

QUANTIZATION PROPERTY OF N-LAPLACIAN MEAN FIELD EQUATION AND SHARP MOSER-ONOFRI INEQUALITY

LU CHEN, GUOZHEN LU, AND BOHAN WANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we are concerned with the following n -Laplacian mean field equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_n u = \lambda e^u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where Ω is a smooth bounded domain of \mathbb{R}^n ($n \geq 2$) and $-\Delta_n u = -\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{n-2} \nabla u)$. We first establish the quantization property of solutions to the above n -Laplacian mean field equation. As an application, combining the Pohozaev identity and the capacity estimate, we obtain the sharp constant $C(n)$ of the Moser-Onofri inequality in the n -dimensional unit ball $B^n := B^n(0, 1)$,

$$\inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \geq C(n),$$

which extends the result of Caglioti-Lions-Marchioro-Pulvirenti in [4] to the case of n -dimensional ball. Here $C_n = (\frac{n^2}{n-1})^{n-1} \omega_{n-1}$ and ω_{n-1} is the surface measure of B^n . For the Moser-Onofri inequality in a general bounded domain of \mathbb{R}^n , we apply the technique of n -harmonic transplantation to give the optimal concentration level of the Moser-Onofri inequality and obtain the criterion for the existence and non-existence of extremals for the Moser-Onofri inequality.

1. INTRODUCTION

The main content of this paper focuses on the quantization property of the solution of the n -Laplacian mean field equation and its application to the sharp constant of the Moser-Onofri inequality, as well as the existence and non-existence of extremal functions of the Moser-Onofri inequality. Mean field equations and Moser-Onofri inequalities have significant applications in geometric analysis, harmonic analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations. Let us briefly present the history of the main results in this direction.

Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain of \mathbb{R}^n ($n \geq 2$) and denote by $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ the closure of $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ under the Dirichlet norm $(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^n dx)^{\frac{1}{n}}$. The classical Trudinger-Moser inequality

Key words and phrases. Moser-Onofri inequality, Mean field equation, Concentration-compactness, capacity estimate.

The first author was partly supported by the National Key Research and Development Program (No. 2022YFA1006900) and National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12271027). The second author was partly supported by a Simons grant and a Simons Fellowship from the Simons Foundation.

(see [21]) states that

$$(1.1) \quad \sup_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega), \|\nabla u\|_n \leq 1} \int_{\Omega} e^{\alpha_n u^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} dx < +\infty,$$

where $\alpha_n = n\omega_{n-1}^{\frac{1}{n-1}}$ refers to the sharp constant and ω_{n-1} denotes the $n-1$ dimensional measure of unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n . The Trudinger-Moser inequality in bounded domain of \mathbb{R}^n has also been extended to bounded domain of Heisenberg group and complex sphere (see [6,7]). An immediate consequence of the Trudinger-Moser inequality is the following Moser-Onofri inequality (see also [2,23])

$$(1.2) \quad \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)} \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{\Omega} e^u dx > -\infty,$$

where $C_n = (\frac{n^2}{n-1})^{n-1} \omega_{n-1}$. The critical point of the above inequality (1.2) satisfies the following n -Laplacian mean field equation

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_n u = \frac{\rho e^u}{\int_{\Omega} e^u dx} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\rho = C_n$.

As $n = 2$, the aforementioned equation reduces to the classical mean field equation:

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = \frac{\rho e^u}{\int_{\Omega} e^u dx} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

which arises in the study of Chern-Simons Higgs theory (see [12,13]). For $\rho < 8\pi$, the functional related with equation (1.4) has the compactness and the existence of solutions directly follows from the standard variational method. For $\rho = 8\pi$, the existence of solutions is non-trivial due to the loss of compactness of the related functional. In fact, many authors have found that the existence of solutions depends on the geometry of Ω in a subtle way. For example, when Ω is a ball, a consequence of the Pohozaev identity implies the non-existence of solutions for the mean field equation (1.4); when Ω is a long and thin domain, the authors of [4] proved that the mean field equation admits a positive solution. For $\rho > 8\pi$, the existence of solutions of the mean field equation (1.4) is a challenging problem. The construction of Bahri-Coron [1] makes it possible to obtain the existence of mean field solutions on domains with non-trivial topology. In fact, Ding-Jost-Li-Wang [9] established the existence of solutions for $\rho \in (8\pi, 16\pi)$ if Ω is a smooth bounded domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ whose complement contains a bounded region. Furthermore, they also obtained the similar existence result for the following mean field equation on a closed Riemann surface (M, g) with genus greater than one:

$$-\Delta_g u = \rho \left(\frac{e^u}{\int_M e^u dx} - 1 \right) \text{ in } M.$$

Struwe-Tarantello [25] proved a similar result for $\rho \in (8\pi, 4\pi^2)$ on the flat torus. For a general closed surface, Malchiodi [20] utilized the barycenter technique and proved the existence for $\rho \neq 8\pi\mathbb{N}$.

In the study of the existence of solutions for mean field equation (1.4), an important tool is to establish its quantization property. This dates back to Brezis and Merle's work in [3]. Lately, many authors, including Nagasaki-Suzuki [22], Li-Shafirir [16] and Ma-Wei [19], etc., have also studied extensively the quantization property of mean field equation (1.4). Their results can be stated as follows:

Theorem A: Let $\{u_{\rho_k}\}$ be a sequence of solutions satisfying the mean field equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \frac{\rho_k}{\int_{\Omega} e^u dx} e^u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

with $\rho_k \leq C$.

(a) If $\|u_{\rho_k}\|_{L^\infty}$ is bounded, then there exists some function $u \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ such that $u_{\rho_k} \rightarrow u$ in $C^2(\Omega)$.

(b) If $\|u_{\rho_k}\|_{L^\infty}$ is unbounded, then u_{ρ_k} must blow up at some finite points set $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subseteq \Omega$. Furthermore, there holds

$$\rho_k \rightarrow 8m\pi \quad \text{and} \quad u_{\rho_k} \rightarrow 8\pi \sum_{i=1}^m G(x, x_i) \quad \text{in } C_{loc}^2(\Omega \setminus S),$$

where $G(x, y)$ satisfies the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta G(x, y) = \delta_x(y) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ G(x, y) = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

However, to our knowledge, quantization analysis for solutions of n -Laplacian mean field equation (1.3) is still unknown. The nonlinearity of n -Laplacian operator and the lack of Green's representation formula for n -Laplacian equation bring significant challenges to the study of the related problem of the n -Laplacian mean field equation. In this paper, we address these difficulties and derive the following result:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $0 < C_1 \leq C_2 < \infty$ be two positive constants and $\alpha_n = n\omega_{n-1}^{\frac{1}{n-1}}$ be the sharp constant in the Moser-Trudinger inequality. Assume that u_λ satisfies the equation*

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_n u = \lambda e^u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ C_1 \leq \int_{\Omega} \lambda e^u dx \leq C_2, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then we have the following:

(a) If $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, the solution u_λ must blow up at some finite points set $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subseteq \Omega$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Furthermore, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \lambda e^{u_\lambda} dx \rightarrow \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \alpha_n\right)^{n-1} m$$

and

$$(1.6) \quad u_\lambda(x) \rightarrow u_0(x) \quad \text{in } C_{loc}^1(\Omega \setminus S),$$

where $u_0(x)$ denotes the equation

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_n u_0 = \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \alpha_n\right)^{n-1} \delta_{x_i}, & x \in \Omega, \quad x_i \in S, \\ u_0 = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

(b) If u_λ arises blow-up, then $\lambda \rightarrow 0$.

Remark 1.2. The usual proof for the analogy of (b) requires complicated blow-up analysis technique and some quantitative calculations. Our proof is based on comparison theorem for n -Laplacian operator, avoiding some of the complicated quantitative estimates.

An immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1 leads to

Corollary 1.3. Let $\{u_{\rho_k}\}$ be a sequence of solutions satisfying n -Laplacian mean field equation

$$(1.8) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_n u = \frac{\rho_k}{\int_{\Omega} e^u dx} e^u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

with $\rho_k \leq C$. Then we have the following:

(a) If $\|u_{\rho_k}\|_{L^\infty}$ is bounded, then there exists $u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ such that $u_{\rho_k} \rightarrow u$ in $C^1(\Omega)$.

(b) If $\|u_{\rho_k}\|_{L^\infty}$ is unbounded, then u_{ρ_k} must blow up at some finite points set $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subseteq \Omega$. Furthermore, we have

$$\rho_k \rightarrow \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \alpha_n\right)^{n-1} m \quad \text{and} \quad u_{\rho_k} \rightarrow u_0(x) \quad \text{in } C_{loc}^1(\Omega \setminus S),$$

where $u_0(x)$ denotes the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_n u_0 = \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{n}{n-1}\alpha_n\right)^{n-1} \delta_{x_i}, & x \in \Omega, \quad x_i \in S, \\ u_0 = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Another interesting problem related to n -Laplacian mean field equation is to consider the existence of extremals and the sharp constant for the Moser-Onofri inequality in a bounded domain Ω of \mathbb{R}^n :

$$(1.9) \quad \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)} \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{\Omega} e^u dx \geq C(n).$$

When Ω is a unit ball B^n of \mathbb{R}^n , applying the Pohozaev identity, we can derive the nonexistence of extremals of Moser-Onofri inequality (1.9) (see Lemma 2.8 and Proposition 3.3). Hence, it is plausible to obtain the sharp constant $C(n)$ of the Moser-Onofri inequality by computing the accurate lower bound of optimal concentration for the Moser-Onofri inequality. Indeed, we obtain

Theorem 1.4. *There holds that*

$$\inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right) = \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{\eta_0(y)} \eta_0(y) dy + \frac{n-1}{n} \ln \beta_n - \ln C_n,$$

where $\beta_n = n \left(\frac{n^2}{n-1}\right)^{n-1}$ and $\eta_0 = \ln \left(\frac{\beta_n}{(1+|x|^{\frac{n}{n-1}})^n} \right)$.

Remark 1.5. *Caglioti-Lions-Marchioro-Pulvirenti in [4] obtained the sharp constant of the Moser-Onofri inequality in two dimensional disk. However, their method based on ODE does not seem to be applicable to the n -Laplacian mean field equation. Furthermore, the calculation of the optimal concentration level of the Moser-Onofri inequality requires the Green representation formula in dimension two, which is not attainable for the n -Laplacian operator. We utilize the capacity estimate to overcome this difficulty and achieve the desired result.*

For a general bounded domain Ω , applying Theorem 1.4 and the technique of n -harmonic transplantation developed in [11], we obtain the optimal concentration level of the Moser-Onofri inequality.

Theorem 1.6. *Assume that Ω is a smooth bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n and $x_0 \in \Omega$, then*

(1.10)

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{\Omega}^{loc}(x_0) &\triangleq \inf \left\{ \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^n dx - \ln \int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx \right) \mid \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx = +\infty, \frac{\int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx}{\int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx} \rightarrow \delta_{x_0} \right\} \\
&= \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right) - n \ln \rho_{\Omega}(x_0),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\rho_{\Omega}(x_0)$ is the n -harmonic radius at x_0 (see Definition 4.2) in Section 4.

Define

$$C(n, \Omega) = \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^n - \ln \int_{\Omega} e^u dx \right).$$

Obviously,

$$C(n, \Omega) \leq \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right) - n \sup_{x_0 \in \Omega} \ln \rho_{\Omega}(x_0).$$

Then we can derive the following criterion for the existence of extremals for the Moser-Onofri inequality on a general bounded domain.

Theorem 1.7. *If*

$$C(n, \Omega) < \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right) - n \sup_{x_0 \in \Omega} \ln \rho_{\Omega}(x_0),$$

then $C(n, \Omega)$ can be achieved by some function $u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$. In other words, if $C(n, \Omega)$ is not achieved, then

$$C(n, \Omega) = \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right) - n \sup_{x_0 \in \Omega} \ln \rho_{\Omega}(x_0).$$

Remark 1.8. *Chang-Chen-Lin [5] have obtained the criterion for the existence of extremals of the Moser-Onofri inequality in two dimensional bounded domain through the conformal map.*

2. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section, we will establish the quantization property for positive solutions of the following n -Laplacian mean field equation (1.5):

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_n u = \lambda e^u & \text{in } \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n, \\ 0 < C_1 \leq \int_{\Omega} \lambda e^u dx \leq C_2, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Namely, we shall provide the proof of Theorem 1.1. The proof is divided into three steps. In Step 1, we show that the solution u_λ of equation (1.5) must blow up at some finite points set $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subseteq \Omega$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. In Step 2, we further prove that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \lambda e^u dx = \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \alpha_n\right)^{n-1} m$$

and

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} u_\lambda(x) \rightarrow u_0(x) \quad \text{in } C_{loc}^1(\Omega \setminus S),$$

where $u_0(x)$ satisfies the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_n u_0 = \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \alpha_n\right)^{n-1} \delta_{x_i}, & x \in \Omega, \\ u_0 = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

for $x_i \in S$. In Step 3, we explain that $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ is indeed equivalent to u_λ blowing up.

The proof of Step 1: We show that u_λ must blow up at some finite points set $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subseteq \Omega$ when λ approaches to zero.

We first prove that u_λ is unbounded when λ approaches to zero. We argue this by contradiction. If not, there exists some constant C such that $\|u_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C$. One can easily conclude that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \lambda \int_{\Omega} e^{u_\lambda} dx \leq \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \lambda e^{\|u_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}} |\Omega| = 0,$$

which contradicts with the assumption, $\lambda \int_{\Omega} e^{u_\lambda} dx \geq C_1 > 0$ of Theorem 1.1.

Define the blow-up set

$$(2.1) \quad S := \left\{ x \in \bar{\Omega} : \begin{array}{l} u_\lambda \text{ is the solutions of equation (1.5), there exists} \\ x_\lambda \in \Omega \text{ such that } u_\lambda(x_\lambda) \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } x_\lambda \rightarrow x. \end{array} \right\}$$

Then we will prove $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subseteq \Omega$ by defining a new set “ Σ_δ ” and analyzing the relationship between $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ and “ Σ_δ ”.

Define $\mu_\lambda := \lambda e^{u_\lambda} dx$, then $\mu_\lambda(\Omega) = \int_\Omega \lambda e^{u_\lambda} dx \leq C$. Hence, there exists a $\mu_0 \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$, the set of all real bounded Borel measures on Ω , such that $\mu_\lambda \rightharpoonup \mu_0$ in the sense of measure. We also denote by

$$(2.2) \quad \Sigma_\delta := \{x \mid x \in \Omega, \exists r = r(x), \text{ s.t. } \mu_0(B^n(x, r)) < (\alpha_n - \delta)^{n-1}\} \quad \text{for any } \delta > 0.$$

We claim

Lemma 2.1. *If $x_0 \in \Sigma_\delta$, then $u_\lambda \in L^\infty(B^n(x_0, r))$ for some $r > 0$.*

The proof of Lemma 2.1 needs the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *(see [10]) If $u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ is the weak solution of*

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div} \vec{a}(x, \nabla u) = f(u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where the non-negative function $f(u) \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $\vec{a}(x, \vec{p})$ is a Caratheodory function satisfying the following two conditions:

$$(2.4) \quad |\vec{a}(x, \vec{p})| \leq c(a(x) + |p|^{n-1}), \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{R}^n, \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega,$$

$$(2.5) \quad \langle \vec{a}(x, \vec{p}) - \vec{a}(x, \vec{q}), p - q \rangle \geq d|p - q|^n, \quad \forall p, q \in \mathbb{R}^n, \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega,$$

for some $c, d > 0$ and $a(x) \in L^{\frac{n}{n-1}}(\Omega)$. Then for any $\delta \in (0, \alpha_n)$, there holds that

$$(2.6) \quad \int_\Omega \exp \left\{ \frac{(\alpha_n - \delta) |u|}{\|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{n-1}}} \right\} dx \leq C.$$

Now we are in the position to prove that $u_\lambda \in L^\infty(B^n(x_0, r))$ for some $r > 0$ when $x_0 \in \Sigma_\delta$.

The proof of Lemma 2.1: Set $u_\lambda = u_\lambda^1 + u_\lambda^2$, equation (1.5) can be written as

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_n u_\lambda^1 = 0 & \text{in } B^n(x_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}), \\ u_\lambda^1 = u_\lambda & \text{on } \partial B^n(x_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}), \end{cases}$$

and

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div} \vec{a}(x, \nabla u_\lambda^2) = \lambda e^{u_\lambda} & \text{in } B^n(x_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}), \\ u_\lambda^2 = 0 & \text{on } \partial B^n(x_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}). \end{cases}$$

It is easy to check that

$$-\operatorname{div} \vec{a}(x, \nabla u_\lambda^2) = -\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u_\lambda|^{n-2} \nabla u_\lambda - |\nabla(u_\lambda - u_\lambda^2)|^{n-2} \nabla(u_\lambda - u_\lambda^2)),$$

and we can also find that $\vec{a}(x, \nabla u_\lambda^2)$ satisfies the two conditions (2.4) and (2.5), with $a(x) = |\nabla u_\lambda|^{n-1} \in L^{\frac{n}{n-1}}(B^n(x_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}))$.

By the definition of Σ_δ , there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mu_0(B^n(x_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})) < (\alpha_n - \delta)^{n-1}.$$

Then it follows from $\mu_\lambda = \lambda e^{u_\lambda} dx \rightharpoonup \mu_0$ that $\int_{B^n(x_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})} \lambda e^{u_\lambda} dx < \alpha_n^{n-1}$. Applying this and Lemma 2.2 into equation (2.8), we deduce that $e^{u_\lambda^2} \in L^{p_1}(B^n(x_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}))$ for some $p_1 > 1$.

Since u_λ satisfies equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_n u_\lambda = \lambda e^{u_\lambda} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_\lambda = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

from the L^1 -boundedness of λe^{u_λ} and Lemma 2.2, we obtain that $e^{u_\lambda} \in L^q(\Omega)$ for some $q > 0$. Combining this and $e^{u_\lambda^2} \in L^p(B^n(x_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}))$ for some $p > 1$ give $u_\lambda^1 \in L^{n-1}(B^n(x_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}))$. Since u_λ^1 satisfies the equation (2.7), using Harnack inequality ([26]) we derive

$$\|u_\lambda^1\|_{L^\infty(B^n(x_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}))} \leq C \|u_\lambda^1\|_{L^{n-1}(B^n(x_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}))} \leq C.$$

Thus, $\lambda e^{u_\lambda} = \lambda e^{u_\lambda^1} e^{u_\lambda^2} \in L^{p_2}(B^n(x_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}))$ for some $p_2 > 1$. By quasilinear elliptic regularity estimate (see [14]), we conclude that u_λ is uniformly bounded in $B^n(x_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{4})$.

Next, we claim that $\bigcup_{\delta>0} \Sigma_\delta^c$ is a finite points set.

Lemma 2.3. *Set $m := \operatorname{card}(\bigcup_{\delta>0} \Sigma_\delta^c)$. Then m is a finite value.*

Proof. By the definition of Σ_δ , formula (2.2), we easily deduce that

$$\bigcup_{\delta>0} \Sigma_\delta^c = \{x | x \in \Omega, \mu_\lambda(x) \geq \alpha_n^{n-1}\}.$$

Thus,

$$\alpha_n^{n-1} m \leq \mu_\lambda(x_1) + \mu_\lambda(x_2) + \dots + \mu_\lambda(x_m) \leq \mu_\lambda(\Omega) < +\infty,$$

that is, $m < +\infty$. □

Now, we are prepared to prove that the blow-up set S is equal to $\bigcup_{\delta>0} \Sigma_\delta^c$, which implies that u_λ must blow up at some finite points set $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subseteq \Omega$ when $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Before proving this, we first state a boundary estimate lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *There exists $\delta > 0$ and a constant $C = C(\delta, \Omega)$ such that*

$$\|u_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\delta)} \leq C(\delta, \Omega),$$

where $\Omega_\delta := \{x \in \Omega \mid \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \leq 2\delta\}$.

Proof. Using the moving-plane technique combining with Kelvin transform (see Proposition 2.1 of [18]), one can show that for all $x \in \Omega_\delta$, there exist a measurable set I_x and a positive constant $\gamma = \gamma(\Omega)$ such that

- (i) $|I_x| \geq \gamma$,
- (ii) $I_x \subseteq \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \geq \delta\}$,
- (iii) $u(x) \leq u(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in I_x$.

We have already known that $e^{u^\lambda} \in L^q(\Omega)$ for some $q > 0$ by Lemma 2.2. This leads to $u_\lambda \in L^p(\Omega)$ for any $p > 1$. Let φ_1 be the first eigenfunction of n -Laplacian operator with Dirichlet boundary condition, obviously φ_1 is positive and bounded in $C(\Omega)$. Then for any $x \in \Omega_\delta$, there holds

$$\gamma u_\lambda^p(x) \inf_{I_x} \varphi_1 \leq \int_{I_x} u_\lambda^p \varphi_1 dy \leq \int_\Omega u_\lambda^p \varphi_1 dy \leq \|u_\lambda\|_{L^p}^p \|\varphi_1\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 1.$$

This deduces that there exists a constant $C = C(\delta, \Omega)$ such that $u(x) \leq C(\Omega, \delta)$ for any $x \in \Omega_\delta$ and the proof of Lemma 2.4 is completed. \square

By the above boundary estimate lemma, we immediately deduce that the blow-up set S must be included into Ω . Next, we analyze the relationship of the blow-up set S and $\bigcup_{\delta>0} \Sigma_\delta^c$.

Lemma 2.5.

$$S = \bigcup_{\delta>0} \Sigma_\delta^c.$$

Proof. This lemma is equivalent to prove $S \subseteq \bigcup_{\delta>0} \Sigma_\delta^c$ and $\bigcup_{\delta>0} \Sigma_\delta^c \subseteq S$.

We first prove $S \subseteq \bigcup_{\delta>0} \Sigma_\delta^c$. One can argue it by contradiction. If not, there exists $x \in S$ such that $x \in \Sigma_{\delta_1}$ for some $\delta_1 > 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 that $u_\lambda \in L^\infty(B^n(x, r))$ for some $r > 0$, which is a contradiction with the definition of S .

Conversely, for the proof of $\bigcup_{\delta>0} \Sigma_\delta^c \subset S$, we also prove it by contradiction. If not, there exists some $x \in \bigcup_{\delta>0} \Sigma_\delta^c$ such that $x \in S^c$, then $u_\lambda \in L^\infty(B^n(x, r))$ for some $r > 0$. Then it follows that

$$\mu(B^n(x, r)) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \lambda \int_{B^n(x, r)} e^{u_\lambda} dx = 0.$$

This arrives at a contradiction with assumption $x \in \bigcup_{\delta>0} \Sigma_\delta^c$. Then we accomplish the proof of Lemma 2.5. \square

The proof of Step 2: We show that as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, $u_\lambda(x) \rightarrow u_0(x)$ in $C_{loc}^1(\Omega \setminus S)$, where $u_0(x)$ satisfies equation (1.7).

From Lemma 2.5, $S = \bigcup_{\delta>0} \Sigma_\delta^c$, we get that $\mu_0(x_i) \geq \alpha_n^{n-1}$ for $x_i \in S$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. For $x \in \Omega \setminus S$, from Lemma 2.1 we know that u_λ is L^∞ -bounded in $B^n(x, r)$, this gives

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \mu_\lambda(B^n(x, r)) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \int_{B^n(x, r)} \lambda e^{u_\lambda} dx = 0.$$

Then it implies that

$$\mu_\lambda \rightharpoonup \mu_0 = \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_0(x_i) \delta_{x_i}.$$

Next, we claim that

Lemma 2.6. $u_\lambda(x) \rightarrow u_0(x)$ in $C_{loc}^1(\Omega \setminus S)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, where $u_0(x)$ satisfies the equation

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_n u_0 = \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_0(x_i) \delta_{x_i}, & x \in \Omega, \quad x_i \in S, \\ u_0(x) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Since $u_\lambda \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ satisfies the equation

$$(2.10) \quad -\Delta_n u_\lambda = \lambda e^{u_\lambda} \in L^1(\Omega),$$

testing equation (2.10) with $u_\lambda^t := \min\{u_\lambda, t\}$, we obtain that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_\lambda^t|^n dx = \int_{\Omega} \lambda e^{u_\lambda^t} u_\lambda^t dx \leq C(q, n)t.$$

Assume $|\Omega| = |B^n(0, r)|$, where $B^n(0, r) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\| \leq r\}$. Let u_λ^* be the classical rearrangement of u_λ^t and $|B^n(x, \rho)| = |\{x \in B^n(x, r) : u_\lambda^* \geq t\}|$. According to properties of classical rearrangement, we have that

$$(2.11) \quad \inf_{\phi \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n(0,r)), \phi|_{B^n(0,r)=t}} \int_{B^n(0,r)} |\nabla \phi|^n dx \leq \int_{B^n(0,r)} |\nabla u_\lambda^*|^n dx \leq C(q, n)t.$$

It is not difficult to check that (see [14]) the infimum on the left-hand side of (2.11) is attained by

$$\phi_1(x) = \begin{cases} t \ln \frac{r}{|x|} / \ln \frac{r}{\rho} & \text{in } B^n(0, r) \setminus B^n(0, \rho), \\ t & \text{in } B^n(0, \rho). \end{cases}$$

Calculating $\|\nabla \phi_1\|_n^n$, by (2.11), we get $\rho \leq r e^{-C(q,n)t}$. Thus,

$$|\{x \in \Omega : u_\lambda \geq t\}| = |B^n(0, \rho)| \leq \frac{\omega_{n-1}}{n} r^n e^{-C(q,n)t}.$$

Using Taylor's expansion formula, for any $0 < v < nC(q, n)$,

$$\int_{\Omega} e^{vu_\lambda} dx \leq e^v |\Omega| + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} e^{v(m+1)} |\{x \in \Omega : m \leq u_\lambda \leq m+1\}| \leq C(q, n),$$

which implies that u_λ is uniformly bounded in $L^n(\Omega)$.

Testing equation (2.10) with $\ln \frac{1+2u_\lambda}{1+u_\lambda}$ and applying Young's inequality, for any $1 < q < n$ we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_\lambda|^q dx &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u_\lambda|^n}{(1+u_\lambda)(1+2u_\lambda)} dx + \int_{\Omega} ((1+u_\lambda)(1+2u_\lambda))^{\frac{q}{n-q}} dx \\ &\leq C(q, n) \ln 2 + C(q, n) \int_{\Omega} e^{vu_\lambda} dx \leq C(q, n). \end{aligned}$$

Namely, one can derive that u_λ is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ for any $1 < q < n$. Then, there exists $u_0 \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ such that $u_\lambda \rightharpoonup u_0$ in $W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$, where u_0 satisfies

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_n u_0 = \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_0(x_i) \delta_{x_i}, & x \in \Omega, x_i \in S, \\ u_0(x) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Due to the definition of S , we know that λe^{u_λ} is uniformly bounded in $L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega \setminus S)$. Applying the regularity estimate for quasilinear differential operator (see [14]), we deduce that $u_\lambda \rightarrow u_0$ in $C_{loc}^1(\Omega \setminus S)$. \square

Furthermore, we will present an accurate expression of $\mu_0(x_i)$ in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.7. *For any $i = 1, \dots, m$, $\mu_0(x_i) = (\frac{n}{n-1}\alpha_n)^{n-1}$.*

To show Lemma 2.7, we state the Pohozaev identity for equation (1.5).

Lemma 2.8. *For any $i = 1, \dots, m$,*

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} n^2 \int_{B^n(x_i, r)} F(u) dx &= \frac{n}{2} \int_{\partial B^n(x_i, r)} F(u) \frac{\partial(|x - x_i|^2)}{\partial n} dS - \int_{\partial B^n(x_i, r)} |\nabla u|^n (x - x_i, \nu) dS \\ &+ n \int_{\partial B^n(x_i, r)} |\nabla u|^{n-2} (\nabla u, \nu) (x - x_i, \nabla u) dS, \end{aligned}$$

where $F(u) = \int_0^u \lambda e^s ds$.

Proof. We multiply the equation (1.5) by $(x - x_i) \cdot \nabla u$ and integrate over $B^n(x_i, r)$,

$$\int_{B^n(x_i, r)} -\Delta_n u ((x - x_i) \cdot \nabla u) dx = \int_{B^n(x_i, r)} \lambda e^u ((x - x_i) \cdot \nabla u) dx.$$

We rewrite this expression as

$$A_1 = A_2.$$

Via the divergence theorem and direct computation, the term on the left is

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \int_{B^n(x_i, r)} -\Delta_n u ((x - x_i) \cdot \nabla u) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \int_{\partial B^n(x_i, r)} |\nabla u|^n (x - x_i, \nu) dS - \int_{\partial B^n(x_i, r)} |\nabla u|^{n-2} (\nabla u, \nu) (x - x_i, \nabla u) dS, \end{aligned}$$

the right-hand side is

$$A_2 = \int_{B^n(x_i, r)} \lambda e^u ((x - x_i) \cdot \nabla u) dx = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B^n(x_i, r)} F(u) \frac{\partial(|x - x_i|^2)}{\partial n} dS - n \int_{B^n(x_i, r)} F(u) dx.$$

Hence, one can obtain equation (2.13). □

Then, we turn to prove Lemma 2.7.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 2.8 that

$$\begin{aligned} n^2 \int_{B^n(x_i, \varepsilon)} F(u_\lambda) dx &= \frac{n}{2} \int_{\partial B^n(x_i, \varepsilon)} F(u_\lambda) \frac{\partial(|x - x_i|^2)}{\partial n} dS - \int_{\partial B^n(x_i, \varepsilon)} |\nabla u_\lambda|^n (x - x_i, \nu) dS \\ &\quad + n \int_{B^n(x_i, \varepsilon)} |\nabla u_\lambda|^{n-2} (\nabla u_\lambda, \nu) (x - x_i, \nabla u_\lambda) dS, \end{aligned}$$

where $F(u_\lambda) = \int_0^{u_\lambda} \lambda e^s ds$.

Since u_λ strongly converges to u_0 in $C_{loc}^1(\Omega \setminus S)$ and u_0 satisfies equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_n u_0 = \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \alpha_n\right)^{n-1} \delta_{x_i}, & x \in \Omega, \\ u_0 = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

then we deduce that $u_\lambda \rightarrow \mu_0^{\frac{1}{n-1}}(x_i) G(x, x_i) + R(x, x_i)$ in $C_{loc}^1(B^n(x_i, r) \setminus \{x_i\})$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, where $G(x, x_i)$ is the Green function of n -Laplacian operator with the singularity at x_i , $R(x, x_i)$ is continuous at x_i and satisfies $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_i} |\nabla(R(x, x_i) - R(x_i, x_i))| |x - x_i| = 0$ (see [14, 15]). Careful calculation gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \int_{\partial B^n(x_i, \varepsilon)} F(u_\lambda) \frac{\partial(|x - x_i|^2)}{\partial n} dS &= 0, \\ \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \int_{\partial B^n(x_i, \varepsilon)} |\nabla u_\lambda|^n (x - x_i, \nu) dS &= \omega_{n-1} \left(\frac{n}{\alpha_n}\right)^n \mu_0^{\frac{n}{n-1}}(x_i), \\ \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \int_{\partial B^n(x_i, \varepsilon)} |\nabla u_\lambda|^{n-2} (\nabla u_\lambda, \nu) (x - x_i, \nabla u_\lambda) dS &= \omega_{n-1} \left(\frac{n}{\alpha_n}\right)^n \mu_0^{\frac{n}{n-1}}(x_i). \end{aligned}$$

This together with Pohozaev identity (2.8) yields that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} n^2 \int_{B^n(x_i, \varepsilon)} F(u_\lambda) dx = (n-1) \omega_{n-1} \left(\frac{n}{\alpha_n}\right)^n \mu_0^{\frac{n}{n-1}}(x_i).$$

On the other hand,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} n^2 \int_{B^n(x_i, \varepsilon)} F(u_\lambda) dx = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} n^2 \int_{B^n(x_i, \varepsilon)} \lambda e^{u_\lambda} dx = n^2 \mu_0(x_i).$$

Combining the above estimate, we conclude that

$$\mu_0^{\frac{1}{n-1}}(x_i) = \frac{n}{n-1} \alpha_n.$$

□

The proof of Step 3: Recalling from Step 1, we have proven that u_λ must blow up as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Hence, to accomplish the proof of Step 3, we only need to prove that if u_λ blows up, then λ must approach to zero. Since $\lambda \int_\Omega e^{u_\lambda} dx$ is bounded, we only need to prove that $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \int_\Omega e^{u_\lambda} dx = +\infty$. By boundary estimate Lemma 2.4, we know that u_λ does not blow up at boundary. If u_λ blows up at some point x_1 , we claim that

$$\mu_0(x_1) \geq \alpha_n^{n-1}.$$

Indeed, suppose not, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\mu_0(x_1) < (\alpha_n - \delta)^{n-1}$. According to Lemma 2.1, $u_\lambda(x_1)$ is bounded which is a contradiction. Using comparison principle for n -Laplacian operator, we get

$$u_\lambda \geq n \ln \frac{1}{|x - x_1|}.$$

Naturally, we have

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \int_{B^n(x_1, \delta)} e^{u_\lambda} dx \geq \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \int_{B^n(x_1, \delta)} \frac{1}{|x - x_1|^n} dx = +\infty.$$

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is completed.

3. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

In this section, we will show the non-existence of extremal functions for the Moser-Onofri inequality in the ball of \mathbb{R}^n and obtain the accurate value of infimum of the Moser-Onofri inequality in the ball, namely, we shall give the proof of Theorem 1.4.

We first show that the Moser-Onofri inequality in the ball of \mathbb{R}^n does not have an extremal, i.e.,

Lemma 3.1.

$$\inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right)$$

cannot be achieved in $W_0^{1,n}(B^n)$.

Proof. We argue this by contradiction. Indeed, if the infimum

$$\inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right)$$

were achieved, then the extremal function u would satisfy the equation

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_n u = C_n \frac{e^u}{\int_{B^n} e^u dx} & \text{in } B^n, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial B^n. \end{cases}$$

Applying the Pohozaev identity to equation (3.1), we get

$$(3.2) \quad \int_{\partial B^n} |\nabla u|^n(x, \nu) dS = \frac{n^2}{n-1} \frac{C_n}{\int_{B^n} e^u dx} \int_{B^n} (e^u - 1) dx.$$

Since $|\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}| = |\nabla u|$ on ∂B^n and using Holder's inequality, one can calculate that

$$C_n = \int_{\partial B^n} |\nabla u|^{n-1} dS \leq |\partial B^n|^{\frac{1}{n}} \left(\int_{\partial B^n} |\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}|^n(x, \nu) dS \right)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} < |\partial B^n|^{\frac{1}{n}} \left(\frac{n^2}{n-1} C_n \right)^{\frac{n-1}{n}}.$$

Thus, by the value of C_n , the above inequality can deduce that

$$C_n < \left(\frac{n^2}{n-1} \right)^{n-1} \omega_{n-1} = C_n,$$

which is a contradiction. This proves that the Moser-Onofri inequality in B^n actually does not admit any extremal. \square

Next, we start to calculate the accurate value of infimum of Moser-Onofri inequality

$$\inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx.$$

The proof can be divided into two parts. In Part 1, we will adopt the method of subcritical approximation and capacity estimate to obtain the lower-bound of the infimum of the Moser-Onofri inequality on the ball. In Part 2, we will construct a suitable test function sequence to show that the lower-bound obtained in Part 1 is actually the infimum of the Moser-Onofri inequality on the ball B^n .

Part 1: We start the proof of the lower-bound of the infimum of the Moser-Onofri inequality on the ball. For this purpose, we first show that the subcritical Moser-Onofri inequality

$$(3.3) \quad \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \frac{1}{n\rho} \int_{B^n} (|\nabla u|^n) dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx > -\infty \quad \text{where } \rho < C_n$$

admits an extremal.

Lemma 3.2. *Denote*

$$J_\rho(u) = \frac{1}{n\rho} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx.$$

Then for $\rho < C_n$, $\inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} J_\rho(u)$ can be achieved by some function $u_\rho \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)$.

Proof. Let $\{u_j\} \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)$ be a minimizing sequence for $J_\rho(u)$, i.e.,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n\rho} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u_j|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^{u_j} dx = J_\rho(u).$$

On the other hand, through the Moser-Onofri inequality (1.2), we derive that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_j|^n dx - \ln \int_{\Omega} e^{u_j} dx > -C.$$

Combining the above estimates, we obtain that u_j is bounded in $W_0^{1,n}(B^n)$, which implies that $e^{u_j} dx \rightarrow e^{u_\rho} dx$ in $L^p(B^n)$ for any $p > 1$, where u_ρ is the weak limit of u_j in $W_0^{1,n}(B^n)$. Then the proof for existence of extremals of $\inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} J_\rho(u)$ for $\rho < C_n$ is accomplished. \square

Obviously, u_ρ satisfies

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_n u_\rho = \rho \frac{e^{u_\rho}}{\int_{B^n} e^{u_\rho} dx} & \text{in } B^n, \\ u_\rho = 0 & \text{on } \partial B^n. \end{cases}$$

By maximum principle and moving-plane method, we know that u_ρ is a radical decreasing function. Since u_ρ is the extremal function of the subcritical Moser-Onofri inequality (3.3),

$$\frac{1}{n\rho} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u_\rho|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^{u_\rho} dx \leq \frac{1}{n\rho} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx, \quad \forall u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n).$$

Letting $\rho \rightarrow C_n$, then taking the infimum of both sides of the above inequality, it deduces that

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \frac{1}{n\rho} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u_\rho|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^{u_\rho} dx \leq \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx.$$

Using the definition of infimum, it is obvious that

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \frac{1}{n\rho} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u_\rho|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^{u_\rho} dx \geq \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx.$$

Then we obtain

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \frac{1}{n\rho} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u_\rho|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^{u_\rho} dx = \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx.$$

Hence, to obtain the infimum of critical Moser-Onofri inequality, we only need to calculate the limit

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \frac{1}{n\rho} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u_\rho|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^{u_\rho} dx.$$

Assume $c_\rho := \max_{B^n} u_\rho(x)$. We claim that c_ρ is unbounded and argue this by contradiction. In fact, if c_ρ is bounded, then it follows from the regularity estimate for n -Laplacian operator that there exists some $u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)$ such that $u_\rho \rightarrow u$ in $C^1(B^n)$ and u satisfies n -Laplacian mean field equation

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_n u_\rho = C_n \frac{e^{u_\rho}}{\int_{B^n} e^{u_\rho} dx} & \text{in } B^n, \\ u_\rho = 0 & \text{on } \partial B^n, \end{cases}$$

which is a contradiction with Lemma 3.1. Thus, c_ρ is unbounded. Furthermore, using Corollary 1.3, one can deduce that $u_\rho(x) \rightarrow u_0(x)$ in $C_{loc}^1(B^n \setminus \{0\})$, where $u_0(x)$ satisfies the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_n u_0 = \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \alpha_n\right)^{n-1} \delta_0, & x \in B^n, \\ u_0 = 0, & x \in \partial B^n. \end{cases}$$

This characterizes the asymptotic behavior of u_ρ away from the blow-up point 0. Now we start to study the asymptotic behavior of u_ρ around the origin. Set

$$\eta_\rho(x) := u_\rho(\varepsilon_\rho x) - c_\rho + \ln \beta_n, \quad x \in B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1})$$

and

$$(3.6) \quad \frac{\rho}{\int_{B^n} e^{u_\rho} dx} \varepsilon_\rho^n e^{c_\rho - \ln \beta_n} = 1.$$

Careful computation gives the following equation

$$-\Delta_n \eta_\rho = e^{\eta_\rho} \quad \text{in } B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1}).$$

Obviously, $\varepsilon_\rho \rightarrow 0$ as $\rho \rightarrow C_n$. Indeed, if $\varepsilon_\rho \not\rightarrow 0$, then $\rho \frac{e^{c\rho}}{\int_{B^n} e^{u_\rho} dx} < +\infty$. This implies $\rho \frac{e^{c\rho}}{\int_{B^n} e^{u_\rho} dx} < +\infty$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(B^n)$. Applying quasilinear elliptic estimate into equation (3.4), we derive that u_ρ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(B^n)$, which is a contradiction.

Since $\eta_\rho \leq 0$ and $e^{\eta_\rho} \in L^\infty(B^n)$, according to Harnack inequality [26], we know that η_ρ is uniformly bounded near origin. Using quasilinear elliptic estimate again, one can derive that there exists $\eta_0 \in C^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\eta_\rho \rightarrow \eta_0$ in $C_{loc}^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, it follows that

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{\eta_0} dx &= \lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B^n(0,R)} e^{\eta_0} dx = \lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \int_{B^n(0,R)} e^{\eta_\rho} dx \\ &\leq \lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \int_{B^n(0,\varepsilon_\rho^{-1})} e^{\eta_\rho} dx = C_n. \end{aligned}$$

By the classification of solution for Liouville equation and $\eta_0(0) = \ln \beta_n$, we have

$$\eta_0 = \ln \frac{\beta_n}{(1 + |x|^{\frac{n}{n-1}})^n}.$$

In summary, we have obtained the asymptotic behavior of u_ρ near and away from origin. Next, we aim to establish the asymptotic behavior of η_ρ at infinity. Denote $\varphi := -c_1 \ln |x| + \ln \beta_n$ and

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{cases} \varphi|_{\partial B^n(0,R)} := -c_1 \ln R + \ln \beta_n, \\ \varphi|_{\partial B^n(0,\varepsilon_\rho^{-1})} := c_1 \ln \varepsilon_\rho + \ln \beta_n, \end{cases}$$

where c_1 is a undetermined positive constant. If c_1 satisfies the following conditions

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{cases} \varphi|_{\partial B^n(0,R)} < \eta_\rho|_{\partial B^n(0,R)}, \\ \varphi|_{\partial B^n(0,\varepsilon_\rho^{-1})} < \eta_\rho|_{\partial B^n(0,\varepsilon_\rho^{-1})}. \end{cases}$$

Since $\eta_\rho|_{\partial B^n(0,\varepsilon_\rho^{-1})} = -c_\rho + \ln \beta_n$ and $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \eta_\rho|_{\partial B^n(0,R)} = \eta_0|_{\partial B^n(0,R)} = \ln \frac{\beta_n}{(1+R^{\frac{n}{n-1}})^n}$, by direct computation we can choose $c_1 = \frac{n^2}{n-1} + \sigma$ such that

$$c_1 \ln R - n \ln(1 + R^{\frac{n}{n-1}}) > 0.$$

Then using the comparison principle, there holds that

$$\eta_\rho \geq -\left(\frac{n^2}{n-1} + \sigma\right) \ln |x| + \ln \beta_n \quad \text{in } B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1}) \setminus B^n(0, R).$$

Furthermore, we will show the accurate asymptotic behavior of η_ρ at infinity. For simplicity, we only provide an outline of the proof. Let us first recall the Kelvin transform $\hat{\eta}_\rho(x) = \eta_\rho(\frac{x}{|x|^2})$ of η_ρ satisfies

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_n \hat{\eta}_\rho = \frac{e^{\hat{\eta}_\rho}}{|x|^{2n}} & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho), \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho)} \frac{e^{\hat{\eta}_\rho}}{|x|^{2n}} dx = \rho. \end{cases}$$

Obviously, $\hat{\eta}_\rho \in C^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho))$.

Step 1. Decomposing $\hat{\eta}_\rho = \eta_\rho^\epsilon + H_\epsilon$, we fix small $r > 0$, and for $0 < \epsilon < r$, H_ϵ satisfies

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_n H_\epsilon = 0 & \text{in } B^n(0, r) \setminus B^n(0, \epsilon), \\ H_\epsilon = \hat{\eta}_\rho & \text{on } \partial(B^n(0, r) \setminus B^n(0, \epsilon)). \end{cases}$$

Local Holder estimates about equation (3.11) can be found in [8,24], we can get $H_\epsilon \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{B^n(0, r) \setminus B^n(0, \epsilon)})$. Then $\eta_\rho^\epsilon = \hat{\eta}_\rho - H_\epsilon \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{B^n(0, r) \setminus B^n(0, \epsilon)})$ satisfies that

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_n(\hat{\eta}_\rho - \eta_\rho^\epsilon) = 0 & \text{in } B^n(0, r) \setminus B^n(0, \epsilon), \\ \eta_\rho^\epsilon = 0 & \text{on } \partial(B^n(0, r) \setminus B^n(0, \epsilon)). \end{cases}$$

Step 2. By Lemma 2.2 and Sobolev embedding Theorem, we find that

$$\|H_\epsilon\|_{L^n(B^n(0,r) \setminus B^n(0,\epsilon))} \leq C.$$

Applying Ascoli-Arzelà's Theorem and the description in [8, 24], as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, there holds that $H_\epsilon \rightarrow H_0$ in $C_{loc}^1(\overline{B^n(0, r) \setminus \{0\}})$, where H_0 satisfies that

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_n H_0 = \delta_0 & \text{in } B^n(0, r), \\ H_0 = \eta_\rho^\epsilon & \text{on } \partial B^n(0, r), \end{cases}$$

and $H_0(x) + (\frac{\rho}{\omega_{n-1}})^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \ln|x| \in L^\infty(B^n(0, r))$.

Step 3. By comparison principle, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have that $\eta_\rho^\epsilon \rightarrow \eta_\rho^0 := \hat{\eta}_\rho - H_0$ in $C_{loc}^1(\overline{B^n(0, r) \setminus \{0\}})$, where $e^{\eta_\rho^0} \in L^p(B^n(0, r))$ for all $p \geq 1$. Using Lemma 2.2 and Sobolev embedding Theorem again, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$,

$$\|\eta_\rho^0\|_{L^\infty(B^n(0,r) \setminus \{0\})} \leq C.$$

Combining Step 1-3, one can easily derive that

$$(3.14) \quad \eta_\rho(x) + \left(\frac{\rho}{\omega_{n-1}}\right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \ln |x| \in L_{loc}^\infty(B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1})).$$

Now, we are in position to use capacity estimate to calculate the value of $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} J_\rho(u_\rho)$, and

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} J_\rho(u_\rho) = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \frac{1}{n\rho} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u_\rho|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^{u_\rho} dx.$$

Proposition 3.3.

$$(3.15) \quad \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} J_\rho(u_\rho) \geq \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{\eta_0(y)} \eta_0(y) dy + \frac{n-1}{n} \ln \beta_n - \ln C_n.$$

Proof. In fact, by equation (3.4) for u_ρ and equality (3.6), we infer to

$$(3.16) \quad \int_{B^n} |\nabla u_\rho|^n dx = \int_{B^n} \rho \frac{e^{u_\rho} u_\rho}{\int_{B^n} e^{u_\rho} dy} dx = (c_\rho - \ln \beta_n) \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1})} e^{\eta_\rho(y)} dy + \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1})} e^{\eta_\rho(y)} \eta_\rho(y) dy$$

and

$$\int_{B^n} e^{u_\rho} dx = \rho \varepsilon_\rho^n e^{c_\rho - \ln \beta_n}.$$

Hence, we calculate directly that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} J_\rho(u_\rho) &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \left(\frac{1}{\rho n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u_\rho|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^{u_\rho} dx \right) \\ &= -\frac{n-1}{n} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \left(c_\rho + \frac{n^2}{n-1} \ln \varepsilon_\rho + n \ln \left(\frac{R^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}{1 + R^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} \right) + \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1}) \setminus B^n(0, R)} e^{\eta_\rho} \eta_\rho dy \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{nC_n} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1})} e^{\eta_\rho(y)} \eta_\rho(y) dy + \frac{n-1}{n} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1}) \setminus B^n(0, R)} e^{\eta_\rho} \eta_\rho dy \\ &\quad + (n-1) \ln \left(\frac{R^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}{1 + R^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} \right) + \frac{n-1}{n} \ln \beta_n - \ln C_n. \end{aligned}$$

We will first claim that, for any sufficiently large R , there holds that

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \left(c_\rho + \frac{n^2}{n-1} \ln \varepsilon_\rho + n \ln \left(\frac{R^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}{1 + R^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} \right) + \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1}) \setminus B^n(0, R)} e^{\eta_\rho} \eta_\rho dy \right) \leq 0.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} J_\rho(u_\rho) &\geq \frac{1}{nC_n} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1})} e^{\eta_\rho(y)} \eta_\rho(y) dy + \frac{n-1}{n} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1}) \setminus B^n(0, R)} e^{\eta_\rho} \eta_\rho dy \\ &\quad + (n-1) \ln \left(\frac{R^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}{1 + R^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} \right) + \frac{n-1}{n} \ln \beta_n - \ln C_n. \end{aligned}$$

One can prove this claim by contradiction. If not, there exists some $R_0 > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \left(c_\rho + \frac{n^2}{n-1} \ln \varepsilon_\rho + n \ln \left(\frac{R_0^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}{1 + R_0^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} \right) + \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1}) \setminus B^n(0, R_0)} e^{\eta_\rho} \eta_\rho dy \right) \geq 0.$$

Consider the following inequality

$$(3.17) \quad \int_{B^n(0, \delta) \setminus B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho R_0)} |\nabla u_\rho|^n dx \geq \inf_{\substack{u|_{\partial B^n(0, \delta)} = u_\rho|_{\partial B^n(0, \delta)} \\ u|_{\partial B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho R_0)} = u_\rho|_{\partial B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho R_0)}} \int_{B^n(0, \delta) \setminus B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho R_0)} |\nabla u|^n dx.$$

Then the left-hand side of inequality (3.17) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B^n(0, \delta) \setminus B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho R_0)} |\nabla u_\rho|^n dx &= \left(\int_{B^n} - \int_{B^n \setminus B^n(0, \delta)} - \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho R_0)} \right) |\nabla u_\rho|^n dx \\ &=: \text{I} - \text{II} - \text{III}. \end{aligned}$$

For I, using equality (3.16), one can easily check that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \text{I} &= (c_\rho - \ln \beta_n) \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1})} e^{\eta_\rho(y)} dy + \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1})} e^{\eta_\rho(y)} \eta_\rho(y) dy \\ &= C_n (c_\rho - \ln \beta_n) + \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1})} e^{\eta_\rho(y)} \eta_\rho(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

For II, recalling Corollary 1.3 in the case of $m = 1$, we have shown that as $\rho \rightarrow C_n$, $u_\rho \rightarrow u_0(x)$ in $C_{loc}^1(B^n \setminus \{0\})$, where $u_0(x)$ satisfies the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_n u_0 = \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \alpha_n \right)^{n-1} \delta_0, & x \in B^n, \\ u_0 = 0, & x \in \partial B^n. \end{cases}$$

By the relationship between the Green function of n-Laplacian operator with the singularity at 0 and the Dirac function δ_0 , one can immediately deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \text{II} &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \int_{B^n \setminus B^n(0, \delta)} |\nabla u_\rho(x)|^n dx = \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \alpha_n\right)^n \int_{B^n \setminus B^n(0, \delta)} |\nabla G(x, 0)|^n dx \\ &= -C_n \frac{n^2}{n-1} \ln \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of η_ρ , we easily get that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \text{III} &= \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho R_0)} |\nabla u_\rho(x)|^n dx = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \int_{B^n(0, R_0)} |\nabla \eta_\rho(x)|^n dx \\ &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \int_{B^n(0, R_0)} e^{\eta_\rho(y)} \eta_\rho(y) dy - C_n \ln \frac{\beta_n}{(1 + R_0^{\frac{n}{n-1}})^n}. \end{aligned}$$

As for the right-hand side, supposing

$$u = a \ln |x| + b.$$

By the following equation

$$\begin{cases} u|_{\partial B^n(0, \delta)} = u_\rho|_{\partial B^n(0, \delta)}, \\ u|_{\partial B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho R_0)} = u_\rho|_{\partial B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho R_0)}, \end{cases}$$

and the definition of u_ρ can yield that

$$\begin{cases} a \ln \delta + b = u_\rho|_{\partial B^n(0, \delta)}, \\ a \ln \varepsilon_\rho R_0 + b = u_\rho|_{\partial B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho R_0)}. \end{cases}$$

Hence, one can compute directly

$$(3.18) \quad a = \frac{-\frac{n^2}{n-1} \ln \delta - c_\rho - \ln \frac{1}{(1 + R_0^{\frac{n}{n-1}})^n}}{\ln \delta - \ln \varepsilon_\rho R_0}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\substack{u|_{\partial B^n(0, \delta)} = u_\rho|_{\partial B^n(0, \delta)} \\ u|_{\partial B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho R_0)} = u_\rho|_{\partial B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho R_0)}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^n(B^n(0, \delta) \setminus B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho R_0))}^n &= |a|^n \int_{B^n(0, \delta) \setminus B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho R_0)} \frac{1}{|x - x_\rho|^n} dx \\ &= |a|^n \omega_{n-1} (\ln \delta - \ln \varepsilon_\rho R_0). \end{aligned}$$

Then as $\rho \rightarrow C_n$, combining with (3.17), (3.18) and the results of I, II, III, one can obtain the following inequality

(3.19)

$$\begin{aligned}
C_n c_\rho + C_n \frac{n^2}{n-1} \ln \delta - n C_n \ln(1 + R_0^{\frac{n}{n-1}}) + \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1}) \setminus B^n(0, R_0)} e^{\eta_\rho(y)} \eta_\rho(y) dy \\
\geq \omega_{n-1} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \frac{\left| -\frac{n^2}{n-1} \ln \delta - c_\rho - \ln \frac{1}{(1 + R_0^{\frac{n}{n-1}})^n} \right|^n}{(\ln \delta - \ln \varepsilon_\rho R_0)^{n-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1}) \setminus B^n(0, R_0)} e^{\eta_\rho(y)} \eta_\rho(y) dy \leq 0$. Hence, we conclude that

$$c_\rho + \frac{n^2}{n-1} \ln \delta - n \ln(1 + R_0^{\frac{n}{n-1}}) \leq \frac{n^2}{n-1} (\ln \delta - \ln \varepsilon_\rho R_0).$$

Consequently, we can write inequality (3.19) as

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \left[c_\rho + \frac{n^2}{n-1} \ln \varepsilon_\rho + n \ln \left(\frac{R_0^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}{1 + R_0^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} \right) + \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1}) \setminus B^n(0, R_0)} e^{\eta_\rho(y)} \eta_\rho(y) dy \right] \leq 0,$$

which contradicts with previous assumption,

$$c_\rho + \frac{n^2}{n-1} \ln \varepsilon_\rho + n \ln \left(\frac{R_0^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}{1 + R_0^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} \right) + \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1}) \setminus B^n(0, R_0)} e^{\eta_\rho(y)} \eta_\rho(y) dy > 0.$$

Thus, we accomplish the proof of the claim.

By estimate (3.14), $|\eta_\rho| \leq \left(\frac{\rho}{\omega_{n-1}}\right)^{n-1} \ln |x|$ in $B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1}) \setminus B^n(0, R)$. Hence, it is easy to check that

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} \int_{B^n(0, \varepsilon_\rho^{-1}) \setminus B^n(0, R)} e^{\eta_\rho} \eta_\rho dy = 0.$$

To sum up,

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow C_n} J_{C_n}(u_\rho) \geq \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{\eta_0(y)} \eta_0(y) dy + \frac{n-1}{n} \ln \beta_n - \ln C_n.$$

□

Part 2: In this part, one can modify the standard solution to deduce an upper bound for J_{C_n} . Since the previous description about η_0 , we easily obtain that $\tilde{\eta}_L(x) := \eta_0\left(\frac{x}{L}\right) - n \ln L$ satisfies the equation

$$(3.20) \quad -\Delta_n \tilde{\eta}_L = e^{\tilde{\eta}_L} \quad \text{in } B^n.$$

We construct a test function sequence $\Phi_L := \tilde{\eta}_L - \tilde{\eta}_L|_{\partial B^n}$. It is easy to check that Φ_L satisfies

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_n \Phi_L = e^{\tilde{\eta}_L} & \text{in } B^n, \\ \Phi_L = 0 & \text{on } \partial B^n. \end{cases}$$

Simple computations give that,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{L \rightarrow +\infty} J_{C_n}(\Phi_L) &= \lim_{L \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla \Phi_L|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^{\Phi_L} dx \\ &= \lim_{L \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} e^{\tilde{\eta}_L} (\tilde{\eta}_L - \tilde{\eta}_L|_{\partial B^n}) dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^{\Phi_L} dx \\ &=: \frac{1}{nC_n} (I_{11} - I_{12}) - \ln I_2. \end{aligned}$$

For I_{11} , by the expression of $\tilde{\eta}_L$, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{11} &= \lim_{L \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B^n} e^{\tilde{\eta}_L} \tilde{\eta}_L dx = \lim_{L \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B^n} \frac{\beta_n}{L^n (1 + |\frac{x}{L}|^{\frac{n}{n-1}})^n} \ln \frac{\beta_n}{L^n (1 + |\frac{x}{L}|^{\frac{n}{n-1}})^n} dx \\ &= \lim_{L \rightarrow +\infty} C_n \ln \frac{\beta_n}{L^n} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\beta_n}{(1 + |y|^{\frac{n}{n-1}})^n} \ln(1 + |y|^{\frac{n}{n-1}})^n dy. \end{aligned}$$

For I_{12} , using the expression of $\tilde{\eta}_L$ again, we have

$$I_{12} = \lim_{L \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} e^{\tilde{\eta}_L} \tilde{\eta}_L|_{\partial B_1(0)} dx = \lim_{L \rightarrow +\infty} C_n \ln \frac{\beta_n}{L^n (1 + |L|^{-\frac{n}{n-1}})^n}.$$

Likewise, for I_2 , we directly calculate

$$I_2 = \lim_{L \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B^n} e^{\Phi_L} dx = \lim_{L \rightarrow +\infty} C_n \ln \frac{L^n (1 + |L|^{-\frac{n}{n-1}})^n}{\beta_n}.$$

Combining the estimate I_{11} , I_{12} and I_2 , we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{L \rightarrow +\infty} J_{C_n}(\Phi_L) &= \lim_{L \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{nC_n} \left(C_n \ln \frac{\beta_n}{L^n} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\beta_n \ln(1 + |y|^{\frac{n}{n-1}})^n}{(1 + |y|^{\frac{n}{n-1}})^n} dy - C_n \ln \frac{\beta_n}{L^n (1 + |L|^{-\frac{n}{n-1}})^n} \right) \\ &\quad - \ln C_n \ln \frac{L^n (1 + |L|^{-\frac{n}{n-1}})^n}{\beta_n} \\ &= \lim_{L \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln(1 + |L|^{-\frac{n}{n-1}})^n - \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{\eta_0(y)} \eta_0(y) dy - \ln C_n - \ln \frac{L^n (1 + |L|^{-\frac{n}{n-1}})^n}{\beta_n} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{\eta_0(y)} \eta_0(y) dy + \frac{n-1}{n} \ln \beta_n - \ln C_n.$$

4. THE PROOFS OF THEOREM 1.6 AND 1.7

In this section, we shall establish the accurate lower bound of optimal concentration for the Moser-Onofri inequality on a general domain and give the criterion for the existence of extremals of the Moser-Onofri inequality. Since our methods are based on the n -harmonic transplantation, for reader's convenience, we also need to introduce some basic concepts and properties for n -capacity, Robin function and n -harmonic radius.

Definition 4.1. (Chapter 2 in [11]). *The n -capacity of a set $A \subseteq \Omega$ with respect to Ω is defined as*

$$(4.1) \quad \text{ncap}_\Omega(A) := \inf \left\{ \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^n : u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega), u \geq 1 \text{ on } A \right\}.$$

We call $n\text{mod}_\Omega(A) := \text{ncap}_\Omega^{\frac{1}{1-n}}(A)$ the n -modulus of A with respect to Ω . A function which realizes the infimum (4.1) is called a n -capacity potential. The n -capacity potential satisfies equation

$$\begin{aligned} -\text{div}(|\nabla u|^{n-2} \nabla u) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus A, \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{in } \partial\Omega, \\ u &= 1 \quad \text{in } \bar{A}. \end{aligned}$$

Integration by parts leads to the boundary integral representation

$$(4.2) \quad \text{ncap}_\Omega(A) = \int_{\partial A} |\nabla u|^{n-1}.$$

Definition 4.2. *The Green function of n -Laplacian operator with the singularity at x_0 on the bounded domain is defined as the singular solution of Dirichlet problem*

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_n G_{x_0}(y) = \delta_{x_0}(y), & y \in \Omega, \\ G_{x_0}(y) = 0, & y \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

The Green function of n -Laplacian operator can be decomposed into singular part and a regular part:

$$G_{x_0}(y) = K(|y - x_0|) - H_{x_0, \Omega}(y), \quad K(|y - x_0|) = -\frac{n}{\alpha_n} \log(|y - x_0|).$$

The regular part of the Green function of n -Laplacian operator on the bounded domain Ω evaluated at singularity x_0 :

$$\tau_{\Omega}(x_0) = H_{x_0, \Omega}(x_0)$$

is called the n -Robin function of Ω at x_0 . The n -harmonic radius $\rho_{\Omega}(x_0)$ at x_0 is defined by the relation

$$-\frac{n}{\alpha_n} \log(\rho_{\Omega}(x_0)) = H_{x_0, \Omega}(x_0).$$

Definition 4.3. Define by G_0 the Green function of n -Laplacian operator on $B^n(0, r)$ with the singularity at 0. For every positive radial function $U = \Phi \circ G_0(y) : B^n(0, r) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ and $x_0 \in \Omega$, we associate $u : \Phi \circ G_{x_0}(y) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. This transformation is called n -harmonic transplantation from $(B^n(0, r), 0)$ to (Ω, x_0) .

Proposition 4.4. The n -harmonic transplantation has the following properties:

(1) It preserves the n -Dirichlet-energy,

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^n dx = \int_{B^n(0, r)} |\nabla U|^n dx.$$

(2) If $r = \rho_{\Omega}(x_0)$, then

$$\int_{\Omega} F(u) dx \geq \int_{B^n(0, r)} F(U) dx = \rho_{\Omega}^n(x_0) \int_{B^n} F(U) dx.$$

(3) If $F(U_k) \rightharpoonup c_0 \delta_0$ in the sense of measure, then $F(u_k) \rightharpoonup c_0 \delta_{x_0}$ in the sense of measure.

Proposition 4.5. (Theorem 9.5 of Chapter 9 in [11]) If the sets (A_{ε}) concentrate at a point $x_0 \in \Omega \cap \tilde{\Omega}$ in the sense $A_{\varepsilon} \subseteq B^n(x_0, r_{\varepsilon})$ with $r_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$, then

$$n \text{mod}_{\Omega}(A_{\varepsilon}) = n \text{mod}_{\tilde{\Omega}}(A_{\varepsilon}) + \tau_{\tilde{\Omega}}(x_0) - \tau_{\Omega}(x_0) + o(1)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Now, we are in the position to give the accurate lower bound of optimal concentration for Moser-Onofri inequality on a general domain, namely, we shall provide the proof of Theorem 1.6. We first claim a basic fact that can be inferred from the proof of Theorem 1.4:

$$F_{B^n}^{loc}(0) = \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right).$$

Indeed, since

$$\inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right)$$

can not be achieved, if we define w_k as the extremal function of

$$\inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{n(C_n - \epsilon_k)} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right)$$

with the $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$, then from the proof of Theorem 1.4, we see that

$$\int_{B^n} e^{w_k} dx \rightarrow +\infty, \quad \frac{\int_{B^n} e^{w_k} dx}{\int_{B^n} e^{w_k} dx} \rightarrow \delta_0$$

and

(4.4)

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla w_k|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^{w_k} dx \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{\eta_0(y)} \eta_0(y) dy + \frac{n-1}{n} \ln \beta_n - \ln C_n. \end{aligned}$$

Recall the *Part 2* of the proof of Theorem 1.4, we construct the suitable test function sequences Φ_L satisfying

$$\int_{B^n} e^{\Phi_L} dx \rightarrow +\infty, \quad \frac{\int_{B^n} e^{\Phi_L} dx}{\int_{B^n} e^{\Phi_L} dx} \rightarrow \delta_0$$

such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla \Phi_L|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^{\Phi_L} dx \right) = \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{\eta_0(y)} \eta_0(y) dy + \frac{n-1}{n} \ln \beta_n - \ln C_n.$$

Combining the above estimate, we derive that

$$\inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right) = F_{B^n}^{loc}(0).$$

A simple change of variable: $x \rightarrow Rx$ will directly yield $F_{B^n(0,R)}^{loc}(0) = R^n F_{B^n}^{loc}(0)$.

Now we start the proof of Theorem 1.6. Assume that $u_k \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ satisfies

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx = +\infty, \quad \frac{\int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx}{\int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx} \rightarrow \delta_{x_0}.$$

Through Proposition 4.4, we see that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^n dx = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla U_k|^2 dx, \quad \int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx \geq \rho_{\Omega}^n(x_0) \int_{B^n} e^{U_k} dx, \quad \frac{\int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx}{\int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx} \rightarrow \delta_0.$$

Then we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.5) \quad & \inf \left\{ \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^n dx - \ln \int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx \right) \mid \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx = +\infty, \frac{\int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx}{\int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx} \rightarrow \delta_{x_0} \right\} \\ & \leq \inf \left\{ \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla U_k|^n dx - \ln \int_{\Omega} e^{U_k} dx \right) - n \ln \rho_{\Omega}(x_0) \mid \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B^n} e^{U_k} dx = +\infty, \frac{\int_{B^n} e^{U_k} dx}{\int_{B^n} e^{U_k} dx} \rightarrow \delta_0 \right\} \\ & = \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right) - n \ln \rho_{\Omega}(x_0). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in order to obtain our desired result, we just need to prove

$$\begin{aligned} (4.6) \quad & \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^n dx - \ln \int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx \right) \\ & \geq \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right) - n \ln \rho_{\Omega}(x_0). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx = +\infty$, one can easily check that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.7) \quad & \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^n dx - \ln \int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx \right) \\ & = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^n dx - \ln \left(\int_{\{|u_k| \leq 1\}} e^{u_k} dx + \int_{\{|u_k| \geq 1\}} e^{u_k} dx \right) \right) \\ & = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^n dx - \ln \int_{\{|u_k| \geq 1\}} e^{u_k} dx \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining with

$$\frac{e^{u_k} dx}{\int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx} \rightharpoonup \delta_{x_0},$$

we find that there exists $r_k \rightarrow 0$ such that $A_k \triangleq \{u_k \geq 1\}$ is included in $B_{r_k}(x_0)$. Then we can replace u_k below level 1 with the n -capacity potential of A_k without changing the limit of the functional. The resulting function is denoted by v_k . We apply the change of the domain formula (Proposition 4.5) with $\tilde{\Omega} = B^n(x_0, \rho_{\tilde{\Omega}}(x_0))$ such that $n\text{mod}_{\tilde{\Omega}}(A_k) = n\text{mod}_{\Omega}(A_k) + o(1)$. By the logarithmic structure of the fundamental singularity, a change of order $o(1)$ in the radius of Ω leads to a change of the same order in the n -modulus. Thus, we can achieve that

$$n\text{mod}_{B^n(x_0, \rho_{\Omega}(x_0) + o(1))}(A_k) \geq n\text{mod}_{\Omega}(A_k)$$

by increasing the radius of $\tilde{\Omega}$ by $o(1)$. Hence, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^n dx - \ln \int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx \right) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^n dx - \ln \int_{A_k} e^{u_k} dx \right) \\ &\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla v_k|^n dx - \ln \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} e^{v_k} dx \right) \\ &\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} F_{B^n(0, \rho_{\Omega}(x_0) + o_k(1))}^{loc}(x_0) \\ &= \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n dx - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right) - n \ln \rho_{\Omega}(x_0), \end{aligned}$$

then we accomplish the proof of Theorem 1.6.

Now, we give the proof of Theorem 1.7. Let u_k denote the extremal of subcritical Moser-Onofri inequality on a general domain Ω :

$$\inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)} \left(\frac{1}{n(C_n - \epsilon_k)} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^n - \ln \int_{\Omega} e^u dx \right)$$

with $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$. Then it is not difficult to check that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^n - \ln \int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx \right) = C(n, \Omega).$$

If u_k is unbounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$, arguing as what we did in Theorem 1.4, we can derive that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx = +\infty, \quad \frac{e^{u_k}}{\int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx} \rightharpoonup \delta_{x_0}.$$

According to the definition of $F_{\Omega}^{loc}(x_0)$, we immediately conclude that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^n - \ln \int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx \right) \geq F_{\Omega}^{loc}(x_0).$$

In view of Theorem 1.6, this gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^n - \ln \int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx \right) \\ & \geq \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right) - n \sup_{x_0 \in \Omega} \ln \rho_{\Omega}(x_0), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts with the assumption

$$C(n, \Omega) < \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,n}(B^n)} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{B^n} |\nabla u|^n - \ln \int_{B^n} e^u dx \right) - n \sup_{x_0 \in \Omega} \ln \rho_{\Omega}(x_0).$$

Hence u_k is bounded in $L^{\infty}(\Omega)$, it follows from the regular estimate for quasilinear operator that there exists $u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ such that $u_k \rightarrow u$ in $C^1(\Omega)$ and

$$C(n, \Omega) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^n - \ln \int_{\Omega} e^{u_k} dx \right) = \frac{1}{nC_n} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^n - \ln \int_{\Omega} e^u dx.$$

Then the proof of Theorem 1.7 is accomplished.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Bahri, J. M. Coron, *Sur une équation elliptique non linéaire avec l'exposant critique de Sobolev*, CR Acad. Sci. Paris. **301** (1985) 345-348.
- [2] W. Beckner, *Sharp Sobolev inequalities on the sphere and the Moser-Trudinger inequality*, Ann. Math. **138** (1993) 213-242.
- [3] H. Brezis, F. Merle, *Uniform estimates and blow-up behavior for solutions of $-\Delta u = V(x)e^u$ in two dimensions*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations. **16** (1991) 1223-1253.
- [4] E. Caglioti, P. Lions, C. Marchioro and M. Pulvirenti, *A special class of stationary flows for two-dimensional Euler equations: A statistical mechanics description*, Commun. Math. Phys. **143** (1992) 501-525.
- [5] A. Chang, C. Chen and C. Lin, *Extremal functions for a mean field equation in two dimension*, New Stud. Adv. Math. **2** (2003) 61-93.
- [6] W. S. Cohn, G. Lu, *Best constants for Moser-Trudinger inequalities on the Heisenberg group*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **50** (2001) 1567-1591.
- [7] W. S. Cohn, G. Lu, *Sharp constants for Moser-Trudinger inequalities on spheres in complex space C^n* , Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **57**, (2004) 1458-1493.
- [8] E. DiBenedetto, *$C^{1,\alpha}$ local regularity of weak solutions of degenerate elliptic equations*, Nonlinear Anal. **7** (1983) 827-850.
- [9] W. Ding, J. Jost, J. Li and G. Wang, *Existence results for mean field equations*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire. **16** (1999) 653-666.

- [10] P. Esposito, *A classification result for the quasi-linear Liouville equation*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire. **35** (2018) 781-801.
- [11] M. Flucher, *Concentration Compactness Alternatives. Variational Problems with Concentration*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications. **36** (1999) 23-33.
- [12] J. Hong, Y. Kim, P. Pac, *Multivortex solutions of the Abelian Chern-Simons-Higgs theory*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990) 2230-2233.
- [13] R. Jackiw, E. Weinberg, *Self-dual Chern-Simons vortices*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990) 2234-2237.
- [14] Y. X. Li, *Extremal functions for the Moser-Trudinger inequalities on compact Riemannian manifolds*, Sci. China Ser. A-Math. **48** (2005) 618-648.
- [15] Y. X. Li, B. Ruf, *A sharp Moser-Trudinger type inequality for unbounded domains in \mathbb{R}^n* , Indiana Univ. Math. **57** (2008) 451-480.
- [16] Y. Li, I. Shafrir, *Blow-up analysis for solutions of $-\Delta u = Ve^u$ in dimension two*, Indiana Univ. Math. **43** (1994) 1255-1270.
- [17] C. Lin, J. Wei, *Locating the peaks of solutions via the maximum principle II: a local version of the method of moving planes*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **56** (2003) 784-809.
- [18] S. Lorca, B. Ruf, P. Ubilla, *A priori bounds for superlinear problems involving the N -Laplacian*, J. Differential Equations. **246** (2009) 2039-2054.
- [19] L. Ma, J. Wei, *Convergence for a Liouville equation*, Comment. Math. Helv. **76** (2001) 506-514.
- [20] A. Malchiodi, *Topological methods for an elliptic equation with exponential nonlinearities*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **21** (2008) 277-294.
- [21] J. Moser, *A sharp form of an inequality by N. Trudinger*, Indiana Univ. Math. **20** (1971) 1077-1092.
- [22] K. Nagasaki, T. Suzuki, *Asymptotic analysis for two-dimensional elliptic eigenvalue problems with exponentially dominated nonlinearities*, Asymptotic Anal. **3** (1990) 173-188.
- [23] E. Onofri, *On the positivity of the effective action in a theory of random surfaces*, Comm. Math. Phys. **86** (1982) 321-326.
- [24] J. Serrin, *Local behavior of solutions of quasilinear equations*, Acta Math. (1964) 247-302.
- [25] M. Struwe, G. Tarantello, *On multivortex solutions in Chern-Simons gauge theory*, Boll. Unione Math. Ital. Sez. B Artic. Ric. Mat. **8** (1998) 109-121.
- [26] N. S. Trudinger, *On Harnack type inequalities and their application to quasilinear elliptic equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **20** (1967) 721-747.

(Lu Chen) KEY LABORATORY OF ALGEBRAIC LIE THEORY AND ANALYSIS OF MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, BEIJING INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, BEIJING 100081, PR CHINA

Email address: chenlu5818804@163.com

(Guozhen Lu) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT, STORRS, CT 06269, USA

Email address: guozhen.lu@uconn.edu

(Bohan Wang) KEY LABORATORY OF ALGEBRAIC LIE THEORY AND ANALYSIS OF MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, BEIJING INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, BEIJING 100081, PR CHINA

Email address: wangbohanbit2022@163.com