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Abstract. We revisit the following nonlinear critical elliptic equation
\[-\Delta u + Q(y)u = u^{\frac{N+2}{N-2}}, \quad u > 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N,\]
where $N \geq 5$. Although there are some existence results of bubbling solutions for problem above, there are no results about the periodicity of bubbling solutions. Here we investigate some related problems. Assuming that $Q(y)$ is periodic in $y_1$ with period 1 and has a local minimum at 0 satisfying $Q(0) = 0$, we prove the existence and local uniqueness of infinitely many bubbling solutions of the problem above. This local uniqueness result implies that some bubbling solutions preserve the symmetry of the potential function $Q(y)$, i.e. the bubbling solution whose blow-up set is \{(jL,0,...,0) : j = 0, 1, 2, ..., m\} must be periodic in $y_1$ provided that $L$ is large enough, where $m$ is the number of the bubbles which is large enough but independent of $L$. Moreover, we also show a non-existence of this bubbling solutions for the problem above if the local minimum of $Q(y)$ does not equal to zero.
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1. Introduction and the main results

In this paper, we consider the following nonlinear elliptic equations with critical exponent:
\[-\Delta u + Q(y)u = u^{\frac{N+2}{N-2}}, \quad u > 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N,\] (1.1)
where $N \geq 5$, and $Q(y)$ is a bounded nonnegative smooth function.

This problem corresponds to the following well-known Brezis-Nirenberg problem in $S^N$,
\[-\Delta_{S^N} u = u^{\frac{N+2}{N-2}} + \mu u, \quad u > 0,\] (1.2)
after using the stereographic project, problem (1.2) can be reduced to (1.1) with $Q(y) = -\frac{4\mu - N(N-2)}{(1+|y|^2)^2}$ and $Q(y) > 0$ if $\mu < -\frac{N(N-2)}{4}$. Problem (1.2) has been studied widely, one can refer to [1, 6, 8, 13, 15].

When there is no linear term $Q(y)u$ in equation (1.1), i.e the following well-known prescribed scalar curvature problem
\[-\Delta u = K(y)u^{\frac{N+2}{N-2}}, \quad u > 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N,\] (1.3)
where $N \geq 5$, and $K(y)$ is a bounded nonnegative smooth function. Compared with problem (1.1), there are many results about problem (1.3). When $K(y)$ is positive and
periodic, Li proved that (1.3) has infinitely many multi-bump solutions for $N \geq 3$ in [20, 21, 22] by gluing approximate solutions into genuine solutions with masses concentrating near isolated sets of maximum points of $K(y)$. Similar results were obtained by Yan in [29], provided that $K(y)$ has a sequence of strict local maximum points tending to infinity. When $K(y)$ is positive and periodic, in [28] Xu constructed multi-bump solutions with mass concentrating near critical points of $K(y)$ including saddle points. When $K(y)$ is a positive radial function with a strict local maximum at $|y| = r_0 > 0$ and satisfies

$$K(r) = K(r_0) - |r - r_0|^{\alpha} + O(|r - r_0|^{|\alpha| + \epsilon}),$$

for some constant $c_0 > 0, \epsilon > 0$ and $\alpha \in [2, N - 2]$ near $|x| = r_0$, Wei and Yan obtained in [27] solutions with a large number of bumps concentrating near the sphere $|y| = r_0$ and $N \geq 5$. Assuming that $K(y) > 0$ is periodic in $(x_1, ..., x_k)$ with $1 \leq k < \frac{N - 2}{2}$, under some natural conditions on $K(y)$ near a critical point, Li, Wei and Xu in [23] proved the existence of multi-bump solutions where the centers of bumps can be placed in some lattices in $\mathbb{R}^k$, including infinite lattices. They also showed that for $k \geq \frac{N - 2}{2}$, no such solutions exist. In [11], Deng, Lin and Yan obtained a local uniqueness and periodicity result of bubbling solutions for (1.3) under the basic assumptions of [23]. For poly-harmonic prescribed scalar curvature problem, under some similar assumptions of the prescribed scalar curvature as in [11], in [18] Guo, Peng and Yan study the existence, local uniqueness and periodicity of a bubbling solutions where the bubble set is a $k$-dimensional lattice. About more other related results, one can refer to [1, 2, 3, 10, 14].

Since when $Q \geq 0$ and $Q \neq 0$, the mountain pass value for problem (1.1) is not a critical value of the corresponding functional, all the arguments based on the concentration compactness arguments [24, 25] can not be used to obtain an existence result of solutions for (1.1). So far, there are very few existence results of solutions for problem (1.1). To our best knowledge, the first existence result for problem (1.1) is from [4] where Benci and Cerami proved that if $\|Q\|_{L^\frac{N}{N-2}(\mathbb{R}^N)}$ is suitably small, problem (1.1) has a solution whose energy is in the interval $(\frac{1}{N}S^\frac{N}{2}, \frac{1}{N}S^\frac{N}{2})$, where $S$ is the best Sobolev constant in the embedding $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{2N}{N-2}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Note that the assumption $Q \in L^\frac{N}{N-2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ excludes the case $Q \geq c_0 > 0$. Later, in order to cancel this restriction, in [9] Chen, Wei and Yan has proved problem (1.1) has infinitely many non-radial solutions where $\frac{Q(y)}{sp}(y)$ is a radial bounded positive function, and $r^2Q(r)$ has a local maximum point or a local minimum point $r_0 > 0$ with $Q(r_0) > 0$. Assuming that $Q(y)$ satisfies a weaker symmetric condition, Peng, Wang and Yan in [20] has shown that problem (1.1) has infinitely many solutions by combining the finite dimensional reduction argument and local Pohozaev identities, where the concentrated points of the bubble solutions include a saddle point of a function involving the potential function $Q(y)$. Very recently, He, Wang and Wang in [19] have proved the non-degeneracy of the bubble solutions constructed in [20] by some local Pohozaev identities and also construct a new type of bubble solutions for problem (1.1).

As far as we know, the results on the uniqueness of solutions which have the concentration phenomena are few. But it is a very profound topic to study the uniqueness of solutions. In this aspect, the first result is the uniqueness of solutions concentrating at one point for Problem (1.1).
Dirichlet problems with critical nonlinearity on bounded domains given by Glaungetas in [16]. When the right nonlinearity of equation (1.1) is subcritical, by calculating the number of single-bump solutions to the equation, Grossi [17] proved that there is one solution concentrating at any non-degenerate critical point of \( Q(y) \). Later, using topological degree, Cao and Heniz [7] gained the uniqueness of multi-bump solutions to the subcritical problem. For more other work about the uniqueness of solutions with the concentration phenomena, one can refer to [8, 11, 18].

In this paper, motivated by [11, 18, 26], we aim to study the existence, the local uniqueness and the periodicity of the bubble solutions for equation (1.1), where we mainly want to study the impact of the linear term \( Q(y)u \) in equation (1.1) to them. Here we call the solutions are local unique if two sequences of solutions blow up at the same set. This uniqueness implies certain kind of symmetry. We will prove that the two solutions are the same by obtaining some useful estimates and applying some local Pohozaev identities.

We assume that \( Q(y) \) satisfies the following conditions:

\[(Q_1) 0 \leq \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^N} Q(y) < \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^N} Q(y) < \infty; \]

\[(Q_2) Q \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ is } 1\text{-periodic in } y_1; \]

\[(Q_3) 0 \text{ is a critical point of } Q(y) \text{ and there exists some real number } \beta \in (N - 4, N - 2) \text{ such that for all } |y| \text{ small, it holds} \]

\[Q(y) = Q(0) + a|y|^\beta + O(|y|^\beta+1) = 0 + a|y|^\beta + O(|y|^\beta+1), \]

where \( a < 0 \).

To state the main results of this paper, we need to introduce some notations first. It is well known that the functions

\[U_{x,\mu} = (N(N - 2))^{\frac{N-4}{2}}\left(\frac{\mu}{1 + \mu^2|y - x|^2}\right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}}, \mu > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^N \]

are the only solutions to the problem

\[-\Delta u = u^{\frac{N+2}{N-2}}, u > 0, \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (1.4)\]

Denote \( x_j = (jL, 0, 0, \cdots, 0), j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, m \), where \( L > 0 \) is a large integer. We also denote \( W_{x_i L, \mu L} = \xi(y - x_{L})U_{x_{L}, \mu L}, W_{x, \mu L} = \sum_{j=0}^{m} W_{x_j L, \mu L} \) where \( \xi \in C_0^\infty(B_2(0)) \) satisfying \( \xi(|y|), \xi = 1 \) in \( B_1(0) \), and \( \xi = 0 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_2(0) \). Applying the cut-off function \( \xi \) above can not only help us deal with the slow decay of the bubble \( U \) when the space dimension is not big but also make some calculations much simpler.

Here we introduce the following norms which capture the decay property of the perturbation term

\[\|\phi\|_* = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_{L}^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_{L}|y - x_{jL}|)^{\frac{N-2}{2} + \tau}} |\phi(y)| \right), \]
\[ \|f\|_{**} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_j^{\frac{N+2}{2}}}{(1 + \mu_j |y - x_j|)^{\frac{N+2}{2} + \tau}} \right) |f(y)|, \]

where \( \tau = 1 + \vartheta \) and \( \vartheta \in (0, \min\{\frac{N-4}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\}) \) is a fixed small constant.

The existence result in our paper is the following.

**Theorem 1.1.** Suppose that \( Q(y) \geq 0 \) is bounded and belongs to \( C^1 \). If \( Q(y) \) satisfies the assumptions \((Q_1) - (Q_3)\) and \( N \geq 5 \), then there is an integer \( L_0 > 0 \), such that for any integer \( L \geq L_0 \) and for any positive integer \( m \) large enough which is independent of \( L \), \( (1.1) \) has a solution \( u_L \) of the form

\[ u_L = W_{x,\mu_L}(y) + \varphi_L = \sum_{j=0}^{m} \xi(y - x_jL)U_{x_jL,\mu_L} + \varphi_L \quad (1.5) \]

for some \( x_jL \) and \( \mu_L \), with

\[ x_jL = x_j + o_L(1) \quad \text{for all} \quad j, \quad (1.6) \]

and

\[ \mu_L = L^{\frac{N-2}{2}}(\bar{B} + o_L(1)), \quad (1.7) \]

for some constant \( \bar{B} > 0 \) and

\[ |\varphi_L(y)| = o_L(1) \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_j^{\frac{N+2}{2}}}{(1 + \mu_j |y - x_j|)^{\frac{N+2}{2} + \tau}} \quad (1.8) \]

where \( o_L(1) \to 0 \) as \( L \to +\infty \).

**Remark 1.2.** In fact, with careful estimates of \( u_L \) in the weighted \( L^\infty \) spaces, similar to the proof of Theorem 2 in [23] we can prove that \( u_L \) converges locally in \( \mathbb{R}^N \) to a solution \( u \) with the form \( u = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \xi(y - x_jL)U_{x_jL,\mu_L} + \varphi_L \) as \( m \to \infty \) independent of \( L \).

Now we also give a nonexistence result of the bubbling solutions for equation \( (1.1) \).

**Theorem 1.3.** Assume that \( Q(y) = Q(x_j) + a|y - x_j|^2 + O(|y - x_j|^3), \quad x_j = (jL, 0, ..., 0), \quad j = 0, 1, ..., m \) and \( Q(x_j) \neq 0 \), where \( L \) and \( m \) are large integers and \( m \) is independent of \( L \). Then there has no \( m \)-bubbles solutions of the form \( (1.5) \) satisfying \( (1.6) \) and \( (1.7) \).

**Remark 1.4.** From the non-existence result of Theorem 1.3, we know that the assumption \( Q(x_j) = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, ..., m \) is natural and necessary.

To discuss the symmetric properties of the solutions obtained in Theorem 1.1, we proceed with the following local uniqueness result for the bubbling solutions of \( (1.1) \).

**Theorem 1.5.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.1 and \( N > 6 \), if \( u_L^{(1)} \) and \( u_L^{(2)} \) are two sequence of solutions of problem \( (1.1) \), which satisfy \( (1.5), (1.6) \) and \( (1.7) \), then \( u_L^{(1)} = u_L^{(2)} \) provided \( L > 0 \) is large enough.
Remark 1.6. Different from the existence result of Theorem 1.1, we assume that $N > 6$ in Theorem 1.5. This is because that the estimate of $\|\varphi_L\|_*$ is not good enough caused by the appearance of the linear term $Q(y)u$ in equation (1.1). And we need to require $N > 6$ in the proof of (3.9). Therefore, When $N = 5, 6$, our methods are not suitable and the local uniqueness and the periodicity of the bubbling solutions are still open.

Remark 1.7. In the proof of Theorem 1.5, in order to obtain some precise estimates involved by the linear term $Q(y)u$ in equation (1.1), we choose the radius $\delta$ of a small ball centered at some $x_jL$ satisfying $\delta = \mu - \theta L$, where $\theta > 0$ (defined in (3.3)).

Our results here shows that concentration of the solution results in the local uniqueness. That is, if two sequence of solutions blow up at the same set, they must coincide.

Theorem 1.5 can be used to study some other properties of the bubbling solutions. A direct consequence of this result is the following periodic property of the solutions.

Theorem 1.8. Under the same assumption as in Theorem 1.1 and $N > 6$, and $u_L$ is a solution of (1.1), which satisfies (1.5), (1.6) and (1.7), then $u_L$ is $L$-periodic in $y_1$, provided $L > 0$ is large enough.

We would like to stress that the novelty and the main difficulty in the proofs of all the Theorems above are the techniques used to obtain some new and delicate estimates involved by the linear term $Q(y)u$ in problem (1.1).

The structure of our paper is as follows. In Section 2, we prove the existence and nonexistence of bubbling solutions by the finite dimensional reduction method and a contradiction argument respectively. In Section 3, applying some local Pohozaev identities, we prove the local uniqueness of the bubbling solutions which can induce the periodicity. Some technical and important estimates are put in Appendices A, B and C.

2. EXISTENCE AND NONEXISTENCE OF SOLUTIONS WITH INFINITELY MANY Bubbles

In this section, we will prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.3. To prove Theorem 1.1, we mainly use the finite dimensional reduction method. And we use a contradiction argument to show Theorem 1.3.

2.1. Linearization and the finite-dimensional problem. We first construct a bubbling solutions blowing up at finite points. We define the function spaces $X$ and $Y$ as follows: $\phi \in X$ if $\|\phi\|_* < +\infty$, while $f \in Y$ if $\|f\|_* < +\infty$. Set

$$Z_{ij} = \xi(y - x_{iL}) \frac{\partial W_{x_{iL},\mu_L}}{\partial x_{iL,j}}, Z_{i,N+1} = \frac{\partial W_{x_{iL},\mu_L}}{\partial \mu_L}, i = 0, 1, \ldots, m, j = 1, 2, \ldots, N,$$

and

$$H_m := \{\phi : \phi \in X, \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \phi W_{x_{iL},\mu_L}^{2-2} Z_{i,j} = 0, i = 0, 1, \ldots, m, j = 1, \ldots, N + 1\}. \quad (2.1)$$

Denote $W_{x,\mu_L} = \sum_{j=0}^{m} \xi(y - x_{jL})U_{x_{jL},\mu_L}, \varphi \in H_m$. We intend to find a solution of the form $W_{x,\mu_L} + \varphi$ for problem (1.1) with $\|\varphi\|_*$ small enough. To achieve this goal, we first prove
that for fixed \((x, \mu_L)\), there exists a smooth function \(\varphi \in H_m\) such that

\[
-\Delta (W_{x,\mu_L} + \varphi) + Q(y) (W_{x,\mu_L} + \varphi) = (W_{x,\mu_L} + \varphi)^{2^* - 1} + \sum_{i=0}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{N+1} c_{ij} W_{x_{ij},\mu_L}^{2^* - 2} Z_{ij},
\]

for some constants \(c_{ij}\). Then, we show the existence of \((x, \mu_L)\) such that

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (-\Delta)(W_{x,\mu_L} + \varphi) Z_{ij} + Q(y) (W_{x,\mu_L} + \varphi) Z_{ij} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (W_{x,\mu_L} + \varphi)^{2^* - 1} Z_{ij} = 0.
\]

With this \((x, \mu_L)\), it is easy to prove that all \(c_{ij}\) must be zero.

**Part I: the reduction.** In this part, for fixed \((x, \mu_L)\) we find \(\varphi(x, \mu_L)\), such that \(C^1\) in \((x, \mu_L)\) and \([2.4]\) holds. Indeed, we will apply the contraction mapping theorem to prove the following result.

**Proposition 2.1.** Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, if \(L > 0\) is sufficiently large, \([2.2]\) admits a unique solution \(\varphi_L \in H_m\) such that \(\|\varphi_L\|_* \leq C(\frac{1}{\mu_L})^{1+\epsilon}\), \(|c_i| \leq C(\frac{1}{\mu_L})^{\frac{N-2}{2} - \tau + n}\), where \(\epsilon > 0\) is a small constant. Moreover, \(\varphi_L\) is \(C^1\) in \((x, \mu_L)\).

First, we consider the following linear problem

\[
-\Delta \varphi + Q(y)\varphi - (2^* - 1) W_{x,\mu}^{2^* - 2} \varphi = h + \sum_{i=0}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{N+1} c_{ij} W_{x_{ij},\mu_L}^{2^* - 2} Z_{ij}
\]

\[
\varphi \in H_m, \sum_{j=0}^{m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} W_{x_{ij},\mu_L}^{2^* - 2} Z_{j, l} \varphi = 0, l = 1, 2, \ldots, N + 1.
\]

for some real number \(c_{ij}\), where \(h\) is a function in \(Y\).

**Lemma 2.2.** Suppose that \(\varphi_L\) solves \([2.4]\) for \(h = h_L\). If \(\|h_L\|_{**}\) goes to zero as \(L\) goes to infinity, then so does \(\|\varphi_L\|_*\).

**Proof.** We argue by a contradiction argument. Suppose that there exist \(L \to +\infty\), and \(\varphi_L\) solving \([2.4]\) for \(h = h_L\), \(\mu = \mu_L\) with \(\|h_L\|_{**} \to 0\) and \(\|\varphi_L\|_* \geq C > 0\). We may assume that \(\|\varphi_L\|_* = 1\). For simplicity, we drop the subscript \(L\).

Since \(Q(y)\) is non-negative, we have

\[
|\varphi(y)| \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|z - y|^{N-2}} W_{x,\mu_L}^{2^* - 2} |\varphi(z)|dz
\]

\[
+ C \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|z - y|^{N-2}} (|h| + \sum_{j=1}^{N+1} \sum_{i=0}^{m} c_{ij} W_{x_{ij},\mu_L}^{2^* - 2} Z_{ij})dz.
\]

As in \([26]\), using Lemma B.2 and B.3, we can prove

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|z - y|^{N-2}} W_{x,\mu_L}^{2^* - 2} |\varphi|dz \leq C \|\varphi\|_* \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{\frac{N-2}{2}}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_{ij}|)^{\frac{N-2}{2} + \tau + \theta}}.
\]
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|z-y|^{N-2}} |h(z)| dz \leq c \|h\|_{**} \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_j|)^{N-2+\tau}},
\]

and
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|z-y|^{N-2}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{m} W^{2^*-2}_{x_j,\mu_L} Z_{j,l} \right| dz \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{-2+n_l}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_j|)^{N-2+\tau}},
\]

where \(n_j = 1, j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, N, n_{N+1} = -1, \tau, \theta \) small enough.

To estimate \(c_{ij}, i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, m, j = 1, 2, \ldots, N + 1, \) multiplying (2.4) by \(Z_{ij}\) and integrating, we see that \(c_{ij}\) satisfies
\[
\sum_{j=1}^{N+1} \sum_{i=0}^{m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} c_{ij} W^{2^*-2}_{x_i,\mu_L} Z_{ij}^2 = \langle -\Delta \varphi + Q(y)\varphi - (2^*-1)W^{2^*-2}_{x_j,\mu_L} \varphi, Z_{ij} \rangle - \langle h, Z_{ij} \rangle. \tag{2.5}
\]

It follows from Lemma B.1 that
\[
|\langle h, Z_{i,j} \rangle| \leq C \mu_L^{n_j} \|h\|_{**}. \tag{2.6}
\]

By direct computation, we have
\[
|\langle Q(y)\varphi, Z_{ii} \rangle| \leq C \|\varphi\|_{*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{\xi^{N-2+n_l}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_{iL}|)^{N-2}} \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{1}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_j|)^{N-2+\tau}}
= \mu_L^{n_l} \|\varphi\|_{*}. \tag{2.7}
\]

On the other hand, we have
\[
|\langle -\Delta \varphi - (2^*-1)W^{2^*-2}_{x_j,\mu_L} \varphi, Z_{i,l} \rangle| = O\left(\frac{\mu_L^{n_l} \|\varphi\|_{*}}{\mu_L^{1+\epsilon}}\right). \tag{2.8}
\]

Combining (2.6)-(2.8), we have
\[
\langle -\Delta \varphi + Q(y)\varphi - (2^*-1)W^{2^*-2}_{x_j,\mu_L} \varphi, Z_{i,l} \rangle - \langle h, Z_{i,l} \rangle = O\left(\frac{\mu_L^{n_l} \|\varphi\|_{*}}{\mu_L^{1+\epsilon}} + \|h\|_{*}\right).
\]

It is easy to check that
\[
\sum_{j=1}^{m} \langle W^{2^*-2}_{x_j,\mu_L} Z_{j,h}, Z_{i,l} \rangle = (\bar{c} + o(1)) \delta_{hl} \mu_L^{2n_l} \tag{2.9}
\]
for some constant \(\bar{c} > 0.\)

Now inserting (2.8) and (2.9) into (2.5), we find
\[
c_{il} = \frac{1}{\mu_L^{n_l}} \left( o(\|\varphi\|_{*} + o(\|h\|_{**})) \right),
\]
so
\[
\|\varphi\|_* \leq c\left(o(1) + \|h\|_* + \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{1}{(1+\mu_L|h-x_j|L)^{2-\tau}} \right).
\]

We can finish the proof of this lemma by using (2.10) as in [18]. □

From Lemma 2.2, applying the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 4.1 in [12]. We can prove the following results.

**Lemma 2.3.** There exist \( L_0 \) and a constant \( C > 0 \) independent of \( L \), such that for \( L > L_0 \) and all \( h \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \), problem (2.4) has a unique solution \( \varphi \equiv L(h) \). Moreover
\[
\|L(h)\|_* \leq C \|h\|_* \quad \text{and} \quad |c_i| \leq C \mu_L^{-1} \|h\|_*.
\]

Now we consider
\[
-\Delta(W_{x,\mu_L} + \varphi) + Q(y)(W_{x,\mu_L} + \varphi) = (W_{x,\mu} + \varphi)(2^*-1) + \sum_{i=0}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{N+1} c_{ij} W_{x_i,\mu_L}^2 - \sum_{i=0}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{N+1} \xi(y - x_j L) U_{x_i,\mu_L} - Q(y) W_{x,\mu_L} + \sum_{j=0}^{m} U_{x_j,\mu_L} \Delta \xi + 2 \nabla \xi \nabla \left( \sum_{j=0}^{m} U_{x_j,\mu_L} \right).
\]

Rewrite as
\[
-\Delta \varphi + Q(y) \varphi - (2^* - 1)W_{x,\mu_L}^2 \varphi = N_L(\varphi) + l_L + \sum_{i=0}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{N+1} c_{ij} W_{x_i,\mu_L}^2 Z_{ij},
\]
where
\[
N_L(\varphi) = (W_{x,\mu_L} + \varphi)(2^* - 1) - W_{x,\mu_L}^2 - (2^* - 1)W_{x,\mu_L}^2 \varphi,
\]

and
\[
l_L = \left( W_{x,\mu_L}^2 - \sum_{j=0}^{m} \xi(y - x_j L) U_{x_j,\mu_L}^2 \right) - Q(y) W_{x,\mu_L} + \sum_{j=0}^{m} U_{x_j,\mu_L} \Delta \xi + 2 \nabla \xi \nabla \left( \sum_{j=0}^{m} U_{x_j,\mu_L} \right).
\]

In order to apply the contraction mapping theorem to prove that (2.12) is uniquely solvable, we have to estimate \( N_L(\varphi) \) and \( l_L \) respectively.

**Lemma 2.4.** If \( N \geq 5 \), then
\[
\|N_L(\varphi)\|_* \leq C \|\varphi\|_*^{\min(2^*-1,2)}, \quad \|l_L\|_* \leq \frac{C}{\mu_L^{2-\tau}}.
\]

**Proof.** Since the proofs are just the same as that of Lemmas A.5 and A.6 in Appendix A, we omit it. □
Proof of Proposition [2.1] First set

\[ \mathcal{N} = \left\{ w : w \in C(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap H_m, \|w\|_* \leq \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\frac{N-2}{2}-\tau}}, \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sum_{j=0}^{m} W^{2^*-2}_{x_jL, \mu_L} Z_{jL}w = 0 \right\}, \]

where \( \epsilon > 0 \) small and \( l = 1, 2, \ldots, N+1 \).

Then (2.12) is equivalent to

\[ \varphi = A(\varphi) =: L(N_L(\varphi)) + L(I_L) \]

where \( L \) is defined in Lemma 2.2. We will prove that \( A \) is a contraction map from \( \mathcal{N} \) to \( \mathcal{N} \). We only consider the case \( N \geq 6 \) since that of \( N = 5 \) is similar.

Firstly, we have

\[ \|A(\varphi)\|_* \leq C(\|N_L(\varphi)\|_{**} + \|I_L\|_{**}) \leq C(\|\varphi\|_{**}^{\min\{2^*-1, 2\}} + (\frac{1}{\mu_L})^{\frac{N-2}{2}-\tau}) \leq \frac{C}{\mu_L^{\frac{N-2}{2}-\tau}}. \]

Hence, \( A \) maps \( \mathcal{N} \) to \( \mathcal{N} \).

On the other hand, we see

\[ \|A(\varphi_1) - A(\varphi_2)\|_* \leq C\|N_L(\varphi_1) - N_L(\varphi_2)\|_{**}. \]

It is easy to check that if \( N \geq 6 \), then

\[ |N_L(\varphi_1) - N_L(\varphi_2)| \leq N_L^\prime(\varphi_1 + \theta \varphi_2)||\varphi_1 - \varphi_2| \leq C(|\varphi_1|^{2^*-2} + |\varphi_2|^{2^*-2})|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2| \]

\[ \leq C(\|\varphi_1\|^{2^*-2}_* + \|\varphi_2\|^{2^*-2}_*)\|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2\|_*(\sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{\frac{N-2}{2}}}{(1 + \mu_L|y - x_jL|)^{\frac{N-2}{2}+\tau}})^{2^*-1} \]

\[ \leq C(\|\varphi_1\|^{2^*-2}_* + \|\varphi_2\|^{2^*-2}_*)\|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2\|_*\sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{\frac{N-2}{2}}}{(1 + \mu_L|y - x_jL|)^{\frac{N-2}{2}+\tau}}. \]

Hence

\[ \|A(\varphi_1) - A(\varphi_2)\|_* \leq C(\|\varphi_1\|^{2^*-2}_* + \|\varphi_2\|^{2^*-2}_*)\|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2\|_* \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2\|_. \]

Therefore, \( A \) is a contraction map.

Now by the contraction mapping theorem, there exists a unique \( \varphi \in \mathcal{N} \) such that

\[ \|\varphi\|_* \leq \|L(N_L(\varphi))\|_* + \|L(I_L)\|_* \leq C(\|N_L(\varphi)\|_{**} + \|I_L\|_{**}) \leq C(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{\frac{N-2}{2}-\tau}}. \]

Moreover, we get the estimate of \( c_L \) from Lemma [2.3]

Part II: the finite-dimensional problem

It follows from Lemmas [A.7] and [A.8] Proposition 2.1 (2.3) is equivalent to

\[ |x_j - x_{jL}| = O(\frac{1}{\mu_L^2}), \quad (2.13) \]
and
\[
\sum_{i \neq j} \frac{C_4}{\mu_L^{N-2} |x_iL - x_jL|^{N-2}} - \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}} = O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+3}}\right). \tag{2.14}
\]

2.2. Proof of the existence result.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1** We need to solve (2.13) and (2.14). Note that
\[
\frac{1}{|x_i - x_j|^{N-2}} = \frac{1}{|i - j|^{N-2}} \frac{L^{N-2}}{L^{N-2}} := d_{ij}, i \neq j.
\]
So, we can use Lemma D.1 in [18] to obtain the result. \[\square\]

2.3. Proof of the nonexistence result. In this subsection, we mainly use a contradiction argument to prove Theorem 1.3. To obtain a contradiction, we need to obtain some technical and careful estimates.

**Proof of Theorem 1.3** For simplicity of notations, here we still denote \(W_{x,\mu L} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \xi(y - x_jL)U_{x_jL,\mu L}\). Assume that problem (1.1) has a solution \(u_{x,\mu L}\), that is
\[
-\Delta (W_{x,\mu L} + \varphi_L) + Q(y)(W_{x,\mu L} + \varphi_L) = (W_{x,\mu L} + \varphi_L)^{2^* - 1}. \tag{2.15}
\]
Since \(U_{x_jL,\mu L}\) satisfies
\[
-\Delta \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} U_{x_jL,\mu L} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} U_{x_jL,\mu L}^{2^* - 1},
\]
we can rewrite (2.15) as
\[
\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} Q(x_j)U_{x_jL,\mu L} = -\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (Q(y) - Q(x_jL))U_{x_jL,\mu L} + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (Q(x_j) - Q(x_jL))U_{x_jL,\mu L} + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} Q(y)(1 - \xi(y - x_jL))U_{x_jL,\mu L} - (-\Delta \varphi_L + Q(y)\varphi_L - (2^* - 1)W_{x,\mu L}^{2^* - 2}\varphi_L)
\]
\[
+ \left(W_{x,\mu L} + \varphi_L\right)^{2^* - 1} - (2^* - 1)W_{x,\mu L}^{2^* - 2}\varphi_L - \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \xi(y - x_jL)U_{x_jL}^{2^* - 1} \right) \]
\[
+ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Delta \xi(y - x_jL)U_{x_jL,\mu L} + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \nabla \xi(y - x_jL) \cdot \nabla U_{x_jL,\mu L}. \tag{2.16}
\]
Multiply \(U_{x_jL,\mu L}\) on both sides of equation (2.16) and integrate over \(\mathbb{R}^N\). Applying integrating by parts, we obtain
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} Q(x_j)U_{x_jL,\mu L} U_{x_jL,\mu L} = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (Q(y) - Q(x_jL))U_{x_jL,\mu L} U_{x_jL,\mu L}
\]
Similar to [26], we can estimate the right hand side of (2.17) equals to 3.1.

Some estimates of the bubbling solutions.

$\mu$ two Pohozaev identities play an important role in these estimates:

\begin{align}
\frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B} \langle \nabla \varphi, \varphi \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B} |\nabla \varphi|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B} Q(y)u^2 \nu_i - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial \nu} u^2
\end{align}

Observing that $\int Q(x_j)U^2 \neq 0$ since $Q(x_j) \neq 0$, we get a contradiction.

3. Local uniqueness and periodicity

3.1. Some estimates of the bubbling solutions. Let $u_L$ be a solution of (1.1), which satisfies (1.3), (1.6), (1.7). In this section, we will estimate $\mu_L$ and $|x_j - x|$. The following two Pohozaev identities play an important role in these estimates:

\begin{align}
- \int_{\partial B(x_j)} \frac{\partial u_L}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial u_L}{\partial y_i} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B(x_j)} |\nabla u_L|^2 \nu_i + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B(x_j)} Q(y)u^2 \nu_i - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B(x_j)} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial \nu} u^2
\end{align}

and

\begin{align}
- \int_{\partial B(x_j)} \frac{\partial u_L}{\partial \nu} \langle y - x_j, \nabla u \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B(x_j)} |\nabla u_L|^2 \langle y - x_j, \nu \rangle + \frac{2 - N}{2} \int_{\partial B(x_j)} \frac{\partial u_L}{\partial \nu} u_L
\end{align}

where $\nu$ is the outward unit normal of $\partial B(x_j)$.

We would like to point out that in order to estimate $\frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B(x_j)} Q(y)u^2 \nu_i$ in (3.1) and $\frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B(x_j)} Q(y)u^2 \langle \nu, y - x_j \rangle$ in (3.2) more accurately, different from [11, 18] in the sequel.
we take $\delta = \mu_L^{-\theta}(\theta > 0)$, where
\[ \theta = \max\left\{ \frac{\beta + 4 - N}{\beta + 1 - 2\tau}, 1 \right\}. \] (3.3)

**Lemma 3.1.** Relation (3.1) is equivalent to
\[ \int_{B_\delta(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial Q(y)}{\partial y_i} U_{x_{jL},\mu_{jL}}^2 = O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2} L^{N-2}} + \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N+2}} + \max |x_{iL} - x_i|^{2\beta-1} \right). \] (3.4)

**Proof.** First, we have
\[ \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} u_{iL}^2 \nu_i = O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N+2}} \right). \] (3.5)
and
\[ \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} Q(x) u_{iL}^2 \nu_i = O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{3+2}} \right), \] (3.6)
whose proof we put in Appendix C.

On the other hand, note that
\[ U_{x_{jL},\mu_{jL}}(y) = \left( \frac{N(N-2)}{\mu_L^{N-2}} \right)^{\frac{N+2}{2}} \frac{1}{|y - x_{jL}|^{N-2}} + O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N+2}} \right), \quad y \in \partial B_\delta(x_{jL}). \]

We can deduce from Corollary 3.2
\[ \frac{1}{(N(N-2))^{\frac{N+2}{2}}} \left( - \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial u_L}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial u_L}{\partial y_i} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} |\nabla u_L|^2 \nu_i \right) \]
\[ = - \frac{1}{\mu_{jL}^{N-2}} \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \frac{1}{|y - x_{jL}|^{N-2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \frac{1}{|y - x_{jL}|^{N-2}} + \frac{1}{2\mu_{jL}^N} \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} |\nabla \frac{1}{|y - x_{jL}|^{N-2}}|^2 \nu_i \]
\[ + O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2} L^{N-2}} + \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N+2}} + \max_i |x_{iL} - x_i|^{\beta} + \max_i |x_{iL} - x_i|^{2\beta} \right) \]
\[ = O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2} L^{N-2}} + \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N+2}} + \max_i |x_{iL} - x_i|^{\beta} + \max_i |x_{iL} - x_i|^{2\beta} \right). \] (3.7)

Moreover, from
\[ \int_{B_\delta(x_{jL})} U_{x_{jL},\mu_{jL}} \sum_{i \neq j} U_{x_{iL},\mu_{jL}} + \left( \sum_{i \neq j} U_{x_{iL},\mu_{jL}} \right)^2 = O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2} L^{N-2}} \right), \] (3.8)
and
\[ \int_{B_\delta(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial Q(y)}{\partial y_i} u_{iL}^2 = \int_{B_\delta(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial Q(y)}{\partial y_i} \left( U_{x_{jL},\mu_{jL}} + \sum_{k \neq j} \xi(y - x_{kL})U_{x_{kL},\mu_{jL}} + \varphi_L \right)^2 \]
\[ = \int_{B_\delta(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial Q(y)}{\partial y_i} U_{x_{jL},\mu_{jL}}^2 + C\|\varphi_L\|^2 \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N+1}} + |x_{jL} - x_j|^{\beta-1} \right) + \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2} L^{N-2}}. \]
We can deduce

\[ \int_{B_{b}(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial y_i} U^2_{x_{jL},\mu_{jL}} + C \left( \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{\beta + 2}} + \max_{j} |x_{jL} - x_{j}|^{2\beta - 1} \right) + \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{N-2} L^{N-2}}. \]  

(3.9)

Combining (3.7)-(3.9), we obtain

\[ \int_{B_{b}(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial y_i} U^2_{x_{jL},\mu_{jL}} = O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{N-2} L^{N-2}} + \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{\beta + 2}} + \max |x_{iL} - x_{i}|^{2\beta - 1} \right). \]

Lemma 3.2. Relation (3.2) is equivalent to

\[ \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{\beta + 2}} = \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{B}{\mu_{L}^{N-2} |x_{iL} - x_{jL}|^{N-2}} + O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{N}} + \max_{i} |x_{iL} - x_{i}|^{\beta - 1} + \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{3}} \right), \]

(3.10)

where \( B > 0 \) is a constant.

Proof. Noting that for \( y \in \partial B_{b}(x_{jL}) \), we have

\[ u_{L}(y) = D_{L}(y) + O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{N-2}} + \max_{i} |x_{iL} - x_{i}|^{\beta} \right) \]

\[ =: (N(N-2))^{N-2} \sum_{i=0}^{m} \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{N}} \frac{1}{|y - x_{iL}|^{N-2}} + O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{N}} + \max_{i} |x_{iL} - x_{i}|^{\beta} \right). \]

We can deduce

\[- \int_{\partial B_{b}(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial u_{L}}{\partial \nu} (y - x_{jL}, \nabla u_{L}) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_{b}(x_{jL})} |\nabla u_{L}|^2 (y - x_{jL}, \nu) + \frac{2 - N}{2} \int_{\partial B_{b}(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial u_{L}}{\partial \nu} u_{L} \]

\[ = - \int_{\partial B_{b}(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial D_{L}}{\partial \nu} (y - x_{jL}, \nabla D_{L}) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_{b}(x_{jL})} |\nabla D_{L}|^2 (y - x_{jL}, \nu) \]

\[ + \frac{2 - N}{2} \int_{\partial B_{b}(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial D_{L}}{\partial \nu} D_{L} + O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{N}} + \max_{i} |x_{iL} - x_{i}|^{\beta} + \frac{2 - N}{2} \int_{\partial B_{b}(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial u_{L}}{\partial \nu} u_{L} \right). \]

On the other hand, it is easy to check that

\[ \int_{\partial B_{b}(x_{jL})} \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{N-2}} (y - x_{jL}, \nabla \frac{1}{y - x_{jL}})^2 (y - x_{jL}, \nu) + \frac{2 - N}{2} \int_{\partial B_{b}(x_{jL})} \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{N-2}} |y - x_{jL}|^{N-2} = 0. \]

So we find

\[- \int_{\partial B_{b}(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial u_{L}}{\partial \nu} (y - x_{jL}, \nabla u_{L}) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_{b}(x_{jL})} |\nabla u_{L}|^2 (y - x_{jL}, \nu) + \frac{2 - N}{2} \int_{\partial B_{b}(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial u_{L}}{\partial \nu} u_{L} \]
Finally we estimate the right hand side of (3.2)

\[ Q = \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2}}|x_{iL} - x_j|^\beta + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^N} + \max_i \frac{|x_{iL} - x_i|\beta}{\mu_L^{N-2+\tau}} + \max_i \frac{|x_{iL} - x_i|^{2\beta}}{\mu_L^{2\beta}}\right), \] (3.11)

where \( B' > 0 \) is a constant.

Similar to (C.1), we also obtain

\[ \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} Q(y)u_L^2(y - x_{jL}, \nu) = O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}}\right). \] (3.12)

On the other hand, we have

\[ \int_{B_\delta(x_{jL})} u_L^2\langle \nabla Q(y), y - x_{jL}\rangle \]

\[ = a \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle \nabla |y - x_{jL}|^\beta, y - x_{jL}\rangle u_L^2 + O\left(\frac{\max_i |x_{iL} - x_i|}{\mu_L^{\beta+1}} + \frac{\max_i |x_{iL} - x_i|^{\beta-1}}{\mu_L^3} + \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+3}}\right) \]

\[ = \frac{a\beta}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |y|^\beta U_{0,1}^2 + O\left(\frac{\max_i |x_{iL} - x_i|}{\mu_L^{\beta+1}} + \frac{\max_i |x_{iL} - x_i|^{\beta-1}}{\mu_L^3} + \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+3}}\right). \] (3.13)

Since \( Q(y) \) is positive and \( Q(y) = a|x - x_j|^\beta + O(|x - x_j|^{\beta+1}) \) in \( B_\delta(x_{jL}) \), similar to (3.12) we obtain

\[ \int_{B_\delta(x_{jL})} Q(y)u_L^2 = O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}}\right). \] (3.14)

Finally we estimate the right hand side of (3.2)

\[ -\int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} u_L^2\langle y - x_{jL}, \nu\rangle = O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^2}\right). \] (3.15)

Thus, the result follows from (3.11)-(3.14). \( \square \)

**Proposition 3.3.** There holds

\[ |x_{jL} - x_j| = O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^2}\right). \]

**Proof.** It follows from (3.11) that

\[ \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_\delta(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial y_i} u_L^2 = -\int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} u_L \frac{\partial u_L}{\partial y_i} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} |\nabla u_L|^2 \nu_i + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} Q(y)u_L^2 \nu_i - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} u_L^2 \nu_i. \] (3.16)

Similar to Lemma 3.1 we obtain

\[ -\int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} \frac{\partial u_L}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial u_L}{\partial y_i} + \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |\nabla u_L|^2 \nu_i + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} Q(y)u_L^2 \nu_i - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} u_L^2 \nu_i = \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2}}|x_{iL} - x_j|^N - 2 + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}}\right). \] (3.17)
On the other hand, from Lemma A.4, we have
\[
\int_{B_{\delta}(x_jL)} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial y_i} u^2_L = \frac{a\beta}{\mu_L^2} \int_{B_{\delta\mu L}(0)} |\mu_L^{-1} y + x_j L - x_j|^{\beta-2}(\mu_L^{-1} y + x_j L - x_j) U_{0,1}^2
\]
\[+ O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^2} \int_{B_{\delta\mu L}(0)} |\mu_L^{-1} y + x_j L - x_j|^{\beta} U_{0,1}^2 \right) \]
\[= \frac{a\beta}{\mu_L^{\beta+1}} \left( \int_{B_{\delta\mu L}(0)} |y + x_0|^{\beta-2}(y_i + x_{0,i}) U_{0,1}^2 + o(1) \right) + O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}} \right). \quad (3.18)\]

It follows from (3.17) and (3.18) that
\[
\int_{B_{\delta\mu L}(0)} |y + x_0|^{\beta-2}(y_i + x_{0,i}) U_{0,1}^2 = o(1),
\]
which yields \(x_0 = 0\).

Observing that \(\int_{B_{\delta\mu L}(0)} |y_i|^{\beta-2} y_i U_{0,1}^2 = 0\), we get
\[
\int_{B_{\delta}(x_jL)} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial y_i} u^2_L = \frac{a\beta}{\mu_L^{\beta+1}} \int_{B_{\delta\mu L}(0)} |y|^{\beta-2} U_{0,1}^{-2\mu L} (x_j L - x_j)_i + O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}} \right).
\]

So we find
\[
\mu_L (x_j L - x_j)_i = O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L} \right),
\]
which shows
\[
|x_j L - x_j| = O\left( \frac{1}{\mu^2} \right).
\]

□

Remark 3.4. Applying Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 3.3, we can prove that to obtain a bubbling solution such that the center of different bubbles are separated from each other, the constant \(\beta\) in assumption \((Q3)\) must satisfy \(\beta > N - 4\). In fact, if \(\beta \leq N - 4\), then (3.10) yields
\[
\frac{1}{\mu^{\beta+2}} = O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2 L N-2}} + \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+3}} \right),
\]
which is impossible if \(\beta \leq N - 4\).

Now, we prove the following Proposition.

Proposition 3.5. It holds
\[
\mu_L = L^{\frac{N-2}{N-4}} (\bar{B} + \frac{1}{\mu_L}),
\]
for some constant \(\bar{B} > 0\).
Proof. By Proposition \[3.3\] \(|x_j - x_{jL}| = O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L}\right)\), we find
\[
\frac{1}{|x_i - x_{jL}|^{N-2}} = \frac{1}{(|x_i - x_j| + O(\frac{1}{\mu_L}))^{N-2}} = \frac{1}{|x_i - x_j|^{N-2}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu^2_L}\right).
\]
As a result, we see that (3.10) is equivalent to
\[
\frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}} = B \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2}|x_i - x_j|^{N-2}} + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+3}} + \frac{1}{\mu_L^N}\right).
\] (3.19)
We can easily deduce from (3.19) that
\[
c^0_L \frac{N-2}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}} \leq \mu_L \leq c^1_L \frac{N-2}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}}.
\]
Let \(\frac{N-2}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}} = \frac{a_iL}{L^{\beta+2}}\). Then \(0 < c_0 \leq a_jL \leq c_1 < +\infty\), and from [18] Lemma C.1, we obtain
\[
a_j^\beta = \overline{B} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{a_iL}{|i - j|^{N-2}} + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L}\right).
\]
Thus, we complete the result. \(\square\)

3.2. Local uniqueness. Assume that problem (1.1) has two different solutions \(u^{(1)}_L\) and \(u^{(2)}_L\), which blow up at \(x_j, j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, m\). For \(l = 1, 2\), we will use \(x_{jL}^{(l)}\) and \(\mu^{(l)}_L\) to denote the center and the height of the bubbles appearing in \(u^{(l)}_L\), respectively.

Let
\[
\eta_L = \frac{u^{(1)}_L - u^{(2)}_L}{||u^{(1)}_L - u^{(2)}_L||_*},
\] (3.20)
Then, \(\eta_L\) satisfies \(||\eta_L||_* = 1\) and
\[
- \Delta \eta_L + Q(y)\eta_L = f(y, u^{(1)}_L, u^{(2)}_L),
\] (3.21)
where
\[
f(y, u^{(1)}_L, u^{(2)}_L) = \frac{1}{||u^{(1)}_L - u^{(2)}_L||_*} ((u^{(1)}_L)^{2^* - 1} - (u^{(2)}_L)^{2^* - 1}).
\] (3.22)
Write
\[
f(y, u^{(1)}_L, u^{(2)}_L) = c_L(y)\eta_L(y),
\] (3.23)
where
\[
c_L(y) = (2^* - 1) \int_0^1 (tu^{(1)}_L(y) + (1 - t)u^{(2)}_L(y))^{2^* - 2} dt.
\] (3.24)
It follows from Propositions [3.3] and [3.5] that
\[
U_{x_{iL}^{(1)}\mu^{(1)}_L} - U_{x_{iL}^{(2)}\mu^{(2)}_L} = O\left(\frac{|x_{iL}^{(1)} - x_{iL}^{(2)}|}{\nabla U_{x_{iL}^{(1)}\mu^{(1)}_L}} + |\mu^{(1)}_L - \mu^{(2)}_L| ||\partial_\mu U_{x_{iL}^{(1)}\mu^{(1)}_L}||\right)
\]
\[
= O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L} U_{x_{iL}^{(1)}\mu^{(1)}_L}\right).
\]
which gives
\[ u^{(1)}_L - u^{(2)}_L = O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L} \sum_{i=0}^{m} U_{x^{(1)}_{ijL}, \mu_{L}^{(1)}} + |\varphi_L^{(1)}| + |\varphi_L^{(2)}| \right). \] (3.25)

Thus, we have proved
\[ c_L(y) = (2^* - 1)U^{2^*-2}_{0,1} + \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N/2}} L^{N-2} + |\varphi_L^{(1)}| + |\varphi_L^{(2)}| \] (3.26)

It is not difficult to deduce from Lemma [A.3] that
\[ |c_L(y)| \leq C(\mathcal{W}^{2^*-2}_{0,1}(y) + \mathcal{W}^{2^*-2}_{0,2}(y)). \]

Hence Lemma [A.3] implies that there exists a large \( R > 0 \) such that
\[ |\eta_L(y)| = o(1), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \bigcup_j B_R(\mu_{L}^{(1)} - 1(x_{jL}^{(1)})). \]

To obtain a contradiction, we only need to check that \( |\eta_L(y)| = o(1) \) in \( \bigcup_j B_R(\mu_{L}^{(1)} - 1(x_{jL}^{(1)})) \), which will be achieved by using the Pohozaev identities in the small ball \( B_\delta(x_{jL}^{(1)}) \).

Let
\[ \tilde{\eta}_{Lj}(y) = \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{(1)}} \right)^{\frac{N}{2}} \eta_L \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{(1)}} y + x_{jL}^{(1)} \right). \] (3.27)

**Lemma 3.6.** It holds
\[ \tilde{\eta}_{Lj}(y) \to \sum_{l=0}^{N} b_{jl} \psi_l(y), \quad \text{as} \quad L \to \infty, \] (3.28)

uniformly in \( C^1(B_R(0)) \) for any \( R > 0 \), where \( b_{jl}, l = 0, \ldots, N \), are some constants, and
\[ \psi_0 = \left. \frac{\partial U_{0,\mu_L}}{\partial \mu_L} \right|_{\mu_L=1}, \quad \psi_j = \left. \frac{\partial U_{0,1}}{\partial y_j} \right|, \quad j = 1, \ldots, N. \] (3.29)

**Proof.** In view of \( |\tilde{\eta}_{Lj}| \leq C \) in any compact subset of \( \mathbb{R}^N \), we may assume that \( \tilde{\eta}_{Lj} \to \eta_j \) in \( C_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N) \). Then it follows from the elliptic regularity theory and (3.21) and (3.26) that \( \eta_j \) satisfies
\[ -\Delta \eta_j = (2^* - 1)U^{2^*-2}_{0,1} \eta_j, \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N, \] (3.30)

which combining with the non-degeneracy of \( U_{0,1} \) gives \( \eta_j = \sum_{l=0}^{N} b_{jl} \psi_l \). \( \square \)

Let \( G(y, x) = C_N |y - x|^{2-N} \) be the corresponding Green’s function of \( -\Delta \) in \( \mathbb{R}^N \), where \( C_N = (N(N - 2)\omega_{N-1})^{-1} \).
Lemma 3.7. There holds
\[ |\eta_L(x)| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{m} \sum_{|\alpha|=0}^{1} A_{j,L,\alpha} \partial^\alpha G(x_{j,L}^{(1)}, x) + O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N/2}} \right) \]
\[ := \sum_{j=0}^{m} F_{j,L}(x) + O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N/2}} \right), \quad \text{in } C^1\left( \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^{m} B_{2\delta}(x_{j,L}^{(1)}) \right), \]
where \( \delta > 0 \) is any small constant, and the constants \( A_{j,L,\alpha} \) satisfy the following estimates:
\[ A_{j,L,0} = \int_{B_\delta(x_{j,L}^{(1)})} f(y, u_L^{(1)}(y), u_L^{(2)}(y)) \, dy = o\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N/2}} \right), \]
\[ A_{j,L,\alpha} = O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N/2+|\alpha|}} \right), \quad |\alpha| \geq 1. \]

Proof. Denote \( f_L^*(y) = f(y, u_L^{(1)}(y), u_L^{(2)}(y)) \). We have
\[ |\eta_L(x)| = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(y, x) f_L^*(y) \, dy - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(y, x) Q(y) |\eta_L(y)| \, dy \]
Note that
\[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(y, x) f_L^*(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{m} \sum_{|\alpha|=0}^{1} A_{j,L,\alpha} \partial^\alpha G(x_{j,L}^{(1)}, x) + O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N/2}} \right) \right) f_L^*(y) \, dy \]
\[ = \sum_{j=0}^{m} \sum_{|\alpha|=0}^{1} A_{j,L,\alpha} \partial^\alpha G(x_{j,L}^{(1)}, x) + O\left( \int_{B_\delta(x_{j,L}^{(1)})} |y - x_{j,L}^{(1)}|^2 |f_L^*(y)| \, dy \right) \]
\[ + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^{m} B_\delta(x_{j,L}^{(1)})} G(y, x) f_L^*(y) \, dy. \]
And
\[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(y, x) Q(y) |\eta_L(x)| \, dy \]
\[ = \int_{\bigcup_{j=0}^{m} B_\delta(x_{j,L}^{(1)})} G(y, x) |y - x_{j,L}|^2 |\eta_L| \, dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^{m} B_\delta(x_{j,L}^{(1)})} G(y, x) |y - x_{j,L}|^2 |\eta_L| \, dy \]
\[ = O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N/2+2}} \right) \]
For \( y \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \bigcup_j B_\delta(x_{jL}^{(1)}) \), noting that \( \tau = \frac{N-2}{2} - \vartheta \) for \( \vartheta > 0 \) small, similar to [13], we find

\[
|f^*_L(y)| \leq C \mu_L^{-\tau} \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L} + (\mu_L^{-\tau} \| \varphi_L^{(1)} \|_*/2)^{2^* - 2} \right) \left( \sum_{j=0}^m \frac{1}{|y - x_{jL}^{(1)}|^{\frac{N-2}{2} + \tau}} \right)^{2^* - 1}
\]

\[
\leq C \mu_L^{-\frac{N+2}{2} + \vartheta} \sum_{j=0}^m \frac{1}{|y - x_{jL}^{(1)}|^{\frac{N+2}{2} + \tau}}.
\]

Thus, we have

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \bigcup_j B_\delta(x_{jL}^{(1)})} G(y, x) f^*_L(y) \, dy \leq C \mu_L^{-\frac{N+2}{2} + \vartheta} \sum_{j=0}^m \frac{1}{|x - x_{jL}^{(1)}|^{\frac{N+2}{2} + \tau}} \leq \frac{C}{\mu_L^{\frac{N+2}{2} - \vartheta}}.
\] (3.37)

Similarly, by Lemma [A.3] we obtain

\[
\int_{B_\delta(x_{jL}^{(1)})} |y - x_{jL}^{(1)}|^2 |f^*_L(y)| \, dy \leq C \mu_L^{-\frac{N+2}{2} + \vartheta} \int_{B_\delta(x_{jL}^{(1)})} \frac{(\mu_L)^{\frac{N+2}{2}}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_{jL}^{(1)}|)(\mu_L^{\frac{N+2}{2} + \tau})^{(2^* - 1)}} \] (3.38)

\[
\leq \frac{C}{(\mu_L)^{\frac{N+2}{2} - (2^* - 1)\vartheta}} \int_{B_\delta(x_{jL}^{(1)})} \frac{1}{|y - x_{jL}^{(1)}|^{N-\vartheta(2^* - 1)}} \leq \frac{C}{\mu_L^{\frac{N+2}{2} - (2^* - 1)\vartheta}}.
\]

Inserting (3.35) into (3.34), we obtain (3.31). Similarly, we can prove that (3.31) holds in \( C^1(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^m B_\delta(x_{jL}^{(1)})) \). It remains to estimate \( A_{j,L,\alpha} \).

\[
A_{j,L,0} = \int_{B_\delta(x_{jL}^{(1)})} f(y, u_L^{(1)}(y), u_L^{(2)}(y)) \, dy
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{(\mu_L)^{N-2}} \int_{B_\delta(0)} \frac{1}{(\mu_L)^2} f^*_L \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L} y + x_{jL}^{(1)} \right) \, dy
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{(\mu_L)^{\frac{N+2}{2}} \, O \left( \int_{B_{\delta \mu_L(0)} \setminus B_\delta(0)} \frac{1}{|y|^{(N-2 - \vartheta)(2^* - 1)}} \right) \, dy)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{(\mu_L)^{\frac{N+2}{2}}} \left( 2^* - 1 \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} U_0^{2^* - 2} \sum_{l=0}^N b_{lj} \psi_l + o(1) \right) = o \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\frac{N+2}{2}}} \right).
\] (3.39)

If \( |\alpha| \geq 1 \), then

\[
|A_{j,L,\alpha}| \leq C \int_{B_\delta(x_{jL}^{(1)})} |y - x_{jL}^{(1)}|^{\alpha} |f(y, u_L^{(1)}(y), u_L^{(2)}(y))| = O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\frac{N+2}{2} + |\alpha|}} \right).
\] (3.40)

Thus, we complete the proof. □
Using (3.1) and (3.2), we can deduce the following identities:
\[
- \int_{\partial B^i(x_j^{(1)})} \frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial \nu} u^{(1)}_L - \int_{\partial B^i(x_j^{(1)})} \frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial y_i} u^{(1)}_L + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B^i(x_j^{(1)})} \langle \nabla (u^{(1)}_L + u^{(2)}_L), \nabla \eta_i \rangle v_i \\
= \int_{\partial B^i(x_j^{(1)})} C_L(y) \eta_i v_i + \int_{\partial B^i(x_j^{(1)})} Q(x) (u^{(1)}_L + u^{(2)}_L) \eta_i v_i - \int_{B^i(x_j^{(1)})} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial y_i} (u^{(1)}_L + u^{(2)}_L) \eta_i,
\]
and
\[
- \int_{\partial B^i(x_j^{(1)})} \frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial \nu} (y - x_j^{(1)}, \nabla u^{(1)}_L) - \int_{\partial B^i(x_j^{(1)})} \frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial y_i} (y - x_j^{(1)}, \nabla \eta_i) \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B^i(x_j^{(1)})} \langle \nabla (u^{(1)}_L + u^{(2)}_L), \nabla \eta_i \rangle (y - x_j^{(1)}, \nu) + \frac{2 - N}{2} \int_{\partial B^i(x_j^{(1)})} \frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial \nu} u^{(1)}_L \\
+ \frac{2 - N}{2} \int_{\partial B^i(x_j^{(1)})} \frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial \nu} u^{(2)}_L \eta_i + \int_{\partial B^i(x_j^{(1)})} Q(y) (u^{(1)}_L + u^{(2)}_L) \eta_i (y - x_j^{(1)}, \nu) \\
= \int_{B^i(x_j^{(1)})} Q(y) (u^{(1)}_L + u^{(2)}_L) \eta_i + \int_{B^i(x_j^{(1)})} (u^{(1)}_L + u^{(2)}_L) \eta_i \langle \nabla Q, x - x_j^{(1)} \rangle \\
+ \int_{\partial B^i(x_j^{(1)})} C_L(y) \eta_i (y - x_j^{(1)}, \nu),
\]
where \( C_L(y) = \int_0^1 (tu^{(1)}_L + (1 - t)u^{(2)}_L)^{2r-1} dt \) and \( d > 0 \) is a small constant.

Similar to (3.26), we can deduce
\[
C_L(y) = U^{2r-1} L^{2r-1} \eta_L + O\left( \left( \frac{1}{\mu L^2} \varphi^{(1)}_L + \frac{1}{\mu L^2} \varphi^{(2)}_L \right)^{2r-1} \right), \quad y \in B^i(x_j^{(1)}).
\]

To estimate the boundary terms in (3.41) and (3.42), we need the following estimates which can be deduced from Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 3.7
\[
u_L^{(1)}(y) = \sum_{j=0}^m \left( \left( \frac{N(N-2)}{\mu L^2} \right)^{-2} \frac{1}{|y - x_j L|^{N-2}} + O\left( \frac{1}{\mu L^2} \right) \right), \quad y \in \partial B^i(x_j L), \quad l = 1, 2,
\]
and
\[
\eta_L(y) = F_{\mu}^L(y) + o\left( \frac{1}{\mu L^2} \right), \quad y \in \partial B^i(x_j L).
\]

**Proof of Theorem 1.5**. Step 1. We prove \( b_j L = 0, j = 1, \cdots, N \). We need to estimate each term in (3.41). From (3.43), we obtain
\[
\int_{\partial B^i(x_j^{(1)})} \langle \nabla (u^{(1)}_L + u^{(2)}_L), \nabla \eta_i \rangle v_i = O\left( \frac{1}{\mu L^2} b_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} U_{0, \psi} + o(1) \right),
\]
and
\[
\int_{B_b(x_{1L}^{(1)})} \frac{\partial Q(y)}{\partial y_j} D_L(y) \eta_L = \frac{\beta}{\mu_L^{\beta - 1 + \frac{N}{2}}} \int_{B_{\beta L}(0)} |y|^{\beta - 2} y_i D_L\left(\frac{y}{\mu_L}\right) x_{1L}^{(1)} \tilde{\eta}_L
\]
\[
= \frac{\beta}{\mu_L^{\beta - 1 + 2}} \int_{B_R(0)} |y_i|^{\beta - 2} y_i U_{0,1} \sum_{k=0}^{N} b_{jL} \psi_k + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta + 2}}\right) \tag{3.46}
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta - 1 + 2}} b_{jL} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |y_i|^{\beta - 2} y_i U_{0,1} \psi_i + o(1) + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta + 2}}\right),
\]
and
\[
\int_{\partial B_b(x_{1L}^{(1)})} Q(y) (u_{L}^{(1)} + u_{L}^{(2)}) \eta_L = O(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta + 2}}).
\tag{3.47}
\]
Combining (3.45), (3.46) and (3.47), we are led to
\[
\text{RHS of (3.41)} = \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta + 1}} b_{j,i} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |y_i|^{\beta - 2} y_i U_{0,1} \psi_i. \tag{3.48}
\]
To estimate the left hand side of (3.41), using (3.44), we have
\[
\text{LHS of (3.41), using (3.44), we have}
\]
\[
\text{LHS of (3.41)} = o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{N - 2} L^{N - 2}} + \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N - 1}}\right). \tag{3.49}
\]
So (3.48) and (3.49) yield
\[
b_{j,i} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |y_i|^{\beta - 2} y_i U_{0,1} \psi_i + o(1) = (\mu_L^{(1)})^{\beta + 1} o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{N - 2} L^{N - 2}} + \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N - 1}}\right) = o(1), \tag{3.50}
\]
which implies \( b_{j,i} = 0, i = 1, \ldots, N. \)

**Step 2.** We prove \( b_{j,0} = 0. \) It follows from Lemma 2.6 and (3.44) that

LHS of (3.42)
\[
= \int_{\partial B_b(x_{1L}^{(1)})} \frac{\partial \eta^*_L}{\partial \nu} (x - x_{1L}^{(1)}, \nabla \frac{1}{|x - x_{1L}^{(1)}|^{N - 2}}) + \int_{\partial B_b(x_{1L}^{(1)})} \frac{\partial \eta^*_L}{\partial \nu} \langle x - x_{1L}^{(1)}, \nabla \eta^*_L \rangle
\]
\[
+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_b(x_{1L}^{(1)})} \langle \nabla \frac{1}{|x - x_{1L}^{(1)}|^{N - 2}}, \nabla \eta^*_L \rangle \langle x - x_{1L}^{(1)}, \nu \rangle
\]
\[
+ \frac{2 - N}{2} \int_{\partial B_b(x_{1L}^{(1)})} \frac{\partial \eta^*_L}{\partial \nu} \frac{1}{|x - x_{1L}^{(1)}|^{N - 2}} + \int_{\partial B_b(x_{1L}^{(1)})} \frac{\partial \eta^*_L}{\partial \nu} \eta^*_L \rangle
\]
\[
+ o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{N - 2} |x_iL - x_{jL}^{(1)}|^{N - 2}}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^N}\right).
\]

If we replace \( \eta^*_L \) by \( \frac{A_{ij}}{|x - x_{1L}|^{N - 2}} \), then it is easy to check that the sum of all the integrals is zero.
Therefore
\[
\text{LHS of (3.42)} = o\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{-2} L^{N-2}}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^N}\right).
\] (3.52)
Combining (3.48) and (3.52), we are led to
\[
b_{j,0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |y|^\beta U_{0,1}^{2^*-1} \psi_0 = o(1).
\] (3.53)
This gives \( b_{j,0} = 0 \).

\text{Proof of Theorem 1.8.} To prove that \( u_L \) is periodic in \( y_1 \), we let
\[
v_L(y) = u_L(y_1 - L, y_2, \ldots, y_N).
\]
Then, \( v_L \) is a bubbling solution whose blow-up set is the same as that of \( u_L \). By the local uniqueness, \( v_L = u_L \).

\text{APPENDIX A. SOME BASIC ESTIMATES}

In this section, we give some technical estimates. Throughout Appendices A, B, C, we will use the same notations as before and we also use the same \( C \) to denote different constants unless otherwise stated.

First we give some known estimates which can be found in [27, 18].

**Lemma A.1.** (Lemma B.1, [27]) Let \( x_i, x_j \in \mathbb{R}^N, x_i \neq x_j, i \neq j \). It holds
\[
\frac{1}{(1 + |y - x_i|)^\alpha (1 + |y - x_j|)^\beta} \leq C \left( \frac{1}{(1 + |x_i - x_j|)^\sigma} \right) \left( \frac{1}{(1 + |y - x_j|)^{\alpha+\beta-\sigma}} \right),
\] where \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are some positive constants, \( 0 < \sigma \leq \min(\alpha, \beta) \).

**Lemma A.2.** (Lemma B.1, [27]) For any constant \( 0 < \sigma < N - 2 \), there exists a constant \( C \) such that
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{dz}{|y - z|^{N-2} (1 + |z|)^{2+\sigma}} \leq C \left( \frac{1}{(1 + |y|)^\sigma} \right).
\]

**Lemma A.3.** (Lemma A.3, [18]) For any \( \gamma > 1 \), there exists a constant \( C \), such that
\[
\sum_j \frac{1}{(1 + \mu L |y - x_j|)^\gamma} \leq C \left( \frac{1}{(1 + \mu L |y - x_i|)^\gamma} \right), \quad y \in B_i := B_1(x_i).
\] (A.1)

Let \( u_L \) be a solution of (1.1) with the form
\[
u_L = W_{x,\mu L} + \varphi_L, \quad W_{x,\mu L} = \sum_{j=0}^m \xi(y - x_j)U_{x_j,\mu L} =: \sum_{j=0}^m W_{x_j,\mu L},
\] (A.2)
satisfying (1.6), (1.7) and (1.8). It is easy to see that \( \varphi_L \) satisfies the following equation:
\[
- \Delta \varphi_L - Q(y) \varphi_L - (2^*-1) W_{x,\mu L}^{2^*-2} \varphi_L = N_L(\varphi_L) + l_L,
\] (A.3)
where
\[
I_L = (W_{x,\mu_L})^{2^* - 1} - \sum_{j=0}^{m} \xi(y - x_{jL})U_{x_{jL},\mu_L}^{2^* - 1} - Q(y)W_{x,\mu_L}
\]
\[
+ \sum_{j=0}^{m} U_{x_{jL},\mu_L} \Delta \xi + 2\nabla \xi \nabla \sum_{j=0}^{m} U_{x_{jL},\mu_L},
\]
(A.4)
and
\[
N_L(\varphi_L) = (W_{x,\mu_L} + \varphi_L)^{2^* - 1} - W_{x,\mu_L}^{2^* - 1} - (2^* - 1)W_{x,\mu_L}^{2^* - 2}\varphi_L. \tag{A.5}
\]
By assumption (1.8), we have \(\|\varphi_L\|_\ast \to 0\) as \(L \to +\infty\).

**Lemma A.4.** It holds
\[
u_L \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_{L}^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_{L}|y - x_{jL}|)^{N-2}},
\]
(A.6)
and
\[
\varphi_L \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_{L}^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_{L}|y - x_{jL}|)^{N-2}}.
\]
(A.7)

**Proof.** Since the proof is the same as that of Lemma A.3 in [11], we omit it. \(\Box\)

We now estimate \(N_L(\varphi_L)\) and \(I_L\).

**Lemma A.5.** If \(N \geq 5\), then
\[
\|N_L(\varphi_L)\|_{**} \leq C\|\varphi_L\|_{**}^{\min(2^* - 1, 2)}.
\]

**Proof.** Considering that the proof is just the same as that of Lemma 2.4 in [26], we omit it. \(\Box\)

**Lemma A.6.** If \(N \geq 5\), then
\[
\|I_L\|_{**} \leq \frac{C}{\mu_{L}^{N-2}} + C \max_{j} |x_{jL} - x_j|^\beta.
\]

**Proof.** Recall that from (A.4)
\[
I_L = \left[ (W_{x,\mu_L})^{2^* - 1} - \sum_{j=0}^{m} \xi U_{x_{jL},\mu_L}^{2^* - 1} \right] - Q(y)W_{x,\mu_L}
\]
\[
+ \sum_{j=0}^{m} U_{x_{jL},\mu_L} \Delta \xi (y - x_{jL}) + 2\nabla \sum_{j=0}^{m} U_{x_{jL},\mu_L} \nabla \xi (y - x_{jL})
\]
\[=: J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4.
\]
Denote
\[
\Omega_i = \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ such that } |y - x_{iL}| \leq |y - x_{jL}| \text{ for all } j \neq i \}.
\]
Assuming $y \in \Omega_i$, then

$$|J_1| \leq C \frac{\mu_L^2}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_iL|)^4} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_jL|)^{N-2}}$$

$$+ C \left( \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_jL|)^{N-2}} \right)^{2^* - 1}.$$

Since

$$|y - x_jL| \geq |y - x_iL|, \forall \ y \in \Omega_i,$$

we find

$$\frac{\mu_L^2}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_iL|)^4} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_jL|)^{N-2}} \leq \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_iL|)^{N-2}} \frac{1}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_jL|)^{N-2}}\left( \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_jL|)^{N-2}} \right)^{2^* - 1}.$$

On the other hand

$$\frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_jL|)^{N-2}} \leq \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_iL|)^{N-2}} \frac{1}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_jL|)^{N-2}}\left( \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_jL|)^{N-2}} \right)^{2^* - 1}.$$

we deduce

$$\left( \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_jL|)^{N-2}} \right)^{2^* - 1} \leq \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_iL|)^{N-2}} \frac{1}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_jL|)^{N-2}}\left( \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_jL|)^{N-2}} \right)^{2^* - 1}.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\|J_1\|_{**} \leq C \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{1}{(\mu_L |x_jL - x_iL|)^{N-2} - \tau} \leq \frac{C}{(\mu_L L)^{N-2} - \tau}.$$

Now, we estimate $J_2$. When $|y - x_jL| \geq 1$, we have

$$|J_2| \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_jL|)^{N-2}}$$

$$\leq C \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_j|)^{N-2}} \frac{1}{\mu_L^{2 + \frac{N-2}{2} - \tau}}.$$

When $|y - x_jL| \leq 1$, we have

$$|J_2| \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_jL|)^{N-2}} |y - x_j|^{\beta}$$

$$\leq C \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_j|)^{N-2}} |y - x_j|^{\beta}.$$

(A.8)
Hence, we have

\[
\leq C \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\frac{N+2}{2} \xi(y - x_{jL})}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_j|)^{\frac{N+2}{2} + \tau}} \left( |x_{jL} - x_j|^{\beta} + |y - x_{jL}|^{\beta} \right)
\]

\[
\leq C \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\frac{N+2}{2} \mu_L}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_j|)^{\frac{N+2}{2} + \tau}} \left( |x_{jL} - x_j|^{\beta} + |y - x_{jL}|^{\beta} \right)
\]

\[
\leq \left( \frac{C}{\mu_L} \right)^{\frac{N}{2} - \tau} + C \max_j |x_{jL} - x_j|^{\beta} \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\frac{N+2}{2} \mu_L}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_j|)^{\frac{N+2}{2} + \tau}}, \tag{A.9}
\]

since \( \tau < \frac{N-2}{2}, \beta > \frac{N-2}{2} + \tau > 0 \) and

\[
\frac{|y - x_{jL}|^{\beta}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_j|)^{\frac{N+2}{2} - \tau}} \leq \frac{C}{\mu_L^{\frac{N-2}{2} - \tau}}.
\]

Hence it follows from (A.8) and (A.9) that

\[
\|J_2\|_{**} \leq \left( \frac{C}{\mu_L^{\frac{N}{2} - \tau}} + C \max_j |x_{jL} - x_j|^{\beta} \right).
\]

Also, we can estimate directly

\[
|J_3| \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\frac{N+2}{2} \mu_L}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_j|)^{N-2}} \left| \Delta \xi(y - x_{jL}) \right|
\]

\[
\leq C \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\frac{N+2}{2} \mu_L}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_j|)^{\frac{N+2}{2} + \tau}} \frac{\left| \Delta \xi(y - x_{jL}) \right|}{\mu_L^2 (1 + \mu_L |y - x_j|)^{\frac{N-6}{2} - \tau}}
\]

\[
\leq C \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\frac{N+2}{2} \mu_L}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_j|)^{\frac{N+2}{2} + \tau}} \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\frac{N-2}{2} - \tau}}.
\]

where we use the following fact that

\[
\frac{1}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_j|)} \sim \frac{C}{\mu_L}, \text{ when } 1 \leq |y - x_j| \leq 2.
\]

Hence, we have

\[
\|J_3\|_{**} \leq C \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2} - \tau}. \tag{A.10}
\]

Similar to (A.10), we can estimate \( \|J_4\|_{**} \leq C \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2} - \tau} \). Thus, combining all the estimates above, we complete the proof. \( \square \)

**Lemma A.7.** If \( N \geq 5 \), then

\[
\frac{\partial I}{\partial \mu_L} = m \left( - \frac{B_1}{\mu_L^{\beta+3}} + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{B_2}{\mu_L^{\beta+1} |x_{0L} - x_{jL}|^{N-2}} + o \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+3}} \right) \right)
\]
where $B_1, B_2$ are constants, and

$$I(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 + Q(y)u^2dx - \frac{1}{2^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{2^*}.$$ 

Proof. Firstly, we have

$$\frac{\partial I(W_{x,\mu_L})}{\partial \mu} = \frac{\partial I(U_m)}{\partial \mu_L} + O(\frac{m}{\mu_L^{N-1}}), \quad \text{(A.11)}$$

where $U_m = \sum_{j=0}^{m} U_{x_j,\mu_L}$.

Direct calculations show

$$\frac{\partial I(U_m)}{\partial \mu_L} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} Q(y)U_m \frac{\partial U_m}{\partial \mu_L} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left( U_m^{2^*-1} - \sum_{j=0}^{m} U_{x_j,\mu_L}^{2^*-1} \right) \frac{\partial U_m}{\partial \mu_L} + O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+3}} \right). \quad \text{(A.12)}$$

It is easy to check that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} Q(y)U_m \frac{\partial U_m}{\partial \mu_L} = m \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} Q(y)U_{0,\mu_L} \frac{\partial U_{0,\mu_L}}{\partial \mu_L} + O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} U_{0,\mu_L} \sum_{j=1}^{m} U_{x_j,\mu_L} \right)$$

$$= m \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} a|y-x_0|^\beta U_{0,\mu_L} \frac{\partial U_{0,\mu_L}}{\partial \mu_L} + O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^2} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{1}{(\mu_L|x_i-x_j|)^{(N-4)}} \right)$$

$$= m \left( \frac{a}{\mu_L^{\beta+3}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} U_{0,1}^2 + O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L\beta+4} \right) \right). \quad \text{(A.13)}$$

On the other hand, similar to \cite{26}, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (U_m^{2^*-1} - \sum_{j=0}^{m} U_{x_j,\mu_L}^{2^*-1}) \frac{\partial U_m}{\partial \mu_L} = m(-\sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{B_2}{\mu_L^{N-1}|x_0-x_j|^{N-2}} + O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}} \right)), \quad \text{(A.14)}$$

for some constant $B_2 > 0$, we obtain the result. \hfill $\Box$

Lemma A.8. If $N \geq 5$, then

$$\frac{\partial I}{\partial y_i} = m \left( -\frac{C_1(x_j-x_i)}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}} + \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{C_2}{\mu_L^{N-2}|x_i-x_j|^{N-2}} + o\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}} \right) \right), \quad i = 1, 2, ..., N.$$ 

where $C_1, C_2$ are constants.

Proof. Since

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} Q(y)U_m \frac{\partial U_m}{\partial y_i} = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{\partial Q(y)}{\partial y_i} U_m^2$$

$$= -\frac{\beta}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} a\beta|\mu_L^{-1}y_i + (x_j-x_i)\beta^{-2}(\mu_L^{-1}y_i + (x_j-x_i))_i U_{0,1}^2$$

$$+ O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+2+\epsilon}} + |x_j-x_i|^{\beta+2+\epsilon} \right)$$
Thus in (B.1), it holds
\begin{equation}
\frac{u}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}}(x_jL - x_ji) + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+2+c}} + |x_jL - x_j|^\beta + c\right),
\end{equation}
combining (A.15) and by the similar argument as that of Lemma A.7, we can complete the proof. \hfill \Box

**Appendix B. Estimate of the error term**

We know that \( u_L \) be a solution of equation (1.1) with the form
\begin{equation}
u_L = \sum_{j=0}^{m} \xi(y - x_{jL})U_{x_{jL},\mu_L} + \varphi_L,
\end{equation}
and
\begin{equation}
-\Delta \varphi_L - Q(y)\varphi_L - (2^* - 1)W^{2^*-2}_{x_{jL},\mu_L} \varphi_L = N_L(\varphi_L) + l_L,
\end{equation}
where \( l_L \) and \( N_L(\varphi_L) \) are defined in (A.4) and (A.5) respectively.

Observe that in the decomposition (B.1), we do not assume that \( \varphi_L \in H_m \). See (2.1) for the definition of \( H_m \). We would like to point out that \( x_{jL} \) and \( \tilde{c}_m\mu_L^{\frac{N}{2}} \) may not be a maximum point and the maximum value of \( u_L \) in \( B_\delta(x_{jL}) \), respectively. Let \( \bar{x}_{jL} \in B_1(x_j) \) be such that \( u_L(\bar{x}_{jL}) = \max_{B_1(x_j)} u_L := \tilde{c}_m\mu_L^{\frac{N}{2}} \). From (1.5), we can deduce that as \( L \to +\infty \), \( \bar{\mu}_L = \mu_L(1 + o_L(1)) \), and \( \mu_L(\bar{x}_{jL} - x_{jL}) = o_L(1) \). As a result, we have
\begin{align*}
U_{x_{jL},\mu_L} - U_{\bar{x}_{jL},\bar{\mu}_L} = & O\left(|\mu_L(\bar{x}_{jL} - x_{jL})| + \mu_L^{-1}|\bar{\mu}_L - \mu_L|\right)U_{\bar{x}_{jL},\bar{\mu}_L} = o_L(1)U_{\bar{x}_{jL},\bar{\mu}_L},
\end{align*}
and
\begin{equation}
|\varphi_L(x)| = o_L(1) \left( \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{\frac{N-2}{2}}}{(1 + \mu_L|y - \bar{x}_{jL}|)^{\frac{N-2}{2} + \tau}} \right).
\end{equation}
So, we find that in (B.1), \( x_{jL} \) and \( \mu_L \) can be replaced by \( \bar{x}_{jL} \) and \( \bar{\mu}_L \) respectively. For simplicity, in the following, we still use \( x_{jL} \) and \( \mu_L \) to denote \( \bar{x}_{jL} \) and \( \bar{\mu}_L \) respectively. Thus in (B.1), it holds
\begin{equation}
|\varphi_L(x_{jL})| = O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{\frac{N-2}{2}} L^{N-2}}\right), \quad |\nabla \varphi_L(x_{jL})| = O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{\frac{N-2}{2}} L^{N-1}}\right).
\end{equation}

In the following, we will use (B.2) to estimate \( \omega_L \).

**Proposition B.1.** Assume that \( N \geq 5 \). There holds
\begin{equation}
\|\varphi_L\|_* \leq C\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{\frac{N-2}{2}}} + \max_i |x_{iL} - x_i|^\beta \right).
\end{equation}

**Proof.** Since
\begin{equation}
-\Delta \varphi_L + Q(y)\varphi_L - (2^* - 1)W^{2^*-2}_{x_{jL},\mu_L} \varphi_L = N_L(\varphi_L) + l_L,
\end{equation}

we have

\begin{equation}
\frac{u}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}}(x_jL - x_ji) + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+2+c}} + |x_jL - x_j|^\beta + c\right),
\end{equation}
noting that \( Q(y) \geq 0 \), we have

\[
|\varphi_L| \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|z-y|^{N-2}} \left| W^{2^* - 2}_{x, \mu_L} \varphi_L \right| dz + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|z-y|^{N-2}} (|N(\varphi_L)| + |l_L|). 
\] (B.4)

We can check easily

\[
\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|z-y|^{N-2}} (N_L(\varphi_L) + l_L) \right| 
\leq C(\|\varphi_L\|_*^{\min\{2^* - 1, 2\}} + \|l_L\|_{**}) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|z-y|^{N-2}} \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L|z - x_jL|)^{N-2 + \tau}} 
\leq C(\|\varphi_L\|_*^{\min\{2^* - 1, 2\}} + \|l_L\|_{**}) \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L|y - x_jL|)^{N-2 + \tau}}. 
\] (B.5)

Suppose \( N \geq 6 \), we have

\[
W^{2^* - 2}_{x, \mu_L} \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^2}{(1 + \mu_L|z - x_jL|)^4};
\]

If \( N = 5 \), then by discrete Hölder inequality we have

\[
W^{2^* - 2}_{x, \mu_L} \leq C \mu_L^2 \left( \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{1}{(1 + \mu_L|z - x_jL|)^3} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} 
\leq C \mu_L^2 \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{1}{(1 + \mu_L|z - x_jL|)^{4 - \frac{4}{3}}} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{1}{(1 + \mu_L|z - x_jL|)^{\frac{4}{3}}} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} 
\leq C \mu_L^2 \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{1}{(1 + \mu_L|z - x_jL|)^{4 - \frac{4}{3}}}. 
\]

So, we obtain that for \( N \geq 6 \),

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|y-z|^{N-2}} W^{2^* - 2}_{x, \mu_L} \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L|z - x_jL|)^{N-2 + \tau}} dz 
\leq \mu_L^{N+2} \sum_{j=0}^{m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|y-z|^{N-2}} \frac{1}{(1 + \mu_L|z - x_jL|)^{N-2 + \tau + 4}} dz 
+ \mu_L^{N+2} \sum_{j=0}^{m} \sum_{i \neq j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N-2}} \frac{1}{|y-z|^{N-2}} \frac{1}{(1 + \mu_L|z - x_jL|)^4} \frac{1}{(1 + \mu_L|z - x_iL|)^{N-2 + \tau}} dz 
\leq C \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L|y - x_jL|)^{2 + \frac{N-2}{2}}},
\]
which implies that if $N \geq 6$, 
\[ \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|z-y|^{N-2}} W_{x,\mu L}^{2^*-2} \varphi_L dz \right| \leq \| \varphi_L \|_* \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L|y-x_j|)^{N-2+\tau}} \] (B.6)

Also, by the similar argument we can show that for $N = 5$, there is a $\zeta > 0$ such that 
\[ \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|z-y|^{N-2}} W_{x,\mu L}^{2^*-2} \varphi_L dz \right| \leq C\| \varphi_L \|_* \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L|y-x_j|)^{N-2+\tau+\zeta}}. \] (B.7)

Therefore, it follows from (B.4) to (B.7) that 
\[ \| \varphi_L \|_* \leq C(\| \varphi_L \|_*^{\text{min}(2^*-1,2)} + \| l_L \|_{**}) \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L|y-x_j|)^{N-2+\tau}} \] 
\[ + C\| \varphi_L \|_* \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L|y-x_j|)^{N-2+\tau+\zeta}} \] (B.8)

where $\zeta > 0$ is a constant.

Assume that there exists $y \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^{m} B_{R\mu_{L}^{-1}}(x_{jL})$ for some large $R > 0$, such that $\| \omega \|_*$ is achieved at $y$. Then, (B.8) yields 
\[ \| \varphi_L \|_* \leq C(\| \varphi_L \|_*^{\text{min}(2^*-1,2)} + \| l_L \|_{**}) + o_R(1)\| \varphi_L \|_* \] (B.9)

Noting that $\| \varphi_L \|_* \to 0$ as $L \to +\infty$, we have 
\[ \| \varphi_L \|_* \leq C\| l_L \|_{**}. \] (B.10)

Suppose that $\| \varphi_L \|_*$ is achieved at $y \in B_{R\mu_{L}^{-1}}(x_{jL})$. Let 
\[ \tilde{\varphi}_L(y) = \mu_L^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \varphi_L(\mu_L^{-1}y + x_{jL}), \]
and 
\[ \| \| \tilde{\varphi}_L \|_* = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m} \frac{\| \mu_L^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \varphi_L(\mu_L^{-1}y - x_{iL}) \|_{\| \varphi_L \|_*}}{(1 + \mu_L|y - \varphi_L(\mu_L^{-1}y - x_{iL}))^{\frac{N-2+\tau}{2}}} \right)^{-1} |\tilde{\varphi}_L(y)|. \]

Then $\| \| \tilde{\varphi}_L \|_*$ is achieved at some $y \in B_R(0)$.

Suppose that 
\[ \| \varphi_L \|_* \geq n_L \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\frac{N-2}{2}}} + C \max_{i} |x_{iL} - x_{i}|^{\beta} \right), \]
for some $n_L \to \infty$. Then as $L \to +\infty$, $\eta_L = \| \tilde{\varphi}_L \|_{\| \varphi_L \|_*}$ converges to $\eta \neq 0$, which satisfies 
\[ -\Delta \eta - (2^* - 1)U_{0,1}^{2^*-2} \eta = 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \]
since $\frac{\|L\|_{\infty}}{\|\varphi_L\|_{\infty}} \leq \frac{C}{n_L} \to 0$. This gives
\[
\eta = \alpha_0 \frac{\partial U_{0,\mu L}}{\partial \mu L} |_{\mu L = 1} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j \frac{\partial U_{0,1}}{\partial y_j},
\]
for some constant $\alpha_j$.

On the other hand, we have
\[
\tilde{\varphi}_L(0) = \mu^{N-2}_L \varphi_L(x_jL) = O\left(\frac{1}{\mu^{N-2}_L L^{N-2}}\right),
\]
\[
\nabla \tilde{\varphi}_L(0) = \mu^{N-2}_L \nabla \varphi_L(x_jL) = O\left(\frac{1}{\mu^{N-1}_L L^{N-1}}\right).
\]

So, we find $\eta(0) = 0$ and $\nabla \eta(0) = 0$, which implies $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_N = 0$. This is a contradiction.

\[\square\]

**Corollary B.2.** For any $\delta > 0$, it holds
\[
|\varphi_L|, |\nabla \varphi_L| \leq \frac{C}{\mu^2_L} \left(\frac{1}{\mu^{N-2}_L} + \max_i |x_iL - x_i|^\beta\right).
\]

**Proof.** It follows from Proposition B.1 that
\[
|\varphi_L| \leq \|\varphi_L\|_{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{\mu^{N-2}_j}{\sqrt{1 + \mu_j |y - x_jL|}} \leq C \frac{1}{\mu^2_L} \left(\frac{1}{\mu^{N-2}_L} + \max_i |x_iL - x_i|^\beta\right), \ x \in B_{4\delta}(x_jL) \setminus B_{\delta}(x_jL).
\]

On the other hand, using the $L^p$ estimates, we can deduce that for any $p > 1$,
\[
\|\varphi_L\|_{W^{2p}(B_{4\delta}(x_jL) \setminus B_{\delta}(x_jL))} \leq C \|\varphi_L\|_{L^\infty(B_{4\delta}(x_jL) \setminus B_{\delta}(x_jL))} \leq C \|\varphi_L\|_{L^\infty(B_{4\delta}(x_jL) \setminus B_{\delta}(x_jL))} \leq C \frac{1}{\mu^2_L} \left(\frac{1}{\mu^{N-2}_L} + \max_i |x_iL - x_i|^\beta\right), \ x \in B_{4\delta}(x_jL) \setminus B_{\delta}(x_jL).
\]

the results follow from Lemma A.6 and Proposition B.1. \[\square\]

**Appendix C. Proof of (3.6)**

In this section, we mainly prove (3.6) which involve some technical and precise computations.
Proof of (3.6). For notations of simplicity, we may denote $d = \max_i |x_{iL} - x_i|$. Recall that $\delta = \mu_L^\theta$, $\theta$ is defined in (3.3). By the assumption $(Q_3)$, we have

$$
\int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} Q(y) u_i^2 \nu_i
= \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} \left( a|y - x_j|^\beta + O(|y - x_j|^{\beta + 1}) \right) u_i^2 \nu_i
= \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} \left( a|y - x_{jL}|^\beta + |x_{jL} - x_j|^\beta + O(|y - x_{jL}|^{\beta - 1} |x_{jL} - x_j| + |y - x_{jL}| |x_{jL} - x_j|^{\beta - 1}
+ |y - x_j|^{\beta + 1}) \right) u_i^2 \nu_i
= a \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} |y - x_{jL}|^\beta \left( \sum_{i \neq j} \xi(y - x_{iL}) U_{\mu L, x_{iL}} + \varphi_L \right)^2 \nu_i
+ O\left( \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} (d^\beta + \delta^\beta - 1) d + \delta d^\beta - 1 + \delta^\beta + 1) u_i^2 \right)
=: F_1 + F_2
= O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta + 2}} \right),
$$

since by Lemma A.4, Proposition B.1 and (3.3), we have

$$
F_1 \leq C \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} \delta^\beta \left\{ \left( \sum_{i \neq j}^{m} \right) \left( 1 + \mu_L^2 |y - x_{iL}|^2 \right) \frac{N-2}{\mu_L^{N-2}} \right\}^2 + \|\varphi_L\|^2 \left\{ \left( \sum_{i \neq j}^{m} \right) \left( 1 + \mu_L |y - x_{iL}| \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} \right\}^2
\leq C \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} \delta^\beta \left\{ \left( \sum_{i \neq j}^{m} \right) \mu_L^2 |y - x_{iL}|^2 \right\}^{\frac{N-2}{2}} + \|\varphi_L\|^2 \left\{ \left( \sum_{i \neq j}^{m} \right) \mu_L |y - x_{iL}| \right\} \frac{N-2}{2} \right\}^2
\leq C \delta^{\beta + N-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2} L^2(\beta-2)} + \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2}} \right) \right\}
\leq C \delta^{\beta + N-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2} L^2(\beta-2)} + \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2}} \right) \right\}
= O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta + 2}} \right) + O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta + 2}} \right)
= O\left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta + 2}} \right)
$$
and

\[ F_2 \leq C \int_{\partial B_{\delta}(x_jL)} (d^\beta + \delta^\beta d + \delta d^{\beta+1}) \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |y - x_{iL}|)^{N-2}} \right)^2 \]

= \: F_{2,1} + F_{2,2} + F_{2,3} + F_{2,4} = O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}} \right), \quad (C.1)

where in (C.1) we use the following estimates

\[ F_{2,1} \leq C d^\beta \int_{\partial B_{\delta}(x_jL)} \left\{ \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L \delta)^{2(N-2)}} + \left( \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |x_{jL} - x_{iL}|)^{N-2}} \right)^2 \right\} \]

\[ \leq C d^\beta \int_{\partial B_{\delta}(x_jL)} \left\{ \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L \delta)^{N-2}} + \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2} L^{2(N-2)}} \right\} \]

\[ \leq C d^\beta \left( \frac{1}{\delta^{N-2}} + \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2} L^{2(N-2)}} \right) \delta^{N-1} \]

\[ = \: C d^\beta \left( \frac{1}{\delta^{N-2} + \mu_L^{N-2(N+\beta-2)\theta} L^{2(N-2)}} \right) \delta^{N-1} = O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}} \right), \]

\[ F_{2,2} \leq C \delta^{\beta-1} d \int_{\partial B_{\delta}(x_jL)} \left\{ \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L \delta)^{2(N-2)}} + \left( \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L |x_{jL} - x_{iL}|)^{N-2}} \right)^2 \right\} \]

\[ \leq C \delta^{\beta-1} d \int_{\partial B_{\delta}(x_jL)} \left\{ \frac{\mu_L^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_L \delta)^{N-2}} + \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2} L^{2(N-2)}} \right\} \]

\[ \leq C \delta^{\beta-1} d \left( \frac{1}{\delta^{N-2}} + \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2} L^{2(N-2)}} \right) \delta^{N-1} \]

\[ = \: C d \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}} + \frac{1}{\mu_L^{N-2(N+\beta-2)\theta} L^{2(N-2)}} \right) \delta^{N-1} \]

\[ = O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_L^{\beta+2}} \right), \]
and

\[
F_{2,4} \leq C\delta^{\beta+1} \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} \left\{ \frac{\mu_{L}^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_{L}\delta)^{2(N-2)}} + \left( \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{\mu_{L}^{N-2}}{(1 + \mu_{L}|x_{jL} - x_{iL}|)^{N-2}} \right)^2 \right\}
\]

\[
\leq C\delta^{\beta+1} \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_{jL})} \left\{ \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{N-2} \delta^{2(N-2)}} + \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{N-2} \delta^{2(N-2)}} \right\}
\]

\[
\leq \delta^{\beta+1} \left( \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{N-2} \delta^{2(N-2)}} + \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{N-2} \delta^{2(N-2)}} \right) \delta^{N-1}
\]

\[
= C \left( \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{N-2+(\beta+4-N)\theta}} + \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{N-2+(\beta+4-N)\theta} \delta^{2(N-2)}} \right) = O \left( \frac{1}{\mu_{L}^{\beta+2}} \right).
\]

\[\square\]
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