

Existence and Nonexistence of Extremals for Adams inequality in \mathbb{R}^{4^*}

Maochun Zhu and Lu Chen[†]

November 3, 2021

Abstract

In this paper, we study the the existence and nonexistence of maximizers for the Adams type inequality in \mathbb{R}^4 of the form

$$S(\alpha) = \sup_{\|u\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}=1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(32\pi^2 |u|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u|^2) dx,$$

where $\alpha \in (-\infty, 32\pi^2)$. We show the existence of the threshold α^* such that $S(\alpha)$ is attained if $\alpha > 32\pi^2 - \alpha^*$, and is not attained if $\alpha < 32\pi^2 - \alpha^*$. The proof is based on a sharp rearrangement principle in [19], the method of blow-up analysis and the estimates for the best constants of higher-order Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities.

1 Introduction

1.1 A Brief History of the problem

Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $W_0^{m,p}(\Omega)$ denote the usual Sobolev space consisting of functions vanishing on boundary $\partial\Omega$ together with their derivatives of order less than $m - 1$, that is, the completion of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ under the norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{m,p}(\Omega)} = \left(\int_{\Omega} (|u|^p + |\Delta^{m/2} u|^p) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

If $1 < p < n/m$, the classical Sobolev embedding asserts that $W_0^{m,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{p^*}(\Omega)$ for $p^* = \frac{np}{n-mp}$. However, when $p = n/m$, it is known that $W_0^{m,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\Omega)$ does not hold. The analogue of optimal Sobolev embedding is the

*The research of the second author was partially supported by Natural Science Foundation of China (11601190), Natural Science Foundation of Jiangsu Province (BK20160483) and Jiangsu University Foundation Grant (16JDG043). **2010 AMS Classification:** Primary 46E35. Secondary: 35J50. **Keywords:** Adams inequality, blow up analysis, extremal function, sharp constants.

[†]Corresponding author: Lu Chen, Email: chenlu5818804@163.com

famous Trudinger-Moser inequality ($m = 1$) ([32], [40]) and Adams inequality ($m > 1$) ([2]).

Trudinger-Moser inequality. The Trudinger inequality was established independently by Yudovič [41], Pohožaev [36] and Trudinger [40]. In 1971, Trudinger's inequality was sharpened in [32] by proving

$$\sup_{\substack{u \in W_0^{1,n}(\Omega) \\ \|\nabla u\|_{n(\Omega)} \leq 1}} \int_{\Omega} e^{\alpha|u|^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} dx < \infty \text{ iff } \alpha \leq \alpha_n = n\omega_{n-1}^{\frac{1}{n-1}}, \quad (1)$$

for any bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, where ω_{n-1} denotes the $n - 1$ dimensional surface measure of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n .

When the volume of Ω is infinite, there are several extensions of the Trudinger-Moser inequality. The earlier version of Trudinger-Moser for unbounded domains was studied by D.M. Cao [7] in the case $n = 2$ and for any dimension ($n \geq 2$) by do Ó [13]. Later, Adachi-Tanaka [1] obtained a sharp Trudinger-Moser on \mathbb{R}^n . Note that, not as (1), the result of [1] has a the subcritical form, that is $\alpha < \alpha_n$. In [37] and [28], Li and Ruf showed that the exponent α_n becomes admissible if the Dirichlet norm $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u|^2 dx$ is replaced by Sobolev norm $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2) dx$, more precisely, they proved that

$$\sup_{\substack{u \in W^{1,n}(\mathbb{R}^n) \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (|u|^n + |\nabla u|^n) dx \leq 1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Phi_n \left(\alpha |u|^{\frac{n}{n-1}} \right) dx < +\infty, \text{ iff } \alpha \leq \alpha_n,$$

where $\Phi_n(t) = e^t - \sum_{j=0}^{N-2} \frac{t^j}{j!}$.

So far, the Trudinger-Moser inequality (1) has been generalized in many other directions. For the Trudinger-Moser inequality on the spheres, CR spheres, compact Riemannian manifolds, or hyperbolic spaces, Heisenberg group, etc, we refer the interested readers to [3], [6], [10], [26], [9], [17], [24], and the reference therein.

Existence of extremals for Trudinger Moser inequality. A classical problem related to Trudinger-Moser inequalities consists in investigating the existence of extremal functions. The first proof of existence of extremals for Trudinger-Moser inequality (1) was given by Carleson and Chang in their celebrated work [8] on balls in \mathbb{R}^2 . After that, the existence of extremals was proved for any bounded domains in [14] and [21]. More related results can be found in several papers, see e.g. Li ([25], [26]) for existence of extremals on compact Riemannian manifold, Lu and Yang ([23],[22]) for Trudinger-Moser inequality involving a remainder term, and Ruf and Li ([37],[28]) for existence of extremals on unbounded domain.

Adams inequality on bounded domains. In 1988, Adams [2] extended the Trudinger-Moser inequality (1) to the higher order space $W_0^{m, \frac{n}{m}}(\Omega)$ and

obtained

$$\sup_{\substack{u \in W_0^{m, \frac{n}{m}}(\Omega) \\ \|\Delta^{\frac{m}{2}} u\|_{\frac{n}{m}} \leq 1}} \int_{\Omega} \exp(\beta |u(x)|^{\frac{n}{n-m}}) dx \begin{cases} \leq c |\Omega| & \text{if } \beta \leq \beta(n, m), \\ = +\infty & \text{if } \beta > \beta(n, m), \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where

$$\Delta^{\frac{m}{2}} u = \begin{cases} \Delta^l u & \text{is } m = 2l, l \in \mathbb{N} \\ \nabla \Delta^l u, & \text{is } m = 2l + 1, l \in \mathbb{N} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\beta(n, m) = \begin{cases} \frac{n}{\omega_{n-1}} \left[\frac{\pi^{n/2} 2^m \Gamma(\frac{m+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n-m+1}{2})} \right]^{\frac{n}{n-m}}, & \text{when } m \text{ is odd.} \\ \frac{n}{\omega_{n-1}} \left[\frac{\pi^{n/2} 2^m \Gamma(\frac{m}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n-m}{2})} \right]^{\frac{n}{n-m}}, & \text{when } m \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

Later, by using an iterative method, Tarsi [39] proved that the Adams inequality (2) also holds for a larger class of Sobolev functions, i.e. the functions with homogeneous Navier boundary condition:

$$W_N^{m, \frac{n}{m}}(\Omega) = \{u \in W^{m, \frac{n}{m}}(\Omega), \text{ s.t. } \Delta^j u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \text{ for } 0 \leq j \leq [(m-1)/2]\}.$$

Adams inequality on the entire Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n . In 1995, Ozawa [34] obtained some version of the Adams inequality in Sobolev space $W^{m, \frac{n}{m}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ on the entire Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n by using the restriction $\|\Delta^{\frac{m}{2}} u\|_{\frac{n}{m}} \leq 1$. However, with the argument in [34, 31], one can not obtain the best possible exponent β for this type of inequality. In [27], Fontana and Morpurgo obtained the following Adachi-Tanaka type Adams inequality:

$$\sup_{\substack{u \in W^{m, \frac{n}{m}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \\ \|\Delta^{\frac{m}{2}} u\|_{\frac{n}{m}} \leq 1, \|u\|_{\frac{n}{m}} \leq 1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \exp\left[\left\lceil \frac{n}{m} - 2 \right\rceil (\theta \beta(n, m) |u(x)|^{\frac{n}{n-m}})\right] dx \begin{cases} \leq \frac{C_{m,n}}{1-\theta} & \text{if } \theta \in (0, 1), \\ = +\infty & \text{if } \theta \geq 1, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

through the Li-Ruf type Adams inequality (see [18] for $m = 2$ and [27] for any $m > 2$):

$$\sup_{\substack{u \in W^{m, \frac{n}{m}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \\ \|\Delta^{\frac{m}{2}} u\|_{\frac{n}{m}} + \|u\|_{\frac{n}{m}} \leq 1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \exp\left[\left\lceil \frac{n}{m} - 2 \right\rceil (\beta |u(x)|^{\frac{n}{n-m}})\right] dx \begin{cases} \leq C_{m,n} & \text{if } \beta \leq \beta(n, m), \\ = +\infty & \text{if } \beta > \beta(n, m), \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where $\lceil \frac{n}{m} - 2 \rceil$ denotes the smallest integer greater than or equal to $\frac{n}{m} - 2$. We note that the sharp Adams inequality on the entire Euclidean space was first proved by Ruf and Sani [38] under the stronger constraint

$$\{u \in W^{m, \frac{n}{m}} \mid \|(I - \Delta)^{\frac{m}{2}} u\|_{\frac{n}{m}} \leq 1\},$$

when m is a even integer, while the odd case is due to Lam and Lu [18] by a rearrangement-free argument.

Existence of extremals for Adams inequality. The first result of the existence of extremals of Adams' inequality (2) was obtained by Lu and Yang in [22]. We note that the work of Carleson and Chang was based on the rearrangement argument to reduce problem to the one-dimensional problem. However, the symmetrization technique can not be used for Adams inequality, since there is no the corresponding Pólya-Szegő type inequality in the higher order case. In [22], the authors applied the capacity-type estimates to obtain the existence of extremals for bounded domains in the case $n = 4$ and $m = 2$. Recently, Dela-Torre and Mancini [11] extended the results of [22] to arbitrary even dimension.

1.2 The main results and Outline of the paper

An interesting question is whether the Adams inequality on unbounded domains has an extremals? As far as we know, there is no related result at present. In this work, we are devoted to studying this kind problem for the special case $n = 4$ and $m = 2$.

Setting

$$S(\alpha) = \sup_{u \in H} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp \left(32\pi^2 |u|^2 \right) - 1 - \alpha |u|^2 \right) dx,$$

and

$$B_2 = \sup_{u \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)} \frac{\|v\|_4^4}{\|\Delta v\|_2^2 \|v\|_2^2}, \quad (5)$$

where $\alpha \in (-\infty, 32\pi^2)$, and

$$H := \left\{ u \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^4) \mid \|u\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^2 + |\Delta u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = 1 \right\}.$$

First, we can prove the following result.

Theorem 1 *If $32\pi^2 - \alpha < \frac{(32\pi^2)^2 B_2}{2}$, then $S(\alpha)$ has a radially symmetric extremal function.*

Remark 2 *Naturally, one may ask whether extremal functions of critical Adams inequalities must be radially symmetric. This problem remains open even in the setting of Trudinger-Moser inequalities. Based on the Fourier rearrangement, we can obtain such a kind of result. In fact, assume that u is a maximizer for $S(\alpha)$, and define u^\sharp by $u^\sharp = F^{-1}\{(F(u))^*\}$, where F denotes the Fourier transform on \mathbb{R}^4 (with its inverse F^{-1}) and u^* stands for the Schwarz symmetrization of u . We easily see that u^\sharp is also a maximizer for $S(\alpha)$ with $\|\Delta u^\sharp\|_2 = \|\Delta u\|_2$. Using the property of the Fourier rearrangement from [19], we conclude that*

$$u(x) = e^{i\alpha} u^\sharp(x - x_0) \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^4$$

with some constants $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^4$. That is to say that u is radially symmetric and real valued up to translation and constant phase.

The general strategy we use here is exploiting the standard blow up analysis. We first apply the method based on the Fourier rearrangement (see [19]) to obtain the existence of radially symmetric extremals for the subcritical Adams functional. Then, we take a sequence $\beta_k \rightarrow 32\pi^2$ and find a radially symmetric maximizing sequence $u_k \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ for $S(\alpha)$. If u_k is bounded in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$, i.e. $c_k := \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^4} |u_k| < \infty$, we can easily show that u_k converges to a function u in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ by the standard elliptic estimates. If $c_k \rightarrow +\infty$, i.e. the blow up arise, we apply the blowing up analysis method to analyze the asymptotic behavior of u_k near and far away from the origin, which is the blowing up point, and we derive an upper bound for the Adams functional:

$$S(\alpha) \leq \frac{\pi^2}{6} \exp\left(\frac{5}{3} + 32\pi^2 A\right),$$

where A is the value at 0 of the trace of the regular part of the Green function G for the operator $\Delta^2 + 1$. Finally, we construct a function sequence to show that the upper bounded can actually be surpassed, this implies that the concentration phenomenon will not happen.

At first sight, this kind of result could seem a straightforward generalization of existing theories. However, several difficulties exist, some hidden in subtle details. We are going to describe some of them.

First of all, unlike the case of bounded domain, in order to establish the existence of a maximizers of subcritical Adams functional in \mathbb{R}^4 , we need to avoid the lack of compactness. In this case, concentration phenomena do not occur and vanishing phenomena is the issue due to the unboundedness of the domain. For this reason, we will impose an extral assumption on α such as $32\pi^2 - \alpha < \frac{(32\pi^2)^2 B_2}{2}$ and adapt the argument used in [16] to rule out the vanishing phenomenon.

Secondly, when we try to analyze the asymptotic behavior of u_k , a crucial step is to prove a local estimate for Δu_k :

$$c_k \int_{B_{Rr_k}} |\Delta u_k| dx \leq C(Rr_k)^2. \quad (6)$$

When Ω is a bounded domain, (6) can be proved by the following estimate

$$\int_{\Omega} |\Delta (u_k^2)| dx < c$$

and a representation formula (see [30]). However, because of the unboundedness of domain, the argument in [30] can not be directly applied in our setting. In order to obtain the estimate (6), we will try to truncate u_k and adapt the approach in [30] to our situation. But as we known, in the second order Sobolev

space $H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$, one cannot truncate u_k directly. To overcome this difficulty, we will apply the bi-harmonic truncations which were first used in [11]. We remark that this kind of truncations have many nice properties: on the one hand, they preserve the high order regularity, on the other hand, their behaviors are very similar to the constant in ball.

When we try to obtain the upper bound for the Adams inequality on the entire Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^4 , one need to know the specific value of the upper bound for any blow up function sequences in $H_0^2(B_R)$, but this value cannot be directly derived from the result of Lu and Yang [22]. We will show that the value of that upper bound is $\frac{1}{3}|B_R|\exp(-\frac{1}{3})$ by solving the corresponding ODE's.

Finally, although we can show that u_k is radially symmetric by the Fourier rearrangement, but this function sequence is not necessarily positive, which makes the proof of the existence of a maximizer more complicated.

Our second result reads as follows.

Theorem 3 *There exists some constant $\alpha^{**} > 0$ such that, when $32\pi^2 - \alpha > \alpha^{**}$, S is not attained.*

The proof of this theorem is based on the precise estimates for the upper bounds of the best constants of higher order Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities. To calculate the best constants, we will exploit the method of Beckner in [4]. We stress that the upper bound derived here is very sharp and can be of independent interest. Indeed, we take B_2 for example. On the one hand, by calculating the number associate to the trial function $(1 + |x|)^{-\alpha}$ and letting $\alpha \rightarrow +\infty$, one can found that $\frac{1}{24\pi^2}$ is a lower bound of B_2 . On the other hand, by the upper bound formula we have $B_2 < \frac{32}{729\pi^2}$ (see Appendix). Then, we get

$$\frac{1}{24\pi^2} (\sim 4.2217 \times 10^{-3}) \leq B_2 < \frac{32}{729\pi^2} (\sim 4.4476 \times 10^{-3}),$$

which indicates that our estimates are quite precise.

Define

$$\alpha^* = \sup \{ (32\pi^2 - \alpha) \mid S(\alpha) \text{ is attained} \}.$$

Based on Theorem 1 and Theorem 3, we can gain the following surprising result:

Theorem 4 *When $32\pi^2 - \alpha < \alpha^*$, $S(\alpha) < \alpha^*$ and could be attained, while when $32\pi^2 - \alpha > \alpha^*$, we have $S(\alpha) = 32\pi^2 - \alpha$, and it is not attained.*

It is important to point out that Theorem 4 provides a further insight on the existence or nonexistence of extremals for Adams inequality on the whole space. From the proof of Theorem 1, we know that the supremum of Adams functional is larger than the upper bound of concentration-compactness sequences. Hence *whether $S(\alpha)$ is attained highly depends on the vanishing phenomena, whose energy level is determined only by the coefficient of the first term of $S(\alpha)$. Thus,*

changing the coefficients of finite terms (especially the first term) of $S(\alpha)$, will not affect on the validity of the Adams inequality and the upper bound of concentration sequences, but will change the existence or nonexistence of extremals. It seems that this aspect has not been noticed before, even in the case of Trudinger-Moser inequality.

Once the existence and nonexistence of extremals for Adams inequality in the special case $m = 2, n = 4$ are established, a natural, but nontrivial extension is to establish similar results for any arbitrary $m \geq 2$. The proof for this extension has some extra difficulties to overcome and we have decided to address this problem in the forthcoming paper.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to proving existence of radially symmetric maximizing sequence for the critical Adams functional; in Section 3, we will analyze the asymptotic behavior of the maximizing sequence, and derive an upper bound for the Adams' inequality when the blowing up arises; in Section 4, we prove the existence of extremals (Theorem 1) by constructing a proper test function sequence. In Section 5, we give the proof for Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 by estimating the best constant of higher order Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities. For the convenience of the reader, the work of estimating the best constants of Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities and some known results concerning elliptic estimates for operator Δ^2 are arranged in the Appendix.

Throughout this paper, the letter c always denotes some positive constant which may vary from line to line.

2 The maximizing sequence for critical Adams functional

2.1 Existence of extremals for the subcritical Adams functionals

In this section, we will establish the existence of extremal functions for subcritical Adams functional. Set

$$I_\beta^\alpha(u) = \int_{B_R} (\exp(\beta|u|^2) - 1 - \alpha|u|^2) dx.$$

Lemma 5 *For any $0 < \beta < 32\pi^2$, there exists a radially symmetric extremal function $u \in H$ such that*

$$I_\beta^\alpha(u) = \sup_{u \in H} I_\beta^\alpha(u),$$

provided $\beta - \frac{\beta^2 B_2}{2} < \alpha < \beta$.

Remark 6 *It follows from that Lemma 31 in the Appendix that $B_2 < \frac{1}{16\pi^2}$, which leads to that $\beta - \frac{\beta^2 B_2}{2} > 0$.*

Proof. Define u^\sharp by $u^\sharp = F^{-1}\{(F(u))^*\}$, where F denotes the Fourier transform on \mathbb{R}^4 (with its inverse F^{-1}) and f^* stands for the Schwarz symmetrization of f . Using the property of the Fourier rearrangement from [19], one can derive that

$$\|\Delta u^\sharp\|_2 \leq \|\Delta u\|_2, \|u^\sharp\|_2 = \|u\|_2.$$

Hence

$$\sup_{u \in H} I_\beta^\alpha(u) = \sup_{u \in H_r} I_\beta^\alpha(u),$$

where H_r denotes all radial functions in H . Therefore, we may assume that $\{u_k\}_k \in H$ is a radially maximizing sequence for $\sup_{u \in H} I_\beta^\alpha(u)$, that is

$$\|u_k\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)} = 1, \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} I_\beta^\alpha(u_k) = \sup_{u \in H} I_\beta^\alpha(u).$$

By the Sobolev compact embedding, there exists a subsequence $\{u_k\}_k$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_k(x) &\rightarrow u(x), \quad \text{strongly in } L^q(B_R(0)) \text{ for any } R > 0, \\ u_k(x) &\rightarrow u(x), \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^4. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\exp(\beta|u|^2) - 1 - \alpha|u|^2 \in L^p(B_R)$ for some $p > 1$, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_R} (\exp(\beta|u_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha|u_k|^2) dx = \int_{B_R} (\exp(\beta|u|^2) - 1 - \alpha|u|^2) dx. \quad (7)$$

On the other hand, it follows from the radial lemma that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_R} (\exp(\beta|u_k|^2) - 1 - \beta u_k^2) dx \\ &\leq c \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_R} |u_k|^4 dx \\ &\leq c \sup_k \|u_k\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}^2 R^{-3}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

From (7) and (8), we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta|u_k|^2) - 1 - \beta u_k^2) dx \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{B_R} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_R} \right) (\exp(\beta|u_k|^2) - 1 - \beta u_k^2) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta|u|^2) - 1 - \beta|u|^2) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta|u_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha|u_k|^2) dx \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta|u_k|^2) - 1 - \beta|u_k|^2) dx + (\beta - \alpha) \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^2 dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta|u|^2) - 1 - \beta|u|^2) dx + (\beta - \alpha) \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^2 dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta|u|^2) - 1 - \alpha|u|^2) dx + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\beta - \alpha) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (u_k^2 - |u|^2) dx. \quad (9)
\end{aligned}$$

When $u \neq 0$, we set

$$\tau^4 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^2 dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u^2 dx},$$

by Fatou's lemma, we have $\tau \geq 1$. Let $\tilde{u}(x) = u(\frac{x}{\tau})$, we can easily verify the following fact:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\Delta \tilde{u}|^2 dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\Delta u|^2 dx \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\Delta u_k|^2 dx, \\
\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \tilde{u}^2 dx &= \tau^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u^2 dx = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^2 dx
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |(\Delta \tilde{u})^2 + \tilde{u}^2| dx \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\Delta u_k|^2 + u_k^2) dx = 1.$$

Hence, by (9) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{u \in H} I_\beta^\alpha(u) &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta \tilde{u}^2) - 1 - \alpha \tilde{u}^2) dx = \tau^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta u^2) - 1 - \alpha u^2) dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta u^2) - 1 - \alpha u^2) dx + (\tau^4 - 1) (\beta - \alpha) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u^2 dx + \\
&+ (\tau^4 - 1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta u^2) - 1 - \beta u^2) dx \\
&\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta u_k^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx + (\tau^4 - 1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta u^2) - 1 - \beta u^2) dx \\
&= \sup_{u \in H} I_\beta^\alpha(u) + (\tau^4 - 1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta u^2) - 1 - \beta u^2) dx. \quad (10)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\exp(\beta u^2) - 1 - \beta u^2 > 0$, we have $\tau = 1$, and then

$$\sup_{u \in H} I_\beta^\alpha(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta u^2) - 1 - \alpha u^2) dx.$$

Therefore, u is an extremal function for $\sup_{u \in H} I_\beta^\alpha(u)$.

Next, it suffices to show that $u = 0$ is impossible to happen. Assume by contradiction that $u = 0$, we derive from radial lemma that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{u \in H} I_\beta^\alpha(u) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta|u_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx \\
&= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{B_R} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_R} \right) (\exp(\beta|u_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx \quad (11) \\
&= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\beta - \alpha) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_R} u_k^2 dx \leq \beta - \alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for any $v \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ and $t > 0$, we introduce a family of functions v_t by

$$v_t(x) = t^{\frac{1}{2}} v(t^{\frac{1}{4}} x),$$

and we easily verify that

$$\|\Delta v_t\|_2^2 = t \|\Delta v\|_2^2, \|v_t\|_p^p = t^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \|v\|_p^p.$$

Hence, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp\left(\beta \left(\frac{v_t}{\|v_t\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}}\right)^2\right) - 1 - \alpha \left(\frac{v_t}{\|v_t\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}}\right)^2 \right) dx \\
&\geq (\beta - \alpha) \frac{\|v_t\|_2^2}{\|\Delta v_t\|_2^2 + \|v_t\|_2^2} + \frac{\beta^2}{2} \frac{\|v_t\|_4^4}{(\|\Delta v_t\|_2^2 + \|v_t\|_2^2)^2} \\
&= (\beta - \alpha) \left(\frac{\|v\|_2^2}{t \|\Delta v\|_2^2 + \|v\|_2^2} \right) + \frac{\beta^2}{2} \left(\frac{t \|v\|_4^4}{(t \|\Delta v\|_2^2 + \|v\|_2^2)^2} \right) \quad (12) \\
&= (\beta - \alpha) \left(\frac{\|v\|_2^2}{t \|\Delta v\|_2^2 + \|v\|_2^2} + \frac{\beta^2}{2(\beta - \alpha)} \frac{t \|v\|_4^4}{(t \|\Delta v\|_2^2 + \|v\|_2^2)^2} \right) \\
&= (\beta - \alpha) g_v(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $g_v(0) = 1$, once we show that $g'_v(t) > 0$ for small $t > 0$, then we have $g_v(t) > g_v(0)$ for small $t > 0$, which leads to $\sup_{u \in H} I_\beta^\alpha(u) > \beta - \alpha$. Combining (11)

and (12), we obtain a contradiction. This accomplishes the proof of Lemma 5.

In the following, we show there exists some $v \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ such that $g'_v(0) > 0$. Indeed, after a direct calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
g'_v(0) &= -\frac{\|\Delta v\|_2^2}{\|v\|_2^2} + \frac{\beta^2}{2(\beta - \alpha)} \frac{\|v\|_4^4}{\|v\|_2^4} \\
&= \frac{\|\Delta v\|_2^2}{\|v\|_2^2} \left(-1 + \frac{\beta^2}{2(\beta - \alpha)} \frac{\|v\|_4^4}{\|\Delta v\|_2^2 \|v\|_2^2} \right). \quad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

It can be shown this supremum could be attained by some $Q \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$, which must satisfy (after a rescaling $Q \rightarrow \mu Q(\lambda \cdot)$, see [5]) the nonlinear equation

$$\Delta^2 Q + Q - |Q|^2 Q = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^4. \quad (14)$$

Set $v = Q$, we get $g'_v(0) = \frac{\|\Delta Q\|_2^2}{\|Q\|_2^2} \left(-1 + \frac{\beta^2}{2(\beta-\alpha)} B_2\right)$. Thus, if $\frac{\beta^2 B_2}{2} > \beta - \alpha$, we have $g'_v(0) > 0$. ■

2.2 The radially symmetric maximizing sequence for critical functional

Let $\{\beta_k\}$ be an increasing sequence which converges to $32\pi^2$. According to Lemma 5, we see that there exists a radial function sequence $\{u_k\}_k$ satisfying $\|u_k\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)} = 1$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta_k |u_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u_k|^2) dx = \sup_{u \in H} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta_k |u|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u|^2) dx.$$

It is not difficult to see that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta_k |u_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u_k|^2) dx = S(\alpha).$$

In fact, for any given $\varphi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\varphi|^2 + |\Delta\varphi|^2) dx = 1$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta_k |\varphi|^2) - 1 - \alpha |\varphi|^2) dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta_k |u_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u_k|^2) dx.$$

It follows from Levi's lemma that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(32\pi^2 |\varphi|^2) - 1 - \alpha |\varphi|^2) dx \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta_k |u_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u_k|^2) dx,$$

which implies that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta_k |u_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u_k|^2) dx = S(\alpha).$$

An easy computation shows that the Euler-Lagrange equation of u_k is given by the following bi-harmonic equation in \mathbb{R}^4 :

$$\Delta^2 u_k + u_k = \lambda_k^{-1} u_k \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right), \quad (15)$$

where $\|u_k\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)} = 1$ and $\lambda_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^2 \left(\exp\{\beta_k u_k^2\} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx$. Since

$$\lambda_k^{-1} u_k \left(\exp\{\beta_k u_k^2\} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) \in L_{loc}^p(\mathbb{R}^4)$$

for any $1 \leq p < \infty$, by Lemma 36, we know $u_k \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$.

Now, we give the following important observation.

Lemma 7 $\inf_k \lambda_k > 0$.

Proof. We assume by contradiction that $\lambda_k \rightarrow 0$. Since $\exp t - 1 \leq t \exp t$, we derive that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\beta_k u_k^2 \exp(\beta_k u_k^2)) dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - 1) dx. \quad (16)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{u \in H} \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp(32\pi^2 |u|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u|^2 \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\beta_k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - 1 - \alpha |u_k|^2 \right) dx \\ &\leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\beta_k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\beta_k u_k^2 \exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \alpha |u_k|^2 \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^2 \left(\exp\{\beta_k u_k^2\} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. ■

Now, we introduce the following

Definition 8 We said that $\{u_k\}_k$ is a normalized vanishing sequence, if $\{u_k\}_k$ satisfies $\|u_k\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)} = 1$, $u_k \rightarrow 0$ in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ and

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_R} \left(\exp(\beta_k |u_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u_k|^2 \right) dx = 0.$$

Extracting a subsequence and changing the sign of u_k , we can always take a point $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^4$ such that

$$c_k = \max |u_k| = u_k(x_k).$$

If c_k is bounded from above, we have the following

Lemma 9 If $\sup_k c_k < +\infty$, then one of the following holds.

- (i) $u \neq 0$ and $S(\alpha)$ could be achieved by a radial function $u \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$,
- (ii) $u = 0$ and $\{u_k\}$ is a normalized vanishing sequence, furthermore, $S(\alpha) \leq 32\pi^2 - \alpha$.

Proof. If $\sup_k c_k < +\infty$, it follows from the standard elliptic estimates (see Lemma 36) that $u_k \rightarrow u$ in $C_{loc}^3(\mathbb{R}^4)$. Then for any $R > 0$, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_R} \left(\exp(\beta_k |u_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u_k|^2 \right) dx = \int_{B_R} \left(\exp(32\pi^2 |u|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u|^2 \right) dx. \quad (17)$$

On the other hand, according to the radial lemma, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_R} (\exp(\beta_k |u_k|^2) - 1 - \beta_k u_k^2) dx \\ & \leq c \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_R} |u_k|^4 dx \\ & \leq c \sup_k \|u_k\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}^2 R^{-3}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar as (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta_k |u_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u_k|^2) dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(32\pi^2 |u|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u|^2) dx \\ &+ (32\pi^2 - \alpha) \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (u_k^2 - u^2) dx. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

When $u \neq 0$, we set

$$\tau^4 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^2 dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u^2 dx},$$

and let $\tilde{u}(x) = u(\frac{x}{\tau})$, as we did in (10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} S(\alpha) &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(32\pi^2 \tilde{u}^2) - 1 - \alpha \tilde{u}^2) dx \\ &= \tau^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(32\pi^2 u^2) - 1 - \alpha u^2) dx \\ &\geq S(\alpha) + (\tau^4 - 1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(32\pi^2 u^2) - 1 - 32\pi^2 u^2) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\exp(32\pi^2 u^2) - 1 - 32\pi^2 u^2 > 0$, we have $\tau = 1$, and then

$$S(\alpha) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(32\pi^2 u^2) - 1 - \alpha u^2) dx.$$

So, u is an extremal function.

When $u = 0$, by (17) we know $\{u_k\}$ is a normalized vanishing sequence. Furthermore, by (18), we get

$$\begin{aligned} S(\alpha) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta_k |u_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\beta_k - \alpha) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^2 dx \leq 32\pi^2 - \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

■

In the following, we show that the second case of Lemma 9 will not happen.

Setting

$$d_{nv} = \sup_{u_k: (NV S)} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp(\beta_k |u_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u_k|^2 \right) dx,$$

we have the following

Proposition 10

$$d_{nv} = 32\pi^2 - \alpha.$$

Proof. Recalling in the proof of Lemma 9, we have verified that if $\{u_k\}_k$ is a radially symmetric normalized vanishing sequence, then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp(\beta_k |u_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u_k|^2 \right) dx \leq 32\pi^2 - \alpha,$$

that is, $d_{nv} \leq 32\pi^2 - \alpha$. Next, we show that there exists a radially symmetric normalized vanishing sequence $\{v_k\}$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp(\beta_k |v_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha |v_k|^2 \right) dx = 32\pi^2 - \alpha.$$

Picking a smooth radially symmetric function η satisfying $\|\Delta\eta\|_2 = \|\eta\|_2 = 1$ with a compact support. Let ω_k be a function defined by $\omega_k(x) = \rho_k^2 \eta(\rho_k x)$ for $\rho_k > 0$, it is easy to check that

$$\|\Delta\omega_k\|_2 = \rho_k^2 \text{ and } \|\omega_k\|_2 = 1.$$

Setting $\bar{\omega}_k = \frac{\omega_k}{(1+\rho_k^4)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ and letting $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k = 0$, we can verify that $\|\omega_k\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)} = 1$, $\bar{\omega}_k \rightarrow 0$ in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^4)$ and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\Delta\bar{\omega}_k\|_2 = 0, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\bar{\omega}_k\|_2 = 1.$$

Hence, $\{\bar{\omega}_k\}_k$ is a radially symmetric normalized vanishing sequence. Through the radial lemma and the definition of the normalized vanishing sequence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp(\beta_k |\bar{\omega}_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha |\bar{\omega}_k|^2 \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_R} \left(\exp(\beta_k |\bar{\omega}_k|^2) - 1 - \alpha |\bar{\omega}_k|^2 \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_R} (\beta_k - \alpha) \bar{\omega}_k^2 dx \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\beta_k - \alpha) \bar{\omega}_k^2 dx = 32\pi^2 - \alpha, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. ■

Proposition 11 *It holds that $S > d_{nv}$.*

Proof. For any $v \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ and $t > 0$, we introduce a family of functions v_t by

$$v_t(x) = t^{\frac{1}{2}}v(t^{\frac{1}{4}}x).$$

then

$$\|\Delta v_t\|_2^2 = t\|\Delta v\|_2^2, \|v_t\|_p^p = t^{\frac{p-2}{2}}\|v\|_p^p$$

for any $p \geq 2$. Similar as that in Lemma 5, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp \left(32\pi^2 \left(\frac{v_t}{\|v_t\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}} \right)^2 \right) - 1 - \alpha \left(\frac{v_t}{\|v_t\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}} \right)^2 \right) dx \\ & \geq (32\pi^2 - \alpha) g_v(t), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$g_v(t) = \left(\frac{\|v\|_2^2}{t\|\Delta v\|_2^2 + \|v\|_2^2} + \frac{(32\pi^2)^2}{2(32\pi^2 - \alpha)} \frac{t\|v\|_4^4}{(t\|\Delta v\|_2^2 + \|v\|_2^2)^2} \right).$$

Furthermore, one can show that $g'_Q(t) > 0$ (Q is the ground state solution of (14)) for small $t > 0$, provided $32\pi^2 - \alpha < \frac{(32\pi^2)^2 B_2}{2}$, which implies that $S > d_{nv}$.
■

3 Blow up analysis

In this section, we are interested the blow-up case, that is,

$$c_k \rightarrow +\infty, \tag{19}$$

the method of blow-up analysis will be used to analyze the asymptotic behavior of the radially maximizing sequence $\{u_k\}_k$. By the radial lemma, we have $x_k \rightarrow 0 \in \mathbb{R}^4$. We call 0 the blow-up point. Here and in the sequel, we do not distinguish sequence and subsequence, the reader can understand it from the context.

Since u_k is bounded in $H_r^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$, we have

$$\begin{cases} u_k \rightharpoonup u \text{ weakly in } H_r^2(\mathbb{R}^4) \\ u_k \rightarrow u \text{ in } L^s(\mathbb{R}^4), \forall s > 2 \\ \beta_k \rightarrow 32\pi^2. \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

3.1 Asymptotic behavior of $\{u_k\}_k$ near the 0

Let

$$r_k^4 = \frac{\lambda_k}{c_k^2 e^{\beta_k} c_k^2}.$$

We claim that r_k^4 converges to zero rapidly. Indeed we have for any $\gamma < 32\pi^2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
r_k^4 c_k^2 e^{\gamma c_k^2} &= e^{(\gamma - \beta_k) c_k^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^2 \exp(\beta_k u_k^2) dx \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^2 \exp(\beta_k u_k^2) \exp((\gamma - \beta_k) u_k^2) dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^2 \exp(\gamma u_k^2) dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^2 (\exp(\gamma u_k^2) - 1) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^2 dx \\
&\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^s dx \right)^{\frac{2}{s}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\gamma u_k^2) - 1)^{\frac{s-2}{s-2}} dx \right)^{\frac{s-2}{s}} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^2 dx \\
&\leq c \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^s dx \right)^{\frac{2}{s}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp\left(\frac{\gamma s}{s-2} u_k^2\right) - 1 \right) dx \right)^{\frac{s-2}{s}} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^2 dx \\
&\leq c
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

provided s large enough, here we have used the Adams inequality in \mathbb{R}^4 and (20).

To understand the asymptotic behavior of u_k near the blow-up point, we define three sequences of functions on \mathbb{R}^4 , namely

$$\begin{cases} \phi_k(x) = \frac{u_k(x_k + r_k x)}{c_k}, \\ v_k(x) = u_k(x_k + r_k x) - u_k(x_k), \\ \psi_k(x) = c_k(u_k(x_k + r_k x) - c_k), \end{cases}$$

where ϕ_k , v_k and ψ_k are defined on $\Omega_k := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 : r_k x \in B_1\}$.

Lemma 12 $\phi_k(x) \rightarrow 1$ in $C_{loc}^3(\mathbb{R}^4)$.

Proof. From equation (15), the decay estimate of r_k and the fact that $\phi_k \leq 1$, we know that for any $R > 0$, and $x \in B_R(0)$, $\phi_k(x)$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta^2 \phi_k(x)| &= \left| \frac{r_k^4}{c_k} (\Delta^2 u_k)(x_k + r_k x) \right| \\
&= \left| r_k^4 \left(\lambda_k^{-1} \phi_k \exp\{\beta_k u_k^2(x_k + r_k x)\} - \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{\lambda_k \beta_k}\right) \phi_k \right) \right| \\
&\leq \left| r_k^4 \left(\lambda_k^{-1} \phi_k \exp\{\beta_k c_k^2\} - \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \lambda_k^{-1}\right) \phi_k \right) \right| \\
&\leq c c_k^{-2} (1 + o(1)) \rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned}$$

and $\phi_k(x) \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^4)$. The standard regularity theory gives for any $R > 0$, $\|\phi_k(x)\|_{C^{3,\gamma}(B_R(0))}$ are uniformly bounded with the respect to k . Through the

Arzela-Ascoli theorem, there exists $\phi \in C^3(\mathbb{R}^4)$ such that $\phi_k(x) \rightarrow \phi$ in $C^3(\mathbb{R}^4)$ with $\Delta\phi = 0$ in \mathbb{R}^4 . Since $\phi_k(0) = 1$, we have $\phi = 1$ in \mathbb{R}^4 by the Liouville Theorem. ■

Lemma 13 *We have*

$$v_k(x) = u_k(x_k + r_k x) - u_k(x_k) \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } C_{loc}^3(\mathbb{R}^4)$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Hence

$$|\nabla^i u_k(x)| = o(r_k^{-i}) \text{ in } B_{Rr_k}, i = 1, 2, 3,$$

for any $R > 0$.

Proof. It is obvious that v_k solves the equation

$$(-\Delta)^2 v_k + r_k^4 u_k(x_k + r_k x_k) = \frac{u_k(x_k + r_k x_k)}{c_k^2} \exp(\beta_k u_k^2 - \beta_k c_k^2) - \frac{1}{\lambda_k} \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} r_k^4 u_k(x_k + r_k x_k).$$

Since u_k is bounded in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$, directly computations yields that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\Delta v_k|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\Delta u_k|^2 dx$. Set $\Delta v_k = g_k$, since

$$f_k = \frac{u_k(x_k + r_k x_k)}{c_k^2} \exp(\beta_k u_k^2 - \beta_k c_k^2) - \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_k} \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} + 1 \right) r_k^4 u_k(x_k + r_k x_k)$$

is bounded in $L_{loc}^p(\mathbb{R}^4)$ for any $p \geq 1$, by Lemma 36 we obtain that for some $\alpha > 0$,

$$\|g_k\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_R)} \leq c,$$

for any $R > 0$. On the other hand, by using Pizzetti's formula (see Lemma 33), we can derive

$$\int_{B_R(0)} v_k(x) dx = c_0 R^4 v_k(0) + c_2 R^6 \Delta v_k(0) + c_2 R^8 \Delta^2 v_k(\xi),$$

for some $\xi \in B_R(0)$.

Observe that $v_k \leq 0$ and $v_k(0) = 0$, then $v_k(x)$ is bounded in $L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^4)$. Hence again by Lemma 36, we obtain that there exists some $v \in C^3(\mathbb{R}^4)$ such that

$$v_k(x) \rightarrow v \text{ in } C_{loc}^3(\mathbb{R}^4)$$

with v satisfying

$$(-\Delta)^2 v = 0.$$

By the Liouville theorem, we know that v must be a constant. This together with $v(0) = 0$ implies $v(x) = 0$. ■

The following lemma plays an important role in determining the limit behavior of $\psi_k(x)$.

Lemma 14 (Gradient estimate on B_{Rr_k}) For any $R > 0$, there holds

$$c_k \int_{B_{Rr_k}} |\Delta u_k| dx \leq c(Rr_k)^2.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\int_{B_R} |\Delta \psi_k| dx = c_k r_k^{-2} \int_{B_{Rr_k}} |\Delta u_k| dx \leq cR^2.$$

Proof. For any $R_0 > 0$, we introduce a sequence of bi-harmonic functions $u_k^{R_0}$ solving

$$\begin{cases} \Delta^2 u_k^{R_0} = 0 \text{ in } \overline{B_{R_0}(x_k)} \\ \partial_v^i u_k^{R_0} = \partial_v^i u_k \text{ on } \partial \overline{B_\delta(x_k)}, i = 1, 2. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

By the elliptic estimates (see Lemma 35) and the radial lemma, we derive that

$$\|u_k^{R_0}\|_{C^4(B_{R_0})} < \frac{c}{R_0^\tau} \quad (23)$$

for some $\tau > 0$.

Observe that $u_k - u_k^{R_0}$ satisfies the following equation

$$\begin{cases} \Delta^2 (u_k - u_k^{R_0}) = \lambda_k^{-1} u_k \left(\exp \{ \beta_k u_k^2 \} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} u_k \right) - u_k \text{ in } \overline{B_{R_0}(0)} \\ \partial_v^i (u_k - u_k^{R_0}) = 0 \text{ on } \partial \overline{B_{R_0}(0)}, i = 0, 1. \end{cases}$$

Set $f_k = \lambda_k^{-1} u_k \left(\exp \{ \beta_k u_k^2 \} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} u_k \right) - u_k$, and define $L(\log L)^\alpha(B_{R_0})$ as the space

$$L(\log L)^\alpha(B_{R_0}) := \{f \in L^1(B_{R_0}) : \|f\|_{L(\log L)^\alpha} := \int_{B_{R_0}} |f| (\log^\alpha(2+|f|)) dx < \infty\}.$$

endowed with the norm $\|f\|_{L(\log L)^\alpha} = \int_{B_{R_0}} |f| (\log^\alpha(2+|f|)) dx$.

It is not difficult to check that $f_k \in L(\log L)^{\frac{1}{2}}(B_{R_0})$. This together with Lemma 34 directly leads to

$$\|\nabla^j (u_k - u_k^{R_0})\|_{L^{(4/j, 2)}} \leq C, \quad j = 1, 2, 3. \quad (24)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{L^{(4/j, 2)}}$ is the Lorentz norm. For the definition of Lorentz spaces and their basic properties, we refer the interested reader to [33].

After some computation, we obtain

$$|\Delta^2((u_k - u_k^{R_0})^2)| \leq |2(u_k - u_k^{R_0})\Delta^2(u_k - u_k^{R_0})| + C \sum_{j=1}^3 \|\nabla^j (u_k - u_k^{R_0})\| \|\nabla^{4-j} (u_k - u_k^{R_0})\|.$$

Thanks to the Lorentz estimates of gradients (24) and some Hölder type inequality of O'Neil [33], we know the term $\sum_{j=1}^3 \|\nabla^j (u_k - u_k^{R_0})\| \|\nabla^{4-j} (u_k - u_k^{R_0})\|$ is bounded in $L^1(B_{R_0})$.

We now show that $|2(u_k - u_k^{R_0})\Delta^2(u_k - u_k^{R_0})|$ is also bounded in $L^1(B_{R_0})$. In fact, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{R_0}} |2(u_k - u_k^{R_0})\Delta^2(u_k - u_k^{R_0})| dx &\leq 2 \int_{B_{R_0}} |u_k \Delta^2(u_k)| dx + 2 \int_{B_{R_0}} |u_k^{R_0} \Delta^2(u_k)| dx \\ &= I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

For I_1 , by equation (15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{R_0}} |u_k \Delta^2(u_k)| dx &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \lambda_k^{-1} u_k^2 \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u_k|^2 dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\Delta u_k|^2 dx + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u_k|^2 dx \leq c. \end{aligned}$$

For I_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{R_0}} |u_k^{R_0} \Delta^2(u_k)| dx &\leq c \int_{B_{R_0}} |u_k \Delta^2(u_k)| dx + c \int_{B_{R_0} \cap \{|u_k| \leq 1\}} |\Delta^2(u_k)| dx \\ &\leq c(R_0). \end{aligned}$$

Using the above estimates, we conclude that $\int_{B_{R_0}} |\Delta^2((u_k - u_k^{R_0})^2)| dx \leq c$. Carrying out the same procedure as in the proof of Lemma 6 of [30], we have for any $R > 0$,

$$\int_{B_{Rr_k}} \Delta((u_k - u_k^{R_0})^2) dx \leq C(Rr_k)^2. \quad (25)$$

Combining (25) and (23), we derive by Lemma 13 that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{Rr_k}} |\Delta(u_k^2)| dx &\leq c \left\{ \int_{B_{Rr_k}} \Delta((u_k - u_k^{R_0})^2) dx + \int_{B_{Rr_k}} |\Delta((u_k^{R_0})^2)| dx \right. \\ &\quad + \int_{B_{Rr_k}} |u_k^{R_0} \Delta u_k| dx + \int_{B_{Rr_k}} |u_k \Delta u_k^{R_0}| dx + \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{B_{Rr_k}} |\nabla u_k \nabla u_k^{R_0}| dx + \int_{B_{Rr_k}} |\nabla u_k^{R_0}|^2 dx \right\} \\ &\leq c \int_{B_{Rr_k}} \Delta((u_k - u_k^{R_0})^2) dx + o(r_k^2). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

On the other hand, we also have

$$c_k |\Delta u_k| \leq c u_k |\Delta u_k| \leq c (\Delta(u_k^2) + |\nabla u_k|^2) \leq c \Delta(u_k^2) + o(r_k^{-2}). \quad (27)$$

From (26) and (27), we conclude that

$$c_k \int_{B_{Rr_k}} |\Delta u_k| dx \leq c(Rr_k)^2.$$

Hence it follows that for any $R > 0$,

$$\int_{B_R} |\Delta \psi_k| dx = c_k r_k^{-2} \int_{B_{Rr_k}} |\Delta u_k| dx \leq cR^2.$$

This accomplishes the proof. ■

Now, we are in position to analyze the limite behavior of $\psi_k(x)$.

Lemma 15 *We have*

$$\psi_k(x) \rightarrow \psi \text{ in } C_{loc}^3(\mathbb{R}^4),$$

where ψ satisfies the equation

$$(-\Delta)^2 \psi = \exp(64\pi^2 \psi).$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\psi(x) = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \log \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}|x|^2},$$

$$\text{and } \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \exp(64\pi^2 \psi(x)) dx = 1.$$

Proof. By equation (15), we see that ψ_k satisfies the equation

$$(-\Delta)^2 \psi_k + c_k r_k^4 u_k(r_k x) = \frac{u_k(x_k + r_k x)}{c_k} \exp(\beta_k u_k^2 - \beta_k c_k^2) - \frac{1}{\lambda_k} \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} c_k r_k^4.$$

According to Lemma 14, we know that

$$\int_{B_R} |\Delta \psi_k| dx = c_k r_k^{-2} \int_{B_{Rr_k}} |\Delta u_k| dx \leq cR^2.$$

This together with the elliptic estimates (see Lemma 36) yields that $\|\Delta \psi_k\|_{C^{1,\alpha}} \leq c$. As in Lemma 13, we know there exists some $\psi \in C^3(\mathbb{R}^4)$ such that

$$\psi_k(x) \rightarrow \psi \text{ in } C_{loc}^3(\mathbb{R}^4),$$

with ψ satisfying the equation

$$(-\Delta)^2 \psi = \exp(64\pi^2 \psi).$$

By Fatou's lemma, we know

$$\exp(64\pi^2 \psi) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k \left(\exp\{\beta_k u_k^2\} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} u_k \right) \leq 1.$$

We now claim that ψ must take the form as

$$\psi(x) = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \log \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}|x|^2}. \quad (28)$$

We argue this by contradiction. If ψ don't have the form as (28), according to [20] (see also [29]), there exists some $a < 0$ such that

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} (-\Delta)\psi(x) = a.$$

This would imply

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B_R} |\Delta\psi_k(x)| dx = |a| \text{vol}(B_1(0))R^4 + o(R^4) \text{ as } R \rightarrow +\infty,$$

but this contradicts $\int_{B_R} |\Delta\psi_k| dx < cR^2$. Hence we have

$$\psi(x) = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \log \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}|x|^2}.$$

Furthermore, careful computations lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \exp(64\pi^2\psi(x)) dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}|x|^2} \right)^4 dx \text{ (setting } t = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}|x|^2) \\ &= \frac{\omega_3}{4} \int_0^\infty (1+t)^{-4} d|x|^4 \\ &= \frac{3\omega_3}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty (1+t)^{-4} t dt \\ &= \frac{3\omega_3}{\pi^2} \cdot \frac{1}{6} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

■

3.2 Bi-harmonic truncations

In the following, we will need some bi-harmonic truncations u_k^M which was studied in [11]. Roughly speaking, the value of truncations u_k^M is close to $\frac{c_k}{M}$ in a small ball centered at x_k , and coincides with u_k outside the same ball.

Lemma 16 [11, Lemma 4.20] *For any $M > 1$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a radius $\rho_k^M > 0$ and a constant $c = c(M)$ such that*

1. $u_k \geq \frac{c_k}{M}$ in $B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)$;
2. $|u_k - \frac{c_k}{M}| \leq \frac{c}{c_k}$ on $\partial B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)$;
3. $|\nabla^l u_k| \leq \frac{c}{c_k(\rho_k^M)^l}$ on $\partial B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)$, for any $1 \leq l \leq 3$;
4. $\rho_k^M \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{\rho_k^M}{r_k} \rightarrow +\infty$, as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $u_k^{\rho_k^M} \in C^4(\overline{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)})$ be the unique solution of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta^2 u_k^{\rho_k^M} = 0 & \text{in } B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k), \\ \partial_v^i u_k^{\rho_k^M} = \partial_v^i u_k \text{ on } \partial B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k), i = 0, 1. \end{cases}$$

We consider the function

$$u_k^M = \begin{cases} u_k^{\rho_k^M} & \text{in } B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k), \\ u_k & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k). \end{cases}$$

Lemma 17 [11, Lemma 4.21] *For any $M > 1$, we have*

$$u_k^M = \frac{c_k}{M} + O(c_k^{-1}),$$

uniformly on $\overline{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)}$.

Lemma 18 *For any $M > 1$, there holds*

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\Delta u_k^M|^2 + |u_k^M|^2) dx \leq \frac{1}{M}.$$

Proof. Since u_k converges in $L^p(B_1)$ for any $p > 1$, by Lemma 16, we have

$$\int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |u_k^M|^p dx \leq c \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |u_k|^p dx \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$\int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |u_k^p u_k^M| dx \leq \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |u_k^p (u_k + O(c_k^{-1}))| dx \rightarrow 0. \quad (29)$$

Testing (15) with $(u_k - u_k^M)$, by Lemma 16, for any $R > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} (\Delta u_k \Delta (u_k - u_k^M) + u_k (u_k - u_k^M)) dx \\ &= \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} \lambda_k^{-1} u_k \left(\exp\{\beta_k u_k^2\} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) (u_k - u_k^M) dx \\ &\geq \int_{B_{Rr_k}(x_k)} \lambda_k^{-1} u_k \exp\{\beta_k u_k^2\} (u_k - u_k^M) dx \\ &= \int_{B_{Rr_k}(x_k)} \lambda_k^{-1} c_k \exp\{\beta_k u_k^2\} \left(c_k - \frac{c_k}{M} \right) dx + o_k(1) \\ &= \int_{B_R} \left(1 - \frac{1}{M} \right) \exp\{2\beta_k \psi_k(x)\} dx + o_k(1) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{M} \right) \int_{B_R} \exp\{64\pi^2 \psi(x)\} dx + o_k(1). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $R \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} (\Delta u_k \Delta (u_k - u_k^M) + u_k (u_k - u_k^M)) dx \geq 1 - \frac{1}{M} + o_k(1). \quad (30)$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\Delta u_k^M|^2 + |u_k^M|^2) dx \\ &= \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |\Delta v_k^M|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |\Delta u_k|^2 dx + \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |v_k^M|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |u_k|^2 dx \\ &= \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |\Delta v_k^M|^2 dx + \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |v_k^M|^2 dx + 1 - \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |\Delta u_k|^2 dx - \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |u_k|^2 dx \\ &= \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |\Delta v_k^M|^2 dx + \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |v_k^M|^2 dx + 1 - \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} \Delta u_k \Delta (u_k - u_k^M) dx \\ &\quad - \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} u_k (u_k - u_k^M) dx - \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} \Delta u_k \Delta u_k^M dx - \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} u_k u_k^M dx, \end{aligned}$$

by (30) and (29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\Delta u_k^M|^2 + |u_k^M|^2) dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M} + \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |\Delta v_k^M|^2 dx + \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |v_k^M|^2 dx - \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} \Delta u_k \Delta v_k^M dx - \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} u_k v_k^M dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M} + \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} \Delta v_k^M \Delta (v_k^M - u_k) dx + \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |v_k^M|^2 dx - \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} u_k v_k^M dx \\ &= \frac{1}{M} + \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |v_k^M|^2 dx - \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} u_k v_k^M dx \\ &= \frac{1}{M} + \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |u_k|^2 dx + o_k(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{M} + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the lemma is proved. \blacksquare

With the help of bi-harmonic truncations u_k^M , we can show the following result.

Corollary 19 *We have,*

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_\delta} (|u_k|^2 + |\Delta u_k|^2) dx = 0,$$

for any $\delta > 0$, and then

$$|\Delta u_k|^2 dx \rightharpoonup \delta_0 \text{ in the sense of measure,} \quad (31)$$

where δ_0 is the Dirac measure supported at 0.

Lemma 20 *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx \\ &= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{Lr_k}(x_k)} (\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_k}{c_k^2} \end{aligned}$$

and consequently,

$$\frac{\lambda_k}{c_k} \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } \sup_k \frac{c_k^2}{\lambda_k} < \infty.$$

Proof. Direct computations yield that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx \\ &= \left(\int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} \right) (\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx \\ &\leq \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} (\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp(\beta_k (u_k^M)^2) - 1 - \alpha (u_k^M)^2 \right) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Taking some L such that $u_k \leq 1$ on $\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_L$, then we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_L} (\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} c \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k^2 dx = 0.$$

In view of Lemma 18 and the Adams' inequality with the Navier boundary condition (see [39]), we obtain

$$\sup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_L} \left(\exp(\beta_k p' (u_k^M - u_k(L))^2) - 1 \right) dx < \infty,$$

for any $p' < M$. Since

$$p (u_k^M)^2 \leq p' (u_k^M - u_k(L))^2 + c(p, p'), \text{ if } p < p',$$

then we get

$$\sup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_L} \left(\exp(\beta_k p (u_k^M)^2) - 1 \right) dx < \infty,$$

for any $p < M$. The weak compactness of Banach space implies

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_L} \left(\exp \left(\beta_k (u_k^M)^2 \right) - 1 \right) dx = 0.$$

Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp \left(\beta_k u_k^2 \right) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2 \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} \left(\exp \left(\beta_k u_k^2 \right) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2 \right) dx + o_k(1) \right) \\ &\leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} M^2 \frac{\lambda_k}{c_k^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \frac{u_k^2}{\lambda_k} \left(\exp \left(\beta_k u_k^2 \right) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx \\ &= M^2 \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_k}{c_k^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

On the other hand, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{Lr_k}(x_k)} \left(\exp \left(\beta_k u_k^2 \right) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2 \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_k}{c_k^2} \int_{B_L} \exp \left(\beta_k u_k^2(r_k x + x_k) - \beta_k c_k^2 \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_k}{c_k^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \exp \left(64\pi^2 \psi(x) \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_k}{c_k^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Combining (32) and (33), and letting $M \rightarrow 1$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp \left(\beta_k u_k^2 \right) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2 \right) dx &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_k}{c_k^2} \\ &= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{Lr_k}(x_k)} \left(\exp \left(\beta_k u_k^2 \right) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2 \right) dx. \end{aligned}$$

■

Now, we introduce the following quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} b_k &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_k}{\int_{B_R(x_k)} |u_k| \left(\exp \left(\beta_k u_k^2 \right) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right)}, \quad \tau = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_k}{c_k} \text{ and} \\ \sigma &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{B_R(x_k)} u_k \left(\exp \left(\beta_k u_k^2 \right) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right)}{\int_{B_R(x_k)} |u_k| \left(\exp \left(\beta_k u_k^2 \right) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 21 *It holds $\sigma = 1$.*

Proof. For any $M > 1$ and $R > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_R(x_k)} u_k \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx &= \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} u_k \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx \\ &\quad + \int_{B_R(x_k) \setminus B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} u_k^M \left(\exp(\beta_k (u_k^M)^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx, \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 18, we know that $\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k}$ is bounded in $L^p(B_R(x_k) \setminus B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k))$ for some $p > 1$, then we have

$$\int_{B_R(x_k) \setminus B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} u_k \left(\exp(\beta_k (u_k^M)^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

This implies that

$$\int_{B_R(x_k)} u_k \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx = \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |u_k| \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx + o_k(1). \quad (34)$$

Similarly, we also have

$$\int_{B_R(x_k)} |u_k| \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx = \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |u_k| \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx + o_k(1). \quad (35)$$

On the other hand, it is not hard to see that

$$\begin{aligned} c_k \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx &\geq \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |u_k| \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx \\ &\geq \frac{c_k}{M} \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Furthermore, by (4) of Lemma 16 and Lemma 20, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx &\geq \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{Lr_k}(x_k)} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx \\ &\geq \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{Lr_k}(x_k)} (\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Therefore, combining (34)-(37), we get

$$\frac{1}{M} + o_k(1) \leq \frac{\int_{B_R(x_k)} u_k \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx}{\int_{B_R(x_k)} |u_k| \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx} \leq 1.$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, $R \rightarrow \infty$ and $M \rightarrow 1$, we derive that $\sigma = 1$. ■

Lemma 22 *It holds $\tau = 1$.*

Proof. For any $R > 0$, similar to (36), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u_k|^2 \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx &= \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} |u_k|^2 \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx + o_k(1) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{c_k}{M} \right)^2 \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx + o_k(1) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{B_R(x_k)} |u_k| \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx \leq c_k \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx + o_k(1).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} b_k &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u_k|^2 \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx}{\int_{B_R(x_k)} |u_k| \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx} \\ &\geq \frac{\left(\frac{c_k}{M} \right)^2}{c_k} = \frac{c_k}{M^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $M \rightarrow 1$, we conclude that $\tau = 1$.

■

3.3 Asymptotic behavior of u_k away from the blow-up point 0

In the following, we consider the asymptotic behavior of u_k away from the blow-up point 0.

We recall that the crucial tool in studying the regularity of higher order equations is the fundamental solution of the operator $\Delta^2 + k^2$ ($k > 0$). The fundamental solution $\Gamma(x, y)$ for $\Delta^2 + k^2$ in \mathbb{R}^4 is the solution of

$$(\Delta^2 + k^2) \Gamma(x, y) = \delta_x(y) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^4,$$

and all functions $u \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^4) \cap C^4(\mathbb{R}^4)$ satisfying $(\Delta^2 + k^2)u = f$ can be represented by

$$u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \Gamma(x, y) f(y) dy. \quad (38)$$

We will need the following useful estimates for Γ :

$$|\Gamma(x, y)| \leq c \ln(1 + |x - y|^{-1}), |\nabla^i \Gamma(x, y)| \leq c |x - y|^{-i}, i \geq 1 \quad (39)$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^4$, $x \neq y$ with $|x - y| \rightarrow 0$, and

$$\nabla^i |\Gamma(x, y)| = o\left(\exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{k}}{\sqrt{2}} |x - y|\right)\right), i = 0, 1, 2. \quad (40)$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^4$, with $|x - y| \rightarrow +\infty$.

The above properties of Γ can be found in [12].

Lemma 23 For any $1 < r < 2$, $c_k u_k$ is bounded in $W^{2,r}(\mathbb{R}^4)$.

Remark 24 It is quite difficult to prove $\|c_k u_k\|_{W^{2,r}(\mathbb{R}^4)} \leq c$ directly. But as we have showed the fact $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_k}{b_k} = 1$ in Lemma 22, we will prove this lemma by showing that $\|b_k u_k\|_{W^{2,r}(\mathbb{R}^4)} \leq c$. We find it quite easy to obtain the desired result for $b_k u_k$.

Proof. Let η_k be the solution of

$$\Delta^2 \eta_k + \eta_k = \frac{b_k u_k}{\lambda_k} \left(\exp\{\beta_k u_k^2\} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right), x \in \mathbb{R}^4.$$

By the representation formula, we have

$$\eta_k(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \Gamma(x, y) \frac{b_k u_k(y)}{\lambda_k} \left(\exp\{\beta_k u_k^2(y)\} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dy.$$

Then, by Hölder's inequality, for any $1 < r < 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^i \eta_k(x)|^r &= \frac{b_k}{\lambda_k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla^i \Gamma(x, y)|^r u_k(y) \left(\exp\{\beta_k u_k^2(y)\} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dy \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla^i \Gamma(x, y)|^r \frac{u_k(y) \exp\{\beta_k u_k^2(y)\}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k(z) \exp\{\beta_k u_k^2(z)\} dz} dy \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla^i \Gamma(x, y)|^r \frac{u_k(y) \exp\{\beta_k u_k^2(y)\}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k(z) \exp\{\beta_k u_k^2(z)\} dz} dy, \end{aligned}$$

where $i = 0, 1, 2$. Applying Fubini's theorem, we get by (39) and (40) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla^i \eta_k(x)|^r dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla^i \Gamma(x, y)|^r dx \frac{u_k(y) \exp\{\beta_k u_k^2(y)\}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k(z) \exp\{\beta_k u_k^2(z)\} dz} dy \\ &\leq c, \text{ for } i = 0, 1, 2, \end{aligned}$$

thus, we get

$$\|\eta_k\|_{W^{2,r}(\mathbb{R}^4)} < c. \quad (41)$$

Let $\eta_k = b_k u_k$, then η_k satisfies

$$\Delta^2 \eta_k + \eta_k = \frac{b_k u_k}{\lambda_k} \left(\exp \{ \beta_k u_k^2 \} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^4.$$

By (41), we have $\|\eta_k\|_{W^{2,r}(\mathbb{R}^4)} < c$. This accomplishes the proof of Lemma 23. \blacksquare

Now, we will show that $c_k u_k$ converges to some Green function.

Lemma 25 *For any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$, one has*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \varphi(x) \frac{c_k u_k}{\lambda_k} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx = \varphi(0). \quad (42)$$

Proof. Suppose $\text{supp } \varphi \subset B_\rho$ and we split the integral as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \varphi(x) \frac{c_k u_k}{\lambda_k} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx \\ &= \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k) \setminus B_{Lr_k}} \varphi(x) \frac{c_k u_k}{\lambda_k} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx \\ &+ \int_{B_{Lr_k}} \varphi(x) \frac{c_k u_k}{\lambda_k} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx \\ &+ \int_{B_\rho \setminus B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k)} \varphi(x) \frac{c_k u_k}{\lambda_k} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx \\ &= I_1^k + I_2^k + I_3^k. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

For I_1^k , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1^k &\leq M \|\varphi\|_{C^0} \int_{B_{\rho_k^M}(x_k) \setminus B_{Lr_k}} \varphi(x) \frac{u_k^2}{\lambda_k} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx \\ &= M \|\varphi\|_{C^0} \left(1 - \int_{B_L} \exp(2\beta_k \psi_k(x) + o_k(1)) dx \right). \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Letting $k \rightarrow +\infty$ and $L \rightarrow +\infty$, we derive that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} I_1^k = 0$.

For I_2^k , we have

$$I_2^k = \int_{B_L} \varphi(r_k x) \frac{u_k(r_k x)}{c_k} \exp(2\beta_k \psi_k(x) + o_k(1)) dx. \quad (45)$$

Letting $k \rightarrow +\infty$ and $L \rightarrow +\infty$, we derive that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} I_2^k = \varphi(0)$.

For I_3^k , since $\exp(\beta_k |u_k^M|^2)$ is bounded in $L^p(B_\rho)$ for some $p > 1$, choosing $q > 1$ sufficiently close to 1 and by Hölder's inequality, we derive that

$$I_3^k \leq \frac{c_k}{\lambda_k} \|\varphi\|_{C^0} \left(\int_{B_\rho} |u_k|^q dx \right)^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left(\int_{B_\rho} \exp(\beta_k |u_k^M|^2) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}. \quad (46)$$

Note that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_k}{\lambda_k} = 0$, hence $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} I_3^k = 0$. Combining (44), (45) and (46), we conclude that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \varphi(x) \frac{c_k u_k}{\lambda_k} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) dx = \varphi(0).$$

■

Lemma 26 *For any $1 < r < 2$, $c_k u_k \rightharpoonup G \in C^4(\mathbb{R}^4) \setminus \{0\}$ weakly in $W^{2,r}(\mathbb{R}^4)$, where G is a Green function satisfying*

$$\Delta^2 G + G = \delta(x) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^4.$$

Also, we have

$$G = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln|x| + A + \varphi(x), \quad (47)$$

where A is a constant depending on 0 , $\varphi(x) \in C^3(\mathbb{R}^4)$ and $\varphi(0) = 0$. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_\delta(0)} |\Delta(c_k u_k)|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_\delta(0)} |c_k u_k|^2 dx \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \delta - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + A + O(\delta). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 23, there exists a function $G \in W^{2,r}(\mathbb{R}^4)$ such that $c_k u_k \rightharpoonup G$ weakly in $W^{2,r}(\mathbb{R}^4)$ for any $1 < r < 2$. For any $s > 0$, by (31), we know $\exp(\beta_k u_k^2)$ is bounded in $L^p(B_R \setminus B_s)$, for any $0 < s < R$. Notice that $c_k u_k$ satisfies

$$\Delta^2(c_k u_k) + c_k u_k = \frac{c_k u_k}{\lambda_k} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^4.$$

Then the standard regularity theory gives $c_k u_k \rightarrow G$ in $C_{loc}^4(\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus \{0\})$.

For any $\varphi(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$, in view of (3.3), we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \varphi(x) \left(\frac{c_k u_k}{\lambda_k} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) - c_k u_k \right) dx = \varphi(0) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} G(x) \varphi(x) dx.$$

Hence, it follows that

$$\Delta^2 G = \delta(x) - G \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^4.$$

Fix $r > 0$, we choose some cutoff function $\phi \in C_0^\infty(B_{2r}(0))$ such that $\phi = 1$ in $B_r(0)$, and let

$$g(x) = G(x) + \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \phi(x) \ln|x|.$$

Then a direct computation shows that

$$\Delta^2 g(x) = f \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^4,$$

where

$$f(x) = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} (\Delta^2 \phi \cdot \ln|x| + 2\nabla \Delta \phi \cdot \nabla \ln|x| + 2\Delta (\nabla \phi \cdot \nabla \ln|x|) + 2\nabla \phi \cdot \nabla \Delta \ln|x| + \phi \cdot \Delta^2 \ln|x|) + \sigma \delta(x) - G.$$

Since $\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \phi \cdot \Delta^2 \ln|x| = \delta(x)$ in \mathbb{R}^4 , direct calculations yield that

$$f(x) = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} (\Delta^2 \phi \cdot \ln|x| + 2\nabla \Delta \phi \cdot \nabla \ln|x| + 2\Delta (\nabla \phi \cdot \nabla \ln|x|) + 2\nabla \phi \cdot \nabla \Delta \ln|x|) - G.$$

Since $G \in W^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}^4)$ for any $1 < s < 2$, we have $f(x) \in L_{loc}^p(\mathbb{R}^4)$ for any $p > 2$. By the standard regularity theory, we get $g(x) \in C_{loc}^3(\mathbb{R}^4)$. Let $A = g(0)$ and

$$\varphi(x) = g(x) - g(0) + \frac{1}{8\pi^2} (1 - \phi) \ln|x|.$$

Then we have

$$G = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln|x| + A + \varphi(x), \quad (48)$$

where A is constant depending on 0 , $\varphi(x) \in C^3(\mathbb{R}^4)$ and $\varphi(0) = 0$. Then (47) follows directly from (48).

Setting $U_k = c_k u_k$, then U_k satisfy:

$$\Delta^2 U_k = \frac{U_k}{\lambda_k} \left(\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta_k} \right) - U_k \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^4.$$

Testing it with U_k , we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_\delta(0)} |\Delta U_k|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_\delta(0)} |U_k|^2 dx = \int_{\partial B_\delta(0)} v \left(U_k \Delta^{3/2} U_k - \Delta^{1/2} U_k \Delta U_k \right) dx,$$

where v is the outer normal vector of $\partial B_\delta(0)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_\delta(0)} |\Delta U_k|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_\delta(0)} |U_k|^2 dx \right) \\ &= \int_{\partial B_\delta(0)} v \left(G \Delta^{3/2} G - \Delta^{1/2} G \Delta G \right) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

It is known that the fundamental solution of Δ^2 in \mathbb{R}^4 is $-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln|x|$, and it

satisfies

$$\Delta^{\frac{1}{2}}(\log|x|) = \frac{x}{|x|^2}, \Delta(\log|x|) = \frac{2}{|x|^2}, \Delta^{1+\frac{1}{2}}(\log|x|) = -4\frac{x}{|x|^4}. \quad (50)$$

After some computation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v \cdot G(\delta) \Delta^{3/2} G(\delta) &= \left(-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln |\delta| + A + O(\delta) \right) \left(\frac{1}{2\pi^2} \frac{1}{\delta^3} + O(1) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \frac{1}{\delta^3} \left(-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \delta + A + O(\delta) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} -v \cdot \Delta^{1/2} G(\delta) \Delta G(\delta) &= - \left(-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \frac{1}{\delta} + O(1) \right) \left(-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \frac{2}{\delta^2} + O(1) \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{32\pi^4} \frac{1}{\delta^3} (1 + O(\delta)). \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Plugging (51) and (52) into (49), we get

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_\delta(0)} |\Delta U_k|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_\delta(0)} |U_k|^2 dx \right) = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \delta - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + A + O(\delta),$$

and we are done. ■

3.4 The upper bound of Adams inequality for normalized concentration sequence

For any $\delta > 0$, let $u_k^\delta \in C^4(\overline{B_\delta(x_k)})$ be the unique solution of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta^2 u_k^\delta = 0 \text{ in } \overline{B_\delta(x_k)}, \\ \partial_v^i u_k^\delta = \partial_v^i u_k \text{ on } \partial B_\delta(x_k), i = 1, 2 \end{cases} \quad (53)$$

From Lemma 35, we find that the behavior of u_k^δ is very similar to the constant $u_k(\delta)$ in $B_\delta(x_k)$, and we have the following properties of u_k^δ :

Lemma 27 *Let u_k^δ be defined as in (53). For any $x \in B_\delta(x_k)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} |u_k^\delta| &\leq c u_k(\delta) \text{ and} \\ |\Delta u_k^\delta| &\leq c(u_k(\delta) + u_k'(\delta)). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 28 *For any $\delta > 0$, we have*

$$\int_{B_\delta(x_k)} |\Delta(u_k(x) - u_k^\delta(x))|^2 dx = \int_{B_\delta(x_k)} |\Delta u_k(x)|^2 dx - \int_{B_\delta(x_k)} |\Delta u_k^\delta|^2 dx.$$

Proof. For any $\delta > 0$, by the definition of u_k^δ , we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_\delta(x_k)} |\Delta(u_k(x) - u_k^\delta(x))|^2 dx \\
&= \int_{B_\delta(x_k)} (u_k(x) - u_k^\delta(x)) \Delta^2 u_k(x) dx \\
&= \int_{B_\delta(x_k)} u_k(x) \Delta^2 u_k(x) dx - \int_{B_\delta(x_k)} u_k^\delta(x) \Delta^2 u_k(x) dx \\
&= I - II.
\end{aligned}$$

We now calculate I and II , respectively: using the divergence theorem twice, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= \int_{B_\delta(x_k)} u_k(x) \Delta^2 u_k(x) dx \\
&= \int_{B_\delta(x_k)} \Delta u_k(x) \Delta u_k(x) dx + \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot u_k(x) \Delta^{\frac{3}{2}} u_k(x) dx - \\
&\quad - \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} u_k(x) \Delta u_k(x) dx,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
II &= \int_{B_\delta(x_k)} u_k^\delta(x) \Delta^2 u_k(x) dx \\
&= \int_{B_\delta(x_k)} \Delta u_k^\delta(x) \Delta u_k(x) dx + \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot u_k^\delta(x) \Delta^{\frac{3}{2}} u_k(x) dx - \\
&\quad - \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} u_k^\delta(x) \Delta u_k(x) dx \\
&= - \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot u_k(x) \Delta^{\frac{3}{2}} u_k^\delta(x) dx + \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} u_k(x) \Delta u_k^\delta(x) dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot u_k^\delta(x) \Delta^{\frac{3}{2}} u_k(x) dx - \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} u_k^\delta(x) \Delta u_k(x) dx \\
&= - \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot u_k^\delta(x) \Delta^{\frac{3}{2}} u_k^\delta(x) dx + \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} u_k^\delta(x) \Delta u_k^\delta(x) dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot u_k^\delta(x) \Delta^{\frac{3}{2}} u_k(x) dx - \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} u_k^\delta(x) \Delta u_k(x) dx \\
&= \int_{B_\delta(x_k)} |\Delta u_k^\delta(x)|^2 dx + \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot u_k^\delta(x) \Delta^{\frac{3}{2}} u_k(x) dx - \\
&\quad - \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} u_k^\delta(x) \Delta u_k(x) dx,
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_\delta(x_k)} |\Delta(u_k(x) - u_k^\delta(x))|^2 dx \\
&= \int_{B_\delta(x_k)} |\Delta u_k(x)|^2 dx + \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot u_k(x) \Delta^{\frac{3}{2}} u_k(x) dx \\
&\quad - \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} u_k(x) \Delta u_k(x) dx - \int_{B_\delta(x_k)} |\Delta u_k^\delta(x)|^2 dx \\
&\quad - \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot u_k^\delta(x) \Delta^{\frac{3}{2}} u_k(x) dx + \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_k)} v \cdot \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} u_k^\delta(x) \Delta u_k(x) dx \\
&= \int_{B_\delta(x_k)} |\Delta u_k(x)|^2 dx - \int_{B_\delta(x_k)} |\Delta u_k^\delta(x)|^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

■

Lemma 29 *Let B_R be the ball with radius R in \mathbb{R}^4 . Assume that u_k is a bounded sequence in $H_0^2(B_R)$ with $\int_{B_R} |\Delta u_k|^2 dx = 1$. If $u_k \rightharpoonup 0$, then*

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B_R} (\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx \leq \frac{1}{3} |B_R| \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}\right).$$

Proof. By the results in [22, (5.23)], we have

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B_R} (\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx \leq \frac{\pi^2}{6} \exp\left(\frac{5}{3} + 32\pi^2 A_0\right),$$

where A_0 is the value at 0 of the trace of the regular part of the Green function \tilde{G} for the operator Δ^2 . Actually, when the domain is a ball, by solving the corresponding ODE's, we have

$$\tilde{G} = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \log|x| + \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \frac{|x|^2}{R^2} + \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \log R - \frac{1}{16\pi^2},$$

and the value at 0 of the trace of the regular part of G is $\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \log R - \frac{1}{8\pi^2}$. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B_R} (\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx \\
&\leq \frac{\pi^2}{6} \exp\left(\frac{5}{3} + 32\pi^2 \left(\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \log R - \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\right)\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{3} |B_R| \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

■

Lemma 30 *If $S(\alpha)$ can not be attained, then*

$$S(\alpha) = \sup_{u \in H} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx \leq \frac{\pi^2}{6} \exp\left(\frac{5}{3} + 32\pi^2 A\right),$$

where A is the value at 0 of the trace of the regular part of the Green function G for the operator $\Delta^2 + 1$.

Proof. Set

$$\tilde{u}_k(x) = \frac{u_k(x) - u_k^\delta}{\|\Delta(u_k(x) - u_k^\delta)\|_{L^2(B_\delta(x_k))}}.$$

By Lemma 26, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_\delta(0)} |c_k \Delta u_k|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_\delta(0)} |c_k u_k|^2 dx \right) \\ & \leq -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \delta - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + A + O_k(\delta). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_\delta(0)} |\Delta u_k|^2 dx &= 1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_\delta(0)} |\Delta u_k|^2 dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_\delta(0)} |u_k|^2 dx - \int_{B_\delta(0)} u_k^2 dx \\ &= 1 - \frac{-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \delta - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + A + O_k(\delta)}{c_k^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Combining (54) with Lemma 27 and Lemma 28, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_\delta(0)} |\Delta(u_k(x) - u_k^\delta(x))|^2 dx \\ &= 1 - \frac{-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \delta - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + A + O_k(\delta)}{c_k^2} + \delta^4 c \left(\frac{G(\delta) + G'(\delta)}{c_k} \right)^2 \\ &= 1 - \frac{-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \delta - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + A + O_k(\delta)}{c_k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_k^2(x) &= \frac{(u_k(x) - u_k^\delta(x))^2}{1 - \frac{-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \delta - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + A + O_k(\delta)}{c_k^2}} \\ &= u_k^2(x) \left(1 + \frac{-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \delta - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + A + O_k(\delta)}{c_k^2} \right) \\ &\quad - (2u_k^\delta(x) u_k(x) + u_k^\delta(x)) (1 + o_k(1)) \\ &= u_k^2(x) - c \ln \delta^4. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 20, we have

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_\rho \setminus B_{Lr_k}(x_k)} \exp(\beta_k u_k^2) = |B_\rho|,$$

for any $\rho < \delta$.

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_\rho \setminus B_{Lr_k}(x_k)} \exp(\beta_k \tilde{u}_k^2) dx &\leq O(\delta^{-4c}) \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_\rho \setminus B_{Lr_k}(x_k)} \exp(\beta_k u_k^2) dx \\ &= O(\delta^{-4c}) |B_\rho| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \rho \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Also, by (31) we get

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_\delta \setminus B_\rho} (\exp(\beta_k \tilde{u}_k^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx = 0.$$

Hence, we derive that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{Lr_k}} (\exp(\beta_k \tilde{u}_k^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_\delta} \exp(\beta_k \tilde{u}_k^2) dx \leq |B_\delta| \frac{1}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}\right).$$

Now, we fix some $L > 0$, then for any $x \in B_{Lr_k}(x_k)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_k u_k^2 &= \beta_k \left(\frac{u_k}{\|\Delta(u_k(x) - u_k^\delta(x))\|_{L^2(B_\delta)}} \right)^2 \int_{B_\delta} |\Delta(u_k(x) - u_k^\delta(x))|^2 dx \\ &= \beta_k \left(\tilde{u}_k + \frac{u_k^\delta(x)}{\|\Delta(u_k(x) - u_k^\delta(x))\|_{L^2(B_\delta)}} \right)^2 \int_{B_\delta} |\Delta(u_k(x) - u_k^\delta(x))|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\int_{B_\delta(0)} |\Delta(u_k(x) - u_k^\delta(x))|^2 dx = 1 - \frac{-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \delta - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + A + O_k(\delta)}{c_k^2}$ and $u_k^\delta = u_k(\delta) + \frac{\delta G(\delta)}{c_k}$, careful computations yield that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_k u_k^2 &= \beta_k \left(\tilde{u}_k + u_k^\delta + O\left(\frac{1}{c_k^3}\right) \right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \delta - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + A + O_k(\delta)}{c_k^2} \right) \\ &= \beta_k \tilde{u}_k^2 \left(1 + \frac{u_k^\delta}{\tilde{u}_k} + O\left(\frac{1}{c_k^4}\right) \right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \delta - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + A + O_k(\delta)}{c_k^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tilde{u}_k(x_k + r_k x)}{c_k} = 1, \text{ and } \tilde{u}_k(x_k + r_k x) u_k(\delta) \rightarrow G(\delta),$$

hence with the help of Lemma 27, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_k u_k^2 &= \beta_k \tilde{u}_k^2 \left(1 + \frac{u_k(\delta)}{c_k} + O\left(\frac{\delta^\gamma G(\delta)}{c_k^2}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{c_k^4}\right) \right)^2 \\
&\cdot \left(1 - \frac{-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \delta - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + A + O_k(\delta)}{c_k^2} \right) \\
&= \beta_k \tilde{u}_k^2 \left(1 + \frac{2u_k(\delta)}{c_k} (1 + o(\delta^\gamma G(\delta))) - \frac{-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \delta - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + A + O_k(\delta)}{c_k^2} \right) \\
&= \beta_k \tilde{u}_k^2 \left(1 + \frac{2u_k(\delta)}{c_k} (1 + o(\delta^\gamma G(\delta))) - \frac{G(\delta) - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + O_\delta(1)}{c_k^2} \right) \\
&= \beta_k \tilde{u}_k^2 + \beta_k G(\delta) + \frac{\beta_k}{16\pi^2} + o_\delta(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{Lr_k}(x_k)} (\exp(\beta_k u_k^2) - 1 - \alpha u_k^2) dx \\
&\leq \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{Lr_k}(x_k)} \exp(\beta_k u_k^2) dx \\
&\leq \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \exp(32\pi^2 G(\delta) + 2 + o_\delta(1)) \int_{B_{Lr_k}} \exp(\beta_k \tilde{u}_k^2) dx \\
&= \exp(32\pi^2 G(\delta) + 2 + o_\delta(1)) |B_\delta| \frac{1}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}\right) \\
&= \exp(\ln \delta^{-4} + 32\pi^2 A + \varphi(\delta) + 2 + o_\delta(1)) |B_\delta| \frac{1}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}\right) \\
&= \frac{\pi^2}{6} \exp\left(\frac{5}{3} + 32\pi^2 A\right) + o(\delta).
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$S(\alpha) \leq \frac{\pi^2}{6} \exp\left(\frac{5}{3} + 32\pi^2 A\right),$$

and the proof is finished. ■

4 The test function

Let

$$\phi_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} C + \frac{a - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \ln\left(1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{x^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right) + A + \varphi(x) + b|x|^2}{C} & \text{if } |x| \leq L\varepsilon, \\ \frac{G(x)}{C} & \text{if } |x| \geq L\varepsilon, \end{cases}$$

where L, C, a, b are functions of ε (which will be defined later) such that

- i) $\varepsilon = \exp(-L)$, $\frac{1}{C^2} = O\left(\frac{1}{L}\right)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$,
- ii) $a = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln(L\varepsilon) - C^2 + \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \ln\left(1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}L^2\right) - bL^2\varepsilon^2$,
- iii) $b = -\frac{1}{16\pi^2 L^2 \varepsilon^2 \left(1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}L^2\right)}$.

By Lemma 26, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_{L\varepsilon}(0)} (|\Delta\phi_\varepsilon|^2 + |\phi_\varepsilon|^2) dx &= \frac{1}{C^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_{L\varepsilon}(0)} (|\Delta G|^2 + |G|^2) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{C^2} \left(-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln(L\varepsilon) - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + A + O(L\varepsilon) \right), \end{aligned}$$

and as [22], one has

$$\int_{B_{L\varepsilon}(0)} |\Delta\phi_\varepsilon|^2 dx = \frac{1}{96\pi^2 C^2} \left(6 \ln\left(1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}L^2\right) + 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\ln^2 \varepsilon}\right) \right).$$

It is easy to check that

$$\int_{B_{L\varepsilon}(0)} |\phi_\varepsilon|^2 dx = O\left((L\varepsilon)^4 C^4\right), \quad (55)$$

thus it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\Delta\phi_\varepsilon|^2 + |\phi_\varepsilon|^2) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{32\pi^2 C^2} \left(2 \ln\left(1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}L^2\right) - \frac{5}{3} - 4 \ln(L\varepsilon) + 32\pi^2 A + O\left(\frac{1}{\ln^2 \varepsilon}\right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{32\pi^2 C^2} \left(2 \ln\left(\frac{\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}\left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{6}}{\pi} \frac{1}{L^2}\right)}{\varepsilon^2}\right) - \frac{5}{3} + 32\pi^2 A + O\left(\frac{1}{\ln^2 \varepsilon}\right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{32\pi^2 C^2} \left(2 \ln\left(\frac{\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}}{\varepsilon^2}\right) + 2 \ln\left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{6}}{\pi} \frac{1}{L^2}\right) - \frac{5}{3} + 32\pi^2 A + O\left(\frac{1}{\ln^2 \varepsilon}\right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{32\pi^2 C^2} \left(2 \ln\left(\frac{\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}}{\varepsilon^2}\right) + \frac{2\sqrt{6}}{\pi} \frac{1}{L^2} - \frac{5}{3} + 32\pi^2 A + O\left(\frac{1}{\ln^2 \varepsilon}\right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{32\pi^2 C^2} \left(2 \ln\left(\frac{\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}}{\varepsilon^2}\right) - \frac{5}{3} + 32\pi^2 A + O\left(\frac{1}{\ln^2 \varepsilon}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Set $\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\Delta\phi_\varepsilon|^2 + |\phi_\varepsilon|^2) dx = 1$ and direct computations yield that

$$32\pi^2 C^2 = 2 \ln \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}\varepsilon^2} - \frac{5}{3} + 32\pi^2 A + O\left(\frac{1}{\ln^2 \varepsilon}\right), \quad (56)$$

then

$$C^2 \sim \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon}. \quad (57)$$

For any $x \in B_{L\varepsilon}$, by careful calculation, we also derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
32\pi^2\phi_\varepsilon^2 &\geq 32\pi^2 \left(C^2 + 2 \left(a - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{x^2}{\varepsilon^2} \right) + A + \varphi(x) + b|x|^2 \right) \right) \\
&= 32\pi^2 \left(-C^2 + 2 \left(-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln(L\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} L^2 \right) - bL^2\varepsilon^2 \right) \right) \\
&\quad + 2A + 2\varphi(x) + 2b|x|^2 - \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{x^2}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \\
&= 4 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} L^2 \right) - 8 \ln(L\varepsilon) - 2 \ln \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}\varepsilon^2} + \frac{5}{3} + 32\pi^2 A \\
&\quad - 4 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{x^2}{\varepsilon^2} \right) + O \left(\frac{1}{\ln^2 \varepsilon} \right) + 64\pi^2 (\varphi(x) + b|x|^2) - 64bL^2\varepsilon^2 \\
&= \ln \left(\left(1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} L^2 \right)^4 \frac{6\varepsilon^4}{\pi^2} (L\varepsilon)^{-8} \right) + \frac{5}{3} + 32\pi^2 A \\
&\quad - 4 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{x^2}{\varepsilon^2} \right) + O \left(\frac{1}{\ln^2 \varepsilon} \right) + 64\pi^2 (\varphi(x) + b|x|^2) - 64bL^2\varepsilon^2 \\
&= \ln \frac{6\varepsilon^{-4} \pi^4}{\pi^2} \frac{\pi^4}{36} + O(L^{-2}) + \frac{5}{3} + 32\pi^2 A - 4 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{x^2}{\varepsilon^2} \right) + O \left(\frac{1}{\ln^2 \varepsilon} \right) \\
&\geq \ln \frac{\pi^2}{6\varepsilon^4} + 32\pi^2 A + \frac{5}{3} - \ln \left(1 + \frac{\pi r^2}{\sqrt{6}\varepsilon^2} \right)^4 + O \left(\frac{1}{\ln^2 \varepsilon} \right), \tag{58}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that fact that φ is a continuous function and $\varphi(0) = 0$.

Therefore, combining (55) and (58), we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B_{L\varepsilon}} (\exp(32\pi^2\phi_\varepsilon^2) - 1 - \alpha\phi_\varepsilon^2) dx \\
&\geq \int_{B_{L\varepsilon}} \exp(32\pi^2\phi_\varepsilon^2) dx + O((L\varepsilon)^4 C^4) \\
&= \frac{\pi^2}{6\varepsilon^4} \exp \left(32\pi^2 A + \frac{5}{3} \right) \int_{B_{L\varepsilon}} \left(1 + \frac{\pi r^2}{\sqrt{6}\varepsilon^2} \right)^{-4} dx + O \left(\frac{1}{\ln^2 \varepsilon} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{L\varepsilon}} \left(1 + \frac{\pi r^2}{\sqrt{6}\varepsilon^2}\right)^{-4} dx \\
&= 2\pi^2\varepsilon^4 \int_0^L \left(1 + \frac{\pi r^2}{\sqrt{6}}\right)^{-4} r^3 dr \\
&= 2\pi^2\varepsilon^4 \frac{1}{2} \frac{6}{\pi^2} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}L^2} \frac{u}{(1+u)^4} du \\
&= 2\pi^2\varepsilon^4 \frac{1}{2} \frac{6}{\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{6} - \frac{1}{3} \left(1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}L^2\right)^{-2} + O(L^{-6}) \right) \\
&= \varepsilon^4 \left(1 - 2 \left(1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}L^2\right)^{-2} + O(L^{-6}) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{L\varepsilon}} (\exp(32\pi^2\phi_\varepsilon^2) - 1 - \alpha\phi_\varepsilon^2) dx \\
&\geq \frac{\pi^2}{6\varepsilon^4} \exp\left(32\pi^2A + \frac{5}{3}\right) \varepsilon^4 \left(1 - 2 \left(1 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}}L^2\right)^{-2} + O(L^{-6}) \right) + \\
&+ O\left(C^4(L\varepsilon)^4\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{\ln^2\varepsilon}\right) \\
&= \frac{\pi^2}{6} \exp\left(32\pi^2A + \frac{5}{3}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{\ln^2\varepsilon}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_{L\varepsilon}} (\exp(32\pi^2\phi_\varepsilon^2) - 1 - \alpha\phi_\varepsilon^2) dx \\
&\geq \frac{32\pi^2 - \alpha}{C^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_{L\varepsilon}} G(x)^2 dx \\
&= \frac{32\pi^2 - \alpha}{C^2} \|G(x)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}^2 \\
&= \frac{32\pi^2 - \alpha}{C^2} \left(\|G(x)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}^2 + O(L^4\varepsilon^4) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Then we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(32\pi^2\phi_\varepsilon^2) - 1 - \alpha\phi_\varepsilon^2) dx \\
&= \frac{\pi^2}{6} \exp\left(32\pi^2A + \frac{5}{3}\right) + \frac{32\pi^2 - \alpha}{C^2} \|G(x)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}^2 + O\left(\frac{1}{\ln^2\varepsilon}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

By (57), we know $C^2 \sim |\ln \varepsilon|$, which implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(32\pi^2 \phi_\varepsilon^2) - 1) dx > \frac{\pi^2}{6} \exp\left(32\pi^2 A + \frac{5}{3}\right) \quad (59)$$

for ε small enough. This accomplishes the proof.

5 Nonexistence of extremals

In this section, we will show that when $32\pi^2 - \alpha$ large enough, the supremum $S(\alpha)$ is not attained. For this aim, we will need the precise estimates for the best constants of Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities, the detailed proof is given in the Appendix.

Lemma 31 *Let $B_k = \sup_{u \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u^{2k} dx}{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\Delta u|^2 dx\right)^{k-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u^2 dx}$, then*

$$B_k \leq \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + \frac{2k}{2k-1}\right)^{2k} \left(\frac{2(k-1)}{2k-1}\right)^{2k-2} \cdot \sqrt{\left(\frac{k}{k-1}\right)^{k-1}} k^{-1/2} \left(\frac{k}{32\pi^2}\right)^k \cdot 32\pi^2. \quad (60)$$

Proof of Theorem 3. Let $u \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ satisfying $\|u\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)} = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\exp(32\pi^2 |u|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u|^2) dx \\ &= (32\pi^2 - \alpha) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u^2 dx + \frac{(32\pi^2)^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u^4 dx + \dots + \frac{(32\pi^2)^k}{k!} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u^{2k} dx + \dots \end{aligned}$$

By the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities, we have

$$\frac{(32\pi^2)^k}{k!} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u^{2k} dx \leq \frac{(32\pi^2)^k}{k!} B_k \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\Delta u|^2 dx\right)^{k-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u^2 dx,$$

where B_k is the best constant. We employ (60) to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} B_k &\leq \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2k-1}\right)^{2k-1} \left(\frac{2k}{2k-1}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2k-1}\right)^{2k-1} \left(\frac{2k-1}{2(k-1)}\right) \\ &\quad \sqrt{\left(1 + \frac{1}{k-1}\right)^{k-1}} k^{-1/2} \left(\frac{k}{32\pi^2}\right)^k \cdot 32\pi^2 \\ &\sim \frac{8\pi^2 \sqrt{e}}{\sqrt{k}} \left(\frac{k}{32\pi^2}\right)^k, \end{aligned}$$

when k is large enough. Thus, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(32\pi^2)^k}{k!} B_k &\sim \frac{(32\pi^2)^k}{k!} \frac{8\pi^2 \sqrt{e}}{\sqrt{k}} \left(\frac{k}{32\pi^2} \right)^k \\ &= 8\pi^2 \sqrt{e} \frac{k^k}{\sqrt{k} k!} \text{ (by the stirling formula)} \\ &\sim \frac{8\pi^2 \sqrt{e}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \cdot \frac{e^k}{k}. \end{aligned}$$

Setting $\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\Delta u|^2 dx = t$, we have

$$\frac{(32\pi^2)^k}{k!} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u^{2k} dx \leq \frac{8\pi^2 \sqrt{e}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \cdot \frac{e^k}{k} t^k (1-t).$$

when k is large enough. Since the series

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{8\pi^2 \sqrt{e}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \cdot \frac{e^k}{k} t^k (1-t)$$

converges if $t < \frac{1}{e}$, hence, there exists some constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp(32\pi^2 |u|^2) - 1 - \alpha |u|^2 \right) dx \\ &\leq F(t) = (32\pi^2 - \alpha) (1-t) + c \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{8\pi^2 \sqrt{e}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \cdot \frac{e^k}{k} t^k. \end{aligned}$$

Since $F'(t)|_{t=0} = -32\pi^2 + \alpha < 0$ if $\alpha < 32\pi^2$ and $c \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{8\pi^2 \sqrt{e}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \cdot \frac{e^k}{k} t^k \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$, there exists some t_0 such that for any $t < t_0$, one has

$$F(t) \leq F(0) + \frac{1}{2} F'(0) t < 32\pi^2 - \alpha.$$

Now we consider the case $t \geq t_0$. By Adams inequality, there exists some $M > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp(32\pi^2 |u|^2) - 1 - 32\pi^2 |u|^2 \right) dx < M.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} F(t) &\leq (32\pi^2 - \alpha) (1-t) + M \\ &= 32\pi^2 - \alpha + M - (32\pi^2 - \alpha) t_0, \end{aligned}$$

and we have $F(t) < 32\pi^2 - \alpha$, if $32\pi^2 - \alpha > \frac{M}{t_0}$. ■

Finally, we give the

Proof of Theorem 4. We only need to show that if $S(\alpha_1)$ is attained, then for any $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$, $S(\alpha_2)$ is also attained.

For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $d_{nv}(\alpha)$ and $d_{nc}(\alpha)$ for the upper bounds of Adams' inequality of the normalized vanishing sequences and the normalized concentration sequences, respectively. It is easy to check the following facts:

$$d_{nc}(\alpha_1) = d_{nc}(\alpha_2), d_{nv}(\alpha_1) - d_{nv}(\alpha_2) = \alpha_2 - \alpha_1,$$

for any $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$. Since $S(\alpha_1)$ is attained, we have

$$S(\alpha_1) \geq \max\{d_{nv}(\alpha_1), d_{nc}(\alpha_1)\}.$$

On the other hand, by (59), we know that

$$S(\alpha) > d_{nc}(\alpha), \text{ for any } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (61)$$

thus, we have

$$S(\alpha_1) \geq d_{nv}(\alpha_1). \quad (62)$$

Now, we show that $S(\alpha_2) \geq d_{nv}(\alpha_2)$. Indeed, since $S(\alpha_1)$ is attained by some $\bar{u} \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^4) \setminus \{0\}$ satisfying $\|\bar{u}\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)} = 1$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} S(\alpha_1) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp\left(32\pi^2 |\bar{u}|^2\right) - 1 - \alpha_1 |\bar{u}|^2 \right) dx \\ &= (32\pi^2 - \alpha_1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u}^2 dx + G(\bar{u}) \end{aligned}$$

where $G(\bar{u}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left(\exp\left(32\pi^2 |\bar{u}|^2\right) - 1 - 32\pi^2 |\bar{u}|^2 \right) dx$. By (62) and the fact that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u}^2 dx < 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S(\alpha_2) &\geq (32\pi^2 - \alpha_2) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u}^2 dx + G(\bar{u}) \\ &= (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u}^2 dx + (32\pi^2 - \alpha_1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u}^2 dx + G(\bar{u}) \\ &= (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u}^2 dx + S(\alpha_1) \\ &\geq (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u}^2 dx + d_{nv}(\alpha_1) \\ &> \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 + 32\pi^2 - \alpha_1 \\ &= 32\pi^2 - \alpha_2 = d_{nv}(\alpha_2). \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

Combining (61) and (63), we have $S(\alpha_2) > \max\{d_{nv}(\alpha_2), d_{nc}(\alpha_2)\}$, and then $S(\alpha_2)$ is attained. ■

6 Appendix.

6.1 Estimates for sharp constants of Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities

Lemma 32 For any fixed $a, b, M, N > 0$, let $h(s) := s^a M + s^{-b} N$, then we have

$$\inf_{s>0} h(s) = h\left(\left(\frac{bN}{aM}\right)^{\frac{1}{a+b}}\right) = \frac{a+b}{a} \left(\frac{b}{a}\right)^{\frac{-b}{a+b}} M^{\frac{b}{a+b}} N^{\frac{a}{a+b}}.$$

Proof of Lemma 31. Define

$$C_j = \sup_{u \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^4)} \frac{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^{2j} dx\right)^{\frac{1}{j}}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\Delta u|^2 + |u|^2) dx}.$$

First, we claim that $B_j = \frac{C_j^j j^j}{(j-1)^{j-1}}$. Set

$$I(u) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\Delta u|^2 + |u|^2) dx$$

and

$$\Lambda := \{u \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^4), \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^{2j} dx = 1\}.$$

For any $\tau > 0$, we set

$$u_\tau := \tau^{\frac{2}{j}} u(\tau x).$$

Direct calculations lead to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u_\tau|^{2j} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^{2j} dx$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\Delta u_\tau|^2 dx = \tau^{\frac{4}{j}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\Delta u|^2 dx, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u_\tau|^2 dx = \tau^{\frac{4}{j}-4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^2 dx.$$

It follows from Lemma 32 that

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{u \in \Lambda} I(u) &= \inf_{u \in \Lambda} \inf_{\tau > 0} I(u_\tau) \\ &= \inf_{u \in \Lambda} \inf_{\tau > 0} \tau^{\frac{4}{j}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\Delta u|^2 dx + \tau^{\frac{4}{j}-4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^2 dx \\ &= j(j-1)^{\frac{1-j}{j}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\Delta u|^2 dx \right)^{1-\frac{1}{j}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{j}}. \end{aligned}$$

According to the definitions of B_j and C_j , we derive that $B_j = \frac{C_j^j j^j}{(j-1)^{j-1}}$.

Next, we turn to the estimate of sharp constants C_j . Through Fourier transform and duality, it is easy to check that

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^{2j} dx\right)^{\frac{1}{j}} \leq C_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\Delta u|^2 + |u|^2) dx$$

is equivalent to

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |G * u|^{2j} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2j}} \leq C_j^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |G * u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C_j^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^{\frac{2j}{2j-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{2j-1}{2j}},$$

where $\hat{G}(\xi) = (16\pi^4|\xi|^4 + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |(G * G * u)u| dx &\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |G * G * u|^{2j} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2j}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^{\frac{2j}{2j-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{2j-1}{2j}} \\ &\leq C_j^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |G * u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^{\frac{2j}{2j-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{2j-1}{2j}} \\ &\leq C_j \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^{\frac{2j}{2j-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{2j-1}{j}}. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

On the other hand, for any $t > 1$, define $A_t = \left(\frac{t^{\frac{1}{t}}}{t^{\frac{1}{t'}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, where t' satisfies $\frac{1}{t'} + \frac{1}{t} = 1$. Then it follows from sharp convolution Young inequality and Hausdorff Young inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |(G * G * u)u| dx \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |G * G * u|^{2j} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2j}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^{\frac{2j}{2j-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{2j-1}{2j}} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{A_{\frac{2j}{2j-1}} A_j}{A_{2j}} \right)^4 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |G * G|^j dx \right)^{\frac{1}{j}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^{\frac{2j}{2j-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{2j-1}{j}} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{A_{\frac{2j}{2j-1}} A_j}{A_{2j}} \right)^4 (j'^{\frac{1}{j'}} j^{-\frac{1}{j}})^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\hat{G}\hat{G}|^{j'} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{j'}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^{\frac{2j}{2j-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{2j-1}{j}}, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

which together with (64) yields that

$$C_j \leq \left(\frac{A_{\frac{2j}{2j-1}} A_j}{A_{2j}} \right)^4 (j'^{\frac{1}{j'}} j^{-\frac{1}{j}})^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\hat{G}\hat{G}|^{j'} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{j'}},$$

and the proof is finished. ■

6.2 Some useful elliptic estimates

Lemma 33 (Pizzetti [35]) *Let $u \in C^{2m}(B_R(x_0))$, $B_R(x_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, for some m, n positive integers. Then there are positive constants $c_i = c_i(n)$ such that*

$$\int_{B_R(x_0)} u(x) dx = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} c_i R^{n+2i} \Delta^i u(x_0) + c_m R^{n+2m} \Delta^m u(\xi),$$

for some $\xi \in B_R(x_0)$.

Lemma 34 (Martinazzi [30]) *Let u solve $\Delta^m u = f \in L(\log L)^\alpha$ in smooth bounded Ω with the Dirichlet boundary condition for some $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ and $n \geq 2m$. Then*

$$\nabla^{2m-l} u \in L^{(\frac{n}{n-l}, \frac{1}{\alpha})}(\Omega), 1 \leq l \leq 2m-1$$

and

$$\|\nabla^{2m-l} u\|_{(\frac{n}{n-l}, \frac{1}{\alpha})} \leq C \|f\|_{L(\log L)^\alpha}.$$

Lemma 35 ([15]) *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded open set with smooth boundary, and take $k, m \in \mathbb{N}, k \geq 2m$, and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. If $u \in H^m(\Omega)$ is a weak solutions of the problem*

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^m u = f \text{ in } \Omega \\ \partial_i^i u = h_i \text{ on } \partial\Omega, 0 \leq i \leq m-1 \end{cases}$$

with $f \in C^{k-2m, \gamma}(\Omega)$ and $h_i \in C^{k-i, \gamma}(\partial\Omega)$, then $u \in C^{k, \gamma}(\Omega)$ and there exists a constant $c = c(\Omega, k, \gamma)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{C^{k, \gamma}(\Omega)} \leq c \left(\|f\|_{C^{k-2m, \gamma}(\Omega)} + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \|h_i\|_{C^{k-i, \gamma}(\partial\Omega)} \right).$$

Similarly, If $f \in C^{k-2m, \gamma}(\Omega)$ and u is a weak solution of $(-\Delta)^m u = f$ in Ω , then $u \in C_{loc}^{k, \gamma}(\Omega)$, and for any open set $V \Subset \Omega$, then there exists a constant $C = C(k, p, V, \Omega)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{C^{k, p}(V)} \leq C(\|f\|_{C^{k-2m, \gamma}(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^1(\Omega)}).$$

Lemma 36 ([15]) *Let $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded open set with smooth boundary and take $m, k \in \mathbb{N}, k \geq 2m, p > 1$. If $f \in W^{k-2m, p}(\Omega)$ and $u \in H^m(\Omega)$ is a weak solution of $(-\Delta)^m u = f$ in Ω , then $u \in W_{loc}^{k, p}(\Omega)$, and for any open set $V \subset \subset \Omega$, then there exists a constant $C = C(k, p, V, \Omega)$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{W^{k, p}(V)} \leq C(\|f\|_{W^{k-2m, p}(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^1(\Omega)}).$$

Similarly, If $f \in C^{k-2m, \gamma}(\Omega)$ and u is a weak solution of $(-\Delta)^m u = f$ in Ω , then $u \in C_{loc}^{k, \gamma}(\Omega)$, and for any open set $V \subset \subset \Omega$, then there exists a constant $C = C(k, p, V, \Omega)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{C^{k, p}(V)} \leq C(\|f\|_{C^{k-2m, \gamma}(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^1(\Omega)}).$$

References

- [1] S. Adachi, K. Tanaka, Trudinger type inequalities in RN and their best exponents, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **128** (2000), 2051-2057.
- [2] D.R. Adams, A sharp inequality of J. Moser for higher order derivatives, Ann. Math., **128** (1988), 385-398.

- [3] W. Beckner, Sharp Sobolev inequalities on the sphere and the Moser-Trudinger inequality, *Ann. Math.*, **138** (1993), 213-242.
- [4] W. Beckner. Estimates on Moser Embedding, *Potential. Anal.*, **20** (2004), 345-359,
- [5] J. Bellazzini, R. L. Frank, and N. Visciglia, Maximizers for Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities and related non-local problems, *Math. Ann.*, **360** (2014), 653–673.
- [6] T. Branson, L. Fontana. and C. Morpurgo, Moser-Trudinger and Beckner-Onofri’s inequalities on the CR sphere, *Ann. Math.*, **177** (2013), no. 1, 1-52.
- [7] D. M. Cao, Nontrivial solution of semilinear elliptic equation with critical exponent in \mathbb{R}^2 , *Comm. Partial Differential Equations.*, **17** (1992), 407-435.
- [8] L. Carleson, S.-Y. A. Chang, On the existence of an extremal function for an inequality of J. Moser, *Bull. Sci. Math.*, **110** (1986), 113-127.
- [9] W.S. Cohn, G. Lu, Best constants for Moser–Trudinger inequalities on the Heisenberg group, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **50** (2001), 1567-1591.
- [10] W.S. Cohn, G. Lu, Sharp constants for Moser-Trudinger inequalities on spheres in complex space C^n , *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **57** (2004), 1458-1493.
- [11] A. DelaTorre, G. Mancini, Improved Adams-type inequalities and their extremals in dimension $2m$, *ArXiv: 1711.00892v2*.
- [12] Y. Deng, Y. Li, Exponential decay of the solutions for nonlinear bihamonic equations, *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, **9** (2007), 753-768.
- [13] J. M. do Ó, N-Laplacian equations in \mathbb{R}^N with critical growth, *Abstr. Appl. Anal.*, **2** (1997), 301-315.
- [14] M. Flucher, Extremal functions for the Trudinger-Moser inequality in 2 dimensions, *Comment. Math. Helv.*, **67** (1992), 471-497.
- [15] F. Gazzola, H-C. Grunau, G. Sweers, Polyharmonic boundary value problems, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2010), ISBN: 978-3-642-12244-6.
- [16] M. Ishiwata, Existence and nonexistence of maximizers for variational problems associated with Trudinger-Moser type inequalities in \mathbb{R}^n , *Math. Ann.*, **351** (2011), 781–804
- [17] N. Lam, G. Lu, Sharp Moser–Trudinger inequality on the Heisenberg group at the critical case and applications, *Adv. Math.*, **231** (2012), 3259–3287.

- [18] N. Lam, G. Lu, A new approach to sharp Moser-Trudinger and Adams type inequalities: a rearrangement-free argument, *J. Differential Equations.*, **255** (2013), 298-325.
- [19] E. Lenzmann, J. Sok, A sharp rearrangement principle in fourier space and symmetry results for PDEs with arbitrary order, arXiv:1805.06294v1.
- [20] C. Lin, A classification of solutions of conformally invariant fourth order equation in \mathbb{R}^4 , *Comment. Math. Helv.*, **73** (1998), 203-231.
- [21] K. C. Lin, Extremal functions for Moser's inequality, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **348** (1996), 2663-2671.
- [22] G. Lu, and Y. Yang, Adams' inequalities for bi-Laplacian and extremal functions in dimension four, *Adv. Maths.*, **220** (2009) 1135–1170.
- [23] G. Lu, Y. Yang, Sharp constant and extremal function for the improved Moser-Trudinger inequality involving L^p norm in two dimension, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **25** (2009), 963-979.
- [24] J. Li, G. Lu, and M. Zhu, Concentration-compactness principle for Trudinger-Moser inequalities on Heisenberg groups and existence of ground state solutions, *Calc. Var.*, (2018) 57-84.
- [25] Y. Li, Moser-Trudinger inequality on compact Riemannian manifolds of dimension two, *J. Partial Differential Equations.*, **14** (2001), 163-192.
- [26] Y. Li, Extremal functions for the Moser-Trudinger inequalities on compact Riemannian manifolds, *Sci. China Ser.A.*, **48** (2005), 618-648.
- [27] L. Fontana, C. Morpurgo, Sharp Adams and Moser-Trudinger inequalities on \mathbb{R}^n and other spaces of infinite measure, preprint (2015), arXiv:1504.04678.
- [28] Y. Li, B. Ruf, A sharp Trudinger-Moser type inequality for unbounded domains in \mathbb{R}^n , *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **57** (2008), 451-480.
- [29] L. Martinazzi, Classification of the entire solutions to the high order Liouville's equations on \mathbb{R}^{2m} , *Math. Z.*, **263** (2009), 307-329.
- [30] L. Martinazzi, A threshold phenomenon for embeddings of H_0^m into Orlicz Spaces, *Calc. Var.*, **36** (2009), 493-506.
- [31] H. Kozono, T. Sato and H. Wadade, Upper bound of the best constant of a Trudinger-Moser inequality and its application to a Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **55** (2006), 1951-1974.
- [32] J. Moser, Sharp form of an inequality by N. Trudinger, *Indiana Univ. Maths J.*, **20** (1971), 1077-1092.

- [33] R. O’Neil, Convolution operator and $L(p, q)$ spaces, *Duke Math. J.*, **30** (1963), 129-142.
- [34] T. Ozawa, On critical cases of Sobolev’s inequalities, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **127** (1995), 259-269.
- [35] P. Pizzetti, Sulla media dei valori che una funzione dei punti dello spazio assume alla superficie di una sfera, *Rend. Lincei.*, **18** (1909), 182-185.
- [36] Pohožaev, S. I. *On the eigenfunctions of the equation $\Delta u + \lambda f(u) = 0$, (Russian)* *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 165(1965), 36-39.
- [37] B. Ruf, A sharp Trudinger-Moser type inequality for unbounded domains in \mathbb{R}^2 , *J. Funct. Anal.*, **219** (2004), 340-367.
- [38] B. Ruf, F. Sani, Sharp Adams-type inequalities in \mathbb{R}^n , *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **365** (2013), no. 2, 645-670.
- [39] C. Tarsi, Adams’ Inequality and Limiting Sobolev Embeddings into Zygmund Spaces, *Potential. Anal.*, **37** (2012), 353C385.
- [40] N. S. Trudinger, On embeddings in to Orlicz spaces and some applications, *J. Math. Mech.*, **17** (1967), 473-484.
- [41] V.I. Yudovič, Some estimates connected with integral operators and with solutions of elliptic equations, *(Russian) Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 138 1961 805-808.

Maochun Zhu
 Faculty of Science
 Jiangsu University
 Zhenjiang, 212013, P. R. China
 zhumaochun2006@126.com

Lu Chen
 School of Mathematics and Statistics
 Beijing Institute of Technology
 Beijing, 100081, P. R. China
 chenlu5818804@163.com