



HAL
open science

f -BIHARMONIC SUBMANIFOLDS OF GENERALIZED SPACE FORMS

Julien Roth, Abhitosh Upadhyay

► **To cite this version:**

Julien Roth, Abhitosh Upadhyay. f -BIHARMONIC SUBMANIFOLDS OF GENERALIZED SPACE FORMS. Results in mathematics = Resultate der Mathematik, Springer Verlag, 2020, 75 (1), pp.article n ° 20. hal-01459382v2

HAL Id: hal-01459382

<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01459382v2>

Submitted on 2 Mar 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

f -BIHARMONIC SUBMANIFOLDS OF GENERALIZED SPACE FORMS

JULIEN ROTH AND ABHITOSH UPADHYAY

ABSTRACT. We study f -biharmonic submanifolds in both generalized complex and Sasakian space forms. We prove necessary and sufficient conditions for f -biharmonicity in the general case and many particular cases. Some geometric estimates as well as non-existence results are also obtained.

1. Introduction

Harmonic maps between two Riemannian manifolds (M^m, g) and (N^n, h) are critical points of the energy functional

$$E(\psi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_M |d\psi|^2 dv_g,$$

where ψ is a map from M to N and dv_g denotes the volume element of g . The Euler-Lagrange equation associated with $E(\psi)$ is given by $\tau(\psi) = 0$, where $\tau(\psi) = \text{Trace} \nabla d\psi$ is the tension field of ψ , which vanishes precisely for harmonic maps.

In 1983, Eells and Lemaire [12] suggested to consider biharmonic maps which are a natural generalization of harmonic maps. A map ψ is called *biharmonic* if it is a critical point of the bi-energy functional

$$E_2(\psi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_M |\tau(\psi)|^2 dv_g,$$

on the space of smooth maps between two Riemannian manifolds. In [17], Jiang studied the first and second variation formulas of E_2 for which critical points are biharmonic maps. The Euler-Lagrange equation associated with this bi-energy functional is $\tau_2(\psi) = 0$, where $\tau_2(\psi)$ is the so-called bi-tension field given by

$$(1) \quad \boxed{\text{bitensionfield}} \quad \tau_2(\psi) = \Delta \tau(\psi) - \text{tr}(R^N(d\psi, \tau(\psi))d\psi).$$

Here, Δ is the rough Laplacian acting on the sections of $\psi^{-1}(TN)$ given by $\Delta V = \text{tr}(\nabla^2 V)$ for any $V \in \Gamma(\psi^{-1}(TN))$ and R^N is the curvature tensor of the target manifold N defined as $R^N(X, Y) = [\nabla_X^N, \nabla_Y^N] - \nabla_{[X, Y]}^N$ for any $X, Y \in \Gamma(TN)$.

Over the past years, many geometers studied biharmonic submanifolds and obtained a great variety of results in this domain (see [3, 5, 6, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31, 32, 34], for instance). If the map $\psi : (M, g) \rightarrow (N, h)$ is an isometric immersion from a manifold (M, g) into an ambient manifold (N, h) then M is called *biharmonic submanifold* of N . Since it is obvious

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53C42, 53C43.

Key words and phrases. f -biharmonic submanifolds, bi- f -harmonic submanifolds, generalized complex space forms, generalized Sasakian space forms.

that any harmonic map is a biharmonic map, we will call *proper biharmonic submanifolds* the biharmonic submanifolds which are not harmonic, that is, minimal.

The main problem concerning biharmonic submanifold is the Chen Conjecture [8]:

“the only biharmonic submanifolds of Euclidean spaces are the minimal ones.”

The Chen biharmonic conjecture is still an open problem, but lots of results on submanifolds of Euclidean spaces provide affirmative partial solutions to the conjecture (see [7, 9] and references therein for an overview). On the other hand, the generalized Chen’s conjecture replacing Euclidean spaces by Riemannian manifolds of non-positive sectional curvature turns out to be false (see [20, 26] for counter-examples). Nevertheless, this generalized conjecture is true in various situations and obtaining non-existence results in non-positive sectional curvature is still an interesting question. In [32], the authors gave two new contexts where such results hold.

In [22], Lu gave a natural generalization of biharmonic maps and introduced f -biharmonic maps. He studied the first variation and calculated the f -biharmonic map equation as well as the equation for the f -biharmonic conformal maps between the same dimensional manifolds. Ou also studied f -biharmonic map and f -biharmonic submanifolds in [29], where he proved that an f -biharmonic map from a compact Riemannian manifold into a non-positively curved manifold with constant f -bienergy density is a harmonic map; any f -biharmonic function on a compact manifold is constant, and that the inversion about S^m for $m \geq 3$ are proper f -biharmonic conformal diffeomorphisms. He also derived f -biharmonic submanifolds equation and proved that a surface in a manifold (N^n, h) is an f -biharmonic surface if and only if it can be biharmonically conformally immersed into (N^n, h) . Further in [30], the author characterizes harmonic maps and minimal submanifolds by using the concept of f -biharmonic maps and obtained an improved equation for f -biharmonic hypersurfaces.

By definition, for a positive, well defined and C^∞ differentiable function $f : M \rightarrow R$, f -biharmonic maps are critical points of the f -bienergy functional for maps $\psi : (M, g) \rightarrow (N, h)$, between Riemannian manifolds, i.e.,

$$E_{2,f}(\psi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_M f |\tau(\psi)|^2 dv_g.$$

Lu also obtained the corresponding Euler-Lagrange equation for f -biharmonic maps, i.e.,

$$(2) \text{relationfbiharmonic} \tau_{2,f}(\psi) = f\tau_2(\psi) + (\Delta f)\tau(\psi) + 2\nabla_{\text{grad}f}^\psi \tau(\psi) = 0.$$

An f -biharmonic map is called a *proper f -biharmonic map* if it is neither a harmonic nor a biharmonic map. Also, we will call *proper f -biharmonic submanifolds* a f -biharmonic submanifolds which is neither minimal nor biharmonic.

Very recently, Karaca and Özgür [18] studied f -biharmonic submanifolds in products space and extended the results obtained by the first author [31] for biharmonic submanifolds. In the present paper, we continue to explore f -biharmonic submanifolds. Precisely, we focus here on f -biharmonic submanifolds of both (generalized) complex space forms and generalized Sasakian space forms. After a section of basics about generalized complex and Sasakian space forms as well as their submanifolds. we study of f -biharmonic submanifolds. For both classes of ambient spaces, we first give the general necessary and sufficient condition for submanifolds to be

f -biharmonic. Then, we focus of many particular cases and obtain some non-existence results for spaces with holomorphic (or ϕ -holomorphic) sectional curvature bounded from above.

2. Preliminaries

?(sec2)?

2.1. Generalized complex space forms and their submanifolds. A Hermitian manifold (N, g, J) with constant sectional holomorphic curvature $4c$ is called a complex space form. We denote by $M_{\mathbb{C}}^n(4c)$ be the simply connected complex n -dimensional complex space form of constant holomorphic sectional curvature $4c$. The curvature tensor R of $M_{\mathbb{C}}^n(4c)$ is given by

$$R^{\mathbb{C}}(X, Y)Z = c\{g(Y, Z)X - g(X, Z)Y + g(Z, JY)JX - g(Z, JX)JY + 2g(X, JY)JZ\},$$

for $X, Y, Z \in \Gamma(TM_{\mathbb{C}}^n(4c))$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the Riemannian metric on $M_{\mathbb{C}}^n(4c)$ and J is the canonical almost complex structure of $M_{\mathbb{C}}^n(4c)$. The complex space form $M_{\mathbb{C}}^n(4c)$ is the complex projective space $\mathbb{C}P^n(4c)$, the complex Euclidean space \mathbb{C}^n or the complex hyperbolic space $\mathbb{C}H^n(4c)$ according to $c > 0$, $c = 0$ or $c < 0$.

Now, we consider a natural generalization of complex space forms, namely the generalized complex space forms. After defining them, we will give some basic information about generalized complex space forms and their submanifolds. Generalized complex space forms form a particular class of Hermitian manifolds which has not been intensively studied. In 1981, Tricerri and Vanhecke [33] introduced the following generalization of the complex space forms $(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}P^n$ and $\mathbb{C}H^n)$. Let (N^{2n}, g, J) be an almost Hermitian manifold. We denote the generalized curvature tensors by R_1 and R_2 which is defined as

$$R_1(X, Y)Z = g(Y, Z)X - g(X, Z)Y,$$

$$R_2(X, Y)Z = g(JY, Z)JX - g(JX, Z)JY + 2g(JY, X)JZ, \quad \forall X, Y, Z \in \Gamma(TN).$$

The manifold (N, g, J) is called *generalized complex space form* if its curvature tensor R has the following form

$$R = \alpha R_1 + \beta R_2,$$

where α and β are smooth functions on N . The terminology comes obviously from the fact that complex space forms satisfy this property with constants $\alpha = \beta$.

In the same paper [33], Tricerri and Vanhecke showed that if N is of (real) dimension $2n \geq 6$, then (N, g, J) is a complex space form. They also showed that $\alpha + \beta$ is necessarily constant. This implies that $\alpha = \beta$ are constants in dimension $2n \geq 6$, but this is not the case in dimension 4. Hence, the notion of generalized complex space form is of interest only in dimension 4. Further, Olszak [25] constructed examples in dimension 4 with α and β non-constant. These examples are obtained by conformal deformation of Bochner flat Kählerian manifolds of non constant scalar curvature. Examples of Bochner flat Kählerian manifolds can be found in [10]. From now on, we will denote by $N(\alpha, \beta)$ a (4-dimensional) generalized complex space form with curvature given by $R = \alpha R_1 + \beta R_2$. Note that these spaces are Einstein, with constant scalar curvature equal to $12(\alpha + \beta)$. Of course, they are not Kählerian because if they were, they would be complex space forms.

Now, let M be a submanifold of the (generalized) complex space form $M_{\mathbb{C}}^n(4c)$ or $N(\alpha, \beta)$. The almost complex structure J on $M_{\mathbb{C}}^n(4c)$ (or $N(\alpha, \beta)$) induces the existence of four operators on M , namely

$$j : TM \longrightarrow TM, \quad k : TM \longrightarrow NM, \quad l : NM \longrightarrow TM \quad \text{and} \quad m : NM \longrightarrow NM,$$

defined for all $X \in TM$ and all $\xi \in NM$ by

$$(3) \text{ \texttt{relationfhst}} \quad JX = jX + kX \quad \text{and} \quad J\xi = l\xi + m\xi.$$

Since J is an almost complex structure, it satisfies $J^2 = -Id$ and for X, Y tangent to $M_{\mathbb{C}}^n(4c)$ (or $N(\alpha, \beta)$), we have $g(JX, Y) = -g(X, JY)$. Then, we deduce that the operators j, k, l, m satisfy the following relations

$$(4) \text{ ?relation1.1?} \quad j^2X + lkX = -X,$$

$$(5) \text{ ?relation1.2?} \quad m^2\xi + kl\xi = -\xi,$$

$$(6) \text{ ?relation1.3?} \quad jl\xi + lm\xi = 0,$$

$$(7) \text{ ?relation1.4?} \quad kjX + mkX = 0,$$

$$(8) \text{ ?relation1.5?} \quad g(kX, \xi) = -g(X, l\xi),$$

for all $X \in \Gamma(TM)$ and all $\xi \in \Gamma(NM)$. Moreover j and m are skew-symmetric.

2.2. Generalized Sasakian space forms and their submanifolds. Now, we give some recalls about almost contact metric manifolds and generalized Sasakian space forms. For more details, one can refer to ([1, 4, 35]) for instance. A Riemannian manifold \widetilde{M} of odd dimension is said almost contact if there exists globally over \widetilde{M} , a vector field ξ , a 1-form η and a field of $(1, 1)$ -tensor ϕ satisfying the following conditions:

$$(9) \text{ {?}} \quad \eta(\xi) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \phi^2 = -Id + \eta \otimes \xi.$$

Remark that this implies $\phi\xi = 0$ and $\eta \circ \phi = 0$. The manifold \widetilde{M} can be endowed with a Riemannian metric \widetilde{g} satisfying

$$(10) \text{ {?}} \quad \widetilde{g}(\phi X, \phi Y) = \widetilde{g}(X, Y) - \eta(X)\eta(Y) \quad \text{and} \quad \eta(X) = \widetilde{g}(X, \xi),$$

for any vector fields X, Y tangent to \widetilde{M} . Then, we say that $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{g}, \xi, \eta, \phi)$ is an almost contact metric manifold. Three class of this family are of particular interest, namely, the Sasakian, Kenmotsu and cosymplectic manifolds. We will give some recalls about them.

First, we introduce the fundamental 2-form (also called Sasaki 2-form) Ω defined for $X, Y \in \Gamma(TM)$ by

$$\Omega(X, Y) = \widetilde{g}(X, \phi Y).$$

We consider also N_ϕ , the Nijenhuis tensor defined by

$$N_\phi(X, Y) = [\phi X, \phi Y] - \phi[\phi X, Y] - \phi[X, \phi Y] + \phi^2[X, Y],$$

for any vector fields X, Y . An almost contact metric manifold is said normal if and only if the Nijenhuis tensor N_ϕ satisfies

$$N_\phi + 2d\eta \otimes \xi = 0.$$

An almost contact metric manifold is said *Sasakian manifold* if and only if it is normal and $d\eta = \Omega$. This is equivalent to

$$(11) \text{ {?}} \quad (\nabla_X \phi)Y = \widetilde{g}(X, Y)\xi - \eta(Y)X, \quad \forall X, Y \in \Gamma(\widetilde{M}).$$

It also implies that

$$(12) \text{ {?}} \quad \nabla_X \xi = -\phi(X).$$

An almost contact metric manifold is said *Kenmotsu manifold* if and only if $d\eta = 0$ and $d\Omega = 2\eta \wedge \Omega$. Equivalently, this means

$$(13) \text{ {?}} \quad (\nabla_X \phi)Y = -\eta(Y)\phi X - g(X, \phi Y)\xi,$$

for any X and Y . Hence, we also have

$$(14) \quad \nabla_X \xi = X - \eta(X)\xi.$$

Finally, an almost contact metric manifold is said *cosymplectic manifold* if and only if $d\eta = 0$ and $d\Omega = 0$, or equivalently

$$(15) \quad \nabla \phi = 0,$$

and in this case, we have

$$(16) \quad \nabla \xi = 0.$$

The ϕ -sectional curvature of an almost contact metric manifold is defined as the sectional curvature on the 2-planes $\{X, \phi X\}$. When the ϕ -sectional curvature is constant, we say that the manifold is a space form (Sasakian, Kenmotsu or cosymplectic in each of the three cases above). It is well known that the ϕ -sectional curvature determines entirely the curvature of the manifold. When the ϕ -sectional curvature is constant, the curvature tensor is expressed explicitly. Let R_1^* , R_2^* and R_3^* be the generalized curvature tensors defined by

$$(17) \quad R_1^*(X, Y)Z = \tilde{g}(Y, Z)X - \tilde{g}(X, Z)Y,$$

$$(18) \quad R_2^*(X, Y)Z = \eta(X)\eta(Z)Y - \eta(Y)\eta(Z)X + \tilde{g}(X, Z)\eta(Y)\xi - \tilde{g}(Y, Z)\eta(X)\xi$$

and

$$(19) \quad R_3^*(X, Y)Z = \Omega(Z, Y)\phi X - \Omega(Z, X)\phi Y + 2\Omega(X, Y)\phi Z.$$

For the three cases we are interested in, the curvature of a space form of constant ϕ -sectional curvature c is given by

- Sasaki: $R^* = \frac{c+3}{4}R_1^* + \frac{c-1}{4}R_2^* + \frac{c-1}{4}R_3^*$.
- Kenmotsu: $R^* = \frac{c-3}{4}R_1^* + \frac{c+1}{4}R_2^* + \frac{c+1}{4}R_3^*$.
- Cosymplectic: $R^* = \frac{c}{4}R_1^* + \frac{c}{4}R_2^* + \frac{c}{4}R_3^*$.

In the sequel, for more clarity, we will denote the Sasakian (*resp.* Kenmotsu, cosymplectic) space form of constant ϕ -sectional curvature c by $\widetilde{M}_S(c)$ (*resp.* $\widetilde{M}_K(c)$, $\widetilde{M}_C(c)$). These space forms appear as particular cases of the so-called generalized Sasakian space forms, introduced by Alegre, Blair and Carriazo in [1]. A generalized Sasakian space form, denoted by $\widetilde{M}(f_1, f_2, f_3)$, is a contact metric manifold with curvature tensor of the form

$$(20) \quad \boxed{\text{CurvatureGSasakian}} \quad f_1 R_1^* + f_2 R_2^* + f_3 R_3^*,$$

where f_1 , f_2 and f_3 are real functions on the manifold. The most simple examples of generalized Sasakian space forms are the warped products of the real line by a complex space form or a generalized complex space forms. Their conformal deformations as well as their so-called \mathcal{D} -homothetic deformations are also generalized Sasakian space forms (see [1]). Other examples can be found in [2].

Now, let (M, g) be a submanifold of an almost contact metric manifold $(\widetilde{M}, \tilde{g}, \xi, \eta, \phi)$. The field of tensors ϕ induces on M , the existence of the following four operators:

$$P : TM \longrightarrow TM, \quad N : TM \longrightarrow NM, \quad t : NM \longrightarrow TM \quad \text{and} \quad s : NM \longrightarrow NM,$$

defined for any $X \in TM$ and $\nu \in NM$. Now, we have

$$(21) \quad \boxed{\text{relationfhst}} \quad \phi X = PX + NX \quad \text{and} \quad \phi \nu = s\nu + t\nu,$$

where PX and NX are tangential and normal components of ϕX , respectively, whereas $t\nu$ and $s\nu$ are the tangential and normal components of $\phi\nu$, respectively. A submanifold M is said invariant (*resp.* anti-invariant) if N (*resp.* P) vanishes identically. In [19], Lotta shows that if the vector field ξ is normal to M , then M is anti-invariant.

3. f -Biharmonic submanifolds of generalized complex space forms

?(sec31)?

At first, we will calculate necessary and sufficient condition of f -biharmonic submanifold of generalized complex space forms and then we make a exposition about the results which could characterize these type of submanifolds.

(thm1)

Theorem 3.1. *Let M^p , $p < 4$ be a submanifold of the generalized complex space form $N(\alpha, \beta)$ with second fundamental form B , shape operator A , mean curvature H and a positive C^∞ -differentiable function f on M . Then M is f -biharmonic submanifold of $N(\alpha, \beta)$ if and only if the following two equations are satisfied*

(1)

$$-\Delta^\perp H + \text{tr}(B(\cdot, A_H \cdot)) - p\alpha H + 3\beta klH + \frac{\Delta f}{f}H + 2\nabla_{\text{grad}(\ln f)}^\perp H = 0,$$

(2)

$$\frac{p}{2}\text{grad}|H|^2 - 2A_H \text{grad}(\ln f) + 2\text{tr}(A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot)) + 6\beta jlH = 0.$$

Proof: It is a classic fact that the tension field of the isometric immersion ψ is given by

$$(22) \text{ [tensionfield]} \quad \tau(\psi) = \text{tr}\nabla d\psi = \text{tr}B = pH.$$

Using equation (22) in equation (1), we have

$$(23) \text{ [eqtau2]} \quad \tau_2(\psi) = p\Delta H - \text{tr}(R^N(d\psi, pH)d\psi).$$

Moreover, we recall that, by some classical and straightforward computations, we have

$$\Delta H = \frac{p}{2}\text{grad}|H|^2 + \text{tr}(B(\cdot, A_H \cdot)) + 2\text{tr}(A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot)) + \Delta^\perp H.$$

Reporting this into (23), we get

$$(24) \text{ [eqbiharmonic]} \quad -\Delta^\perp H + \text{tr}(B(\cdot, A_H \cdot)) + \frac{p}{2}\text{grad}|H|^2 + 2\text{tr}(A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot)) + 2\text{tr}(R^N(\cdot, H)\cdot).$$

Now, the curvature tensor of generalized complex space form, $N(\alpha, \beta)$, is given by

$$\text{tr}(R(\cdot, H)\cdot) = \alpha \text{tr}(R_1(\cdot, H)\cdot) + \beta \text{tr}(R_2(\cdot, H)\cdot).$$

Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_p\}$ be a local orthonormal frame of TM . Then, we have

$$\text{tr}(R(\cdot, H)\cdot) = \alpha \sum_{i=1}^p R_1(e_i, H)e_i + \beta \sum_{i=1}^p R_2(e_i, H)e_i$$

or,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(R(\cdot, H)\cdot) &= \alpha \sum_{i=1}^p [g(H, e_i)e_i - g(e_i, e_i)H] \\ &+ \beta \sum_{i=1}^p [g(JH, e_i)Je_i - g(Je_i, e_i)JH + 2g(JH, e_i)Je_i]. \end{aligned}$$

or,

$$(25) \quad \text{tr}(R(\cdot, H)\cdot) = \alpha(-pH) + \beta(3jH + 3kH).$$

From equation (2), M is f -biharmonic if and only if

$$f\tau_2(\psi) + \Delta f\tau(\psi) + 2\nabla_{\text{grad}f}^\psi\tau(\psi) = 0,$$

which is equivalent to

$$(26) \quad p\frac{\Delta f}{f}H + 2p(-A_H\text{grad}(\ln f) + \nabla_{\text{grad}(\ln f)}^\perp H) = 0.$$

Now, using equations (24) and (25) in equation (26) and considering that jH is tangent and kH is normal, we get the statement of the theorem by identification of tangent and normal parts. \square

We can easily obtain by the same computations an analogous result for f -biharmonic submanifolds of complex space forms $M_{\mathbb{C}}^n(4c)$. Namely, we have

(cor1)

Corollary 3.2. *Let M^p , $p \leq 2n$, be a submanifold of the complex space form $M_{\mathbb{C}}^n(4c)$ of complex dimension n and constant holomorphic sectional curvature $4c$, with second fundamental form B , shape operator A , mean curvature H and a positive C^∞ -differentiable function f on M . Then M is f -biharmonic submanifold of $M_{\mathbb{C}}^n(4c)$ if and only if the following two equations are satisfied*

(1)

$$-\Delta^\perp H + \text{tr}(B(\cdot, A_H\cdot)) - pcH + 3ckH + \frac{\Delta f}{f}H + 2\nabla_{\text{grad}(\ln f)}^\perp H = 0,$$

(2)

$$\frac{p}{2}\text{grad}|H|^2 - 2A_H\text{grad}(\ln f) + 2\text{tr}(A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot)) + 6cjlH = 0.$$

Proof: For complex space forms the computations are essentially the same as for the generalized complex space forms with the only differences that $\alpha = \beta = c$ and dimension is not necessarily equal to 4. \square

In the sequel, we will state many results for biharmonic submanifolds of the generalized complex space forms $N(\alpha, \beta)$. They have of course analogue for the complex space forms but for a sake of brevity, we do not write them since the results are the same with $\alpha = \beta = c$. Assuming particular cases such as hypersurfaces, Lagrangian or complex surfaces and curves of generalized complex space form $N(\alpha, \beta)$, we have the following conclusion.

(cor2)

Corollary 3.3. *Let M^p , $p < 4$ be a submanifold of the generalized complex space form $N(\alpha, \beta)$ with second fundamental form B , shape operator A , mean curvature H and a positive C^∞ -differentiable function f on M .*

(1) *If M is a hypersurface then M is f -biharmonic if and only if*

$$-\Delta^\perp H + \frac{\Delta f}{f}H + 2\nabla_{\text{grad}(\ln f)}^\perp H + \text{tr}(B(\cdot, A_H\cdot)) - 3(\alpha + \beta)H = 0,$$

and

$$\frac{3}{2}\text{grad}|H|^2 - 2A_H\text{grad}(\ln f) + 2\text{tr}(A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot)) = 0.$$

(2) If M is a complex surface then M is f -biharmonic if and only if

$$-\Delta^\perp H + \frac{\Delta f}{f} H + 2\nabla_{\text{grad}(\ln f)}^\perp H + \text{tr}(B(\cdot, A_H \cdot)) - 2\alpha H = 0,$$

and

$$\text{grad}|H|^2 - 2A_H \text{grad}(\ln f) + 2\text{tr}(A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot)) = 0.$$

(3) If M is a Lagrangian surface then M is f -biharmonic if and only if

$$-\Delta^\perp H + \frac{\Delta f}{f} H + 2\nabla_{\text{grad}(\ln f)}^\perp H + \text{tr}(B(\cdot, A_H \cdot)) - 2\alpha H - 3\beta H = 0,$$

and

$$\text{grad}|H|^2 - 2A_H \text{grad}(\ln f) + 2\text{tr}(A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot)) = 0.$$

(4) If M is a curve then M is f -biharmonic if and only if

$$-\Delta^\perp H + \frac{\Delta f}{f} H + 2\nabla_{\text{grad}(\ln f)}^\perp H + \text{tr}(B(\cdot, A_H \cdot)) - \alpha H - 3\beta(H + m^2 H) = 0,$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2}\text{grad}|H|^2 - 2A_H \text{grad}(\ln f) + 2\text{tr}(A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot)) = 0.$$

Proof: The proof is a consequence of Theorem 3.1 using the facts that

- (1) if M is a hypersurface, then $m = 0$ and so $jlH = 0$, $kjH = 0$ and $klH = -H$,
- (2) if M is a complex surface then $k = 0$ and $l = 0$,
- (3) if M is a Lagrangian surface, then $j = 0$, $m = 0$,
- (4) if M is a curve, then $j = 0$.

□

Remark 3.4. It is a well known fact that any complex submanifold of a Kähler manifold is necessarily minimal. But as mentioned above, the generalized space forms $N(\alpha, \beta)$ are not Kählerian unless there are the complex projective plane or the complex hyperbolic plane. Hence, considering f -biharmonic surfaces into $N(\alpha, \beta)$ is of real interest, since they are not necessarily minimal.

Similarly, if we assume mean curvature vector H as parallel vector then for curves and complex or Lagrangian surfaces, we obtain the following corollaries.

?(corlag)?

Corollary 3.5. Let M^p , $p < 4$ be a submanifold of the generalized complex space form $N(\alpha, \beta)$ with second fundamental form B , shape operator A , mean curvature H and a positive C^∞ -differentiable function f on M .

(1) If M be a Lagrangian surface of $N(\alpha, \beta)$ with parallel mean curvature then M is f -biharmonic if and only if

$$\text{tr}(B(\cdot, A_H \cdot)) = 2\alpha H + 3\beta H - \frac{\Delta f}{f} H, \text{ and } A_H \text{grad} f = 0.$$

(2) If M be a complex surface of $N(\alpha, \beta)$ with parallel mean curvature then M is f -biharmonic if and only if

$$\text{tr}(B(\cdot, A_H \cdot)) = 2\alpha H - \frac{\Delta f}{f} H \text{ and } A_H \text{grad} f = 0.$$

(3) If M is a curve in $N(\alpha, \beta)$ with parallel mean curvature then M is f -biharmonic if and only if

$$\text{tr}(B(\cdot, A_H \cdot)) = \alpha H + 3\beta(H + m^2 H) - \frac{\Delta f}{f} H, \text{ and } A_H \text{grad} f = 0.$$

Proof: Since M has parallel mean curvature so that the terms $\Delta^\perp H$, $\nabla_{\text{grad} f}^\perp H$, $\text{grad}|H|^2$ and $\text{tr}(A_{\nabla^\perp H \cdot})$ vanish and we obtain immediately the result from the previous Corollary. \square

Further, for constant mean curvature hypersurfaces in $N(\alpha, \beta)$, we have the following result.

(propB)

Proposition 3.6. (1) *Let M^3 be a hypersurface of the generalized complex space form $N(\alpha, \beta)$ with second fundamental form B , non zero constant mean curvature H and f a positive C^∞ -differentiable function on M . Then M is f biharmonic if and only if*

$$|B|^2 = 3(\alpha + \beta) - \frac{\Delta f}{f} \quad \text{and} \quad A \text{grad} f = 0$$

or equivalently, M is proper f -biharmonic if and only if the scalar curvature of M satisfies

$$\text{Scal}_M = 3(\alpha + \beta) + 9H^2 + \frac{\Delta f}{f} \quad \text{and} \quad A \text{grad} f = 0.$$

(2) *There exists no proper f -biharmonic hypersurfaces with constant mean curvature and constant scalar curvature.*

Proof: For the first point, since M is a hypersurface, by Corollary 3.2, M is f -biharmonic if and only if

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta^\perp H + \frac{\Delta f}{f} H + 2\nabla_{\text{grad}(\ln f)}^\perp H + \text{tr}(B(\cdot, A_H \cdot)) - 3(\alpha + \beta)H = 0, \\ \frac{3}{2} \text{grad}|H|^2 - 2A_H \text{grad}(\ln f) + 2\text{tr}(A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot)) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Since M has constant mean curvature, the above equation reduces to

$$\begin{cases} \text{tr}(B(\cdot, A_H \cdot)) = 3(\alpha + \beta)H - \frac{\Delta f}{f} H, \\ A_H \text{grad}(\ln f) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Using condition $A_H = HA$ for hypersurfaces, we get

$$\text{tr}(B(\cdot, A_H(\cdot))) = H \text{tr}(B(\cdot, A(\cdot))) = H|B|^2.$$

Reporting this result in first equation of the above condition and from the assumption that H is a non-zero constant, we get the desired identity $|B|^2 = 3(\alpha + \beta) - \frac{\Delta f}{f}$.

For the second equivalence, by the Gauss equation, we have

$$\text{Scal}_M = \sum_{i,j=1}^3 g(R^N(e_i, e_j)e_j, e_i) - |B|^2 + 9H^2,$$

where $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ is a local orthonormal frame of M . From the expression of the curvature tensor of $N(\alpha, \beta)$, we get

$$\text{Scal}_M = 6(\alpha + \beta) - ||B||^2 + 9H^2.$$

Moreover, since $\text{grad}(\ln f) = \frac{1}{f} \text{grad} f$ and $A_H = HA$ with H is a non-zero constant, then $A_H \text{grad}(\ln f) = 0$ reduces to $A \text{grad} f = 0$.

Hence, we deduce that M is proper f -biharmonic if and only if $|B|^2 = 3(\alpha + \beta) - (\frac{\Delta f}{f})$ and $A \text{grad} f = 0$, that is, if and only if $\text{Scal}_M = 3(\alpha + \beta) + 9H^2 + \frac{\Delta f}{f}$ and $A \text{grad} f = 0$.

Now, for the second point, if M is a hypersurface with constant mean curvature and constant scalar curvature, then by the first point, if M is f -biharmonic then

$$\text{Scal}_M = 3(\alpha + \beta) + 9H^2 + \frac{\Delta f}{f}.$$

As we have already mentioned, $\alpha + \beta$ is constant, hence, since H and Scal_M are constant, then $\frac{\Delta f}{f}$ is constant, that is, f is an eigenvalue of the Laplacian. But f is a positive function, so the only possibility is that f is a positive constant and M is biharmonic. This concludes the proof of the second point. \square

Now, we give this proposition which give an estimate of the mean curvature for a f -biharmonic Lagrangian surface.

(proplag)

Proposition 3.7. *Let M^2 be a Lagrangian surface of the generalized complex space form $N(\alpha, \beta)$ with second fundamental form B , shape operator A , non-zero constant mean curvature H and a positive C^∞ -differentiable function f on M .*

- (1) *If $\inf_M \left(2\alpha + 3\beta - \frac{\Delta f}{f}\right)$ is non-positive then M is not f -biharmonic.*
- (2) *If $\inf_M \left(2\alpha + 3\beta - \frac{\Delta f}{f}\right)$ is positive and M is proper f -biharmonic then*

$$0 < |H|^2 \leq \inf_M \left(\frac{2\alpha + 3\beta - \frac{\Delta f}{f}}{2} \right).$$

Proof: Assume that M is a f -biharmonic Lagrangian surface of $N(\alpha, \beta)$, considering third assertion of Corollary 3.2, we have

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta^\perp H + \frac{\Delta f}{f} H + \frac{2}{f} \nabla_{\text{grad} f}^\perp H + \text{tr}(B(\cdot, A_H \cdot)) - 2\alpha H - 3\beta H = 0, \\ \text{grad}|H|^2 - \frac{2}{f} A_H \text{grad} f + 2\text{tr}(A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot)) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Hence, by taking the scalar product with H and taking the assumption that mean curvature $H \neq 0$, i.e., $|H|$ is constant, from the first part of the above equation, we have

$$-\langle \Delta^\perp H, H \rangle + \frac{2}{f} \langle \nabla_{\text{grad} f}^\perp H, H \rangle + |A_H|^2 - \left(\frac{\Delta f}{f} - 2\alpha - 3\beta \right) \langle H, H \rangle = 0.$$

This equation implies that

$$-\langle \Delta^\perp H, H \rangle = \left(2\alpha + 3\beta - \frac{\Delta f}{f} \right) |H|^2 - |A_H|^2,$$

where we have used that $\langle \nabla_{\text{grad} f}^\perp H, H \rangle = 0$ since $|H|$ is constant. Now, with the help of the Bochner formula, we get

$$\left(2\alpha + 3\beta - \frac{\Delta f}{f} \right) |H|^2 = |A_H|^2 + |\nabla^\perp H|^2.$$

Now, using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, i.e., $|A_H|^2 \geq 2|H|^4$ in the above equation, we have

$$(27) \text{ ?inequality?} \quad \left(2\alpha + 3\beta - \frac{\Delta f}{f} \right) |H|^2 \geq 2|H|^4 + |\nabla^\perp H|^2 \geq 2|H|^4.$$

So, we have $0 < |H|^2 \leq \inf_M \left(\frac{2\alpha + 3\beta - \frac{\Delta f}{f}}{2} \right)$ because $|H|$ is a non-zero constant. This is only possible if the function $2\alpha + 3\beta - \frac{\Delta f}{f}$ has a positive infimum. This concludes the proof. \square

Now, we have similar result for complex surfaces.

?(propcomp)?

Proposition 3.8. *Let $\psi : M^2 \rightarrow N(\alpha, \beta)$ be a complex surface of generalized complex space form $N(\alpha, \beta)$ with second fundamental form B , shape operator A , mean curvature H and a positive C^∞ -differentiable function f on M .*

- (1) *If $\inf_M \left(2\alpha - \frac{\Delta f}{f} \right)$ is non-positive then M is not f -biharmonic.*
- (2) *If $\inf_M \left(2\alpha - \frac{\Delta f}{f} \right)$ is positive and M is proper f -biharmonic then*

$$0 < |H|^2 \leq \inf_M \left(\frac{2\alpha - \frac{\Delta f}{f}}{2} \right).$$

Proof: Let M be a f -biharmonic complex surface of $N(\alpha, \beta)$ with non-zero constant mean curvature. Then, by the second assertion of Corollary 3.2, we have

$$-\Delta^\perp H + \frac{\Delta f}{f} H + \text{tr}(B(\cdot, A_H \cdot)) - 2\alpha H = 0, \text{ and } A_H \text{grad} f = 0.$$

Replacing $2\alpha + 3\beta$ by 2α in the proof of Proposition 3.7, we have the required result. \square

Remark 3.9. *Note that we can obtain analogues of all the results of this section for submanifolds of the complex space forms $M_{\mathbb{C}}^n(4c)$ directly from Corollary 3.2. We do not write them here for brevity. However, there is no analogue for complex submanifolds since any complex submanifold of $M_{\mathbb{C}}^n(4c)$ is in fact minimal.*

4. f -BIHARMONIC SUBMANIFOLDS OF GENERALIZED SASAKIAN SPACE FORMS

?(sec32)?

Now, we consider f -biharmonic submanifolds of generalized Sasakian space forms and give the following theorem for its characterization.

(thm2)

Theorem 4.1. *Let M^p be a submanifold of a generalized Sasakian space form $\widetilde{M}(f_1, f_2, f_3)$, with second fundamental form B , shape operator A , mean curvature H and a positive C^∞ -differentiable function f on M . Then M is f -biharmonic submanifold of $\widetilde{M}(f_1, f_2, f_3)$ if and only if the following two equations are satisfied*

$$-\Delta^\perp H + \text{tr}B(\cdot, A_H \cdot) + \frac{\Delta f}{f} H + 2\nabla_{\text{grad}(\ln f)}^\perp H = pf_1 H - f_2 |\xi^\top|^2 H - pf_2 \eta(H) \xi^\perp - 3f_3 N_s H$$

and

$$\frac{p}{2} \text{grad}|H|^2 + 2\text{tr}A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot) - 2A_H \text{grad}(\ln f) = -2f_2(p-1)\eta(H)\xi^\top - 6f_3 P_s H.$$

Proof: At first, we calculate the curvature tensor of generalized Sasakian space form $\widetilde{M}(f_1, f_2, f_3)$. From equation (20), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(X, Y)Z &= f_1 R_1^*(X, Y)Z + f_2 R_1^*(X, Y)Z + f_3 R_2^*(X, Y)Z \\
&= f_1 \{\tilde{g}(Y, Z)X - \tilde{g}(X, Z)Y\} \\
&+ f_2 \{\eta(X)\eta(Z)Y - \eta(Y)\eta(Z)X + \tilde{g}(X, Z)\eta(Y)\xi - \tilde{g}(Y, Z)\eta(X)\xi\} \\
&+ f_3 \{\tilde{g}(X, \phi Z)\phi Y - \tilde{g}(Y, \phi Z)\phi X + 2\tilde{g}(X, \phi Y)\phi Z\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us consider $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_p\}$ an orthogonal basis of the tangent space of M . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(e_i, H)e_i &= f_1 \{\tilde{g}(H, e_i)e_i - \tilde{g}(e_i, e_i)H\} + f_2 \{\eta(e_i)\eta(e_i)H - \eta(H)\eta(e_i)e_i + \tilde{g}(e_i, e_i)\eta(H)\xi\} \\
&+ f_3 \{\tilde{g}(e_i, \phi e_i)\phi H - \tilde{g}(H, \phi e_i)\phi e_i + 2\tilde{g}(e_i, \phi H)\phi e_i\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the trace and using (21) in the above equation, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
tr(R^*(\cdot, H)\cdot) &= -f_1 p H + f_2 \sum_i \{\eta(e_i)^2 H - \eta(H)\eta(e_i)e_i + |e_i|^2 \eta(H)\xi\} \\
&+ f_3 \sum_i \{tr(P)\phi H - \tilde{g}(H, Ne_i)\phi e_i + 2\tilde{g}(e_i, sH)\phi e_i\} \\
&= -f_1 p H + f_2 \{|\xi^\top|^2 H - \eta(H)\xi^\top + p\eta(H)\xi\} \\
&+ f_3 \sum_i \{tr(P)sH + tr(P)tH - \tilde{g}(H, Ne_i)Pe_i - \tilde{g}(H, Ne_i)Ne_i \\
&+ 2\tilde{g}(e_i, sH)Pe_i + 2\tilde{g}(e_i, sH)Ne_i\}.
\end{aligned}$$

It implies that

$$tr(R^*(\cdot, H)\cdot) = -f_1 p H + f_2 \{|\xi^\top|^2 H - \eta(H)\xi^\top + p\eta(H)\xi\} + 3f_3 (PsH + NsH),$$

by considering the anti-symmetry property of ϕ , $tr(P) = 0$ and $\tilde{g}(H, Ne_i) = -\tilde{g}(tH, e_i)$.

Now, from value of $tr(R^*(\cdot, H)\cdot)$ and equations (24), (26), we have result of the theorem by considering the tangential and normal parts. \square

Now, we have the following corollary if we assume different particular cases in Theorem 4.1.

(cor2)

Corollary 4.2. *Let M^p be a submanifold of a generalized Sasakian space form $\widetilde{M}(f_1, f_2, f_3)$.*

(1) *If M is invariant then M is f -biharmonic if and only if*

$$-\Delta^\perp H + trB(\cdot, A_H \cdot) + \frac{\Delta f}{f} H + 2\nabla_{\text{grad}(\ln f)}^\perp H = pf_1 H - f_2 |\xi^\top|^2 H - pf_2 \eta(H)\xi^\perp$$

and

$$\frac{p}{2} \text{grad}|H|^2 + 2trA_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot) - 2A_H \text{grad}(\ln f) = -2f_2(p-1)\eta(H)\xi^\top - 6f_3 PsH.$$

(2) *If M is anti-invariant then M is f -biharmonic if and only if*

$$\begin{aligned}
-\Delta^\perp H + trB(\cdot, A_H \cdot) + \frac{\Delta f}{f} H + 2\nabla_{\text{grad}(\ln f)}^\perp H &= pf_1 H \\
-f_2 |\xi^\top|^2 H - pf_2 \eta(H)\xi^\perp - 3f_3 NsH &
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{p}{2}\text{grad}|H|^2 + 2\text{tr}A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot) - 2A_H\text{grad}(\ln f) = -2f_2(p-1)\eta(H)\xi^\top.$$

(3) If ξ is normal to M then M is f -biharmonic if and only if

$$-\Delta^\perp H + \text{tr}B(\cdot, A_H\cdot) + \frac{\Delta f}{f}H + 2\nabla_{\text{grad}(\ln f)}^\perp H = pf_1H - pf_2\eta(H)\xi - 3f_3NsH$$

and

$$\frac{p}{2}\text{grad}|H|^2 + 2\text{tr}A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot) - 2A_H\text{grad}(\ln f) = 0.$$

(4) If ξ is tangent to M then M is f -biharmonic if and only if

$$-\Delta^\perp H + \text{tr}B(\cdot, A_H\cdot) + \frac{\Delta f}{f}H + 2\nabla_{\text{grad}(\ln f)}^\perp H = pf_1H - f_2H - 3f_3NsH$$

and

$$\frac{p}{2}\text{grad}|H|^2 + 2\text{tr}A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot) - 2A_H\text{grad}(\ln f) = -6f_3PsH.$$

(5) If M is a hypersurface then M is f -biharmonic if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta^\perp H + \text{tr}B(\cdot, A_H\cdot) + \frac{\Delta f}{f}H + 2\nabla_{\text{grad}(\ln f)}^\perp H &= (2nf_1 + 3f_3)H \\ &\quad - f_2|\xi^\top|^2H - (2nf_2 + 3f_3)\eta(H)\xi^\perp \end{aligned}$$

and

$$n\text{grad}|H|^2 + 2\text{tr}A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot) - 2A_H\text{grad}(\ln f) = -(2(2n-1)f_1 + 6f_3)\eta(H)\xi^\top.$$

Proof. The proof is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.1 using the following facts.

- (1) If M is invariant then $P = 0$.
- (2) If M is anti-invariant then $N = 0$.
- (3) If ξ is normal then $\eta(\text{grad}f) = 0$ and M is anti-invariant which implies $P = 0$.
- (4) If ξ is tangent then $\eta(H) = 0$.
- (5) If M is a hypersurface then $sH = 0$.

Analogously to the case of generalized complex space forms (Proposition 3.6), we can obtain some curvature properties in some special cases by using characterizations of f -biharmonic submanifolds of generalized Sasakian space forms.

(propscal)

Proposition 4.3. (1) Let M^{2n} be a hypersurface of generalized Sasakian space form $\widetilde{M}(f_1, f_2, f_3)$ with non zero constant mean curvature H and ξ is tangent to M . Then M is proper f -biharmonic if and only if

$$|B|^2 = 2nf_1 - f_2 + 3f_3 - \frac{\Delta f}{f}, \text{ and } A\text{grad}f = 0,$$

or equivalently if and only if

$$\text{Scal}_M = 2n(2n-2)f_1 + (4n-1)f_2 - (2n-4)f_3 + (2n-1)H^2 + \frac{\Delta f}{f}H \text{ and } A\text{grad}f = 0.$$

(2) There exists no proper f -biharmonic hypersurfaces with constant mean curvature and constant scalar curvature so that ξ is tangent.

Proof. Let M be a f -biharmonic hypersurface of $\widetilde{M}(f_1, f_2, f_3)$ with non zero constant mean curvature and ξ tangent to M . Then, from Corollary 4.2, we have

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta^\perp H + \text{tr}B(\cdot, A_H \cdot) + \frac{\Delta f}{f} H + 2\nabla_{\text{grad}(\ln f)}^\perp H \\ = (pf_1 + 3f_3)H - f_2|\xi^\top|^2 H - (2nf_2 + 3f_3)\eta(H)\xi^\perp, \\ n\text{grad}|H|^2 + 2\text{tr}A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot) - 2A_H \text{grad}(\ln f) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Now, as per assumption, ξ is tangent to M which gives $\eta(H) = \eta(\nu) = 0$. Therefore, we have

$$\phi^2 \nu = -\nu + \eta(\nu)\xi = -\nu.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^2 \nu &= \phi(s\nu + t\nu) \\ &= P s\nu + N s\nu + s t\nu + t^2 \nu. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we get

$$(28) \quad \boxed{\text{minusnu}} \quad -\nu = P s\nu + N s\nu + s t\nu + t^2 \nu.$$

Moreover, since $\langle \phi\nu, \nu \rangle = \Omega(\nu, \nu) = 0$, we have that $\phi\nu$ is tangent, i.e., $t\nu = 0$. Thus, Equation (28) becomes

$$-\nu = P s\nu + N s\nu,$$

and so $P s = 0$ and $N s = -\text{Id}$ by identification of tangential and normal parts. Using these results in the above f -biharmonic condition for the hypersurfaces of generalized Sasakian space forms, we have

$$\begin{cases} \text{tr}B(\cdot, A_H \cdot) = (2nf_1 + 3f_3)H - f_2|\xi^\top|^2 H - \frac{\Delta f}{f} H, \\ A_H \text{grad}(\ln f) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Hence, the second equation is trivial and the first becomes

$$\text{tr}B(\cdot, A_H \cdot) = 2nf_1 H - f_2 H + 3f_3 H - \frac{\Delta f}{f} H,$$

or equivalently

$$|B|^2 = 2nf_1 - f_2 + 3f_3 - \frac{\Delta f}{f},$$

since $\text{tr}B(\cdot, A_H \cdot) = |B|^2 H$ and H is a non zero constant.

Similarly, using Gauss formula for second part, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Scal}_M &= \sum_{i,j} \tilde{g}(R^*(e_i, e_j)e_j, e_i) - |B|^2 - pH^2 \\ &= \sum_{i,j} f_1 \{ \tilde{g}(e_j, e_j)\tilde{g}(e_i, e_i) - \tilde{g}(e_i, e_j)\tilde{g}(e_j, e_i) \} + \sum_{i,j} f_2 \{ \eta(e_i)\eta(e_j)\tilde{g}(e_j, e_i) \\ &\quad - \eta(e_j)\eta(e_i)\tilde{g}(e_i, e_i) + \tilde{g}(e_i, e_j)\eta(e_j)\tilde{g}(\xi, e_i) - \tilde{g}(e_j, e_j)\eta(e_i)\tilde{g}(\xi, e_i) \} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j} f_3 \{ \tilde{g}(e_i, \phi e_j)\tilde{g}(\phi e_j, e_i) - \tilde{g}(e_j, \phi e_j)\tilde{g}(\phi e_i, e_i) + 2\tilde{g}(e_i, \phi e_j)\tilde{g}(\phi e_j, e_i) \} \\ &\quad - |B|^2 - pH^2 = 2n(2n-1)f_1 + 2(2n-1)f_2 - (2n-1)f_3 - |B|^2 - pH^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using the value of $|B|^2$ obtain in the first part of the proof, we get the required result, that is,

$$\text{Scal}_M = 2n(2n-2)f_1 + (4n-1)f_2 - (2n-4)f_3 + (2n-1)H^2 + \frac{\Delta f}{f}H.$$

Moreover, since $\text{grad}(\ln f) = \frac{1}{f}\text{grad}f$ and $A_H = HA$ with H is a positive constant, the equation $A_H\text{grad}(\ln f) = 0$ reduces to $A\text{grad}f = 0$. This concludes the proof. \square

Now, from this proposition, we can prove the following non-existence result.

Corollary 4.4. *Let M^{2n} be a constant mean curvature hypersurface of generalized Sasakian space form $\widetilde{M}(f_1, f_2, f_3)$ with ξ tangent. If the functions f_1, f_2, f_3 satisfy the inequality $2nf_1 - f_2 + 3f_3 \leq \frac{\Delta f}{f}$ on M then M is not biharmonic.*

In particular, there exists no proper f -biharmonic CMC hypersurface with ξ tangent and f satisfying

- $\tilde{c} \leq \frac{4}{2n+2}[\frac{\Delta f}{f} - \frac{6n-2}{4}]$ in a Sasakian space form $\widetilde{M}_S^{2n+1}(\tilde{c})$.
- $\tilde{c} \leq \frac{4}{2n+2}[\frac{\Delta f}{f} + \frac{6n-2}{4}]$ in a Kenmotsu space form $\widetilde{M}_K^{2n+1}(\tilde{c})$.
- $\tilde{c} \leq \frac{4}{2n+2}\frac{\Delta f}{f}$ in a cosymplectic space form $\widetilde{M}_C^{2n+1}(\tilde{c})$.

Proof: As per assumption, M is a hypersurface of $\widetilde{M}(f_1, f_2, f_3)$ with non zero constant mean curvature H and ξ tangent to M . From Proposition 4.3, M is f -biharmonic if and only if its second fundamental form B satisfies $|B|^2 = 2nf_1 - f_2 + 3f_3 - \frac{\Delta f}{f}$. In other words, this is not possible if

$$(29) \quad 2nf_1 - f_2 + 3f_3 \leq \frac{\Delta f}{f}.$$

Now, $f_1 = \frac{\tilde{c}+3}{4}$ and $f_2 = f_3 = \frac{\tilde{c}-1}{4}$ if $\widetilde{M}(f_1, f_2, f_3)$ is a Sasakian space form where \tilde{c} is ϕ -sectional curvature. Therefore, the inequality $2nf_1 - f_2 + 3f_3 \leq \frac{\Delta f}{f}$ reduces to $\tilde{c} \leq \frac{4}{2n+2}[\frac{\Delta f}{f} - \frac{6n-2}{4}]$. Similarly, we have $f_1 = \frac{\tilde{c}-3}{4}$ and $f_2 = f_3 = \frac{\tilde{c}+1}{4}$ (resp. $f_1 = f_2 = f_3 = \frac{\tilde{c}}{4}$) for the Kenmotsu (resp. cosymplectic) case and the inequality $2nf_1 - f_2 + 3f_3 \leq \frac{\Delta f}{f}$ reduces to $\tilde{c} \leq \frac{4}{2n+2}[\frac{\Delta f}{f} + \frac{6n-2}{4}]$ (resp. $\tilde{c} \leq \frac{4}{2n+2}\frac{\Delta f}{f}$). \square

Now, we have the following proposition analogous to complex case.

?(thmSKC)?

Theorem 4.5. *Let M^q be a submanifold of Sasakian (Kenmotsu or cosymplectic) space form $\widetilde{M}_S^{2n+1}(\tilde{c})$ (resp. $\widetilde{M}_K^{2n+1}(\tilde{c})$ or $\widetilde{M}_C^{p+1}(\tilde{c})$) with constant mean curvature H so that ξ and ϕH are tangent. Further, we consider $F(f, q, \tilde{c})$ the function defined on M by*

$$F(f, q, \tilde{c}) = qf_1 - f_2 + 3f_3 - \frac{\Delta f}{f} = \begin{cases} \frac{(q+2)\tilde{c}}{4} + \frac{(3q-2)}{4} - \frac{\Delta f}{f} & \text{for } \widetilde{M}_S^{p+1}(\tilde{c}), \\ \frac{(q+2)\tilde{c}}{4} - \frac{(3q-2)}{4} - \frac{\Delta f}{f} & \text{for } \widetilde{M}_K^{p+1}(\tilde{c}), \\ \frac{(q+2)\tilde{c}}{4} - \frac{\Delta f}{f} & \text{for } \widetilde{M}_C^{p+1}(\tilde{c}). \end{cases}$$

Then we have the following observations.

- (1) If $\inf_M F(f, q, \tilde{c})$ is non-positive then M is not f -biharmonic.

(2) If $\inf_M F(f, q, \tilde{c})$ is positive and M is proper f -biharmonic then

$$0 < |H|^2 \leq \frac{1}{q} \inf_M F(f, q, \tilde{c}).$$

Proof: As M is proper f -biharmonic submanifold with constant mean curvature H and ξ tangent to M , so we get from Corollary 4.2 that

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta^\perp H + \text{tr}B(\cdot, A_H \cdot) + \frac{2}{f} \nabla_{\text{grad} f}^\perp H + \frac{\Delta f}{f} H = qf_1 H - f_2 H - 3f_3 NtH, \\ 2\text{tr}A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot) - 2A_H \text{grad}(\ln f) = -6f_3 PtH. \end{cases}$$

Now, considering ϕH is tangent implies that $sH = 0$. Again applying ϕ gives that $\phi^2 H = PtH + NtH$. But from $\phi^2 H = -H + \eta(H)\xi$ and ξ is tangent, we have $\phi^2 H = -H$. Therefore, comparing tangential and normal parts, we get $PtH = 0$ and $NtH = -H$. Using these facts in the above equation, we get

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta^\perp H + \text{tr}B(\cdot, A_H \cdot) = qf_1 H - f_2 H + 3f_3 H - \frac{\Delta f}{f} H, \\ 2\text{tr}A_{\nabla^\perp H}(\cdot) - 2A_H \text{grad}(\ln f) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Now, considering ν as an real eigenvalue of the eigenfunction f corresponding to Laplacian operator Δ , i.e., $\frac{\Delta f}{f} = \nu$, from first equation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta^\perp H + \text{tr}B(\cdot, A_H \cdot) &= qf_1 H - f_2 H + 3f_3 H - \nu H \\ &= F(f, q, \tilde{c})H. \end{aligned}$$

Taking scalar product by H , we get

$$-\langle \Delta^\perp H, H \rangle + \langle \text{tr}B(\cdot, A_H \cdot), H \rangle = F(f, q, \tilde{c})|H|^2.$$

Using the facts $\langle \text{tr}B(\cdot, A_H \cdot), H \rangle = |A_H|^2$, $|H|$ is a constant and the Böchner formula, i.e., $\frac{1}{2}\Delta|H|^2 = \langle \Delta^\perp H, H \rangle - |\nabla^\perp H|^2$ in the above equation, we have

$$|A_H|^2 + |\nabla^\perp H|^2 = F(f, q, \tilde{c})|H|^2.$$

Now, this equation reduces to

$$F(f, q, \tilde{c})|H|^2 = |A_H|^2 + |\nabla^\perp H|^2 \geq q|H|^2 + |\nabla^\perp H|^2 \geq q|H|^4,$$

by considering the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $|A_H|^2 \geq \frac{1}{q}\text{tr}(A_H) = q|H|^4$. It implies that

$$F(f, q, \tilde{c}) \geq q|H|^2,$$

as $|H|$ is a positive constant. This proves the two assertions of the theorem. \square

Now, we have the analogous result replacing the assumption that ϕH is tangent by ϕH is normal. Namely, we have:

Proposition 4.6. *Let $\psi : M^q \rightarrow \widetilde{M}_S^{p+1}(\tilde{c})$ (resp. $\widetilde{M}_K^{p+1}(\tilde{c})$ or $\widetilde{M}_C^{p+1}(\tilde{c})$) be a submanifold of Sasakian (Kenmotsu or cosymplectic) space form with constant mean curvature H so that ξ is*

tangent and ϕH is normal. Further, we consider $F(f, q, \tilde{c})$ the function defined on M by

$$G(f, q, \tilde{c}) = qf_1 - f_2 - \frac{\Delta f}{f} = \begin{cases} \frac{(q-1)\tilde{c}}{4} + \frac{(3q+1)}{4} - \frac{\Delta f}{f} & \text{for } \widetilde{M}_S^{p+1}(\tilde{c}), \\ \frac{(q-1)\tilde{c}}{4} - \frac{(3q+1)}{4} - \frac{\Delta f}{f} & \text{for } \widetilde{M}_K^{p+1}(\tilde{c}), \\ \frac{(q-1)\tilde{c}}{4} - \frac{\Delta f}{f} & \text{for } \widetilde{M}_C^{p+1}(\tilde{c}). \end{cases}$$

Then we have the following observations.

- (1) If $\inf_M G(f, q, \tilde{c})$ is non-positive then M is not f -biharmonic.
- (2) If $\inf_M G(f, q, \tilde{c})$ is positive and M is proper f -biharmonic then

$$0 < |H|^2 \leq \frac{1}{q} \inf_M G(f, q, \tilde{c}).$$

Proof: Now, in this case, M is proper f -biharmonic submanifold with ξ is tangent and ϕH is normal. Normality of ϕH implies that $sH = 0$. Therefore, from Corollary 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta^\perp H + \text{tr}B(\cdot, A_H \cdot) &= qf_1 H - f_2 H \\ &= G(f, q, \tilde{c})H. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, as in the previous theorem, taking the scalar product by H and using the Böchner formula and then with the help of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$G(f, q, \tilde{c})|H|^2 = |A_H|^2 + |\nabla^\perp H|^4 \geq q|H|^2 + |\nabla^\perp H|^2 \geq q|H|^4.$$

It easily provides the inequality $G(f, q, \tilde{c}) \geq q|H|^2$, since $|H|$ is a positive constant. We get $0 < |H|^2 \leq \frac{1}{q} \inf_M G(f, q, \tilde{c})$, which concludes the proof. \square

Acknowledgements

Second author is supported by post doctoral scholarship of “Harish Chandra Research Institute”, Department of Atomic Energy, Government of India.

REFERENCES

- [ABC][1] P. Alegre, D. E. Blair and A. Carriazo, *Generalized Sasakian space forms*, Israel J. Math., 141, 157 - 183, (2004).
- [AC][2] P. Alegre, and A. Carriazo, *Generalized Sasakian space forms and conformal change of the metric*, Results Math., 59(3), 485 - 493, (2011).
- [BFO][3] P. Baird, A. Fardoun and S. Ouakkas, *Conformal and semi-conformal biharmonic maps*, Ann. Glob. Anal. Geom., 34, 403 - 414, (2008).
- [Bl1a][4] D. E. Blair, *Riemannian Geometry of Contact and Symplectic Manifolds*, Birkhäuser Boston, Progress in Mathematics, 203, (2002).
- [CMO][5] R. Caddeo, S. Montaldo, C. Oniciuc, *Biharmonic submanifolds in spheres*. Israel J. Math., 130, 109 - 123, (2002).

- [CM01][6] R. Caddeo, S. Montaldo, and P. Piu, *On biharmonic maps*, Global differential geometry: the mathematical legacy of Alfred Gray, Contemp. Math., vol. 288, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, (2000).
- [Chen][7] B. Y. Chen, *Total Mean Curvature and Submanifolds of Finite Type*, Series in Pure Mathematics **1**, World Scientific Publishing Co., Singapore, (1984).
- [Ch2][8] B. Y. Chen, *Some open problems and conjectures on submanifolds of finite type*, Soochow J. Math., **17**, 169 - 188, (1991).
- [Ch3][9] B. Y. Chen, *Recent developments of biharmonic conjecture and modified biharmonic conjectures*, Pure and Applied Differential Geometry, Proceedings of the conference PADGE 2012, Shaker Verlag, Aachen, 81 - 90, (2013).
- [Der][10] A. Derdzinski, *Exemples de métriques de Kähler et d'Einstein auto-duales sur le plan complexe*, Géométrie riemannienne en dimension 4, (Séminaire Arthur Besse 1978/79), Cedic/Fernand Nathan, Paris, 334 - 346, (1981).
- [EL][11] J. Eells and L. Lemaire, *Selected topics in harmonic maps*, CBMS, 50, Amer. Math. Soc, (1983).
- [FLMO][12] D. Fetcu, E. Loubeau, S. Montaldo and C. Oniciuc, *Biharmonic submanifolds of $\mathbb{C}P^n$* , Math. Z., 266, 505 - 531, (2010).
- [FO][13] D. Fetcu, C. Oniciuc, *Explicit formulas for biharmonic submanifolds in Sasakian space forms*, Pacific J. Math., 240 (1), 85 - 107, (2009).
- [FOR][14] D. Fetcu, C. Oniciuc and H. Rosenberg, *Biharmonic submanifolds with parallel mean curvature in $\mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}$* , J. Geom. Anal. (in press).
- [JI][15] J. Inoguchi, *Submanifolds with harmonic mean curvature vector field in contact 3-manifolds*, Colloq. Math., 100, 163 - 179, (2004).
- [Ji][16] G. Y. Jiang, *2-harmonic maps and their first and second variational formulas*, Chinese Ann. Math. Ser., A7 (4), 389 - 402, (1986).
- [KÖ][17] F. Karaca and C. Özgür, *f-Biharmonic and Bi-f-harmonic submanifolds of product spaces*, Sarajevo J. Math., 13 (1), 115-129, (2017).
- [Lot][18] A. Lotta, *Slant submanifolds in contact geometry*, Bull. Math. Soc. Roumanie, 39, 183 - 198, (1996).
- [LO][19] T. Liang and Y. -L. Ou, *Biharmonic hypersurfaces in a conformally flat space*, Results Math. 64, 91 - 104, (2013).
- [LM][20] E. Loubeau and S. Montaldo, *Biminimal immersions*, Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc., 51, 421 - 437, (2008).
- [LU][21] Wei-Jun Lu, *On f-Biharmonic maps between Riemannian manifolds*, arXiv:1305.5478, preprint, (2013).
- [SH][22] S. Maeta and H. Urakawa, *Biharmonic Lagrangian submanifolds in Kähler manifolds*, Glasgow Math. J., 55, 465 - 480, (2013).
- [MC][23] S. Montaldo and C. Oniciuc, *A short survey on biharmonic maps between Riemannian manifolds*, Rev. Un. Mat. Argentina, 47, 1 - 22 (2007).
- [Ols][24] Z. Olszak, *On the existence of generalized complex space forms*, Israel J. Math., 65, no. 2, 214 - 218, (1989).
- [OL][25] Y. -L. Ou and L. Tang, *The generalized Chens conjecture on biharmonic submanifolds is false*, Michigan Math. J., 61, 531 - 542, (2012).

- [Y0] [26] Y. -L. Ou, *Biharmonic hypersurfaces in Riemannian manifolds*, Pacific J. Math., Vol. 248, No. 1, 217 - 232, (2010).
- [Y01] [27] Y. -L. Ou, *Some recent progress of biharmonic submanifolds*, arXiv:1511.09103.
- [Y02] [28] Y. -L. Ou, *On f-biharmonic maps and f-biharmonic submanifolds*, Pacific J. Math., 271, 461-477, (2014).
- [Y03] [29] Y. -L. Ou, *f-Biharmonic maps and f-biharmonic submanifolds II*, arXiv:1605.00128.
- [Rot] [30] J. Roth, *A note on biharmonic submanifolds of product spaces*, J. Geom., 104, 375 - 381, (2013).
- [RotAu] [31] J. Roth and A. Upadhyay, *Biharmonic submanifolds of generalized space forms*, arXiv:1602.06131.
- [TV] [32] F. Tricerri and L. Vanhecke, *Curvature tensors on almost Hermitian manifolds*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 267, no. 2, 365 - 397, (1981).
- [HU] [33] H. Urakawa, *Sasaki manifolds, Kähler cone manifolds and biharmonic submanifolds*, Illinois J. Math., Volume 58, Number 2, 521 - 535, (2014).
- [YK] [34] K. Yano and M. Kon, *Structures on manifolds*, Series in Pure Mathematics, 3. World Scientific Publishing Co., Singapore, (1984).

(J. ROTH) LABORATOIRE D'ANALYSE ET DE MATHÉMATIQUES APPLIQUÉES, UPEM-UPEC, CNRS, F-77454 MARNE-LA-VALLÉE

E-mail address: `julien.roth@u-pem.fr`

(A. UPADHYAY) HARISH CHANDRA RESEARCH INSTITUTE, CHHATNAG ROAD, JHUNSI, ALLAHABAD, INDIA, 211019

E-mail address: `abhi.basti.ipu@gmail.com`, `abhitoshupadhyay@hri.res.in`