

PRESCRIBING POSITIVE CURVATURE WITH CONICAL SINGULARITIES ON \mathbb{S}^2

JINGYI CHEN, YUXIANG LI, YUNQING WU

ABSTRACT. For conformal metrics with conical singularities and positive curvature on \mathbb{S}^2 , we prove a convergence theorem and apply it to obtain a criterion for nonexistence in an open region of the prescribing data. The core of our study is a fine analysis of the bubble trees and an area identity in the convergence process.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Preliminary	5
3.	Positive curvatures on \mathbb{S}^2 with divisors	9
3.1.	Bubbles at 1-level	10
3.2.	The structure of bubble tree	12
3.3.	Simplification of bubble-tree convergence when $K_k \rightarrow K$ in C^1	21
3.4.	Nonexistence of solutions around certain prescribed data	26
	References	27

1. INTRODUCTION

A real divisor \mathfrak{D} on a compact surface Σ is a formal sum $\mathfrak{D} = \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i p_i$, where $\beta := (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $p_i \in \Sigma$ are distinct. The Euler characteristic of the pair (Σ, β) is defined to be

$$\chi(\Sigma, \beta) := \chi(\Sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i.$$

Let g_0 be a Riemannian metric on Σ . A conformal metric g on (Σ, g_0) is said to represent the divisor \mathfrak{D} if g is a smooth metric away from p_1, \dots, p_m such that around each p_i there is an isothermal coordinate neighbourhood U_i w.r.t. g_0 with a coordinate z_i such that $z_i(p_i) = 0$ and g is in the form

$$g = e^{2v} |z_i|^{2\beta_i} g_{\text{euc}},$$

where $v \in C^0(U_i) \cap C^2(U_i \setminus \{p_i\})$. The point p_i is called a conical singularity of angle $\theta_i = 2\pi(\beta_i + 1)$ if $\beta_i > -1$ and a cusp if $\beta_i = -1$.

Chen is partially supported by NSERC Discovery Grant GR010074.

Li is partially supported by National Key R&D Program of China 2022YFA1005400.

Finding a conformal metric $g = e^{2u}g_0$ representing \mathfrak{D} with a prescribed function K on \mathcal{K} is equivalent to solving

$$(1.1) \quad -\Delta_{g_0}u = Ke^{2u} - K_{g_0} - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \delta_{p_i}$$

in the sense of distribution, where δ_{p_i} is the Dirac measure at p_i .

When $\chi(\Sigma, \beta) > 0$ and \mathfrak{D} consists of conical singularities, existence of a conformal metric representing \mathfrak{D} is known in a few cases. For instance, it is shown that (1.1) admits a solution if $0 < \chi(\Sigma, \beta) < 2 \min_i \{1, \beta_i + 1\}$ (which is called the Trudinger constant), $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m > -1$ and K is positive somewhere [28, Theorem C] and if $\chi(\Sigma, \beta) > 2$, the genus of Σ is at least 1, $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m > 0$ and β not in certain lattice, K is a positive Lipschitz continuous function [1, Theorem 1.1]. In [22], F. Luo and G. Tian established the uniqueness of Troyanov's solution to Liouville's equation on the punctured complex plane. For Liouville type equations, uniqueness and symmetry of solutions are studied in [17, 2, 25], etc. and existence via a topological degree theory in [19, 21, 6, 7]; we refer the reader to the reference therein for many other works.

For the spherical metric of constant curvature on \mathbb{S}^2 , important classifications of conformal metrics with conical singularities has been achieved. It is shown that a solution cannot have exactly one singularity by W.X. Chen and C.M. Li [11], a solution with exactly two conical singularities must satisfy a strong rigidity by M. Troyanov [27], and A. Eremenko [14] treated three conical singularities. We will use the first two cases in our proof of results stated below.

When the singular points $\{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$ are not fixed on \mathbb{S}^2 , the question of finding a spherical metric with prescribed angles at m conical singularities has been studied, in particular, under a constrain on the holonomy representation: $\pi_1(\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}) \rightarrow SO(3)$, in [24, 12, 15, 18]. Inspired by these works, although the points in \mathfrak{D} are fixed in our consideration, we introduce a function to describe the type of divisors in our interest:

First, let $\mathbb{F} : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\{1, \dots, m\})$ be an index function for certain half spaces of \mathbb{R}^m where \mathcal{P} stands for the power set, given by

$$\mathbb{F}((v_1, \dots, v_m)) = \left\{ i : v_i \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^m v_k \right\}.$$

Then, we define

$$\mathcal{A}_m = \left\{ \beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m : -1 < \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m \neq 0, \frac{1}{2}\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) \in (0, +\infty) \setminus \mathbb{N}, \right. \\ \left. \text{and for } \forall J \subset \mathbb{F}(\beta), \frac{1}{2}\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) - \sum_{j \in J} \beta_j \neq |J|, |J| + 1, \dots, |J| + \left[\frac{1}{2}\chi(\mathbb{S}^2) \right] \right\}.$$

There are divisors on \mathbb{S}^2 with β in \mathcal{A}_m that are not representable by the spherical metric (cf. [24, 12]); in other words, (1.1) with such β and $K = K_{g_0} = 1$ admits no solutions. The *nonexistence* persists in an open neighbourhood of $(\beta, 1)$ as a special case of our results in this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let K lie in the set $C^+(\mathbb{S}^2)$ of positive continuous functions on \mathbb{S}^2 . Suppose that $\beta \in \mathcal{A}_m$ and one of the following assumptions holds:*

- (\mathcal{O}_1) $0 < \chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) < 2$;
- (\mathcal{O}_2) $\beta_i \leq 1$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.

If the equation

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^2} u = Ke^{2u} - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \delta_{p_i} - 1$$

has no solutions in $\cap_{p \in [1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$, then there exists a neighbourhood \mathcal{U} of (K, β) in $C^+(\mathbb{S}^2) \times (-1, \infty)^{\times m}$ such that for any $(\tilde{K}, \tilde{\beta}) \in \mathcal{U}$,

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^2} u = \tilde{K}e^{2u} - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{\beta}_i \delta_{p_i} - 1$$

has no solutions in $\cap_{p \in [1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$.

In fact, stronger regularity on K allows us to drop the assumption (\mathcal{O}_1) and (\mathcal{O}_2) in Theorem 1.1:

Theorem 1.2. *Let K lie in the set $C^{1,+}(\mathbb{S}^2)$ of positive C^1 -smooth functions on \mathbb{S}^2 . Suppose $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m) \in \mathcal{A}_m$. If the equation*

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^2} u = Ke^{2u} - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \delta_{p_i} - 1$$

has no solutions in $\cap_{p \in [1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$, then there exists a neighbourhood \mathcal{U} of (K, β) in $C^1(\mathbb{S}^2) \times (-1, \infty)^{\times m}$ such that for any $(\tilde{K}, \tilde{\beta}) \in \mathcal{U}$,

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^2} u = \tilde{K}e^{2u} - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{\beta}_i \delta_{p_i} - 1$$

has no solutions in $\cap_{p \in [1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$.

A key ingredient in proving Theorem 1.1 is the compactness statement in Theorem 1.3 below. Fix m distinct points p_1, \dots, p_m on \mathbb{S}^2 . Let $\beta^k = (\beta_1^k, \dots, \beta_m^k) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\beta^k \rightarrow \beta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $\mathfrak{D}^k = \beta_1^k p_1 + \dots + \beta_m^k p_m$. For a sequence of conformal metrics $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\mathbb{S}^2}$ representing \mathfrak{D}^k with curvature $K_k \rightarrow K > 0$, the theorem says that (up to passing to subsequences) either the sequence converges to a conformal metric with curvature K representing a divisor $\mathfrak{D} = \sum_{i=1}^m (\beta_i - 2n_i) p_i$ where $n_i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, or the sequence collapses to 0-measure but after normalization it converges to a conformal metric representing a nontrivial divisor (possibly different from \mathfrak{D}) on \mathbb{S}^2 with curvature 0.

Suppose that the curvature measures \mathbb{K}_{g_k} of g_k (or a subsequence under consideration) converge weakly. The function $\Theta(x) : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\Theta(x) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{K}_{g_k}(B_r^{g_{\mathbb{S}^2}}(x)).$$

reveals the curvature concentration at x and we can show that $\{x : \Theta(x) \neq 0\}$ has only finite elements, hence the sum $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{S}^2} \Theta(x) \delta_x$ is well-defined. The value of

$\Theta(x)$ can be calculated precisely by analyzing the bubble tree structure carefully (see Proposition 3.3, Proposition 3.5 and Proposition 3.6).

Theorem 1.3. *Let p_1, \dots, p_m be distinct points on \mathbb{S}^2 . Suppose that $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\mathbb{S}^2}$ and u_k satisfies*

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^2} u_k = K_k e^{2u_k} - 1 - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i^k \delta_{p_i},$$

in the sense of distribution, where

(A1) $K_k \in C^0(\mathbb{S}^2)$ and $K_k \rightarrow K > 0$ in $C^0(\mathbb{S}^2)$,

(A2) $\beta_i^k \rightarrow \beta_i > -1$,

(A3) $\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) = 2 + \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i > 0$.

Then after passing to a subsequence one of the following holds:

(a) If $u_k \rightarrow u$ weakly in $\cap_{p \in (1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$, then u solves

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^2} u = K e^{2u} + \sum_{x \in \mathbb{S}^2} \Theta(x) \delta_x - 1.$$

$\{u_k\}$ can only has bubbles at p_i with $\beta_i > 1$, and the bubble tree at each such point has only one level. Furthermore, the total number of bubbles, saying s , has an upper bound:

$$s \leq \frac{1}{2} \chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta).$$

(b) If $u_k - c_k \rightarrow v$ weakly in $\cap_{p \in (1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$ with $c_k \rightarrow -\infty$, then

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^2} v = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{S}^2} \Theta(x) \delta_x - 1.$$

Each bubble tree has at most two levels, and

$$s_1 - s_2 = \frac{1}{2} \chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) - \sum_{\{i: \{u_k\} \text{ has a singular bubble at } p_i\}} \beta_i,$$

where s_1 and s_2 denote the total number of bubbles of $\{u_k\}$ at 1-level and 2-level, respectively.

We will show that (a) in the above theorem does not happen and the bubble trees have only one level, provided one of the following holds:

(1) $\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) < 2$

(2) $\beta_i \leq 1$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.

For these two cases, the number of bubbles is bounded by the divisor:

$$\#\{\text{bubbles}\} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m |\beta_i|.$$

Convergence of solutions without divisors has been studied extensively, for example, in [5, 20, 19, 13, 26], etc. For conformal metrics representing divisors,

it is shown in [4, 3] that if $\{u_k\}$ has at least one bubble and $K_k \rightarrow K$ in $C^1(\mathbb{S}^2)$ (compare to $C^0(\mathbb{S}^2)$ in Theorem 1.3), then (b) in Theorem 1.3 holds and v solves

$$(1.2) \quad -\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^2} v = \sum_{j=1}^{s_1} (4\pi + 4\pi\beta_{i_j}) \delta_{p_{i_j}} + \sum_{j=1}^{s_2} 4\pi\delta_{q_j} - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \delta_{p_i} - 1.$$

Using the techniques developed in this paper, we can give a detailed description on the bubble development under the stronger assumption $K_k \rightarrow K$ in $C^1(\mathbb{S}^2)$: the sequence $\{u_k\}$ can only develop bubbles at 1-level, $u_k \rightarrow -\infty$ almost everywhere, and the bubble tree structure can be described in a clear way (see the detailed argument in Proposition 3.12):

- (1) $\{u_k\}$ has s_i smooth bubbles at 1-level at some p_i with $s_i = \beta_i + 1$; thus, if $\beta_i \notin \mathbb{N}$, then $\{u_k\}$ has no smooth bubbles at p_i ;
- (2) $\{u_k\}$ has one bubble with two singularities at 1-level at some p_i ;
- (3) $\{u_k\}$ has one smooth bubble at 1-level at some $q_j \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$.

Finally, we would like to mention that Mazzeo-Zhu have developed a theory for moduli of metrics with divisors in [23] (see the reference therein).

Acknowledgement. The first author would like to thank Professor Gang Tian for arranging the visits to BICMR in the summers of 2023 and 2024 in the course of this work. All authors are grateful for the wonderful research environment provided by Tsinghua University during their collaboration.

2. PRELIMINARY

In this section, we collect a few definitions and results from [8, 9] and [10] that will be used in this paper.

Let Σ be a closed surface with a Riemannian metric g_0 , the Gauss curvature K_{g_0} and the area element dV_{g_0} . Let $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma, g_0)$ be the set of Radon measures $g_u = e^{2u}g_0$ so that there is a *signed* Radon measure $\mu(g_u)$ for $u \in L^1(\Sigma, g_0)$ satisfying

$$\int_{\Sigma} \varphi d\mu(g_u) = \int_{\Sigma} (\varphi K_{g_0} - u\Delta_{g_0}\varphi) dV_{g_0}, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^{\infty}(\Sigma).$$

We write $dV_{g_u} = e^{2u}dV_{g_0}$ and call the signed Radon measure $\mathbb{K}_{g_u} = \mu(g_u)$ the curvature measure for g_u .

In an isothermal coordinate chart (x, y) for the smooth metric g_0 , we can write $g_0 = e^{2u_0}g_{\text{euc}}$ for some local function u_0 . So any $g \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma, g_0)$ is locally expressible as $g = e^{2v}g_{\text{euc}}$, where $v \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Sigma)$ and

$$(2.1) \quad -\Delta v \, dx dy = \mathbb{K}_{g_v}$$

as distributions where $\Delta = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2}$.

Definition 2.1. Let (Σ, g_0) be a surface and $\mathfrak{D} = \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i p_i$ be a divisor on Σ . A Radon measure $g = e^{2u}g_0 \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma, g_0)$ represents \mathfrak{D} with curvature function K if

$$\mathbb{K}_g = K e^{2u} dV_{g_0} - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \delta_{p_i}, \quad \text{and} \quad K e^{2u} \in L^1(\Sigma, g_0).$$

In other words, in the sense of distributions,

$$(2.2) \quad -\Delta_{g_0} u = Ke^{2u} - K_{g_0} - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \delta_{p_i}.$$

By (2.2), for a closed surface Σ we have

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\Sigma} Ke^{2u} dV_{g_0} = \chi(\Sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i = \chi(\Sigma, \beta).$$

For simplicity, we use the notations: $\mathcal{M}(\Omega) = \mathcal{M}(\Omega, g_{\text{euc}})$ where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a domain and $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S}^2) = \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$ where $g_{\mathbb{S}^2}$ is the metric on \mathbb{S}^2 of curvature 1.

Theorem 2.2. [9] *Let $\{\mu_k\}$ be a sequence of signed Radon measures on D with $|\mu_k|(D) < \epsilon_0 < \pi$. Suppose that $-\Delta u_k = \mu_k$ holds weakly with $\|\nabla u_k\|_{L^1(D)} < \Lambda$ and $\text{Area}(D, g_k) < \Lambda'$. Then after passing to a subsequence, one of the following holds:*

- (1) $u_k \rightarrow u$ weakly in $W^{1,p}(D_{1/2})$ for any $p \in [1, 2)$ and $e^{2u_k} \rightarrow e^{2u}$ in $L^q(D_{1/2})$ for some $q > 1$;
- (2) $u_k \rightarrow -\infty$ for a.e. x and $e^{2u_k} \rightarrow 0$ in $L^q(D_{1/2})$ for some $q > 1$.

Lemma 2.3. [9] *Let μ be a signed Radon measure defined on a closed surface (Σ, g_0) and $u \in L^1(\Sigma, g_0)$ solves $-\Delta_{g_0} u = \mu$ weakly. Then, for any $r > 0$ and $q \in [1, 2)$, there exists $C = C(q, r, g_0)$ such that*

$$r^{q-2} \int_{B_r^{g_0}(x)} |\nabla_{g_0} u|^q \leq C(|\mu|(\Sigma))^q.$$

We now discuss terminologies needed to describe the *bubble-tree* analysis. Let $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\text{euc}} \in \mathcal{M}(D)$ with $|\mathbb{K}_{g_k}|(D) < \Lambda$.

Definition 2.4. A sequence $\{(x_k, r_k)\}$ is a *blowup sequence* of $\{u_k\}$ at 0 if $x_k \rightarrow 0$, $r_k \rightarrow 0$ and $u'_k = u_k(x_k + r_k x) + \log r_k$ converges weakly to a function u in $\cap_{p \in [1, 2)} W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and u is called a *bubble*. The sequence $\{u_k\}$ has *no bubble* at 0 if no subsequence of $\{u_k\}$ has a blowup sequence at 0. We say u'_k converges to a *ghost bubble* if there exists $c_k \rightarrow -\infty$ such that $u'_k - c_k$ converges weakly to some function v in $\cap_{p \in [1, 2)} W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

The ghost bubble has the following property:

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{D_{1/r} \setminus \cup_{z \in \mathcal{S}} D_r(z)} e^{2u'_k} = 0,$$

where \mathcal{S} is the set consisting of measure-concentration points:

$$\mathcal{S} = \left\{ y : \mu(y) \geq \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \right\}.$$

where μ is the weak limit of $|\mathbb{K}_{e^{2(u'_k - c_k)} g_{\text{euc}}}|$ and ϵ_0 is chosen as in Theorem 2.2.

At a point, the sequence $\{u_k\}$ may have more than one blowup sequences, we distinguish them according to the following definitions.

Definition 2.5. Two blowup sequences $\{(x_k, r_k)\}$ and $\{(x'_k, r'_k)\}$ of $\{u_k\}$ at 0 are *essentially different* if one of the following happens

$$\frac{r_k}{r'_k} \rightarrow \infty, \text{ or } \frac{r'_k}{r_k} \rightarrow \infty, \text{ or } \frac{|x_k - x'_k|}{r_k + r'_k} \rightarrow \infty.$$

Otherwise, they are *essentially same*.

Definition 2.6. We say *the sequence $\{u_k\}$ has m bubbles* if $\{u_k\}$ has m essentially different blowup sequences and no subsequence of $\{u_k\}$ has more than m essentially different blowup sequences.

Definition 2.7. For two essentially different blowup sequences $\{(x_k, r_k)\}$, $\{(x'_k, r'_k)\}$, we say $\{(x'_k, r'_k)\}$ is *on the top of* $\{(x_k, r_k)\}$ and write $\{(x'_k, r'_k)\} < \{(x_k, r_k)\}$, if $\frac{r'_k}{r_k} \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{x'_k - x_k}{r_k}$ converges as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 2.8. (1) If $\{(x'_k, r'_k)\} < \{(x_k, r_k)\}$, we have $l_k := \frac{r'_k}{r_k} \rightarrow 0$ and $y_k := \frac{x'_k - x_k}{r_k} \rightarrow y$. If we set $v_k = u_k(x_k + r_k x) + \log r_k$ and $v'_k = u_k(x'_k + r'_k x) + \log r'_k$, we can verify $v'_k(x) = v_k(l_k x + y_k) + \log l_k$. Then $\{(y_k, l_k)\}$ is a blowup sequence of $\{v_k\}$ at y , and the limit of v'_k can be considered as a bubble of $\{v_k\}$.

(2) If two essentially different blowup sequences $\{(x_k, r_k)\}$, $\{(x'_k, r'_k)\}$ are not on the top of each other, then we must have $\frac{|x_k - x'_k|}{r_k + r'_k} \rightarrow \infty$ and separation of domains: for any $t > 0$, when k is sufficiently large it holds $D_{tr_k}(x_k) \cap D_{tr'_k}(x'_k) = \emptyset$.

Definition 2.9. $\{(x'_k, r'_k)\}$ is *right on the top of* $\{(x_k, r_k)\}$, if $\{(x'_k, r'_k)\} < \{(x_k, r_k)\}$ and there is no $\{(x''_k, r''_k)\}$ with $\{(x'_k, r'_k)\} < \{(x''_k, r''_k)\} < \{(x_k, r_k)\}$.

We define the *level of a blowup sequence* and its corresponding bubble as follows:

Definition 2.10.

- (1) A blowup sequence $\{(x_k, r_k)\}$ of $\{u_k\}$ at the point 0 is *at 1-level* if there is no $\{(x'_k, r'_k)\}$ with $\{(x_k, r_k)\} < \{(x'_k, r'_k)\}$. For $m \geq 2$, a blowup sequence $\{(x_k, r_k)\}$ is *at m -level* if there exists a blowup sequence $\{(x'_k, r'_k)\}$ which is at $(m - 1)$ -level such that $\{(x_k, r_k)\} < \{(x'_k, r'_k)\}$.
- (2) For $m \geq 1$, *a bubble is at m -level* if it is induced by a blowup sequence at m -level.

Two essentially different blowup sequences at m -level may be right on the top of two essentially different blowup sequences at $(m - 1)$ -level. By Remark 2.8, if $\{(x_k^1, r_k^1)\}$, $\{(x_k^2, r_k^2)\}$ are at the same level, then for any $t > 0$, when k is large

$$D_{tr_k^1}(x_k^1) \cap D_{tr_k^2}(x_k^2) = \emptyset$$

Let $g = e^{2u} g_{\text{euc}} \in \mathcal{M}(D \setminus \{0\})$ with

$$|\mathbb{K}_g|(D \setminus \{0\}) < \epsilon_1 < \pi.$$

for some ϵ_1 . Extend \mathbb{K}_g to a signed Radon measure μ by taking $\mu(A) = \mathbb{K}_g(A \cap (D \setminus \{0\}))$, $\forall A \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and write $\mu = \mathbb{K}_g \llcorner (D \setminus \{0\})$. By [10], we have the following

decomposition:

$$u(z) = I_\mu(z) + \lambda \log |z| + w(z),$$

where

$$I_\mu(z) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \log |z - y| d\mu(y), \quad \lambda = \lim_{\text{a.e } r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial D_r} \frac{\partial u}{\partial r},$$

and w is a harmonic function on $D \setminus \{0\}$ with $\int_{\partial D_r} \frac{\partial w}{\partial r} = 0$. Hence, we can find a holomorphic function F on $D \setminus \{0\}$ with $\text{Re}(F) = w$, which means

$$(u - I_\mu)(z) = \text{Re}(F(z)) + \lambda \log |z|, \quad z \in D \setminus \{0\}.$$

Lemma 2.11. [10] (1) *If the area of D is finite, namely,*

$$\int_D e^{2u} < \infty,$$

then w is smooth on D , and $\lambda \geq -1$. Moreover, $g \in \mathcal{M}(D)$ with

$$\mathbb{K}_g = \mu - 2\pi\lambda\delta_0.$$

(2) *If we further assume $\mathbb{K}_g \geq 0$ on $D \setminus \{0\}$, then $\lambda > -1$.*

Definition 2.12. (1) For $g = e^{2u} g_{\text{euc}} \in \mathcal{M}(D)$, the residue of g (or u) at 0 is

$$\text{Res}(g, 0) = \text{Res}(u, 0) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \mathbb{K}_g(\{0\}).$$

(2) For $g = e^{2u} g_{\text{euc}} \in \mathcal{M}(D \setminus \{0\})$ satisfying

$$|\mathbb{K}_g|(D \setminus \{0\}) + \int_D e^{2u} < \infty,$$

the residue of g (or u) at 0 is

$$\text{Res}(g, 0) = \text{Res}(u, 0) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \mathbb{K}_g(\{0\}).$$

(3) For $g = e^{2u} g_{\text{euc}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D)$ satisfying

$$|\mathbb{K}_g|(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D} e^{2u} < \infty,$$

the residue of g (or u) at ∞ is

$$\text{Res}(g, \infty) = \text{Res}(u, \infty) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \mathbb{K}_{g'}(\{0\})$$

where $g' = e^{2u'} g_{\text{euc}} \in \mathcal{M}(D \setminus \{0\})$ with $u'(x') = u(\frac{x'}{|x'|^2}) - 2 \log |x'|$, $x' = \frac{x}{|x|^2}$ is extended in $\mathcal{M}(D)$.

Proposition 2.13. [10] *Let $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\text{euc}} \in \mathcal{M}(D)$ with*

$$|\mathbb{K}_{g_k}|(D) + \text{Area}(D, g_k) \leq \Lambda.$$

Assume that u_k converges to u weakly in $W^{1,p}(D)$ for some $p \in [1, 2)$ and $\{u_k\}$ has a blowup sequence $\{(x_k, r_k)\}$ at 0 with the corresponding bubble u' . Then there exists $t_i \rightarrow 0$, such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{K}_{g_k}(D_{t_i}(0) \setminus D_{\frac{r_k}{t_i}}(x_k)) = -2\pi(2 + \text{Res}(u, 0) + \text{Res}(u', \infty)).$$

If no bubble occurs then there is no area concentration point:

Proposition 2.14. [10] *Let $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\text{euc}} \in \mathcal{M}(D)$ which satisfies (P1)-(P3). Assume that $\{u_k\}$ has no bubble. Then*

$$(2.3) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Area}(D_r, g_k) = 0.$$

If the curvature does not change sign then convergence of solutions occurs:

Proposition 2.15. [10] *Let $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\text{euc}} \in \mathcal{M}(D)$ with $\mathbb{K}_{g_k} = f_k e^{2u_k} dx - 2\pi\beta_k \delta_0$. Assume*

- (1) $\text{Area}(D, g_k) \leq \Lambda_1$;
- (2) $r \|\nabla u_k\|_{L^1(D_r(x))} \leq \Lambda_2$ for all $D_r(x) \subset D$;
- (3) $-\Lambda_3 \leq f_k \leq -1$ or $1 \leq f_k \leq \Lambda_3$, and f_k converges to f for a.e. $x \in D$;
- (4) $\beta_k \rightarrow \beta$.

Assume $\{u_k\}$ has no bubble. Then, after passing to a subsequence, one of the following holds:

- (a) $u_k \rightarrow u$ weakly in $\cap_{p \in [1, 2)} W^{1,p}(D_{1/2})$ and $e^{2u_k} \rightarrow e^{2u}$ in $L^1(D_{1/2})$, and

$$-\Delta u = f e^{2u} - 2\pi\beta\delta_0;$$
- (b) $u_k \rightarrow -\infty$ a.e. and $e^{2u_k} \rightarrow 0$ in $L^1(D_{1/2})$.

The following *area identity* plays a key role in this paper:

Theorem 2.16. [10] *Let $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\text{euc}} \in \mathcal{M}(D)$ satisfy*

- (P1) $\mathbb{K}_{g_k} = f_k dV_{g_k} + \lambda_k \delta_0$ (where λ_k might be 0) with $f_k \geq 1$ or $f_k \leq -1$;
- (P2) $|\mathbb{K}_{g_k}|(D) + \text{Area}(D, g_k) \leq \Lambda_1$;
- (P3) $r^{-1} \|\nabla u_k\|_{L^1(D_r(x))} \leq \Lambda_2$ for all $D_r(x) \subset D$.

We assume $\{u_k\}$ has finitely many bubbles v_1, \dots, v_m , induced by blowup sequences $\{(x_k^1, r_k^1)\}, \dots, \{(x_k^m, r_k^m)\}$ at the point 0, respectively. and we further assume that $\{u_k\}$ has no bubbles at any point $x \in D \setminus \{0\}$. Then after passing to a subsequence,

$$(2.4) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Area}(D_{1/2}, g_k) = \text{Area}(D_{1/2}, g_\infty) + \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Area}(\mathbb{R}^2, e^{2v_i} g_{\text{euc}}).$$

We allow $m = 0$, which means $\{u_k\}$ has no bubbles at 0, and the sum term in (2.4) vanishes for this case.

3. POSITIVE CURVATURES ON \mathbb{S}^2 WITH DIVISORS

In this section, we investigate the bubble tree convergence of a sequence of conformal metrics with conical singularities on a sphere.

3.1. Bubbles at 1-level. In this subsection, we establish a result concerning a property of bubbles at 1-level on a disk, which will play a crucial role in the subsequent discussions.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\text{euc}} \in \mathcal{M}(D)$ and let $u_k \in \bigcap_{p \in [1,2)} W^{1,p}(D)$ solve*

$$-\Delta u_k = K_k(x) e^{2u_k} - 2\pi \lambda_k \delta_{y_k},$$

under the following assumptions:

- (a) *There exists $\Lambda_1 > 0$ such that $\text{Area}(D, g_k) \leq \Lambda_1$;*
- (b) *There exists $\Lambda_2 > 0$ such that $r^{-1} \|\nabla u_k\|_{L^1(D_r(x))} \leq \Lambda_2$ for all $D_r(x) \subset D$;*
- (c) *$\{u_k\}$ converges to u weakly in $\bigcap_{p \in [1,2)} W^{1,p}(D)$;*
- (d) *K_k converges to K in $C(\overline{D})$, where $K > 0$;*
- (e) *The sequences $\{y_k\}$ and $\{\lambda_k\}$ converge to y and $\lambda \in (-1, \infty)$, respectively.*

Then, we have:

- (1) *$\{u_k\}$ converges weakly in $W_{\text{loc}}^{2,p}(D \setminus \{y\})$ for any $p > 1$;*
- (2) *If $\{u_k\}$ has a blowup sequence $\{(x_k, r_k)\}$, then $x_k \rightarrow y$, $y_k \in D_t(y) \setminus D_{\frac{r_k}{t}}(x_k)$ for any fixed $t > 0$ and large k , and the corresponding bubble is smooth;*
- (3) *If $\lambda \leq 1$, then $\{u_k\}$ has no bubble in D .*

Proof. Step 1: We show that u_k converges weakly in $W_{\text{loc}}^{2,p}(D \setminus \{y\})$ for any $p > 1$.

We assume that $|\mathbb{K}_{g_k}|$ converges weakly to a Radon measure μ and define

$$\mathcal{S} = \left\{ x : \mu(\{x\}) > \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \right\},$$

where ϵ_0 is chosen as in Theorem 2.2.

By Theorem 2.2, e^{2u_k} is bounded in $L^{q_1}(\Omega)$ for some $q_1 > 1$ and any $\Omega \subset \subset D \setminus \mathcal{S}$. By the L^p -estimate [16, Theorem 9.11], $u_k \rightarrow u$ weakly in $W_{\text{loc}}^{2,p}(D \setminus \mathcal{S})$ for any $p \geq 1$. Thus, to see $u_k \rightarrow u$ in $W_{\text{loc}}^{2,p}(D \setminus \{y\})$, it suffices to show $\mathcal{S} \setminus \{y\} = \emptyset$.

We assume that there exists $\tilde{y} \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{y\}$, and select δ such that $D_{2\delta}(\tilde{y}) \cap (\mathcal{S} \cup \{y\}) = \{\tilde{y}\}$. For large k , the equation satisfied by u_k on $D_{2\delta}(\tilde{y})$ is

$$-\Delta u_k = K_k e^{2u_k}.$$

If u_k is bounded from above in $D_{2\delta}(\tilde{y})$, then u_k is bounded in $W^{2,p}(\overline{D_\delta(\tilde{y})})$ for any p . This implies that $K_k e^{2u_k}$ converges in $C(\overline{D_\delta(\tilde{y})})$, which contradicts the choice that \tilde{y} is in \mathcal{S} . Thus, we must have $\max_{\overline{D_\delta(\tilde{y})}} u_k \rightarrow +\infty$. Let

$$c_k = \max_{\overline{D_\delta(\tilde{y})}} u_k = u_k(z_k), \quad \rho_k = e^{-c_k},$$

and define

$$\tilde{u}_k(x) = u_k(z_k + \rho_k x) + \log \rho_k.$$

Recalling that $u_k \rightarrow u$ weakly in $W_{\text{loc}}^{2,p}(D_{2\delta} \setminus \{\tilde{y}\})$ for any p , we conclude $z_k \rightarrow \tilde{y}$ (otherwise we will obtain a contradiction to the choice of z_k). Since $\tilde{u}_k(0) = \max_{D_R} \tilde{u}_k$, applying [20, Theorem 0] and [16, Theorem 9.11], we conclude

$\|\tilde{u}_k\|_{W^{2,p}(D_R)} < C(R)$ for any R . Then, \tilde{u}_k converges weakly in $W_{loc}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ to a function \tilde{u} which satisfies

$$-\Delta\tilde{u} = K(\tilde{y})e^{2\tilde{u}}, \quad \tilde{u}(0) = \max_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{u} = 0, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\tilde{u}} < \infty.$$

By [11, Theorem 1], we have

$$\tilde{u}(x) = -\log\left(1 + \frac{K(\tilde{y})}{4}|x|^2\right), \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} K(\tilde{y})e^{2\tilde{u}} = 4\pi.$$

Thus, $e^{2\tilde{u}}g_{\text{euc}}$ is the metric with constant curvature $K(\tilde{y})$ on $\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{\infty\}$. So ∞ is not a singularity hence $\text{Res}(\tilde{u}, \infty) = 0$. By Proposition 2.13, we obtain

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{K}_{g_k}(D_r(\tilde{y}) \setminus D_{\frac{r_k}{r}}(z_k)) \leq -2\pi(2 + \text{Res}(u, \tilde{y}) + \text{Res}(\tilde{u}, \infty)) < 0.$$

However, since $\mathbb{K}_{g_k} = K_k e^{2u_k} dx$ on $D_r(\tilde{y}) \setminus D_{\frac{r_k}{r}}(z_k)$ and $K_k > 0$, we arrive at a contradiction.

Step 2: Assume that $\{u_k\}$ has a blowup sequence $\{(x_k, r_k)\}$ at some point $x_0 \in D$. We claim that for any fixed $r > 0$, y_k lies in the neck region $D_r(x_0) \setminus D_{\frac{r_k}{r}}(x_k)$.

Suppose $u'_k = u_k(x_k + r_k x) + \log r_k \rightarrow u'$ weakly in $\cap_{p \in [1,2)} W_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. If $y_k \notin D_r(x_0) \setminus D_{\frac{r_k}{r}}(x_k)$, then u_k has no singularity in $D_r(x_0) \setminus D_{\frac{r_k}{r}}(x_k)$. By Proposition 2.13,

$$0 \leq \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{K}_{g_k}(D_r(x_0) \setminus D_{\frac{r_k}{r}}(x_k)) \leq -2\pi(2 + \text{Res}(u, x_0) + \text{Res}(u', \infty)),$$

which leads to a contradiction since $\text{Res}(u, x_0) > -1$ and $\text{Res}(u', \infty) > -1$.

Consequently, $x_0 = y$, $|\frac{y_k - x_k}{r_k}| \rightarrow \infty$. In turn, for any $r > 0$, u'_k solves the following equation on D_r when k is sufficiently large:

$$-\Delta u'_k = K_k(x_k + r_k x)e^{2u'_k}.$$

Applying similar argument as in **Step 1**, $u'_k \rightarrow u'$ weakly in $W_{loc}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for any $p > 1$, where u' satisfies

$$-\Delta u' = K(x_0)e^{2u'}, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2u'} < \infty.$$

Applying the result in [11] again, we deduce that $\text{Res}(u', \infty) = 0$.

By Proposition 2.13,

$$\begin{aligned} -2\pi\lambda &\leq \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{K}_{g_k}(D_r(y) \setminus D_{\frac{r_k}{r}}(x_k)) \\ &\leq -2\pi(2 + \text{Res}(u, y) + \text{Res}(u', \infty)) < -2\pi \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\lambda > 1$.

Therefore, if $\lambda \leq 1$, $\{u_k\}$ has no bubble in D . \square

Remark 3.2. Sygne's theorem tells us that a Riemannian surface with positive Gauss curvature is simply-connected and has no closed minimizing geodesics. Heuristically, Lemma 3.1 (2) can be viewed as a version of Sygne's theorem on surfaces with positive curvature measure: if (2) does not hold, the neck which joins

the bubble part and the base part has no singularities so it will eventually disappear in the blowup process, and it looks like the middle part of a dumbbell, which is “thin”. Hence a “closed minimizing geodesic” will occur, see Figure I.




Figure I. There is a closed minimizing geodesic.




Figure II. The singular point is in the neck region, shortest loops may not be smooth.

3.2. The structure of bubble tree. Let p_1, \dots, p_m be distinct points on \mathbb{S}^2 . From now on, we set $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\mathbb{S}^2} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S}^2)$ with

$$\mathbb{K}_{g_k} = K_k dV_{g_k} - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i^k \delta_{p_i},$$

in other words, $u_k \in \cap_{p \in [1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$ solves the equation

$$(3.1) \quad -\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^2} u_k = K_k e^{2u_k} - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i^k \delta_{p_i} - 1$$

in the sense of distributions.

For the remainder of this section, we make the following assumptions:

- (A1) K_k is continuous and $K_k \rightarrow K$ in $C(\mathbb{S}^2)$, with $K > 0$.
- (A2) $\beta_i > -1$, and $\beta_i^k \rightarrow \beta_i$.
- (A3) $\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) = 2 + \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i > 0$.

Then, there exist constants $0 < a < b$ depending on K and β_i such that

$$a < \text{Area}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_k) < b.$$

Let c_k be the mean value of u_k over $(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$. By Lemma 2.3, after passing to a subsequence, we assume $u_k - c_k \rightarrow v$ weakly in $\cap_{p \in (1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$. By Jensen's inequality, c_k is bounded from above. If c_k is bounded, we may further assume $u_k \rightarrow u$ weakly in $\cap_{p \in (1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$. We will use the curvature concentration function Θ to investigate the equations that u and v satisfy.

Note. From now on, the phrase “for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}^2$, we choose an appropriate isothermal coordinate system with $x_0 = 0$ ” means: the domain of u_k under this coordinate system is $D \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, $\{u_k\}$ has no bubbles on $D \setminus \{x_0\}$, and if $x_0 \in \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$ then $D \cap \{p_1, \dots, p_m\} = \{x_0\}$; if $x_0 \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$ then $D \cap \{p_1, \dots, p_m\} = \emptyset$.

We divide the proof of Theorem 1.3 into following propositions.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\mathbb{S}^2} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S}^2)$ where u_k are the solutions of ((3.1)) satisfying (A1), (A2), (A3). If $\{u_k\}$ has no bubble at x_0 , then*

$$\Theta(x_0) = \begin{cases} -2\pi\beta_i & \text{if } x_0 = p_i \in \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}, \\ 0 & \text{if } x_0 \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By choosing an appropriate isothermal coordinate system with $x_0 = 0$, u_k solves the following equation locally:

$$-\Delta u_k = \begin{cases} K_k e^{2u_k} - 2\pi\beta_i^k \delta_0 & \text{when } x_0 \in \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}, \\ K_k e^{2u_k} & \text{when } x_0 \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}. \end{cases}$$

Applying Proposition 2.14, if $x_0 \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$,

$$\Theta(x_0) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{D_r} K_k e^{2u_k} \leq 2\|K\|_{C^0} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{D_r} e^{2u_k} = 0;$$

if $x_0 = p_i \in \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$,

$$\Theta(x_0) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{D_r} K_k e^{2u_k} - 2\pi\beta_i^k \delta_0 \right) = -2\pi\beta_i.$$

□

Denote

$$\mathcal{C} = \{x \in \mathbb{S}^2 : \{u_k\} \text{ has at least a bubble at } x\} \cup \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}.$$

We know that \mathcal{C} consists of finite points, then by Proposition 3.3, the following sum is well-defined:

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{S}^2} \Theta(x) \delta_x = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \Theta(x) \delta_x.$$

Proposition 3.4. *Let $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\mathbb{S}^2} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S}^2)$ where u_k are the solutions of (3.1) satisfying (A1), (A2), (A3). Then*

(1) *If $u_k \rightarrow u$ weakly in $\cap_{p \in (1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$, then u solves*

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^2} u = K e^{2u} + \sum_{x \in \mathbb{S}^2} \Theta(x) \delta_x - 1.$$

(2) *If $u_k - c_k \rightarrow v$ weakly in $\cap_{p \in (1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$ with $c_k \rightarrow -\infty$, then v solves*

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^2} v = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{S}^2} \Theta(x) \delta_x - 1.$$

Proof. Since the proofs of (1) and (2) are almost the same, we only present the proof for (1).

At any fixed $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}^2$, we choose an appropriate isothermal chart with $x_0 = 0$. Then for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(D)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_D \nabla u \nabla \varphi &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_D \nabla u_k \nabla \varphi = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_D \varphi d\mathbb{K}_{g_k} = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{D \setminus D_r} + \int_{D_r} \right) \varphi d\mathbb{K}_{g_k} \\ &= \int_D \varphi K e^{2u} + \varphi(0) \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{K}_{g_k}(D_r) = \int_D \varphi K e^{2u} + \Theta(x_0) \varphi(0), \end{aligned}$$

which yields that locally u solves

$$-\Delta u = Ke^{2u} + \Theta(x_0)\delta_0 = Ke^{2u} + \sum_{x \in D} \Theta(x)\delta_x.$$

Therefore, u solves

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^2} u = Ke^{2u} + \sum_{x \in \mathbb{S}^2} \Theta(x)\delta_x - 1.$$

□

To obtain the explicit equations that u and v satisfy, we need to compute $\Theta(x_0)$ when $\{u_k\}$ has at least one bubble at x_0 .

Proposition 3.5. *Let $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\mathbb{S}^2} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S}^2)$ where u_k are the solutions of (3.1) satisfying (A1), (A2), (A3). Suppose $u_k \rightarrow u$ weakly in $\cap_{p \in (1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$. If $\{u_k\}$ has at least one bubble at some $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}^2$, then $x_0 = p_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ satisfying $\beta_i > 1$, all bubbles of $\{u_k\}$ at x_0 are smooth and at 1-level. Moreover, if s is the number of bubbles at x_0 , then*

$$\Theta(x_0) = 4\pi s - 2\pi\beta_i.$$

Proof. If $\{u_k\}$ has at least one bubble at some $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}^2$, we choose an appropriate isothermal chart with $x_0 = 0$. Then the following equation holds on D :

$$-\Delta u_k = \begin{cases} K_k e^{2u_k} - 2\pi\beta_i^k \delta_0 & \text{when } x_0 \in \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}, \\ K_k e^{2u_k} & \text{when } x_0 \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}. \end{cases}$$

If $x_0 \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$, then $\{u_k\}$ has no bubbles at 0 by Lemma 3.1(3), a contradiction. So $x_0 \in \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$. WLOG, we assume $x_0 = p_1$. Then u_k satisfies

$$-\Delta u_k = K_k e^{2u_k} - 2\pi\beta_1^k \delta_0$$

on D . By Lemma 3.1 (3), $\beta_1 > 1$. By Lemma 3.1 (2), all bubbles at 1-level are smooth. We claim that there is no bubble at 2-level. Assume $\{(x_k, r_k)\}$ is a blowup sequence at 1-level, then by Lemma 3.1 (2), for any $t > 0$, $0 \in D_t \setminus D_{\frac{r_k}{t}}(x_k)$ for sufficiently large k . Then for any $r > 0$, $u'_k(x) = u_k(r_k x + x_k) + \log r_k$ solves the following equation on D_r when k is sufficiently large:


$$-\Delta u'_k = K_k(r_k x + x_k) e^{2u'_k}.$$

By Lemma 3.1 (3), $\{u'_k\}$ has no bubble, which means that there does not exist bubbles at 2-level.

Since each bubble is smooth with total curvature 4π , there exist only finitely many bubbles, saying $\{(x_k^1, r_k^1)\}, \dots, \{(x_k^s, r_k^s)\}$. Then by Theorem 2.16,


$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(x_0) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{K}_{g_k}(D_r) \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{D_r} K_k e^{2u_k} - 2\pi\beta_1^k \delta_0 \right) \\ &= K(x_0) \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Area}(D_r, g_k) - 2\pi\beta_1 \\ &= 4\pi s - 2\pi\beta_1. \end{aligned}$$

□



Local figure of Non-Collapsing Case:

All bubbles of $\{u_k\}$ at p_i with $\beta_i > 1$ are smooth and at 1-level.



Global figure of Non-collapsing Case:

All bubbles are smooth, and their south poles are attached to a singularity.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\mathbb{S}^2} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S}^2)$ where u_k are solutions of (3.1) satisfying (A1), (A2), (A3). Suppose $u_k - c_k \rightarrow v$ weakly in $\cap_{p \in (1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$ with $c_k \rightarrow -\infty$. If $\{u_k\}$ has at least one bubble at some $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}^2$, then one of the following holds:*

- (1) $x_0 \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$ and $\{u_k\}$ has s bubbles at 1-level at x_0 . Each bubble is smooth and $\Theta(x_0) = 4\pi s$.
- (2) $x_0 = \text{some } p_i$ and $\{u_k\}$ has s bubbles at 1-level at x_0 . Each bubble is smooth and $\Theta(x_0) = 4\pi s - 2\pi\beta_i$.
- (3) $x_0 = \text{some } p_i$ and $\{u_k\}$ has s bubbles at x_0 while only one of them is singular and the others are all smooth with $\Theta(x_0) = 4\pi s + 2\pi\beta_i$.
- (4) $x_0 = \text{some } p_i$ and $\{u_k^i\}$ has s bubbles at 1-level and s' bubbles at 2-level at x_0 . Exactly one of the bubbles at 1-level is singular, say v' , while the other bubbles at 1-level are smooth. All bubbles at 2-level are right on the top of v' and smooth with $\Theta(x_0) = 4\pi(s - s') + 2\pi\beta_i$.

Proof. If $\{u_k\}$ has at least a bubble at some $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}^2$, we choose an appropriate isothermal coordinate system with $x_0 = 0$.

Firstly, we show that there are only finitely many bubbles at 1-level. We assume $\{(x_k^1, r_k^1)\}, \dots, \{(x_k^s, r_k^s)\}$ are arbitrary s blowup sequences at 1-level (here we do not say there are only s blowup sequences at 1-level), then for any fixed $R > 0$,

$$D_{Rr_k^i}(x_k^i) \cap D_{Rr_k^j}(x_k^j) = \emptyset, \quad i \neq j,$$

when k is sufficiently large. Then we may assume for any $i \in \{2, \dots, s\}$, for any fixed $R > 0$, $0 \notin D_{Rr_k^i}(x_k^i)$ when k is sufficiently large. We set

$$u_k^i = u_k(x_k^i + r_k^i x) + \log r_k^i,$$

which converges to a bubble v^i , then for any $i \in \{2, \dots, s\}$, for any fixed $R > 0$, u_k^i satisfies the equation

$$-\Delta u_k^i(x) = K_k(x_k^i + r_k^i x) e^{2u_k^i(x)}, \quad x \in D_R,$$

when k is sufficiently large. Applying Lemma 3.1 (3) to u_k^i , $\{u_k^i\}$ has no bubble, we conclude that u_k^i has no concentration, hence v^i is smooth. Therefore, there is at most one nonsmooth bubble at 1-level, so there are only finitely many bubbles at 1-level.

Now we may assume that $\{(x_k^1, r_k^1)\}, \dots, \{(x_k^s, r_k^s)\}$ are exactly all blowup sequences at 1-level. We divide the argument into the following different cases.

Case 1: $x_0 \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$. For this case, u_k solves

$$-\Delta u_k = K_k e^{2u_k}.$$

Then for any $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and any fixed R , $0 \notin D_{Rr_k^i}(x_k^i)$ when k is large. So each v^i is smooth and there are no bubbles at 2-level. By Theorem 2.16,


$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(x_0) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{K}_{g_k}(D_r) \\ &= K(x_0) \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \text{Area}(D_r) \\ &= K(x_0) \sum_{i=1}^s \text{Area}(\mathbb{R}^2, g_{v^i}) \\ &= 4\pi s. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $x_0 \in \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$. WLOG, we assume $x_0 = p_1$. Then

$$-\Delta u_k = K_k e^{2u_k} - 2\pi\beta_1^k \delta_0.$$

Case 2.1: For any $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and any fixed $R > 0$, $0 \notin D_{Rr_k^i}(x_k^i)$ when k is large. Then each v^i is smooth and no bubbles are at 2-level. By Theorem 2.16,

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(x_0) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{K}_{g_k}(D_r) \\ &= K(x_0) \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \text{Area}(D_r) - 2\pi\beta_1 \\ &= K(x_0) \sum_{i=1}^s \text{Area}(\mathbb{R}^2, g_{v^i}) - 2\pi\beta_1 \\ &= 4\pi s - 2\pi\beta_1. \end{aligned}$$



Collapsing Case 1 and Case 2.1: All bubbles are smooth and at 1-level

Case 2.2: There exists i_0 such that $0 \in D_{Rr_k^{i_0}}(x_k^{i_0})$ for fixed R . WLOG, we assume $i_0 = 1$. Then for any $i \in \{2, \dots, s\}$, for any fixed $R > 0$, we have $0 \notin D_{Rr_k^i}(x_k^i)$ when k is large. Hence, v^i is smooth for any $i \in \{2, \dots, s\}$. Now we consider the bubble v^1 . Set $y_k^1 = \frac{-x_k^1}{r_k^1}$ and assume $y_k^1 \rightarrow y_\infty$. Then

$$-\Delta u_k^1 = K_k(x_k^1 + r_k^1 x) e^{2u_k^1} - 2\pi\beta_1^k \delta_{y_k^1}.$$

By arguments similar to those for Proposition 3.4, there exists τ such that

$$-\Delta v^1 = K(x_0) e^{2v^1} + \tau \delta_{y_\infty}.$$

We further divide **Case 2.2** into two cases.

Case 2.2.1: $\{u_k^1\}$ has no bubble, i.e. no bubbles at 2-level. Then


$$-\Delta v^1 = K(x_0) e^{2v^1} - 2\pi\beta_1 \delta_{y_\infty}.$$

By [11] and [27], as a metric over \mathbb{S}^2 , g_{v^1} has exactly 2 singularities and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} K(x_0) e^{2v^1} = 4\pi + 4\pi\beta_1.$$

Then by Theorem 2.16,

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(x_0) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{K}_{g_k}(D_r) \\ &= K(x_0) \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \text{Area}(D_r, g_k) - 2\pi\beta_1 \\ &= K(x_0) \sum_{i=1}^s \text{Area}(\mathbb{R}^2, g_{v^i}) - 2\pi\beta_1 \\ &= (4\pi + 4\pi\beta_1) + 4\pi(s-1) - 2\pi\beta_1 = 4\pi s + 2\pi\beta_1. \end{aligned}$$



Collapsing Case 2.2.1: All bubbles are at 1-level; only one of them is singular

Case 2.2.2: $\{u_k^1\}$ has bubbles. By Lemma 3.1 (2), $\{u_k^1\}$ can only have bubbles at 1-level (which are the bubbles of $\{u_k\}$ at 2-level) and all bubbles of $\{u_k^1\}$ are smooth. By Lemma 3.1 (3), $\beta_1 > 1$. Similar to the arguments in Proposition 3.5,


$$\tau = 4\pi s' - 2\pi\beta_1,$$

where s' is the number of the bubbles of $\{u_k^1\}$. By [11] and [27] again,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} K(x_0) e^{2v^1} = 4\pi - 2\tau.$$


Let $\{(x_k^{s+1}, r_k^{s+1})\}, \dots, \{(x_k^{s+s'}, r_k^{s+s'})\}$ be all of the blowup sequences right on the top of $\{(x_k^1, r_k^1)\}$. Then for any $i \in \{s+1, \dots, s+s'\}$, $\{(x_k^i, r_k^i)\}$ converges to a smooth bubble and $\{(x_k^i, r_k^i)\}$ has no bubbles. By Theorem 2.16, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(x_0) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{K}_{g_k}(D_r) \\ &= K(x_0) \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \text{Area}(D_r, g_k) - 2\pi\beta_1 \\ &= K(x_0) \sum_{i=1}^{s+s'} \text{Area}(\mathbb{R}^2, g_{v^i}) - 2\pi\beta_1 \\ &= 4\pi(s-1) + (4\pi - 2\tau) + 4\pi s' - 2\pi\beta_1 \\ &= 4\pi(s-s') + 2\pi\beta_1. \end{aligned}$$



Collapsing Case 2.2.2:

There are two levels; the only singular bubble is at 1-level; all bubbles at 2-level are right on the top of the singular bubble.



Global figure of Collapsing Case:

There are at most two levels. The first level consists of smooth spheres and a sphere with two singular points. The South Poles of the smooth spheres and one of the singular points of the

nonsmooth sphere are attached to a point (the limit of g_k). The second level consists of smooth spheres with their South Poles attached to the other singular point of a nonsmooth sphere.

□

Theorem 1.3 now follows from combining Proposition 3.3, Proposition 3.4, Proposition 3.5 and Proposition 3.6.

Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.6, if we further assume $\{u_k\}$ has only bubbles at 1-level, we will obtain a numerical relation between the number of the bubbles and a linear combination of β 's components. Furthermore, both the number of singular bubbles and that of smooth bubbles can be controlled by $\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta)$.

Proposition 3.7. *Let $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\mathbb{S}^2} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S}^2)$ where u_k are solutions of (3.1) satisfying (A1), (A2), (A3). We assume that $u_k - c_k \rightarrow v$ weakly in $\cap_{p \in (1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$ with $c_k \rightarrow -\infty$ and $\{u_k\}$ only have bubbles at 1-level. If $\{u_k\}$ has singular bubbles at p_1, \dots, p_{j_0} and $\{u_k\}$ has t smooth bubbles, then $\{u_k\}$ has*

$$s = t + j_0 = \frac{1}{2}\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) - \sum_{i=1}^{j_0} \beta_i$$

bubbles. Moreover,

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq j_0} \beta_i \leq \frac{1}{2}\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) - 1, \quad t \leq \frac{1}{2}\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta).$$

Proof. By our assumptions, **Case 2.2.2** in the proof of Proposition 3.6 will not occur. Then we may assume that $\{u_k\}$ has t_i smooth bubbles and one singular bubble at p_i for $i = 1, \dots, j_0$, t_i smooth bubbles at p_i for $i = j_0 + 1, \dots, j_1$ and t'_i smooth bubbles at q_i for $i = 1, \dots, j_2$ where $q_i \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$. Then $\{u_k\}$ has

$$s = \sum_{i=1}^{j_0} (t_i + 1) + \sum_{i=j_0+1}^{j_1} t_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j_2} t'_i = j_0 + t$$

bubbles. By Proposition 3.4 (2) and Proposition 3.6,

$$\begin{aligned} 4\pi &= \sum_{i=1}^{j_0} (4\pi + 2\pi\beta_i + 4\pi t_i) + \sum_{i=j_0+1}^{j_1} (4\pi t_i - 2\pi\beta_i) + \sum_{i=j_1+1}^m (-2\pi\beta_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{j_2} 4\pi t'_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{j_0} (4\pi + 4\pi\beta_i) + 4\pi t - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i, \end{aligned}$$

which yields that

$$2\pi\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) = 4\pi + 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i = 4\pi(j_0 + t) + 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^{j_0} \beta_i.$$

Since $\beta_i > -1$,

$$4\pi + 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i = 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^{j_0} (1 + \beta_i) + 4\pi t$$

$$\geq \max\{4\pi + 4\pi\beta_1, \dots, 4\pi + 4\pi\beta_{j_0}, 4\pi t\},$$

which yields that

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq j_0} \beta_i \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i = \frac{1}{2} \chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) - 1, \quad t \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i = \frac{1}{2} \chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta).$$

□

With additional assumptions on β , the assumptions of Proposition 3.7 are satisfied and the following corollaries are obtained.

Corollary 3.8. *Let $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\mathbb{S}^2} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S}^2)$ where u_k are the solutions of (3.1) satisfying (A1), (A2), (A3). Suppose that $\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) = 2 + \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \in (0, 2)$ and $\{u_k\}$ has at least one bubble. Then*

(1) $u_k - c_k \rightarrow v$ weakly in $\cap_{p \in (1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$ with $c_k \rightarrow -\infty$.

(2) There exist $s < m$ and $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_s \leq m$ with $\beta_{i_j} < 0$ such that $\{u_k\}$ has exactly one singular bubble at p_{i_j} . Moreover,

$$4\pi s + 4\pi \sum_{j=1}^s \beta_{i_j} = 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i + 4\pi.$$

Proof. Since $\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) \in (0, 2)$, then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} K_k dV_{g_k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (4\pi + 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i^k) = 4\pi + 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i < 4\pi,$$

which implies that $\{u_k\}$ cannot have smooth bubbles. Then by Proposition 3.5, $u_k - c_k \rightarrow v$ weakly in $\cap_{p \in (1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$ with $c_k \rightarrow -\infty$, and by Proposition 3.6, **Case 1**, **Case 2.1** and **Case 2.2.2** in the proof of Proposition 3.6 cannot happen. Therefore, only **Case 2.2.1** can happen with $s = 1$ and $\beta_i < 0$, which means that $\{u_k\}$ has exactly one singular bubble at 1-level at some p_i with $\beta_i < 0$. By Proposition 3.4 (2), there exist $s \leq m$ and $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_s \leq m$ with $\beta_{i_j} < 0$ such that

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^2} v = \sum_{j=1}^s (4\pi + 4\pi\beta_{i_j}) \delta_{p_{i_j}} - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \delta_{p_i} - 1,$$

which yields

$$4\pi s + 4\pi \sum_{j=1}^s \beta_{i_j} = 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i + 4\pi.$$

What left is to show $s < m$. If $s = m$,

$$4m\pi + 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i = 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i + 4\pi,$$

in turn

$$2 - 2m = \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \in (-2, 0).$$

This is impossible as m is an integer. \square

Corollary 3.9. *Let $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\mathbb{S}^2} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S}^2)$ where u_k are the solution of (3.1) satisfying (A1), (A2), (A3). Assume $\beta_i \leq 1$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $\{u_k\}$ has at least one bubble. Then*

(1) $u_k - c_k \rightarrow v$ weakly in $\cap_{p \in (1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$ with $c_k \rightarrow -\infty$.

(2) All bubbles of $\{u_k\}$ are at 1-level. Further, there exists a set $I \subset \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that

$$4\pi s + 4\pi \sum_{i \in I} \beta_i = 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i + 4\pi,$$

where s is the number of bubbles of $\{u_k\}$.

Proof. Since $\{u_k\}$ has at least one bubble and $\beta_i \leq 1$, then by Proposition 3.5 $u_k - c_k \rightarrow v$ weakly in $\cap_{p \in (1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$ with $c_k \rightarrow -\infty$. By Proposition 3.6, **Case 2.2.2** (in the proof) cannot happen, hence the assertion follows from Proposition 3.7 immediately. \square

3.3. Simplification of bubble-tree convergence when $K_k \rightarrow K$ in C^1 . In this subsection, we will use the Pohozaev inequality to show that if $\{u_k\}$ has at least one bubble and K_k converges in C^1 then $c_k \rightarrow -\infty$ and u_k has only bubbles at 1-level.

Proposition 3.10 (Pohozaev identity on an annulus). *Assume $K \in C^1(D \setminus \overline{D_\delta})$ and*

$$-\Delta u = Ke^{2u} \text{ on } D \setminus \overline{D_\delta}.$$

Define a function

$$P(t) = t \int_{\partial D_t} \left(\left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} \right|^2 - \frac{1}{r^2} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 \right) + 2 \int_{\partial D_t} \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} + t \int_{\partial D_t} Ke^{2u}.$$

Then for any $\delta < s < t < 1$, we have

$$P(t) - P(s) = \int_{D_t \setminus D_s} re^{2u} \frac{\partial K}{\partial r}.$$

Lemma 3.11. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.1, if we further assume K_k converges to a positive function K in $C^1(\overline{D})$, then $\{u_k\}$ has no bubbles.*

Proof. We argue by contradiction. Assume $\{u_k\}$ has at least one bubble. Then by Lemma 3.1, there exist $s \geq 1$ smooth bubbles at 1-level at y . By Theorem 2.16,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{D_r(y)} K_k e^{2u_k} = 4\pi s,$$

which yields

$$-\Delta u = Ke^{2u} - 2\pi(\lambda - 2s)\delta_y.$$

For convenience, we set $\lambda' = \lambda - 2s$. Define

$$P_k(t) = t \int_{\partial D_t(y_k)} \left(\left| \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial r} \right|^2 - \frac{1}{r^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 \right) + 2 \int_{\partial D_t(y_k)} \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial r} + t \int_{\partial D_t(y_k)} K_k e^{2u_k},$$

$$P(t) = t \int_{\partial D_t(y)} \left(\left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} \right|^2 - \frac{1}{r^2} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 \right) + 2 \int_{\partial D_t(y)} \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} + t \int_{\partial D_t(y)} K e^{2u}.$$

By Proposition 3.10, for any $0 < s < t < \frac{1}{2}$ and sufficiently large k ,

$$|P_k(t) - P_k(s)| = \left| \int_{D_t(y_k) \setminus D_s(y_k)} r e^{2u} \frac{\partial K_k}{\partial r} \right| \leq t \|K_k\|_{C^1(\bar{D})} \text{Area}(D, g_k),$$

which yields

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} |P_k(t) - P_k(s)| = 0.$$

Let's calculate $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} P_k(s)$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} P_k(t)$ step by step.

Since

$$-\Delta u_k = K_k e^{2u_k} - 2\pi \lambda_k \delta_{y_k},$$

we may write $u_k = v_k + \lambda_k \log r$, where

$$-\Delta v_k = K_k e^{2u_k}.$$

Since $\lambda_k > -1$, for large j we have $K_k e^{2u_k} \in L^p(D_{2^{-j}}(y_k))$ for some $p > 1$. Then $v_k \in W^{2,p}(D_{2^{-j}}(y_k)) \subset W^{1,2}(D_{2^{-j}}(y_k)) \cap C^0(D_{2^{-j}}(y_k))$. It follows

$$\int_{D_{2^{-j}}(y_k) \setminus D_{2^{-j-1}}(y_k)} |\nabla v_k|^2 \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Hence, there exists $s_j \in (2^{-j-1}, 2^{-j})$ such that

$$s_j \int_{\partial D_{s_j}(y_k)} |\nabla v_k|^2 \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow +\infty.$$

By direct calculations,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} s_j \int_{\partial D_{s_j}} \left| \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial r} \right|^2 &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} s_j \int_{\partial D_{s_j}} \left| \frac{\partial v_k}{\partial r} + \frac{\lambda_k}{r} \right|^2 = 2\pi \lambda_k^2, \\ \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} s_j \int_{\partial D_{s_j}} \frac{1}{r^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 &\leq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} s_j \int_{\partial D_{s_j}} |\nabla v_k|^2 = 0, \\ \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial D_{s_j}(y_k)} \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial r} &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(2\pi \lambda_k + \int_{\partial D_{s_j}(y_k)} \frac{\partial v_k}{\partial r} \right) \\ &= 2\pi \lambda_k - \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{D_{s_j}(y_k)} K_k e^{2u_k} = 2\pi \lambda_k, \\ \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} s_j \int_{\partial D_{s_j}(y_k)} K_k e^{2u_k} &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} s_j^2 \int_0^{2\pi} K_k(s_j, \theta) e^{2u_k(s_j, \theta)} \\ &\leq C \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} s_j^{2+2\lambda_k} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} P_k(s_j) = 2\pi \lambda^2 + 4\pi \lambda.$$

Since u_k converges to u in $C_{\text{loc}}^{2,\alpha}(D \setminus \{y\})$, then by similar calculations,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} P_k(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} P(t) = 2\pi \lambda'^2 + 4\pi \lambda'.$$

Then

$$(\lambda - \lambda')(\lambda + \lambda' + 2) = 0.$$

Since $\lambda' = \lambda - 2s < \lambda$, we obtain

$$\lambda' = -\lambda - 2 < -1$$

which leads to a contradiction to Lemma 2.11. \square

Proposition 3.12. *Let $g_k = e^{2u_k} g_{\mathbb{S}^2} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S}^2)$ where u_k are the solutions of (3.1). Assume (A2), (A3) hold and $K_k \rightarrow K$ in $C^1(\mathbb{S}^2)$ with $K > 0$. If $\{u_k\}$ has at least one bubble, then*

(a) $u_k - c_k \rightarrow v$ weakly in $\cap_{p \in (1,2)} W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_{\mathbb{S}^2})$ with $c_k \rightarrow -\infty$.

(b) All bubbles of $\{u_k\}$ are at 1-level. More precisely, if $\{u_k\}$ has at least one bubble at some $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}^2$, then one of the following holds:

(1) $x_0 = \text{some } p_i$, $\{u_k\}$ has $s = \beta_i + 1$ smooth bubbles at 1-level at x_0 , and

$$\Theta(x_0) = 4\pi + 2\pi\beta_i.$$

(2) $x_0 = \text{some } p_i$, $\{u_k\}$ has one singular bubble at x_0 at 1-level, and

$$\Theta(x_0) = 4\pi + 2\pi\beta_i.$$

(3) $x_0 \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$, $\{u_k\}$ has one smooth bubble at 1-level at x_0 , and

$$\Theta(x_0) = 4\pi.$$

(c) Furthermore, there exists a set $I \subset \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that

$$\#\{\text{bubbles of } \{u_k\}\} = \frac{1}{2}\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) - \sum_{i \in I} \beta_i, \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m |\beta_i|.$$

Proof. (a) follows from Lemma 3.11 immediately.

Step 1: We prove (b) by investigating the structure of bubble trees.

For any fixed point $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}^2$, if $\{u_k\}$ has at least one bubble at x_0 , we choose an appropriate isothermal coordinate system with $x_0 = 0$. Via similar arguments as in the proof of Proposition 3.6, we may assume $\{u_k\}$ has s blowup sequences $\{(x_k^1, r_k^1)\}, \dots, \{(x_k^s, r_k^s)\}$ at x_0 at 1-level, and let v^1, \dots, v^s the corresponding bubbles. Set

$$u_k^i(x) = u_k(x_k^i + r_k^i x) + \log r_k^i.$$

Then for any fixed $R > 0$, when k is sufficiently large,

$$D_{Rr_k^i}(x_k^i) \cap D_{Rr_k^j}(x_k^j) = \emptyset, \quad i \neq j.$$

By Lemma 3.11, $\{u_k^i(x)\}$ has no bubbles.

Case 1: $x_0 \in \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$. WLOG, we may assume $x_0 = p_1$, then u_k solves

$$-\Delta u_k = K_k e^{2u_k} - 2\pi\beta_1^k \delta_0.$$

Case 1.1: For any $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and any fixed $R > 0$, $0 \notin D_{Rr_k^i}(x_k^i)$ for large k . Then each v^i is smooth and no bubbles are at 2-level. By Theorem 2.16, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta(x_0) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{K}_{g_k}(D_r) \\ &= K(x_0) \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \text{Area}(D_r) - 2\pi\beta_1 \\ &= K(x_0) \sum_{i=1}^s \text{Area}(\mathbb{R}^2, g_{v^i}) - 2\pi\beta_1 \\ &= 4\pi s - 2\pi\beta_1.\end{aligned}$$

Case 1.2: There exists i_0 such that $0 \in D_{Rr_k^{i_0}}(x_k^{i_0})$ for fixed R . WOLG, we assume $i_0 = 1$, then for any $i \in \{2, \dots, s\}$, for any fixed $R > 0$, $0 \notin D_{Rr_k^i}(x_k^i)$ when k is sufficiently large. Hence for any $i \in \{2, \dots, s\}$, v^i is smooth. We set $y_k^1 = \frac{-x_k^1}{r_k^1}$ and assume $y_k^1 \rightarrow y_\infty$. Then u_k^1 satisfies the equation

$$-\Delta u_k^1 = K_k(x_k^1 + r_k^1 x) e^{2u_k^1} - 2\pi\beta_1^k \delta_{y_k^1}.$$

Since $\{u_k^1\}$ has no bubbles, then

$$-\Delta v^1 = K(x_0) e^{2v^1} - 2\pi\beta_1 \delta_Y, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} K(x_0) e^{2v^1} = 4\pi + 4\pi\beta_1.$$

Then by Theorem 2.16,

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta(x_0) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{K}_{g_k}(D_r) \\ &= K(x_0) \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \text{Area}(D_r, g_k) - 2\pi\beta_1 \\ &= K(x_0) \sum_{i=1}^s \text{Area}(\mathbb{R}^2, g_{v^i}) - 2\pi\beta_1 \\ &= (4\pi + 4\pi\beta_1) + 4\pi(s-1) - 2\pi\beta_1 = 4\pi s + 2\pi\beta_1.\end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $x_0 \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$. For this case, u_k solves

$$-\Delta u_k = K_k e^{2u_k}.$$

Then for any $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and any fixed $R > 0$, $0 \notin D_{Rr_k^i}(x_k^i)$ when k is large. So each v^i is smooth and no bubbles are at 2-level. By Theorem 2.16, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta(x_0) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{K}_{g_k}(D_r) \\ &= K(x_0) \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \text{Area}(D_r) \\ &= K(x_0) \sum_{i=1}^s \text{Area}(\mathbb{R}^2, g_{v^i}) \\ &= 4\pi s.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, v solves the following equation locally:

$$-\Delta v = \Theta(x_0) \delta_0,$$

where $\Theta(x_0) = 4\pi s - 2\pi\beta_1$ (when **Case 1.1** holds) or $4\pi s + 2\pi\beta_1$ (when **Case 1.2** holds) or $4\pi s$ (when **Case 2** holds).

Now we calculate $\Theta(x_0)$ more precisely via Proposition 3.10. Define

$$P_k(t) = t \int_{\partial D_t} \left(\left| \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial r} \right|^2 - \frac{1}{r^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 \right) + 2 \int_{\partial D_t} \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial r} + t \int_{\partial D_t} K e^{2u_k}.$$

By Proposition 3.10, we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} |P_k(t) - P_k(s)| \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} Ct \text{Area}(\mathbb{S}^2, g_k) = 0.$$

Since

$$-\Delta u_k = \begin{cases} K_k e^{2u_k} - 2\pi\beta_1^k \delta_0 & \text{when } x_0 = p_1, \\ K_k e^{2u_k} & \text{when } x_0 \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}, \end{cases}$$

then as in the proof of Lemma 3.11, there exists $s_j \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} P_k(s_j) = \begin{cases} 2\pi(\beta_1)^2 + 4\pi\beta_1 & \text{when } x_0 = p_1, \\ 0 & \text{when } x_0 \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, since $c_k \rightarrow -\infty$ and $v = -\frac{\Theta(x_0)}{2\pi} \log r + V$, where V is harmonic on D , then

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\partial D_t} \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial r} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\partial D_t} \frac{\partial v}{\partial r} = -\Theta(x_0) \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} t \int_{\partial D_t} K_k e^{2u_k} &\leq \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} Ct \int_{\partial D_t} e^{2v} e^{2c_k} = 0, \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} t \int_{\partial D_t} \left| \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial r} \right|^2 &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t \int_{\partial D_t} \left| \frac{\partial v}{\partial r} \right|^2 = \frac{\Theta(x_0)^2}{2\pi}, \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} t \int_{\partial D_t} \frac{1}{r^2} \left| \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t \int_{\partial D_t} \frac{1}{r^2} \left| \frac{\partial v}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} P_k(t) = \frac{\Theta(x_0)^2}{2\pi} - 2\Theta(x_0) = 2\pi(\lambda')^2 - 4\pi\lambda',$$

where we set $\lambda' = \frac{\Theta(x_0)}{2\pi}$. Therefore, when $x_0 = p_1$, we obtain

$$(\lambda')^2 - 2\lambda' = (\beta_1)^2 + 2\beta_1.$$

which is equivalent to

$$(\lambda' + \beta_1)(\lambda' - \beta_1 - 2) = 0.$$

If $\lambda' = 2s - \beta_1$ (when **Case 1.1** holds), then

$$2s(2s - 2\beta_1 - 2) = 0,$$

which yields that $s = \beta_1 + 1$, and

$$\Theta(x_0) = 2\pi\beta_1 + 4\pi.$$

If $\lambda' = 2s + \beta_1$ (when **Case 1.2** holds), then

$$(2s + 2\beta_1)(2s - 2) = 0,$$

which yields that $s = 1$, and

$$\Theta(x_0) = 2\pi\beta_1 + 4\pi.$$

When $x_0 \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$ (when **Case 2** holds), $\lambda' = 2s$, then we obtain

$$(\lambda')^2 - 2\lambda' = 0,$$

which yields that $s = 1$, and

$$\Theta(x_0) = 4\pi.$$

Step 2: We prove (c). By (b), we know that $\{u_k\}$ only has bubbles at 1-level, then by (a) and Proposition 3.7, there exists a set $I \subset \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that

$$s = \frac{1}{2}\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) - \sum_{i \in I} \beta_i,$$

which yields an upper bound of s immediately:

$$s = 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus I} \beta_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in I} \beta_i \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m |\beta_i|.$$

□

3.4. Nonexistence of solutions around certain prescribed date. We give the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof. We first show the assertion holds under the assumption (\mathcal{O}_1) .

Assuming the contrary, there exist $K_k \in C^+(\mathbb{S}^2)$, $\beta_k = (\beta_1^k, \dots, \beta_m^k) \in (-1, \infty)^m$ such that $K_k \rightarrow K$ in $C(\mathbb{S}^2)$, $\beta_k \rightarrow \beta$, and u_k solves

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^2} u_k = K_k e^{2u} - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i^k \delta_{p_i} - 1.$$

By (\mathcal{O}_1) , $\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \in (-2, 0)$. If $\{u_k\}$ has at least one bubble, then by Corollary 3.8, there exist $s < m$ and $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_s \leq m$ such that for any $1 \leq j \leq s$, $\beta_{i_j} < 0$ and

$$4\pi s + 4\pi \sum_{j=1}^s \beta_{i_j} = 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i + 4\pi.$$

which contradicts to the assumption: $\beta \in \mathcal{A}_m$.

In conclusion, $\{u_k\}$ has no bubble. Applying Proposition 2.15, u solves

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^2} u = K e^{2u} - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \delta_{p_i} - 1,$$

a contradiction to our assumptions.

By applying similar arguments and Corollary 3.9, the assertion still holds under assumption (\mathcal{O}_2) . □

Applying similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 3.12, we can prove Theorem 1.2.

The result below follows from Theorem 1.2 and [12, Theorem 5].

Corollary 3.13. *Assume $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m) \in \mathcal{A}_m$ satisfying*

$$d_1(\beta, \mathbb{Z}_o^m) = 1, \quad \beta_i - 1 \notin \mathbb{Z}.$$

Then for any distinct p_1, \dots, p_m , there is a neighbourhood U of β in $(-1, \infty)^m$, such that for any $\tilde{\beta} \in U$, the divisor $\sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{\beta}_i p_i$ cannot be represented by any metric in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S}^2)$ with constant curvature 1.

Example. Let

$$\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4) = \left(-\frac{3-2\alpha}{10}, 2k + \frac{\alpha-1}{10}, \frac{\alpha-1}{10}, 2k + \frac{1}{10} \right),$$

where $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{100})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} d_1(\beta, \mathbb{Z}_o^4) &= d_1(\beta, (-1, 2k, 0, 2k)) = 1, \\ \frac{1}{2}\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) &= 1 + 2k + \frac{\alpha-1}{5} \in (0, +\infty) \setminus \mathbb{N}, \\ \left[\frac{1}{2}\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) \right] &= 2k, \\ \mathbb{F}(\beta) &= \{i : \beta_i \leq 2k + \frac{\alpha-1}{5}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Case 1: when $k = 0$, $\mathbb{F}(\beta) = \{1\}$, and

$$\frac{1}{2}\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) - \beta_1 = \frac{11}{10} \neq 1.$$

Case 2: when $k \geq 1$, $\mathbb{F}(\beta) = \{1, 3\}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) - \beta_1 &= 2k + \frac{11}{10} \neq 1, \dots, 1 + 2k, \\ \frac{1}{2}\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) - \beta_3 &= 1 + 2k + \frac{\alpha-1}{10} \neq 1, \dots, 1 + 2k, \\ \frac{1}{2}\chi(\mathbb{S}^2, \beta) - \beta_1 - \beta_3 &= 1 + 2k - \frac{\alpha}{10} \neq 2, \dots, 2 + 2k. \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, $\beta \in \mathcal{A}_4 \cap \{d_1(\beta, \mathbb{Z}_o^4) = 1\}$. In other words,

$$\mathcal{A}_4 \cap \{d_1(\beta, \mathbb{Z}_o^4) = 1\} \neq \emptyset.$$

All conditions in Corollary 3.13 are fulfilled, therefore there is a neighbourhood U of β such that no divisor in U can be represented by a spherical metric.

REFERENCES

- [1] Daniele Bartolucci, Francesca De Marchis, and Andrea Malchiodi. Supercritical conformal metrics on surfaces with conical singularities. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2011(24):5625–5643, 2011.

- [2] Daniele Bartolucci, Changfeng Gui, Aleks Jevnikar, and Amir Moradifam. A singular sphere covering inequality: uniqueness and symmetry of solutions to singular liouville-type equations. *Mathematische Annalen*, 374:1883–1922, 2019.
- [3] Daniele Bartolucci and Eugenio Montefusco. Blow-up analysis, existence and qualitative properties of solutions for the two-dimensional Emden–Fowler equation with singular potential. *Mathematical methods in the applied sciences*, 30(18):2309–2327, 2007.
- [4] Daniele Bartolucci and Gabriella Tarantello. Liouville type equations with singular data and their applications to periodic multivortices for the electroweak theory. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 229:3–47, 2002.
- [5] Haïm Brezis and Frank Merle. Uniform estimates and blow-up behavior for solutions of $-\Delta u = V(x)e^u$ in two dimensions. *Communications in partial differential equations*, 16(8-9):1223–1253, 1991.
- [6] Chiun-Chuan Chen and Chang-Shou Lin. Topological degree for a mean field equation on riemann surfaces. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 56(12):1667–1727, 2003.
- [7] Chiun-Chuan Chen and Chang-Shou Lin. Mean field equation of liouville type with singular data: topological degree. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 68(6):887–947, 2015.
- [8] Jingyi Chen and Yuxiang Li. Homotopy classes of harmonic maps of the stratified 2-spheres and applications to geometric flows. *Advances in Mathematics*, 263:357–388, 2014.
- [9] Jingyi Chen and Yuxiang Li. Uniform convergence of metrics on Alexandrov surfaces with bounded integral curvature. 2022.
- [10] Jingyi Chen, Yuxiang Li, and Yunqing Wu. Prescribing negative curvature with cusps and conical singularities on compact surface. 2024.
- [11] Wenxiong Chen and Congming Li. Classification of solutions of some nonlinear elliptic equations. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 63(3):615 – 622, 1991.
- [12] Subhadip Dey. Spherical metrics with conical singularities on 2-spheres. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 196:53–61, 2018.
- [13] Weiyue Ding, Jürgen Jost, Jiayu Li, and Guofang Wang. Existence results for mean field equations. In *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire*, volume 16, pages 653–666. Elsevier, 1999.
- [14] Alexandre Eremenko. Metrics of positive curvature with conic singularities on the sphere. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 132(11):3349–3355, 2004.
- [15] Alexandre Eremenko. Co-axial monodromy. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di Scienze. Serie V*, (2):619–634, 2020.
- [16] David Gilbarg and Neil S Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, volume 224. Springer, 1977.
- [17] Changfeng Gui and Amir Moradifam. The sphere covering inequality and its applications. *Invent. math.*, 214:1169–1204, 2018.
- [18] Michael Kapovich. Branched covers between spheres and polygonal inequalities in simplicial trees. *preprint*, 273, 2017.
- [19] Yanyan Li. Harnack type inequality: the method of moving planes. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 200:421–444, 1999.
- [20] Yanyan Li and Itai Shafir. Blow-up analysis for solutions of $-\Delta u = V(x)e^u$ in dimension two. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 43(4):1255–1270, 1994.
- [21] C.S. Lin. Topological degree for mean field equations on S^2 . *Duke Math. J.*, 104(3):501–536, 2000.
- [22] Feng Luo and Gang Tian. Liouville equation and spherical convex polytopes. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 116(4):1119–1129, 1992.
- [23] Rafe Mazzeo and Xuwen Zhu. Conical metrics on Riemann surfaces, I: the compactified configuration space and regularity. *Geometry & Topology*, 24(1):309–372, 2020.
- [24] Gabriele Mondello and Dmitri Panov. Spherical metrics with conical singularities on a 2-sphere: angle constraints. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2016(16):4937–4995, 2016.
- [25] Yuguang Shi, Jiacheng Su, Gang Tian, and Dongyi Wei. Uniqueness of the mean field equation and rigidity of hawking mass. *Calc. Var.*, 58(41), 2019.

- [26] Gabriella Tarantello. A quantization property for blow up solutions of singular Liouville-type equations. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 219(2):368–399, 2005.
- [27] Marc Troyanov. Metrics of constant curvature on a sphere with two conical singularities. *Differential Geometry: Proceedings of the 3rd International Symposium*, pages 296–306, 1988.
- [28] Marc Troyanov. Prescribing curvature on compact surfaces with conical singularities. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 324(2):793–821, 1991.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, VANCOUVER, CANADA
Email address: jychen@math.ubc.ca

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, CHINA
Email address: liyuxiang@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn

THE INSTITUTE OF GEOMETRY AND PHYSICS, UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY OF CHINA,
HEFEI, ANHUI, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
Email address: yqw19@ustc.edu.cn