

BLOWUP ANALYSIS FOR INTEGRAL EQUATIONS ON BOUNDED DOMAINS

QIANQIAO GUO

ABSTRACT. Consider the integral equation

$$f^{q-1}(x) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{f(y)}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy, \quad f(x) > 0, \quad x \in \overline{\Omega},$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a smooth bounded domain. For $1 < \alpha < n$, the existence of energy maximizing positive solution in subcritical case $2 < q < \frac{2n}{n+\alpha}$, and nonexistence of energy maximizing positive solution in critical case $q = \frac{2n}{n+\alpha}$ are proved in [6]. For $\alpha > n$, the existence of energy minimizing positive solution in subcritical case $0 < q < \frac{2n}{n+\alpha}$, and nonexistence of energy minimizing positive solution in critical case $q = \frac{2n}{n+\alpha}$ are also proved in [4]. Based on these, in this paper, the blowup behaviour of energy maximizing positive solution as $q \rightarrow (\frac{2n}{n+\alpha})^+$ (in the case of $1 < \alpha < n$), and the blowup behaviour of energy minimizing positive solution as $q \rightarrow (\frac{2n}{n+\alpha})^-$ (in the case of $\alpha > n$) are analyzed. We see that for $1 < \alpha < n$ the blowup behaviour obtained is quite similar to that of the elliptic equation involving subcritical Sobolev exponent. But for $\alpha > n$, different phenomena appears.

Keywords Blowup analysis, Integral equation, Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality, Reversed Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 45G05, 35B09, 35B44

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we consider the integral equation

$$(\mathcal{P}_q) \quad f^{q-1}(x) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{f(y)}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy, \quad f(x) > 0, \quad x \in \overline{\Omega},$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a smooth bounded domain.

The equation (\mathcal{P}_q) is quite similar to the classical scalar curvature equation, but with a global defined boundary condition. The study of this integral equation was called to our attention by Li in [14], where he was studying the global defined integral equations. This nonlocal equation is also much closer to the integral curvature equation introduced by Zhu in [19]. In [6] and [4], the existence of extremal energy solution as well as the nonexistence (on star-shaped domains) of positive solutions to (\mathcal{P}_q) are studied for $1 < \alpha < n$ and $\alpha > n$ respectively. In particular as q going to the critical exponent $q_{\alpha} := \frac{2n}{n+\alpha}$, the sequence of extremal energy solutions usually do not converge in L^{∞} sense. In this paper, we would like to analyze how does the sequence of extremal energy solutions blow up in both cases $1 < \alpha < n$ and $\alpha > n$.

For simplicity, we denote $p_{\alpha} := \frac{2n}{n-\alpha}$, the conjugate exponent of q_{α} .

1.1. **For** $1 < \alpha < n$. In this case the integral equation (\mathcal{P}_q) is the Euler-Lagrange equation for the maximizer (if the supremum is attained) of

$$\xi_{\alpha,q}(\Omega) := \sup_{f \in L^q(\Omega), f \neq 0} \frac{\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} f(x)|x-y|^{-(n-\alpha)} f(y) dx dy}{\|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^2}.$$

Due to the classical sharp Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev (HLS for short) inequality [11, 12, 18, 15], one can show (see, for example, Dou and Zhu [6]) that $\xi_{\alpha,q}(\Omega)$ is not attained by any functions in any smooth domain $\Omega \neq \mathbb{R}^n$, but $\xi_{\alpha,q}(\Omega)$ is always attained by a maximizer $f \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, $f > 0$, in the subcritical case $q_{\alpha} < q < 2$ in any smooth bounded domain Ω .

This indicates that, for smooth bounded domain Ω , the integral equation (\mathcal{P}_q) admits an energy maximizing positive solution (i.e., a positive solution which is also a maximizer to $\xi_{\alpha,q}(\Omega)$) $f_q \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ in the subcritical case $q_{\alpha} < q < 2$, but does not admit any energy maximizing positive solution in the critical case $q = q_{\alpha}$.

Based on these, we claim that the energy maximizing positive solution f_q must blow up as $q \rightarrow (q_{\alpha})^+$, that is, $\max_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} f_q \rightarrow \infty$ as $q \rightarrow (q_{\alpha})^+$ (see (i) of the following

Theorem 1.1). In this paper we will study the blowup behaviour of f_q as $q \rightarrow (q_{\alpha})^+$.

To compare with the semilinear elliptic equation, we denote $u_q(x) := f_q^{q-1}(x)$, which is a positive solution to

$$u(x) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1}(y)}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy, \quad u(x) > 0, \quad x \in \overline{\Omega}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = 1$. For convenience we also call u_q an energy maximizing positive solution to (1.1). Notice that $q_{\alpha} < q < 2$ is equivalent to $2 < p < p_{\alpha}$ and $q \rightarrow (q_{\alpha})^+$ is equivalent to $p \rightarrow (p_{\alpha})^-$. The first result of this paper is as following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\alpha \in (1, n)$ and Ω a smooth bounded domain. For $q_{\alpha} < q < 2$, if u_q is an energy maximizing positive solution to (1.1), then as $q \rightarrow (q_{\alpha})^+$, up to a subsequence,*

(i). $\max_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} u_q(x) := u_q(x_q) \rightarrow \infty$, and x_q will stay away from $\partial\Omega$.

(ii). $u_q(x) \leq C \left(\frac{\mu_q}{\mu_q^2 + |x-x_q|^2} \right)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}$, where $\mu_q = u_q^{-\frac{p-2}{\alpha}}(x_q)$.

(iii). $u_q(x_q)u_q(x) \rightarrow \frac{\sigma_{n,\alpha}}{|x-x_0|^{n-\alpha}}$ if $x \neq x_0$, $x \in \overline{\Omega}$, where x_0 is the unique point such that $x_q \rightarrow x_0$, and $\sigma_{n,\alpha} = \left(\pi^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n+\alpha}{2})} \right)^{\frac{\alpha-n}{\alpha}}$.

For the semi-linear elliptic equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = n(n-2)u^{p-1}, & u > 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 3$) is a smooth bounded domain, $p \in (2, 2^*)$, $2^* := \frac{2n}{n-2}$ is the critical Sobolev exponent, the blowup behaviour of the extremal energy positive solutions as $p \rightarrow (2^*)^-$ (i.e., the sequence of positive solutions which is a minimizing sequence for the Sobolev inequality) has been studied extensively, see for example [1, 9, 10, 16, 17]. Comparing with the semi-linear elliptic equation, no accurate form of the Green's function corresponding to the integral equation (1.1) can be used directly, which is the big difference. Again due to this difference, unlike what has been proved by Flucher and Wei [9] for the semi-linear elliptic equation (1.2), the location of the blowup point x_0 is still not clear in Theorem 1.1, which is our

next concern. Another difference comes from the nonlocal property of the integral equation (1.1). Thus some different techniques are needed even we follow the line of [10].

1.2. **For $\alpha > n$.** In this case the integral equation (\mathcal{P}_q) is the Euler-Lagrange equation for the minimizer (if the infimum is attained) of

$$\widehat{\xi}_{\alpha,q}(\Omega) = \inf_{f \in L^q(\Omega), f \geq 0, f \neq 0} \frac{\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} f(x) |x-y|^{-(n-\alpha)} f(y) dx dy}{\|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^2},$$

where we still denote $L^q(\Omega) := \{f \mid \int_{\Omega} |f|^q dx < \infty\}$, and $\|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)} := (\int_{\Omega} |f|^q dx)^{\frac{1}{q}}$ even it is not a norm for $0 < q \leq q_{\alpha} < 1$.

Due to the sharp reversed HLS inequality [7], we have proved in [4] that $\xi_{\alpha,q_{\alpha}}(\Omega)$ is not attained by any functions in smooth domain $\Omega \neq \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\xi_{\alpha,q}(\Omega)$ is always attained by a minimizer $f \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, $f > 0$, in the subcritical case $0 < q < q_{\alpha}$ in any smooth bounded domain Ω . That is, for smooth bounded domain Ω , the integral equation (\mathcal{P}_q) admits an energy minimizing positive solution (i.e., a positive solution which is a minimizer to $\widehat{\xi}_{\alpha}(\Omega)$) $f_q \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ in the subcritical case $0 < q < q_{\alpha}$, but admits no any energy minimizing positive solution in the critical case $q = q_{\alpha}$.

Hence, for $\alpha > n$, we again claim that the energy minimizing positive solution f_q to (\mathcal{P}_q) must blow up as $q \rightarrow (q_{\alpha})^-$, that is, $\max_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} f_q \rightarrow +\infty$ as $q \rightarrow (q_{\alpha})^-$ (see (i) of the following Theorem 1.2). Then it is interesting to study the blowup behaviour of the energy minimizing positive solution f_q to (\mathcal{P}_q) as $q \rightarrow (q_{\alpha})^-$.

Denote $u_q(x) = f_q^{q-1}(x)$. Then u_q satisfies (1.1) and, for convenience, we also call u_q an energy minimizing positive solution. Notice that $0 < q < q_{\alpha}$ is equivalent to $p_{\alpha} < p < 0$ and $q \rightarrow (q_{\alpha})^-$ is equivalent to $p \rightarrow (p_{\alpha})^+$.

We point out that when $\alpha > n$ the integral equation (1.1) is of negative power. We have the following analogue of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\alpha > n$ and Ω a smooth bounded domain. For $0 < q < q_{\alpha}$, if u_q is an energy minimizing positive solution to (1.1), then as $q \rightarrow (q_{\alpha})^-$, up to a subsequence,*

- (i). $\min_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} u_q(x) := u_q(x_q) \rightarrow 0$, and x_q will stay away from $\partial\Omega$.
- (ii). $u_q(x) \geq C \left(\frac{\mu_q}{\mu_q^2 + |x - x_q|^2} \right)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}$, where $\mu_q = u_q^{-\frac{p-2}{\alpha}}(x_q)$.
- (iii). $u_q(x_q) u_q(x) \rightarrow \frac{\sigma_{n,\alpha}}{|x-x_0|^{n-\alpha}}$ if $x \neq x_0$, $x \in \overline{\Omega}$, where $x_0 \in \Omega$ is the unique point such that $x_q \rightarrow x_0$.

For $n = 1, \alpha = 2$, similar blowup analysis for the following semilinear elliptic equation with negative power

$$4u_{\theta\theta} + u = R(\theta)u^{-3+\epsilon}, \quad u > 0, \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^1$$

was carried out in [13] and [8], where $0 < \epsilon < 2$. As in [8] we call x_0 in Theorem 1.2 the blowup point of u_q , which is actually the most important point since $u_q(x_0) \rightarrow 0$ and $u_q(x) \rightarrow \infty$ for $x \neq x_0, x \in \overline{\Omega}$, as $q \rightarrow (q_{\alpha})^-$. We can see that for $\alpha > n$, the negative power does bring some differences (for example, no Nash-Moser iteration can be used) comparing with the case $1 < \alpha < n$ in carrying out the blowup analysis.

2. BLOWUP BEHAVIOUR FOR $\alpha \in (1, n)$

Proof of (i) of Theorem 1.1. Let $u_q(x_q) := \max_{\overline{\Omega}} u_q(x)$. We first prove $u_q(x_q) \rightarrow \infty$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$. By contrary, we assume $u_q(x) \leq C$ uniformly, then by the results in [6] it is easy to see that the C^1 norm of $u_q(x)$ is also uniformly bounded, thus $u_q(x)$ is equicontinuous. Then we conclude that $u_q(x) \rightarrow u^*(x) \geq 0$ pointwise as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$ and $u^*(x)$ is a nonnegative solution to (1.1). So $f^* = (u^*)^{p_\alpha-1}$ is a nonnegative solution to (\mathcal{P}_{q_α}) . Notice that $f_q = u_q^{p_\alpha-1}$ is the energy maximizing positive solution to (\mathcal{P}_q) , and $\xi_{\alpha,q}(\Omega) \rightarrow \xi_{\alpha,q_\alpha}(\Omega) > 0$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$ (see [6]). Then

$$\|f_q\|_{L^q(\Omega)} = (\xi_{\alpha,q}(\Omega))^{\frac{1}{q-2}} \geq \frac{(\xi_{\alpha,q_\alpha}(\Omega))^{\frac{1}{q_\alpha-2}}}{2} > 0 \quad (2.1)$$

as q close to q_α and $\|f_q\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \rightarrow \|f^*\|_{L^{q_\alpha}(\Omega)}$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$. So $f^* \not\equiv 0$ and thus is positive pointwise, and f^* is an energy maximizing positive solution to (\mathcal{P}_{q_α}) , which is obviously of C^1 . Hence we obtain a contradiction.

So we have $u_q(x_q) \rightarrow \infty$, and $x_q \rightarrow x_0 \in \overline{\Omega}$, up to a subsequence.

Now we prove that x_q will stay away from $\partial\Omega$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$. For simplicity, in this part below we write u instead of u_q , f instead of f_q .

(I). The domain Ω is strictly convex.

By using the method of moving planes to integral equation (1.1), which is omitted here since it is similar to Theorem 3.4 in [6] (see also [3]), we can prove that there exist $t_0 > 0, \alpha > 0$ depending on the domain only, such that for every $x \in \partial\Omega$, $u(x - t\nu)$ is increasing in $t \in [0, t_0]$, where $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n, |\nu| = 1$ satisfying $(\nu, \vec{n}(x)) \geq \alpha$, and $\vec{n}(x)$ is the unit outer normal of Ω at the boundary point x .

Now as in [10], we know that there are $\gamma, \delta > 0$ only depending on the domain Ω such that for any $x \in \{z \in \overline{\Omega} : d(z, \partial\Omega) < \delta\}$, there exists a measurable set $\Gamma_x \subset \{z \in \overline{\Omega} : d(z, \partial\Omega) > \delta/2\}$ satisfying $meas(\Gamma_x) \geq \gamma$ and $u(y) \geq u(x)$ for any $y \in \Gamma_x$. In fact, Γ_x can be taken to be a piece of cone with vertex at x . Then for any $x \in \{z \in \overline{\Omega} : d(z, \partial\Omega) < \delta\}$, by (2.1),

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) &\leq \frac{1}{meas(\Gamma_x)} \int_{\Gamma_x} u(y) dy \leq \gamma^{-1} |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\int_{\Omega} u^p(y) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= \gamma^{-1} |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\int_{\Omega} f^q(y) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C < \infty \end{aligned}$$

uniformly, which implies that x_q must stay out of the region $\{z \in \overline{\Omega} : d(z, \partial\Omega) < \delta\}$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$.

(II). The domain Ω is not necessarily strictly convex.

As in [10], we use the Kelvin transformation at each boundary point and then apply the method of moving planes. We show the details of the argument here for the reader's convenience since it is a little different from Theorem 3.4 in [6].

Pick any point $P \in \partial\Omega$. For simplicity, we assume the ball $B(0, 1)$ contacts P from the exterior of Ω . Let w be the Kelvin transform of u , that is,

$$w(x) = \frac{1}{|x|^{n-\alpha}} u\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right), \quad x \in \overline{\Omega}^*,$$

where Ω^* is the image of Ω under the Kelvin transform. Then $w(x)$ satisfies

$$w(x) = \int_{\Omega^*} \frac{w^{p-1}(y)}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} |y|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p_\alpha)} dy, \quad x \in \overline{\Omega}^*. \quad (2.2)$$

Without loss of generality we assume $P = (-1, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $x_1 = -1$ is the tangent plane of $\partial\Omega^*$ at P . Then it is enough to prove that $w(x)$ is increasing along the x_1 direction in a neighbourhood of P .

Assume that we can move the tangent plane at P along the x_1 direction to the limiting place $x_1 = \bar{x} < 0$, denoted by T_0 , such that the reflection of $\Omega^* \cap \{x_1 < \lambda\}$ with respect to T_λ is also a subset of Ω^* , where $T_\lambda = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 = \lambda\}$, $\lambda \in (-1, \bar{x}]$.

We denote by Ω'_1 the reflection of $\Omega_1 := \Omega^* \cap \{x_1 < \bar{x}\}$ with respect to T_0 . Now we apply the method of moving planes to integral equation (2.2) on $\Omega' := \Omega_1 \cup \Omega'_1$.

For any real number $\lambda \in (-1, \bar{x})$, define $x^\lambda = (2\lambda - x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ as the reflection of point $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ about the plane T_λ . Let

$$\Sigma_\lambda := \{x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \Omega' \mid -1 < x_1 < \lambda\},$$

$\tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda := \{x^\lambda \mid x \in \Sigma_\lambda\}$ be the reflection of Σ_λ about the plane T_λ , and $\Sigma_\lambda^C = \Omega^* \setminus \Sigma_\lambda$ be the complement of Σ_λ in Ω^* . Set $w_\lambda(x) := w(x^\lambda)$. We shall complete the proof in two steps.

Step 1. We show that for λ larger than and sufficiently close to -1 ,

$$w_\lambda(x) - w(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda, \quad (2.3)$$

which can be obtained easily by

$$\frac{\partial w(x)}{\partial x_1} \Big|_{x_1=-1} = (\alpha - n) \int_{\Omega^*} \frac{w^{p-1}(y)}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha+2}} (-1-y_1) |y|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p\alpha)} dy > 0$$

since $w(x) \in C^1(\overline{\Omega^*})$.

Step 2. Plane T_λ can be moved continuously towards right to its limiting position T_0 as long as inequality (2.3) holds. Thus we conclude that $w(x)$ is increasing in the x_1 direction for any $x \in \Omega_1$.

Define

$$\lambda_0 := \sup\{\lambda \in (-1, \bar{x}) \mid w_\mu(y) \geq w(y), \forall y \in \Sigma_\mu, \quad -1 < \mu \leq \lambda\}.$$

We claim that $\lambda_0 = \bar{x}$. We prove it by contradiction. Suppose not, that is, $\lambda_0 < \bar{x}$.

We first show that

$$w_{\lambda_0}(x) - w(x) > 0$$

in the interior of Σ_{λ_0} .

In fact, since $|x - y| < |x - y^{\lambda_0}|$ for $x, y \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& w_{\lambda_0}(x) - w(x) \\
&= \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_0}} \left[\frac{1}{|x^{\lambda_0} - y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} \right] w^{p-1}(y) |y|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p_\alpha)} dy \\
&\quad + \int_{\tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}} \left[\frac{1}{|x^{\lambda_0} - y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} \right] w^{p-1}(y) |y|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p_\alpha)} dy \\
&\quad + \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_0}^C \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}} \left[\frac{1}{|x^{\lambda_0} - y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} \right] w^{p-1}(y) |y|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p_\alpha)} dy \\
&= \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_0}} \left[\frac{1}{|x - y^{\lambda_0}|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} \right] w^{p-1}(y) |y|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p_\alpha)} dy \\
&\quad - \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_0}} \left[\frac{1}{|x - y^{\lambda_0}|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} \right] w_{\lambda_0}^{p-1}(y) |y^{\lambda_0}|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p_\alpha)} dy \\
&\quad + \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_0}^C \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}} \left[\frac{1}{|x^{\lambda_0} - y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} \right] w^{p-1}(y) |y|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p_\alpha)} dy \\
&\geq \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_0}} \left[\frac{1}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x - y^{\lambda_0}|^{n-\alpha}} \right] (w_{\lambda_0}^{p-1}(y) - w^{p-1}(y)) |y|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p_\alpha)} dy \\
&\quad + \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_0}^C \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}} \left[\frac{1}{|x^{\lambda_0} - y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} \right] w^{p-1}(y) |y|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p_\alpha)} dy \\
&\geq \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_0}^C \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}} \left[\frac{1}{|x^{\lambda_0} - y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x - y|^{n-\alpha}} \right] w^{p-1}(y) |y|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p_\alpha)} dy. \tag{2.4}
\end{aligned}$$

If there exists some point $\xi \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$ such that $w(\xi) = w_{\lambda_0}(\xi)$, then, since $|x - y| > |x^{\lambda_0} - y|$ for $x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0}, y \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0}^C$, we deduce from (2.4) that

$$w(y) \equiv 0, \quad \forall y \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0}^C \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}.$$

This contradicts to the assumption that $w > 0$ since $\Sigma_{\lambda_0}^C \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}$ is not empty. Hence $w_{\lambda_0}(x) - w(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$.

For any $\delta > 0$, choose $0 < \lambda(\delta) < \lambda_0$ but close to λ_0 such that $meas(\Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus \Sigma_{\lambda(\delta)}) < \delta$. There is a number $C(\delta) > 0$, such that

$$w_{\lambda_0}(x) - w(x) \geq C(\delta) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{\lambda(\delta)}.$$

Thus, there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that $\forall \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_1)$,

$$w_\lambda(x) - w(x) \geq \frac{C(\delta)}{2} > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{\lambda(\delta)}.$$

We can further assume that ε_1 small enough so that $meas(\Sigma_{\lambda_0 + \varepsilon_1} \setminus \Sigma_{\lambda(\delta)}) \leq 2\delta < 1$.

It is easy to see

$$\Sigma_\lambda^w := \{x \in \Sigma_\lambda \mid w(x) > w_\lambda(x)\} \subset \Sigma_{\lambda_0 + \varepsilon_1} \setminus \Sigma_{\lambda(\delta)}, \quad \forall \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_1).$$

Similar to (2.4) and by using the mean value theorem, we have: $\forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda^w$,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &< w(x) - w_\lambda(x) \\
&\leq \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} \left[\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x^\lambda-y|^{n-\alpha}} \right] w^{p-1}(y) |y|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p_\alpha)} dy \\
&\quad + \int_{\tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda} \left[\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x^\lambda-y|^{n-\alpha}} \right] w^{p-1}(y) |y|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p_\alpha)} dy \\
&\leq C(\Omega) \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} \left[\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x-y^\lambda|^{n-\alpha}} \right] (w^{p-1}(y) - w_\lambda^{p-1}(y)) dy \\
&\leq C(\Omega) \int_{\Sigma_\lambda^w} \left[\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x-y^\lambda|^{n-\alpha}} \right] (w^{p-1}(y) - w_\lambda^{p-1}(y)) dy \\
&\leq C(\Omega) \int_{\Sigma_\lambda^w} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} (w^{p-1}(y) - w_\lambda^{p-1}(y)) \\
&\leq (p-1)C(\Omega) \int_{\Sigma_\lambda^w} \frac{w^{p-2}(y)(w(y) - w_\lambda(y))}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy, \tag{2.5}
\end{aligned}$$

where $C(\Omega) > 0$. Since $w \in C(\overline{\Omega^*})$, we have $|w| \leq c_1$. Hence by using HLS inequality and Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|w - w_\lambda\|_{L^r(\Sigma_\lambda^w)} &\leq (p-1)C(\Omega) \left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda^w} \left(\int_{\Sigma_\lambda^w} \frac{w^{p-2}(y)[w(y) - w_\lambda(y)]}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \right)^r dx \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \\
&\leq (p-1)C(\Omega)c_1^{p-2} \|w(y) - w_\lambda(y)\|_{L^s(\Sigma_\lambda^w)} \\
&\leq c|\Sigma_\lambda^w|^{\frac{1}{s}-\frac{1}{r}} \|w - w_\lambda\|_{L^r(\Sigma_\lambda^w)},
\end{aligned}$$

where r and s satisfy

$$\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{s} - \frac{\alpha}{n}, \quad 1 \leq s < r < \infty, \quad \text{and } |\Sigma_\lambda^w| = \text{meas}(\Sigma_\lambda^w).$$

For example, we can take $r = p_\alpha, s = q_\alpha$. Now we choose $\delta > 0$ and $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ small enough such that

$$c|\Sigma_\lambda^w|^{\frac{1}{s}-\frac{1}{r}} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

It implies that

$$\|w - w_\lambda\|_{L^r(\Sigma_\lambda^w)} \equiv 0.$$

And hence the measure of set Σ_λ^w must be zero.

We arrive at

$$w_\lambda(x) - w(x) \geq 0, \quad x \in \Sigma_\lambda, \quad \forall \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_1)$$

since w is continuous. This contradicts to the definition of λ_0 . Hence, $\lambda_0 = \bar{x}$.

Thus by using the same argument of convex domain, we conclude that there is $\delta > 0$ only depending on the domain Ω such that for any $x \in \{z \in \overline{\Omega^*} : d(z, \partial\Omega^*) < \delta\}$,

$$w(x) \leq C < \infty$$

uniformly. By using the Kelvin transformation, we conclude that there exists $\delta' > 0$ such that x_q must stay out of the region $\{z \in \overline{\Omega} : d(z, \partial\Omega) < \delta'\}$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$. \square

To continue, we need the following lemma, which can be seen in [15, 2, 14].

Lemma 2.1. *Let $v \in L_{loc}^{p_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a positive solution to*

$$v(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{v^{p_\alpha-1}(y)}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

then $v = c_1 \left(\frac{1}{c_2 + |x-y_0|^2} \right)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}$ for some $c_1, c_2 > 0, y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof of (ii) of Theorem 1.1. Notice that $u_q(x) = f_q^{q-1}(x) \in L^p(\Omega)$. Denote $u_q(x_q) := \max_{\bar{\Omega}} u_q(x)$ and

$$\mu_q := u_q^{-\frac{p-2}{\alpha}}(x_q), \quad \Omega_\mu := \frac{\Omega - x_q}{\mu_q} = \{z \mid z = \frac{x - x_q}{\mu_q}, \forall x \in \Omega\}.$$

Define

$$v_q(z) := \mu_q^{\frac{\alpha}{p-2}} u_q(\mu_q z + x_q), \quad \text{for } z \in \bar{\Omega}_\mu.$$

Then v_q satisfies

$$v_q(z) = \int_{\Omega_\mu} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|z-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy, \quad z \in \bar{\Omega}_\mu,$$

and $v_q(0) = 1, v_q(z) \in (0, 1]$.

We claim $v_q(z)$ is equicontinuous on any bounded domain $\hat{\Omega} \subset \Omega_\mu$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$. In fact, for $z \in \hat{\Omega}$, we can first write

$$v_q(z) = \int_{\Omega_\mu \setminus B(0,R)} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|z-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy + \int_{\Omega_\mu \cap B(0,R)} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|z-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy$$

for fixed $R > 0$. On one hand, if $z = \frac{x-x_q}{\mu_q} \in \hat{\Omega}$, then $|x-x_q| \leq C\mu_q$ for some $C > 0$. Hence for $z \in \hat{\Omega}, \epsilon > 0$ small enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_\mu \setminus B(0,R)} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|z-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \\ &= \mu_q^{\frac{\alpha}{p-2}} \int_{\Omega \setminus B(x_q, R\mu_q)} \frac{u_q^{p-1}(\xi)}{|x-\xi|^{n-\alpha}} d\xi \quad (x = x_q + \mu_q z) \\ &\leq \mu_q^{\frac{\alpha}{p-2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} u_q^p(\xi) d\xi \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left(\int_{\Omega \setminus B(x_q, R\mu_q)} |x-\xi|^{(\alpha-n)p} d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= \mu_q^{\frac{\alpha}{p-2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} u_q^p(\xi) d\xi \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left(\int_{\Omega \setminus B(x-x_q, R\mu_q)} |\xi|^{(\alpha-n)p} d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq C \mu_q^{\frac{\alpha}{p-2}} (R\mu_q)^{\alpha - \frac{n}{q}} = CR^{\alpha - \frac{n}{q}} \mu_q^{\frac{q(n+\alpha)-2n}{q(2-q)}} < \epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

as q close to q_α and $R > 0$ large enough, where we use $\alpha < n/q$ as q close to q_α .

On the other hand, it is easy to see that $\int_{\Omega_\mu \cap B(0,R)} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|z-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \in C^1(\hat{\Omega})$. Hence for $z_1, z_2 \in \hat{\Omega}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\Omega_\mu \cap B(0,R)} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|z_1-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy - \int_{\Omega_\mu \cap B(0,R)} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|z_2-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \right| \\ &\leq C \int_{\Omega_\mu \cap B(0,R)} v_q^{p-1}(y) \frac{1}{|\xi-y|^{n-\alpha+1}} dy |z_1 - z_2| \\ &\leq CR^{\alpha-1} |z_1 - z_2|, \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

where $\xi = tz_1 + (1-t)z_2$ for some $t \in (0, 1)$. By (2.6) and (2.7) we conclude that $v_q(z)$ is equicontinuous on the bounded domain $\widehat{\Omega} \subset \Omega_\mu$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$.

As $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$, since x_q will stay away from $\partial\Omega$, then we have $\Omega_\mu \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $v_q(z) \rightarrow v(z) \in C_{loc}^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ uniformly for any $0 < \gamma < 1$, where $v(z)$ satisfies

$$v(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{v^{p_\alpha-1}(y)}{|z-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy, \quad v(0) = 1.$$

We also have $v(z) \in L^{p_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ since

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^{p_\alpha}(z) dz \leq \liminf_{q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+} \int_{\Omega_\mu} v_q^p(z) dz = \liminf_{q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+} \mu_q^{\frac{p_\alpha}{p-2}-n} \int_{\Omega} u_q^p(x) dx \leq C. \quad (2.8)$$

By Lemma 2.1 and noticing that $\max_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} v(z) = v(0)$, we know

$$v(z) = c_1 \left(\frac{1}{c_2 + |z|^2} \right)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}} \quad (2.9)$$

for some $c_1, c_2 > 0$ satisfying

$$c_1 \cdot c_2^{\frac{\alpha-n}{2}} = 1. \quad (2.10)$$

By [6] we know $\xi_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\Omega) = \xi_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then $v^{p_\alpha-1}$ must be an extremal function to $\xi_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ since

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n) &\geq \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^{p_\alpha}(y) dy}{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^{p_\alpha}(y) dy \right)^{\frac{2}{q_\alpha}}} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^{p_\alpha}(y) dy \right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{n}} \\ &\geq \left(\liminf_{q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+} \mu_q^{\frac{p_\alpha}{p-2}-n} \int_{\Omega} u_q^p(x) dx \right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{n}} \\ &\geq \left(\liminf_{q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+} \int_{\Omega} u_q^p(x) dx \right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{n}} \\ &= \xi_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\Omega) = \xi_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n), \end{aligned}$$

where we use (2.1), (2.8), $2 < p < p_\alpha$ and $\mu_q \rightarrow 0^+$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$. Therefore

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^{p_\alpha}(y) dy = (\xi_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n))^{-\frac{n}{\alpha}}. \quad (2.11)$$

Notice that $p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^-$ is equivalent to $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$. We claim that

$$\mu_q^s \rightarrow 1, \quad \text{as } p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^-, \quad (2.12)$$

where $s = p_\alpha - p \rightarrow 0^+$. In fact, it is easy to see that $\mu_q^s \leq 1$. On the other hand, we know for any $R > 0$, $v_q(z) \rightarrow v(z)$ in $B(0, R) \cap \Omega_\mu$ uniformly as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$. By (2.11), for any $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, there exists $R > 0$ large enough such that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\xi_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\Omega))^{-\frac{n}{\alpha}} - \epsilon \quad (2.13) \\ &\leq \int_{B(0, R)} v^{p_\alpha}(z) dz = \lim_{p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^-} \int_{B(0, R) \cap \Omega_\mu} v_q^p(z) dz \\ &= \lim_{p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^-} \mu_q^{\frac{p_\alpha}{p-2}-n} \int_{B(x_q, R\mu_q) \cap \Omega} u_q^p(x) dx \\ &\leq \lim_{p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^-} \mu_q^{\frac{s(n-\alpha)}{p-2}} \int_{\Omega} u_q^p(x) dx \\ &= (\xi_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\Omega))^{-\frac{n}{\alpha}} \lim_{p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^-} \mu_q^{\frac{s(n-\alpha)}{p-2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use (2.1) in the last equality. Thus the claim (2.12) holds by using the arbitrary chosen of ϵ .

To continue, let $w_q(\xi), \xi \in \Omega_\mu^*$ be the Kelvin transform of v_q , where Ω_μ^* is the image of Ω_μ under the Kelvin transform. We have

$$\begin{aligned} w_q(\xi) &= \int_{\Omega_\mu^*} \frac{w_q^{p-1}(\eta)}{|\xi - \eta|^{n-\alpha}} |\eta|^{(n-\alpha)(p-1)-(n+\alpha)} d\eta \\ &\leq C \int_{\Omega_\mu^*} \frac{w_q^{p-1}(\eta)}{|\xi - \eta|^{n-\alpha}} \mu_q^{(n-\alpha)(p-1)-(n+\alpha)} d\eta \\ &\leq C \int_{\Omega_\mu^*} \frac{w_q^{p-1}(\eta)}{|\xi - \eta|^{n-\alpha}} d\eta \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

by using (2.12).

For fixed $1 > r > 0$ small, which will be determined later, we have $w_q(\xi) \leq C(r)$ for $|\xi| \geq \frac{r}{2}$. On the other hand, for $\xi \in B^*(0, \frac{r}{2}) := B(0, \frac{r}{2}) \cap \Omega_\mu^*$, by (2.14),

$$w_q(\xi) \leq C \int_{B^*(0,r)} \frac{w_q^{p-1}(\eta)}{|\xi - \eta|^{n-\alpha}} d\eta + C(r).$$

Take $t = \frac{p}{p-1} > q_\alpha$ and $p_1 > 0$ satisfies $\frac{1}{p_1} = \frac{1}{t} - \frac{\alpha}{n}$, which implies that $p_1 > p_\alpha$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{B^*(0, \frac{r}{2})} w_q^{p_1}(\xi) d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \\ & \leq C \left(\int_{B^*(0,r)} \left(\int_{B^*(0,r)} \frac{w_q^{p-1}(\eta)}{|\xi - \eta|^{n-\alpha}} d\eta \right)^{p_1} d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} + C(r) \\ & \leq C \|w_q^{p-1}\|_{L^t(B^*(0,r))} + C(r) \\ & = C \left(\int_{B^*(0,r)} (w_q^{p-2}(\eta) w_q(\eta))^t d\eta \right)^{\frac{1}{t}} + C(r) \\ & \leq C \left(\int_{B^*(0,r)} w_q^{(p-2) \frac{p_1 t}{p_1 - t}}(\eta) d\eta \right)^{\frac{p_1 - t}{p_1 t}} \left(\int_{B^*(0,r)} w_q^{t \frac{p_1}{t}}(\eta) d\eta \right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} + C(r) \\ & = C \left(\int_{B^*(0,r)} w_q^{(p-2) \cdot \frac{n}{\alpha}}(\eta) d\eta \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{n}} \left(\int_{B^*(0,r)} w_q^{p_1}(\eta) d\eta \right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} + C(r). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $(p-2) \cdot \frac{n}{\alpha} < p$. Then as in (2.13), for $\epsilon_0 > 0$ small enough, there exists $r > 0$ small enough such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B^*(0,r)} w_q^{(p-2) \cdot \frac{n}{\alpha}} \leq C \left(\int_{B^*(0,r)} w_q^p \right)^{\frac{(p-2) \frac{n}{\alpha}}{p}} \\ & \leq C \left(\int_{\Omega_\mu \setminus B(0, \frac{1}{r})} v_q^p \right)^{\frac{(p-2) \frac{n}{\alpha}}{p}} \leq \epsilon_0 \end{aligned}$$

uniformly as q close to q_α , and then

$$C \left(\int_{B^*(0,r)} w_q^{(p-2) \cdot \frac{n}{\alpha}}(\eta) d\eta \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{n}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$$

as q close to q_α . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{B^*(0, \frac{r}{2})} w_q^{p_1}(\xi) d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{B^*(0, r)} w_q^{p_1}(\eta) d\eta \right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} + C(r) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{B^*(0, \frac{r}{2})} w_q^{p_1}(\eta) d\eta \right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} + C(r). \end{aligned}$$

Then $w_q \in L^{p_1}(B^*(0, \frac{r}{2}))$ and $\|w_q\|_{L^{p_1}(B^*(0, \frac{r}{2}))} \leq C(r)$ uniformly as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$. Thus similar to Lemma 3.3 in [6], we know $w_q \in L^\infty(B^*(0, \frac{r}{2}))$ uniformly as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$ and thus we conclude. \square

Now to prove (iii) of Theorem 1.1, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *We have $u_q^{p-1}(x)u_q(x_q) \rightarrow \sigma_{n,\alpha}\delta_{x_0}(x)$ as $p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^-$.*

Proof. Take any function $\varphi(x) \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. For any small $r > 0$, by (ii) of Theorem 1.1,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\Omega \setminus B(x_0, r)} u_q^{p-1}(x)u_q(x_q)\varphi(x)dx \right| \\ & \leq C \int_{\Omega \setminus B(x_0, r)} \mu_q^{\frac{(n-\alpha)(p-1)}{2}} \frac{u_q(x_q)}{|x-x_0|^{(n-\alpha)(p-1)}} dx \\ & \leq C(r)\mu_q^{\frac{(n-\alpha)(p-1)}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{p-2}} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^-$. On the other hand, by using (2.12), (ii) of Theorem 1.1, and the Dominated Convergence Theorem, as $p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^-$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x_0, r)} u_q^{p-1}(x)u_q(x_q)\varphi(x_0)dx \\ & = \varphi(x_0) \int_{B(\frac{x_0-x_q}{\mu_q}, \frac{r}{\mu_q})} u_q^{p-1}(\mu_q z + x_q)u_q(x_q)\mu_q^n dz \\ & = \varphi(x_0)\mu_q^{-\frac{p\alpha}{p-2}+n} \int_{B(\frac{x_0-x_q}{\mu_q}, \frac{r}{\mu_q})} v_q^{p-1}(z)dz \\ & \rightarrow \varphi(x_0) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^{p_\alpha-1}(z)dz = \varphi(x_0)\sigma_{n,\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

since by (2.9), (2.10), (2.11),

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^{p_\alpha-1}(z)dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (c_1 \left(\frac{1}{c_2 + |x|^2} \right)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}})^{\frac{n+\alpha}{n-\alpha}} dz \\ & = c_2^{\frac{n}{2}} \omega_n \int_0^\infty \frac{r^{n-1}}{(1+r^2)^{\frac{n+\alpha}{2}}} dr = \frac{(\xi_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n))^{-\frac{n}{\alpha}} \int_0^\infty \frac{r^{n-1}}{(1+r^2)^{\frac{n+\alpha}{2}}} dr}{\int_0^\infty \frac{r^{n-1}}{(1+r^2)^n} dr} \\ & = \left(\pi^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n+\alpha}{2})} \right)^{\frac{\alpha-n}{\alpha}} = \sigma_{n,\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where ω_n is the area of the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n , and

$$\xi_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n) = \pi^{(n-\alpha)/2} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha/2)}{\Gamma(n/2 + \alpha/2)} \left\{ \frac{\Gamma(n/2)}{\Gamma(n)} \right\}^{-\alpha/n},$$

see [15]. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B(x_0, r)} u_q^{p-1}(x) u_q(x_q) \varphi(x) dx \\
&= \int_{B(x_0, r)} u_q^{p-1}(x) u_q(x_q) (\varphi(x_0) + o_r(1)) dx \\
&\rightarrow (\varphi(x_0) + o_r(1)) \sigma_{n, \alpha}
\end{aligned}$$

as $p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^-$, where $o_r(1) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. Therefore

$$\int_{\Omega} u_q^{p-1}(x) u_q(x_q) \varphi(x) dx \rightarrow \varphi(x_0) \sigma_{n, \alpha}$$

as $p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^-$. Thus we conclude. \square

Proof of (iii) of Theorem 1.1. Firstly by using (ii) of Theorem 1.1 it is easy to see that there is one single point x_0 such that $x_q \rightarrow x_0$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$, up to a subsequence, and

$$u_q(x_q) u_q(x) \leq C \frac{1}{|x - x_0|^{n-\alpha}}, \quad u_q(x) \rightarrow 0 \text{ if } x \neq x_0, \quad (2.15)$$

as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$. For any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, it is easy to check that $\int_{\Omega} \frac{\varphi(x)}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dx$ is continuous in $y \in \bar{\Omega}$. Then by (1.1) and Lemma 2.2, for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega} u_q(x_q) u_q(x) \varphi(x) dx &= \int_{\Omega} \varphi(x) dx \int_{\Omega} \frac{u_q^{p-1}(y) u_q(x_q)}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \\
&= \int_{\Omega} u_q^{p-1}(y) u_q(x_q) dy \int_{\Omega} \frac{\varphi(x)}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dx \\
&\rightarrow \sigma_{n, \alpha} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\varphi(x)}{|x-x_0|^{n-\alpha}} dx,
\end{aligned}$$

as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$. So in order to prove that $u_q(x_q) u_q(x) \rightarrow \frac{\sigma_{n, \alpha}}{|x-x_0|^{n-\alpha}}$ pointwise for $x \neq x_0$, it is left to prove that $u_q(x_q) u_q(x)$ is uniformly bounded and equicontinuous in $\Omega \setminus B(x_0, r)$ for any $r > 0$ small enough, as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$.

In fact, by using (2.15), $u_q(x_q) u_q(x)$ is uniformly bounded in $\Omega \setminus B(x_0, r)$. On the other hand, for any $|x_1 - x_2| < \frac{r}{2}$, $x_1, x_2 \in \Omega \setminus B(x_0, r)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |u_q(x_q) u_q(x_1) - u_q(x_q) u_q(x_2)| \\
&= u_q(x_q) \left| \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{|x_1 - y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x_2 - y|^{n-\alpha}} \right) u_q^{p-1}(y) dy \right| \\
&\leq (n - \alpha) u_q(x_q) \int_{\Omega} \frac{u_q^{p-1}(y)}{|\xi - y|^{n-\alpha+1}} dy |x_1 - x_2| \\
&\quad (\xi = tx_1 + (1-t)x_2, \text{ for some } t \in (0, 1)) \\
&= (n - \alpha) u_q(x_q) \left(\int_{B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})} + \int_{\Omega \setminus B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})} \right) \frac{u_q^{p-1}(y)}{|\xi - y|^{n-\alpha+1}} dy |x_1 - x_2|. \quad (2.16)
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
& u_q(x_q) \int_{B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})} \frac{u_q^{p-1}(y)}{|\xi - y|^{n-\alpha+1}} dy \\
&\leq C \int_{B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})} u_q(x_q) u_q^{p-1}(y) dy \rightarrow C \sigma_{n, \alpha}, \quad (2.17)
\end{aligned}$$

as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$. By using (ii) of Theorem 1.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
& u_q(x_q) \int_{\Omega \setminus B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})} \frac{u_q^{p-1}(y)}{|\xi - y|^{n-\alpha+1}} dy \\
& \leq C u_q(x_q) \int_{\Omega \setminus B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})} \left(\frac{\mu_q}{\mu_q^2 + |x - x_q|^2} \right)^{\frac{(n-\alpha)(p-1)}{2}} \cdot \frac{1}{|\xi - y|^{n-\alpha+1}} dy \\
& \leq C \mu_q^{-\frac{\alpha}{p-2} + \frac{(n-\alpha)(p-1)}{2}} \int_{\Omega \setminus B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})} \frac{1}{|\xi - y|^{n-\alpha+1}} dy \\
& \leq C \mu_q^{-\frac{\alpha}{p-2} + \frac{(n-\alpha)(p-1)}{2}} \rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$. Thus combining with (2.16), (2.17) and (2.18), we conclude that $u_q(x_q)u_q(x)$ is equicontinuous in $\Omega \setminus B(x_0, r)$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^+$. \square

3. BLOWUP BEHAVIOUR FOR $\alpha > n$

Proof of (i) of Theorem 1.2. Notice that $f_q = u_q^{p-1}$ is the energy minimizing positive solution to (\mathcal{P}_q) , and $\widehat{\xi}_{\alpha, q}(\Omega) \rightarrow \widehat{\xi}_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\Omega) > 0$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$ [4]. Then

$$\|f_q\|_{L^q(\Omega)} = (\widehat{\xi}_{\alpha, q}(\Omega))^{\frac{1}{q-2}} \geq \frac{(\widehat{\xi}_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\Omega))^{\frac{1}{q_\alpha-2}}}{2} > 0 \tag{3.1}$$

as q close to q_α .

We assume by contradiction that $\min_{\overline{\Omega}} u_q(x) \geq C_1 > 0$ uniformly.

If $u_q(x) \leq C_2 < \infty$ uniformly, then it is easy to see that the C^1 norm of $u_q(x)$ is also uniformly bounded by [4]. Thus $u_q(x)$ is equicontinuous. Hence $u_q(x) \rightarrow u^*(x) > 0$ pointwise as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$. We also have $\|f_q\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \rightarrow \|f^*\|_{L^{q_\alpha}(\Omega)}$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$, where $f^* = (u^*)^{p_\alpha-1}$. So f^* is an energy minimizing positive solution to (\mathcal{P}_{q_α}) , which is of C^1 obviously. Then we obtain a contradiction.

If $\max_{\overline{\Omega}} u_q(x) := u_q(\tilde{x}_q) \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\infty \leftarrow u_q(\tilde{x}_q) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{u_q^{p-1}(y)}{|\tilde{x}_q - y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \leq C < \infty,$$

as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$, which again gives a contradiction.

Thus we conclude that $\min_{\overline{\Omega}} u_q(x) := u_q(x_q) \rightarrow 0$ and $x_q \rightarrow x_0 \in \overline{\Omega}$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$,

up to a subsequence.

To prove that x_q will stay away from $\partial\Omega$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$, we consider two cases. For simplicity, in the proof of this part below we write u instead of u_q , f instead of f_q .

(I). The domain Ω is strictly convex.

By using the method of moving planes to integral equation (1.1), which is omitted here since it is standard (see for example [3], [4], [5], [6]), we can prove that there exist $t_0 > 0, \alpha > 0$ depending on the domain only, such that for every $x \in \partial\Omega$, $u(x - t\nu)$ is decreasing in $t \in [0, t_0]$, where $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n, |\nu| = 1$ satisfying $(\nu, \vec{n}(x)) \geq \alpha$, and $\vec{n}(x)$ is the unit outer normal of Ω at the boundary point x .

Now as in [10], we can prove that there are $\gamma, \delta > 0$ only depending on the domain Ω such that for any $x \in \{z \in \overline{\Omega} : d(z, \partial\Omega) < \delta\}$, there exists a measurable set $\Gamma_x \subset \{z \in \overline{\Omega} : d(z, \partial\Omega) > \delta/2\}$ satisfying $meas(\Gamma_x) \geq \gamma$ and $u(y) \leq u(x)$ for

any $y \in \Gamma_x$. As in Theorem 1.1, Γ_x again can be taken to be a piece of cone with vertex at x . Then for any $x \in \{z \in \overline{\Omega} : d(z, \partial\Omega) < \delta\}$, by (3.1),

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) &\geq \frac{1}{\text{meas}(\Gamma_x)} \int_{\Gamma_x} u(y) dy \geq \frac{\gamma^{\frac{1}{q}}}{|\Omega|} \left(\int_{\Omega} u^p(y) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= \frac{\gamma^{\frac{1}{q}}}{|\Omega|} \left(\int_{\Omega} f^q(y) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \geq C > 0 \end{aligned}$$

uniformly, which implies that x_q must stay out of the region $\{z \in \overline{\Omega} : d(z, \partial\Omega) < \delta\}$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$.

(II). The domain Ω is not necessarily strictly convex.

As in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we use the Kelvin transformation at each boundary point and then apply the method of moving planes. We give the details for the reader's convenience.

Without loss of generality we assume $P = (-1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \partial\Omega$ and the ball $B(0, 1)$ contacts P from the exterior of Ω . Let $w(x)$, $x \in \Omega^*$ be the Kelvin transform of u , where Ω^* is the image of Ω under the Kelvin transform. We also can assume that $x_1 = -1$ is the tangent plane of $\partial\Omega^*$ at P . Thus $w(x)$ satisfies (2.2). Now it is enough to prove that $w(x)$ is decreasing along the x_1 direction in a neighbourhood of P .

Again as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, assume that we can move the tangent plane at P along the x_1 direction to the limiting place $x_1 = \bar{x}$, denoted by T_0 , such that the reflection of $\Omega^* \cap \{x_1 < \lambda\}$ with respect to T_λ is also a subset of Ω^* , where $T_\lambda = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 = \lambda\}$, $\lambda \in (-1, \bar{x}]$.

We denote by Ω'_1 the reflection of $\Omega_1 := \Omega^* \cap \{x_1 < \bar{x}\}$ with respect to T_0 . Now we apply the method of moving planes to integral equation (2.2) on $\Omega' := \Omega_1 \cup \Omega'_1$.

For any real number $\lambda \in (-1, \bar{x})$, define x^λ , Σ_λ , $\tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$, Σ_λ^C as in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Set $w_\lambda(x) := w(x^\lambda)$. We complete the proof in two steps.

Step 1. We show that for λ larger than and sufficiently close to -1 ,

$$w(x) - w_\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda, \quad (3.2)$$

which can be obtained easily by

$$\frac{\partial w(x)}{\partial x_1} \Big|_{x_1=-1} = (\alpha - n) \int_{\Omega^*} \frac{w^{p-1}(y)}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha+2}} (-1-y_1) |y|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p_\alpha)} dy < 0$$

since $w(x) \in C^1(\overline{\Omega^*})$.

Step 2. Plane T_λ can be moved continuously towards right to its limiting position T_0 as long as inequality (3.2) holds. Thus we conclude that $w(x)$ is decreasing in the x_1 direction for any $x \in \Omega_1$.

Define

$$\lambda_0 := \sup\{\lambda \in (-1, \bar{x}) \mid w(y) \geq w_\mu(y), \forall y \in \Sigma_\mu, \quad -1 < \mu \leq \lambda\}.$$

We claim that $\lambda_0 = \bar{x}$. For that we assume by contradiction that $\lambda_0 < \bar{x}$.

We first show that

$$w(x) > w_{\lambda_0}(x), \quad \text{in } \Sigma_{\lambda_0}.$$

Hence we have

$$w(x) - w_{\lambda_0}(x) \geq c_1 > 0, \quad \text{in } \Sigma_{\lambda_0 - \epsilon_1}$$

for $\epsilon_1 > 0$ small, which will be determined later.

In fact, as in (2.4), we have for $x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & w(x) - w_{\lambda_0}(x) \\ & \geq \int_{\Sigma_{\lambda_0}^C \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}} \left[\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x^{\lambda_0}-y|^{n-\alpha}} \right] w^{p-1}(y) |y|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p_\alpha)} dy. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

If there exists some point $\xi \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$ such that $w(\xi) = w_{\lambda_0}(\xi)$, then since $|x-y| > |x^{\lambda_0}-y|$ for $x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0}, y \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0}^C$, we deduce from (3.3) that

$$w(y) \equiv \infty, \quad \forall y \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0}^C \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}.$$

This contradicts to that $w \in C^1(\overline{\Omega^*})$ since $\Sigma_{\lambda_0}^C \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}$ is not empty.

For fixed small $\delta_1 > 0$, we choose ϵ_1 small and $\varepsilon \in (0, \epsilon_1)$ such that for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon]$, there holds

$$w(x) \geq w_\lambda(x), \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{\lambda_0 - \varepsilon_1},$$

and

$$\left| \frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x^\lambda-y|^{n-\alpha}} \right| \leq \delta_1, \quad \text{for } x \in \Sigma_\lambda \setminus \Sigma_{\lambda_0 - \varepsilon_1}.$$

Write

$$\Sigma_\lambda^w := \{x \in \Sigma_\lambda \mid w_\lambda(x) > w(x)\}.$$

Similar to (2.5), for any $x \in \Sigma_\lambda^w$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 & > w(x) - w_\lambda(x) \\ & \geq \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} \left[\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x^\lambda-y|^{n-\alpha}} \right] (w^{p-1}(y) - w_\lambda^{p-1}(y)) |y|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p_\alpha)} dy \\ & \geq \int_{\Sigma_\lambda^w} \left[\frac{1}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|x^\lambda-y|^{n-\alpha}} \right] (w^{p-1}(y) - w_\lambda^{p-1}(y)) |y|^{(n-\alpha)(p-p_\alpha)} dy \\ & \geq -C(\Omega)\delta_1 \int_{\Sigma_\lambda^w} (w^{p-1}(y) - w_\lambda^{p-1}(y)) dy, \end{aligned}$$

where $C(\Omega) > 0$. Since $w \in C^1(\overline{\Omega^*})$, there exists a positive constant C_0 such that $\frac{1}{C_0} \leq w \leq C_0$. It follows from the above that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_\lambda^w} (w_\lambda(x) - w(x)) dx & \leq C(\Omega)\delta_1 \int_{\Sigma_\lambda^w} \int_{\Sigma_\lambda^w} (w^{p-1}(y) - w_\lambda^{p-1}(y)) dy dx \\ & \leq C(\Omega)(1-p)\delta_1 \int_{\Sigma_\lambda^w} \int_{\Sigma_\lambda^w} w^{p-2}(y) (w_\lambda(y) - w(y)) dy dx \\ & \leq C\delta_1(\varepsilon + \varepsilon_1)^n \int_{\Sigma_\lambda^w} (w_\lambda(y) - w(y)) dy, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\|w_\lambda - w\|_{L^1(\Sigma_\lambda^w)} \equiv 0,$$

for $\delta_1, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_1 > 0$ small enough. Hence Σ_λ^w must have measure zero.

We thus have

$$w(x) - w_\lambda(x) \geq 0, \quad \text{for any } x \in \Sigma_\lambda, \quad \forall \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon]$$

since w is continuous. This contradicts to the definition of λ_0 . Hence, $\lambda_0 = \bar{x}$.

We hereby complete the proof by using the same argument as Theorem 1.1. \square

To continue, we need the following lemma from [14].

Lemma 3.1. *Let v be a nonnegative measurable solution to*

$$v(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{v^{p_\alpha-1}(y)}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

then $v = c_1 \left(\frac{1}{c_2 + |x-y_0|^2} \right)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}$ for some $c_1, c_2 > 0, y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof of (ii) of Theorem 1.2. Notice that $u_q(x) = f_q^{q-1}(x) \in L^p(\Omega) := \{u \mid \int_\Omega |u|^p dx < \infty\}$, $p_\alpha < p < 0$. Denote $u_q(x_q) := \min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} u_q(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$.

Let

$$\mu_q := u_q^{-\frac{p-2}{\alpha}}(x_q) \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_\mu := \frac{\Omega - x_q}{\mu_q} = \{z \mid z = \frac{x - x_q}{\mu_q} \text{ for } x \in \Omega\}.$$

Define

$$v_q(z) := \mu_q^{\frac{\alpha}{p-2}} u_q(\mu_q z + x_q), \quad \text{for } z \in \bar{\Omega}_\mu.$$

Then v_q satisfies

$$v_q(z) = \int_{\Omega_\mu} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|z-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy, \quad z \in \bar{\Omega}_\mu,$$

and $v_q(0) = 1, v_q(z) \geq 1$.

Firstly, we have

$$1 = v_q(0) = \int_{\Omega_\mu} v_q^{p-1}(y) |y|^{\alpha-n} dy. \quad (3.4)$$

Claim: We have

$$\liminf_{q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-} \int_{\Omega_\mu} v_q^{p-1}(y) dy \geq c_0 > 0. \quad (3.5)$$

Otherwise, if up to a subsequence $\int_{\Omega_\mu} v_q^{p-1}(y) dy \rightarrow 0$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$, then for fixed $R_0 > 0$ we actually can prove that $v_q(z) \rightarrow 1$ uniformly for $z \in B(0, R_0) \cap \Omega_\mu$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$, which then gives a contradiction. In fact for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $R > 0$ large enough and q close to q_α , such that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq v_q(z) \\ &= \int_{\Omega_\mu \setminus B(0,R)} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|z-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy + \int_{B(0,R)} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|z-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{R_0}{R}\right)^{\alpha-n} \int_{\Omega_\mu \setminus B(0,R)} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|y|^{n-\alpha}} dy + (R + R_0)^{\alpha-n} \int_{B(0,R)} v_q^{p-1}(y) dy \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{R_0}{R}\right)^{\alpha-n} + (R + R_0)^{\alpha-n} \int_{\Omega_\mu} v_q^{p-1}(y) dy \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \text{ for } z \in B(0, R_0) \cap \Omega_\mu \text{ uniformly.} \end{aligned}$$

That is, $v_q(z) \rightarrow 1, z \in B(0, R_0) \cap \Omega_\mu$ uniformly as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$.

It is also easy to see that $\int_{\Omega_\mu} v_q^{p-1}(y) dy$ is uniformly bounded as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$ by using (3.4), which then combining with (3.5) gives that

$$0 < C_1(1 + |z|)^{\alpha-n} \leq v_q(z) \leq C_2(1 + |z|)^{\alpha-n}, \text{ uniformly for any } z. \quad (3.6)$$

Now we claim $v_q(z)$ is equicontinuous on any bounded domain $\widehat{\Omega} \subset \Omega_\mu$ when $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$. For $z \in \widehat{\Omega}$, we write

$$v_q(z) = \int_{\Omega_\mu \setminus B(0,R)} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|z-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy + \int_{\Omega_\mu \cap B(0,R)} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|z-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy.$$

For $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, we have for $z \in \widehat{\Omega}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_\mu \setminus B(0,R)} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|z-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \leq C \int_{\Omega_\mu \setminus B(0,R)} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \\ & \leq C \int_R^\infty r^{(\alpha-n)(p-1)+\alpha-1} dr = CR^{(\alpha-n)(p-1)+\alpha} < \epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

as q close to q_α , and $R > 0$ large enough. On the other hand, it is easy to see that $\int_{B(0,R) \cap \Omega_\mu} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|z-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \in C^1(\widehat{\Omega})$. Hence for $z_1, z_2 \in \widehat{\Omega}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{B(0,R) \cap \Omega_\mu} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|z_1-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy - \int_{B(0,R) \cap \Omega_\mu} \frac{v_q^{p-1}(y)}{|z_2-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \right| \\ & \leq C \int_{B(0,R) \cap \Omega_\mu} v_q^{p-1}(y) \frac{1}{|\xi-y|^{n-\alpha+1}} dy |z_1 - z_2|, \\ & \leq CR^{\alpha-1} |z_1 - z_2|, \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where $\xi = tz_1 + (1-t)z_2$ for some $t \in (0, 1)$. By (3.7) and (3.8) we conclude that $v_q(z)$ is equicontinuous on the bounded domain $\widehat{\Omega} \subset \Omega_\mu$ when $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$.

As $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$, since x_q will stay away from $\partial\Omega$, we have $\Omega_\mu \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $v_q(z) \rightarrow v(z) \in C(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $v(z)$ satisfies

$$v(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{v^{p_\alpha-1}(y)}{|z-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy, \quad v(0) = 1.$$

By Lemma 3.1 and noticing that $\min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} v(z) = v(0)$, we know

$$v(z) = c_1 \left(\frac{1}{c_2 + |z|^2} \right)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}} \quad (3.9)$$

for some $c_1, c_2 > 0$ satisfying

$$c_1 \cdot c_2^{\frac{\alpha-n}{2}} = 1. \quad (3.10)$$

By [4] we know $\widehat{\xi}_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\Omega) = \widehat{\xi}_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then we know $v^{p_\alpha-1}$ is an extremal function to $\widehat{\xi}_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ since

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\xi}_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n) & \leq \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^{p_\alpha}(y) dy}{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^{p_\alpha}(y) dy \right)^{\frac{2}{q_\alpha}}} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^{p_\alpha}(y) dy \right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{n}} \\ & = \left(\lim_{q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-} \int_{\Omega} v_q^p(z) dz \right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{n}} \\ & = \left(\lim_{q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-} \mu_q^{\frac{p_\alpha}{q} - n} \int_{\Omega} u_q^p(x) dx \right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{n}} \\ & \leq \left(\lim_{q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-} \int_{\Omega} u_q^p(x) dx \right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{n}} \\ & = \widehat{\xi}_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\Omega) = \widehat{\xi}_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n), \end{aligned}$$

where we use (3.6), (3.1), $p_\alpha < p < 0$ and $\mu_q \rightarrow 0^+$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$. Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^{p_\alpha}(y) dy = (\widehat{\xi}_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n))^{-\frac{n}{\alpha}}. \quad (3.11)$$

To continue, let w_q be the Kelvin transform of v_q , that is,

$$w_q(\xi) = \frac{1}{|\xi|^{n-\alpha}} v_q\left(\frac{\xi}{|\xi|^2}\right), \quad \xi \in \overline{\Omega_\mu^*},$$

which satisfies

$$w_q(\xi) = \int_{\Omega_\mu^*} \frac{w_q^{p-1}(\eta)}{|\xi - \eta|^{n-\alpha}} |\eta|^{(n-\alpha)(p-1)-(n+\alpha)} d\eta,$$

where Ω_μ^* is the image of Ω_μ under the Kelvin transform.

For fixed $r > 0$ small, which will be determined later, we have $w_q(\xi) \geq C(r)$ for $|\xi| \geq \frac{r}{2}$.

For a fixed $r_0 > 0$, we know that $v_q(x) \rightarrow v(x) = c_1 \left(\frac{1}{c_2 + |z|^2}\right)^{\frac{n-\alpha}{2}}$ uniformly in $B_{1/r_0}(0) \setminus B_{1/(2r_0)}(0)$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$. Then for $\xi \in (B_{2r_0}(0) \setminus B_{r_0}(0)) \cap \Omega_\mu^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} w_q(\xi) &\leq |\xi|^{\alpha-n} \left(v\left(\frac{\xi}{|\xi|^2}\right) + o(1)\right) \\ &\leq Cr_0^{\alpha-n} (C + o(1)) \\ &\leq C(r_0). \end{aligned}$$

Then for any $\xi \in B_r(0) \cap \Omega_\mu^*$ with $r > 0$ small enough,

$$w_q(\xi) \geq C \int_{(B_{2r_0}(0) \setminus B_{r_0}(0)) \cap \Omega_\mu^*} \frac{w_q^{p-1}(\eta)}{|\xi - \eta|^{n-\alpha}} d\eta \geq C(r_0)$$

uniformly as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$. Thus we conclude. \square

Remark 3.2. As in (2.12), we also can prove

$$\mu_q^s \rightarrow 1, \quad \text{as } p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^+, \quad (3.12)$$

where $s = p - p_\alpha \rightarrow 0^+$. In fact, it is easy to see that $\mu_q^s \leq 1$. By (3.6) and (3.11),

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{\xi}_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\Omega))^{-\frac{n}{\alpha}} &= \lim_{p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^+} \int_{\Omega} u_q^p(x) dx \\ &= \lim_{p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^+} \mu_q^{n - \frac{p_\alpha}{p-2}} \int_{\Omega_\mu} v_q^p(z) dz = \lim_{p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^+} \mu_q^{\frac{s(n-\alpha)}{p-2}} \int_{\Omega_\mu} v_q^p(z) dz \\ &= \lim_{p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^+} \mu_q^{\frac{s(n-\alpha)}{p-2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^{p_\alpha}(z) dz = (\widehat{\xi}_{\alpha, q_\alpha}(\Omega))^{-\frac{n}{\alpha}} \lim_{p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^+} \mu_q^{\frac{s(n-\alpha)}{p-2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use (3.1) in the first equality. Thus (3.12) holds.

Now to prove (iii) of Theorem 1.2, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *We have $u_q^{p-1}(x)u_q(x_q) \rightarrow \sigma_{n,\alpha}\delta_{x_0}(x)$ as $p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^+$.*

Proof. Take any function $\varphi(x) \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. For any $r > 0$ small, by (ii) of Theorem 1.2,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\Omega \setminus B(x_0, r)} u_q^{p-1}(x) u_q(x) \varphi(x) dx \right| \\ & \leq C \int_{\Omega \setminus B(x_0, r)} \mu_q^{\frac{(n-\alpha)(p-1)}{2}} \frac{u_q(x_q)}{|x-x_0|^{(n-\alpha)(p-1)}} dx \\ & \leq C \mu_q^{\frac{(n-\alpha)(p-1)}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{p-2}} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^+$. On the other hand, by using (3.9), (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12), similar to Lemma 2.2 we have

$$\int_{B(x_0, r)} u_q^{p-1}(x) u_q(x) \varphi(x) dx \rightarrow \varphi(x_0) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v^{p_\alpha-1}(z) dz = \varphi(x_0) \sigma_{n, \alpha},$$

as $p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^+$. Thus

$$\int_{B(x_0, r)} u_q^{p-1}(x) u_q(x) \varphi(x) dx \rightarrow (\varphi(x_0) + o_r(1)) \sigma_{n, \alpha}$$

as $p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^+$, where $o_r(1) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. Hence

$$\int_{\Omega} u_q^{p-1}(x) u_q(x) \varphi(x) dx \rightarrow \varphi(x_0) \sigma_{n, \alpha}$$

as $p \rightarrow (p_\alpha)^+$. \square

Proof of (iii) of Theorem 1.2. From (ii) of Theorem 1.2 it is easy to see that there is one single point x_0 such that $x_q \rightarrow x_0$, up to a subsequence, and

$$u_q(x_q) u_q(x) \geq C |x - x_0|^{\alpha-n}, \quad u_q(x) \rightarrow \infty \text{ if } x \neq x_0,$$

as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$. For any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, it is also easy to check that $\int_{\Omega} \frac{\varphi(x)}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dx$ is continuous in $y \in \bar{\Omega}$. Then by (1.1) and Lemma 3.3, for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} u_q(x_q) u_q(x) \varphi(x) dx &= \int_{\Omega} \varphi(x) dx \int_{\Omega} \frac{u_q^{p-1}(y) u_q(x_q)}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \\ &= \int_{\Omega} u_q^{p-1}(y) u_q(x_q) dy \int_{\Omega} \frac{\varphi(x)}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dx \\ &\rightarrow \sigma_{n, \alpha} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\varphi(x)}{|x-x_0|^{n-\alpha}} dx, \end{aligned}$$

as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$. So to prove that $u_q(x_q) u_q(x) \rightarrow \frac{\sigma_{n, \alpha}}{|x-x_0|^{n-\alpha}}$ pointwise for $x \neq x_0$, it is enough to prove that $u_q(x_q) u_q(x)$ is uniformly bounded and equicontinuous in $\Omega \setminus B(x_0, r)$ for any $r > 0$ small enough, as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$.

In fact, by using (3.6) and (3.12),

$$\begin{aligned} u_q(x_q) u_q(x) &= \mu_q^{-\frac{2\alpha}{p-2}} v_q(z) \leq C \mu_q^{-\frac{2\alpha}{p-2}} (1+|z|)^{\alpha-n} \quad (z = \frac{x-x_q}{\mu_q}) \\ &= C \mu_q^{-\frac{2\alpha}{p-2}} (1 + |\frac{x-x_q}{\mu_q}|)^{\alpha-n} \leq C \mu_q^{-\frac{2\alpha}{p-2} + n - \alpha} \leq C \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $\Omega \setminus B(x_0, r)$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$. On the other hand, similar to the proof of (iii) of Theorem 1.1, by using Lemma 3.3 and (ii) of Theorem 1.2, we can prove that $u_q(x_q) u_q(x)$ is equicontinuous in $\Omega \setminus B(x_0, r)$ as $q \rightarrow (q_\alpha)^-$. \square

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Professor Meijun Zhu for many helpful discussions and valuable comments during the preparation of this manuscript. The project is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11571268).

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Brézis, L.A. Peletier, *Asymptotics for elliptic equations involving critical growth*, Partial differential equations and the calculus of variations, Birkhäuser Boston, 1989, 149-192.
- [2] W. Chen, C. Li, B. Ou, Classification of solutions for an integral equation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 59 (2006), 330-343.
- [3] W. Chen, Y. Fang, R. Yang, Semilinear equations involving the fractional Laplacian on domains, arXiv:1309.7499.
- [4] J. Dou, Q. Guo, M. Zhu, Negative power nonlinear integral equations on bounded domains, in preparation.
- [5] J. Dou, Q. Guo, M. Zhu, Subcritical approach to sharp Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev type inequalities on the upper half space, *Adv. Math.* 312 (2017), 1-45; Corrigendum to "Subcritical approach to sharp Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev type inequalities on the upper half space" [*Adv. Math.* 312 (2017) 1-45], *Adv. Math.* 317 (2017), 640-644.
- [6] J. Dou, M. Zhu, Nonlinear integral equations on bounded domains, *J. Funct. Anal.* (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2018.05.020>.
- [7] J. Dou, M. Zhu, Reversed Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 2015 (2015), 9696-9726.
- [8] Q. Guo, M. Zhu, Blowup analysis for a nonlinear equation with negative exponent, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 436 (2016), 822-834.
- [9] M. Flucher, J. Wei, Semilinear Dirichlet problem with nearly critical exponent, asymptotic location of hot spots, *Manuscripta Math.* 94 (1997), 337-346.
- [10] Z. Han, Asymptotic approach to singular solutions for nonlinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponent, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 8 (1991), 159-174.
- [11] G.H. Hardy, J.E. Littlewood, Some properties of fractional integrals. I., *Math. Z.* 27 (1928), 565-606.
- [12] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, On certain inequalities connected with the calculus of variations, *J. London Math. Soc.* 5 (1930), 34-39.
- [13] M. Jiang, L. Wang, J. Wei, 2π -periodic self-similar solutions for the anisotropic affine curve shortening problem, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 41 (2011), 535-565.
- [14] Y. Li, Remark on some conformally invariant integral equations: the method of moving spheres, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 6 (2004), 153-180.
- [15] E.H. Lieb, Sharp constants in the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev and related inequalities, *Ann. of Math.* 118 (1983), 349-374.
- [16] O. Rey, Proof of two conjectures of H. Brézis and L.A. Peletier, *Manuscripta Math.* 65 (1989), 19-37.
- [17] O. Rey, The role of the Green's function in a nonlinear elliptic equation involving the critical Sobolev exponent, *J. Funct. Anal.* 89 (1990), 1-52.
- [18] S.L. Sobolev, On a theorem of functional analysis, *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)* 4 (1938), 471-479. *A. M. S. Transl. Ser. 2*, 34 (1963), 39-68.
- [19] M. Zhu, Prescribing integral curvature equation, *Differential Integral Equations* 29 (9-10) (2016), 889-904.

QIANQIAO GUO, DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, NORTHWESTERN POLYTECHNICAL
UNIVERSITY, XI'AN, SHAANXI, 710129, CHINA
E-mail address: gqianqiao@nwpu.edu.cn