

Compactness of solutions to nonlocal elliptic equations

Miaomiao Niu, Zhipeng Peng, Jingang Xiong*

October 14, 2018

Abstract

We show that all nonnegative solutions of the critical semilinear elliptic equation involving the regional fractional Laplacian are locally universally bounded. This strongly contrasts with the standard fractional Laplacian case. Second, we consider the fractional critical elliptic equations with nonnegative potentials. We prove compactness of solutions provided the potentials only have non-degenerate zeros. Corresponding to Schoen's Weyl tensor vanishing conjecture for the Yamabe equation on manifolds, we establish a Laplacian vanishing rate of the potentials at blow-up points of solutions.

1 Introduction

Let Ω be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$. The regional fractional Laplace operator is defined as

$$(-\Delta_\Omega)^\sigma u(x) := \text{P.V.} c_{n,\sigma} \int_\Omega \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{n+2\sigma}} dy \quad \text{for } u \in C^2(\Omega),$$

where $0 < \sigma < 1$ is a parameter, $c_{n,\sigma} = \frac{2^{2\sigma} \sigma \Gamma(\frac{n+2\sigma}{2})}{\pi^{\frac{n}{2}} \Gamma(1-\sigma)}$. The regional fractional Laplacian arises, for instance, from the Feller generator of the reflected symmetric stable process, see Bogdan-Burdzy-Chen [3], Chen-Kumagai [12], Guan-Ma [24], Guan [23], Mou-Yi [38] and many others. Here we are interested in universal boundness of positive solutions to nonlinear Poisson equation involving the regional fractional Laplacian. Making use of the standard blow-up argument of Gidas-Spruck [19] and the Liouville theorem, one can show that any nonnegative solutions of the equation $(-\Delta_\Omega)^\sigma u(x) = u^p$ with $1 < p < \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}$ are locally universally bounded. In view of the fractional Sobolev inequality, for p in that range we say the equation is subcritical. In contrast, the critical equation $p = \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}$ has blow-up solutions when $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$. See Jin-Li-Xiong [26, 27] and references therein for more discussions.

However, if Ω has nontrivial complement, we have

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that Ω is an open subset of \mathbb{R}^n and the measure of $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$ is non-zero. Without loss of generality, suppose that the unit ball $B_1 \subset \Omega$. Let $u \in C^2(\Omega)$ be a nonnegative solution of*

$$(-\Delta_\Omega)^\sigma u = u^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} \quad \text{in } B_1. \quad (1)$$

*Supported in part by NSFC 11501034, a key project of NSFC 11631002, NSFC 11571019.

If $n \geq 4\sigma$, then

$$\|u\|_{C^2(B_{1/2})} \leq C(n, \sigma, \Omega),$$

where $C(n, \sigma, \Omega) > 0$ is a constant depending only n, σ, Ω .

Theorem 1.1 is of nonlocal nature and fails when $\sigma = 1$. Since no condition is assumed on solutions in the complement of B_1 , there exist infinitely many solutions of (1). Note that (1) is the Euler-Lagrange equation of the fractional Sobolev inequality in Ω . Recently, Frank, Jin and Xiong [18] showed that the best constants of fractional Sobolev inequality depend on domains and can be achieved in many cases, which is different from the classical Sobolev inequalities in domains.

For every smooth bounded function u defined in Ω , by extending u to zero outside Ω we see that

$$(-\Delta_\Omega)^\sigma u(x) = (-\Delta)^\sigma u(x) - A_\Omega(x)u(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega, \quad (2)$$

where $(-\Delta)^\sigma := (-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^n})^\sigma$ is the standard fractional Laplacian,

$$A_\Omega(x) := c(n, \sigma) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega} \frac{1}{|x - y|^{n+2\sigma}} dy. \quad (3)$$

Since the measure of $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$ is positive, $A_\Omega > 0$. Generally, let us consider the equation

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma u - a(x)u = u^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} \quad \text{in } B_3, \quad u \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (4)$$

where the potential $a(x)$ is assumed to be nonnegative and smooth.

Second order critical semilinear elliptic equations of (4) type have been studied very extensively. A typical example is the Yamabe equation on Riemannian manifolds whose potential is the scalar curvature multiplied by a constant. Compactness and blow-up phenomenon of solutions to the Yamabe equation have been well understood; see, e.g., the recent book Hebey [25] and references therein. Note that the Laplacian of scalar curvature at the center of conformal normal coordinates equals $-\frac{1}{6}|W_g|^2$, where W_g is the Weyl tensor of the metric g . A conjecture due to Schoen says if there exists a sequence of local solutions to the Yamabe equation that blow up at $x_i \rightarrow \bar{x}$ then the Weyl tensor will vanish at \bar{x} up to $[\frac{n-6}{2}]$ -th order derivatives, where n is the dimension of manifolds. If $6 \leq n \leq 24$, the conjecture was proved positively by Li-Zhang [33, 34], Marques [36] and Khuri-Marques-Schoen [31]. If $n \geq 25$, a counterexample was obtained by Marques [37]. Consequently, solutions set of the Yamabe equation is compact in C^2 if the Weyl tensor or some derivatives of order $\leq [\frac{n-6}{2}]$ does not vanish everywhere in dimension less than 24. If the Weyl tensor does not vanish everywhere, compactness was proved in all dimensions $n \geq 6$ by [33, 36]. Similar phenomenon has been proved recently by Li-Xiong [32] for the fourth order Q -curvature equation in dimension $n \geq 8$. Another purpose of paper is to establish an analogue for Yamabe type equations with non-geometric potentials.

Let us introduce the space

$$\mathcal{L}_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n) = \{u \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|u(x)|}{(1 + |x|)^{n+2\sigma}} dx < \infty\}.$$

Even though the two theorems below are stated in the nonlocal setting, they can be extended to $\sigma = 1$.

Theorem 1.2. Let $u \in C^2(B_3) \cap \mathcal{L}_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a solution of (4) with $a \geq 0$ and $n \geq 4\sigma$. If either

- (i) $a > 0$ in B_2 , or
- (ii) $\Delta a > 0$ on $\{x : a(x) = 0\} \cap B_2$ and $n \geq 4\sigma + 2$

holds, then

$$\|u\|_{C^2(B_1)} \leq C,$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on $n, \sigma, \|a\|_{C^4(B_3)}$ and $\inf_{B_2} a$ if (i) holds, otherwise it depends only on $n, \sigma, \|a\|_{C^4(B_3)}$ and $\inf_{\{x:a(x)=0\} \cap B_2} \Delta a$.

In view of (2), Theorem 1.1 follows from Theorem 1.2. We believe there are blow-up examples if $n < 4\sigma$ and $a > 0$. Compactness of finite energy changing-signs solutions of Brezis-Nirenberg problem was established in dimensions $n > 6\sigma$ by Devillanova-Solimini [14] for $\sigma = 1$ and Yan-Yang-Yu [41] for $0 < \sigma < 1$, where a is a positive constant. Corresponding to [33, 36], we have:

Theorem 1.3. Let $u_i \in C^2(B_3) \cap \mathcal{L}_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$, be a solution of

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma u_i - a_i(x)u_i = u_i^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} \quad \text{in } B_3, \quad u_i \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (5)$$

where $a_i \geq 0$, $\|a_i\|_{C^4(B_3)} \leq A_0$ for some $A_0 > 0$ and $a_i \rightarrow a$ in $C^4(B_3)$. Suppose that $\Delta a_i \geq 0$ in $\{x : a_i(x) < \varepsilon\} \cap B_2$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ independent of i and $n \geq 4\sigma + 2$. If $x_i \rightarrow \bar{x} \in B_1$ and $u_i(x_i) \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, then $a(\bar{x}) = \Delta a(\bar{x}) = 0$. Furthermore,

- (i) If $4\sigma + 2 \leq n < 6\sigma + 2$, we can find $x'_i \rightarrow \bar{x}$ such that

$$a_i(x'_i)u(x'_i)^{\frac{4}{n-2\sigma}} \ln u_i(x'_i) + \Delta a_i(x'_i) \leq C(\ln u_i(x'_i))^{-1}$$

for $n = 4\sigma + 2$ and

$$a_i(x'_i)u(x'_i)^{\frac{4}{n-2\sigma}} + \Delta a_i(x'_i) \leq C u(x'_i)^{\frac{2(4\sigma+2-n)}{n-2\sigma}}$$

for $4\sigma + 2 < n < 6\sigma + 2$, where $C > 0$ depends only on n, σ, ε and A_0 .

- (ii) If $n \geq 6\sigma + 2$, assume that

$$x_i \text{ is a local maximum point of } u_i, \quad \max_{B_{\bar{d}}(x_i)} u_i(x) \leq \bar{b} u_i(x_i) \quad (6)$$

for some positive constants \bar{b} and \bar{d} . Then

$$a_i(x_i)u(x_i)^{\frac{4}{n-2\sigma}} + \Delta a_i(x_i) \leq C \begin{cases} u_i(x_i)^{\frac{-4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} \ln u_i(x_i) & \text{for } n = 6\sigma + 2, \\ u_i(x_i)^{\frac{-4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} & \text{for } n > 6\sigma + 2, \end{cases}$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on $n, \sigma, \varepsilon, A_0$, as well as constants \bar{b} and \bar{d} .

It is interesting to point out that if $\sigma \geq 1$, the constant $6\sigma + 2$ would be replaced by $4\sigma + 4$ and $u_i(x'_i)^{\frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}$ by $u_i(x'_i)^{\frac{4}{n-2\sigma}}$, see the proof Proposition 6.1. The borderlines of dimensions in the above theorem might be not applicable to the compactness problem of the fractional Yamabe equations on the conformal boundaries of Einstein-Poincaré manifolds, as the second order operators have a non-trivial zero-order term. Fractional conformal invariant operators and fractional Yamabe problem have been studied by Graham-Zworski [22], Chang-González [11], Case-Chang [10], González-Qing [20], Fang-González [16] and Kim-Musso-Wei [29] recently. Non-compactness examples of the fractional Yamabe equations were obtained by Kim-Musso-Wei [30] in higher dimensions as Brendle [4] and Brendle-Marques [5] did for the Yamabe equation. The 1/2-Yamabe problem coincides with the boundary Yamabe problem initiated by Escobar [15]. The compactness problem of 1/2-Yamabe equation has been studied by Felli-Ould Ahmedou [17] and Almaraz [1, 2].

The proofs of main theorems rely on asymptotic analysis of blowing up solutions. First, we should understand the possible bubbles interaction caused by the non-locality. By now two methods have been developed:

1. Using the extension formula of Caffarelli-Silvestre [8], see Jin-Li-Xiong [26];
2. Using Green's representation, see Jin-Li-Xiong [27] and Li-Xiong [32].

We will use the first one in the paper. Except the interest of degenerate elliptic equations, it appears easier to be adapted to study fractional Yamabe equations mentioned above. In addition, our proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 imply that both of them are still true when $(-\Delta)^\sigma$ is replaced by the spectral fractional Laplace operator. See Cabré-Tan [7], Capella-Dávila-Dupaigne-Sire [9], Yan-Yang-Yu [41] and many others for study of nonlinear problems involving spectral fractional Laplace operator. The second method has prominent advantage in dealing with higher order elliptic equations.

By using Caffarelli-Silvestre extension, the blow up analysis procedure will need a Bôcher type theorem for degenerate elliptic equations with isolated singularities. Existence of Green function of this type degenerate elliptic equations on manifolds were obtained by Jin-Xiong [28] and Kim-Musso-Wei [29] via a duality argument but asymptotic expansion seems unknown. A difficulty is the lack of weighted $W^{1,p}$ estimates. In section 3, we establish existence and asymptotic expansion of Green functions via *parametrix method* with the help of half-space Riesz potentials. Our approach also works for degenerate elliptic equations on manifolds.

The proofs of Theorem 1.2 and 1.3 need a refined quantitative asymptotic analysis of that in Jin-Li-Xiong [26]. In the second order case, such type analysis was developed first by Chen-Lin [13] for the prescribing scalar curvature equation and then references cited above for the Yamabe equation. Since potentials in (4) and (5) are not geometric and their Taylor expansion polynomials of order ≥ 2 have not to be orthogonal to the zeroth and first order polynomials, it is not possible to construct correctors. It is unclear to us how to show higher order derivatives vanishing estimates. Furthermore, we lose the algebraic structure used by Khuri-Marques-Schoen [31] to construct correctors in polynomial form.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In section 2, we prove a localizing lemma in metric spaces by extending a result in [32]. It allows us to localize bubbles interaction in bounded domains. In section 3, we prove the existence and uniqueness of Green's functions as well as Bôcher type theorem. In section 4, we establish basic results of so-called isolated simple blow up

points. Compared with the counterpart of [26], several new ingredients are introduced. In section 5, we establish the refined quantitative asymptotic analysis mentioned above. In section 6, we estimate the Pohozaev integral of blow up solutions. The main theorems are proved in section 7.

Acknowledgments: The authors are grateful to Professor YanYan Li for his patient guidance and constant encouragement.

2 A localizing lemma

In this section, we prove the following lemma, which extends a result in Li-Xiong [32].

Lemma 2.1. *Let (\mathcal{M}, d) be a complete metric space. Let $S_i \subset \mathcal{M}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$, be a sequence of sets of finite points, however, the cardinality of S_i may tend to infinity. Suppose that $x_i, y_i \in S_i$ are distinct points satisfying $x_i, y_i \rightarrow \bar{x}$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Define $f_i : S_i \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ by*

$$f_i(x) := \min_{x' \in S_i \setminus \{x\}} d(x', x).$$

Let $R_i \rightarrow \bar{R} \in (1, \infty]$ satisfying $R_i f_i(x_i) \rightarrow 0$. Then subject to a subsequence of $i \rightarrow \infty$ one can find $z_i \in S_i \cap \mathbf{B}_{(2R_i f_i(x_i))}(x_i)$ satisfying

$$f_i(z_i) \leq (2R_i + 1)f_i(x_i) \quad (7)$$

and

$$\min_{x \in S_i \cap \mathbf{B}_{R_i f_i(z_i)}(z_i)} f_i(x) \geq \frac{1}{2} f_i(z_i), \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{B}_r(x) = \{y \in \mathcal{M} : d(x, y) < r\}$ for $r > 0$.

Proof. Suppose the contrary, then there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $i \geq N$, z_i in the lemma can not be selected. Since $f_i(x_i) \leq (2R_i + 1)f_i(x_i)$, by the contradiction hypothesis, there must exist $x_{i,1} \in S_i \cap \mathbf{B}_{R_i f_i(x_i)}(x_i)$ such that $f_i(x_{i,1}) < \frac{1}{2} f_i(x_i)$. Denote $x_{i,0} = x_i$. We can define $x_{i,l} \in S_i$, $l = 1, 2, \dots$, satisfying $f_i(x_{i,l}) < \frac{1}{2} f_i(x_{i,(l-1)})$ and $0 < d(x_{i,l}, x_{i,(l-1)}) < R_i f_i(x_{i,(l-1)})$ inductively as follows. Once $x_{i,l}$, $l \geq 2$, is defined, we have, for $2 \leq m \leq l$, that

$$d(x_{i,m}, x_{i,(m-1)}) < R_i f_i(x_{i,(m-1)}) < R_i 2^{-1} f_i(x_{i,(m-2)}) < \dots < R_i 2^{1-m} f_i(x_i),$$

which implies

$$d(x_{i,l}, x_i) \leq \sum_{m=1}^l d(x_{i,m}, x_{i,(m-1)}) < R_i f_i(x_i) \sum_{m=1}^l 2^{1-m} < 2R_i f_i(x_i),$$

and

$$f_i(x_{i,l}) \leq d(x_{i,l}, x_i) + f_i(x_i) \leq (2R_i + 1)f_i(x_i).$$

So $z_i := x_{i,l}$ satisfies $z_i \in S_i \cap \mathbf{B}_{R_i f_i(x_i)}(x_i)$ and (7). By the contradiction hypothesis, there must exist $x_{i,(l+1)} \in S_i \cap \mathbf{B}_{R_i f_i(x_{i,l})}(x_{i,l})$ such that $f_i(x_{i,(l+1)}) < \frac{1}{2} f_i(x_{i,l})$. But S_i is a finite set and we can not work for all $l \geq 2$. Therefore, the lemma follows. \square

3 Green's function and Bôcher type theorems

Hereby, we use capital letters, such as $X = (x, t)$, to denote points in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} , and $t \geq 0$ usually. $\mathcal{B}_R(X)$ denotes as the ball in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} with radius R and center X , $\mathcal{B}_R^+(X)$ as $\mathcal{B}_R(X) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$, and $B_R(x)$ as the ball in \mathbb{R}^n with radius R and center x . We also write $\mathcal{B}_R(0)$, $\mathcal{B}_R^+(0)$, $B_R(0)$ as \mathcal{B}_R , \mathcal{B}_R^+ , B_R for short. We use $\partial' \mathcal{B}_R^+(X) = \partial \mathcal{B}_R^+(X) \cap \partial \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$, $\partial'' \mathcal{B}_R^+(X) = \partial \mathcal{B}_R^+(X) \setminus \partial' \mathcal{B}_R^+(X)$. Through the extension formulation for $(-\Delta)^\sigma$ in [8], the equation (4) is equivalent to a degenerate elliptic equation with a Neumann boundary condition in one dimension higher:

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla_X U) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}, \\ \frac{\partial U}{\partial \nu^\sigma} = N(\sigma) a(x) u + N(\sigma) u^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} & \text{for } x \in B_3, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where $N_\sigma = 2^{1-2\sigma} \Gamma(1-\sigma) / \Gamma(\sigma)$,

$$\frac{\partial U}{\partial \nu^\sigma}(x, 0) = - \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} t^{1-2\sigma} \partial_t U(x, t),$$

and $u(x) = U(x, 0)$. Since the Dirichlet problem does not have uniqueness, the extension will always refer to the *canonical* one obtained by Poisson type integral:

$$U(x, t) = \mathcal{P}_\sigma * u(x, t) = \beta(n, \sigma) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{t^{2\sigma}}{(|x-y|^2 + t^2)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{2}}} u(y) dy, \quad (10)$$

where $\beta(n, \sigma)$ is a normalization constant.

For every open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$, we denote $W^{1,p}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \Omega)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, the weighted Sobolev space equipped with the norm

$$\|U\|_{W^{1,p}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \Omega)} = \left(\int_{\Omega} t^{1-2\sigma} (U^p + |\nabla U|^p) dx dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

It is easy to check that if $u \in C^2(B_3) \cap \mathcal{L}_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then $\mathcal{P}_\sigma * u \in W^{1,2}(t^{1-2\sigma}, B_\rho \times T)$ for any $\rho < 3$ and $T > 0$. The weighted space $W^{1,2}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \Omega)$ and weak solutions in the space for linear equation

$$\operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla U) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{B}_1^+, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^\sigma} U(x, 0) = a(x)U(x, 0) + b(x)$$

can be found in Cabré-Sire [6], Jin-Li-Xiong [26] and etc. Classical regularity theory, such as Harnack inequality, Hölder estimates and Schauder estimates still hold. However, there is no weighted $W^{1,p}$, $p > 2$, theory.

The Harnack inequality will be used repeatedly, and thus we state it here. One can find proofs from [6] or [40].

Proposition 3.1. *Let $U \in W^{1,2}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_R^+)$ be a nonnegative weak solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla_X U) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_R^+, \\ \frac{\partial U}{\partial \nu^\sigma} = a(x)U(x, 0) & \text{on } \partial' \mathcal{B}_R. \end{cases}$$

If $a \in L^p(B_R)$ for some $p > n/2\sigma$, then we have

$$\sup_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{R/2}^+} U \leq C(R) \inf_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{R/2}^+} U,$$

where C depends only on n, σ, R and $\|a\|_{L^p(B_R)}$.

Denote

$$\mathcal{N}_\sigma(x, t) := c(n, \sigma)|X|^{2\sigma-n}, \quad (11)$$

where $c(n, \sigma)$ is a normalization constant. Then

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla\mathcal{N}_\sigma) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\nu^\sigma}\mathcal{N}_\sigma = \delta_0 & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}, \end{cases}$$

in distribution sense, where δ_0 is the Dirac measure centered at 0.

Proposition 3.2. *Given a function $a \in L^\infty(B_1)$, we can find a constant $0 < \tau \leq 1$, depending only on n, σ and $\|a\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}$, such that there exists $G(X) \in W^{1,2}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_\tau^+ \setminus \mathcal{B}_\rho^+)$ for any $\rho > 0$ satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla G) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_\tau^+, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\nu^\sigma}G = aG & \text{on } \partial'\mathcal{B}_\tau^+ \setminus \{0\}, \\ G = 0 & \text{on } \partial''\mathcal{B}_\tau^+, \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

in weak sense, and

$$\lim_{X \rightarrow 0} |X|^{n-2\sigma}G(X) = c(n, \sigma). \quad (13)$$

Here $c(n, \sigma) > 0$ is the constant in (11). Furthermore, if $a \in C^1(B_1)$, then

$$G(X) = c(n, \sigma)|X|^{2\sigma-n} + E(X), \quad (14)$$

where $E(X)$ satisfies

$$|E(X)| + |X||\nabla_x E(X)| + |X|^{2\sigma}|t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t E(X)| \leq C|X|^{4\sigma-n}. \quad (15)$$

Proof. Denote $V_0 = c(n, \sigma)|X|^{2\sigma-n}$ and define inductively

$$V_k(X) = \mathcal{N}_\sigma * (aV_{k-1})(x, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{N}_\sigma(x-y, t)a(y)V_{k-1}(y) dy \quad \text{if } |X| \leq 2,$$

and

$$V_k(X) = 0 \quad \text{if } |X| \geq 2, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, \left[\frac{n}{2\sigma}\right].$$

Clearly, $V_k \in C^\infty(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{3/2}^+ \setminus \{0\})$, for $k < \left[\frac{n}{2\sigma}\right]$ we have

$$|V_k(X)| \leq C|X|^{2\sigma(k+1)-n} \quad \forall |X| \leq 1$$

and $V_{\left[\frac{n}{2\sigma}\right]}(X)$ is Hölder continuous in \mathcal{B}_1^+ . Furthermore,

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla V_k) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_2^+, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\nu^\sigma}V_k = aV_{k-1} & \text{on } \partial'\mathcal{B}_2^+ \setminus \{0\} \end{cases}$$

in weak sense. Let

$$V = \sum_{k=0}^{\left[\frac{n}{2\sigma}\right]} V_k.$$

Choose τ to be small such that

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{B}_\tau^+} t^{1-2\sigma} |\nabla \varphi|^2 - \int_{\partial' \mathcal{B}_\tau^+} a \varphi^2 \geq 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in W^{1,2}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_\tau^+), \varphi = 0 \text{ on } \partial'' \mathcal{B}_\tau^+. \quad (16)$$

By Lax-Milgram theorem,

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla W) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_\tau^+, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^\sigma} W = aW + aV_{[\frac{n}{2\sigma}]} & \text{on } \partial' \mathcal{B}_\tau^+, \\ W = -V & \text{on } \partial'' \mathcal{B}_\tau^+. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

has a unique weak solution in $W^{1,2}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_\tau^+)$. Let $G := V + W$ and $E := (V - V_0) + W$. By the construction of V and the regularity theory in [26], the proposition follows immediately. \square

Remark 3.3. *From the selecting τ by (16), the maximum principle holds in B_τ . And thus $G(X) > 0$ in $\mathcal{B}_\tau^+ \cup \partial' \mathcal{B}_\tau^+$.*

Proposition 3.4 (Bôcher type). *Suppose that $U \in W^{1,2}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_1^+ \setminus \mathcal{B}_\rho^+)$ for any $\rho > 0$ is a nonnegative weak solution*

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla U) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_1^+, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^\sigma} U = aU & \text{on } \partial' \mathcal{B}_1^+ \setminus \{0\}, \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

where $a \in C^1(B_1)$, then

$$U(X) = AG(X) + H(X) \quad \text{for } 0 < |X| \leq \tau,$$

where A is some nonnegative constant, $0 < \tau < 1$ and $G(X)$ are as in Proposition 3.2, and H is a $W^{1,2}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_\tau^+)$ weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla H) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_\tau^+, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^\sigma} H = aH & \text{on } \partial' \mathcal{B}_\tau^+. \end{cases}$$

By Proposition 4.4, we immediately have

Corollary 3.5. *$G(X)$ constructed in Proposition 3.2 is unique.*

The proof of Proposition 3.4 adapts some idea from Li-Zhu [35].

Lemma 3.6. *Assume the assumptions in Proposition 3.4. If in addition*

$$U(X) = o(|X|^{2\sigma-n}) \text{ as } |X| \rightarrow 0,$$

then $U \in W^{1,2}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_1^+)$ and thus 0 is a removable singularity of U .

Proof. Let τ and G be constructed in Proposition 3.2. Let

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla\varphi) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_\tau^+, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\nu^\sigma}\varphi = a\varphi & \text{on } \partial'\mathcal{B}_\tau^+, \\ \varphi = U & \text{on } \partial''\mathcal{B}_\tau^+. \end{cases}$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\phi_\varepsilon = \varepsilon G + \varphi$. Since $U(X) = o(|X|^{2\sigma-n})$, one can find $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ with $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta(\varepsilon) = 0$ such that $\phi_\varepsilon > U$ on $\partial''\mathcal{B}_\delta$. By maximum principle (Remark 3.3), $U \leq \phi_\varepsilon$ in $\mathcal{B}_\tau^+ \setminus \mathcal{B}_\delta^+$. Sending $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have $U(X) \leq \varphi(X) \leq \max_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_\tau^+} U$ for all $X \in \mathcal{B}_\tau^+ \setminus \{0\}$. Namely, $U \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}_{1/2}^+)$.

Next, by the Schauder estimate for U , we have

$$|X||\nabla_x U(X)| + |X|^{2\sigma}|t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U| \leq C. \quad (19)$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$, let η_ε be a cutoff function satisfying

$$\eta_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } |X| \leq \varepsilon, \\ 0 & \text{for } |X| \geq 2\varepsilon, \end{cases} \quad |\nabla\eta_\varepsilon| \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon},$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on n . Using $U(1 - \eta_\varepsilon)$ as a test function for the equation of U , we have

$$0 = - \int_{\mathcal{B}_1^+} t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U \cdot \nabla(U(1 - \eta_\varepsilon)) \, dX + \int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+} aU^2(1 - \eta_\varepsilon) \, dx.$$

Since U is bounded and (19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{B}_1^+} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla U|^2(1 - \eta_\varepsilon) \, dX &\leq C + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathcal{B}_{2\varepsilon}^+ \setminus \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon^+} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla U| \\ &\leq C + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \varepsilon^{n+1-2\sigma} \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Sending $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}_1^+} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla U|^2 \, dX \leq C.$$

In conclusion, we showed $U \in W^{1,2}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_1^+) \cap L^\infty(\mathcal{B}_1^+)$. The proposition follows immediately. \square

From the proof of Lemma 3.6, the condition $U \geq 0$ can be removed.

Lemma 3.7. *Assume the assumptions in Proposition 3.4. Then*

$$A := \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 0} \max_{|X|=r} U(X)|X|^{n-2\sigma} < \infty.$$

Proof. By Harnack inequality (Proposition 3.1), for $0 < r < 1$ we have

$$\max_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_r^+} U(X) \leq C \min_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_r^+} U(X),$$

where $C(r) > 0$ depends only on n, σ and $\|a\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}$. Let $\tau > 0$ and $G(X)$ as in Proposition 3.2. If $A = \infty$, using maximum principle (see Remark 3.3) we have

$$U(X) \geq kG(X) \quad \text{for all } k > 0.$$

This is impossible. Therefore, the lemma is proved. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Let $\tau > 0$ and $G(X)$ be as in Proposition 3.2. Set

$$\bar{A} = \sup\{\lambda \geq 0 \mid \lambda G(X) \leq U(X) \forall X \in \mathcal{B}_\tau^+ \setminus \{0\}\}.$$

It follows from Lemma 3.7 that $0 \leq \bar{A} \leq A < \infty$.

Case 1: $\bar{A} = 0$.

We claim that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $r_\epsilon \in (0, \tau)$ such that

$$\min_{|X|=r} \{U(X) - \epsilon G(X)\} \leq 0 \quad \forall 0 < r < r_\epsilon.$$

If the above claim were false, then there would exist some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and $r_j \rightarrow 0^+$ such that

$$\min_{|X|=r_j} \{U(X) - \epsilon_0 G(X)\} > 0.$$

Notice that $U(X) - \epsilon_0 G(X) \geq 0$ for $|X| = \tau$. We derive from the maximum principle that $U(X) - \epsilon_0 G(X) \geq 0$ on $\mathcal{B}_\tau^+ \setminus \mathcal{B}_{r_j}^+$. It follows that $U(X) - \epsilon_0 G(X) \geq 0$ on $\mathcal{B}_\tau^+ \setminus \{0\}$ which implies that $\bar{A} \geq \epsilon_0 > 0$, a contradiction.

Therefore, for any $\epsilon > 0$, and $0 < r < r_\epsilon$, there exists X_ϵ with $|X_\epsilon| = r$ such that $U(X_\epsilon) \leq \epsilon G(X_\epsilon)$. By Harnack inequality, we have

$$\max_{|X|=r} U(X) \leq CU(X_\epsilon) \leq C\epsilon G(X_\epsilon).$$

It follows that

$$U(X) = o(|X|^{2\sigma-n}) \text{ as } |X| \rightarrow 0.$$

By Lemma 3.6, the singularity is removable.

Case 2: $\bar{A} > 0$. We consider $H(X) = U(X) - \bar{A}G(X)$. From the definition of \bar{A} , we know that $H(X) \geq 0$. By the maximum principle, we know that either $H(X) = 0$ or $H(X) > 0$ in $\mathcal{B}_\tau^+ \setminus \{0\}$. In the former case we are done.

In the latter case, $H(X)$ satisfies (18) with \mathcal{B}_1^+ replaced by \mathcal{B}_τ^+ . Set

$$b = \sup\{\lambda \geq 0 \mid \lambda G(X) \leq H(X) \forall X \in \mathcal{B}_\tau^+ \setminus \{0\}\}.$$

Arguing as in case 1, we have $b = 0$ and $H(X) = o(|X|^{2\sigma-n})$. By Lemma 3.6, $H \in W^{1,2}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_\tau^+)$. We are done again.

Therefore, the proposition is proved. \square

4 Analysis of isolated blow up points

In this section, we follow Jin-Li-Xiong [26], but several new ingredients are needed to deal with the linear term. For example, a conformal type transform will be used to show the sharp upper bound of blow up solutions; see Lemma 4.9.

Let $\tau_i \geq 0$ satisfy $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \tau_i = 0$, $p_i = (n + 2\sigma)/(n - 2\sigma) - \tau_i$, and $a_i \geq 0$ be a sequence of functions converging to a in $C^2(B_3)$, and $\{u_i\}$ be a sequence of $C^2(B_3) \cap \mathcal{L}_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ solutions of

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma u_i = a_i(x)u_i + u_i^{p_i} \quad \text{in } B_3, \quad u_i \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (20)$$

Let $U_i = \mathcal{P}_\sigma * u_i$ be the extension of u_i as in (10). Then we have

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla U_i) = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}, \\ \frac{\partial U_i(x,0)}{\partial \nu^\sigma} = a_i(x)U_i(x,0) + U_i(x,0)^{p_i}, & x \in B_3, \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

where we dropped the harmless constant $N(\sigma)$ for brevity.

A point $\bar{y} \in B_2$ is called a blowup point of $\{u_i\}$ if $u_i(y_i) \rightarrow \infty$ for some $y_i \rightarrow \bar{y}$.

Definition 4.1. Let $\{u_i\}$ satisfy (20). We say a point $\bar{y} \in B_2$ is an isolated blow up point of $\{u_i\}$ if there exist $0 < \bar{r} < \operatorname{dist}(\bar{y}, \partial B_3)$, a constant $\tilde{C} > 0$, and a sequence y_i tending to \bar{y} , such that, y_i is a local maximum of u_i , $u_i(y_i) \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$u_i(y) \leq \tilde{C}|y - y_i|^{-2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \quad \text{for all } y \in B_{\bar{r}}(y_i).$$

Let $y_i \rightarrow \bar{y}$ be an isolated blow up point of u_i , define for $0 < r < \bar{r}$,

$$\bar{u}_i(r) = \frac{1}{|\partial B_r(y_i)|} \int_{\partial B_r(y_i)} u_i \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{w}_i(r) = r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \bar{u}_i(r). \quad (22)$$

Definition 4.2. We say $y_i \rightarrow \bar{y} \in B_2$ is an isolated simple blow up point, if $y_i \rightarrow \bar{y}$ is an isolated blow up point, such that, for some $\rho > 0$ (independent of i) \bar{w}_i has precisely one critical point in $(0, \rho)$ for large i .

In the above, we use B_2 and B_3 for conveniences. One can replace them by open sets.

Lemma 4.3. Suppose that u_i is a sequence of solutions of (20), and $y_i \rightarrow 0$ is an isolated blow up point of $\{u_i\}$, i.e., for some positive constants A_1 and \bar{r} independent of i ,

$$|y - y_i|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} u_i(y) \leq A_1, \quad \text{for all } y \in B_{\bar{r}}(y_i) \subset B_3. \quad (23)$$

Then for any $0 < r < \frac{1}{3}\bar{r}$, we have the following Harnack inequality

$$\sup_{B_{2r}^+(Y_i) \setminus B_{r/2}^+(Y_i)} U_i \leq C \inf_{B_{2r}^+(Y_i) \setminus B_{r/2}^+(Y_i)} U_i,$$

where $Y_i = (y_i, 0)$ and $C > 0$ depends only on n, σ, A_1, \bar{r} and $\sup_i \|a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_{\bar{r}}(y_i))}$.

Proof. It follows from applying Proposition 3.1 to $r^{\frac{2\sigma}{p_i-1}} U_i(rX + Y_i)$. See the proof of Lemma 4.3 of [26] for more details. \square

Without loss of generality, we assume $\bar{r} = 2$ to the end of the section.

Proposition 4.4. *Assume as in Lemma 4.3. Suppose that $\|a_i\|_{C^2(B_3)} \leq A_0$. Then for any $R_i \rightarrow \infty$, $\varepsilon_i \rightarrow 0^+$, we have, after passing to a subsequence (still denoted as $\{u_i\}$, $\{y_i\}$, etc. ...), that*

$$\|m_i^{-1}u_i(m_i^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma} \cdot + y_i) - \bar{c}(1 + |\cdot|^2)^{(2\sigma-n)/2}\|_{C^2(B_{2R_i}(0))} \leq \varepsilon_i, \quad (24)$$

$$R_i m_i^{-\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } i \rightarrow \infty, \quad (25)$$

where $m_i = u_i(y_i)$ and \bar{c} depends only on n and σ .

Proof. See the proof of Proposition 4.4 of [26]. \square

In the sequel, we will always work on the sequences $R_i \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varepsilon_i \rightarrow 0$ which ensure (24) and (25) valid.

Proposition 4.5. *Under the hypotheses of Proposition 4.4, there exists a positive constant $C = C(n, \sigma, A_0, A_1)$ such that,*

$$u_i(y) \geq C^{-1}m_i(1 + \bar{c}m_i^{(p_i-1)/\sigma}|y - y_i|^2)^{(2\sigma-n)/2}, \quad |y - y_i| \leq 1.$$

In particular, for any $e \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|e| = 1$, we have

$$u_i(y_i + e) \geq C^{-1}m_i^{-1 + ((n-2\sigma)/2\sigma)\tau_i},$$

where $\tau_i = (n + 2\sigma)/(n - 2\sigma) - p_i$.

Proof. Since $a_i \geq 0$, the proof is the same as that of Proposition 4.5 of [26]. \square

Lemma 4.6. *In addition to the hypotheses of Proposition 4.4, suppose further that $y_i \rightarrow 0$ is an isolated simple blow up point of $\{u_i\}$ with a constant $\rho > 0$. Assume $R_i \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varepsilon_i \rightarrow 0^+$ are sequences with which (24) and (25) hold. Then for any $0 < \delta \ll (n - 2\sigma)/2$, we have*

$$u_i(y) \leq C u_i(y_i)^{-\lambda_i} |y - y_i|^{2\sigma-n+\delta}, \quad \text{for all } r_i \leq |y - y_i| \leq 1,$$

where $\lambda_i = (n - 2\sigma - \delta)(p_i - 1)/2\sigma - 1$ and $C > 0$ depends only on n, σ, A_0, A_1 and δ .

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 4.6 of [26], but here $\delta > 0$ can not be a sequence $\delta_i \rightarrow 0$ as in [26]. From Proposition 4.4, we see that

$$u_i(y) \leq C u_i(y_i) R_i^{2\sigma-n} \quad \text{for all } |y - y_i| = r_i. \quad (26)$$

Let $\bar{u}_i(r)$ be the average of u_i over the sphere of radius r centered at y_i . It follows from the assumption of isolated simple blow up and Proposition 4.4 that

$$r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \bar{u}_i(r) \quad \text{is strictly decreasing for } r_i < r < \rho. \quad (27)$$

By Lemma 4.3, (27) and (26), we have, for all $r_i < |y - y_i| < \rho$,

$$\begin{aligned} |y - y_i|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} u_i(y) &\leq C |y - y_i|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \bar{u}_i(|y - y_i|) \\ &\leq r_i^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \bar{u}_i(r_i) \leq C R_i^{\frac{2\sigma-n}{2} + o(1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $o(1)$ denotes some quantity tending to 0 as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Applying Lemma 4.3 again, we obtain

$$U_i(Y)^{p_i-1} \leq O(R_i^{-2\sigma+o(1)})|Y - Y_i|^{-2\sigma} \quad \text{for all } r_i \leq |Y - Y_i| < \rho. \quad (28)$$

Consider operators

$$\begin{cases} \mathfrak{L}(\Phi) = \operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma}\nabla\Phi(Y)) & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_2^+, \\ L_i(\Phi) = \frac{\partial}{\partial\nu^\sigma}\Phi(y, 0) - [a_i(y) + u_i^{p_i-1}(y)]\Phi(y, 0) & \text{on } \partial'\mathcal{B}_2^+ \end{cases}$$

for $\Phi \in W^{1,2}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_2^+)$. Clearly, $U_i > 0$ satisfies $\mathfrak{L}(U_i) = 0$ in \mathcal{B}_2^+ and $L_i(U_i) = 0$ on $\partial'\mathcal{B}_2^+$.

For $0 \leq \mu \leq n - 2\sigma$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, a direct computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathfrak{L}(|Y - Y_i|^{-\mu} - \varepsilon s^{2\sigma}|Y - Y_i|^{-(\mu+2\sigma)}) \\ &= s^{1-2\sigma}|Y - Y_i|^{-(\mu+2)} \left\{ -\mu(n - 2\sigma - \mu) + \frac{\varepsilon(\mu + 2\sigma)(n - \mu)s^{2\sigma}}{|Y - Y_i|^{2\sigma}} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & L_i(|Y - Y_i|^{-\mu} - \varepsilon s^{2\sigma}|Y - Y_i|^{-(\mu+2\sigma)}) \\ &= \left\{ 2\varepsilon\sigma - (a_i(y) + u_i^{p_i-1}(y))|Y - Y_i|^{2\sigma} \right\} |Y - Y_i|^{-(\mu+2\sigma)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for fixed $\delta > 0$, we can choose $\varepsilon > 0$ small such that for $r_i \leq |Y - Y_i| < \rho$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathfrak{L}(|Y - Y_i|^{-\delta} - \varepsilon s^{2\sigma}|Y - Y_i|^{-(\delta+2\sigma)}) \leq 0, \\ & \mathfrak{L}(|Y - Y_i|^{-(n-2\sigma-\delta)} - \varepsilon s^{2\sigma}|Y - Y_i|^{-(n-\delta)}) \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now ε is fixed. Then we can find $0 < \rho_1 \leq \rho$, depending only on n, σ, A_0, A_1 and ε , such that for $r_i \leq |y - y_i| < \rho_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & L_i(|Y - Y_i|^{-\delta} - \varepsilon s^{2\sigma}|Y - Y_i|^{-(\delta+2\sigma)}) \geq 0, \\ & L_i(|Y - Y_i|^{-(n-2\sigma-\delta)} - \varepsilon s^{2\sigma}|Y - Y_i|^{-(n-\delta)}) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Set $M_i = \max_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_{\rho_1}^+} U_i$, $\lambda_i = (n - 2\sigma - \delta)(p_i - 1)/2\sigma - 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_i(Y) &= 2M_i\rho_1^\delta(|Y - Y_i|^{-\delta} - \varepsilon s^{2\sigma}|Y - Y_i|^{-(\delta+2\sigma)}) \\ &\quad + 2Au_i(y_i)^{-\lambda_i}(|Y - Y_i|^{2\sigma-n+\delta} - \varepsilon s^{2\sigma}|Y - Y_i|^{-n+\delta}), \end{aligned}$$

where $A > 1$ will be chosen later. By the choice of M_i and λ_i , we immediately have

$$\Phi_i(Y) \geq M_i \geq U_i(Y) \quad \text{for all } |Y - Y_i| = \rho_1.$$

$$\Phi_i \geq AU_i(Y_i)R_i^{2\sigma-n+\delta} \geq AU_i(Y_i)R_i^{2\sigma-n} \quad \text{for all } |Y - Y_i| = r_i.$$

Due to (28), we can choose A to be sufficiently large such that

$$\Phi_i \geq U_i \quad \text{for all } |Y - Y_i| = r_i.$$

Applying the maximum principle in Lemma A.3 of [26] to $\Phi_i - U_i$ in $\mathcal{B}_{\rho_1}^+ \setminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{r_i}^+$, it yields

$$U_i \leq \Phi_i \quad \text{for all } r_i \leq |Y - Y_i| \leq \rho_1. \quad (29)$$

For $r_i < \theta < \rho_1$, by (27) and Lemma 4.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} M_i &\leq C \rho_1^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \bar{u}_i(\rho_1) \\ &\leq C \theta^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \bar{u}_i(\theta) \\ &\leq C \theta^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \{M_i \rho_1^\delta \theta^{-\delta} + A u_i(y_i)^{-\lambda_i} \theta^{2\sigma-n+\delta}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose $\theta = \theta(n, \sigma, \rho, A_0, A_1)$ sufficiently small so that

$$C \theta^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \rho_1^\delta \theta^{-\delta} \leq \frac{1}{2} \rho_1^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}.$$

It follows that

$$M_i \leq C u_i(y_i)^{-\lambda_i}.$$

Together with (29), Lemma 4.6 holds when $|y - y_i| \leq \rho_1$. By Lemma 4.3 it also holds when $\rho_1 \leq |y - y_i| \leq 1$.

Therefore, we complete the proof. \square

Proposition 4.7 (Pohozaev type). *Let $U \in W^{1,2}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_{2R}^+)$ and $U \geq 0$ in \mathcal{B}_{2R}^+ be a weak solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla U) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_{2R}^+, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^\sigma} U(x, 0) = a(x)U(x, 0) + U^p(x, 0) & \text{on } \partial' \mathcal{B}_{2R}^+, \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

where $a \in C^1(B_2)$ and $p > 0$. Then

$$P_\sigma(0, R, U) + Q_\sigma(0, R, U, p) = 0, \quad (31)$$

where

$$P_\sigma(0, R, U) := \int_{\partial'' \mathcal{B}_R^+} t^{1-2\sigma} \left(\frac{n-2\sigma}{2} U \frac{\partial U}{\partial \nu} - \frac{R}{2} |\nabla U|^2 + R \left| \frac{\partial U}{\partial \nu} \right|^2 \right) dS,$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\sigma(0, R, U, p) &:= \left(\frac{n-2\sigma}{2} - \frac{n}{p+1} \right) \int_{B_R} U(x, 0)^{p+1} dx \\ &\quad - \int_{B_R} \left(\sigma a(x) + \frac{1}{2} x \nabla a(x) \right) U(x, 0)^2 dx + R \int_{\partial B_R} \frac{1}{2} a U^2 + \frac{1}{p+1} U^{p+1} dS \end{aligned}$$

and ν is the unit out normal to $\partial \mathcal{B}_R$.

Proof. See the proof of Proposition 4.7 of [26]. \square

Lemma 4.8. *Assume as in Lemma 4.6. Choose δ small, then*

$$\tau_i = O(u_i(y_i)^{-\min\{\frac{2}{n-2\sigma}, 1\}})$$

Consequently,

$$u_i(y_i)^{\tau_i} \rightarrow 1.$$

Proof. Denote $Y_i = (y_i, 0)$. By Proposition 4.7 for equation (21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(n-2\sigma)\tau_i}{2(p_i+1)} \int_{B_\rho(y_i)} U_i^{p_i+1} &= - \int_{B_\rho(y_i)} (\sigma a_i + \frac{1}{2}(y-y_i)\nabla a_i) U_i(y, 0)^2 \\ &\quad + \rho \int_{\partial B_\rho(y_i)} \frac{1}{2} a U^2 + \frac{1}{p_i+1} U^{p_i+1} dS + P_\sigma(Y_i, \rho, U_i), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

It follows from Proposition 4.5 that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_\rho(y_i)} U_i^{p_i+1} &\geq C^{-1} \int_{B_\rho(y_i)} \frac{m_i^{p_i+1}}{(1+\bar{c}|m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}(y-y_i)|^2)^{(n-2\sigma)(p_i+1)/2}} \\ &\geq C^{-1} m_i^{\tau_i(n/2\sigma-1)} \int_{B_{\rho m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}}} \frac{1}{(1+\bar{c}|z|^2)^{(n-2\sigma)(p_i+1)/2}} \\ &\geq C^{-1} m_i^{\tau_i(n/2\sigma-1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where we used change of variables $z = m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}(y-y_i)$ in the second inequality. By Lemma 4.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_\rho(y_i) \setminus B_{r_i}(y_i)} |y-y_i| u_i^2 \\ &\leq \int_{B_\rho(y_i) \setminus B_{r_i}(y_i)} |y-y_i| (u_i(y_i)^{-\lambda_i} |y-y_i|^{2\sigma-n+\delta})^2 \\ &\leq m_i^{-2\lambda_i} \int_{B_\rho(y_i) \setminus B_{r_i}(y_i)} |y-y_i| (|y-y_i|^{2\sigma-n+\delta})^2 \\ &= \begin{cases} O(m_i^{-2\lambda_i}), & n < 2(2\sigma + \delta) + 1, \\ O(m_i^{-2\lambda_i}) \ln m_i, & n = 2(2\sigma + \delta) + 1, \\ O(m_i^{\frac{-4\sigma-2}{n-2\sigma} + o(1)}), & n > 2(2\sigma + \delta) + 1, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

and

$$\rho \int_{\partial B_\rho} \frac{1}{2} a U^2 + \frac{1}{p_i+1} U^{p_i+1} dS = O(m_i^{-2 + \frac{4\delta}{n-2\sigma} + o(1)}).$$

By Lemma 4.6, Lemma 4.3 and regularity theory of linear equations in [26],

$$P_\sigma(Y_i, \rho, U_i) = O(m_i^{-2 + \frac{4\delta}{n-2\sigma} + o(1)}).$$

By Proposition 4.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{r_i}(y_i)} |y - y_i| u_i^2 \\
& \leq C \int_{B_{r_i}(y_i)} \frac{|y - y_i| m_i^2}{(1 + \bar{c} |m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma} (y - y_i)|^2)^{(n-2\sigma)}} \\
& \leq C m_i^{2-(n+1)\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}} \int_{B_{R_i}} \frac{|z|}{(1 + \bar{c} |z|^2)^{n-2\sigma}} \tag{35} \\
& = \begin{cases} O(m_i^{2-(n+1)\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}}) = O(m_i^{\frac{-4\sigma-2}{n-2\sigma}+o(1)}), & n > 4\sigma + 1, \\ O(m_i^{2-(n+1)\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}}) \ln m_i = O(m_i^{\frac{-4\sigma-2}{n-2\sigma}+o(1)} \ln m_i), & n = 4\sigma + 1, \\ O(m_i^{2-(n+1)\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}}) \times R_i^{n+1-2(n-2\sigma)} = o(m_i^{-2+o(1)}), & n < 4\sigma + 1. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $a_i \geq 0$, combining the above estimates and the fact $\tau_i = o(1)$, the lemma follows immediately. \square

Lemma 4.9. *Assume as in Lemma 4.6. Then for all $0 < \theta < 1$, we have*

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \max_{y \in \partial B_\theta(y_i)} u_i(y) u_i(y_i) \leq C(\theta).$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.3, it suffices to show the lemma for sufficiently small $\theta > 0$. Let $e = (e_1, \dots, e_{n+1})$ be a unit vector with $e_{n+1} = 0$, $Y_\theta = Y_i + \theta e$ and $\xi_i(Y) = U_i(Y_\theta)^{-1} U_i(Y)$. Then $\xi_i(Y)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla \xi_i(Y)) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_3^+, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^\sigma} \xi_i(y, 0) = a_i(y) \xi_i(y, 0) + U_i(Y_\theta)^{p_i-1} \xi_i(y, 0)^{p_i} & \text{on } \partial' \mathcal{B}_3^+. \end{cases}$$

It follows from lemma 4.3 that for any compact set $K \subseteq \mathcal{B}_1^+ \setminus \{0\}$,

$$C(K)^{-1} \leq \xi_i(Y) \leq C(K) \quad \text{on } K,$$

where $C(K) > 0$ depends only on n, σ, A_0, A_1 and K . Note also that $U_i(Y_i + \theta e) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ by Lemma 4.6. Then after passing to a subsequence,

$$\xi_i - \xi, \nabla_x(\xi_i - \xi) \text{ and } s^{1-2\sigma} \partial_s(\xi_i - \xi) \text{ converge to } 0 \quad \text{in } C^\alpha(\mathcal{B}_1^+ \setminus \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon^+) \tag{36}$$

for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\xi_i(y, 0) \rightarrow \xi(y, 0) \quad \text{in } C_{loc}^2(B_1 \setminus \{0\}),$$

for some ξ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma} \nabla \xi(Y)) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_{1/2}^+, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^\sigma} \xi(y, 0) = a(y) \xi(y, 0) & \text{on } \partial' \mathcal{B}_{1/2}^+ \setminus \{0\}, \end{cases}$$

with $a(y) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} a_i(y)$. Hence $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} u_i(y_\theta)^{-1} r^{\frac{2\sigma}{p_i-1}} \bar{u}_i(r) = r^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}} \bar{\xi}(r, 0)$, where $\bar{\xi}(r, 0)$ is the integral average of $\xi(\cdot, 0)$ over ∂B_r . Since $r_i \rightarrow 0$ and $y_i \rightarrow 0$ is an isolated simple blow up point of $\{u_i\}$, it follows from Proposition 4.4 that $r^{(n-2\sigma)/2} \bar{\xi}(r, 0)$ is nonincreasing for all $0 < r < \rho$, i.e., for any $0 < r_1 \leq r_2 < \rho$,

$$r_1^{(n-2\sigma)/2} \bar{\xi}(r_1, 0) \geq r_2^{(n-2\sigma)/2} \bar{\xi}(r_2, 0).$$

Therefore, ξ has to have a singularity at $Y = 0$. By Proposition 3.4,

$$\xi(Y) = A|Y|^{2\sigma-n} + O(|Y|^{4\sigma-n}), \quad 0 < |Y| \leq 1/2, \quad (37)$$

where $A > 0$. For any given $0 < d < 1/2$, let $\phi > 0$ be the first eigenfunction of

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma} \nabla \phi(Y)) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_d^+, \\ -\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^\sigma} \phi(y, 0) = \lambda_1 \phi(y, 0) & \text{on } \partial' \mathcal{B}_d^+, \\ \phi = 0 & \text{on } \partial'' \mathcal{B}_d^+. \end{cases}$$

Let d be small so that $\lambda_1 \geq A_0$. Let $W_i = \frac{\xi_i}{\phi}$. Then

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma} \phi^2 \nabla W_i(Y)) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_d^+, \\ -\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} s^{1-2\sigma} \phi^2 \partial_s W_i(y, 0) = (a_i - \lambda_1) \phi \xi_i + \phi U_i(Y_\theta)^{p_i-1} \xi_i^{p_i} & \text{on } \partial' \mathcal{B}_d^+, \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

in weak sense. It follows that for $\theta \in (0, \frac{d}{2}]$,

$$0 = \int_{\partial'' \mathcal{B}_\theta^+(Y_i)} s^{1-2\sigma} \phi^2 \frac{\partial W_i}{\partial \nu} + \int_{\partial' \mathcal{B}_\theta^+(Y_i)} (a_i - \lambda_1) \phi \xi_i + \phi U_i(Y_\theta)^{p_i-1} \xi_i^{p_i}. \quad (39)$$

By (36) and (37), we have for i large

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{\partial'' \mathcal{B}_\theta^+(Y_i)} s^{1-2\sigma} \phi^2 \frac{\partial W_i}{\partial \nu} &\geq -A \int_{\partial'' \mathcal{B}_\theta^+(0)} s^{1-2\sigma} \phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Y|^{2\sigma-n} - C\theta^{2\sigma} \\ &= A(n-2\sigma)\theta^{2\sigma-n-1} \min_{\mathcal{B}_{d/2}} \phi \int_{\partial'' \mathcal{B}_\theta^+} s^{1-2\sigma} - C\theta^{2\sigma} =: m(\theta) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

provided θ is small. By Proposition 4.4, Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.8 we have

$$\int_{\partial' \mathcal{B}_\theta^+(Y_i)} U_i^{p_i} \leq C U_i(Y_i)^{-1}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} m(\theta) &\leq \int_{\partial' \mathcal{B}_\theta^+(Y_i)} (a_i - \lambda_1) \phi \xi_i + \phi U_i(Y_\theta)^{p_i-1} \xi_i^{p_i} \\ &\leq \int_{\partial' \mathcal{B}_\theta^+(Y_i)} \phi U_i(Y_\theta)^{p_i-1} \xi_i^{p_i} \\ &= U_i(Y_\theta)^{-1} \int_{\partial' \mathcal{B}_\theta^+(Y_i)} \phi U_i^{p_i} \leq C U_i(Y_\theta)^{-1} U_i(Y_i)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$U_i(Y_\theta)U_i(Y_i) \leq \frac{C}{m(\theta)}.$$

Therefore, we complete the proof. \square

Proposition 4.10. *Assume as in Lemma 4.6. Then*

$$u_i(y) \leq C u_i(y_i)^{-1} |y - y_i|^{2\sigma - n} \quad \forall |y - y_i| \leq 1,$$

where $C \geq 0$ depends only on n, σ, A_0, A_1 and ρ .

Proof. It suffices to show

$$U_i(Y)U_i(Y_i)|Y - Y_i|^{n-2\sigma} \leq C. \quad (40)$$

If not, then after passing to a subsequence we can find $\{\tilde{Y}_i\}$ such that $|\tilde{Y}_i - Y_i| \leq 1$ and

$$U_i(\tilde{Y}_i)U_i(Y_i)|\tilde{Y}_i - Y_i|^{n-2\sigma} \rightarrow \infty, \text{ as } i \rightarrow \infty. \quad (41)$$

It follows from (25) that

$$r_i = R_i u_i(y_i)^{-\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}} \leq |\tilde{Y}_i - Y_i| \leq 1.$$

Set $\mu_i = |\tilde{Y}_i - Y_i|$, $\tilde{U}_i(Y) = \mu_i^{\frac{2\sigma}{p_i-1}} U_i(\mu_i Y + Y_i)$. Clearly, $\tilde{U}_i(Y)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma} \nabla \tilde{U}_i(Y)) = 0, & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_1^+ \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^\sigma} \tilde{U}_i(y, 0) = \tilde{a}_i \tilde{U}_i + \tilde{U}_i^{p_i}, & \text{on } \partial' \mathcal{B}_1^+. \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{a}_i(Y) = \mu_i^{2\sigma} a_i(\mu_i Y + Y_i)$. It is easy to see that $\tilde{U}_i(Y)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 4.9 and therefore

$$\max_{|Y|=1} \tilde{U}_i(Y) \tilde{U}_i(0) \leq C,$$

from which we deduce that

$$U_i(Y_i)U_i(\tilde{Y}_i)\mu_i^{n-2\sigma} \leq C.$$

Namely,

$$U_i(Y_i)U_i(\tilde{Y}_i)|\tilde{Y}_i - Y_i|^{n-2\sigma} \leq C,$$

which contradicts (41). We thus established (40) and the proof of the proposition is finished. \square

Corollary 4.11. *Assume as in Lemma 4.6. We have*

$$\int_{|y-y_i| \leq 1} |y - y_i|^s u_i(y)^2 dy = \begin{cases} O(m_i^{-2}), & s + 4\sigma > n, \\ O(m_i^{-2}) \ln m_i, & s + 4\sigma = n, \\ O(m_i^{\frac{-4\sigma-2s}{n-2\sigma}}), & s + 4\sigma < n. \end{cases}$$

Proof. It follows from Proposition 4.4, Lemma 4.8 and Proposition 4.10. \square

Lemma 4.12. *Assume as in Lemma 4.6. Then*

$$a_i(y_i) \leq C \begin{cases} (\ln m_i)^{-1} (1 + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}) & \text{if } n = 4\sigma, \\ m_i^{-2 + \frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} (1 + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}) & \text{if } 4\sigma < n < 4\sigma + 2, \\ m_i^{-2 + \frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} (1 + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \ln m_i) & \text{if } n = 4\sigma + 2, \\ m_i^{-2 + \frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} m_i^{-\frac{4}{n-2\sigma}} & \text{if } n > 4\sigma + 2, \end{cases}$$

and

$$|\nabla a_i(y_i)| \leq C \begin{cases} (\ln m_i)^{-1} (1 + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}) & \text{if } n = 4\sigma, \\ m_i^{-2 + \frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} (1 + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}) & \text{if } 4\sigma < n < 4\sigma + 1, \\ m_i^{-2 + \frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} (1 + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \ln m_i) & \text{if } n = 4\sigma + 1, \\ m_i^{-2 + \frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} m_i^{-\frac{2}{n-2\sigma}} & \text{if } n > 4\sigma + 1, \end{cases}$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on n, σ, A_0, A_1 and ρ .

Proof. Choose a cut-off function $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{B}_{1/2})$ satisfying $\eta(Y) = 1$ if $|Y| \leq 1/4$. Multiplying (21) by $\eta(Y - Y_i) \partial_{y_j} U_i(y, s)$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, and integrating by parts over \mathcal{B}_1^+ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= - \int_{\mathcal{B}_1^+} s^{1-2\sigma} \nabla U_i \nabla (\eta \partial_{y_j} U_i) + \int_{\partial' \mathcal{B}_1^+} \eta \partial_{y_j} U_i (a_i U_i + U_i^{p_i}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{B}_{1/2}^+ \setminus \mathcal{B}_{1/4}^+} s^{1-2\sigma} [|\nabla U_i|^2 \partial_{y_j} \eta - 2 \nabla U_i \nabla \eta \partial_{y_j} U_i] - \int_{\partial' \mathcal{B}_1^+} \left[\frac{1}{2} \partial_{y_j} (a_i \eta) U_i^2 + \frac{1}{p_i + 1} \partial_{y_j} \eta U_i^{p_i+1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.10, we have

$$U_i(Y) \leq C U_i(Y_i)^{-1} \quad \forall \frac{1}{4} \leq |Y| \leq \frac{1}{2}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}_{1/2}^+ \setminus \mathcal{B}_{1/4}^+} s^{1-2\sigma} |\nabla U_i|^2 \leq C U_i(Y_i)^{-2}.$$

Hence, by Corollary 4.11,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \partial_j a_i(y_i) \int_{B_1} u_i^2 \right| &\leq C U_i(Y_i)^{-2} + \int_{B_1} |\partial_j a_i(y_i) - \partial_j a_i(y)| u_i^2 \\ &\leq C \begin{cases} m_i^{-2} (1 + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}) & \text{if } n < 4\sigma + 1, \\ m_i^{-2} (1 + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \ln m_i) & \text{if } n = 4\sigma + 1, \\ m_i^{-2} + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} m_i^{-\frac{4\sigma+2}{n-2\sigma}} & \text{if } n > 4\sigma + 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

By Proposition 4.5 and Lemma 4.8,

$$\int_{B_1} u_i^2 \geq \frac{1}{C} m_i^{-\frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} \int_B \frac{1}{(1 + |x|^2)^{n-2\sigma}} dx. \quad (43)$$

Therefore, desired estimates of $|\nabla a_i(y_i)|$ follows.

By (32), using Lemma 4.8 and Proposition 4.10 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_i &\leq C \int_{B_1(y_i)} |y - y_i| |\nabla a_i(y)| U_i(y, 0)^2 dy + C m_i^{-2} \\
&\leq C |\nabla a_i(y_i)| \int_{B_1(y_i)} |y - y_i| U_i(y, 0)^2 dy \\
&\quad + C \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \int_{B_1(y_i)} |y - y_i|^2 U_i(y, 0)^2 dy + C m_i^{-2} \\
&\leq C \begin{cases} m_i^{-2} (1 + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}) & \text{if } n < 4\sigma + 2, \\ m_i^{-2} (1 + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \ln m_i) & \text{if } n = 4\sigma + 2, \\ m_i^{-2} + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} m_i^{-\frac{4\sigma+4}{n-2\sigma}} & \text{if } n > 4\sigma + 2. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $a_i \geq 0$ in the first inequality.

Using (32) again, by the estimates for $|\nabla a_i(y_i)|$, τ_i and estimates (43), the estimate of $a_i(y_i)$ follows immediately. \square

5 Expansions of blow up solutions

Lemma 5.1. For $s \geq 0$, $\ell > 100$, $0 < \alpha < n$ and $\alpha \leq \mu$, we have

$$\int_{|y| \leq \ell} \frac{1}{(|x - y|^2 + s^2)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}} \frac{1}{(1 + |y|)^\mu} dy \leq C \begin{cases} \ln\left(\frac{\ell}{r} + 1\right) & \text{if } \mu = \alpha, \\ (1 + r)^{\alpha - \mu} & \text{if } \alpha < \mu < n, \\ (1 + r)^{\alpha - n} \ln(2 + r) & \text{if } \mu = n, \\ (1 + r)^{\alpha - n} & \text{if } \mu > n, \end{cases}$$

for all $r = \sqrt{|x|^2 + s^2} < \ell$, where $C > 0$ is independent of ℓ .

Proof. Let $r^2 = |x|^2 + s^2$. Then by change of variables $y = rz$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{|y| \leq \ell} \frac{1}{(|x - y|^2 + s^2)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}} \frac{1}{(1 + |y|)^\mu} dy \\
&= r^\alpha \int_{|z| \leq \ell/r} \frac{1}{(|x/r - z|^2 + s^2/r^2)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}} \frac{1}{(1 + r|z|)^\mu} dz \\
&= r^\alpha \int_{|z| \leq 1/10} + \int_{\frac{1}{10} \leq |z| \leq \ell/r} \frac{1}{(|x/r - z|^2 + s^2/r^2)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}} \frac{1}{(1 + r|z|)^\mu} dz \\
&\leq C r^\alpha \int_{|z| \leq 1/10} \frac{1}{(1 + r|z|)^\mu} dz + C r^{\alpha - \mu} \int_{\frac{1}{10} \leq |z| \leq \ell/r} \frac{1}{(|x/r - z|^2 + s^2/r^2)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}} \frac{1}{|z|^\mu} dz.
\end{aligned}$$

The lemma follows immediately. \square

Let

$$\theta_\lambda(x) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{1 + \lambda^2 \bar{c} |x|^2} \right)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}$$

and

$$\Theta_\lambda(x, t) = \mathcal{P}_\sigma * \theta_\lambda(x, t),$$

where \bar{c} is chosen such that $(-\Delta)^\sigma \theta_\lambda = \theta_\lambda^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}$ as in Proposition 4.4. In the following we will adapt some arguments from Marques [36] for the Yamabe equation; see also the proof of Proposition 2.2 of Li-Zhang [33].

Lemma 5.2. *Assume as in Lemma 4.6. Suppose $\rho = 1$. If $n \geq 4\sigma$, we have for $|Y| \leq m_i^{\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}}$*

$$|\Phi_i(Y) - \Theta_1(Y)| \leq C \begin{cases} m_i^{-2}(1 + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}) & \text{if } n < 4\sigma + 2, \\ m_i^{-2}(1 + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \ln m_i) & \text{if } n = 4\sigma + 2, \\ m_i^{-2} + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} m_i^{-2 + \frac{2(n-(4\sigma+2))}{n-2\sigma}} & \text{if } n > 4\sigma + 2, \end{cases}$$

where $\Phi_i(Y) = \frac{1}{m_i} U_i(m_i^{-\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}} Y + Y_i)$, $m_i = u_i(0)$, and $C > 0$ depends only on n, σ and A_0 .

Proof. For brevity, set $\ell_i = m_i^{\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}}$. Let

$$\Lambda_i = \max_{|Y| \leq \ell_i} |\Phi_i(Y) - \Theta_1(Y)|.$$

By Proposition 4.10 and Lemma 4.3, we have for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $\varepsilon \ell_i \leq |Y| \leq \ell_i$

$$|\Phi_i(Y) - \Theta_1(Y)| \leq C(\varepsilon) m_i^{-2},$$

where we used $m_i^{\tau_i} = 1 + o(1)$. Hence, we may assume that Λ_i is achieved at some point $|Z_i| \leq \frac{1}{2}\ell_i$, otherwise the proof is finished. By maximum principle, $Z_i = (z_i, 0)$. Set

$$V_i(Y) = \frac{1}{\Lambda_i} (\Phi_i(Y) - \Theta_1(Y)).$$

Then

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma} \nabla V_i(Y)) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_{\ell_i}^+, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^\sigma} V_i(y, 0) = b_i V_i(y, 0) + \frac{\tilde{a}_i}{\Lambda_i} \Phi_i(y, 0) & \text{on } \partial' \mathcal{B}_{\ell_i}^+, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{a}_i(y) = m_i^{1-p_i} a_i(\ell_i^{-1} y + y_i)$ and

$$b_i(y) = \frac{\Phi_i(y, 0)^{p_i} - \theta_1(y)^{p_i}}{\Phi_i(y, 0) - \theta_1(y)}.$$

Let

$$W_i(Y) := c(n, \sigma) \int_{|z| \leq \ell_i} \frac{b_i V_i(z, 0) + \frac{\tilde{a}_i}{\Lambda_i} \Phi_i(z, 0)}{(|y-z|^2 + s^2)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}} dz, \quad (44)$$

where $c(n, \sigma)$ is the constant in (11). Then $W_i(Y) \in W^{1,2}(s^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_{\ell_i}^+)$ is a weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma} \nabla W_i(Y)) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_{\ell_i}^+, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^\sigma} W_i(y, 0) = b_i V_i(y, 0) + \frac{\tilde{a}_i}{\Lambda_i} \Phi_i(y, 0) & \text{on } \partial' \mathcal{B}_{\ell_i}^+. \end{cases}$$

By Taylor expansion of a_i at y_i , we have

$$a_i(\ell_i^{-1}y + y_i) \leq a_i(y_i) + \ell_i^{-1}|y| |\nabla a_i(y_i)| + \ell_i^{-2}|y|^2 \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}.$$

Since $\Phi_i(y, 0) \leq C\theta_1(y)$, by Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 4.12 we have

$$\int_{|z| \leq \ell_i} \frac{\tilde{a}_i \Phi_i(z, 0)}{(|y - z|^2 + s^2)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}} dz \leq C\alpha_i$$

with

$$\alpha_i := \begin{cases} m_i^{-2}(1 + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}) & \text{if } n < 4\sigma + 2, \\ m_i^{-2}(1 + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \ln m_i) & \text{if } n = 4\sigma + 2, \\ m_i^{-2} + \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} m_i^{-2 + \frac{2(n-4\sigma+2)}{n-2\sigma}} & \text{if } n > 4\sigma + 2, \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

and

$$b_i(y) \leq C(1 + |y|^2)^{-3\sigma/2}.$$

It follows that

$$|W_i(Y)| \leq C(1 + |Y|)^{-\sigma} + C \frac{\alpha_i}{\Lambda_i}. \quad (46)$$

Note that

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma} \nabla (V_i - W_i)) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_{\ell_i}^+, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^\sigma} (V_i - W_i) = 0 & \text{on } \partial' \mathcal{B}_{\ell_i}^+. \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

If Lemma 5.2 were wrong, by maximum principle we have

$$\|W_i - V_i\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{B}_{\ell_i/2}^+)} \leq \sup_{\partial'' \mathcal{B}_{\ell_i/2}^+} |W_i - V_i| \leq C(\ell_i^{-\sigma} + \frac{\alpha_i + m_i^{-2}}{\Lambda_i}) \rightarrow 0 \quad (48)$$

as $i \rightarrow \infty$. By regularity theory in [26], both $W_i(y, 0)$ and $V_i(y, 0)$ are locally uniformly bounded in $C^{2+\varepsilon}$ for some $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. By (44), it follows from Arzela-Ascoli theorem and Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem that, after passing to subsequence,

$$W_i(y, 0), V_i(y, 0) \rightarrow v(y) \quad \text{in } C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

for some $v \in C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying

$$v(y) = C(n, \sigma) \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\theta_1(z)^{\frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} v(z)}{|y-z|^{n-2\sigma}} dz.$$

It follows from the non-degeneracy result, see, e.g., the proof of Lemma 4.1 of [32], that

$$v(y) = c_0 \left(\frac{n-2\sigma}{2} \theta_1 + y \nabla \theta_1 \right) + \sum_{j=1}^n c_j \partial_j \theta_1,$$

where c_0, \dots, c_n are constants. By Proposition 4.4, $v(0) = 0$ and $\nabla v(0) = 0$. Hence, $v = 0$. Hence, the maximum points $(z_i, 0)$ of V_i have to go to infinity. This contradicts to (46) and (48). \square

Lemma 5.3. *After passing to subsequence, if necessary, there holds*

$$|\Phi_i(Y) - \Theta_1(Y)| \leq C \begin{cases} \max\{\|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} m_i^{-2+\frac{2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} (1+|Y|)^{-\sigma}, m_i^{-2}\} & \text{if } n = 4\sigma + 2, \\ \max\{\|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} m_i^{-2+\frac{2(n-(4\sigma+2))}{n-2\sigma}} (1+|Y|)^{4\sigma+2-n}, m_i^{-2}\} & \text{if } n > 4\sigma + 2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let α_i be defined in (45). We may assume $\frac{m_i^{-2}}{\alpha_i} \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \geq 4\sigma + 2$; otherwise there exists a subsequence i_l of $\{i\}$ such that $m_{i_l}^{-2} \geq \frac{1}{C}\alpha_{i_l}$ for some $C > 0$ and the lemma follows from Lemma 5.2. Set

$$\alpha'_i = \begin{cases} \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} m_i^{-2+\frac{2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} & \text{if } n = 4\sigma + 2, \\ \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} m_i^{-2+\frac{2(n-(4\sigma+2))}{n-2\sigma}} & \text{if } n > 4\sigma + 2, \end{cases}$$

and

$$V_i(Y) = \frac{\Phi_i(Y) - \Theta_1(Y)}{\alpha'_i}, \quad |Y| \leq m_i^{\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}}.$$

Since $\frac{m_i^{-2}}{\alpha_i} \rightarrow 0$ and $\alpha_i \leq \alpha'_i$, it follows from Lemma 5.2 that $|V_i| \leq C$. Since $0 < \Phi_i \leq C\Theta_1$ and $m_i^{\frac{p_i}{2\sigma}} = 1 + o(1)$, we have

$$|V_i(Y)| \leq \begin{cases} C m_i^{-\frac{2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} & \text{if } n = 4\sigma + 2, \\ C m_i^{-\frac{2(n-(4\sigma+2))}{n-2\sigma}} & \text{if } n > 4\sigma + 2, \end{cases} \quad \frac{1}{2}\ell_i \leq |Y| \leq \ell_i \quad (49)$$

and thus we only need to prove the proposition when $|Y| \leq \frac{1}{2}\ell_i$, where $\ell_i = m_i^{\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}}$. Note that

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma} \nabla V_i(Y)) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_{\ell_i}^+, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^\sigma} V_i(y, 0) = b_i V_i(y, 0) + \frac{\tilde{a}_i}{\alpha'_i} \Phi_i(y, 0) & \text{on } \partial' \mathcal{B}_{\ell_i}^+ \end{cases}$$

in weak sense, where $\tilde{a}_i(y) = m_i^{1-p_i} a_i(\ell_i^{-1}y + y_i)$ and

$$b_i(y) = \frac{\Phi_i(y, 0)^{p_i} - \theta_1(y)^{p_i}}{\Phi_i(y, 0) - \theta_1(y)}.$$

Let

$$W_i(Y) := C(n, \sigma) \int_{|z| \leq \ell_i} \frac{b_i V_i(z, 0) + \frac{\tilde{a}_i}{\alpha'_i} \Phi_i(z, 0)}{(|y-z|^2 + s^2)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}} dz. \quad (50)$$

Then $W_i(Y) \in W^{1,2}(s^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_{\ell_i}^+)$ is a weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma} \nabla W_i(Y)) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_{\ell_i}^+, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^\sigma} W_i(y, 0) = b_i V_i(y, 0) + \frac{\tilde{a}_i}{\alpha'_i} \Phi_i(y, 0) & \text{on } \partial' \mathcal{B}_{\ell_i}^+. \end{cases}$$

By Taylor expansion of a_i at y_i , we have

$$a_i(\ell_i^{-1}y + y_i) \leq a_i(y_i) + \ell_i^{-1}|y| |\nabla a_i(y_i)| + \ell_i^{-2}|y|^2 \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}.$$

Since $\Phi_i(y, 0) \leq C\theta_1(y)$, by Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 4.12 we have: for $n = 4\sigma + 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|z| \leq \ell_i} \frac{\frac{\tilde{a}_i}{\alpha_i} \Phi_i(z, 0)}{(|y - z|^2 + s^2)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}} dz &\leq C \int_{|z| \leq \ell_i} \frac{1}{(|y - z|^2 + s^2)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}} (1 + |z|)^{n-2\sigma-2} m_i^{\frac{2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}} dz \\ &\leq C \int_{|z| \leq \ell_i} \frac{1}{(|y - z|^2 + s^2)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}} (1 + |z|)^{n-\sigma-2}} dz \\ &\leq C(1 + |Y|)^{-\sigma}; \end{aligned}$$

for $n > 4\sigma + 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|z| \leq \ell_i} \frac{\frac{\tilde{a}_i}{\alpha_i} \Phi_i(z, 0)}{(|y - z|^2 + s^2)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}} dz &\leq C \int_{|z| \leq \ell_i} \frac{1}{(|y - z|^2 + s^2)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}} (1 + |z|)^{n-2\sigma-2}} dz \\ &\leq C(1 + |Y|)^{4\sigma+2-n}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$b_i(y) \leq C(1 + |y|^2)^{-3\sigma/2},$$

and $V_i(y, 0) \leq C$, by Lemma 5.1 we have

$$\int_{|z| \leq \ell_i} \frac{|b_i V_i(z, 0)|}{(|y - z|^2 + s^2)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}} dz \leq C(1 + |Y|)^{-\sigma}. \quad (51)$$

Hence, we obtain

$$|W_i(Y)| \leq C(1 + |Y|)^{-\sigma}.$$

Since $W_i - V_i$ satisfies the homogenous equation (47), by (49) and the maximum principle we have

$$\begin{aligned} |V_i(Y)| &\leq |W_i(Y)| + \max_{|Y|=\ell_i/2} |W_i - V_i| \\ &\leq C(1 + |Y|)^{-\sigma} + C m_i^{-\frac{2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} \leq C(1 + |Y|)^{-\sigma} \quad \text{for } |Y| \leq \ell_i/2. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Therefore, we proved the lemma when $n = 4\sigma + 2$. If $n > 4\sigma + 2$, we use above estimate of V_i and can improve (51) to

$$\int_{|z| \leq \ell_i} \frac{|b_i V_i(z, 0)|}{(|y - z|^2 + s^2)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}} dz \leq C(1 + |Y|)^{-2\sigma}. \quad (53)$$

It follows that

$$|W_i(Y)| \leq C(1 + |Y|)^{-2\sigma} + C(1 + |Y|)^{4\sigma+2-n}.$$

Arguing as (52), V_i has the same upper bound as W_i 's. Repeating the precess finite times, we have

$$|V_i(Y)| \leq C(1 + |Y|)^{4\sigma+2-n}.$$

Therefore, we complete the proof. □

Corollary 5.4. *Assume as Lemma 5.2. We have*

$$|\nabla^k(\Phi_i(y, 0) - \theta_1(y))| \leq C(1 + |Y|)^{-k}$$

$$\times \begin{cases} m_i^{-2} & \text{if } 4\sigma \leq n < 4\sigma + 2 \\ \max\{\|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} m_i^{-2 + \frac{2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} (1 + |Y|)^{-\sigma}, m_i^{-2}\} & \text{if } n = 4\sigma + 2, \\ \max\{\|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} m_i^{-2 + \frac{2(n-(4\sigma+2))}{n-2\sigma}} (1 + |Y|)^{4\sigma+2-n}, m_i^{-2}\} & \text{if } n > 4\sigma + 2 \end{cases}$$

for $k = 0, 1$, where $C > 0$ depends only on n, σ, A_0 and A_1 .

Proof. Consider the equation of $\Phi_i - \Theta_i$, and the corollary follows from Lemma 5.2, Lemma 5.2 and estimates of solutions to linear equations. \square

6 Estimates of Pohozaev integral for blow up solutions

Proposition 6.1. *Assume as Lemma 4.6. Assume further that $\|a_i\|_{C^4(B_1)} \leq A_0$. Then for $0 < r < \rho$ there holds*

$$m_i^2 P_\sigma(Y_i, r, U_i) = -m_i^2 Q_\sigma(Y_i, r, U_i, p_i) \geq -C_0 r^{-n} m_i^{-\frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} - C_0 \|a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} r^{4\sigma-n}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{C_1} \begin{cases} \sigma a_i(y_i) \ln(r m_i^{\frac{2}{n-2\sigma}}) & n = 4\sigma, \\ \sigma a_i(y_i) m_i^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma)}{n-2\sigma}} & 4\sigma < n < 4\sigma + 2, \\ \sigma a_i(y_i) m_i^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma)}{n-2\sigma}} + \frac{(\sigma+1)}{2n} \Delta a_i(y_i) \ln(r m_i^{\frac{2}{n-2\sigma}}) & n = 4\sigma + 2, \\ \sigma a_i(y_i) m_i^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma)}{n-2\sigma}} + \frac{(\sigma+1)}{2n} \Delta a_i(y_i) m_i^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}} & 4\sigma + 2 < n < 6\sigma + 2, \\ \beta_i - C_0 \|a_i\|_{B_1} \ln(r m_i^{\frac{2}{n-2\sigma}}) & n = 6\sigma + 2, \\ \beta_i - C_0 \|a_i\|_{B_1} m_i^{\frac{2(n-6\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}} & n > 6\sigma + 2, \end{cases}$$

where $\beta_i := \sigma a_i(y_i) m_i^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma)}{n-2\sigma}} + \frac{(\sigma+1)}{2n} \Delta a_i(y_i) m_i^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}}$, $\|a_i\|_{B_1} := \|a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \|\nabla^4 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}$, $C_0 > 0$ depends only on $n, \sigma, A_0, A_1, \rho$ and independent of r if i is sufficiently large, and $C_1 > 0$ depends only on n and σ .

Proof. By Proposition 4.7, we have

$$P_\sigma(Y_i, r, U_i) = -Q_\sigma(Y_i, r, U_i, p_i) = - \int_{B_r(y_i)} \left((y - y_i)_k \partial_k u_i + \frac{n-2\sigma}{2} u_i \right) a_i u_i \, dy + \mathcal{N}(r, u_i),$$

where

$$\mathcal{N}(r, u_i) = \frac{(n-2\sigma)\tau_i}{2(p_i+1)} \int_{B_r(y_i)} u_i(y)^{p_i+1} \, dy - \frac{r}{p_i+1} \int_{\partial B_r(y_i)} u_i^{p_i+1} \, dS.$$

By Proposition 4.10,

$$m_i^2 \mathcal{N}(r, u_i) \geq -C r^{-n} m_i^{1-p_i}. \quad (54)$$

By change of variables $z = \ell_i(y - y_i)$ with $\ell_i = m_i^{\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_i(r) &:= -m_i^2 \int_{B_r(y_i)} ((y - y_i)_k \partial_k u_i + \frac{n-2\sigma}{2} u_i) a_i u_i \, dy \\ &= -m_i^{4-\frac{n(p_i-1)}{2\sigma}} \int_{B_{\ell_i r}} (z_k \partial_k \phi_i + \frac{n-2\sigma}{2} \phi_i) a_i (y_i + \ell_i^{-1} z) \phi_i \, dz,\end{aligned}$$

where $\phi_i(z) = m_i^{-1} u_i(\ell_i^{-1} z + y_i)$. Let

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_i(r) := -m_i^{4-\frac{n(p_i-1)}{2\sigma}} \int_{B_{\ell_i r}} (z_k \partial_k \theta_1 + \frac{n-2\sigma}{2} \theta_1) a_i (y_i + \ell_i^{-1} z) \theta_1 \, dz.$$

Making use of Corollary 5.4 and Lemma 4.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{E}_i(r) - \hat{\mathcal{E}}_i(r)| &\leq C \|a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} m_i^{2-\frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} \int_{B_{\ell_i r}} \sum_{j=0}^1 |\nabla^j(\phi_i - \theta_1)|(z) (1 + |z|)^{2\sigma-n+j} \, dz \\ &\leq C \|a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \begin{cases} r^{2\sigma} & \text{if } n < 4\sigma + 2, \\ \max\{\|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} r^\sigma, r^{2\sigma}\} & \text{if } n = 4\sigma + 2, \\ \max\{\|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} r^{6\sigma+2-n}, r^{2\sigma}\} & \text{if } 4\sigma + 2 < n < 6\sigma + 2, \\ \max\{\|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \ln(r m_i^{\frac{2}{n-2\sigma}}), r^{2\sigma}\} & \text{if } n = 6\sigma + 2, \\ \max\{\|\nabla^2 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} m_i^{\frac{2(n-6\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}}, r^{2\sigma}\} & \text{if } n > 6\sigma + 2, \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on n, σ, A_0 and A_1 . Next, by direction computations we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathcal{E}}_i(r) &= -m_i^2 \int_{B_r} (y_k \partial_k \theta_{\ell_i} + \frac{n-2\sigma}{2} \theta_{\ell_i}) a_i (y_i + y) \theta_{\ell_i} \, dy \\ &\geq m_i^2 \int_{B_r} (\frac{1}{2} y_k \partial_k a_i (y_i + y) + \sigma a_i (y_i + y)) \theta_{\ell_i}^2 \, dy - C \|a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} r^{4\sigma-n} \\ &\geq m_i^2 \int_{B_r} \left(\sigma a_i (y_i) + (\sigma + \frac{1}{2}) y_k \partial_k a_i (y_i) + (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sigma}{2}) \partial_{kl} a_i (y_i) y_k y_l \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\frac{1}{4} + \frac{\sigma}{6}) \partial_{jkl} a_i (y_i) y_j y_k y_l \right) \theta_{\ell_i}^2 \, dy - C m_i^2 \|\nabla^4 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \int_{B_r} |y|^4 \theta_{\ell_i}^2 \, dy - C \|a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} r^{4\sigma-n} \\ &= m_i^2 \int_{B_r} \left(\sigma a_i (y_i) + \frac{(\sigma + 1)}{2n} \Delta a_i (y_i) |y|^2 \right) \theta_{\ell_i}^2 \, dy \\ &\quad - C m_i^2 \|\nabla^4 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \int_{B_r} |y|^4 \theta_{\ell_i}^2 \, dy - C \|a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} r^{4\sigma-n},\end{aligned}$$

$$m_i^2 \int_{B_r} \left(\sigma a_i(y_i) + \frac{(\sigma+1)}{2n} \Delta a_i(y_i) |y|^2 \right) \theta_{\ell_i}^2 dy \geq \frac{1}{C} \begin{cases} \sigma a_i(y_i) \ln(r m_i^{\frac{2}{n-2\sigma}}) & n = 4\sigma, \\ \sigma a_i(y_i) m_i^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma)}{n-2\sigma}} & 4\sigma < n < 4\sigma + 2, \\ \sigma a_i(y_i) m_i^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma)}{n-2\sigma}} + \frac{(\sigma+1)}{2n} \Delta a_i(y_i) \ln(r m_i^{\frac{2}{n-2\sigma}}) & n = 4\sigma + 2, \\ \sigma a_i(y_i) m_i^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma)}{n-2\sigma}} + \frac{(\sigma+1)}{2n} \Delta a_i(y_i) m_i^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}} & n > 4\sigma + 2 \end{cases}$$

and

$$m_i^2 \int_{B_r} |y|^4 \theta_{\ell_i}^2 dy \leq C \begin{cases} r^{4\sigma+4-n} & n < 4\sigma + 4 \\ \ln(r m_i^{\frac{2}{n-2\sigma}}) & n = 4\sigma + 4, \\ m_i^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma-4)}{n-2\sigma}} & n > 4\sigma + 4, \end{cases}$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on n, σ and $\sup_i \|\nabla^4 a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}$. Since $4\sigma + 4 > 6\sigma + 2$ and

$$-m_i^2 Q_\sigma(Y_i, r, U_i, p_i) \geq \hat{\mathcal{E}}_i(r) - |\mathcal{E}_i(r) - \hat{\mathcal{E}}_i(r)| + m_i^2 \mathcal{N}(r, u_i),$$

the proposition follows immediately. \square

By Proposition 4.10 and local estimates in [26], after passing to a subsequence we have

$$|\partial_y^k (U_i(Y_i) U_i(Y) - U(Y))| + |s^{1-2\sigma} \partial_s (U_i(Y_i) U_i(Y) - U(Y))| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } C^\alpha(\mathcal{B}_1^+ \setminus \mathcal{B}_\rho^+)$$

for $k = 0, 1, 2$, some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and all $\rho > 0$, where $0 \leq U \in W^{1,2}(s^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_1^+ \setminus \mathcal{B}_\rho^+)$ for all $\rho > 0$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla U) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_1^+, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^\sigma} U = aU & \text{on } \partial' \mathcal{B}_1^+ \setminus \{0\} \end{cases} \quad (55)$$

in weak sense. We will still denote the subsequence as U_i . Notice that for every $0 < r < 1$

$$m_i^2 P_\sigma(Y_i, r, U_i) \rightarrow P_\sigma(0, r, U) \quad \text{as } i \rightarrow \infty. \quad (56)$$

Proposition 6.2. *Assume as Lemma 4.3. Suppose that for large i*

- (i) $\beta_i \geq 0$ if $4\sigma + 2 \leq n < 6\sigma + 2$;
- (ii) $\beta_i \geq (C_0 + 1) \|a_i\|_{B_1} \ln m_i$ if $n = 6\sigma + 2$;
- (iii) $\beta_i \geq (C_0 + 1) \|a_i\|_{B_1} m_i^{\frac{2(n-6\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}}$ if $n > 6\sigma + 2$;

where $\beta_i := \sigma a_i(y_i) m_i^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma)}{n-2\sigma}} + \frac{(\sigma+1)}{2n} \Delta a_i(y_i) m_i^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}}$ if $n > 4\sigma + 2$ and $\beta_i := \sigma a_i(y_i) m_i^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma)}{n-2\sigma}} + \frac{(\sigma+1)}{2n} \Delta a_i(y_i) \ln m_i$ if $n = 4\sigma + 2$, $m_i = u_i(y_i)$, and C_0 is the constant in Proposition 6.1 with $\rho = 1$, then, after passing to a subsequence, $y_i \rightarrow 0$ is an isolated simple blow up point of $\{u_i\}$.

Proof. By Proposition 4.4, $r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\bar{u}_i(r)$ has precisely one critical point in the interval $0 < r < r_i := R_i u_i(y_i)^{-\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}}$. If the proposition were wrong, let $\mu_i \geq r_i$ be the second critical point of $r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\bar{u}_i(r)$. Then there must hold

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mu_i = 0. \quad (57)$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $y_i = 0$. Set

$$\phi_i(y) := \mu_i^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} u_i(\mu_i y), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Clearly, ϕ_i satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^\sigma \phi_i &= \mu_i^{2\sigma} a_i(\mu_i y) \phi_i + \phi_i^{p_i}, \\ |y|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \phi_i(y) &\leq \tilde{C}, \quad |y| < 1/\mu_i, \\ \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \phi_i(0) &= \infty, \end{aligned}$$

$r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\bar{\phi}_i(r)$ has precisely one critical point in $0 < r < 1$,

and

$$\frac{d}{dr} \left\{ r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \bar{\phi}_i(r) \right\} \Big|_{r=1} = 0,$$

where $\bar{\phi}_i(r) = |\partial B_r|^{-1} \int_{\partial B_r} \phi_i$. Denote $\tilde{a}_i(y)$ by $\mu_i^{2\sigma} a_i(\mu_i y)$.

Therefore, 0 is an isolated simple blow up point of ϕ_i . Let $\Phi_i(Y)$ be the extension of $\phi_i(y)$ in the upper half space. Then Lemma 4.3, Proposition 4.10, Proposition 3.4 and estimates for linear equations in [26] imply that

$$\Phi_i(0)\Phi_i(Y) \rightarrow G(Y) = A|Y|^{2\sigma-n} + H(Y) \quad \text{in } C_{loc}^\alpha(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} \setminus \{0\}) \cap C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}), \quad (58)$$

and

$$\phi_i(0)\phi_i(y) \rightarrow G(y, 0) = A|y|^{2\sigma-n} + H(y, 0) \quad \text{in } C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}) \quad (59)$$

as $i \rightarrow \infty$, where $A > 0$, $H(Y)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla H) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^\sigma} H(y, 0) = 0 & \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

in weak sense.

Note that $G(Y)$ is nonnegative, we have $\liminf_{|Y| \rightarrow \infty} H(Y) \geq 0$. It follows from the weak maximum principle and the Harnack inequality that $H(y) \equiv H \geq 0$ is a constant. Since

$$\frac{d}{dr} \left\{ r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \phi_i(0) \bar{\phi}_i(r) \right\} \Big|_{r=1} = \phi_i(0) \frac{d}{dr} \left\{ r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \bar{\phi}_i(r) \right\} \Big|_{r=1} = 0,$$

we have, by sending i to ∞ and making use of (59), that

$$A = H > 0.$$

By (58) and the interior estimates for linear equation in [26], we have

$$\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_i(0)^2 P_\sigma(0, \delta, \Phi_i) = P_\sigma(0, \delta, G) = -\frac{(n-2\sigma)^2}{2} A^2 \int_{\partial^\nu B_1^+} t^{1-2\sigma} < 0. \quad (60)$$

If $n < 6\sigma + 2$, by Proposition 6.1 and item (i) in the assumptions we have

$$\liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_i(0)^2 P_\sigma(0, \delta, \Phi_i) \geq 0.$$

This contradicts to (60). Hence $y_i \rightarrow 0$ has to be an isolated simple blow up point of $\{u_i\}$ upon passing to a subsequence.

If $n \geq 6\sigma + 2$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\beta}_i &:= \sigma \tilde{a}_i(y_i) \Phi_i(0)^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma)}{n-2\sigma}} + \frac{(\sigma+1)}{2n} \Delta \tilde{a}_i(y_i) \Phi_i(0)^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}} \\ &= (1+o(1)) \mu_i^{n-2\sigma} \beta_i. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\tilde{a}_i\|_{C^4(B_1)} \leq \mu_i^{2\sigma} A_0$ and $\|\tilde{a}_i\|_{B_1} \leq \mu_i^{4\sigma+2} \|a_i\|_{B_1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{\beta}_i - C_0 \|\tilde{a}_i\|_{B_1} \ln \Phi_i(0) - C_0 \|\tilde{a}_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \delta^{4\sigma-n} \\ &\geq (1+o(1)) \mu_i^{4\sigma+2} \beta_i - C_0 \mu_i^{4\sigma+2} \|a_i\|_{B_1} \ln m_i - C_0 \|\tilde{a}_i\|_{B_1} \ln \mu_i^{\frac{2\sigma}{p_i-1}} - C_0 \mu_i^{2\sigma} \|a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \delta^{4\sigma-n} \\ &\geq (1+o(1)) \mu_i^{4\sigma+2} (C_0 + 1) \|a_i\|_{B_1} \ln m_i - C_0 \mu_i^{4\sigma+2} \|a_i\|_{B_1} \ln m_i - C_0 \|\tilde{a}_i\|_{B_1} \ln \mu_i^{\frac{2\sigma}{p_i-1}} \\ &\quad - C_0 \mu_i^{2\sigma} \|a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \delta^{4\sigma-n} \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

for $n = 6\sigma + 2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{\beta}_i - C_0 \|\tilde{a}_i\|_{B_1} \Phi_i(0)^{\frac{2(n-6\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}} - C_0 \|\tilde{a}_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \delta^{4\sigma-n} \\ &\geq (1+o(1)) \mu_i^{n-2\sigma} \beta_i - C_0 (1+o(1)) \mu_i^{n-2\sigma} \|a_i\|_{B_1} m_i^{\frac{2(n-6\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}} - C_0 \mu_i^{2\sigma} \|a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \delta^{4\sigma-n} \\ &\geq (1+o(1)) \mu_i^{n-2\sigma} (C_0 + 1) \|a_i\|_{B_1} m_i^{\frac{2(n-6\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}} - C_0 (1+o(1)) \mu_i^{n-2\sigma} \|a_i\|_{B_1} m_i^{\frac{2(n-6\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}} \\ &\quad - C_0 \mu_i^{2\sigma} \|a_i\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \delta^{4\sigma-n} \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

for $n > 6\sigma + 2$. By Proposition 6.1

$$\liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_i(0)^2 P_\sigma(0, \delta, \Phi_i) \geq 0.$$

This contradicts to (60). Hence $y_i \rightarrow 0$ has to be an isolated simple blow up point of $\{u_i\}$ upon passing to a subsequence.

Therefore, we complete the proof of Proposition 6.2. \square

Remark 6.3. *Note that*

1. From (61) and (62), we say assumptions (ii) and (iii) in Proposition 6.2 are scaling invariant.
2. Either $a_i > \frac{1}{C}$ in B_1 for some $C > 0$ or $a_i \geq 0$ and $\Delta a_i \geq 1/C$ on $\{x : a_i(x) < d\} \cap B_2$ for some constant $d > 0$ when $n \geq 4\sigma + 2$, then the assumptions (ii) and (iii) in Proposition 6.2 hold automatically.

7 Proof of the main theorems

Let $u \in C^2(B_3) \cap \mathcal{L}_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a solution of

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma u - a(x)u = u^p \quad \text{in } B_3, \quad u > 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (63)$$

where $a(x) \in C^2(B_3)$ and $1 < p \leq \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}$.

Proposition 7.1. *Assume as above. Then for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $R > 1$, there exists large positive constants C_1 and C_2 depending only on $n, \sigma, \|a\|_{C^2(B_2)}, \varepsilon$ and R such that the following statement holds. If*

$$\max_{\bar{B}_2} \text{dist}(x, \partial B_2)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}} u(x) \geq C_1,$$

then $p \geq \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma} - \varepsilon$ and a finite set S of local maximum points of u in B_2 such that:

(i). For any $y \in S$, it holds

$$\|u(y)^{-1} u(u(y)^{\frac{p-1}{2\sigma}} x + y) - (1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{2\sigma-n}{2}}\|_{C^2(B_{2R})} < \varepsilon,$$

where $\bar{c} > 0$ depends only on n, σ .

(ii). If $y_1, y_2 \in S$ and $y_1 \neq y_2$, then

$$B_{Ru(y_1)^{(1-p)/2\sigma}}(y_1) \cap B_{Ru(y_2)^{(1-p)/2\sigma}}(y_2) = \emptyset.$$

(iii). $u(x) \leq C_2 \text{dist}(x, S)^{-2\sigma/(p-1)}$ for all $x \in B_2$.

The proof is standard by now, which follows from the blow-up argument as the proof of Proposition 4.4 and Liouville theorem in Jin-Li-Xiong [26]. We omit it here.

Proposition 7.2. *Let $u \in C^2(B_3) \cap \mathcal{L}_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a solution of (63) with $0 \leq a \in C^4(B_3)$. Suppose that $\Delta a \geq 0$ on $\{x : a(x) < d\} \cap B_2$ for some constant $d > 0$, and further that $\Delta a > \gamma > 0$ on $\{x : a(x) < d\} \cap B_2$ for some constant γ if $n \geq 6\sigma + 2$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $R > 1$, once $\max_{\bar{B}_2} \text{dist}(x, \partial B_2)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}} u(x) \geq C_1$ with the constant C_1 given by Proposition 7.1 there must be true*

$$|y_1 - y_2| \geq \delta^* > 0 \quad \text{for every } y_1, y_2 \in S \cap B_{3/2},$$

where S associated to u is also given by Proposition 7.1, and the constant δ^* depends only on $n, \sigma, d, \gamma, \varepsilon, R$ and $\|a\|_{C^4(B_3)}$.

Proof. The idea is similar to that of Proposition 5.2 of [26] on the unit sphere, but Lemma 2.1 have to be used since our equation is defined in a bounded domain with boundary. Suppose the contrary, for some ε, R and $d > 0$, there exist sequence $\{p_i\}$ and nonnegative potentials $a_i \rightarrow a$ in $C^4(B_3)$ with $\|a_i\|_{C^4(B_3)} \leq A_0$, satisfying the assumptions for a , and a sequence of corresponding solutions $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \min_{j \neq l} |z_{i,j} - z_{i,l}| = 0,$$

where $z_{i,j}, z_{i,l} \in S_i \cap B_{3/2}$ associated to u_i defined in Proposition 7.1.

Upon passing to a subsequence, we assume $z_{i,j}, z_{i,l} \rightarrow \bar{z} \in \bar{B}_{3/2}$. Define $f_i(z) : S_i \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ by $f_i(z) = \min_{y \in S_i \setminus \{z\}} |z - y|$. Let $R_i \rightarrow \infty$ with $R_i f_i(z_{i,j}) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. By Lemma 2.1, one can find, say, $z_{i,1} \in S_i \cap B_{2R_i f_i(z_{i,j})}(z_{i,j})$ satisfying

$$f_i(z_{i,1}) \leq (2R_i + 1)f_i(z_{i,j}) \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{z \in S_i \cap B_{R_i f_i(z_{i,1})}(z_{i,1})} f_i(z) \geq \frac{1}{2}f_i(z_{i,1}).$$

Let $|z_{i,2} - z_{i,1}| = f(z_{i,1})$. Let U_i be the extension of u_i and

$$\Phi_i(X) = f_i(z_{i,1})^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} U_i(f_i(z_{i,1})X + Z_{i,1}) \quad \text{with } Z_{i,1} = (z_{i,1}, 0).$$

The rest of the proof is divided into three steps:

1. Prove that 0 and $x_i := f_i(z_{i,1})^{-1}(z_{i,2} - z_{i,1}) \rightarrow \bar{x}$ with $|\bar{x}| = 1$ are two isolated blow up points of $\{\Phi_i(x, 0)\}$.
2. By Proposition 6.2, after passing to a subsequence 0 and $x_i \rightarrow \bar{x}$ have to be isolated simple blow up points of $\{\Phi_i(x, 0)\}$.
3. Since $\Phi_i(0)\Phi_i(X)$ tends to a Green function with at least two poles, we can drive a contradiction by Pohozaev identity.

For step 1 and 3, see the proof of Proposition 5.2 of [26]. For step 2, we let

$$\tilde{a}_i(x) := f_i(z_{i,1})^{2\sigma} a_i(f_i(z_{i,1})x + z_{i,1})$$

and verify assumptions in Proposition 6.2. We only show it if $n \geq 6\sigma + 2$. By the assumption of a_i , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sigma \tilde{a}_i(0)\Phi_i(0)^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma)}{n-2\sigma}} + \frac{\sigma+1}{2n} \Delta \tilde{a}_i(0)\Phi_i(0)^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}}}{\|\tilde{a}_i\|_{B_{1/2}}} \\ & \geq \Phi_i(0)^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}} \|a_i\|_{B_2}^{-1} \left\{ \sigma a_i(z_{i,1})\Phi_i(0)^{\frac{4}{n-2\sigma}} f_i(z_{i,1})^{-2} + \frac{\sigma+1}{2n} \Delta a_i(z_{i,1}) \right\} \\ & \geq \Phi_i(0)^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}} \|a_i\|_{B_2}^{-1} \frac{\sigma+1}{2n} \cdot \gamma \quad \text{for large } i. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\frac{\Phi_i(0)^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}} \|a_i\|_{B_2}^{-1} \frac{\sigma+1}{2n} \cdot \gamma}{\ln \Phi_i(0)} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{if } n = 6\sigma + 2$$

and

$$\frac{\Phi_i(0)^{\frac{2(n-4\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}} \|a_i\|_{B_2}^{-1} \frac{\sigma+1}{2n} \cdot \gamma}{\Phi_i(0)^{\frac{2(n-6\sigma-2)}{n-2\sigma}}} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{if } n > 6\sigma + 2,$$

by Proposition 6.2 0 is an isolated simple blow up point of $\{\Phi_i(\cdot, 0)\}$. Similarly, one can show $x_i \rightarrow \bar{x}$ is an isolated simple blow up point of $\{\Phi_i(\cdot, 0)\}$.

Therefore, we complete the proof of Proposition 7.2. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We first prove that $\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{5/4})} \leq C$. Suppose the contrary that there exists a sequence of solutions u_i of (4) satisfying $\|u_i\|_{L^\infty(B_{5/4})} \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small and $R \gg 1$, by Proposition 7.2 the set S_i associated to u_i defined by Proposition 7.1 only consists of finite many points in $B_{3/2}$ with a uniform positive lower bound of distances between each two points, if $S_i \cap B_{3/2}$ has points more than 1. By the contradiction assumption $\|u_i\|_{L^\infty(B_{5/4})} \rightarrow \infty$ and Proposition 7.1, $S_i \cap B_{11/8}$ is not empty and has only isolated blow up points of $\{u_i\}$ after passing to a subsequence. By Proposition 6.2, these isolated blow up points have to be isolated simple blow up points. Suppose that $y_i \rightarrow \bar{y} \in \bar{B}_{11/8}$ is an isolated simple blow up point of $\{u_i\}$. Let U_i be the extensions of u_i and $Y_i = (y_i, 0)$. By Proposition 4.10, we have

$$|U_i(Y_i)^2 P_\sigma(Y_i, r, U_i)| \leq C(r).$$

On the other hand, by the assumption of a and Proposition 6.1 we have

$$\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} U_i(Y_i)^2 P_\sigma(Y_i, r, U_i) = \infty \quad \text{for some small } r > 0$$

if $n \geq 4\sigma$. Hence, we obtain a contraction and thus $\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{5/4})} \leq C$. The theorem then follows from interior estimates of solutions of linear equations in [26]. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small and $R \gg 1$ let S_i be the set associated to u_i defined by Proposition 7.1.

If $4\sigma + 2 \leq n < 6\sigma + 2$, by Proposition 7.2 the set S_i associated to u_i defined by Proposition 7.1 only consists of finite many points in $B_{3/2}$. Since $u_i(x_i) \rightarrow \infty$ and $x_i \rightarrow \bar{x}$, by item (iii) of Proposition 7.1, after passing to subsequence, there exists $S_i \ni x'_i \rightarrow \bar{x}$ is an isolated blow up point of $\{u_i\}$. By Proposition 6.2, it has to be an isolated simple blow up point. Let U_i be the extensions of u_i and $X'_i = (x'_i, 0)$. By Proposition 4.10, we have

$$|U_i(X'_i)^2 P_\sigma(X'_i, r, U_i)| \leq C(r).$$

By Proposition 6.1, we establish the theorem for $4\sigma + 2 \leq n < 6\sigma + 2$.

If $n \geq 6\sigma + 2$, suppose the contrary that, for some subsequence which we still denote as i ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma a_i(x_i) u_i(x_i)^{\frac{4}{n-2\sigma}} + \frac{\sigma+1}{2n} \Delta a_i(x_i) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{|o(1)|} \begin{cases} u_i(x_i)^{\frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} \ln u_i(x_i)^{-1} & \text{for } n = 6\sigma + 2, \\ u_i(x_i)^{\frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} & \text{for } n > 6\sigma + 2. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Let $\mu_i = \text{dist}\{x_i, S_i \setminus \{x_i\}\}$ and

$$\Phi_i(X) = \mu_i^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}} U_i(\mu_i X + X_i),$$

where U_i is the extension of u_i and $X_i = (x_i, 0)$. If $x_i \notin S_i$, we have $u_i(x_i) \leq C \mu_i^{-\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}$. Hence, $\Phi_i(0) \leq C < \infty$ and $\mu_i \rightarrow 0$. Since $\max_{B_{\bar{d}}(x_i)} u_i(x) \leq \bar{b} u_i(x_i)$, $\Phi_i(x, 0) \leq C \bar{b}$ for all $|x| \leq \bar{d}/\mu_i$.

By the argument of proof of Proposition 4.4, for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\lambda > 0$,

$$\Phi_i(x, 0) \rightarrow \left(\frac{\lambda}{1 + \bar{c}\lambda^2 |x - x_0|^2} \right)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}} \quad \text{in } C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Note that the limiting function has only one critical point. Suppose $z_i \in S_i$ satisfying $|z_i - x_i| = \mu_i$. Since x_i and z_i both are local maximum points of $\{u_i\}$, $\nabla\Phi_i(0) = 0$ and, after passing to subsequence,

$$\frac{z_i - x_i}{\mu_i} \rightarrow \bar{x} \text{ with } |\bar{x}| = 1, \quad 0 = \nabla_x \Phi_i\left(\frac{z_i - x_i}{\mu_i}, 0\right).$$

We obtain a contradiction. Hence, $x_i \in S_i$. It follows that 0 is an isolated blow up point of $\{\Phi_i(x, 0)\}$. By Remark 6.3 and contradiction assumption (64), 0 is an isolated simple blow up point. Making use of Proposition 4.10 and Proposition 6.1 we obtain contradiction again.

Therefore, we complete the proof. □

References

- [1] S. Almaraz, *A compactness theorem for scalar-flat metrics on manifolds with boundary*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **41** (2011), 341–386.
- [2] S. Almaraz, *Blow-up phenomena for scalar-flat metrics on manifolds with boundary*. J. Differential Equations **251** (2011), no. 7, 1813–1840.
- [3] K. Bogdan, K. Burdzy and Z. Chen, *Censored stable processes*. Probab. Theory Related Fields **127** (2003), 89–152.
- [4] S. Brendle, *Blow up phenomena for the Yamabe equation*. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **21** (4) (2008), 951–979.
- [5] S. Brendle and F. C. Marques, *Blow up phenomena for the Yamabe equation. II*. J. Differential Geom. **81** (2) (2009), 225–250.
- [6] X. Cabré and Y. Sire, *Nonlinear equations for fractional Laplacians I: Regularity, maximum principles, and Hamiltonian estimates*. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **31** (2014), no.1, 23–53.
- [7] X. Cabré and J. Tan, *Positive solutions of nonlinear problems involving the square root of the Laplacian*. Adv. Math. **224** (2010) 2052–2093.
- [8] L. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre, *An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations **32** (2007), no. 7-9, 1245–1260.
- [9] A. Capella, J. Dávila, L. Dupaigne and Y. Sire, *Regularity of radial extremal solutions for some non-local semilinear equations*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations **36** (2011), no. 8, 1353–1384.
- [10] J. S. Case and S.-Y. A. Chang, *On fractional GJMS operators*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **69** (2016), no. 6, 1017–1061.
- [11] S.-Y. A. Chang and M. González, *Fractional Laplacian in conformal geometry*. Adv. Math. **226** (2011), no. 2, 1410–1432.
- [12] Z-Q. Chen and T. Kumagai, *Heat Kernel Estimates for Stable-like Process on d -Sets*. Stochastic Process Appl. **108** (2003), 27–62.
- [13] C.C. Chen and C.S. Lin, *Estimates of the scalar curvature equation via the method of moving planes*. J. Differential Geom. **49** (1998) 115–178.
- [14] G. Devillanova and S. Solimini, *Concentration estimates and multiple solutions to elliptic problems at critical growth*. Adv. Differential Equations **7** (2002), no. 10, 1257–1280.
- [15] J. F. Escobar, *Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to a scalar flat metric with constant mean curvature on the boundary*. Ann. of Math. (2) **136** (1992), no. 1, 1–50.
- [16] Y. Fang and M. d. M. Gonzalez, *Asymptotic behavior of Palais-Smale sequences associated with fractional Yamabe type equations*. Pacific J. Math. **278** (2015), 369–405.
- [17] V. Felli and M. Ould Ahmedou, *Compactness results in conformal deformations of Riemannian metrics on manifolds with boundaries*. Math. Z. **244** (2003), no. 1, 175–210.
- [18] R. Frank, T. Jin and J. Xiong, *Minimizers for the fractional Sobolev inequality*. Preprint.
- [19] B. Gidas and J. Spruck, *A priori bounds for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations **6** (1981), no. 8, 883–901.

- [20] M. d. M. González and J. Qing, *Fractional conformal Laplacians and fractional Yamabe problems*. Analysis and PDE **6** (2013), 1535–1576.
- [21] M. d. M. González and M. Wang, *Further results on the fractional Yamabe problem: the umbilic case*. Journal of Geometric Analysis to appear.
- [22] C.R. Graham and M. Zworski, *Scattering matrix in conformal geometry*. Invent. Math. **152** (2003), 89–118.
- [23] Q. Guan, *Integration by parts formula for regional fractional Laplacian*. Comm. Math. Phys. **266** (2006), 289–329.
- [24] Q. Guan and Z. Ma, *Reflected symmetric α -stable processes and regional fractional Laplacian*. Probab. Theory Related Fields **134** (2006), 649–694.
- [25] E. Hebey, *Compactness and stability for nonlinear elliptic equations*. Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2014. x+291 pp.
- [26] T. Jin, Y.Y. Li and J. Xiong, *On a fractional Nirenberg problem, part I: blow up analysis and compactness of solutions*. J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **16** (2014), no. 6, 1111–1171.
- [27] —, *The Nirenberg problem and its generalizations: A unified approach*. Math Ann. online.
- [28] T. Jin and J. Xiong, *Sharp constants in weighted trace inequalities on Riemannian manifolds*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **48** (2013), 555–585.
- [29] S. Kim, M. Musso and J. Wei, *Existence theorems of the fractional Yamabe problem*. Preprint at arXiv:1603.06617.
- [30] S. Kim, M. Musso and J. Wei, *A non-compactness result on the fractional Yamabe problem in large dimensions*. Preprint at arXiv:1505.06183.
- [31] M.A. Khuri, F.C. Marques and R. Schoen, *A compactness theorem for the Yamabe problem*. J. Differential Geom. **81** (1) (2009), 143–196.
- [32] Y.Y. Li and J. Xiong, *Compactness of conformal metrics with constant Q -curvature. I*. Preprint, arXiv:1506.00739.
- [33] Y.Y. Li and L. Zhang, *Compactness of solutions to the Yamabe problem II*. Calc. Var. and PDEs **25** (2005), 185–237.
- [34] —: *Compactness of solutions to the Yamabe problem III*. J. Funct. Anal. **245** (2006), 438–474.
- [35] Y.Y. Li, M. Zhu, *Yamabe type equations on three dimensional Riemannian manifolds*. Communications in Contemporary Math. **1** (1999), 1–50.
- [36] F. C. Marques, *A priori estimates for the Yamabe problem in the non-locally conformally flat case*. J. Differential Geom. **71** (2005), 315–346.
- [37] —: *Blow-up examples for the Yamabe problem*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **36** (2009), no. 3, 377–397.
- [38] C. Mou and Y. Yi, *Interior regularity for regional fractional Laplacian*. Comm. Math. Phys. **340** (2015), no. 1, 233–251.
- [39] R. Schoen, *A report on some recent progress on nonlinear problems in geometry*. in Surveys in differential geometry (Cambridge, MA, 1990), 201–241, Lehigh Univ., Bethlehem, PA.
- [40] J. Tan and J. Xiong, *A Harnack inequality for fractional Laplace equations with lower order terms*. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **31** (2011), 975–983.
- [41] S. Yan, J. Yang and X. Yu, *Equations involving fractional Laplacian operator: compactness and application*. J. Funct. Anal. **269** (2015), no. 1, 47–79.

School of Mathematical Sciences, Beijing Normal University
Beijing 100875, China

Email: miaomiaoni@mail.bnu.edu.cn (M.N);
201321130137@mail.bnu.edu.cn (Z.P);
jx@bnu.edu.cn (J.X)