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#### Abstract

Let $g=e^{2 u}\left(d x^{2}+d y^{2}\right)$ be a conformal metric defined on the unit disk of $\mathbb{C}$. We give an estimate of $\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2}, \infty\left(D_{\frac{1}{2}}\right)}$ when $\|K(g)\|_{L^{1}}$ is small and $\frac{\mu\left(B_{r}^{g}(z), g\right)}{\pi r^{2}}<\Lambda$ for any $r$ and $z \in D_{\frac{3}{4}}$. Then we will use this estimate to study the Gromov-Hausdorff convergence of a conformal metric sequence with bounded $\|K\|_{L^{1}}$ and give some applications.


## 1. Introduction

In [14], Takashi Shioya studied the convergence of surfaces and proved the following.
Theorem 1.1 (Shioya). Let $\mathcal{M}(C, d)$ denote the set of isometry classes of closed 2dimensional Riemannian manifolds with diameter $\leq d$ and total absolute curvature $\|K\|_{L^{1}} \leq$ $C$. For any positive $C$ and $d, \mathcal{M}(C, d)$ is precompact with respect to the Gromov-Hausdorff distance.

In this paper, we use the theory of moduli space and Brezis-Merle Theorem to give more information of the convergence in case of Riemann surfaces. The idea is the following. By the theory of moduli space, we can divide a Riemann surface into finitely many parts, and each part is conformal to a disk or $D \backslash D_{r_{k}}$ with $r_{k} \rightarrow 0$, where $D$ is the unit disk, and $D_{r_{k}}=D_{r_{k}}(0)$. So if we get the convergence of $D$ and $D \backslash D_{r_{k}}$, we can study the convergence of a surface sequence by a standard blowup analysis. In addition, the converging behavior of a metric sequence on $D \backslash D_{r_{k}}$ can be also obtained from a precise bubble tree argument of a metric sequence defined on the unit disk. So the key point to such a problem is to understand the detail of a conformal metric sequence defined on a disk. The main topic of this paper is the first step of this program. We need to point out that similar problems under different assumptions have already been studied by many authors [3, 4, 5, 11, (17].

Set $g_{k}=e^{2 u_{k}} g_{\text {euc }}$, where $g_{\text {euc }}=d x^{2}+d y^{2}$. Let $K\left(g_{k}\right)$ be the Gauss curvature of $g_{k}$. We have the following Gauss curvature equation:

$$
-\Delta u_{k}=K\left(g_{k}\right) e^{2 u_{k}}
$$

By Brezis-Merle's result (see section 2), we can decompose $u_{k}$ into a sum of a harmonic function $w_{k}$ and a function $v_{k}$ which is bounded in $W^{1, p}$. Thus, to understand the convergence of $u_{k}$, we only need to study the behavior of the mean value of $w_{k}$.

The first result in this direction was obtained by Hélein. In (9), Hélein proved that a conformal immersion sequence from $D$ into $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ with induced metrics $g_{k}=e^{2 u_{k}} g_{\text {euc }}$, with small $L^{2}$-norm of second fundamental and area bounds, is bounded in $W_{l o c}^{2,2}\left(D, \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ and converges to a conformal immersion or a point. Moreover, if the limit is not a point, then $u_{k}$ is bounded in $L_{l o c}^{\infty}(D)$. In Hélein's case, $u_{k}$ can be decomposed into the sum of a $L^{\infty}$
function and a harmonic function, so he was able to discuss the $W^{1,2}$ convergence and $L^{\infty}$ bound of $u_{k}$.

We call the sequence collapse if the limit is a point. Usually, collapse is the most difficult part in the analysis. When it happens, one will be lucky to find a constant $c_{k}$, such that $u_{k}-c_{k}$ converges. Unfortunately, we have the following counterexample. Let $f_{k}=\frac{e^{k z}}{a_{k}}: D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, and $g_{k}=e^{2 u_{k}} g_{\text {euc }}$ is the induced metric. We choose $a_{k}$ such that $\mu\left(D, g_{k}\right)=\int_{D} \frac{e^{2 k x}}{a_{k}^{2}}=1$. Then for any $c_{k}, u_{k}-c_{k}$ can not converge. However, in a recent result [12], we showed that this is almost the only counterexample. Specifically, we proved that if $\left\|A_{k}\right\|_{L^{2}} \rightarrow 0$ and $\left\|\nabla u_{k}\right\|$ is not bounded, then we can find $x_{k}$ and $r_{k}$, such that $u_{k}\left(x_{k}+r_{k} x\right)$ converges to a linear function. As an application, we proved that when $\frac{\mu\left(f_{k}(D) \cap B_{r}^{n}(p)\right)}{\pi r^{2}}<C$ for any $B_{r}^{n}(p)$, we can find $c_{k}$ such that $u_{k}-c_{k}$ converges weakly in $W^{1,2}$.

We will show that a similar argument works in the intrinsic case. Precisely, we will use the John-Nirenberg radius defined in [12] to measure the Harnack properties of a function satisfying an elliptic equation. The main observation is, when $\Delta u_{k}$ is very closed to 0 in $L^{1}$-norm, then we can find sequence $u_{k}\left(x_{k}+r_{k} x\right)$ which converges to a linear function.

The first result of this paper is the following.
Theorem 1.2. Let $g=e^{2 u} g_{\text {euc }}$ be a smooth metric defined on $D$. We assume

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\mu\left(B_{r}^{g}(z), g\right)}{\pi r^{2}}<\Lambda_{1}, \quad \forall r>0 \quad \text { and } \quad z \in D_{\frac{3}{4}} . \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then there exists an $\epsilon_{0}$, such that if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{D}|K(g)| d \mu_{g} \leq \epsilon_{0}<\frac{4}{3} \pi \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2, \infty}\left(D_{\frac{1}{2}}\right)}<C
$$

Moreover, we have

$$
\|u\|_{W^{1, p}\left(D_{\frac{1}{2}}\right)} \leq C\left(1+\left|\log \mu\left(D_{\frac{1}{2}}, g\right)\right|\right)
$$

where $p \in(1,2)$.
Remark 1.3. By Corollary 2.3 and Poincaré inequality, (1.1) and (1.2) imply that

$$
\int_{D_{\frac{1}{2}}} e^{q(u-c)}<C\left(q, \epsilon_{0}, \Lambda_{1}\right)
$$

where $c$ is the mean value of $u$ along $\partial D_{\frac{1}{4}}$, and $q<\frac{4 \pi}{\epsilon_{0}}$.
As a consequence, we have the following corollary.
Corollary 1.4. Let $g_{k}=e^{2 u_{k}} g_{\text {euc }}$ be a smooth metric defined on $D$. We assume $\left(D, g_{k}\right)$ can be extended to a complete surface with total Gauss curvature uniformly bounded. If

$$
\int_{D}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| d \mu_{g_{k}}<\tau \leq \epsilon_{0}
$$

then all results in Theorem 1.2 hold.

Together with the theory of moduli space of Riemann surface, this corollary may help us to study the convergence of a Riemann surface sequence with bounded total Gauss curvature.

It is easy to check that if $\mu\left(D, g_{k}\right)$ is uniformly bounded, then $c_{k}$ must be uniformly bounded above. If $\mu\left(D, g_{k}\right) \rightarrow 0$, then $c_{k} \rightarrow-\infty$, hence $\left\|e^{u_{k}}\right\|_{W^{1, p}\left(D_{r}\right)} \rightarrow 0$. Then by the trace embedding inequality, we get the following corollary.

Corollary 1.5. Let $g_{k}$ be as in Corollary 1.4 and assume $\mu\left(D, g_{k}\right)<\Lambda_{2}$ in addition. Then, after passing to a subsequence, $e^{u_{k}}$ converges in $L^{q}\left(D_{r}\right)$ for any $q<\frac{4 \pi}{\tau}$, and for any $r \in(0,1)$ and $p \in(1,2)$, one of the following two alternatives holds:
(a) $u_{k}$ converges weakly in $W^{1, p}\left(D_{r}\right)$;
(b) $e^{u_{k}}$ converges to 0 in $L^{q}\left(D_{r}\right)$ and both $\mu\left(g_{k}, D_{r}\right)$ and diam $\left(D_{r}, g_{k}\right)$ converge to 0 . Moreover, when (b) happens, we can find $c_{k}$, such that $u_{k}-c_{k}$ converges weakly in $W^{1, p}\left(D_{r}\right)$.

We need to study the limit distance space. For this sake, we denote

$$
\mathcal{R}^{p}(D)=\left\{u \in W^{1, p}(D): \Delta u \text { is a finite Radon measure }\right\} .
$$

Here $\Delta u$ is a Radon measure means that there exists a Radon measure $\mu$, such that for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$
\int_{D} \nabla u \nabla \varphi=\int_{D} \varphi d \mu
$$

Given $u \in \mathcal{R} \mathcal{F}^{p}(D)$, we define

$$
d_{u}(x, y)=\inf _{\gamma \in P(x, y)} \int_{\gamma} e^{u}
$$

where $P(x, y)$ denotes the set of all piecewise smooth paths joining $x$ and $y$. We will show that
Theorem 1.6. For any $u \in \mathcal{R} \mathcal{F}^{p}(D)$ with $p \in(1,2), d_{u}$ is a metric. Moreover, if $g_{k}=e^{2 u_{k}} g_{\text {euc }}$ is a smooth metric satisfying

$$
\int_{D}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| d \mu_{g_{k}}<\epsilon_{0}
$$

and $u_{k}$ converges to $u$ weakly in $W^{1, p}$, then $\left(\overline{D_{r}}, d_{g_{k}}\right)$ converges to $\left(\overline{D_{r}}, d_{u}\right)$ in the sense of Gromov-Hausdorff distance.

To make some preparations for the blowup analysis for a surface sequence with finite total curvature in a forthcoming paper, we prove the following result.

Theorem 1.7. Let $g=e^{2 u} g_{\text {euc }}$ on $D_{4} \backslash D_{\frac{1}{4}}$ with

$$
\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2, \infty}\left(D_{4} \backslash D_{\frac{1}{4}}\right)}<\Lambda_{3} .
$$

Set $c$ to be the mean value of $u$ on $\partial D_{\frac{3}{2}}$. Then, there exists a constant $\epsilon_{2}=\epsilon_{2}\left(\Lambda_{3}\right)$, such that if

$$
\int_{D_{4} \backslash D_{\frac{1}{2}}}|K| e^{2 u}<\epsilon_{2},
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{1} \leq \frac{d_{g}\left(e^{i \theta}, 2 e^{i \theta^{\prime}}\right)}{e^{c}} \leq C_{2}, \quad \forall \theta, \theta^{\prime} \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
C_{1}^{\prime} \leq \frac{\mu\left(D_{2} \backslash D, g\right)}{e^{2 c}} \leq C_{2}^{\prime}
$$

where $C_{1}, C_{1}^{\prime}, C_{2}, C_{2}^{\prime}$ only depend on $\Lambda_{3}$ and $\epsilon_{2}$.
In the last section, we will give some applications. First, we prove that under assumption of bounded total curvature, if a Riemann surface sequence converges to a Riemann surface in the Gromov-Hausdorff distance, then the conformal class and the volume converge. Second, we will show that when $\left\|K\left(g_{k}\right)-1\right\|_{L^{1}}$ is small, $\left\{\left(S^{2}, g_{k}\right)\right\}$ is precompact in the Gromov Hausdorff distance and in $W^{1, p}$ weakly. At the end, we prove that when $K\left(g_{k}\right) \geq 1$ and the $\left(S^{2}, g_{k}\right)$ does not collapse, then the Gromov-Hausdorff limit is a topological sphere.

## 2. Preliminary

The arguments of this paper base on the following theorem.
Theorem 2.1. [1, 9] Let $v$ be the solution of

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\Delta v=f,\left.\quad v\right|_{\partial D}=0 \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f \in L^{1}$. Then for any $\epsilon>0$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|\nabla v\|_{L^{2, \infty}(D)}<C\|f\|_{L^{1}(D)}, \quad \text { and } \quad \int_{\Omega} e^{\frac{(4 \pi-\epsilon)|v|}{\|f\|_{L^{1}(D)}}}<\frac{16 \pi^{2}}{\epsilon^{2}} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 2.2. Note that for any $p \in(1,2)$ and $D_{r}(x) \subset D$,

$$
\left(r^{2-p} \int_{D_{r}(x)}|\varphi|^{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}<C\|\varphi\|_{L^{2, \infty}(D)}
$$

Thus, if $v$ is the solution of (2.1), we have

$$
r^{2-p} \int_{D_{r}(x)}|\nabla v|^{p} d x \leq C\|f\|_{L^{1}}, \quad \forall D_{r}(x) \subset D
$$

Brezis-Merle's result can be considered as the $W^{2,1}$-version of Trudinger inequality:

$$
\sup _{v \in W_{0}^{1,2}(\Omega),\|\Delta v\|_{L^{1}}=1} \int_{\Omega} e^{(4 \pi-\epsilon)|v|}<C(\epsilon) .
$$

When $u \notin W_{0}^{1,2}$ with $|\Delta u| \in L^{1}$, we set $v \in W_{0}^{1,2}$ to be a solution of

$$
\Delta v=\Delta u .
$$

We have the decomposition:

$$
u=v+w,
$$

where $w$ is harmonic and $v$ satisfies (2.2). Then, by mean value theorem of harmonic function, we have the following:

Corollary 2.3. Let $u$ be a solution of

$$
-\Delta u=f, \quad x \in D
$$

If there exist $\epsilon_{1}$ and $\Lambda_{3}$ such that

$$
\|f\|_{L^{1}(D)}<\epsilon_{1}, \quad\|u\|_{L^{1}(D)}<\Lambda_{3},
$$

then

$$
\left\|e^{|u|}\right\|_{L^{q}\left(D_{r}\right)}<C\left(q, \Lambda_{3}, r\right)
$$

for any $q<\frac{4 \pi}{\epsilon_{1}}$.
For a function $\phi \in L^{1}(\Omega)$, we define $\rho$ as follows:
$\rho\left(\phi, x_{0}, \Omega, \lambda\right)=\sup \left\{r: D_{t}\left(x_{0}\right) \subset \Omega, \quad \frac{1}{\left|D_{t}\left(x_{0}\right)\right|} \int_{D_{t}\left(x_{0}\right)}\left|\phi-\frac{1}{\left|D_{t}(x)\right|} \int_{D_{t}\left(x_{0}\right)} \phi\right| d x \leq \lambda, \quad \forall t<r\right\}$.
We define $\rho\left(\phi, x_{0}, \Omega, \lambda\right)=0$, if

$$
\varliminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\left|D_{r}\left(x_{0}\right)\right|} \int_{D_{r}\left(x_{0}\right)}\left|\phi-\frac{1}{\left|D_{r}\left(x_{0}\right)\right|} \phi\right| d x>\lambda .
$$

For a harmonic function, we have the following result.
Lemma 2.4. Let $u$ be harmonic on $D$ with $\rho(u, x, D, \lambda)>a>0$ for any $x \in D_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and some positive number $a$. Then

$$
\|\nabla u\|_{C^{m}\left(D_{\frac{1}{2}}\right)}<C(a, \lambda, m) .
$$

Proof. Let $c=\frac{1}{\left|D_{a}(0)\right|} \int_{D_{a}(0)} u d x$. It follows from $\rho(u, x, D, \lambda)>a$ that

$$
\frac{1}{\left|D_{a}(0)\right|} \int_{D_{a}(0)}|u-c| d x \leq \lambda .
$$

By the mean value formula, we have

$$
\|u-c\|_{L^{\infty}\left(D_{\frac{a}{2}}(0)\right)}<C .
$$

Since

$$
\frac{1}{\left|D_{a}(p)\right|} \int_{D_{a}(p)}\left|(u-c)-\frac{1}{\left|D_{a}(p)\right|} \int_{D_{a}(p)}(u-c)\right| d x \leq \lambda, \quad \forall p \in D_{\frac{a}{2}}(0)
$$

by the mean value formula again, we get

$$
\int_{D_{a}(p)}|u-c| d x \leq \int_{D_{a}(p)}|u-c-(u(p)-c)| d x+|u(p)-c|\left|D_{a}(p)\right|
$$

Hence $\|u-c\|_{L^{\infty}\left(D_{\frac{a}{2}}^{2}\right)}<C$. Then we are able to prove

$$
\|u-c\|_{\left.L^{\infty}\left(D_{\frac{a}{2} k} k\right)\right)}<C
$$

whenever $\frac{a}{2} k<1$.

Let $u=v+w$, where $v \in W_{0}^{1,2}(D)$ and $w$ is harmonic. By Theorem 2.1 and Sobolev inequality, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{\left|D_{r}(x)\right|} \int_{D_{r}(x)}\left|v-\frac{1}{\left|D_{r}(x)\right|} \int_{D_{r}(x)} v\right| d x<C r^{2-p} \int_{D_{r}(x)}|\nabla v|^{p} d x<C\|f\|_{L^{1}(D)} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, if $\rho(u, x, D, \lambda)>a$, we get

$$
\rho\left(w, x, D, \lambda+C\|f\|_{L^{1}}\right)>a .
$$

Then, we get the following corollary.
Corollary 2.5. Suppose $u_{k} \in W^{1, p}(D)$ solve the equation

$$
-\Delta u_{k}=f_{k}
$$

in the sense of distribution. Assume

$$
\left\|f_{k}\right\|_{L^{1}(D)}<\epsilon_{1}, \quad \text { and } \quad \inf _{x \in D_{\frac{1}{2}}} \rho\left(x, u_{k}, D, \lambda\right)>a>0
$$

then $\nabla u_{k}$ is bounded in $L^{2, \infty}\left(D_{\frac{1}{2}}\right)$.
Lemma 2.6. Suppose $-\Delta u_{k}=f_{k}$, and assume

$$
\int_{D}\left|f_{k}\right| d x \rightarrow 0, \quad \inf _{x \in D_{\frac{1}{2}}} \rho\left(u_{k}, x, D, \lambda\right) \rightarrow 0
$$

Then after passing to a subsequence, we can find $x_{k} \in D_{\frac{1}{2}}, r_{k} \rightarrow 0$, and $c_{k} \in \mathbb{R}$, such that $u_{k}\left(x_{k}+r_{k} x\right)-c_{k}$ converges to a nontrivial linear function weakly in $W^{1, p}\left(D_{R}\right)$ for any $R$ and $p \in(1,2)$.

Proof. Let $y_{k} \in D_{\frac{1}{2}}$, s.t. $\rho\left(y_{k}, u_{k}, D, \lambda\right) \rightarrow 0$. For simplicity, we denote $\rho\left(x, u_{k}, D, \lambda\right)$ by $\rho_{k}(x)$.

Put $x_{k} \in D_{\frac{2}{3}}$, such that

$$
\frac{\rho_{k}\left(x_{k}\right)}{2 / 3-\left|x_{k}\right|}=\inf _{x \in D_{\frac{2}{3}}} \frac{\rho_{k}(x)}{2 / 3-|x|}:=\tau_{k}
$$

Noting that

$$
\tau_{k} \leq \frac{\rho_{k}\left(y_{k}\right)}{\frac{2}{3}-\left|y_{k}\right|} \rightarrow 0
$$

we have $\rho_{k}\left(x_{k}\right)=\tau_{k}\left(\frac{2}{3}-\left|x_{k}\right|\right) \rightarrow 0$, and hence for any fixed $R$

$$
D_{R \rho_{k}\left(x_{k}\right)}\left(x_{k}\right) \subset D_{\frac{2}{3}-\left|x_{k}\right|}\left(x_{k}\right) \subset D_{\frac{2}{3}}
$$

when $k$ is sufficiently large. Then, for any $x \in D_{R \rho_{k}}\left(x_{k}\right)$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\rho_{k}(x)}{\rho_{k}\left(x_{k}\right)} & \geq \frac{\frac{2}{3}-|x|}{\frac{2}{3}-\left|x_{k}\right|} \geq \frac{\frac{2}{3}-\left|x_{k}\right|-\left|x-x_{k}\right|}{\frac{2}{3}-\left|x_{k}\right|} \\
& \geq 1-\frac{R \rho_{k}\left(x_{k}\right)}{\frac{2}{3}-\left|x_{k}\right|} \\
& =1-R \tau_{k} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, as $k$ is large enough, there holds

$$
\frac{\rho_{k}(x)}{\rho_{k}\left(x_{k}\right)}>\frac{1}{2} .
$$

Set $r_{k}=\rho_{k}\left(x_{k}\right)$ and $u_{k}^{\prime}=u_{k}\left(x_{k}+r_{k} x\right)$, we get

$$
\rho\left(u_{k}^{\prime}, x, D_{R}, \lambda\right)>\frac{1}{2}, \quad \forall x \in D_{\frac{R}{2}} .
$$

Then $\nabla u_{k}$ is bounded in $L^{2, \infty}\left(D_{R}\right)$ for any $R$. Set $c_{k}$ to be mean value of $u_{k}$ over $D$. By Poincare inequality, $u_{k}{ }^{\prime}-c_{k}$ is bounded in $W^{1, p}\left(D_{R}\right)$. Then we may assume $u_{k}{ }^{\prime}-c_{k}$ converges to $u$ weakly in $W_{l o c}^{1, p}$, where

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
-\Delta u=0 \\
\frac{1}{|D|} \int_{|D|}\left|u-\frac{1}{|D|} \int_{D} u\right| d x=\lambda \\
\frac{1}{|D(x)|} \int_{D(x)}\left|u-\frac{1}{|D(x)|} \int_{D(x)} u\right| d x \leq \lambda
\end{array}\right.
$$

Hence, we get

$$
\left\|u-u\left(x_{0}\right)\right\|_{L^{1}\left(D\left(x_{0}\right)\right)} \leq \lambda, \quad \forall x_{0}
$$

which implies that $\|\nabla u\|_{L^{\infty}\left(D_{\frac{1}{2}}\left(x_{0}\right)\right)}<C$. Then $\nabla u$ is a constant vector.
Since $\int_{D}|u-u(0)|=\lambda|D|$, $u$ can not be a constant.
Theorem 1.2 is a corollary of the following lemma.
Lemma 2.7. Let $g=e^{2 u} g_{\text {euc }}$ be a metric defined on $D$, and $K_{g}$ be the Gauss curvature. We assume there exists $r_{0}>0$ and $\Lambda_{1}$, such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\mu\left(B_{r}^{g}(x) \cap D_{\frac{3}{4}}, g\right)}{\pi r^{2}}<\Lambda_{1} \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $x \in D_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $r<r_{0}$. Then, there exists $\epsilon_{0}=\epsilon_{0}\left(\Lambda_{1}\right)$ and $a=a\left(\epsilon_{0}, r_{0}, \Lambda_{1}\right)$, such that if $\int_{D}\left|K_{g}\right| d \mu_{g}<\epsilon_{0}$, then

$$
\inf _{D_{\frac{1}{2}}} \rho(u, x, D, \lambda)>a>0
$$

 $\overline{D_{\frac{1}{2}}}$ and $c_{k}$ such that $u_{k}\left(x_{k}+r_{k} x\right)-c_{k} \rightarrow u_{0}=a x^{1}+b x^{2}+c$ weakly in $W_{l o c}^{1, p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{2}\right)$, and $e^{u_{k}\left(x_{k}+r_{k} x\right)-c_{k}}$ converges in $L_{l o c}^{q}\left(\mathbb{R}^{2}\right)$ for any $q$. For simplicity, we assume $u_{0}=x^{1}$ and define $g_{0}=e^{2 u_{0}}\left(d x^{1} \otimes d x^{1}+d x^{2} \otimes d x^{2}\right)$.

Set $T(\theta)$ to be the constant, such that

$$
\operatorname{Length}\left(\left.(\cos \theta, \sin \theta) t\right|_{t \in[0, T(\theta)]}, g_{0}\right)=R
$$

It is easy to check that

$$
T(\theta)=\frac{\log (1+R \cos \theta)}{\cos \theta}, \text { i.e. } e^{T(\theta) \cos \theta}=R \cos \theta+1
$$

Let $a>0$ be sufficiently small and put

$$
\Omega(R)=\left\{(r, \theta): r \in(0, T(\theta)), \quad \theta \in\left(-\frac{\pi}{2}+a, \frac{\pi}{2}-a\right)\right\} .
$$

Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu\left(\Omega(R), g_{0}\right)= & \left.\int_{-\frac{\pi}{2}+a}^{\frac{\pi}{2}-a}\left(\frac{e^{2 r \cos \theta} r}{2 \cos \theta}-\frac{e^{2 r \cos \theta}}{4 \cos ^{2} \theta}\right)\right|_{0} ^{T(\theta)} d \theta \\
= & \int_{-\frac{\pi}{2}+a}^{\frac{\pi}{2}-a}\left(\frac{(R \cos \theta+1)^{2} T(\theta)}{2 \cos \theta}-\frac{(R \cos \theta+1)^{2}-1}{4 \cos ^{2} \theta}\right) d \theta \\
= & R^{2} \int_{-\frac{\pi}{2}+a}^{\frac{\pi}{2}-a}\left(\frac{1}{2} \log (1+R \cos \theta)-\frac{1}{4}\right) d \theta+\int_{-\frac{\pi}{2}+a}^{\frac{\pi}{2}-a} R T(\theta) d \theta \\
& +\int_{-\frac{\pi}{2}+a}^{\frac{\pi}{2}-a} \frac{T(\theta)-R}{2 \cos \theta} d \theta \\
= & R^{2} \int_{-\frac{\pi}{2}+a}^{\frac{\pi}{2}-a}\left(\frac{1}{2} \log (1+R \cos \theta)-\frac{1}{4}\right) d \theta+O(R \log R),
\end{aligned}
$$

we have

$$
\lim _{R \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{\mu\left(\Omega(R), g_{0}\right)}{\pi R^{2}}=+\infty
$$

Let $T_{1}=\max _{S^{1}} T(\theta)$. We have

$$
\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{T_{1}}\left|e^{u_{k}(r, \theta)}-e^{u_{0}(r, \theta)}\right| d r d \theta=\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{T_{1}}\left|e^{u_{k}(r, \theta)}-e^{u_{0}(r, \theta)}\right| r^{\frac{1}{p}} r^{-\frac{1}{p}} d r d \theta \leq C\left\|e^{u_{k}}-e^{u_{0}}\right\|_{L^{p}} \rightarrow 0
$$

After passing to a subsequence, we can find $A \subset S^{1}$, such that $L_{S^{1}}^{1}(A)<\epsilon$ and

$$
\int_{0}^{T(\theta)}\left|e^{u_{k}}-e^{u_{0}}\right| d r \rightarrow 0, \forall \theta \notin A .
$$

Set

$$
\Omega(R, A)=\Omega(R) \backslash\{(r, \theta): \theta \in A\}
$$

Then, we have

$$
\Omega(R, A) \subset B_{R+1}^{g_{k}}(0)
$$

when $k$ is sufficiently large. Hence, we can choose $\epsilon$ small enough such that

$$
\mu\left(\Omega(R, A), g_{k}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \mu\left(\Omega(R), g_{0}\right)
$$

Then for any $K>0$, we can find $R$, such that

$$
\frac{\mu\left(B_{R+1}^{g_{k}}(0), g_{k}\right)}{\pi(R+1)^{2}}>K
$$

when $k$ is sufficiently large. Then we get

$$
\frac{\mu\left(B_{(R+1) r_{k}}^{g_{k}}\left(x_{k}\right), g_{k}\right)}{\pi\left((R+1) r_{k}\right)^{2}}>K
$$

This is a contradiction.

The proof of Corollary 1.4: It is well-known that on a complete Riemann $\operatorname{surface}(\Sigma, g)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\mu\left(B_{r}^{g}(p), g\right)}{\pi r^{2}}<1+\int_{B_{r}^{g}(p)} K^{-} \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

In fact, if we let $\Omega \subset T_{x} \Sigma$ be the segment domain, and

$$
\exp _{x}^{*}(g)=d r \otimes d r+\Theta^{2} d \theta \otimes d \theta
$$

then by the Jacobi equation $\Theta_{r r}+K \Theta=0$ in $\Omega_{p}$, we have

$$
\Theta=r-\int_{0}^{r} \int_{0}^{t} K \Theta(\tau, \theta) d \tau d t \leq r+\int_{0}^{r} \int_{0}^{t} K^{-} \Theta d \tau d t
$$

Let

$$
\hat{\Theta}= \begin{cases}\Theta & x \in \Omega \\ 0 & x \notin \Omega\end{cases}
$$

We get

$$
\mu\left(B_{r}^{g}(x), g\right)=\int_{B_{r}^{\exp _{x}^{*}(g)} \cap \exp _{x}^{-1}(D)} \hat{\Theta} \leq \int_{0}^{r} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \hat{\Theta} d r d \theta \leq \pi r^{2}+r^{2} \int_{B_{r}^{g}} K^{-} d \mu_{g}
$$

We will use the following simple lemma.
Lemma 2.8. If $u$ is smooth and $\|u\|_{W^{1,1}(D)}+\|\Delta u\|_{L^{1}(D)}<\Lambda_{3}$, then $\left.e^{2 u} g_{\text {euc }}\right|_{D_{\frac{1}{2}}}$ can be extended to a complete metric on $\mathbb{C}$ with $\|K\|_{L^{1}}<C\left(\Lambda_{3}\right)$. Moreover, we have

$$
\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2, \infty}\left(D_{\frac{1}{2}}\right)}<C\left(\Lambda_{3}\right) .
$$

Proof. Let $\eta$ be a cut-off function which is 1 on $D_{\frac{5}{8}}$ and 0 on $D_{\frac{7}{8}}^{c}$. Set $g^{\prime}=e^{2 \eta u} g_{\text {euc }}$. We have

$$
-\Delta \eta u=-u \Delta \eta-2 \nabla u \nabla \eta-\eta \Delta u
$$

Then

$$
K\left(g^{\prime}\right)=e^{-2 \eta u}(-u \Delta \eta-2 \nabla u \nabla \eta-\eta \Delta u) .
$$

Hence

$$
\int_{\mathbb{C}}\left|K\left(g^{\prime}\right)\right| d \mu_{g^{\prime}} \leq C \int_{D}(|u|+|\nabla u|+|\Delta u|)<C\left(\Lambda_{3}\right)
$$

## 3. CONVERGENCE OF DISTANCE FUNCTION

In this section, we set $g_{k}=e^{2 u_{k}} g_{\text {euc }}$ which satisfies

1) $u_{k}=0$ on $D_{2}^{c}$;
2) $u_{k}$ converges weakly to $u_{0}$ in $W^{1, p}\left(D_{2}\right)$ for any $p \in(1,2)$;
3) $\int_{D}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| d \mu_{g_{k}}<\epsilon_{0}$.

By the results in the last section, we have

$$
\left\|\nabla u_{k}\right\|_{L^{2, \infty}(D)}<C .
$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| d \mu_{g_{k}}$ and $K^{-}\left(g_{k}\right) d \mu_{g_{k}}$ converge to a measure $\nu$ and $\nu^{-}$respectively in the sense of distribution.

Let $d_{k}$ be the distance function defined by $g_{k}$. Then we have

$$
\left|e^{-u_{k}(x)} \nabla_{x} d_{k}(x, y)\right|=\left|e^{-u_{k}(y)} \nabla_{y} d_{k}(x, y)\right|=1
$$

Therefore,

$$
\int_{D \times D}\left(\left|\nabla_{x} d_{k}\right|^{q}+\left|\nabla_{y} d_{k}\right|^{q}\right) d x d y<C
$$

where $q<\frac{4 \pi-\epsilon_{0}}{\epsilon_{0}}$. Hence, $d_{k}(x, y)$ converges to a function $d_{0}$ in $C^{0}(D \times D)$.
First, we prove the following lemma.
Lemma 3.1. If $u_{0}=0$ and $\nu^{-}=0$, then

$$
d_{0}(0, x)=d_{g_{e u c}}(0, x), \quad \forall x \in D
$$

Proof. Note that $\nabla e^{2 u_{k}}=2 e^{2 u_{k}} \nabla u_{k}$, which is bounded in $L^{q}$ for some $q>1$. By the trace embedding theorem, it is easy to check that $d_{0} \leq d_{g_{e u c}}$, therefore, we only need to show $d_{0} \geq d_{g_{\text {euc }}}$. Assume there exists $x^{\prime}$, such that

$$
r=d_{0}\left(0, x^{\prime}\right)<d_{g_{e u c}}\left(0, x^{\prime}\right)
$$

Then $x^{\prime} \notin \overline{D_{r}}, B_{r}^{d_{0}}(0) \backslash \overline{D_{r}}$, which is a non-empty open set, hence

$$
\mu\left(B_{r}^{d_{0}}(0) \backslash \overline{D_{r}}, g_{\text {euc }}\right)>a>0
$$

Here $B_{r}^{d_{0}}(0)=\left\{x: d_{0}(0, x)<r\right\}$. Since $\left\|K^{-}\left(g_{k}\right)\right\|_{L^{1}} \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$
\varlimsup_{k \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{\mu\left(B_{t}^{g_{k}}(0), g_{k}\right)}{\pi t^{2}} \leq 1, \quad \forall t>0
$$

Since $B_{r-\epsilon}^{d_{0}}(0) \subset B_{r}^{g_{k}}(0)$ when $k$ is sufficiently large, we have

$$
\mu\left(B_{r-\epsilon}^{d_{0}}(0), g_{e u c}\right)=\lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \mu\left(B_{r-\epsilon}^{d_{0}}(0), g_{k}\right) \leq \varlimsup_{k \rightarrow+\infty} \mu\left(B_{r}^{g_{k}}(0), g_{k}\right) \leq \pi r^{2}
$$

Let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we get a contradiction.
As an application, we give the proof of Theorem 1.7 .
The proof of Theorem 1.7: Assume the left inequality of (1.3) is no true. Then we can find $u_{k}$ with $\left\|\nabla u_{k}\right\|_{L^{2, \infty}(D)}<\Lambda_{3}$, and $\theta_{k}, \theta_{k}^{\prime} \in[0,2 \pi)$, such that

$$
\frac{d_{g_{k}}\left(e^{i \theta_{k}}, 2 e^{i \theta_{k}^{\prime}}\right)}{e^{c_{k}}} \rightarrow 0
$$

Let $c_{k}$ be the mean value of $u_{k}$ on $\partial D_{\frac{3}{2}}$. By Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 2.3, $u_{k}-c_{k}$ converges to a harmonic function with $\int_{\partial D_{\frac{3}{2}}}^{2} w=0$, and $\|\nabla w\|_{L^{p}}<C\left(\Lambda_{3}\right)$. Then we get

$$
\|w\|_{C^{0}}<C\left(\Lambda_{3}\right) .
$$

Let $g_{k}^{\prime}=e^{2 u_{k}-2 c_{k}-2 w} g_{\text {euc }}$. We have

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} d_{g_{k}^{\prime}}\left(e^{i \theta_{k}}, 2 e^{i \theta_{k}^{\prime}}\right)=\left|e^{i \theta}-2 e^{i \theta^{\prime}}\right|,
$$

where $\theta$ and $\theta^{\prime}$ are the limits of $\theta_{k}$ and $\theta_{k}^{\prime}$ respectively. Note that

$$
\frac{d_{g_{k}}\left(e^{i \theta_{k}}, 2 e^{i \theta_{k}^{\prime}}\right)}{e^{c_{k}}} \geq C\left(\Lambda_{3}\right) d_{g_{k}^{\prime}}\left(e^{i \theta_{k}}, 2 e^{i \theta_{k}^{\prime}}\right)
$$

We get a contradiction.
The proofs of the other parts of this theorem are similar, hence are omitted here.

Lemma 3.2. $d_{0}$ is a distance function. Moreover, for any $\delta>0$, we can find $a(\delta)>0$, such that

$$
d_{0}(x, y)>a(\delta), \text { whenever }|x-y| \geq \delta
$$

Or equivalently, $\phi(x, y)=|x-y|$ is continuous on $\left(\mathbb{C}, d_{0}\right)$
Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $|x-y|=\delta$. We may choose $m$, such that $\frac{\int_{\mathrm{C}}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| d \mu_{g_{k}}}{m}<\epsilon_{2}$. Then, after passing to a subsequence, we can choose $i<m$, such that

$$
\int_{D_{2-i_{\delta}} \backslash D_{2-i-1_{\delta}}(x)}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| e^{2 u_{k}}<\epsilon_{2}
$$

for any $k$. By the trace embedding theorem, we may assume that

$$
\left|\int_{\partial D_{2-i}(x)} u_{k}\right|<C(\delta)
$$

By Theorem 1.7, we have

$$
d_{g_{k}}(x, y) \geq \lambda(\delta)>0
$$

Thus, $d_{0}(x, y)=0$ implies that $x=y$.
Now, we start to proof $d_{0}=d_{u_{0}}$. By the trace embedding theorem, we have

$$
\int_{\gamma} e^{u_{k}} \rightarrow \int_{\gamma} e^{u}
$$

Then, we get

$$
d_{0}(x, y) \leq d_{u_{0}}(x, y)
$$

Thus, it only needs to check whether $d_{0}(x, y) \geq d_{u_{0}}(x, y)$. The key observation is the following result.

Lemma 3.3. For any $\epsilon$, we can find $\beta$ and $\tau$, such that if

$$
\nu\left(B_{\delta}(x)\right)<\tau, \quad \delta<\frac{1}{2}, \quad x \in D_{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

then

$$
\frac{d_{u_{0}}(x, y)}{d_{0}(x, y)} \leq 1+\epsilon, \quad \forall y \in D_{\beta \delta}(x)
$$

Proof. Assume the result is not true. Then we can find $\delta_{m} \in\left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right), x_{m} \in D_{\frac{1}{2}}, y_{m} \in D$, such that $\frac{\left|x_{m}-y_{m}\right|}{\delta_{m}} \rightarrow 0$ and

$$
\lim _{m \rightarrow+\infty} \limsup _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \int_{D_{\delta_{m}\left(y_{m}\right)}}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| d \mu_{g_{k}}=0, \quad \frac{d_{0}\left(y_{m}, x_{m}\right)}{d_{u_{0}}\left(y_{m}, x_{m}\right)} \rightarrow l_{0} \leq \frac{1}{1+\epsilon}
$$

For any fixed $m$, we can find $k_{m}$, such that

$$
\left|\frac{d_{g_{k_{m}}}\left(y_{m}, x_{m}\right)}{d_{u_{0}}\left(y_{m}, x_{m}\right)}-\frac{d_{0}\left(y_{m}, x_{m}\right)}{d_{u_{0}}\left(y_{m}, x_{m}\right)}\right|<\frac{1}{m}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{\left|D_{r_{m}}\right|} \int_{D_{r_{m}\left(y_{m}\right)}}\left|u_{k_{m}}-u_{0}\right|<\frac{1}{m}, \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $r_{m}=\left|y_{m}-x_{m}\right|$. For simplicity, we set $x_{m}=y_{m}+r_{m}(0,1)$ and $u_{m}^{\prime}=u_{k_{m}}\left(y_{m}+\right.$ $\left.r_{m} x\right)-c_{k}$, where $c_{k}$ is chosen such that

$$
\int_{D_{1}} u_{m}^{\prime}=0
$$

We set $g_{m}^{\prime}=e^{2 u_{m}^{\prime}} g_{\text {euc }}$. By Corollary [1.4, $\left\|\nabla u_{m}^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2, \infty}(D(z)}<C$ for any $z$, then we may assume $u_{m}^{\prime}$ converges to a harmonic function $u$ weakly in $W_{\text {loc }}^{1, p}(\mathbb{C})$. Moreover, for any $D_{r}(z)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
r^{2-q} \int_{D_{r}(z)}|\nabla u|^{q} & \leq \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty}\left(r r_{m}\right)^{2-q} \int_{D_{r r_{m}}\left(y_{m}+r_{m} z\right)}\left|\nabla u_{k_{m}}\right|^{q} \\
& \leq C\left\|\nabla u_{k_{m}}\right\|_{L^{2, \infty}\left(D_{r r_{m}}\left(y_{m}+r_{m} z\right)\right)}^{q} \\
& <\Lambda .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then $u$ is a constant with $\int_{D} u=0$. Hence, $u=0$. By (3.1), $\left(u_{0}\left(x_{m}+r_{m} x\right)-u_{k_{m}}\left(x_{m}+\right.\right.$ $\left.r_{m} x\right)$ ) converges to 0 in $W_{\text {loc }}^{1, p}(\mathbb{C})$ weakly, and

$$
e^{-c_{k}} d_{u_{0}}\left(x_{m}, y_{m}\right) \leq \int_{[0,1]} e^{u_{0}\left(y_{m}+r_{m} x\right)-c_{k}}=\int_{[0,1]} e^{\left(u_{0}\left(y_{m}+r_{m} x\right)-u_{k_{m}}\left(y_{m}+r_{m} x\right)\right)+u_{m}^{\prime}} .
$$

By the trace embedding theorem, we get

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} e^{-c_{k}} d_{u_{0}}(x, y) \leq \int_{[0,1]} e^{u_{0}-c_{k}} \leq 1
$$

By Lemma 3.1,

$$
e^{-c_{k}} d_{g_{k_{m}}}\left(x_{m}, y_{m}\right)=d_{g_{m}^{\prime}}(0,(0,1)) \rightarrow 1 .
$$

Then

$$
l_{0}>\frac{d_{0}(x, y)}{\left|d_{u_{0}}(x, y)\right|} \geq 1
$$

which is impossible.

Proposition 3.4. $d_{0}=d_{u_{0}}$.
Proof. Let $\epsilon, \tau$ and $\beta$ be as in Lemma 3.3. We set $A_{\tau}=\{x: \nu(\{x\})>\tau\}$. Obviously, $A_{\tau}$ is a finite set. Then, for any $\delta>0$ and $B_{2 \delta}(x) \cap A_{\tau}=\emptyset$, we have

$$
\int_{B_{\delta}(x)}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| d \mu_{g_{k}}<\tau
$$

when $k$ is sufficiently large. Then

$$
\frac{d_{u_{0}}(x, y)}{d_{0}(x, y)}<1+\epsilon
$$

whenever $|x-y|<\beta \delta$ and $x \notin B_{\delta}\left(A_{\tau}\right)$.
Let $\gamma$ be the segment defined in $\left(\mathbb{C}, d_{0}\right)$ connecting $x_{1}$ and $x_{2}$, i.e. $\gamma:[0, a] \rightarrow\left(\mathbb{C}, d_{0}\right)$ is a continuous map which satisfies

$$
d_{0}\left(\gamma(s), \gamma\left(s^{\prime}\right)\right)=\left|s-s^{\prime}\right|, \quad \forall s, s^{\prime} \in[0, a]
$$

First, we consider the case when $\gamma \cap A_{\tau}=\emptyset$. We may assume

$$
d_{g_{\text {euc }}}\left(A_{\tau}, \gamma[0, a]\right)>\delta>0
$$

By Lemma 3.2, we can find

$$
s_{0}=0<s_{1}<\cdots<s_{m}=a,
$$

such that

$$
\left|\gamma\left(s_{i+1}\right)-\gamma\left(s_{i}\right)\right|<\beta \delta
$$

Then

$$
\begin{align*}
d_{0}\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) & =\sum_{i=0}^{m} d_{0}\left(\gamma\left(s_{i}\right), \gamma\left(s_{i+1}\right)\right) \\
& \geq(1+\epsilon)^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} d_{u_{0}}\left(\gamma\left(s_{i}\right), \gamma\left(s_{i+1}\right)\right)  \tag{3.2}\\
& \geq(1+\epsilon)^{-1} d_{u_{0}}\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

Now, we consider the case in which $\gamma \cap A_{\tau} \neq \emptyset$. Let

$$
\gamma \cap A_{\tau}=\left\{\gamma\left(a_{1}\right), \cdots, \gamma\left(a_{i}\right)\right\}
$$

Then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
d_{0}\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) & \geq d_{0}\left(x_{1}, \gamma\left(a_{1}-\epsilon^{\prime}\right)\right)+d_{0}\left(\gamma\left(a_{1}+\epsilon^{\prime}\right), \gamma\left(a_{2}-\epsilon^{\prime}\right)\right)+\cdots+d_{0}\left(\gamma\left(a_{i}+\epsilon^{\prime}, x_{2}\right)\right) \\
& \geq(1-\epsilon)^{-1}\left(d_{u_{0}}\left(x_{1}, \gamma\left(a_{1}-\epsilon^{\prime}\right)\right)+\cdots+d_{u_{0}}\left(\gamma\left(a_{i}+\epsilon^{\prime}\right), x_{2}\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $\epsilon^{\prime} \rightarrow 0$, we get (3.2) again.
Now, let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we get the desired result.

## 4. Some applications

In this section, we give some applications.
4.1. A sequence defined on $D_{r} \backslash D_{\frac{r_{k}}{r}}$. Let $g_{k}=e^{2 u_{k}} g_{e u c}$ be a metric defined on $D_{r} \backslash D_{\frac{r_{k}}{r}}$, where $r_{k} \rightarrow 0$. We assume

1) ( $D_{r} \backslash D_{\frac{r_{k}}{r}}, g_{k}$ ) can be extended to a complete surface with

$$
\left\|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right\|_{L^{1}}<C
$$

2) $\int_{D_{2 t} \backslash D_{t}}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| e^{2 u_{k}}<\epsilon_{2}, \quad \forall t \in\left(\frac{r_{k}}{r}, r\right)$;
3) $\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \sup _{t \in\left[\frac{r_{k}}{r}, r\right]} d_{g_{k}}\left(\partial D_{2 t}, \partial D_{t}\right)=0$.

By Theorem 1.7,

$$
\frac{\mu\left(D_{2 t} \backslash D_{t}, g_{k}\right)}{d_{g_{k}}^{2}\left(\partial D_{2 t}, \partial D_{t}\right)}<C, \quad \forall t \in\left[\frac{r_{k}}{r}, r\right] .
$$

Without loss of generality, we set $r=2^{m} \frac{r_{k}}{r}$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu\left(D_{r} \backslash D_{\frac{r_{k}}{r}}, g_{k}\right) & =\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mu\left(D_{2^{i} \frac{r_{k}}{r}} \backslash D_{2^{i-1} \frac{r_{k}}{r}}, g_{k}\right) \\
& \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_{g_{k}}^{2}\left(\partial D_{2^{i} \frac{r_{k}}{r}}, \partial D_{2^{i-1} \frac{r_{k}}{r}}\right) \\
& \leq \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_{g_{k}}\left(\partial D_{2^{i} \frac{r_{k}}{r}}, \partial D_{2^{i-1} \frac{r_{k}}{r}} .\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, when $\operatorname{diam}_{g_{k}}\left(D_{r} \backslash D_{\frac{r_{k}}{r}}\right)$ is bounded above, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \mu\left(D_{r} \backslash D_{\frac{r_{k}}{r}}, g_{k}\right)=0 \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

As an application, we have the following result.
Proposition 4.1. Assume

$$
\int_{D}\left(1+\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right|\right) e^{2 u_{k}}<C, \quad\left\|\nabla u_{k}\right\|_{L^{2, \infty}(D)}<C
$$

and

$$
\lim _{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \mu\left(D_{\delta}, g_{k}\right)>0
$$

Then we can find $x_{k} \rightarrow x_{0}, r_{k} \rightarrow 0$, and a finite set $\mathcal{S}$, such that $u_{k}\left(x_{k}+r_{k} x\right)-\log r_{k}$ converges weakly in $W_{\text {loc }}^{1, p}(\mathbb{C} \backslash \mathcal{S})$ to a function $u$ with

$$
\int_{\mathbb{C}} e^{2 u}<+\infty, \text { where } p \in(1,2) .
$$

Proof. Let $\epsilon_{0}^{\prime}=\min \left\{\epsilon_{0}, \epsilon_{2}\right\}$. We assume $\int_{D}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| e^{2 u_{k}} \leq m \frac{\epsilon_{0}^{\prime}}{2}$. We will prove the result by induction of $m$. When $m=1$, we set

$$
r_{k}(x)=\sup \left\{t: \int_{D_{t}(x)}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| e^{2 u_{k}} \leq \frac{\epsilon_{0}^{\prime}}{2}\right\}
$$

and take $x_{k}$ such that $\int_{D_{r_{k}}\left(x_{k}\right)}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| e^{2 u_{k}}=\frac{\epsilon_{0}^{\prime}}{2}$. If there exists $r_{k}^{\prime} \rightarrow 0, \frac{r_{k}^{\prime}}{r_{k}} \rightarrow+\infty$, such that

$$
d_{g_{k}}\left(\partial D_{2 r_{k}^{\prime}}\left(x_{k}\right), \partial D_{r_{k}^{\prime}}\left(x_{k}\right)\right) \rightarrow \lambda>0,
$$

then by Theorem [1.7, $\mu\left(D_{2 r_{k}^{\prime}}\left(x_{k}\right) \backslash D_{r_{k}^{\prime}}\left(x_{k}\right), g_{k}\right)>\lambda^{\prime}>0$. By Theorem 1.2, $u_{k}\left(r_{k}^{\prime} x+x_{k}\right)$ converges weakly in $W^{1, p}(\mathbb{C} \backslash\{0\})$.

Now, we assume

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \sup _{t \in\left[\frac{r_{k}}{r}, r\right]} d_{g_{k}}\left(\partial D_{2 t}\left(x_{k}\right), \partial D_{t}\left(x_{k}\right)\right)=0
$$

We claim that $u_{k}^{\prime}(x)=u_{k}\left(r_{k} x+x_{k}\right)$ must converge. Since $\left\|\nabla u_{k}^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2, \infty}}\left(D_{R}\right)<C(R)$, $u_{k}^{\prime}-c_{k}$ must converge weakly in $W^{1, p}\left(D_{R}\right)$, where $c_{k}$ is the mean value of $u_{k}^{\prime}$ on $D$. Since $\int_{D} e^{2 u_{k}^{\prime}}<C$, it follows from Jensen's inequality that $c_{k}<+\infty$. Thus, the fact that $u_{k}^{\prime}$ does not converge implies that $c_{k} \rightarrow-\infty$, hence $\mu\left(D_{\frac{r_{k}}{r}}\left(x_{k}\right)\right) \rightarrow 0$, which implies

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \mu\left(D_{r}\left(x_{0}\right), g_{k}\right)=\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \mu\left(D_{r}\left(x_{k}\right) \backslash D_{\frac{r_{k}}{r}}, g_{k}\right)=0
$$

We get a contradiction.
Now, we assume $\int_{D}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| e^{2 u_{k}} \leq(m-1) \frac{\epsilon_{0}^{\prime}}{2}$ implies the result and set $\int_{D}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| e^{2 u_{k}} \leq$ $m \frac{\epsilon_{0}^{\prime}}{2}$. We assume $u_{k}^{\prime}$ does not converge and set

$$
t_{k}=\sup \left\{t: \int_{D_{t}(x)}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| e^{2 u_{k}} \leq \frac{\epsilon_{0}^{\prime}}{2}(m-1)\right\}
$$

Assume $\int_{D_{t_{k}}\left(x_{k}\right)}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| e^{2 u_{k}}=\frac{\epsilon_{0}^{\prime}}{2}(m-1)$. If there exists $t_{k}^{\prime} \rightarrow 0, \frac{t_{k}^{\prime}}{t_{k}} \rightarrow+\infty$, such that

$$
d\left(\partial D_{2 t_{k}^{\prime}}\left(x_{k}\right), \partial D_{t_{k}^{\prime}}\left(x_{k}\right)\right) \rightarrow \lambda>0
$$

then $u_{k}\left(t_{k}^{\prime} x+x_{k}^{\prime}\right)-\log t_{k}^{\prime}$ converges weakly in $W^{1, p}(\mathbb{C} \backslash\{0\})$.
Now, we assume

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \sup _{t \in\left[\frac{t_{k}}{r}, r\right]} d\left(\partial D_{2 t}\left(x_{k}\right), \partial D_{t}\left(x_{k}\right)\right)=0
$$

which implies that

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \mu\left(D_{r} \backslash D_{\frac{t_{k}}{r}}\left(x_{k}\right)\right)=0
$$

Since $u_{k}^{\prime}$ does not converge, we have $\frac{t_{k}}{r_{k}} \rightarrow 0$. Otherwise, we get

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \mu\left(D_{r}\left(x_{k}\right), g_{k}\right)=0
$$

Put $u_{k}^{\prime \prime}=u_{k}\left(x_{k}+t_{k} x\right)-\log t_{k}$. Then, we have

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \mu\left(u_{k}^{\prime \prime}, D_{R}\right)=\lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \mu\left(u_{k}, D_{R t_{k}}\left(x_{k}\right)\right)>0
$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $K\left(x_{k}+t_{k} x\right) e^{2 u_{k}^{\prime \prime}} d x d y$ converges to $\nu$ in the sense of distribution. Choose $c_{k}$ such that $u_{k}^{\prime \prime}-c_{k}$ converges weakly in $W^{1, p}\left(\mathbb{C} \backslash \mathcal{S}^{\prime \prime}\right)$, where

$$
\mathcal{S}^{\prime \prime}=\left\{z: \nu(\{z\}) \geq \frac{\epsilon_{0}^{\prime}}{2}\right\}
$$

If $c_{k}$ is bounded, then $u_{k}^{\prime \prime}$ converges weakly. Thus we may assume $c_{k} \rightarrow-\infty$, which implies

$$
\sum_{z \in \mathcal{S}^{\prime \prime}} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \mu\left(D_{r}(z), g_{k}\right)>0
$$

However, $r_{k} / t_{k} \rightarrow 0$ implies that $\mu(\{0\}) \geq \frac{\epsilon_{0}^{\prime}}{2}$. Together with $\nu\left(D_{1}^{c}\right) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, we have

$$
\mu(\{z\}) \leq \frac{m-1}{2} \epsilon_{0}^{\prime}, \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{S}^{\prime \prime} .
$$

Using the induction on $u_{k}^{\prime \prime}$, we will get the result.
4.2. A Mumford type lemma. Let $(\Sigma, g)$ be a Riemann surface and $\sigma \in \pi_{1}(\Sigma)$. We denote the length of the shortest closed geodesic representing $\sigma$ by $L^{-}(\sigma)$. We will use the following lemmas (see [6] and [10] for proofs):

Lemma 4.2. Let $g_{k}, g$ be smooth Riemannian metrics on a surface $M$, such that $g_{k} \rightarrow g$ in $C^{s, \alpha}(M)$, where $s \in N, \alpha \in(0,1)$. Then for each $p \in M$ there exist neighborhoods $U_{k}, U$ and smooth conformal diffeomorphisms $\varphi_{k}: D \rightarrow U_{k}$, such that $\varphi_{k} \rightarrow \varphi$ in $C^{s+1, \alpha}(\bar{D}, M)$.

Lemma 4.3. If $\operatorname{Conf}\left(g_{k}\right)$ converges, then there exists $h_{k}$ which is conformal to $g_{k}$, such that $h_{k}$ converges smoothly.

First, we prove the following:
Theorem 4.4. Let $\left(\Sigma, g_{k}\right)$ be a Riemann surface with genus $\geq 1$. We assume $\left\|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right\|_{L^{1}}=$ 1. Then if the conformal class Conf $\left(g_{k}\right)$ is induced by $g_{k}$ diverges, then there exists a nontrivial $\sigma \in \pi_{1}(\Sigma)$ such that $L^{-}(\sigma) \rightarrow 0$. Conversely, if there exist $\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2} \in \pi_{1}(\Sigma)$ and some number $l_{0}$, such that $L^{-}\left(\sigma_{1}, g_{k}\right) \rightarrow 0$ and $L^{-}\left(\sigma_{2}, g_{k}\right)>l_{0}>0$, then $\operatorname{Conf}\left(g_{k}\right)$ diverges.

Proof. First of all, we assume $\operatorname{Conf}\left(g_{k}\right)$ diverges. By the Collar Lemma, we can find $T_{k} \rightarrow+\infty$ and $\Omega_{k} \subset \Sigma$, such that $\Omega_{k}$ is conformal to $S^{1} \times\left[-T_{k}, T_{k}\right]$, where the homotopy class of $S^{1} \times\{0\}$ is nontrivial in $\pi_{1}(\Sigma)$. Obviously, we can find $a_{k}<\frac{T_{k}}{2}$, such that

$$
\int_{S^{1} \times\left[a_{k}-1, a_{k}+1\right]}\left(1+\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right|\right) e^{2 u_{k}} \rightarrow 0 .
$$

Put $g_{k}=e^{2 u_{k}}\left(d t^{2}+d \theta^{2}\right)$. By Corollary 1.5, $l_{g_{k}}\left(S^{1} \times\left\{a_{k}\right\}\right) \rightarrow 0$.
Next, we will show when $\operatorname{Conf}\left(g_{k}\right)$ converges, if there exists nontrivial $\sigma \in \pi_{1}(\Sigma)$, such that $L^{-}\left(\sigma, g_{k}\right) \rightarrow 0$, then $L^{-}\left(\sigma^{\prime}, g_{k}\right) \rightarrow 0$ for any nontrivial $\sigma^{\prime}$.

First, we consider the case when $\operatorname{Conf}\left(g_{k}\right)$ is fixed. Assume $g_{k}=e^{2 u_{k}} g$ for a smooth metric $g$. Without loss of generality, assume $\nu$ be limit measure of $\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| e^{2 u_{k}} d x$ in the sense of distribution and set

$$
\mathcal{S}\left(\left\{g_{k}\right\}\right)=\left\{x: \nu(\{x\})>\frac{\epsilon_{0}}{2}\right\} .
$$

Set $\gamma_{k}:\left[0, a_{k}\right] \rightarrow \Sigma$ to be the shortest nontrivial closed geodesic with the unit speed, which represents $\sigma^{\prime}$. For simplicity, we assume $\gamma_{k}(0) \rightarrow x_{0}$. Select an isothermal coordinate system $\left(D,\left(x^{1}, x^{2}\right)\right)$ around $x_{0}$. Let $2 m \epsilon_{0}<1$. Since $\sigma^{\prime}$ is nontrivial in $\pi_{1}$, we can find $b_{0}=0<b_{1} \leq b_{2}<\cdots<b_{2 m+1}=a_{k}$, such that $\gamma_{k}\left(\left[b_{2 i}, b_{2 i+1}\right]\right) \subset \overline{D_{(i+1) /(2 m)} \backslash D_{i /(2 m)}}$ and $\gamma_{k}\left(b_{2 i+1}\right), \gamma_{k}\left(b_{2 i+2}\right) \subset \partial D_{(i+1) /(2 m)}$, where $i=1, \cdots, m$. Choose $i_{0}$, such that

$$
\int_{D_{\left(i_{0}+1\right) /(2 m)} \backslash D_{\left(i_{0}-2\right) /(2 m)}}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| e^{2 u_{k}}<\epsilon_{0}
$$

and let $c_{k}$ be the mean value of $u_{k}$ on a small disk contained in $D_{i_{0}} \backslash D_{i_{0}-1}$, which contains no Condensation points. By Theorem [1.2, $\left\|\nabla u_{k}\right\|_{L^{2, \infty}}$ is bounded on any $\Omega \subset \subset$ $\Sigma \backslash \mathcal{S}\left(\left\{g_{k}\right\}\right)$. Then, by Poincaré inequality, $\left\|u_{k}-c_{k}\right\|_{W^{1, p}(\Omega)}$ is bounded when

$$
D_{i_{0} /(2 m)} \backslash D_{\left(i_{0}-1\right) /(2 m)} \subset \Omega \subset \subset \Sigma \backslash \mathcal{S}\left(\left\{g_{k}\right\}\right)
$$

Thus we must have $c_{k} \rightarrow-\infty$, for $d\left(D_{i_{0}}, D_{i_{0}-1}, g_{k}\right) \leq l_{g_{k}}\left(\gamma_{k}\right) \rightarrow 0$. This implies that $e^{u_{k}}$ converges to 0 in $W_{l o c}^{1, p}\left(\mathcal{S}\left(\left\{g_{k}\right\}\right)\right)$. Then $L^{-}(\gamma) \rightarrow 0$ for any $\gamma \neq 1$ in $\pi_{1}(\Sigma)$. We get a contradiction.

Now, we assume $\operatorname{Conf}\left(g_{k}\right)$ converges. By Lemma 4.2 and 4.3, the proof for this case is almost the same with the case when $\operatorname{Con} f\left(g_{k}\right)$ is fixed, hence is omitted here.

Corollary 4.5. Let $g_{k}$ and $g_{\infty}$ be metrics on a closed Riemann surface. We assume $\left\|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right\|_{L^{1}}<C$ and $\left(\Sigma, g_{k}\right)$ converges to $\left(\Sigma, g_{\infty}\right)$ in the sense of Gromov-Hausdorff distance. Then $\mu\left(\Sigma, g_{k}\right) \rightarrow \mu\left(\Sigma, g_{\infty}\right)$.

Proof. Note that it follows from (2.6) that $\mu\left(g_{k}\right)<C$.
First, we prove $\operatorname{Conf}\left(g_{k}\right)$ converges. Assume this is not true. By the proof of the Theorem 4.4, we can find $\Omega_{k} \subset \Sigma_{k}$, which is conformal to $\left(S^{1} \times\left[-T_{k}, T_{k}\right], e^{2 u_{k}}\left(d t^{2}+d \theta^{2}\right)\right.$ ) with $T_{k} \rightarrow+\infty$, and $a_{k}<\frac{T_{k}}{2}$, such that the homotopy class of $S^{1} \times\{0\}$ is nontrivial in $\pi_{1}$ and $\operatorname{diam}\left(S^{1} \times\left(a_{k}-1, a_{k}+1\right)\right) \rightarrow 0$. In fact, by Theorem 1.2, 1.4, and trace embedding inequality, we may assume $\sup _{t \in\left[a_{k}-1, a_{k}+1\right]} l_{g_{k}}\left(S^{1} \times\{t\}\right) \rightarrow 0$. We replace $g_{k}$ with $e^{2 u_{k}}\left|a_{k}-t\right|\left(d t^{2}+d \theta^{2}\right)$ on $S^{1} \times\left[a_{k}-1, a_{k}+1\right]$, which can be considered as a metric defined on the cone

$$
C_{k}=\left\{(|t| \cos \theta,|t| \sin \theta, t): t \in\left[a_{k}-1, a_{k}+1\right]\right\}
$$

with $\operatorname{diam}\left(C_{k}\right) \rightarrow 0$. Denote the new metric space by $\Sigma_{k}^{\prime}$. By Theorem 2.1 in [16], whose proof can be also found in [8, page 100] and [2], there exists a surjective homomorphism from $\pi_{1}\left(\Sigma_{k}^{\prime}\right)$ to $\pi(\Sigma)$. This is impossible.

By Lemma 4.2 and 4.3, we may assume $\operatorname{Conf}\left(g_{k}\right)$ is fixed. Let $g_{k}=e^{2 u_{k}} g$, where $g$ is a fixed metric. We show that $u_{k}$ converges weakly in $W^{1, p}\left(\Sigma \backslash \mathcal{S}\left(\left\{g_{k}\right\}\right)\right)$. Assume this is not true. Then there exists $c_{k} \rightarrow-\infty$, such that $u_{k}-c_{k}$ converges weakly in $W^{1, p}\left(\Sigma \backslash \mathcal{S}_{0}\right)$ for some finite set $\mathcal{S}_{0}$. Then we can find embedded curves $\gamma_{1}, \cdots, \gamma_{m}$, such that

$$
\gamma_{i} \cap \mathcal{S}_{0}=\emptyset, \quad\left\langle\gamma_{1}, \cdots, \gamma_{m}\right\rangle=\pi_{1}(\Sigma)
$$

By the trace embedding inequality, $l_{g_{k}}\left(\gamma_{i}\right) \rightarrow 0$. Let $\varphi$ be a smooth function which is 0 when $t \leq 0,1$ when $t>\delta_{0}$ and positive on $(0,+\infty)$, here $\delta_{0}<\frac{1}{2} d_{g}\left(\mathcal{S}_{0}, \cup_{i} \gamma_{i}\right)$. Set $d_{0}(x)=d\left(x, \cup_{i} \gamma_{i}\right)$ and $g_{k}^{\prime}=g_{k} \varphi\left(d_{0}\right)$. Then $g_{k}^{\prime}$ define a distance function $d_{k}^{\prime}$ on $\Sigma / \sim$, where we say $x \sim y$ if $x, y \in \cup_{i} \gamma_{i}$. Obviously, we have

$$
d_{G H}\left(\left(\Sigma / \sim, d_{k}^{\prime}\right),\left(\Sigma, d_{g_{\infty}}\right)\right) \rightarrow 0
$$

By Theorem 2.1 in [16] again, $\pi_{1}(\Sigma)$ is trivial, which is impossible.
Next, we claim that for any $p \in \mathcal{S}\left(\left\{g_{k}\right\}\right)$, it must hold true that

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \mu\left(B_{r}^{g_{0}}(p), g_{k}\right)=0
$$

Otherwise, by Lemma 4.1, we can find $x_{k} \rightarrow p, r_{k} \rightarrow 0$ such that $u_{k}^{\prime}=u_{k}\left(x_{k}+r_{k} x\right)$ converges weakly in $W^{1, p}\left(\mathbb{C} \backslash \mathcal{S}^{\prime}\right)$, where $\mathcal{S}^{\prime}$ is a finite set.

Let $u^{\prime}$ be the limit. Then we have $\int_{D_{2 R} \backslash D_{R}} e^{2 u^{\prime}} \rightarrow 0$ as $R \rightarrow+\infty$. Let $u_{R}^{\prime}=u(R x)-$ $\log R$, and $g_{R}^{\prime}=e^{2 u_{R}^{\prime}} g_{\text {euc }}$. Then $\left(D_{2} \backslash D_{1}, g_{R}^{\prime}\right)$ is a new parametrization of $\left(D_{2 R} \backslash D_{R}, g\right)$. By Corollary 1.4, we have

$$
\lim _{R \rightarrow+\infty} L\left(\partial D_{R}, g_{R}\right)=\lim _{R \rightarrow+\infty} L\left(\partial D_{2}, g_{R}^{\prime}\right)=0
$$

Thus, we have

$$
\lim _{R \rightarrow+\infty} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} L\left(\partial D_{R r_{k}}\left(x_{k}\right), g_{k}\right)=0
$$

Then there must be a shortest closed geodesic $\gamma_{k}$ on $D_{\frac{1}{R}}\left(x_{k}\right) \backslash D_{R r_{k}}\left(x_{k}\right)$, which is also nontrivial in $\pi_{1}\left(D_{\frac{1}{R}}\left(x_{k}\right) \backslash D_{R r_{k}}\left(x_{k}\right)\right)$, when $R$ and $k$ are sufficiently large. In addition, the length of $\gamma_{k}$ converges to 0 as $k \rightarrow+\infty$ and $D_{\frac{1}{R}}\left(x_{k}\right) \backslash\left\{\gamma_{k}\right\}$ has just two connected components.

Without loss of generality, we assume $d_{G H}\left(\left(\Sigma, g_{k}\right),\left(\Sigma, g_{\infty}\right)\right)<2^{-k}$. We set $\Sigma_{k}=\left(\Sigma, g_{k}\right)$ and

$$
X=\left(\bigsqcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \Sigma_{k}\right) \bigsqcup \Sigma_{\infty}
$$

where $\bigsqcup$ is the disjoint union operator, and $d$ is an admissible distance such that

$$
d_{H, X}\left(\Sigma_{k}, \Sigma_{\infty}\right)<2^{-k}
$$

We set $x_{\infty} \in \Sigma_{\infty}$ to be the limit of a sequence $\hat{x}_{k} \in \gamma_{k} \subset X_{k}$. Since $L\left(\gamma_{k}, g_{k}\right) \rightarrow 0, \gamma_{k}$ converges to $x_{\infty}$.

Let $2 r$ be the injective radius of $\Sigma_{\infty}$. Then ${\overline{B_{r}\left(\hat{x}_{k}\right)}}^{{ }^{2}}$ converges to ${\overline{B_{r}\left(x_{\infty}\right)}}^{\Sigma_{\infty}}$ in the Hausdorff distance. Since $l_{g_{k}}\left(\gamma_{k}\right) \rightarrow 0$, we have $\gamma_{k} \subset{\overline{B_{r}\left(\hat{x}_{k}\right)}}^{\Sigma_{k}}$ for sufficiently large $k$. Then $\overline{B_{r}\left(\hat{x}_{k}\right)}{ }^{\Sigma_{k}} \backslash \gamma_{k}$ has just two connected components. Let $y_{k}, y_{k}^{\prime} \in \partial B_{r-\epsilon}^{\Sigma_{k}}\left(\hat{x}_{k}\right)$ lie on different components, which converge to $y_{\infty}$ and $y_{\infty}^{\prime}$ respectively. Since the segment $\widehat{y_{k} y_{k}^{\prime}}$ must pass through $\gamma_{k}$, the segment $\widehat{y_{\infty} y_{\infty}^{\prime}}$ must pass through $x_{\infty}$. In the same way, we can find $r^{\prime}$, such that for any $y^{\prime} \in B_{r^{\prime}}\left(y_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ in $\Sigma_{\infty}, \widehat{y_{\infty} y^{\prime}}$ passes through $x_{\infty}$, which is impossible.
4.3. Metrics On $S^{2}$ With Small $\|K(g)-1\|_{L^{1}}$. Let $g_{S^{2}}$ be the standard metric defined on $S^{2}$ with $K=1$ and $g_{k}=e^{2 u_{k}} g_{S^{2}}$. By Theorem A. 1 in [13], if $\left\|K\left(g_{k}\right)-1\right\|_{L^{p}}<\epsilon$ for some $\epsilon$ and $p>1$, then $\left(S^{2}, g_{k}\right)$ converges in $C^{1, \alpha}$. We will extend their result to the case $p=1$. We first prove that

Lemma 4.6. Let $g_{k}=e^{2 u_{k}} g_{\mathbb{S}^{2}}$. Assume $\mu\left(g_{k}\right) \leq \Lambda$ and $\left\|K\left(g_{k}\right)-1\right\|_{L^{1}\left(S^{2}, g_{k}\right)} \rightarrow 0$. After passing to a subsequence, we can find a Möbius transformation $\sigma_{k}$, such that $\sigma_{k}^{*}\left(g_{k}\right)$ converges to $g_{\mathbb{S}^{2}}$ weakly in $W^{1, p}$. Moreover, we have $\sigma_{k}^{*}\left(g_{k}\right)=e^{2 u_{k}^{\prime}} g_{\mathbb{S}^{2}}$ with $u_{k}^{\prime}$ converges to 0 in $W^{1, p}$ for any $p \in(1,2)$ and $e^{u_{k}^{\prime}}$ converges to 1 in $L^{q}$ for any $q>1$.

Proof. Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu\left(g_{k}\right) & =\int_{S^{2}}\left(1-K\left(g_{k}\right)\right) d \mu_{g_{k}}+\int_{S^{2}} K\left(g_{k}\right) d \mu_{g_{k}} \\
& =\int_{S^{2}}\left(1-K\left(g_{k}\right)\right) d \mu_{g_{k}}+4 \pi
\end{aligned}
$$

we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu\left(g_{k}\right) \rightarrow 4 \pi . \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, we have

$$
\left\|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right\|_{L^{1}\left(S^{2}, g_{k}\right)} \leq\left\|K\left(g_{k}\right)-1\right\|+\mu\left(g_{k}\right) \rightarrow 4 \pi
$$

Assume $\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| d \mu_{g_{k}}$ converges to measure $\nu$ in the sense of distribution. Put

$$
\mathcal{S}=\left\{x: \nu(\{x\})>\frac{\epsilon_{0}}{2}\right\} .
$$

Let $x_{0} \in \mathcal{S}, y_{0}$ be the antipodal point of $x_{0}$ on $\mathbb{S}^{2}$, and $\pi$ be the stereographic projection from $\mathbb{S}^{2} \backslash\left\{y_{0}\right\}$ to $\mathbb{C}$. It is well-known that $\pi$ defines an isothermal coordinate system with $x_{0}=0$. In this new coordinate, we set

$$
g_{k}=e^{2 v_{k}} g_{e u c}
$$

We have $-\Delta v_{k}=K_{g_{k}} e^{2 v_{k}}$, and

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \mu\left(D_{r}, g_{k}\right)=\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \int_{D_{r}}\left|K_{g_{k}}\right| e^{2 v_{k}}>\frac{\epsilon_{0}}{2} .
$$

We set

$$
r_{k}(x)=\sup \left\{t: \int_{D_{t}(x)}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| e^{2 v_{k}} \leq \frac{\epsilon_{0}}{2}\right\},
$$

and take $x_{k}$ such that $\int_{D_{r_{k}}\left(x_{k}\right)}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| e^{2 v_{k}}=\frac{\epsilon_{0}}{2}$. Put $v_{k}^{\prime}=v_{k}\left(x_{k}+r_{k} x\right)-\log r_{k}, g_{k}^{\prime}=$ $e^{2 v_{k}^{\prime}} g_{\text {euc }}$. Since

$$
\mu\left(D_{R}, g_{k}^{\prime}\right)=\int_{D_{R r_{k}}\left(x_{k}\right)} e^{2 v_{k}} \geq \int_{D_{R r_{k}}\left(x_{k}\right)}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| e^{2 v_{k}}-\int_{D_{R r_{k}}\left(x_{k}\right)}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)-1\right| e^{2 v_{k}} \rightarrow \frac{\epsilon_{0}}{2}
$$

by Corollary 1.5, $v_{k}^{\prime}$ converges weakly in $W^{1, p}$ and $e^{v_{k}^{\prime}}$ converges in $L^{q}$. Let $v^{\prime}$ be the limit. We have

$$
-\Delta v^{\prime}=e^{2 v^{\prime}}, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2}} e^{2 v^{\prime}}<+\infty
$$

By Theorem 1 in [7], $v^{\prime}=-\log \left(1+\frac{1}{4}\left|x-x_{0}\right|^{2}\right)$, and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2}} e^{2 v^{\prime}}=4 \pi$, i.e. $\left(\mathbb{C}, e^{2 v^{\prime}} g_{\text {euc }}\right)$ is a parametrization of $\left(S^{2} \backslash\left\{y_{0}\right\}, g_{S^{2}}\right)$.

Put $\sigma_{k}=\pi^{-1}\left(x_{k}+r_{k} \pi(x)\right)$, which defines a Möbius transformation of $S^{2}$. If we set $g_{k}^{\prime \prime}=\sigma_{k}^{*}\left(g_{k}\right)=e^{2 u_{k}^{\prime \prime}} g_{S^{2}}$, then $g_{k}^{\prime \prime}$ converges to $g_{S^{2}}$ weakly in $W_{l o c}^{1, p}\left(S^{2} \backslash\left\{y_{0}\right\}\right)$. Then we have

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \int_{B_{r}^{g} S^{2}\left(y_{0}\right)}\left|K\left(g_{k}^{\prime \prime}\right)\right| d \mu_{g_{k}^{\prime \prime}}=0
$$

Then $g_{k}^{\prime \prime}$ converges weakly in $W^{1, p}$.
It is easy to deduce Theorem 1.2 from Corollary 1.4 and the following lemma:

Lemma 4.7. For any given $\Lambda$, if $\mu\left(S^{2}, g\right) \leq \Lambda$, then for any $q>1$, there exit $\tau>0$, such that if $\|K(g)-1\|_{L^{1}\left(S^{2}, g\right)}<\tau$, then we can find a Möbius transformation $\sigma$, such that $\sigma^{*}(g)=e^{2 u^{\prime}} g_{S^{2}}$ with

$$
\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{W^{1, p}}<C(p), \quad\left\|e^{2 u^{\prime}}\right\|_{L^{q}}<C
$$

4.4. A sequence with $K \geq 1$. Let $g_{k}$ be a metric sequence with $K\left(g_{k}\right) \geq 1$ and $\mu\left(g_{k}\right) \geq$ $a>0$. We may set $g_{k}=e^{2 u_{k}} g_{S^{2}}$. We have

$$
\operatorname{diam}\left(g_{k}\right) \leq \pi, \quad \int_{S^{2}}\left|K\left(g_{k}\right)\right| d \mu_{g_{k}}=4 \pi
$$

By the volume comparison theorem, we have $\mu\left(g_{k}\right) \leq 4 \pi^{2}$.
Using the proof of Lemma 4.6, we may assume $u_{k}$ converges to $u$ weakly in $W^{1, p}\left(S^{2} \backslash \mathcal{S}\right)$, where $\mathcal{S}$ is a finite set. Let $p \in \mathcal{S}$. If $\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \mu\left(B_{r}^{g_{S^{2}}}(p), g_{k}\right)>a$, then we can find $x_{k} \rightarrow p, r_{k} \rightarrow 0$, and $c_{k}$, such that $u_{k}-c_{k}$ converges weakly in $W_{l o c}^{1, p}\left(\mathbb{C} \backslash \mathcal{S}^{\prime}\right)$, where $\mathcal{S}^{\prime}$ is a finite set. Then there exist a closed stable geodesic, which is impossible for $K \geq 1$. Otherwise, we get $\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \mu\left(B_{r}^{g_{S^{2}}}(p), g_{k}\right)=0$. By the volume comparison theorem, we have $\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \lim _{k \rightarrow+\infty} \operatorname{diam}\left(B_{r}(p), g_{k}\right) \rightarrow 0$. Then we get the following:

Corollary 4.8. Let $g_{k}$ be a metric sequence with $K_{g_{k}} \geq 1$ and $\mu\left(g_{k}\right) \geq a>0$. The Gromov-Hausdorff limit of $\left(S^{2}, g_{k}\right)$ is a topological sphere. Moreover, there exists a Möbius transformation $\sigma_{k}$, such that $\sigma_{k}^{*}\left(g_{k}\right)$ converges weakly in $W_{\text {loc }}^{1, p}\left(S^{2} \backslash \mathcal{S}, g_{S^{2}}\right)$, where $\mathcal{S}$ is a finite set.
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