

ON BREZIS' FIRST OPEN PROBLEM: A COMPLETE SOLUTION

LIMING SUN, JUN-CHENG WEI, AND WEN YANG

ABSTRACT. In 2023, H. Brezis [5] published a list of his “favorite open problems”, which he described as challenges he had “raised throughout his career and has resisted so far”. We provide a complete resolution to the first one—Open Problem 1.1—in Brezis’s favorite open problems list: the existence of solutions to the long-standing Brezis-Nirenberg problem on a three-dimensional ball. Furthermore, using the building blocks of Del Pino-Musso-Pacard-Pistoia sign-changing solutions to the Yamabe problem, we establish the existence of infinitely many sign-changing, nonradial solutions for the full range of the parameter.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Motivation and main results	2
1.2. Nodal solutions to Yamabe problem and the non-degeneracy	3
1.3. Sketch of Proofs.	5
2. On the Del Pino-Musso-Pacard-Pistoia solution	7
2.1. Estimates of ψ	9
2.2. On the nodal set of Del Pino-Musso-Pacard-Pistoia’s solution	12
2.3. Non-degeneracy	21
3. Preliminary on Approximate Solutions	24
4. Energy expansion	29
5. Gluing Procedure	34
6. The linear and nonlinear problem	37
7. The finite-dimensional reduction and the critical point	42
8. Critical computations	48
8.1. Estimates on Type I	48
8.2. Estimates on the Type II	54
9. Some estimates on finite sum	58
Appendix A. Some technical computations in Section 2	66
References	67

Date: March 10, 2025 (Last Typeset).

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 35J20, Secondary 35J25; 35J61.

Key words and phrases. critical exponent, Brezis-Nirenberg problem, sign-changing solution.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Motivation and main results. Let Ω be a smooth and bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^N . In their seminal work, Brezis and Nirenberg [6] studied the following problem:

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u + \lambda u + |u|^{\frac{4}{N-2}}u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

and established the existence of at least one positive solution under the following conditions: $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1$ if $N \geq 4$, and $0 < \lambda_* < \lambda < \lambda_1$ if $N = 3$. Here, λ_1 denotes the first eigenvalue of the Laplacian, and λ_* is a domain-dependent constant, which was later quantified by Druet [25] in terms of Robin functions. When Ω is the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^N , Brezis and Nirenberg showed that $\lambda_* = \frac{\lambda_1}{4}$ and positive solution exists if and only if $\lambda \in (\frac{\lambda_1}{4}, \lambda_1)$. Moreover, as a consequence of the classical Pohozaev's identity, solutions do not exist if $\lambda \leq 0$ and Ω is star-shaped.

Since the pioneering work of Brezis-Nirenberg [6] in 1983, the study of nonlinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponents has been an area of intense research. A natural question arises regarding the existence of *sign-changing* solutions to (1.1). In the case of (1.1), several existence results have been established for dimensions $N \geq 4$. In these higher dimensions, sign-changing solutions can be obtained for every $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1(\Omega))$ and even for $\lambda > \lambda_1(\Omega)$ (see [10, 12, 11, 13, 15, 23, 53]). In particular, Capozzi-Fortunato-Palmieri [10] proved that for $N = 4$ and $\lambda > 0$, provided that $\lambda \notin \sigma(-\Delta)$ (the spectrum of $-\Delta$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$), problem (1.1) admits a nontrivial solution. The same conclusion holds for all $\lambda > 0$ when $N \geq 5$. Clapp-Weth [15] considered the existence of multiple solutions to the Brezis-Nirenberg problem for dimensions $N \geq 4$. However, the existence of sign-changing solutions in the three-dimensional case ($N = 3$) poses challenges similar to those encountered for positive solutions, while also introducing additional complexities. This problem remains unresolved, even in the simplified scenario of a unit ball, and is the central focus of **Open Problem 1.1** as formulated by H. Brezis in [5]. Let Ω be the unit ball B_1 in \mathbb{R}^3 . Consider the following problem:

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u + \lambda u + u^5 = 0 & \text{in } B_1, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_1. \end{cases}$$

H. Brezis' first open problem, implicitly raised by Brezis and Nirenberg [Remark (6)(d), [6]], is as follows:

Open Problem 1.1 (Implicit in [6]) Assume that

$$(1.3) \quad 0 < \lambda < \frac{\lambda_1}{4}.$$

Does there exist a non-trivial solution $u \not\equiv 0$ to (1.2)?

As remarked by H. Brezis, under the condition (1.3), any solution to (1.2), if exists, must be non-radial and sign-changing. When $\lambda > \lambda_1$ there are sign-changing solutions but there is no positive solution to (1.2). See [6]. They are obtained by bifurcation from non-radial sign-changing eigenfunctions.

Our main result provides a complete resolution to Brezis' Open Problem 1.1 and, in fact, establishes even more.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that*

$$(1.4) \quad 0 < \lambda < +\infty.$$

Then there are infinitely many (sign-changing) solutions to (1.2).

There has been extensive research aimed at finding nontrivial solutions to the Brezis-Nirenberg problem (1.2) in three dimensions. Most of these studies focus on cases where λ is greater than $\lambda_1/4$ or a small perturbation of $\lambda_1/4$ and the solutions are positive; for further details, we refer the reader to Del Pino-Dolbeault-Musso [18], Musso-Salazar [43] and the references therein. For constructions in higher dimensions, we refer to Iacopetti-Vaira [35, 36], Musso-Pistoia [42], Musso-Serena-Vaira [46], Pistoia-Vaira [47], Premoselli [48], Rey [49] and Robert-Vetois [51, 52]. For bubbling analysis to the Brezis-Nirenberg problem we refer to Bahri-Li-Rey [2], Han [33], König-Laurin [39], Frank-König-Kovářík [30], Malchiodi-Mayer [41], Rey [49], Wei [57] and references therein. There are many related works on the Brezis-Nirenberg problem which are virtually impossible to give an exhaustive bibliography. In addition to the ones mentioned above, one can see [1, 3, 9, 16, 26, 34, 46, 54, 55] and references therein.

In this paper, we prove that for any positive λ , there exist infinitely many solutions to (1.2). Motivated by the nonexistence result of Brezis and Nirenberg for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1/4)$, we focus on the existence of sign-changing solutions. Unlike most of the existing literature mentioned before, which relies on the standard positive Talenti solution, the building blocks of our construction are the *sign-changing* solutions to the Yamabe problem

$$(1.5) \quad \Delta u + |u|^{\frac{4}{N-2}} u = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N$$

constructed by Del Pino-Musso-Pacard-Pistoia [20] which we shall describe next.

1.2. Nodal solutions to Yamabe problem and the non-degeneracy. Problem (1.5) is a canonical equation in the so-called constant scalar curvature problem with conformal metrics, i.e. Yamabe problem. In an earlier seminal paper, Gidas-Nirenberg [31] employed the moving plane method to classify all positive finite-energy solutions of the equation (1.5). They showed that all such solutions are given by (the so-called Talenti bubbles)

$$(1.6) \quad u(z) = \left(\frac{\sqrt{N(N-2)\lambda}}{\lambda^2 + |z-a|^2} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}}, \quad \lambda > 0, \quad a \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

In 1989, Caffarelli-Gidas-Spruck [8] extended this classification by removing the finite-energy assumption, obtaining the same result, and Chen-Li [14] gave a more simplified proof. The classification of solutions for polyharmonic equations with critical exponents was later established by the second author and Xu in [58].

Concerning sign-changing solutions to (1.5), it is noteworthy that Ding [24] was the first to employ variational methods to construct infinitely many conformally inequivalent sign-changing solutions with finite energy. Since then, the existence of sign-changing solutions to the Yamabe equation in the entire space has become an active research topic. Del Pino-Musso-Pacard-Pistoia [20] introduced a novel constructive approach that produces sign-changing solutions with large energy, where the energy densities concentrate along specific submanifolds of \mathbb{S}^N . In particular, they constructed a solution resembling a positive bubble but crowned by m negative spikes arranged in a regular polygon with radius 1. Remarkably,

this solution is invariant under both rotation and the Kelvin transformation. Denote by Σ the set of nonzero finite-energy solutions to (1.5):

$$(1.7) \quad \Sigma := \left\{ Q \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}) : \Delta Q + |Q|^{\frac{4}{N-2}}Q = 0 \right\}.$$

In fact, one can see that equation (1.5) is invariant under the four transformations: translation, dilation, orthogonal transformation and Kelvin transformation, we refer the readers to Section 2.3 for the explicit definition of these transformations. If $Q \in \Sigma$ we denote

$$L_Q \cdot = \Delta \cdot + \frac{N+2}{N-2} |Q|^{\frac{4}{N-2}} \cdot$$

as the linearized operator around Q . Define the kernel space of L_Q :

$$(1.8) \quad \mathcal{Z}(Q) = \{f \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) : L_Q f = 0\}.$$

The elements in $\mathcal{Z}(Q)$ generated by the family of the aforementioned four transformations define the following space

$$(1.9) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_Q = \text{Span} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (2-N)z_j Q + |z|^2 \partial_{z_j} Q - 2z_j z \cdot \nabla Q, \partial_{z_j} Q, 1 \leq j \leq N, \\ (z_j \partial_{z_\ell} - z_\ell \partial_{z_j})Q, 1 \leq j < \ell \leq N, \frac{N-2}{2} Q + z \cdot \nabla Q \end{array} \right\}.$$

One can verify that the dimension of $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_Q$ is at most

$$2N + 1 + \frac{N(N-1)}{2}.$$

However, for the positive radial bubble solution u given in (1.6), the dimension of $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_Q$ is found to be $N + 1$. In general, the dimension of the solution may be smaller than $2N + 1 + \frac{N(N-1)}{2}$. Duyckaerts-Kenig-Merle introduced the following definition of non-degeneracy for a solution of equation (1.5) in [28]: a solution $Q \in \Sigma$ is said to be *non-degenerate* if

$$(1.10) \quad \mathcal{Z}(Q) = \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}(Q).$$

In [44], Musso-Wei established that the solution constructed by Del Pino-Musso-Pacard-Pistoia is non-degenerate in the sense of Duyckaerts-Kenig-Merle. Using this non-degeneracy property of the crown solution, Musso-Wei [45] constructed a sign-changing solution to the Barhi-Coron problem, while Deng-Musso-Wei [22] presented a novel solution to the scalar curvature problem, and Deng-Musso [21] provided a new construction of sign-changing solutions to Coron's problem. The notion of non-degeneracy is not only significant in the study of elliptic partial differential equations but also serves as a fundamental component in proving soliton resolution for solutions to the energy-critical wave equation. This resolution relies on the compactness property established by Kenig and Merle [37, 38]. For dimensions $N = 3, 4, 5$, and under the assumption of non-degeneracy, Duyckaerts et al. [27, 29] demonstrated that any nontrivial solution to the energy-critical wave equation asymptotically decomposes into a finite sum of stationary solutions and solitary waves, which are Lorentz transforms of the former.

1.3. **Sketch of Proofs.** Going back to the proof of Theorem 1.1, we remark that a key difficulty in dimension three is that the decay of solutions at infinity is not fast enough. Specifically, the standard bubble (1.6) decays only algebraically as $1/|z|$, and solving a Poisson equation with a source term of the form $1/|z|$ would lead to an ansatz that grows algebraically at infinity. This challenge is significantly more difficult in three dimensions than in higher dimensions. (Another reason we avoid using positive bubbles is more complex. See the explanation at the end for further details.) Therefore, it is crucial to construct a suitable building block that is both sign-changing and exhibits a faster decay than the standard bubble.

Following this principle, a key observation in this paper is that we can apply an inversion transformation at the nodal set of the crown solution constructed by Del Pino-Musso-Pacard-Pistoia (see also [60]). This transformation plays a central role in our strategy. Two essential properties ensure that this solution serves as an appropriate candidate. First, the crown solution remains invariant under Kelvin transformation, and Musso-Wei [44] have proved its non-degeneracy in the sense of Duyckaerts-Kenig-Merle [28]. Second, as we will show in Section 2 (Theorem 2.1) by lengthy computations, the crown solution q satisfies $\nabla q(z) \neq 0$ for each point z in its nodal set, thus the nodal set forms a smooth compact Riemann surface. See Figure 2. These two factors ensure the robustness of the gluing and reduction procedure.

Once the appropriate building block is established, the next step is to determine where we put the configurations and construct a suitable approximate solution. Our approach is as follows: we seek solutions that are rotationally invariant in the first two variables and exhibit even symmetry in the third one. This symmetry assumption allows us to eliminate certain kernel elements from $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}(Q)$. To proceed, we divide the unit ball into K subdomains, where K is chosen to be a sufficiently large even number, serving as the perturbation parameter in our analysis. (The idea of using the number of bubbles as a parameter seems first due to Wei-Yan [59]). Each subdomain is a replica of the following region:

$$(1.11) \quad \Sigma_K = \left\{ (r, \theta, z_3) \in B_1; 0 < r < 1, -\frac{\pi}{K} < \theta < \frac{\pi}{K} \right\}.$$

See Figure 1 for illustration.




FIGURE 1. Left picture is the region Σ_K and its two boundaries inside B_1 . Right one is the necklace solution.

We will position a crown bubble (after applying the inversion transformation) in each sector in an alternating manner. In fact, they are arranged close to the boundary ∂B_1 . These

bubbles form **necklace** pattern consisting alternating Del Pino-Musso-Pacard-Pistoia bubbles near the boundary. See Figure 1 for the right one. Specifically, in the vicinity of the crown bubble located in Σ_K , the neighboring two bubbles will have opposite signs. This setup reduces the problem to solving the following Dirichlet problem in Σ_K :

$$(1.12) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u + \lambda u + u^5 = 0 & \text{in } \Sigma_K, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Sigma_K. \end{cases}$$

With respect to (1.12), we present the following existence result.

Theorem 1.2. *If K is even and large enough, then (1.12) has a solution.*

To prove Theorem 1.2, we must modify the alternating sum of crown bubbles (after inversion) to ensure that it satisfies the boundary conditions. As a result, the next-order correction terms T_A , φ_A , and ψ_A become essential, with their definitions provided in Section 3. In particular, T_A accounts for the influence of crown bubbles from the other sectors, while φ_A represents the effect of the mirror bubble of the one in Σ_K with respect to the boundary of the unit ball. Although the non-degeneracy of the solution has already been established by Musso-Wei in [44], analyzing the associated linearized problem remains challenging. The main difficulty arises from the necessity of positioning the center of the crown bubble close to the boundary. To tackle this, we decompose the perturbation into two components: one that resolves the problem in a small ball centered near the boundary and another that handles the remaining errors. By employing the classical inner-outer gluing method (see [19, 40]), we confirm that the resulting coupled system exhibits weak coupling, allowing us to reduce the original linearized problem to a standard form. Following the well-established procedure of analyzing the linearized operator and the nonlinear problem (see Section 6), we further reduce the infinite-dimensional problem to a finite-dimensional one. For this finite-dimensional setting, we apply the localized energy method (see [32]) to identify the critical points of the energy function with respect to the parameters.

We face two essential difficulties. First, due to the algebraic decay of the building blocks and the specific configuration of our approximation, the interaction between bubbles renders the energy computation particularly intricate. In particular, we must determine the asymptotic behavior of several types of series like

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (-1)^j \left(x^2 + \sin^2 \frac{j\pi}{n}\right)^{-\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left(x^2 + \sin^2 \frac{j\pi}{n}\right)^{-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

(See Section 9.) It is fortunate that contour integration from complex analysis can be employed to derive an integral representation for the given series. Utilizing results on elliptic integrals, we establish a precise asymptotic behavior for these series under specific conditions on x and n . The detailed computations are provided in Section 9.

The second difficulty is that we have **six** parameter configuration spaces: they are respectively (1) scaling; (2) two translations; (3) one rotation; (4) two Kelvin transforms. These parameters have different scales, some of them may dominate others, so we have to find out the delicate small forces. After calculating the energy of the solution carefully, we analyze its leading order terms and identify the critical point through minimization, thereby proving the existence of a solution to (1.12). The whole process is a careful balancing act, where

we must figure out the proper order for each parameter. Roughly speaking, we find that the scaling parameter is of $O(K^{-3})$, the distance of the center of bubble to the boundary is of $O(K^{-1} \log K)$, the shift of the bubble in the z_1 -axis is of $O(K^{-2} \log K)$, and finally the rotation is found to be of $O(K^{-1} \log K)$. The Kelvin transform parameters are smaller in order.

Using the existence result from Theorem 1.2, we can get a solution to the Brezis-Nirenberg problem in B_1 . Specifically, we extend u by performing an odd reflection across each hyperplanes $\theta = j\pi/K$, $j = 1, 3, 5, \dots, K-1$, consecutively. As a consequence, u can be extended to a function in $B_1 \setminus \{0\}$ and verifies (1.2) in $B_1 \setminus \{0\}$. Since the solution we constructed is bounded, the singularity at the origin is removable. Consequently, we establish the existence of a nontrivial solution to (1.2), thereby resolving Brezis's open problem.

Remark 1.3. *The solution we constructed has a special shape, see Figure 1, where blue and red colors represent the positive and negative bubbles, respectively.*

To end the introduction, we make a few comments. First, when λ is a sufficiently small positive number, an alternative type of solution can be constructed, where a single crown bubble is placed at the origin. We will report it elsewhere. Second, for the Brezis-Nirenberg problem in higher dimensions, we can apply the same approach to construct infinitely many sign-changing solutions. Third, we believe that the procedure outlined in this paper can be adapted to other elliptic problems involving critical exponents. Finally, since the Del Pino-Musso-Pacard-Pistoia bubble has large Morse index, the solutions we constructed carry very high Morse index. It remains open if one can give a positive answer to Brezis' Open Problem 1.1 by direct variational methods. The corresponding Brezis' problem in general three-dimensional domains is also challenging. By [Theorem 1.2, Brezis-Nirenberg [6]], for strictly starshaped three dimensional domain Ω , positive solution exists only if $\lambda \geq \lambda_0(\Omega) > 0$. (As a result and by a scaling argument, if we use positive bubble as building block in Theorem 1.2, then $\lambda \geq c_0 K^2 > 0$.) By Theorem 1.1, we raise the following generalized Brezis' Open Problem 1.1:

Generalized Brezis' Open Problem. Let Ω be strictly star-shaped domain in \mathbb{R}^3 . Then for every $\lambda > 0$, problem (1.1) admits infinitely many solutions.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we examine the crown solution constructed by Del Pino-Musso-Pacard-Pistoia [20] by analyzing its nodal set. In Sections 3 and 4 we introduce the approximate solution with correction terms and include the computation of the energy for the approximate solution. Section 5 presents the inner-outer gluing procedure, reducing the coupled system to the inner one. In Section 6, we consider the linear and nonlinear problems. In Section 7 we focus on reducing the infinite-dimensional problem to a finite-dimensional one, where we resolve the reduced problem by identifying the local minimum of the reduced energy and provide the proof of Theorem 1.2. Sections 8 and 9 focus on the delicate estimation of the correction terms and the analysis of certain series, respectively. Finally, some technical computations from Section 2 are included in the appendix.

2. ON THE DEL PINO-MUSSO-PACARD-PISTOIA SOLUTION

In this section, we give a detailed study on the Del Pino-Musso-Pacard-Pistoia solutions to equation (1.5). Del Pino, Musso, Pacard, and Pistoia discovered an interesting sign-changing

solution to (1.5) characterized by a large number m of bubbles. This presents the first semi-explicit construction of its kind, utilizing an approach that naturally reveals spectral information related to the linearized problem. Because of its distinctive shape, they refer to it as the crown solution. Recently, this type of crown solution has played a significant role in understanding the long-term dynamics in the corresponding Schrödinger equation. (See [60].) Moreover, it serves as the foundation for the current work. In this section, we begin by describing this solution q_m and providing a more refined analysis of its asymptotic behavior. Additionally, we examine the nodal set of this solution, demonstrating that it forms a smooth manifold, a property that proves crucial in addressing the reduction problem. Finally, we offer an interpretation for the non-degeneracy of the solution.

In [20], the authors proved that there exists m_0 such that for all integer $m > m_0$, there exists a solution q_m of (1.5) that can be represented as follows

$$(2.1) \quad q_m(z) = U_*(z) + \phi(z),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} U_* &= U(z) - \sum_{j=1}^m U_j(z) = U(z) - \sum_{j=1}^m \mu_m^{-\frac{1}{2}} U\left(\frac{z - \xi_j}{\mu_m}\right) \\ &= 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{1}{1 + |z|^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \sum_{j=1}^m \mu_m^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \mu_m^{-2}|z - \xi_j|^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \phi(z) &= \sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{\phi}_j(z) + \psi(z). \end{aligned}$$

For U_* , the parameters μ_m and ξ_j , $j = 1, \dots, m$ are chosen as the following

$$(2.2) \quad \xi_j = \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} \left(\cos \frac{2(j-1)\pi}{m}, \sin \frac{2(j-1)\pi}{m}, 0 \right),$$

and (for the choice of d_m , see [20, Page 2590])

$$(2.3) \quad \mu_m = \frac{d_m^2}{m^2(\log m)^2} \quad \text{and} \quad d_m = \sqrt{2} \frac{m \log m}{\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \csc \frac{j\pi}{m}} + O\left(\frac{1}{m \log m}\right).$$

It follows from [4, Theorem 7] that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \csc\left(\frac{j\pi}{m}\right) = \frac{2m}{\pi} \left(\log \frac{2m}{\pi} + \gamma_0 \right) + O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

where $\gamma_0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{j} - \log n) = 0.577 \dots$ is the Euler's constant. Thus

$$(2.4) \quad d_m = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \pi + O\left(\frac{1}{\log m}\right)$$

For the error terms $\tilde{\phi}_j$, $j = 1, \dots, m$, and ψ , we have

$$(2.5) \quad |\nabla^\ell \tilde{\phi}_j(z)| \leq \frac{C}{1 + \mu_m^{-1}|z - \xi_j|^{\ell+1}}, \quad \ell = 0, 1, 2, \quad j = 1, \dots, m,$$

and

$$(2.6) \quad |\psi(z)| \leq \frac{C}{\log m} \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla\psi(z)| + |\nabla^2\psi(z)| \leq C.$$

Although [20] does not provide explicit estimates for the derivatives of $\tilde{\phi}_j$ and ψ , these can be obtained using the equations they satisfy along with standard elliptic estimates. From the estimates in (2.5) and (2.6), it is obvious that, away from the centers of the negative bubbles, $\psi(z)$ is the dominant term, with an order of $O(1/\log m)$. In fact, the leading-order behavior of $\psi(z)$ plays a crucial role in determining the nodal set of q_m . Therefore, it is necessary to determine the precise value of ψ in this order for the points z lying on the circle of radius $\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2}$ on the $z_1 z_2$ plane. In Subsection 2.1, we will carry out this computation.

The following theorem provides precise estimates of the nodal set of the Del Pino-Musso-Pacard-Pistoia solution. This will be crucially used in later constructions.

Theorem 2.1. *When m is large enough, q_m has a smooth embedding and compact nodal set $\mathcal{N}(q_m)$ such that $q_m(z) = 0$ and $\nabla q_m(z) \neq 0$ for any $z \in \mathcal{N}(q_m)$. Near the center of each bump ξ_j , $\mathcal{N}(q_m) \cap \{z_3 = 0\} \sim \{|z - \xi_j| \sim 1/m\}$.¹*

Remark 2.2. *When analyzing the behavior of the approximate solution U_* , the nodal set exhibits a structure resembling a torus, as illustrated in the left image of Figure 2. However, the strong influence of ψ also affects the behavior of $q_m(z)$ for $|z| = \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2}$. Specifically, $q_m(z)$ is positive at the point*

$$z = \left(\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} \cos \frac{\pi}{m}, \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} \sin \frac{\pi}{m}, 0 \right).$$

Consequently, when considering the nodal set of $q_m(z)$ in the $z_1 z_2$ -plane, the numerical simulations reveal that it consists of m circles surrounding the center of each negative bubble.

In Subsection 2.2 we shall give the proof of Theorem 2.1 by analyzing the nodal set of $q_m(z)$ and its smoothness. First, we estimate the global term ψ in the next subsection.

2.1. Estimates of ψ . Recall that ψ satisfies (see [20, (4.13)])

$$(2.7) \quad \Delta\psi + 5U^4\psi + V(z)\psi + 5|U_*|^4 \sum_j (1 - \zeta_j)\tilde{\phi}_j + M(\psi) = 0,$$

where (we used the notations from there)

$$\begin{aligned} V(z) &:= 5(|U_*|^4 - |U|^4) \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j \right) - 5U^4 \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j, \\ M(\psi) &:= \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j \right) \left(E + N \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{\phi}_j + \psi \right) \right), \\ E &= \left(U - \sum_{j=1}^m U_j \right)^5 - U^5 - \sum_{j=1}^m U_j^5, \end{aligned}$$

¹Indeed, we can prove that near the center of each bump ξ_j , the distance between the zero point z of q_m and ξ_j is on the order of $1/m$. However, it is neither possible nor necessary for our proof to show that the nodal set resembles a ball in topology; it suffices to confirm that it is a smooth Riemannian manifold.




FIGURE 2. The left one is the nodal sets of U_* inside the cube $[-5/2, 5/2]^3$ when $m = 16$ and $d_m = \sqrt{2}m \log m \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \csc \frac{j\pi}{m} \right)^{-1}$. The right one is the intersection of nodal sets of q_m with $z_1 z_2$ -plane.

and

$$\zeta_j(z) = \begin{cases} \zeta(m\eta^{-1}|z|^{-2}|(z - \xi_j|z|)|), & \text{if } |z| > 1, \\ \zeta(m\eta^{-1}|z - \xi_j|), & \text{if } |z| \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Here $\zeta(s)$ is a smooth function such that $\zeta(s) = 1$ for $s < 1$ and $\zeta(s) = 0$ for $s > 2$, and η is a small positive constant. It is not difficult to check that

$$(2.8) \quad U(z) = \frac{1}{|z|} U \left(\frac{z}{|z|^2} \right), \quad U_j(z) = \frac{1}{|z|} U_j \left(\frac{z}{|z|^2} \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, m,$$

and

$$(2.9) \quad \zeta_j(z) = \zeta_j \left(\frac{z}{|z|^2} \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, m.$$

Together with the properties that the ansatz is $2\pi/m$ -rotationally invariant in $z_1 z_2$ plane and even symmetry with respect to the z_3 axis, one can solve ψ from (2.7) uniquely in a suitable Sobolev space, which is the orthogonal complement of the space spanned by the kernels of the linear operator $\Delta + 5U^4$. More precisely, the authors in [20] proved that

$$\|\psi\|_{L_w^\infty} \leq C \left(\|V(z)\psi\|_{L_w^q} + 5 \left\| |U_*|^4 \sum_j (1 - \zeta_j) \tilde{\phi}_j \right\|_{L_w^q} + \|M(\psi)\|_{L_w^q} \right),$$

where

$$\|\psi\|_{L_w^\infty} := \|(1 + |z|)\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|h\|_{L_w^q} := \|(1 + |z|)^{5-\frac{6}{q}}h\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

Particularly, for $q > \frac{3}{2}$ it has been shown that

$$\left\| \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j \right) N \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{\phi}_j + \psi \right) \right\|_{L_w^q} + \left\| |U_*|^4 \sum_j (1 - \zeta_j) \tilde{\phi}_j \right\|_{L_w^q} + \|V(z)\psi\|_{L_w^q} \leq \frac{C}{(\log m)^2}.$$

In order to capture the leading behavior of ψ , we decompose $\psi = \psi_d + \psi_s$, where ψ_d and ψ_s are the solutions are used for solving the major error term $\left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j\right) E$ and the left terms in (2.7) respectively, i.e.,

$$(2.10) \quad \Delta\psi_d + 5U^4\psi_d + \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j\right) E = 0,$$

and

$$(2.11) \quad \Delta\psi_s + 5U^4\psi_s + V(z)\psi + 5|U_*|^4 \sum_j (1 - \zeta_j) \tilde{\phi}_j + M(\psi) - \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j\right) E = 0.$$

It is straightforward to verify that both equations are solvable, since the source terms are orthogonal to the kernel of the linear operator $\Delta + 5U^4$. Moreover, if we impose the condition that both functions ψ_d and ψ_s lie in the orthogonal complement of the kernel of $\Delta + 5U^4$, it can be shown that

$$(2.12) \quad \|\psi_s\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \frac{C}{(\log m)^2}.$$

In the following, we study ψ_d . By diving it into two parts $\psi_{d,1}$ and $\psi_{d,2}$

$$(2.13) \quad \Delta\psi_{d,1} + 5U^4\psi_{d,1} - 5U^4 \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|z - \xi_{j,0}|} = 0,$$

and

$$(2.14) \quad \Delta\psi_{d,2} + 5U^4\psi_{d,2} + 5U^4 \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|z - \xi_{j,0}|} + \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j\right) E = 0,$$

where $\xi_{j,0} = \left(\cos \frac{2(j-1)\pi}{m}, \sin \frac{2(j-1)\pi}{m}, 0\right)$. Note that $\xi_{j,0}$ is on the unit circle, while ξ_j (see (2.2)) is on the circle of radius $\sqrt{1 - \mu^2}$. For (2.14), one can check that

$$(2.15) \quad \left\| 5U^4 \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|x - \xi_{j,0}|} + \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j\right) E \right\|_{L_w^q} \leq \frac{C}{(\log m)^2}.$$

The proof of (2.15) is lengthy and thus left to Appendix A. From (2.15) we see that

$$(2.16) \quad \|\psi_{d,2}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \frac{C}{(\log m)^2}.$$

It remains to study $\psi_{d,1}$. In fact, we can find the explicit form of the solution for $z = \left(\cos \frac{\pi}{m}, \sin \frac{\pi}{m}, 0\right)$. Indeed, we write

$$(2.17) \quad \psi_{d,1} = 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{\frac{m}{2}} \left(\psi_{d,1,j} + \frac{1}{|z - \xi_{j,0}|} + \frac{1}{|z - \xi_{j+\frac{m}{2},0}|} \right),$$

where $\psi_{d,1,j}$ verifies

$$(2.18) \quad \Delta\psi_{d,1,j} + 5U^4\psi_{d,1,j} = 4\pi \left(\delta_{\xi_{j,0}} + \delta_{\xi_{j+\frac{m}{2},0}} \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, \frac{m}{2}.$$

where δ_ξ is the Dirac function at ξ . Particularly $\psi_{d,1,1}$ is given below

$$(2.19) \quad \psi_{d,1,1}(z) = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{(1+|z|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}(1+|z|^2)\sqrt{(1+|z|^2)^2-4z_1^2}},$$

the other $\psi_{d,1,j}$, $j = 2, \dots, \frac{m}{2}$ can be derived from $\psi_{d,1,1}$ by a rotation of $\frac{2(j-1)\pi}{m}$. At $z = \hat{\xi}_0 = (\cos \frac{\pi}{m}, \sin \frac{\pi}{m}, 0)$, we can compute the value of $\psi_{d,1}$ and get that

$$(2.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_{d,1}(\xi_0) &= 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{\frac{m}{2}} \left(\frac{1 - 2 \cos^2 \left(\frac{2(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\pi}{m} \right)}{\left| \sin \left(\frac{2(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\pi}{m} \right) \right|} + \frac{1}{\sin \left(\frac{(2j-1)\pi}{2m} \right)} \right) \\ &= 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{\frac{m}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{\sin \left(\frac{(2j-1)\pi}{2m} \right)} - \frac{1}{\left| \sin \left(\frac{2(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\pi}{m} \right) \right|} \right) \\ &\quad + 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{\frac{m}{2}} 2 \left| \sin \left(\frac{2(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\pi}{m} \right) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Together with the estimation (2.12), (2.16), and (2.6), we have

$$(2.21) \quad \psi \left(\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} \cos \frac{\pi}{m}, \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} \sin \frac{\pi}{m}, 0 \right) = \psi_{d,1}(\xi_0) + O \left(\frac{1}{(\log m)^2} \right).$$

We shall see that it plays an important role in determining the nodal set of the crown bubble solution q_m .

2.2. On the nodal set of Del Pino-Musso-Pacard-Pistoia's solution. In this subsection, we will study the nodal set of the solution by Del Pino-Musso-Pacard-Pistoia. To begin with, we present the following lemma to describe the location of the nodal set.

Lemma 2.3. *When m is large enough, q_m has a compact nodal set $\mathcal{N}(q_m)$ such that for any point z in $\mathcal{N}(q_m)$, the following holds*

$$\text{dist}(z, \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m\}) \sim \frac{1}{m}.$$

In addition, there exists a small positive constant c_0 such that

$$(2.22) \quad \mathcal{N}(q_m) \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^m B_{c_0/m} \left(\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} \cos \frac{2j-1}{m} \pi, \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} \sin \frac{2j-1}{m} \pi, 0 \right) = \emptyset.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we write $z = (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta, z_3)$ and assume that

$$|z - \xi_1| = \min\{|z - \xi_j|, j = 1, \dots, m\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \theta \in \left[0, \frac{\pi}{m} \right].$$

If $|z - \xi_1| \geq C$, then for sufficiently large m we have

$$q_m(z) \geq 3^{\frac{1}{4}} - 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|z - \xi_j|} - O \left(\frac{1}{\log m} \right) > 0.$$

Hence, the zero point z of $q_m(z)$ must be close to ξ_1 . As a consequence, we may restrict our discussion for the point z satisfying

$$(2.23) \quad |z - \xi_1| = o_m(1) \quad \text{and} \quad |r - 1| = o_m(1).$$

In the following, we divide our discussion into three steps. First, we will prove that $q_m(z)$ is negative in the vicinity of ξ_1 . The key point here is that when z is extremely close to ξ_1 , the effect of the other negative bubbles offsets the central positive bubble, making the negative bubble at ξ_1 the dominant term determining the sign of q_m . Next, we introduce a quantity h (refer to (2.28)), which measures the distance from the point z to the center of the negative bubble. We will show that when h is not too small, the major contributions from all negative bubbles form a series. This series can be assessed using an integral representation and the asymptotic behavior of the elliptic integral, enabling us to figure out the leading term in the total sum of negative bubbles. Finally, we will analyze the behavior of $q_m(z)$ at the midpoint between ξ_1 and ξ_2 , denoted by ξ_0 . By using the estimate of ψ at ξ_0 from (2.21), we will compare ψ to $U_* = U - \sum_{j=1}^m U_j$ and establish that q_m is positive at ξ_0 . Together with the evaluation of ∇q_m , this analysis reveals a small region (a tiny ball) where q_m remains positive.

Step 1. In this step, we shall prove that q_m is negative within a small neighborhood of ξ_1 , i.e.,

$$(2.24) \quad q_m(z) < 0 \quad \text{for} \quad |z - \xi_1| = \min_{j \in \{1, \dots, m\}} |z - \xi_j| \leq \frac{c_1}{m},$$

provided c_1 is sufficiently small. For $|z - \xi_1| \leq \frac{c_1}{m}$, we have

$$|z - \xi_1| \leq \frac{1}{2} |\xi_j - \xi_1| \quad \text{and} \quad |z - \xi_j| \leq |\xi_j - \xi_1| + |z - \xi_1|, \quad j = 2, \dots, m.$$

Then using the simple inequality $\frac{1}{1+x} \geq 1 - x$ for $x \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$(2.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \mu_m^{-2} |z - \xi_j|^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &= \frac{\mu_m}{|z - \xi_j|} + O \left(\frac{1}{m^3 (\log m)^6} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{\mu_m}{|\xi_j - \xi_1| + |z - \xi_1|} + O \left(\frac{1}{m^3 (\log m)^6} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{\mu_m}{|\xi_j - \xi_1|} - \frac{\mu_m |z - \xi_1|}{|\xi_j - \xi_1|^2} + O \left(\frac{1}{m^3 (\log m)^6} \right), \end{aligned}$$

for any $j = 2, \dots, m$. Similarly, we can apply the inequality $\frac{1}{1-x} \leq 1 + 2x$ for $x \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ to derive that

$$\frac{\mu_m}{|z - \xi_j|} \leq \frac{\mu_m}{|\xi_j - \xi_1|} + \frac{2\mu_m |z - \xi_1|}{|\xi_j - \xi_1|^2}, \quad j = 2, \dots, m.$$

Together with (2.5) and (2.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.26) \quad q_m(z) &\leq 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\left(\frac{1}{1+|z|^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{\mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|\xi_1 - \xi_j|} + \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{\mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} |z - \xi_1|}{|\xi_1 - \xi_j|^2} \right) \\
&\quad - 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \mu_m^{-2} |z - \xi_1|^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + O \left(\frac{1}{m(\log m)^5} \right) \\
&\quad + O \left(\frac{1}{\log m} \right) + O \left(\frac{1}{1 + \mu_m^{-1} |z - \xi_1|} \right) \\
&\quad + O \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{\mu_m}{|\xi_j - \xi_1|} + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\mu_m |z - \xi_1|}{|\xi_j - \xi_1|^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

On the right hand side of (2.26), using $|z - \xi_1| \leq \frac{c_1}{m}$ we have

$$\frac{1}{1+|z|^2} = \frac{1}{1+|\xi_1|^2} + O \left(\frac{1}{m} \right) = \frac{1}{2} + O \left(\frac{1}{m} \right),$$

the second and third terms in the bracket can be handled respectively as follows

$$\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{\mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|\xi_1 - \xi_j|} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} + O \left(\frac{1}{m \log m} \right),$$

and

$$\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{|z - \xi_1|}{m \log m |\xi_1 - \xi_j|^2} \leq C \frac{m |z - \xi_1|}{\log m}.$$

Consider the fourth term on the right hand side of (2.26), we have

$$\mu_m^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \mu_m^{-2} |z - \xi_1|^2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \mu_m^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \frac{\mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|z - \xi_1|} \right\}.$$

Putting all these information on the right hand side of (2.25) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.27) \quad q_m(z) &\leq -3^{\frac{1}{4}} \min \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \mu_m^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \frac{\mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|z - \xi_1|} \right\} + \frac{Cm |z - \xi_1|}{\log m} \\
&\quad + O \left(\frac{1}{\log m} \right) + O \left(\min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\mu_m^{-1} |z - \xi_1|} \right\} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

If $|z - \xi_1| \leq c_1/m$ with c_1 is small enough, we can see that the right-hand side of (2.27) is strictly negative for m sufficiently large. Thus, we finish the proof of the claim (2.24).

Step 2. Let

$$(2.28) \quad h^2 = \frac{(r - \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2})^2 + z_3^2}{4r\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2}}.$$

In this step we will show that

$$(2.29) \quad q_m(z) \text{ is positive for } h \geq \frac{C_0}{m} \text{ for } C_0 \text{ sufficiently large.}$$

To begin with, we will prove that

$$(2.30) \quad q_m(z) \text{ is positive for } h \geq m^{-\alpha_1} \text{ with any } \alpha_1 < 1.$$

Based on the definition of h , we can express $|z - \xi_j|^2$ as follows

$$(2.31) \quad |z - \xi_j|^2 = 4r \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} \left(h^2 + \sin^2 \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \right).$$

Using (2.5), (2.25) and (2.31) we have

$$(2.32) \quad q_m(z) = 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{1}{1 + |z|^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2(r \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2})^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\left(h^2 + \sin^2 \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \psi(z) + O \left(\frac{1}{m \log m} \right).$$

For the second term on the right hand side of (2.32), we have

$$(2.33) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\left(h^2 + \sin^2 \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}} &\leq \sum_{j=m_1+3}^{m-m_1} \frac{1}{\sin \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)} + \frac{2m_1 + 2}{h} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=m_1+1}^{m-m_1-1} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{j\pi}{m}} + \frac{2m_1 + 2}{h}, \end{aligned}$$

where $m_1 = \lfloor m^{1-\alpha_1} \rfloor$.² Substituting (2.3) and (2.33) into (2.32) we have

$$(2.34) \quad \begin{aligned} q_m(z) &\geq 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} - \frac{3^{\frac{1}{4}}}{2} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=m_1+1}^{m-m_1-1} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{j\pi}{m}} - 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{m_1 + 1}{h} + o_m(1) \\ &\geq 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_1} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{j\pi}{m}} + O \left(m \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) + o_m(1) \\ &\geq C \frac{\log m_1}{\log m} + o_m(1) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we also used that $|\psi| \leq \frac{C}{\log m}$ and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m_1} \frac{1}{j} \geq C \log m_1.$$

Next, we show that $q(z)$ is positive for $m^{-\alpha_1} \geq h \geq \frac{C_0}{m}$ for C_0 sufficiently large, where m is large enough such that $m^{-\alpha_1} \geq \frac{C_0}{m}$. Then we have

$$|z - \xi_1| \leq C m^{-\alpha_1}.$$

It implies

$$|z| = 1 + O(m^{-\alpha_1}) \quad \text{and} \quad r = 1 + O(m^{-\alpha_1}).$$

² $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the greatest integer less than x .

Following almost the same argument as we did in (2.33), we have

$$(2.35) \quad q_m(z) \geq 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} - 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{\mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2(r\sqrt{1-\mu_m^2})^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{j=m_2+1}^{m-m_2-1} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{j\pi}{m}} - 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{\mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}(m_2+1)}{(r\sqrt{1-\mu_m^2})^{\frac{1}{2}}h} + \psi(z) + O\left(\frac{1}{m \log m}\right),$$

where m_2 is determined later. Using (2.3), we see that

$$(2.36) \quad \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} - \frac{\mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2(r\sqrt{1-\mu_m^2})^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{j=m_2+1}^{m-m_2-1} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{j\pi}{m}} = \frac{d_m}{m \log m} \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{j\pi}{m}} + O\left(\frac{1}{m \log m}\right).$$

From (2.35) and (2.36) we have

$$(2.37) \quad \begin{aligned} q_m(z) &\geq 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{d_m}{m \log m} \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{j\pi}{m}} - 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{\mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}(m_2+1)}{(r\sqrt{1-\mu_m^2})^{\frac{1}{2}}h} + \psi(z) + O\left(\frac{1}{m \log m}\right) \\ &\geq C \frac{\log m_2}{\log m} - C \frac{m_2}{C_0 \log m} + O\left(\frac{1}{\log m}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $|\psi| \leq \frac{C}{\log m}$ and $h \geq \frac{C_0}{\log m}$. By first selecting a sufficiently large m_2 and then C_0 large enough, we can ensure that the right-hand side of (2.37) is positive. Together with (2.30), this allows us to establish (2.29), thereby completing the proof of this step.

Step 3. In this step, we shall show (2.22). For convenience, we set

$$\xi_0 = \left(\sqrt{1-\mu_m^2} \cos \frac{\pi}{m}, \sqrt{1-\mu_m^2} \sin \frac{\pi}{m}, 0 \right).$$

First, we prove that $q_m(\xi_0)$ is positive. After straightforward calculation we have

$$(2.38) \quad \begin{aligned} q_m(\xi_0) &= 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} - 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{|\xi_0 - \xi_j|} + \psi(\xi_0) + O\left(\frac{1}{m \log m}\right) \\ &= 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} - 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{\frac{m}{2}} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{(2j-1)\pi}{2m}} + \psi(\xi_0) + O\left(\frac{1}{m \log m}\right). \end{aligned}$$

By (2.21) and

$$(2.39) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\frac{m}{2}} 2 \left| \sin \left(\frac{2(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\pi}{m} \right) \right| = 2 \sin \frac{\pi}{m} + \frac{1 - \cos \frac{(m-2)\pi}{m}}{\sin \frac{\pi}{m}} = \frac{2m}{\pi} + O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right),$$

we have

$$(2.40) \quad q_m(\xi_0) = 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} - 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{\frac{m}{2}} \frac{1}{\left| \sin \left(\frac{2(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\pi}{m} \right) \right|} + 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{2m}{\pi} + O\left(\frac{1}{m \log m}\right).$$

Recall that (see (2.3))

$$\mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{d_m}{m \log m} = \sqrt{2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{j\pi}{m}} \right)^{-1} + O\left(\frac{1}{m \log m}\right),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} - \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{\frac{m}{2}} \frac{1}{\left| \sin \left(\frac{2(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\pi}{m} \right) \right|} \\ (2.41) \quad &= \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{\frac{m}{2}} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{j\pi}{m}} - \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{\frac{m}{2}} \frac{1}{\left| \sin \left(\frac{2(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\pi}{m} \right) \right|} + O\left(\frac{1}{m \log m}\right) \\ &\geq -\mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{\pi}{m}} + O\left(\frac{1}{m \log m}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that

$$\frac{1}{\sin \frac{2j\pi}{m}} \geq \frac{1}{\sin \frac{(m-2j-1)\pi}{m}}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{m}{2}.$$

Substituting (2.41) into (2.40) we have

$$(2.42) \quad q_m(\xi_0) \geq 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{m}{\pi} + O(\mu_m) \geq \frac{3^{\frac{1}{4}} d_m}{2\pi \log m}.$$

Consider the derivative of $q_m(z)$. By direct computation we have

$$(2.43) \quad \nabla q_m(z) = -\frac{3^{\frac{1}{4}} z}{(1+|z|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{-\frac{5}{2}} (z - \xi_j)}{(1 + \mu_m^{-2} |z - \xi_j|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \nabla \psi(z) + \sum_{j=1}^m \nabla \tilde{\phi}_j(z).$$

For $z \in B_{c_2 m^{-1}}(\xi_0)$ with c_2 small, we write

$$\nabla q_m(z) = 3^{\frac{1}{4}} (q_{m,1}(z), q_{m,2}(z), q_{m,3}(z)),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (2.44) \quad q_{m,1}(z) &= -\frac{\sqrt{2} z_1}{4} + \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{(r - \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2}) \cos \theta}{(4r \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2})^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(h^2 + \sin^2 \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\ &+ \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{2\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} \sin \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} + \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \sin \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)}{(4r \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2})^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(h^2 + \sin^2 \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\ &+ 3^{-\frac{1}{4}} \partial_{z_1} \psi + 3^{-\frac{1}{4}} \sum_{j=1}^m \partial_{z_1} \tilde{\phi}_j + O\left(\frac{1}{m(\log m)^5}\right), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.45) \quad q_{m,2}(z) = & -\frac{\sqrt{2}z_2}{4} + \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{(r - \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2}) \sin \theta}{(4r\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2})^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(h^2 + \sin^2 \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\
& - \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{2\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} \cos \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} + \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \sin \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)}{(4r\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2})^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(h^2 + \sin^2 \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\
& + 3^{-\frac{1}{4}} \partial_{z_2} \psi + 3^{-\frac{1}{4}} \sum_{j=1}^m \partial_{z_2} \tilde{\phi}_j + O \left(\frac{1}{m(\log m)^5} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.46) \quad q_{m,3}(z) = & -\frac{\sqrt{2}z_3}{4} + \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{z_3}{(4r\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2})^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(h^2 + \sin^2 \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\
& + 3^{-\frac{1}{4}} \partial_{z_3} \psi + 3^{-\frac{1}{4}} \sum_{j=1}^m \partial_{z_3} \tilde{\phi}_j + O \left(\frac{1}{m(\log m)^5} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For $z \in B_{c_2 m^{-1}}(\xi_0)$ with c_2 small, we have $h + |z_3| \leq C m^{-1}$. Furthermore, we can derive the following estimate for $q_{m,\ell}$, $\ell = 1, 2, 3$ from (2.5)-(2.6) and (2.44)-(2.46)

$$(2.47) \quad \sum_{\ell=1}^3 |q_{m,\ell}| \leq C \frac{m}{\log m}.$$

As a consequence of (2.42) and (2.47) we derive that there exists a small positive generic constant c_0 such that

$$q_m(z) > 0 \quad \text{for } z \in B_{c_0 m^{-1}}(\xi_0).$$

Hence we proved (2.22) and it finishes the whole proof. \square

In addition to Lemma 2.3, we can further show that the nodal set $\mathcal{N}(q_m)$ is smooth.

Lemma 2.4. *The nodal set $\mathcal{N}(q_m)$ of q_m is a smooth Riemann surface whenever m is sufficiently large, i.e., for any point z of $\mathcal{N}(q_m)$, $\nabla q_m(z) \neq 0$.*

Proof. We first show that $\nabla q_m(z) \neq 0$ for any zero point $z = (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta, z_3)$ with $|z| \geq 1$. Based on Lemma 2.3 we may assume that

$$|z - \xi_1| = \inf_{j=1, \dots, m} |z - \xi_j| \geq c_1 m^{-1}, \quad \theta \in \left[0, \frac{\pi}{m} \right], \quad \text{and} \quad h \leq C_0 m^{-1}.$$

We will divide our argument into three steps based on the location of the zero point z . Initially, we will prove that $\nabla q_m(z) \neq 0$ when $z_3 \neq 0$, enabling us to focus our analysis on points z within the $z_1 z_2$ plane. In the second step, we will establish that the radial derivative of q_m is strictly positive when $|z| \geq 1$ and h is not too small. However, when h is small, we observe that the series from the negative bubble exhibits rapid oscillations in the angular direction, provided z is not close to ξ_0 . Combined with the findings of Lemma 2.3, this allows us to prove that $\partial_\theta q_m(z)$ is nonzero for zero points in the $z_1 z_2$ plane where h is small.

Step 1. For any zero point z of $q_m(z)$ with $z_3 \neq 0$, $\partial_{z_3} q_m(z) \neq 0$. Using (2.46) and the fact ψ and $\tilde{\phi}_j$ is evenly symmetry with respect to z_3 we see that,

$$|\nabla\psi(z)| \leq C|z_3| \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^m |\nabla\tilde{\phi}_j(z)| \leq C \frac{m}{(\log m)^2} |z_3| \quad \text{for} \quad |z - \xi_1| \geq \frac{c_0}{m}.$$

Hence

$$\left| \frac{\partial q(z)}{\partial z_3} \right| \geq \left| \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2 \left(h^2 + \sin^2 \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} - C \frac{m}{(\log m)^2} \right| |z_3| > 0,$$

where we used that $\theta \in [0, \frac{\pi}{m}]$.

Step 2. For any zero point z lying on the $z_1 z_2$ plane, we show that $\nabla q_m(z) \neq 0$ with $h \geq C m^{-\frac{5}{3}}$. To be precise, if $z_3 = 0$ we have

$$h^2 = \frac{(r - \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2})^2}{4r\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2}} \quad \text{and} \quad r \geq 1 > \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2}.$$

Multiplying the above $\nabla q_m(z)$ by z we have

$$(2.48) \quad \nabla q_m(z) \cdot z = -3^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{|z|^2}{(1 + |z|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} + 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{(z - \xi_j) \cdot z}{|z - \xi_j|^3} + O(1).$$

Let us compute $(z - \xi_j) \cdot z$,

$$(z - \xi_j) \cdot z = r^2 - r\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} \cos \left(\frac{2(j-1)\pi}{m} - \theta \right) > 0,$$

where we used $r > \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2}$ due to that $r = |z| \geq 1$. Particularly for $j = 1$ we have

$$(2.49) \quad (z - \xi_1) \cdot z = r^2 - r\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} + 2r\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2} \geq C(h + \theta^2).$$

Substituting (2.49) into (2.48), we have

$$(2.50) \quad \nabla q_m(z) \cdot z \geq -3^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{|z|^2}{(1 + |z|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{C}{m \log m} \frac{h + \theta^2}{(h^2 + \sin^2 \theta)^{\frac{3}{2}}} + O(1).$$

So if $h \geq C m^{-\frac{5}{3}}$,

$$\frac{C}{m \log m} \frac{h + \theta^2}{(h^2 + \sin^2 \theta)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \geq \min \left\{ \frac{C}{h^2 m \log m}, C \frac{h m^2}{\log m} \right\} \gg 1.$$

Hence $\nabla q_m \neq 0$.

Step 3. It remains to study the zero point $z = (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta, z_3)$ of $q_m(z)$ with

$$(2.51) \quad |z| = r \geq 1, \quad |z - \xi_1| \geq \frac{c_1}{m}, \quad \theta \in \left(0, \frac{\pi}{m} \right], \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq h \leq C m^{-\frac{5}{3}}.$$

By (2.22) we see that distances between all the zero points of $q_m(z)$ and ξ_0 is no less than c_0/m , i.e.,

$$|z - \xi_0| \geq \frac{c_0}{m}.$$

For the zero point z in (2.51), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{c_0}{m} &\leq \left| z - \left(\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} \cos \frac{\pi}{m}, \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} \sin \frac{\pi}{m}, 0 \right) \right| \\ &\leq \left| z - \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} (\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 0) \right| + \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} \left| \left(\cos \theta - \cos \frac{\pi}{m}, \sin \theta - \sin \frac{\pi}{m} \right) \right| \\ &\leq Ch + C \left| \theta - \frac{\pi}{m} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the angle of the zero point must have a distance of the order $\frac{1}{m}$ to $\frac{\pi}{m}$. It implies that there exists a small positive constant c_3 such that $\left| \theta - \frac{\pi}{m} \right| \geq \frac{c_3 \pi}{m}$. Together with (2.51) we can further restrict our discussion to

$$(2.52) \quad |z| = r \geq 1, \quad |z - \xi_1| \geq \frac{c_1}{m}, \quad \theta \in \left(0, \frac{\pi(1 - c_3)}{m} \right], \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq h \leq Cm^{-\frac{5}{3}}.$$

Now we shall prove that for all the zero points z satisfying (2.52), $\nabla q_m(z) \neq 0$. In fact, we compute $\partial_\theta q_m(z) = -\sin \theta \partial_{z_1} q_m(z) + \cos \theta \partial_{z_2} q_m(z)$. It is known that

$$\partial_\theta \psi \left(\cos \frac{\pi}{m}, \sin \frac{\pi}{m}, 0 \right) = 0$$

due to $\psi(z)$ being symmetric with respect to $\theta = \frac{\pi}{m}$. Thus $\partial_\theta \psi(z) = O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right)$ for all z in (2.52). Using (2.44) and (2.45), we have

$$(2.53) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_\theta q_m(z) &= -3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{2\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2} \sin \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \cos \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)}{(4r\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2})^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(h^2 + \sin^2 \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\ &\quad + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log m)^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $h \leq Cm^{-\frac{5}{3}}$ we have

$$(2.54) \quad \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{\sin \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \cos \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)}{\left(h^2 + \sin^2 \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} = \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{\cos \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)}{\sin^2 \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)} + O\left(m^{\frac{2}{3}} \right).$$

On the other hand, it is not difficult to check that

$$(2.55) \quad -\frac{\cos \left(\frac{(m-j+1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)}{\sin^2 \left(\frac{(m-j+1)\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)} = \frac{\cos \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} + \frac{\theta}{2} \right)}{\sin^2 \left(\frac{(j-1)\pi}{m} + \frac{\theta}{2} \right)} \geq \frac{\cos \left(\frac{j\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)}{\sin^2 \left(\frac{j\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)}, \quad j = 2, \dots, \frac{m}{2}.$$

Substituting (2.54) and (2.55) into (2.53), we have

$$(2.56) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_\theta q_m(z) &\geq 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{2\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2}}{(4r\sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2})^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left(\frac{\cos \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \frac{\theta}{2}}{(h^2 + \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2})^{\frac{3}{2}}} - \frac{\cos \left(\frac{\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)}{\sin^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)} \right) \\ &\quad + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log m)^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

If $\theta \in \left[\frac{\pi}{3m}, \frac{\pi(1-c_3)}{m} \right]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.57) \quad \partial_\theta q_m(z) &\geq 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{2\sqrt{1-\mu_m^2}}{(4r\sqrt{1-\mu_m^2})^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left(\frac{\cos \frac{\theta}{2}}{\sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2}} - \frac{\cos \left(\frac{\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)}{\sin^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)} \right) + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log m)^2} \right) \\
&\geq 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{2\sqrt{1-\mu_m^2}}{(4r\sqrt{1-\mu_m^2})^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left(\frac{4}{\theta^2} - \frac{4}{\left(\frac{2\pi}{m} - \theta \right)^2} \right) + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log m)^2} \right) \\
&\geq 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{2\sqrt{1-\mu_m^2}}{(4r\sqrt{1-\mu_m^2})^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left(\frac{16c_3 m^2}{\pi^2 (1-c_3^2)^2} \right) + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log m)^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

While if $\theta \in (0, \frac{\pi}{3m})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.58) \quad \partial_\theta q_m(z) &\geq 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{2\sqrt{1-\mu_m^2}}{(4r\sqrt{1-\mu_m^2})^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left(\min \left\{ \frac{\theta}{4\sqrt{2}(h^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\theta^2} \right\} - \frac{4}{\left(\frac{2\pi}{m} - \theta \right)^2} \right) \\
&\quad + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log m)^2} \right) \\
&\geq 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{2\sqrt{1-\mu_m^2}}{(4r\sqrt{1-\mu_m^2})^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left(\frac{9\sqrt{2}m^2}{\pi^2} - \frac{36m^2}{25\pi^2} \right) + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log m)^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence of (2.56)-(2.58), for z in (2.52) we have

$$\partial_\theta q_m(z) = \frac{Cm}{\log m} + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log m)^2} \right) < 0.$$

Together with the conclusions in Step 1 and Step 2, we conclude that for all the zero point $|z| \geq 1$ of $q_m(z)$, $|\nabla q_m(z)| \neq 0$.

For the zero point z of $q(z)$ with $|z| \leq 1$, due to the fact that the solution is invariant after the Kelvin transform, we see that $q_m(z^*) = 0$ for $z^* = \frac{z}{|z|^2}$. We have already shown that $\nabla q_m(z^*) \neq 0$, using the fact $q_m(z) = \frac{1}{|z|} q_m\left(\frac{z}{|z|^2}\right)$ and $q_m(z^*) = q_m(z) = 0$ for z is zero point, we have

$$\partial_{z_j^*} q_m(z^*) = \frac{1}{|z^*|} \partial_j q_m(z) \frac{1}{|z^*|^2} - 2 \frac{1}{|z^*|} \sum_{\ell=1}^3 \partial_\ell q_m(z) \frac{z_j^* z_\ell^*}{|z^*|^4}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3.$$

As a consequence, if $\nabla q_m(z^*) \neq 0$ for $z^* = \frac{z}{|z|^2}$ is a zero point of $q_m(z)$, we must have $\nabla_m q(z) \neq 0$. Hence we finish the whole proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Theorem 2.1 follows from Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.4. \square

2.3. Non-degeneracy. In this subsection, we shall interpret the non-degeneracy in the sense of Duyckaerts-Kenig-Merle for our demands. From now on, we choose m large enough and fix a function $q = q_m$. For simplicity of notation, we drop the index m when there is no ambiguity.

$$(2.59) \quad \Delta q + q^5 = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3.$$

As we have pointed out, the following transformations keep the solution set of the Yamabe equation (2.59) invariant.

- (1) the translation $T_y : z \rightarrow z + y$ where $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$,
- (2) the dilation $D_\varepsilon : z \rightarrow \varepsilon z$ for $\varepsilon > 0$,
- (3) the rotation $R_\theta : z \rightarrow R_\theta z$ for $R_\theta \in SO(3)$,
- (4) the inversion $J : z \rightarrow \frac{z}{|z|^2}$,
- (5) the translation under inversion $\psi_\xi = J \circ T_\xi \circ J$.

For any set of parameters $A = (y, R_\theta, \varepsilon, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times SO(3) \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^3$, we define the transformation $\mathcal{T}_A = T_{-y} \circ R_\theta \circ D_\varepsilon \circ \psi_\xi$. Then $\Theta_A(x) = |\det(\mathcal{T}'_A(x))|^{\frac{1}{6}} q(\mathcal{T}_A(x))$ is also a solution to the Yamabe equation (2.59). Using $Jq = q$, we have

$$\Theta_A(z) = \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|z - y|} q \left(\frac{\varepsilon R_\theta(z - y)}{|z - y|^2} + \xi \right).$$

Choosing A near to $(0, Id, 1, 0)$, it generates a family of solutions near q . Taking the derivatives on each parameter in A , we obtain 10 functions

$$(2.60) \quad \begin{aligned} & -z_j q + |z|^2 \partial_{z_j} q - 2z_j z \cdot \nabla q, \quad \partial_{z_j} q, \quad 1 \leq j \leq 3, \\ & (z_j \partial_{z_\ell} - z_\ell \partial_{z_j}) q, \quad 1 \leq j < \ell \leq 3, \quad \frac{1}{2} q + z \cdot \nabla q. \end{aligned}$$

One can verify that $L_q f = 0$ for any f in the above, where L_q is linearized operator near q

$$L_q = -\Delta - 5q^4.$$

Note that these 10 functions are generated consecutively by ψ_ξ , translation, rotation, and dilation. The linear combination of these 10 functions form a subspace $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_q$ of $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $L_q f = 0$ for any $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_q$. Some of these 10 functions may be equal, therefore $\dim \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_q \leq 10$.

Define the kernel space of L_q by $\mathcal{Z}_q = \{f \in D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3) : L_q f = 0\}$. Musso-Wei [44] proved that $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_q = \mathcal{Z}_q$. The results there indicate that $-z_3 q + |z|^2 \partial_{z_3} q - 2z_3 z \cdot \nabla q = \partial_{z_3} q$ in (2.60). We re-state their result as the following proposition.

Proposition 2.5 (Non-degeneracy). *When m is large enough, q_m is non-degenerate and*

$$\dim \mathcal{Z}_{q_m} = 9,$$

where q_m is the one constructed in [20] in \mathbb{R}^3 .

In the following, we will construct a solution to the Brezis-Nirenberg problem. Note that q is even for z_3 . We will use Lyapunov-Schmidt reduction (or gluing method) to seek a solution that is also even for z_3 . First, we need a family of bubbles that are even for z_3 and depend on finite-dimensional parameters. The construction will be similar to Θ_A in the above, but in this case we need to restrict the rotation and translation to the $z_1 z_2$ -plane and choose the translation in a subtle way.

We define

$$(2.61) \quad \Gamma = \mathcal{N}(q) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : (z_1, z_2, 0)\}$$

which is the intersection of the nodal set of q with the $z_1 z_2$ -plane. For any set of parameters $A = (\varepsilon, \xi, a, b, \beta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \Gamma \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S}$, we define

$$(2.62) \quad Q_A(z) = \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|z-b|} q \left(\frac{\varepsilon R_\beta(z-b)}{|z-b|^2} + \xi + a\nu(\xi) \right),$$

where $\nu(\xi) = \frac{\nabla q(\xi)}{|\nabla q(\xi)|}$ is the unit normal to Σ . Here R_β is the rotation matrix in $z_1 z_2$ -plane by angle β

$$(2.63) \quad R_\beta = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta & 0 \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In the notation of (2.62), we also will treat a vector in the $z_1 z_2$ -plane as a vector in three-dimensional space with the last coordinate being 0. For example, $b = (b_1, b_2)$ also denotes $b = (b_1, b_2, 0)$.

The family of Q_A plays a vital role in this paper. Note that in the particular case $a = 0$, $\varepsilon = 1$ and $b = 0$, $Q_A(z) = O(|z|^{-2})$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly for $\xi \in \Gamma$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{S}$. This is a fast decay bubble. When we perturb a a little bit, $Q_A(z)$ has leading order $a|z|^{-1}$ when $z \rightarrow \infty$. However, if a is small enough, it is still fast decaying inside B_1 .

In the following, we will need the kernel of the L_{Q_A} for $A = (1, \xi, 0, 0, \theta_*)$ where $\theta_* = \theta_*(\xi)$ is chosen such that $R_{\theta_*}^T \nabla q(\xi) = |\nabla q(\xi)|(1, 0, 0)^T$. The purpose of $\theta_*(\xi)$ is to fix the direction of Q_A as ξ runs in the nodal set of q . Since ξ is the coordinates of the zero set of q , then $(q_{\nu(\xi)}, q_\xi, q_{z_3})^T = |\nabla q(\xi)|(1, 0, 0)^T = R_{\theta_*}^T \nabla q(\xi)$. Thus

$$q_{\nu(\xi)} = \nabla q(\xi) \cdot (\cos \theta_*, \sin \theta_*, 0)^T, \quad q_\xi = \nabla q(\xi) \cdot (-\sin \theta_*, \cos \theta_*, 0)^T, \quad q_{z_3} = \nabla q(\xi) \cdot (0, 0, 1)^T.$$

The associate kernels of the linearized kernels are given by

$$\begin{aligned} Z_0(z) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} Q_A|_{\varepsilon=1, b=0, a=0, \beta=\theta_*} = \frac{1}{2|z|} q \left(R_{\theta_*} \frac{z}{|z|^2} + \xi \right) - \frac{1}{|z|^3} R_{\theta_*}^T \nabla q \left(R_{\theta_*} \frac{z}{|z|^2} + \xi \right) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ Z_1(z) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial a} Q_A|_{\varepsilon=1, b=0, a=0, \beta=\theta_*} = \frac{1}{|z|} q_{\nu(\xi)} \left(R_{\theta_*} \frac{z}{|z|^2} + \xi \right), \\ Z_2(z) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} Q_A|_{\varepsilon=1, b=0, a=0, \beta=\theta_*} = \frac{1}{|z|} q_\xi \left(R_{\theta_*} \frac{z}{|z|^2} + \xi \right), \\ Z_3(z) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial b_1} Q_A|_{\varepsilon=1, b=0, a=0, \beta=\theta_*} = \frac{2z_1}{|z|^2} \frac{\partial Q_A}{\partial \varepsilon} - \frac{1}{|z|^2} \frac{\partial Q_A}{\partial a} = \frac{2z_1}{|z|^2} Z_0 - \frac{1}{|z|^2} Z_1, \\ Z_4(z) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial b_2} Q_A|_{\varepsilon=1, b=0, a=0, \beta=\theta_*} = \frac{2z_2}{|z|^2} \frac{\partial Q_A}{\partial \varepsilon} - \frac{1}{|z|^2} \frac{\partial Q_A}{\partial \xi} = \frac{2z_2}{|z|^2} Z_0 - \frac{1}{|z|^2} Z_2, \\ Z_5(x) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} Q_A|_{\varepsilon=1, b=0, a=0, \beta=\theta_*} = \frac{z_1}{|z|^2} \frac{\partial Q_A}{\partial \xi} - \frac{z_2}{|z|^2} \frac{\partial Q_A}{\partial a} = \frac{z_1}{|z|^2} Z_2 - \frac{z_2}{|z|^2} Z_1. \end{aligned}$$

There are three functions we did not list here, which come from the differentiation of translation in z_3 , rotation in $z_1 z_3$ -plane, and rotation in $z_2 z_3$ -plane. They are all odd in z_3 and play no role in our proof.

3. PRELIMINARY ON APPROXIMATE SOLUTIONS

In this section, we shall modify the family of bubbles Q_A , defined at (2.62), to satisfy a similar equation to the Brezis-Nirenberg problem in Σ_K and Dirichlet boundary conditions. This is the first step in the gluing process. More precisely, we define the approximate solution PQ_A (or the projection of Q_A) to be

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta PQ_A + \lambda PQ_A + Q_A^5 = 0 & \text{in } \Sigma_K, \\ PQ_A = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Sigma_K. \end{cases}$$

At the end of this section, we will prove PQ_A is Q_A summing other terms with good control.

First, let us set up some notations which will be used for the rest of this paper. Let $z = (z_1, z_2, z_3)^T = (z_1 + iz_2, z_3)^T$, where $i = \sqrt{-1}$ is the imaginary number. We abuse the notation $ze^{i\alpha} = ((z_1 + iz_2)e^{i\alpha}, z_3)^T$ and $\bar{z} = (z_1 - iz_2, z_3)^T = (z_1, -z_2, z_3)^T$. Using this notation convention and definition of R_β in (2.63), we have $R_\beta z = ze^{i\beta}$. All vectors in \mathbb{R}^3 are column vectors without explicit mention.

We define

$$(3.2) \quad \Sigma_K = \{(r, \theta, z_3) \in B_1; 0 < r < 1, -\theta_0 < \theta < \theta_0\} \quad \text{where } \theta_0 = \frac{\pi}{K}.$$

For any function u in B_1 , we define an operation

$$(3.3) \quad u^e(z) = u(z) - u(\bar{z}e^{2i\theta_0}) + u(ze^{4i\theta_0}) - \dots + u(ze^{2(K-2)\theta_0}) - u(\bar{z}e^{2(K-1)i\theta_0}).$$

In the sum notation, it reads that

$$u^e(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} [u(ze^{4ji\theta_0}) - u(\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0})].$$

This operation creates a function which is odd under the reflection along each ray $re^{ji\theta_0}$, $j = 1, 3, 5, \dots, K-1$. That is,

$$u^e(re^{ji\theta_0-i\theta}, z_3) = -u^e(re^{ji\theta_0+i\theta}, z_3), \quad j = 1, 3, 5, \dots, K-1,$$

In particular

$$u^e(re^{ji\theta_0}, z_3) = 0 \quad j = 1, 3, 5, \dots, K-1.$$

We shall use the following family of bubbles described in (2.62) in the subsection 2.3,

$$Q_A(z) = \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|z-b|} q \left(\frac{\varepsilon R_\beta(z-b)}{|z-b|^2} + \xi + a\nu(\xi) \right),$$

where $A = (\varepsilon, \xi, a, b, \beta)$ and $\beta = \theta_*(\xi) + \hat{\beta}$ where $R_{\theta_*(\xi)}^T \nabla q(\xi) = |\nabla q(\xi)|(1, 0, 0)^T$. The purpose of $\theta_*(\xi)$ is to fix the ‘‘direction’’ of Q_A as ξ runs in the nodal set of q .

We will make some constraints on the parameters of A . The rationale for selecting these constraints is to make sure some functional (see $\Psi(A)$ in (4.11)) has an infimum achieved inside it. It will become clear throughout the computations in sections 3 and 4, culminating in the proof of Theorem 7.2. Denote $b = |b|e^{i\alpha_b}$ and $d = (1 - |b|^2)/(2|b|)$. We make the following constraint.

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \varepsilon K^3 \in [\delta, \delta^{-1}], \quad \xi \in \Gamma, \quad |a| \leq \delta^{-1} \varepsilon \log K, \quad d \in \left[\frac{\log K - \log \log K}{K}, \frac{\log K}{K} \right], \\ |\alpha_b| \leq \delta^{-1/2} K^{-2} \log K, \quad |\hat{\beta}| \leq \delta^{-1/2} K^{-1} \log K. \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta \in (0, 1)$ is some fixed number that will be determined later. We always choose K that is sufficiently large and even. All the constants C in this paper are independent of K and δ .

Under these constraints, we have

$$|q(\hat{\xi})| \leq C|a| \leq C\delta^{-1}\varepsilon \log K, \quad \text{dist}(b, \partial\Sigma_K) \geq \frac{1}{2K}.$$

Hereafter, we adopt the following notations for the remainder of this paper.

$$(3.5) \quad \hat{\xi} = \xi + a\nu(\xi), \quad w = R_\beta^T \nabla q(\hat{\xi}), \quad W = R_\beta^T \nabla^2 q(\hat{\xi}) R_\beta.$$

Note that $|w| = |\nabla q(\hat{\xi})| \leq C$ and $|W| = |\nabla^2 q(\hat{\xi})| \leq C$ for a constant C just depend on q . Moreover, since q is even for z_3 , then $w_3 = 0$ and $w = (|\nabla q(\hat{\xi})|e^{i\alpha_w}, 0)$. By our definition of $\theta_*(\xi)$, we have $\alpha_w = \hat{\beta}$.

Define Q_A^e by the operation (3.3),

$$(3.6) \quad Q_A^e = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} [Q_A(z e^{4ji\theta_0}) - Q_A(\bar{z} e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0})] =: Q_A - T_A,$$

where T_A is the summation of other bubbles (centered on other copies of Σ_K in B_1)

$$(3.7) \quad T_A = Q_A(\bar{z} e^{2i\theta_0}) - \sum_{j=1}^{K/2-1} [Q_A(z e^{4ji\theta_0}) - Q_A(\bar{z} e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0})].$$

We define the following key function, $\gamma(z, p)$, which is used to bound the influence of other bubbles in Σ_K .

$$(3.8) \quad \gamma(z, p) := \frac{1}{|\bar{z} e^{2i\theta_0} - p|} - \sum_{j=1}^{K/2-1} \left(\frac{1}{|z e^{4ji\theta_0} - p|} - \frac{1}{|\bar{z} e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} - p|} \right).$$

We can have a lower bound for each denominator.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose b satisfies (3.4). Then for any $z \in \Sigma_K$,*

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} |z e^{4ji\theta_0} - b| &\geq C \sin 2j\theta_0, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq K/2 - 1, \\ |\bar{z} e^{(4j+2)\theta_0} - b| &\geq C \sin(2j + 1)\theta_0, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq j \leq K/2 - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Suppose $z = (z_1, z_2, z_3) = (r e^{i\alpha_z}, z_3)$ and $b = (b_1, b_2, 0) = (|b| e^{i\alpha_b}, 0)$. Then

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} |z e^{4ji\theta_0} - b|^2 &= |z|^2 + |b|^2 - 2r|b| \cos(4j\theta_0 + \alpha_z - \alpha_b) \\ &= (r - |b|)^2 + z_3^2 + 4r|b| \sin^2(2j\theta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_z - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_b), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(3.11) \quad |\bar{z} e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} - b|^2 = (r - |b|)^2 + z_3^2 + 4r|b| \sin^2((2j + 1)\theta_0 - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_z - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_b).$$

If $r < \frac{1}{4}$, then $|z e^{4ji\theta_0} - b| \geq \frac{1}{4}$ for $1 \leq j \leq K/2 - 1$ and $|\bar{z} e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} - b| \geq \frac{1}{4}$ for any $0 \leq j \leq K/2 - 1$. Obviously, (3.9) holds.

If $r \geq \frac{1}{4}$, then using (3.10) and (3.11) and $|b| \geq \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain that

$$|z e^{4ji\theta_0} - b|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \sin^2(2j\theta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_z - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_b), \quad 1 \leq j \leq K/2 - 1,$$

$$|\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} - b|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \sin^2((2j+1)\theta_0 - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_z - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_b), \quad 0 \leq j \leq K/2 - 1.$$

Since $|\alpha_z \pm \alpha_b| \leq 2\theta_0$, then (3.9) also holds in this case. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Under the constraint (3.4), for any $z \in \Sigma_K$, one has*

$$(3.12) \quad T_A(z) = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} q(\hat{\xi}) \gamma(z, b) + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} w \cdot \nabla_p \gamma(z, b) + \frac{1}{6} \varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}} W_{ij} \partial_{p_i p_j}^2 \gamma(z, b) + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{7}{2}} K^4).$$

In particular, one has $|T_A| = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} K^2)$. Here $\nabla_p \gamma(z, b)$ is the abbreviation of $\nabla_p \gamma(z, p)|_{p=b}$.

Proof. Using Taylor expansion of q near $\hat{\xi}$, we have the expansion of $Q(z)$ for any z satisfying $|z - b| \geq \varepsilon$

$$(3.13) \quad Q_A(z) = \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|z - b|} \left[q(\hat{\xi}) + \frac{\varepsilon w \cdot (z - b)}{|z - b|^2} + \frac{\varepsilon^2 (z - b)^T W (z - b)}{2|z - b|^4} + O\left(\frac{\varepsilon^3}{|z - b|^3}\right) \right].$$

It readily verifies that

$$(3.14) \quad \nabla_{p_j} \left(\frac{1}{|z - p|} \right) = \frac{(z - p)_j}{|z - p|^3}, \quad \nabla_{p_j p_\ell}^2 \left(\frac{1}{|z - p|} \right) = \frac{-\delta_{j\ell}}{|z - p|^3} + \frac{3(z - p)_j (z - p)_\ell}{|z - p|^5}.$$

Using these identities, one can rewrite (3.13) as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_A(z) &= \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} q(\hat{\xi})}{|z - b|} + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} w \cdot \nabla_p \left(\frac{1}{|z - p|} \right) \Big|_{p=b} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6} \varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}} W_{j\ell} \left[\partial_{p_j p_\ell}^2 \left(\frac{1}{|z - p|} \right) + \frac{\delta_{j\ell}}{|z - p|^3} \right] \Big|_{p=b} + O\left(\frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{7}{2}}}{|z - b|^4}\right). \end{aligned}$$

When $b \in \Sigma_K$ satisfies (3.4), then (3.9) implies $|ze^{4ji\theta_0} - b| \geq C/K \gg \varepsilon$ and $|\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} - b| \geq C/K \gg \varepsilon$. Thus the corresponding expansion of $Q_A(ze^{4ji\theta_0})$ and $Q_A(\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0})$ from the above hold uniformly for $z \in \Sigma_K$. Recall the definition of T_A in (3.7). We have

$$\begin{aligned} T_A &= \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} q(\hat{\xi}) \gamma(z, b) + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} w \cdot \nabla_p \gamma(z, p)|_{p=b} + \frac{1}{6} \varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}} W_{ij} \partial_{p_i p_j}^2 \gamma(z, p)|_{p=b} \\ &\quad + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}} \gamma_3(z, b) |\Delta q(\hat{\xi})| + \varepsilon^{\frac{7}{2}} \gamma_4(z, b)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_3(z, b) = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} |\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} - b|^{-3} + \sum_{j=1}^{K/2-1} |ze^{4ji\theta_0} - b|^{-3}$ and $\gamma_4(z, p)$ is the corresponding one with the exponent replaced by -4 . Again, (3.9) implies that

$$\gamma_3(z, b) \leq CK^3 \sum_{j=1}^{K/2-1} j^{-3} \leq CK^3, \quad \gamma_4(z, b) \leq CK^4.$$

Thus $\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}} \gamma_3(z, b) |\Delta q(\hat{\xi})| + \varepsilon^{\frac{7}{2}} \gamma_4(z, b) = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}} K^3 |a|^5 + \varepsilon^{\frac{7}{2}} K^4) = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{7}{2}} K^4)$. Therefore (3.12) is proved.

Finally, it follows from Lemma 8.1 that $|\nabla^m \gamma(z, p)|_{p=b} \leq CK^{m+1}$ for $m = 0, 1, 2$. Applying these in (3.12) and using the constraint (3.4), we get

$$|T_A| \leq C(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} |q(\hat{\xi})| K + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} K^2 + \varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}} K^3 + \varepsilon^{\frac{7}{2}} K^4) \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} K^2.$$

\square

Suppose that $G(z, p)$ is the Green's function for B_1 in \mathbb{R}^3 . We denote by $H_0(z, p)$ the regular part of the Green's function, namely

$$H_0(z, p) = 4\pi \left(\frac{1}{4\pi|z-p|} - G(z, p) \right).$$

It is well-known that in the unit ball case

$$(3.15) \quad H_0(z, p) = \left| |z|p - \frac{z}{|z|} \right|^{-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - 2z \cdot p + |z|^2|p|^2}}.$$

We apply operation (3.3) to H_0 and denote it as $H_0^e(z, p)$

$$(3.16) \quad H_0^e(z, p) = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} [H_0(ze^{4ji\theta_0}, p) - H_0(\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0}, p)].$$

Such a function is used to control the influence of H_0 from other copies of Σ_K in B_1 .

To get PQ_A in (3.1), we first solve φ_A from

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta\varphi_A = 0 & \text{in } B_1, \\ \varphi_A = Q_A^e & \text{on } \partial B_1, \end{cases}$$

where Q_A^e is defined in (3.6).

Lemma 3.3. *Under the constraint (3.4), for any $z \in \Sigma_K$, one has*

$$(3.18) \quad \varphi_A(z) = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}q(\hat{\xi})H_0^e(z, b) + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}w \cdot \nabla_p H_0^e(z, b) + \frac{1}{6}\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}}W_{ij}\partial_{p_i p_j}^2 H_0^e(z, b) + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{7}{2}}K^4),$$

where $H_0^e(z, p)$ is defined in (3.16). In particular, one has $|\varphi_A(z)| = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}K^2)$.

Proof. When $z \in \partial B_1$, one has $\varepsilon/|z-b| \leq C\varepsilon K \ll 1$. Using the Taylor expansion of q near $\hat{\xi}$, we have the expansion of $Q_A(z)$ in (3.13). Using (3.15), one knows that, $H_0(z, p) = |z-p|^{-1}$ for $z \in \partial B_1$. Thus (3.14) implies

$$\nabla_{p_j} H_0(z, b) = \frac{(z-b)_j}{|z-b|^3}, \quad \nabla_{p_j p_\ell}^2 H_0(z, b) = \frac{-\delta_{j\ell}}{|z-b|^3} + \frac{3(z-b)_j(z-b)_\ell}{|z-b|^5}.$$

Comparing the expansion of $Q_A(z)$ in (3.13), we found that Q_A on ∂B_1 can be approximated by $H_0(z, b)$ and its derivatives. Similar things also hold for $Q_A(ze^{4ji\theta_0})$ and $Q(\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0})$. Thus if we let

$$\varphi_A = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}q(\hat{\xi})H_0^e(z, b) + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}w \cdot \nabla_p H_0^e(z, b) + \frac{1}{6}\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}}W_{ij}\partial_{p_i p_j}^2 H_0^e(z, b) + f_A(z),$$

then f_A satisfies $\Delta f_A(z) = 0$ in Σ_K and

$$f_A(z) = \left[Q_A(z) - \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}q(\hat{\xi})}{|z-b|} - \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}w \cdot (z-b)}{|z-b|^3} - \frac{1}{6} \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}}(z-b)^T W (z-b)}{|z-b|^5} - \frac{1}{6} \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}}\Delta q(\hat{\xi})}{|z-b|^3} \right]^e$$

for $z \in \partial\Sigma_K$. Note that on $\partial\Sigma_K$,

$$|f_A(z)| \leq C \left(\frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}}|\Delta q(\hat{\xi})|}{|z-b|^3} + \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{7}{2}}}{|z-b|^4} \right)^e \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}}|q(\hat{\xi})|^5 K^3 + C\varepsilon^{\frac{7}{2}}K^4 \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{7}{2}}K^4.$$

By maximum principle, we have $|f_A(z)| = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{7}{2}}K^4)$ for $z \in B_1$. Finally, one can get $|\varphi_A| = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}K^2)$ by using Lemma 8.5, as did for T_A . \square

Using the symmetry of Q_A^e and the uniqueness of φ_A , φ_A enjoys the same symmetry as Q_A^e . Thus $\varphi_A(z) = 0$ for $z \in \partial\Sigma_K \cap \{|z| < 1\}$, i.e., the two portions of the boundary of Σ_K inside B_1 . Since $Q_A^e = 0$ on these two portions of the boundary and $\varphi_A = Q_A^e$ on ∂B_1 , then

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta\varphi_A = 0 & \text{in } \Sigma_K, \\ \varphi_A = Q_A^e & \text{on } \partial\Sigma_K. \end{cases}$$

Let $PQ_A = Q_A^e - \varphi_A - \psi_A$. Using the above equation and the one of PQ_A in (3.1), ψ_A must satisfy

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta\psi_A + \lambda\psi_A = \lambda(Q_A^e - \varphi_A) + F & \text{in } \Sigma_K, \\ \psi_A = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Sigma_K, \end{cases}$$

where

$$(3.21) \quad F(z) = Q_A(\bar{z}e^{2i\theta_0})^5 - \sum_{j=1}^{K/2-1} [Q_A(ze^{4ji\theta_0})^5 - Q_A(\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0})^5].$$

We want to derive the estimates of ψ_A . First, we consider F . Note that (3.13) leads to

$$(3.22) \quad |Q_A(z)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}|a|}{|z-b|} + C \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{|z-b|^2}, \quad \text{for any } |z-b| \geq \varepsilon.$$

For any $z \in \Sigma_K$, this applies to $Q(\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0})$ and $Q(ze^{4ji\theta_0})$ since (3.9).

$$(3.23) \quad |F(z)| \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}}|a|^5\gamma_5(z, b) + \varepsilon^{\frac{15}{2}}\gamma_{10}(z, b) \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}K^2.$$

Lemma 3.4. *Under the constraint (3.4), for any $z \in \Sigma_K$, one has $|\psi_A(z)| = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}|\log \varepsilon|)$.*

Proof. Let $y = (z-b)/\varepsilon$. Consider $\psi_A(z) = \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}\tilde{\psi}((z-b)/\varepsilon)$, then $\Delta_z\psi_A + \lambda\psi_A = \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}[\Delta_y\tilde{\psi} + \lambda\varepsilon^2\tilde{\psi}]$. Thus

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_y\tilde{\psi} + \lambda\varepsilon^2\tilde{\psi} = \lambda\frac{1}{|y|}q\left(\frac{R_\beta y}{|y|^2} + \hat{\xi}\right) + O(\varepsilon^2K^2) & \text{in } \tilde{\Sigma}_K, \\ \tilde{\psi}_A = 0 & \text{on } \partial\tilde{\Sigma}_K, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{\Sigma}_K = \{y = (z-b)/\varepsilon : z \in \Sigma_K\}$. Here we used $|T_A(z)| + |\varphi_A(z)| + |F(z)| = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}K^2)$ for $z \in \Sigma_K$. Let

$$\tilde{\psi}_0(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{4\pi|y-z|} \frac{1}{|z|} q\left(\frac{R_\beta z}{|z|^2} + \hat{\xi}\right) dz.$$

Then it is easy to see that $\tilde{\psi}_0(y)$ satisfies the equation $\Delta_y\tilde{\psi}_0 + \frac{1}{|y|}q\left(\frac{R_\beta y}{|y|^2} + \hat{\xi}\right) = 0$. One can verify that $|\tilde{\psi}_0| \leq C(1 + \log \sqrt{1+y^2})$. Now let $\tilde{\psi} = \lambda\tilde{\psi}_0 + \tilde{\psi}_1$. Then $\tilde{\psi}_1$ satisfies

$$\Delta_y\tilde{\psi}_1 + \lambda\varepsilon^2\tilde{\psi}_1 = O(\varepsilon^2K^2).$$

Note that $B_{1/(2K\varepsilon)}(0) \subset \tilde{\Sigma}_K \subset \{|y_2| \leq \frac{2\pi}{K\varepsilon}\}$. Thus, on $\partial\tilde{\Sigma}_K$, one has $\tilde{\psi}_1 = O(|\log \varepsilon|)$. We construct a barrier function

$$\bar{\psi}_1(y) = C|\log \varepsilon|[(3\pi)^2 - (K\varepsilon y_2)^2].$$

One can verify that

$$\Delta_y \bar{\psi}_1 + \lambda \varepsilon^2 \bar{\psi}_1 \leq C|\log \varepsilon|[-2(K\varepsilon)^2 + \lambda \varepsilon^2 (3\pi)^2] \leq -C(K\varepsilon)^2,$$

provided K is large enough. Moreover, $\bar{\psi}_1 \geq C|\log \varepsilon|$ on $\partial\tilde{\Sigma}_K$.

Note that $\tilde{\Sigma}_K \subset \{|y_2| \leq 2\pi/(K\varepsilon)\}$ implies that the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\tilde{\Sigma}_K) \geq (K\varepsilon/2\pi)^2$. Thus $\Delta_y + \lambda \varepsilon^2$ satisfies the maximum principle on $\tilde{\Sigma}_K$ when K is large enough. Therefore $|\tilde{\psi}_1(y)| \leq C|\bar{\psi}_1| = O(|\log \varepsilon|)$. Note that $|\tilde{\psi}_0| \leq C(1 + \log \sqrt{1+y^2}) \leq C|\log \varepsilon|$. The proof is complete. \square

To summarize Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4 in this section, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.5. *Assume A satisfies the constraint (3.4). The solution of (3.1) can be written $PQ_A = Q_A - \tilde{T}_A$ where $\tilde{T}_A = T_A - \varphi_A - \psi_A$ satisfying*

$$(3.24) \quad |\tilde{T}_A| \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}K^2.$$

Remark 3.6. *By elliptic theory, it is not hard to show that the dependence of \tilde{T}_A on the parameters in A is at least C^1 .*

4. ENERGY EXPANSION

In this section, we shall compute the energy of the approximate solution and find its leading-order term with respect to the parameters.

Define the energy of PQ_A as

$$\begin{aligned} J(PQ_A) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_K} (|\nabla PQ_A|^2 - \lambda |PQ_A|^2) dz - \frac{1}{6} \int_{\Sigma_K} (PQ_A)^6 dz \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 PQ_A dz - \frac{1}{6} \int_{\Sigma_K} (PQ_A)^6 dz. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term on the right-hand side

$$\int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 PQ_A dz = \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 (Q_A - \tilde{T}_A) dz = \int_{\Sigma_K} (Q_A^6 - Q_A^5 \tilde{T}_A) dz.$$

For the second term

$$\int_{\Sigma_K} (PQ_A)^6 dz = \int_{\Sigma_K} (Q_A - \tilde{T}_A)^6 dz = \int_{\Sigma_K} (Q_A^6 - 6Q_A^5 \tilde{T}_A) dz + I,$$

where

$$I = \int_{\Sigma_K} \left(15Q_A^4 (\tilde{T}_A)^2 - 20Q_A^3 (\tilde{T}_A)^3 + 15Q_A^2 (\tilde{T}_A)^4 - 6Q_A (\tilde{T}_A)^5 + (\tilde{T}_A)^6 \right) dz.$$

To estimate each term, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Assuming the constraints (3.4) are satisfied, we have*

$$(4.1) \quad \int_{\Sigma_K} |Q_A|^\ell dz \leq C \begin{cases} \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} K^{-1} \log K & \text{if } \ell = 1, \\ \varepsilon^{3-\frac{\ell}{2}} & \text{if } \ell = 2, 3, 4, 5, \end{cases}$$

$$(4.2) \quad \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^6 dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} q(z)^6 dz + O(\varepsilon^9 K^9),$$

$$(4.3) \quad \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 dz = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} 4\pi q(\hat{\xi}) + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{15}{2}} K^7),$$

$$(4.4) \quad \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5(z)(z-b) dz = \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} 4\pi R_\beta^T \nabla q(\hat{\xi}) + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{15}{2}} K^6),$$

$$(4.5) \quad \int_{\Sigma_K} |Q_A|^5 |z-b|^2 dz = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}}).$$

Proof. To prove (4.1). Since q is Kelvin invariant, then $q(z) = O(|z|^{-1})$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$. When $|z-b| < \varepsilon$, one has

$$\left| q\left(\frac{\varepsilon(z-b)}{|z-b|^2} + \hat{\xi}\right) \right| \leq C \frac{|z-b|}{\varepsilon},$$

then $|Q_A(z)| \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and

$$\int_{|z-b|<\varepsilon} |Q_A|^\ell dz \leq C \varepsilon^{3-\frac{\ell}{2}}.$$

When $\varepsilon < |z-b|$, we have (3.22). One can integrate its right-hand side respectively.

$$\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}\ell} \int_{\{z \in \Sigma_K : |z-b| > \varepsilon\}} \frac{dz}{|z-b|^{2\ell}} \leq \begin{cases} C \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} K^{-1} \log K & \text{if } \ell = 1, \\ C \varepsilon^{3-\frac{\ell}{2}} & \text{if } \ell \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

$$\varepsilon^{\frac{\ell}{2}} |a|^\ell \int_{\{z \in \Sigma_K : |z-b| > \varepsilon\}} \frac{dz}{|z-b|^\ell} \leq \begin{cases} C \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} |a| K^{-1} & \text{if } \ell = 1, \\ C \varepsilon |a|^2 K^{-1} \log K & \text{if } \ell = 2, \\ C \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} |a|^3 \log \varepsilon & \text{if } \ell = 3, \\ C \varepsilon^{3-\frac{\ell}{2}} |a|^\ell & \text{if } \ell = 4, 5. \end{cases}$$

where we have used the estimates

$$(4.6) \quad \rho_2(b) := \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\Sigma_K} \frac{dz}{|z-b|^2} \leq C \frac{\log K}{K}, \quad \rho_1(b) := \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\Sigma_K} \frac{dz}{|z-b|} \leq \frac{C}{K}.$$

The proof of (4.1) is complete by combining the above three equations.

To prove (4.2) and (4.3), we split the integral

$$\int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^\ell dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} Q_A^\ell dz - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Sigma_K} Q_A^\ell dz \quad \text{for } \ell = 5, 6.$$

On one hand, we use (3.22) to get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Sigma_K} Q_A^\ell dz \leq C \varepsilon^{\frac{3\ell}{2}} K^{2\ell-3} + C \varepsilon^\ell |a|^\ell K^{\ell-3} \leq C \varepsilon^{\frac{3\ell}{2}} K^{2\ell-3}, \quad \ell = 5, 6.$$

On the other hand, making a change of variables, $z = b + \varepsilon \frac{R_\beta^T x}{|x|^2}$, one obtains that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} Q_A^6 dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} q(z + \hat{\xi})^6 dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} q(z)^6 dz.$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} Q_A^5 dz &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}}}{|z-b|^5} \left(q \left(\frac{\varepsilon(z-b)}{|z-b|^2} + \hat{\xi} \right) \right)^5 dz \\ &= \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|z|} [q(z + \hat{\xi})]^5 dz = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|z - \hat{\xi}|} q(z)^5 dz = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} 4\pi q(\hat{\xi}). \end{aligned}$$

where we have used

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|z - \xi|} q(z)^5 dz = 4\pi q(\xi)$$

for any ξ in the last step. This completes (4.2) and (4.3).

The proof of (4.4) and (4.5) is similar to the previous proofs. We omit it. \square

It follows from (3.24) and (4.1) that $I = O(\varepsilon^4 K^4)$. Therefore

$$(4.7) \quad J(PQ_A) = \frac{1}{3} \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^6 dz + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 (T_A + \varphi_A + \psi_A) dz + O(\varepsilon^4 K^4).$$

We will compute the first two terms on the right-hand side.

Lemma 4.2. *Under the constraint (3.4), we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 \varphi_A dz &= \varepsilon [q(\hat{\xi})]^2 H_0^e(b, b) + \varepsilon^2 q(\hat{\xi}) w \cdot [\nabla_z H_0^e(b, b) + \nabla_p H_0^e(b, b)] \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^3 w^T \nabla_{z,p}^2 H_0^e(b, b) w + O(\varepsilon^4 K^4). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Recall the expansion of φ_A in (3.18). Then applying Lemma 4.1 yields

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 \varphi_A dz &= \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} q(\hat{\xi}) \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 H_0^e(z, b) dz + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} w \cdot \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 \nabla_p H_0^e(z, b) dz \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6} \varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}} W_{ij} \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 \partial_{p_i p_j}^2 H_0^e(z, b) dz + O(\varepsilon^4 K^4). \end{aligned}$$

Let us compute each term on the right-hand side. Using Lemma 8.5, one has the Taylor expansion

$$H_0^e(z, b) = H_0^e(b, b) + \nabla_z H_0^e(b, b) \cdot (z - b) + O(|z - b|^2 K^3).$$

Applying (4.3)-(4.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 H_0^e(z, b) dz &= H_0^e(b, b) \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 dz + \nabla_z H_0^e(b, b) \cdot \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 (z - b) dz + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}} K^3) \\ &= \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} 4\pi q(\hat{\xi}) H_0^e(b, b) + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} 4\pi w \cdot \nabla_z H_0^e(b, b) + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}} K^3). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using $\nabla_p H_0^e(z, b) = \nabla_p H_0^e(b, b) + \nabla_{z,p}^2 H_0^e(b, b) \cdot (z - b) + O(|z - b|^2 K^4)$,

$$\int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 \nabla_p H_0^e(z, b) dz = \nabla_p H_0^e(b, b) \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 dz + \nabla_{z,p}^2 H_0^e(b, b) \cdot \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 (z - b) dz + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}} K^4)$$

$$= \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} 4\pi q(\hat{\xi}) \nabla_p H_0^e(b, b) + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} 4\pi \partial_{z,p}^2 H_0^e(b, b) R_\beta^T \nabla q(\hat{\xi}) + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}} K^4)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 \partial_{p_i p_j}^2 H_0^e(z, b) dz &= \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 \partial_{p_i p_j}^2 H_0^e(b, b) dz + \nabla_z \partial_{p_i p_j}^2 H_0^e(b, b) \cdot \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 (z - b) dz \\ &\quad + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}} K^5) \\ &= O(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} |q(\hat{\xi})| K^2) + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} K^4) + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}} K^5) = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} K^4). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting the above three estimates back to (4.8), we can get the conclusion. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Under the constraint (3.4), we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 T_A dz &= \varepsilon [q(\hat{\xi})]^2 \gamma(b, b) + \varepsilon^2 q(\hat{\xi}) w \cdot [\nabla_z \gamma(b, b) + \nabla_p \gamma(b, b)] \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^3 w^T \nabla_{z,p}^2 \gamma(b, b) w + O(\varepsilon^4 K^4). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is almost identical to the previous one. One should use T_A in (3.12) and the estimates of γ in Lemma 8.1. We leave the details to the readers. \square

Lemma 4.4. *Under the constraint (3.4), we have*

$$\int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 \psi_A dz = -\lambda \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^2 dz + O(\varepsilon^3 K \log K).$$

Proof. Using (3.1) and (3.20)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 \psi_A dz &= - \int_{\Sigma_K} (\Delta P Q_A + \lambda P Q_A) \psi_A dz = - \int_{\Sigma_K} P Q_A (\Delta \psi_A + \lambda \psi_A) dz \\ (4.9) \quad &= -\lambda \int_{\Sigma_K} (Q_A - \tilde{T}_A)(Q_A - T_A - \varphi_A) dz + \int_{\Sigma_K} P Q_A F dz \\ &= -\lambda \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^2 dz + \lambda \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A (\tilde{T}_A + T_A + \varphi_A) dz + \int_{\Sigma_K} P Q_A F dz, \end{aligned}$$

where F is defined in (3.21). Recall (3.24), Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.3 and (4.1),

$$\left| \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A (\tilde{T}_A + T_A + \varphi_A) dz \right| \leq C \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} K^2 \int_{\Sigma_K} |Q_A| dz \leq C \varepsilon^3 K \log K.$$

Using (3.23), (4.1) and (3.24), one has

$$\left| \int_{\Sigma_K} P Q_A F dz \right| \leq C \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} K^2 \int_{\Sigma_K} |P Q_A| dz \leq C \varepsilon^3 K \log K.$$

Therefore, plugging in the above estimates back to (4.9),

$$\int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^5 \psi_A dz = -\lambda \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^2 dz + O(\varepsilon^3 K \log K).$$

\square

Now, let us compute $\int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^2 dz$. We recall $\rho_2(b)$ in (4.6). Taking the derivative to b on both sides, we get

$$\nabla \rho_2(b) = \frac{1}{4\pi} P.V. \int_{\Sigma_K} \frac{2(z-b)}{|z-b|^4} dz = -\frac{1}{4\pi} P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Sigma_K} \frac{2(z-b)}{|z-b|^4} dz.$$

It is not hard to show that $|\nabla \rho_2(b)| \leq C \log K$ in the constraint (3.4).

Lemma 4.5. *Assume (3.4), we have*

$$\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^2 dz = \varepsilon^2 P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{[q(z+\xi)]^2}{4\pi|z|^4} dz + O(\varepsilon^3 K(\log K)^2).$$

Proof. Note that

$$\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\Sigma_K} Q_A^2 dz = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\Sigma_K} \frac{\varepsilon}{|z-b|^2} q \left(\frac{\varepsilon R_\beta(z-b)}{|z-b|^2} + \hat{\xi} \right)^2 dz.$$

Notice that $\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\Sigma_K} \frac{\varepsilon q(\hat{\xi})^2}{|z-b|^2} dz = \varepsilon [q(\hat{\xi})]^2 \rho_2(b) = O(\delta^{-2} \varepsilon^3 K^{-1} (\log K)^2)$. It suffices to estimate

$$I = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\Sigma_K} \frac{\varepsilon}{|z-b|^2} \left(q \left(\frac{\varepsilon R_\beta(z-b)}{|z-b|^2} + \hat{\xi} \right)^2 - q(\hat{\xi})^2 \right) dz.$$

Again, we split the integral into two on \mathbb{R}^3 and $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Sigma_K$. First, using a change of variable,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\varepsilon}{|z-b|^2} \left[q \left(\frac{\varepsilon R_\beta(z-b)}{|z-b|^2} + \hat{\xi} \right)^2 - q(\hat{\xi})^2 \right] dz = \varepsilon^2 P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{[q(z+\hat{\xi})]^2 - [q(\hat{\xi})]^2}{|z|^4} dz \\ & = \varepsilon^2 P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{[q(z+\hat{\xi})]^2}{|z|^4} dz + \varepsilon^2 P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{[q(z+\hat{\xi})]^2 - [q(\hat{\xi})]^2 - [q(z+\hat{\xi})]^2}{|z|^4} dz \\ & = \varepsilon^2 P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{[q(z+\hat{\xi})]^2}{|z|^4} dz + O(\varepsilon^2 |a|). \end{aligned}$$

Second, since $\varepsilon/|z-b| \lesssim 1$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Sigma_K$, then

$$q \left(\frac{\varepsilon R_\beta(z-b)}{|z-b|^2} + \hat{\xi} \right)^2 - q(\hat{\xi})^2 = 2q(\hat{\xi}) \nabla q(\hat{\xi}) \cdot \frac{\varepsilon R_\beta(z-b)}{|z-b|^2} + O(\varepsilon^2 |z-b|^{-2})$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Sigma_K} \frac{\varepsilon}{|z-b|^2} \left(q \left(\frac{\varepsilon R_\beta(z-b)}{|z-b|^2} + \hat{\xi} \right)^2 - q(\hat{\xi})^2 \right) dz \\ & = \varepsilon^2 q(\hat{\xi}) w \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Sigma_K} \frac{(z-b)}{|z-b|^4} + O(\varepsilon^3) \\ & = -\varepsilon^2 q(\hat{\xi}) w \cdot \nabla \rho_2(b) + O(\varepsilon^3) = O(\varepsilon^2 |a| \log K). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the two results, the proof is complete. \square

Inserting Lemma 4.2, Lemma 4.3, Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.5 to (4.7), we obtain

$$(4.10) \quad J(PQ_A) = \frac{1}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} q^6 dz + 2\pi \Psi(A) + O(\varepsilon^3 K(\log K)^2),$$

where

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi(A) = & \varepsilon[q(\hat{\xi})]^2 \mathcal{H}(b, b) + \varepsilon^2 q(\hat{\xi}) w \cdot [\nabla_z \mathcal{H}(b, b) + \nabla_p \mathcal{H}(b, b)] \\ & + \varepsilon^3 w^T \nabla_{z,p}^2 \mathcal{H}(b, b) w - \lambda \varepsilon^2 C_*(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

and $\mathcal{H}(z, p) = H_0^e(z, p) + \gamma(z, p)$ and

$$C_*(\xi) = P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{[q(z + \xi)]^2}{4\pi|z|^4} dz.$$

Remark 4.6. Clearly, $\Psi(A)$ depends smoothly on the parameters of A . By elliptic theory and Remark 3.6, it is not hard to show that the dependence of $J(PQ_A)$ on the parameters in A is at least C^1 .

5. GLUING PROCEDURE

In this section, we outline the gluing procedure by separating the perturbation into inner and outer components. Specifically, we will prove that the inner part is the dominant term.

Let PQ_A denote the approximate solution defined in section 3

$$(5.1) \quad PQ_A = Q_A - \tilde{T}_A = Q_A - T_A - \varphi_A - \psi_A.$$

We introduce the following form of PQ_A for convenience

$$\begin{aligned} PQ_{A'} &= \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_A - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} T_A - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_A - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi_A \\ &= Q_{A'} - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} T_A - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_A - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi_A \\ &= \frac{1}{|y - b_\varepsilon|} q \left(\frac{R_\beta(y - b_\varepsilon)}{|y - b_\varepsilon|^2} + \varepsilon^{-1} \xi + \varepsilon^{-1} a\nu(\xi) \right) - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{T}_A \end{aligned}$$

where $y = \frac{z}{\varepsilon}$ and $b_\varepsilon = \frac{b}{\varepsilon}$. The Brezis-Nirenberg problem is equivalent to finding ϕ such that

$$(5.2) \quad \Delta_y(PQ_{A'} + \phi) + \lambda \varepsilon^2(PQ_{A'} + \phi) + (PQ_{A'} + \phi)^5 = 0,$$

which can be rewritten as

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta_y \phi + \lambda \varepsilon^2 \phi + 5PQ_{A'}^4 \phi = -E - N_\varepsilon(\phi) & \text{in } \Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}, \\ \phi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}, \end{cases}$$

where $\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon} = \{y \mid \varepsilon y \in \Sigma_k\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \Delta PQ_{A'} + \lambda \varepsilon^2 PQ_{A'} + PQ_{A'}^5 = PQ_{A'}^5 - Q_{A'}^5 \\ &= -5\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_{A'}^4 (T_A + \varphi_A + \psi_A) + O(\varepsilon^4 K^4) Q_{A'}^3 + O(\varepsilon^6 K^6) Q_{A'}^2 \\ &\quad + O(\varepsilon^8 K^8) Q_{A'} + O(\varepsilon^{10} K^{10}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$N_\varepsilon(\phi) = (PQ_{A'} + \phi)^5 - PQ_{A'}^5 - 5PQ_{A'}^4 \phi.$$

It is important to mention how the functions $PQ_{A'}$ and $Q_{A'}$ depend on the parameters $A' = (\Lambda, \varepsilon^{-1}a, \varepsilon^{-1}\xi, b_\varepsilon, \beta)$. Particularly, the dependence of $Q_{A'}$ on Λ can be understood as follows:

$$Q_{A'} = \frac{\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|y - b_\varepsilon|} q \left(\frac{R_\beta \Lambda (y - b_\varepsilon)}{|y - b_\varepsilon|^2} + \varepsilon^{-1}\xi + \varepsilon^{-1}a\nu(\xi) \right) \Big|_{\Lambda=1}.$$

Since we scale Q_A by ε for the space variable, so the parameter Λ does not appear in $Q_{A'}$ and we will not carry it in the expression of $Q_{A'}$ in the following argument.

We separate ϕ in the following form

$$(5.4) \quad \phi(y) = \eta_{2r}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}(y)\phi_{\text{in}}(y) + \phi_{\text{out}}(y),$$

where $\bar{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon K$ and

$$\eta_{2r}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}(y) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \bar{\varepsilon}|y - b_\varepsilon| \leq 2r, \\ 0, & \text{if } \bar{\varepsilon}|y - b_\varepsilon| \geq 4r. \end{cases}$$

for some $r \in (0, \frac{1}{32})$ and $\phi_{\text{in}}(y), \phi_{\text{out}}(y)$ satisfy the following equation respectively

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta_y \phi_{\text{in}} + \lambda \varepsilon^2 \phi_{\text{in}} + 5PQ_{A'}^4 \phi_{\text{in}} = -\eta_r^{\bar{\varepsilon}}(N_\varepsilon(\eta_{2r}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}\phi_{\text{in}} + \phi_{\text{out}}) + E) \\ \quad \quad \quad - 5\eta_r^{\bar{\varepsilon}}PQ_{A'}^4 \phi_{\text{out}} & \text{in } B_{\frac{4r}{\bar{\varepsilon}}}(b_\varepsilon), \\ \phi_{\text{in}} = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_{\frac{4r}{\bar{\varepsilon}}}(b_\varepsilon), \end{cases}$$

and

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta_y \phi_{\text{out}} + \lambda \varepsilon^2 \phi_{\text{out}} + 5(1 - \eta_r^{\bar{\varepsilon}})PQ_{A'}^4 \phi_{\text{out}} \\ = -(1 - \eta_r^{\bar{\varepsilon}})(E + N(\eta_{2r}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}\phi_{\text{in}} + \phi_{\text{out}})) + \Delta \eta_{2r}^{\bar{\varepsilon}} \phi_{\text{in}} + 2\nabla \eta_{2r}^{\bar{\varepsilon}} \nabla \phi_{\text{in}} & \text{in } \Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}, \\ \phi_{\text{out}} = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}. \end{cases}$$

It is crucial to see that $|\nabla \eta_{2r}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}| \leq C\bar{\varepsilon}$ and $|\Delta \eta_{2r}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}| \leq C\bar{\varepsilon}^2$, which makes equations (5.5) and (5.6) weakly coupled. Next we shall reduce this system to a single problem in the ball. To do this, we first pick out a small ϕ_{in} and solve ϕ_{out} from (5.6). We shall need the fact that the operator $\Delta_y + \lambda \varepsilon^2$ satisfies the Maximum principle in $\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}$ provided K is large enough and the following lemma

Lemma 5.1. *Let ϕ solve*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \phi + \lambda \varepsilon^2 \phi + f = 0 & \text{in } \Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}, \\ \phi = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}. \end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon})} \leq \frac{C}{\bar{\varepsilon}^2} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon})}.$$

Proof. We construct a function

$$w = \frac{2\pi^2}{\bar{\varepsilon}^2} - r^2 \sin^2 \theta.$$

After straightforward computation, we check that

$$\Delta w + \frac{\lambda \bar{\varepsilon}^2}{K^2} w = -2 + \frac{\lambda \bar{\varepsilon}^2}{K^2} \left(\frac{2\pi^2}{\bar{\varepsilon}^2} - r^2 \sin^2 \theta \right) < -1$$

provided K is large enough. Thus, by maximum principle, we derive that

$$\left(\frac{2\pi^2}{\bar{\varepsilon}^2} - r^2 \sin^2 \theta \right) \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon})}$$

defines a super-solution and the conclusion follows easily. \square

By Lemma 5.1, we get that

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\phi_{\text{out}}\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon})} &\leq \frac{C}{\bar{\varepsilon}^2} \left\| (1 - \eta_r^{\bar{\varepsilon}}) PQ_{A'}^4 \phi_{\text{out}} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon})} \\ &+ \frac{C}{\bar{\varepsilon}^2} \left\| (1 - \eta_r^{\bar{\varepsilon}}) (E + N(\eta_{2r}^{\bar{\varepsilon}} \phi_{\text{in}} + \phi_{\text{out}})) \right\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon})} \\ &+ \frac{C}{\bar{\varepsilon}^2} \|\nabla \eta_{2r}^{\bar{\varepsilon}} \nabla_y \phi_{\text{in}}\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon})} + \frac{C}{\bar{\varepsilon}^2} \|\Delta \eta_{2r}^{\bar{\varepsilon}} \phi_{\text{in}}\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon})}. \end{aligned}$$

If we presumably assume that

$$(5.8) \quad \|\phi_{\text{in}}\|_* := \sup_{y \in B_{4r/\bar{\varepsilon}}} \|\langle y - b_\varepsilon \rangle \phi_{\text{in}}\| + \sup_{y \in B_{4r/\bar{\varepsilon}}} \|\langle y - b_\varepsilon \rangle^2 \nabla \phi_{\text{in}}\| \text{ is small.}$$

Then we can apply the contraction mapping principle and the term N_ε has a powerlike behavior with power greater than 1 to deduce a unique (small) solution ϕ_{out} with

$$(5.9) \quad \|\phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in}})\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon})} \leq \frac{C}{\bar{\varepsilon}^2} \|(1 - \eta_r^{\bar{\varepsilon}}) E\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon})} + C\bar{\varepsilon} \|\phi_{\text{in}}\|_*.$$

Given any two functions $\phi_{\text{in},1}$ and $\phi_{\text{in},2}$, we see that the corresponding solution of (5.6) satisfies a Lipschitz condition of the form

$$(5.10) \quad \|\phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in},1}) - \phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in},2})\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon})} \leq C\bar{\varepsilon} \|\phi_{\text{in},1} - \phi_{\text{in},2}\|_*.$$

In addition, one can follow the similar process to derive that

$$(5.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{A'} \phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in}})\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon})} &\leq \frac{C}{\bar{\varepsilon}^2} \|\nabla_{A'}((1 - \eta_r^{\bar{\varepsilon}}) E)\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon})} + C\bar{\varepsilon} \|\phi_{\text{in}}\|_* \\ &+ C\bar{\varepsilon} \|\nabla_{A'} \phi_{\text{in}}\|_* + C\bar{\varepsilon}^2 \|\phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in}})\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon})}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(5.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{A'}(\phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in},1}) - \phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in},2}))\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon})} &\leq C\bar{\varepsilon} \|\phi_{\text{in},1} - \phi_{\text{in},2}\|_* \\ &+ C\bar{\varepsilon} \|\nabla_{A'}(\phi_{\text{in},1} - \phi_{\text{in},2})\|_*. \end{aligned}$$

Then the full problem can be reduced to solving the nonlocal problem in the ball $B_{4r/\bar{\varepsilon}}(b_\varepsilon)$,

$$(5.13) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta \phi_{\text{in}} + \lambda \varepsilon^2 \phi_{\text{in}} + 5PQ_{A'}^4 \phi_{\text{in}} = -\eta_r^{\bar{\varepsilon}} N_\varepsilon(\phi_{\text{in}} + \phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in}})) \\ \quad \quad \quad - \eta_r^{\bar{\varepsilon}} (E + 5PQ_{A'}^4 \phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in}})) & \text{in } B_{4r/\bar{\varepsilon}}(b_\varepsilon), \\ \phi_{\text{in}} = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_{4r/\bar{\varepsilon}}(b_\varepsilon). \end{cases}$$

Next section, we shall study (5.13) and investigate the related linear problem.

6. THE LINEAR AND NONLINEAR PROBLEM

In this section, we will study the linearized problem associated with (5.13) as well as the nonlinear problem. Given that this material is now well-established and standard, we will state the main result and provide a concise outline of its proof. For the details we refer the readers to [17, 45, 50].

We first study the following linearized problem

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta\phi + \lambda\varepsilon^2\phi + 5PQ_{A'}^4\phi = h + \sum_{j=0}^5 c_j PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_j(y), & \text{in } B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon), \\ \phi = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon), \\ \int_{B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)} \phi PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_j(y) dy = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, 5, \end{cases}$$

where $A' = (\Lambda, \varepsilon^{-1}a, \varepsilon^{-1}\xi, b_\varepsilon, \beta)$ and $\hat{Z}_j(y) = \chi(y)Z_j(y)$. Here $Z_j(y)$ is the kernel function introduced in section 2.3³ and $\chi(y)$ is the characteristic function such that

$$\chi(y) = \begin{cases} 1, & y \in B_{2r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon), \\ 0, & y \in B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)^c. \end{cases}$$

To state the main result concerning the linearized problem, we introduce the following weighted function space:

$$(6.2) \quad \|h\|_{**} = \sup_{y \in B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)} |\langle y - b_\varepsilon \rangle^{3+2\sigma} h(y)|,$$

$$(6.3) \quad \|\phi\|_* = \sup_{y \in B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)} |\langle y - b_\varepsilon \rangle \phi(y)| + \sup_{y \in B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)} |\langle y - b_\varepsilon \rangle^2 \nabla \phi(y)|,$$

where σ is a sufficiently small positive number and $\langle y \rangle = \sqrt{1 + |y|^2}$. The first result of this section is the following.

Proposition 6.1. *Suppose that the parameters A and ε satisfy the relation in (3.4). Then there exists K_0 large enough such that for all $K > K_0$ and all $h \in C^\alpha(B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon))$ which is even in z_3 , the problem (6.1) has a unique solution $\phi \equiv L_\varepsilon(h)$ which is even in z_3 , and*

$$\|\phi\|_* \leq C\|h\|_{**}, \quad |c_j| \leq C\|h\|_{**},$$

and

$$\|\nabla_{A'}\phi\|_* \leq C\|h\|_{**}.$$

Proof. We shall prove the proposition by contradiction, we mainly follow [45, Proposition 4.2] to sketch the major steps. Suppose that there exists a sequence $K = K_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that there are functions ϕ_n and h_n with $\|\phi_n\|_* = 1$ and $\|h_n\|_{**} = o(1)$ such that

$$(6.4) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta\phi_n + \lambda\varepsilon^2\phi_n + 5PQ_{A'}^4\phi_n = h_n + \sum_{j=0}^5 c_j PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_j & \text{in } B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon), \\ \phi_n = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon), \\ \int_{B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)} \phi_n PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_j dx = 0 \quad \text{for } j = 0, \dots, 5, \end{cases}$$

for certain constants c_j , we shall prove that $\|\phi_n\|_* \rightarrow 0$ to derive a contradiction.

³The parameters $(1, \xi, 0, 0, \theta_*)$ are replaced by $(\Lambda, \varepsilon^{-1}\xi, \varepsilon^{-1}a, b_\varepsilon, \beta)$.

Step 1. We first establish the following:

$$\|\phi_n\|_\mu := \sup_{y \in B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)} |\langle y - b_\varepsilon \rangle^{1-2\mu} \phi_n(y)| + \sup_{y \in B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)} |\langle y - b_\varepsilon \rangle^{2-2\mu} D\phi_n(y)| \rightarrow 0$$

with $\mu > 0$ being a small fixed number. We shall also prove this statement by contradiction. Without loss of generality, we may take $\|\phi_n\|_\mu = 1$. Multiplying the equation against \hat{Z}_ℓ , integrating by parts twice, we get that

$$\sum_{j=0}^5 c_j \int_{B_{\frac{4r}{\varepsilon}}(b_\varepsilon)} PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_j \hat{Z}_\ell dy = \int_{B_{\frac{4r}{\varepsilon}}(b_\varepsilon)} (\Delta \hat{Z}_\ell + \lambda \varepsilon_n^2 \hat{Z}_\ell + 5PQ_{A'} \hat{Z}_\ell) \phi_n dy - \int_{B_{\frac{4r}{\varepsilon}}(b_\varepsilon)} h_n \hat{Z}_\ell dy.$$

By straightforward calculation one can verify that $(\int_{B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)} PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_j \hat{Z}_l dy)_{j,l}$ is an invertible matrix. While, one can easily prove that the right-hand side of the above equation is bounded by

$$o(1)\|\phi_n\|_\mu + C\|h_n\|_{**}.$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$(6.5) \quad |c_j| \leq C(\|h_n\|_{**} + o(1)\|\phi_n\|_\mu), \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, 5,$$

so that $c_j = o(1)$. Then by Green's representation formula we can derive the following estimation

$$|\phi_n(y)| + \langle y - b_\varepsilon \rangle |D\phi_n(y)| \leq C(\|\phi_n\|_\mu + \|h_n\|_{**}) \langle y - b_\varepsilon \rangle^{-1}.$$

In particular,

$$\langle y - b_\varepsilon \rangle^{1-2\mu} |\phi_n(y)| \leq C \langle y - b_\varepsilon \rangle^{-2\mu}.$$

Since $\|\phi_n\|_\mu = 1$, we assume that $\|\phi_n\|_{L^\infty(B_R(0))} > \gamma$ for certain $R > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ independently of ε . Then local elliptic estimates and the bounds above yield that, up to a subsequence $\phi_n(y + b_\varepsilon)$ converges uniformly over compact sets of \mathbb{R}^3 to a nontrivial solution ϕ of

$$(6.6) \quad \Delta \phi + 5Q^4 \phi = 0, \quad |\phi(y)| \leq C|y|^{-1}.$$

Due to the non-degenerate result in Proposition 2.5 and h is even in z_3 , we have that ϕ is a linear combination of the functions Z_j , $j = 0, \dots, 5$, defined in Section 2.3. On the other hand, by the dominated convergence theorem, we see that (after passing to a subsequence if necessary) the limit function ϕ is perpendicular to these kernels Z_j , $j = 0, 1, \dots, 5$. Hence the only possibility is that $\phi \equiv 0$, which is a contradiction. This yields the proof of $\|\phi_n\|_\mu \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, we have

$$\|\phi_n\|_* \leq C(\|h_n\|_{**} + \|\phi_n\|_\mu),$$

hence $\|\phi_n\|_* \rightarrow 0$.

Step 2. In this step, we shall prove the existence of ϕ to (6.4) in the following function space

$$H = \left\{ \phi \in H_0^1(B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)) \left| \int_{B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)} \phi PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_j \phi dy = 0, \forall j = 0, \dots, 5 \right. \right\}$$

endowed with the usual inner product

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle = \int_{B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)} \nabla \phi \nabla \psi dy.$$

Problem (6.4) expressed in weak form is equivalent to that of finding a $\phi \in H$ such that

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle = \int_{B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)} (\lambda \varepsilon^2 \phi + 5PQ_{A'}^4 \phi - h) \psi dy, \quad \forall \psi \in H.$$

Using the Riesz's representation theorem, the above equation could be rewritten in H as the following form

$$(6.7) \quad \phi = T_\varepsilon(\phi) + \tilde{h}$$

with certain $\tilde{h} \in H$ which depends linearly in h and where T_ε is a compact operator in H . As a consequence of Fredholm's alternative principle and the fact that $\|\phi_n\|_* \rightarrow 0$ as $\|h_n\|_{**} \rightarrow 0$, we conclude that for each h , problem (6.4) admits a unique solution, and the estimate follows easily.

Step 3. In this step we shall study the dependence of ϕ on $A' = (\Lambda, \varepsilon^{-1}a, \varepsilon^{-1}\xi, \varepsilon^{-1}b, \beta)$ with $(\varepsilon, a, \xi, b, \beta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \Gamma \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$. Let us define $A' = (A'_0, \dots, A'_5)$ the components of A' . We differentiate ϕ with respect to A'_ℓ and set formally $Z_{\phi,\ell} = \frac{\partial}{\partial A'_\ell} \phi$, $\ell = 0, \dots, 5$.

We define $c_{\ell,j}$ so that

$$(6.8) \quad \int_{B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)} PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_m (Z_{\phi,\ell} - \sum_{j=0}^5 c_{\ell,j} \hat{Z}_j) dy = 0, \quad \forall \ell, j.$$

This amounts to solving a linear system in the constants $c_{\ell,j}$,

$$(6.9) \quad \sum_j c_{\ell,j} \int_{B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)} PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_m \hat{Z}_j dy = \int_{B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)} \phi \frac{\partial}{\partial A'_\ell} (PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_m) dy,$$

which follows by a direct differentiation with respect to A'_ℓ of the orthogonal conditions $\int_{B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)} \phi PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_m dx = 0$. Arguing as before, we see that the above equation is uniquely solvable and that

$$c_{\ell,j} = O(\|\phi\|_*)$$

uniformly for parameters A' in the considered region. Thus

$$\eta := Z_{\phi,\ell} - \sum_{j=0}^5 c_{\ell,j} \hat{Z}_j \in H_0^1(B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{B_{4r/\varepsilon}(b_\varepsilon)} \eta PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_j dx = 0, \quad \forall j = 0, \dots, 5.$$

On the other hand, a direct but tedious computation shows that

$$(6.10) \quad \Delta \eta + \lambda \varepsilon^2 \eta + 5PQ_{A'}^4 \eta = f + \sum_{j=0}^5 d_j PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_j \quad \text{in} \quad B_{\frac{4r}{\varepsilon}}(b_\varepsilon),$$

where $d_j = \frac{\partial}{\partial A'_\ell} c_j$ and

$$(6.11) \quad f = - \sum_{j=0}^5 c_{\ell,j} (\Delta + \lambda_n \varepsilon_n^2 + 5PQ_{A'}^4) \hat{Z}_j + \sum_{j=0}^5 c_j \partial_{A'_\ell} (PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_j) - 5(\partial_{A'_\ell} PQ_{A'}^4) \phi.$$

Thus, we have $\eta = L_\varepsilon(f)$. Consider the function f , we have

$$\|\phi \partial_{A'_\ell}(PQ_{A'}^4)\|_{**} \leq C\|\phi\|_*, \quad \left| \partial_{A'_\ell}(PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_j) \right| \leq C(1 + |y|^2)^{-3},$$

hence

$$\|c_j \partial_{A'_\ell} PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_j\|_{**} \leq C\|h\|_{**},$$

which dues to that $c_i = O(\|h\|_{**})$. Lastly, by direct computation we have

$$\left| (\Delta + \lambda\varepsilon^2 + 5PQ_{A'}^4) \hat{Z}_j \right| \leq C\varepsilon^2(1 + |y|^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\varepsilon^{1-2\sigma}(1 + |y|^2)^{-\frac{3}{2}-\sigma},$$

which leads to

$$\left\| \sum_{j=0}^5 c_{\ell,j} (\Delta + \lambda\varepsilon^2 + 5PQ_{A'}^4) \hat{Z}_j \right\|_{**} \leq C\|h\|_{**}.$$

Thus we conclude that

$$\|f\|_{**} \leq C\|h\|_{**}.$$

Next, we define

$$Z_{\phi,\ell} = L_\varepsilon(f) + \sum_j c_{\ell,j} PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_j,$$

with $c_{\ell,j}$ given by relations (6.9) and f given by (6.11), we check that indeed $Z_{\phi,\ell} = \partial_{A'_\ell} \phi$. In fact, Z depends continuously on the parameters A and h with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_*$ and $\|Z_{\phi,\ell}\|_* \leq C\|h\|_{**}$ for parameters in the considered region. Hence, we finish the proof. \square

Next, we shall solve the nonlinear problem

$$(6.12) \quad \begin{cases} (\Delta + \lambda\varepsilon^2 + 5PQ_{A'}^4) \phi_{\text{in}} = -\eta_r^\varepsilon(\bar{N}_\varepsilon(\phi_{\text{in}}) + E) + \sum_{j=0}^5 c_j PQ_{A'}^4 \bar{Z}_j & \text{in } B_{\frac{4r}{\varepsilon}}(b_\varepsilon), \\ \phi_{\text{in}} = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_{\frac{4r}{\varepsilon}}(b_\varepsilon), \end{cases}$$

where

$$\bar{N}_\varepsilon(\phi_{\text{in}}) = N_\varepsilon(\phi_{\text{in}} + \phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in}})) + 5PQ_{A'}^4 \phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in}}).$$

Proposition 6.2. *Suppose that the parameters A and ε satisfy the relation in (3.4). Then there exists K_0 large enough such that for all $K \geq K_0$, there is a unique solution $\phi_{\text{in}}(A')$ to problem (6.12) with*

$$(6.13) \quad \|\phi_{\text{in}}\|_* \leq C\varepsilon^2 K^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla_{A'} \phi_{\text{in}}\|_* \leq C\varepsilon^2 K^2.$$

Proof. Here we shall give the details for the estimation on ϕ . For the derivation of the estimation for the derivative of ϕ with respect to the parameters A' , we refer the readers to [17, 45, 50] for the details.

Consider the right-hand side of (6.12), we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} E &= Q_{A'}^5 - PQ_{A'}^5 = 5\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} PQ_{A'}^4 (T_A + \varphi_A + \psi_A) + O(\varepsilon^4 K^4) Q_{A'}^3 + O(\varepsilon^6 K^6) Q_{A'}^2 \\ &\quad + O(\varepsilon^8 K^8) Q_{A'} + O(\varepsilon^{10} K^{10}). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\|\eta_r^\varepsilon E\|_{**} \leq C\varepsilon^2 K^2.$$

To estimate $\bar{N}_\varepsilon(\phi_{\text{in}})$, we first see that

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta_r^\varepsilon \bar{N}_\varepsilon(\phi_{\text{in}})| &\leq C|PQ_{A'}|^4|\phi_{\text{out}}| + C|PQ_{A'}|^3(|\phi_{\text{in}}|^2 + |\phi_{\text{out}}|^2) \\ &\quad + C|PQ_{A'}|^2(|\phi_{\text{in}}|^3 + |\phi_{\text{out}}|^3) + C|PQ_{A'}|(|\phi_{\text{in}}|^4 + |\phi_{\text{out}}|^4) \\ &\quad + C(|\phi_{\text{in}}|^5 + |\phi_{\text{out}}|^5). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\|\eta_r^\varepsilon \bar{N}_\varepsilon(\phi_{\text{in}})\|_{**} \leq C\varepsilon^4 + C\varepsilon^{2-\sigma}(\|\phi_{\text{in}}\|_*^2 + \|\phi_{\text{in}}\|_*^3 + \|\phi_{\text{in}}\|_*^4 + \|\phi_{\text{in}}\|_*^5).$$

Next we shall show that equation (6.12) has a unique solution $\phi_{\text{in}} = \phi_{\text{in},0} + \phi_{\text{in},n}$ with

$$(6.14) \quad \phi_{\text{in},0} = T_\varepsilon(\eta_r^\varepsilon E),$$

as the required properties. Here T_ε denotes the linear operator defined in Proposition 6.1. That is $T_\varepsilon(\eta_r^\varepsilon E) = \phi_{\text{in},0}$. As a consequence, $\phi_{\text{in}} = \phi_{\text{in},0} + \phi_{\text{in},n}$ is a solution to (6.12) if and only if

$$(6.15) \quad \phi_{\text{in},n} = -T_\varepsilon(\bar{N}_\varepsilon(\phi_{\text{in},0} + \phi_{\text{in},n})) = \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\phi_{\text{in},n}).$$

Then we need to show that the operator \mathcal{M}_ε defined above is a contraction inside a property chosen region. Since $\|\eta_r^\varepsilon E\|_{**} \leq C\varepsilon^2 K^2$, the result of Proposition 6.1 gives that

$$\|T_\varepsilon(\eta_r^\varepsilon E)\|_* \leq C\varepsilon^2 K^2,$$

and

$$(6.16) \quad \|\eta_r^\varepsilon \bar{N}_\varepsilon(\phi_{\text{in},0} + \phi_{\text{in},n})\|_{**} \leq C(\bar{\varepsilon}\varepsilon^2 K^2 + \bar{\varepsilon}\|\phi_{\text{in},n}\|_* + \varepsilon^{2-\sigma}\|\phi_{\text{in},n}\|_*^2).$$

We shall study the problem (6.15) in the following function space

$$(6.17) \quad \mathcal{F} = \{f \in H_0^1(\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}) : \|f\|_* \leq C\varepsilon^2 K^2\}.$$

From Proposition 6.1 and (6.16) we conclude that, for K sufficiently large and any $\bar{\phi} \in \mathcal{F}$ we have

$$\|\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\bar{\phi})\|_* \leq C\varepsilon^2 K^2.$$

If we choose R large enough in the definition of \mathcal{F} , see (6.17), then we get that \mathcal{M}_ε maps \mathcal{F} into itself. Now we shall show that the map \mathcal{M}_ε is a contraction, for any K sufficiently large, and it will imply that \mathcal{M}_ε has a unique fixed point in \mathcal{F} and hence problem (6.12) has a unique solution. For any $\bar{\phi}_1, \bar{\phi}_2$ in \mathcal{F} we have

$$\|\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\bar{\phi}_1) - \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\bar{\phi}_2)\|_* \leq C\|\bar{N}_\varepsilon(\phi_{\text{in},0} + \bar{\phi}_1) - \bar{N}_\varepsilon(\phi_{\text{in},0} + \bar{\phi}_2)\|_{**},$$

now we just need to check that \bar{N}_ε is a contraction in its corresponding norms. By definition of \bar{N}_ε , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|N_\varepsilon(\phi_{\text{in},0} + \bar{\phi}_1 + \phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in},0} + \bar{\phi}_1)) - N_\varepsilon(\phi_{\text{in},0} + \bar{\phi}_2 + \phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in},0} + \bar{\phi}_2))| \\ &\leq CPQ_{A'}^3|\bar{\phi}|\|\bar{\phi}_1 - \bar{\phi}_2\| \end{aligned}$$

for some $\bar{\phi}$ in the segment joining $\phi_{\text{in},0} + \bar{\phi}_1 + \phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in},0} + \bar{\phi}_1)$ and $\phi_{\text{in},0} + \bar{\phi}_2 + \phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in},0} + \bar{\phi}_2)$, and

$$|PQ_{A'}^4\phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in},0} + \bar{\phi}_1) - PQ_{A'}^4\phi_{\text{out}}(\phi_{\text{in},0} + \bar{\phi}_2)| \leq C\bar{\varepsilon}PQ_{A'}^4|\bar{\phi}_1 - \bar{\phi}_2|.$$

Therefore, we can conclude that there exists $c \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$(6.18) \quad \|\bar{N}_\varepsilon(\phi_{\text{in},0} + \bar{\phi}_1) - \bar{N}_\varepsilon(\phi_{\text{in},0} + \bar{\phi}_2)\|_{**} \leq c\|\bar{\phi}_1 - \bar{\phi}_2\|_*.$$

This concludes the proof of existence of ϕ solution to (6.12), and the first estimate in (6.13). \square

7. THE FINITE-DIMENSIONAL REDUCTION AND THE CRITICAL POINT

In this section, we will first set up the reduction that transforms the original infinite-dimensional problem into a finite-dimensional one. Then, we will determine the critical points of the energy with respect to the parameters, using these to establish the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Suppose that $\phi_{A'}$ is the solution of (6.12). Let $u_\varepsilon(y) = PQ_{A'}(y) + \phi_{A'}(y)$, then

$$\Delta_y u_\varepsilon(y) + \lambda \varepsilon^2 u_\varepsilon y + u_\varepsilon(y)^5 = \sum_{j=0}^5 c_j PQ_{A'}^4 \bar{Z}_j.$$

Note that u_ε will satisfy (5.2) if the Lagrange multiplier $c_j = 0$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, 5$. The following reduction Lemma says that this is equivalent to the criticality of A' in a finite-dimensional space. Returning to the original variable z and A (before scaling), denoting $PQ_A(z) = \varepsilon^{-1/2} PQ_{A'}(z/\varepsilon)$ and $\phi_A(z) = \varepsilon^{-1/2} \phi_{A'}(z/\varepsilon)$, then $PQ_A(z) + \phi_A(z)$ will be a solution to the Brezis-Nirenberg problem under the criticality of A .

Lemma 7.1. *$u_\varepsilon = PQ_{A'} + \phi_{A'}(y)$ is a solution of problem (5.2) if and only if A' is a critical point of the energy*

$$J_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} |\nabla_y u_\varepsilon|^2 dy - \frac{\lambda \varepsilon^2}{2} \int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} u_\varepsilon^2 dy - \frac{1}{6} \int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} u_\varepsilon^6 dy.$$

Equivalently, $PQ_A(z) + \phi_A(z)$ is a solution to (1.12) if and only if A is a critical point of the energy $J(PQ_A + \phi_A) = J_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} J(PQ_A + \phi_A) &:= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_K} |\nabla_z (PQ_A + \phi_A)|^2 dz - \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\Sigma_K} (PQ_A + \phi_A)^2 dz \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{6} \int_{\Sigma_K} (PQ_A + \phi_A)^6 dz. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let A'_ℓ , $\ell = 0, \dots, 5$ be the elements of A' . Considering the derivative of I with respect to A'_ℓ , we see that $\frac{\partial I}{\partial A'_\ell} = 0$ is equivalent to say that $\frac{\partial J_\varepsilon(PQ_{A'} + \phi_{A'})}{\partial A'_\ell} = 0$. Next we compute

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial A'_\ell} J_\varepsilon(PQ_{A'} + \phi_{A'}) = DJ_\varepsilon(PQ_{A'} + \phi_{A'}) \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial A'_\ell} PQ_{A'} + \frac{\partial}{\partial A'_\ell} \phi_{A'} \right].$$

On the other hand, one sees that

$$\frac{\partial PQ_{A'}}{\partial A'_\ell} = \hat{Z}_2(y) + o(1).$$

Using Proposition 6.2 and estimates (5.9)-(5.12), one can show

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \phi_{A'}}{\partial A'_\ell} \right\|_{**} = O(\varepsilon^2 K^2) \quad \text{as } K \rightarrow \infty,$$

then we get that $\frac{\partial I}{\partial A'_\ell} = 0$ is equivalent to say $DJ_\varepsilon(PQ_{A'} + \phi_{A'})[\hat{Z}_\ell + o(1)] = 0$. As a consequence, we can draw a conclusion that $\nabla_{A'}I = 0$ is equivalent to

$$(7.1) \quad DJ_\varepsilon(PQ_{A'} + \phi_{A'}) \left[\hat{Z}_\ell + o(1) \right] = 0, \quad \forall \ell = 0, \dots, 5.$$

From the fact that $DJ_\varepsilon(PQ_{A'} + \phi_{A'})[g] = 0$ for all functions such that $\int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_\ell g dy = 0$, we can see that (7.1) can be written as

$$(7.2) \quad DJ_\varepsilon(PQ_{A'} + \phi_{A'}) \left[\hat{Z}_\ell + o(1)\Xi \right] = 0, \quad \forall \ell = 0, \dots, 5,$$

where Ξ is a uniformly bounded function, that belongs to the vector space generated by the functions \hat{Z}_ℓ . Then $\nabla I(A') = 0$ is equivalent to

$$DJ_\varepsilon(PQ_{A'} + \phi_{A'})[\hat{Z}_\ell] = 0, \quad \forall \ell = 0, \dots, 5.$$

By definition of c_ℓ in (6.12), then we readily derive that this is equivalent to $c_\ell = 0$ for all ℓ and it finishes the proof. \square

In the following calculation, we shall see the major in the expansion of $J(PQ_A + \phi_A)$ is $J(PQ_{A'})$.

$$\begin{aligned} J(PQ_A + \phi_A) &= J_\varepsilon(PQ_{A'} + \phi_{A'}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} |\nabla_y(PQ_{A'} + \phi_{A'})|^2 dy - \frac{\lambda\varepsilon^2}{2} \int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} (PQ_{A'} + \phi_{A'})^2 dy \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{6} \int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} (PQ_{A'} + \phi_{A'})^6 dy. \end{aligned}$$

By expanding all terms and grouping them, we get

$$(7.3) \quad \begin{aligned} J_\varepsilon(PQ_{A'} + \phi_{A'}) &= J_\varepsilon(PQ_{A'}) - \int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} (\Delta PQ_{A'} + \lambda\varepsilon^2 PQ_{A'} + PQ_{A'}^5) \phi_{A'} dy \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} (\Delta \phi_{A'} + \lambda\varepsilon^2 \phi_{A'} + 5PQ_{A'}^4 \phi_{A'}) \phi_{A'} dy \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{6} \int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} (20PQ_{A'}^3 \phi_{A'}^3 + 15PQ_{A'}^2 \phi_{A'}^4 + 6PQ_{A'} \phi_{A'}^5 + \phi_{A'}^6) dy. \end{aligned}$$

It is known that $\|\phi_A\|_* \leq C\varepsilon^2 K^2$, one can easily show that

$$\left| \int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} (20PQ_{A'}^3 \phi_{A'}^3 + 15PQ_{A'}^2 \phi_{A'}^4 + 6PQ_{A'} \phi_{A'}^5 + \phi_{A'}^6) dy \right| \leq C\varepsilon^6 K^6.$$

Consider the second term on the right-hand side of (7.3), we have

$$(7.4) \quad \Delta PQ_{A'} + \lambda\varepsilon^2 PQ_{A'} + PQ_{A'}^5 = E(PQ_{A'}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E(PQ_{A'}) &= PQ_{A'}^5 - Q_{A'}^5 = -5\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_{A'}^4 (T_A + \varphi_A + \psi_A) + O(\varepsilon^4 K^4) Q_{A'}^3 + O(\varepsilon^6 K^6) Q_{A'}^2 \\ &\quad + O(\varepsilon^8 K^8) Q_{A'} + O(\varepsilon^{10} K^{10}). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
(7.5) \quad & \int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} (\Delta PQ_{A'} + \lambda\varepsilon^2 PQ_{A'} + PQ_{A'}^5) \phi_{A'} dy \\
&= -5 \int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_{A'}^4 (T_A + \varphi_A + \psi_A) \phi_{A'} dy + O(\varepsilon^6 K^6) \\
&= O(\varepsilon^4 K^4) \int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} Q_{A'}^4 dy + O(\varepsilon^6 K^6) = O(\varepsilon^4 K^4).
\end{aligned}$$

While for the third term on the right hand side of (7.3),

$$(7.6) \quad \Delta\phi_{A'} + \lambda\varepsilon^2\phi_{A'} + 5PQ_{A'}^4\phi_{A'} = E(PQ_{A'}) + N(\phi_{A'}) + \sum_{j=0}^5 c_j PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_j.$$

As the above computation,

$$(7.7) \quad \int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} E(PQ_{A'}) \phi_{A'} dy = O(\varepsilon^4 K^4).$$

While for the higher order term $N(\phi_{A'})$, it is easy to see that

$$(7.8) \quad \int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} N(\phi_{A'}) \phi_{A'} dy = O(\varepsilon^6 K^6).$$

The multiplicative of $c_j PQ_{A'}^4 \hat{Z}_j$ and $\phi_{A'}$ is obvious zero due to the setting of $\phi_{A'}$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$(7.9) \quad \int_{\Sigma_{K,\varepsilon}} (\Delta\phi_{A'} + \lambda\varepsilon^2\phi_{A'} + 5PQ_{A'}^4\phi_{A'}) \phi_{A'} dy = O(\varepsilon^4 K^4).$$

Thus we conclude that

$$(7.10) \quad J(PQ_A + \phi_A) = J_\varepsilon(PQ_{A'} + \phi_{A'}) = J_\varepsilon(PQ_{A'}) + O(\varepsilon^4 K^4) = J(PQ_A) + O(\varepsilon^4 K^4).$$

Theorem 7.2. *There exists δ small such that for K large enough, the $\inf_{A \in \mathcal{C}} J(PQ_A + \phi_A)$ is achieved in the interior of the set \mathcal{C} defined by (3.4), i.e.*

$$(7.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \varepsilon K^3 &\in [\delta, \delta^{-1}], \quad \xi \in \Gamma, \quad |a| \leq \delta^{-1} \varepsilon \log K, \quad d \in \left[\frac{\log K - \log \log K}{K}, \frac{\log K}{K} \right], \\ |\alpha_b| &\leq \delta^{-1/2} K^{-2} \log K, \quad |\hat{\beta}| \leq \delta^{-1/2} K^{-1} \log K. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since the constraint set \mathcal{C} is closed, the infimum of $J(PQ_A + \phi_A)$ over $A \in \mathcal{C}$ is attained at some point $A = (\varepsilon, \xi, a, d, \alpha_b, \hat{\beta}) \in \mathcal{C}$. Note that since we denote $b = |b|e^{i\alpha_b}$ and $d = (1 - |b|^2)/b$, then it is equivalent to write $A = (\varepsilon, \xi, a, d, \alpha_b, \hat{\beta})$ and $A = (\varepsilon, \xi, a, b, \hat{\beta})$. Recall that our notation convention (3.5) implies $\alpha_w = \hat{\beta}$.

We will prove that for each point on the boundary $\partial\mathcal{C}$ there is another interior point whose value is strictly smaller than that. Thus, the infimum must be achieved in the interior. First, let us recall that

$$(7.12) \quad J(PQ_A + \phi_A) = J(PQ_A) + O(\varepsilon^4 K^4) = \frac{1}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} q^6 dz + 2\pi\Psi(A) + O(\varepsilon^3 K (\log K)^2).$$

Notice that $\frac{1}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} q^6$ is a constant and does not depend on A . We need to study $\Psi(A)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(A) &= \varepsilon[q(\hat{\xi})]^2 \mathcal{H}(b, b) + \varepsilon^2 q(\hat{\xi}) w \cdot [\nabla_z \mathcal{H}(b, b) + \nabla_p \mathcal{H}(b, b)] \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^3 w^T \nabla_{z,p}^2 \mathcal{H}(b, b) w - \lambda \varepsilon^2 C_*(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

It is essential to determine the exact order of each term involving \mathcal{H} . To maintain the flow of the proof, we defer this analysis to the following sections and list the results here. First, it follows from Lemma 8.2 and Lemma 8.6 that

$$\mathcal{H}(b, b) = \gamma(b, b) + H_0^e(b, b) = \frac{1}{2|b|} [\hat{S}_1(K) + S_1(K, d) + O(K^3 \alpha_b^2)].$$

For later references, we denote the ‘‘leading term’’ as $\mathcal{C}_0 := \hat{S}_1(K) + S_1(K, d)$. The order of \mathcal{C}_0 can be obtained by Lemma 9.1 and Lemma 9.4 in Section 9.

$$\mathcal{C}_0(K, d) = \hat{S}_1(K) + S_1(K, d) = \frac{K}{\pi} \log 4 + O((\log K)^{1/2}).$$

Second, by Lemma 8.3 and Lemma 8.7, we have

$$w \cdot \nabla_z \mathcal{H}(b, b) = w \cdot \nabla_z \gamma(b, b) + w \cdot \nabla_z H_0^e(b, b) = O(K(\log K)^{1/2}).$$

Third, using Lemma 8.4 and Lemma 8.8,

$$w^T \nabla_{z,p}^2 \mathcal{H}(b, b) = \frac{|w|^2}{8|b|^3} [\mathcal{C}_2(K, d) + (\alpha_w, \alpha_b) \mathcal{A}^\gamma(\alpha_w, \alpha_b)^T + O(Kd^{-2} \alpha_w^2 + Kd^{-4} \alpha_b^2)],$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}_2(K, d) = \hat{S}_1(K) + \hat{S}_3(K) + S_1(K, d) - (d + \sqrt{1 + d^2})^2 S_3(K, d) + 3(d^2 + d^4) S_5(K, d),$$

$$\mathcal{A}^\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} S_3^o(K) - 2S_1^o(K) + 3\hat{S}_3^e(K) & -3\hat{S}_3(K) + 3S_1^o(K) \\ -3\hat{S}_3(K) + 3S_1^o(K) & \frac{3}{2}[4S_5^o(K) + S_3^o(K) - 3S_1^o(K)] + 3\hat{S}_3^e(K) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Again, Lemma 9.1, Lemma 9.2 and Lemma 9.4 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} (7.13) \quad \mathcal{C}_2(K, d) &= \frac{3\zeta(3)}{2\pi^3} K^3 + O(K \log K) + \sqrt{\frac{8}{\pi}} K^3 (Kd)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-Kd} (1 + O((Kd)^{-1})) \\ &= \frac{3\zeta(3)}{2\pi^3} K^3 + O(K^2 (\log K)^{1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.14) \quad \mathcal{A}^\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{5\zeta(3)}{2\pi^3} K^3 + O(K \log K) & -\frac{6\zeta(3)}{\pi^3} K^3 + O(K \log K) \\ -\frac{6\zeta(3)}{\pi^3} K^3 + O(K \log K) & \frac{93\zeta(5)}{8\pi^5} K^5 + O(K^3) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\zeta(\cdot)$ is the Riemann zeta function.

Now, we decompose

$$\Psi(A) = \Psi(A_0) + \Psi(A) - \Psi(A_0)$$

where $A_0 = (\varepsilon, \xi, a, b_0, 0)$ and $b_0 = (|b|, 0, 0)$.

$$(7.15) \quad \Psi(A_0) = \varepsilon[q(\hat{\xi})]^2 \frac{\mathcal{C}_0(K, d)}{2|b|} + \frac{|w|^2}{8|b|^3} \varepsilon^3 \mathcal{C}_2(K, d) - \lambda \varepsilon^2 C_*(\xi) + O(\delta^{-1} \varepsilon^3 K (\log K)^2),$$

$$(7.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi(A) - \Psi(A_0) &= \varepsilon^3(\alpha_w, \alpha_b)\mathcal{A}^\gamma(\alpha_w, \alpha_b)^T \\ &+ O\left(\varepsilon[q(\hat{\xi})]^2 K^3 \alpha_b^2 + \varepsilon^2 q(\hat{\xi}) K d^{-1}(\alpha_w^2 + d^{-2} \alpha_b^2) + \varepsilon^3 K d^{-2}(\alpha_w^2 + d^{-2} \alpha_b^2)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the explicit orders of \mathcal{A}^γ and the bounds in \mathcal{C} , we have rough estimates

$$(7.17) \quad |\Psi(A) - \Psi(A_0)| \leq C\delta^{-1}\varepsilon^3 K(\log K)^2.$$

In the following, we will prove that if δ is sufficiently small and K sufficiently large then any point on the boundary $\partial\mathcal{C}$ is strictly greater than some interior point. Since Γ is a closed curve, ξ is always in the interior. It remains to consider the variation of $J(PA_A + \phi_A)$ for $\varepsilon, a, d, \alpha_b, \alpha_w$. We denote $C_q = \frac{1}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} q^6 dz$ for short.

(1) Consider the variation of ε , and fix all the other variables in A . Thus one can think of $J(PQ_A + \phi_A) = \mathcal{J}_1(\varepsilon)$ as a function of ε on $[\delta K^{-3}, \delta^{-1} K^{-3}]$. If $\varepsilon = \delta K^{-3}$, then using (7.12), (7.15), (7.17), and the definition of \mathcal{C} in (7.11),

$$\mathcal{J}_1(\delta K^{-3}) \geq C_q - 2\pi\lambda\delta^2 K^{-6} C_*(\xi) + O(\delta^2 K^{-8}(\log K)^2).$$

If $\varepsilon = \delta^{-1} K^{-3}$, then the same estimates yields

$$\mathcal{J}_1(\delta^{-1} K^{-3}) \geq C_q + 2\pi \left(\frac{|w|^2}{8|b|^3} \delta^{-3} K^{-6} \mathcal{C}_2(K, d) - \lambda\delta^{-2} K^{-6} C_*(\xi) \right) + O(\delta^{-4} K^{-8}(\log K)^2).$$

However, one can choose another $\varepsilon_* = \delta_* K^{-3}$ with $\delta_* = 16|b|^3 \lambda C_*(\xi) K^3 / (3|w|^2 \mathcal{C}_2(K, d))$ and compute its energy. Notice that $\varepsilon_* [q(\hat{\xi})]^2 \mathcal{C}_0(K, d) / (2|b|) \leq C\delta^{-2}(\varepsilon_*)^3 K(\log K)^2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_1(\delta_* K^{-3}) &\leq C_q + 2\pi \left(\frac{2}{3} \lambda(\varepsilon_*)^2 C_*(\xi) - \lambda(\varepsilon_*)^2 C_*(\xi) \right) + O(\delta^{-4} K^{-8}(\log K)^2) \\ &\leq C_q - \frac{\pi}{2} \lambda(\varepsilon_*)^2 C_*(\xi) = C_q - \frac{\pi}{2} \lambda \delta_*^2 C_*(\xi) K^{-6}. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing the order K^{-6} of three cases, one can choose a sufficiently small δ satisfying $\delta < \delta_* < \delta^{-1}$ and sufficiently large K such that

$$\mathcal{J}_1(\delta_* K^{-3}) < \min\{\mathcal{J}_1(\delta K^{-3}), \mathcal{J}_1(\delta^{-1} K^{-3})\}.$$

(2) Consider the variation of a , and fix all the other variables in A . Thus one can think of $J(PQ_A + \phi_A) = \mathcal{J}_2(|a|)$ as a function of $|a|$ on $[0, \delta^{-1}\varepsilon \log K]$. If $|a| = \delta^{-1}\varepsilon \log K$. Plugging in $q(\hat{\xi}) = q(\xi + a\nu(\xi)) = a|\nabla q(\xi)| + O(a^2)$ and

$$|w|^2 = |\nabla q(\hat{\xi})|^2 = |\nabla q(\xi)|^2 + 2a|\nabla q(\xi)|\nu(\xi)^T(\nabla^2 q(\xi))\nu(\xi) + O(a^2)$$

to (7.15) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_2(\delta^{-1}\varepsilon(\log K)^{1/2}) &= C_q + 2\pi \left(\frac{|\nabla q(\xi)|^2 \varepsilon^3 K \log K \log 4}{2\pi|b|\delta^2} + \frac{|\nabla q(\xi)|^2}{8|b|^3} \varepsilon^3 \mathcal{C}_2(K, d) - \lambda\varepsilon^2 C_*(\xi) \right) \\ &+ O(\delta^{-1}\varepsilon^3 K(\log K)^2). \end{aligned}$$

However, if we choose $a = 0$ then

$$\mathcal{J}_2(0) \leq C_q + 2\pi \left(\frac{|\nabla q(\xi)|^2}{8|b|^3} \varepsilon^3 \mathcal{C}_2(K, d) - \lambda\varepsilon^2 C_*(\xi) \right) + O(\delta^{-1}\varepsilon^3 K(\log K)^2).$$

Taking K large enough and δ small enough, we have

$$\mathcal{J}_2(0) < \mathcal{J}_2(\delta^{-1}\varepsilon \log K).$$

(3) Consider the variation of d , and fix all the other variables in A . Thus one can think of $J(PQ_A + \phi_A) = \mathcal{J}_3(d)$ as a function of d on $[\frac{\log K - \log \log K}{K}, \frac{\log K}{K}]$. In this case, we use (7.15), (7.17), and the estimate of $\mathcal{C}_0(K, d)$ to get

$$(7.18) \quad \Psi(A_0) = \varepsilon^3 \frac{|w|^2 \mathcal{C}_2(K, d)}{8 |b|^3} - \lambda \varepsilon^2 C_*(\xi) + O(\delta^{-2} \varepsilon^3 K (\log K)^2).$$

Note that $|b| = \sqrt{1 + d^2} - d = 1 - d + O(d^2)$. Using the definition of $\mathcal{C}_2(K, d)$ and the estimate of S_i and $S_i(K, d)$ in the Lemma 9.1 and Lemma 9.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{C}_2(K, d)}{|b|^3} &= K^3 \left[\frac{3\zeta(3)}{2\pi^3} + (Kd)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-Kd} + O((Kd)^{-\frac{3}{2}} e^{-Kd}) \right] (1 + 3d + O(d^2)) \\ &= K^3 \left[\frac{3\zeta(3)}{2\pi^3} + \frac{9\zeta(3)}{2\pi^3} d + (Kd)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-Kd} + O(d^2 + (Kd)^{-\frac{3}{2}} e^{-Kd}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

If $d = \frac{\log K}{K}$, then

$$\frac{\mathcal{C}_2(K, d)}{|b|^3} = K^3 \left[\frac{3\zeta(3)}{2\pi^3} + \frac{9\zeta(3)}{2\pi^3} \frac{\log K}{K} + \frac{(\log K)^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{K} + O\left(\frac{(\log K)^{-\frac{3}{2}}}{K}\right) \right].$$

If $d = \frac{\log K - \log \log K}{K}$, then

$$\frac{\mathcal{C}_2(K, d)}{|b|^3} = K^3 \left[\frac{3\zeta(3)}{2\pi^3} + \frac{9\zeta(3)}{2\pi^3} \frac{\log K}{K} + \frac{(\log K)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{K} + O\left(\frac{\log \log K}{K}\right) \right].$$

If $d = \frac{1}{K} [\log K - \frac{1}{2} \log \log K]$, then

$$\frac{\mathcal{C}_2(K, d)}{|b|^3} = K^3 \left[\frac{3\zeta(3)}{2\pi^3} + \frac{9\zeta(3)}{2\pi^3} \frac{\log K - \frac{1}{2} \log \log K}{K} + O\left(\frac{1}{K}\right) \right].$$

Obviously, the third one is strictly less than the first two at least by a term of the order $\varepsilon^3 K^2 \log \log K$ when K is large enough. Consequently, (7.18) implies that

$$\mathcal{J}_3\left(\frac{\log K - \frac{1}{2} \log \log K}{K}\right) < \min\left\{\mathcal{J}_3\left(\frac{\log K}{K}\right), \mathcal{J}_3\left(\frac{\log K - \log \log K}{K}\right)\right\}.$$

(4) Consider the variation of α_b and α_w , and fix all the other variables in A . Recall that our definition of $\theta_*(\xi)$ makes $\alpha_w = \hat{\beta}$. Denote $\hat{\alpha}_b = K\alpha_b$. Thus the constraint \mathcal{C} indicates that $|\alpha_w| \leq \delta^{-1/2} K^{-1} \log K$ and $|\hat{\alpha}_b| \leq \delta^{-1/2} K^{-1} \log K$. In this case, $\Psi(A_0)$ is fixed. We think of $J(PQ_A + \phi_A) = \mathcal{J}_4(\alpha_w, \hat{\alpha}_b)$ as a function of $\alpha_w, \hat{\alpha}_b$ on the square

$$\left[-\frac{\log K}{K\delta^{1/2}}, \frac{\log K}{K\delta^{1/2}} \right] \times \left[-\frac{\log K}{K\delta^{1/2}}, \frac{\log K}{K\delta^{1/2}} \right].$$

Then (7.16) can be simplified

$$(7.19) \quad \Psi(A) - \Psi(A_0) = \varepsilon^3 (\alpha_w, \hat{\alpha}_b) \hat{\mathcal{A}}^\gamma (\alpha_w, \hat{\alpha}_b)^T + O\left(\frac{\varepsilon^3 K^3}{\log K} (\alpha_w^2 + \hat{\alpha}_b^2)\right),$$

where

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}^\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{5\zeta(3)}{2\pi^3} K^3 + O(K \log K) & -\frac{6\zeta(3)}{\pi^3} K^2 + O(\log K) \\ -\frac{6\zeta(3)}{\pi^3} K^2 + O(\log K) & \frac{93\zeta(5)}{8\pi^5} K^3 + O(K) \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easy to see that $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^\gamma$ is positive-definite with lowest eigenvalue

$$\lambda_\gamma \geq \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \frac{5\zeta(3)}{2\pi^3}, \frac{93\zeta(5)}{8\pi^5} \right\} K^3$$

if K is large enough. If $|\alpha_w| = \delta^{-1/2}K^{-1} \log K$ or $|\hat{\alpha}_b| = \delta^{-1/2}K^{-1} \log K$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(A) - \Psi(A_0) &\geq \varepsilon^3(\alpha_w, \hat{\alpha}_b) \hat{\mathcal{A}}^\gamma(\alpha_w, \hat{\alpha}_b)^T + O\left(\frac{\varepsilon^3 K^3}{\log K}(\alpha_w^2 + \hat{\alpha}_b^2)\right) \\ &\geq \lambda_\gamma \varepsilon^3(\alpha_w^2 + \hat{\alpha}_b^2) + O\left(\frac{\varepsilon^3 K^3}{\log K}(\alpha_w^2 + \hat{\alpha}_b^2)\right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \delta^{-1} \min \left\{ \frac{5\zeta(3)}{2\pi^3}, \frac{93\zeta(5)}{8\pi^5} \right\} \varepsilon^3 K (\log K)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $J(PQ_A + \phi_A) = C_q + \Psi(A_0) + \Psi(A) - \Psi(A_0) + O(\varepsilon^3 K (\log K)^2)$. Choosing δ small and K large, the above analysis implies that

$$\mathcal{J}_4(0, 0) < \mathcal{J}_4(\alpha_w, \hat{\alpha}_b), \quad \forall |\alpha_w| \text{ or } |\hat{\alpha}_b| = \delta^{-1/2}K^{-1} \log K.$$

Now combining the previous (1)-(4) parts, we know that the infimum of $J(PQ_A + \phi_A)$ must be achieved when the parameters $\varepsilon, \xi, a, d, \alpha_b, \alpha_w$ are in the interior of the constraint set. Hence we finish the whole proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By Theorem 7.2, it follows that $\inf_{A \in \mathcal{C}} J(PQ_A + \phi_A)$ is attained in the interior of \mathcal{C} . By Remark 4.6 and Proposition 6.2, $J(PQ_A + \phi_A)$ is at least C^1 on the parameters of A . Then the partial derivatives of $J(PQ_A + \phi_A)$ with respect to the six parameters of A are zero at a minimum point in the interior of \mathcal{C} . Then using Lemma 7.1, we find a nontrivial solution to (1.12) and it proves Theorem 1.2. \square

8. CRITICAL COMPUTATIONS

In this section, we present essential estimates for γ and H_0^e , which are necessary for the analyses discussed in the preceding sections. These two functions exhibit certain computational similarities. We provide a detailed computation for γ and outline the corresponding steps for H_0^e .

8.1. Estimates on Type I. We estimate $\gamma(z, p)$ in this subsection. Recall

$$(8.1) \quad \gamma(z, p) := \frac{1}{|\bar{z}e^{2i\theta_0} - p|} - \sum_{j=1}^{K/2-1} \left(\frac{1}{|ze^{4ji\theta_0} - p|} - \frac{1}{|\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} - p|} \right).$$

The following lemma gives a rough bound of γ and its derivatives.

Lemma 8.1. *For any $z, b \in \Sigma_K$ with $b = (|b|e^{i\alpha_b}, 0)^T$ and $|b| > \frac{1}{2}$, one has*

$$|\nabla^m \gamma(z, p)|_{p=b} \leq CK^{m+1}, \quad m = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4.$$

Proof. Let us first prove the case $m = 0$. Suppose $z = (z_1, z_2, z_3) = (re^{i\alpha_z}, z_3)$. We recall (3.10) and (3.11). Since $|\alpha_z \pm \alpha_b| < 2\theta_0$, one can see that

$$2j\theta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_z - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_b \in [(2j-1)\theta_0, (2j+1)\theta_0],$$

$$(2j+1)\theta_0 - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_z - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_b \in [2j\theta_0, (2j+2)\theta_0].$$

Moreover, they both belong to $[0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ when $1 \leq j \leq j_0 = \lfloor K/4 - 1 \rfloor$, the largest integer less than or equal to $K/4 - 1$. Thus, (3.10), (3.11) and the monotonicity of Sine function on $[0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ imply that

$$|\bar{z}e^{2i\theta_0} - b| < |ze^{4i\theta_0} - b| < |\bar{z}e^{6i\theta_0} - b| < \dots < |\bar{z}e^{(4j_0+2)i\theta_0} - b|.$$

Therefore

$$(8.2) \quad 0 < \sum_{j=1}^{j_0} \left(\frac{1}{|ze^{4ji\theta_0} - b|} - \frac{1}{|\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} - b|} \right) < \frac{1}{|ze^{4i\theta_0} - b|} - \frac{1}{|\bar{z}e^{(4j_0+2)i\theta_0} - b|}.$$

When $j \geq j_1 = \lceil K/4 + 1/2 \rceil$, the least integer greater than or equal to $K/4 + 1/2$. In this case, we have $2j\theta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_z - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_b$ and $(2j+1)\theta_0 - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_z - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_b$ belong to $[\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi]$. Thus (3.10) and (3.11) and the monotonicity of Sine function on $[\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi]$ imply that

$$|ze^{4j_1i\theta_0} - b| > |\bar{z}e^{(4j_1+2)i\theta_0} - b| > \dots > |\bar{z}e^{2(K-1)i\theta_0} - b|.$$

Therefore

$$(8.3) \quad \frac{1}{|ze^{4j_1i\theta_0} - b|} - \frac{1}{|\bar{z}e^{2(K-1)i\theta_0} - b|} < \sum_{j=j_1}^{K/2-1} \left(\frac{1}{|ze^{4ji\theta_0} - b|} - \frac{1}{|\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} - b|} \right) < 0.$$

For $j_0 \leq j \leq j_1$, one has that $ze^{4ji\theta_0}$ and $\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0}$ are far from b . More precisely, $|ze^{4ji\theta_0} - b| \geq |b|$, and $|\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} - b| \geq |b|$. Since $j_1 - j_0 \leq 3$, then

$$\left| \sum_{j=j_0+1}^{j_1-1} \left(\frac{1}{|ze^{4ji\theta_0} - b|} - \frac{1}{|\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} - b|} \right) \right| \leq \frac{6}{|b|}.$$

Combining the above with (8.2) and (8.3), we get

$$(8.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \gamma(z, b) &\leq \frac{1}{|\bar{z}e^{2i\theta_0} - b|} + \frac{1}{|\bar{z}e^{2(K-1)i\theta_0} - b|} - \frac{1}{|ze^{4j_1i\theta_0} - b|} + \frac{6}{|b|}, \\ \gamma(z, b) &\geq \frac{1}{|\bar{z}e^{2i\theta_0} - b|} - \frac{1}{|ze^{4i\theta_0} - b|} + \frac{1}{|\bar{z}e^{(4j_0+2)i\theta_0} - b|} - \frac{6}{|b|}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for any $z, b \in \Sigma_K$, one has $1/(2K) \leq |ze^{4ji\theta_0} - b| \leq 2$ for any $j \geq 1$. This also holds for $|\bar{z}e^{2(K-1)i\theta_0} - b|$ and $|ze^{4i\theta_0} - b|$. Thus, the above inequalities imply that

$$|\gamma(z, b)| \leq CK.$$

For the derivatives of γ , using the estimates like (3.14), it is easy to show that for $m \geq 1$

$$|\nabla^m \gamma(z, b)| \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{1}{|\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} - b|^{m+1}} + C \sum_{j=1}^{K/2-1} \frac{1}{|ze^{4ji\theta_0} - b|^{m+1}}.$$

Invoking (3.9), one has

$$|\nabla^m \gamma(z, b)| \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \csc^{m+1} j\theta_0 \leq CK^{m+1}.$$

Hence we finish the proof. \square

In this particular case $z = b$, we have a more precise estimate.

Lemma 8.2. *Suppose that $b = (|b|e^{i\alpha_b}, 0)^T$ satisfies $|b| > \frac{1}{2}$ and $|\alpha_b| < \frac{1}{2}\theta_0$. Then*

$$\gamma(b, b) = \frac{1}{2|b|} \left[\hat{S}_1(K) + O(K^3\alpha_b^2) \right].$$

where $\hat{S}_1(K)$ is defined in Lemma 9.1.

Proof. Using (3.10), (3.11) and $|\alpha_b| < \frac{1}{2}\theta_0$, we obtain $|be^{4ji\theta_0} - b| = 2|b|\sin 2j\theta_0$ and $|\bar{b}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} - b| = 2|b|\sin((2j+1)\theta_0 - \alpha_b)$. Then

$$\gamma(b, b) = \frac{1}{2|b|} \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{1}{\sin((2j+1)\theta_0 - \alpha_b)} - \frac{1}{2|b|} \sum_{j=1}^{K/2-1} \sin(2j\theta_0).$$

The following expansion holds uniformly for any $\theta \in (0, \pi)$ and $|\alpha_b| < \min\{\frac{\theta}{2}, \pi - \frac{\theta}{2}\}$,

$$\frac{1}{\sin(\theta - \alpha_b)} = \frac{1}{\sin \theta} + \frac{\cos \theta}{\sin^2 \theta} \alpha_b + O\left(\frac{\alpha_b^2}{\sin^3 \theta}\right).$$

Replacing $\theta = (2j+1)\theta_0$ in the above and summing on j from 0 to $K/2 - 1$, we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{1}{\sin((2j+1)\theta_0 - \alpha_b)} = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{1}{\sin(2j+1)\theta_0} + O(K^3\alpha_b^2).$$

Here the odd term on α_b vanishes because $\sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \csc((2j+1)\theta_0 - \alpha_b)$ is an even function on α_b . One can see this by changing j to $K/2 - 1 - j$ in the summation. Consequently

$$\gamma(b, b) = \frac{1}{2|b|} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{K-1} \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{\sin(j\theta_0)} + O(K^3\alpha_b^2) \right) = \frac{1}{2|b|} \left[\hat{S}_1(K) + O(K^3\alpha_b^2) \right],$$

where we have used the notations in Lemma 9.1. The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 8.3. *Suppose that $w = (|w|e^{i\alpha_w}, 0)^T$ and $b = (|b|e^{i\alpha_b}, 0)^T$ satisfy $|b| > \frac{1}{2}$ and $|\alpha_b| < \frac{1}{2}\theta_0$. Then*

$$w \cdot \nabla_z \gamma(b, b) = \frac{|w|}{4|b|^2} \left[-\hat{S}_1(K) + O(K(\log K)\alpha_w^2 + K^3|\alpha_w\alpha_b| + K^3\alpha_b^2) \right]$$

and the same expansion applies to $w \cdot \nabla_p \gamma(b, b)$.

Proof. Step 1: It is straightforward to verify that for any $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$,

$$\nabla_z |ze^{i\theta} - p|^{-1} = -|ze^{i\theta} - p|^{-3}(z - pe^{-i\theta}).$$

Thus

$$(8.5) \quad w \cdot \nabla_z |ze^{i\theta} - p|^{-1} \Big|_{z=b, p=b} = \frac{w \cdot (be^{-i\theta} - b)}{|be^{i\theta} - b|^3} = -\frac{|w|}{(2|b|)^2} \frac{\sin(\frac{\theta}{2} + \alpha_w - \alpha_b)}{\sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2}},$$

where we have used $|be^{i\theta} - b| = 2|b|\sin \frac{\theta}{2}$ and

$$(8.6) \quad \begin{aligned} w \cdot (be^{-i\theta} - b) &= |w||b|(\cos(\alpha_b - \theta - \alpha_w) - \cos(\alpha_b - \alpha_w)) \\ &= 2|w||b|\sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin(\alpha_b - \alpha_w - \frac{\theta}{2}). \end{aligned}$$

Step 2: It is easy to get that for any $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$

$$\nabla_z |\bar{z}e^{i\theta} - p|^{-1} = -|\bar{z}e^{i\theta} - p|^{-3}(z - \bar{p}e^{i\theta}).$$

Thus when $|\alpha_b| < \frac{1}{2}\theta$

$$(8.7) \quad w \cdot \nabla |\bar{z}e^{i\theta} - p|^{-1}|_{z=b, p=b} = \frac{w \cdot (\bar{b}e^{i\theta} - b)}{|\bar{b}e^{i\theta} - b|^3} = -\frac{|w|}{(2|b|)^2} \frac{\sin(\frac{\theta}{2} - \alpha_w)}{\sin^2(\frac{\theta}{2} - \alpha_b)},$$

where we have used $|\bar{b}e^{i\theta} - b| = |b| \sin(\frac{\theta}{2} - \alpha_b)$ and

$$(8.8) \quad \begin{aligned} w \cdot (\bar{b}e^{i\theta} - b) &= |w||b|(\cos(\theta - \alpha_b - \alpha_w) - \cos(\alpha_b - \alpha_w)) \\ &= 2|w||b| \sin(\alpha_b - \frac{\theta}{2}) \sin(\frac{\theta}{2} - \alpha_w). \end{aligned}$$

Step 3: Plugging in $\theta = 4j\theta_0$ in (8.5) and $\theta = (4j + 2)\theta_0$ in (8.7), taking sum on j , we obtain

$$(8.9) \quad w \cdot \nabla_z \gamma(z, p)|_{z=b, p=b} = \frac{|w|}{(2|b|)^2} [I_1 - I_2],$$

where

$$I_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{K/2-1} \frac{\sin(2j\theta_0 + \alpha_w - \alpha_b)}{\sin^2 2j\theta_0}, \quad I_2 = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{\sin((2j+1)\theta_0 - \alpha_w)}{\sin^2((2j+1)\theta_0 - \alpha_b)}.$$

Think of $I_1 = I_1(\alpha_w, \alpha_b)$ and $I_2 = I_2(\alpha_w, \alpha_b)$ as a function of α_w and α_b . We want to do the Taylor expansion of I_1 and I_2 for α_b, α_w . Changing j to $K/2 - j$, we find that $I_1(\alpha_w, \alpha_b) = I_1(-\alpha_w, -\alpha_b)$. Changing j to $K/2 - 1 - j$ in I_2 , we find that $I_2(\alpha_w, \alpha_b) = I_2(-\alpha_w, -\alpha_b)$. In fact, using the estimates in Lemma 9.1, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \sum_{j=1}^{K/2-1} \csc 2j\theta_0 + O((K \log K)(\alpha_w^2 + \alpha_b^2)), \\ I_2 &= \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \csc(2j+1)\theta_0 + O(K(\log K)\alpha_w^2 + K^3|\alpha_w\alpha_b| + K^3\alpha_b^2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using $\sum_{j=0}^{K-1} (-1)^j \csc j\theta_0 = -\hat{S}_1(K)$ from Lemma 9.1,

$$I_1 - I_2 = -\hat{S}_1(K) + O(K(\log K)\alpha_w^2 + K^3\alpha_w\alpha_b + K^3\alpha_b^2).$$

Inserting this back to (8.9), we get the expansion of $w \cdot \nabla_z \gamma(b, b)$.

For $w \cdot \nabla_p \gamma(b, b)$, the proof goes like the previous one by using the following two identities

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_p |ze^{i\theta} - p|^{-1} &= |ze^{i\theta} - p|^{-3}(ze^{i\theta} - p), \\ \nabla_p |\bar{z}e^{i\theta} - p|^{-1} &= |\bar{z}e^{i\theta} - p|^{-3}(\bar{z}e^{i\theta} - p). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 8.4. Let $w = (|w|e^{i\alpha_w}, 0)^T \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $b = (|b|e^{i\alpha_b}, 0)^T$. If $\alpha_w \leq 1$ and $|\alpha_b| \leq \frac{1}{2}\theta_0$, we have

$$w^T \nabla_{z,p}^2 \gamma(b, b) w = \frac{|w|^2}{8|b|^3} \left[\hat{S}_1(K) + \hat{S}_3(K) + (\alpha_w, \alpha_b) \mathcal{A}^\gamma(\alpha_w, \alpha_b)^T + O(\alpha_w^4 K^3 + \alpha_b^4 K^7) \right],$$

where we used the notations in the Lemma 9.1.

$$\mathcal{A}^\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} S_3^o(K) - 2S_1^o(K) + 3\hat{S}_3(K) & -3\hat{S}_3(K) + 3S_1^o(K) \\ -3\hat{S}_3(K) + 3S_1^o(K) & \frac{3}{2}[4S_5^o(K) + S_3^o(K) - 3S_1^o(K)] + 3\hat{S}_3(K) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. Step 1: Recall

$$\partial_{z_\ell, p_j}^2 |z - p|^{-1} = \frac{1}{|z - p|^3} \left(\delta_{\ell j} - 3 \frac{(z - p)_\ell (z - p)_j}{|z - p|^2} \right).$$

Using $ze^{i\theta} = R_\theta z$, it is easy to verify that

$$(\nabla_{z,p}^2 |ze^{i\theta} - p|^{-1}) = |ze^{i\theta} - p|^{-3} R_{-\theta} \left(\delta_{\ell j} - 3 \frac{(ze^{i\theta} - p)_\ell (ze^{i\theta} - p)_j}{|ze^{i\theta} - p|^2} \right).$$

For any vector $w = (|w|e^{i\alpha_w}, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $z = b$ with $p = b$,

$$\begin{aligned} & w^T (\nabla_{z,p}^2 |ze^{i\theta} - p|^{-1}) w|_{z=b, p=b} \\ &= \frac{1}{|be^{i\theta} - b|^3} \left[|w|^2 \cos \theta + 3 \frac{[w \cdot (be^{i\theta} - b)][w \cdot (be^{-i\theta} - b)]}{|be^{i\theta} - b|^2} \right] \\ &= \frac{|w|^2}{|be^{i\theta} - b|^3} \left[\cos \theta - 3 \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2} + \alpha_b - \alpha_w\right) \sin\left(-\frac{\theta}{2} + \alpha_b - \alpha_w\right) \right] \\ &= \frac{|w|^2}{|be^{i\theta} - b|^3} \left[\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \cos(\theta - 2\alpha_w) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (8.6) in the second equal sign. When $\theta = 4j\theta_0$, we have

$$(8.10) \quad w^T (\nabla_{z,p}^2 |ze^{4j\theta_0} - p|^{-1}) w|_{z=b, p=b} = \frac{|w|^2}{(2|b|)^3} \frac{[-\cos 4j\theta_0 + 3 \cos 2(\alpha_b - \alpha_w)]}{2(\sin 2j\theta_0)^3}.$$

Step 2: Similarly, we can compute the other one. Recall that

$$\bar{z}e^{i\theta} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta & 0 \\ \sin \theta & -\cos \theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \\ z_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easy to verify that

$$(\nabla_{z,p}^2 |\bar{z}e^{i\theta} - p|^{-1}) = \frac{1}{|\bar{z}e^{i\theta} - p|^3} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta & 0 \\ \sin \theta & -\cos \theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \left(\delta_{\ell j} - 3 \frac{(\bar{z}e^{i\theta} - p)_\ell (\bar{z}e^{i\theta} - p)_j}{|\bar{z}e^{i\theta} - p|^2} \right).$$

For any $w = (|w|e^{i\alpha_w}, 0)^T$, and $z = b$ with $p = b$

$$\begin{aligned} & w^T (\nabla_{z,p}^2 |\bar{z}e^{i\theta} - p|^{-1}) w|_{z=b, p=b} = \frac{1}{|\bar{b}e^{i\theta} - b|^3} \left[|w|^2 \cos(\theta - 2\alpha_w) + 3 \frac{[w \cdot (\bar{b}e^{i\theta} - b)]^2}{|\bar{b}e^{i\theta} - b|^2} \right] \\ &= \frac{|w|^2}{|\bar{b}e^{i\theta} - b|^3} \left[\cos(\theta - 2\alpha_w) + 3 |\sin(\frac{\theta}{2} - \alpha_w)|^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{|w|^2}{|\bar{b}e^{i\theta} - b|^3} \left[\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \cos(\theta - 2\alpha_w) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (8.8). When $\theta = (4j + 2)\theta_0$, we have $|\bar{b}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} - b| = 2|b| \sin(2j + 1)\theta_0 - \alpha_b$ and

$$(8.11) \quad w^T(\nabla_{z,p}^2 |\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} - p|^{-1})w|_{z=b,p=b} = \frac{|w|^2}{(2|b|)^3} \frac{3 - \cos((4j + 2)\theta_0 - 2\alpha_w)}{2(\sin((2j + 1)\theta_0 - \alpha_b))^3}.$$

Step 3: Inserting the above formula (8.10) and (8.11) to (8.1), we have

$$(8.12) \quad w^T(\nabla_{z,p}^2 \gamma(z, p))w|_{z=b,p=b} = \frac{|w|^2}{(2|b|)^3} [I_1 - I_2],$$

where

$$I_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{3 - \cos((4j + 2)\theta_0 - 2\alpha_w)}{2(\sin((2j + 1)\theta_0 - \alpha_b))^3}, \quad I_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{K/2-1} \frac{-\cos 4j\theta_0 + 3 \cos 2(\alpha_b - \alpha_w)}{2(\sin 2j\theta_0)^3}.$$

Think of $I_1 = I_1(\alpha_w, \alpha_b)$ and $I_2 = I_2(\alpha_w, \alpha_b)$ as a function of α_w and α_b . It is easy to know $I_2(\alpha_w, \alpha_b) = I_2(-\alpha_w, -\alpha_b)$ and $I_1(\alpha_w, \alpha_b) = I_1(-\alpha_w, -\alpha_b)$.

For I_1 , the following expansion holds uniformly for K when $|\alpha_w| \leq 1$ and $|\alpha_b| \leq \frac{1}{2}\theta_0$,

$$I_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{3 - \cos(4j + 2)\theta_0}{2(\sin(2j + 1)\theta_0)^3} + [A_{11}\alpha_w^2 + 2A_{12}\alpha_w\alpha_b + A_{22}\alpha_b^2] + O(\alpha_w^4 K^3 + \alpha_b^4 K^7),$$

where

$$A_{11} = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{\cos(4j + 2)\theta_0}{(\sin(2j + 1)\theta_0)^3}, \quad A_{12} = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{-3(\cos((2j + 1)\theta_0))^2}{(\sin(2j + 1)\theta_0)^3},$$

$$A_{22} = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{3[4 + (\sin(2j + 1)\theta_0)^2 - 3(\sin(2j + 1)\theta_0)^4]}{2(\sin(2j + 1)\theta_0)^5}.$$

For I_2 , the following expansion holds uniformly for K when $|\alpha_w| \leq 1$ and $|\alpha_b| \leq \frac{1}{2}\theta_0$,

$$I_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{K/2-1} \frac{3 - \cos 4j\theta_0}{2(\sin 2j\theta_0)^3} + [B_{11}\alpha_w^2 + 2B_{12}\alpha_w\alpha_b + B_{22}\alpha_b^2] + O(\alpha_w^4 K^3 + \alpha_b^4 K^3),$$

where

$$B_{11} = \sum_{j=1}^{K/2-1} \frac{-3}{(\sin 2j\theta_0)^3}, \quad B_{12} = -B_{11}, \quad B_{22} = B_{11}.$$

Combining the leading terms of I_1 and I_2 , we obtain

$$\sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{1 + (\sin(2j + 1)\theta_0)^2}{(\sin(2j + 1)\theta_0)^3} - \sum_{j=1}^{K/2-1} \frac{1 + (\sin 2j\theta_0)^2}{(\sin 2j\theta_0)^3} = \sum_{j=1}^{K-1} \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{(\sin(j\theta_0))^3} + \sum_{j=1}^{K-1} \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{(\sin(j\theta_0))}$$

$$= \hat{S}_3(K) + \hat{S}_1(K).$$

Here we have used the notations in Lemma 9.1. For the quadratic terms, using some trigonometric identities, we can rewrite them as $A_{11} = S_3^o(K) - 2S_1^o(K)$, $A_{12} = -3(S_3^o(K) - S_1^o(K))$, $A_{22} = \frac{3}{2}[4S_5^o(K) + S_3^o(K) - 3S_1^o(K)]$, $B_{11} = -3\hat{S}_3^e(K)$, $B_{12} = 3\hat{S}_3^e(K)$, $B_{22} =$

$-3\hat{S}_3^e(K)$. We denote the coefficients of quadratic terms in $w^T \nabla_{z,p}^2 \gamma(b, b) w$ is \mathcal{A}^γ , then $\mathcal{A}^\gamma = A - B$ and consequently

$$\mathcal{A}^\gamma := \begin{pmatrix} S_3^o(K) - 2S_1^o(K) + 3\hat{S}_3^e(K) & -3\hat{S}_3(K) + 3S_1^o(K) \\ -3\hat{S}_3(K) + 3S_1^o(K) & \frac{3}{2}[4S_5^o(K) + S_3^o(K) - 3S_1^o(K)] + 3\hat{S}_3^e(K) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The proof is complete by plugging in the expansion of I_1 and I_2 back to (8.12). \square

8.2. Estimates on the Type II. In this subsection, we will prove the corresponding estimate of H_0^e . Since most of the computations are similar to that of $\gamma(z, p)$, we will sketch the proof. Recall

$$H_0^e(z, p) = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} [H_0(ze^{4j\theta_0}, p) - H_0(\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)\theta_0}, p)].$$

The following lemma gives a rough bound of H_0^e and its derivatives.

Lemma 8.5. *For any $z, b \in \Sigma_K$ with $b = (|b|e^{i\alpha_b}, 0)^T$ and $1 - |b| = (1 + o_K(1))\frac{\log K}{K}$,*

$$|\nabla^m H_0^e(z, p)|_{p=b} \leq CK^{m+1}/(\log K)^{m+1}, \quad m = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of γ in Lemma 8.1. We sketch the main steps. By (3.15), we know $H_0(ze^{4j\theta_0}, b) = (1 + |z|^2|b|^2 - 2ze^{4ji\theta_0} \cdot b)^{-1/2}$, $H_0(\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)\theta_0}, b) = (1 + |z|^2|b|^2 - 2\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} \cdot b)^{-1/2}$ and

$$(8.13) \quad 1 + |z|^2|b|^2 - 2ze^{4ji\theta_0} \cdot b = (1 - r|b|)^2 + z_3^2|b|^2 + 4r|b| \sin^2(2j\theta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_z - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_b)$$

and

$$1 + |z|^2|b|^2 - 2\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} \cdot b = (1 - r|b|)^2 + z_3^2|b|^2 + 4r|b| \sin^2((2j+1)\theta_0 - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_z - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_b).$$

Since $|\alpha_z \pm \alpha_b| < 2\theta_0$, we see that

$$H_0(z, b) > H_0(\bar{z}e^{2i\theta_0}, b) > H_0(ze^{4j\theta_0}, b) > \dots > H_0(\bar{z}e^{(4j_0+2)\theta_0}, b).$$

for $1 \leq j \leq j_0 = \lfloor K/4 - 1 \rfloor$ and

$$H_0(ze^{4j_1\theta_0}, b) < H_0(\bar{z}e^{(4j_1+2)\theta_0}, b) < \dots < H_0(\bar{z}e^{2(K-1)\theta_0}, b).$$

for $j \geq j_1 = \lceil K/4 + 1/2 \rceil$. Therefore, we have

$$0 < \sum_{j=0}^{j_0} [H_0(ze^{4ji\theta_0}, b) - H_0(\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)\theta_0}, b)] < H_0(z, b) - H_0(\bar{z}e^{(4j_0+2)\theta_0}, b),$$

and

$$H_0(ze^{4j_1\theta_0}, b) - H_0(\bar{z}e^{2(K-1)\theta_0}, b) < \sum_{j=j_1}^{K/2-1} [H_0(ze^{4ji\theta_0}, b) - H_0(\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)\theta_0}, b)] < 0.$$

When $j_0 \leq j \leq j_1$, we have that $ze^{4ji\theta_0} \cdot b < 0$ and $\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)\theta_0} \cdot b < 0$. This implies $H_0(ze^{4ji\theta_0}, b) \leq 1$ and $H_0(\bar{z}e^{(4j+2)\theta_0}, b) \leq 1$. Since $j_1 - j_0 \leq 3$, then combining this with the above two inequalities, we get

$$(8.14) \quad \begin{aligned} H_0^e(z, b) &\leq H_0(z, b) - H_0(\bar{z}e^{(4j_0+2)\theta_0}, b) + 6, \\ H_0^e(z, b) &\geq H_0(ze^{4j_1\theta_0}, b) - H_0(\bar{z}e^{2(K-1)\theta_0}, b) - 6. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for any $z, b \in B_1$, one has $1 + |z|^2|b|^2 - 2z \cdot b \leq 4$ and

$$1 + |z|^2|b|^2 - 2z \cdot b \geq 1 + |z|^2|b|^2 - 2|z||b| = (1 - |z||b|)^2 \geq (1 - |b|)^2.$$

Therefore $1/2 \leq H_0(z, b) \leq (1 - |b|)^{-1}$. As a consequence, (8.14) implies that

$$|H_0^e(z, b)| \leq C(1 - |b|)^{-1} \leq CK/\log K.$$

For the derivative of H_0^e . It is straightforward to verify that

$$\left| \nabla^m H_0(z, p) \Big|_{p=b} \right| \leq C|z - b^*|^{-m-1}, \quad m = 1, 2, 3, 4$$

Similar to (3.9), we can prove

$$\begin{aligned} |ze^{4ji\theta_0} - b^*|^2 &\geq (1 - |b|)^2 + \sin^2 2j\theta_0 \\ |ze^{(4j+2)i\theta_0} - b^*|^2 &\geq (1 - |b|)^2 + \sin^2(2j+1)\theta_0 \end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq j \leq K/2 - 1$. Thus

$$\left| \nabla^m H_0^e(z, p) \Big|_{p=b} \right| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{((1 - |b|)^2 + \sin^2 j\theta_0)^{\frac{m+1}{2}}} \leq C \frac{K^{m+1}}{(\log K)^m}$$

where we apply Lemma 9.2 since $1 - |b| = (1 + o_K(1)) \frac{\log K}{K}$. \square

Lemma 8.6. *Suppose that $b = (|b|e^{i\alpha_b}, 0)^T$ satisfies $d = (1 - |b|^2)/(2|b|) = (1 + o_K(1)) \frac{\log K}{K}$ and $|\alpha_b| \leq \frac{1}{2}\theta_0$. One has*

$$H_0^e(b, b) = \frac{1}{2|b|} [S_1(K, d) + O(Kd^{-2}\alpha_b^2)].$$

Proof. Note that

$$(8.15) \quad |be^{i\theta} - b^*| = (|b|^2 + |b|^{-2} - 2\cos\theta)^{1/2} = 2(d^2 + \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2})^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$(8.16) \quad |\bar{b}e^{i\theta} - b^*| = (|b|^2 + |b|^{-2} - 2\cos(\theta - 2\alpha_b))^{\frac{1}{2}} = 2(d^2 + \sin^2(\frac{\theta}{2} - \alpha_b))^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Since $H(z, p) = (|p||z - p^*|)^{-1}$ and the definition of $H_0^e(z, p)$ in (3.16), then

$$H_0^e(b, b) = \frac{1}{2|b|} \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} (d^2 + \sin^2 2j\theta_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - (d^2 + \sin^2((2j+1)\theta_0 - \alpha_b))^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The following expansion holds uniformly for $|\alpha_b| < \frac{1}{2}\theta_0$

$$\sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} (d^2 + \sin^2((2j+1)\theta_0 - \alpha_b))^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} (d^2 + \sin^2((2j+1)\theta_0))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + O(Kd^{-2}\alpha_b^2).$$

Thus

$$H_0^e(b, b) = \frac{1}{2|b|} \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \frac{(-1)^j}{(d^2 + \sin^2 j\theta_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}} + O(Kd^{-2}\alpha_b^2) = \frac{1}{2|b|} [S_1(K, d) + O(Kd^{-2}\alpha_b^2)].$$

\square

Lemma 8.7. *Suppose that $b = (|b|e^{i\alpha_b}, 0)^T$ satisfies $1 - |b| = (1 + o_K(1))\frac{\log K}{K}$ and $|\alpha_b| \leq \frac{1}{2}\theta_0$. One has*

$$w \cdot \nabla_z H_0^e(z, p)|_{z=b, p=b} = \frac{|w|}{4|b|^2} \left[-S_1(K, d) + d\sqrt{1+d^2}S_3(K, d) + O(Kd^{-1}\alpha_w^2 + Kd^{-3}\alpha_b^2) \right],$$

where $d = (1 - |b|^2)/(2|b|)$. The expansion of $w \cdot \nabla_p H_0^e(z, p)|_{z=b, p=b}$ is similar to the above.

Proof. Recall that $H_0(z, p) = (|p||z - p^*|)^{-1}$. It is easy to see that

$$\nabla_z H_0(z e^{i\theta}, p) = -\frac{z - p^* e^{-i\theta}}{|p||z e^{i\theta} - p^*|^3}, \quad \nabla_z H_0(\bar{z} e^{i\theta}, p) = -\frac{z - (\bar{p} e^{i\theta})^*}{|p||\bar{z} e^{i\theta} - p^*|^2}.$$

Then

$$(8.17) \quad w \cdot \nabla_z H_0(z e^{i\theta}, p)|_{z=b, p=b} = \frac{|w|}{8|b|^2} \frac{(\cos(\alpha_b - \alpha_w - \theta) - |b|^2 \cos(\alpha_b - \alpha_w))}{(d^2 + \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2})^{3/2}},$$

$$(8.18) \quad w \cdot \nabla_z H_0(\bar{z} e^{i\theta}, p)|_{z=b, p=b} = \frac{|w|}{8|b|^2} \frac{\cos(\theta - \alpha_b - \alpha_w) - |b|^2 \cos(\alpha_b - \alpha_w)}{(d^2 + \sin^2(\frac{\theta}{2} - \alpha_b))^{3/2}}.$$

Plugging in $\theta = 4j\theta_0$ in (8.17) and $\theta = (4j + 2)\theta_0$ in (8.18), and summing on j , we get

$$w \cdot \nabla_z H_0^e(z, p)|_{z=b, p=b} = \frac{|w|}{8|b|^2} [I_1 - I_2],$$

where

$$I_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{\cos(4j\theta_0 + \alpha_w - \alpha_b) - |b|^2 \cos(\alpha_w - \alpha_b)}{(d^2 + \sin^2 2j\theta_0)^{3/2}},$$

$$I_2 = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{\cos((4j + 2)\theta_0 - \alpha_w - \alpha_b) - |b|^2 \cos(\alpha_w - \alpha_b)}{(d^2 + \sin^2((2j + 1)\theta_0 - \alpha_b))^{3/2}}.$$

One can compute the Taylor expansion of I_1 and I_2 with respect to α_w, α_b . The leading term in $I_1 - I_2$ is

$$\sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{\cos(4j\theta_0) - |b|^2}{(d^2 + \sin^2 2j\theta_0)^{3/2}} - \frac{\cos((4j + 2)\theta_0) - |b|^2}{(d^2 + \sin^2(2j + 1)\theta_0)^{3/2}} = -2S_1(K, d) + 2d\sqrt{1+d^2}S_3(K, d),$$

where we used $\cos 2\theta - |b|^2 = -2(d^2 + \sin^2 \theta) + 2d^2 + 1 - |b|^2$ and $2d^2 + 1 - |b|^2 = 2d\sqrt{1+d^2}$ and the notation (9.2) in Section 9. This completes the proof of $w \cdot \nabla_z H_0^e(z, p)|_{z=b, p=b}$.

For $w \cdot \nabla_p H_0^e(z, p)|_{z=b, p=b}$, one can repeat the above proof verbatim. \square

Lemma 8.8. *Suppose that $w = (|w|e^{i\alpha_w}, 0)^T$ and $b = (|b|e^{i\alpha_b}, 0)^T$. Assume that $|\alpha_w| \leq 1$ and $|\alpha_b| \leq \frac{1}{2}\theta_0$, $1 - |b| = (1 + o_K(1))\frac{\log K}{K}$ as $K \rightarrow \infty$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & w^T \nabla_{z,p}^2 H_0^e(z, p) w|_{z=b, p=b} \\ &= \frac{|w|^2}{8|b|^3} \left[S_1 - (d + \sqrt{1+d^2})^2 S_3 + 3(d^2 + d^4) S_5 + O(Kd^{-2}\alpha_w^2 + Kd^{-4}\alpha_b^2) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $d = (1 - |b|^2)/(2|b|)$ and $S_i = S_i(K, d)$ for $i = 1, 3, 5$.

Proof. Step 1: It is easy to see that

$$\partial_{z_i, p_j}^2 H_0(z, p) = \frac{1}{(|p| |z - p^*|)^3} \left(\delta_{ij} - 2p_j z_i + 3|z|^2 \frac{(p^* - z)_i (z^* - p)_j}{|z - p^*|^2} \right),$$

where $z^* = \frac{z}{|z|^2}$. Then for any vector $w = (|w|e^{i\alpha_w}, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^3$,

$$\begin{aligned} & w^T (\nabla_{z, p}^2 H_0(z e^{i\theta}, p) w)|_{z=b, p=b} \\ &= \frac{1}{(|b| |b e^{i\theta} - b^*|)^3} \left[|w|^2 \cos \theta - 2(b \cdot w)^2 + 3|b|^2 \frac{[w \cdot (b^* e^{i\theta} - b)][w \cdot (b^* e^{-i\theta} - b)]}{|b e^{i\theta} - b^*|^2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

To simplify this, we shall use the computation in (8.17) to achieve

$$\begin{aligned} & [w \cdot (b^* e^{i\theta} - b)][w \cdot (b^* e^{-i\theta} - b)] \\ &= \frac{|w|^2}{|b|^2} (\cos(\theta + \alpha) - |b|^2 \cos \alpha)(\cos(-\theta + \alpha) - |b|^2 \cos \alpha) \\ &= \frac{|w|^2}{|b|^2} [\cos(\theta + \alpha) \cos(-\theta + \alpha) - 2|b|^2 \cos^2 \alpha \cos \theta + |b|^4 \cos^2 \alpha] \\ &= \frac{|w|^2}{|b|^2} [-\sin^2 \theta + \cos^2 \alpha (1 + |b|^4 - 2|b|^2 \cos \theta)], \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha = \alpha_b - \alpha_w$. Using this computation and (8.15), we have

(8.19)

$$w^T (\nabla_{z, p}^2 H_0(z e^{i\theta}, p) w)|_{z=b, p=b} = \frac{|w|^2}{8|b|^3} \left[\frac{\cos \theta + |b|^2 \cos^2(\alpha_b - \alpha_w)}{(d^2 + \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2})^{3/2}} - \frac{3 \sin^2 \theta}{4(d^2 + \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2})^{5/2}} \right].$$

Step 2: Similarly, we can compute the other one. For any $w = (|w|e^{i\alpha_w}, 0)^T$,

$$\begin{aligned} & w^T \nabla_{z, p}^2 H_0(\bar{z} e^{i\theta}, p) w|_{z=b, p=b} \\ &= \frac{1}{(|b| |\bar{b} e^{i\theta} - b^*|)^3} \left[|w|^2 \cos(\theta - 2\alpha_w) - 2(b \cdot w)^2 + 3|b|^2 \frac{[w \cdot ((\bar{b} e^{i\theta})^* - b)]^2}{|\bar{b} e^{i\theta} - b^*|^2} \right] \\ (8.20) \quad &= \frac{|w|^2}{8|b|^3} \left[\frac{\cos(\theta - 2\alpha_w) - 2|b|^2 \cos^2 \alpha}{(d^2 + \sin^2(\frac{\theta}{2} - \alpha_b))^{3/2}} + \frac{3 [\cos(\theta - \alpha_b - \alpha_w) - |b|^2 \cos \alpha]^2}{4(d^2 + \sin^2(\frac{\theta}{2} - \alpha_b))^{5/2}} \right] \\ &=: \frac{|w|^2}{8|b|^3} f(\alpha_b, \alpha_w, \theta), \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha = \alpha_b - \alpha_w$ and we have used the computation in (8.18) and (8.16) in the last step.

Step 3: Inserting $\theta = 4j\theta_0$ in (8.19) and $\theta = (4j + 2)\theta_0$ in (8.20), summing on j , we obtain

$$(8.21) \quad w^T \nabla_{z, p}^2 H_0^e(z, p) w|_{z=b, p=b} = \frac{|w|^2}{(2|b|)^3} [I_1 - I_2],$$

where

$$I_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{\cos 4j\theta_0 + |b|^2 \cos^2(\alpha_b - \alpha_w)}{(d^2 + \sin^2 2j\theta_0)^{3/2}} - \frac{3 \sin^2 4j\theta_0}{4(d^2 + \sin^2 2j\theta_0)^{5/2}},$$

$$I_2 = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} f(\alpha_b, \alpha_w, (4j+2)\theta_0).$$

Here $f(\alpha_b, \alpha_w, \theta)$ is defined in (8.20).

Next, we need to compute I_1 and I_2 . Again, we have $I_j(\alpha_b, \alpha_w) = I_j(-\alpha_b, -\alpha_w)$ for $j = 1, 2$. It is easy to have the expansion of I_1 as

$$I_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{\cos(4j\theta_0) + |b|^2}{(d^2 + \sin^2(2j\theta_0))^{3/2}} - \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{3 \sin^2(4j\theta_0)}{4(d^2 + \sin^2(2j\theta_0))^{5/2}} + O(Kd^{-2}(\alpha_b^2 + \alpha_w^2)).$$

After some lengthy calculation, the expansion of I_2 is

$$I_2 = \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{\cos((4j+2)\theta_0) + |b|^2}{(d^2 + \sin^2((2j+1)\theta_0))^{3/2}} - \sum_{j=0}^{K/2-1} \frac{3 \sin^2((4j+2)\theta_0)}{(d^2 + \sin^2((2j+1)\theta_0))^{5/2}} + O(Kd^{-2}\alpha_w^2 + Kd^{-4}\alpha_b^2).$$

Using the expansion of I_1 and I_2 , we have

$$I_1 - I_2 = \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \frac{(-1)^j (\cos 2j\theta_0 + |b|^2)}{(d^2 + \sin^2 j\theta_0)^{3/2}} - \frac{3}{4} \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \frac{(-1)^j \sin^2 2j\theta_0}{(d^2 + \sin^2 j\theta_0)^{5/2}} + O(Kd^{-2}\alpha_w^2 + Kd^{-4}\alpha_b^2).$$

The leading term in the above can be rewritten in terms of $S_i(K, d)$ defined in (9.2). Using $\cos 2j\theta_0 = 1 + 2d^2 - 2(d^2 + \sin^2 j\theta_0)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} \sin^2 2j\theta_0 &= \sin^2 j\theta_0 \cos^2 j\theta_0 = \sin^2 j\theta_0 - \sin^4 j\theta_0 \\ &= (1 + 2d^2)(d^2 + \sin^2 j\theta_0) - (d^2 + \sin^2 j\theta_0)^2 - d^4 - d^2, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \frac{(-1)^j (\cos 2j\theta_0 + |b|^2)}{(d^2 + \sin^2 j\theta_0)^{3/2}} - \frac{3}{4} \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \frac{(-1)^j \sin^2 2j\theta_0}{(d^2 + \sin^2 j\theta_0)^{5/2}} \\ &= (1 + 2d^2)S_3 - 2S_1 + [|b|^2 - 3(1 + 2d^2)]S_3 + 3S_1 + 3(d^2 + d^4)S_5 \\ &= S_1 + [|b|^2 - 2(1 + 2d^2)]S_3 + 3(d^2 + d^4)S_5, \end{aligned}$$

where $S_i = S_i(K, d)$.

Since $|b| = \sqrt{1 + d^2} - d$, then $|b|^2 - 2(1 + 2d^2) = -(d + \sqrt{1 + d^2})^2$. The proof is complete. \square

9. SOME ESTIMATES ON FINITE SUM

This section will prove several estimates of finite sums involving the trigonometric function. These estimates are needed for the previous section. For any even integer $n \geq 2$, any integer $k \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$(9.1) \quad S_k^o(n, x) := \sum_{j=0}^{n/2-1} (x^2 + \sin^2(\frac{(2j+1)\pi}{n}))^{-\frac{k}{2}}, \quad S_k^e(n, x) := \sum_{j=0}^{n/2-1} (x^2 + \sin^2(\frac{2j\pi}{n}))^{-\frac{k}{2}},$$

$$(9.2) \quad S_k(n, x) := S_k^e(n, x) - S_k^o(n, x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j (x^2 + (\sin(\frac{j\pi}{n}))^2)^{-\frac{k}{2}}.$$

Here S^o denotes the sum of odd parts, and S^e denotes the sum of even parts. Note that when $x = 0$, the sum in S_k^e has a singular term, thus we also define⁴

$$(9.3) \quad \hat{S}_k^e(n, x) := \sum_{j=1}^{n/2-1} (x^2 + \sin^2(\frac{2j\pi}{n}))^{-\frac{k}{2}},$$

$$(9.4) \quad \hat{S}_k(n, x) := S_k^o(n, x, \theta) - \hat{S}_k^e(n, x) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (-1)^{j+1} (x^2 + (\sin(\frac{j\pi}{n}))^2)^{-\frac{k}{2}}.$$

If $x = 0$, we denote $S_k^o(n, 0)$ as $S_k^o(n)$. The same rule applies to S_k^e , S_k , \hat{S}_k^e , and \hat{S}_k .

Lemma 9.1. *Suppose n is an even number. As $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\begin{aligned} S_3^o(n) &= \sum_{j=0}^{n/2-1} \csc^3 \frac{(2j+1)\pi}{n} = \frac{7\zeta(3)}{4\pi^3} n^3 + O(n \log n), \\ S_5^o(n) &= \sum_{j=0}^{n/2-1} \csc^5 \frac{(2j+1)\pi}{n} = \frac{93\zeta(5)}{48\pi^5} n^5 + O(n^3), \\ \hat{S}_3^e(n) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n/2-1} \csc^3 \frac{2j\pi}{n} = \frac{\zeta(3)}{4\pi^3} n^3 + O(n \log n), \\ \hat{S}_1(n) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (-1)^{j+1} \csc \frac{j\pi}{n} = \frac{n}{\pi} \log 4 + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof here is partially inspired by [56, 4]. Using the classical result of Euler

$$\pi \csc a\pi = \int_0^\infty \frac{x^{a-1}}{1+x} dx, \quad 0 < a < 1,$$

one can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{n/2-1} \csc \left(\phi + \frac{2j\pi}{n} \right) &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{x^{\frac{\phi}{\pi}}}{x(1+x)} \sum_{j=0}^{n/2-1} x^{\frac{2j}{n}} dx = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{x^{\frac{\phi}{\pi}} (x-1)}{x(1+x)(x^{\frac{2}{n}}-1)} dx \\ &= \frac{n}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{e^{\frac{n\phi y}{2\pi}} (e^{\frac{ny}{2}} - 1)}{(1 + e^{\frac{ny}{2}})(e^y - 1)} dy = \frac{n}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{[e^{\frac{n\phi y}{2\pi}} + e^{y - \frac{n\phi y}{2\pi}}] (e^{\frac{yn}{2}} - 1)}{(1 + e^{\frac{yn}{2}})(e^y - 1)} dy, \end{aligned}$$

where we make a change of variable $x = e^{\frac{ny}{2}}$, split the integral and change the integral on $(-\infty, 0)$ to $(0, \infty)$. Furthermore, if we set $y = 2t$, then

$$(9.5) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{n/2-1} \csc \left(\phi + \frac{2j\pi}{n} \right) = \frac{n}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{\tanh \frac{nt}{2}}{\sinh t} \cosh \left(\frac{n\phi}{\pi} t - t \right) dt.$$

⁴Note that the order of difference in $\hat{S}_k(n, x)$ is different from that in $S_k(n, x)$. The purpose of doing this is to make both of them positive when $x = 0$.

Setting $\phi = \pi/n$, we have

$$(9.6) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{n/2-1} \csc^3 \frac{(2j+1)\pi}{n} = \frac{n}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{\tanh \frac{n}{2}t}{\sinh t} dt.$$

Taking derivative of (9.5) on ϕ twice and using $(\csc x)'' = 2 \csc^3 x - \csc x$, we get

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n/2-1} 2 \csc^3 \left(\phi + \frac{2j\pi}{n} \right) - \csc \left(\phi + \frac{2j\pi}{n} \right) = \left(\frac{n}{\pi} \right)^3 \int_0^\infty \frac{t^2 \tanh \frac{nt}{2}}{\sinh t} \cosh \left(\frac{n\phi}{\pi} t - t \right) dt.$$

Setting $\phi = \pi/n$,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n/2-1} \csc^3 \frac{(2j+1)\pi}{n} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{n/2-1} \csc \frac{(2j+1)\pi}{n} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{n}{\pi} \right)^3 \int_0^\infty \frac{t^2 \tanh \frac{n}{2}t}{\sinh t} dt.$$

To compute its leading order. First, it is easy to show $\sum_{j=0}^{n/2-1} \csc \frac{(2j+1)\pi}{n} = O(n \log n)$. Second,

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{t^2 \tanh \frac{n}{2}t}{\sinh t} dt = \int_0^\infty \frac{t^2}{\sinh t} \left(1 + \frac{-2}{e^{nt} + 1} \right) dt.$$

For the first part,

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{t^2}{\sinh t} dt = \int_0^\infty \frac{2t^2 e^{-t}}{1 - e^{-2t}} dt = 2 \int_0^\infty t^2 \sum_{j=0}^\infty e^{-(2j+1)t} dt = 4 \sum_{j=0}^\infty (2j+1)^{-3} = \frac{7}{2} \zeta(3),$$

where ζ is the Riemann zeta function. For the second part, using $\sinh t \geq t$ for $t > 0$

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{t^2}{\sinh t} \frac{1}{1 + e^{nt}} dt \leq \int_0^\infty t e^{-nt} dt = n^{-2}.$$

Summarizing the above analysis,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n/2-1} \csc^3 \frac{(2j+1)\pi}{n} = \frac{7\zeta(3)}{4\pi^3} n^3 + O(n \log n).$$

Differentiating (9.5) five times on ϕ and using $\frac{d^4}{dx^4} \csc x = (24 - 20(\sin x)^2 + (\sin x)^4)(\csc x)^5$, one has

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n/2-1} \csc^5 \frac{(2j+1)\pi}{n} = \frac{1}{24} \left(\frac{n}{\pi} \right)^5 \int_0^\infty \frac{t^4 \tanh \frac{n}{2}t}{\sinh t} dt + O(n^3) = \frac{93\zeta(5)}{48\pi^5} n^5 + O(n^3).$$

This finishes the odd sum. For the even sum, we can compute similarly.

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n/2-1} \csc \left(\phi + \frac{2j\pi}{n} \right) = \frac{n}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{\sinh \left[\left(\frac{n}{2} - 1 \right) t \right]}{(\sinh t) (\cosh \frac{nt}{2})} \cosh \left(\frac{n\phi}{\pi} t \right) dt.$$

Letting $\phi = 0$, we have

$$(9.7) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{n/2-1} \csc \frac{2j\pi}{n} = \frac{n}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{\sinh \left[\left(\frac{n}{2} - 1 \right) t \right]}{(\sinh t) (\cosh \frac{nt}{2})} dt.$$

Taking derivative on ϕ twice, we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n/2-1} 2 \csc^3 \left(\phi + \frac{2j\pi}{n} \right) - \csc \left(\phi + \frac{2j\pi}{n} \right) = \left(\frac{n}{\pi} \right)^3 \int_0^\infty \frac{t^2 \sinh \left[\left(\frac{n}{2} - 1 \right) t \right]}{(\sinh t) (\cosh \frac{nt}{2})} \cosh \left(\frac{n\phi}{\pi} t \right) dt.$$

Setting $\phi = 0$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n/2-1} \csc^3 \frac{2j\pi}{n} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n/2-1} \csc \frac{2j\pi}{n} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{n^3}{\pi^3} \int_0^\infty \frac{t^2 \sinh \left[\left(\frac{n}{2} - 1 \right) t \right]}{(\sinh t) (\cosh \frac{nt}{2})} dt.$$

Compute the leading order of them, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n/2-1} \csc^3 \frac{2j\pi}{n} = \frac{\zeta(3)}{4\pi^3} n^3 + O(n \log n).$$

Using (9.6) and (9.7), one has

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (-1)^{j+1} \csc \frac{j\pi}{n} = \frac{n}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{\sinh \frac{n}{2} t - \sinh \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1 \right) t}{\sinh t \cosh \frac{n}{2} t} dt.$$

It is easy to verify the following identity

$$\sinh \frac{n}{2} t - \sinh \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1 \right) t = (\cosh \frac{n}{2} t) (1 - e^{-t}) + \frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{n}{2} t} (e^t + e^{-t} - 2).$$

Note that

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{\frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{n}{2} t} (e^t + e^{-t} - 2)}{\sinh t \cosh \frac{n}{2} t} dt = 2 \int_0^\infty \frac{e^t - 1}{(1 + e^{nt})(e^t + 1)} dt = O(n^{-1}).$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (-1)^{j+1} \csc \frac{j\pi}{n} = \frac{n}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{1 - e^{-t}}{\sinh t} dt + O(1) = \frac{n}{\pi} \log 4 + O(1).$$

□

Lemma 9.2. When $x \in [0, 1]$,

$$S_k^o(n, x) + S_k^e(n, x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (x^2 + \sin^2 \frac{j\pi}{n})^{-\frac{k}{2}} \leq C \begin{cases} n |\log x| & \text{if } k = 1, \\ nx^{1-k} & \text{if } k \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. It is easy to see the following

$$S_k^o(n, x) + S_k^e(n, x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (x^2 + \sin^2 \frac{j\pi}{n})^{-\frac{k}{2}} = 2 \sum_{j=0}^{n/2-1} (x^2 + \sin^2 \frac{j\pi}{n})^{-\frac{k}{2}}.$$

We divide the sum into two parts. Let $j_0 = \lfloor nx \rfloor$, the greatest integer less than or equal to nx . Then,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{j_0} (x^2 + \sin^2 \frac{j\pi}{n})^{-\frac{k}{2}} \leq x^{-k} nx = Cnx^{1-k},$$

$$\sum_{j=j_0}^{n-1} (x^2 + \sin^2 \frac{j\pi}{n})^{-\frac{k}{2}} \leq \sum_{j=j_0}^{n-1} \csc^k \frac{j\pi}{n} \leq C n^k \sum_{j_0}^{n-1} j^{-k} \leq C \begin{cases} n |\log x| & \text{if } k = 1, \\ n x^{1-k} & \text{if } k \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

□

Lemma 9.3. *Suppose that n is even. The following formula holds*

$$S_1(n, x) = \frac{2n}{\pi} \int_{\operatorname{arcsinh} x}^{\infty} \frac{\operatorname{csch} nt}{\sqrt{\sinh^2 t - x^2}} dt.$$

Proof. By the periodic and even property, we assume $\theta \in (0, \pi/n)$. To prove the first one, one can apply Cauchy's residue theorem to

$$\frac{\csc(nz)}{\sqrt{x^2 + \sin^2 z}}$$

in the complex plane. It has poles $z = j\pi/n$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ in $[0, \pi)$. Choose a branch of $\sqrt{x^2 + \sin^2 z}$ by removing the rays $[i \operatorname{arcsinh} x, i\infty) + l\pi$ and $(-\infty, -i \operatorname{arcsinh} x] + l\pi$ for all $l \in \mathbb{Z}$. Draw an integration contour including the poles of $\csc(nz)$ in $[0, \pi)$ and deform it along the branch cut of $\sqrt{x^2 + \sin^2 z}$. See figure 3. We omit the details.




FIGURE 3. The illustration of the integration contour in Lemma 9.3.

□

Lemma 9.4. *Suppose that n is even and $x = (1 + o_n(1)) \frac{\log n}{n}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(n, x) &= \sqrt{\frac{8}{\pi}} n (nx)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-nx} (1 + O((nx)^{-1})), \\ S_3(n, x) &= \sqrt{\frac{8}{\pi}} n^3 (nx)^{-\frac{3}{2}} e^{-nx} (1 + O((nx)^{-1})), \\ S_5(n, x) &= \frac{1}{3} \sqrt{\frac{8}{\pi}} n^5 (nx)^{-\frac{5}{2}} e^{-nx} (1 + O((nx)^{-1})). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 9.3 that

$$S_1(n, x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j (x^2 + (\sin \frac{j\pi}{n})^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{2n}{\pi} \int_{\operatorname{arcsinh} x}^{\infty} \frac{\operatorname{csch} n\phi}{\sqrt{\sinh^2 \phi - x^2}} d\phi.$$

Making a change of variable $\sinh \phi = x \cosh u$ to the above formula, one has

$$(9.8) \quad S_1(n, x) = \frac{2n}{\pi} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{\operatorname{csch}(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u))}{\sqrt{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u}} du.$$

First, the integral is very small when u is away from 0. In fact, since $\operatorname{arcsinh} t \sim t$ as $t \rightarrow 0$ and $\cosh(2) > 3$, then $\operatorname{csch}(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u)) \leq Ce^{-3nx}$ if $u > 2$ and n is large enough. Thus

$$(9.9) \quad \int_2^{\infty} \frac{\operatorname{csch}(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u))}{\sqrt{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u}} du \leq Ce^{-3nx} \int_2^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u}} du.$$

Making a change of variable $\tanh u = t$, we obtain

$$\int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u}} du = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{(1-t^2)(1+x^2-t^2)}} dt = \frac{\operatorname{EllipticK}((1+x^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}})}{\sqrt{1+x^2}},$$

where

$$(9.10) \quad \operatorname{EllipticK}(\sigma) = \int_0^1 \frac{dt}{\sqrt{(1-t^2)(1-\sigma^2 t^2)}}.$$

Using [7, Formula 900.05] we have

$$(9.11) \quad \operatorname{EllipticK}(\sigma) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \binom{-\frac{1}{2}}{\ell}^2 \left[\log \frac{4}{\sqrt{1-\sigma^2}} - b_{\ell} \right] (1-m^2)^{\ell},$$

with

$$b_0 = 0, \quad b_{\ell} = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{2\ell} \frac{(-1)^{j-1}}{j} = b_{\ell-1} + \frac{2}{2\ell(2\ell-1)}.$$

Using (9.11), we have

$$(9.12) \quad \frac{\operatorname{EllipticK}((1+x^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}})}{\sqrt{1+x^2}} = -\log x + \log 4 + O(x^2) \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow 0.$$

Insert the above estimates back to (9.9),

$$\int_2^{\infty} \frac{\operatorname{csch}(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u))}{\sqrt{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u}} du \leq Ce^{-3nx} \int_2^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u}} du \leq C |\log x| e^{-3nx}.$$

Second, for $u \in [0, 2]$, we recall the Taylor expansion

$$(9.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{arcsinh}(t) &= t - \frac{t^3}{6} + O(t^5) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0, \\ \operatorname{csch} t &= 2e^{-t} + 2e^{-3t} + O(e^{-5t}), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+t^2}} &= 1 - \frac{1}{2}t^2 + O(t^4), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have the following expansion as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\frac{\operatorname{csch}(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u))}{\sqrt{1 + (x \cosh u)^2}} = (2 + O(nx^3))e^{-nx \cosh u}$$

holds uniformly for $u \in [0, 2]$. Using this expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^2 \frac{\operatorname{csch}(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u))}{\sqrt{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u}} du &= (2 + O(nx^3)) \int_0^2 e^{-nx \cosh u} du \\ &= (2 + O(nx^3)) \int_0^\infty e^{-nx \cosh u} du + O(e^{-3nx}) \\ &= (2 + O(nx^3)) \operatorname{BesselK}_0(nx) + O(e^{-3nx}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\operatorname{BesselK}_\alpha(t)$ is the modified Bessel function.

$$\operatorname{BesselK}_\alpha(t) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t \cosh u} \cosh(\alpha u) du.$$

It is well known that

$$\operatorname{BesselK}_0(t) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-t} \left(1 + \frac{a_1}{t} + \frac{a_2}{t^2} + O(t^{-3})\right), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

where a_1, a_2 are some constants. Since $nx \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\int_0^2 \frac{\operatorname{csch}(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u))}{\sqrt{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u}} du = \sqrt{2\pi} (nx)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-nx} (1 + O((nx)^{-1})).$$

Combining the two integral estimates and using $|\log x|e^{-2nx} = O((nx)^{-3/2})$, we get the asymptotic of S_1 .

To get the asymptotic of S_3 , we take the derivative of (9.8) on x

$$(9.14) \quad S_3(n, x) = -\frac{1}{x} \frac{d}{dx} S_1(n, x) = \frac{2n}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{-1}{x} \frac{d}{dx} \right) \frac{\operatorname{csch}(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u))}{\sqrt{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u}} du.$$

It is straightforward to get

$$\left(\frac{-1}{x} \frac{d}{dx} \right) \frac{\operatorname{csch}(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u))}{\sqrt{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u}} = \frac{n}{x} \cdot \frac{f_1(n, x, u)}{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u} + \frac{f_2(n, x, u)}{(1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u)^{3/2}},$$

where

$$f_1(n, x, u) = \coth(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u)) \operatorname{csch}(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u)) \cosh u,$$

$$f_2(n, x, u) = \operatorname{csch}(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u)) \cosh^2 u.$$

We shall study the right-hand side of (9.14) as we did for S_1 . First, if $u > 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{-1}{x} \frac{d}{dx} \right) \frac{\operatorname{csch}(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u))}{\sqrt{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u}} &\leq C e^{-3nx} \left(\frac{n}{x} \frac{\cosh u}{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u} + \frac{\cosh^2 u}{(1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u)^{3/2}} \right) \\ &\leq C e^{-3nx} \frac{n}{x} \frac{\cosh u}{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u}. \end{aligned}$$

Making a change of variable $\cosh u = t^{-1}$,

$$\int_2^\infty \frac{\cosh u}{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u} du = \int_0^{1/\cosh 2} \frac{1}{(x^2 + t^2)\sqrt{1-t^2}} dt \leq C \int_0^{1/\cosh 2} \frac{1}{x^2 + t^2} dt \leq \frac{C}{x}.$$

Thus

$$\int_2^\infty \left(\frac{-1}{x} \frac{d}{dx} \right) \frac{\operatorname{csch}(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u))}{\sqrt{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u}} du \leq C n x^{-2} e^{-3nx}.$$

Second, consider $u \in [0, 2]$. Using the expansion (9.13), we obtain

$$\left(\frac{-1}{x} \frac{d}{dx} \right) \frac{\operatorname{csch}(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u))}{\sqrt{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u}} = 2n x^{-1} e^{-nx \cosh u} \cosh u (1 + O(nx^3)),$$

holds uniformly for $u \in [0, 2]$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^2 \left(\frac{-1}{x} \frac{d}{dx} \right) \frac{\operatorname{csch}(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u))}{\sqrt{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u}} du &= 2n x^{-1} (1 + O(nx^3)) \int_0^2 e^{-nx \cosh u} \cosh u du \\ &= 2n x^{-1} (1 + O(nx^3)) \int_0^\infty e^{-nx \cosh u} \cosh u du + O(n x^{-1} e^{-3nx}) \\ &= -2n x^{-1} (1 + O(nx^3)) \operatorname{BesselK}'_0(nx) + O(n x^{-1} e^{-3nx}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\operatorname{BesselK}'_\alpha(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \operatorname{BesselK}_\alpha(t)$. It follows from the expansion of $\operatorname{BesselK}_0(t)$ that

$$\operatorname{BesselK}'_0(t) = -\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-t} (1 + O(t^{-1})), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore

$$\int_0^2 \left(\frac{-1}{x} \frac{d}{dx} \right) \frac{\operatorname{csch}(n \operatorname{arcsinh}(x \cosh u))}{\sqrt{1 + x^2 \cosh^2 u}} du = \sqrt{2\pi} n x^{-1} (nx)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-nx} (1 + O((nx)^{-1})).$$

Combining the above estimates with the one in $(2, \infty)$, we get the asymptotic of S_3 .

The proof of S_5 can be obtained similarly to S_3 . We omit the details. \square

Acknowledgement

The research of L. Sun is partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 1247012316), and the Strategic Priority Research Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (No. XDB0510201), and CAS Project for Young Scientists in Basic Research Grant (No. YSBR-031). The research of J.C. Wei is supported by GRF New frontier in singular limits of nonlinear partial differential equations. The research of W. Yang is supported by the National Key R&D Program of China 2022YFA1006800, NSFC China No. 12171456, NSFC, China No. 12271369, FDCT No. 0070/2024/RIA1, Start-up Research Grant No. SRG2023-00067-FST, Multi-Year Research Grant No. MYRG-GRG2024-00082-FST and UMDf-TISF/2025/006/FST.

APPENDIX A. SOME TECHNICAL COMPUTATIONS IN SECTION 2

In this section, we shall provide the details for the proof of (2.15) in Section 2.

Proof of (2.15). Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| 5 \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|x - \xi_{j,0}|} U^4 + \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j\right) E \right\|_{L_w^q} \\
& \leq \left\| 5 \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|z - \xi_{j,0}|} U^4 - 5 \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j\right) \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|z - \xi_{j,0}|} U^4 \right\|_{L_w^q} \\
& \quad + \left\| 5 \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j\right) \sum_{j=1}^m 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{U^4}{|z - \xi_{j,0}|} - \frac{U^4}{|z - \xi_j|} \right) \right\|_{L_w^q} \\
& \quad + \left\| \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j\right) \left(5 \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|z - \xi_j|} U^4 + E \right) \right\|_{L_w^q}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

It is not difficult to check that

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} U^4}{|z - \xi_{j,0}|} - \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j\right) \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} U^4}{|z - \xi_{j,0}|} \right\|_{L_w^q} \leq \frac{C}{(\log m)^2}, \tag{A.2}$$

and

$$\left\| \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j\right) \sum_{j=1}^m 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{U^4}{|z - \xi_{j,0}|} - \frac{U^4}{|z - \xi_j|} \right) \right\|_{L_w^q} \leq \frac{C}{(\log m)^2}. \tag{A.3}$$

Consider the last term. Recall that the support of $1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j$ is $\bigcap_{j=1}^m \{|z - \xi_j| > \frac{\eta}{m}\}$. Thus

$$\left| 5 \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{3^{\frac{1}{4}} \mu_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|z - \xi_j|} U^4 + E \right| \leq C \frac{\mu_m}{(1 + |z|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{|z - \xi_j|} \right)^2.$$

We write $z = (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta, z_3)$ as Section 2.2, by (2.31) we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{|z - \xi_j|} = \frac{1}{2(r \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2})^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \frac{1}{(h^2 + \sin^2(\frac{j\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2}))^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \tag{A.4}$$

where h is given in (2.28). It is not difficult to check that

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{|z - \xi_j|} \leq Cm \log m, \text{ for } z \in \bigcap_{j=1}^m \left\{ |z - \xi_j| > \frac{\eta}{m} \right\} \text{ with } h \leq Cm^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Next we claim that for $h \in (m^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \frac{1}{3})$, it holds that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \frac{1}{(h^2 + \sin^2(\frac{j\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2}))^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq Cm \log \frac{1}{h}. \tag{A.5}$$

By symmetry, we may assume that $\theta \in (0, \frac{\pi}{m})$. We set j_h to be the greatest number such that $\frac{j\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2} \geq h$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \frac{1}{(h^2 + \sin^2(\frac{j\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2}))^{\frac{1}{2}}} &\leq 2 \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{m}{2}-1} \frac{1}{(h^2 + \sin^2(\frac{j\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2}))^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{j=0}^{j_h} \frac{1}{h} + 2 \sum_{j=j_h}^{\frac{m}{2}-1} \frac{1}{\sin(\frac{j\pi}{m} - \frac{\theta}{2})} \\ &\leq C \frac{j_h}{h} + Cm \log \frac{m}{j_h} \leq Cm \log \frac{1}{h}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we proved the claim (A.5). While for $h \geq \frac{1}{3}$, we have

$$(A.6) \quad \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j\right) \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{|z - \xi_j|} \leq Cm.$$

Using (A.4), (A.5) and (A.6) we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} (A.7) \quad &\left\| \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j\right) \frac{\mu_m}{(1 + |z|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{|z - \xi_j|}\right)^2 \right\|_{L_w^q} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{(\log m)^2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{(1 + |z|)^{5q-6}}{(1 + |z|)^{5q}} dz\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} + \frac{C}{(\log m)^2} \left(\int_{m^{-\frac{1}{2}}}^{\frac{1}{3}} s \left(\log \frac{1}{s}\right)^q ds\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\quad + C \left| \left\{ z \mid (r - \sqrt{1 - \mu_m^2})^2 + z_3^2 \leq Cm^{-1} \right\} \right|^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{(\log m)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By (A.7) and (A.1)-(A.3) we get (2.15). □

REFERENCES

- [1] Amadori Anna Lisa, Gladiali Francesca, Grossi Massimo, Pistoia Angela, and Vaira Giusi. A complete scenario on nodal radial solutions to the brezis nirenberg problem in low dimensions. *Nonlinearity*, 34(11):8055, 2021.
- [2] Abbas Bahri, Yanyan Li, and Olivier Rey. On a variational problem with lack of compactness: the topological effect of the critical points at infinity. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 3(1):67–93, 1995.
- [3] Thomas Bartsch, Anna Maria Micheletti, and Angela Pistoia. On the existence and the profile of nodal solutions of elliptic equations involving critical growth. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 26(3):265–282, 2006.
- [4] Iaroslav V Blagouchine and Eric Moreau. On a finite sum of cosecants appearing in various problems. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 539(1):128515, 2024.
- [5] Haïm Brezis. Some of my favorite open problems. *Rendiconti Lincei*, 34(2):307–335, 2023.

- [6] Haïm Brezis and Louis Nirenberg. Positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations involving critical sobolev exponents. *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, 36(4):437–477, 1983.
- [7] Paul F Byrd. *Handbook of Elliptic Integrals for Engineers and Scientists: By Paul F. Byrd and Morris D. Friedman*. Springer-Verlag, 1971.
- [8] Luis A Caffarelli, Basilis Gidas, and Joel Spruck. Asymptotic symmetry and local behavior of semilinear elliptic equations with critical sobolev growth. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 42(3):271–297, 1989.
- [9] Daomin Cao, Peng Luo, and Shuangjie Peng. The number of positive solutions to the Brezis-Nirenberg problem. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 374(3):1947–1985, 2021.
- [10] Alberto Capozzi, Donato Fortunato, and Giulian Palmieri. An existence result for nonlinear elliptic problems involving critical Sobolev exponent. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 2(6):463–470, 1985.
- [11] Alfonso Castro and Mónica Clapp. The effect of the domain topology on the number of minimal nodal solutions of an elliptic equation at critical growth in a symmetric domain. *Nonlinearity*, 16(2):579, 2003.
- [12] Giovanna Cerami, Donato Fortunato, and Michael Struwe. Bifurcation and multiplicity results for nonlinear elliptic problems involving critical Sobolev exponents. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 1(5):341–350, 1984.
- [13] Giovanna Cerami, Struwe Solimini, and Michael Struwe. Some existence results for superlinear elliptic boundary value problems involving critical exponents. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 69(3):289–306, 1986.
- [14] Wenxiong Chen and Congming Li. Classification of solutions of some nonlinear elliptic equations. *Duke Math. J.*, 64(1):615–622, 1991.
- [15] Mónica Clapp and Tobias Weth. Multiple solutions for the Brezis-Nirenberg problem. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 10(4):463–480, 2005.
- [16] Yessine Dammak. A non-existence result for low energy sign-changing solutions of the Brezis-Nirenberg problem in dimensions 4, 5 and 6. *J. Differential Equations*, 263(11):7559–7600, 2017.
- [17] Manuel Del Pino, Patricio Felmer, and Monica Musso. Two-bubble solutions in the supercritical Bahri-Coron’s problem. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 16(2):113–145, 2003.
- [18] Manuel Del Pino, Jean Dolbeault, and Monica Musso. The Brezis–Nirenberg problem near criticality in dimension 3. *Journal de mathématiques pures et appliquées*, 83(12):1405–1456, 2004.
- [19] Manuel Del Pino, Michal Kowalczyk, and Jun-Cheng Wei. Concentration on curves for nonlinear schrödinger equations. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics: A Journal Issued by the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences*, 60(1):113–146, 2007.
- [20] Manuel Del Pino, Monica Musso, Frank Pacard, and Angela Pistoia. Large energy entire solutions for the Yamabe equation. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 251(9):2568–2597, 2011.
- [21] Shengbing Deng and Monica Musso. High energy sign-changing solutions for coron’s problem. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 271:916–962, 2021.
- [22] Shengbing Deng, Monica Musso, and Juncheng Wei. New type of sign-changing blow-up solutions for scalar curvature type equations. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2019(13):4159–4197, 2019.
- [23] Giuseppe Devillanova and Sergio Solimini. Concentration estimates and multiple solutions to elliptic problems at critical growth. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 7(10):1257–1280, 2002. ISSN 1079-9389.

- [24] Weiyue Ding. On a conformally invariant elliptic equation on \mathbb{R}^n . *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 107: 331–335, 1986.
- [25] Olivier Druet. Elliptic equations with critical Sobolev exponents in dimension 3. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire*, 19(2):125–142, 2002.
- [26] Olivier Druet, Emmanuel Hebey, and Frédéric Robert. *Blow-up theory for elliptic PDEs in Riemannian geometry*, volume 45 of *Mathematical Notes*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2004.
- [27] Thomas Duyckaerts, Carlos E Kenig, and Frank Merle. Universality of the blow-up profile for small type ii blow-up solutions of the energy-critical wave equation: the nonradial case. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 14(5):1389–1454, 2012.
- [28] Thomas Duyckaerts, Carlos Kenig, and Frank Merle. Solutions of the focusing nonradial critical wave equation with the compactness property. *Annali della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa - Classe di scienze*, 15(291214):731–808, 2016. doi: 10.2422/2036-2145.201402_001.
- [29] Thomas Duyckaerts, Hao Jia, Carlos Kenig, and Frank Merle. Soliton resolution along a sequence of times for the focusing energy critical wave equation. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 27(4):798–862, 2017.
- [30] Rupert L. Frank, Tobias König, and Hynek Kovařík. Blow-up of solutions of critical elliptic equations in three dimensions. *Anal. PDE*, 17(5):1633–1692, 2024.
- [31] Basilis Gidas, Wei-Ming Ni, and Louis Nirenberg. Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 68(3):209–243, 1979.
- [32] Changfeng Gui and Juncheng Wei. Multiple interior peak solutions for some singularly perturbed neumann problems. *Journal of differential equations*, 158(1):1–27, 1999.
- [33] Zheng-Chao Han. Asymptotic approach to singular solutions for nonlinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponent. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 8(2):159–174, 1991.
- [34] Emmanuel Hebey. *Compactness and stability for nonlinear elliptic equations*. Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2014.
- [35] Alessandro Iacopetti and Giusi Vaira. Sign-changing tower of bubbles for the Brezis-Nirenberg problem. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 18(1):1550036, 53, 2016.
- [36] Alessandro Iacopetti and Giusi Vaira. Sign-changing blowing-up solutions for the Brezis-Nirenberg problem in dimensions four and five. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 18(1):1–38, 2018.
- [37] Carlos E Kenig and Frank Merle. Global well-posedness, scattering and blow-up for the energy-critical, focusing, non-linear schrödinger equation in the radial case. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 166(3), 2006.
- [38] Carlos E Kenig and Frank Merle. Global well-posedness, scattering and blow-up for the energy-critical focusing non-linear wave equation. *Acta Math*, 201:147–212, 2008.
- [39] Tobias König and Paul Laurain. Fine multibubble analysis in the higher-dimensional Brezis-Nirenberg problem. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 41(5):1239–1287, 2024.
- [40] Michal Kowalczyk, Juncheng Wei, and Manuel del Pino. On De Giorgi's conjecture in dimension $N > 9$. *Annals of mathematics*, 174(3):1485–1569, 2011.
- [41] Andrea Malchiodi and Martin Mayer. Prescribing Morse scalar curvatures: blow-up analysis. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 2021(18):14123–14203, 2021.
- [42] Monica Musso and Angela Pistoia. Multispikes solutions for a nonlinear elliptic problem involving the critical Sobolev exponent. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 51(3):541–579, 2002.
- [43] Monica Musso and Dora Salazar. Multispikes solutions for the brezis-nirenberg problem in dimension three. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 264(11):6663–6709, 2018.

- [44] Monica Musso and Juncheng Wei. Nondegeneracy of Nodal Solutions to the Critical Yamabe Problem. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 340(3):1049–1107, 2015.
- [45] Monica Musso and Juncheng Wei. Sign-changing blowing-up solutions for supercritical Bahri–Coron’s problem. *Calculus of variations and partial differential equations*, 55:1–39, 2016.
- [46] Monica Musso, Serena Rocci, and Giusi Vaira. Nodal cluster solutions for the Brezis-Nirenberg problem in dimensions $N \geq 7$. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 63(5):Paper No. 119, 32, 2024.
- [47] Angela Pistoia and Giusi Vaira. Nodal solutions of the Brezis-Nirenberg problem in dimension 6. *Anal. Theory Appl.*, 38(1):1–25, 2022.
- [48] Bruno Premoselli. Towers of bubbles for Yamabe-type equations and for the Brézis-Nirenberg problem in dimensions $n \geq 7$. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 32(3):Paper No. 73, 65, 2022.
- [49] Olivier Rey. The role of the Green’s function in a nonlinear elliptic equation involving the critical Sobolev exponent. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 89(1):1–52, 1990.
- [50] Olivier Rey and Juncheng Wei. Arbitrary number of positive solutions for an elliptic problem with critical nonlinearity. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 7(4):449–476, 2005.
- [51] Frédéric Robert and Jérôme Vétois. Sign-changing blow-up for scalar curvature type equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 38(8):1437–1465, 2013.
- [52] Frédéric Robert and Jérôme Vétois. Examples of non-isolated blow-up for perturbations of the scalar curvature equation on non-locally conformally flat manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.*, 98(2):349–356, 2014.
- [53] Martin Schechter and Wenming Zou. On the Brézis-Nirenberg problem. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 197(1):337–356, 2010.
- [54] Pierre-Damien Thizy and Jérôme Vétois. Positive clusters for smooth perturbations of a critical elliptic equation in dimensions four and five. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 275(1):170–195, 2018.
- [55] Giusi Vaira. A new kind of blowing-up solutions for the Brezis-Nirenberg problem. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 52(1-2):389–422, 2015.
- [56] George-Neville Watson. Xvi. the sum of a series of cosecants. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, 31(182):111–118, 1916.
- [57] Juncheng Wei. Asymptotic behavior of least energy solutions to a semilinear Dirichlet problem near the critical exponent. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 50(1):139–153, 1998.
- [58] Juncheng Wei and Xingwang Xu. Classification of solutions of higher order conformally invariant equations. *Mathematische Annalen*, 313:207–228, 1999.
- [59] Juncheng Wei and Shusen Yan. Infinitely many solutions for the prescribed scalar curvature problem on \mathbb{S}^N . *J. Funct. Anal.*, 258(9):3048–3081, 2010.
- [60] Xu Yuan. Construction of excited multi-solitons for the focusing 4d cubic wave equation. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 282(4):109336, 2022.

STATE KEY LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100190, CHINA

Email address: lmsun@amss.ac.cn

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG, SHATIN, HONG KONG

Email address: jcwei@math.ubc.ca

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF MACAU, TAIPA, MACAU

Email address: wenyang@um.edu.mo