

CLASSIFICATION OF BLOWUP LIMITS FOR $SU(3)$ SINGULAR TODA SYSTEMS

CHANG-SHOU LIN, JUNCHENG WEI, AND LEI ZHANG

ABSTRACT. For singular $SU(3)$ Toda systems, we prove that the limit of energy concentration is a finite set. In addition, for fully bubbling solutions we use Pohozaev identity to prove a uniform estimate. Our results extend previous results of Jost-Lin-Wang [27] on regular $SU(3)$ Toda systems.

1. INTRODUCTION

Systems of elliptic equations in two dimensional space with exponential nonlinearity are very commonly observed in Physics, Geometry, Chemistry and Biology. In this article we consider the following general system of equations defined in \mathbb{R}^2 :

$$(1.1) \quad \Delta u_i + \sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} h_j e^{u_j} = 4\pi \gamma_i \delta_0, \quad \text{in } B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \quad \text{for } i \in I,$$

where $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$, B_1 is the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^2 , h_1, \dots, h_n are smooth functions, $A = (a_{ij})_{n \times n}$ is a constant matrix, $\gamma_i > -1$, δ_0 is the Dirac mass at 0. If $n = 1$ and $a_{11} = 1$, the system (1.1) is reduced to a single Liouville equation, which has vast background in conformal geometry and Physics. The general system (1.1) is used for many models in different disciplines of science. If the coefficient matrix A is non-negative, symmetric and irreducible, (1.1) is called a Liouville system and is related to models in the theory of chemotaxis [19, 29], in the Physics of charged particle beams [7, 21, 30], and in the theory of semi-conductors [44], see [11, 20, 37] and the reference therein for more applications of Liouville systems. If A is the following Cartan matrix A_n :

$$A_n = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ -1 & 2 & -1 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 2 & & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \\ 0 & \dots & -1 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & \dots & & -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix},$$

the system (1.1) is called $SU(n+1)$ Toda system (which has n equations) and is related to the non-abelian gauge in Chern-Simons theory, see [23, 24, 25, 31, 32,

Date: December 2, 2018.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35J60, 35J55.

Key words and phrases. $SU(n+1)$ -Toda system, asymptotic analysis, a priori estimate, classification theorem, topological degree, blowup solutions.

41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 51, 52] and the references therein. There are also many works on the relationship between $SU(n+1)$ Toda systems and holomorphic curves in $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$, flat $SU(n+1)$ connection, complete integrability and harmonic sequences, see [8, 9, 10, 18, 22, 26, 32, 35] for references.

After decades of extensive study, many important questions related to the scalar Liouville equation are answered and the behavior of blowup solutions is well understood (see [3, 4, 5, 13, 14] for related discussions). However, the understanding of blowup solutions to the more general systems (1.1) is far from complete. In recent years, much progress has been made on more general systems and we only mention a few works related to the topic of the current article. First, Lin and Zhang [37, 38] completed a degree counting project for Liouville systems defined on Riemann surfaces. Second, for regular $SU(3)$ Toda systems (which have two equations), Jost-Lin-Wang [27] proved some uniform estimates for fully bubbling solutions (see section 4 for definition) using holonomy theory. Later Lin-Wei-Zhao [36] improved the estimate of Jost-Lin-Wang to the sharp form using the non-degeneracy of the global $SU(3)$ solutions, which is established in Lin-Wei-Ye [35] among other things.

In this article we mainly focus on the asymptotic behavior of blowup solutions of (1.1) and the weak limit of energy concentration for $SU(n+1)$ Toda system. More specifically, let $u^k = (u_1^k, \dots, u_n^k)$ be a sequence solutions

$$(1.2) \quad \Delta u_i^k + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} h_j^k e^{u_j^k} = 4\pi \gamma_i^k \delta_0, \quad \text{in } B_1, \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

with 0 being its only possible blowup point in B_1 :

$$(1.3) \quad \max_{K \subset \subset B_1 \setminus \{0\}} u_i^k \leq C(K).$$

Since the right hand side of (1.2) is a Dirac mass, we define the regular part of u_i^k to be

$$(1.4) \quad \tilde{u}_i^k(x) = u_i^k(x) - 2\gamma_i^k \log|x|, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad x \in B_1.$$

$u^k = (u_1^k, \dots, u_n^k)$ is called a *sequence of blowup solutions* if $\max_i \max_{x \in B_1} \tilde{u}_i^k \rightarrow \infty$.

We assume that $\gamma_i^k \rightarrow \gamma_i > -1$, h_1^k, \dots, h_n^k are positive smooth functions with a uniform bound on their C^3 norm:

$$(1.5) \quad \frac{1}{C} \leq h_i^k \leq C, \quad \|h_i^k\|_{C^3(B_1)} \leq C, \quad \text{in } B_1, \quad \gamma_i^k \rightarrow \gamma_i > -1, \quad \forall i \in I;$$

and we suppose that there is a uniform bound on the oscillation of u_i^k on ∂B_1 and its energy ($\int_{B_1} h_i^k e^{u_i^k}$ is called the energy of u_i^k):

$$(1.6) \quad |u_i^k(x) - u_i^k(y)| \leq C, \quad \forall x, y \in \partial B_1, \quad \int_{B_1} h_i^k e^{u_i^k} \leq C, \quad i \in I,$$

where C is independent of k .

Note that the oscillation finiteness assumption in (1.6) is natural and generally satisfied in most applications. The energy bound in (1.6) is also natural for system/equation defined in two dimensional space.

If $A = A_2$, system (1.2) describes $SU(3)$ with sources. Our first main theorem is concerned with the energy limits of solutions to singular $SU(3)$ Toda systems.

Given any $\delta > 0$, u^k has no blowup point in $B_1 \setminus B_\delta$ (in this article we use $B(x, r)$ to denote a ball centered at x with radius r and use B_r to denote $B(0, r)$). Thus we are interested in the following limit:

$$(1.7) \quad \sigma_i = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B_\delta} h_i^k e^{u_i^k}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Since for each $\delta > 0$, $\int_{B_\delta} h_i^k e^{u_i^k}$ is uniformly bounded, the $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}$ in (1.7) is understood as the limit of a subsequence of u^k . For convenience we don't distinguish u^k and its subsequences in this article.

Let

$$\mu_i = 1 + \gamma_i, \quad i = 1, 2$$

and

$$\Gamma = \{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) : \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \geq 0, \sigma_1^2 - \sigma_1\sigma_2 + \sigma_2^2 = 2\mu_1\sigma_1 + 2\mu_2\sigma_2\}$$

be a quadratic curve in the first quadrant. It is easy to see that Γ is contained in the box

$$\left[0, \frac{4}{3}\mu_1 + \frac{2}{3}\mu_2 + \frac{4}{3}\sqrt{\mu_1^2 + \mu_1\mu_2 + \mu_2^2}\right] \times \left[0, \frac{2}{3}\mu_1 + \frac{4}{3}\mu_2 + \frac{4}{3}\sqrt{\mu_1^2 + \mu_1\mu_2 + \mu_2^2}\right].$$

In Definition 1.1 below we shall define a finite set on Γ . In order to describe the mutual positions of points we say (c, d) is *in the upper right part of* (a, b) if $c \geq a$ and $d \geq b$.

Definition 1.1. *It is easy to verify that the following six points are on Γ :*

$$(0, 0), (2\mu_1, 0), (0, 2\mu_2), (2\mu_1, 2(\mu_1 + \mu_2)), \\ (2(\mu_1 + \mu_2), 2\mu_2), (2(\mu_1 + \mu_2), 2(\mu_1 + \mu_2)).$$

First we let the six points above belong to Σ , then we determine other points in Σ as follows: For $(a, b) \in \Sigma$ intersect Γ with $\sigma_1 = a + 2N$ and $\sigma_2 = b + 2N$ ($N = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) and add the point(s) of intersection to Σ that belong to the upper right part of (a, b) . For each new member $(c, d) \in \Sigma$ added by this process, we apply the same procedure based on (c, d) to obtain possible new members.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $A = A_2$, h_i^k and γ_i^k satisfy (1.5). Then for u^k satisfying (1.2), (1.3) and (1.6), we have $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \Sigma$, where σ_i is defined by (1.7) and Σ is defined as in Definition 1.1.*

Remark 1.1. *If $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0$, the system is the nonsingular $SU(3)$ Toda system. One sees easily that*

$$\Sigma = \{(0, 0), (2, 0), (0, 2), (2, 4), (4, 2), (4, 4)\}.$$

Indeed, when the procedure described in Definition 1.1 is applied to any of the six points in Σ , no extra point of intersection can be found. For example if we start from $(0, 0)$ and intersect Γ by lines $\sigma_1 = 2N$ (N being nonnegative integers). Then we see immediately that the intersection of Γ with $\sigma_1 = 2$ gives $(2, 0)$ and $(2, 4)$, which are already in Σ . The intersection with $\sigma_1 = 4$ gives $(4, 2)$ and $(4, 4)$,

which also belong to the six types in Σ . There is no intersection between Γ and $\sigma_1 = 6$. Theorem 1.1 in this special case was proved by Jost-Lin-Wang in [27]. A recent work of Pistoia-Musso-Wei [47] proved that all the six cases for nonsingular $SU(3)$ Toda systems can occur.

Remark 1.2. It is easy to observe that the maximum value of σ_1 on Γ is

$$\frac{4}{3}\mu_1 + \frac{2}{3}\mu_2 + \frac{4}{3}\sqrt{\mu_1^2 + \mu_1\mu_2 + \mu_2^2}.$$

The maximum value of σ_2 is

$$\frac{2}{3}\mu_1 + \frac{4}{3}\mu_2 + \frac{4}{3}\sqrt{\mu_1^2 + \mu_1\mu_2 + \mu_2^2}.$$

Thus Σ is a finite set. As two special cases, we see that

(1) If

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{4}{3}\mu_1 + \frac{2}{3}\mu_2 + \frac{4}{3}\sqrt{\mu_1^2 + \mu_1\mu_2 + \mu_2^2} < 2, \quad \text{and} \\ \frac{2}{3}\mu_1 + \frac{4}{3}\mu_2 + \frac{4}{3}\sqrt{\mu_1^2 + \mu_1\mu_2 + \mu_2^2} < 2. \end{aligned}$$

then there are only six points in Σ :

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma = \{ & (0, 0), (2\mu_1, 0), (0, 2\mu_2), (2(\mu_1 + \mu_2), 2\mu_2), \\ & (2\mu_1, 2(\mu_1 + \mu_2)), (2(\mu_1 + \mu_2), 2(\mu_1 + \mu_2)) \}. \end{aligned}$$

(2) For $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$, in addition to $(0, 0), (4, 0), (0, 4), (4, 8), (8, 4), (8, 8)$, Σ has other 14 points.

An earlier version of the current article was posted on arxiv.org in March 2013. After that some works have been done based on Theorem 1.1 (see [6] for example). Theorem 1.1 reflects some essential differences between Toda systems and Liouville systems. Lin-Wei-Ye [35] proved that all the global solutions of $SU(n+1)$ Toda systems can be described by $n^2 + 2n$ parameters and the energy of global solutions is a discrete set. On the other hand, the global solutions of Liouville systems all belong to a family of three parameters but their energy forms a $n - 1$ dimensional hyper-surface (see [20, 37]). These differences lead to very different approaches in their respective research. For example, Lin-Wei-Zhao [36] obtained sharp estimates for fully-bubbling solutions (see section 4 for definition) of $SU(3)$ Toda system using the discreteness of energy as a key ingredient in their proof.

Here we briefly describe the strategy to prove Theorem 1.1. First we introduce a selection process suitable for $SU(n+1)$ Toda systems. The selection process has been widely used for prescribing curvature type equations (see [34], [15], etc) and we modify it to locate the bubbling area, which is a union of finite disks. In each of the disks, the blowup solutions have roughly the energy of a global $SU(m+1)$ Toda system on \mathbb{R}^2 (with $m \leq n$), which is the limit of the blowup solutions after scaling. If $m = n$, which means no component is lost after scaling and taking the limit, we say the sequence of solutions in the disk is fully bubbling. Otherwise we call it partially bubbling. Next we introduce the concept ‘‘group’’

to place bubbling disks according to their mutual locations. There are only finite bubbling disks and their mutual distances may tend to 0 with very different speed. The name “group” is used to describe a few disks that are roughly closest to one another and much further from other disks. Lemma 2.1 is a Harnack type result that plays an important role in determining the energy concentration around a group. Suppose there is a circle that surrounds a group and both components of the blowup solutions have fast decay (see section three for definition) on the circle. Then a Pohozaev identity can be computed on this circle to determine how much energy this group carries. Because of Lemma 2.1 such a circle can always be found, so the energy within the circle can be determined. Then we consider the combination of groups by scaling. The relationship among groups is similar to that of members in a same group. For example if the distance between two groups is scaled to be 1, the bubbling disks of one group look like a Dirac mass from afar. We can similarly find circles surrounding groups that are also suitable for computing Pohozaev identities (i.e. both components of the blowup solutions have fast decay on these circles). From these Pohozaev identities we determine how much energy is contained in each group and all the combinations of groups. One important fact is that one component of the blowup solutions always has fast decay, even though the second component may not be the case. It is possible for the first (fast decay) component to turn to a slow decay component as the distance to a group becomes bigger, but before that happens the second component, which used to be a slow decay component, will turn to fast decay component first.

As another application of the Pohozaev identity we establish some uniform estimates for fully bubbling solutions. These estimates were first obtained by Li [33] for scalar Liouville equation without singularity (using the method of moving planes) and Bartolucci-et al. [1] for scalar Liouville equation with singularity (using Pohozaev identity and potential analysis). For regular $SU(3)$ Toda systems Jost-Lin-Wang [27] established similar estimates using holonomy theory. Our results (Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2) apply to general $SU(n+1)$ Toda systems with singularity.

This article is set out as follows. In section two we introduce the selection process mentioned before and in section three we prove the Pohozaev identity, which is crucial for the proof of Theorem 1.1. Then in Section four we prove a uniform estimate for fully bubbling solutions (Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.1). Then in section five and section six we finish the proof of Theorem 1.1 according to the strategy mentioned before.

Acknowledgements: Part of the paper was finished when the third author was visiting Chinese University of Hong Kong in April, May and December in 2012, and Taida Institute of Mathematical Sciences (TIMS) in June 2012. He would like to thank both institutes for their warm hospitality and generous financial support. The research of J. Wei is partially supported by NSERC of Canada.

2. A SELECTION PROCESS FOR $SU(n+1)$ TODA SYSTEMS

Clearly in the proof of Theorem 1.1 we can assume 0 to be a blowup point:

$$(2.1) \quad \max_{x \in B_1, i \in I} \{u_i^k - 2\gamma_i^k \log |x|\} \rightarrow \infty$$

because otherwise the blowup type is $(0, 0)$. So from now on throughout the paper (2.1) is assumed.

2.1. **Case one:** $\gamma_1^k = \dots = \gamma_n^k = 0$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $A = (a_{ij})_{n \times n}$ be the Cartan matrix A_n , h_i^k satisfy (1.5) and $u^k = (u_1^k, \dots, u_n^k)$ be a sequence of solutions to (1.2) with $\gamma_1^k = \dots = \gamma_n^k = 0$ such that (1.6) and (1.3) hold. Then there exist finite sequences of points $\Sigma_k := \{x_1^k, \dots, x_m^k\}$ (all $x_j^k \rightarrow 0, j = 1, \dots, m$) and positive numbers $l_1^k, \dots, l_m^k \rightarrow 0$ such that the following four properties hold:*

- (1) $\max_{i \in I} \{u_i^k(x_j^k)\} = \max_{B(x_j^k, l_j^k), i \in I} \{u_i^k\}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, m$.
- (2) $\exp(\frac{1}{2} \max_{i \in I} \{u_i^k(x_j^k)\}) l_j^k \rightarrow \infty, \quad j = 1, \dots, m$.
- (3) There exists $C_1 > 0$ independent of k such that

$$u_i^k(x) + 2 \log \text{dist}(x, \Sigma_k) \leq C_1, \quad \forall x \in B_1, \quad i \in I$$

where dist stands for distance.

- (4) In each $B(x_j^k, l_j^k)$ let

$$(2.2) \quad v_i^k(y) = u_i^k(\varepsilon_k y + x_j^k) + 2 \log \varepsilon_k, \quad \varepsilon_k = e^{-\frac{1}{2} M_k}, \quad M_k = \max_i \max_{B(x_j^k, l_j^k)} u_i^k.$$

Then one of the following two alternatives holds

(a): The sequence is fully bubbling: along a subsequence (v_1^k, \dots, v_n^k) converges in $C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ to (v_1, \dots, v_n) which satisfies

$$\Delta v_i + \sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} h_j e^{v_j} = 0, \quad \mathbb{R}^2, \quad i \in I.$$

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B(x_j^k, l_j^k)} \sum_{t \in I} a_{it} h_t^k e^{u_t^k} > 4\pi, \quad i \in I.$$

(b): $I = J_1 \cup J_2 \cup \dots \cup J_m \cup N$ where J_1, J_2, \dots, J_m and N are disjoint sets. $N \neq \emptyset$ and each J_t ($t = 1, \dots, m$) consists of consecutive indices. For each $i \in N$, v_j^k tends to $-\infty$ over any fixed compact subset of \mathbb{R}^2 . The components of $v^k = (v_1^k, \dots, v_n^k)$ corresponding to each J_l ($l = 1, \dots, m$) converge in $C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ to a $SU(|J_l| + 1)$ Toda system, where $|J_l|$ is the number of indices in J_l . For each $i \in J_l$, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B(x_j^k, l_j^k)} \sum_{t \in J_l} a_{it} h_t^k e^{v_t^k} > 4\pi.$$

Remark 2.1. *In this article we don't use different notations for sequences and subsequences.*

Remark 2.2. For each $x_j^k \in \Sigma_k$ suppose $2t_j^k$ is the distance from x_j^k to $\Sigma_k \setminus \{x_j^k\}$. Then $t_j^k/l_j^k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ if l_j^k is suitably chosen.

Proof of Proposition 2.1:

Without loss of generality we assume

$$u_1^k(x_1^k) = \max_{i \in I, x \in B_1} u_i^k(x).$$

Clearly $x_1^k \rightarrow 0$ because $\max_i \max_{x \in B_1} u_i^k \rightarrow \infty$ and u^k is uniformly bounded above away from the origin. Let (v_1^k, \dots, v_n^k) be defined by (2.2) with x_j^k replaced by x_1^k . Immediately we observe that $|\Delta v_i^k|$ is bounded because each $v_i^k \leq 0$. Consequently $|v_i^k(z) - v_i^k(0)|$ is uniformly bounded in any compact subset of \mathbb{R}^2 . Thus, by $v_1^k(0) = 0$, at least (along a subsequence) v_1^k converges in $C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ to a function v_1 . For other components of $v^k = (v_1^k, \dots, v_n^k)$, either some of them tend to $-\infty$ over any compact subset of \mathbb{R}^2 , or all of them converge to a system of n equations. Let $J \subset I$ be the set of indices corresponding to those convergent components. That is, for all $i \in J$, v_i^k converges to v_i in $C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and for all $j \in I \setminus J$, v_j^k tends to $-\infty$ over any fixed compact subset of \mathbb{R}^2 . For each $i \in I \setminus J$, there is $J_1 \subset J$ such that $i \in J_1$, the indices in J_1 are consecutive and the limit of v_i^k is one component of a $SU(|J_1| + 1)$ Toda system:

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta v_m + \sum_{j \in J} a_{mj} h_j e^{v_j} = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \forall m \in J_1 \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} h_m e^{v_m} \leq C, & m \in J_1 \end{cases}$$

where $h_m = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_m^k(x_1^k)$, $(a_{ij}) = A_{|J_1|}$, and C is the same constant as in (1.6). By the classification theorem of Lin-Wei-Ye [35] (if the limit is a system) or Chen-Li [16] (if the limit is one equation) we have

$$(2.4) \quad \sum_{j \in J_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} a_{ij} h_j e^{v_j} = 8\pi, \quad \forall i \in J_1$$

and

$$(2.5) \quad v_i(x) = -4 \log |x| + O(1), \quad |x| > 2, \quad \forall i \in J_1.$$

Thus for any index $i \in I$ we can find $R_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$(2.6) \quad v_i^k(y) + 2 \log |y| \leq C, \quad |y| \leq R_k, \quad \text{for } i \in I.$$

Equivalently for u^k there exist $l_1^k \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$u_i^k(x) + 2 \log |x - x_1^k| \leq C, \quad |x - x_1^k| \leq l_1^k, \quad \text{for } i \in I$$

and

$$e^{\frac{1}{2} u_1^k(x_1^k)} l_1^k \rightarrow \infty, \quad i \in J, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Next we let q_k be the maximum point of $\max_{|x| < 1, i \in I} u_i^k(x) + 2 \log |x - x_1^k|$. If

$$\max_{|x| \leq 1, i \in I} u_i^k(x) + 2 \log |x - x_1^k| \rightarrow \infty,$$

we let j be the index such that

$$u_j^k(q_k) + 2\log|q_k - x_1^k| = \max_{i \in I} u_i^k(x) + 2\log|x - x_1^k| \rightarrow \infty.$$

The following localization is to adapt the original argument of R. Schoen [49] for the scalar curvature equation (also see [12]). Set

$$d_k = \frac{1}{2}|q_k - x_1^k|$$

and

$$S_i^k(x) = u_i^k(x) + 2\log\left(d_k - |x - q_k|\right) \text{ in } B(q_k, d_k).$$

Then clearly for fixed k , $S_i^k \rightarrow -\infty$ as x tends to $\partial B(q_k, d_k)$. On the other hand, at least for j we have

$$S_j^k(q_k) = u_j^k(q_k) + 2\log d_k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let p_k be where

$$\max_i \max_{x \in \bar{B}(q_k, d_k)} S_i^k$$

is attained and i_0 be the index corresponding to where the the maximum is taken:

$$(2.7) \quad u_{i_0}^k(p_k) + 2\log\left(d_k - |p_k - q_k|\right) \geq S_j^k(q_k) \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let

$$l_k = \frac{1}{2}(d_k - |p_k - q_k|).$$

Then for $y \in B(p_k, l_k)$, by the choice of p_k and l_k we have

$$u_i^k(y) + 2\log(d_k - |y - q_k|) \leq u_{i_0}^k(p_k) + 2\log(2l_k), \quad \forall i \in I.$$

On the other hand, by the definition of l_k we have

$$d_k - |y - q_k| \geq d_k - |p_k - q_k| - |y - p_k| \geq l_k, \quad \text{if } |y - p_k| < l_k,$$

and

$$(2.8) \quad u_i^k(y) \leq u_{i_0}^k(p_k) + 2\log 2, \quad \forall y \in B(p_k, l_k).$$

Next we set

$$(2.9) \quad \mathcal{R}_k = e^{\frac{1}{2}u_{i_0}^k(p_k)} l_k$$

and scale u_i^k by

$$\tilde{v}_i^k(y) = u_i^k(p_k + e^{-\frac{1}{2}u_{i_0}^k(p_k)} y) - u_{i_0}^k(p_k), \quad \text{for } i \in I.$$

From (2.7) we clearly have $\mathcal{R}_k \rightarrow \infty$. By (2.8) and standard elliptic estimates for the Laplace, \tilde{v}_i^k is bounded in $C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and there exists $\emptyset \neq J \subset I$ such that for all $i \in J$, \tilde{v}_i^k converges to a limit system like (2.3). On the other hand \tilde{v}_i^k converges uniformly to $-\infty$ over all compact subsets of \mathbb{R}^2 for all $i \in I \setminus J$. Clearly (2.6) holds for \tilde{v}_i^k . Going back to u^k we have

$$u_i^k(x) + 2\log|x - x_2^k| \leq C, \text{ for } |x - x_2^k| \leq l_2^k$$

where x_2^k is where $\max_i \max_{B(p_k, l_2^k)} u_i^k$ is attained and $l_2^k = l_k$. Here we note that x_2^k is neither q_k nor p_k and the distance between p_k and x_2^k is small: $e^{\frac{1}{2}u_{i_0}^k(p_k)} |x_2^k - p_k| = O(1)$. If we re-scale u^k around x_2^k , v^k defined as in (2.2) satisfies (a) and (b) in Proposition 2.1. Clearly $B(x_1^k, l_1^k) \cap B(x_2^k, l_2^k) = \emptyset$.

To continue with the selection process, we let $\Sigma_{k,2} := \{x_1^k, x_2^k\}$ and consider

$$\max_{i \in I, x \in B_1} u_i^k(x) + 2 \log \text{dist}(x, \Sigma_{k,2}).$$

If along a subsequence, the quantity above tends to infinity we apply the same procedure to get x_3^k and l_3^k . Since after each selection we add a new disjoint disk, say $B(x_m^k, l_m^k)$, in which the profile of bubbling solutions is like that of a global system. From (2.4) we see that

$$\int_{B(x_m^k, l_m^k)} \sum_i h_i^k e^{u_i^k} \geq C, \quad \text{for some } C > 0 \text{ independent of } k.$$

Therefore the process stops after finite steps by (1.6). Eventually we let

$$\Sigma_k = \{x_1^k, \dots, x_L^k\}$$

and it holds

$$(2.10) \quad u_i^k(x) + 2 \log d(x, \Sigma_k) \leq C, \quad i \in I.$$

Proposition 2.1 is established. \square

2.2. Case two: Singular case $\exists \gamma_i \neq 0$. First the selection process is almost the same. The difference is instead of taking the maximum of u_i^k over B_1 we let $0 \in \Sigma_k$. Clearly in $B_1 \setminus \{0\}$ u^k satisfies the same equation as the nonsingular case. Then we consider the maximum of $u_i^k(x) + 2 \log \text{dist}(x, \Sigma_k) = u_i^k(x) + 2 \log |x|$ and the selection proceeds the same as before. Therefore in the singular case $\Sigma_k = \{0, x_1^k, \dots, x_m^k\}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let Σ_k be the blowup set (Thus if all $\gamma_i^k = 0$, $\Sigma_k = \{x_1^k, \dots, x_m^k\}$, if the system is singular, $\Sigma_k = \{0, x_1^k, \dots, x_m^k\}$). In either case for all $x_0 \in B_1 \setminus \Sigma_k$, there exists C_0 independent of x_0 and k such that*

$$|u_i^k(x_1) - u_i^k(x_2)| \leq C_0, \quad \forall x_1, x_2 \in B(x_0, d(x_0, \Sigma_k)/2), \text{ for all } i \in I.$$

Proof of Lemma 2.1: We can assume $|x| < \frac{1}{10}$ because it is easy to see from the Green's representation formula that the oscillation of u_i^k on $B_1 \setminus B_{1/10}$ is finite. Recall the regular part of u_i^k is defined in (1.4) and \tilde{u}_i^k satisfies

$$\Delta \tilde{u}_i^k(x) + \sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} h_j^k(x) |x|^{2\gamma_j^k} e^{\tilde{u}_j^k(x)} = 0, \quad B_1, \quad i \in I.$$

Let σ_k be the distance between x_0 and Σ_k . Clearly, for $x_0 \in B_1 \setminus \Sigma_k$ and $x_1, x_2 \in B(x_0, d(x_0, \Sigma_k)/2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & u_i^k(x_1) - u_i^k(x_2) \\ &= \tilde{u}_i^k(x_1) - \tilde{u}_i^k(x_2) + O(1) \\ &= \int_{B_1} (G(x_1, \eta) - G(x_2, \eta)) \sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} h_j^k(\eta) |\eta|^{2\gamma_j^k} e^{\tilde{u}_j^k(\eta)} d\eta + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Here G is the Green's function on B_1 . The last term on the above is $O(1)$ because it is the difference of two points of a harmonic function that has bounded oscillation on ∂B_1 . Since both $x_1, x_2 \in B_{1/10}$, it is easy to use the uniform bound on the energy (1.6) to obtain

$$\int_{B_1} (\gamma(x_1, \eta) - \gamma(x_2, \eta)) \sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} h_j^k(\eta) |\eta|^{2\gamma_j^k} e^{\tilde{u}_j^k(\eta)} d\eta = O(1)$$

where $\gamma(\cdot, \cdot)$ the regular part of G . Therefore we only need to show

$$\int_{B_1} \log \frac{|x_1 - \eta|}{|x_2 - \eta|} \sum_j a_{ij} h_j^k |\eta|^{2\gamma_j} e^{\tilde{u}_j} d\eta = O(1).$$

If $\eta \in B_1 \setminus B(x_0, \frac{3}{4}\sigma_k)$, we have $\log(|x_1 - \eta|/|x_2 - \eta|) = O(1)$, then the integration over $B_1 \setminus B(x_0, \frac{3}{4}\sigma_k)$ is uniformly bounded. Therefore we only need to show

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x_0, \frac{3}{4}\sigma_k)} \log \frac{|x_1 - \eta|}{|x_2 - \eta|} \sum_j a_{ij} h_j^k |\eta|^{2\gamma_j} e^{\tilde{u}_j^k} d\eta \\ &= \int_{B(x_0, \frac{3}{4}\sigma_k)} \log \frac{|x_1 - \eta|}{|x_2 - \eta|} \sum_j a_{ij} h_j^k e^{u_j^k} d\eta = O(1). \end{aligned}$$

To this end, let

$$(2.11) \quad v_i^k(y) = u_i^k(x_0 + \sigma_k y) + 2 \log \sigma_k, \quad i \in I, \quad y \in B_{3/4}.$$

Then we just need to show

$$(2.12) \quad \int_{B_{3/4}} \log \frac{|y_1 - \eta|}{|y_2 - \eta|} \sum_j a_{ij} h_j^k(x_0 + \sigma_k \eta) e^{v_j^k(\eta)} d\eta = O(1).$$

We assume, without loss of generality that e_1 is the image of the closest blowup point in Σ_k . Thus by the selection process

$$v_i^k(\eta) \leq -2 \log |\eta - e_1| + C.$$

Therefore

$$e^{v_i^k(\eta)} \leq C |\eta - e_1|^{-2}.$$

With this estimate we observe that $|\eta - e_1| \geq C > 0$ for $\eta \in B_{3/4}$. Thus for $j = 1, 2$ and any fixed $i \in I$,

$$\int_{B_{3/4}} \left| \log |y_j - \eta| \right| e^{v_i^k(\eta)} d\eta \leq C \int_{B_{3/4}} \frac{|\log |y_j - \eta||}{|\eta - e_1|^2} d\eta \leq C.$$

Lemma 2.1 is established. \square

Remark 2.3. For systems with nonnegative coefficient matrix A , the selection process can also be applied. See Chen-Li [17] or Lin-Zhang [37] for more details.

3. POHOZAEV IDENTITY AND RELATED ESTIMATES ON THE ENERGY

In this section we derive a Pohozaev identity for u^k satisfying (1.2), (1.3), (1.6), h_i^k and γ_i^k satisfying (1.5), and $A = A_n$.

Proposition 3.1. Let $A = A_n$, σ_i be defined by (1.7). Suppose $u^k = (u_1^k, \dots, u_n^k)$ satisfy (1.2), (1.6), (1.3) and (2.1), h^k and γ_i^k satisfy (1.5). Then we have

$$\sum_{i,j \in I} a_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j = 4 \sum_{i=1}^n (1 + \gamma_i) \sigma_i.$$

Proof of Proposition 3.1:

Lemma 3.1. Given any $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ such that $\Sigma_k \subset B(0, \varepsilon_k/2)$, there exist $l_k \rightarrow 0$ satisfying $l_k \geq 2\varepsilon_k$ and

$$(3.1) \quad \bar{u}_i^k(l_k) + 2\log l_k \rightarrow -\infty, \text{ for all } i \in I, \text{ where } \bar{u}_i^k(r) := \frac{1}{2\pi r} \int_{\partial B_r} u_i^k.$$

Remark 3.1. By Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 2.1

$$u_i^k(x) + 2\log|x| \rightarrow -\infty, \quad \forall i \in I \text{ and } \forall x \in \partial B_{l_k}.$$

This is crucial for evaluating the \mathcal{R}_1 term (the first term on the right) of (3.7) below.

Proof of Lemma 3.1: Since $\Sigma_k \subset B(0, \varepsilon_k/2)$, we have, by the third statement of Proposition 2.1,

$$(3.2) \quad u_i^k(x) + 2\log|x| \leq C, \quad |x| \geq \varepsilon_k.$$

The key point of the argument below is that we can always use the finite energy assumption and Lemma 2.1 to make u_1^k satisfy (3.1). Then we can adjust the radius to make other components satisfy (3.1) as well.

First we observe that for each fixed i there exists $r_{k,i} \geq \varepsilon_k$ such that

$$(3.3) \quad \bar{u}_i^k(r_{k,i}) + 2\log r_{k,i} \rightarrow -\infty,$$

because otherwise we would have

$$\bar{u}_i^k(r) + 2\log r \geq -C \quad \text{for all } r \geq \varepsilon_k$$

for some $C > 0$. By Lemma 2.1 u_i^k has bounded oscillation on each ∂B_r . Thus

$$u_i^k(x) + 2\log|x| \geq -C \quad \text{for all } x \in \partial B_r, \quad \varepsilon_k < r < 1$$

for some C . Then

$$e^{u_i^k(x)} \geq C|x|^{-2}, \quad \varepsilon_k \leq |x| \leq 1.$$

Integrating $e^{u_i^k}$ on $B_1 \setminus B_{\varepsilon_k}$ we get a contradiction on the uniform energy bound of $\int_{B_1} h_i^k e^{u_i^k}$. (3.3) is established.

First for u_1^k , we find $r_{k,1} \geq \varepsilon_k$ so that

$$\bar{u}_1^k(r_{k,1}) + 2 \log r_{k,1} \rightarrow -\infty.$$

Here we claim that we can assume $r_{k,1} \rightarrow 0$ as well. In fact, if $r_{k,1}$ does not tend to 0, by Lemma 2.1

$$\bar{u}_1^k(r) + 2 \log r \leq -N_k + C, \quad r_{k,1}/2 < r < r_{k,1}$$

where $N_k \rightarrow \infty$ and satisfies

$$\bar{u}_1^k(r_{k,1}) + 2 \log r_{k,1} \leq -N_k.$$

Using Lemma 2.1 again we have

$$\bar{u}_1^k(r) + 2 \log r \leq -N_k + C, \quad r_{k,1}/4 < r < r_{k,1}/2.$$

Obviously this process can be done \bar{N}_k times where \bar{N}_k is chosen to tend to infinity slowly enough so that $\bar{r}_k := r_{k,1} 2^{-\bar{N}_k}$ satisfies

$$\bar{u}_1^k(\bar{r}_k) + 2 \log \bar{r}_k \leq -N_k + C\bar{N}_k \rightarrow -\infty.$$

We can use \bar{r}_k to replace $r_{k,1}$. Exactly the same argument clearly shows the existence of $s_k \rightarrow 0$, $\tilde{N}_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\begin{cases} s_k/r_{k,1} \rightarrow \infty, \\ \bar{u}_1^k(r) + 2 \log r \leq -\tilde{N}_k, \quad r_{k,1} \leq r \leq s_k. \end{cases}$$

Next we claim that between $r_{k,1}$ and s_k , there must be a $r_{k,2}$ such that

$$(3.4) \quad \bar{u}_2^k(r_{k,2}) + 2 \log r_{k,2} \leq -N_{k,2}$$

for some $N_{k,2} \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. The proof of (3.4) is very similar to what has been used before: If this is not the case, $e^{u_2^k} \geq Cr^{-2}$ for some $C > 0$ and $r \in (r_{k,1}, s_k)$. The fact that $s_k/r_{k,1} \rightarrow \infty$ leads to a contradiction to the uniform bound of u_2^k 's energy.

Thus we have proved that for $r = r_{k,2}$ both u_1^k, u_2^k decay faster than $-2 \log r$:

$$\bar{u}_i^k(r) + 2 \log r \leq -N_k, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad r = r_{k,2}$$

for some $N_k \rightarrow \infty$. Then it is easy to see that there exists $s_k \rightarrow 0$ and $s_k/r_{k,2} \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\bar{u}_i^k(r) + 2 \log r \leq -N'_k, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad r_{k,2} \leq r \leq s_k$$

for some $N'_k \rightarrow \infty$ as well. The same argument above guarantees the existence of $l_k \in (r_{k,2}, s_k)$ and some $N''_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\bar{u}_3^k(l_k) + 2 \log l_k \leq -N''_k.$$

Clearly this argument can be applied finite times to exhaust all the components of the whole system. Lemma 3.1 is established. \square

Now we continue with the proof of Proposition 3.1.

Case one: $\gamma_i^k \equiv 0$.

Using the definition of σ_i in (1.7) we choose $l_k \rightarrow 0$ such that $\Sigma_k \subset B(0, l_k/2)$ and

$$(3.5) \quad \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B_{l_k}} h_i^k e^{u_i^k} = \sigma_i + o(1), \quad \text{for } i \in I.$$

Here we claim that (3.1) also holds, because otherwise we would have

$$\bar{u}_i(l_k) + 2 \log l_k \geq -C.$$

By Lemma 2.1

$$\bar{u}_i(r) + 2 \log r \geq -C_1, \quad l_k \leq r \leq 2l_k,$$

which means there is a lower bound on the energy in the annulus $B_{2l_k} \setminus B_{l_k}$. Consequently $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B_{2l_k}} h_i^k e^{u_i^k} > \sigma_i + \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ independent of k , a contradiction to the definition of σ_i in (1.7).

Let

$$v_i^k(y) = u_i^k(l_k y) + 2 \log l_k, \quad i \in I.$$

Then clearly we have

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta v_i^k(y) + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} H_j^k(y) e^{v_j^k(y)} = 0, & |y| \leq 1/l_k, \quad i \in I \\ \bar{v}_i^k(1) \rightarrow -\infty, \end{cases}$$

where

$$H_i^k(y) = h_i^k(l_k y), \quad i \in I, \quad |y| \leq 1/l_k.$$

The Pohozaev identity we use is

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_i \int_{B_{\sqrt{R_k}}} (x \cdot \nabla H_i^k) e^{v_i^k} + 2 \sum_i \int_{B_{\sqrt{R_k}}} H_i^k e^{v_i^k} \\ &= \sqrt{R_k} \int_{\partial B_{\sqrt{R_k}}} \sum_i H_i^k e^{v_i^k} + \sqrt{R_k} \int_{\partial B_{\sqrt{R_k}}} \sum_{i,j} (a^{ij} \partial_\nu v_i^k \partial_\nu v_j^k - \frac{1}{2} a^{ij} \nabla v_i^k \nabla v_j^k) \end{aligned}$$

where $R_k \rightarrow \infty$ will be chosen later, (a^{ij}) is the inverse matrix of (a_{ij}) . The key point of the following proof is to choose R_k properly in order to estimate ∇v_i^k on $\partial B_{\sqrt{R_k}}$. In the estimate of $\partial B_{\sqrt{R_k}}$, the procedure is to get rid of not important parts and prove that the radial part of ∇v_i^k is the leading term. To estimate all the terms of the Pohozaev identity we first write (3.7) as

$$\mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2 = \mathcal{R}_1 + \mathcal{R}_2 + \mathcal{R}_3$$

where \mathcal{L}_1 stands for ‘‘the first term on the left’’. Other terms are understood similarly. First we choose $R_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that $R_k^{3/2} = o(l_k^{-1})$, then by using $l_k \rightarrow 0$ to show that $\mathcal{L}_1 = o(1)$. To evaluate \mathcal{L}_2 , we observe that by Lemma 2.1, $v_i^k(y) \rightarrow -\infty$ over all compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_{1/2}$. Thus we further require R_k to satisfy

$$(3.8) \quad \int_{B_{R_k} \setminus B_{3/4}} H_i^k e^{v_i^k} = o(1)$$

and for $i \in I$, by (3.6) and Lemma 2.1

$$(3.9) \quad v_i^k(y) + 2 \log |y| \rightarrow -\infty, \quad \text{uniformly in } 1 < |y| \leq R_k.$$

By the choice of l_k we clearly have

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B_1} H_i^k e^{v_i^k} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B_{l_k}} h_i^k e^{u_i^k} = \sigma_i + o(1), \quad i \in I.$$

By (3.8) we have

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i + o(1).$$

For \mathcal{R}_1 we use (3.9) to have $\mathcal{R}_1 = o(1)$.

Therefore we are left with the estimates of \mathcal{R}_2 and \mathcal{R}_3 , for which we shall estimate ∇v_i^k on ∂B_{R_k} . Let

$$G_k(y, \eta) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \log |y - \eta| + \gamma_k(y, \eta)$$

be the Green's function on $B_{l_k^{-1}}$ with respect to Dirichlet boundary condition. Clearly

$$\gamma_k(y, \eta) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \log \frac{|y|}{l_k^{-1}} \left| \frac{l_k^{-2} y}{|y|^2} - \eta \right|$$

and we have

$$(3.10) \quad \nabla_y \gamma_k(y, \eta) = O(l_k), \quad y \in \partial B_{\sqrt{R_k}}, \quad \eta \in B_{l_k^{-1}}.$$

We first estimate ∇v_i^k on $\partial B_{R_k^{1/2}}$. By Green's representation formula

$$v_i^k(y) = \int_{B_{l_k^{-1}}} G(y, \eta) \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} H_j^k e^{v_j^k} d\eta + H_{ik},$$

where H_{ik} is the harmonic function satisfying $H_{ik} = v_i^k$ on $\partial B_{l_k^{-1}}$. Since $H_{ik} - c_k = O(1)$ for some c_k , $|\nabla H_{ik}(y)| = O(l_k)$,

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \nabla v_i^k(y) &= \int_{B_{l_k^{-1}}} \nabla_y G_k(y, \eta) \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} H_j^k e^{v_j^k} d\eta + \nabla H_{ik}(y) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B_{l_k^{-1}}} \frac{y - \eta}{|y - \eta|^2} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} H_j^k e^{v_j^k} d\eta + O(l_k). \end{aligned}$$

We estimate the integral in (3.11) over a few subregions. First the integral over $B_{l_k^{-1}} \setminus B_{R_k^{2/3}}$ is $o(1)R_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ because over this region $1/|y - \eta| \sim 1/|\eta| \leq o(R_k^{-1/2})$. For the integral over B_1 , we use

$$\frac{y - \eta}{|y - \eta|^2} = \frac{y}{|y|^2} + O(1/|y|^2)$$

to obtain

$$-\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B_1} \frac{y - \eta}{|y - \eta|^2} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} H_j^k e^{v_j^k} = \left(-\frac{y}{|y|^2} + O(1/|y|^2)\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \sigma_j + o(1)\right).$$

This is the leading term. For the integral over region $B(0, \sqrt{R_k}/2) \setminus B_1$, we use $1/|y - \eta| \sim 1/|y|$ and (3.8) to get

$$\int_{B_{R_k^{1/2/2}} \setminus B_1} \frac{y - \eta}{|y - \eta|^2} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} H_j^k e^{v_j^k} = o(1)|y|^{-1}.$$

By similar argument we also have

$$\int_{B_{R_k^{2/3}} \setminus (B_{R_k^{1/2/2}} \cup B(y, \frac{|y|}{2}))} \frac{y - \eta}{|y - \eta|^2} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} H_j^k e^{v_j^k} = o(1)|y|^{-1}.$$

Finally over the region $B(y, \frac{|y|}{2})$ we use $e^{v_i^k(\eta)} = o(1)|\eta|^{-2}$ to get

$$\int_{B(y, \frac{|y|}{2})} \frac{y - \eta}{|y - \eta|^2} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} H_j^k e^{v_j^k} = o(1)|y|^{-1}.$$

Combining the estimates on all the subregions mentioned above we have

$$\nabla v_i^k(y) = \left(-\frac{y}{|y|^2}\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \sigma_j + o(1)\right) + o(|y|^{-1}), \quad |y| = R_k^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Using the above in \mathcal{R}_2 and \mathcal{R}_3 we have

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j = 4 \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i + o(1).$$

Proposition 3.1 is established for the non-singular case.

Case two: Singular case: $\exists \gamma_i \neq 0$.

Lemma 3.2. For $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, the following Pohozaev identity holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma \int_{\partial B_\sigma} \sum_{i,j \in I} a^{ij} (\partial_\nu u_i^k \partial_\nu u_j^k - \frac{1}{2} \nabla u_i^k \cdot \nabla u_j^k) + \sum_{i \in I} \sigma \int_{\partial B_\sigma} h_i^k e^{u_i^k} \\ &= 2 \sum_{i \in I} \int_{B_\sigma} h_i^k e^{u_i^k} + \sum_{i \in I} \int_{B_\sigma} (x \cdot \nabla h_i^k) e^{u_i^k} + 4\pi \sum_{i,j \in I} a^{ij} \gamma_i^k \gamma_j^k. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.2:

First, we claim that for each fixed k ,

$$(3.12) \quad \nabla u_i^k(x) = 2\gamma_i^k x/|x|^2 + O(1) \quad \text{near the origin.}$$

Indeed, recall the equation for the regular part \tilde{u}_i^k is

$$\Delta \tilde{u}_i^k(x) + \sum_j |x|^{2\gamma_j^k} h_j^k(x) e^{\tilde{u}_j^k(x)} = 0 \quad B_1.$$

By the argument of Lemma 4.1 in [37], for fixed k , \tilde{u}_i^k is bounded above near 0, then elliptic estimate leads to (3.12).

Let $\Omega = B_\sigma \setminus B_\varepsilon$. Then standard Pohozaev identity on Ω is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i \in I} \left(\int_{\Omega} (x \cdot \nabla h_i^k) e^{u_i^k} + 2h_i^k e^{u_i^k} \right) \\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega} \left(\sum_i (x \cdot \nu) h_i^k e^{u_i^k} + \sum_{i,j} a^{ij} (\partial_\nu u_j^k (x \cdot \nabla u_i^k) - \frac{1}{2} (x \cdot \nu) (\nabla u_i^k \cdot \nabla u_j^k)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, then the integration over Ω extends to B_σ by the integrability of $h_i^k e^{u_i^k}$ and (1.5). For the terms on the right hand side, clearly $\partial\Omega = \partial B_\sigma \cup \partial B_\varepsilon$. Thanks to (3.12), the integral on ∂B_ε is $-4\pi \sum_{i,j} a^{ij} \gamma_i^k \gamma_j^k$. Lemma 3.2 is established. \square

Let

$$\sigma_i^k(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B_r} h_i^k e^{u_i^k}, \quad i \in I,$$

then we have

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ such that $\Sigma_k \subset B(0, \varepsilon_k/2)$ and*

$$(3.13) \quad u_i^k(x) + 2 \log |x| \rightarrow -\infty, \quad |x| = \varepsilon_k, \quad i \in I.$$

Then we have

$$(3.14) \quad \sum_{i,j \in I} a_{ij} \sigma_i^k(\varepsilon_k) \sigma_j^k(\varepsilon_k) = 4 \sum_{i \in I} (1 + \gamma_i^k) \sigma_i^k(\varepsilon_k) + o(1).$$

Proof of Lemma 3.3: First the existence of ε_k that satisfies (3.13) is guaranteed by Lemma 2.1. In B_{ε_k} , we let $\tilde{u}_i^k(x)$ be defined as in (1.4). Then

$$v_i^k(y) = \tilde{u}_i^k(\varepsilon_k y) + 2(1 + \gamma_i^k) \log \varepsilon_k.$$

Using $v_i^k \rightarrow -\infty$ on ∂B_1 , we obtain, by Green's representation formula and standard estimates,

$$\nabla v_i^k(y) = \left(\sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} \sigma_j^k(\varepsilon_k) + o(1) \right) y, \quad y \in \partial B_1.$$

After translating the above to estimates of u_i^k , we have

$$(3.15) \quad \nabla u_i^k(x) = \left(\sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} \sigma_j^k(\varepsilon_k) - 2\gamma_j^k \right) x / |x|^2 + o(1) / |x|, \quad |x| = \varepsilon_k.$$

As we observe the Pohozaev identity in Lemma 3.2 with $\sigma = \varepsilon_k$, we see easily that the second term on the LHS and the second term on the RHS are both $o(1)$. The first term on the RHS is clearly $4\pi \sum_i \sigma_i^k(\varepsilon_k)$. Therefore we only need to evaluate the first term on the LHS, for which we use (3.15). Lemma 3.3 is established by similar estimates as in the nonsingular case. \square

Proposition 3.1 is established for the singular case as well. \square

Remark 3.2. *The proof of Proposition 3.1 clearly indicates the following statements when it is applied to SU(3) Toda system. Let $B(p_k, l_k)$ be a circle centered at p_k with radius l_k . Let Σ'_k be a subset of Σ_k . Suppose $\text{dist}(\Sigma'_k, \partial B(p_k, l_k)) =$*

$o(1)\text{dist}(\Sigma_k \setminus \Sigma'_k, \partial B(p_k, l_k))$ and we consider the following two situations: If $p_k = 0$, we have

$$\tilde{\sigma}_1^k(l_k)^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_1^k(l_k)\tilde{\sigma}_2^k(l_k)^2 + \tilde{\sigma}_2^k(l_k) = 2\mu_1\tilde{\sigma}_1^k(l_k) + 2\mu_2\tilde{\sigma}_2^k(l_k) + o(1).$$

If $0 \in \Sigma_k \setminus \Sigma'_k$, then

$$\tilde{\sigma}_1^k(l_k)^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_1^k(l_k)\tilde{\sigma}_2^k(l_k) + \tilde{\sigma}_2^k(l_k)^2 = 2\tilde{\sigma}_1^k(l_k) + 2\tilde{\sigma}_2^k(l_k) + o(1)$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}_i^k(l_k) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B(p_k, l_k)} h_i^k e^{u_i^k}$. This fact will be used in the final step of the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Remark 3.3. From the proof of Proposition 3.1 we see that the Pohozaev identity has to be evaluated on fast decay components in order to rule out the \mathcal{R}_1 term. A component is called fast decay if the difference between itself the thresh-hold harmonic function tends to $-\infty$, for example, see (3.13). A component is called a slow decay component if it is not a fast decay component. Later in the remaining part of the proof of Theorem 1.1 we shall derive Pohozaev identities over different regions and all of them will have to be evaluated on fast decay components.

4. FULLY BUBBLING SYSTEMS

Next we consider a typical blowup situation for systems: Fully bubbling solutions. First let $\gamma_i^k \equiv 0$ for all $i \in I$. Let

$$(4.1) \quad \lambda^k = \max\{\max_{B_1} u_1^k, \dots, \max_{B_1} u_n^k\}$$

and $x^k \rightarrow 0$ be where λ^k is attained. Let

$$(4.2) \quad v_i^k(y) = u_i^k(x_k + e^{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda^k} y) - \lambda^k, \quad i \in I, \quad y \in \Omega_k$$

where $\Omega_k = \{y; e^{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda^k} y + x_k \in B_1\}$. The sequence is called fully bubbling if, along a subsequence

$$(4.3) \quad \{v_1^k, \dots, v_n^k\} \text{ converge in } C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ to } (v_1, \dots, v_n)$$

that satisfies

$$(4.4) \quad \Delta v_i + \sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} h_j e^{v_j} = 0, \quad \mathbb{R}^2, \quad i \in I$$

where $h_i = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_i^k(0)$. Our next theorem is concerned with the closeness between $u^k = (u_1^k, \dots, u_n^k)$ and $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$.

Theorem 4.1. Let $A = A_n$, u^k be a sequence of solutions to (1.2) with $\gamma_i^k = 0, \forall i \in I$. Suppose u^k satisfies (1.3) and (1.6), h^k satisfies (1.5), λ^k, x^k, v^k are described by (4.1), (4.2), respectively. Suppose u^k is fully bubbling, then there exists $C > 0$ independent of k such that

$$(4.5) \quad |u_i^k(e^{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda^k} y + x^k) - \lambda^k - v_i(y)| \leq C + o(1) \log(1 + |y|), \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega_k, i \in I.$$

Remark 4.1. If A is nonnegative, i.e. the system is Liouville system, Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 below are established in [37]. For $A = A_2$, Jost-Lin-Wang [27] proved

$$|u_i^k(e^{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda^k}y + x^k) - \lambda^k - v_i(y)| \leq C, \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega_k, i = 1, 2.$$

Clearly this estimate is slightly stronger than (4.5) for $n = 2$. The proof of Jost-Lin-Wang is involved with holonomy theory but the proof of Theorem 4.1 is a simply application of the Pohozaev identity proved in section three.

If $\exists \gamma_i \neq 0$, we let

$$\tilde{\lambda}^k = \max\left\{\frac{\max_{B_1} \tilde{u}_1^k}{(1 + \gamma_1^k)}, \dots, \frac{\max_{B_1} \tilde{u}_n^k}{(1 + \gamma_n^k)}\right\},$$

and

$$\tilde{v}_i^k(y) = \tilde{u}_i^k(e^{-\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\lambda}^k}y) - (1 + \gamma_i^k)\tilde{\lambda}^k$$

for $i \in I$ and $y \in \Omega_k := \{y; e^{-\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\lambda}^k}y \in B_1\}$. We assume

$$(4.6) \quad \{\tilde{v}_1^k, \dots, \tilde{v}_n^k\} \text{ converge in } C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ to } (\tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_n)$$

that satisfies

$$(4.7) \quad \Delta \tilde{v}_i + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} |x|^{2\gamma_j} h_j e^{\tilde{v}_j} = 0 \quad \mathbb{R}^2, \quad i \in I$$

where $h_i = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_i^k(0)$.

Theorem 4.2. Let $A = A_n$, \tilde{u}^k , \tilde{v}^k , $(\tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_n)$, $\tilde{\lambda}^k$, ε_k and Ω_k be described as above, h_i^k and γ_i^k satisfy (1.5), then under assumption (4.6) there exists $C > 0$ independent of k such that

$$(4.8) \quad |\tilde{u}_i^k(e^{-\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\lambda}^k}y) - (1 + \gamma_i^k)\tilde{\lambda}^k - \tilde{v}_i(y)| \leq C + o(1) \log(1 + |y|), \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega_k.$$

Proof of Theorem 4.1:

Recall that σ_i is defined in (1.7). By Proposition 3.1 we have

$$(4.9) \quad \sum_{i,j \in I} a_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j = 4 \sum_{i \in I} \sigma_i.$$

On the other hand, let

$$\sigma_{iv} := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} h_i e^{v_i}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n$$

where $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ is the limit of the fully bubbling sequence after scaling. Clearly $\sigma_v = (\sigma_{1v}, \dots, \sigma_{nv})$ also satisfies (4.9). We claim that

$$(4.10) \quad \sigma_i = \sigma_{iv}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Let $s_i = \sigma_i - \sigma_{iv}$, we obviously have $s_i \geq 0$. The difference between σ and σ_v on (4.9) gives

$$(4.11) \quad \sum_{i,j \in I} a_{ij} s_i s_j + 2 \sum_{i \in I} \left(\sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} \sigma_{vj} - 2 \right) s_i = 0.$$

First by Proposition 2.1 we have $\sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} \sigma_{vj} - 2 > 0$. Next if either A is nonnegative ($a_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$) or A is positive definite, we have $\sum_{i, j \in I} a_{ij} s_i s_j \geq 0$. Then (4.11) and $s_i \geq 0$ imply (4.10).

From the convergence from v_i^k to v_i in $C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ we can find $R_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$|v_i^k(y) - v_i(y)| = o(1), \quad |y| \leq R_k.$$

For $|y| > R_k$, let

$$\bar{v}_i^k(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi r} \int_{\partial B_r} v_i^k(y) dS_y.$$

Then

$$\frac{d}{dr} \bar{v}_i^k(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi r} \int_{B_r} \Delta v_i^k = -\frac{1}{2\pi r} \int_{B_r} \sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} h_j^k e^{v_j^k} = -\frac{\sum_j a_{ij} \sigma_j + o(1)}{r}.$$

Hence

$$\bar{v}_i^k(r) = -\left(\sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} \sigma_j + o(1)\right) \log r + O(1), \quad \text{for all } r > 2.$$

Since $v_i^k(y) = \bar{v}_i^k(|y|) + O(1)$ and

$$v_i(y) = -\left(\sum_j a_{ij} \sigma_j\right) \log |y| + O(1) \quad \text{for } |y| > 1,$$

we see that (4.5) holds. Theorem 4.1 is established. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.2: By (3.14) we have

$$(4.12) \quad \sum_{i, j \in I} a_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j = 4 \sum_{i \in I} (1 + \gamma_i) \sigma_i.$$

Recall that $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ satisfies (4.7). Let

$$\sigma_{iv} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} h_i |x|^{2\gamma_i} e^{v_i}.$$

On one hand, $(\sigma_{1v}, \dots, \sigma_{iv})$ also satisfies (4.12), on the other hand, the classification theorem of Lin-Wei-Ye [35] gives

$$(4.13) \quad \sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} \sigma_{jv} > 2 + 2\gamma_i, \quad i \in I.$$

Let $s_i = \sigma_i - \sigma_{iv}$ ($i \in I$), then (4.12), which is satisfied by both $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$ and $(\sigma_{1v}, \dots, \sigma_{nv})$, gives

$$\sum_{i, j \in I} a_{ij} s_i s_j + 2 \sum_{i \in I} \left(\sum_{j \in J} a_{ij} \sigma_{jv} - 2 - 2\gamma_i \right) s_i = 0.$$

By (4.13) and the assumption on A , we have $s_i = 0$ for all $i \in I$. The remaining part of the proof is exactly like the last part of the proof of Theorem 4.1. Theorem 4.2 is established. \square

5. ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOR OF SOLUTIONS IN EACH SIMPLE BLOWUP AREA

In this section we derive some results on the energy classification around each blowup point. First we let $A = A_n$ (the Cartan Matrix) and consider

The neighborhood around 0.

Since 0 is postulated to belong to Σ_k first, it means there may not be a bubbling picture in a neighborhood of 0.

Let $\tau_k = \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(0, \Sigma_k \setminus \{0\})$ we consider the energy limits of $h_i^k e^{u_i^k}$ in B_{τ_k} . By the selection process and Lemma 2.1,

$$(5.1) \quad u_i^k(x) + 2 \log |x| \leq C, \quad u_i^k(x) = \bar{u}_i^k(|x|) + O(1) \quad i \in I, \quad |x| \leq \tau_k$$

where $\bar{u}_i^k(|x|)$ is the average of u_i^k on $\partial B_{|x|}$. Let \tilde{u}_i^k be defined by (1.4). Then we have

$$\Delta \tilde{u}_i^k(x) + \sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} |x|^{2\gamma_j} h_j^k(x) e^{\tilde{u}_j^k(x)} = 0, \quad |x| \leq \tau_k.$$

Let

$$-2 \log \delta_k = \max_{i \in I} \max_{x \in B(0, \tau_k)} \frac{\tilde{u}_i^k}{1 + \gamma_i^k}$$

and

$$(5.2) \quad v_i^k(y) = \tilde{u}_i^k(\delta_k y) + 2(1 + \gamma_i^k) \log \delta_k, \quad |y| \leq \tau_k / \delta_k.$$

Easy to see the equation for v_i^k is

$$\Delta v_i^k(y) + \sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} |y|^{2\gamma_j} h_j^k(\delta_k y) e^{v_j^k(y)} = 0, \quad |y| \leq \tau_k / \delta_k.$$

Then we consider two trivial cases. First: $\tau_k / \delta_k \leq C$. This is a case that there is no entire bubble after scaling.

Let f_i^k solve

$$\begin{cases} \Delta f_i^k + \sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} |y|^{2\gamma_j} h_j^k(\delta_k y) e^{v_j^k} = 0, & |y| \leq \tau_k / \delta_k, \\ f_i^k = 0, & \text{on } |y| = \tau_k / \delta_k. \end{cases}$$

Using $v_i \leq 0$ we have $|f_i^k| \leq C$ on $B(0, \tau_k / \delta_k)$. Since $v_i^k - f_i^k$ is harmonic and v_i^k has bounded oscillation on $\partial B(0, \tau_k / \delta_k)$, we have

$$(5.3) \quad v_i^k(x) = \bar{v}_i^k(\partial B(0, \tau_k / \delta_k)) + O(1), \quad \forall x \in B(0, \tau_k / \delta_k)$$

where $\bar{v}_i^k(\partial B(0, \tau_k / \delta_k))$ stands for the average of v_i^k on $\partial B(0, \tau_k / \delta_k)$. Direct computation shows that

$$\int_{B(0, \tau_k)} e^{u_i^k(x)} dx = \int_{B(0, \tau_k / \delta_k)} e^{v_i^k(y)} |y|^{2\gamma_i^k} dy.$$

Therefore

$$(5.4) \quad \int_{B_{\tau_k}} h_i^k e^{u_i^k} dx = O(1) e^{\bar{v}_i^k(\partial B(0, \tau_k / \delta_k))}.$$

So if $\bar{v}_i^k(\partial B(0, \tau_k / \delta_k)) \rightarrow -\infty$, $\int_{B_{\tau_k}} h_i^k e^{u_i^k} dx = o(1)$.

The second trivial case is when the blowup sequence is fully bubbling. Clearly we now have

$$(5.5) \quad \tau_k / \delta_k \rightarrow \infty$$

and we assume that $(v_1^k, \dots, v_n^k) \rightarrow (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ in $C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Clearly

$$\Delta v_i + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} |x|^{2\gamma_j} h_j e^{v_j} = 0 \quad \mathbb{R}^2, \quad i \in I$$

where $h_i = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_i^k(0)$. By the classification theorem of Lin-Wei-Ye [35], we have

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |y|^{2\gamma_j} e^{v_j} h_j dy = 2(2 + \gamma_i + \gamma_{n+1-i})$$

and

$$v_i(y) = -(4 + 2\gamma_{n+1-i}) \log |y| + O(1), \quad |y| > 1, \quad i \in I.$$

By the proof of Theorem 4.2 that there is only one bubble.

The final case we consider is a partially blown-up picture. Note that (5.5) is assumed. For the following two propositions we assume $n = 2$. i.e. we consider $SU(3)$ Toda systems.

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose (1.2), (1.3), (1.5) and (1.6) hold for u^k , h_i^k and γ_i etc. The matrix $A = A_2$. (5.5) also holds. Suppose $s_k \in (0, \tau_k)$ satisfies*

$$u_i^k(x) \leq -2 \log |x| - N_k, \quad i = 1, 2$$

for all $|x| = s_k$ and some $N_k \rightarrow \infty$. Then $(\sigma_1^k(s_k), \sigma_2^k(s_k))$ is an $o(1)$ perturbation of one of the following five types:

$$(2\mu_1, 0), \quad (0, 2\mu_2), \quad (2(\mu_1 + \mu_2), 2\mu_2), \\ (2\mu_1, 2(\mu_1 + \mu_2)), \quad (2\mu_1 + 2\mu_2, 2\mu_1 + 2\mu_2).$$

On $\partial B(0, \tau_k)$, for each i either

$$u_i^k(x) + 2 \log |x| \geq -C, \quad |x| = \tau_k$$

for some $C > 0$ or

$$(5.6) \quad u_i^k(x) + 2 \log |x| < -(2 + \delta) \log |x| + \delta \log \delta_k, \quad |x| = \tau_k$$

for some $\delta > 0$. If (5.6) holds for some i , then

$$\sigma_i^k(\tau_k) = o(1), 2\mu_i + o(1), \text{ or } 2\mu_1 + 2\mu_2 + o(1).$$

Moreover, there exists at least one i_0 such that (5.6) holds for i_0 .

Similarly for bubbles away from the origin we have

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose (1.2), (1.3), (1.5) and (1.6) hold for u^k , h_i^k and γ_i etc. The matrix $A = A_2$. Let $x_k \in \Sigma_k \setminus \{0\}$, $\bar{\tau}_k = \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(x_k, \Sigma_k \setminus \{0, x_k\})$ and*

$$\bar{\delta}_k = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \max_{i=1,2; x \in B(x_k, \bar{\tau}_k)} u_i^k(x)\right).$$

Then for all $s_k \in (0, \bar{\tau}_k)$, if

$$u_i^k(x) + 2\log|x - x_k| \leq -N_k, \quad \forall i \in I, \quad |x - x_k| = s_k, \quad i = 1, 2$$

for some $N_k \rightarrow \infty$, then $(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B(x_k, s_k)} h_1^k e^{u_1^k}, \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B(x_k, s_k)} h_2^k e^{u_2^k})$ is an $o(1)$ perturbation of one of the following five types:

$$(2, 0), (0, 2), (2, 4), (4, 2), (4, 4).$$

On $\partial B(x_k, \bar{\tau}_k)$, for each i either

$$u_i^k(x) + 2\log \bar{\tau}_k \geq -C, \quad \forall x \in \partial B(x_k, \bar{\tau}_k)$$

or

$$(5.7) \quad u_i^k(x) \leq -(2 + \delta) \log \bar{\tau}_k + \delta \log \bar{\delta}_k, \quad \forall x \in \partial B(x_k, \bar{\tau}_k).$$

If (5.7) holds for some i , then $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B(x_k, \bar{\tau}_k)} h_i^k e^{u_i^k}$ is $o(1)$, $2 + o(1)$ or $4 + o(1)$. Moreover, there exists at least one i_0 such that (5.7) holds for i_0 .

We shall only prove Proposition 5.1 as the proof for Proposition 5.2 is similar.

Proof of Proposition 5.1:

Let v_i^k be defined by (5.2). Since we only need to consider a partially blown-up situation, without loss of generality we assume v_1^k converges to v_1 in $C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and v_2^k tends to $-\infty$ over any compact subset of \mathbb{R}^2 . The equation for v_1 is

$$\Delta v_1 + 2h_1|y|^{2\gamma_1} e^{v_1} = 0, \quad \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} h_1|y|^{2\gamma_1} e^{v_1} < \infty.$$

where $h_1 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_1^k(0)$. By the classification result of Prajapat-Tarantello [48] we have

$$2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} h_1|y|^{2\gamma_1} e^{v_1} = 8\pi\mu_1$$

and

$$v_1(y) = -4\mu_1 \log|y| + O(1), \quad |y| > 1.$$

Thus we can find $R_k \rightarrow \infty$ (without loss of generality $R_k = o(1)\tau_k/\delta_k$) such that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B_{R_k}} h_1^k(\delta_k y) |y|^{2\gamma_1^k} e^{v_1^k} = 2\mu_1 + o(1), \quad (\text{i.e. } \sigma_1^k(\delta_k R_k) = 2\mu_1 + o(1))$$

and

$$\int_{B_{R_k}} h_2^k(\delta_k y) |y|^{2\gamma_2^k} e^{v_2^k} = o(1).$$

For $r \geq R_k$, recall that,

$$\sigma_i^k(\delta_k r) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B_r} h_i^k(\delta_k y) |y|^{2\gamma_i^k} e^{v_i^k} dy$$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dr} v_1^k(r) &= \frac{-2\sigma_1^k(\delta_k r) + \sigma_2^k(\delta_k r)}{r}, \\ \frac{d}{dr} v_2^k(r) &= \frac{\sigma_1^k(\delta_k r) - 2\sigma_2^k(\delta_k r)}{r} \quad R_k \leq r \leq \tau_k/\delta_k. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly we have

$$(5.8) \quad R_k \frac{d}{dr} \bar{v}_1^k(R_k) = -4\mu_1 + o(1), \quad R_k \frac{d}{dr} \bar{v}_2^k(R_k) = 2\mu_1 + o(1).$$

The following lemma says that as long as both components stay well below the harmonic function $-2\log|y|$ (i.e. both of them are fast decay components), there is no essential change on the energy for either component:

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose $L_k \in (R_k, \tau_k/\delta_k)$ satisfies*

$$(5.9) \quad v_i^k(y) + 2\gamma_i^k \log|y| \leq -2\log|y| - N_k, \quad R_k \leq |y| \leq L_k, \quad i = 1, 2$$

for some $N_k \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\sigma_i^k(\delta_k R_k) = \sigma_i^k(\delta_k L_k) + o(1), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Proof of Lemma 5.1: We aim to prove that σ_i^k does not change much from $\delta_k R_k$ to $\delta_k L_k$. Suppose this is not the case, then there exists i such that $\sigma_i^k(\delta_k L_k) > \sigma_i^k(\delta_k R_k) + \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$. Let $\tilde{L}_k \in (R_k, L_k)$ such that

$$(5.10) \quad \max_{i=1,2} (\sigma_i^k(\delta_k \tilde{L}_k) - \sigma_i^k(\delta_k R_k)) = \varepsilon, \quad \forall i = 1, 2$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. Then for v_1^k ,

$$(5.11) \quad \frac{d}{dr} \bar{v}_1^k(r) \leq \frac{-4(1+\gamma_1) + \varepsilon}{r} \leq -\frac{2(1+\gamma_1) + \varepsilon}{r}.$$

Then it is easy to see from Lemma 2.1 that

$$\int_{B_{\tilde{L}_k} \setminus B_{R_k}} |y|^{2\gamma_1^k} e^{v_1^k} = o(1),$$

which is $\sigma_1^k(\delta_k \tilde{L}_k) = \sigma_1^k(\delta_k R_k) + o(1)$. Indeed, by Lemma 2.1

$$\int_{B_{L_k} \setminus B_{R_k}} |y|^{2\gamma_1^k} e^{v_1^k} = O(1) \int_{B_{L_k} \setminus B_{R_k}} |y|^{2\gamma_1^k} e^{\bar{v}_1^k} = o(1).$$

The second equality above is because by (5.11)

$$\bar{v}_1^k(r) + 2\gamma_1^k \log r \leq -N_k - 2\log R_k + (-2 - \varepsilon/2) \log r, \quad R_k \leq r \leq L_k.$$

Thus $\sigma_2^k(\delta_k \tilde{L}_k) = \sigma_2^k(\delta_k R_k) + \varepsilon$. However, since (5.9) holds, by Remark 3.2 we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\sigma_1^k(\delta_k \tilde{L}_k), \sigma_2^k(\delta_k \tilde{L}_k)) \in \Gamma.$$

The two points on Γ that have the first component equal to $2\mu_1$ are $(2\mu_1, 0)$ and $(2\mu_1, 2(\mu_1 + \mu_2))$. Thus (5.10) is impossible. Lemma 5.1 is established. \square

From Lemma 5.1 and (5.8) we see that for $r \geq R_k$, either

$$(5.12) \quad v_i^k(y) + 2\gamma_i^k \log|y| \leq -2\log|y| - N_k, \quad R_k \leq |y| \leq \tau_k/\delta_k, \quad i = 1, 2$$

or there exists $L_k \in (R_k, \tau_k/\delta_k)$ such that

$$(5.13) \quad v_2^k(y) + 2\gamma_2^k \log L_k \geq -2\log L_k - C \quad |y| = L_k$$

for some $C > 0$, while for $R_k \leq |y| \leq \tilde{L}_k$,

$$(5.14) \quad v_1^k(y) + 2\gamma_1^k \log |y| \leq -(2 + \delta) \log |y|, \quad R_k \leq |y| \leq L_k$$

for some $\delta > 0$. Indeed, from (5.8) we see that if the energy has to change, σ_2^k has to change first. L_k can be chosen so that $\sigma_2^k(\delta_k L_k) - \sigma_2^k(\delta_k R_k) = \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ small.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose there exist $L_k \geq R_k$ such that (5.13) and (5.14) hold. For L_k we assume $L_k = o(1)\tau_k/\delta_k$. Then there exists \tilde{L}_k such that $\tilde{L}_k/L_k \rightarrow \infty$ and $\tilde{L}_k = o(1)\tau_k/\delta_k$ still holds. For $|y| = \tilde{L}_k$, we have*

$$(5.15) \quad v_i^k(y) + 2(1 + \gamma_i^k) \log |y| \leq -N_k, \quad |y| = \tilde{L}_k, \quad i = 1, 2$$

for some $N_k \rightarrow \infty$. In particular

$$(5.16) \quad v_1^k(y) + 2(1 + \gamma_1^k + \frac{\delta}{4}) \log |y| \leq 0, \quad |y| = \tilde{L}_k.$$

$$(5.17) \quad \sigma_1^k(\delta_k \tilde{L}_k) = 2\mu_1 + o(1), \quad \sigma_2^k(\delta_k \tilde{L}_k) = 2\mu_1 + 2\mu_2 + o(1).$$

Remark 5.1. *The statement of Lemma 5.2 can be understood as follows: Suppose starting from ∂B_{L_k} , σ_2^k starts to change because (5.13) holds. Then from L_k to \tilde{L}_k , σ_1^k does not change much and v_1^k is still way below $-2(1 + \gamma_1^k) \log |y|$ but v_2^k has changed from decaying slowly (which is (5.13)) to a fast decay (the $i = 2$ part of (5.16)). In other words, as σ_2^k changes from L_k to \tilde{L}_k , v_2^k changes from slow decay to fast decay but v_1^k still has fast decay in the meanwhile. The change of σ_2^k has influenced the derivative of v_1^k but has not made σ_1^k change much because σ_2^k changes too fast from L_k to \tilde{L}_k .*

Proof of Lemma 5.2: First we observe that by Lemma 5.1 the energy does not change if both components satisfy (5.12). Thus we can assume that $\sigma_2^k(\delta_k L_k) \leq \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ small. Consequently

$$\frac{d}{dr} \bar{v}_1^k(r) \leq \frac{-4(1 + \gamma_1) + 2\varepsilon}{r}, \quad r \geq R_k.$$

Now we claim that there exists $N > 1$ such that

$$(5.18) \quad \sigma_2^k(\delta_k(L_k N)) \geq 2 + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + o(1).$$

If this is not true, we would have $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $\tilde{R}_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$(5.19) \quad \sigma_2^k(\delta_k \tilde{R}_k L_k) \leq 2 + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - \varepsilon_0.$$

On the other hand \tilde{R}_k can be chosen to tend to infinity slowly so that, by Lemma 2.1 and (5.14)

$$(5.20) \quad v_1^k(y) + 2(1 + \gamma_1^k) \log |y| \leq -\frac{\delta}{2} \log |y|, \quad L_k \leq |y| \leq \tilde{R}_k L_k.$$

Clearly (5.20) implies $\sigma_1^k(\delta_k L_k) = \sigma_1^k(\delta_k \tilde{R}_k L_k) + o(1)$. Thus by (5.19)

$$(5.21) \quad \frac{d}{dr} \bar{v}_2^k(r) \geq \frac{-2 - 2\gamma_2 + \varepsilon_0/2}{r}.$$

Using (5.21) and

$$v_2^k(y) = (-2 - 2\gamma_2^k) \log |y| + O(1), \quad |y| = L_k$$

we see easily that

$$\int_{B(0, \tilde{R}_k L_k) \setminus B(0, L_k)} |y|^{2\gamma_2^k} e^{v_2^k} \rightarrow \infty,$$

a contradiction to (1.6). Therefore (5.18) holds.

By Lemma 2.1

$$v_i^k(y) + 2 \log(NL_k) = \bar{v}_i^k(NL_k) + 2 \log(NL_k) + O(1), \quad i = 1, 2, \quad |y| = NL_k.$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{v}_1^k(NL_k) &\leq (-2 - 2\gamma_1^k - \delta/2) \log(NL_k), \\ \bar{v}_2^k(NL_k) &\geq (-2 - 2\gamma_2^k) \log(NL_k) - C. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\bar{v}_2^k((N+1)L_k) \geq (-2 - 2\gamma_2^k) \log L_k - C,$$

leads to

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B(0, (N+1)L_k)} h_2^k(\delta_k y) |y|^{2\gamma_2^k} e^{v_2^k(y)} dy \geq 2 + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \varepsilon_0$$

for some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. Going back to the equation for \bar{v}_2^k we have

$$\frac{d}{dr} \bar{v}_2^k(r) \leq -\frac{2 + 2\gamma_2 + \varepsilon_0}{r}, \quad r = (N+1)L_k.$$

Therefore we can find $\tilde{R}_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\tilde{R}_k L_k = o(1) \tau_k / \delta_k$ and

$$\begin{aligned} v_2^k(y) &\leq (-2 - 2\gamma_2^k - \varepsilon_0) \log |y| - N_k, \quad |y| = \tilde{R}_k L_k, \\ v_1^k(y) &\leq (-2 - 2\gamma_1^k - \delta/4) \log |y|, \quad L_k \leq |y| \leq \tilde{R}_k L_k. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously

$$\sigma_1^k(\delta_k \tilde{R}_k L_k) = \sigma_1^k(\delta_k L_k) + o(1) = \sigma_1^k(\delta_k R_k) + o(1) = 2(1 + \gamma_1) + o(1).$$

By computing the Pohozaev identity on $\tilde{R}_k L_k$ we have

$$\sigma_2^k(\delta_k \tilde{R}_k L_k) = 2\mu_1 + 2\mu_2 + o(1).$$

Letting $\tilde{L}_k = \tilde{R}_k L_k$ we have proved Lemma 5.2. \square

To finish the proof of Proposition 5.1 we need to consider the region $\tilde{L}_k \leq |y| \leq \tau_k / \delta_k$ if $L_k = o(1) \tau_k / \delta_k$ (in which case \tilde{L}_k can be made as $o(1) \tau_k / \delta_k$), or $L_k = O(1) \tau_k / \delta_k$. First we consider the region $\tilde{L}_k \leq |y| \leq \tau_k / \delta_k$ when $\tilde{L}_k = o(1) \tau_k / \delta_k$. It is easy to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dr} \bar{v}_1^k(r) &= -\frac{2\gamma_1 - 2\gamma_2}{r} + o(1)/r, \quad r = \tilde{L}_k, \\ \frac{d}{dr} \bar{v}_2^k(r) &= -\frac{6 + 2\gamma_1 + 4\gamma_2 + o(1)}{r}, \quad r = \tilde{L}_k. \end{aligned}$$

The second equation above implies

$$\frac{d}{dr} \bar{v}_2^k(r) \leq -\frac{2\mu_2 + \delta}{r}, \quad r = \tilde{L}_k$$

for some $\delta > 0$. So $\sigma_2^k(r)$ does not change for $r \geq \tilde{L}_k$ unless σ_1^k changes. By the same argument as before, either v_1^k rises to $-2\log|y| + O(1)$ on $|y| = \tau_k/\delta_k$ or there is $\hat{L}_k = o(1)\tau_k/\delta_k$ such that

$$\sigma_i^k(\delta_k \hat{L}_k) = 2\mu_1 + 2\mu_2 + o(1), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Since this is the energy of a fully blowup system, we have in this case both

$$v_i^k(y) \leq -(2\mu_i + \delta) \log|y|, \quad |y| = \tau_k \delta_k, \quad i = 1, 2$$

for some $\delta > 0$.

If $L_k = O(1)\tau_k/\delta_k$. In this case it is easy to use Lemma 2.1 to see that one component is $-2(1 + \gamma_i^k) \log|y| + O(1)$ and the other component has the fast decay. Proposition 5.1 is established. \square

6. COMBINATION OF BUBBLING AREAS

The following definition plays an important role:

Definition 6.1. Let $Q_k = \{p_1^k, \dots, p_q^k\}$ be a subset of Σ_k such that Q_k has more than one point in it and $\Sigma_k \setminus Q_k = \emptyset$. Q_k is called a group if and

(1)

$$\text{dist}(p_i^k, p_j^k) \sim \text{dist}(p_s^k, p_t^k),$$

where $p_i^k, p_j^k, p_s^k, p_t^k$ are any points in Q_k such that $p_i^k \neq p_j^k$ and $p_s^k \neq p_t^k$.

(2) For any $p_k \in \Sigma_k \setminus Q_k$, $\frac{\text{dist}(p_i^k, p_j^k)}{\text{dist}(p_i^k, p_k)} \rightarrow 0$ for all $p_i^k, p_j^k \in Q_k$ with $p_i^k \neq p_j^k$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1: Let $2\tau_k$ be the distance between 0 and $\Sigma_k \setminus \{0\}$. For each $z_k \in \Sigma_k \cap \partial B(0, 2\tau_k)$, if $\text{dist}(z_k, \Sigma_k \setminus \{z_k\}) \sim \tau_k$, let G_0 be the group that contains the origin. On the other hand, if there exists $z'_k \in \partial B(0, 2\tau_k)$ such that $\tau_k/\text{dist}(z'_k, \Sigma_k \setminus z'_k) \rightarrow \infty$ we let G_0 be 0 itself. By the definition of group, all members of G_0 are in $B(0, N\tau_k)$ for some N independent of k . Let

$$v_i^k(y) = u_i^k(\tau_k y) + 2\log \tau_k, \quad |y| \leq \tau_k^{-1}.$$

Then we have

$$(6.1) \quad \Delta v_i^k(y) + \sum_{j=1}^2 a_{ij} h_j^k(\tau_k y) e^{v_j^k(y)} = 4\pi \gamma_i^k \delta_0, \quad |y| \leq \tau_k^{-1}.$$

Let $0, Q_1, \dots, Q_m$ be the images of members of G_0 after the scaling from y to $\tau_k y$. Then all $Q_i \in B_N$. By Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 5.2 at least one component decays fast on ∂B_1 . Without loss of generality we assume

$$v_1^k \leq -N_k \quad \text{on} \quad \partial B_1$$

for some $N_k \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\sigma_1^k(\tau_k) = o(1), 2\mu_1 + o(1) \text{ or } 2\mu_1 + 2\mu_2 + o(1).$$

Specifically, if $\tau_k/\delta_k \leq C$, $\sigma_1^k(\tau_k) = o(1)$. Otherwise, $\sigma_1^k(\tau_k)$ is equal to the two other cases mentioned above. By Lemma 2.1 $v_1^k \leq -N_k + C$ on all $\partial B(Q_t, 1)$ ($t = 1, \dots, m$), therefore by Proposition 5.2,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B(Q_t, 1)} h_1^k(\tau_k \cdot) e^{v_1^k} = 2m_t + o(1), \quad t = 1, \dots, m$$

where for each t , $m_t = 0, 1$ or 2 . Let $2\tau_k L_k$ be the distance from 0 to the nearest group other than G_0 . Then $L_k \rightarrow \infty$. By Lemma 2.1 and the proof of Lemma 3.1 we can find $\tilde{L}_k \leq L_k$, $\tilde{L}_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that most of the energy of v_1^k in $B(0, \tilde{L}_k)$ is contributed by bubbles and v_2^k decays faster than $-2 \log \tilde{L}_k$ on $\partial B(0, \tilde{L}_k)$:

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B(0, \tilde{L}_k)} h_1^k(0) e^{v_1^k} \\ &= 2m + o(1), \quad 2\mu_1 + 2m + o(1) \quad \text{or} \quad 2(\mu_1 + \mu_2) + 2m + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

for some nonnegative integer m , and

$$(6.3) \quad v_2^k(y) + 2 \log \tilde{L}_k \rightarrow -\infty \quad |y| = \tilde{L}_k.$$

Then we evaluate the Pohozaev identity on $B(0, \tilde{L}_k)$. Since (6.3) holds, by Remark 3.2 we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\sigma_1^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k), \sigma_2^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k)) \in \Gamma.$$

Moreover, by (6.2) we see that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\sigma_1^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k), \sigma_2^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k)) \in \Sigma$ because the limit point is the intersection between the line $\sigma_1 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_1^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k)$ with Γ .

The Pohozaev identity for $(\sigma_1^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k), \sigma_2^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k))$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma_1^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) (2\sigma_1^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) - \sigma_2^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) - 4\mu_1) \\ & + \sigma_2^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) (2\sigma_2^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) - \sigma_1^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) - 4\mu_2) = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus either

$$(6.4) \quad 2\sigma_1^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) - \sigma_2^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) \geq 4\mu_1 + o(1)$$

or

$$2\sigma_2^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) - \sigma_1^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) \geq 4\mu_2 + o(1).$$

Moreover, if

$$2\sigma_1^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) - \sigma_2^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) \geq 2\mu_1 + o(1) \quad \text{and} \quad 2\sigma_2^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) - \sigma_1^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) \geq 2\mu_2 + o(1),$$

by the proof of Theorem 4.2

$$\int_{B_{l_k} \setminus \tau_k \tilde{L}_k} h_i^k e^{u_i^k} = o(1), \quad i = 1, 2$$

for any $l_k \rightarrow 0$. In this case we have

$$\sigma_i = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_i^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k), \quad i = 1, 2$$

and Theorem 1.1 is proved in this case.

Thus without loss of generality we assume that (6.4) holds. From the equation for u_1^k , this means for some $\delta > 0$

$$(6.5) \quad \bar{u}_1^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) \leq -2 \log(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) - N_k, \quad \frac{d}{dr} \bar{u}_1^k(r) < (-2 - \delta)/r, \quad r = \tau_k \tilde{L}_k.$$

The property above implies, by the proof of Proposition 5.1, that as r grows from $\tau_k \tilde{L}_k$ to $\tau_k L_k$, the following three situations may occur:

Case one: Both u_i^k satisfy, for some $N_k \rightarrow \infty$, that

$$u_i^k(x) + 2 \log|x| \leq -N_k, \quad \tau_k \tilde{L}_k \leq |x| \leq \tau_k L_k, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

In this case

$$\sigma_i^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) = \sigma_i^k(\tau_k L_k) + o(1), \quad i = 1, 2$$

So on $\partial B(0, \tau_k L_k)$, u_1^k is still a fast decaying component.

Case two: There exist $L_{1,k}, L_{2,k} \in (\tilde{L}_k, L_k)$ such that

$$u_2^k(x) \geq -2 \log(\tau_k L_{1,k}) - C \quad |x| = \tau_k L_{1,k},$$

$$(6.6) \quad u_i^k(x) \leq -2 \log(\tau_k L_{2,k}) - N_k \quad |x| = \tau_k L_{2,k}, \quad i = 1, 2$$

and

$$(6.7) \quad \sigma_1^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) = \sigma_1^k(\tau_k L_{2,k}) + o(1).$$

Since (6.6) holds, by Remark 3.2, $(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_1^k(\tau_k L_{2,k}), \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_2^k(\tau_k L_{2,k})) \in \Gamma$. Then we further observe that since (6.7) holds, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\sigma_1^k(\tau_k L_{2,k}), \sigma_2^k(\tau_k L_{2,k})) \in \Sigma$ because this point is obtained by intersecting Γ with $\sigma_1 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_1^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k)$. In other words, the new point $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\sigma_1^k(\tau_k L_{2,k}), \sigma_2^k(\tau_k L_{2,k}))$ is on the upper right part of the old point $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\sigma_1^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k), \sigma_2^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k))$.

Case three:

$$u_2^k(x) \geq -2 \log \tau_k L_k - C, \quad |x| = \tau_k L_k$$

for some $C > 0$ and $\sigma_1^k(\tau_k \tilde{L}_k) = \sigma_1^k(\tau_k L_k) + o(1)$. This means at $\partial B(0, \tau_k L_k)$, u_1^k is still the fast decaying component.

If the second case above happens, the discussion of the relationship between σ_1^k and σ_2^k on $B(0, \tau_k L_k) \setminus B(0, \tau_k L_{2,k})$ is the same as before. In any case on $\partial B(0, \tau_k L_k)$ at least one of the two components has fast decay and has its energy equal to a corresponding component of a point in Σ . For any group not equal to G_0 , it is easy to see that the fast decay component has its energy equal to 0, 2 or 4. The combination of bubbles for groups is very similar to the combination of bubbling disks as we have done before. For example, let G_0, G_1, \dots, G_t be groups in $B(0, \varepsilon_k)$ for some $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$. Suppose the distance between any two of G_0, \dots, G_t are comparable and

$$\text{dist}(G_i, G_j) = o(1)\varepsilon_k, \quad \forall i, j = 0, \dots, t, \quad i \neq j.$$

Also we require $(\Sigma_k \setminus (\cup_{i=0}^t G_i)) \cap B(0, 2\varepsilon_k) = \emptyset$. Let $\varepsilon_{1,k} = \text{dist}(G_0, G_1)$, then all G_0, \dots, G_t are in $B(0, N\varepsilon_{1,k})$ for some $N > 0$. Without loss of generality let u_1^k be a fast decaying component on $\partial B(0, N\varepsilon_{1,k})$. Then we have

$$\sigma_1^k(N\varepsilon_{1,k}) = \sigma_1^k(\tau_k L_k) + 2m + o(1)$$

where m is a nonnegative integer because by Lemma 2.1, u_1^k is also a fast decaying component for G_1, \dots, G_r . Moreover, by Proposition 5.2, the energy of u_1^k in G_s ($s = 1, \dots, t$) is $o(1), 2 + o(1)$ or $4 + o(1)$. If u_2^k also has fast decay on $\partial B(0, N\varepsilon_{1,k})$, then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\sigma_1^k(N\varepsilon_{1,k}), \sigma_1^k(N\varepsilon_{1,k})) \in \Sigma$ because this is a point of intersection between Γ and $\sigma_1 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_1^k(\tau_k L_k) + 2m$. If

$$u_2^k(x) \geq -2 \log N\varepsilon_{1,k} - C, \quad |x| = N\varepsilon_{1,k},$$

then as before we can find $\varepsilon_{3,k}$ in $(N\varepsilon_{1,k}, \varepsilon_k)$ such that, for some $N_k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$u_i^k(x) + 2 \log \varepsilon_{3,k} \leq -N_k, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad |x| = \varepsilon_{3,k}$$

and

$$\sigma_1^k(N\varepsilon_{1,k}) = \sigma_1^k(\varepsilon_{3,k}).$$

Thus we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\sigma_1^k(\varepsilon_{3,k}), \sigma_2^k(\varepsilon_{3,k})) \in \Sigma.$$

because this point is the intersection between Γ and $\sigma_1 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_1^k(N\varepsilon_{1,k})$.

The last possibility on $B(0, \varepsilon_k) \setminus B(0, \varepsilon_{1,k})$ is

$$\sigma_1^k(\varepsilon_k) = \sigma_1^k(N\varepsilon_{1,k}) + o(1)$$

and

$$u_2^k(x) + 2 \log \varepsilon_k \geq -C, \quad |x| = \varepsilon_k.$$

In this case u_1^k is the fast decaying component on $\partial B(0, \varepsilon_k)$.

Such a procedure can be applied to include groups further away from G_0 . Since we have only finite blowup disks this procedure only needs to be applied finite times. Finally let $s_k \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\sigma_i = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{s_k \rightarrow 0} \sigma_i^k(s_k), \quad i = 1, 2$$

and, for some $N_k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$u_i^k(x) + 2 \log s_k \leq -N_k, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad |x| = s_k.$$

Then we see that $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \Sigma$. Theorem 1.1 is established. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Bartolucci, D.; Chen, Chiun-Chuan; Lin, Chang-Shou; Tarantello, Gabriella Profile of blow-up solutions to mean field equations with singular data. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 29 (2004), no. 7-8, 1241-1265.
- [2] Bartolucci, D.; Lin, Chang-shou; Sharp existence results for mean field equations with singular data. *J. Differential Equations* 252 (2012), no. 7, 41154137.
- [3] Bartolucci, D.; Tarantello, G. The Liouville equation with singular data: a concentration-compactness principle via a local representation formula. *J. Differential Equations* 185 (2002), no. 1, 161180.
- [4] Bartolucci, D.; Tarantello, G. Liouville type equations with singular data and their applications to periodic multivortices for the electroweak theory. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 229 (2002), no. 1, 347.
- [5] Bartolucci, D.; Malchiodi, A. An improved geometric inequality via vanishing moments, with applications to singular Liouville equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 322 (2013), no. 2, 415452.

- [6] Battaglia, L; Malchiodi, A; A Moser-Trudinger Inequality for the singular Toda system, *preprint*.
- [7] W. H. Bennet, Magnetically self-focusing streams, *Phys. Rev.* 45 (1934), 890-897.
- [8] Bolton, J., Woodward, L.M.: Some geometrical aspects of the 2-dimensional Toda equations. In: *Geometry, Topology and Physics*, Campinas, 1996, pp. 6981. de Gruyter, Berlin (1997).
- [9] Bolton, J., Jensen, G.R., Rigoli, M., Woodward, L.M.: On conformal minimal immersions of S^2 into CP^n . *Math. Ann.* 279(4), 599-620 (1988).
- [10] Calabi, E.: Isometric imbedding of complex manifolds. *Ann. Math.* 58(2), 1-23 (1953).
- [11] S. Chanillo, M. K-H Kiessling, Conformally invariant systems of nonlinear PDE of Liouville type. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 5 (1995), no. 6, 924-947.
- [12] C. C. Chen, C. S. Lin, Estimate of the conformal scalar curvature equation via the method of moving planes. II. *J. Differential Geom.* 49 (1998), no. 1, 115178.
- [13] C. C. Chen, C. S. Lin, Sharp estimates for solutions of multi-bubbles in compact Riemann surfaces. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 55 (2002), no. 6, 728-771.
- [14] C. C. Chen, C. S. Lin, Topological degree for a mean field equation on Riemann surfaces. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 56 (2003), no. 12, 16671727.
- [15] C. C. Chen, C. S. Lin, Estimate of the conformal scalar curvature equation via the method of moving planes. II. *J. Differential Geom.* 49 (1998), no. 1, 115178.
- [16] W. X. Chen, C. M. Li, Classification of solutions of some nonlinear elliptic equations. *Duke Math. J.* 63 (1991), no. 3, 615-622.
- [17] W. X. Chen, C. M. Li, Qualitative properties of solutions to some nonlinear elliptic equations in R^2 . *Duke Math. J.* 71 (1993), no. 2, 427-439.
- [18] Chern, S.S., Wolfson, J.G.: Harmonic maps of the two-sphere into a complex Grassmann manifold. II. *Ann. Math.* 125(2), 301-335 (1987).
- [19] S. Childress and J. K. Percus, Nonlinear aspects of Chemotaxis, *Math. Biosci.* 56 (1981), 217-237.
- [20] M. Chipot, I. Shafrir, G. Wolansky, On the solutions of Liouville systems. *J. Differential Equations* 140 (1997), no. 1, 59-105.
- [21] P. Debye and E. Huckel, Zur Theorie der Electrolyte, *Phys. Zft* 24 (1923), 305-325.
- [22] Doliwa, A.: Holomorphic curves and Toda systems. *Lett. Math. Phys.* 39(1), 21-32 (1997).
- [23] G. Dunne, R. Jackie, S.Y.Pi, C. Trugenberger, Self-dual Chern-Simons solitons and two dimensional nonlinear equations, *Phys. Rev. D* 43 (1991), 1332-1345.
- [24] G. Dunne, Self-dual Chern-Simons theories. *Lecture Notes in Physics*, Springer, Berline, 1995.
- [25] N. Ganoulis, P. Goddard, D. Olive, : Self-dual monopoles and Toda molecules. *Nucl. Phys. B* 205, 601-636 (1982)
- [26] Guest, M.A.: *Harmonic Maps, Loop Groups, and Integrable Systems*. London Mathematical Society Student Texts, vol. 38. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1997).
- [27] J. Jost, C. S. Lin and G. F. Wang, Analytic aspects of the Toda system II: bubbling behavior and existence of solutions, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 59 (2006), no. 4, 526-558.
- [28] J. Jost, G. F. Wang, Classification of solutions of a Toda system in R^2 . *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 2002, no. 6, 277-290.
- [29] E. F. Keller and L. A. Segel, Traveling bands of Chemotactic Bacteria: A theoretical analysis, *J. Theor. Biol.* 30 (1971), 235-248.
- [30] M. K.-H. Kiessling and J. L. Lebowitz, Dissipative stationary Plasmas: Kinetic Modeling Bennet Pinch, and generalizations, *Phys. Plasmas* 1 (1994), 1841-1849.
- [31] Leznov, A.N.: On the complete integrability of a nonlinear system of partial differential equations in two-dimensional space. *Theor. Math. Phys.* 42, 225-229 (1980).
- [32] Leznov, A.N., Saveliev, M.V.: *Group-Theoretical Methods for Integration of Nonlinear Dynamical Systems*. Progress in Physics, vol. 15. Birkhäuser, Basel (1992)
- [33] Y. Y. Li, Harnack type inequality: the method of moving planes, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 200 (1999), no. 2, 421-444.
- [34] Y. Y. Li, Prescribing scalar curvature on S^n and related problems. *I.J. Differential Equations* 120 (1995), no. 2, 319410.

- [35] C.S. Lin, J. C. Wei, D. Ye, Classification and nondegeneracy of $SU(n+1)$ Toda system, *Invent. Math.* 190(2012), no.1, 169-207.
- [36] C. S. Lin, J. C. Wei, C. Zhao, Sharp estimates for fully bubbling solutions of a $SU(3)$ Toda system, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 22 (2012), no. 6, 1591-1635.
- [37] C. S. Lin, L. Zhang, Profile of bubbling solutions to a Liouville system, *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré / Analyse non linéaire* Volume 27, Issue 1, January-February 2010, Pages 117–143,
- [38] C. S. Lin, L. Zhang, A topological degree counting for some Liouville systems of mean field type. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 64 (2011), no. 4, 556-590.
- [39] C. S. Lin, L. Zhang, On Liouville systems at critical parameters, Part 1: One bubble. *J. Funct. Anal.* 264 (2013), no. 11, 2584-2636.
- [40] C. S. Lin, L. Zhang, On Liouville systems at critical parameters, Part 2: Multi bubbles, in preparation.
- [41] A. Malchiodi, C.B. Ndiaye, Some existence results for the Toda system on closed surfaces, *Att. Accad. Naz. Lincei Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur. Rend. Lincei (9) Mat. Appl.* 18(2007), no.4, 391-412.
- [42] A. Malchiodi and D. Ruiz, a variational analysis of the Toda system on compact surfaces, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 66 (2013), no. 3, 332-371.
- [43] Mansfield, P.: Solutions of Toda systems. *Nucl. Phys. B* 208, 277-300 (1982).
- [44] M. S. Mock, Asymptotic behavior of solutions of transport equations for semiconductor devices, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 49 (1975), 215–225.
- [45] Nolasco, M., Tarantello, G.: Double vortex condensates in the Chern-Simons theory. *Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ.* 9, 31-94 (1999).
- [46] Nolasco, M., Tarantello, G.: Vortex condensates for the $SU(3)$ Chern-Simons theory. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 213(3), 599-639 (2000).
- [47] A. Pistoia, M. Musso and J. Wei, New concentration phenomena for $SU(3)$ Toda system, *preprint*.
- [48] J. Prajapat, G. Tarantello, On a class of elliptic problems in \mathbb{R}^2 : symmetry and uniqueness results. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* 131 (2001),no. 4, 967–985.
- [49] . R. Schoen, Stanford lecture notes.
- [50] J. C. Wei, C. Y. Zhao, F. Zhou, On nondegeneracy of solutions of $SU(3)$ Toda system *CRAS* 349(2011), no.3-4, 185–190.
- [51] Yang, Y.: The relativistic non-abelian Chern-Simons equation. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 186(1), 199-218 (1999)
- [52] Yang, Y.: Solitons in Field Theory and Nonlinear Analysis. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, New York (2001)
- [53] L. Zhang, Blowup solutions of some nonlinear elliptic equations involving exponential nonlinearities. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 268 (2006), no. 1, 105–133.
- [54] L. Zhang, Asymptotic behavior of blowup solutions for elliptic equations with exponential nonlinearity and singular data. *Commun. Contemp. Math.* 11 (2009), no. 3, 395–411.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TAIDA INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NATIONAL TAIWAN UNIVERSITY, TAIPEI 106, TAIWAN
E-mail address: cslin@math.ntu.edu.tw

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, VANCOUVER, B.C., CANADA V6T 1Z2, AND DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG, SHATIN, HONG KONG
E-mail address: jcwei@math.ubc.ca

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, 358 LITTLE HALL P.O.BOX 118105, GAINESVILLE FL 32611-8105
E-mail address: leizhang@ufl.edu