

A singular Kazdan-Warner problem on a compact Riemann surface

Xiaobao Zhu^{*†}

School of Mathematics
Renmin University of China
Beijing 100872, P. R. China

Abstract

Let (M, g) be a compact Riemann surface with unit area, $h \in C^\infty(M)$ a function which is positive somewhere, $\rho > 0$, $p_i \in M$ and $\alpha_i \in (-1, +\infty)$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, we consider the mean field equation

$$\Delta v + 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha_i (1 - \delta_{p_i}) = \rho \left(1 - \frac{he^v}{\int_M he^v d\mu} \right),$$

on M , where Δ and $d\mu$ are the Laplace-Beltrami operator and the area element of (M, g) respectively. Using variational method and blowup analysis, we prove some existence results in the critical case $\rho = 8\pi(1 + \min\{0, \min_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \alpha_i\})$. These results can be seen as partial generalizations of works of Chen-Li (J. Geom. Anal. 1: 359–372, 1991), Ding-Jost-Li-Wang (Asian J. Math. 1: 230–248, 1997), Mancini (J. Geom. Anal. 26: 1202–1230, 2016), Yang-Zhu (Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 145: 3953–3959, 2017), Sun-Zhu (arXiv:2012.12840) and Zhu (arXiv:2212.09943). Among other things, we prove that the blowup (if happens) must be at the point where the conical angle is the smallest one and h is positive, this is the most important contribution of our paper.

1 Introduction

Let (M, g) be a compact Riemann surface with unit area, h a smooth function on M which is positive somewhere and $\rho > 0$ a parameter. In this paper, we consider the

^{*}Partially supported by the National Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 11171347 and 11401575).

[†]Email: zhuxiaobao@ruc.edu.cn

singular mean field equation

$$\Delta v + 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha_i (1 - \delta_{p_i}) = \rho \left(1 - \frac{he^v}{\int_M he^v d\mu} \right), \quad (1.1)$$

where Δ and $d\mu$ are the Laplace-Beltrami operator and the area element of (M, g) respectively, $p_i \in M$ are given distinct points, $\alpha_i \in (-1, +\infty)$ and δ_{p_i} denotes the Dirac measure with pole at p_i for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.

Since (1.1) is invariant under adding a constant, one can assume $\int_M he^v d\mu = 1$. When (M, g) is the standard sphere with constant Gauss curvature 4π (since we have assumed the area of M is unit) and $\rho = 8\pi + 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha_i$, the metric $e^v g$ has Gauss curvature $(4\pi + 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha_i)h$ on $M \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_\ell\}$ and conical angle $2\pi(1 + \alpha_i)$ at p_i for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. This is the singular version of ‘‘Nirenberg problem’’. We refer the reader to [6, 9–11, 13, 14, 19, 25, 34–36, 44] for the development of this topic. Eq. (1.1) also appears in theoretical physics when people describes the models like Abelian Chern-Simons vortices, the reader could find this interpretation in [4, 12, 16, 17, 32]. For the study on Eq. (1.1) when $\rho \neq \bar{\rho}$, we refer the reader to [1, 2, 26]. Besides, we refer three nice survey papers [20, 21, 33].

Let G_p be the Green function at p which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta G_p = 1 - \delta_p, \\ \int_M G_p d\mu = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

In a normal coordinate system around p we assume that

$$G_p(x) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \log r + A(p) + \sigma(x),$$

where $r(x) = \text{dist}(x, p)$ and $\sigma(x) = O(r)$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. By the change of variables

$$u = v + 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha_i G_{p_i} := v + h_\ell,$$

we can transform Eq. (1.1) with $\int_M he^v d\mu = 1$ into

$$\Delta u = \rho (1 - he^{-h_\ell} e^u). \quad (1.3)$$

To study the existence of Eq. (1.3), one likes to pursue a variational method. Namely, consider

$$J_\rho(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_M |\nabla u|^2 d\mu + \rho \int_M u d\mu$$

in the Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{H} = \left\{ u \in H^1(M) : \int_M h e^u e^{-h_\ell} d\mu = 1 \right\}.$$

Since h is positive somewhere, $\mathcal{H} \neq \emptyset$. By a simple calculation, one knows critical points of J_ρ in \mathcal{H} are solutions of (1.3). Therefore, to solve Eq. (1.3), we can find critical points of J_ρ in \mathcal{H} . Let us recall the Moser-Trudinger inequality for surfaces with conical singularities, which has strong relationship with finding critical points for J_ρ . This inequality was firstly built by Troyanov [35] for any subcritical case and then sharpened by Chen [7]. Precisely, there exists a constant C which depends only on (M, g) , such that for any $u \in H^1(M)$ with $\int_M |\nabla u|^2 d\mu \leq 1$ and $\int_M u e^{-h_\ell} d\mu = 0$,

$$\int_M e^{4\pi(1+\bar{\alpha})u^2} e^{-h_\ell} d\mu \leq C, \quad (1.4)$$

where $\bar{\alpha} = \min\{0, \min_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \alpha_i\}$. We refer the reader to [42] for a more general version. A direct consequence of (1.4) is

$$\log \int_M e^u e^{-h_\ell} d\mu \leq \frac{1}{16\pi(1+\bar{\alpha})} \int_M |\nabla u|^2 d\mu + \int_M u e^{-h_\ell} d\mu + C. \quad (1.5)$$

To study J_ρ , a more convenient inequality compared with (1.5) was derived by the author [41]. In fact, we replaced the term $\int_M u e^{-h_\ell} d\mu$ with $\int_M u d\mu$ on the right-hand side of (1.5) and obtained

$$\log \int_M e^u e^{-h_\ell} d\mu \leq \frac{1}{16\pi(1+\bar{\alpha})} \int_M |\nabla u|^2 d\mu + \int_M u d\mu + C. \quad (1.6)$$

Note that all the coefficients in (1.4)-(1.6) are sharp. Based on this fact, $\rho = 8\pi(1 + \bar{\alpha}) := \bar{\rho}$ is the critical case in (1.3). When $\rho < \bar{\rho}$, J_ρ is coercive in \mathcal{H} and hence it attains its infimum by the standard variational principle (c.f. for example, Theorem 1.2 in [29]). However, when $\rho = \bar{\rho}$, the situation becomes more subtle, one just knows $J_{\bar{\rho}}$ is bounded from below in \mathcal{H} by (1.6).

When there is no singular source, that is $h_\ell = 0$, $\bar{\alpha} = 0$ and $\bar{\rho} = 8\pi$. Kazdan and Warner [18] asked, under what kind of conditions on h , the equation

$$\Delta u = 8\pi - 8\pi h e^u \quad (1.7)$$

has a solution. In the literal, people calls it as *Kazdan-Warner problem*.

In the celebrated paper [12], Ding, Jost, Li and Wang firstly attacked Kazdan-Warner problem successfully. If h is positive and $J_{8\pi}$ has no minimum, they proved

$$\inf_{u \in H^1(M)} J_{8\pi} \geq -8\pi - 8\pi \log \pi - 8\pi \max_{p \in M} (4\pi A(p) + \log h(p)) := \Lambda_{8\pi}.$$

After that, they constructed a blowup sequence ϕ_ϵ and proved that $J_{8\pi}(\phi_\epsilon)$ is smaller than $\Lambda_{8\pi}$ for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ under the condition

$$\Delta \log h(p_0) - 2K(p_0) + 8\pi > 0, \quad (1.8)$$

where p_0 is the maximum point of $4\pi A(p) + \log h(p)$ on M and K is the Gauss curvature of (M, g) . Therefore, under (1.8), $J_{8\pi}$ has a minimum and Eq. (1.7) has a solution. In the following, we call (1.8) as *Ding-Jost-Li-Wang condition*. Twenty years later, Yang and the author [39] generalized this existence result to the case $h \geq 0, \not\equiv 0$, they mainly excluded the situation that blowup happens at zero point of h . Recently, this result was generalized to the case which permits h changing signs. This were done using variational method first by Sun and Zhu [31] and then by the author [43] with a different argument. The other successful method to study Eq. (1.7) is the flow method, we refer the reader to [5], [22], [30], [37] and [23].

In this paper, we shall follow Ding-Jost-Li-Wang's method to study Eq. (1.3) when there are singular sources and in the critical case $\rho = \bar{\rho}$. We call it as the *singular Kazdan-Warner problem*. Mainly, we remove the positivity restriction on h and just assume h is positive somewhere. Pioneer works were done by Chen-Li [9] when $M = S^2$ and Mancini [27] for general surfaces and positive h .

We consider the perturbed functional J_{ρ_k} when $\rho_k \uparrow \bar{\rho}$ strictly. Because of (1.6), J_{ρ_k} is coercive in the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Then by Theorem 1.2 in [29], J_{ρ_k} attains its infimum at some $u_k \in \mathcal{H}$. By a direct calculation, we have

$$\Delta u_k = \rho_k (1 - h e^{-h_\ell} e^{u_k}). \quad (1.9)$$

We define the *conical singularity* at $p \in M$ as

$$\alpha(p) = \begin{cases} \alpha_i, & \text{if } p = p_i \text{ for some } i = 1, \dots, \ell, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Correspondingly, the *conical angle* at p is $2\pi(1 + \alpha(p))$. Now we are prepared to state our results.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (M, g) be a compact Riemann surface with unit area. Denote $M_+ = \{x \in M : h(x) > 0\}$. If the minimizing sequence u_k of $J_{\bar{\rho}}$ does not converge in $H^1(M)$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{H^1(M)} J_{\bar{\rho}}(u) &= -\bar{\rho} \left(1 + \log \frac{\pi}{1 + \bar{\alpha}} \right) \\ &\quad - \bar{\rho} \max_{p \in M_+, \alpha(p) = \bar{\alpha}} \left(4\pi A(p) + \log \left(h(p) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi \alpha_i G_{p_i}(p)} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Concerning the existence result, we have

Theorem 1.2. *Let (M, g) be a compact Riemann surface with unit area. Denote $M_+ = \{x \in M : h(x) > 0\}$. Suppose $h \in C^\infty(M)$ is positive somewhere. Then Eq. (1.3) has a solution provided one of the following conditions holds:*

- (i) $\{p \in M_+ : \alpha(p) = \bar{\alpha}\} = \emptyset$;
- (ii) $\{p \in M_+ : \alpha(p) = \bar{\alpha}\} \neq \emptyset$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\mathcal{H}} J_{\bar{\rho}} &< -\bar{\rho} \left(1 + \log \frac{\pi}{1 + \bar{\alpha}} \right) \\ &- \bar{\rho} \max_{p \in M_+, \alpha(p) = \bar{\alpha}} \left(4\pi A(p) + \log \left(h(p) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi \alpha_i G_{p_i}(p)} \right) \right) \\ &:= \Lambda_{\bar{\rho}}. \end{aligned}$$

We organize our paper as follows: The introduction and main results are presented in Section 1; In Section 2, we collect some useful lemmas which will be used; We derive the explicit lower bound of $J_{\bar{\rho}}$ when (u_k) blows up in Section 3 and construct a blowup sequence in Section 4; In the last section, we complete the proofs of our main results. Throughout the whole paper, the constant C is varying from line to line and even in the same line, we do not distinguish sequence and its subsequences since we just consider the existence result.

2 Some lemmas

In this section, we would like to present some useful results which will be used in the next section, where we will calculate the explicit lower bound of J_{ρ_k} when (u_k) blows up.

Lemma 2.1 (Theorem 2.1, [9]). *Let (M, g) be a compact Riemann surface with unit area, Ω_1 and Ω_2 be two subsets of M such that $\text{dist}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \geq \epsilon_0 > 0$. Assume $\gamma_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ is a fixed number. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant $C = C(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \epsilon)$ such that the inequality*

$$\log \int_M e^{-h_\epsilon} e^u d\mu \leq \left(\frac{1}{32\pi(1 + \bar{\alpha})} + \epsilon \right) \int_M |\nabla u|^2 d\mu + \int_M u d\mu + C$$

holds for all $u \in H^1(M)$ satisfying

$$\frac{\int_{\Omega_1} e^{-h_\epsilon} e^u d\mu}{\int_M e^{-h_\epsilon} e^u d\mu} \geq \gamma_0, \quad \frac{\int_{\Omega_2} e^{-h_\epsilon} e^u d\mu}{\int_M e^{-h_\epsilon} e^u d\mu} \geq \gamma_0.$$

The reader can follow Chen-Li's proof effortlessly, we omit it here.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose u_k attains the infimum of J_{ρ_k} in \mathcal{H} . Then there exist two positive constants c_1 and c_2 such that*

$$c_1 \leq \int_M e^{-h_\ell} e^{u_k} d\mu \leq c_2.$$

Proof. Since $u_k \in \mathcal{H}$, one can choose $c_1 = 1/\max_M h$. As to the upper bound, notice

$$J_{\rho_k}(u_k) = \inf_{\mathcal{H}} J_{\rho_k}(u) \leq C,$$

then the Moser-Trudinger inequality (1.6) and Jensen's inequality yield that

$$\begin{aligned} \log \int_M e^{-h_\ell} e^{u_k} d\mu &\leq \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}} J_{\rho_k}(u_k) + \left(1 - \frac{\rho_k}{\bar{\rho}}\right) \int_M u_k d\mu + C \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\rho_k}{\bar{\rho}}\right) \int_M (-h_\ell + u_k) d\mu + \left(1 - \frac{\rho_k}{\bar{\rho}}\right) \int_M h_\ell d\mu + C \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\rho_k}{\bar{\rho}}\right) \log \left(\int_M e^{-h_\ell} e^{u_k} d\mu \right) + C, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used the fact that $h_\ell \in L^1(M)$. Now we finish the proof. \square

Lemma 2.3. *If (u_k) blows up, then for every $q \in (1, 2)$, it holds that*

$$\|\nabla u_k\|_{L^q(M)} \leq C.$$

Proof. Let $q' = \frac{q}{q-1} > 2$. By definition, we have

$$\|\nabla u_k\|_{L^q(M)} \leq \sup \left\{ \left| \int_M \nabla u_k \cdot \nabla \varphi d\mu \right| : \varphi \in W^{1,q'}(M), \int_M \varphi d\mu = 0, \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,q'}(M)} = 1 \right\}.$$

It follows from the Sobolev embedding theorem that

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(M)} \leq C.$$

Then by equation (1.9) and Lemma 2.2 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_M \nabla u_k \cdot \nabla \varphi d\mu \right| &= \left| - \int_M \Delta u_k \varphi d\mu \right| \\ &= \left| \int_M \rho_k (h e^{-h_\ell} e^{u_k} - 1) \varphi d\mu \right| \\ &\leq \bar{\rho} \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(M)} \left(\max_M |h| \int_M e^{-h_\ell} e^{u_k} d\mu + 1 \right) \\ &\leq C. \end{aligned}$$

This gives the proof of the lemma. \square

Denote $\overline{u}_k = \int_M u_k d\mu$, $\lambda_k = \max_M u_k$. Assume $u_k(x_k) = \lambda_k$ for some $x_k \in M$ and $x_k \rightarrow p \in M$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 2.4. *The following three conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $\lambda_k \rightarrow +\infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$;
- (ii) $\|\nabla u_k\|_{L^2(M)} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$;
- (iii) $\overline{u}_k \rightarrow -\infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Since $J_{\rho_k}(u_k)$ is bounded, we have (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) obviously.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii): Suppose not, $\|\nabla u_k\|_{L^2(M)} \leq C$, then by the proved equivalent relation (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii), \overline{u}_k is bounded from below. It follows by Jensen's inequality and Lemma 2.2 that

$$\overline{u}_k - \overline{h}_\ell \leq \log \left(\int_M e^{-h_\ell + u_k} d\mu \right) \leq C,$$

this together with the fact $h_\ell \in L^1(M)$ yields $\overline{u}_k \leq C$. By Poincaré's inequality,

$$\int_M u_k^2 d\mu - \overline{u}_k^2 = \int_M (u_k - \overline{u}_k)^2 d\mu \leq C \int_M |\nabla u_k|^2 d\mu \leq C.$$

So (u_k) is bounded in $L^2(M)$ and therefore it is in $W^{2,2}(M)$. Then elliptic estimates tell us that $\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(M)}$ is bounded. Of course, we also have $\lambda_k \leq C$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): Suppose not, $\lambda_k \leq C$, then e^{u_k} is bounded. It is clear that he^{-h_ℓ} is bounded in $L^s(M)$ for some $s > 1$ ($s = \infty$ if $\overline{\alpha} = 0$ and $s < -1/\overline{\alpha}$ if $\overline{\alpha} < 0$). By Lemma 2.3, $\|u_k - \overline{u}_k\|_{L^{s_1}(M)}$ for any $s_1 > 1$. Since $\Delta(u_k - \overline{u}_k)$ is bounded in $L^s(M)$, it follows from the elliptic estimates that $u_k - \overline{u}_k$ is bounded in $L^\infty(M)$. This together with $\overline{u}_k \rightarrow -\infty$ yields that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_M he^{-h_\ell} e^{u_k} d\mu = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} e^{\overline{u}_k} \int_M he^{-h_\ell} e^{u_k - \overline{u}_k} d\mu = 0.$$

It contradicts $u_k \in \mathcal{H}$. This finishes the proof. \square

By Brezis-Merle's lemma ([3], Theorem 1) and following elliptic estimates as the proof of Lemma 2.8 in [12] (or Lemma 2.9 in [41]), one has

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\Omega \subset M$ be a domain. If*

$$\int_\Omega |h| e^{-h_\ell + u_k} d\mu \leq \frac{1}{2(1 + \overline{\alpha})} - \delta$$

for some $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2(1 + \overline{\alpha})}$, then

$$\|u_k - \overline{u}_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C.$$

Due to Lemma 2.5, we define the *blowup set* of (u_k) as

$$S = \left\{ x \in M : \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_r(x)} |h| e^{-h_\ell + u_k} d\mu \geq \frac{1}{2(1 + \bar{\alpha})} \right\}. \quad (2.1)$$

The following observation is very important to us. Even though h may change signs, the blowup set is still a single point set at most. It breaks the surmise that when h changes signs, it may have two or more blowup points, they concentrate at different points where h may be negative and positive, but cancel each other.

Lemma 2.6. $S = \{p\}$.

Proof. We divide the whole proof into three parts: (1) $S \neq \emptyset$; (2) $\#S = 1$; (3) $S = \{p\}$. In the following, we shall prove these three parts one by one.

(1) $S \neq \emptyset$. Suppose not, for every $x \in M$, there exists a positive number r_x which is smaller than the injective radius of M , such that

$$\int_{B_{r_x}(x)} |h| e^{-h_\ell + u_k} d\mu < \frac{1}{2(1 + \bar{\alpha})}.$$

Then by Lemma 2.5 we obtain that

$$\|u_k - \bar{u}_k\|_{L^\infty(B_{r_x/2}(x))} \leq C.$$

This combining with a finite covering argument tells us that

$$\|u_k - \bar{u}_k\|_{L^\infty(M)} \leq C.$$

Since (u_k) blows up, we have $\bar{u}_k \rightarrow -\infty$ by Lemma 2.4 and then we have $u_k \rightarrow -\infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. This contradicts with Lemma 2.2.

(2) $\#S = 1$. Suppose not, we must have $\#S \geq 2$ since we have proved that $S \neq \emptyset$. Suppose $x_1 \neq x_2 \in S$, then for sufficiently small r , one has

$$\frac{\int_{B_r(x_i)} e^{-h_\ell + u_k} d\mu}{\int_M e^{-h_\ell + u_k} d\mu} \geq \frac{1}{2(1 + \bar{\alpha})c_2 \|h\|_{L^\infty(M)}}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Then by Lemma 2.1 we have for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{8\bar{\rho}}$, there exists a constant C such that

$$\begin{aligned} \log \int_M e^{-h_\ell + u_k} d\mu &\leq \frac{3}{8\bar{\rho}} \int_M |\nabla u_k|^2 d\mu + \bar{u}_k + C \\ &= \frac{3}{4\bar{\rho}} J_{\rho_k}(u_k) + \left(1 - \frac{3\rho_k}{4\bar{\rho}}\right) \bar{u}_k + C \\ &\rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where we have used facts $J_{\rho_k}(u_k)$ is bounded and $\overline{u_k} \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. (2.2) contradicts Lemma 2.2. Therefore, $\#S = 1$.

(3) $S = \{p\}$. Let us recall that $u_k(x_k) = \max_M u_k$ and $x_k \rightarrow p$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. If $p \notin S$, then by (2.1) (the definition of S) there exist $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2(1+\overline{\alpha})}$ and $r > 0$ such that

$$\int_{B_r(p)} |h| e^{-h_\ell + u_k} d\mu < \frac{1}{2(1+\overline{\alpha})} - \delta.$$

Then Lemma 2.5 yields that

$$\|u_k - \overline{u_k}\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2}(p))} \leq C.$$

So we have by Lemma 2.4 that

$$u_k(x_k) \leq \overline{u_k} + C \rightarrow -\infty \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

this contradicts $u_k(x_k) = \lambda_k \rightarrow +\infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, $S = \{p\}$. \square

Lemma 2.7. *If (u_k) blows up, then h must be positive at the single blowup point, i.e., $h(p) > 0$.*

Proof. It follows from Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6 that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{M \setminus B_r(p)} e^{-h_\ell + u_k} d\mu = 0$$

and then

$$h(p) \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_r(p)} e^{-h_\ell + u_k} d\mu = 1.$$

So $h(p) > 0$ and we finish the proof of the lemma. \square

Recall that the author [41] proved, if (u_k) blows up, it must blow up at the point where the conical angle is the smallest, i.e., $\alpha(p) = \overline{\alpha}$. Now, let us recall more results in [41]. We choose an isothermal coordinate system around p , denote $r_k = e^{-\frac{\lambda_k}{2(1+\overline{\alpha})}}$, then

$$\varphi_k(x) := u_k(x_k + r_k x) - \lambda_k \rightarrow \varphi(x) = -2 \log \left(1 + \frac{\pi}{1+\overline{\alpha}} H(p) |x|^{2(1+\overline{\alpha})} \right), \quad (2.3)$$

in $C_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ if $\overline{\alpha} = 0$ and in $C_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}) \cap C_{\text{loc}}^0(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap W_{\text{loc}}^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for every $s \in (1, -1/\overline{\alpha})$ if $\overline{\alpha} < 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, where

$$H(p) = h(p) e^{-4\pi A(p)} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi \alpha_i G_{p_i}(p)}.$$

Calculate directly, one has

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{Rr_k}(x_k)} h e^{-h_\ell + u_k} d\mu = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} H(p) |x|^{2\bar{\alpha}} e^{\varphi_0} dx = 1. \quad (2.4)$$

Since $S = \{p\}$, for any $x \in M \setminus \{p\}$, there exists a $\gamma_x \in (0, 1/2)$ and a small $r_x \in (0, \frac{1}{2(1+\bar{\alpha})} \text{dist}(x, p))$ such that

$$\int_{B_{r_x}(x)} |h| e^{-h_\ell + u_k} d\mu < \frac{1}{2(1+\bar{\alpha})} - \gamma_x.$$

By Lemma 2.5, $\|u_k - \bar{u}_k\|_{L^\infty_{B_{r_x/2}(x)}} \leq C$, then by Lemma 2.4 we have $u_k(x) \leq C + \bar{u}_k \rightarrow -\infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. So for any $\Omega \subset\subset M \setminus \{p\}$, there holds

$$\int_{\Omega} |h| e^{-h_\ell + u_k} d\mu \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.5)$$

By (2.4) and (2.5) we get that $h e^{-h_\ell + u_k}$ converges to δ_p in the sense of measure. Therefore $u_k - \bar{u}_k \rightarrow \bar{\rho} G_p(x)$ weakly in $W^{1,q}(M)$ for any $1 < q < 2$, where G_p is the Green function satisfying (1.2), since G_p is the only solution of (1.2) in $W^{1,q}(M)$. Lemma 2.5 and (2.5) yield that for any $\Omega \subset\subset M \setminus \{p\}$,

$$\|u_k - \bar{u}_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C.$$

This inequality together with the standard elliptic estimates yields that

$$u_k - \bar{u}_k \rightarrow \bar{\rho} G_p \quad \text{in } C_{\text{loc}}^\gamma(M \setminus \{p\}) \cap W^{1,s}(M) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty \quad (2.6)$$

for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and $s > 2$.

3 Lower bound of $J_{\bar{\rho}}$ when (u_k) blows up

Based on the prepared work in the former section, we could estimate the explicit lower bound of $J_{\bar{\rho}}$ in this section.

Since the asymptotic phenomenons are different, we divide the integral $\int_M |\nabla u_k|^2$ into three parts. Namely,

$$\int_M |\nabla u_k|^2 = \int_{M \setminus B_\delta(x_k)} |\nabla u_k|^2 + \int_{B_\delta(x_k) \setminus B_{Rr_k}(x_k)} |\nabla u_k|^2 + \int_{B_{Rr_k}(x_k)} |\nabla u_k|^2. \quad (3.1)$$

For the first term in the right-hand side of (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{M \setminus B_\delta(x_k)} |\nabla u_k|^2 &= \int_{M \setminus B_\delta(p)} |\nabla G_p|^2 + o_k(1) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi} \bar{\rho}^2 \log \delta + \bar{\rho}^2 A(p) + o_k(1) + o_\delta(1), \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where and in the following we use $o_k(1)$ (resp. $o_R(1)$; $o_\delta(1)$) to denote the terms which tend to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$ (resp. $R \rightarrow \infty$; $\delta \rightarrow 0$).

For the third term in the right-hand side of (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{Rr_k}(x_k)} |\nabla u_k|^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{B}_{R(0)}} |\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi|^2 + o_k(1) \\ &= 2\bar{\rho} \log\left(1 + \frac{\pi H(p)}{1 + \bar{\alpha}} R^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})}\right) - 2\bar{\rho} + o_k(1) + o_R(1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

We use the capacity method, to estimate the second term in the right-hand side of (3.1). This method was first used by Li [24] to estimate the neck-part of the integral $\int_M |\nabla u_k|^2$ when he studied the Moser-Trudinger inequality in dimension two. Set

$$u_k^*(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u_k(x_k + r e^{i\theta}) d\theta.$$

Then it follows by (2.6) and (2.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} u_k^*(\delta) &= \bar{u}_k + \bar{\rho} \left(-\frac{1}{2\pi} \log \delta + A(p)\right) + o_k(1) + o_\delta(1). \\ u_k^*(Rr_k) &= \lambda_k - 2 \log\left(1 + \frac{\pi H(p)}{1 + \bar{\alpha}} R^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})}\right) + o_k(1) + o_R(1). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose w_k solves

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} w_k = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{B}_\delta(0) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{Rr_k}(0), \\ w_k(x) = u_k^*(x) & \text{on } \partial(\mathbb{B}_\delta(0) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{Rr_k}(0)), \end{cases}$$

then

$$w_k(x) = \frac{u_k^*(\delta) (\log |x| - \log(Rr_k)) + u_k^*(Rr_k) (\log \delta - \log |x|)}{\log \delta - \log(Rr_k)}.$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_\delta(x_k) \setminus B_{Rr_k}(x_k)} |\nabla u_k|^2 \\
& \geq \int_{\mathbb{B}_\delta(0) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{Rr_k}(0)} |\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} w_k(x)| dx \\
& = 2\pi \frac{(u_k^*(\delta) - u_k^*(Rr_k))^2}{\log \delta - \log(Rr_k)} \\
& = 2\pi \frac{\left(\overline{u}_k - \lambda_k + \frac{\bar{\rho}}{2\pi} \log \frac{R}{\delta} + \bar{\rho} A(p) + 2 \log \frac{\pi H(p)}{1+\bar{\alpha}} + o(1)\right)^2}{\frac{\lambda_k}{2(1+\bar{\alpha})} + \log \frac{R}{\delta}}. \tag{3.4}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.2), (3.3) and (3.4) with the fact that $J_{\rho_k}(u_k) = \inf_{\mathcal{H}} J_{\rho_k}$ is bounded, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{\rho_k}(u_k) & \geq \frac{\bar{\rho}^2}{2} A(p) + \bar{\rho} \log \frac{\pi H(p)}{1+\bar{\alpha}} - \bar{\rho} + \frac{\bar{\rho}^2}{4\pi} \log \frac{R}{\delta} + \rho_k \overline{u}_k \\
& \quad + \pi \frac{\left(\overline{u}_k - \lambda_k + \frac{\bar{\rho}}{2\pi} \log \frac{R}{\delta} + \bar{\rho} A_p + 2 \log \frac{\pi H(p)}{1+\bar{\alpha}} + o(1)\right)^2}{\frac{\lambda_k}{2(1+\bar{\alpha})} + \log \frac{R}{\delta}} \tag{3.5}
\end{aligned}$$

is bounded, dividing the quantity on the right-hand side of (3.5) by λ_k and letting k tend to ∞ one arrives at

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\overline{u}_k}{\lambda_k} - 1 + \frac{\frac{\bar{\rho}}{2\pi} \log \frac{R}{\delta} + \bar{\rho} A(p) + 2 \log \frac{\pi H(p)}{1+\bar{\alpha}} + o(1)}{\lambda_k} + \frac{2\rho_k}{\bar{\rho}} \right)^2 = 0.$$

Here and in the following we use $o(1)$ to denote terms which tend to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$ first and then $R \rightarrow \infty$ and $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Hence

$$\overline{u}_k = \left(1 - \frac{2\rho_k}{\bar{\rho}}\right) \lambda_k - \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}}{2\pi} \log \frac{R}{\delta} + \bar{\rho} A(p) + 2 \log \frac{\pi H(p)}{1+\bar{\alpha}} + o(1) \right).$$

Taking this into (3.5) and calculating directly we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{\rho_k}(u_k) & \geq -\frac{\bar{\rho}^2}{2} A(p) - \bar{\rho} \log \frac{\pi H(p)}{1+\bar{\alpha}} - \bar{\rho} \\
& \quad + \frac{\rho_k}{\bar{\rho}} (\bar{\rho} - \rho_k) \lambda_k + \frac{1}{4\pi} (\bar{\rho} - \rho_k)^2 \log \frac{R}{\delta} + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Then similar as Lemma 2.10 in [12] we have when (u_k) blows up,

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{\mathcal{H}} J_{\bar{\rho}}(u) &\geq \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} J_{\rho_k}(u_k) \geq -\frac{\bar{\rho}^2}{2} A(p) - \bar{\rho} \log \frac{\pi H(p)}{1 + \bar{\alpha}} - \bar{\rho} \\
&\geq -\bar{\rho} \left(1 + \log \frac{\pi}{1 + \bar{\alpha}} \right) \\
&\quad - \bar{\rho} \max_{p \in M_+, \alpha(p) = \bar{\alpha}} \left(4\pi A(p) + \log \left(h(p) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi \alpha_i G_{p_i}(p)} \right) \right). \quad (3.6)
\end{aligned}$$

4 The blowup sequence

Since we have derived an explicit lower bound of $J_{\bar{\rho}}$ when (u_k) blows up in the former section, the successful experiences in [12, 15, 28] tell us that, if we can construct a blowup sequence ϕ_ϵ which can make $J_{\bar{\rho}}(\phi_\epsilon) < \Lambda_{\bar{\rho}}$ for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, then the blowup will not happen and $J_{\bar{\rho}}$ attains its infimum.

Let $p \in M$ be such that $\alpha(p) = \bar{\alpha}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
&4\pi A(p) + \log \left(h(p) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi \alpha_i G_{p_i}(p)} \right) \\
&= \max_{q \in M_+, \alpha(q) = \bar{\alpha}} \left(4\pi A(q) + \log \left(h(q) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq q} e^{-4\pi \alpha_i G_{p_i}(q)} \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $(\Omega; (x_1, x_2))$ be an isothermal coordinate system around p and set

$$r(x_1, x_2) = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}, \quad \text{and } B_\delta(p) = \{(x_1, x_2) : r(x_1, x_2) < \delta\}.$$

We write near p the metric

$$g|_\Omega = e^{\psi(x_1, x_2)}(dx_1^2 + dx_2^2)$$

with $\psi(x_1, x_2) = O(r)$ ($r \rightarrow 0$). It is well known that

$$|\nabla u|^2 d\mu = |\nabla u|^2 dx_1 dx_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} ds_g = \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} r d\theta \quad \text{on } \partial B_r(p).$$

Denote $\gamma_\epsilon = \frac{\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\bar{\alpha})}}}{-\log \epsilon}$ and $r_\epsilon := \gamma_\epsilon \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2(1+\bar{\alpha})}}$. We define

$$\phi_\epsilon = \begin{cases} -2 \log(\epsilon + r^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})}) + \log \epsilon & \text{if } r \leq r_\epsilon, \\ \bar{\rho}(G_p - \eta\sigma) + C_\epsilon + \log \epsilon & \text{if } r \geq r_\epsilon, \end{cases}$$

where $r = \text{dist}(x, p)$, $\eta \in C_0^1(B_{2r_\epsilon}(p))$ is a radial cutoff function which satisfies $\eta \equiv 1$ in $B_{r_\epsilon}(p)$ and $|\nabla\eta| \leq Cr_\epsilon^{-1}$, and

$$C_\epsilon = -2 \log \frac{1 + \gamma_\epsilon^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})}}{\gamma_\epsilon^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})}} - \bar{\rho}A(p).$$

Now, by direct calculations

$$\int_{B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} |\nabla\phi_\epsilon|^2 d\mu = 2\bar{\rho} \log(1 + \gamma_\epsilon^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})}) - 2\bar{\rho} + o_\epsilon(1). \quad (4.1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{M \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} |\nabla\phi_\epsilon|^2 d\mu &= \bar{\rho}^2 \int_{M \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} |\nabla(G_p - \eta\beta)|^2 d\mu \\ &= \bar{\rho}^2 \int_{M \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} |\nabla G_p|^2 d\mu + \bar{\rho}^2 \int_{B_{2r_\epsilon}(p) \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} |\nabla(\eta\beta)|^2 d\mu \\ &\quad - 2\bar{\rho}^2 \int_{B_{2r_\epsilon}(p) \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} \nabla G_p \cdot \nabla(\eta\beta) d\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Do calculations, one has directly

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{M \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} |\nabla G_p|^2 d\mu &= - \int_{M \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} G_p \Delta G_p d\mu - \int_{\partial B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} G_p \frac{\partial G_p}{\partial n} ds_g \\ &= - \frac{1}{4\pi} \log r_\epsilon^2 + A(p) + o_\epsilon(1), \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

$$\int_{B_{2r_\epsilon}(p) \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} |\nabla(\eta\sigma)|^2 d\mu = o_\epsilon(1) \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &- 2 \int_{B_{2r_\epsilon}(p) \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} \nabla G_p \cdot \nabla(\eta\beta) d\mu \\ &= \int_{B_{2r_\epsilon}(p) \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} \eta\sigma \Delta G_p d\mu - \int_{\partial(B_{2r_\epsilon}(p) \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p))} \eta\sigma \frac{\partial G_p}{\partial n} ds_g \\ &= \int_{B_{2r_\epsilon}(p) \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} \eta\sigma d\mu + \int_{\partial B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} \sigma \frac{\partial G_p}{\partial r} ds_g = o_\epsilon(1). \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Substituting (4.3)-(4.5) into (4.2) and then together with (4.1) we have

$$\int_M |\nabla\phi_\epsilon|^2 d\mu = -2\bar{\rho} \log \epsilon - 2\bar{\rho} + \bar{\rho}^2 A(p) + o_\epsilon(1). \quad (4.6)$$

Calculating directly, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} -2 \log(\epsilon + r^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})}) d\mu \\
&= -2\pi r_\epsilon^2 \log(\epsilon + r_\epsilon^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})}) + \frac{\bar{\rho}}{2} \int_0^{r_\epsilon} \frac{r^{3+2\bar{\alpha}}}{\epsilon + r^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})}} dr \\
&\quad + O(r_\epsilon^4 \log(\epsilon + r_\epsilon^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})})) \\
&= o_\epsilon(1)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

since

$$0 < \int_0^{r_\epsilon} \frac{r^{3+2\bar{\alpha}}}{\epsilon + r^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})}} dr \leq \frac{1}{2} r_\epsilon^2.$$

It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{M \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} \phi_\epsilon d\mu \\
&= \bar{\rho} \int_{M \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} G_p - \bar{\rho} \int_{B_{2r_\epsilon}(p) \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} \eta \sigma + C_\epsilon(1 - \text{Vol}(B_{r_\epsilon}(p))) \\
&\quad + \log \epsilon(1 - \text{Vol}(B_{r_\epsilon}(p))) \\
&= C_\epsilon(1 - \text{Vol}(B_{r_\epsilon}(p))) + \log \epsilon(1 - \text{Vol}(B_{r_\epsilon}(p))) + o_\epsilon(1).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

By combining (4.7) and (4.8), we obtain that

$$\int_M \phi_\epsilon d\mu = \log \epsilon - \bar{\rho} A(p) + o_\epsilon(1). \tag{4.9}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}G_p} e^{\phi_\epsilon} d\mu \\
&= e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}A(p)} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{r_\epsilon} \frac{\epsilon r^{2\bar{\alpha}}}{(\epsilon + r^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})})^2} e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}\sigma + \psi} r dr d\theta \\
&= e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}A(p)} \int_0^{r_\epsilon} \frac{\epsilon r^{2\bar{\alpha}}}{(\epsilon + r^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})})^2} (2\pi + O(r^2)) r dr \\
&= \frac{\pi}{1 + \bar{\alpha}} e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}A(p)} \frac{\gamma_\epsilon^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})}}{1 + \gamma_\epsilon^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})}} + \pi e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}A(p)} O\left(\int_0^{r_\epsilon} \frac{\epsilon r^{3+2\bar{\alpha}}}{(\epsilon + r^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})})^2} dr\right) \\
&= \frac{\pi}{1 + \bar{\alpha}} e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}A(p)} + o_\epsilon(1),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where we have used

$$\int_0^{2\pi} e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}\sigma+\psi} d\theta = 2\pi + O(r^2)$$

and

$$0 < \int_0^{r_\epsilon} \frac{r^{3+2\bar{\alpha}}}{(\epsilon + r^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})})^2} dr \leq \frac{1}{-2\bar{\alpha}} r_\epsilon^{-2\bar{\alpha}}.$$

in the second equality and the last equality respectively.

By choosing $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small we can make the expansion of G_p hold in $B_\delta(p)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{M \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}G_p} e^{\phi_\epsilon} d\mu \\ &= \epsilon \int_{M \setminus B_\delta(p)} e^{4\pi(2+\bar{\alpha})G_p + C_\epsilon} d\mu + \epsilon \int_{B_\delta(p) \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} e^{4\pi(2+\bar{\alpha})G_p - \bar{\rho}\eta\sigma + C_\epsilon} d\mu \\ &= \epsilon e^{C_\epsilon} \int_{r_\epsilon}^\delta r^{-2(2+\bar{\alpha})} (2\pi + O(r^2)) r dr + o_\epsilon(1) \\ &= o_\epsilon(1), \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

where we have used the fact that $\gamma^{-2(1+\bar{\alpha})} = o_\epsilon(1)$ in the last equality. Combining (4.11) with (4.10) we have

$$\int_M e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}G_p} e^{\phi_\epsilon} = \frac{\pi}{1+\bar{\alpha}} e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}A(p)} + o_\epsilon(1).$$

It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M h e^{-h_\ell} e^{\phi_\epsilon} &= h(p) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}(p)} \int_M e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}G_p} e^{\phi_\epsilon} \\ &+ \int_M \left(h \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}} - h(p) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}(p)} \right) e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}G_p} e^{\phi_\epsilon} \end{aligned}$$

By direct calculations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_{r_\epsilon}} \left(h \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}} - h(p) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}(p)} \right) e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}G_p} e^{\phi_\epsilon} \\ &= O(1) \int_0^{r_\epsilon} \frac{\epsilon r^{3+2\bar{\alpha}}}{(\epsilon + r^{2(1+\bar{\alpha})})^2} dr + o_\epsilon(1) = o_\epsilon(1) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{M \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} \left(h \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}} - h(p) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}(p)} \right) e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}G_p} e^{\phi_\epsilon} \\
&= \int_{B_\delta(p) \setminus B_{r_\epsilon}(p)} \left(h \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}} - h(p) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}(p)} \right) e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}G_p} e^{\phi_\epsilon} \\
&+ \int_{M \setminus B_\delta(p)} \left(h \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}} - h(p) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}(p)} \right) e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}G_p} e^{\phi_\epsilon} \\
&= o_\epsilon(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\int_M \left(h \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}} - h(p) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}(p)} \right) e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}G_p} e^{\phi_\epsilon} = o_\epsilon(1).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_M h e^{-h_\ell} e^{\phi_\epsilon} \\
&= h(p) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}(p)} \int_M e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}G_p} e^{\phi_\epsilon} \\
&+ \int_M \left(h \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}} - h(p) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}(p)} \right) e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}G_p} e^{\phi_\epsilon} \\
&= h(p) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}(p)} \left[\frac{\pi}{1 + \bar{\alpha}} e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}A(p)} + o_\epsilon(1) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\log \int_M h e^{-h_\ell} e^{\phi_\epsilon} = \log \left(\frac{\pi}{1 + \bar{\alpha}} e^{-4\pi\bar{\alpha}A(p)} h(p) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq p} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}(p)} \right) + o_\epsilon(1). \quad (4.12)$$

We put (4.6), (4.9) and (4.12) together and obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} J_{\bar{\rho}}(\phi_\epsilon) &= -\bar{\rho} \left(1 + \log \frac{\pi}{1 + \bar{\alpha}} \right) \\
&- \bar{\rho} \max_{q \in M_+, \alpha(q) = \bar{\alpha}} \left(4\pi A(q) + \log \left(h(q) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, p_i \neq q} e^{-4\pi\alpha_i G_{p_i}(q)} \right) \right). \quad (4.13)
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 1. *If the reader is familiar with [12], it is easy to ask that, suppose (u_k) blows up at some p with $h(p) > 0$ and $\alpha(p) = \bar{\alpha}$, can we add condition on h at p like what were done by Ding-Jost-Li-Wang to derive a sufficient condition for the existence of Eq. (1.3)? In fact, since of the conical singularities, the blow up (if happens) must at the most singular point p . This is the first thing that prevents us to using the value of $\Delta \log h(p)$ to given a sufficient condition; the second thing can be noticed by dedicate calculations like in [12], which can be interpreted by*

$$\int r^{-1} dr = \log r + c \rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \int r^{-1-2\bar{\alpha}} dr = r^{-2\bar{\alpha}} + c \rightarrow 0$$

as $r \rightarrow 0$ (for fixed c).

5 Complement of the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and 1.2

In this last section, we complete the proofs of our main theorems.

It is easy to see that Theorem 1.1 follows from (3.6) and (4.13) directly. Notice that, either (i) or (ii) in Theorem 1.2 holds, we know from Theorem 1.1 and its proof that (u_k) does not blow up, then $J_{\bar{p}}$ attains its infimum and Eq. (1.3) has a solution. \square

Acknowledgement The main part of this paper was finished when the author visited School of Mathematics Science and China-France Mathematics Center at University of Science and Technology of China. He would like to thank them for their enthusiasm and the excellent working conditions they supplied for him.

References

- [1] Bartolucci, D., Gui, C., Jevnikar, A., Moradifam, A., A singular sphere covering inequality: uniqueness and symmetry of solutions to singular Liouville-type equations, *Math. Ann.* 374 (2019), no. 3-4, 1883–1922.
- [2] Bartolucci, D., Tarantello, G., Liouville type equations with singular data and their applications to periodic multivortices for the electroweak theory, *Comm. Math. Phys* 229 (2002), no. 1, 3–47.

- [3] Brezis, H., Merle, F., Uniform estimates and blow-up behavior of solutions of $-\Delta u = V(x)e^u$ in two dimensions, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 16 (1991), no. 8-9, 1223–1253.
- [4] Caffarelli, L., Yang, Y., Vortex condensation in the Chern-Simons Higgs model: an existence theorem, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 168 (1995), no. 2, 321–336.
- [5] Castéras, J.-B., A mean field type flow II: Existence and convergence, *Pacific J. Math.* 276 (2015), no. 2, 321–345.
- [6] Chen, Q., Wang, W., Wu, Y., Xu, B., Conformal metrics with constant curvature one and finitely many conical singularities on compact Riemann surfaces, *Pacific J. Math.* 273 (2015), no. 1, 75–100.
- [7] Chen, W., A Trüdinger inequality on surfaces with conical singularities, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 108 (1990), no. 3, 821–832.
- [8] Chen, W., Li, C., Classification of solutions of some nonlinear elliptic equations, *Duke Math. J.* 63 (1991), no. 3, 615–622.
- [9] Chen, W., Li, C., Prescribing Gaussian curvatures on surfaces with conical singularities, *J. Geom. Anal.* 1 (1991), no. 4, 359–372.
- [10] D’Aprile, T., De Marchis, F., Ianni, I., Isabella, Prescribed Gauss curvature problem on singular surfaces, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 57 (2018), no. 4, Paper No. 99.
- [11] Dey, S., Spherical metrics with conical singularities on 2-spheres, *Geom. Dedicata* 196 (2018), 53–61.
- [12] Ding, W., Jost, J., Li, J., Wang, G., The differential equation $\Delta u = 8\pi - 8\pi h e^u$ on a compact Riemann surface, *Asian J. Math.* 1 (1997), no. 2, 230–248.
- [13] Eremenko, A., Metrics of positive curvature with conic singularities on the sphere, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 132 (2004), no. 11, 3349–3355.
- [14] Eremenko, A., Metrics of constant positive curvature with four conic singularities on the sphere, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 148 (2020), no. 9, 3957–3965.
- [15] Escobar, J., Schoen, R., Conformal metrics with prescribed scalar curvature, *Invent. Math.* 86 (1986), no. 2, 243–254.
- [16] Hong, J., Kim, Y., Pac, P., Multivortex solutions of the abelian Chern-Simons-Higgs theory, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 64 (1990), no. 19, 2230–2233.

- [17] Jackiw, R., Weinberg, E., Self-dual Chern-Simons vortices, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 64 (1990), no. 19, 2234–2237.
- [18] Kazdan, J., Warner, F., Curvature functions for compact 2-manifolds, *Ann. of Math. (2)* 99 (1974), 14–47.
- [19] Kalvin, V., Determinants of Laplacians for constant curvature metrics with three conical singularities on the 2-sphere, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 62 (2023), no. 2, Paper No. 59.
- [20] Lai, M., Metric aspects of conic surfaces, *Front. Math. China* 11 (2016), no. 5, 1291–1312.
- [21] Li, J., Variational approach to various nonlinear problems in geometry and physics, *Front. Math. China* 3 (2008), no. 2, 205–220.
- [22] Li, J., Zhu, C., The convergence of the mean field type flow at a critical case, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 58 (2019), no. 2, Paper No. 60.
- [23] Li, M., Xu, X., A flow approach to mean field equation, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 61 (2022), no. 4, Paper No. 143.
- [24] Li, Y., Moser-Trudinger inequality on compact Riemannian manifolds of dimension two, *J. Partial Differential Equations* 14 (2001), no. 2, 163–192.
- [25] Luo, F., Tian, G., Liouville equation and spherical convex polytopes, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 116 (1992), no. 4, 1119–1129.
- [26] Malchiodi, A., Ruiz, D., New improved Moser-Trudinger inequalities and singular Liouville equations on compact surfaces, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 21 (2011), no. 5, 1196–1217.
- [27] Mancini, G., Onofri-type inequalities for singular Liouville equations, *J. Geom. Anal.* 26 (2016), no. 2, 1202–1230.
- [28] Schoen, R., Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to constant scalar curvature, *J. Differential Geom.* 20 (1984), no. 2, 479–495.
- [29] Struwe, M., *Variational method*, vol. 34, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996, xvi+272 pp. ISBN: 3-540-58859-0.
- [30] Sun, L., Zhu, J., Global existence and convergence of a flow to Kazdan-Warner equation with non-negative prescribed function, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 60 (2021), no. 1, Paper No. 42.

- [31] Sun, L., Zhu, J., Existence of Kazdan-Warner equation with sign-changing prescribed function, arXiv:2012.12840.
- [32] Tarantello, G., Multiple condensate solutions for the Chern-Simons-Higgs theory, *J. Math. Phys.* 37 (1996), no. 8, 3769–3796.
- [33] Tarantello, G., Analytical, geometrical and topological aspects of a class of mean field equations on surfaces, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 28 (2010), no. 3, 931–973.
- [34] Troyanov, M., Metrics of constant curvature on a sphere with two conical singularities, *Differential geometry (Peñíscola, 1988)*, *Lecture Notes in Math.* 1410 (1989), 296–306.
- [35] Troyanov, M., Prescribing curvature on compact surfaces with conical singularities, *Tran. Amer. Math. Soc.* 324 (1991) no. 2, 793–821.
- [36] Umehara, M., Yamada, K., Metrics of constant curvature 1 with three conical singularities on the 2-sphere, *Illinois J. Math.* 44 (2000), no. 1, 72–94.
- [37] Wang, Y., Yang, Y., A mean field type flow with sign-changing prescribed function on a symmetric Riemann surface, *J. Funct. Anal.* 282 (2022), no. 11, Paper No. 109449.
- [38] Yang, Y., A Trudinger-Moser inequality on a compact Riemannian surface involving Gaussian curvature, *J. Geom. Anal.* 26 (2016), no. 4, 2893–2913.
- [39] Yang, Y., Zhu, X., A remark on a result of Ding-Jost-Li-Wang, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 145 (2017), no. 9, 3953–3959.
- [40] Yang, Y., Zhu, X., Existence of solutions to a class of Kazdan-Warner equations on compact Riemannian surface, *Sci. China Math.* 61 (2018), no. 6, 1109–1128.
- [41] Zhu, X., A weak Trudinger-Moser inequality with a singular weight on a compact Riemannian surface, *Commun. Math. Stat.* 5 (2017), no. 1, 37–57.
- [42] Zhu, X., A generalized Trudinger-Moser inequality on a compact Riemannian surface with conical singularities, *Sci. China Math.* 62 (2019), no. 4, 699–718.
- [43] Zhu, X., Another remark on a result of Ding-Jost-Li-Wang, arXiv:2212.09943.
- [44] Zhu, X., Rigidity of a family of spherical conical metrics, *New York J. Math.* 26 (2020), 272–284.