

MIN-MAX THEORY AND EXISTENCE OF H-SPHERES WITH ARBITRARY CODIMENSIONS

RUI GAO AND MIAOMIAO ZHU

Dedicated to Stefan Oscar Walter Hildebrandt (1936-2015)

ABSTRACT. We demonstrate the existence of branched immersed 2-spheres with prescribed mean curvature, with controlled Morse index and with arbitrary codimensions in closed Riemannian manifold N admitting finite fundamental group, where $\pi_k(N) \neq 0$ and $k \geq 2$, for certain generic choice of prescribed mean curvature vector. Moreover, we enhance this existence result to encompass all possible choices of prescribed mean curvatures under certain Ricci curvature condition on N when $\dim N = 3$. When $\dim N \geq 4$, we establish a Morse index lower bound while N satisfies some isotropic curvature condition. As a consequence, we can leverage latter strengthened result to construct 2-spheres with parallel mean curvature when N has positive isotropic curvature and $\dim N \geq 4$. At last, we partially resolve the homotopy problem concerning the existence of a representative surface with prescribed mean curvature type vector field in some given homotopy classes.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Open Problems and Main Results	2
1.2. Backgrounds	6
1.3. Settings	9
1.4. Basic Ideas of Seeking H -spheres	11
1.5. Outline of Proof	12
1.6. Organizations	14
2. Variational Properties of Perturbed Functional E_α^ω	14
2.1. Some Preliminaries	14
2.2. First and Second Variation of Perturbed Functional E_α^ω	15
2.3. Palais-Smale Condition and Regularity of Critical Points for Functional E_α^ω	21

Date: July 17, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 49J35; 53A10; 53C42; 58E20.

Key words and phrases. H-surfaces; Arbitrary Codimensions; Parallel Mean Curvature; Min-Max Theory.

We would like to thank Professor Xin Zhou for valuable conversations and helpful comments.

3.	Existence of non-trivial Critical Points of the Perturbed Functional $E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}$	25
3.1.	Construction of Min-Max Type Critical Value.	25
3.2.	α -Energy Estimates for Min-Max Type Critical Points	26
3.3.	Morse Index Upper Bound for Min-Max Critical Points u_α	33
4.	Compactness for Critical Points of Functional $E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}$	53
4.1.	Main Results on Asymptotic Analysis for Sequences of α - H -surfaces	53
4.1.1.	Descriptions of Bubbling Procedure	53
4.1.2.	Generalized Energy Identity	56
4.1.3.	Asymptotic Behavior on Necks	57
4.1.4.	Energy Identity Under Topological and Curvature Conditions	58
4.1.5.	Non-constancy of Weak Limit	59
4.2.	Preparations for the Proof of Main Theorem	62
4.2.1.	Small Energy Regularity, Energy Gap and Removability of Isolated Singularities	62
4.2.2.	Pohozaev type Identities	65
4.3.	Proof of Generalized Energy Identity — Theorem 4.1.1	72
4.3.1.	Proof of Single Bubble Case for Theorem 4.3.1	73
4.3.2.	Proof of General Case for Theorem 4.3.1.	82
4.4.	Proof of Asymptotic Behavior on Necks—Theorem 4.1.2	85
4.4.1.	No Neck Property for the case $\nu = 1$	85
4.4.2.	Asymptotic Neck Analysis and Length Formula for $\nu > 1$	89
4.5.	Energy Identity for α - H -surfaces with Bounded Morse Index	104
5.	Existence of H -Sphere of Bounded Morse Index	112
5.1.	Existence of Minimizing H -Surfaces.	112
5.2.	Existence of H -Sphere of Bounded Morse Index for Generic Choice of $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$	115
5.3.	Existence of H -Sphere under Ricci Curvature Assumption When $\dim(N) = 3$	120
5.4.	Existence of H -Sphere under Isotropic Curvature Assumption When $\dim(N) \geq 4$	128
	References	130

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Open Problems and Main Results.

Surfaces with *Constant Mean Curvature* (CMC) and with *Prescribed Mean Curvature* (PMC) are important in mathematics, physics and biology. They arise naturally in partitioning problems, isoperimetric problems, general relativity, two phases interface problems and tissue growth etc.

Around the early 1980's, Yau imposed the following

Open Problem ([Yau82, Problem 59]). *Let h be a real valued function on \mathbb{R}^3 . Find reasonable conditions on h to insure that one can find a closed surface with prescribed genus in \mathbb{R}^3 whose mean curvature is given by h .*

At almost the same time, Yau also posed an open problem for the existence of closed PMC surfaces in closed 3-manifolds¹. It is natural to impose the following extension to the higher codimensional setting:

Generalized Yau's Open Problem. *Let $H \in \Gamma(\wedge^2(N) \otimes TN)$ be a tensor field on a closed n -dimensional Riemannian manifold N . Find reasonable conditions on H to insure that one can construct a closed surface with prescribed genus in N whose mean curvature vector is given by H .*

The general existence for PMC surfaces (also called μ -bubbles) with all codimensions is a challenging problem, see for instance comments by Gromov in a recent series of four lectures [Gro21, pp.116, footnote 194.].

In this paper, we derive a resolution to the generalized Yau's open problem for branched immersed 2-spheres in closed Riemannian manifolds having finite fundamental groups with arbitrary codimensions, with controlled Morse index and with certain generic choice of prescribed mean curvature vector field H .

Now, we state our first result:

Theorem 1.1.1. *Let (N, h) be a closed n -dimensional ($n \geq 3$) Riemannian manifold with finite fundamental group, then given any $\omega \in C^2(\wedge^2(N))$ with induced mean curvature type tensor field $H \in \Gamma(\wedge^2(N) \otimes TN)$ determined by (1.3.3), for almost every constant $\lambda > 0$, there exists a non-trivial branched immersed 2-sphere in N with prescribed mean curvature vector λH and Morse index at most $k - 2$, where k is the least integer such that $\pi_k(N) \neq 0$.*

By imposing some curvature constraint in the target N , we can improve the Morse index estimates to get the following:

Theorem 1.1.2. *Let (N, h) be a closed n -dimensional Riemannian manifold with finite fundamental group and given $\omega \in C^2(\wedge^2(N))$ with induced mean curvature type vector field $H \in \Gamma(\wedge^2(N) \otimes TN)$ determined by (1.3.3), the following holds:*

(1) *If $\dim N = 3$ with $\pi_3(N) \neq 0$ and the Ricci curvature of N satisfies*

$$(1.1.1) \quad |H|^2 h + \frac{\text{Ric}_h}{2} > |\nabla H| h,$$

¹This was confirmed by communication between Yau and Zhou-Zhu, see comments in [ZZ20, page. 312].

then there exists a non-trivial branched immersed 2-sphere in N with prescribed mean curvature vector field H determined by (1.3.3) and Morse index exactly 1.

- (2) If $\dim N \geq 4$ and N has positive isotropic curvature (PIC), namely, on any totally isotropic two plane $\sigma \subset TN \otimes \mathbb{C}$ the complex sectional curvature fulfils $\mathcal{K}(\sigma) > 0$, then, for \mathcal{K} being the isotropic curvature and for almost every constant $\lambda > 0$ satisfying

$$(1.1.2) \quad \mathcal{K} - \lambda|\nabla H|h > 0,$$

there exists a non-trivial branched immersed 2-sphere in N with prescribed mean curvature vector field λH and Morse index satisfying $[(n-2)/2] \leq \text{Index} \leq k-2$, where k is the least integer such that $\pi_k(N) \neq 0$.

Consequently, for the existence of surfaces with parallel mean curvature vector field (see Definition 1.3.1 below) we have

Theorem 1.1.3. *Let (N, h) be a closed n -dimensional ($n \geq 4$) Riemannian manifold with positive isotropic curvature and finite fundamental group, then given any $\omega \in C^2(\wedge^2(N))$ with induced parallel mean curvature type vector field $H \in \Gamma(\wedge^2(N) \otimes TN)$ determined by (1.3.3), for almost every constant $\lambda > 0$, there exists a non-trivial branched immersed 2-sphere in N with prescribed parallel mean curvature vector field λH and with Morse index satisfying $[(n-2)/2] \leq \text{Index} \leq k-2$, where k is the least integer such that $\pi_k(N) \neq 0$.*

Remark 1.1.4. Indeed, stronger existence results than Theorem 1.1.1, Theorem 1.1.2 and Theorem 1.1.3 still hold true, namely, we can remove the assumption that N has finite fundamental group, see step 2 in Subsection 1.5 and Proposition 4.1.7 below for more details. Considering the completeness of our min-max theory and technical issues arising from the compactness in Section 4, we added the assumption that N has finite fundamental group in these Theorems.

In general, CMC 2-spheres in Riemannian 3-manifold need not being embedded, see comments by Meeks-Mira-Pérez-Ros [MMPMnR22]. In fact, for certain ambient Berger 3-spheres with positive sectional curvature and for some specific choice of H , Torralbo [Tor10] proved that every immersed CMC 2-sphere with mean curvature H always exists self-intersecting points. See also comments by Zhou [Zho22, pp. 2700]. In a recent work [CZ23, Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.2, Remark 1.3], Cheng-Zhou settled the existences of branched immersed CMC 2-spheres in 3-manifolds with constant $H > 0$ by developing a min-max theory for a fourth-order perturbation of the action functional. In the present paper, we develop a new min-max theory for a perturbed functional

of Sacks-Uhlenbeck-Moore type, it achieves a natural extension to the more general setting of PMC 2-spheres in Riemannian manifolds with arbitrary codimensions.

Remark 1.1.5. Theorem 1.1.1 and Theorem 1.1.2 can be viewed as a natural generalization of the existence results about minimal 2-spheres by Sacks-Uhlenbeck [SU81] and Micallef-Moore [MM88]. As an application of Morse index estimates of minimal 2-spheres described as in Theorem 1.1.2, Micallef-Moore [MM88, pp.201 Main Theorem] proved that any closed n -dimensional ($n \geq 4$) PIC manifold admits $\pi_i(N) = 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq [n/2]$. In particular, if N is simply connected, then N is homeomorphic to a sphere.

In 1964, Eells-Sampson proposed a fundamental homotopy problem for the existence of harmonic maps:

Problem ([ES64, Section 6, pp.133]²). *Is it possible for every homotopy class of smooth maps $u : M \rightarrow N$ between closed Riemannian manifolds M and N have a harmonic representative?*

Eells-Sampson [ES64] answered this question when M is an oriented closed m -dimensional Riemannian manifold and N has non-positive sectional curvature. For M a closed surface and N a general target with $\pi_2(N) = 0$, Sacks-Uhlenbeck [SU81] proved that there exists a minimizing harmonic map in every homotopy class of the mapping space $C^0(M, N)$ and moreover, the generating set of $\pi_2(N, p)$ can be represented by area minimizing 2-spheres by viewing $\pi_2(N, p)$ as a $\mathbb{Z}(\pi_1(N, p))$ -module for some base point $p \in N$. Transforming into the H -surface setting, it is natural to impose the following:

Homotopy Problem for H -surfaces. *Can every homotopy class of smooth map u from a closed surface M into a closed Riemannian manifold N be represented by a H -surface?*

In this paper, we answer this homotopy problem by imposing

$$(1.1.3) \quad \|\omega\|_{L^\infty(N)} := \max_{p \in N} \|\omega(p)\|_{T_p N} < 1.$$

Theorem 1.1.6. *Let N be a closed Riemannian manifold with $\pi_2(N) = 0$ and $\|\omega\|_{L^\infty(N)} < 1$, then there exists a minimizing H -surface $u : M \rightarrow N$ in every homotopy class of maps in $C^0(M, N)$.*

Note that the assumption $\pi_2(N) = 0$ is necessary as claimed in [SU81]. Moreover, by considering $\pi_2(N, p)$ as a $\mathbb{Z}(\pi_1(N, p))$ -module, whose action orbits represent the free homotopy classes of maps from \mathbb{S}^2 into N , we obtain:

²See also [EL95, Section (1.3), p.1 and (2.3), p.72] and [Str23, Section 3.2, pp.49]

Theorem 1.1.7. *Let N be a closed Riemannian manifold and $\|\omega\|_{L^\infty(N)} < 1$. Then, each generating set for $\pi_2(N, p)$ acted by $\pi_1(N, p)$ can be represented by minimizing H -spheres. In particular, if N is simply connected, then every set of generators of $H_2(N, \mathbb{Z})$ can be represented by minimizing H -spheres.*

Theorem 1.1.6 and Theorem 1.1.7 extend the existence theory of minimizing harmonic maps with arbitrary codimensions in [SU81] to the H -surface setting. Moreover, when $\dim(N) = 3$, by Micallef-White's descriptions [MW95] on local behavior of branch points for minimizing almost conformal H -surfaces, the H -surfaces obtained in Theorem 1.1.6 and Theorem 1.1.7 are immersed and free from branch points if they are almost conformal.

1.2. Backgrounds.

The searching for CMC surfaces and PMC surfaces is a long standing problem. There has been extensive and substantial works dedicated to this problem. The construction of CMC surfaces with boundary started at Plateau's experiment with soap films and soap bubbles enclosed by various contours, and the natural existence questions arose from these experiments are called Plateau problem. The classical Plateau problem for disk-type minimal surfaces in \mathbb{R}^3 , that is, with mean curvature $H = 0$, was solved independently by Douglas [Dou31] and Radó [Rad30]. In 1954, Heinz [Hei54] investigated the Plateau problem for CMC surfaces in \mathbb{R}^3 and obtained an existence result provided that $|H| < \frac{1}{8}(\sqrt{17} - 1)$. Werner [Wer57] optimized the configuration of Heinz to improve the existence result for $|H| < \frac{1}{2}$. Later, Hildebrandt [Hil70] proved the existence of CMC surface for $|H| \leq 1$ and subsequently extended this result to variable mean curvature H satisfying $\|H\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1$ in [Hil69]. It is worth mentioning that the upper bound $|H| \leq 1$ is optimal in the sense that there is no solution when $|H| > 1$ for the Plateau contour $\Gamma = \{(\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 0) : 0 \leq \theta < 2\pi\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, see comments by Heinz [Hei69, pp. 250] and Jost [Jos16, pp.45]. For further developments of the Plateau problem for CMC surfaces, see e.g. Wente [Wen69], Hildebrandt-Kaul [HK72], Steffen [Ste76]. Brezis-Coron [BC84] and Struwe [Str85, Str86] proved the existence of at least two solution for the Plateau problem of CMC surfaces which confirmed the Rellich's conjecture, see also Steffen [Ste86]. For existence of PMC surfaces with Plateau boundary, see [Hil69, GS71, GS73, Ste76, Duz93]. The study for the existence of CMC surfaces or PMC surfaces with free boundary initiated from Struwe [Str88] by applying heat flow method, and also studied by [BK08, LZZ21, Che22]. The Dirichlet problem for the minimal surface equation was studied by Jenkins-Serrin [JS66] for domain contained in \mathbb{R}^2 and Spruck [Spr73] considered the same problem when mean curvature $H > 0$, see also [Rey91, HRS09, CR10, MRR11, FR12] for recent developments.

For closed CMC surfaces, Hopf [Hop51] proved that the round sphere is the only CMC surface with genus zero in \mathbb{R}^3 . Later, Barbosa-Do Carmo [BdC84] showed that the standard sphere is the only closed stable CMC hypersurfaces in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . Wente [Wen86] constructed an immersed CMC torus in \mathbb{R}^3 which also gives a counterexample of Hopf's conjecture [Hop83]. Moreover, Kapouleas [Kap90, Kap91, Kap92] constructed a series of immersed closed CMC surfaces in \mathbb{R}^3 with arbitrary genus, see also Briener-Kapouleas [BK21] for higher dimensional CMC hypersurfaces setting. The Almgren-Pitts min-max theory, which was introduced in [Alm62, Alm65, Pit81, SS81], is a significant breakthrough in the field of constructing closed minimal hypersurfaces. In recent years, this theory has been further developed and refined, starting with the confirmation of the Willmore conjecture by Marques-Neves [MN14], followed by the resolution of Yau's conjecture [Yau82, Problem 88] on the existence of infinitely many closed minimal surfaces in any closed 3-manifold, also by Marques-Neves [MN17] under the assumption of positive Ricci curvature. Later, Zhou [Zho20] confirmed the multiplicity one conjecture of Marques-Neves [MN21, Section 1.2] and Song [Son23b] proved the Yau's conjecture [Yau82, Problem 88] in the general case where the dimension of ambient manifold is relaxed from 3 to 7. Additionally, there have been several recent works on this topic, such as [CM20, CM21, Wan22, Li23a]. In the context of $H \neq 0$, closed CMC hypersurfaces in an ambient manifold were initially constructed by minimizing the area functional among all volume-preserving variations. For a more detailed understanding, we refer to [Alm76, Mor03, Ros05]. However, this approach provides little information about the mean curvature value or the topology of CMC surfaces in ambient manifolds. There is another series of deformation approaches to construct CMC hypersurfaces, one can generate foliations by closed CMC hypersurfaces with small mean curvature H from a closed non-degenerate minimal surface. Moreover, Ye [Ye91], Mahmoudi-Mazzeo-Pacard [MMP06], and others have constructed foliations by closed CMC hypersurfaces from minimal submanifolds of strictly lower dimensions, see also [Pac05, PX09]. The obtained CMC hypersurfaces by this method have a mean curvature that tends to be either very small or very large. Besides, a degree theory established by Rosenberg-Smith [RS20] constructed many important examples of CMC hypersurface when mean curvature is greater than some constant. Zhou-Zhu's construction [ZZ19] on the min-max method has led to the establishment of a comprehensive existence theory for closed CMC hypersurfaces in closed Riemannian manifolds of dimension between 3 and 7. Furthermore, Zhou-Zhu [ZZ20] extended their min-max theory for CMC hypersurfaces into the PMC setting, allowing for any prescribed mean curvature h lying in an open dense subset of smooth function space. This was later generalized to higher dimensions by Dey [Dey23], allowing a singular set

of codimension 7, see also [Maz22, PS] for more recent development of min-max theory developed from [ZZ19]. Very recently, Mazurowski-Zhou [MZ24a] introduced the half-volume spectrum $\{\tilde{w}_p\}_{p \in N}$ which also satisfies a Weyl law and they developed an Almgren-Pitts type min-max theory for finding closed CMC hypersurfaces associated to the half-volume spectrum in [MZ24b], hence showed that there exists infinitely many geometrically distinct closed CMC hypersurfaces in closed manifold M^n of dimension $3 \leq n \leq 5$.

The existence theory of CMC and PMC surfaces with prescribed topology in general closed Riemannian manifold is less understood. For minimal 2-spheres, Simon-Smith [Smi82] explored the existence of embedded minimal 2-spheres in any Riemannian 3-sphere, utilizing the Almgren-Pitts min-max theory [Alm62]. The existence of branched immersed minimal 2-spheres in general Riemannian manifold with arbitrary codimensions was firstly studied in the pioneering work by Sacks-Uhlenbeck [SU81] and then explored in greater depth by Micallef-Moore [MM88], who obtained branched immersed minimal 2-spheres with controlled Morse index. For CMC 2-spheres in homogeneous 3-spaces, Meeks-Mira-Pérez-Ros proved the existence and uniqueness of immersed CMC 2-spheres with any prescribed mean curvature in homogeneous 3-spheres [MMPMnR22] and later in homogeneous 3-manifolds [MMPMnR21].

For CMC 2-spheres in closed Riemannian 3-manifolds, a recent breakthrough was made by Cheng-Zhou [CZ23, Theorem 1.1] who established the existence of branched immersed CMC 2-spheres in arbitrary Riemannian 3-spheres (\mathbb{S}^3, h) for almost every positive constant mean curvature $H > 0$ and with Morse index at most 1. Moreover, if (\mathbb{S}^3, h) has positive Ricci curvature, then the existence result can be enhanced to encompass any choice of constant mean curvature $H > 0$ and guarantee the Morse index exactly 1 [CZ23, Theorem 1.2].

Remark 1.2.1. Here, we need to point out that, due to the third De Rham cohomology group $H_{dR}^3(\mathbb{S}^3) \cong \mathbb{R} \neq 0$, by our choices of functional E^ω we can not obtain the existence of branched immersed CMC 2-spheres in 3-manifolds, see Theorem 1.1.3. However, we believe that, if we modify our functional E^ω as following

$$E_H = \frac{1}{2} \int_M |\nabla u|^2 dV_g + H \cdot V(f_u)$$

and adapt a similar Sacks-Uhlenbeck type perturbation

$$E_{\alpha, H} := \frac{1}{2} \int_M (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^\alpha dV_g + H \cdot V(f_u)$$

to study the existence of branched immersed 2-spheres with constant mean curvature in Riemannian 3-spheres (\mathbb{S}^3, h) , utilizing a similar proof as Theorem 1.1.1 and Theorem 1.1.2 we will provide an alternative proof for Cheng-Zhou's results [CZ23, Theorem

1.1, Theorem 1.2]. Here, $H > 0$ is some positive constant and $V(f_u)$ is the enclosed volume of the map $u : (\mathbb{S}^2, g) \rightarrow (\mathbb{S}^3, h)$, see [Str88, Section 2] and [CZ23, Section 2.1] for more detailed descriptions about E_H .

Very recently, Sarnataro-Stryker [SS23] constructed an embedded PMC 2-sphere in the round 3-sphere for generic set of prescribed mean curvature functions h with L^∞ norm at most 0.547 and obtained an embedded 2-sphere with constant mean curvature H when the metric on (\mathbb{S}^3, h) is sufficiently close to the round metric and H is below some threshold.

As a higher codimensional generalization of CMC surfaces, the study of surfaces with parallel mean curvature vectors (see definition 1.3.1 below) can be traced back to approximately 1940s, see e.g. Schouten-Struik [SS38], Coburn [Cob39] and Wong [Won46]. From the early 1970s, numerous studies have been conducted on the rigidity theory of such surfaces in homogeneous ambient manifolds, such as, the characterization of the spherical immersion of 4-dimensional space form by Ferus [Fer71], rigidity results for submanifolds with parallel mean curvature vector in spaces of constant sectional curvature by Yau [Yau74] which involves the classification of surfaces with parallel mean curvature vector in 4-dimensional real space form, see also independent and related works by Hoffman [Hof72, Hof73] and Chen [Che73], a structure theorem into higher dimensional space form by Alencar-do Carmo-Tribuzy [AdCT10]. And for more classification results see Kenmotsu-Zhou [KZ00] in 2-dimensional complex space form, Fetcu [Fet12] in general complex space forms and Fetcu-Rosenberg [FR15] in Sasakian space forms.

In contrast with the theory of CMC and PMC hypersurfaces, the existence of closed surfaces with parallel mean curvature vector, or more generally, with prescribed mean curvature vector, admitting prescribed topology and controlled Morse index in general n -dimensional compact Riemannian manifold is not widely understood. In this paper, our existence theory of CMC spheres (Theorem 1.1.3), PMC spheres (Theorem 1.1.1 and Theorem 1.1.2), and partial resolution of homotopy problem (Theorem 1.1.6 and Theorem 1.1.7) with arbitrary codimensions serves a supplement in such area.

1.3. Settings.

Before describing our main ideas about proving main results, we recall some basic notions about H -surfaces with arbitrary codimensions, and introduce some notations, see Grüter [Grü84, Section 2], Jost [Jos91, Section 1.2] and Rivière [Riv12, Section III] for more details.

Let (M, g) be a closed surface and (N, h) a closed Riemannian manifold of dimension n that is isometrically embedded into some \mathbb{R}^K . Take a C^2 2-form ω on N and consider

the functional

$$(1.3.1) \quad E^\omega(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_M |\nabla u|^2 dV_g + \int_M u^* \omega$$

acting on maps $u \in C^2(M, N)$. It is easy to see that the functional E^ω is conformally invariant. Surprisingly enough, Grüter [Grü84, Theorem 1] showed that any coercive conformally invariant functional with quadratic growth has the form of (1.3.1) for some appropriately chosen metric on M and ω on N . Critical points of the functional E^ω are called H -surfaces and one can verify that H -surface satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$(1.3.2) \quad \Delta u + A(u)(\nabla u, \nabla u) = H(u)(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u).$$

Here, A is the second fundamental form of embedding $N \subset \mathbb{R}^K$, and the mean curvature type vector field $H \in \Gamma(\wedge^2(N) \otimes TN)$ is determined by

$$(1.3.3) \quad \forall U, V, W \in \Gamma(TN), \quad d\omega(U, V, W) := \langle U, H(V, W) \rangle_{TN} = U \cdot H(V, W)$$

where “ \cdot ” is the standard scalar product on \mathbb{R}^K . We write

$$H(u)(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u) := H(u_{x^1}, u_{x^2}) - H(u_{x^2}, u_{x^1}) = 2H(u_{x^1}, u_{x^2})$$

for notation simplicity. If a solution u to (1.3.2) is conformal, that is,

$$(1.3.4) \quad |u_{x^1}|^2 - |u_{x^2}|^2 = \langle u_{x^1}, u_{x^2} \rangle_{u^*(TN)} = 0,$$

then $H(u)$ is the mean curvature vector of the surface determined by $u : M \rightarrow N$, see [Jos91, pp.10]. In particular, due to the uniqueness of conformal structure on \mathbb{S}^2 , all H -spheres are conformal automatically. Naturally, we assume H is non-degenerate in the sense that $H(u)(u_{x^1}, u_{x^2}) \neq 0$, otherwise, the problem is reduced to a harmonic map setting. Then, we define $\nabla H \in \Gamma(\wedge^3(N) \otimes TN)$ to be the covariant differential of H with respect to vector field component of H , more precisely, ∇H is determined by

$$\langle \nabla H(U, V), W \rangle_{TN} = (\nabla_W H)(U, V) \in \Gamma(T(N)) \quad \text{for all } U, V, W \in TN.$$

In particular, when $\dim N = 3$, the 3-form $d\omega$ defined on N can be identified with a function on N , that is, there exists $H \in C^1(N, \mathbb{R})$ such that $d\omega = H dz^1 \wedge dz^2 \wedge dz^3$ where (z^1, z^2, z^3) is some local coordinates of N . In this case, the equation (1.3.2) can be written as

$$(1.3.5) \quad \Delta u + A(u)(\nabla u, \nabla u) = 2H(u)(u_{x^1} \wedge u_{x^2}).$$

A solution to (1.3.4) and (1.3.5) determines a PMC surface, which is a CMC surface when H is constant.

A natural extension of CMC surfaces in higher codimensions is the concept of surfaces with parallel mean curvature vector field. For detailed description of surfaces with parallel mean curvature vector field in some homogeneous spaces, see e.g. classical works [Hof72], [Hof73, Section 1.], [Che73, pp.655]. For surfaces in general Riemannian manifolds with prescribed parallel mean curvature vectors and with arbitrary codimensions, based on our previous settings it is natural to define the following:

Definition 1.3.1 (Parallel H -surfaces). We call a C^2 map $u : M \rightarrow N$ a *parallel H -surface* if u is a solution to (1.3.2) with the mean curvature type vector field H satisfying $\nabla H \equiv 0$.

From the perspective of submanifold theory, it is important to note that the mean curvature vector H is a section of the normal bundle and parallelism is referred to the mean curvature vector H is parallel in the normal bundle. We would like to mention that the mean curvature of the parallel conformal H -surface, as described in Definition 1.3.1, is parallel in the usual sense (see e.g. [Hof73, Section 1.]).

1.4. Basic Ideas of Seeking H -spheres.

Seeking critical points of E^ω by directly applying methods from calculus of variations is a challenging task due to several technical difficulties:

- (1) The conformally invariant functional E^ω does not satisfy the Palais-Smale condition.
- (2) Due to the appearance of the term involving ω in E^ω , some classical methods developed for harmonic maps can not be applied.

To this end, we consider a perturbation of E^ω , denoted by

$$E_\alpha^\omega : W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

as follows, called the **Sacks-Uhlenbeck-Moore approximation**:

$$E_\alpha^\omega(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_M (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^\alpha dV_g + \int_M u^* \omega$$

where $\alpha > 1$ and ω is a C^2 2-form on N .

In his book [Moo17, Section 4.5], Moore wrote down the above perturbed functional and pointed out that it satisfies Palais-Smale condition and indicated the regularity of critical points for E_α^ω . Sacks-Uhlenbeck type perturbations have been effectively employed in various other settings, for instance, by utilizing these approximations, Cheng-Zhou [CZ21] established the existence of curves with constant geodesic curvature in Riemannian 2-spheres, and Cheng [Che22] demonstrated the existence of free boundary disks with constant mean curvature in \mathbb{R}^3 .

In this paper, we demonstrate that this perturbed functional E_α^ω is a feasible one to derive the existence of branched immersed H -spheres in Riemannian manifolds with arbitrary codimensions. More precisely, we develop a min-max theory for the functional E_α^ω , then deduce a compactness theory for non-trivial critical points of E_α^ω as $\alpha \searrow 1$, and finally achieve the desired existence results.

1.5. Outline of Proof.

Perturbing the functional E^ω also brings in many new challenges. To this end, we develop a method to construct sequences of non-trivial critical points $\{u_{\alpha_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $E_{\alpha_j}^\omega$ with uniformly bounded α_j -energy and uniform Morse index upper bound. Also, we implement a convergence scheme to produce non-constant H -spheres and we related the existence of prescribed mean curvature sphere with the continuity of α -energy E_α as $\alpha \searrow 1$.

- (1) Firstly, thanks to the fact that the functional E_α^ω satisfies the Palais-Smale condition on Banach manifold $W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$, inspired by a monotonicity technique by Struwe [Str88, Section 4] and an argument by Colding-Minicozzi [CM08, Section 1.6], for almost every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we exploit the notion of *Width* with higher dimensional parameter spaces in our setting to construct a sequence of non-constant critical points $\{u_{\alpha_j}\}$ of the functional $E_{\alpha_j}^{\lambda\omega}$ with uniformly bounded α_j -energy $E_{\alpha_j}(u_{\alpha_j})$. Here, we utilized the monotonicity technique in [Str88] with respect to the parameter $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ to obtain some α -energy upper bound which depends on the choice of λ but is uniform for the sequence $\{u_{\alpha_j}\}$ as $\alpha_j \searrow 1$, see Proposition 3.2.3. To establish the Morse index upper bound for our approximated sequence, we draw inspiration from the Morse index upper bound estimates within the framework of Almgren-Pitts min-max theory as explored by Marques-Neves [MN16], Song [Son23a], and Li [Li23b]. Additionally, we refer to the works of Cheng-Zhou [CZ23] and Cheng [Che22] for insights into a newly devised min-max theory setting. Leveraging a homotopical deformation approach for the min-max sequences of sweepouts, we construct a sequence $\{u_{\alpha_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ with prescribed mean curvature type vector field λH that simultaneously satisfies the desired Morse index upper bound and uniformly α_j -energy bound, see Theorem 3.3.5 and Theorem 3.3.6 for detailed descriptions.
- (2) Next, we investigate the limit u_{α_j} as $\alpha_j \searrow 1$. Standard tools for blow-up analysis for α -harmonic maps developed in [SU81] still hold in our case. We also have an alternative:
 - If Dirichlet energy $E(u_{\alpha_j})$ is nowhere concentrated as $\alpha_j \searrow 1$, then u_{α_j} converges strongly in $C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ to some (λH) -sphere with same Morse index upper bound $k - 2$.

- If Dirichlet energy $E(u_{\alpha_j})$ concentrates somewhere $x_1 \in \mathbb{S}^2$, then the rescaled sequence $v_{\alpha_j}(x) := u_{\alpha_j}(x_1 + \lambda_{\alpha_j}x)$ for some $\lambda_{\alpha_j} \searrow 0$ also converges smoothly to a limit $v \in W^{1,2}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$. But due to the absence of conformally invariance for functional E_α^ω , v solves a new equation

$$\Delta v + A(v)(\nabla v, \nabla v) = \frac{1}{\mu} \lambda H(v)(\nabla^\perp v, \nabla v)$$

where $\mu = \liminf_{\alpha_j \searrow 1} \lambda_{\alpha_j}^{2-2\alpha_j} \in [1, \infty)$. We call it the *blow-up spectrum* of v_{α_j} which characterizes the competition between the extent of energy dissipation $|\nabla u_{\alpha_j}| \nearrow \infty$ and the speed of $(\alpha_j - 1) \searrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ during blow-up process. For α -harmonic maps, such type of quantity was introduced by Li-Wang [LW10] to investigate the generalized energy identity. The second challenge in our paper is to establish $\mu = 1$. An intriguing observation is that $\mu = 1$ if and only if there is no energy loss during the blow-up process for a general sequence $\{u_{\alpha_j}\}_{\alpha_j \searrow 1}$ of critical points of E_α^ω around each energy concentration point. Through a meticulous neck analysis and leveraging Gromov's [Gro78] estimates on the length of geodesics by its Morse index, we demonstrate that the energy identity holds, hence $\mu = 1$, for sequences of min-max type critical points $\{u_{\alpha_j}\}_{\alpha_j \searrow 1}$, see Section 4 for more details. Therefore, when energy concentrates at a particular point, a non-constant (λH) -sphere with Morse index bounded from above by $k - 2$ is also obtained.

In general, as a consequence of Theorem 4.1.4, u_{α_j} converges to some (λH) -sphere u weakly in $W^{1,2}(M, N)$ and strongly in $C^2(\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l\}, N)$ for some $l \geq 0$. Surprisingly, we observe that the weak limit u of u_{α_j} is always non-constant, as shown in Proposition 4.1.7. This suggests the possibility of a second non-trivial H -sphere being produced when the bubbling phenomenon occurs. As a result, the proof of Theorem 1.1.1 is completed in both scenario.

To prove the part (1) of Theorem 1.1.2, we firstly modify the calculation of Ejiri-Micallef [EM08], which is also applied in the proof of [CZ23, Theorem 1.2] in CMC setting, to obtain a new bi-linear form whose Morse index is controlled by E^ω . Then, we combine the Ricci curvature assumption on target N with the conformal balance argument (see for instance Li-Yau [LY82]) to get a uniform energy upper bound and exclude the possibility of existence of non-trivial stable H -sphere. Then Theorem 1.1.2 when $\dim(N) = 3$ follows by a convergence argument for sequences of H -spheres. For the part (2) of Theorem 1.1.2, by adapting the calculation and counting argument of [MM88, Theorem 1], we can get the Morse index lower bound of non-constant H -sphere.

The proofs of Theorem 1.1.6 and Theorem 1.1.7 follow by adapting the scheme of Sacks-Uhlenbeck's [SU81] resolutions on homotopy problem of harmonic map setting and an observation that the assumption (1.1.3) implies the lower boundedness of functional E^ω .

1.6. Organizations.

The paper is structured as follows:

In Section 2, we provide the necessary notations and discuss the variational properties of the perturbed functional, $E_\alpha^\omega : W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Note that the results presented in this section are applicable to general closed Riemann surfaces (M, g) .

Section 3 is dedicated to the construction of a sequence of non-trivial critical points $\{u_{\alpha_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $E_{\alpha_j}^\omega$ with uniformly bounded α_j -energy E_{α_j} and a Morse index bounded from above by $k - 2$.

Section 4 focuses on investigating the limits of u_{α_j} as $\alpha_j \searrow 1$. More precisely, we establish a generalized energy identity and unveil a direct convergence relationship between our blow-up spectrum and the energy identity for a general sequence u_{α_j} from a closed Riemann surface M to a compact n -manifold N .

In Section 5, we prove the main results Theorem 1.1.1, Theorem 1.1.2, Theorem 1.1.6 and Theorem 1.1.7.

2. VARIATIONAL PROPERTIES OF PERTURBED FUNCTIONAL E_α^ω

In this section, we shall review some notations and variational properties of the perturbed functional E_α^ω . It is worth noting that the restriction of $M = \mathbb{S}^2$ is not a necessary condition for the results to hold and consequences presented in this section can apply to general Riemann surfaces (M, g) .

2.1. Some Preliminaries.

Recall that we assumed that N is isometrically embedded into \mathbb{R}^K for some $K \in \mathbb{N}$. In order to utilize the coordinate of \mathbb{R}^K to locate the point of N , we choose a tubular neighborhood \tilde{N} of N equipped with canonical Euclidean coordinate (y^1, y^2, \dots, y^K) in \mathbb{R}^K . Furthermore, \tilde{N} can be chosen to be close to N enough such that ω can be extended to a C^2 2-form defined on \tilde{N} which is also denoted by ω . Hence, utilizing this local coordinate of \tilde{N} , we can write

$$\omega = \omega_{ij} dy^i \wedge dy^j$$

and

$$H = H_{kl}^i dy^k \wedge dy^l \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial y^i} \in \Gamma(\wedge^2(N) \otimes TN).$$

Similar to the extension procedure of ω , we also extend H to a small neighborhood \tilde{N} of N and using the coordinate of \tilde{N} to represent H . In the following content of paper, we will always use coordinate of \tilde{N} to represent ω and H defined on N unless giving other specific convention. In particular, taking $U = \frac{\partial}{\partial y^k}$, $V = \frac{\partial}{\partial y^i}$ and $W = \frac{\partial}{\partial y^j}$, by the correspondence (1.3.3) we can write

$$d\omega \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y^i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y^j} \right) = \frac{\partial \omega_{ij}}{\partial y^k} + \frac{\partial \omega_{jk}}{\partial y^i} + \frac{\partial \omega_{ki}}{\partial y^j} := H_{ij}^k.$$

Then coefficients of H are anti-symmetric in the indices i, j and k , i.e.

$$(2.1.1) \quad H_{ij}^k = -H_{ji}^k \quad \text{and} \quad H_{ij}^k = -H_{kj}^i.$$

Let $u : (M, g) \rightarrow (N, h)$ be a critical point of E_α^ω in $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)$, which is called the α - H -surface. By Sobolev embedding

$$W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K) \hookrightarrow C^0(M, \mathbb{R}^K),$$

the mapping space $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)$ is a smooth, closed, infinite dimensional submanifold of $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$. For each $u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)$, the tangent space \mathcal{T}_u of Banach manifold $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)$ at u can be identified with

$$\mathcal{T}_u := \{V \in W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K) : V(x) \in T_{u(x)}N \text{ for all } x \in M\}$$

which is a closed subspace of $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$.

2.2. First and Second Variation of Perturbed Functional E_α^ω .

The differential of E_α^ω at u or the first variation of E_α^ω at u , denoted by $\delta E_\alpha^\omega(u) : \mathcal{T}_u \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, is defined as following

$$\delta E_\alpha^\omega(u)(V) := \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} E_\alpha^\omega(u_{V,t}) \quad \text{for all } u_{V,t} = \exp_{u(x)} tV(x) \text{ and } V \in \mathcal{T}_u.$$

Moreover, if $\delta E_\alpha^\omega(u) = 0$, then the Hessian of E_α^ω at u or the second variation of E_α^ω at u , denoted by $\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u) : \mathcal{T}_u \times \mathcal{T}_u \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u)(V, V) := \left. \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \right|_{t=0} E_\alpha^\omega(u_{V,t}) \quad \text{for all } u_{V,t} = \exp_{u(x)} tV(x) \text{ and } V \in \mathcal{T}_u.$$

And by parallelogram law, for any $V, W \in \mathcal{T}_u$ we have

$$\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u)(V, W) = \frac{1}{4} (\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u)(V + W, V + W) - \delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u)(V - W, V - W))$$

To begin, we compute the first and second variations of E_α^ω . Although we will carry out the computation in choosing a local version, i.e. for compactly supported variations, the choice turns out to be not crucial and the outcome makes sense globally.

Lemma 2.2.1. *Let $u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)$ and $V \in \mathcal{T}_u$. Then, the first variation formula of E_α^ω is*

$$\begin{aligned} \delta E_\alpha^\omega(u)(V) &= \int_M \alpha (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \langle \nabla u, \nabla V \rangle dV_g \\ &\quad + \int_M \langle H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u), V \rangle dV_g, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_u : T_u W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K) \cong W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_u$ is the orthogonal projection, and the second variation formula of E_α^ω is

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u)(V, V) &= \alpha \int_M (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left(\langle \nabla V, \nabla V \rangle - R(V, \nabla u, V, \nabla u) \right) dV_g \\ &\quad + 2\alpha(\alpha - 1) \int_M (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-2} \langle \nabla u, \nabla V \rangle^2 dV_g \\ &\quad + 2 \int_M \langle H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla V), V \rangle dV_g \\ &\quad + \int_M \langle \nabla_V H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u), V \rangle dV_g, \end{aligned}$$

where A is the second fundamental form of embedding $N \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$.

Proof. As mentioned before, we only need to compute the variation formula for compact supported section $V \in \mathcal{T}_u$. On the one hand, for the first variation of α -energy E_α , it is well known that

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} E_\alpha(u_{V,t}) = \int_M \alpha (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \langle \nabla u, \nabla V \rangle dV_g.$$

On the other hand, in local coordinate $\{y^1, y^2, \dots, y^K\}$ of \tilde{N} and integration by parts we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \int_M (u_{V,t})^* \omega &= \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \int_M \omega_{ij}(u_{V,t}) \nabla^\perp u_{V,t}^i \nabla u_{V,t}^j dx \\ &= \int_M \frac{\partial \omega_{ij}}{\partial y^k} \frac{du_{V,t}^k}{dt} \nabla^\perp u^i \nabla u^j dx + \int_M \omega_{ij}(u) \nabla^\perp V^i \nabla u^j dx \\ &\quad + \int_M \omega_{ij} \nabla^\perp u^i \nabla V^j dx \\ &= \int_M \left(\frac{\partial \omega_{ij}}{\partial y^k} + \frac{\partial \omega_{jk}}{\partial y^i} + \frac{\partial \omega_{ki}}{\partial y^j} \right) \nabla^\perp u^i \nabla u^j V^k dx \end{aligned}$$

$$= \int_M \langle H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u), V \rangle dV_g.$$

Consequently, we obtain the following first variation formula for E_α^ω

$$\begin{aligned} \delta E_\alpha^\omega(u)(V) &= \int_M \alpha (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \langle \nabla u, \nabla V \rangle dV_g \\ &\quad + \int_M \langle H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u), V \rangle dV_g. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we turn to compute the Hessian of $\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega$, from the definition we compute the $\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u)(V, V)$ by taking the derivative of the following expression with respect to t at $t = 0$:

$$(2.2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_M \alpha (1 + |\nabla u_{V,t}|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left\langle \nabla u_{V,t}, \nabla \frac{du_{V,t}}{dt} \right\rangle dV_g \\ &\quad + \int_M \left\langle H(\nabla^\perp u_{V,t}, \nabla u_{V,t}), \frac{du_{V,t}}{dt} \right\rangle dV_g \end{aligned}$$

To begin with, we can differentiate the first term in (2.2.1) to obtain

$$(2.2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \int_M \alpha (1 + |\nabla u_{V,t}|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left\langle \nabla u_{V,t}, \nabla \frac{du_{V,t}}{dt} \right\rangle dV_g \\ &= 2\alpha(\alpha-1) \int_M (1 + |\nabla u_{V,t}|^2)^{\alpha-2} \langle \nabla u, \nabla V \rangle^2 dV_g \\ &\quad + \int_M 2\alpha (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} (\langle \nabla V, \nabla V \rangle + \langle \nabla u, \nabla_V \nabla_{\nabla u} V \rangle) dV_g \\ &= 2\alpha(\alpha-1) \int_M (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-2} \langle \nabla u, \nabla V \rangle^2 dV_g \\ &\quad + \int_M \alpha (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} (\langle \nabla V, \nabla V \rangle - R(V, \nabla u, V, \nabla u)) dV_g, \end{aligned}$$

where R is the Riemann curvature tensor on N . Next, we consider the mean curvature type vector field part in (2.2.1). Before penetrating into details, we note that

$$\frac{d^2 u_{V,t}}{dt^2} \Big|_{t=0} = \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \Big|_{t=0} \exp_{u(x)} tV(x) = A(V, V),$$

which is perpendicular to the tangent bundle TN . Utilizing this observation and integrating by parts, we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \int_M \left\langle H(\nabla^\perp u_{V,t}, \nabla u_{V,t}), \frac{du_{V,t}}{dt} \right\rangle dV_g \\ &= \int_M \frac{\partial H_{ij}^k}{\partial y^l} V^l V^k \nabla^\perp u^i \nabla u^j dx + \int_M H_{ij}^k V^k \nabla^\perp V^i \nabla u^j dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_M H_{ij}^k V^k \nabla^\perp u^i \nabla V^j dx \\
(2.2.3) \quad & = \int_M \langle \nabla_V H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u), V \rangle dV_g + 2 \int_M \langle H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla V), V \rangle dV_g.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining computations (2.2.2) and (2.2.3) will yield the second variation formula of E_α^ω formulated in Lemma 2.2.1. \square

For $\alpha > 1$, by a similar computations as Lemma 2.2.1, the Euler-Lagrange equation of critical points of E_α^ω , which are called α - H -surfaces, can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.2.4) \quad \Delta u_\alpha + (\alpha - 1) \frac{\nabla |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 \cdot \nabla u_\alpha}{1 + |\nabla u_\alpha|^2} + A(u_\alpha)(\nabla u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha) \\
= \frac{H(u_\alpha)(\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha)}{\alpha (1 + |\nabla u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1}},
\end{aligned}$$

or equivalently in divergence form

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.2.5) \quad \operatorname{div} \left((1 + |\nabla u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u_\alpha \right) + (1 + |\nabla u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} A(u_\alpha)(\nabla u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha) \\
= \frac{1}{\alpha} H(u_\alpha)(\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha).
\end{aligned}$$

Using parallelogram law, from Lemma 2.2.1, we can write the Hessian of E_α^ω as following.

Corollary 2.2.2. *For $V, W \in \mathcal{T}_u$, we can compute the Hessian for $E_\alpha^\omega(u)$ at some critical point $u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)$*

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u)(V, W) & = \alpha \int_M (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left(\langle \nabla V, \nabla W \rangle - R(V, \nabla u, W, \nabla u) \right) dV_g \\
& + 2\alpha(\alpha - 1) \int_M (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \langle \nabla u, \nabla V \rangle \langle \nabla u, \nabla W \rangle dV_g \\
& + \int_M \left(\langle H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla V), W \rangle + \langle H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla W), V \rangle \right) dV_g \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \int_M \left(\langle (\nabla_V H)(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u), W \rangle + \langle (\nabla_W H)(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u), V \rangle \right) dV_g
\end{aligned}$$

where $A(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the second fundamental form of embedding $N \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$.

In order to derive a priori estimate that will be used in later sections, especially when it comes to proving Lemma 2.3.1, we need a formula for $\delta E_\alpha^\omega(\mathcal{P}_u(\varphi))$ with $\varphi \in W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$. To simplify the notation, we set

$$G_\alpha^\omega(u) := \delta E_\alpha^\omega \circ \mathcal{P}_u$$

and define the norm of $G_\alpha^\omega(u) : W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\|G_\alpha^\omega(u)\| := \sup \left\{ |G_\alpha^\omega(u)(\varphi)| : \varphi \in W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K) \text{ with } \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Based on above conventions, we can obtain the following estimates:

Lemma 2.2.3. *The following properties for G_α^ω holds:*

(1) *Given $u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)$, for any $\varphi \in W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$ we have that*

$$(2.2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} G_\alpha^\omega(u)(\varphi) &= \int_M \alpha (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left(\nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi - A(u)(\nabla u, \nabla u) \cdot \varphi \right) dV_g \\ &+ \int_M H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u) \cdot \varphi dV_g; \end{aligned}$$

(2) *For all $L > 0$, there exists constant $C_L > 0$ such that*

$$\|G_\alpha^\omega(u)\| \leq C_L$$

whenever $\alpha > 1$ and $u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)$ satisfying $\|u\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)} \leq L$;

(3) *For all $L > 0$, there exists constant $C_L > 0$ such that*

$$\|G_\alpha^\omega(u_1) - G_\alpha^\omega(u_2)\| \leq C_L \|u_1 - u_2\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)}$$

whenever $\alpha > 1$, and $\|u_1\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)}, \|u_2\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} \leq L$.

Proof. For the part (1), using the first variation formula in Lemma 2.2.1, we get

$$(2.2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \delta E_\alpha^\omega(u)(\mathcal{P}_u(\varphi)) &= \int_M \alpha (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \langle \nabla u, \nabla \mathcal{P}_u(\varphi) \rangle dV_g \\ &+ \int_M \langle H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u), \mathcal{P}_u(\varphi) \rangle dV_g \\ &= -\alpha \int_M \left\langle \operatorname{div} \left((1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u \right), \mathcal{P}_u(\varphi) \right\rangle dV_g \\ &+ \int_M \langle H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u), \mathcal{P}_u(\varphi) \rangle dV_g. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_u \left\{ \operatorname{div} \left((1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u \right) \right\} &= \operatorname{div} \left((1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u \right) \\ &- (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} A(\nabla u, \nabla u), \end{aligned}$$

we decompose $\varphi = \mathcal{P}_u(\varphi) + \varphi^\perp$ where φ^\perp is normal component of φ in TN^\perp and plug this into (2.2.7) to obtain

$$\delta G_\alpha^\omega(u)(\varphi) = \delta E_\alpha^\omega(u)(\mathcal{P}_u(\varphi))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -\alpha \int_M \operatorname{div} \left((1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u \right) \cdot \varphi dV_g + \int_M H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u) \cdot \varphi dV_g \\
&\quad - \alpha \int_M (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} A(\nabla u, \nabla u) \cdot \varphi dV_g \\
&= \alpha \int_M (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \langle \nabla u, \nabla \varphi \rangle dV_g + \int_M H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u) \cdot \varphi dV_g \\
&\quad - \alpha \int_M (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} A(\nabla u, \nabla u) \cdot \varphi dV_g,
\end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the desired of part (1). For part (2), using the formula (2.2.6) we straightforward estimate that

$$\begin{aligned}
|G_\alpha^\omega(u)(\varphi)| &\leq \int_M \alpha (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla \varphi| \cdot |\nabla u| + \alpha (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^\alpha \cdot |\varphi| dV_g \\
&\quad + \int_M C |\nabla u|^2 \cdot |\varphi| dV_g \\
&\leq C'_L \left(\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^{2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} + \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} \right) \\
&\leq C_L \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, in the last inequality we used the Sobolev embedding

$$W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K) \hookrightarrow C^0(M, \mathbb{R}^K).$$

Next, we consider the part (3). To begin, we use formula (2.2.6) obtained in part (1) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&G_\alpha^\omega(u_1)(\varphi) - G_\alpha^\omega(u_2)(\varphi) \\
&= \int_M \alpha \left((1 + |\nabla u_1|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla \varphi - (1 + |\nabla u_2|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u_2 \cdot \nabla \varphi \right) dV_g \\
&\quad - \int_M \alpha (1 + |\nabla u_1|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left(A(u_1)(\nabla u_1, \nabla u_1) - A(u_2)(\nabla u_2, \nabla u_2) \right) \cdot \varphi dV_g \\
&\quad - \int_M \alpha \left((1 + |\nabla u_2|^2)^{\alpha-1} - (1 + |\nabla u_1|^2)^{\alpha-1} \right) A(u_2)(\nabla u_2, \nabla u_2) \cdot \varphi dV_g \\
(2.2.8) \quad &+ \int_M \left(H(\nabla^\perp u_1, \nabla u_1) - H(\nabla^\perp u_2, \nabla u_2) \right) \cdot \varphi dV_g.
\end{aligned}$$

Based on part (2) and Sobolev embedding $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K) \hookrightarrow C^0(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$, we can simplify the estimates by focusing on the case when

$$\|u_1 - u_2\|_{C^0(M, N)} \leq \delta_0$$

for some small $\delta_0 > 0$. Here, we choose small enough $\delta_0 > 0$ to ensure that

$$tu_1 + (1-t)u_2 \in W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \tilde{N}),$$

hence the formula obtained in part (1) can be applied to such convex combination. we can estimate the integrand of the first integral on the right hand side of (2.2.8) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha (1 + |\nabla u_1|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla \varphi - \alpha (1 + |\nabla u_2|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u_2 \cdot \nabla \varphi \\ &= \int_0^1 \alpha(\alpha-1) (1 + |\nabla(tu_1 + (1-t)u_2)|^2)^{\alpha-2} \cdot \\ & \quad [\nabla(tu_1 + (1-t)u_2) \cdot \nabla \varphi][\nabla(u_1 - u_2) \cdot \nabla \varphi] dt \\ & \quad + \int_0^1 \alpha (1 + |tu_1 + (1-t)u_2|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla(u_1 - u_2) \cdot \nabla \varphi dt. \end{aligned}$$

From this identity and Hölder's inequality, the first integral on the right-hand side will be bounded by

$$C_L \|u_1 - u_2\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} \cdot \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)}.$$

The remaining terms in (2.2.8) can be estimated in a complete similar manner by using Sobolev embedding $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K) \hookrightarrow C^0(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$ and Hölder's inequality. \square

2.3. Palais-Smale Condition and Regularity of Critical Points for Functional E_α^ω .

The Palais-Smale conditions are a set of compactness conditions that are essential in variational analysis. Our first objective in this subsection is to confirm that the functional $E_\alpha^\omega : W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies a version of the Palais-Smale condition, which was also pointed out by Moore [Moo17, pp. 212].

Lemma 2.3.1. *For $\alpha > 1$, the functional $E_\alpha^\omega : W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the Palais-Smale condition, more precisely, let $\{u_j\}$ be a sequence in $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)$ satisfying*

- (1) $E_\alpha^\omega(u_j) \leq C$ for some universal constant C independent of $j \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (2) $\|\delta E_\alpha^\omega(u_j)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$,

then, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, u_j converges strongly in $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)$ to a critical point of E_α^ω as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Let $\{u_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N) \subset W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$ such that $E_\alpha^\omega(u_j)$ is uniformly bounded and $\|\delta E_\alpha^\omega(u_j)\| \rightarrow 0$ for fixed $\alpha > 1$. It follows that the α -energy of u_j , $E_\alpha(u_j)$, is also uniformly bounded. Otherwise if, after choosing a subsequence, $E_\alpha(u_j) \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$|E_\alpha^\omega(u_j)| \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_M (1 + |\nabla u_j|^2)^\alpha dV_g - \frac{1}{2} \|\omega\|_{L^\infty(N)} \int_M |\nabla u_j|^2 dV_g$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{4} \int_M (1 + |\nabla u_j|^2)^\alpha dV_g \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty,$$

which contradicts to the uniformly boundedness of E_α^ω . From this observation, by Sobolev embedding $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N) \hookrightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K) \hookrightarrow C^{0,1-1/\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$, every u_j is Hölder continuous. And together with the compactness of N , it follows that $\{u_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is equi-continuous. Therefore, thanks to the Arzela-Ascoli Theorem, there exists a subsequence of $\{u_j\}$, also denoted by $\{u_j\}$, converges uniformly to a continuous map $u_0 : M \rightarrow N$. To complete the proof of the Lemma 2.3.1, it is sufficient to demonstrate that $\{\nabla u_j\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^{2\alpha}(M, N)$.

Recall that $\mathcal{P} : \mathbb{R}^K \times \mathbb{R}^K \cong T\mathbb{R}^K \rightarrow TN$ is the pointwise orthogonal projection from $\mathbb{R}^K \times \mathbb{R}^K \cong T\mathbb{R}^K$ onto TN and simplify the notation of $(\mathcal{P} \circ u)(V)$ to $\mathcal{P}_u(V)$ for any $V \in T_u W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$. This allows us to make the following estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \|d\mathcal{P}_u(V)\|_{L^{2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} &\leq \|d(\mathcal{P} \circ u)(V)\|_{L^{2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} + \|\mathcal{P}_u(\nabla V)\|_{L^{2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} \\ &\leq C \|V\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} \|\nabla u\|_{L^{2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} + C \|\nabla V\|_{L^{2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} \end{aligned}$$

which further implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{P}_u(V)\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} &\leq C \left(\|V\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} E_\alpha(u) + \|\nabla V\|_{L^{2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} + \|V\|_{L^{2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} \right) \\ (2.3.1) \quad &\leq C (1 + E_\alpha(u)) \|V\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $E_\alpha(u_j)$ is uniformly bounded and u_j is also uniformly bounded, then $\{u_j\}$ is uniformly bounded in $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$ and (2.3.1) tells us that $\mathcal{P}_u(u_i - u_j)$ is bounded in $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$ for each $u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$. Because $\|\delta E_\alpha^\omega(u_j)\| \rightarrow 0$ and recall part 3 Lemma 2.2.3, we have

$$(2.3.2) \quad |\delta G_\alpha^\omega(u_i)(u_i - u_j) - \delta G_\alpha^\omega(u_j)(u_i - u_j)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } i, j \rightarrow \infty.$$

By part (1) of Lemma 2.2.3, replacing φ with $u_i - u_j$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &G_\alpha^\omega(u)(u_i - u_j) \\ &= \int_M \alpha (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left(\nabla u \cdot \nabla(u_i - u_j) - A(u)(\nabla u, \nabla u) \cdot (u_i - u_j) \right) dV_g \\ &\quad + \int_M H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u) \cdot (u_i - u_j) dV_g. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this identity into (2.3.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_M \alpha \left[(1 + |\nabla u_i|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u_i \cdot \nabla(u_i - u_j) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - (1 + |\nabla u_j|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u_j \cdot \nabla(u_i - u_j) \right] dV_g \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_M [H(\nabla^\perp u_i, \nabla u_i) \cdot (u_i - u_j) - H(\nabla^\perp u_j, \nabla u_j) \cdot (u_i - u_j)] dV_g \\
& - \int_M (1 + |\nabla u_i|^2)^{\alpha-1} A(\nabla u_i, \nabla u_i) \cdot (u_i - u_j) dV_g \\
& - \int_M (1 + |\nabla u_j|^2)^{\alpha-1} A(\nabla u_j, \nabla u_j) \cdot (u_i - u_j) dV_g \Big| \\
(2.3.3) \quad & \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } i, j \rightarrow \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

We consider the above asymptotic quantity (2.3.3) term by term, first we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_M (1 + |\nabla u_i|^2)^{\alpha-1} A(\nabla u_i, \nabla u_i) \cdot (u_i - u_j) dV_g \right| \\
& \leq 2 \|u_i - u_j\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} \|A\|_{L^\infty(N)} E_\alpha(u_i) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } i, j \rightarrow \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

And similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_M H(\nabla^\perp u_i, \nabla u_i) \cdot (u_i - u_j) dV_g \right| \leq 2 \|u_i - u_j\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbb{R}^K)} \|H\|_{L^\infty(N)} E(u_i) \\
& \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } i, j \rightarrow \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (2.3.3) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_M \alpha \left[(1 + |\nabla u_i|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u_i \cdot \nabla(u_i - u_j) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - (1 + |\nabla u_j|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u_j \cdot \nabla(u_i - u_j) \right] dV_g \right| \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } i, j \rightarrow \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

and this further implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_M |\nabla u_i - \nabla u_j|^{2\alpha} dV_g \\
& \leq C \int_M \int_0^1 |\nabla u_j + t(\nabla u_i - \nabla u_j)|^{2\alpha-2} |\nabla u_i - \nabla u_j|^2 dt dV_g \\
& \leq C \int_M \int_0^1 \int_0^1 d^2 (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^\alpha (\nabla u_j + t(\nabla u_i - \nabla u_j)) (\nabla u_i - \nabla u_j) dt dV_g \\
& \leq C \left| \int_M \alpha \left[(1 + |\nabla u_i|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u_i \cdot \nabla(u_i - u_j) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - (1 + |\nabla u_j|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u_j \cdot \nabla(u_i - u_j) \right] dV_g \right| \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } i, j \rightarrow \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

that is, $\{\nabla u_j\}$ is Cauchy in $L^{2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$. In summary, by combining the fact that $u_j \rightarrow u_0$ in $C^0(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$ with that $\{\nabla u_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^{2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$ and

the completeness of $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$, we can conclude the desired assertion of Lemma 2.3.1. \square

Based on the beginning part of the proof for Lemma 2.3.1, it can be argued that the functional E_α^ω is bounded from below, although the lower bound may be dependent on the choice of $\alpha > 1$. Thus, by a classical consequence of variational analysis in [Pal68], we have

Corollary 2.3.2. *For functional $E_\alpha^\omega : W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the followings hold*

- (1) E_α^ω attains its minimum value in every component of $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)$;
- (2) If there are no critical points of E_α^ω in the interval $[a, b]$, then there exists a deformation retraction

$$\varrho : (E_\alpha^\omega)^{-1}(-\infty, b] \rightarrow (E_\alpha^\omega)^{-1}(-\infty, a].$$

We will now examine the smoothness of the critical points $u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)$ with respect to the functional E_α^ω by following the argument in [SU81, Proposition 2.3], which was also indicated by Moore [Moo17, Remark 4.4.8.]. To ensure the comprehensiveness of our content, we provide an outline of the proof here.

Lemma 2.3.3. *For sufficiently small $\alpha_0 - 1$, all critical points of $E_\alpha^\omega : W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are smooth.*

Proof. By Sobolev embedding $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N) \subset W^{1,2\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K) \hookrightarrow C^{0,1-1/\alpha}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$, the critical point $u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)$ is Hölder continuous. The Euler-lagrange equation for u can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div} \left((1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u \right) + (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} A(u)(\nabla u, \nabla u) \\ (2.3.4) \qquad \qquad \qquad = \frac{1}{\alpha} H(u)(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u) \end{aligned}$$

in weak sense. This is a quasi-linear uniformly elliptic system when $\alpha - 1$ is small enough. Based on standard variational analysis consequences, such as in [Mor66, Theorem 1.11.1] or [Eva10, Chapter 8.3, Theorem 1], it can be concluded that u belongs to the space $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)$. Thus, the Euler-Lagrange equation (2.3.4) can be written pointwisely as

$$\Delta u + (\alpha - 1) \frac{\nabla |\nabla u|^2 \cdot \nabla u}{1 + |\nabla u|^2} = \frac{H(u)(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u)}{\alpha (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1}} - A(u)(\nabla u, \nabla u).$$

The right hand side of the above equation belongs to $L^\alpha(M, N)$, $\alpha > 1$, for $u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)$. From the L^p theory of uniformly elliptic equations, we can conclude that u belongs to $W^{2,2\alpha}(M, N)$. Then, the conclusion of Lemma 2.3.3 follows by applying standard elliptic PDE's bootstrapping argument. \square

3. EXISTENCE OF NON-TRIVIAL CRITICAL POINTS OF THE PERTURBED FUNCTIONAL $E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}$

In this section, we combine the analytic preliminaries established in previous Section 2 with the min-max theory for perturbed functional E_α^ω , that will be described in this section, to establish the existence of a sequences of non-trivial critical points u_{α_j} of $E_{\alpha_j}^\omega$. More precisely, for each fixed $\omega \in C^2(\wedge^2(N))$, we can find a generic choice of $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ to construct a sequence of non-constant critical points u_{α_j} of $E_{\alpha_j}^{\lambda\omega}$ (see (3.2.1) below for the definition of $E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}$) with bounded α_j -energy that is uniformly with respect to $j \in \mathbb{N}$, see Proposition 3.2.3, and with bounded Morse index from above, see Theorem 3.3.6. The main result of this section is summarized in Corollary 3.3.7.

3.1. Construction of Min-Max Type Critical Value.

In this subsection, we construct the min-max type critical value by introducing a higher dimensional version of *width*, in the spirit of [CM08] for finding minimal 2-sphere in Riemannian 3-sphere. Furthermore, we always assume that N is a closed Riemannian manifold with $\pi_k(N) \neq 0$ for some $k \geq 2$ and M is the standard 2-sphere \mathbb{S}^2 which is same as the assumption of our main Theorem 1.1.1 and Theorem 1.1.2.

Then, we can choose a least integer $k \geq 2$ such that $\pi_k(N) \neq 0$. Let

$$I^{k-2} = \{t = (t^1, t^2, \dots, t^{k-2}) : 0 \leq t^i \leq 1, 1 \leq i \leq k-2\}$$

be the $k-2$ dimensional unit complex cube. We define a sweepout as a continuous map $\sigma : I^{k-2} \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$, which also can be viewed as a map $\sigma(\cdot, t) : \mathbb{S}^2 \times I^{k-2} \rightarrow N$, such that σ assigns ∂I^{k-2} to constant maps which can be identified with the points in N and the map $f_\sigma : \mathbb{S}^k \rightarrow N$ induced by σ represents a non-trivial free homotopy class in $\pi_k(N)$. Considering that $W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N) \hookrightarrow C^0(M, N)$ when $\alpha > 1$, it can be inferred that the induced map f_σ is continuous. Then take a non-trivial homotopy class $[l] \in \pi_k(N)$ and we define the set of admissible sweepouts as below

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\sigma \in C^0(I^{k-2}, W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)) : \sigma(t) \text{ is constant for } t \in \partial I^{k-2} \text{ and } f_\sigma \in [l]\}$$

Thus, the corresponding min-max value for E_α^ω is defined as following

$$\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\omega} := \inf_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \sup_{t \in I^{k-2}} E_\alpha^\omega(\sigma(t))$$

which is called *width* depicted by the functional E_α^ω upon $W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$. It is important to note that for every admissible sweepout σ , the boundary of the complex cube ∂I^{k-2} is mapped to constant maps. This implies that

$$0 \leq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\omega} < \infty$$

which represents a well-defined real-valued number depending on the choice of $\alpha > 1$ and ω .

3.2. α -Energy Estimates for Min-Max Type Critical Points.

In this subsection, we apply the idea of Struwe's monotonicity technique [Str88] to obtain uniformly α_j -energy estimates for some specific subsequence of critical points $\{u_{\alpha_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of the perturbed functional $E_{\alpha_j}^{\lambda\omega}$ for generic choice of $\lambda > 0$, see (3.2.1) below for the definition of $E_{\alpha}^{\lambda\omega}$. This is essential in the process of obtaining the existence of H -sphere by letting $\alpha_j \searrow 1$ for suitable choice of sequences $\alpha_j \searrow 1$.

In order to apply the monotonicity technique, we need to bring in a scalar parameter in our perturbed functional as follows

$$(3.2.1) \quad E_{\alpha}^{\lambda\omega}(u) := E_{\alpha}(u) + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} u^* \omega$$

for given $\omega \in C^2(\wedge^2(N))$ and positive number $\lambda > 0$. And we use abbreviated notation $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ to denote the min-max value $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda\omega}$ constructed in previous Section 3.1 and u_{α} is denoted to be the critical points of $E_{\alpha}^{\lambda\omega}$. Equipped with these notations for functional $E_{\alpha}^{\lambda\omega}$ and corresponding min-max value $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ we have

Lemma 3.2.1. *Viewing $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ as a two variable function of $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$ and $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$, the following properties hold*

- (1) *For each $\alpha > 1$, the function $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda}/\lambda$ is non-increasing;*
- (2) *For each $\lambda > 0$, the function $\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ is non-decreasing;*

Moreover, given any sequences $\alpha_j \searrow 1$, then, for almost every $\lambda > 0$, there exists a subsequence of $\{\alpha_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, also denoted by α_j , and a constant $C > 0$ which is independent of j , such that

$$0 \leq \frac{d}{d\lambda} \left(-\frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_j,\lambda}}{\lambda} \right) \leq C, \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. We first consider part (1), for any $u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ and $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2$, by the expression (3.2.1) of functional $E_{\alpha}^{\lambda\omega}$ we have

$$(3.2.2) \quad \frac{E_{\alpha}^{\lambda_1\omega}(u)}{\lambda_1} - \frac{E_{\alpha}^{\lambda_2\omega}(u)}{\lambda_2} = \frac{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}{\lambda_1 \cdot \lambda_2} E_{\alpha}(u) \geq 0.$$

By the construction of min-max value $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda}$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda_1} \leq \max_{t \in I^{k-2}} E_{\alpha}^{\lambda_1\omega}(\sigma(t)) \leq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda_1} + \varepsilon.$$

Thus, using the monotone formula (3.2.2) we can estimate

$$\frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda_2}}{\lambda_2} \leq \max_{t \in I^{k-2}} \frac{E_{\alpha}^{\lambda_2\omega}(\sigma(t))}{\lambda_2} \leq \max_{t \in I^{k-2}} \frac{E_{\alpha}^{\lambda_1\omega}(\sigma(t))}{\lambda_1} \leq \frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda_1}}{\lambda_1} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda_1}.$$

Since the choice of $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we can obtain the conclusion of (1).

For part (2), it is worth noting that the function $(1 + |x|^2)^\alpha$ is increasing with respect to $\alpha > 1$, hence we have

$$E_{\alpha_2}^{\lambda\omega}(u) - E_{\alpha_1}^{\lambda\omega}(u) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha_2} - (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha_1} dV_g \geq 0$$

for any $u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ and $1 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2$. The remaining argument is essentially identical to the process outlined in part (1) and therefore leads to the conclusion as stated in (2).

For the last statement, since $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_j, \lambda}/\lambda$ is a monotone function with respect to λ by part (1), the derivative

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} \left(-\frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_j, \lambda}}{\lambda} \right)$$

exists for almost every $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ and is non-negative. Furthermore, given any $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \infty$, we have

$$\int_{\lambda_1}^{\lambda_2} \frac{d}{d\lambda} \left(-\frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_j, \lambda}}{\lambda} \right) d\lambda \leq \frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_j, \lambda_1}}{\lambda_1} - \frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_j, \lambda_2}}{\lambda_2} < \infty$$

Then, by Fatou's Lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\lambda_1}^{\lambda_2} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d}{d\lambda} \left(-\frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_j, \lambda}}{\lambda} \right) d\lambda &\leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\lambda_1}^{\lambda_2} \frac{d}{d\lambda} \left(-\frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_j, \lambda}}{\lambda} \right) d\lambda \\ &\leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_j, \lambda_1}}{\lambda_1} - \frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_j, \lambda_2}}{\lambda_2} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\mathcal{W}_{2, \lambda_1}}{\lambda_1} - \frac{\mathcal{W}_{1, \lambda_2}}{\lambda_2} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the monotonicity of $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda}$ with respect to α obtained in part (2). It can be inferred that for almost every λ within the range of $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$ there holds

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d}{d\lambda} \left(-\frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_j, \lambda}}{\lambda} \right) < \infty.$$

Therefore, the last assertion of Lemma 3.2.1 follows by the arbitrary choices of λ_1 and λ_2 . \square

Next, in Lemma 3.2.2 below, we show that based on the conclusion of Lemma 3.2.1 for certain choice $t_0 \in I^{k-2}$ there exists a α -energy control for some sweepouts valued at t_0 , with upper bounds depending on the constant C obtained in last assertion of Lemma 3.2.1.

Lemma 3.2.2. *Let $\lambda > 0$ and $\alpha_0 > \alpha > 1$ for some small enough $\alpha_0 - 1$. And assume there exists a constant $C > 0$, independent of $\alpha \searrow 1$, such that*

$$0 \leq \frac{d}{d\lambda} \left(-\frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda}}{\lambda} \right) \leq C.$$

Then, there exists a sequence of sweepouts $\sigma_j : I^{k-2} \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ such that

$$\max_{t \in I^{k-2}} E_{\alpha}^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t)) \leq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} + \lambda\varepsilon_j,$$

and

$$E_{\alpha}(\sigma_j(t_0)) \leq 8\lambda^2 C$$

as long as $t_0 \in I^{k-2}$ satisfying $E_{\alpha}^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t_0)) \geq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} - \lambda\varepsilon_j$, for any sequence $\varepsilon_j \searrow 0$ with $0 < \varepsilon_j \leq \lambda/2$.

Proof. Given any sequence $\varepsilon_j \searrow 0$ with $0 < \varepsilon_j \leq \lambda/2$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $\lambda_j = \lambda - \varepsilon_j/(4C)$. By the assumption of Lemma 3.2.2, there exists a large $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $j \geq j_0$ there holds

$$\frac{1}{\lambda - \lambda_j} \left(\frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda_j}}{\lambda_j} - \frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda}}{\lambda} \right) \leq 2C.$$

This is equivalent to

$$\frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda_j}}{\lambda_j} \leq \frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda}}{\lambda} + \frac{\varepsilon_j}{2}, \quad \text{for all } j \geq j_0.$$

Next, recalling that the functional $E_{\alpha}^{\lambda\omega}$ has min-max value $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda}$, there exists a sequence of sweepouts $\sigma_j \in \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$(3.2.3) \quad \frac{1}{\lambda_j} \max_{t \in I^{k-2}} E_{\alpha}^{\lambda_j\omega}(\sigma_j(t)) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_j} \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda_j} + \frac{\varepsilon_j}{2}.$$

Thus, combining with the monotone formula (3.2.2) we can obtain

$$\max_{t \in I^{k-2}} E_{\alpha}^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t)) \leq \lambda \left(\frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda_j}}{\lambda_j} \right) + \frac{\lambda\varepsilon_j}{2} \leq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} + \lambda\varepsilon_j.$$

For the another side of inequality, we pick $t_0 \in I^{k-2}$ satisfying

$$(3.2.4) \quad \frac{1}{\lambda} E_{\alpha}^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t_0)) \geq \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} - \varepsilon_j,$$

then, for $j \geq j_0$, by subtracting (3.2.4) from (3.2.3) and utilizing (3.2.2), we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\lambda \cdot \lambda_j} E_{\alpha}(\sigma_j(t_0)) &= \frac{1}{\lambda - \lambda_j} \left(\frac{E_{\alpha}^{\lambda_j\omega}(\sigma_j(t_0))}{\lambda_j} - \frac{E_{\alpha}^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t_0))}{\lambda} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda - \lambda_j} \left(\frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda_j}}{\lambda_j} - \frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda}}{\lambda} + \frac{3\varepsilon_j}{2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\lambda - \lambda_j} \left(\frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda_j}}{\lambda_j} - \frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda}}{\lambda} \right) + 6C \leq 8C.$$

Therefore, we have

$$E_\alpha(\sigma_j(t_0)) \leq 8\lambda^2 C$$

provided $t_0 \in I^{k-2}$ satisfying (3.2.4). \square

Next, we show that the min-max value $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda}$ is a critical value and construct a critical point $\{u_\alpha\}$ for the functional $E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}$ with uniformly bounded α -energy, where the α -energy upper bound depends on the value of derivatives

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} \left(-\frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda}}{\lambda} \right),$$

the choice of $\lambda > 0$ in view of Lemma 3.2.2.

Proposition 3.2.3. *Given $\lambda > 0$ and $\alpha > 1$ such that there exists a sequence of sweepouts $\sigma_j \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying*

$$\max_{t \in I^{k-2}} E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t)) \leq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda} + \lambda\varepsilon_j,$$

and

$$E_\alpha(\sigma_j(t_0)) \leq 8\lambda^2 C$$

for any $t_0 \in I^{k-2}$ admitting $E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t_0)) \geq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda} - \lambda\varepsilon_j$ and for any sequence $\varepsilon_j \searrow 0$ with $0 < \varepsilon_j \leq \lambda/2$. Then, after passing to a subsequence, there exists $t_j \in I^{k-2}$ so that the following holds:

- (1) $|E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t_j)) - \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda}| \leq \lambda\varepsilon_j$, which further implies $E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t_j)) \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda}$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$;
- (2) $\sigma_j(t_j)$ converges strongly in $W^{1, 2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ to some u_α with uniformly bounded energy

$$E_\alpha(u_\alpha) \leq 8\lambda^2 C;$$

- (3) The limiting map u_α obtained in part (2) is non-constant. Moreover, there exists a positive constant $\delta(\alpha, \lambda\omega) > 0$ depending on $\alpha > 1$, $\lambda > 1$ and $\omega \in C^2(\wedge^2(N))$ such that $E_\alpha(u_\alpha) \geq \frac{1}{2}\text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^2) + \delta(\alpha, \lambda\omega)$.

Remark 3.2.4. Given a sequence of admissible sweepouts $\{\sigma_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{S}$, we call σ_j is a min-max sequence if

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \max_{t \in I^{k-2}} E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t)) = \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda}.$$

Therefore, combining the Lemma 3.2.1, Lemma 3.2.2 and Proposition 3.2.3, we can conclude that, for almost every choice of $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ given any min-max sequence $\{\sigma_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{S}$, after passing to certain subsequences, there exists a sequence of $t_j \in I^{k-2}$ such that

$\sigma_j(t_j)$ converges strongly in $W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ to a non-constant α - H -surface u_α with

$$E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(u_\alpha) = \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda}.$$

Moreover, Given any $\alpha_j \searrow 1$ there exists a subsequence of $\alpha_j \searrow 1$ such that the α_j -energy of u_{α_j} is uniformly bounded.

Remark 3.2.5. In the Lemma 4.2.2 below in Section 4.2.1, we can actually show that when $\alpha_0 - 1$ is small enough there exists a constant $\delta(\lambda\omega) > 0$ independent of $\alpha \in (1, \alpha_0)$ such that $E_\alpha(u_\alpha) \geq \frac{1}{2}\text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^2) + \delta(\lambda\omega)$ for the non-constant critical point u_α obtained in (3) of Proposition 3.2.3.

Proof. We first consider part (1) and define

$$U_j = \{t \in I^{k-2} : E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t)) > \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} - \lambda\varepsilon_j\} \subset I^{k-2}.$$

Since $E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}$ satisfies the Palais-Smale condition, see Lemma 2.3.1, considering the assumption of Proposition 3.2.3, it suffices to show that the first variation acting on $\sigma_j(U_j)$ is not bounded away from zero. More precisely, we claim that:

Claim 1. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(3.2.5) \quad \inf_{t \in U_j} \|\delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t))\| < \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } j \geq j_0.$$

Proof of Claim 1. We prove the Claim 1 by contradiction, that is, suppose that there exists some $\delta > 0$ and a subsequence of $\sigma_j \in \mathcal{S}$, which is also denoted by σ_j , such that

$$\|\delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t))\| \geq \delta, \quad \text{for all } t \in U_j \text{ and all } j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The following existence of pseudo-gradient vector field is essential for us and the detailed proof can be founded in [Str88, Chapter II. Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.9].

Lemma 3.2.6. *There exists a locally Lipschitz continuous map*

$$X : \tilde{V} \rightarrow T(W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)) \subset T(W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, \mathbb{R}^K)),$$

where

$$\tilde{V} = \{u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N) : \delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(u) \neq 0\},$$

such all the following holds:

- (1) $X(u) \in \mathcal{T}_u$ for each $u \in \tilde{V}$;
- (2) $\|X(u)\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, \mathbb{R}^K)} < 2 \min \{\|\delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(u)\|, 1\}$;
- (3) $\delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(u)(X(u)) < -\min \{\|E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(u)\|, 1\} \cdot \|E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(u)\|$.

Then, we consider the continuous 1-parameter family of homeomorphisms associated with X , denoted by

$$\Phi : \left\{ (u, s) : u \in \tilde{V}, 0 \leq s < T(u) \right\} \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N) \subset W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, \mathbb{R}^K),$$

where $T(u)$ is the maximal existence time of the integral curve from u along X . Next, we show that $T(u)$ has a uniformly positive lower bound which is independent of $u \in \tilde{V}$, following the outline of the proof presented in [CZ23, Lemma 3.8].

Lemma 3.2.7. *For all $L > 0$ and $0 < \delta < 1$, there exists $T = T(\delta, L) > 0$ such that if $\|\delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(u)\| \geq \delta$ and $E_\alpha(u) \leq L$, then the maximal existence time $T(u)$ satisfies*

$$T(u) \geq T(\delta, L).$$

In particular, when $s \leq T(\delta, L)$ there holds

$$\|\delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\Phi(u, s))\| \geq \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

Proof. By part (2) of Lemma 3.2.6 and general ODE theory on Banach manifold, we see that if $T(u) < \infty$, then

$$\liminf_{s \nearrow T(u)} \|\delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\Phi(u, s))\| = 0.$$

Thus, it suffices to obtain a lower bound for $\|E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\Phi(u, s))\|$ when $s \in [0, T(u)]$ in order to obtain a lower bound of $T(u)$. To this end, given $s < \min\{1/2, T(u)\}$, we use property (2) in Lemma 3.2.6 to see

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(u, s) - u\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)} &\leq \int_0^s \|X(\Phi(u, t))\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, \mathbb{R}^K)} dt \\ (3.2.6) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\leq \int_0^s 2 \min \{ \|\delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\Phi(u, t))\|, 1 \} dt \leq 2s < 1. \end{aligned}$$

This further implies

$$\|\Phi(u, s)\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)} \leq C_N(L + 1), \quad \text{whenever } s < \min\{1/2, T(u)\},$$

for some constant depending only on geometries of N . By the estimates

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)} \leq C_N E_\alpha(u) \leq C_N L \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Phi(u, s)\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)} \leq C_N(L + 1),$$

we can apply part (3) of Proposition 2.2.3 to get

$$\|\delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\Phi(u, s)) - \delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(u)\| \leq C_L \|\Phi(u, s) - u\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)} \leq 2C_L s.$$

Utilizing this inequality, we can get

$$\|\delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\Phi(u, s))\| \geq \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad \text{whenever } s \leq \min \left\{ T(u), \frac{\delta}{4(C_L + 1)} \right\}$$

which implies that $T(u) \geq \frac{\delta}{4(C_L+1)} := T(\delta, L)$ and the second conclusion is also followed. \square

Then we come back to the proof of Claim 1. Recalling that we assumed by contradiction that

$$(3.2.7) \quad \|\delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t))\| \geq \delta, \quad \text{for all } t \in U_j,$$

and by the assumption of Proposition 3.2.3, there exists a universal constant $C_\lambda := 8\lambda^2 C > 0$ such that

$$E_\alpha(\sigma_j(t)) \leq C_\lambda, \quad \text{when } t \in U_j.$$

So, we can apply Lemma 3.2.7 to obtain a lower bound of $T(\sigma_j(t)) \geq T(\delta, C_\lambda)$ for all $t \in U_j$ and

$$(3.2.8) \quad \|\delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\Phi(\sigma_j(t), s))\| \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \quad \text{for all } (t, s) \in U_j \times [0, T(\delta, C_\lambda)].$$

In order to construct a new sweepout from σ_j and Φ , we define a compact subset V_j of U_j as follows

$$V_j = \left\{ t \in I^{k-2} : E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t)) \geq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} - \frac{\lambda\varepsilon_j}{2} \right\}.$$

By the continuity of $t \mapsto E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t))$, V_j is a compact subset of U_j . So, there exists a smooth cut-off function $\varphi_j : I^{k-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\varphi_j \equiv 1$ on V_j and vanishes outside of U_j . Then, we set

$$\tilde{\Phi}_j(t, s) := \Phi(\sigma_j(t), \varphi_j(t)T(\delta, C_\lambda)s) \quad \text{for } (t, s) \in I^{k-2} \times [0, 1].$$

We observe that, when $t \in \partial I^{k-2}$ and j is large enough, $\varphi_j(t) = 0$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_j(t, s) = \sigma_j(t)$ is a constant map for all $s \in [0, 1]$. Hence, if we let $\tilde{\sigma}_j(t) = \tilde{\Phi}_j(t, 1)$, $\tilde{\sigma}_j \in \mathcal{S}$ is an admissible sweepout. Then differentiating $E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\tilde{\Phi}_j(t, s))$ with respect to s at $(t_0, s_0) \in I^{k-2} \times [0, 1]$ yields that

$$\left. \frac{d}{ds} \right|_{s=s_0} E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\tilde{\Phi}_j(t_0, s)) = \varphi_j(t_0)T(\delta, C_\lambda)\delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\tilde{\Phi}_j(t_0, s_0)) \left(X(\tilde{\Phi}_j(t_0, s_0)) \right).$$

Then, we integrate the above identity with respect to s from 0 to 1 by changing variables to get

$$(3.2.9) \quad E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\tilde{\sigma}_j(t)) = E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t)) + \int_0^{\varphi_j(t)T(\delta, C_\lambda)} \delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\tilde{\Phi}_j(x, s)) \left(X(\tilde{\Phi}_j(x, s)) \right) ds.$$

Next, combining the identity (3.2.9) with estimate (3.2.8) and part (3) of Lemma 3.2.6, we can get

$$E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\tilde{\sigma}_j(t)) < E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t)) - \frac{\delta^2}{4}T(\delta, C_\lambda) < \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} + \lambda\varepsilon_j - \frac{\delta^2}{4}T(\delta, C_\lambda)$$

for all $t \in V_j$. Thus, when $t \in V_j$ and j is large enough, we have

$$\max_{t \in I^{k-2}} E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\tilde{\sigma}_j(t)) \leq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} - \frac{\delta^2 T(\delta, C_\lambda)}{8} < \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda},$$

which is a contradiction to the definition of min-max value $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda}$. Therefore Claim 1 holds. \square

Let us now return to the proof of the Proposition 3.2.3. Consequently, by Claim 1, there exists a subsequence of $\sigma_j(t_j)$ for $t_j \in U_j$, which are still denoted by same symbols, such that

$$E_\alpha(\sigma_j(t_j)) \leq C_\lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \|\delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\sigma_j(t_j))\| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

In view of Lemma 2.3.1, after passing to a subsequence, $\sigma_j(t_j)$ converges strongly in $W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ to some u_α satisfying $\delta E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(u_\alpha) = 0$ and $E_\alpha(u_\alpha) \leq C_\lambda$. The conclusion of part (1) and (2) of Proposition 3.2.3 follows directly. For part (3) of Proposition 3.2.3, we first note that the α -energy for critical points u_α is strictly larger than $\frac{1}{2}\text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^2)$, that is, there exists a $\delta(\alpha, \lambda\omega) > 0$ such that

$$E_\alpha(u_\alpha) \geq \frac{1}{2}\text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^2) + \delta(\alpha, \lambda\omega).$$

Otherwise, assume for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a sweepout $\sigma_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$\max_{t \in I^{k-2}} E_\alpha(\sigma_\varepsilon(t)) < \frac{1}{2}\text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^2) + \varepsilon.$$

Then, the map $f_{\sigma_\varepsilon} : \mathbb{S}^k \rightarrow N$, induced by σ_ε , is homotopy to some constant map, by directly applying Poincaré's inequality and Sobolev Embedding $W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^k, N) \hookrightarrow C^0(\mathbb{S}^k, N)$, which contradicts to the choice of $\sigma_j \in [\iota] \neq 0$. Thus, u_α is a non-constant critical point for $E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}$ and the proof of Proposition 3.2.3 is now complete. \square

3.3. Morse Index Upper Bound for Min-Max Critical Points u_α .

In this subsection, we are devoted to construct a sequence of non-constant critical points $\{u_{\alpha_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $E_{\alpha_j}^{\lambda\omega}$ for $\alpha_j \searrow 1$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ that admits an uniformly α_j -energy upper bound together with a Morse index upper bound: $\text{Ind}_{E_{\alpha_j}^{\lambda\omega}}(u_{\alpha_j}) \leq k - 2$. The main obstruction in constructing the critical points u_{α_j} with desired Morse index upper bound is the dependence of α_j -energy upper bound obtained in Proposition 3.2.3 with the choices of sequence $\{u_{\alpha_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Such dependence prevents us to apply Morse theory to obtain the Morse index upper bound estimates by perturbing the functional $E_{\alpha_j}^{\lambda\omega}$ further to a Morse one. To overcome this obstacle, inspired by the Morse index upper bound estimates in the setting of Almgren-Pitts min-max theory by Marques-Neves [MN16], Song [Son23a], and Li [Li23b], see also Cheng-Zhou [CZ23] and

Cheng [Che22] for the setting of a newly devised min–max theory, we design a homotopical deformation for the min-max sequences of sweepouts $\sigma_l : I^{k-2} \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ obtained in Proposition 3.2.3 to construct a sequence $\{u_{\alpha_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ with the desired Morse index upper bound and α_j -energy bound simultaneously, for more details see Theorem 3.3.5 and Theorem 3.3.6 below. Note that the main result—Theorem 3.3.5 in this subsection holds for all choice of $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and any $\alpha > 1$ in the definition of functional E_α^ω , so we simply write α for α_j when $j \in \mathbb{N}$ fixed, ω for $\lambda\omega$ and E_α^ω for $E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}$.

Before penetrating into the detailed description of homotopical deformation Theorem 3.3.5 and Theorem 3.3.6, we prepare some essential notions and estimates. To begin, recall that the second variation formula of $E_\alpha^\omega : W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is written as following, for more details see Lemma 2.2.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u)(V, V) &= \alpha \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left(\langle \nabla V, \nabla V \rangle - R(V, \nabla u, V, \nabla u) \right) dV_g \\
&\quad + 2\alpha(\alpha - 1) \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-2} \langle \nabla u, \nabla V \rangle^2 dV_g \\
(3.3.1) \quad &\quad + 2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \langle H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla V), V \rangle dV_g + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \langle (\nabla_V H)(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u), V \rangle dV_g,
\end{aligned}$$

for $V \in \mathcal{T}_u$.

Definition 3.3.1. For any $\omega \in C^2(\wedge^2(N))$, the *Morse index* of a critical point $u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ for E_α^ω is the maximal dimension of linear subspace of \mathcal{T}_u on which $\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u)$ restricted to be a negative definite symmetric bilinear form.

By Lemma 2.3.3, every critical point $u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ of E_α^ω is smooth for small enough $\alpha > 1$. Then, we can extend $\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u) : \mathcal{T}_u \times \mathcal{T}_u \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to a bounded symmetric bilinear form on the Hilbert space

$$(3.3.2) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u := \{V \in W^{1,2}(\mathbb{S}^2, \mathbb{R}^K) : V(x) \in T_{u(x)}N \text{ for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{S}^2\}.$$

The Morse index of critical point u of E_α^ω on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$ is defined exactly the same manner with Definition 3.3.1. At each $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$, it follows from the Riesz representation theorem that there exists a bounded linear operator \mathcal{L}_u such that

$$(3.3.3) \quad \delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u)(V, W) = \langle \mathcal{L}_u(V), W \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u} \quad \text{for } V, W \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u,$$

which is called the *Jacobi operator* of E_α^ω at u . Here, the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u}$ is induced from inclusion $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u \subset W^{1,2}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$. Furthermore, in the Lemma 3.3.2 below, we demonstrate that the Morse index defined on \mathcal{T}_u is equivalent to the one extended on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$ and we establish a spectral decomposition on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$ using the standard uniformly elliptic operator theory.

Lemma 3.3.2. *Given a critical point $u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ of E_α^ω , when $\alpha - 1$ is small enough, the following properties holds:*

- (L₁) *The Jacobi operator \mathcal{L}_u is a self-adjoint second order elliptic differential operator, hence a Fredholm operator on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$.*
- (L₂) *There exists a sequence of real eigenvalues $\lambda_j \nearrow \infty$ of \mathcal{L}_u and a sequence of corresponding eigenfunctions $\{\phi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ which forms a basis of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$ such that*

$$\delta E_\alpha^\omega(u)(\phi_i, \phi_j) = \langle \mathcal{L}_u(\phi_i), \phi_j \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u} = \lambda_i \langle \phi_i, \phi_j \rangle_{L^2} = \lambda_i \delta_{ij}.$$

- (L₃) *The Morse index defined on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$ is finite and is identical with the standard one defined as in Definition 3.3.1.*

Proof. It suffices to show (L₁), (L₂) follows directly from the Sobolev compact embedding

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u \hookrightarrow \{V \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^2, \mathbb{R}^K) : V(x) \in T_{u(x)}N \text{ for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{S}^2\},$$

and the application of standard compact operator theory to \mathcal{L}_u . And (L₃) follows from the observation that each eigenfunction ϕ_j actually is smooth by applying the elliptic bootstrapping to the eigenequations of ϕ_j . Note that the self-adjointness of \mathcal{L}_u follows from the symmetry of bilinear form $\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega$, and that by the smoothness of critical point u , when $\alpha - 1$ is small enough, \mathcal{L}_u is uniformly elliptic. To verify \mathcal{L}_u is a Fredholm operator on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$, it is enough to establish the following Gårding-type inequality:

$$(3.3.4) \quad \delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u)(V, V) \geq C_1(u, H, N) \int_M |\nabla V|^2 dV_g - C_2(u, H, N) \int_M |V|^2 dV_g$$

for some constants $C_1(u, H, N)$, $C_2(u, H, N)$ depending on u , mean curvature type vector field H and geometries of N . In fact, since the integrand in second line of (3.3.1) is positive, it is not difficult to see

$$(3.3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u)(V, V) &\geq \int_M (|\nabla V|^2 - C(u, N) |V|^2) dV_g \\ &\quad - C(u, H) \int_M |\nabla V| \cdot |V| dV_g - C(u, H) \int_M |V|^2 dV_g. \end{aligned}$$

Then, applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality with ε to the first integrand in the second line of (3.3.5) will yield (3.3.4), hence completes the proof of Lemma 3.3.2. \square

Utilizing the conclusions (L₂) and (L₃) of Lemma 3.3.2, the Morse index of critical point u of $\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega$ can also be defined as

Definition 3.3.3. The $\text{Ind}_{E_\alpha^\omega}(u)$ equals to the number of negative eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_u on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$ counted with multiplicity. Furthermore, by the spectral decomposition (L₂) of

Lemma 3.3.2 and regularity of ϕ_j , we have

$$\mathcal{T}_u = \mathcal{T}_u^- \oplus \mathcal{T}_u^+$$

where \mathcal{T}_u^- is the direct sum of negative eigenspaces of \mathcal{L}_u with $\dim(\mathcal{T}_u^-) = \text{Ind}_{E_\alpha^\omega}(u)$ and \mathcal{T}_u^+ is the L^2 -orthogonal complement of \mathcal{T}_u^- in \mathcal{T}_u . Based on this decomposition, we write $V = V^- + V^+$ for each $V \in \mathcal{T}_u$.

For $\alpha > 1$, $W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ is a Banach manifold. Then, for each $u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$, taking a small enough ball

$$\mathcal{B}_u(0, r_u) = \{V \in \mathcal{T}_u : \|V\|_{\mathcal{T}_u} < r_u\} \subset \mathcal{T}_u$$

center at the origin of \mathcal{T}_u such that

$$\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(w))|_{\mathcal{T}_u^-} : \mathcal{T}_u^- \times \mathcal{T}_u^- \cong \mathcal{T}_u^- \times \mathcal{T}_u^- \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is negatively definite for all $w \in \mathcal{B}_u(0, r_u)$, we define the coordinate map as below

$$\Phi_u : \mathcal{B}_u(0, r_u) \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N) \quad \text{by } [\Phi_u(V)](x) = \exp_{u(x)}(V(x)), \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{S}^2.$$

Here, the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{T}_u}$ is induced from inclusion $\mathcal{T}_u \subset W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, \mathbb{R}^K)$. The collection

$$\{\mathcal{B}_u(0, r_u), \Phi_u\}_{u \in W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)}$$

consists of a smooth structure for $W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$. Note that in the sequel, we use

$$\mathcal{B}_u^-(0, r_u) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B}_u^+(0, r_u)$$

to represent the balls in \mathcal{T}_u^- and \mathcal{T}_u^+ , respectively.

In Lemma 3.3.4 below, around each critical point u of E_α^ω we establish some local estimates of $E_\alpha^\omega \circ \Phi_u$ on $\mathcal{B}_u(0, r_0(u))$ for small enough $0 < r_0(u) < r_u/3$.

Lemma 3.3.4 (See also [Che22, Proposition 4.5]). *With the same notations as above, given $\omega \in C^2(\wedge^2(N))$ and $\alpha > 1$, for each critical point u of E_α^ω there exists $0 < r_0 := r_0(u) < r_u/3$ such that the following holds:*

(I₁) *There exists a constant $0 < \kappa := \kappa(u) < 1$ and a constant $C := C(u) > 0$ such that for all $V \in \mathcal{T}_u$ with*

$$V \in \mathcal{B}_u(0, r_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \|V^+\|_{\mathcal{T}_u} \leq \kappa \|V^-\|_{\mathcal{T}_u},$$

we have

$$E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(V)) - E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(0)) \leq -C \|V^-\|_{\mathcal{T}_u}^2.$$

(I₂) *There exists a constant $C := C(u) > 0$ such that for all $V, W \in \mathcal{T}_u$ with*

$$V \in \mathcal{B}_u(0, r_0) \quad \|W^-\|_{\mathcal{T}_u} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \delta E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(V))(W^-) \leq 0,$$

we have

$$E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(V + rW^-)) - E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(V)) \leq -Cr^2, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq r \leq r_0.$$

Proof. Since $\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(0)) = \delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u) : \mathcal{T}_u \times \mathcal{T}_u \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded bilinear form, there exists $C_1(u) := \|\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u)\| > 0$ such that

$$(3.3.6) \quad |\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(0))(V, V)| \leq C_1(u) \|V\|_{\mathcal{T}_u}^2, \quad \text{for all } V \in \mathcal{T}_u.$$

In particular, observe that $\dim(\mathcal{T}_u^-) = \text{Ind}_{E_\alpha^\omega}(u) < \infty$, the induced norms $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{T}_u}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u}$ restricted on \mathcal{T}_u^- are equivalent. There exists a constant $C_2(u) > 0$ such that

$$(3.3.7) \quad \delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(0))(V^-, V^-) \leq -C_2(u) \|V^-\|_{\mathcal{T}_u}^2 \quad \text{for all } V^- \in \mathcal{T}_u^-.$$

By the continuity of $\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega \circ \Phi_u$ on $\mathcal{B}_u(0, r_u)$, we can choose small enough $0 < r_0 < r_u/3$ such that for any $W \in \mathcal{B}_u(0, 2r_0)$ and any $V \in \mathcal{T}_u$ there holds

$$(3.3.8) \quad |\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(W))(V, V) - \delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(0))(V, V)| \leq \frac{\kappa^2 C_1(u)}{4} \|V\|_{\mathcal{T}_u}^2,$$

where $\kappa > 0$ is a constant that will be determined later. Therefore, for $V \in \mathcal{B}_u(0, r_0)$ with $\|V^+\|_{\mathcal{T}_u} \leq \kappa \|V^-\|_{\mathcal{T}_u}$, utilizing the Taylor formula with integral remainder at critical point u and keeping in mind (3.3.6) and (3.3.7) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(V)) - E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(0)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(0))(V^-, V^-) + \delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(0))(V^+, V^+)) \\ & \quad + \int_0^1 (1-s) (\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(sV))(V, V) - \delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(0))(V, V)) ds \\ & \leq -\frac{C_2(u)}{2} \|V^-\|_{\mathcal{T}_u}^2 + \frac{C_1(u)}{2} \|V^+\|_{\mathcal{T}_u}^2 + \frac{\kappa^2 C_1(u)}{8} \|V\|_{\mathcal{T}_u}^2 \\ (3.3.9) \quad & \leq -\frac{1}{2} (C_2(u) - \kappa^2 C_1(u) - \kappa^2 C_1(u)) \|V^-\|_{\mathcal{T}_u}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first equality we used $\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(0))(\mathcal{T}_u^-, \mathcal{T}_u^+) = 0$ in viewing of part (L₂) in Lemma 3.3.2 and we used the inequality $\|V\|_{\mathcal{T}_u} \leq 2\|V^-\|_{\mathcal{T}_u}$ in the last inequality which comes from our assumption $\|V^+\|_{\mathcal{T}_u} \leq \kappa\|V^-\|_{\mathcal{T}_u}$ for $0 < \kappa < 1$. Then, letting $\kappa > 0$ small enough such that

$$\kappa^2 < \min \left(\frac{C_2(u)}{4C_1(u)}, 1 \right)$$

will yield the conclusion of (I₁) by taking $C(u) := \frac{1}{4}C_2(u)$.

Next, in order to prove (I₂) we apply (3.3.8) and the Taylor formula with integral remainder for $E_\alpha^\omega \circ \Phi_u$ at u acting on $V \in \mathcal{B}_u(0, r_0)$ and $V + tW^- \in \mathcal{B}_u(0, 2r_0)$ satisfying

$\|W^-\|_{\mathcal{T}_u} = 1$ and $\delta E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(V))(W^-) \leq 0$, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(V + tW^-)) - E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(V)) \\
&= t\delta E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(V))(W^-) + \frac{t^2}{2}\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(V))(W^-, W^-) \\
&\quad + \int_0^t (t-s) \left(\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(V + sW^-))(W^-, W^-) \right. \\
&\quad \quad \left. - \delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_u(0))(W^-, W^-) \right) ds \\
(3.3.10) \quad & \leq -\frac{t^2}{2} \left(C_2(u) - \frac{\kappa^2 C_1(u)}{8} \right) \|W^-\|_{\mathcal{T}_u}^2 \leq -\frac{31C_2(u)}{64} t^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This leads to the conclusion of (I_2) in Lemma 3.3.4 by letting

$$C(u) := \frac{31C_2(u)}{64}.$$

□

In order to describe the main result in this subsection more precisely, given $\lambda > 0$ and $\alpha > 1$, writing ω as $\lambda\omega$ we define $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, C}$ to be the collection of admissible sweepouts $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying

$$\max_{t \in I^{k-2}} E_\alpha^\omega(\sigma(t)) \leq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda} + \varepsilon$$

and

$$E_\alpha(\sigma(t)) \leq C \quad \text{as long as } t \in I^{k-2} \text{ satisfying } E_\alpha^\omega(\sigma(t)) \geq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda} - \varepsilon.$$

Note that $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, C}$ is exactly the set of sweepouts that fulfills the assumptions of Proposition 3.2.3 by replacing constant $C > 0$ by $8\lambda^2 C$. Moreover, for $C > 0$ we define $\mathcal{U}_C \subset W^{1, 2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ to be the set of critical points $u \in W^{1, 2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ for functional E_α^ω satisfying

$$\delta E_\alpha^\omega(u) = 0 \quad \text{with } E_\alpha(u) \leq C \text{ and } E_\alpha^\omega(u) = \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda}.$$

Since E_α^ω satisfies the Palais-Smale condition, see Lemma 2.3.1, it is not difficult to see that $\mathcal{U}_C \subset W^{1, 2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ is a compact set. Equipped with these notations at our disposal, we are prepared to present the main result in this subsection:

Theorem 3.3.5 (Deformations of Sweepouts). *Given $\omega \in C^2(\wedge^2(N))$, $\lambda > 0$ writing ω as $\lambda\omega$, $\alpha > 1$ and $C > 0$, let \mathcal{U}_0 be a closed subset of \mathcal{U}_{C+1} . If $\text{Ind}_{E_\alpha^\omega}(u) \geq k-1$ for all $u \in \mathcal{U}_0$, then for each sequence of sweepouts $\{\sigma_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon_j, C}$ with $\varepsilon_j \searrow 0$ there exists another sequence of sweepouts $\{\tilde{\sigma}_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{S}$ such that*

$$(T_1) \quad \tilde{\sigma}_j \in \mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon_j, C+1} \text{ when } j \text{ is large enough.}$$

(T₂) For any $u \in \mathcal{U}_0$, there exists $j_0(u) \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varepsilon_0(u) > 0$ such that for all $j \geq j_0(u)$,

$$\inf_{t \in I^{k-2}, j \geq j_0} \left\{ \|\tilde{\sigma}_j(t) - u\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)} : E_\alpha^\omega(\tilde{\sigma}_j(t)) \geq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda} - \varepsilon_j \right\} \geq \varepsilon_0(0).$$

Proof. Firstly, we observe that there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ is an admissible sweepout then

$$(3.3.11) \quad \max_{t \in I^{k-2}} E_\alpha(\sigma(t)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^2) + \delta_0.$$

In fact, suppose that for any $\delta > 0$ there exists a $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$\max_{t \in I^{k-2}} E_\alpha(\sigma(t)) < \frac{1}{2} \text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^2) + \delta.$$

By Poincaré's inequality, we see that there exists a $C(\alpha) > 0$ such that the oscillation of $\sigma(t) \in W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ satisfies

$$\text{Osc}_{\mathbb{S}^2}(\sigma(t)) \leq C(\alpha) \left(E_\alpha(\sigma(t)) - \frac{1}{2} \text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^2) \right)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}} \leq C(\alpha) \delta^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}}, \quad \text{for all } t \in I^{k-2},$$

which means $\sigma : I^{k-2} \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ can be deformed onto a map that assigns each points in $(k-2)$ -dimensional complex cube I^{k-2} to constant maps, hence the induced map $f_\sigma : \mathbb{S}^k \rightarrow N$ is null-homotopic, contradicting to the definition of \mathcal{S} .

Equipped with this observation, the construction of new sweepouts $\tilde{\sigma}_j \in \mathcal{S}$ stated in Theorem 3.3.5 splits into four steps.

Step 1. We construct a finite subset $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^m \subset \mathcal{U}_0$ and their associated open balls

$$B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_1(u_i)) \subset W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq m$$

satisfying the following:

- (A₁) $\mathcal{U}_0 \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^m B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_1(u_i)) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^m \mathcal{D}_{u_i}(1)$ where $\mathcal{D}_u(1)$ is defined in (3.3.14);
- (A₂) $E_\alpha^\omega(v) \leq E_\alpha^\omega(u) - \frac{(r_0(u))^2}{4} C(u)$ for any $v \in \partial^- \mathcal{D}_u(2)$ where $r_0(u)$ and $C(u)$ are obtained in (I₁) of Lemma 3.3.4 and $\partial^- \mathcal{D}_u(2)$ is defined in (3.3.15).
- (A₃) For each $1 \leq i \leq m$ and any $v, w \in B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, 2r_1(u_i))$, there holds

$$(3.3.12) \quad |E_\alpha(u) - E_\alpha(v)| \leq \frac{\delta_0}{4}$$

where $\delta_0 > 0$ is obtained in (3.3.11).

Here,

$$B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_1(u_i)) := \left\{ v \in W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N) : \|v - u_i\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)} < r_1(u_i) \right\}$$

are balls defined with respect to the topology induced by the Finsler structure of $W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$.

Proof of Step 1. For each $u \in \mathcal{U}_0$, by Lemma 3.3.4 we can find constants $0 < r_0(u) < r_u/3$, $0 < \kappa(u) < 1$ and $C(u) > 0$ such that the conclusions of (I₁) and (I₂) in Lemma 3.3.4 can be applied in the neighborhood $\Phi_u(\mathcal{B}_u(0, r_u))$ of u . By the continuity of $E_\alpha : W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, after shrinking $r_0(u)$ if necessary, we can further assume that

$$(3.3.13) \quad |E_\alpha(v) - E_\alpha(w)| \leq \frac{\delta_0}{4} \quad \text{for any } v, w \in \Phi_u(\mathcal{B}_u(0, r_0(u))).$$

Then, we define

$$(3.3.14) \quad \mathcal{D}_u(\rho) := \Phi_u \left(\left\{ V \in \mathcal{T}_u : \|V^-\|_{\mathcal{T}_u} \leq \frac{r_0(u)}{4} \rho, \|V^+\|_{\mathcal{T}_u} \leq \frac{\kappa(u)r_0(u)}{4} \rho \right\} \right),$$

and

$$(3.3.15) \quad \partial^- \mathcal{D}_u(\rho) := \Phi_u \left(\left\{ V \in \mathcal{T}_u : \|V^-\|_{\mathcal{T}_u} = \frac{r_0(u)}{4} \rho, \|V^+\|_{\mathcal{T}_u} \leq \frac{\kappa(u)r_0(u)}{4} \rho \right\} \right)$$

for $\rho \in [1, 4]$. Thus, by the estimates obtained in (I₁) of Lemma 3.3.4 we see that

$$(3.3.16) \quad E_\alpha^\omega(v) \leq E_\alpha^\omega(u) - \frac{(r_0(u))^2}{4} C(u) \quad \text{for any } v \in \partial^- \mathcal{D}_u(2)$$

Then, for each $u \in \mathcal{U}_0$ we can choose small enough $0 < r_1(u) < r_0(u)$ such that

$$(3.3.17) \quad B^{1,2\alpha}(u, 2r_1(u)) \subset \mathcal{D}_u(1).$$

Since the collection $\{B^{1,2\alpha}(u, r_1(u))\}_{u \in \mathcal{U}_0}$ consists of an open covering of compact set \mathcal{U}_0 , there exists a finite subcovering $\{B^{1,2\alpha}(u, r_1(u))\}_{i=1}^m$ satisfying all the assertions of Step 1 by the choice of $r_1(u)$. \square

In the following, for the notation simplicity, we write

$$r_i := r_1(u_i) \quad \text{and} \quad b_i := \frac{(r_0(u_i))^2}{4} C(u_i),$$

and denote

$$\underline{r} := \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} r_i, \quad \underline{b} := \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} b_i, \quad \underline{C} := \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} C(u_i).$$

Step 2. We construct a constant $\eta > 0$ such that the following properties hold

$$(B_1) \quad \mathcal{N}_\eta^{1,2\alpha} := \bigcup_{u \in \mathcal{U}_0} B^{1,2\alpha}(u, \eta) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^m B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_i).$$

(B₂) For any $u \in \mathcal{U}_0$ and any $v \in B(u, \eta)$, we have

$$(3.3.18) \quad |E_\alpha^\omega(v) - \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda}| \leq \frac{1}{4} \underline{b}.$$

(B₃) For any $p \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-2\}$, any $\vartheta \in (0, \underline{b}/4)$, any $1 \leq i \leq m$ and any continuous map $\varsigma : I^p \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_\eta^{1,2\alpha} \cap B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_i)$, there exists a continuous homotopy

$$H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta} : I^p \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{u_i}(3) \text{ such that the following holds}$$

$$(3b_1) \quad H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, 0) = \varsigma(\tau) \text{ for } \tau \in I^p.$$

$$(3b_2) \quad E_\alpha^\omega \left(H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, t) \right) - E_\alpha^\omega(\varsigma(\tau)) \leq \vartheta, \text{ for all } \tau \in I^p \text{ and } t \in [0, 1].$$

$$(3b_3) \quad \left\| H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, t) - \varsigma(\tau) \right\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)} \leq \vartheta, \text{ for all } \tau \in I^p \text{ and } t \in [0, 1/2].$$

$$(3b_4) \quad H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, 1) \notin \mathcal{N}_\eta^{1,2\alpha}, \text{ for all } \tau \in I^p.$$

Proof of Step 2. Given $\eta > 0$ we define

$$\mathcal{N}_\eta^{1,2\alpha} := \bigcup_{u \in \mathcal{U}_0} B^{1,2\alpha}(u, \eta)$$

and by the compactness of \mathcal{U}_0 we can choose small enough $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{N}_\eta^{1,2\alpha} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^m B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_i)$$

and the second assertion (B_2) of Step 2 can also be satisfied by the continuity of $w \mapsto |E_\alpha^\omega(w) - \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda}|$. For the part (B_3) of Step 2, firstly, we are devoted to construct a continuous homotopy $\hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}$ inductively on the l -dimensional skeleton $I_{(l)}^p$ of I^p for $0 \leq l \leq p$ such that

$$(\hat{H}_1) \quad \hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, 0) = \varsigma(\tau), \text{ for } \tau \in I^p.$$

$$(\hat{H}_2) \quad \text{For } t \in [0, 1] \text{ and } \tau \in I^p,$$

$$\left\| \hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, t) - \varsigma(\tau) \right\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)} \leq \vartheta.$$

(\hat{H}_3) There exists some $\delta(\vartheta, \varsigma, p, i) > 0$ satisfying

$$\inf_{\tau \in I^p} \left(\sup_{V^- \in \mathcal{T}_{u_i}^- \text{ with } \|V^-\|_{\mathcal{T}_{u_i}} = 1} \left| \delta E_\alpha^\omega \left(\Phi_{u_i}^{-1} \left(\hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, 1) \right) \right) (V) \right| \right) \geq \delta(\vartheta, \varsigma, p, i) > 0.$$

If

$$\delta E_\alpha^\omega \left(\Phi_{u_i}^{-1}(\varsigma(\tau)) \right) \Big|_{\mathcal{T}_{u_i}^-} \not\equiv 0 \quad \text{for each } \tau \in I^p,$$

then by the continuity of ς on compact complex cube I^p we can simply choose $\hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta} \equiv \varsigma$ for $t \in [0, 1]$ being the constant homotopy and let $\delta(\vartheta, \varsigma, p, i)$ to be

$$\inf_{\tau \in I^p} \left(\sup_{V^- \in \mathcal{T}_{u_i}^- \text{ with } \|V^-\|_{\mathcal{T}_{u_i}} = 1} \left| \delta E_\alpha^\omega \left(\Phi_{u_i}^{-1}(\varsigma(\tau)) \right) (V) \right| \right) > 0.$$

Thus, we assume that

$$\delta E_\alpha^\omega \left(\Phi_{u_i}^{-1}(\varsigma(\tau)) \right) \Big|_{\mathcal{T}_{u_i}^-} \equiv 0$$

for some $\tau \in I^p$. Observe that $\delta E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_{u_i}(0)) = 0$ and $\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_{u_i}(w)) \Big|_{\mathcal{T}_{u_i}^-}$ is negatively definite for all $w \in \mathcal{B}_{u_i}(0, r_{u_i})$ by the choice of $r_{u_i} > 0$, which implies that

$\delta E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_{u_i}(V^-)) \neq 0$ for $V^- \in \mathcal{B}_{u_i}^-(0, r_i) \setminus \{0\}$. Since $\mathcal{B}_{u_i}^-(0, r_i)$ is a convex set of dimension at least $k-1$ by the assumption of Theorem 3.3.5, it suffices to define $\hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}(\tau, 1)$ through the homeomorphism Φ_{u_i} such that

$$(3.3.19) \quad \left\| \Phi_{u_i}^{-1} \left(\hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}(\tau, 1) \right) - \Phi_{u_i}^{-1}(\varsigma(\tau)) \right\|_{\mathcal{T}_{u_i}} \leq \vartheta', \quad \text{for all } \tau \in I^p$$

and

$$(3.3.20) \quad \left(\Phi_{u_i}^{-1} \left(\hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}(\tau, 1) \right) \right)^- \neq 0, \quad \text{for all } \tau \in I^p.$$

Here, by the continuity of Φ_{u_i} , $\vartheta' > 0$ is chosen to satisfy the property (\hat{H}_2) in Step 2 of $\hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}$ as long as (3.3.19) holds. Then, for each $\tau \in I_{(0)}^p$ which is a finite discrete set, we can choose $(\Phi_{u_i}^{-1}(\hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}(\tau, 1)))^- \neq 0$ satisfying (3.3.19). Suppose we have defined the homotopy $\hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}(\tau, 1)$ on $I_{(l)}^p$ for some $0 \leq l \leq p-1$ such that (3.3.19) and (3.3.20) are satisfied. Let $\mathcal{O}(\Phi_{u_i}^{-1}(\varsigma(I_{(l)}^p)), \vartheta')$ be the ϑ' -neighborhood of $\Phi_{u_i}^{-1}(\varsigma(I_{(l)}^p))$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{O} \left(\Phi_{u_i}^{-1} \left(\varsigma \left(I_{(l)}^p \right) \right), \vartheta' \right) \\ & := \left\{ w \in \mathcal{T}_{u_i} : \min_{\tau \in I_{(l)}^p} \|w - \Phi_{u_i}^{-1}(\varsigma(\tau))\|_{\mathcal{T}_{u_i}} < \vartheta' \right\} \end{aligned}$$

which is also equal to

$$\bigcup_{\tau \in I^q} \mathcal{B}_{u_i}(\Phi_{u_i}^{-1}(\varsigma(\tau)), \vartheta').$$

And we use

$$\mathcal{O}^-(\Phi_{u_i}^{-1}(\varsigma(I_{(l)}^p)), \vartheta')$$

to denote the L^2 -orthogonal projection of $\mathcal{O}(\Phi_{u_i}^{-1}(\varsigma(I_{(l)}^p)), \vartheta')$ into $\mathcal{T}_{u_i}^-$. Since $\dim \mathcal{T}_{u_i}^- \geq k-1 > p \geq l+1$, we have that

$$\pi_l \left(\mathcal{O}^-(\Phi_{u_i}^{-1}(\varsigma(I_{(l)}^p)), \vartheta') \setminus \{0\} \right) = \pi_l(\mathcal{T}_{u_i}^- \setminus \{0\}) = 0,$$

there exists a continuous extension of $H_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}(\tau, 1)$ from $I_{(l)}^p$ onto $I_{(l+1)}^p$ such that (3.3.19) and (3.3.20) are also satisfied. Therefore, we complete the induction construction of the homotopy $\hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}$.

Now, we construct the desired homotopy $H_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}$ satisfying the properties stated in (B_3) of Step 2. For each $w \in \mathcal{B}_{u_i}(0, r_i) \setminus \{0\}$, we pick up a $\xi_{u_i}(w) \in \mathcal{T}_{u_i}^-$ with $\|\xi_{u_i}(w)\|_{\mathcal{T}_{u_i}} = 1$ satisfying

$$\delta E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_{u_i})(\xi_{u_i}(w)) := \inf_{V^- \in \mathcal{T}_{u_i}^- \text{ with } \|V^-\|_{\mathcal{T}_{u_i}} = 1} \delta E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_{u_i}(w^-))(V^-) < 0.$$

Because

$$\delta E_\alpha^\omega(\Phi_{u_i})|_{\mathcal{T}_{u_i}^-} : \mathcal{T}_{u_i}^- \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is a linear function defined on a finite dimensional vector space $\mathcal{T}_{u_i}^-$, the minimum point $\xi_{u_i}(w) \in \mathcal{T}_{u_i}^-$ on unit sphere of $\mathcal{T}_{u_i}^-$ is unique and well defined. Then, we pick $0 < \varrho_{u_i}(w) \leq r_{u_i}$ such that

$$\|w^- + \varrho_{u_i}(w)\xi_{u_i}(w)\|_{\mathcal{T}_{u_i}} = \frac{r_0(u_i)}{2}$$

and that

$$\|w^- + t\xi_{u_i}(w)\|_{\mathcal{T}_{u_i}} \leq \frac{r_0(u_i)}{2} \quad \text{for any } 0 \leq t \leq \varrho_{u_i}(w).$$

Thus, for $w \in \mathcal{B}_{u_i}^-(0, r_i) \setminus \{0\}$, we can define a path $\gamma_w : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{u_i}(3)$ as below

$$\gamma_w(t) = \Phi_{u_i} \left(w^0 + \left(w^- + t \frac{\varrho_{u_i}(w)}{2 \|\xi_{u_i}(w)\|_{\mathcal{T}_{u_i}}} \xi_{u_i}(w) \right) + w^+ \right)$$

which starts at $\Phi_{u_i}(w)$ and terminates at

$$\Phi_{u_i} \left(w^0 + \left(w^- + \frac{\varrho_{u_i}(w)}{2} \cdot \frac{\xi_{u_i}(w)}{2 \|\xi_{u_i}(w)\|_{\mathcal{T}_{u_i}}} \right) + w^+ \right) \in \partial^- \mathcal{D}_{u_i}(2).$$

By the (I_1) in Lemma 3.3.4 for $E_\alpha^\omega \circ \Phi_{u_i}$ and the choice of $\xi_{u_i}(w)$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} E_\alpha^\omega(\gamma_w(1)) - \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda} &= E_\alpha^\omega(\gamma_w(1)) - E_\alpha^\omega(\gamma_w(0)) + E_\alpha^\omega(\gamma_w(0)) - \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda} \\ &\leq -\frac{(r_0(u_i))^2}{4} C(u_i) + \frac{1}{4} b \leq -\frac{3}{4} b. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we define

$$H_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}(\tau, t) := \begin{cases} \hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}(\tau, 2t), & \text{for } t \in \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right], \\ \gamma_{\hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}(\tau, 1)}(2t-1), & \text{for } t \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right]. \end{cases}$$

By the construction of $\hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}$, we see that

$$\delta E_\alpha^\omega \left(\Phi_{u_i}^{-1} \left(\hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}(\tau, 1) \right) \right) \Big|_{\mathcal{T}_{u_i}^-} \neq 0 \quad \text{for each } \tau \in I^p,$$

which means that $\xi_{u_i}(\hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}(\tau, 1))$ depends continuously on $\tau \in I^p$. Hence, $H_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}(\tau, t)$ is a well-defined continuous homotopy.

Next, we show that $H_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}$ satisfies the properties stated in (B_3) of Step 2. When $t \in [0, 1/2]$, the $(3b_1)$, $(3b_2)$ and $(3b_3)$ follow straightforwardly from the construction of $\hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}$ corresponding to properties (\hat{H}_1) and (\hat{H}_2) . When $t \in [1/2, 1]$, thanks to (I_2) of Lemma 3.3.4 and the definition of $H_{p,i}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}$, the $(3b_2)$ of Step 2 also holds. At last, by the

choice of $\vartheta \leq \underline{b}/4$ and the construction of $\hat{H}_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}$, we see that for all $\tau \in I^p$

$$E_\alpha^\omega \left(H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, 1) \right) - E_\alpha^\omega(\varsigma(\tau)) \leq -\frac{3}{4}\underline{b} + \vartheta \leq -\frac{1}{2}\underline{b}.$$

Thanks to the choice of $\eta > 0$ in (B_2) of Step 2, we see that $H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(s, 1) \notin \mathcal{N}_\eta^{1,2\alpha}$, for all $s \in I^{k-2}$. \square

Step 3. We would like to show that for any $u \in \mathcal{U}_0$, there exists finite many positive numbers $\{e_p(u)\}_{p=1}^{k-1} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\{\theta_p(u)\}_{p=0}^{k-2} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for any $p \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$, any $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ with $B^{1,2\alpha}(u, \eta) \subset B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_i)$ and any $\tau \in I^p$ with

$$\varsigma(\tau) \notin B^{1,2\alpha}(u, \eta/e_p(u)) \quad \text{and} \quad E_\alpha^\omega(\varsigma(\tau)) - \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} \leq \theta_p(u),$$

we have

$$H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, t) \notin B^{1,2\alpha}(u, \eta/e_{p+1}(u))$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and $\vartheta < \min(\eta/(4e_p(u)), \theta_p(u))$.

Furthermore, viewing $e_p(u)$ and $\theta_p(u)$ as functions

$$e_p(u) : \mathcal{U}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_p(u) : \mathcal{U}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+,$$

$e_p(u)$ has an uniform upper bound \bar{e}_p on \mathcal{U}_0 and $\theta_p(u)$ has a positive lower bound $\underline{\theta}_p > 0$ on \mathcal{U}_0 .

Proof of Step 3. We construct $e_p(u)$ and $\theta_p(u)$ by induction on p . For $u \in \mathcal{U}_0$, we take $e_1(u) = 2$, $\theta_0(u) = 0$ and suppose that we have defined $e_p(u)$ and $\theta_{p-1}(u)$ for some $p \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}$.

For any natural number $1 \leq i \leq m$ with $B^{1,2\alpha}(u, \eta) \subset B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_i)$, we define

$$d_{i,p}(u) := \text{dist} \left(\mathcal{T}_{u_i}^- \cap \Phi_{u_i}^{-1} \left(\overline{B^{1,2\alpha} \left(u, \frac{\eta}{2e_p(u)} \right)} \right), \mathcal{T}_{u_i}^- \cap \Phi_{u_i}^{-1} \left(\partial B^{1,2\alpha} \left(u, \frac{3\eta}{4e_p(u)} \right) \right) \right).$$

Note that $\dim(\mathcal{T}_{u_i}^-) < \infty$ which means that

$$\mathcal{T}_{u_i}^- \cap \Phi_{u_i}^{-1} \left(\overline{B^{1,2\alpha} \left(u, \frac{\eta}{2e_p(u)} \right)} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_{u_i}^- \cap \Phi_{u_i}^{-1} \left(\partial B^{1,2\alpha} \left(u, \frac{3\eta}{4e_p(u)} \right) \right)$$

are two disjoint compact set, hence, $d_{i,p}(u) : B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_i - \eta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a positive continuous function. Moreover, we see that

$$\underline{d}_{i,p} := \inf \{ d_{i,p}(u) : u \in \mathcal{U}_0 \text{ with } B^{1,2\alpha}(u, \eta) \subset B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_i) \} > 0.$$

Otherwise, suppose that $\underline{d}_{i,p} = 0$, we can find a sequence $\{u_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}_0$ such that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} d_{i,p}(u_j) = 0.$$

Since $E_\alpha^\omega : W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the Palais-Smale condition, see Lemma 2.3.1, by the definition of \mathcal{U}_0 after passing to certain subsequence we can assume u_j converges to some $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}_0$ in $W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$. This leads to the contradiction

$$0 < d_{i,p}(u_0) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} d_{i,p}(u_j) = 0.$$

Then we define

$$\theta_p(u) := \min \left\{ \frac{C(u_i)}{4} \underline{d}_{i,p}^2 : 1 \leq i \leq m \quad \text{with } B^{1,2\alpha}(u, \eta) \subset B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_i) \right\} > 0$$

and take $e_{p+1}(u) \geq 2e_p(u) + 1$ to be the smallest number such that for any

$$w \in \overline{B^{1,2\alpha}(u, \eta/e_{p+1}(u))},$$

there holds

$$(3.3.21) \quad E_\alpha^\omega(w) \geq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} - \theta_p(u).$$

Note that

$$\theta_p(u) \geq \underline{\theta}_p := \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} \frac{C(u_i)}{4} \underline{d}_{i,p}^2 > 0,$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{U}_0$, has a positive uniform lower bound, where $C(u_i) > 0$ is a constant determined in Step 1 and Lemma 3.3.4. Moreover, we claim that

Claim 1. There exists $\bar{e}_{p+1} > 0$ such that

$$(3.3.22) \quad \sup_{v \in \mathcal{U}_0} e_{p+1}(v) \leq \bar{e}_{p+1}.$$

Proof of Claim 1. In fact, since $\eta \leq 1/2$, it suffices to show there exists a constant $c_p > 0$ such that for any $u \in \mathcal{U}_0$ and $w \in \overline{B^{1,2\alpha}(u, \eta/c_p)}$ there holds

$$E_\alpha^\omega(w) \geq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} - \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} \frac{C(u_i)}{4} \underline{d}_{i,p}^2.$$

Then, we can conclude that $e_{p+1}(u) \leq c_p$ for any $u \in \mathcal{U}_0$. By contradiction, suppose that there exists two sequences

$$\{u_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{ w_j : w_j \in \overline{B^{1,2\alpha}(u_j, 1/j)} \right\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$$

such that

$$(3.3.23) \quad E_\alpha^\omega(w_j) < \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} - \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} \frac{C(u_i)}{4} \underline{d}_{i,p}^2.$$

Then similarly to the previous argument, by the compactness of \mathcal{U}_0 , after passing to a subsequence, we can conclude that u_j converges strongly in $W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ to some $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}_0$ and w_j converges strongly in $W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ to u_0 . However, the identity

$E_\alpha^\omega(u_0) = \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ leads to the contradiction

$$\mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} < \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} - \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} \frac{C(u_i)}{4} \underline{d}_{i,p}^2.$$

Therefore, we complete the proof of Claim 1. \square

Now, the sequences $\{e_p(u)\}_{p=1}^{k-1} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\{\theta_p(u)\}_{p=1}^{k-2} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ are defined by our induction argument. In the end, we prove the following Claim to finish the proof of Step 3.

Claim 2. $H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, t) \notin B^{1,2\alpha}(u, \eta/e_{p+1}(u))$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$ provided that

$$\varsigma(\tau) \notin B^{1,2\alpha}(u, \eta/e_p(u)), \quad E_\alpha^\omega(\varsigma(\tau)) - \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} \leq \theta_p(u)$$

and $\vartheta < \min(\eta/(4e_p(u)), \theta_p(u))$.

Proof of Claim 2. For $t \in [0, 1/2]$, since $\vartheta < \min(\eta/(4e_p(u)), \theta_p(u))$ and $\varsigma(\tau) \notin B^{1,2\alpha}(u, \eta/e_p(u))$, consulting the (3b₃) of item (B₃) in Step 2 we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, t) - u \right\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)} &\geq \left\| \varsigma(\tau) - u \right\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)} - \left\| H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, t) - \varsigma(\tau) \right\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)} \\ &\geq \frac{3\eta}{4e_p(u)} \geq \frac{\eta}{e_{p+1}(u)}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, t) \notin B(u, \eta/e_{p+1}(u))$ for all $t \in [0, 1/2]$

Next, we show that

$$\left\| H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, t) - u \right\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)} \geq \frac{\eta}{e_{p+1}(u)} \quad \text{when } t \in (1/2, 1].$$

To see this, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} E_\alpha^\omega \left(H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, t) \right) &= \left(E_\alpha^\omega(H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, t)) - E_\alpha^\omega(\varsigma(\tau)) \right) + E_\alpha^\omega(\varsigma(\tau)) \\ &\leq \vartheta + \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} + \theta_p(u) \leq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} + 2\theta_p(u) \end{aligned}$$

for $\vartheta < \theta_p(u)$. Next, we proceed the proof by contradiction. Suppose that there exists some $t \in (1/2, 1]$ such that $H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, t) \in B^{1,2\alpha}(u, \eta/e_{p+1}(u))$. Observe that $H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, t) \in \mathcal{D}_{u_i}(3) \subset \Phi_{u_i}(\mathcal{B}_{u_i}(0, r_{u_i}))$ and by the definitions of $e_{p+1}(u)$ and $d_{i,p}(u)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \left(\Phi_{u_i}^{-1} \left(H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, t) \right) \right)^- - \left(\Phi_{u_i}^{-1} \left(H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, 1/2) \right) \right)^- \right\|_{\mathcal{T}_{u_i}} \\ &\geq \text{dist} \left(\mathcal{T}_{u_i}^- \cap \Phi_{u_i}^{-1} \left(B^{1,2\alpha} \left(u, \frac{\eta}{e_{p+1}(u)} \right) \right), \mathcal{T}_{u_i}^- \cap \Phi_{u_i}^{-1} \left(\partial B^{1,2\alpha} \left(u, \frac{3\eta}{4e_p(u)} \right) \right) \right) \\ &\geq d_{i,p}(u) \geq \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} \underline{d}_{i,p} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Next, by the construction of $H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, t)$ for $t \geq 1/2$ in Step 2, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} E_\alpha^\omega \left(H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, t) \right) - E_\alpha^\omega \left(H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, 1/2) \right) &= E_\alpha^\omega \left(\gamma_{H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, 1/2)}(2t - 1) \right) - E_\alpha^\omega \left(H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, 1/2) \right) \\ &\leq E_\alpha^\omega \left(H_{p,i}^{\varsigma,\vartheta}(\tau, 1/2) \right) - C(u_i) \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} \underline{d}_{i,p}^2 \\ &\leq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} + 2\theta_p(u) - 4\theta_p(u) \\ &= \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} - 2\theta_p(u), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts to the definition of $e_{p+1}(u)$. This completes the proof of Claim 2. \square

Therefore, we finish the proof of Step 3. \square

Before penetrating to the detailed description of next step, for the notation simplicity we take

$$(3.3.24) \quad \underline{d} := \min_{1 \leq p \leq k-1} \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_0} \min \left(\frac{\eta}{4e_p(u)}, \theta_p(u) \right) > 0.$$

Step 4. After passing to some subsequence, we construct a sequence of desired continuous homotopies $H_j : I^{k-2} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ such that $H_j(\cdot, 0) = \sigma_j$ and $H_j(\cdot, 1) = \tilde{\sigma}_j$ satisfies all the properties asserted in Theorem 3.3.5.

Proof of Step 4. To begin, we choose a subsequence $\sigma_{j_l} \in \mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon_{j_l}, C}$ of σ_j such that

$$\max_{\tau \in I^{k-2}} E_\alpha^\omega(\sigma_{j_l}(\tau)) \leq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha,\lambda} + \underline{d}/2.$$

where \underline{d} is defined in (3.3.24). For notation simplicity, we still write $\{\sigma_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ to represent $\{\sigma_{j_l}\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$. For fixed $\sigma_j : I^{k-2} \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$, to show Step 4, recalling that

$$\mathcal{U}_0 \subset \mathcal{N}_\eta^{1,2\alpha} = \bigcup_{u \in \mathcal{U}_0} B^{1,2\alpha}(u, \eta) \quad \text{for some fixed } \eta > 0,$$

it suffices to construct the homotopy H_j from σ_j to $\tilde{\sigma}_j$ such that

$$\tilde{\sigma}_j(I^{k-2}) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\frac{\eta}{2\bar{\varepsilon}_{k-1}}}^{1,2\alpha} = \emptyset$$

where the constant $\bar{\varepsilon}_{k-1} > 0$ is defined in Step 3 and η is obtained in Step 2.

To this end, firstly we denote $I(1, n)$ to be the cell complex on the unit interval I whose 1-cells are the intervals $[0, 1 \cdot 3^{-n}]$, $[1 \cdot 3^{-n}, 2 \cdot 3^{-n}]$, \dots , $[1 - 3^{-n}, 1]$ and whose 0-cells are the end points $\{0\}$, $\{3^{-n}\}$, $\{2 \cdot 3^{-n}\}$, \dots , $\{1\}$. Then, $I(k-2, n)$ denotes the cell complex of I^{k-2} as below

$$I(k-2, n) = I(1, n) \otimes I(1, n) \otimes \dots \otimes I(1, n).$$

Then, for each fixed $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we take n large enough to obtain a sufficiently fine subdivision of I^{k-2} such that for each closed face F of $I(k-2, n)$ the followings are fulfilled:

(C₁) If $\sigma_j(F) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\eta/2}^{1,2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$, then $\sigma_j(F) \subset \mathcal{N}_{\eta}^{1,2\alpha}$.

(C₂) Each $F \in \mathcal{F}$ can be covered by single $B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_i)$ for certain $1 \leq i \leq m$. Here, \mathcal{F} is the set of faces F satisfying $\sigma_j(F) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\eta/2}^{1,2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$.

To see (C₁), since $I(k-2, n)$ is compact and $\sigma_j : I(k-2, n) \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ is continuous, we can take finitely many times barycentric subdivision upon I^{k-2} such that the oscillation of σ_j on each face $F \in \mathcal{F}$ is less than $\eta/4$. Moreover, by Step 2, $\mathcal{N}_{\eta}^{1,2\alpha}$ is covered by the union of finite collection $\{B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_i)\}_{i=1}^m$, after further taking finitely many times barycentric subdivision, by the notion of Lebesgue's number, we can arrange that each maximal $F \in \mathcal{F}$ (here, $F \in \mathcal{F}$ is maximal means that there is no $F' \in \mathcal{F}$ with $F \subsetneq F'$) $\sigma_j(F)$ can be covered by exactly one $B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_i)$. Then (C₂) follows by an induction argument by decreasing dimensions of $F \in \mathcal{F}$.

In the following, we are devoted to construct the desired continuous homotopy H_j inductively on dimension $1 \leq l \leq k-2$ of the l -skeletons $I_{(l)}^{k-2}$ for I^{k-2} .

For $l=0$, we can apply the homotopy constructed in (B₃) of Step 2. More precisely, for the 0-cells outside $\mathcal{N}_{\eta/e_1}^{1,2\alpha}$, we simply take the $H_j^{(0)}$ to be the constant homotopy on them. For the 0-cells X in $\mathcal{N}_{\eta/e_1}^{1,2\alpha}$, we choose the homotopy

$$H_j^{(0)} := H_{0,i}^{\sigma_j, \vartheta} \Big|_X$$

defined on $X \times [0, 1]$, where $H_{0,i}^{\sigma_j, \vartheta}$ is constructed in Step 2, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ is chosen to be the smallest positive integer such that $\sigma_j(X) \subset B(u_i, r_i)$ and ϑ is chosen to satisfies $\vartheta < \underline{d}/4$. In summary, by Step 2 and Step 3 we obtain a homotopy $H_j^{(0)}$ such that

$$H_j^{(0)} \left(I_{(0)}^{k-2} \times \{1\} \right) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\eta/e_1} = \emptyset$$

and

$$H_j^{(0)}(X, t) \in \mathcal{D}_{u_i}(3) \quad \text{for any } X \in I_{(0)}^{k-2} \text{ and any } t \in [0, 1].$$

Now, suppose that we have constructed $H_j^{(l-1)}$ on $I_{(l-1)}^{k-2} \times [0, 1]$ for some $l \geq 1$ such that

$$H_j^{(l-1)} \left(I_{(l-1)}^{k-2} \times \{1\} \right) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\eta/e_{l-1}} = \emptyset, \quad H_j^{(l-1)} \left(I_{(l-1)}^{k-2} \times [0, 1] \right) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\eta/e_l} = \emptyset$$

by consulting the conclusion of Step 3 and such that

$$H_j^{(l-1)}(X, t) \in \mathcal{D}_{u_i}(3) \quad \text{for any } X \in I_{(l-1)}^{k-2} \text{ and any } t \in [0, 1].$$

Then, we consider the l -cells in I^{k-2} . For $F_l \in I_{(l)}^{k-2} \setminus I_{(l-1)}^{k-2}$, we see that $\partial F_l \in I_{(l-1)}^{k-2}$ and $\tilde{F}_l := F_l \cup (\partial F_l \times [0, 1])$ is homeomorphic to F_l by concatenating F_l and $\partial F_l \times [0, 1]$ along the ∂F_l . This implies that we can construct the continuous map

$$\varsigma : F_l \cong \tilde{F}_l \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$$

by gluing

$$H_j^{(l-1)} : \partial F_l \times [0, 1] \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_j : F_l \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$$

along the ∂F_l .

Next, we construct the homotopy $\tilde{H}_j^{(l)}$ from ς on $\tilde{F}_l \cong F_l$ conditionally depending on whether \tilde{F}_l belongs to \mathcal{F} or not.

- If $\tilde{F}_l \in \mathcal{F}$, then by the definition of \mathcal{F} there is also no cells of $\partial \tilde{F}_l$ belongs to \mathcal{F} . Therefore, we define $\tilde{H}_j^{(l)} : \tilde{F}_l \times [0, 1] \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N) \equiv \varsigma$ to be the constant homotopy. Note that in this case $\varsigma|_{\partial \tilde{F}_l}$ satisfies the assumption of Step 3, so we have that

$$\tilde{H}_j^{(l)} \left(\tilde{F}_l \times \{1\} \cup \partial \tilde{F}_l \times [0, 1] \right) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\frac{\eta}{e_{l+1}}} = \emptyset.$$

- If $\tilde{F}_l \notin \mathcal{F}$, by the induction assumption on $H_j^{(l-1)}$ and the choice of fine subdivision on I^{k-2} , see (C₂), there exists $1 \leq i_l \leq m$ such that $\varsigma(\tilde{F}_l) \subset B(u_{i_l}, r_{i_l})$. However, it is important to point out that $\varsigma(\tilde{F}_l)$ may not be contained in \mathcal{N}_η which means that the construction of continuous homotopy obtained in (B₃) of Step 2 can not be applied directly. Based on this consideration, we further take finer subdivision on \tilde{F}_l such that each l -dimensional face \tilde{f}_l of \tilde{F}_l satisfying $\varsigma(\tilde{f}_l) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\eta/e_p} \neq \emptyset$ must fulfill $\varsigma(\tilde{f}_l) \subset \mathcal{N}_\eta$. Then, similarly, we denote $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_l$ to be the union of all l -dimensional faces \tilde{f}_l of \tilde{F}_l with $\varsigma(\tilde{f}_l) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\eta/e_l} \neq \emptyset$. By induction assumption, we see that $\varsigma(\partial \tilde{F}_l) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\eta/e_l} = \emptyset$ which implies that $\varsigma(\partial \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_l) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\eta/e_l} = \emptyset$. Then, we can construct a homotopy map

$$(3.3.25) \quad \hat{H}_j^{(l)} : \left(\tilde{F}_l \times [0, 1/2] \right) \cup \left(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_l \times [1/2, 1] \right) \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$$

such that $\hat{H}(x, t) = \varsigma(x)$ when $t \in [0, 1/2]$ and $x \in \tilde{F}_l$ and that $\hat{H}(x, t) = H_{l, i_l}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}(x, 2t - 1)$ for $t \in [1/2, 1]$, where $H_{l, i_l}^{\varsigma, \vartheta}(x, 2t - 1)$ is defined in (B₃) of Step 2 with $\vartheta < \underline{d}/4$. By the definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_l$, we see that

$$\hat{H}_j^{(l)} \left(\left(\tilde{F}_l \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_l \right) \times \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \right\} \cup \left(\partial \tilde{F}_l \times [0, 1/2] \right) \right) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\frac{\eta}{e_{l+1}}} = \emptyset.$$

And by the construction of $\hat{H}_j^{(l)}$ and the (B₃) in Step 2, we have that

$$\hat{H}_j^{(l)} \left(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_l \times \{1\} \right) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\frac{\eta}{e_{l+1}}} = \emptyset.$$

Moreover, by Step 3, we have

$$\hat{H}_j^{(l)} \left(\partial \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_l \times [1/2, 1] \right) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\frac{\eta}{e_{l+1}}} = \emptyset.$$

Then by the homeomorphisms

$$\tilde{F}_l \times [0, 1] \cong \left(\tilde{F}_l \times [0, 1/2] \right) \cap \left(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_l \times [1/2, 1] \right),$$

that is induced from the homeomorphism

$$\tilde{F}_l \times \{1\} \cong \left(\left(\tilde{F}_l \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_l \right) \times \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \right\} \right) \cup \left(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_l \times \{1\} \right) \cup \left(\partial \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_l \times [1/2, 1] \right),$$

and the identification

$$\partial \tilde{F}_l \times [0, 1] = \partial \tilde{F}_l \times [0, 1],$$

we can derive a continuous homotopy $\tilde{H}_j^{(l)} : \tilde{F}_l \times [0, 1] \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ from $\hat{H}_j^{(l)}$ which satisfies

$$(3.3.26) \quad \tilde{H}_j^{(l)} \left(\left(\tilde{F}_l \times \{1\} \right) \cup \left(\partial \tilde{F}_l \times [0, 1] \right) \right) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\frac{\eta}{e_{l+1}}} = \emptyset.$$

In summary, whenever $F_l \in \mathcal{F}$ or not, we can construct a continuous homotopy

$$H_j^{(l)} : F_l \times [0, 1] \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$$

induced from the homeomorphisms

$$F_l \times [0, 1] \cong \tilde{F}_l \times [0, 1] \quad \text{and} \quad F_l \times \{1\} \cong \left(\tilde{F}_l \times \{1\} \right) \cup \left(\partial \tilde{F}_l \times [0, 1] \right),$$

which satisfies that

$$H_j^{(l)}|_{\partial F_l \times [0,1]} = H_j^{(l-1)}|_{\partial F_l \times [0,1]} \quad \text{and} \quad H_j^{(l)}(x, 0) = \sigma_j(x) \text{ for all } x \in F_l.$$

Then, we glue all together such continuous homotopy $H_j^{(l)}$ defined on $F_l \times [0, 1]$ when F_k runs through $I_{(l)}^{k-2} \setminus I_{(l-1)}^{k-2}$ to obtain the desired homotopy

$$H_j^{(l)} : I_{(l)}^{k-2} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N).$$

Keeping in mind that

$$H_j^{(l)}(F_l \times \{1\}) = \tilde{H}_j^{(l)} \left(\left(\tilde{F}_l \times \{1\} \right) \cup \left(\partial \tilde{F}_l \times [0, 1] \right) \right)$$

on each $F_l \in I_{(l)}^{k-2} \setminus I_{(l-1)}^{k-2}$ for any $1 \leq l \leq k-2$ and recalling (3.3.26), we have that

$$H_j^{(k-2)} \left(I_{(k-2)}^{k-2} \times \{1\} \right) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\frac{\eta}{e_{l+1}}} = \emptyset.$$

To complete the construction, we let $\tilde{\sigma}_j := H_j^{(k-2)}(\cdot, 1)$ which satisfies that

$$(3.3.27) \quad \tilde{\sigma}_j(I^{k-2}) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\frac{\eta}{e_{k-1}}} = \emptyset.$$

In the following, we show that there exists large enough $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tilde{\sigma}_j$ satisfies the first property (T_1) when $j \geq j_0$, and for each $u \in \mathcal{U}_0$ there exists $j_0(u) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tilde{\sigma}_j$ satisfies the second property (T_2) asserted in Theorem 3.3.5 when $j \geq j_0(u)$.

To see (T_1) of Theorem 3.3.5, by our choice of δ_0 and covering $\{B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_i)\}_{i=1}^m$, in particular see (3.3.13), we find that

$$\sigma_j(\tau) \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^m B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_i) \quad \text{for any } \tau \in \partial I^{k-2}.$$

This implies that the continuous homotopy $H_j^{(k-2)}$ restricted to ∂I^{k-2} is constant, hence $\sigma_j|_{\partial I^{k-2}} = \tilde{\sigma}_j|_{\partial I^{k-2}}$. Thus, $\tilde{\sigma}_j \in \mathcal{S}$ is an admissible sweepout. Moreover, to show $\tilde{\sigma}_j \in \mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon_j, C+1}$, we first observe that the homotopy $H_j^{(k-2)}$ is constructed from σ_j by gluing $\hat{H}_j^{(l)}$ finitely many times and that $\hat{H}_j^{(l)}$ is constructed from the continuous homotopy obtained in (B_3) of Step 2 for $1 \leq l \leq k-2$. By the arbitrariness of ϑ in $(3b_2)$ of Step (B_3) , choosing large enough $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\varepsilon_j \leq \underline{d}/8$ and small enough ϑ we can conclude that

$$\max_{\tau \in I^{k-2}} E_\alpha^\omega(\tilde{\sigma}_j(\tau)) = \max_{\tau \in I^{k-2}} E_\alpha^\omega\left(H_j^{(k-2)}(\tau, 1)\right) \leq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda} + \varepsilon_j$$

for all $j \geq j_0$. Next, we verify the second part of definition of $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon_j, C+1}$. Let $\tau \in I^{k-2}$ be the point such that

$$(3.3.28) \quad E_\alpha^\omega(\tilde{\sigma}_j(\tau)) \geq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda} - \varepsilon_j.$$

If $\tau \notin \bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} F$, then we have

$$E_\alpha^\omega(\tilde{\sigma}_j(\tau)) = E_\alpha^\omega(\sigma_j(x)) \geq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda} - \varepsilon_j$$

which implies that

$$E_\alpha(\tilde{\sigma}_j(x)) = E_\alpha(\sigma_j(x)) \leq C < C + 1.$$

On the other hand, if $\tau \in \bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} F$, then $\sigma_j(\tau) \in \mathcal{N}_\eta$ and there exists $1 \leq i \leq m$ such that $\sigma_j(\tau) \in B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, r_i)$. By the construction of $\tilde{\sigma}_j$ and the choice of τ satisfying (3.3.28), we know that $\tilde{\sigma}_j(\tau) \in B^{1,2\alpha}(u_i, 2r_i)$ which implies that

$$E_\alpha(\tilde{\sigma}_j(\tau)) \leq |E_\alpha(\tilde{\sigma}_j(\tau)) - E_\alpha(u_i)| + E_\alpha(u_i) \leq C + 1.$$

thanks to (3.3.13) and the choice $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_0 \subset \mathcal{U}_C$. Therefore, we showed that $\tilde{\sigma}_j \in \mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon_j, C+1}$, that is, the first assertion (T_1) of Theorem 3.3.5.

To show (T_2) of Theorem 3.3.5, we argue by contradiction. Suppose that there exists subsequences of $\tilde{\sigma}_j, \varepsilon_j$ (still denoted by $\tilde{\sigma}_j, \varepsilon_j$), a sequence of points $u_j \in \mathcal{U}_0$ and a sequence $\tau_j \in I^{k-2}$ such that

$$E_\alpha^\omega(\tilde{\sigma}_j(\tau_j)) \geq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda} - \varepsilon_j$$

and that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{\sigma}_j(\tau_j) - u_j\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)} = 0.$$

for any $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, by the compactness of \mathcal{U}_0 , after passing some subsequences we have

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{\sigma}_j(\tau_j) - u\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)} = 0$$

for some $u \in \mathcal{U}_0$. But this contradicts to (3.3.27), hence we finish the proof of Step 4. \square

Therefore, we complete the proof of Theorem 3.3.5. \square

Equipped with the deformation of sweepouts Theorem 3.3.5, we can construct the desired non-trivial critical points in \mathcal{U}_C with Morse index bounded from above by $k-2$.

Theorem 3.3.6. *Given $\omega \in C^2(\wedge^2(N))$, $\lambda > 0$ writing ω as $\lambda\omega$, $\alpha > 1$ and a sequence of sweepouts $\sigma_j \in \mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon_j, C}$ for some constant $C > 0$ with $\varepsilon_j \searrow 0$. Then, there exists a non-trivial critical point $u \in \mathcal{U}_C$ satisfying*

$$E_\alpha(u) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^2) + \delta(\alpha, \lambda\omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ind}_{E_\alpha^\omega}(u) \leq k-2,$$

for some constant $\delta(\alpha, \lambda\omega) > 0$ depending on the choice of $\alpha > 0$, $\omega \in C^2(\wedge^2(N))$ and $\lambda > 0$ which is obtained in (3) of Proposition 3.2.3.

Proof. Let

$$\mathcal{U}_0 = \left\{ u \in \mathcal{U}_{C+1} : E_\alpha^\omega(u) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^2) + \delta(\alpha, \omega) \right\}$$

which is a non-empty closed subset of \mathcal{U}_{C+1} by Proposition 3.2.3. By contradiction, if $\text{Ind}_{E_\alpha^\omega}(u) \geq k-1$ for all $u \in \mathcal{U}_0$, then by (T₁) of Theorem 3.3.5 we can obtain a sequence of sweepouts $\tilde{\sigma}_j \in \mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon_j, C+1}$ constructing from σ_j . Then, combining the Theorem 3.3.5 with the Proposition 3.2.3, after passing to some subsequences of $\tilde{\sigma}_j$ and ε_j , there exists a sequence $\tau_j \in I^{k-2}$ such that

$$E_\alpha^{\lambda\omega}(\tilde{\sigma}_j(\tau_j)) \geq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, \lambda} - \varepsilon_j$$

and that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{\sigma}_j(\tau_j) - u\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)} = 0.$$

for some $u \in \mathcal{U}_0$ which contradicts to (T₂) of Theorem 3.3.5. Therefore, there exists an $u \in \mathcal{U}_0$ with $\text{Ind}_{E_\alpha^\omega}(u) \leq k-2$ completing the proof of Theorem 3.3.6. \square

As a summary of this section, for almost every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we constructed a sequence of non-trivial α_j - λH -spheres with desired properties described as below.

Corollary 3.3.7. *Given $\omega \in C^2(\wedge^2(N))$, for almost every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, a sequence $\alpha_j \searrow 1$ and a sequence of positive constant $\delta(\alpha_j, \lambda\omega) > 0$ such that for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a α_j - λH -sphere $u_{\alpha_j} \in W^{1,2\alpha_j}(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ satisfying*

$$\delta E_{\alpha_j}^{\lambda\omega}(u_{\alpha_j}) = 0, \quad \frac{1}{2}\text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^2) + \delta(\alpha_j, \lambda\omega) \leq E_{\alpha_j}^{\lambda\omega}(u) \leq C + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ind}_{E_{\alpha_j}^{\lambda\omega}}(u_{\alpha_j}) \leq k - 2.$$

Proof. Given a sequence $\alpha_j \searrow 1$, combining Lemma 3.2.1 and Lemma 3.2.2, for almost every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we can find a constant $C > 0$ and a subsequence of $\alpha_j \searrow 1$, still denoted by α_j , such that for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a sequences of sweepouts

$$\{\sigma_l^j\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\lambda\varepsilon_l^j, 8\lambda^2 C}$$

for some $\{\varepsilon_l^j\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\varepsilon_l^j \searrow 0$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$ and large enough $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for fixed $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we can apply the Theorem 3.3.6 to obtain a sequence u_{α_j} satisfying all the properties asserted in Corollary 3.3.7. \square

4. COMPACTNESS FOR CRITICAL POINTS OF FUNCTIONAL $E_{\alpha}^{\lambda\omega}$

In Section 3, in particular see Corollary 3.3.7, we constructed a sequence of non-trivial critical points $\{u_{\alpha_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of the functional $E_{\alpha_j}^{\lambda\omega}$ with uniformly bounded α_j -energy and with uniformly bounded Morse index from above by $k - 2$. Next, in order to obtain the existence of non-constant H -sphere, we need to study the behavior of sequence u_{α_j} as $\alpha_j \searrow 1$ which is the primary task in this section. It is crucial to point out that the compactness result developed in this section is applicable to a broad range of sequences of α - H -surfaces $\{u_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha > 1}$ (being the critical points of E_{α}^{ω}) between closed Riemann surface M and compact Riemannian n -manifold N with uniformly bounded α -energy and with uniformly bounded Morse index from above, where $H \in \Gamma(\wedge^2(N) \otimes TN)$ induced from any given $\omega \in C^2(\wedge^2(N))$ as in (1.3.3). Therefore, we simply write α for α_j to represent the general sequence $\alpha \searrow 1$, ω for $\lambda\omega$ and E_{α}^{ω} for $E_{\alpha}^{\lambda\omega}$, respectively. Considering that the asymptotic analysis for general sequences of α - H -surfaces are involved and complicated, we summarize the main result of this section in Subsection 4.1, with the detailed proofs provided in the subsequent subsections.

4.1. Main Results on Asymptotic Analysis for Sequences of α - H -surfaces.

4.1.1. Descriptions of Bubbling Procedure.

Given a sequence of α - H -surfaces $\{u_\alpha\}_{\alpha \searrow 1} : M \rightarrow N$ with uniformly bounded α -energy

$$\sup_{\alpha > 1} E_\alpha(u_\alpha) \leq \Lambda < \infty.$$

Then, from Lemma 4.2.1, Lemma 4.2.2, Lemma 4.2.3 below and adapting a rescaling argument by Sacks-Uhlenbeck [SU81], after passing to a subsequence, u_α converges to a H -surface $u_0 : M \rightarrow N$ smoothly except at most finitely many singular points (that is, energy concentration points) $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^{n_0}$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$. Around point each x^i for $1 \leq i \leq n_0$, we assume that there are n_i bubbles (that is, non-trivial H -spheres) arising at x^i during bubbling. Therefore, there exists sequences of points $\{x_\alpha^{ij}\}_{\alpha \searrow 1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n_0$ and $1 \leq j \leq n_i$, and sequences of positive numbers $\{\lambda_\alpha^{ij}\}_{\alpha \searrow 1}$ such that

$$x_\alpha^{ij} \rightarrow x^i \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq n_i \text{ and } \lambda_\alpha^{ij} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \alpha \searrow 1.$$

By a standard scaling argument, see for instance [Qin95, LW10], for $1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq n_i$ and $j_1 \neq j_2$ at least one alternative of the following two statements holds:

- (S1) for any fixed $R > 0$, $B^M(x_\alpha^{ij_1}, \lambda_\alpha^{ij_1} R) \cap B^M(x_\alpha^{ij_2}, \lambda_\alpha^{ij_2} R) = \emptyset$ whenever $\alpha - 1$ is sufficiently small.
- (S2) $\frac{\lambda_\alpha^{ij_1}}{\lambda_\alpha^{ij_2}} + \frac{\lambda_\alpha^{ij_2}}{\lambda_\alpha^{ij_1}} \rightarrow \infty$, as $\alpha \searrow 1$.

Moreover, after taking a conformal transformation $\mathbb{R}^2 \cup \{\infty\} \cong \mathbb{S}^2$ and applying the removability of isolated singularities Lemma 4.2.3 the rescaled maps

$$v_\alpha^{ij} := u_\alpha(x_\alpha^{ij} + \lambda_\alpha^{ij} x) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n_0, 1 \leq j \leq n_i$$

converges strongly in

$$C_{loc}^\infty \left(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{p_1^{ij}, \dots, p_{s_{ij}}^{ij}\} \right)$$

to a non-trivial H -sphere $w^{ij} : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow N$ for some finite energy concentration points $\{p_1^{ij}, \dots, p_{s_{ij}}^{ij}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Then we choose small enough $r_i > 0$ such that

$$B(x_i, r_i) \cap \{x^1, x^2, \dots, x^{i-1}, x^{i+1}, \dots, x^{n_0}\} = \emptyset,$$

and hence $v_\alpha^{ij} : B(0, (\lambda_\alpha^{ij})^{-1} r_i) \rightarrow N$ is a critical points of

$$(4.1.1) \quad E_{\alpha, ij}^\omega := \frac{1}{2} \int_{B(0, (\lambda_\alpha^{ij})^{-1} r_i)} \left((\lambda_\alpha^{ij})^2 + |\nabla v_\alpha^{ij}|^2 \right)^\alpha dV_{g_{\alpha, ij}} + (\lambda_\alpha^{ij})^{2\alpha-2} \int_{B(0, (\lambda_\alpha^{ij})^{-1} r_i)} (v_\alpha^{ij})^* \omega,$$

where

$$g_{\alpha, ij} := e^{\varphi(x_\alpha + \lambda_\alpha^{ij} x)} \left((dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2 \right)$$

arising from the metric $g := e^{\varphi(x)}((dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2)$ on M under a conformal coordinate (x^1, x^2) and v_α^{ij} solves the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$(4.1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta v_\alpha^{ij} + (\alpha - 1) \frac{\nabla |\nabla_{g_\alpha, ij} v_\alpha^{ij}|^2 \cdot \nabla v_\alpha^{ij}}{(\lambda_\alpha^{ij})^2 + |\nabla_{g_\alpha, ij} v_\alpha^{ij}|^2} + A(v_\alpha^{ij}) (\nabla v_\alpha^{ij}, \nabla v_\alpha^{ij}) \\ = (\lambda_\alpha^{ij})^{2\alpha-2} \frac{H(v_\alpha^{ij})(\nabla^\perp v_\alpha^{ij}, \nabla v_\alpha^{ij})}{\alpha ((\lambda_\alpha^{ij})^2 + |\nabla_{g_\alpha, ij} v_\alpha^{ij}|)^{\alpha-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

The deficiency of conformally invariance for functional E_α^ω leads to distinct formulations of E_α^ω and $E_{\alpha, ij}^\omega$, hence the distinct formulation of Euler Lagrange equations (2.2.4) and (4.1.2). Based on this consideration, we will employ the following more general functional to show our main Theorem 4.1.9, Theorem 4.1.2 and Theorem 4.1.4 in this section

$$(4.1.3) \quad \tilde{E}_\alpha^\omega = \frac{1}{2} \int_M (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^\alpha dV_{g_\alpha} + \tau_\alpha^{\alpha-1} \int_M u_\alpha^* \omega$$

where $0 < \tau_\alpha \leq 1$ satisfying $0 < \beta_0 \leq \liminf_{\alpha \searrow 1} \tau_\alpha^{\alpha-1} \leq 1$ and g_α is a sequence of metrics on (M, g) that is conformal to g and converges smoothly to the standard g as $\alpha \searrow 1$. Critical points $u_\alpha : M \rightarrow N$ of generalized functional \tilde{E}_α^ω are also called α - H -surfaces for simplicity, similarly to (2.2.4) and (2.2.5), it solves the following generalized Euler Lagrange equation

$$(4.1.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha + (\alpha - 1) \frac{\nabla_{g_\alpha} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 \cdot \nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha}{\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2} + A(u_\alpha) (\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha, \nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha) \\ = \tau_\alpha^{\alpha-1} \frac{H(u_\alpha)(\nabla_{g_\alpha}^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha)}{\alpha (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1}} \end{aligned}$$

or equivalently in divergence form

$$(4.1.5) \quad \begin{aligned} -\operatorname{div} \left((\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha \right) + (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} A(u_\alpha) (\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha, \nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha) \\ = \frac{\tau_\alpha^{\alpha-1}}{\alpha} H(u_\alpha) (\nabla_{g_\alpha}^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha) \end{aligned}$$

Considering the (4.1.1) and (4.1.2), the following quantities arise naturally in the process of studying the energy identity and asymptotic analysis of necks

$$(4.1.6) \quad \mu_{ij} := \liminf_{\alpha \searrow 1} (\lambda_\alpha^{ij})^{2-2\alpha}$$

and

$$(4.1.7) \quad \nu_{ij} := \liminf_{\alpha \searrow 1} (\lambda_\alpha^{ij})^{-\sqrt{\alpha-1}}$$

indicating the comparison with expansion speed of blow-up radius and the speed of $\alpha \searrow 1$. It is easy to check that $\mu_{ij}, \nu_{ij} \in [1, \infty]$ as $\lambda_\alpha^{ij} \rightarrow 0$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$. Moreover, we can see that all μ_{ij} are finite, that is, there exists a positive constant $1 \leq \mu_{max} < \infty$ such that $\mu_{ij} \in [1, \mu_{max}]$. Indeed, without loss generality we can assume there is only one blow-up point $x_1 \in M$ and there are n_1 bubbles arising at this point, which implies, there exists a sequence of points $\{x_\alpha^j\}_{\alpha>1}$ and a sequence of positive numbers $\{\lambda_\alpha^j\}_{\alpha>1}$ satisfying one of (S1) and (S2). For simplicity, we assume

$$\limsup_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{\lambda_\alpha^1}{\lambda_\alpha^j} < \infty \quad \text{for all } 2 \leq j \leq n_1$$

which implies $w_\alpha^1(x) := u_\alpha(x_\alpha^1 + \lambda_\alpha^1 x)$ converges strongly to w^1 in $C_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, namely, w^1 is the first non-trivial H -bubble. Therefore, we have

$$\Lambda > \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(x_\alpha^1, \lambda_\alpha^1 R)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^{2\alpha} dx = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} (\lambda_\alpha^1)^{2-2\alpha} \int_{B(0, R)} |\nabla w_\alpha^1| dx = \mu_1 E(w^1).$$

By the energy gap Lemma 4.2.2, there is a positive constant

$$(4.1.8) \quad \varepsilon_0 := \inf \left\{ E(w) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla w|^2 dV_{\mathbb{S}^2} : \begin{array}{l} w \text{ is a non-constant} \\ \text{harmonic sphere in } N \end{array} \right\} > 0$$

such that $E(w^1) \geq \varepsilon_0$ hence

$$\mu_j \leq \mu_1 \leq \frac{\Lambda_1}{E(w^1)} \leq \frac{\Lambda_1}{\varepsilon_0} := \mu_{max} < \infty.$$

4.1.2. Generalized Energy Identity.

Now, we are in a position to state our first main compactness result of generalized energy identity for sequences of α - H -surfaces.

Theorem 4.1.1. *Let (M, g) be a closed Riemann surface, (N, h) be a n -dimensional closed Riemannian manifold that is isometrically embedded in \mathbb{R}^K for some $K \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that $\{u_\alpha\}_{\alpha \searrow 1} \subset C^\infty(M, N)$ is a sequence of α - H -surfaces with uniformly bounded generalized α -energy, that is,*

$$\sup_{\alpha \searrow 1} E_\alpha(u_\alpha) \leq \Lambda < \infty.$$

We define the blow-up set

$$\mathfrak{S} := \left\{ x \in M : \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \int_{B^M(x, r)} |\nabla u_\alpha| dV_g \geq \varepsilon_0^2, \quad \text{for all } r > 0 \right\}$$

where $B^M(x, r) = \{y \in M : \text{dist}^M(x, y) < r\}$ denotes the geodesic ball in M and ε_0 is determined in (4.1.8). Then \mathfrak{S} is finite, written as $\mathfrak{S} = \{x^1, \dots, x^{n_0}\}$. After choosing a subsequence, there exists a smooth H -surface $u_0 : M \rightarrow N$ and finitely many

bubbles, that is, a finite set of H -spheres w^{ij} , $1 \leq j \leq n_i$ such that $u_\alpha \rightarrow u_0$ weakly in $W^{1,2}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$ and strongly in $C_{loc}^\infty(M \setminus \mathfrak{S}, N)$. Moreover, the following generalized energy identity holds

$$(4.1.9) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_\alpha(u_\alpha) = E(u_0) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Vol}(M) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \mu_{ij}^2 E(w^{ij}).$$

4.1.3. Asymptotic Behavior on Necks.

Now, we present our second main result about asymptotic analysis on neck, which provides a complete geometric picture of all possible limiting behaviors of the necks occurring in the blow-up process for sequences of α - H -surfaces. We show that all necks between bubbles and the base map converge to geodesics and we provide a scheme to calculate the length of these geodesics, see Remark 4.1.3 below. More precisely, we have

Theorem 4.1.2. *Let (M, g) be a closed Riemann surface, (N, h) be a n -dimensional closed Riemannian manifold that is isometrically embedded in \mathbb{R}^K for some $K \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that $\{u_\alpha\}_{\alpha \searrow 1} \subset C^\infty(M, N)$ is a sequence of α - H -surfaces with uniformly bounded α -energy, that there is only one blow up point $\mathfrak{S} = \{x_1\}$ and there is only one bubble in $B^M(x_1, r) \subset M$, for some $r > 0$, denoted by $w^1 : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow N$. Let*

$$\nu^1 = \liminf_{\alpha \searrow 1} (\lambda_\alpha^1)^{-\sqrt{\alpha-1}}.$$

Then one of following statement holds

- (1) when $\nu^1 = 1$, the set $u_0(B^M(x_1, r)) \cup w^1(\mathbb{S}^2)$ is a connected subset of N where u_0 is the weak limit of u_α in $W^{1,2}(M, N)$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$;
- (2) when $\nu^1 \in (1, \infty)$, the set $u_0(B^M(x_1, r))$ and $w^1(\mathbb{S}^2)$ are connected by a geodesic $\Gamma \subset N$ with length

$$L(\Gamma) = \sqrt{\frac{E(w^1)}{\pi}} \log \nu^1;$$

- (3) when $\nu^1 = \infty$, the neck contains at least a geodesic of infinite length.

Remark 4.1.3. It is important to note that, although we state the Theorem 4.1.2 under the assumption that there is only one bubble w^1 occurring the single blow up point $\{x_1\}$, it is not difficult to obtain a general version by an induction argument following the proofs in Section 4.4.2. The length formula looks quite complicated and needs to be discussed by case splitting. For instance, if there are two H -spheres, w^1 and w^2 , occurring the blow up point $\{x_1\}$, namely, there exists sequences of positive numbers $\lambda_\alpha^1 \searrow 1$, $\lambda_\alpha^2 \searrow 1$ with $\lambda_\alpha^1/\lambda_\alpha^2 \rightarrow 0$ and sequences of points $x_\alpha^1 \rightarrow x_1$, $x_\alpha^2 \rightarrow x_1$ satisfying

$$w^1 = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} u_\alpha(\lambda_\alpha^1 x + x_\alpha^1) \quad \text{and} \quad w^2 = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} u_\alpha(\lambda_\alpha^2 x + x_\alpha^2).$$

Then, the length formula for geodesic connecting $u_0 (B^M(x_1, r))$ and $w^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$ is given by

$$L(u_0, w^2) = \sqrt{\frac{E(w^1) + E(w^2)}{\pi}} \log \nu^2.$$

And the length formula for geodesic connecting $w^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$ and $w^1(\mathbb{S}^2)$ is given by

$$L(w^2, w^1) = \sqrt{\frac{E(w^1)}{\pi}} \log \frac{\nu^1}{\nu^2}.$$

Here,

$$\nu^1 = \liminf_{\alpha \searrow 1} (\lambda_\alpha^1)^{-\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \nu^2 = \liminf_{\alpha \searrow 1} (\lambda_\alpha^2)^{-\sqrt{\alpha-1}}.$$

4.1.4. Energy Identity Under Topological and Curvature Conditions.

The topology and geometry of target manifold (N, h) plays a critical role in investigating the convergence properties of α - H -surfaces from some compact surface and moreover comparing the $\alpha - 1$ and the rate of scaling $\lambda_\alpha^{ij} \rightarrow 0$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$, that is, the value of μ_{ij} and ν_{ij} . From the point view of differential geometry, it is natural and reasonable to find some geometric and topology condition on target (N, h) to ensure the energy identity holds, equivalently ensure the neck converges to a geodesic of finite length. To this end, utilizing Gromov's estimates [Gro78] (See also [Moo17, Corollary 3.3.5]) on length of geodesics by its Morse index, we have the following

Theorem 4.1.4. *Let (M, g) be a closed Riemann surface, (N, h) be a n -dimensional compact Riemannian manifold, that is isometrically embedded in \mathbb{R}^K for some $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and has finite fundamental group. Assume that $\{u_\alpha\}_{\alpha \searrow 1} \subset C^\infty(M, N)$ is a sequence of α - H -surfaces with uniformly bounded α -energy and uniformly bounded Morse index, that is, $\text{Ind}_{E_\alpha^\omega}(u_\alpha) \leq C$ for some universal constant $C > 0$. Then \mathfrak{S} is finite, written as $\mathfrak{S} = \{x^1, \dots, x^{n_0}\}$. After choosing a subsequence, there exists a smooth H -surface $u_0 : M \rightarrow N$ and finitely many bubbles, that is, a finite set of H -spheres w^{ij} , $1 \leq j \leq n_i$ such that $u_\alpha \rightarrow u_0$ weakly in $W^{1,2}(M, \mathbb{R}^K)$ and strongly in $C_{loc}^\infty(M \setminus \mathfrak{S}, N)$. Moreover, the limiting necks consists of some geodesics of finite length, and hence the following energy identity holds*

$$(4.1.10) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_\alpha(u_\alpha) = E(u_0) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Vol}(M) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} E(w^{ij}).$$

By Myers' Theorem from Riemannian geometry, see [Mye41], the diameter of complete Riemannian manifold (N, h) with $\text{Ric}(N) \geq \kappa > 0$ satisfies

$$\text{diam}(N) \leq \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{\kappa}}$$

and any geodesic $\Gamma \subset (N, h)$ with length

$$L(\Gamma) \geq \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{\kappa}}$$

is unstable. Moreover, the fundamental group $\pi_1(N)$ is finite. Utilizing this fact, as a corollary of Theorem 4.1.4 we can obtain the following consequence

Corollary 4.1.5. *If we assume (N, h) be a n -dimensional complete Riemannian manifold with strictly positive Ricci curvature, that is, $\text{Ric}(N) > \kappa > 0$ and keep the remaining assumption same as Theorem 4.1.4, then the energy identity stated as Theorem 4.1.4 for sequences of α - H -surfaces with bounded Morse index still holds.*

In the context of α -harmonic maps, Moore [Moo07] (see also [Moo17, Theorem 4.9.2]) demonstrated bubble tree convergence, akin to the conditions described in Theorem 4.1.4. Similar result for α -harmonic maps under Ricci curvature assumptions, as seen in Corollary 4.1.5, was established by Li-Liu-Wang [LLW17].

4.1.5. Non-constancy of Weak Limit.

There is a key insight about sequences of non-trivial α - H -spheres, as one of main advantages of α -energy approximation to Dirichlet energy. More precisely, we can show that, if u_α is a sequence of non-trivial α - H -spheres with uniformly bounded α -energy, then the weak limit of u_α is non-constant. In the context of α -harmonic maps, see [SU81, Lemma 5.3]. The following Lemma 4.1.6 plays a crucial role in reaching the desired result.

Lemma 4.1.6. *Let $\iota : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be the standard isometric embedding, that is,*

$$(\iota^1(p))^2 + (\iota^2(p))^2 + (\iota^3(p))^2 = 1, \quad \text{for } p \in \mathbb{S}^2$$

If $u_\alpha \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ is a critical point for E_α^ω for $\alpha > 1$, then

$$(4.1.11) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \iota^i(x) \Psi_\alpha (|\nabla u_\alpha(x)|^2) dV_g = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

where $\Psi_\alpha : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a strictly increasing smooth function defined by

$$\Psi_\alpha(r) = \frac{\alpha(1+r)^{\alpha-1}r - (1+r)^\alpha + 1}{\alpha - 1}.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we take the standard metric on \mathbb{S}^2 such that it admits constant curvature one. Moreover, by the rotational symmetric of \mathbb{S}^2 and (4.1.11), it suffices to show

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \iota^3(x) \Psi_\alpha (|\nabla u_\alpha(x)|^2) dV_g = 0.$$

Utilizing the stereographic projection from \mathbb{S}^2 to \mathbb{R}^2 we can write the metric on (\mathbb{S}^2, ds^2) with the polar coordinate (ρ, θ) as

$$ds^2 = \frac{4}{(1 + \rho^2)^2} (d\rho^2 + \rho^2 d\theta^2).$$

Then, taking a conformal transformation $(\rho, \theta) \mapsto (\varphi, \eta)$ by $\rho = e^{-\varphi}$ and $\theta = \eta$, we can rewrite the metric ds^2 as

$$ds^2 = \frac{1}{\cosh^2 \varphi} (d\varphi^2 + d\eta^2).$$

Note that, since stereographic projection is a conformal coordinate, (φ, η) is also a conformal coordinate of \mathbb{S}^2 . Then, using this coordinate we can define a collection of conformal transformation $\{\phi_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ with each $\phi_t : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ expressed as

$$\varphi(\phi_t(x)) = \varphi(x) + t, \quad \eta(\phi_t(x)) = \eta(x).$$

Thus, the function E_α^ω acts on $u \circ \phi_t$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} E_\alpha^\omega(u \circ \phi_t) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left(1 + \left(\left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \varphi} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} \right|^2 \right) \cosh^2(\varphi + t) \right)^\alpha dV_g + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} (u \circ \phi_t)^* \omega \\ (4.1.12) \quad &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left(1 + \left(\left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \varphi} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} \right|^2 \right) \cosh^2(\varphi + t) \right)^\alpha \frac{d\varphi d\eta}{\cosh^2(\varphi + t)} + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} u^* \omega. \end{aligned}$$

Here, in the second identity we use the conformally invariance of the integral of $u^* \omega$. Then, we take the derivative in the identity (4.1.12) with respect to t at $t = 0$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} E_\alpha^\omega(u \circ \phi_t) &= \alpha \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left(\left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \varphi} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} \right|^2 \right) \tanh \varphi d\varphi d\eta \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^\alpha \frac{\tanh \varphi}{\cosh^2 \varphi} d\varphi d\eta \\ &= \alpha \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u|^2 \tanh \varphi dV_g - \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^\alpha \tanh \varphi dV_g. \end{aligned}$$

If u is a critical point of E_α^ω , then by the regularity Lemma 2.3.3 u is stationary with respect to ϕ_t . Hence, we have

$$(4.1.13) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left(\alpha (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u|^2 - (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^\alpha \right) \tanh \varphi dV_g = 0.$$

In the stereographic projection coordinate, we have

$$\tanh \varphi = \frac{\sinh \varphi}{\cosh \varphi} = \frac{\rho^2 - 1}{\rho^2 + 1} = \iota(\varphi, \eta)^3$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \tanh \varphi dV_g = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \iota^3(\varphi, \eta) dV_g = 0.$$

Plugging these two identities into (4.1.13), we finally obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left(\alpha (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u|^2 - (1 + |\nabla u|^2)^\alpha + 1 \right) \iota^3(\varphi, \eta) dV_g = 0$$

which is exactly (4.1.11). \square

We need to mention that Ψ_α converges to a smooth function Ψ_1 as $\alpha \searrow 1$, more precisely, it can be expressed as

$$\Psi_1(r) = r - \log(1 + r)$$

which is also a strictly increasing smooth function. Now, we can prove the main consequence of this subsection.

Proposition 4.1.7. *Let $u_\alpha : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow N$ be a sequence of non-constant critical points for E_α^ω that converges strongly in $C^2(\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l\})$ to u for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 1$. Then the limit $u : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow N$ is also non-constant.*

Proof. Let (φ, θ) be the geographic coordinates of \mathbb{S}^2 with $0 \leq \varphi \leq \pi$ and $0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi$. And denote $\mathbb{S}^+ = \{(\varphi, \theta) : 0 \leq \varphi \leq \frac{\pi}{2}\}$ and $\mathbb{S}^- = \{(\varphi, \theta) : \frac{\pi}{2} \leq \varphi \leq \pi\}$. Since the set of points that fails to convergence is finite, after taking a fractional linear transformation of \mathbb{S}^2 , we can assume $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l\} \subset \text{int}(\mathbb{S}^+)$ such that $\varphi(x_i) < \frac{\pi}{3}$ for $1 \leq i \leq l$. Then splitting the integral domain \mathbb{S}^2 into \mathbb{S}^+ and \mathbb{S}^- in identity (4.1.11) obtained in Lemma 4.1.6 gives

$$(4.1.14) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^+} \iota^3(x) \Psi_\alpha(|\nabla u_\alpha(x)|^2) dV_g = \int_{\mathbb{S}^-} |\iota^3(x)| \Psi_\alpha(|\nabla u_\alpha(x)|^2) dV_g.$$

If the limit u is constant, then by Theorem 4.1.4 the energy must concentrate at some point, say x_1 , and one can construct a rescaling map v_α that converges strongly in C_{loc}^2 to a non-constant bubble $v : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow N$. Then, utilizing (4.1.14) we can estimate

$$(4.1.15) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 < \frac{E(v)}{2} &\leq \frac{1}{2} \liminf_{\alpha \searrow 1} E(u_\alpha, \mathbb{S}^+) \leq \liminf_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{\mathbb{S}^+} \iota^3(x) |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dV_g \\ &\leq 2 \liminf_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{\mathbb{S}^+} \iota^3(x) \Psi_\alpha(|\nabla u_\alpha(x)|^2) dV_g \\ &= 2 \liminf_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{\mathbb{S}^-} |\iota^3(x)| \Psi_\alpha(|\nabla u_\alpha(x)|^2) dV_g = 0 \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Here, we note that $\Psi(r)/r \rightarrow 1$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ which implies the second inequality of the above estimates (4.1.15). Therefore, we reach the conclusion of Proposition 4.1.7. \square

4.2. Preparations for the Proof of Main Theorem.

In this subsection, we will derive some basic Lemmas for α - H -surfaces, such as small energy regularity, energy gap and removability of isolated singularities of H -surfaces that will be described in Subsubsection 4.2.1, and we will establish several Pohozaev type identities see Lemma 4.2.5 in Subsubsection 4.2.2.

By Riemann mapping theorem, for each $p \in M$ there exists an isothermal coordinate system in a neighborhood $U(p)$ of p such that the metric g can be written as

$$g = e^\varphi \left((dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2 \right)$$

where $x = (x^1, x^2) \in B(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and φ is a smooth function satisfying $\varphi(p) = 0$. Therefore, it suffices to restrict our analysis on unit ball $B(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ equipped with the metric

$$g_\alpha := e^{\varphi_\alpha} \left((dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2 \right) \quad \text{with } \varphi_\alpha(0) = 0 \text{ and } \varphi_\alpha \rightarrow \varphi \in C^\infty(\overline{B(0, 1)})$$

in order to investigate the local bubbling behavior for α - H -surfaces. Hence, under these isothermal coordinates the Euler Lagrange equation (4.2.1) and (4.2.2) are equivalent to the following

$$(4.2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta u_\alpha + (\alpha - 1) \frac{\nabla |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 \cdot \nabla u_\alpha}{\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2} + A(u_\alpha) (\nabla u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha) \\ = \tau_\alpha^{\alpha-1} \frac{H(u_\alpha) (\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha)}{\alpha (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1}} \end{aligned}$$

and in divergence form

$$(4.2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} -\operatorname{div} \left((\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \nabla u_\alpha \right) + (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} A(u_\alpha) (\nabla u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha) \\ = \frac{\tau_\alpha^{\alpha-1}}{\alpha} H(u_\alpha) (\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha) \end{aligned}$$

4.2.1. *Small Energy Regularity, Energy Gap and Removability of Isolated Singularities.*

Similarly to blow-up phenomenon for sequences of α -harmonic maps, that was developed by Sacks-Uhlenbeck [SU81], by showing the small energy regularity Lemma 4.2.1, energy gap Lemma 4.2.2 and the removability of isolated singularities Lemma 4.2.3 for H -surfaces, we can establish a similar convergence theory for general sequence of α - H -surfaces $\{u_\alpha\}_{\alpha \searrow 1}$ (as critical points of generalized functional \tilde{E}_α^ω) with uniformly bounded α -energy. In the H -surface context, compared with the case of harmonic

maps, the following inequality

$$(4.2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{H(u)(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u)}{\alpha(\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u|^2)^{\alpha-1}} \right\|_{L^1(M)} &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha\beta_0} \|H(u)(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u)\|_{L^1(M)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\alpha\beta_0} \|H\|_{L^\infty(N)} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

implies that the new quadratic growth part arising from the mean curvature type vector field $H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u)$ actually plays a complete similar role with the original second fundamental form term $A(\nabla u, \nabla u)$ in the proof of small energy regularity for α -harmonic maps, see [SU81, Main Estimate 3.2]. Based on this fact, it is not difficult to establish the following small energy regularity for α - H -surfaces:

Lemma 4.2.1 (Small Energy Regularity). *Let $\{u_\alpha\}_{\alpha>1}$ be a sequence of critical points of \tilde{E}_α^ω in $W^{1,2\alpha}(B(0,1), N)$ where $B(0,1)$ is equipped with metric*

$$g_\alpha := e^{\varphi_\alpha} \left((dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2 \right) \quad \text{with } \varphi_\alpha(0) = 0 \text{ and } \varphi_\alpha \rightarrow \varphi \in C^\infty(\overline{B(0,1)})$$

as $\alpha \searrow 1$. Then, there exists constants $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $\alpha_0 > 1$ such that if

$$\sup_{1 < \alpha < \alpha_0} E(u_\alpha, B) \leq \varepsilon_0^2,$$

where $B := B(0,1)$ for simplicity, then for any $B' \subset\subset B$ we have

$$(4.2.4) \quad \|\nabla u_\alpha(x)\|_{W^{2,p}(B',N)} \leq C(p, B', N) \|\nabla u_\alpha\|_{L^2(B(0,1),N)},$$

for all $1 < \alpha \leq \alpha_0$ and $1 < p < \infty$, where $C(p, B', N)$ is a constant depending only on $1 < p < \infty$, $B' \subset B$ and geometries of N .

Proof. Since the desired estimates holds locally and $g_\alpha \rightarrow g$ smoothly as $\alpha \searrow 1$, it suffices to prove the Lemma 4.2.1 for sequence $u_\alpha : B \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow N$ with Euclidean metric on B by choosing small enough $\alpha_0 - 1$. Let φ be a smooth function which is 1 on B' and supports in B , then multiplying the Euler-Lagrange equation (4.2.1) for \tilde{E}_α^ω by φ and writing the terms arising from the derivatives on φ in the right-hand side yield

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \Delta(\varphi u_\alpha) + (\alpha - 1) \frac{\langle \nabla^2(\varphi u_\alpha), \nabla u_\alpha \rangle \cdot \nabla u_\alpha}{\tau_\alpha + |\nabla u_\alpha|^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + A(u_\alpha)(\nabla(\varphi u_\alpha), \nabla u_\alpha) + \tau_\alpha^{\alpha-1} \frac{H(u_\alpha)(\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla(\varphi u_\alpha))}{\alpha(\tau_\alpha + |\nabla u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1}} \right| \\ &\leq C(\varphi, \nabla\varphi, N, \|A\|_{L^\infty}, \|H\|_{L^\infty}) (|u_\alpha| + |\nabla u_\alpha|), \end{aligned}$$

where $C(\varphi, \nabla\varphi, N, \|A\|_{L^\infty}, \|H\|_{L^\infty})$ is a constant that depends on the φ , $\nabla\varphi$, geometries of target N , second fundamental form A and mean curvature type vector field H .

For notation simplicity, we denote it by C_0 . Keeping in mind (4.2.3) and applying L^p estimates for Laplace operators, we obtain

$$(4.2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} (C_p)^{-1} \|\varphi u_\alpha\|_{W^{2,p}(B,N)} &\leq (\alpha - 1) \|\varphi u_\alpha\|_{W^{2,p}(B,N)} \\ &\quad + (\|A\|_{L^\infty(N)} + \|H\|_{L^\infty(N)}) \|\nabla(\varphi u_\alpha)\| \cdot \|\nabla u_\alpha\|_{L^p(B,N)} \\ &\quad + C_0 \|u_\alpha\|_{W^{1,p}(B,N)}, \end{aligned}$$

where C_p is the constant arising from operator norms of Laplace operator. Now, let $p = 4/3$ and take $2(\alpha_0 - 1) < (C_p)^{-1}$, using Hölder's inequality we have

$$(4.2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left((C_{\frac{4}{3}})^{-1} - 2(\alpha - 1) \right) \|\varphi u_\alpha\|_{W^{2,4/3}(B,N)} \\ &\leq C(A, H) \|\nabla(\varphi u_\alpha)\| \cdot \|\nabla u_\alpha\|_{L^{4/3}(B,N)} + C_0 \|u_\alpha\|_{W^{1,4/3}(B,N)} \\ &\leq C(A, H) E(u_\alpha, B) \|\nabla(\varphi u_\alpha)\|_{L^4} + C_0 \|u_\alpha\|_{W^{1,4/3}(B,N)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Sobolev embedding $W^{2,4/3}(B, N) \hookrightarrow W^{1,4}(B, N)$, we conclude that from (4.2.6)

$$(4.2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left((C_{\frac{4}{3}})^{-1} - 2(\alpha - 1) - C_e C(A, H) E(u_\alpha, B) \right) \|\varphi u_\alpha\|_{W^{2,4/3}(B,N)} \\ &\leq C_0 \|u_\alpha\|_{W^{1,4/3}(B,N)} \end{aligned}$$

where C_e is the norm of the embedding $W^{2,4/3}(B, N) \hookrightarrow W^{1,4}(B, N)$ and

$$C(A, H) := \|A\|_{L^\infty(N)} + \|H\|_{L^\infty(N)}.$$

Note that, after replacing u_α with $u_\alpha - 1/\text{Vol}(B) \int_B u_\alpha$, we can assume $\int_B u_\alpha = 0$. So, the right-hand side of (4.2.7) is controlled by $E(u_\alpha, B)$ by Poincaré's inequality. We take ε_0 is small enough such that

$$(C_{\frac{4}{3}})^{-1} - 2(\alpha - 1) - C_e C(A, H) \varepsilon_0^2 > 0.$$

Then, in estimate (4.2.5), we take $p = 2$ to obtain

$$(4.2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left((C_2)^{-1} - 2(\alpha - 1) \right) \|\varphi u_\alpha\|_{W^{1,2\alpha}(B,N)} \\ &\leq C(A, H) \|\varphi u_\alpha\|_{W^{1,4}(B,N)} + C_0 \|u_\alpha\|_{W^{1,2}(B,N)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Sobolev embedding $W^{1,2\alpha}(B, N) \hookrightarrow W^{1,p}(B, N)$ for all $1 < p < \infty$. (4.2.8) will give the estimates of $\|\varphi u_\alpha\|_{W^{1,p}(B,N)}$ and plugging this estimates into (4.2.5) gives

$$\|\varphi u_\alpha\|_{W^{2,p}(B,N)} \leq C'(\varphi, \nabla\varphi, N, \|A\|_{L^\infty}, \|H\|_{L^\infty}) \|\nabla u_\alpha\|_{L^4(B,N)}.$$

Then, by $W^{2,4/3}(B, N) \hookrightarrow W^{1,4}(B, N)$, plugging (4.2.7) into above inequality will give the desired estimates of the Lemma 4.2.1. \square

By a similar argument to [SU81, Theorem 3.3], we can obtain the following globally energy gap Lemma for α - H -surfaces u_α from M to N .

Lemma 4.2.2 (Energy Gap). *There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $\alpha_0 > 1$ such that if $E(u_\alpha) < \varepsilon_0^2$, $1 \leq \alpha < \alpha_0$ and $u_\alpha : M \rightarrow N$ is a critical map of \tilde{E}_α^ω , then u_α is constant and $E(u_\alpha) = 0$.*

Proof. If we replace the smooth function φ with $\varphi \equiv 1$ and do the estimates globally on M , then $C_0 \equiv 0$ arising in Lemma 4.2.1. Thus, (4.2.7) becomes

$$\left((C_{\frac{4}{3}})^{-1} - 2(\alpha - 1) - C_e C(A, H) E(u_\alpha, B) \right) \|\varphi u_\alpha\|_{W^{2,4/3}(M,N)} \leq 0.$$

Therefore, when $E(u_\alpha, M) < \varepsilon_0^2$ is small enough, every critical point u_α of \tilde{E}_α^ω is constant. \square

Moreover, when $\alpha = 1$, we have the following removability of isolated singularities for H -surfaces by combining the proof in [Jos91, Theorem 2.4.1] and the regularity result in [Riv07, Theorem 1.2].

Lemma 4.2.3 (Removability of Isolated Singularities). *Suppose that $u \in C^2(B(0, 1) \setminus \{0\}, N)$ where $B(0, 1)$ equipped with metric $g = e^\varphi ((dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2)$ for some smooth function φ , $E(u, B(0, 1)) < \infty$ and that u satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation (1.3.2), then u can extend to a smooth H -surface $u : B(0, 1) \rightarrow N$.*

4.2.2. Pohozaev type Identities.

As a corollary of Lemma 4.2.1, we can establish the following boundedness estimates

$$\limsup_{\alpha \searrow 1} \left\| (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \right\|_{C^0(B(0,1))} \leq C < \infty.$$

Lemma 4.2.4. *Let $(B(0, 1), g_\alpha)$ be a unit disk in \mathbb{R}^2 equipped with a metric*

$$g_\alpha = e^{\varphi_\alpha} ((dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2)$$

where $\varphi_\alpha(0) = 0$ and φ_α is a sequence of smooth function such that $\varphi_\alpha \rightarrow \varphi$ strongly in $C^\infty(\overline{B(0, 1)})$. If u_α is a sequence of α - H -surfaces with uniformly bounded generalized α -energy $\sup_{\alpha > 1} \tilde{E}_\alpha(u_\alpha, B(0, 1)) < \infty$ and $\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \tau_\alpha^{\alpha-1} > \beta_0 > 0$, then there exists a positive $\beta_1 > 0$ which is independent of $\alpha \searrow 1$ such that

$$(4.2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta_0 &\leq \liminf_{\alpha \searrow 1} \left\| (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \right\|_{C^0(B(0,1))} \\ &\leq \limsup_{\alpha \searrow 1} \left\| (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \right\|_{C^0(B(0,1))} \leq \beta_1. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. It suffices to prove the upper bound part of (4.2.9). If the energy concentrate set

$$\mathfrak{S} := \left\{ x \in B(0, 1) : \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \int_{B(x,r)} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 dV_{g_\alpha} \geq \varepsilon_0^2, \quad \text{for all } r > 0 \right\}$$

is empty, then by Lemma 4.2.1 u_α converges to some H -surface u_0 smoothly which implies

$$\limsup_{\alpha \searrow 1} \|\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha\|_{C^0(B(0,1))} \leq C < \infty.$$

Hence, (4.2.9) follows directly. Thus, we assume that \mathfrak{S} is non-empty. Without loss of generality, we further assume that $0 \in \mathfrak{S}$ is the only energy concentration point. Then, there exists finitely many bubbles occurring around 0, hence there exists sequences of positive numbers $\lambda_\alpha^i \searrow 0$ and sequences of points $x_\alpha^i \searrow 0$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$, for $1 \leq i \leq n_0$ satisfying the alternative (S1) or (S2). We choose the smallest $\lambda_\alpha^{i_0}$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{\lambda_\alpha^{i_0}}{\lambda_\alpha^i} \leq C < \infty \quad \text{for any } 1 \leq i \neq i_0 \leq n_0.$$

Therefore, the energy concentration \mathfrak{S} set of rescaled sequences $w_\alpha(x) := u_\alpha(x_\alpha^{i_0})$ is empty, hence by Lemma 4.2.1 we have

$$\limsup_{\alpha \searrow 1} \left\| (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \right\|_{C^0(B(0,1))} \leq C \limsup_{\alpha \searrow 1} \left(1 + (\lambda_\alpha^{i_0})^{2-2\alpha} \right) \leq C(1 + \mu_{max})$$

which yields the estimate (4.2.9) by letting $\beta_1 := C(1 + \mu_{max})$. \square

Next we are devoted to derive some general variational formulas for the functional $\widetilde{E}_\alpha^\omega$, to obtain some critical estimates of the energy of α - H -surfaces on the neck domains. We adapt the idea introduced in [LW10, Lemma 2.3] and hence some reduplicative computational details are omitted.

Lemma 4.2.5. *Let $(B(0, 1), g_\alpha)$ be a unit disk in \mathbb{R}^2 equipped with a metric*

$$g_\alpha = e^{\varphi_\alpha} \left((dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2 \right)$$

where $\varphi_\alpha(0) = 0$ and φ_α is a sequence of smooth function and $\varphi_\alpha \rightarrow \varphi$ strongly in $C^\infty(\overline{B(0, 1)})$. If u_α is a critical point of $\widetilde{E}_\alpha^\omega(u, B(0, 1))$, then for any $0 < t < 1$ there holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \right) \int_{\partial B(0,t)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 ds \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \int_{\partial B(0,t)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \frac{1}{|x|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 ds \\ (4.2.10) \quad & = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \frac{1}{t} \int_{B(0,t)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx + O(t). \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \right) \int_{\partial B(0,t)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 ds$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \int_{\partial B(0,t)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \frac{1}{|x|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 ds \\
(4.2.11) \quad & = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \frac{1}{t} \int_{B(0,t)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx + O(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Taking a 1-parameter family of transformations group $\{\phi_s\}$ that is generated by the vector field supported in $B(0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{E}_\alpha^\omega(u \circ \phi_s, B(0,1)) \\
& = \int_{B(0,1)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha}(u \circ \phi_s)|^2)^\alpha dV_{g_\alpha} + \int_{B(0,1)} (u \circ \phi_s)^* \omega \\
& = \int_{B(0,1)} \left(\tau_\alpha + \sum_{i=1}^2 |du((\phi_s)_*(e_i(x)))|^2 \right)^\alpha dV_{g_\alpha} \\
& \quad + \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u \circ \phi_s) \nabla^\perp(u \circ \phi_s)^i \nabla(u \circ \phi_s)^j dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \\
& = \int_{B(0,1)} \left(\tau_\alpha + \sum_{i=1}^2 |du((\phi_s)_*(e_i(\phi_s^{-1}(x))))|^2 \right)^\alpha J(\phi_s^{-1}) dV_{g_\alpha} \\
& \quad + \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u \circ \phi_s) \left(\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial \phi_s^k}{\partial z^1} \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^l} \frac{\partial \phi_s^l}{\partial z^2} - \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial \phi_s^k}{\partial z^1} \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^l} \frac{\partial \phi_s^l}{\partial z^2} \right) dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \\
& := A + B
\end{aligned}$$

where $\{e_i\}$ is a local orthonormal basis of $TB(0,1)$ and $J(\phi_s^{-1})$ is the Jacobian of ϕ_s^{-1} . Utilizing the first variational formula for area functional

$$\frac{d}{ds} J(\phi_s^{-1}) dV_{g_\alpha} \Big|_{s=0} = -\operatorname{div}(X) dV_{g_\alpha},$$

differentiating \tilde{E}_α^ω yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{ds} \tilde{E}_\alpha^\omega(u \circ \phi_s) \Big|_{s=0} & = \delta \tilde{E}_\alpha^\omega(u) (du(X)) \\
& = - \int_{B(0,1)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u|^2)^\alpha \operatorname{div}(X) dV_{g_\alpha} \\
& \quad + 2\alpha \sum_i \int_{B(0,1)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \langle du(\nabla_{e_i} X), du(e_i) \rangle dV_{g_\alpha} \\
& \quad + \frac{d}{ds} B \Big|_{s=0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we focus on

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{ds}B \Big|_{s=0} &= \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{\partial \omega_{ij}}{\partial y^p} \frac{\partial u^p}{\partial x^q} \frac{d\phi_s^q}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \nabla^\perp u^i \nabla u^j dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \\
&+ \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u) \left(\frac{\partial^2 u^i}{\partial x^p \partial x^1} \frac{d\phi_s^p}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial X^k}{\partial z^1} \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial^2 u^j}{\partial x^p \partial x^2} \frac{d\phi_s^p}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \right. \\
&+ \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^l} \frac{\partial X^l}{\partial z^2} - \frac{\partial^2 u^j}{\partial x^p \partial x^1} \frac{d\phi_s^p}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial X^k}{\partial z^1} \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^2} \\
&\left. - \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial^2 u^i}{\partial x^p \partial x^2} \frac{d\phi_s^p}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} - \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^l} \frac{\partial X^l}{\partial z^2} \right) dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \\
&= \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{\partial \omega_{ij}}{\partial y^p} \frac{\partial u^p}{\partial x^q} X^q \nabla^\perp u^i \nabla u^j dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \\
&+ \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u) \left(\frac{\partial^2 u^i}{\partial x^p \partial x^1} X^p \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial X^k}{\partial z^1} \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial^2 u^j}{\partial x^p \partial x^2} X^p \right. \\
&+ \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^l} \frac{\partial X^l}{\partial z^2} - \frac{\partial^2 u^j}{\partial x^p \partial x^1} X^p \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial X^k}{\partial z^1} \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^2} \\
&\left. - \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial^2 u^i}{\partial x^p \partial x^2} X^p - \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^l} \frac{\partial X^l}{\partial z^2} \right) dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \\
&:= C + D
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging terms in D and integrating by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned}
D &= - \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^p} \left(\omega_{ij}(u) X^p \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^2} \right) dx \\
&+ \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u) \left(\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^2} \right) \frac{\partial X^1}{\partial z^1} dx \\
&+ \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u) \left(\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^2} \right) \frac{\partial X^2}{\partial z^2} dx + \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u) \frac{\partial^2 u^j}{\partial x^p \partial x^2} X^p \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^1} dx \\
&+ \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^p} \left(\omega(u)_{ij} X^p \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^2} \right) dx - \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u) \frac{\partial^2 u^i}{\partial x^p \partial x^2} X^p \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^1} dx \\
&= \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u) \nabla^\perp u^i \nabla u^j \operatorname{div}(X) dx - \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{\partial \omega_{ij}}{\partial x^p} \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^2} X^p dx \\
&- \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u) \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^2} \operatorname{div}(X) dx - \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u) \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial^2 u^j}{\partial x^p \partial x^2} X^p dx \\
&+ \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u) \frac{\partial^2 u^j}{\partial x^p \partial x^2} X^p \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^1} dx + \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{\partial \omega_{ij}}{\partial x^p} \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^2} \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^1} X^p dx
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u) \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^2} \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^1} \operatorname{div}(X) dx + \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u) \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial^2 u^i}{\partial x^p \partial x^2} X^p dx \\
& - \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u) \frac{\partial^2 u^i}{\partial x^p \partial x^2} X^p \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^1} dx \\
& = \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u) \nabla^\perp u^i \nabla u^j \operatorname{div}(X) dx - \int_{B(0,1)} \omega_{ij}(u) \nabla^\perp u^i \nabla u^j \operatorname{div}(X) dx \\
& + \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{\partial \omega_{ij}}{\partial x^p} \left(\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^2} \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^1} - \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x^2} \right) dx \\
& = - \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{\partial \omega_{ij}}{\partial x^p} X^p \nabla^\perp u^i \nabla u^j dx
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\left. \frac{dB}{ds} \right|_{s=0} = 0.$$

Now if u_α is the critical point of $\widetilde{E}_\alpha^\omega$, for any vector field X supported in unite disk $B(0, 1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.2.12) \quad & 2\alpha \sum_i \int_{B(0,1)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u|^2)^{\alpha-1} \langle du(\nabla_{e_i} X), du(e_i) \rangle dV_{g_\alpha} \\
& = \int_{B(0,1)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u|^2)^\alpha \operatorname{div}(X) dV_{g_\alpha}
\end{aligned}$$

To obtain (4.2.10), we choose a vector field X supported in B_ρ by

$$X = \eta(r) r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} = \eta(|x|) x^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$$

where $\eta(r)$ is defined by

$$\eta(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r \leq t', \\ \frac{t-r}{t-t'} & \text{if } t' \leq r \leq t, \\ 0 & \text{if } r \geq t, \end{cases} \quad \text{for } 0 < t' < t \leq \rho < 1.$$

Plugging this vector field into (4.2.12), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
0 & = (2\alpha - 2) \int_{B(0,t)} \eta (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla_0 u_\alpha|^2 dx \\
& + \int_{B(0,t)} O(|x|) (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla_0 u_\alpha|^2 dx \\
& - 2\tau_\alpha \int_{B(0,t)} \eta (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} dV_{g_\alpha}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{\tau_\alpha}{t-t'} \int_{B(0,t) \setminus B_{t'}} r (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u|^2)^{\alpha-1} dV_{g_\alpha} \\
& + \frac{1}{t-t'} \int_{B(0,t) \setminus B_{t'}} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left[|\nabla_0 u_\alpha|^2 r - 2\alpha r \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 \right] dx \\
(4.2.13) \quad & - \int_{B(0,t)} \tau_\alpha (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} r \eta \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial r} dV_{g_\alpha}
\end{aligned}$$

In equation (4.2.13) taking $t' \nearrow t$ yields estimation (4.2.11)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\partial B(0,t)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 ds \\
& - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \int_{\partial B(0,t)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 ds \\
(4.2.14) \quad & = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \frac{1}{t} \int_{B(0,t)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx + O(t).
\end{aligned}$$

where we used co-area formula and Lemma 4.2.4. Since under the polar coordinates the metric tensor can be written as

$$g_\alpha = e^{\varphi_\alpha} (dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2),$$

hence

$$(4.2.15) \quad |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 = \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 + \frac{1}{|x|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2.$$

Therefore, (4.2.10) is obtained from above observation and (4.2.14). \square

Next, compared with previous Lemma 4.2.5 we proceed to derive an alternative form of the Pohozaev-type identity, which directly connects the angular component of the energy function with the radial component of the energy functional.

Lemma 4.2.6. *Let $(B(0,1), g_\alpha)$ be the unit disk in \mathbb{R}^2 with metric*

$$g_\alpha = e^{\varphi_\alpha} ((dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2)$$

where $\varphi_\alpha \in C^\infty(B(0,1))$ and $\varphi_\alpha(0) = 0$ for $\alpha > 1$. If u_α is a α -H-surface being a critical point of $\tilde{E}_\alpha^\omega(u, B(0,1))$, then for any $0 < t < 1$ the following holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\partial B(0,t)} \left(\left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 - \frac{1}{r^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 \right) ds \\
(4.2.16) \quad & = -\frac{2(\alpha-1)}{t} \int_{B(0,t)} \frac{\nabla |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 \nabla u_\alpha}{\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2} r \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Multiplying the Euler Lagrange equation (4.2.1) by $r \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}$ written as polar coordinate of $B(0, 1)$ and integrating over $B(0, t)$ to yield

$$(4.2.17) \quad \int_{B(0,t)} r \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \Delta u_\alpha dx = -(\alpha - 1) \int_{B(0,t)} \frac{\nabla |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 \cdot \nabla u_\alpha}{\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2} r \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} dx \\ + \tau_\alpha^{\alpha-1} \int_{B(0,t)} \frac{H(u_\alpha)(\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha)}{\alpha (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1}} r \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} dx.$$

Integration by parts to lefthand integral of (4.2.17) gets

$$(4.2.18) \quad \int_{B(0,t)} r \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \Delta u_\alpha dx = \int_{\partial B(0,t)} t \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 ds - \int_{B(0,t)} \nabla \left(r \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right) \cdot \nabla u_\alpha dx.$$

The second integral of righthand of (4.2.18) can be further computed as

$$(4.2.19) \quad \int_{B(0,t)} \nabla \left(r \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right) \cdot \nabla u_\alpha dx = \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{B(0,t)} \nabla \left(x^i \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial x^i} \right) \cdot \nabla u_\alpha dx \\ = \int_{B(0,1)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx + \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{r}{2} \frac{\partial (|\nabla u_\alpha|^2)}{\partial r} dx \\ = \int_{B(0,1)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx + \frac{t}{2} \int_{\partial B(0,t)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 ds - \int_{B(0,1)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \\ = \frac{t}{2} \int_{\partial B(0,t)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 ds.$$

On the other hand, we take a polar coordinate transformation, letting

$$\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial x^1} = \cos \theta \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} - \frac{\sin \theta}{r} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial x^2} = \sin \theta \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} + \frac{\cos \theta}{r} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta},$$

we can rewrite the mean curvature type vector term in (4.2.17) as

$$(4.2.20) \quad \int_{B(0,t)} \frac{H(u_\alpha)(\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha)}{\alpha (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1}} r \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} dx \\ = \int_{B(0,t)} \frac{H(u_\alpha)(\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha) \cdot (x \nabla u)}{\alpha (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1}} \\ = \sum_{i,j,k=1}^K \int_{B(0,t)} \frac{1}{\alpha (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1}} H_{ij}^k \frac{\partial u_\alpha^k}{\partial r} \left(\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial r} \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial \theta} - \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial r} \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial \theta} \right) dx$$

The antisymmetric of H_{ij}^k in indices i, j and k , see (2.1.1), tells us that the above quantity vanishes identically. Hence, combining (4.2.18), (4.2.19) and (4.2.20) with

(4.2.17), we have

$$(4.2.21) \quad \int_{\partial B(0,t)} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 ds = -\frac{\alpha-1}{t} \int_{B(0,t)} \frac{\nabla |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 \nabla u_\alpha}{\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2} r \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} dx$$

which leads to (4.2.16) keeping in mind that

$$|\nabla u|^2 = \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} \right|^2 + \frac{1}{|x|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \theta} \right|^2.$$

□

4.3. Proof of Generalized Energy Identity — Theorem 4.1.1.

In this subsection, our goal is to establish the generalized energy identity for sequences of α - H -surfaces (being the critical points of \tilde{E}_α^ω) with uniformly bounded generalized α -energy. We will adapt the approach outlined by Ding-Tian [DT95] in showing the energy identity for a sequence of approximate harmonic maps with uniformly L^2 -norm bounded tension field and Li-Wang [LW10] for sequences of α -harmonic maps. And it is important to emphasize the significance of the Pohozaev identity (4.2.10) and (4.2.11) in the proof. To prove Theorem 4.1.9, it is sufficient to focus on the simpler case of a single blow-up point, stated as below:

Theorem 4.3.1. *Let $(B(0,1), g_\alpha) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the unit disk in \mathbb{R}^2 equipped with sequence of conformal metric $g_\alpha = e^{\varphi_\alpha(x)}((dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2)$ and $g = e^{\varphi(x)}((dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2)$ where $\varphi_\alpha \in C^\infty(B(0,1))$, $\varphi_\alpha(0) = 0$ for $\alpha > 1$ and $\varphi_\alpha \rightarrow \varphi$ strongly in $C^\infty(\overline{B(0,1)})$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$. Let $u_\alpha \in C^\infty(B(0,1), N)$ be a sequence of α - H -surfaces satisfying*

- (a) $\sup_{\alpha > 1} \tilde{E}_\alpha(u_\alpha) \leq \Lambda < \infty$ and $0 < \beta_0 \leq \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \tau_\alpha^{\alpha-1} \leq 1$,
- (b) $u_\alpha \rightarrow u_0$ strongly in $C_{loc}^\infty(B(0,1) \setminus \{0\}, \mathbb{R}^K)$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$.

Then there exists a subsequence of u_α still denoted by u_α and a nonnegative integer n_0 such that for any $i = 1, \dots, n_0$ there exists a sequence of points x_α^i , positives number λ_α^i and a non-trivial H -sphere w^i such that all following statements hold:

- (1) $x_\alpha^i \rightarrow 0$ and $\lambda_\alpha^i \rightarrow 0$, as $\alpha \searrow 1$;
- (2) $\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \left(\frac{r_\alpha^i}{r_\alpha^j} + \frac{r_\alpha^j}{r_\alpha^i} + \frac{|x_\alpha^i - x_\alpha^j|}{r_\alpha^i + r_\alpha^j} \right) = \infty$ for any $i \neq j$;
- (3) w^i is the weak limit of $u_\alpha(x_\alpha^i + \lambda_\alpha^i x)$ in $W_{loc}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$
- (4) **Generalized Energy Identity:**

$$(4.3.1) \quad \lim_{\delta \searrow 0} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \tilde{E}_\alpha(u_\alpha, B(0, \delta)) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \mu_i^2 E(w^i)$$

where $\mu_i = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} (\lambda_\alpha^i)^{2-2\alpha}$.

4.3.1. Proof of Single Bubble Case for Theorem 4.3.1.

At the first step, we will commence by establishing Theorem 4.3.1 under the assumption of a single bubble, i.e., when $n_0 = 1$. The proof for the scenarios involving multiple bubbles will be presented in the subsequent section.

To begin, since $0 \in B(0, 1)$ is the only energy concentration point as stated in Theorem 4.3.1, we can assume the only bubble w is produced by sequence

$$(4.3.2) \quad w := \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} w_\alpha(x) = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} u_\alpha(x_\alpha + \lambda_\alpha x)$$

where

$$\lambda_\alpha = \frac{1}{\max_{B(0,1/2)} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|}$$

and x_α is the point where the maximum is taken on, that is,

$$|\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha(x_\alpha)| = \max_{x \in B(0,1/2)} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha(x)|.$$

Then, $\|\nabla w_\alpha\|_{L^\infty} = |\nabla w_\alpha(0)| = 1$. So, by Lemma 4.2.1, w_α converges strongly in $C_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ to a non-trivial H -surface w from \mathbb{R}^2 to N . Moreover, by Lemma 4.2.3 and identifying $\mathbb{R}^2 \cap \{\infty\} \cong \mathbb{S}^2$, w actually extends to a H -sphere.

Remark 4.3.2. Note that for any $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$, u_α converges to weak limit u_0 strongly in $C^\infty(B(0, 1) \setminus B(0, \delta), N)$. For any large enough $R > 0$ and small enough $\alpha - 1$ such that $\lambda_\alpha R < \delta$, we have w_α converges to H -sphere w strongly in $C^\infty(B(0, R), N)$. Therefore, the workload to prove the our main Theorem 4.3.1 reduces to study to asymptotic formulation of u_α on the neck domain $B(0, \delta) \setminus B(x_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha R)$ when $\alpha \searrow 1$.

Under the one bubble hypothesis and by a similar argument in Ding-Tian [DT95], we claim the following:

Claim 1. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ and $R > 0$ such that

$$(4.3.3) \quad \int_{B(x_\alpha, 2t) \setminus B(x_\alpha, t)} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 dV_{g_\alpha} \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for any } t \in \left(\frac{\tilde{\lambda}_\alpha R}{2}, 2\delta \right)$$

when $\alpha - 1$ is small enough.

Proof of Claim 1. We argue by contradiction, suppose that the Claim 1 fails, then there exists a sequence of $\alpha_j \searrow 1$ and $\lambda'_{\alpha_j} \searrow 0$ satisfying $\lambda'_{\alpha_j} / \lambda_{\alpha_j} \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$(4.3.4) \quad \int_{B(x_\alpha, 2\lambda'_{\alpha_j}) \setminus B(x_\alpha, \lambda'_{\alpha_j})} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 dV_{g_\alpha} \geq \varepsilon$$

Then, the rescaled map

$$w'_{\alpha_j}(x) := u_{\alpha_j}(\lambda'_{\alpha_j} x + x_{\alpha_j}) \quad \text{converges strongly in } C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0, x^1, \dots, x^m\}, N)$$

to some H -surface w' for some energy concentration set $\{0, x^1, \dots, x^m\}$.

If $m = 0$, by (4.3.4) and the fact that $\lambda'_{\alpha_j}/\lambda_{\alpha_j} \rightarrow \infty$, we can conclude that w' is a non-constant H -surface that is different from w . This contradicts to the only one bubble assumption.

If $m \geq 1$, then similarly to previous argument around some energy concentration point x^i for w_α after passing to some subsequence we can also construct a sequence $\tilde{x}_{\alpha_j} \searrow x^i$ and a sequence $\tilde{\lambda}_{\alpha_j}$ such that the second rescaled map $w'_{\alpha_j}(\tilde{x}_{\alpha_j} + \tilde{\lambda}_{\alpha_j}x)$ converges to a non-trivial H -sphere \tilde{w}^i . Hence

$$w'_{\alpha_j}(\tilde{x}_{\alpha_j} + \tilde{\lambda}_{\alpha_j}x) = u_{\alpha_j}(x_{\alpha_j} + \lambda'_{\alpha_j}(\tilde{x}_{\alpha_j} + \tilde{\lambda}_{\alpha_j}x)) \rightarrow \tilde{w}^i \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty$$

which means \tilde{w}^i is also a second non-constant H -sphere which contradicts to the only one bubble assumption again. In a word, the Claim 1 always holds. \square

In the sequel, for any $0 < a < b < \infty$ and $x \in B(0, 1)$ we will use the notation

$$A(a, b, x) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^2 : a \leq |y - x| \leq b\}$$

to denote the annulus centered at x with inner radii a and outer radii b . By small energy regularity, Lemma 4.2.1, we have

Lemma 4.3.3. *With the same hypothesis as Theorem 4.3.1 and assume there is only one bubble for u_α as $\alpha \searrow 1$. Given any small enough $\delta > 0$, large enough $R > 0$ and small enough such that $\alpha - 1 \leq \alpha_0 - 1$ where $\alpha_0 - 1$ is chosen in Lemma 4.2.1. Then for any $\lambda_\alpha R < a < b \leq \delta$, we have*

$$(4.3.5) \quad \int_{A(a, b, x_\alpha)} |\nabla_{g_\alpha}^2 u_\alpha| \cdot |x - x_\alpha| \cdot |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha| dV_{g_\alpha} \leq C \int_{A(\frac{a}{2}, 2b, x_\alpha)} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 dV_{g_\alpha}.$$

where C is a constant independent of α as $\alpha \searrow 1$.

Proof. Since both the lefthand and righthand of (4.3.5) is conformally invariant, it suffices to show

$$(4.3.6) \quad \int_{A(a, b, x_\alpha)} |\nabla^2 u_\alpha| \cdot |x - x_\alpha| \cdot |\nabla u_\alpha| dx \leq C \int_{A(\frac{a}{2}, 2b, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx.$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume $b = 2^I a$ for some positive integer $I \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be the mapping such that $r = e^{-\rho}$ and $\theta = \varphi$ where $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^1$ equipped with product metric $f^*g = d\rho^2 + d\varphi^2$. Here, we use notation (r, θ) to represent the polar coordinates centered at x_α and (ρ, φ) be coordinate of cylinder $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^1$. Then f is a conformal map from $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^1$ into \mathbb{R}^2 . Let $v_\alpha(t, \varphi) = u_\alpha(f)(t, \varphi) = u_\alpha(e^{-t}, \varphi)$ which satisfies Euler Lagrange equation (4.2.1) and hence fulfills Lemma 4.2.1. Thus after

conformal transformation f the annulus $A(2^{i-1}a, 2^i a, x_\alpha)$ maps to be

$$(4.3.7) \quad \left[i - 1 + \log \frac{1}{a}, i + \log \frac{1}{a} \right] \times \mathbb{S}^1.$$

Since we have assumed there is only one bubble, in view of (4.3.3) we can apply small energy regularity Lemma 4.2.1 to v_α on (4.3.7) and transform the estimates back to u_α to derive

$$(4.3.8) \quad |\nabla u_\alpha(x)| \cdot |x - x_\alpha| \leq C \left(\int_{A(2^{i-2}a, 2^{i+1}a, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq I,$$

for any $x \in A(2^{i-1}a, 2^i a, x_\alpha)$ and constant C which is independent of $1 \leq i \leq I$ and $\alpha \searrow 1$. And similarly, we have

$$(4.3.9) \quad |\nabla^2 u_\alpha(x)| \cdot |x - x_\alpha|^2 \leq C \left(\int_{A(2^{i-2}a, 2^{i+1}a, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq I.$$

Then, combining (4.3.8) and (4.3.9) and taking summation with respect to i from 1 to I , we can get

$$(4.3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{A(a,b,x_\alpha)} |\nabla^2 u_\alpha| \cdot |x - x_\alpha| \cdot |\nabla u_\alpha| dx \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^I \int_{A(2^{i-1}a, 2^i a, x_\alpha)} |\nabla^2 u_\alpha| \cdot |x - x_\alpha|^2 \cdot |\nabla u_\alpha| \cdot |x - x_\alpha| \frac{dx}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^I \sup_{x \in A(2^{i-1}a, 2^i a, x_\alpha)} |\nabla^2 u_\alpha| \cdot |x - x_\alpha|^2 \cdot \\ &\quad \sup_{x \in A(2^{i-1}a, 2^i a, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha| \cdot |x - x_\alpha| \int_{A(2^{i-1}a, 2^i a, x_\alpha)} \frac{dx}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \\ &\leq C \sum_{i=1}^I \left(\int_{A(2^{i-2}a, 2^{i+1}a, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ (4.3.11) \quad &= C \int_{A(\frac{a}{2}, 2b, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 4.3.3. \square

In the polar coordinate, the energy functional has two components, namely, the radical part and the angular part.

$$\int |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx = \int \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 dx + \int \frac{1}{|x|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx.$$

To show the generalized energy identity stated in Theorem 4.3.1, considering the Remark 4.3.2 we first establish the following energy decay of the angular component:

Lemma 4.3.4. *With the same assumption as Lemma 4.3.3, there holds*

$$\lim_{\delta \searrow 0} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx = 0.$$

Here, we always use the same (r, θ) to represent the polar coordinate systems centered at x_α as $\alpha \searrow 1$.

Proof. Combining the deduction (4.3.3) of one bubble assumption and small energy regularity Lemma 4.2.1 with the conformal transformation argument described in the proof of Lemma 4.3.3, we have

$$(4.3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Osc}_{A(t, 2t, x_\alpha)}(u_\alpha) &:= \sup_{x, y \in A(t, 2t, x_\alpha)} |u_\alpha(x) - u_\alpha(y)| \\ &\leq C \|\nabla u_\alpha\|_{L^2(A(\frac{t}{2}, 4t, x_\alpha))} \quad \text{for any } t \in (\lambda_\alpha R, \delta). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$u_\alpha^*(t) := \frac{1}{2\pi t} \int_{\partial B(x_\alpha, t)} u_\alpha = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u_\alpha(x_\alpha + te^{i\theta}) d\theta$$

Then, using (4.3.12) we have

$$(4.3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u_\alpha(x) - u_\alpha^*(|x|)\|_{L^\infty(A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha))} &\leq \sup_{\lambda_\alpha R \leq t \leq \delta} \|u_\alpha(x) - u_\alpha^*(|x|)\|_{L^\infty(A(t, 2t, x_\alpha))} \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda_\alpha R \leq t \leq \delta} \text{Osc}_{A(t, 2t, x_\alpha)}(u_\alpha) \\ &\leq C \|\nabla u_\alpha\|_{L^2(A(\frac{t}{2}, 4t, x_\alpha))} \leq C\varepsilon \quad \text{for any } t \in (\lambda_\alpha R, \delta). \end{aligned}$$

Next, by integration by part and recall the Euler Lagrange equation (4.2.1) of α -H-surface we can estimate the energy on neck domain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \\ &= \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \nabla u_\alpha \cdot \nabla (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) dx + \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \nabla u_\alpha \cdot \nabla u_\alpha^* dx \\ &= - \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha, \delta, x_\alpha)} \Delta u_\alpha \cdot (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) dx + \int_{\partial A(\lambda_\alpha, \delta, x_\alpha)} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \cdot (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) ds \\ &\quad + \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \nabla u_\alpha \cdot \nabla u_\alpha^* dx \\ &= \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} A(u_\alpha) (\nabla u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha) \cdot (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (\alpha - 1) \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \frac{\nabla |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 \cdot \nabla u_\alpha}{\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2} \cdot (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) dx \\
& + \tau_\alpha^{\alpha-1} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \frac{H(u_\alpha)(\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha)}{\alpha (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1}} (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) dx \\
(4.3.14) \quad & + \int_{\partial A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \cdot (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) ds + \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \nabla u_\alpha \cdot \nabla u_\alpha^* dx.
\end{aligned}$$

In the following, we estimate every terms obtained in last equation of (4.3.14). For the last integral of (4.3.14), by Jensen's inequality we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \nabla u_\alpha \cdot \nabla u_\alpha^* dx \\
& = \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \cdot \frac{\partial u_\alpha^*}{\partial r} dx \\
& \leq \left(\int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha^*}{\partial r} \right|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& = \left(\int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \left| \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} d\theta \right|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 dx \\
(4.3.15) \quad & = \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx - \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, for the boundary term in (4.3.14) using trace theorem in Sobolev spaces and (4.3.13) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\partial A(\lambda_\alpha, \delta, x_\alpha)} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) ds \leq C\varepsilon \left(\int_{\partial A(\lambda_\alpha, \delta, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C\varepsilon \left(\|\nabla u_\alpha\|_{L^2(A(\frac{1}{2}\lambda_\alpha R, 2\lambda_\alpha R, x_\alpha) \cup A(\frac{1}{2}\delta, 2\delta, x_\alpha))} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \||x - x_\alpha| \cdot \nabla^2 u_\alpha\|_{L^2(A(\frac{1}{2}\lambda_\alpha R, 2\lambda_\alpha R, x_\alpha) \cup A(\frac{1}{2}\delta, 2\delta, x_\alpha))} \right) \\
(4.3.16) \quad & \leq C\varepsilon \|\nabla u_\alpha\|_{L^2(A(\frac{1}{2}\lambda_\alpha R, 2\lambda_\alpha R, x_\alpha) \cup A(\frac{1}{2}\delta, 2\delta, x_\alpha))} \leq C\varepsilon
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is obtained from the small energy regularity, Lemma 4.2.1. Furthermore, for the second integral in (4.3.14), by Lemma 4.3.3, we can estimate

$$(\alpha - 1) \left| \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \frac{\nabla |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 \cdot \nabla u_\alpha}{\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2} (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) dx \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 2(\alpha - 1)C \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} |\nabla^2 u_\alpha| \cdot |x - x_\alpha| \cdot |\nabla u_\alpha| dx \\
(4.3.17) \quad &\leq 2(\alpha - 1)C \int_{A(\frac{\lambda_\alpha R}{2}, 2\delta, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

At last, by (4.3.13) it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} A(u_\alpha)(\nabla u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha) (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) dx \\
&\quad + \tau_\alpha^{\alpha-1} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \frac{H(u_\alpha)(\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha)}{\alpha (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1}} \cdot (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) dx \\
(4.3.18) \quad &\leq C\varepsilon \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \leq C\varepsilon
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging the estimates (4.3.15), (4.3.16), (4.3.17) and (4.3.18) to (4.3.14), we can obtain

$$\int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx \leq C\varepsilon + C(\alpha - 1) \int_{A(\frac{\lambda_\alpha R}{2}, 2\delta, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx$$

which yields

$$\lim_{\delta \searrow 0} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx = 0.$$

Hence, we complete the proof of Lemma 4.3.4. \square

As a corollary of Lemma 4.3.4 and the uniformly boundedness of

$$\limsup_{\alpha \searrow 1} \left\| (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \right\|_{C^0(B(0,1))} \leq \beta_0 < \infty,$$

see Lemma 4.2.4, we have

Corollary 4.3.5. *With the same hypothesis as Lemma 4.3.4, there holds*

$$(4.3.19) \quad \lim_{\delta \searrow 0} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx = 0.$$

To simplify the notation, considering the Pohozaev identity (4.2.10), for $0 < t < 1$ we define the quantities

$$(4.3.20) \quad \mathcal{E}_\alpha(t) = \int_{B(x_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha^t)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx.$$

Besides, for fixed $0 < t_0 < 1$ and $0 < t < t_0 < 1$ we define

$$(4.3.21) \quad \mathcal{E}_{r, t_0, \alpha}(t) = \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_0}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 dx$$

and

$$(4.3.22) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\theta,t_0,\alpha}(t) = \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_0}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx.$$

Therefore, for $t \in (0, t_0)$ the Pohozaev identity (4.2.10) can be rewritten as

$$(4.3.23) \quad \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}\right) \mathcal{E}'_{r,t_0,\alpha}(t) - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathcal{E}'_{\theta,t_0,\alpha}(t) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \log(\lambda_\alpha) \mathcal{E}_\alpha(t) + O(\lambda_\alpha^t \log(\lambda_\alpha)).$$

Integrating with respect to t to get

$$(4.3.24) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}\right) \mathcal{E}_{r,t_0,\alpha}(t) - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathcal{E}_{\theta,t_0,\alpha}(t) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^t \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} \log(\lambda_\alpha^{2(\alpha-1)}) \mathcal{E}_\alpha(s) + O(\lambda_\alpha^s \log(\lambda_\alpha)) \right) ds \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, since the generalized α -energy \tilde{E}_α is uniformly bounded and using (4.3.23) and (4.3.24) one can see that

$$\left\| \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}\right) \mathcal{E}_{r,t_0,\alpha}(\cdot) - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathcal{E}_{\theta,t_0,\alpha}(\cdot) \right\|_{C^1([\tau, t_0])}$$

is uniformly bounded for any $0 < \tau < t_0/2$. On the other hand, by Lemma 4.3.4

$$\|\mathcal{E}_{\theta,t_0,\alpha}(\cdot)\|_{C^1(\delta, t_0)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \alpha \searrow 1$$

for any $\tau > 0$. Therefore, we can conclude that the sequences

$$\{\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t)\}_{\alpha \searrow 1}, \quad \{\mathcal{E}_{r,t_0,\alpha}(t)\}_{\alpha \searrow 1} \quad \text{and} \quad \{\mathcal{E}_{\theta,t_0,\alpha}(t)\}_{\alpha \searrow 1}$$

are compact in $C^0([\tau, t_0])$ norm for any $0 < \tau < t_0/2$, which implies there exists functions $\mathcal{E} : (0, t_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\mathcal{E}_{r,t_0} : (0, t_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for any $\tau > 0$

$$\mathcal{E}_\alpha \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_{r,t_0,\alpha} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{r,t_0} \quad \text{in } C^0([\tau, t_0]) \text{ as } \alpha \searrow 1.$$

Based on Lemma 4.3.4 and the construction above quantities, we can establish the following

Lemma 4.3.6. *With the same hypothesis as Theorem 4.3.1, for any $t \in (0, 1)$, there holds*

$$(4.3.25) \quad \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(x_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha^t)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 dV_{g_\alpha} = \mu^{1-t} \Lambda$$

where

$$\Lambda := \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(x_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha R)} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^{2\alpha} dV_{g_\alpha}$$

$$(4.3.26) \quad = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(0,R)} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} w_\alpha|^{2\alpha} \lambda_\alpha^{2-2\alpha} dV_{g_\alpha} = \mu E(w)$$

Proof. To begin, we decompose the integral of (4.3.6) as below

$$(4.3.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{B(x_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha})} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 dV_{g_\alpha} &= \int_{B(x_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha})} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \\ &= \mathcal{E}_{r,t_0,\alpha}(t) + \mathcal{E}_{\theta,t_0,\alpha}(t) + \mathcal{E}_\alpha(t_0) \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 4.3.5, we know that

$$(4.3.28) \quad \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \mathcal{E}_{\theta,t_0,\alpha}(t) = 0$$

for any $0 < t_0 < 1$. Then, in (4.3.24) letting $\alpha \searrow 1$ we see that

$$(4.3.29) \quad \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \mathcal{E}_{r,t_0,\alpha}(t) = \mathcal{E}_{r,t_0}(t) = - \int_{t_0}^t \log(\mu) \mathcal{E}(s) ds.$$

Recalling that $\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t) - \mathcal{E}_\alpha(t_0) = \mathcal{E}_{r,t_0,\alpha} - \mathcal{E}_{\theta,t_0,\alpha}$ and (4.3.28), letting $\alpha \searrow 1$ we have $\mathcal{E}(t) - \mathcal{E}(t_0) = \mathcal{E}_{r,t_0}$. Plugging this identity into (4.3.29), we have that

$$(4.3.30) \quad \mathcal{E}_{r,t_0}(t) = - \log(\mu) \int_{t_0}^t \mathcal{E}_{r,t_0}(s) + \mathcal{E}(t_0) ds.$$

Solving this integral equation, we see that

$$(4.3.31) \quad \mathcal{E}_{r,t_0}(t) = \mu^{t_0-t} \mathcal{E}(t_0) - \mathcal{E}(t_0).$$

Now, taking $\alpha \searrow 1$ in (4.3.27) and utilizing (4.3.31) we have

$$(4.3.32) \quad \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(x_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha})} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx = \mu^{t_0-t} \mathcal{E}(t_0)$$

Therefore, to show (4.3.25) it suffices to prove

$$(4.3.33) \quad \lim_{t_0 \rightarrow 1} \mathcal{E}(t_0) = \Lambda.$$

To see this, integrating the Pohozaev identity (4.2.10) with respect to t from $\lambda_\alpha R$ to $\lambda_\alpha^{t_0}$, we get

$$(4.3.34) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \mathcal{E}_\alpha(t_0) - \int_{B(x_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha R)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \\ &\leq C \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \lambda_\alpha^{t_0}, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx \\ &\quad + C \int_{\lambda_\alpha R}^{\lambda_\alpha^{t_0}} \frac{\alpha - 1}{r} dr + C(\lambda_\alpha^{t_0} - \lambda_\alpha R). \end{aligned}$$

Note that for the second integral on the righthand of (4.3.34) we have

$$\lim_{t_0 \rightarrow 1} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{\lambda_\alpha R}^{\lambda_\alpha^{t_0}} \frac{\alpha - 1}{r} dr = \lim_{t_0 \rightarrow 1} \frac{1 - t_0}{2} \log(\mu) = 0.$$

Moreover, keeping in mind that (4.3.28) and the definition of w_α , see (4.3.2), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t_0 \rightarrow 1} F(t_0) &= \lim_{t_0 \rightarrow 1} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(x_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha R)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(0, R)} (\lambda_\alpha^2 \tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} w_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \lambda_\alpha^{2-2\alpha} |\nabla w_\alpha|^2 dx \\ &= \mu E(w) = \Lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we prove the (4.3.33) and complete the proof of Lemma 4.3.6. \square

Now we are in a position to prove the generalized energy identity—Theorem 4.3.1 when there is only one bubble during the blow-up procedure.

Proof of Theorem 4.3.1 under One Bubble Assumption. Integrating the Pohozaev identity (4.2.11) with respect to t over the interval $[\lambda_\alpha^t, \delta]$ for some $t \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^t, \delta, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \\ &\leq C \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^s, \delta, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx \\ (4.3.35) \quad &+ C \int_{\lambda_\alpha^s}^{\delta} \frac{\alpha - 1}{r} dr + C(\delta - \lambda_\alpha^s). \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 4.3.5, we have

$$(4.3.36) \quad \lim_{\delta \searrow 0} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^s, \delta, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx = 0$$

Moreover, by direct computations we have

$$(4.3.37) \quad \lim_{\delta \searrow 0} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{\lambda_\alpha^s}^{\delta} \frac{\alpha - 1}{r} dr = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{s}{2} \log \mu = 0$$

Therefore, plugging (4.3.36) and (4.3.37) into (4.3.35) we have

$$(4.3.38) \quad \lim_{\delta \searrow 0} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^s, \delta, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx = 0.$$

Moreover, utilizing Lemma 4.3.6 we know that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(x_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha^s)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx = \mu \Lambda = \mu^2 E(w)$$

In the end, by Lemma 4.2.4, we can conclude that

$$\lim_{\delta \searrow 0} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(x_\alpha, \delta)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^\alpha dV_{g_\alpha} = \mu^2 E(w).$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 4.3.1 when $n_0 = 1$. \square

4.3.2. Proof of General Case for Theorem 4.3.1.

In this subsection, we employ an induction argument on the number of bubbles n_0 to complete the proof of Theorem 4.3.1.

Proof of the General Case for Theorem 4.3.1. Since we have proved the Theorem 4.3.1 when $n_0 = 1$ in Subsubsection 4.3.1, now suppose that the generalized energy identity asserted in Theorem 4.3.1 holds when there are $n_0 - 1$ many bubbles for sequence u_α as $\alpha \searrow 1$.

Firstly, recall that the first bubble w^1 for α - H -surfaces u_α are constructed by sequence

$$(4.3.39) \quad w^1 := \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} w_\alpha^1(x) = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} u_\alpha(x_\alpha^1 + \lambda_\alpha^1 x)$$

where

$$\lambda_\alpha^1 = \frac{1}{\max_{B(0,1/2)} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|}$$

and x_α^1 is the point where the maximum is taken on, that is,

$$|\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha(x_\alpha)| = \max_{x \in B(0,1/2)} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha(x)|.$$

Then, $\|\nabla w_\alpha^1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} = |\nabla w_\alpha^1(0)| = 1$. So, by Lemma 4.2.1, w_α^1 converges strongly in $C_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ to the first non-trivial H -sphere w^1 modulo a conformal transformation from $\mathbb{R}^2 \cup \{\infty\}$ onto \mathbb{S}^2 and removing the singularity ∞ , see Lemma 4.2.3.

Then, similarly, we assume that the remaining $n_0 - 1$ many bubbles are produced by sequences

$$w^i := \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} w_\alpha^i = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} u_\alpha(x_\alpha^i + \lambda_\alpha^i x) \quad \text{strongly in } C_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathfrak{S}^i)$$

for some sequences of points $x_\alpha^i \rightarrow 0$ and $\lambda_\alpha^i \rightarrow 0$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$ satisfying the alternative (S1) or (S2), $2 \leq i \leq n_0$. Here, $\mathfrak{S}^i \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ are finite sets consisting of energy concentration points for sequences w_α^i as $\alpha \searrow 1$. By our choice of first bubble, we see

that

$$\lambda_\alpha^1 = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n_0} \{\lambda_\alpha^1, \lambda_\alpha^2, \dots, \lambda_\alpha^{n_0}\}.$$

For notation simplicity, we assume that

$$\lambda_\alpha^{n_0} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n_0} \{\lambda_\alpha^1, \lambda_\alpha^2, \dots, \lambda_\alpha^{n_0}\}$$

and define

$$\tilde{\lambda}_\alpha = \lambda_\alpha^{n_0} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_0-1} |x_\alpha^{n_0} - x_\alpha^i|}{n_0 - 1}.$$

Thanks to the choice of $\tilde{\lambda}_\alpha$ and through a complete similar argument as Claim 1, we also have

Claim 2. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ and $R > 0$ such that

$$(4.3.40) \quad \int_{B(x_\alpha^1, 2t) \setminus B(x_\alpha^1, t)} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 dV_{g_\alpha} \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for any } t \in \left(\frac{\tilde{\lambda}_\alpha R}{2}, 2\delta \right)$$

when $\alpha - 1$ is small enough such that $\tilde{\lambda}_\alpha R \leq \delta$.

Then, we can apply the argument of subsection 4.3.1 in proving the Theorem 4.3.1 to conclude that

$$(4.3.41) \quad \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(x_\alpha^1, \delta)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^\alpha dV_{g_\alpha} = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(0, R)} \left(\tau_\alpha \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha^2 + |\nabla_{\tilde{g}_\alpha} \tilde{u}_\alpha|^2 \right)^\alpha \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha^{2-2\alpha} dV_{\tilde{g}_\alpha} \\ + \text{Vol}(B(0, \delta)) \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \tau_\alpha + \int_{B(0, \delta)} |\nabla u_0|^2 dx,$$

where $\tilde{u}_\alpha(x) := u_\alpha(x_\alpha^1 + \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha x)$,

$$\tilde{g}_\alpha(x) = e^{\varphi_\alpha(x_\alpha^1 + \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha x)} \left((dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2 \right)$$

and u_0 is the weak limit of u_α . Note that as a corollary of Claim 2 there exists a large $R > 0$ such that all the energy concentration points $\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}$ of \tilde{u}_α belongs to $B(0, R)$. Then, \tilde{u}_α converges to some H -surface \tilde{w} strongly in $C_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \tilde{\mathfrak{S}})$. Then, we proceed the induction argument conditionally depending on whether \tilde{w} is trivial or not.

- \tilde{w} is a non-constant H -sphere. Then, there must holds

$$\limsup_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_0-1} |x_\alpha^{n_0} - x_\alpha^i|}{(n_0 - 1)\lambda_\alpha^{n_0}} < \infty$$

Otherwise, there will exists one more bubble which is distinct from w^i for $1 \leq i \leq n_0$ around 0 contradicting the assumption of Theorem 4.3.1. Thus, we see that \tilde{w} is exactly the w^{n_0} after formulating a conformal transformation and

hence

$$\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} (\tilde{\lambda}_\alpha)^{2-2\alpha} = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} (\lambda_\alpha^{n_0})^{2-2\alpha} = \mu_{n_0}.$$

Furthermore, by our choice of $\tilde{\lambda}_\alpha$ we know that the later one of the alternatives (S1) and (S2) must hold, that is, $\lambda_\alpha^i / \lambda_\alpha^{n_0} \rightarrow 0$ as $\alpha \searrow 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n_0 - 1$. Observe that

$$\tilde{u}_\alpha \left(\tilde{x}_\alpha^i + \frac{\lambda_\alpha^i}{\lambda_\alpha^{n_0}} (x - \tilde{x}_\alpha^i) \right) = w_\alpha(x) \rightarrow w^i \text{ as } \alpha \searrow 1,$$

where

$$\tilde{x}_\alpha^i = \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_\alpha - \lambda_\alpha^i} (x_\alpha^i - x_\alpha^i).$$

This means w^1, \dots, w^{n_0-1} are exactly all bubbles of \tilde{u}_α . Now, we consider the functional

$$(4.3.42) \quad \tilde{E}_{\alpha, n_0}^\omega(w) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{B(0, R)} \left(\tau_\alpha \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha^2 + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} w|^2 \right)^\alpha dV_{g_\alpha} + \tau_\alpha^{\alpha-1} \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha^{2\alpha-2} \int_{B(0, R)} w^* \omega.$$

And we can apply the induction assumption to this functional and for sequence $\{\tilde{u}_\alpha\}$ to get

$$(4.3.43) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(0, R)} \left(\tau_\alpha \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha^2 + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} \tilde{u}_\alpha|^2 \right)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla_{\tilde{g}_\alpha} \tilde{u}_\alpha|^2 dV_{\tilde{g}_\alpha} \\ &= E(\tilde{w}, B(0, R)) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_0-1} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \left(\frac{\lambda_\alpha^i}{\tilde{\lambda}_\alpha} \right)^{4-4\alpha} E(w^i). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha^{2-2\alpha} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(0, R)} \left(\tau_\alpha \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha^2 + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} \tilde{u}_\alpha|^2 \right)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla_{\tilde{g}_\alpha} \tilde{u}_\alpha|^2 dV_{\tilde{g}_\alpha} \\ &= \int_{B(x_\alpha^1, \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha R)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 dV_{g_\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

we can conclude that

$$(4.3.44) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(x_\alpha^1, \tilde{\lambda}_\alpha R)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 dV_{g_\alpha} = \mu_{n_0}^2 E(\tilde{w}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_0-1} \mu_i^2 E(w^i).$$

Combining (4.3.41) and (4.3.44), we will get

$$\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(x_\alpha, \delta)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^\alpha dV_{g_\alpha} = \text{Vol}(B(0, \delta)) \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \tau_\alpha + E(u_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \mu_i^2 E(w^i).$$

- \tilde{w} is constant. Then, there are at least two distinct energy concentration points for sequence \tilde{u}_α . This means at each energy concentration point there at most have $n_0 - 1$ many bubbles. And one can apply the induction assumption and utilize a similar argument as the previous case to conclude the desired generalized energy identity stated in Theorem 4.3.1.

Therefore, whether \tilde{w} is trivial or not, both cases contribute to the completion of the proof for Theorem 4.3.1. \square

4.4. Proof of Asymptotic Behavior on Necks—Theorem 4.1.2.

In this subsection, we will examine the convergent behaviors of necks for sequence u_α as $\alpha \searrow 1$ and present the proof of our second main consequence, Theorem 4.1.2. As in the previous Subsection 4.3, it suffices to consider the following simple case to prove the Theorem 4.1.2.

Theorem 4.4.1. *Let $(B(0, 1), g_\alpha) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the unit disk equipped with sequence of conformal metric $g_\alpha = e^{\varphi_\alpha}((dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2)$ and $g = e^\varphi((dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2)$ where $\varphi_\alpha \in C^\infty(B(0, 1))$, $\varphi_\alpha(0) = 0$ for $\alpha > 1$ and $\varphi_\alpha \rightarrow \varphi$ strongly in $C^\infty(\overline{B(0, 1)})$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$. Let $u_\alpha \in C^\infty(B(0, 1), N)$ be a sequence of α -H-surfaces satisfying*

- (a) $\sup_{\alpha > 1} \tilde{E}_\alpha(u_\alpha) \leq \Lambda < \infty$ and $0 < \beta_0 \leq \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \tau_\alpha^{\alpha-1} \leq 1$,
- (b) $u_\alpha \rightarrow u$ strongly in $C_{loc}^\infty(B(0, 1) \setminus \{0\}, \mathbb{R}^K)$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$.

We further assume there is only one bubble $w^1 : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow N$ around $0 \in B(0, 1)$ for sequence u_α as $\alpha \searrow 1$. Let

$$\nu^1 = \liminf_{\alpha \searrow 1} (\lambda_\alpha^1)^{-\sqrt{\alpha-1}}.$$

Then there exists a subsequence of u_α still denoted by u_α , a sequence of points x_α and a sequence of positive numbers λ_α such that the following statements hold:

- (N₁) when $\nu^1 = 1$, the set $u_0(B^M(x_1, 1)) \cup w^1(\mathbb{S}^2)$ is a connected subset of N where u_0 is the weak limit of u_α in $W^{1,2}(M, N)$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$;
- (N₂) when $\nu^1 \in (1, \infty)$, the set $u_0(B^M(x_1, 1))$ and $w^1(\mathbb{S}^2)$ are connected by a geodesic $\Gamma \subset N$ with length

$$L(\Gamma) = \sqrt{\frac{E(w^1)}{\pi}} \log \nu^1;$$

- (N₃) when $\nu^1 = \infty$, the neck contains at least an infinite length geodesic.

4.4.1. No Neck Property for the case $\nu = 1$.

In this subsection, we focus on the case where $\nu = 1$ in Theorem 4.4.1 to demonstrate that the base map and all bubbles are directly connected.

Proof Theorem 4.4.1 when $\nu = 1$. Considering the Remark 4.3.2, similarly to the construction of first bubble described in Subsubsection 4.3.1, let $x_\alpha \in B(0, \delta)$ be the maximum point of $|\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|$ on $\overline{B(0, \delta)}$. Since 0 is the only blow-up point, there must have $\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} x_\alpha = 0$. The first bubble w for α - H -surfaces u_α is constructed by sequence

$$(4.4.1) \quad w := \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} w_\alpha(x) = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} u_\alpha(x_\alpha + \lambda_\alpha x).$$

And $1 \leq \mu \leq \nu = 1$, Theorem 4.1.1 tells us that the energy identity holds, that is,

$$(4.4.2) \quad \lim_{\delta \searrow 0} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx = 0.$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume for each $\alpha > 1$ there is a positive integer k_α such that $\delta = 2^{k_\alpha} \lambda_\alpha R$. For $k = 1, \dots, k_\alpha - 1$ and $0 \leq t \leq \min\{k_\alpha - k, k\}$, we define

$$Q(k, t) = A(2^{k-t} \lambda_\alpha R, 2^{k+t} \lambda_\alpha R, x_\alpha),$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}_{\alpha, k}(t) = \int_{Q(k, t)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx.$$

By the same estimate techniques as in Lemma 4.3.4, as a consequence of (4.3.14) we can obtain

$$(4.4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{Q(k, t)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx &\leq C\varepsilon \int_{Q(k, t)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx + C(\alpha - 1) \int_{Q(k, t+1)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \\ &+ \int_{\partial Q(k, t)} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) ds + \int_{Q(k, t)} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 dx \end{aligned}$$

for any small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ that will be determined later. Next, we want to utilizing Pohozaev identity (4.2.16) obtained in Lemma 4.2.6 to control the term

$$\int_{Q(k, t)} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 dx$$

occurring in righthand of (4.4.3). Integrating

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial B(x_\alpha, s)} \left(\left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 - \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 \right) ds \\ = -\frac{2(\alpha - 1)}{s} \int_{B(x_\alpha, s)} \frac{\nabla |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 \nabla u_\alpha}{\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2} \cdot |x - x_\alpha| \cdot \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} dx. \end{aligned}$$

with respect to s from $2^{k-t} \lambda_\alpha R$ to $2^{k+t} \lambda_\alpha R$, we can get

$$\int_{Q(k, t)} \left(\left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 - \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 \right) ds$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= - \int_{2^{k-t}\lambda_\alpha R}^{2^{k+t}\lambda_\alpha R} \left(\frac{2(\alpha-1)}{s} \int_{B(x_\alpha, s)} \frac{\nabla |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 \nabla u_\alpha}{\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2} \cdot |x - x_\alpha| \cdot \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} dx \right) ds \\
&\leq C \int_{2^{k-t}\lambda_\alpha R}^{2^{k+t}\lambda_\alpha R} \frac{2(\alpha-1)}{s} \left(\int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} |x - x_\alpha| \cdot |\nabla_{g_\alpha}^2 u_\alpha| \cdot \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right| dx \right) ds \\
(4.4.4) \quad &+ \int_{2^{k-t}\lambda_\alpha R}^{2^{k+t}\lambda_\alpha R} \frac{2(\alpha-1)}{s} \left(\int_{B(x_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha R)} |x - x_\alpha| \cdot |\nabla_{g_\alpha}^2 u_\alpha| \cdot \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right| dx \right) ds
\end{aligned}$$

For the first integral in the righthand of (4.4.4), utilizing the energy identity (4.4.2) and together with the small energy identity Lemma 4.2.1, when $\alpha - 1$ is small we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{2^{k-t}\lambda_\alpha R}^{2^{k+t}\lambda_\alpha R} \frac{2(\alpha-1)}{s} \left(\int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} |x - x_\alpha| \cdot |\nabla_{g_\alpha}^2 u_\alpha| \cdot \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right| dx \right) ds \\
&\leq \int_{2^{k-t}\lambda_\alpha R}^{2^{k+t}\lambda_\alpha R} \frac{2(\alpha-1)}{s} \left(\int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R/2, 2\delta, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \right) ds \\
(4.4.5) \quad &\leq C(\alpha-1) \int_{2^{k-t}\lambda_\alpha R}^{2^{k+t}\lambda_\alpha R} \frac{1}{s} ds \leq C(\alpha-1)t.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second integral in the righthand of (4.4.4), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{2^{k-t}\lambda_\alpha R}^{2^{k+t}\lambda_\alpha R} \frac{2(\alpha-1)}{s} \left(\int_{B(x_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha R)} |x - x_\alpha| \cdot |\nabla_{g_\alpha}^2 u_\alpha| \cdot \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right| dx \right) ds \\
&= \int_{2^{k-t}\lambda_\alpha R}^{2^{k+t}\lambda_\alpha R} \frac{2(\alpha-1)}{s} \left(\int_{B(0, R)} |x| \cdot |\nabla_{g_\alpha}^2 w_\alpha| \cdot |\nabla w_\alpha| dx \right) ds \\
(4.4.6) \quad &\leq C(\alpha-1) \int_{2^{k-t}\lambda_\alpha R}^{2^{k+t}\lambda_\alpha R} \frac{1}{s} ds \leq C(\alpha-1)t.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we used that the α -energy of u_α is uniformly bounded in estimates (4.4.5) and (4.4.6). Plugging (4.4.5) and (4.4.6) into (4.4.4) and keeping in mind that (4.2.15), we obtain

$$(4.4.7) \quad \int_{Q(k,t)} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q(k,t)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx + C(\alpha-1)t$$

for small enough $\alpha - 1$. Combining inequalities (4.4.3) and (4.4.7), we obtain

$$(4.4.8) \quad \left(\frac{1}{2} - C\varepsilon \right) \int_{Q(k,t)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \leq \int_{\partial Q(k,t)} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) ds + C(\alpha-1)(t+1)$$

where we choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $C\varepsilon < 1/4$. Furthermore, for the boundary term in (4.4.8) we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\partial Q(k,t)} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \cdot (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) ds \\
&= \int_{\partial Q(k,t)} \sqrt{|x - x_\alpha|} \cdot \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \cdot (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{|x - x_\alpha|}} ds \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{\partial Q(k,t)} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 \cdot |x - x_\alpha| ds + \int_{\partial Q(k,t)} |u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*|^2 \cdot \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|} ds \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{\partial Q(k,t)} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 \cdot |x - x_\alpha| ds + \int_{\partial Q(k,t)} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 \cdot \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|} ds \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial Q(k,t)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 \cdot |x - x_\alpha| ds \\
(4.4.9) \quad &= 2^{k+t-1} \lambda_\alpha R \int_{\partial B(x_\alpha, 2^{k+t} \lambda_\alpha R)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 ds - 2^{k-t-1} \lambda_\alpha R \int_{\partial B(x_\alpha, 2^{k-t} \lambda_\alpha R)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall the definition of $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,k}(t)$, (4.4.9) tells us that

$$(4.4.10) \quad \int_{\partial Q(k,t)} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) ds \leq \frac{1}{2 \log 2} \mathcal{F}'_{\alpha,k}(t).$$

Thus, plugging the (4.4.10) into (4.4.8) we get

$$(1 - C\varepsilon) \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,k}(t) \leq \frac{1}{\log 2} \mathcal{F}'_{\alpha,k}(t) + C(\alpha - 1)(t + 1)$$

Let $\sigma = 1 - C\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, multiplying the both side of above inequality by $2^{-\sigma t}$ yields

$$(2^{-\sigma t} \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,k}(t))' \geq -2^{-\sigma t} C(\alpha - 1)(t + 1).$$

Integrating from 2 to T for some $T \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,k}(2) \leq C 2^{-\sigma T} \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,k}(T) + C(\alpha - 1).$$

Let $T = T_k := \min\{k, k_\alpha - k\}$, then we get

$$\int_{Q(k,2)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \leq C 2^{-\sigma T_k} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R/2, 2\delta, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx + C(\alpha - 1).$$

Thus, by small energy regularity Lemma 4.2.1, we have

$$Osc_{Q(k,1)}(u_\alpha) \leq \left(\int_{Q(k,2)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$\leq C 2^{-\frac{\sigma}{2} T_k} \left(\int_{A(\frac{\lambda_\alpha R}{2}, 2\delta, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C \sqrt{\alpha - 1}.$$

which implies

$$(4.4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} OSC_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)}(u_\alpha) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{k_\alpha} OSC_{Q(k,1)}(u_\alpha) \\ &\leq C \left(\int_{A(\frac{\lambda_\alpha R}{2}, 2\delta, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C \sqrt{\alpha - 1} (\log \delta - \log(\lambda_\alpha R)) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, keeping in mind that $\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \lambda_\alpha^{-\sqrt{\alpha-1}} = \nu = 1$ we can conclude that

$$\lim_{\delta \searrow 0} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} OSC_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)}(u_\alpha) = 0$$

which shows that the set $u_0(B(0,1)) \cup w^1(\mathbb{S}^2)$ is a connected subset of N , as desired in part (N_1) of Theorem 4.4.1. \square

4.4.2. Asymptotic Neck Analysis and Length Formula for $\nu > 1$.

In this subsection, if $1 < \nu < \infty$ we demonstrate that the neck domain converges to a geodesic of finite length in N , allowing us to derive the formula for the length of this geodesic. And if $\nu = \infty$, we prove that the neck domain converges to a geodesic of infinite length. These cases present a higher level of complexity, necessitating the introduction of several preliminary lemmas before proving the main consequences.

First, we note that

Lemma 4.4.2. *With same hypothesis as Theorem 4.4.1 and the assumption $\nu > 1$, we have*

$$\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \left\| (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \right\|_{C^0(B(0,1/2))} = \mu.$$

Proof. Since we have assumed there is only one bubble, there exists $x_\alpha \in B(0,1/2)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha} := \max_{x \in B(0,1/2)} |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha(x)| = |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha(x_\alpha)|$$

for small enough $\alpha - 1$. On the one hand,

$$\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \left\| (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \right\|_{C^0(B(0,1/2))} \geq \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \|\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha\|_{C^0(B(0,1/2))}^{2\alpha-2} = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \lambda_\alpha^{2-2\alpha} = \mu.$$

On the other hand, recalling we have assumed $\tau_\alpha \leq 1$ for $\alpha > 1$ we estimate

$$\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \left\| (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \right\|_{C^0(B(0,1/2))} \leq \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \|2\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha\|_{C^0(B(0,1/2))}^{2\alpha-2} = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \lambda_\alpha^{2-2\alpha} = \mu.$$

\square

First, similarly to the estimates in Lemma 4.3.4, we establish a more delicate decay estimates of angle component of the energy functional of u_α as $\alpha \searrow 1$, more precise description is following.

Proposition 4.4.3. *With same hypothesises as Theorem 4.4.1, we further assume $\nu > 1$. Then for any sequence $t_\alpha \in [t_1, t_2]$ where $0 < t_1 \leq t_2 < 1$ and any $R > 0$, after choosing a subsequence, we have*

$$(4.4.12) \quad \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}/R, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha} R, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx = 0.$$

Proof. The proof splits into two steps.

Step 1. Firstly, we prove a weaker version of this Proposition 4.4.3, that is, we show that for any positive integer k , there exists a constant C that is independent of k such that

$$(4.4.13) \quad \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \int_{A(2^{-k} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, 2^k \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx \leq C.$$

Taking a small enough positive number $\gamma < \min\{t_1, 1 - t_2\}$ and $t \leq \log \lambda_\alpha^{-\gamma} / \log 2$ we can define

$$Q(t) := A(2^{-t} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, 2^t \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha).$$

Transforming the integral domain of (4.4.3) over $Q(t)$, we can obtain

$$(4.4.14) \quad \begin{aligned} (1 - C\varepsilon) \int_{Q(t)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx &\leq C(\alpha - 1) \int_{Q(t+1)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \\ &+ \int_{\partial Q(t)} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) ds + \int_{Q(t)} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Next, similarly to the proof in the proof of Theorem 4.4.1 for case $\nu = 1$ in Subsubsection 4.4.1, we want to utilizing Pohozaev identity (4.2.21) obtained in Lemma 4.2.6 to establish a more delicate estimates of the term

$$\int_{Q(t)} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 dx$$

occurring in righthand of (4.4.3). Integrating

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\partial B(x_\alpha, s)} \left(\left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 - |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 \right) ds \\ &= -\frac{(\alpha - 1)}{s} \int_{B(x_\alpha, s)} \frac{\nabla |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 \nabla u_\alpha}{\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2} \cdot |x - x_\alpha| \cdot \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} dx \end{aligned}$$

with respect to s from $2^{-t}\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}$ to $2^t\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}$ with respect to t , we can get

$$(4.4.15) \quad \int_{Q(t)} \left(\left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 - |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 \right) dx \\ = - \int_{2^{-t}\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}}^{2^t\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}} \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{s} \int_{B(x_\alpha, s)} \frac{\nabla |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 \nabla u_\alpha}{\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2} \cdot |x - x_\alpha| \cdot \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} dx \right) ds.$$

Combining (4.4.14) and (4.4.15) we have

$$(4.4.16) \quad \left(\frac{1}{2} - C\varepsilon \right) \int_{Q(t)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \leq C(\alpha-1) \int_{Q(t+1)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \\ + \int_{\partial Q(t)} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) ds + \int_{2^{-t}\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}}^{2^t\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}} \frac{\alpha-1}{s} I_\alpha(s) ds,$$

where we choose small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $C\varepsilon \leq 1/4$ and we denote

$$I_\alpha(t) := - \int_{B(x_\alpha, t)} \frac{\nabla |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 \nabla u_\alpha}{\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2} \cdot |x - x_\alpha| \cdot \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} dx.$$

For any $2^{-t}\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha} \leq r \leq 2^t\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}$, utilizing Lemma 4.3.3 we get that

$$|I(r) - I(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha})| \leq C \int_{A(2^{-t}\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, 2^t\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} |\nabla_{g_\alpha}^2 u_\alpha| \cdot |x - x_\alpha| \cdot |\nabla u_\alpha| dx \\ = C \int_{A(2^{-t-1}\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, 2^{t+1}\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \\ \leq C \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha+\gamma}, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha-\gamma}, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx := \eta(\gamma, \alpha),$$

where in the last inequality we used the choice of $t \leq \log \lambda_\alpha^{-\gamma} / \log 2$. Next, we show that $\eta(\gamma, \alpha) \rightarrow 0$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$ and $\gamma \rightarrow 0$. To see this, by transforming the integral domain from $[2^{k-t}\lambda_\alpha R, 2^{k+t}\lambda_\alpha R]$ into $[\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha+\gamma}, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha-\gamma}]$ in (4.4.4), we have

$$\int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha+\gamma}, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha-\gamma}, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 dx \\ \leq \frac{1}{2\alpha} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha+\gamma}, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha-\gamma}, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \\ + \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \int_{\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha+\gamma}}^{\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha-\gamma}} \frac{1}{t} \left(\int_{B(x_\alpha, t)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \right) dt \\ + C\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha-2\gamma} \\ \leq \frac{1}{2\alpha} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha+\gamma}, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha-\gamma}, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx$$

$$(4.4.17) \quad + C(\alpha - 1)\gamma \log(\lambda_\alpha) + C\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha - 2\gamma}.$$

Keeping in mind that Lemma 4.4.2, given $0 < \varepsilon < 1/8$ choosing $\alpha - 1$ small enough such that

$$\left| \left\| (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \right\|_{C^0(B(x_\alpha, \delta))} - \mu \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2},$$

plugging this into (4.4.17) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(\gamma, \alpha) &= \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha + \gamma}, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha - \gamma}, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon \right) \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha + \gamma}, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha - \gamma}, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx + C \frac{(\alpha - 1)}{\mu} \gamma \log(\lambda_\alpha) \\ &\quad + \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha + \gamma}, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha - \gamma}, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx + \frac{C}{\mu} \lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha - 2\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$(4.4.18) \quad \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} |I(r) - I(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha})| \leq \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \eta(\gamma, \alpha) = 0,$$

by recalling the Lemma 4.3.4. Therefore, by (4.4.18) and (4.4.16) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{2} - C\varepsilon \right) \int_{Q(t)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx &\leq \int_{\partial Q(t)} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) ds + C(\alpha - 1) \int_{Q(t+1)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \\ &\quad + (I(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) + \eta(\gamma, \alpha)) \int_{2^{-t}\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}}^{2^t\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}} \frac{\alpha - 1}{t} dt \\ &\leq \int_{\partial Q(t)} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) ds + C(\alpha - 1)\eta(\gamma, \alpha) \\ (4.4.19) \quad &\quad + 2\log(2)(\alpha - 1) (I(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) + \eta(\gamma, \alpha)) t. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\mathcal{F}_\alpha(t) := \int_{Q(t)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx,$$

then by (4.4.10) we can rewrite (4.4.19) as

$$(1 - C\varepsilon)\mathcal{F}_\alpha(t) \leq \frac{1}{\log 2} \mathcal{F}'_\alpha(t) + 4\log(2)(\alpha - 1)I(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha})t + C(\alpha - 1)\eta(\gamma, \alpha)(t + 1),$$

which implies

$$(4.4.20) \quad (2^{-\sigma t} \mathcal{F}_\alpha(t))' \geq -4\log^2(2)(\alpha - 1)2^{-\sigma t} I(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha})t - C(\alpha - 1)2^{-\sigma t} \eta(\gamma, \alpha)(t + 1),$$

where $\sigma = 1 - C\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ is a constant. Letting $2^T = \lambda_\alpha^{-\gamma}$ and integrating above inequality (4.4.20) from k to T yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_\alpha(k) &\leq 2^{\sigma(k-T)} \mathcal{F}_\alpha(T) + \frac{4 \log(2)}{\sigma} (\alpha - 1) I(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) 2^{\sigma k} \int_k^T 2^{-\sigma t} t dt \\
&\quad + C(\alpha - 1) \eta(\gamma, \alpha) 2^{\sigma k} \int_k^T (t + 1) 2^{-\sigma t} dt \\
&\leq 2^{\sigma(k-T)} \mathcal{F}_\alpha(T) + \frac{4 \log(2) k}{\sigma} (\alpha - 1) I(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) \\
(4.4.21) \quad &\quad + C(\alpha - 1) (I(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) + \eta(\gamma, \alpha)(k + 1)),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the estimates

$$\int_k^T 2^{-\sigma t} t dt \leq \frac{k}{\sigma \log(2)} 2^{-\sigma k} + \left(\frac{1}{\sigma \log(2)} \right)^2 2^{-\sigma k}.$$

On the other hand, utilizing the Pohozaev identity (4.2.16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{Q(k)} \left(\left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 - \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 \right) dx &= 2 \int_{2^{-k} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}}^{2^k \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}} \frac{\alpha - 1}{t} I_\alpha(t) dt \\
(4.4.22) \quad &\geq 4 \log(2) k (\alpha - 1) (I_\alpha(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) - \eta(\gamma, \alpha)).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, subtracting (4.4.21) by (4.4.22) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
2 \int_{Q(k)} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx &\leq 2^{\sigma k} \lambda_\alpha^{\gamma \sigma} \mathcal{F}_\alpha(T) + (\alpha - 1) 4 \log(2) I_\alpha(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) \left(\frac{1}{\sigma} - 1 \right) k \\
(4.4.23) \quad &\quad + C(\alpha - 1) I(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) + C(\alpha - 1) \eta(\gamma, \alpha) k.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\nu = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \lambda_\alpha^{-\sqrt{\alpha-1}} > 1$, one have

$$\lambda_\alpha^{\gamma \sigma} = o((\alpha - 1)^m) \quad \text{as } \alpha \searrow 1,$$

for any positive integer $m > 0$. Then in (4.4.23), taking $\alpha \searrow 1$ first, then $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, yields

$$(4.4.24) \quad \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \int_{A(2^{-k} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, 2^k \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx \leq C \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} I(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) \leq C,$$

for some universal constant $C > 0$ independent of k .

Step 2. Next, we prove the assertion of Proposition 4.4.3, that is, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \int_{A(2^{-k} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, 2^k \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx = 0.$$

Utilizing Fubini's theorem we rewrite (4.4.24) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \int_{A(2^{-k}\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, 2^k\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx \\ &= \int_{2^{-k}\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}}^{2^k\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta}(r, \theta) \right|^2 d\theta \right) \frac{dr}{|x - x_\alpha|} \leq C, \end{aligned}$$

thus given any small $\varepsilon > 0$ there will always exist a large enough positive integer k_0 , which is independent of $\alpha > 1$, and $L_\alpha \in [2^{k_0}, 2^{k_0+1}]$ such that

$$(4.4.25) \quad \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta}(L_\alpha \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \theta) \right|^2 d\theta < \varepsilon$$

and

$$(4.4.26) \quad \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \left(\frac{1}{L_\alpha} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \theta \right) \right|^2 d\theta < \varepsilon.$$

From these two estimates (4.4.25) and (4.4.26), we can obtain a more delicate estimate of (4.4.9)

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\partial A(\frac{1}{L_\alpha} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, L_\alpha \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) ds \\ & \leq \left(\int_{\partial A(\frac{1}{L_\alpha} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, L_\alpha \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} |x - x_\alpha| \cdot \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \quad \left(\int_{\partial A(\frac{1}{L_\alpha} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, L_\alpha \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ (4.4.27) \quad & \leq \sqrt{(\alpha - 1)\varepsilon} \left(\int_{\partial A(\frac{1}{L_\alpha} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, L_\alpha \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} |x - x_\alpha| \cdot \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using (4.2.10) and Corollary 4.3.5 we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\partial A(\frac{1}{L_\alpha} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, L_\alpha \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} |x - x_\alpha| \cdot \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 ds \\ & \leq C \int_{\partial A(\frac{1}{L_\alpha} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, L_\alpha \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 ds \\ & \quad + C(\alpha - 1) + C\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$(4.4.28) \quad \int_{\partial A(\frac{1}{L_\alpha} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, L_\alpha \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} (u_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) ds \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon}(\alpha - 1).$$

Applying (4.4.28) to (4.4.19), we can obtain a more refined estimate

$$(4.4.29) \quad \begin{aligned} (1 - C\varepsilon) \int_{A(\frac{1}{L_\alpha} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, L_\alpha \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx &\leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon}(\alpha - 1) + C(\alpha - 1)\eta(\gamma, \alpha) (\log(L_\alpha) + 1) \\ &+ 4 \log(L_\alpha)t(\alpha - 1)I(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}). \end{aligned}$$

Similar to (4.4.22), we have

$$(4.4.30) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{A(\frac{1}{L_\alpha} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, L_\alpha \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} \left(\left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right|^2 - \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 \right) dx \\ \geq 4(\alpha - 1) \log(L_\alpha)I(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) - C(\alpha - 1)\eta(\gamma, \alpha) \log(L_\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting (4.4.29) by (4.4.30) yields

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \int_{A(\frac{1}{L_\alpha} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, L_\alpha \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx \\ \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon}(\alpha - 1) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 - C\varepsilon} \right) 4(\alpha - 1) \log(L_\alpha)I(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) \\ + C(\alpha - 1)\eta(\gamma, \alpha) (\log(L_\alpha) + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the choice of $\log(L_\alpha) \in [\log(2)k_0, \log(2)(k_0 + 1)]$ and the fact (4.4.18), taking $\alpha \searrow 1$ firstly and then letting $\varepsilon \searrow 0$ will yield the assertion of Proposition 4.4.3 immediately. \square

As a corollary, we have the following observation which will be used later.

Corollary 4.4.4. *With the same hypothesis as Proposition 4.4.3. For any fixed $R > 0$ and $0 < t_1 < t_2 < 1$, we have*

$$\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \sup_{t \in [t_1, t_2]} \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \int_{A(\frac{1}{R} \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha} R, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx = 0.$$

Proof. We prove by contradiction. If the assertion fails, then after choosing a subsequence there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t_{\alpha_k} \rightarrow t_0$ for some $t_0 \in [t_1, t_2]$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \int_{A(\frac{1}{R} \lambda_{\alpha_k}^{t_{\alpha_k}}, \lambda_{\alpha_k}^{t_{\alpha_k}} R, x_{\alpha_k})} \frac{1}{|x - x_{\alpha_k}|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx \geq \varepsilon_0$$

However, Proposition 4.4.3 tells us that

$$\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \int_{A(\frac{1}{R}\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha} R, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x - x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx = 0.$$

for any sequence $\{t_\alpha\}_{\alpha \searrow 1} \subset [t_1, t_2]$. This is a contradiction. \square

Note that by Lemma 4.3.6, we find that for any $0 < t_1 \leq t \leq t_2 < 1$

$$\begin{aligned} Osc_{\partial B(x_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha^t)}(u_\alpha) &\leq C \left(\int_{A(\frac{1}{2}\lambda_\alpha^t, 2\lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \int_{A(\frac{1}{2}\lambda_\alpha^t, 2\lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \alpha \searrow 1. \end{aligned}$$

which implies the $u_\alpha(\partial B(x_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha^t))$ converges to some point of N as $\alpha \searrow 1$.

Proposition 4.4.5. *With same hypotheses as Theorem 4.4.1, we further assume $\nu > 1$. Then for any sequence $t_\alpha \in [t_1, t_2]$ where $0 < t_1 \leq t_2 < 1$ and any $R > 0$, after choosing a subsequence, we have*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha - 1}} \left(u_\alpha(x_\alpha + \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha} x) - u(x_\alpha + (\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, 0)) \right) \rightarrow \vec{a} \log |x|$$

strongly in $C^2(A(\frac{1}{R}, R, 0), \mathbb{R}^K)$ for any $R > 0$ and any integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$, here

$$y = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} u_\alpha(\partial B(x_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}))$$

and

$$\vec{a} \in T_y N \subset T_y \mathbb{R}^K \cong \mathbb{R}^K$$

is a vector in \mathbb{R}^K satisfying

$$|\vec{a}| = \mu^{1 - \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} t_\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{E(w^1)}{\pi}}.$$

Proof. Let

$$u'_\alpha(x) := u_\alpha(x_\alpha + \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha} x) \quad \text{and} \quad v_\alpha(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha - 1}} \left(u_\alpha(x_\alpha + \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha} x) - u(x_\alpha + (\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, 0)) \right).$$

By (4.4.21) and small energy regularity Lemma 4.2.1, recalling $\lambda_\alpha^\gamma = o((\alpha - 1)^m)$ for all $\gamma > 0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\|\nabla u'_\alpha\|_{C^0(A(2^{-k}, 2^k, 0))} + \|\nabla^2 u'_\alpha\|_{C^0(A(2^{-k}, 2^k, 0))} \leq C(k) \sqrt{\alpha - 1}$$

which further implies

$$\|\nabla v_\alpha\|_{C^0(A(2^{-k}, 2^k, 0))} + \|\nabla^2 v_\alpha\|_{C^0(A(2^{-k}, 2^k, 0))} \leq C(k),$$

for some constant $C(k)$ depending on k . Since $v_\alpha(1, 0) = 0$, the above estimate implies

$$\|v_\alpha\|_{C^0(A(2^{-k}, 2^k, 0))} \leq C(k).$$

By the Euler-Lagrange equation (4.2.1) of u_α , one can check that v_α satisfies the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta v_\alpha + \sqrt{\alpha - 1}A(\nabla v_\alpha, \nabla v_\alpha) + (\alpha - 1)O(|\nabla^2 v_\alpha|) \\ = \sqrt{\alpha - 1}H(\nabla^\perp v_\alpha, \nabla v_\alpha) + \sqrt{\alpha - 1}o(1) \end{aligned}$$

where $o(1)$ tends to 0 as $\alpha \searrow 1$. By the compactness of PDE's theory, there exists a subsequence of v_α , which is still denoted by v_α , such that

$$v_\alpha \rightarrow v_0 \quad \text{in } C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\})$$

where v_0 is a harmonic function on \mathbb{R}^2 . Moreover, by Proposition 4.4.3, the angel component energy of v_0 vanishes, that is, $v_0(x) = v_0(|x|)$. Thus, v_0 is a fundamental solution of Laplacian equation over \mathbb{R}^2 , without loss of generality we can write v_0 as

$$v_0 = \vec{a} \log r = (a_1, \dots, a_K) \log r, \quad \text{for some vector } \vec{a} \in T_y N \subset \mathbb{R}^K$$

From (4.2.10), we know that v_α satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial B(0,t)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla v_\alpha|^2 ds \\ = \frac{2\alpha}{(2\alpha - 1)} \int_{\partial B(0,t)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \frac{1}{|x|^2} \left| \frac{\partial v_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 ds \\ + \frac{2}{(2\alpha - 1)t} \int_{B(0,t)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx + \frac{O(t)}{\alpha - 1}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, 2\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla v_\alpha|^2 dx \\ = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{2\alpha}{(2\alpha - 1)} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, 2\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \frac{1}{|x|^2} \left| \frac{\partial v_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx \\ + \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{2}{(2\alpha - 1)} \int_{\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}}^{2\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}} \frac{1}{t} \left(\int_{B(0,t)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \right) dt \\ + \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{O(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha})}{\alpha - 1} \\ (4.4.31) \quad = 2 \log 2\mu^{1-\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} t_\alpha} \Lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we used Lemma 4.3.6 and Proposition 4.4.3. On the other hand, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, 2\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla v_\alpha|^2 dx \\
&= \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{A(1,2,0)} \left(\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} v_\alpha|^2 \frac{\alpha-1}{\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha}} \right)^{\alpha-1} |\nabla v_\alpha|^2 dx \\
(4.4.32) \quad &= 2\pi \log 2 |\vec{a}|^2 \mu^{\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} t_\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, combining above two identities (4.4.31) and (4.4.32) we have

$$|\vec{a}|^2 = \frac{\Lambda}{\pi} \mu^{1-2\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} t_\alpha}.$$

This completes the proof the Proposition 4.4.5. \square

As a corollary of above Proposition 4.4.5, we can obtain the following result.

Corollary 4.4.6. *Under the same assumption of Proposition 4.4.5, the following holds*

(1) *For the radical direction, we have*

$$\int_{\lambda_\alpha^t}^{2\lambda_\alpha^t} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right| dr \rightarrow \log 2 \mu^{1-t} \sqrt{\frac{E(w)}{\pi}} \quad \text{in } C^0([t_1, t_2]),$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \left(r \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right| \right) (\lambda_\alpha^t, \theta) \rightarrow \mu^{1-t} \sqrt{\frac{E(w)}{\pi}} \quad \text{in } C^0([t_1, t_2]);$$

(2) *For the angular direction, we have*

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \left(\frac{1}{r} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right| \right) (\lambda_\alpha^t, \theta) d\theta \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } C^0([t_1, t_2])$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \left(\frac{1}{r} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right| \right) (\lambda_\alpha^t, \theta) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } C^0([t_1, t_2])$$

Proof. We only prove the angular direction case (2), the other statements in (1) can be argued similarly and the proof can be found in [LW10, JLZ22]. For the case (2), it suffices to show the second assertion

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \left(\frac{1}{r} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right| \right) (\lambda_\alpha^t, \theta) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } C^0([t_1, t_2]),$$

since the first one of (2) is a direct corollary of the second one. By contradiction, if it fails, then there exists a sequence $t_\alpha \in [t_1, t_2]$ and $\theta_\alpha \in [0, 2\pi]$ such that

$$(4.4.33) \quad \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \left(\frac{1}{r} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right| \right) (\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \theta_\alpha) \right| \geq \varepsilon_0 > 0$$

for some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. But, Proposition 4.4.5 tells us that for any $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right) (\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \theta) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } C^2 \text{ as } \alpha \searrow 1$$

which contradicts to (4.4.33) by the compactness of $\theta_\alpha \in [0, 2\pi]$ modulo some subsequences. Thus, we complete the proof of Corollary 4.4.6. \square

Next, we show the necks of α - H -surfaces u_α converges to a geodesic, that is, the base map u_0 and single bubble w are connected by some geodesic. To this end, we define the following curve

$$\gamma_\alpha(r) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u_\alpha(r, \theta) d\theta : [\lambda_\alpha^{t_2}, \lambda_\alpha^{t_1}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$$

where (r, θ) is the polar coordinate around x_α . We denote the image of γ_α by $\Gamma_\alpha \subset N$. For convenience, we use the following notation

$$\dot{\gamma}_\alpha := \frac{d\gamma_\alpha}{dr}, \quad \ddot{\gamma}_\alpha := \frac{d^2\gamma_\alpha}{dr^2}.$$

We directly compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{\gamma}_\alpha &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\partial^2 u_\alpha}{\partial r^2} d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\partial^2 u_\alpha}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial^2 u_\alpha}{\partial \theta^2} d\theta - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \Delta u_\alpha d\theta - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} d\theta \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} A(u_\alpha) (\nabla u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha) d\theta \\ &\quad - \frac{(\alpha-1)}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\nabla |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 \cdot \nabla u_\alpha}{\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2} d\theta \\ (4.4.34) \quad &\quad + \frac{\tau_\alpha^{\alpha-1}}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{H(u_\alpha) (\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha)}{\alpha (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1}} d\theta - \frac{\dot{\gamma}_\alpha}{r}. \end{aligned}$$

We use h_α to denote the induced metric upon Γ_α in \mathbb{R}^K and A_{Γ_α} to denote the second fundamental form restricted on Γ_α . Equipped with these notations, we have

Lemma 4.4.7. *For any $\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha} \in [\lambda_\alpha^{t_2}, \lambda_\alpha^{t_1}]$, after choosing a subsequence, there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\gamma}_\alpha(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) &= \frac{\sqrt{\alpha-1}}{\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}} (\vec{a} + o(1)), \\ h_\alpha \left(\frac{d}{dr}, \frac{d}{dr} \right) &= |\dot{\gamma}_\alpha|^2 = \frac{\alpha-1}{\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha}} (|\vec{a}|^2 + o(1)) \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.4.35) \quad A_{\Gamma_\alpha}(\nabla\gamma_\alpha, \nabla\gamma_\alpha) = \frac{\alpha-1}{\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha}} (A(y)(\vec{a}, \vec{a}) + o(1)),$$

where \vec{a} and y are constructed in Proposition 4.4.5 and $o(1) \rightarrow 0$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$. Moreover, for any $t \in [t_1, t_2]$, there exists a positive constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\|A_{\Gamma_\alpha}\|_{h_\alpha}(\lambda_\alpha^t) \leq C.$$

Proof. For any $\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha} \in [\lambda_\alpha^{t_2}, \lambda_\alpha^{t_1}]$, by Proposition 4.4.5, we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \left(u_\alpha(x_\alpha + \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha} x) - u(x_\alpha + (\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, 0)) \right) \rightarrow \vec{a} \log|x|, \quad \text{as } \alpha \searrow 1$$

where $\vec{a} \in T_y N \subset T_y \mathbb{R}^K = \mathbb{R}^K$ is a vector in \mathbb{R}^K satisfying

$$|\vec{a}| = \mu^{1-\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} t_\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{E(w^1)}{\pi}}$$

and $y = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} u_\alpha(\partial B(x_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha})) = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} u_\alpha(x_\alpha + \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha} e^{i\theta})$. Then we have

$$\dot{\gamma}_\alpha(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \theta) d\theta = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha-1}}{\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}} (\vec{a} + o(1))$$

and hence

$$h_\alpha \left(\frac{d}{dr}, \frac{d}{dr} \right) = |\dot{\gamma}_\alpha|^2 = \frac{\alpha-1}{\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha}} (|\vec{a}|^2 + o(1))$$

where $o(1) \rightarrow 0$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$. Let

$$G_\alpha = -\ddot{\gamma}_\alpha - \frac{\dot{\gamma}_\alpha}{r}$$

and by equation(4.4.34), Proposition 4.4.5, Corollary 4.4.6 and the assumption $0 < \beta_0 \leq \lambda_\alpha^{\alpha-1} \leq 1$ we can further compute that

$$\begin{aligned} G_\alpha(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} A(u_\alpha) (\nabla u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha) d\theta + \frac{(\alpha-1)}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\nabla |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2 \cdot \nabla u_\alpha}{\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2} d\theta \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\alpha\pi} \tau_\alpha^{\alpha-1} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{H(u_\alpha)(\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha)}{(\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1}} d\theta \\ &= \frac{\alpha-1}{\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha}} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} A(y)(\vec{a}, \vec{a}) d\theta + o(1) \right) + (\alpha-1) \int_0^{2\pi} O(|\nabla_{g_\alpha}^2 u_\alpha|) d\theta \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} O(|H(u_\alpha)(\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha)|) d\theta \\ &= \frac{\alpha-1}{\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha}} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} A(y)(\vec{a}, \vec{a}) d\theta + \sqrt{\alpha-1} \int_0^{2\pi} O\left(\frac{\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha} |\nabla_{g_\alpha}^2 u_\alpha|}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}}\right) d\theta + o(1) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha-1}{2\pi \lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha}} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha}}{\alpha-1} O\left(\left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right| \frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right| \right) d\theta \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\alpha - 1}{\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha}} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} A(y)(\vec{a}, \vec{a}) d\theta + \sqrt{\alpha - 1} \int_0^{2\pi} O(|\nabla_{g_\alpha}^2 v_\alpha|) d\theta + o(1) \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\alpha - 1}{\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha}} \int_0^{2\pi} O \left(\left| \frac{\partial v_\alpha}{\partial r} \right| (\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \theta) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{r} \left| \frac{\partial v_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right| \right) (\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \theta) \right) d\theta \\
&= \frac{\alpha - 1}{\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha}} (A(y)(\vec{a}, \vec{a}) + O(\sqrt{\alpha - 1}) + o(1)) \\
&= \frac{\alpha - 1}{\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha}} (A(y)(\vec{a}, \vec{a}) + o(1)).
\end{aligned}$$

Because $\langle A(y)(\vec{a}, \vec{a}), \vec{a} \rangle = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-A_{\Gamma_\alpha}(\nabla \gamma_\alpha, \nabla \gamma_\alpha) &= \ddot{\gamma}_\alpha - \frac{\langle \ddot{\gamma}_\alpha, \dot{\gamma}_\alpha \rangle}{|\dot{\gamma}_\alpha|^2} \dot{\gamma}_\alpha = -G_\alpha + \frac{\langle G_\alpha, \dot{\gamma}_\alpha \rangle}{|\dot{\gamma}_\alpha|^2} \dot{\gamma}_\alpha \\
&= -\frac{\alpha - 1}{\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha}} (A(y)(\vec{a}, \vec{a}) + o(1)).
\end{aligned}$$

which implies $\|A_{\Gamma_\alpha}\|_{h_\alpha}(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) < \infty$. Since $t_\alpha \in [t_1, t_2]$ is a arbitrary sequence, by a contradiction argument similar to Corollary 4.4.6 we will obtain that for any $t \in [t_1, t_2]$

$$\|A_{\Gamma_\alpha}\|_{h_\alpha}(\lambda_\alpha^t) \leq C,$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 4.4.7. \square

Lemma 4.4.8. *After choosing a subsequence, the sequence of curves $\Gamma_\alpha \subset \mathbb{R}^K$, which is defined by γ_α and parametrized by its arc length, converges to geodesic $a \gamma : [0, L] \rightarrow (N, h)$ for some $L \in \mathbb{R}_+$, that is, γ satisfies the following equation*

$$\frac{d^2 \gamma}{ds^2} + A(\gamma) \left(\frac{d\gamma}{ds}, \frac{d\gamma}{ds} \right) = 0.$$

Proof. Let s be the arc length parameter of $\gamma_\alpha(t)$ with $s(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) = 0$ for $t_\alpha \in [t_1, t_2]$ and

$$y_\alpha = \gamma_\alpha(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u_\alpha(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \theta) d\theta.$$

We know that the sequence $\{\gamma_\alpha(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha})\} = \{y_\alpha\}$ is convergent and $\gamma_\alpha(s)$ satisfies equation

$$(4.4.36) \quad \frac{d^2 \gamma_\alpha}{ds^2} + A_{\Gamma_\alpha}(\gamma_\alpha) \left(\frac{d\gamma_\alpha}{ds}, \frac{d\gamma_\alpha}{ds} \right) = 0$$

for $\alpha > 1$. Then, by the uniformly boundedness of $\|A_{\Gamma_\alpha}\|_{h_\alpha}(\lambda_\alpha^t)$ obtained in Lemma 4.4.7 as $\alpha \searrow 1$, $\gamma_\alpha(s)$ converges locally in $C^1([0, s_1], \mathbb{R}^K)$ to a vector valued function for some small $s_1 > 0$, denoted by $\gamma(s)$ which also parameterized by arc length. To show γ is a geodesic, that is, to show $\gamma(s)$ solves

$$\frac{d^2 \gamma}{ds^2} + A(\gamma) \left(\frac{d\gamma}{ds}, \frac{d\gamma}{ds} \right) = 0,$$

it suffices to show

$$(4.4.37) \quad A_{\Gamma_\alpha}(\gamma_\alpha) \left(\frac{d\gamma_\alpha}{ds}, \frac{d\gamma_\alpha}{ds} \right) \longrightarrow A(\gamma) \left(\frac{d\gamma}{ds}, \frac{d\gamma}{ds} \right)$$

strongly in $C^0([0, s_1], \mathbb{R}^K)$ for some small enough $s_1 > 0$. By contradiction, if not, then for any arbitrary small s_1 , there always exists a subsequence of $\{u_\alpha\}$ still denoted by $\{u_\alpha\}$ and a sequence of $\lambda_\alpha^{t'_\alpha}$ such that

$$(4.4.38) \quad s'_\alpha := s(\lambda_\alpha^{t'_\alpha}) = \int_{\lambda_\alpha^{t'_\alpha}}^{\lambda_\alpha^{t'_\alpha}} |\dot{w}_\alpha(r)| dr \rightarrow s' \in (0, s_1)$$

and

$$(4.4.39) \quad \left| A_{\Gamma_\alpha}(\gamma_\alpha) \left(\frac{d\gamma_\alpha}{ds}, \frac{d\gamma_\alpha}{ds} \right) - A(\gamma) \left(\frac{d\gamma}{ds}, \frac{d\gamma}{ds} \right) \right|_{s=s'_\alpha} > \varepsilon_0 > 0,$$

for some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. Furthermore, we can choose small enough s_1 and small enough $\alpha - 1$ such that $t'_\alpha \in [\frac{t_1}{2}, t_2]$. In fact, without loss of generality, we assume there exists an integer T_α such that

$$\lambda_\alpha^{\frac{t_1}{2}} = 2^{T_\alpha} \lambda_\alpha^{t'_\alpha}$$

where $T_\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$. Utilizing Corollary 4.4.6, when $\alpha - 1$ is small enough we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\lambda_\alpha^{t'_\alpha}}^{\lambda_\alpha^{\frac{t_1}{2}}} |\dot{\gamma}_\alpha(r)| dr &= \sum_{k=1}^{T_\alpha} \int_{2^{k-1} \lambda_\alpha^{t'_\alpha}}^{2^k \lambda_\alpha^{t'_\alpha}} |\dot{\gamma}_\alpha(r)| dr \\ &\geq T_\alpha \sqrt{\alpha - 1} \left(\log 2 \sqrt{\frac{E((w^1))}{\pi}} + o(1) \right) \\ &\geq C \left(t_\alpha - \frac{t_1}{2} \right) \log \lambda_\alpha^{-\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \\ &\geq C \frac{t_1}{2} \log \nu > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we let $s_1 \leq C \frac{t_1}{2} \log \nu$, we can make $t'_\alpha \in [\frac{t_1}{2}, t_2]$ when $\alpha - 1$ is small enough. Therefore, we can apply Proposition 4.4.5 and Lemma 4.4.7 to yield that

$$(4.4.40) \quad \frac{d\gamma_\alpha}{ds}(s'_\alpha) = \frac{\dot{\gamma}_\alpha(\lambda_\alpha^{t'_\alpha})}{|\dot{\gamma}_\alpha(\lambda_\alpha^{t'_\alpha})|} \longrightarrow \frac{d\gamma}{ds}(s') \quad \text{as } \alpha \searrow 1$$

which furthermore implies that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\Gamma_\alpha}(\gamma_\alpha) \left(\frac{d\gamma_\alpha}{ds}, \frac{d\gamma_\alpha}{ds} \right) \Big|_{s=s'_\alpha} &= \frac{1}{|\dot{\gamma}_\alpha(\lambda_\alpha^{t'_\alpha})|^2} A_{\Gamma_\alpha}(\gamma_\alpha) (\dot{\gamma}_\alpha(r), \dot{\gamma}_\alpha(r)) \Big|_{r=\lambda_\alpha^{t'_\alpha}} \\ &\longrightarrow A(\gamma) \left(\frac{d\gamma}{ds}, \frac{d\gamma}{ds} \right) \Big|_{s=s'} \quad \text{as } \alpha \searrow 1. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts to the choice of s'_α asserted in (4.4.38) and (4.4.39), hence (4.4.37) holds. Therefore, from the equation (4.4.36) of γ_α and the convergence properties induced from Lemma 4.4.7:

$$\frac{d\gamma_\alpha}{ds}(r) = \frac{\dot{\gamma}_\alpha(r)}{|\dot{\gamma}_\alpha(r)|} \longrightarrow \frac{d\gamma}{ds}(s) \quad \text{as } \alpha \searrow 1$$

and (4.4.37) we will get

$$\frac{d\gamma}{ds}(s) - \frac{d\gamma}{ds}(0) = - \int_0^s A(\gamma) \left(\frac{d\gamma}{ds}, \frac{d\gamma}{ds} \right) ds \quad \text{for all } s \in [0, s_1]$$

which is the integral formation of geodesic equation. Thus, $\gamma(s)$ is a geodesic which completes the proof of Lemma 4.4.8. \square

Now, we are in a position to prove the remaining cases of main Theorem 4.4.1

Proof of the Theorem 4.4.1 for $\nu > 1$. Without loss of generality, we assume

$$k_\alpha = \frac{t_1 - t_2}{\log 2} \log \lambda_\alpha$$

is an integer, that is equivalent to $\lambda_\alpha^{t_1} = 2^{k_\alpha} \lambda_\alpha^{t_2}$, which tends to infinity as $\alpha \searrow 1$.

Case 1: We first consider the case $\nu = \infty$.

For any $0 < t_1 < t_2 < 1$, by Corollary 4.4.6 there holds

$$L \left(\Gamma_\alpha |_{A(2^k \lambda_\alpha^{t_2}, 2^{k+1} \lambda_\alpha^{t_2}, x_\alpha)} \right) := \int_{2^k \lambda_\alpha^{t_2}}^{2^{k+1} \lambda_\alpha^{t_2}} |\dot{\gamma}_\alpha(r)| dr \geq \sqrt{\alpha - 1} \left(\log 2 \sqrt{\frac{E(w^1)}{\pi}} + o(1) \right).$$

Then, we can estimate

$$L(\Gamma_\alpha) \geq C k_\alpha \sqrt{\alpha - 1} \left(\log 2 \sqrt{\frac{E(w^1)}{\pi}} + o(1) \right) \geq C \log \lambda_\alpha^{-\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } \alpha \searrow 1.$$

which means in this case the length $L(\Gamma)$ of $\gamma(s)$ is infinite.

Case 2: Now, we consider the case $1 < \nu < \infty$.

Note that $1 < \nu < \infty$ implies $\mu = 1$ which is equivalent to the energy identity shown in Theorem 4.1.1, that is

$$\lim_{\delta \searrow 0} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \delta, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx = 0.$$

Then, we can use same estimates as the proof for the case $\nu = 1$, just replacing δ by λ_α^t for any $0 < t_1 \leq t \leq t_2 < 1$, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} OSC_{A(\lambda_\alpha R, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)}(u_\alpha) &\leq C \left(\int_{A(\frac{\lambda_\alpha R}{2}, 2\delta, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + C\sqrt{\alpha-1}(t-1) \log \lambda_\alpha - C\sqrt{\alpha-1} \log R \\ (4.4.41) \quad &\longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{letting } \alpha \searrow 1 \quad \text{then } R \rightarrow \infty, \delta \searrow 0 \text{ and } t \rightarrow 1. \end{aligned}$$

And similarly, replacing $\lambda_\alpha R$ by λ_α^t for any $0 < t_1 \leq t \leq t_2 < 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} OSC_{A(\lambda_\alpha^t, \delta, x_\alpha)}(u_\alpha) &\leq C \left(\int_{A(\frac{\lambda_\alpha R}{2}, 2\delta, x_\alpha)} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C\sqrt{\alpha-1}(\log \delta - t \log \lambda_\alpha) \\ (4.4.42) \quad &\longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{letting } \alpha \searrow 1 \quad \text{then } R \rightarrow \infty, \delta \searrow 0 \text{ and } t \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Also, by Corollary 4.4.6, we have

$$L \left(\Gamma_\alpha |_{A(2^k \lambda_\alpha^{t_2}, 2^{k+1} \lambda_\alpha^{t_2}, x_\alpha)} \right) = \sqrt{\alpha-1} \left(\log 2 \sqrt{\frac{E(w)}{\pi}} + o(1) \right),$$

which implies

$$L(\Gamma) = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} k_\alpha \sqrt{\alpha-1} \left(\log 2 \sqrt{\frac{E(w)}{\pi}} + o(1) \right) = (t_2 - t_1) \log \nu \sqrt{\frac{E(w)}{\pi}}.$$

Now, letting $t_1 \rightarrow 0$ and $t_2 \rightarrow 1$ and keeping in mind that (4.4.41), (4.4.42) and Lemma 4.4.8, we know that the neck converges to a geodesic of length

$$L = \log \nu \sqrt{\frac{E(w)}{\pi}}$$

which complete the proof of Theorem 4.4.1 for the case $\nu > 1$. □

4.5. Energy Identity for α - H -surfaces with Bounded Morse Index.

In this subsection, we prove another main consequence — Theorem 4.1.4. Before giving the detailed proof, some lemmas are needed.

Let s be the arc length parameter of $\gamma_\alpha(r)$ such that $s(\lambda_\alpha^t) = 0$ for some fixed $0 < t < 1$. Then as a corollary of the proof of Lemma 4.4.8 and Theorem 4.1.2, we have the following result

Lemma 4.5.1. *Let $\{u_\alpha\}_{\alpha \searrow 1}$ be a sequence satisfying hypothesis of Theorem 4.4.1. Assume that the limiting neck of $\{u_\alpha\}$ is a geodesic of infinite length. Then, for any given $l > 0$ and $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$, $u_\alpha(s, \theta) = u_\alpha(x_\alpha + s(\cos \theta, \sin \theta))$ converges to γ in $C^1([0, l])$. Furthermore, we have*

$$(4.5.1) \quad \left\| \frac{r(s)}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \left| \frac{\partial s}{\partial r} \right| - \mu^{1-t} \sqrt{\frac{E(w^1)}{\pi}} \right\|_{C^0([0, l])} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \alpha \searrow 1.$$

where $r(s)$ is the inverse of the arc length parameter $s(r)$ with $s(\lambda_\alpha^t) = 0$.

Proof. Since the limiting neck of u_α converges to a geodesic of infinite length, we can choose a real number $\iota \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$s(\lambda_\alpha^{\iota}) = l$$

By Corollary 4.4.6, we can estimate

$$(4.5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} l &= \int_{\lambda_\alpha^{\iota}}^{\lambda_\alpha^t} \left| \frac{d\gamma_\alpha(r)}{dr} \right| dr = \int_{\lambda_\alpha^{\iota}}^{\lambda_\alpha^t} \left| \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{du_\alpha(r, \theta)}{dr} d\theta \right| dr \\ &\geq C \int_{\lambda_\alpha^{\iota}}^{\lambda_\alpha^t} \frac{\sqrt{\alpha-1}}{r} dr = C(t_\alpha^\iota - t) \log(\lambda_\alpha^{-\sqrt{\alpha-1}}) \end{aligned}$$

But, notice that

$$\log(\lambda_\alpha^{-\sqrt{\alpha-1}}) \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } \alpha \searrow 1,$$

there must holds $t_\alpha^\iota \rightarrow t$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$. We prove the Lemma 4.5.1 by contradiction, suppose that $u_\alpha(s, \theta)$ does not converge to γ in $C^1([0, l])$, then, after choosing a subsequence, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and a sequence $\{s_\alpha\}_{\alpha \searrow 1} \subset [0, l]$ such that

$$(4.5.3) \quad \sup_{\theta \in [0, 2\pi]} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial s}(s_\alpha, \theta) - \frac{d\gamma_\alpha(s_\alpha)}{ds} \right| > \varepsilon_0$$

Write $s(\lambda_\alpha^{\tilde{t}_\alpha}) = s_\alpha$, then $\tilde{t}_\alpha \in [t, t_\alpha^\iota]$ which implies $\tilde{t}_\alpha \rightarrow t$. Thus, applying Corollary 4.4.6 yields

$$\frac{\lambda_\alpha^{\tilde{t}_\alpha}}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}(\lambda_\alpha^{\tilde{t}_\alpha}, \theta) - \frac{d\gamma_\alpha}{dr}(\lambda_\alpha^{\tilde{t}_\alpha}) \right| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \alpha \searrow 1.$$

Note that by Corollary 4.4.6

$$\left| \frac{ds}{dr}(\lambda_\alpha^{\tilde{t}_\alpha}) \right| = \left| \frac{d\gamma_\alpha}{dr}(\lambda_\alpha^{\tilde{t}_\alpha}) \right| \geq \frac{C\lambda_\alpha^{\tilde{t}_\alpha}}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}},$$

which implies

$$\left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial s}(s_\alpha, \theta) - \frac{d\gamma_\alpha(s_\alpha)}{ds} \right| = \left| \frac{dr}{ds} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}(s_\alpha, \theta) - \frac{d\gamma_\alpha(s_\alpha)}{dr} \right|$$

$$\leq \frac{\lambda_{\alpha}^{\tilde{t}_{\alpha}}}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \left| \frac{\partial u_{\alpha}}{\partial r}(\lambda_{\alpha}^{\tilde{t}_{\alpha}}, \theta) - \frac{d\gamma_{\alpha}}{dr}(\lambda_{\alpha}^{\tilde{t}_{\alpha}}) \right| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \alpha \searrow 1.$$

This is a contradiction to (4.5.3), thus we obtain the converges of first derivatives

$$\left\| \frac{\partial u_{\alpha}}{\partial s}(s_{\alpha}, \theta) - \frac{d\gamma_{\alpha}(s_{\alpha})}{ds} \right\|_{C^0([0,l])}$$

The C^0 converges of γ_{α} can be obtained by a similar argument using Proposition 4.4.5. Next, the convergence (4.5.1) is the direct result of radical part of Corollary 4.4.6. \square

Let us recall the definition of stability of a geodesic in Riemannian manifold.

Definition 4.5.2. A geodesic $\gamma(s) : [0, l] \rightarrow N$ is *unstable* if its index form is not non-negative definite, that is, there exists $V_0 \in \mathcal{V}_{\gamma}$ such that

$$I_{\gamma}(V_0, V_0) = \int_0^l \langle \nabla_{\gamma'} V_0, \nabla_{\gamma'} V_0 \rangle - R(V_0, \gamma', V_0, \gamma') ds < 0$$

where R is the Riemann curvature tensor on N and \mathcal{V}_{γ} is the vector space formed by vector fields V along γ which are piecewise differentiable and vanish at the end points of γ , that is, $V(0) = V(l) = 0$.

The following Lemma 4.5.1 is of vital importance in the proof of Theorem 4.1.4

Lemma 4.5.3. *Let $\{u_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \searrow 1}$ be a sequence satisfying hypothesis of Theorem 4.1.4. If the necks of $\{u_{\alpha}\}$ converges to an unstable geodesic $\gamma(s) : [0, l] \rightarrow N$ parameterized by arc length, then for small enough $\alpha - 1$, there exists a vector field V_{α} along u_{α} on N , that is, $V_{\alpha} \in u_{\alpha}^*(TN)$, which vanishes outside of $A(\lambda_{\alpha}^t, \lambda_{\alpha}^t, x_{\alpha})$, such that the second variation of E_{α}^{ω} acting on V_{α} is strictly negative, i.e.*

$$\delta^2 E_{\alpha}^{\omega}(V_{\alpha}, V_{\alpha}) < 0.$$

Proof. By the assumption of Lemma 4.5.1, $\gamma(s) : [0, l] \rightarrow N$ is an unstable geodesic, then there exists a vector field $V_0 \in \mathcal{V}_{\gamma}$ such that

$$I_{\gamma}(V_0, V_0) < 0.$$

Recall that \mathcal{P} be the projection from $T\mathbb{R}^K$ onto TN , more precisely for $y \in N$ \mathcal{P}_y is the orthogonal projection from $T_y\mathbb{R}^K = \mathbb{R}^K$ onto $T_yN \subset T_y\mathbb{R}^K$. Then we define V_{α} as

$$V_{\alpha}(u_{\alpha}(s, \theta)) = V_{\alpha} \left(u(x_{\alpha} + r(s)(\cos \theta, \sin \theta)) \right) := \mathcal{P}_{u_{\alpha}(s, \theta)}(V_0(s)),$$

where $r(s)$ is the inverse function of arc parameter of $\gamma_{\alpha}(r)$ with $s(\lambda_{\alpha}^t) = 0$. Here, we put $V_0(s)$ as a vector in \mathbb{R}^K which is identified with $T_{u_{\alpha}(s, \theta)}\mathbb{R}^K$, thus the expression $\mathcal{P}_{u_{\alpha}(s, \theta)}(V_0(s))$ is well defined. Then, V_{α} is a piecewise smooth vector field along u_{α} which also vanishes outside of $A(\lambda_{\alpha}^t, \lambda_{\alpha}^t, x_{\alpha})$. From Lemma 4.5.1, for fixed $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$

$V_\alpha(u_\alpha(s, \theta))$ converges to $V_0(\gamma(s))$ in $C^1([0, l])$. Next, we will compute $\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(V_\alpha, V_\alpha)$ and judge its negativity by showing that

$$\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha - 1}} \delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(V_\alpha, V_\alpha) = 4\pi\mu \sqrt{\frac{E(w^1)}{\pi}} I_\gamma(V_0, V_0).$$

The right hand of identity is negative by our assumption which implies the conclusion of Lemma 4.5.3.

To this end, we first split the computation into some different parts using second variation formula obtained in Lemma 2.2.1 and the conformal coordinates of M

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(u_\alpha)(V_\alpha, V_\alpha) \\ &= \alpha \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left(\langle \nabla V_\alpha, \nabla V_\alpha \rangle - R(V_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha, V_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha) \right) dx \\ & \quad + 2\alpha(\alpha - 1) \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \langle \nabla u_\alpha, \nabla V_\alpha \rangle^2 dx \\ & \quad + 2 \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} \langle H(\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla V_\alpha), V_\alpha \rangle dx \\ & \quad + \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} \langle (\nabla_{V_\alpha} H)(\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha), V_\alpha \rangle dx \\ &= \alpha \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left(\left\langle \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}} V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}} V_\alpha \right\rangle \right. \\ & \quad \left. - R\left(V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}} u_\alpha, V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}} u_\alpha\right) \right) dx \\ & \quad + \alpha \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \frac{1}{r^2} \left(\left\langle \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta}} V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta}} V_\alpha \right\rangle \right. \\ & \quad \left. - R\left(V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta}} u_\alpha, V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta}} u_\alpha\right) \right) dx \\ & \quad + 2\alpha(\alpha - 1) \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-2} \langle \nabla u_\alpha, \nabla V_\alpha \rangle^2 dx \\ & \quad + \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} 2 \langle H(\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla V_\alpha), V_\alpha \rangle + \langle (\nabla_{V_\alpha} H)(\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha), V_\alpha \rangle dx \\ & := I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 \end{aligned}$$

where I_i represents the i -th integral of above identity. First, we consider I_1 and observe that

$$\mu^t \longleftarrow \sup_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} \left(C \frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha}} \right)^{\alpha-1} = \sup_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1}$$

$$\leq \sup_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} \left(\tau_\alpha + C \frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha^{2t_\alpha}} \right)^{\alpha-1} \longrightarrow \mu^t \quad \text{as } \alpha \searrow 1.$$

since in Lemma 4.5.1 we have concluded that $t_\alpha \rightarrow t$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$. Utilizing (4.5.1), we can estimate I_1 as below

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{I_1}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \\ &= \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{2\alpha}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left(\left\langle \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}} V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}} V_\alpha \right\rangle \right. \\ & \quad \left. - R \left(V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}} u_\alpha, V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}} u_\alpha \right) \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^l \left(\left\langle \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}} V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}} V_\alpha \right\rangle \right. \\ & \quad \left. - R \left(V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}} u_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}} u_\alpha, V_\alpha \right) \right) (1 + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \frac{|\frac{\partial s}{\partial r}| r(s)}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} ds d\theta \\ &= \mu \sqrt{\frac{E(w^1)}{\pi}} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^l \left(\left\langle \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}} V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}} V_\alpha \right\rangle - R \left(V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}} u_\alpha, V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r}} u_\alpha \right) \right) ds d\theta \\ &= 2\pi \mu \sqrt{\frac{E(w^1)}{\pi}} I(V_0, V_0). \end{aligned}$$

Here, we used the fact that $V_\alpha(u_\alpha(s, \theta))$ converges to $V_0(\gamma(s))$ in $C^1([0, l])$ and $u_\alpha(s, \theta)$ converges to γ in $C^1([0, l])$ for fixed $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$, see Lemma 4.5.1. Before calculating I_2 , we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta}} V_\alpha &= \mathcal{P}_{u_\alpha(s, \theta)} \left(\frac{\partial V_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right) = \mathcal{P}_{u_\alpha(s, \theta)} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} (\mathcal{P}_{u_\alpha(s, \theta)}(V_0)) \right) \\ (4.5.4) \quad &= \mathcal{P}_{u_\alpha(s, \theta)} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} (\mathcal{P}_{u_\alpha(s, \theta)})(V_0) \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\frac{\partial V_\alpha}{\partial \theta}$ is taken in \mathbb{R}^K . This implies

$$(4.5.5) \quad \left| \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta}} V_\alpha \right| \leq C_l \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|$$

for some constant C_l depending on l . Given $R > 0$, we take

$$T_\alpha = \left\lceil \frac{\log \lambda_\alpha^{t-t_\alpha}}{\log R} \right\rceil + 1$$

and by choice of T_α , one can see that

$$A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{T_\alpha} A(R^{i-1}\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, R^i\lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha).$$

Then, we can compute I_2

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{I_2}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} &= \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-1} \left(\left\langle \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta}} V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta}} V_\alpha \right\rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. - R \left(V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta}} u_\alpha, V_\alpha, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta}} u_\alpha \right) \right) \frac{dr}{r} d\theta \\ &\leq \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{C}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x-x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx \\ &\leq \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{C}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \sum_{i=1}^{T_\alpha} \int_{A(R^{i-1}\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, R^i\lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x-x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx \\ &\leq \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} CT_\alpha \sqrt{\alpha-1} \sup_{\tau \in [t-\varepsilon, t+\varepsilon]} \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \int_{A_{\frac{1}{R}}\lambda_\alpha^\tau, \lambda_\alpha R^\tau} \frac{1}{|x-x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

By the choice of T_α , we have

$$\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} T_\alpha \sqrt{\alpha-1} \leq C(R) \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} |t-t_\alpha| \log \lambda_\alpha^{-\sqrt{\alpha-1}} + \sqrt{\alpha-1}$$

which is bounded by (4.5.2). Thus, by Corollary 4.4.4 we can conclude

$$\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{I_2}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} = 0.$$

For the third integral I_3 , by Cauchy-Schwartz inequality we can straightforward estimate that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{I_3}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} &= 2\alpha \sqrt{\alpha-1} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-2} \langle \nabla u_\alpha, \nabla V_\alpha \rangle^2 dx \\ &\leq 2\alpha \sqrt{\alpha-1} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^{\alpha-2} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 |\nabla V_\alpha|^2 dx \\ &\leq C \sqrt{\alpha-1} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} (\tau_\alpha + |\nabla_{g_\alpha} u_\alpha|^2)^\alpha \\ &\leq C \sqrt{\alpha-1} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \alpha \searrow 1. \end{aligned}$$

Here, similar to derivation of (4.5.4) and (4.5.5), we used the estimate

$$(4.5.6) \quad |\nabla V_\alpha| \leq C_l |\nabla u_\alpha|.$$

At last, for the fourth integral I_4 , we split I_4 into I_{41} and I_{42} and consider I_{41} firstly

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{I_{41}}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \\
& := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha^t}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} 2 \langle H(\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla V_\alpha), V_\alpha \rangle dx \\
& = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha^t}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} 2H_{ij}^k \nabla^\perp u_\alpha^i \nabla V_\alpha^j V_\alpha^k dx \\
& \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \|H\|_{L^\infty(N)} \|V\|_{C^0(N)} \sum_{i,j}^K \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha^t}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x-x_\alpha|} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha^i}{\partial r} \frac{\partial V_\alpha^j}{\partial \theta} - \frac{\partial V_\alpha^j}{\partial r} \frac{\partial u_\alpha^i}{\partial \theta} \right| dx \\
& \leq C \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha^t}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x-x_\alpha|} \left(\left| \frac{\partial V_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right| \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right| \left| \frac{\partial V_\alpha}{\partial r} \right| \right) dx \\
& \leq C \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha^t}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x-x_\alpha|} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right| \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right| dx \\
& \leq C \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha^t}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x-x_\alpha|^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right| dx \\
& = o(1) \sqrt{\alpha-1} \int_{\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha^t}}^{\lambda_\alpha^t} \frac{1}{r} dr \\
& = -(t_\alpha^t - t) \sqrt{\alpha-1} \log \lambda_\alpha o(1) = o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used the estimate (4.5.6) and Corollary 4.4.6. For the second part I_{42} of I_4 we have similarly computations

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{I_{42}}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} & = \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha^t}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} \langle (\nabla_{V_\alpha} H)(\nabla^\perp u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha), V_\alpha \rangle dx \\
& = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha^t}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} \left(\frac{\partial H_{ij}^k}{\partial y^l} + \frac{\partial H_{jl}^k}{\partial y^i} + \frac{\partial H_{il}^k}{\partial y^j} \right) \nabla^\perp u_\alpha^i \nabla u_\alpha^j V_\alpha^l V_\alpha^k dx \\
& \leq C \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \|\nabla H\|_{L^\infty(N)} \|V_0\|_{L^\infty(N)}^2 \cdot \\
& \quad \int_{A(\lambda_\alpha^{t_\alpha^t}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)} \frac{1}{|x-x_\alpha|} \left(\left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right| \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial r} \right| \left| \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial \theta} \right| \right) dx \\
& = o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining all computations for I_1 , I_2 , I_3 and $I_4 = I_{41} + I_{42}$, we conclude that

$$\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha-1}} \delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(V_\alpha, V_\alpha) = 4\pi\mu \sqrt{\frac{E(w^1)}{\pi}} I_\gamma(V_0, V_0).$$

which implies the conclusion of Lemma 4.5.3. \square

Under the assumption of Theorem 4.1.4, (N, h) has finite fundamental group. Then, the Gromov's estimates [Gro78] (See also [Moo17, Corollary 3.3.5]) on the length of geodesic γ and its Morse index hold:

$$\text{Length}(\gamma) \leq C_0 (\text{Ind}(\gamma) + 1) \leq C (C_I + 1)$$

for some universal constant $C_0 > 1$ and C_I is the uniformly Morse index upper bound of γ . Thus. any geodesic $\gamma \subset (N, h)$ with length

$$\text{Length}(\gamma) > C_0$$

is unstable. Therefore, if we choose $l > C_0$, then any geodesic $\gamma(s) : [0, l] \rightarrow N$ with arc length parameter is unstable and under the assumption that γ is of infinite length we can apply above Lemma 4.5.3 successively to finish the proof of our Theorem 4.1.4. More precisely, we have:

Proof of Theorem 4.1.4. By contradiction, suppose that the neck of u_α converges to a geodesic γ with infinite length. Then, we take $l > C_0$ and $u_\alpha(s, \theta)$ converges to an unstable geodesic $\gamma : [0, l] \rightarrow N$ in $C^1([0, l])$ for any $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$ by Lemma 4.5.1. Using same notation as Lemma 4.5.1 and Lemma 4.5.3, let $s(\lambda_\alpha^t) = 0$ and $\delta_1 > 0$ such that $s(\lambda_\alpha^{t+\delta_1}) = l$. Since $t_\alpha^t \rightarrow t$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$, for arbitrary small $\varepsilon > 0$ when α tends to 1 close enough there holds that $|t^\alpha - t| < \varepsilon$. Therefore, by Lemma 4.5.3 there exists a vector fields V_α^1 along u_α , that is vanishes outside $A(\lambda_\alpha^{t+\delta_1}, \lambda_\alpha^t, x_\alpha)$, such that

$$\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(V_\alpha^1, V_\alpha^1) < 0 \quad \text{for all } \alpha \leq \alpha_1$$

for some small enough $\alpha_1 - 1$. Since the limiting neck is a geodesic with infinite length, then we replace t by $t + \delta_1$ and apply Lemma 4.5.3 again on $A(\lambda_\alpha^{t+\delta_1+\delta_2}, \lambda_\alpha^{t+\delta_1}, x_\alpha)$ for some $\delta_2 > 0$ to find second vector field V_α^2 , that vanishes outside $A(\lambda_\alpha^{t+\delta_1+\delta_2}, \lambda_\alpha^{t+\delta_1}, x_\alpha)$, such that

$$\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(V_\alpha^2, V_\alpha^2) < 0 \quad \text{for all } \alpha \leq \alpha_2$$

for some small enough $\alpha_2 - 1 \leq \alpha_1 - 1$. This process can keep going continuously and for any integer $L > 0$ we can construct a collection of vector fields $\{V_\alpha^1, V_\alpha^2, \dots, V_\alpha^L\}$ and small $\alpha_L - 1$ satisfying

$$\delta^2 E_\alpha^\omega(V_\alpha^i, V_\alpha^i) < 0 \quad \text{for all } \alpha \leq \alpha_L \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq L.$$

Since the support of V_α^i are disjoint each other, $V_\alpha^1, V_\alpha^2, \dots, V_\alpha^L$ are linearly independent which implies that

$$\text{Ind}_{E_\alpha^\omega}(u_\alpha) \geq L, \quad \text{for any } L \geq 0.$$

Thus, $\text{Ind}_{E_\alpha^\omega}(u_\alpha) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\alpha \searrow 1$ which contradicts to the uniformly bounded assumptions of $\text{Ind}_{E_\alpha^\omega}(u_\alpha)$. We conclude that the limiting necks of $\{u_\alpha\}$ consists of geodesics

with finite length and by Theorem 4.1.2 we know that the energy identity holds, completing the proof of Theorem 4.1.4. \square

5. EXISTENCE OF H -SPHERE OF BOUNDED MORSE INDEX

In this section, we prove our main results using the convergence schemes developed in Section 4 and combining with the existence results obtained in Section 3. In the following, ε_0 is a uniform constant depending on the geometries of N and mean curvature vectors λH , which is assumed to be the minimum of the constants appearing in the previous results.

5.1. Existence of Minimizing H -Surfaces.

In the first instance, let us consider a relatively simpler scenario where $\|\omega\|_{L^\infty(N)} < 1$. In such a case, the surgery construction appeared in [SU81] can be applied in the H -surface setting to rule out the occurrence of bubbles.

Proof of Theorem 1.1.6. Since E_α^ω satisfies the Palais-Smale condition, see Lemma 2.3.1 and Corollary 2.3.2, and by the upper bound of $\|\omega\|_{L^\infty(N)} < 1$, we can take a minimizing map $u_\alpha : M \rightarrow N$ for E_α^ω in a fixed non-trivial homotopy class in $W^{1,2\alpha}(M, N)$ with

$$E_\alpha(u_\alpha) \leq CE_\alpha^\omega(u_\alpha) \leq C(1 + B^2)^\alpha + C\|\omega\|_{L^\infty(N)} B^2 \text{Vol}(M)$$

where $B = \max_{x \in M} |\nabla u(x)|$ and u is a smooth map in that homotopy class. By Theorem 4.1.4, we can choose a subsequence, which still denoted by u_α , such that $u_\alpha \rightarrow u$ in $C^2(M - \{x_1, \dots, x_l\}, N)$ for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u : M \rightarrow N$ is a H -surface. Next we prove that there is actually no energy concentration point for $\{u_\alpha\}$, that is, $u_\alpha \rightarrow u$ in $C^2(M, N)$.

Take a small ball centering at x_i in M of radius ρ where ρ is small enough such that $x_j \notin B(x_i, \rho)$ for $1 \leq j \neq i \leq l$ and will be determined more precisely later. Let $\varphi(r)$ be a smooth function which is 1 on $r \geq 1$ and 0 on $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\exp : TN \rightarrow N$ be the exponential map on N . Then we can define

$$(5.1.1) \quad \hat{u}_\alpha(x) = \begin{cases} u(x) & \text{if } 0 \leq |x| \leq \frac{\rho}{2} \\ \exp_{u(x)} \left(\varphi \left(\frac{|x|}{\rho} \right) \exp_{u(x)}^{-1} \circ u_\alpha(x) \right) & \text{if } \frac{\rho}{2} < |x| < \rho \\ u_\alpha(x) & \text{if } |x| \geq \rho \end{cases}$$

which agrees with u_α near the boundary of $B(x_i, \rho)$ and with u near the center x_i . Then

$$u_\alpha \rightarrow u \quad \text{in} \quad C^2 \left(\text{supp } \varphi \left(\frac{|\cdot|}{\rho} \right) \cap B(x_i, \rho), N \right),$$

and we have $\hat{u}_\alpha \rightarrow u$ in $C^2(B(x_i, \rho), N)$ which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} E_\alpha^\omega(\hat{u}_\alpha, B(x_i, \rho)) - \frac{1}{2} \text{Vol}(M) &= \frac{1}{2} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(x_i, \rho)} (1 + |\nabla \hat{u}_\alpha|^2)^\alpha - 1 dV_g \\ &\quad + \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(x_i, \rho)} (\hat{u}_\alpha)^* \omega \\ (5.1.2) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= E(u, B(x_i, \rho)) + \int_{B(x_i, \rho)} u^* \omega \end{aligned}$$

By assumption $\pi_2(N) = 0$, which implies that every $u_1, u_2 \in C^0(B(x_i, \rho), N)$ with $u_1|_{\partial B(x_i, \rho)} = u_2|_{\partial B(x_i, \rho)}$ are homotopic, u_α and \hat{u}_α are homotopic. Since u_α is a minimizing map for E_α^ω in its homotopy class, we have

$$E_\alpha^\omega(u_\alpha, B(x_i, \rho)) \leq E_\alpha^\omega(\hat{u}_\alpha, B(x_i, \rho))$$

Applying (5.1.2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} E(u_\alpha, B(x_i, \rho)) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Vol}(M) &\leq \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} E_\alpha^\omega(u_\alpha, B(x_i, \rho)) - \liminf_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(x_i, \rho)} (u_\alpha)^* \omega \\ &\leq \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} E_\alpha^\omega(\hat{u}_\alpha, B(x_i, \rho)) - \liminf_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(x_i, \rho)} (u_\alpha)^* \omega \\ &= E^\omega(u, B(x_i, \rho)) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Vol}(M) - \liminf_{\alpha \searrow 1} \int_{B(x_i, \rho)} (u_\alpha)^* \omega \\ &\leq C\pi\rho^2 \|\nabla u\|_\infty + \|\omega\|_{L^\infty(N)} \liminf_{\alpha \searrow 1} E(u_\alpha, B(x_i, \rho)) + \text{Vol}(M). \end{aligned}$$

If we initially choose ρ small enough such that

$$C\pi\rho^2 \|\nabla u\|_\infty \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2(1 - \|\omega\|_{L^\infty(N)})}$$

and keeping in mind that $\|\omega\|_{L^\infty(N)} < 1$, then we can utilize small energy regularity Lemma 4.2.1 to conclude that u_α converges to u in $C^2(B(x_i, \rho), N)$, given that $E(u_\alpha, B(x_i, \rho)) < \varepsilon_0^2$ for α sufficiently close to 1. Therefore, an induction argument tells us that the convergence can be extended over the points $\{x_1, \dots, x_l\}$ and hence we can conclude $u_\alpha \rightarrow u$ in $C^2(M, N)$. Since u_α minimizes E_α^ω , u must minimize the E^ω in the same homotopy class. \square

Now, we are in a position to prove the Theorem 1.1.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.1.7. Let \mathcal{C} be the set of free homotopy classes containing minimizing H -sphere and G be the subgroup of $\pi_2(N)$ generated by the elements of \mathcal{C} . If $G \neq \pi_2(N)$, then there exists a homotopy class that does not contain the minimizing H -sphere. Let

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \{u \in C^1(\mathbb{S}^2, N) : \text{the corresponding free homotopy class } [u] \notin G\}$$

then by Corollary 2.3.2 we can find a sequence of maps $\{u_\alpha\}_{\alpha>1}$ which are minimizers for each E_α^ω in \mathcal{C}_1 . By a similarly argument as proof of Theorem 1.1.6, there is a constant C such that $E_\alpha(u_\alpha) \leq C$. Then by small energy regularity Lemma 4.2.1 either there is a subsequence converges strongly in C^2 to a non-constant H -sphere $u : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow N$ such that $u \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and $E^\omega(u) = \inf_{v \in \mathcal{C}_1} E(v)$, or there exists some energy concentration point, saying $x_1 \in \mathbb{S}^2$.

Let us consider the second case. Pick a small disk $B(x_1, r)$ near blow-up point x_1 , by energy gap Lemma 4.2.2, there exists a $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $E(u_\alpha) \geq \varepsilon_0^2$ provided that $\alpha - 1$ is small enough. Then, we define

$$s_\alpha(x) = \begin{cases} u_\alpha(x), & \text{when } x \in \mathbb{S}^2 \setminus B(x_1, r) \\ \hat{u}_\alpha(x) & \text{when } x \in B(x_1, r) \end{cases}$$

$$w_\alpha(x) = \begin{cases} \hat{u}_\alpha \circ f(x), & \text{when } x \in \mathbb{S}^2 \setminus B(x_1, r) \\ u_\alpha(x) & \text{when } x \in B(x_1, r) \end{cases}$$

where \hat{u}_α is constructed as (5.1.1) and $f : \mathbb{S}^2 \setminus B(x_1, r) \rightarrow B(x_1, r)$ is the conformal reflection preserving the boundary $\partial B(x_1, r)$ fixed. Thus, s_α agrees with u_α outside $B(x_1, r)$ while w_α agrees with u_α inside $B(x_1, r)$. Next, by conformality of f , we have

$$\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} E_\alpha^\omega(s_\alpha) = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} E_\alpha^\omega(u_\alpha, \mathbb{S}^2 \setminus B(x_1, r)) + E(u, B(x_1, r)) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Vol}(B(x_1, r)),$$

$$\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} E_\alpha^\omega(w_\alpha) = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} E_\alpha^\omega(u_\alpha, B(x_1, r)) + E(u, B(x_1, r)) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Vol}(B(x_1, r)).$$

Therefore, we can choose small enough $r > 0$ and small enough $\alpha - 1$ such that

$$E_\alpha^\omega(s_\alpha) \leq E_\alpha^\omega(u_\alpha, \mathbb{S}^2 \setminus B(x_1, r)) + \frac{\delta}{3}$$

$$E_\alpha^\omega(w_\alpha) \leq E_\alpha^\omega(u_\alpha, B(x_1, r)) + \frac{\delta}{3}$$

for some $\delta > 0$. Let $[s_\alpha]$ and $[w_\alpha]$ be the free homotopy classes of s_α and w_α , respectively. Then, $[u_\alpha] \subset [s_\alpha] + [w_\alpha]$ and we can conclude that

$$\inf_{v \in [s_\alpha]} E_\alpha^\omega(v) + \inf_{v \in [w_\alpha]} E_\alpha^\omega(v) \leq E_\alpha^\omega(s_\alpha) + E_\alpha^\omega(w_\alpha) < E_\alpha^\omega(u_\alpha) + \frac{2\delta}{3} = \inf_{v \in \mathcal{C}_1} E_\alpha^\omega(v) + \frac{2\delta}{3},$$

which implies that

$$\inf_{v \in [s_\alpha]} E_\alpha^\omega(v) \leq \inf_{v \in \mathcal{C}_1} E_\alpha^\omega(v) - \frac{\varepsilon_0^2}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{v \in [w_\alpha]} E_\alpha^\omega(v) \leq \inf_{v \in \mathcal{C}_1} E_\alpha^\omega(v) - \frac{\varepsilon_0^2}{4},$$

where we used the Proposition 4.1.7 to conclude that $E(s_\alpha) \geq \varepsilon_0^2$ and $E(w_\alpha) \geq \varepsilon_0^2$. Thus, $[u_\alpha] \neq [s_\alpha]$ and $[u_\alpha] \neq [w_\alpha]$, in particular, $[s_\alpha]$ and $[w_\alpha]$ are both non-trivial. Furthermore, by the choice of \mathcal{C}_1 , the free homotopy classes $[s_\alpha]$ and $[w_\alpha]$ must belong to G which further implies $[u_\alpha] \in G$ for $[u_\alpha] \subset [s_\alpha] + [w_\alpha]$. This contradicts to the choice of u_α , hence the conclusion of Theorem 1.1.7 holds. \square

5.2. Existence of H -Sphere of Bounded Morse Index for Generic Choice of $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

In this subsection, we complete the proof of main Theorem 1.1.1. Before presenting into the detailed proofs, we would like to demonstrate that it is possible to modify the values of a finite number of points on a non-constant H -sphere $u : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow N$ without affecting its Morse index, see [MM88, Lemma in Section 4] for the setting of α -harmonic maps and Gulliver-Lawson [GL86, Proposition 1.9] for more general consequences.

Lemma 5.2.1. *Let m be the Morse index of a non-constant H -sphere $u : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow N$. For any finite points $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l\}$ in N , there exists a m -dimensional linear subspace \mathcal{V} of $\Gamma(u^*TN)$ such that*

(1) *The index form*

$$\begin{aligned} I_u(V, V) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left(\langle \nabla V, \nabla V \rangle - R(V, \nabla u, \nabla u, V) \right) dV_g + 2 \int_M \langle H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla V), V \rangle dV_g \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \langle (\nabla_V H)(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u), V \rangle dV_g, \quad \text{for } V \in \mathcal{V}, \end{aligned}$$

of u is negative definite on \mathcal{V} .

(2) *Given any $V \in \mathcal{V}$, V vanishes in some neighborhood of x_i , for every $1 \leq i \leq l$.*

Proof. By assumption, we can find a m -dimensional linear subspace \mathcal{V}_0 of $\Gamma(u^*TN)$ on which the index form I_u is negative definite. Then, choose a small enough $\rho > 0$ such that $B(x_i, \rho) \cap B(x_j, \rho) = \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i \neq j \leq l$ and the distant function $r_i : B(x_i, \rho) \setminus \{x_i\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is smooth. Take $0 < \varepsilon < \min\{\rho, 1\}$ and a series of piecewise

smooth functions $\varphi_i(r_i) : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ can be defined as following

$$\varphi_i(r_i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq r_i < \varepsilon^2, \\ \frac{2 \log \varepsilon - \log r_i}{\log \varepsilon} & \text{if } \varepsilon^2 \leq r_i \leq \varepsilon, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, a straightforward computation yields that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla \varphi_i| dV_g \leq C \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{\varepsilon^2}^{\varepsilon} \frac{1}{|\log \varepsilon|} dr d\theta \leq \frac{C\varepsilon}{|\log \varepsilon|} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla \varphi_i|^2 dV_g \leq \frac{C}{|\log \varepsilon|}.$$

Let $\varphi = \prod_{i=1}^l \varphi_i$ and for each $V \in \mathcal{V}$ we estimate that

$$\begin{aligned} I_u(\varphi V, \varphi V) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} (\langle \nabla(\varphi V), \nabla(\varphi V) \rangle - \varphi^2 R(V, \nabla u, \nabla u, V)) dV_g \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \langle H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla(\varphi V)), \varphi V \rangle dV_g + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \langle (\nabla_{\varphi V} H)(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u), \varphi V \rangle dV_g \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \varphi^2 (\langle \nabla V, \nabla V \rangle - R(V, \nabla u, \nabla u, V)) dV_g \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \varphi^2 \langle H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla V), V \rangle dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \varphi^2 \langle (\nabla_V H)(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u), V \rangle dV_g + \frac{C\varepsilon}{|\log \varepsilon|} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}^2} (|V(x)| + |\nabla V(x)|) \\ &\quad + \frac{C}{|\log \varepsilon|} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}^2} |V(x)|^2 + \frac{C\sqrt{E(u)} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}^2} |V(x)|^2}{|\log \varepsilon|^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that by the construction of φ which equals to 1 away from x_i and vanishes in each small neighborhood of x_i , thus we must have

$$I_u(\varphi V, \varphi V) < 0 \quad \text{for each } V \in \mathcal{V}$$

as long as $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough. And $\mathcal{V} := \varphi \mathcal{V}_0$ is a m -dimensional linear space of $\Gamma(u^*TN)$ satisfying the desired conclusions (1) and (2) of Lemma 5.2.1. \square

We are now ready to complete the proof for the main Theorem 1.1.1. As per Theorem 4.1.4, we only need to establish the upper bound for the Morse index of H -spheres mentioned in Theorem 1.1.1. We adapt the convergence scheme established in [MM88, Theorem 2 in Section 4] where the authors proved a similar Morse index upper bound for sequences of α -harmonic maps.

Proof of Theorem 1.1.1. By Corollary 3.3.7, for almost every $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$, we can find a sequence of non-constant critical points $\{u_{\alpha_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ for $E_{\alpha_j}^{\lambda\omega}$ such that the Morse index of $E_{\alpha_j}^{\lambda\omega}$ at u_{α_j} bounded from above by $k-2$ and the α_j -energy of u_{α_j} is uniformly

bounded as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Then, by Theorem 4.1.4, after passing to a subsequence, u_{α_j} converges strongly in $C^2(\mathbb{S}^2, N)$ except a finite many singular points $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l\}$ to a smooth λH -sphere $u : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow N$. In the following part of proof Theorem 1.1.1, without ambiguity we simply write H to denote λH and ω to denote $\lambda\omega$ for notation simplicity. Then, it suffices to show that the Morse index of limit map u is at most $k - 2$ if $l = 0$, or to show that the Morse index of bubbles is no more than $k - 2$ if $l \geq 1$. To this end, we split the proof into two steps.

Step 1. The Morse index of weak limit u is at most $k - 2$.

In this step, it suffices to show $\text{Ind}_{E^\omega}(u) := m \leq k - 2$. Note that our argument is non-vacuous, since in viewing of Proposition 4.1.7 the weak limit u is always non-constant.

By previous Lemma 5.2.1, there exists m linearly independent vector fields V_1, V_2, \dots, V_m such that the index form of u is negative definite on subspace $\text{Span}\{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_m\}$ and $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_m \in u^*TN$ vanish in neighborhoods of singular points $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l\}$. We then consider the commutative diagram of vector bundles

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} u^*TN & \longrightarrow & \Pi_2^*TN & \longrightarrow & TN \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{S}^2 & \xrightarrow{(i,u)} & \mathbb{S}^2 \times N & \xrightarrow{\Pi_2} & N \end{array}$$

where Π_2 is the projection to the second variable and $i : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ is the identity map. Then we extend V_1, V_2, \dots, V_m to smooth vector fields $\tilde{V}_1, \tilde{V}_2, \dots, \tilde{V}_m \in \Pi_2^*TN$ that supported in a tubular neighborhood of $(i, u)(\mathbb{S}^2)$, and set

$$W_{\alpha_j}^l = (i, u_{\alpha_j})^*(\tilde{V}_l), \quad \text{for } 1 \leq l \leq m.$$

The sequence $W_{\alpha_j}^l$ can be regarded as a map from \mathbb{S}^2 to the tangent bundle of N such that $W_{\alpha_j}^l(p) \in T_{u_{\alpha_j}(p)}N$, then

$$(5.2.1) \quad W_{\alpha_j}^l = (i, u_{\alpha_j})^*(\tilde{V}_l) \longrightarrow (i, u)^*(\tilde{V}_l) = V_l, \quad \text{in } C^2\left(\mathbb{S}^2, u_{\alpha_j}^*(TN)\right).$$

Now we apply the second variation formula of $E_{\alpha_j}^\omega$ to study the asymptotic properties of Morse index $\text{Ind}_{E_{\alpha_j}^\omega}(u_{\alpha_j})$ as $\alpha_j \searrow 1$. By Corollary 2.2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta^2 E_{\alpha_j}^\omega(u_{\alpha_j})(W_{\alpha_j}^p, W_{\alpha_j}^q) \\ &= \alpha_j \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left(1 + |\nabla u_{\alpha_j}|^2\right)^{\alpha_j - 1} \left(\left\langle \nabla W_{\alpha_j}^p, \nabla W_{\alpha_j}^q \right\rangle - R\left(W_{\alpha_j}^p, \nabla u_{\alpha_j}, W_{\alpha_j}^q, \nabla u_{\alpha_j}\right) \right) dV_g \\ & \quad + 2\alpha_j(\alpha_j - 1) \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left(1 + |\nabla u_{\alpha_j}|^2\right)^{\alpha_j - 2} \left\langle \nabla u_{\alpha_j}, \nabla W_{\alpha_j}^p \right\rangle \left\langle \nabla u_{\alpha_j}, \nabla W_{\alpha_j}^q \right\rangle dV_g \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left(\langle H(\nabla^\perp u_{\alpha_j}, \nabla W_{\alpha_j}^p), W_{\alpha_j}^q \rangle + \langle H(\nabla^\perp u_{\alpha_j}, \nabla W_{\alpha_j}^q), W_{\alpha_j}^p \rangle \right) dV_g \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \langle (\nabla_{W_{\alpha_j}^p} H)(\nabla^\perp u_{\alpha_j}, \nabla u_{\alpha_j}), W_{\alpha_j}^q \rangle dV_g \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \langle (\nabla_{W_{\alpha_j}^q} H)(\nabla^\perp u_{\alpha_j}, \nabla u_{\alpha_j}), W_{\alpha_j}^p \rangle dV_g
\end{aligned}$$

for $1 \leq p, q \leq m$. By the choice of $W_{\alpha_j}^l$ and (5.2.1), we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2\alpha_j(\alpha_j - 1) \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left(1 + |\nabla u_{\alpha_j}|^2\right)^{\alpha_j - 2} \left| \langle \nabla u_{\alpha_j}, \nabla W_{\alpha_j}^p \rangle \langle \nabla u_{\alpha_j}, \nabla W_{\alpha_j}^q \rangle \right| dV_g \\
& \leq 2\alpha_j(\alpha_j - 1) \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left(1 + |\nabla u_{\alpha_j}|^2\right)^{\alpha_j - 1} \left\| \nabla W_{\alpha_j}^p \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)} \left\| \nabla W_{\alpha_j}^q \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)} dV_g \\
& \leq C(\alpha_j - 1) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \alpha_j \searrow 1,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^2 E_{\alpha_j}^\omega(u_{\alpha_j})(W_{\alpha_j}^p, W_{\alpha_j}^q) & \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left(\langle \nabla V_p, \nabla V_q \rangle - R(V_p, \nabla u, V_q, \nabla u) \right) dV_g \\
& + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left(\langle H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla V_p), V_q \rangle + \langle H(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla V_q), V_p \rangle \right) dV_g \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \langle (\nabla_{V_p} H)(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u), V^q \rangle dV_g \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \langle (\nabla_{V_q} H)(\nabla^\perp u, \nabla u), V^p \rangle dV_g \\
& = I_u(V_p, V_q).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, I_u is the index form of E^ω at u . Therefore, when $\alpha_j - 1$ is small enough, $\delta^2 E_{\alpha_j}^\omega(u_{\alpha_j})$ is also negatively definite on $\text{span}\{W_{\alpha_j}^1, W_{\alpha_j}^2, \dots, W_{\alpha_j}^m\}$, that is, $m = \text{Ind}_{E^\omega}(u) \leq k - 2$, as desired.

Step 2. The Morse index of bubbles is less than $k - 2$ if the number of energy concentration points $l \geq 1$.

By energy gap Lemma 4.2.2, we have

$$E(u_{\alpha_j}) \geq \varepsilon_0^2, \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N},$$

which means the set of singular points is non-empty, say x_1 is an energy concentration point. Thus, by Theorem 4.1.4, there exists a non-constant H -sphere $v : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow N$ obtained by rescaling the sequence $v_{\alpha_j}(x) = u_{\alpha_j}(x_{\alpha_j} + \lambda_{\alpha_j} x)$ where

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_{\alpha_j}} = \max_{x \in B(x_1, r_0)} |\nabla u_{\alpha_j}|$$

for some small $r_0 > 0$ and x_{α_j} is the point such that the maximum is take on. Then $v_{\alpha_j} : B(0, \lambda_{\alpha_j}^{-1} r_0) \rightarrow N$ is a critical points of a new functional

$$\tilde{E}_{\alpha_j}^{\omega}(u_{\alpha_j}) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{B(0, r_0 \lambda_{\alpha_j}^{-1})} \left(\lambda_{\alpha_j}^2 + |\nabla v_{\alpha_j}|^2 \right)^{\alpha_j} dV_{g_{\alpha_j}} + \lambda_{\alpha_j}^{2\alpha_j-2} \int_{B(0, r_0 \lambda_{\alpha_j}^{-1})} (v_{\alpha_j})^* \omega$$

where

$$g_{\alpha_j} := e^{\varphi(x_{\alpha_j} + \lambda_{\alpha_j} x)} \left((dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2 \right)$$

converges to the Euclidean metric on \mathbb{R}^2 as $\alpha_j \searrow 1$. Near the energy concentration point x_1 , we note that

$$\text{Ind}_{E_{\alpha_j}^{\omega}}(u_{\alpha_j}) = \text{Ind}_{\tilde{E}_{\alpha_j}^{\omega}}(v_{\alpha_j}) \quad \text{for} \quad E_{\alpha_j}^{\omega}(u_{\alpha_j}) = \lambda_{\alpha_j}^{2-2\alpha_j} \tilde{E}_{\alpha_j}^{\omega}(v_{\alpha_j}).$$

As in Step 1, it follows from the Lemma 5.2.1 that there exists m linearly independent vector fields V_1, V_2, \dots, V_m on \mathbb{S}^2 such that the Morse index of v is negative definite on subspace $\text{Span}\{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_m\}$ and vanish in neighborhoods of the branch points of v and vanish around the infinite point $\infty \in \mathbb{S}^2$. Then we extend V_1, V_2, \dots, V_m to smooth vector fields $\tilde{V}_1, \tilde{V}_2, \dots, \tilde{V}_m \in \Pi_2^* TN$ that supported in a tubular neighborhood of $(i, v)(\mathbb{S}^2)$, and set

$$\tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^l = (i, v_{\alpha_j})^*(\tilde{V}_l), \quad \text{for } 1 \leq l \leq m.$$

Similar to the computation of Lemma 2.2.1, we obtain the second variation of the functional $\tilde{E}_{\alpha_j}^{\omega}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta^2 \tilde{E}_{\alpha_j}^{\omega}(v_{\alpha_j})(\tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^p, \tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^q) \\ &= \alpha_j \int_{B(0, \lambda_{\alpha_j}^{-1} r_0)} \left(\lambda_{\alpha_j}^2 + |\nabla v_{\alpha_j}|^2 \right)^{\alpha_j-1} \left(\left\langle \nabla \tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^p, \nabla \tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^q \right\rangle \right. \\ & \quad \left. - R \left(\tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^p, \nabla v_{\alpha_j}, \tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^q, \nabla v_{\alpha_j} \right) \right) dV_{g_{\alpha_j}} \\ &+ 2\alpha_j(\alpha_j - 1) \int_{B(0, \lambda_{\alpha_j}^{-1} r_0)} \left(\lambda_{\alpha_j}^2 + |\nabla v_{\alpha_j}|^2 \right)^{\alpha_j-2} \left\langle \nabla v_{\alpha_j}, \nabla \tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^p \right\rangle \left\langle \nabla v_{\alpha_j}, \nabla \tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^q \right\rangle dV_{g_{\alpha_j}} \\ &+ \lambda_{\alpha_j}^{2\alpha_j-2} \int_{B(0, \lambda_{\alpha_j}^{-1} r_0)} \left(\left\langle H(\nabla^{\perp} v_{\alpha_j}, \nabla \tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^p), \tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^q \right\rangle + \left\langle H(\nabla^{\perp} v_{\alpha_j}, \nabla \tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^q), \tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^p \right\rangle \right) dV_{g_{\alpha_j}} \\ &+ \frac{\lambda_{\alpha_j}^{2\alpha_j-2}}{2} \int_{B(0, \lambda_{\alpha_j}^{-1} r_0)} \left\langle \left(\nabla_{\tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^p} H \right) (\nabla^{\perp} v_{\alpha_j}, \nabla v_{\alpha_j}), \tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^q \right\rangle dV_{g_{\alpha_j}} \\ &+ \frac{\lambda_{\alpha_j}^{2\alpha_j-2}}{2} \int_{B(0, \lambda_{\alpha_j}^{-1} r_0)} \left\langle \left(\nabla_{\tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^q} H \right) (\nabla^{\perp} v_{\alpha_j}, \nabla v_{\alpha_j}), \tilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^p \right\rangle dV_{g_{\alpha_j}} \end{aligned}$$

and observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2\alpha_j(\alpha_j - 1) \int_{B(0, \lambda_{\alpha_j}^{-1} r_0)} \left(\lambda_{\alpha_j}^2 + |\nabla v_{\alpha_j}|^2 \right)^{\alpha_j - 2} \left| \left\langle \nabla v_{\alpha_j}, \nabla \widetilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^p \right\rangle \left\langle e \nabla u_{\alpha_j}, \nabla \widetilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^q \right\rangle \right| dV_{g_{\alpha_j}} \\
& \leq 4\alpha_j(\alpha_j - 1) \int_{B(0, \lambda_{\alpha_j}^{-1} r_0)} \left(1 + |\nabla v_{\alpha_j}|^2 \right)^{\alpha_j - 1} \left\| \nabla \widetilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^i \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)} \left\| \nabla \widetilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^j \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)} dV_{g_{\alpha_j}} \\
& \leq C(\alpha_j - 1) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \alpha_j \searrow 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Because $\max_{x \in B(0, \lambda_{\alpha_j}^{-1} r_0)} |\nabla v_{\alpha_j}| = 1$ and $\lambda_{\alpha_j}^{2-2\alpha_j} \rightarrow \mu = 1$ as $\alpha_j \searrow 1$, see Theorem 4.1.4, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^2 \widetilde{E}_{\alpha_j}^\omega(v_{\alpha_j}) & \longrightarrow \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left(\langle \nabla \widetilde{V}_i, \nabla \widetilde{V}_j \rangle - R(\widetilde{V}_i, \nabla v, \widetilde{V}_j, \nabla v) \right) dV_g \\
& \quad + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left(\langle H(\nabla^\perp v, \nabla \widetilde{V}_i), \widetilde{V}_j \rangle + \langle H(\nabla^\perp v, \nabla \widetilde{V}_j), \widetilde{V}_i \rangle \right) dV_g \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left\langle (\nabla_{\widetilde{V}^p} H)(\nabla^\perp v, \nabla v), \widetilde{V}^q \right\rangle dV_g \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left\langle (\nabla_{\widetilde{V}^q} H)(\nabla^\perp v, \nabla v), \widetilde{V}^p \right\rangle dV_g \\
& = I_v(V_p, V_q),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the conformally invariance of index form I_v to change the integral domain from \mathbb{R}^2 to \mathbb{S}^2 . Therefore, when $\alpha_j - 1$ is small enough, $\delta^2 \widetilde{E}_{\alpha_j}^\omega(v_{\alpha_j})$ is negatively definite on

$$\text{span} \left\{ \widetilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^1, \widetilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^2, \dots, \widetilde{W}_{\alpha_j}^m \right\},$$

that is, $m = \text{Ind}_{\widetilde{E}^\omega}(v) \leq k - 2$. Therefore, we complete the proof of the main Theorem 1.1.1. \square

5.3. Existence of H -Sphere under Ricci Curvature Assumption When $\dim(N) = 3$.

In this subsection, we prove the part (1) of Theorem 1.1.2, more precisely, we aim to show that there exists a H -sphere in N for every choice of prescribed mean curvature H satisfying (1.1.1) with Morse index at most 1. To this end, we first combine the Ricci curvature condition with Morse index estimates to obtain an energy bound for H -spheres which is uniformly for H , see Proposition 5.3.1 and Proposition 5.3.3 and then we can pass the limit to obtain the desired H -sphere for every H satisfying (1.1.1).

In order to get the uniformly energy bound, we aim to build an index comparison for variable prescribed mean curvature H , see [EM08, Theorem 1.1] for the case of minimal surfaces and [CZ23, Proposition 5.1] within the context of CMC surfaces.

Before stating the detailed results, we recall some fundamental concepts about complex vector bundle and introduce our notations which inherits from [EM08, Section 2] and [CZ23, Section 5].

Let $u : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow N$ be a H -sphere and denote the pull back bundle u^*TN simply by E . We represent the Riemannian metric on TN by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, which can be complex bi-linearly extended to $T_{\mathbb{C}}N := TN \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C}$. The Levi-Civita connection ∇ on TN is also extended complex linearly to $T_{\mathbb{C}}N$ and is compatible with the Hermitian metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $T_{\mathbb{C}}N$. Here, we use the same notations, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and ∇ , regardless of whether they are defined on TN or $T_{\mathbb{C}}N$. When the dimension of N is three, it is worth noting that the mean curvature type vector field $H \in \Gamma(\wedge^2(N) \otimes TN)$ can be identified with a function defined on N . Therefore, the Euler-Lagrange equation (1.3.2) of H -sphere is written as (1.3.5) and the corresponding second variation formula becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 \delta^2 E^\omega(u)(V, V) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \langle \nabla V, \nabla V \rangle - R(V, \nabla u, V, \nabla u) dV_g \\
 &\quad + 2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} H \langle \nabla_{\partial_{x^1}} V \wedge u_{x^2} + u_{x^1} \wedge \nabla_{\partial_{x^2}} V, V \rangle dx^1 dx^2 \\
 (5.3.1) \quad &\quad + 2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} (\nabla_V H) \langle u_{x^1} \wedge u_{x^2}, V \rangle dx^1 dx^2
 \end{aligned}$$

in this scenario. Then, let $z = x^1 + \sqrt{-1}x^2$ be a local complex coordinate of \mathbb{S}^2 , we can rewrite the conformal H -sphere equations (1.3.5) and (1.3.4) as

$$(5.3.2) \quad \nabla_{\partial_{\bar{z}}} u_z = \sqrt{-1}H(u_{\bar{z}} \wedge u_z),$$

$$(5.3.3) \quad \langle u_z, u_z \rangle = 0.$$

The solution $u : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow N$ to (5.3.2) and (5.3.3) is a branched immersion and at each branch point p using coordinate $z = x^1 + \sqrt{-1}x^2$ u_z can be locally represented as

$$u_z = z^{b_p} V$$

where $b_p \in \mathbb{N}$ is the order of branching at p and V is a local section of $E \otimes \mathbb{C} := \mathbf{E}$ with $V(p) \neq 0$. This allows us to define the ramified tangent bundle ξ on \mathbb{S}^2 , that is, ξ is the tangent bundle of \mathbb{S}^2 twisted at the branch points by the amount equal to b_p such that $E = \xi \oplus \nu$ where ν is the normal bundle of \mathbb{S}^2 in N . The complex structure on \mathbb{S}^2 gives ξ the structure of a complex line bundle and induces the splitting

$$\xi_{\mathbb{C}} := \xi \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C} = \xi^{1,0} \oplus \xi^{0,1}$$

where the fibres of $\xi^{1,0}$ and $\xi^{0,1}$ are locally spanned by u_z and $u_{\bar{z}}$ away from the branch points of u . The connection ∇ on E gives rise to metric compatible connections ∇^{\top} on ξ and ∇^{\perp} on ν .

Inspired by the construction of compared bi-linear functional described in [EM08, Theorem 2.1] and [CZ23, Equation (5.4)], we define the following bi-linear form to compared with $\delta^2 E^\omega(u)$. For any $s \in \Gamma(\nu)$ we let

$$B_\omega(u)(s, s) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla f|^2 - |\nabla u|^2 \left(|H|^2 + \frac{\text{Ric}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n})}{2} - |\nabla H| \right) f^2 dV_g$$

where $\mathbf{n} \in \Gamma(\nu)$ is the unit normal section of ν , $f = \langle s, \mathbf{n} \rangle \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2, \mathbb{R})$, $\text{Ric}_h(N)$ (in the following abbreviated as Ric) is the Ricci curvature tensor of target manifold (N, h) . The index of $B_\omega(u)$ is naturally defined to be the maximum of dimension of the linear subspace of $\Gamma(\nu)$ on which $B_\omega(u)$ is negative definite. The following proposition is the first main result in this subsection.

Proposition 5.3.1. *Let (N, h) be a 3-dimensional Riemannian manifold, then for non-constant solution u to (5.3.2) and (5.3.3), the index of $B_\omega(u)$ is no more than $\text{Ind}_{E^\omega}(u)$.*

Before proving the Proposition 5.3.1, we modify computations in [EM08, Theorem 2.1] and [CZ23, Lemma 5.2] to obtain the following relations between $\delta^2 E^\omega(u)$ and $B_\omega(u)$:

Lemma 5.3.2. *For any $\sigma \in \Gamma(\xi)$ and $s \in \Gamma(\nu)$, we define $\eta \in \Gamma(\wedge^{1,0}(\mathbb{S}^2) \otimes \xi^{0,1})$ by*

$$\eta = ((\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{0,1} + \nabla_{\partial_z}^\top \sigma^{0,1}) dz.$$

Then

$$(5.3.4) \quad \delta^2 E^\omega(u)(s + \sigma, s + \sigma) \leq B_\omega(u)(s, s) + 4 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\eta|^2 dV_g.$$

Proof. First, recalling Lemma 5.2.1 it suffices to prove (5.3.4) in the case where s and σ are supported away from the set of branch points \mathcal{B} . And, the Riemann uniformization theorem enables us to simplify our computations by assuming that they are always performed in a isothermal coordinate, denoted as (x^1, x^2) , with a metric of $ds^2 = \kappa^2((dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2)$. To begin, keeping in mind that

$$|\nabla_{\partial_{x^1}} v|^2 + |\nabla_{\partial_{x^2}} v|^2 = 4|\nabla_{\partial_z} v|^2, \quad u_{x^1} \wedge u_{x^2} = 2\sqrt{-1}u_{\bar{z}} \wedge u_z$$

and

$$\nabla_{\partial_{x^1}} v \wedge u_{x^2} + u_{x^1} \wedge \nabla_{\partial_{x^2}} v = 4 \text{Im}(u_z \wedge \nabla_{\partial_{\bar{z}}} v) = 4 \text{Re}(-\sqrt{-1}u_z \wedge \nabla_{\partial_z} v),$$

we rewrite the second variational formula (5.3.1) of E^ω by representing $\delta^2 E^\omega(u)(v, v)$ in terms of complex coordinates as follows:

$$\delta^2 E^\omega(u)(v, v) = 4 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla_{\partial_z} v|^2 - \langle R(v, u_z)u_{\bar{z}}, v \rangle dx^1 dx^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 8 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \operatorname{Re} \left\langle \nabla_{\partial_z} v, \overline{\sqrt{-1}H(u_z \wedge v)} \right\rangle dx^1 dx^2 \\
(5.3.5) \quad & + 4 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \operatorname{Im} \left\langle v, (\nabla_v H)(u_z \wedge u_{\bar{z}}) \right\rangle dx^1 dx^2
\end{aligned}$$

where $v := s + \sigma$. Taking derivative to the identity $\langle s, u_{\bar{z}} \rangle = 0$ and utilizing equation (5.3.2) to yields

$$\langle \nabla_{\partial_z} s + \sqrt{-1}H(u_z \wedge s), u_{\bar{z}} \rangle = \langle \nabla_{\partial_z} s + \sqrt{-1}H(u_z \wedge s), \bar{u}_z \rangle = 0$$

which is equivalent to

$$(5.3.6) \quad (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0} + \sqrt{-1}H(u_z \wedge s) = 0$$

since clearly

$$\langle (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0} + \sqrt{-1}H(u_z \wedge s), u_z \rangle = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0} + \sqrt{-1}H(u_z \wedge s), \mathbf{n} \rangle = 0.$$

Similarly, from identity $\langle \sigma^{0,1}, u_{\bar{z}} \rangle = 0$ and equation (5.3.2), we can obtain

$$(5.3.7) \quad (\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{0,1})^\perp + \sqrt{-1}H(u_z, \sigma^{0,1}) = 0.$$

Then, we decompose $v = s + \sigma^{1,0} + \sigma^{0,1}$, and keeping in mind that $u_z \wedge \sigma^{1,0} = 0$, (5.3.6) and (5.3.7), we can rewrite the integrand in the second line of (5.3.5) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Re} \left\langle \nabla_{\partial_z} v, \overline{\sqrt{-1}H(u_z \wedge v)} \right\rangle \\
& = \operatorname{Re} \left\langle \nabla_{\partial_z} v, \overline{\sqrt{-1}H(u_z \wedge \sigma^{0,1})} \right\rangle + \operatorname{Re} \left\langle \nabla_{\partial_z} v, \overline{\sqrt{-1}H(u_z \wedge s)} \right\rangle \\
& = -\operatorname{Re} \left\langle (\nabla_{\partial_z} v)^\perp, \overline{(\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{0,1})^\perp} \right\rangle - \operatorname{Re} \left\langle (\nabla_{\partial_z} v)^\top, \overline{(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0}} \right\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above calculation with the first term in the first line of (5.3.5) and writing it as $|\nabla_{\partial_z} v|^2 = |(\nabla_{\partial_z} v)^\perp|^2 + |(\nabla_{\partial_z} v)^\top|^2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla_{\partial_z} v|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} \left\langle \nabla_{\partial_z} v, \overline{\sqrt{-1}H(u_z \wedge v)} \right\rangle & = \left(|(\nabla_{\partial_z} v)^\perp|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re} \left\langle (\nabla_{\partial_z} v)^\perp, \overline{(\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{0,1})^\perp} \right\rangle \right) \\
& \quad + \left(|(\nabla_{\partial_z} v)^\top|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re} \left\langle (\nabla_{\partial_z} v)^\top, \overline{(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0}} \right\rangle \right) \\
& = \left(|(\nabla_{\partial_z} v)^\perp - (\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{0,1})^\perp|^2 - |(\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{0,1})^\perp|^2 \right) \\
(5.3.8) \quad & \quad + \left(|(\nabla_{\partial_z} v)^\top - (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0}|^2 - |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0}|^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We split

$$(\nabla_{\partial_z} v)^\perp = (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^\perp + (\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0})^\perp + (\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{0,1})^\perp$$

for the normal component, and recalling $\eta = (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{0,1} + \nabla_{\partial_z}^\top \sigma^{0,1}$, for the tangent component, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla_{\partial_z} v)^\top &= (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0} + (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{0,1} + (\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0})^\top + (\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{0,1})^\top \\ &= (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0} + \eta + (\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0})^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Then plugging these terms into (5.3.8) and expanding the square terms yield

$$\begin{aligned} &|\nabla_{\partial_z} v|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} \left\langle \nabla_{\partial_z} v, \overline{\sqrt{-1}H(u_z \wedge v)} \right\rangle \\ &= |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^\perp + (\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0})^\perp|^2 - |(\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{0,1})^\perp|^2 \\ &\quad + |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{0,1} + (\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{0,1})^\top + (\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0})^\top|^2 - |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0}|^2 \\ &= |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^\perp|^2 + |(\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0})^\perp|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^\perp, \overline{\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0}} \rangle \\ (5.3.9) \quad &- |(\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{0,1})^\perp|^2 + \frac{\mu^2}{2} |\eta|^2 + |(\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0})^\top|^2 - |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0}|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Next we combine the following identities into (5.3.9)

$$\begin{aligned} |(\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0})^\perp|^2 + |(\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0})^\top|^2 &= |\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0}|^2 \\ \operatorname{Re} \langle (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^\perp, \overline{\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0}} \rangle &= \operatorname{Re} \langle \nabla_{\partial_z} s, \overline{\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0}} \rangle - \operatorname{Re} \langle (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0}, \overline{\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0}} \rangle \\ |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0}|^2 &= |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^\top|^2 - |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{0,1}|^2 \end{aligned}$$

and plugging the result into second variation formula (5.3.5) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} \delta^2 E^\omega(u)(v, v) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\eta|^2 dV_g + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^\perp|^2 - |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^\top|^2 + |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{0,1}|^2 dx^1 dx^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |(\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0})^\perp|^2 - |(\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{0,1})^\perp|^2 dx^1 dx^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \operatorname{Re} \langle \nabla_{\partial_z} s, \overline{\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0}} \rangle - \operatorname{Re} \langle (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0}, \overline{\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0}} \rangle dx^1 dx^2 \\ (5.3.10) \quad &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \operatorname{Im} \langle v, (\nabla_v H)(u_z \wedge u_{\bar{z}}) \rangle - \langle R(v, u_z) u_{\bar{z}}, v \rangle dx^1 dx^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then we consider the integral in (5.3.10) term by term. First, we compute the first two integrands in the second line of (5.3.10). Integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |(\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0})^\perp|^2 - |(\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{0,1})^\perp|^2 dx^1 dx^2 \\ (5.3.11) \quad &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |(\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{0,1})^\top|^2 + \langle R(u_z, u_{\bar{z}}) \sigma^{1,0}, \sigma^{0,1} \rangle dx^1 dx^2. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the first integrand in the third line of integral (5.3.10), we integrate by parts again to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \operatorname{Re} \langle \nabla_{\partial_z} s, \nabla_{\partial_{\bar{z}}} \sigma^{0,1} \rangle dx^1 dx^2 \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} -2 \operatorname{Re} \langle s, R(u_z, u_{\bar{z}}) \sigma^{0,1} \rangle + 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle \nabla_{\partial_z} s, \nabla_{\partial_{\bar{z}}} \sigma^{1,0} \rangle dx^1 dx^2 \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} -2 \operatorname{Re} \langle s, R(u_z, u_{\bar{z}}) \sigma^{0,1} \rangle + 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{0,1}, (\nabla_{\partial_{\bar{z}}} \sigma^{1,0})^\top \rangle dx^1 dx^2 \\
(5.3.12) \quad &+ \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^\perp, (\nabla_{\partial_{\bar{z}}} \sigma^{1,0})^\perp \rangle dx^1 dx^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting equations (5.3.11) and (5.3.12) into (5.3.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{4} \delta^2 E^\omega(u)(v, v) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\eta|^2 dV_g + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^\perp|^2 - |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^\top|^2 dx^1 dx^2 \\
&+ \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \langle R(\sigma^{1,0}, u_{\bar{z}}) u_z, \sigma^{0,1} \rangle - 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle s, R(u_z, u_{\bar{z}}) \sigma^{0,1} \rangle dx^1 dx^2 \\
&+ \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle \nabla_{\partial_z} s, (\nabla_{\partial_{\bar{z}}} \sigma^{1,0})^\perp \rangle - 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0}, \overline{\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0}} \rangle dx^1 dx^2 \\
(5.3.13) \quad &+ \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \operatorname{Im} \langle v, (\nabla_v H)(u_z \wedge u_{\bar{z}}) \rangle - \langle R(v, u_z) u_{\bar{z}}, v \rangle dx^1 dx^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the integral identity

$$\frac{\mu^2}{2} |\eta|^2 = |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{0,1}|^2 + |(\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{0,1})^\top|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{0,1}, (\nabla_{\partial_{\bar{z}}} \sigma^{1,0})^\top \rangle.$$

By (5.3.6) and (5.3.7), utilizing integration by parts we consider the integral in the third line of (5.3.13) to see

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle \nabla_{\partial_z} s, (\nabla_{\partial_{\bar{z}}} \sigma^{1,0})^\perp \rangle - 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle (\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0}, \overline{\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0}} \rangle dx^1 dx^2 \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle \nabla_{\partial_z} s, -\sqrt{-1} H(u_z \wedge \sigma^{0,1}) \rangle \\
&\quad - 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle (-\sqrt{-1} H(u_z \wedge s), \nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{1,0}) \rangle dx^1 dx^2 \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} 2H \operatorname{Re} \partial_z \langle s, -\sqrt{-1} u_z \wedge \sigma^{0,1} \rangle dx^1 dx^2 \\
(5.3.14) \quad &= - \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \operatorname{Re} \langle s, -\sqrt{-1} (\nabla_\sigma H)(u_z \wedge u_{\bar{z}}) \rangle dx^1 dx^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For the term about derivatives of H in (5.3.13), we use the ant-symmetric of wedge product to get that

$$(5.3.15) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \operatorname{Im} \left\langle v, \overline{(\nabla_v H)(u_z \wedge u_{\bar{z}})} \right\rangle dx^1 dx^2 = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \operatorname{Im} \left\langle s, \overline{(\nabla_s H)(u_z \wedge u_{\bar{z}})} \right\rangle dx^1 dx^2 \\ + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \operatorname{Re} \left\langle s, -\sqrt{-1}(\nabla_\sigma H)(u_z \wedge u_{\bar{z}}) \right\rangle dx^1 dx^2.$$

Furthermore, conjunction the second line in (5.3.13) with the Riemann curvature tensor term in the final line of equation (5.3.13) results in

$$(5.3.16) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left\langle R(\sigma^{1,0}, u_{\bar{z}})u_z, \sigma^{0,1} \right\rangle - 2 \operatorname{Re} \left\langle s, R(u_z, u_{\bar{z}})\sigma^{0,1} \right\rangle - \left\langle R(v, u_z)u_{\bar{z}}, v \right\rangle dx^1 dx^2 \\ = - \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left\langle R(s, u_z)u_{\bar{z}}, s \right\rangle dx^1 dx^2.$$

Therefore, by substituting (5.3.14), (5.3.15), (5.3.16) into (5.3.13), we obtain

$$(5.3.17) \quad \delta^2 E^\omega(u)(v, v) = 4 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\eta|^2 dV_g + 4 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^\perp|^2 - |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^\top|^2 dx^1 dx^2 \\ + 4 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \operatorname{Im} \left\langle s, \overline{\sqrt{-1}(\nabla_s H)(u_z, u_{\bar{z}})} \right\rangle - \left\langle R(s, u_z)u_{\bar{z}}, s \right\rangle dx^1 dx^2 \\ \leq 4 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\eta|^2 dV_g + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla f|^2 - |\nabla u|^2 \left(|H|^2 + \frac{\operatorname{Ric}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n})}{2} - |\nabla H| \right) f^2 dV_g$$

where $s = f\mathbf{n}$,

$$\left\langle R(s, u_z)u_{\bar{z}}, s \right\rangle = \frac{\mu^2 |\nabla u|^2}{8} f^2 \operatorname{Ric}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n})$$

$$|(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^\top|^2 \geq |(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{1,0}|^2 = |H|^2 f^2 |u_z|^2 = \frac{\mu^2 |\nabla u|^2}{4} |H|^2 f^2,$$

and

$$\operatorname{Im} \left\langle s, \overline{\sqrt{-1}(\nabla_s H)(u_z \wedge u_{\bar{z}})} \right\rangle \leq \frac{1}{4} |\nabla H| \cdot |\nabla u|^2 f^2,$$

which gives the inequality (5.3.4) as asserted. \square

We are now ready to give the proof of Proposition 5.3.1.

Proof of Proposition 5.3.1. Based on Lemma 5.3.2, the task at hand can be accomplished by finding the solution to the following equation for $\sigma^{0,1} \in \Gamma(\xi^{0,1})$

$$(5.3.18) \quad (\nabla_{\partial_z} \sigma^{0,1})^\top dz = -(\nabla_{\partial_z} s)^{0,1} dz.$$

But from the proof of genus zero part of [EM08, Theorem 1] or [CZ23, Proposition 5.3], for each $s \in \Gamma(\nu)$ there exists a solution to (5.3.18). Then, pick any linearly independent sections s_1, \dots, s_d of ν such that $B_\omega(u)$ is negative definite on their $\mathcal{V} := \operatorname{Span}\{s_1, \dots, s_d\}$. For each $1 \leq i \leq d$ we choose a solution $\sigma_i^{0,1} \in \Gamma(\xi^{0,1})$ to (5.3.18)

with s placed by s_i and define

$$\sigma_i := \sigma_i^{0,1} + \overline{\sigma_i^{0,1}}.$$

Next, we define a linear map $T : V \rightarrow \Gamma(E)$ by assigning each s_i to $s_i + \sigma_i$. By substituting $s + \sigma$ with $T(s)$ in Lemma 5.3.2, it can be inferred that

$$\delta^2 E^\omega(u)(T(s), T(s)) \leq B_\omega(u)(s, s) < 0 \text{ for all } s \in V.$$

The fact that T is injective leads to the conclusion that the index of $B_\omega(u)$ is no greater than $\text{Ind}_{E^\omega}(u)$. \square

Using the index comparison mentioned in Proposition 5.3.1, in conjunction with the standard conformal balancing argument (as described in [LY82] and also see [CZ23, Proposition 5.3]), we are able to derive a uniform energy bound. The main result is the following.

Proposition 5.3.3. *Suppose*

$$(5.3.19) \quad |H|^2 h + \frac{\text{Ric}_h}{2} - |\nabla H| h > C_0 h,$$

and let $u : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow N$ be a solution to (5.3.2) and (5.3.3) with Morse index at most 1. Then

$$(5.3.20) \quad E(u) \leq \frac{C_0}{8\pi}.$$

Proof. To establish this proposition, it is necessary to assume that u is non-constant. By assumption and Proposition 5.3.1, we see that $B_\omega(u)$ also has Morse index at most 1. Moreover, let f be a constant function in $B_\omega(u)(f, f)$, it follows that $B_\omega(u)$ admits index exactly one, which further implies

$$(5.3.21) \quad B_\omega(u)(f, f) \geq 0,$$

for any non-constant f . Suppose $\varphi > 0$ is a smallest eigenfunction for the elliptic operator

$$-\Delta - \left(|H|^2 + \frac{\text{Ric}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n})}{2} - |\nabla H| \right) |\nabla u|^2.$$

A mapping degree argument described in [LY82, pp. 274] tells us that there exists a conformal map $F : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} (F^i) \varphi dV_g = 0, \text{ for } i = 1, 2, 3.$$

which implies F^i can not be constant. Here $\{x^1, x^2, x^3\}$ is the coordinates of the standard embedding $\mathbb{S}^2 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ and we use the abbreviation F^i as $x^i(F)$ to simplify the

notation. Hence by (5.3.21) we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla(F^i)|^2 - |\nabla u|^2 \left(|H|^2 + \frac{\text{Ric}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n})}{2} - |\nabla H| \right) (F^i)^2 dV_g \geq 0.$$

Rearranging the above inequality and taking summation to conclude

$$\begin{aligned} C_0 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla u|^2 dV_g &= C_0 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla u|^2 \sum_{i=1}^3 (F^i)^2 dV_g \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla(F^i)|^2 dV_g = \sum_{i=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla x^i|^2 dV_g = 8\pi, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is obtained by the conformally invariance of the energy. This gives (5.3.20). \square

Proof of Part (1) Theorem 1.1.2. Firstly, by Theorem 1.1.1 there exists a strictly increasing sequence $\lambda_j \nearrow \lambda$ such that we can find a sequence of corresponding non-constant H -spheres u_j with prescribed mean curvature $\lambda_j H$ and Morse index at most 1. By compactness of N and assumption (1.1.1), there exists $C_0 > 0$ such that (5.3.19) holds, hence

$$E(u_j) \leq \frac{C_0}{8\pi}.$$

By the energy gap Lemma 4.2.2, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$(5.3.22) \quad E(u_j) \geq \varepsilon_0^2.$$

By a similar estimate as Lemma 4.2.1 and Theorem 4.1.4, we also have an alternative: either, after passing to a subsequence, u_j converges strongly to a H -sphere u with $E(u) \geq \varepsilon_0^2$, or the the energy $E(u_j)$ of sequence u_j concentrates at some points, in which case we can also obtain a H -sphere v satisfying $E(v) \geq \varepsilon_0^2$ by a rescaling argument and applying Lemma 4.2.3. In both cases, the index upper bound is established exactly as in the proof of corresponding part of Theorem 1.1.1 and the Ricci curvature condition (5.3.19) implies that the Morse index of a non-constant H -sphere is positive. In a word, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.2. \square

5.4. Existence of H -Sphere under Isotropic Curvature Assumption When $\dim(N) \geq 4$.

In this subsection, we prove the second assertion of Theorem 1.1.2. We first recall that an element $z \in T_p N \otimes \mathbb{C}$ is called isotropic if $\langle z, z \rangle = 0$ for complex linearly extended metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ from h defined on $T_p N$ and a complex linear subspace $Z \subset T_p N \otimes \mathbb{C}$ is called *totally isotropic* if $\langle z, z \rangle = 0$ for any $z \in Z$. The Riemannian manifold (N, h) is said that has positive isotropic curvature if the complexified sectional

curvature R satisfies

$$\mathcal{K}(\sigma) := \frac{R(z, w, \bar{z}, \bar{w})}{|z \wedge w|^2} > 0$$

whenever $\sigma \subset T_p N \otimes \mathbb{C}$ is a totally isotropic two plane at $p \in N$. Moreover, recall $\xi^{1,0}$ and $\xi^{0,1}$ are locally spanned by u_z and $u_{\bar{z}}$ which are isotropic line bundles within \mathbf{E} , let $\nu \otimes \mathbb{C} := \nu_{\mathbb{C}}$ be the complexified normal bundle of $\xi_{\mathbb{C}}$ in \mathbf{E} . Since \mathbb{S}^2 can be viewed as an 1-dimensional complex manifold, by [AHS78, Theorem 5.1] there exists a unique holomorphic structure on $\nu_{\mathbb{C}}$ such that $\nabla'' = \bar{\partial}$ where

$$\nabla' : \wedge^{0,0}(\nu_{\mathbb{C}}) \longrightarrow \wedge^{1,0}(\nu_{\mathbb{C}}), \quad \nabla'' : \wedge^{0,0}(\nu_{\mathbb{C}}) \longrightarrow \wedge^{0,1}(\nu_{\mathbb{C}})$$

are two component of complex linear extended connection ∇^{\perp} on $\nu_{\mathbb{C}}$. Equipped with above notions, we have:

Proof of Part (2) of Main Theorem 1.1.2. We will actually prove a stronger assertion:

Claim 1. Let (N, h) be an n -dimensional Riemannian manifold with isotropic curvature satisfying (1.1.2). Then any non-constant conformal H -sphere has Morse index at least $\lfloor (n-2)/2 \rfloor$.

Proof of Claim 1. By Grothendick's theorem, see [Gro57], which says that any holomorphic vector bundle over \mathbb{S}^2 can be represented as a direct sum of holomorphic line bundles, we can decompose $\nu_{\mathbb{C}}$ as

$$\nu_{\mathbb{C}} = L_1 \oplus L_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus L_{n-2}$$

which is unique up to a permutation of the order for L_i . So after changing the order of L_i , we can assume that

$$\mathbf{c}_1(L_1) \geq \mathbf{c}_1(L_2) \geq \cdots \geq \mathbf{c}_1(L_{n-2})$$

where $\mathbf{c}_1(L_i)$ is the first Chern class of L_i evaluated on the fundamental class of \mathbb{S}^2 . The Levi-Civita connection ∇ preserves the Riemannian metric parallelly, resulting in a complex linearly extended bi-linear form denoted as $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \nu_{\mathbb{C}} \times \nu_{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. This bi-linear form is holomorphic and establishes a holomorphic isomorphism between $\nu_{\mathbb{C}}$ and its dual $\nu_{\mathbb{C}}^*$. Thus, by the invariance of Chern class, we have

$$\mathbf{c}_1(L_i) + \mathbf{c}_1(L_{n-i-1}) = 0.$$

Let V_i be a meromorphic section of L_i for $1 \leq i \leq n-2$. If $\langle V_i, V_j \rangle \not\equiv 0$, then we must have $\mathbf{c}_1(L_i) + \mathbf{c}_1(L_j) = 0$, that is, $\langle V_i, V_j \rangle \equiv 0$ provided that $\mathbf{c}_1(L_i) + \mathbf{c}_1(L_j) \neq 0$ for any section $V_i \in \Gamma(L_i)$ and $V_j \in \Gamma(L_j)$. Denote \mathbf{N}_0 the direct sum of the line bundle that has zero first Chern class and $\mathbf{N}_+(\mathbf{N}_-)$ be the direct sum of the line bundle that has positive (negative) first Chern class. Then \mathbf{N}_+ is an isotropic sub-bundle of $\nu_{\mathbb{C}}$ and

$\langle V_0, V_+ \rangle = 0$ for each $V_0 \in \Gamma(\mathbf{N}_0)$ and $V_+ \in \Gamma(\mathbf{N}_+)$. It follows from the Riemann-Roch theorem that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{O}(L_i)) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{c}_1(L_i) + 1, & \text{if } \mathbf{c}_1(L_i) \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{c}_1(L_i) < 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{O}(L_i)$ is the set of holomorphic section of L_i . For any holomorphic sections W_i, W_j of \mathbf{N}_0 , since $\langle V_i, V_j \rangle$ is a holomorphic function on \mathbb{S}^2 , $\langle W_i, W_j \rangle$ is constant which means that one can choose W_i such that $\{W_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq \dim(\mathbf{N}_0)}$ to be an orthonormal basis at each fibre of \mathbf{N}_0 respect to the bi-linear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Let \mathcal{O} be the complex linear space of holomorphic sections of $\nu_{\mathbb{C}}$ spanned by the holomorphic isotropic sections

$$\{W_1 + \sqrt{-1}W_2, W_3 + \sqrt{-1}W_4, \dots, W_{2m-1} + \sqrt{-1}W_{2m}\}$$

where $m = [\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbf{N}_0)/2] \in \mathbb{N}$ together with the holomorphic sections of \mathbf{N}_+ . Then, we conclude that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{O}) \geq [(n-2)/2]$. Note that by the choice of $\nu_{\mathbb{C}}$, u_z is linearly independent with elements in \mathcal{O} , that is, u_z and V can span a totally isotropic two plane in \mathbf{E} for any $V \in \mathcal{O}$. Thus, by complex form of second variation formula (5.3.5) for E^ω , for any $V \in \mathcal{O}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^2 E^\omega(u)(V, V) &= 4 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} -\langle R(V, u_z)u_{\bar{z}}, V \rangle dV_g \\ &\quad + 4 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \operatorname{Re} \left\langle V, \overline{\sqrt{-1}(\nabla_V H)(u_z, u_{\bar{z}})} \right\rangle dV_g < 0, \end{aligned}$$

provided that (1.1.2) holds. Therefore, the Morse index of u is greater than or equal to $[(n-2)/2]$. \square

The proof of part (2) of Theorem 1.1.2 follows directly from Claim 1. \square

REFERENCES

- [AdCT10] Hilário Alencar, Manfredo Perdigão do Carmo, and Renato Tribuzy, *A Hopf theorem for ambient spaces of dimensions higher than three*, J. Differential Geom. **84** (2010), no. 1, 1–17. MR 2629507
- [AHS78] Michael Francis Atiyah, Nigel James Hitchin, and Isadore M. Singer, *Self-duality in four-dimensional Riemannian geometry*, Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **362** (1978), no. 1711, 425–461. MR 506229
- [Alm62] Jr. Almgren, Frederick Justin, *The homotopy groups of the integral cycle groups*, Topology **1** (1962), 257–299. MR 146835
- [Alm65] Jr. Almgren, Frederick Justin, *The theory of varifolds*, Mimeographed notes, Princeton (1965).

- [Alm76] Jr. Almgren, Frederick Justin, *Existence and regularity almost everywhere of solutions to elliptic variational problems with constraints*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **4** (1976), no. 165, viii+199. MR 420406
- [BC84] Haïm Brezis and Jean-Michel Coron, *Multiple solutions of H -systems and Rellich's conjecture*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **37** (1984), no. 2, 149–187. MR 733715
- [BdC84] João Lucas Marquês Barbosa and Manfredo Perdigão do Carmo, *Stability of hypersurfaces with constant mean curvature*, Math. Z. **185** (1984), no. 3, 339–353. MR 731682
- [BK08] Wolfram Bürger and Ernst Christoph Kuwert, *Area-minimizing disks with free boundary and prescribed enclosed volume*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **621** (2008), 1–27. MR 2431248
- [BK21] Christine Breiner and Nikolaos Kapouleas, *Complete constant mean curvature hypersurfaces in Euclidean space of dimension four or higher*, Amer. J. Math. **143** (2021), no. 4, 1161–1259. MR 4291252
- [Che22] Da Rong Cheng, *Existence of free boundary disks with constant mean curvature in \mathbb{R}^3* , arXiv:2203.16323 (2022).
- [Che73] Bang-yen Chen, *On the surface with parallel mean curvature vector*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **22** (1972/73), 655–666. MR 315606
- [CM08] Tobias Holck Colding and William Philip Minicozzi, II, *Width and finite extinction time of Ricci flow*, Geom. Topol. **12** (2008), no. 5, 2537–2586. MR 2460871
- [CM20] Otis Chodosh and Christos Mantoulidis, *Minimal surfaces and the Allen-Cahn equation on 3-manifolds: index, multiplicity, and curvature estimates*, Ann. of Math. (2) **191** (2020), no. 1, 213–328. MR 4045964
- [CM21] Otis Chodosh and Christos Mantoulidis, *Minimal hypersurfaces with arbitrarily large area*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2021), no. 14, 10841–10847. MR 4285736
- [Cob39] Nathaniel Coburn, *Surfaces in four-space of constant curvature*, Duke Math. J. **5** (1939), no. 1, 30–38. MR 1546103
- [CR10] Pascal Collin and Harold Rosenberg, *Construction of harmonic diffeomorphisms and minimal graphs*, Ann. of Math. (2) **172** (2010), no. 3, 1879–1906. MR 2726102
- [CZ21] Da Rong Cheng and Xin Zhou, *Existence of curves with constant geodesic curvature in a Riemannian 2-sphere*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **374** (2021), no. 12, 9007–9028. MR 4337936
- [CZ23] Da Rong Cheng and Xin Zhou, *Existence of constant mean curvature 2-spheres in Riemannian 3-spheres*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **76** (2023), no. 11, 3374–3436. MR 4642821
- [Dey23] Akashdeep Dey, *Existence of multiple closed CMC hypersurfaces with small mean curvature*, J. Differential Geom. **125** (2023), no. 2, 379–403. MR 4649390
- [Dou31] Jesse Douglas, *Solution of the problem of Plateau*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **33** (1931), no. 1, 263–321. MR 1501590
- [DT95] Weiyue Ding and Gang Tian, *Energy identity for a class of approximate harmonic maps from surfaces*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **3** (1995), no. 3-4, 543–554. MR 1371209
- [Duz93] Frank Duzaar, *On the existence of surfaces with prescribed mean curvature and boundary in higher dimensions*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire **10** (1993), no. 2, 191–214. MR 1220033

- [EL95] James Eells and Luc Lemaire, *Two reports on harmonic maps*, World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1995. MR 1363513
- [EM08] Norio Ejiri and Mario Micalef, *Comparison between second variation of area and second variation of energy of a minimal surface*, *Adv. Calc. Var.* **1** (2008), no. 3, 223–239. MR 2458236
- [ES64] James Eells and Joseph H. Sampson, *Harmonic mappings of Riemannian manifolds*, *Amer. J. Math.* **86** (1964), 109–160. MR 164306
- [Eva10] Lawrence Craig Evans, *Partial differential equations*, second ed., Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 19, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. MR 2597943
- [Fer71] Dirk Ferus, *The torsion form of submanifolds in E^N* , *Math. Ann.* **193** (1971), 114–120. MR 287493
- [Fet12] Dorel Fetcu, *Surfaces with parallel mean curvature vector in complex space forms*, *J. Differential Geom.* **91** (2012), no. 2, 215–232. MR 2971287
- [FR12] Abigail Folha and Harold Rosenberg, *The Dirichlet problem for constant mean curvature graphs in $\mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}$* , *Geom. Topol.* **16** (2012), no. 2, 1171–1203. MR 2946806
- [FR15] Dorel Fetcu and Harold Rosenberg, *Surfaces with parallel mean curvature in Sasakian space forms*, *Math. Ann.* **362** (2015), no. 1-2, 501–528. MR 3359706
- [GL86] Robert Gulliver and H. Blaine Lawson, Jr., *The structure of stable minimal hypersurfaces near a singularity*, *Geometric measure theory and the calculus of variations* (Arcata, Calif., 1984), *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, vol. 44, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1986, pp. 213–237. MR 840275
- [Gro57] Alexander Grothendieck, *Sur la classification des fibrés holomorphes sur la sphère de Riemann*, *Amer. J. Math.* **79** (1957), 121–138. MR 87176
- [Gro78] Misha Gromov, *Homotopical effects of dilatation*, *J. Differential Geometry* **13** (1978), no. 3, 303–310. MR 551562
- [Gro21] Misha Gromov, *Four lectures on scalar curvature*, arXiv:1908.10612v5 (2021).
- [Grü84] Michael Grüter, *Conformally invariant variational integrals and the removability of isolated singularities*, *Manuscripta Math.* **47** (1984), no. 1-3, 85–104. MR 744314
- [GS71] Robert David Gulliver, II and Joel Spruck, *The Plateau problem for surfaces of prescribed mean curvature in a cylinder*, *Invent. Math.* **13** (1971), 169–178. MR 298515
- [GS73] Robert David Gulliver, II and Joel Spruck, *Existence theorems for parametric surfaces of prescribed mean curvature*, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **22** (1972/73), 445–472. MR 308904
- [Hei54] Erhard Heinz, *Über die Existenz einer Fläche konstanter mittlerer Krümmung bei vorgegebener Berandung*, *Math. Ann.* **127** (1954), 258–287. MR 70013
- [Hei69] Erhard Heinz, *On the nonexistence of a surface of constant mean curvature with finite area and prescribed rectifiable boundary*, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **35** (1969), 249–252. MR 246237
- [Hil69] Stefan Oscar Walter Hildebrandt, *Randwertprobleme für Flächen mit vorgeschriebener mittlerer Krümmung und Anwendungen auf die Kapillaritätstheorie. I. Fest vorgegebener Rand*, *Math. Z.* **112** (1969), 205–213. MR 250208
- [Hil70] Stefan Oscar Walter Hildebrandt, *On the Plateau problem for surfaces of constant mean curvature*, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **23** (1970), 97–114. MR 256276

- [HK72] Stefan Oscar Walter Hildebrandt and Helmut Kaul, *Two-dimensional variational problems with obstructions, and Plateau's problem for H -surfaces in a Riemannian manifold*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **25** (1972), 187–223. MR 296829
- [Hof72] David Allen Hoffman, *Surfaces in constant curvature manifolds with parallel mean curvature vector field*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1972, Thesis (Ph.D.)–Stanford University. MR 2621777
- [Hof73] David A. Hoffman, *Surfaces of constant mean curvature in manifolds of constant curvature*, J. Differential Geometry **8** (1973), 161–176. MR 390973
- [Hop51] Heinz Hopf, *über Flächen mit einer Relation zwischen den Hauptkrümmungen*, Math. Nachr. **4** (1951), 232–249. MR 40042
- [Hop83] Heinz Hopf, *Differential geometry in the large*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1000, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983, Notes taken by Peter Lax and John Gray, With a preface by S. S. Chern. MR 707850
- [HRS09] Laurent Hauswirth, Harold Rosenberg, and Joel Spruck, *Infinite boundary value problems for constant mean curvature graphs in $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{S}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$* , Amer. J. Math. **131** (2009), no. 1, 195–226. MR 2488489
- [JLZ22] Jürgen Jost, Lei Liu, and Miaomiao Zhu, *Asymptotic analysis and qualitative behavior at the free boundary for Sacks-Uhlenbeck α -harmonic maps*, Adv. Math. **396** (2022), Paper No. 108105, 68. MR 4370467
- [Jos91] Jürgen Jost, *Two-dimensional geometric variational problems*, Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York), John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1991, A Wiley-Interscience Publication. MR 1100926
- [Jos16] Jürgen Jost, *Stefan Hildebrandt 1936–2015*, Jahresber. Dtsch. Math.-Ver. **118** (2016), no. 1, 39–49. MR 3476738
- [JS66] Howard Jenkins and James Serrin, *Variational problems of minimal surface type. II. Boundary value problems for the minimal surface equation*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **21** (1966), 321–342. MR 190811
- [Kap90] Nicolaos Kapouleas, *Complete constant mean curvature surfaces in Euclidean three-space*, Ann. of Math. (2) **131** (1990), no. 2, 239–330. MR 1043269
- [Kap91] Nicolaos Kapouleas, *Compact constant mean curvature surfaces in Euclidean three-space*, J. Differential Geom. **33** (1991), no. 3, 683–715. MR 1100207
- [Kap92] Nicolaos Kapouleas, *Constant mean curvature surfaces constructed by fusing Wente tori*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **89** (1992), no. 12, 5695–5698. MR 1165926
- [KZ00] Katsuei Kenmotsu and Detang Zhou, *The classification of the surfaces with parallel mean curvature vector in two-dimensional complex space forms*, Amer. J. Math. **122** (2000), no. 2, 295–317. MR 1749050
- [Li23a] Yangyang Li, *Existence of infinitely many minimal hypersurfaces in higher-dimensional closed manifolds with generic metrics*, J. Differential Geom. **124** (2023), no. 2, 381–395. MR 4602728
- [Li23b] Yangyang Li, *An improved Morse index bound of min-max minimal hypersurfaces*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **62** (2023), no. 6, Paper No. 179, 32. MR 4608450

- [LLW17] Yuxiang Li, Lei Liu, and Youde Wang, *Blowup behavior of harmonic maps with finite index*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **56** (2017), no. 5, Paper No. 146, 16. MR 3708270
- [LW10] Yuxiang Li and Youde Wang, *A weak energy identity and the length of necks for a sequence of Sacks-Uhlenbeck α -harmonic maps*, Adv. Math. **225** (2010), no. 3, 1134–1184. MR 2673727
- [LY82] Peter Li and Shing-Tung Yau, *A new conformal invariant and its applications to the Willmore conjecture and the first eigenvalue of compact surfaces*, Invent. Math. **69** (1982), no. 2, 269–291. MR 674407
- [LZZ21] Chao Li, Xin Zhou, and Jonathan J Zhu, *Min-max theory for capillary surfaces*, arXiv:2111.09924 (2021).
- [Maz22] Liam Mazurowski, *CMC doublings of minimal surfaces via min-max*, J. Geom. Anal. **32** (2022), no. 3, Paper No. 104, 28. MR 4368628
- [MM88] Mario Joseph Micallef and John Douglas Moore, *Minimal two-spheres and the topology of manifolds with positive curvature on totally isotropic two-planes*, Ann. of Math. (2) **127** (1988), no. 1, 199–227. MR 924677
- [MMP06] Fethi Mahmoudi, Rafe Roys Mazzeo, and Frank Pacard, *Constant mean curvature hypersurfaces condensing on a submanifold*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **16** (2006), no. 4, 924–958. MR 2255386
- [MMPMnR21] William Hamilton Meeks, III, Pablo Mira, Joaquín Pérez Muñoz, and Antonio Ros, *Constant mean curvature spheres in homogeneous three-manifolds*, Invent. Math. **224** (2021), no. 1, 147–244. MR 4228502
- [MMPMnR22] William Hamilton Meeks, III, Pablo Mira, Joaquín Pérez Muñoz, and Antonio Ros, *Constant mean curvature spheres in homogeneous three-spheres*, J. Differential Geom. **120** (2022), no. 2, 307–343. MR 4385119
- [MN14] Fernando Codá Marques and André Arroja Neves, *Min-max theory and the Willmore conjecture*, Ann. of Math. (2) **179** (2014), no. 2, 683–782. MR 3152944
- [MN16] Fernando Codá Marques and André Arroja Neves, *Morse index and multiplicity of min-max minimal hypersurfaces*, Camb. J. Math. **4** (2016), no. 4, 463–511. MR 3572636
- [MN17] Fernando Codá Marques and André Arroja Neves, *Existence of infinitely many minimal hypersurfaces in positive Ricci curvature*, Invent. Math. **209** (2017), no. 2, 577–616. MR 3674223
- [MN21] Fernando Codá Marques and André Arroja Neves, *Morse index of multiplicity one min-max minimal hypersurfaces*, Adv. Math. **378** (2021), Paper No. 107527, 58. MR 4191255
- [Moo07] John Douglas Moore, *Energy growth in minimal surface bubbles*, unpublished manuscript, <https://web.math.ucsb.edu/~moore/growthrev.pdf> (2007).
- [Moo17] John Douglas Moore, *Introduction to global analysis*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 187, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017, Minimal surfaces in Riemannian manifolds. MR 3729450
- [Mor66] Charles B. Morrey, Jr., *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. Band 130, Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, 1966. MR 202511

- [Mor03] Frank Morgan, *Regularity of isoperimetric hypersurfaces in Riemannian manifolds*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **355** (2003), no. 12, 5041–5052. MR 1997594
- [MRR11] L. Mazet, M. M. Rodríguez, and H. Rosenberg, *The Dirichlet problem for the minimal surface equation, with possible infinite boundary data, over domains in a Riemannian surface*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **102** (2011), no. 6, 985–1023. MR 2806098
- [MW95] Mario Joseph Micallef and Brian Cabell White, *The structure of branch points in minimal surfaces and in pseudoholomorphic curves*, Ann. of Math. (2) **141** (1995), no. 1, 35–85. MR 1314031
- [Mye41] Sumner Byron Myers, *Riemannian manifolds with positive mean curvature*, Duke Math. J. **8** (1941), 401–404. MR 4518
- [MZ24a] Liam Mazurowski and Xin Zhou, *The half-volume spectrum of a manifold*, 2024, To appear: Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations.
- [MZ24b] Liam Mazurowski and Xin Zhou, *Infinitely many half-volume constant mean curvature hypersurfaces via min-max theory*, arXiv:2405.00595 (2024).
- [Pac05] Frank Pacard, *Constant mean curvature hypersurfaces in Riemannian manifolds*, Riv. Mat. Univ. Parma (7) **4*** (2005), 141–162. MR 2198126
- [Pal68] Richard S. Palais, *Foundations of global non-linear analysis*, W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York-Amsterdam, 1968. MR 248880
- [Pit81] Jon T. Pitts, *Existence and regularity of minimal surfaces on Riemannian manifolds*, Mathematical Notes, vol. 27, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1981. MR 626027
- [PS] Frank Pacard and Taoniu Sun, *Doubling construction for cmc hypersurfaces in riemannian manifolds*, Preprint.
- [PX09] Frank Pacard and Xiaodong Xu, *Constant mean curvature spheres in Riemannian manifolds*, Manuscripta Math. **128** (2009), no. 3, 275–295. MR 2481045
- [Qin95] Jie Qing, *On singularities of the heat flow for harmonic maps from surfaces into spheres*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **3** (1995), no. 1-2, 297–315. MR 1362654
- [Rad30] Tibor Radó, *On Plateau’s problem*, Ann. of Math. (2) **31** (1930), no. 3, 457–469. MR 1502955
- [Rey91] Olivier Rey, *Heat flow for the equation of surfaces with prescribed mean curvature*, Math. Ann. **291** (1991), no. 1, 123–146. MR 1125012
- [Riv07] Tristan Rivière, *Conservation laws for conformally invariant variational problems*, Invent. Math. **168** (2007), no. 1, 1–22. MR 2285745
- [Riv12] Tristan Rivière, *Conformally invariant variational problems*, arXiv:1206.2116 (2012).
- [Ros05] Antonio Ros, *The isoperimetric problem*, Global theory of minimal surfaces, Clay Math. Proc., vol. 2, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005, pp. 175–209. MR 2167260
- [RS20] Harold William Rosenberg and Graham Andrew Craig Smith, *Degree theory of immersed hypersurfaces*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **265** (2020), no. 1290, v+62. MR 4080916
- [Smi82] Francis R Smith, *On the existence of embedded minimal 2-spheres in the 3-sphere, endowed with an arbitrary riemannian metric*, Ph.D. thesis, Australian National University, 1982.
- [Son23a] Antoine Song, *A dichotomy for minimal hypersurfaces in manifolds thick at infinity*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) **56** (2023), no. 4, 1085–1134. MR 4650156

- [Son23b] Antoine Song, *Existence of infinitely many minimal hypersurfaces in closed manifolds*, Ann. of Math. (2) **197** (2023), no. 3, 859–895. MR 4564260
- [Spr73] Joel Spruck, *Infinite boundary value problems for surfaces of constant mean curvature*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **49** (1972/73), 1–31. MR 334010
- [SS38] J. A. Schouten and D. J. Struik, *Einführung in die neueren Methoden der Differentialgeometrie 2., vollst. umgearb. Aufl. Bd. 2. Geometrie. Von D. J. Struik*, Groningen, Batavia: P. Noordhoff N. V. XII, 338 S., 11 Abb. (1938)., 1938.
- [SS81] Richard M. Schoen and Leon Simon, *Regularity of stable minimal hypersurfaces*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **34** (1981), no. 6, 741–797. MR 634285
- [SS23] Lorenzo Sarnataro and Douglas Stryker, *Optimal regularity for minimizers of the prescribed mean curvature functional over isotopies*, arXiv:2304.02722 (2023).
- [Ste76] Klaus Steffen, *On the existence of surfaces with prescribed mean curvature and boundary*, Math. Z. **146** (1976), no. 2, 113–135. MR 394394
- [Ste86] Klaus Steffen, *On the nonuniqueness of surfaces with constant mean curvature spanning a given contour*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **94** (1986), no. 2, 101–122. MR 832287
- [Str85] Michael Struwe, *Large H -surfaces via the mountain-pass-lemma*, Math. Ann. **270** (1985), no. 3, 441–459. MR 774369
- [Str86] Michael Struwe, *Nonuniqueness in the Plateau problem for surfaces of constant mean curvature*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **93** (1986), no. 2, 135–157. MR 823116
- [Str88] Michael Struwe, *the existence of surfaces of constant mean curvature with free boundaries*, Acta Math. **160** (1988), no. 1-2, 19–64. MR 926524
- [Str23] Michael Struwe, *“Bubbling” and topological degeneration in the calculus of variations*, Milan J. Math. **91** (2023), no. 1, 47–58. MR 4583868
- [SU81] Jonathan Sacks and Karen Keskulla Uhlenbeck, *The existence of minimal immersions of 2-spheres*, Ann. of Math. (2) **113** (1981), no. 1, 1–24. MR 604040
- [Tor10] Francisco Torralbo, *Rotationally invariant constant mean curvature surfaces in homogeneous 3-manifolds*, Differential Geom. Appl. **28** (2010), no. 5, 593–607. MR 2670089
- [Wan22] Zhichao Wang, *Existence of minimal hypersurfaces with non-empty free boundary for generic metrics*, Amer. J. Math. **144** (2022), no. 2, 599–606. MR 4401513
- [Wen69] Henry C. Wente, *An existence theorem for surfaces of constant mean curvature*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **26** (1969), 318–344. MR 243467
- [Wen86] Henry C. Wente, *Counterexample to a conjecture of H. Hopf*, Pacific J. Math. **121** (1986), no. 1, 193–243. MR 815044
- [Wer57] Helmut Werner, *Das Problem von Douglas für Flächen konstanter mittlerer Krümmung*, Math. Ann. **133** (1957), 303–319. MR 95335
- [Won46] Yung-Chow Wong, *Contributions to the theory of surfaces in a 4-space of constant curvature*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **59** (1946), 467–507. MR 16231
- [Yau74] Shing Tung Yau, *Submanifolds with constant mean curvature. I, II*, Amer. J. Math. **96** (1974), 346–366; *ibid.* **97** (1975), 76–100. MR 370443
- [Yau82] Shing Tung Yau (ed.), *Seminar on Differential Geometry*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. No. 102, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1982, Papers presented at seminars held during the academic year 1979–1980. MR 645728

- [Ye91] Rugang Ye, *Foliation by constant mean curvature spheres*, Pacific J. Math. **147** (1991), no. 2, 381–396. MR 1084717
- [Zho20] Xin Zhou, *On the multiplicity one conjecture in min-max theory*, Ann. of Math. (2) **192** (2020), no. 3, 767–820. MR 4172621
- [Zho22] Xin Zhou, *Mean curvature and variational theory*, Proc. Int. Cong. Math. **4** (2022), 2696–2717.
- [ZZ19] Xin Zhou and Jonathan J. Zhu, *Min-max theory for constant mean curvature hypersurfaces*, Invent. Math. **218** (2019), no. 2, 441–490. MR 4011704
- [ZZ20] Xin Zhou and Jonathan J. Zhu, *Existence of hypersurfaces with prescribed mean curvature I—generic min-max*, Camb. J. Math. **8** (2020), no. 2, 311–362. MR 4091027

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY, 800 DONGCHUAN ROAD, SHANGHAI, 200240, P. R. CHINA

Email address: gaorui0416@sjtu.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY, 800 DONGCHUAN ROAD, SHANGHAI, 200240, P. R. CHINA

Email address: mizhu@sjtu.edu.cn