

# HARMONIC MAP FLOW WITH LOW $\bar{\partial}$ -ENERGY

CHONG SONG AND ALEX WALDRON

ABSTRACT. Let  $\Sigma$  be a compact oriented surface and  $N$  a compact Kähler manifold with nonnegative holomorphic bisectional curvature. For harmonic map flow starting from a map  $\Sigma \rightarrow N$  with low  $\bar{\partial}$ -energy, the limit at each singular time extends continuously over the bubble points and no necks appear.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Basic identities	3
3. Epsilon-regularity	10
4. Estimate on the curvature scale	15
5. Decay estimate in annular regions	18
6. Hölder continuity and bubble-tree convergence	25
References	30

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $(M, g)$  and  $(N, h)$  be compact Riemannian manifolds. The *Dirichlet energy* of a map  $u : M \rightarrow N$  is given by

$$E(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_M |du|^2 dV_g.$$

Critical points of the functional  $E(u)$  are referred to as *harmonic maps* and play a fundamental role in geometric analysis. *Harmonic map flow* is the downward gradient flow of the Dirichlet functional:

$$(1.1) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \operatorname{tr}_g \nabla du.$$

In 1964, Eells and Sampson [7] introduced the evolution equation (1.1) and proved their foundational theorem: if  $N$  has nonpositive sectional curvature, then harmonic map flow smoothly deforms any initial map to a harmonic map in the same homotopy class.

The situation becomes more challenging when the target manifold is allowed to have positive sectional curvatures. It is common to assume that the domain manifold  $M = \Sigma$  has dimension two, where the Dirichlet functional is conformally invariant and its variational theory is especially well developed. Following in the vein of Sacks and Uhlenbeck [20], Struwe [25] in 1985 constructed a global weak solution of (1.1) starting from any  $W^{1,2}$  initial map; the solution is regular away from finitely many spacetime points where the Dirichlet energy may concentrate, forming a singularity. In 1992, Chang, Ding, and Ye [4] described

a simple scenario in which finite-time singularities must occur: more than a mere difficulty, these are a main feature of 2-dimensional harmonic map flow.

The picture of singularities in dimension two was sharpened through the work of Qing [15, 16], Ding-Tian [6], Wang [32], Qing-Tian [17] and Lin-Wang [9]. Supposing that  $0 < T < \infty$  is a singular time, the limit  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} u(t) = u(T)$  exists smoothly away from the singular set, with  $u(T) \in W^{1,2}(\Sigma, N)$ . By a rescaling procedure near each singular point, one obtains a *bubble tree*<sup>1</sup> consisting of finitely many harmonic maps  $\phi_i : S^2 \rightarrow N$  that account for all of the concentrated energy. Furthermore, *necks* cannot form between the bubbles; *i.e.*, for each  $i$ , the set  $\phi_1(S^2) \cup \dots \cup \phi_{i_{max}}(S^2)$  must be connected.

In spite of this progress, Topping [29] in 2004 was able to construct a solution in which  $u(T)$  has an essential discontinuity. This example might well have dashed one's hope of obtaining a meaningful limiting picture for harmonic map flow in dimension two.

However, Topping's example depends on the construction of a pathological metric on the target manifold. In the same paper [29], he conjectured that when the metric on  $N$  is real-analytic, such catastrophes cannot occur; in particular,  $u(T)$  will have only removable discontinuities at the singular points. Beyond this, it is important to rule out necks between the bubble maps  $\{\phi_i\}$  and  $u(T)$ , which has yet to be achieved in the case of finite-time singularities.

This paper establishes the continuity and no-neck properties under a familiar set of hypotheses on the target manifold and the initial map. When  $N$  is Kähler, the Dirichlet energy decomposes into holomorphic and antiholomorphic parts:

$$E(u) = \int_{\Sigma} |\partial u|^2 dV_g + \int_{\Sigma} |\bar{\partial} u|^2 dV_g =: E_{\partial}(u) + E_{\bar{\partial}}(u).$$

Topping's earlier work [28] on rigidity of (1.1) at infinite time was based on assuming that  $u$  is almost (anti-)holomorphic, *i.e.*, that either  $E_{\partial}(u)$  or  $E_{\bar{\partial}}(u)$  is small. Liu and Yang [10] generalized Topping's rigidity theorem using a Bochner technique that depends on a well-known positivity assumption on the curvature of  $N$ . We make the same assumptions in our main result.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Given a compact Kähler manifold  $(N, h)$  with nonnegative holomorphic bisectional curvature, there exists a constant  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  as follows.*

*Let  $(\Sigma, g)$  be a compact, oriented, 2-dimensional Riemannian manifold and  $u : \Sigma \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow N$ , a weak solution (in Struwe's sense) of harmonic map flow with either  $E_{\partial}(u(0)) < \varepsilon_0$  or  $E_{\bar{\partial}}(u(0)) < \varepsilon_0$ . For each singular time  $T < \infty$ , the map  $u(T)$  is Hölder continuous with each exponent less than one. Moreover, given any sequence of times  $t_n$  approaching  $T$  or  $\infty$ , the maps  $u(t_n)$  sub-converge in the bubble-tree sense, without necks.*

Note that by the proof of the generalized Frankel conjecture by Mori [12], Siu-Yau [24], and Mok [11], our curvature assumption implies that  $N$  is biholomorphic to a Hermitian symmetric space (or, in particular, to  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$ , if the holomorphic bisectional curvature is strictly positive). However, the metric  $h$  itself need not have any symmetry; for example, any metric on  $S^2$  with nonnegative curvature satisfies the hypothesis.

<sup>1</sup>See Parker [14] for an introduction to the bubble-tree concept.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 proceeds by analogy with the second-named author's thesis [30], with a twist. We first show that under our assumptions,  $|\bar{\partial}u|$  is uniformly bounded along the flow (Theorem 3.5). This follows from a version of the standard  $\varepsilon$ -regularity estimate (Proposition 3.3) that works in conjunction with the well-known split Bochner formula (Lemma 2.5).

We then observe that the bound on  $|\bar{\partial}u|$  yields improved control on the stress-energy tensor (Corollary 4.6). Since the stress-energy tensor (2.5) governs concentration of the energy along the flow, we obtain an improved "Type-II" bound on the energy scale:

$$\lambda(t) = O(T - t)^{\frac{q}{2}} \quad (t \nearrow T),$$

where  $q > 1$ . This bound is crucial; indeed, it is violated by Topping's counterexample (*cf.* [29], Theorem 1.14e).

Finally, we use this small amount of "spare time" before the blowup to carry out a decay estimate on the angular component of  $du$  in the neck region (§5.1-5.2). Using the stress-energy bound once more, we obtain a strong decay estimate on  $|du|$  (Theorems 5.5-5.6), which leads directly to our main theorems (§6).

**Acknowledgement.** C. Song is supported by NSFC no. 11971400. A. Waldron is supported by NSF no. 2004661. The authors thank K. Gimre for comments on the introduction.

## 2. BASIC IDENTITIES

In this section, we derive the required identities for obtaining estimates along the flow. The calculations in §2.1-2.3 apply to general domains and targets, while those of §2.4-2.6 specialize to a surface domain and Kähler target.

**2.1. Intrinsic viewpoint on harmonic map flow.** Let  $(M, g)$  and  $(N, h)$  be Riemannian manifolds. Given a  $C^1$  map  $u : M \rightarrow N$ , we write  $du$  for its differential, which may be viewed as a section of

$$\mathcal{E} = u^*TN \otimes T^*M.$$

We shall use the notation  $\langle, \rangle$  for the pullback of  $h$  on  $u^*TN$ , combined appropriately with  $g$  on tensor products with  $T^*M$ . The energy density of  $u$  is given by

$$e(u) = \frac{1}{2}|du|^2 = \frac{1}{2}g^{ij} \langle \partial_i u, \partial_j u \rangle,$$

and the *Dirichlet functional* by

$$E(u) = E_g(u) = \int_M e(u) dV_g.$$

We denote by  $\nabla$  the pullback to  $u^*TN$  of the Levi-Civita connection of  $h$ , which we will combine with that of  $g$  on tensors.

Under a variation

$$\begin{aligned} u &\rightarrow u + \delta u \\ g &\rightarrow g + \delta g, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$(2.1) \quad \delta E_g(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int (2g^{ij} \langle \partial_i u, \nabla_j \delta u \rangle + \delta g^{ij} \langle \partial_i u, \partial_j u \rangle + g^{ij} \langle \partial_i u, \partial_j u \rangle \frac{1}{2} g^{ij} \delta g_{ij}) dV_g$$

$$(2.2) \quad = \int \left( -g^{ij} \langle \nabla_j \partial_i u, \delta u \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \left( -g^{ik} g^{lj} \langle \partial_k u, \partial_l u \rangle + \frac{1}{2} |du|^2 g^{ij} \right) \delta g_{ij} \right) dV_g$$

$$(2.3) \quad = - \int \left( \langle \mathcal{T}(u), \delta u \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle S, \delta g \rangle \right) dV_g.$$

Here

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{T}(u) = \text{tr}_g \nabla du$$

is the *tension field*, and

$$(2.5) \quad S(u) = \langle du \otimes du \rangle - \frac{1}{2} |du|^2 g$$

is the *stress-energy tensor*. The former is a section of  $u^*TN$ , and the latter of  $\text{Sym}^2 T^*M$ .

Recall that harmonic map flow is the evolution equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \mathcal{T}(u)$$

for the map  $u = u(x, t)$ . This is the downward gradient flow of the Dirichlet functional, where the metric  $g$  is fixed in time. Then (2.1) immediately gives the *global energy identity*

$$(2.6) \quad E(u(t_2)) + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_M |\mathcal{T}(u)|^2 dV_g dt = E(u(t_1))$$

for a sufficiently regular solution of (1.1).

**Remark 2.1.** In what follows, we shall always assume that  $u$  is a classical solution of harmonic map flow on  $[0, T)$ , where  $0 < T \leq \infty$  is included in the data of  $u$ . In particular,  $T$  need not be the maximal smooth existence time.

**2.2. Pointwise energy identity.** The following brief calculation yields a useful “pointwise” version of (2.6). Using normal coordinates at a point, we take the divergence of  $S$ :

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} (\text{div } S)_j &= \nabla_i S_{ij} = \langle \nabla_i \partial_i u, \partial_j u \rangle + \langle \partial_i u, \nabla_i \partial_j u \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_j |du|^2 \\ &= \langle \mathcal{T}(u), \partial_j u \rangle + \langle \partial_i u, \nabla_j \partial_i u \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_j |du|^2 \\ &= \langle \mathcal{T}(u), \partial_j u \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the fact

$$(2.8) \quad \nabla_i \partial_j u = \nabla_j \partial_i u,$$

which follows from torsion-freeness of the Levi-Civita connection(s). The identity (2.7) appears as (2.10) in the paper of Baird and Eells [2].

Taking another divergence, we obtain

$$\text{div}^2(S) = \langle \nabla \mathcal{T}(u), du \rangle + |\mathcal{T}(u)|^2.$$

On the other hand, for a solution  $u(x, t)$  of harmonic map flow, we have

$$\frac{\partial e(u)}{\partial t} = \left\langle \nabla \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, du \right\rangle = \langle \nabla \mathcal{T}(u), du \rangle.$$

We obtain

$$(2.9) \quad \frac{\partial e(u)}{\partial t} + |\mathcal{T}(u)|^2 = \operatorname{div}^2(S).$$

**2.3. Bochner formula.** Let  $\nabla$  (as above) be the connection induced on  $\mathcal{E} = u^*TN \otimes T^*M$  by the pullback of the Levi-Civita connection on  $N$ , coupled with that of  $M$ . The connection  $\nabla$  defines a (crude) Laplace operator  $\Delta = -\nabla^* \nabla$  on  $\mathcal{E}$ .

Fixing  $p \in M$ , we let  $\{x^i\}$  be normal coordinates at  $p$ , and  $\{y^a\}$  be normal coordinates at  $u(p) \in N$ . We shall denote the tensor components of  $du$  in these coordinates by

$$u_i^a = \frac{\partial y^a(u)}{\partial x^i}.$$

We then have

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} (\Delta du)_j^a &= \nabla_i \nabla_i u_j^a = \nabla_i \nabla_j u_i^a \\ &= \nabla_j \nabla_i u_i^a + [\nabla_i, \nabla_j] u_i^a \\ &= \nabla_j \mathcal{T}(u)^a - {}^M R_{ij}{}^k{}_i u_k^a + (u^* N R)_{ij}{}^a{}_b u_i^b \\ &= \nabla_j \mathcal{T}(u)^a - {}^M R_{ij}{}^k{}_i u_k^a + {}^N R_{cd}{}^a{}_b u_i^c u_j^d u_i^b \\ &= \nabla_j \mathcal{T}(u)^a + {}^M Ric_{jk} u_k^a - {}^N R_{abcd} u_i^b u_j^c u_i^d. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used (2.8) in the first line, and the Bianchi identities in the last line.

Now, given a map  $u : M \times [0, T) \rightarrow N$ , we shall write  $\frac{\nabla}{\partial t}$  for the time-component of the covariant derivative induced by the pullback of the Levi-Civita connection. The identity

$$\frac{\nabla(du)}{\partial t} = \nabla \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$$

is obvious in normal coordinates. Assuming that  $u(x, t)$  is a solution of harmonic map flow, we obtain

$$(2.11) \quad \frac{\nabla(du)}{\partial t} = \nabla \mathcal{T}(u).$$

Then (2.10) becomes

$$(2.12) \quad \left( \frac{\nabla}{\partial t} - \Delta \right) u_j^a = -g^{k\ell} ({}^M Ric_{jk}) u_\ell^a + g^{k\ell} ({}^N R_{abcd}) u_k^b u_j^c u_\ell^d.$$

Taking an inner product with  $du$ , and using the identity

$$\Delta e(u) = \langle \Delta du, du \rangle + |\nabla du|^2,$$

we obtain

$$(2.13) \quad \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \Delta \right) e(u) = -|\nabla du|^2 - h_{ab} ({}^M Ric^{ij}) (u_i^a, u_j^b) + g^{ik} g^{j\ell} ({}^N R_{abcd}) (u_i^a, u_j^b, u_k^c, u_\ell^d).$$

This yields the differential inequality

$$(2.14) \quad \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \Delta \right) e(u) \leq -|\nabla du|^2 + Ae^2(u) + Be(u).$$

Here,  $A$  is a constant times an upper bound for the sectional curvature of  $N$ , and  $-B$  is a constant times a lower bound for the Ricci curvature of  $M$ .

**Remark 2.2.** If the sectional curvature of  $N$  is non-positive, then one may let  $A = 0$  in (2.14), which gives a uniform bound on  $e(u)$  by Moser's Harnack inequality. This is the key point in the proof of Eells-Sampson's Theorem.

**2.4. Holomorphic splitting in the Kähler case.** We now restrict to the case that  $M = \Sigma$  is an oriented surface and  $N$  is a Kähler manifold of complex dimension  $n$ . The complexified tangent spaces decompose as

$$(2.15) \quad T\Sigma^{\mathbb{C}} = T^{1,0}\Sigma \oplus T^{0,1}\Sigma, \quad TN^{\mathbb{C}} = T^{1,0}N \oplus T^{0,1}N.$$

As an element of  $\mathcal{E}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathbb{C}$ , the differential of  $u$  decomposes under the splittings (2.15) as

$$(2.16) \quad du = \begin{pmatrix} \partial u & \bar{\partial} u \\ \partial \bar{u} & \bar{\partial} \bar{u} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here we abuse notation slightly: letting  $z$  be a local conformal coordinate on  $\Sigma$  near a point  $p$ , and  $\{w^\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^n$  local holomorphic coordinates on  $N$  near  $u(p)$ , we have

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial u &= \frac{\partial w^\alpha}{\partial z} dz \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial w^\alpha}, & \bar{\partial} u &= \frac{\partial w^\alpha}{\partial \bar{z}} d\bar{z} \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial w^\alpha} \\ \partial \bar{u} &= \frac{\partial \bar{w}^\alpha}{\partial z} dz \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}^\alpha}, & \bar{\partial} \bar{u} &= \frac{\partial \bar{w}^\alpha}{\partial \bar{z}} d\bar{z} \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}^\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} dz &= dx + idy, & \frac{\partial}{\partial z} &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - i \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right) \\ d\bar{z} &= dx - idy, & \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right), \quad \text{etc.} \end{aligned}$$

We shall also write

$$\begin{aligned} w_z &= \frac{\partial w^\alpha}{\partial z} \frac{\partial}{\partial w^\alpha}, & w_{\bar{z}} &= \frac{\partial w^\alpha}{\partial \bar{z}} \frac{\partial}{\partial w^\alpha} \\ \bar{w}_z &= \overline{w_z}, & \bar{w}_{\bar{z}} &= \overline{w_{\bar{z}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $h(\cdot, \cdot)$  denote the complex-linear extension of the metric to  $TN^{\mathbb{C}}$ . Then

$$(2.18) \quad h\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial w^\alpha}, \frac{\partial}{\partial w^\beta}\right) = 0 = h\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}^\alpha}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}^\beta}\right).$$

The complex  $n \times n$  matrix

$$h_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} = h\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial w^\alpha}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}^\beta}\right)$$

is Hermitian, with  $h_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} = \overline{h_{\beta\bar{\alpha}}}$ , and positive-definite. Denote the Hermitian inner product corresponding to  $h$  by

$$(2.19) \quad \langle v, w \rangle = h(v, \bar{w})$$

for  $v, w \in TN^{\mathbb{C}}$ . Denote the corresponding norm by  $|\cdot|$ , which agrees with the ordinary norm on real tangent vectors. The Kähler form on  $N$  can be written

$$\omega_N = ih_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} dw^\alpha \wedge d\bar{w}^\beta.$$

We also extend  $g$  complex-linearly, and let

$$(2.20) \quad \sigma^2(z) = g\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}}\right) > 0.$$

The metric and Kähler form on  $\Sigma$  can be written

$$g = g_\Sigma = \sigma^2 (dz \otimes d\bar{z} + d\bar{z} \otimes dz), \quad \omega_\Sigma = i\sigma^2 dz \wedge d\bar{z}.$$

Let

$$(2.21) \quad \begin{aligned} e_\partial(u) &= |\partial u|^2 = \sigma^{-2} |w_z|^2 = \sigma^{-2} h_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} w_z^\alpha \bar{w}_z^\beta \\ e_{\bar{\partial}}(u) &= |\bar{\partial} u|^2 = \sigma^{-2} |w_{\bar{z}}|^2 = \sigma^{-2} h_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} w_{\bar{z}}^\alpha \bar{w}_{\bar{z}}^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Then according to (2.16), the energy density decomposes as

$$e(u) = \frac{1}{2} |du|^2 = e_\partial(u) + e_{\bar{\partial}}(u).$$

On the other hand, the Kähler form on  $N$  pulls back to

$$\begin{aligned} u^* \omega_N &= ih \left( (\partial u + \bar{\partial} u) \wedge (\partial \bar{u} + \bar{\partial} \bar{u}) \right) \\ &= i \left( |w_z|^2 - |w_{\bar{z}}|^2 \right) dz \wedge d\bar{z} \\ &= (e_\partial(u) - e_{\bar{\partial}}(u)) \omega_\Sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$(2.22) \quad E_\partial(u) - E_{\bar{\partial}}(u) = \int_\Sigma u^* \omega_N =: \kappa$$

is an invariant of the homotopy class of  $u$ ; the energy of  $u$  satisfies

$$(2.23) \quad E(u) = E_\partial(u) + E_{\bar{\partial}}(u) = 2E_\partial(u) - \kappa = 2E_{\bar{\partial}}(u) + \kappa.$$

Hence, an (anti-)holomorphic map minimizes the Dirichlet energy within its homotopy class. It also follows from (2.23) that both  $E_\partial(u(t))$  and  $E_{\bar{\partial}}(u(t))$  decrease in time along a solution of harmonic map flow.

**2.5. Hopf differential and stress-energy tensor.** We now define the *Hopf differential*

$$\Phi(u) = h(du \otimes du)^{2,0} \in \text{Sym}^2 \Omega_M^{1,0}.$$

In local coordinates, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(u) &= h((\partial u + \partial \bar{u}) \otimes (\partial u + \partial \bar{u})) \\ (2.24) \quad &= (h(w_z, w_z) + h(\bar{w}_z, \bar{w}_z) + h(w_z, \bar{w}_z) + h(\bar{w}_z, w_z)) dz \otimes dz \\ &= 2 \langle w_z, w_{\bar{z}} \rangle dz \otimes dz, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (2.18). It follows from (2.24) that the Hopf differential of a harmonic map is holomorphic. We shall not use this fact, but only the following identity which holds for general maps.

**Lemma 2.3.** *For a differentiable map  $u : \Sigma \rightarrow N$ , the stress-energy tensor is given by*

$$(2.25) \quad S(u) = 2 \text{Re } \Phi(u).$$

*In particular, the pointwise bound*

$$(2.26) \quad |S(u)|_g \leq 4 \sqrt{e_{\partial}(u) e_{\bar{\partial}}(u)}$$

*holds.*

*Proof.* Recall the definition (2.5) of  $S(u)$ . Since  $du$  is real, and in view of (2.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle du \otimes du \rangle &= h(du \otimes du) = h(\partial u \otimes \bar{\partial} u) + h(\partial u \otimes \partial \bar{u}) + h(\bar{\partial} u \otimes \partial u) + h(\bar{\partial} u \otimes \bar{\partial} u) \\ &\quad + h(\bar{\partial} u \otimes \bar{\partial} u) + h(\bar{\partial} u \otimes \partial \bar{u}) + h(\partial \bar{u} \otimes \partial u) + h(\partial \bar{u} \otimes \bar{\partial} u) \\ &= (|w_z|^2 + |w_{\bar{z}}|^2)(dz \otimes d\bar{z} + d\bar{z} \otimes dz) \\ &\quad + 2(\langle w_z, w_{\bar{z}} \rangle dz \otimes dz + \langle w_{\bar{z}}, w_z \rangle d\bar{z} \otimes d\bar{z}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} |du|^2 g + 4 \text{Re}(\langle w_z, w_{\bar{z}} \rangle dz \otimes dz). \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging yields (2.25). Applying (2.24) and Cauchy-Schwarz to (2.25) yields (2.26).  $\square$

**Remark 2.4.** There is a strong analogy between harmonic maps from a Riemann surface to an (almost-)complex manifold and Yang-Mills connections on 4-manifolds. Letting  $j$  and  $J$  be the complex structures on  $\Sigma$  and  $N$ , respectively, define an operator

$$\begin{aligned} \star : \mathcal{E} &\rightarrow \mathcal{E} \\ \phi &\mapsto J \circ \phi \circ j. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\star^2 = 1$ , and the differential  $du$  decomposes along the  $\pm$ -eigenspaces of  $\star$  as

$$du = du^+ + du^-$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} du^+ &= \frac{1}{2}(du + J \circ du \circ j) = 2 \text{Re } \bar{\partial} u, \\ du^- &= \frac{1}{2}(du - J \circ du \circ j) = 2 \text{Re } \partial u. \end{aligned}$$



The stress energy tensor then takes the form

$$S = 2 \langle du^+ \otimes du^- \rangle,$$

which can be compared with [31, Remark 2.8].

**2.6. Split Bochner formula.** We also require a split Bochner formula that goes back to Schoen and Yau [22], Toledo [27], and Wood [33] for harmonic maps, and has been exploited in a parabolic context by Liu and Yang [10].

Since  $\Sigma$  and  $N$  are Kähler, their complex structures commute with the  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear extension of  $\nabla$  to  $\mathcal{E}^{\mathbb{C}}$ . Hence, the operators on the LHS of (2.12) preserve the splittings (2.15). Taking an inner product with  $\bar{\partial}u$  in (2.12), we obtain

$$(2.27) \quad \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \Delta \right) e_{\bar{\partial}}(u) = -|\nabla \bar{\partial}u| + \langle \bar{\partial}u, I \rangle + \langle \bar{\partial}u, II \rangle,$$

where  $I$  and  $II$  are the terms on the RHS of (2.12). These may be expanded as follows. Since  $Ric_{\Sigma} = K_{\Sigma}g$ , we have

$$(2.28) \quad \langle \bar{\partial}u, I \rangle = -K_{\Sigma} |\bar{\partial}u|^2 = -K_{\Sigma} e_{\bar{\partial}}(u).$$

For the second term, choose a conformal coordinate  $z = x + iy$  such that  $\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right\}$  form an orthonormal basis at  $p$  (in particular,  $\sigma^2(p) = \frac{1}{2}$ ). At the point  $p$ , we have

$$(2.29) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \bar{\partial}u, II \rangle &= {}^N R \left( \bar{\partial}u \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right), du \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right), du \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right), du \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right) \right) \\ &\quad + {}^N R \left( \bar{\partial}u \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right), du \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right), du \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right), du \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}}, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial y} = i \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \right)$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} du \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) &= (w_z^{\alpha} + w_{\bar{z}}^{\alpha}) \frac{\partial}{\partial w^{\alpha}} + (\bar{w}_z^{\alpha} + \bar{w}_{\bar{z}}^{\alpha}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}^{\alpha}} \\ du \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right) &= i (w_z^{\alpha} - w_{\bar{z}}^{\alpha}) \frac{\partial}{\partial w^{\alpha}} + i (\bar{w}_z^{\alpha} - \bar{w}_{\bar{z}}^{\alpha}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}^{\alpha}} \\ \bar{\partial}u \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) &= w_{\bar{z}}^{\alpha} \frac{\partial}{\partial w^{\alpha}}, \quad \bar{\partial}u \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right) = -i w_{\bar{z}}^{\alpha} \frac{\partial}{\partial w^{\alpha}}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting into (2.29), and using the fact that  ${}^N R$  is a section of  $\Lambda^{1,1} \otimes \Lambda^{1,1}$ , we obtain

$$(2.30) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \bar{\partial}u, II \rangle &= {}^N R_{\alpha\bar{\beta}\gamma\bar{\delta}} w_{\bar{z}}^{\alpha} i (\bar{w}_z^{\beta} - \bar{w}_{\bar{z}}^{\beta}) (w_z^{\gamma} + w_{\bar{z}}^{\gamma}) i (\bar{w}_z^{\delta} - \bar{w}_{\bar{z}}^{\delta}) \\ &\quad + {}^N R_{\alpha\bar{\beta}\bar{\delta}\gamma} w_{\bar{z}}^{\alpha} i (\bar{w}_z^{\beta} - \bar{w}_{\bar{z}}^{\beta}) (\bar{w}_z^{\delta} + \bar{w}_{\bar{z}}^{\delta}) i (w_z^{\gamma} - w_{\bar{z}}^{\gamma}) \\ &\quad + {}^N R_{\alpha\bar{\beta}\gamma\bar{\delta}} (-i w_{\bar{z}}^{\alpha}) (\bar{w}_z^{\beta} + \bar{w}_{\bar{z}}^{\beta}) i (w_z^{\gamma} - w_{\bar{z}}^{\gamma}) (\bar{w}_z^{\delta} + \bar{w}_{\bar{z}}^{\delta}) \\ &\quad + {}^N R_{\alpha\bar{\beta}\bar{\delta}\gamma} (-i w_{\bar{z}}^{\alpha}) (\bar{w}_z^{\beta} + \bar{w}_{\bar{z}}^{\beta}) i (\bar{w}_z^{\delta} - \bar{w}_{\bar{z}}^{\delta}) (\bar{w}_z^{\gamma} + \bar{w}_{\bar{z}}^{\gamma}) \\ &= 2 {}^N R_{\alpha\bar{\beta}\gamma\bar{\delta}} w_{\bar{z}}^{\alpha} \bar{w}_z^{\beta} \left( - (w_z^{\gamma} + w_{\bar{z}}^{\gamma}) (\bar{w}_z^{\delta} - \bar{w}_{\bar{z}}^{\delta}) + (w_z^{\gamma} - w_{\bar{z}}^{\gamma}) (\bar{w}_z^{\delta} + \bar{w}_{\bar{z}}^{\delta}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have combined the first with the fourth, and the second with the third lines. This yields

$$(2.31) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \bar{\partial}u, II \rangle &= 4^N R_{\alpha\bar{\beta}\gamma\bar{\delta}} w_{\bar{z}}^\alpha \bar{w}_z^\beta (w_z^\gamma \bar{w}_{\bar{z}}^\delta - w_{\bar{z}}^\gamma \bar{w}_z^\delta) \\ &= \sigma^{-4} R_{\alpha\bar{\beta}\gamma\bar{\delta}} (w_{\bar{z}}^\alpha \bar{w}_z^\beta w_z^\gamma \bar{w}_{\bar{z}}^\delta - w_{\bar{z}}^\alpha \bar{w}_z^\beta w_{\bar{z}}^\gamma \bar{w}_z^\delta) =: q_1(u) + q_2(u). \end{aligned}$$

Returning to (2.27), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \Delta \right) e_{\bar{\partial}}(u) = -|\nabla \bar{\partial}u| - K_\Sigma e_{\bar{\partial}}(u) + q_1(u) + q_2(u).$$

The condition that  $h$  have nonnegative holomorphic bisectional curvature (see Goldberg and Kobayashi [8] or Schoen and Yau [24], Ch. VIII) is equivalent to the assumption that  $q_1(u) \leq 0$ . It is also clear that

$$q_2(u) \leq C_N e_{\bar{\partial}}(u)^2,$$

where  $C_N$  is a constant times the supremum of the holomorphic sectional curvature of  $N$ . Similar formulae hold for the holomorphic part of the energy density,  $e_\partial(u)$ .

We have shown:

**Lemma 2.5** (Liu and Yang [10]). *Assume that  $N$  has nonnegative holomorphic bisectional curvature. For a solution  $u(x, t)$  of (HM), we have*

$$(2.32) \quad \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \Delta \right) e_\partial(u) \leq -|\nabla \partial u|^2 - K_\Sigma e_\partial(u) + C_N e_\partial(u)^2$$

$$(2.33) \quad \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \Delta \right) e_{\bar{\partial}}(u) \leq -|\nabla \bar{\partial}u|^2 - K_\Sigma e_{\bar{\partial}}(u) + C_N e_{\bar{\partial}}(u)^2.$$

### 3. EPSILON-REGULARITY

**3.1. Scalar heat inequality.** In this subsection, we estimate a weak solution  $v(x, t)$  of the differential inequality

$$(3.1) \quad \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \Delta_g \right) v \leq Av^3 + Bv$$

on a ball inside the compact surface  $(\Sigma, g)$ .<sup>2</sup> These estimates will lead to  $\varepsilon$ -regularity results of the form we require.

We shall let  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  be a constant depending only on  $A$ , which may decrease with each subsequent appearance. The constant  $R_0 > 0$  will depend on  $B$  and the geometry of  $\Sigma$ , and may also decrease. We shall always assume

$$(3.2) \quad 0 < R < R_0$$

where  $R_0$  is small enough that any relevant Sobolev inequality holds on  $B_R(p)$  with a constant independent of  $R$  and  $p$ , and abbreviate  $B_R = B_R(p)$ . For  $0 < r < R$ , denote the annulus

$$U_r^R = B_R \setminus \bar{B}_r.$$

Let  $\varphi \geq 0$  be a smooth cutoff function, with  $\text{supp } \varphi \subset B_R$ ,  $\varphi \equiv 1$  on  $B_{R/2}$ , and  $\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^\infty} < 4/R$ .

<sup>2</sup>The same results are true in the case that  $\Sigma$  is noncompact and  $g$  has ‘‘bounded geometry,’’ *i.e.*, uniform bounds on each derivative of the Riemann tensor and injectivity radius bounded from below.

**Lemma 3.1** (Struwe [26], III.6.10). *Given any function  $v$  on  $B_R$  of Sobolev class  $H^1$ , we have*

$$(3.3) \quad \int v^2 \varphi^2 \leq C \left( R^2 \int_{B_R} |\nabla v|^2 \varphi^2 + \int_{U_{R/2}^R} v^2 \right)$$

$$(3.4) \quad \int v^4 \varphi^2 \leq C \left( \int_{B_R} v^2 \right) \left( \int_{B_R} |\nabla v|^2 \varphi^2 + R^{-2} \int_{U_{R/2}^R} v^2 \right).$$

*Proof.* The estimate (3.3) follows from the Poincaré inequality and Young's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \int v^2 \varphi^2 &\leq CR^2 \int |\nabla(v\varphi)|^2 \\ &\leq CR^2 \int (|\nabla v|^2 \varphi^2 + 2\varphi v \langle \nabla v, \nabla \varphi \rangle + v^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2) \\ &\leq CR^2 \int (|\nabla v|^2 \varphi^2 + v^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2) \\ &\leq C \left( R^2 \int_{B_R} |\nabla v|^2 + \int_{U_{R/2}^R} v^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

For (3.4), we refer to Lemma III.6.7 of [26]. The proof there gives an inequality

$$\int v^4 \varphi^2 \leq C \left( \int_{\text{supp } \varphi} v^2 \right) \int (|\nabla v|^2 \varphi^2 + v^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2).$$

The estimate (3.4) follows again since  $\text{supp } \nabla \varphi \subset U_{R/2}^R$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.2** (Cf. [31], Proposition 3.4). *Let  $v$  be a nonnegative continuous weak solution of (3.1) on  $B_R \times [0, T)$ . Suppose that*

$$\int_{B_R} v(0)^2 < \varepsilon_0, \quad \sup_{0 \leq t < T} \int_{U_{R/2}^R} v(t)^2 \leq \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0.$$

*Then*

$$(3.5) \quad \int_{B_{R/2}} v(t)^2 \leq e^{-\alpha t/R^2} \int_{B_R} v(0)^2 + C\varepsilon (1 - e^{-\alpha t/R^2})$$

*for  $0 \leq t < T$ . Here  $\alpha > 0$  is a universal constant.*

*Proof.* Let  $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_0$ . Define  $0 < T_1 \leq T$  to be the maximal time such that

$$(3.6) \quad \int_{B_R} v(t)^2 < \varepsilon_1 \quad (\forall 0 \leq t < T_1).$$

Let  $\varphi$  be as above. Multiplying (3.1) by  $\varphi^2 v$  and integrating by parts, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left( \int \varphi^2 v^2 \right) + \int \nabla(\varphi^2 v) \cdot \nabla v \leq A \int \varphi^2 v^4 + B \int \varphi^2 v^2.$$

Applying Young's inequality, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left( \int \varphi^2 v^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \int \varphi^2 |\nabla v|^2 \leq 2 \int |\nabla \varphi|^2 v^2 + A \int \varphi^2 v^4 + B \int \varphi^2 v^2.$$

For  $0 \leq t < T_1$ , we apply (3.4) on the RHS and rearrange, to obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int (\varphi v)^2 + \left( \frac{1}{2} - CA\varepsilon_1 \right) \int \varphi^2 |\nabla v|^2 \leq C(1 + A\varepsilon_1) R^{-2} \varepsilon + B \int (\varphi v)^2.$$

Applying (3.3) on the left-hand side, and rearranging again, we obtain

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \int (\varphi v)^2 + \frac{\alpha}{R^2} \int (\varphi v)^2 \leq C(1 + A\varepsilon_1) R^{-2} \varepsilon,$$

where

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{C} \left( \frac{1}{2} - CA\varepsilon_1 \right) - CBR^2.$$

We assume that  $\varepsilon_1 < (4CA)^{-1}$  and  $R_0 < (4CB)^{-1}$ , so that  $\alpha > (8C)^{-1}$ .

Rewrite (3.7) as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left( e^{\alpha t/R^2} \int (\varphi v)^2 \right) \leq CR^{-2} \varepsilon e^{\alpha t/R^2}$$

and integrate in time, to obtain

$$\int_{B_{R/2}} v(t)^2 \leq e^{-\alpha t/R^2} \int_{B_R} v(0)^2 + C\varepsilon_2 (1 - e^{-\alpha t/R^2}).$$

This establishes (3.5) for  $0 \leq t < T_1$ .

Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that  $T_1 < T$ . For  $t < T_1$ , (3.5) reads

$$\int_{B_{R/2}} v^2 \leq \varepsilon_0 + C\varepsilon.$$

Provided that

$$2(2 + C)\varepsilon_0 < \varepsilon_1$$

we have

$$(3.8) \quad \int_{B_R} v^2 = \int_{B_{R/2}} v^2 + \int_{U_{R/2}^R} v^2 \leq \varepsilon_0 + (C + 1)\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_1.$$

Since the flow is smooth for  $t < T$ , the bound (3.8) persists at  $t = T_1$ . This contradicts the maximality of  $T_1$  subject to the open condition (3.6); hence  $T_1 = T$ , and (3.5) is proved.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $0 < R \leq \min[R_0, \sqrt{T}]$ . Suppose that  $v \geq 0$  satisfies (3.1) on  $B_R \times [0, T]$ , with*

$$(3.9) \quad \int_{B_R} v(0)^2 + \sup_{0 \leq t < T} \int_{U_{R/2}^R} v(t)^2 \leq \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0.$$

Then

$$(3.10) \quad \sup_{B_{R/2} \times [R^2/2, T]} v(x, t) \leq \frac{C\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{R}.$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.2, the assumption (3.9) implies

$$(3.11) \quad \int_{B_R} v(t)^2 \leq C\varepsilon$$

for all  $0 \leq t < T$ . We may therefore assume without loss of generality that  $T = R^2$ , i.e.,  $v$  is defined on a parabolic cylinder.

We now repeat the argument of [30], Proposition 2.3, originally due to Schoen and Uhlenbeck [21]. After rescaling

$$(3.12) \quad v(x, t) \rightarrow Rv(Rx, R^2t)$$

in geodesic coordinates on  $B_R(p)$ , we may assume that  $v$  is defined on  $B_1 \times [0, 1]$ . Then (3.9) is preserved, and (3.1) becomes

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} (\partial_t - \Delta)v &\leq Av^3 + R^2Bv \\ &\leq (Av^2 + 1) \cdot v \end{aligned}$$

provided that  $R_0 \leq 1/\sqrt{B}$ . For  $R < R_0$ , the rescaled metric (and any further rescaling) is close enough to Euclidean that we have uniform volume bounds and a uniform Sobolev constant, and may apply Moser iteration.

Let  $P_r(x, t) = B_r(x) \times [t - r^2, t]$ , and write  $P_r = P_r(0, 1)$ . Define

$$(3.14) \quad e(r) = (1 - r) \sup_{P_r} v$$

and let  $e_0, r_0$  be such that

$$(3.15) \quad e_0 = e(r_0) = \sup_{0 \leq r \leq 1} e(r).$$

Choose  $(x_0, t_0) \in P_{r_0}$  such that  $v(x_0, t_0) = \sup_{P_{r_0}} v$ . Letting  $\rho_0 = (1 - r_0)/2$ , we have

$$(3.16) \quad \rho_0 \sup_{P_{\rho_0}(x_0, t_0)} v \leq 2e_0.$$

First assume, for the sake of contradiction, that  $e_0 > 1$ . Letting

$$\rho_1 = \frac{\rho_0}{e_0}$$

we may define a function  $v_1$  on  $P_1$  by

$$v_1(x, t) = \rho_1 v(\rho_1 x + x_0, \rho_1^2(t - 1) + t_0).$$

Then  $v_1$  again satisfies (3.13), and (3.16) implies

$$\sup_{P_1} v_1(x, t) \leq 2.$$

But then Moser's Harnack inequality (see *e.g.* [30], Lemma 2.2), applied to (3.13), gives

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} 1 = v_1(0, 1)^2 &\leq C \int_0^1 \int_{B_1} v_1^2(x, t) dV dt \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

for a constant depending only on  $A$ . For  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently small, this is a contradiction. Therefore  $e_0 \leq 1$ .

Now, from the definition (3.14) and (3.15), we have for any  $0 < r < 1$

$$\sup_{P_r} v = \frac{e(r)}{1 - r} \leq \frac{e_0}{1 - r} \leq \frac{1}{1 - r}.$$

Then (3.13) becomes

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)v \leq C(A + 1)v$$

on  $P_{3/4}$ . We may again apply Moser's Harnack inequality, to find

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{P_{1/2}} v &\leq C \left( \int_0^1 \int_{B_{3/4}} v^2 dV dt \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

By choosing  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently small, we can also ensure that  $\sup v \leq 1/\sqrt{A}$ . Then the coefficient on the RHS of (3.13) is 2, so the constant in (3.18) is independent of  $A$ .

The estimate (3.10) now follows from (3.18) by undoing the rescaling (3.12).  $\square$

**3.2. Epsilon-regularity theorems.** The above estimates yield the following version of the standard  $\varepsilon$ -regularity theorem, as well as a split version in the case that  $N$  is Kähler with nonnegative holomorphic bisectional curvature.

**Theorem 3.4.** *There exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ , depending on the geometry of  $N$ , and  $R_0 > 0$ , depending on the geometry of  $\Sigma$ , as follows.*

*Let  $0 < R \leq \min[R_0, \sqrt{T}]$  and  $0 \leq \tau \leq T - R^2$ . Suppose that  $u : B_R \times [0, T)$  is a solution of (1.1) such that*

$$(3.19) \quad E(u(\tau), B_R) + \sup_{\tau \leq t < T} E(u(t), U_{R/2}^R) \leq \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0.$$

*Then*

$$(3.20) \quad \sup_{B_{R/2} \times [\tau + R^2/2, T)} |du| \leq \frac{C\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{R}.$$

*For each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , with  $R_0$  sufficiently small, we have*

$$(3.21) \quad \sup_{B_{R/2} \times [\tau + R^2/2, T)} |\nabla^{(k)} du| \leq \frac{C_k \sqrt{\varepsilon}}{R^{1+k}}.$$

*Moreover, the tension field satisfies*

$$(3.22) \quad \sup_{B_{R/2} \times [\tau + R^2/2, T)} |\nabla^{(k)} \mathcal{T}(u)| \leq \frac{C_k \sqrt{\int_\tau^T \int_{B_R} |\mathcal{T}(u)|^2 dV dt}}{R^{2+k}}.$$

*Proof.* By applying Kato's inequality to (2.14), we obtain a differential inequality of the form (3.1) with  $v = |du|$ . The estimate (3.20) follows directly from Proposition 3.3. The derivative estimates (3.21) then follow by a standard bootstrapping argument applied to (2.12).

The estimates (3.22) on the tension field can be obtained from the evolution equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\nabla}{\partial t} \mathcal{T}(u) &= tr_g \frac{\nabla}{\partial t} \nabla du \\ &= tr_g \nabla \frac{\nabla du}{\partial t} + tr_g R^N \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, du \right) du \\ &= \Delta \mathcal{T}(u) + tr_g R^N (\mathcal{T}(u), du) du. \end{aligned}$$

by (2.11). Taking an inner product with  $\mathcal{T}(u)$ , we obtain

$$(3.23) \quad \frac{1}{2} (\partial_t - \Delta) |\mathcal{T}(u)|^2 = -|\nabla \mathcal{T}(u)|^2 + \mathcal{T}(u) \# \mathcal{T}(u) \# du \# du.$$

By rescaling, we may assume without loss that  $R = 1$ . Then we have  $|du| \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon} \leq 1$  by (3.20). Then (3.23) gives an inequality

$$(3.24) \quad \frac{1}{2} (\partial_t - \Delta) |\mathcal{T}(u)|^2 \leq C|\mathcal{T}(u)|^2.$$

The estimate (3.22) with  $k = 0$  now follows from Moser's Harnack inequality, and the higher derivative estimates are obtained by bootstrapping.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.5.** *Suppose that  $N$  is compact Kähler with nonnegative holomorphic bisectional curvature, and let  $0 < \tau < \min[R_0^2, T]$ . If  $u : \Sigma \times [0, T] \rightarrow N$  solves (1.1) with*

$$(3.25) \quad E_{\bar{\partial}}(u(0)) \leq \delta^2 < \varepsilon_0$$

then

$$(3.26) \quad \sup_{\Sigma \times [\tau, T]} |\bar{\partial}u| \leq C\delta \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}} + 1 \right).$$

A similar result holds for  $\partial u$ , with  $E_{\partial}$  in place of  $E_{\bar{\partial}}$ .

*Proof.* It follows from (2.6) and (2.23) that  $E_{\bar{\partial}}(u(t))$  is decreasing along the flow, so the assumption (3.9) is satisfied with  $v = |\bar{\partial}u|$  on any ball  $B_{\sqrt{\tau}}(p) \subset \Sigma$ . By applying Kato's inequality to (2.32), we obtain an inequality of the form (3.1). The result then follows directly from Proposition 3.3, with  $R = \sqrt{\tau}$ .  $\square$

#### 4. ESTIMATE ON THE CURVATURE SCALE

Let  $q \geq 1$ . We now show that a uniform  $L^q$ -bound on the stress-energy tensor

$$(4.1) \quad \sup_{\tau \leq t < T} \|S(u(t))\|_{L^q} \leq \sigma$$

provides a degree of control over the energy scale (*cf.* Definition 4.2 below) along the flow, based on the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Given  $p \in \Sigma$  and  $0 < R < R_0$ , write  $B_R = B_R(p)$ . Let  $u$  solve (1.1) on  $B_R \times [0, T]$ , and assume the stress-energy bound (4.1). Then for  $\tau \leq t_1 \leq t_2 < T$ , we have*

$$E(u(t_2), B_{R/2}) \leq E(u(t_1), B_R) + C\sigma \frac{t_2 - t_1}{R^{\frac{2}{q}}}.$$

*Proof.* Choose a cutoff  $\varphi$  for  $B_{R/2} \subset B_R$ . Integrating by parts against the pointwise energy identity (2.9), we have

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \int e(t_2) \varphi dV - \int e(t_1) \varphi dV &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int \nabla^i \nabla^j \varphi S_{ij} dV dt \\ &\leq C(t_2 - t_1) \|\nabla^{(2)} \varphi\|_{L^{\frac{q-1}{q}}} \sup_{t_1 \leq t \leq t_2} \|S(t)\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have applied Hölder's inequality. We have

$$\|\nabla^{(2)}\varphi\|_{L^{\frac{q-1}{q}}} \leq \left[ \int_{B_R} \left( \frac{C}{R^2} \right)^{\frac{q}{q-1}} dV \right]^{\frac{q-1}{q}} \leq CR \left( 2 - \frac{2q}{q-1} \right)^{\frac{q-1}{q}} = CR^{\frac{-2}{q}}.$$

Then (4.2) yields

$$(4.3) \quad E(u(t_2), B_{R/2}) - E(u(t_1), B_R) \leq C(t_2 - t_1)R^{\frac{-2}{q}}\sigma$$

as desired.  $\square$

**Definition 4.2.** Let  $0 < \rho < R_0$ ,  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ , and  $p \in \Sigma$ . Given an  $L^2_1$  map  $u : B_\rho(p) \rightarrow N$ , define the (*outer*) *energy scale*  $\lambda_{\varepsilon, \rho, p}(u)$  to be the minimal number  $\lambda \in [0, \rho]$  such that

$$(4.4) \quad \sup_{\lambda < r < \rho} E(u, U_{r/2}^r(p)) < \varepsilon.$$

**Lemma 4.3.** For a solution  $u : \Sigma \times [0, T) \rightarrow N$  of (1.1) as above,  $|du|$  is bounded near  $(p, T)$  if and only if there exists  $\rho > 0$  such that  $\lambda_{\varepsilon, \rho, p}(u(t)) = 0$  for all  $T - \rho^2 \leq t < T$ .

*Proof.* If  $|du|$  is locally bounded, then it is clear from the definition that  $\lambda_{\varepsilon, \rho, p}(u(t)) = 0$  for  $\rho$  sufficiently small. Conversely, suppose that  $\lambda_{\varepsilon, \rho, p}(u(t)) = 0$  for some  $\rho > 0$  and all  $T - \rho^2 \leq t < T$ . Then, since  $du(T - \rho^2)$  is square-integrable, we may choose  $R > 0$  such that

$$E(u(T - \rho^2), B_R) \leq \varepsilon.$$

But, by assumption, we also have

$$\sup_{T - \rho^2 \leq t < T} E(u(t), U_{R/2}^R) < \varepsilon.$$

Hence (3.19) is satisfied, and Theorem 3.4 implies that the energy density is bounded near  $p$  as  $t \nearrow T$ .  $\square$


**Theorem 4.4.** Let  $u$  be as above, and assume that the stress-energy bound (4.1) is satisfied for some  $q \geq 1$ . Suppose that  $0 < R \leq \rho < R_0$  and  $\tau \leq t_1 \leq t_2 < T$  are such that

$$(4.5) \quad \sup_{t_1 \leq t \leq t_2} E(u(t), B_\rho(p)) \leq E(u(t_2), B_R(p)) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Then for  $t_1 \leq t \leq t_2$ , we have

$$(4.6) \quad \lambda_{\varepsilon, \rho, p}(u(t)) \leq \max \left[ 4R, \left( \frac{C\sigma(t_2 - t)}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \right].$$



FIGURE 1. The trapezoidal region ( $q = 2$ )

*Proof.* Suppose the contrary. Then there exists  $t_1 \leq t \leq t_2$  such that  $\lambda = \lambda_{\varepsilon, \rho, p}(u(t)) \geq 4R$  satisfies

$$(4.7) \quad \lambda^{\frac{2}{q}} > \frac{2C(t_2 - t)\sigma}{\varepsilon}.$$

Then we must have

$$E(u(t), U_{\lambda/2}^\lambda) \geq \varepsilon.$$

Now (4.5) implies

$$\begin{aligned} E(u(t), B_{\lambda/2}) &\leq E(u(t), B_\rho) - E(u(t), U_{\lambda/2}^\lambda) \\ &\leq E(u(t_2), B_R) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - \varepsilon \\ &\leq E(u(t_2), B_R) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

But then Lemma 4.1 and (4.7) give

$$\begin{aligned} E(u(t_2), B_R) &\leq E(u(t_2), B_{\lambda/4}) \leq E(u(t), B_{\lambda/2}) + C\sigma \frac{t_2 - t}{\lambda^{\frac{2}{q}}} \\ &< E(u(t_2), B_R) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = E(u(t_2), B_R), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. This establishes the desired estimate (4.6).  $\square$

**Corollary 4.5.** *Suppose that the stress-energy bound (4.1) holds for some  $q \geq 1$ , and assume  $T < \infty$ . For any  $p \in \Sigma$ , there exists  $\rho > 0$  such that*

$$(4.8) \quad \lambda_{\varepsilon, \rho, p}(u(t)) = O(T - t)^{\frac{q}{2}} \quad (t \nearrow T).$$

*Proof.* Define

$$E_0 = \lim_{r \searrow 0} \limsup_{t \nearrow T} E(u(t), B_r(p)).$$

Here, the outer limit must exist because the inner lim sup is nonnegative and decreasing with respect to  $r$ . We may choose  $0 < \rho < R_0$  and  $t_1 < T$  such that

$$\sup_{t_1 \leq t < T} E(u(t), B_\rho(p)) \leq E_0 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

But then for any  $R > 0$ , we may also choose  $t_1 \leq t_2 < T$  such that

$$E(u(t_2), B_R(p)) \geq E_0 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

We obtain

$$\sup_{t_1 \leq t < T} E(u(t), B_\rho(p)) \leq E(u(t_2), B_R(p)) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Theorem 4.4 now implies the claim, since  $R > 0$  was arbitrary.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.6.** *Suppose that  $N$  is compact Kähler with nonnegative holomorphic bisectional curvature, and assume that  $E_{\bar{\partial}}(u(0)) < \varepsilon_0$  or  $E_{\partial}(u(0)) < \varepsilon_0$ . Then for each  $\tau > 0$ , the stress-energy tensor  $S(t)$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^2$  for  $\tau \leq t < T$ . In particular, for each  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ ,  $p \in \Sigma$ , and  $T < \infty$ , there exists  $\rho > 0$  such that*

$$(4.9) \quad \lambda_{\varepsilon, \rho, p}(u(t)) = O(T - t) \quad (t \nearrow T).$$

*Proof.* From Lemma 2.3 and Theorem 3.5, we have

$$|S(t)| \leq 4\sqrt{e_{\partial}(t)e_{\bar{\partial}}(t)} \leq C\delta\sqrt{e_{\partial}(t)}\left(\frac{1}{\tau} + 1\right)$$

for  $\tau \leq t < T$ . This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(t)\|_{L^2(\Sigma)}^2 &\leq C\delta^2 E_{\partial}(u(t))\left(\frac{1}{\tau} + 1\right) \\ &\leq C\delta^2 (2\delta^2 + \kappa)\left(\frac{1}{\tau} + 1\right) \end{aligned}$$

since  $E_{\partial}(u(t))$  is decreasing, where we have applied (2.23). The result now follows from the previous corollary, with  $q = 2$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.7.** Angenent, Hulshof, and Matano [1] first established the bound (4.9) in the degree-1 rotationally symmetric case originally studied by Chang, Ding, and Ye [4]. Raphael and Schweyer [18, 19] have shown that blowup occurs in that setting with the precise rate

$$(4.10) \quad \lambda(t) \sim \kappa \frac{(T - t)^\ell}{|\log(T - t)|^{2\ell/(2\ell-1)}}$$

for each  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , as predicted by Van den Berg, Hulshof, and King [3]. Dávila, del Pino, and Wei [5] have recently constructed more extensive examples with the  $\ell = 1$  rate.

## 5. DECAY ESTIMATE IN ANNULAR REGIONS

In this section, we obtain decay estimates for a solution of (1.1) on an annulus, which will apply in our setting. This is analogous to §5 in [31], although we give a less detailed estimate with a much simpler proof.

5.1. **Evolution of the angular energy.** Given  $0 < R < 1$ , let

$$(5.1) \quad U = U_R^1 = \{(r, \theta) \mid R \leq r \leq 1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$$

denote an annulus in the plane. Let  $g$  be a metric on  $U$  of the form

$$(5.2) \quad g = \zeta^2(dr^2 + r^2d\theta^2),$$

where  $\zeta = \zeta(r, \theta) > 0$  is a positive smooth function with

$$(5.3) \quad |\zeta^2(r, \theta) - 1| \leq \alpha r^2$$

for a constant  $\alpha > 0$ .

For convenience, we work in cylindrical coordinates ( $s = \ln r, \theta$ ). The flat cylindrical metric is given by  $g_0 = ds^2 + d\theta^2$ , and (5.2) becomes

$$g = \zeta^2 e^{2s}(ds^2 + d\theta^2).$$

We shall write

$$(5.4) \quad du = u_s ds + u_\theta d\theta.$$

The tension field with respect to  $g_0$  is given by

$$\mathcal{T}_0(u) = \nabla_s u_s + \nabla_\theta u_\theta,$$

where  $\nabla$  denotes the pullback connection on  $u^*TN$ , as above. The heat flow equation (1.1) with respect to the metric  $g$  becomes

$$(5.5) \quad \partial_t u = \mathcal{T}(u) = \zeta^2 e^{-2s} \mathcal{T}_0(u).$$

Define the angular energy of  $u$  by

$$(5.6) \quad f(u; r, t) := \sqrt{\int_{\{r\} \times S^1} |u_\theta(r, \theta, t)|^2 d\theta}.$$

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $u$  be a solution of (1.1) on  $U \times [0, T]$  with respect to a metric  $g$  given by (5.2). Suppose that for some  $0 < \eta^2 < \varepsilon_0$ , we have*

$$(5.7) \quad r|du| + r^2|\nabla du| + r^3|\nabla^2 du| \leq \eta.$$

*Then the angular energy  $f = f(u; r, t)$  satisfies a differential equality*

$$(5.8) \quad \partial_t f - \left( \partial_r^2 + \frac{1}{r} \partial_r - \frac{1 - C\eta}{r^2} \right) f \leq C\alpha(\alpha + 1)\eta.$$

*Here  $\varepsilon_0$  depends on the geometry of  $N$ , and  $\alpha$  is the constant of (5.2).*

*Proof.* We start from the identity

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_s^2 f^2 = \int_{S^1} (|\nabla_s u_\theta|^2 + \langle \nabla_s^2 u_\theta, u_\theta \rangle).$$

By interchanging derivatives and integrating by parts, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \partial_s^2 f^2 &= \int_{S^1} (|\nabla_s u_\theta|^2 + \langle \nabla_\theta \nabla_s u_s + R(u_s, u_\theta) u_s, u_\theta \rangle) \\ &= \int_{S^1} (|\nabla_s u_\theta|^2 - \langle \nabla_s u_s, \nabla_\theta u_\theta \rangle + \langle R(u_s, u_\theta) u_s, u_\theta \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

Using the flow equation (5.5), we get

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_s^2 f^2 = \int_{S^1} (|\nabla_s u_\theta|^2 + |\nabla_\theta u_\theta|^2 - \zeta^2 e^{2s} \langle \partial_t u, \nabla_\theta u_\theta \rangle + \langle R(u_s, u_\theta) u_s, u_\theta \rangle)$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_t f^2 = \int_{S^1} \langle \nabla_t u_\theta, u_\theta \rangle d\theta = - \int_{S^1} \langle \partial_t u, \nabla_\theta u_\theta \rangle.$$

Combining the above two identities, we get

$$(5.9) \quad \frac{1}{2}(e^{2s}\partial_t - \partial_s^2)f^2 = - \int_{S^1} (|\nabla_s u_\theta|^2 + |\nabla_\theta u_\theta|^2 + \langle R(u_s, u_\theta) u_s, u_\theta \rangle) + Q(u),$$

where

$$Q(u) = \int_{S^1} (\zeta^2 - 1)e^{2s} \langle \partial_t u, \nabla_\theta u_\theta \rangle.$$

Now, using (5.2) and plugging in the equation (5.5) again, we have

$$|Q(u)| \leq \sup_{S^1} |\zeta^2(\zeta^2 - 1)| \cdot \left| \int_{S^1} \langle \zeta^{-2} e^{2s} \partial_t u, \nabla_\theta u_\theta \rangle \right| \leq \alpha(\alpha + 1) e^{2s} \left| \int_{S^1} \langle \mathcal{T}_0(u), \nabla_\theta u_\theta \rangle \right|.$$

Integrating by parts and using the assumption (5.7), we get

$$(5.10) \quad |Q(u)| \leq \alpha(\alpha + 1) e^{2s} \left| \int_{S^1} \langle \nabla_\theta \mathcal{T}_0(u), u_\theta \rangle \right| \leq C\alpha(\alpha + 1) \eta e^{2s} f.$$

The bound (5.7) also gives  $|u_s| \leq \eta$ . Hence

$$(5.11) \quad \left| \int_{S^1} \langle R(u_s, u_\theta) u_s, u_\theta \rangle \right| \leq C_N \eta^2 f^2 \leq \eta f^2$$

for  $\eta$  sufficiently small.

Since  $|u_\theta| \leq \eta$  is small, we may also assume that the image of the curve  $u(s, \cdot, t) : S^1 \rightarrow N$  lies in a coordinate chart of  $N$  where the Christoffel symbol  $\Gamma$  is bounded by  $C_N$ . Then in local coordinates, we have

$$|\partial_\theta u_\theta| = |\nabla_\theta u_\theta - \Gamma(u_\theta, u_\theta)| \leq |\nabla_\theta u_\theta| + |\Gamma(u_\theta, u_\theta)| \leq \eta + C_N \eta^2 \leq 2\eta.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_\theta u_\theta|^2 &= |\partial_\theta u_\theta + \Gamma(u_\theta, u_\theta)|^2 \\ &\geq |\partial_\theta u_\theta|^2 - 2|\partial_\theta u_\theta||\Gamma(u_\theta, u_\theta)| + |\Gamma(u_\theta, u_\theta)|^2 \\ &\geq |\partial_\theta u_\theta|^2 - C\eta|u_\theta|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then the classical Poincaré inequality on  $S^1$  yields

$$(5.12) \quad \int_{S^1} |\nabla_\theta u_\theta|^2 \geq \int_{S^2} |u_\theta|^2 - C\eta \int_{S^1} |u_\theta|^2 = (1 - C\eta) f^2.$$

Combining (5.9), (5.10), (5.11) and (5.12), we arrive at

$$(5.13) \quad \frac{1}{2}(e^{2s}\partial_t - \partial_s^2)f^2 \leq - \int_{S^1} |\nabla_s u_\theta|^2 - (1 - C\eta)f^2 + C\alpha(\alpha + 1) \eta e^{2s} f.$$

Next, note that

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_s f^2 = f\partial_s f = \int_{S^1} \langle \nabla_s u_\theta, u_\theta \rangle \leq \left( \int_{S^1} |\nabla_s u_\theta|^2 \right)^{1/2} f,$$

so we have  $|\partial_s f|^2 \leq \int |\nabla_s u_\theta|^2$ . Inserting into (5.13), we get

$$(5.14) \quad \frac{1}{2}(e^{2s}\partial_t - \partial_s^2)f^2 \leq -|\partial_s f|^2 - (1 - C\eta)f^2 + C\eta\alpha(\alpha + 1)e^{2s}f.$$

On the other hand,

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_s^2(f^2) = f \cdot \partial_s^2 f + |\partial_s f|^2.$$

Inserting this into (5.14), we obtain

$$e^{2s}\partial_t f - \partial_s^2 f + (1 - C\eta)f \leq C\eta\alpha(\alpha + 1)e^{2s}.$$

Finally, translating the above equation back to polar coordinates, we get (5.8) and the lemma is proved.  $\square$

**5.2. Construction of supersolution.** Given  $\frac{1}{2} \leq \gamma < 1$ , define the trapezoidal spacetime region

$$(5.15) \quad \Omega_\gamma = \{(r, t) \in [R, 1] \times [0, T] \mid 1 - t \leq r^{2\gamma} \leq 1\}.$$

(see Figure 1). We will now construct a supersolution for the equation (5.8) on  $\Omega_\gamma$ , with controlled boundary values.

Letting

$$(5.16) \quad \lambda_\gamma^{R,1}(t) := \max\left[R, (1 - t)^{\frac{1}{2\gamma}}\right],$$

the parabolic boundary of  $\Omega_\gamma$  is given by

$$(5.17) \quad \partial\Omega_\gamma = (\{1\} \times [0, T]) \cup \{(\lambda_\gamma^{R,1}(t), t) \mid t \in [0, T]\}.$$

Let  $\frac{1}{2} \leq \gamma < \nu \leq 1$  and consider the operator

$$(5.18) \quad \Delta_\nu = \partial_r^2 + \frac{1}{r}\partial_r - \frac{\nu^2}{r^2}.$$

Let

$$v_0(r, t) = \frac{((1 - t)_+ + r^{2\nu})^{\frac{\nu}{2\gamma}}}{r^\nu}.$$

Choose  $\mu$  with

$$(5.19) \quad 0 < \mu < \min\left[\nu, \frac{\nu^2}{\gamma} - 3\nu + 2\right].$$

Now let

$$(5.20) \quad v(r, t) = v_0(r, t) + \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^\nu + \frac{\nu + 1}{\nu^2 - \mu^2} r^\mu.$$

**Lemma 5.2.** *On  $\Omega_\gamma$ , the function  $v(r, t)$  satisfies*

$$(5.21) \quad (\partial_t - \Delta_\nu)v \geq r^{\mu-2}$$

with

$$(5.22) \quad 1 \leq \sup_{\partial\Omega_\gamma} v \leq C_{\mu, \nu}$$

and

$$(5.23) \quad v(r, t) \leq C_{\mu, \nu} \left( \left( \frac{\lambda_{\gamma}^{R,1}(t)}{r} \right)^{\nu} + r^{\min[\mu, \nu(\frac{\nu}{\gamma}-1)]} \right).$$

*Proof.* We first claim that

$$(5.24) \quad \Delta_{\nu} v_0 \leq 0.$$

We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_r v_0 &= \frac{\nu}{2\gamma} \frac{v_0 2\nu r^{2\nu-1}}{(1-t+r^{2\nu})} - \nu \frac{v_0}{r} \\ &= \nu v_0 \left[ \frac{\nu}{\gamma} \frac{r^{2\nu-1}}{(1-t+r^{2\nu})} - \frac{1}{r} \right] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_r^2 v_0 &= \nu^2 v_0 \left[ \frac{\nu}{\gamma} \frac{r^{2\nu-1}}{(1-t+r^{2\nu})} - \frac{1}{r} \right]^2 \\ &\quad + \nu v_0 \left[ \frac{\nu(2\nu-1)r^{2\nu-2}}{\gamma(1-t+r^{2\nu})} - \frac{\nu r^{2\nu-1} 2\nu r^{2\nu-1}}{\gamma(1-t+r^{2\nu})^2} + \frac{1}{r^2} \right] \\ &= \nu v_0 \left[ \frac{r^{4\nu-2}}{(1-t+r^{2\nu})^2} \left( \frac{\nu^3}{\gamma^2} - 2\frac{\nu^2}{\gamma} \right) + \frac{r^{2\nu-2}}{1-t+r^{2\nu}} \left( \frac{\nu(2\nu-1)}{\gamma} - \frac{2\nu^2}{\gamma} \right) + \frac{\nu+1}{r^2} \right] \\ &= \nu v_0 \left[ \frac{\nu^2}{\gamma^2} \frac{r^{4\nu-2}}{(1-t+r^{2\nu})^2} (\nu-2\gamma) - \frac{\nu}{\gamma} \frac{r^{2\nu-2}}{1-t+r^{2\nu}} + \frac{\nu+1}{r^2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \partial_r^2 + \frac{1}{r} \partial_r - \frac{\nu^2}{r^2} \right) v_0 &= \nu v_0 \left[ \begin{aligned} &\frac{\nu^2}{\gamma^2} \frac{r^{4\nu-2}}{(1-t+r^{2\nu})^2} (\nu-2\gamma) \\ &- \frac{\nu}{\gamma} \frac{r^{2\nu-2}}{1-t+r^{2\nu}} + \frac{\nu}{\gamma} \frac{r^{2\nu-2}}{1-t+r^{2\nu}} \\ &+ \frac{\nu+1-1-\nu}{r^2} \end{aligned} \right] \\ &= \frac{\nu^3}{\gamma^2} v_0 \frac{r^{4\nu-2}}{(1-t+r^{2\nu})^2} (\nu-2\gamma), \end{aligned}$$

which is non-positive for  $t \leq 1$ , since  $\nu-2\gamma \leq \nu-1 \leq 0$ . This proves (5.24).

We also have

$$\partial_t v = \partial_t v_0 = \frac{-\left(\frac{\nu}{2\gamma}\right)}{(1-t+r^{2\nu})^{\frac{-\nu+2\gamma}{2\gamma}} r^{\nu}} \geq -\left(\frac{\nu}{2\gamma}\right) r^{-\frac{\nu(-\nu+2\gamma)+\nu\gamma}{\gamma}} \geq -\nu r^{-\frac{\nu(3\gamma-\nu)}{\gamma}}.$$

Note that

$$\Delta_{\nu} r^{\mu} = (\mu^2 - \nu^2) r^{\mu-2}.$$

By (5.19), we have

$$\mu - 2 \leq \frac{\nu}{\gamma} (\nu - 3\gamma).$$

We therefore obtain

$$(5.25) \quad (\partial_t - \Delta_\nu)v \geq -\nu r^{-\frac{\nu(3\gamma-\nu)}{\gamma}} + (\nu+1)r^{\mu-2} \geq r^{\mu-2}$$

for  $r \leq 1$ , which establishes (5.21).

The bounds (5.22-5.23) follow from (5.20) by inspection.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $1/2 \leq \gamma < \nu \leq 1$ , and  $\mu$  be as in (5.19). Suppose  $g(r, t) : \Omega_\gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies the equation*

$$(\partial_t - \Delta_\nu)g \leq Ar^{\mu-2}$$

with

$$\sup_{\partial\Omega_\gamma} g \leq A.$$

Then  $g$  satisfies a bound

$$(5.26) \quad g(r, t) \leq C_{\mu, \nu} A \left( \left( \frac{\lambda_\gamma^{R, 1}(t)}{r} \right)^\nu + r^{\min[\mu, \nu(\frac{\nu}{\gamma}-1)]} \right)$$

for  $(r, t) \in \Omega_\gamma$ .

*Proof.* This follows from the previous lemma by the comparison principle, applied to the functions  $g$  and  $Av(r, t)$ .  $\square$

**5.3. Decay estimates.** We can now prove a decay estimate for the angular energy in the above scenario.

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $0 < \eta^2 < \varepsilon_0$  and  $\frac{1}{2} \leq \gamma < 1$ . Let  $u$  be a solution of (1.1) on  $U_R^1 \times [0, T)$ , with  $T > 1$ , where  $U_R^1$  has a metric  $g$  as in (5.2). Suppose that for all  $(x, t)$  with*

$$(5.27) \quad \max[R, (1-t)] \leq |x|^{2\gamma} \leq 1$$

we have

$$(5.28) \quad r|du(x, t)| + r^2|\nabla du(x, t)| + r^3|\nabla^{(2)} du(x, t)| \leq \eta.$$

Then for

$$(5.29) \quad \gamma < \nu \leq \sqrt{1 - C\eta}$$

and for all  $1 \leq t < T$  and  $R \leq r \leq 1$ , the angular energy satisfies

$$(5.30) \quad f(u; r, t) \leq C_{\nu, \gamma} \eta (\alpha + 1)^2 \left( \left( \frac{R}{r} \right)^\nu + r^{\nu(\frac{\nu}{\gamma}-1)} \right).$$

Here  $\alpha$  is the constant of (5.3).

*Proof.* This follows from Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 5.3, where we let  $\mu = \nu \left( \frac{\nu}{\gamma} - 1 \right)$  and  $A = C\eta(1 + \alpha(\alpha + 1))$ .  $\square$

We now state two versions of the decay estimate that will be used in our context.

**Theorem 5.5.** *Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . There exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ , depending on the geometry of  $N$ , and  $R_0 > 0$ , depending on  $k$  and the geometry of  $\Sigma$ , as follows.<sup>3</sup>*

*For  $2R \leq \rho < \min[R_0, \sqrt{T}]$  and  $p \in \Sigma$ , let  $u : U_R^{2\rho}(p) \times [0, T] \rightarrow N$  be a solution of (1.1) that satisfies (4.1) for some  $q > 1$ . Given  $1/2 \leq \gamma < 1$ , let*

$$(5.31) \quad \lambda_\gamma^{R,\rho}(x) = \max \left[ 2R, \rho \left( 1 - \frac{x}{\rho^2} \right)^{1/2\gamma} \right].$$

*Suppose that  $\tau + \rho^2 \leq t < T$  is such that for all  $r, s$  with  $\lambda_\gamma^{R,\rho}(s - t + \rho^2) \leq r \leq 2\rho$ , we have*

$$(5.32) \quad E(u(s), U_{r/2}^r) \leq \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0.$$

*Then for  $\nu$  as in (5.29) and all  $2R \leq r \leq \rho/2$ , we have*

$$(5.33) \quad r^{1+k} |\nabla^{(k)} du(t)| \leq C_{\gamma,\nu,k} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \left( \left( \frac{R}{r} \right)^\nu + \left( \frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{\nu(\frac{\nu-1}{\gamma})} \right) + C \sqrt{\sigma} r^{1-\frac{1}{q}}.$$

*Proof.* Since for  $R$  sufficiently small, radial balls in conformal and geodesic coordinates are almost equivalent, we may conflate the two in the statement. After rescaling by a factor of  $\rho$  and shifting  $\tau$  to zero, we may assume that  $u$  is defined on an annulus  $U = U_{R/\rho}^2$ , with  $\alpha$  arbitrarily small in (5.3), and  $T > 1$ . By the  $\varepsilon$ -Regularity Theorem 3.4, (5.32) implies a bound

$$\sup_{\lambda_\gamma^{R/\rho,1}(t) \leq |x| \leq 1/2} \left( r |du(x, t)| + r^2 |\nabla du(x, t)| + r^3 |\nabla^{(2)} du(x, t)| \right) \leq C \sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

This is equivalent to (5.7), with  $\eta = C \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ . We may therefore apply Lemma 5.4, to obtain a bound

$$(5.34) \quad f(u; r, t) \leq C_{\nu,\gamma} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \left( \left( \frac{R}{\rho r} \right)^\nu + r^{\nu(\frac{\nu-1}{\gamma})} \right).$$

This implies (5.33) for the angular energy, after undoing the rescaling.

It remains to bound the radial energy using the stress-energy bound (4.1). By definition (2.5), the stress-energy tensor is conformally invariant and has the form

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \left( |u_r|^2 - \frac{1}{r^2} |u_\theta|^2 \right) (dr^2 - r^2 d\theta^2) + 2 \langle u_r, u_\theta \rangle dr d\theta.$$

It follows that

$$|du|^2 = |u_r|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |u_\theta|^2 \leq \frac{2}{r^2} |u_\theta|^2 + |S|.$$

Therefore, by Hölder inequality and (4.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(u(t), U_{r/2}^r) &\leq \int_{U_{r/2}^r} \frac{2}{r^2} |u_\theta|^2 + \int_{U_{r/2}^r} |S| \\ &= \int_{r/2}^r \frac{2}{r} f^2(r, t) dr + C \sigma r^{2(1-\frac{1}{q})}. \end{aligned}$$

<sup>3</sup>It is again sufficient to assume that  $\Sigma$  has bounded geometry, or that the metric on the annulus is sufficiently close to flat.



This combined with (5.34) gives

$$E(u(t), U_{r/2}^r) \leq C_{\nu, \gamma} \varepsilon \left( \left( \frac{R}{r} \right)^{2\nu} + \left( \frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{2\nu \left( \frac{\nu}{\gamma} - 1 \right)} \right) + C\sigma r^{2(1-\frac{1}{q})}.$$

Now the desired estimate (5.33) follows from the  $\varepsilon$ -regularity Theorem 3.4, applied on a finite cover of the annulus  $U_{r/2}^r$  by geodesic balls.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.6.** *Let  $u$  be as in the previous theorem, and assume that  $N$  is a Hermitian manifold. If  $\sup |\bar{\partial}u| \leq \delta$ , then we have*

$$(5.35) \quad r^{1+k} |\nabla^{(k)} du(t)| \leq C_{\gamma, \nu, k} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \left( \left( \frac{R}{r} \right)^\nu + \left( \frac{r}{\rho} \right)^\nu \left( \frac{\nu}{\gamma} - 1 \right) \right) + C\delta r.$$

*Proof.* We have  $|\bar{\partial}u| = |(u_r + \frac{i}{r}u_\theta) dz|$ . The result follows by using this identity in place of the stress-energy bound in the previous argument.  $\square$

## 6. HÖLDER CONTINUITY AND BUBBLE-TREE CONVERGENCE

**6.1. Main theorems.** Our main theorems combine the results of the previous sections, as follows.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $q > 1$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , and fix  $\nu > 0$  with*

$$(6.1) \quad \max \left[ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{q} \right] \cdot \frac{2q-1}{q} \leq \nu^2 < 1.$$

*There exists  $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ , depending on  $q, \nu$ , and the geometry of  $N$ , as well as  $R_0 > 0$ , depending on  $k$  and the geometry of  $\Sigma$ , as follows.*

*Given  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_1$ , let  $u$  be a solution of (1.1) on  $B_\rho \times [0, T)$ , for  $B_\rho \subset \Sigma$  with*

$$(6.2) \quad 0 < \rho < \min \left[ R_0, \sqrt{T}, \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{C\sigma} \right)^{\frac{q}{2q-2}} \right],$$

*and assume the stress-energy bound (4.1). Suppose  $\tau + \rho^2 \leq t < T$  is such that*

$$(6.3) \quad \sup_{t-\rho^2 \leq s \leq t} E(u(s), B_\rho) \leq E(u(t), B_{\rho/2}) + 2\varepsilon.$$

*Then for  $2\lambda_{\varepsilon, \rho, p}(t) \leq r \leq \rho/2$ ,  $u(t)$  satisfies a bound*

$$(6.4) \quad r^{1+k} |\nabla^{(k)} du(t)| \leq C_{q, \nu, k} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \left( \left( \frac{\lambda_{\varepsilon, \rho, p}(u(t))}{r} \right)^\nu + \left( \frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{1-\frac{1}{q}} \right).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\gamma = \max \left[ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{q} \right]$ . Then (6.1) reads  $\gamma \left( 2 - \frac{1}{q} \right) \leq \nu^2$ , which implies

$$(6.5) \quad 1 - \frac{1}{q} < 1 - \frac{1}{q} + 1 - \nu \leq \nu \left( \frac{\nu}{\gamma} - 1 \right).$$

Now, let  $0 \leq R < \rho/2$  be the minimal number such that

$$(6.6) \quad \sup_{t-\rho^2 \leq s \leq t} E(u(s), B_\rho) \leq E(u(t), B_R) + 3n\varepsilon$$

for a positive integer  $n \geq 3$  to be chosen later. We may also choose  $\varepsilon_1$  so that  $3n\varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_0$  and  $\nu < \sqrt{1 - 3Cn\varepsilon_1}$ , per (5.29).

By Theorem 4.4, we have

$$(6.7) \quad \lambda_{3n\varepsilon, \rho, p}(u(s)) \leq \max \left[ 4R, \left( \frac{C\sigma(t-s)}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \right]$$

for  $t - \rho^2 \leq s \leq t$ . But, by (6.2), we have

$$(6.8) \quad \left( \frac{C\sigma}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \leq \rho^{1-q}$$

and so (6.7) implies

$$(6.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda_{3n\varepsilon, \rho, p}(u(s)) &\leq \max \left[ 4R, \rho^{1-q} (t-s)^{\frac{q}{2}} \right] \\ &= \max \left[ 4R, \rho \left( \frac{t-s}{\rho^2} \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \right] \\ &= \lambda_{\gamma}^{2R, \rho}(s-t+\rho^2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (5.32) is satisfied, and we conclude from Theorem 5.5 that

$$(6.10) \quad \begin{aligned} r|du(t)| &\leq C\sqrt{n\varepsilon} \left( \left( \frac{R}{r} \right)^{\nu} + \left( \frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{\nu \left( \frac{\nu}{\gamma} - 1 \right)} \right) + C\sqrt{\sigma} r^{1-\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\leq C\sqrt{n\varepsilon} \left( \left( \frac{R}{r} \right)^{\nu} + \left( \frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{1-\frac{1}{q}} \right) + C\sqrt{\sigma} r^{1-\frac{1}{q}} \end{aligned}$$

by (6.5). But, again by (6.2), we have

$$\sqrt{\sigma} \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon} \rho^{-\frac{q-1}{q}}$$

and

$$(6.11) \quad \sqrt{\sigma} r^{1-\frac{1}{q}} \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon} \left( \frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{1-\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Hence (6.10) simplifies to

$$(6.12) \quad r|du(t)| \leq C\sqrt{n\varepsilon} \left( \left( \frac{R}{r} \right)^{\nu} + \left( \frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{1-\frac{1}{q}} \right).$$

Finally, we claim that  $R \leq 2\lambda_{\varepsilon, \rho, p}(u(t))$  for the appropriate choice of  $n$ . Assume the contrary; then we must have  $R > 0$  and  $\lambda = \lambda_{\varepsilon, \rho, p}(u(t)) \leq \rho/2$ , and moreover (6.6) is an equality:

$$(6.13) \quad \sup_{t-\rho^2 \leq s \leq t} E(u(s), B_{\rho}) = E(u(t), B_R) + 3n\varepsilon.$$

Then from (6.3), we have

$$E(u(t), B_R) + 3n\varepsilon \leq E(u(t), B_{\rho/2}) + 2\varepsilon$$

and

$$(6.14) \quad (3n-2)\varepsilon \leq E(u(t), U_R^{\rho/2}).$$

But, since  $\lambda < 2R$ , we have

$$(6.15) \quad E(u(t), U_R^{2^n R} \cup U_{2^{-n}\rho}^\rho) < 2n\varepsilon.$$

By (6.12), we also have

$$\begin{aligned} E(u(t), U_{2^n R}^{2^{-n}\rho}) &\leq Cn\varepsilon \int_{2^n R}^{2^{-n}\rho} \left( \left( \frac{R}{r} \right)^\nu + \left( \frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{1-\frac{1}{q}} \right)^2 \frac{dr}{r} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon n 2^{-(1-\frac{1}{q})n}. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $n$  sufficiently large (depending on  $q$  and  $C$ ), we obtain

$$(6.16) \quad E(u(t), U_{2^n R}^{2^{-n}\rho}) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Combining (6.14), (6.15), and (6.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (3n-2)\varepsilon &\leq E(u(t), U_R^{\rho/2}) \\ &= E(u(t), U_R^{2^n R} \cup U_{2^{-n}\rho}^\rho) + E(u(t), U_{2^n R}^{2^{-n}\rho}) \\ &< 2n\varepsilon + \varepsilon = (2n+1)\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $n \geq 3$ , this is a contradiction.

We have established that  $R \leq \lambda = \lambda_{\varepsilon, \rho, p}(u(t))$ , and the desired estimate (6.4) with  $k = 0$  now follows from (6.12). The estimates for  $k > 0$  are proven similarly.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.2.** *Given  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_1$ , let  $u$  be a solution of (1.1) on  $\Sigma \times [0, T)$  which satisfies (4.1), as well as*

$$(6.17) \quad E(u(\tau)) - E(u(t)) \leq c \frac{\varepsilon^2}{E(u(\tau))}$$

for  $\tau \leq t < T$ . For each  $p \in \Sigma$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\rho$  as in (6.2), and  $\tau + \rho^2 \leq t < T$ , we have

$$(6.18) \quad r^{1+k} |\nabla^{(k)} du(x, t)| \leq C_{q, \nu, k} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \left( \frac{\lambda_{\varepsilon, \rho, p}(t)}{r} + \frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{1-\frac{1}{q}}$$

for  $2\lambda_{\varepsilon, \rho, p}(t) \leq |x| \leq \rho/2$ .

*Proof.* We may let  $\nu = \sqrt{\max\left[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{q}\right] \cdot \frac{2q-1}{q}} > 1 - \frac{1}{q}$ . It suffices to show that (6.17) implies (6.3) for any choice of  $\rho$ , by the following standard argument.

We may assume without loss of generality that  $\lambda_{\varepsilon, \rho, p}(u(t)) \leq \rho/2$ , which implies

$$(6.19) \quad E(u(t), U_{\rho/2}^\rho) < \varepsilon.$$

Notice that by the global energy identity (2.6), the assumption (6.17) implies

$$(6.20) \quad \int_\tau^T \int_\Sigma |\mathcal{T}(u(t))|^2 dV dt \leq c \frac{\varepsilon^2}{E(u(\tau))}.$$

Let  $\varphi$  be a cutoff for  $B_\rho \subset B_{2\rho}$ . Integrating once against  $\varphi$  in (2.9), and inserting (2.7), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int \varphi |\nabla u|^2 dV + \int \varphi |\mathcal{T}(u)|^2 dV = \int \langle \mathcal{T}(u), \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla u \rangle.$$

Integrating in time, and using Hölder's inequality and (6.19), gives (6.3).  $\square$

**Corollary 6.3.** *If  $u$  satisfies (4.1) for  $T < \infty$ , then the body map  $u(T) = \lim_{t \nearrow T} u(t)$  is in  $C^{1-\frac{1}{q}}$ .*

*Proof.* By advancing  $\tau$  if necessary, one can always assume that (6.17) is satisfied. The result then follows from Corollaries 4.5 and 6.2.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.4** (*Cf.* Theorem 1.1). *Assume that  $N$  has nonnegative holomorphic bisectional curvature, and  $u : \Sigma \times [0, T)$ ,  $T < \infty$ , is a global smooth solution of (1.1) with  $E_{\bar{\partial}}(u(0)) < \varepsilon_0$ . Then  $u(T)$  is  $C^\alpha$  for each  $\alpha < 1$ .*

*Proof.* This follows by redoing the previous arguments with Theorem 5.6 in place of Theorem 5.5, and  $q = 2$  (by Corollary 4.6).  $\square$

**6.2. Bubble-tree convergence.** We can now state the bubble-tree results that follow from our main theorems. The arguments are by now standard (see Ding and Tian [6], Parker [13], or Qing-Tian [17]), once one establishes the following key estimates on the energy and oscillation in the neck region (*cf.* Lin and Wang [9], Lemma 3.1).

**Lemma 6.5.** *Let  $0 < \rho_i < R_0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, \infty$ , be a sequence of positive numbers, and  $p_i \in \Sigma$  a sequence of points. Let  $u_i : \Sigma \times [0, T) \rightarrow N$  be a sequence of solutions of harmonic map flow with uniformly bounded energy. Suppose that there exists  $0 < \tau < T$  such that a uniform stress-energy bound of the form (4.1) holds, with  $q > 1$ , as well as*

$$(6.21) \quad E(u_i(\tau)) - E(u_i(t)) < \delta_0$$

for  $\tau \leq t < T$ , where  $\delta_0 > 0$  is a sufficiently small constant (depending only on  $\Sigma, N$ , and the uniform bound on the energy). Given any sequence of times  $t_i \nearrow T$ , let  $\lambda_i = \lambda_{\varepsilon_1, \rho_i, p_i}(u(t_i))$ , and assume that

$$\lambda_i / \rho_i \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } i \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then we have

$$(6.22) \quad \lim_{\beta \searrow 0} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} E(u_i(t_i), U_{\alpha \lambda_i}^{\beta \rho_i}(p_i)) = 0$$

and

$$(6.23) \quad \lim_{\beta \searrow 0} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{osc}_{U_{\alpha \lambda_i}^{\beta \rho_i}(p_i)} u_i(t_i) = 0.$$

*Proof.* By Corollary 6.2, we have

$$(6.24) \quad r |du_i(x, t_i)| \leq C \left( \frac{\lambda_i}{r} + \frac{r}{\rho_i} \right)^{1-\frac{1}{q}}$$

for  $2\lambda_i \leq |x| \leq \rho_i/2$ . Then (6.22-6.23) follow by integrating (6.24), using the assumption  $\lambda_i / \rho_i \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 6.6.** *Let  $u_i : \Sigma \times [0, T) \rightarrow N$  be a sequence of solutions of harmonic map flow with uniformly bounded energy, and suppose that there exists  $0 < \tau < T$  such that (4.1), with  $q > 1$ , and (6.21) hold. Given any sequence of times  $t_i \nearrow T$ , there exists a subsequence (again labeled  $i$ ) such that  $u_i(t_i)$  converges to a Hölder-continuous weak limit  $u_\infty : \Sigma \rightarrow N$ , smoothly away from finitely many singular points in  $\Sigma$ . For each singular point  $p$ , there exist finitely many harmonic maps  $\phi_k : S^2 \rightarrow N$  such that the energy identity holds:*

$$(6.25) \quad \lim_{r \searrow 0} \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} E(u_i(t_i), B_r(p)) = \sum_k E(\phi_k).$$

Moreover,  $\cup_k \phi_k(S^2)$  is connected and contains  $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} u_\infty(x)$ .

*Proof.* Since the argument is standard, we provide only a sketch. It is most natural to use an “outside-in” argument in the manner of Parker [13].

By the parabolic estimates of Theorem 3.4, after passing to a subsequence, we may assume that  $u_i(t_i)$  converges smoothly away from a finite singular set. Given a singular point  $p$ , let

$$E_0 = \lim_{r \searrow 0} \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} E(u_i(t_i), B_r(p)).$$

By the argument of Lemma 4.3, we may choose  $\rho > 0$  such that  $\lambda_i^\circ = \lambda_{\varepsilon_1, \rho, p}(u_i(t_i)) \rightarrow 0$ . In geodesic coordinates where  $p = 0$ , we may then let  $q_i$  be the “center-of-mass” of  $e(u_i)$  over the ball  $B_{\lambda_i^\circ}(0)$ , and put

$$\lambda_i = \lambda_{\varepsilon_1, \rho/2, q_i}(u_i(t_i)).$$

It follows from Corollary 6.2 that we must have  $\lambda_i > 0$  for each  $i$  and  $\lambda_i \leq C\lambda_i^\circ$ .

Consider the rescaled sequence

$$(6.26) \quad v_i(x) = u_i(q_i + \lambda_i x, t_i).$$

Then  $v_i(x)$  is defined for  $x \in B_{\rho/2\lambda_i}(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ , and satisfies

$$(6.27) \quad \lambda_{\varepsilon_1, \rho/2\lambda_i, 0}(v_i) = 1.$$

The sequence  $v_i$  approaches a weak limit  $\phi_1 : \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{p'_1, \dots, p'_n\} \rightarrow N$ . The energy inequality combined with the parabolic estimates of Theorem 3.4 imply that  $\phi_1$  is a harmonic map, so in fact either  $E(\phi_1, \mathbb{R}^2) > \varepsilon_0$  or  $\phi_1$  is constant.

We claim that if  $\phi_1$  is constant, then there must be at least two distinct points in the singular set. Assume for contradiction that there is only one such point  $p'_1$ . Then since  $\phi_1$  is flat, all of the energy must concentrate at  $p'_1$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ ; since the origin is the center-of-mass, we must have  $p'_1 = 0$ . But then we clearly have  $E(v_i, U_{1/4}^1(0)) < \varepsilon_1$  for  $i$  sufficiently large, which implies that  $\lambda_{\varepsilon_1, \rho/2\lambda_i, 0}(v_i) < 1$ . This contradicts (6.27).

We are left with two scenarios: either  $\phi_1$  is nonconstant, with energy at least  $\varepsilon_0$ , or there are at least two distinct points in the bubbling set of  $\{v_i\}$ , each consuming energy at least  $\varepsilon_0$ . By Lemma 6.5, we certainly have

$$(6.28) \quad E_0 = E(\phi_1) + \sum_j \lim_{r \searrow 0} \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} E(v_i, B_r(p'_j))$$

and

$$(6.29) \quad \lim_{q \rightarrow p} u(t_i, q) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \phi_1(x).$$

In either case, for each  $p'_j$ , we must have

$$(6.30) \quad \lim_{r \searrow 0} \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} E(v_i, B_r(p'_j)) < E_0 - \varepsilon_0.$$

We can now rescale around each point  $p'_j$  in the same fashion, and repeat the procedure. In view of (6.30), the amount of concentrated energy at each point goes down by at least  $\varepsilon_0$ , therefore the process must terminate in finitely many steps. The identity (6.28) yields the energy identity (6.25), and (6.29) yields the no-neck property.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.7.** *Let  $u : \Sigma \times [0, T) \rightarrow N$  be a solution of harmonic map flow, with  $T \leq \infty$ . Assume that either a uniform stress-energy bound (4.1) holds, or  $N$  has nonnegative holomorphic bisectional curvature and  $E_{\bar{\delta}}(u(0)) < \varepsilon_0$ . Given any sequence of times  $t_i \nearrow T$ , there exists a subsequence such that  $u(t_i)$  converges in the bubble-tree sense with no necks, where  $u(T)$  is Hölder continuous and the bubble maps are harmonic. If  $T = \infty$ , then the global weak limit  $u_\infty$  of  $u(t_i)$  is also harmonic.*

*Proof.* This follows from the previous theorem. For, if  $T < \infty$ , then we may choose  $\tau$  as required since  $E(u(t))$  is a nonnegative decreasing function, and let  $u = u_i$  for all  $i$ . If  $T = \infty$ , then we may apply the theorem to the sequence of solutions  $u_i(t) = u(t_i + t)$ . The fact that  $u_\infty$  is harmonic follows from the global energy identity and (3.22).  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. B. Angenent, J. Hulshof, and H. Matano, *The radius of vanishing bubbles in equivariant harmonic map flow from  $D^2$  to  $S^2$* . SIAM J. Math. Anal. 41, no. 3, 1121-1137 (2009).
- [2] P. Baird and J. Eells. *A conservation law for harmonic maps*. Geometry Symposium Utrecht 1980, Springer (1981).
- [3] J. B. van den Berg, J. Hulshof, and J. R. King, *Formal asymptotics of bubbling in the harmonic map heat flow*. SIAM J. Appl. Math., 63, pp. 1682-1717 (2003).
- [4] K. Chang, W. Ding and R. Ye, *Finite-time blow up of the heat flow of harmonic maps from surfaces*. J. Diff. Geom. **36**, 507-515 (1992).
- [5] J. Dávila, M. del Pino, and J. Wei, *Singularity formation for the two-dimensional harmonic map flow into  $S^2$* . Invent. Math. 219, no. 2, 345-466 (2020).
- [6] W. Ding and G. Tian, *Energy identity for a class of approximate harmonic maps from surfaces*. Comm. Anal. Geom. **3**, 543-554 (1995).
- [7] J. Eells and J. H. Sampson, *Harmonic mappings of Riemannian manifolds*. Amer. J. Math. 86, 109-169 (1964).
- [8] S. I. Goldberg, and S. Kobayashi, *Holomorphic bisectional curvature*. J. Differ. Geom. 1.3-4: 225-233 (1967).
- [9] F. Lin and C. Wang, *Energy identity of harmonic map flows from surfaces at finite singular time*. Calc. Var. **6**, 369-380 (1998).
- [10] Q. Liu and Y. Yang, *Rigidity of the harmonic map heat flow from the sphere to compact Kähler manifolds*. Ark. Mat. 48, no. 1, 121-130 (2010).
- [11] N. Mok, *The uniformization theorem for compact Kähler manifolds of nonnegative bisectional curvature*. J Diff Geom, 27: 179-214 (1988).
- [12] S. Mori, *Projective manifolds with ample tangent bundles*. Ann of Math, 110: 593-606 (1979).
- [13] T. Parker, *Bubble tree convergence for harmonic maps*. J. Diff. Geom. **44**(3), 595-633 (1996).
- [14] T. H. Parker. *What is a Bubble Tree?* Notices of the American Mathematical Society, 50(6), 666-667 (2003).

- [15] J. Qing, *On singularities of the heat flow for harmonic maps from surfaces into spheres*. Commun. Anal. Geom. 3(1-2), 297-315 (1995).
- [16] J. Qing, *A remark on the finite time singularity of the heat flow for harmonic maps*. Calc. Var. 17, 393-403 (2003).
- [17] J. Qing and G. Tian, *Bubbling of the heat flows for harmonic maps from surfaces*. Commun. Pure Appl. Math. 50(4), 295-310 (1997).
- [18] P. Raphaël and R. Schweyer, *Stable blowup dynamics for the 1-corotational energy critical harmonic heat flow*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 66, no. 3, 414-480 (2013).
- [19] P. Raphaël and R. Schweyer, *Quantized slow blow-up dynamics for the corotational energy-critical harmonic heat flow*. Anal. PDE 7, no. 8, 1713-1805 (2014).
- [20] J. Sacks and K. Uhlenbeck, *The existence of minimal immersions of 2-spheres*. Ann. of Math. 113 1-24 (1981).
- [21] R. Schoen and K. Uhlenbeck. *A regularity theory for harmonic maps*. J. Differ. Geom. 17.2: 307-335 (1982).
- [22] R. Schoen and S. T. Yau, *On univalent harmonic maps between surfaces*. Invent. Math., 44(3), 265-278 (1978).
- [23] R. Schoen and S. T. Yau, *Lectures on harmonic maps. Conference Proceedings and Lecture Notes in Geometry and Topology, II*. International Press, Cambridge, MA, (1997).
- [24] Y. T. Siu and S. T. Yau, *Compact Kähler manifolds of positive bisectional curvature*. Invent. Math. 59: 189-204 (1980).
- [25] M. Struwe, *On the evolution of harmonic mappings of Riemannian surfaces*. Comment. Math. Helv. 60(4), 558-581 (1985).
- [26] M. Struwe, *Variational Methods, 3rd ed. Applications to Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations and Hamiltonian Systems*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag (1996).
- [27] D. Toledo, *Harmonic maps from surfaces to certain Kaehler manifolds*. Math. Scand. 45, no. 1, 13-26 (1979).
- [28] P. Topping, *Rigidity in the harmonic map heat flow*. J. Differential Geom. 45 no. 3, 593-610 (1997).
- [29] P. Topping, *Winding behaviour of finite-time singularities of the harmonic map heat flow*. Math. Z. 247, no. 2, 279-302 (2004).
- [30] A. Waldron, *Instantons and singularities in the Yang-Mills flow*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 55 (5), 113 (2016).
- [31] A. Waldron, *Long time existence for Yang-Mills flow*. Invent. Math. 217, no. 3, 1069-1147 (2019).
- [32] C. Wang, *Bubble phenomena of certain Palais-Smale sequences from surfaces to general targets*. Houston. J. Math. 22(3), 559-590 (1996).
- [33] J. C. Wood, *Holomorphicity of certain harmonic maps from a surface to complex projective n-space*. Journal of the London Mathematical Society 2.1: 137-142 (1979).

XIAMEN UNIVERSITY, FUJIAN, CHINA  
E-mail address: songchong@xmu.edu.cn

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON  
E-mail address: waldron@math.wisc.edu