

# Quantization for an elliptic equation with critical exponential growth on compact Riemannian surface without boundary

Yunyan Yang

*Department of Mathematics, Renmin University of China, Beijing 100872, P. R. China*

---

## Abstract

In this paper, using blow-up analysis, we prove a quantization result for an elliptic equation with critical exponential growth on compact Riemannian surface without boundary. Similar results for Euclidean space were obtained by Adimurthi-Struwe [2], Druet [6], Lamm-Robert-Struwe [8], Martinazzi [9], Martinazzi-Struwe [10], and Struwe [13] respectively.

*Key words:* Quantization, Multi-bubble analysis, Trudinger-Moser inequality  
*2010 MSC:* 58J05

---

## Contents

1	Introduction and main results .....	1
2	Weak convergence .....	4
3	Multibubble analysis .....	5
4	Gradient estimate .....	14
5	Quantization .....	18
6	Completion of the proof of Theorem 1.1 .....	42

## 1. Introduction and main results

Let  $(\Sigma, g)$  be a compact Riemannian surface without boundary,  $W^{1,2}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$  be the usual Sobolev space, namely the completion of  $C^\infty(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$  under the norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,2}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})} = \left( \int_{\Sigma} (|\nabla_g u|^2 + u^2) dv_g \right)^{1/2},$$

where  $\nabla_g u$  denotes the gradient of  $u$  and  $dv_g$  denotes the volume element with respect to the Riemannian metric  $g$ . Let  $f_k : \Sigma \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a sequence of functions satisfying the following hypotheses:

---

*Email address:* yunyan yang@ruc.edu.cn (Yunyan Yang)

*Preprint submitted to \*\*\**

*May 16, 2018*

- (H1)  $f_k(x, 0) = 0$ , and  $f_k(x, t) > 0$  for all  $k$ , all  $x \in \Sigma$ , and all  $t > 0$ ;  
(H2)  $f_k \in C^2(\Sigma \times [0, +\infty))$  for each  $k$  and  $f_k \rightarrow f_\infty$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^1(\Sigma \times [0, +\infty))$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ;  
(H3) for any  $\nu > 0$ , there exists a constant  $C_\nu > 0$  such that for all  $k$ , all  $x \in \Sigma$ , and all  $t > 0$ ,

$$F_k(x, t) \leq \nu t f_k(x, t) + C_\nu,$$

where

$$F_k(x, t) = \int_0^t f_k(x, s) ds$$

is the primitive of  $f_k(x, t)$ ;

- (H4)  $f'_k(x, t)/(t f_k(x, t)) \rightarrow 2$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  uniformly in  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and in  $x \in \Sigma$ , where  $f'_k$  is the derivative of  $f_k$  with respect to  $t$ , moreover there exists a constant  $C$  such that  $|\nabla_g f_k(x, t)| \leq C(1 + f_k(x, t))$  for all  $(x, t) \in \Sigma \times \mathbb{R}$ ;

- (H5) there exist  $\psi$ , a continuous function with  $\psi(0) = 0$ ,  $t_0 > 0$ , and  $k_0 > 0$ , such that

$$|f_k(x, t)/f_k(y, t) - 1| \leq \psi(d_g(x, y))$$

for all  $t \geq t_0$ , all  $k > k_0$ , and all  $x, y \in \Sigma$ , where  $d_g(\cdot, \cdot)$  denotes the geodesic distance between two points of  $\Sigma$ .

By (H4) we have  $f_k(x, t) = f_k(x, t_0)e^{(1+o(1))(t^2-t_0^2)}$  for any given  $t_0 > 0$ , where  $o(1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly in  $x \in \Sigma$ . In view of the Trudinger-Moser embedding [7, 11, 12, 14], we say that  $f_k(x, t)$  is of critical exponential growth with respect to  $t$ . A typical example satisfying (H1)-(H5) is

$$f_k(x, t) = \lambda_k t e^{t^2}, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\lambda_k$  is a sequence of positive real numbers such that  $\lambda_k \rightarrow \lambda_\infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Suppose that for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  we have a smooth function  $u_k \geq 0$  satisfying the equation

$$\Delta_g u_k + \tau_k u_k = f_k(x, u_k) \quad \text{in } \Sigma, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $\Delta_g$  is the Laplace-Beltrami operator,  $\tau_k$  is a sequence of smooth functions such that

$$\tau_k \rightarrow \tau_\infty \quad \text{in } C^0(\Sigma, \mathbb{R}), \quad \tau_\infty(x) > 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \Sigma. \quad (1.3)$$

Clearly  $u_k$  is a critical point of the functional

$$J_k(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Sigma (|\nabla_g u|^2 + \tau_k u^2) dv_g - \int_\Sigma F_k(x, u) dv_g \quad (1.4)$$

on the Sobolev space  $W^{1,2}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$ . The existence of nonnegative solutions to equation (1.2) in case that  $\tau_k$  is a positive real number was studied by Zhao and the author [16] by using variational methods. More explicitly, assuming that  $\lambda_\tau = \lambda_\tau(\Sigma)$  is the first eigenvalue of the operator  $\Delta_g + \tau$ , where  $\tau > 0$  is a constant, we proved that the equation  $\Delta_g u + \tau u = \lambda u e^{u^2}$  has a nonnegative solution if  $\lambda < \lambda_\tau$ . The aim of this paper is to study the quantization problem for equation (1.2). Precisely we shall prove the following result.

**Theorem 1.1** *Let  $(\Sigma, g)$  be a compact Riemannian surface without boundary. Suppose that  $u_k \geq 0$  is a sequence of smooth solutions to equation (1.2), where  $\tau_k$  is a sequence of smooth functions*

satisfying (1.3), and  $f_k$  is a sequence of functions satisfying (H1)-(H5). Let  $J_k$  be as in (1.4). If  $J_k(u_k) \rightarrow \beta$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  for some  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ , then there exists a nonnegative solution  $u_\infty \in C^1(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$  of the equation

$$\Delta_g u_\infty + \tau_\infty u_\infty = f_\infty(x, u_\infty(x)) \quad \text{in } \Sigma, \quad (1.5)$$

and there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $J_k(u_k) = J_\infty(u_\infty) + 2\pi N + o(1)$ , where  $o(1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Here  $J_\infty$  is also as in (1.4), where  $\tau_k, F_k$  are replaced by  $\tau_\infty$  and  $F_\infty$  respectively. If  $N = 0$ ,  $u_k \rightarrow u_\infty$  strongly in  $W^{1,2}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$  and in fact in  $C^1(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$ .

Several works were devoted to prove analogues of Theorem 1.1. In [2], Adimurthi and Struwe considered a sequence of solutions  $u_k$  to the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_k = f_k(x, u_k) & \text{in } \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \\ u_k > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \quad u_k = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

where  $f_k(x, t) = te^{\varphi_k(t)}$ ,  $0 \leq \varphi_k'(t) \leq 2$  for  $t \geq t_0$  and  $\varphi_k'(t)/t \rightarrow 2$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly in  $k$ . Such a sequence of functions  $f_k$  satisfies (H1)-(H5) in case that the Riemannian surface  $(\Sigma, g)$  is replaced by a smooth bounded domain of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Assuming that

$$J_k(u_k) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_k|^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} F_k(x, u_k) dx \rightarrow \beta$$

for  $0 \leq \beta < 4\pi$  and that the limit equation does not admit any positive solution with energy less than  $2\pi$ , they proved that either  $u_k \rightarrow u_\infty$  strongly in  $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$  and  $u_\infty$  has energy  $\beta$ , or  $u_k \rightarrow 0$  weakly in  $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$  and  $u_k$  develops one blow-up point carrying the energy  $2\pi$ . This quantization result was surprisingly refined by Druet [6] to the case of all  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$  and general nonlinearities of uniform critical growth, analogous to that of the current paper. (Blow-up analysis for equation (1.6) with similar nonlinearity was also considered by Adimurthi and Druet [1].) The key point in [6] is the gradient estimate ([6], Proposition 2), through which Druet studied the energy of  $\varphi_k$ , the spherical average of  $u_k$  with respect to blow-up points, instead of  $u_k$  itself. Thus he transformed the quantization problem for  $u_k$  to the quantization problem for  $\varphi_k$ , which depends only on analysis on certain ordinary differential equation and is comparatively easy to be handled. Shortly after, using similar idea, Struwe [13] succeeded to get a quantization result for a fourth order elliptic equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^4}^2 u_k = \lambda_k u_k e^{2u_k^2} & \text{in } \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^4 \\ u_k > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \quad u_k = \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where  $0 < \lambda_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $u_k \rightarrow 0$  weakly in  $W^{2,2}(\Omega)$ . Also Lamm, Robert and Struwe [8] proved a quantization result for the evolution of equation (1.6), where  $f_k$  is as in (1.1). A recent inspiring work of Martinazzi and Struwe [10] states the following: Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2m}$  be a smooth bounded domain,  $u_k$  be a sequence of positive solutions to the equation  $-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}} u_k = \lambda_k u_k e^{m u_k^2}$  subject to Dirichlet boundary conditions, where  $0 < \lambda_k \rightarrow 0$  and  $u_k \rightarrow 0$  weakly in  $W^{m,2}(\Omega)$ . Assuming  $\Lambda = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} u_k (-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}})^m u_k dx < \infty$ , they proved that  $\Lambda$  is an integer multiple of  $\Lambda_1 = (2m-1)! \text{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{2m})$ , the total  $Q$ -curvature of the standard  $2m$ -dimensional sphere. In view of the Trudinger-Moser embedding for the space  $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$ , where  $n \geq 3$  and  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is a smooth

bounded domain, one may ask how about the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_n u_k = \lambda_k u_k^{\frac{1}{n-1}} e^{u_k^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} & \text{in } \Omega \\ u_k \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \quad u_k = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

Up to now only an energy inequality has been obtained by Adimurthi and the author [3]. Concerning the quantization for equation (1.7), we have a long way to go. For other works related to this kind of quantization problems we refer the reader to [10, 13] and the references therein.

For the proof of Theorem 1.1, we follow the lines of [6, 8, 10, 13]. Firstly we use a pointwise estimate on  $u_k$  to find all separate blow-up points. Specifically we need to deal carefully with the term  $\tau_k u_k$ , which does not appear in the Euclidean case. Secondly we establish a gradient estimate for  $u_k$ . This permits us to compare  $u_k$  with its spherical average with respect to blow-up points. Finally we get the quantization result, where we should deal with the extra term  $\tau_k u_k$  again. For calculations near blow-up points we prefer to choose isothermal coordinates instead of normal coordinates. The advantage of such coordinates is that both the Laplace-Beltrami operator  $\Delta_g$  and the gradient operator  $\nabla_g$  have simple expressions.

The remaining part of this paper is organized as follows. In the next section we prove a simple property of the weak convergence of  $u_k$ . In Section 3, we locate the blow-up points of  $u_k$  and describe the asymptotic behavior of  $u_k$  near those points. In Section 4 we derive a gradient estimate on  $u_k$ . We shall prove quantization results for  $u_k$  near the blow-up points in Section 5, and complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Section 6.

Throughout this paper we often denote various constants independent of  $k$  by the same  $C$ . In addition, we do not distinguish between sequence and subsequence or points and sequence sometimes. The reader can easily recognize it from the context.

## 2. Weak convergence

In this section, we let  $u_k \geq 0$  be a sequence of solutions to equation (1.2) verifying that

$$J_k(u_k) \rightarrow \beta \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty \text{ for some } \beta \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $J_k$  is defined in (1.4). Testing equation (1.2) by  $u_k$ , we have

$$\int_{\Sigma} (|\nabla_g u_k|^2 + \tau_k u_k^2) dv_g = \int_{\Sigma} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g. \quad (2.2)$$

It follows from (2.1) that

$$\int_{\Sigma} (|\nabla_g u_k|^2 + \tau_k u_k^2) dv_g = 2\beta + 2 \int_{\Sigma} F_k(x, u_k) dv_g + o(1).$$

Hence

$$\int_{\Sigma} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g = 2\beta + 2 \int_{\Sigma} F_k(x, u_k) dv_g + o(1).$$

If  $f_k$  satisfies the hypotheses (H1)-(H4), then we have

$$\int_{\Sigma} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g \leq C \quad (2.3)$$

for some constant  $C$ . In view of (1.3), it follows from (2.2) and (2.3) that  $u_k$  is bounded in  $W^{1,2}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$ . Hence there exists some  $u_{\infty} \in W^{1,2}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$  such that up to a subsequence,  $u_k \rightharpoonup u_{\infty}$  weakly in  $W^{1,2}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$ ,  $u_k \rightarrow u_{\infty}$  strongly in  $L^2(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$ , and  $u_k \rightarrow u_{\infty}$  a.e. in  $\Sigma$ . Similarly to [6], we then get that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Sigma} F_k(x, u_k) dv_g = \int_{\Sigma} F_{\infty}(x, u_{\infty}) dv_g \quad (2.4)$$

that  $u_{\infty}$  is a weak solution of (1.5), and that  $u_{\infty} \in C^1(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$ . In conclusion we obtained an analogue of ([6], Lemma1), namely

**Lemma 2.1** *Let  $f_k$  be a sequence of functions satisfying (H1)-(H4). Let  $u_k \geq 0$  be a sequence of solutions to (1.2), where  $\tau_k$  is as defined in (1.3). If (2.1) holds, then  $u_k$  is bounded in  $W^{1,2}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$ , and thus, up to a subsequence,  $u_k \rightharpoonup u_{\infty}$  weakly in  $W^{1,2}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$ , where  $u_{\infty} \in C^1(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$  is a solution to (1.5). Also, there holds*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Sigma} (|\nabla_g u_k|^2 + \tau_k u_k^2) dv_g = 2\beta + 2 \int_{\Sigma} F_{\infty}(x, u_{\infty}) dv_g. \quad (2.5)$$

### 3. Multibubble analysis

In this section we shall use point wise estimate to find blow-up points of a sequence of solutions to the equation (1.2). This technique was first used by Druet [6] to deal with blow-up analysis for solutions to the equation (1.6). Assume  $u_k \geq 0$  is a sequence of solutions to the equation (1.2) and (2.1) holds. From (2.2) and (2.3) we can find some constant  $C$  such that

$$\int_{\Sigma} (|\nabla_g u_k|^2 + \tau_k u_k^2) dv_g \leq C. \quad (3.1)$$

Then the Sobolev embedding theorem implies that for any  $p > 1$  there is some constant  $C$  such that

$$\int_{\Sigma} u_k^p dv_g \leq C. \quad (3.2)$$

These two properties are very important during the process of exhausting blow-up points. Precisely we have the following proposition which is analogous to ([6], Proposition 1), ([8], Theorem 4.2), ([9], Theorem 1 in the case  $m = 1$ ) and ([3], Proposition 3.1).

**Proposition 3.1** *Let  $(\Sigma, g)$  be a compact Riemannian surface without boundary,  $(f_k)$  be a sequence of functions satisfying the hypotheses (H1)-(H5), and  $(u_k)$  be a sequence of smooth non-negative solutions to (1.2) such that (2.1) holds. Assume that  $\max_{\Sigma} u_k \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Then there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ , and up to a subsequence, there exist  $N$  sequences of points  $x_{i,k} \rightarrow x_i^* \in \Sigma$  and of positive real numbers  $r_{i,k} \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $r_{i,k}$  is defined by*

$$r_{i,k}^{-2} = u_k(x_{i,k}) f_k(x_{i,k}, u_k(x_{i,k})), \quad (3.3)$$

such that the following hold:

(i) For any  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , take an isothermal coordinate system  $(U_i, \phi_i; \{x^1, x^2\})$  near  $x_i^*$ , where  $U_i \subset \Sigma$  is a neighborhood of  $x_i^*$ ,  $\phi_i : U_i \rightarrow \Omega_i \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is a diffeomorphism and  $\phi_i(x_i^*) = (0, 0)$ . If we define

$$\eta_{i,k}(x) = u_k(x_{i,k}) (\tilde{u}_k(\tilde{x}_{i,k} + r_{i,k}x) - u_k(x_{i,k})) \quad (3.4)$$

for all  $x \in \Omega_{i,k} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \tilde{x}_{i,k} + r_{i,k}x \in \Omega_i\}$ , where  $\tilde{x}_{i,k} = \phi_i(x_{i,k})$  and  $\tilde{u}_k = u_k \circ \phi_i^{-1}$ , then there holds

$$\eta_{i,k}(x) \rightarrow \eta_\infty(x) = \log \frac{1}{1 + |x|^2/4} \quad \text{in } C_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^2);$$

(ii) For any  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq N$ , there holds

$$\frac{d_g(x_{i,k}, x_{j,k})}{r_{i,k}} \rightarrow +\infty, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $d_g(\cdot, \cdot)$  denotes the geodesic distance between two points of  $\Sigma$ ;

(iii) Define  $R_{N,k}(x) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} d_g(x, x_{i,k})$  for  $x \in \Sigma$ , then there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$R_{N,k}^2(x) u_k(x) f_k(x, u_k(x)) \leq C$$

uniformly in  $x \in \Sigma$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Moreover, given any sequence of points  $(x_{N+1,k})$ , it is impossible to extract a new subsequence from the previous one such that (i) – (iii) hold with the sequences  $(x_{i,k})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N + 1$ .

Finally, we have  $u_k \rightarrow u_\infty$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^1(\Sigma \setminus \mathcal{S})$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\mathcal{S} = \{x_1^*, \dots, x_N^*\}$ , and  $u_\infty$  is given in Lemma 2.1.

*Proof.* Similarly to [6, 8, 9, 3], we prove the proposition by several steps as follows.

*Step 1. The first bubble.*

Assume  $u_k(x_k) = \max_\Sigma u_k$ . If  $u_k(x_k)$  is bounded, applying elliptic estimates to equation (1.2), we then have  $u_k \rightarrow u_\infty$  in  $C^1(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$ , where  $u_\infty$  is given by Lemma 2.1. Hereafter we assume  $u_k(x_k) \rightarrow +\infty$ . Set

$$r_k^{-2} = u_k(x_k) f_k(x_k, u_k(x_k)). \quad (3.5)$$

It is clear that  $r_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

Assume  $x_k \rightarrow x^*$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Take an isothermal coordinate system  $(U, \phi; \{x^1, x^2\})$  near  $x^*$ , where  $U \subset \Sigma$  is a neighborhood of  $x^*$ ,  $\phi : U \rightarrow \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is a diffeomorphism and  $\phi(x^*) = (0, 0)$ . In such a coordinate system, the metric  $g$  can be represented by

$$g = e^\psi (dx^1{}^2 + dx^2{}^2)$$

for some smooth function  $\psi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\psi(0, 0) = 0$ . It follows that

$$\nabla_g = e^{-\psi} \nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2}, \quad \Delta_g = -e^{-\psi} \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}, \quad (3.6)$$

where  $\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2}$  and  $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}$  denote the usual gradient operator and the Laplace operator of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  respectively. The existence of isothermal coordinate system on Riemannian surface is a well-known fact in Riemannian geometry, see for example [15]. Define

$$v_k(x) = \frac{\tilde{u}_k(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x)}{u_k(x_k)} \quad (3.7)$$

for  $x \in \Omega_k = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \tilde{x}_k + r_k x \in \Omega\}$ , where  $\tilde{u}_k = u_k \circ \phi^{-1}$ ,  $\tilde{x}_k = \phi(x_k)$ . It follows from (1.2), (3.5) and (3.6) that  $v_k$  satisfies the following equation

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(x) = e^{\psi(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x)} \frac{\tilde{f}_k(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x, \tilde{u}_k(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x))}{u_k^2(x_k) f_k(x_k, u_k(x_k))} - e^{\psi(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x)} r_k^2 \tilde{\tau}_k(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x) v_k(x) \quad (3.8)$$

on  $\Omega_k$ , where  $\tilde{f}_k(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x, t) = f_k(\phi^{-1}(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x), t)$ . Note that  $u_k(x_k) = \max_{\Sigma} u_k$  and  $\Omega_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . It follows from (3.7) that  $v_k$  is uniformly bounded in  $\mathbb{B}_R(0)$  for any fixed  $R > 0$ . Since  $\psi$  is smooth,  $\psi(0, 0) = 0$ ,  $\tilde{x}_k \rightarrow (0, 0)$  and  $r_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $e^{\psi(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x)}$  is also uniformly bounded in  $\mathbb{B}_R(0)$  for any fixed  $R > 0$ . Furthermore  $e^{\psi(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x)} \rightarrow 1$  locally uniformly in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . By (H4) and (H5), we have for all  $x \in \Omega_k$  and all  $k$

$$\frac{\tilde{f}_k(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x, \tilde{u}_k(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x))}{f_k(x_k, u_k(x_k))} \leq C. \quad (3.9)$$

All these estimates together with (1.3) lead to

$$\|-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{B}_R(0))} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty, \forall R > 0.$$

Applying elliptic estimates to (3.8), one gets  $v_k \rightarrow v_\infty$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ , where  $v_\infty$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_\infty = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \\ v_\infty(0) = 1 = \max_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_\infty. \end{cases}$$

The Liouville theorem for harmonic functions then leads to  $v_\infty \equiv 1$ . Therefore

$$v_k \rightarrow 1 \text{ in } C_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^2). \quad (3.10)$$

Now we set

$$\eta_k(x) = u_k(x_k)(\tilde{u}_k(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x) - u_k(x_k)).$$

In view of (1.2),  $\eta_k$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_k(x) &= e^{\psi(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x)} \frac{\tilde{f}_k(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x, \tilde{u}_k(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x))}{f_k(x_k, u_k(x_k))} \\ &\quad - e^{\psi(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x)} \tilde{\tau}_k(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x) r_k^2 u_k^2(x_k) v_k(x), \quad x \in \Omega_k. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

We claim that

$$r_k u_k^p(x_k) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty, \quad \forall p > 1. \quad (3.12)$$

Actually, it is clear that there exists some constant  $c > 0$  depending only on the diffeomorphism  $\phi$  such that for any fixed  $R > 0$  and all large  $k$

$$B_{c^{-1}Rr_k}(x_k) \subset \phi^{-1}(\mathbb{B}_{Rr_k}(\tilde{x}_k)) \subset B_{cRr_k}(x_k). \quad (3.13)$$

Here and throughout this paper we denote the geodesic ball centered at  $x \in \Sigma$  with radius  $r$  by  $B_r(x)$ , while the Euclidean ball centered at  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$  with radius  $r$  by  $\mathbb{B}_r(x)$ . This together with (3.10), the mean value theorem for integral and the Hölder inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
r_k u_k^p(x_k) &= \frac{r_k}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{B}_1(0)} u_k^p(x_k) dx \\
&= (1 + o(1)) \frac{r_k}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{B}_1(0)} \tilde{u}_k^p(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x) dx \\
&\leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{r_k}{\pi^{1/3}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{B}_1(0)} \tilde{u}_k^{3p}(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x) dx \right)^{1/3} \\
&\leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{r_k^{1/3}}{\pi^{1/3}} \left( \int_{B_{cr_k}(x_k)} u_k^{3p} dv_g \right)^{1/3}, \tag{3.14}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $o(1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  for any fixed  $p > 1$ . In view of (3.2), our claim (3.12) follows from (3.14) immediately.

For any fixed  $R > 0$  we let  $\eta_k^{(1)}$  be a solution to the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_k^{(1)} = -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_k & \text{in } \mathbb{B}_R(0) \\ \eta_k^{(1)} = 0 & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{B}_R(0). \end{cases} \tag{3.15}$$

In view of (3.11), we have by (3.9) and (3.12) that  $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_k$  is bounded in  $L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ . Applying elliptic estimates to (3.15), we have

$$\eta_k^{(1)} \rightarrow \eta_\infty^{(1)} \quad \text{in } C^1(\mathbb{B}_R(0)). \tag{3.16}$$

Let  $\eta_k^{(2)} = \eta_k - \eta_k^{(1)}$ . Then  $\eta_k^{(2)}$  satisfies

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_k^{(2)} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{B}_R(0). \tag{3.17}$$

It follows from (3.16) and  $\eta_k \leq 0$  that there exists some constant  $C$  such that  $\eta_k^{(2)}(x) \leq C$  for all  $k$  and all  $x \in \mathbb{B}_R(0)$ . Applying the Harnack inequality to (3.17), we conclude that  $\eta_k^{(2)}$  is uniformly bounded on  $\mathbb{B}_{R/2}(0)$ . Hence  $\eta_k$  is also uniformly bounded in  $\mathbb{B}_{R/2}(0)$ . Applying elliptic estimates to (3.11), we obtain

$$\eta_k \rightarrow \eta_\infty \quad \text{in } C^1(\mathbb{B}_{R/4}(0)).$$

This together with (H4), (H5) and (3.10) gives

$$\frac{\tilde{f}_k(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x, \tilde{u}_k(\tilde{x}_k + r_k x))}{f_k(x_k, u_k(x_k))} = (1 + o(1)) e^{(2+o(1))\eta_\infty} \tag{3.18}$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{B}_{R/4}(0)$ , where  $o(1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly in  $x \in \mathbb{B}_{R/4}(0)$ . Inserting (3.12) and (3.18) into (3.11) and noting that  $R > 0$  is arbitrary we obtain

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_\infty = e^{2\eta_\infty} & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \\ \eta_\infty(0) = 0 = \max_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_\infty. \end{cases} \tag{3.19}$$



Moreover, using (2.3), (3.5), (3.10), (3.13) and (3.18), we estimate for any fixed  $R > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} e^{2\eta_\infty} dx &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_R(0)} \frac{\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x) \widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x, \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x))}{u_k(x_k) f_k(x_k, u_k(x_k))} dx \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{Rr_k}(\widetilde{x}_k)} \widetilde{u}_k(x) \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k(x)) dx \\ &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{cRr_k}(x_k)} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta_\infty(x)} dx < \infty.$$

A result of Chen-Li [5] implies that

$$\eta_\infty(x) = -\log(1 + |x|^2/4), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (3.20)$$

It follows from (3.13) that

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_{c^{-1}Rr_k}(\widetilde{x}_k)} \widetilde{u}_k \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k) e^{\psi(x)} dx \leq \int_{B_{Rr_k}(x_k)} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g \leq \int_{\mathbb{B}_{cRr_k}(\widetilde{x}_k)} \widetilde{u}_k \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k) e^{\psi(x)} dx.$$

In view of (3.10) and (3.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{cRr_k}(\widetilde{x}_k)} \widetilde{u}_k \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k) e^{\psi(x)} dx &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{c^{-1}Rr_k}(\widetilde{x}_k)} \widetilde{u}_k \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k) e^{\psi(x)} dx \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{c^{-1}R}(0)} e^{2\eta_\infty} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta_\infty} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain by (3.20)

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{Rr_k}(x_k)} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta_\infty(x)} dx = 4\pi. \quad (3.21)$$

*Step 2. Multi-bubble analysis.*

In this step, we shall prove that there exists some positive integer  $\ell$  such that the properties  $(\mathcal{B}_\ell)$  and  $(\mathcal{G}_\ell)$  hold. Namely, there exist  $\ell$  sequences of points  $(x_{i,k}) \subset \Sigma$  such that  $x_{i,k} \rightarrow x_i^*$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ , and the following are satisfied:

$(\mathcal{B}_\ell^1)$  For every  $i : 1 \leq i \leq \ell$ , letting  $r_{i,k} > 0$  be given by (3.3),  $(U_i, \phi_i; \{x^1, x^2\})$  be an isothermal coordinate system near  $x_i^*$ , where  $U_i \subset \Sigma$  is a neighborhood of  $x_i^*$ ,  $\phi_i : U_i \rightarrow \Omega_i \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is a diffeomorphism with  $\phi_i(x_i^*) = (0, 0)$ , and letting  $\eta_{i,k}$  be given by (3.4), we have that  $r_{i,k} \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and

$$\eta_{i,k}(x) \rightarrow \eta_\infty(x) = -\log(1 + |x|^2/4) \quad \text{in } C_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty;$$

$(\mathcal{B}_\ell^2)$  For all  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq \ell$ ,

$$\frac{d_g(x_{i,k}, x_{j,k})}{r_{i,k}} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty;$$

( $\mathcal{B}_\ell^3$ ) The following energy identity holds

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\cup_{i=1}^\ell B_{Rr_{i,k}}(x_{i,k})} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g = 4\pi\ell;$$

( $\mathcal{G}_\ell$ ) There exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$R_{\ell,k}^2(x) u_k(x) f_k(x, u_k(x)) \leq C$$

for all  $x \in \Sigma$  and all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Here

$$R_{\ell,k}(x) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} d_g(x, x_{i,k}). \quad (3.22)$$

From Step 1, we know that ( $\mathcal{B}_1$ ) holds. Suppose for some  $\ell \geq 1$ , ( $\mathcal{B}_\ell$ ) holds but ( $\mathcal{G}_\ell$ ) does not hold. Choose  $x_{\ell+1,k} \in \Sigma$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\ell,k}^2(x_{\ell+1,k}) u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}) f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})) &= \max_{x \in \Sigma} R_{\ell,k}^2(x) u_k(x) f_k(x, u_k(x)) \\ &\rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

Let  $r_{\ell+1,k} > 0$  be as defined in (3.3). It follows from (3.3), (3.22), and (3.23) that  $r_{\ell+1,k} \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d_g(x_{\ell+1,k}, x_{i,k})}{r_{\ell+1,k}} = +\infty, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq \ell. \quad (3.24)$$

Also we claim that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d_g(x_{\ell+1,k}, x_{i,k})}{r_{i,k}} = +\infty, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq \ell. \quad (3.25)$$

Suppose not. There exists some constant  $C$  such that for some  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ , there holds

$$d_g(x_{\ell+1,k}, x_{i,k}) \leq C r_{i,k} \quad \text{for all } k.$$

Hence we have

$$R_{\ell,k}^2(x_{\ell+1,k}) u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}) f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})) \leq C r_{i,k}^2 u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}) f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})) \quad (3.26)$$

By ( $\mathcal{B}_\ell^1$ ), we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} r_{i,k}^2 u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}) f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})) &= \frac{1 + o(1)}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{r_{i,k}}(\bar{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{u}_k(x) \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k(x)) e^{\psi_i(x)} dx \\ &\leq \frac{1 + o(1)}{\pi} \int_{\Sigma} u_k(x) f_k(x, u_k(x)) dv_g. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (2.3) implies that  $r_{i,k}^2 u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}) f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}))$  is a bounded sequence, and whence (3.26) implies that  $R_{\ell,k}^2(x_{\ell+1,k}) u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}) f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}))$  is bounded. This contradicts (3.23). Hence our claim (3.25) holds, and thus ( $\mathcal{B}_{\ell+1}^2$ ) holds.

Assume  $x_{\ell+1,k} \rightarrow x_{\ell+1}^*$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Take an isothermal coordinate system  $(U_{\ell+1}, \phi_{\ell+1}; \{x^1, x^2\})$  near  $x_{\ell+1}^*$ , where  $U_{\ell+1}$  is a neighborhood of  $x_{\ell+1}^*$ ,  $\phi_{\ell+1} : U_{\ell+1} \rightarrow \Omega_{\ell+1} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is a diffeomorphism with  $\phi_{\ell+1}(x_{\ell+1}^*) = (0, 0)$ . In this coordinate system, the metric  $g$  can be represented by

$$g = e^{\psi_{\ell+1}} (dx^1{}^2 + dx^2{}^2)$$

for some smooth function  $\psi_{\ell+1} : \Omega_{\ell+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\psi_{\ell+1}(0, 0) = 0$ . Also we have  $\nabla_g = e^{-\psi_{\ell+1}} \nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2}$  and  $\Delta_g = -e^{-\psi_{\ell+1}} \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ .

Define

$$v_{\ell+1,k}(x) = \frac{\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x)}{u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})}$$

for  $x \in \Omega_{\ell+1,k} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x \in \Omega_{\ell+1}\}$ , where  $\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} = \phi_{\ell+1}(x_{\ell+1,k})$ ,  $\widetilde{u}_k = u_k \circ \phi_{\ell+1}^{-1}$ . Now we prove that

$$v_{\ell+1,k} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{in } C_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.27)$$

In view of (1.2),  $v_{\ell+1,k}$  satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_{\ell+1,k}(x) &= e^{\psi_{\ell+1}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x)} \frac{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x, \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x))}{u_k^2(x_{\ell+1,k}) f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}))} \\ &\quad - e^{\psi_{\ell+1}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x)} r_{\ell+1,k}^2 \widetilde{\tau}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x) v_{\ell+1,k}(x) \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

on  $\Omega_{\ell+1,k}$ , where  $\widetilde{f}_k(x, t) = f_k(\phi_{\ell+1}^{-1}(x), t)$ . By (3.23), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\widetilde{R}_{\ell,k}^2(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x) \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x) \widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x, \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x)) \\ &\leq R_{\ell,k}^2(x_{\ell+1,k}) u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}) f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})), \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

where  $\widetilde{R}_{\ell,k} = R_{\ell,k} \circ \phi_{\ell+1}^{-1}$ . Fix any  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ . If  $x_{\ell+1}^* \neq x_i^*$ , noting that  $d_g(\phi_{\ell+1}^{-1}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x), x_{i,k}) \rightarrow d_g(x_{\ell+1}^*, x_i^*)$  and  $d_g(x_{\ell+1,k}, x_{i,k}) \rightarrow d_g(x_{\ell+1}^*, x_i^*)$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we then have

$$d_g(\phi_{\ell+1}^{-1}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x), x_{i,k}) = (1 + o(1)) d_g(x_{\ell+1,k}, x_{i,k}), \quad (3.30)$$

where  $o(1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly in  $x \in \mathbb{B}_R(0)$ . If  $x_{\ell+1}^* = x_i^*$ , since the Riemannian distance and the Euclidean distance are equivalent in the same local coordinate system, we then have  $|\phi_{\ell+1}(x_{\ell+1,k}) - \phi_{\ell+1}(x_{i,k})| = (1 + o(1)) d_g(x_{\ell+1,k}, x_{i,k})$ . Recalling (3.24), we obtain for all  $x \in \mathbb{B}_R(0)$

$$\begin{aligned} d_g(\phi_{\ell+1}^{-1}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x), x_{i,k}) &= (1 + o(1)) |\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x - \phi_{\ell+1}(x_{i,k})| \\ &= (1 + o(1)) d_g(x_{\ell+1,k}, x_{i,k}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have (3.30) in any case. Combining (3.29) and (3.30), we obtain for  $x \in \mathbb{B}_R(0)$

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\ell+1,k}(x) &\frac{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x, \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x))}{f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}))} \\ &\leq \frac{\inf_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} d_g(x_{\ell+1,k}, x_{i,k})^2}{\inf_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} d_g(\phi_{\ell+1}^{-1}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x), x_{i,k})^2} = 1 + o(1), \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

where  $o(1) \rightarrow 0$  uniformly in  $x \in \mathbb{B}_R(0)$ . From (H4), we know that there exists  $t_0 > 0$  such that

$$\frac{f_k(x, t_2)}{f_k(x, t_1)} \geq e^{t_2^2 - t_1^2} \quad \text{for all } t_1, t_2 \geq t_0, \quad \text{and all } x \in \Sigma. \quad (3.32)$$

If there exist some  $R_0 > 0$  and a sequence of points  $(z_k) \subset \mathbb{B}_{R_0}(0)$  such that  $v_{\ell+1,k}(z_k) \rightarrow \alpha > 1$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , then we conclude by (3.32) and (H5) that

$$v_{\ell+1,k}(z_k) \frac{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}z_k, \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}z_k))}{f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}))} \geq \frac{\alpha + 1}{2} > 1$$

for sufficiently large  $k$ , which contradicts (3.31). Therefore we obtain

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|v_{\ell+1,k}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{B}_R(0))} \leq 1, \quad \forall R > 0.$$

When  $v_{\ell+1,k}(x) > 1$ , we have by (3.28) and (3.31),  $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_{\ell+1,k}(x) = o(1)$ , where  $o(1)$  is the same meaning as that of (3.31). When  $v_{\ell+1,k}(x) \leq 1$ , using (H4) and (H5), we also have  $\Delta v_{\ell+1,k}(x) = o(1)$ , where  $o(1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly in all  $x$  satisfying  $v_{\ell+1,k}(x) \leq 1$  for sufficiently large  $k$ . Now applying elliptic estimates to equation (3.28), we obtain

$$v_{\ell+1,k} \rightarrow v_{\ell+1,\infty} \quad \text{in } C_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^2),$$

where  $v_{\ell+1,\infty}$  is a solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_{\ell+1,\infty} = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \\ 0 \leq v_{\ell+1,\infty} \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that  $v_{\ell+1,\infty}(0) = 1$ . The Liouville theorem for harmonic functions leads to  $v_{\ell+1,\infty} \equiv 1$ . Whence (3.27) holds.

Define another sequence of blow-up functions by

$$\eta_{\ell+1,k}(x) = u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})(\tilde{u}_k(\tilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x) - u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})), \quad x \in \Omega_{\ell+1,k}. \quad (3.33)$$

In the following, we will prove that  $(\mathcal{B}_{\ell+1}^1)$  and  $(\mathcal{B}_{\ell+1}^3)$  hold. By (1.2),  $\eta_{\ell+1,k}$  satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_{\ell+1,k}(x) &= e^{\psi_{\ell+1}(\tilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x)} \frac{\tilde{f}_k(\tilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x, \tilde{u}_k(\tilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x))}{f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}))} \\ &\quad - e^{\psi_{\ell+1}(\tilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x)} \tilde{\tau}_k(\tilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}x) r_{\ell+1,k}^2 u_k^2(x_{\ell+1,k}) v_{\ell+1,k}(x) \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

on  $\Omega_{\ell+1,k}$ . We claim that for any fixed  $R > 0$ ,

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_{\ell+1,k}(x) \leq 0 \quad \text{uniformly in } x \in \mathbb{B}_R(0). \quad (3.35)$$

For otherwise, we may take a sequence of points  $(y_k) \subset \mathbb{B}_R(0)$  such that  $\eta_{\ell+1,k}(y_k) \geq \beta > 0$  for all sufficiently large  $k$ . By (H4), (H5) and (3.27), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\tilde{f}_k(\tilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}y_k, \tilde{u}_k(\tilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}y_k))}{f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}))} &= (1 + o(1)) e^{\tilde{u}_k^2(\tilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}y_k) - u_k^2(x_{\ell+1,k})} \\ &= (1 + o(1)) e^{(2+o(1))\eta_{\ell+1,k}(y_k)} \\ &\geq 1 + 2\beta + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

This together with (3.31) leads to

$$1 + 2\beta + o(1) \leq 1 + o(1),$$

which is impossible when  $k$  is sufficiently large. Hence our claim (3.35) holds. By (3.27), using the same method of deriving (3.12), we conclude

$$r_{\ell+1,k}^2 u_k^2(x_{\ell+1,k}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.36)$$

Combining (3.27) and (3.33)-(3.36), similarly as we did in Step 1, we arrive at

$$\eta_{\ell+1,k}(x) \rightarrow \eta_\infty(x) \text{ in } C_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $\eta_\infty(x) = -\log(1 + |x|^2/4)$  is the unique solution to (3.19). Hence  $(\mathcal{B}_{\ell+1}^1)$  holds.

Moreover, using the same method for proving (3.21), we arrive at

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{Rr_{\ell+1,k}}(x_{\ell+1,k})} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta_\infty(x)} dx = 4\pi.$$

Thus  $(\mathcal{B}_{\ell+1}^3)$  holds.

Actually, we have proved that if  $(\mathcal{B}_\ell)$  holds but  $(\mathcal{G}_\ell)$  does not hold, then  $(\mathcal{B}_{\ell+1})$  holds. Note that

$$\int_{\Sigma} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} \int_{B_{Rr_{i,k}}(x_{i,k})} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g = 4(\ell+1)\pi. \quad (3.37)$$

In view of (2.3), the process must be terminate after finite steps. This ends the proof of Step 2.

*Step 3. Exhaustion of blow-up points.*

It follows from Step 2 that there exists some  $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $\ell$  sequences of points  $(x_{i,k})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ , such that  $(\mathcal{B}_\ell)$  and  $(\mathcal{G}_\ell)$  hold. If there exists a sequence of points  $(x_{\ell+1,k})$  of  $\Sigma$  such that after extracting a new subsequence from the previous one,  $(\mathcal{B}_{\ell+1})$  and  $(\mathcal{G}_{\ell+1})$  hold, we add this sequence of points, and so on. The process necessarily terminates because of (2.3) and (3.37). Therefore there exists some  $N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $N$  sequences of points  $(x_{i,k})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , such that  $(\mathcal{B}_N)$  and  $(\mathcal{G}_N)$  hold and such that, given any sequence of points  $(x_{N+1,k})$ , it is impossible to extract a new subsequence from the previous one such that  $(\mathcal{B}_{N+1})$  and  $(\mathcal{G}_{N+1})$  hold with sequences  $(x_{i,k})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N+1$ .

*Step 4. Convergence away from blow-up points.*

Set  $\mathcal{S} = \{x_1^*, \dots, x_N^*\}$ . We will prove that  $u_k \rightarrow u_\infty$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^1(\Sigma \setminus \mathcal{S})$ . In view of  $(\mathcal{G}_N)$ , given any compact set  $K \subset \Sigma \setminus \mathcal{S}$ , there exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$u_k(x) f_k(x, u_k(x)) \leq C \text{ for all } x \in K \text{ and all } k.$$

If  $u_k(x) > 1$  for some  $x \in K$ , then  $f_k(x, u_k(x)) \leq C_K$ . If  $u_k(x) \leq 1$  for some  $x \in K$ , then (H2) implies that  $f_k(x, u_k(x))$  is bounded uniformly in  $x$  with  $u_k(x) \leq 1$ . Thus, for all  $x \in K$ ,  $f_k(x, u_k(x))$  is bounded in  $L^\infty(K)$ . In view of (1.3) and (3.2), applying elliptic estimates to the equation

$$\Delta_g u_k(x) + \tau_k(x) u_k(x) = f_k(x, u_k(x)), \quad x \in K,$$

we obtain the convergence  $u_k \rightarrow u_0$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^1(\Sigma \setminus \mathcal{S})$ .

Combining the above four steps, we complete the proof of Proposition 3.1.  $\square$

#### 4. Gradient estimate

Let  $u_k \geq 0$  be a sequence of solutions to (1.2). In this section we shall establish a gradient estimate on  $u_k$ , which can be viewed as a version on manifolds of ([6], Proposition 2). Precisely we have the following result.

**Proposition 4.1** *Let  $(\Sigma, g)$  be a compact Riemannian surface without boundary,  $f_k$  be a sequence of functions satisfying (H1)-(H5), and  $u_k \geq 0$  be a sequence of smooth solutions to equation (1.2) such that (2.1) holds. Assume that  $\max_{\Sigma} u_k \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$  and the sequences  $x_{i,k}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , be given by Proposition 3.1. Then there exists a uniform constant  $C$  such that*

$$R_{N,k}(x)u_k(x)|\nabla_g u_k(x)| \leq C$$

for all  $x \in \Sigma$  and all  $k$ , where  $R_{N,k}(x)$  is defined as in (3.22).

*Proof.* Choose  $y_k \in \Sigma$  such that

$$R_{N,k}(y_k)u_k(y_k)|\nabla_g u_k(y_k)| = \max_{x \in \Sigma} R_{N,k}(x)u_k(x)|\nabla_g u_k(x)|. \quad (4.1)$$

Suppose by contradiction that

$$R_{N,k}(y_k)u_k(y_k)|\nabla_g u_k(y_k)| \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.2)$$

Set

$$s_k = R_{N,k}(y_k). \quad (4.3)$$

By Proposition 3.1, we have  $u_k \rightarrow u_{\infty}$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^1(\Sigma \setminus \{x_1^*, \dots, x_N^*\})$ , which together with (4.2) implies that  $s_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $y_k \rightarrow x_1^*$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $x_1^* = \dots = x_{\ell}^*$  for some  $1 \leq \ell \leq N$ , and  $x_j^* \neq x_1^*$  for any  $j \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, N\}$ . Take an isothermal coordinate system  $(U, \phi; \{x^1, x^2\})$  near  $x_1^*$ , where  $U$  is a neighborhood of  $x_1^* \in \Sigma$ ,  $\phi : U \rightarrow \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is a diffeomorphism with  $\phi(x_1^*) = (0, 0)$ . In this coordinate system the metric  $g$  can be represented by  $g = e^{\psi}(dx^{1^2} + dx^{2^2})$ , where  $\psi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a smooth function with  $\psi(0, 0) = 0$ . Denote  $\tilde{y}_k = \phi(y_k)$ ,  $\tilde{u}_k = u_k \circ \phi^{-1}$ . We set

$$v_k(y) = \tilde{u}_k(\tilde{y}_k + s_k y)$$

for  $y \in \Omega_k = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \tilde{y}_k + s_k y \in \Omega\}$ . Define

$$y_{i,k} = \frac{\tilde{x}_{i,k} - \tilde{y}_k}{s_k} \in \Omega_k, \quad i = 1, \dots, \ell,$$

and

$$\tilde{S}_k = \{y_{1,k}, \dots, y_{\ell,k}\}.$$

Since  $s_k \rightarrow 0$ , we have  $\Omega_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Denote

$$\tilde{S} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{S}_k.$$

By (4.3) and the fact  $\psi(0, 0) = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(0, \tilde{S}_k) &= \inf_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} |y_{i,k}| = \inf_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{|\tilde{x}_{i,k} - \tilde{y}_k|}{s_k} \\ &= \inf_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{(1 + o(1))d_g(x_{i,k}, y_k)}{s_k} \\ &= 1 + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(0, \widetilde{S}) = 1, \quad (4.4)$$

where  $d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\cdot, \cdot)$  denotes the Euclidean distance of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Clearly,  $v_k(y)$  satisfies

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(y) = e^{\psi(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y)} s_k^2 \left( \widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y, \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y)) - \widetilde{\tau}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y) v_k(y) \right) \quad (4.5)$$

for  $y \in \Omega_k$ . By (iii) of Proposition 3.1, we have

$$\widetilde{R}_{N,k}(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y)^2 v_k(y) \widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y, v_k(y)) \leq C \quad (4.6)$$

for some constant  $C$  independent of  $k$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{R}_{N,k}(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y) &= R_{N,k}(\phi^{-1}(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y)) \\ &= \inf_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} d_g(\phi^{-1}(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y), x_{i,k}) \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \inf_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y, \widetilde{x}_{i,k}) \\ &= (1 + o(1)) s_k d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(y, \widetilde{S}_k). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Combining (4.6) and (4.7), we have

$$s_k^2 v_k(y) \widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y, v_k(y)) \leq \frac{C}{d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(y, \widetilde{S}_k)^2}, \quad (4.8)$$

which together with (H1) and (H2) leads to

$$0 \leq s_k^2 \widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y, v_k(y)) \leq \frac{C}{d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(y, \widetilde{S}_k)^2}. \quad (4.9)$$

In view of (3.2), we estimate for any  $p > 1$  and any  $R > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{B}_R(0)} (s_k^2 v_k(y))^p dy &= s_k^{2p} \int_{\mathbb{B}_R(0)} \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y)^p dy \\ &\leq C s_k^{2p-2} \int_{\Sigma} u_k^p dy_g \\ &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

Denote for any  $R > 0$

$$A_R = \mathbb{B}_R(0) \setminus \cup_{y \in S} \mathbb{B}_{1/R}(y).$$

Clearly there exists some  $R_0 > 0$  such that  $A_{R/4}$  is necessarily smooth bounded domain provided that  $R \geq R_0$ . Now we take  $R \geq R_0$ . In view of (1.3), (4.5), (4.9), and (4.10), we arrive at

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k\|_{L^p(A_R)} = 0, \quad \forall R \geq R_0, \quad \forall p > 1.$$

Let  $w_k$  satisfy

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} w_k = -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k & \text{in } A_R \\ w_k = 0 & \text{on } \partial A_R. \end{cases}$$

It follows from (4.10) and elliptic estimates that there exists some function  $w$  such that

$$w_k \rightarrow w \quad \text{in } C^1(\overline{A_R}).$$

In particular,  $w_k$  is uniformly bounded in  $A_R$ . While  $v_k - w_k$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}(v_k - w_k) = 0 & \text{in } A_R \\ v_k - w_k = v_k & \text{on } \partial A_R. \end{cases} \quad (4.11)$$

We claim that

$$v_k(0) \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.12)$$

For otherwise,  $(v_k(0) - w_k(0))$  would be a bounded sequence. Noting that  $v_k - w_k$  has a lower bound in  $A_R$ , applying Harnack's inequality to (4.11), we obtain

$$\|v_k - w_k\|_{L^\infty(A_{R/2})} \leq C$$

for some constant  $C$  depending only on  $R$ , and whence  $v_k$  is bounded in  $C^1(A_{R/4})$ . In view of (4.4), this leads to

$$v_k(0)|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(0)| \leq C.$$

While (4.1) and (4.2) implies

$$v_k(0)|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(0)| \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.13)$$

This is a contradiction. Hence our claim (4.12) follows.

Replacing  $v_k$  by  $v_k/v_k(0)$  in the above estimates, we obtain

$$\frac{v_k}{v_k(0)} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{in } C^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}) \quad (4.14)$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . For  $y \in \Omega_k$ , we set

$$\tilde{v}_k(y) = \frac{v_k(y) - v_k(0)}{|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(0)|}.$$

It follows from (4.1) and (4.7) that

$$v_k(y)|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(y)| \leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{v_k(0)|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(0)|}{d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(y, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_k)}, \quad y \in \Omega_k \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_k.$$

This together with (4.14) gives

$$|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{v}_k(y)| \leq \frac{1 + o(1)}{d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(y, \mathcal{S})}, \quad (4.15)$$

where  $o(1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  locally uniformly in  $y \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}$ . Since  $\tilde{v}_k(0) = 0$ , it follows from (4.15) that  $\tilde{v}_k$  is uniformly bounded in  $C^1(A_R)$  for any  $R > 0$ . In view of (4.5) and (4.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{v}_k(y) &= -(1 + o(1)) \frac{v_k(y) \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(y)}{v_k(0) |\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(0)|} \\ &= \frac{1 + o(1)}{v_k(0) |\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(0)|} e^{\psi(\tilde{y}_k + s_k y)} s_k^2 v_k(y) \left\{ \tilde{f}_k(\tilde{y}_k + s_k y, v_k(y)) - \tilde{\tau}_k(\tilde{y}_k + s_k y) v_k(y) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$



for  $y \in \Omega_k$ . Similarly to (4.10),  $s_k^2 v_k^2$  is bounded in  $L_{\text{loc}}^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for any  $p > 1$ . In view of (4.8) and (4.13), applying elliptic estimates to the equation (4.16), we have

$$\tilde{v}_k \rightarrow \tilde{v} \quad \text{in } C_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.17)$$

where  $\tilde{v}$  satisfies

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{v} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}, \quad \tilde{v}(0) = 0, \quad |\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{v}(0)| = 1, \quad (4.18)$$

and

$$|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{v}(y)| \leq \frac{1}{d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(y, \mathcal{S})}, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}. \quad (4.19)$$

Let  $\hat{y} \in \mathcal{S}$ . For any  $0 < r < d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\hat{y}, \mathcal{S} \setminus \{\hat{y}\})/2$ , since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})} v_k \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k dy &= \int_{\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})} \tilde{u}_k(\tilde{y}_k + s_k y) s_k^2 \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{u}_k(\tilde{y}_k + s_k y) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{B}_{s_k r}(\tilde{y}_k + s_k \hat{y})} \tilde{u}_k(x) \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{u}_k(x) dx \\ &= - \int_{\phi^{-1}(\mathbb{B}_{s_k r}(\tilde{y}_k + s_k \hat{y}))} u_k \Delta_g u_k dv_g, \end{aligned}$$

we get by (1.3), (2.3) and (3.2)

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})} v_k \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k dy \right| \leq \int_{\Sigma} (u_k f_k(x, u_k) + \tau_k u_k^2) dv_g \leq C.$$

Similarly we have by (3.1)

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})} |\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k|^2 dy \leq \int_{\Sigma} |\nabla_g u_k|^2 dv_g \leq C.$$

It then follows that

$$\int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})} v_k \partial_\nu v_k d\sigma = \int_{\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})} |\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k|^2 dy - \int_{\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})} v_k \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k dy = O(1).$$

While (4.14) and (4.17) lead to

$$\int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})} v_k \partial_\nu v_k d\sigma = v_k(0) |\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(0)| \left( \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})} \partial_\nu \tilde{v} d\sigma + o(1) \right).$$

This together with (4.13) gives for any  $0 < r < d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\hat{y}, \mathcal{S} \setminus \{\hat{y}\})/2$

$$\int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})} \partial_\nu \tilde{v} d\sigma = 0,$$

which leads to

$$\frac{d}{dr} \left( \frac{1}{2\pi r} \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})} \tilde{v} d\sigma \right) = \frac{1}{2\pi r} \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})} \partial_\nu \tilde{v} d\sigma = 0.$$

Hence there exists some constant  $\alpha$  depending only on  $\hat{y}$  such that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi r} \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})} \tilde{v} d\sigma = \alpha, \quad \forall 0 < r < d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\hat{y}, \mathcal{S} \setminus \{\hat{y}\})/2. \quad (4.20)$$

Given any  $y \in \partial\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})$ . (4.20) permits us to take  $y^* \in \partial\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})$  such that  $\tilde{v}(y^*) = \alpha$ . It then follows from (4.19) that  $|\tilde{v}(y) - \alpha| \leq \pi$ . This indicates that  $\tilde{v}$  is bounded near  $\hat{y}$ . Since this is true for all  $\hat{y} \in \mathcal{S}$ , we conclude that  $\tilde{v}$  is a smooth harmonic function in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . By the mean value equality,

$$\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_R(0)} \tilde{v} d\sigma = 0, \quad \forall R > 0.$$

This together with (4.19) implies that  $\tilde{v}$  is bounded in  $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ . Actually we can take  $z \in \partial\mathbb{B}_R(0)$  such that  $\tilde{v}_k(z) = 0$ , in view of (4.19), we then have for all  $y \in \partial\mathbb{B}_R(0)$

$$|\tilde{v}_k(y)| = |\tilde{v}_k(y) - \tilde{v}_k(z)| \leq \pi R \sup_{\partial\mathbb{B}_R(0)} |\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{v}| \leq 2\pi,$$

provided that  $R > 2 \sup_{\hat{y} \in \mathcal{S}} |\hat{y}|$ . Note again that  $\tilde{v}(0) = 0$ . Applying the Liouville theorem to (4.18), we have  $\tilde{v} \equiv 0$ , which contradicts the fact that  $|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{v}(0)| = 1$ . This completes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

## 5. Quantization

In this section we prove quantization results for equation (1.2). Let  $x_1^*, \dots, x_N^*$  be as in Proposition 3.1. For some  $1 \leq i \leq N$ ,  $x_i^*$  is called a *simple* blow-up point if  $N = 1$  or  $x_j \neq x_i$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \setminus \{i\}$ ; Otherwise we call  $x_i^*$  a *non-simple* blow-up point. In the following, we distinguish between these two types of points to proceed.

### 5.1. Quantization for simple blow-up points

Let  $x_i^*$  be a simple blow-up point. Take an isothermal coordinate system  $(U_i, \phi_i; \{x^1, x^2\})$  near  $x_i^*$ , where  $U_i \subset \Sigma$  is a neighborhood of  $x_i^*$  such that  $x_j^* \notin \overline{U_i}$ , the closure of  $U_i$ , for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \setminus \{i\}$ . As before  $\phi_i : U_i \rightarrow \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is a diffeomorphism with  $\phi_i(x_i^*) = (0, 0)$ . Particularly we can find some  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{B}_{2\delta}(0) \subset \Omega$ . In this coordinate system, the metric  $g$  writes as  $g = e^{\psi_i}(dx^1{}^2 + dx^2{}^2)$  for some smooth function  $\psi_i : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\psi_i(0, 0) = 0$ . In this subsection we prove the following quantization result.

**Proposition 5.1** *Let  $u_k, u_\infty, \tau_k, \tau_\infty, x_{i,k}$  and  $x_i^*$  be as in Proposition 3.1. Suppose that  $x_i^*$  is a simple blow-up point. Then up to a subsequence, there exists some positive integer  $I^{(i)}$  such that*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{U_i} (|\nabla_g u_k|^2 + \tau_k u_k^2) dv_g = \int_{U_i} (|\nabla_g u_\infty|^2 + \tau_\infty u_\infty^2) dv_g + 4\pi I^{(i)}, \quad (5.1)$$

where  $U_i$  is a neighborhood of  $x_i^*$  as above.

In the coordinate system  $(U_i, \phi_i; \{x^1, x^2\})$ , we write  $\tilde{x}_{i,k} = \phi_i^{-1}(x_{i,k})$ ,  $\tilde{u}_k(x) = u_k(\phi_i^{-1}(x))$ ,  $\tilde{\tau}_k(x) = \tau_k(\phi_i^{-1}(x))$  and  $\tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k(x)) = f_k(\phi_i^{-1}(x), u_k(\phi_i^{-1}(x)))$  for any  $x \in \Omega$ . Moreover for  $0 < s < t < \delta$  we define the spherical mean of  $\tilde{u}_k$ , the total energy and the neck energy of  $\tilde{u}_k$  around  $\tilde{x}_{i,k}$  by

$$\varphi_k(t) = \varphi_k^{(i)}(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi t} \int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_t(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \tilde{u}_k d\sigma, \quad (5.2)$$

$$\Lambda_k(t) = \Lambda_k^{(i)}(t) = \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \tilde{u}_k \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k) dx, \quad (5.3)$$

and

$$N_k(s, t) = N_k^{(i)}(s, t) = \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\tilde{x}_{i,k}) \setminus \mathbb{B}_s(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \tilde{u}_k \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k) dx \quad (5.4)$$

respectively. We say that the property  $(\mathcal{H}_\ell)$  holds if there exist sequences

$$s_k^{(0)} = 0 < r_k^{(1)} < s_k^{(1)} < \dots < r_k^{(\ell)} < s_k^{(\ell)} = o(1)$$

such that the following hypotheses are satisfied:

- $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,1})$   $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} r_k^{(j)} / s_k^{(j)} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s_k^{(j-1)} / r_k^{(j)} = 0$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ ;
- $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,2})$   $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_k(s_k^{(j)}) / \varphi_k(Lr_k^{(j)}) = 0$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq \ell$  and all  $L > 0$ ;
- $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,3})$   $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_k(s_k^{(j)}) = 4\pi j$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ ;
- $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,4})$   $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (N_k(s_k^{(j-1)}, r_k^{(j)} / L) + N_k(Lr_k^{(j)}, s_k^{(j)})) = 0$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ .

To prove Proposition 5.1, we follow the lines of [8, 10, 13]. Precisely we use induction as follows:  $(\mathcal{H}_1)$  holds; if  $(\mathcal{H}_\ell)$  holds, then either  $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell+1})$  holds, or

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, \delta / L) = 0. \quad (5.5)$$

In view of (5.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_k(s_k^{(\ell)}) &= \int_{\mathbb{B}_{s_k^{(\ell)}}(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \tilde{u}_k(x) \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k(x)) dx \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \int_{\mathbb{B}_{s_k^{(\ell)}}(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \tilde{u}_k(x) \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k(x)) e^{\psi_k(x)} dx \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \int_{\phi_i^{-1}(\mathbb{B}_{s_k^{(\ell)}}(\tilde{x}_{i,k}))} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g \\ &\leq (1 + o(1)) \int_{\Sigma} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (2.3) and  $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,3})$  implies that the induction terminates after finitely-many steps. Letting  $\ell_0$  be the largest integer such that  $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell_0})$  holds. Since  $\tilde{x}_{i,k} \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , in view of the last assertion of Proposition 3.1, for any fixed  $L > 2/\delta$ ,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{u}_k - \tilde{u}_\infty\|_{C^1(\Omega \setminus \mathbb{B}_{\delta/L}(\tilde{x}_{i,k}))} = 0. \quad (5.6)$$

Moreover it follows from  $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell_0,3})$  and (5.5) (with  $\ell$  replaced by  $\ell_0$ ) that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\phi_i^{-1}(\mathbb{B}_{\delta/L}(\tilde{x}_{i,k}))} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{\delta/L}(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \tilde{u}_k \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k) dx = 4\pi \ell_0. \quad (5.7)$$

Recalling equation (1.2), we obtain (5.1) by combining (5.6) and (5.7) with  $I^{(i)} = \ell_0$ , and thus complete the proof of Proposition 5.1.

The proof of the above induction process will be divided into the two steps below.

*Step 1. The property  $(\mathcal{H}_1)$  holds.*

For any function  $h : \Omega = \phi_i(U_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , denote the spherical average of  $h$  around  $\tilde{x}_{i,k}$  by

$$\bar{h}(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi r} \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_r(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} h d\sigma, \quad \forall 0 < r < \delta.$$

Let  $w_k$  be the unscaled function with respect to the blow-up sequence  $\eta_{i,k}$  as in (3.4), namely

$$w_k(x) = u_k(x_{i,k})(\tilde{u}_k(x) - u_k(x_{i,k})), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

The decay estimate on  $\bar{w}_k$  near the point  $\tilde{x}_{i,k}$  is crucial for the property  $(\mathcal{H}_1)$ . Precisely we have the following result.

**Lemma 5.2** *Given  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ . Let  $T_k$  be the smallest number such that  $\varphi_k(T_k) = \epsilon u_k(x_{i,k})$ . Then  $r_{i,k}/T_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $r_{i,k}$  is as in (3.3). Moreover, for any  $b < 2$ , there exist some integer  $k_0$  and a constant  $C$  such that when  $k \geq k_0$ , we have*

$$\bar{w}_k(r) \leq b \log \frac{r_{i,k}}{r} + C \quad (5.8)$$

for all  $0 \leq r \leq T_k$  and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_k(T_k) = 4\pi. \quad (5.9)$$

*Proof.* It follows from Proposition 3.1 and the definition of  $T_k$  that  $r_{i,k} = o(T_k)$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . In view of (1.2),  $\tilde{u}_k$  satisfies the equation

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{u}_k = e^{\psi_i} (\tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k) - \tilde{\tau}_k \tilde{u}_k) \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (5.10)$$

Let  $(v_k)$  be a sequence of solutions to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k = e^{\psi_i} \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k) & \text{on } \mathbb{B}_{T_k}(\tilde{x}_{i,k}) \\ v_k = \tilde{u}_k & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{B}_{T_k}(\tilde{x}_{i,k}). \end{cases} \quad (5.11)$$

Then we have by (5.10)

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} (v_k - \tilde{u}_k) = e^{\psi_i} \tilde{\tau}_k \tilde{u}_k & \text{on } \mathbb{B}_{T_k}(\tilde{x}_{i,k}) \\ v_k - \tilde{u}_k = 0 & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{B}_{T_k}(\tilde{x}_{i,k}). \end{cases} \quad (5.12)$$

Applying elliptic estimates to (5.12), we can find some constant  $C$  independent of  $k$  such that

$$|v_k(x) - \tilde{u}_k(x)| \leq C \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{B}_{T_k}(\tilde{x}_{i,k}).$$

Moreover, it follows from Proposition 4.1 that

$$\inf_{\partial \mathbb{B}_{T_k}(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \tilde{u}_k \geq \varphi_k(T_k) - C \quad (5.13)$$

for some constant  $C$  depending only on the Riemannian metric  $g$ . Applying the maximum principle to (5.11), we have by (5.13)

$$\widetilde{u}_k(x) \geq \varphi_k(T_k) - C \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{B}_{T_k}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}). \quad (5.14)$$

Note that  $\varphi_k(T_k) = \epsilon u_k(x_{i,k})$ . For any  $0 \leq t \leq T_k$ , we have by (5.14) and the fact that  $u_k \rightarrow u_\infty$  strongly in  $L^2(\Sigma)$

$$u_k(x_{i,k}) \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i \widetilde{\tau}_k \widetilde{u}_k} dx \leq \frac{\|\tau_k\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma)}}{\epsilon} \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i} (\widetilde{u}_k^2 + C \widetilde{u}_k) dx = o(1). \quad (5.15)$$

For any  $Lr_{i,k} \leq t \leq T_k$ , we obtain by Proposition 3.1

$$\begin{aligned} -u_k(x_{i,k}) \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i} \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k) dx &\leq -u_k(x_{i,k}) \int_{\mathbb{B}_{Lr_{i,k}}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i} \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k) dx \\ &= -r_{i,k}^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{Lr_{i,k}}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i} \frac{\widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k)}{f_k(x_{i,k}, u_k(x_{i,k}))} dx \\ &= -(1 + o(1)) \int_{\mathbb{B}_L(0)} e^{(2+o(1))\eta_\infty} dx \\ &= -4\pi + o(1), \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

where  $o(1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  first, and then  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . In view of (5.10),  $\overline{w}_k$  satisfies

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \overline{w}_k = u_k(x_{i,k}) \overline{e^{\psi_i} \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k)} - u_k(x_{i,k}) \overline{e^{\psi_i} \widetilde{\tau}_k \widetilde{u}_k}.$$

Then we have for any  $Lr_{i,k} \leq t \leq T_k$

$$\begin{aligned} 2\pi t \overline{w}'_k(t) &= \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \partial_\nu \overline{w}_k d\sigma = \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \overline{w}_k dx \\ &= -u_k(x_{i,k}) \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \overline{e^{\psi_i} \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k)} dx + u_k(x_{i,k}) \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \overline{e^{\psi_i} \widetilde{\tau}_k \widetilde{u}_k} dx \\ &= -u_k(x_{i,k}) \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i} \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k) dx + u_k(x_{i,k}) \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i} \widetilde{\tau}_k \widetilde{u}_k dx \\ &\leq -4\pi + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used (5.15) and (5.16) in the last inequality. Thus for any  $b < 2$ , there exists some integer  $k_0$  such that

$$\overline{w}'_k(t) \leq -\frac{b}{t} \text{ for all } k \geq k_0.$$

This together with Proposition 3.1 leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{w}_k(t) &\leq \overline{w}_k(Lr_{i,k}) - b \log \frac{t}{Lr_{i,k}} \\ &\leq \log \frac{1}{1+L^2} - b \log \frac{t}{Lr_{i,k}} + o(1) \\ &\leq b \log \frac{r_{i,k}}{t} + C \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C$ , all  $k \geq k_0$ , and all  $Lr_{i,j} \leq t \leq T_k$ . It follows from Proposition 3.1 again that the above inequality also holds for  $0 \leq t \leq Lr_{i,k}$ . Hence (5.8) holds.

By (5.8) and (5.14) we have

$$(\epsilon - 1)u_k^2(x_{i,k}) - Cu_k(x_{i,k}) \leq \bar{w}_k(r) \leq C, \quad \forall r \in [Lr_{i,k}, T_k].$$

Hence there holds for  $Lr_{i,k} \leq r \leq T_k$

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_k^2(r) - u_k^2(x_{i,k}) &= \left(1 + \frac{\varphi_k(r)}{u_k(x_{i,k})}\right) \bar{w}_k(r) \\ &= \left(2 + \frac{\bar{w}_k}{u_k^2(x_{i,k})}\right) \bar{w}_k(r) \\ &\leq (1 + \epsilon + o(1))\bar{w}_k(r) + (1 - \epsilon + o(1))C \\ &\leq (1 + 2\epsilon/3)b \log \frac{r_{i,k}}{r} + C, \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

provided that  $k$  is sufficiently large. For  $0 < r < \delta$  we denote

$$\theta_k(r) = \theta_k^{(i)}(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi r} \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_r(\bar{x}_{i,k})} \tilde{f}_k(x, \varphi_k(r)) d\sigma. \quad (5.18)$$

Taking  $b$  such that  $(1 + 2\epsilon/3)b = 2 + \epsilon$  in (5.17) and recalling (H4) and (H5), we can find some constant  $C$  such that for  $Lr_{i,k} \leq r \leq T_k$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\theta_k(r)}{f_k(x_{i,k}, u_k(x_{i,k}))} &= \frac{\theta_k(r)}{\tilde{f}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k}, \varphi_k(r))} \frac{\tilde{f}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k}, \varphi_k(r))}{f_k(x_{i,k}, u_k(x_{i,k}))} \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{f_k(x_{i,k}, \varphi_k(r))}{f_k(x_{i,k}, u_k(x_{i,k}))} \\ &= (1 + o(1)) e^{(1+o(1))(\varphi_k^2(r) - u_k^2(x_{i,k}))} \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{r_{i,k}}{r}\right)^{2+\epsilon} \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

for sufficiently large  $k$ . For  $0 < s < t < \delta$ , we define next a function analogous to (5.4) as below.

$$\bar{N}_k(s, t) = \bar{N}_k^{(i)}(s, t) = 2\pi \int_s^t r \varphi_k(r) \theta_k(r) dr. \quad (5.20)$$

In view of (5.8) and (5.19), we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{N}_k(Lr_{i,k}, T_k) &= 2\pi \int_{Lr_{i,k}}^{T_k} r \varphi_k(r) \theta_k(r) dr \\ &= 2\pi r_{i,k}^{-2} \int_{Lr_{i,k}}^{T_k} r \frac{\varphi_k(r)}{u_k(x_{i,k})} \frac{\theta_k(r)}{f_k(x_{i,k}, u_k(x_{i,k}))} dr \\ &\leq 2\pi(1 + o(1)) Cr_{i,k}^\epsilon \int_{Lr_{i,k}}^{T_k} \frac{1}{r^{1+\epsilon}} dr \\ &\leq 2\pi(1 + o(1)) C \epsilon^{-1} L^{-\epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \overline{N}_k(Lr_{i,k}, T_k) = 0. \quad (5.21)$$

Since Proposition 4.1 implies that

$$u_k^2(x) - \varphi_k^2(r) \leq C \quad \text{for all } x \in \partial \mathbb{B}_r(\tilde{x}_{i,k}),$$

there holds

$$N_k(Lr_{i,k}, T_k) \leq C \overline{N}_k(Lr_{i,k}, T_k) + o(1).$$

This together with (5.21) leads to

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k(Lr_{i,k}, T_k) = 0. \quad (5.22)$$

By Proposition 3.1,

$$\Lambda_k(Lr_{i,k}) = \int_{\mathbb{B}_{Lr_{i,k}}(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \tilde{u}_k \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k) dx = (1 + o(1)) \int_{\mathbb{B}_L(0)} e^{2\eta_\infty} dx.$$

Hence

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_k(Lr_{i,k}) = 4\pi. \quad (5.23)$$

Thus (5.9) follows immediately from (5.22) and (5.23).  $\square$

By Lemma 5.2 we may choose a subsequence  $u_k$ , numbers  $\epsilon_k \searrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and  $s_k = T_k(\epsilon_k)$  with  $r_{i,k}/s_k \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\varphi_k(s_k) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_k(s_k) = 4\pi, \quad \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k(Lr_{i,k}, s_k) = 0,$$

while in addition

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi_k(s_k)}{\varphi_k(Lr_{i,k})} = 0, \quad \forall L > 0.$$

Let  $r_k^{(1)} = r_{i,k}$ ,  $s_k^{(1)} = s_k$ . Then  $(\mathcal{H}_1)$  holds and Step 1 is finished.

*Step 2. Suppose that  $(\mathcal{H}_\ell)$  already holds for some integer  $\ell \geq 1$ , namely there exist sequences  $s_k^{(0)} = 0 < r_k^{(1)} < s_k^{(1)} < \dots < r_k^{(\ell)} < s_k^{(\ell)} = o(1)$  such that  $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,1})$  up to  $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,4})$  hold. Then we shall prove that either  $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, \delta/L) = 0$  or  $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell+1})$  holds.*

Setting

$$P_k(t) = P_k^{(i)}(t) = t \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_t} \tilde{u}_k \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k) d\sigma, \quad \overline{P}_k(t) = \overline{P}_k^{(i)}(t) = 2\pi t^2 \varphi_k(t) \theta_k(t) \quad (5.24)$$

and assuming  $(\mathcal{H}_\ell)$  holds, we have the following result.

**Lemma 5.3** *There exists a constant  $C_0$  depending only on the upper bound of the total energy (2.3) and the Riemannian metric  $g$  such that for  $s_k^{(\ell)} \leq t_k = o(1)$ , there holds*

$$\overline{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k) \leq \overline{P}_k(t_k) + C_0 \overline{N}_k^2(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k) + o(1), \quad (5.25)$$

where  $o(1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\bar{N}_k$  and  $\bar{P}_k$  are defined as in (5.20) and (5.24) respectively.

*Proof.* We first claim that there exists a constant  $C$  depending only on  $\delta$  and the Riemannian metric  $g$  such that

$$\varphi_k(s) \leq \sup_{\partial \mathbb{B}_s(\bar{x}_{i,k})} \tilde{u}_k \leq \inf_{\partial \mathbb{B}_r(\bar{x}_{i,k})} \tilde{u}_k + C \leq \varphi_k(r) + C \quad \text{for all } 0 < r < s \leq \delta. \quad (5.26)$$

To see the last inequality, we set  $v_k$  be a positive solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k = e^{\psi_i} \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k) & \text{in } \mathbb{B}_\delta(\bar{x}_{i,k}) \\ v_k = \tilde{u}_k & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{B}_\delta(\bar{x}_{i,k}). \end{cases} \quad (5.27)$$

Thus we have by (1.2)

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}(v_k - \tilde{u}_k) = e^{\psi_i} \tilde{\tau}_k \tilde{u}_k & \text{in } \mathbb{B}_\delta(\bar{x}_{i,k}) \\ v_k - \tilde{u}_k = 0 & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{B}_\delta(\bar{x}_{i,k}). \end{cases} \quad (5.28)$$

Noting that  $\|e^{\psi_i} \tilde{\tau}_k \tilde{u}_k\|_{L^p(\mathbb{B}_\delta(\bar{x}_{i,k}))}$  is bounded for any  $p > 1$  and applying elliptic regularity estimates to (5.28), we then find some constant  $C = C(\delta)$  such that

$$v_k(x) - C \leq \tilde{u}_k(x) \leq v_k(x) + C \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{B}_\delta(\bar{x}_{i,k}). \quad (5.29)$$

By (5.27), we have for  $0 < r < \delta$

$$-(r\bar{v}'_k(r))' = \overline{r e^{\psi_i} \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k)}.$$

Integration from 0 to  $r$  gives

$$-r\bar{v}'_k(r) = \int_0^r \overline{r e^{\psi_i} \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k)} dr.$$

Hence

$$\bar{v}'_k(r) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } 0 < r < \delta. \quad (5.30)$$

Now fix  $0 < r < s \leq \delta$ . There exist two points  $\xi \in \partial \mathbb{B}_r(\bar{x}_{i,k})$  and  $\zeta \in \partial \mathbb{B}_s(\bar{x}_{i,k})$  such that

$$v_k(\xi) = \bar{v}_k(r), \quad v_k(\zeta) = \bar{v}_k(s).$$

This together with the gradient estimate (Proposition 4.1), (5.29), and (5.30) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\partial \mathbb{B}_s(\bar{x}_{i,k})} \tilde{u}_k &\leq \tilde{u}_k(\zeta) + C \leq v_k(\zeta) + C \\ &\leq v_k(\xi) + C \leq \inf_{\partial \mathbb{B}_r(\bar{x}_{i,k})} \tilde{u}_k + C. \end{aligned}$$

This confirms our claim (5.26).

Next we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \theta'_k(r) &= \frac{d}{dr} \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \tilde{f}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k}^1 + r \cos \theta, \bar{x}_{i,k}^2 + r \sin \theta, \varphi_k(r)) d\theta \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \nabla_x \tilde{f}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k}^1 + r \cos \theta, \bar{x}_{i,k}^2 + r \sin \theta, \varphi_k(r)) \cdot (\cos \theta, \sin \theta) d\theta \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \tilde{f}'_k(\bar{x}_{i,k}^1 + r \cos \theta, \bar{x}_{i,k}^2 + r \sin \theta, \varphi_k(r)) \varphi'_k(r) d\theta, \end{aligned}$$



where we write  $\tilde{x}_{i,k} = (\tilde{x}_{i,k}^1, \tilde{x}_{i,k}^2)$ . In view of (H4), we obtain

$$|\theta'_k(r)| \leq C \left( 1 + \theta_k(r) + \varphi_k(r) |\varphi'_k(r)| \theta_k(r) \right). \quad (5.31)$$

For  $s = s_k^{(\ell)} \leq t \leq t_k$ , we have by equation (1.2).

$$\begin{aligned} -2\pi t \varphi'_k(t) &= - \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_t(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \partial_\nu \varphi_k d\sigma = - \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi_k dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \overline{e^{\psi_i} \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k)} dx - \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \overline{e^{\psi_i} \tilde{\tau}_k \tilde{u}_k} dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i} \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k) dx - \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i} \tilde{\tau}_k \tilde{u}_k dx. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (H4), (H5) and Proposition 4.1 that  $\tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k) \leq C(1 + \tilde{f}_k(x, \varphi_k(r))) \leq C(1 + \theta_k(r))$ , where  $r = |x - \tilde{x}_{i,k}|$ . Combining (H4), (H5) and (5.26), we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_s(\tilde{x}_k)} \varphi_k(s) \theta_k(r) dx \leq C(1 + \Lambda_k(s)),$$

where we used  $r = |x - \tilde{x}_{i,k}|$ . Note that  $\varphi_k(s) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -2\pi t \varphi'_k(t) &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} (1 + \theta_k(r)) dx \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\tilde{x}_{i,k}) \setminus \mathbb{B}_s(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \theta_k(r) dx + \frac{C}{\varphi_k(s)} \int_{\mathbb{B}_s(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(s) \theta_k(r) dx + o(1) \\ &\leq C \bar{N}_k(s, t) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

This immediately leads to

$$-\pi \int_s^t r^2 \varphi'_k(r) \theta_k(r) dr \leq C \bar{N}_k^2(s, t) + o(1). \quad (5.32)$$

Similarly we have

$$\begin{aligned} -2\pi t \varphi_k(t) \varphi'_k(t) &= - \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_t(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(t) \partial_\nu \varphi_k d\sigma = - \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(t) \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi_k dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(t) \overline{e^{\psi_i} \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k)} dx - \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(t) \overline{e^{\psi_i} \tilde{\tau}_k \tilde{u}_k} dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\tilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(t) e^{\psi_i} \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k) dx + o(1), \end{aligned} \quad (5.33)$$

where the last equality follows from (5.26) and  $u_k \rightarrow u_\infty$  strongly in  $L^2(\Sigma)$ . Repeatedly using

(5.26), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\bar{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(t) \overline{e^{\psi_i} \widetilde{f}_k(x, \bar{u}_k)} dx &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\bar{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(t) (1 + \theta_k(r)) dx \\
&\leq C \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\bar{x}_{i,k}) \setminus \mathbb{B}_s(\bar{x}_{i,k})} (1 + \varphi_k(r)) (1 + \theta_k(r)) dx \\
&\quad + C \int_{\mathbb{B}_s(\bar{x}_{i,k}) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{L_k^{(\ell)}}(\bar{x}_{i,k})} (1 + \varphi_k(r)) (1 + \theta_k(r)) dx \\
&\quad + C \int_{\mathbb{B}_{L_k^{(\ell)}}(\bar{x}_{i,k})} (1 + \varphi_k(s)) (1 + \theta_k(r)) dx \\
&\leq C \left( \bar{N}_k(s, t) + \bar{N}_k(L_k^{(\ell)}, s) + \frac{\varphi_k(s)}{\varphi_k(L_k^{(\ell)})} (\Lambda_k(L_k^{(\ell)}) + o(1)) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This together with (5.33),  $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,2})$  and  $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,4})$  implies

$$2\pi t \varphi_k(t) |\varphi'_k(t)| \leq C \bar{N}_k(s, t) + o(1). \quad (5.34)$$

Obviously

$$\int_s^t r^2 \varphi_k(r) dr = o(1), \quad \int_s^t r^2 \varphi_k(r) \theta_k(r) dr = o(1).$$

It then follows from (5.31) and (5.34) that

$$\begin{aligned}
-\pi \int_s^t r^2 \varphi_k(r) \theta'_k(r) dr &\leq \pi C \int_s^t r^2 \varphi_k^2(r) |\varphi'_k(r)| \theta_k(r) dr + o(1) \\
&\leq C \bar{N}_k^2(s, t) + o(1).
\end{aligned} \quad (5.35)$$

Integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{N}_k(s, t) &= \int_s^t 2\pi r \varphi_k(r) \theta_k(r) dr \\
&\leq \pi t^2 \varphi_k(t) \theta_k(t) - \pi \int_s^t r^2 \varphi'_k(r) \theta_k(r) dr - \pi \int_s^t r^2 \varphi_k(r) \theta'_k(r) dr.
\end{aligned}$$

This together with (5.32) and (5.35) implies (5.25).  $\square$

**Lemma 5.4** *Let  $C_0$  be the constant as in Lemma 5.3. Let  $t_k$  be such that for a subsequence*

$$s_k^{(\ell)} < t_k = o(1), \quad 0 < \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k) = \alpha < \frac{1}{2C_0}.$$

*Then  $s_k^{(\ell)} = o(t_k)$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{P}_k(t_k) \geq \alpha/2$ , and*

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k/L) = 0, \quad (5.36)$$

*where  $\bar{N}_k$  and  $\bar{P}_k$  are as defined in (5.20) and (5.24) respectively.*

*Proof.* We first claim that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, Ls_k^{(\ell)}) = 0. \quad (5.37)$$

Actually, in view of (5.26), we have for  $0 < t \leq t_k$

$$\bar{P}_k(t) \leq C\bar{N}_k(t/2, t) + o(1) \leq C\bar{P}_k(t/2) + o(1), \quad (5.38)$$

and

$$\bar{N}_k(t, 2t) \leq C\bar{N}_k(t/2, t) + o(1).$$

In particular, for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{N}_k(2^{j-1}s_k^{(\ell)}, 2^j s_k^{(\ell)}) &\leq C \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{N}_k(2^{j-2}s_k^{(\ell)}, 2^{j-1}s_k^{(\ell)}) \\ &\leq C^j \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}/2, s_k^{(\ell)}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

If  $L \leq 2^j$ , we obtain

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, Ls_k^{(\ell)}) \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{m=1}^j \bar{N}_k(2^{m-1}s_k^{(\ell)}, 2^m s_k^{(\ell)}) = 0.$$

Thus our claim (5.37) follows immediately. One can see from (5.37) that  $s_k^{(\ell)}/t_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . By Lemma 5.3,

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{P}_k(t_k) \geq \frac{1}{2} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k) = \frac{\alpha}{2}. \quad (5.39)$$

Now we show (5.36). Assuming the contrary, there holds

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k/L) = \beta > 0.$$

Then we have for any fixed  $L \geq 1$  and all sufficiently large  $k$

$$\frac{\beta}{2} \leq \bar{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k/L) \leq \bar{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k) < \frac{1}{2C_0}.$$

Applying (5.25) with  $t_k/L$  instead of  $t_k$ , we get

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{P}_k(t_k/L) \geq \frac{\beta}{4},$$

and then by (5.38)

$$C \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{N}_k(t_k/(2L), t_k/L) \geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{P}_k(t_k/L) \geq \frac{\beta}{4}.$$

Choosing  $L = 2^m$ ,  $m = 0, 1, \dots, j-1$ , we have

$$\frac{j\beta}{4} \leq C \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{N}_k(2^{-j}t_k, t_k) \leq C(1 + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_k(t_k)) \leq C.$$

We get a contradiction by letting  $j \rightarrow \infty$  and obtain (5.36).  $\square$

**Lemma 5.5** *Suppose that*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{s_k^{(\ell)} < t < t_k} \bar{P}_k(t) = 0 \quad \text{for any sequence } t_k \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.40)$$

*Then we have*

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, \delta/L) = 0.$$

*Proof.* In view of Lemma 5.4, it suffices to prove

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{s_k^{(\ell)} < t < \delta/L} \bar{P}_k(t) = 0. \quad (5.41)$$

Indeed, if we take some number  $t_{k,L} \in (s_k^{(\ell)}, \delta/L)$  such that

$$\bar{P}_k(t_{k,L}) = \sup_{s_k^{(\ell)} < t < \delta/L} \bar{P}_k(t),$$

then either

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_{k,L} = 0, \quad (5.42)$$

or

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_{k,L} = t_L^* > 0. \quad (5.43)$$

In case of (5.42), we already have (5.41) because of (5.40). While in case of (5.43), we have by using (5.26)

$$\bar{P}_k(t_{k,L}) \leq C t_{k,L}^2 (1 + \varphi_k(t_L^*/2) \theta_k(t_L^*/2)) \quad (5.44)$$

for sufficiently large  $k$ . Note that  $\partial \mathbb{B}_{t_L^*/2}(\tilde{x}_{i,k}) \subset \mathbb{B}_{t_L^*}(\tilde{x}_i^*) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{t_L^*/3}(\tilde{x}_i^*)$  for sufficiently large  $k$ , and that  $t_{k,L} \leq \delta/L \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  first and then  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, by Proposition 3.1, we have  $u_k \rightarrow u_\infty$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^1(\Sigma \setminus \cup_{j=1}^N \{x_j^*\}, \mathbb{R})$  and  $u_\infty \in C^1(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$ . In particular,  $u_\infty$  is bounded on  $\mathbb{B}_\delta(x_i^*)$ . It then follows from (5.44) that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{P}_k(t_{k,L}) = 0.$$

Thus (5.41) holds again.  $\square$

If the assumption (5.40) is not satisfied, then (5.38) implies that there exists a sequence  $t_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k) > 0. \quad (5.45)$$

We shall show that the property  $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell+1})$  holds. Take  $r_k^{(\ell+1)} \in (s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k)$  such that up to a subsequence, there holds

$$0 < \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, r_k^{(\ell+1)}) < \frac{1}{2C_0},$$

where  $C_0$  is as in Lemma 5.3. It then follows from Lemma 5.4 that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s_k^{(\ell)}}{r_k^{(\ell+1)}} = 0, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, r_k^{(\ell+1)}) > 0, \quad (5.46)$$

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{P}_k(r_k^{(\ell+1)}) > 0, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell+1)}) = \infty, \quad (5.47)$$

and that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, r_k^{(\ell+1)})/L = 0. \quad (5.48)$$

Moreover, we have the following result.

**Lemma 5.6** *Up to a subsequence there holds*

$$\eta_k^{(\ell+1)}(x) := \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell+1)}) \left( \bar{u}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k} + r_k^{(\ell+1)}x) - \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell+1)}) \right) \rightarrow \eta^{(\ell+1)}(x)$$

in  $C_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\})$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , where

$$\eta^{(\ell+1)}(x) = \log \frac{2}{\sqrt{\alpha_0}(1 + |x|^2)}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta^{(\ell+1)}} dx = \frac{4\pi}{\alpha_0}$$

for some constant  $\alpha_0 > 0$ .

*Proof.* To simplify the notations we write  $r_k = r_k^{(\ell+1)}$ ,  $\eta_k = \eta_k^{(\ell+1)}$ , and  $\eta = \eta^{(\ell+1)}$ . For any fixed  $L > 0$ , we set

$$v_k(x) = \bar{u}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k} + r_k x), \quad x \in \mathbb{B}_L(0) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0). \quad (5.49)$$

In view of Proposition 4.1, there exists some constant  $C = C(L)$  such that

$$|\bar{u}_k^2(\bar{x}_{i,k} + r_k x) - \varphi_k^2(r_k)| \leq C,$$

and thus

$$|\varphi_k(r_k) (\bar{u}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k} + r_k x) - \varphi_k(r_k))| \leq C. \quad (5.50)$$

Hence

$$\eta_k \text{ is bounded in } L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}). \quad (5.51)$$

Combining (5.47) and (5.50), we have

$$v_k - \varphi_k(r_k) \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}) \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

in particular

$$\frac{v_k}{\varphi_k(r_k)} \rightarrow 1 \text{ in } L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}) \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.52)$$

By the equation (1.2), we write for  $x \in \Omega_k = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \bar{x}_{i,k} + r_k x \in \mathbb{B}_\delta(0)\}$

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_k(x) = e^{\psi_i(\bar{x}_{i,k} + r_k x)} \varphi_k(r_k) r_k^2 \tilde{f}(\bar{x}_{i,k} + r_k x, v_k(x)) - e^{\psi_i(\bar{x}_{i,k} + r_k x)} \varphi_k(r_k) r_k^2 \tilde{\tau}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k} + r_k x) v_k(x). \quad (5.53)$$

Since  $u_k \rightarrow u_\infty$  strongly in  $L^2(\Sigma)$ , we have by using (5.52)

$$\begin{aligned} r_k^2 \varphi_k^2(r_k) &= \frac{r_k^2}{3\pi} \int_{\mathbb{B}_2(0) \setminus \mathbb{B}_1(0)} \varphi_k^2(r_k) dx \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{r_k^2}{3\pi} \int_{\mathbb{B}_2(0) \setminus \mathbb{B}_1(0)} v_k^2(x) dx \\ &= \frac{1 + o(1)}{3\pi} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{2r_k}(\bar{x}_{i,k}) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{r_k}(\bar{x}_{i,k})} \bar{u}_k^2(y) dy \\ &\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (5.54)$$

By (5.47) we may assume

$$r_k^2 \varphi_k^2(r_k) \theta_k(r_k) \rightarrow \alpha_0 > 0. \quad (5.55)$$

Moreover, by (H4) and (H5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_k x, v_k(x))}{\theta_k(r_k)} &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_k x, v_k(x))}{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_k x, \varphi_k(r_k))} \\ &= (1 + o(1)) e^{(1+o(1))(v_k^2(x) - \varphi_k^2(r_k))} \\ &= (1 + o(1)) e^{(2+o(1))\eta_k(x)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.56)$$

Applying elliptic estimates to (5.53), we conclude from (5.51), (5.54)–(5.56) that

$$\eta_k \rightarrow \eta \quad \text{in } C_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5.57)$$

where  $\eta$  satisfies

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta = \alpha_0 e^{2\eta} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}. \quad (5.58)$$

For any  $L > 0$ , (5.57) together with (2.3), (5.52) and (5.55) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{B}_L(0) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} e^{2\eta} dx &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_L(0) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} e^{2\eta_k} dx \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_L(0) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \frac{v_k(x) \widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_k x, v_k(x))}{\varphi_k(r_k) \theta_k(r_k)} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha_0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{Lr_k}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{r_k/L}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{u}_k(y) \widetilde{f}_k(y, \widetilde{u}_k(y)) dy \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\alpha_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta} dx < \infty.$$

It follows from (5.26),  $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,2})$  and  $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,4})$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{s_k^{(\ell)}}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(r_k) \widetilde{f}_k(y, \widetilde{u}_k(y)) dy &\leq \int_{\mathbb{B}_{s_k^{(\ell)}}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{Lr_k^{(\ell)}}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(r) \widetilde{f}_k(y, \widetilde{u}_k(y)) dy \\ &\quad + \frac{\varphi_k(s_k^{(\ell)})}{\varphi_k(Lr_k^{(\ell)})} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{Lr_k^{(\ell)}}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(r) \widetilde{f}_k(y, \widetilde{u}_k(y)) dy + o(1) \\ &\leq N_k(Lr_k^{(\ell)}, s_k^{(\ell)}) + \frac{\varphi_k(s_k^{(\ell)})}{\varphi_k(Lr_k^{(\ell)})} \Lambda_k(Lr_k^{(\ell)}) + o(1) \\ &\rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  first then  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , that

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_{r_k/L}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(r_k) \widetilde{f}_k(y, \widetilde{u}_k(y)) dy \leq N_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, r_k/L) + o(1) \rightarrow 0$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  first, then  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , and that

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_{r_k/L}(\bar{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(r_k) \widetilde{u}_k(y) dy \leq \int_{\mathbb{B}_{r_k/L}(\bar{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{u}_k^2(y) dy + o(1) \rightarrow 0$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} -\Delta \eta_k dx \right| &\leq \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{r_k/L}(\bar{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(r_k) \widetilde{f}_k(y, \widetilde{u}_k(y)) dy \\ &\quad + \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{r_k/L}(\bar{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(r_k) \widetilde{\tau}_k(y) \widetilde{u}_k(y) dy \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.59}$$

Let  $\zeta_k$  be a sequence of solution to the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \zeta_k(x) = e^{\psi_i(\bar{x}_{i,k} + r_k x)} \varphi_k(r_k) r_k^2 \widetilde{f}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k} + r_k x, v_k(x)) & \text{in } \mathbb{B}_1(0) \\ \zeta_k = \eta_k & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{B}_1(0). \end{cases} \tag{5.60}$$

Then in view of (5.53),  $\eta_k - \zeta_k$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} (\eta_k - \zeta_k)(x) = -e^{\psi_i(\bar{x}_{i,k} + r_k x)} \varphi_k(r_k) r_k^2 \widetilde{\tau}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k} + r_k x) v_k(x) & \text{in } \mathbb{B}_1(0) \\ \eta_k - \zeta_k = 0 & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{B}_1(0). \end{cases} \tag{5.61}$$

Since  $u_k$  is bounded in  $L^p(\Sigma)$  for any  $p > 1$ , applying elliptic estimates to (5.61), we get

$$\|\eta_k - \zeta_k\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{B}_1(0))} \leq C$$

for some constant  $C$ . By (5.57),  $\eta_k$  is uniformly bounded on  $\partial \mathbb{B}_1(0)$ . In view of (5.60), the maximum principle implies that there exists some constant  $C$  such that

$$\zeta_k(x) \geq -C \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{B}_1(0).$$

Hence

$$\eta_k(x) \geq -C \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{B}_1(0). \tag{5.62}$$

By (5.26),  $\varphi_k(r_k) \leq v_k(x) + C$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)$  and  $L > 1$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_k(r_k) r_k^2 \widetilde{f}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k} + r_k x, v_k(x)) &= \varphi_k(r_k) r_k^2 \theta_k(r_k) \frac{\widetilde{f}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k} + r_k x, v_k(x))}{\theta_k(r_k)} \\ &= (\alpha_0 + o(1)) e^{(1+o(1))(v_k^2(x) - \varphi_k^2(r_k))}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.63}$$

Using the inequality  $a^2 - b^2 \geq 2b(a-b)$ ,  $a, b \geq 0$ , we get  $v_k^2(x) - \varphi_k^2(r_k) \geq 2\eta_k(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{B}_1(0)$ . Then (5.63) leads to

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} e^{\eta_k} dx \leq \frac{2}{\alpha_0} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \varphi_k(r_k) r_k^2 \widetilde{f}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k} + r_k x, v_k(x)) dx \tag{5.64}$$

for sufficiently large  $k$ . Combining (5.53), (5.59), (5.62) and (5.64), we obtain

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \eta_k dx = 0. \tag{5.65}$$

For any  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ , integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta \Delta \varphi dx &= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \eta \Delta \varphi dx \\ &= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \left( - \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \eta \partial_\nu \varphi d\sigma + \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \varphi \partial_\nu \eta d\sigma + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \varphi \Delta \eta dx \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.66)$$

It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \eta \partial_\nu \varphi d\sigma &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \eta_k \partial_\nu \varphi d\sigma \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \eta_k \Delta \varphi dx + \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \nabla \eta_k \nabla \varphi dx \right) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \eta_k \Delta \varphi dx + \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \varphi \partial_\nu \eta_k d\sigma - \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \varphi \Delta \eta_k dx \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.67)$$

Moreover, by Proposition 4.1 and (5.26), there exists some constant  $C$  such that

$$|\nabla \eta_k(x)| = \varphi_k(r_k) r_k |\nabla u_k(\tilde{x}_{i,k} + r_k x)| \leq C/|x|$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)$ . This together with (5.59) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \varphi \partial_\nu \eta_k d\sigma &= \varphi(0) \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \partial_\nu \eta_k d\sigma \\ &= \varphi(0) \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \Delta \eta_k dx \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \varphi \partial_\nu \eta d\sigma = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \varphi \partial_\nu \eta_k d\sigma = 0. \quad (5.68)$$

Inserting (5.58), (5.59), (5.65), (5.67) and (5.68) into (5.66), we obtain

$$- \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta \Delta \varphi dx = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \alpha_0 e^{2\eta} \varphi dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \alpha_0 e^{2\eta} \varphi dx.$$

Therefore  $\eta$  is a distributional solution to the equation

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta = \alpha_0 e^{2\eta} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2.$$

By the regularity theory for elliptic equations, see for example ([4], Chapter 2),  $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ . By a result of Chen-Li [5],

$$\eta(x) = \log \frac{2}{1 + |x|^2} - \log \sqrt{\alpha_0},$$

and thus

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta} dx = \frac{4\pi}{\alpha_0}.$$



This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

It follows from Lemma 5.6 that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k(r_k^{(\ell+1)}/L, Lr_k^{(\ell+1)}) = \alpha_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta^{(\ell+1)}} dx = 4\pi.$$

This together with (5.48) gives

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, Lr_k^{(\ell+1)}) = 4\pi.$$

By the inductive hypothesis ( $\mathcal{H}_{\ell,3}$ ),

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_k(Lr_k^{(\ell+1)}) &= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\Lambda_k(s_k^{(\ell)}) + N_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, Lr_k^{(\ell+1)})) \\ &= 4\pi(\ell + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Now we set  $w_k^{(\ell+1)}(x) = \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell+1)})(\widetilde{u}_k(x) - \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell+1)}))$ . Similar to Lemma 5.2, we have

**Lemma 5.7** *For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , let  $T_k^{(\ell+1)} = T_k^{(\ell+1)}(\epsilon) > r_k^{(\ell+1)}$  be the minimal number such that  $\varphi_k(T_k^{(\ell+1)}) = \epsilon\varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell+1)})$ . Then  $r_k^{(\ell+1)}/T_k^{(\ell+1)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, for any  $b < 2$  and sufficiently large  $k, L$ , there holds*

$$\overline{w_k^{(\ell+1)}}(r) \leq b \log \frac{r_k^{(\ell+1)}}{r} + C \quad \text{for all } Lr_k^{(\ell+1)} \leq r \leq T_k^{(\ell+1)},$$

where  $C$  is a constant depending only on  $\alpha_0$  and  $(\Sigma, g)$ , and we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, T_k^{(\ell+1)}) = 4\pi.$$

*Proof.* Since the proof is completely analogous to that of Lemma 4.2, except that instead of Proposition 3.1 we shall use Lemma 5.6, the details are omitted here.  $\square$

For suitable  $s_k^{(\ell+1)} = T_k^{(\ell+1)}(\epsilon_k)$ , where  $\epsilon_k \searrow 0$  is chosen such that  $u_k(s_k^{(\ell+1)}) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and  $r_k^{(\ell+1)}/s_k^{(\ell+1)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_k(s_k^{(\ell+1)}) = 4\pi(\ell + 1),$$

and

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k(Lr_k^{(\ell+1)}, s_k^{(\ell+1)}) = 0.$$

By the definition of  $s_k^{(\ell+1)}$ ,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi_k(s_k^{(\ell+1)})}{\varphi_k(Lr_k^{(\ell+1)})} = 0 \quad \text{for any } L > 0.$$

Hence ( $\mathcal{H}_{\ell+1}$ ) holds. This completes Step 2, and thus the proof of Proposition 5.1.

## 5.2. Quantization for non-simple blow-up points

In this subsection, we shall prove a quantization result for non-simple blow-up points. We assume that  $x_i^*$  is a non-simple blow-up point of order  $m$ , namely there exists a subset  $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$  such that  $d_g(x_i^*, x_\ell^*) = 0$  for all  $\ell \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$  and  $d_g(x_j^*, x_i^*) > 0$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ . In particular,  $i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ . Take an isothermal coordinate system  $(U, \phi; \{x^1, x^2\})$  near  $x_i^*$ , where  $U \subset \Sigma$  is a neighborhood of  $x_i^*$  such that  $x_j^* \notin \bar{U}$ , the closure of  $U$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ ,  $\phi : U \rightarrow \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is a diffeomorphism with  $\phi(x_i^*) = (0, 0)$ . We can find some  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{B}_{2\delta}(0) \subset \Omega$ . In this coordinate system, the metric  $g = e^\psi(dx^1{}^2 + dx^2{}^2)$  for some smooth function  $\psi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\psi(0, 0) = 0$ . We shall prove the following result.

**Proposition 5.8** *Let  $u_k, u_\infty, \tau_k, \tau_\infty, x_{i,k}$  and  $x_i^*$  be as in Proposition 3.1. Suppose that  $x_i^*$  is a non-simple blow-up point of order  $m$  as above. Then up to a subsequence, there exists some positive integer  $I$  such that*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_U (|\nabla_g u_k|^2 + \tau_k u_k^2) dv_g = \int_U (|\nabla_g u_\infty|^2 + \tau_\infty u_\infty^2) dv_g + 4\pi I, \quad (5.69)$$

where  $U$  is a neighborhood of  $x_i^*$  chosen as above.

Similarly as before we denote  $\tilde{x}_{j,k} = \phi(x_{j,k})$  for  $j \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ ,  $\tilde{u}_k = u_k \circ \phi^{-1}$ ,  $\tilde{\tau}_k = \tau_k \circ \phi^{-1}$ , and  $\tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k(x)) = f(\phi^{-1}(x), u_k(\phi^{-1}(x)))$ . Let  $\varphi_k = \varphi_k^{(i)}$ ,  $\Lambda_k = \Lambda_k^{(i)}$  and  $N_k = N_k^{(i)}$  be as defined in (5.2), (5.3) and (5.4) respectively. The proof of Proposition 5.8 will be divided into several steps below.

*Step 1. Blow-up analysis at the scale  $o(\rho_k)$ , where*

$$\rho_k = \rho_k^{(i)} = \frac{1}{2} \inf_{j \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \setminus \{i\}} |\tilde{x}_{j,k} - \tilde{x}_{i,k}|.$$

By Proposition 3.1 we have  $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_k(Lr_{i,k}) = 4\pi$ . Let  $r_k^{(1)} = r_{i,k}$ . We distinguish the following two cases to proceed.

**Case 1** *there exists some  $0 < \epsilon_0 < 1$  such that for all  $t \in [r_k^{(1)}, \rho_k]$  there holds  $\varphi_k(t) \geq \epsilon_0 \varphi_k(r_k^{(1)})$ ;*

**Case 2** *for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a minimal  $T_k = T_k(\epsilon) \in [r_k^{(1)}, \rho_k]$  such that  $\varphi_k(T_k) = \epsilon \varphi_k(r_k^{(1)})$ .*

In Case 1, the decay estimate that we established in Lemma 5.2 remains valid on  $[r_k^{(1)}, \rho_k]$ . Moreover

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_k(s_k) = 4\pi$$

for any sequence  $s_k$  satisfying  $s_k/\rho_k \rightarrow 0$  and  $s_k/r_k^{(1)} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . The concentration analysis at scales up to  $o(\rho_k)$  is complete.

In Case 2, as before we can find numbers  $s_k^{(1)} < \rho_k$  with  $\varphi_k(s_k^{(1)}) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\Lambda_k(s_k^{(1)}) \rightarrow 4\pi$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $\varphi_k(s_k^{(1)})/\varphi_k(Lr_k^{(1)}) \rightarrow 0$  for any  $L \geq 1$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . We proceed by iteration up to some maximal index  $\ell_0 \geq 1$  where either Case 1 or (5.40) holds with final radii  $r_k^{(\ell_0)}, s_k^{(\ell_0)}$ , respectively. Hence

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_k(s_k^{(\ell_0)}) = 4\pi \ell_0, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_k(s_k^{(\ell_0)})/\varphi_k(Lr_k^{(\ell_0)}) = 0, \quad \forall L \geq 1 \quad (5.70)$$

and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell_0)}, t_k) = 0 \text{ for any sequence } t_k = o(\rho_k). \quad (5.71)$$

This leads to

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell_0)}, \rho_k/L) = 0. \quad (5.72)$$

For otherwise, we can find some  $\mu_0 > 0$  such that up to a subsequence

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell_0)}, \rho_k) \geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell_0)}, \rho_k/L) \geq \mu_0$$

for all  $L \geq 1$ . Take  $t'_k \in (s_k^{(\ell_0)}, \rho_k)$  such that

$$0 < \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell_0)}, t'_k) < \frac{1}{2C_0}, \quad (5.73)$$

where  $C_0$  is a constant as in Lemma 5.3. Then by Lemma 5.4 we have

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell_0)}, t'_k/L) = 0.$$

In view of (5.71) and (5.73), there exists some  $\nu_0 > 0$  such that up to a subsequence,  $t'_k \geq \nu_0 \rho_k$  for all  $k$ . This immediately implies (5.72) and completes Step 1.

To proceed, we introduce several terminologies concerning the classification of blow-up points near  $x_i^*$ . Define a set

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^{(i)} = \{x_{i_1, k}, \dots, x_{i_m, k}\},$$

where each  $x_{j, k}$ ,  $j \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ , denotes a sequence  $(x_{j, k})$ . In the sequel we do not distinguish sequences  $(x_{j, k})$  and points  $x_{j, k}$ . Let  $t_k > 0$  be a bounded sequence. For any  $j \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ , we define a  $t_k$ -equivalent class associated to the sequence  $x_{j, k}$  by

$$[x_{j, k}]_{t_k} := \{x_{\ell, k} : d_g(x_{\ell, k}, x_{j, k}) = o(t_k), \ell \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}\}.$$

The total number of sequences in  $[x_{j, k}]_{t_k}$  is called the order of  $[x_{j, k}]_{t_k}$ . In particular, the order of  $[x_{j, k}]_{\rho_k^{(j)}}$  is exactly one, while the order of  $[x_{j, k}]_{\delta}$  is  $m$ . Actually we have  $[x_{j, k}]_{\delta} = \mathcal{X}$ . Moreover, if  $x_{\ell, k} \in [x_{j, k}]_{t_k}$ , then  $x_{j, k} \in [x_{\ell, k}]_{t_k}$ . Also, if  $[x_{j, k}]_{t_k} \cap [x_{\ell, k}]_{t_k} \neq \emptyset$ , then  $[x_{j, k}]_{t_k} = [x_{\ell, k}]_{t_k}$ . Hence every subset of  $\mathcal{X}$  can be divided into several  $t_k$ -equivalent classes, any two of which have no intersection.

For any  $1 \leq \ell < m$ , we say that the property  $(\mathcal{A}_\ell)$  holds for some  $t_k$ -equivalent class  $[x_{j, k}]_{t_k}$  of order  $\ell$ , if either (a) there exist  $r_k > 0$  and integer  $I^{(j)}$  such that for some  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  and all  $t \in [r_k, t_k]$  there holds  $\varphi_k^{(j)}(t) \geq \epsilon_0 \varphi_k^{(j)}(r_k)$ ,  $\Lambda_k^{(j)}(Lr_k) \rightarrow 4\pi I^{(j)}$  and  $N_k^{(j)}(Lr_k, t_k/L) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  first, and then  $L \rightarrow \infty$ ; or (b) there exist sequences  $r_k < s_k < t_k$  and an integer  $I^{(j)}$  such that  $\varphi_k^{(j)}(s_k)/\varphi_k^{(j)}(Lr_k) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  for any  $L \geq 1$ ,  $\Lambda_k^{(j)}(t_k/L) \rightarrow 4\pi I^{(j)}$  and  $N_k^{(j)}(s_k, t_k/L) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  first, and then  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . While we say that the property  $(\mathcal{A}_m)$  holds, if there exists some  $j \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$  and integer  $I^{(j)}$  such that  $\Lambda_k^{(j)}(\delta/L) \rightarrow 4\pi I^{(j)}$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  first, and then  $L \rightarrow \infty$ .

According to Proposition 5.1, when  $m = 1$ ,  $(\mathcal{A}_1)$  holds. When  $m > 1$ , we let  $\rho_{k,0} = \rho_k$  and  $\rho_{k,j}$  ( $1 \leq j \leq m-1$ ) be defined as in (5.88) and (5.92) below. It follows from Step 1 that  $(\mathcal{A}_1)$  holds for any  $t_k$ -equivalent class of order one, where

$$t_k \in \{\rho_{k,0}, \dots, \rho_{k,m-1}\}. \quad (5.74)$$

We now we make an induction procedure on both orders of  $t_k$ -equivalent class and  $m$ . Suppose that for some integer  $\nu \geq 1$ , when  $m = \nu$ , the property  $(\mathcal{A}_\nu)$  holds; while when  $m > \nu$ , the property  $(\mathcal{A}_\ell)$  holds for any  $t_k$ -equivalent class of order  $1 \leq \ell \leq \nu$ , where  $t_k$  is as in (5.74). We shall prove the following: When  $m = \nu + 1$ , the property  $(\mathcal{A}_{\nu+1})$  holds; When  $m > \nu + 1$ , the property  $(\mathcal{A}_\ell)$  holds for any  $t_k$ -equivalent class of order  $1 \leq \ell \leq \nu + 1$ , where  $t_k$  is as in (5.74). Assuming this induction argument is complete, we conclude that  $(\mathcal{A}_m)$  holds for any integer  $m$ . It is easy to see that (5.69) follows immediately from  $(\mathcal{A}_m)$  and the fact that  $u_k \rightarrow u_\infty$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^1(\Sigma \setminus \{x_1^*, \dots, x_i^*\})$ .

In the next two steps, we shall prove that  $(\mathcal{A}_m)$  holds for  $m = \nu + 1$ . In Step 4, we shall prove that  $(\mathcal{A}_\ell)$  holds for any  $t_k$ -equivalent class of order  $1 \leq \ell \leq \nu + 1$ , where  $t_k$  is as in (5.74).

*Step 2. Blow-up analysis at the scale  $\rho_k$ .*

Let  $m = \nu + 1$ . Now we turn to carry out blow-up analysis at the scale  $\rho_k$  near  $\tilde{x}_{i,k}$ . We first assume that for some  $L \geq 1$  there exists some sequence  $(x_k)$  such that  $\rho_k/L \leq R_k(x_k) \leq |x_k - \tilde{x}_{i,k}| \leq L\rho_k$  and

$$|x_k - \tilde{x}_{i,k}|^2 \tilde{u}_k(x_k) \tilde{f}_k(x_k, \tilde{u}_k(x_k)) \geq \nu_0 > 0. \quad (5.75)$$

By Proposition 4.1 we may assume that  $|x_k - \tilde{x}_{i,k}| = \rho_k$ . The following estimate is important for our subsequent analysis.

**Lemma 5.9** *Assuming (5.75), we have  $\varphi_k(\rho_k)/\varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof.* If we suppose that there exists some  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  such that  $\varphi_k(\rho_k) \geq \epsilon_0 \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)})$ , then we set

$$w_k(x) = \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)}) (\tilde{u}_k(x) - \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)})), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

Similar to Lemma 5.2, there holds for any  $b < 2$

$$\bar{w}_k(r) \leq b \log \frac{r_k^{(\ell_0)}}{r} + C \quad (5.76)$$

for all  $r \in [r_k^{(\ell_0)}, \rho_k]$ . Let  $\theta_k$  be as defined in (5.18). By (H5) and (iii) of Proposition 3.1, we find some uniform constant  $C$  such that

$$r_k^{(\ell_0)} \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)}) \theta_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)}) \leq C. \quad (5.77)$$

Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |x_k - \tilde{x}_{i,k}|^2 u_k(x_k) \tilde{f}_k(x_k, \tilde{u}_k(x_k)) &\leq C \rho_k^2 \varphi_k(\rho_k) \theta_k(\rho_k) \\ &= C (r_k^{(\ell_0)})^2 \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)}) \theta_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)}) \left( \frac{\rho_k}{r_k^{(\ell_0)}} \right)^2 \frac{\varphi_k(\rho_k)}{\varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)})} \frac{\theta_k(\rho_k)}{\theta_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)})} \\ &\leq C \left( \rho_k / r_k^{(\ell_0)} \right)^2 e^{(1+o(1))(\varphi_k^2(\rho_k) - \varphi_k^2(r_k^{(\ell_0)}))} \\ &\leq C \left( \rho_k / r_k^{(\ell_0)} \right)^2 e^{(1+o(1))(1+\epsilon_0) \bar{w}_k(\rho_k)} \\ &\leq C \left( \rho_k / r_k^{(\ell_0)} \right)^{2-(1+o(1))(1+\epsilon_0)b} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned} \quad (5.78)$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , if we choose  $b < 2$  such that  $(1 + \epsilon_0)b > 2$ . Here the first inequality follows from Proposition 4.1, the second one follows from (H4), (H5) and (5.77), while the third one is a consequence of our assumption  $\varphi_k(\rho_k) \geq \epsilon_0 \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)})$ , and the last one is implied by (5.76). The contradiction between (5.78) and (5.75) ends the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

Lemma 5.9 implies that for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $T_k \in [r_k^{(\ell_0)}, \rho_k]$  such that  $\varphi_k(T_k) = \epsilon \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)})$ . Hence at scales up to order  $o(\rho_k)$  we end up with (5.40), where  $\ell$  is replaced by  $\ell_0$ . The desired quantization result at the scale  $\rho_k$  then is a consequence of the following result.

**Lemma 5.10** *Assuming (5.75), then up to a subsequence we can find some  $\alpha_0 \geq \nu_0$  such that*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |x_k - \tilde{x}_{i,k}|^2 \tilde{u}_k(x_k) \tilde{f}_k(x_k, \tilde{u}_k(x_k)) = \alpha_0. \quad (5.79)$$

Moreover there exist a finite set  $\mathcal{S}_\infty \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  such that

$$\eta_k(x) = \tilde{u}_k(x_k) (\tilde{u}_k(\tilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x) - \tilde{u}_k(x_k)) \rightarrow \eta(x) = \log \frac{2}{\sqrt{\alpha_0}(1 + |x|^2)}$$

in  $C_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_\infty)$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* It is obvious that (5.79) holds for some  $\alpha_0 \geq \nu_0 > 0$ . Define

$$v_k(y) = \tilde{u}_k(\tilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k y)$$

for  $y \in \Omega_k = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \tilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k y \in \Omega\}$ . Let

$$y_{j,k} = \frac{\tilde{x}_{j,k} - \tilde{x}_{i,k}}{\rho_k}$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}_k = \mathcal{S}_k^{(i)} = \{y_{j,k} : j = i_1, \dots, i_{\nu+1}\}.$$

Without loss of generality we assume either  $|y_{j,k}| \rightarrow \infty$  or  $y_{j,k} \rightarrow y_j$ ,  $j = i_1, \dots, i_{\nu+1}$ , and we let  $\mathcal{S}_\infty = \mathcal{S}_\infty^{(i)}$  be the set of accumulation points of  $\mathcal{S}_k$ . Also we let

$$y_{0,k} = \frac{x_k - \tilde{x}_{i,k}}{\rho_k}$$

be the scaled points of  $x_k$  for which (5.75) holds and which satisfy  $|y_{0,k}| = 1$ . Moreover we can assume  $y_{0,k} \rightarrow y_0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

Since  $\tilde{u}_k(x_k) \rightarrow \infty$  by (5.75) and  $\mathcal{S}_\infty$  is a finite set, we have by using Proposition 4.1 and a standard covering argument that

$$v_k - \tilde{u}_k(x_k) \rightarrow 0 \text{ locally uniformly on } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_\infty \quad (5.80)$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Using the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 5.6, we obtain

$$\eta_k \rightarrow \eta \text{ in } C_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_\infty),$$

where  $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_\infty)$  satisfies the equation

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta = \alpha_0 e^{2\eta} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_\infty.$$

It follows from (5.80) that  $v_k/\tilde{u}_k(x_k) \rightarrow 1$  locally uniformly on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_\infty$ . For any  $L \geq 1$  we write

$$K_L = \mathbb{B}_L(0) \setminus (\cup_{y_j \in \mathcal{S}_\infty} \mathbb{B}_{\delta/L}(y_j)).$$

Combining (H4), (H5), (2.3) and (5.80), we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta} dx &\leq \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{K_L} \frac{v_k(x)}{\tilde{u}_k(x_k)} e^{(1+o(1))\eta_k(1+\frac{v_k(x)}{\tilde{u}_k(x_k)})} dx \\ &= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{K_L} \frac{\tilde{u}_k(\tilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x) \tilde{f}_k(\tilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x, \tilde{u}_k(\tilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x))}{\tilde{u}_k(x_k) \tilde{f}_k(x_k, \tilde{u}_k(x_k))} dx \\ &\leq \frac{C}{v_0} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Sigma} u_k f_k(x, u_k) d\nu_g \leq \frac{C}{v_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $y_{j,k} \rightarrow y_j$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we can take sufficiently large  $L$  and  $k$  such that  $\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j) \subset \mathbb{B}_{2/L}(y_{j,k})$  and  $\mathbb{B}_{2/L}(y_{j,k}) \cap \mathbb{B}_{2/L}(y_{\alpha,k}) = \emptyset$  for any  $\alpha \neq j$ . Moreover let  $\ell$  be the order of the  $\rho_k$ -equivalent class  $[x_{j,k}]_{\rho_k}$ . Clearly  $\ell \leq \nu$ . By our inductive assumption,  $(\mathcal{A}_\ell)$  holds for  $[x_{j,k}]_{\rho_k}$ . Noting that Lemma 5.9 excludes the possibility of Case 1 with  $r_k^{(1)}$  replaced by  $r_k^{(\ell_0)}$ , we can find sequences  $r_k^{(j)} < s_k^{(j)}$  such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_k(s_k^{(j)})/\varphi_k(Lr_k^{(j)}) = 0, \quad \forall L \geq 1. \quad (5.81)$$

and

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k^{(j)}(s_k^{(j)}, \rho_k/L) = 0, \quad (5.82)$$

Note again that  $y_{j,k} \rightarrow y_j$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . There exists some constant  $C$ , which may depends on  $|y_j|$  but not on  $k$ , such that  $|\tilde{x}_{j,k} - \tilde{x}_{i,k}| \leq C\rho_k$ . For any  $x_{\alpha,k} \notin [x_{j,k}]_{\rho_k}$ , we can take some large  $L_0$  such that  $|\tilde{x}_{j,k} - \tilde{x}_{\alpha,k}| \geq \rho_k/(2L_0)$  for all sufficiently large  $k$ . Recalling that  $|x_k - \tilde{x}_{i,k}| = \rho_k$  and applying Proposition 4.1, we obtain

$$\tilde{u}_k(x_k) \leq \inf_{\partial \mathbb{B}_{2\rho_k/L_0}(\tilde{x}_{j,k})} \tilde{u}_k + C$$

for some uniform constant  $C$ . As in the proof of Lemma 5.2, we can find another uniform constant  $C$  such that for all  $x \in \mathbb{B}_{2\rho_k/L_0}(\tilde{x}_{j,k})$

$$\tilde{u}_k(x) \geq \inf_{\partial \mathbb{B}_{2\rho_k/L_0}(\tilde{x}_{j,k})} \tilde{u}_k - C.$$

These two estimates immediately imply the existence of some uniform constant  $C$  such that

$$\tilde{u}_k(x_k) \leq \tilde{u}_k(x) + C \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{B}_{2\rho_k/L}(\tilde{x}_{j,k}), \quad (5.83)$$

provided that  $L \geq L_0$ . Note that  $g = e^\psi(dx^{1^2} + dx^{2^2})$  for some smooth function  $\psi$  with  $\psi(0,0) = 0$ .

By the equation (1.2), we have for large  $L$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)} |\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_k| dx &\leq \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)} \rho_k^2 \bar{u}_k(x_k) \bar{f}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x, v_k(x)) e^{\psi(\bar{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x)} dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)} \rho_k^2 \bar{u}_k(x_k) \bar{\tau}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x) v_k(x) e^{\psi(\bar{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x)} dx \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{B}_{2/L}(y_{j,k})} \rho_k^2 \bar{u}_k(x_k) \bar{f}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x, v_k(x)) e^{\psi(\bar{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x)} dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{B}_{2/L}(y_{j,k})} \rho_k^2 \bar{u}_k(x_k) \bar{\tau}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x) v_k(x) e^{\psi(\bar{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x)} dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{B}_{2\rho_k/L}(\bar{x}_{j,k})} \bar{u}_k(x_k) (\bar{f}_k(y, \bar{u}_k(y)) + \bar{\tau}_k(y) \bar{u}_k(y)) e^{\psi(y)} dy.
\end{aligned}$$

With the help of (5.81)-(5.83) and an obvious analogy to (5.26), we obtain

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)} |\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_k| dx = 0,$$

analogous to (5.59). In the same way of proving (5.65) we get

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)} \eta_k dx = 0.$$

In view of (5.83), we can find some uniform constant  $C$  such that for all  $y \in \partial \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)$

$$\bar{u}_k(x_k) / \bar{u}_k(\bar{x}_{j,k} + \rho_k y) \leq C,$$

which together with Proposition 4.1 leads to

$$|y - y_{j,k}| |\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_k(y)| = |\bar{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x - \bar{x}_{j,k}| \bar{u}_k(x_k) |\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} \bar{u}_k(\bar{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x)| \leq C.$$

This gives

$$|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_k(y)| \leq \frac{C}{|y - y_j|}$$

for all  $y \in \partial \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)$ , provided that  $k$  is sufficiently large. Then we obtain an analogy to (5.68), namely, for any  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)} \varphi \partial_\nu \eta d\sigma = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)} \eta \partial_\nu \varphi d\sigma = 0.$$

This excludes  $y_j$  as a singular point of  $\eta$  as in Lemma 5.6. Since  $y_j$  is any point of  $\mathcal{S}_\infty$ , we conclude that  $\eta$  is a smooth solution to the equation

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta = \alpha_0 e^{2\eta} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2.$$

The remaining part of the conclusions of the lemma follows from a result of Chen-Li [5].  $\square$

Define a set

$$A_{L,k} = \{x \in \Omega : \rho_k/L \leq R_k(x) \leq |x - \tilde{x}_{i,k}| \leq L\rho_k\}. \quad (5.84)$$

It follows from Proposition 4.1 that  $u_k(x)/\tilde{u}_k(x_k) \rightarrow 1$  uniformly in  $A_{L,k}$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus by Lemma 5.10, in case of (5.75) there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A_{L,k}} \tilde{u}_k(x) \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k(x)) dx &= \alpha_0 \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A_{L,k}} \frac{\tilde{u}_k(x) \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k(x))}{\tilde{u}_k(x_k) \tilde{f}_k(x_k, \tilde{u}_k(x_k))} dx \\ &= \alpha_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta(x)} dx \\ &= \alpha_0 \frac{4\pi}{\alpha_0} = 4\pi. \end{aligned} \quad (5.85)$$

Let

$$X_{k,1} = X_{k,1}^{(i)} = \{\tilde{x}_{j,k} : \exists C > 0 \text{ such that } |\tilde{x}_{j,k} - \tilde{x}_{i,k}| \leq C\rho_k \text{ for all } k\}. \quad (5.86)$$

We can divide  $X_{k,1}$  into several  $\rho_k$ -equivalent classes with their orders no more than  $\nu$ . Recalling our inductive assumption  $(\mathcal{A}_\ell)$  with  $1 \leq \ell \leq \nu$  and using (5.85), we can find some integer  $I$  such that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_k(L\rho_k) = 4\pi(1 + I).$$

On the other hand, if (5.75) does not hold, we have

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A_{L,k}} \tilde{u}_k \tilde{f}_k(x, \tilde{u}_k) dx = 0. \quad (5.87)$$

The energy estimate at the scale  $\rho_k$  again is finished.

*Step 3. Blow-up analysis at scales exceeding  $\rho_k$ .*

Now we deal with blow-up analysis at scales exceeding  $\rho_k$  near  $\tilde{x}_{i,k}$ . Write

$$X_{k,0} = \{\tilde{x}_{i_1,k}, \dots, \tilde{x}_{i_m,k}\}.$$

Recalling (5.86), we let

$$\rho_{k,1} = \rho_{k,1}^{(i)} = \begin{cases} \inf_{\tilde{x}_{j,k} \in X_{k,0} \setminus X_{k,1}} \frac{|\tilde{x}_{j,k} - \tilde{x}_{i,k}|}{2} & \text{if } X_{k,0} \setminus X_{k,1} \neq \emptyset \\ \delta, & \text{if } X_{k,0} \setminus X_{k,1} = \emptyset. \end{cases} \quad (5.88)$$

From this definition it follows that  $\rho_{k,1}/\rho_k \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Then, using the obvious analogy of Lemma 5.4, either we have

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k(L\rho_k, \rho_{k,1}/L) = 0,$$

and we iterate to the next scale; or there exist a sequence  $t_k$  such that  $t_k/\rho_k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $t_k/\rho_{k,1} \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and up to a subsequence such that

$$P_k(t_k) \geq \nu_0 > 0 \text{ for all large } k. \quad (5.89)$$

The argument then depends on whether (5.75) or (5.87) holds. In case of (5.75), as in Lemma 5.9, the bound (5.89) and Lemma 5.10 imply that  $\varphi_k(t_k)/\varphi_k(\rho_k) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Then we can



argue as in (5.40) for  $r \in [L\rho_k, \rho_{k,1}/L]$  for sufficiently large  $L$ , and we can continue as before to resolve concentrations in this range of scales.

In case of (5.87) we further need to distinguish whether (5.40) or Case 1 holds at the final stage of our analysis at scales  $o(\rho_k)$ . Recalling that in case of (5.40) we have (5.70) and (5.72), in view of (5.87) for a suitable sequence of numbers  $s_{k,1}^{(0)}$  such that  $s_{k,1}^{(0)}/\rho_k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $t_k/s_{k,1}^{(0)} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  we obtain

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( \Lambda_k(s_{k,1}^{(0)}) - \sum_{\tilde{x}_{j,k} \in \tilde{X}_{k,1}} \Lambda_k^{(j)}(Lr_k^{(\ell_0^{(j)})}) \right) = 0, \quad (5.90)$$

where  $\Lambda_k^{(j)}(r)$  and  $r_k^{(\ell_0^{(j)})}$  are computed as above with respect to the blow-up point  $x_{j,k}$  and  $\tilde{X}_{k,1}$  is the modular set containing all  $t_k$ -equivalent classes of  $X_{k,1}$ , whence the distance between any two points of  $\tilde{X}_{k,1}$  is greater than  $\tilde{\nu}\rho_k$  for some constant  $\tilde{\nu} > 0$ . In particular, with such a choice of  $s_{k,1}^{(0)}$  we find the immediate quantization result

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_k(s_{k,1}^{(0)}) = 4\pi I$$

for some positive integer  $I$ . Here again we use the inductive assumption that  $(\mathcal{A}_l)$  holds for all  $\rho_k$ -equivalent classes of order  $\ell$  with  $1 \leq \ell \leq \nu$ . While in Case 1 if we assume there is some  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  such that

$$\varphi_k(s_{k,1}^{(0)}) \geq \epsilon_0 \varphi_k(Lr_k^{(\ell_0^{(j)})}) \quad (5.91)$$

for all  $r \in [Lr_k^{(\ell_0^{(j)})}, s_{k,1}^{(0)}]$ , then as before we have

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k^{(j)}(Lr_k^{(\ell_0^{(j)})}, s_{k,1}^{(0)}) = 0.$$

This contradicts (5.90) since  $s_{k,1}^{(0)}/\rho_k \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and the modular set  $\tilde{X}_{k,1}$  has at least two elements. This implies that (5.91) does not hold and up to a subsequence there holds for any  $L \geq 1$

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi_k(s_{k,1}^{(0)})}{\varphi_k(Lr_k^{(\ell_0^{(j)})})} = 0$$

for all  $x_{j,k} \in \tilde{X}_{k,1}$  where Case 1 holds. Then we can continue to resolve concentrations on the range  $[s_{k,1}^{(0)}, \rho_{k,1}/L]$  as before.

We then proceed by iteration. For  $\ell \geq 2$  we inductively define the sets

$$X_{k,\ell} = X_{k,\ell}^{(i)} = \{ \tilde{x}_{j,k} : \exists C > 0 \text{ such that } |\tilde{x}_{j,k} - \tilde{x}_{i,k}| \leq C\rho_{k,\ell-1} \text{ for all } k \}$$

and let

$$\rho_{k,\ell} = \rho_{k,\ell}^{(i)} = \begin{cases} \inf_{\tilde{x}_{j,k} \in \tilde{X}_{k,0} \setminus X_{k,\ell}} \frac{|\tilde{x}_{j,k} - \tilde{x}_{i,k}|}{2} & \text{if } X_{k,0} \setminus X_{k,\ell} \neq \emptyset \\ \delta, & \text{if } X_{k,0} \setminus X_{k,\ell} = \emptyset. \end{cases} \quad (5.92)$$

Iteratively carrying out the above analysis at all scales  $\rho_{k,\ell}$ , exhausting all blow-up points  $x_{j,k}$ , up to a subsequence we obtain quantization result for  $X_{k,0}$ . Then Step 3 is finished.

It follows from Step 2 and Step 3 that there exists some integer  $I$  such that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_k(\delta/L) = 4\pi I, \quad (5.93)$$

different analogous to Lemma 5.5. Here and in the sequel,  $I$  may denote different integer. Hence the property  $(\mathcal{A}_m)$  holds when  $m = \nu + 1$ .

*Step 4.  $(\mathcal{A}_\ell)$  holds for  $1 \leq \ell \leq \nu + 1$  when  $m > \nu + 1$ .*

When  $m > \nu + 1$ , by our inductive assumption,  $(\mathcal{A}_\ell)$  holds for all  $1 \leq \ell \leq \nu$ , it suffices to prove that  $(\mathcal{A}_{\nu+1})$  holds for any  $t_k$ -equivalent class  $[x_{j,k}]_{t_k}$  of order  $\nu + 1$ , where  $j \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$  and  $t_k$  is as in (5.74). This is completely analogous to that  $(\mathcal{A}_m)$  holds in the case of  $m = \nu + 1$ , which we proved above, except that (5.93) is replaced by

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_k^{(j)}(t_k/L) = 4\pi I$$

for some integer  $I$ . We omit the details here. This ends Step 4.  $\square$

Proposition 5.8 follows from the property  $(\mathcal{A}_m)$  and the last assertion of Proposition 3.1.

## 6. Completion of the proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. Let  $x_{i,k} \rightarrow x_i^*$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , be as in Proposition 3.1. In view of possible non-simple blow-up points, without loss of generality, we may assume for some  $q \leq N$ ,  $x_1^*, \dots, x_q^*$  are different from each other and  $x_\ell^* \in \{x_1^*, \dots, x_q^*\}$  for any  $q + 1 \leq \ell \leq N$ . For any  $1 \leq i \leq q$ , we take an isothermal coordinate system  $(U_i, \phi_i; \{x^1, x^2\})$  near  $x_i^*$  such that  $\phi_i(x_i^*) = (0, 0)$  and  $U_i = \phi_i^{-1}(\mathbb{B}_\delta(0))$ , where  $\delta$  is chosen sufficiently small such that  $\bar{U}_i$  does not contain any  $x_j^*$  with  $j \in \{1, \dots, q\} \setminus \{i\}$ . It follows from Propositions 5.1 and 5.8 that for some integer  $I^{(i)}$  there holds

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\phi_i^{-1}(\mathbb{B}_{\delta/L}(0))} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g = 4\pi I^{(i)}.$$

By Proposition 3.1,  $u_k \rightarrow u_\infty$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^1(\Sigma \setminus \{x_1^*, \dots, x_q^*\})$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . hence

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Sigma \setminus \cup_{i=1}^q \phi_i^{-1}(\mathbb{B}_{\delta/L}(0))} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g = \int_{\Sigma} u_\infty f_k(x, u_\infty) dv_g.$$

Combining these two estimates, we obtain

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Sigma} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g = \int_{\Sigma} u_\infty f_k(x, u_\infty) dv_g + 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^q I^{(i)}.$$

This together with (1.2) leads to

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Sigma} (|\nabla_g u_k|^2 + \tau_k u_k^2) dv_g = \int_{\Sigma} (|\nabla_g u_\infty|^2 + \tau_\infty u_\infty^2) dv_g + 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^q I^{(i)}.$$

In view of (2.5), or particularly (2.4), we then have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} J_k(u_k) = J_\infty(u_\infty) + 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^q I^{(i)}.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.  $\square$

**Acknowledgements.** This work is supported by the NSFC 11171347. The author thanks the referee for his careful reading and valuable suggestions on the first version of this paper.

## References

- [1] Adimurthi, O. Druet, Blow-up analysis in dimension 2 and a sharp form of Trudinger-Moser inequality, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 29 (2004) 295-322.
- [2] Adimurthi, M. Struwe, Global compactness properties of semilinear elliptic equation with critical exponential growth, *J. Functional Analysis* 175 (2000) 125-167.
- [3] Adimurthi, Y. Yang, Multibubble analysis on  $N$ -Laplace equation in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 40 (2011) 1-14.
- [4] T. Aubin, *Nonlinear analysis on manifolds*, Springer, 1982.
- [5] W. Chen, C. Li, Classification of solutions of some nonlinear elliptic equations, *Duke Math. J.* 63 (1991) 615-622.
- [6] O. Druet, Multibumps analysis in dimension 2: quantification of blow-up levels, *Duke Math. J.* 132 (2006) 217-269.
- [7] L. Fontana, Sharp borderline Sobolev inequalities on compact Riemannian manifolds, *Comm. Math. Helv.* 68 (1993) 415-454.
- [8] T. Lamm, F. Robert, M. Struwe, The heat flow with a critical exponential nonlinearity, *J. Functional Analysis* 257 (2009) 2951-2998.
- [9] L. Martinazzi, A threshold phenomenon for embeddings of  $H_0^m$  into Orlicz spaces, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 36 (2009) 493-506.
- [10] L. Martinazzi, M. Struwe, Quantization for an elliptic equation of order  $2m$  with critical exponential non-linearity, *Math Z.* 270 (2012) 453-486.
- [11] J. Moser, A sharp form of an inequality by N. Trudinger, *Ind. Univ. Math. J.* 20 (1971) 1077-1091.
- [12] S. Pohozaev, The Sobolev embedding in the special case  $pl = n$ , *Proceedings of the technical scientific conference on advances of scientific research 1964-1965, Mathematics sections, 158-170, Moscov. Energet. Inst., Moscow, 1965.*
- [13] M. Struwe, Quantization for a fourth order equation with critical exponential growth, *Math. Z.* 256 (2007) 397-424.
- [14] N. Trudinger, On embeddings into Orlicz spaces and some applications, *J. Math. Mech.* 17 (1967) 473-484.
- [15] H. Wu, C. Shen, Y. Yu, *Introduction to Riemannian geometry*, Peking University Press, 1981.
- [16] Y. Yang, L. Zhao, A class of Adams-Fontana type inequalities and related functionals on manifolds, *Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl.* 17 (2010) 119-135.