

# On the Nirenberg problem on spheres: Arbitrarily many solutions in a perturbative setting

Mohameden AHMEDOU<sup>a,\*</sup>, Mohamed BEN AYED<sup>b,c†</sup> and Khalil EL MEHDI<sup>b,d‡</sup>

a : Department of Mathematics, Giessen University, Arndtstrasse 2, 35392, Giessen, Germany.

b : Department of Mathematics, College of Science, Qassim University, Buraydah 51452, Saudi Arabia.

c : Faculté des Sciences de Sfax, Université de Sfax, Route Soukra, Sfax, Tunisia.

d : Faculté des Sciences et Techniques, Université de Nouakchott, Nouakchott, Mauritania.

**Abstract:** Given a smooth positive function  $K$  on the standard sphere  $(\mathbb{S}^n, g_0)$ , we use Morse theoretical methods and counting index formulae to prove that, under generic conditions on the function  $K$ , there are arbitrarily many metrics  $g$  conformally equivalent to  $g_0$  and whose scalar curvature is given by the function  $K$  provided that the function is sufficiently close to the scalar curvature of  $g_0$ . Our approach leverages a comprehensive characterization of blowing-up solutions of a subcritical approximation, along with various Morse relations involving their indices. Notably, this multiplicity result is achieved without relying on any symmetry or periodicity assumptions about the function  $K$ .

**Key Words:** Partial Differential Equations, analysis on manifolds, Nirenberg problem, Morse theory.

**AMS subject classification:** 35A01, 58J05, 58E05.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction and main Results</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Topology of some level sets of the Euler-Lagrange functional</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Proof of Theorem 1.2 in a simplified framework</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Counting index formulae and Morse type relations</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Proof of the theorems in a general case</b>	<b>15</b>

---

\*E-mail: Mohameden.Ahmedou@math.uni-giessen.de

†E-mails: M.BenAyed@qu.edu.sa and Mohamed.Benayed@fss.rnu.tn

‡E-mail : K.Jiyid@qu.edu.sa

# 1 Introduction and main Results

In the academic year 1969–1970 Louis Nirenberg, likely motivated by the Yamabe problem posed the following question: Given a smooth positive function  $K$  on the standard sphere  $\mathbb{S}^n; n \geq 3$  endowed with its standard metric  $g_0$ , does there exist a riemannian metric  $g$  conformally equivalent to  $g_0$  such that the scalar curvature  $R_g$  with respect to  $g$  is given by the function  $K$ ? Such a geometric question has a nice PDE interpretation. Indeed writing  $g = u^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g_0$ , the Nirenberg problem amounts to solving the following nonlinear problem involving the critical Sobolev exponent:

$$(\mathcal{N}_K) \quad L_{g_0}u = Ku^{(n+2)/(n-2)}, \quad u > 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{S}^n,$$

where  $L_{g_0} := -\Delta_{g_0} + n(n-2)/4$  denotes the conformal Laplacian.

Such a problem has been intensively studied in the last half century. See [3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 35] and the references therein.

Shortly after Nirenberg posed his question, Kazdan and Warner identified topological obstructions [14, 24], showing that the Nirenberg problem cannot be solved for every function  $K$ . Therefore, the central inquiry revolves around identifying sufficient conditions on  $K$  under which the problem is solvable. To provide conditions on the function  $K$ , under which the Nirenberg problem is solvable, some Euler-Poincaré type criteria have been established. Notable results include those of Bahri-Coron [7], Chang-Gursky-Yang [17] on  $\mathbb{S}^3$ , Ben Ayed et al [11] and Yanyan Li [27] on  $\mathbb{S}^4$ . Further existence results have been obtained for higher-dimensional spheres under various conditions: flatness near the critical points of  $K$  [26], in the perturbative setting [16], and under pinching conditions [21, 31].

To understand the analytical challenges posed by the Nirenberg problem, one must interpret its solutions as critical points of an Euler-Lagrange functional. Specifically, positive critical points of the functional

$$(1) \quad I_K(u) := \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2 - \frac{n-2}{2n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K|u|^{2n/(n-2)},$$

defined on  $H^1(\mathbb{S}^n)$  equipped with the norm:

$$\|u\|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{n(n-2)}{4} \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} u^2,$$

correspond to solutions of the Nirenberg problem. However, due to the presence of the Sobolev critical exponent, this functional does not satisfy the Palais-Smale condition. This means that there exists a sequence  $(u_k)$  along which  $I_K(u_k)$  is bounded,  $\nabla I_K(u_k)$  goes to zero and  $(u_k)$  does not converge. The reason for such a lack of compactness is the existence of almost solutions of the equation  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  [36].

One way to overcome the lack of compactness of the functional  $I_K$ , which traces back to Yamabe [37], is to lower the exponent and first consider the subcritical approximation

$$(\mathcal{N}_{K,\tau}) \quad L_{g_0}u = Ku^{((n+2)/(n-2))-\tau}, \quad u > 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n,$$

and its associated Euler-Lagrange functional

$$I_{K,\tau}(u) := \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2 - \frac{n-2}{2n-\tau(n-2)} \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K|u|^{\frac{2n}{n-2}-\tau}, \quad u \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^n).$$

Using elliptic estimates, one obtains that either the solution  $u_\tau$  remains uniformly bounded as  $\tau \rightarrow 0$  and hence converges strongly to a solution  $u_\infty$  of the Nirenberg problem  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  or it blows up. In the latter case, following the works of Schoen [33], Yanyan Li [26, 27], Chen-lin [19, 20] or Druet-Hebey-Robert [22], one performs a refined blow up analysis. For energy-bounded solutions of  $(\mathcal{N}_{K,\tau})$ , two scenarios can arise: Either the solution  $u_\tau$  converges weakly to zero or it converges weakly to  $\omega \neq 0$  which is a solution of  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$ . The case of a zero weak limit has been extensively studied, and the complete blow-up picture on high-dimensional spheres has been fully described only in recent papers by Malchiodi and Mayer [29, 30]. Recently, we investigated in [2] the scenario where the sequence of blowing-up solutions exhibits a non-zero weak limit.

We point out that the blow up picture described in [2] contrasts with the Yamabe case where the function  $K$  is a constant, say  $K \equiv 1$ . Indeed the level sets of the Yamabe functional  $I_1$  on the sphere are all contractible, the critical points of  $I_1$  are minima and  $I_1$  does not have any *critical point at infinity*, which are non compact orbits of the gradient flow. This observation is quite striking if one considers the case where the function  $K$  is close to one. Indeed thinking of a homotopy between  $K$  and constant 1 one observes that all the blowing up solutions constructed in Theorem 1.2 of [2] will disappear when  $K \equiv 1$  without giving rise to *critical points at infinity* for  $I_1$ . Such a situation may only occur if there is a *cancellation phenomenon* with genuine solutions of  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  and our goal in this paper is to find a class of functions  $K$  for which such solutions exist. Namely we consider the following class of functions: For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we define

$$\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon = \left\{ K : \mathbb{S}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : 0 < K \in C^3(\mathbb{S}^n) \quad \text{and} \quad \left( \frac{K_{max}}{K_{min}} - 1 \right) < \varepsilon \right\},$$

where  $K_{max} := \max_{\mathbb{S}^n} K$  and  $K_{min} := \min_{\mathbb{S}^n} K$ .

Furthermore we assume  $K \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$  to satisfy the following generic conditions:

**(H1)** The critical points  $y_1, \dots, y_{m_1}$  of  $K$  are non degenerate and satisfy  $\Delta K(y_i) \neq 0$ .

**(H2)** The critical points of the associated variational function  $I_K$  are non degenerate.

**(H3)**  $m := \#\mathcal{K}^\infty \geq 2$ , where  $\mathcal{K}^\infty$  is defined by

$$(2) \quad \mathcal{K}^\infty := \{y \in \mathbb{S}^n : \nabla K(y) = 0 \text{ and } \Delta K(y) < 0\}$$

and  $\#\mathcal{K}^\infty$  denotes the cardinal of the set  $\mathcal{K}^\infty$ .

First, we consider the case where the Hopf-Poincaré index formula related to the topological contribution of critical points of  $I_K$  is equal to 1, that is,

$$\text{Index}_K := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{K}^\infty} (-1)^{n - \text{morse index}(K,y)} = 1.$$

We remark that, in this case, we have necessarily that  $m := \#\mathcal{K}^\infty \geq 3$  and  $m$  has to be odd.

Given an arbitrary integer  $N$ , we claim that, under appropriate conditions on  $K$ , for  $\varepsilon$  small and  $1 \leq k \leq [\frac{N}{2}]$ , problem  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  has solutions whose energies are close to  $\frac{2k}{n} S_n$ , where

$$(3) \quad S_n = (n(n-2))^{n/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{(1+|x|^2)^n} dx$$

is the Sobolev universal constant. Here  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  is said to have a solution  $\omega$  whose energy is close to  $\frac{2k}{n} S_n$  if we have

$$I_K(\omega) \in \left[ \left( 2k \frac{S_n}{n} (1 - \eta) \right), \left( 2k \frac{S_n}{n} (1 + \eta) \right) \right]$$

for some small positive constant  $\eta$ .

More precisely, our first multiplicity result reads as follows:

**Theorem 1.1** *Let  $n \geq 7$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  be an integer. There exists  $\varepsilon_N > 0$  such that, if  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_N$  and  $K \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$  satisfying **(H1-H2-H3)** and*

$$Index_K := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{K}^\infty} (-1)^{n - \text{morse index}(K,y)} = 1,$$

*then the following facts hold:*

*for any  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor\}$ ,  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  has at least  $C_{k+\ell-1}^k$  solutions  $u_{j,k}$ 's whose energies are close to  $\frac{2k}{n}S_n$ . Here,  $\ell$  denotes  $\ell := (m-1)/2$ .*

*In particular,  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  has at least  $C_{\ell+\lfloor N/2 \rfloor}^\ell - 1$  solutions.*

Next, we deal with the case where the Hopf-Poincaré index formula related to the topological contribution of critical points of  $I_K$  is different from 1, that is,  $Index_K \neq 1$ . We take an arbitrary integer  $N$  and our goal is to show that, for  $\varepsilon$  small and  $1 \leq k \leq N$ , problem  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  has solutions whose energies are close to  $\frac{k}{n}S_n$ . Namely, we prove:

**Theorem 1.2** *Let  $n \geq 7$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  be an integer. There exists  $\varepsilon_N > 0$  such that, if  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_N$  and  $K \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$  satisfying **(H1-H2-H3)** and*

$$Index_K := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{K}^\infty} (-1)^{n - \text{morse index}(K,y)} \neq 1,$$

*then the following facts hold:*

*for any  $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ ,  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  has at least a solution  $u_k$  whose energy is close to  $\frac{k}{n}S_n$ .*

*In particular,  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  has at least  $N$  solutions.*

**Remark 1.3** • *For each  $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , we can be more precise for the number of solutions whose energies are close to  $\frac{k}{n}S_n$ . See Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 for precise statements.*

- *If  $\#\mathcal{K}^\infty$  is even then one can deduce that  $Index_K := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{K}^\infty} (-1)^{\iota(y)} \neq 1$ .*

Up to the knowledge of the authors the results presented above are the first multiplicity results for the Nirenberg problem which do not rely on periodicity or symmetry assumptions for the function  $K$ .

The underlying idea behind our multiplicity results can be described as follows: If the total index of the blowing up solutions is different from one then one derives, under assumption that the function  $K$  is close to one, the existence of a solution whose energy level is close to the first Yamabe level  $S_n/n$ . Such a solution gives rise by Theorem 2 of [2] to a blowing up solution near the second Yamabe energy level  $2S_n/n$ . Taking into account the topological contribution of all blowing up solutions and the fact that for  $K$  close enough to 1 the nearby levels are topologically trivial one derives the existence of a second solution which again gives rise to a blowing up solution at the third Yamabe level  $3S_n/n$  and so one. Using Morse equalities relating to the contribution of the solutions to the difference of topology between the level sets of the associated Euler-Lagrange functional, one proves the existence of a new solution of the Nirenberg problem near every Yamabe level and hence a new blowing up solution of the approximate problem. In case where the above mentioned sum is equal to one a similar argument provides the existence of a solution near the second Yamabe level.

The organization of the sequel is as follows : in Section 2 we explore the topology of certain sublevels of the Euler-Lagrange functional  $I_K$ . In Section 3 we present the proof of Theorem 1.2 in the special case while the contribution of the critical points of  $K$  in the difference of topology between the level sets of  $I_K$  is spherical. Section 4 is devoted to derive several Morse inequalities and index counting formulae relating the critical points of  $I_K$  via their Morse indices. Finally in Section 5 we provide the full proofs of our main multiplicity results.

## 2 Topology of some level sets of the Euler-Lagrange functional

We first, observe that, if  $u$  is a solution of  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  then  $\beta^{(2-n)/4}u$  is a solution of  $(\mathcal{N}_{\beta K})$ , where  $\beta > 0$ . Therefore, without loss of generality, we can assume that  $K_{min} = 1$  in the sequel. Therefore if  $K$  in  $\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$ , it follows that  $K$  is close to 1. Moreover since the free functional  $I_{K,\tau}$  is not lower bounded, it is more convenient to consider the following functional

$$J_{K,\tau}(u) := \frac{1}{\left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K|u|^{\frac{2n}{n-2}-\tau}\right)^{2(n-2)/(2n-\tau(n-2))}} \quad u \in \Sigma := \{u \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^n) : \|u\| = 1\}.$$

By easy computations, we can check that

$$(4) \quad \nabla J_{K,\tau}(u) = 2J_{K,\tau}(u)^{1-\frac{2n-\tau(n-2)}{8-2\tau(n-2)}} \nabla I_{K,\tau}\left(J_{K,\tau}(u)^{\frac{2n-\tau(n-2)}{8-2\tau(n-2)}} u\right) \quad \forall u \in \Sigma.$$

Thus, up to a multiplicative constant, the positive critical points of  $J_{K,\tau}$  are in one to one correspondence with the positive critical points of  $I_{K,\tau}$ . Furthermore, for  $\tau = 0$ , if  $u$  is a positive critical point of  $J_K$ , it follows that  $\omega := J_K(u)^{n/4}u$  is a positive critical point of  $I_K$  (that is a solution of  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$ ) and we have

$$(5) \quad I_K(\omega) = \frac{1}{n}J_K(u)^{n/2} \quad \text{with } \omega := J_K(u)^{n/4}u.$$

Our aim in this section is to obtain some useful information about some sublevel sets of the functional  $J_{K,\tau}$  under the assumption that the function  $K$  is close to a constant. First, we recall the following abstract lemma due to Malchiodi-Mayer [31] (Proposition 3.1), which reads as follows:

**Lemma 2.1** ([31]) *Let  $\underline{A}$  and  $\overline{A} := (K_{\max}/K_{\min})^{(n-2)/n} \underline{A}$ . Assume that  $J_{K,\tau}$  does not have any critical point in the set  $J_{K,\tau}^{\overline{A}} \setminus J_{K,\tau}^{\underline{A}}$  where  $J_{K,\tau}^A := \{u : J_{K,\tau}(u) < A\}$ . Then for each  $c \in [\underline{A}, \overline{A}]$ , the level set  $J_{K,\tau}^c$  is contractible.*

The crucial ingredient in the proof of our multiplicity Theorems is the following result:

**Proposition 2.2** *Let  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\eta$  be a positive constant satisfying  $\eta < 1/(2N + 1)$ . There exists  $\varepsilon_{N,\eta} > 0$  such that, for*

$$0 < \varepsilon < \min\left(\varepsilon_{N,\eta}, \left(\frac{N+1}{N}\right)^{2/(n-2)} \left(\frac{1-\eta}{1+\eta}\right)^{2/(n-2)} - 1\right)$$

and  $K \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$ , the sublevel sets  $J_{K,\tau}^C$ , for  $\tau$  small enough, are contractible for any

$$C \in \left[(kS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}, ((k+1)S_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}\right] \quad \forall k \in \{1, \dots, N\},$$

where  $S_n$  is the Sobolev constant defined in (3).

**Proof.** It follows from the quantization of Palais-Smale sequences for the Yamabe functional  $J_1$  (see [28, 36]) and the classification of Yamabe solutions on the sphere (see [34, 15]) that each Palais-Smale sequence  $(u_q)_q$  (under the level  $(N+1)^{2/n}S_n^{2/n}$ ) has to be close to a sum of  $\tilde{\delta}_{a_i, \lambda_i}$  and therefore  $J_1(u_q)$  will be close to  $k^{2/n} \times S_n^{2/n}$  for some  $k \leq N$ . Here, for  $a \in \mathbb{S}^n$  and  $\lambda > 0$ , the function  $\tilde{\delta}_{a, \lambda}$  denotes the solution of the Yamabe Problem on  $\mathbb{S}^n$  and it is defined by

$$(6) \quad \tilde{\delta}_{(a, \lambda)}(x) = c_0 \frac{\lambda^{(n-2)/2}}{(2 + (\lambda^2 - 1)(1 - \cos d_{g_0}(x, a)))^{(n-2)/2}}, \quad \text{with } c_0 := [n(n-2)^{(n-2)/4}]$$

where  $d_0$  is the geodesic distance on  $\mathbb{S}^n$ .

Hence  $|\nabla J_1(u)| \geq 3C_{N, \eta}$  for some positive constant  $C_{N, \eta}$  and for each  $u$  such that

$$J_1(u) \in \bigcup_{1 \leq k \leq N} \left[ (kS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}, ((k+1)S_n(1-\eta))^{2/n} \right].$$

Next, since  $K = 1 + O(\varepsilon)$ , we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} J_K(u) &= (1 + O(\varepsilon))J_1(u), \\ \langle \nabla J_K(u), h \rangle &= 2J_K(u) \left( \langle u, h \rangle - J_K(u)^{n/(n-2)} \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} K|u|^{(n+2)/(n-2)} h \right) \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $\nabla J_K \rightarrow \nabla J_1$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Thus, there exists  $\varepsilon_{N, \eta}$  such that for  $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_{N, \eta}$  and  $K \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$ , we have

$$(7) \quad |\nabla J_K(u)| \geq 2C_{N, \eta} \quad \text{for } u \text{ satisfying } J_K(u) \in \cup_{k=1}^N \left[ (kS_n(1+\eta))^{\frac{2}{n}}, ((k+1)S_n(1-\eta))^{\frac{2}{n}} \right].$$

Now, we need to prove that an analogue result is true for  $J_{K, \tau}$ . To do so, let  $(u_q)_q$  be a positive Palais-Smale sequence for  $J_{K, \tau}$  under the level  $(N+1)^{2/n}S_n^{2/n}$ . On one hand, since  $J_{K, \tau}$  satisfies the Palais-Smale condition, it follows that  $u_q$  has to be close to a positive critical point  $\omega^\tau$  of  $J_{K, \tau}$  and therefore we have

$$(8) \quad J_{K, \tau}(u_q) = J_{K, \tau}(\omega^\tau) + o_q(1)$$

where  $o_q(1)$  is a quantity which goes to zero as  $q \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence,  $(\omega^\tau)_\tau$  is a family of critical points of  $J_{K, \tau}$  under the level  $(N+1)^{2/n}S_n^{2/n}$ .

On the other hand, combining Theorem 1 in [30] and Theorem 1.1 in [2], we have that  $\omega^\tau$  either converges strongly to a positive critical point  $\omega_p$  of  $J_K$  and therefore we deduce that  $J_{K, \tau}(\omega^\tau) = J_K(\omega_p) + o_\tau(1)$ , or it converges weakly to a positive critical point  $\omega_q$  of  $J_K$  (with  $q < p$ ) and blows up at  $p - q$  points  $y_i$ 's in  $\mathcal{K}^\infty$  and in this case we deduce that  $J_{K, \tau}(\omega^\tau) = J_K(\omega_q) + (p - q)S_n + o_\tau(1)$ .

Here and in the sequel  $\omega_k$  denoted a solution of  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  having an energy  $J_K(\omega_k)$  lying in the interval  $[(kS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}, (kS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}]$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ .

Thus, we deduce that the energy of each Palais-Smale sequence of  $J_{K, \tau}$  has to be close to  $(pS_n)^{2/n}$  for some  $p \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ . Therefore, for small  $\varepsilon$  and small  $\tau$ ,

$$|\nabla J_{K, \tau}(u)| \geq C_{N, \eta} \quad \text{for } u \text{ satisfying } J_{K, \tau}(u) \in \cup_{k=1}^N \left[ (kS_n(1+\eta))^{\frac{2}{n}}, ((k+1)S_n(1-\eta))^{\frac{2}{n}} \right].$$

But, since  $J_{K,\tau}$  satisfies the Palais-Smale condition, it follows that  $J_{K,\tau}^{((k+1)S_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}}$  retracts by deformation onto  $J_{K,\tau}^{(kS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}}$ . Lastly, to apply Lemma 2.1, we take  $\underline{A} = (kS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}$  and it is sufficient to get  $\overline{A} \leq ((k+1)S_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}$  which implies that

$$\left(\frac{k+1}{k}\right)^{2/(n-2)} \left(\frac{1-\eta}{1+\eta}\right)^{2/(n-2)} - 1 \geq \varepsilon \quad \forall k \in \{1, \dots, N\}.$$

Since  $\frac{k+1}{k} \geq \frac{N+1}{N}$  for  $k \leq N$ , our proposition follows. ■

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1.2 in a simplified framework

The proofs of our results are basically based on Morse theoretical arguments and some counting Morse index of blowing up solutions of the subcritical approximation. We notice that, when  $m := \#\mathcal{K}^\infty = 2$ , we clearly have  $\text{Index}_K \neq 1$  and therefore we are in the situation of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 stated in Section 5. Now, we are going to fix some notation which will be used in the proof of the theorems. For  $y \in \mathcal{K}^\infty$ , we denote by

$$\iota(y) = n - \text{morse index}(K, y).$$

Suppose that  $\mathcal{K}^\infty = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$  with  $y_1$  is a global maximum point of  $K$  and for  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\eta < \frac{1}{2N+1}$  we choose  $\varepsilon$  as in Proposition 2.2. We denote by  $u_p^\tau$  a solution of  $(\mathcal{N}_{K,\tau})$  having an energy  $J_{K,\tau}(u_p^\tau)$  in the interval  $[(pS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}, (pS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}]$ . Combining Theorem 1 in [30] and Theorem 1.1 in [2], we have that  $u_p^\tau$  either converges strongly to a solution  $\omega_p$  of  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  or it converges weakly to a solution  $\omega_q$  of  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  (with  $q < p$ ) and blows up at  $p-q$  points  $y_i$ 's in  $\mathcal{K}^\infty$ . Here and in the sequel  $\omega_k$  denoted a solution of  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  having an energy  $J_K(\omega_k)$  lying in the interval  $[(kS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}, (kS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}]$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ .

Next observe that if  $u_p^\tau$  converges strongly as  $\tau \rightarrow 0$  to  $\omega_p$ , then

$$(9) \quad m(u_p^\tau) := \text{morse index}(J_{K,\tau}, u_p^\tau) = \text{morse index}(J_K, \omega_p) := m(\omega_p),$$

and when  $u_p^\tau$  converges weakly to  $\omega_q$  and blows up at  $y_{i_1}, \dots, y_{i_{(p-q)}}$  (in this case, we will denote it by  $u_{\infty,p}^\tau$ ), we have that

$$m(u_{\infty,p}^\tau) = (p-q) + m(\omega_q) + \sum_{j=1}^{p-q} \iota(y_{i_j}).$$

However, if  $u_p^\tau$  converges weakly to 0 and blows up at  $y_{i_1}, \dots, y_{i_p}$ , we have that

$$m(u_{\infty,p}^\tau) = (p-1) + \sum_{j=1}^p \iota(y_{i_j}).$$

Next we denote by

$$(10) \quad \mathcal{S}^p = \{u_p^\tau : J_{K,\tau}(u_p^\tau) \in [(pS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}, (pS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}] \text{ and } u_p^\tau \rightarrow \omega_p\},$$

where  $\omega_p$  is a critical point of  $J_K := J_{K,0}$ .

We set

$$(11) \quad \mu_p := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \mathcal{S}^p = \emptyset, \\ \sum_{u_p^\tau \in \mathcal{S}^p} (-1)^{m(u_p^\tau)}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We observe that, when  $\mathcal{S}^p \neq \emptyset$ , (9) implies that

$$(12) \quad \mu_p = \sum_{\omega_p} (-1)^{m(\omega_p)}.$$

Hence, for some positive small constant  $\eta$ , letting

$$(13) \quad \text{Crit}^p(J_K) := \{\omega_p : \nabla J_K(\omega_p) = 0 \text{ and } J_K(\omega_p) \in [(pS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}, (pS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}]\},$$

we deduce from (12) that

$$(14) \quad \#(\text{Crit}^p(J_K)) \geq |\mu_p|,$$

where  $\#(F)$  denotes the cardinal of the set  $F$ .

Therefore, to prove the theorems, we need to get some information about the values of the  $\mu_p$ .

**Proof of Theorem 1.2 when  $m := \#\mathcal{K}^\infty = 2$**

For the sake of clarity we first prove the theorems in a simplified framework where the topology induced by the function  $K$  to the difference of topology between the sublevels  $J_K^{(S_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}}$  and  $J_K^{(S_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}}$  is spherical. Namely we consider the case where  $\mathcal{K}^\infty = \{y_1, y_2\}$  with  $y_1$  is a global maximum point of  $K$  and  $y_2$  is a critical point of  $K$  of co-index  $\iota_2 := n - \text{morse}(K, y_2)$ .

To prove that  $\mu_1 \neq 0$ , we observe that, according to Proposition 2.2, we have that the level set  $J_{K,\tau}^{(S_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}}$  is contractible. Furthermore according to Theorem 1 in [29] there are exactly two blowing up solutions converging weakly to 0 and whose energy levels lie under this level set. These solutions blow up respectively at  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  and their Morse indices are respectively 0 and  $\iota_2 := \iota(y_2)$ . Hence it follows from Euler-Poincaré Theorem that

$$1 = \chi(J_{K,\tau}^{(S_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}}) = \mu_1 + 1 + (-1)^{\iota_2}.$$

Therefore

$$(15) \quad \mu_1 = -(-1)^{\iota_2} \neq 0.$$

Hence the problem  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  has at least one solution under the energy level  $S_n^{2/n}(1+\eta)^{2/n}$ . We denote by  $(\omega_1^j)_{j=1}^{p_1}$  these solutions.

Again using Proposition 2.2 we have that the level sets  $J_{K,\tau}^{(2S_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}}$  and  $J_{K,\tau}^{(2S_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}}$  are contractible. Furthermore according to Theorem 1 in [29] and Theorem 1.2 in [2], blowing up solutions whose energy levels lie in the interval  $[(2S_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}, (2S_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}]$  are :

- the solution which converges weakly to 0 and blows up at  $y_1$  and  $y_2$ ,
- the solutions  $\omega_1^j$  which converge weakly to a solution  $\omega_1^j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p_1$ , and blow up at  $y_1$ ,
- the solutions  $\omega_1^j$  which converge weakly to a solution  $\omega_1^j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p_1$ , and blow up at  $y_2$ .



In addition, there are also the solutions which converge strongly to a solution  $\omega_2^j$ . Therefore it follows from the Euler-Poincaré theorem that

$$1 = \mu_2 + (-1)^{1+\iota_2} + \sum_{j=1}^{p_1} (-1)^{1+morse(\omega_1^j)} + \sum_{j=1}^{p_1} (-1)^{1+\iota_2+morse(\omega_1^j)} + 1.$$

Hence we obtain that

$$\mu_2 = (-1)^{\iota_2} + \mu_1 + (-1)^{\iota_2} \mu_1 = -1,$$

where we have used (15). Therefore the problem  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  has at least one solution in the interval  $[(2S_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}, (2S_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}]$ .

We need to obtain an iteratively relation between  $\mu_k$ 's. Let  $(\omega_k^j)$  be the solutions (if there exist) of  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  whose energy levels belong to the interval  $[(kS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}, (kS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}]$ . For  $3 \leq p \leq N$ , arguing as above we see that the level sets  $J_{K,\tau}^{(pS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}}$  and  $J_{K,\tau}^{(pS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}}$  are contractible and blowing up solutions whose energy levels lie in the interval  $[(pS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}, (pS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}]$  are:

- the solutions which converge weakly to a solution  $\omega_{p-2}$  and blow up at  $y_1$  and  $y_2$ ,
- the solutions which converge weakly to a solution  $\omega_{p-1}$  and blow up at  $y_1$ ,
- the solutions which converge weakly to a solution  $\omega_{p-1}$  and blow up at  $y_2$ .

In addition, there are also the solutions which converge strongly to a solution  $\omega_p$ . Hence, for  $3 \leq p \leq N$ , we obtain that

$$1 = \mu_p + \sum_{\omega_{p-2}} (-1)^{2+\iota_2+m(\omega_{p-2})} + \sum_{\omega_{p-1}} (-1)^{1+m(\omega_{p-1})} + \sum_{\omega_{p-1}} (-1)^{1+\iota_2+m(\omega_{p-1})} + 1,$$

which implies

$$0 = \mu_p - (1 + (-1)^{\iota_2})\mu_{p-1} + (-1)^{\iota_2}\mu_{p-2} \quad \forall 3 \leq p \leq N.$$

Hence two cases may occur:

(i)  $\iota_2 := \iota(y_2)$  is even. In this case, the last equality implies that

$$\mu_p - \mu_{p-1} = \mu_{p-1} - \mu_{p-2} = \cdots = \mu_2 - \mu_1 = 0 \quad \forall 3 \leq p \leq N.$$

Thus  $\mu_p = \mu_1 = -1$  for each  $1 \leq p \leq N$ .

(ii)  $\iota_2 := \iota(y_2)$  is odd. In this case, we obtain

$$\mu_p = \mu_{p-2} \quad \forall 3 \leq p \leq N.$$

This implies that, for  $1 \leq p \leq N$ , we have

$$\mu_p := \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } p \text{ is even,} \\ 1 & \text{if } p \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2 in the case where  $\#\mathcal{K}^\infty = 2$ . ■

## 4 Counting index formulae and Morse type relations

Unfortunately for arbitrarily  $m$  computing  $\mu_k$  explicitly for any number of points in  $\mathcal{K}^\infty$  is very difficult and to prove that  $\mu_k \neq 0$  we have to argue differently using recurrence relations between the  $\mu_k$ 's. To this aim we make use of the following notation: For  $1 \leq k \leq m := \#\mathcal{K}^\infty$ , we introduce the following sets:

$$(16) \quad \mathcal{S}_{\geq k}^{\infty,p} \quad ; \quad \mathcal{S}_{\geq k;k}^{\infty,p}$$

- $\mathcal{S}_{\geq k}^{\infty,p}$  is the set of critical points  $u_{\infty,p}^\tau$  such that  $J_{K,\tau}(u_{\infty,p}^\tau) \in [(pS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}, (pS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}]$  and which blow up at  $r$  points  $y_{i_1}, \dots, y_{i_r}$  with  $i_j \geq k$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq r$ ,  $r \leq p$  and  $u_{\infty,p}^\tau$  converges weakly to  $\omega_{p-r}$  (with  $\omega_0 = 0$ ),
- $\mathcal{S}_{\geq k;k}^{\infty,p}$  is the set of blowing up critical points belonging to  $\mathcal{S}_{\geq k}^{\infty,p}$  such that  $y_k$  is one of their blow up points.

Furthermore we set

$$\mu_{\geq k}^{\infty,p} := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } k > m := \#\mathcal{K}^\infty, \\ \sum_{u_{\infty,p}^\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq k}^{\infty,p}} (-1)^{m(u_{\infty,p}^\tau)}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mu_{\geq k;k}^{\infty,p} := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } k > m := \#\mathcal{K}^\infty, \\ \sum_{u_{\infty,p}^\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq k;k}^{\infty,p}} (-1)^{m(u_{\infty,p}^\tau)}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We point out that these above quantities are the contribution of the blowing up critical points in the sets  $\mathcal{S}_{\geq k}^{\infty,p}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{\geq k;k}^{\infty,p}$  in the Euler-Poincaré characteristic of the pair

$$(J_{K,\tau}^{(pS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}}, J_{K,\tau}^{(pS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}}).$$

In the next two lemmas, we show some useful relations between  $\mu_p$ ,  $\mu_{\geq k}^{\infty,p}$  and  $\mu_{\geq k;k}^{\infty,p}$ . Our first relations read as follows:

**Lemma 4.1 (recurrence relations)** *Using the above notation, for each  $1 \leq k \leq m$ , there holds:*

$$(17) \quad \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty,1} = \sum_{j=k}^m (-1)^{l_j} = (-1)^{l_k} + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty,1}.$$

Furthermore, for  $p \geq 2$ , we have

$$(18) \quad \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty,p} = \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty,p} + \mu_{\geq k;k}^{\infty,p} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{\geq k;k}^{\infty,p} = (-1)^{1+l(y_k)} \left[ \mu_{p-1} + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty,p-1} \right],$$

$$(19) \quad \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty,p} = \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty,p} + (-1)^{1+l(y_k)} \left[ \mu_{p-1} + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty,p-1} \right].$$

**Proof.** By definition, a sequence of critical points  $u_{\infty,1}^\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq k}^{\infty,1}$  has to blow up at one point  $y_j$  with  $j \geq k$  and has to converge weakly to 0. Hence the proof of (17) follows.

Now, for  $p \geq 2$ , by definition, a sequence of critical points  $u_{\infty,p}^\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq k}^{\infty,p}$  has to blow up and two cases may occur:

- either  $y_k$  does not belong to the set of the blow up points of  $u_{\infty,p}^\tau$ . In this case, the function  $u_{\infty,p}^\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq k+1}^{\infty,p}$ .
- or  $y_k$  belongs to the set of the blow up points of  $u_{\infty,p}^\tau$ . In this case, the function  $u_{\infty,p}^\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq k;k}^{\infty,p}$ .

Hence the first claim of (18) follows.

Next, the second above mentioned situation can be split into two subcases:

- either  $y_k$  is the only blow up point of  $u_{\infty,p}^\tau$  and in this case,  $u_{\infty,p}^\tau$  has to converge weakly to a critical point  $\omega_{p-1}$  of  $J_K$ . By Theorem 1 of [2] we have that

$$(-1)^{\text{morse index}(u_{\infty,p}^\tau)} = -(-1)^{\iota(y_k)}(-1)^{\text{morse index}(\omega_{p-1})}.$$

- or  $u_{\infty,p}^\tau \rightharpoonup \omega_q$  (with  $0 \leq q \leq p-2$ ) where  $\omega_q$  is either zero (if  $q=0$ ) or a critical point of  $J_K$  with  $J_K(\omega_q) \in [(qS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}, (qS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}]$  and  $u_{\infty,p}^\tau$  blows up at  $y_k$  and at some other critical points  $y_{j_1}, \dots, y_{j_{p-q-1}}$  with  $j_i \geq k+1$  for each  $i$ . Furthermore according to Theorem 2 of [2], there exists a unique solution  $u_{\infty,p-1}^\tau$  of  $(\mathcal{N}_{K,\tau})$  which blows up at these points  $y_{j_1}, \dots, y_{j_{p-q-1}}$  and converges weakly to  $\omega_q$  as  $\tau \rightarrow 0$ . Hence  $u_{\infty,p-1}^\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq k+1}^{\infty,p-1}$ . Hence inferring again to Theorem 2 of [2] we have that

$$(-1)^{\text{morse index}(J_{K,\tau}, u_{\infty,p}^\tau)} = -(-1)^{\iota(y_k)}(-1)^{\text{morse index}(J_{K,\tau}, u_{\infty,p-1}^\tau)}.$$

Summing over all critical points in  $\mathcal{S}_{\geq k}^{\infty,p}$  respectively in  $\mathcal{S}_{\geq k+1}^{\infty,p-1}$  we recover the second equality in (18). Finally we notice that (19) follows from the two equalities in (18). ■

The second type of relations of the above quantities are some *Morse equalities* relating the difference of topology of the pair  $(J_{K,\tau}^{(pS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}}, J_{K,\tau}^{(pS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}})$  to the topological contribution of all critical points whose energy levels lie in the interval  $[(pS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}, (pS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}]$ . Namely we prove:

**Lemma 4.2 (Morse equalities)** *With the above notation, we have*

$$(20) \quad (i) \quad \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq 1}^{\infty,1} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_p + \mu_{\geq 1}^{\infty,p} = 0 \quad \forall 2 \leq p \leq N.$$

$$(21) \quad (ii) \quad \mu_p + \mu_{\geq 2}^{\infty,p} = 0 \quad \forall 1 \leq p \leq N.$$

**Proof.** Since  $J_{K,\tau}$  satisfies the Palais-Smale condition, it follows from the classical deformation lemma that

$$J_{K,\tau}^{(pS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}} \text{ retracts by deformation onto } J_{K,\tau}^{(pS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}} \bigcup_{u_p^\tau \in \mathcal{S}^p \cup \mathcal{S}_{\geq 1}^{\infty,p}} W_u(u_p^\tau) \quad \text{for } p \geq 2,$$

$$J_{K,\tau}^{(S_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}} \text{ retracts by deformation onto } \bigcup_{u_1^\tau \in \mathcal{S}^1 \cup \mathcal{S}_{\geq 1}^{\infty,1}} W_u(u_1^\tau),$$

where  $W_u(u_p^\tau)$  denotes the unstable manifold at the critical point  $u_p^\tau$  of  $J_{K,\tau}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}^p$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{\geq 1}^{\infty,p}$  are introduced in (10) and (16) respectively. Using the Euler-Poincaré theorem, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(J_{K,\tau}^{(pS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}}) &= \chi(J_{K,\tau}^{(pS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}}) + \sum_{u_p^\tau \in \mathcal{S}^p \cup \mathcal{S}_{\geq 1}^{\infty,p}} (-1)^{\text{morse index}(u_p^\tau)} \quad \text{for } p \geq 2, \\ \chi(J_{K,\tau}^{(S_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}}) &= \sum_{u_1^\tau \in \mathcal{S}^1 \cup \mathcal{S}_{\geq 1}^{\infty,1}} (-1)^{\text{morse index}(u_1^\tau)}.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, Proposition 2.2 implies that  $J_{K,\tau}^{(pS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}}$  and  $J_{K,\tau}^{(pS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}}$  are contractible sets. Therefore, for  $p \geq 2$ , we get

$$1 = 1 + \sum_{u_p^\tau \in \mathcal{S}^p} (-1)^{\text{morse index}(u_p^\tau)} + \sum_{u_{\infty,p}^\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 1}^{\infty,p}} (-1)^{\text{morse index}(u_{\infty,p}^\tau)}$$

which gives the second claim in (20). Likewise follows the first claim of (20). Next using (17), (19) and (20), we derive that

$$(22) \quad (-1)^{\iota(y_1)} + \mu_{\geq 2}^{\infty,1} + \mu_1 = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad -(-1)^{\iota(y_1)} \left[ \mu_{\geq 2}^{\infty,p-1} + \mu_{p-1} \right] + \mu_{\geq 2}^{\infty,p} + \mu_p = 0 \quad \forall 2 \leq p \leq N.$$

Since  $y_1$  is a maximum point of  $K$ , we have that  $\Delta K(y_1) < 0$  and  $\iota(y_1) = 0$  is even. This implies that the first equation in (22) is equivalent to

$$\mu_{\geq 2}^{\infty,1} + \mu_1 = 0.$$

Furthermore denoting  $x_p := \mu_{\geq 2}^{\infty,p} + \mu_p$ , on one hand the above equation implies that  $x_1 = 0$ . On the other hand, we see that the second equation in (22) is equivalent to  $x_p = x_{p-1}$  for each  $2 \leq p \leq N$ . Thus, we obtain Claim (21) and the proof of the lemma is thereby complete. ■

Next we are going to prove the following crucial Lemmas about the value of  $\mu_p$ . The first one reads as follows:

**Lemma 4.3** *Assume that  $m \geq 3$  and  $\iota(y_j)$  is even for each  $j \geq 2$ . Then it holds that*

$$\mu_p = -C_{p+m-2}^{m-2} \quad \text{for each } p \in \{1, \dots, N\}.$$

**Proof.** Observe that, since  $\iota(y_j)$  is even for each  $j \geq 2$ , from (17) and (20), it holds

$$(23) \quad \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty,1} = \sum_{j=k}^m (-1)^{\iota(y_j)} = m - k + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_1 = 1 - m.$$

Furthermore, (19) can be written as

$$\left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty,q} \right) = \left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty,q} \right) - \left( \mu_{q-1} + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty,q-1} \right) \quad \text{for each } q \in \{2, \dots, N\}$$

and therefore, we derive that

$$(24) \quad \left( \mu_p + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty,p} \right) = \sum_{q=2}^p \left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty,q} \right) + \left( \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty,1} \right) \quad \text{for each } p \in \{2, \dots, N\}.$$

Now, we claim that

$$(25) \quad \left( \mu_p + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, p} \right) = -C_{p+k-2}^{k-2} \quad \text{for each } p \in \{2, \dots, N\} \text{ and for each } k \in \{2, \dots, m\}.$$

The proof of the claim will be by induction on  $k$ .

For  $k = 2$ , using (24), (21) and (23), we get

$$\left( \mu_p + \mu_{\geq 3}^{\infty, p} \right) = \sum_{q=2}^p \left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq 2}^{\infty, q} \right) + \left( \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq 3}^{\infty, 1} \right) = -1 = -C_p^0$$

which proves the claim for  $k = 2$ .

Now, assuming that the claim holds for  $k \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$ , then (24) and (23) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \mu_p + \mu_{\geq k+2}^{\infty, p} \right) &= \sum_{q=2}^p \left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, q} \right) + \left( \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq k+2}^{\infty, 1} \right) \\ &= - \left( \sum_{q=2}^p C_{q+k-2}^{k-2} \right) - k = -C_{p+(k+1)-2}^{(k+1)-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence our claim is proved.

Finally, the proof of Lemma 4.3 follows from the fact that  $\mu_{\geq m+1}^{\infty, p} = 0$  by taking  $k = m$  in the previous claim. ■

The second tool to determine the value of the local degree  $\mu_p$  is provided in the next lemma.

**Lemma 4.4** *Assume that  $m \geq 3$  and  $\iota(y_j)$  is odd for each  $j \geq 2$ . Then it holds that*

$$\mu_p = (-1)^{p+1} C_{p+m-2}^{m-2} \quad \text{for each } p \in \{2, \dots, N\}.$$

**Proof.** Observe that, since  $\iota(y_j)$  is odd for each  $j \geq 2$ , from (17) and (21), it holds

$$(26) \quad \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty, 1} = \sum_{j=k}^m (-1)^{\iota(y_j)} = -(m-k+1) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_1 = -\mu_{\geq 2}^{\infty, 1} = m-1.$$

Furthermore, (19) can be written as

$$\left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty, q} \right) = \left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, q} \right) + \left( \mu_{q-1} + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, q-1} \right) \quad \text{for each } q \in \{2, \dots, N\}$$

and therefore, we derive that, for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and each  $p \in \{2, \dots, N\}$ ,

$$(27) \quad (-1)^p \left( \mu_p + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, p} \right) = \sum_{q=2}^p (-1)^q \left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty, q} \right) - \left( \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, 1} \right).$$

Now, we claim that

$$(28) \quad (-1)^p \left( \mu_p + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, p} \right) = -C_{p+k-2}^{k-2} \quad \text{for each } p \in \{2, \dots, N\} \text{ and for each } k \in \{2, \dots, m\}.$$

The proof of the claim will be by induction on  $k$ . Observe that, for  $k = 2$ , applying (27), we get

$$(-1)^p \left( \mu_p + \mu_{\geq 3}^{\infty, p} \right) = \sum_{q=2}^p (-1)^q \left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq 2}^{\infty, q} \right) - \left( \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq 3}^{\infty, 1} \right) = -1 = -C_p^0,$$

where we have used (21). Hence the claim (28) is true for  $k = 2$ .

By induction on  $k$ , assume that the claim (28) holds for  $k - 1 \in \{2, \dots, m - 1\}$ . Applying (27) and (26), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^p \left( \mu_p + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, p} \right) &= \sum_{q=2}^p (-1)^q \left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty, q} \right) - \left( \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, 1} \right) \\ &= \sum_{q=2}^p -C_{q+k-3}^{k-3} - (k-1) \\ &= -\sum_{q=0}^p C_{q+k-3}^{k-3} = -C_{p+k-2}^p. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the proof of the claim (28) is thereby completed.

Finally, taking  $k = m$  in (28) and using the fact that  $\mu_{\geq m+1}^{\infty, p} = 0$ , we deduce Lemma 4.4 ■

Notice that, in Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4, we assumed that, for  $j \geq 2$ , the parameters  $\iota(y_j)$ 's have the same sign. In the sequel, we need to cover the other situations.

**Lemma 4.5** *Assume that  $m \geq 3$ , that  $\iota(y_2)$  is odd and let  $1 \leq \ell_0 \leq (m-1)/2$  be such that  $\iota(y_{2j})$  is odd and  $\iota(y_{2j+1})$  is even for  $j \in \{1, \dots, \ell_0\}$ . Then there holds:*

$$\begin{cases} \mu_{2p-1} + \mu_{\geq 2j+2}^{\infty, 2p-1} = 0 & \forall 1 \leq p \leq [(N+1)/2], \\ \mu_{2p} + \mu_{\geq 2j+2}^{\infty, 2p} = -C_{p+j-1}^p & \forall 1 \leq p \leq [N/2], \end{cases} \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq \ell_0.$$

**Proof.** First, if  $\iota(y_k)$  is odd and  $\iota(y_{k+1})$  is even, applying (19) two times, it follows that

$$(29) \quad \left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty, q} \right) = \left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq k+2}^{\infty, q} \right) - \left( \mu_{q-2} + \mu_{\geq k+2}^{\infty, q-2} \right) \quad \forall q \in \{3, \dots, N\},$$

$$(30) \quad \left( \mu_2 + \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty, 2} \right) = \left( \mu_2 + \mu_{\geq k+2}^{\infty, 2} \right) + 1.$$

Second, taking  $k = 2$  in (29) and using (19), we obtain

$$\left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq 4}^{\infty, q} \right) = \left( \mu_{q-2} + \mu_{\geq 4}^{\infty, q-2} \right) \quad \forall q \in \{3, \dots, N\}$$

which implies that (by using (20) and (30))

$$(31) \quad \left( \mu_{2p-1} + \mu_{\geq 4}^{\infty, 2p-1} \right) = \left( \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq 4}^{\infty, 1} \right) = \left( \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq 2}^{\infty, 1} \right) - (-1)^{\iota(y_2)} - (-1)^{\iota(y_3)} = 0,$$

$$(32) \quad \left( \mu_{2p} + \mu_{\geq 4}^{\infty, 2p} \right) = \left( \mu_2 + \mu_{\geq 4}^{\infty, 2} \right) = -1.$$

Now, we will prove the lemma by induction on  $j$ . Notice that, (31) and (32) imply the statements of Lemma 4.5 in the case  $j = 1$ . Now, we assume that the result holds for  $j - 1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell_0 - 1\}$

and we will prove it for  $j$ . Note that  $\iota(y_{2j})$  is odd and  $\iota(y_{2j+1})$  is even. Furthermore, by the induction assumption we have that

$$(33) \quad \begin{cases} \mu_{2p-1} + \mu_{\geq 2j}^{\infty, 2p-1} = 0 & \forall 1 \leq p \leq [(N+1)/2], \\ \mu_{2p} + \mu_{\geq 2j}^{\infty, 2p} = -C_{p+j-2}^p & \forall 1 \leq p \leq [N/2]. \end{cases}$$

Using (29) and the first equation of (33), we deduce that

$$\mu_{2p-1} + \mu_{\geq 2j+2}^{\infty, 2p-1} = \mu_{2p-3} + \mu_{\geq 2j+2}^{\infty, 2p-3} \quad \forall 2 \leq p \leq [(N+1)/2]$$

which implies that, for each  $2 \leq p \leq [(N+1)/2]$ ,

$$(34) \quad \mu_{2p-1} + \mu_{\geq 2j+2}^{\infty, 2p-1} = \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq 2j+2}^{\infty, 1} = \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq 2j}^{\infty, 1} - (-1)^{\iota(y_{2j})} - (-1)^{\iota(y_{2j+1})} = 0.$$

In addition, for  $p = 1$ , using (21), we have

$$(35) \quad \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq 2j+2}^{\infty, 1} = \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq 2}^{\infty, 1} - \mu_{\geq 2}^{\infty, 1} + \mu_{\geq 2j+2}^{\infty, 1} = \sum_{k=2}^{2j+1} (-1)^{\iota(y_k)} = 0.$$

Thus, (34) and (35) complete the proof of the first assertion of the lemma.

Concerning the second statement, using (29), we deduce that

$$\left( \mu_{2q} + \mu_{\geq 2j}^{\infty, 2q} \right) = \left( \mu_{2q} + \mu_{\geq 2j+2}^{\infty, 2q} \right) - \left( \mu_{2(q-1)} + \mu_{\geq 2j+2}^{\infty, 2(q-1)} \right) \quad \forall 2 \leq q \leq [N/2]$$

which implies that

$$\left( \mu_{2p} + \mu_{\geq 2j+2}^{\infty, 2p} \right) = \left( \mu_2 + \mu_{\geq 2j+2}^{\infty, 2} \right) + \sum_{q=2}^p \left( \mu_{2q} + \mu_{\geq 2j}^{\infty, 2q} \right) \quad \forall 2 \leq p \leq [N/2].$$

Hence, using (30) and (33), for each  $2 \leq p \leq [N/2]$ , we have

$$\left( \mu_{2p} + \mu_{\geq 2j+2}^{\infty, 2p} \right) = -1 + \sum_{q=1}^p \left( \mu_{2q} + \mu_{\geq 2j}^{\infty, 2q} \right) = -1 - \sum_{q=1}^p C_{q+j-2}^q = - \sum_{q=0}^p C_{q+j-2}^q = -C_{p+j-1}^p.$$

Finally, for  $p = 1$ , using (30) and (33), we get

$$\left( \mu_2 + \mu_{\geq 2j+2}^{\infty, 2} \right) = -1 + \left( \mu_2 + \mu_{\geq 2j}^{\infty, 2} \right) = -1 - C_{j-1}^1 = -C_j^1.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. ■

## 5 Proof of the theorems in a general case

This section is devoted to the proof of the theorems in their most generalities. We notice that, when  $m := \#\mathcal{K}^\infty = 2$ , we clearly see that  $\text{Index}_K \neq 1$  and therefore we are in the situation of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 stated below. These theorems have been proved in Section 3 in this case. Thus, in the sequel, we assume that  $m := \#\mathcal{K}^\infty \geq 3$ . For arbitrarily  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and for  $\eta < \frac{1}{2N+1}$  we choose  $\varepsilon$  as Proposition 2.2 and assume that  $K \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$  and satisfies the conditions (H1, H2, H3).

We first consider the case  $\text{Index}_K := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{K}^\infty} (-1)^{\iota(y)} = 1$ , that is, we are going to prove Theorem 1.1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1** Since  $\text{Index}_K = 1$ ,  $m$  has to be odd, say  $2\ell + 1$ ;  $\ell \geq 1$  with  $\ell + 1$  points satisfying  $\iota(y)$  even and  $\ell$  points satisfying  $\iota(y)$  odd. Furthermore observe that by definition  $\mu_{\geq 2\ell+2}^{\infty, p} = 0$  for each  $1 \leq p \leq N$ .

Next, we arrange the points  $y_k$ 's of  $\mathcal{K}^\infty$  such that  $\iota(y_1), \dots, \iota(y_{2\ell+1})$  are even and  $\iota(y_2), \dots, \iota(y_{2\ell})$  are odd. We observe that the assumptions of Lemma 4.5 are satisfied (by taking  $\ell_0 = \ell$ ). Thus Lemma 4.5 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\geq 2\ell+2}^{\infty, 2p-1} + \mu_{2p-1} &= \mu_{2p-1} = 0 & \forall 1 \leq p \leq [(N+1)/2], \\ \mu_{\geq 2\ell+2}^{\infty, 2p} + \mu_{2p} &= \mu_{2p} = -C_{p+\ell-1}^p & \forall 1 \leq p \leq [N/2]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for each  $p \in \{1, \dots, [N/2]\}$ , the functional  $J_K$  has at least  $C_{p+\ell-1}^p$  critical points  $\omega_{2p, k}$ 's such that

$$J_K(\omega_{2p, k}) \in [(2pS_n(1-\eta))^{2/n}, (2pS_n(1+\eta))^{2/n}] \quad \forall 1 \leq k \leq C_{p+\ell-1}^p.$$

By using (4) and (5), it follows that the Nirenberg problem  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  has at least  $C_{p+\ell-1}^p$  solutions whose energies are close to  $\frac{1}{n}2pS_n$ .

Hence Theorem 1.1 is proved. ■

From now, we assume that  $\text{Index}_K \neq 1$  and without loss of generality, we can assume that  $y_1, \dots, y_m$  are arranged so that we are in one of the following four cases:

**Case 1.** all the indices  $\iota(y_j)$ 's are even.

**Case 2.** for  $j \geq 2$ , all the indices  $\iota(y_j)$  are odd.

**Case 3.** there exists  $l \geq 1$  with  $2l \leq m - 2$  such that

$$\iota(y_{2j}) \text{ is odd and } \iota(y_{2j+1}) \text{ is even for } j \in \{1, \dots, l\} \text{ and } \iota(y_j) \text{ is even } \forall j \in \{2\ell + 2, \dots, m\}.$$

**Case 4.** there exists  $l \geq 1$  with  $2l \leq m - 2$  such that

$$\iota(y_{2j}) \text{ is odd and } \iota(y_{2j+1}) \text{ is even for } j \in \{1, \dots, l\} \text{ and } \iota(y_j) \text{ is odd for } j \in \{2\ell + 2, \dots, m\},$$

where  $\iota(y) = n - \text{morse index}(K, y)$ .

Notice that, in cases 3 and 4, we have used the fact that  $\text{Index}_K \neq 1$  which implies that  $m \geq 2\ell + 2$ .

To specify the exact number of solutions obtained and their levels, we will present our multiplicity results for each case. Using the above notations, our multiplicity results are as follows:

**Theorem 5.1** *Let  $n \geq 7$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  be an integer. There exists  $\varepsilon_N > 0$  such that, if  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_N$  and  $K \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$  satisfying **(H1-H2-H3)**,  $\text{Index}_K := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{K}^\infty} (-1)^{\iota(y)} \neq 1$  and the assumption stated in Case 1 or Case 2, then there hold:*

*for any  $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ ,  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  has at least  $C_{p+m-2}^p$  solutions whose energies are close to  $\frac{p}{n}S_n$ .*

*In particular  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  has at least  $C_{N+m-1}^{m-1} - 1$  solutions.*

**Theorem 5.2** *Let  $n \geq 7$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  be an integer. There exists  $\varepsilon_N > 0$  such that, if  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_N$  and  $K \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$  satisfying **(H1-H2-H3)**,  $\text{Index}_K := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{K}^\infty} (-1)^{\iota(y)} \neq 1$  and the assumption stated in Case 3 or Case 4, then*



- for each  $p \in \{1, \dots, [N/2]\}$ ,  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  has at least  $C_{p+m-\ell-2}^p$  solutions whose energies are close to  $\frac{2p}{n}S_n$ ,
- for each  $p \in \{1, \dots, [(N+1)/2]\}$ ,  $(\mathcal{N}_K)$  has at least  $C_{p+m-\ell-3}^{p-1}$  solutions whose energies are close to  $\frac{2p-1}{n}S_n$ ,

Now, we are going to prove Theorems 5.1 and 5.2.

**Proof of Theorem 5.1** For  $m = 2$ , the proof is done in Section 3 and for  $m \geq 3$ , the proof follows from Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4. ■

**Proof of Theorem 5.2** We have to consider Cases 3 and 4.

- In Case 3, i.e, there exists  $\ell \geq 1$  such that  $\iota(y_{2k+1})$  is even and  $\iota(y_{2k})$  is odd for each  $k \leq \ell$  and  $\iota(y_j)$  is even for each  $j \geq 2\ell + 2$ .

Note that, in this case, the assumptions of Lemma 4.5 are satisfied for  $\ell_0 = \ell$ . Hence, we have

$$(36) \quad \begin{cases} \mu_{2p-1} + \mu_{\geq 2\ell+2}^{\infty, 2p-1} = 0 & \forall 1 \leq p \leq [(N+1)/2], \\ \mu_{2p} + \mu_{\geq 2\ell+2}^{\infty, 2p} = -C_{p+\ell-1}^p & \forall 1 \leq p \leq [N/2]. \end{cases}$$

Since  $\text{Index}_K \neq 1$ , we see that  $m \geq 2\ell + 2$ . By assumption of the theorem,  $\iota(y_k)$  is even for each  $k \geq 2\ell + 2$ , and therefore, using (19), we get

$$(37) \quad \left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty, q} \right) = \left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, q} \right) - \left( \mu_{q-1} + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, q-1} \right) \quad \forall q \in \{2, \dots, N\}, \forall k \geq 2\ell + 2$$

which implies that

$$(38) \quad \left( \mu_p + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, p} \right) = \sum_{q=2}^p \left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty, q} \right) + \left( \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, 1} \right) \quad \forall p \in \{2, \dots, N\}, \forall k \geq 2\ell + 2.$$

Notice that, using (36) and the fact that  $\iota(y_k)$  is even for  $k \geq 2\ell + 2$ , we get

$$(39) \quad \left( \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, 1} \right) = \left( \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq 2\ell+2}^{\infty, 1} \right) - \sum_{j=2\ell+2}^k (-1)^{\iota(y_j)} = -(k - 2\ell - 1).$$

Thus, by induction on  $k \in \{2\ell + 2, \dots, m\}$  and using (36), we deduce that

$$(40) \quad \left( \mu_p + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, p} \right) < 0 \quad \forall p \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \forall k \geq 2\ell + 2.$$

Now, we need to be more precise. In fact, using (37), (40) and (36), we deduce that

$$(41) \quad \left( \mu_{2p+1} + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, 2p+1} \right) \leq \left( \mu_{2p} + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, 2p} \right) \quad \forall p \in \{1, \dots, [(N-1)/2]\}, \forall k \geq 2\ell + 2.$$

Thus, taking  $k = m$  in (41) and (39), it follows that

$$(42) \quad \mu_1 = -(m - 2\ell - 1) \leq -1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{2p+1} \leq \mu_{2p} \quad \forall p \in \{1, \dots, [(N-1)/2]\}.$$

In addition, (38), (40) and (36) imply

$$(43) \quad \left( \mu_{2p} + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, 2p} \right) \leq \sum_{q=1}^p \left( \mu_{2q} + \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty, 2q} \right) - 1 \quad \forall p \in \{1, \dots, [N/2]\}, \forall k \geq 2\ell + 2.$$

Now, we claim that

$$(44) \quad \left( \mu_{2p} + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, 2p} \right) \leq -C_{p+\ell+(k-2\ell-2)}^p \quad \forall p \in \{1, \dots, [N/2]\}, \forall k \geq 2\ell + 2.$$

In fact, for  $k = 2\ell + 2$ , using (43) and (36), we deduce that

$$(45) \quad \left( \mu_{2p} + \mu_{\geq 2\ell+3}^{\infty, 2p} \right) \leq \sum_{q=1}^p -C_{q+\ell-1}^q - 1 = -\sum_{q=0}^p C_{q+\ell-1}^q = -C_{p+\ell}^p \quad \forall p \in \{1, \dots, [N/2]\}$$

which implies that Claim (44) is true for  $k = \ell + 2$ .

By induction on  $k$ , assume that Claim (44) is true for  $k$ , hence, using (43), we deduce that, for each  $p \in \{1, \dots, [N/2]\}$ ,

$$(46) \quad \left( \mu_{2p} + \mu_{\geq k+2}^{\infty, 2p} \right) \leq \sum_{q=1}^p -C_{q+\ell+(k-2\ell-2)}^q - 1 = -\sum_{q=0}^p C_{q+\ell+(k-2\ell-2)}^q = -C_{p+\ell+(k+1-2\ell-2)}^p.$$

This completes the proof of Claim (44).

Finally, taking  $k = m$  in (44) and recalling that  $\mu_{\geq m+1}^{\infty, q} = 0$  for each  $q$ , we derive that

$$(47) \quad \mu_{2p} = \left( \mu_{2p} + \mu_{\geq m+1}^{\infty, 2p} \right) \leq -C_{p+m-\ell-2}^p \quad \forall p \in \{1, \dots, [N/2]\}.$$

Hence the proof of Theorem 5.2 follows from (14), (47) and (42) in the situation where Case 3 holds.

- In Case 4, there exists  $\ell \geq 1$  such that  $\iota(y_{2k+1})$  is even and  $\iota(y_{2k})$  is odd for each  $k \leq \ell$  and  $\iota(y_j)$  is odd for each  $j \geq 2\ell + 2$ . Clearly, in this case, assumptions of Lemma 4.5 are satisfied for  $\ell_0 = \ell$ . Thus, we see that (36) holds in this case. The proof of this case will follow the previous one with some changes because the sign of  $\iota(y_k)$  for  $k \geq 2\ell + 2$ . Precisely, equations (37) and (38) become

$$(48) \quad \left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty, q} \right) = \left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, q} \right) + \left( \mu_{q-1} + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, q-1} \right) \quad \forall q \in \{2, \dots, N\}, \forall k \geq 2\ell + 2$$

(49)

$$(-1)^p \left( \mu_p + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, p} \right) = \sum_{q=2}^p (-1)^q \left( \mu_q + \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty, q} \right) - \left( \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, 1} \right) \quad \forall 2 \leq p \leq N, \forall k \geq 2\ell + 2.$$

Notice that, using (36) and the fact that  $\iota(y_k)$  is odd for  $k \geq 2\ell + 2$ , we get

$$(50) \quad \left( \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, 1} \right) = \left( \mu_1 + \mu_{\geq 2\ell+2}^{\infty, 1} \right) - \sum_{j=2\ell+2}^k (-1)^{\iota(y_j)} = (k - 2\ell - 1).$$

Thus, by induction on  $k \in \{2\ell + 2, \dots, m\}$  and using (36), we deduce that

$$(51) \quad (-1)^p \left( \mu_p + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, p} \right) < 0 \quad \forall p \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \forall k \geq 2\ell + 2$$

and therefore, (41) becomes

$$(52) \quad - \left( \mu_{2p+1} + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, 2p+1} \right) \leq \left( \mu_{2p} + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, 2p} \right) \quad \forall p \in \{1, \dots, [(N-1)/2]\}, \forall k \geq 2\ell + 2.$$

Thus, taking  $k = m$  in (52) and (50), it follows that

$$(53) \quad \mu_1 = (m - 2\ell - 1) \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad -\mu_{2p+1} \leq \mu_{2p} \quad \forall p \in \{1, \dots, [(N-1)/2]\}.$$

In addition, (49), (51) and (36) imply

$$(54) \quad \left( \mu_{2p} + \mu_{\geq k+1}^{\infty, 2p} \right) \leq \sum_{q=1}^p \left( \mu_{2q} + \mu_{\geq k}^{\infty, 2q} \right) - 1 \quad \forall p \in \{1, \dots, [N/2]\}, \forall k \geq 2\ell + 2$$

which is exactly the equation (43). The sequel of the proof is exactly the same than the previous case (that is Case 3). Thus we will omit it.

The proof of Theorem 5.2 is thereby completed. ■

## References

- [1] Ahmedou, M; Ben Ayed, M. *Non simple blow ups for the Nirenberg problem on high dimensional half spheres*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **42** (2022), no. 12, 5967-6005.
- [2] Ahmedou, M; Ben Ayed, M; El Mehdi K. *Nirenberg problem on high dimensional spheres: Blow up with residual mass phenomenon*, Preprint 2024, submitted.arXiv:2404.13341
- [3] Aubin, T. *Equations différentielles non linéaires et problème de Yamabe concernant la courbure scalaire*. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **55** (1976), no. 3, 269–296.
- [4] Aubin, T; Hebey, E. *Courbure scalaire prescrite*. (French) [*Prescribed scalar curvature*] Bull. Sci. Math. **115** (1991), no. 2, 125–131.
- [5] Bahri A., *Critical points at infinity in some variational problems*, Research Notes in Mathematics, 182, Longman-Pitman, London, 1989.
- [6] A. Bahri, *An invariant for yamabe-type flows with applications to scalar curvature problems in high dimensions*, A celebration of J. F. Nash Jr., Duke Math. J. **81** (1996), 323-466.
- [7] Bahri, A; and Coron, J.-M. *The scalar curvature problem on the standard three dimensional spheres*, J. Funct. Anal. **95**, (1991), 106-172.
- [8] Bahri, A.; Coron, J.-M. *On a nonlinear elliptic equation involving the critical Sobolev exponent: the effect of the topology of the domain*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math **41**(1988), 253–294.
- [9] Bahri, A; Li, Y.Y; Rey, O. *On a variational problem with lack of compactness: the topological effect of the critical points at infinity*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **3** (1995), 67–93.

- [10] Bartolucci, D.; Tarantello, G. *Asymptotic blow-up analysis for singular Liouville type equations with applications*. J. Differential Equations **262** (2017), 3887–3931.
- [11] Ben Ayed, M; Chen, Y.; Chtioui, H; Hammami, M. *On the prescribed scalar curvature problem on 4-manifolds*, Duke Mathematical Journal, **84**, (1996), 633–677.
- [12] Brézis, H.; Coron, J.-M. *Convergence of solutions of H-systems or how to blow bubbles*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **89** (1985), no. 1, 21–56.
- [13] Brézis, H; Nirenberg, L. *Positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponents*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **36** (1983), no. 4, 437–477.
- [14] Bourguignon, J.P.; Ezin, J.P. *Scalar curvature functions in a conformal class of metrics and conformal transformations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **301**, (1987), 723–736.
- [15] Caffarelli, L.; Gidas, B.; and Spruck, J. *Asymptotic symmetry and local behavior of semilinear equations with critical Sobolev growth*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **42** (1989), 271–297.
- [16] Chang, A.; Yang, P. *A perturbation result in prescribing scalar curvature on  $S^n$* . Duke Math. J. **64** (1991), 27–69.
- [17] Chang, A.; Gursky, Matthew J.; Yang, Paul C. *The scalar curvature equation on 2- and 3-spheres*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **1** (1993), no. 2, 205–229.
- [18] Chen, C.C; Lin, C.S. *Blowing up with infinite energy of conformal metrics on  $S^n$* . Comm. Partial Differential Equations **24** (1999), 785–799.
- [19] Chen, C.C; Lin, C.S. *Prescribing the scalar curvature on  $S^n$ , I. A priori estimates* J. Differential Geom. **57**, (2001), 67–171.
- [20] Chen, C-C; Lin, C.S. *Estimate of the conformal scalar curvature equation via the method of moving planes. II*. J. Differential Geom. **49** (1998), 115–178.
- [21] Chen, X; Xu, X. *The scalar curvature flow on  $S^n$ —perturbation theorem revisited*, Invent. Math. **187** (2012), no. 2, 395–506
- [22] Druet, O; Hebey, E; Robert, F. *Blow-up theory for elliptic PDEs in Riemannian geometry*. Mathematical Notes, 45. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2004.
- [23] Hebey, E. *Changements de métriques conformes sur la sphère. Le problème de Nirenberg* Bull. Sci. Math. **114** (1990), 215–242.
- [24] J. Kazdan and F. Warner, *Existence and conformal deformation of metrics with prescribed Gaussian and scalar curvatures*, Ann. of Math (2) **101** (1975), 317–331.
- [25] Khuri, M. A; Marques, F. C; Schoen, R. *A compactness theorem for the Yamabe problem*. J. Differential Geom. **81** (2009), no. 1, 143–196.
- [26] Li, Y.Y. *Prescribing scalar curvature on  $S^n$  and related topics, Part I*, Journal of Differential Equations, **120** (1995), 319–410.
- [27] Li, Y.Y. *Prescribing scalar curvature on  $S^n$  and related topics, Part II : existence and compactness*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **49** (1996), 437–477.
- [28] Lions, P.L. *The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The limit case. Part I*. Rev. Mat. Iberoamericano **1**(1985), 145–201.

- [29] Malchiodi, A; Mayer, M. *Prescribing Morse scalar curvatures: subcritical blowing-up solutions*. J. Differential Equations **268** (2020), no. 5, 2089–2124.
- [30] Malchiodi, A; Mayer, M. *Prescribing Morse scalar curvatures: blow up analysis*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 2021, no. 18, 14123–14203.
- [31] Malchiodi, A; Mayer, M. *Prescribing Morse scalar curvatures: pinching and Morse theory*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., to appear.
- [32] Mayer, M. *A scalar curvature flow in low dimensions*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **56** (2017), no. 2, Paper No. 24, 41 pp.
- [33] Schoen, R. Topics in Differential geometry, Graduate course at Stanford University, 1988 unpublished notes available at: <https://sites.math.washington.edu/~pollack/research/Schoen-1988-notes.html>.
- [34] Obata, M. *The conjecture on conformal transformations of Riemannian manifolds*, J. Differential Geom. **6** (1971), 247–258.
- [35] Schoen, R; Zhang, D. *Prescribed scalar curvature on the  $n$ -sphere*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **4** (1996), 1–25.
- [36] Struwe, M. *A global compactness result for elliptic boundary value problems involving limiting nonlinearities*. Math. Z. **187** (1984), 511–517.
- [37] Yamabe, H. *On a deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds*, Osaka Math. J. **12** (1960) 21–37,