

A GLOBAL REGULARITY THEORY FOR SPHERE-VALUED FRACTIONAL HARMONIC MAPS

YU HE, CHANG-LIN XIANG* AND GAO-FENG ZHENG

ABSTRACT. In this paper we consider sphere-valued stationary/minimizing fractional harmonic mappings introduced in recent years by several authors, especially by Millot-Pegon-Schikorra [17] and Millot-Sire [18]. Based on their rich partial regularity theory, we establish a quantitative stratification theory for singular sets of these mappings by making use of the quantitative differentiation approach of Cheeger-Naber [7], from which a global regularity estimates follows.

Keywords: s -harmonic maps; regularity theory; quantitative symmetry; singular set.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 53C43, 35J48

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and main results	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Main results	3
2. Classical singularity stratification	6
3. Quantitative stratification and volume estimates	9
4. Proof of Theorems 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7	14
References	16

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

1.1. Background. In the series of seminar works [8, 9, 10], odd order harmonic mappings from \mathbb{R}^m into a closed Riemannian manifold N were considered by Da Lio and Rivière for the first time. That is, critical points of the energy functional

$$(1.1) \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |(-\Delta)^{\frac{m}{4}} u|^2 dx, \quad u \in H^m(\mathbb{R}^m, N),$$

where m is an odd positive integer. One of their main results in [8, 9, 10] is the smoothness of these harmonic mappings in critical dimensions, which thus extended the famous work of Helein [15, 14] on Harmonic mappings from surfaces. Since then, odd order harmonic mappings have been extended to various nonlocal settings, see e.g. [11, 16, 17, 18,

*: corresponding author.

The corresponding author C.-L. Xiang is supported by NSFC (No. 11701045) and the NSF of Hubei province, P.R. China (No. 2024AFA061). G.-F. Zheng is supported by the NSFC (No. 11571131). Both C.-L. Xiang and G.-F. Zheng are partly supported by the Open Research Fund of Key Laboratory of Nonlinear Analysis & Applications (Central China Normal University), Ministry of Education, P. R. China.

[19, 20, 26, 28, 29] and the references therein. Due to its close connection with nonlocal Ginzburgh-Landau equations, nonlocal minimal surfaces, fractional Allen-Cahn equations, free boundary value problems and etc, in the interesting series works [16, 17, 18, 19, 20] of Millot, Pegon, Sire, Wang and Yu, the following type of fractional harmonic mappings were considered. To be precise, let us assume throughout this note that $s \in (0, 1)$ and $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is a bounded smooth open set. Following [17, 18, 19], define the fractional Dirichlet energy in Ω of a measurable map $u : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{E}_s(u, \Omega) := \frac{\gamma_{m,s}}{4} \iint_{(\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m) \setminus (\Omega^c \times \Omega^c)} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{m+2s}} dx dy,$$

where $\Omega^c := \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Omega$ denotes the complement of Ω . The normalisation constant $\gamma_{m,s} = s2^{2s}\pi^{-\frac{m}{2}}\Gamma\left(\frac{m+2s}{2}\right)/\Gamma(1-s)$ is such that

$$\mathcal{E}_s(u, \Omega) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \left| (-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} u \right|^2 dx, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d).$$

In particular, in the case $m = 1$ and $s = 1/2$, this coincides with energy (1.1) in 1-dimension. To define the fractional harmonic map, we first introduce the Hilbert space (see e.g. [17, Section 2.1])

$$\widehat{H}^s(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d) := \left\{ u \in L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^d) : \mathcal{E}_s(u, \Omega) < \infty \right\}$$

with norm

$$\|u\|_{\widehat{H}^s(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)} = \left(\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \mathcal{E}_s(u, \Omega) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and then define, for a closed Riemannian manifold $N \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ (the embedding is isometric),

$$\widehat{H}^s(\Omega, N) := \left\{ u \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d) : u(x) \in N \text{ for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^m \right\}.$$

Now we can recall the definition of s -harmonic mappings of [16, 17, 18, 19, 20].

Definition 1.1. *We say that $u \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega, N)$ is a weakly s -harmonic map, if*

$$(1.3) \quad \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \mathcal{E}_s(\pi_N(u + t\varphi), \Omega) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d),$$

where π_N denotes the smooth nearest point projection of N .

If a weakly s -harmonic map $u \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega, N)$ also satisfies

$$(1.4) \quad \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \mathcal{E}_s(u(x + t\psi(x))) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m),$$

then it is called a stationary s -harmonic map.

Finally, $u \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega, N)$ is called a minimizing s -harmonic map if

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{E}_s(u, \Omega) \leq \mathcal{E}_s(v, \Omega)$$

for all $v \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega, N)$ with $v = u$ on $\Omega \setminus K$ for some compact $K \subset \Omega$.

In the series of works [16, 17, 18, 19, 20], a very rich partial regularity theory for s -harmonic mappings have been established. For our purpose, we merely collect part of their results concerning sphere-valued s -harmonic mappings in the below.

Theorem 1.2. ([17, Theorem 1.1]) *If $m = 1$ and $s \in [1/2, 1)$, then each weakly s -harmonic map $u \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is smooth.*

In the case $0 < s < 1/2$, the same smoothness result also holds for minimizing s -harmonic maps, see the third conclusion of Theorem 1.4 (see also [20, Theorem 1.2] for Hölder regularity). These results will play a fundamental role in our later argument. For stationary s -harmonic maps, the following partial regularity holds. That is, by defining the set of singular points as

$$\text{sing}(u) = \{x \in \Omega : u \text{ is not continuous at } x\},$$

there holds

Theorem 1.3. ([17, Theorem 1.2]) *Assume that $s \in (0, 1)$ and $m > 2s$. If $u \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is a stationary s -harmonic map in Ω , then $u \in C^\infty(\Omega \setminus \text{sing}(u))$ and*

- (1) *for $s > 1/2$ and $m \geq 3$, $\dim_{\mathcal{H}} \text{sing}(u) \leq m - 2$;*
- (2) *for $s > 1/2$ and $m = 2$, $\text{sing}(u)$ is locally finite in Ω ;*
- (3) *for $s = 1/2$ and $m \geq 2$, $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\text{sing}(u)) = 0$;*
- (4) *for $s < 1/2$ and $m \geq 2$, $\dim_{\mathcal{H}} \text{sing}(u) \leq m - 1$;*
- (5) *for $s < 1/2$ and $m = 1$, $\text{sing}(u)$ is locally finite in Ω .*

The above regularity result can be improved for minimizing s -harmonic maps.

Theorem 1.4. ([17, Theorem 1.3]) *Assume that $s \in (0, 1)$ and $m > 2s$. If $u \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is a minimizing s -harmonic map in Ω , then $u \in C^\infty(\Omega \setminus \text{sing}(u))$ and*

- (1) *for $m \geq 3$, $\dim_{\mathcal{H}} \text{sing}(u) \leq m - 2$;*
- (2) *for $m = 2$, $\text{sing}(u)$ is locally finite in Ω ;*
- (3) *for $m = 1$, $\text{sing}(u) = \emptyset$ (that is, $u \in C^\infty(\Omega)$).*

In case the target sphere satisfies $d \geq 3$, Millot and Pegon [16, Theorem 1.3] proved that the singular set of a minimizing $1/2$ -harmonic map is even smaller: $\dim_{\mathcal{H}} \text{sing}(u) \leq m - 3$. A similar result for minimizing s -harmonic maps with $s \in (0, 1/2)$ can also be found in Millot, Sire and Yu [20].

1.2. Main results. Since regularity theory is basic for studying fractional harmonic mappings, in this paper, we aim to derive volume estimates for the singular sets $\text{sing}(u)$ by making use of the quantitative differentiation approach of Cheeger and Naber [7], from which a global regularity estimate for s -harmonic mappings will follow. This approach has been applied to e.g. harmonic mappings, biharmonic mappings, varifolds and currents, harmonic map flow, mean curvature flow and so on, see e.g. [1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 24, 25] and the references therein. To state our results precisely, let us first introduce some necessary notation. Given $\Lambda > 0$, denote

$$(1.6) \quad \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(\Omega, N) = \{u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^m, N) : \mathcal{E}_s(u, \Omega) < \Lambda\}.$$

To avoid confuse with the balls in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} , we use

$$D_r(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : |y - x| < r\}$$

to denote the ball in \mathbb{R}^m centered at x with radius r , and simply write $D_r = D_r(0)$. Our first result reads as follows.

Theorem 1.5 (Integrability estimates). *Given $\Lambda > 0$, $m \geq 2$, and assume $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is a stationary s -harmonic map if $1/2 < s < 1$, or $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is a minimizing s -harmonic map if $0 < s \leq 1/2$. Then for all $1 \leq p < 2$, there exists $C = C(s, m, \Lambda, p)$ such that*

$$\int_{D_1} |\nabla u|^p \leq C \int_{D_1} r_u^{-p} < C.$$

Here r_u is the regularity scale of u defined as follows. For a given function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define the regularity scale function of f by

$$(1.7) \quad r_f(x) = \max \left\{ 0 \leq r \leq 1 : \sup_{y \in D_r(x)} r |\nabla f(y)| \leq 1 \right\},$$

and define the set of points of f with bad regularity scales by

$$\mathcal{B}_r(f) = \{x \in \Omega : r_f(x) < r\}.$$

Then Theorem 1.5 follows from the volume estimate below.

Theorem 1.6. *Given $\Lambda > 0$, $m \geq 2$, and assume $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is a stationary s -harmonic map if $1/2 < s < 1$, or $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is a minimizing s -harmonic map if $0 < s \leq 1/2$. Then, for all $\eta > 0$, there exists $C = C(s, m, \Lambda, \eta)$ such that*

$$\text{Vol}(T_r(\mathcal{B}_r(u)) \cap D_1) \leq Cr^{2-\eta}, \quad \forall 0 < r < 1,$$

where $T_r(A)$ denotes the r tubular neighborhood of a set A in \mathbb{R}^m . Consequently, this implies that the Minkowski dimension of $\text{sing}(u)$ satisfies

$$\dim_{\text{Min}} \text{sing}(u) \leq m - 2.$$

We remark that the above result does not hold for stationary s -harmonic maps if $0 < s < 1/2$. To see this, consider the map $u(x) = \chi_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} - \chi_{\overline{\mathbb{R}^m}}$ which has its origin in nonlocal minimal surface (see e.g. [2, 27]). It was proven that u is a stationary s -harmonic map for $0 < s < 1/2$ in \mathbb{S}^1 , but with $m - 1$ dimensional singular set with infinite \mathcal{H}^{m-1} -measure, see e.g. [17, Remark 1.5].

Combining the improved estimate in Millot and Pegon [16, Theorem 1.3], we can improve the above theorems for minimizing 1/2-harmonic maps as in the below.

Theorem 1.7. *Given $\Lambda > 0$ and assume that $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^{1/2}(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is a minimizing 1/2-harmonic map with $d \geq 3$. Then, for all $\eta > 0$, there exists $C = C(s, m, N, \Lambda, \eta)$ such that*

$$\text{Vol}(T_r(\mathcal{B}_r(u)) \cap D_1) \leq Cr^{3-\eta}, \quad \forall 0 < r < 1,$$

As a result, we have $\dim_{\text{Min}} \text{sing}(u) \leq m - 3$; furthermore, there exists a constant $C = C(s, m, \Lambda, p) > 0$ for each $1 \leq p < 3$ such that $\int_{D_1} |\nabla u|^p \leq C \int_{D_1} r_u^{-p} < C$.

To deduce the above regularity estimates, the key is to prove the following volume estimate concerning quantitative singular set $\mathcal{S}_{\eta,r}^k(u)$ (see Definition 3.3).

Theorem 1.8 (Volume estimate of singular set). *Let $\Lambda > 0$, $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, m - 1\}$, $s \in (0, 1)$ and $m > 2s$. Then, for all $\eta > 0$ there exists $C = C(m, s, N, \Lambda, \eta) > 0$ such that, for all stationary s -harmonic map $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, N)$ and all $0 < r < 1$, we have*

$$(1.8) \quad \text{Vol}(T_r(\mathcal{S}_{\eta,r}^k(u)) \cap D_1) \leq Cr^{m-k-\eta}.$$

Note that, unlike that of Theorems 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7, this volume estimate in Theorem 1.8 holds for all stationary s -harmonic maps $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$, and also for a general closed Riemannian manifold $N \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, due to the fact that the monotonicity formula (2.8) holds for all such targets. As aforementioned, to prove this volume estimate, we will use the approach of Cheeger and Naber [7]. However, different from the situations in [7, 1], in our case we first need to extend the mapping from \mathbb{R}^m into the upper half space \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1} so as to get monotonicity formula (2.8), and then we need to defined a new type of quantitative symmetry so as to match the monotonicity property, and finally we will establish quantitative cone splitting principles so as to find a useful cover for the quantitative singular set $\mathcal{S}_{\eta,r}^k(u)$. For details of the proof of Theorem 1.8, see Section 3.

Once Theorem 1.8 is obtained, Theorems 1.5, 1.6, 1.7 will follow from an ϵ -regularity result (see Theorem 4.1 below) and the volume estimates of Theorem 1.8. Details are given in Section 4. To prove Theorem 4.1, we have to assume that the s -harmonic mapping u is either stationary or minimal according to the range of s so as to use the compactness results of [17].

Before ending this section, we remark that the above regularity theorems are sharp in a sense. To see this, consider the s -harmonic map $u(x) = x/|x|$ for $x \in D_4 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ (see e.g. [17, Remark 1.6]). A simple computation shows that our result is optimal in the sense $\nabla u \in L_{\text{loc}}^p$ for all $1 < p < 2$ but not for $p = 2$. However, note that ∇u is weakly L^2 integrable. We shall deduce this even more sharp regularity result together with the rectifiability of the stratified singular set in another paper, applying the much more sophisticated approach of Naber and Valtorta [22, 23] on harmonic mappings; see also [13] on the global regularity of biharmonic mappings for instance.

Notation. Throughout the paper, we will use the following notations:

- $\mathbb{R}_+^{m+1} = \{\mathbf{x} = (x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^m, z > 0\}$ denotes the $n + 1$ dimensional open upper half space;
 - $B_r(\mathbf{x})$ denotes the open ball in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} with radius r centered at $\mathbf{x} = (x, z)$;
 - $B_r^+(\mathbf{x})$ denotes the half open ball in \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1} of radius r centered at $\mathbf{x} = (x, 0)$, and simply write $B_r^+ = B_r^+(0)$;
 - $D_r(x)$ denotes the the open ball/disk in \mathbb{R}^m centered at x , and write $D_r = D_r(0)$.
- For an arbitrary set $G \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$, we write

$$G^+ := G \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial^+ G := \partial G \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}.$$

If $G \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}$ is a bounded open set, we shall say that G is admissible whenever

- ∂G is Lipschitz regular;
- the (relative) open set $\partial^0 G \subset \partial \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}$ defined by

$$\partial^0 G := \{\mathbf{x} \in \partial G \cap \partial \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1} : B_r^+(\mathbf{x}) \subset G \text{ for some } r > 0\},$$

is non empty and has Lipschitz boundary; and then we have $\partial G = \partial^+ G \cup \overline{\partial^0 G}$.

- Finally, we identify $\mathbb{R}^m = \partial \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}$; a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is also identified with $A \times \{0\} \subset \partial \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}$.

2. CLASSICAL SINGULARITY STRATIFICATION

Since one of the main tools in this note is the Caffarelli-Silvestre extension of [3] (which may have originated in the probability literature [21]), we first introduce some spaces over an open set $G \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$. Following [17, 18], we define the weighted L^2 -space

$$L^2(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x}) := \left\{ v \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(G) : |z|^{\frac{a}{2}} v \in L^2(G) \right\}$$

with $a = 1 - 2s$ and norm

$$\|v\|_{L^2(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x})}^2 := \int_G |z|^a |v|^2 d\mathbf{x}.$$

Accordingly, we introduce the weighted Sobolev space

$$H^1(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x}) := \left\{ v \in L^2(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x}) : \nabla v \in L^2(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x}) \right\},$$

normed by

$$\|v\|_{H^1(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x})} := \|v\|_{L^2(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x})} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x})}.$$

It follows that both $L^2(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x})$ and $H^1(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x})$ are separable Hilbert spaces when equipped with the scalar product induced by their respective Hilbertian norms. On $H^1(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x})$, we define the weighted Dirichlet energy $\mathbf{E}_s(\cdot, G)$ by setting

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbf{E}_s(v, G) := \frac{\delta_s}{2} \int_G |z|^a |\nabla v|^2 d\mathbf{x} \quad \text{with } \delta_s := 2^{2s-1} \frac{\Gamma(s)}{\Gamma(1-s)}.$$

Some properties of $H^1(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x})$ are in order (see [17, 18] for more results). For a bounded admissible open set $G \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}$, the space $L^2(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x})$ embeds continuously into $L^\gamma(G)$ for every $1 \leq \gamma < \frac{1}{1-s}$ whenever $s \in (0, 1/2)$ by Hölder's inequality. For $s \in [1/2, 1)$, we have $L^2(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x}) \hookrightarrow L^2(G)$ continuously since $a \leq 0$. In any case, it implies that

$$H^1(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x}) \hookrightarrow W^{1,\gamma}(G)$$

continuously for every $1 < \gamma < \min\{1/(1-s), 2\}$. As a consequence, we have the compact embedding

$$(2.2) \quad H^1(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x}) \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow L^\gamma(G), \quad \forall 1 < \gamma < \min\{1/(1-s), 2\}.$$

Now we define the s -harmonic extension of a given measurable function $u : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to the half-space \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1} by setting

$$(2.3) \quad u^e(x, z) := \sigma_{m,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \frac{z^{2s} u(y)}{(|x-y|^2 + z^2)^{\frac{m+2s}{2}}} dy,$$

where $\sigma_{m,s} := \pi^{-\frac{m}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{m+2s}{2})/\Gamma(s)$ is a normalization constant. It follows that u^e solves the equation

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(z^a \nabla u^e) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1} \\ u^e = u & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{m+1} \end{cases}$$

We mention that the first equation of (2.4) is locally uniformly elliptic in \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1} with smooth coefficient, and thus the unique continuation principle in Theorem 1.2 of [12] applies. That is, if both functions u, v solves the first equation of (2.4) and $u \equiv v$ in an open subset of

\mathbb{R}_+^{m+1} , then $u \equiv v$ holds in \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1} ; and consequently $u \equiv v$ holds also on the boundary $\mathbb{R}^m = \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}$. This property will be used to study the symmetry of u later.

It has been proved in [3] that, for every $u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^m)$, there holds

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} [u]_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^m)}^2 &= \mathbf{E}_s(u^e, \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}) \\ &= \inf \left\{ \mathbf{E}_s(v, \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}) : v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}, |z|^a d\mathbf{x}), v = u \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^m \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the function space $H^s(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is defined as follows: for any open subset $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, the function space $H^s(\Omega)$ consists of all measurable functions $u \in L^2(\Omega)$ which satisfies

$$[u]_{H^s(\Omega)}^2 := \frac{\gamma_{m,s}}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{m+2s}} dx dy < \infty.$$

If $u \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega)$ for some open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, the following estimates on u^e somehow extends the first equality in (2.5) to the localized setting.

Lemma 2.1. ([17, Lemma 2.9]) *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be an open set. For every $u \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega)$, the extension u^e given by (2.3) belongs to $H^1(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x}) \cap L_{\text{loc}}^2(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}}, |z|^a d\mathbf{x})$ for every bounded admissible open set $G \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}$ satisfying $\overline{\partial^0 G} \subseteq \Omega$. In addition, for every point $\mathbf{x}_0 = (x_0, 0) \in \Omega \times \{0\}$ and $r > 0$ such that $D_{3r}(x_0) \subseteq \Omega$,*

$$(2.6) \quad \|u^e\|_{L^2(B_r^+(\mathbf{x}_0), |z|^a d\mathbf{x})}^2 \leq C \left(r^2 \mathcal{E}_s(u, D_{2r}(x_0)) + r^{2-2s} \|u\|_{L^2(D_{2r}(x_0))}^2 \right),$$

and

$$(2.7) \quad \mathbf{E}_s(u^e, B_r^+(\mathbf{x}_0)) \leq C_1 \mathcal{E}_s(u, D_{2r}(x_0)),$$

for a constant $C_1 = C_1(m, s)$.

Consequently, there follows

Corollary 2.2. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be an open set and $G \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}$ a bounded admissible open set such that $\overline{\partial^0 G} \subseteq \Omega$. The extension operator $u \mapsto u^e$ defines a continuous linear operator from $\widehat{H}^s(\Omega)$ into $H^1(G, |z|^a d\mathbf{x})$.*

The next theorem concerns monotonicity formula of s -harmonic mappings, which plays the most important role in the regularity theory of s -harmonic mappings.

Theorem 2.3. ([17, Proposition 2.17]) *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be a bounded open set. If $u \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ is stationary in Ω , then for every $\mathbf{x}_0 = (x_0, 0) \in \Omega \times \{0\}$, the normalized energy function*

$$r \in (0, \text{dist}(x_0, \Omega^c)) \mapsto \Theta_s(u^e, \mathbf{x}_0, r) := \frac{1}{r^{m-2s}} \mathbf{E}_s(u^e, B_r^+(\mathbf{x}_0))$$

is nondecreasing. Moreover,

$$(2.8) \quad \Theta_s(u^e, \mathbf{x}_0, r) - \Theta_s(u^e, \mathbf{x}_0, \rho) = \delta_s \int_{B_r^+(\mathbf{x}_0) \setminus B_\rho^+(\mathbf{x}_0)} z^a \frac{(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0) \cdot \nabla u^e}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0|^{m+2-2s}} dx$$

for every $0 < \rho < r < \text{dist}(x_0, \Omega^c)$, where δ_s is the constant defined in (2.1).

Based on the monotonicity formula above, the following partial Lipschitz regularity theorem was established by [17, Theorem 5.1].

Theorem 2.4 (Partial Regularity). *There exist $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(m, s) > 0$ and $\kappa_2 = \kappa_2(m, s) \in (0, 1)$ such that the following holds. Let $u \in \widehat{H}^s(D_{2R}; \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ be a weakly s -harmonic map in D_{2R} such that the function $r \in (0, 2R - |\mathbf{x}|) \mapsto \Theta_s(u^e, \mathbf{x}, r)$ is nondecreasing for every $\mathbf{x} \in \partial^0 B_{2R}^+$. If*

$$\Theta_s(u^e, \mathbf{0}, R) \leq \varepsilon_1,$$

then $u \in C^{0,1}(D_{\kappa_2 R})$ and

$$R^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(D_{\kappa_2 R})}^2 \leq C_2 \Theta_s(u^e, \mathbf{0}, R)$$

for a constant $C_2 = C_2(m, s)$.

In terms of the regularity scale function (see definition (1.7)), we have

Proposition 2.5. *Suppose $u \in \widehat{H}^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is a stationary s -harmonic map. There exist $\varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon_2(m, s) > 0$ and $\kappa_2 = \kappa_2(m, s) \in (0, 1)$ such that if $\mathcal{E}_s(u, D_4) < \varepsilon_2$, then*

$$r_u(0) \geq \kappa_2.$$

Proof. Choose $\varepsilon_2 \leq \min\{\varepsilon_1/C_1, 1/(C_1 C_2)\}$ such that $\mathcal{E}_s(u, D_4) < \varepsilon_2$. Then (2.7) implies

$$\Theta_s(v, \mathbf{x}_0, 2) \leq C_1 \varepsilon_2 \leq \varepsilon_1.$$

Then Theorem 2.4 yields

$$\kappa_2^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(D_{2\kappa_2})}^2 \leq C_2 \Theta_s(u^e, \mathbf{0}, 2) \kappa_2^2 \leq C_2 C_1 \varepsilon_2 \leq 1.$$

This yields the result. \square

Another important consequence of monotonicity formula is the compactness results of [17, Theorems 7.1, 7.2, 7.3].

Theorem 2.6. (1) *Assume that $s \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/2\}$ and $m > 2s$. Let $\{u_i\}_{i \geq 1} \subset \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ be a sequence of uniformly bounded stationary s -harmonic map and $u_i \rightarrow u$ in $\widehat{H}^s(D_4, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Then u is a stationary s -harmonic map in D_4 , and for any open subset $\omega \subset D_4$ and every bounded admissible open set $G \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}$ satisfying $\bar{\omega} \subset D_4$ and $\overline{\partial^0 G} \subset D_4$, there hold*

$$\begin{aligned} u_i &\rightarrow u && \text{strongly in } \widehat{H}^s(\omega, \mathbb{R}^d). \\ u_i^e &\rightarrow u^e && \text{strongly in } H^1(G; \mathbb{R}^d, |z|^\alpha d\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

(2) *In the case $0 < s \leq 1/2$, the same compactness result also holds in case $\{u_i\}$ is a sequence of minimizing s -harmonic maps. Moreover, in this case the limit u is also a minimizing s -harmonic map.*

This compactness result implies (see [17, Section 7.2] for details) that if $u \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is a stationary s -harmonic map for $s \neq 1/2$ or a minimizing $1/2$ -harmonic map, then for every $x \in \Omega$ and every sequence $r_k \rightarrow 0$, there exists a subsequence $r'_k \rightarrow 0$ and a map $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ which is 0-homogeneous at the origin (see Definition 2.8 below) such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_{x, r'_k} &\rightarrow \varphi && \text{strongly in } \widehat{H}^s(D_r), \text{ and} \\ u_{x, r'_k}^e &\rightarrow \varphi^e && \text{strongly in } H^1(B_r^+; \mathbb{R}^d, |z|^\alpha d\mathbf{x}) \end{aligned}$$

for all $r > 0$, where $u_{x, r}(y) = u(x + ry)$.

Definition 2.7. Let $u \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a stationary s -harmonic map for $s \neq 1/2$, or a minimizing $1/2$ -harmonic maps for $s = 1/2$. The above deduced map φ is called a tangent map of u at $x \in \Omega$.

Now we recall the definition of k -symmetry (see, e.g. Cheeger and Naber [7]).

Definition 2.8 (symmetry). Given a measurable map $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We say that

(1) φ is 0-homogeneous or 0-symmetric with respect to point $p \in \mathbb{R}^m$ if $\varphi(p + \lambda v) = \varphi(p + v)$ for all $\lambda > 0$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

(2) φ is k -symmetric if φ is 0-symmetric with respect to the origin, and φ is translation invariant with respect to a k -dimensional subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, i.e.,

$$\varphi(x + v) = \varphi(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^m, v \in V.$$

Then, for any $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$, we can define for s -harmonic map the set

$$(2.9) \quad \Sigma^k(u) = \{x \in \Omega : \text{no tangent map of } u \text{ is } (k+1)\text{-symmetric at } x\}.$$

It is direct to verify that

$$\Sigma^0(u) \subset \Sigma^1(u) \subset \dots \subset \Sigma^{m-1}(u) \subset \Sigma^m(u) = \Omega.$$

Furthermore, $x \notin \Sigma^{m-1}(u)$ means that u has a constant tangent map at x . This leads to the following simple observation. Let $s \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/2\}$ and $u \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ be a stationary s -harmonic map; or $s = 1/2$ and $u \in \widehat{H}^{1/2}(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ be a minimizing $1/2$ -harmonic map. Then we have

$$\text{sing}(u) = \Sigma^{m-1}(u).$$

To see this, first suppose that $x \in \Omega \setminus \Sigma^{m-1}(u)$; that is, u has a constant tangent map at x . Then the compactness theorem 2.6 implies that $\Theta_s(u^e, x, r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 0$, which in turn implies by the ϵ -regularity theorem that u is smooth in a neighborhood of x . Hence $\text{sing}(u) \subset \Sigma^{m-1}(u)$. On the other hand, if u is smooth in a neighborhood of x , then surely there is a unique constant tangent map at x . This implies that $\Sigma^{m-1}(u) \subset \text{sing}(u)$. Therefore, in this case we deduce

$$\Sigma^0(u) \subset \Sigma^1(u) \subset \dots \subset \Sigma^{m-1}(u) = \text{sing}(u).$$

This is the so-called classical stratification of $\text{sing}(u)$. In the next section we will use the approach of Cheeger and Naber [7] to study each $\Sigma^k(u)$.

3. QUANTITATIVE STRATIFICATION AND VOLUME ESTIMATES

In spirit of the idea in Cheeger and Naber [7], and also in order to combine the Caffarelli-Silvestre extension of a given mappings with the symmetry together, we define

Definition 3.1 (Quantitative symmetry). Fix a constant $1 < \gamma_0 < \min\{1/(1-s), 2\}$. Given a map $u \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$, $\epsilon > 0$ and nonnegative integer k , we say that u is (k, ϵ) -symmetric on $D_r(x) \subset \subset \Omega$, if there exists a k -symmetric function $h \in \widehat{H}^s(D_{2r}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\int_{B_1^+} |u_{x,r}^e(\mathbf{y}) - h_{0,r}^e(\mathbf{y})|^{\gamma_0} d\mathbf{y} = \int_{B_r^+(\mathbf{x})} |u^e(\mathbf{y}) - h^e(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})|^{\gamma_0} d\mathbf{y} \leq \epsilon$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x, 0)$.

By Corollary 2.2 and the compact embedding (2.2), the above integral is well defined. A basic fact concerning the above notion is the following weak compactness of quantitatively symmetric functions.

Remark 3.2. *Suppose $\{u_i\} \subset \widehat{H}^s(\Omega)$ converges weakly to a mapping v in $\widehat{H}^s(\Omega)$, $D_{2r}(x) \subset \Omega$ and u_i is (k, ϵ_i) -symmetric on $D_r(x)$ for some $\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0$. Then v is k -symmetric on $D_r(x)$.*

To see this, we can assume without loss of generality that $x = 0$ and $r = 1$. Using the definition of quantitative symmetry, there exist a sequence of k -symmetric functions h_i such that

$$\int_{B_1^+} |(u_i)^e(\mathbf{y}) - (h_i)^e(\mathbf{y})|^{\gamma_0} d\mathbf{y} \leq \epsilon_i \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $u_i \rightharpoonup v$ in $\widehat{H}^s(\Omega)$, we can assume up to a subsequence that $u_i^e \rightarrow v^e$ weakly in $H^1(B_1^+, z^a d\mathbf{x})$ and strongly in $L^{\gamma_0}(B_1^+)$. Then $h_i^e \rightarrow v^e$ strongly in $L^{\gamma_0}(B_1^+)$.

On the other hand, since h_i is k -symmetric, it is 0-homogeneous and translation invariant with respect to a k -dimensional subspace $V_i \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, and so is $(h_i)^e$. We claim that this implies v^e is k -symmetric in D_1 . To see this, first we note that v^e is 0-homogeneous with respect to the origin in B_1^+ since so is each h_i^e . Hence, it follows from the unique continuation principle of [12] that v^e is 0-homogeneous with respect to the origin in the whole upper half space \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1} . This in turn implies that v is 0-homogeneous in \mathbb{R}^m . Secondly, note that by the k -symmetry of h_i^e , we infer that v^e is translation invariant locally in B_1^+ in the sense that

$$(3.1) \quad v^e(\mathbf{x} + t) = v^e(\mathbf{x}), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in B_{1/2}^+ \text{ and } t \in V \times \{0\} \text{ with } |t| < 1/10,$$

where $V \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is a k -dimensional subspace. However, since $v^e(\cdot + t)$ satisfies the same equation as that of v^e , the unique continuation principle of [12] implies that (3.1) holds for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}$. This further implies that v^e is translation invariant with respect to V . Therefore, we can conclude that v is k -symmetric.

Given the definition of quantitative symmetry, we can introduce a quantitative stratification for points of a function according to how much it is symmetric around those points.

Definition 3.3 (Quantitative stratification). *For any map $u \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega, N)$, $r, \eta > 0$ and $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$, we define the k -th quantitative singular stratum $\mathcal{S}_{\eta, r}^k(u) \subset \Omega$ as*

$$\mathcal{S}_{\eta, r}^k(u) \equiv \left\{ x \in \Omega : u \text{ is not } (k+1, \eta)\text{-symmetric on } D_s(x) \text{ for any } r \leq s \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Furthermore, we set

$$\mathcal{S}_{\eta}^k(u) := \bigcap_{r>0} \mathcal{S}_{\eta, r}^k(u) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{S}^k(u) = \bigcup_{\eta>0} \mathcal{S}_{\eta}^k(u).$$

It is then straightforward to verify by definition that,

$$\text{If } k' \leq k, \eta' \geq \eta, r' \leq r, \quad \text{then } \mathcal{S}_{\eta', r'}^{k'}(u) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\eta, r}^k(u).$$

The following remark shows that this definition of quantitative stratification is indeed a quantitative version of the classically defined one.

Remark 3.4. If $u \in \widehat{H}^s(\Omega, N)$ is a stationary s -harmonic map for $s \neq 1/2$, or a minimizing s -harmonic map for $s = 1/2$, then

$$S^k(u) = \Sigma^k(u), \quad \forall 0 \leq k \leq m,$$

where $\Sigma^k(u)$ is defined as in (2.9).

Proof. Suppose $x \notin S^k(u)$. Then, for each $i \geq 1$, there exists $r_i > 0$ such that u is $(k+1, 1/i)$ -symmetric on $D_{r_i}(x)$. That is, there exist a $(k+1)$ -symmetric function $h_i \in \widehat{H}^s(D_{2r_i})$ such that

$$\int_{B_1^+} |u_{x,r_i}^e - (h_i)_{r_i}^e|^{\gamma_0} < 1/i.$$

If $r_i \rightarrow 0$, then we obtain a tangent map v of u at x which is $(k+1)$ -symmetric on D_1 from the above inequality (see Remark 3.2). If $r_i \geq \delta > 0$ for all $i \gg 1$ for some δ , then the above inequality implies that $u_{x,\delta}$ is $(k+1)$ -symmetric on D_1 , which still has the same consequence as the previous case. Hence $x \notin \Sigma^k(u)$. Therefore, $\Sigma^k(u) \subset S^k(u)$.

On the other hand, suppose $x \notin \Sigma^k(u)$. Then there exist $r_i \rightarrow 0$ such that $u_{x,r_i}^e \rightarrow v^e$ in $L^2(B_1^+)$ for some $(k+1)$ -symmetric tangent map v . But this certainly implies that $x \notin S_\eta^k(u) = \bigcap_{r>0} S_{\eta,r}^k(u)$ for any $\eta > 0$. Hence $x \notin S^k(u)$. Thus $S^k(u) \subset \Sigma^k(u)$. The proof is complete. \square

The following two lemmata give a criterion on the quantitative symmetry of a given mapping.

Lemma 3.5 (Quantitative Rigidity). *Let $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, N)$ be a stationary s -harmonic map. Then for every $\epsilon > 0$ and $0 < \gamma < 1/2$ there exist $\delta = \delta(\gamma, \epsilon, s, m, N, \Lambda) > 0$ and $q = q(\gamma, \epsilon, s, m, N, \Lambda) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $r \in (0, 1/2)$, if*

$$\Theta_s(u^e, \mathbf{0}, 2r) - \Theta_s(u^e, \mathbf{0}, \gamma^q r) \leq \delta,$$

then u is $(0, \epsilon)$ -symmetric on D_{2r} .

Proof. Assume there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and $0 < \gamma < 1/2$ for which the statement is false. Again we assume that $r = 1$. Then there exist a sequence of stationary s -harmonic maps $u_i \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, N)$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots$) satisfying

$$\Theta_s(u_i^e, \mathbf{0}, 2) - \Theta_s(u_i^e, \mathbf{0}, \gamma^i) \leq \frac{1}{i}$$

but none of u_i is $(0, \epsilon)$ -symmetric on D_2 . Up to a subsequence, we may assume that $u_i \rightharpoonup u$ in $\widehat{H}^s(D_4, N)$ and $u_i^e \rightharpoonup u^e$ in $H^1(B_2^+, |z|^a d\mathbf{x})$. Then the Monotonicity formula (2.8) implies that

$$\int_{B_2^+} z^a |\mathbf{x} \cdot \nabla u^e|^2 d\mathbf{x} \leq C \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_2^+} z^a \frac{|\mathbf{x} \cdot \nabla u_i^e|^2}{|\mathbf{x}|^{m+2-2s}} d\mathbf{x} = 0.$$

Thus, the s -harmonic function u^e is 0-homogeneous in B_2^+ with respect to the origin. Using the unique continuation theorem 1.2 of [12] we infer that u^e is 0-homogeneous in the whole upper space \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1} , which implies u is 0-symmetric on \mathbb{R}^m . But then, the strong convergence of $u_i^e \rightarrow u^e$ in $L^{\gamma_0}(B_2^+)$ implies that $\int_{B_2^+} |u_i^e - u^e|^{\gamma_0} < \epsilon$ for i sufficiently large. Hence, u_i is $(0, \epsilon)$ -symmetric on D_2 , which gives a contradiction. \square

In the above proof we need to assume u is a stationary s -harmonic mappings so as to use the monotonicity formula (2.8). The following lemma gives a quantitative geometric description on k -symmetry for all mappings in $\widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, N)$.

Lemma 3.6 (Quantitative cone splitting). *Given constants $\eta, \tau, \Lambda > 0$, there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(s, m, N, \Lambda, \eta, \tau) > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, N)$, $x \in D_1$ and $0 < r < 1$. If $x \in \mathcal{S}_{\eta, r}^k(u)$ and u is $(0, \epsilon)$ -symmetric on $D_{2r}(x)$, then there exists a k -dimensional affine subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ such that*

$$\{y \in D_r(x) : u \text{ is } (0, \epsilon)\text{-symmetric on } D_{2r}(y)\} \subset T_{\tau r}(V).$$

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that $x = 0$ and $r = 1$. We use a contradiction argument. Thus, for given $\eta, \tau > 0$, there exist a sequence $\{u_i\}$ with $\mathcal{E}_s(u_i, D_4) \leq \Lambda$ such that $0 \in \mathcal{S}_{\eta, 1}^k(u_i)$ for all i , u_i is $(0, 1/i)$ -symmetric on D_2 and there exist points $\{x_1^i, x_2^i, \dots, x_{k+1}^i\} \subset D_1$ satisfying the following two conditions:

- u_i is $(0, 1/i)$ -symmetric on each $D_2(x_j^i)$ for $j = 1, \dots, k+1$. That is,

$$\int_{B_2^+(x_j^i)} |u_i^e - h_{ij}^e|^{\gamma_0} d\mathbf{x} \leq 1/i$$

for some 0-symmetric function h_{ij} .

- $\text{dist}\left(x_j^i, \text{span}\left\{0, x_1^i, \dots, x_{j-1}^i\right\}\right) \geq \tau$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k+1$.

After passing to a subsequence, there exists a map u such that $u_i^e \rightarrow u^e$ weakly in $H^1(B_3^+, |z|^a d\mathbf{x})$ and strongly in $L^{\gamma_0}(B_3^+)$; and there exist points $\{x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}\} \subset \overline{D}_1$ such that u is 0-symmetric on $D_2(x_j)$ for all $j = 0, 1, \dots, k+1$. Here we write $x_0 = 0$. The distance relations are also preserved: we have $\text{dist}(x_j, \text{span}\{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}\}) \geq \tau$ for all $j = 0, \dots, k+1$.

It is now straightforward to verify that u is $(k+1)$ -symmetric on D_1 . But then, the strong convergence $u_i^e \rightarrow u^e$ in $L^{\gamma_0}(B_1^+)$ gives a contradiction to the assumption $0 \in \mathcal{S}_{\eta, 1}^k(u_i)$ for $i \gg 1$. \square

To continue, let us introduce the following notation.

Definition 3.7. *For a stationary s -harmonic map $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, N)$, $x \in D_1$ and $0 \leq s_0 < t_0 < 1$, denote*

$$\mathcal{W}_{s_0, t_0}(x, u) := \Theta_s(u^e, \mathbf{x}, t_0) - \Theta_s(u^e, \mathbf{x}, s_0) \geq 0.$$

Notice that, by Monotonicity formula (2.8), for $(s_1, t_1), (s_2, t_2)$ with $t_1 \leq s_2$,

$$\mathcal{W}_{s_1, t_1}(x, u) + \mathcal{W}_{s_2, t_2}(x, u) \leq \mathcal{W}_{s_1, t_2}(x, u)$$

with equality if $t_1 = s_2$. Given constants $0 < \gamma < 1/2$ and $\delta > 0$ and $q \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ (these parameters will be fixed suitably in Lemma 3.8), let Q be the number of positive integers j such that

$$\mathcal{W}_{\gamma^{j+q}, \gamma^{j-1}}(x, u) > \delta.$$

Then there has

$$(3.2) \quad Q \leq \frac{C_1(q+2)}{4^{m-2s}} \Lambda \delta^{-1},$$

where C_1 is chosen as in (2.7). To see this, just note that

$$Q\delta \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{W}_{\gamma^{j+q}, \gamma^{j-1}}(x, u) \leq (q+2)\mathcal{W}_{0,1}(x, u) \leq (q+2)\Theta_s(u^e, \mathbf{0}, 2) \leq \frac{C_1(q+2)}{4^{m-2s}} \mathcal{E}_s(u, D_4).$$

Following [4, 5, 6, 7], for each $x \in D_3$, we define a sequence $\{T_j(x)\}_{j \geq 1}$ with values in $\{0, 1\}$ in the following manner. For each $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ define

$$T_j(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathcal{W}_{\gamma^{j+q}, \gamma^{j-1}}(x, u) > \delta, \\ 0, & \text{if } \mathcal{W}_{\gamma^{j+q}, \gamma^{j-1}}(x, u) \leq \delta. \end{cases}$$

(3.2) implies that

$$\sum_{j \geq 1} T_j(x) \leq Q, \quad \forall x \in D_3.$$

That is, there exist at most Q nonzero entries in the sequence. Thus, for each β -tuple $T^\beta = (T_j^\beta)_{1 \leq j \leq \beta}$ with entries in $\{0, 1\}$, by defining

$$E_{T^\beta}(u) = \left\{ x \in D_1 \mid T_j(x) = T_j^\beta \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq \beta \right\},$$

we obtain a decomposition of D_1 by at most $\binom{\beta}{Q} \leq \beta^Q$ non-empty such sets $E_{T^\beta}(u)$, even through aprior there have 2^β choices of such β -tuple. This estimate plays an important role in the volume estimate below.

Lemma 3.8 (Covering Lemma). *There exists $c_0(m) < \infty$ such that, for each $\beta \geq 1$, the set $\mathcal{S}_{\eta, \gamma^\beta}^j(u) \cap E_{T^\beta}(u)$ can be covered by at most $c_0 (c_0 \gamma^{-m})^Q (c_0 \gamma^{-j})^{\beta-Q}$ balls of radius γ^β .*

Proof. For fixed η, γ , let $\tau = \gamma$ and choose ϵ as in Lemma 3.6. For this ϵ, γ , by Lemma 3.5 there exist $\delta > 0$ and $q \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that if

$$\Theta_s(u^e, \mathbf{x}, 2\gamma^j) - \Theta_s(u^e, \mathbf{x}, \gamma^{j+q}) \leq \delta$$

then u is $(0, \epsilon)$ -symmetric on $D_{2\gamma^j}(x)$. Fix this δ, q throughout the proof and define $T_j(x)$ accordingly.

We now determine the covering by induction argument. For $\beta = 0$, we can simply choose a minimal covering of $\mathcal{S}_{\eta, 1}^j(u) \cap D_1$ by at most $c(m)$ balls of radius 1 with centers in $\mathcal{S}_{\eta, 1}^j(u) \cap D_1$. Suppose now the statement holds for all β -tuples, and given a $\beta+1$ tuple $T^{\beta+1}$. Here are two simple observations. First, by definition, we have $\mathcal{S}_{\eta, \gamma^{\beta+1}}^j(u) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\eta, \gamma^\beta}^j(u)$. Next, by denoting T^β the β tuple obtained by dropping the last entry from $T^{\beta+1}$, we immediately get $E_{T^{\beta+1}}(u) \subset E_{T^\beta}(u)$.

We determine the covering recursively. For each ball $D_{\gamma^\beta}(x)$ in the covering of $\mathcal{S}_{\eta, \gamma^\beta}^j(u) \cap E_{T^\beta}(u)$, we will take a minimal covering of $D_{\gamma^\beta}(x) \cap \mathcal{S}_{\eta, \gamma^\beta}^j(u) \cap E_{T^\beta}(u)$ by balls of radius $\gamma^{\beta+1}$ as follows. In the case $T_\beta^\beta = 1$, then we use a simple volume argument to bound the number of balls geometrically to get a weaker bound on the covering by

$$c(m)\gamma^{-m}.$$

In the other case $T_\beta^\beta = 0$, we can do better. In this case we have both $T_\beta(x) = 0$ and $T_\beta(y) = 0$ for all $y \in D_{\gamma^\beta}(x) \cap E_{T^\beta}(u)$, i.e. $\mathcal{W}_{\gamma^{\beta+q}, \gamma^{\beta-1}}(y, u) \leq \delta$. By the choice of δ, q ,

this implies that u is $(0, \epsilon)$ -symmetric on $D_{2\gamma^\beta}(y)$. Recall that $x \in \mathcal{S}_{\eta, \gamma^\beta}^j(u)$. Hence we can apply Lemma 3.6 to conclude that the set $E_{T^\beta}(u) \cap D_{\gamma^\beta}(x)$ is contained in a $\gamma^{\beta+1}$ tubular neighborhood of some j dimensional plane V . Therefore, in this case we can cover the intersection with the stronger bound on the number of balls

$$c(m)\gamma^{-j}.$$

Given any $\beta > 0$ and $E_{T^\beta}(u)$, the number of times we need to apply the weaker estimate is bounded above by Q . Thus, the proof is complete. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.8.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. Choose $\gamma < 1/2$ such that $\gamma \leq c_0^{-2/\eta}$, where c_0 is as in Lemma 3.8. Then $c_0^\beta \leq (\gamma^\beta)^{-\eta/2}$ and since exponentials grow faster than polynomials,

$$\beta^Q \leq c(Q)c_0^\beta \leq c(\eta, m, Q) \left(\gamma^\beta\right)^{-\eta/2}.$$

Since $\text{Vol}(D_{\gamma^\beta}(x)) = \omega_m \gamma^{\beta m}$ and D_1 can be decomposed into at most β^Q sets $E_{T^\beta}(u)$ for any β , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Vol}\left(T_{\gamma^\beta}\left(\mathcal{S}_{\eta, \gamma^\beta}^j\right) \cap D_1\right) &\leq \beta^Q \left[(c_0 \gamma^{-m})^Q (c_0 \gamma^{-j})^{\beta-Q} \right] \omega_m \gamma^{\beta m} \\ &\leq c(m, Q, \eta) \beta^Q c_0^\beta \left(\gamma^\beta\right)^{m-j} \\ &\leq c(m, Q, \eta) \left(\gamma^\beta\right)^{m-j-\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $0 < r < 1$, by choosing $\beta > 0$ such that $\gamma^{\beta+1} \leq r < \gamma^\beta$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Vol}\left(T_r\left(\mathcal{S}_{\eta, r}^j\right) \cap D_1\right) &\leq \text{Vol}\left(T_{\gamma^\beta}\left(\mathcal{S}_{\eta, \gamma^\beta}^j\right) \cap D_1\right) \\ &\leq c(m, Q, \eta) \left(\gamma^\beta\right)^{m-j-\eta} \\ &\leq c(m, Q, \eta) (\gamma^{-1}r)^{m-j-\eta} \\ &\leq c(m, s, \eta, N, \Lambda) r^{m-j-\eta} \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREMS 1.5, 1.6 AND 1.7

We first prove the following ϵ -regularity theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *Given $\Lambda > 0$ and assume $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is a stationary s -harmonic map if $1/2 < s < 1$, or $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is a minimizing s -harmonic map if $0 < s \leq 1/2$. There exists a constant $\delta(m, \Lambda, s) > 0$ such that, if u is $(m-1, \delta)$ -symmetric on D_2 , then*

$$r_u(0) \geq \kappa_2,$$

where $\kappa_2 = \kappa_2(m, s) > 0$ is the constant defined as in Theorem 2.4.

The proof relies on the following lemmata. The first is an ϵ -regularity lemma, which shows that high order symmetry implies regularity.

Lemma 4.2 ((m, ϵ) -Regularity). *Given $\Lambda > 0$ and assume that $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is a stationary s -harmonic map if $1/2 < s < 1$, or $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is a minimizing s -harmonic map if $0 < s \leq 1/2$. There exists $\epsilon > 0$ depending only on s, m, Λ, n such that*

$$r_u(0) \geq \kappa_2$$

whenever u is (m, ϵ) -symmetric on D_2 .

Proof. We only consider the case $s \in (1/2, 1)$, another case can be proved similarly. Suppose, on the contrary, that there exist a sequence of stationary s -harmonic maps $u_k \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ such that u_k is $(m, 1/k)$ -symmetric on D_2 and $r_{u_k}(0) < \kappa_2$. By Theorem 2.6, we can assume that $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ weakly for some stationary s -harmonic map $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$, and $u_k^e \rightarrow u^e$ strongly in $H^1(B_2^+, |z|^a d\mathbf{x})$. Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ we find that u^e is 0-homogeneous and translation invariant with respect to the subspace $\mathbb{R}^m \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$. This implies that $u^e \equiv \text{const.}$. But then, by the strong convergence we know that

$$\Theta_s(u_k^e, \mathbf{0}, 2) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

which implies that $r_{u_k}(0) \geq \kappa_2$ for $k \gg 1$ by Proposition 2.5. We reach a contradiction. \square

We remark that, in the case $0 < s < 1/2$, the above lemma also holds for stationary s -harmonic maps, since in the argument only the compactness of s -harmonic maps is needed. The second ingredient of the proof of Theorem 4.1 is the following symmetry self-improvement lemma.

Lemma 4.3 (Symmetry self-improvement). *Given $\Lambda > 0$ and assume that $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is a stationary s -harmonic map if $1/2 < s < 1$, or $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is a minimizing s -harmonic map if $0 < s \leq 1/2$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if u is $(m-1, \delta)$ -symmetric on D_2 , then u is also (m, ϵ) -symmetric on D_2 .*

Proof. We first consider the case $s \in (1/2, 1)$. Suppose, for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and for each $k \geq 1$, there is a sequence of stationary s -harmonic maps $u_k \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ which is $(m-1, 1/k)$ -symmetric but not (m, ϵ_0) -symmetric on D_2 . By the first conclusion of Theorem 2.6, we can assume that $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ weakly for some stationary s -harmonic map $u \in \widehat{H}_\Lambda^s(D_4, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$, and $u_k^e \rightarrow u^e$ strongly in $H^1(B_2^+, |z|^a d\mathbf{x})$. Then u is $(m-1)$ -symmetric but not (m, ϵ_0) -symmetric on D_2 . Now, using the strong unique continuation result of [12, Theorem 1.2] (see also the paragraph right below the equation (2.4)), we infer that $u(x) = v(x_1)$ for some $v \in H^s(D_2, \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ such that (due to the homogeneity)

$$v(x_1) = \begin{cases} a, & \text{if } x_1 > 0 \\ b, & \text{if } x_1 < 0 \end{cases}$$

for some $a, b \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. It is known that $a \neq b$ implies $[v]_{H^s((-1,1))} = +\infty$ (see the argument of [17, Lemma 7.12]). Hence $a = b$, which means that v is a constant map and so m -symmetric in D_2 , again a contradiction. The proof is complete.

In the case $s \in (0, 1/2]$, arguing as in the previous case by using the second conclusion of the compactness theorem 2.6, and also as that of [17, Lemma 7.13], we can conclude that u is a minimizing s -harmonic map in the 1-dimensional interval $(-1, 1)$. Thus u must

be a continuous map by conclusion (3) of Theorem 1.4. Therefore u is a constant map since u is also 0-homogeneous. We reach a contradiction again! \square

Now we can prove Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. It follows from Lemma 4.2 and 4.3. The proof is complete. \square

Now we are ready to prove Theorems 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. If $x \in \mathcal{B}_r(u)$, then by Theorem 4.1, u is not $(m-1, \delta)$ -symmetric on $D_{2r/\kappa_2}^+(x)$. In other words, $x \in \mathcal{S}_{\eta, 2r/\kappa_2}^{m-2}$ for any $0 < \eta \leq \delta(s, m, \Lambda)$, the constant defined as in Theorem 4.1. Therefore, we have

$$\mathcal{B}_r(u) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\eta, 2r/\kappa_2}^{m-2}, \quad \forall 0 < \eta \leq \delta(s, m, \Lambda).$$

Then Theorem 1.8 yields

$$\text{Vol}(T_r(\mathcal{B}_r(u)) \cap D_1(x)) \leq \text{Vol}\left(T_r\left(\mathcal{S}_{\eta, 2r/\kappa_2}^{m-2}\right) \cap D_1(x)\right) \leq C(m, s, \Lambda, \eta)r^{2-\eta}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Totally similar to the above, and omitted. \square

Proof of theorem 1.5. This theorem follows from the simple observation that

$$\{x \in D_1 : |\nabla u(x)| > 1/r\} \subset \{x \in D_1 : r_u(x) < r\}$$

and the volume estimate of Theorem 1.6. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] C. BREINER AND T. LAMM, *Quantitative stratification and higher regularity for biharmonic maps*, Manuscripta Math. **148** (2015), no. 3-4, 379-398.
- [2] L. CAFFARELLI, L.J.-M. ROQUEJOFFRE, AND O. SAVIN, *Nonlocal minimal surfaces*. Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **63** (2010), 1111-1144.
- [3] L. CAFFARELLI, L. SILVESTRE, *An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian*, Commun. Partial Differ. Equ. **32** (2007), no. 8, 1245-1260.
- [4] J. CHEEGER, R.HASLHOFER AND A. NABER, *Quantitative stratification and the regularity of mean curvature flow*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **23** (2013), no. 3, 828-847.
- [5] J. CHEEGER, R.HASLHOFER AND A. NABER, *Quantitative stratification and the regularity of harmonic map flow*, Cal. Var. Partial Differential Equations **53** (2015), no. 1-2, 365-381.
- [6] J. CHEEGER AND A. NABER, *Lower bounds on Ricci curvature and quantitative behavior of singular sets*, Invent. Math. **191** (2013), 321-339.
- [7] J. CHEEGER AND A. NABER, *Quantitative stratification and the regularity of harmonic maps and minimal currents*, Comm. Pure. Appl. Math. **66** (2013), no.6, 965-990.
- [8] F. DA LIO, *Fractional harmonic maps into manifolds in odd dimension $n > 1$* . Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, **48** (2013), 421-445.
- [9] F. DA LIO AND T. RIVIÈRE, *Sub-criticality of non-local Schrödinger systems with antisymmetric potentials and applications to 1/2-harmonic maps*. Adv. Math. **227** (2011), 1300-1348.
- [10] F. DA LIO AND T. RIVIÈRE, *3-Commutators estimates and the regularity of 1/2-harmonic maps into spheres*. Anal. PDE **4** (2011), no. 1, 149-190.
- [11] F. DA LIO AND A. SCHIKORRA, *n/p -harmonic maps: regularity for the sphere case*. Adv. Calc. Var. **7** (2014), 1-26.
- [12] N. GAROFALO AND F.-H. LIN, *Monotonicity properties of variational integrals, Ap weights and unique continuation*. Indiana Univ. Math. J. **35** (1986), no. 2, 245-268.

- [13] C.-Y. GUO, G.-C. JIANG, C.-L. XIANG AND G.-F. ZHENG, *Optimal higher regularity for biharmonic maps via quantitative stratification*. Preprint at arXiv:2401.11177 [math.AP].
- [14] F. HÉLEIN, *Harmonic maps, conservation laws and moving frames*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, **150**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [15] F. HÉLEIN, Régularité des applications faiblement harmoniques entre une surface et une variété riemannienne, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris S . I Math., **312** (1991), 591-596.
- [16] V. MILLOT AND M. PEGON, *Minimizing 1/2-harmonic maps into spheres*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **59** (2020), no. 2, Paper No. 55, 37 pp.
- [17] V. MILLOT, M. PEGON AND A. SCHIKORRA, *Partial Regularity for Fractional Harmonic Maps into Spheres*. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **242** (2021), 747-825.
- [18] V. MILLOT AND Y. SIRE, *On a fractional Ginzburg-Landau equation and 1/2-harmonic maps into spheres*. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **215** (2015), 125-210.
- [19] V. MILLOT, Y. SIRE AND K. WANG, *Asymptotics for the fractional Allen-Cahn equation and stationary nonlocal minimal surfaces*. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **231** (2019), no. 2, 1129-1216.
- [20] V. MILLOT, Y. SIRE AND H. YU, *Minimizing fractional harmonic maps on the real line in the supercritical regime*. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **38** (2018), no. 12, 6195-6214.
- [21] S. A. MOLCHANOV AND E. OSTROVSKII, *Symmetric stable processes as traces of degenerate diffusion processes*. Theory Probab. Appl. **14** (1969), 128-131.
- [22] A. NABER AND D. VALTORTA, *Reifenberg-rectifiable and the regularity of stationary and minimizing harmonic maps*, Ann. of Math. (2) **185** (2017), no.1, 131-227.
- [23] A. NABER AND D. VALTORTA, *Stratification for singular set of approximate harmonic maps*, Math. Z. **290** (2018), no. 3-4, 1415-1455.
- [24] A. NABER AND D. VALTORTA, *The singular structure and regularity of stationary varifolds*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **22** (2020), no. 10, 3305-3382.
- [25] A. NABER, D. VALTORTA AND G. VERONELLI, *Quantitative regularity for p-harmonic maps*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **27** (2019), no. 1, 111-159.
- [26] J. ROBERTS, *A regularity theory for intrinsic minimising fractional harmonic maps*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **57** (2018), no. 4, Paper No. 109, 68 pp.
- [27] O. SAVIN AND E. VALDINOCI, *Density estimates for a variational model driven by the Gagliardo norm*. J. Math. Pures Appl. **101** (2014), 1-26.
- [28] A. SCHIKORRA, *Regularity of $n/2$ harmonic maps into spheres*. J. Differ. Equ. **252** (2012), 1862-1911.
- [29] A. SCHIKORRA, *Integro-differential harmonic maps into spheres*. Commun. Partial Differ. Equ. **40** (2015), 506-539.

(Yu He) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, CENTRAL CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, WUHAN 430079, P. R. CHINA

Email address: yu_he@mails.ccnu.edu.cn

(Chang-Lin Xiang) THREE GORGES MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH CENTER, CHINA THREE GORGES UNIVERSITY, 443002, YICHANG, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Email address: changlin.xiang@ctgu.edu.cn

(Gao-Feng Zheng) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, CENTRAL CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, WUHAN 430079, P. R. CHINA

Email address: gfzheng@ccnu.edu.cn