

Spin(7)-instantons on Joyce's first examples of compact Spin(7)-manifolds

Mateo Galdeano, Daniel Platt, Yuuji Tanaka, and Luya Wang

October 6, 2023

Abstract

We construct *Spin*(7)-instantons on one of Joyce's compact *Spin*(7)-manifolds. The underlying compact *Spin*(7)-manifold given by Joyce is the same as in Lewis' construction of *Spin*(7)-instantons. However, our construction method and the resulting instantons are new. The compact *Spin*(7)-manifold is constructed by gluing a *Spin*(7)-orbifold and certain local model spaces around the orbifold singularities. We construct our instantons by gluing non-flat connections on the local model spaces to a flat connection on the *Spin*(7)-orbifold. We deliver more than 20,000 examples within the structure groups $SO(3)$, $SO(4)$, $SO(5)$, $SO(7)$, and $SO(8)$.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	The first examples of compact Spin(7)-manifolds by Joyce	5
2.1	Spin(7)-manifolds	5
2.2	Examples of compact Spin(7)-manifolds by Joyce	6
3	Spin(7)-instantons on Spin(7)-manifolds	10
3.1	Spin(7)-instantons and their local deformation	10
3.2	Lewis' construction of Spin(7)-instantons	12
3.3	Spin(7)-instantons in Physics	14
4	Approximate solutions and the estimate	16
4.1	Improved estimate for torsion-free Spin(7)-structures	16
4.2	Approximate solutions	19
4.3	Pregluing estimate	20
5	Linear problems on local models	22
5.1	Linear problem on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$	22
5.2	Linear problem on $X \times X$	25

6	Deforming to genuine solutions	29
6.1	Linear problem on M_t	29
6.2	The perturbation step	37
7	Examples	39
7.1	Flat connections on orbifolds	39
7.2	Examples with structure group $SO(3)$	43
7.3	Examples with structure group $SO(4)$	47
7.4	Examples with structure group $SO(5)$	50
7.5	Examples with structure group $SO(7)$	52
7.6	Examples with structure group $SO(8)$	54
7.7	Other cases among $SO(n)$'s	55
A	Anti-self-dual instantons on ALE spaces	59
B	Flat $SO(3)$-connections via non-commutative representations	60
C	List of $SO(3)$-representations on T^8/Γ	61
D	List of $SO(4)$-representations on T^8/Γ	61
	References	63

1 Introduction

$Spin(7)$ -instantons are Yang–Mills connections on a $Spin(7)$ -manifold, which minimise the Yang–Mills functional and are solutions to a system of non-linear first-order elliptic equations. They are among the main objects in Gauge theory in higher dimensions as proposed by Donaldson–Thomas [35] and Donaldson–Segal [34]. $Spin(7)$ -instantons have similar deformation properties to anti-self-dual instantons on 4-manifolds. In fact, pursuing the algebro-geometric counterpart of them has recently become one of the hot topics in the research area of virtual enumerative invariants on Calabi–Yau four-folds (see e.g. Borisov–Joyce [16] and Oh–Thomas [79,80] for foundational works). However, producing examples of these $Spin(7)$ -instantons is known to be a very difficult problem, especially, if the underlying manifolds are compact. In this article, we construct them on examples of compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds by Joyce [63].

Joyce’s examples of compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds. Examples of compact $Spin(7)$ -manifold on which we construct $Spin(7)$ -instantons were constructed by Joyce in [63] (see also [65]). These are the first examples of compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds in the literature decades after Berger’s prediction [11] of the existence of such manifolds. These manifolds are obtained by resolving singularities of T^8/Γ , where T^8 is an eight-dimensional torus, and Γ is a finite subgroup of $Aut(T^8)$. Differential-geometrically, this resolution is given by gluing in Eguchi–Hanson spaces. Then Joyce’s elaborate analysis gives a family of torsion-free

$Spin(7)$ -structures on the resolution. See Section 2.2 for a detailed description of a particular type of them, on which we construct $Spin(7)$ -instantons in this paper. Note that, prior to this construction of compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds, Joyce performed a similar construction of examples of compact G_2 -manifolds [61, 62]. They are resolutions of T^7/Γ , where T^7 is a seven-dimensional torus, and Γ is a finite subgroup of $\text{Aut}(T^7)$.

Lewis' construction of $Spin(7)$ -instantons. Lewis [69] constructed $Spin(7)$ -instantons on one of Joyce's examples of compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds. His construction is to place Hermitian-Yang-Mills connections on a smooth K3 surface in a partial resolution of T^8/Γ , which becomes a Cayley submanifold after the resolution, he glues them to the trivial connection, and perturbs the resulting connection alongside the underlying $Spin(7)$ -structure of Joyce. This can be thought of as a Taubes style construction of $Spin(7)$ -instantons, since, as Lewis and Tian [92] find out, a sequence of $Spin(7)$ -instantons may bubble out along a Cayley submanifold, after taking a subsequence and gauge transformations. Later, Walpuski [96] beautifully worked out the Taubes construction of $Spin(7)$ -instantons, and Lewis's construction can be seen as an example of the Walpuski construction. See Section 3.2 for a detailed description of these.

Our results. We work on the same examples as Lewis did. By resolving the orbifold singularity of T^8/Γ , Joyce obtains the smooth $Spin(7)$ -manifold M^8 . We consider one type of singular sets in the orbifold T^8/Γ , whose resolution has a local model given by $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$, where X is the Eguchi-Hanson space (see Section 2.2 for more details). While Lewis glues in pullbacks of ASD connections which are concentrated away from the singular sets of the orbifold, we glue in pullbacks of ASD connections over X near the singularities of T^8/Γ and a flat connection on the orbifold T^8/Γ together with the underlying $Spin(7)$ -structures on M^8 by Joyce. (See Figure 1).

The following is our main theorem in this paper, which will be proved as Theorem 6.7 at the end of Section 6.2:

Theorem 1.1. *Let M_t be Joyce's compact $Spin(7)$ -manifold described in Section 2.2. Let G be a compact Lie group. Suppose we are given compatible gluing data in the sense of Definition 4.6 and assume that the flat connection in the compatible gluing data is unobstructed. Then, there exist a vector bundle E_t over the manifold M_t with structure group G and a $Spin(7)$ -instanton \tilde{A}_t on E_t for sufficiently small t .*

We provide lots of examples (more than 20,000 in total) of these $Spin(7)$ -instantons in the above theorem for $G = SO(3), SO(4), SO(5), SO(7), SO(8)$ in Section 7.

As we mentioned earlier, there is a similar construction of compact G_2 -manifolds by Joyce [61, 62]. Walpuski constructed G_2 -instantons on examples of those compact G_2 -manifolds in [95] (see [97] as well). The work of Walpuski solves lots of technical issues which also arise in our case, hence, we thankfully




Figure 1: Comparison of the instanton construction by Lewis [69] (top right) and our instanton construction (bottom right).

make use of his estimates in this article. However, like in the construction of the underlying compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds by Joyce, the $Spin(7)$ case forces us to prove more estimates than the G_2 one, simply because the dimension is higher. One can see it, especially in the estimates on the product of the Eguchi–Hanson spaces in Section 5.2, which do not appear in the G_2 case.

Structure of the paper. Section 2 is a review of Joyce’s construction of compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds. After recalling the definition of and some facts on $Spin(7)$ -manifolds, we describe Joyce’s first construction of compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds, especially focusing on one example of them, on which we construct $Spin(7)$ -instantons.

Section 3 addresses basic facts on $Spin(7)$ -instantons. We review the construction of $Spin(7)$ -instantons by Lewis in Section 3.2, and we also mention roles of and related research on $Spin(7)$ -instantons in Physics in Section 3.3,

We start our construction in Section 4. We introduce the relevant weighted Hölder norm and prove an improved estimate for the torsion-free $Spin(7)$ -structure, which we need in the later sections. We then give the definition of the compatible gluing data, and construct our approximate solution in Section 4.2. We prove an estimate for the approximate solution in Section 4.3.

Section 5 studies the linearised operators of the problem on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$ and $X \times X$, where X is the Eguchi–Hanson space. These give local models for our gluing construction. In Section 6, we prove our analytic gluing theorem of $Spin(7)$ -instantons, using the estimates in Sections 4 and 5. We give plenty of examples of our construction for the structure groups $SO(3)$, $SO(4)$, $SO(5)$, $SO(7)$, $SO(8)$

by producing suitable flat connections on the orbifold T^8/Γ in Section 7.

Acknowledgements. This project was started when the authors attended the British Isles Graduate Workshop III in Jersey in 2019, and we are very grateful to the organisers and participants for providing a stimulative research environment. We thank Panagiotis Angelinos, Shih-Kai Chiu, Yoshihiro Fukumoto, Xenia de la Ossa, Lorenzo Foscolo, Dominic Joyce, Fabian Lehmann, Jason Lotay, Holly Mandel, Simon Salamon, Jesus Sanchez, and Thomas Walpuski for helpful correspondence and discussions.

M.G. was supported by a scholarship from the Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, as well as the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy – EXC 2121 “Quantum Universe” – 390833306. D.P. was supported by the Eric and Wendy Schmidt AI in Science Postdoctoral Fellowship, a Schmidt Futures program. D.P. and Y.T. were partially supported by the Simons Collaboration on Special Holonomy in Geometry, Analysis and Physics. Y.T. was partially supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research numbers 20H00114, 20K03582, 21H00973, 21K03246, 23H01073. L.W. was supported by NSF GRFP and Award No. 2303437.

2 The first examples of compact $\text{Spin}(7)$ -manifolds by Joyce

2.1 $\text{Spin}(7)$ -manifolds

We define the group $\text{Spin}(7)$ as the double cover of the group $SO(7)$, which is 21-dimensional, compact, connected, simply-connected, and semisimple Lie group. However, it will be more relevant for our purposes to use an alternative definition, namely, we describe $\text{Spin}(7)$ as a subgroup of $GL(8, \mathbb{R})$, motivated by the fact that the Spin representation of the group $\text{Spin}(7)$ is eight-dimensional (see Joyce [65]).

Let \mathbb{R}^8 have coordinates (x_1, \dots, x_8) . Write $dx_{ijkl} = dx_i \wedge dx_j \wedge dx_l \wedge dx_k$ and define the following four-form:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_0 = & dx_{1234} + dx_{1256} + dx_{1278} + dx_{1357} - dx_{1368} - dx_{1458} - dx_{1467} - \\ & - dx_{2358} - dx_{2367} - dx_{2457} + dx_{2468} + dx_{3456} + dx_{3478} + dx_{5678}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the group $\text{Spin}(7)$ is the subgroup of $GL(8, \mathbb{R})$ preserving Ω_0 . We call Ω_0 the *standard $\text{Spin}(7)$ -structure* on \mathbb{R}^8 .

Note that given the Euclidean metric $g_0 = dx_1^2 + \dots + dx_8^2$ and an orientation, Ω_0 is a self-dual four-form, that is, $*\Omega_0 = \Omega_0$.

Now let M be an eight-dimensional manifold. We consider a pair (Ω, g) consisting of a Riemannian metric g and a four-form Ω on M , and call it *$\text{Spin}(7)$ -structure* if there exists an isometry between $T_p M$ and \mathbb{R}^8 identifying $\Omega|_p$ and Ω_0 for all $p \in M$. We say $\nabla\Omega$ is the *torsion* of the $\text{Spin}(7)$ -structure, where ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection of g , and (Ω, g) is *torsion-free* if $\nabla\Omega = 0$.

Theorem 2.1 (Section 12 in [86] and Proposition 10.5.3 in [65]). *Let M be an eight-dimensional manifold with $Spin(7)$ -structure (Ω, g) . Then the following are equivalent:*

1. (Ω, g) is torsion-free;
2. $Hol(g) \subset Spin(7)$; and
3. $d\Omega = 0$ on M .

Definition 2.2. A $Spin(7)$ -manifold is a triple (M, Ω, g) where M is an 8-dimensional manifold and (Ω, g) is a torsion-free $Spin(7)$ -structure.

The existence of Riemannian manifolds with holonomy group $Spin(7)$ was not known for a long time after the classification of non-symmetric orientable Riemannian manifolds with special holonomy by Berger [11]. Bryant [19] and subsequently Bryant–Salamon [20] opened up a new area of research by constructing examples of such manifolds. Their examples are non-compact (the former is non-complete and the latter is complete). Joyce came up with examples of compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds in [63], using his breathtakingly superb analysis. We give a summary of the construction in Section 2.2. Later, Joyce constructed more examples of compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds out of Calabi–Yau four-orbifolds in [64].

In Physics, compact manifolds of dimension 8 with holonomy $Spin(7)$ provide supersymmetric backgrounds of F-theory [15, 17, 53, 94], M-theory [1, 9, 29, 30] and type II string theories [2, 40, 88].

2.2 Examples of compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds by Joyce

The first construction of compact manifolds with holonomy $Spin(7)$ was obtained by Joyce [63] (see also [65, §13–14]). The underlying topological space for this construction is a resolution M of T^8/Γ , where T^8 is an eight-dimensional torus, and Γ is a finite subgroup of $Aut(T^8)$.

In this paper, we are interested in one example of compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds in [63], which we describe in more detail later in this section. In that example, the resolution of each component of the singular set of T^8/Γ is locally an open subset of the product of the Eguchi–Hanson space X with itself, namely, $X \times X$, or $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$.

For carefully chosen Γ , one has $\hat{A}(M) = 1$, which guarantees that the holonomy group of M equals to $Spin(7)$, provided that there exists a torsion-free $Spin(7)$ -structure on M .

Joyce proves the existence of such a structure in the following form:

Theorem 2.3 (Theorem 13.6.1 and Proposition 13.7.1 in [65]). *Let $\lambda, \mu, \nu > 0$ be constants. Then there exist constants $\kappa, K > 0$ such that for $0 < t \leq \kappa$ the following holds. Let M be a compact 8-manifold, and (Ω_t, g_t) a family of $Spin(7)$ -structures on M . Suppose that ϕ_t is a family of four-forms on X with $d\Omega_t + d\phi_t = 0$, and*

- (i) $\|\phi_t\|_{L^2} \leq \lambda t^{13/3}$ and $\|d\phi_t\|_{L^{10}} \leq \lambda t^{7/5}$;
- (ii) the injectivity radius $\delta(g_t)$ satisfies $\delta(g_t) \geq \mu t$; and
- (iii) the Riemannian curvature $R(g_t)$ satisfies $\|R(g_t)\|_{C^0} \leq \nu t^{-2}$.

Then there exists a smooth torsion-free $Spin(7)$ -structure $(\tilde{\Omega}_t, \tilde{g}_t)$ on M such that $\|\tilde{\Omega}_t - \Omega_t\|_{C^0} \leq Kt^{1/3}$ and $\|\nabla(\tilde{\Omega}_t - \Omega_t)\|_{L^{10}} \leq Kt^{2/15}$.

Here g_t is the metric induced by Ω_t , that is, the metric with respect to which $Spin(7)$ is a subgroup of $SO(8)$.

To construct the data of the assumption in Theorem 2.3, we interpolate between the torsion-free $Spin(7)$ -structures on the smooth locus of T^8/Γ and on the resolutions of the components of the singular set. In the example we describe below, the latter carries $Spin(7)$ structures because the Eguchi–Hanson space X carries a Ricci-flat ALE metric, and therefore has holonomy $SU(2)$. Hence, the local resolutions have holonomy $SU(2) \times SU(2)$, or $\{1\} \times SU(2)$. Since each of these is a subgroup of $Spin(7)$, this implies that each local resolution carries a $Spin(7)$ -structure. The $Spin(7)$ -structure asymptotes to the $Spin(7)$ -structure on the smooth locus of T^8/Γ on the overlap region.

The interpolation between these two structures requires significant additional work. Unlike the G_2 case, a straightforward use of partitions of unity is not sufficient, because one would only achieve $\|\phi_t\|_{L^2} = O(t^4)$, whereas we require that $\|\phi_t\|_{L^2} = o(t^4)$. A more detailed construction allowed Joyce to cancel the fourth-order terms and apply Theorem 2.3.

An example of the construction by Joyce. Here, we describe in detail one type of compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds constructed in [63]. Similar arguments for other choices of Γ lead to topologically distinct $Spin(7)$ -manifolds.

Consider $T^8 := (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^8$ with coordinates (x_1, \dots, x_8) , and carrying the flat $Spin(7)$ -structure Ω_0 . The group Γ , generated by the following involutions, acts on T^8 :

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha &: (x_1, \dots, x_8) \mapsto (-x_1, -x_2, -x_3, -x_4, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8); \\
\beta &: (x_1, \dots, x_8) \mapsto (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, -x_5, -x_6, -x_7, -x_8); \\
\gamma &: (x_1, \dots, x_8) \mapsto \left(\frac{1}{2} - x_1, \frac{1}{2} - x_2, x_3, x_4, \frac{1}{2} - x_5, \frac{1}{2} - x_6, x_7, x_8 \right); \text{ and } (2.1) \\
\delta &: (x_1, \dots, x_8) \mapsto \left(-x_1, x_2, \frac{1}{2} - x_3, x_4, \frac{1}{2} - x_5, x_6, \frac{1}{2} - x_7, x_8 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that Γ preserves Ω_0 and $\Gamma \cong \mathbb{Z}_2^4$.

To understand how T^8/Γ is resolved, we first determine the fixed locus of each element of Γ . Then we investigate how Γ acts on a neighborhood of the fixed locus. Different choices of Γ lead to different singular loci in the quotient and require topologically distinct resolutions. Our choice of Γ is made to achieve $\hat{A}(M) = 1$ so that the holonomy group of the resolved manifold M coincides with the group $Spin(7)$.

- The fixed locus of α is equal to $\{p_i\} \times T^4$ for 16 $p_i \in T^4$. For each p_i , the action of α on the first factor is the quotient of T^4 by \mathbb{Z}_2 , while in a neighborhood of p_i on the second factor the action of β is modelled by the action of \mathbb{Z}_2 on \mathbb{R}^4 on the second component. On the other hand, γ and δ act freely on the fixed set of α , dividing its 16 components into 4 sets of 4. The resulting singularities in T^8/Γ , are called *singularities of type (ii)* in [63], and we can resolve each component of the fixed locus of α by $T^4/\{\pm 1\} \times U$, where U is an open subset of the Eguchi–Hanson space. We leave the first factor unresolved because the singular point is included in the singular set of $\alpha\beta$, so a different resolution will be glued to a neighborhood of this point.
- The discussion for the fixed locus of β is identical to the case for α described above, up to the order of the factors and the resulting singularities in T^8/Γ .
- The fixed locus of $\alpha\beta$ is 256 points. Also, γ and δ act freely on these points, identifying them into 64 sets of 4. Locally, the singularities at these points are modelled by neighborhoods of 0 in $\mathbb{R}^4/\{\pm 1\} \times \mathbb{R}^4/\{\pm 1\}$, are called *singularities of type (iii)* in [63] and are resolved by $U \times U$.
- The fixed locus of γ is 16 copies of T^4 , and α , β , and δ act freely on these components, identifying them into 2 sets of 8. These singularities are called *singularities of type (i)* in [63]. A neighborhood of each component is isomorphic to $T^4 \times B^4/\{\pm 1\}$, so the resolution is $T^4 \times U$.
- The discussion for δ is identical to the discussion for γ .

We label the fixed loci of elements of Γ by S_j for $j \in \{1, \dots, 76\}$ as displayed in table 1. For some small $\zeta > 0$ ($\zeta = 1/9$ will do) we have that each of the S_j then has a neighbourhood isomorphic to $T^4/\{\pm 1\} \times B_\zeta^4/\{\pm 1\}$, $B_\zeta^4/\{\pm 1\} \times B_\zeta^4/\{\pm 1\}$, or $T^4 \times B_\zeta^4/\{\pm 1\}$ considered as Spin(7)-orbifolds, and those neighbourhoods will be denoted by T_j for $j \in \{1, \dots, 76\}$. Note that $T := \bigcup_{j \in \{1, \dots, 76\}} T_j$ consists of five connected components:

$$C_1 := T_{73}, C_2 := T_{74}, C_3 := T_{75}, C_4 := T_{76}, \text{ and } C_5 := T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_8, \quad (2.2)$$

where C_5 also contains T_j for $j \in \{9, \dots, 72\}$.

	Type	Neighbourhood	Label
$\text{fix}(\alpha), \text{fix}(\beta)$	(ii)	$T^4/\{\pm 1\} \times B_\zeta^4/\{\pm 1\}$	S_1, \dots, S_8
$\text{fix}(\alpha\beta)$	(iii)	$B_\zeta^4/\{\pm 1\} \times B_\zeta^4/\{\pm 1\}$	S_9, \dots, S_{72}
$\text{fix}(\gamma), \text{fix}(\delta)$	(i)	$T^4 \times B_\zeta^4/\{\pm 1\}$	S_{73}, \dots, S_{76}

Table 1: Labels for the singular loci in T^8/Γ .

Denote by $\rho : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}$ the blowup of $\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}$ at the origin, i.e., X is the Eguchi–Hanson space. For each $t \in (0, 1)$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, 76\}$ we define a resolution $\pi_{j,t} : \tilde{T}_{j,t} \rightarrow T_j$ as follows:

- For $j \in \{1, \dots, 8\}$; $\pi_{j,t} : \tilde{T}_{j,t} = T^4/\{\pm 1\} \times \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\}) \rightarrow T_j$ is given by $\pi_{j,t}(x, y) = (x, t \cdot \rho(y))$.
- For $j \in \{9, \dots, 72\}$; $\pi_{j,t} : \tilde{T}_{j,t} = \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\}) \times \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\}) \rightarrow T_j$ is given by $\pi_{j,t}(x, y) = (t \cdot \rho(x), t \cdot \rho(y))$.
- For $j \in \{73, \dots, 76\}$; $\pi_{j,t} : \tilde{T}_{j,t} = T^4 \times \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\}) \rightarrow T_j$ is given by $\pi_{j,t}(x, y) = (x, t \cdot \rho(y))$.

For later use we also define the *regular part* of $\tilde{T}_{j,t}$:

- For $j \in \{1, \dots, 8\}$; $\tilde{T}_{j,t}^{\text{reg}} := (T^4/\{\pm 1\} \setminus \text{fix}(-1)) \times \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\})$,
- For $j \in \{9, \dots, 76\}$; $\tilde{T}_{j,t}^{\text{reg}} := \tilde{T}_{j,t}$.

By appropriately identifying points in the resolution of the overlapping areas, these spaces glue to a resolution $\pi : M \rightarrow T^8/\Gamma$. The usefulness of this construction is that all resolutions are modelled on products of the Eguchi–Hanson space with itself or flat space. The explicit formula for the Eguchi–Hanson metric allows us to describe the geometry as we rescale the metric on the resolutions by t^2 .

On an eight-manifold carrying a $Spin(7)$ -structure, the \hat{A} genus is computed as a linear combination of the Betti numbers (see [65, §10.6] and [87, Theorem 7.3]). Therefore, one can check $\hat{A}(M) = 1$ by computing the Betti numbers of each of the spaces comprising the resolutions described above and then use Mayer–Vietoris arguments to compute the Betti numbers of M (see [65, §14.2]).

The above eight-manifold M carries a $Spin(7)$ -structure obtained as follows: the sets $\tilde{T}_{j,t}$ carry product $Spin(7)$ -structures $\Omega_{j,t}$. In [63, p. 535], the smooth $Spin(7)$ -structure $\Omega_t \in \Omega^4(M)$ is defined, which satisfies the following estimate:

Proposition 2.4. *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that the following is true: on $M \setminus \pi^{-1}(\bigcup_{j=1}^{76} T_j)$ we have*

$$\|\Omega_t - \Omega_0\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \leq ct^{7/2}.$$

For $j \in \{1, \dots, 76\}$ we have on $\pi^{-1}(T_j)$ the estimate

$$\|\Omega_t - \Omega_j\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \leq ct^{7/2}.$$

Proof. We write out the proof for the first estimate, the proof for the second is analogous. In [63], the four-form X_t is defined. In the proof of [63, Proposition 4.2.3] we have the estimates $|\nabla(X_t - \Omega_0)| = O(t^{7/2})$ and $|\nabla(X_t - \Omega_t)| = O(t^{7/2})$, which implies $|\nabla(\Omega_t - \Omega_0)| = O(t^{7/2})$. From [63, Proposition 4.2.2] we have $|\Omega_t - \Omega_0| = O(t^4)$, which proves the claim. \square

We denote the resulting manifold by M_t , when we emphasize the t -dependency. Otherwise, it is denoted by M .

3 Spin(7)-instantons on Spin(7)-manifolds

3.1 Spin(7)-instantons and their local deformation

Let M be a compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds. Then the bundle $\Lambda^2 := \Lambda^2 T^*M$ on a $Spin(7)$ -manifold orthogonally splits as:

$$\Lambda^2 = \Lambda_{21}^2 \oplus \Lambda_7^2, \quad (3.1)$$

where Λ_{21}^2 is a vector bundle of rank 21 corresponding to $\mathfrak{so}(7) \subset \mathfrak{so}(8)$ and Λ_7^2 is a vector bundle of rank 7 orthogonal to Λ_{21}^2 (see e.g. [85, §9] for more details). We denote by π_7^2 the projection $\Lambda^2 \rightarrow \Lambda_7^2$.

Remark 3.1. There is an alternative way of finding the decomposition (3.1). Using the $Spin(7)$ -structure, we define the operator $S : \Lambda^2 \rightarrow \Lambda^2$ by

$$\alpha \mapsto *(\Omega \wedge \alpha).$$

It turns out that S preserves the splitting and the subspaces are eigenspaces of the operator. We find that Λ_{21}^2 has eigenvalue -1 ; and Λ_7^2 has eigenvalue 3 . Namely, the orthogonal projections onto Λ_7^2 and Λ_{21}^2 are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{21}^2 : \Lambda^2 &\rightarrow \Lambda_{21}^2 \\ \omega &\mapsto \frac{1}{4}(*(\Omega \wedge \omega) - 3\omega), \\ \pi_7^2 : \Lambda^2 &\rightarrow \Lambda_7^2 \\ \omega &\mapsto \frac{1}{4}(*(\Omega \wedge \omega) + \omega). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

See e.g. again [85, §9] for more details.

Definition 3.2. A connection A of a principal G -bundle P over M is said to be a $Spin(7)$ -instanton if its curvature F_A satisfies

$$\pi_7^2(F_A) = 0. \quad (3.3)$$

Examples of Spin(7)-instantons. Examples of $Spin(7)$ -instantons were first constructed in Physics such as by Fairlie–Nuyts [37], Fubini–Nicolai [42] on \mathbb{R}^8 . Then Kanno–Yasui [67] constructed examples of them on Bryant–Salamon’s $Spin(7)$ -manifolds with structure group $Spin(7)$. Later, Clarke [24] (see also Clarke–Oliveira [26]) constructed them on Bryant–Salamon’s manifolds with structure group $SU(2)$.

Constructing $Spin(7)$ -instantons on compact eight-manifolds with $Spin(7)$ holonomy has been a difficult problem and not many examples are available in the literature. Lewis [69] gave examples of $Spin(7)$ -instantons on Joyce’s first examples of compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds. We describe Lewis’ examples in detail in Section 3.2. Subsequently, the third-named author [90] constructed examples of $Spin(7)$ -instantons on Joyce’s second examples of compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds.

Walpuski [96] worked out a Taubes' construction for $Spin(7)$ -instantons, which recovers the examples by Lewis (see Section 3.2 in this paper for further accounts on this). See also the unpublished work [18] by Brendle. The main result of this paper is the construction of new examples of $Spin(7)$ -instantons on the compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds of Joyce.

Linearisation and the index formula. As in the case of anti-self-dual instantons in four dimensions, the action of the gauge group $\mathcal{G}(P)$ preserves the decomposition of the curvature F_A of a connection A , that is, if A is a $Spin(7)$ -instanton, then so is $g(A)$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}(P)$. Therefore, we consider*

$$\mathcal{M}(P, \Omega) := \{A \in \mathcal{A}(P) : \pi_7^2(F_A) = 0\} / \mathcal{G}(P),$$

and call it the *moduli space of $Spin(7)$ -instantons on P* .

The local description around $A \in \mathcal{M}(P, \Omega)$ is described by means of the linearisation of the $Spin(7)$ -instanton equation (3.3), namely, the linear operator $\pi_7^2 \circ d_A$, with customarily the *Coulomb gauge condition* $d_A^* a = 0$ (cf. [33, §2.3.1]). In other words, the following elliptic complex governs the infinitesimal deformation of a $Spin(7)$ -instanton A :

$$0 \longrightarrow \Gamma(\Lambda^0 \otimes \text{Ad } P) \xrightarrow{d_A} \Gamma(\Lambda^1 \otimes \text{Ad } P) \xrightarrow{d_A^7} \Gamma(\Lambda_7^2 \otimes \text{Ad } P) \longrightarrow 0, \quad (3.4)$$

where $d_A^7 = \pi_7^2 \circ d_A$, or, equivalently, so does the following linear elliptic operator:

$$L_A = (d_A^*, d_A^2) : \Gamma(\Lambda^1 \otimes \text{Ad } P) \longrightarrow \Gamma(\Lambda^0 \otimes \text{Ad } P) \oplus \Gamma(\Lambda_7^2 \otimes \text{Ad } P).$$

We denote by \mathcal{H}_A^i the i -th cohomology of the complex (3.4) for $i = 0, 1, 2$.

Remark 3.3. The ellipticity of the $Spin(7)$ -instanton equations was first addressed in Bilge [13] and the existence of an elliptic complex was described in Reyes Carrión [84]. See Section 3.3 for more accounts on the complex (3.4) from the viewpoint of Physics.

Definition 3.4. Let A be a $Spin(7)$ -instanton on P . We say A is *irreducible* if $\mathcal{H}_A^0 = 0$, it is *infinitesimally rigid* if $\mathcal{H}_A^1 = 0$, and it is *unobstructed* if $\mathcal{H}_A^2 = 0$.

If a $Spin(7)$ -instanton A is irreducible and unobstructed, then one may think of the moduli space around $[A]$ as a finite-dimensional smooth manifold, and the tangent space at $[A]$ is given by \mathcal{H}_A^1 . In this case, the dimension of the moduli space around $[A]$ is the same as the index of the above operator L_A , and it is calculated by the Atiyah–Singer index theorem, which is:

$$\begin{aligned} & -\dim \mathfrak{g} (b^0(M) - b^1(M) + b_7^2(M)) \\ & + \frac{1}{24} \int_M p_1(M) p_1(\text{Ad } P) - \frac{1}{12} \int_M p_1(\text{Ad } P)^2 - 2p_2(\text{Ad } P). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

*with an appropriate topology.

See [96] for a derivation of this form of the index.

Muñoz–Shahbazi [74] looked into the transversality problem for the moduli spaces of $Spin(7)$ -instantons. The orientation problem was studied by Muñoz–Shahbazi [75], Cao–Gross–Joyce [22].

More generally, one can prove the following *Kuranishi model* for the local description of the moduli space:

Proposition 3.5 (Proposition 1.111 in [97]). *Let M be a compact $Spin(7)$ -manifold, and let A be a $Spin(7)$ -instanton on a principal G -bundle P over M . Then there is an open subset $U \subset \mathcal{H}_A^1$ and a smooth map $\kappa : U \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_A^2$ such that the moduli space of $Spin(7)$ -instantons near $[A]$ is given by $\kappa^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_A$, where $\Gamma_A \subset \mathcal{G}(P)$ is the stabilizer group of the group of gauge transformations at A .*

When the underlying manifold is a Calabi–Yau four-fold, $Spin(7)$ -instantons on a hermitian vector bundle on it become Hermitian–Yang–Mills connections (see [69]). Therefore, the moduli space of $Spin(7)$ -instantons can be identified with that of semistable bundles via the Hitchin–Kobayashi correspondence. Then one may consider an analogue of the theory of Donaldson invariants by means of the moduli spaces of semistable sheaves on a Calabi–Yau four-fold with the help of virtual techniques. This direction of research has been pursued by Borisov–Joyce [16], Oh–Thomas [79], [80], and other people.

3.2 Lewis’ construction of $Spin(7)$ -instantons

Lewis [69] constructed $Spin(7)$ -instantons on an example in [63, §3.2] of compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds constructed by Joyce, which we described in Section 2.2. He constructed them by placing certain anti-self-dual instantons on one of $K3$ surfaces in the resolution of $T^8/\langle\alpha, \beta\rangle$ and glued them simultaneously with the underlying manifold gluing.

The idea behind the construction by Lewis [69] is to use Taubes’ gluing [91] of an ASD instanton around a point in a 4-manifold. As Lewis observed in [69, Chap.5], a sequence of $Spin(7)$ -instantons may produce a bubble along a Cayley submanifold (cf. Nakajima’s pioneering work [76], also, this was further scrutinized by Tian [92] in a broader setting, including e.g. the G_2 -instanton case).

The construction starts with building an approximate $Spin(7)$ -instanton, then moves on to modifying it in certain Sobolev norms to obtain a family of genuine $Spin(7)$ -instantons. The input of the construction consists of a compact $Spin(7)$ -manifold and a Cayley submanifold on it, along which one glues a family of ASD instantons in order to make approximate $Spin(7)$ -instantons.

The manifolds. The manifold which Lewis considers is constructed as a resolution of an orbifold, which is an 8-dimensional torus T^8 divided by the 16 element group $\Gamma = \langle\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta\rangle$ from eq. (2.1). Note that a resolution of singularities of $T^8/\langle\alpha, \beta\rangle$ yields $K3 \times K3$, then he takes one more resolution of $(K3 \times K3)/\langle\gamma, \delta\rangle$ to obtain a compact $Spin(7)$ -manifold M .

The Cayley submanifolds. Now we describe Cayley submanifolds of interest. First, consider the involution

$$\sigma(x_1, \dots, x_8) = \left(\frac{1}{2} - x_1, -x_2, -x_3, \frac{1}{2} - x_4, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8\right).$$

This σ preserves the 4-form Ω defining the $Spin(7)$ -structure on T^8 and commutes with Γ . The fixed points of it is given by $\{(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) \times T^4\}$, where $a_1, a_4 \in \{\pm 1/4\}$ and $a_2, a_3 \in \{0, 1/2\}$. These are disjoint from the fixed points of $\langle \alpha, \gamma, \delta \rangle$. Therefore, one can make sure the construction of M can be made in such a way that it contains a family of $Spin(7)$ -structures that are invariant under σ . Then the fixed points of σ , which consist of two copies of $K3$, is a Cayley submanifold of M .

Bundles with approximate solutions. Lewis constructs a bundle with approximate $Spin(7)$ -instantons. First, he considers the action of σ on the resolution of singularities of $T^8/\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle$, which is $K3 \times K3$. This action has fixed points $\{\{p_i\} \times K3\}$, where $i = 1, \dots, 8$ and p_i 's are points in $K3$, which come from the corresponding points to the above $\{(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)\}$ in the first factor of $K3 \times K3$.

Second, restricting to the first $K3$ factor, Lewis glues in an $SU(2)$ ASD instanton on a bundle $E \rightarrow K3$ so that the curvature of the instanton is concentrated around the p_i 's in the $K3$ surface. The procedure is as follows: Around each p_i , he considers a small ball B as well as an annulus U around B . On B , he puts the standard ASD instanton with small characteristic radius. On U , he cuts off the instanton so that it decays to zero to the outside of the annulus. He requires that this procedure is $\langle \gamma, \delta \rangle$ -invariant.

Now he pulls back the bundle and the connection to obtain an almost $Spin(7)$ -instanton[†] on the $SU(2)$ bundle over $K3 \times K3$, which is almost an ASD instanton on the first $K3$ and flat on the second $K3$. Since the above procedure is $\langle \gamma, \delta \rangle$ -invariant, he has an $SU(2)$ bundle $F \rightarrow (K3 \times K3)/\langle \gamma, \delta \rangle$ with an almost $Spin(7)$ -instanton A over it. He then pulls back the bundle by the map of the resolution of the singularities $\pi : M \rightarrow (K3 \times K3)/\langle \gamma, \delta \rangle$, and considers a connection $A' := \pi^*(A)$ on the pull backed bundle $F' := \pi^*(F)$.

Estimates to obtain genuine solutions. One can ensure that F' is trivial near the resolutions of singularities by imposing F is trivial near the fixed points of $\langle \gamma, \delta \rangle$. Moreover, since the largest differences of the underlying Riemannian metrics occur around the singular sets of the construction of the underlying compact $Spin(7)$ -manifold, which are away from the concentration of the almost $Spin(7)$ -instantons in this construction, one can control the error coming from the resolution of singularities.

Remark 3.6. There are two independent parameters s and t to consider in this construction, where s denotes the characteristic radius of the instanton glued in

[†]Note that the holonomy group of $K3 \times K3$ is $SU(2) \times SU(2) \subset Spin(7)$.




Figure 2: Drawing of the construction from [69] of $Spin(7)$ -instantons on the smooth $Spin(7)$ -manifold M^8 , which is a resolution of the orbifold $(K3 \times K3)/\langle \gamma, \delta \rangle$. The construction proceeds by gluing in an ASD instanton onto one $K3$ factor, pulling back to a $Spin(7)$ -instanton on $K3 \times K3$. The result is invariant under γ, δ and concentrated away from $\text{fix}(\gamma), \text{fix}(\delta)$. It is shown that this is sufficient to construct a $Spin(7)$ -instanton on the resolution M^8 .

and t denotes the parameter of the family of almost $Spin(7)$ -structures on the manifold M . Each of these parameters contributes to the error $\pi_7^2(F_A)$ of an approximate $Spin(7)$ -instanton A , namely to the deviation from being a genuine $Spin(7)$ -instanton. Lewis equals these two parameters in his construction.

Example in Walpuski's construction. Walpuski [96] performed a Taubes type construction of $Spin(7)$ -instantons. He glues a family of ASD instantons along a certain Cayley submanifold in a compact $Spin(7)$ -manifold to obtain a family of $Spin(7)$ -instantons on it.

Among other things, Theorem 1.3 in [96] states that one can obtain a family of $Spin(7)$ -instantons from distinct Cayley submanifolds with self-intersection numbers zero and diffeomorphic to $K3$ surfaces, whose induced connections on the normal bundles are almost flat. This can be applied to the Cayley submanifold described in this summary (i.e., two copies of $K3$ surfaces) and recovers Lewis' examples of $Spin(7)$ -instantons on the compact $Spin(7)$ -manifold.

3.3 $Spin(7)$ -instantons in Physics

$Spin(7)$ -instanton equations appeared early on in the physics literature as an 8-dimensional generalisation of the self-duality conditions in 4 dimensions [27, 98], see also [36]. This was motivated by the Yang–Mills equations in higher dimensions: these are in general difficult to solve, and $Spin(7)$ -instantons on $Spin(7)$ -manifolds are particular solutions satisfying the simpler equation (3.3).

Explicit examples of $Spin(7)$ -instanton gauge fields in \mathbb{R}^8 were constructed in [28, 37, 42, 59] (see also [71]). $Spin(7)$ -instantons on more general non-compact manifolds were obtained in [24, 26, 49, 51, 66] and others, whereas $Spin(7)$ gravitational instantons were studied in e.g. [7].

$Spin(7)$ -instantons appear in a natural way in different contexts in Physics. For example, by reducing ten-dimensional super Yang–Mills theory on a $Spin(7)$ -manifold one obtains a cohomological Yang–Mills theory [3] whose observables

are topological invariants of the moduli space of $Spin(7)$ -instantons [5, 8] in the spirit of [99].

A generalisation of the $Spin(7)$ -instanton equation known as the $Spin(7)$ -monopole equation has also received attention in the physics literature, see for example [14, 45, 81].

In type II string theory, one can consider a compactification on a $Spin(7)$ -manifold, and branes can then be wrapped around Cayley submanifolds [10]. The worldvolume theory resulting from wrapping n euclidean D -branes around the whole $Spin(7)$ -manifold is a super Yang–Mills $SU(n)$ gauge theory on the manifold (if orientifold planes are included, the gauge groups $SO(n)$ and $Sp(n)$ can also be obtained) [82]. The $Spin(7)$ -instanton equations remain undeformed in the presence of fluxes [73], so $Spin(7)$ -instantons describe particular background configurations in this setting.

On the other hand, $Spin(7)$ -instantons are one of the main ingredients in the construction of background solutions of heterotic string theory on manifolds with $Spin(7)$ -structures. Indeed, the field content of heterotic supergravity is given by an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity multiplet coupled to an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ super Yang–Mills multiplet, and gauge fields in the latter must satisfy an instanton condition. This was first considered in Calabi–Yau compactifications [21] and in the Hull–Strominger system [54, 89]; [46] is an excellent review for the research in this direction. For compactifications on 8-dimensional manifolds, the Killing spinor equations have a solution if and only if the manifold has a conformally balanced $Spin(7)$ -structure [56], see also [43]. In addition both the gauge connection [44] and an additional tangent bundle connection [57] are required to be $Spin(7)$ -instantons.

Heterotic background solutions where the gauge field is a $Spin(7)$ -instanton were first obtained in flat space [52, 58]. Solutions on non-compact $Spin(7)$ -manifolds can be found in [4, 49, 55]. Compact solutions are extremely scarce [38] and it would be interesting to use the instantons we obtain in this paper to construct more examples of this type.

Given a string theory vacuum solution, the scalar massless fields of the effective theory are determined by the (infinitesimal) moduli space of solutions of the physical system. Supersymmetry is preserved in the compactification if the Killing spinor equations are satisfied. These equations impose the existence of a G -structure with a particular type of torsion in the compactifying manifold [44]. Heterotic supergravity has additional background gauge fields, and the gaugino Killing spinor equation forces them to be instantons.

It turns out that the G -structures imposed by the Killing spinor equations always include the cases described by Reyes Carrión [84], ensuring the existence of a canonical complex associated to the G -structure. For heterotic supergravity, the infinitesimal moduli space can be described as the cohomology of a certain bundle-valued complex over the compactifying manifold. The instanton deformation complex of Reyes Carrión appears naturally in this description, encoding the infinitesimal moduli of the gauge fields. See [6, 47] for the $SU(3)$ case and [25, 32] for the G_2 case.

4 Approximate solutions and the estimate

The smooth manifold M_t carries the $Spin(7)$ -structure with small torsion Ω_t from Section 2.2. In [63] the torsion-free $Spin(7)$ -structure $\tilde{\Omega}_t$ on M_t was constructed. The difference $\tilde{\Omega}_t - \Omega_t$ is small and in Section 4.1 we will sharpen an estimate from the literature and quantify this smallness explicitly.

The $Spin(7)$ -structure Ω_t was obtained by gluing together different local $Spin(7)$ -structures. For each local $Spin(7)$ -structure there exist certain obvious $Spin(7)$ -instantons. In Section 4.2, we will glue these obvious $Spin(7)$ -instantons together to a connection A_t that is globally defined on all of M_t .

Because of the gluing process, A_t is not exactly a $Spin(7)$ -instanton—neither with respect to Ω_t nor with respect to $\tilde{\Omega}_t$. However, it is close to being a $Spin(7)$ -instanton. In Section 4.3 we estimate the error of A_t of being a $Spin(7)$ -instanton with respect to $\tilde{\Omega}_t$, making use of the estimate from Section 4.1.

In Section 6.2, the connection A_t will be perturbed to an exact solution of the $Spin(7)$ -instanton equation.

Convention 4.1. In what follows, we will prove estimates on the one-parameter family of manifolds $(M, \tilde{\Omega}_t)$ and it will be important to understand exactly how these estimates depend on t . Throughout, we will use c to denote a constant that can be different from line to line, but is always independent of t .

We use the following norm:

Definition 4.2 (Weighted Hölder norm). On M_t we define $r_t : M_t \rightarrow [0, \zeta]$ by $r_t(x) := \min\{\zeta, d_{T^*S/\Gamma}(\pi(x), S)\}$ for $x \in M_t$ and the weight functions by

$$w_t(x) = t + r_t(x) \text{ and } w_t(x, y) = \min\{w_t(x), w_t(y)\}.$$

For a Hölder exponent $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and weight parameter $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ define

$$\begin{aligned} [f]_{C_{\beta,t}^{0,\alpha}(U)} &= \sup_{d(x,y) \leq w_t(x,y)} w_t(x,y)^{\alpha-\beta} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{d(x,y)^\alpha}, \\ \|f\|_{L_{\beta,t}^\infty(U)} &= \left\| w_t^{-\beta} f \right\|_{L^\infty(U)}, \text{ and} \\ \|f\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{k,\alpha}(U)} &= \sum_{j=0}^k \left\| \nabla^j f \right\|_{L_{\beta-j}^\infty(U)} + [\nabla^j f]_{C_{\beta-j}^{0,\alpha}(U)}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, f is a section of a vector bundle over $U \subset M_t$ equipped with a norm $|\cdot|$ and a connection ∇ . We use parallel transport to compare values of f at different points. If U is not specified, then we take $U = M_t$.

4.1 Improved estimate for torsion-free $Spin(7)$ -structures

In [63] the torsion-free $Spin(7)$ -structure $\tilde{\Omega}_t$ on M_t was constructed, and an estimate for $\tilde{\Omega}_t - \Omega_t$ in the C^0 -norm was given. For later analysis, we require an

estimate in the weighted Hölder norms from Definition 4.2, and it is the purpose of this section to prove this estimate.

We begin with the following technical lemma which is an adaptation from Proposition 2.25 in [97].

Proposition 4.3. *For each $\mu > 0$ and $K \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there exists a constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that the following holds for all $t \in (0, T)$ and $p \in M_t$: the number $R := \epsilon(t + r_t(p))$ is less than the injectivity radius of M_t at p and if we identify $T_p M_t$ isometrically with \mathbb{R}^8 and denote by $s_R : B_1 \rightarrow B_R(p)$ the map obtained by multiplication with R followed by the exponential map, then*

$$|\partial^k (R^{-2} s_R^* g_t - g_{\mathbb{R}^8})| \leq \mu \quad (4.1)$$

for all $k \in \{0, \dots, K\}$. Here $g_{\mathbb{R}^8}$ denotes the standard metric on \mathbb{R}^8 .

This allows to transport a standard elliptic regularity theorem from \mathbb{R}^8 to small neighbourhoods of M_t as in Equation (2.29) in [97]:

Lemma 4.4. *There exist $\epsilon, c > 0$ independent of t such that for all $p \in M_t$ and R as in Proposition 4.3 we have*

$$R^\alpha [\sigma]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2R})} \leq c \left(R^{1/5} \|\mathrm{d}\sigma\|_{L^{10}(B_R)} + \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \right) \quad (4.2)$$

for any $\sigma \in \Omega_-^4(B_1)$.

Proof. We get the following estimate on \mathbb{R}^8 from elliptic regularity for the operator d on $\Omega_-^4(\mathbb{R}^8)$ and the Sobolev embedding $C^{0,\alpha} \hookrightarrow L_1^{10}$, which holds in dimension 8:

$$[\sigma]_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq c \left(\|\mathrm{d}\sigma\|_{L^{10}(B_1)} + \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \right). \quad (4.3)$$

Applying the rescaling map $s_R : B_1 \rightarrow B_R(p)$ and using Proposition 4.3 gives the claim. \square

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section, namely the estimate for the difference $\tilde{\Omega}_t - \Omega_t$ in the weighted Hölder norm:

Theorem 4.5. *There exists $c > 0$ independent of t such that for small t there exists a torsion-free $Spin(7)$ -structure $\tilde{\Omega}_t$ satisfying*

$$\left\| \tilde{\Omega}_t - \Omega_t \right\|_{C_{0;t}^{0,\alpha}} \leq ct^{3/10}. \quad (4.4)$$

[63, Theorem A and Theorem 4.2.4] give Theorem 4.5 with $\left\| \tilde{\Omega}_t - \Omega_t \right\|_{C^0} \leq ct^{1/2}$, and we now claim a $C_{0;t}^{0,\alpha}$ -estimate. We will give a proof of this improved theorem in the following.

Proof of Theorem 4.5. In the proof of [63, Theorem A], an element $\eta_t \in \Omega_-^4(M_t)$ solving the equation $d\eta_t = d\phi_t + dF(\eta_t)$ and obeying the estimates

$$\|\eta_t\|_{L^\infty} \leq ct^{1/2} \text{ and } \|\nabla\eta_t\|_{L^{10}} \leq ct^{3/10} \quad (4.5)$$

was constructed. From this, the torsion-free *Spin*(7)-structure

$$\tilde{\Omega}_t := \Omega_t + \eta_t - \Theta(\eta_t) \quad (4.6)$$

was defined, where Θ is the smooth function from a closed ball in $\Lambda_{35}^4 = \Lambda_-^4$ to Λ_{27}^4 from [63, Lemma 5.1.1].

We first prove

$$\|\eta\|_{C_{0;t}^{0,\alpha}} \leq ct^{3/10}. \quad (4.7)$$

The estimate $\|\eta\|_{C^0} \leq ct^{1/2}$ is contained in (4.5), thus, it remains to show $[\eta]_{C_{0;t}^{0,\alpha}} \leq ct^{3/10}$. For $x, y \in M_t$ with $d(x, y) \leq \epsilon w_t(x, y)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_t^\alpha(x, y) \frac{|\eta(x) - \eta(y)|}{d(x, y)^\alpha} &\leq cR^\alpha \frac{|\eta(x) - \eta(y)|}{d(x, y)^\alpha} \\ &\leq c \left(R^{1/5} \|\eta\|_{L^{10}(B_R)} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \right) \\ &\leq c \left(t^{3/10} + t^{1/2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

where we used $R = \epsilon w_t(x, y)$ in the first step, we used Lemma 4.4 in the second step (for this we used the assumption $d(x, y) \leq \epsilon w_t(x, y)$), and we used $R \leq c$ together with the bounds in (4.5) in the last step. The estimate (4.8) for $x, y \in M_t$ with $d(x, y) \leq w_t(x, y)$ rather than $d(x, y) \leq \epsilon w_t(x, y)$ follows because one can choose at most $1/\epsilon$ points, which is a fixed number of points, between x and y with pairwise distance $\epsilon w_t(x, y)$ or less and apply (4.8). This shows the bound (4.7).

Next, we check that this implies the estimate (4.4). We have

$$\left\| \tilde{\Omega}_t - \Omega_t \right\|_{C_{0;t}^{0,\alpha}} \leq \|\eta_t\|_{C_{0;t}^{0,\alpha}} + \|\Theta(\eta_t)\|_{C_{0;t}^{0,\alpha}} \quad (4.9)$$

by (4.6). We estimate the last summand as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Theta(\eta_t)\|_{C_{0;t}^{0,\alpha}} &\leq \|\Theta(\eta_t)\|_{C^0} + \sup_{d(x,y) \leq w_t(x,y)} w_t(x, y)^\alpha \frac{|\Theta(\eta_t)(x) - \Theta(\eta_t)(y)|}{d(x, y)^\alpha} \\ &\leq c(t^{3/10})^2 \\ &\quad + c \underbrace{\sup_{d(x,y) \leq w_t(x,y)} w_t(x, y)^\alpha \frac{|\eta_t(x) - \eta_t(y)|}{d(x, y)^\alpha}}_{=[\eta]_{C_{0;t}^{0,\alpha}}} \cdot (|\eta(x)| + |\eta(y)|) \\ &\leq ct^{3/5}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where the first step is the definition of our weighted Hölder norm, the second step is from (4.5) together with [63, Lemma 5.1.1 (iii)], and the last step is (4.7).

Now, combining (4.7), (4.9), and (4.10) gives the claim. \square

4.2 Approximate solutions

In the following, let G be a compact Lie group. We construct a bundle E_t on the compact $Spin(7)$ -manifold M_t and a family of approximate $Spin(7)$ -instantons A_t on it.

Definition 4.6. We consider the following data consisting of:

- (i) an orbifold G -bundle $(E_0, \theta) \rightarrow T^8/\Gamma$ with flat connection θ that is infinitesimally rigid;
- (ii) one point $x_k \in C_k \setminus S$ ($k = 1, \dots, 5$) together with G -equivariant maps $\phi_k : (E_0)_{x_k} \rightarrow G$ for each connected component C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4, C_5 of $T := \bigcup_{j \in \{1, \dots, 76\}} T_j$ (see eq. (2.2)); and
- (iii) a bundle E_j over Eguchi–Hanson space X with a finite energy infinitesimally rigid ASD instanton A_j on it that is asymptotic to the flat connection at infinity defined by the representation $\text{hol}_\theta : \pi_1(T_j \setminus S_j) \rightarrow G$ for $j \in \{73, \dots, 76\}$

with the property that

- (iv) The monodromy representation $\text{hol}_\theta : \pi_1(T_j \setminus S_j) \rightarrow G$ is trivial for $j \in \{1, \dots, 72\}$

is called *compatible gluing data*.

Given compatible gluing data, we construct a bundle E_t over the compact $Spin(7)$ -manifold M_t and a connection A_t on E_t as follows: for $j \in \{1, \dots, 76\}$ define the G -bundle $\tilde{E}_j \rightarrow \tilde{T}_{j,t}^{\text{reg}}$ as

$$\tilde{E}_j := \begin{cases} (G \times (\mathbb{R}^4 \times X)) / (\mathbb{Z}^4 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2) & \text{for } j \in \{1, \dots, 8\} \\ G \times (X \times X) & \text{for } j \in \{9, \dots, 72\} \\ p_2^* E_j / \mathbb{Z}^4 & \text{for } j \in \{73, \dots, 76\} \end{cases}$$

where $p_2 : \mathbb{R}^4 \times X \rightarrow X$ denotes projection onto the second coordinate, and the lifts of $\mathbb{Z}^4 \curvearrowright \mathbb{R}^4 \times X$ and $\mathbb{Z}^4 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \curvearrowright \mathbb{R}^4 \times X$ to $p_2^* E_j$ and $(G \times (\mathbb{R}^4 \times X))$ respectively are induced by θ . Then set

$$E_t := \left(E_0|_{(T^8/\Gamma) \setminus S} \cup \bigcup_{j \in \{1, \dots, 76\}} \tilde{E}_j \right) / \sim, \quad (4.11)$$

where \sim denotes the following equivalence relation: recall that

$$M_t = \left((T^8/\Gamma) \setminus S \bigcup_{j \in \{1, \dots, 76\}} \tilde{T}_{j,t}^{\text{reg}} \right) / \approx,$$

where \approx identifies points in the resolution of the overlapping areas. We have bundles E_0 over $(T^8/\Gamma) \setminus S$ and \tilde{E}_j over $\tilde{T}_{j,t}^{\text{reg}}$ and can lift the equivalence relation \approx to an equivalence relation \sim on the bundles by the compatibility conditions from Definition 4.6.

For $j \in \{73, \dots, 76\}$, under the identification of E_0 and $p_2^*E_j$ on T_j we can write $p_2^*A_j = \theta + a_j$. Fix a smooth cut-off function $\bar{\chi} : [0, \zeta] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\bar{\chi}|_{[0, \zeta/4]} \equiv 1$ and $\bar{\chi}|_{[\zeta/2, \zeta]} \equiv 0$. Let $\chi = \bar{\chi} \circ d_{T^8/\Gamma}(\pi(\cdot), \text{fix } \Gamma)$ and define the *gluing region* by

$$O := \left\{ x \in M_t : \frac{\zeta}{4} \leq d_{T^8/\Gamma}(\pi(x), \text{fix } \Gamma) \leq \frac{\zeta}{2} \right\}. \quad (4.12)$$

We then interpolate between $p_2^*A_j$ and θ on O as follows:

$$A_t(x) := \begin{cases} p_2^*A_j(x) & \text{if } d_{T^8/\Gamma}(\pi(x), \text{fix } \Gamma) \leq \frac{\zeta}{4}, \\ \theta(x) + \chi(x)a_j(x) & \text{if } x \in O, \text{ and} \\ \theta(x), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.13)$$

Remark 4.7. Denote by $[S_j]$ a homology class in $H_4(M_t, \mathbb{Z})$, which is defined as $(i_{j,t})_*(T^4 \times \{x\})$, where $i_{j,t} : \tilde{T}_{j,t} \rightarrow M_t$ is the inclusion, and $x \in \pi_{j,t}^{-1}(B_\zeta^4 / \{\pm 1\})$. Write the adjoint bundle of E_t by $\text{Ad } E_t$. Then, from the above construction, one sees the first Pontryagin class of $\text{Ad } E_t$ is given by $p_1(\text{Ad } E_t) = - \sum_{j=73}^{76} k_j \text{P.D.}[S_j]$,

where k_j is $\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_X |F_{A_j}|^2 d\text{vol}$, and $p_2(\text{Ad } E_t) = 0$. In addition, we have $\langle w_2(\text{Ad } E_t), [\Sigma] \rangle = \langle w_2(\text{Ad } E_j), [\Sigma] \rangle$ for $[\Sigma] \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z}) \subset H_2(M_t, \mathbb{Z})$. We omit the proof of these claims here, since they are almost the same as ones given by Walpuski for the G_2 -instanton case (see [97, Proposition 2.60]).

4.3 Pregluing estimate

We prove an estimate on the approximate solution A_t .

Proposition 4.8. *The approximate solution A_t satisfies:*

$$\left\| (\pi_7^2)^{\tilde{\Omega}^t} (F_{A_t}) \right\|_{C_{-2;t}^{0,\alpha}} \leq ct^{3/10}, \quad (4.14)$$

where $(\pi_7^2)^{\tilde{\Omega}^t} : \Omega^2(M_t) \rightarrow \Omega_7^2(M_t)$ is defined using the torsion-free $\text{Spin}(7)$ -structure $\tilde{\Omega}^t$.

Proof. First note that A_t is flat everywhere except on $\pi_{j,t}^{-1}(T_j)$ for $j \in \{73, \dots, 76\}$, so it suffices to estimate $\pi_7^2(F_{A_t})$ there. Denote by $(\pi_7^2)^{\Omega_j} : \Omega^2(M_t) \rightarrow \Omega_7^2(M_t)$ the projection defined by the $Spin(7)$ -structure Ω_j on $\pi_{j,t}^{-1}(T_j)$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (\pi_7^2)^{\tilde{\Omega}^t}(F_{A_t}) \right\|_{C_{-2;t}^{0,\alpha}} &\leq \left\| \left((\pi_7^2)^{\tilde{\Omega}^t} - (\pi_7^2)^{\Omega_j} \right) (F_{A_t}) \right\|_{C_{-2;t}^{0,\alpha}} \\ &\quad + \left\| (\pi_7^2)^{\Omega_j}(F_{A_t}) \right\|_{C_{-2;t}^{0,\alpha}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

We now estimate the first summand. As before, $\rho : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}$ denotes the blowup map of the Eguchi–Hanson space. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |(t+r_t)^2 \nabla^k F_{A_t}|_{g_t} &\leq t^{-2} |(t+r_t)^4 \nabla^k F_{A_t}|_{g_t} \\ &\leq ct^2 |(1+|\rho|)^4 \nabla^k F_{A_j}|_{g_X} \\ &= c |(1+|\rho|)^4 \nabla^k F_{A_j}|_{g_X} \\ &\leq c, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $r_t = |\rho \circ p_2|$ on $\pi_{j,t}^{-1}(T_j)$, where $p_2 : T^4 \times X \rightarrow X$ denotes projection onto the second component, in the second step; we used $g_t|_{\{p\} \times X} = t^2 g_X$ for any $p \in T^4$ on $\pi^{-1}(T_j)$ in the third step; and we used Proposition A.3 in the last step. Thus,

$$\|F_{A_t}\|_{C_{-2;t}^{0,\alpha}} \leq c. \quad (4.16)$$

We can now estimate the first summand on the right-hand side of (4.15) and get:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left((\pi_7^2)^{\tilde{\Omega}^t} - (\pi_7^2)^{\Omega_j} \right) (F_{A_t}) \right\|_{C_{-2;t}^{0,\alpha}} &\leq c \left\| \tilde{\Omega}^t - \Omega_j \right\|_{C_{0;t}^{0,\alpha}} \cdot \|F_{A_t}\|_{C_{-2;t}^{0,\alpha}} \\ &\leq ct^{3/10}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

Here we used (3.2) in the first step, and Theorem 4.5 and Proposition 2.4 together with the bound (4.16) in the second step. For the second summand, recall that on T_j for $j \in \{73, \dots, 76\}$ we have $A_t = \theta + \chi a_j$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} F_{p_2^* A_j} &= \underbrace{F_\theta}_{=0} + d_\theta a_j + \frac{1}{2} [a_j, a_j], \text{ which implies} \\ F_{A_t} &= \underbrace{F_\theta}_{=0} + d_\theta(\chi a_j) + \frac{1}{2} \chi^2 [a_j, a_j] \\ &= (d\chi) \wedge a_j + \chi F_{p_2^* A_j} + \frac{\chi^2 - \chi}{2} [a_j, a_j] \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

The connection A_j is an ASD instanton, so $p_2^* A_j$ is a $Spin(7)$ -instanton with respect to Ω_j . Furthermore, A_j is asymptotic to some flat connection A_j^∞ with

rate -3 by Proposition A.3, and therefore

$$\nabla^k a_j = t^{2+k} \mathcal{O}(r_t^{-3-k}). \quad (4.19)$$

Combining eqs. (4.18) and (4.19), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (\pi_7^2)^{\Omega_j} (F_{A_t}) \right\|_{C_{-2;t}^{0,\alpha}} &= \left\| (\pi_7^2)^{\Omega_j} (F_{A_t}) \right\|_{C_{-2;t}^{0,\alpha}(O)} \\ &\leq c \left\| (\pi_7^2)^{\Omega_j} (F_{A_t}) \right\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(O)} \\ &\leq ct^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

For the first equality we used that the factors $d\chi$ and $\frac{\chi^2 - \chi}{2}$ from eq. (4.18) are supported in O . In the second step, we used that, in O , the weight function $(t + r_t)$ is uniformly bounded by a constant. Estimating the terms in the right-hand side of (4.15) by the bounds (4.17) and (4.20), we obtain the claim. \square

5 Linear problems on local models

We will now make the first step towards perturbing the approximate $Spin(7)$ -instanton from the previous sections to genuine $Spin(7)$ -instantons. Like in other gluing problems, this makes use of a fixed point theorem and elliptic estimates for the linearisation of the partial differential equation to be solved, for us the $Spin(7)$ -instanton equation. The proof of the estimate for the linearisation of the instanton equation on M_t will be given in Section 6. It will crucially use local analysis on the gluing regions of M_t . Recall the singular sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{76} in T^8/Γ from table 1. S_1, \dots, S_8 are isometric to $T^4/\{\pm 1\}$; S_{73}, \dots, S_{76} are isometric to T^4 ; and analysis around the resolution of these singularities will reduce to analysis on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$, which is explained in Section 5.1. The singular sets S_9, \dots, S_{72} are points, and analysis around the resolution of these singularities will reduce to analysis on $X \times X$, which is explained in Section 5.2. Here, X denotes the Eguchi–Hanson space as usual and it comes with the blowup map $\rho : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}$.

5.1 Linear problem on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$

The estimates stated in this section are mostly adaptations of similar ones in Walpuski [97] to our $Spin(7)$ -instanton setting.

In Definition 4.2 we defined weighted Hölder norms on M_t . In the following definition, we define weighted Hölder norms on the gluing piece $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$. The norms are related by a rescaling, which is made precise at the end of this section in Proposition 5.6.

Definition 5.1 (Weighted Hölder norm). We denote by p_2 the projection onto the second factor of $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$ and define the weight function by

$$w(x) = 1 + |\pi \circ p_2(x)|.$$

We define $w(x, y)$, $[\cdot]_{C_\beta^{0,\alpha}(U)}$, $\|\cdot\|_{L_\beta^\infty(U)}$, and $\|\cdot\|_{C_\beta^{k,\alpha}(U)}$ in the same manner as in Definition 4.2.

The Eguchi–Hanson space X is a hyper-Kähler manifold which implies that $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$ is a $Spin(7)$ -manifold. This is essentially a linear algebra computation which is explained in the following lemma from Walpuski [97]:

Lemma 5.2 (Examples 1.11, and 1.44 in [97]). *Let $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)$ and $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3)$ be two hyper-Kähler triples on \mathbb{R}^4 . Consider $\mathbb{R}^8 = (\mathbb{R}^4, \mu) \times (\mathbb{R}^4, \omega)$. Let (x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3) be coordinates on (\mathbb{R}^4, μ) such that*

$$\mu_1 = dx^{01} + dx^{23}, \quad \mu_2 = dx^{02} - dx^{13}, \quad \mu_3 = dx^{03} + dx^{12}.$$

Then we have:

1. The three-form $\varphi_0 := dx^{123} - \sum_{i=1}^3 dx^i \wedge \omega^i$ on $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (\mathbb{R}^4, \omega)$ has stabiliser G_2 ,
2. The four-form $\Omega_0 := dx^0 \wedge \varphi_0 + *_{\varphi_0} \varphi_0 = \frac{1}{2} \omega_1 \wedge \omega_1 + \frac{1}{2} \mu_1 \wedge \mu_2 - \sum_{i=1}^3 \omega_i \wedge \mu_i$ on $(\mathbb{R}^4, \mu) \times (\mathbb{R}^4, \omega)$ has stabiliser $Spin(7)$.

The following is about how the linearised operator of the $Spin(7)$ -instanton equation on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$ and that of the ASD instanton equation on X are related:

Corollary 5.3 (Equation 5.23 in [97]). *Let (E, A) be a bundle with a finite energy ASD instanton over a hyper-Kähler four-manifold X . Denote by $p_X : \mathbb{R}^4 \times X \rightarrow X$ the projection onto the second factor. Then $(p_X^* E, p_X^* A)$ is a $Spin(7)$ -instanton with respect to the $Spin(7)$ -structure from Lemma 5.2.*

Then we have identifications

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^1(\mathbb{R}^4 \times X) &\simeq \Lambda^0(\mathbb{R}^4 \times X) \oplus p_X^* \Lambda^1(X) \oplus p_X^* \Lambda_+^2(X), \\ \Lambda^0(\mathbb{R}^4 \times X) \oplus \Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^4 \times X) &\simeq p_X^* \Lambda^1(X) \oplus p_X^* \Lambda_+^2(X) \oplus p_X^* \Lambda^0(X), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Lambda_+^2(X)$ is the bundle of self-dual two-forms on X , under which we obtain

$$L_{p_X^* A} L_{p_X^* A}^* = L_{p_X^* A}^* L_{p_X^* A} = \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^4} + \begin{pmatrix} \delta_A \delta_A^* & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_A^* \delta_A \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_A : \Omega^1(X, \text{Ad}(E)) &\rightarrow \Omega^0(X, \text{Ad}(E)) \oplus \Omega_+^2(X, \text{Ad}(E)) \\ a &\mapsto (d_A^* a, d_A^+ a) \end{aligned}$$

is the linearised operator of the ASD instanton equation on X .

We state the following auxiliary lemma that will be used at different points throughout the article:

Lemma 5.4 (Lemma 2.76 in [97]). *Let E be a vector bundle of bounded geometry over a Riemannian manifold X of bounded geometry and with subexponential volume growth, and suppose that $D : C^\infty(X, E) \rightarrow C^\infty(X, E)$ is a uniformly elliptic operator of second order whose coefficients and their first derivatives are uniformly bounded, that is non-negative, i.e. $\langle Da, a \rangle \geq 0$ for all $a \in L^2_2(X, E)$, and formally self-adjoint. If $a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times X, E)$ satisfies*

$$(\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^n} + D)a = 0$$

and $\|a\|_{L^\infty}$ is finite, then a is constant in the \mathbb{R}^n -direction, that is $a(x, y) = a(y)$. Here, by slight abuse of notation, let E denote the pullback of E to $\mathbb{R}^n \times X$ as well.

By similar arguments as in the proof of [97, Proposition 2.74], we obtain the following Lemma 5.5 as a consequence of Lemma 5.4:

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\beta < 0$. Then $a \in C^{1,\alpha}_\beta$ is in the kernel of $L_{p^*A} : C^{1,\alpha}_\beta \rightarrow C^{0,\alpha}_{\beta-1}$ if and only if it is given by the pullback of an element of the L^2 -kernel of δ_A to $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$.*

This concludes the analysis of the $Spin(7)$ -equation on the model space $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$, but there is one thing left to do before ending the section. In Section 6, we will prove estimates for the linearised $Spin(7)$ -instanton operator L_{A_t} on the manifold M_t . We will do this by rescaling around the glued-in parts, thereby comparing sections on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$ and on M_t . This rescaling is made precise by the map $s_{j,\beta,t}$ defined below.

Fix $j \in \{1, \dots, 76\}$ such that the singularity S_j is isometric to T^4 (that is $j \in \{73, \dots, 76\}$) or $T^4/\{\pm 1\}$ (that is $j \in \{1, \dots, 8\}$).

Part of the compatible gluing data (cf. Definition 4.6) is then a bundle E_j over the Eguchi–Hanson space X carrying an infinitesimally rigid ASD connection A_j . We define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{l}_{j,t} : \mathbb{R}^4 \times \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\}) &\rightarrow T^4 \times \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\}) \subset M_t \text{ for } j \in \{73, \dots, 76\} \\ (x, y) &\mapsto [tx, y], \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{l}_{j,t} : \mathbb{R}^4 \times \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\}) &\rightarrow T^4/\{\pm 1\} \times \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\}) \subset M_t \text{ for } j \in \{1, \dots, 8\} \\ (x, y) &\mapsto [tx, y]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ we consider

$$\begin{aligned} s_{j,\beta,t} : \Omega^k(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t) &\rightarrow \Omega^k(\mathbb{R}^4 \times \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\}), p_2^* \text{Ad } E_j) \\ a &\mapsto t^{\beta-k}(\tilde{l}_{j,t})^* a. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

Here, $p_2 : \mathbb{R}^4 \times \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\}) \rightarrow X$ denotes the projection onto the second factor so that $p_2^*A_j$ is a $Spin(7)$ -instanton on the bundle $p_2^*E_j$. The map $s_{j,\beta,t}$ has the property that it is close to an isometry between the weighted Hölder norm $C^{k,\alpha}_\beta$ on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$ and the weighted Hölder norm $C^{k,\alpha}_{t;\beta}$ on M_t .

This is made precise in Proposition 5.6 below. The map is not precisely an isometry because the model $Spin(7)$ -structure on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$ and the torsion-free $Spin(7)$ -structure on M_t are not the same, but their difference is roughly of size $t^{3/10}$, which was shown in Theorem 4.5. For the G_2 -case, the statement can be found as [95, Proposition 7.7], and we omit the proof here.

Proposition 5.6. *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{c} \|a\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{k,\alpha}(\tilde{T}_{j,t})} &\leq \|s_{j,\beta,t} a\|_{C_{\beta}^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^4 \times \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4 / \{\pm 1\}))} \leq c \|a\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{k,\alpha}(\tilde{T}_{j,t})}, \\ \left\| L_t a - s_{j,\beta-1,t}^{-1} L_{A_i} s_{j,\beta,t} a \right\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}(\tilde{T}_{j,t})} &\leq ct^{3/10} \|a\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{0,\alpha}(\tilde{T}_{j,t})}, \\ \left\| L_t^* \underline{b} - s_{j,\beta-1,t}^{-1} L_{A_i}^* s_{j,\beta,t} \underline{b} \right\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}(\tilde{T}_{j,t})} &\leq ct^{3/10} \|\underline{b}\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{0,\alpha}(\tilde{T}_{j,t})}. \end{aligned}$$

5.2 Linear problem on $X \times X$

Around point singularities on T^8/Γ we glue in copies of $X \times X$ for the manifold construction. For our $Spin(7)$ -instanton construction we glue in the trivial connection over $X \times X$. Because of this, we study the deformation theory of the trivial connection over $X \times X$ in this section.

Definition 5.7 (Weighted Hölder norm). We denote by p_i ($i = 1, 2$) the projection onto the i -th factor of $X \times X$, or $(\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}) \times (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\})$, according to context. Define the weight function by

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) &= 1 + \min\{|\pi \circ p_1(x)|, |\pi \circ p_2(x)|\} && \text{on } X \times X, \\ w(x) &= 1 + \min\{|p_1(x)|, |p_2(x)|\} && \text{on } (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}) \times (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}). \end{aligned}$$

We then define $w(x, y)$, $[\cdot]_{C_{\beta}^{0,\alpha}(U)}$, $\|\cdot\|_{L_{\beta}^{\infty}(U)}$, and $\|\cdot\|_{C_{\beta}^{k,\alpha}(U)}$ in the same way as in Definition 4.2.

The manifold $X \times X$ is a special case of a QALE manifold, defined in Joyce [65]. Our norms are equivalent to the norms from [65, Definition 9.5.5], if one chooses $\beta = 0$ in that definition. In turn, QALE manifolds are special cases of the QAC manifolds from Degeratu–Mazzeo [31] and how weighted norms on these spaces relate to the weighted norms in [65] is explained in [31, Section 8.1].

The goal of this section is to prove the following:

Proposition 5.8. *Let $L := (d^*, d_7) : \Omega^1(X \times X) \rightarrow (\Omega^0 \oplus \Omega_7^2)(X \times X)$ and let L^* be its formal adjoint. Then*

$$\text{Ker } L = 0, \text{Ker } L^* = 0,$$

if acting on $C_{\beta}^{1,\alpha}$ -sections for any $\beta < 0$.

We note that $X \times X$ is a QALE manifold asymptotic to $(\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}) \times (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\})$, and first check that the corresponding statement on the asymptotic limit is true:

Proposition 5.9. *Let $L := (d^*, d_7) : \Omega^1((\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}) \times (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\})) \rightarrow (\Omega^0 \oplus \Omega_7^2)((\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}) \times (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}))$ and let L^* be its formal adjoint. Then*

$$\text{Ker } L = 0, \text{Ker } L^* = 0,$$

if acting on $C^{1,\alpha} \cap C_\beta^0$ -sections for any $\beta < 0$.

Proof. Let $a \in \Omega^1((\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}) \times (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}))$ such that $La = 0$. We pull back a and L under the quotient map $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}) \times (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\})$ and will carry on with analysis on $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2$, without changing notation.

Elliptic regularity implies that a is smooth, so $La = 0$ implies $L^*La = 0$. By eq. (5.1):

$$\left(\Delta_{\mathbb{C}^2} + \begin{pmatrix} \delta\delta^* & 0 \\ 0 & \delta^*\delta \end{pmatrix} \right) a = 0$$

where δ denotes the ASD deformation operator of the trivial connection on \mathbb{C}^2 . By Lemma 5.4 we have that a is a pullback from \mathbb{C}^2 . In particular its norm in the $(\mathbb{C}^2 \times \{0\})$ -direction is constant, i.e. $|a|(x, y) = |a|(x', y)$ for all $x, x', y \in \mathbb{C}^2$. By swapping the two \mathbb{C}^2 -factors in the argument we see that $|a|$ is constant on all of $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2$. That is a contradiction to $a \in C_\beta^0$.

The proof for $\text{Ker } L^* = 0$ is analogous. \square

The idea for the following proof of Proposition 5.8 is taken from [23, Section 4.2.3].

Proof of Proposition 5.8. We only prove $\text{Ker } L^* = 0$, the proof for $\text{Ker } L = 0$ is analogous. Assume there is $0 \neq a \in \text{Ker } L^*$ with

$$\|a\|_{C_\beta^{1,\alpha}} < c_1. \quad (5.3)$$

By elliptic regularity, a is smooth. By the Lichnerowicz formula, $\nabla^* \nabla a = LL^*a = 0$ and therefore $|a|^2$ is a subharmonic function, i.e.

$$\Delta|a|^2 = |\nabla a|^2 + \langle \nabla^* \nabla a, a \rangle = |\nabla a|^2 \geq 0. \quad (5.4)$$

By the Weitzenböck formula on $\Lambda^0 \oplus \Lambda_7^2$ we have that $\Delta a = 0$. The plan of the proof is to define a sequence of rescalings a_{ϵ_i} converging to a harmonic form on the singular space $\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\} \times \mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}$, which will lead to a contradiction to 5.9.

On $X \times X$ we have the 1-parameter family of metrics g_ϵ , where ϵ is the size of a minimal S^2 in each of the X factors. We have a map $\phi_\epsilon : X \times X \rightarrow X \times X$ satisfying $\phi_\epsilon^* g_\epsilon = \sqrt{\epsilon} g_1$.

Fix $x_0 \in X \times X$ with $a(x_0) \neq 0$ and define

$$a_\epsilon := \frac{(\phi_\epsilon)_* a}{\|(\phi_\epsilon)_* a\|_{L^2(B(\phi_\epsilon(x_0), 1), g_\epsilon)}},$$

where for $\delta > 0$ we wrote $B(\phi_\epsilon(x_0), \delta)$ for the ball around $\phi_\epsilon(x_0)$ with radius δ , and $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(B(\phi_\epsilon(x_0), 1), g_\epsilon)}$ denotes the L^2 -norm with respect to g_ϵ . The definition

of $B(\phi_\epsilon(x_0), \delta)$ depends on ϵ , which is missing from our notation by slight abuse of notation. The function $|a|^2$ is subharmonic by (5.4) and therefore satisfies the mean-value inequality [70, Theorem 1.2]:

$$|a(x_0)|^2 \leq c_3 \int_{B(x_0, \epsilon^{-1})} |a|^2 \quad (5.5)$$

for some constant $c_3 > 0$, independent of ϵ . (Here we used Ricci-flatness of $X \times X$.) Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|a_\epsilon\|_{L^2(B(\phi_\epsilon(x_0), 2), g_\epsilon)}^2 &= \frac{\|(\phi_\epsilon)_* a\|_{L^2(B(\phi_\epsilon(x_0), 2), g_\epsilon)}^2}{\|(\phi_\epsilon)_* a\|_{L^2(B(\phi_\epsilon(x_0), 1), g_\epsilon)}^2} \\ &= \frac{\|a\|_{L^2(B(x_0, 2\epsilon^{-1}), g_\epsilon)}^2}{\|a\|_{L^2(B(x_0, \epsilon^{-1}), g_\epsilon)}^2} \\ &= \frac{\int_{B(x_0, 2\epsilon^{-1})} |a|^2}{\int_{B(x_0, \epsilon^{-1})} |a|^2} \cdot \frac{\text{vol}(B(x_0, 2\epsilon^{-1}))}{\text{vol}(B(x_0, \epsilon^{-1}))} \\ &\leq \frac{c_1}{|a(x_0)|^2 \cdot (1/c_3)} \cdot c_2 \\ &\leq c_4, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second to last step we used the bounds (5.3) and (5.5).

We therefore have for $y \in B(\phi_\epsilon(x_0), 1)$ that

$$|a_\epsilon(y)|^2 \leq c_5 \int_{B(y, 1)} |a_\epsilon|^2 \leq c_6 \|a_\epsilon\|_{L^2(B(\phi_\epsilon(x_0), 2), g_\epsilon)}^2 \leq c_4 \cdot c_6, \quad (5.6)$$

where in the first step we used the mean value inequality around y . Furthermore, by the inequality (5.3) we have $c > 0$ such that

$$\frac{|a(x)|w^{-\beta}(x)}{\|a\|_{C^0(B(x_0, 1))}} \leq c$$

for all $x \in X \times X$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|a_\epsilon(y)|w^{-\beta}(y)}{\|a_\epsilon\|_{C^0(B(\phi_\epsilon(x_0), 1))}} &= \frac{|a(\phi_\epsilon^{-1}(y))|}{\|a\|_{C^0(\phi_\epsilon^{-1}(B(\phi_\epsilon(x_0), 1))}} \cdot w^{-\beta}(y) \\ &\leq \frac{|a(\phi_\epsilon^{-1}(y))|}{\|a\|_{C^0(B(x_0, 1))}} \cdot w^{-\beta}(\phi_\epsilon^{-1}(y)) \\ &\leq c \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

for all $y \in X \times X$, where in the second step we used $w^{-\beta}(y) \leq w^{-\beta}(\phi_\epsilon^{-1}(y))$ which holds if $\beta \leq 0$ and $\epsilon \leq 1$, and $B(x_0, 1) \subset \phi_\epsilon^{-1}(B(\phi_\epsilon(x_0), 1))$. The estimate (5.6) gives a uniform bound for a_ϵ on $B(\phi_\epsilon(x_0), 1)$. Together with the bound (5.7) this implies a uniform C_β^0 -bound for a_ϵ on $X \times X$, independent of ϵ :

$$\|a_\epsilon\|_{C_\beta^0} \leq c. \quad (5.8)$$

Let $K \subset U \subset X \times X$, where K is compact and U is open. By general elliptic theory, we have the following Schauder estimate for the Laplacian

$$\|u\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(K),g_\epsilon} \leq c_{K,U,\epsilon} \left(\|\Delta u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(U),g_\epsilon} + \|u\|_{C^0(U),g_\epsilon} \right),$$

for all $u \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Lambda^2(U))$ where $c_{K,U,\epsilon}$ is a constant depending on K, U , and ϵ . If U has a positive distance from $(S^2 \times X) \cup (X \times S^2)$, then $c_{K,U,\epsilon}$ can be chosen to be independent of ϵ , because the metric on U converges to the flat metric. Applying the Schauder estimate to the harmonic element a_ϵ and using that $|a_\epsilon|$ is bounded on every bounded set, we obtain a bound $\|a_\epsilon\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(K)} < c$ independent of ϵ . By the Arzela–Ascoli theorem we can therefore extract a limit, up to passing to a subsequence, $a_\epsilon \rightarrow a^*$ in K . By exhausting all of $X \times X \setminus (S^2 \times X \cup X \times S^2)$ with compact sets, we can use a diagonal argument to extract a limit $a^* \in (\Omega^0 \oplus \Omega_7^2)((\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\} \setminus 0) \times (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\} \setminus 0))$, i.e. $a_\epsilon \rightarrow a^*$ in $C^{2,\alpha/2}$ on compact sets.

Let $y_0 \in \{0\} \times (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\} \setminus 0) \cup (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\} \setminus 0) \times \{0\}$, i.e., one of the points where a^* is not defined. Let U be a bounded open neighbourhood of y_0 . As a_ϵ is uniformly bounded on U , we have that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $|a^*(y)| < c$ for $y \in U$, where defined. Thus $a^* \in L^2((\Lambda^0 \oplus \Lambda_7^2)(U))$, and is therefore smooth on U by elliptic regularity. Repeating this argument on all of $\{0\} \times (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\} \setminus 0) \cup (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\} \setminus 0) \times \{0\}$, we find that a^* is smooth on all of $\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\} \times \mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}$.

Denote the blowup map $\pi : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\} \times \mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}$. Using this notation, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(0,1)} |a^*|_{g_0}^2 &= \int_{B(0,1) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}) \times (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\} \times \{0\})} |a^*|_{g_0}^2 \\ &= \int_{\pi^{-1}(B(0,1) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}) \times (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\} \times \{0\}))} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} |a_\epsilon|_{g_\epsilon}^2 \\ &= \int_{\pi^{-1}(B(0,1) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}) \times (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\} \times \{0\}))} \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} |a_\epsilon|_{g_\epsilon}^2 \quad (5.9) \\ &\geq \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\pi^{-1}(B(0,1) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}) \times (\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\} \times \{0\}))} |a_\epsilon|_{g_\epsilon}^2 \\ &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the Reverse Fatou lemma in the second to last step. Thus $a^* \in C^{2,\alpha}((\Lambda^0 \oplus \Lambda_7^2)(\mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\} \times \mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}))$ with $\Delta a^* = 0$, $\|a^*\|_{C_\beta^0} < c$ by the bound (5.8), and $a^* \neq 0$ by the estimate (5.9). But this is a contradiction to Proposition 5.9. \square

In (5.2) we defined a map $s_{j,\beta,t}$ that takes elements in $\Omega^1(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t)$ to one-forms over (an open set of) the model space $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, 8\}$ and $j \in \{73, \dots, 76\}$. It remains to define the analogue of $s_{j,\beta,t}$ in the case that the model space is $X \times X$, i.e. for $j \in \{9, \dots, 72\}$. To this end, fix $j \in \{9, \dots, 72\}$. Recall that we glue together trivial bundles around the point

singularities in our definition of E_t , cf. (4.11), so $E_t|_{\tilde{T}_{j,t}}$ is the trivial bundle and $s_{j,\beta,t}$ will produce Lie algebra valued 1-forms and not 1-forms taking values in a potentially non-trivial adjoint bundle as in the case of (5.2).

Denote the inclusion of $\tilde{T}_{i,t} = \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\}) \times \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\})$ in M_t by $\tilde{i}_{i,t}$. Then, for $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ define

$$\begin{aligned} s_{j,\beta,t} : \Omega^k(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t) &\rightarrow \Omega^k(\rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\}) \times \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\}), \mathfrak{g}) \\ a &\mapsto t^{\beta-k}(\tilde{i}_{i,t})^* a. \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

The following is an analogue of Proposition 5.6 and we again omit the proof:

Proposition 5.10. *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{c} \|a\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{k,\alpha}(\tilde{T}_{i,t})} &\leq \|s_{\beta,t} a\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{k,\alpha}(\rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\}) \times \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4/\{\pm 1\}))} \leq c \|a\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{k,\alpha}(\tilde{T}_{i,t})}, \\ \left\| L_t a - s_{\beta-1,t}^{-1} L s_{\beta,t} a \right\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}(\tilde{T}_{i,t})} &\leq c t^{3/10} \|a\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{0,\alpha}(\tilde{T}_{i,t})}, \\ \left\| L_t^* \underline{b} - s_{\beta-1,t}^{-1} L^* s_{\beta,t} \underline{b} \right\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}(\tilde{T}_{i,t})} &\leq c t^{3/10} \|\underline{b}\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{0,\alpha}(\tilde{T}_{i,t})}, \end{aligned}$$

where L denotes the linearisation of the $Spin(7)$ -instanton equation at the product connection over the trivial G -bundle over $X \times X$.

6 Deforming to genuine solutions

So far, we have constructed an approximate solution A_t to the $Spin(7)$ -instanton equation on M_t in Section 4, and we have studied the linearisation of the instanton equation on model spaces in Section 5. In this section, we will complete our construction by deforming the approximate solution A_t to a family of genuine $Spin(7)$ -instantons on M_t for sufficiently small t .

To implement this, we prove an estimate for the linearisation on M_t in Section 6.1. We then use this estimate to prove the existence of the genuine $Spin(7)$ -instantons in Section 6.2.

6.1 Linear problem on M_t

We recall the following Schauder estimate:

Proposition 6.1 (Proposition 2.86 in [97]). *For $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ there is a constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$\|a\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{1,\alpha}} \leq c \left(\|L_{A_t} a\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}} + \|a\|_{L_{\beta,t}^\infty} \right)$$

for all $a \in \Omega^1(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t)$.

Using this, we prove the key ingredient of our existence theorem, namely, the following uniform estimate for the linearisation of the instanton operator L_{A_t} :

Proposition 6.2. *Assume that the flat connection θ on T^8/Γ and the $Spin(7)$ -instantons A_j 's over X from Definition 4.6 are infinitesimally rigid. Then, given $\beta \in (-2, 0)$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for small t we have*

$$\|a\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{1,\alpha}} \leq c \|L_{A_t} a\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}} \quad (6.1)$$

for all $a \in \Omega^1(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t)$.

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that the claim is not true. We then have a sequence $\{t_i\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $t_i \rightarrow 0$ and an element $a_i \in \Omega^1(M_{t_i}, E_{t_i})$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

$$\|a_i\|_{L_{\beta,t_i}^\infty} \equiv 1 \text{ and } \|L_{t_i} a_i\|_{C_{\beta-1,t_i}^{0,\alpha}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (6.2)$$

By Proposition 6.1 this implies

$$\|a_i\|_{C_{\beta,t_i}^{1,\alpha}} \leq 2c. \quad (6.3)$$

Let $x_i \in M_{t_i}$ such that

$$w_{t_i}(x_i)^{-\beta} |a_i(x_i)| = 1. \quad (6.4)$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that we are in one of the following three cases, and we will arrive at a contradiction in each case.

Case 1. Assume that the sequence $\{x_i\}$ accumulates on the regular part of T^8/Γ , namely, suppose $\lim r_{t_i}(x_i) > 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $K \subset (T^8/\Gamma) \setminus \text{fix}(\Gamma)$ be a compact subset. Using the projection $\pi : M_{t_i} \rightarrow T^8/\Gamma$ from Section 2, we can consider $\pi^{-1}(K) \subset M_{t_i}$ which is a compact set for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. The restriction $\pi|_{\pi^{-1}(K)}$ is a diffeomorphism that is not exactly an isometry, but $\pi^* g_t$ converges to the flat metric g_0 on T^8/Γ in C^2 by the definition of g_t .

For the bundles, $E_0|_K$ is naturally identified with a subset of $E_t|_{\pi^{-1}(K)}$ by the construction of E_t . Under this identification, $A_t|_{\pi^{-1}(K)} \rightarrow \theta|_K$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

Therefore, we obtain from eq. (6.3) that the sequence $a_i|_K$ is uniformly bounded in $C^{1,\alpha}$, measured with respect to the flat metric g_0 on T^8/Γ and with respect to the flat connection θ on E_0 . By the Arzela–Ascoli theorem, we can extract a subsequence of $a_i|_K$ converging in $C^{1,\alpha/2}(\text{Ad } E_0|_K)$. Exhausting the set $(T^8/\Gamma) \setminus \text{fix}(\Gamma)$ with compact sets (K_i) , we may use a diagonal sequence argument to extract a limit $a^* \in \Omega^1((T^8/\Gamma) \setminus \text{fix}(\Gamma), \text{Ad } E_0)$. This limit satisfies

$$|a^*| \leq c d_{\Omega_0}(\cdot, \text{fix}(\Gamma))^\beta \text{ and } L_\theta a^* = 0.$$

Furthermore, by passing to a subsequence, we find a limit $x^* = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x_i$, viewed as a point in T^8/Γ . By the assumption of this case, x_i converges away from the singular set, namely, we have $x^* \in (T^8/\Gamma) \setminus \text{fix}(\Gamma)$. Thus, from eq. (6.4), we obtain

$$a^*(x^*) > 0.$$

Since $\beta > -2$, the limit a^* is in L^2 , therefore, it is a well-defined distribution acting on L^2 -sections of $\Lambda_{T^8/\Gamma}^1 \otimes \text{Ad } E_0$. Thus, a^* is a solution to the equation $L_\theta a^* = 0$ in the distributional sense on all of T^8/Γ . Here, a section over the orbifold T^8/Γ means a section over T^8 that is Γ -invariant. Therefore, by elliptic regularity (cf. [41, Theorem 6.33]), we have that $a^* \in \Omega^1(T^8/\Gamma, \text{Ad } E_0)$ is a smooth, non-zero element in the kernel of L_θ . This is a contradiction to the assumption that θ is infinitesimally rigid.

Case 2. Assume that the sequence $\{x_i\}$ accumulates on one of the ALE spaces, namely, suppose $\lim r_{t_i}(x_i)/t_i < \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

Without loss of generality, we can assume that $x_i \in \tilde{T}_{j,t_i}$ for one fixed $j \in I$ (cf. Section 2) and all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Define $\tilde{a}_i := s_{j,\beta,t_i} a_i$ and choose $\tilde{x}_i \in \iota_{j,t_i}^{-1}(x_i)$. The \tilde{a}_i are then 1-forms over (an open subset of) one of the model spaces $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$ or $X \times X$, the map s_{j,β,t_i} is defined in (5.10) for $j \in \{1, \dots, 8, 73, \dots, 76\}$, and it is defined in (5.2) for $j \in \{9, \dots, 72\}$. By Propositions 5.6 and 5.10, and the bound (6.3) we have

$$\|\tilde{a}_i\|_{C_\beta^{1,\alpha}} \leq c, \quad (6.5)$$

and by the bound (6.4) we have

$$w(\tilde{x}_i) |\tilde{a}_i(\tilde{x}_i)| > \frac{1}{2}. \quad (6.6)$$

Case 2.A. Suppose $j \in \{1, \dots, 8, 73, \dots, 76\}$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\tilde{x}^* := \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{x}_i$ exists. This is because the X -component of $\tilde{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^4 \times X$ is bounded by the assumption that $\lim r_{t_i}(x_i)/t_i < \infty$, thus, it has a convergent subsequence. The \mathbb{R}^4 -component need not be bounded, but by translating in the \mathbb{R}^4 -direction, if necessary, we can assume the \mathbb{R}^4 -component to be zero.

By the second point of (6.2) and the second estimate in Propositions 5.6 and 5.10, we have

$$\|L_{p_2^* A_j} \tilde{a}_i\|_{C_{\beta-1}^{0,\alpha}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (6.7)$$

Using a diagonal argument, we obtain a limit $a^* \in \Omega^1(\mathbb{R}^4 \times X, p_2^* \text{Ad } E_j)$ satisfying

$$\|a^*\|_{C_\beta^{1,\alpha/2}} \leq c, \quad L_{p_2^* A_j} a^* = 0, \quad \text{and } a^*(\tilde{x}^*) > 0,$$

where we used the bound (6.5) for the first inequality, (6.7) for the equality, and the inequality (6.6) for the last one. By Lemma 5.5, a^* is the pullback of an element in the L^2 -kernel of δ_{A_j} over X . Since A_j is chosen to be rigid, this contradicts the above $a^*(\tilde{x}^*) > 0$.

Case 2.B. Suppose $j \in \{9, \dots, 72\}$. The sequence \tilde{x}_i has a converging subsequence because of the assumption $\lim r_{t_i}(x_i)/t_i < \infty$. Thus we can assume without loss of generality that the limit $\tilde{x}^* := \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{x}_i$ exists. Analogously to

Case 2.A we obtain an element $a^* \in \Omega^1(X \times X, \mathfrak{g})$ satisfying

$$\|a^*\|_{C_\beta^{1,\alpha/2}} \leq c, La^* = 0, \text{ and } a^*(\tilde{x}^*) > 0, \quad (6.8)$$

where L is the linearisation of the $Spin(7)$ -instanton equation at the product connection. This is a contradiction to Proposition 5.8.

Case 3. Assume that the sequence $\{x_i\}$ accumulates on one of the necks, namely, suppose $\lim r_{t_i}(x_i) = 0$ and $\lim r_{t_i}(x_i)/t_i = \infty$.

Again, without loss of generality, we can assume that $x_i \in \tilde{T}_{j,t_i}$ for one fixed $j \in I$ and all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We define $\tilde{a}_i := s_{j,\beta,t_i} a_i$ and choose $\tilde{x}_i \in \iota_{j,t_i}^{-1}(x_i)$. In this case, we cannot assume that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{x}_i$ exists, because \tilde{x}_i tends to infinity. We will therefore rescale it first.

Fix a sequence $R_i \rightarrow \infty$ such that $R_i/(r_{t_i}(x_i)/t_i) \rightarrow 0$.

Case 3.A. Suppose $j \in \{1, \dots, 8, 73, \dots, 76\}$. In this case, \tilde{a}_i is defined over $\mathbb{R}^4 \times \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4) \subset \mathbb{R}^4 \times X$. Define the restriction

$$\tilde{\tilde{a}}_i := \tilde{a}_i|_{\mathbb{R}^4 \times (\rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4 \setminus B_{R_i}^4))}.$$

Since $(\text{id}, \rho) : \mathbb{R}^4 \times (\rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4 \setminus B_{R_i}^4)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4 \times (B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4 \setminus B_{R_i}^4)$ is a diffeomorphism, we can view $\tilde{\tilde{a}}_i$ as a tensor on a subset of $\mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}$ rather than a tensor on a subset of $\mathbb{R}^4 \times X$. By pulling back under the quotient map $\mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{C}^2/\{\pm 1\}$, we obtain a tensor on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times (B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4 \setminus B_{R_i}^4) \subset \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{C}^2$, that we again denote by the same symbol, namely, $\tilde{\tilde{a}}_i$. We now define the rescaling by

$$\tilde{\tilde{\tilde{a}}}_i := (\cdot r_{t_i}(x_i)/t_i)^* \tilde{\tilde{a}}_i \cdot (r_{t_i}(x_i)/t_i)^{-1-\beta}.$$

This is defined on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times (B_{\zeta/r_{t_i}(x_i)}^4 \setminus B_{R_i/(r_{t_i}(x_i)/t_i)}^4)$ and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\tilde{\tilde{a}}}_i \cdot r^{-\beta}|_{g_{\mathbb{R}^4 \oplus g_{\mathbb{C}^2}}} &= |(\cdot r_{t_i}(x_i)/t_i)^* \tilde{\tilde{a}}_i \cdot (r_{t_i}(x_i)/t_i)^{-1-\beta} \cdot r^{-\beta}|_{g_{\mathbb{R}^4 \oplus g_{\mathbb{C}^2}}} \\ &= |(\cdot r_{t_i}(x_i)/t_i)^* [\tilde{\tilde{a}}_i \cdot r^{-\beta}] (r_{t_i}(x_i)/t_i)^{-1}|_{g_{\mathbb{R}^4 \oplus g_{\mathbb{C}^2}}} \\ &= |\tilde{\tilde{a}}_i \cdot r^{-\beta}|_{g_{\mathbb{R}^4 \oplus g_{\mathbb{C}^2}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

where the last step follows from the behaviour of covariant tensors under rescaling. Because the sets $\mathbb{R}^4 \times (B_{\zeta/r_{t_i}(x_i)}^4 \setminus B_{R_i/(r_{t_i}(x_i)/t_i)}^4)$ exhaust $\mathbb{R}^4 \times (\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\})$, we can again use a diagonal sequence argument to extract a limit a^* on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times (\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\})$ of the sequence. As in Case 2, we can assume without loss of generality that the sequence $\tilde{x}_i/(r_{t_i}(x_i)/t_i)$ converges to a point $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{C}^2$. Taking (6.2), (6.3), and (6.9) together, we obtain

$$|a^*| \leq c|\pi_2|^\beta, LA_\beta^\infty a^* = 0, \text{ and } a^*(x^*)|\pi_2|(x^*)^{-\beta} > 0. \quad (6.10)$$

Because $\beta > -3$, this a^* defines a distribution on all of $\mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{C}^2$, and it is smooth by elliptic regularity. We now check that a^* is uniformly bounded. This follows

from the first estimate in (6.10) on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times (\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\})$ as follows: for $z \in \mathbb{R}^4$, the first estimate in (6.10) gives an estimate for a^* on the ball $B_2(z, 0) \subset \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{C}^2$ in an L^p -norm for some $p \in (1, \infty)$ independent of z . By elliptic regularity, this gives L_k^p -estimates independent for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, still independent of z . By the Sobolev embedding theorems, we therefore obtain an L^∞ -estimate for a^* on $B_2(z, 0)$. This estimate is independent of z , and therefore holds on all of $\mathbb{R}^4 \times B_2(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{C}^2$. Together with the estimate for a^* on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times (\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\})$ we find that a^* is uniformly bounded.

It follows from (5.1) and the second point of (6.10) that $L_{A_j}^* L_{A_j} a^* = (\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^4} + \Delta_{\mathbb{C}^2})a^* = 0$. By Lemma 5.4 this implies that a^* is constant in the \mathbb{R}^4 -direction. Thus, restricted to a single fibre $\{z\} \times \mathbb{C}^2$ we have that a^* consists of several harmonic real-valued functions that are bounded and decay at infinity. Then, by Liouville's theorem, we obtain $a^* = 0$. However, this contradicts the third point of (6.10).

Case 3.B. Suppose $j \in \{9, \dots, 72\}$. In this case, \tilde{a}_i is defined over $\rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4) \times \rho^{-1}(B_{t^{-1}\zeta}^4) \subset X \times X$. Similar to Case 3.A, we can extract a limit a^* over $(\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\}) \times (\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\})$ which gives a contradiction to Proposition 5.9. \square

We also have the following:

Proposition 6.3. *Assume that the flat connection θ on T^8/Γ and the ASD instantons A_i over X from Definition 4.6 are infinitesimally rigid. Suppose furthermore that θ is irreducible and unobstructed. Then, given $\beta \in (-2, 0)$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for small t we have*

$$\|\underline{b}\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{1,\alpha}} \leq c \left\| L_{A_t}^* (\underline{b}) \right\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}} \quad (6.11)$$

for all $\underline{b} \in \Omega^0(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t) \oplus \Omega_7^2(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t)$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Proposition 6.2. First, we have the following analogue of Proposition 6.1 that can be proved in the same way:

$$\|\underline{b}\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{1,\alpha}} \leq c \left(\left\| L_{A_t}^* \underline{b} \right\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}} + \|\underline{b}\|_{L_{\beta,t}^\infty} \right). \quad (6.12)$$

Now assume that the proposition does not hold. As in the proof of Proposition 6.2, we obtain sequences $t_i \rightarrow 0$, $x_i \in M_{t_i}$ and a sequence $\underline{b}_i \in \Omega^0(M_{t_i}, \text{Ad } E_{t_i}) \oplus \Omega_7^2(M_{t_i}, \text{Ad } E_{t_i})$ such that

$$\|\underline{b}_i\|_{C_{\beta,t_i}^{1,\alpha}} \leq 2c, \left\| L_{A_{t_i}}^* \underline{b}_i \right\|_{C_{\beta-1,t_i}^{0,\alpha}} \rightarrow 0, \text{ and } w_{t_i}(x_i)^{-\beta} |\underline{b}_i(x_i)| = 1. \quad (6.13)$$

Again, we consider the following three cases and arrive at a contradiction in each case:

Case 1. Assume that the sequence $\{x_i\}$ accumulates on the regular part of T^8/Γ , namely, suppose $\lim r_{t_i}(x_i) > 0$.

Using a diagonal argument as in Case 1 in the proof of Proposition 6.2, we can extract a limit $\underline{b}^* \in \Omega^0(T^8/\Gamma, \text{Ad } E_0) \oplus \Omega_7^2(T^8/\Gamma, \text{Ad } E_0)$ satisfying

$$L_\theta^*(\underline{b}^*) = 0 \text{ and } \underline{b}^* \neq 0, \quad (6.14)$$

which contradicts the fact that θ is irreducible and unobstructed.

Case 2. Assume that the sequence $\{x_i\}$ accumulates on one of the ALE spaces, namely, suppose $\lim r_{t_i}(x_i)/t_i < \infty$.

Without loss of generality, we can assume that $x_i \in \tilde{T}_{j,t_i}$ for one fixed $j \in I$ (cf. Section 2) and all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Case 2.A. Suppose $j \in \{1, \dots, 8, 73, \dots, 76\}$. As in Case 2.A in the proof of Proposition 6.2, we can extract a limit $\underline{b}^* \in \Omega^0(\mathbb{R}^4 \times X, p_2^* \text{Ad } E_j) \oplus \Omega_7^2(\mathbb{R}^4 \times X, p_2^* \text{Ad } E_j)$ satisfying

$$\|\underline{b}^*\|_{C_\beta^{1,\alpha/2}} \leq c, L_{p_2^* A_j}^* \underline{b}^* = 0, \text{ and } \underline{b}^* \neq 0. \quad (6.15)$$

By Lemma 5.4, \underline{b}^* is constant in the \mathbb{R}^4 -direction, namely, the pullback of an element in $\Omega^0 \oplus \Omega_7^2(X, \text{Ad } E_j)$ that we denote by the same symbol. By (5.1), \underline{b}^* can be written as the sum of an element in the kernel of δ_{A_j} and an element in the kernel of $\delta_{A_j}^*$. By the second point of Proposition A.4, the element in the kernel of $\delta_{A_j}^*$ is zero. On the other hand, we assume that A_j is infinitesimally rigid, therefore the component in the kernel of δ_{A_j} is also zero. This contradicts $\underline{b}^* \neq 0$ from (6.15).

Case 2.B. Suppose $j \in \{9, \dots, 72\}$. As in Case 2.B in the proof of Proposition 6.2, we can extract a limit $\underline{b}^* \in \Omega^0(X \times X, \mathfrak{g}) \oplus \Omega_7^2(X \times X, \mathfrak{g})$ satisfying

$$\|\underline{b}^*\|_{C_\beta^{1,\alpha/2}} \leq c, d\xi + d^*b = 0, \text{ and } \underline{b}^* \neq 0. \quad (6.16)$$

This is a contradiction to Proposition 5.8.

Case 3. Assume the sequence (x_i) accumulates on one of the necks, namely, suppose $\lim r_{t_i}(x_i) = 0$ and $\lim r_{t_i}(x_i)/t_i = \infty$.

Case 3.A. As in Case 3.A. in the proof of Proposition 6.2, we can extract a limit $\underline{b}^* = (\xi, b) \in \Omega^0(\mathbb{R}^4 \times (\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus \{0\}), \mathfrak{g}) \oplus \Omega_7^2(\mathbb{R}^4 \times (\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus \{0\}), \mathfrak{g})$ satisfying

$$|a^*| \leq c|\pi_2|^\beta, L_{A_j^*}^* a^* = 0, \text{ and } a^*(x^*)|\pi_2|(x^*)^{-\beta} > 0. \quad (6.17)$$

Using (5.1) and Lemma 5.4 we conclude like in the proof of Proposition 6.2 that a^* is the pullback of a harmonic function with decay on \mathbb{R}^4 , which contradicts the last point of (6.17).

Case 3.B. As in Case 3.B. in the proof of Proposition 6.2, we can extract a limit $\underline{b}^* = (\xi, b) \in \Omega^0((\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus \{0\}) \times (\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus \{0\}), \mathfrak{g}) \oplus \Omega_7^2((\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus \{0\}) \times (\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus \{0\}), \mathfrak{g})$ satisfying

$$\|\underline{b}^*\|_{C_\beta^{1,\alpha/2}} \leq c, d\xi + d^*b = 0, \text{ and } \underline{b}^* \neq 0. \quad (6.18)$$

This contradicts Proposition 5.9. \square

We assumed in Proposition 6.3 that the ambient connection θ is irreducible. This assumption can be removed, though one can no longer guarantee that the resulting *Spin*(7)-instanton is irreducible, and we will not use this generalisation for our examples in Section 7.

As in the proof of Proposition 6.2, we consider sections of the orbifold bundle $\Omega^1(T^8/\Gamma, \text{Ad } E_0)$. Since the orbifold T^8/Γ is a global quotient, such sections are in one-to-one correspondence with Γ -invariant sections over T^8 , which we take as a definition of sections of orbifold bundles. In the case that θ is reducible (we still assume unobstructed), the map

$$L_\theta : \Omega^1(T^8/\Gamma, \text{Ad } E_0) \rightarrow \Omega^0(T^8/\Gamma, \text{Ad } E_0) \oplus \Omega_7^2(T^8/\Gamma, \text{Ad } E_0)$$

is not surjective. Identifying $\mathcal{H}_\theta^0 = \text{Coker } d_\theta^* \cong \text{Ker } d_\theta \subset \Omega^0(T^8/\Gamma, \text{Ad } E_0)$, we can define

$$(1 - \chi_t) \cdot \mathcal{H}_\theta^0 := \{(1 - \chi_t) \cdot \xi : \xi \in \mathcal{H}_\theta^0\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}_\theta : \Omega^1(T^8/\Gamma, \text{Ad } E_0) \oplus (1 - \chi)\mathcal{H}_\theta^0 &\rightarrow \Omega^0(T^8/\Gamma, \text{Ad } E_0) \oplus \Omega_7^2(T^8/\Gamma, \text{Ad } E_0) \\ \underline{a} = (a, u) &\mapsto L_\theta(a) + (u, 0). \end{aligned} \tag{6.19}$$

The definition was made so that the following proposition is true:

Proposition 6.4. *If θ is unobstructed, then \tilde{L}_θ is surjective. If θ is infinitesimally rigid, then \tilde{L}_θ is injective.*

Proof. We first check that \tilde{L}_θ is surjective if θ is unobstructed. Without loss of generality, we can assume that

$$\langle (1 - \chi)u, u \rangle_{L^2} \neq 0 \text{ for all } 0 \neq u \in \mathcal{H}_\theta^0. \tag{6.20}$$

This can be arranged by slightly perturbing χ , if necessary. Then

$$\text{Coker } \tilde{L}_\theta = (\text{Im } L_\theta)^\perp \cap ((1 - \chi)\mathcal{H}_\theta^0)^\perp = \mathcal{H}_\theta^0 \cap ((1 - \chi)\mathcal{H}_\theta^0)^\perp = \{0\}.$$

For the second equality, we used that $(\text{Im } L_\theta)^\perp = \mathcal{H}_\theta^0$ which holds because θ is unobstructed by assumption. For the last equality, we used (6.20).

We now check that \tilde{L}_θ is also injective if θ is infinitesimally rigid. Assume that $\tilde{L}_\theta(a, u) = 0$ for some $(a, u) \in \Omega^1(T^8/\Gamma, \text{Ad } E_0) \oplus (1 - \chi)\mathcal{H}_\theta^0$. That is, $L_\theta(a) + (u, 0) = 0$. By applying the L^2 -projection onto \mathcal{H}_θ^0 to both sides of this equation, we get $u = 0$, because $\text{Im } L_\theta \perp \mathcal{H}_\theta^0$ and because of (6.20). Thus also $L_\theta(a) = 0$. But L_θ is infinitesimally rigid by assumption, so $a = 0$. This proves the claim. \square

Because the bundle E_t can be identified with E_0 away from the singularities, we can view $(1 - \chi_t) \cdot \mathcal{H}_\theta^0$ as contained in $\Omega^0(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t)$. We use this to augment L_{A_t} into \tilde{L}_{A_t} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}_{A_t} : \Omega^1(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t) \oplus (1 - \chi_t) \cdot \mathcal{H}_\theta^0 &\rightarrow \Omega^0(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t) \oplus \Omega_7^2(M, \text{Ad } E_t), \\ \underline{a} = (a, u) &\mapsto L_{A_t} a + (u, 0). \end{aligned}$$

The important properties of L_{A_t} from Propositions 6.2 and 6.3 carry over to \tilde{L}_{A_t} , as stated in the following two propositions:

Proposition 6.5. *Assume the flat connection θ on T^8/Γ and the $Spin(7)$ -instantons A_i over Y_i from Definition 4.6 are infinitesimally rigid. Given $\beta \in (-2, 0)$, there exists $c > 0$ such that for small t we have*

$$\|\underline{a}\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{1,\alpha}} \leq c \left\| \tilde{L}_{A_t} \underline{a} \right\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}} \quad (6.21)$$

for all $\underline{a} \in \Omega^1(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t) \oplus (1 - \chi_t) \cdot \mathcal{H}_\theta^0$.

Proposition 6.6. *Assume the flat connection θ on T^8/Γ and the ASD instantons A_i over X from Definition 4.6 are infinitesimally rigid, and assume that θ is unobstructed. Given $\beta \in (-4, 0)$, there exists $c > 0$ such that for small t we have*

$$\|\underline{b}\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{1,\alpha}} \leq c \left\| \tilde{L}_{A_t}^* (\underline{b}) \right\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}} \quad (6.22)$$

for all $\underline{b} \in \Omega^0(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t) \oplus \Omega_7^2(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t)$.

Proof of Proposition 6.5. First note that we have an analogue of the Schauder estimate from Proposition 6.1 for \tilde{L}_{A_t} , which is seen as follows. For $\underline{a} = (a, u) \in \Omega^1(M, \text{Ad } E_t) \oplus (1 - \chi_t) \cdot \mathcal{H}_\theta^0$ we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\underline{a}\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{1,\alpha}} &\leq \|a\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{1,\alpha}} + \|u\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{1,\alpha}} \\ &\leq c \left(\|L_{A_t} a\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}} + \|a\|_{L_{\beta,t}^\infty} + \|u\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{1,\alpha}} \right) \\ &\leq c \left(\|L_{A_t} a + u\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}} + \|u\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}} + \|a\|_{L_{\beta,t}^\infty} + \|u\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{1,\alpha}} \right) \\ &\leq c \left(\left\| \tilde{L}_{A_t} \underline{a} \right\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}} + \|u\|_{L_{\beta,t}^\infty} + \|a\|_{L_{\beta,t}^\infty} \right) \\ &\leq c \left(\left\| \tilde{L}_{A_t} \underline{a} \right\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}} + \|\underline{a}\|_{L_{\beta,t}^\infty} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second step we used Proposition 6.1 and in the fourth step we used that $\|\cdot\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{k,\alpha}}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L_{\beta',t}^\infty}$ are equivalent norms for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{R}$ on the set $(1 - \chi_t) \cdot \mathcal{H}_\theta^0$, uniformly in t . Here is why this last fact holds: we have $\text{supp}(u) = \text{supp}(1 - \chi)$, and on this set $\|\cdot\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{k,\alpha}}$ and $C^{k,\alpha}$ are equivalent norms for any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ uniformly in t . The same is true for $\|\cdot\|_{L_{\beta,t}^\infty}$ and L^∞ . Furthermore, $(1 - \chi_t) \cdot \mathcal{H}_\theta^0$ is a finite-dimensional vector space, so L^∞ and $C^{k,\alpha}$ on this space are equivalent norms uniformly in t .

Thus, it suffices to prove

$$\|\underline{a}\|_{L_{\beta,t}^\infty} \leq c \left\| \tilde{L}_{A_t} \underline{a} \right\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}}. \quad (6.23)$$

The proof works the same as the proof for Proposition 6.1. The only difference is that in case 1 we get a limit $\underline{a}^* \in \Omega^1(T^8/\Gamma, \text{Ad } E_0) \oplus (1 - \chi) \mathcal{H}_\theta^0$ such that $\tilde{L}_\theta \underline{a}^* = 0$, but that is a contradiction to Proposition 6.4. \square

Proof of Proposition 6.6. First note that we easily get a Schauder estimate for $\tilde{L}_{A_t}^*$ from the Schauder estimate for $L_{A_t}^*$, because for $\underline{b} \in (\Omega^0 \oplus \Omega_7^2)(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\underline{b}\|_{C_{\beta;t}^{1,\alpha}} &\leq c \left(\|L_{A_t}^* \underline{b}\|_{C_{\beta-1;t}^{0,\alpha}} + \|\underline{b}\|_{L_{\beta;t}^\infty} \right) \\ &\leq c \left(\|L_{A_t}^* \underline{b}\|_{C_{\beta-1;t}^{0,\alpha}} + \left\| \varpi_{(1-\chi)\mathcal{H}_\theta^0}(\underline{b}) \right\|_{C_{\beta-1;t}^{0,\alpha}} + \|\underline{b}\|_{L_{\beta;t}^\infty} \right) \\ &\leq c \left(\left\| \left(L_{A_t}^* \underline{b}, \varpi_{(1-\chi)\mathcal{H}_\theta^0}(\underline{b}) \right) \right\|_{C_{\beta-1;t}^{0,\alpha}} + \|\underline{b}\|_{L_{\beta;t}^\infty} \right) \\ &\leq c \left(\left\| \tilde{L}_{A_t}^* \underline{b} \right\|_{C_{\beta-1;t}^{0,\alpha}} + \|\underline{b}\|_{L_{\beta;t}^\infty} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\varpi_{(1-\chi)\mathcal{H}_\theta^0} : \Omega^0(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t) \rightarrow (1-\chi)\mathcal{H}_\theta^0$ denotes the orthogonal projection onto $(1-\chi)\mathcal{H}_\theta^0$ with respect to the L^2 inner product. We used the estimate (6.12) in the first step, added a non-negative term in the second step, and used that the adjoint of the inclusion $(1-\chi)\mathcal{H}_\theta^0 \hookrightarrow \Omega^1(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t)$ is the L^2 -projection in the last step.

The statement is then proved in the same way as in Proposition 6.3 and Proposition 6.5. \square

6.2 The perturbation step

With all of this in place, we can prove the desired gluing result:

Theorem 6.7. *Let A_t be the connection on the bundle E_t over M_t constructed in Section 4. Assume the flat connection θ on T^8/Γ and the ASD instantons A_j 's over X from Definition 4.6 are infinitesimally rigid, and assume that θ is unobstructed. Then there exists $c > 0$ such that for small t there exists $a_t \in \Omega^1(M_t, \text{Ad } E_t)$ such that $A_t + a_t$ is a Spin(7)-instanton on E_t . Moreover, $\|a_t\|_{C_{-1,t}^{1,\alpha}} \leq ct^{3/10}$ and $A_t + a_t$ is smooth.*

Proof. We aim to find a solution $a \in C_{-1;t}^{1,\alpha}(\Lambda^1(M, \text{Ad } E_t))$ of the equation

$$\pi_7^2(F_{A_t+a}) = 0. \quad (6.24)$$

This equation decomposes into three summands. If we denote the term that is quadratic in a by Q_t , i.e. $Q_t(a) := \pi_7^2([a, a])$, and denote the term that is constant in a (that is the pre-gluing error) by e_t , i.e. $e_t := \pi_7^2(F_{A_t})$, then it will suffice to solve the equation:

$$\tilde{L}_{A_t}(\underline{a}) = (0, -e_t - Q_t(a)) \quad (6.25)$$

for $\underline{a} = (a, \xi) \in \Omega^1(M, \text{Ad } E_t) \oplus \mathcal{H}_{A_t}^0$. In this case, $A_t + a$ will turn out to be a solution to eq. (6.24).

Equation (6.25) is a *non-linear* equation in $\underline{a} = (a, \xi)$. In order to solve it, we will repeatedly solve its linearisation and a limit of these solutions will be a solution to eq. (6.25).

To this end, define $\underline{a}_0 := 0$ and for $k > 0$ let $\underline{a}_k = (a_k, \xi_k) \in \Omega^1(M, \text{Ad } E_t) \oplus (1 - \chi_t) \cdot \mathcal{H}_\theta^0$ be such that

$$\tilde{L}_{A_t}(\underline{a}_k) = (0, -e_t - Q_t(a_{k-1})), \quad (6.26)$$

where \underline{a}_k exists because \tilde{L}_{A_t} is surjective by Proposition 6.6.

For the moment, denote by c' the constant from Proposition 6.5, namely, $\|\underline{a}\|_{C_{\beta,t}^{1,\alpha}} \leq c' \left\| \tilde{L}_{A_t} \underline{a} \right\|_{C_{\beta-1,t}^{0,\alpha}}$, and denote by c'' the constant from Proposition 4.8, that is, $\|e_t\|_{C_{-2;t}^{0,\alpha}} \leq c'' t^{3/10}$.

Claim: if t is small, then $\|\underline{a}_k\|_{C_{-1;t}^{1,\alpha}} \leq 2c' c'' t^{3/10}$ for all $k \geq 0$.

Proof. We prove the claim by induction. By definition, it is true for $k = 0$.

If $k > 0$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\underline{a}_k\|_{C_{-1;t}^{1,\alpha}} &\leq c' \left\| \tilde{L}_{A_t} \underline{a}_k \right\|_{C_{-2;t}^{0,\alpha}} \\ &= c' \|e_t + Q_t(\underline{a}_{k-1})\|_{C_{-2;t}^{0,\alpha}} \\ &\leq c' \|e_t\|_{C_{-2;t}^{0,\alpha}} + c' \|Q_t(\underline{a}_{k-1})\|_{C_{-2;t}^{0,\alpha}} \\ &\leq c' c'' t^{3/10} + c' \|\underline{a}_{k-1}\|_{C_{-1;t}^{0,\alpha}}^2 \\ &\leq 2c' c'' t^{3/10}. \end{aligned}$$

In the first step, we used Proposition 6.6, in the last step we used the induction hypothesis together with the fact that t is sufficiently small, in particular, it is small enough so that $c'(2c' c'' t^{3/10})^2 \leq c' c'' t^{3/10}$. This proves the intermediate claim. \square

Therefore, \underline{a}_k is a bounded sequence, thus, it has a convergent subsequence by the Arzela–Ascoli theorem. Denote its limit by $\underline{a} = (a, \xi) \in \Omega^1(M, \text{Ad } E_t) \oplus (1 - \chi_t) \cdot \mathcal{H}_\theta^0$. By taking the limit of eq. (6.26), we see that \underline{a} satisfies eq. (6.25). Thus,

$$e_t + (L_{A_t}(a)) + Q_t(a) = 0,$$

and therefore $A_t + a$ is a *Spin*(7)-instanton. It remains to show smoothness of $A_t + a$. As A_t is smooth by definition, we have to show that a is smooth. This is done by *elliptic bootstrapping*: assume that $a \in C^{k,\alpha}$ for some $k \geq 1$. Then, by general elliptic theory there exists a constant $M > 0$ (depending on t and k) such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|a\|_{C^{k+1,\alpha}} &\leq M \|L_{A_t} a\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} + \|a\|_{C^0} \\ &= M \|e_t + Q_t(a)\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} + \|a\|_{C^0}. \end{aligned}$$

Because $a \in C^{k,\alpha}$ we have that the right-hand side is finite, which implies that the left-hand side is finite, so $a \in C^{k+1,\alpha}$. Induction shows that $a \in C^\infty$. \square

7 Examples

In Section 4.2, we constructed approximate $Spin(7)$ -instantons on M_t , using compatible gluing data. Roughly speaking, compatible gluing data consist of a flat connection θ on the orbifold T^8/Γ and of rigid ASD instantons on Eguchi–Hanson space X , satisfying some compatibility conditions. In Section 6, we proved that, given such an approximate solution, one obtains a nearby exact solution to the $Spin(7)$ -instanton equation.

We have not yet shown that there exist examples of compatible gluing data. In this section, we will exhibit many examples of these data, leading to lots of new examples of $Spin(7)$ -instantons. It will turn out that given a rigid flat connection on the orbifold T^8/Γ , there is an easy way to extend it to compatible gluing data. Therefore, we review flat connections on the orbifold T^8/Γ and state how to produce compatible gluing data in the sense of Definition 4.6 out of suitable flat connections on the orbifold T^8/Γ in Section 7.1. In Section 7.2, we present explicit examples with structure group $SO(3)$, in Section 7.4 examples with structure group $SO(5)$, in Section 7.5 examples with structure group $SO(7)$ and in Section 7.6 examples with structure group $SO(8)$. In Section 7.7, we comment on the situation for all the other cases among $SO(n)$'s.

7.1 Flat connections on orbifolds

The following is an adaptation of [95, Proposition 9.2] to the $Spin(7)$ -setting:

Lemma 7.1. *A flat connection θ on a G -bundle E_0 over a flat $Spin(7)$ -orbifold T^8/Γ corresponding to a representation $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow G$ is irreducible if and only if the induced representation of $\pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma)$ on the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of G has no non-zero fixed vectors, where the action is given by the adjoint representation. Similarly, it is infinitesimally rigid if and only if the induced representation of $\pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma)$ on $\mathbb{R}^8 \otimes \mathfrak{g}$ has no non-zero fixed vectors; and it is unobstructed if and only if the induced representation of $\pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma)$ on $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8) \otimes \mathfrak{g}$ has no non-zero fixed vectors, where $\pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma)$ acts on \mathbb{R}^8 and $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8)$ via the holonomy representation of the Levi-Civita connection.*

Proof. By the Weitzenböck formula, we have

$$L_\theta^* L_\theta = \nabla^* \nabla, \quad L_\theta L_\theta^* = \nabla^* \nabla.$$

Thus, elements in the kernel of L_θ and elements in the kernel of L_θ^* are parallel sections of $\Lambda^1(T^8/\Gamma) \otimes \text{Ad } E_0$ and $\Lambda^0(T^8/\Gamma) \otimes \text{Ad } E_0 \oplus \Lambda_7^2(T^8/\Gamma) \otimes \text{Ad } E_0$, respectively. Hence, the claim then follows from the holonomy principle. \square

As discussed in Section 6, the crucial ingredients for our construction are unobstructed flat connections on a G -bundle over the $Spin(7)$ -orbifold. Flat connections are in bijective correspondence with representations of the orbifold fundamental group on G , and Lemma 7.1 provides a simple criterion to verify whether a given flat connection is irreducible, infinitesimally rigid, or unobstructed.

Now recall that an *orbifold* is locally modeled on \mathbb{R}^n quotiented by finite group actions. In Section 2, we consider the action of Γ on T^8 , where Γ is given in eq. (2.1). Since the action of Γ is properly discontinuous, we obtain that T^8/Γ is an orbifold (see for example Proposition 13.2.1 in [93]). Furthermore, we may consider the universal cover \mathbb{R}^8 of T^8 . Recall that the *fundamental group* π_1^{orb} is the group of deck transformations of the universal cover. Therefore, the orbifold fundamental group of T^8/Γ is generated by the group of involutions $\Gamma = \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta\}$ together with the translations along the torus directions, which we denote by $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1, \dots, 8}$.

Lemma 7.2. *The generators $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_8$ of $\pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma)$ satisfy the following relations:*

1. $[\tau_i, \tau_j] = 1$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, 8\}$. That is, the τ_i commute among themselves.
2. $\alpha^2 = \beta^2 = \gamma^2 = \delta^2 = 1$. That is, $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta\}$ are involutions.
3. $[\alpha, \beta] = 1$, $[\alpha, \gamma] = \tau_2^{-1}\tau_1^{-1}$, $[\alpha, \delta] = \tau_3^{-1}$, $[\beta, \gamma] = \tau_6^{-1}\tau_5^{-1}$, $[\beta, \delta] = \tau_7^{-1}$ and $[\gamma, \delta] = \tau_1$. This shows $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta\}$ do not commute among themselves.
4. $\alpha\tau_i = \tau_i^{-1}\alpha$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\alpha\tau_i = \tau_i\alpha$ for $i \in \{5, 6, 7, 8\}$.
5. $\beta\tau_i = \tau_i^{-1}\beta$ for $i \in \{5, 6, 7, 8\}$, $\beta\tau_i = \tau_i\beta$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.
6. $\gamma\tau_i = \tau_i^{-1}\gamma$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 5, 6\}$, $\gamma\tau_i = \tau_i\gamma$ for $i \in \{3, 4, 7, 8\}$.
7. $\delta\tau_i = \tau_i^{-1}\delta$ for $i \in \{1, 3, 5, 7\}$, $\delta\tau_i = \tau_i\delta$ for $i \in \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$.

The above relations in Lemma 7.2 are obtained from the action of the group elements on \mathbb{R}^8 , for example from

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_1 &: (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8) \longmapsto (x_1 + 1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8) , \\ \alpha &: (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8) \longmapsto (-x_1, -x_2, -x_3, -x_4, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8) , \end{aligned}$$

it is immediate to verify that $\alpha\tau_1 = \tau_1^{-1}\alpha$. We omit the proof. (See also Ma [72] for the corresponding G_2 -orbifold case.)

Lemma 7.2 gives conditions that representations of the orbifold fundamental group must satisfy.

Remark 7.3. Because of Definition 4.6, we are interested in representations for which $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ have a trivial representative. From the conditions 4 and 5 in Lemma 7.2, we immediately see that this implies that the representatives of all the $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1, \dots, 8}$ must be involutions, so we will only be interested in subgroups of involutions of the structure group G . In fact, from the condition 1 in Lemma 7.2 the representatives $\{\rho(\tau_i)\}_{i=1, \dots, 8}$ generate a subgroup of commuting involutions, and the conditions 6 and 7 in Lemma 7.2 imply they must also commute with $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\rho(\delta)$.

Furthermore, the condition 3 in Lemma 7.2 for $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$ imposes additional constraints on the involutions representing the translations

$$\rho(\tau_3) = \rho(\tau_7) = 1, \quad \rho(\tau_1) = \rho(\tau_2), \quad \rho(\tau_5) = \rho(\tau_6), \quad (7.1)$$

whereas there are no restrictions on $\rho(\tau_4)$ or $\rho(\tau_8)$.

Finally, let us observe that if the representatives of γ and δ also commute, the condition 3 in Lemma 7.2 further implies that

$$\rho(\tau_1) = \rho(\tau_2) = \rho(\tau_3) = \rho(\tau_7) = 1, \quad \rho(\tau_5) = \rho(\tau_6), \quad (7.2)$$

with still no additional restrictions on $\rho(\tau_4)$ or $\rho(\tau_8)$. In this case, the image of the orbifold group generates a subgroup of commuting involutions of G which is completely determined by the images of $\gamma, \delta, \tau_4, \tau_5, \tau_8$. The conditions 1 to 7 in Lemma 7.2 are automatically satisfied as long as we impose the condition (7.2). All the solutions we are going to present are of this type, as we will show in Proposition 7.36 that without the commutativity assumption the associated connection is obstructed.

Remark 7.4. When $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$, the adjoint representation of α and β acts trivially on \mathfrak{g} whereas the holonomy representation does not fix any nonzero elements of \mathbb{R}^8 . Therefore, from Lemma 7.1 we find that the corresponding flat connection is infinitesimally rigid.

Now we prove a short lemma and proposition that will be useful to show that certain connections are obstructed.

Lemma 7.5. *The holonomy action of α and β fixes a 3-dimensional subspace V of $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8)$. Within V , there is a 1-dimensional subspace $V_{-,-}$ where γ and δ act both as -1 , and two 1-dimensional subspaces $V_{\pm,\mp}$ where γ acts as ± 1 and δ acts as ∓ 1 .*

Proof. Consider the following basis of $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8)$:

$$\begin{aligned} e_1 &= dx_{12} + dx_{34} + dx_{56} + dx_{78}, & e_2 &= dx_{13} - dx_{24} + dx_{57} - dx_{68}, \\ e_3 &= dx_{14} + dx_{23} + dx_{58} + dx_{67}, & e_4 &= dx_{15} - dx_{26} - dx_{37} + dx_{48}, \\ e_5 &= dx_{16} + dx_{25} + dx_{38} + dx_{47}, & e_6 &= dx_{17} - dx_{28} + dx_{35} - dx_{46}, \\ & & e_7 &= dx_{18} + dx_{27} - dx_{36} - dx_{45}. \end{aligned}$$

It is immediate to check that α and β act as the identity on $V = \langle e_1, e_2, e_3 \rangle$ and as minus the identity on the subspace $\langle e_4, e_5, e_6, e_7 \rangle$. Now, from the holonomy action of γ and δ we find that $V_{-,-} = \langle e_3 \rangle$, $V_{+,-} = \langle e_1 \rangle$ and $V_{-,+} = \langle e_2 \rangle$ \square

Proposition 7.6. *Let $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow G$ be a group homomorphism from the orbifold group to a gauge group G such that $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$. Suppose there exists an element $g \in \mathfrak{g}$ fixed by $\{\rho(\tau_i)\}_{i=1,\dots,8}$ and such that at least one of $\rho(\gamma)$, $\rho(\delta)$ acts on g with a global minus sign, with the other element acting as ± 1 . Then, the associated connection is obstructed.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.1, it is enough to show there exists an element of $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8) \otimes \mathfrak{g}$ fixed by the action of the orbifold group. To this end, we will use the subspaces $V, V_{-, -}, V_{\pm, \mp} \subset \Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8)$ we introduced in Lemma 7.5. First note the subspace $V \otimes \langle g \rangle$ is fixed by $\rho(\alpha)$, $\rho(\beta)$ and $\{\rho(\tau_i)\}_{i=1, \dots, 8}$, so it is enough to find an element in this subspace that is also fixed by $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\rho(\delta)$.

If both $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\rho(\delta)$ act with a minus sign on g , then the subspace $V_{-, -} \otimes \langle g \rangle$ is fixed by the action of $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\rho(\delta)$. On the other hand, if $\rho(\gamma)$ acts as -1 and $\rho(\delta)$ acts as $+1$ on g , the subspace $V_{-, +} \otimes \langle g \rangle$ is then fixed by the action of both elements. Finally, if $\rho(\gamma)$ acts trivially and $\rho(\delta)$ acts with a minus sign on g then $V_{+, -} \otimes \langle g \rangle$ is a subspace fixed by $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\rho(\delta)$. Therefore, in all cases the associated connection is obstructed. \square

In the rest of this section, we describe how to obtain compatible gluing data in the sense of Definition 4.6 from flat connections.

We denote by $[M]$ the real rank 2μ bundle underlying a complex vector bundle M of rank μ , and use the notation $sV := \underbrace{V \oplus \dots \oplus V}_{s \text{ times}}$ for any vector bundle V .

The following lemma is a generalisation of [33, §4.2.2]:

Lemma 7.7. *Let L be a complex vector bundle of rank one with connection A over a manifold X . Consider $E := m[L] \oplus \mathbb{R}^k$ for $m, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Then there exist $s_0, s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that*

$$\text{Ad } E = s_0 \mathbb{R} \oplus s_1 [L] \oplus s_2 [L^2]$$

and the connection on $\text{Ad } E$ induced by A restricts to each of the summands.

Proof. Write $r := \text{rank}_{\mathbb{R}}(E)$. We prove the statement via induction over r . For $r = 0$ and $r = 1$ the claim is clear. For $r \geq 2$ there are two possibilities for $E_{\mathbb{C}}$:

$$E_{\mathbb{C}} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{C}^2 \oplus W, \text{ or} \\ L \oplus L^{-1} \oplus W \end{cases}$$

for $W = a\mathbb{C} \oplus b(L \oplus L^{-1})$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. For the $\mathfrak{so}(n, \mathbb{C})$ -endomorphisms of $E_{\mathbb{C}}$ we have

$$\mathfrak{so}_{\mathbb{C}}(E_{\mathbb{C}}) = \Lambda^2(E_{\mathbb{C}}) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} \oplus 2W \oplus \mathfrak{so}_{\mathbb{C}}(W), \text{ or} \\ \mathbb{C} \oplus (L \oplus L^{-1}) \otimes W \oplus \mathfrak{so}_{\mathbb{C}}(W). \end{cases}$$

Using the induction assumption on W , we find $t_0, t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$\mathfrak{so}_{\mathbb{C}}(W) = t_0 \mathbb{C} \oplus t_1 (L \oplus L^{-1}) \oplus t_2 (L^2 \oplus L^{-2}),$$

therefore, we have $s_0, s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Ad } E)_{\mathbb{C}} &= \mathfrak{so}_{\mathbb{C}}(E_{\mathbb{C}}) \\ &= s_0 \mathbb{C} \oplus s_1 (L \oplus L^{-1}) \oplus s_2 (L^2 \oplus L^{-2}) \\ &= (s_0 \mathbb{R} \oplus s_1 [L] \oplus s_2 [L^2])_{\mathbb{C}}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies the claim. \square

Proposition 7.8. *Choose $n > 1$ and let $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow SO(n)$ be a representation so that $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$. Let E_0 be the corresponding $SO(n)$ -bundle with flat connection θ . Then this can be extended to compatible gluing data in the sense of Definition 4.6.*

Proof. For $j \in \{73, 74\}$ we can canonically identify $\pi_1(T_j \setminus S_j) \cong \langle \gamma, \tau_3, \tau_4, \tau_7, \tau_8 \rangle$. The group element $\gamma \in \Gamma$ has order 2, so, $\text{hol}_\theta(\gamma) =: g_j \in SO(n)$ is the identity or has order 2. If $g_j = 1$, then choose (E_j, A_j) to be the trivial bundle and connection over X .

Now assume $g_j \neq 1$. Denote by (L, A) the $U(1)$ -bundle with ASD instanton on the Eguchi–Hanson space X from Proposition A.5. Choose $m, k \geq 0$ such that $E_j := m[L] \oplus \mathbb{R}^k$ has $\text{hol}_{A_j}(\infty) = g_j$, where A_j is the connection on E_j induced by A .

We claim that A_j is infinitesimally rigid. By Lemma 7.7, we have $\text{Ad } E_j = s_0\mathbb{R} \oplus s_1[L] \oplus s_2[L^2]$ with $s_0, s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and the induced connection reduces to each of the summands.

None of the $[L^i]$ for $i \geq 1$ admit parallel L^2 -sections, as otherwise $[L^i]$ would be topologically trivial which contradicts $c_1(L^i) \neq 0$, see [68, Theorem A.7]. Therefore, by the Weitzenböck formula,

$$\text{Ker}(\delta_{A_j}) \cap \Omega^1(s_1[L] \oplus s_2[L^2]) = 0 \subset \Omega^1(s_1[L] \oplus s_2[L^2]).$$

Because A on L is infinitesimally rigid, there exist no infinitesimal deformations in $\Omega^1(\text{Ad } L) = \Omega^1(\mathbb{R})$. Altogether:

$$\text{Ker}(\delta_{A_j}) = 0 \subset \Omega^1(s_0\mathbb{R} \oplus s_1[L] \oplus s_2[L^2]).$$

The data from (ii) in Definition 4.6 can be chosen arbitrarily. The construction for $j \in \{75, 76\}$ and $\text{hol}_\theta(\delta) =: g_j$ is analogous. \square

7.2 Examples with structure group $SO(3)$

In this section, we describe how to construct irreducible, infinitesimally rigid, and unobstructed flat connections with structure group $G = SO(3)$. We consider a representation $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow SO(3)$ with $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$ and such that the representatives of γ and δ commute, with at least one of them being non-trivial. By Remark 7.3, the representation is well-defined as long as the condition (7.2) is satisfied. As a result, ρ is completely determined by the images of $\gamma, \delta, \tau_4, \tau_5, \tau_8$, which generate a subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(3)$.

Recall involutions of $SO(3)$ are given by rotations of angle π , and two of them commute if and only if they are performed either along the same axis or along perpendicular axes. Therefore, the maximal number of commuting involutions in $SO(3)$ is three, and the image of the representation is a subgroup of $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$. By performing a change of basis—which corresponds to a gauge transformation of the connection—we can assume the subgroup consists of rotations around the

standard axes, which is precisely the Klein four-group $K = \langle a, b, c \rangle$, where:

$$a = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad b = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad c = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note each element of $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ is the infinitesimal generator of rotations on a certain plane and it is therefore only fixed by the adjoint action of rotations on the same plane. The adjoint action of a rotation of angle π around an axis which is perpendicular to that of the infinitesimal rotation results in a global change of sign. Taking the generators $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ defined by

$$u_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad u_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad u_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7.3)$$

one easily checks

$$\begin{aligned} a(u_1) &= u_1, & b(u_1) &= -u_1, & c(u_1) &= -u_1, \\ a(u_2) &= -u_2, & b(u_2) &= u_2, & c(u_2) &= -u_2, \\ a(u_3) &= -u_3, & b(u_3) &= -u_3, & c(u_3) &= u_3. \end{aligned}$$

Now we perform a detailed study of which connections are irreducible and unobstructed.

Lemma 7.9. *The connection associated with the representation ρ is irreducible if and only if there exist two elements within $\gamma, \delta, \tau_4, \tau_5, \tau_8$ with different non-trivial representatives.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.1, we need to study which elements of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}(3)$ are fixed by the adjoint representation of ρ .

If the image of $\gamma, \delta, \tau_4, \tau_5, \tau_8$ consists of a single rotation, then the elements of $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ infinitesimally generating that same rotation will be fixed by the adjoint representation and the connection will not be irreducible.

Conversely, if the image of $\gamma, \delta, \tau_4, \tau_5, \tau_8$ includes rotations around two different axes then no non-trivial elements of $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ can be fixed by the adjoint action and the connection will be irreducible. \square

Lemma 7.10. *The connection associated with the representation ρ is unobstructed if and only if one of the following is true:*

- *Two elements within τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 have different non-trivial representatives.*
- *The image of τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 has a single non-trivial representative and agrees with the image of γ, δ .*

Proof. Suppose first that there exist at least two elements within τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 with different non-trivial representatives. The holonomy representation of τ_i acts trivially on $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 8$, so by Lemma 7.1 it is enough to show

that no non-trivial elements of $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ are fixed by the adjoint action of all $\rho(\tau_i)$. This is immediate arguing analogously to the proof of Lemma 7.9.

Suppose now that τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 have precisely one non-trivial representative. In this case, there exists one element $g \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ such that the action of $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1, \dots, 8}$ on $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8) \otimes \mathfrak{so}(3)$ fixes precisely $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8) \otimes \langle g \rangle$. One then has to check whether $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ fix any of these elements.

If the image of γ, δ agrees with the image of τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 , then $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ act as the identity on g . However, 0 is the only common fixed vector of $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ in $\Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^8)$, and so in particular in $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8)$. Therefore, there are no non-zero elements in $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8) \otimes \mathfrak{so}(3)$ fixed by α, β, γ , and δ . By Lemma 7.1, the representation is unobstructed.

Assume the image of γ, δ does not agree with the image of τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 . This means that at least one of $\rho(\gamma)$ or $\rho(\delta)$ acts as -1 on g via the adjoint action, whereas the other element acts either trivially or as -1 . By Proposition 7.6, we conclude that the connection is obstructed.

It only remains to study the case where the image of τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 is trivial. Since the image of γ, δ is non-trivial, there exists some $g \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ for which the adjoint action of either $\rho(\gamma)$ or $\rho(\delta)$ acts with a minus sign. Once again, Proposition 7.6 shows that the connection is obstructed. \square

Combining Remark 7.4, Lemma 7.9 and Lemma 7.10 we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 7.11. *Let $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow SO(3)$ be a representation of the orbifold fundamental group with image a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(3)$, satisfying the condition (7.2), with $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$, at least one of $\rho(\gamma)$ or $\rho(\delta)$ non-trivial, and with $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ generating the whole image of ρ . Then, the flat connection associated with this representation is irreducible, infinitesimally rigid, and unobstructed.*

Remark 7.12. By a change of basis of $SO(3)$ we can always consider the Klein four-group K as the image of ρ and gauge transformations map the generators a, b, c to each other. The number of connections is the number of ways of assigning 1, a, b, c to $\rho(\gamma), \rho(\delta), \rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ in such a way that at least two out of $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ are different and not equal to 1, we do not have $\rho(\gamma) = \rho(\delta) = 1$, where then some will be gauge equivalent.

Up to gauge equivalence, there are 105 possibilities to do this. Here is how to arrive at this number by counting representations $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow K$: we get the number of representations satisfying the two criteria by taking the number of all representations minus the number of representations violating one of the criteria, and adding back in the representations which violate more than one

criterion, because we have multiply counted them.

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\{\rho\}| \\
& - |\{\rho : \rho(\gamma) = \rho(\delta) = 1\}| \\
& - |\{\rho : \rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8) \in \{1, a\}\}| \\
& - |\{\rho : \rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8) \in \{1, b\}\}| \\
& - |\{\rho : \rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8) \in \{1, c\}\}| \\
& + |\{\rho : \rho(\gamma) = \rho(\delta) = 1, \rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8) \in \{1, a\}\}| \\
& + |\{\rho : \rho(\gamma) = \rho(\delta) = 1, \rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8) \in \{1, b\}\}| \\
& + |\{\rho : \rho(\gamma) = \rho(\delta) = 1, \rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8) \in \{1, c\}\}| \\
& + 2 \cdot |\{\rho : \rho(\tau_4) = \rho(\tau_5) = \rho(\tau_8) = 1\}| \\
& - 2 \cdot |\{\rho : \rho \equiv 1\}| \\
& = 4^5 - 4^3 - 4^2 \cdot 2^3 - 4^2 \cdot 2^3 - 4^2 \cdot 2^3 + 2^3 + 2^3 + 2^3 + 2 \cdot 4^2 - 2 = 630
\end{aligned}$$

Before the first equality, we subtracted $2 \cdot |\{\rho : \rho \equiv 1\}|$ because we counted the trivial representation $1 - 4 + 5 = 2$ times and should have counted it zero times, because it is not an allowed solution. Each of these representations takes at least two non-identity values in K , so their stabiliser in

$$\text{Aut}(K) = \{f : K \rightarrow K : f(1) = 1, f \text{ bijective}\} \cong S_3$$

is trivial. Thus, these 630 representations are made up of 105 orbits of representations under the action of $\text{Aut}(K)$. That is, up to gauge equivalence, we have 105 flat connections to which our construction can be applied. An explicit list of 105 representations which give rise to flat connections that are not gauge equivalent is given in Appendix C. By Proposition 7.8, this gives rise to 105 new $Spin(7)$ -instantons.

Remark 7.13. If the representatives of γ and δ are not assumed to commute, further representations of the orbifold group can be obtained. Unfortunately, they can not be used for our construction and we show this in Appendix B.

Remark 7.14. Our construction cannot produce irreducible $Spin(7)$ -instantons with structure group $G = SU(2)$. Here is why: for the resulting connection to be irreducible, we would need either (a) the flat connection θ to be irreducible, or we would need (b) at least one of the glued in connections to have full holonomy $SU(2)$ and still be rigid.

Irreducible, flat $SU(2)$ -connections on T^8/Γ do not exist. The conditions $\alpha^2 = \beta^2 = \gamma^2 = \delta^2 = 1$ force $\rho(\alpha), \rho(\beta), \rho(\gamma), \rho(\delta) \in \{\pm 1\}$. The conditions $[\tau_i, \tau_j] = 1$ mean that $\tau_j \in Z(\tau_i)$, and if $\tau_i \neq 1$, then its centralizer satisfies $Z(\tau_i) \simeq U(1) \subset SU(2)$. I.e. ρ takes values in $U(1) \subset SU(2)$ and the corresponding connection is reducible. (One can even argue that the image of ρ is contained in $\{\pm 1\}$, but this is not needed here.)

Note however that all these connections are unobstructed. The condition $\rho(\alpha), \rho(\beta), \rho(\gamma), \rho(\delta) \in \{\pm 1\}$ implies that the adjoint action of these elements

is trivial on $\mathfrak{su}(2)$. Since 0 is the only element of $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8)$ fixed by the holonomy action of $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$, we find there are no non-trivial elements of $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8) \otimes \mathfrak{su}(2)$ fixed by ρ and the associated connection is unobstructed.

On the other hand, non-flat instantons with structure group $SU(2)$ on Eguchi–Hanson space always come in a positive dimensional moduli space, see [12, Equation 5.10].

7.3 Examples with structure group $SO(4)$

Analogously to the case $G = SO(3)$, we consider a representation $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow SO(4)$ with $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$ and such that $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\rho(\delta)$ commute—and at least one of them is non-trivial. Imposing the condition (7.2), we have that ρ is completely determined by the images of $\gamma, \delta, \tau_4, \tau_5, \tau_8$ and we know from Remark 7.3 that the image of the representation is a subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(4)$.

Remark 7.15. The maximal subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(4)$ is of the form $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$. To see this, note that the elements of $SO(4)$ are diagonalisable matrices and this means that a set of these matrices commutes with itself if and only if the matrices are simultaneously diagonalisable. Therefore, given a subgroup of commuting involutions, one can find a basis such that all the involutions are represented by a diagonal matrix. Diagonal involutions can only have the following entries in the diagonal:

$$\begin{array}{cccc} (1, 1, 1, 1), & (1, -1, -1, 1), & (-1, 1, -1, 1), & (-1, -1, 1, 1), \\ (-1, -1, -1, -1), & (-1, 1, 1, -1), & (1, -1, 1, -1), & (1, 1, -1, -1). \end{array}$$

Thus, there can be at most eight mutually commuting involutions and it is easy to verify they constitute a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup. We denote the above diagonal involutions as $1, a, b, c, -1, -a, -b, -c$, respectively, where $1, a, b, c$ form a Klein subgroup and, as the notation indicates, $-a$ is the product of a with the central inversion -1 . The central inversion -1 is a very special involution that has no analogous element in $SO(3)$. Every other non-trivial involution acts as a reflection on a 2-dimensional plane and as the identity on the orthogonal directions. Note any two different non-trivial involutions generate a Klein subgroup $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$.

Remark 7.16. There are two types of Klein subgroups in $SO(4)$. The first type is subgroups which include -1 . In this case, the other two non-trivial involutions act as reflections on planes orthogonal to each other. The second type of subgroups is characterized by the fact that any two non-trivial involutions act as reflections on planes that intersect at a line.

Each element of $\mathfrak{so}(4)$ is the infinitesimal generator of a 4-dimensional rotation. Rotations in 4 dimensions always leave invariant (at least) two orthogonal planes, so an element of $\mathfrak{so}(4)$ is fixed by the adjoint action of rotations that preserve precisely the same planes as the rotation generated by that element.

The action of an involution that does not preserve the same planes results in a global minus sign, similarly to the $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ case. In fact, all these statements can be explicitly checked by considering a basis analogous to the one considered for $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ in (7.3) and studying the action of the diagonal involutions.

Lemma 7.17. *The connection associated to the representation ρ is irreducible if and only if the image of ρ includes a Klein subgroup without the central inversion -1 .*

Proof. Using Lemma 7.1, the connection will be irreducible if and only if the adjoint action of the representation ρ fixes no elements of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}(4)$.

Suppose first that the image of the representation contains a Klein subgroup which does not include -1 . By Remark 7.16, the image of ρ includes two involutions that preserve different orthogonal planes. No non-zero elements of $\mathfrak{so}(4)$ can be simultaneously fixed by the adjoint action of these two elements, and as a result, the associated connection is irreducible.

Suppose that the image of the representation does not contain such a subgroup. In that case, the image is either generated by a single involution or it is a Klein subgroup containing -1 . In both cases, the image consists of rotations that preserve a pair of orthogonal planes. The adjoint action of these elements will preserve a 2-dimensional subspace of $\mathfrak{so}(4)$ given by the infinitesimal generators of rotations preserving those same planes. Therefore, the associated connection is not irreducible. \square

Lemma 7.18. *The connection associated with the representation ρ is unobstructed if and only if at least one of the following is true:*

- *Two elements within τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 generate a Klein subgroup not containing the central inversion -1 .*
- *The images of τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 and γ, δ are non-trivial and contained in a Klein subgroup that includes the central inversion -1 .*

Proof. By Lemma 7.1 we need to study the elements in $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8) \otimes \mathfrak{so}(4)$ fixed by the action of ρ . Suppose first that the image of τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 generates a Klein subgroup with no -1 . Recall the holonomy representation of τ_i on $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8)$ is trivial for all $i = 1, \dots, 8$, so it is enough to argue that no non-trivial elements of $\mathfrak{so}(4)$ are fixed by the adjoint action of all $\rho(\tau_i)$. Since the Klein subgroup does not contain -1 , this is indeed the case following the same argument as in Lemma 7.17 and the associated connection is unobstructed.

Otherwise, the image of τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 is either trivial, or it is generated by an involution, or it generates a Klein subgroup which contains -1 .

Assume first that the image of τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 is either generated by an involution or it generates a Klein subgroup containing -1 . In this case there is a 2-dimensional subspace $W \subset \mathfrak{so}(4)$ such that the elements of $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8) \otimes W$ are all fixed by the action of $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1, \dots, 8}$.

Suppose the image of γ, δ also acts trivially on W . This can happen in two cases: either the image of γ, δ is contained in the image of τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 , or the

image of τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 is generated by an involution and the image of $\tau_4, \tau_5, \tau_8, \gamma, \delta$ generates the Klein subgroup containing that same involution and -1 . In this situation, the action of $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ is trivial on W . However, 0 is the only common fixed vector of $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ in $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8)$ and this implies that no non-zero elements in $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8) \otimes \mathfrak{so}(4)$ are fixed by α, β, γ , and δ . Once again, Lemma 7.1 implies the corresponding connection is unobstructed.

Otherwise, the image of γ, δ acts non-trivially on W and there exists an element $g \in W$ such that at least one of $\rho(\gamma)$ or $\rho(\delta)$ acts with a global minus sign on g . Applying Proposition 7.6, we conclude that the connection is obstructed.

The only remaining case is supposing that the image of τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 is trivial. Since we are assuming that the image of γ, δ is non-trivial, there exists some $g \in \mathfrak{so}(4)$ for which the adjoint action of either $\rho(\gamma)$ or $\rho(\delta)$ acts with a minus sign. By Proposition 7.6, the connection is obstructed. \square

Combining Remark 7.4, Lemma 7.17 and Lemma 7.18 we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 7.19. *Let $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow SO(4)$ be a representation of the orbifold fundamental group with image a subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(4)$, satisfying the condition (7.2), with $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$, at least one of $\rho(\gamma)$ or $\rho(\delta)$ non-trivial, and with the image of $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ generating at least one Klein subgroup which does not include the central inversion -1 . Then, the flat connection associated to this representation is irreducible, infinitesimally rigid and unobstructed.*

Remark 7.20. After taking into account possible gauge equivalences, there are 882 different connections. A possible argument goes as follows: we want to count all possible representations up to gauge equivalence, so we give a set of rules to gauge transform any representation to a canonical configuration and we count how many of these configurations we have. Given a representation ρ , we choose a basis of $SO(4)$ such that the image of ρ are diagonal involutions.

First we change basis to gauge fix $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$, in that order. Our gauge fixing criteria is to impose that the first Klein subgroup not including -1 we encounter is generated by a and b . In this way, if $\rho(\tau_4) = 1$ or $\rho(\tau_4) = -1$ we do not change basis but in any other case we change basis so that $\rho(\tau_4) = a$. Note $\rho(\tau_4) = 1$ or $\rho(\tau_4) = -1$ immediately implies we must change basis so that $\rho(\tau_5) = a, \rho(\tau_8) = b$. If $\rho(\tau_4) = a$, we can have $\rho(\tau_5)$ equal to $1, -1, a, -a$ or otherwise we change basis so that $\rho(\tau_5) = b$. Exploring all possibilities in this way we obtain 14 different canonical configurations for $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$.

Now that the basis is fixed, so are $\rho(\gamma), \rho(\delta)$ and we just need to count how many possible canonical configurations we have. All possible pairs of $(\rho(\gamma), \rho(\delta))$ are allowed except for $(1, 1)$, that means there are $8^2 - 1 = 63$ different configurations. Combining the number of canonical configurations for $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ and $\rho(\gamma), \rho(\delta)$ we obtain $14 \cdot 63 = 882$ different possible representations which are not gauge equivalent. By Proposition 7.8, we obtain 882 additional $Spin(7)$ -instantons.

7.4 Examples with structure group $SO(5)$

For the next set of examples, consider a representation $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow SO(5)$ with $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$ and such that $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\rho(\delta)$ commute—and at least one of them is non-trivial. Once again we impose the condition (7.2) and ρ is completely determined by the images of $\gamma, \delta, \tau_4, \tau_5, \tau_8$. From Remark 7.3, the image of the representation is a subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(5)$.

Remark 7.21. The maximal subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(5)$ is of the form $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, this can be seen choosing a diagonal basis analogously to the $SO(4)$ case in Remark 7.15. There are two types of non-trivial involutions: those that act with a minus sign on a plane and those that act with a minus sign on a 4-dimensional subspace. It is also important to understand the two types of $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroups of commuting involutions.

The first type is characterized by acting trivially on a 1-dimensional subspace but acting non-trivially on every higher-dimensional subspace. They can be understood as subgroups of commuting involutions corresponding to a 4-dimensional subspace, and each of them is generated by 3 involutions which are non-trivial along 3 different planes that intersect on the same line. These are going to play a role analogous to the Klein subgroups that do not include the central inversion in the $SO(4)$ case. An example of such a subgroup is generated by diagonal matrices with entries

$$(-1, -1, 1, 1, 1), \quad (-1, 1, -1, 1, 1), \quad (-1, 1, 1, -1, 1).$$

The second type acts non-trivially on the full 5-dimensional space. Each of them is again generated by 3 involutions which are non-trivial along 3 different planes, however in this case two of the planes intersect at a line and the remaining plane is orthogonal to the other two. As a result, each of these subgroups preserves a 2-dimensional subspace. In the $SO(4)$ case the Klein subgroups with a central inversion played a role analogous to the one these groups will play. An example of such a subgroup is generated by diagonal matrices with entries

$$(-1, -1, 1, 1, 1), \quad (-1, 1, -1, 1, 1), \quad (1, 1, 1, -1, -1).$$

Each element of $\mathfrak{so}(5)$ is the infinitesimal generator of a 5-dimensional rotation. A generic 5-dimensional rotation has an axis of rotation and leaves invariant two planes orthogonal to each other and to the axis. However, the simplest possible rotations act trivially on one of the orthogonal planes and can be understood simply as a rotation on a 2-dimensional subspace. A basis of $\mathfrak{so}(5)$ is given by the infinitesimal generator of these simple rotations. Each of these elements is fixed by the adjoint action of rotations that preserve the plane of the rotation generated by the $\mathfrak{so}(5)$ element. On the other hand, it is not hard to see that an involution that does not preserve such a plane acts with a global minus sign, analogously to the $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ and $\mathfrak{so}(4)$ cases.

Lemma 7.22. *The connection associated to the representation ρ is irreducible if and only if the image of ρ includes a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup of involutions that acts trivially on a 1-dimensional subspace.*

Proof. Lemma 7.1 says the connection will be irreducible if and only if no elements of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}(5)$ are fixed by the adjoint representation of ρ .

Assume the image of ρ includes a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup acting trivially on a 1-dimensional subspace. Such a subgroup does not leave any plane invariant. Indeed: if one considers a plane including the trivial subspace, it is enough to consider an element of the group that acts non-trivially in the remaining direction of the plane. If one considers a plane contained in the 4-dimensional subspace where the group acts non-trivially, by Remark 7.21 we know there exists an element of the group that acts non-trivially in just a 1-dimensional subspace of that plane. Therefore, there are no invariant planes and the adjoint action of this group fixes no non-zero elements of $\mathfrak{so}(5)$. The associated connection is irreducible.

If this is not the case, the image of ρ is still a subgroup of commuting involutions. By Remark 7.21, it must be a subgroup of a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup which does not act trivially on the whole 5-dimensional space, and we know such a subgroup preserves a 2-dimensional subspace. As a result, in this case, there is at least one element of $\mathfrak{so}(5)$ fixed by the adjoint action of ρ , and the associated connection is not irreducible. \square

For $SO(5)$, a lemma analogous to Lemma 7.10 or Lemma 7.18 would have several different cases that we do not need to study in detail, so we present instead a simplified version:

Lemma 7.23. *Let ρ be a representation whose image includes a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup acting trivially on a 1-dimensional subspace. The associated connection is unobstructed if and only if τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 generate such a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup.*

Proof. Once again Lemma 7.1 tells us that we must study whether any elements in $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8) \otimes \mathfrak{so}(5)$ are fixed by the holonomy and the adjoint action of ρ .

" \Rightarrow ": We begin assuming that the image of τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 generates a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup that acts trivially on a 1-dimensional subspace. Since the holonomy representation of τ_i on $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8)$ is trivial for all $i = 1, \dots, 8$, only the $\mathfrak{so}(5)$ part is relevant. However, as we have shown in the proof of Lemma 7.22 when the image of ρ is such a subgroup no non-trivial elements are fixed by the adjoint action and we conclude that the associated connection is unobstructed.

" \Leftarrow ": Assume τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 do not generate a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup that acts trivially on a 1-dimensional subspace. Then the image of τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 must be a subgroup of a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup which acts non-trivially on the full 5-dimensional space. Furthermore, this subgroup must be non-trivial since $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\rho(\delta)$ cannot generate the whole image. From the discussion in the proof of Lemma 7.22, there is a subspace $W \subset \mathfrak{so}(5)$ such that the elements of $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8) \otimes W$ are all fixed by the action of $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1, \dots, 8}$. However, by Lemma 7.22 the image of $\{\gamma, \delta\}$ acts non-trivially on W and there exists an element $g \in W$ such that at least one of $\rho(\gamma)$ or $\rho(\delta)$ acts with a global minus sign on g . Using Proposition 7.6 we show the connection is obstructed in this case. \square

Now, Remark 7.4 together with Lemma 7.22 and Lemma 7.23 gives the following proposition.

Proposition 7.24. *Let $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow SO(5)$ be a representation of the orbifold fundamental group with image a subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(5)$, satisfying the condition (7.2), with $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$, at least one of $\rho(\gamma)$ or $\rho(\delta)$ non-trivial, and with the image of $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ generating a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup that acts trivially on a 1-dimensional subspace. Then, the flat connection associated with this representation is irreducible, infinitesimally rigid, and unobstructed.*

Remark 7.25. Up to gauge equivalence, there are 1785 such connections. We count them as in Remark 7.20: the first step is to change basis to gauge fix $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ and the $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup they generate. It is important to take into account that the subgroup can be generated by 3 involutions acting non-trivially on different planes, or by 2 such involutions and another one acting non-trivially on a 4-dimensional subspace. Denoting commuting elements in $SO(5)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} a_{12} &= \text{diag}(-1, -1, 1, 1, 1), a_{13} = \text{diag}(-1, 1, -1, 1, 1), \dots, \\ a_{45} &= \text{diag}(1, 1, 1, -1, -1). \end{aligned}$$

and

$$b_1 = \text{diag}(1, -1, -1, -1, -1), \dots, b_5 = \text{diag}(-1, -1, -1, -1, 1)$$

we obtain the following 7 configurations for $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ that are not gauge equivalent:

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)) \in \{ & (a_{12}, a_{13}, a_{14}), (a_{12}, a_{13}, a_{24}), (a_{12}, a_{13}, a_{34}), \\ & (a_{12}, a_{13}, b_5), (a_{12}, a_{34}, a_{13}), (a_{12}, b_5, a_{13}), \\ & (b_5, a_{12}, a_{13}) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, each element in the pair $(\rho(\gamma), \rho(\delta))$ can be equal to any of the 16 elements of $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^4$, with the only restriction of $(1, 1)$ not being allowed. This gives $16^2 - 1 = 255$ configurations, which combined with the previous ones result in $7 \cdot 255 = 1785$ non-equivalent representations. Thus, we find 1785 $Spin(7)$ -instantons thanks to Proposition 7.8.

7.5 Examples with structure group $SO(7)$

As we show later in Proposition 7.34, our method does not immediately provide irreducible $Spin(7)$ -instantons with structure group $SO(6)$ when the image of the representation is an abelian subgroup. Therefore, for the next set of examples we focus on $SO(7)$.

Consider a representation $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow SO(7)$ with $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$, $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\rho(\delta)$ commuting and at least one of $\rho(\gamma), \rho(\delta)$ non-trivial. From Remark 7.3, the representation ρ is completely determined by the images of $\gamma, \delta, \tau_4, \tau_5, \tau_8$ and is a subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(7)$.

We work on a basis of \mathbb{R}^7 where the image of ρ is given by diagonal matrices with entries ± 1 . Non-trivial involutions can have 2, 4 or 6 minus signs, and

accordingly preserve 2-, 4- or 6-dimensional subspaces of \mathbb{R}^7 as well as the subspaces orthogonal to those. There are $2^6 = 64$ different commuting involutions (also counting the identity here). The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(7)$ is generated by the infinitesimal generators of rotations on planes. Similarly to other $SO(n)$ groups, the adjoint action of an involution fixes the generators of $\mathfrak{so}(7)$ that give rise to rotations on planes preserved by that involution, whereas the action on all other generators is a global minus sign.

Proposition 7.26. *If the connection associated with ρ is irreducible and unobstructed, then up to gauge equivalence the images of τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 are fixed. In a convenient basis, the diagonal entries of the matrices can be taken to be, respectively: $(-1, -1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1)$, $(-1, -1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1)$ and $(1, -1, -1, 1, 1, -1, -1)$.*

Proof. From Lemma 7.1 we know the image of ρ must fix no elements of $\mathfrak{so}(7)$ to have an irreducible connection. This means that if the image of $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1,\dots,8}$ fixes some element of $\mathfrak{so}(7)$, then either $\rho(\gamma)$ or $\rho(\delta)$ must act non-trivially on that element. Nevertheless, by Proposition 7.6 this would mean that the associated connection is obstructed. Therefore, the representation associated to an irreducible and unobstructed connection must satisfy that $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ fix no elements of $\mathfrak{so}(7)$.

If any of $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ is trivial or has either 2 or 6 minus signs, at least a plane in \mathbb{R}^7 is preserved by $\{\rho(\tau_i)\}_{i=1,\dots,8}$ and an element of $\mathfrak{so}(7)$ is fixed. Indeed: assume without loss of generality that $\rho(\tau_4)$ has 2 or 6 minus signs. Then it preserves at least a 5-dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^7 , and for dimensional reasons $\rho(\tau_5)$ and $\rho(\tau_8)$ preserve a plane inside that subspace.

Therefore, $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ are all involutions with 4 minus signs. Consider first the 4-dimensional space preserved by $\rho(\tau_4)$. We can only have no fixed planes in that subspace if $\rho(\tau_5)$ and $\rho(\tau_8)$ each act with minus signs on 2-dimensional subspaces that intersect on a line. Similarly, consider the 3-dimensional space preserved by $\rho(\tau_4)$. We have that $\rho(\tau_5)$ and $\rho(\tau_8)$ each act as -1 on a plane within that subspace, so we require those planes to intersect only on a line.

Now the image of $\{\rho(\tau_i)\}_{i=1,\dots,8}$ does not fix any elements of $\mathfrak{so}(7)$ and the associated connection is indeed irreducible and unobstructed—irrespective of the image of γ and δ . By simply reordering the \mathbb{R}^7 basis, $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ can be brought to the desired form. \square

Note Proposition 7.26 together with Remark 7.4 determine the valid representations for our construction.

Proposition 7.27. *Let $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow SO(7)$ be a representation of the orbifold fundamental group with image a subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(7)$, satisfying the condition (7.2), with $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$, at least one of $\rho(\gamma)$ or $\rho(\delta)$ non-trivial, and with $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ being gauge equivalent to the matrices in Proposition 7.26. Then, the flat connection associated with this representation is irreducible, infinitesimally rigid, and unobstructed.*

Remark 7.28. We can construct 4095 of these connections, up to gauge equivalence. First, we gauge fix $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ as in Proposition 7.26. Then, each coordinate is uniquely fixed, and different values of $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\rho(\delta)$ correspond to connections which are not gauge equivalent. We have 64 possible choices for each, but we do not allow both to be trivial simultaneously. This gives $64^2 - 1 = 4095$ inequivalent connections, and by Proposition 7.8 they produce 4095 new $Spin(7)$ -instantons.

7.6 Examples with structure group $SO(8)$

This is the last set of examples we present, since we will show in Proposition 7.35 that, under the assumption that the image of ρ is a commuting subgroup, our method does not immediately produce irreducible $Spin(7)$ -instantons when choosing a structure group $G = SO(n)$ with $n \geq 9$.

Therefore, we consider a representation $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow SO(8)$ with $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$ and such that $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\rho(\delta)$ commute—and at least one of them is non-trivial. Imposing the condition (7.2) we have that ρ is completely determined by the images of $\gamma, \delta, \tau_4, \tau_5, \tau_8$ and Remark 7.3 implies that the image of ρ is a subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(8)$.

The analysis of this section will be very similar to that of Section 7.5. We again work on a basis of \mathbb{R}^8 where the commuting involutions take the form of diagonal matrices with either $+1$ or -1 entries. There are $2^7 = 128$ of them and, apart from the identity and the central inversion -1 , they can have either 2, 4 or 6 minus signs. As in the $SO(6)$ case, these preserve 2-, 4- or 6-dimensional subspaces as well as the orthogonal subspaces, and they act on generators of $\mathfrak{so}(8)$ as ± 1 depending on whether the plane of the generated rotation is contained within a preserved subspace or not.

Proposition 7.29. *If the connection associated to ρ is irreducible and unobstructed, then up to gauge equivalence the images of τ_4, τ_5, τ_8 are fixed. In a convenient basis, the diagonal entries of the matrices can be taken to be, respectively: $(-1, -1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$, $(-1, -1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1, 1)$ and $(1, -1, -1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1)$.*

Proof. Since the connection is irreducible, we know from Lemma 7.1 that the image of ρ must fix no non-zero elements of $\mathfrak{so}(8)$. Suppose the image of $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1, \dots, 8}$ fixes some element of $\mathfrak{so}(8)$, then either $\rho(\gamma)$ or $\rho(\delta)$ act non-trivially on that element. By Proposition 7.6 the associated connection is obstructed and we reach a contradiction. Thus, the representation associated to an irreducible and unobstructed connection must satisfy that $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ fix no elements of $\mathfrak{so}(8)$.

If any of $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ is equal to the identity, -1 , or an involution with 2 or 6 minus signs, then an element of $\mathfrak{so}(8)$ is fixed by $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1, \dots, 8}$. This is because that element would preserve a 6-dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^8 , and just by dimensional reasons the other two elements would preserve at least a plane within this subspace.

This means $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ are involutions with 4 minus signs. As a result, $\rho(\tau_4)$ preserves two 4-dimensional subspaces and it must be the case that

for each of them $\rho(\tau_5)$ and $\rho(\tau_8)$ act with minus signs on 2-dimensional subspaces that intersect on a line. Otherwise, we could find a plane preserved by $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ and we would conclude that an element of $\mathfrak{so}(8)$ is fixed by $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1, \dots, 8}$.

Upon reordering the \mathbb{R}^8 basis, $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ can be brought to the desired form, showing the result. \square

Note that the condition on $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1, \dots, 8}$ in Proposition 7.29 actually characterizes irreducible and unobstructed connections with structure group $SO(8)$. Together with Remark 7.4, we see they are all valid for our construction.

Proposition 7.30. *Let $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow SO(8)$ be a representation of the orbifold fundamental group with image a subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(8)$, satisfying the condition (7.2), with $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$, at least one of $\rho(\gamma)$ or $\rho(\delta)$ non-trivial, and with $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ being gauge equivalent to the matrices in Proposition 7.29. Then, the flat connection associated to this representation is irreducible, infinitesimally rigid and unobstructed.*

Remark 7.31. Up to gauge equivalence there are 16383 of these connections. This is because after gauge fixing $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ as in Proposition 7.29. each possible choice of $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\rho(\delta)$ determines non-equivalent connections. Excluding the case where both elements have a trivial representation, we obtain $128^2 - 1 = 16383$ possibilities. By Proposition 7.8 we obtain 16383 new $Spin(7)$ -instantons.

7.7 Other cases among $SO(\mathfrak{n})$'s

First of all, we consider the case $G = SO(2) = U(1)$.

Proposition 7.32. *Consider a representation $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow SO(2)$. The associated connection is infinitesimally rigid and unobstructed, but it is always reducible.*

Proof. Since $SO(2)$ is abelian, Lemma 7.2 implies that the image of ρ is a subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(2)$ and it is therefore contained in $\{\pm 1\}$. This shows the adjoint representation of $\pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma)$ acts trivially on $\mathfrak{so}(2)$ and by Lemma 7.1 the associated connection is reducible. On the other hand, the holonomy representation of $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ leaves no non-zero elements of \mathbb{R}^8 and $\Lambda_7^2(\mathbb{R}^8)$ fixed and again by Lemma 7.1 we conclude that the associated connection is infinitesimally rigid and unobstructed. \square

Remark 7.33. Setting $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$, by Remark 7.3 we see a representation is completely determined by choosing $\gamma, \delta, \tau_4, \tau_5, \tau_8 \in \{\pm 1\}$. Since at least one of $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\rho(\delta)$ must be non-trivial, we obtain $(2^2 - 1)2^3 = 24$ non-equivalent flat connections. They can be extended to compatible gluing data by Proposition 7.8. Theorem 6.7 guarantees the existence of $Spin(7)$ -instantons with structure group $SO(2)$ even though θ is reducible, thanks to eq. (6.19) and following. A priori, the resulting $Spin(7)$ -instanton $A_t := A_t + a_t$ could be

reducible, which would imply that it is flat. There are different ways to see this cannot occur: one is that by Remark 4.7 we have that $p_1(E_t) \neq 0$ if at least one of $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\rho(\delta)$ is non-trivial, so the Chern-Weil representative of $p_1(E_t)$ is non-zero, i.e. \hat{A}_t has non-zero curvature. Note that the existence of \hat{A}_t was already known on abstract grounds, because for each harmonic $\omega \in \Omega^2(M)$ there exists a line bundle with connection ∇ , such that $F_\nabla = \omega$. By [65, Proposition 10.6.5], $0 = \pi_7^2(\omega) = \pi_7^2(F_\nabla)$, and ∇ is a $Spin(7)$ -instanton. However, the precise description of ∇ in terms of our gluing theorem is new.

SO(6). Now we comment on the case $G = SO(6)$ and show that a commuting representation does not immediately produce irreducible $Spin(7)$ -instantons with our method. The reason is that we cannot find any irreducible and unobstructed flat connections on the orbifold with $G = SO(6)$.

Proposition 7.34. *Consider a representation $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow SO(6)$ such that $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$ and the representatives of γ and δ commute. The associated connection can not be simultaneously irreducible and unobstructed.*

Proof. We showed in Remark 7.3 that the image of ρ must be a subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(6)$. It is illustrative to work in a basis where these involutions are given by diagonal matrices such that all non-zero entries are equal to 1 except for an even number of -1 entries. Note all these involutions preserve a 2-dimensional subspace and the complementary 4-dimensional subspace when acting on \mathbb{R}^6 , with action given by ± 1 on each subspace.

As a first step, we want to show that the subgroup $\{\rho(\tau_i)\}_{i=1,\dots,8}$, which by the condition (7.2) is generated by $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$, preserves at least a 2-dimensional subspace. Consider a 4-dimensional subspace S preserved by $\rho(\tau_4)$. If it contains a 2-dimensional subspace which is also preserved by $\rho(\tau_5)$ and $\rho(\tau_8)$, we are done. Otherwise, it must be the case that the 2-dimensional subspaces preserved by $\rho(\tau_5)$ and $\rho(\tau_8)$ intersect on a 1-dimensional subspace and are fully contained in S . As a result, the 2-dimensional subspace orthogonal to S is preserved by $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$ finishing the first step of the proof.

Let us take an element $g \in \mathfrak{so}(6)$ corresponding to an infinitesimal generator of rotations on the invariant plane under $\{\rho(\tau_i)\}_{i=1,\dots,8}$. It is immediate to conclude that the adjoint action of $\{\rho(\tau_i)\}_{i=1,\dots,8}$ fixes g .

If the adjoint action of both γ and δ fixes g , then the adjoint action of the whole representation fixes $g \in \mathfrak{so}(6)$ and Lemma 7.1 implies the associated connection is not irreducible.

Assume instead that the associated connection is irreducible, it must then be the case that at least one of $\rho(\gamma), \rho(\delta)$ acts as -1 on g . By Proposition 7.6, the connection is obstructed. \square

SO(n) for $n \geq 9$. We show that we can not immediately obtain irreducible $Spin(7)$ -instantons with gauge group $SO(n)$ for $n \geq 9$ through a commuting representation. The reasoning is analogous to the $SO(6)$ case: all the allowed representations correspond to connections which can not be irreducible and unobstructed.

Proposition 7.35. *Consider a representation $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow SO(n)$ with $n \geq 9$ such that $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$ and the representatives of γ and δ commute. The associated connection cannot be simultaneously irreducible and unobstructed.*

Proof. Recall from Remark 7.3 that the image of ρ is a subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(n)$. Changing to a convenient basis, these elements can be written as diagonal matrices with an even number of -1 entries and 1 in the remaining entries. We first focus on the subgroup $\{\rho(\tau_i)\}_{i=1,\dots,8}$. From the condition (7.2) we see this group is generated by $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$, which are at most 3 different elements.

We study the action of these involutions on \mathbb{R}^n . An involution with $2k$ minus signs preserves a subspace of dimension $2k$ and the complementary subspace of dimension $n - 2k$. Therefore, by dimensional reasons, $\rho(\tau_4)$ preserves at least a 5-dimensional subspace. Note that the action of $\rho(\tau_5)$ and $\rho(\tau_8)$ on this subspace always leaves a 2-dimensional subspace invariant. This can be seen as follows: $\rho(\tau_5)$ and $\rho(\tau_8)$ act as ± 1 on the coordinates corresponding to the adapted basis. Again by dimensional reasons, there must be at least 2 coordinates x_1, x_2 for which $\rho(\tau_5)(x_1) = \rho(\tau_5)(x_2)$ and $\rho(\tau_8)(x_1) = \rho(\tau_8)(x_2)$.

We have thus shown that there always exists a plane in \mathbb{R}^n with coordinates (x_1, x_2) that is invariant under $\rho(\tau_4), \rho(\tau_5), \rho(\tau_8)$. Consider an element $g \in \mathfrak{so}(n)$ corresponding to an infinitesimal generator of rotations on that plane. For example, we can take g as the matrix sending x_1 to x_2 , x_2 to $-x_1$ and with zeroes in all other entries. The adjoint action of $\{\rho(\tau_i)\}_{i=1,\dots,8}$ fixes g .

If the adjoint action of both γ and δ is trivial on g , then $g \in \mathfrak{so}(n)$ is fixed by the adjoint representation of ρ and by Lemma 7.1 the associated connection is not irreducible.

Suppose the associated connection is irreducible. This means that at least one of $\rho(\gamma), \rho(\delta)$ must act non-trivially on g . For this to happen, such involution must not preserve the plane with coordinates (x_1, x_2) , which means it acts on the coordinates with opposite signs. It is then immediate to check that the adjoint action of the element must send g to $-g$. We can now use Proposition 7.6 to conclude that the connection is obstructed. \square

The non-commutative case. So far, we have focused on representations on $G = SO(n)$ for which the representatives of γ and δ commute. The following proposition shows that without this assumption the associated flat connection is obstructed and cannot produce new $Spin(7)$ -instantons via our method. An alternative proof in the case $G = SO(3)$ can be found in Appendix B.

Proposition 7.36. *Consider a representation $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow SO(n)$ with $n \geq 3$ such that $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$ and such that the representatives of γ and δ do not commute. Then the associated connection is obstructed.*

Proof. By Remark 7.3, requiring $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$ implies that $\{\rho(\tau_i)\}_{i=1,\dots,8}$ are commuting involutions that commute with both the involutions $\rho(\gamma)$ and

$\rho(\delta)$. Since $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\rho(\delta)$ do not commute, by Lemma 7.2 $\rho(\tau_1)$ can not be equal to the identity and we have that

$$[\rho(\gamma), \rho(\delta)] = \rho(\tau_1) \implies \rho(\gamma)\rho(\delta) = \rho(\tau_1)\rho(\delta)\rho(\gamma). \quad (7.4)$$

Consider a basis of \mathbb{R}^n where $\{\rho(\tau_i)\}_{i=1,\dots,8}$ and $\rho(\gamma)$ are given by diagonal matrices with ± 1 entries, and such that $\rho(\tau_1)$ has -1 in the first p diagonal entries and 1 in the remaining $n - p$, where $0 < p \leq n$. Reordering the first p basis elements if necessary, we can further assume that $\rho(\gamma)$ has -1 in the first q diagonal entries and 1 in the following $p - q$, where $0 \leq q \leq p$.

Since $\rho(\delta)$ commutes with $\rho(\tau_1)$, it must be the case that $\rho(\delta)$ in the basis we are considering is a block diagonal matrix with two blocks M_1 and M_2 of sizes $p \times p$ and $(n - p) \times (n - p)$, matching the entries with -1 or $+1$ in $\rho(\tau_1)$. Note M_1 and M_2 are orthogonal matrices (with the same determinant) and they are also involutions. This implies they are symmetric matrices.

$$\rho(\delta) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} M_1 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & M_2 \end{array} \right). \quad (7.5)$$

We focus now on the subspace \mathbb{R}^p of \mathbb{R}^n given by the first p coordinates. Equation (7.4) can be rewritten as $\rho(\gamma)|_{\mathbb{R}^p} \cdot M_1 = -M_1 \cdot \rho(\gamma)|_{\mathbb{R}^p}$, where $\rho(\gamma)|_{\mathbb{R}^p}$ is a block diagonal matrix with a $q \times q$ block equal to minus the identity and a $(p - q) \times (p - q)$ block equal to the identity. Decomposing M_1 as a symmetric block matrix matching the block structure of $\rho(\gamma)|_{\mathbb{R}^p}$, this equation implies that the diagonal blocks of M_1 must vanish. Furthermore, since M_1 is not singular it must be the case that the off-diagonal blocks are square matrices, this means $q = p - q$ (which forces $p = 2q$) and we can write

$$M_1 = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & B \\ \hline -B^T & 0 \end{array} \right), \quad (7.6)$$

where B is a $q \times q$ orthogonal matrix (not necessarily involutive). Consider the following element $g \in \mathfrak{so}(n)$, which we write as a block matrix splitting n into $(q, q, n - 2q)$

$$g = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} 0 & -B & 0 \\ \hline B^T & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right), \quad (7.7)$$

We now study the adjoint action of the elements of $\pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma)$ on g . By direct computation, we see $\rho(\delta)$ acts on g with a global minus sign. Since $\{\rho(\tau_i)\}_{i=1,\dots,8}$ and $\rho(\gamma)$ are diagonal matrices, we can restrict to the subspace $\mathbb{R}^p = \mathbb{R}^{2q}$ where g is non-trivial to determine the action. Using the block decomposition of $\rho(\gamma)|_{\mathbb{R}^p}$ and $\rho(\tau_1)|_{\mathbb{R}^p}$, we find by direct computation that $\rho(\gamma)$ acts on g with a global minus sign whereas $\rho(\tau_1)$ acts as the identity.

Now, each $\rho(\tau_i)|_{\mathbb{R}^p}$ is a diagonal matrix that commutes with M_1 . Equivalently, M_1 is fixed under conjugation by $\rho(\tau_i)|_{\mathbb{R}^p}$ and it is immediate to see that so is $g|_{\mathbb{R}^p}$. Therefore, $\rho(\tau_i)$ acts trivially on g via the adjoint action.

The element g satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition 7.6 and we conclude that the associated connection is obstructed. \square

A Anti-self-dual instantons on ALE spaces

The ASD instantons on ALE spaces are well understood due to the intensive studies by Nakajima [77], Kronheimer–Nakajima [68], Gocho–Nakajima [48] and others. Walpuski gives an excellent overview on them in [97, Section 2.2]. For the reader’s convenience, we list some facts which we use in this paper. The following are taken from [97, Section 2.2].

Let Γ be a finite subgroup of $SU(2)$, let X be an ALE space asymptotic to \mathbb{C}^2/Γ with projection $\rho : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2/\Gamma$, and let E be a G -bundle over X .

Definition A.1. A *framing at infinity* of E is a bundle isomorphism $\Phi : E_\infty|_U \rightarrow \rho_*E|_U$ where E_∞ is a G -bundle over $(\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\})/\Gamma$ and U is the complement of a compact neighbourhood of the singular point in \mathbb{C}^2/Γ .

Let θ be a flat connection on a G -bundle E_∞ over $(\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\})/\Gamma$.

Definition A.2. Let $\Phi : E_\infty|_U \rightarrow \rho_*E|_U$ be a framing at infinity of E . Then a connection $A \in \mathcal{A}(E)$ is called *asymptotic to θ at rate δ with respect to Φ* if

$$\nabla^k(\Phi^*A - \theta)(x) = O(|\rho(x)|^{\delta-k}) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

for all $k \geq 0$. Here ∇ is the covariant derivative associated with θ .

We exhibit next two propositions from [97].

Proposition A.3 (Proposition 2.36 in [97]). *Let $A \in \mathcal{A}(E)$ be a Yang–Mills connection on E with finite energy, then there is a G -bundle E_∞ over $(\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\})/\Gamma$ together with a flat connection θ and a framing $\Phi : E_\infty|_U \rightarrow \rho_*E|_U$ such that eq. (A.1) holds with $\delta = -3$.*

Proposition A.4 (Proposition 2.41 in [97]). *Let $A \in \mathcal{A}(E)$ be a finite energy ASD instanton on E . Then the following holds:*

1. *If $a \in \text{Ker } \delta_A$ decays to zero at infinity, i.e., $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\rho(x)=r} |a|(x) = 0$, then $\nabla_A^k a = \mathcal{O}(|\rho|^{-3-k})$ for all $k \geq 0$.*
2. *If $(\xi, \omega) \in \text{Ker } \delta_A^*$ decays to zero at infinity, then $(\xi, \omega) = 0$.*

We use the following explicit example of an ASD instanton on Eguchi–Hanson space by Gocho–Nakajima:

Proposition A.5 (Section 2 in [48], see also Lemma 7.1 in [68]). *There exists a $U(1)$ -bundle on Eguchi–Hanson space carrying a connection that*

1. *has finite energy,*
2. *is an infinitesimally rigid ASD instanton,*
3. *is asymptotic to the flat connection defined by the representation $\rho : \mathbb{Z}_2 \rightarrow U(1)$ given by $\rho(-1) = -1$.*

B Flat $SO(3)$ -connections via non-commutative representations

In Section 7.2, we have described flat orbifold connections with structure group $SO(3)$ coming from a commutative representation. In this Appendix, we give a geometric description of representations that do not commute and explain why the associated flat connections cannot be used in our construction.

Note that if we assume that the image of the representation is an abelian subgroup, it is not hard to show that the image must be a subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(3)$. The representation is then completely determined by the conditions (7.2) and the images of $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \tau_4, \tau_5, \tau_8$, which must be rotations of angle π along orthogonal axes.

We now drop the assumption of commutativity. Conditions 4 and 5 in Lemma 7.2 imply that, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, 8\}$, $\rho(\tau_i)$ is equal to its inverse after conjugation by a rotation. Since a rotation and its conjugate have the same angle, this implies $\rho(\tau_i)$ and its inverse are rotations with the same angle. This is only possible when the angle is π (or 0) and therefore $\rho(\tau_i)$ is an involution. Thus, the image of $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1, \dots, 8}$ must still be a subgroup of commuting involutions of $SO(3)$.

Suppose now that the images of two elements $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\} \in \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta\}$ do not commute. Note that by condition 3 in Lemma 7.2 we can not choose $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\} \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$. Moreover, combining this condition with the fact that the images of all the elements are involutions we conclude that $\rho(\alpha_1)\rho(\alpha_2)$ must square to a rotation of angle π . This can only happen if $\rho(\alpha_1)$ and $\rho(\alpha_2)$ are rotations of angle π whose product is a rotation of angle $\pi/2$ or $3\pi/2$. Given two rotations of angles θ_1 and θ_2 around axes \hat{v}_1 and \hat{v}_2 , their product is a rotation of angle θ around an axis \hat{v} given by the formulas

$$\begin{aligned} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} &= \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} - \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} \hat{v}_1 \cdot \hat{v}_2, \\ \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \hat{v} &= \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} \hat{v}_1 + \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} \hat{v}_2 + \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} \hat{v}_1 \times \hat{v}_2. \end{aligned}$$

These formulas are easily obtained using quaternions to represent the rotations. It is then not hard to see that $\rho(\alpha_1)\rho(\alpha_2)$ is a rotation of angle $\pi/2$ or $3\pi/2$ when $\rho(\alpha_1)$ and $\rho(\alpha_2)$ are at an angle of $\pi/4$ or $3\pi/4$. Furthermore, $\rho(\alpha_1)\rho(\alpha_2)$ is a rotation around the axis perpendicular to the axes of both $\rho(\alpha_1)$ and $\rho(\alpha_2)$.

Lemma 7.2 forces the involutions $\rho(\tau_i)$ to commute with $\rho(\alpha_1)$ and $\rho(\alpha_2)$. As a result, each $\rho(\tau_i)$ is equal to either 1 or a rotation of angle π around the axis of rotation perpendicular to those of $\rho(\alpha_1)$ and $\rho(\alpha_2)$. In fact, Lemma 7.2 imposes further constraints on the $\rho(\tau_i)$ as well as on the $\rho(\alpha), \rho(\beta), \rho(\gamma), \rho(\delta)$, and the following proposition shows that these representations can not be used to produce $Spin(7)$ -instantons in our construction.

Proposition B.1. *Given a non-commutative representation $\rho : \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(T^8/\Gamma) \rightarrow SO(3)$ with $\rho(\alpha) = \rho(\beta) = 1$, the associated connection is always obstructed.*

(-c, c, a, b, -1), (-c, c, a, b, -c), (-c, c, a, -1, b), (-c, c, a, -b, b), (-c, c, -1, a, b), (-c, c, -a, a, -b), (-c, c, -a, -a, -b), (-c, c, -a, -b, -a), (-c, -1, 1, -a, -b), (-c, -1, a, 1, b), (-c, -1, a, b, 1), (-c, -1, a, b, b), (-c, -1, a, b, -1), (-c, -1, a, b, -c), (-c, -1, a, -1, b), (-c, -1, a, -b, b), (-c, -1, -1, a, b), (-c, -1, -a, a, -b), (-c, -1, -a, -a, -b), (-c, -1, -a, -b, -a), (-c, -a, 1, b, a), (-c, -a, 1, -b, -a), (-c, -a, 1, -c, -b), (-c, -a, a, 1, b), (-c, -a, a, b, -a), (-c, -a, b, 1, c), (-c, -a, b, a, 1), (-c, -a, b, a, b), (-c, -a, b, c, 1), (-c, -a, b, c, -a), (-c, -a, c, b, -1), (-c, -a, c, -1, b), (-c, -a, -1, -a, -b), (-c, -a, -a, 1, -b), (-c, -a, -a, -a, -b), (-c, -a, -a, -b, -a), (-c, -a, -b, a, b), (-c, -a, -b, -a, 1), (-c, -a, -b, -a, -1), (-c, -a, -b, -b, -c), (-c, -a, -b, -c, -b), (-c, -a, -c, a, -b), (-c, -a, -c, -c, -b), (-c, -c, 1, a, b), (-c, -c, a, 1, b), (-c, -c, a, a, b), (-c, -c, a, b, 1), (-c, -c, a, b, a), (-c, -c, a, b, b), (-c, -c, a, b, -1), (-c, -c, a, b, -c), (-c, -c, a, -1, b), (-c, -c, a, -b, b), (-c, -c, -1, a, b), (-c, -c, -a, c, -b), (-c, -c, -a, -c, b)}

References

- [1] B. S. Acharya, *$\mathcal{N} = 1$ heterotic/M-theory duality and Joyce manifolds*, Nuclear Phys. B 475 (1996), 579–596. arXiv:hep-th/9603033.
- [2] B. S. Acharya, *On mirror symmetry for manifolds of exceptional holonomy*, Nuclear Phys. B 524 (1998), 269–282. arXiv:hep-th/9707186.
- [3] B. S. Acharya, J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, M. O’Loughlin, and B. Spence, *Euclidean D-branes and higher-dimensional gauge theory*, Nuclear Phys. B 514 (1998), 583–602. arXiv:hep-th/9707118.
- [4] B. S. Acharya and M. O’Loughlin, *Selfduality in $(D \leq 8)$ -dimensional Euclidean gravity*, Phys. Rev. D (3) 55 (1997), R4521–R4524.
- [5] B. S. Acharya, M. O’Loughlin, and B. Spence, *Higher-dimensional analogues of Donaldson–Witten theory*, Nuclear Phys. B, 503 (1997), 657–674. hep-th/9705138.
- [6] L. B. Anderson, J. Gray, A. Lukas, and B. Ovrut, *The Atiyah Class and Complex Structure Stabilization in Heterotic Calabi-Yau Compactifications*, J. High Energy Phys. 2011, 32. arXiv:1107.5076.
- [7] I. Bakas, E. G. Floratos, and A. Kehagias, *Octonionic gravitational instantons*, Phys. Lett. B 445 (1998), 69–76.
- [8] L. Baulieu, H. Kanno, and I. M. Singer, *Special quantum field theories in eight and other dimensions*, Comm. Math. Phys. 194 (1998), 149–175. hep-th/9704167.
- [9] K. Becker, *A note on compactifications on Spin(7)-holonomy manifolds*, J. High Energy Phys. 2001, Paper 3. arXiv:hep-th/0011114.
- [10] K. Becker, M. Becker, D. R. Morrison, H. Ooguri, Y. Oz, and Z. Yin., *Supersymmetric cycles in exceptional holonomy manifolds and Calabi-Yau 4 folds*, Nuclear Phys. B 480 (1996), no. 1-2, 225–238. arXiv:hep-th/9608116.
- [11] M. Berger, *Sur les groupes d’holonomie homogène des variétés à connexion affine et des variétés riemanniennes*, Bull. Soc. Math. France 83 (1955), 279–330.
- [12] M. Bianchi, F. Fucito, G. Rossi, and M. Martellini, *Explicit construction of Yang-Mills instantons on ALE spaces*, Nuclear Phys. B 473 (1996), no. 1-2, 367–404. arXiv:hep-th/9601162.

- [13] A. H. Bilge, *Solution and ellipticity properties of the self-duality equations of Corrigan et al. in eight dimensions.*, Internat. J. Theoret. Phys. 35 (1996), 2507–2515.
- [14] A. H. Bilge, T. Dereli, and S. Koçak, *Monopole equations on 8-manifolds with Spin(7) holonomy*, Comm. Math. Phys. 203 (1999), 21–30.
- [15] F. Bonetti, T. W. Grimm, E. Palti, and T. G. Pugh, *F-Theory on Spin(7) Manifolds: Weak-Coupling Limit*, J. High Energy Phys. 2014, 76. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1309.2287>
- [16] D. Borisov and D. Joyce, *Virtual fundamental classes for moduli spaces of sheaves on Calabi–Yau four-folds*, Geometry and Topology 21 (2017), 3231–3311. arXiv:1504.00690.
- [17] A. P. Braun and S. Schäfer-Nameki, *Spin(7)-manifolds as generalized connected sums and 3d $\mathcal{N} = 1$ theories*, J. High Energy Phys. 2018, 103. arXiv:1803.10755.
- [18] S. Brendle, *Complex anti-self-dual instantons and Cayley submanifolds*, preprint, 2003. arXiv:math/0302094.
- [19] R. L. Bryant, *Metrics with exceptional holonomy*, Ann. of Math. 126 (1987), 525–576.
- [20] R. L. Bryant and S. M. Salamon, *On the construction of some complete metrics with exceptional holonomy*, Duke Math. J. 58 (1989), 829–850.
- [21] P. Candelas, G. T. Horowitz, A. Strominger, and E. Witten, *Vacuum configurations for superstrings*, Nuclear Phys. B, 258 (1985), 46–74.
- [22] Y. Cao, J. Gross, and D. Joyce, *Orientability of moduli spaces of Spin(7)-instantons and coherent sheaves on Calabi–Yau 4-folds*, Adv. Math. 368 (2020), 107134, 60 pp. arXiv:181.09658.
- [23] S-K. Chiu, *On Calabi–Yau Manifolds with Maximal Volume Growth*, Ph. D. thesis, University of Notre Dame, 2021.
- [24] A. Clarke, *Instantons on the exceptional holonomy manifolds of Bryant and Salamon*, J. Geom. Phys. 82 (2014), 84–97. arXiv:1308.6358.
- [25] A. Clarke, M. Garcia-Fernandez and C. Tipler, *Moduli of G_2 structures and the Strominger system in dimension 7*, preprint, 2016. arXiv:1607.01219.
- [26] A. Clarke and G. Oliveira, *Spin(7)-instantons from evolution equations*, J. Geom. Anal. 31 (2021), 4328–4355. arXiv:1903.05526.
- [27] E. Corrigan, C. Devchand, D. B. Fairlie, and J. Nuyts, *First-order equations for gauge fields in spaces of dimension greater than four*, Nuclear Phys. B, 214 (1983), 452–464.

- [28] E. Corrigan, P. Goddard, and A. Kent, *Some comments on the ADHM construction in $4k$ dimensions*, Comm. Math. Phys. 100 (1985), 1–13.
- [29] M. Cvetič, J. J. Heckman, E. Torres, G. Zoccarato, *Reflections on the matter of $3D \mathcal{N} = 1$ vacua and local $Spin(7)$ compactifications*, Phys. Rev. D 105 (2022), Paper No. 026008, arXiv:2107.00025.
- [30] M. Cvetič, J. J. Heckman, T. B. Rochais, E. Torres, G. Zoccarato, *Geometric unification of Higgs bundle vacua*, Phys. Rev. D 102 (2020), 106012. arXiv:2003.13682.
- [31] A. Degeratu and R. Mazzeo, *Fredholm theory for elliptic operators on quasi-asymptotically conical spaces*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) 116 (2018), 1112–1160. arXiv:1406.3465.
- [32] X. de la Ossa, M. Larfors and E. E. Svanes, *The Infinitesimal Moduli Space of Heterotic G_2 Systems*, Commun. Math. Phys. **360** (2018), 727–775. arXiv:1704.08717.
- [33] S. K. Donaldson and P. B. Kronheimer. *The geometry of four-manifolds*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, 1990.
- [34] S. Donaldson and E. Segal, *Gauge theory in higher dimensions, II*, in “Surveys in Differential Geometry, Volume 16, *Geometry of special holonomy and related topics*”, International Press, Somerville, MA, 2011. arXiv:0902.3239.
- [35] S. K. Donaldson and R. P. Thomas, *Gauge theory in higher dimensions*, in “The Geometric Universe : Science, Geometry, and the Work of Roger Penrose”, Oxford University Press, 1998.
- [36] R. Dündarer, F. Gürsey, and C. H. Tze, *Generalized vector products, duality, and octonionic identities in $D = 8$ geometry*, J. Math. Phys. 25 (1984), 1496–1506.
- [37] D. B. Fairlie and J. Nuyts, *Spherically symmetric solutions of gauge theories in eight dimensions*, J. Phys. A 17 (1984), 2867–2872.
- [38] M. Fernández, S. Ivanov, L. Ugarte, and R. Villacampa, *Compact supersymmetric solutions of the heterotic equations of motion in dimensions 7 and 8*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 15 (2011), 245–284. arXiv:0806.4356.
- [39] J. Figueroa-O’Farrill, *Gauge theory and the division algebras*, J. Geom. Phys. 32 (1999), 227–240. arXiv:hep-th/9710168.
- [40] M-A. Fiset and M. Galdeano, *Superconformal algebras for generalized $Spin(7)$ and G_2 connected sums*, J. High Energy Phys. 2021, Paper No. 137. arXiv:2104.05716.

- [41] G. B. Folland, *Introduction to partial differential equations*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1995.
- [42] S. Fubini and H. Nicolai, *The octonionic instanton*, Phys. Lett. B 155 (1985), 369–372.
- [43] J. P. Gauntlett, D. Martelli, D. Waldram, and N. Kim, *Fivebranes wrapped on SLAG three-cycles and related geometry*, J. High Energy Phys. 2001, no. 11, Paper 18, 28 pp. arXiv:hep-th/0110034.
- [44] J. P. Gauntlett, D. Martelli, D. Waldram, *Superstrings with intrinsic torsion*, Phys. Rev. D (3) 69 (2004), no. 8, 086002, 27 pp. arXiv:hep-th/0302158.
- [45] Y-H. Gao and G. Tian, *Instantons and the monopole-like equations in eight dimensions*, J. High Energy Phys. 2000, Paper 36, 23 pp. arXiv:hep-th/0004167.
- [46] M. Garcia-Fernandez, *Lectures on the Strominger system*, Travaux mathématiques. Vol. XXIV, 7-61, Trav. Math., 24, Fac. Sci. Technol. Commun. Univ. Luxemb., Luxembourg, 2016. arXiv:1609.02615.
- [47] M. Garcia-Fernandez, R. Rubio, and C. Tipler, *Infinitesimal moduli for the Strominger system and Killing spinors in generalized geometry*, Math. Ann. 369 (2017), 539–595. arXiv:1503.07562.
- [48] T. Gocho and H. Nakajima, *Einstein-Hermitian connections on hyper-Kähler quotient*, J. Math. Soc. Japan 44 (1992), 43–51.
- [49] D. Harland and C. Nölle, *Instantons and Killing spinors* J. High Energy Phys. (2012), 082. arXiv:https:1109.3552.
- [50] D. Harl and A. D. Popov, *Yang–Mills fields in flux compactifications on homogeneous manifolds with $SU(4)$ structure*, J. High Energy Phys. 2012, 107. arXiv:1005.2837.
- [51] A. S. Haupt, T. A. Ivanova, O. Lechtenfeld, and A. D. Popov, *Chern–Simons flows on Aloff–Wallach spaces and $Spin(7)$ instantons*, Phys. Rev. D 83, 105028, 2011. arXiv:1104.5231.
- [52] J. A. Harvey and A. Strominger, *Octonionic superstring solitons*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66 (1991), 549–552.
- [53] J. J. Heckman, C. Lawrie, L. Lin, and G. Zoccarato, *F-theory and dark energy*, Fortschr. Phys. 67 (2019), 1900057, 27 pp. arXiv:1811.01959.
- [54] C. M. Hull, *Compactifications of the heterotic superstring*, Phys. Lett. B 178 (1986), 357–364.
- [55] P. Ivanov and S. Ivanov, *$SU(3)$ -instantons and G_2 , $Spin(7)$ -heterotic string solitons*, Comm. Math. Phys. 259 (2005), 79–102. arXiv:math/0312094.

- [56] S. Ivanov, *Connections with torsion, parallel spinors and geometry of $Spin(7)$ manifolds*, Math. Res. Lett. 11 (2004), 171–186. arXiv:math/0111216.
- [57] S. Ivanov, *Heterotic supersymmetry, anomaly cancellation and equations of motion*, Phys. Lett. B 685 (2010), 190–196. arXiv:0908.2927.
- [58] T. A. Ivanova, *Octonions, self-duality and strings*, Phys. Lett. B 315 (1993), 277–282.
- [59] T. A. Ivanova and A. D. Popov, *Self-dual Yang–Mills fields in $d = 7, 8$, octonions and Ward equations*, Lett. Math. Phys. 24 (1992), 85–92.
- [60] J. Jost and H. Karcher, *Geometrische Methoden zur Gewinnung von a-priori Schranken für harmonische Abbildungen*, Manuscripta Math. 40 (1982), 27–77.
- [61] D. D. Joyce, *Compact Riemannian 7-manifolds with holonomy G_2 . I*, J. Diff. Geom. 43 (1996), 291–328.
- [62] D. D. Joyce, *Compact Riemannian 7-manifolds with holonomy G_2 . II*, J. Diff. Geom. 43 (1996), 329–375.
- [63] D. D. Joyce, *Compact 8-manifolds with holonomy $Spin(7)$* , Invent. Math. 123 (1996), 507–552.
- [64] D. D. Joyce, *A new construction of compact 8-manifolds with holonomy $Spin(7)$* , J. Differential Geom. 53 (1999), 89–130.
- [65] D. D. Joyce, *Compact manifolds with special holonomy*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Oxford University Press, 2000.
- [66] H. Kanno, *A note on higher dimensional instantons and supersymmetric cycles*, Gauge theory and integrable models (Kyoto, 1999). Progr. Theoret. Phys. Suppl. No. 135 (1999), 18–28. hep-th/9903260.
- [67] H. Kanno and Y. Yasui, *Octonionic Yang–Mills instanton on quaternionic line bundle of $Spin(7)$ holonomy*, J. Geom. Phys. 34 (2000), 302–320. hep-th/9910003.
- [68] P. B. Kronheimer and H. Nakajima, *Yang–Mills instantons on ALE gravitational instantons*, Math. Ann. 288.2 (1990), 263–307.
- [69] C. Lewis, *$Spin(7)$ instantons*, D.Phil thesis, Oxford University, 1998.
- [70] P. Li and R. Schoen, *L^p and mean value properties of subharmonic functions on Riemannian manifolds*, Acta Math. 153 (1984), 279–301.
- [71] J. D. Lotay and T. B. Madsen, *Instantons on flat space: Explicit constructions*, preprint, 2022. arXiv:2204.11517.

- [72] L. Ma, *On Counting Flat Connections over G_2 -Orbifolds*, preprint, 2023. arXiv:2304.00606.
- [73] M. Marino, R. Minasian, G. W. Moore, and A. Strominger, *Nonlinear instantons from supersymmetric p -branes*, J. High Energy Phys. 2000, 01. arXiv:hep-th/9911206.
- [74] V. Muñoz and C. S. Shahbazi, *Orientability of the moduli space of $Spin(7)$ -instantons*, Pure Appl. Math. Q. 13 (2017), no. 3, 453–476. arXiv:1707.02998.
- [75] V. Muñoz and C. S. Shahbazi, *Transversality for the moduli space of $Spin(7)$ -instantons*, Rev. Math. Phys. 32 (2020), no. 5, 2050013, 47 pp. arXiv:1611.04127.
- [76] H. Nakajima, *Compactness of the moduli space of Yang–Mills connections in higher dimensions*, J. Math. Soc. Japan 40 (1988), 383–392.
- [77] H. Nakajima, *Moduli spaces of anti-self-dual connections on ALE gravitational instantons*, Invent. Math. 102 (1990), 267–303.
- [78] J. Nordström, *Deformations and gluing of asymptotically cylindrical manifolds with exceptional holonomy*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2008.
- [79] J. Oh and R. P. Thomas, *Counting sheaves on Calabi–Yau 4-folds, I*, Duke Math. J. 172 (2023), 1333–1409. arXiv:2009.05542.
- [80] J. Oh and R. P. Thomas, *Complex Kuranishi structures and counting sheaves on Calabi–Yau 4-folds, II*, preprint, 2023. arXiv:2305.16441.
- [81] N. Özdemir and N. Değirmenci, *Seiberg–Witten like equations on 8-manifolds with structure group $Spin(7)$* , J. Dyn. Syst. Geom. Theor. 7 (2009), 21–39.
- [82] J. Polchinski, *Tasi lectures on D-branes*, Theoretical Advanced Study Institute in Elementary Particle Physics (TASI): Fields, Strings, 1996, 11, 293–356. arXiv:hep-th/9611050.
- [83] A. D. Popov and R. J. Szabo, *Double quiver gauge theory and nearly Kähler flux compactifications*, J. High Energy Phys. 2012, 033. arXiv:1009.3208.
- [84] R. Reyes Carrión, *A generalization of the notion of instanton*, Differential Geom. Appl. (1998), 1–20.
- [85] D. Salamon and T. Walpuski, *Notes on the octonions*, Proceedings of the Gökova Geometry-Topology Conference 2016, Gökova Geometry/Topology Conference (GGT), Gökova, 2017, 1–85. arXiv:1005.2820.

- [86] S. Salamon, *Riemannian Geometry and Holonomy Groups*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, 201. Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow, 1989.
- [87] S. Salamon, *Quaternionic Kähler manifolds*, Invent. Math. 67 (1982), 143–171.
- [88] S. L. Shatashvili and C. Vafa, *Superstrings and manifolds of exceptional holonomy*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) 1 (1995), 347–381. arXiv:hep-th/9407025.
- [89] A. Strominger, *Superstrings with torsion*, Nuclear Phys. B 274 (1986), 253–284.
- [90] Y. Tanaka, *A construction of Spin(7)-instantons*, Ann. Global Anal. Geom. 42 (2012), 495–521. arXiv:1201.3150.
- [91] C. H. Taubes, *Self-dual Yang–Mills connections on non-self-dual 4-manifolds*, J. Diff. Geom. 17 (1982), 139–170.
- [92] G. Tian, *Gauge theory and calibrated geometry. I.*, Ann. of Math. (2) 151 (2000), 193–268. arXiv:math/0010015.
- [93] W. Thurston, *The Geometry and Topology of Three-Manifolds*. Available at library.msri.org/books/gt3m.
- [94] C. Vafa, *Evidence for F-theory*, Nuclear Phys. B 469 (1996), 403–415. arXiv:hep-th/9602022.
- [95] T. Walpuski, *G_2 -instantons on generalised Kummer constructions*, Geom. Topol. 17, (2013), 2345–2388. arXiv:1109.6609.
- [96] T. Walpuski, *Spin(7)-instantons, Cayley submanifolds and Fueter sections*, Commun. Math. Phys. 352 (2017), 1–36. arXiv:1409.6705.
- [97] T. Walpuski, *Gauge theory on G_2 -manifolds*, PhD thesis, Imperial College London, 2013.
- [98] R. S. Ward, *Completely solvable gauge-field equations in dimension greater than four*, Nuclear Phys. B. 236 (1984), 381–396.
- [99] E. Witten, *Topological quantum field theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. 117 (1988), 353–386.

FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT HAMBURG, BUNDESSTRASSE 55, 20146, HAMBURG, GERMANY
 E-MAIL: mateo.galdeano@uni-hamburg.de

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON, EXHIBITION RD, LONDON SW7 2BX, UNITED KINGDOM;
 I-X CENTRE FOR AI IN SCIENCE, IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON, WHITE CITY CAMPUS, 84 WOOD LANE, LONDON W12 0BZ, UNITED KINGDOM

E-MAIL: daniel.platt.berlin@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KITASHIRAKAWA OIWAKE-CHO, SAKYO-KU, KYOTO 606-8502, JAPAN

E-MAIL: y-tanka@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, STANFORD, CA 94305, U.S.A.

E-MAIL: luyawang@stanford.edu