

INFINITE-TIME BLOWING-UP SOLUTIONS TO SMALL PERTURBATIONS OF THE YAMABE FLOW

SEUNGHYEOK KIM AND MONICA MUSSO

ABSTRACT. Under the validity of the positive mass theorem, the Yamabe flow on a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $N \geq 3$ is known to exist for all time t and converges to a solution to the Yamabe problem as $t \rightarrow \infty$. We prove that if a suitable perturbation, which may be smooth and arbitrarily small, is imposed on the Yamabe flow on any given Riemannian manifold M of dimension $N \geq 5$, the resulting flow may blow up at multiple points on M in the infinite time. Our proof is constructive, and indeed we construct such a flow by using solutions of the Yamabe problem on the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^N as blow-up profiles. We also examine the stability of the blow-up phenomena under a negativity condition on the Ricci curvature at blow-up points.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. History. Let (M, g_0) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $N \geq 3$. The Yamabe flow on (M, g_0) is defined as

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} g(t) = -(S[g(t)] - \bar{S}[g(t)]) g(t) & \text{for } t \in (0, T), \\ g(0) = g_0 \end{cases}$$

where T is the maximal time, $S[g(t)]$ is the scalar curvature of the metric $g(t)$, and $\bar{S}[g(t)]$ is the average value of $S[g(t)]$. If we set $g(t) = u(t)^{\frac{4}{N-2}} g_0$ where $u(t)$ is a positive function on M for each $t \in (0, T)$, then (1.1) is reduced to the quasi-linear parabolic equation

$$(1.2) \quad pu^{p-1}u_t = \frac{N+2}{4} (\kappa_N \Delta_{g_0} u - S[g_0]u + \bar{S}[g(t)]u^p) \quad \text{on } M \times (0, T)$$

where $\kappa_N := \frac{4(N-1)}{N-2}$ and $p := \frac{N+2}{N-2}$.

Let E_{g_0} be the energy corresponding to equation (1.2),

$$E_{g_0}(u) := \frac{\int_M (\kappa_N |\nabla_{g_0} u|_{g_0}^2 + S[g_0]u^2) dv_{g_0}}{\left(\int_M |u|^{\frac{2N}{N-2}} dv_{g_0} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{N}}}$$

where dv_{g_0} is the volume form on (M, g_0) , and $Y(M, g_0)$ is the Yamabe constant on (M, g_0) defined by

$$Y(M, g_0) = \inf \{E_{g_0}(u) : u \in C^\infty(M) \setminus \{0\}\}.$$

If $Y(M, g_0) \leq 0$, a relatively simple argument based on the maximum principle shows that the flow (1.1) exists globally ($T = \infty$) and converges to a metric of constant scalar curvature as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

However, treating (1.1) in the case $Y(M, g_0) > 0$ is challenging, because one has to exclude the possibility of blowing-up phenomena. Thanks to the series of works by Chow [12], Ye [49], Schwetlick and Struwe [44], and Brendle [6, 7], it is now known that (1.1) is always globally well-defined in time and converges to a metric of constant scalar curvature as $t \rightarrow \infty$, under the validity

Date: January 10, 2022.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 58J35, Secondary: 35B33, 35B44, 35K59.

Key words and phrases. Yamabe-type flow, fast diffusion equation, degenerate parabolic equation, type II blow-up, compact Riemannian manifold, bubble.

of the positive mass theorem; see also [9] in which Carlotto, Chodosh, and Rubinstein showed the existence of a Yamabe flow on a certain manifold converging at a polynomial rate.

One of the main ingredients of the proof by Brendle in [6, 7] is to construct a suitable family $\{\bar{u}_{z,\epsilon} \in C^\infty(M) : z \in M, \epsilon > 0 \text{ small}\}$ of test functions satisfying

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} \sup \{E_{g_0}(\bar{u}_{z,\epsilon}) : z \in M, \epsilon > 0 \text{ small}\} \leq Y(\mathbb{S}^N, g_{\mathbb{S}^N}), \\ \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \bar{u}_{z,\epsilon}(\exp_z(\epsilon x)) = W_{1,0}(x) \quad \text{for } z \in M, x \in T_z M \end{cases}$$

where $(\mathbb{S}^N, g_{\mathbb{S}^N})$ is the N -dimensional unit-sphere in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} with the canonical metric $g_{\mathbb{S}^N}$, \exp is the exponential map, and $W_{1,0}$ is the standard bubble in \mathbb{R}^N , that is,

$$(1.4) \quad W_{1,0}(x) = \frac{\alpha_N}{(1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{N-2}{2}}} \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad \alpha_N := (N(N-2))^{\frac{N-2}{4}}.$$

Given a smooth function h on M such that $\max_M h > 0$, let $E_{g_0,h}$ be a perturbed energy of E_{g_0} given as

$$E_{g_0,h}(u) = \frac{\int_M [\kappa_N |\nabla_{g_0} u|_{g_0}^2 + (S[g_0] + h)u^2] dv_{g_0}}{\left(\int_M |u|^{\frac{2N}{N-2}} dv_{g_0} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{N}}}.$$

If $h(z) > 0$ at some $z \in M$, then there is no test function $\bar{u}_{z,\epsilon}$ satisfying (1.3). For instance, if $N \geq 7$, M is non-locally conformally flat, and $\bar{u}_{z,\epsilon}$ is a ‘bubble-like’ function satisfying the second condition in (1.3), then

$$E_{g_0,h}(\bar{u}_{z,\epsilon}) \approx Y(\mathbb{S}^N, g_{\mathbb{S}^N}) + \tilde{c}_1 h(z) \epsilon^2 - \tilde{c}_2 \|\text{Weyl}[g_0](z)\|_{g_0}^2 \epsilon^4$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, so

$$E_{g_0,h}(\bar{u}_{z,\epsilon}) > Y(\mathbb{S}^N, g_{\mathbb{S}^N}) \quad \text{provided } \epsilon > 0 \text{ small enough.}$$

Here, $\tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2 > 0$, $\text{Weyl}[g_0]$ is the Weyl tensor on (M, g_0) , and $\|\cdot\|_{g_0}$ is the tensor norm in the metric g_0 .

Now setting

$$(1.5) \quad L_{g_0,h} u = \kappa_N \Delta_{g_0} - (S[g_0] + h)$$

so that $L_{g_0} := L_{g_0,h}$ is the conformal Laplacian on (M, g_0) , we consider a perturbed Yamabe flow

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{cases} pu^{p-1}u_t = \frac{N+2}{4}(L_{g_0,h}u + \kappa_N u^p) & \text{on } M \times (0, \infty), \quad p = \frac{N+2}{N-2}, \\ u > 0 & \text{on } M \times (0, \infty), \\ u(\cdot, 0) = u_0 > 0 & \text{on } M, \end{cases}$$

corresponding to the energy $E_{g_0,h}$. Observe that we replaced the function $\bar{S}[g(t)]$ in (1.1) with the constant $\kappa_N > 0$, recalling that it tends to a positive constant as $t \rightarrow \infty$ provided $Y(M, g_0) > 0$.

A natural question is what is the asymptotic behavior of a solution to (1.6) as $t \rightarrow T$. As we will prove in this paper, (1.6) may exhibit infinite-time blow-up phenomena driven by the bubbles (also known as the Talenti-Aubin instantons)

$$(1.7) \quad W_{\mu,\xi}(x) = \mu^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} W_{1,0}(\mu^{-1}(x - \xi)), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \mu > 0, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N;$$

see (1.4). It is a classical result that the solution set of the Yamabe problem in \mathbb{R}^N

$$(1.8) \quad -\Delta W = W^p, \quad W > 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N$$

is precisely $\{W_{\mu,\xi} : \mu > 0, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N\}$, which corresponds to a family of standard metrics on N -dimensional spheres in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} via the stereographic projection.

1.2. Main theorems. We now list the main theorems of this paper and some remarks on them.

The following theorem precisely describes the infinite-time blow-up phenomena of the perturbed Yamabe flow (1.6) driven by the bubbles.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (M, g_0) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $N \geq 5$ such that*

$$(1.9) \quad Y_h(M, g_0) := \inf \{E_{g_0, h}(u) : u \in C^\infty(M) \setminus \{0\}\} > 0.$$

Assume that h is a C^2 -function on M such that $\max_M h > 0$. Given a point $z_0 \in M$ such that $h(z_0) > 0$, there exists an initial datum $u_{z_0, 0}$ such that (1.6) has a solution u_{z_0} blowing-up at z_0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$. More precisely, there is a constant $C > 0$ depending only on (M, g_0) , N , h , and z_0 such that

$$(1.10) \quad \begin{cases} u_{z_0}(z, t) = (1 + O(|\exp_{z_0}^{-1}(z)|^2)) W_{\mu(t), \xi(t)}(\exp_{z_0}^{-1}(z)) & \text{if } d_{g_0}(z, z_0) \leq \delta_0, \\ u_{z_0}(z, t) \leq C \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}}(t) G(z, z_0) & \text{if } d_{g_0}(z, z_0) > \delta_0 \end{cases}$$

for $t > 0$ large enough, where

- \exp is the exponential map on (M, g_0) , and $d_{g_0}(z, z_0)$ is the geodesic distance between z and z_0 ;
- $\delta_0 > 0$ is a sufficiently small number;
- $\mu : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and $\xi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ are parameters such that $\mu(t) \simeq t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $|\xi(t)| \lesssim t^{-1+\varepsilon}$ for all $t > 0$ large and some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ small;
- G is the Green's function of the perturbed conformal Laplacian $L_{g_0, h}$ defined in (2.2).

In fact, equation (1.6) also possesses solutions which blow-up at multiple points as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let (M, g_0) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $N \geq 5$ such that $Y_h(M, g_0) > 0$. Assume that h is a C^2 -function on M such that $\max_M h > 0$. Given any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, choose a k -tuple $\mathbf{z}_0 := \{z_0^{(1)}, \dots, z_0^{(k)}\}$ of distinct points on M such that $h(z_0^{(l)}) > 0$ for $l = 1, \dots, k$. Then there exists an initial datum $u_{\mathbf{z}_0, 0}$ such that (1.6) has a solution $u_{\mathbf{z}_0}$ blowing-up at each point $z_0^{(1)}, \dots, z_0^{(k)}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. More precisely, there is a constant $C > 0$ depending only on (M, g_0) , N , h , k , and \mathbf{z}_0 such that*

$$\begin{cases} u_{\mathbf{z}_0}(z, t) = \left(1 + O\left(\left|\exp_{z_0^{(l)}}^{-1}(z)\right|^2\right)\right) W_{\mu^{(l)}(t), \xi^{(l)}(t)}\left(\exp_{z_0^{(l)}}^{-1}(z)\right) & \text{if } d_{g_0}(z, z_0^{(l)}) \leq \delta_0, l = 1, \dots, k, \\ u_{\mathbf{z}_0}(z, t) \leq C \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}}(t) \sum_{l=1}^k G(z, z_0^{(l)}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $t > 0$ large enough, where $\mu^{(l)} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and $\xi^{(l)} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ are parameters such that $\mu^{(l)}(t) \simeq t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $|\xi^{(l)}(t)| \lesssim t^{-1+\varepsilon}$ for all $t > 0$ large and some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ small.

Regarding the stability of the solution found above, we have the following result.

Corollary 1.3. *In the setting of Theorem 1.2, we further assume that the largest eigenvalue of the Ricci curvature tensor at $z_0^{(l)}$ is less than or equal to $-\frac{6}{N-4}h(z_0^{(l)})$ for each $l = 1, \dots, k$. Let $\sigma \in (0, 1)$. There is a k -codimensional manifold $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{z}_0}$ in $C^{2, \sigma}(M)$ containing $u_{\mathbf{z}_0}$ such that if $u_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{z}_0}$ is sufficiently close to $u_{\mathbf{z}_0, 0}$, then (1.6) has a solution u blowing-up at each point $z_0^{(1)}, \dots, z_0^{(k)}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

In the above corollary, the technical condition on the Ricci curvature comes from the ODE system (5.43) that each $\xi^{(l)}$ solves.

Remark 1.4. Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 show that the Yamabe flow is an equation at the borderline guaranteeing the global existence and uniform boundness of solutions. A couple of remarks regarding them are in order.

(1) If $Y(M, g_0) > 0$ and h is a function such that $\|h\|_{L^{N/2}(M)} < Y(M, g_0)$, then a simple application of Hölder's inequality yields that $Y_h(M, g_0) > 0$. Therefore, if (M, g_0) is a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $N \geq 5$ such that $Y(M, g_0) > 0$, (1.6) exhibits infinite-time blow-up phenomena (with an arbitrary number of blow-up points) provided $h \in C^2(M)$ is a sufficiently small and $\max_M h > 0$.

(2) Our results can be regarded as parabolic analogues of the theorems of Micheletti, Pistoia, and Vétois [36], and of Esposito, Pistoia, and Vétois [21] which assert the existence of blow-up solutions to slightly perturbed (elliptic) Yamabe problems. Their results are related to $C^2(M)$ -compactness property of the solution set of the Yamabe problem on (M, g_0) ; see [30, 8] and references therein.

In the elliptic case, the blow-up points must be a critical point of some function involving the function h and a geometric quantity on (M, g_0) ; either the Weyl curvature or the $O(1)$ -order term of the Green's function of the conformal Laplacian on (M, g_0) . In our evolutionary setting, we only require that h is positive at each blow-up point.

We wonder if there exist non-isolated positive blowing-up solutions (namely, clustering solutions) or isolated non-simple positive blowing-up solutions (namely, bubble-tower solutions) to (1.6) as in the elliptic case [41, 37, 47, 11, 38]. Also, we may ask if (1.6) has a finite-time blowing-up solution. We hope to examine these problems elsewhere.

(3) Our results are in spirit close to the work of Daskalopoulos, del Pino, and Sesum [15] which constructed type II ancient compact solutions to the Yamabe flow on \mathbb{S}^N , and that of Sire, Wei, and Zheng [46] which built finite-time extinguishing solutions to fast diffusion equations with the critical exponent in smooth bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^N .

To handle the degeneracy of the equation (u^{p-1} in (1.6) for our setting), the authors in [46] lifted the spatial domain to a subset of \mathbb{S}^N via the stereographic projection so that the equation becomes uniformly parabolic. However, there are limitations in employing their idea directly, because our spatial domain is a general Riemannian manifold M and so it may not be embedded into \mathbb{S}^N . We will overcome this technical difficulty with the help of a maximum principle adapted to our setting; see Lemma 4.5.

(4) Suppose that $\min_M h < 0$. In this case, our approach suggests that given a k -tuple of points $\mathbf{z}_0 = \{z_0^{(1)}, \dots, z_0^{(k)}\}$ on M such that $h(z_0^{(l)}) < 0$ for $l = 1, \dots, k$, there exist ancient solutions to (1.6) which blow-up at each point $z_0^{(1)}, \dots, z_0^{(k)}$ as $t \rightarrow -\infty$. We also suspect the existence of ancient solutions to (1.6) which look like towers of spheres similar to ones found in [15].

There have been extensive studies on type II blow-up solutions to various time-dependent energy-critical equations; e.g. the critical nonlinear heat equations [22, 45, 13, 14, 17, 23, 18], the harmonic map heat flows and the nematic liquid crystal flows [10, 2, 48, 40, 16, 32], the critical wave equations [29, 31, 24, 19, 20, 25, 26], the wave maps equations and the Yang-Mills equations [39, 42], the critical Schrödinger equations and map equations [34, 35], and so on. Our contribution towards this direction is to build solutions to energy-critical degenerate parabolic equations on general Riemannian manifolds, blowing up at an arbitrary number of points. We believe that our method may help construct bubbling solutions to related problems on manifolds, such as the harmonic map heat flow from a smooth closed two-dimensional Riemannian manifold to another provided the target manifold satisfies a certain geometric assumption.

Furthermore, several results on the optimal regularity and sharp extinction rates for fast diffusion equations in bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^N were proved recently; refer to [27, 28, 5, 4] among others. In their proofs, Aronson-Bénilan type inequalities (namely, bounds for $u^{-1}|u_t|$; see [1]) appear as one

of the key tools. In our analysis of (1.6), such an inequality is derived in a very specific manner; see (4.4) below and its proof.

1.3. Structure of the paper and comment on the proof. In order to establish Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 as well as Corollary 1.3, we will apply the modulation argument combined with the inner-outer gluing procedure. Our presentation is largely influenced by the paper [14] which studied the existence of infinite-time type II multiple blowing-up solutions to the critical nonlinear heat equations in smooth bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^N .

From Section 2 to 5, we only concern the proof of Theorem 1.1. Necessary modifications to prove Theorem 1.2 and the proof of Corollary 1.3 will be provided in Section 6.

In Section 2, we construct approximate solutions which behave as in (1.10). This is one of the most tricky parts of the proof, because approximate solutions must be sufficiently regular and very close to true solutions for every point on M regardless of its distance from the blow-up point. In particular, the approximate solutions used for the elliptic analogues do not work well in our setting. At points away from the blow-up point, we depict the approximate solution in terms of the Green's function G of the perturbed conformal Laplacian $L_{g_0,h}$; cf. [43, 21]. At points near the blow-up point, we deform the bubble by multiplying it by G and then combining the result and a solution to the linear equation (2.30) together. During the refinement, we also determine the main order term of the dilation parameter by solving the ODE (2.36).

In Section 3, we decompose equation (1.6) into the outer problem (3.2) and the inner problem (3.6).

In Section 4, we prove the unique solvability of the outer problem and establish a priori estimates of the solution, by examining the associated inhomogeneous problem (4.1) with the maximum principle for degenerate parabolic equations. A delicate issue is to choose suitable norms to work with. While the authors in [14] worked successfully in a weighted L^∞ setting, we cannot do for (1.6) because of its degeneracy u^{p-1} . To control the terms resulting from the degeneracy such as $(\psi_{\mu,\xi})_t$ in (3.4) in a pointwise sense, we will devise various Hölder-type norms; refer to Subsection 1.5. In defining them, we must reflect that the scaling properties in the spatial variable and in the time variable are different from each other, which makes the analysis considerably complicated.

In Section 5, we develop the existence theory for an associated inhomogeneous problem (5.1) to the inner problem. By lifting its spatial domain to \mathbb{S}^N , we prove that it is solvable whenever the orthogonality condition (5.2) holds. Also, from (5.2), we find a system of ODEs that the dilation and translation parameters satisfy, and solve it. Finally, collecting all the information obtained so far, we find a solution to the inner problem and derive a priori estimate on it, thereby completing the proof of Theorem 1.1.

1.4. Notations. We collect some notations used throughout the paper.

- The Einstein convention is used throughout the paper. Unless otherwise stated, the indices i, j, q, r , and s take values from 1 to the dimension N of the underlying manifold M , and l and m range over values from 1 to the number k of blowing-up points of solutions.
- For a tensor field T on (M, g) , a notation such as $T_{;a}$ stands for a covariant derivative of T .
- \mathbb{S}^N is the standard unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} , $g_{\mathbb{S}^N}$ is its canonical metric, and $|\mathbb{S}^N|$ is its surface measure.
- ∇_g , Δ_g , $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_g$, and $|\cdot|_g$ are the gradient, the Laplace-Beltrami operator, the inner product, and the norm on (M, g) , respectively. On $(\mathbb{S}^N, g_{\mathbb{S}^N})$, we write $\nabla_{\mathbb{S}^N} = \nabla_{g_{\mathbb{S}^N}}$, etc. In the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^N , we write $\nabla = \nabla_x$, $\Delta = \Delta_x$, etc, where the subscript x denotes the variable in \mathbb{R}^N .
- $i(M, g_0)$ is the injectivity radius of (M, g_0) .
- For a surface integral, dS denotes the volume form on the domain of integration.

- Given a number $\delta > 0$ and a metric g on M , let $B^N(x, \delta) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^N : |y - x| < \delta\}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $B_g(z, \delta) = \{\xi \in M : d_g(z, \xi) < \delta\}$ for $z \in M$.

- For a function f and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $\partial_i f = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$, $\dot{f} = f_t = \partial_t f = \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}$, and

$$(1.11) \quad f_{[\ell]}(x) = f(x) - \sum_{|\gamma|=0}^{\ell-1} \frac{x^\gamma}{\gamma!} \partial_\gamma f(0) = O(|x|^\ell)$$

for $|x|$ small, where γ is a multi-index.

- For $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, $T > 0$, and a set Ω , we write $C^{\ell+\sigma}(\Omega) = C^{\ell, \sigma}(\Omega)$ and $C^{2\ell+\sigma, \ell+\sigma/2}(\Omega \times [0, T])$ to refer the Hölder space and the parabolic Hölder space, respectively.

- $\text{supp}(f)$ is the support of a function f .

- Let $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be a function such that

$$(1.12) \quad \begin{cases} \eta(r) \geq 0, \quad \eta'(r) \leq 0 \text{ for } r \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \eta(r) = 1 \text{ for } r \in (-\infty, 1] \text{ and } 0 \text{ for } r \in [2, \infty), \end{cases}$$

and $\eta_\delta(r) = \eta(\delta^{-1}r)$ for $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta > 0$. By abuse of notation, we often write $\eta_\delta(x) = \eta_\delta(|x|)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

- $C, \zeta > 0$ are universal constants that may vary from line to line.

1.5. Norms. We introduce all the norms that will be used throughout the paper. Let $\delta_0 > 0$ be the small number in the statement of Theorem 1.1, for which we impose that $4\delta_0 < i(M, g_0)$. Let also $t_0 > 0$ be a large number, and $\mu = \mu(t) > 0$ and $\xi = \xi(t) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be small functions on $[t_0, \infty)$ tending to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$. The functions $\mu_0 = \mu_0(t)$ and $u_{\mu, \xi} = u_{\mu, \xi}^{(2)}(z, t)$ are defined in (2.5) and (2.39) below, respectively.

Definition 1.5 (Local Hölder semi-norms). Assume that $\sigma \in (0, 1)$. For a function $\lambda : [t_0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$[\lambda]_{C_t^{\sigma/2}}(t) = \sup \left\{ \frac{|\lambda(t_1) - \lambda(t_2)|}{|t_1 - t_2|^{\sigma/2}} : t_1, t_2 \in (\max\{t_0, t-1\}, t), t_1 \neq t_2 \right\}.$$

For a function $\psi : M \times [t_0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$[\psi]_{C_z^\sigma}(z, t) = \sup \left\{ \frac{|\psi(z_1, t) - \psi(z_2, t)|}{d_{g_0}(z_1, z_2)^\sigma} : z_1, z_2 \in B_{g_0}(z, r_0(z, t)), z_1 \neq z_2 \right\}$$

and

$$[\psi]_{C_t^{\sigma/2}}(z, t) = \sup \left\{ \frac{|\psi(z, t_1) - \psi(z, t_2)|}{|t_1 - t_2|^{\sigma/2}} : t_1, t_2 \in (\max\{t_0, t-1\}, t), t_1 \neq t_2 \right\}$$

where

$$r_0(z, t) := \begin{cases} \frac{\mu_0(t)}{2} & \text{for } z \in B_{g_0}(z_0, \mu_0(t)), \\ \frac{d_{g_0}(z, z_0)}{2} & \text{for } z \in B_{g_0}(z_0, \delta_0) \setminus B_{g_0}(z_0, \mu_0(t)), \\ \frac{\delta_0}{2} & \text{for } z \in M \setminus B_{g_0}(z_0, \delta_0), \end{cases}$$

and $t \in [t_0, \infty)$.

Let Ω be a smooth domain in \mathbb{R}^N . For a function $\psi : \Omega \times [t_0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$[\psi]_{C_\Omega^\sigma}(y, t) = \sup \left\{ \frac{|\psi(y_1, t) - \psi(y_2, t)|}{|y_1 - y_2|^\sigma} : y_1, y_2 \in B^N(y, r_1(y)) \cap \Omega, y_1 \neq y_2 \right\}$$

where

$$r_1(y) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{in } \Omega \cap \{|y| < 1\}, \\ \frac{|y|}{2} & \text{in } \Omega \cap \{|y| \geq 1\}. \end{cases}$$

Definition 1.6 (A Hölder norm for functions on $[t_0, \infty)$). For numbers $\nu > 0$ and $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and functions $\lambda : [t_0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N) : [t_0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, we define

$$(1.13) \quad \begin{cases} \|\lambda\|_{\nu; \sigma} = \sup_{t \in [t_0, \infty)} \mu_0^{-\nu}(t) \left[|\lambda(t)| + [\lambda]_{C_t^{\sigma/2}(t)} \right], \\ \|\xi\|_{\nu; \sigma} = \sup_{t \in [t_0, \infty)} \mu_0^{-\nu}(t) \sum_{i=1}^N \left[|\xi_i(t)| + [\xi_i]_{C_t^{\sigma/2}(t)} \right]. \end{cases}$$

Definition 1.7 (Weighted integral norms for functions on M or $M \times [t_0, \infty)$). Let $M_\tau = M \times [\tau, \tau+1]$ for $\tau \geq t_0$.

- Local in time weighted L^2 , H^1 and H^2 norms: We set

$$\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} = \left[\int_M (|\nabla_{g_0} \psi_0|_{g_0}^2 + \psi_0^2) dv_{g_0} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for a function ψ_0 on M , and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi(\cdot, \tau)\|_{L^2(M)} &= \left[\int_M (|\psi|^2 u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1})(z, \tau) dv_{g_0} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \|\psi\|_{L^2(M_\tau)} &= \left[\iint_{M_\tau} (|\psi|^2 u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1})(z, t) dv_{g_0} dt \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \|\psi\|_{H^1(M_\tau)} &= \left\| u_{\mu, \xi}^{-\frac{p-1}{2}} \nabla_{g_0} \psi \right\|_{L^2(M_\tau)} + \|\psi\|_{L^2(M_\tau)}, \\ \|\psi\|_{H^2(M_\tau)} &= \|\psi_t\|_{L^2(M_\tau)} + \left\| u_{\mu, \xi}^{1-p} L_{g_0, h} \psi \right\|_{L^2(M_\tau)} + \|\psi\|_{H^1(M_\tau)} \end{aligned}$$

for a function ψ on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$.

- Global in time weighted L^2 , H^1 and H^2 norms: Given two positive numbers t_0 and s_0 such that $t_0 < s_0 - 1$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi\|_{L_{t_0, s_0}^2} &= \sup_{\tau \in [t_0, s_0-1]} \|\psi\|_{L^2(M_\tau)}, \\ \|\psi\|_{H_{t_0, s_0}^1} &= \sup_{\tau \in [t_0, s_0-1]} \|\psi\|_{H^1(M_\tau)}, \\ \|\psi\|_{H_{t_0, s_0}^2} &= \sup_{\tau \in [t_0, s_0-1]} \|\psi\|_{H^2(M_\tau)}. \end{aligned}$$

In the case that $s_0 = \infty$, we omit the subscript s_0 so that $\|\psi\|_{L_{t_0, \infty}^2} = \|\psi\|_{L_{t_0}^2}$, etc.

Observe that $\|\psi\|_{H^2(M_\tau)}$ is a norm if $Y_h(M, g_0) > 0$ holds; see (1.9).

Definition 1.8 (Weighted Hölder norms for functions on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$). Given $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma \geq 0$, we define

$$(1.14) \quad w_{\alpha, \gamma}(z, t) = \mu^\alpha(t) \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{\eta_{\delta_0}(d_{g_0}(z, z_0))}{\mu^{\alpha+\gamma}(t) + |\exp_{z_0}^{-1}(z) - \xi(t)|^{\alpha+\gamma}}, 2^{3(\alpha+\gamma)} \delta_0^{-(\alpha+\gamma)} \right\}$$

on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$. Here, η_{δ_0} is the cut-off function defined after (1.12).

- The weighted L^∞ norms: Given $\alpha > 0$ and $\rho \geq -\frac{N-2}{2}$, we define

$$\|f\|_{*,\alpha,\rho} = \left\| (\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha,2})^{-1} u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} f \right\|_{L^\infty(M \times [t_0, \infty))}, \quad \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} = \left\| (\mu_0^\rho(t_0) w_{\alpha,0})^{-1} \psi_0 \right\|_{L^\infty(M)},$$

and

$$\|\psi\|_{*,\alpha,\rho} = \left\| (\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha,0})^{-1} \psi \right\|_{L^\infty(M \times [t_0, \infty))}.$$

- The weighted Hölder norms: Given $\alpha > 0$, $\rho \geq -\frac{N-2}{2}$, and $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, we define

$$(1.15) \quad \|f\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma} = \left\| (\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha,2})^{-1} \left| u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} f \right| + (\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha,2+\sigma})^{-1} \left[u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} f \right]_{C_z^\sigma} + (\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha-\sigma,2})^{-1} \left[u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} f \right]_{C_t^{\sigma/2}} \right\|_{L^\infty(M \times [t_0, \infty))},$$

$$(1.16) \quad \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha; \sigma} = \sum_{\ell=0}^2 \left\| (\mu_0^\rho(t_0) w_{\alpha,\ell})^{-1} \left| \nabla_{g_0}^\ell \psi_0 \right| + (\mu_0^\rho(t_0) w_{\alpha,\ell+\sigma})^{-1} \left[\nabla_{g_0}^\ell \psi_0 \right]_{C_z^\sigma} \right\|_{L^\infty(M)},$$

and

$$(1.17) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\psi\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^2 \left\| (\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha,\ell})^{-1} \left| \nabla_{g_0}^\ell \psi \right| + (\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha,\ell+\sigma})^{-1} \left[\nabla_{g_0}^\ell \psi \right]_{C_z^\sigma} + (\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha-\sigma,\ell})^{-1} \left[\nabla_{g_0}^\ell \psi \right]_{C_t^{\sigma/2}} \right\|_{L^\infty(M \times [t_0, \infty))} \\ &+ \left\| (\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha-2,0})^{-1} |\psi_t| + (\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha-2,\sigma})^{-1} [\psi_t]_{C_z^\sigma} + (\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha-2-\sigma,0})^{-1} [\psi_t]_{C_t^{\sigma/2}} \right\|_{L^\infty(M \times [t_0, \infty))}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 1.9 (Weighted Hölder norms for functions on $\Omega \times [t_0, \infty)$). Let Ω be a smooth domain in \mathbb{R}^N , $a \in (0, N-2)$, $b > 0$, and $s_0 > \frac{3t_0}{2} \gg 1$.

- The weighted L^∞ norms: We set

$$\|\mathcal{H}\|_{\sharp,a+2,b;t_0,s_0} = \left\| \mu_0^{-b} (1 + |\bar{y}|^{a+2}) \left(W_{1,0}^{p-1} \mathcal{H} \right) (\bar{y}, t) \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \times [t_0, s_0])}$$

and

$$\|\psi\|_{\sharp',a,b;t_0,s_0(\Omega)} = \left\| \mu_0^{-b} (1 + |\bar{y}|^a) \psi(\bar{y}, t) \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \times [t_0, \infty))}.$$

In the case that $s_0 = \infty$, we write $\|\mathcal{H}\|_{\sharp,a+2,b} = \|\mathcal{H}\|_{\sharp,a+2,b;t_0,s_0}$ and $\|\psi\|_{\sharp',a,b(\Omega)} = \|\psi\|_{\sharp',a,b;t_0,s_0(\Omega)}$.

- The weighted Hölder norms: Given $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, we set

$$(1.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{H}\|_{\sharp,a+2,b;\sigma} &= \left\| \mu_0^{-b} \left\{ (1 + |\bar{y}|^{a+2}) \left| W_{1,0}^{p-1} \mathcal{H} \right| (\bar{y}, t) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + (1 + |\bar{y}|^{a+2+\sigma}) \left[W_{1,0}^{p-1} \mathcal{H} \right]_{C_{\mathbb{R}^N}^\sigma} (\bar{y}, t) + (1 + |\bar{y}|^{a+2-\sigma}) \left[W_{1,0}^{p-1} \mathcal{H} \right]_{C_t^{\sigma/2}} (\bar{y}, t) \right\} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \times [t_0, \infty))} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(1.19) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\psi\|_{\sharp',a,b;\sigma(\Omega)} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^2 \left\| \mu_0^{-b} \left\{ (1 + |\bar{y}|^{a+\ell}) \left| \nabla_{\bar{y}}^\ell \psi(\bar{y}, t) \right| + (1 + |\bar{y}|^{a+\ell+\sigma}) \left[\nabla_{\bar{y}}^\ell \psi \right]_{C_\Omega^\sigma} (\bar{y}, t) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + (1 + |\bar{y}|^{a+\ell-\sigma}) \left[\nabla_{\bar{y}}^\ell \psi \right]_{C_t^{\sigma/2}} (\bar{y}, t) \right\} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \times [t_0, \infty))} \\ &+ \left\| \mu_0^{-b} \left\{ (1 + |\bar{y}|^{a-2}) |\psi_t(\bar{y}, t)| + (1 + |\bar{y}|^{a-2+\sigma}) [\psi_t]_{C_\Omega^\sigma} (\bar{y}, t) + (1 + |\bar{y}|^{a-2-\sigma}) [\psi_t]_{C_t^{\sigma/2}} (\bar{y}, t) \right\} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \times [t_0, \infty))}. \end{aligned}$$

2. CONSTRUCTION OF APPROXIMATE SOLUTIONS

From Section 2 to Section 5, we will concern the proof of Theorem 1.1, which asserts the existence of solutions to (1.6) blowing-up at a single point $z_0 \in M$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. During the proof, we will consider the equation

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} pu^{p-1}u_t = \frac{N+2}{4}(L_{g_0,h}u + \kappa_N u^p) & \text{on } M \times (t_0, \infty), \\ u > 0 & \text{on } M \times (t_0, \infty), \\ u(\cdot, t_0) = u_0 > 0 & \text{on } M \end{cases}$$

for $t_0 > 0$ large enough. Clearly, a time translation $u(\cdot - t_0)$ of a solution u to (2.1) solves (1.6).

In this section, we construct approximate solutions through two stages.

In Subsection 2.1, we define the first approximate solution which resembles to a bubble near z_0 and to the Green's function G of the perturbed conformal Laplacian $L_{g_0,h}$ away from z_0 .

In Subsection 2.2, we refine the first approximate solutions in a small neighborhood of z_0 , by attaching solutions of certain linearized equations to the approximate solutions. In order to make the linearized equations solvable, we choose the main order of the dilation factor $\mu(t) > 0$ suitably.

2.1. First approximate solutions. Throughout the paper, we always assume that $N \geq 5$.

Let G be the Green's function of $L_{g_0,h}$, i.e.,

$$(2.2) \quad -L_{g_0,h}G(z, z_0) = \delta_{z_0}(z) \quad \text{on } M$$

where δ_{z_0} is the Dirac measure supported at $z_0 \in M$.

Given a pair of parameters $(\mu, \xi) = (\mu(t), \xi(t))$, we are going to define the first approximate solution $u_{\mu, \xi}^{(1)}$ to (1.6).

EXPRESSION OF $\mu(t)$: Let

$$(2.3) \quad Z_{N+1}(y) = y \cdot \nabla W_{1,0}(y) + \frac{N-2}{2}W_{1,0}(y) = \alpha_N \left(\frac{N-2}{2} \right) \frac{1 - |y|^2}{(1 + |y|^2)^{\frac{N}{2}}} \quad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R}^N$$

and positive numbers

$$(2.4) \quad c_1 = p \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} W_{1,0}^{p-1} Z_{N+1}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad c_2 = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} W_{1,0} Z_{N+1}.$$

Reminding the hypothesis that $h(z_0) > 0$, we set

$$(2.5) \quad d_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{h(z_0)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_0(t) = \sqrt{\frac{2c_1}{(N+2)c_2 t}} \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0, \infty)$$

where $t_0 > 0$ is a sufficiently large number. Then we assume that $\mu(t)$ has the form

$$(2.6) \quad \mu(t) = d_0 \mu_0(t) + \lambda(t) =: \bar{\mu}(t) + \lambda(t) \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0, \infty)$$

where $\lambda(t)$ is a higher-order term.

EXPRESSION OF $\lambda(t)$ AND $\xi(t)$: The parameters $\lambda(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ as well as $\xi(t) = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N)(t) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ will be determined in Subsection 5.2. Until then, we assume that

$$(2.7) \quad \|\lambda\|_{\nu_1; \sigma_0} + \|\dot{\lambda}\|_{\nu_1+2; \sigma_0} + \|\xi\|_{\nu_2; \sigma_0} + \|\dot{\xi}\|_{\nu_2+2; \sigma_0} \leq C$$

where $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = 2 - \varepsilon_0$ for some small numbers $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $\sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$; refer to (1.13) for the definition of the norms.

EXPRESSION OF APPROXIMATE SOLUTIONS: From now on, we will often identify points $z \in B_{g_0}(z_0, 2\delta_0)$ and $x = \exp_{z_0}^{-1}(z) \in B^N(0, 2\delta_0)$ via g_0 -normal coordinates centered at z_0 . Given a pair (μ, ξ) satisfying (2.5)–(2.7), we define

$$(2.8) \quad u_{\mu, \xi}^{(1)}(z, t) = \gamma_N^{-1} \kappa_N G(z, z_0) v_{\mu, \xi}^{(1)}(z, t) \quad \text{on } M \times [t_0, \infty)$$

where

$$(2.9) \quad v_{\mu, \xi}^{(1)}(z, t) = \begin{cases} |x|^{N-2} \mu^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} W_{1,0}(\mu^{-1}(x - \xi)) & \text{if } |x| = d_{g_0}(z, z_0) \leq \delta_0, \\ \alpha_N \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \left[1 + \eta_{\delta_0}(x) \left\{ \frac{|x|^{N-2}}{(\mu^2 + |x - \xi|^2)^{(N-2)/2}} - 1 \right\} \right] & \text{if } \delta_0 < |x| = d_{g_0}(z, z_0) \leq 2\delta_0, \\ \alpha_N \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}} & \text{if } d_{g_0}(z, z_0) > 2\delta_0. \end{cases}$$

Here, $\kappa_N, \alpha_N > 0$ are the numbers appearing in (1.2) and (1.4), and $\gamma_N := [(N-2)|\mathbb{S}^{N-1}|]^{-1}$.

Lemma 2.1. *The function $u_{\mu, \xi}^{(1)}$ is of class $C^{2+\sigma_0, 1+\sigma_0/2}(M \times [t_0, \infty))$. Moreover, it is positive on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$ provided $t_0 > 0$ large enough.*

Proof. Since $Y_h(M, g_0) > 0$, the principal $L^2(M)$ -eigenvalue of the operator $L_{g_0, h}$ is positive, and so $L_{g_0, h}$ satisfies the maximum principle on M . Therefore, the Green's function G of $L_{g_0, h}$ is uniquely determined and positive on M . From this fact and (2.5)–(2.7), we deduce the assertion. \square

We remark that the definition of $u_{\mu, \xi}^{(1)}$ is motivated by Schoen [43].

By slightly modifying the proof of [33, Lemma 6.4] and taking δ_0 smaller if needed, we see

$$\gamma_N^{-1} \kappa_N |x|^{N-2} G(z, z_0) = 1 + \sum_{\ell=2}^{N-3} P_\ell(x) + c|x|^{N-2} \log |x| + O(|x|^{N-2})$$

for $z = \exp_{g_0}(x) \in B_{g_0}(z_0, \delta_0)$ where P_ℓ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree ℓ , and c is a number that is zero for N odd.

Lemma 2.2. *It holds that*

$$(2.10) \quad P_2(x) = \hat{c}_1 R_{ij}(z_0) x_i x_j + \hat{c}_2 S(z_0) |x|^2 + \hat{c}_3 h(z_0) |x|^2$$

where

$$(2.11) \quad \hat{c}_1 := \frac{1}{12}, \quad \hat{c}_2 := -\frac{1}{24(N-1)}, \quad \hat{c}_3 := -\frac{N-2}{8(N-1)(N-4)},$$

$R_{ij}(z_0)$ is a component of the Ricci curvature tensor at z_0 on (M, g_0) , and $S(z_0)$ is the scalar curvature at z_0 on (M, g_0) .

Proof. We continue to identify two points $z \in B_{g_0}(z_0, 2\delta_0)$ and $x = \exp_{z_0}^{-1}(z) \in B^N(0, 2\delta_0)$. It is well-known that

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{cases} \sqrt{|g_0|}(x) = 1 - \frac{1}{6} R_{ij}(z_0) x_i x_j + \sqrt{|g_0|}_{[3]}(x), \\ g_0^{ij}(x) = \delta_{ij} + \frac{1}{3} R_{iqjr}(z_0) x_q x_r + (g_0^{ij})_{[3]}(x) \end{cases}$$

where

- $R_{iqjr}(z_0)$ is a component of the Riemannian curvature tensor at z_0 on (M, g_0) ;
- $\sqrt{|g_0|}_{[3]}$ and $(g_0^{ij})_{[3]}$ are the remainder terms in the Taylor expansions of $\sqrt{|g_0|}$ and g_0^{ij} , respectively, defined by (1.11).

We set

$$(2.13) \quad P(x) = \gamma_N^{-1} \kappa_N |x|^{N-2} G(x, z_0) - 1 \quad \text{for } x \in B^N(0, 2\delta_0)$$

and write $P_2(x) = c_{ij} x_i x_j$ for some $c_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ so that

$$(2.14) \quad P(x) = c_{ij} x_i x_j + P_{[3]}(x) = c_{ij} x_i x_j + O(|x|^3).$$

Since $\gamma_N \Delta |x|^{2-N} = L_{g_0, h} G(z, z_0) = \delta_{z_0}(z)$, it holds that

$$(2.15) \quad |x|^2 \Delta P - 2(N-2) x_i \partial_i P + |x|^N (\Delta_{g_0} - \Delta) \{ (1+P) |x|^{2-N} \} - \kappa_N^{-1} |x|^2 (S+h)(1+P) = 0.$$

Putting (2.12) and (2.14) into (2.15), we obtain

$$-4(N-2) c_{ij} x_i x_j + 2 \sum_{i=1}^N c_{ii} |x|^2 + \frac{N-2}{3} R_{ij}(z_0) x_i x_j - \kappa_N^{-1} (S(z_0) + h(z_0)) |x|^2 = O(|x|^3).$$

Solving this identity, we deduce (2.10). \square

Define the error $\mathcal{S}(u)$ of a positive function u on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$ as

$$\mathcal{S}(u) = -p u^{p-1} u_t + \frac{N+2}{4} (L_{g_0, h} u + \kappa_N u^p)$$

where $p = \frac{N+2}{N-2}$. In the next lemmas, we compute the error of the first approximate solution $u_{\mu, \xi}^{(1)}$.

Lemma 2.3. For $z = \exp_{z_0}(x) = \exp_{z_0}(\mu y + \xi) \in B_{g_0}(z_0, \delta_0)$ and $t \in [t_0, \infty)$,

$$(2.16) \quad \mu^{\frac{N+2}{2}} \mathcal{S} \left(u_{\mu, \xi}^{(1)} \right) (y, t) = \mathcal{E}_0[\mu](y, t) + \mathcal{E}_1[\mu, \xi](y, t).$$

Here,

$$(2.17) \quad \mathcal{E}_0[\mu](y, t) := \mu^{-1} \dot{\mu} \left(p W_{1,0}^{p-1} Z_{N+1} \right) (y) + \mu^2 \mathcal{F}_0(y)$$

and

$$(2.18) \quad \mathcal{E}_1[\mu, \xi](y, t) := \mu^{-1} \dot{\xi} \cdot \left(p W_{1,0}^{p-1} \nabla W_{1,0} \right) (y) + \mathcal{F}_1[\mu, \xi](y, t) \\ + \mu^3 a^{\{1\}} + \mu^{\nu_2+2} a^{\{2\}} + \mu \dot{\mu} a^{\{0\}} + \mu \dot{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{a}^{\{-1\}}$$

where

$$(2.19) \quad \mathcal{F}_0(y) := \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \left[\{ (2\hat{c}_1 + 2N\hat{c}_2 - \kappa_N^{-1}) S(z_0) + (2N\hat{c}_3 - \kappa_N^{-1}) h(z_0) \} W_{1,0}(y) \right. \\ \left. + 4 \{ \hat{c}_2 S(z_0) + \hat{c}_3 h(z_0) \} y_j \partial_j W_{1,0}(y) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{4}{N-2} \{ \hat{c}_1 R_{ij}(z_0) y_i y_j + \hat{c}_2 S(z_0) |y|^2 + \hat{c}_3 h(z_0) |y|^2 \} W_{1,0}^p(y) \right],$$

$$(2.20) \quad \mathcal{F}_1[\mu, \xi](y, t) := (N+2)\kappa_N \mu \left[\{ \hat{c}_2 S(z_0) + \hat{c}_3 h(z_0) \} \xi_j \partial_j W_{1,0}(y) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{2}{N-2} \{ \hat{c}_1 R_{ij}(z_0) y_i \xi_j + \hat{c}_2 S(z_0) y_i \xi_i + \hat{c}_3 h(z_0) y_i \xi_i \} W_{1,0}^p(y) \right],$$

and \hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2 , and \hat{c}_3 are constants defined in (2.11). Furthermore, $a^{\{\gamma\}} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{a}^{\{\gamma\}} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ are C^1 functions of $(y, \mu, \mu^{-1}\xi)$ such that

$$(2.21) \quad \sum_{\ell=0}^1 \left(1 + |y|^{N-\gamma+\ell} \right) \left(\left| \nabla_y^\ell a^{\{\gamma\}} \right| + \left| \nabla_y^\ell \mathbf{a}^{\{\gamma\}} \right| \right) + \mu_0^{-2} (1 + |y|^{N-\gamma}) \left(\left| \partial_t a^{\{\gamma\}} \right| + \left| \partial_t \mathbf{a}^{\{\gamma\}} \right| \right)$$

is uniformly bounded.

Proof. We recall the functions P , $W_{\mu,\xi}$, and P_2 given in (2.13), (1.7), and (2.10), respectively.

Let us write $u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} = (1 + P)W_{\mu,\xi}$ on $B_{g_0}(z_0, \delta_0) \times [t_0, \infty)$. Then

$$(2.22) \quad \mathcal{S} \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} \right) = -p(1 + P)^p \partial_t W_{\mu,\xi} + \frac{N+2}{4} [\kappa_N \Delta_{g_0} ((1 + P)W_{\mu,\xi}) \\ + \kappa_N (1 + P)^p W_{\mu,\xi}^p - (S + h)(1 + P)W_{\mu,\xi}]$$

in the (x, t) -variable. Also, thanks to (2.6)–(2.7), we see

$$(2.23) \quad -p(1 + P)^p \partial_t W_{\mu,\xi} \\ = p\mu^{-\frac{N+4}{2}} W_{1,0}^{p-1}(y) \left[\dot{\mu} Z_{N+1}(y) + \dot{\xi} \cdot \nabla W_{1,0}(y) \right] + \mu^{-\frac{N}{2}} \dot{\mu} a^{\{0\}} + \mu^{-\frac{N}{2}} \dot{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{a}^{\{-1\}}.$$

Setting

$$\mathcal{R} = \left[\kappa_N \Delta_{g_0} ((1 + P)W_{\mu,\xi}) + \kappa_N (1 + P)^p W_{\mu,\xi}^p - (S + h)(1 + P)W_{\mu,\xi} \right] \\ - [\kappa_N (\Delta P_2) W_{\mu,\xi} + 2\kappa_N \nabla P_2 \cdot \nabla W_{\mu,\xi} - (S + h)(z_0) W_{\mu,\xi} \\ - \frac{\kappa_N}{3} R_{ij}(z_0) x_i \partial_j W_{\mu,\xi} + \kappa_N (p - 1) P_2^p W_{\mu,\xi}^p],$$

we claim that

$$(2.24) \quad \mu^{\frac{N+2}{2}} \mathcal{R}(y, t) = \mu^3 a^{\{1\}} + \mu^{\nu_2+2} a^{\{2\}}.$$

By (1.8), it holds that

$$(2.25) \quad \mathcal{R} = \kappa_N (\Delta_{g_0} P - \Delta P_2) W_{\mu,\xi} + 2\kappa_N \left(\langle \nabla_{g_0} P, \nabla_{g_0} W_{\mu,\xi} \rangle_{g_0} - \nabla P_2 \cdot \nabla W_{\mu,\xi} \right) \\ - [(S + h)(1 + P) - (S + h)(z_0)] W_{\mu,\xi} \\ + \kappa_N \left[(1 + P)(\Delta_{g_0} - \Delta) W_{\mu,\xi} + \frac{1}{3} R_{ij}(z_0) x_i \partial_j W_{\mu,\xi} \right] \\ + \kappa_N [(1 + P)^p - (1 + P) - (p - 1) P_2] W_{\mu,\xi}^p.$$

From this, we readily deduce that (2.24) holds for $|y| \leq 1$. Suppose that $|y| \geq 1$. Putting (1.4), (1.7), and the estimate

$$[(1 + P)^p - (1 + P) - (p - 1) P_2] W_{\mu,\xi}^p = \mu^{-\frac{N-4}{2}} a^{\{1\}}$$

into (2.25) yields

$$\left(\alpha_N \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \right)^{-1} \mathcal{R} = \kappa_N (\Delta_{g_0} P - \Delta P_2) |x|^{2-N} + 2\kappa_N \left(\langle \nabla_{g_0} P, \nabla_{g_0} |x|^{2-N} \rangle_{g_0} - \nabla P_2 \cdot \nabla |x|^{2-N} \right) \\ - [(S + h)(1 + P) - (S + h)(z_0)] |x|^{2-N} \\ + \kappa_N \left[(1 + P)(\Delta_{g_0} - \Delta) |x|^{2-N} + \frac{1}{3} R_{ij}(z_0) x_i \partial_j |x|^{2-N} \right] \\ + \mu^{-(N-3)} a^{\{1\}} + \mu^{-(N-2)+\nu_2} a^{\{2\}}.$$

Then (2.15) and (2.10)–(2.11) imply

$$\mu^{\frac{N+2}{2}} \mathcal{R}(y, t) = -\mu^N \alpha_N [\kappa_N \Delta P_2 |x|^{2-N} + 2\kappa_N \nabla P_2 \cdot \nabla |x|^{2-N} - (S + h)(z_0) |x|^{2-N} \\ + \frac{(N-2)\kappa_N}{3} R_{ij}(z_0) x_i x_j |x|^{2-N}] + \mu^3 a^{\{1\}} + \mu^{\nu_2+2} a^{\{2\}} \\ = -\mu^N \alpha_N \kappa_N \underbrace{[2\hat{c}_1 + 2N\hat{c}_2 - 4(N-2)\hat{c}_2 - \kappa_N^{-1}]}_{=0} S(z_0) |x|^{2-N}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\mu^N \alpha_N \kappa_N \underbrace{[2N\hat{c}_3 - 4(N-2)\hat{c}_3 - \kappa_N^{-1}]}_{=0} h(z_0) |x|^{2-N} + \mu^3 a^{\{1\}} + \mu^{\nu_2+2} a^{\{2\}} \\
& = \mu^3 a^{\{1\}} + \mu^{\nu_2+2} a^{\{2\}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We note that the term involving $R_{ij}(z_0)x_i x_j |x|^{-N}$ vanished here, because its coefficient is a multiple of $4\hat{c}_1 - \frac{1}{3} = 0$. Therefore, the assertion (2.24) is true.

Now, by applying (2.10) once more, we derive

$$(\Delta P_2)W_{\mu,\xi} = \mu^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} [(2\hat{c}_1 + 2N\hat{c}_2)S(z_0) + 2N\hat{c}_3 h(z_0)] W_{1,0}(y)$$

and

$$\nabla P_2 \cdot \nabla W_{\mu,\xi} = 2\mu^{-\frac{N}{2}} [\hat{c}_1 R_{ij}(z_0)(\mu y_i + \xi_i) + (\hat{c}_2 S(z_0) + \hat{c}_3 h(z_0))(\mu y_j + \xi_j)] \partial_j W_{1,0}(y).$$

Accordingly,

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.26) \quad & \Delta_{g_0}((1+P)W_{\mu,\xi}) + (1+P)^p W_{\mu,\xi}^p - \kappa_N^{-1}(S+h)(1+P)W_{\mu,\xi} \\
& = (\Delta P_2)W_{\mu,\xi} + 2\nabla P_2 \cdot \nabla W_{\mu,\xi} - \kappa_N^{-1}(S+h)(z_0)W_{\mu,\xi} - \frac{1}{3}R_{ij}(z_0)x_i \partial_j W_{\mu,\xi} + (p-1)P_2 W_{\mu,\xi}^p \\
& \quad + \mu^{-\frac{N-4}{2}} a^{\{1\}} + \mu^{\nu_2-\frac{N-2}{2}} a^{\{2\}} \\
& = \mu^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} [(2\hat{c}_1 + 2N\hat{c}_2 - \kappa_N^{-1})S(z_0) + (2N\hat{c}_3 - \kappa_N^{-1})h(z_0)] W_{1,0}(y) \\
& \quad + \mu^{-\frac{N}{2}} [4(\hat{c}_2 S(z_0) + \hat{c}_3 h(z_0))(\mu y_j + \xi_j)] \partial_j W_{1,0}(y) \\
& \quad + \mu^{-\frac{N+2}{2}} \left(\frac{4}{N-2} \right) \{ \hat{c}_1 R_{ij}(z_0)(\mu y_i + \xi_i)(\mu y_j + \xi_j) + (\hat{c}_2 S(z_0) + \hat{c}_3 h(z_0)) |\mu y + \xi|^2 \} W_{1,0}^p(y) \\
& \quad + \mu^{-\frac{N-4}{2}} a^{\{1\}} + \mu^{\nu_2-\frac{N-2}{2}} a^{\{2\}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging (2.23) and (2.26) into (2.22), we establish the desired estimate (2.16). \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, 1)$ be a small number. It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.27) \quad & \left[1 - \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(d_{g_0}(z, z_0)) \right] \mathcal{S} \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} \right) (z, t) \\
& = \mu^{\frac{N}{2}-\zeta_1\varepsilon_1} \dot{\mu} b_1(z, t) + \mu^{\frac{N+2}{2}-\zeta_1\varepsilon_1} b_2(z, t) + \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}+\nu_2-\zeta_1\varepsilon_1} b_3(z, t)
\end{aligned}$$

for $(z, t) \in M \times [t_0, \infty)$. Here,

- $\eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}} = \eta_0(\mu_0^{-\varepsilon_1} \cdot)$ is the cut-off function introduced after (1.12);
- $\zeta_1 > 0$ is a number depending only on N , and $\nu_2 = 2 - \varepsilon_0$;
- b_1, b_2 , and b_3 are functions on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$ such that

$$(2.28) \quad \sum_{\ell=0}^1 \left\| \nabla_z^\ell b \right\|_{L^\infty(M \times [t_0, \infty))} + \sup_{(z,t) \in M \times [t_0, \infty)} \mu_0^{-2}(t) [b]_{C_t^{\sigma_0/2}}(z, t) \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta}$$

for $b = b_1, b_2$ and b_3 , where $C, \zeta > 0$ are constants depending only on (M, g_0) , N , h , and z_0 .

Proof. The proof is split into two steps.

STEP 1. We assume that $d_{g_0}(z, z_0) > 2\delta_0$. Because $L_{g_0,h}G(z, z_0) = 0$, we simply obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.29) \quad & \mathcal{S} \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} \right) = \mathcal{S} \left(\gamma_N^{-1} \kappa_N \alpha_N G(z, z_0) \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \right) \\
& = - \left(\frac{N+2}{2} \right) (\gamma_N^{-1} \kappa_N \alpha_N G(z, z_0))^p \mu^{\frac{N}{2}} \dot{\mu} + \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} (\gamma_N^{-1} \kappa_N \alpha_N G(z, z_0))^p \mu^{\frac{N+2}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \mu^{\frac{N}{2}-\zeta_1\varepsilon_1} \dot{\mu} b_1 + \mu^{\frac{N+2}{2}-\zeta_1\varepsilon_1} b_2.$$

By taking $b_3 = 0$, we get (2.27) for this case.

STEP 2. We assume that $\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1} \leq d_{g_0}(z, z_0) \leq 2\delta_0$. Let $\hat{b}_1, \hat{b}_2, \dots$ be functions satisfying (2.28) for $b = \hat{b}_1, \hat{b}_2, \dots$. Arguing as in (2.29), we find

$$\mathcal{S}\left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)}\right) = \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4\gamma_N} L_{g_0,h}\left(G(z, z_0) v_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)}\right) + \mu^{\frac{N}{2}-\zeta_1\varepsilon_1} \dot{\mu} \hat{b}_1 + \mu^{\frac{N+2}{2}-\zeta_1\varepsilon_1} \hat{b}_2.$$

Also, applying $L_{g_0,h} G(z, z_0) = 0$ once more, we see

$$L_{g_0,h}\left(G(z, z_0) v_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)}\right) = \kappa_N \left[2 \left\langle \nabla_{g_0} G(z, z_0), \nabla_{g_0} v_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} \right\rangle_{g_0} + G(z, z_0) \Delta_{g_0} v_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} \right].$$

On the other hand, we infer from (2.9) and the mean value theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i v_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)}(x, t) &= \alpha_N \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \left[\frac{\partial_i(\eta_{\delta_0}(x))}{(\mu^2 + |x - \xi|^2)^{(N-2)/2}} \left\{ |x|^{N-2} - (\mu^2 + |x - \xi|^2)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{(N-2)\eta_{\delta_0}(x)}{(\mu^2 + |x - \xi|^2)^{N/2}} \left\{ x_i |x|^{N-4} (\mu^2 - 2x \cdot \xi + |\xi|^2) + |x|^{N-2} \xi \right\} \right] \\ &= \mu^{\frac{N+2}{2}} \hat{b}_{3i} + \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}+\nu_2} \hat{b}_{4i} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\partial_{ij} v_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)}(x, t) = \mu^{\frac{N+2}{2}} \hat{b}_{3ij} + \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}+\nu_2} \hat{b}_{4ij}.$$

Consequently, by setting

$$b_1 = \left[1 - \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(d_{g_0}(\cdot, z_0)) \right] \hat{b}_1,$$

$$b_2 = \left[1 - \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(d_{g_0}(\cdot, z_0)) \right] \left[\hat{b}_2 + \kappa_N \left\{ 2g_0^{ij} \partial_i G(\cdot, z_0) + \left(\frac{\partial_i \sqrt{|g_0|}}{\sqrt{|g_0|}} g_0^{ij} + \partial_i g_0^{ij} \right) G(\cdot, z_0) \right\} \hat{b}_{3j} + \kappa_N g_0^{ij} G(\cdot, z_0) \hat{b}_{3ij} \right],$$

and so on, we deduce (2.27). Note that $\text{supp}(b_3) \subset B_{g_0}(z_0, 2\delta_0) \times [t_0, \infty)$. \square

2.2. Second approximation solutions. In this subsection, we refine the approximate solutions to reduce their errors in the ball $B_{g_0}(z, z_0)$ significantly. To this end, we introduce a linear equation

$$(2.30) \quad \Delta \Psi(\cdot, t) + pW_{1,0}^{p-1} \Psi(\cdot, t) = -\frac{4}{(N+2)\kappa_N} \mathcal{E}_0[\bar{\mu}](\cdot, t) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \quad \Psi(\cdot, t) \in \dot{W}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$$

for each $t \in [t_0, \infty)$, where $\bar{\mu}$ and $\mathcal{E}_0[\bar{\mu}]$ are given in (2.6) and (2.17), respectively.

By virtue of the definition of $\bar{\mu}$, we have

$$(2.31) \quad \bar{\mu}^{-1} \dot{\bar{\mu}} = -\frac{(N+2)c_2}{4c_1} h(z_0) \bar{\mu}^2 \quad \text{on } [t_0, \infty).$$

Hence the function $\bar{\mu}^{-2} \mathcal{E}_0[\bar{\mu}]$ is independent of t , and a solution Ψ to (2.30) is decomposed into $\Psi(y, t) = \bar{\mu}^2(t) Q(y)$ on $\mathbb{R}^N \times [t_0, \infty)$ where Q satisfies

$$(2.32) \quad \Delta Q + pW_{1,0}^{p-1} Q = -\frac{4}{(N+2)\kappa_N} (\bar{\mu}^{-2} \mathcal{E}_0[\bar{\mu}]) (y) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \quad Q \in \dot{W}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

From (2.17) and (2.19), we immediately see that $(\bar{\mu}^{-2} \mathcal{E}_0[\bar{\mu}]) (y) = O(|y|^{2-N})$ for $|y|$ large. In fact, as we shall see in the next lemma, a remarkable cancellation among the terms of \mathcal{F}_0 occurs, so we actually have a better decay estimate for $\bar{\mu}^{-2} \mathcal{E}_0[\bar{\mu}]$. This observation turns out to be essential in constructing the refined approximate solution with sufficiently small error.

Lemma 2.5. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on (M, g_0) , N , h , and z_0 such that*

$$(2.33) \quad |(\bar{\mu}^{-2} \mathcal{E}_0[\bar{\mu}]) (y)| \leq \frac{C}{1 + |y|^N} \quad \text{for } (y, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [t_0, \infty).$$

Proof. A direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\alpha_N \hat{c}_2} [(2\hat{c}_1 + 2N\hat{c}_2 - \kappa_N^{-1}) W_{1,0}(y) + 4\hat{c}_2 y_j \partial_j W_{1,0}(y)] \\ = \frac{1}{\alpha_N \hat{c}_3} [(2N\hat{c}_3 - \kappa_N^{-1}) W_{1,0}(y) + 4\hat{c}_3 y_j \partial_j W_{1,0}(y)] = \frac{4(N-2)}{(1+|y|^2)^{\frac{N}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

In light of (2.17), (2.19), (2.31), and the above identity, we obtain (2.33). \square

Lemma 2.6. *Equation (2.32) has a solution.*

Proof. It is well-known that the space of all bounded solutions to

$$L_0[\Psi] := W_{1,0}^{1-p} \left(\Delta \Psi + p W_{1,0}^{p-1} \Psi \right) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N$$

is spanned by the function Z_{N+1} in (2.3) and

$$(2.34) \quad Z_i(y) := \partial_i W_{1,0}(y) = -(N-2)\alpha_N \frac{y_i}{(1+|y|^2)^{\frac{N}{2}}} \quad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ and } i = 1, \dots, N.$$

This fact, (2.33), the dimensional assumption $N \geq 5$, and the Fredholm alternative imply that (2.32) is solvable if and only if

$$(2.35) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\bar{\mu}^{-2} \mathcal{E}_0[\bar{\mu}]) (y) Z_n(y) dy = 0$$

for $n = 1, \dots, N+1$.

By parity, (2.35) holds automatically for $n = 1, \dots, N$. Besides, setting

$$c_3 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (y \cdot \nabla W_{1,0}(y)) Z_{N+1}(y) dy \quad \text{and} \quad c_4 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |y|^2 \left(W_{1,0}^p Z_{N+1} \right) (y) dy,$$

we deduce from (2.17), (2.19), (2.4), (2.11), and (2.31) that

$$\begin{aligned} (2.36) \quad & \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mathcal{E}_0[\bar{\mu}](y, t) Z_{N+1}(y) dy \\ &= c_1 \bar{\mu}^{-1} \dot{\bar{\mu}} + \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \underbrace{\left[-(2N\hat{c}_3 - \kappa_N^{-1})c_2 + 4\hat{c}_3 c_3 + \frac{4}{N-2} \hat{c}_3 c_4 \right]}_{=\kappa_N^{-1} c_2} h(z_0) \bar{\mu}^2 \\ &+ \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \underbrace{\left[-(2\hat{c}_1 + 2N\hat{c}_2 - \kappa_N^{-1})c_2 + \left(\frac{4\hat{c}_1}{N} + 4\hat{c}_2 - \frac{1}{3N} \right) c_3 + \frac{4}{N-2} \left(\frac{\hat{c}_1}{N} + \hat{c}_2 \right) c_4 \right]}_{=0} S(z_0) \bar{\mu}^2 \\ &= c_1 \bar{\mu}^{-1} \dot{\bar{\mu}} + \frac{(N+2)c_2}{4} h(z_0) \bar{\mu}^2 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (2.32) is solvable. \square

Lemma 2.7. *There is a constant $C > 0$ depending on Q such that*

$$(2.37) \quad \left| \nabla_y^\ell Q(y) \right| \leq \frac{C \log(2+|y|)}{|y|^{N-2+\ell}} \quad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ and } \ell = 0, 1, 2, 3.$$

Proof. By employing the rescaling argument with the condition $Q \in \dot{W}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, we obtain

$$|Q(y)| \leq \frac{C}{1+|y|^{\frac{N-2}{2}}} \quad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Then, having (2.33) in hand, we apply the comparison principle to (2.32) repeatedly, which produces

$$(2.38) \quad |Q(y)| \leq \frac{C}{1+|y|^{N-2-\varepsilon}} \quad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R}^N$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is any small number. By (2.32), (2.33), and (2.38),

$$\Delta Q(y) = -\frac{4}{(N+2)\kappa_N} (\bar{\mu}^{-2} \mathcal{E}_0[\bar{\mu}]) (y) - pW_{1,0}^{p-1} Q = O\left(\frac{1}{|y|^N}\right) \quad \text{for } |y| \geq 1.$$

Consequently, from the Green's representation formula for Q , we get

$$|Q(y)| \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|\Delta Q(\tilde{y})|}{|y - \tilde{y}|^{N-2}} d\tilde{y} \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|y - \tilde{y}|^{N-2}} \frac{d\tilde{y}}{1 + |\tilde{y}|^N} \leq \frac{C \log(2 + |y|)}{|y|^{N-2}} \quad \text{for } |y| \geq 1$$

where we estimate the second integral by decomposing the domain \mathbb{R}^N into

$$\overline{B^N(0, R_0)} \cup \overline{B^N(y, R_0)} \cup (\mathbb{R}^N \setminus (B^N(0, R_0) \cup B^N(y, R_0))) \quad \text{for } R_0 := \frac{|y|}{2}.$$

Therefore, (2.37) for $\ell = 0$ holds. The gradient estimate for Q , that is, (2.37) for $\ell = 1, 2, 3$ follows from elliptic regularity. \square

Let $\Psi_0 = \bar{\mu}^2 Q_0$ be the unique solution to (2.30) such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (Q_0 Z_n)(y) dy = 0 \quad \text{for } n = 1, \dots, N+1.$$

We now define the second (or, refined) approximate solution

$$(2.39) \quad u_{\mu, \xi}^{(2)}(z, t) = \gamma_N^{-1} \kappa_N G(z, z_0) v_{\mu, \xi}^{(2)}(z, t) \quad \text{on } M \times [t_0, \infty)$$

where

$$(2.40) \quad v_{\mu, \xi}^{(2)}(z, t) = \begin{cases} |x|^{N-2} \mu^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} [W_{1,0}(y) + \Psi_0(y, t)] & \text{if } d_{g_0}(z, z_0) \leq \delta_0, \\ \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \left[\alpha_N + \eta_{\delta_0}(x) \left\{ \alpha_N \left(\frac{|x|^{N-2}}{(\mu^2 + |x - \xi|^2)^{(N-2)/2}} - 1 \right) \right. \right. & \text{if } \delta_0 < d_{g_0}(z, z_0) \leq 2\delta_0, \\ \quad \left. \left. + \mu^{-(N-2)} |x|^{N-2} \Psi_0(y, t) \right\} \right] & \\ \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \alpha_N & \text{if } d_{g_0}(z, z_0) > 2\delta_0. \end{cases}$$

Here, $z = \exp_{z_0}(x) = \exp_{z_0}(\mu y + \xi)$ for $z \in B_{g_0}(z_0, 2\delta_0)$. By taking t_0 large, we see from (2.37) that $u_{\mu, \xi}^{(2)}$ is of class $C^{2+\sigma_0, 1+\sigma_0/2}(M \times [t_0, \infty))$ and positive on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$. The next lemmas measure its error.

Lemma 2.8. *It holds that*

$$(2.41) \quad \mu^{\frac{N+2}{2}} \mathcal{S} \left(u_{\mu, \xi}^{(2)} \right) (y, t) = \mathcal{E}_2[\mu, \xi](y, t)$$

for $y \in B^N(-\mu^{-1}\xi, \mu^{-1}\delta_0)$ and $t \in [t_0, \infty)$. Here,

$$(2.42) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_2[\mu, \xi](y, t) &:= \bar{\mu}^{-1} \left(\dot{\lambda} - \bar{\mu}^{-1} \dot{\mu} \lambda \right) \left(pW_{1,0}^{p-1} Z_{N+1} \right) (y) + \mu^{-1} \dot{\xi} \cdot \left(pW_{1,0}^{p-1} \nabla W_{1,0} \right) (y) + 2\bar{\mu} \lambda \mathcal{F}_0(y) \\ &+ \mathcal{F}_1[\mu, \xi](y, t) + \mu^3 a^{\{1\}} + \mu^{2\nu_1} a^{\{2\}} + \mu \dot{\mu} a^{\{0\}} + \mu^{\nu_1-2} \dot{\lambda} a^{\{-2\}} + \mu \dot{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{a}^{\{-1\}} \end{aligned}$$

where

- \mathcal{F}_0 , \mathcal{F}_1 , and P are the functions in (2.19), (2.20), and (2.13), respectively, and ν_1 and ν_2 are numbers in (2.7);
- $a^{\{\gamma\}} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{a}^{\{\gamma\}} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ are C^1 functions of $(y, \mu, \mu^{-1}\xi, \mu^{-1}\lambda)$ satisfying (2.21).

Proof. We see from (2.8)–(2.9), (2.39)–(2.40), (2.16), and (2.30) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu^{\frac{N+2}{2}} \mathcal{S} \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(2)} \right) &= \mu^{\frac{N+2}{2}} \mathcal{S} \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} + (1+P)\mu^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \Psi_0 \right) \\
 (2.43) \quad &= \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \left(\Delta_{g_0(x)} \Psi_0 + pW_{1,0}^{p-1} \Psi_0 \right) + \mu^{\frac{N+2}{2}} \mathcal{S} \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} \right) + \mathcal{A}(\Psi_0) \\
 &= \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \left(\Delta_{g_0(x)} - \Delta \right) \Psi_0 + (\mathcal{E}_0[\mu] - \mathcal{E}_0[\bar{\mu}]) + \mathcal{E}_1[\mu, \xi] + \mathcal{A}(\Psi_0)
 \end{aligned}$$

in the (y, t) -variable. Here,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{A}(\Psi_0) &:= \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \left[(W_{1,0} + \Psi_0)^p - W_{1,0}^p - pW_{1,0}^{p-1} \Psi_0 \right] \\
 &\quad + p\mu^{-1} \dot{\mu} \left[(W_{1,0} + \Psi_0)^{p-1} \left\{ y \cdot \nabla(W_{1,0} + \Psi_0) + \frac{N-2}{2} (W_{1,0} + \Psi_0) \right\} - W_{1,0}^{p-1} Z_{N+1} \right] \\
 &\quad + p\mu^{-1} \dot{\xi} \cdot \left[(W_{1,0} + \Psi_0)^{p-1} \nabla(W_{1,0} + \Psi_0) - W_{1,0}^{p-1} \nabla W_{1,0} \right] + \mu^4 \log(2 + |y|) a^{\{2\}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

By Taylor's theorem and (2.37),

$$(2.44) \quad \mathcal{A}(\Psi_0) = \log(2 + |y|) \left[\mu^4 a^{\{2\}} + \mu \dot{\mu} a^{\{-2\}} + \mu \dot{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{a}^{\{-3\}} \right].$$

Also, in view of (2.7), (2.12), (2.37), it holds that

$$(2.45) \quad (\Delta_{g_0(x)} - \Delta) \Psi_0 = \mu^4 \log(2 + |y|) a^{\{2\}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.46) \quad \mathcal{E}_0[\mu] - \mathcal{E}_0[\bar{\mu}] &= \bar{\mu}^{-1} \left(\dot{\lambda} - \bar{\mu}^{-1} \dot{\mu} \lambda \right) \left(pW_{1,0}^{p-1} Z_{N+1} \right) (y) + 2\bar{\mu} \lambda \mathcal{F}_0(y) \\
 &\quad + \mu^{2\nu_1} a^{\{2\}} + \mu^{\nu_1-2} \dot{\lambda} a^{\{-2\}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Inserting (2.44)–(2.46) and (2.18) into (2.43), and then arranging the resulting terms, we deduce the desired equality (2.41). \square

Lemma 2.9. *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.47) \quad &\left[1 - \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(d_{g_0}(z, z_0)) \right] \mathcal{S} \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(2)} \right) (z, t) \\
 &= \mu^{\frac{N}{2} - \zeta_2 \varepsilon_1} \dot{\mu} b_4(z, t) + \mu^{\frac{N+2}{2} - \zeta_2 \varepsilon_1} b_5(z, t) + \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2} + \nu_2 - \zeta_2 \varepsilon_1} b_6(z, t)
 \end{aligned}$$

for $(z, t) \in M \times [t_0, \infty)$. Here,

- $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, 1)$ is the small number in Lemma 2.4, and $\eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}$ is the cut-off function introduced after (1.12);
- $\zeta_2 > 0$ is a number depending only on N , and $\nu_2 = 2 - \varepsilon_0$;
- b_4 , b_5 , and b_6 are functions on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$ such that (2.28) holds for $b = b_4$, b_5 , and b_6 .

Proof. If $d_{g_0}(z, z_0) > 2\delta_0$, then by (2.8), (2.39), and (2.29), we have

$$\mathcal{S} \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(2)} \right) = \mathcal{S} \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} \right) = \mu^{\frac{N}{2} - \zeta_1 \varepsilon_1} \dot{\mu} b_1 + \mu^{\frac{N+2}{2} - \zeta_1 \varepsilon_1} b_2.$$

Suppose that $\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1} \leq d_{g_0}(z, z_0) \leq 2\delta_0$. Setting

$$\tilde{u}_{\mu,\xi}^{(2)} = \gamma_N^{-1} \kappa_N G(z, z_0) \cdot \mu^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \bar{\mu}^2 \eta_{\delta_0}(x) |x|^{N-2} Q_0(y),$$

we write

$$(2.48) \quad \mathcal{S} \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(2)} \right) = \mathcal{S} \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} \right) + \frac{N+2}{4} L_{g_0, h} \tilde{u}_{\mu,\xi}^{(2)}$$

$$- \left\{ \partial_t \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} + \tilde{u}_{\mu,\xi}^{(2)} \right)^p - \partial_t \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} \right)^p \right\} + \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \left\{ \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} + \tilde{u}_{\mu,\xi}^{(2)} \right)^p - \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} \right)^p \right\}.$$

Let \hat{b}_5 , \hat{b}_6 , and \hat{b}_7 be functions satisfying (2.28). Applying (2.37), we argue as in Step 2 of the proof of Lemma 2.4. Then we obtain

$$(2.49) \quad L_{g_0,h} \tilde{u}_{\mu,\xi}^{(2)} = \mu^{\frac{N+2}{2}-\varepsilon_1\zeta_2} \hat{b}_5.$$

Also, we compute

$$(2.50) \quad \begin{aligned} & \partial_t \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} + \tilde{u}_{\mu,\xi}^{(2)} \right)^p - \partial_t \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} \right)^p \\ &= p \left[\left\{ \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} + \tilde{u}_{\mu,\xi}^{(2)} \right)^{p-1} - \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} \right)^{p-1} \right\} \partial_t u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} + \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} + \tilde{u}_{\mu,\xi}^{(2)} \right)^{p-1} \partial_t \tilde{u}_{\mu,\xi}^{(2)} \right] = \mu^{\frac{N+4}{2}-\varepsilon_1\zeta_2} \dot{\mu} \hat{b}_6 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(2.51) \quad \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} + \tilde{u}_{\mu,\xi}^{(2)} \right)^p - \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} \right)^p = \mu^{\frac{N+6}{2}-\varepsilon_1\zeta_2} \hat{b}_7.$$

By substituting (2.49)–(2.51), and (2.27) into (2.48), and then defining b_4 , b_5 , and b_6 suitably, we obtain (2.47). \square

3. INNER-OUTER GLUING PROCEDURE

For the sake of brevity, we write $u_{\mu,\xi} = u_{\mu,\xi}^{(2)}$ in the sequel.

In the rest of the paper, we construct a remainder term $\psi_{\mu,\xi}$ such that $u = u_{\mu,\xi} + \psi_{\mu,\xi}$ is a solution to (2.1). To this end, we apply the inner-outer gluing procedure as in [14]. It amounts to decomposing $\psi_{\mu,\xi}$ into two parts

$$(3.1) \quad \psi_{\mu,\xi} = \psi_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}} + \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(d_{g_0}(z, z_0)) \hat{\psi}_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{in}}(\exp_{z_0}^{-1}(z), t) \quad \text{on } M \times [t_0, \infty)$$

and determining $\psi_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}}$ and $\hat{\psi}_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{in}}$ by solving so-called outer and inner problems.

OUTER PROBLEM: Let $\psi_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}}$ be a function on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$ solving

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} pu_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1}(\psi_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}})_t &= \frac{N+2}{4} L_{g_0,h} \psi_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}} + \mathcal{W}_{\mu,\xi} \psi_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}} \\ &\quad + \left(1 - \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}\right) \mathcal{S}(u_{\mu,\xi}) + \mathcal{J}_1 \left[\hat{\psi}_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{in}} \right] + \mathcal{J}_2 \left[\psi_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}}, \hat{\psi}_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{in}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $L_{g_0,h}$ is the differential operator defined in (1.5),

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_1 \left[\hat{\psi}_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{in}} \right] &:= \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N p}{4} \left[u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} - \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} \right)^{p-1} \right] \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}} \hat{\psi}_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{in}} - p \left[u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} - \left(u_{\mu,\xi}^{(1)} \right)^{p-1} \right] \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}} \left(\hat{\psi}_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{in}} \right)_t \\ &\quad + \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \left[\left(\Delta_{g_0} \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}} \right) \hat{\psi}_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{in}} + 2 \left\langle \nabla_{g_0} \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}, \nabla_{g_0} \hat{\psi}_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{in}} \right\rangle_{g_0} \right] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_2 \left[\psi_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}}, \hat{\psi}_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{in}} \right] &:= \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \left[(u_{\mu,\xi} + \psi_{\mu,\xi})^p - u_{\mu,\xi}^p - pu_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} \psi_{\mu,\xi} \right] \\ &\quad - p \left[(u_{\mu,\xi} + \psi_{\mu,\xi})^{p-1} - u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} \right] \left[\left(1 - \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}/2} \right) (u_{\mu,\xi})_t + (\psi_{\mu,\xi})_t \right]. \end{aligned}$$

INNER PROBLEM: As before, we identify points $z \in B_{g_0}(z_0, \delta_0)$ and $x \in B^N(0, \delta_0)$ via g_0 -normal coordinates at $z_0 \in M$. Let $\hat{\psi}_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}}$ be a function on $B^N(0, 2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}) \times [t_0, \infty)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} p \left(u_{\mu, \xi}^{(1)} \right)^{p-1} \left(\hat{\psi}_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} \right)_t &= \frac{N+2}{4} \left[L_{g_0, h} \hat{\psi}_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} + \kappa_N p \left(u_{\mu, \xi}^{(1)} \right)^{p-1} \left(\hat{\psi}_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} + \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}} \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \mu^{-\frac{N+2}{2}} \mathcal{E}_2[\mu, \xi](\mu^{-1}(x - \xi), t) \\ &\quad - p \left[\left(u_{\mu, \xi} + \hat{\psi}_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} + \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}} \right)^{p-1} - u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1} \right] \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}/2}(u_{\mu, \xi})_t. \end{aligned}$$

We write $x = \bar{\mu}\bar{y} + \xi$ and define $\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}}$ by the relation

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\psi}_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}}(x, t) &= \gamma_N^{-1} \kappa_N |x|^{N-2} G(x, z_0) \cdot \bar{\mu}^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}}(\bar{\mu}^{-1}(x - \xi), t) \\ (3.5) \quad &= (1 + P(x)) \bar{\mu}^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}}(\bar{y}, t) \end{aligned}$$

for $(\bar{y}, t) \in B^N(-\bar{\mu}^{-1}\xi, 2\bar{\mu}^{-1}\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1})$ where P is the function in (2.13). Then $\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}}$ solves

$$\begin{aligned} p W_{1,0}^{p-1}(\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}})_t &= \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \left(\Delta \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} + p W_{1,0}^{p-1} \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} \right) \\ (3.6) \quad &+ \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} (1 + P)^{-p}(x) \mathcal{E}_2[\mu, \xi](y, t) + \mathcal{K}_1[\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}}] + \mathcal{K}_2[\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}}] \end{aligned}$$

in the (\bar{y}, t) -variable, where $y = \mu^{-1}\bar{\mu}\bar{y}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_1[\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}}] &:= \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N p}{4} [W_{1,0}^{p-1}(y) - W_{1,0}^{p-1}(\bar{y})] \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} - p [W_{1,0}^{p-1}(y) - W_{1,0}^{p-1}(\bar{y})] (\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}})_t \\ &\quad + p W_{1,0}^{p-1}(y) \left[\bar{\mu}^{-1} \bar{\mu} \left(\bar{y} \cdot \nabla \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} + \frac{N-2}{2} \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} \right) + \bar{\mu}^{-1} \xi \cdot \nabla \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} \right] \\ (3.7) \quad &+ \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \left[\left(\frac{\mu}{\bar{\mu}} \right)^2 (1 + P)^{1-p}(x) \Delta_{g_0(x)} \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} - \Delta \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} \right] - \frac{N+2}{4} \mu^2 (1 + P(x))(S + h)(x) \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} \\ &+ \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \left(\frac{\mu}{\bar{\mu}} \right)^2 (1 + P)^{-p}(x) \left[2\bar{\mu} g_0^{ij}(x) (\partial_{x_i} P)(x) \partial_j \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} + \bar{\mu}^2 (\Delta_{g_0} P)(x) \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_2[\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}}] &:= \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N p}{4} \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} (1 + P)^{-1}(x) W_{1,0}^{p-1}(y) \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}}(x, t) \\ (3.8) \quad &- p \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \left[\left\{ (W_{1,0} + \bar{\mu}^2 Q_0)(y) + \left(\frac{\mu}{\bar{\mu}} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} + (1 + P)^{-1}(x) \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}}(x, t) \right\}^{p-1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (W_{1,0} + \bar{\mu}^2 Q_0)^{p-1}(y) \right] \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}/2}(x) \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \left\{ \mu^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} (W_{1,0} + \bar{\mu}^2 Q_0)(y) \right\}_t. \end{aligned}$$

If $\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}}$ and $\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}}$ solve (3.2) and (3.6), respectively, then $u = u_{\mu, \xi} + \psi_{\mu, \xi}$ will satisfy (2.1) provided it is positive on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$. In Sections 4 and 5, we will look for solutions to (3.2) and (3.6) with appropriate choices of parameters (μ, ξ) and initial conditions u_0 , and verify that u is indeed positive.

4. OUTER PROBLEM

This section is devoted to the analysis of the outer problem (3.2).

In Subsections 4.1 and 4.2, we develop existence theory and a priori estimates on a solution to an associated inhomogeneous problem (4.1). The main technical point is to control the degenerate factor $u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1}$.

In Subsections 4.3 and 4.4, we apply the results for (4.1) and the contraction mapping theorem to derive the unique solvability of (3.2) as well as several a priori estimates on the solution.

4.1. Inhomogeneous problem associated to (3.2): Weighted H^2 estimate. In this subsection, we will prove the unique existence of a solution to the inhomogeneous problem

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{cases} pu_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1}\psi_t = \frac{N+2}{4}L_{g_0,h}\psi + \mathcal{W}_{\mu,\xi}\psi + u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1}f & \text{on } M \times (t_0, \infty), \\ \psi(\cdot, t_0) = \psi_0 & \text{on } M \end{cases}$$

in a weighted H^2 space by deriving a priori estimate for solutions. Here and after, we mean by a solution to (4.1) and other related equations a function that satisfies them in a weak sense.

We first establish the following version of a priori weighted H^2 estimate. Refer to Definition 1.7 for the definition of the norms.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that $Y_h(M, g_0) > 0$, $t_0 < s_0 - 1$, $\|f\|_{L_{t_0,s_0}^2} + \|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} < \infty$ and (2.5)–(2.7) hold. Then there is a constant $C > 0$ depending only on (M, g_0) , N , h , and z_0 such that every solution ψ to*

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{cases} pu_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1}\psi_t = \frac{N+2}{4}L_{g_0,h}\psi + \mathcal{W}_{\mu,\xi}\psi + u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1}f & \text{on } M \times (t_0, s_0), \\ \psi(\cdot, t_0) = \psi_0 & \text{on } M \end{cases}$$

satisfies

$$(4.3) \quad \|\psi\|_{H_{t_0,s_0}^2} \leq C \left(\|\psi\|_{L_{t_0,s_0}^2} + \|f\|_{L_{t_0,s_0}^2} + \|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \right)$$

provided $t_0 > 0$ is large enough.

Proof. The proof is inspired by that of [15, Lemma 3.2]. We will divide it into four steps.

Throughout the proof, we assume that C depends only on (M, g_0) , N , h , and z_0 , and in particular, is independent of s_0 .

STEP 1. We claim that

$$(4.4) \quad u_{\mu,\xi}^{-1}|(u_{\mu,\xi})_t| \leq C\mu_0^2.$$

If $z \in B_{g_0}(z_0, \delta_0)$, we infer from (2.39)–(2.40), (2.37), and (2.5)–(2.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\mu,\xi}^{-1}(u_{\mu,\xi})_t &= \frac{N-2}{2}\mu^{-1}\dot{\mu} + \left[\frac{1}{(1+|y|^2)^{\frac{N-2}{2}}} + \bar{\mu}^2 Q_0(y) \right]^{-1} \\ &\quad \times \left[\frac{(N-2)\mu^{-1}(\dot{\xi} \cdot y - \dot{\mu})}{(1+|y|^2)^{\frac{N}{2}}} + O(\mu_0^4)Q_0(y) + O(\mu_0) \left(\dot{\mu}y - \dot{\xi} \right) \cdot \nabla Q_0(y) \right] \\ &= O \left(\mu^{-1}\dot{\mu} + \frac{\mu^{-1}\dot{\xi}}{1+|y|} \right) = O(\mu_0^2) \end{aligned}$$

in the (y, t) -variable.

If $z \in B_{g_0}(z_0, 2\delta_0) \setminus \overline{B_{g_0}(z_0, \delta_0)}$, then

$$u_{\mu,\xi}^{-1}(u_{\mu,\xi})_t = \frac{N-2}{2}\mu^{-1}\dot{\mu} + O(\mu_0^2(\mu_0^2 \log \mu_0 + \delta_0^{-1}\mu_0^{\nu_2})) = O(\mu_0^2).$$

If $z \in M \setminus \overline{B_{g_0}(z_0, 2\delta_0)}$, then

$$u_{\mu,\xi}^{-1}(u_{\mu,\xi})_t = \frac{N-2}{2}\mu^{-1}\dot{\mu} = O(\mu_0^2).$$

Consequently, the claim follows.

STEP 2. Fixing any $t \in [t_0, s_0]$, we multiply (4.1) by ψ and integrate the resultant equality over M . Then we obtain

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{p}{2} \partial_t \int_M \psi^2 u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} dv_{g_0} - \frac{N+2}{4} \int_M \psi L_{g_0,h} \psi dv_{g_0} \\ = \int_M \mathcal{W}_{\mu,\xi} \psi^2 dv_{g_0} + \int_M f \psi u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} dv_{g_0} + \frac{p(p-1)}{2} \int_M \left[u_{\mu,\xi}^{-1}(u_{\mu,\xi})_t \right] \psi^2 u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} dv_{g_0}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, Hölder's inequality yields

$$\int_M \psi^2 u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} dv_{g_0} \leq C \left(\int_M u_{\mu,\xi}^{p+1} dv_{g_0} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p+1}} \left(\int_M |\psi|^{p+1} dv_{g_0} \right)^{\frac{2}{p+1}} \leq C \left(\int_M |\psi|^{p+1} dv_{g_0} \right)^{\frac{2}{p+1}}.$$

Hence, together with the condition $Y_h(M, g_0) > 0$ and the Sobolev inequality, we deduce

$$(4.6) \quad \int_M \psi^2 u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} dv_{g_0} \leq C \int_M (|\nabla_{g_0} \psi|_{g_0}^2 + \psi^2) dv_{g_0} \leq -C \int_M \psi L_{g_0,h} \psi dv_{g_0}.$$

Owing to (4.4), (4.6), the bound $|\mathcal{W}_{\mu,\xi}| \leq C u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1}$ on $M \times [t_0, s_0]$, and Hölder's inequality, we see from (4.5) that

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t \int_M \psi^2 u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} dv_{g_0} + \int_M (|\nabla_{g_0} \psi|_{g_0}^2 + \psi^2) dv_{g_0} \\ \leq C \left(\int_M \mathcal{W}_{\mu,\xi} \psi^2 dv_{g_0} + \int_M f \psi u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} dv_{g_0} + \mu_0^2(t) \int_M \psi^2 u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} dv_{g_0} \right) \\ \leq C \left(\|\psi(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(M)}^2 + \|f(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(M)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Given any $\tau \in (t_0, s_0 - 1]$, we set a function $\chi(t) = t - \tau \in [0, 1]$ for $t \in [\tau, \tau + 1]$. For such t ,

$$\partial_t \left(\chi(t) \int_M \psi^2 u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} dv_{g_0} \right) + \chi(t) \int_M (|\nabla_{g_0} \psi|_{g_0}^2 + \psi^2) dv_{g_0} \leq C \left(\|\psi(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(M)}^2 + \|f(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(M)}^2 \right)$$

by (4.7). Integrating it over $t \in [\tau, \tau + 1]$, we arrive at

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_M \left(\psi^2 u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} \right) (z, \tau + 1) dv_{g_0} + \iint_{M_\tau} \chi(t) (|\nabla_{g_0} \psi|_{g_0}^2 + \psi^2) dv_{g_0} dt \\ \leq C \left(\|\psi\|_{L^2(M_\tau)}^2 + \|f\|_{L^2(M_\tau)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

From (4.7), we also derive

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_M \left(\psi^2 u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} \right) (z, t_0 + 1) dv_{g_0} + \iint_{M_{t_0}} (|\nabla_{g_0} \psi|_{g_0}^2 + \psi^2) dv_{g_0} dt \\ \leq C \left(\|\psi\|_{L^2(M_{t_0})}^2 + \|f\|_{L^2(M_{t_0})}^2 + \|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

To get this inequality, we use the initial datum ψ_0 in (4.1) instead of introducing the cut-off function $\chi(t)$, and (4.6).

STEP 3. Fixing $t \in [t_0, s_0]$ again, we multiply (4.1) by ψ_t , integrate the result over M , and then apply Hölder's inequality and $|\partial_t \mathcal{W}_{\mu,\xi}| \leq C \mu_0^2 u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1}$ on $M \times [t_0, s_0]$. Then we observe

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \left[-\frac{N+2}{4} \int_M \psi L_{g_0,h} \psi dv_{g_0} - \int_M \mathcal{W}_{\mu,\xi} \psi^2 dv_{g_0} \right] + \|\psi_t\|_{L^2(M)}^2 \\ \leq C \left(\int_M |\partial_t \mathcal{W}_{\mu,\xi}| \psi^2 dv_{g_0} + \|f\|_{L^2(M)}^2 \right) \leq C \left(\mu_0^2(t) \|\psi\|_{L^2(M)}^2 + \|f\|_{L^2(M)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using $\chi^2(t)$ as a cut-off function and employing (4.8), we find

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \iint_{M_\tau} \chi^2(t) \psi_t^2 u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1} dv_{g_0} dt &\leq C \left[\int_M (\mathcal{W}_{\mu,\xi} \psi^2)(z, \tau+1) dv_{g_0} + \iint_{M_\tau} \chi(t) (|\nabla_{g_0} \psi|_{g_0}^2 + \psi^2) dv_{g_0} dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mu_0^2(t) \|\psi\|_{L^2(M_\tau)}^2 + \|f\|_{L^2(M_\tau)}^2 \right] \\ &\leq C \left(\|\psi\|_{L^2(M_\tau)}^2 + \|f\|_{L^2(M_\tau)}^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\tau \in (t_0, s_0 - 1]$. Furthermore, we have

$$(4.11) \quad \|\psi_t\|_{L^2(M_{t_0})}^2 \leq C \left(\|\psi\|_{L^2(M_{t_0})}^2 + \|f\|_{L^2(M_{t_0})}^2 + \|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \right)$$

as in (4.9).

STEP 4. Combining (4.8)–(4.11), using (4.6), and performing algebraic manipulations, we conclude that

$$\|\psi_t\|_{L_{t_0,s_0}^2} + \|\psi\|_{H_{t_0,s_0}^1} \leq C \left(\|\psi\|_{L_{t_0,s_0}^2} + \|f\|_{L_{t_0,s_0}^2} + \|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \right).$$

By (4.1) and the previous estimate,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{\mu,\xi}^{1-p} L_{g_0,h} \psi\|_{L_{t_0,s_0}^2} &\leq C \left(\|\psi_t\|_{L_{t_0,s_0}^2} + \|\psi\|_{L_{t_0,s_0}^2} + \|f\|_{L_{t_0,s_0}^2} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\|\psi\|_{L_{t_0,s_0}^2} + \|f\|_{L_{t_0,s_0}^2} + \|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Adding the above two estimates, we immediately obtain (4.3). \square

Next, we improve Lemma 4.1 by dropping the norm of ψ in the right-hand side of (4.3). We need some preliminary definitions.

Definition 4.2. Let Π be the inverse of the stereographic projection

$$\Pi(y) = \left(\frac{2y}{1+|y|^2}, -\frac{1-|y|^2}{1+|y|^2} \right) \in \mathbb{S}_n^N := \mathbb{S}^N \setminus \{(0, \dots, 0, 1)\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$$

for $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and $\Pi_* f : \mathbb{S}_n^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a weighted push-forward of a function $f : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$(\Pi_* f)(\tilde{y}) = \left(\frac{1+|y|^2}{2} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} f(y) \quad \text{for } \tilde{y} := \Pi(y) \in \mathbb{S}_n^N.$$

Lemma 4.3. Suppose that all the conditions of Lemma 4.1 hold, and $s_0 > \frac{3t_0}{2}$. Then there is a constant $C > 0$ depending only on (M, g_0) , N , h , and z_0 such that every solution ψ to (4.2) satisfies

$$(4.12) \quad \|\psi\|_{H_{t_0,s_0}^2} \leq C \left(\|f\|_{L_{t_0,s_0}^2} + \|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \right)$$

provided $t_0 > 0$ is large enough.

Proof. Thanks to (4.3), it suffices to show that

$$(4.13) \quad \|\psi\|_{L_{t_0,s_0}^2} \leq C \left(\|f\|_{L_{t_0,s_0}^2} + \|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \right).$$

Throughout the proof, we assume that $C > 0$ depends only on (M, g_0) , N , h , and z_0 .

STEP 1. To establish (4.13), we argue by contradiction. Suppose that there are increasing sequences $\{t_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\{s_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ of positive numbers such that

$$(4.14) \quad s_\ell > \frac{3t_\ell}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad t_\ell, s_\ell \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } \ell \rightarrow \infty,$$

sequences $\{\mu_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\xi_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ of parameters satisfying (2.5)–(2.7), and sequences $\{\psi_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\{f_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\{\psi_{0\ell}\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ of functions which satisfy

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{cases} pu_{\mu_\ell, \xi_\ell}^{p-1}(\psi_\ell)_t = \frac{N+2}{4} L_{g_0, h} \psi_\ell + \mathcal{W}_{\mu_\ell, \xi_\ell} \psi_\ell + u_{\mu_\ell, \xi_\ell}^{p-1} f_\ell & \text{on } M \times (t_\ell, s_\ell), \\ \psi_\ell(\cdot, t_\ell) = \psi_{0\ell} & \text{on } M \end{cases}$$

and

$$(4.16) \quad \|\psi_\ell\|_{L_{t_\ell, s_\ell}^2} = 1, \quad \|f_\ell\|_{L_{t_\ell, s_\ell}^2} + \|\psi_{0\ell}\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \ell \rightarrow \infty.$$

There exists $\tau_\ell \in [t_\ell, s_\ell - 1]$ such that

$$(4.17) \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq \iint_{M_{\tau_\ell}} \psi_\ell^2 u_{\mu_\ell, \xi_\ell}^{p-1} dv_{g_0} dt \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\psi_\ell\|_{H_{t_\ell, s_\ell}^1} \leq C$$

where the latter inequality is valid by virtue of Lemma 4.1. By passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that $\{\tau_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ is increasing.

The main assertion of this step is

$$(4.18) \quad \liminf_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} (\tau_\ell - t_\ell) = \infty.$$

Let us prove it. We define

$$\Psi_\ell(\tau) := \int_M \left(\psi_\ell^2 u_{\mu_\ell, \xi_\ell}^{p-1} \right) (\cdot, \tau) dv_{g_0} \quad \text{for } \tau \in [t_\ell, s_\ell - 1].$$

If we integrate (4.7) over $s \in [t_\ell, \tau]$, we find

$$\Psi_\ell(\tau) \leq C \left[\int_{t_\ell}^\tau \Psi_\ell(s) ds + (\tau - t_\ell + 1) \left(\|f_\ell\|_{L_{t_\ell, s_\ell}^2}^2 + \|\psi_{0\ell}\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \right) \right].$$

By Grönwall's inequality and (4.16), it follows that

$$\Psi_\ell(\tau) \leq o(1) \cdot (\tau - t_\ell + 1) e^{C(\tau - t_\ell)}.$$

This and (4.17) yield the assertion (4.18).

STEP 2. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_\ell(z, t) &= \psi_\ell(z, t + \tau_\ell), \quad u_\ell(z, t) = u_{\mu_\ell, \xi_\ell}(z, t + \tau_\ell), \\ \mathcal{W}_\ell(z, t) &= \mathcal{W}_{\mu_\ell, \xi_\ell}(z, t + \tau_\ell), \quad \tilde{f}_\ell(z, t) = f_\ell(z, t + \tau_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

We infer from (4.15), (4.17) and (4.18) that

$$pu_\ell^{p-1}(\phi_\ell)_t = \frac{N+2}{4} L_{g_0, h} \phi_\ell + \mathcal{W}_\ell \phi_\ell + u_\ell^{p-1} \tilde{f}_\ell \quad \text{on } M \times (t_\ell - \tau_\ell, 1)$$

where $t_\ell - \tau_\ell \rightarrow -\infty$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, and

$$(4.19) \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq \iint_{M_0} \phi_\ell^2 u_\ell^{p-1} dv_{g_0} dt \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\psi_\ell\|_{H_{t_\ell - \tau_\ell, 1}^1} \leq C.$$

Moreover, by (2.39), (4.17) and the Sobolev inequality, there exists a large number $R_1 > 0$ such that

$$(4.20) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \int_{M \setminus B_{g_0}(z_0, R_1 \tilde{\mu}_\ell)} \phi_\ell^2 u_\ell^{p-1} dv_{g_0} dt \\ & \leq C \int_0^1 \left[\int_{M \setminus B_{g_0}(z_0, \delta_0)} \delta_0^{-2N} \mu_0^N(\tau_\ell) dv_{g_0} + \int_{\{R_1 \leq |y - \tilde{\xi}_\ell| \leq \delta_0 \tilde{\mu}_\ell^{-1}\}} W_{1,0}^{p+1}(y) dy \right]^{\frac{2}{N}} dt \\ & \leq C (\delta_0^{-4} \mu_0^2(\tau_\ell) + R_1^{-2}) \leq \frac{1}{4} \end{aligned}$$

for all large $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Here, $\tilde{\mu}_\ell := \mu_\ell(\cdot + \tau_\ell)$ and $\tilde{\xi}_\ell := \xi_\ell(\cdot + \tau_\ell)$.

STEP 3. According to (4.19) and (4.20),

$$(4.21) \quad \int_0^1 \int_{B_{g_0}(z_0, R_1 \tilde{\mu}_\ell)} \phi_\ell^2 u_\ell^{p-1} dv_{g_0} dt \geq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Identifying $z \in B_{g_0}(z_0, \frac{\delta_0}{4})$ and $x = \tilde{\mu}_\ell y + \tilde{\xi}_\ell \in B^N(0, \frac{\delta_0}{4})$ as before, we define

$$\varphi_\ell(y, t) = \tilde{\mu}_\ell^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \phi_\ell(\tilde{\mu}_\ell y + \tilde{\xi}_\ell, t) \quad \text{for } (y, t) \in B_\ell \times (t_\ell - \tau_\ell, 1)$$

where $B_\ell := B^N(-\tilde{\mu}_\ell^{-1} \tilde{\xi}_\ell, \frac{\delta_0}{4} \tilde{\mu}_\ell^{-1})$. It solves

$$\begin{aligned} & p(1+P)^{p-1}(x) (W_{1,0} + \tilde{\mu}_\ell^2 Q_0)^{p-1} (\varphi_\ell)_t \\ &= \frac{N+2}{4} [\kappa_N \Delta_{g_0(x)} \varphi_\ell - \tilde{\mu}_\ell^2 (S+h) \varphi_\ell] + \tilde{\mu}_\ell^2 \overline{\mathcal{W}}_\ell \varphi_\ell + (1+P)^{p-1}(x) (W_{1,0} + \tilde{\mu}_\ell^2 Q_0)^{p-1} \bar{f}_\ell \\ &+ p(1+P)^{p-1}(x) (W_{1,0} + \tilde{\mu}_\ell^2 Q_0)^{p-1} \left[\tilde{\mu}_\ell^{-1} \dot{\tilde{\mu}}_\ell \left(y \cdot \nabla \varphi_\ell + \frac{N-2}{2} \varphi_\ell \right) + \tilde{\mu}_\ell^{-1} \dot{\tilde{\xi}}_\ell \cdot \nabla \varphi_\ell \right] \end{aligned}$$

in $B_\ell \times (t_\ell - \tau_\ell, 1)$, where P is the function in (2.13), $\tilde{\mu}_\ell := \mu_\ell(\cdot + \tau_\ell)$,

$$\overline{\mathcal{W}}_\ell(y, t) := \mathcal{W}_\ell(\tilde{\mu}_\ell y + \tilde{\xi}_\ell, t) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{f}_\ell(y, t) := \tilde{f}_\ell(\tilde{\mu}_\ell y + \tilde{\xi}_\ell, t).$$

Also, in light of (4.19) and (4.21),

$$\int_0^1 \int_{B^N(0, 2R_1)} \varphi_\ell^2 W_{1,0}^{p-1} dy dt \geq C \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\tau \in [t_\ell - \tau_\ell, 0]} \int_\tau^{\tau+1} \int_{B_\ell} |\nabla \varphi_\ell|^2 dy dt \leq C.$$

Hence, there exists a function φ_∞ in $\mathbb{R}^N \times (-\infty, 1)$ such that for each $\tau \in [t_\ell - \tau_\ell, 0]$,

$$\varphi_\ell \rightarrow \varphi_\infty \begin{cases} \text{weakly in } \dot{W}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N \times (\tau, \tau+1)) \\ \text{strongly in } L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^N \times (\tau, \tau+1)) \\ \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^N \times (\tau, \tau+1) \end{cases} \quad \text{as } \ell \rightarrow \infty,$$

up to a subsequence. In particular, exploiting (4.16) and (2.5)–(2.7), we see that

$$(4.22) \quad pW_{1,0}^{p-1}(\varphi_\infty)_t = \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \Delta \varphi_\infty \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \times (-\infty, 1)$$

as well as

$$(4.23) \quad \int_0^1 \int_{B^N(0, 2R_1)} \varphi_\infty^2 W_{1,0}^{p-1} dy dt \geq C \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\tau \in (-\infty, 0]} \int_\tau^{\tau+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla \varphi_\infty|^2 dy dt \leq C.$$

In the next step, we will deduce that

$$(4.24) \quad \varphi_\infty = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \times (-\infty, 1),$$

a contradiction to the first inequality in (4.23). Therefore, (4.13) is valid.

STEP 4. Referring to Definition 4.2, we write $\bar{\varphi}_\infty = \Pi_* \varphi_\infty$ on \mathbb{S}_n^N . From (4.22), the second inequality in (4.23), and the conformal covariance of conformal Laplacians, we observe

$$(4.25) \quad (\bar{\varphi}_\infty)_t = \frac{\kappa_N}{N} \left[\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^N} \bar{\varphi}_\infty - \frac{N(N-2)}{4} \bar{\varphi}_\infty \right] \quad \text{in } \mathbb{S}_n^N \times (-\infty, 1)$$

and

$$(4.26) \quad \sup_{\tau \in (-\infty, 0]} \int_\tau^{\tau+1} \int_{\mathbb{S}^N} (|\nabla_{\mathbb{S}^N} \bar{\varphi}_\infty|_{\mathbb{S}^N}^2 + \bar{\varphi}_\infty^2) dS_{\bar{y}} dt \leq C.$$

Parabolic regularity theory and (4.26) imply that $(0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{S}^N$ is a removable singularity of $\bar{\varphi}_\infty$ and $\|\bar{\varphi}_\infty\|_{C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^N \times (-\infty, 1))} \leq C$.

Let us apply a well-known argument to prove that $\bar{\varphi}_\infty = 0$ on $\mathbb{S}^N \times (-\infty, 1)$. By using (4.25) and Bochner's formula, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (|\nabla \bar{\varphi}|^2)_t &= 2 \langle \nabla \bar{\varphi}, \nabla \bar{\varphi}_t \rangle = \frac{2\kappa_N}{N} \left[\langle \nabla \bar{\varphi}, \nabla \Delta \bar{\varphi} \rangle - \frac{N(N-2)}{4} |\nabla \bar{\varphi}|^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{\kappa_N}{N} \left[\Delta |\nabla \bar{\varphi}|^2 - 2 |\nabla^2 \bar{\varphi}|^2 - 2 \text{Ric}(\nabla \bar{\varphi}, \nabla \bar{\varphi}) - \frac{N(N-2)}{2} |\nabla \bar{\varphi}|^2 \right] \leq \frac{\kappa_N}{N} \Delta |\nabla \bar{\varphi}|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Ric} = (N-1)g_{\mathbb{S}^N}$ is the Ricci curvature on \mathbb{S}^N , and we wrote $\bar{\varphi} = \bar{\varphi}_\infty$, $\nabla = \nabla_{\mathbb{S}^N}$, etc. Hence, for any $\tau_0 \in (-\infty, 1)$ fixed and $t > \tau_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\bar{\varphi}^2 + \frac{2\kappa_N}{N} (t - \tau_0) |\nabla \bar{\varphi}|^2 \right)_t &\leq \frac{2\kappa_N}{N} \left[\bar{\varphi} \left\{ \Delta \bar{\varphi} - \frac{N(N-2)}{4} \bar{\varphi} \right\} + |\nabla \bar{\varphi}|^2 + \frac{\kappa_N}{N} (t - \tau_0) \Delta |\nabla \bar{\varphi}|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\kappa_N}{N} \Delta \left[\bar{\varphi}^2 + \frac{2\kappa_N}{N} (t - \tau_0) |\nabla \bar{\varphi}|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By the maximum principle,

$$\bar{\varphi}^2 + \frac{2\kappa_N}{N} (t - \tau_0) |\nabla \bar{\varphi}|^2 \leq \max_{\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{S}^N} \bar{\varphi}^2(\tilde{y}, \tau_0) \leq C.$$

Thus

$$|\nabla \bar{\varphi}(\tilde{y}, t)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{t - \tau_0}} \quad \text{for all } (\tilde{y}, t) \in \mathbb{S}^N \times [\tau_0, 1).$$

Taking $\tau_0 \rightarrow -\infty$ shows that $\bar{\varphi}_\infty$ depends only on t . In view of (4.25),

$$\bar{\varphi}(t) = \bar{c}_1 e^{-\frac{\kappa_N(N-2)}{4} t} + \bar{c}_2 \quad \text{in } (-\infty, 1) \quad \text{for some } \bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2 \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Since it must be bounded in $(-\infty, 1)$, we have that $\bar{c}_1 = 0$. From (4.25) again, we conclude that $\bar{c}_2 = 0$.

Now, (4.24) follows at once. \square

Using a priori estimate (4.12), we deduce the unique existence of a solution to (4.1).

Corollary 4.4. *Suppose that $Y_h(M, g_0) > 0$, $\|f\|_{L^2_{t_0}} + \|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} < \infty$ and (2.5)–(2.7) hold. Then there exists a unique solution ψ to (4.1) satisfying*

$$(4.27) \quad \|\psi\|_{H^2_{t_0}} \leq C \left(\|f\|_{L^2_{t_0}} + \|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \right).$$

Proof. Pick an increasing sequence $\{s_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\frac{3t_0}{2} < s_\ell \rightarrow \infty$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, and let ψ_ℓ be a unique solution to a uniformly parabolic equation (4.2) with $s_0 = s_\ell$. Then a priori estimate (4.12) with $s_0 = s_\ell$ is true for ψ_ℓ , and the constant $C > 0$ in (4.12) is independent of $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, passing to a subsequence, ψ_ℓ converges weakly to a function ψ_∞ in a Banach space equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^2_{t_0, t}}$ for each $t > \frac{3t_0}{2}$. As a result, ψ_∞ is the only function satisfying (4.1) and (4.27). Setting $\psi = \psi_\infty$, we conclude the proof. \square

4.2. Inhomogeneous problem associated to (3.2): Pointwise estimate. We next derive a pointwise estimate for a solution to the inhomogeneous problem (4.1). A main tool is a version of the maximum principle presented in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose that ψ satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} pu_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1} \psi_t \geq \frac{N+2}{4} L_{g_0, h} \psi + \mathcal{W}_{\mu, \xi} \psi & \text{on } M \times (t_0, \infty), \\ \psi(\cdot, t_0) \geq 0 & \text{on } M \end{cases}$$

in a weak sense. Then $\psi \geq 0$ on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$.

Proof. Fix $s_0 > t_0$ and let $M(s_0) = M \times (t_0, s_0)$. We set

$$\phi(z, t) = e^{-C_0 t} \psi(z, t) \quad \text{for } (z, t) \in M \times [t_0, \infty)$$

where

$$C_0 := p^{-1} \left(\min_{M(s_0)} u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1} \right)^{-1} \left[\frac{N+2}{4} \max_M (|S| + |h|) + \max_{M(s_0)} |\mathcal{W}_{\mu, \xi}| + 1 \right].$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} (4.28) \quad 0 &\geq -\frac{N+2}{4} \left[\kappa_N \iint_{M(s_0)} \langle \nabla_{g_0} \phi, \nabla_{g_0} \omega \rangle_{g_0} + \iint_{M(s_0)} (S+h) \phi \omega \right] + \iint_{M(s_0)} \mathcal{W}_{\mu, \xi} \phi \omega \\ &+ p(p-1) \iint_{M(s_0)} u_{\mu, \xi}^{-1} (u_{\mu, \xi})_t \phi \omega u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1} - C_0 p \iint_{M(s_0)} \phi \omega u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1} + p \iint_{M(s_0)} \phi \omega_t u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1} \\ &- p \int_M (\phi \omega u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1})(\cdot, s_0) + p \int_M (\phi \omega u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1})(\cdot, t_0) \end{aligned}$$

for any nonnegative regular function ω on $M(s_0)$, and

$$f_0 := \frac{N+2}{4} (S+h) - \mathcal{W}_{\mu, \xi} + p(p-1) u_{\mu, \xi}^{-1} (u_{\mu, \xi})_t \cdot u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1} + C_0 p u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1} > 0 \quad \text{on } M(s_0)$$

by (4.4).

Fix a function $\omega_0 \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $\omega_0 \geq 0$ on M . By standard parabolic theory, the backward uniformly parabolic equation

$$\begin{cases} p u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1} \omega_t + \frac{N+2}{4} \kappa_N \Delta_{g_0} \omega - f_0 \omega = 0 & \text{on } M(s_0), \\ \omega(\cdot, s_0) = \omega_0 & \text{on } M \end{cases}$$

has a unique solution $\omega \geq 0$ on $M(s_0)$. Taking it as a test function for (4.28) and employing $\phi(\cdot, t_0) \geq 0$ on M , we find

$$0 \geq -p \int_M (\phi u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1})(\cdot, s_0) \omega_0 dv_{g_0}.$$

Since ω_0 and s_0 were chosen arbitrarily, we must have that $\phi(\cdot, t_0) \geq 0$, namely, $\psi(\cdot, t_0) \geq 0$ on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$. \square

In the rest of this subsection, we will deduce a priori pointwise estimates for (4.1) by means of barrier and rescaling arguments. For the definition of the associated norms, refer to Definition 1.8.

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose that $Y_h(M, g_0) > 0$, $\|f\|_{L_{t_0}^2} + \|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} < \infty$, and (2.5)–(2.7) hold so that equation (4.1) admits the unique solution ψ ; refer to Corollary 4.4. Assume further that $\|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho} + \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} < \infty$ for some $\alpha \in (0, N-2)$ and $\rho \geq -\frac{N-2}{2}$. Then there exist constants $C > 0$ large and $\delta_1 > 0$ small depending only on (M, g_0) , N , h , z_0 , α , and ρ such that*

$$(4.29) \quad |\psi(z, t)| \leq C \left[\delta_0^{-2} \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho} \mu_0^\rho(t) + \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \right] w_{\alpha, 0}(z, t)$$

for $(z, t) \in M \times [t_0, \infty)$.

Proof. Throughout the proof, we assume that $C > 0$ depends only on (M, g_0) , N , h , z_0 , α , and ρ . Moreover, we write $\psi = \psi[f, \psi_0]$, emphasizing the dependence of ψ on f and ψ_0 . Let $\psi_1 = \psi[0, \psi_0]$ and $\psi_2 = \psi[f, 0]$ so that $\psi = \psi_1 + \psi_2$.

STEP 1: A BOUND FOR ψ_1 . First of all, we assume that $d_{g_0}(z, z_0) < \frac{\delta_0}{4}$ so that $u(x, t) = (1 + P(x))\mu^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}[W_{1,0}(y) + \bar{\mu}^2 Q_0(y)]$ for $x = \exp_{z_0}^{-1}(z) = \mu y + \xi \in B^N(0, \frac{\delta_0}{4})$ and $t \in [t_0, \infty)$. Given a small number $\delta_1 > 0$, we set

$$\tilde{\psi}_{11}(z, t) = \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \times \begin{cases} 2 - |y|^2 & \text{for } |y| \leq 1, \\ |y|^{-\alpha} & \text{for } |y| > 1. \end{cases}$$

If $|y| \leq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} pu_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1}(\tilde{\psi}_{11})_t &= p\mu^{-2} W_{1,0}^{p-1}(y) (1 + O(\mu_0^2)) \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} [-\delta_1(2 - |y|^2) + O(\mu_0^2)] \\ &\geq -4p\alpha_N^{p-1} \delta_1 \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \mu^{-2}, \end{aligned}$$

$$-L_{g_0, h} \tilde{\psi}_{11} = \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} L_{g_0, h} |y|^2 \geq \frac{3N}{2} \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \mu^{-2},$$

and

$$|\mathcal{W}_{\mu, \xi} \tilde{\psi}_{11}| = o(\mu_0^{-2}) \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)}.$$

Thus we obtain

$$(4.30) \quad pu_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1}(\tilde{\psi}_{11})_t - \frac{N+2}{4} L_{g_0, h} \tilde{\psi}_{11} - \mathcal{W}_{\mu, \xi} \tilde{\psi}_{11} \geq \frac{N(N+2)}{4} \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \mu^{-2} > 0$$

for sufficiently small $\delta_1 > 0$.

If $|y| > 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} pu_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1}(\tilde{\psi}_{11})_t &= p\mu^{-2} W_{1,0}^{p-1}(y) (1 + O(\delta_0^2)) \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} [-\delta_1 + O(\mu_0^2)] |y|^{-\alpha} \\ &\geq -2p\alpha_N^{p-1} \delta_1 \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \mu^{-2} |y|^{-(\alpha+4)} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$-\frac{N+2}{4} L_{g_0, h} \tilde{\psi}_{11} - \mathcal{W}_{\mu, \xi} \tilde{\psi}_{11} \geq \left[C + O\left(\mu_0^{\frac{8}{N-2}} \log \mu_0\right) \right] \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \mu^{-2} |y|^{-(\alpha+2)}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant depending only on N and α . Therefore,

$$(4.31) \quad pu_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1}(\tilde{\psi}_{11})_t - \frac{N+2}{4} L_{g_0, h} \tilde{\psi}_{11} - \mathcal{W}_{\mu, \xi} \tilde{\psi}_{11} \geq C \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \mu^{-2} |y|^{-(\alpha+2)} > 0$$

for small $\delta_0, \delta_1 > 0$. On the other hand, there exists a large constant $c > 0$ depending only on (M, g_0) , N , and α such that

$$(4.32) \quad (c\tilde{\psi}_{11} \pm \psi_1)(z, t_0) = (c\tilde{\psi}_{11})(z, t_0) \pm \psi_0(z) \geq 0$$

for $z \in B_{g_0}(z_0, \frac{\delta_0}{4})$.

Next, we handle the case that $d_{g_0}(z, z_0) > \frac{\delta_0}{6}$. Let v be a solution to $-L_{g_0, h} v = 1$ on M . Owing to the condition $Y_h(M, g_0) > 0$, the strong maximum principle holds for the elliptic operator $L_{g_0, h}$. Hence, such v exists uniquely in $C^2(M)$ and is positive on M . Let us set

$$\tilde{\psi}_{12}(z, t) = 2^{3\alpha} \left(\min_{z \in M} v(z) \right)^{-1} \delta_0^{-\alpha} \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \mu^\alpha(t) v(z) \quad \text{on } M \times [t_0, \infty).$$

A simple calculation shows that if $\frac{\delta_0}{6} < d_{g_0}(z, z_0) < \frac{\delta_0}{4}$ and $t \in [t_0, \infty)$, then $\tilde{\psi}_{12}(z, t) > \tilde{\psi}_{11}(z, t)$. Besides,

$$pu_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1}(\tilde{\psi}_{12})_t \geq -C\delta_1 \delta_0^{-(\alpha+4)} \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \mu^{\alpha+2}$$

and

$$-\frac{N+2}{4} L_{g_0, h} \tilde{\psi}_{12} - \mathcal{W}_{\mu, \xi} \tilde{\psi}_{12} = [C + O(\delta_0^{-4} \mu_0^2)] \delta_0^{-\alpha} \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \mu^\alpha.$$

Consequently, we have

$$(4.33) \quad pu_{\mu,\xi}^{p-1}(\tilde{\psi}_{12})_t - \frac{N+2}{4}L_{g_0,h}\tilde{\psi}_{12} - \mathcal{W}_{\mu,\xi}\tilde{\psi}_{12} \geq C\delta_0^{-\alpha}\|\psi_0\|_{**,\alpha}\mu_0^\rho(t_0)e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)}\mu^\alpha > 0$$

taking $\delta_1 > 0$ smaller if needed. In addition, it holds that

$$(4.34) \quad (c\tilde{\psi}_{12} \pm \psi_1)(z, t_0) \geq 0 \quad \text{on } M$$

for some large $c > 0$.

Now, letting $\tilde{\psi}_{11}(z, t) = 0$ for $z \in M \setminus B_{g_0}(z, \frac{\delta_0}{4})$ and $t \in [t_0, \infty)$, we define a function

$$\tilde{\psi} = \max \left\{ \tilde{\psi}_{11}, \tilde{\psi}_{12} \right\} \quad \text{on } M \times [t_0, \infty).$$

By applying Lemma 4.5 for functions $c\tilde{\psi} \pm \psi_1$ and using (4.30)–(4.34), we deduce

$$(4.35) \quad |\psi_1(z, t)| \leq C\|\psi_0\|_{**,\alpha}\mu_0^\rho(t_0)e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)}w_{\alpha,0}(z, t) \quad \text{on } M \times [t_0, \infty).$$

STEP 2: A BOUND FOR ψ_2 . For $z \in B_{g_0}(z_0, \frac{\delta_0}{4})$, we redefine

$$\tilde{\psi}_{21}(z, t) = \delta_0^{-2}\|f\|_{*,\alpha,\rho}\mu^\rho(t) \times \begin{cases} 2 - |y|^2 & \text{for } |y| \leq 1, \\ |y|^{-\alpha} & \text{for } |y| > 1 \end{cases}$$

where $x = \exp^{-1}(z) = \mu y + \xi \in B^N(0, \frac{\delta_0}{4})$ and $t \in [t_0, \infty)$.

To treat the case that $d_{g_0}(z, z_0) > \frac{\delta_0}{6}$, we also set

$$\tilde{\psi}_{22}(z, t) = 2^{3\alpha} \left(\min_{z \in M} v(z) \right)^{-1} \delta_0^{-(\alpha+2)} \|f\|_{*,\alpha,\rho} \mu^{\alpha+\rho}(t) v(z) \quad \text{on } M \times [t_0, \infty).$$

Then, arguing as in Step 1, we arrive at

$$(4.36) \quad |\psi_2(z, t)| \leq C\delta_0^{-2}\|f\|_{*,\alpha,\rho}\mu_0^\rho(t)w_{\alpha,0}(z, t) \quad \text{on } M \times [t_0, \infty).$$

Summing (4.35) and (4.36) up, we get (4.29). \square

Corollary 4.7. *Suppose that all the conditions of Lemma 4.6 hold, and $\|f\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0} + \|\psi_0\|_{**,\alpha;\sigma_0} < \infty$ where $\sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$ is the number appearing in (2.7). There exist constants $C > 0$ large and $\delta_1 > 0$ small depending only on (M, g_0) , N , h , z_0 , α , ρ , and σ_0 such that*

$$(4.37) \quad \begin{cases} |\nabla_{g_0}^\ell \psi(z, t)| \leq C [\delta_0^{-2}\|f\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0}\mu_0^\rho(t) + \|\psi_0\|_{**,\alpha;\sigma_0}\mu_0^\rho(t_0)e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)}] w_{\alpha,\ell}(z, t), \\ [\nabla_{g_0}^\ell \psi]_{C_z^{\sigma_0}}(z, t) \leq C [\delta_0^{-2}\|f\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0}\mu_0^\rho(t) + \|\psi_0\|_{**,\alpha;\sigma_0}\mu_0^\rho(t_0)e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)}] w_{\alpha,\ell+\sigma_0}(z, t), \\ [\nabla_{g_0}^\ell \psi]_{C_t^{\sigma_0/2}}(z, t) \leq C [\delta_0^{-2}\|f\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0}\mu_0^\rho(t) + \|\psi_0\|_{**,\alpha;\sigma_0}\mu_0^\rho(t_0)e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)}] w_{\alpha-\sigma_0,\ell}(z, t), \end{cases}$$

and

$$(4.38) \quad \begin{cases} |\psi_t(z, t)| \leq C [\delta_0^{-2}\|f\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0}\mu_0^\rho(t) + \|\psi_0\|_{**,\alpha;\sigma_0}\mu_0^\rho(t_0)e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)}] w_{\alpha-2,0}(z, t), \\ [\psi_t]_{C_z^{\sigma_0}}(z, t) \leq C [\delta_0^{-2}\|f\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0}\mu_0^\rho(t) + \|\psi_0\|_{**,\alpha;\sigma_0}\mu_0^\rho(t_0)e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)}] w_{\alpha-2,\sigma_0}(z, t), \\ [\psi_t]_{C_t^{\sigma_0/2}}(z, t) \leq C [\delta_0^{-2}\|f\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0}\mu_0^\rho(t) + \|\psi_0\|_{**,\alpha;\sigma_0}\mu_0^\rho(t_0)e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)}] w_{\alpha-2-\sigma_0,0}(z, t) \end{cases}$$

for $(z, t) \in M \times [t_0, \infty)$ and $\ell \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. In particular, we have that

$$(4.39) \quad \|\psi\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0} \leq C_1\delta_0^{-2} (\|f\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0} + \|\psi_0\|_{**,\alpha;\sigma_0})$$

where $C_1 > 0$ is a constant depending only on (M, g_0) , N , h , z_0 , α , ρ , and σ_0 .

Proof. The proof is decomposed into two steps.

STEP 1. We examine the case that $d_{g_0}(z, z_0) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{12}$.

We set

$$\phi(y, t) = \psi(z, t) \quad \text{for } y \in B^N \left(-\xi, \frac{\delta_0}{4\mu} \right) \text{ and } t \in [t_0, \infty).$$

It solves

$$(4.40) \quad \phi_t = \frac{N-2}{4} \mu^{-2} u_{\mu, \xi}^{1-p}(x, t) \Delta_{g_0(x)} \phi + \mu^{-1} \left(\dot{\mu} y + \dot{\xi} \right) \cdot \nabla \phi \\ + p^{-1} u_{\mu, \xi}^{1-p}(x, t) \left[\frac{N+2}{4} (S+h)(x) + \mathcal{W}_{\mu, \xi}(x, t) \right] \phi + p^{-1} f(x, t).$$

For a number $t > t_0 + 2$ and a set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$, we define

$$\Omega_{11} = \{|y| \leq 6\} \times [t-1, t], \quad \Omega_{12} = \{|y| \leq 8\} \times [t-2, t],$$

and a standard parabolic Hölder norm

$$\|\phi\|_{C^{\sigma_0, \sigma_0/2}(\Omega)} = \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \sup_{(y_1, t_1) \neq (y_2, t_2) \in \Omega} \frac{|\phi(y_1, t_1) - \phi(y_2, t_2)|}{|y_1 - y_2|^{\sigma_0} + |t_1 - t_2|^{\sigma_0/2}}.$$

A straightforward computation shows that the $C^{\sigma_0, \sigma_0/2}(\Omega_{12})$ -norms of the coefficients in (4.40) are uniformly bounded in t . Therefore, the interior parabolic Schauder estimate is applicable, which gives

$$(4.41) \quad \sum_{\ell=0}^2 \left\| \nabla^\ell \phi \right\|_{C^{\sigma_0, \sigma_0/2}(\Omega_{11})} + \|\phi_t\|_{C^{\sigma_0, \sigma_0/2}(\Omega_{11})} \leq C \left(\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{12})} + \|f(x, t)\|_{C^{\sigma_0, \sigma_0/2}(\Omega_{12})} \right).$$

Given any $(y_1, t_1), (y_2, t_2) \in \Omega_{12}$, we have

$$\frac{|f(x_1, t_1) - f(x_2, t_2)|}{|y_1 - y_2|^{\sigma_0} + |t_1 - t_2|^{\sigma_0/2}} \leq (1 + O(\delta_0^2)) \mu^{\sigma_0}(t_1) \frac{|f(x_1, t_1) - f(x_{12}, t_1)|}{d_{g_0}(x_1, x_{12})^{\sigma_0}} + \frac{|f(x_{12}, t_1) - f(x_2, t_2)|}{|t_1 - t_2|^{\sigma_0/2}}$$

where

$$x_1 := \mu(t_1)y_1 + \xi(t_1), \quad x_2 := \mu(t_2)y_2 + \xi(t_2) \quad \text{and} \quad x_{12} := \mu(t_1)y_2 + \xi(t_1).$$

Moreover, if $|y_1 - y_2| < \delta$ for a number $\delta > 0$ small enough, then $d_{g_0}(x_1, x_2) < \mu_0(t_1)$ and so

$$|f(x_1, t_1) - f(x_{12}, t_1)| \leq u_{\mu, \xi}^{1-p}(x_1, t_1) \left[u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1} f \right]_{C_z^{\sigma_0}}(x_1, t_1) d_{g_0}(x_1, x_{12})^{\sigma_0} \\ + \sup_{\theta \in (0,1)} \left| \nabla_x (u_{\mu, \xi}^{1-p})(x_1 + \theta(x_{12} - x_1), t_1) \right| \left| (u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1} f)(x_{12}, t_1) \right| \\ \leq C \left[\mu^{-\sigma_0}(t_1) \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} + d_{g_0}(x_1, x_{12})^{1-\sigma_0} \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho} \right] \mu_0^\rho(t_1) d_{g_0}(x_1, x_{12})^{\sigma_0}.$$

If $|t_1 - t_2| < 1$, then

$$|x_{12} - x_2| \leq C \mu_0^3(t_1) (|y_2| + o(1)) |t_1 - t_2| \leq C \mu_0^3(t_1) |t_1 - t_2|,$$

which implies

$$|f(x_{12}, t_1) - f(x_2, t_2)| \leq |f(x_{12}, t_1) - f(x_2, t_1)| + |f(x_2, t_1) - f(x_2, t_2)| \\ \leq C \left[\mu_0^{2\sigma_0}(t_1) |t_1 - t_2|^{\sigma_0/2} \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} + \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho} \right] \mu_0^\rho(t_1) |t_1 - t_2|^{\sigma_0/2} \\ \leq C \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \mu_0^\rho(t_1) |t_1 - t_2|^{\sigma_0/2}.$$

It follows that

$$(4.42) \quad \|f(x, t)\|_{C^{\sigma_0, \sigma_0/2}(\Omega_{12})} \leq C \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \mu_0^\rho(t).$$

Substituting (4.29) and (4.42) into (4.41) gives us that

$$(4.43) \quad \begin{cases} |\nabla^\ell \psi(x, t)| = \mu^{-\ell} |\nabla^\ell \phi(y, t)| \leq C [\delta_0^{-2} \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \mu_0^\rho + \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)}] \mu_0^{-\ell}, \\ \mu_0^{\sigma_0} [\nabla^\ell \psi]_{C_{z^0}^{\sigma_0}}(x, t) + [\nabla^\ell \psi]_{C_t^{\sigma_0/2}}(x, t) \\ \leq C [\delta_0^{-2} \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \mu_0^\rho + \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)}] \mu_0^{-\ell} \end{cases}$$

and

$$(4.44) \quad \begin{cases} |\psi_t(x, t)| \leq |\phi_t(y, t)| + \mu^{-1} (\dot{\mu}|y| + \dot{\xi}) |\nabla \psi(x, t)| \\ \leq C [\delta_0^{-2} \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \mu_0^\rho + \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)}], \\ \mu_0^{\sigma_0} [\psi_t]_{C_{z^0}^{\sigma_0}}(x, t) + [\psi_t]_{C_t^{\sigma_0/2}}(x, t) \leq C [\delta_0^{-2} \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \mu_0^\rho + \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)}] \end{cases}$$

for $\ell \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, $|x - \xi| < 4\mu$, and $t > t_0 + 2$.

Let n_0 be a natural number such that $2^{n_0} \leq \frac{\delta_0}{24} \mu^{-1}(t) < 2^{n_0+1}$. In the rest of this step, we will estimate ϕ on each set

$$\Omega_{n1} := \{2^n < |y| < 2^{n+1}\} \times [t - 2^{-2n}, t] \quad \text{for } n = 1, \dots, n_0.$$

With this aim, we introduce

$$\tilde{\Omega}_{n1} := \{1 < |Y| < 2\} \times [-1, 0], \quad \tilde{\Omega}_{n2} := \left\{ \frac{1}{2} < |Y| < \frac{5}{2} \right\} \times [-2, 0]$$

and

$$\varphi(Y, \tau) = \phi(2^n Y, t + 2^{-2n} \tau) \quad \text{for } (Y, \tau) \in \tilde{\Omega}_{n2}.$$

By (4.40), it is a solution to

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\tau &= \frac{N-2}{4} 2^{-4n} \mu^{-2} u_{\mu, \xi}^{1-p}(x, t + 2^{-2n} \tau) \Delta_{g_0(x)} \varphi + 2^{-2n} \mu^{-1} (\dot{\mu} y + \dot{\xi}) \cdot \nabla \varphi \\ &\quad + p^{-1} 2^{-2n} u_{\mu, \xi}^{1-p}(x, t + 2^{-2n} \tau) \left[\frac{N+2}{4} (S+h)(x) + \mathcal{W}_{\mu, \xi}(x, t + 2^{-2n} \tau) \right] \varphi \\ &\quad + 2^{-2n} p^{-1} f(x, t + 2^{-2n} \tau) \end{aligned}$$

in $\tilde{\Omega}_{n2}$. A direct computation gives that the above equation is uniformly parabolic and all the $C^{\sigma_0, \sigma_0/2}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n2})$ -norms of the coefficients in it are uniformly bounded in n and t . Hence

$$(4.45) \quad \sum_{\ell=0}^2 \left\| \nabla^\ell \varphi \right\|_{C^{\sigma_0, \sigma_0/2}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n1})} + \|\varphi_\tau\|_{C^{\sigma_0, \sigma_0/2}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n1})} \leq C \left(\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}_{n2})} + \|2^{-2n} f(x, t + 2^{-2n} \tau)\|_{C^{\sigma_0, \sigma_0/2}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n2})} \right),$$

which can be interpreted as

$$(4.46) \quad \begin{cases} |\nabla^\ell \psi(x, t)| = (\mu 2^n)^{-\ell} |\nabla^\ell \varphi(Y, 0)| \\ \leq C [\delta_0^{-2} \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \mu_0^\rho + \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)}] \frac{\mu_0^{-\ell}}{|y|^{\alpha+\ell}}, \\ (\mu_0 |y|)^{\sigma_0} [\nabla^\ell \psi]_{C_{z^0}^{\sigma_0}}(x, t) + |y|^{-\sigma_0} [\nabla^\ell \psi]_{C_t^{\sigma_0}}(x, t) \\ \leq C [\delta_0^{-2} \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \mu_0^\rho + \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)}] \frac{\mu_0^{-\ell}}{|y|^{\alpha+\ell}} \end{cases}$$

and

$$(4.47) \quad \begin{cases} |\psi_t(x, t)| \leq C\mu^2 |\nabla \varphi(Y, \tau)| + 2^{2n} |\varphi_\tau(Y, \tau)| \\ \leq C \left[\delta_0^{-2} \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \mu_0^\rho + \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \right] \frac{1}{|y|^{\alpha-2}}, \\ (\mu_0 |y|)^{\sigma_0} [\psi_t]_{C_{z^0}^{\sigma_0}}(x, t) + |y|^{-\sigma_0} [\psi_t]_{C_t^{\sigma_0/2}}(x, t) \\ \leq C \left[\delta_0^{-2} \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \mu_0^\rho + \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \right] \frac{1}{|y|^{\alpha-2}} \end{cases}$$

for $\ell \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, $2\mu < |x - \xi| < \frac{\delta_0}{12}$, and $t \geq t_0 + 2$. To get the estimates for the $C_t^{\sigma_0}$ -norms in (4.46)–(4.47), we need (4.45) with t replaced by any number in the interval $[t - 1 + 2^{2n}, t]$.

To treat the case that $t \in [t_0, t_0 + 2]$, we repeat the above argument with the interior Schauder estimate for Cauchy problems. For example, instead of (4.41), we use

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell=0}^2 \left\| \nabla^\ell \phi \right\|_{C^{\sigma_0, \sigma_0/2}(\Omega'_{11})} + \|\phi_t\|_{C^{\sigma_0, \sigma_0/2}(\Omega'_{11})} \\ \leq C \left(\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega'_{12})} + \|f(x, t)\|_{C^{\sigma_0, \sigma_0/2}(\Omega'_{12})} + \sum_{\ell=0}^2 \left\| \nabla^\ell \phi_0 \right\|_{C^{\sigma_0}(\{|y| \leq 8\})} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\phi_0(y) := \psi_0(x)$ for $y \in B^N(-\xi, \frac{\delta_0}{4\mu})$,

$$\Omega'_{11} := \{|y| \leq 6\} \times [t_0, t_0 + 2] \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega'_{12} := \{|y| \leq 8\} \times [t_0, t_0 + 2].$$

Then, the corresponding estimate to (4.43) is

$$\left| \nabla^\ell \psi(x, t) \right| + \mu_0^{\sigma_0} \left[\nabla^\ell \psi \right]_{C_{z^0}^{\sigma_0}}(x, t) + \left[\nabla^\ell \psi \right]_{C_t^{\sigma_0/2}}(x, t) \leq C \left[\delta_0^{-2} \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \mu_0^\rho + \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha; \sigma_0} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) \right] \mu_0^{-\ell},$$

and we can deduce an analogous estimate to (4.44), (4.46), and (4.47).

STEP 2. We examine the case that $d_{g_0}(z, z_0) \geq \frac{\delta_0}{12}$.

Define a function $\tilde{\psi}$ on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$ by

$$\psi(z, t) = \tilde{\psi}(z, s(t)) \quad \text{where } s(t) := \delta_0^4 t^2.$$

It solves

$$\tilde{\psi}_s = \frac{N-2}{8\delta_0^4 t} u_{\mu, \xi}^{1-p} \Delta_{g_0} \tilde{\psi} + \frac{1}{2p\delta_0^4 t} u_{\mu, \xi}^{1-p} \left[\frac{N+2}{4} (S + h) + \mathcal{W}_{\mu, \xi} \right] \tilde{\psi} + \frac{1}{2p\delta_0^4 t} f(z, t).$$

If $d_{g_0}(z, z_0) \geq \frac{\delta_0}{24}$, a coefficient function $(\delta_0^4 t)^{-1} u_{\mu, \xi}^{1-p}$ is bounded from above, bounded away from 0 (because $(\delta_0^4 t)^{-1} u_{\mu, \xi}^{1-p} \simeq t^{-1} \mu_0^{-2} \simeq 1$), and uniformly Lipschitz. Therefore, we conclude from the parabolic Schauder estimate (for Cauchy problems) that

$$(4.48) \quad \begin{cases} \left| \nabla^\ell \psi(z, t) \right| = \left| \nabla^\ell \tilde{\psi}(z, s) \right| \leq C \left[\delta_0^{-2} \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \mu_0^\rho + \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \right] \delta_0^{-(\alpha+\ell)} \mu_0^\alpha, \\ \delta_0^{\sigma_0} \left[\nabla^\ell \psi \right]_{C_{z^0}^{\sigma_0}}(x, t) + (\delta_0^{-1} \mu_0)^{\sigma_0} \left[\nabla^\ell \psi \right]_{C_t^{\sigma_0}}(x, t) \\ \leq C \left[\delta_0^{-2} \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \mu_0^\rho + \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \right] \delta_0^{-(\alpha+\ell)} \mu_0^\alpha \end{cases}$$

for $\ell \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ and

$$(4.49) \quad \begin{cases} |\psi_t(z, t)| \leq 2\delta_0^4 t |\tilde{\psi}_s(z, s)| \leq C \left[\delta_0^{-2} \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \mu_0^\rho + \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \right] \delta_0^{2-\alpha} \mu_0^{\alpha-2} \\ \delta_0^{\sigma_0} [\psi_t]_{C_{z^0}^{\sigma_0}}(x, t) + (\delta_0^{-1} \mu_0)^{\sigma_0} [\psi_t]_{C_t^{\sigma_0}}(x, t) \\ \leq C \left[\delta_0^{-2} \|f\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \mu_0^\rho + \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha} \mu_0^\rho(t_0) e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)} \right] \delta_0^{2-\alpha} \mu_0^{\alpha-2} \end{cases}$$

provided $d_{g_0}(z, z_0) \geq \frac{\delta_0}{12}$.

Combining (4.43)–(4.49), we find the desired gradient estimates (4.37) and (4.38). \square

4.3. Unique solvability of (3.2) and a priori estimate of the solution. Denote $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi} := B^N(-\bar{\mu}^{-1}\xi, 2\bar{\mu}^{-1}\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1})$. Let $\hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}$ be a function on $B^N(-0, 2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}) \times [t_0, \infty)$ and ψ^{in} be a function on $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi} \times [t_0, \infty)$ such that

$$(4.50) \quad \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}(x, t) = (1 + P(x))\bar{\mu}^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}\psi^{\text{in}}(\bar{y}, t);$$

cf. (3.5). We remark that ψ^{in} needs not to be a solution to (3.6) at this moment. Letting also ψ_0 be a function on M , we assume that

$$(4.51) \quad \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})} \leq C_{21} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\psi_0\|_{**, \alpha; \sigma_0} \leq C_{22}\mu_0^{\delta_2}(t_0)$$

for some $C_{21}, C_{22} > 0$, $a \in (\sigma_0, N-2)$, $b \simeq 3$, $\alpha \in (0, a)$ to be determined later, and an arbitrarily chosen $\delta_2 > 0$; the \sharp' - and $**$ -norms are given in (1.19) and (1.16), respectively, and $\sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$ is the number appearing in (2.7). By employing the existence theory and a priori estimates for the inhomogeneous problem (4.1), we shall prove the unique solvability of the outer problem (3.2), i.e.,

$$(4.52) \quad \begin{cases} pu_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1}(\psi^{\text{out}})_t = \frac{N+2}{4}L_{g_0, h}\psi^{\text{out}} + \mathcal{W}_{\mu, \xi}\psi^{\text{out}} + u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1}f_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}}[\psi^{\text{out}}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}] & \text{on } M \times (t_0, \infty), \\ \psi^{\text{out}}(\cdot, t_0) = \psi_0 & \text{on } M \end{cases}$$

where

$$(4.53) \quad f_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}}[\psi^{\text{out}}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}] := u_{\mu, \xi}^{1-p} \left[\left(1 - \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}\right) \mathcal{S}(u_{\mu, \xi}) + \mathcal{J}_1[\hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}] + \mathcal{J}_2[\psi^{\text{out}}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}] \right].$$

Proposition 4.8. *Assume that (4.51) and (2.5)–(2.7) hold, and $t_0 > 0$ is sufficiently large. Suppose also that $\alpha \in (0, a)$ and $\beta \in (0, b]$ satisfy $\alpha + \beta = N-2$, and set $\rho = -\frac{N-2}{2} + \beta = \frac{N-2}{2} - \alpha$. Choose any*

$$(4.54) \quad \delta_3 \in (0, \min\{2, \beta, \beta(p-1), a+b-(N-2), (p-1)(a+b-(N-2))\}).$$

Then (4.52) possesses a unique solution $\psi^{\text{out}} = \psi^{\text{out}}[\lambda, \xi, \dot{\lambda}, \dot{\xi}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0]$ such that

$$(4.55) \quad \|\psi^{\text{out}}\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \leq C\delta_0^{-2}\mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0)$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant depending only on (M, g_0) , N , h , z_0 , α , and σ_0 ,

$$(4.56) \quad \delta_4 \in (0, \min\{\nu_2 - \zeta_2\varepsilon_1, 2(p-1), \delta_3\}) \cap (0, \min\{(1-\varepsilon_1)(a-\alpha), \delta_2\}),$$

and the $*$ '-norm is defined in (1.17).

The proof of Proposition 4.8 consists of several lemmas. Let $\mathbf{1}_{N=5}$ be a quantity equal to 1 if $N = 5$ and 0 if $N \geq 6$.

Lemma 4.9. *We have*

$$(4.57) \quad \left\| u_{\mu, \xi}^{1-p} \left(1 - \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}\right) \mathcal{S}(u_{\mu, \xi}) \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \leq C_{31}\delta_0^{-\zeta_{31}}\mu_0^{\nu_2 - \zeta_2\varepsilon_1}(t_0)$$

where

- $C_{31}, \zeta_{31} > 0$ are constants depending only on (M, g_0) , N , h , z_0 , α , and σ_0 ;
- $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, 1)$ is the small number in Lemma 2.4, $\zeta_2 > 0$ is the number depending only on N in Lemma 2.9, and $\nu_2 = 2 - \varepsilon_0$ is the number in (2.7);
- the $*$ -norm is defined in (1.15).

Proof. Write $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = (1 - \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}) \mathcal{S}(u_{\mu, \xi})$. Applying (2.47) and (2.5)–(2.7), we observe

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^1 \left| \nabla_z^\ell \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(z, t) \right| + \left[(1 - \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}) \tilde{\mathcal{S}} \right]_{C_t^{\sigma_0/2}}(z, t) \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \left(\mu_0^{\frac{N+2}{2} - \zeta_2 \varepsilon_1} + \mu_0^{\frac{N-2}{2} + \nu_2 - \zeta_2 \varepsilon_1} \right).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[(\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha, 2})^{-1} \left| \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(z, t) \right| + (\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha, 2 + \sigma_0})^{-1} \left[\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(z, t) \right]_{C_t^{\sigma_0}} + (\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha - \sigma_0, 2})^{-1} \left[\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(z, t) \right]_{C_t^{\sigma_0/2}} \right](z, t) \\ & \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \mu_0^{-\alpha - \rho} \mu_0^{\frac{N-2}{2} + \nu_2 - \zeta_2 \varepsilon_1} = C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \mu_0^{\nu_2 - \zeta_2 \varepsilon_1}, \end{aligned}$$

which reads (4.57). \square

Lemma 4.10. *We have*

$$(4.58) \quad \left\| u_{\mu, \xi}^{1-p} \mathcal{J}_1 \left[\psi^{\text{out}}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right] \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \leq C_{32} \mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0) \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})}$$

where $C_{32} > 0$ depends only on (M, g_0) , N , h , z_0 , α , and σ_0 , and $\delta_4 > 0$ is a number satisfying (4.56).

Proof. It suffices to consider only points in the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : |x| \leq 2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}\} \supset \text{supp}(\eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}})$.

In view of (2.8)–(2.9), (2.39)–(2.40), (2.13), and (2.37), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1} - \left(u_{\mu, \xi}^{(1)} \right)^{p-1} \right|(x, t) &= (1 + P(x))^{p-1} \mu^{-2} \left| (W_{1,0} + \Psi_0)^{p-1} - W_{1,0}^{p-1} \right|(y, t) \\ &\leq C \mu_0^{-2} \left[\mathbf{1}_{N=5} \bar{\mu}^2 \left(W_{1,0}^{p-2} Q_0 \right)(y) + (\bar{\mu}^2 Q_0(y))^{p-1} \right] \\ &\leq C \left[\mathbf{1}_{N=5} \log(2 + |y|) + \mu_0^{-2 + \frac{8}{N-2}} \log(2 + |y|)^{p-1} \right] \frac{1}{1 + |y|^4}. \end{aligned}$$

Besides, by (4.50),

$$(4.59) \quad \left| \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}(x, t) \right| \leq C \bar{\mu}^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \left| \psi^{\text{in}}(\bar{y}, t) \right| \leq C \mu_0^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp', a, b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})} \frac{\mu_0^b}{1 + |\bar{y}|^a}$$

and

$$\left| \hat{\psi}_t^{\text{in}}(x, t) \right| \leq C \mu_0^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp', a, b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})} \frac{\mu_0^b}{1 + |\bar{y}|^{a-2}}$$

where $x = \mu y + \xi = \bar{\mu} \bar{y} + \xi$. Accordingly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| p u_{\mu, \xi}^{1-p} \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}} \left[u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1} - \left(u_{\mu, \xi}^{(1)} \right)^{p-1} \right] \left[\frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \left| \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right| + \left| \hat{\psi}_t^{\text{in}} \right| \right] \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho} \\ (4.60) \quad & \leq C \left[\mathbf{1}_{N=5} \mu_0^2 |\log \mu_0| + (\mu_0^2 |\log \mu_0|)^{p-1} \right] \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp', a, b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})} \sup_{(\bar{y}, t) \in \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi} \times [t_0, \infty)} \frac{\mu_0^{b-\beta}}{1 + |\bar{y}|^{a-\alpha}} \\ & \leq C \left[\mathbf{1}_{N=5} \mu_0^2 |\log \mu_0| + (\mu_0^2 |\log \mu_0|)^{p-1} \right] (t_0) \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp', a, b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})} \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality comes from the assumption that $\alpha \in (0, a)$ and $\beta \in (0, b]$.

On the other hand, we see

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left(\Delta_{g_0} \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}} \right) \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right|(x, t) + \left[\left| \nabla_{g_0} \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}} \right| \left| \nabla_{g_0} \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right| \right](x, t) \\ & \leq C \mu_0^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp', a, b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})} \left(\mu_0^{-2\varepsilon_1} \frac{\mu_0^b}{1 + |\bar{y}|^a} + \mu_0^{-\varepsilon_1} \frac{\mu_0^b}{1 + |\bar{y}|^{a+1}} \right) \\ & \leq C \mu_0^{-\frac{N+2}{2}} \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp', a, b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})} \frac{\mu_0^b}{1 + |\bar{y}|^{a+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.61) \quad & \left\| u_{\mu,\xi}^{1-p} \cdot \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \left[\left(\Delta_{g_0} \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}} \right) \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} + 2 \left\langle \nabla_{g_0} \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}, \nabla_{g_0} \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right\rangle_{g_0} \right] \right\|_{*,\alpha,\rho} \\
 & \leq C \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp',a,b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu},\xi})} \sup_{\{(\bar{y},t): \bar{\mu}^{-1} \mu_0^{\varepsilon_1} \leq |\bar{y} + \bar{\mu}^{-1} \xi| \leq 2\bar{\mu}^{-1} \mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}, t \geq t_0\}} \frac{\mu_0^{b-\beta}}{1 + |\bar{y}|^{a-\alpha}} \\
 & \leq C \mu_0^{(1-\varepsilon_1)(a-\alpha)}(t_0) \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp',a,b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu},\xi})}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.60) and (4.61) gives

$$\left\| u_{\mu,\xi}^{1-p} \mathcal{J}_1 \left[\psi^{\text{out}}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right] \right\|_{*,\alpha,\rho} \leq C \mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0) \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp',a,b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu},\xi})}.$$

Further computations yield a weighted Hölder bound of \mathcal{J}_1 and so (4.58). We omit the details. \square

Lemma 4.11. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.62) \quad & \left\| u_{\mu,\xi}^{1-p} \mathcal{J}_2 \left[\psi^{\text{out}}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right] \right\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0} \leq C_{33} \delta_0^{-\zeta_{33}} \left[\mathbf{1}_{N=5} \left\{ \left(\left\| \psi^{\text{out}} \right\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0} + \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp',a,b;\sigma_0(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu},\xi})} \right) \mu_0^{4-3\varepsilon_1}(t_0) \right. \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \left. + \left(\left\| \psi^{\text{out}} \right\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0}^2 + \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp',a,b;\sigma_0(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu},\xi})}^2 \right) \mu_0^{\delta_3}(t_0) \right\} \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \left\{ \left(\left\| \psi^{\text{out}} \right\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0}^{p-1} + \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp',a,b;\sigma_0(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu},\xi})}^{p-1} \right) \mu_0^{4-(N-2)\varepsilon_1}(t_0) \right. \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \left. + \left(\left\| \psi^{\text{out}} \right\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0}^p + \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp',a,b;\sigma_0(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu},\xi})}^p \right) \mu_0^{\delta_3}(t_0) \right\} \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{33}, \zeta_{33} > 0$ depends only on (M, g_0) , N , h , z_0 , α , and σ_0 , and $\delta_3 > 0$ is the number satisfying (4.54).

Proof. By (3.4), (3.1), and (4.4),

$$\mathcal{J}_2 \left[\psi^{\text{out}}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right] = A_1 + A_2 \quad \text{on } M \times [t_0, \infty)$$

where

$$|A_1| \leq C \left[\mathbf{1}_{N=5} u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-2} \left\{ |\psi^{\text{out}}|^2 + \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}^2 |\hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}|^2 \right\} + \left\{ |\psi^{\text{out}}|^p + \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}^p |\hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}|^p \right\} \right]$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 |A_2| \leq C & \left[\mathbf{1}_{N=5} u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-2} \left\{ |\psi^{\text{out}}| + \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}} |\hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}| \right\} + \left\{ |\psi^{\text{out}}|^{p-1} + \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}^{p-1} |\hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}|^{p-1} \right\} \right] \\
 & \times \left[\mu_0^{\frac{N+2}{2} - (N-2)\varepsilon_1} + |\psi_t^{\text{out}}| + \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}} |\hat{\psi}_t^{\text{in}}| \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

Let us estimate the term A_1 . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha,2})^{-1} \left[\mathbf{1}_{N=5} u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-2} |\psi^{\text{out}}|^2 + |\psi^{\text{out}}|^p \right] \\
 & \leq C \left[\mathbf{1}_{N=5} \left\| \psi^{\text{out}} \right\|_{*,\alpha,\rho}^2 \mu_0^\rho u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-2} \left(w_{\alpha,2}^{-1} w_{\alpha,0}^2 \right) + \left\| \psi^{\text{out}} \right\|_{*,\alpha,\rho}^p \mu_0^{\rho(p-1)} \left(w_{\alpha,2}^{-1} w_{\alpha,0}^p \right) \right] \\
 & \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \left[\mathbf{1}_{N=5} \left\| \psi^{\text{out}} \right\|_{*,\alpha,\rho}^2 \left(\mu_0^\beta + \mu_0^2 \right) + \left\| \psi^{\text{out}} \right\|_{*,\alpha,\rho}^p \left(\mu_0^{\beta(p-1)} + \mu_0^2 \right) \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$. In addition, for $x = \mu y + \xi \in \text{supp}(\eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}})$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha,2})^{-1} \left[\mathbf{1}_{N=5} u_{\mu,\xi}^{p-2} \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}^2 |\hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}|^2 + \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}^p |\hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}|^p \right] (x, t) \\
 & \leq C \left[\mathbf{1}_{N=5} \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp',a,b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu},\xi})}^2 \mu_0^{2b+\alpha-3} (1 + |y|^{\alpha+1-2a}) + \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp',a,b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu},\xi})}^p \mu_0^{bp-\beta} (1 + |y|^{\alpha+2-ap}) \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C \left[\mathbf{1}_{N=5} \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\sharp',a,b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu},\xi})}^2 \left(\mu_0^{2b-\beta} + \mu_0^{2(a+b-2)} \right) + \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\sharp',a,b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu},\xi})}^p \left(\mu_0^{bp-\beta} + \mu_0^{(a+b)p-N} \right) \right]$$

where we applied (4.59) for the first inequality.

Arguing as above, we can also estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mu_0^\rho w_{\alpha,2})^{-1} |A_2| \\ & \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \left[\mathbf{1}_{N=5} \left\{ \left(\|\psi^{\text{out}}\|_{\ast',\alpha,\rho} + \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\sharp',a,b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu},\xi})} \right) \mu_0^{4-3\varepsilon_1} + \left(\|\psi^{\text{out}}\|_{\ast',\alpha,\rho}^2 + \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\sharp',a,b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu},\xi})}^2 \right) \mu_0^{\delta_3}(t_0) \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left\{ \left(\|\psi^{\text{out}}\|_{\ast',\alpha,\rho}^{p-1} + \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\sharp',a,b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu},\xi})}^{p-1} \right) \mu_0^{4-(N-2)\varepsilon_1} + \left(\|\psi^{\text{out}}\|_{\ast',\alpha,\rho}^p + \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\sharp',a,b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu},\xi})}^p \right) \mu_0^{\delta_3}(t_0) \right\} \right] \end{aligned}$$

on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$. To deduce the inequality, we repeatedly use the relations $\alpha + \beta = N - 2$, $\alpha \in (0, a)$, and $\beta \in (0, b]$.

Combining all the computations together, we establish a weighted L^∞ -estimate for \mathcal{J}_2 , that is, (4.62) where the weighted Hölder norms are replaced with the associated weighted L^∞ -norms.

Further computations yield a weighted Hölder bound of \mathcal{J}_2 and so (4.62). We omit the details. \square

Completion of the proof of Proposition 4.8. For the parameters (μ, ξ) satisfying (2.5)–(2.7) and the function ψ_0 satisfying (4.51), let $\mathcal{T}_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}}[f, \psi_0]$ be a unique solution to (4.1) obtained in Corollary 4.4. A function ψ^{out} is a solution to (4.52) if and only if it satisfies

$$(4.63) \quad \psi^{\text{out}} = \mathcal{T}_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}} \left[f_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}} \left[\psi^{\text{out}}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right], \psi_0 \right]$$

where $f_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}}$ is the map given in (4.53). We shall prove the existence of a fixed point of the operator $\mathcal{T}_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}}[f_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}}[\cdot, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}], \psi_0]$ by applying the contraction mapping theorem on the set

$$(4.64) \quad \mathcal{D}^{\text{out}} := \left\{ \psi^{\text{out}} : \|\psi^{\text{out}}\|_{\ast',\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0} \leq 2C_1(C_{21}C_{32} + C_{22})\delta_0^{-2}\mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0) \right\}$$

where $C_1, C_{21}, C_{22}, C_{32}, C_{33} > 0$ are the numbers appearing in (4.39), (4.51), (4.58), and (4.62).

By employing (4.39), (3.3), (3.4), (4.57), (4.58), (4.62), (4.51), and (4.56), and taking a larger $t_0 > 0$ if required, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathcal{T}_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}} \left[f_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}} \left[\psi^{\text{out}}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right], \psi_0 \right] \right\|_{\ast',\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0} \\ & \leq C_1 \delta_0^{-2} \left(\left\| f_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{out}} \left[\psi^{\text{out}}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right] \right\|_{\ast,\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0} + \|\psi_0\|_{\ast\ast,\alpha;\sigma_0} \right) \\ & \leq C_1 \delta_0^{-2} \left[C_{31} \delta_0^{-\zeta_{31}} \mu_0^{\nu_2 - \zeta_{2\varepsilon_1}}(t_0) + C_{21} C_{32} \mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0) + C_{22} \mu_0^{\delta_2}(t_0) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + C_{33} \delta_0^{-\zeta_{33}} \left\{ \mathbf{1}_{N=5} \left(2C_{21} \mu_0^{4-3\varepsilon_1}(t_0) + \|\psi^{\text{out}}\|_{\ast',\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0}^2 + C_{21}^2 \mu_0^{\delta_3}(t_0) \right) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \left(2C_{21}^{p-1} \mu_0^{4-(N-2)\varepsilon_1}(t_0) + \|\psi^{\text{out}}\|_{\ast',\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0}^p + C_{21}^p \mu_0^{\delta_3}(t_0) \right) \right\} \right] \\ & \leq 2C_1(C_{21}C_{32} + C_{22})\delta_0^{-2}\mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0) \end{aligned}$$

for any $\psi \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{out}}$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.65) \quad & \left\| \mathcal{T}_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}} \left[f_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}} \left[\psi_1^{\text{out}}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right], \psi_0 \right] - \mathcal{T}_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}} \left[f_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}} \left[\psi_2^{\text{out}}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right], \psi_0 \right] \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \\
& \leq C_1 \delta_0^{-2} \left\| \mathcal{J}_2 \left[\psi_1^{\text{out}}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right] - \mathcal{J}_2 \left[\psi_2^{\text{out}}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right] \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \\
& \leq C \delta_0^{-2} \left[\left\| (u_{\mu, \xi} + \psi_1^{\text{out}})_+^p - (u_{\mu, \xi} + \psi_2^{\text{out}})_+^p - p u_{\mu, \xi}^{p-1} (\psi_1^{\text{out}} - \psi_2^{\text{out}}) \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \right. \\
& \quad + \left\| \left\{ (u_{\mu, \xi} + \psi_1^{\text{out}})_+^{p-1} - (u_{\mu, \xi} + \psi_2^{\text{out}})_+^{p-1} \right\} \left\{ (1 - \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}) (u_{\mu, \xi})_t + (\psi_1^{\text{out}})_t \right\} \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \\
& \quad \left. + \left\| \left\{ (u_{\mu, \xi} + \psi_2^{\text{out}})_+^{p-1} - (u_{\mu, \xi})_+^{p-1} \right\} (\psi_1^{\text{out}} - \psi_2^{\text{out}})_t \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \right] \\
& \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \left[\mathbf{1}_{N=5} \mu_0^{\delta_4} (t_0) + \mu_0^{\delta_4(p-1)} (t_0) \right] \left\| \psi_1^{\text{out}} - \psi_2^{\text{out}} \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0}
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{out}}$. Therefore, the operator $\mathcal{T}_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}}[f_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}}[\cdot, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}], \psi_0]$ is a contraction map on \mathcal{D}^{out} , and it has a fixed point in \mathcal{D}^{out} , namely, a point satisfying (4.63). Finally, (4.55) follows directly from (4.64). \square

4.4. Derivatives of the solution to (3.2) with respect to parameters. In the following proposition, we provide quantitative estimates on the derivatives of ψ^{out} with respect to its parameters.

Proposition 4.12. *Suppose that all the conditions of Proposition 4.8 hold. There exists a constant $C, \zeta > 0$ depending only on $(M, g_0), N, h, z_0, \alpha$, and σ_0 such that*

$$(4.66) \quad \begin{cases} \left\| \partial_{\lambda} \psi^{\text{out}} [\bar{\lambda}] \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \mu_0^{\delta_4} (t_0) \mu_0^{\nu_1-1} \left\| \bar{\lambda} \right\|_{\nu_1}, \\ \left\| \partial_{\xi} \psi^{\text{out}} [\bar{\xi}] \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \mu_0^{\delta_4} (t_0) \mu_0^{\nu_2-1} \left\| \bar{\xi} \right\|_{\nu_2}, \\ \left\| \partial_{\dot{\lambda}} \psi^{\text{out}} [\dot{\bar{\lambda}}] \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \mu_0^{\nu_1+3-\zeta \varepsilon_1} \left\| \dot{\bar{\lambda}} \right\|_{\nu_1+2}, \\ \left\| \partial_{\dot{\xi}} \psi^{\text{out}} [\dot{\bar{\xi}}] \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \mu_0^{\nu_2+4-\zeta \varepsilon_1} \left\| \dot{\bar{\xi}} \right\|_{\nu_2+2}, \\ \left\| \partial_{\hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}} \psi^{\text{out}} [\bar{\psi}] \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \mu_0^{\delta_4} (t_0) \left\| \mu_0^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \bar{\psi} \right\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0} \end{cases}$$

and

$$(4.67) \quad \left\| \psi^{\text{out}}[\psi_{01}] - \psi^{\text{out}}[\psi_{02}] \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \leq C \delta_0^{-2} \left\| \psi_{01} - \psi_{02} \right\|_{**, \alpha; \sigma_0}$$

Here, we write

$$\partial_{\lambda} \psi^{\text{out}}[\bar{\lambda}] := \partial_s \psi^{\text{out}} \left[\lambda + s \bar{\lambda}, \xi, \dot{\lambda}, \dot{\xi}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0 \right] \Big|_{s=0}, \quad \psi^{\text{out}}[\psi_0] := \psi^{\text{out}}[\lambda, \xi, \dot{\lambda}, \dot{\xi}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0],$$

and so on. Also, the ν - and \sharp' -norms were defined in (1.13) and (1.19), respectively.

Proof. The implicit function theorem implies that the functions $\partial_{\lambda} \psi^{\text{out}}[\bar{\lambda}], \dots, \partial_{\hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}} \psi^{\text{out}}[\bar{\psi}]$ are well-defined in a neighborhood of given data $(\lambda, \xi, \dot{\lambda}, \dot{\xi}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0)$. Examining the equations that the functions solve, we can deduce (4.66). We skip the details, because the necessary computations are similar to those in the proof of Proposition 4.8; refer to [14, Proposition 4.2] where an analogous result was obtained for critical nonlinear heat equation.

Furthermore, by (4.39) and (4.65),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \psi^{\text{out}}[\psi_{01}] - \psi^{\text{out}}[\psi_{02}] \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \\
& \leq C \delta_0^{-2} \left(\left\| \mathcal{J}_2 \left[\psi^{\text{out}}[\psi_{01}], \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right] - \mathcal{J}_2 \left[\psi^{\text{out}}[\psi_{02}], \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}} \right] \right\|_{*, \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} + \left\| \psi_{01} - \psi_{02} \right\|_{**, \alpha; \sigma_0} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C\delta_0^{-2} \left(o(1) \|\psi^{\text{out}}[\psi_{01}] - \psi^{\text{out}}[\psi_{02}]\|_{*,\alpha,\rho;\sigma_0} + \|\psi_{01} - \psi_{02}\|_{**, \alpha; \sigma_0} \right),$$

which yields (4.67). \square

5. INNER PROBLEM AND THE COMPLETION OF THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

This section is devoted to the analysis of the inner problem (3.6), which will allow us to complete the proof of the main theorem.

In Subsection 5.1, we establish the unique solvability and a priori estimate of the non-uniform inhomogeneous parabolic equation

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{cases} pW_{1,0}^{p-1}\psi_t = \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \left(\Delta\psi + pW_{1,0}^{p-1}\psi \right) + W_{1,0}^{p-1}\mathcal{H} & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \times (t_0, \infty), \\ \psi(\cdot, t_0) = e_0(t_0)Z_0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \end{cases}$$

under the assumption that

$$(5.2) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mathcal{H}(\bar{y}, t) \left(W_{1,0}^{p-1}Z_n \right) (\bar{y})d\bar{y} = 0 \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0, \infty) \text{ and } n = 1, \dots, N+1.$$

Here,

- $e_0(t_0)$ is a real number to be determined by \mathcal{H} ;
- Z_1, \dots, Z_{N+1} are the functions in (2.3) and (2.34);
- Z_0 is the unique positive radial function in \mathbb{R}^N such that

$$\begin{cases} L_0[Z_0] = W_{1,0}^{1-p} \left(\Delta Z_0 + pW_{1,0}^{p-1}Z_0 \right) = \mathbf{m}_0 Z_0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ \mathbf{m}_0 > 0, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} W_{1,0}^{p-1}Z_0^2 = 1. \end{cases}$$

It is clear that $\mathbf{m}_0 = p - 1$ and Z_0 is a constant multiple of $W_{1,0}$; refer to [3, Appendix].

Given parameters (λ, ξ) , and functions ψ^{in} and ψ_0 satisfying (2.5)–(2.7) and (4.51), respectively, let $\psi^{\text{out}} = \psi^{\text{out}}[\lambda, \xi, \hat{\lambda}, \hat{\xi}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0]$ be the unique solution to (4.52) found in Proposition 4.8. In Subsection 5.2, we reduce

$$(5.3) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) \left[\left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} (1+P)^{-p}(x) \mathcal{E}_2[\mu, \xi](y, t) + \mathcal{K}_1[\psi^{\text{in}}] + \mathcal{K}_2[\psi^{\text{in}}, \psi^{\text{out}}] \right] Z_n(\bar{y})d\bar{y} = 0$$

for $n = 1, \dots, N+1$ and $t \in [t_0, \infty)$ into a system of nonlinear ODEs (5.30) and (5.39) of (λ, ξ) and solve it; refer to (1.12), (2.42), (3.1), (3.5), (3.7), (3.8), and Subsection 2.1 for the definition of the notations.

In Subsection 5.3, we solve (3.6) by applying (5.3), the unique solvability of (5.1) under (5.2), and the contraction mapping theorem.

In Subsection 5.4, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

5.1. Linear theory. In this subsection, we examine (5.1) provided $a \in (\sigma_0, N-2)$ and $b \simeq 3$.

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose that $\|\mathcal{H}\|_{\sharp, a+2, b; \sigma_0} < \infty$ and (5.2) holds. Then one can find $\psi = \psi[\mathcal{H}]$ and $e_0 = e_0[\mathcal{H}] \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying (5.1). These ψ and e_0 are linear in \mathcal{H} , and*

$$(5.4) \quad \|\psi\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathbb{R}^N)} + \|e_0\|_{b; \sigma_0} \leq C_4 \|\mathcal{H}\|_{\sharp, a+2, b; \sigma_0}$$

for a constant $C_4 > 0$ depending only on N , a , b and σ_0 . Here, the norms of ψ , e_0 , and \mathcal{H} are given in Definitions 1.9 and 1.6.

As an intermediate step to proving the proposition, we will analyze a uniformly parabolic equation on \mathbb{S}^N

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{cases} p \varphi_t = \frac{\kappa_{NP}}{N} (\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^N} \varphi + N \varphi) + \tilde{\mathcal{H}} - \tilde{c}_0(t) & \text{on } \mathbb{S}^N \times (t_0, s_0), \\ \varphi(\tilde{y}, t_0) = 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{S}^N \end{cases}$$

for $s_0 > \frac{3t_0}{2}$ large enough. Here, $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ is a function satisfying

$$\left\| \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \right\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{H}}_{a,b;t_0,s_0}} := \left\| \mu_0^{-b} [d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y})]^{N-a} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tilde{y}, t) \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^N \times [t_0, s_0])} < \infty,$$

where $d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}) := \arccos(\tilde{y}_{N+1})$ is the geodesic distance on \mathbb{S}^N between $\tilde{y}_{\text{north}} := (0, \dots, 0, 1)$ and \tilde{y} , and

$$(5.6) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^N} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tilde{y}, t) \tilde{y}_n dS_{\tilde{y}} = 0 \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0, s_0) \text{ and } n = 1, \dots, N+1.$$

Also, \tilde{c}_0 is defined as

$$(5.7) \quad \tilde{c}_0(t) = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}^N|} \int_{\mathbb{S}^N} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tilde{y}, t) dS_{\tilde{y}} \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0, s_0).$$

By integrating the equation in (5.5) over \mathbb{S}^N , and applying (5.7) and the initial condition on φ , we find

$$(5.8) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^N} \varphi(\tilde{y}, t) dS_{\tilde{y}} = 0 \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0, s_0).$$

Moreover, testing \tilde{y}_n on (5.5) for $n = 1, \dots, N+1$, and exploiting (5.6) and the fact that N is the second eigenvalue of $-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^N}$ with eigenfunctions $\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_{N+1}$, we obtain

$$(5.9) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^N} \varphi(\tilde{y}, t) \tilde{y}_n dS_{\tilde{y}} = 0 \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0, s_0) \text{ and } n = 1, \dots, N+1.$$

Lemma 5.2. *Assume that $\left\| \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \right\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{H}}_{a,b;t_0,s_0}} < \infty$ for $s_0 > \frac{3t_0}{2}$ large, and (5.6) holds. If φ is a solution to (5.5) such that $\varphi, D_{\tilde{y}}\varphi, D_{\tilde{y}}^2\varphi, \varphi_t \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^N \times (t_0, s_0))$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on N, a and b such that*

$$(5.10) \quad \|\varphi\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{H}}_{a+2,b;t_0,s_0}} + \sup_{t \in [t_0, s_0)} \mu_0^{-b}(t) |\tilde{c}_0(t)| \leq C \left\| \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \right\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{H}}_{a,b;t_0,s_0}}.$$

Proof. To deduce the lemma, we will argue as in the proof of [46, Lemma 4.1]; see Remark 1.4 (3). The proof is divided into two steps.

Throughout the proof, C denotes a universal constant independent of s_0 .

STEP 1. We insist that

$$(5.11) \quad \sup_{t \in [t_0, s_0)} \mu_0^{-b}(t) |\tilde{c}_0(t)| \leq C \left\| \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \right\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{H}}_{a,b;t_0,s_0}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\varphi\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{H}}_{a+2,b;t_0,s_0}} < \infty.$$

The first inequality in (5.11) is obvious. Let us consider the second one. If $\delta > 0$ is any small number, parabolic regularity theory ensures the existence of $K_1 > 0$ depending on φ and $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ such that

$$\|\varphi\|_{C^0((\mathbb{S}^N \setminus B_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}_{\text{north}}, \delta)) \times [t_0, s_0])} \leq K_1.$$

Also, the geodesic distance $d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}) = \arccos(\tilde{y}_{N+1})$ on \mathbb{S}^N between \tilde{y}_{north} and \tilde{y} satisfies

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^N} [d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y})]^{a-(N-2)} = ((N-2) - a) (-a + O(\delta^2)) [d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y})]^{a-N} \quad \text{in } B_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}_{\text{north}}, \delta).$$

Therefore, if we set

$$v(\tilde{y}, t) = K_2 \left\| \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \right\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{H}}_{a,b;t_0,s_0}} \mu_0^b(t) [d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y})]^{a-(N-2)} \quad \text{in } B_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}_{\text{north}}, \delta) \times (t_0, s_0),$$

then

$$\begin{cases} (v \pm \varphi)_t \geq \frac{\kappa_N}{N} [\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^N}(v \pm \varphi) + N(v \pm \varphi)] & \text{in } B_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}_{\text{north}}, \delta) \times (t_0, s_0), \\ (v \pm \varphi)(\tilde{y}, t_0) = v(\tilde{y}, t_0) \geq 0 & \text{in } B_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}_{\text{north}}, \delta), \\ v \pm \varphi \geq 0 & \text{on } \partial B_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}_{\text{north}}, \delta) \times (t_0, s_0) \end{cases}$$

provided $K_2 \gg K_1$. The parabolic maximum principle implies the second inequality in (5.11).

STEP 2. We assert that

$$(5.12) \quad \|\varphi\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\sharp, a+2, b; t_0, s_0}} \leq C \|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\sharp, a, b; t_0, s_0}}.$$

To the contrary, suppose that there exist increasing sequences $\{t_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\{s_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ of positive numbers for which (4.14) holds, and sequences $\{\varphi_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ of functions which satisfy

$$(5.13) \quad \begin{cases} p(\varphi_\ell)_t = \frac{\kappa_N p}{N} (\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^N} \varphi_\ell + N \varphi_\ell) + \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\ell - \tilde{c}_\ell(t) & \text{on } \mathbb{S}^N \times (t_\ell, s_\ell), \\ \varphi_\ell(\tilde{y}, t_\ell) = 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{S}^N, \end{cases}$$

$$(5.14) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^N} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\ell(\tilde{y}, t) \tilde{y}_n dS_{\tilde{y}} = 0 \quad \text{for } t \in [t_\ell, s_\ell) \text{ and } n = 1, \dots, N+1,$$

and

$$(5.15) \quad \|\varphi_\ell\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\sharp, a+2, b; t_\ell, s_\ell}} = 1, \quad \|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\ell\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\sharp, a, b; t_\ell, s_\ell}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \ell \rightarrow \infty.$$

Here, \tilde{c}_ℓ is defined as

$$(5.16) \quad \tilde{c}_\ell(t) := \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}^N|} \int_{\mathbb{S}^N} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\ell(\tilde{y}, t) dS_{\tilde{y}} \quad \text{for } t \in [t_\ell, s_\ell).$$

By (5.8), (5.9) and (5.15), we have

$$(5.17) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^N} \varphi_\ell(\tilde{y}, t) dS_{\tilde{y}} = \int_{\mathbb{S}^N} \varphi_\ell(\tilde{y}, t) \tilde{y}_n dS_{\tilde{y}} = 0 \quad \text{for } t \in [t_\ell, s_\ell) \text{ and } n = 1, \dots, N+1,$$

and there is a sequence $\{(\tilde{y}_\ell, \tau_\ell)\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\{\tau_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ is increasing and

$$(5.18) \quad \begin{cases} \tilde{y}_\ell = (\tilde{y}_{\ell 1}, \dots, \tilde{y}_{\ell(N+1)}) \in \mathbb{S}^N, \quad \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{y}_\ell = \tilde{y}_\infty \in \mathbb{S}^N, \quad \tau_\ell \in (t_\ell, s_\ell), \\ \frac{1}{2} \leq \mu_0^{-b}(\tau_\ell) [d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}_\ell)]^{N-2-a} |\varphi_\ell(\tilde{y}_\ell, \tau_\ell)| \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } \ell \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases}$$

Let us check that $\tilde{y}_\infty = \tilde{y}_{\text{north}}$. If not, we would have a small number $\delta > 0$ such that $d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}_\ell) \geq \delta$ for all large $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\chi : \mathbb{S}^N \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a smooth function such that $\chi(\tilde{y}) = 1$ if $d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}) \geq \frac{\delta}{2}$, $\chi(\tilde{y}) = 0$ if $d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}) \leq \frac{\delta}{4}$, and $|\nabla \chi| \leq \frac{4}{\delta}$ on \mathbb{S}^N . We test (5.13) against $\chi^2 \varphi_\ell$ for each $\tau \in (t_\ell, s_\ell)$, integrate the result over (t_ℓ, τ) , and apply (5.11), the initial condition on φ_ℓ , (5.15), and Grönwall's inequality. Then we obtain

$$\int_{\{d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}) \geq \frac{\delta}{2}\}} \varphi_\ell^2(\tilde{y}, \tau) dS_{\tilde{y}} \leq o(1) \left[\int_{t_\ell}^\tau \mu_0^{2b}(t) dt \right] e^{C(\tau - t_\ell)} \quad \text{for } \tau \in [t_\ell, s_\ell).$$

Combining this with parabolic estimates yields that $\liminf_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} (\tau_\ell - t_\ell) = \infty$, as otherwise

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_0^{-b}(\tau_\ell) \|\varphi_\ell\|_{C^0(\{d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}) \geq \delta\} \times [\tau_\ell - 1, \tau_\ell])} \\ & \leq C \mu_0^{-b}(\tau_\ell) \left[\|\varphi_\ell\|_{L^2(\{d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}) \geq \frac{\delta}{2}\} \times [\tau_\ell - 2, \tau_\ell])} + \|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\ell\|_{L^\infty(\{d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}) \geq \frac{\delta}{2}\} \times [\tau_\ell - 2, \tau_\ell])} + \|\tilde{c}_\ell\|_{L^\infty([\tau_\ell - 2, \tau_\ell])} \right] \\ & \leq o(1) \left[\left\{ \int_{\tau_\ell - 2}^{\tau_\ell} \int_{t_\ell}^\tau \left(\frac{\tau_\ell}{t} \right)^b e^{C(\tau - t_\ell)} dt d\tau \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} + 1 \right] = o(1), \end{aligned}$$

contradicting (5.18). It follows that the limit equation of the sequence $\{\mu_0^{-b}(t + \tau_\ell) \varphi_\ell(\tilde{y}, t + \tau_\ell)\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ is

$$(5.19) \quad \begin{cases} (\bar{\varphi}_\infty)_t = \frac{\kappa_N}{N} (\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^N} \bar{\varphi}_\infty + N \bar{\varphi}_\infty) & \text{on } \mathbb{S}^N \times (-\infty, 0), \\ |\bar{\varphi}_\infty(\tilde{y}, t)| \leq [d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y})]^{a-(N-2)} & \text{for } (\tilde{y}, t) \in \mathbb{S}^N \times (-\infty, 0), \end{cases}$$

and it holds that $\bar{\varphi}_\infty(\tilde{y}_\infty, 0) \neq 0$ and

$$(5.20) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^N} \bar{\varphi}_\infty(\tilde{y}, t) dS_{\tilde{y}} = \int_{\mathbb{S}^N} \bar{\varphi}_\infty(\tilde{y}, t) \tilde{y}_n dS_{\tilde{y}} = 0 \quad \text{for } t \in (-\infty, 0) \text{ and } n = 1, \dots, N+1.$$

By the growth condition on $\bar{\varphi}_\infty$ in (5.19) and parabolic regularity, $\bar{\varphi}_\infty$ is in fact smooth on $\mathbb{S}^N \times (-\infty, 0)$ and $\|\bar{\varphi}_\infty\|_{C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^N \times (-\infty, 0))} \leq C$. Also, (5.20) gives

$$\mathfrak{B}(\bar{\varphi}_\infty(\cdot, t)) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } t \in (-\infty, 0) \quad \text{where } \mathfrak{B}(\bar{\varphi}) := \int_{\mathbb{S}^N} (|\nabla_{\mathbb{S}^N} \bar{\varphi}|^2 - N \bar{\varphi}^2) dS_{\tilde{y}}.$$

Testing $(\bar{\varphi}_\infty)_t$ on (5.19) and the equation of $(\bar{\varphi}_\infty)_t$, respectively, we get

$$\int_{-t}^0 \int_{\mathbb{S}^N} (\bar{\varphi}_\infty)_t^2 = \frac{\kappa_N}{2N} [\mathfrak{B}(\bar{\varphi}_\infty(\cdot, -t)) - \mathfrak{B}(\bar{\varphi}_\infty(\cdot, 0))] \leq C \|\bar{\varphi}_\infty\|_{C^1(\mathbb{S}^N \times (-\infty, 0))} \leq C$$

and

$$\partial_t \int_{\mathbb{S}^N} (\bar{\varphi}_\infty)_t^2 = -\mathfrak{B}(\bar{\varphi}_\infty(\cdot, t)) \leq 0$$

for all $t \in (-\infty, 0]$. Hence $(\bar{\varphi}_\infty)_t = 0$ on $\mathbb{S}^N \times (-\infty, 0]$. By plugging it into (5.19) and employing (5.20) again, we conclude that $\bar{\varphi}_\infty = 0$ on $\mathbb{S}^N \times (-\infty, 0]$. This is a contradiction, and we must have that $\tilde{y}_\infty = \tilde{y}_{\text{north}}$. Especially, $\nu_\ell := d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}_\ell) \rightarrow 0$ and $(\tilde{y}_{\ell 1}, \dots, \tilde{y}_{\ell N}) \rightarrow 0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$.

Now, we regard φ_ℓ as the function in $B^N(0, \frac{1}{2}) \times (t_\ell, s_\ell)$, abusing the notation

$$\varphi_\ell(y, t) = \varphi_\ell \left(\left(y, \sqrt{1 - |y|^2} \right), t \right) \quad \begin{cases} \text{for } (y, t) \in B^N(0, \frac{1}{2}) \times (t_\ell, s_\ell) \\ \text{so that } \left(\left(y, \sqrt{1 - |y|^2} \right), t \right) \in \mathbb{S}^N \times (t_\ell, s_\ell), \end{cases}$$

and define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\varphi}_\ell(Y, \tau) &= \mu_0^{-b}(\tau_\ell) \nu_\ell^{N-2-a} \varphi_\ell(\tilde{y}_{\ell 1} + \nu_\ell Y_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_{\ell N} + \nu_\ell Y_N, \tau_\ell + \nu_\ell^2 \tau) \\ &\quad \text{for } Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_N) \in B^N\left(0, \frac{1}{4\nu_\ell}\right) \text{ and } \tau \in \left(\frac{t_\ell - \tau_\ell}{\nu_\ell^2}, 0\right]. \end{aligned}$$

As $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, $\tilde{\varphi}_\ell$ tends to a function $\tilde{\varphi}_\infty$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \times (-\infty, 0]$ which satisfies

$$(5.21) \quad \begin{cases} (\tilde{\varphi}_\infty)_\tau = \frac{\kappa_N}{N} \Delta \tilde{\varphi}_\infty & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \times (-\infty, 0), \\ |\tilde{\varphi}_\infty(Y, \tau)| \leq |Y - Y_0|^{a-(N-2)} & \text{for } (Y, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times (-\infty, 0] \text{ and some } Y_0 \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}, \end{cases}$$

and $\frac{1}{2} \leq |\tilde{\varphi}_\infty(0, 0)| \leq 1$. However, a standard comparison argument shows that the only solution to (5.21) is the trivial one. This is a contradiction, and (5.12) must hold.

Inequality (5.10) is an immediate consequence of (5.11) and (5.12). \square

Corollary 5.3. *Assume that $\|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}\|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}, a, b} := \|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}\|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}, a, b; t_0, \infty} < \infty$, and (5.6) and (5.7) hold for $s_0 = \infty$. Then one can find a solution φ to the equation*

$$(5.22) \quad \begin{cases} p \varphi_t = \frac{\kappa_N p}{N} (\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^N} \varphi + N \varphi) + \tilde{\mathcal{H}} - \tilde{c}_0(t) & \text{on } \mathbb{S}^N \times (t_0, \infty), \\ \varphi(\tilde{y}, t_0) = 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{S}^N, \end{cases}$$

which automatically satisfies (5.8) and (5.9) for $s_0 = \infty$. Also, $\varphi = \varphi[\tilde{\mathcal{H}}]$ and $\tilde{c}_0 = \tilde{c}_0[\tilde{\mathcal{H}}]$ are linear in $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, and

$$(5.23) \quad \|\varphi\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}, a+2, b} + \sup_{t \in [t_0, \infty)} \mu_0^{-b}(t) |\tilde{c}_0(t)| \leq C \|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}, a, b}$$

for a constant $C > 0$ depending only on N , a and b .

Proof. Given an increasing sequence $\{s_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\frac{3t_0}{2} < s_\ell \rightarrow \infty$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, let us consider the problem

$$(5.24) \quad \begin{cases} p(\varphi_\ell)_t = \frac{\kappa_N p}{N} (\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^N} \varphi_\ell + N \varphi_\ell) + \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\ell - \tilde{c}_\ell(t) & \text{on } \mathbb{S}^N \times (t_0, s_\ell), \\ \varphi_\ell(\tilde{y}, t_0) = 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{S}^N. \end{cases}$$

Here,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\ell(\tilde{y}, t) := \min \left\{ \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tilde{y}, t), \ell \right\} - \sum_{n=1}^{N+1} \tilde{d}_{n\ell}(t) \tilde{y}_n \in L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^N \times (t_0, s_\ell)),$$

$$\tilde{d}_{n\ell}(t) := \frac{N+1}{|\mathbb{S}^N|} \int_{\mathbb{S}^N} \min \left\{ \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tilde{y}, t), \ell \right\} \tilde{y}_n dS_{\tilde{y}} \quad \text{for } t \in (t_0, s_\ell) \text{ and } n = 1, \dots, N+1,$$

and \tilde{c}_ℓ is the quantity defined by (5.16) in which t_ℓ is replaced with t_0 . Clearly, (5.14) holds provided $t_\ell = t_0$, and $\tilde{d}_{n\ell}(t) \rightarrow 0$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\ell \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ a.e. as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$.

By applying the Galerkin method, we can construct a solution φ_ℓ to (5.24) such that φ_ℓ , $D_{\tilde{y}} \varphi_\ell$, $D_{\tilde{y}}^2 \varphi_\ell$, $(\varphi_\ell)_t \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^N \times (t_0, s_\ell))$. Lemma 5.2 tells us that such φ_ℓ is unique and

$$(5.25) \quad \|\varphi_\ell\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}, a+2, b; t_0, s_\ell} + \sup_{t \in [t_0, s_\ell)} \mu_0^{-b}(t) |\tilde{c}_\ell(t)| \leq C \|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\ell\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}, a, b; t_0, s_\ell} \leq C \|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}, a, b}$$

for a constant $C > 0$ independent of $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. By (5.14), we also have (5.17) provided $t_\ell = t_0$.

Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{a}{N-a})$. Given any $s > t_0$, parabolic regularity and (5.25) yield that

$$\| |\varphi_\ell| + |D_{\tilde{y}} \varphi_\ell| + |D_{\tilde{y}}^2 \varphi_\ell| + |(\varphi_\ell)_t| \|_{L^{1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{S}^N \times (t_0, s))} \leq C$$

for some $C > 0$ independent of $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, we have a function φ_∞ on $\mathbb{S}^N \times (t_0, \infty)$ such that

$$\varphi_\ell \rightarrow \varphi_\infty \begin{cases} \text{weakly in } W_{\text{loc}}^{1, 1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{S}^N \times (t_0, \infty)), \\ \text{strongly in } L_{\text{loc}}^{1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{S}^N \times (t_0, \infty)), \\ \text{a.e. on } \mathbb{S}^N \times (t_0, \infty) \end{cases} \quad \text{as } \ell \rightarrow \infty,$$

along a subsequence. In particular, φ_∞ satisfies (5.22) with $\tilde{c}_0(t) = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{c}_\ell(t)$. Setting $\varphi = \varphi_\infty$, we also infer from (5.17) and (5.25) that (5.8)–(5.9) for $s_0 = \infty$ and (5.23) are valid.

The linear dependence of φ and \tilde{c}_0 in $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ is obvious. This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 5.4. *Assume that $\|\mathcal{H}\|_{\mathcal{H}, a+2, b} < \infty$ and (5.2) holds. Then one can find a solution ϕ to the equation*

$$(5.26) \quad \begin{cases} pW_{1,0}^{p-1} \phi_t = \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \left(\Delta \phi + pW_{1,0}^{p-1} \phi \right) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \times (t_0, \infty), \\ \quad \quad \quad + W_{1,0}^{p-1} \mathcal{H} - c_0(t) W_{1,0}^{p-1} Z_0 & \\ \phi(\bar{y}, t_0) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \end{cases}$$

for a suitable c_0 , which also satisfies

$$(5.27) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \phi(\bar{y}, t) \left(W_{1,0}^{p-1} Z_n \right) (\bar{y}) d\bar{y} = 0 \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0, \infty) \text{ and } n = 0, \dots, N+1.$$

Also, $\phi = \phi[\mathcal{H}]$ and $c_0 = c_0[\mathcal{H}]$ are linear in \mathcal{H} , and

$$(5.28) \quad \|\phi\|_{\sharp', a, b(\mathbb{R}^N)} + \sup_{t \in [t_0, \infty)} \mu_0^{-b}(t) |c_0(t)| \leq C \|\mathcal{H}\|_{\sharp, a+2, b}$$

for a constant $C > 0$ depending only on N , a and b .

Proof. Let $\Pi : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_n^N$ and $\Pi_* f : \mathbb{S}_n^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the inverse of the stereographic projection and the weighted push-forward of $f : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in Definition 4.2, respectively.

We set $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \Pi_* \mathcal{H}$ for each fixed $t \in [t_0, \infty)$. If $d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y})$ is the geodesic distance on \mathbb{S}^N between $\tilde{y}_{\text{north}} = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$ and $\tilde{y} = \Pi(\bar{y})$ for $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, then

$$d_{\mathbb{S}^N}(\tilde{y}) = \arccos \left(\frac{|\bar{y}|^2 - 1}{|\bar{y}|^2 + 1} \right) = \frac{2}{|\bar{y}|} \left[1 + O \left(\frac{1}{|\bar{y}|^2} \right) \right] \quad \text{for } |\bar{y}| \text{ large.}$$

Hence, $\|\mathcal{H}\|_{\sharp, a+2, b} < \infty$ is reduced to $\|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}\|_{\tilde{\sharp}, a, b} < \infty$. Besides, each $\Pi_* Z_\ell$ being a constant multiple of \tilde{y}_ℓ , (5.2) is transformed into (5.6) with $s_0 = \infty$.

Given the solution (φ, \tilde{c}_0) to (5.22) deduced from Corollary 5.3, we set (ϕ, c_0) by

$$\varphi = \Pi_* \phi \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{c}_0(t) := c_0(t)(\Pi_* Z_0) \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0, \infty),$$

noting that $\Pi_* Z_0$ is a positive constant. By virtue of conformality of the map Π , it satisfies (5.26)–(5.28). \square

Corollary 5.5. *Suppose that all the assumptions on Proposition 5.1 hold. Let ϕ be a solution to (5.26) satisfying (5.28). Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on N , a , b and σ_0 such that*

$$(5.29) \quad \|\phi\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathbb{R}^N)} + \|c_0\|_{b; \sigma_0} \leq C \|\mathcal{H}\|_{\sharp, a+2, b; \sigma_0}.$$

Proof. From the relation

$$c_0(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} W_{1,0}^{p-1} Z_0 \mathcal{H}(\bar{y}, t) d\bar{y} \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0, \infty),$$

it is easy to see that $[c_0]_{C_t^{\sigma_0/2}}$ is controlled by $\|\mathcal{H}\|_{\sharp, a+2, b; \sigma_0}$ provided $a > \sigma_0$. Using this fact and (5.28), one can estimate $\|\phi\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathbb{R}^N)}$ as in Step 1 in the proof of Corollary 4.7. We skip the details. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Let ϕ be the solution to (5.26) satisfying (5.27) and (5.29) found in Corollary 5.4. If we set $\psi = \phi + e_0(t)Z_0$, it satisfies (5.1) provided e_0 satisfies

$$\dot{e}_0 - \kappa_N e_0 = p^{-1} c_0 \quad \text{on } [t_0, \infty),$$

which is explicitly given by

$$e_0(t) = -\frac{1}{p} \int_t^\infty \exp(\kappa_N(t - \tau)) c_0(\tau) d\tau \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0, \infty).$$

The function e_0 is linear in \mathcal{H} . Moreover, by (5.29),

$$\|e_0\|_{b; \sigma_0} \leq C \sup_{t \in [t_0, \infty)} \mu_0^{-b}(t) |c_0(t)| \leq C \|\mathcal{H}\|_{\sharp, a+2, b},$$

which together with the condition $a < N - 2$ yields

$$\|\psi\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq \|\phi\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathbb{R}^N)} + \|e_0 Z_0\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \|\mathcal{H}\|_{\sharp, a+2, b; \sigma_0}$$

as desired. \square

5.2. Choice of parameters. As mentioned at the beginning of this section, we reduce (5.3) into a system of nonlinear ODEs of $(\lambda, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_N)$. Recall ν_1 and ν_2 in (2.7), δ_4 in (4.56), and $a, b, \alpha, \beta, \rho, \sigma_0$, and $\psi^{\text{out}} = \psi^{\text{out}}[\lambda, \xi, \dot{\lambda}, \dot{\xi}, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0]$ in Proposition 4.8.

Lemma 5.6. *Assume that (4.51) and (2.5)–(2.7) hold. For $n = 1, \dots, N$, (5.3) is equivalent to*

$$(5.30) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\xi}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \dot{\xi}_n \end{pmatrix} - \frac{N-4}{6h(z_0)t} \begin{pmatrix} R_{11}(z_0) & \cdots & R_{1N}(z_0) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ R_{N1}(z_0) & \cdots & R_{NN}(z_0) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 \\ \vdots \\ \xi_n \end{pmatrix} = \mu_0^4 \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{11} \\ \vdots \\ \Theta_{N1} \end{pmatrix} + \mu_0^{b+\nu_1} \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{12} \\ \vdots \\ \Theta_{N2} \end{pmatrix} + \mu_0^{\delta_4(t_0)} \mu_0^{\beta+1} \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{13} \\ \vdots \\ \Theta_{N3} \end{pmatrix}$$

on $[t_0, \infty)$. Here, $\Theta_n = \Theta_{n1}, \Theta_{n2}, \Theta_{n3}$ is a function on $[t_0, \infty)$ such that

- $\|\Theta_n\|_{0;\sigma_0} \leq C_5 \delta_0^{-\zeta_5}$ for some $C_5, \zeta_5 > 0$ where the norm is defined in (1.13);
- It depends on the parameters $\lambda, \dot{\lambda}, \xi, \dot{\xi}$ and the functions ψ^{in}, ψ_0 . Besides, it satisfies

$$(5.31) \quad \begin{cases} \|\Theta_n[\lambda_1] - \Theta_n[\lambda_2]\|_{0;\sigma_0} \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2\|_{\nu_1;\sigma_0}, \\ \|\Theta_n[\xi_1] - \Theta_n[\xi_2]\|_{0;\sigma_0} \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \|\xi_1 - \xi_2\|_{\nu_2;\sigma_0}, \\ \|\Theta_n[\dot{\lambda}_1] - \Theta_n[\dot{\lambda}_2]\|_{0;\sigma_0} \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \|\dot{\lambda}_1 - \dot{\lambda}_2\|_{\nu_1+2;\sigma_0}, \\ \|\Theta_n[\dot{\xi}_1] - \Theta_n[\dot{\xi}_2]\|_{0;\sigma_0} \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \|\dot{\xi}_1 - \dot{\xi}_2\|_{\nu_2+2;\sigma_0}, \\ \|\Theta_n[\psi_1^{\text{in}}] - \Theta_n[\psi_2^{\text{in}}]\|_{0;\sigma_0} \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \|\psi_1^{\text{in}} - \psi_2^{\text{in}}\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})} \end{cases}$$

and

$$(5.32) \quad \|\Theta_n[\psi_{01}] - \Theta_n[\psi_{02}]\|_{0;\sigma_0} \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \mu_0^{-\delta_4(t_0)} \|\psi_{01} - \psi_{02}\|_{**;\alpha;\sigma_0}$$

for $C, \zeta > 0$ large depending only on $(M, g_0), N, h, z_0, a, b, \alpha$, and σ_0 .

Proof. Throughout the proof, we will use the notation Θ_n to refer functions which behave as in the statement of the lemma. They may vary from line to line and even in the same line.

Fixing $n = 1, \dots, N$, we will examine

$$(5.33) \quad \begin{aligned} B_{n1} &:= \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) (1+P)^{-p}(x) \mathcal{E}_2[\mu, \xi](y, t) Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y}, \\ B_{n2} &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) \mathcal{K}_1[\psi^{\text{in}}] Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y}, \quad B_{n3} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) \mathcal{K}_2[\psi^{\text{in}}, \psi^{\text{out}}] Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$, respectively. Here, $x = \mu y + \xi = \bar{\mu} \bar{y} + \xi$.

ESTIMATE ON B_{n1} : To estimate B_{n1} , we treat the quantity $\mathcal{E}_2[\mu, \xi](y, t)$ in (2.42) term by term.

First, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\mu}^{-1} (\dot{\lambda} - \bar{\mu}^{-1} \dot{\bar{\mu}} \lambda) \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) (1+P)^{-p}(x) \left(pW_{1,0}^{p-1} Z_{N+1}\right)(y) Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} \\ &= \mu_0^{\nu_1+1} \Theta_n \left(1 + \mu_0^{\nu_1-1} \Theta_n\right) \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(\eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) - 1\right) \left(pW_{1,0}^{p-1} Z_{N+1} Z_n\right)(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} \right. \\ & \quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) \left\{ \left(pW_{1,0}^{p-1} Z_{N+1}\right)(y) - \left(pW_{1,0}^{p-1} Z_{N+1}\right)(\bar{y}) \right\} Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} \\ & \quad \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) \left\{ (1+P)^{-p}(x) - 1 \right\} \left(pW_{1,0}^{p-1} Z_{N+1}\right)(y) Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} \right] \\ &= \mu_0^{\nu_1+1} \Theta_n \left(\mu_0^{(N+1)(1-\varepsilon_1)} \Theta_n + \mu_0^{\nu_1-1} \Theta_n + \mu_0^2 \Theta_n \right) = \mu_0^{2\nu_1} \Theta_n, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$\left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \mu^{-1} \dot{\xi} \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) (1+P)^{-p}(x) \left(p W_{1,0}^{p-1} \nabla W_{1,0}\right)(y) Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} = c_5 \bar{\mu}^{-1} \dot{\xi}_n + \mu_0^{\nu_1+\nu_2} \Theta_n$$

where

$$(5.34) \quad c_5 := p \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} W_{1,0}^{p-1} Z_1^2 > 0.$$

Second, we infer from (2.19) and the parity that

$$2\bar{\mu}\lambda \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) (1+P)^{-p}(x) \mathcal{F}_0(y) Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} = 2\bar{\mu}\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\mathcal{F}_0 Z_n)(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} + \mu_0^{2\nu_1} \Theta_n = \mu_0^{2\nu_1} \Theta_n.$$

Third, (2.20) and the identity

$$\frac{2}{N-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (y \cdot \nabla W_{1,0}(y)) W_{1,0}^p(y) dy = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla W_{1,0}|^2$$

imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) (1+P)^{-p}(x) \mathcal{F}_1[\mu, \xi](y) Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\mathcal{F}_1[\bar{\mu}, \xi] Z_n)(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} + \mu_0^{\nu_1+\nu_2} \Theta_n = -\frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{12N} \bar{\mu} \xi_j R_{jn}(z_0) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla W_{1,0}|^2 + \mu_0^{\nu_1+\nu_2} \Theta_n. \end{aligned}$$

Lastly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) (1+P)^{-p}(x) \left[\mu^3 a^{\{1\}} + \mu^{2\nu_1} a^{\{2\}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \mu \dot{\mu} a^{\{0\}} + \mu^{\nu_1-2} \dot{\lambda} a^{\{-2\}} + \mu \dot{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{a}^{\{-1\}} \right] Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} = \mu_0^3 \Theta_n. \end{aligned}$$

From the above calculations, (2.5), and (5.34), we conclude that

$$(5.35) \quad B_{n1} = c_5 \bar{\mu}^{-1} \left[\dot{\xi}_n - \frac{N-4}{6h(z_0)t} R_{jn}(z_0) \xi_j \right] + \mu_0^3 \Theta_n.$$

ESTIMATE ON B_{n2} : To estimate B_{n2} , we handle the quantity $\mathcal{K}_1[\psi^{\text{in}}]$ in (3.7) term by term.

As an illustration, we consider the integrals involving the first and third terms of $\mathcal{K}_1[\psi^{\text{in}}]$: The mean value theorem, (1.19), (4.51), and the assumption $a > \sigma_0$ lead to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) \left[W_{1,0}^{p-1}(\bar{y}) - W_{1,0}^{p-1}(y) \right] (\psi^{\text{in}})_t Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} = \mu_0^{b+\nu_1-1} \Theta_n$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) \left[\left(\frac{\mu}{\bar{\mu}} \right)^2 (1+P)^{1-p}(x) (\Delta_{g_0(x)} \psi^{\text{in}})(\bar{y}, t) - \Delta \psi^{\text{in}}(\bar{y}, t) \right] Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} \\
&= \left(\frac{\mu}{\bar{\mu}} \right)^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) [(1+P)^{1-p}(x) - 1] (\Delta_{g_0(x)} \psi^{\text{in}})(\bar{y}, t) Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} \\
(5.36) \quad &+ \left[\left(\frac{\mu}{\bar{\mu}} \right)^2 - 1 \right] \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) (\Delta_{g_0(x)} \psi^{\text{in}})(\bar{y}, t) Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} \\
&+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) [(\Delta_{g_0(\bar{\mu} \cdot + \xi)} - \Delta) \psi^{\text{in}}](\bar{y}, t) Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} \\
&= \mu_0^{b+1} \Theta_n + \mu_0^{b+\nu_1-1} \Theta_n + \left(\mu_0^{a+b+1-\sigma_0} \Theta_n + \mu_0^{b+2} \Theta_n \right) = \mu_0^{b+\nu_1-1} \Theta_n.
\end{aligned}$$

In a similar manner, one can compute the integrals involving the remaining terms of $\mathcal{K}_1[\psi^{\text{in}}]$, deriving

$$(5.37) \quad B_{n2} = \mu_0^{b+\nu_1-1} \Theta_n.$$

ESTIMATE ON B_{n3} : We consider two terms of $\mathcal{K}_2[\psi^{\text{in}}, \psi^{\text{out}}]$ in (3.8) separately.

First, by (1.17) and (4.55),

$$\left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) (1+P)^{-1}(x) W_{1,0}^{p-1}(y) \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \psi^{\text{out}}(x, t) Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} = \mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0) \mu_0^{\beta} \Theta_n.$$

Second, the mean value theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) \left[\left\{ (W_{1,0} + \bar{\mu}^2 Q_0)(y) + \left(\frac{\mu}{\bar{\mu}} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \psi^{\text{in}} + (1+P)^{-1}(x) \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \psi^{\text{out}}(x, t) \right\}^{p-1} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - (W_{1,0} + \bar{\mu}^2 Q_0)^{p-1}(y) \right] \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}/2} \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \left\{ \mu^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} (W_{1,0} + \bar{\mu}^2 Q_0)(y) \right\}_t Z_n(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} \\
&= \mu_0^{b+2} \Theta_n + \mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0) \mu_0^{\beta+2} \Theta_n.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$(5.38) \quad B_{n3} = \mu_0^{b+2} \Theta_n + \mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0) \mu_0^{\beta} \Theta_n.$$

Notice that (5.3) is equivalent to the equation $B_{n1} + B_{n2} + B_{n3} = 0$. By combining (5.35), (5.37), and (5.38), we establish (5.30).

A closer look at the above computations with (4.66)–(4.67) gives (5.31)–(5.32). The details are omitted. \square

Lemma 5.7. Assume that (4.51) and (2.5)–(2.7) hold. For $n = N + 1$, (5.3) is equivalent to

$$(5.39) \quad \dot{\lambda}(t) + \frac{3}{2t} \lambda(t) = \mu_0^4 \Theta_{(N+1)1} + \mu_0^{b+\nu_1} \Theta_{(N+1)2} + \mu_0^{a+b+1-\sigma_0} \Theta_{(N+1)3} + \mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0) \mu_0^{\beta+1} \Theta_{(N+1)4}$$

on $[t_0, \infty)$. Here, $\Theta_{N+1} = \Theta_{(N+1)1}, \dots, \Theta_{(N+1)4}$ is a function on $[t_0, \infty)$ that behaves as the function Θ_n described in the statement of Lemma 5.6.

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of the previous lemma. Let $B_{(N+1)1}$, $B_{(N+1)2}$, and $B_{(N+1)3}$ be the quantities obtained by taking $n = N + 1$ in (5.33). It suffices to estimate each of them.

ESTIMATE ON $B_{(N+1)1}$: In view of (2.4) and (2.5)–(2.6) (see also (2.31)), we know

$$\frac{N+2}{2} \bar{\mu}^2 h(z_0) c_2 - \bar{\mu}^{-1} \dot{\bar{\mu}} c_1 = \frac{3}{2t} c_1.$$

By (2.42), (2.36), and the above identity, the dominating term of $B_{(N+1)1}$ turns out to be

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[\bar{\mu}^{-1} \left(\dot{\lambda} - \bar{\mu}^{-1} \dot{\bar{\mu}} \lambda \right) pW_{1,0}^{p-1}(\bar{y}) + 2\bar{\mu}\lambda\mathcal{F}_0(\bar{y}) \right] Z_{N+1}(\bar{y}) d\bar{y} \\ = \bar{\mu}^{-1} \left(\dot{\lambda} - \bar{\mu}^{-1} \dot{\bar{\mu}} \lambda \right) c_1 + \frac{N+2}{2} \bar{\mu}\lambda h(z_0) c_2 = \bar{\mu}^{-1} c_1 \left(\dot{\lambda} + \frac{3}{2t} \lambda \right). \end{aligned}$$

Treating the other parts of $B_{(N+1)1}$, we obtain

$$B_{(N+1)1} = \bar{\mu}^{-1} c_1 \left(\dot{\lambda} + \frac{3}{2t} \lambda \right) + \mu_0^3 \Theta_{N+1}.$$

ESTIMATE ON $B_{(N+1)2}$ AND $B_{(N+1)3}$: Arguing as in the derivation of (5.37) and (5.38), we deduce

$$B_{(N+1)2} = \mu_0^{b+\nu_1-1} \Theta_{N+1} + \mu_0^{a+b-\sigma_0} \Theta_{N+1}$$

and

$$B_{(N+1)3} = \mu_0^{b+2} \Theta_{N+1} + \mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0) \mu_0^\beta \Theta_{N+1}.$$

Observe that the above estimate on $B_{(N+1)2}$ has one more term than that on B_{n2} in (5.37). It is because the integrand of $B_{(N+1)2}$ decays slower than that of B_{n2} as $|\bar{y}| \rightarrow \infty$; compare (2.3) and (2.34). \square

We next solve the system (5.30) and (5.39) of nonlinear ODEs, thereby determining the parameters (λ, ξ) .

Proposition 5.8. *Suppose that (4.51) holds and $t_0 > 0$ is large enough. Given $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = 2 - \varepsilon_0$ in (2.7), δ_4 in (4.56), and $a, b, \alpha, \beta, \sigma_0$, and ψ^{out} in Proposition 4.8, we further assume that $\delta_4 \leq \varepsilon_0$, $a \in [\sigma_0 + \varepsilon_0, N - 2)$, and $b = \beta = 3 - \varepsilon_0$. Then there exists a solution $(\lambda[\hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0], \xi[\hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0])$ to the system (5.30) and (5.39) of ODEs which satisfies*

$$(5.40) \quad \|\lambda\|_{\nu_1; \sigma_0} + \|\dot{\lambda}\|_{\nu_1+2; \sigma_0} + \|\xi\|_{\nu_2; \sigma_0} + \|\dot{\xi}\|_{\nu_2+2; \sigma_0} \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0)$$

where $C, \zeta > 0$ are constants depending only on (M, g_0) , N , h , z_0 , a , b , α , σ_0 , and ε_0 ; compare with (2.7). Additionally,

$$(5.41) \quad \left\| \lambda[\hat{\psi}_1^{\text{in}}] - \lambda[\hat{\psi}_2^{\text{in}}] \right\|_{\nu_1} + \left\| \xi[\hat{\psi}_1^{\text{in}}] - \xi[\hat{\psi}_2^{\text{in}}] \right\|_{\nu_2} \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0) \left\| \hat{\psi}_1^{\text{in}} - \hat{\psi}_2^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})}$$

and

$$(5.42) \quad \|\lambda[\psi_{01}] - \lambda[\psi_{02}]\|_{\nu_1} + \|\xi[\psi_{01}] - \xi[\psi_{02}]\|_{\nu_2} \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \|\psi_{01} - \psi_{02}\|_{**, \alpha; \sigma_0}.$$

Proof. The proof is decomposed into three steps.

STEP 1. Let \mathcal{M} be an $N \times N$ symmetric matrix and $\bar{\mathbf{h}}(t) := (\mathbf{h}_1(t), \dots, \mathbf{h}_N(t))$ a function on $[t_0, \infty)$ such that $\|\bar{\mathbf{h}}\|_{\nu; \sigma} < \infty$ for some numbers $\nu > 2$ and $\sigma \in (0, 1)$. We assert that there exists a solution $\xi(t) = (\xi_1(t), \dots, \xi_N(t))$ to the ODE system

$$(5.43) \quad \dot{\xi}(t) + \frac{1}{t} \mathcal{M} \xi(t) = \bar{\mathbf{h}}(t) \quad \text{on } [t_0, \infty), \quad \xi(t) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \|\dot{\xi}\|_{\nu-\epsilon; \sigma} \leq C \|\bar{\mathbf{h}}\|_{\nu; \sigma}$$

where ξ and $\bar{\mathbf{h}}$ are regarded as column vectors, $\epsilon > 0$ is any small number, and $C > 0$ is a constant depending only on $N, \mathcal{M}, \nu, \epsilon$, and σ .

Indeed, since \mathcal{M} is symmetric, there exist an orthogonal matrix \mathcal{Q} and a diagonal matrix $\mathcal{D} = \text{diag}(\varsigma_1, \dots, \varsigma_N)$ such that $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{Q}^T \mathcal{D} \mathcal{Q}$. If we set $\xi(t)$ by

$$(5.44) \quad \xi(t) = \mathcal{Q}^T \tilde{\xi}(t) \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{\xi}_i(t) := \begin{cases} t^{-\varsigma_i} \int_{t_0}^t s^{\varsigma_i} (\mathcal{Q} \bar{\mathbf{h}})_i(s) ds & \text{if } \varsigma_i \geq \frac{\nu}{2} - 1, \\ -t^{-\varsigma_i} \int_t^\infty s^{\varsigma_i} (\mathcal{Q} \bar{\mathbf{h}})_i(s) ds & \text{if } \varsigma_i < \frac{\nu}{2} - 1, \end{cases}$$

then it satisfies (5.43). Note that one can select $\epsilon = 0$ unless $\varsigma_i = \frac{\nu}{2} - 1$ for some $i = 1, \dots, N$.

STEP 2. Let $\mathfrak{h}(t) = (\mathfrak{h}_1(t), \dots, \mathfrak{h}_{N+1}(t))$ be a function on $[t_0, \infty)$ and

$$(5.45) \quad \mathcal{M} = -\frac{N-4}{6h(z_0)} \begin{pmatrix} R_{11}(z_0) & \cdots & R_{1N}(z_0) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ R_{N1}(z_0) & \cdots & R_{NN}(z_0) \end{pmatrix}.$$

By adjusting ε_0 suitably, we may assume that $\varsigma_i \neq \frac{\nu_1}{2} = \frac{\nu_2}{2}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, and so we may take $\epsilon = 0$. Let ξ be the solution to (5.43) chosen in the previous step,

$$(5.46) \quad \lambda(t) = t^{-\frac{3}{2}} \int_{t_0}^t s^{\frac{3}{2}} \mathfrak{h}_{N+1}(s) ds \quad \text{so that} \quad \dot{\lambda}(t) + \frac{3}{2t} \lambda(t) = \mathfrak{h}_{N+1}(t) \quad \text{on } [t_0, \infty),$$

and

$$(5.47) \quad \mathcal{T}^{\text{par}}[\mathfrak{h}] = (\Xi, \Lambda) := (\dot{\xi}, \dot{\lambda}).$$

By (5.43) and (5.46),

$$(5.48) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}^{\text{par}}[\mathfrak{h}]\|_{\nu_2+2, \nu_1+2; \sigma_0} &= \|(\Xi, \Lambda)\|_{\nu_2+2, \nu_1+2; \sigma_0} := \|\Xi\|_{\nu_2+2; \sigma_0} + \|\Lambda\|_{\nu_1+2; \sigma_0} \\ &\leq C_6(\|(\mathfrak{h}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{h}_n)\|_{\nu_2+2; \sigma_0} + \|\mathfrak{h}_{N+1}\|_{\nu_1+2; \sigma_0}) = C_6\|\mathfrak{h}\|_{\nu_2+2, \nu_1+2; \sigma_0} \end{aligned}$$

for some $C_6 > 0$.

STEP 3. Parameters (λ, ξ) solve the system (5.30) and (5.39) of nonlinear ODEs if and only if

$$(5.49) \quad (\Xi, \Lambda) = \mathcal{T}^{\text{par}} \left[f^{\text{par}} \left[\Xi, \Lambda, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0 \right] \right]$$

where

$$f_n^{\text{par}} \left[\Xi, \Lambda, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0 \right] := \begin{cases} \mu_0^4 \Theta_{n1} + \mu_0^{b+\nu_1} \Theta_{n2} + \mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0) \mu_0^{\beta+1} \Theta_{n3} & \text{for } n = 1, \dots, N, \\ \mu_0^4 \Theta_{n1} + \mu_0^{b+\nu_1} \Theta_{n2} + \mu_0^{a+b+1-\sigma_0} \Theta_{n3} + \mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0) \mu_0^{\beta+1} \Theta_{n4} & \text{for } n = N+1 \end{cases}$$

and

$$f^{\text{par}} \left[\Xi, \Lambda, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0 \right] := \left(f_1^{\text{par}} \left[\Xi, \Lambda, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0 \right], \dots, f_{N+1}^{\text{par}} \left[\Xi, \Lambda, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0 \right] \right)$$

on $[t_0, \infty)$.

We claim that there exists a point (Ξ, Λ) on the set

$$\mathcal{D}^{\text{par}} := \left\{ \mathfrak{h} : \|\mathfrak{h}\|_{\nu_2+2, \nu_1+2; \sigma_0} \leq 4\delta_0^{-\zeta_5} \mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0) C_5 C_6 \right\}$$

for which (5.49) holds, where $C_5, \zeta_5 > 0$ are the numbers in the statement of Lemma 5.6.

To see this, we infer from (5.48) and the conditions $a \geq \sigma_0 + \varepsilon_0$ and $b+1 = \beta+1 = \nu_2+2$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathcal{T}^{\text{par}} \left[f^{\text{par}} \left[\Xi, \Lambda, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0 \right] \right] \right\|_{\nu_2+2, \nu_1+2; \sigma_0} &\leq C_6 \left\| f^{\text{par}} \left[\Xi, \Lambda, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0 \right] \right\|_{\nu_2+2, \nu_1+2; \sigma_0} \\ &\leq 4\delta_0^{-\zeta_5} \mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0) C_5 C_6. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, (5.31) says

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \mathcal{T}^{\text{par}} \left[f^{\text{par}} \left[\Xi_1, \Lambda_1, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0 \right] \right] - \mathcal{T}^{\text{par}} \left[f^{\text{par}} \left[\Xi_2, \Lambda_2, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0 \right] \right] \right\|_{\nu_2+2, \nu_1+2; \sigma_0} \\ &\leq C \left\| f^{\text{par}} \left[\Xi_1, \Lambda_1, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0 \right] - f^{\text{par}} \left[\Xi_2, \Lambda_2, \hat{\psi}^{\text{in}}, \psi_0 \right] \right\|_{\nu_2+2, \nu_1+2; \sigma_0} \\ &\leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \mu_0^{\delta_4}(t_0) \|(\Xi_1, \Lambda_1) - (\Xi_2, \Lambda_2)\|_{\nu_2+2, \nu_1+2; \sigma_0} \leq \frac{1}{2} \|(\Xi_1, \Lambda_1) - (\Xi_2, \Lambda_2)\|_{\nu_2+2, \nu_1+2; \sigma_0} \end{aligned}$$

provided $t_0 > 0$ large enough. By the contraction mapping theorem, the assertion holds.

Checking (5.40) for the associated parameters (λ, ξ) is a simple task. In addition, a closer look at the above computations with (5.31)–(5.32) gives (5.41)–(5.42). The proof is finished. \square

5.3. Unique solvability of (3.6). We are in position to solve the inner problem (3.6). We define

$$(5.50) \quad f_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{in}} [\psi^{\text{in}}, \psi^{\text{out}}] \\ = \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) W_{1,0}^{1-p} \left[\left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} (1+P)^{-p}(x) \mathcal{E}_2[\mu, \xi](y, t) + \mathcal{K}_1 [\psi^{\text{in}}] + \mathcal{K}_2 [\psi^{\text{in}}, \psi^{\text{out}}] \right];$$

cf. (5.3). If a function ψ^{in} satisfies

$$(5.51) \quad \begin{cases} pW_{1,0}^{p-1}(\psi^{\text{in}})_t = \frac{(N+2)\kappa_N}{4} \left(\Delta \psi^{\text{in}} + pW_{1,0}^{p-1} \psi^{\text{in}} \right) + W_{1,0}^{p-1} f_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{in}} [\psi^{\text{in}}, \psi^{\text{out}}] & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \times (t_0, \infty), \\ \psi^{\text{in}}(\cdot, t_0) = e_0(t_0) Z_0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \end{cases}$$

for some $e_0(t_0) \in \mathbb{R}$, then it solves (3.6) in $B^N(0, \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi}) \times (t_0, \infty)$ where $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi} = B^N(-\bar{\mu}^{-1}\xi, 2\bar{\mu}^{-1}\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1})$. Furthermore, estimate (5.52) given below clearly implies the first inequality of (4.51).

Proposition 5.9. *Suppose that the second inequality in (4.51) holds and $t_0 > 0$ is large enough. Given numbers a, b, α, β , and σ_0 in Proposition 5.8, we further assume that $a \in [\sigma_0 + \varepsilon_0, \min\{N - 4, \alpha + 2\}]$. Then one can find $\psi^{\text{in}} = \psi^{\text{in}}[\psi_0]$ and $e_0 = e_0[\psi_0]$ satisfying (5.51),*

$$(5.52) \quad \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathbb{R}^N)} + \mu_0^{-b}(t_0)|e_0(t_0)| \leq C,$$

and

$$(5.53) \quad \|\psi^{\text{in}}[\psi_{01}] - \psi^{\text{in}}[\psi_{02}]\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})} + \mu_0^{-b}(t_0)|e_0[\psi_{01}](t_0) - e_0[\psi_{02}](t_0)| \\ \leq C\delta_0^{-\zeta} \|\psi_{01} - \psi_{02}\|_{**, \alpha; \sigma_0}$$

for a constant $C, \zeta > 0$ depending only on $(M, g_0), N, h, z_0, a, b, \alpha$, and σ_0 . Here, (λ, ξ) and ψ^{out} are the ones determined in Propositions 5.8 and 4.8, respectively.

As in the proof of Proposition 4.8, we start by estimating $f_{\mu,\xi}^{\text{in}} [\psi^{\text{in}}, \psi^{\text{out}}]$ in the \sharp -norm, defined in (1.18).

Lemma 5.10. *We have*

$$(5.54) \quad \left\| \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) W_{1,0}^{1-p} \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} (1+P)^{-p}(x) \mathcal{E}_2[\mu, \xi](y, t) \right\|_{\sharp, a+2, b; \sigma_0} \leq C_{71}$$

where $C_{71} > 0$ is a constant depending only on $(M, g_0), N, h, z_0, \alpha$, and σ_0 .

Proof. It follows from (2.42) that the dominating term of $\mathcal{E}_2[\mu, \xi]$ is a constant multiple of $\bar{\mu}\lambda W_{1,0}(y)$. For this term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_0^{-b} \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \bar{\mu}\lambda \left[(1 + |\bar{y}|^{a+2}) \left| \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) (1+P)^{-p}(x) W_{1,0}(y) \right| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (1 + |\bar{y}|^{a+2+\sigma_0}) \left[\eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(\bar{\mu} \cdot + \xi) (1+P)^{-p}(\bar{\mu} \cdot + \xi) W_{1,0} \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu} \cdot \right) \right]_{C_{\mathbb{R}^N}^{\sigma_0}}(\bar{y}, t) \right] \\ & \leq C \frac{\mu_0^{\nu_1+1-b}}{1 + |\bar{y}|^{N-4-a}} \leq C \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mu_0^{-b} (1 + |\bar{y}|^{a+2-\sigma_0}) \left[\bar{\mu}\lambda \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(\bar{\mu} \cdot + \xi) (1+P)^{-p}(\bar{\mu} \cdot + \xi) W_{1,0} \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu} \cdot \right) \right]_{C_t^{\sigma_0/2}}(\bar{y}, t)$$

$$\leq C \frac{\mu_0^{\nu_1+3-b}}{1 + |\bar{y}|^{N-4-a+\sigma_0}} \leq C \mu_0^2(t_0)$$

where we employed the condition $a \in (0, N-4]$; see Definition 1.5 for the definition of the local Hölder semi-norms.

Handling the other terms of $\mathcal{E}_2[\mu, \xi]$ in an analogous way, we establish (5.54). \square

Lemma 5.11. *We have*

$$(5.55) \quad \left\| \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) W_{1,0}^{1-p} \mathcal{K}_1[\psi^{\text{in}}] \right\|_{\sharp, a+2, b; \sigma_0} \leq C_{72} \mu_0^{2\varepsilon_1}(t_0) \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})}$$

where $C_{72} > 0$ is a constant depending only on (M, g_0) , N , h , z_0 , α , and σ_0 .

Proof. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 4.10, we can estimate the first three terms of $\mathcal{K}_1[\psi^{\text{in}}]$ in (3.7).

Let us consider the fourth term. From the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_0^{-b} (1 + |\bar{y}|^{a+2}) \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) \left| \left(\frac{\mu}{\bar{\mu}} \right)^2 (1+P)^{1-p}(x) (\Delta_{g_0(x)} \psi^{\text{in}})(\bar{y}, t) - \Delta \psi^{\text{in}}(\bar{y}, t) \right| \\ & \leq C \mu_0^{-b} (1 + |\bar{y}|^{a+2}) \left[\left(\mu_0^2 |\bar{y}|^2 + \mu_0^{\nu_1-1} \right) |\nabla^2 \psi^{\text{in}}(\bar{y}, t)| + \mu_0^2 |\bar{y}| |\nabla \psi^{\text{in}}(\bar{y}, t)| \right] \\ & \leq C \mu_0^{2\varepsilon_1}(t_0) \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\sharp', a, b(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})}, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain its weighted L^∞ -bound; cf. (5.36). By further inspection, we deduce a weighted Hölder estimate.

Handling the remaining terms of $\mathcal{K}_1[\psi^{\text{in}}]$ in an analogous way, we establish (5.55). \square

Lemma 5.12. *We have*

$$(5.56) \quad \left\| \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) W_{1,0}^{1-p} \mathcal{K}_2[\psi^{\text{in}}, \psi^{\text{out}}] \right\|_{\sharp, a+2, b; \sigma_0} \leq C_{73} \left(\mu_0^2(t_0) \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})} + \|\psi^{\text{out}}\|_{\sharp', \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \right)$$

where $C_{73} > 0$ is a constant depending only on (M, g_0) , N , h , z_0 , α , and σ_0 .

Proof. Let us consider the first term of $\mathcal{K}_2[\psi^{\text{in}}]$. Applying the condition $a \in (0, \alpha+2]$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_0^{-b} (1 + |\bar{y}|^{a+2}) \eta_{2\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}}(x) \left| \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\mu} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} (1+P)^{-1}(x) W_{1,0}^{p-1}(y) \mu^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}}(x, t) \right| \\ & \leq C \|\psi^{\text{out}}\|_{\sharp', \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \sup_{(\bar{y}, t) \in \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi} \times [t_0, \infty)} \frac{\mu_0^{\beta-b}}{1 + |\bar{y}|^{\alpha-a+2}} \leq C \|\psi^{\text{out}}\|_{\sharp', \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0}, \end{aligned}$$

from which we obtain a weighted L^∞ -bound. By further inspection, we deduce a weighted Hölder estimate.

Employing the mean value theorem, we can handle the second term of $\mathcal{K}_1[\psi^{\text{in}}]$. Inequality (5.56) then readily follows. \square

Completion of the proof of Proposition 5.9. Let $\mathcal{T}^{\text{in}}[\mathcal{H}] := \psi[\mathcal{H}]$ and $e_0[\mathcal{H}]$ be the solution to (5.1) found in Proposition 5.1. A function ψ^{in} solves (5.51) if it satisfies

$$\psi^{\text{in}} = \mathcal{T}^{\text{in}}[f_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}}[\psi^{\text{in}}, \psi^{\text{out}}[\psi^{\text{in}}; \psi_0]]]$$

where $f_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}}$ is the map defined in (5.50), and the notation $\psi^{\text{out}}[\psi^{\text{in}}; \psi_0]$ emphasizes the dependence of ψ^{out} on ψ^{in} and ψ_0 .

We claim that the operator $\mathcal{T}^{\text{in}} \circ f_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}}$ has a fixed point on the set

$$\mathcal{D}^{\text{in}} := \left\{ \psi^{\text{in}} : \|\psi^{\text{in}}\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq 2C_4 C_{71} \right\}$$

where C_4 and C_{71} are the numbers appearing in (5.4) and (5.54).

By using (5.4), (5.50), (5.54), (5.55), (5.56), and (4.55), and taking a large $t_0 > 0$ if needed, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \mathcal{T}^{\text{in}} \left[f_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} \left[\psi^{\text{in}}, \psi^{\text{out}} \left[\psi^{\text{in}}; \psi_0 \right] \right] \right] \right\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathbb{R}^N)} \\
(5.57) \quad & \leq C_4 \left\| f_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} \left[\psi^{\text{in}}, \psi^{\text{out}} \left[\psi^{\text{in}}; \psi_0 \right] \right] \right\|_{\sharp, a+2, b; \sigma_0} \\
& \leq C_4 \left[C_{71} + \left(C_{72} \mu_0^{2\varepsilon_1}(t_0) + C_{73} \mu_0^2(t_0) \right) \left\| \psi^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})} + C_{73} \left\| \psi^{\text{out}} \right\|_{\sharp', \alpha, \rho; \sigma_0} \right] \leq 2C_4 C_{71}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by the linearity of \mathcal{T}^{in} , (5.4), (4.66), and (5.41) (see also the derivation of (5.55)),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \mathcal{T}^{\text{in}} \left[f_{(\mu, \xi)[\psi_1^{\text{in}}]}^{\text{in}} \left[\psi_1^{\text{in}}, \psi^{\text{out}} \left[\psi_1^{\text{in}}; \psi_0 \right] \right] \right] - \mathcal{T}^{\text{in}} \left[f_{(\mu, \xi)[\psi_2^{\text{in}}]}^{\text{in}} \left[\psi_2^{\text{in}}, \psi^{\text{out}} \left[\psi_2^{\text{in}}; \psi_0 \right] \right] \right] \right\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathbb{R}^N)} \\
& \leq C \left\| f_{(\mu, \xi)[\psi_1^{\text{in}}]}^{\text{in}} \left[\psi_1^{\text{in}}, \psi^{\text{out}} \left[\psi_1^{\text{in}}; \psi_0 \right] \right] - f_{(\mu, \xi)[\psi_2^{\text{in}}]}^{\text{in}} \left[\psi_2^{\text{in}}, \psi^{\text{out}} \left[\psi_2^{\text{in}}; \psi_0 \right] \right] \right\|_{\sharp, a+2, b; \sigma_0} \\
& \leq C \delta_0^{-\zeta} \mu_0^{\min\{\delta_4, 2\varepsilon_1\}}(t_0) \left\| \psi_1^{\text{in}} - \psi_2^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})} \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| \psi_1^{\text{in}} - \psi_2^{\text{in}} \right\|_{\sharp', a, b; \sigma_0(\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}, \xi})}
\end{aligned}$$

where the notation $(\mu, \xi) = (\mu, \xi)[\psi^{\text{in}}]$ stresses the dependence of (μ, ξ) in ψ^{in} . By the contraction mapping theorem, the assertion holds.

We now have a unique solution ψ^{in} to (5.51) with the desired \sharp' -norm bound given in (5.52). Also, the bound on $e_0(t_0)$ in (5.52) immediately follows from (5.4) and (5.57). A further inspection based on (4.67) and (5.42) gives (5.53), concluding the proof. \square

5.4. Completion of the proof of Theorem 1.1. Let z_0 be a point on M such that $h(z_0) > 0$. In Subsection 2.1, we selected sufficiently small numbers $\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1, \sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$ and set $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = 2 - \varepsilon_0$. Take

$$a = N - 4, \quad b = 3 - \varepsilon_0, \quad \alpha = N - 5 + \varepsilon_0, \quad \beta = 3 - \varepsilon_0, \quad \delta_2 = \varepsilon_0,$$

and any $\delta_4 \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ satisfying (4.56). Choose also $\psi_0 = 0$ on M . From the discussion in Section 3 and Propositions 4.8, 5.8, and 5.9, we find a solution u_{z_0} to (1.6) of the form $u_{z_0} = u_{\mu, \xi} + \psi_{\mu, \xi}$ on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$ where $u_{\mu, \xi} = u_{\mu, \xi}^{(2)}$ and $\psi_{\mu, \xi}$ are given in (2.39) and (3.1), respectively. Estimates (4.55), (2.7), and (5.52) (or (4.51)) imply that $u_{z_0} > 0$ on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$ and (1.10) holds. Consequently, the proof of Theorem 1.1 is completed.

Note that we have a freedom to choose the initial value $\psi_0 = \psi^{\text{out}}(\cdot, t_0)$ on the outer problem (3.2) or (4.52), provided the second inequality of (4.51) holds. In Subsection 6.2, we will further analyze this observation to establish the k -codimensional stability stated in Corollary 1.3.

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2 AND COROLLARY 1.3

Throughout the section, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is fixed and l can take any integer between 1 and k .

6.1. Proof of Theorem 1.2. In this subsection, we provide the outline of the proof of Theorem 1.2, pointing out the changes needed with respect to the one bubble case.

By choosing the number $\delta_0 > 0$ sufficiently small, we may assume that $\mathbf{z}_0 = (z_0^{(1)}, \dots, z_0^{(k)})$ is an element of the configuration set

$$\mathcal{C} := \left\{ \left(z_0^{(1)}, \dots, z_0^{(k)} \right) \in M^k : d_{g_0} \left(z_0^{(l)}, z_0^{(m)} \right) \geq c\delta_0 \text{ for } 1 \leq l \neq m \leq k \right\}$$

where $c > 0$ is a number determined by (M, g_0) , N , h , and k . Given $l = 1, \dots, k$, we write

$$(6.1) \quad d^{(l)} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{h(z_0^{(l)})}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^{(l)}(t) = d^{(l)} \mu_0(t) + \lambda^{(l)}(t) =: \bar{\mu}^{(l)}(t) + \lambda^{(l)}(t) \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0, \infty)$$

where μ_0 is the function in (2.5), and $\lambda^{(l)}$ is a higher-order term. We assume that (2.7) holds for $(\lambda, \xi) = (\lambda^{(l)}, \xi^{(l)})$.

By substituting $z_0^{(l)}$ and $\bar{\mu}^{(l)}$ for z_0 and $\bar{\mu}$, respectively, we define the analogue $P^{(l)}$ of P in (2.14), and the analogue $\Psi_0^{(l)}$ of Ψ_0 in the paragraph after Lemma 2.7. In (2.39)–(2.40), we put $z_0, (\mu, \xi)$ and Ψ_0 in place of $z_0^{(l)}, (\mu^{(l)}, \xi^{(l)})$, respectively, to define $u_{\mu^{(l)}, \xi^{(l)}}^{(2)}$ and $v_{\mu^{(l)}, \xi^{(l)}}^{(2)}$. Then we set the refined approximate solution

$$(6.2) \quad u_{\mu, \xi}(z, t) = u_{\mu, \xi}^{(2)}(z, t) = \sum_{l=1}^k u_{\mu^{(l)}, \xi^{(l)}}^{(2)}(z, t) \quad \text{on } M \times [t_0, \infty)$$

where $\mu := (\mu^{(1)}, \dots, \mu^{(k)}) \in (0, \infty)^k$ and $\xi := (\xi^{(1)}, \dots, \xi^{(k)}) \in (\mathbb{R}^N)^k$. It holds that

$$\mu^{\frac{N+2}{2}} \mathcal{S} \left(u_{\mu, \xi}^{(2)} \right) (y, t) = \mathcal{E}_2 \left[\mu^{(l)}, \xi^{(l)} \right] (y, t)$$

for $z = \exp_{z_0^{(l)}}(x) = \exp_{z_0^{(l)}}(\mu^{(l)}y + \xi^{(l)}) \in B_{g_0}(z_0^{(l)}, \delta_0)$ and $t \in [t_0, \infty)$, where \mathcal{E}_2 is the function in (2.42). Indeed, the interaction between two different bubbles is estimated by

$$\mathbf{1}_{N=5} \mu_0^3 a^{\{1\}} + \mu_0^{N-2} a^{\{N-4\}} \left(\lesssim \mathbf{1}_{N=5} \mu_0^3 a^{\{1\}} + \mu_0^4 a^{\{2\}} \right),$$

which is smaller than the main order terms of \mathcal{E}_2 . An analogous formula to (2.47) is also true.

The norms in Subsection 1.5 must be adjusted accordingly. For instance, every $u_{\mu, \xi}$ in the norms has to be replaced with $u_{\mu, \xi}$, and the weight $w_{\alpha, \gamma}$ in (1.14) needs to be redefined as

$$w_{\alpha, \gamma}(z, t) = \max \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^k \eta_{\delta_0} \left(|x^{(l)}| \right) \frac{\mu_0^{-\gamma}}{1 + \left| (\mu^{(l)})^{-1} (x^{(l)} - \xi^{(l)}) \right|^{\alpha+\gamma}}, \right. \\ \left. 2^{3(\alpha+\gamma)} \min \left\{ h \left(z_0^{(1)} \right), \dots, h \left(z_0^{(k)} \right) \right\}^{-\frac{\alpha+\gamma}{2}} \delta_0^{-(\alpha+\gamma)} \mu_0^\alpha \right\}$$

where $x^{(l)} := \exp_{z_0^{(l)}}^{-1}(z)$.

Let $\psi_{\mu, \xi}$ stand for the remainder term such that $u = u_{\mu, \xi} + \psi_{\mu, \xi}$ is a solution to (2.1). We assume that it can be written as

$$(6.3) \quad \psi_{\mu, \xi} = \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}} + \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} \quad \text{on } M \times [t_0, \infty)$$

where $\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}}$ has the form

$$(6.4) \quad \psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}}(z, t) = \sum_{l=1}^k \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}} \left(|x^{(l)}| \right) \left(1 + P^{(l)} \left(x^{(l)} \right) \right) \left(\bar{\mu}^{(l)} \right)^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \left(\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}} \right)^{(l)} \left(\bar{y}^{(l)}, t \right)$$

for $(z, t) \in M \times [t_0, \infty)$ and $x^{(l)} = \bar{\mu}^{(l)} \bar{y}^{(l)} + \xi^{(l)}$. The inner-outer gluing procedure consists of finding a solution $\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}}$ to the outer problem on $M \times [t_0, \infty)$ and a solution $(\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}})^{(l)}$ of an inner problem on $B^N(-(\bar{\mu}^{(l)})^{-1} \xi^{(l)}, 2(\bar{\mu}^{(l)})^{-1} \mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}) \times [t_0, \infty)$ for $l = 1, \dots, k$.

Minor modifications of the arguments in Sections 4 and 5 yield a priori estimates for inhomogeneous equations associated to the outer and inner problems. For example, the only change required in the proof of Lemma 4.3 is to replace (4.21) with

$$\int_0^1 \int_{B_{g_0}(z_0^{(m)}, R_1 \mu_\ell^{(m)}(\cdot + \tau_\ell))} \phi_\ell^2 u_\ell^{p-1} dv_{g_0} dt \geq \frac{1}{4k}$$

for some $m \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. The existence of such m is guaranteed by the pigeonhole principle. To prove Lemma 4.6, we divide the manifold M into $k+1$ subsets $B_{g_0}(z_0^{(1)}, \frac{\delta_0}{4}), \dots, B_{g_0}(z_0^{(k)}, \frac{\delta_0}{4})$, and $M \setminus \bigcup_{l=1}^k B_{g_0}(z_0^{(l)}, \frac{\delta_0}{6})$, and then examine the behavior of ψ on each subset.

By employing the a priori estimates for inhomogeneous equations and adopting the arguments in Sections 4 and 5 once again, we establish the existence of $\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{out}}, (\lambda^{(l)}, \xi^{(l)})$, and $(\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}})^{(l)}$ for $l = 1, \dots, k$ as well as estimates on their respective norms. Combining this information leads us to complete the proof of Theorem 1.2.

6.2. Proof of Corollary 1.3. By modifying the argument in the proof of [14, Corollary 1.1] suitably, one can prove the corollary. Here we give a sketch the proof.

As in the previous subsection, a quantity with the superscript (l) indicates that it is related to the l -th blow-up point $z_0^{(l)}$.

Fix $l = 1, \dots, k$ and let \mathcal{M} be the matrix in (5.45) with $z_0 = z_0^{(l)}$. If $\varsigma_1, \dots, \varsigma_N$ are the eigenvalues of \mathcal{M} , then the assumption on the Ricci curvature implies that

$$(6.5) \quad \min\{\varsigma_1, \dots, \varsigma_N\} \geq 1 > 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} = \frac{\nu_2 + 2}{2} - 1.$$

Set $(\overline{f^{\text{par}}})^{(l)} = ((f_1^{\text{par}})^{(l)}, \dots, (f_N^{\text{par}})^{(l)})$ and an orthogonal matrix \mathcal{Q} such that $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{Q}^T \mathcal{D} \mathcal{Q}$ with $\mathcal{D} = \text{diag}(\varsigma_1, \dots, \varsigma_N)$. In light of (6.5), (5.44), (5.46), (5.47), and (5.49), we can select the parameters $(\lambda^{(l)}, \xi^{(l)})$ by

$$\lambda^{(l)}(t) = t^{-\frac{3}{2}} \int_{t_0}^t s^{\frac{3}{2}} (f_{N+1}^{\text{par}})^{(l)}(s) ds$$

and

$$(6.6) \quad \xi^{(l)}(t) = \mathcal{Q}^T \tilde{\xi}^{(l)}(t) \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{\xi}_i^{(l)}(t) = t^{-\varsigma_i} \int_{t_0}^t s^{\varsigma_i} \left[\mathcal{Q} (\overline{f^{\text{par}}})^{(l)} \right]_i(s) ds \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, N.$$

They satisfy (2.7), and

$$(6.7) \quad \mu^{(l)}(t_0) = d^{(l)} \mu_0(t_0), \quad \xi^{(l)}(t_0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \xi^{(l)}(t) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

by (6.1).¹

Let ψ_0 be the initial condition for the outer problem, and $e_0^{(l)}[\psi_0]Z_0$ the initial condition for the inner problem of $(\psi_{\mu, \xi}^{\text{in}})^{(l)}$. Recalling (6.2) and (6.3)–(6.4), we choose the initial datum for (2.1) of the form

$$\begin{aligned} u(z, t_0) &= u_{\mu, \xi}(z, t_0) + \sum_{l=1}^k \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}(t_0)} \left(|x^{(l)}| \right) \left(1 + P^{(l)}(x^{(l)}) \right) \left(\bar{\mu}^{(l)}(t_0) \right)^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} e_0^{(l)}[0](t_0) Z_0(z) \\ &\quad + F[\psi_0](z) \quad \text{for } z \in M \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F[\psi_0](z) &:= \psi_0(z) \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=1}^k \eta_{\mu_0^{\varepsilon_1}(t_0)} \left(|x^{(l)}| \right) \left(1 + P^{(l)}(x^{(l)}) \right) \left(\bar{\mu}^{(l)}(t_0) \right)^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \left[e_0^{(l)}[\psi_0](t_0) - e_0^{(l)}[0](t_0) \right] Z_0(z). \end{aligned}$$

According to (6.7), the solution $u(z, t)$ to (2.1) blows up precisely at $z_0^{(1)}, \dots, z_0^{(k)}$ on M . Besides, F is a C^1 -function on $C^{2, \sigma_0}(M)$ (see (5.53)), $F[0] = 0$, and $DF[\Psi_0] = \text{Id}$ on the subspace $W := \bigcap_{l=1}^k \ker(D_{\psi_0} e_0^{(l)}[0])$ of $C^{2, \sigma_0}(M)$. Hence the inverse function theorem says that there is a manifold of

¹Suppose that $\varsigma_1 < \frac{\nu_2+2}{2} - 1 = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}$. If we define $\xi^{(l)}$ by (6.6), then we cannot obtain the estimate $\|\dot{\xi}\|_{\nu_2+2; \sigma} \leq C\|\bar{h}\|_{\nu_2+2; \sigma}$ needed in the proof of Proposition 5.8.

codimension $\text{codim}(W) \leq k$ in a neighborhood of $0 \in C^{2,\sigma_0}(M)$ such that each element is expressed as $F[\psi_0]$ for some $\psi_0 \in C^{2,\sigma_0}(M)$ near 0. Calling such a manifold $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{z}_0}$ and taking $\sigma = \sigma_0$, we conclude the proof.

Acknowledgement. S. Kim was supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Ministry of Education (NRF2020R1C1C1A01010133, NRF2020R1A4A3079066) and associate member program of Korea Institute for Advanced Study (KIAS). M. Musso has been supported by EPSRC research Grant EP/T008458/1.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. G. Aronson, P. Bénilan, *Régularité des solutions de l'équation des milieux poreux dans R^N* . C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B **288** (1979), A103–A105.
- [2] J. B. van den Berg, J. Hulshof, J. R. King, *Formal asymptotics of bubbling in the harmonic map heat flow*. SIAM J. Appl. Math. **63** (2003), 1682–1717.
- [3] G. Bianchi, H. Egnell, *A note on the Sobolev inequality*. J. Funct. Anal. **100** (1991), 18–24.
- [4] M. Bonforte, A. Figalli, *Sharp extinction rates for fast diffusion equations on generic bounded domains*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **74** (2021), 744–789.
- [5] M. Bonforte, G. Grillo, J. L. Vázquez, *Behaviour near extinction for the fast diffusion equation on bounded domains*. J. Math. Pures Appl. **97** (2012), 1–38.
- [6] S. Brendle, *Convergence of the Yamabe flow for arbitrary initial energy*. J. Differential Geom. **69** (2005), 217–278.
- [7] ———, *Convergence of the Yamabe flow in dimension 6 and higher*. Invent. Math. **170** (2007), 541–576.
- [8] S. Brendle, F. Marques, *Blow-up phenomena for the Yamabe equation. II*. J. Differential Geom. **81** (2009), 225–250.
- [9] A. Carlotto, O. Chodosh, Y. A. Rubinstein, *Slowly converging Yamabe flows*. Geom. Topol. **19** (2015), 1523–1568.
- [10] K.-C. Chang, W. Y. Ding, R. Ye, *Finite-time blow-up of the heat flow of harmonic maps from surfaces*. J. Differential Geom. **36** (1992), 507–515.
- [11] W. Chen, *Clustered solutions for supercritical elliptic equations on Riemannian manifolds*. Adv. Nonlinear Anal. **8** (2019), 1213–1226.
- [12] B. Chow, *The Yamabe flow on locally conformally flat manifolds with positive Ricci curvature*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **45** (1992), 1003–1014.
- [13] C. Collot, F. Merle, P. Raphaël, *Dynamics near the ground state for the energy critical nonlinear heat equation in large dimensions*. Comm. Math. Phys. **352** (2017), 103–157.
- [14] C. Cortázar, M. del Pino, M. Musso, *Green's function and infinite-time bubbling in the critical nonlinear heat equation*. J. Eur. Math. Soc. **22** (2020), 283–344.
- [15] P. Daskalopoulos, M. del Pino, N. Sesum, *Type II ancient compact solutions to the Yamabe flow*. J. Reine Angew. Math. **738** (2018), 1–71.
- [16] J. Dávila, M. del Pino, J. Wei, *Singularity formation for the two-dimensional harmonic map flow into S^2* . Invent. Math. **219** (2020), 345–466.
- [17] M. del Pino, M. Musso, J. Wei, *Infinite time blow-up for the 3-dimensional energy critical heat equation*. Anal. PDE **13** (2020), 215–274.
- [18] ———, *Geometry driven Type II higher dimensional blow-up for the critical heat equation*. J. Funct. Anal. **280** (2021), 108788.
- [19] R. Donninger, J. Krieger, *Nonscattering solutions and blowup at infinity for the critical wave equation*. Math. Ann. **357** (2013), 89–163.
- [20] T. Duyckaerts, C. E. Kenig, F. Merle, *Classification of radial solutions of the focusing, energy-critical wave equation*. Camb. J. Math. **1** (2013), 75–144.
- [21] P. Esposito, A. Pistoia, J. Vétois, *The effect of linear perturbations on the Yamabe problem*. Math. Ann. **358** (2014), 511–560.
- [22] S. Filippas, M. A. Herrero, J. J. L. Velázquez, *Fast blow-up mechanisms for sign-changing solutions of a semilinear parabolic equation with critical nonlinearity*. R. Soc. Lond. Proc. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci. **456** (2000), 2957–2982.
- [23] J. Harada, *A higher speed type II blowup for the five dimensional energy critical heat equation*. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **37** (2020), 309–341.
- [24] M. Hillairet, P. Raphaël, *Smooth type II blow-up solutions to the four-dimensional energy-critical wave equation*. Anal. PDE **5** (2012), 777–829.
- [25] J. Jendrej, *Construction of type II blow-up solutions for the energy-critical wave equation in dimension 5*. J. Funct. Anal. **272** (2017), 866–917.

- [26] J. Jendrej, Y. Martel, *Construction of multi-bubble solutions for the energy-critical wave equation in dimension 5*. J. Math. Pures Appl. **139** (2020), 317–355.
- [27] T. Jin, J. Xiong, *Optimal boundary regularity for fast diffusion equations in bounded domains*. To appear in Amer. J. Math.
- [28] ———, *Bubbling and extinction for some fast diffusion equations in bounded domains*. Preprint, arXiv:2008.01311.
- [29] C. E. Kenig, F. Merle, *Global well-posedness, scattering and blow-up for the energy-critical focusing non-linear wave equation*. Acta Math. **201** (2008), 147–212.
- [30] M. A. Khuri, F. C. Marques, R. M. Schoen, *A compactness theorem for the Yamabe problem*. J. Differential Geom. **81** (2009), 143–196.
- [31] J. Krieger, W. Schlag, D. Tataru, *Slow blow-up solutions for the $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ critical focusing semilinear wave equation*. Duke Math. J. **147** (2009), 1–53.
- [32] C.-C. Lai, F. Lin, C. Wang, J. Wei, Y. Zhou, *Finite time blow-up for the nematic liquid crystal flow in dimension two*. To appear in Comm. Pure Appl. Math.
- [33] J. M. Lee, T. H. Parker, *The Yamabe problem*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **17** (1987), 37–91.
- [34] F. Merle, P. Raphaël, *The blow-up dynamic and upper bound on the blow-up rate for critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation*. Ann. of Math. **161** (2005), 157–222.
- [35] F. Merle, P. Raphaël, I. Rodnianski, *Blowup dynamics for smooth data equivariant solutions to the critical Schrödinger map problem*. Invent. Math. **193** (2013), 249–365.
- [36] A. M. Micheletti, A. Pistoia, J. Vétois, *Blow-up solutions for asymptotically critical elliptic equations on Riemannian manifolds*. Indiana Univ. Math. J. **58** (2009), 1719–1746.
- [37] A. Pistoia, G. Vaira, *Clustering phenomena for linear perturbation of the Yamabe equation*. Partial differential equations arising from physics and geometry, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 450, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2019, 311–331.
- [38] B. Premoselli, *Towers of bubbles for Yamabe-type equations and for the Brézis-Nirenberg problem in dimensions $n \geq 7$* . Preprint, arXiv:2009.01515.
- [39] P. Raphaël, I. Rodnianski, *Stable blow up dynamics for the critical co-rotational wave maps and equivariant Yang-Mills problems*. Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **115** (2012), 1–122.
- [40] P. Raphaël, R. Seiringer, *Stable blowup dynamics for the 1-corotational energy critical harmonic heat flow*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **66** (2013), 414–480.
- [41] F. Robert, J. Vétois, *Examples of non-isolated blow-up for perturbations of the scalar curvature equation on non-locally conformally flat manifolds*. J. Differential Geom. **98** (2014), 349–356.
- [42] I. Rodnianski, J. Sterbenz, *On the formation of singularities in the critical $O(3)$ σ -model*. Ann. of Math. **172** (2010), 187–242.
- [43] R. Schoen, *Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to constant scalar curvature*. J. Differential Geom. **20** (1984), 479–495.
- [44] H. Schwetlick, M. Struwe, *Convergence of the Yamabe flow for large energies*. J. Reine Angew. Math. **562** (2003), 59–100.
- [45] R. Seiringer, *Type II blow-up for the four dimensional energy critical semi linear heat equation*. J. Funct. Anal. **263** (2012), 3922–3983.
- [46] Y. Sire, J. Wei, Y. Zheng, *Extinction behaviour for the fast diffusion equations with critical exponent and Dirichlet boundary conditions*. Preprint, arXiv:2006.01308.
- [47] P.-D. Thizy, J. Vétois, *Positive clusters for smooth perturbations of a critical elliptic equation in dimensions four and five*. J. Funct. Anal. **275** (2018), 170–195.
- [48] P. M. Topping, *Repulsion and quantization in almost-harmonic maps, and asymptotics of the harmonic map flow*. Ann. of Math. **159** (2004), 465–534.
- [49] R. Ye, *Global existence and convergence of the Yamabe flow*. J. Differential Geom. **39** (1994), 35–50.

(Seunghyeok Kim) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR NATURAL SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCES, HANYANG UNIVERSITY, 222 WANGSIMNI-RO SEONGDONG-GU, SEOUL 04763, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Email address: shkim0401@hanyang.ac.kr shkim0401@gmail.com

(Monica Musso) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF BATH, BATH BA2 7AY, UNITED KINGDOM

Email address: m.musso@bath.ac.uk