

ATTAINABILITY OF THE BEST CONSTANT OF HARDY-SOBOLEV INEQUALITY WITH FULL BOUNDARY SINGULARITIES

LIMING SUN AND LEI WANG

ABSTRACT. We consider a type of Hardy-Sobolev inequality, whose weight function is singular on the whole domain boundary. We are concerned with the attainability of the best constant of such inequality. In dimension two, we link the inequality to a conformally invariant one using the conformal radius of the domain. The best constant of such inequality on a smooth bounded domain is achieved if and only if the domain is non-convex. In higher dimensions, the best constant is achieved if the domain has negative mean curvature somewhere. If the mean curvature vanishes but is non-umbilic somewhere, we also establish the attainability for some special cases. In the other direction, we also show the best constant is not achieved if the domain is sufficiently close to a ball in C^2 sense.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Statement of main results. When $N \geq 3$, the well-known Hardy's inequality states that

$$\left(\frac{N-2}{2}\right)^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u(x)|^2}{|x|^2} dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx, \quad \forall u \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N). \quad (1.1)$$

The constant $(N-2)^2/4$ is optimal and can not be attained by any non-trivial function in $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, the completion of $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ under the norm $(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx)^{1/2}$. For any Lipschitz domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ with $N \geq 3$, we have the Sobolev inequality

$$\mu^S(\Omega) \left(\int_{\Omega} u^{\frac{2N}{N-2}} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{N}} \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2, \quad \forall u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega). \quad (1.2)$$

It is well-known that the best constant $\mu^S(\Omega) = \mu^S(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for any domain Ω and $\mu^S(\Omega)$ is never attained unless $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$.

Hölder-interpolating Hardy's inequality and Sobolev inequality, one can obtain the so-called *Hardy-Sobolev* type inequality. For instance, using (1.1) and (1.2), one can establish the following inequality for any Lipschitz domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ with $N \geq 3$.

$$C \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} \right)^{2/2^*(s)} \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2, \quad \forall u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) \quad (1.3)$$

where $2^*(s) = \frac{2(N-s)}{N-2}$ and $s \in (0, 2)$. When $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$, the above one is a particular case of Caffarelli–Kohn–Nirenberg inequality (cf. [9]), which has received considerable attention.

Date: May 17, 2024 (Last Typeset).

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35A23 (Primary), 35B09, 35B44, 35J75, 35J91 (Secondary).

Key words and phrases. Hardy-Sobolev inequality, distance function, best constant, least-energy solution.

When 0 is in the interior of Ω , Ghoussoub and Yuan [23] show that the best constant in (1.3) is independent of Ω and not achieved unless $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$. New phenomena happen when 0 is on the boundary of Ω . Egnell [15] shows that the best constant for any cone with vertex at 0 can be achieved. If the mean curvature of $\partial\Omega$ at the origin is negative then Ghoussoub and Robert [22] show that the best constant can also be achieved. On the other hand, if Ω is star-shaped around 0, then Ghoussoub and Kang [20] show that it is not attained.

For domains with boundaries, there is also a version of Hardy's inequality formulated in terms of the distance function from points in the domain to the boundary. To be more precise, let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{R}^N ($N \geq 2$) with non-empty boundary. Consider the following variational problem

$$\mu^H(\Omega) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 : u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) \text{ and } \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{u}{\delta_{\Omega}} \right)^2 = 1 \right\} \quad (1.4)$$

where $\delta_{\Omega}(x) = \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$. The infimum being positive is equivalent to the validity of the following Hardy's inequality

$$\mu^H(\Omega) \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{u}{\delta_{\Omega}} \right)^2 \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2, \quad \forall u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega). \quad (1.5)$$

The infimum of (1.4) is the so-called *Hardy constant* of Ω . It is known that $\mu^H(\Omega) > 0$ for a large class of domains, including bounded Lipschitz ones, for instance, see Opic and Kufner [29]. If $\partial\Omega$ has a tangent plane at least at one point, then $\mu^H(\Omega) \leq 1/4$, see Marcus et al. [27]. If Ω is convex, then [27] and Matskewich et al. [33] also shows that $\mu^H(\Omega) = 1/4$. Lewis et al. [26] prove that this also holds for weakly mean convex C^2 domains. For the attainability of $\mu^H(\Omega)$, it was proved in [27] that, for bounded C^2 domains, the infimum in (1.4) is achieved if and only if $\mu^H(\Omega) < 1/4$. There are works on Hardy's inequality and its improvement which are impossible to list all, for instance, see [8, 18, 34, 7, 21, 24, 25, 12] and references therein.

Hölder-interpolating (1.5) and (1.2) gives the following type of Hardy-Sobolev inequality. For Lipschitz domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}_+^N$ with $N \geq 3$, one has

$$C \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{\delta_{\Omega}^s} \right)^{2/2^*(s)} \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2, \quad \forall u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega). \quad (1.6)$$

There appears to be limited research conducted on it. It seems the above one was first studied by Chen and Li [10]. The second-named author and Zhu also consider the above inequality in [35]. Moreover, they also study an inequality for $N = 2$ on a Lipschitz domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$C \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^p}{\delta_{\Omega}^2} \right)^{2/p} \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2, \quad \forall u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) \quad (1.7)$$

where $p \in (2, \infty)$. Although inequality (1.7) does not arise directly from Hölder-interpolating Hardy and Sobolev ones, it is reminiscent of (1.6) in $N = 2$. We shall call both of them Hardy-Sobolev inequalities with full boundary singularities.

The best constants in (1.6) and (1.7) are¹

$$\mu_p(\Omega) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 : u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) \text{ and } \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^p}{\delta_\Omega^s} = 1 \right\}. \quad (1.8)$$

Here we make the following assumption on p and s throughout this paper (unless specified),

$$\begin{cases} s \in (0, 2), & p = 2^*(s) = \frac{2(N-s)}{N-2}, & \text{if } N \geq 3, \\ s = 2, & p \in (2, \infty), & \text{if } N = 2. \end{cases} \quad (1.9)$$

The positivity of the infimum is equivalent to the validity of (1.6) and (1.7) with $C = \mu_p(\Omega)$. Note that when $p = \frac{2N}{N-2}$ for $N \geq 3$ (that is $s = 0$), (1.6) reduces to Sobolev inequality (1.2) and $\mu_{\frac{2N}{N-2}}(\Omega) = \mu^S(\Omega)$. When $p = 2$, (1.6) and (1.7) reduce to Hardy's inequality (1.5) and $\mu_2(\Omega) = \mu^H(\Omega)$. Moreover, for $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^N$, both $\mu^S(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ and $\mu^H(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ are not attainable.

As far as we know, for p and s satisfy (1.9), there are not many studies on this type of Hardy-Sobolev inequality unless the works [10, 35] mentioned above. We summarize the results of [35] in the following (some of them are already obtained in [10] for $N \geq 3$).

Theorem A. *Assume that $N \geq 2$, p and s satisfy (1.9).*

- (1) $\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N) > 0$ and it is attainable.
- (2) If $\partial\Omega$ possesses a tangent plane at least at one point, then $\mu_p(\Omega) \leq \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. If Ω is a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary, then $\mu_p(\Omega) > 0$.
- (3) Let Ω be a bounded domain with C^1 boundary. If $\mu_p(\Omega) < \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, then $\mu_p(\Omega)$ is achieved by some $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.
- (4) For any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $\mu_p(B) = \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ and it is not attained by any $u \in H_0^1(B)$.

Note that part (1) already shows that $\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ has distinct behavior when p are in the intermediate values and endpoints of $[2, \frac{2N}{N-2}]$. In part (1), the attainability of $\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ and its extremals actually use authors' previous work [14]. The extremal can be classified, but one has explicit expression only when $p = 1 + 2/N$ and $p = 1 + 4/N$. See Theorem B in Section 2 for a precise statement. Part (3) is the standard Brezis-Nirenberg argument for the compactness of minimizing sequences with energy below a certain threshold. Part (4) uses the conformal equivalence of balls and \mathbb{R}_+^N .

This paper concerns the following two questions:

- (Q1) What kind of domain do we have $\mu_p(\Omega) < \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$?
- (Q2) For a general smooth convex domain, is $\mu_p(\Omega) = \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$? If so, is $\mu_p(\Omega)$ attainable?

There are some serious difficulties in attacking these problems. For instance, the loss of compactness, no moving plane available, the singularity of weight function on the whole boundary, no explicit expressions of minimizers for some cases, and so on.

We have some partial answers for both questions. We find that the answer to (Q1) is strongly linked to the curvature of the boundary $\partial\Omega$.

¹In $N \geq 3$, it seems that $\mu_s(\Omega)$ is more appropriate than $\mu_p(\Omega)$. This is the notation in [10, 20]. However, to include the case $N = 2$, we have to use $\mu_p(\Omega)$.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 2$) is a domain. If $\partial\Omega$ is C^2 near one point and the mean curvature of this point is negative, then $\mu_p(\Omega) < \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ for p satisfying (1.9). Consequently, if Ω is also bounded with C^1 boundary then $\mu_p(\Omega)$ is attainable.*

Remark 1.2. *In contrast, for $N \geq 3$, Theorem 1.1 does not hold for the endpoint case $p = 2$, i.e. the Hardy case. For example, $\mu_2(\Omega) = \frac{1}{4}$ holds for Ω being a small enough tubular neighborhood of a surface [19] and some convex domains with punctured balls [4]. For $N = 2$, however, we neither know the above theorem holds for the endpoint case $p = 2$ nor can find C^2 non-convex planar domain such that its Hardy constant is $1/4$. It is worth pointing out that Davies [13] showed that $\mu_2(\Omega) = \frac{1}{4}$ for some non-convex plane sectors Ω , but here Ω is not a C^2 domain.*

To prove $\mu_p(\Omega) < \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, we construct some auxiliary functions under the Fermi coordinates. The computation here is inspired greatly by the work of Escobar [16] on the boundary Yamabe problem. However, unlike the boundary Yamabe problem, the extremal of $\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ is not explicitly known except in two cases. We find some interesting Pohozaev type identity to overcome this difficulty (cf. Lemma 4.4).

Next, we consider the weakly convex domain. We know from [26] that for $p = 2$, it holds that $\mu_2(\Omega) = \mu_2(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. But the situation may be different for p satisfying (1.9). Specifically, when $p = 2 + 2/N$ the minimizer of $\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ has explicit form. We take advantage of this fact to establish the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that $p = 2 + 2/N$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 18$) is a domain. If $\partial\Omega$ is C^3 near one point, and the mean curvature vanishes at this point, but this point is non-umbilic, then $\mu_p(\Omega) < \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. Consequently, if Ω is also bounded with C^1 boundary then $\mu_p(\Omega)$ is attainable.*

To investigate (Q2), we propose to study the following

$$\sigma_p(\Omega) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 : u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) \text{ and } \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^p}{\tau_{\Omega}^s} = 1 \right\}, \quad (1.10)$$

where τ_{Ω} is the harmonic radius of a Lipschitz domain Ω with non-empty boundary. In dimension 2, it also coincides with the conformal radius. See Section 2 for its definition and property. For convex domains, one has the fact that $\tau_{\Omega} \leq 2\delta_{\Omega}$ and the inequality is strictly somewhere in Ω unless $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^N$. Moreover, it is easy to see that $\sigma_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N) = 2^{\frac{2s}{p}} \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. For $\sigma_p(\Omega)$, it has the following remarkable feature.

Proposition 1.4. *Assume $s \in [0, 2]$, $p = 2^*(s)$ when $N \geq 3$ and $s = 2$, $p \geq 2$ when $N = 2$.*

- (1) *If two Lipschitz domains Ω and $\tilde{\Omega}$ are conformally equivalent, then $\sigma_p(\Omega) = \sigma_p(\tilde{\Omega})$.*
- (2) *If p satisfies (1.9), Ω is convex with non-empty boundary and $\sigma_p(\Omega) = \sigma_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, then $\mu_p(\Omega)$ is attained if and only if Ω is a half-space.*

We now consider $N = 2$. By Riemann mapping theorem, any simply connected hyperbolic region (a planar domain whose complement contains at least two points) is conformal to \mathbb{R}_+^2 . Then we have

Theorem 1.5. *For planar domains, we assume $s = 2$ and $p \in [2, \infty)$. Then*

- (1) *For any simply connected Lipschitz hyperbolic region Ω , one has $\sigma_p(\Omega) = \sigma_p(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$. In particular, $\sigma_2(\mathbb{R}_+^2) = 1$.*
- (2) *If $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a convex domain with non-empty boundary, then $\mu_p(\Omega) = \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$. Moreover, if $p = 2$, then $\mu_2(\Omega)$ is never attained. If $p \in (2, \infty)$, then $\mu_p(\Omega)$ is attainable if and only if Ω is a half-plane.*

The application of conformal invariance to Hardy inequalities on \mathbb{R}^2 has its origins in the work of Ancona [3]. Ancona utilized both the Riemann mapping theorem and Koebe's one-quarter theorem to establish a lower bound for the Hardy constant in the context of simply connected domains. The introduction of harmonic radius here can give several novel results about Hardy inequality on convex domains. The second part above expands upon existing results in the literature in the context of Hardy's case, i.e. $p = 2$. Notably, we refrain from imposing any smoothness assumptions on $\partial\Omega$, while [27] specifically concludes the non-attainability of the Hardy constant for C^2 smooth convex bounded domains. Moreover, a by-product of our approach is

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{u^2}{\tau_{\Omega}^2} \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2. \quad (1.11)$$

Note that if Ω is a convex planar domain, (1.11) is stronger than Hardy's inequality (1.5). In fact, by Lemma 2.4, one has $\tau_{\Omega} \leq 2\delta_{\Omega}$. Thus

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 \geq \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^2}{\tau_{\Omega}^2} \geq \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^2}{4\delta_{\Omega}^2}. \quad (1.12)$$

For bounded planar domains, it is well-known that mean convexity is equivalent to convexity, see [1, Thm 6.20]. Combining Theorem 1.1 and 1.5, we have a rather complete answer of (Q1) and (Q2) for planar domains.

Corollary 1.6. *Suppose $s = 2, p \in (2, +\infty)$, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a bounded C^2 domain. Then $\mu_p(\Omega)$ is attainable if and only if Ω is non-convex.*

In higher dimensions $N \geq 3$, the Liouville theorem asserts that the conformal transformations consist of translation, scaling, and inversion. The scarcity of conformal equivalence in higher dimensions makes the application of Proposition 1.4 limited. Recall that Theorem A proves the non-attainability of $\mu_p(B)$ for balls B . We can address (Q2) for domains that are C^2 close to balls in high dimensions $N \geq 3$.

Theorem 1.7. *Assume $N \geq 3, s \in (0, 2)$ and $p = 2^*(s)$. For any domain Ω which is sufficiently close to a ball in C^2 sense, it holds $\mu_p(\Omega) = \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ and $\mu_p(\Omega)$ is not attainable.*

The proof is inspired by the work of Pan and Wang [30] on the Lin-Ni problem. Our problem resembles the Lin-Ni one because the minimizing sequence of $\mu_p(\Omega)$ can only blow up at the boundary. We can draw from Theorem 1.7 that there is some ellipsoid E , such that $\mu_p(E) = \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ and $\mu_p(E)$ is not attainable. But it is still open whether for any ellipsoid, the best constant is equal to $\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ and not attainable.

1.2. Discussion. We shall summarize the results obtained and state some open problems. For smooth bounded domains Ω , the attainability results we obtained are listed in table 1 to make some comparisons to that of the Hardy case. There are some cases not completely solved. For instance, we conjecture that for (smooth) bounded convex domains $\mu_p(\Omega)$ is not attainable.

Domains Ω	$p = 2$	$p = 2^*(s), s \in (0, 2), N \geq 3$	$p > 2, N = 2$
$\inf H < 0$	may or may not	A	A
$H \geq 0$	N	A under further conditions	N
convex	N	N near balls	N

TABLE 1. Attainability of $\mu_p(\Omega)$. Here A denotes attainable and N denotes not attainable. H is the mean curvature of $\partial\Omega$.

In the level of Euler-Lagrange equation, $\mu_p(\Omega)$ is also different from the two endpoints case. The minimizers of $\mu_p(\Omega)$, up to the multiplication of some constant, satisfy the following elliptic equation,

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + \delta_{\Omega}^{-s} u^{p-1} = 0, & u > 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0, & & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.13)$$

For p and s satisfying (1.9), the existence of solutions to the above singular elliptic equations seems to be open. For domains such that $\mu_p(\Omega)$ is not attainable, it just says there is no ground state (or least energy) solution to (1.13), but it might still have higher energy solutions. In fact, if Ω is the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^N , [31] and [11] have found a radial symmetric solution for (1.13). This solution can not be the ground state one considering Theorem A. This shows the distinctive behavior of (1.13) between $s \in (0, 2)$ and $s = 0$. Indeed, when $s = 0$, the Pohozaev identity implies there is no solution to $\Delta u + u^{(N+2)/(N-2)} = 0$ if the domain is star-shaped. However, in our case, the Pohozaev identity for (1.13) is too complicated to obtain some non-existence results.

1.3. Structure of this paper. In Section 2, we shall give some preliminary about some properties of the minimizer of $\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. Harmonic radius will also be introduced. In Section 3, we will give the proof of Proposition 1.4 and Theorem 1.5. Sections 4, 5, and 6 are devoted to proving Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.3, and 1.7 respectively. Finally, in the appendix, we prove Lemma 2.2 and the non-degeneracy of the minimizers.

2. PRELIMINARY

Denote $\mathbb{R}_+^N = \{x = (x', x_N) : x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}, x_N > 0\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ as the completion of $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ under the norm $(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx)^{1/2}$. Recall Möbius transformation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M} : \mathbb{R}_+^N &\rightarrow \mathbb{B}^N \\ (x', x_N) &\mapsto y = \left(\frac{2x'}{|x'|^2 + (1+x_N)^2}, \frac{1-|x|^2}{|x'|^2 + (1+x_N)^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

In [35], the second named author and Meijun Zhu proved the following result.

Theorem B. Assume p and s satisfy (1.9). Then $\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ can be attained by some $0 < U \in \mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. All minimizers of $\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ consist of

$$\{CU(\varepsilon(x' - x_0), \varepsilon x_N) : \forall C > 0, \forall \varepsilon > 0, \forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}\}. \quad (2.2)$$

Moreover, U is unique in the sense that if we define \tilde{U} on \mathbb{B}^N by $\tilde{U} \circ \mathcal{M} = U |\det(D\mathcal{M})|^{\frac{2-N}{2N}}$, where \mathcal{M} is the Möbius transformation (2.1), then \tilde{U} is the unique radial solution of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + \frac{2^s u^{p-1}}{(1-|y|^2)^s} = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{B}^N, \quad 0 < u \in C^2(\mathbb{B}^N) \cap C^0(\overline{\mathbb{B}^N}), \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{B}^N. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

Furthermore, all the positive solutions of (1.13) with $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^N$ in $\mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ is of the form in (2.2).

Remark 2.1. The equality case follows from [14]. In the following two cases, the extremal functions can be explicitly written out and the best constant can be calculated.

(1) $p = 2 + \frac{2}{N}$ (that is $s = 1 + \frac{2}{N}$), one has

$$U(x', x_N) = (2N)^{\frac{N}{2}} \frac{x_N}{[(1+x_N)^2 + |x'|^2]^{N/2}}, \quad x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}, x_N > 0, \quad (2.4)$$

$$\tilde{U}(y) = \frac{1}{2} N^{\frac{N}{2}} (1 - |y|^2), \quad y \in \mathbb{B}^N.$$

(2) $p = 2 + \frac{4}{N}$ (that is $s = \frac{4}{N}$), one can take

$$U(x', x_N) = [N(N+2)]^{\frac{N}{4}} \frac{x_N}{(1+|x|^2)^{N/2}}, \quad x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}, x_N > 0, \quad (2.5)$$

$$\tilde{U}(y) = \frac{1}{2} [N(N+2)]^{\frac{N}{4}} (1 - |y|^2)(1 + |y|^2)^{-\frac{N}{2}}, \quad y \in \mathbb{B}^N.$$

For other cases, although we do not know the explicit expression of solutions, we can still have the following estimates. The proof is deferred to the appendix.

Lemma 2.2. Suppose U is the unique solution defined in Theorem B. Then

(1) U is cylindrical, i.e. $U(x', x_N) = U(|x'|, x_N)$.

(2) There exists a positive constant $C = C(p, N)$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$,

$$\begin{aligned} C^{-1} x_N (|x| + 1)^{-N} &\leq |U(x)| \leq C x_N (|x| + 1)^{-N}, \\ |\nabla U(x)| &\leq C (|x| + 1)^{-N}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

(3) If $N = 2$, then U attains the global maximum only at $(0', 1) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. If $N \geq 3$, then U attains the global maximum at finitely many points in \mathbb{R}_+^N , and all of them lie on the interval $\{(0', x_N) : 0 < x_N \leq 1\}$.

Remark 2.3. For $N \geq 3$ and any $s \in (0, 2)$, we conjecture that U has only one critical point where it takes the global maximum. One can verify this for $s = 1 + 2/N$ and $s = 4/N$ (see (2.4) and (2.5)). However, for general $s \in (0, 2)$, we do not know how to prove this.

Let us recall some basic facts about harmonic radius (see [6]). Suppose that Ω is an Euclidean domain of dimension $N \geq 2$ with Lipschitz boundary. The Green's function $G(x, y)$ of Ω with boundary Dirichlet boundary condition satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_y G(x, y) = -\delta_y(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \\ G(x, y) = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

here, δ_y is the Dirac function located at $y \in \Omega$. The Green's function can be decomposed into a fundamental singularity and a regular part:

$$G(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\pi}(-\log|x-y| - H(x, y)) & \text{if } N = 2, \\ \frac{\Gamma(N/2)}{2(N-2)\pi^{N/2}}(|x-y|^{2-N} - H(x, y)) & \text{if } N = 3. \end{cases}$$

The regular part $H(x, y)$ is harmonic in both variables. In particular, when $x = y$, $H(x, x)$ is called *Robin's function* of Ω at x . When $x \rightarrow \partial\Omega$, it holds $H(x, x) \rightarrow +\infty$. The *harmonic radius* $\mathfrak{r}_\Omega(x)$ of Ω at x is defined by

$$\mathfrak{r}_\Omega(x) := \begin{cases} \exp(-H(x, x)) & \text{if } N = 2, \\ H^{\frac{1}{2-N}}(x, x) & \text{if } N \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

The subscript of \mathfrak{r}_Ω will be dropped if the domain Ω is understood without ambiguity.

In two dimensions, the harmonic radius coincides with the *conformal radius* which seems to appear for the first time in the proof of Riemann mapping theorem. For every simply connected planar domain Ω whose complement contains at least two points, Riemann mapping theorem asserts that there is a f from Ω to the unit disk \mathbb{B}^2 , which is unique up to a rotation. The *Liouville formula* says that $\mathfrak{r}_\Omega = (1 - |f|^2)/|f'|$. Here f' is the complex derivative. In any dimension $N \geq 2$, the harmonic radius of \mathbb{B}^N and \mathbb{R}_+^N are known

$$\mathfrak{r}_{\mathbb{B}^N}(x) = 1 - |x|^2, \quad \mathfrak{r}_{\mathbb{R}_+^N}(x) = 2x_N.$$

Here we list some basic properties of harmonic radius (see [6]).

Lemma 2.4. *For domains with Lipschitz boundary, the harmonic radius has the following properties.*

- (1) (Positivity) *For $x \in \Omega$, we have $\mathfrak{r}_\Omega(x) > 0$ and \mathfrak{r}_Ω is smooth.*
- (2) (Monotonicity) *If $\Omega \subset \tilde{\Omega}$, then $\mathfrak{r}_\Omega(x) \leq \mathfrak{r}_{\tilde{\Omega}}(x)$ for any $x \in \Omega$.*
- (3) *For $x \in \Omega$, $\delta_\Omega(x) \leq \mathfrak{r}_\Omega(x) \leq \text{diam}(\Omega)/2$.*
- (4) *If Ω is convex, then $\mathfrak{r}_\Omega \leq 2\delta_\Omega$. If $\mathfrak{r}_\Omega = 2\delta_\Omega$, then Ω is a half-space.*

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose that $f : \Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}$ is a conformal equivalence, then the following transformation rules hold*

$$\Delta \tilde{u} \circ f = |f'|^{-\frac{N+2}{2}} \Delta \left(|f'|^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} u \right), \quad (2.8)$$

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{r}} \circ f = |f'| \mathfrak{r}, \quad (2.9)$$

where $|f'| := |\det Df|^{\frac{1}{N}}$.

3. PROOF OF CONFORMAL INVARIANCE AND CONSEQUENCE ON PLANAR DOMAINS

In this section, we give the proof of Proposition 1.4 and Theorem 1.5. First, we have the following equalities for conformal equivalence.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that $f : \Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}$ is a conformal equivalence. For any $u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, define $\tilde{u} \in C_0^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})$ such that $\tilde{u} \circ f = |f'|^{\frac{2-N}{2}}u$. Then*

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx = \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 d\tilde{x}, \quad (3.1)$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^p}{\mathbf{r}^s} dx = \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{|\tilde{u}|^p}{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}^s} d\tilde{x}. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. Using integration by parts, for $\tilde{u} \in C_0^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})$ we have

$$\int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 d\tilde{x} = - \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \tilde{u} \Delta \tilde{u} d\tilde{x}.$$

Making a change of variables, $d\tilde{x} = |f'|^N dx$, using (2.8), we have

$$\int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \tilde{u} \Delta \tilde{u} d\tilde{x} = \int_{\Omega} |f'|^{\frac{2-N}{2}} u \cdot |f'|^{-\frac{N+2}{2}} \Delta u \cdot |f'|^N dx = \int_{\Omega} u \Delta u dx.$$

Using (2.9), one has

$$\int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{|\tilde{u}|^p}{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}^s} d\tilde{x} = \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f'|^{\frac{2-N}{2}} u|^p}{(|f'| \mathbf{r})^s} |f'|^N dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^p}{\mathbf{r}^s} |f'|^{-s + \frac{2-N}{2} p + N} dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^p}{\mathbf{r}^s} dx.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Now, we give the proof of Proposition 1.4.

Proof of Proposition 1.4. Define the quotient

$$J_p^\Omega[u] = \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} \mathbf{r}^{-s} |u|^p dx \right)^{2/p}}. \quad (3.3)$$

Suppose Ω and $\tilde{\Omega}$ are conformally equivalent, Lemma 3.1 implies that $J_p^\Omega[u] = J_p^{\tilde{\Omega}}[\tilde{u}]$ for any $u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ and its counterparts $\tilde{u} \in C_0^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})$. Thus $\sigma_p(\Omega) \geq \sigma_p(\tilde{\Omega})$. The reverse inequality holds for the same reason. Therefore, $\sigma_p(\Omega) = \sigma_p(\tilde{\Omega})$.

To prove the second part, we only need to show if $\mu_p(\Omega)$ is attained for some convex Ω with $\sigma_p(\Omega) = \sigma_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, then it must be a half-space. Since Ω is convex, it holds $\mathbf{r}_\Omega \leq 2\delta_\Omega$ according to (4) of Lemma 2.4, which implies that

$$J_p^\Omega[u] = \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} \mathbf{r}_\Omega^{-s} |u|^p dx \right)^{2/p}} \leq 2^{\frac{2s}{p}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} \delta_\Omega^{-s} |u|^p dx \right)^{2/p}}, \quad (3.4)$$

here we have used the fact that $s \geq 0$. Taking the infimum on $u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, it leads to $\sigma_p(\Omega) \leq 2^{\frac{2s}{p}} \mu_p(\Omega)$. By our assumption, (2) of Theorem A and the fact that $\sigma_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N) = 2^{\frac{2s}{p}} \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, we have

$$\sigma_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N) = \sigma_p(\Omega) \leq 2^{\frac{2s}{p}} \mu_p(\Omega) \leq 2^{\frac{2s}{p}} \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N) = \sigma_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N).$$

Thus all inequalities must be equalities. Thus if $\mu_p(\Omega)$ is achieved by some $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, then $\sigma_p(\Omega)$ can also be achieved by this u . Thus (3.4) implies that $\mathfrak{r}(x) = 2\delta(x)$ for any $x \in \Omega$. This implies that Ω must be a half-space by (4) of Lemma 2.4. \square

Next, we give the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. To prove (1), Riemann mapping theorem implies that $\sigma_p(\Omega) = \sigma_p(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ for any simply connected Lipschitz hyperbolic region Ω . Then we only need to show $\sigma_2(\mathbb{R}_+^2) = 1$. In the planar case, one has $s = 2$. Note that $\sigma_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N) = 2^{\frac{2s}{p}} \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ and $\mu_2(\mathbb{R}_+^2) = 1/4$, the conclusion is obvious.

To prove (2). Since a convex planar domain with non-empty boundary must be simply connected Lipschitz hyperbolic region, then part (1) shows that $\sigma_p(\Omega) = \sigma_p(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$. It follows from Proposition 1.4 that Ω is a half-plane. When $p = 2$, $\mu_2(\Omega)$ is the Hardy constant $\mu^H(\Omega)$, which is not attained for half-plane. If $p > 2$, Theorem A implies that $\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ is achieved. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Fixing any point P on $\partial\Omega$, we assume that $\partial\Omega$ is C^2 near to it. Throughout this section, let P be the origin $0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ for simplicity. One has the so-called *Fermi coordinates* on a neighborhood \mathcal{O} of the origin in Ω , say $\Phi \in C^2$, which maps $B_{2\rho_0}^+ = \{(x', x_N) : |x| < 2\rho_0, x_N > 0\}$ to \mathcal{O} , for instance, see [16, section 3]. More precisely, $y = \Phi(x) = (\Phi_1(x), \dots, \Phi_N(x))$ for $x \in B_{2\rho_0}^+$ form a set of coordinates near $0 \in \partial\Omega$ with the following two properties. First, (x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}) is normal coordinates on $\partial\Omega$ at the point 0 . Second, the geodesic leaving from (x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}) in the orthogonal direction to $\partial\Omega$ is parameterized by x_N . In these coordinates, (\mathcal{O}, g_E) is isometric to $(B_{2\rho_0}, g)$ where

$$g := \Phi^* g_E = dx_N^2 + g_{ij}(x', x_N) dx_i dx_j$$

where the index i, j run from 1 to $N - 1$. Repeated index means summation. We have the following expansion formula of the metric g from [16].

Lemma 4.1. *Let (g^{ij}) be the inverse of the metric (g_{ij}) . For $|x|$ small, we have*

- (1) $g^{ij}(x', x_N) = \delta^{ij} + 2h_{ij}x_N + o(|x|)$,
- (2) $\sqrt{\det(g_{ij})}(x, x_N) = 1 - Hx_N + o(|x|)$,

where $\{h_{ij}\}$ is the second fundamental form at 0 , $H = \text{tr } h$ is the mean curvature at 0 .

Suppose that $\varphi(\rho)$ is a smooth decreasing function of ρ , which satisfies $\varphi(\rho) = 1$ for $\rho \leq \rho_0$, $\varphi(\rho) = 0$ for $\rho \geq 2\rho_0$ and $|\varphi'(\rho)| \leq 2\rho_0^{-1}$ for $\rho_0 \leq \rho \leq 2\rho_0$. Let

$$u(x) = \varphi(|x|)U_\varepsilon(x), \tag{4.1}$$

where $U_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{1-\frac{N}{2}}U(\frac{x}{\varepsilon})$ and U is the extremal function of $\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ defined in Theorem B. Via Fermi coordinates, one can define $\tilde{u}(y) = u(\Phi^{-1}(y))$, which is well defined for any $y \in \Omega$ because of the support of the φ .

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that ρ_0 is a fixed small number and u is defined through (4.1). For ε sufficiently small, we have*

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \tilde{u}|_{g_E}^2 dvol_{g_E} = \int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|_g^2 dvol_g = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla U|^2 dx + \varepsilon H I_1 + o(\varepsilon), \quad (4.2)$$

where $I_1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} [-x_N |\nabla U|^2 + 2x_N (\partial_{x_1} U)^2] dx$.

Proof. The first equal sign is obvious because Φ is an isomorphism. Let us first compute the integral in $B_{\rho_0}^+$. From the expression of $g = \Phi^* g_E$ and Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|_g^2 dvol_g &= \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} (g^{ij} u_i u_j + u_N^2) dvol_g = \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} (g^{ij} u_i u_j + u_N^2) \sqrt{\det(g)} dx \\ &= \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|^2 \sqrt{\det(g)} dx + 2h_{ij} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N u_i u_j \sqrt{\det(g)} dx + o(e), \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where $u_i = \partial_{x_i} u$, $|\nabla u|^2 = u_1^2 + \dots + u_{N-1}^2 + u_N^2$ and

$$e := \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |x| |\nabla u|^2 \sqrt{\det(g)} dx.$$

For the first term on the right hand side of (4.3), we apply Lemma 4.1 again to get

$$\int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|^2 \sqrt{\det(g)} dx = \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx - H \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N |\nabla u|^2 dx + o(e). \quad (4.4)$$

To deal with the first term on the right-hand side of the above equality, using the decay estimates of U in (2.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx &= \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} |\nabla U|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla U|^2 dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} |\nabla U|^2 dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla U|^2 dx + O(\varepsilon^N \rho_0^{-N}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Similarly, we estimate the second term on the right-hand side of (4.4) as the following

$$\int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N |\nabla u|^2 dx = \varepsilon \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N |\nabla U|^2 dx = \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N |\nabla U|^2 dx + O(\varepsilon^N \rho_0^{1-N}).$$

To deal with the last term on the right-hand side of (4.4), we notice that on $B_{\rho_0}^+$,

$$|\nabla u|^2(x) \leq C \varepsilon^{-N} \left(\frac{|x|}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right)^{-2N},$$

which leads to

$$e \leq C \varepsilon \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} |x| (1 + |x|)^{-2N} dx \leq C \varepsilon.$$

Now we insert the previous three estimates to (4.4) and $\varepsilon^N \rho_0^{-N} = o(\varepsilon)$ to obtain

$$\int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|^2 \sqrt{\det(g)} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla U|^2 dx - \varepsilon H \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N |\nabla U|^2 dx + o(\varepsilon). \quad (4.6)$$

For the second integral on the right-hand side in (4.3), we estimate

$$\int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N u_i u_j \sqrt{\det(g)} dx = \varepsilon \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N U_i U_j dx + o(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N U_i U_j dx + o(\varepsilon).$$

The symmetries of the half-ball and U imply

$$h_{ij} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N u_i u_j \sqrt{\det(g)} dx = \varepsilon H \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N (\partial_{x_1} U)^2 dx + O(\varepsilon). \quad (4.7)$$

Consolidating the results in (4.6) and (4.7), we have a bound of (4.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|_g^2 dvol_g &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla U|^2 dx - \varepsilon H \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N |\nabla U|^2 dx \\ &\quad + 2\varepsilon H \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N (\partial_{x_1} U)^2 dx + o(\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

On $B_{2\rho_0}^+ - B_{\rho_0}^+$, we observe that

$$|\nabla u|_g^2 \leq C |\nabla u|^2 \leq C (\varphi^2 \cdot |\nabla U_\varepsilon|^2 + |\nabla \varphi|^2 U_\varepsilon^2).$$

Using the estimates of U and the facts that $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$ and $|\nabla \varphi| \leq 2/\rho_0$, we get

$$\int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+ - B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|_g^2 dvol_g \leq C \left(\frac{\rho_0}{\varepsilon}\right)^{-N} = C \varepsilon^N \rho_0^{-N} = o(\varepsilon). \quad (4.9)$$

Combining (4.8), (4.9), we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|_g^2 dvol_g = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla U|^2 dx + \varepsilon H I_1 + o(\varepsilon),$$

where I_1 is defined in (4.2). The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that ρ_0 is a fixed small number and u is defined through (4.1). For ε sufficiently small, one has*

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{\tilde{u}^p}{\delta_{\Omega}^s} dvol_{g_E} = \int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+} \frac{u^p}{x_N^s} dvol_g = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} U^p dx - \varepsilon H I_2 + o(\varepsilon), \quad (4.10)$$

where $I_2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s+1} U^p dx$.

Proof. In the Fermi coordinates, the distance function $\delta_\Omega = x_N$. This implies the first equal sign in (4.10). Applying Lemma 4.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} \frac{u^p}{x_N^s} d\text{vol}_g &= \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} \frac{u^p}{x_N^s} \sqrt{\det(g)} dx \\ &= \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s} U^p dx - \varepsilon H \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s+1} U^p dx - o\left(\varepsilon \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} |x|^{1-s} U^p dx\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

The last term can be estimated by applying (2.6),

$$\int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} |x|^{1-s} U^p dx \leq C \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} (1 + |x|)^{1-s-(N-1)p} dx \leq C \int_0^{\rho_0/\varepsilon} (1+r)^{-\frac{Np}{2}} dr \leq C,$$

where we have used the fact $p > 2$. Similarly, for the left terms on the right hand side of (4.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s} U^p dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} U^p dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s} U^p dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} U^p dx + O\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{Np}{2}} \rho_0^{-\frac{Np}{2}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s+1} U^p dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s+1} U^p dx + O\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{Np}{2}-1} \rho_0^{1-\frac{Np}{2}}\right).$$

On $B_{2\rho_0}^+ - B_{\rho_0}^+$, using (2.6), we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+ - B_{\rho_0}^+} \frac{u^p}{x_N^s} d\text{vol}_g &\leq C \int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+ - B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N^{-s} U_\varepsilon^p dx = C \int_{B_{2\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+ - B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s} (1 + |x|)^{(1-N)p} dx \\ &= C \left(\frac{\rho_0}{\varepsilon}\right)^{-\frac{Np}{2}} = o(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Back to (4.11), we have

$$\int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+} \frac{u^p}{x_N^s} d\text{vol}_g = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} U^p dx - \varepsilon H I_2 + o(\varepsilon),$$

where I_2 is defined in (4.10). The proof is complete. \square

We have the following Pohozaev-type identities.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose U is defined in Theorem B, I_1 is defined in (4.2), and I_2 is defined in (4.10). One has*

$$I_1 + \frac{2(N-1) - s}{(N-1)p} I_2 = 0.$$

Proof. Recall that U satisfies

$$-\Delta U = x_N^{-s} U^{p-1}, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N. \quad (4.12)$$

Multiplying equation (4.12) by $x_N U$ and integrating by parts, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s+1} U^p dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \nabla U \cdot \nabla(x_N U) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N |\nabla U|^2 dx. \quad (4.13)$$

Note that $x_N U$ is not in $L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ when $N = 2$. To justify the integration by parts, one has to multiply a cut-off function of $x_N U$ or do the integration by parts on compact domains, and then take the limit. We omit the details here. The above equality means $I_2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N |\nabla U|^2 dx$.

Multiplying equation (4.12) by $x_N^2 \partial_{x_N} U$ and integrating by parts on both sides, we have

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 \partial_{x_N} U \Delta U dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \nabla U \cdot \nabla(x_N^2 \partial_{x_N} U) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 \partial_{x_N} |\nabla U|^2 dx + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N (\partial_{x_N} U)^2 dx \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N |\nabla U|^2 dx + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N (\partial_{x_N} U)^2 dx \\ &= I_2 - 2(N-1) \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N (\partial_{x_1} U)^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} U^{p-1} \cdot x_N^2 \partial_{x_N} U dx = \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{2-s} \partial_{x_N} U^p dx = \frac{s-2}{p} I_2.$$

Putting the above two identities together, we obtain

$$2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N (\partial_{x_1} U)^2 dx = \frac{p+2-s}{(N-1)p} I_2.$$

Inserting this identity with equation (4.13) to the expression of I_1 in (4.2), one readily have

$$I_1 = -I_2 + \frac{p+2-s}{(N-1)p} I_2 = \frac{-2(N-1)+s}{(N-1)p} I_2.$$

□

Now we can prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Suppose the origin is on $\partial\Omega$ such that its mean curvature is negative. Set up the Fermi coordinates Φ near the origin. Define u to (4.1) and $\tilde{u} = u \circ \Phi^{-1}$. We shall show $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \tilde{u}|_{g_E}^2 dvol_{g_E} < \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N) (\int_{\Omega} \delta^{-s} \tilde{u}^p dvol_{g_E})^{\frac{2}{p}}$ if ε is chosen small enough.

Using Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3, we need to show

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla U|^2 dx + \varepsilon H I_1 + o(\varepsilon) < \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} U^p dx - \varepsilon H I_2 + o(\varepsilon) \right)^{\frac{2}{p}}.$$

Since U satisfies (4.12), then $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla U|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} U^p dx = (\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{\frac{p}{p-2}}$. Then it suffices to show

$$H I_1 < \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} U^p dx \right)^{\frac{2-p}{p}} \frac{2}{p} (-H I_2) = -\frac{2}{p} H I_2. \quad (4.14)$$

Note that $H < 0$, then we only need to show $I_1 + \frac{2}{p} I_2 > 0$. This can be seen from the Lemma 4.4 and $s > 0$ that

$$I_1 + \frac{2}{p} I_2 = \frac{s}{(N-1)p} I_2 > 0.$$

The proof is complete. \square

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

In this section, we assume $N \geq 3$, $\partial\Omega$ is C^3 near one point, whose mean curvature vanishes and is non-umbilic there. First, we have a refined expansion of the metric under Fermi coordinates from [16].

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose $\partial\Omega$ is C^3 near origin and $H = 0$ at the origin. For $|x|$ small, we have*

- (1) $g^{ij}(x', x_N) = \delta_{ij} + 2h_{ij}x_N - \frac{1}{3}\bar{R}_{iklj}x_kx_l + g^{ij}_{,Nm}x_Nx_m + 3h_{im}h_{mj}x_N^2 + o(|x|^2)$,
- (2) $\sqrt{\det(g_{ij})(x', x_N)} = 1 - \frac{1}{2}\|h\|^2x_N^2 - H_ix_N - \frac{1}{6}\bar{R}_{ij}x_ix_j + o(|x|^2)$,

where the coefficients are all evaluated at 0. Here $\{h_{ij}\}$ is the second fundamental form, $\|h\|^2 = h_{ij}h_{ij}$, H is the trace of h , $H_i = (\partial_{x_i}H)(0)$. $\{\bar{R}_{iklj}\}$ is the Riemann tensor of $\partial\Omega$ and $\{\bar{R}_{ij}\}$ is its Ricci tensor.

We define

$$u(x) = \varphi(|x|)(U_\varepsilon + \psi_\varepsilon)(x), \quad (5.1)$$

where φ and U_ε are as before, $\psi_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{2-\frac{N}{2}}\psi(x/\varepsilon)$ with $\psi(x) = Ah_{ij}x_ix_jx_NZ(x)$. Here Z is some function to be chosen and A is some constant to be determined. Such type of test function has been used by Marques [28]. Again, via Fermi coordinates, we define $\tilde{u} = u \circ \Phi$ which lives on Ω .

We shall assume that Z has cylindrical symmetry and a similar bound as U in (2.6).

$$\begin{aligned} Z(x) &= Z(|x'|, x_N) = Z(r, x_N), \\ |Z(x)| &\leq C(1 + |x|)^{-1-N}, \quad |\nabla Z(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)^{-2-N}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

Here and throughout this section, we denote $r = |x'|$. Later we will choose $Z(r, x_N) = r^{-1}\partial_r U(r, x_N)$. One can see that it satisfies the above two properties in the special case $p = 2 + 2/N$ and $p = 2 + 4/N$ because the explicit form (2.4) and (2.5).

Under the assumption of Z , ψ can be bounded as

$$|\psi(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)^{2-N}, \quad |\nabla\psi(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)^{1-N}. \quad (5.3)$$

One can think of ψ as a perturbation of U , because if ρ_0 is sufficiently small and A is fixed, then $|\psi_\varepsilon| = O(r)U_\varepsilon$ by (2.6). Thus, in $B_{2\rho_0}^+$, one has

$$\frac{1}{2}\varphi(|x|)U_\varepsilon \leq u \leq 2\varphi(|x|)U_\varepsilon. \quad (5.4)$$

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose that ρ_0 is a fixed small number and u is defined as (5.1) with Z satisfies (5.2). For ε sufficiently small, we have*

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla\tilde{u}|_{g_E}^2 d\text{vol}_{g_E} = \int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|_g^2 d\text{vol}_g = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla U|^2 dx + \varepsilon^2 \|h\|^2 I_5 + o(\varepsilon^2), \quad (5.5)$$

where

$$I_5 = I_3 + \frac{2A^2}{N^2 - 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 r^4 |\nabla Z|^2 + \frac{8A}{N^2 - 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 [rU_r - r^2 U_{rr}] Z dr, \quad (5.6)$$

and

$$I_3 = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \left[-\frac{1}{2} x_N^2 |\nabla U|^2 + \frac{1}{6} x_1^2 |\nabla U|^2 + 3x_N^2 (\partial_{x_1} U)^2 \right] dx.$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of Lemma 4.2, we apply Lemma 5.1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|_{g_E}^2 d\text{vol}_{g_E} = \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} (g^{ij} u_i u_j + u_N^2) \sqrt{\det(g)} dx \\ &= \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|^2 \sqrt{\det(g)} dx + 2h_{ij} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N u_i u_j \sqrt{\det(g)} dx - \frac{1}{3} \bar{R}_{iklj} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_k x_l u_i u_j \sqrt{\det(g)} dx \\ &+ \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} g^{ij}{}_{,Nm} x_N x_m u_i u_j \sqrt{\det(g)} + 3h_{im} h_{mj} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N^2 u_i u_j \sqrt{\det(g)} dx + o(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \\ &= J_1 + J_2 - J_3 + J_4 + J_5 + o(\tilde{\varepsilon}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where

$$\tilde{\varepsilon} := \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |x|^2 |\nabla u|^2 \sqrt{\det(g)} dx.$$

For the first term J_1 on the right hand side of (5.7), we apply Lemma 5.1 again to get

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|^2 \sqrt{\det(g)} dx \\ &= \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{1}{2} \|h\|^2 \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N^2 |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{1}{6} \bar{R}_{ij} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_i x_j |\nabla u|^2 dx + o(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

Here we have used the cylindrical symmetry of u which leads to $\int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_i x_N |\nabla u|^2 dx = 0$.

For $N \geq 3$, the first term on the right-hand side of (5.8) is estimated by (4.5) and the following

$$\int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} (|\nabla U|^2 + \varepsilon^2 |\nabla \psi|^2) dx + O(\varepsilon^N \rho_0^{-N}), \quad (5.9)$$

where we claim that

$$\int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} \nabla U \cdot \nabla \psi dx = 0, \quad (5.10)$$

due to the cylindrical symmetry of U and $H = 0$. In fact, since $\psi = Ah_{kl}x_kx_lx_NZ$, we have

$$\psi_j = Ax_N[2h_{jl}x_lZ + h_{kl}x_kx_lx_jr^{-1}Z_r], \quad (5.11)$$

$$\psi_N = Ah_{kl}x_kx_l[Z + x_NZ_N], \quad (5.12)$$

where $Z_r = \partial_r Z(r, x_N)$ and $Z_N = \partial_{x_N} Z(r, x_N)$. Then by $H = 0$, we have

$$\int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} U_N \psi_N dx = Ah_{kl} \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_kx_l U_N [Z + x_N Z_N] dx = AH \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_1^2 U_N [Z + x_N Z_N] dx = 0,$$

and summing j from 1 to $N - 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} U_j \psi_j dx &= \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_j r^{-1} U_r A x_N [2h_{jl}x_lZ + h_{kl}x_kx_lx_jr^{-1}Z_r] dx \\ &= 2Ah_{jl} \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_jx_lx_N r^{-1} U_r Z dx + Ah_{kl} \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_kx_lx_N U_r Z_r dx \\ &= 2AH \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_1^2 x_N r^{-1} U_r Z dx + AH \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_1^2 x_N U_r Z_r dx = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Adding the last two equalities together, we get (5.10). Next, we compute $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla \psi|^2 dx$. By (5.11) and (5.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla \psi|^2 dx &= A^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 [4h_{jk}h_{jl}x_kx_lZ^2 + h_{kl}h_{mn}x_kx_lx_mx_nZ_r^2 + 4h_{ji}h_{kl}x_kx_lx_ix_jr^{-1}ZZ_r] dx \\ &\quad + A^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} h_{kl}h_{mn}x_kx_lx_mx_n [Z^2 + x_N^2Z_N^2 + 2x_NZZ_N] dx \\ &= A^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 [4h_{jk}h_{jl}x_kx_lZ^2 + (h_{kl}x_kx_l)^2Z_r^2 + 4(h_{kl}x_kx_l)^2r^{-1}ZZ_r] dx \\ &\quad + A^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} (h_{kl}x_kx_l)^2 [Z^2 + x_N^2Z_N^2 + 2x_NZZ_N] dx \\ &= A^2 \|h\|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 \left[\frac{4}{N-1} r^2 Z^2 + \frac{2}{N^2-1} r^4 Z_r^2 + \frac{8}{N^2-1} r^3 ZZ_r \right] dx \\ &\quad + A^2 \|h\|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{2r^4}{N^2-1} [Z^2 + x_N^2Z_N^2 + 2x_NZZ_N] dx, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the identity (see [28, p. 390])

$$\int_{S_r^{N-2}} (h_{ij}x_i x_j)^2 = \int_{S_r^{N-2}} h_{ij}h_{kl}x_i x_j x_k x_l = \frac{2\|h\|^2}{N^2-1} \int_{S_r^{N-2}} r^4. \quad (5.13)$$

Simple integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla\psi|^2 dx \\ &= \frac{2A^2\|h\|^2}{N^2-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} (x_N^2 r^2 [2(N+1)Z^2 + r^2 Z_r^2 + 4rZZ_r] + r^4 [Z^2 + x_N^2 Z_N^2 + 2x_N Z Z_N]) dx \\ &= \frac{2A^2\|h\|^2}{N^2-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} (x_N^2 r^2 [2(N+1)Z^2 + r^2 Z_r^2 - 2(N+1)Z^2] + x_N^2 r^4 Z_N^2) dx \\ &= \frac{2A^2\|h\|^2}{N^2-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 r^4 (Z_r^2 + Z_N^2) dx = \frac{2A^2\|h\|^2}{N^2-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 r^4 |\nabla Z|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Back to (5.9), we have

$$\int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla U|^2 dx + \frac{2A^2\|h\|^2}{N^2-1} \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 r^4 |\nabla Z|^2 dx + O(\varepsilon^N \rho_0^{-N}). \quad (5.14)$$

Similarly, we estimate the second term on the right-hand side of (5.8) as the following

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N^2 |\nabla u|^2 dx &= \varepsilon^2 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^2 |\nabla U + \varepsilon \nabla \psi|^2 dx \\ &= \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 |\nabla U|^2 dx + O(\varepsilon^N \rho_0^{2-N}) + O\left(\varepsilon^4 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^2 |\nabla \psi|^2 dx\right) \\ &= \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 |\nabla U|^2 dx + \begin{cases} O(\varepsilon^3 \rho_0^{-1}), & \text{if } N = 3, \\ O(\varepsilon^4 \ln \frac{\rho_0}{\varepsilon}), & \text{if } N = 4, \\ O(\varepsilon^4), & \text{if } N \geq 5, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the following fact, whose verification is similar to that of (5.10),

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 \nabla U \nabla \psi dx = 0.$$

For the third term on the right-hand side of (5.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{R}_{ij} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_i x_j |\nabla u|^2 dx &= \bar{R} \varepsilon^2 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_1^2 |\nabla U + \varepsilon \nabla \psi|^2 \\ &= \bar{R} \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_1^2 |\nabla U|^2 + O(\varepsilon^N \rho_0^{2-N}) + O\left(\varepsilon^4 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_1^2 |\nabla \psi|^2 dx\right) \\ &= -\|h\|^2 \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_1^2 |\nabla U|^2 + O(\varepsilon^N \rho_0^{2-N}) + \begin{cases} O(\varepsilon^3 \rho_0^{-1}), & \text{if } N = 3, \\ O(\varepsilon^4 \ln \frac{\rho_0}{\varepsilon}), & \text{if } N = 4, \\ O(\varepsilon^4), & \text{if } N \geq 5. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Here \bar{R} is the scalar curvature of $\partial\Omega$ at 0. By the Gauss curvature equation, since the ambient metric is Euclidean, one has $\bar{R} = -\|h\|^2$, for instance, see [16, (3.22)].

To deal with the last term on the right-hand side of (5.8), applying the bound of U in (2.6) and ψ in (5.3), we obtain that on $B_{\rho_0}^+$,

$$|\nabla u|^2(x) \leq C\varepsilon^{-N} \left(\frac{|x|}{\varepsilon} + 1\right)^{-2N} + C\varepsilon^{2-N} \left(\frac{|x|}{\varepsilon} + 1\right)^{2-2N} \leq C(\rho_0)\varepsilon^{-N} \left(\frac{|x|}{\varepsilon} + 1\right)^{-2N},$$

which leads to

$$\tilde{\varepsilon} \leq C \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |x|^2 |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq \varepsilon^2 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} |x|^2 (1 + |x|)^{-2N} dx \leq C\varepsilon^2$$

Now we insert the previous four estimates to (5.8) to get

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla U|^2 dx + \frac{2A^2 \|h\|^2}{N^2 - 1} \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 r^4 |\nabla Z|^2 dx - \frac{1}{2} \|h\|^2 \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 |\nabla U|^2 dx \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6} \|h\|^2 \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_1^2 |\nabla U|^2 dx + o(\varepsilon^2) \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

For the second integral J_2 on the right-hand side of (5.7), we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} J_2 &= 2h_{ij} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N u_i u_j \sqrt{\det(g)} dx = 2h_{ij} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N u_i u_j dx + o(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \\ &= 2h_{ij} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N (U_\varepsilon)_i (U_\varepsilon)_j dx + 4h_{ij} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N (U_\varepsilon)_i (\psi_\varepsilon)_j dx \\ &\quad + 2h_{ij} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N (\psi_\varepsilon)_i (\psi_\varepsilon)_j dx + o(\tilde{\varepsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right-hand side of the above equality is zero because of the symmetries of the half-ball and U and $H = 0$. For the other two terms, we have

$$\int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N (\psi_\varepsilon)_i (\psi_\varepsilon)_j dx = \varepsilon^3 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N \psi_i \psi_j dx = \varepsilon^3 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N (1 + |x|)^{2-2N} dx = o(\varepsilon^2),$$

$$\int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N (U_\varepsilon)_i (\psi_\varepsilon)_j dx = \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N U_i \psi_j dx + O(\varepsilon^N \rho_0^{2-N}).$$

We recall (5.11) to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{ij} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N U_i \psi_j dx &= Ah_{ij} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 x_i r^{-1} \partial_r U [2h_{jl} x_l Z + h_{kl} x_k x_l x_j r^{-1} Z_r] dx \\
&= A \|h\|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \left[\frac{2}{N-1} x_N^2 (r U_r) Z + \frac{2}{N^2-1} x_N^2 r^2 U_r Z_r \right] dx \\
&= \frac{2A \|h\|^2}{N^2-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 [(N+1)r U_r Z - N r U_r Z - r^2 U_{rr} Z] dx \\
&= \frac{2A \|h\|^2}{N^2-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 [r U_r - r^2 U_{rr}] Z dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$J_2 = \frac{8A \|h\|^2}{N^2-1} \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 [r U_r - r^2 U_{rr}] Z dx + o(\varepsilon^2).$$

For J_3 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_3 &= \frac{1}{3} \bar{R}_{iklj} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_k x_l u_i u_j \sqrt{\det(g)} dx = \frac{1}{3} \bar{R}_{iklj} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_k x_l u_i u_j dx + o(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \\
&= \frac{1}{3} \bar{R}_{iklj} \varepsilon^2 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_k x_l (U_i + \varepsilon \psi_i) (U_j + \varepsilon \psi_j) dx + o(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \\
&= \frac{1}{3} \bar{R}_{iklj} \varepsilon^2 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_k x_l x_i x_j r^{-2} (\partial_r U)^2 dx + o(\tilde{\varepsilon}) = o(\tilde{\varepsilon})
\end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

where we have used the symmetries of the curvature tensor (i.e. $\bar{R}_{ijkl} + \bar{R}_{iklj} + \bar{R}_{iljk} = 0$) and cylindrical symmetry of $U(x', x_N) = U(r, x_N)$ to write $U_i = x_i r^{-1} \partial_r U$.

Similarly, using the cylindrical symmetry of U , we have

$$J_4 = \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} g^{ij}{}_{,Nm} x_N x_m u_i u_j \sqrt{\det(g)} dx = o(\tilde{\varepsilon}). \tag{5.17}$$

For J_5 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_5 &= 3h_{im} h_{mj} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N^2 u_i u_j \sqrt{\det(g)} dx = 3h_{im} h_{mj} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N^2 u_i u_j dx + o(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \\
&= 3h_{im} h_{mj} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N^2 (U_\varepsilon)_i (U_\varepsilon)_j dx + o(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \\
&= 3 \|h\|^2 \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 (\partial_{x_1} U)^2 dx + o(\tilde{\varepsilon}) + O(\varepsilon^N \rho_0^{2-N}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above estimates of J_1 to J_5 , we have a bound of (5.7),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|_g^2 dvol_g &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla U|^2 dx + \frac{2A^2 \|h\|^2}{N^2 - 1} \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 r^4 |\nabla Z|^2 dx \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \|h\|^2 \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 |\nabla U|^2 dx + \frac{1}{6} \varepsilon^2 \|h\|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_1^2 |\nabla U|^2 dx \\ &\quad + \frac{8A \|h\|^2}{N^2 - 1} \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 [rU_r - r^2 U_{rr}] Z dx \\ &\quad + 3 \|h\|^2 \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 (\partial_{x_1} U)^2 dx + o(\varepsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

On $B_{2\rho_0}^+ - B_{\rho_0}^+$, we can derive a similar estimates as (4.9).

$$\int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+ - B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|_g^2 dvol_g \leq C \cdot \left(\frac{\rho_0}{\varepsilon}\right)^{-N} = C \varepsilon^N \rho_0^{-N} = o(\varepsilon^2).$$

Combining the above two estimates, we have

$$\int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+} |\nabla u|_g^2 dvol_g = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla U|^2 dx + \varepsilon^2 \|h\|^2 I_5 + o(\varepsilon^2),$$

where I_5 is defined in (5.6). This proves (5.5). \square

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose that ρ_0 is a fixed small number and u is defined through (4.1) with Z satisfies (5.2). For ε sufficiently small, one has*

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{\tilde{u}^p}{\delta_{\Omega}^s} dvol_{g_E} = \int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+} \frac{u^p}{x_N^s} dvol_g = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} U^p dx - \varepsilon^2 \|h\|^2 I_6 + o(\varepsilon^2), \quad (5.18)$$

where

$$I_6 = I_4 - p(p-1) \frac{A^2}{N^2 - 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{2-s} r^4 U^{p-2} Z^2, \quad (5.19)$$

and $I_4 = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \left[\frac{1}{2} x_N^{-s+2} U^p - \frac{1}{6} x_N^{-s} x_1^2 U^p \right] dx$.

Proof. Via Fermi coordinates, the distance function δ_{Ω} is just x_N . Applying Lemma 5.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} \frac{u^p}{x_N^s} dvol_g &= \int_{B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N^{-s} (U_{\varepsilon} + \psi_{\varepsilon})^p \sqrt{\det(g)} dx \\ &= \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s} (U + \varepsilon\psi)^p dx - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \|h\|^2 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s+2} (U + \varepsilon\psi)^p dx \\ &\quad - \varepsilon^2 H_i \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s+1} x_i (U + \varepsilon\psi)^p dx - \frac{1}{6} \bar{R}_{ij} \varepsilon^2 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s} x_i x_j (U + \varepsilon\psi)^p dx \\ &\quad + o\left(\varepsilon^2 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} |x|^2 x_N^{-s} (U + \varepsilon\psi)^p dx\right) = \tilde{J}_1 + \tilde{J}_2 + \tilde{J}_3 + \tilde{J}_4 + o(\varepsilon^2), \end{aligned}$$

where the last term is estimated using (2.6), $p > 2$ and $N \geq 3$,

$$\int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} |x|^2 x_N^{-s} U^p dx \leq C \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} (1 + |x|)^{2-s-(N-1)p} dx \leq C \int_0^{\rho_0/\varepsilon} (1+r)^{2-\frac{Np}{2}} dr \leq C,$$

and the fact $\varepsilon\psi = O(\varepsilon|x|)U \leq \rho_0 U$ in $B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+$ which follows from (2.6) and (5.3).

For \tilde{J}_1 , by $(U + \varepsilon\psi)^p = U^p + p\varepsilon U^{p-1}\psi + \frac{p(p-1)}{2}\varepsilon^2 U^{p-2}\psi^2 + O(\varepsilon^3 U^p)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J}_1 &= \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s} U^p + \frac{p(p-1)}{2}\varepsilon^2 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s} U^{p-2}\psi^2 dx + O\left(\varepsilon^3 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s} |x|^3 U^p\right) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} U^p + \frac{p(p-1)}{2}\varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} U^{p-2}\psi^2 dx + O(\varepsilon^3) + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{Np}{2}} \rho_0^{-\frac{Np}{2}}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

where we have used the following fact, which holds by the symmetry of U and ψ and $H = 0$

$$\int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s} U^{p-1}\psi dx = 0.$$

For the second term on the right hand of (5.20), applying (5.13), we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} U^{p-2}\psi^2 dx = A^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{2-s} (h_{ij} x_i x_j)^2 U^{p-2} Z^2 dx = \frac{2A^2 \|h\|^2}{N^2 - 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{2-s} r^4 U^{p-2} Z^2 dx.$$

Back to (5.20), it holds that

$$\tilde{J}_1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} U^p + p(p-1) \frac{A^2 \|h\|^2}{N^2 - 1} \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{2-s} r^4 U^{p-2} Z^2 dx + O(\varepsilon^3).$$

For \tilde{J}_2 , similarly with \tilde{J}_1 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J}_2 &= -\frac{1}{2} \|h\|^2 \varepsilon^2 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s+2} (U + \varepsilon\psi)^p dx \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \|h\|^2 \varepsilon^2 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s+2} U^p dx + O\left(\varepsilon^4 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s+2} U^p dx\right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \|h\|^2 \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s+2} U^p dx + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{Np}{2}} \rho_0^{2-\frac{Np}{2}}) + O(\varepsilon^4). \end{aligned}$$

For \tilde{J}_3 , since $\int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{1-s} x_i U^p dx = 0$ due to the cylindrical symmetry of U , we have

$$\tilde{J}_3 = O(\varepsilon^3 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{1-s} |x| U^p dx) = O(\varepsilon^3).$$

By the Gauss curvature equation, since the ambient metric is Euclidean, one has $\bar{R} = -\|h\|^2$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{J}_4 &= -\frac{1}{6}\bar{R}_{ij}\varepsilon^2 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s} x_i x_j (U + \varepsilon\psi)^p dx \\ &= -\frac{1}{6}\bar{R}\varepsilon^2 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s} x_1^2 U^p dx + O(\varepsilon^3 \int_{B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s} x_1^2 U^p dx) \\ &= \frac{1}{6}\|h\|^2 \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} x_1^2 U^p dx + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{Np}{2}} \rho_0^{2-\frac{Np}{2}}) + O(\varepsilon^3).\end{aligned}$$

On $B_{2\rho_0}^+ - B_{\rho_0}^+$, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+ - B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N^{-s} U^p dvol_{g_E} &\leq C \int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+ - B_{\rho_0}^+} x_N^{-s} U_\varepsilon^p dx = C \int_{B_{2\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+ - B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} x_N^{-s} (1 + |x|)^{-Np} dx \\ &= C \left(\frac{\rho_0}{\varepsilon}\right)^{-\frac{Np}{2}} = C \varepsilon^{\frac{Np}{2}} \rho_0^{-\frac{Np}{2}} = o(\varepsilon^2)\end{aligned}$$

because $p > 2$ and $N \geq 3$. Combining the inequalities of \tilde{J}_1 to \tilde{J}_4 and the above, we have

$$\int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+} \frac{u^p}{x_N^s} dvol_g = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} U^p dx - \varepsilon^2 \|h\|^2 I_6 + o(\varepsilon^2),$$

where I_6 is defined in (5.19). This completes the proof. \square

Now we can prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Suppose the origin is on $\partial\Omega$ such that its mean curvature is zero and $\|h\| \neq 0$. Set up the Fermi coordinates Φ near the origin. Define u as (5.1) and $\tilde{u} = u \circ \Phi^{-1}$. We shall show $\int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde{u}|_{g_E}^2 dvol_{g_E} < \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N) (\int_\Omega \delta_\Omega^{-s} \tilde{u}^p dvol_{g_E})^{\frac{2}{p}}$ if ε is chosen small enough.

Using Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.3, we need to show

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla U|^2 dx + \varepsilon^2 \|h\|^2 I_5 + o(\varepsilon^2) \leq \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} U^p dx - \varepsilon^2 \|h\|^2 I_6 + o(\varepsilon^2) \right)^{\frac{2}{p}}.$$

Since U satisfies (4.12), then $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla U|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} U^p dx = (\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{\frac{p}{p-2}}$. Then it suffices to show

$$\|h\|^2 I_5 < \frac{2}{p} (-\|h\|^2 I_6) = -\frac{2}{p} \|h\|^2 I_6.$$

Note that $\|h\| \neq 0$, then we only need to show $I_5 + \frac{2}{p} I_6 < 0$. Unfortunately, in this case, we do not have a nice Pohozaev identity.

Choosing $Z(r, x_N) = r^{-1}\partial_r U(r, x_N)$ and using (5.6) and (5.19), it leads to

$$\begin{aligned} I_5 + \frac{2}{p}I_6 &= I_3 + \frac{2}{p}I_4 + \frac{8A}{N^2 - 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 [rU_r - r^2U_{rr}]Z dx \\ &\quad + \frac{2A^2}{N^2 - 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 r^4 |\nabla Z|^2 dx - 2(p-1) \frac{A^2}{N^2 - 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{2-s} r^4 U^{p-2} Z^2. \end{aligned}$$

We want to find A such that $I_5 + \frac{2}{p}I_6 < 0$. It suffices to have the discriminant $D_N > 0$, where

$$\begin{aligned} D_N &= \frac{8}{N^2 - 1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^2 [rU_r - r^2U_{rr}]Z dx \right)^2 - \left(I_3 + \frac{2}{p}I_4 \right) \\ &\quad \times \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} [x_N^2 r^4 |\nabla Z|^2 - (p-1)x_N^{2-s} r^4 U^{p-2} Z^2] dx \right) \end{aligned}$$

(1) If $p = 2 + \frac{2}{N}$, we have

$$U(x', x_N) = (2N)^{\frac{N}{2}} \frac{x_N}{[(1+x_N)^2 + |x'|^2]^{N/2}}$$

Using Mathematica [32], one can compute that

$$I_3 + \frac{2}{p}I_4 = -\frac{\sqrt{\pi}N^N((N-26)N-8)\Gamma\left(\frac{N+1}{2}\right)}{4(N-2)(N-1)^2(N+1)\Gamma\left(\frac{N}{2}+2\right)}\omega_{N-2}.$$

Let $Z(r, x_N) = r^{-1}\partial_r U(r, x_N)$.

$$D_N = \frac{\pi N^{2N+1}(N+2)((N-14)N-56)\Gamma\left(\frac{N+3}{2}\right)^2}{4(N-2)^2(N^2-1)^3\Gamma\left(\frac{N}{2}+2\right)^2}\omega_{N-2}^2$$

It is positive when $N \geq 18$. Therefore we can choose A such that $I_5 + \frac{2}{p}I_6 < 0$.

(2) If $p = 2 + \frac{4}{N}$, we have

$$U(x', x_N) = (N(N+2))^{\frac{N}{4}} \frac{x_N}{[1+x_N^2 + |x'|^2]^{N/2}}.$$

Using Mathematica, one can verify that

$$I_3 + \frac{2}{p+1}I_4 = \frac{\pi 2^{-N-2}(N(N+2))^{N/2}(5N+4)}{(N-2)(N^2-1)}\omega_{N-2}$$

It is never negative for $N \geq 3$. Let $Z = r^{-1}\partial_r U(r, x_N)$,

$$D_N = -\frac{\pi^2 2^{-2N-3}N(N(N+2))^N(N+8)}{(N-2)^2(N^2-1)}\omega_{N-2}^2$$

It is never positive when $N \geq 3$. Then we could not choose A in this case.

One can play around with the Mathematica code and search for new Z such that $D_N > 0$. Furthermore, one can choose another perturbation ψ , such that $I_5 + \frac{2}{p}I_6 < 0$.

□

6. NON-EXISTENCE OF MINIMIZERS FOR DOMAINS NEAR BALLS

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 1.7. First, we introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 6.1. *Let (M, g) be a C^2 Riemannian manifold with compact boundary. Assume the Riemann curvature of g is bounded in absolute value by K_1 . Assume $s \in (0, 2)$, $p \in [2, \infty)$. Suppose that $u \in C^2(M) \cap H_0^1(M)$ satisfies*

$$-\Delta_g u \leq \delta^{-s} u^{p-1} \text{ and } 0 < u < K_2 \text{ in } M, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial M$$

Here Δ_g is the Laplace-Beltrami operator and δ is the distance function to the boundary under metric g . Then for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there exists $C = C(K_1, K_2, \alpha)$ and $\beta = \beta(K_1, K_2, \alpha)$ such that

$$u(x) \leq C\delta(x)^\alpha, \quad \text{for } x \in M_\beta$$

where $M_\beta = \{x \in M : \delta(x) < \beta\}$.

Proof. Fix any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Since $s < 2$, $p \geq 2$ and $0 < u < K_2$, there exists $\beta = \beta(K_2, \alpha)$ such that $\delta^{-s} u^{p-1} \leq \alpha(1 - \alpha)\delta^{-2}u$ in M_β . Therefore $Lu := -\Delta_g u - \alpha(1 - \alpha)\delta^{-2}u \leq 0$ in M_β . That is, u is a subsolution of L in M_β . By Hardy's inequality near the boundary (see [8, Lemma 1.2]), we also have

$$\limsup_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \int_{M_\beta} \delta^{-2} u^2 d\text{vol}_g \leq C \limsup_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \int_{M_\beta} |\nabla u|_g^2 d\text{vol}_g = 0.$$

Denote $w(x) = \delta^\alpha(x) - \delta(x)/2$. Using $|\nabla \delta|_g = 1$ and $\Delta_g \delta^\alpha(x) = \alpha\delta(x)^{\alpha-1} \Delta_g \delta(x) + \alpha(\alpha - 1)\delta(x)^{\alpha-2} |\nabla \delta(x)|_g^2$, one has

$$Lw = -\alpha\delta(x)^{\alpha-1} \Delta_g \delta(x) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_g \delta(x) + \frac{\alpha(1 - \alpha)}{2} \delta^{-1}(x). \quad (6.1)$$

Since $|\Delta_g \delta|$ is uniformly bounded near the boundary, then $Lw \geq 0$ for $x \in M_\beta$ provided $\beta = \beta(K_1, K_2, \alpha)$ is small enough. That is, w is a supersolution of L on M_β .

We can apply the comparison principle of L (see [27, Lemma 8], whose proof is done on Euclidean domains but can be generalized to the manifold setting with minor modifications) to see there exists $C = C(K_1, K_2, \beta)$ such that $u(x) \leq Cw(x)$ for $x \in M_{\beta/2}$. □

Now, we turn to Theorem 1.7. We give the definition of ε -close, and give a more general version of Theorem 1.7.

Definition 6.2. *Assume Ω_1 and Ω_2 are bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^N . We call that they are C^2 -diffeomorphic to each other up to the boundary if there exists a C^2 -diffeomorphism $F : \bar{\Omega}_1 \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}_2$ such that $F(\bar{\Omega}_1) = \bar{\Omega}_2$. We call that they are ε -close in C^2 sense, if after a suitable translation and rotation of Ω_1 ,*

$$\|F - id\|_{C^2} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Theorem 6.3. *Let Ω_0 be a C^2 bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^N with mean curvature $H > 0$ everywhere on the boundary. Assume $N \geq 3$, p and s satisfy (1.9). Suppose $\mu_p(\Omega_0)$ is not attainable, then for any domain Ω which is sufficiently close to Ω_0 in C^2 -sense, $\mu_p(\Omega)$ is not attainable either.*

Proof of Theorem 1.7. The conclusion follows from Theorem A part (4) and Theorem 6.3. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.3. The proof is similar to that given in [30]. We argue by contradiction. Suppose there exists a sequence $\{\Omega_t\}$ of domains which converge to Ω_0 in C^2 -sense as $t \rightarrow 0$, such that $\mu_p(\Omega_t)$ is attained by $0 < u_t \in H_0^1(\Omega_t)$. Then there exists C^2 -diffeomorphism $F_t : \overline{\Omega_0} \rightarrow \overline{\Omega_t}$ with $\|F_t - id\|_{C^2} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. After multiplying some constant, we can assume u_t satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u_t + \delta_t^{-s} u_t^{p-1} = 0, & u_t > 0, & \text{in } \Omega_t, \\ u_t = 0, & & \text{on } \partial\Omega_t, \end{cases}$$

where $\delta_t = \delta_{\Omega_t}$.

Via F_t , we can pull back u_t and the Euclidean metric on Ω_t to Ω_0 , that is for $x \in \Omega_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} v_t(x) &= u_t(F_t(x)), & g_t(x) &= F_t^* g_E, \\ (g_t)_{ij}(x) &= \frac{\partial F_t}{\partial x_i} \cdot \frac{\partial F_t}{\partial x_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (Ω_t, g_E) is equivalent to (Ω_0, g_t) viewed as a family of Riemannian manifolds with boundary. Then the $\Delta = \Delta_{g_E}$ on Ω_t is equivalent to the Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ_{g_t} on Ω_0 . Due to the distance-preserving property, we shall abuse the notation δ_t to denote the distance function in (Ω_t, g_E) and (Ω_0, g_t) at the same time. Thus v_t satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_t} v_t + \delta_t^{-s} v_t^{p-1} = 0, & v_t > 0, & \text{in } \Omega_0, \\ v_t = 0, & & \text{on } \partial\Omega_0. \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

Since $\|F_t - id\|_{C^2} \rightarrow 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_t} |\nabla u_t|^2 dvol_{g_E} &= \int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla v_t|_{g_t}^2 dvol_{g_t} = (1 + o(1)) \int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla v_t|^2 dvol_{g_E}, \\ \int_{\Omega_t} \delta_t^{-s} u_t^p dvol_{g_E} &= \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} v_t^p dvol_{g_t} = (1 + o(1)) \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_0^{-s} v_t^p dvol_{g_E}. \end{aligned}$$

Here and in the following, $|\cdot|$ is the norm in Euclidean metric, $|\cdot|_{g_t} = \left((g_t)^{ij} \frac{\partial \cdot}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial \cdot}{\partial x_j} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is the norm under the metric g_t , $dvol_{g_t} = \sqrt{\det((g_t)_{ij})} dvol_{g_E}$, and $\delta_0 = \delta_{\Omega_0}$. Since u_t is a minimizer of $\mu_p(\Omega_t) \leq \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ and $\mu_p(\Omega_0)$ is not attainable, then

$$\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N) = \mu_p(\Omega_0) \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0} J_p^{\Omega_0}[v_t] \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} J_p^{\Omega_0}[v_t] = \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} J_p^{\Omega_t}[u_t] \leq \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N).$$

Here J_p^{Ω} is defined in (3.3). It follows that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} J_p^{\Omega_0}[v_t] = \mu_p(\Omega_0) = \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega_t} |\nabla u_t|^2 dvol_{g_E} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla v_t|^2 dvol_{g_E} = (\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{\frac{p}{p-2}}, \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega_t} \delta_t^{-s} u_t^p dvol_{g_E} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_0^{-s} v_t^p dvol_{g_E} = (\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{\frac{p}{p-2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

The proof is lengthy, we divide it into 6 steps.

Step 1: We claim that $\|v_t\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $t \rightarrow 0$.

Suppose not. Then after passing to a subsequence we have that $v_t \rightharpoonup v_0$ weakly in $H_0^1(\Omega_0)$ and v_0 satisfies $\Delta v_0 + \delta_0^{-s} v_0^{p-1} = 0$ weakly in Ω_0 . If $v_0 \not\equiv 0$, then $\mu_p(\Omega_0)$ is attained by v_0 for

$$J^{\Omega_0}[v_0] = \left(\int_{\Omega_0} \delta_0^{-s} v_0^p dvol_{g_E} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0} \left(\int_{\Omega_0} \delta_0^{-s} v_t^p dvol_{g_t} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{p}} = \mu_p(\Omega_0). \quad (6.4)$$

This contradicts our assumption about $\mu_p(\Omega_0)$.

Therefore $v_0 = 0$. By elliptic regularity theory, we also have $v_t \rightarrow 0$ in $C_{loc}^2(\Omega_0)$. Applying Lemma 6.1 to v_t on (Ω_0, g_t) , there exist two uniform constants β and C which depend on $\sup_t \|v_t\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)}$ such that $|v_t(x)| \leq C \delta_t^{1/2}(x)$ for $x \in (\Omega_0)_\beta$. Combining the estimates in the interior and on the boundary, we have $v_t \rightarrow 0$ in $C^0(\overline{\Omega_0})$. This contradicts (6.3).

Step 2: Let P_t be a maximum point of v_t , such point exists because v_t vanishes on the boundary. We claim that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\delta_t(P_t)}{\lambda_t} = T \in (0, 1], \quad (6.5)$$

where $\lambda_t = (\|U\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^N)} / \|v_t\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)})^{2/(N-2)}$ and $\delta_t(P) = \text{dist}_{g_t}(P, \partial\Omega_0)$ for $P \in \Omega_0$. In addition, $(0', T) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ is one of the points where U achieves the global maximum.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{v}_t(x) &= \lambda_t^{(N-2)/2} v_t(P_t + \lambda_t x) \quad \text{for } x \in \hat{\Omega}_t := (\Omega_0 - P_t) / \lambda_t, \\ \hat{g}_t(x) &= \lambda_t^{-2} g_t(P_t + \lambda_t x) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\delta}_t = \text{dist}_{\hat{g}_t}(\cdot, \partial\hat{\Omega}_t). \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

Then $\hat{g}_t \rightarrow g_E$ uniformly in C^1 on $\hat{\Omega}_t \cap K$ for any fixed compact set K . Then $\hat{v}_t \in H_0^1(\hat{\Omega}_t)$ satisfies $\hat{v}_t(0) = \|U\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}$ where U is defined in Theorem B. It follows from (6.2) and (6.3) that \hat{v}_t satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{\hat{g}_t} \hat{v}_t + \hat{\delta}_t^{-s} \hat{v}_t^{p-1} = 0, \hat{v}_t > 0, & \text{in } \hat{\Omega}_t, \\ \hat{v}_t = 0, & \text{on } \partial\hat{\Omega}_t, \end{cases}$$

and as $t \rightarrow 0$,

$$\int_{\hat{\Omega}_t} |\nabla \hat{v}_t|_{\hat{g}_t}^2 dvol_{\hat{g}_t} = \int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla v_t|_{g_t}^2 dvol_{g_t} = \int_{\Omega_t} |\nabla u_t|^2 dvol_{g_E} \rightarrow (\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{\frac{p}{p-2}}, \quad (6.7)$$

$$\int_{\hat{\Omega}_t} \hat{\delta}_t^{-s} \hat{v}_t^p dvol_{\hat{g}_t} = \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} v_t^p dvol_{g_t} = \int_{\Omega_t} \delta_t^{-s} u_t^p dvol_{g_E} \rightarrow (\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{\frac{p}{p-2}}, \quad (6.8)$$

where $\hat{\delta}_t = \delta_{\hat{\Omega}_t}$.

If there exists a subsequence such that $\delta_t(P_t)/\lambda_t \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow 0$, then $\hat{v}_t \rightarrow \hat{v}_0$ in $C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$, where \hat{v}_0 satisfies $\Delta \hat{v}_0 = 0$ in \mathbb{R}^N and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla \hat{v}_0|^2 < \infty$. This implies $\hat{v}_0 \equiv 0$. This contradicts with $\hat{v}_0(0) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \hat{v}_t(0) = \|U\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^N)} > 0$.

If there exists a subsequence $\delta_t(P_t)/\lambda_t \rightarrow 0$, then after suitable rotation, $\hat{\Omega}_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^N$. Since $0 < \hat{v}_t \leq \|U\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}$ in $\hat{\Omega}_t$ and the principal curvature of $\hat{\Omega}_t$ is uniformly bounded, then Lemma 6.1 asserts that $\hat{v}_t \leq C\hat{\delta}_t^{1/2}$ near $\partial\hat{\Omega}_t$, where C is independent of t . This contradicts with $\hat{v}_t(0) = \|U\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}$ when t is sufficiently small.

If there exists a subsequence $\delta_t(P_t)/\lambda_t \rightarrow T$ for some $T \in (0, \infty)$, then after suitable rotation, $\hat{\Omega}_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{+,T}^N = \{(x', x_N) : x_N > -T\}$. Then there exists $\hat{v}_0 \in \mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_{+,T}^N)$ such that $\hat{v}_t \rightharpoonup \hat{v}_0$ weakly in $\mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_{+,T}^N)$ and $\hat{v}_t \rightarrow \hat{v}_0$ in $C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}_{+,T}^N)$. Similar to (6.4), one can show that \hat{v}_0 is a minimizer of $\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_{+,T}^N)$ which attains the global maximum $\|U\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}$ at 0. Using Theorem B, one has $\hat{v}_0(x) = U_{-Te_N,1}(x) = U(x + Te_N)$. Furthermore, by Lemma 2.2, $(0', T)$ is one of the points where U achieves the global maximum and $T \in (0, 1]$.

We also have the following facts. For any fixed $r_t \in (0, r_0)$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} r_t/\lambda_t = \infty$, then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_{r_t}(P_t) \cap \Omega_0} |\nabla v_t|_{g_t}^2 dvol_{g_t} = (\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{\frac{p}{p-2}}, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega_0 \setminus B_{r_t}(P_t)} |\nabla v_t|_{g_t}^2 dvol_{g_t} = 0. \quad (6.9)$$

In Fact, since $r_t/\lambda_t \rightarrow \infty$, then for any fixed M , by Fatou's lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_{r_t}(P_t) \cap \Omega_0} |\nabla v_t|_{g_t}^2 dvol_{g_t} &= \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_{r_t/\lambda_t}(0) \cap \hat{\Omega}_t} |\nabla \hat{v}_t|_{\hat{g}_t}^2 dvol_{\hat{g}_t} \\ &\geq \int_{B_M(0) \cap \mathbb{R}_{+,T}^N} |\nabla \hat{v}_0|^2 dvol_{g_E}. \end{aligned}$$

We have used the fact that $\hat{g}_t \rightarrow g_E$ locally uniformly. Now letting $M \rightarrow \infty$, we have the right-hand side of the above converges to $(\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{\frac{p}{p-2}}$. Thus

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_{r_t}(P_t) \cap \Omega_0} |\nabla v_t|_{g_t}^2 dvol_{g_t} \geq (\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{\frac{p}{p-2}}.$$

Combining this with (6.7), it readily has (6.9).

Step 3: In this step, we shall decompose v_t to $c_t V_{x(t), \varepsilon(t), t} + w_t$, where $c_t V_{x(t), \varepsilon(t), t}$ is the best approximation, see Claim 2, and $w_t \in H_0^1(\Omega_0)$ is a small remainder.

By the compactness of $\partial\Omega_0$ and the metric g_t , we can fix a small ρ_0 such that each $Q \in \partial\Omega_0$ has a neighborhood in (Ω_0, g_t) which contains $B_{2\rho_0}^+(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ in the Fermi coordinates Φ_Q^t at Q . See Section 4 for the definition of Fermi coordinates. Here the superscript t indicates the metric g_t .

Let $Q_t \in \partial\Omega_0$ be the point such that $\text{dist}_{g_t}(P_t, \partial\Omega_0) = \text{dist}_{g_t}(P_t, Q_t)$. For any $x \in B_{\rho_0} \cap \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N$, $\varepsilon > 0$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} V_{x,\varepsilon,t}(y) &= (\varphi U_{x,\varepsilon}) \circ ((\Phi_{Q_t}^t)^{-1}(y)), \quad y \in (\Phi_{Q_t}^t)(B_{2\rho_0}^+), \\ U_{x,\varepsilon}(z) &= \varepsilon^{1-\frac{N}{2}} U\left(\frac{z-x}{\varepsilon}\right), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}_+^N, \end{aligned}$$

where φ is the cut off function used in (4.1). Note that $V_{x,\varepsilon,t}$ is well defined in Ω_0 because of the cutoff function.

Introduce the following norm on (Ω_0, g_t) .

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla f, \nabla \tilde{f} \rangle_{g_t} &= \int_{\Omega_0} g_t(\nabla f, \nabla \tilde{f}) d\text{vol}_{g_t} = \int_{\Omega_0} g_t^{ij} \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial y_j} \sqrt{\det(g_t)} dy, \\ \|\nabla f\|_{g_t} &= \sqrt{\langle \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle_{g_t}}. \end{aligned}$$

Claim 1.

$$\|\nabla v_t - \nabla V_{0,\lambda_t,t}\|_{g_t} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0. \quad (6.10)$$

Proof. Similar to (6.6), define

$$\hat{V}_{0,\lambda_t,t}(y) = \lambda_t^{\frac{N-2}{2}} V_{0,\lambda_t,t}(P_t + \lambda_t y).$$

Note that $\|\nabla v_t - \nabla V_{0,\lambda_t,t}\|_{g_t} = \|\nabla \hat{v}_t - \nabla \hat{V}_{0,\lambda_t,t}\|_{\hat{g}_t}$. Since (6.5), then $\hat{V}_{0,\lambda_t,t}(y) \rightarrow U_{-Te_N,1}(y) = U(y + Te_N)$ in $C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}_{+,T}^N)$. Recall that Step 2 implies that $\hat{v}_t \rightarrow U_{-Te_N,1}$ in $C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}_{+,T}^N)$ and $\hat{g}_t \rightarrow g_E$ locally uniformly. Then for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}_{+,T}^N$, one has

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_K |\nabla \hat{v}_t - \nabla \hat{V}_{0,\lambda_t,t}(y)|_{\hat{g}_t}^2 d\text{vol}_{\hat{g}_t} = 0.$$

Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, we choose a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}_{+,T}^N$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}_{+,T}^N \setminus K} [|\nabla U_{-Te_N,1}|^2 + U_{-Te_N,1}^2] d\text{vol}_{g_E} < \varepsilon$. Using (6.7) and $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_K |\nabla \hat{v}_t|_{\hat{g}_t}^2 d\text{vol}_{\hat{g}_t} = \int_K |\nabla U_{-Te_N,1}|^2 d\text{vol}_{g_E}$, then

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\hat{\Omega}_t \setminus K} |\nabla \hat{v}_t|_{\hat{g}_t}^2 d\text{vol}_{\hat{g}_t} < \varepsilon.$$

Direct computation shows that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\hat{\Omega}_t \setminus K} |\nabla \hat{V}_{0,\lambda_t,t}|_{\hat{g}_t}^2 d\text{vol}_{\hat{g}_t} \leq C\varepsilon + C\rho_0^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_{+,1}^N} U_{-Te_N,1}^2 d\text{vol}_{g_E} \leq C(1 + \rho_0^{-2})\varepsilon.$$

Combining the previous three inequalities, we have

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \|\nabla \hat{v} - \nabla \hat{V}_{0,\lambda_t,t}\|_{\hat{g}_t}^2 \leq C(1 + \rho_0^{-2})\varepsilon.$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, then (6.10) is established. \square

Claim 2. *If t is sufficiently small, then the following infimum*

$$l_t := \inf\{\|\nabla v_t - c\nabla V_{x,\epsilon,t}\|_{g_t} : c \in \mathbb{R}, \epsilon \in (0, 1), |x| \leq \rho_0, x \in \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N\}$$

can be achieved by some $c_t V_{x(t),\epsilon(t),t}$ where

$$c_t \rightarrow 1, \quad \frac{\epsilon(t)}{\lambda_t} \rightarrow 1, \quad |x(t)| = o(\lambda_t). \quad (6.11)$$

Proof. For fixed t , let $\{C_k V_{x_k,\epsilon_k,t}\}$ be a minimizing sequence of l_t , i.e.

$$\|\nabla(v_t - C_k V_{x_k,\epsilon_k,t})\|_{g_t} \rightarrow l_t, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Then it holds

$$C_k \|\nabla V_{x_k,\epsilon_k,t}\|_{g_t} \leq l_t + \|\nabla v_t\|_{g_t} + o(1). \quad (6.12)$$

Since $|x_k| \leq \rho_0$ and $0 < \epsilon_k < 1$, it is easy to check that $\|\nabla V_{x_k,\epsilon_k,t}\|_{g_t}$ is bounded from below by a positive constant which does not depend on $k \geq 1$ and small t . Then by (6.12), C_k is uniformly bound for all $k \geq 1$ and small t . Thus there is a subsequence of $\{C_k\}$ (still denote it as $\{C_k\}$) converging to $c_t \geq 0$.

Now we apply (6.10) to prove that ϵ_k does not converge to 0 as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. By (6.10), we know that $l_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} -2C_k \langle \nabla v_t, \nabla V_{x_k,\epsilon_k,t} \rangle_{g_t} &= \|\nabla(v_t - C_k V_{x_k,\epsilon_k,t})\|_{g_t}^2 - \|\nabla v_t\|_{g_t}^2 - C_k^2 \|\nabla V_{x_k,\epsilon_k,t}\|_{g_t}^2 \\ &\leq l_t^2 - \|\nabla v_t\|_{g_t}^2 + o(1) \leq -\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla v_t\|_{g_t}^2. \end{aligned}$$

If $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$, then $V_{x_k,\epsilon_k,t} \rightarrow 0$ weakly in $H_0^1(\Omega_0)$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, hence $\langle \nabla v_t, \nabla V_{x_k,\epsilon_k,t} \rangle_{g_t} = o(1)$ for $k \rightarrow +\infty$ and small t . It follows that $\|\nabla v_t\|_{g_t} = o(1)$, which contradicts (6.3). Then there is a subsequence of $\{\epsilon_k\}$ (still denote it as $\{\epsilon_k\}$) converges to a positive constant $\epsilon(t)$.

Since $|x_k| \leq \rho_0$, there is a subsequence (still denote it as $\{x_k\}$) converging to $x(t) \in B_{\rho_0} \cap \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N$. Since $C_k \rightarrow c_t$ and $\epsilon_k \rightarrow \epsilon(t) > 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, it is easy to check that

$$\|\nabla(C_k V_{x_k,\epsilon_k,t} - c_t V_{x(t),\epsilon(t),t})\|_{g_t} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty,$$

Then l_t is attained by $c_t V_{x(t),\epsilon(t),t}$.

At last, we prove (6.11). From (6.10), we know that

$$\|\nabla V_{0,\lambda_t,t} - c_t \nabla V_{x(t),\epsilon(t),t}\|_{g_t} \leq l_t + \|\nabla v_t - \nabla V_{0,\lambda_t,t}\|_{g_t} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0. \quad (6.13)$$

Then

$$(\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{\frac{p}{p-2}} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|\nabla V_{0,\lambda_t,t}\|_{g_t}^2 = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|c_t \nabla V_{x(t),\epsilon(t),t}\|_{g_t}^2 = (\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{\frac{p}{p-2}} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} c_t, \quad (6.14)$$

which implies that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} c_t = 1$.

Again by (6.13) and (6.14), it holds

$$c_t \langle \nabla V_{0,\lambda_t,t}, \nabla V_{x(t),\epsilon(t),t} \rangle_{g_t} \rightarrow (\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{\frac{p}{p-2}}, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0. \quad (6.15)$$

On the other hand, by similar calculations in [5] or Appendix B of [17] and applying (2.6), we can show that for small t ,

$$\langle \nabla V_{0,\lambda_t,t}, \nabla V_{x(t),\varepsilon(t),t} \rangle_{g_t} \leq C(N, \partial\Omega_0) \left[\min \left\{ \frac{\lambda_t}{\varepsilon(t)}, \frac{\varepsilon(t)}{\lambda_t}, \frac{\lambda_t \varepsilon(t)}{|x(t)|^2} \right\} \right]^{\frac{N}{2}}.$$

Then combined with (6.15), it implies that $\frac{\varepsilon(t)}{\lambda_t}$ is bounded from both above and below by two positive constants and $|x| = O(\lambda_t)$.

Let $a = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda_t}{\varepsilon(t)}$ and $w_o = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{x(t)}{\lambda_t}$, then by (6.13) and changing variables, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla U(w) - a^{\frac{N}{2}} \nabla U(a(w - w_o))|^2 dw = 0,$$

which implies that $a = 1$ and $w_o = 0$. Thus we have (6.11). \square

According to Claim 2, we can write

$$v_t = c_t V_{x(t),\varepsilon(t),t} + w_t$$

for some $w_t \in H_0^1(\Omega_0)$ with $\|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t}$ is small. Moreover ∇w_t is orthogonal to the space

$$\text{span} \left\{ \nabla V_{x(t),\varepsilon(t),t}, \nabla \left(\frac{\partial V_{x(t),\varepsilon(t),t}}{\partial \varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon(t)} \right), \nabla \left(\frac{\partial V_{x(t),\varepsilon(t),t}}{\partial x_1} \Big|_{x(t)} \right), \dots, \nabla \left(\frac{\partial V_{x(t),\varepsilon(t),t}}{\partial x_{N-1}} \Big|_{x(t)} \right) \right\} \quad (6.16)$$

in the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{g_t}$.

Step 4: In this step, we need to establish the second variation estimate.

Claim 3. *There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that if t is sufficiently small, then*

$$\|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t}^2 \geq (p-1 + \eta_0) \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} V_{x(t),\varepsilon(t),t}^{p-2} w_t^2 d\text{vol}_{g_t}.$$

The proof by now is standard. One can argue it by contradiction using the non-degeneracy of U in the Appendix. We omit the details.

Step 5: For the following, we will abbreviate $V_{x(t),\varepsilon(t),t}$ as V_t . Multiplying (6.2) by w_t , integrating by parts, using the orthogonal condition (6.16), one has

$$\|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t}^2 = \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} [c_t V_t + w_t]^{p-1} w_t d\text{vol}_{g_t}. \quad (6.17)$$

Given any $\alpha > 0$, recall an inequality $|(a+b)^\alpha - a^\alpha - \alpha a^{\alpha-1}b| \leq C(|b|^\alpha + |a|^{\alpha-2} \min\{a^2, b^2\})$ for any $a > 0, a + b > 0$ from [5, p. 3]. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} [c_t V_t + w_t]^{p-1} w_t dvol_{g_t} - \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} [c_t^{p-1} V_t^{p-1} w_t + (p-1)c_t^{p-2} V_t^{p-2} w_t^2] dvol_{g_t} \\ & \leq C \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} [|w_t|^p + (c_t V_t)^{p-3} \min\{(c_t V_t)^2, w_t^2\} |w_t|] dvol_{g_t} \\ & \leq C \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} [|w_t|^p + (c_t V_t)^{p-3} |w_t|^3] dvol_{g_t} \leq C \|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t}^\sigma, \end{aligned} \quad (6.18)$$

where $\sigma = \min\{3, p\}$. In the last step we have used Hölder's inequality and

$$\int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} w_t^p dvol_{g_t} \leq C \left(\int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla w_t|_{g_t}^2 dvol_{g_t} \right)^p.$$

Such inequality holds if t is sufficiently small since $g_t \rightarrow g_E$ as $t \rightarrow 0$.

Now plugging in (6.18) to (6.17), one has

$$\|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t}^2 = \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} [c_t^{p-1} V_t^{p-1} w_t + (p-1)c_t^{p-2} V_t^{p-2} w_t^2] dvol_{g_t} + O(\|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t}^\sigma). \quad (6.19)$$

Since $c_t \rightarrow 1$ as $t \rightarrow 0$, using Claim 3

$$\|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t}^2 \leq C(\eta_0) \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} V_t^{p-1} w_t dvol_{g_t}. \quad (6.20)$$

Claim 4. *If t is sufficiently small, then*

$$\int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} V_t^{p-1} w_t dvol_{g_t} = O(\varepsilon^{\min\{N-2, 2\}}). \quad (6.21)$$

Proof of Claim 4. Using the orthogonal condition (6.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} V_t^{p-1} w_t dvol_{g_t} \right| &= \left| \int_{\Omega_0} (\Delta_{g_t} V_t + \delta_t^{-s} V_t^{p-1}) w_t dvol_{g_t} \right| \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\Omega_0} w_t^{\frac{2N}{N-2}} dvol_{g_t} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2N}} \left(\int_{\Omega_0} |\Delta_{g_t} V_t + \delta_t^{-s} V_t^{p-1}|^{\frac{2N}{N+2}} dvol_{g_t} \right)^{\frac{N+2}{2N}} \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\Omega_0} |\Delta_{g_t} V_t + \delta_t^{-s} V_t^{p-1}|^{\frac{2N}{N+2}} dvol_{g_t} \right)^{\frac{N+2}{2N}} \|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.22)$$

where we have used Sobolev inequality in the last step. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta_{g_t} V_{x,\varepsilon,t} + \delta_t^{-s} V_{x,\varepsilon,t}^{p-1} \\ &= U_{x,\varepsilon} \Delta_{g_t} \varphi + 2g_t(\nabla \varphi, \nabla U_{x,\varepsilon}) + \varphi \Delta_{g_t} U_{x,\varepsilon} + \delta_t^{-s} V_{x,\varepsilon,t}^{p-1} \\ &= U_{x,\varepsilon} \Delta_{g_t} \varphi + 2g_t(\nabla \varphi, \nabla U_{x,\varepsilon}) + \varphi [\Delta_{g_t} U_{x,\varepsilon} + \delta_t^{-s} U_{x,\varepsilon}^{p-1}] + \delta_t^{-s} [V_{x,\varepsilon,t}^{p-1} - \varphi U_{x,\varepsilon}^{p-1}] \\ &= \hat{J}_1 + \hat{J}_2 + \hat{J}_3 + \hat{J}_4. \end{aligned}$$

Now let us compute \hat{J}_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_0} |\hat{J}_1|^{\frac{2N}{N+2}} dvol_{g_t} &\leq C(\rho_0) \int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+/B_{\rho_0}^+} U_{x,\varepsilon}^{\frac{2N}{N+2}} dvol_{g_E} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{-\frac{N(N-2)}{N+2}+N} \int_{B_{2\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+ \setminus B_{\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} (1+|x|)^{\frac{2N(1-N)}{N+2}} dx \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{N^2}{N+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_0} |\hat{J}_2|^{\frac{2N}{N+2}} dvol_{g_t} &\leq C \int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+/B_{\rho_0}^+} |\nabla U_{x,\varepsilon}|^{\frac{2N}{N+2}} dvol_{g_t} \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{N^2}{N+2}}, \\ \int_{\Omega_0} |\hat{J}_4|^{\frac{2N}{N+2}} dvol_{g_t} &\leq C \int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+/B_{\rho_0}^+} |U_{x,\varepsilon}^{p-1}|^{\frac{2N}{N+2}} dvol_{g_t} \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{N^2}{N+2}(p-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $g_t(y) = g_E(y) + O(y)$ uniformly at Ω_0 when $t \rightarrow 0$, then on the support of φ ,

$$\Delta_{g_t} U_{x,\varepsilon} + \delta_t^{-s} U_{x,\varepsilon}^{p-1} = O(|y| |\nabla_y^2 U_{x,\varepsilon}| + |\nabla_y U_{x,\varepsilon}|).$$

Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_0} |\hat{J}_3|^{\frac{2N}{N+2}} dvol_{g_t} &\leq C \int_{B_{2\rho_0}^+} [(|y| |\nabla_y^2 U_{x,\varepsilon}|)^{\frac{2N}{N+2}} + |\nabla_y U_{x,\varepsilon}(y)|^{\frac{2N}{N+2}}] dvol_{g_t} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{2N}{N+2}} \int_{B_{2\rho_0/\varepsilon}^+} (1+|y|)^{-\frac{2N^2}{N+2}} dy \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{2N}{N+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting the above four estimates to (6.22), since $N \geq 3$, one has

$$\int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} V_t^{p-1} w_t dvol_{g_t} = O(\varepsilon) \|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t}.$$

Since we also have (6.20), then $\|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t} = O(\varepsilon)$ and consequently $\int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} V_t^{p-1} w_t dvol_{g_t} = O(\varepsilon^2)$. \square

Step 6: Define

$$J^t(u) = \frac{\int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla u|_{g_t}^2 dvol_{g_t}}{(\int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} |u|^p dvol_{g_t})^{2/p}} \quad \text{for } u \in H_0^1(\Omega_0).$$

By our assumption, v_t is a minimizer of $\inf_{H_0^1(\Omega_0)} J^t \leq \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. However, we shall prove $J^t(v_t) > \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. This is a contradiction.

To compute $J(v_t)$, we first notice that $\|\nabla v_t\|_{g_t}^2 = c_t^2 \|\nabla V_t\|_{g_t}^2 + \|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t}^2$. Second, using the inequality $|(a+b)^\alpha - a^\alpha - \alpha a^{\alpha-1}b - \frac{1}{2}\alpha(\alpha-1)a^{\alpha-2}b^2| \leq C(|b|^3 + |a|^{\alpha-3} \min\{a^2, b^2\})$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} v_t^p dvol_{g_t} \\ &= \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} \left[(c_t V_t)^p + p(c_t V_t)^{p-1} w_t + \frac{1}{2} p(p-1) (c_t V_t)^{p-2} w_t^2 \right] dvol_{g_t} + O(\|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t}^\sigma) \\ &= \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} (c_t V_t)^p dvol_{g_t} + \frac{p}{2} \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} (c_t V_t)^{p-1} w_t dvol_{g_t} + \frac{p}{2} \|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t}^2 + O(\|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t}^\sigma), \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma = \min\{p, 3\}$. Here, we have used (6.19) in the second step. Inserting the expansion of $\|\nabla v_t\|_{g_t}^2$ and $\int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} v_t^p dvol_{g_t}$ into $J^t(v_t)$, using Taylor's expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J^t(v_t) &= J^t(c_t V_t + w_t) \\ &= J^t(V_t) \left[1 + \frac{\|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t}^2}{\|c_t \nabla V_t\|_{g_t}^2} - (1 + o(1)) \frac{\int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} (c_t V_t)^{p-1} w_t dvol_{g_t} + \|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t}^2}{\int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} (c_t V_t)^p dvol_{g_t}} \right] + O(\|\nabla w_t\|_{g_t}^\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

Using (6.3), one can see that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|c_t \nabla V_t\|_{g_t}^2 = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} (c_t V_t)^p dvol_{g_t} = (\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{\frac{p}{p-2}},$$

then

$$J^t(v_t) = J^t(V_t) - (\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{-\frac{2}{p-2}} [1 + o(1)] \int_{\Omega_0} \delta_t^{-s} V_t^{p-1} w_t dvol_{g_t}. \quad (6.23)$$

Recalling Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3,

$$J^t(V_t) = \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N) + \varepsilon (\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{\frac{p}{p-2}} H_t(x(t)) (I_1 + \frac{2}{p} I_2) + o(\varepsilon), \quad (6.24)$$

where $H_t(x(t))$ is the mean curvature of $\partial\Omega_0$ at $x(t)$ with respect to metric g_t .

Inserting (6.21) and (6.24) to (6.23), one obtains that

$$J^t(v_t) = \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N) + \varepsilon (\mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{\frac{p}{p-2}} H(x(t)) (I_1 + \frac{2}{p} I_2) + o(\varepsilon).$$

Suppose $P(t) \rightarrow P_0 \in \partial\Omega_0$, then $H_t(x(t)) \rightarrow H(P_0) > 0$, where $H(P_0)$ is the mean curvature of $\partial\Omega_0$ at P_0 with respect to the Euclidean metric. Since v_t achieves the minimum of J^t , using Lemma 4.4, then

$$\mu_p(\Omega_t) > \mu_p(\mathbb{R}_+^N),$$

when t is sufficiently small. This contradicts Theorem A.

This completes the whole proof. □

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

APPENDIX A. NON-DEGENERACY OF THE MINIMIZER

In this section, we assume that U is the unique minimizer defined in Theorem B.

Proof of Lemma 2.2. (1) The cylindrical symmetry is obvious from \tilde{U} and Möbius transformation.

(2) From [14] and [35], we know that

$$\begin{aligned} U(x) &= x_N V(x), \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ \tilde{U}(y) &= \frac{1 - |y|^2}{2} \tilde{V}(y), \quad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{B}^N, \end{aligned}$$

where $y = \mathcal{M}x$, $\tilde{V} \circ \mathcal{M} = V |\det(D\mathcal{M})|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, and \tilde{V} is the unique radial solution of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \tilde{V} - \frac{4\nabla \tilde{V} \cdot y}{1 - |y|^2} - \frac{2N\tilde{V}}{1 - |y|^2} + \left(\frac{1 - |y|^2}{2}\right)^{p-2-s} \tilde{V}^{p-1} = 0, & \tilde{V} > 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{B}^N, \\ \tilde{V} = K, & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{B}^N, \end{cases}$$

for only one positive constant K . Let $r = |y|$, and write $\tilde{U}(r) = \tilde{U}(y)$ and $\tilde{V}(r) = \tilde{V}(y)$ for simplicity. The regularity in [14] shows that $\tilde{V} \in C^2[0, 1] \cap C^\alpha[0, 1]$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. It is easy to see that \tilde{V} is bounded in $[0, 1]$, then there exists $C > 1$ such that $C^{-1}(1 - r^2) \leq |\tilde{U}(r)| \leq C(1 - r^2)$ for all $r \in [0, 1]$. Using

$$1 - r^2 = \frac{4x_N}{|x + e_N|^2},$$

and

$$U(x) = |\det(D\mathcal{M})|^{\frac{N-2}{2N}} \tilde{U} \circ \mathcal{M}(x) = \frac{2^{\frac{N-2}{2}}}{|x + e_N|^{N-2}} \tilde{U}(r),$$

we obtain that for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$,

$$C^{-1}x_N(|x| + 1)^{-N} \leq |U(x)| \leq Cx_N(|x| + 1)^{-N}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Next, we give the estimate of $|\nabla U|$. By $\tilde{U}(r) = \frac{1-r^2}{2}\tilde{V}(r)$ and $\tilde{U}(1) = 0$, we have that $\tilde{U}'(1) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{-\tilde{U}(r)}{1-r} = -\tilde{V}(1)$. Then we obtain that $\tilde{U} \in C^1[0, 1]$, which implies that $\tilde{U}'(r)$ is bounded in $[0, 1]$, i.e. $|\nabla \tilde{U}|$ is bounded in $\overline{\mathbb{B}^N}$. By simple calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla U|^2 &= \frac{2^{N-2}}{|x + e_N|^{2N}} \left[4|\nabla_y \tilde{U}|^2 + (N-2)^2 \tilde{U}^2 |x + e_N|^2 + 4(N-2)\tilde{U} \nabla_y \tilde{U} \cdot (x + e_N) \right] \\ &= \frac{2^N}{|x + e_N|^{2N}} |\nabla_y \tilde{U}|^2 + \frac{(N-2)^2}{|x + e_N|^2} \tilde{U}^2 + \frac{2^{\frac{N+2}{2}}}{|x + e_N|^{N+2}} \tilde{U} \nabla_y \tilde{U} \cdot (x + e_N). \end{aligned}$$

Then by (A.1) and the boundedness of $|\nabla \tilde{U}|$, we obtain that for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$,

$$|\nabla U(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)^{-N}.$$

(3) Using coordinates $y = (y', y_N)$ and $r = |y|$ on \mathbb{B}^N , elementary computations show that for $1 \leq i \leq N-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\det(D\mathcal{M})|^{\frac{2-N}{2N}} \partial_{x_i} U &= \frac{y_i}{2r} \xi(r) \circ \mathcal{M}, \\ |\det(D\mathcal{M})|^{\frac{2-N}{2N}} \partial_{x_N} U &= \left[\frac{1+y_N}{2r} \xi(r) - \tilde{U}'(r) \frac{|y'|^2 + (1+y_N)^2}{2r} \right] \circ \mathcal{M}, \\ |\det(D\mathcal{M})|^{\frac{2-N}{2N}} \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=1} U_\varepsilon &= \frac{y_N}{2r} \xi(r) \circ \mathcal{M}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $\xi(r) = \tilde{U}'(r)(1-r^2) - (N-2)\tilde{U}(r)r$. Since \tilde{U} satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{U}'' + \frac{N-1}{r} \tilde{U}' + \frac{2^s \tilde{U}^{p-1}}{(1-r^2)^s} = 0, & \tilde{U} > 0, \text{ in } (0, 1), \\ \tilde{U}'(0) = 0, \tilde{U}(1) = 0, \end{cases}$$

we have that for $r \in (0, 1]$,

$$\tilde{U}'(r) = -\frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \int_0^r \frac{2^s t^{N-1} \tilde{U}(t)^{p-1}}{(1-t^2)^s} dt < 0.$$

Thus $\xi(r) < 0$ for $r \in (0, 1)$.

Suppose that U has a critical point $P \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$. Consider $\mathcal{M}(P) = (y_1, \dots, y_N) \in \mathbb{B}^N$. Using (A.2), we have $y_i = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq N-1$. It suffices to consider the points $(0, y_N) \in \mathbb{B}^N$. Note that

$$U \circ \mathcal{M}^{-1}(0, y_N) = (\det(D\mathcal{M}))^{\frac{N-2}{2N}} \tilde{U}(r) = \left(\frac{(1+y_N)^2}{2} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \tilde{U}(r).$$

Since $U \circ \mathcal{M}^{-1}$ is strictly increasing from $(-1, 0)$, we only need to consider $y_N > 0$, that is the critical points of $(1+r)^{N-2} \tilde{U}(r)$ on $[0, 1)$.

If $N = 2$, then the only critical point is $r = 0$. More precisely, $U \circ \mathcal{M}$ attains the global maximum only at the origin in \mathbb{B}^N . Equivalently, U attains the global maximum only at the $(0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$.

If $N > 2$, it is easy to see $(1+r)^{N-2} \tilde{U}(r)$ has only finitely many critical points in $[0, 1)$. Equivalently, U has finitely many critical points in \mathbb{R}_+^N , and all of them lie on the interval $\{(0', x_N) : 0 < x_N \leq 1\}$.

□

Next, we prove the non-degeneracy of U when $N \geq 3$, which is used the Step 4 in section 6. We denote $\rho = x_N^{-s} U^{p-2}$ and $L^2(\Omega, \rho dx) = L_\rho^2(\Omega)$.

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} |u|^p dx \right)^{2/p} \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Proposition A.1. *We have a compact embedding $\mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \hookrightarrow L_\rho^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$.*

Proof. For any Borel set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}_+^N$ and $f \in \mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, using Hölder's inequality,

$$\int_{\Omega} f^2 \rho dx \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} x_N^{-s} U^p dx \right)^{1-\frac{2}{p}} \left(\int_{\Omega} x_N^{-s} f^p dx \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla f|^2 dx. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Thus the embedding is continuous. Suppose $\{\Omega_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of smooth compact enlarging domains exhausting \mathbb{R}_+^N . Applying the Rellich-Kondrakov theorem, one has a compact embedding as the following.

$$\mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \hookrightarrow L^2(\Omega_k, dx) \hookrightarrow L^2_{\rho}(\Omega_k). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Now fix any bounded sequence $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. Going to a subsequence if necessary, thanks to the above compact embedding, by a diagonal argument we can find $f \in \mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ such that $f_j \rightarrow f$ strongly in $L^2_{\rho}(\Omega_k)$ for each k as $j \rightarrow \infty$. We want to prove $f_j \rightarrow f$ strongly in $L^2_{\rho}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. Using Hölder's inequality and (A.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|f_j - f\|_{L^2_{\rho}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)} &= \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} (\|f_j - f\|_{L^2_{\rho}(\Omega_k)} + \|f_j - f\|_{L^2_{\rho}(\mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Omega_k)}) \\ &\leq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Omega_k} x_N^{-s} U^p dx \right)^{1-\frac{2}{p}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Omega_k} x_N^{-s} |f_j - f|^p dx \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \\ &\leq C \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Omega_k} x_N^{-s} U^p dx \right)^{1-\frac{2}{p}} \sup_j \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla f_j - \nabla f|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now letting k go to infinity, we have the desired convergence. \square

Proposition A.2. *There exists a compact self-adjoint operator $(-\rho^{-1}\Delta)^{-1}$ from $L^2_{\rho}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ to itself.*

Proof. For any $f \in L^2_{\rho}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, one has

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} f \phi \rho dx \leq \|f\|_{L^2_{\rho}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)} \|\phi\|_{L^2_{\rho}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^2_{\rho}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)} \|\phi\|_{\mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}.$$

Applying Riesz theorem, we have $T(f) \in \mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} f \phi \rho dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \nabla T(f) \cdot \nabla \phi dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} -\Delta T(f) \phi.$$

This is equivalent to say $-\rho^{-1}\Delta T(f) = f$. It is easy to see $T : L^2_{\rho}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ is continuous. By the previous proposition, $T : L^2_{\rho}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \rightarrow L^2_{\rho}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ is compact. \square

The previous two propositions imply that the spectrum of $(-\rho^{-1}\Delta)^{-1}$ is discrete. Denote the eigenvalues of $-\rho^{-1}\Delta$ by λ_i as the following

$$\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \lambda_3 < \dots \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

The first eigenvalue is $\lambda_1 = 1$ and eigenspace is $\text{span}\{U\}$. This follows from that U satisfies $-\Delta U = \rho U$ and it is positive in \mathbb{R}_+^N .

Theorem A.3. *The second eigenvalue is $\lambda_2 = p - 1$, which has multiplicity N . The corresponding eigenfunctions consist of*

$$\text{span} \left\{ \partial_{x_1} U, \dots, \partial_{x_{N-1}} U, \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=1} U_\varepsilon \right\}.$$

Before proving this theorem, let us establish an equivalent formulation in \mathbb{B}^N . For any $f \in L^2_\rho(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, we define \tilde{f} on \mathbb{B}^N by $\tilde{f} \circ \mathcal{M} = f | \det(D\mathcal{M}) |^{\frac{2-N}{2N}}$, where \mathcal{M} is the Möbius transformation (2.1). Denote

$$\tilde{\rho} = \left(\frac{2}{1 - |y|^2} \right)^s \tilde{u}^{p-2}.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\tilde{\rho} \circ \mathcal{M} = \rho | \det(D\mathcal{M}) |^{-2/N}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}^N} \tilde{f}^2 \tilde{\rho} dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} f^2 \rho | \det(D\mathcal{M}) |^{\frac{2-N}{N} - \frac{2}{N} + 1} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} f^2 \rho dx.$$

Therefore $L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N, \rho dx)$ is isometric to $L^2(\mathbb{B}^N, \tilde{\rho} dy)$. Moreover,

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} f = \rho g \text{ is equivalent to } -\Delta_{\mathbb{B}^N} \tilde{f} = \tilde{\rho} \tilde{g}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Therefore, it is equivalent to studying the spectrum of $(-\tilde{\rho}^{-1} \Delta_{\mathbb{B}^N})^{-1} : L^2_{\tilde{\rho}}(\mathbb{B}^N) \rightarrow L^2_{\tilde{\rho}}(\mathbb{B}^N)$.

Proof of Theorem A.3. Define

$$J(u) = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx}{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} x_N^{-s} |u|^p \right)^{2/p}}.$$

Theorem B says that $J(u) \geq J(U)$ for any $u \in \mathcal{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. The first variation near U implies that $-\Delta U = x_N^{-s} U^{p-1} = \rho U$. The second variation $J''(u)(f, f) \geq 0$ implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla f|^2 dx \geq (p-1) \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} f^2 \rho dx$$

for any $f \in H_0^1(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ satisfies $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} f U \rho dx = 0$. Thus $\lambda_2 \geq p - 1$. Obviously any function in the set of $\text{span} \{ \partial_{x_1} U, \dots, \partial_{x_{N-1}} U, \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=1} U_\varepsilon \}$ satisfies $-\Delta f = (p-1)\rho f$. Thus $\lambda_2 = p - 1$.

It suffices to prove all the eigenfunctions corresponding to $p-1$ belong to this set. We will prove this fact for $(-\tilde{\rho} \Delta_{\mathbb{B}^N})^{-1}$. The proof is inspired by [2, Lemma 4.1]. Recalling (A.2) and (A.7), one has $\{ \xi(r) r^{-1} y_i \}_{i=1}^N$ satisfy the equation

$$-\Delta \tilde{f} = (p-1) \tilde{\rho} \tilde{f}.$$

Let Δ_r , resp. $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}}$ denote the Laplace operator in radial coordinates, resp. the Laplace-Beltrami operator on \mathbb{S}^{N-1} . Consider the spherical harmonics $\{ Y_{k,i}(\theta) : k = 0, 1, \dots, 1 \leq i \leq N_k \}$ satisfying

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}} Y_{k,i} = \mu_k Y_{k,i}$$

and recall that this equation has a sequence of eigenvalues

$$\mu_k = k(k + n - 2), \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

whose multiplicity is given by N_k . In particular, one has that $\mu_0 = 0$ has multiplicity 1, and $\mu_1 = N - 1$ has multiplicity N . Suppose $Y_{k,i}$ are normalized so that they form a complete orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{S}^{N-1})$. For any $\tilde{f} \in L^2_\rho(\mathbb{B}^N)$ can be expressed as

$$\tilde{f} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{N_k} \phi_{k,i}(r) Y_{k,i}(\theta) \text{ where } \phi_{k,i}(r) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}} \tilde{f}(r, \theta) Y_{k,i}(\theta) d\theta \in L^2([0, 1], \tilde{\rho}(r) dr).$$

Suppose that \tilde{f} satisfies $\Delta \tilde{f} + (p-1)\tilde{\rho}\tilde{f} = 0$, then it is equivalent to the following equations of $\phi_{k,i}$

$$\begin{cases} A_k(\phi_{k,i}) := \phi_{k,i}'' + \frac{N-1}{r}\phi_{k,i}' - \frac{\mu_k}{r^2}\phi_{k,i} + (p-1)\tilde{\rho}\phi_{k,i} = 0 \\ \phi_{k,i}(1) = 0, \phi_{k,i}'(0) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, i = 1, \dots, N_k$. We shall show that $\phi_{1,i} \in \text{span}\{\xi(r)\}$ and $\phi_{k,i} = 0$ for any $k \neq 1$.

Step 1: Consider the case $k = 0$. Multiplying $A_0(\phi_0) = 0$ by \tilde{U} and applying integration by parts, one has $\int_{\mathbb{B}^N} \tilde{U} \phi_0 \tilde{\rho} dx = 0$. Since \tilde{U} is positive in \mathbb{B}^N , then ϕ_0 must changes sign. However, $A_0(\phi_0) = 0$ implies $\Delta \phi_0 < 0$. By maximum principle and $\phi_0 = 0$ on the boundary, one has $\phi_0 > 0$ in \mathbb{B}^N . This is a contradiction unless $\phi_0 = 0$.

Step 2: Consider the case $k = 1$. First, it is easy to see $\xi(r)$ satisfies (A.8) for $k = 1$. Suppose there exists another solution $\phi(r)$ of $A_1(\phi) = 0$. Since $\xi(r) < 0$, then we can write $\phi(r) = c(r)\xi(r)$. By a straightforward calculation, one has

$$c''\xi + 2c'\xi' + \frac{N-1}{r}c'\xi = 0.$$

If $c(r)$ is not constant, it follows that

$$\frac{c''}{c'} = \frac{-2\xi'}{\xi} - \frac{N-1}{r}$$

and hence $c' \sim 1/(r^{N-1}\xi^2)$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. Note that $\xi \sim r$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. Thus $c \sim r^{-N}$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. However, $c(r)\xi(r)$ does not belong to $L^2(\mathbb{B}^N, \tilde{\rho} dx)$ for $N \geq 2$. Therefore c must be a constant and $\phi \in \text{span}\{\xi\}$.

Step 3: Consider the case $k \geq 2$. Note that A_1 has a solution $\xi(r)$ which does not change sign in $(0, 1)$. By Sturm theorem, A_1 is a non-negative operator. Since $\mu_k > \mu_1$ if $k \geq 2$ and

$$A_k = A_1 + \frac{\mu_k - \mu_1}{r^2},$$

then A_k is a positive operator for $k \geq 2$. Thus $A_k(\phi) = 0$ implies $\phi = 0$. Combining the above analysis, we have that if \tilde{f} satisfies $\Delta \tilde{f} + (p-1)\tilde{\rho}\tilde{f} = 0$, then

$$\tilde{f} \in \text{span}\{\xi(r)Y_{1,1}(\theta), \dots, \xi(r)Y_{1,N}(\theta)\}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Elsa Abbena, Simon Salamon, and Alfred Gray. *Modern differential geometry of curves and surfaces with Mathematica*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2017.
- [2] Antonio Ambrosetti and Andrea Malchiodi. *Perturbation methods and semilinear elliptic problems on \mathbb{R}^n* . Springer, 2006.
- [3] Alano Ancona. On strong barriers and an inequality of Hardy for domains in \mathbb{R}^n . *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 2(2):274–290, 1986.
- [4] Farit Avkhadiiev and Ari Laptev. Hardy inequalities for nonconvex domains. *Int. Math. Ser. (N. Y.)*, 11:1–12, 2010.
- [5] A. Bahri. *Critical points at infinity in some variational problems*, volume 182 of *Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series*. Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow, 1989. ISBN 0-582-02164-2.
- [6] Catherine Bandle and Martin Flucher. Harmonic radius and concentration of energy; hyperbolic radius and Liouville’s equations $\Delta U = e^U$ and $\Delta U = U^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}$. *SIAM Review*, 38(2):191–238, 1996.
- [7] Rafael D Benguria, Rupert L Frank, and Michael Loss. The sharp constant in the Hardy-Sobolev-Maz’ya inequality in the three dimensional upper half-space. *Mathematical Research Letters*, 15(4):613–622, 2008.
- [8] Haïm Brezis and Moshe Marcus. Hardy’s inequalities revisited. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa-Classe di Scienze*, 25(1-2):217–237, 1997.
- [9] L Caffarelli, R Kohn, and L Nirenberg. First order interpolation inequality with weights. *Compositio Math*, 53:259–275, 1984.
- [10] Shaowei Chen and Shujie Li. Hardy–Sobolev inequalities in half-space and some semilinear elliptic equations with singular coefficients. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 66(2):324–348, 2007.
- [11] Xiyu Cheng, Lei Wei, and Yimin Zhang. Estimate, existence and nonexistence of positive solutions of Hardy–Hénon equations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A: Mathematics*, 152(2):518–541, 2022.
- [12] Ujjal Das, Yehuda Pinchover, and Baptiste Devyver. On existence of minimizers for weighted L^p -Hardy inequalities on $C^{1,\gamma}$ -domains with compact boundary. *arXiv:2303.03527*, 2023.
- [13] E. B. Davies. The Hardy constant. *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*, 46(4):417–431, 1995.
- [14] Jingbo Dou, Liming Sun, Lei Wang, and Meijun Zhu. Divergent operator with degeneracy and related sharp inequalities. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 282(2):1–85, 2022.
- [15] Henrik Egnell. Positive solutions of semilinear equations in cones. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 330(1):191–201, 1992.
- [16] José F Escobar. Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to a scalar flat metric with constant mean curvature on the boundary. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 1–50, 1992.
- [17] Alessio Figalli and Federico Glaudo. On the sharp stability of critical points of the Sobolev inequality. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 237(1):201–258, 2020.
- [18] Staffas Filippas, V Maz’ya, and A Tertikas. Critical Hardy–Sobolev inequalities. *Journal de mathématiques pures et appliquées*, 87(1):37–56, 2007.
- [19] Stathis Filippas, Vladimir Gilelevich Maz’ya, and Achilles Tertikas. Sharp hardy-sobolev inequalities. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 339(7):483–486, 2004.
- [20] Nassif Ghoussoub and Xiao Song Kang. Hardy–Sobolev critical elliptic equations with boundary singularities. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire*, 21(6):767–793, 2004.

- [21] Nassif Ghoussoub and Amir Moradifam. Bessel pairs and optimal Hardy and Hardy–Rellich inequalities. *Mathematische Annalen*, 349(1):1–57, 2011.
- [22] Nassif Ghoussoub and Frédéric Robert. The effect of curvature on the best constant in the Hardy–Sobolev inequalities. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA*, 16(6):1201–1245, 2006.
- [23] Nassif Ghoussoub and C Yuan. Multiple solutions for quasi-linear pdes involving the critical sobolev and hardy exponents. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 352(12):5703–5743, 2000.
- [24] Nguyen Lam, Guozhen Lu, and Lu Zhang. Geometric Hardy’s inequalities with general distance functions. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 279(8):108673, 2020.
- [25] Pier Domenico Lamberti and Yehuda Pinchover. L^p Hardy inequality on $C^{1,\gamma}$ domains. *Annali Della Scuola Normale Superiore Di Pisa-classe Di Scienze*, 19:1135–1159, 2019.
- [26] Roger T Lewis, Junfang Li, and Yanyan Li. A geometric characterization of a sharp hardy inequality. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 262(7):3159–3185, 2012.
- [27] Moshe Marcus, Victor Mizel, and Yehuda Pinchover. On the best constant for Hardy’s inequality in \mathbb{R}^n . *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 350(8):3237–3255, 1998.
- [28] Fernando C Marques. Conformal deformations to scalar-flat metrics with constant mean curvature on the boundary. *Communications in Analysis and Geometry*, 15(2):381–405, 2007.
- [29] B. Opic and Alois Kufner. *Hardy-type inequalities*. Longman Scientific & Technical, 1990.
- [30] Xing-Bin Pan and Xuefeng Wang. Semilinear neumann problem in exterior domains. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 31(7):791–821, 1998.
- [31] Takasi Senba, Yukiyooshi Ebihara, and Yasuhiro Furusho. Dirichlet problem for a semilinear elliptic equation with singular coefficient. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 15(4):299–306, 1990.
- [32] Liming Sun and Lei Wang. *Mathematica Code*. https://sunliminghome.github.io/Computation_H, 2023.
- [33] P. E. Sobolevskii T. Matskewich. The best possible constant in generalized Hardy’s inequality for convex domain in \mathbb{R}^n . *Nonlinear Anal.*, 28:1601–1610, 1997.
- [34] Achilles Tertikas and Kyril Tintarev. On existence of minimizers for the Hardy–Sobolev–Maz’ya inequality. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*, 186(4):645–662, 2007.
- [35] Lei Wang and Meijun Zhu. Hardy-Sobolev inequalities with distance to the boundary weight functions. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 530(2):1–26, 2024.

ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCES, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING, 100190, CHINA.

Email address: lmsun@amss.ac.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SHANDONG UNIVERSITY, JINAN, 250100, CHINA.

Email address: wangleiwl@sdu.edu.cn