

# CONFORMAL SYMMETRIES OF SELF-DUAL HYPERBOLIC MONOPOLE METRICS

NOBUHIRO HONDA AND JEFF VIACLOVSKY

ABSTRACT. We determine the group of conformal automorphisms of the self-dual metrics on  $n\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  due to LeBrun for  $n \geq 3$ , and Poon for  $n = 2$ . These metrics arise from an ansatz involving a circle bundle over hyperbolic three-space  $\mathcal{H}^3$  minus a finite number of points, called monopole points. We show that for  $n \geq 3$  connected sums, any conformal automorphism is a lift of an isometry of  $\mathcal{H}^3$  which preserves the set of monopole points. Furthermore, we prove that for  $n = 2$ , such lifts form a subgroup of index 2 in the full automorphism group, which we show is a semi-direct product  $(U(1) \times U(1)) \ltimes D_4$ , the dihedral group of order 8.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Hyperbolic monopole metrics	3
3. An explicit global connection	8
4. LeBrun's twistor spaces	18
5. Poon's projective model	21
6. Geometric interpretation	36
References	45

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In [Po86] and [Po92], Yat-Sun Poon found examples of self-dual conformal classes on the connected sums  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  and  $3\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  using techniques from algebraic geometry. In [LeB91b], Claude LeBrun gave a more explicit construction of  $U(1)$ -invariant self-dual conformal classes on  $n\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  for any  $n$ . Briefly, the idea is to choose  $n$  distinct points  $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  in hyperbolic 3-space  $\mathcal{H}^3$ , and consider a certain  $U(1)$ -bundle  $X_0 \rightarrow M_0$ , where  $M_0 = \mathcal{H}^3 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ . A scalar-flat Kähler metric is written explicitly on  $X_0$  in terms of a connection 1-form, and extends to the metric completion of  $X$  of  $X_0$ , which is biholomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}^2$  blown up at  $n$  points along a line. This metric conformally compactifies to give a self-dual conformal class on  $\hat{X} = n\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ , which we denote by  $[g_{LB}]$ . It turns out that any hyperbolic isometry which preserves the set of monopole points lifts to a conformal automorphism of  $(n\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2, [g_{LB}])$ . The

---

*Date:* February 11, 2009.

The first author has been partially supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B), The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan. The second author has been partially supported by the National Science Foundation under grant DMS-0804042.

main result of this paper is that the converse is also true for  $n \geq 3$ , and when  $n = 2$ , such lifts form a subgroup of index 2 in the full conformal group.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $n \geq 3$ , and  $[g_{\text{LB}}]$  be any LeBrun self-dual conformal class on  $\hat{X} = n\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ . A map  $\Phi : \hat{X} \rightarrow \hat{X}$  is a conformal automorphism if and only if it is the lift of an isometry of  $\mathcal{H}^3$  which preserves the set of monopole points.*

*For  $n = 2$ , there is a conformal involution  $\Lambda : \hat{X} \rightarrow \hat{X}$  with the following property. For any conformal automorphism  $\Phi : \hat{X} \rightarrow \hat{X}$ , exactly one of  $\Phi$  or  $\Phi \circ \Lambda$  is the lift of an isometry of  $\mathcal{H}^3$  which preserves the set of the two monopole points.*

**Remark 1.2.** The involution  $\Lambda$  arises as follows. For  $n = 2$ , there are exactly two semi-free conformal  $S^1$ -actions, which yield a double fibration of an open subset of  $\hat{X}$  over  $\mathcal{H}^3 \setminus \{\text{two points}\}$ . The map  $\Lambda$  interchanges the fibers of these two fibrations. We moreover find an  $S^1$ -family of involutions with the same properties, this will be proved in Section 6. To visualize this map, it is well-known that  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  can be viewed as a boundary connect sum of two Eguchi-Hanson ALE spaces (glued along the boundary  $\mathbb{R}\mathbb{P}^3$ -s). The involution  $\Lambda$  interchanges the Eguchi-Hanson spaces, and has an invariant  $\mathbb{R}\mathbb{P}^3$  (with fixed point set an  $S^2$ ). The existence of such an automorphism is not difficult from the topological perspective, but finding one that is *conformal* is highly nontrivial.

We will let  $\text{Aut}(g)$  denote the conformal automorphism group, and  $\text{Aut}_0(g)$  denote the identity component. Theorem 1.1 implies the following.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $[g_{\text{LB}}]$  be any LeBrun self-dual conformal class on  $\hat{X} = n\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  and  $n \geq 2$ . All conformal automorphisms are orientation preserving.*

*If the monopole points do not lie on any common geodesic, then*

$$(1.1) \quad \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}}) = \text{U}(1) \ltimes G, \quad \text{Aut}_0(g_{\text{LB}}) = \text{U}(1),$$

*where  $G$  is a finite subgroup of  $\text{O}(3)$ .*

*If the monopole points all lie on a common hyperbolic geodesic, then*

$$(1.2) \quad \text{Aut}_0(g_{\text{LB}}) = \text{U}(1) \times \text{U}(1).$$

*In this case, for  $n \geq 3$  the full conformal group is*

$$(1.3) \quad \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}}) = \text{Aut}_0(g_{\text{LB}}) \ltimes \mathbb{Z}_2,$$

*unless the points are configured symmetrically about a midpoint, in which case*

$$(1.4) \quad \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}}) = \text{Aut}_0(g_{\text{LB}}) \ltimes (\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2).$$

*In the case  $n = 2$ , (1.2) necessarily holds, and the full conformal group is*

$$(1.5) \quad \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}}) = \text{Aut}_0(g_{\text{LB}}) \ltimes \text{D}_4,$$

*where  $\text{D}_4$  is the dihedral group of order 8.*

The symmetry condition in the case of (1.4) is, more precisely, that there exists an extra hyperbolic reflection preserving the set of monopole which fixes only a midpoint on the common geodesic. We will give explicit generators for each of the finite subgroups appearing in the semi-direct products (1.3)-(1.5), see Theorem 3.11.

We next give a brief outline of the paper. We review the construction of LeBrun metrics in Section 2, and we will detail the procedure for lifting hyperbolic isometries to conformal automorphisms of the LeBrun metrics. In Section 3, we present an explicit form of the LeBrun metrics in the toric case, and discuss the extra involution in the case  $n = 2$ . In Subsection 3.3, we give a summary of the results, and give a short discussion of the fixed point set of involutions and invariant sets, and the action on cohomology.

The remainder of the paper will use twistor methods to prove that there are no other conformal automorphisms. Section 4 will cover the case of  $n \geq 3$ , while Section 5 will cover the case when  $n = 2$ . The case of  $n \geq 3$  is relatively easy, since in this case a (rational) quotient map for the  $\mathbb{C}^*$ -action on the twistor space corresponding to the semi-free  $U(1)$ -action is induced by a *complete* linear system, which implies that any automorphism descends to the quotient space. For  $n = 2$ , this is not true, and for this reason we instead use Poon's model of the twistor space, which is a small resolution of the intersection of two quadrics in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^5$ , see Section 5. In Subsection 5.1, we show that the holomorphic automorphisms of the intersection of the two quadrics which commute with the real structure consist of 16 tori. In Subsection 5.2, we determine explicitly which small resolutions actually give the twistor space. Then in Subsection 5.3, we show that the conformal automorphism group of Poon's metric consists of 8 tori, by explicitly determining which automorphisms among the 16 tori lift to the small resolutions obtained in Subsection 5.2. Finally, we interpret these automorphisms geometrically in Section 6, focusing on the involution  $\Lambda$  when  $n = 2$ .

We could have alternatively started the paper with the sections on twistor theory—this completely determines the automorphism group using only algebraic methods. However, one would like to understand the automorphisms geometrically, so we begin with the metric definition. From this perspective, it is easier to visualize the automorphisms for  $n \geq 3$ , as they are lifts of hyperbolic isometries. However, the existence of the extra conformal involution for  $n = 2$  is not at all obvious from the metric perspective (in fact we first discovered it from the twistor viewpoint).

**1.1. Acknowledgements.** The authors are very grateful to Claude LeBrun for valuable discussions on his hyperbolic ansatz. The authors would also like to thank Simon Donaldson and Simon Salamon for insightful remarks.

## 2. HYPERBOLIC MONOPOLE METRICS

We briefly recall the construction of LeBrun's self-dual hyperbolic monopole metrics from [LeB91b]. Consider the upper half-space model of hyperbolic space

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{H}^3 = \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3, z > 0\},$$

with the hyperbolic metric  $g_{\mathcal{H}^3} = z^{-2}(dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2)$ . Choose  $n$  distinct points  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  in  $\mathcal{H}^3$ , and let  $P = p_1 \cup \dots \cup p_n$ . Let  $\Gamma_{p_j}$  denote the fundamental solution for the hyperbolic Laplacian based at  $p_j$  with normalization  $\Delta\Gamma_{p_j} = -2\pi\delta_{p_j}$ , and let  $V = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{p_i}$ . Then  $*dV$  is a closed 2-form on  $\mathcal{H}^3 \setminus P$ , and  $(1/2\pi)[*dV]$  is an integral class in  $H^2(\mathcal{H}^3 \setminus P, \mathbb{Z})$ . Let  $\pi : X_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^3 \setminus P$  be the unique principal

U(1)-bundle determined by the the above integral class. By Chern-Weil theory, there is a connection form  $\omega \in H^1(X_0, i\mathbb{R})$  with curvature form  $i(*dV)$ . LeBrun's metric is defined by

$$(2.2) \quad g_{\text{LB}} = z^2(V \cdot g_{\mathcal{H}^3} - V^{-1}\omega \odot \omega).$$

Note the minus sign appears, since by convention our connection form is imaginary valued. We define a larger manifold  $X$  by attaching points  $\tilde{p}_j$  over each  $p_j$ , and by attaching an  $\mathbb{R}^2$  at  $z = 0$ . The space  $X$  is non-compact, and has the topology of an ALE space. Adding the point at infinity will result in a compact manifold  $\hat{X}$ .

**Remark 2.1.** Choosing a different connection form will result in the same metric, up to diffeomorphism, see the proof of Proposition 2.6 below.

We summarize the main properties of  $(X, g_{\text{LB}})$  in the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.2** (LeBrun [LeB91b]). *The metric  $g_{\text{LB}}$  extends to  $X$  as a smooth Riemannian metric. The space  $(X, g_{\text{LB}})$  is asymptotically flat Kähler scalar-flat with a single end, and is biholomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}^2$  blown up  $n$  points on a line. By adding one point, this metric conformally compactifies to a self-dual conformal class on the compactification  $(\hat{X}, [g_{\text{LB}}])$ , which is diffeomorphic to  $n\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ .*

We next review some facts from bundle theory, which will then be applied to LeBrun's metrics.

**2.1. Bundle methods.** In this section  $U(1) \rightarrow X_0 \xrightarrow{\pi} M$  will be a principal U(1)-bundle over a connected oriented base manifold  $M$ . The group U(1) acts on  $X_0$  from the right, we will denote this action by  $R_g$  for  $g \in U(1)$ . Recall that a connection  $\omega \in \Lambda^1(X_0; i\mathbb{R})$  is a 1-form on  $X_0$  with values in the Lie algebra of U(1). The connection satisfies (i)  $\omega$  restricted to the fiber  $\pi^{-1}(z)$  is  $i \cdot d\theta$ , the Maurer-Cartan form on U(1), and (ii)  $R_g^*\omega = \omega$ . Since the group is abelian, the *curvature 2-form* of the connection is given by  $\Omega_\omega = d\omega \in H^2(X, i\mathbb{R})$ , and this forms descends to  $M$ .

**Definition 2.3.** The connections  $\omega$  and  $\omega'$  are said to be *gauge equivalent* if there exists a function  $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\omega = \omega' + i \cdot df$ .

**Remark 2.4.** If  $\Omega_\omega = \Omega_{\omega'}$  then  $d(\omega - \omega') = 0$ . If  $H^1(M; \mathbb{R}) = 0$ , then  $\omega - \omega' = i \cdot df$ , so  $\omega$  and  $\omega'$  are gauge equivalent.

**Definition 2.5.** The connections  $\omega$  and  $\omega'$  are said to be *bundle equivalent* if there exists a fiber-preserving map  $B : X_0 \rightarrow X_0$  covering the identity map of  $M$ , that is  $\pi \circ B = \pi$ , and which commutes with the right action of U(1), satisfying  $B^*\omega' = \omega$ .

**Proposition 2.6.** *If the connections  $\omega$  and  $\omega'$  are gauge equivalent then they are bundle equivalent. The converse holds if  $H^1(M, \mathbb{R}) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* If the connections are gauge equivalent, then  $\omega = \omega' + i \cdot df$ . Define a bundle map  $B : X_0 \rightarrow X_0$  by  $Bv = v \cdot e^{if}$  (right action). Letting  $\omega'_1$  denote a local connection form on the base, we have

$$(2.3) \quad B^*\omega' = B^*(\omega'_1 + i \cdot d\theta) = \omega'_1 + iB^*d\theta = \omega'_1 + i(d\theta + df) = \omega' + i \cdot df = \omega.$$

Conversely, if  $B^*\omega' = \omega$ , then  $\Omega_\omega = d\omega = dB^*\omega' = B^*\Omega_{\omega'}$ . These are forms on the base, and  $B$  covers the identity map, so  $\Omega_\omega = \Omega_{\omega'}$ , which implies that  $\omega$  and  $\omega'$  are gauge equivalent by Remark 2.4.  $\square$

Since  $X_0$  is a  $U(1)$ -bundle, it has a first Chern class  $c_1(X_0) \in H^2(M; \mathbb{Z})$ . From the exponential sheaf sequence,  $H^1(M, \mathcal{E}^*) = H^2(M; \mathbb{Z})$ , so  $X_0$  is determined up to smooth bundle equivalence by  $c_1(X_0)$ . By Chern-Weil theory, the image of  $c_1(X_0)$  in  $H^2(M; i\mathbb{R})$  is cohomologous to  $\Omega_\omega$ , for any connection  $\omega$  on  $X_0$ .

**Proposition 2.7.** *Assume that  $H^1(M; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$ , and that  $H^2(M; \mathbb{Z})$  has no torsion. Let  $\omega$  be a connection on  $X_0$ , and  $\phi : M \rightarrow M$  an orientation preserving diffeomorphism satisfying  $\phi^*\Omega_\omega = \Omega_\omega$ . Then there exists an equivariant lift of  $\phi$  to  $\Phi : X_0 \rightarrow X_0$  satisfying  $\Phi^*\omega = \omega$ . If  $\phi : M \rightarrow M$  is an orientation reversing diffeomorphism satisfying  $\phi^*\Omega_\omega = -\Omega_\omega$ , then there exists such a lift satisfying  $\Phi^*\omega = -\omega$ . These lifts are unique up to right action by a constant in  $U(1)$ . In both cases,  $\Phi$  is orientation preserving.*

*Proof.* First assume that  $\phi$  is orientation preserving. Consider the pull-back bundle  $\phi^*X_0$ . By naturality,

$$(2.4) \quad c_1(\phi^*X_0) = \phi^*c_1(X_0) = \phi^*[\Omega_\omega] = [\Omega_\omega] = c_1(X_0).$$

Consequently, there exists a bundle equivalence  $A : \phi^*X_0 \rightarrow X_0$ , which is an equivariant map covering the identity map on  $M$ . Denote by  $\pi_2$  the natural map  $\pi_2 : \phi^*X_0 \rightarrow X_0$ . This is summarized in the following diagram.

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} X_0 & \xrightarrow{A^{-1}} & \phi^*X_0 & \xrightarrow{\pi_2} & X_0 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ M & \xrightarrow{Id} & M & \xrightarrow{\phi} & M. \end{array}$$

The pull-back  $\omega' = (A^{-1})^*\pi_2^*\omega$  is a connection on  $X_0$ . Since  $\pi_2 \circ A^{-1}$  covers  $\phi$ , we have

$$(2.6) \quad \Omega_{\omega'} = d\omega' = d((\pi_2 \circ A^{-1})^*\omega) = (\pi_2 \circ A^{-1})^*\Omega_\omega = \phi^*\Omega_\omega = \Omega_\omega.$$

From Remark 2.4, it follows that  $\omega'$  and  $\omega$  are gauge equivalent. By Proposition 2.6,  $\omega'$  and  $\omega$  are bundle equivalent, so there exists a bundle map  $B : X_0 \rightarrow X_0$  satisfying  $B^*\omega' = \omega$ . The desired map is given  $\pi_2 \circ A^{-1} \circ B$ . In the construction of the map  $B$  in the proof of Proposition 2.6 above, there is a freedom to replace the function  $f$  by  $f + c$  for any constant  $c$ , and the uniqueness statement follows.

If  $\phi$  is orientation reversing, then the pull-back bundle  $\phi^*X_0$  will satisfy  $c_1(\phi^*X_0) = -c_1(X_0)$ . In this case we need to add an additional map identifying the bundle with its conjugate bundle using complex conjugation, which corresponds geometrically to making a reflection in each fiber (such a choice is not canonical). Clearly, this makes the lift orientation preserving.  $\square$

**Remark 2.8.** These lifts can be computed explicitly once the transition functions of the bundle are known (with respect to some open cover). Assume that the bundle is

trivialized over a simply connected open set  $U$ , and that  $U$  is a  $\phi$ -invariant set. Tracing through the above proof, to find the lift, we must first find a function  $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$(2.7) \quad \phi^*\omega - \omega = i \cdot df,$$

and the lift is then right multiplication by  $e^{if}$  in each fiber (if  $\phi$  is orientation-reversing, then we add a reflection in each fiber). The action in other coordinate systems is then found using the transition functions.

**Proposition 2.9.** *Let  $p$  be a fixed point of  $\phi$ . If  $\phi$  is orientation reversing, then any lift  $\Phi$  of  $\phi$  fixes exactly 2 points over  $p$ .*

*Proof.* From the above proof, any lift is a reflection in the fiber over a fixed point. A reflection always has exactly 2 fixed points.  $\square$

**2.2. Lifts of hyperbolic isometries.** We only give a brief summary in this section; for background on hyperbolic geometry, see [Rat94]. Using the quaternions, write hyperbolic upper half space as

$$(2.8) \quad \mathcal{H}^3 = \{x + yi + zj \mid (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3, z > 0\}.$$

The group of hyperbolic isometries is the group of time-oriented Lorentz transformations  $\mathrm{SO}_+(3, 1)$ . The identity component is isomorphic to  $\mathrm{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ ; an isomorphism can be seen explicitly as follows [Rat94, Chapter 4]. Any orientation preserving hyperbolic isometry  $\phi : \mathcal{H}^3 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^3$  may be written

$$(2.9) \quad \phi(w) = (aw + b)(cw + d)^{-1},$$

with  $(a, b, c, d) \in \mathbb{C}^4$ , and  $ad - bc = 1$ , where we use quaternionic multiplication and inverse. Similarly, any orientation reversing hyperbolic isometry  $\phi : \mathcal{H}^3 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^3$  may be written

$$(2.10) \quad \phi(w) = (a(-\bar{w}) + b)(c(-\bar{w}) + d)^{-1},$$

with  $(a, b, c, d) \in \mathbb{C}^4$ , and  $ad - bc = 1$ .

**Proposition 2.10.** *Let  $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}^3$ , and  $n \geq 2$ . Let  $G$  denote the group of all hyperbolic isometries preserving this set of points. If all points lie on a single hyperbolic geodesic  $\gamma$ , then  $G = \mathrm{O}(2)$  acting as rotations and reflections about  $\gamma$ , unless the points are configured symmetrically about a midpoint, in which case  $G = \mathrm{O}(2) \oplus \mathrm{O}(2)$  (more precisely, this symmetry condition is that there is another reflection preserving the set of points, and  $G$  is generated by  $\mathrm{O}(2)$  and this reflection). Finally, if the points do not lie on any common geodesic, then  $G$  is conjugate to finite subgroup of  $\mathrm{O}(3)$ .*

*Proof.* This can be proved by a direct computation using the presentations (2.9) and (2.10). The proof is finished by noting that *any* finite subgroup of  $\mathrm{SO}_+(3, 1)$  is conjugate to a subgroup of  $\mathrm{O}(3)$ , see [Rat94, Theorem 5.5.2].  $\square$

The following proposition shows the lifts obtained in Proposition 2.7 yield conformal automorphisms of LeBrun's metrics.

**Proposition 2.11.** *If  $\phi : \mathcal{H}^3 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^3$  is a hyperbolic isometry preserving the set of monopole points, then there exists a unique  $U(1)$ -family of lifts  $\Phi$  as in Proposition 2.7 which are orientation preserving conformal automorphisms of  $(X_0, g_{LB})$ . Furthermore, any such lift extends to a conformal automorphism of the compactification  $(n\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2, [g_{LB}])$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\phi$  is a hyperbolic isometry, then

$$(2.11) \quad V \circ \Phi = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n \Gamma_{\Phi^{-1}(p_j)}.$$

Since  $\phi$  fixes the set of monopole points, we have  $\phi^*V = V$ . We chose the connection above so that  $\Omega_\omega = i(*dV)$ . This implies that  $\phi^*\Omega_\omega = \Omega_\omega$  if  $\phi$  is orientation preserving, and  $\phi^*\Omega_\omega = -\Omega_\omega$  if  $\phi$  is orientation reversing. In either case, we may apply Proposition 2.7 to find a lift of  $\phi$  satisfying  $\Phi^*\omega = \pm\omega$ . By assumption,  $\phi^*g_{\mathcal{H}^3} = g_{\mathcal{H}^3}$ , so we have

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \Phi^*g_{LB} &= (z \circ \Phi)^2 \left( (V \circ \Phi) \cdot \Phi^*g_{\mathcal{H}^3} - (V \circ \Phi)^{-1} \cdot \Phi^*(\omega \odot \omega) \right) \\ &= (z \circ \Phi)^2 \left( V \cdot g_{\mathcal{H}^3} - V^{-1}\omega \odot \omega \right) = \left( \frac{z \circ \Phi}{z} \right)^2 g_{LB}. \end{aligned}$$

For the last statement, the  $S^1$ -action of fiber rotation on  $X_0$  clearly extends smoothly to the compactification, since  $\hat{X}$  is obtained from  $X_0$  by adding fixed points over the monopole points, and also adding the entire boundary of  $\mathcal{H}^3$ , which is also fixed by the  $S^1$ -action. The argument in [LeB91b] for extending the metric conformally to  $\hat{X}$  generalizes to show that  $\Phi$  yields a *smooth* conformal diffeomorphism of  $\hat{X}$ , we omit the details.  $\square$

We emphasize that Proposition 2.7 only provides a lift of a single isometry. The lifting of a group of isometries is more subtle. We define  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{H}^3; p_1, \dots, p_n)$  to be the group of isometries of  $\mathcal{H}^3$  which preserve the set of monopole points, and let  $\text{Aut}(g_{LB}; p_1, \dots, p_n)$  denote the subgroup of conformal automorphisms which are lifts of elements in  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{H}^3; p_1, \dots, p_n)$ . Clearly, we have an exact sequence

$$(2.13) \quad 1 \rightarrow U(1) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(g_{LB}; p_1, \dots, p_n) \xrightarrow{\rho} \text{Aut}(\mathcal{H}^3; p_1, \dots, p_n),$$

where  $\rho$  is the obvious projection. A natural question is whether this sequence *splits*, that is, does there exist a homomorphism

$$(2.14) \quad \mu : \text{Aut}(\mathcal{H}^3; p_1, \dots, p_n) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(g_{LB}; p_1, \dots, p_n)$$

such that  $\rho \circ \mu = \text{id}$ ?

In general, this sequence does not split. We next give a condition for the sequence to split when restricted to a subgroup of  $G \subset \text{Aut}(\mathcal{H}^3; p_1, \dots, p_n)$ .

**Proposition 2.12.** *Let the subgroup  $G$  consist of orientation preserving elements. If the subgroup  $G$  has a fixed point  $p \in \mathcal{H}^3 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ , then there is a splitting homomorphism*

$$(2.15) \quad \mu : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(g_{LB}; p_1, \dots, p_n), \quad \rho \circ \mu = \text{id}_G.$$

Furthermore,

$$(2.16) \quad \mathrm{U}(1) \times G \subset \mathrm{Aut}(g_{\mathrm{LB}}; p_1, \dots, p_n).$$

*Proof.* Since  $p$  is not one of the monopole points, then any element of  $G$  has a unique lift which fixes the fiber over  $p$ . This defines the splitting map  $\mu$ . To see that  $\mu$  is a homomorphism: given  $g_1 \in G$  and  $g_2 \in G$ , we compare  $\mu(g_1 g_2)$  with  $\mu(g_1) \mu(g_2)$ . The former is, by definition, the lift of  $g_1 g_2$  in the unique lift which fixes the fiber over  $p$ . The latter is also a lift of  $g_1 g_2$ , and fixes the fiber over  $p$ , since both  $\mu(g_1)$  and  $\mu(g_2)$  fix this fiber. By uniqueness, they are the same.

Next,  $\mathrm{U}(1)$  is the identity component, which is normal. We claim that  $\mu(G)$  is also normal. To see this, let  $\mu(g) \in \mu(G)$ , and  $\Phi \in \mathrm{Aut}(g_{\mathrm{LB}}; p_1, \dots, p_n)$ . Then  $\Phi \mu(g) \Phi^{-1}$  fixes  $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  and fixes the fiber over  $p$ , therefore must be the of the form  $\mu(h)$  for some element  $h \in G$ .

Finally, since both subgroups are normal, by an elementary theorem in group theory, we therefore have a direct product.  $\square$

**Remark 2.13.** Consider the case when the points are not contained on a common geodesic. Then  $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{H}^3; p_1, \dots, p_n)$  is conjugate to a subgroup of  $\mathrm{O}(3)$ . Let us assume for simplicity that the symmetry group  $G$  is conjugate to a subgroup of  $\mathrm{SO}(3)$ . The group  $G$  either fixes a geodesic, or has a single fixed point. In the former case, there must be a non-monopole fixed point, and Proposition 2.12 can be applied. In the latter case, if the fixed point is not a monopole point, then again Proposition 2.12 can be applied. But if the fixed point is a monopole point, then the entire group might not lift. In this case, it is possible that the group  $G$  appearing in (1.1) is a strictly smaller subgroup of  $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{H}^3; p_1, \dots, p_n)$ , and which might not necessarily lift to a normal subgroup. We do not know of any such example for which this happens, however.

**Proposition 2.14.** *If all of the monopole points lie on a common geodesic, then*

$$(2.17) \quad \mathrm{U}(1) \times \mathrm{SO}(2) = \mathrm{U}(1) \times \mathrm{U}(1) \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}(g_{\mathrm{LB}}).$$

*Proof.* The subgroup  $\mathrm{SO}(2)$  of rotations around a geodesic fix the entire geodesic. Let  $p$  be any non-monopole point on the geodesic, and apply Proposition 2.12.  $\square$

In the next section we present a direct method of finding such lifts, via an explicit connection form.

### 3. AN EXPLICIT GLOBAL CONNECTION

In this section we give an explicit connection for the LeBrun ansatz in the toric case. We first consider the case of 2 monopole points. Let the monopole points lie on the  $z$ -axis,  $p_1 = (0, 0, c_1)$ , and  $p_2 = (0, 0, c_2)$ , with  $c_1 < c_2$ . Choose cylindrical coordinates

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{H}^3 = \{(x, y, z) = (r \cos \theta_3, r \sin \theta_3, z), z > 0\}.$$

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $U = \mathcal{H}^3 \setminus \{z\text{-axis}\}$ , and write*

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{H}^3 \setminus \{p_1, p_2\} = U_1 \cup U_2 \cup U_3,$$

where

$$(3.3) \quad U_1 = U \cup \{(0, 0, z), z < c_1\} = U \cup I_1,$$

$$(3.4) \quad U_2 = U \cup \{(0, 0, z), c_1 < z < c_2\} = U \cup I_2,$$

$$(3.5) \quad U_3 = U \cup \{(0, 0, z), z > c_2\} = U \cup I_3.$$

Let  $f_c : \mathcal{H}^3 \setminus \{p_1, p_2\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denote the function

$$(3.6) \quad f_c(r, z) = \frac{c^2 - r^2 - z^2}{2\sqrt{(c^2 + r^2 + z^2)^2 - 4c^2z^2}}.$$

Then  $f = f_{c_1} + f_{c_2}$  satisfies

$$(3.7) \quad d(fd\theta_3) = *dV,$$

in  $U$ . That is, the form  $ifd\theta_3$  is a local connection form in  $U$ . Define

$$(3.8) \quad \omega_1(x) = i(-1 + f)d\theta_3, x \in U_1,$$

$$(3.9) \quad \omega_2(x) = ifd\theta_3, x \in U_2,$$

$$(3.10) \quad \omega_3(x) = i(1 + f)d\theta_3, x \in U_3.$$

These 1-forms define a global connection (with values in  $\mathfrak{u}(1) = i\mathbb{R}$ ) on the total space  $X_0 \rightarrow M$ . That is, there is a global connection  $\omega$  on  $X_0$ , such that over  $U_j$ ,  $\omega$  has the form  $\omega_j + i \cdot d\theta_1$ , where  $\theta_1$  is an angular coordinate on the fiber.

*Proof.* Recall we want the connection to have curvature form  $\Omega_\omega = *dV$ , where  $V = 1 + \Gamma_{p_1} + \Gamma_{p_2}$ . The Green's function is given by

$$(3.11) \quad \Gamma_{(0,0,c)}(x, y, z) = -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 - \frac{4c^2z^2}{(r^2 + z^2 + c^2)^2} \right]^{-1/2},$$

where  $r^2 = x^2 + y^2$ , see [LeB91a, Section 2]. An important point is that  $\Gamma$  only depends upon  $z$  and  $r$ . A computation shows that in cylindrical coordinates

$$(3.12) \quad *dV = \left( \frac{r}{z} (-V_r dz + V_z dr) \right) \wedge d\theta_3,$$

since  $d * dV = 0$ , this implies that

$$(3.13) \quad d \left( \frac{r}{z} (-V_r dz + V_z dr) \right) = 0.$$

The first quadrant  $Q_1 = \{(r, z), r > 0, z > 0\}$  is contractible, so there exists a function  $f = f(r, z)$  such that

$$(3.14) \quad df = \frac{r}{z} (-V_r dz + V_z dr).$$

We let

$$(3.15) \quad \kappa = \frac{r}{z} V_z dr - \frac{r}{z} V_r dz = \kappa_1 dr + \kappa_2 dz.$$

An explicit potential  $f$  satisfying  $df = \kappa$  is

$$(3.16) \quad f = \left( \int_0^1 \kappa_1(tr, tz) dt \right) r + \left( \int_0^1 \kappa_2(tr, tz) dt \right) z.$$

A computation, which we omit, shows that

$$(3.17) \quad f = f_{c_1} + f_{c_2},$$

is a solution where  $f_c$  is given by

$$(3.18) \quad f_c(r, z) = \frac{c^2 - r^2 - z^2}{2\sqrt{(c^2 + r^2 + z^2)^2 - 4c^2z^2}},$$

and any other solution differs from this by a constant, since  $U$  is connected. An important remark is that

$$(3.19) \quad (c^2 + r^2 + z^2)^2 - 4c^2z^2 \geq 0,$$

and if  $(c^2 + r^2 + z^2)^2 - 4c^2z^2 = 0$ , then  $(z - c)^2 + r^2 = 0$ , so  $f_c$  is well-defined on all of  $\mathcal{H}^3 \setminus \{(0, 0, c)\}$ . We then have on  $U$ ,

$$(3.20) \quad d(fd\theta_3) = df \wedge d\theta_3 = *dV.$$

Along the  $z$ -axis, we have the following

$$(3.21) \quad f(0, z) = \begin{cases} 1 & z < c_1, \\ 0 & c_1 < z < c_2, \\ -1 & z > c_2. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore,  $\frac{\partial}{\partial r}f(0, z) = 0$ . Consequently,  $(f - 1)d\theta_3$  is a smooth 1-form in  $U_1$ ,  $\omega_2 = fd\theta_3$  is a smooth 1-form in  $U_2$ , and  $\omega_3 = (1 + f)d\theta_3$  is a smooth 1-form in  $U_3$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** For  $n > 2$ , simply take  $f = f_{c_1} + \dots + f_{c_n}$ , and  $U_j$  to be the union of  $U$  with the corresponding interval on the  $z$ -axis, with the connection form in each chart adding the appropriate constant multiple of  $d\theta_3$ . We remark that an explicit potential in the case  $n = 2$  was written down in [GW07] in pseudospherical coordinates, but only in a single chart; our method above yields a *global* connection form.

We can use the above to write down explicit transition functions for the bundle  $X_0 \rightarrow M$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *With respect to the covering  $\{U_1, U_2, U_3\}$ , the transition functions of the bundle are given by  $g_{21} = e^{i\theta_3}$ , and  $g_{23} = e^{-i\theta_3}$ .*

*Proof.* From above

$$(3.22) \quad \omega_2 - \omega_1 = ifd\theta_3 - i(-1 + f)d\theta_3 = i \cdot d\theta_3.$$

The formula for the change of connection is given by

$$(3.23) \quad \omega_2 - \omega_1 = g_{21}^{-1}dg_{21},$$

which implies that  $g_{21} = e^{i\theta_3}$ . Also,

$$(3.24) \quad \omega_2 - \omega_3 = i(fd\theta_3) - i(1+f)d\theta_3 = -i \cdot d\theta_3 = g_{23}^{-1}dg_{23},$$

which implies that  $g_{23} = e^{-i\theta_3}$ .  $\square$

We name two points on the boundary of  $\mathcal{H}^3$ :  $q_1 = (0, 0, 0)$ , and  $q_2 = (0, 0, \infty)$ . We denote the union of the fibers over  $\bar{I}_j$  by  $\Sigma_j$  ( $1 \leq j \leq 3$ ), which is a 2-sphere. We also let  $\Sigma_4$  denote the 2-sphere corresponding to the boundary of hyperbolic space. Using the above, we next show that the  $S^1$ -action on  $\mathcal{H}^3$  given by rotation around the  $z$ -axis has infinitely many lifts to conformal  $S^1$ -actions on  $(\hat{X}, [g_{\text{LB}}])$ . We recall that a *semi-free* action is a non-trivial action of a group  $G$  on a connected space  $M$  such that for every  $x \in M$ , the corresponding isotropy subgroup is either all of  $G$  or is trivial.

**Proposition 3.4.** *Consider the  $S^1$ -action on  $\mathcal{H}^3$  by oriented rotations around the  $z$ -axis. Then for any integer  $k$ , there exists a lift to a conformal  $S^1$ -action on  $(\hat{X}, [g_{\text{LB}}])$  such that  $e^{i\theta}$  lifts with following property: the lifted action rotates the fibers over  $I_2$  by  $e^{ik\theta}$ , it rotates the fibers over  $I_1$  by  $e^{i(k-1)\theta}$ , and rotates the fibers over  $I_3$  by  $e^{i(k+1)\theta}$ .*

*Consequently, for  $k = 0$ , the lift fixes only  $\Sigma_2 \cup \{q_1, q_2\}$ , and this action is the only lift to a semi-free  $S^1$ -action. For  $k = 1$ , the fixed points are  $\Sigma_1 \cup \{p_2, q_2\}$ , and for  $k = -1$ , the lift fixes only  $\Sigma_3 \cup \{p_1, q_1\}$ . For any other  $k$ , the fixed set consists of four points  $\{p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2\}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\phi$  denote an oriented rotation about the  $z$ -axis, determined by  $e^{i\theta_0}$ . As in the above section, we know a lift of  $\phi$ , call it  $\Phi$ , exists, and is unique up to a right multiplication by a constant. If we choose the lift  $\Phi$  so that  $\Phi$  fixes fiber over a point on  $I_2$ , then  $\Phi$  fixes all fibers over  $I_2$ . This follows because the connection form on  $U_2$  chosen in Theorem 3.1 is invariant under rotations around the  $z$ -axis, see Remark 2.8. From the transition functions given in Proposition 3.3,  $\Phi$  rotates the fibers over  $I_1$  by  $e^{-i\theta_0}$ , and the fibers over  $I_3$  are rotated by  $e^{+i\theta_0}$ . Finally, it is clear that we can lift to an  $S^1$ -action by specifying the action on the fibers over  $I_2$ ; there is a lift for any integer  $k$  so that the fibers of  $I_2$  are rotated by  $e^{ik\theta}$ . The semi-free claim is obvious, since for  $k = 0$ , the lift only makes a single rotation on  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_3$ , while for  $k \neq 0$ ,  $I_1$  and  $I_3$  are rotated multiple times. Again, the argument in [LeB91b] extends to show all of the above actions yield smooth actions on the compactification  $\hat{X}$ , we omit the details.  $\square$

We denote the lifted action for  $k = 0$  by  $K_3$ . Since the  $K_3$ -action clearly commutes with the  $K_1$ -action, this then gives an identification of the identity component of the automorphism group with  $K_1 \times K_3$ , where  $K_1$  is the group of rotations in the fiber. It will be shown below in Lemma 6.1, that for  $n = 2$ ,  $K_1$  and  $K_3$  are the only semi-free  $S^1$ -actions. We will also see in Section 6 that the  $K_3$ -action yields another fibration of an open subset of  $X$  over  $\mathcal{H}^3 \setminus \{\text{two points}\}$ .

While for simplicity of presentation we restricted the above discussion to the case of 2 monopole points, it is clear that for the case of  $n$  monopole points all lying on a common geodesic, the  $SO(2)$ -action of rotations in  $\mathcal{H}^3$  around the geodesic will have

a lift to an  $S^1$ -action for any integer  $k$ . Since these actions commute with the fiber rotation, there is a torus action as identity component. However, in contrast to  $n = 2$ , for  $n \geq 3$ , none of these lifted  $S^1$ -actions are semi-free, see Lemma 6.1.

**3.1. Relation to Joyce metrics.** In [Joy95], Dominic Joyce gave a very general construction for toric self-dual metrics. In that paper, on page 547, Joyce remarks that toric LeBrun metrics are in fact Joyce metrics. However, a direct argument is not provided. In this short section (which is really just an extended remark) we suggest a direct argument, using the explicit connection form from the previous section. For space considerations, we do not provide full details. Again, for simplicity we consider only that case  $n = 2$ . With this choice of connection, the LeBrun metric takes the form

$$(3.25) \quad g_{\text{LB}} = V \frac{1}{z^2} (dr^2 + r^2 d\theta_3^2 + dz^2) - V^{-1} \omega_2^2,$$

which we can write as

$$(3.26) \quad V^{-1} g_{\text{LB}} = \frac{1}{z^2} (dr^2 + dz^2) + \frac{r^2}{z^2} d\theta_3^2 + V^{-2} (fd\theta_3 + d\theta_1)^2$$

$$(3.27) \quad = g_{\mathcal{H}^2} + \frac{r^2}{z^2} d\theta_3^2 + V^{-2} (fd\theta_3 + d\theta_1)^2.$$

Recall that the coordinates  $(r, z)$  lie in the first quadrant  $Q_1$ . Let  $(x_1, x_2)$  be coordinates in upper half space  $\mathcal{H}^2$ . Under the conformal change of coordinates

$$(3.28) \quad x_1 = r^2 - z^2,$$

$$(3.29) \quad x_2 = 2rz,$$

we have

$$(3.30) \quad dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 = 4(r^2 + z^2)(dr^2 + dz^2) = 4\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}(dr^2 + dz^2).$$

Solving for  $r$  and  $z$ ,

$$(3.31) \quad r^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left( x_1 + \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} \right),$$

$$(3.32) \quad z^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left( -x_1 + \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} \right).$$

Consequently, in these coordinates,  $g_{\text{LB}}$  is conformal to

$$(3.33) \quad g_{\mathcal{H}^2} + \frac{2(x_1^2 + x_2^2)}{x_2^2} \left[ \left( 1 + \frac{x_1}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}} \right) d\theta_3^2 + \left( 1 - \frac{x_1}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}} \right) V^{-2} (fd\theta_3 + d\theta_1)^2 \right].$$

This looks very close to Joyce's ansatz for toric self-dual metrics over hyperbolic 2-space  $\mathcal{H}^2$  (with  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  switched). However, the weights of the torus action here are not exactly the same as chosen in Joyce's paper. Identifying the torus action using  $K_1 \times K_3$ , the stabilizer subgroups are given as follows:

$$(3.34) \quad \Sigma_1 : (1, -1), \Sigma_2 : (1, 0), \Sigma_3 : (1, 1), \Sigma_4 : (0, 1).$$

However, Joyce's weights for the boundary spheres are given by (notation as in [Joy95])

$$(3.35) \quad (m_1, n_1) = (0, 1), (m_2, n_2) = (1, 2), (m_3, n_3) = (1, 1), (m_4, n_4) = (1, 0),$$

The change of angular coordinates  $\theta_1 \mapsto \theta_3$ ,  $\theta_3 \mapsto \theta_1 + \theta_3$  (which corresponds to an outer automorphism of  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ ), then brings the boundary weights into agreement. After this change, it is then possible to show directly this is indeed a Joyce metric, but we omit the computation. A similar argument also works for  $n \geq 3$  monopole points.

**3.2. Extra involution for  $\mathbf{n} = 2$ .** Recall we have the boundary sphere  $\Sigma_4$  fixed by  $K_1$ , and the sphere  $\Sigma_2$ , fixed by  $K_3$ . We next find a conformal transformation which interchanges these spheres, and also has the property that  $p_1$  maps to  $q_1 = (0, 0, 0)$ , and  $p_2$  maps to  $q_2 = (0, 0, \infty)$ . This map will interchange the orbits of the  $K_1$  and  $K_3$  actions.

Let  $r, z$  and  $c_1, c_2$  have the same meaning as in the beginning of Section 3. We first define an automorphism  $\varphi : Q_1 \rightarrow Q_1$ , where  $Q_1 = \{(r, z) \mid r > 0, z > 0\}$  is the first quadrant.

**Definition 3.5.** Let  $w = r + iz$ , and define

$$(3.36) \quad \varphi(w) = ic_2 \sqrt{\frac{\bar{w}^2 + c_1^2}{w^2 + c_2^2}} = \varphi_1(r, z) + i\varphi_2(r, z).$$

**Proposition 3.6.** *The map  $\varphi$  interchange  $I_2$  and  $I_4$ , interchanges  $p_1$  and  $q_1 = (0, 0, 0)$ , and interchanges  $p_2$  and  $q_2 = (0, 0, \infty)$  (thinking of the above as contained in  $\bar{Q}_1$ ). Under the identification of  $Q_1$  with the upper half plane under the complex square  $w \mapsto w^2$ , the map is a hyperbolic isometry.*

*Proof.* We identify  $Q_1$  with  $\mathcal{H}^2$  using the complex square,

$$(3.37) \quad \zeta = x_1 + ix_2 = (r + iz)^2 = s(w).$$

Under this map, the monopole points  $p_j$  map to  $(-c_j^2, 0)$ . Consider the Möbius transformation defined by

$$(3.38) \quad L(\zeta) = -(c_2)^2 \frac{\bar{\zeta} + (c_1)^2}{\bar{\zeta} + (c_2)^2},$$

which is an orientation-reversing hyperbolic isometry of  $\mathcal{H}^2$ . It has the property that

$$(3.39) \quad L((-c_1^2, 0)) = (0, 0), \quad L(0, 0) = (-c_1^2, 0), \quad \text{and} \quad L(-c_2^2, 0) = (\infty, 0).$$

Clearly,  $\varphi(w) = s^{-1} \circ L \circ s(w)$ , which is (3.36). The first statement follows easily.  $\square$

**Remark 3.7.** The map  $L$  is the unique orientation-reversing hyperbolic involution satisfying (3.39).

The original coordinates on  $U_2 \times S^1$  are ordered  $(r, \theta_3, z, \theta_1)$ , but in the following we will rearrange coordinates so that this domain is  $Q_1 \times S^1 \times S^1$ .

**Definition 3.8.** For any angle  $\vartheta$ , define the map  $\tilde{\Lambda}(\vartheta) : X \rightarrow X$  by

$$(3.40) \quad \tilde{\Lambda}(\vartheta) : ((r, z), \theta_3, \theta_1) \mapsto (\varphi(r, z), \theta_1 - \vartheta, \theta_3 + \vartheta).$$

On first observation, it might appear that the map  $\tilde{\Lambda}(\vartheta)$  is not well-defined at points on the  $z$ -axis corresponding to the intervals  $I_1$  and  $I_3$ , where the coordinate  $\theta_3$  is not defined. However, the map is in fact well-defined everywhere:

**Proposition 3.9.** *For any angle  $\vartheta$ , the map  $\tilde{\Lambda}(\vartheta)$  extends to a diffeomorphic involution of  $\hat{X} = 2\#\mathbb{CP}^2$ . The extension interchanges  $\Sigma_2$  and  $\Sigma_4$ , and interchanges the points  $p_j$  and  $q_j$  for  $j = 1, 2$ .*

*Proof.* We need only consider the case that  $\vartheta = 0$ , since  $\tilde{\Lambda}(\vartheta) = (e^{-i\vartheta}, e^{i\vartheta}) \cdot \tilde{\Lambda}(0)$  (viewing this as the  $K_1 \times K_3$ -action). We note that initially  $\tilde{\Lambda}(0)$  is defined with respect to a trivialization of the bundle on the open set  $U_2$ . To confirm that it is well-defined everywhere, we must use the transition functions from Proposition 3.3. For example, in  $U_2$ , the angles change by  $(\theta_3, \theta_1) \mapsto (\theta_1, \theta_3)$ . Taking into account the transition function  $g_{21} = e^{i\theta_3}$ , in  $U_1$  the action is  $(\theta_3, \theta_1) \mapsto (\theta_1 - \theta_3, \theta_1)$ . In the  $U_1$  chart, the map  $\tilde{\Lambda}(0)$  therefore takes the form

$$(3.41) \quad (r, z, \theta_3, \theta_1) \mapsto (\varphi_1(r, z), \varphi_2(r, z), \theta_1 - \theta_3, \theta_1).$$

Rewriting the map in the coordinates  $(x, y, z, \theta_1)$ ,

$$(3.42) \quad (x, y, z, \theta_1) \mapsto (\varphi_1(r, z) \sin(\theta_1 - \theta_3), \varphi_1(r, z) \cos(\theta_1 - \theta_3), \varphi_2(r, z), \theta_1).$$

For points with  $r = 0$ , the map  $\varphi$  is given by

$$(3.43) \quad \varphi(0, z) = \left( 0, c_2 \sqrt{\frac{c_1^2 - z^2}{c_2^2 - z^2}} \right),$$

which is well-defined on  $I_1$ . Therefore, for  $(x, y) = (0, 0)$ , (3.42) becomes

$$(3.44) \quad (0, 0, z, \theta_1) \mapsto (0, 0, \varphi(0, z), \theta_1),$$

which is indeed well-defined. A similar argument confirms that  $\tilde{\Lambda}(0)$  is well-defined (and smooth) everywhere on  $2\#\mathbb{CP}^2$ .

It is easy to see that  $\tilde{\Lambda}(0)$  interchanges  $\Sigma_2$  and  $\Sigma_4$ , and interchanges the points  $p_j$  and  $q_j$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . Finally, it is clear that  $\tilde{\Lambda}(\vartheta)$  is an involution.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.10.** *For any angle  $\vartheta$ , the map  $\tilde{\Lambda}(\vartheta)$  is a conformal involution of  $[g_{\text{LB}}]$ .*

*Proof.* It would be a formidable calculation to show directly that this map is indeed conformal. In this paper, for space considerations, we therefore prefer to argue indirectly using twistor theory, see Theorem 6.13 below.  $\square$

**3.3. Summary.** In this section, we summarize what we have obtained so far, and we also make some remarks about the fixed point sets of various lifts.

**Theorem 3.11.** *Consider  $(n\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2, [g_{\text{LB}}])$  and  $n \geq 2$ . If the monopole points do not lie on any common geodesic (so that  $n \geq 3$ ), then*

$$(3.45) \quad \text{U}(1) \rtimes G \subseteq \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}}),$$

where  $G$  is a finite subgroup of  $\text{O}(3)$ .

Next, assume that the monopole points all lie on a common geodesic. Let  $\text{Aut}_0$  denote the identity component of  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$ . Then we have

$$(3.46) \quad \text{U}(1) \times \text{U}(1) = \text{Aut}_0(g_{\text{LB}}).$$

Let  $\phi_3$  be any reflection about a hemisphere on which all the monopole points belong. Then there exists a lift  $\Phi_3$  of  $\phi_3$  which is also an involution. Let  $\mathbb{Z}_2 = \{Id, \Phi_3\}$  denote the subgroup generated by  $\Phi_3$ . Then the semi-direct product

$$(3.47) \quad (\text{U}(1) \times \text{U}(1)) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \subseteq \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}}).$$

In the case there is an additional reflection symmetry  $\phi_2$  (which is always the case for  $n = 2$ ), consider also the composition  $\phi_1 = \phi_2 \circ \phi_3$ . Then, in addition to  $\Phi_3$ , there exist lifts  $\Phi_j$  of  $\phi_j$ , for  $j = 1, 2$  such that  $\{Id, \Phi_1, \Phi_2, \Phi_3\}$  is a subgroup of  $\text{Aut}$  which is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$ , and

$$(3.48) \quad (\text{U}(1) \times \text{U}(1)) \rtimes (\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2) \subseteq \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}}).$$

For  $n = 2$  consider also the extra involution  $\tilde{\Lambda}(0)$ . Then

$$\{Id, \Phi_1, \Phi_2, \Phi_3, \tilde{\Lambda}(0), \tilde{\Lambda}(0)\Phi_1, \tilde{\Lambda}(0)\Phi_2, \tilde{\Lambda}(0)\Phi_3\}$$

is a subgroup of  $\text{Aut}$  isomorphic to  $D_4$ , the dihedral group with 8 elements, and

$$(3.49) \quad (\text{U}(1) \times \text{U}(1)) \rtimes D_4 \subseteq \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}}).$$

*Proof.* The inclusion (3.45) was discussed above in Remark 2.13. The equality (3.46) follows from Proposition 2.14, and the fact that the identity component is a manifold, and cannot be strictly greater than dimension 2 in this case [Po94].

For (3.47), we let  $\tilde{\Phi}_3$  be any lifting of  $\phi_3$  from Proposition 2.11. Note that  $\tilde{\Phi}_3^2$  is orientation preserving and covers the identity map of  $\mathcal{H}^3$ . Therefore, by the uniqueness in Proposition 2.11, we must have that  $\tilde{\Phi}_3^2 = R(g)$  is right multiplication by  $g \in \text{U}(1)$ . To find an involution, we then define  $\Phi_3$  to be  $\tilde{\Phi}_3 \circ R(\sqrt{g^{-1}})$ . This is an involution since any lift is equivariant. Therefore  $\{Id, \Phi_3\}$  is indeed a subgroup of  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ . Since the identity component is necessarily normal, the group generated by the identity component and this  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -subgroup is a semi-direct product.

For (3.48), we let  $\Phi_3$  be as in the previous paragraph. Next, the map  $\phi_1 = \phi_2 \circ \phi_3$  is an orientation preserving hyperbolic isometry which fixes a geodesic. Thus we may apply Proposition 2.15, and let  $\Phi_1 = \mu(\phi_1)$ . Since  $\phi_1$  is an involution, from the definition of  $\mu$ , it follows that  $\Phi_1$  is also an involution. Then we define  $\Phi_2 = \Phi_1 \circ \Phi_3$ , which is necessarily a lift of  $\phi_2$ . Clearly,  $\{Id, \Phi_1, \Phi_2, \Phi_3\}$  is a subgroup isomorphic

to  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$ , and for the same reason as in the previous paragraph, the generated subgroup is the semi-direct product.

Finally, the inclusion (3.49) will be proved in Section 6, see Proposition 6.9.  $\square$

It is the purpose of Sections 4 and 5 below to show that the inclusions (3.47)-(3.49) are in fact equalities. We end this section with a short discussion on fixed point sets of involutions, and the action on cohomology.

**Theorem 3.12.** *For  $(n\#\mathbb{CP}^2, [g_{\text{LB}}])$  and  $n \geq 2$ , assume that the monopole points all lie on a common geodesic. If  $\phi_3$  is a reflection about a hemisphere containing all the monopole points, then the lift  $\Phi_3$  of  $\phi_3$  given in Theorem 3.11 has fixed point locus  $\Upsilon_3 = n\#\mathbb{RP}^2$ , which is contained in an invariant  $n\#\mathbb{RP}^3$ . Furthermore,  $\Phi_3$  induces the identity map on cohomology.*

*In the case there is an additional reflection symmetry  $\phi_2$  (which is always the case for  $n = 2$ ), consider also the composition  $\phi_1 = \phi_2 \circ \phi_3$ . Let  $\Upsilon_j$  denote the fixed locus of  $\Phi_j$ , where  $\Phi_j$  are the lifts of  $\phi_j$  given in Theorem 3.11. For  $n$  even,  $\Upsilon_1$  and  $\Upsilon_2$  are both two-dimensional spheres, and  $\Upsilon_1 \cap \Upsilon_2 = S^1$ . For  $n$  odd,  $\Upsilon_1 = S^2$  and  $\Upsilon_2 = \mathbb{RP}^2$ , with  $\Upsilon_1 \cap \Upsilon_2 = S^1$ . The maps  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  induce the following map on cohomology*

$$(3.50) \quad (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n) \mapsto (k_n, k_{n-1}, \dots, k_1),$$

*with respect to an orthonormal basis of  $H^2(n\#\mathbb{CP}^2; \mathbb{Z})$ . Further, for  $n$  even,  $\Phi_2$  leaves invariant an  $S^3$ . For  $n$  odd,  $\Phi_2$  leaves invariant an  $\mathbb{RP}^3$ .*

*For  $n = 2$ , the fixed point set of the extra involution  $\tilde{\Lambda}(0)$  is an  $S^2$ , which is contained in an invariant  $\mathbb{RP}^3$ . Also,  $\tilde{\Lambda}(0)$  induces the following map on cohomology:*

$$(3.51) \quad (k_1, k_2) \mapsto (-k_2, k_1),$$

*with respect to an orthonormal basis of  $H^2(2\#\mathbb{CP}^2; \mathbb{Z})$ .*

*Proof.* We let  $\phi_3$  be a reflection in a hemisphere containing the monopole points. Since  $\phi_3$  is orientation reversing, by Proposition 2.9, the lift  $\Phi_3$  will fix exactly 2 points in each fiber over this hemisphere. Let  $\Upsilon_3$  denote the fixed locus. Topologically,  $\Upsilon_3$  is a double covering of a 2-disc branched over the boundary circle and over  $n$  points. We compute

$$(3.52) \quad \chi(\Upsilon_3) = 2\chi(D^2) - \chi(S^1) - n = 2 - n.$$

It turns out that  $\Upsilon_3$  is non-orientable, so by the surface classification,  $\Upsilon_3 = n\#\mathbb{RP}^2$  (to see non-orientability, we note that odd dimensions is clear since the Euler characteristic is odd, and the even-dimensional case can be viewed as a limiting case of the next higher odd dimension). The invariant set is a circle bundle over this hemisphere, branched over 2 points and the boundary circle, so is  $n\#\mathbb{RP}^3$ .

When the points are in symmetric configuration, we let  $\phi_2$  denote the extra symmetry of inversion in a hemisphere. If  $n$  is even, there is no monopole point on this hemisphere. Since  $\phi_2$  is orientation reversing, Proposition 2.9 implies that the fixed point set of the lift  $\Phi_2$  is a double cover of  $D^2$  branched only over the boundary circle, so  $\Upsilon_2 = S^2$ . The invariant set is a circle bundle over the disc branched over the boundary, so is an  $S^3$ . Next, define  $\phi_1 = \phi_2 \circ \phi_3$ . The fixed point set of  $\phi_1$  is

a geodesic  $\gamma$ . From the proof of Theorem 3.11, our choice of the lifting  $\Phi_1$  fixes a fiber over a point of  $\gamma$ , thus fixes every fiber over  $\gamma$ . Therefore,  $\Upsilon_1$  is a circle bundle over  $\gamma$ , completed by adding two points on the boundary of  $\mathcal{H}^3$ , so  $\Upsilon_1 = S^2$ . The intersection of  $\Upsilon_1$  and  $\Upsilon_2$  gives 2 points in each fiber over  $\gamma$ . Adding the 2 boundary points gives that  $\Upsilon_1 \cap \Upsilon_2 = S^1$ .

If  $n$  is odd, then there is a monopole point on this hemisphere. From Proposition 2.9, the fixed point set of the lift  $\Phi_2$  is a double cover of  $D^2$  branched over the boundary circle, and a single point. We have

$$(3.53) \quad \chi(\Upsilon_2) = 2\chi(D^2) - \chi(S^1) - 1 = 1,$$

which implies that  $\Upsilon_2$  is  $\mathbb{RP}^2$ . The invariant set is a circle bundle over  $D^2$  branched over the boundary circle, and a single point, thus is an  $\mathbb{RP}^3$ .

As in the even case, define  $\phi_1 = \phi_2 \circ \phi_3$ . Again, the fixed point set of  $\phi_1$  is a geodesic  $\gamma$ . Therefore,  $\Upsilon_1$  is contained in the restriction of the bundle to this geodesic (including the 2 boundary points of the geodesic). Since there is a single monopole point on this geodesic, the restriction of the bundle is topologically the wedge  $S^2 \vee S^2$ . From the proof of Theorem 3.11, the lift  $\Phi_1$  was chosen to fix a fiber over some point on this geodesic. Since the fixed point set must be a smooth 2-dimensional manifold,  $\Upsilon_1$  must be one of these  $S^2$ -s, depending upon the particular choice of the lift  $\Phi_1$ . The intersection of  $\Upsilon_1$  and  $\Upsilon_2$  then is 2 points in each fiber over one half of  $\gamma$ , together with the monopole point and a single boundary point, which implies that  $\Upsilon_1 \cap \Upsilon_2 = S^1$ .

In the case  $n = 2$ , recall the hyperbolic isometry  $L$  defined in (3.38). It is easy to verify that the fixed point set of  $L$  is given by

$$(3.54) \quad (x_1 - c_2^2)^2 + x_2^2 = c_2^2(c_2^2 - c_1^2),$$

and is therefore a semicircle centered at  $(-c_2^2, 0)$  of radius  $c_2\sqrt{c_2^2 - c_1^2}$ . Since  $z \mapsto z^2$  is a conformal transformation, the fixed point set of  $\varphi$  is a semi-circle centered on the  $z$ -axis at  $(0, c_2)$ , intersecting the positive  $z$ -axis at two points, one of them on the interval  $I_1$ , and the other on  $I_3$ . The fixed point set of  $(\theta_3, \theta_1) \mapsto (\theta_1, \theta_3)$  is obviously points of the form  $(\theta_3, \theta_3)$ . Thus the fixed point set of  $\tilde{\Lambda}(0)$  is a circle bundle over the semicircle branched over the two endpoints, therefore is an  $S^2$ . The invariant set consists of all the torus fibers over the semicircle, which is easily seen to be an  $\mathbb{RP}^3$  (it is the  $S^1$  bundle restricted to a sphere containing both monopole points).

These involutions can be visualized as follows. In the case  $n = 2$ , it is well-known that  $\mathbb{CP}^2 \# \mathbb{CP}^2$  can also be viewed as a boundary connect sum of 2 Eguchi-Hanson ALE space (glued along the boundary  $\mathbb{RP}^3$ -s). The involution  $\Phi_1$  reverses the two factors of the usual connect sum, and has an invariant  $S^3$  (it flips  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_3$ ), while the involution  $\tilde{\Lambda}(0)$  interchanges the Eguchi-Hanson spaces, and has an invariant  $\mathbb{RP}^3$  (it flips  $\Sigma_2$  and  $\Sigma_4$ ). For  $n$  even, then involution  $\Phi_1$  reflects the connect sum through the central neck of the connect sum, and has an invariant  $S^3$ . For  $n$  odd, then involution  $\Phi_1$  reflects the connect sum through a central  $\mathbb{CP}^2$  summand, and has an invariant  $\mathbb{RP}^3$ . The action on cohomology follows easily from these descriptions.  $\square$

**Remark 3.13.** In the case of a single monopole point, the LeBrun conformal class compactifies to the conformal class of the Fubini-Study metric on  $\mathbb{CP}^2$ , which is Einstein. By Obata's Theorem, any conformal automorphism is an isometry, thus the conformal automorphism group for  $n = 1$  is  $SU(3)$ . For  $n = 0$ , the LeBrun conformal class compactifies to the conformal class of the round metric on  $S^4$ , thus the conformal group is  $SO_+(5, 1)$ , the time-oriented Lorentz transformations. For  $n \geq 1$ , there are no orientation reversing diffeomorphisms, this follows from the Hirzebruch Signature Theorem since the signature is non-zero. However,  $S^4$  does admit orientation-reversing diffeomorphisms, which is reflected in the fact that  $SO_+(5, 1)$  has 2 components.

#### 4. LEBRUN'S TWISTOR SPACES

Let  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{H}^3; p_1, \dots, p_n)$  be the group of isometries of  $\mathcal{H}^3$  which preserve the set of monopole points  $p_1, \dots, p_n$ . In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1 in the case  $n \geq 3$  by showing the following.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $[g_{\text{LB}}]$  be a LeBrun self-dual conformal class on  $n\#\mathbb{CP}^2$  with monopole points  $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathcal{H}^3$ . Suppose  $n \geq 3$ . Then there is a homomorphism*

$$(4.1) \quad \rho : \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}}) \longrightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{H}^3; p_1, \dots, p_n)$$

such that  $\rho(\Phi) = \phi$ , where  $\Phi$  is any lift of  $\phi$  obtained in Proposition 2.11.

**Remark 4.2.** In the previous sections, we used the upper half space model of hyperbolic space. However, in this and the following sections,  $\mathcal{H}^3$  will no longer refer to any specific model of hyperbolic 3-space.

In the following we prove Proposition 4.1 by using twistor spaces; for background on twistor theory, see [AHS78], [Bes87]. Let  $Z$  be the twistor space of  $[g_{\text{LB}}]$  in Proposition 4.1, and  $\text{Aut}(Z)$  the group of holomorphic transformations of  $Z$ . By the twistor correspondence, there is a canonical injective homomorphism

$$(4.2) \quad \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}}) \longrightarrow \text{Aut}(Z)$$

(see, for example, [PP95, Proposition 2.1]). Using this, we regard  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  as a subgroup of  $\text{Aut}(Z)$ . Let  $F$  be the canonical square root of  $-K_Z$  (the anticanonical line bundle). Then the action of  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  on  $Z$  naturally lifts to the line bundle  $F$ . Hence we obtain a homomorphism

$$(4.3) \quad \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}}) \longrightarrow \text{GL}(H^0(Z, F)).$$

In general, this map will not be injective.

**4.1. Proof of Proposition 4.1.** For this, we first recall the following result on the structure of LeBrun twistor spaces.

**Proposition 4.3.** *If  $n \geq 3$ ,  $\dim H^0(Z, F) = 4$  holds. Further, if  $\Psi : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^3$  denotes the rational map induced by the linear system  $|F|$ , we have the following.*  
*(i) The base locus of  $|F|$  consists of two smooth rational curves  $C_1$  and  $\overline{C}_1$ , which are mapped to the boundary sphere  $\partial\mathcal{H}^3 \subset n\#\mathbb{CP}^2$  by the twistor fibration  $Z \rightarrow$*

$n\#\mathbb{CP}^2$ . (ii) The image  $\Psi(Z)$  is a non-singular quadratic surface  $\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1$ . (iii) If  $Z' \rightarrow Z$  denotes the blow-up of  $Z$  at  $C_1 \cup \overline{C}_1$ , the composition  $Z' \rightarrow Z \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1$  is holomorphic. Further, the discriminant locus consists of  $n$  smooth rational curves  $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n$  of bidegree  $(1, 1)$ , which canonically correspond to the monopole points  $p_1, \dots, p_n$ .

*Proof.* We first take any smooth member  $S \in |F|$  and consider an exact sequence

$$(4.4) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow K_S^{-1} \longrightarrow 0$$

and use  $H^1(\mathcal{O}_Z) = 0$  to conclude that  $\dim H^0(F) = 1 + \dim H^0(K_S^{-1})$  and  $\text{Bs } |F| = \text{Bs } |K_S^{-1}|$ . Since  $S$  is obtained from  $\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1$  by blowing-up  $n$  points lying on a curve of bidegree  $(1, 0)$  and also  $n$  points lying on another curve of the same bidegree, we readily obtain  $\dim H^0(K_S^{-1}) = 3$ . We also obtain that  $\text{Bs } |K_S^{-1}|$  is exactly the strict transform of the last two curves, for which we write  $C_1$  and  $\overline{C}_1$ . (Note that to conclude these, we have used the assumption  $n \geq 3$ .) As  $\mathbb{C}^*$  acts on  $S$  fixing any points on  $C_1 \cup \overline{C}_1$  and the twistor fibration  $Z \rightarrow n\#\mathbb{CP}^2$  is  $U(1)$ -equivariant, the image of  $C_1$  under the twistor fibration must be the unique 2-sphere fixed by the  $U(1)$ -action on  $n\#\mathbb{CP}^2$ . Thus we obtain (i). For (ii), there are two distinguished pencils of degree-one divisors, which form a conjugate pair. These two pencils generate a 3-dimensional system in  $|F|$ . As  $\dim |F| = 3$ , this means  $|F|$  is in fact generated by the two pencils. This implies that  $\Psi(Z)$  is a smooth quadric. For the first part of (iii), it suffices to notice that the union of the base locus of the above 2 pencils (of degree-one divisors) are exactly  $C_1 \cup \overline{C}_1$ , and they are eliminated after blowing-up  $C_1 \cup \overline{C}_1$ . See [LeB91b, §7], [Po92, §3] and [KK92, §3] for details.  $\square$

**Remark 4.4.** The proposition is true for arbitrary  $n \geq 0$  if we consider  $H^0(Z, F)^{U(1)}$  (the subspace consisting of all  $U(1)$ -invariant sections) instead of  $H^0(Z, F)$ , where  $U(1)$  is the subgroup of fiber rotations of  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  coming from the bundle construction.

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $\Psi : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^3$  and  $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n$  be as in Proposition 4.3. Then the following are all degree-one divisors on  $Z$ : (i) the inverse images of curves on  $\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1$  whose bidegree are  $(1, 0)$  or  $(0, 1)$ , (ii) the inverse images  $\Psi^{-1}(\mathcal{C}_j)$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ .*

*Proof.* If  $D$  is a degree-one divisor, then  $D + \overline{D} \in |F|$  holds by a Chern-class consideration (see [Po92]). Hence, since the rational map  $\Psi$  is associated to  $|F|$ , any degree-one divisor is an irreducible component of a reducible divisor of the form  $\Psi^{-1}(H)$ , where  $H$  is a hyperplane in  $\mathbb{CP}^3$ . If the divisor  $\Psi^{-1}(H)$  is reducible, then one of the following must clearly hold:  $H \cap (\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1)$  is reducible, or  $H \cap (\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1)$  is irreducible but  $\Psi^{-1}(H)$  is reducible. The former and latter correspond to the cases (i) and (ii) in the lemma respectively.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.6.** *Suppose  $n \geq 3$ . Then we have the following. (i) Any  $\Phi \in \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  leaves the boundary sphere  $\partial\mathcal{H}^3$  (regarded as a subset of  $n\#\mathbb{CP}^2$ ) invariant. (ii) Any  $\Phi \in \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  leaves the set of isolated fixed points invariant.*

*Proof.* As before, we regard  $\Phi$  as an automorphism of  $Z$ . For (i), by Proposition 4.3 (i) it suffices to show  $\{\Phi(C_1), \Phi(\overline{C}_1)\} = \{C_1, \overline{C}_1\}$ . But since  $C_1 \cup \overline{C}_1$  are the base locus of the system  $|F|$  as in Proposition 4.3 (i), this is automatic. For (ii), let  $L_1, \dots, L_n$  be the twistor lines over the isolated fixed points of the  $U(1)$ -action. Then we have  $\Psi(L_j) = \mathcal{C}_j$  and  $\Psi^{-1}(\mathcal{C}_j) = D_j + \overline{D}_j$ , where  $D_j$  and  $\overline{D}_j$  are degree one divisors intersecting transversally along  $L_j$  ([Po92, Proposition 3.6], [LeB91b, §7]). Further, we have

$$(4.5) \quad \{\Phi(D_j), \Phi(\overline{D}_j) \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\} = \{D_j, \overline{D}_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\},$$

since the  $\mathcal{C}_j$ -s are discriminant curves of the morphism  $Z' \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$  by Proposition 4.3. Since  $\Phi$  commutes with the real structure, this means that  $\{\Phi(L_j) \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\} = \{L_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ , which implies (ii) of the lemma.  $\square$

**Remark 4.7.** The lemma says that if  $n \geq 3$ , any  $\Phi \in \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  preserves the open subset  $X_0$  (on which  $U(1)$  acts freely). Obviously this does not hold if  $n = 0$  or  $1$ . Namely, the general automorphism of the standard metrics on  $S^4$  or  $\mathbb{C}P^2$  does not preserve the boundary sphere  $\partial\mathcal{H}^3$ . We will show in the next subsection that the lemma also fails to hold when  $n = 2$ .

By Proposition 4.3, when  $n \geq 3$  we obtain a homomorphism

$$(4.6) \quad \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}}) \longrightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1).$$

Further, by LeBrun's construction [LeB91b], the image quadric  $\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$  can be regarded as a quotient space of the twistor space by a  $\mathbb{C}^*$ -action, where the last action is the complexification of the semi-free  $U(1)$ -action on  $Z$ . More intrinsically,  $\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$  can be interpreted as the minitwistor space (in the sense of Hitchin [Hit82]) of the hyperbolic space  $\mathcal{H}^3$ . This in particular means that  $\mathcal{H}^3$  can be canonically identified with the space of minitwistor lines in  $\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$ . Such lines are explicitly given as real irreducible curves of bidegree  $(1, 1)$  which are disjoint from  $(\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1)^\sigma$  (the real locus on  $\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$ ). Furthermore, as a consequence of

$$(4.7) \quad \Psi^{-1}((\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1)^\sigma) = \bigcup_{x \in \partial\mathcal{H}^3} L_x,$$

where  $L_x$  denotes the twistor line over a point  $x \in n\#\mathbb{C}P^2$ , there is a natural identification  $(\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1)^\sigma \simeq \partial\mathcal{H}^3$ . By Lemma 4.6, we have  $\Phi(\partial\mathcal{H}^3) = \partial\mathcal{H}^3$  (on  $n\#\mathbb{C}P^2$ ). From this it follows that the automorphism of  $\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$  coming from any  $\Phi \in \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  (via (4.6)) maps real  $(1, 1)$ -curves disjoint from  $(\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1)^\sigma$  to real  $(1, 1)$ -curves disjoint from  $(\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1)^\sigma$ . Hence it maps minitwistor lines to minitwistor lines. This way, we obtain a homomorphism

$$(4.8) \quad \rho : \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}}) \longrightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{H}^3).$$

Moreover, since the action of  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  on  $\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$  preserves  $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n$  (as they are discriminant curves), the image of (4.8) is contained in  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{H}^3; p_1, \dots, p_n)$ .

To finish the proof of Proposition 4.1, it remains to show that if  $\Phi \in \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  is one of the lifts (obtained in Proposition 2.11) of some  $\phi \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{H}^3; p_1, \dots, p_n)$ ,

then  $\rho(\Phi) = \phi$  holds. Take any point  $p \in \mathcal{H}^3 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ , and put  $q = \phi(p)$ . Let  $\tilde{p} \in X_0$  be any point belonging to the fiber over  $p$  and let  $\tilde{q} = \Phi(\tilde{p})$ . Let  $L_{\tilde{p}}$  and  $L_{\tilde{q}}$  be the twistor lines over  $\tilde{p}$  and  $\tilde{q}$ , respectively. Letting  $\Phi$  also denote the induced automorphism on  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$ , we have  $\Phi(\Psi(L_{\tilde{p}})) = \Psi(L_{\tilde{q}})$  by construction. By the result of Jones-Tod [JT85] on the relation between Penrose correspondence (between self-dual 4-manifolds and 3-dimensional twistor spaces) and Hitchin correspondence (between Einstein-Weyl 3-manifolds and minitwistor spaces), the points on  $\mathcal{H}^3$  which correspond to the minitwistor lines  $\Psi(L_{\tilde{p}})$  and  $\Psi(L_{\tilde{q}})$  are exactly  $p$  and  $q$  respectively. This implies  $(\rho(\Phi))(p) = q$ , as required. This completes the proof of Proposition 4.1.

## 5. POON'S PROJECTIVE MODEL

In this section, we determine the group of all conformal isometries of Poon's metrics on  $2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ . Although Poon's metrics can be constructed by LeBrun's hyperbolic ansatz, it turns out that, in contrast to the case  $n \geq 3$ , not all conformal isometries come from isometries of  $\mathcal{H}^3$ . More precisely, we show that such lifts form a subgroup of index 2 in the full conformal isometry group.

**5.1. Automorphism group of Poon's projective models.** In order to analyze the automorphism group in the case of  $2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ , instead of LeBrun's projective model, it is more convenient to use Poon's projective model of the twistor spaces (these are of course equivalent, see [LeB91b, Section 7]). In this subsection we investigate the holomorphic automorphism group of the projective models. We begin with recalling the following result due to Poon [Po86].

**Proposition 5.1** ([Po86]). *Let  $g$  be a self-dual metric on  $2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  of positive scalar curvature and  $Z$  the twistor space of  $g$ . Then (i) the linear system  $|F|$  is base point free, 5-dimensional, and its associated morphism  $\Psi : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^5$  is bimeromorphic to its image. (ii) The image  $\tilde{Z} := \Psi(Z)$  is an intersection of the two hyperquadrics in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^5$  defined by*

$$(5.1) \quad Q_\infty = \{w_0w_1 + z_2^2 + z_3^2 + w_4w_5 = 0\}, \quad Q_0 = \{2w_0w_1 + \lambda z_2^2 + (3/2)z_3^2 + w_4w_5 = 0\}$$

where  $(w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5)$  is a homogeneous coordinate on  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^5$  and  $\lambda$  is a real number satisfying  $3/2 < \lambda < 2$ . (iii) The singular locus of  $\tilde{Z}$  consists of 4 points

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} P_1 &:= (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0), & \bar{P}_1 &:= (0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0), \\ P_3 &:= (0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0), & \bar{P}_3 &:= (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1), \end{aligned}$$

and all these are ordinary nodes. (iv) The morphism  $\Psi : Z \rightarrow \tilde{Z}$  is a small resolution of these 4 nodes. (v) The real structure on  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^5$  induced by that on  $Z$  is given by

$$(5.3) \quad (w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5) \mapsto (\bar{w}_1, \bar{w}_0, \bar{z}_2, -\bar{z}_3, -\bar{w}_5, -\bar{w}_4).$$

The identity component of the conformal transformation group of Poon's conformal class is  $U(1) \times U(1)$ . Correspondingly, the identity component of holomorphic

transformation group of Poon's twistor space is  $\mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^*$ . In the above coordinates, this action is explicitly given by

$$(5.4) \quad (w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5) \mapsto (sw_0, s^{-1}w_1, z_2, z_3, tw_4, t^{-1}w_5), \quad (s, t) \in \mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^*,$$

which preserves the quadrics  $Q_\infty$  and  $Q_0$ . The map (5.4) commutes with the real structure (5.3) if and only if  $|s| = |t| = 1$ .

In the following we put  $K = \mathrm{U}(1) \times \mathrm{U}(1)$ , and  $G = \mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^*$  for simplicity. The  $K$ -action on  $2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  has exactly 4 fixed points. Correspondingly, there are four  $G$ -invariant twistor lines in  $Z$ .

**Definition 5.2.** Define the two real numbers  $\alpha := \sqrt{4 - 2\lambda}$  and  $\beta := \sqrt{2\lambda - 2}$ .

We remark that since  $3/2 < \lambda < 2$ , we have the inequalities  $0 < \alpha < \beta$ . These numbers will play an important role in the following.

**Lemma 5.3.** (i) Any  $\Phi \in \mathrm{Aut}(g)$  leaves the set of four  $K$ -fixed points (on  $2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ ) invariant. (ii) The image under  $\Psi$  of the twistor lines over these 4 points are conics whose equations are respectively given by

$$(5.5) \quad \{\alpha z_2 - iz_3 = w_4 = w_5 = w_0 w_1 + (2\lambda - 3)z_2^2 = 0\},$$

$$(5.6) \quad \{\alpha z_2 + iz_3 = w_4 = w_5 = w_0 w_1 + (2\lambda - 3)z_2^2 = 0\},$$

$$(5.7) \quad \{\beta z_2 - iz_3 = w_0 = w_1 = (3 - 2\lambda)z_2^2 + w_4 w_5 = 0\},$$

$$(5.8) \quad \{\beta z_2 + iz_3 = w_0 = w_1 = (3 - 2\lambda)z_2^2 + w_4 w_5 = 0\}.$$

*Proof.* For (i), consider the two linear projections  $f_j : \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^3$  ( $j = 1, 3$ ) defined by

$$(5.9) \quad f_1(w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5) = (z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5),$$

$$(5.10) \quad f_3(w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5) = (w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3).$$

By an elementary computation, we have

$$(5.11) \quad f_1(\tilde{Z}) = \{\alpha^2 z_2^2 + z_3^2 + 2w_4 w_5 = 0\}, \quad f_3(\tilde{Z}) = \{2w_0 w_1 + \beta^2 z_2^2 + z_3^2 = 0\}.$$

Intrinsically, the composition  $f_j \circ \Psi : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^3$  is the meromorphic map associated to the linear system corresponding to the subspace  $H^0(Z, F)^{G_j}$ , where  $G_1$  and  $G_3$  are  $\mathbb{C}^*$ -subgroups of  $G$  defined by

$$(5.12) \quad G_1 = \{\mathrm{diag}(s, s^{-1}, 1, 1, 1, 1) \in \mathrm{PGL}(6, \mathbb{C}) \mid s \in \mathbb{C}^*\}$$

and

$$(5.13) \quad G_3 = \{\mathrm{diag}(1, 1, 1, 1, t, t^{-1}) \in \mathrm{PGL}(6, \mathbb{C}) \mid t \in \mathbb{C}^*\}.$$

Since  $\alpha\beta \neq 0$  by Poon's constraint  $(3/2) < \lambda < 2$ , (5.11) means that the images  $f_1(\tilde{Z})$  and  $f_3(\tilde{Z})$  are non-singular quadrics. Hence both are isomorphic to a product  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$ . (Both of these two rational maps from  $Z$  to  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$  exactly correspond to the map  $\Psi : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$  for LeBrun twistor spaces considered above for  $n \geq 3$ ). Then by taking the pull-back of pencils on  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$  of bidegree  $(1, 0)$  and  $(0, 1)$ ,

we obtain 2 pencils on  $Z$  for each of  $j = 1$  and  $j = 3$ . Hence we obtain 4 pencils on  $Z$  in total. Since  $(f_j \circ \Psi)^* \mathcal{O}(1) \simeq F$  and hyperplane sections of the quadrics are bidegree  $(1, 1)$ , members of the 4 pencils are degree one, since the intersection number of the divisor with twistor lines is one. On the other hand, by [Po92, Lemma 1.9], for  $2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  there are at most 4 degree one line bundles on  $Z$  which have a non-trivial section. Further, since  $\dim |D| \leq 1$  for any degree 1 divisor  $D$  on any twistor space on  $n\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  by [Po92, Lemma 1.10 (2)], these 4 pencils have mutually different Chern classes. This implies that there are no pencils of degree one other than the above 4 ones. Obviously, the  $G$ -action preserves each of these pencils. Furthermore, it can be readily seen by (5.4), (5.9), (5.10), and (5.11) that  $G$  acts non-trivially on the parameter space  $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1)$  of the pencils. Hence each pencil has precisely two  $G$ -invariant members, so that we have eight  $G$ -invariant degree one divisors in total. By (5.3), it is clear that the two  $G$ -invariant divisors in the same pencil form a conjugate pair. So we may write  $\{D_j, \bar{D}_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq 4\}$  for the set of  $G$ -invariant degree one divisors.

We next compute the defining equations of the images of these 8 divisors in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^5$  (under  $\Psi$ ) in the following way. First, by using (5.11), we can obtain equations of the four  $G$ -invariant curves of bidegrees  $(1, 0)$  or  $(0, 1)$ . (For instance, one of them is given by  $\alpha z_2 - iz_3 = w_4 = 0$ .) Next, substituting the equations into (any one of) (5.1), we obtain the equations of the images  $\Psi(D_j)$  and  $\Psi(\bar{D}_j)$ . (For the above curve, the equations become  $\alpha z_2 - iz_3 = w_4 = w_0 w_1 + (2\lambda - 3)z_2^2 = 0$ .) The last equations imply that  $\Phi(D_j)$  is a quadratic cone in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^3$  and that its vertex is exactly one of the four singular points of  $\tilde{Z} = \Psi(Z)$ . (For the above case  $\bar{P}_3$  is contained as the vertex.) Recall that  $\Psi$  is the morphism which contracts the four rational curves, and that the images of the curves are exactly the singular points of  $\tilde{Z}$ . On the other hand, by ([Po92, Lemma 1.9]), any degree-one divisor is non-singular. Therefore the morphisms  $D_j \rightarrow \Psi(D_j)$  and  $\bar{D}_j \rightarrow \Psi(\bar{D}_j)$  factor through the minimal resolution of the quadratic cones. Then again by ([Po92, Lemma 1.10]),  $D_j$  and  $\bar{D}_j$  are obtained from  $\Sigma_2 = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(2))$  (the minimal resolution of the cone) by blowing-up one point.

In a similar fashion, we can compute the defining equations of  $\Psi(D)$  for a non- $G$ -invariant degree-one divisor  $D$ . (For instance, one of them is given by

$$(5.14) \quad w_4 - c(\alpha z_2 - iz_3) = \alpha z_2 + iz_3 + 2cw_5 = 2w_0 w_1 + (2\lambda - 2)z_2^2 + z_3^2 = 0,$$

where  $c \in \mathbb{C}^*$ .) From these (and also by the constraint  $3/2 < \lambda < 2$ ), we obtain that  $\Psi(D)$  is biholomorphic to a non-singular quadric in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^3$ ; namely  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$ . Then again by [Po92, Lemmas 1.9 and 1.10] we obtain that the divisor  $D$  is obtained from  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$  by blowing-up one point. Since the one point blow-up of  $\Sigma_2$  and that of  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$  cannot be biholomorphic, we conclude that the  $G$ -invariant divisors  $D_j, \bar{D}_j$  and non- $G$ -invariant divisors  $D$  cannot be biholomorphic.

For a given  $\Phi \in \text{Aut}(g)$ , if we use the same letter to denote the induced automorphism of  $Z$ ,  $\Phi$  clearly preserves the set of 4 pencils (as any  $\Phi \in \text{Aut}(Z)$  preserves the degree of divisors). Further, by the above distinction of complex structure between  $G$ -invariant and non- $G$ -invariant members, the set of  $G$ -invariant members (which are explicitly given by  $\{D_j, \bar{D}_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq 4\}$ ) are preserved under  $\Phi$ . As  $\Phi$  preserves

the real structure, this means that  $\Phi$  preserves the set  $\{D_j \cap \bar{D}_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq 4\}$ . Since these are exactly the set of  $G$ -invariant twistor lines, this implies the claim (i) of the lemma.

For (ii) we notice that each  $D_j + \bar{D}_j$  is contracted to a reducible curve of bidegree  $(1, 1)$  under precisely one of the two rational maps  $f_1 \circ \Psi$  and  $f_3 \circ \Psi$ . Therefore each twistor line  $L_j = D_j \cap \bar{D}_j$  is mapped to a real  $G$ -fixed point on (one of) the image quadrics. On the quadric  $f_1(\tilde{Z}) \simeq \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$ , there are exactly two real  $G$ -fixed points, and they are explicitly given by

$$\{\alpha z_2 - iz_3 = w_4 = w_5 = 0\}, \text{ and } \{\alpha z_2 + iz_3 = w_4 = w_5 = 0\}.$$

Similarly, on the quadric  $f_3(\tilde{Z})$ , real  $G$ -fixed points are explicitly given by

$$\{\beta z_2 - iz_3 = w_0 = w_1 = 0\}, \text{ and } \{\beta z_2 + iz_3 = w_0 = w_1 = 0\}.$$

Computing the inverse images of these 4 points under  $f_1$  and  $f_3$  (namely substituting these into the equations (5.1)), we obtain the desired equations for the images of  $G$ -invariant twistor lines.  $\square$

The homomorphism (4.3) and the coordinates  $(w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5)$  give a homomorphism

$$(5.15) \quad \text{Aut}(g) \longrightarrow \text{GL}(6, \mathbb{C}).$$

We shall obtain the image of (5.15) explicitly. Take any  $\Phi \in \text{Aut}(g)$  and let  $U \in \text{GL}(6, \mathbb{C})$  be its image. Then as in the case of  $n \geq 3$ ,  $U$  preserves the variety  $\tilde{Z}$ . Hence  $U$  preserves the singular set  $\{P_1, P_3, \bar{P}_1, \bar{P}_3\}$ . Taking the real structure into account, the following two possibilities can occur:

- (I)  $\{U(P_1), U(\bar{P}_1)\} = \{P_1, \bar{P}_1\}$  and  $\{U(P_3), U(\bar{P}_3)\} = \{P_3, \bar{P}_3\}$ ,
- (II)  $\{U(P_1), U(\bar{P}_1)\} = \{P_3, \bar{P}_3\}$  and  $\{U(P_3), U(\bar{P}_3)\} = \{P_1, \bar{P}_1\}$ .

For case (I), using the fact that  $U$  commutes with the real structure (5.3), it is easy to deduce that  $U$  is of the form

$$(5.16) \quad \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & O \\ O & A_{22} & O \\ O & A_{32} & A_{33} \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $A_{12}, A_{22}$  and  $A_{32}$  are  $2 \times 2$  matrices with  $\det A_{22} \neq 0$  and

$$(5.17) \quad A_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{a} \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a \\ \bar{a} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{33} = \begin{pmatrix} b & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{b} \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b \\ \bar{b} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^*$ . Similarly, for case (II),  $U$  is of the form

$$(5.18) \quad \begin{pmatrix} O & A_{12} & A_{13} \\ O & A_{22} & O \\ A_{31} & A_{32} & O \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $A_{12}, A_{22}$  and  $A_{32}$  are  $2 \times 2$  matrices with  $\det A_{22} \neq 0$  and

$$(5.19) A_{13} = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & -\bar{a} \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a \\ -\bar{a} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{31} = \begin{pmatrix} b & 0 \\ 0 & -\bar{b} \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b \\ -\bar{b} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^*$ .

Using Lemma 5.3, we can deduce another restriction for the  $6 \times 6$  matrix  $U$  as follows.

**Lemma 5.4.** (i) In the presentations (5.16) and (5.18),  $A_{12} = A_{32} = O$  holds. (ii) If  $U$  belongs to the case (I), the matrix  $A_{22}$  must be of the form

$$(5.20) \quad A_{22} = c \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } c \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad c \in \mathbb{R}^*.$$

(iii) If  $U$  belongs to the case (II), we have

$$(5.21) \quad A_{22} = c \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \alpha\beta & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } c \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ \alpha\beta & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad c \in i\mathbb{R}^*.$$

*Proof.* First, we note that by Lemma 5.3,  $U$  has to leave the set of 4 conics (5.5)–(5.8) invariant. In the case (I), namely if  $\{U(P_1), U(\bar{P}_1)\} = \{P_1, \bar{P}_1\}$ , the set of the two conics  $\{(5.5), (5.6)\}$  must be preserved under  $U$ , since (5.5) and (5.6) contain  $P_1$  and  $\bar{P}_1$ , and (5.7) and (5.8) do not. Similarly, the set  $\{(5.7), (5.8)\}$  must also be preserved under  $U$ .

A generic point on the conics (5.5) and (5.6) is of the form  $(w_0, w_1, 1, \mp i\alpha, 0, 0)$ . Since

$$(5.22) \quad \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & O \\ O & A_{22} & O \\ O & A_{32} & A_{33} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} w_0 \\ w_1 \\ 1 \\ \mp i\alpha \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} * \\ * \\ A_{22} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \mp i\alpha \end{pmatrix} \\ A_{32} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \mp i\alpha \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix},$$

and these points still belong to (5.5) or (5.6), we obtain

$$A_{32} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\alpha \end{pmatrix} = A_{32} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i\alpha \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since  $\alpha = \sqrt{4 - 2\lambda} \neq 0$ , we obtain  $A_{32} = 0$ . Similarly, considering the analogous requirement for (5.7) and (5.8), we obtain  $A_{12} = 0$ .

Thus we have obtained the claim (i) for the case (I). For the case (II), namely if  $\{U(P_1), U(\bar{P}_1)\} = \{P_3, \bar{P}_3\}$ , the sets of the two conics  $\{(5.5), (5.6)\}$  and  $\{(5.7), (5.8)\}$  must be interchanged under  $U$ . From this we can again deduce  $A_{12} = A_{32} = O$  by similar computations. Hence we obtain (i).

Next we show (ii). Suppose  $U$  belongs to the case (I). Then since the right hand side of (5.22) belongs to the conics (5.5) or (5.6), as points on  $\mathbb{CP}^1$  we have either

$$(5.23) \quad A_{22} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i\alpha \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\alpha \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } A_{22} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\alpha \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i\alpha \end{pmatrix}$$

or

$$(5.24) \quad A_{22} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i\alpha \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i\alpha \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A_{22} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\alpha \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\alpha \end{pmatrix},$$

according to whether  $U$  interchanges (5.5) and (5.6) or not. Similarly, by using the computations to deduce  $A_{12} = 0$ , either

$$(5.25) \quad A_{22} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i\beta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\beta \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A_{22} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\beta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i\beta \end{pmatrix}$$

or

$$(5.26) \quad A_{22} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i\beta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i\beta \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A_{22} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\beta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\beta \end{pmatrix},$$

according to whether  $U$  interchanges (5.7) and (5.8) or not. We note that as points on  $\mathbb{CP}^1$

$$(5.27) \quad (1, i\alpha), (1, -i\alpha), (1, i\beta), (1, -i\beta)$$

are four distinct points. Thus (5.23)–(5.26) mean that in any case the projective transformation determined by the matrix  $A_{22}$  leaves the set of the 4 points (5.27) invariant. If (5.24) and (5.26) happens, then  $A_{22}$  fixes all 4 points. This means  $A_{22} = cI_2$  for some  $c \in \mathbb{C}^*$ . If (5.23) and (5.25) happen, then  $A_{22}$  interchanges  $(1, i\alpha)$  and  $(1, -i\alpha)$  and also  $(1, i\beta)$  and  $(1, -i\beta)$ . This means  $A_{22} = c \operatorname{diag}(1, -1)$ . A simple computation also shows that there exists no projective transformation realizing the remaining two cases. Moreover, since  $U$  commutes with the real structure (5.3), we readily obtain  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . Thus we obtain the claim (ii) in case (I).

If  $U$  belongs to the case (II), by similar computation as above, we deduce that, as a projective transformation,  $A_{22}$  maps  $(1, i\alpha)$  to either  $(1, i\beta)$  or  $(1, -i\beta)$  (so that  $(1, -i\alpha)$  is mapped to  $(1, -i\beta)$  or  $(1, i\beta)$  respectively). Further,  $A_{22}$  maps  $(1, i\beta)$  to either  $(1, i\alpha)$  or  $(1, -i\alpha)$  (so that  $(1, -i\beta)$  is mapped to  $(1, -i\alpha)$  or  $(1, i\alpha)$  respectively). Among these  $2 \cdot 2 = 4$  possibilities, only the two cases

$$A_{22} : (1, i\alpha) \mapsto (1, i\beta) \quad \text{and} \quad (1, i\beta) \mapsto (1, i\alpha),$$

and

$$A_{22} : (1, i\alpha) \mapsto (1, -i\beta) \quad \text{and} \quad (1, i\beta) \mapsto (1, -i\alpha)$$

can actually occur, and for each these cases  $A_{22}$  is represented by the matrices

$$(5.28) \quad A_{22} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \alpha\beta & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ \alpha\beta & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

respectively. Finally, again by commutativity with (5.3) we obtain  $c \in i\mathbb{R}$ . This completes the proof of claim (iii).  $\square$

The next lemma determines all automorphisms of the projective model  $\tilde{Z}$  which commute with the real structure.

**Lemma 5.5.** (i) Let  $U$  be a  $6 \times 6$  matrix in Case (I) of the form (5.16), where  $A_{11}$  and  $A_{33}$  are as in (5.17) and  $A_{12} = A_{32} = O$  and  $A_{22}$  is as in (5.20) by Lemma 5.4. Then after normalizing by a scalar multiplication to make  $c = 1$ ,  $U$  preserves the projective model  $\tilde{Z}$  if and only if the entries in (5.17) satisfy  $|a| = |b| = 1$ . (ii) Let  $U$  be the  $6 \times 6$  matrix in Case (II) of the form (5.18), where  $A_{13}$  and  $A_{31}$  are as in (5.19) and  $A_{12} = A_{32} = O$  and  $A_{22}$  is as in (5.21) by Lemma 5.4. Then after normalizing by a scalar multiplication to make  $c = i$ ,  $U$  preserves the projective model  $\tilde{Z}$  if and only if the entries in (5.19) satisfy

$$(5.29) \quad |a| = \beta, \quad |b| = \alpha \quad (\text{and } c = i).$$

*Proof.* We only show (ii) since (i) can be proved by a similar (and simpler) computation. We recall that  $\tilde{Z}$  is defined by the following 2 quadratic polynomials:

$$(5.30) \quad h_0 = 2w_0w_1 + \lambda z_2^2 + \frac{3}{2}z_3^2 + w_4w_5,$$

$$(5.31) \quad h_\infty = w_0w_1 + z_2^2 + z_3^2 + w_4w_5.$$

We also recall  $\alpha^2 = 4 - 2\lambda$ ,  $\beta^2 = 2\lambda - 2$ . Let the constants  $(a, b, c)$  be arbitrary satisfying  $c \in i\mathbb{R}$ . Then by substitution, we obtain

$$(5.32) \quad Uh_0 = -2|a|^2w_4w_5 + c^2\lambda z_3^2 + (3/2)c^2\alpha^2\beta^2z_2^2 - |b|^2w_0w_1,$$

$$(5.33) \quad Uh_\infty = -|a|^2w_4w_5 + c^2z_3^2 + c^2\alpha^2\beta^2z_2^2 - |b|^2w_0w_1.$$

By multiplying a real constant to  $U$ , we may suppose  $|b| = 1$ . So we have constants  $(a, b, c)$  with  $|b| = 1$  determining  $U$  in Case (II). This gives,

$$(5.34) \quad Uh_0 = -2|a|^2w_4w_5 + c^2\lambda z_3^2 + (3/2)c^2\alpha^2\beta^2z_2^2 - w_0w_1,$$

$$(5.35) \quad Uh_\infty = -|a|^2w_4w_5 + c^2z_3^2 + c^2\alpha^2\beta^2z_2^2 - w_0w_1.$$

If  $U$  preserves  $\tilde{Z}$ , then preserves the quadratic ideal  $(h_0, h_\infty)$ , so there exist constants  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  so that

$$(5.36) \quad c_1Uh_0 - c_2Uh_\infty = h_0 - h_\infty = w_0w_1 + (\lambda - 1)z_2^2 + (1/2)z_3^2.$$

A computation gives

$$(5.37) \quad \begin{aligned} c_1Uh_0 - c_2Uh_\infty &= -(c_1 - c_2)w_0w_1 + |a|^2(-2c_1 + c_2)w_4w_5 \\ &\quad + c^2(c_1\lambda - c_2)z_3^2 + \left(\frac{3}{2}c_1 - c_2\right)c^2\alpha^2\beta^2z_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing with (5.36), we see that  $c_2 - c_1 = 1$  and  $|a|^2(-2c_1 + c_2) = 0$ . Since  $|a| \neq 0$ , we obtain

$$(5.38) \quad c_1 = 1, c_2 = 2.$$

Then we have

$$(5.39) \quad Uh_0 - 2Uh_\infty = w_0w_1 + c^2(\lambda - 2)z_3^2 - (1/2)c^2\alpha^2\beta^2z_2^2.$$

Comparing coefficients with (5.36), we have

$$(5.40) \quad c^2(\lambda - 2) = 1/2$$

$$(5.41) \quad -(1/2)c^2\alpha^2\beta^2 = (\lambda - 1).$$

By (5.40) we obtain  $c^2 = -\alpha^{-2}$ . Further, if this is satisfied, (5.41) automatically holds. So we find that  $h_0 - h_\infty \in (Uh_0, Uh_\infty)$  holds if and only if after a rescaling the entries of  $U$  satisfy  $c = i$  and  $|b| = \alpha$ .

Next, by rescaling, we assume  $|a| = 1$ . We compute that

$$(5.42) \quad Uh_0 = -2w_4w_5 + c^2\lambda z_3^2 + \frac{3}{2}c^2\alpha^2\beta^2 z_2^2 - |b|^2w_0w_1$$

$$(5.43) \quad Uh_\infty = -w_4w_5 + c^2z_3^2 + c^2\alpha^2\beta^2 z_2^2 - |b|^2w_0w_1$$

Consider the element

$$(5.44) \quad h_0 - 2h_\infty = (\lambda - 2)z_2^2 - \frac{1}{2}z_3^2 - w_4w_5.$$

We next find  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  so that

$$(5.45) \quad c_1Uh_0 - c_2Uh_\infty = (\lambda - 2)z_2^2 - \frac{1}{2}z_3^2 - w_4w_5.$$

We compute

$$(5.46) \quad \begin{aligned} c_1Uh_0 - c_2Uh_\infty &= (-2c_1 + c_2)w_4w_5 + c^2(c_1\lambda - c_2)z_3^2 \\ &+ \left(\frac{3}{2}c_1 - c_2\right)c^2\alpha^2\beta^2 z_2^2 - |b|^2(c_1 - c_2)w_0w_1. \end{aligned}$$

We find that

$$(5.47) \quad |b|^2(c_1 - c_2) = 0, \quad -2c_1 + c_2 = -1,$$

which implies that  $c_1 = c_2 = 1$ . We then have

$$(5.48) \quad \frac{1}{2}c^2\alpha^2\beta^2 = \lambda - 2, \quad c^2(\lambda - 1) = -\frac{1}{2}.$$

The latter equation implies  $c^2 = -|\beta|^{-2}$ , which implies the former equation. So we find that  $h_0 - 2h_\infty \in (Uh_0, Uh_\infty)$  holds if and only if after a rescaling the entries of  $U$  satisfy  $c = i$  and  $|a| = \beta$ .

On the other hand, as  $(h_0, h_\infty) = (h_0 - h_\infty, h_0 - 2h_\infty)$ , and  $(h_0, h_\infty) = (Uh_0, Uh_\infty)$  holds if and only if  $h_0 \in (Uh_0, Uh_\infty)$  and  $h_\infty \in (Uh_0, Uh_\infty)$ . Hence by a combination of the above two, we conclude that  $U$  preserves  $\tilde{Z}$  if and only if  $U$  can be rescaled to satisfy  $c = i$ ,  $|a| = \beta$  and  $|b| = \alpha$ .  $\square$

According to Lemma 5.5, in Case (I), each of  $A_{11}$ ,  $A_{22}$  and  $A_{33}$  has 2 types of choices, with  $|a| = |b| = 1$ . Hence the automorphisms in (i) of Lemma 5.5 constitute  $2^3 = 8$  tori. Similarly by Lemma 5.5 (ii), the same is true for Case (II), so that we again obtain 8 tori. Thus we obtain 16 tori in the holomorphic automorphism group of  $\tilde{Z}$ . All automorphisms in these 16 tori commute with the real structure.

**5.2. Determination of small resolutions.** As in Proposition 5.1, the projective model  $\tilde{Z}$  of Poon's twistor spaces on  $2\#\mathbb{CP}^2$  has precisely 4 ordinary nodes  $P_1, \bar{P}_1, P_3$  and  $\bar{P}_3$ . The actual twistor space  $Z$  is obtained from  $\tilde{Z}$  by taking small resolutions for each node. Of course, there are exactly 2 ways of small resolutions for each node. (We refer the reader to [Kol87, Section 12] for a discussion of the small resolutions of ordinary nodes of threefolds.) Since the resolution must preserve the real structure, the small resolutions of  $P_1$  and  $P_3$  uniquely determine those of  $\bar{P}_1$  and  $\bar{P}_3$  respectively, so there are exactly 4 ways to obtain small resolutions of the variety  $\tilde{Z}$  which preserve the real structure. In this subsection we explicitly determine which small resolutions yield the twistor space. This gives a completely explicit construction of the twistor spaces of Poon's metrics on  $2\#\mathbb{CP}^2$ , starting from his projective models in  $\mathbb{CP}^5$ .

For the purpose of specifying the small resolutions of ordinary nodes of  $\tilde{Z}$ , we first investigate local structure of  $\tilde{Z}$  in neighborhoods of the singularities. First we take  $P_1 = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$  and  $\bar{P}_1 = (0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ . By (5.5) and (5.6) the two irreducible components of the two reducible hyperplane sections  $\tilde{Z} \cap H_\alpha$  and  $\tilde{Z} \cap H_{-\alpha}$  contain  $P_1$  and  $\bar{P}_1$  as smooth points. Namely, the 4 surfaces

$$(5.49) \quad D'_1 := \{\alpha z_2 - iz_3 = w_4 = w_0 w_1 + (2\lambda - 3)z_2^2 = 0\},$$

$$(5.50) \quad \bar{D}'_1 := \{\alpha z_2 - iz_3 = w_5 = w_0 w_1 + (2\lambda - 3)z_2^2 = 0\},$$

$$(5.51) \quad D'_2 := \{\alpha z_2 + iz_3 = w_4 = w_0 w_1 + (2\lambda - 3)z_2^2 = 0\},$$

$$(5.52) \quad \bar{D}'_2 := \{\alpha z_2 + iz_3 = w_5 = w_0 w_1 + (2\lambda - 3)z_2^2 = 0\},$$

all of which are cones over a smooth conic, share  $P_1$  and  $\bar{P}_1$  as smooth points. Note that  $\bar{D}'_1 = \sigma(D'_1)$  and  $\bar{D}'_2 = \sigma(D'_2)$  hold, and that all of these 4 surfaces are  $G$ -invariant. The configuration of these 4 surfaces and the ordinary nodes is illustrated in the diagram on the left in Figure 1. In a neighborhood of  $P_1$ , by setting  $w_0 = 1$  in the defining equations in (5.1) and eliminating  $w_1$ , we can think of  $\tilde{Z}$  as defined in  $\mathbb{C}^4 = \{(z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5)\}$  by the equation

$$(5.53) \quad \alpha^2 z_2^2 + z_3^2 + 2w_4 w_5 = 0,$$

from which one can see that  $P_1$  is an ordinary node of  $\tilde{Z}$ . Similarly, by neglecting the last common hyperquadric in (5.49)–(5.52), these 4 surfaces can be considered to be defined in the same  $\mathbb{C}^4$  (at least in a neighborhood of  $P_1$ ).

By the equations (5.53) and (5.49)–(5.52) (with the last common quadratic equation neglected), a small resolution of  $\tilde{Z}$  at  $P_1$  is clearly specified by which pair among  $\{D'_1, \bar{D}'_2\}$  or  $\{\bar{D}'_1, D'_2\}$  is blown-up at  $P_1$ . By exchanging the role of  $w_0$  and  $w_1$  in the above argument, we see that a small resolution at the conjugate point  $\bar{P}_1$  can also be specified by which pair of  $\{D'_1, \bar{D}'_2\}$  or  $\{\bar{D}'_1, D'_2\}$  is blown-up at  $\bar{P}_1$ .

Similarly, by (5.7) and (5.8), the other two reducible hyperplane sections  $\tilde{Z} \cap H_\beta$  and  $\tilde{Z} \cap H_{-\beta}$  contain  $P_3$  and  $\bar{P}_3$  as smooth points. They consist of the four  $G$ -invariant




FIGURE 1. The 8 cones meeting at singularities of  $\tilde{Z}$ . The broken lines are the images of the four  $G$ -invariant twistor lines, which separate  $D_j$  and  $\bar{D}_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq 4$ . The rational curves  $C_j, \bar{C}_j, j = 2, 4$  and  $L_j, 1 \leq j \leq 4$ , are the intersection of the corresponding divisors.

surfaces

$$(5.54) \quad D'_3 := \{\beta z_2 - iz_3 = w_0 = (3 - 2\lambda)z_2^2 + w_4 w_5 = 0\},$$

$$(5.55) \quad \bar{D}'_3 := \{\beta z_2 - iz_3 = w_1 = (3 - 2\lambda)z_2^2 + w_4 w_5 = 0\},$$

$$(5.56) \quad D'_4 := \{\beta z_2 + iz_3 = w_0 = (3 - 2\lambda)z_2^2 + w_4 w_5 = 0\},$$

$$(5.57) \quad \bar{D}'_4 := \{\beta z_2 + iz_3 = w_1 = (3 - 2\lambda)z_2^2 + w_4 w_5 = 0\}.$$

These are illustrated in the diagram on the right in Figure 1. By the same reasons as for  $P_1$  and  $\bar{P}_1$ , the small resolutions of  $\tilde{Z}$  at  $P_3$  and  $\bar{P}_3$  are specified by which pair among  $\{D'_3, \bar{D}'_4\}$  or  $\{\bar{D}'_3, D'_4\}$  is blown-up at  $P_3$  and  $\bar{P}_3$  respectively.

Hence any small resolution of  $\tilde{Z}$  preserving the real structure falls into exactly one of the following:

(\*)  $\{D'_1, \bar{D}'_2\}$  and  $\{D'_3, \bar{D}'_4\}$  are blown-up pairs near  $P_1$  and  $P_3$ , respectively, or  $\{\bar{D}'_1, D'_2\}$  and  $\{\bar{D}'_3, D'_4\}$  (the complementary pairs) are blown-up pairs near  $P_1$  and  $P_3$  respectively.

(\*)'  $\{D'_1, \bar{D}'_2\}$  and  $\{\bar{D}'_3, D'_4\}$  are blown-up pairs near  $P_1$  and  $P_3$ , respectively, or  $\{\bar{D}'_1, D'_2\}$  and  $\{D'_3, \bar{D}'_4\}$  (the complementary pairs) are blown-up pairs near  $P_1$  and  $P_3$  respectively.

Obviously, each of these cases contain two ways of resolutions. Consequently, for each case, we obtain two (non-singular) 3-folds. Next we see that these two spaces in

each case are biholomorphic. For this, we define a new matrix  $U_0$  by

$$(5.58) \quad U_0 := \text{diag}(1, 1, 1, -1, 1, 1).$$

It is immediate to see (from (5.1)) that  $U_0(\tilde{Z}) = \tilde{Z}$  holds. We denote this involution on  $\tilde{Z}$  by the same letter  $U_0$ . Note that  $U_0$  commutes with the real structure.

**Proposition 5.6.** *Let  $\nu_1 : Z_1 \rightarrow \tilde{Z}$  and  $\nu_2 : Z_2 \rightarrow \tilde{Z}$  be the two resolutions of  $\tilde{Z}$  in the case (\*), and  $\nu'_1 : Z'_1 \rightarrow \tilde{Z}$  and  $\nu'_2 : Z'_2 \rightarrow \tilde{Z}$  be the two resolutions of  $\tilde{Z}$  in the case (\*). Then the involution  $U_0$  on  $\tilde{Z}$  lifts as a biholomorphic map  $Z_1 \rightarrow Z_2$  and  $Z'_1 \rightarrow Z'_2$ . Furthermore, the last two biholomorphic maps commute with the real structure.*

*Proof.* It suffices to verify that  $U_0$  maps the blow-up pairs to the (complementary) blow-up pairs. By elementary computations, we have  $U_0(D'_1) = D'_2, U_0(D'_3) = D'_4$ . This immediately implies the former claim of the proposition. The latter claim follows from the commutativity of  $U_0$  with the real structure.  $\square$

By Proposition 5.6, we can identify  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$ , and also  $Z'_1$  and  $Z'_2$ . Next we show that the latter two spaces are *not* twistor spaces:

**Proposition 5.7.** *Let  $Z'_1$  and  $Z'_2$  be as above and  $\sigma'_1$  and  $\sigma'_2$  the real structure induced by that on  $\tilde{Z}$ . Then  $(Z'_1, \sigma'_1)$  and  $(Z'_2, \sigma'_2)$  are not twistor spaces.*

*Proof.* By Proposition 5.6, it suffices to show the claim for  $(Z'_1, \sigma'_1)$ . In  $\mathbb{CP}^5$  we define

$$(5.59) \quad \begin{aligned} C_2 &:= \{z_2 = z_3 = w_1 = w_5 = 0\}, \quad \bar{C}_2 := \{z_2 = z_3 = w_0 = w_4 = 0\}, \\ C_4 &:= \{z_2 = z_3 = w_0 = w_5 = 0\}, \quad \bar{C}_4 := \{z_2 = z_3 = w_1 = w_4 = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is immediate to see that these are  $G$ -invariant non-singular rational curves in  $\tilde{Z}$ . Moreover, each of these 4 curves goes through exactly two singular points of  $\tilde{Z}$  (see Figure 1). We further define

$$(5.60) \quad L_j := D'_j \cap \bar{D}'_j, \quad 1 \leq j \leq 4,$$

recalling from above that these are precisely the images of the  $G$ -invariant twistor lines. Suppose that  $Z'_1$  is a twistor space. Then by Lemma 5.3, these are the images of the four  $G$ -invariant twistor lines (under  $\Psi$ ). We use the same letters to mean the strict transforms into  $Z'_1$  of these curves. Further, let  $C_1, \bar{C}_1, C_3, \bar{C}_3$  be the exceptional curves of the small resolution  $Z'_1 \rightarrow Z$ . Then in the small resolution  $Z'_1$ , the 8 curves  $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4, \bar{C}_1, \bar{C}_2, \bar{C}_3$  and  $\bar{C}_4$  form an ‘octagon’. (This is true for any small resolution of  $\tilde{Z}$ .) Further, under the present choice of the small resolution, the curves  $L_j$  in  $\tilde{Z}'_1$  can be seen to be configured as in the left diagram in Figure 2.

We make a short remark on how Figure 2 is obtained. For example, consider the the first small resolution in (\*). Then the blow-up pair at  $P_1$  is  $\{D'_1, \bar{D}'_2\}$ . This means that by the effect of the resolution,  $L_1$  and  $\bar{C}_4$  are separated by the exceptional curve  $C_1$  since  $D'_1$  is blown-up at  $P_1 (= L_1 \cap \bar{C}_4)$ . At the same time,  $C_2$  and  $L_2$  are separated by  $C_1$  since  $\bar{D}'_2$  is blown-up at  $P_1 (= C_2 \cap L_2)$ . As a result, near  $C_1$  the




FIGURE 2. Octagons formed by the 8 torus-invariant rational curves and the configuration of torus-invariant twistor lines. The left figure is for one of the two incorrect small resolutions, and the right figure is for one of the two correct small resolutions.

situation becomes as in the left diagram in Figure 2. Similar reasoning applies to all other edges of the octagon.

Next, we let  $z := z_3/z_2$  (where  $z_2, z_3$  are part of the homogeneous coordinates of  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^5$ ) and consider it as a non-homogeneous coordinate on  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1 = \{(z_2, z_3)\}$ . Then by (5.3) the real structure on the last  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$  is given by  $z \mapsto -\bar{z}$ , so that the real locus is given by  $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid z \in i\mathbb{R}\}$ . Moreover by the definition of  $L_j$ , we have

$$(5.61) \quad \begin{aligned} z &= -i\alpha \text{ on } L_1, \quad z = i\alpha \text{ on } L_2, \\ z &= -i\beta \text{ on } L_3, \quad z = i\beta \text{ on } L_4. \end{aligned}$$

These mean that under the (meromorphic)  $G$ -quotient map  $Z' \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$  which is induced by the projection  $(w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5) \mapsto (z_2, z_3)$ , each  $L_j$  is mapped to the point

$$(5.62) \quad \begin{aligned} z &= -i\alpha \text{ for } j = 1, \quad z = i\alpha \text{ for } j = 2, \\ z &= -i\beta \text{ for } j = 3, \quad z = i\beta \text{ for } j = 4. \end{aligned}$$

As Poon's metric is a special form of a Joyce metric, we will next apply the theorem of Fujiki [Fuj00, Theorem 9.1, 1)], which identifies the  $(n+2)$  real parameters involved in the construction of Joyce metrics on  $n\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  and the twistorial invariant that specifies the positions of the reducible members in the pencil  $|F|^K$  (which in our case are  $D_j + \bar{D}_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq 4$ ). Consequently, the four points in (5.62) can be canonically regarded as points on the boundary  $\partial\mathcal{H}^2$  (where the Joyce metric is constructed on  $K \times \mathcal{H}^2$ ). Furthermore, since the twistor fibration map  $Z \rightarrow 2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  is  $K$ -equivariant,

we have the diagram

$$(5.63) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} Z & \longleftarrow & (\cup_{i=1}^4 C_i) \cup (\cup_{i=1}^4 \bar{C}_i) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow / \langle \sigma'_1 \rangle \\ 2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 & \longleftarrow & 4 \text{ } K\text{-invariant 2-spheres} \\ \downarrow /K & & \downarrow /K \\ \mathcal{H}^2 \cup \partial\mathcal{H}^2 & \longleftarrow & \partial\mathcal{H}^2 \end{array}$$

where all horizontal arrows mean the obvious inclusions as subsets. In particular, we have an isomorphism

$$(5.64) \quad ((\cup_{i=1}^4 C_i) \cup (\cup_{i=1}^4 \bar{C}_i)) / \langle K, \sigma'_1 \rangle \simeq \partial\mathcal{H}^2,$$

where  $\langle K, \sigma'_1 \rangle$  means the automorphism group of  $Z'$  generated by  $K$  and  $\sigma'_1$ . Therefore, looking the left diagram of Figure 2, we see that the image of the four  $K$ -fixed points of the  $K$ -action on  $2\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  under the quotient map

$$2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \rightarrow (2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2)/K \simeq \mathcal{H}^2 \cup \partial\mathcal{H}^2$$

are configured along  $\partial\mathcal{H}^2$  in the order

$$(5.65) \quad -\alpha, \beta, -\beta, \alpha.$$

But as  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\beta > 0$ , the 4 numbers cannot be configured in this order, even up to cyclic permutation and reversing the orientation. Therefore, the  $L_j$ -s cannot be configured as in the left diagram in Figure 2. This means that the small resolutions in  $(*)'$  are not the twistor space, as claimed.  $\square$

Thus we have obtained the small resolutions of the projective variety  $\tilde{Z}$  which give the twistor space in completely explicit form. Namely, such small resolutions are exactly the two ones in  $(*)$ . We remark that for the former among the two correct small resolutions, the torus-invariant twistor lines are configured as in the right diagram in Figure 2; the latter case becomes the mirror image of this.

**5.3. Determination of the conformal isometry group (for  $2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ ).** In this subsection we determine, among the automorphisms in Lemma 5.5 (parameterized by 16 tori), which automorphisms actually lift to the twistor space. (Note that in general automorphisms of the base do not necessarily lift to a small resolution.) We begin with Case (I).

**Proposition 5.8.** *Let  $U$  be the  $6 \times 6$  matrix of the form*

$$(5.66) \quad U = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & O & O \\ O & A_{22} & O \\ O & O & A_{33} \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$(5.67) \quad A_{22} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

(5.68)

$$A_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{a} \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a \\ \bar{a} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{33} = \begin{pmatrix} b & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{b} \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b \\ \bar{b} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |a| = |b| = 1.$$

(These are necessary conditions obtained in Lemmas 5.4 and 5.5.) Then  $U$  lifts to the twistor space if and only if  $A_{22}$ ,  $A_{11}$  and  $A_{33}$  take the following combinations:

- $A_{22} = I_2$  and  $A_{11}, A_{33}$  are diagonal,
- $A_{22} = I_2$  and  $A_{11}, A_{33}$  are off-diagonal,
- $A_{22} = \text{diag}(1, -1)$ ,  $A_{11}$  is diagonal and  $A_{33}$  is off-diagonal,
- $A_{22} = \text{diag}(1, -1)$ ,  $A_{11}$  is off-diagonal and  $A_{33}$  is diagonal.

**Remark 5.9.** This proposition means that the natural injective homomorphism

$$(5.69) \quad \text{Aut}^\sigma Z \rightarrow \text{Aut}^\sigma \tilde{Z}$$

is not surjective. Namely, even if we restrict to the real resolutions, the projective models can have strictly larger symmetries than that of the twistor space.

*Proof (of Proposition 5.8).* We determine whether the projective transformation  $U$  lifts to a small resolution, by using the obvious fact that an automorphism  $U$  of  $\tilde{Z}$  lifts to a small resolution  $Z$  if and only if  $U$  maps blow-up pairs at any ordinary nodes of  $\tilde{Z}$  (in the sense of Section 5.2; see  $(*)$ ) to a blow-up pair. More concretely:

1) If  $U$  fixes  $P_j$  ( $j = 1$  or  $3$ ), then  $U$  can be lifted to a small resolution of  $\tilde{Z}$  at  $P_j$  if and only if  $U$  preserves *each* pair of divisors. (If  $j = 1$ , this means  $\{U(D_1), U(\bar{D}_2)\} = \{D_1, \bar{D}_2\}$ ; if  $\{U(D_1), U(\bar{D}_2)\} = \{\bar{D}_1, D_2\}$ ,  $U$  does not lift on any small resolutions. If  $j = 3$ , this means  $\{U(D_3), U(\bar{D}_4)\} = \{D_3, \bar{D}_4\}$ ; if  $\{U(D_3), U(\bar{D}_4)\} = \{\bar{D}_3, D_4\}$ ,  $U$  does not lift on any small resolutions.) In these cases,  $U$  can also be lifted to any small resolution (of  $P_j$ ) automatically.

2) If  $U(P_1) = \bar{P}_1$ , then  $U$  can be lifted to small resolutions of  $\tilde{Z}$  at  $P_1$  and  $\bar{P}_1$  which preserve the real structure if and only if  $\{U(D_1), U(\bar{D}_2)\} = \{\bar{D}_1, D_2\}$ . Similarly, if  $U(P_3) = \bar{P}_3$ ,  $U$  can be lifted to small resolutions at  $P_3$  and  $\bar{P}_3$  which preserves the real structure if and only if  $\{U(D_3), U(\bar{D}_4)\} = \{\bar{D}_3, D_4\}$ .

First we examine  $U$  of (5.66) in the case where  $A_{22} = I_2$  and  $A_{11}, A_{33}$  are diagonal. These  $U$  fix all four singularities of  $\tilde{Z}$  and leave any  $D_j$  and  $\bar{D}_j$  ( $1 \leq j \leq 4$ ) invariant. Hence by 1) above, we conclude that such  $U$  lift to any small resolution of  $\tilde{Z}$ . In particular,  $U$  lifts to an automorphism of the twistor space  $Z$ . Since these  $U$  include the identity matrix, they form the identity component of the automorphism group.

Next, if  $A_{22} = \text{diag}(1, -1)$ , and  $A_{11}, A_{33}$  are diagonal, then  $U(P_1) = P_1$  and  $U(D_1) = D_2$  hold. Hence by 1), these  $U$  do not lift to any small resolution. If  $A_{22} = I_2$  and  $A_{11}$  is diagonal, and  $A_{33}$  is off-diagonal, then  $U(P_1) = P_1$  and  $U(D_1) = \bar{D}_1$  hold. Hence by 1), these  $U$  do not lift to any small resolution. If  $A_{22} = \text{diag}(1, -1)$ , and  $A_{11}$  is diagonal and  $A_{33}$  is off-diagonal, then  $U(P_1) = P_1$  and  $U(D_1) = \bar{D}_2$ . Hence by 1), these  $U$  lift to any small resolution at  $P_1$  and  $\bar{P}_1$ . Further since  $U(P_3) = \bar{P}_3$  and  $U(D_3) = D_4$ , by 2) this time, we conclude that these  $U$  lift to any small resolution

at  $P_3$  and  $\overline{P}_3$  as long as they preserve the real structure. Hence these  $U$  lift to an automorphism of the twistor space  $Z$ . If  $A_{22} = I_2$ ,  $A_{11}$  is off-diagonal and  $A_{33}$  is diagonal, then we have  $U(P_3) = P_3$  and  $U(D_3) = \overline{D}_3$ . Hence by 1), these  $U$  do not lift to  $Z$ . If  $A_{22} = \text{diag}(1, -1)$ ,  $A_{11}$  is off-diagonal and  $A_{33}$  is diagonal, then we have  $U(P_1) = \overline{P}_1$ ,  $U(D_1) = D_2$ ,  $U(P_3) = P_3$  and  $U(D_3) = \overline{D}_4$ . Hence by 2) and 1), these  $U$  do lift to the twistor space  $Z$ . If  $A_{22} = I_2$  and  $A_{11}$  and  $A_{33}$  are off-diagonal, then we have  $U(P_1) = \overline{P}_1$ ,  $U(D_1) = \overline{D}_1$ ,  $U(P_3) = \overline{P}_3$ , and  $U(D_3) = \overline{D}_3$ . Hence by 2), these  $U$  do lift to the twistor space  $Z$ . Finally, if  $A_{22} = \text{diag}(1, -1)$  and  $A_{11}$  and  $A_{33}$  are off-diagonal, then we have  $U(P_1) = \overline{P}_1$ ,  $U(D_1) = \overline{D}_2$ . Hence by 2), these  $U$  do not lift to  $Z$ . This completes the proof of Proposition 5.8.  $\square$

Next we consider Case (II). In order to simplify notation, we put

$$(5.70) \quad A_{22}^+ = i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \alpha\beta & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{22}^- = i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ \alpha\beta & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Proposition 5.10.** *Let  $U$  be a  $6 \times 6$  matrix of the form*

$$(5.71) \quad U = \begin{pmatrix} O & O & A_{13} \\ O & A_{22} & O \\ A_{31} & O & O \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $A_{22} = A_{22}^+$  or  $A_{22} = A_{22}^-$  and

$$(5.72) \quad A_{13} = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & -\bar{a} \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a \\ -\bar{a} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{31} = \begin{pmatrix} b & 0 \\ 0 & -\bar{b} \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b \\ -\bar{b} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |a| = \beta, \quad |b| = \alpha.$$

(These are necessary conditions obtained in Lemmas 5.4 and 5.5.) Then  $U$  lifts to the twistor space if and only if  $A_{22}$ ,  $A_{13}$  and  $A_{31}$  take the following combinations:

- $A_{22} = A_{22}^-$  and  $A_{13}, A_{31}$  are diagonal,
- $A_{22} = A_{22}^-$  and  $A_{13}, A_{31}$  are off-diagonal,
- $A_{22} = A_{22}^+$ ,  $A_{13}$  is diagonal and  $A_{31}$  is off-diagonal,
- $A_{22} = A_{22}^+$ ,  $A_{13}$  is off-diagonal and  $A_{31}$  is diagonal.

*Proof.* We define a matrix of the form (5.71) (satisfying (5.72)) by

$$(5.73) \quad \Lambda := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \beta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\beta \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & i\alpha\beta & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \alpha & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\alpha & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We note  $\Lambda^2 = \alpha\beta I$ , so that  $\Lambda$  defines an involution of  $\tilde{Z}$ . Moreover, we have

$$(5.74) \quad \Lambda(D'_1) = D'_3, \quad \Lambda(\overline{D}'_2) = \overline{D}'_4, \quad \Lambda(D'_3) = D'_1, \quad \Lambda(\overline{D}'_4) = \overline{D}'_2.$$

In particular we have  $\{\Lambda(D'_1), \Lambda(\overline{D}'_2)\} = \{D'_3, \overline{D}'_4\}$  and  $\{\Lambda(D'_3), \Lambda(\overline{D}'_4)\} = \{D'_1, \overline{D}'_2\}$ . Noting that  $\Lambda(P_1) = P_3$ ,  $\Lambda(P_3) = P_1$ , this means that  $\Lambda$  maps any blow-up pairs to

blow-up pairs for the small resolutions in the case (\*). Therefore  $\Lambda$  lifts to  $Z$  if (and only if) the above condition (\*) is satisfied. Hence  $\Lambda$  lifts to the twistor space  $Z$ .

Having done this, for any matrix  $U$  of the form (5.71) (subject to (5.72)) we consider the product  $\Lambda U$ . If  $A_{13}$  and  $A_{31}$  (in the matrix  $U$ ) are diagonal and  $A_{22} = A_{22}^-$ , up to a non-zero constant, the product  $\Lambda U$  becomes of the first form in Proposition 5.8. Hence by the proposition  $\Lambda U$  lifts to  $Z$ . Therefore, as  $\Lambda$  lifts to  $Z$  for the small resolutions in (\*) as above, we obtain that these  $U$  lifts to  $Z$  for the small resolutions in the case (\*). Similarly, if  $A_{13}$  and  $A_{31}$  (in the matrix  $U$ ) are off-diagonal and  $A_{22} = A_{22}^-$ , then up to a non-zero constant, the product  $\Lambda U$  becomes of the second form, so that  $U$  lifts to  $Z$  for the small resolutions in (\*). If  $A_{13}$  and  $A_{31}$  are diagonal and off-diagonal respectively and  $A_{22} = A_{22}^+$ , then up to a non-zero constant,  $\Lambda U$  becomes of the forth form, so that  $U$  lifts to  $Z$  for the small resolutions in (\*). If  $A_{13}$  and  $A_{31}$  are off-diagonal and diagonal respectively and  $A_{22} = A_{22}^+$ , then up to a non-zero constant,  $\Lambda U$  becomes of the third form, so that  $U$  lifts to  $Z$  for the small resolutions in (\*). Further, it can be readily checked that if  $U$  is not of these 4 forms, then  $\Lambda U$  does not coincide with any of the 4 forms and therefore  $U$  does not lift to  $Z$  for the small resolutions in (\*) by Proposition 5.8. Thus we have proved the claim of the proposition.  $\square$

By Propositions 5.8, 5.10 and 5.7, we have obtained explicit representations of all conformal isometries of Poon's metrics on  $2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  by  $6 \times 6$  matrices. Namely, we have obtained the image of the (injective) homomorphism (5.15) explicitly.

## 6. GEOMETRIC INTERPRETATION

In this subsection, we investigate the geometry of the conformal automorphisms obtained in the previous sections. We begin with the following

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $n \geq 2$  and  $[g_{\text{LB}}]$  be a LeBrun metric on  $n\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ . Then (i) if  $n \geq 3$ , there exists a unique  $U(1)$ -subgroup of  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  which acts semi-freely on  $n\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ , (ii) if  $n = 2$ , the number of such  $U(1)$ -subgroups is two.*

*Proof.* Let  $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathcal{H}^3$  be the monopole points of  $[g_{\text{LB}}]$ . Then the structure group  $U(1)$  of the principal bundle over  $\mathcal{H}^3 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  acts semi-freely on  $n\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ , and it coincides with the identity component of  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  if and only if the  $n$  points do not lie on a common geodesic. Therefore to prove (i) it suffices to consider the case that  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  are contained on a common geodesic. If the last condition is satisfied, the identity component of  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  becomes the torus  $K$ . Note that for  $n = 2$ , this condition is automatically satisfied.

The  $K$ -action on  $n\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  is obtained as follows. First consider a standard  $K$ -action on  $\mathbb{C}^2$ , which is given by  $(z, w) \mapsto (sz, tw)$  for  $(s, t) \in U(1) \times U(1)$ . We blow-up  $\mathbb{C}^2$  at  $n$  points in such a way that the blown-up points are always on the unique  $K$ -fixed point of the strict transform of the  $z$ -axis. Let  $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2$  be the resulting complex (toric) surface. Next, we add a point at infinity to  $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2$ . Then by reversing the standard orientation, we obtain  $n\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  with a  $K$ -action. (Over the open subset  $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2 \subset n\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ ,  $[g_{\text{LB}}]$  contains a Kähler scalar-flat metric with a  $K$ -action.) As this  $K$ -action contains

a  $U(1)$ -subgroup acting semi-freely (which is explicitly given by  $\{(s, t) \mid s = 1\}$ ), it can be identified with the identity component of  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  (in the present situation). Hence to prove the lemma it is enough to classify all  $U(1)$ -subgroups of  $K$  which act semi-freely on  $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2$ .

If  $K_1 \subset K$  is such a  $U(1)$ -subgroup,  $K_1$  has non-isolated fixed points [LeB93, Proposition 1]. Hence, since the  $K$ -action on  $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2$  is free on the preimage of  $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{zw = 0\}$ , the subgroup  $K_1$  has to fix the strict transform of the  $z$ -axis or the  $w$ -axis, or some exceptional curve of the blow-up  $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ . On these  $K$ -invariant subsets, the  $K$ -action is explicitly given by multiplication by

$$(6.1) \quad t, s^{-1}, ts^{-1}, ts^{-2}, \dots, ts^{-n},$$

respectively. Namely, all subgroups having non-isolated fixed locus are explicitly given by

$$(6.2) \quad \{t = 1\}, \{s = 1\}, \text{ and } \{t = s^k\} (1 \leq k \leq n).$$

Since  $n \geq 2$  the first one acts non-semi-freely, whereas the second one acts semi-freely.

For the remaining subgroups  $\{t = s^k\} (1 \leq k \leq n)$ , the action on the  $(n + 2)$   $K$ -invariant subsets (in the last paragraph)

$$(6.3) \quad s^k, s^{k-1}, s^{k-2}, \dots, s^{k-n}, s^{-1}.$$

Hence the action becomes semi-free if and only if  $n = 2$  and  $k = 1$ . This means that if  $n \geq 3$  the subgroup  $\{s = 1\}$  is the unique  $U(1)$ -subgroup acting semi-freely, and if  $n = 2$ , the subgroups  $\{s = 1\}$  and  $\{t = s\}$  are all such subgroups. Thus we have obtained the claim of the lemma.  $\square$

We return to the case of  $2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ . Recall that in the proof of Lemma 5.3 we have defined two  $\mathbb{C}^*$ -subgroups  $G_1$  and  $G_3$  (explicitly defined as (5.12) and (5.13)).

**Lemma 6.2.** *Viewing the group  $G = \mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^*$  (acting on Poon's twistor space) as the complexification of  $K = U(1) \times U(1)$  (acting on Poon's metric), the subgroups  $G_1$  and  $G_3$  of  $G$  are exactly the complexification of the two  $U(1)$ -subgroups acting semi-freely on  $2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ .*

*Proof.* We freely use notations in the previous section. It suffices to show that  $G_1$  and  $G_3$  act semi-freely on the twistor space  $Z$ . By their explicit forms (5.12) and (5.13),  $G_1$  and  $G_3$  clearly act semi-freely on  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^5$ . Therefore they act semi-freely on the projective model  $\tilde{Z}$ . Hence it is enough to show that they act semi-freely on the exceptional curves  $C_1, C_3, \bar{C}_1$  and  $\bar{C}_3$  of the small resolutions  $Z \rightarrow \tilde{Z}$ . The weights for the  $G_1$  and  $G_3$ -actions on these curves can readily be computed by using the  $G$ -invariant divisors  $D'_i$  and  $\bar{D}'_i (1 \leq i \leq 4)$ , and they become either 0 or 1. Thus we conclude that  $G_1$  and  $G_3$  act semi-freely on  $Z$ .  $\square$

Let  $K_1$  and  $K_3$  be the  $U(1)$ -subgroups of  $K$  whose complexifications are  $G_1$  and  $G_3$ , respectively. We know that these are all of the  $U(1)$ -subgroups acting semi-freely. For these subgroups, we set

$$(6.4) \quad X_0 = \{p \in 2\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \mid \text{the isotropy subgroup of } K_1 \text{ at } p \text{ is } \{\text{Id}\}\},$$

and

$$(6.5) \quad Y_0 = \{p \in 2\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \mid \text{the isotropy subgroup of } K_3 \text{ at } p \text{ is } \{\text{Id}\}\}.$$

From the proof of Lemma 6.1 we know  $X_0 \neq Y_0$ . Let  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  be the image of the two isolated fixed points of the  $K_1$ -action under the quotient map  $2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \rightarrow 2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2/K_1$ . Similarly, let  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  be the image of the two isolated fixed points of the  $K_3$ -action under the quotient map  $2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \rightarrow 2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2/K_3$ . Then since  $[g_{\text{LB}}]$  is  $K_1$ -invariant, by the result of LeBrun [LeB93], the quotient space  $\mathcal{H}_1^3 := (X_0/K_1) \cup \{p_1, p_2\}$  becomes a 3-manifold equipped with a hyperbolic metric and  $g_{\text{LB}}$  is obtained by the hyperbolic ansatz with monopole points  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ . Similarly,  $\mathcal{H}_3^3 := (Y_0/K_3) \cup \{q_1, q_2\}$  becomes a 3-manifold equipped with a hyperbolic metric and  $g_{\text{LB}}$  is obtained by the hyperbolic ansatz whose monopole points are  $q_1$  and  $q_2$ . Thus any Poon metric on  $2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  has the following double fibration:

$$(6.6) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & 2\#\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 & \\ \pi_1 \swarrow & & \searrow \pi_3 \\ \mathcal{H}_1^3 \cup \partial\mathcal{H}_1^3 & & \mathcal{H}_3^3 \cup \partial\mathcal{H}_3^3. \end{array}$$

Here,  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_3$  are the quotient maps by the  $K_1$ -action and  $K_3$ -action, respectively, and  $\partial\mathcal{H}_1^3 (\simeq S^2)$  and  $\partial\mathcal{H}_3^3 (\simeq S^2)$  are the images of the non-isolated fixed locus of the  $K_1$ -action and  $K_3$ -action, respectively. Note that if  $n \geq 3$ , an analogous double fibration does not exist by Lemma 6.1.

By Propositions 5.8 and 5.10, when  $n = 2$  the group  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  consists of 8 tori.

**Definition 6.3.** We define  $H$  to be a subgroup of the full conformal isometry group  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  consisting of the 4 tori in Proposition 5.8; namely  $H$  consists of automorphisms which are lifts of automorphisms of the projective model  $\tilde{Z}$  represented by matrices of ‘diagonal type’.

**Proposition 6.4.** *The image of the subgroup  $H$  under the homomorphism*

$$\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}}) \longrightarrow \text{GL}(H^0(Z, F))$$

*in (4.3) preserves the two subspaces  $H^0(Z, F)^{G_1}$  and  $H^0(Z, F)^{G_3}$ .*

*Proof.* Take any  $\Phi \in H$  and let  $U \in \text{GL}(6, \mathbb{C})$  be the image of  $H$  under the homomorphism, where we are using  $\{w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5\}$  as a basis of  $H^0(Z, F) \simeq \mathbb{C}^6$  as before. By the definition of the subgroup  $H$ ,  $U$  must be of the form

$$(6.7) \quad \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & O & O \\ O & A_{22} & O \\ O & O & A_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{11}, A_{22}, A_{33} \in \text{GL}(2, \mathbb{C}).$$

On the other hand, by (5.4), the two subspaces are explicitly given by

$$(6.8) \quad H^0(Z, F)^{G_1} = \langle z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5 \rangle, \text{ and } H^0(Z, F)^{G_3} = \langle w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3 \rangle.$$

These directly imply the claim of the proposition. □

**Proposition 6.5.** *Let  $n = 2$  and  $H \subset \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  be as in Definition 6.3. Then there are homomorphisms*

$$(6.9) \quad \rho_1 : H \longrightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{H}_1^3; p_1, p_2)$$

and

$$(6.10) \quad \rho_3 : H \longrightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{H}_3^3; q_1, q_2)$$

such that  $\rho_j(\Phi) = \phi$ , where  $\Phi$  is any lift of  $\phi$  obtained in Proposition 2.11.

*Proof.* We recall that we have defined the linear projections  $f_j : \mathbb{CP}^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^3$  for  $j = 1, 3$  which are explicitly given by (5.9)-(5.10). By the definition and (5.4), the composition  $f_j \circ \Psi : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^3$  is exactly the rational map associated to the vector space  $H^0(Z, F)^{G_j}$ . The image  $f_j \circ \Psi(Z) = f_j(\tilde{Z})$  (explicitly given as (5.11)) is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1$ , on which  $K_j$  acts trivially. Moreover, by Proposition 6.4,  $H$  automatically preserves the quadric  $f_j(\tilde{Z})$  for  $j = 1, 3$ . (This is also clear from Proposition 5.8 and (5.11).) Hence for  $j = 1, 3$  we obtain two homomorphisms

$$(6.11) \quad H \longrightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1).$$

Furthermore, as we have considered those matrices  $U$  which commute with the real structure, the image of these homomorphisms commutes with the natural real structure on  $\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1$ . Moreover, if  $U$  is a matrix representing an element of  $H$ , we have  $\{U(P_1), U(\bar{P}_1)\} = \{P_1, \bar{P}_1\}$  and  $\{U(P_3), U(\bar{P}_3)\} = \{P_3, \bar{P}_3\}$ . If  $C_1$  and  $C_3$  respectively denote the exceptional curves (for  $\Psi$ ) over the singular points  $P_1$  and  $P_3$  of  $\tilde{Z}$  as before, by the twistor fibration  $C_1$  and  $C_3$  are mapped to the 2-spheres which are fixed by  $K_1$ -action and  $K_3$ -action, respectively. Hence any  $\Phi \in H$  leaves the boundary sphere  $\partial\mathcal{H}_j^3 \subset 2\#\mathbb{CP}^2$  invariant for  $j = 1$  and  $3$ . Therefore, viewing  $\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1$  as the minitwistor space of the hyperbolic space  $\mathcal{H}_j^3$  as in the case  $n \geq 3$ , we obtain a homomorphism

$$(6.12) \quad \rho_j : H \longrightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{H}_j^3) \quad (j = 1, 3).$$

Moreover, the image of (6.11) preserves the set of discriminant curves  $\{\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2\}$  of the map  $f_j \circ \Psi$  by the same reason for the case  $n \geq 3$  given in Proposition 4.3 (iii). Hence the image of (6.12) is contained in  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{H}_1^3; p_1, p_2)$  for  $j = 1$  and  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{H}_3^3; q_1, q_2)$  for  $j = 3$ . Furthermore, the homomorphism  $\rho_j$  is an inverse of the lift in Proposition 2.11 by the same reason for the case  $n \geq 3$  given in the final part of the proof of Proposition 4.1. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

This means that the action of the subgroup  $H$  preserves each of the two fibrations in (6.6) respectively. On the other hand, for automorphisms not belonging to  $H$ , we have the following

**Proposition 6.6.** *If  $\Phi \in \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  satisfies  $\Phi \notin H$ ,  $\Phi$  maps any fiber of  $\pi_1$  to a fiber of  $\pi_3$ , and any fiber of  $\pi_3$  to a fiber of  $\pi_1$ , where  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_3$  are the quotient maps by the  $K_1$ -action and the  $K_3$ -action, respectively, as before.*

*Proof.* Since the lift of the  $K_j$ -actions ( $j = 1, 3$ ) on  $2\#\mathbb{CP}^2$  to the twistor space is given by the restriction of the  $G_j$ -action to the real forms by Lemma 6.2, it suffices to show that by any  $\Phi \notin H$ ,  $G_1$ -orbits are mapped to  $G_3$ -orbit, and  $G_3$ -orbits are mapped to  $G_1$ -orbits. Let  $U$  be a  $6 \times 6$  matrix corresponding to  $\Phi \notin H$ . Then  $U$  is as in Proposition 5.10. As  $U$  contains 2 parameters  $a$  and  $b$  (satisfying  $|a| = \beta$  and  $|b| = \alpha$ ), we write  $U = U(a, b)$  (to simplify notation). On the other hand, the subgroups  $G_1$  and  $G_3$  are explicitly given in (5.12) and (5.13). Let  $B(s) := \text{diag}(s, s^{-1}, 1, 1, 1, 1)$  and  $C(t) := \text{diag}(1, 1, 1, 1, t, t^{-1})$ . Then as  $6 \times 6$  matrices, we have the following relations

$$(6.13) \quad \begin{aligned} B(s)U(a, b) &= U(sa, b), \quad U(a, b)B(s) = U(a, s^{-1}b), \\ C(t)U(a, b) &= U(a, tb), \quad U(a, b)C(t) = U(t^{-1}a, b). \end{aligned}$$

These imply that  $U(a, b)$  interchanges  $G_1$ -orbits and  $G_3$ -orbits, as required.  $\square$

As an immediate consequence of the above discussion, we obtain the following

**Corollary 6.7.** *Let  $d_1$  and  $d_3$  be the hyperbolic distance between  $p_1$  and  $p_2 \in \mathcal{H}_1^3$ , and  $q_1$  and  $q_2 \in \mathcal{H}_3^3$ , respectively. Then  $d_1 = d_3$  holds.*

**6.1. Generators of the automorphism group.** Finally, we give generators of the full automorphism group  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  in the case  $n = 2$ . (For  $n \geq 3$  generators of  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  were already given in Theorem 3.11).

**Proposition 6.8.** *Suppose  $n = 2$  and let  $H \subset \text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  be as in Definition 6.3, and let  $\text{Aut}_0(g_{\text{LB}}) (\simeq K)$  be the identity component of  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$ . Then we have: (i) The subgroup  $H$  is generated by  $\text{Aut}_0(g_{\text{LB}})$  and two involutions. (ii)  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  is generated by  $H$  and an involution  $\Lambda$  not belonging to  $H$ .*

*Proof.* This is easy since we have explicit representation of  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$  as  $6 \times 6$  matrices. For (i), as the two involutions in  $H$  we choose the ones represented by the following matrices

$$(6.14) \quad \Lambda_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & & & \\ & 1 & & & & \\ & & 1 & & & \\ & & & -1 & & \\ & & & & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_2 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & & \\ 1 & 0 & & & & \\ & & 1 & & & \\ & & & -1 & & \\ & & & & 1 & \\ & & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where a blank entry means 0. It is readily seen that  $\Lambda_1^2 = \Lambda_2^2 = I$ ,  $\Lambda_1$  and  $\Lambda_2$  belong to mutually different non-identity connected components of  $H$ , and that the product  $\Lambda_1\Lambda_2$  belongs to the remaining connected component of  $H$ . This means that the identity component and  $\Lambda_1$  and  $\Lambda_2$  generate the subgroup  $H$ . Hence we obtain (i). Note that these corresponds to the transformations described in Theorem 3.11.

For (ii) we choose the involution  $\Lambda$  given in (5.73). As in the proof of Propositions 5.8,  $\Lambda$  defines an involution on the twistor space  $Z$ . Since  $\Lambda$  is off-diagonal type, we have  $\Lambda \notin H$ . Further it is elementary by using Propositions 5.8 and 5.10 to show that for any one of the other 3 components of  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}}) \setminus H$ , we can find an element

$U \in H$  for which the product  $U \cdot \Lambda$  belongs to that component. This means that  $H$  and  $\Lambda$  generate  $\text{Aut}(g_{\text{LB}})$ .  $\square$

The following proposition completes the proof of Theorem 3.11 above.

**Proposition 6.9.** *As before, let  $\text{Aut}_0$  be the identity component of  $\text{Aut}_0(g_{\text{LB}})$ , which is obviously a normal subgroup of  $H$ . Then the quotient group  $H/\text{Aut}_0$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ . Moreover, the quotient  $\text{Aut}/\text{Aut}_0$  is isomorphic to  $D_4$  (the dihedral group of order 8).*

*Proof.* The former claim readily follows from the explicit form of the matrices  $U$  in Proposition 5.8. For the second claim, we first note that the group is non-Abelian, by the explicit form of the matrices  $U$  in Proposition 5.10. Therefore, it is isomorphic to either the quaternion group (the subgroup generated by  $i$  and  $j$  in the quaternions), or the dihedral group  $D_4$ . But the former group cannot contain a subgroup which is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ . Therefore  $\text{Aut}/\text{Aut}_0$  is isomorphic to  $D_4$ .  $\square$

**6.2. Einstein-Weyl spaces.** We end this section by reconciling the automorphisms found using twistor theory with the automorphisms given in Theorem 3.11, and also proving that  $\tilde{\Lambda}(\vartheta)$  defined in Section 3 is indeed a conformal map. To do this, we need to study more closely the associated Einstein-Weyl spaces of the  $G_1$  and  $G_3$  actions on the twistor space. Recall that in the proof of Lemma 5.3, we defined two linear projections  $f_j : \mathbb{CP}^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^3$  ( $j = 1, 3$ ) whose restriction to  $\tilde{Z}$  can be viewed as the quotient map with respect to the  $G_i$ -action. Also recall that the images  $f_j(\tilde{Z})$  are non-singular quadrics whose equations are given by

$$(6.15) \quad f_1(\tilde{Z}) = \{\alpha^2 z_2^2 + z_3^2 + 2w_4 w_5 = 0\}, \quad f_3(\tilde{Z}) = \{2w_0 w_1 + \beta^2 z_2^2 + z_3^2 = 0\}.$$

For fibers of  $f_1$  and hyperplane sections of the image  $f_1(\tilde{Z})$ , we have the following

**Lemma 6.10.** *(i) The closures of general fibers of  $f_1$  are smooth conics. (ii) If  $h$  is a  $G_3$ -invariant plane in  $\mathbb{CP}^3$ , the inverse image  $f_1^{-1}(h)$  is reducible if and only if  $h = \{z_2 = \pm iz_3/\alpha\}$  or  $\{z_2 = \pm iz_3/\beta\}$*

Since everything is explicit, we omit a proof of the lemma. Of course, an analogous result holds for the other quotient map  $f_3$ . We also note that the three involutions on  $\mathbb{CP}^5$  determined by the matrices  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2$  (defined in (6.14)), and  $\Lambda_3 := \Lambda_2 \Lambda_1$  naturally descend to the target space for both of the quotient maps.

By [LeB91b, Section 7], the minitwistor lines of these minitwistor spaces are precisely the hyperplane sections  $h \cap f_j(\tilde{Z})$ , where the plane  $h$  satisfies

(A)  $h$  is real with respect to the naturally induced real structure on  $\mathbb{CP}^3$  (so that the real locus on  $h$  is necessarily  $\mathbb{RP}^2$ ).

(B)  $h \cap f_j(\tilde{Z})$  does not contain a real point.

In other words, the 3-dimensional Einstein-Weyl space appears as the parameter space of these planes. In particular, since the involutions  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2$  and  $\Lambda_3$  naturally induce those on  $\mathbb{CP}^3$  as above, these also induce involutions on  $\mathcal{H}^3$ , which we denote by  $\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3$ , respectively. For the purpose of writing these down in explicit form, next we determine all the planes  $h$  satisfying (A) and (B):

**Lemma 6.11.** (i) Any plane in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^3$  having  $(z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5)$  as homogeneous coordinates as in (5.9) satisfying the above conditions (A) and (B), is of the form

$$(6.16) \quad z_2 = ibz_3 + cw_4 - \bar{c}w_5,$$

where  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{C}$  satisfy the following inequality:

$$(6.17) \quad b^2 + 2|c|^2 < \frac{1}{\alpha^2}.$$

(ii) Alternatively any plane in  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^3$  having  $(w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3)$  as homogeneous coordinates as in (5.10) satisfying the conditions (A) and (B), is either of the form

$$(6.18) \quad z_2 = ib'z_3 + c'w_0 + \bar{c}'w_1,$$

where  $b' \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $c' \in \mathbb{C}$  satisfy the inequality

$$(6.19) \quad (b')^2 - 2|c'|^2 > \frac{1}{\beta^2},$$

or otherwise of the form

$$(6.20) \quad z_3 = cw_0 - \bar{c}w_1,$$

where  $c \in \mathbb{C}$  satisfies  $|c|^2 < 1/2$ .

*Proof.* Since the real structure on  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^3$  is given by

$$(6.21) \quad (z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5) \mapsto (\bar{z}_2, -\bar{z}_3, -\bar{w}_5, -\bar{w}_4),$$

a plane  $h = \{az_2 + bz_3 + cw_4 + dw_5 = 0\}$  is real if and only if  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $b \in i\mathbb{R}$ ,  $d = -\bar{c}$ . It can be verified by simple computations that if  $a = 0$ ,  $h \cap f_1(\tilde{Z})$  always contains real points. Hence we may suppose

$$(6.22) \quad h = \{z_2 = ibz_3 + cw_4 - \bar{c}w_5\}, \quad b \in \mathbb{R}, \quad c \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Substituting into (6.15), putting  $w_5 = -\bar{w}_4$  and replacing  $z_3$  by  $iz_3$  using the reality requirement, the condition (B) is equivalent to the condition that the equation

$$(6.23) \quad \alpha^2(-bz_3 + cw_4 + \bar{c}w_4)^2 - z_3^2 - |w_4|^2 = 0$$

has no solution in  $(z_3, w_4) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C}$ . If we write  $c = c_1 + ic_2$  and  $w_4 = x + iy$ , the left hand side can be seen to be equal to

$$(6.24) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\alpha^2 b^2 - 1) \left( z_3 - \frac{2\alpha^2 b}{\alpha^2 b^2 - 1} (c_1 x - c_2 y) \right)^2 \\ & - 2 \frac{2\alpha^2 c_1^2 + \alpha^2 b^2 - 1}{\alpha^2 b^2 - 1} \left( x - \frac{2\alpha^2 c_1 c_2}{2\alpha^2 c_1^2 + \alpha^2 b^2 - 1} y \right)^2 \\ & - 2 \frac{2\alpha^2 c_1^2 + 2\alpha^2 c_2^2 + \alpha^2 b^2 - 1}{2\alpha^2 c_1^2 + \alpha^2 b^2 - 1} y^2. \end{aligned}$$

The condition is equivalent to the definiteness of (6.24), viewed as a real quadratic form of  $(z_3, x, y)$ . If this is positive definite, we have  $\alpha^2 b^2 - 1 > 0$  from the first term. But then the coefficient of  $y^2$  necessarily becomes negative, contradicting the definiteness. Hence (6.24) must be negative definite. Hence we have  $\alpha^2 b^2 - 1 < 0$ .

Then looking the coefficient of the second square, we obtain  $2\alpha^2c_1^2 + \alpha^2b^2 - 1 < 0$ . Then by negativity of the coefficient of  $y^2$ , we obtain  $2\alpha^2c_1^2 + 2\alpha^2c_2^2 + \alpha^2b^2 - 1 < 0$ . Conversely, if this last equality holds, all of the three coefficients are easily seen to be negative. Thus the quadratic form (6.24) is definite if and only  $2\alpha^2c_1^2 + 2\alpha^2c_2^2 + \alpha^2b^2 - 1 < 0$ . This is equivalent to (6.17), and we obtain (i).

The claim (ii) can be argued in a similar way, as long as we notice that the real structure on  $\mathbb{CP}^3$  with the coordinates  $(w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3)$  is given by  $(w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3) \mapsto (\bar{w}_1, \bar{w}_0, \bar{z}_2, -\bar{z}_3)$ , which is slightly different form from (6.21). We omit the details of the computations, as they are similar to the above.  $\square$

The region defined by (6.17) is an ellipsoid, which we will denote by  $\mathcal{B}(\alpha)$ . Although the region defined by (6.19) is disconnected, it becomes connected by adding the last disc  $\{|c|^2 < 1/2\}$ , and we will denote this connected region by  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\beta)$ . Lemma 6.11 says that the planes satisfying (A) and (B) are parameterized by the ellipsoid  $\mathcal{B}(\alpha)$ , for  $f_1(\tilde{Z})$ , and by the region  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\beta)$  for  $f_3(\tilde{Z})$ . If we think of the Einstein-Weyl space as the space of real hyperplane sections of the minitwistor space, these regions naturally appear for the two semi-free  $U(1)$ -actions, rather than the upper-half space model, as long as we adopt the present coordinates. By [LeB93, Theorem 2], an Einstein-Weyl structure is naturally induced on these regions and it is precisely the hyperbolic structure. Using this, it is now easy to explicitly write down the three involutions  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  and  $\phi_3$  on the Einstein-Weyl space  $\mathcal{B}(\alpha)$  (with respect to  $G_1$ ):

**Lemma 6.12.** *For  $(b, c) \in \mathcal{B}(\alpha)$ , we have*

$$(6.25) \quad \phi_1(b, c) = (-b, -\bar{c}), \quad \phi_2(b, c) = (-b, c), \quad \phi_3(b, c) = (b, -\bar{c}).$$

Furthermore, the image of the two isolated fixed points of the  $K_1$ -action on  $2\#\mathbb{CP}^2$  (the monopole points) under the quotient map to  $\mathcal{B}(\alpha)$  are given by  $(b, c) = (\pm 1/\beta, 0)$ . The images of the two isolated fixed points of the  $K_3$ -action are given by  $(b', c') = (\pm 1/\alpha, 0)$ .

*Proof.* The formulas for  $\phi_j$  immediately follow from (6.16) and the explicit forms of  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2$ , and  $\Lambda_3$  on  $\mathbb{CP}^5$ . The second statement follows from Lemma 6.10 (ii).  $\square$

Since the  $K_3$ -action acts by isometries on  $\mathcal{B}(\alpha)$ , the fixed locus of  $K_3$  must be a hyperbolic geodesic in  $\mathcal{B}(\alpha)$ . By Lemma 6.12, this geodesic contains the monopole points. The formulas (6.25) then clearly imply that the involutions  $\phi_j$  induced by  $\Lambda_j$  correspond exactly with those in Theorem 3.11.

In conclusion, we show that the maps  $\tilde{\Lambda}(\vartheta)$  defined in Subsection 3.2 above are conformal automorphisms. We first define

$$(6.26) \quad \Lambda(\vartheta) = B(e^{i\vartheta})\Lambda C(e^{-i\vartheta}),$$

recalling the diagonal matrices  $B(s)$  and  $C(t)$  defined in the proof of Proposition 6.6.

**Theorem 6.13.** *For any angle  $\vartheta$ ,  $\Lambda(\vartheta)$  is an involution of the twistor space, which induces a conformal involution of  $[g_{LB}]$ . The induced involution is  $\tilde{\Lambda}(\vartheta + \pi/2)$ , thus the map  $\tilde{\Lambda}(\vartheta + \pi/2)$  is a conformal automorphism of  $(2\#\mathbb{CP}^2, [g_{LB}])$ .*

*Proof.* It is easy to see that  $\Lambda(\vartheta)$  is also an involution. For the moment, let us consider only  $\Lambda$ . We first note that the involution  $\Lambda$  induces a diffeomorphism from  $\mathcal{H}^2$  to itself. To see this, we argue as follows: in the  $6 \times 6$  matrix representation, the involution is off-diagonal type. The middle coordinates  $(z_2, z_3)$  in Section 4 can be regarded as a (homogeneous) coordinate on the quotient space  $Z/(\mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^*) \simeq \mathbb{CP}^1$ , while  $\mathcal{H}^2$  is the space of maximal orbits in the quotient space  $2\#\mathbb{CP}^2/K$ . By the explicit form of the matrix  $\Lambda$  and the  $\mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^*$ -action (given in (5.4)) these involutions map  $\mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^*$ -orbits to  $\mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^*$ -orbits, which means that the involution is indeed a lift of some diffeomorphism of  $\mathcal{H}^2$ .

By [Fuj00, Theorem 9.1], the induced involution on  $\mathcal{H}^2$  must be a hyperbolic isometry. To see this, we first note that as the coordinate  $z$  in the equation (53) on [Fuj00, page 276] is a non-homogeneous coordinate on the parameter space of the pencil  $|F|^K$  (consisting of torus-invariant members of the system  $|F|$ ), and since the same is true for the coordinate  $z_3/z_2$  of ours, it follows that  $z$  in Fujiki's paper is related to  $z_3/z_2$  by a fractional transformation. (It is possible to write the precise relation between these two coordinates; but we do not need the explicit form). On the other hand [Fuj00, Theorem 9.1] states that the coordinate  $z$  can be used as a conformal coordinate on  $\mathcal{H}^2$ . This means that any conformal automorphism of Poon's metric on  $2\#\mathbb{CP}^2$  (which is of course a special form of Joyce metrics) induces a conformal map on  $\mathcal{H}^2$  as long as the automorphism descends to a map on  $\mathcal{H}^2$ . Since the conformal group of  $\mathcal{H}^2$  is equal to the isometry group, this implies the involution must be a hyperbolic isometry.

We next discuss the angular transformation induced by  $\Lambda$ . The  $K$ -action on  $\mathbb{CP}^5$  in (5.4) naturally induces  $K_3 \simeq K/K_1$ -action on  $\mathbb{CP}^3 = \{(z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5)\}$ , which is explicitly written as

$$(6.27) \quad (z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5) \longmapsto (z_2, z_3, tw_4, t^{-1}w_5), \quad t \in K_3.$$

This  $K_3$ -action naturally induces the (dual) action on the dual space  $(\mathbb{CP}^3)^*$ . If  $(a, b, c, d)$  means the dual coordinates as before, the action is concretely given by  $(a, b, c, d) \longmapsto (a, b, tc, t^{-1}d)$ . By putting  $a = 1$  and using  $(b, c, d)$  as non-homogeneous coordinates, the action can be written as

$$(6.28) \quad (b, c, d) \longmapsto (b, tc, t^{-1}d).$$

Then recalling  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $d = -\bar{c}$  on the real locus, we obtain that the  $K_3$ -action on  $\mathcal{B}(\alpha)$  is given by

$$(6.29) \quad (b, c) \longmapsto (b, tc).$$

Then since this must be an isometric  $U(1)$ -action on the hyperbolic space, and since any non-trivial isometric  $U(1)$ -action must be rotations around a geodesic, (6.29) means that  $\text{Arg}(c)$  can be used as a coordinate on the hyperbolic space  $\mathcal{B}(\alpha) \simeq \mathcal{H}_1^3$ . Then  $\text{Arg}(t)$  can be naturally identified with the coordinate  $\theta_3$ , where  $\theta_3$  is the coordinate on  $U(1) \simeq K_3$  we have used throughout Section 3.

Similarly, replacing the role of  $K_1$  and  $K_3$  in the above argument, we first obtain that  $K_1 (\simeq K/K_3)$  naturally acts on  $\mathbb{CP}^3 = \{(w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3)\}$  by  $(w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3) \mapsto$

$(sw_0, s^{-1}w_1, z_2, z_3)$ . Taking the dual, we obtain the  $K_1$ -action on  $(\mathbb{CP}^3)^*$  equipped with dual coordinates  $(c', d', a', b')$  given by  $(c', d', a', b') \mapsto (sc', s^{-1}d', a', b')$ . On the locus  $a' \neq 0$  if we use  $(b', c', d')$  as non-homogenous coordinates by putting  $a' = 1$ , the action is written as  $(b', c', d') \mapsto (b', sc', s^{-1}d')$ . Therefore  $\text{Arg}(s)$  can be naturally identified with the coordinate  $\theta_1$ , where  $\theta_1$  is the coordinate on  $U(1) \simeq K_1$  we used in Sections 2 and 3.

The involution  $\Lambda : \mathbb{CP}^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^5$  induces an isomorphism from  $\mathbb{CP}^3$  with coordinates  $(z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5)$  to  $\mathbb{CP}^3$  with coordinates  $(w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3)$ , which is given by

$$(6.30) \quad (z_2, z_3, w_4, w_5) \longmapsto (w_0, w_1, z_2, z_3) = (\beta w_4, -\beta w_5, -iz_3, i\alpha\beta z_2).$$

This induces an isomorphism between the dual spaces which is given by

$$(6.31) \quad (c', d', a', b') \longmapsto (a, b, c, d) = (i\alpha\beta b', -ia', \beta c', -\beta d').$$

In the above non-homogeneous coordinates on these two  $(\mathbb{CP}^3)^*$ -s, this can be written as

$$(6.32) \quad (b', c', d') \longmapsto (b, c, d) = \left( -\frac{1}{\alpha\beta b'}, -\frac{ic'}{\alpha b'}, \frac{id'}{\alpha b'} \right).$$

Restricting to the real locus, we obtain

$$(6.33) \quad \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C} \ni (b', c') \longmapsto (b, c) = \left( -\frac{1}{\alpha\beta b'}, -\frac{ic'}{\alpha b'} \right) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C}.$$

In particular,  $\Lambda^*c' = -ic'/(ab')$ . Therefore under  $\Lambda^*$ , the two angular coordinates  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_3$  are related by  $\theta_1 = \theta_3 + (3\pi/2)$ . Equivalently, this says that the angular action induced by  $\Lambda$  is given by

$$(6.34) \quad (\theta_1, \theta_3) \mapsto (\theta_3 - \pi/2, \theta_1 + \pi/2).$$

Since the angular map induced by  $\Lambda$  is orientation-reversing, the induced hyperbolic isometry must also be orientation-reversing. Since the map  $L(\zeta)$  defined above in (3.38) is the unique orientation-reversing isometry with the correct properties (see Remark 3.7),  $\Lambda$  must induce the map  $\tilde{\Lambda}(\pi/2)$ . This clearly implies that  $\Lambda(\vartheta)$  induces the map  $\tilde{\Lambda}(\vartheta + \pi/2)$ , and the proof is complete.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [AHS78] M. F. Atiyah, N. J. Hitchin, and I. M. Singer. Self-duality in four-dimensional Riemannian geometry. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A*, 362(1711):425–461, 1978.
- [Bes87] Arthur L. Besse. *Einstein manifolds*, volume 10 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- [Fuj00] Akira Fujiki. Compact self-dual manifolds with torus actions. *J. Differential Geom.*, 55(2):229–324, 2000.
- [GW07] G. W. Gibbons and C. M. Warnick. Hidden symmetry of hyperbolic monopole motion. *J. Geom. Phys.*, 57(11):2286–2315, 2007.
- [Hit82] N. J. Hitchin. Complex manifolds and Einstein’s equations. In *Twistor geometry and non-linear systems (Primorsko, 1980)*, volume 970 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 73–99. Springer, Berlin, 1982.

- [Joy95] Dominic D. Joyce. Explicit construction of self-dual 4-manifolds. *Duke Math. J.*, 77(3):519–552, 1995.
- [JT85] P. E. Jones and K. P. Tod. Minitwistor spaces and Einstein-Weyl spaces. *Classical Quantum Gravity*, 2(4):565–577, 1985.
- [KK92] Bernd Kreussler and Herbert Kurke. Twistor spaces over the connected sum of 3 projective planes. *Compositio Math.*, 82(1):25–55, 1992.
- [Kol87] János Kollár. The structure of algebraic threefolds: an introduction to Mori’s program. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 17(2):211–273, 1987.
- [LeB91a] Claude LeBrun. Anti-self-dual Hermitian metrics on blown-up Hopf surfaces. *Math. Ann.*, 289(3):383–392, 1991.
- [LeB91b] Claude LeBrun. Explicit self-dual metrics on  $\mathbf{CP}_2\#\cdots\#\mathbf{CP}_2$ . *J. Differential Geom.*, 34(1):223–253, 1991.
- [LeB93] Claude LeBrun. Self-dual manifolds and hyperbolic geometry. In *Einstein metrics and Yang-Mills connections (Sanda, 1990)*, volume 145 of *Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.*, pages 99–131. Dekker, New York, 1993.
- [Po86] Y. Sun Poon. Compact self-dual manifolds with positive scalar curvature. *J. Differential Geom.*, 24(1):97–132, 1986.
- [Po92] Y. Sun Poon. On the algebraic structure of twistor spaces. *J. Differential Geom.*, 36(2):451–491, 1992.
- [Po94] Y. Sun Poon. Conformal transformations of compact self-dual manifolds. *Internat. J. Math.*, 5(1):125–140, 1994.
- [PP95] Henrik Pedersen and Yat Sun Poon. Equivariant connected sums of compact self-dual manifolds. *Math. Ann.*, 301(4):717–749, 1995.
- [Rat94] John G. Ratcliffe. *Foundations of hyperbolic manifolds*, volume 149 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TOKYO INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, O-OKAYAMA, TOKYO, JAPAN

*E-mail address:* honda@math.titech.ac.jp

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON, WI, 53706

*E-mail address:* jeffv@math.wisc.edu