^{n_1} \times \dots \times M_k^{n_k} \rightarrow S^{n+2k-1}$$

is a submanifold with both parallel mean curvature vector and flat normal bundle in S^{n+2k-1} with $n = n_1 + \dots + n_k$.

3. ON MINIMAL PRODUCT IMMERSED BY ITS FIRST EIGENFUNCTIONS

3.1. On the first eigenvalue of a minimal product. Due to the famous Takahashi theorem, an isometric submanifold $f : M^n \rightarrow S^{n+p}$ is minimal if and only if

$$\Delta^f f = -n f.$$

Here Δ^f denote the Laplacian operator of f with respect to the induced metric. As a consequence, the coordinate functions of an isometric minimal submanifold are eigenfunctions of the Laplacian w.r.t. the eigenvalue n . In this sense, the geometry of minimal submanifolds are closely related with the spectrum of the Laplacian of minimal submanifolds. Here we refer to [1, 4] for standard references of the spectrum theory of Riemannian manifolds. We denote by

$$\text{Spec}_f = \left\{ 0 < \lambda_1^f \leq \lambda_2^f \leq \dots \rightarrow +\infty \right\}$$

the spectrum of the Laplacian of f , with

$$\Delta^f \phi_\alpha^f + \lambda_\alpha^f \phi_\alpha^f = 0$$

for some non-zero function ϕ_α^f . The function ϕ_α^f is called an eigenfunction w.r.t λ_α^f . We denote by

$$E_{\lambda_\alpha^f}^f := \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{\phi_\alpha^f | \Delta^f \phi_\alpha^f + \lambda_\alpha^f \phi_\alpha^f = 0\}$$

to be the linear space spanned by the eigenfunctions w.r.t λ_α^f . Note that 0 is always an eigenvalue of f with $E_0^f = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{\phi \equiv 1 \text{ on } M\}$.

An n -dimensional minimal submanifold is called immersed by its first eigenfunctions if the first eigenvalue of the Laplacian of it is equal to n . Minimal submanifolds immersed by the first eigenfunctions are very important due to the fact that they play important roles in many geometric problems (See for instance [18], [9], [10], [20], [26]).

We have the following

Theorem 3.1. *f is immersed by its first eigenfunctions if and only if both f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ are immersed by their first eigenfunctions. That is, $\lambda_1^f = n$ if and only if both $\lambda_1^{f_1} = n_1$ and $\lambda_1^{\hat{f}_1} = \hat{n}_1$.*

Theorem 3.1 is a simple application of the following

Proposition 3.2. (Page 144, Proposition A.II.3 of [1]) *Let $(N, g) = (N_1 \times N_2, g_1 \times g_2)$ be a Riemannian manifold by Riemannian product of (N_1, g_1) and (N_2, g_2) . Let Spec_N , Spec_{N_1} and Spec_{N_2} denote the spectrum of Δ^N , Δ^{N_1} and Δ^{N_2} respectively. Then $\Delta^N = \Delta^{N_1} + \Delta^{N_2}$. Moreover, we have*

$$\text{Spec}_N = \{ \lambda^N | \lambda^N = \lambda^{N_1} + \lambda^{N_2} \text{ with } \lambda^{N_1} \in \text{Spec}_{N_1} \text{ and } \lambda^{N_2} \in \text{Spec}_{N_2} \},$$

and

$$E_{\lambda^N}^N = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}} \left\{ (\phi^{N_1} \circ \pi_1) \cdot (\phi^{N_2} \circ \pi_2) | \phi^{N_1} \in E_{\lambda^{N_1}}^{N_1} \text{ and } \phi^{N_2} \in E_{\lambda^{N_2}}^{N_2} \right\}.$$

Here $\pi_i : N = N_1 \times N_2 \rightarrow N_i$, $i = 1, 2$, denotes the natural projection.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. For a smooth function φ on f , the Laplacian Δ_f of φ is given by

$$(3.1) \quad \Delta^f(\varphi) = \frac{n}{n_1} \Delta^{f_1} \varphi + \frac{n}{\hat{n}_1} \Delta^{\hat{f}_1} \varphi.$$

By Proposition 3.2, taking into account the scaling in (3.1), we see that

$$(3.2) \quad \lambda_1^f = \min \left\{ \frac{n}{n_1} \lambda_1^{f_1}, \frac{n}{\hat{n}_1} \lambda_1^{\hat{f}_1} \right\}.$$

If $\lambda_1^{f_1} = n_1$ and $\lambda_1^{\hat{f}_1} = \hat{n}_1$, we obtain immediately that $\lambda_1^f = n$. Conversely, if $\lambda_1^f = n$, then both $\frac{n}{n_1} \lambda_1^{f_1} \geq n$ and $\frac{n}{\hat{n}_1} \lambda_1^{\hat{f}_1} \geq n$. Since $\lambda_1^{f_1} \leq n_1$ and $\lambda_1^{\hat{f}_1} \leq \hat{n}_1$, we obtain $\lambda_1^{f_1} = n_1$ and $\lambda_1^{\hat{f}_1} = \hat{n}_1$. $\square$

This yields immediately a simple proof of the following well-known fact.

Corollary 3.3. *For all $n_j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, the Clifford minimal submanifold*

$$(3.3) \quad f := \left(\sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n}} f_1, \dots, \sqrt{\frac{n_k}{n}} f_k \right) : M^n = S^{n_1} \times \dots \times S^{n_k} \rightarrow S^{n+k-1}, \quad n = \sum_{j=1}^k n_j,$$

is a minimal submanifold immersed by its first eigenfunctions and with flat normal bundle. Here $f_j : S^{n_j} \rightarrow S^{n_j}$ denotes the standard n_j -sphere for $j = 1, \dots, k$.

Example 3.4. Theorem 3.1 allows us to construct many new examples of minimal submanifolds immersed by their first eigenfunctions, with different kinds of topology. Let $f_1 : S^{n_1} \rightarrow S^{n_1} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_1+1}$ denotes the standard n_1 -sphere.

- (1) Recall that the minimal surface $\tilde{\tau}_{3,1}$, the bipolar surface of Lawson's $\tau_{3,1}$, is a minimal Klein bottle in S^4 immersed by its first eigenfunctions [15, 9]. Set $\hat{f}_1 = \tilde{\tau}_{3,1}$. We obtain that $f = (c_1 f_1, \hat{c}_1 \hat{f}_1) : S^{n_1} \times \mathbb{K} \rightarrow S^{n_1+5}$ is an $n_1 + 2$ dimensional non-orientable minimal submanifold in S^{n_1+5} immersed by its first eigenfunctions.

- (2) In [7], it is proved that the Lawson minimal surface $\xi_{m,k}$ [15] is immersed in S^3 by its first eigenfunctions. Set $\hat{f}_1 = \xi_{m,k}$. We obtain that $f = (c_1 f_1, \hat{c}_1 \hat{f}_1) : S^{n_1} \times \hat{M}_1 \rightarrow S^{n_1+4}$ is an $n_1 + 2$ dimensional minimal submanifold immersed by its first eigenfunctions and with flat normal bundle. Here $\hat{M}_1$ is the Riemann surface $\xi_{m,k}$ of genus mk .
- (3) It is proved in [26] that all minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces are immersed by their first eigenfunctions. Let $\hat{f}_1 : \hat{M}_1 \rightarrow S^{\hat{n}_1+1}$ be a $\hat{n}_1$ -dimensional minimal isoparametric hypersurface. Then $f = (c_1 f_1, \hat{c}_1 \hat{f}_1) : S^{n_1} \times \hat{M}_1 \rightarrow S^{n_1+\hat{n}_1+2}$ is an $(n_1 + \hat{n}_1)$ dimensional minimal submanifold immersed by its first eigenfunctions and with flat normal bundle.

3.2. On a problem of Tang and Yan. In [26], Tang and Yan discussed briefly the influence of the co-dimension on the submanifold version of Yau's conjecture. They asked the following problem (See page 526 of [26]):

Problem 3.5. *of [26]: Let M^d be an oriented, embedded, closed minimal submanifold in the unit sphere S^{n+1} with $d \geq \frac{2}{3}n + 1$. Is it true that $\lambda_1(M^d) = d$?*

For the discussion of above problem, we need the following result on the first eigenvalue of focal submanifold of OT-FKM type. We refer to [26] and reference therein for the definition of focal submanifold of OT-FKM type and more details.

Proposition 3.6. *(Proposition 1.1 of [26]) Let $M_2 \subset S^{2k+3}$ be the focal submanifold of OT-FKM type defined before with $(m_1, m_2) = (1, k)$. The following equality is valid:*

$$\lambda_1(M_2) = \min\{4, 2 + k\}.$$

Recall that M_2 has dimension $\dim M_2 = k + 2$ and co-dimension $k + 1$.

The following examples give some partial answers to the above problem.

Example 3.7.

- (1) Let f_1 be a focal submanifold of OT-FKM type in Proposition 1.1 of [26] (Proposition 3.6) and let $\hat{f}_1 : S^m \rightarrow S^m$ be the totally geodesic map. Then by Proposition 3.6 and Theorem 3.1, the minimal product

$$f = \left(\sqrt{\frac{k+2}{m+k+2}} f_1, \sqrt{\frac{m}{m+k+2}} \hat{f}_1 \right) : M_2 \times S^m \rightarrow S^{m+2k+4}$$

is an embedded minimal submanifold *not* immersed by its first eigenfunctions of dimension $m + k + 2$ and codimension $k + 2$ when $k \geq 3$. In particular, when k is fixed, the ratio $\frac{m+k+2}{m+2k+4} \rightarrow 1$ when $m \rightarrow +\infty$. Note that in this case the lowest co-dimension is 5 since k is chosen to be 3.

- (2) Set $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $k \geq 2$. Let $T^2 = \mathbb{R}^2/\Lambda = \mathbb{C}/\Lambda$ with $\Lambda = \{2\pi\mathbb{Z} \oplus (1 + i\sqrt{4k^2 - 1})\pi\mathbb{Z}\}$ and $z = u + iv$. Then $f_1 : T^2 \rightarrow S^5 \subset \mathbb{C}^3$,

$$(3.4) \quad f_1(u, v) = \left(\sqrt{\frac{2k^2 - 1}{4k^2 - 1}} e^{i\frac{2kv}{\sqrt{4k^2 - 1}}}, \sqrt{\frac{k^2}{4k^2 - 1}} e^{i\left(u - \frac{v}{\sqrt{4k^2 - 1}}\right)}, \sqrt{\frac{k^2}{4k^2 - 1}} e^{i\left(u + \frac{v}{\sqrt{4k^2 - 1}}\right)} \right),$$

is an embedded flat minimal torus in S^5 (see for example [3, 13] for the geometry of flat minimal tori in S^n), not immersed by its first eigenfunctions. In fact, for any $1 \leq l < k$, $\frac{2l^2}{k^2}$ is an eigenvalue of f_1 with two linearly independent eigenfunctions $\cos \frac{2lv}{\sqrt{4k^2 - 1}}$ and

$\sin \frac{2lv}{\sqrt{4k^2-1}}$. Let $\hat{f}_1 : S^m \rightarrow S^m$ be the totally geodesic map as above. Then by Theorem 3.1, the minimal product

$$f = \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{m+2}} f_1, \sqrt{\frac{m}{m+2}} \hat{f}_1 \right) : T^2 \times S^m \rightarrow S^{m+6}$$

is an embedded minimal submanifold of dimension $m+2$ and co-dimension 4, not immersed by its first eigenfunctions.

In view of above examples, one may ask the revised version of Tang-Yan's problem [26].

Problem 3.8.

- (1) Let M^d be an oriented, embedded closed minimal submanifold in the unit sphere S^{d+2} . Is it true that $\lambda_1(M^d) = d$?
- (2) Let M^d be an oriented, embedded closed minimal submanifold in the unit sphere S^{d+3} with $d \geq 7$. Is it true that $\lambda_1(M^d) = d$? What if $3 \leq d < 7$?

4. MORSE INDEX & NULLITY OF MINIMAL PRODUCT

In this section, we will obtain a lower bound estimate of f in terms of the index of f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ and some spectral data of them. We will assume that the manifolds discussed in this section are closed and oriented.

4.1. First and second variation of volume, index and nullity. Suppose f_t is a variation of $f : M^n \rightarrow S^{n+p}$ with $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(f_t)|_{t=0} = V$ being a section of the normal bundle of f , and let $A(t)$ denote the volume of f_t . If f is a minimal submanifold $f : M^n \rightarrow S^{n+p}$, it is well known [25] that $A'(0) = 0$ and

$$(4.1) \quad Q(V, V) = A''(0) = - \int_M \langle \Delta^{\perp, f} V + nV + \tilde{A}^f(V), V \rangle = - \int_M \langle \mathcal{L}^f(V), V \rangle dA,$$

where we denote by $\Delta^{\perp, f}$ the Laplace operator of the normal bundle $T^\perp M$, and by

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{L}^f := \Delta^{\perp, f} + n + \tilde{A}^f$$

the *Jacobi operator*, acting on sections of the normal bundle. Recall that $\tilde{A}^f : \Gamma(T^\perp M) \rightarrow \Gamma(T^\perp M)$ is defined as follow (here A^f is the shape operator of f):

$$\langle \tilde{A}^f(V), W \rangle = \langle A_V^f, A_W^f \rangle$$

for all sections V, W of the normal bundle. It is well-known [25] that the Jacobi operator $\mathcal{L}^f$ is a strongly elliptic, self-adjoint operator acting on sections of $T^\perp M$, with a discrete spectrum of real eigenvalues bounded from below, and of having finite-dimensional eigenspaces w.r.t. every eigenvalue. Similar to the spectrum of the Laplacian, we will denote the spectrum of $\mathcal{L}^f$ by

$$Spec \mathcal{L}^f := \left\{ \mu_1^f \leq \mu_2^f \leq \cdots \rightarrow +\infty \right\},$$

with μ_α^f satisfying

$$\mathcal{L}^f(V_\alpha^f) + \mu_\alpha^f V_\alpha^f = 0 \text{ for some } V_\alpha^f \in \Gamma(T^\perp M) \setminus \{0\}, \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

We denote by

$$\mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^f} := Span_{\mathbb{R}} \left\{ V_\alpha^f | \mathcal{L}^f(V_\alpha^f) + \mu_\alpha^f V_\alpha^f = 0 \right\}$$

the eigenspace w.r.t. μ_α^f .

Definition 4.1.

- (1) The index $Ind(f)$ of the minimal immersion f is defined to be the (Morse) index of the quadratic form Q (4.1) associated with the second-variation of f : it is the maximal dimension of a subspace of normal sections on which Q is negative definite, i.e.,

$$(4.3) \quad Ind(f) = \sum_{\mu_\alpha^f < 0} \dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^f}.$$

- (2) The nullity $Null(f)$ of f is defined to be the dimension of the kernel (0-eigenspace) of $\mathcal{L}^f$, i.e.

$$(4.4) \quad Null(f) := \dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^f} |_{\mu_\alpha^f = 0}.$$

Eigensections of the 0-eigenspaces are called the Jacobi fields of f .

Note that Killing fields of f are Jacobi fields, which leads to a lower bound estimate of the nullity of f (See [25] for more details). Moreover, f is called *non-degenerate* if all Jacobi fields of f are Killing fields.

4.2. Estimates of Index and Nullity for minimal products.**4.2.1. The main results.**

Theorem 4.2. Assume that f is a minimal product of two oriented, closed minimal submanifolds f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$, with both f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ being full and not totally geodesic. Then we have

$$(4.5) \quad Ind(f) \geq Ind(f_1) + Ind(\hat{f}_1) + n + p + 2,$$

and

$$(4.6) \quad Null(f) \geq Null(f_1) + Null(\hat{f}_1) + 3(n_1 + p_1 + 1)(\hat{n}_1 + \hat{p}_1 + 1).$$

It comes from the following computations of index and nullity of f .

Theorem 4.3. Assume that f is a minimal product of two oriented, closed minimal submanifolds f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$.

- (1) Let $Ind(f)$, $Ind(f_1)$ and $Ind(\hat{f}_1)$ denote the Morse index of f , f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ respectively. Then

$$(4.7) \quad Ind(f) = Ind(f_1) + Ind(\hat{f}_1) + 1 + \mathfrak{I}_0 + \mathfrak{I}_1 + \hat{\mathfrak{I}}_1,$$

where

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathfrak{I}_0 := & \# \left\{ (\alpha, \beta) \left| \frac{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1}}{n_1} + \frac{\lambda_\beta^{\hat{f}_1}}{\hat{n}_1} < 2, \alpha \geq 1, \beta \geq 1 \right. \right\} \\ & + \# \left\{ \alpha \left| \frac{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1}}{n_1} < 2, \alpha \geq 1 \right. \right\} + \# \left\{ \beta \left| \frac{\lambda_\beta^{\hat{f}_1}}{\hat{n}_1} < 2, \beta \geq 1 \right. \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(4.9) \quad \mathfrak{I}_1 = \# \left\{ (\gamma, \beta) \left| \frac{\mu_\gamma^{f_1}}{n_1} + \frac{\lambda_\beta^{\hat{f}_1}}{\hat{n}_1} < 0, \beta \geq 1 \right. \right\}, \quad \hat{\mathfrak{I}}_1 = \# \left\{ (\gamma, \alpha) \left| \frac{\mu_\gamma^{\hat{f}_1}}{\hat{n}_1} + \frac{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1}}{n_1} < 0, \alpha \geq 1 \right. \right\},$$

with

$$(4.10) \quad \mu_\gamma^{f_1} \in \text{Spec}^{\mathcal{L}^{f_1}}, \quad \mu_\gamma^{\hat{f}_1} \in \text{Spec}^{\mathcal{L}^{\hat{f}_1}}, \quad \lambda_\alpha^{f_1} \in \text{Spec}_{f_1} \setminus \{0\}, \quad \lambda_\beta^{\hat{f}_1} \in \text{Spec}_{\hat{f}_1} \setminus \{0\}.$$

In particular

$$(4.11) \quad \mu_1^f = \min \left\{ -2n, \frac{n}{n_1} \mu_1^{f_1}, \frac{n}{\hat{n}_1} \mu_1^{\hat{f}_1} \right\} \leq -2n.$$

(2) Let $\text{Null}(f)$, $\text{Null}(f_1)$ and $\text{Null}(\hat{f}_1)$ denote the nullity of f , f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ respectively. Then

$$(4.12) \quad \text{Null}(f) = \text{Null}(f_1) + \text{Null}(\hat{f}_1) + \mathfrak{N}_0 + \mathfrak{N}_1 + \hat{\mathfrak{N}}_1,$$

where

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathfrak{N}_0 := & \# \left\{ (\alpha, \beta) \left| \frac{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1}}{n_1} + \frac{\lambda_\beta^{\hat{f}_1}}{\hat{n}_1} = 2, \alpha \geq 1, \beta \geq 1 \right. \right\} \\ & + \# \left\{ \alpha \left| \frac{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1}}{n_1} = 2, \alpha \geq 1 \right. \right\} + \# \left\{ \beta \left| \frac{\lambda_\beta^{\hat{f}_1}}{\hat{n}_1} = 2, \beta \geq 1 \right. \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(4.14) \quad \mathfrak{N}_1 = \# \left\{ (\gamma, \beta) \left| \frac{\mu_\gamma^{f_1}}{n_1} + \frac{\lambda_\beta^{\hat{f}_1}}{\hat{n}_1} = 0, \beta \geq 1 \right. \right\}, \quad \hat{\mathfrak{N}}_1 = \# \left\{ (\gamma, \alpha) \left| \frac{\mu_\gamma^{\hat{f}_1}}{\hat{n}_1} + \frac{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1}}{n_1} = 0, \alpha \geq 1 \right. \right\},$$

with $\{\lambda_\alpha^*, \mu_\alpha^*\}$ satisfying the same conditions as in (4.10).

To prove Theorem 4.3, we need some technical lemmas.

4.2.2. *Technical lemmas.* For later computations it is natural to decompose $T^\perp M$ as

$$(4.15) \quad T^\perp M = T^{\perp,0} M \oplus T^{\perp,1} M \oplus T^{\perp,2} M$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} T^{\perp,0} M &= \Pi_{p \in M} T_p^{\perp,0} M = \Pi_{p \in M} \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}} \{ \eta_p \}, \\ T^{\perp,1} M &= \Pi_{p \in M} T_p^{\perp,1} M = \Pi_{p \in M} \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}} \{ (\sigma_i(p_1), 0) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n_1 \}, \\ T^{\perp,2} M &= \Pi_{p \in M} T_p^{\perp,2} M = \Pi_{p \in M} \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}} \left\{ \left(0, \tau_{\hat{j}}(\hat{p}_1) \right) \mid 1 \leq \hat{j} \leq \hat{n}_1 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for any $p = (p_1, \hat{p}_1) \in M = M_1 \times M_2$. The first lemma is

Lemma 4.4. Let $\mathcal{L}^f$, $\mathcal{L}^{f_1}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{f}_1}$ be the Jacobi operators of f , f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ respectively.

(1) The decomposition (4.15) is $\mathcal{L}^f$ -invariant. That is, for any $V \in \Gamma(T^{\perp,i} M)$, $\mathcal{L}^f(V) \in \Gamma(T^{\perp,i} M)$, for $i = 0, 1, 2$.

(2) Let $V \in \Gamma(T^{\perp,0} M)$ with $V = v_0 \eta$. Then we have

$$(4.16) \quad \mathcal{L}^f(v_0 \eta) = \left(\Delta^f(v_0) + 2nv_0 \right) \eta.$$

(3) Let $V \in \Gamma(T^{\perp,1} M)$ such that $V = \sum_i v_i (\sigma_i, 0)$ under the local basis $\{(\sigma_i, 0)\}$. Then we have

$$(4.17) \quad \mathcal{L}^f(V) = \frac{1}{c_1^2} \left(\mathcal{L}^{f_1} \left(\sum_i v_i \sigma_i \right), 0 \right) + \frac{1}{\hat{c}_1^2} \left(\sum_i \left(\Delta^{\hat{f}_1} v_i \right) \sigma_i, 0 \right).$$

(4) Let $V \in \Gamma(T^{\perp,2}M)$ such that $V = \left(0, \sum_{\hat{j}} \hat{v}_{\hat{j}} \tau_{\hat{j}}\right)$ under the local basis $\{(0, \tau_{\hat{j}})\}$. Then we have

$$(4.18) \quad \mathcal{L}^f(V) = \frac{1}{\hat{c}_1^2} \left(0, \mathcal{L}^{\hat{f}_1} \left(\sum_{\hat{j}} \hat{v}_{\hat{j}} \tau_{\hat{j}}\right)\right) + \frac{1}{c_1^2} \left(0, \sum_{\hat{j}} \left(\Delta^{\hat{f}_1} \hat{v}_{\hat{j}}\right) \tau_{\hat{j}}\right).$$

Proof. (1) comes directly from the definitions of $T^{\perp,i}M$ and the fact that η being parallel.

(2) By (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3), together with the fact that $\text{tr} A_{(\sigma_i,0)}^f = \text{tr} A_{(0,\tau_j)}^f = 0$ for all i, j , we obtain

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^f(\eta) = \left(n_1 \cdot \frac{\hat{c}_1^2}{c_1^2} + \hat{n}_1 \cdot \frac{c_1^2}{\hat{c}_1^2}\right) \eta = n\eta.$$

Since η is parallel, we have

$$\mathcal{L}^f(v_0\eta) = \left(\Delta^f(v_0) + nv_0\right) \eta + v_0 \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^f(\eta) = \left(\Delta^f(v_0) + 2nv_0\right) \eta.$$

(3) and (4): Consider $\mathcal{L}^f \left(\sum_i v_i \sigma_i, \sum_{\hat{j}} \hat{v}_{\hat{j}} \tau_{\hat{j}}\right)$. First, by (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3) we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^f \left(\sum_i v_i \sigma_i, \sum_{\hat{j}} \hat{v}_{\hat{j}} \tau_{\hat{j}}\right) = \frac{1}{c_1^2} \left(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^{\hat{f}_1} \left(\sum_i v_i \sigma_i\right), 0\right) + \frac{1}{\hat{c}_1^2} \left(0, \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^{\hat{f}_1} \left(\sum_{\hat{j}} \hat{v}_{\hat{j}} \tau_{\hat{j}}\right)\right).$$

Second, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{\perp,f} \left(\sum_i v_i \sigma_i, \sum_{\hat{j}} \hat{v}_{\hat{j}} \tau_{\hat{j}}\right) &= \Delta^{\perp,f} \left(\sum_i v_i \sigma_i, 0\right) + \Delta^{\perp,f} \left(0, \sum_{\hat{j}} \hat{v}_{\hat{j}} \tau_{\hat{j}}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{c_1^2} \left(\Delta^{\perp,\hat{f}_1} \left(\sum_i v_i \sigma_i\right), 0\right) + \frac{1}{c_1^2} \left(0, \sum_{\hat{j}} \left(\Delta^{\hat{f}_1} \hat{v}_{\hat{j}}\right) \tau_{\hat{j}}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\hat{c}_1^2} \left(\sum_i \left(\Delta^{\hat{f}_1} v_i\right) \sigma_i, 0\right) + \frac{1}{\hat{c}_1^2} \left(0, \Delta^{\perp,\hat{f}_1} \left(\sum_{\hat{j}} \hat{v}_{\hat{j}} \tau_{\hat{j}}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Summing up the above equations finish the proof of (4.17) and (4.18). $\square$

Let π_1 and $\hat{\pi}_1$ denote the projections of M into M_1 and $\hat{M}_1$ respectively. Then for any $\phi \in C^\infty(M_1)$ and $\hat{\phi} \in C^\infty(\hat{M}_1)$, $\phi \circ \pi_1 \in C^\infty(M)$ and $\hat{\phi} \circ \hat{\pi}_1 \in C^\infty(M)$. Similarly, we identify $V^{f_1} \in \Gamma(T^\perp M_1)$ as the projections defining on M such that

$$V^{f_1}(p_1, \hat{p}_1) := (V^{f_1}(p_1), 0) \text{ for all } (p_1, \hat{p}_1) \in M.$$

Similarly for $V^{\hat{f}_1} \in \Gamma(T^\perp \hat{M}_1)$ we define

$$V^{\hat{f}_1}(p_1, \hat{p}_1) := (0, V^{\hat{f}_1}(\hat{p}_1)) \text{ for all } (p_1, \hat{p}_1) \in M.$$

The second lemma is then stated as follow.

Lemma 4.5. *The eigenspace $\mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha}^f$ of μ_α^f is given by*

$$(4.19) \quad \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha}^f = \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha,0}^f \oplus \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha,1}^f \oplus \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha,2}^f$$

with

$$(4.20) \quad \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha^f, 0} := \left\{ \sum_{\beta, \hat{\beta}} a_{\beta, \hat{\beta}} \left(v_\beta^{f_1} \circ \pi_1 \right) \left(v_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{f}_1} \circ \hat{\pi}_1 \right) \eta \left| \mu_\alpha^f = n \left(\frac{\lambda_\beta^{f_1}}{n_1} + \frac{\lambda_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{f}_1}}{\hat{n}_1} - 2 \right), a_{\beta, \hat{\beta}} \in \mathbb{R} \right. \right\},$$

$$(4.21) \quad \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha^f, 1} := \left\{ \sum_{\gamma, \hat{\beta}} a_{\gamma, \hat{\beta}} \left(v_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{f}_1} \circ \hat{\pi}_1 \right) \left(V_\gamma^{f_1}, 0 \right) \left| \mu_\alpha^f = n \left(\frac{\mu_\gamma^{f_1}}{n_1} + \frac{\lambda_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{f}_1}}{\hat{n}_1} \right), a_{\gamma, \hat{\beta}} \in \mathbb{R} \right. \right\},$$

$$(4.22) \quad \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha^f, 2} := \left\{ \sum_{\beta, \hat{\gamma}} a_{\beta, \hat{\gamma}} \left(v_\beta^{f_1} \circ \pi_1 \right) \left(0, V_{\hat{\gamma}}^{\hat{f}_1} \right) \left| \mu_\alpha^f = n \left(\frac{\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}^{\hat{f}_1}}{\hat{n}_1} + \frac{\lambda_\beta^{f_1}}{n_1} \right), a_{\beta, \hat{\gamma}} \in \mathbb{R} \right. \right\},$$

where

$$v_\beta^{f_1} \in E_{\lambda_\beta^{f_1}}^{f_1}, \quad v_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{f}_1} \in E_{\lambda_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{f}_1}}^{\hat{f}_1}, \quad V_\gamma^{f_1} \in \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\gamma^{f_1}} \quad \text{and} \quad V_{\hat{\gamma}}^{\hat{f}_1} \in \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}^{\hat{f}_1}}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.4, we can decompose the eigenspace $\mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^f}$ according to the decomposition of the normal bundle $T^\perp M = T^{\perp, 0} M \oplus T^{\perp, 1} M \oplus T^{\perp, 2} M$:

$$\mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^f} = \left(\mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^f} \cap \Gamma(T^{\perp, 0} M) \right) \oplus \left(\mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^f} \cap \Gamma(T^{\perp, 1} M) \right) \oplus \left(\mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^f} \cap \Gamma(T^{\perp, 2} M) \right).$$

It therefore suffices to check that

$$\mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha^f, l} = \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^f} \cap \Gamma(T^{\perp, l} M), \quad l = 0, 1, 2.$$

It is direct to show that $\mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha^f, l} \subseteq \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^f} \cap \Gamma(T^{\perp, l} M)$, $l = 0, 1, 2$, from the proof of Lemma 4.4.

To show that $\mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^f} \cap \Gamma(T^{\perp, l} M) \subseteq \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha^f, l}$ for $l = 0, 1, 2$, one needs only to check that the sections defining $\mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha^f, l}$ also form a basis of $\mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^f} \cap \Gamma(T^{\perp, l} M)$ for $l = 0, 1, 2$.

Let $V \in \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^f} \cap \Gamma(T^{\perp, 0} M)$. Then $V = v_0 \eta$ for some $v_0 \in C^\infty(M)$. By (4.16), we have $v_0 \in E_{\lambda_\alpha^f}^f$ with $\lambda_\alpha^f = \mu_\alpha^f + 2n$. By Proposition 3.2, $V = v_0 \eta \in \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha^f, 0}$. So $\mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^f} \cap \Gamma(T^{\perp, 0} M) \subseteq \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha^f, 0}$ holds.

Let $V \in \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^f} \cap \Gamma(T^{\perp, 1} M)$. By Chapter III, Theorem 5.8 of [16], $L^2(T^\perp M_1)$ has a L^2 normalized basis $\{\mathcal{V}_\gamma^{f_1}\}$ via eigensections of $\mathcal{L}^{f_1}$, that is, $\mathcal{V}_\gamma^{f_1} \in \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\gamma^{f_1}}$ and $\|\mathcal{V}_\gamma^{f_1}\|_{L^2} = 1$ for all γ . So

$$V = \sum_{\gamma} (v_\gamma \circ \hat{\pi}) \left(\mathcal{V}_\gamma^{f_1}, 0 \right), \quad \text{with } v_\gamma = \int_{M_1} \langle V, (\mathcal{V}_\gamma^{f_1}, 0) \rangle dM_1.$$

Now $v_\gamma \in C^\infty(\hat{M}_1)$ and hence we have furthermore

$$v_\gamma = \sum_{\hat{\beta}} \tilde{a}_{\gamma \hat{\beta}} \hat{v}_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{f}_1}, \quad \text{with } \tilde{a}_{\gamma \hat{\beta}} \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \hat{v}_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{f}_1} \in E_{\lambda_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{f}_1}}^{\hat{f}_1}.$$

Similar to computations of $\mathcal{L}^f$ in Lemma 4.4, we have

$$\mathcal{L}^f(V) + \mu_\alpha^f V = \sum_{\gamma, \hat{\beta}} \tilde{a}_{\gamma \hat{\beta}} \left(\mu_\alpha^f - \frac{n}{n_1} \mu_\gamma^{f_1} - \frac{n}{\hat{n}_1} \lambda_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{f}_1} \right) \left(\hat{v}_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{f}_1} \circ \hat{\pi} \right) \left(\mathcal{V}_\gamma^{f_1}, 0 \right) = 0.$$

So $\tilde{a}_{\gamma \hat{\beta}} = 0$ if $\mu_\alpha^f \neq \frac{n}{n_1} \mu_\gamma^{f_1} + \frac{n}{\hat{n}_1} \lambda_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{f}_1}$. Hence $V \in \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha^f, 1}$ and $\mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^f} \cap \Gamma(T^{\perp, 1} M) \subseteq \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha^f, 1}$ holds.

¹We are thankful to the referee for pointing out Chapter III, Theorem 5.8 of [16] and for the helps on proofs of this lemma.

Similarly $\mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha}^f \cap \Gamma(T^{\perp,2}M) \subseteq \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha,2}^f$ holds. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.3.

(1) By Lemma 4.5, it suffices to compute $\sum_{\mu_\alpha^f < 0} (\dim \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha,0}^f + \dim \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha,1}^f + \dim \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha,2}^f)$. We have by (4.20), (4.21), (4.22), (4.8) and (4.9)

$$\sum_{\mu_\alpha^f < 0} \dim \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha,0}^f = \mathfrak{I}_0 + 1,$$

$$\sum_{\mu_\alpha^f < 0} \dim \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha,1}^f = \sum_{\mu_\alpha^{f_1} < 0} \dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^{f_1}}^{f_1} + \mathfrak{I}_1 = \text{Ind}(f_1) + \mathfrak{I}_1,$$

and

$$\sum_{\mu_\alpha^f < 0} \dim \mathfrak{V}_{\mu_\alpha,2}^f = \sum_{\mu_\alpha^{\hat{f}_1} < 0} \dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^{\hat{f}_1}}^{\hat{f}_1} + \hat{\mathfrak{I}}_1 = \text{Ind}(\hat{f}_1) + \hat{\mathfrak{I}}_1.$$

(2) follows by same computations in terms of (4.20), (4.21), (4.22), (4.8) and (4.9). $\square$

Before the proof of Theorem 4.2, we need one more lemma, which has been proved in [22] for minimal hypersurfaces.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\psi : M^n \rightarrow S^{n+p}$ be an n -dimensional closed minimal submanifold, which is not totally geodesic. Then*

$$(4.23) \quad \dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^\psi}^\psi|_{\mu_\alpha^\psi = -n} \geq n + p + 1,$$

and hence

$$(4.24) \quad \text{Ind}(\psi) \geq n + p + 1.$$

Since the index estimate of minimal submanifolds involves sections while the case of minimal hypersurfaces concerns functions, we will give a proof of Lemma 4.6 in Appendix A. It is basically taken verbatim from the proof of Lemma 3.1 of [22].

Proof of Theorem 4.2.

(1) Since both f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ are full, their coordinate functions are linear independent. So there exist some α and β such that

$$\dim E_{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1}}^{f_1}|_{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1} = n_1} \geq n_1 + p_1 + 1, \text{ and } \dim E_{\lambda_\beta^{\hat{f}_1}}^{\hat{f}_1}|_{\lambda_\beta^{\hat{f}_1} = \hat{n}_1} \geq \hat{n}_1 + \hat{p}_1 + 1.$$

So

$$\mathfrak{I}_0 \geq 0 + (n_1 + p_1 + 1) + (\hat{n}_1 + \hat{p}_1 + 1) = n + p + 1.$$

This finishes (4.5).

(2) By the same argument as above we have

$$\mathfrak{N}_0 \geq \dim E_{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1}}^{f_1}|_{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1} = n_1} \cdot \dim E_{\lambda_\beta^{\hat{f}_1}}^{\hat{f}_1}|_{\lambda_\beta^{\hat{f}_1} = \hat{n}_1} \geq (n_1 + p_1 + 1)(\hat{n}_1 + \hat{p}_1 + 1).$$

When f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ are full and not totally geodesic, by Lemma 4.6, one has

$$\dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\gamma^{f_1}}^{f_1}|_{\mu_\gamma^{f_1} = -n_1} \geq n_1 + p_1 + 1 \text{ and } \dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}^{\hat{f}_1}}^{\hat{f}_1}|_{\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}^{\hat{f}_1} = -\hat{n}_1} \geq \hat{n}_1 + \hat{p}_1 + 1.$$

As a consequence

$$\mathfrak{N}_1 \geq \dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}^{f_1} | \mu_{\hat{\gamma}}^{f_1} = -n_1} \cdot \dim E_{\lambda_{\hat{\beta}}^{f_1} | \lambda_{\hat{\beta}}^{f_1} = \hat{n}_1} \geq (n_1 + p_1 + 1)(\hat{n}_1 + \hat{p}_1 + 1),$$

and

$$\hat{\mathfrak{N}}_1 \geq \dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}^{f_1} | \mu_{\hat{\gamma}}^{f_1} = -\hat{n}_1} \cdot \dim E_{\lambda_{\hat{\alpha}}^{f_1} | \lambda_{\hat{\alpha}}^{f_1} = n_1} \geq (n_1 + p_1 + 1)(\hat{n}_1 + \hat{p}_1 + 1).$$

Summing up the above estimates yields (4.6). $\square$

4.2.3. Applications to some examples. Recall that by Theorem 5.1.1 of [25], the totally geodesic submanifold $\hat{f}_1 : \hat{S}^{\hat{n}_1} \rightarrow \hat{S}^{\hat{n}_1 + \hat{p}_1}$ is the unique minimal submanifold with $Ind(\hat{f}_1) = \hat{p}_1$ or $Null(\hat{f}_1) = (\hat{n}_1 + 1)\hat{p}_1$.

Applying Theorem 4.3, we can re-obtain the following known results (see for example [22] for the index of f).

Corollary 4.7. *Let f be the Clifford minimal hypersurface with $f_1 : S^{n_1} \rightarrow S^{n_1}$ and $\hat{f}_1 : \hat{S}^{\hat{n}_1} \rightarrow \hat{S}^{\hat{n}_1}$ being totally geodesic. Then*

$$Ind(f) = n + 3, \quad Null(f) = (n_1 + 1)(\hat{n}_1 + 1).$$

In particular, the Clifford minimal hypersurface f is non-degenerate.

Proof. Since $Ind(f_1) = Ind(\hat{f}_1) = 0$, by Theorem 4.3, we obtain that

$$Ind(f) = 1 + \mathfrak{I}_0 + \mathfrak{I}_1 + \hat{\mathfrak{I}}_1.$$

Recall that for the m -dimensional unit sphere (See e.g., page 160 of [1]) all distinct elements of $Spec_{S^m}$ are

$$(4.25) \quad \{0, k(k + m - 1) | k \in \mathbb{Z}^+\},$$

with $\dim E_{\lambda_1}^{S^m} |_{\lambda_1 = m} = m + 1$ and $\dim E_{\lambda_\alpha}^{S^m} |_{m < \lambda_\alpha \leq 2m} = 0$. So

$$\mathfrak{I}_0 = n_1 + 1 + \hat{n}_1 + 1 = n + 2, \quad \mathfrak{I}_1 = \hat{\mathfrak{I}}_1 = 0.$$

Summing up, we obtain that $Ind(f) = n + 3$.

Since $Null(f_1) = Null(\hat{f}_1) = 0$, by Theorem 4.3, we have

$$Null(f) = \mathfrak{N}_0 + \mathfrak{N}_1 + \hat{\mathfrak{N}}_1.$$

By (4.25) and the fact that $\mu_1^{f_1} = \mu_1^{\hat{f}_1} = 0$, we derive

$$\mathfrak{N}_0 = (n_1 + 1)(\hat{n}_1 + 1), \quad \mathfrak{N}_1 = Null(f_1) = 0 \text{ and } \hat{\mathfrak{N}}_1 = Null(\hat{f}_1) = 0.$$

This finishes the computations.

Finally it is direct to compute the dimension of the space of Killing fields of f :

$$\dim SO(n + 2) - \dim SO(n_1 + 1) - \dim SO(\hat{n}_1 + 1) = (n_1 + 1)(\hat{n}_1 + 1) = Null(f).$$

$\square$

Corollary 4.8. *Let f be the minimal product of a full minimal submanifold $f_1 : S^{n_1} \rightarrow S^{n_1 + p_1}$ and the totally geodesic sphere $\hat{f}_1 : \hat{S}^{\hat{n}_1} \rightarrow \hat{S}^{\hat{n}_1}$. Then*

(1) The index of f satisfies

$$(4.26) \quad \text{Ind}(f) \geq \text{Ind}(f_1) + n + p_1 + 3,$$

with equality holding if and only if f_1 is immersed by its first eigenfunctions and $\lambda_{n_1+p_1+2}^{f_1} \geq 2n_1$.

(2) The nullity of f satisfies

$$(4.27) \quad \text{Null}(f) \geq (n_1 + 1)(\hat{n}_1 + 1),$$

with equality holding if and only if f_1 is the totally geodesic sphere $f_1 : S^{n_1} \rightarrow S^{n_1}$.

Proof. By Theorem 4.3, we obtain that

$$\text{Ind}(f) = \text{Ind}(f_1) + 1 + \mathfrak{I}_0 + \mathfrak{I}_1 + \hat{\mathfrak{I}}_1.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathfrak{I}_1 = \text{Ind}(f_1), \quad \hat{\mathfrak{I}}_1 = 0.$$

And

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{I}_0 &= (\hat{n}_1 + 1) \cdot \sum_{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1} < n_1} \dim E_{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1}}^{f_1} + \sum_{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1} < 2n_1} \dim E_{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1}}^{f_1} + \hat{n}_1 + 1 \\ &\geq n_1 + p_1 + 1 + \hat{n}_1 + 1 \\ &= n + p_1 + 2. \end{aligned}$$

So $\text{Ind}(f) \geq \text{Ind}(f_1) + n + p_1 + 2$, with equality holding if and only if both $\sum_{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1} < n_1} \dim E_{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1}}^{f_1} = 0$ and $\sum_{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1} < 2n_1} \dim E_{\lambda_\alpha^{f_1}}^{f_1} = n_1 + p_1 + 1$. That is, f_1 is immersed by its first eigenfunctions and $\lambda_{n_1+p_1+2}^{f_1} \geq 2n_1$.

By Theorem 4.3, we obtain

$$\text{Null}(f) = \text{Null}(f_1) + \mathfrak{N}_0 + \mathfrak{N}_1 + \hat{\mathfrak{N}}_1.$$

By (4.25) and the fact that $\mu_1^{\hat{f}_1} = 0$, we get

$$\mathfrak{N}_0 \geq (n_1 + 1)(\hat{n}_1 + 1), \quad \mathfrak{N}_1 \geq \text{Null}(f_1) \geq 0 \text{ and } \hat{\mathfrak{N}}_1 = \text{Null}(\hat{f}_1) = 0.$$

Therefore (4.27) holds. And the equality holds if and only if $\text{Null}(f_1) = 0$, which means exactly that [25] f_1 is the totally geodesic sphere $f_1 : S^{n_1} \rightarrow S^{n_1}$. $\square$

4.3. Index & nullity of the Clifford minimal submanifolds. In this subsection we compute the index & nullity of the Clifford minimal submanifolds.

4.3.1. *Index.*

Proposition 4.9. *The Clifford minimal submanifold (3.3) $f = (\sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n}}f_1, \dots, \sqrt{\frac{n_k}{n}}f_k) : M^n = S^{n_1} \times \dots \times S^{n_k} \rightarrow S^{n+k-1}$ has*

$$(4.28) \quad \text{Ind}(f) = (k-1) \sum_{j=1}^k n_j + \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} (2l+1) = (k-1)(n+k+1).$$

To prove Proposition 4.9, we need the following Lemma which itself is of independent interest.

Lemma 4.10. *Assume that f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ are immersed by their first eigenfunctions as in Theorem 4.3. Assume furthermore that the spectrums of f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ satisfy the following*

- (1) $\mu_{\alpha_1}^{f_1} < \mu_{\alpha_1+1}^{f_1} = -n_1$. Here we set $\alpha_1 = 0$ if there exists no $\mu_{\alpha_1}^{f_1} < -n_1$;
- (2) $\mu_{\beta_1}^{\hat{f}_1} < \mu_{\beta_1+1}^{\hat{f}_1} = -\hat{n}_1$. Here we set $\beta_1 = 0$ if there exists no $\mu_{\beta_1}^{\hat{f}_1} < -\hat{n}_1$;
- (3) $\lambda_{\alpha}^{f_1} \geq 2n_1$ for all $\lambda_{\alpha}^{f_1} > n_1$;
- (4) $\lambda_{\alpha}^{\hat{f}_1} \geq 2\hat{n}_1$ for all $\lambda_{\alpha}^{\hat{f}_1} > \hat{n}_1$.

Then f satisfies

- (1) $\mu_{\alpha_1+\beta_1+1}^f < \mu_{\alpha_1+\beta_1+2}^f = -n$;
- (2) $\lambda_{\alpha}^f \geq 2n$ for all $\lambda_{\alpha}^f > n$.

Moreover, we have

$$(4.29) \quad \text{Ind}(f) = \text{Inf}(f_1) + \text{Ind}(\hat{f}_1) + 1 + (1 + \beta_1) \cdot \dim E_{\lambda_1^{f_1}}^{f_1} + (1 + \alpha_1) \cdot \dim E_{\lambda_1^{\hat{f}_1}}^{\hat{f}_1}.$$

Proof. By (4.20), (4.21) and (4.22), for $\mu_{\alpha}^f < -n$, the only possibilities are the following

$$\mu_{\alpha}^f = 0 + 0 - 2n, \quad \mu_{\alpha}^f = \frac{n}{n_1} \mu_{\gamma}^{f_1} + 0 < -n, \quad \text{or} \quad \mu_{\alpha}^f = \frac{n}{\hat{n}_1} \mu_{\gamma}^{\hat{f}_1} + 0 < -n.$$

By assumption (1) and (2), there are exactly $(1 + \alpha_1 + \beta_1)$ eigenvalues of $\text{Spec}^{\mathcal{L}}$ being less than $-n$. The argument $\mu_{\alpha_1+\beta_1+2}^f = -n$ comes from the fact that $-n \in \text{Spec}^{\mathcal{L}^f}$ when f has co-dimension at least 1 (See [25]).

The second argument comes from the fact that

$$\min \left\{ \lambda_{\alpha}^f | \lambda_{\alpha}^f > n \right\} = \min \left\{ 2n, \frac{n}{n_1} \lambda_{\alpha}^{f_1}, \frac{n}{\hat{n}_1} \lambda_{\beta}^{\hat{f}_1} \mid \lambda_{\alpha}^{f_1} > n_1, \lambda_{\beta}^{\hat{f}_1} > \hat{n}_1 \right\}.$$

With the above estimates, it is direct to compute

$$\mathfrak{I}_0 = \dim E_{\lambda_1^{f_1}}^{f_1} + \dim E_{\lambda_1^{\hat{f}_1}}^{\hat{f}_1}, \quad \mathfrak{I}_1 = \beta_1 \cdot \dim E_{\lambda_1^{f_1}}^{f_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathfrak{I}}_1 = \alpha_1 \cdot \dim E_{\lambda_1^{\hat{f}_1}}^{\hat{f}_1}.$$

Then (4.29) follows by substituting the above equations into (4.7). $\square$

Proof of Proposition 4.9. We prove it by induction. Consider

$$f^{(1)} = \left(\sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2}} f_1, \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1 + n_2}} f_2 \right).$$

One checks easily that f_1 and f_2 satisfy the assumptions in Lemma 4.10. So we have $\mu_1^{f^{(1)}} < \mu_2^{f^{(1)}} = -(n_1 + n_2) = -n^{(1)}$, i.e., $\alpha_1(f^{(1)}) = 1$. We also have $\lambda_{\alpha}^{f^{(1)}} \geq 2n^{(1)}$ for all $\lambda_{\alpha}^{f^{(1)}} > n^{(1)}$. So $f^{(1)}$ satisfies the assumptions (1) and (3) of Lemma 4.10. Moreover, (4.28) holds for $f^{(1)}$.

Now we assume that $f^{(l-1)} = \left(\sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n^{(l-1)}}} f_1, \dots, \sqrt{\frac{n_l}{n^{(l-1)}}} f_l \right)$, with $n^{(l-1)} = n_1 + \dots + n_l$, satisfies the assumptions (1) and (3) of Lemma 4.10 with $\alpha_1(f^{(l-1)}) = l - 1$ and index $\text{Ind}(f^{(l-1)}) = (l - 1)(l + 1 + \sum_{j=1}^l n_j)$. Then

$$f^{(l)} = \left(\sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n^{(l)}}} f_1, \dots, \sqrt{\frac{n_l}{n^{(l)}}} f_l, \sqrt{\frac{n_{l+1}}{n^{(l)}}} f_{l+1} \right), \quad n^{(l)} = n_1 + \dots + n_{l+1},$$

is the minimal product of $f^{(l-1)}$ and $f_{l+1} = S^{l+1}$. Since

$$\dim E_{\lambda_1^{f^{(l-1)}}}^{f^{(l-1)}} = l + \sum_{j=1}^l n_j \quad \text{and} \quad \dim E_{\lambda_1^{f_{l+1}}}^{f_{l+1}} = n_{l+1} + 1,$$

we obtain by Lemma 4.10 that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ind}(f^{(l)}) &= (l-1)(l+1 + \sum_{j=1}^l n_j) + 0 + 1 + (1+0)(l + \sum_{j=1}^l n_j) + (1+l-1)(n_{l+1} + 1) \\ &= l(l+2 + \sum_{j=1}^{l+1} n_j). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.10, we also have that $f^{(l)}$ satisfies the assumptions (1) and (3) in Lemma 4.10 with $\alpha_1(f^{(l)}) = l$. Then we finish the induction. $\square$

4.3.2. Nullity. Throughout Section 4.3.2, we denote by f_j the totally geodesic sphere $f_j : S^{n_j} \rightarrow S^{n_j}$ for any $j = 1, \dots, k$.

Proposition 4.11. *The Clifford minimal submanifold $f = (\sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n}}f_1, \dots, \sqrt{\frac{n_k}{n}}f_k) : M^n = S^{n_1} \times \dots \times S^{n_k} \rightarrow S^{n+k-1}$, $n = \sum_{j=1}^k n_j$, has*

$$(4.30) \quad \text{Null}(f) = (k-1) \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} (n_i + 1)(n_j + 1) \geq \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} (n_i + 1)(n_j + 1),$$

with equality holding if and only if $k = 2$. In particular, f is degenerate when $k \geq 3$, i.e., there exists Jacobi fields of f which are not Killing fields of f .

The proof is based on the following lemma.

Lemma 4.12. *Assume $f^{(l-1)} = (\sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n}}f_1, \dots, \sqrt{\frac{n_l}{n}}f_l)$, $n = \sum_{j=1}^l n_j$, has*

$$(1) \quad \mu_1^{f^{(l-1)}} = -2n, \text{ with } \dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_1^{f^{(l-1)}}} = l-1;$$

$$(2) \quad \mu_l^{f^{(l-1)}} = -n, \text{ with } \dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_l^{f^{(l-1)}}} = (l-1) \sum_{j=1}^l (n_j + 1);$$

$$(3) \quad \text{Min}\{\mu_\alpha^{f^{(l-1)}} > -n\} = 0, \text{ with}$$

$$\dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^{f^{(l-1)}}} \big|_{\mu_\alpha^{f^{(l-1)}} = 0} = (l-1) \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l} (n_i + 1)(n_j + 1);$$

$$(4) \quad \lambda_1^{f^{(l-1)}} = n, \text{ with}$$

$$\dim E_{\lambda_1}^{f^{(l-1)}} = \sum_{j=1}^l (n_j + 1);$$

$$(5) \quad \lambda_{1+\sum_{j=1}^l (n_j+1)}^{f^{(l-1)}} = 2n, \text{ with}$$

$$\dim E_{\lambda_{1+\sum_{j=1}^l (n_j+1)}}^{f^{(l-1)}} = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l} (n_i + 1)(n_j + 1).$$

Then $f^{(l)} = (\sqrt{\frac{n_1}{\tilde{n}}}f_1, \dots, \sqrt{\frac{n_l}{\tilde{n}}}f_l, \sqrt{\frac{n_{l+1}}{\tilde{n}}}f_{l+1})$ with $\tilde{n} = n + n_{l+1}$ satisfies

$$(1) \quad \mu_1^{f^{(l)}} = -2\tilde{n} \text{ with } \dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_1^{f^{(l)}}} = l;$$

$$(2) \quad \mu_{l+1}^{f^{(l)}} = -\tilde{n} \text{ with } \dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_{l+1}^{f^{(l)}}} = l \sum_{j=1}^{l+1} (n_j + 1);$$

(3) $\text{Min}\{\mu_\alpha^{f^{(l)}} > -\tilde{n}\} = 0$, with

$$\dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^{f^{(l)}}|_{\mu_\alpha^{f^{(l)}}=0}} = l \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l+1} (n_i + 1)(n_j + 1);$$

(4) $\lambda_1^{f^{(l)}} = \tilde{n}$, with

$$\dim E_{\lambda_1^{f^{(l)}}}^{f^{(l)}} = \sum_{j=1}^{l+1} (n_j + 1);$$

(5) $\lambda_{1+\sum_{j=1}^{l+1}(n_j+1)}^{f^{(l)}} = 2\tilde{n}$, with

$$\dim E_{\lambda_{1+\sum_{j=1}^{l+1}(n_j+1)}^{f^{(l)}}}^{f^{(l)}} = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l+1} (n_i + 1)(n_j + 1).$$

Proof. (1) follows from the proof of Lemma 4.10.

(2) For $\mu_\alpha^{f^{(l)}} = -\tilde{n}$, there are 4 kinds of possibilities by Lemma 4.5: $(\lambda_\beta^{f^{(l-1)}}, \lambda_\beta^{f_{l+1}}) = (n, 0)$, or $(\lambda_\beta^{f^{(l-1)}}, \lambda_{\hat{\beta}}^{f_{l+1}}) = (0, n_{l+1})$, or $(\mu_\beta^{f^{(l-1)}}, \lambda_\beta^{f_{l+1}}) = (-2n, n_{l+1})$, or $(\mu_\beta^{f^{(l-1)}}, \lambda_{\hat{\beta}}^{f_{l+1}}) = (-n, 0)$. By assumptions (1) to (5), we obtain

$$\dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_{l+1}^{f^{(l)}}}^{f^{(l)}} = \sum_{j=1}^l (n_j + 1) + n_{l+1} + 1 + (l-1)(n_{l+1} + 1) + (l-1) \sum_{j=1}^l (n_j + 1).$$

(3) Similarly by Lemma 4.5, the next eigenvalue of $\mu_\alpha^{f^{(l)}}$ is 0, with 4 kinds of possibilities (Note that $\mu_\beta^{f_{l+1}} > 0$ for all $\hat{\beta}$): $(\lambda_\beta^{f^{(l-1)}}, \lambda_\beta^{f_{l+1}}) = (n, n_{l+1})$, or $(\lambda_\beta^{f^{(l-1)}}, \lambda_{\hat{\beta}}^{f_{l+1}}) = (2n, 0)$, or $(\mu_\beta^{f^{(l-1)}}, \lambda_\beta^{f_{l+1}}) = (-n, n_{l+1})$, or $(\mu_\beta^{f^{(l-1)}}, \lambda_{\hat{\beta}}^{f_{l+1}}) = (0, 0)$. By assumptions (1) to (5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^{f^{(l)}}|_{\mu_\alpha^{f^{(l)}}=0}}^{f^{(l)}} &= \sum_{j=1}^l (n_j + 1)(n_{l+1} + 1) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l} (n_i + 1)(n_j + 1) \\ &\quad + (l-1) \sum_{j=1}^l (n_j + 1)(n_{l+1} + 1) + (l-1) \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l} (n_i + 1)(n_j + 1). \end{aligned}$$

(4) and (5) follow easily from (3.1). □

Proof of Proposition 4.11. First it is direct to verify that $f^{(1)}$ satisfies (1) to (5) of Lemma 4.12, by use of (4.20), (4.21), (4.22), (3.1), (3.2) and (4.25). Then applying Lemma 4.12, we finish the computation of the nullity of f by induction.

The last inequality of Proposition 4.11 is due to the fact that the dimension of the space of Killing fields of f is $\frac{(n+k)(n+k-1)}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k n_j (n_j + 1) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} (n_i + 1)(n_j + 1)$. □

5. ON THE AVERAGE OF S OF MINIMAL PRODUCTS

In this section we will discuss the estimate of S and its average. We refer to [23] for some discussions for the estimate of average of S of minimal hypersurfaces.

5.1. **An estimate of the average of S .** From (2.5), we have

Theorem 5.1.

- (1) Let $f = (c_1 f_1, \hat{c}_1 \hat{f}_1)$ be a minimal product of two oriented, closed minimal submanifolds. Then for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(5.1) \quad \int_M S^a (S - n) dM \geq 0,$$

with equality holding if and only if f is congruent to the Clifford hypersurface $C_{n_1, \hat{n}_1}$. In particular, when $a = 0$, we obtain

$$(5.2) \quad \overline{S} = n \left(1 + \frac{1}{n_1} \overline{S_1} + \frac{1}{\hat{n}_1} \overline{\hat{S}_1} \right) \geq n,$$

with equality holding if and only if f is congruent to the Clifford hypersurface $C_{n_1, \hat{n}_1}$. Here

$$\overline{S} = \frac{1}{Vol(f)} \int_M S dM, \quad \overline{S_1} = \frac{1}{Vol(f_1)} \int_{M_1} S_1 dM_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\hat{S}_1} = \frac{1}{Vol(\hat{f}_1)} \int_{\hat{M}_1} \hat{S}_1 d\hat{M}_1$$

denote the average of the the square of the length of the second fundamental forms of f , f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ respectively.

- (2) Let $f = (c_1 f_1, \dots, c_k f_k)$ be a minimal product of k oriented, closed minimal submanifolds with f_j being of dimension n_j and $n = n_1 + \dots + n_k$. Then for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(5.3) \quad \int_M S^a (S - (k-1)n) dM \geq 0,$$

with equality holding if and only if f is congruent to the Clifford minimal submanifold $C_{n_1, \dots, n_k}$ (3.3). In particular, when $a = 0$, we obtain

$$(5.4) \quad \overline{S} = n \left(k-1 + \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\overline{S_j}}{n_j} \right) \geq (k-1)n,$$

with equality holding if and only if f is congruent to the Clifford minimal submanifold $C_{n_1, \dots, n_k}$. Here

$$\overline{S} = \frac{1}{Vol(f)} \int_M S dM \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{S_j} = \frac{1}{Vol(f_j)} \int_{M_j} S_j dM_j, \quad 1 \leq j \leq k.$$

Proof. (1) By (2.5) we obtain that

$$S^a (S - n) = n^{a+1} \left(1 + \frac{S_1}{n_1} + \frac{\hat{S}_1}{\hat{n}_1} \right)^a \left(\frac{S_1}{n_1} + \frac{\hat{S}_1}{\hat{n}_1} \right) \geq 0.$$

Then (5.1) holds. Moreover, the equality holds if and only if $S_1 = \hat{S}_1 \equiv 0$. Then we conclude that f is congruent to the Clifford hypersurface $C_{n_1, \hat{n}_1}$. (5.2) follows directly when we set $a = 0$.

The proof of (2) is the same as (1) except using the following formula instead of (2.5)

$$(5.5) \quad S = n \left(k-1 + \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{S_j}{n_j} \right).$$

It is deduced directly from (2.5). □

Recall that the scalar curvature R of the minimal submanifold $f = (c_1 f_1, \hat{c}_1 \hat{f}_1)$ satisfies ([25, 21])

$$R = n(n-1) - S.$$

It turns out that the scalar curvatures R , R_1 and $\hat{R}_1$ of f , f_1 and $\hat{f}_1$ satisfy the following property:

$$(5.6) \quad \frac{R}{n} = \frac{R_1}{n_1} + \frac{\hat{R}_1}{\hat{n}_1}.$$

And the average property of S in (5.2) can also be written for average scalar curvature:

$$(5.7) \quad \frac{\bar{R}}{n} = \frac{\int_M R dM}{n \text{Vol}(f)} = \frac{\int_{M_1} R_1 dM_1}{n_1 \text{Vol}(f_1)} + \frac{\int_{\hat{M}_1} \hat{R}_1 d\hat{M}_1}{\hat{n}_1 \text{Vol}(\hat{f}_1)} = \frac{\bar{R}_1}{n_1} + \frac{\bar{\hat{R}}_1}{\hat{n}_1}.$$

5.2. On minimal product of minimal submanifolds with constant S . Concerning the value distribution of S when S is constant, we have the following

Theorem 5.2. *Let $f = (c_1 f_1, \hat{c}_1 \hat{f}_1)$ be a minimal product of closed minimal submanifolds as above. Then*

- (1) $S \equiv \text{const}$ if and only if both $S_1 \equiv \text{const}$ and $\hat{S}_1 \equiv \text{const}$.
- (2) If $S \equiv \text{const}$, then $S \geq n$, with equality holding if and only if f is congruent to the Clifford hypersurface $C_{n_1, \hat{n}_1}$.
- (3) If $S \equiv \text{const}$ and $n < S \leq \frac{5}{3}n$, then $S = \frac{5}{3}n$ and f is congruent to the minimal product of an $(n-2)$ -dimensional great sphere and the Veronese two-sphere.

Proof. (1) and (2) come directly from (2.5).

For (3), from (2.5) we obtain

$$0 < \frac{S_1}{n_1} + \frac{\hat{S}_1}{\hat{n}_1} \leq \frac{2}{3}.$$

Then we obtain $S_1 \leq \frac{2}{3}n_1$. By [17], we obtain that $S_1 \equiv 0$ or $S_1 \equiv \frac{2}{3}n_1$ and f_1 is congruent to the Veronese surface (with $n_1 = 2$). If $S_1 \equiv \frac{4}{3}$, then $\hat{S}_1 \equiv 0$ and $\hat{f}_1$ is congruent to some $\hat{n}_1$ -dimensional great sphere. If $S_1 \equiv 0$, we obtain that f_1 is congruent to some n_1 -dimensional great sphere, and that $0 < \hat{S}_1 \leq \frac{2}{3}\hat{n}_1$. Again by [17], $\hat{S}_1 \equiv \frac{4}{3}$ and $\hat{f}_1$ is congruent to the Veronese surface. This finishes (3). □

An immediate application of (5.5) yields the following examples of closed minimal submanifolds with constant S .

Example 5.3.

- (1) Let f_j be the n_j -dimensional totally geodesic spheres, $1 \leq j \leq k$ and let f_j be the Veronese surface in S^4 for $k+1 \leq j \leq k+r$. Then $f = (c_1 f_1, \dots, c_{k+r} f_{k+r})$ is an n -dimensional closed minimal submanifold in S^{n+p} with constant

$$(5.8) \quad S = n \left(\frac{5}{3}r + k - 1 \right).$$

Here $n = n_1 + \dots + n_k + 2r$, $p = 3r + k - 1$ and $c_j = \sqrt{\frac{n_j}{n}}$ for $1 \leq j \leq k+r$.

In particular, if $r = 0$, we obtain that $S = (k-1)n$ and that f is some Clifford minimal submanifold; if $r = 1$, we obtain that $S = (\frac{2}{3} + k)n$ and that f corresponds to a minimal product of the Veronese surface and some Clifford minimal submanifold.

- (2) Let f_j be one of the n_j -dimensional minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces with g_j distinct principal curvatures, $1 \leq j \leq k$. It is well-known that g_j must be one of $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 6\}$ and $S_j = (g_j - 1)n_j$ (see [26], [27] and [29] and reference therein for more details). Then $f = (c_1 f_1, \dots, c_k f_k)$ is an n -dimensional closed minimal submanifold in S^{n+p} with constant

$$(5.9) \quad S = (\tilde{g} - 1)n.$$

Here $n = n_1 + \dots + n_k$, $\tilde{g} = g_1 + \dots + g_k$, $p = 2k - 1$ and $c_j = \sqrt{\frac{n_j}{n}}$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$.

Acknowledgements CPW was partly supported by the Project 11831005 of NSFC. PW was partly supported by the Project 11971107 of NSFC. The authors are thankful to Prof. H.Z. Li, Prof. Kusner, Prof. Z.Z. Tang, Prof. Z.X. Xie, Prof. W.J. Yan, Prof. Y.S. Zhang and Prof. E.T. Zhao for valuable discussions. The authors are thankful to Prof. H.Z. Li for introducing to us Perdomo's paper [23]. The authors are thankful to Prof. Z.Z. Tang and Prof. W.J. Yan for introducing to us the problem of [26]. The authors are thankful to the referees for many valuable corrections and suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] Berger M., Gauduchon P., Mazet E. Le Spectre d'une Variété Riemannienne. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 194, Berlin-New York: Springer-Verlag, 1971
- [2] Brendle, S. Embedded minimal tori in S^3 and the Lawson conjecture. *Acta Math.*, 2013, 211: 177-190
- [3] Bryant, R.L. Minimal surfaces of constant curvature in S^n . *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 1985, 290: 259-271
- [4] Chavel, I. Eigenvalues in Riemannian geometry. Pure and Applied Mathematics, 115. Academic Press, 1984
- [5] Chern, S. S., do Carmo, M., Kobayashi, S. Minimal submanifolds of constant length. in: F.E. Browder (Ed.), *Functional Analysis and Related Fields*, New York: Springer, 1970
- [6] Choe, J., Hoppe, J. Some minimal submanifolds generalizing the Clifford torus. *Math. Nachr.* 2018, 291: 2536-2542
- [7] Choe, J., Soret, M. First Eigenvalue of Symmetric Minimal Surfaces in S^3 . *Indiana U. Math. J.* 2009, 59: 269-281
- [8] Ding, Q., Xin, Y. L. On Chern's problem for rigidity of minimal hypersurfaces in the spheres. *Adv. Math.* 2011, 227: 131-145
- [9] El Soufi, A., Giacomini, H., Jazar, M. A unique extremal metric for the least eigenvalue of the Laplacian on the Klein bottle. *Duke Math. J.* 2006, 135: 181-202.
- [10] El Soufi, A., Ilias, S. Immersions minimales, première valeur propre du laplacien et volume conforme. *Math. Ann.* 1986, 275, 257-267
- [11] Gu J R, Xu H W, Xu Z Y, et al. A survey on rigidity problems in geometry and topology of submanifolds. In: *Proceedings of the 6th International Congress of Chinese Mathematicians. Advanced Lectures in Mathematics*, vol. 37. Beijing-Boston: Higher Education Press-International Press, 2016, 79-99
- [12] Kapouleas, N., Wiygul, D. The index and nullity of the Lawson surfaces $\xi_{g,1}$. *Camb. J. Math.* 2020, 8: 363-405
- [13] Kenmotsu, K. On minimal immersions of $\mathbb{R}^2$ into S^n . *J. Math. Soc. Japan* 1976, 28: 182-191
- [14] Kusner, R., Wang, P. Willmore stability of minimal surfaces in S^n , in preparation
- [15] Lawson, H. B. Jr. Complete minimal surfaces in S^3 , *Ann. of Math.* (2) 1970, 92: 335-374
- [16] Lawson, H. B. Jr., Michelsohn, M. L. Spin geometry. Princeton Mathematical Series, 38. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989
- [17] Li, A. M., Li, J. M. An Intrinsic Rigidity Theorem for Minimal Submanifolds in a Sphere. *Archiv Der Mathematik*, 1992, 58: 582-594
- [18] Li, P., Yau, S. T. A new conformal invariant and its applications to the Willmore conjecture and the first eigenvalue of compact surfaces. *Invent. Math.* 1982, 69: 269-291
- [19] Marques, F. & Neves, A. Min-Max theory and the Willmore conjecture. *Ann. of Math.* (2) 2014, 179: 683-782

- [20] Montiel, S. and Ros, A. Minimal immersions of surfaces by the first eigenfunctions and conformal area. *Invent. Math.* 1986, 83: 153-166
- [21] Peng, C. K., Terng, C. L. The Scalar Curvature of Minimal Hypersurfaces in Spheres. *Math. Ann.*, 1983, 266: 105-113
- [22] Perdomo, O. Low index minimal hypersurfaces of spheres. *Asian J. Math.* 2001, 5: 741-749
- [23] Perdomo, O. On the average of the scalar curvature of minimal hypersurfaces of spheres with low stability index. *Illinois J. Math.*, Vol. 2004, 48: 559-565
- [24] Qian, C., Tang, Z. Z. Isoparametric foliations, a problem of Eells-Lemaire and conjectures of Leung. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* (3) 2016, 112: 979-1001
- [25] Simons, J. Minimal varieties in Riemannian manifolds. *Ann. of Math.* (2) 1968, 88: 62-105
- [26] Tang, Z. Z., Yan, W. J. Isoparametric foliation and Yau conjecture on the first eigenvalue. *J. Differential Geom.* 2013, 94: 521-540
- [27] Tang, Z. Z., Xie, Y. Q., Yan, W. J. T Isoparametric foliation and Yau conjecture on the first eigenvalue, II. *J. Funct. Anal.* 2014, 266: 6174-6199
- [28] Tang, Z. Z., Wei, D. Y., Yan, W. J. A sufficient condition for a hypersurface to be isoparametric, *Tohoku Math. J.* (2) 2020, 72: 493-505
- [29] Tang, Z. Z., Yan, W. J. On the Chern conjecture for isoparametric hypersurfaces. *arXiv:2001.10134*.
- [30] Tang, Z. Z., Zhang, Y. S. Minimizing cones associated with isoparametric foliations. *J. Differential Geom.* 2020, 115: 367-393
- [31] Terng, C. L. Submanifolds with flat normal bundle. *Math. Ann.* 1987, 277: 95-111
- [32] Urbano, F. Minimal surfaces with low index in the three-dimensional sphere. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 1990, 108: 989-992
- [33] Yau, S. T. Review of geometry and analysis. Kodaira's issue. *Asian J. Math.* 2000, 4: 235-278

APPENDIX A. ON THE INDEX ESTIMATE OF A MINIMAL SUBMANIFOLD IN S^{n+p+1}

Lemma 4.6 gives an index estimate of an n -dimensional minimal submanifold in S^{n+p} , which is of independent interest. Here we provide a proof which is in the same spirit as Perdomo's proof for hypersurfaces. We refer to [14] for a different proof of Lemma 4.6 for minimal surfaces in spheres.

Proof of Lemma 4.6. Consider the subspace

$$(A.1) \quad \mathcal{E} := \{\mathbf{a}^\perp \in \Gamma(T^\perp M) \mid \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+p+1}\}.$$

Here $T^\perp M$ denotes the normal bundle of M . It is well-known that [25]

$$\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathfrak{E}_{\mu_\alpha^\phi} \big|_{\mu_\alpha^\phi = -n}.$$

Therefore we need only to prove $\dim(\mathcal{E}) = n + p + 1$.

We argue by contradiction, that is, $\dim(\mathcal{E}) < n + p + 1$. Then there exists a unit vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+p+1}$ such that

$$\mathbf{a}^\perp \equiv 0 \text{ on } M.$$

For each $x \in M$, let $\mathbf{a}^T(x)$ be the tangential projection of E onto $T_x M$. We have

$$\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}^T(x) + (\cdots)x.$$

Since $\mathbf{a}$ is perpendicular to the normal bundle $T^\perp M$ at each point of M , $\mathbf{a}^T$ defines a vector field tangent to M itself. Since for any $x \neq \pm \mathbf{a}$ in M the great semicircle containing x and $\mathbf{a}$ is an integral curve of $\mathbf{a}^T$ passing through x , it is contained in M . This forces M to be equal to

the totally geodesic great n -sphere S^n containing $\mathbf{a}$ and tangent to $T_{\mathbf{a}}M$, which contradicts to the assumption M being not totally geodesic. $\square$

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, FJKLMAA, FUJIAN NORMAL UNIVERSITY, FUZHOU 350117, P. R. CHINA

Email address: cpwang@fjnu.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, FJKLMAA, FUJIAN NORMAL UNIVERSITY, FUZHOU 350117, P. R. CHINA

Email address: pengwang@fjnu.edu.cn