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Abstract. Let \((N, \gamma)\) be a class-\(\gamma\) nilpotent Lie group of dimension \(n\); i.e. \(N\) is a simply connected nilpotent Lie group and \(\gamma\) is an invariant geometric structure on \(N\) (as it is defined by Lauret in [Lau1 Definition 2.1]). Let \(\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle\) be a compatible metric with \((N, \gamma)\) and \(G_\gamma = K_\gamma \exp(a_\gamma)K_\gamma\) be the reductive Lie group given by the automorphism group of \(\gamma;\) \(\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle\) can be thought of as the canonical inner product of \(\mathbb{R}^n\) and so \(G_\gamma\) is compatible with the usual Cartan decomposition of \(\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{R});\) \(K_\gamma \leq O(n)\) and \(a_\gamma \leq a\) with \(a = \{\text{Diag}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) : a_i \in \mathbb{R}\}\). We call a orthonormal basis \(\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}\) of \((\mathfrak{n} = \text{Lie}(N), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)\) \(\gamma\)-nice basis if all metrics of the form \(a \cdot \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : = \langle a^{-1} \cdot, a^{-1} \cdot \rangle\) with \(a \in \exp(a_\gamma)\) have diagonal invariant Ricci operator with respect to the basis \(\{a \cdot e_1, \ldots, a \cdot e_n\}\), i.e. \(\text{Ric}\_a^{\gamma} \in a_\gamma\).

Using our generalization of Nikolayevsky’s nice basis criterium to rational real reductive representations (see [Per2 Theorem 3.14]), in this notes we give the corresponding criterion to know when a pair \((N, \gamma)\) admitting a \(\gamma\)-nice basis has a minimal compatible metric.

As an application, we give a complete classification of minimal compatible metrics with abelian complex structures and symplectic two-step nilpotent Lie algebras in dimension 6. Many illustrative examples are carefully developed.

1. Introduction

In [Lau1], Jorge Lauret noted that there is a close relationship between the geometry of nilpotent Lie groups and Real geometric invariant theory (Real GIT) applied to actions of reductive subgroups of \(\text{GL}_m(\mathbb{R})\) on the vector space \(\Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^m)^* \otimes \mathbb{R}^m\). For instance, the recent advances in the study of \textit{Einstein solvmanifolds} and, more generally, \textit{Solvsolitons}, have come from using powerful tools that are given by GIT (see [Lau2, Nik2]) and Michael Jablonski has proved new results in GIT and Real GIT to be applied in the study of solvsolitons (see [Jab1, Jab2]).
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By using this fact, it has been proposed in [Lau1] a way to study the problem of finding “the best metric” which is compatible with a fixed geometric structure $\gamma$ on a simply connected nilpotent Lie group. In this approach, it is defined the notion of minimal compatible metric with a invariant geometric structure as a compatible left invariant metric that minimizes the norm of the invariant Ricci tensor among all left invariant compatible metrics with the same scalar curvature.

The properties that make a minimal metric “special” are given in [Lau1] by using strong results from GIT; a minimal metric is unique (up to isometry and scaling) when it exists and it can be characterized as a soliton solution of the invariant Ricci flow (see [Lau1, Theorem 4.4]).

From [Lau1, Proposition 4.2 and Theorem 4.4], the existence problem of minimal metrics lead us to study distinguished orbits of the natural action of $G_{\gamma}$ on $V := \Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n)^* \otimes \mathbb{R}^n$; i.e. we must determine when an orbit of the action contains a critical point of the norm-square of the moment map $m_{\gamma}$ associated to the action. In general, it is hard to know when an orbit is distinguished, but such problem is very important in GIT; for instance, closed orbits can be characterized as orbits containing a zero of the moment map.

In [Fer2], by using convexity properties of the moment map and recent results of Jablonski in [Jab1], we gave a useful criterion to know when a nice element has a distinguished orbit. Such result can be considered as a generalization of Nikolayevsky’s nice basis criterium (see [Nik2, Theorem 3]) and our aim in this notes is to give the corresponding criterion to study minimal metrics. To this end, we introduce the notion of $\gamma$-nice basis (Definition 3.1) and we show that a pair $(\mathfrak{n}, \gamma)$ admitting a $\gamma$-nice basis has a minimal metric if and only if certain lineal equation has a positive solution (Theorem 3.5).

By a simple inspection, it is easy to see that abelian complex structures on 6-dimensional nilpotent Lie algebras admit a nice basis for such structure and which permits to study the existence of minimal metrics with our results. The same thing happens in the case of symplectic two-step nilpotent Lie algebras, where we also give a complete classification of minimal metrics. In both cases, many examples are given and the respective classification are obtained by proceeding in an entirely analogous way.

2. Preliminaries

Let $(\mathcal{N}, \gamma)$ be a class $\gamma$-nilpotent Lie group: $\mathcal{N}$ is a simply connected nilpotent Lie group and $\gamma$ is an invariant geometric structure on $\mathcal{N}$ (see [Lau1, Definition 2.1]). We identify $\mathfrak{n}$ with $\mathbb{R}^n$ and so the structure of Lie algebra on $\mathfrak{n}$ is given by an element $\mu \in \Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n)^* \otimes \mathbb{R}^n$; $\mathfrak{n} = (\mathbb{R}^n, \mu)$ and the geometric structure $\gamma$ is given by left translation of a tensor on $\mathbb{R}^n$ which we denote also by $\gamma$. In the same way, any left invariant compatible metric with $(\mathcal{N}, \gamma)$ is defined by an inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$. 
By definition, there is no loss of generality in assuming that the canonical inner product of $\mathbb{R}^n, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, also defines a compatible metric with $(N, \gamma)$. Since the reductive group
\[ \{ g \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{R}) : g \cdot \gamma = \gamma \} \]
is self-adjoint with respect to any compatible metric (it also follows easily from definition), then $G_\gamma$ is compatible with the usual Cartan decomposition of $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$; it is to say: $G_\gamma = K_\gamma \exp(a_\gamma)K_\gamma$ with $K_\gamma$ a subgroup of the Orthogonal group $O(n)$ and $a_\gamma$ a subalgebra of the diagonal matrices $\mathfrak{a}$.

For the convenience of the reader, let us repeat relevant material from [Lau1].

**Definition 2.1.** [Lau1] Definition 2.2 Let $(\cdot, \cdot)$ be a compatible metric with the class-$\gamma$ nilpotent Lie group $(N, \gamma)$. Consider the orthogonal projection $\text{Ric}^\gamma_{(\cdot, \cdot)}$ of the Ricci operator $\text{Ric}_{(\cdot, \cdot)}$ on $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma = \text{Lie}(G_\gamma)$ with respect to the inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)$ of $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma(\mathbb{R})$ induced by $(\cdot, \cdot)$; i.e. for any $A, B$ in $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma(\mathbb{R})$, $(A, B) = \text{tr}(AB^T)$ where $B^T$ denote the transpose of $B$ with respect to $(\cdot, \cdot)$. $\text{Ric}^\gamma_{(\cdot, \cdot)}$ is said to be invariant Ricci operator, and the corresponding invariant Ricci tensor is given by $\text{ric}^\gamma = (\text{Ric}^\gamma, \cdot, \cdot)$.

**Definition 2.2 (Minimal compatible metric).** [Lau1] Definition 2.3 A left invariant metric $(\cdot, \cdot)$ compatible with a class-$\gamma$ nilpotent Lie group $(N_\mu, \gamma)$ is called minimal if
\[
\text{tr}(\text{Ric}^\gamma_{(\cdot, \cdot)})^2 = \min \left\{ \text{tr}(\text{Ric}^\gamma_{(\cdot, \cdot)})^2 : (\cdot, \cdot) \text{ is a compatible metric with } (N_\mu, \gamma) \right\}
\]

Now we study the natural action of $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ (and $G_\gamma$) on $V := \Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n)^* \otimes \mathbb{R}^n$ given by the change of basis:
\[ g \cdot \mu(X, Y) = g\mu(g^{-1}X, g^{-1}Y), \quad X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \ g \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{R}), \ \mu \in V. \]
The corresponding representation of $\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{R})$ on $V$ is given by
\[ A \cdot \mu(X, Y) = A\mu(X, Y) - \mu(AX, Y) - \mu(X, AY), \ A \in \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{R}), \ \mu \in V. \]

Consider the usual inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)$ on $V$ which is defined by the canonical inner product of $\mathbb{R}^n$ as follows:
\[ \langle \mu, \lambda \rangle = \sum_{ijk} \langle \mu(e_i, e_j), e_k \rangle \langle \lambda(e_i, e_j), e_k \rangle, \ \forall \mu, \lambda \in V. \]
and let $(\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ the canonical inner product of $\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{R})$ induced by the canonical inner product of $\mathbb{R}^n$ (as in the Definition 2.1).

We are now in a position to define the moment map of the above-mentioned action. This map is implicitly defined by
\[
\begin{equation}
(2.1) \quad m_{\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{R})} : V \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{R}) \quad \langle \langle m_{\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{R})}(\mu), A \rangle \rangle = \langle A \cdot \mu, \mu \rangle,
\end{equation}
\]
for all $A \in \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mu \in V$.

Let $\text{Proj}_{\mathfrak{g}_\gamma}$ be denote the orthogonal projection of $\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{R})$ on $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma$ with respect to the inner product $(\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$, then it is easy to see that the moment
map for the action of $G_\gamma$ on $V$, $m_{\theta_\gamma}$, is $\operatorname{Proj}_{g_{\gamma^*}} m_{\theta_\gamma}(R)$. The relationship between minimal metrics and the moment map is given by the following result

**Proposition 2.3.** [Lau1, Proposition 4.2] Let $(N_\mu, \gamma)$ be a class-$\gamma$ nilpotent Lie group. Then

\begin{equation}
4\operatorname{Ric}_{g(\cdot,\cdot)} = m_{\theta_\gamma}(g^{-1} \cdot \mu), \forall g \in \text{GL}_n(R)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
4\operatorname{Ric}_{h(\cdot,\cdot)}^\gamma = m_{\theta_\gamma}(h^{-1} \cdot \mu), \forall h \in G_\gamma
\end{equation}

where $\operatorname{Ric}_{g(\cdot,\cdot)}$ is the Ricci operator of the Riemannian manifold $(N_\mu, g \cdot (\cdot,\cdot))$ with respect to the orthonormal basis \{\(g \cdot e_1, \ldots, g \cdot e_n\)\} and $\operatorname{Ric}_{h(\cdot,\cdot)}^\gamma$ is the invariant Ricci operator of $(N_\mu, \gamma, h \cdot (\cdot,\cdot))$ with respect to the orthonormal basis \{\(h \cdot e_1, \ldots, h \cdot e_n\)\}.

Hence, the problem of finding a minimal compatible metric with $(N_\mu, \gamma)$ is equivalent to finding a minimum value of $\|m_{\theta_\gamma}\|^2$ along the $G_\gamma$-orbit of $\mu$ (we recall that any compatible metric is of the form $h \cdot (\cdot,\cdot)$ with $h \in G_\gamma$). The above is exactly to know if the orbit $G_\gamma \cdot \mu$ is distinguished for the action of $G_\gamma$ on $V$ ($G_\gamma \cdot \mu$ contains a critical point of $\|m_{\theta_\gamma}\|^2$).

**Theorem 2.4.** [Lau1, Proposition 4.3 and 4.4] Let $(N_\mu, \gamma)$ be a class-$\gamma$ nilpotent Lie group. $(N_\mu, \gamma)$ admits a minimal compatible metric if and only if the $G_\gamma$-orbit of $\mu$ is distinguished for the natural action of $G_\gamma$ on $V$. Moreover, there is at most one minimal compatible metric on $(N, \gamma) \uparrow$ up to isometry (and scaling).

**Remark 2.5.** The last part of the above theorem follows of strong results on critical points of the norm-square of a moment map. In [Lau1, Proposition 4.3 and 4.4] is used a result of Alina Marian ([M, Theorem 1]) to prove such part. However, there is an error in the proof of Marian’s Theorem 1. A correct proof follows from Jablonski’s results in [Jab2] (see [Jab2, Theorem 5.1]) or from [HSS, Corollary 6.12].

### 3. The criterion

We are now in a position to introduce the main result in this notes. To do this, we use results proved in [Fer2]. We suggest to the interested reader to consult the above-mentioned paper for a more detailed discussion of the following notions and results.

**Definition 3.1 (\(\gamma\)-nice basis).** We say that the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$, \(\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}\), is a $\gamma$-nice basis of $(\mathbb{R}^n, \mu, \gamma)$ if for any metric of the form $a \cdot (\cdot,\cdot)$ with $a \in \exp(a_\gamma)$ is such that $\operatorname{Ric}_{a(\cdot,\cdot)}^\gamma \in a_\gamma$ where $\operatorname{Ric}_{a(\cdot,\cdot)}^\gamma$ is represented with respect to the orthonormal basis \{\(a \cdot e_1, \ldots, a \cdot e_n\)\} of $(\mathbb{R}^n, \mu, a \cdot (\cdot,\cdot))$.

**Remark 3.2.** By Propositions 2.3 and [Fer2, Proposition 4.8], the above definition is equivalent to saying that $\mu$ is a nice-element for the natural action of $G_\gamma$ on $V$ ([Fer2, Definition 3.3]).
Remark 3.3. In general, it is difficult to know when a pair \((N, \gamma)\) admits a \(\gamma\)-nice basis, even if \(\gamma = 0\) (nilsoliton case). In [Fer2, Section 4] we study this problem in the general case of real reductive representations and results obtained can be very useful in the study of minimal metrics.

Notation 3.4. Let \((\mathbb{R}^n, \mu, \gamma)\) be such that \(\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}\) is a \(\gamma\)-nice basis. Let us denote by \(\mathcal{R}_\gamma(\mu)\) the ordered set of weights related with \(\mu\) to the action of \(G_\gamma\) on \(V\) (see [Fer2, Notation 2.5]); i.e. if \(\{C^k_{i,j}\}\) are the structural constants of \((\mathbb{R}^n, \mu)\) in the basis \(\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}\) then

\[ \mathcal{R}_\gamma(\mu) := \{\text{Proj}_{g_\gamma}(E_{k,k} - E_{i,i} - E_{j,j}) : C^k_{i,j} \neq 0\} \]

where \(\{E_{i,j}\}\) is the canonical basis of \(\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{R})\).

We denote by \(\beta_\mu^\gamma\) the minimal convex combination of the convex hull of \(\mathcal{R}_\gamma(\mu)\); i.e. if \(\mathcal{R}_\gamma(\mu)_p\) is \(p\)-th element of \(\mathcal{R}_\gamma(\mu)\), then

\[ U_\mu^\gamma(p, q) = \langle\langle \mathcal{R}_\gamma(\mu)_p, \mathcal{R}_\gamma(\mu)_q \rangle\rangle \]

By using the above notation, it follows from [Fer2, Theorem 3.14] our aim in this notes

**Theorem 3.5.** Let \((\mathbb{R}^n, \mu, \gamma)\) be such that \(\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}\) is a \(\gamma\)-nice basis. \((N, \mu, \gamma)\) admits a compatible minimal metric if and only if the equation

\[ U_\mu^\gamma[x_i] = \lambda[1] \quad (3.1) \]

has a positive solution \([x_i]\) for some \(\lambda \in \mathbb{R}\). Moreover, in such case, there exists \(a \in \exp(a_\gamma)\) such that \(a \cdot \langle\cdot, \cdot\rangle\) defines a minimal compatible metric with \((N, \mu, \gamma)\).

Remark 3.6. The proof of Theorem [Fer2, Theorem 3.14] gives more, namely if \((\mathbb{R}^n, \mu, \gamma)\) admits a minimal compatible metric, then one can find a such metric by solving the equation

\[ m_{\mathfrak{g}_\gamma}(a \cdot \mu) = \beta_\mu^\gamma \quad (3.2) \]

for \(a \in \exp(a_\gamma)\). Since,

\[ \beta_\mu^\gamma = \frac{1}{\sum x_p} \left( \sum x_p \mathcal{R}_\gamma(\mu)_p \right) \]

where \([x_i]\) is any positive solution to the Equation \((3.1)\), in practice it is sometimes easy to solve the Equation \((3.2)\).

4. Applications

In this section, we study minimal compatible metrics in the cases of abelian complex structures and symplectic structures on 6-dimensional nilpotent Lie algebras. By following classifications given in [ABD1, ABD2] for abelian complex structures on 6-dimensional nilpotent Lie algebras and
for 6-dimensional symplectic nilpotent Lie algebras, a simple inspection of respective classification lists reveals that many pairs \((n, \gamma)\) are written in a \(\gamma\)-nice basis or that by using a suitable change of basis, these can be written in a nice basis. This observation is more evident in the first case, where any pair admits a \(J_{cn}\)-nice basis with \(J_{cn}\) the endomorphism defined by \(J_{cn}e_1 = e_2, J_{cn}e_3 = e_4, J_{cn}e_5 = e_6\) and \(J_{cn}^2 = -\text{Id}\). In the symplectic case, the same situation occurs in symplectic two-step nilpotent Lie algebras, i.e. we can give a \(\omega_{cn}\)-nice basis where \(\omega_{cn} = e_1^* \wedge e_2^* + e_3^* \wedge e_4^*\).

### 4.1. Abelian complex structures on 6-dimensional nilpotent Lie algebras

From now on, we denote by \(m_{gl}(=4Ric\langle\cdot\rangle)\) the moment map for the action of \(\text{GL}_6(\mathbb{R})\) on \(V\) and, in this part, we denote by \(m_{glc}\) the moment map for the action of the “hydrated” \(\text{GL}_3(\mathbb{C})\) (= \(G_{J_{cn}}\); i.e. 

\[
\text{GL}_3(\mathbb{C}) = \{g \in \text{GL}_6(\mathbb{R}) : gJ_{cn} = J_{cn}g\},
\]

on \(V\).

**Example 4.1.** Consider the 6-dimensional nilpotent Lie algebra \(\mathfrak{n}_3\) given by the direct sum of two 3-dimensional Heisenberg Lie algebra, i.e. \(\mathfrak{n}_3 := \{[e_1, e_2] = e_5, [e_3, e_4] = e_6\}. \) By [ABDI] Theorem 3.3 (iii)], \(\mathfrak{n}_3\) admits a curve of non-equivalent abelian complex structures \(J_s\) given by \(J_se_1 = e_2, J_se_3 = e_4, J_se_5 = se_5 + e_6\) with \(s \in \mathbb{R}\). In our approach, we need that the canonical inner product defines a compatible metric, which is similar to give a basis of \(\mathfrak{n}_3\) where the abelian complex structure is defined by \(J_{cn}\). We can try with a change of basis of the form

\[
g = \text{Diag}\left(1, 1, 1, 1, \left(\begin{array}{cc} m_{5,5} & m_{5,6} \\ m_{6,5} & m_{6,6} \end{array}\right)\right).
\]

And solving for \(\{m_{5,5}, m_{5,6}, m_{6,5}, m_{6,6}\}\) in the equation \(g \cdot J_s = gJ_sg^{-1} = J_{cn}\), we obtain

\[
\{m_{5,5} = m_{6,6}s + m_{6,6}, m_{5,6} = -m_{6,5} + m_{6,6}s, m_{6,5} = m_{6,5}, m_{6,6} = m_{6,6}\}.
\]

If we let \(m_{6,5} = 0\) and \(m_{6,6} = 1\) then

\[
g = \text{Diag}\left(1, 1, 1, 1, \left(\begin{array}{cc} 1 & s \\ 0 & 1 \end{array}\right)\right)
\]

defines a holomorphic isomorphism from \((\mathfrak{n}_3, J_s)\) to \((\mathbb{R}^6, \mu_s, J_{cn})\) with

\[
\mu_s := \{[e_1, e_2] = e_5, [e_3, e_4] = se_5 + e_6
\]

and moreover, the canonical product of \(\mathbb{R}^6\) defines a compatible metric with \((\mathbb{R}^6, \mu_s, J_{cn})\).

In the case of complex structures, \(\mathfrak{a}_{J_{cn}}\) is given by

\[
\mathfrak{a}_{J_{cn}} = \{\text{Diag}(x_1, x_1, x_2, x_2, x_3, x_3) : x_i \in \mathbb{R}\}
\]

and it is easy to see that for any \(s \in \mathbb{R}\), \(\{e_1, \ldots, e_6\}\) is a \(J_{cn}\)-nice basis of \((\mathbb{R}^6, \mu_s, J_{cn})\); i.e. \(Ric\tilde{\gamma}_{s,\alpha} (\cdot, \cdot) = \frac{1}{2}(Ric_{s,\alpha} (\cdot, \cdot) - J_{cn}Ric_{s,\alpha} (\cdot, \cdot)J_{cn}) \in \mathfrak{a}_{J_{cn}}\) for every
a ∈ \exp(\mathfrak{a}_{J_{cn}}) or equivalently \( m_{glc}(a \cdot \mu_s) \in \mathfrak{a}_{J_{cn}} \) (by using \[ Fer2, \ Corollary 4.7 \]), for instance).

For all \( s ∈ \mathbb{R} \),

\[
\mathfrak{R}_{J_{cn}}(\mu_s) = \{ \text{Diag}(-1, -1, 0, 0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}), \text{Diag}(0, 0, -1, -1, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \}
\]

and the Gram matrix is given by

\[
U_{\mu_s}^{J_{cn}} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 5 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 5 \end{pmatrix}
\]

Since the general solution to \( U_{\mu_s}^{J_{cn}}[x_i] = [1] \) is \( [x_i] = \frac{1}{\mu} [1, 1]^T \), we have \((n_3, J_s)\) admits a minimal compatible metric for any \( s \) by Theorem 3.5. To find a such metrics, we must solve the equation

\[
m_{glc}(a \cdot \mu_s) = \beta_{\mu_s}
\]

for \( a ∈ \exp(\mathfrak{a}_{J_{cn}}) \), where the vector \( \beta_{\mu_s} \) is given by

\[
\beta_{\mu_s} = \frac{3}{2} \left( \frac{1}{3} \text{Diag}(-1, -1, 0, 0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) + \frac{1}{3} \text{Diag}(0, 0, -1, -1, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \text{Diag}(-1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1)
\]

Let \( a = \exp(X) \) with \( X = \text{Diag}(0, 0, \frac{1}{2} \ln(s^2 + 1), \frac{1}{2} \ln(s^2 + 1), -\ln(2), -\ln(2)) \). The change of basis given by \( a = \exp(X) = \text{Diag}(1, 1, (s^2 + 1) \frac{1}{2}, (s^2 + 1) \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \) defines

\[
\overline{\mu}_s := \left\{ [e_1, e_2] = \frac{1}{2} e_5, [e_3, e_4] = \frac{\sqrt{s^2 + 1}}{2} e_6 \right\}
\]

Since

\[
m_{gl}(\overline{\mu}) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Diag} \left( -1, -1, -1, -1, \left( \frac{2s^2 + 1}{s^2 + 1}, \frac{2s^2 + 1}{s^2 + 1} \right) \right)
\]

it follows that

\[
m_{glc}(\overline{\mu}) = \frac{1}{2} \left( m_{gl}(\overline{\mu}) - J m_{gl}(\overline{\mu}) . J \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \text{Diag}(-1, -1, -1, -1, 1, 1)
\]

\[
= -\frac{3}{2} \text{Id} + \text{Diag}(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2)
\]

and thus, the canonical inner product of \( \mathbb{R}^6 \) defines a minimal metric on \((\mathbb{R}^6, \overline{\mu}_s, J_{cn})\).

**Example 4.2.** Consider the nilpotent Lie algebra

\[
n_5 := \{ [e_1, e_2] = e_5, [e_1, e_4] = e_6, [e_2, e_3] = e_6 \}
\]

By \[ ABDJ, \ Theorem 3.3 (vi) \], \( n_5 \) admits only one abelian complex structure \( J \) given by \( Je_1 = e_2, Je_3 = -e_4, Je_5 = e_6 \).
Let \( g = \text{Diag}(1,1,-1,1,1,1) \). The change of basis given by \( g \) defines a holomorphic isomorphism from \((\mathfrak{n}_5, J)\) to \((\mathbb{R}^6, \mu, J_{cn})\) with

\[
\mu := \{(e_1, e_2) = e_5, [e_1, e_4] = e_6, [e_2, e_3] = -e_6 \}.
\]

As in the above example, \((\mathbb{R}^6, \mu, J_{cn})\) is written in a \( J_{cn} \)-nice basis, so the existence of a minimal compatible metric follows from Theorem \ref{thm:existence}. The set \( \mathcal{R}_{J_{cn}}(\mu) \) is given by

\[
\mathcal{R}_{J_{cn}}(\mu) = \{ \text{Diag}(-1, -1, 0, 0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}), \frac{1}{2} \text{Diag}(-1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1) \}
\]

and the Gram matrix \( U_{\mu; J_{cn}} \) is

\[
U_{\mu; J_{cn}} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 5 & 3 \\ 3 & 3 \end{pmatrix}
\]

The general solution to \( U_{\mu; J_{cn}}^{J_{cn}}[x_i] = [1] \) is \( [x_i] = \frac{4}{7}[0,2]^T \), thus \((\mathfrak{n}_5, J)\) does not admit a minimal metric, because the above equation has not any positive solution.

**Example 4.3.** For a final example, Consider the nilpotent Lie algebra \( \mathfrak{n}_7 \) in [ABDI, Theorem 3.2], which carries a curve of non-equivalent abelian complex structures \( J_t \) defined by \( J_t e_1 = e_2, J_t e_3 = -e_4, J_t e_5 = t e_6 \) with \( 0 < |t| \leq 1 \).

Choose the change of basis given by \( g = \text{Diag}(1,1,1,-1,1,1,t) \), which defines a holomorphic isomorphism from \((\mathfrak{n}_7, J_t)\) to \((\mathbb{R}^6, \mu_t, J_{cn})\) with

\[
\mu_t := [e_1, e_2] = e_4, [e_1, e_3] = e_5, [e_1, e_4] = \frac{1}{t} e_6, [e_2, e_3] = \frac{1}{t} e_6, [e_2, e_4] = e_5.
\]

We have for any \( t \), \((\mathfrak{n}_7, J_t)\) is written in a \( J_{cn} \)-nice basis and

\[
\mathcal{R}_{J_{cn}}(\mu_t) = \{ \text{Diag}(-1, -1, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0, 0), \frac{1}{2} \text{Diag}(-1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1) \}
\]

Hence the Gram matrix is given by

\[
U_{\mu; J_{cn}} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 5 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}
\]

and the general solution to \( U_{\mu; J_{cn}}^{J_{cn}}[x_i] = [1] \) is \( [x_i] = \frac{2}{7}[1,2]^T \); \((\mathfrak{n}_7, J_t)\) admits a minimal metric for all \( t \) with \( 0 < |t| \leq 1 \).

The vector \( \beta_{\mu_t} \) is given by

\[
\beta_{\mu_t} = \frac{1}{6} \text{Diag}(-4, -4, -1, -1, 2, 2)
\]

and by solving \( m_{\text{glc}}(a \cdot \mu_t) = \beta_{\mu_t} \) for \( a \in \exp(\mathfrak{a}_{J_{cn}}) \), we find that

\[
X = -\text{Diag}\left(0,0,\frac{1}{2} \ln 6, \frac{1}{2} \ln 6, \ln \left(6 \sqrt{\frac{t^2 + 1}{t^2}}\right), \ln \left(6 \sqrt{\frac{t^2 + 1}{t^2}}\right)\right)
\]
gives us the change of basis
\[ a = \exp(X) = \text{Diag} \left( 1, 1, \frac{\sqrt{6}}{6}, \frac{\sqrt{6}}{6}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{t^2 + 1}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{t^2 + 1}} \right) \]
which defines a critical point of \( ||m_{glc}||^2 \) in the \( GL_n(\mathbb{C}) \)-orbit of \( \mu_t \)
\[ \bar{\mu}_t := [e_1, e_2] = -\frac{\sqrt{6}}{6} e_4, [e_1, e_3] = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{6} \frac{|t|}{\sqrt{t^2 + 1}} e_5, [e_1, e_4] = -\frac{\sqrt{6}}{6} \frac{\text{sgn}(t)}{\sqrt{t^2 + 1}} e_6, \]
\[ [e_2, e_3] = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{6} \frac{\text{sgn}(t)}{\sqrt{t^2 + 1}} e_6, [e_2, e_4] = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{6} \frac{|t|}{\sqrt{t^2 + 1}} e_5 \]
where \( \text{sgn}(t) \) is the sign of \( t \) (\( \text{sgn}(t) = 1 \) if \( t > 0 \) and \( \text{sgn}(t) < 1 \) if \( t < 0 \)).
In fact, we have
\[ m_{gl} (\bar{\mu}) = \frac{1}{3} \text{Diag} (-2, -2, -1, 0, \frac{2t^2}{t^2 + 1}, \frac{2}{t^2 + 1}) , \]
thus
\[ m_{glc} (\bar{\mu}) = \frac{1}{6} (m_{gl} (\bar{\mu}) - J.m_{gl} (\bar{\mu}).J) \]
\[ = \frac{1}{6} \text{Diag} (-4, -4, -1, -1, 2, 2) \]
\[ = -\frac{7}{6} \text{Id} + \frac{1}{6} \text{Diag} (1, 1, 2, 3, 3) ; \]
Derivation
for this reason, the canonical inner product of \( \mathbb{R}^6 \) defines a minimal compatible metric on \( (\mathbb{R}^6, \bar{\mu}, J_{cn}) \).

Proceeding analogously to the above example it follows that

**Theorem 4.4.** [Rod, Theorem 4.4] Any 6-dimensional abelian complex nilmanifold admits a minimal metric, with the only exception of \( (N_5, J) \).

**Remark 4.5.** The above theorem was given in [Rod], where the minimal metrics are constructed by unclear methods (for instance, see \( n_3, n_4 \) and \( n_7 \)). Note that, the Example 4.2 can be considered as a more simple and clear proof of what \( (n_5, J) \) does not admit a minimal metric.

In Table I each Lie algebra defines an abelian complex nilmanifold given by \( (\mathbb{R}^6, \bar{\mu}, J_{cn}) \) and is such that the canonical inner product on \( \mathbb{R}^6 \) defines a minimal compatible metric of scalar curvature equal to \( \frac{1}{6} \). In the column \( ||\beta||^2 \) we give the norm squared of stratum associated to the minimal metric and in Derivation column we give the derivation of \( (\mathbb{R}^6, \bar{\mu}) \) such that
\[ m_{glc} (\bar{\mu}) = -||\beta||^2 \text{Id} + \text{Derivation} \]
In the last column, we give the dimension of automorphism group of the abelian complex nilmanifold.
4.2 Symplectic two-step nilpotent Lie algebra. Here, we denote by $m_{\text{sp}}$ the moment map corresponding to the action of the symplectic group $G_{\text{cn}} = \text{Sp}(3, \mathbb{R})$ on $V$, and we have

$$a_{\text{cn}} = \{ \text{Diag}(-x_1, -x_2, -x_3, x_3, x_2, x_1) : x_i \in \mathbb{R} \}$$

Example 4.6. Consider the free 2-step nilpotent Lie algebra of rank 3; $n_{18} := \{ e_1, e_2 \} = e_4, [e_1, e_3] = e_5, [e_2, e_3] = e_6$. By [KGM] Theorem 5, $n_{18}$ carries two curves of non-equivalent symplectic structures, namely $\omega_1(s)$ and $\omega_2(t)$ (with $s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$), and an isolated symplectic structure $\omega_3$. In this example we want to prove that every pair $(n_{18}, \omega_i)$ admits a minimal compatible metric.

We take the case of the first curve

$$\omega_1(s) = e_1^* \wedge e_2^* + s e_2^* \wedge e_5^* + (s - 1) e_3^* \wedge e_4^*$$

with $s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and let $g = \text{Diag}(1, 1, 1, s - 1, s, 1)$. The change of basis given by $g$ defines a symplectomorphism from $(n_{18}, \omega_1(s))$ to $(\mathbb{R}^6, \mu_s, \omega_{cn})$ with

$$\mu_s = [e_1, e_2] = (s - 1)e_4, [e_1, e_3] = s e_5, [e_2, e_3] = e_6$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not.</th>
<th>Critical point</th>
<th>Derivation</th>
<th>$|\beta|^2$</th>
<th>dim Aut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$n_1$</td>
<td>$[e_1, e_2] = \sqrt{2} e_6$, $[e_3, e_4] = \frac{1}{2} e_6$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2} \text{Diag}(3, 3, 5, 5, 6, 6)$</td>
<td>$\frac{5}{2}$</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_2(\pm)$</td>
<td>$[e_1, e_2] = \pm \frac{1}{2} e_6$, $[e_3, e_4] = \frac{1}{2} e_6$</td>
<td>$\text{Diag}(1, 1, 1, 2, 2)$</td>
<td>$\frac{3}{2}$</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_3(s)$</td>
<td>$[e_1, e_2] = \frac{1}{2} e_5, [e_3, e_4] = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(s^2 + 1)} e_5$</td>
<td>$\text{Diag}(1, 1, 1, 2, 2)$</td>
<td>$\frac{3}{2}$</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_4(t)$</td>
<td>$[e_1, e_2] = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(1 + t^2)} e_5$, $[e_1, e_4] = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(1 + t^2)} e_6$, $[e_2, e_3] = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(1 + t^2)} e_6$, $[e_3, e_4] = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(1 + t^2)} e_5$</td>
<td>$\text{Diag}(1, 1, 1, 2, 2)$</td>
<td>$\frac{3}{2}$</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_5$</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_6$</td>
<td>$[e_1, e_2] = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{6} e_5, [e_1, e_3] = \frac{1}{2} e_4$, $[e_2, e_5] = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{6} e_4$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2} \text{Diag}(1, 1, 3, 3, 2, 2)$</td>
<td>$\frac{7}{6}$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_7(t)$</td>
<td>$[e_1, e_2] = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{6} e_4$, $[e_1, e_3] = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{6} \frac{</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>}{\sqrt{t^2 + 1}} e_5$, $[e_1, e_4] = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{6} \frac{\text{sgn}(t)}{\sqrt{t^2 + 1}} e_6$, $[e_2, e_3] = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{6} \frac{\text{sgn}(t)}{\sqrt{t^2 + 1}} e_6$, $[e_2, e_4] = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{6} \frac{</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Classification of minimal compatible metrics on 6-dimensional abelian complex nilmanifold.
It is obvious that \((\mathbb{R}^6, \omega, \omega_{cn})\) is written in a \(\omega_{cn}\)-nice basis, because

\[
\mathcal{M}_{\omega_{cn}}(\mu_s) = \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \text{Diag}(-1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1) \right\}
\]

and that from this \((n_{18}, \omega_1(s))\) admits a minimal compatible metric which can be found by solving the equation

\[
m_{sp}(a \cdot \mu_s) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Diag}(-1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1)
\]

for \(a \in \exp(a_{\omega_{cn}})\).

Let \(a = \exp(X)\) with

\[
X = \frac{1}{2} \text{Diag}(\ln(4s^2 - 4s + 4), 0, 0, 0, 0, -\ln(4s^2 - 4s + 4))
\]

The change of basis given by \(a\) defines the curve

\[
\vec{\mu}_s := [e_1, e_2] = \frac{1}{2} (s - 1) \sqrt{(s^2 - s + 1)^{-1} e_4}, [e_1, e_3] = \frac{1}{2} s \sqrt{(s^2 - s + 1)^{-1} e_5},
\]

\[
[e_2, e_3] = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(s^2 - s + 1)^{-1} e_6}
\]

and it is a solution of the above equation, since

\[
m_{gl}(\vec{\mu}_s) = \frac{1}{2(s^2 - s + 1)} \text{Diag}(-2s^2 + 2s - 1, -s^2 + 2s - 2, -(s^2 + 1), (s - 1)^2, s^2, 1),
\]

and thus

\[
m_{sp}(\vec{\mu}_s) = \frac{1}{2}(m_{gl}(\vec{\mu}_s) + J.m_{gl}(\vec{\mu}_s).J)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \text{Diag}(-1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1)
\]

\[
= \frac{-2}{3} \text{Id} + \text{Diag}(1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2);
\]

Derivation

The canonical inner product of \(\mathbb{R}^6\) defines a minimal compatible metric on \((\mathbb{R}^6, \vec{\mu}_s, \omega_{cn})\).

Now, consider the case of

\[
\omega_2(t) = e_1^* \wedge e_5^* + te_1^* \wedge e_6^* - te_2^* \wedge e_5^* + e_2^* \wedge e_6^* - 2te_3^* \wedge e_4^*.
\]

We need that the canonical inner product defines a compatible metric, so we can try to do a change of basis of the form

\[
g = \text{Diag}\left( m_{1,1}, m_{2,2}, m_{3,3}, m_{4,4}, \begin{pmatrix} m_{5,5} & m_{5,6} \\ m_{6,5} & m_{6,6} \end{pmatrix} \right)
\]

and to solve \(g \cdot \omega_2(t) = \omega_{cn}\) for \(\{m_{1,1}, m_{2,2}, m_{3,3}, m_{4,4}, m_{5,5}, m_{5,6}, m_{6,5}, m_{6,6}\}\).

The solution to this equation is given by

\[
\begin{align*}
m_{1,1} &= m_{1,1}, m_{2,2} = m_{2,2}, m_{3,3} = m_{3,3}, m_{4,4} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{m_{3,3}}, \\
m_{5,5} &= -\frac{t}{(t^2 + 1)m_{2,2}}, m_{5,6} = \frac{1}{(t^2 + 1)m_{1,1}}, m_{6,5} = \frac{1}{(t^2 + 1)m_{2,2}}, m_{6,6} = \frac{t}{(t^2 + 1)m_{1,1}};
\end{align*}
\]
hence, we can take the particular solution defined by \( m_{1,1} = m_{2,2} = m_{3,3} = 1 \), which defines symplectomorphism from \((n_{18}, \omega_2)\) to \((\mathbb{R}^6, \mu_t, \omega_{cn})\) with
\[
\begin{aligned}
\mu_t &= \begin{bmatrix} e_1, e_2 \end{bmatrix} = -2 t e_4, [e_1, e_3] = -t e_5 + e_6, [e_2, e_3] = e_5 + t e_6
\end{aligned}
\]

The set \( \mathcal{R}_{\omega_{cn}}(\mu_t) \) is given by
\[
\mathcal{R}_{\omega_{cn}}(\mu) = \{ \text{Diag}(-1, 0, -\frac{1}{2}, 1, 0), \text{Diag}(0, -1, -\frac{1}{2}, 1, 0),
\frac{2}{3} \text{Diag}(-1, -1, 1, 1, 1) \}
\]
and a straightforward verification shows that \((\mathbb{R}^6, \mu_t, \omega_{cn})\) is written in a \( \omega_{cn} \)-nice basis.

Like above, the Theorem 3.5 states that \((n_{18}, \omega_2)\) admits a minimal compatible metric and proceeding in a way similar, we find that \( \tilde{\mu}_t := a \cdot \mu \) with
\[
a = \text{Diag}(1, 1, 2\sqrt{3}t^2 + 1, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}t^2 + 1}, 1, 1)
\]
is such that the canonical inner product of \( \mathbb{R}^6 \) defines a minimal compatible metric on \((\mathbb{R}^6, \tilde{\mu}_t, \omega_{cn})\) for any \( t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \).

In the last case,
\[
\omega_3 := e_3^* \wedge e_5^* - e_1^* \wedge e_6^* + e_2^* \wedge e_5^* + 2e_3^* \wedge e_4^*
\]
we can now proceed analogously like above. We leave it to the reader to verify that the following change of basis gives a minimal compatible metric with \((n_{18}, \omega_3)\):
\[
g := \text{Diag}(-1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{5}{6} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{6} \end{pmatrix}), \begin{pmatrix} -2 & -\frac{1}{2} \\ 2 & \frac{1}{6} \end{pmatrix}, 1),
\]
\[
a := \text{Diag}(2\sqrt{3}, 1, 1, 1, \sqrt{3}, 6).
\]

Proceeding in an entirely analogous way, we can study the remainder symplectic two-step Lie algebras given in [KGM] Theorem 5. 24] and to obtain

**Theorem 4.7.** All symplectic two-step Lie algebras of dimension 6 admit a minimal compatible metric.

**Remark 4.8.** We must say that we have found several mistakes in the classification given in [KGM]. For instance, 16.(b) does not define a symplectic structure. Some errors have already been corrected by personal communication with authors; as the symplectic structure given in 23.(c).

In the Table 2 each Lie algebra defines a symplectic two-step Lie algebra given by \((\mathbb{R}^6, \mu, \omega_{cn})\) where
\[
\omega_{cn} := e_1^* \wedge e_6^* + e_2^* \wedge e_5^* + e_3^* \wedge e_4^*,
\]
and is such that the canonical inner product on \( \mathbb{R}^6 \) defines a minimal metric of scalar curvature equal to \( \frac{1}{4} \). In the column \( ||\beta||^2 \) we give the norm squared
of the stratum associated to the minimal metric and in Derivation column, we give the derivation of \((\mathbb{R}^6, \widetilde{\mu})\) such that

\[ m_{sp_e(\mathbb{R})}(\widetilde{\mu}) = -||\beta||^2 \text{Id} + \text{Derivation}. \]

In the last column, We give the dimension of automorphism group of the symplectic two-step Lie algebra \((\mathbb{R}^6, \widetilde{\mu}, \omega_{cn})\).

| Not. | Critical point | Derivation | \[ ||\beta||^2 \text{dim} \] | \text{Aut} |
|------|----------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| 16.(1) | \([e_1, e_2] = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} e_3, [e_1, e_5] = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} e_6, [e_2, e_4] = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} e_6, [e_4, e_5] = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} e_3\) | \(\frac{1}{2} \text{Diag}(1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 3)\) | 1 | 6 |
| 17 | \([e_1, e_3] = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} e_5, [e_1, e_4] = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{2} e_6, [e_2, e_3] = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{6} e_6\) | \(\frac{1}{6} \text{Diag}(3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11)\) | \(\frac{7}{6}\) | 7 |
| 18.(1) | \([e_1, e_2] = \frac{1}{2} (s - 1) \sqrt{(s^2 - s + 1)^{-1}} e_4, [e_1, e_3] = \frac{1}{2} s \sqrt{(s^2 - s + 1)^{-1}} e_5, [e_2, e_3] = \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{(s^2 - s + 1)^{-1}} e_6\) | \(\text{Diag}(1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2)\) | \(3\) | 8 |
| 18.(2) | \([e_1, e_2] = -\frac{1}{2} t \sqrt{(3t^2 + 1)^{-1}} e_4, [e_1, e_3] = -\frac{1}{2} t \sqrt{(3t^2 + 1)^{-1}} e_5, [e_2, e_3] = -\frac{1}{4} t \sqrt{(3t^2 + 1)^{-1}} e_6\) | \(\text{Diag}(1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2)\) | \(3\) | 8 |
| 18.(3) | \([e_1, e_2] = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{12} e_4 - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4} e_5, [e_1, e_3] = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4} e_4 - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{12} e_5, [e_2, e_3] = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{6} e_6\) | \(\text{Diag}(1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2)\) | \(3\) | 10 |
| 23.(1) | \([e_1, e_2] = \frac{1}{2} e_5, [e_1, e_3] = \frac{1}{2} e_6\) | \(\frac{1}{2} \text{Diag}(4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10)\) | \(\frac{1}{2}\) | 9 |
| 23.(2) | \([e_1, e_2] = \frac{1}{2} e_4, [e_2, e_3] = \frac{1}{2} e_6\) | \(\frac{1}{2} \text{Diag}(1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2)\) | \(\frac{1}{2}\) | 8 |
| 23.(3) | \([e_1, e_2] = \frac{1}{6} e_5, [e_1, e_3] = -\frac{1}{6} e_4\) | \(\frac{1}{6} \text{Diag}(1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2)\) | \(\frac{1}{6}\) | 8 |
| 24.(1) | \([e_1, e_4] = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{6} e_6, [e_2, e_3] = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{6} e_5\) | \(\frac{1}{6} \text{Diag}(1, 1, 2, 2, 3, 3)\) | 1 | 6 |
| 24.(2) | \([e_1, e_4] = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{6} e_6, [e_2, e_3] = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{6} e_5\) | \(\frac{1}{6} \text{Diag}(1, 1, 2, 2, 3, 3)\) | 1 | 6 |
| 25 | \([e_1, e_2] = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{6} e_6\) | \(\frac{1}{6} \text{Diag}(3, 4, 5, 5, 6, 7)\) | \(\frac{1}{6}\) | 12 |

Table 2. Classification of minimal compatible metrics on symplectic two-step Lie algebras of dimension 6

Remark 4.9. The above minimal metrics define soliton solutions to the Street-Tian symplectic curvature flow, which was recently introduced in [ST]. To be more precise, following Vezzoni [Vez], in [Poo] it has been noted that, in two-step nilpotent Lie groups, the symplectic curvature flow reduces to the anti-complexified Ricci flow, which was given by Hong Van Lê and Guofang Wang in [LeW]. Given that the invariant Ricci tensor \(\text{ric}^{oc}_{(\cdot)}\) coincides with the anti-complexified Ricci tensor \(\text{ric}^{ac}_{(\cdot)}\) (see [Lau1] Equation (23)), the affirmation follows from [Lau1] Proposition 2.7.
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