



**HAL**  
open science

## Smooth Yamabe invariant and surgery

Bernd Ammann, Mattias Dahl, Emmanuel Humbert

► **To cite this version:**

Bernd Ammann, Mattias Dahl, Emmanuel Humbert. Smooth Yamabe invariant and surgery. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 2013, 94 (1), pp.1-58. hal-00271361v3

**HAL Id: hal-00271361**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00271361v3>**

Submitted on 9 Dec 2008

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# SMOOTH YAMABE INVARIANT AND SURGERY

BERND AMMANN, MATTIAS DAHL, AND EMMANUEL HUMBERT

ABSTRACT. We prove a surgery formula for the smooth Yamabe invariant  $\sigma(M)$  of a compact manifold  $M$ . Assume that  $N$  is obtained from  $M$  by surgery of codimension at least 3. We prove the existence of a positive constant  $\Lambda_n$ , depending only on the dimension  $n$  of  $M$ , such that

$$\sigma(N) \geq \min\{\sigma(M), \Lambda_n\}.$$

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Main result	2
1.2. Background	2
1.3. Stronger version of the main result	6
1.4. Topological applications	7
1.5. Comparison to other results	8
2. The connected sum along a submanifold	9
3. The constants $\Lambda_{n,k}$	10
3.1. The manifolds $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$	10
3.2. Definition of $\Lambda_{n,k}$	11
3.3. Proof of $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(1)} > 0$	11
3.4. Proof of $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(2)} > 0$	14
3.5. The constants $\Lambda_{n,0}$	15
3.6. Speculation about $\Lambda_{n,k}$ for $k \geq 1$	16
4. Limit spaces and limit solutions	17
5. $L^2$ -estimates on $WS$ -bundles	18
5.1. Definition and statement of the result	18
5.2. Proof of Theorem 5.2	20
6. Proof of Theorem 1.3	27
6.1. Stronger version of Theorem 1.3	27
6.2. Definition of the metrics $g_\theta$	28
6.3. Geometric description of the new metrics	31
6.4. Proof of Theorem 6.1	32
Appendix A. Scalar curvature	43
Appendix B. Details for equation (16)	44
Appendix C. A cut-off formula	44

---

*Date:* December 9th, 2008.

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J60 (Primary), 35P30, 57R65, 58J50, 58C40 (Secondary).

*Key words and phrases.* Yamabe operator, Yamabe invariant, surgery, positive scalar curvature.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Main result.** The smooth Yamabe invariant, also called Schoen's  $\sigma$ -invariant, of a compact manifold  $M$  is defined as

$$\sigma(M) := \sup \inf \int_M \text{Scal}^g dv^g,$$

where the supremum runs over all conformal classes  $[g_0]$  on  $M$  and the infimum runs over all metrics  $g$  of volume 1 in  $[g_0]$ . The integral  $\mathcal{E}(g) := \int_M \text{Scal}^g dv^g$  is the integral of the scalar curvature of  $g$  integrated with respect to the volume element of  $g$  and is known as the Einstein-Hilbert-functional.

Let  $n = \dim M$ . We assume that  $N$  is obtained from  $M$  by surgery of codimension  $n - k \geq 3$ . That is for a given embedding  $S^k \hookrightarrow M$ , with trivial normal bundle,  $0 \leq k \leq n - 3$ , we remove a tubular neighborhood  $U - \epsilon(S^k)$  of this embedding. The resulting manifold has boundary  $S^k \times S^{n-k-1}$ . This boundary is glued together with the boundary of  $B^{k+1} \times S^{n-k-1}$ , and we thus obtain the closed smooth manifold

$$N := (M \setminus U_\epsilon(S^k)) \cup_{S^k \times S^{n-k-1}} (B^{k+1} \times S^{n-k-1}).$$

Our main result is the existence of a positive constant  $\Lambda_n$  depending only on  $n$  such that

$$\sigma(N) \geq \min\{\sigma(M), \Lambda_n\}.$$

This formula unifies and generalizes previous results by Gromov-Lawson, Schoen-Yau, Kobayashi, Petean-Yun and allows many conclusions by using bordism theory.

In Section 1.2 we give a detailed description of the background of our result. The construction of a generalization of surgery is recalled in Section 2. Then, in Section 3 the constant  $\Lambda_n$  is described and it is proven to be positive. After the proof of some preliminary results on limit spaces in Section 4, we derive a key estimate in Section 5, namely an estimate for the  $L^2$ -norm of solutions of a perturbed Yamabe equation on a special kind of sphere bundle, called  $WS$ -bundle. The last section contains the proof of the main theorem, Theorem 1.3.

**1.2. Background.** We denote by  $B^n(r)$  the open ball of radius  $r$  around 0 in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and we set  $B^n := B^n(1)$ . The unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted by  $S^{n-1}$ . By  $\xi^n$  we denote the standard flat metric on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and by  $\sigma^{n-1}$  the standard metric of constant sectional curvature 1 on  $S^{n-1}$ . We denote the Riemannian manifold  $(S^{n-1}, \sigma^{n-1})$  by  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ .

Let  $(M, g)$  be a Riemannian manifold of dimension  $n$ . The Yamabe operator, or Conformal Laplacian, acting on smooth functions on  $M$  is defined by

$$L^g u = a \Delta^g u + \text{Scal}^g u,$$

where  $a := \frac{4(n-1)}{n-2}$ . Let  $p := \frac{2n}{n-2}$ . Define the functional  $J^g$  acting on non-zero compactly supported smooth functions on  $M$  by

$$J^g(u) := \frac{\int_M u L^g u dv^g}{\left(\int_M u^p dv^g\right)^{\frac{2}{p}}}. \quad (1)$$

If  $g$  and  $\tilde{g} = f^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g = f^{p-2}g$  are conformal metrics on  $M$ , then the corresponding Yamabe operators are related by

$$L^{\tilde{g}}u = f^{-\frac{n+2}{n-2}}L^g(fu) = f^{1-p}L^g(fu). \quad (2)$$

It follows that

$$J^{\tilde{g}}(u) = J^g(fu). \quad (3)$$

For a compact Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$  the conformal Yamabe invariant is defined by

$$\mu(M, g) := \inf J^g(u) \in \mathbb{R},$$

where the infimum is taken over all non-zero smooth functions  $u$  on  $M$ . The same value of  $\mu(M, g)$  is obtained by taking the infimum over positive smooth functions. From (3) it follows that the invariant  $\mu$  depends only on the conformal class  $[g]$  of  $g$ , and the notation  $\mu(M, [g]) = \mu(M, g)$  is also used. For the standard sphere we have

$$\mu(\mathbb{S}^n) = n(n-1)\omega_n^{2/n}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\omega_n$  denotes the volume of  $\mathbb{S}^n$ . This value is a universal upper bound for  $\mu$ .

**Theorem 1.1** ([7, Lemma 3]). *The inequality*

$$\mu(M, g) \leq \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$$

*holds for any compact Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$ .*

For  $u > 0$  the  $J^g$ -functional is related to the Einstein-Hilbert-functional via

$$J^g(u) = \frac{\mathcal{E}(u^{4/(n-2)}g)}{\text{Vol}(M, u^{4/(n-2)}g)^{\frac{n-2}{n}}}, \quad \forall u \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R}^+),$$

and it follows that  $\mu(M, g)$  has the alternative characterization

$$\mu(M, g) = \inf_{\tilde{g} \in [g]} \frac{\mathcal{E}(\tilde{g})}{\text{Vol}(M, \tilde{g})^{\frac{n-2}{n}}}.$$

Critical points of the functional  $J^g$  are given by solutions of the Yamabe equation

$$L^g u = \mu |u|^{p-2} u$$

for some  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ . If the inequality in Theorem 1.1 is satisfied strictly, that is if  $\mu(M, g) < \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$ , then the infimum in the definition of  $\mu(M, g)$  is attained.

**Theorem 1.2** ([42, 7]). *Let  $M$  be connected. If  $\mu(M, g) < \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$  then there exists a smooth positive function  $u$  with  $J^g(u) = \mu$  and  $\|u\|_{L^p} = 1$ . This implies that  $u$  solves (5) with  $\mu = \mu(M, g)$ . The minimizer  $u$  is unique if  $\mu \leq 0$ .*

The inequality  $\mu(M, g) < \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$  was shown by Aubin [7] for non-conformally flat, compact manifolds of dimension at least 6. Later Schoen [36] could apply the positive mass theorem to obtain this strict inequality for all compact manifolds not conformal to the standard sphere. We thus have a solution of

$$L^g u = \mu u^{p-1}, \quad u > 0. \quad (5)$$

To explain the geometric meaning of these results we recall a few facts about the Yamabe problem, see for example [29] and [41, Chapter 5] for more details on this material. The name of Yamabe is associated to the problem, as Yamabe wrote the first article about this subject [43].

For a given compact Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$  the Yamabe problem consists of finding a metric of constant scalar curvature in the conformal class of  $g$ . The

above results yield a minimizer  $u$  for  $J^g$ . Equation (5) is equivalent to the fact that the scalar curvature of the metric  $u^{4/(n-2)}g$  is everywhere equal to  $\mu$ . Thus, the above Theorem, together with  $\mu(M, g) < \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$ , resolves the Yamabe problem.

A conformal class  $[g]$  on  $M$  contains a metric of positive scalar curvature if and only if  $\mu(M, [g]) > 0$ . If  $M = M_1 \amalg M_2$  is a disjoint union of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  and if  $g_i$  is the restriction of  $g$  to  $M_i$ , then

$$\mu(M, [g]) = \min \{ \mu(M_1, [g_1]), \mu(M_2, [g_2]) \}$$

if  $\mu(M_1, [g_1]) \geq 0$  or  $\mu(M_2, [g_2]) \geq 0$ , and otherwise

$$\mu(M, [g]) = - \left( |\mu(M_1, [g_1])|^{n/2} + |\mu(M_2, [g_2])|^{n/2} \right)^{2/n}.$$

One now defines the smooth Yamabe invariant as

$$\sigma(M) := \sup \mu(M, [g]) \leq n(n-1)\omega_n^{2/n},$$

where the supremum is taken over all conformal classes  $[g]$  on  $M$ .

The introduction of this invariant was originally motivated by Yamabe's attempt to find Einstein metrics on a given compact manifold, see [37] and [26]. Yamabe's idea in the early 1960's was to search for a conformal class  $[g_{\text{sup}}]$  that attains the supremum. The minimizer  $g_0$  of  $\mathcal{E}$  among all unit volume metrics in  $[g_{\text{sup}}]$  exists according to Theorem 1.2, and Yamabe hoped that the  $g_0$  obtained with this minimax procedure would be a stationary point of  $\mathcal{E}$  among all unit volume metrics (without fixed conformal class), which is equivalent to  $g_0$  being an Einstein metric.

Yamabe's approach was very ambitious. If  $M$  is a simply connected compact 3-manifold, then an Einstein metric on  $M$  is necessarily a round metric on  $S^3$ , hence the 3-dimensional Poincaré conjecture would follow. It turned out, that his approach actually yields an Einstein metric in some special cases. For example, LeBrun [27] showed that if a compact 4-dimensional  $M$  carries a Kähler-Einstein metric with non-positive scalar curvature, then the supremum is attained by the conformal class of this metric. Moreover, in any maximizing conformal class the minimizer is a Kähler-Einstein metric.

Compact quotients  $M = \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^3$  of 3-dimensional hyperbolic space  $\mathbb{H}^3$  yield other examples on which Yamabe's approach yields an Einstein metric. On such quotients the supremum is attained by the hyperbolic metric on  $M$ . The proof of this statement uses Perelman's proof of the Geometrization conjecture, see [6]. In particular,  $\sigma(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^3) = -6(v_\Gamma)^{2/3}$  where  $v_\Gamma$  is the volume of  $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^3$  with respect to the hyperbolic metric.

On a general manifold, Yamabe's approach failed for various reasons. In dimension 3 and 4 obstructions against the existence of Einstein metrics are known today, see for example [25, 28]. In many cases the supremum is not attained.

R. Schoen and O. Kobayashi started to study the  $\sigma$ -invariant systematically in the late 1980's, [37, 38, 22, 23]. In particular, they determined  $\sigma(S^{n-1} \times S^1)$  to be  $\sigma(S^n) = n(n-1)\omega_n^{2/n}$ . On  $S^{n-1} \times S^1$  the supremum in the definition of  $\sigma$  is not attained. In order to commemorate Schoen's important contributions in these articles, the  $\sigma$ -invariant is also often called Schoen's  $\sigma$ -constant.

The smooth Yamabe invariant determines the existence of positive scalar curvature metrics. Namely, it follows from above that the smooth Yamabe invariant  $\sigma(M)$  is positive if and only if the manifold  $M$  admits a metric of positive scalar

curvature. Thus the value of  $\sigma(M)$  can be interpreted as a quantitative refinement of the property of admitting a positive scalar curvature metric.

In general calculating the  $\sigma$ -invariant is very difficult. LeBrun [25, Section 5], [27] showed that the  $\sigma$ -invariant of a complex algebraic surfaces is negative (resp. zero) if and only if it is of general type (resp. of Kodaira dimension 0 or 1), and the value of  $\sigma(M)$  can be calculated explicitly in these cases. As already explained above, the  $\sigma$ -invariant can also be calculated for hyperbolic 3-manifolds, they are realized by the hyperbolic metrics.

There are many manifolds admitting a Ricci-flat metric, but no metric of positive scalar curvature, for example tori, K3-surfaces and compact connected 8-dimensional manifolds admitting metrics with holonomy  $\text{Spin}(7)$ . These conditions imply  $\sigma(M) = 0$ , and the supremum is attained.

Conversely, Bourguignon showed that if  $\sigma(M) = 0$  and if the supremum is attained by a conformal class  $[g_{\text{sup}}]$ , then  $\mathcal{E} : [g_{\text{sup}}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  attains its minimum in a Ricci-flat metric  $g_0 \in [g_{\text{sup}}]$ . Thus Cheeger's splitting principle implies topological restrictions on  $M$  in this case. In particular, a compact quotient  $\Gamma \backslash N$  of a non-abelian nilpotent Lie group  $N$  does not admit metrics of non-negative scalar curvature, but it admits a sequence of metrics  $g_i$  with  $\mu(\Gamma \backslash N, g_i) \rightarrow 0$ . Thus  $\Gamma \backslash N$  is an example of a manifold for which  $\sigma(\Gamma \backslash N) = 0$ , for which the supremum is not attained.

All the examples mentioned up to here have  $\sigma(M) \leq 0$ . Positive smooth Yamabe invariants are even harder to determine. The calculation of non-positive  $\sigma(M)$  often relies on the formula

$$|\min\{\sigma(M), 0\}|^{n/2} = \inf_g \int_M |\text{Scal}^g|^{n/2} dv^g$$

where the infimum runs over all metrics on  $M$ . This formula does not distinguish between different positive values of  $\sigma(M)$ , and thus it cannot be used in the positive case.

It has been conjectured by Schoen [38, Page 10, lines 6–11] that all finite quotients of round spheres satisfy  $\sigma(S^n/\Gamma) = (\#\Gamma)^{-2/n} Y(S^n)$ , but this conjecture is only verified for  $\mathbb{R}P^3$  [10], namely  $\sigma(\mathbb{R}P^3) = 6(\omega_3/2)^{2/3}$ . The  $\sigma$ -invariant is also known for connected sums of  $\mathbb{R}P^3$ 's with  $S^2 \times S^1$ 's [3], for  $\mathbb{C}P^2$  [17] and for connected sums of  $\mathbb{C}P^2$  with several copies of  $S^3 \times S^1$ . With similar methods, it can also be determined for some related manifolds, but for example the value of  $\sigma(S^2 \times S^2)$  is not known. To the knowledge of the authors there are no manifolds  $M$  of dimension  $n \geq 5$  for which it has been shown that  $0 < \sigma(M) < \sigma(S^n)$ , but due to Schoen's conjecture finite quotients of spheres would be examples of such manifolds.

As explicit calculation of the Yamabe invariant is difficult, it is natural to use surgery theory to get estimates for more complicated examples. Several articles study the behavior of the smooth Yamabe invariant under surgery. In [16] and [39] it is proven that the existence of a positive scalar curvature metric is preserved under surgeries of codimension at least 3. In terms of the  $\sigma$ -invariant this means that if  $N$  is obtained from a compact manifold  $M$  by surgery of codimension at least 3 and  $\sigma(M) > 0$ , then  $\sigma(N) > 0$ .

Later Kobayashi proved in [23] that if  $N$  is obtained from  $M$  by 0-dimensional surgery, then  $\sigma(N) \geq \sigma(M)$ . A first consequence is an alternative deduction of

$\sigma(S^{n-1} \times S^1) = \sigma(S^n)$  using the fact that  $S^{n-1} \times S^1$  is obtained from  $S^n$  by 0-dimensional surgery. More generally one sees that  $\sigma(S^{n-1} \times S^1 \# \dots \# S^{n-1} \times S^1) = \sigma(S^n)$  as this connected sum is obtained from  $S^n$  by 0-dimensional surgeries as well.

Note that it follows from what we said above that the smooth Yamabe invariant of disjoint unions  $M = M_1 \amalg M_2$  satisfies

$$\sigma(M) = \min \{ \sigma(M_1), \sigma(M_2) \}$$

if  $\sigma(M_1) \geq 0$  or  $\sigma(M_2) \geq 0$ , and otherwise

$$\sigma(M) = - \left( |\sigma(M_1)|^{n/2} + |\sigma(M_2)|^{n/2} \right)^{2/n}.$$

Kobayashi's result then implies  $\sigma(M_1 \# M_2) \geq \sigma(M_1 \amalg M_2)$ , and thus yields a lower bound for  $\sigma(M_1 \# M_2)$  in terms of  $\sigma(M_1)$  and  $\sigma(M_2)$ .

A similar monotonicity formula for the  $\sigma$ -invariant was proved by Petean and Yun in [33]. They prove that  $\sigma(N) \geq \min \{ \sigma(M), 0 \}$  if  $N$  is obtained from  $M$  by surgery of codimension at least 3. See also [26, Proposition 4.1], [1] for other approaches to this result. Clearly, this surgery result is particularly interesting in the case  $\sigma(M) \leq 0$ , and it has several fruitful applications. In particular, any simply connected compact manifold of dimension at least 5 has  $\sigma(M) \geq 0$ , [32]. This result has been generalized to manifolds with certain types of fundamental group in [9].

**1.3. Stronger version of the main result.** In the present article we prove a surgery formula which is stronger than the Gromov-Lawson/Schoen-Yau surgery formula, the Kobayashi surgery formula and the Petean-Yun surgery formula described above. Suppose that  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are compact manifolds of dimension  $n$  and that  $W$  is a compact manifold of dimension  $k$ . Let embeddings  $W \hookrightarrow M_1$  and  $W \hookrightarrow M_2$  be given. We assume further that the normal bundles of these embeddings are trivial. Removing tubular neighborhoods of the images of  $W$  in  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ , and gluing together these manifolds along their common boundary, we get a new compact manifold  $N$ , the connected sum of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  along  $W$ . Strictly speaking  $N$  also depends on the choice of trivialization of the normal bundle. See section 2 for more details.

Surgery is a special case of this construction: if  $M_2 = S^n$ ,  $W = S^k$  and if  $S^k \hookrightarrow S^n$  is the standard embedding, then  $N$  is obtained from  $M_1$  via  $k$ -dimensional surgery along  $S^k \hookrightarrow M_1$ .

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  be compact manifolds of dimension  $n$ . If  $N$  is obtained as a connected sum of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  along a  $k$ -dimensional submanifold where  $k \leq n - 3$ , then*

$$\sigma(N) \geq \min \{ \sigma(M_1 \amalg M_2), \Lambda_{n,k} \}$$

where  $\Lambda_{n,k}$  is positive, and only depends on  $n$  and  $k$ . Furthermore  $\Lambda_{n,0} = \sigma(S^n)$ .

From Theorem 1.1 we know that  $\sigma(M) \leq \sigma(S^n)$  and thus  $\sigma(M \amalg S^n) = \sigma(M)$  for all compact  $M$ . Hence, we obtain for the special case of surgery the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.4.** *Let  $M$  be a compact manifold of dimension  $n$ . Assume that  $N$  is obtained from  $M$  via surgery along a  $k$ -dimensional sphere  $W$ ,  $k \leq n - 3$ . We then have*

$$\sigma(N) \geq \min \{ \sigma(M), \Lambda_{n,k} \}$$

The constants  $\Lambda_{n,k}$  will be defined in Section 3. In Subsections 3.3 and 3.4 we prove that these constants are positive, and in Subsection 3.5 we prove that  $\Lambda_{n,0} = \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$ . However, an explicit calculation of  $\Lambda_{n,k}$  for  $k > 0$  seems very difficult. The main problem consists in calculating the conformal Yamabe invariant of certain Riemannian products, which in general is a hard problem. See [2] for recent progress on this problem.

**1.4. Topological applications.** The above surgery result can be combined with standard techniques of bordism theory. Such applications will be the subject of a sequel to this article, and we will only give some typical conclusions as examples here.

The first corollary uses the fact that spin bordism groups and oriented bordism groups are finitely generated together with techniques developed for the proof of the  $h$ -cobordism theorem.

**Corollary 1.5.** *For any  $n \geq 5$  there is a constant  $C_n > 0$ , depending only on  $n$ , such that*

$$\sigma(M) \in \{0\} \cup [C_n, \sigma(S^n)]$$

for any simply-connected compact manifold  $M$  of dimension  $n$ .

We now sketch how interesting bordism invariants can be constructed using our main result. This construction will be explained here only for spin manifolds, but similar constructions can also be done for oriented, non-spin manifolds or for non-oriented manifolds.

Fix a finitely presented group  $\Gamma$ , and let  $B\Gamma$  be the classifying space of  $\Gamma$ . We consider pairs  $(M, f)$  where  $M$  is a compact spin manifold and where  $f : M \rightarrow B\Gamma$  is continuous. Two such pairs  $(M_1, f_1)$  and  $(M_2, f_2)$  are called spin bordant over  $B\Gamma$  if there exists an  $(n+1)$ -dimensional spin manifold  $W$  with boundary  $-M_1 \cup M_2$  with a map  $F : W \rightarrow B\Gamma$  such that the restriction of  $F$  to the boundary yields  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ . It is implicitly required that the boundary carries the induced orientation and spin structure and  $-M_1$  denotes  $M_1$  with reversed orientation. Being spin bordant over  $B\Gamma$  is an equivalence relation. The equivalence class of  $(M, f)$  under this equivalence relation is denoted by  $[M, f]$  and the set of equivalence classes is called  $\Omega_n^{\text{Spin}}(B\Gamma)$ . Disjoint union of manifolds defines a sum on  $\Omega_n^{\text{Spin}}(B\Gamma)$  which turns it into a group.

We say that a pair  $(M, f)$  with  $f : M \rightarrow B\Gamma$  is a  $\pi_1$ -bijective representative of  $[M, f]$  if  $M$  is connected and if the induced map  $f_* : \pi_1(M) \rightarrow \Gamma$  is a bijection. Any equivalence class in  $\Omega_n^{\text{Spin}}(B\Gamma)$  has a  $\pi_1$ -bijective representative.

Now we define

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_n &:= \min\{\Lambda_{n,1}, \dots, \Lambda_{n,n-3}\} > 0, \\ \bar{\sigma}(M) &:= \min\{\sigma(M), \Lambda_n\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 1.6.** *Let  $n \geq 5$ . Let  $(M_1, f_1)$  and  $(M_2, f_2)$  be compact spin manifolds with maps  $f_i : M_i \rightarrow B\Gamma$ . If  $(M_1, f_1)$  and  $(M_2, f_2)$  are spin bordant over  $B\Gamma$  and if  $(M_2, f_2)$  is a  $\pi_1$ -bijective representative of its class, then*

$$\bar{\sigma}(M_1) \leq \bar{\sigma}(M_2).$$

We define  $s_\Gamma : \Omega_n^{\text{Spin}}(B\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$s_\Gamma([M, f]) := \sup_{(M_1, f_1) \in [M, f]} \bar{\sigma}(M_1).$$



The proposition states  $s_\Gamma([M, f]) = \bar{\sigma}(M)$  if  $(M, f)$  is a  $\pi_1$ -bijective representative of its class. The surgery formula further implies

$$s_\Gamma\left([M_1, f_1] + [M_2, f_2]\right) \geq \min\left\{s_\Gamma([M_1, f_1]), s_\Gamma([M_2, f_2])\right\}$$

if  $s_\Gamma([M_1, f_1]) \geq 0$  or  $s_\Gamma([M_2, f_2]) \geq 0$ , and otherwise

$$s_\Gamma\left([M_1, f_1] + [M_2, f_2]\right) \geq -\left(|s_\Gamma([M_1, f_1])|^{n/2} + |s_\Gamma([M_2, f_2])|^{n/2}\right)^{2/n}.$$

We conclude, and obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.7.** *Let  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $t \geq 0$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n \geq 5$ . Then the sets*

$$G(t) := \{[M, f] \in \Omega_n^{\text{Spin}}(B\Gamma) \mid s_\Gamma([M, f]) > t\}$$

and

$$\bar{G}(t) := \{[M, f] \in \Omega_n^{\text{Spin}}(B\Gamma) \mid s_\Gamma([M, f]) \geq t\}$$

are subgroups of  $\Omega_n^{\text{Spin}}(B\Gamma)$ .

The theorem admits — among other interesting conclusions — the following application. For a positive integer  $p$  we write  $p\#M$  for  $M\#\cdots\#M$  where  $M$  appears  $p$  times. We already know  $\sigma(p\#M) \geq \sigma(M)$  if  $\sigma(M) \geq 0$ .

**Corollary 1.8.** *Suppose  $M$  is a compact spin manifold of dimension at least 5 with  $\sigma(M) \in (0, \Lambda_n)$ . Let  $p$  and  $q$  be two relatively prime positive integers. If  $\sigma(p\#M) > \sigma(M)$ , then  $\sigma(q\#M) = \sigma(M)$ .*

If Schoen's conjecture about the  $\sigma$ -invariant of quotients of spheres holds true, then quotients of spheres by large fundamental groups yield examples of manifolds  $M$  with  $\sigma(M) \in (0, \Lambda_n)$ .

The determination of manifolds admitting positive scalar curvature metrics, i. e. manifolds with  $\sigma(M) > 0$  has led to interesting results and challenging problems in topology [35]. It would be interesting to develop similar topological tools for manifolds with  $\sigma(M) > \epsilon$  for  $\epsilon > 0$ . As explained above such manifolds form a subgroup on the bordism level. In particular, it would be interesting to find on the bordism level a ring structure on manifolds with  $\sigma(M^n) > \epsilon_n$  where  $\epsilon_n > 0$  is a given sequence of positive numbers, generalizing the ring structure on positive scalar curvature bordism classes.

**1.5. Comparison to other results.** At the end of the section we want to mention some similar constructions in the literature. An analogous surgery formula holds if we replace the Conformal Laplacian by the Dirac operator, see [4] for details and applications. D. Joyce [20], followed by L. Mazziere [30, 31], considered a problem tightly related to our result: their goal is to construct a metric on a manifold obtained via a connected sum along a  $k$ -dimensional submanifold. For these metrics they construct a solution of the Yamabe equation on the new manifold which is close to solutions of the Yamabe equations on the original pieces. Such a construction was achieved by D. Joyce for  $k = 0$  and by L. Mazziere for  $k \in \{1, \dots, n - 3\}$  provided that the embeddings defining the connected sum are isometric. In contrast to our article their solutions on the new manifold are not necessarily minimizers of the volume-normalized Einstein-Hilbert functional.

*Acknowledgments.* The authors want to thank the Max Planck Institute for Gravitational Physics in Potsdam for its hospitality, its support, and its friendly

working conditions which had an important impact on this article. We thank Andreas Hermann for the numerical computation of the equivariant version of  $\Lambda_{4,1}$  mentioned in Section 3.6. We also thank Kazuo Akutagawa for interesting discussions and insightful comments.

## 2. THE CONNECTED SUM ALONG A SUBMANIFOLD

In this section we are going to describe how two manifolds are joined along a common submanifold with trivialized normal bundle. Strictly speaking this is a differential topological construction, but since we work with Riemannian manifolds we will make the construction adapted to the Riemannian metrics and use distance neighborhoods defined by the metrics etc.

Let  $(M_1, g_1)$  and  $(M_2, g_2)$  be complete Riemannian manifolds of dimension  $n$ . Let  $W$  be a compact manifold of dimension  $k$ , where  $0 \leq k \leq n$ . Let  $\bar{w}_i : W \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k} \rightarrow TM_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , be smooth embeddings. We assume that  $\bar{w}_i$  restricted to  $W \times \{0\}$  maps to the zero section of  $TM_i$  (which we identify with  $M_i$ ) and thus gives an embedding  $W \rightarrow M_i$ . The image of this embedding is denoted by  $W'_i$ . Further we assume that  $\bar{w}_i$  restrict to linear isomorphisms  $\{p\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k} \rightarrow N_{\bar{w}_i(p,0)}W'_i$  for all  $p \in W_i$ , where  $NW'_i$  denotes the normal bundle of  $W'_i$  defined using  $g_i$ .

We set  $w_i := \exp^{g_i} \circ \bar{w}_i$ . This gives embeddings  $w_i : W \times B^{n-k}(R_{\max}) \rightarrow M_i$  for some  $R_{\max} > 0$  and  $i = 1, 2$ . We have  $W'_i = w_i(W \times \{0\})$  and we define the disjoint union

$$(M, g) := (M_1 \amalg M_2, g_1 \amalg g_2),$$

and

$$W' := W'_1 \amalg W'_2.$$

Let  $r_i$  be the function on  $M_i$  giving the distance to  $W'_i$ . Then  $r_1 \circ w_1(p, x) = r_2 \circ w_2(p, x) = |x|$  for  $p \in W$ ,  $x \in B^{n-k}(R_{\max})$ . Let  $r$  be the function on  $M$  defined by  $r(x) := r_i(x)$  for  $x \in M_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . For  $0 < \epsilon$  we set  $U_i(\epsilon) := \{x \in M_i : r_i(x) < \epsilon\}$  and  $U(\epsilon) := U_1(\epsilon) \cup U_2(\epsilon)$ . For  $0 < \epsilon < \theta$  we define

$$N_\epsilon := (M_1 \setminus U_1(\epsilon)) \cup (M_2 \setminus U_2(\epsilon)) / \sim,$$

and

$$U_\epsilon^N(\theta) := (U(\theta) \setminus U(\epsilon)) / \sim$$

where  $\sim$  indicates that we identify  $x \in \partial U_1(\epsilon)$  with  $w_2 \circ w_1^{-1}(x) \in \partial U_2(\epsilon)$ . Hence

$$N_\epsilon = (M \setminus U(\theta)) \cup U_\epsilon^N(\theta).$$

We say that  $N_\epsilon$  is obtained from  $M_1$ ,  $M_2$  (and  $\bar{w}_1$ ,  $\bar{w}_2$ ) by a connected sum along  $W$  with parameter  $\epsilon$ .

The diffeomorphism type of  $N_\epsilon$  is independent of  $\epsilon$ , hence we will usually write  $N = N_\epsilon$ . However, in situations when dropping the index causes ambiguities we will keep the notation  $N_\epsilon$ . For example the function  $r : M \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  gives a continuous function  $r_\epsilon : N_\epsilon \rightarrow [\epsilon, \infty)$  whose domain depends on  $\epsilon$ . It is also going to be important to keep track of the subscript  $\epsilon$  on  $U_\epsilon^N(\theta)$  since crucial estimates on solutions of the Yamabe equation will be carried out on this set.

The surgery operation on a manifold is a special case of taking connected sum along a submanifold. Indeed, let  $M$  be a compact manifold of dimension  $n$  and let  $M_1 = M$ ,  $M_2 = S^n$ ,  $W = S^k$ . Let  $w_1 : S^k \times B^{n-k} \rightarrow M$  be an embedding defining a surgery and let  $w_2 : S^k \times B^{n-k} \rightarrow S^n$  be the standard embedding. Since

$S^n \setminus w_2(S^k \times B^{n-k})$  is diffeomorphic to  $B^{k+1} \times S^{n-k-1}$  we have in this situation that  $N$  is obtained from  $M$  using surgery on  $w_1$ , see [24, Section VI, 9].

### 3. THE CONSTANTS $\Lambda_{n,k}$

In Section 1.2 we defined the conformal Yamabe invariant only for compact manifolds. There are several ways to generalize the conformal Yamabe invariant to non-compact manifolds. In this section we define two such generalizations  $\mu^{(0)}$  and  $\mu^{(1)}$ , and also introduce a related quantity called  $\mu^{(2)}$ . These invariants will be needed to define the constants  $\Lambda_{n,k}$  and to prove their positivity on our model spaces  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$ .

The definition of  $\mu^{(2)}$  comes from a technical difficulty in the proof of Theorem 6.1 and is only relevant in the case  $k = n - 3 \geq 3$ , see Remark 3.4.

**3.1. The manifolds  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$ .** For  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  we define the metric  $\eta_c^{k+1} := e^{2ct}\xi^k + dt^2$  on  $\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}$  and we write

$$\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} := (\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}, \eta_c^{k+1}).$$

This is a model of hyperbolic space of curvature  $-c^2$ . We denote by

$$G_c := \eta_c^{k+1} + \sigma^{n-k-1}$$

the product metric on  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$ . The scalar curvature of  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  is  $\text{Scal}^{G_c} = -k(k+1)c^2 + (n-k-1)(n-k-2)$ .

**Proposition 3.1.**  $\mathbb{H}_1^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  is conformal to  $\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \mathbb{S}^k$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbb{S}^k$  be embedded in  $\mathbb{S}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  by setting the last  $n-k$  coordinates to zero and let  $s := d(\cdot, \mathbb{S}^k)$  be the intrinsic distance to  $\mathbb{S}^k$  in  $\mathbb{S}^n$ . Then the function  $\sin s$  is smooth and positive on  $\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \mathbb{S}^k$ . The points of maximal distance  $\pi/2$  to  $\mathbb{S}^k$  lie on an  $(n-k-1)$ -sphere, denoted by  $(\mathbb{S}^k)^\perp$ . On  $\mathbb{S}^n \setminus (\mathbb{S}^k \cup (\mathbb{S}^k)^\perp)$  the round metric is

$$\sigma^n = (\cos s)^2 \sigma^k + ds^2 + (\sin s)^2 \sigma^{n-k-1}.$$

Substitute  $s \in (0, \pi/2)$  by  $t \in (0, \infty)$  such that  $\sinh t = \cot s$ . Then  $\cosh t = (\sin s)^{-1}$  and  $\cosh t dt = -(\sin s)^{-2} ds$ , so  $\sigma^n$  is conformal to

$$(\sin s)^{-2} \sigma^n = (\sinh t)^2 \sigma^k + dt^2 + \sigma^{n-k-1}.$$

Here we see that the first two terms give a metric

$$(\sinh t)^2 \sigma^k + dt^2$$

on  $S^k \times (0, \infty)$ . This is just the standard metric on  $\mathbb{H}_1^{k+1} \setminus \{p_0\}$  where  $t = d(\cdot, p_0)$ , written in polar normal coordinates. In the case  $k \geq 1$  it is evident that the conformal diffeomorphism  $\mathbb{S}^n \setminus (\mathbb{S}^k \cup (\mathbb{S}^k)^\perp) \rightarrow (\mathbb{H}_1^{k+1} \setminus \{p_0\}) \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  extends to a conformal diffeomorphism  $\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \mathbb{S}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_1^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$ .

In the case  $k = 0$  we equip  $s$  and  $t$  with a sign, that is we let  $s > 0$  and  $t > 0$  on one of the components of  $\mathbb{S}^n \setminus (\mathbb{S}^0 \cup (\mathbb{S}^0)^\perp)$ , and  $s < 0$  and  $t < 0$  on the other component. The functions  $s$  and  $t$  are then smooth on  $\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \mathbb{S}^0$  and take values  $s \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then the argument is the same as above.  $\square$

**3.2. Definition of  $\Lambda_{n,k}$ .** Let  $(N, h)$  be a Riemannian manifold of dimension  $n$ . For  $i = 1, 2$  we let  $\Omega^{(i)}(N, h)$  be the set of non-negative  $C^2$  functions  $u$  which solve the Yamabe equation

$$L^h u = \mu u^{p-1} \quad (6)$$

for some  $\mu = \mu(u) \in \mathbb{R}$  and satisfy

- $u \not\equiv 0$ ,
- $\|u\|_{L^p(N)} \leq 1$ ,
- $u \in L^\infty(N)$ ,

together with

- $u \in L^2(N)$ , for  $i = 1$ ,

or

- $\mu(u) \|u\|_{L^\infty(N)}^{p-2} \geq \frac{(n-k-2)^2(n-1)}{8(n-2)}$ , for  $i = 2$ .

For  $i = 1, 2$  we set

$$\mu^{(i)}(N, h) := \inf_{u \in \Omega^{(i)}(N, h)} \mu(u).$$

In particular, if  $\Omega^{(i)}(N, h)$  is empty then  $\mu^{(i)}(N, h) = \infty$ .

**Definition 3.2.** For integers  $n \geq 3$  and  $0 \leq k \leq n - 3$  let

$$\Lambda_{n,k}^{(i)} := \inf_{c \in [-1, 1]} \mu^{(i)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1})$$

and

$$\Lambda_{n,k} := \min \left\{ \Lambda_{n,k}^{(1)}, \Lambda_{n,k}^{(2)} \right\}.$$

Note that the infimum could just as well be taken over  $c \in [0, 1]$  since  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  and  $\mathbb{H}_{-c}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  are isometric. We are going to prove that these constants are positive.

**Theorem 3.3.** For all  $n \geq 3$  and  $0 \leq k \leq n - 3$ , we have  $\Lambda_{n,k} > 0$ .

To prove Theorem 3.3 we have to prove that  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(1)} > 0$  and that  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(2)} > 0$ . This is the object of the following two subsections. In the final subsection we prove that  $\Lambda_{n,0} = \mu(\mathbb{S}^n) = n(n-1)\omega_n^{2/n}$ .

*Remark 3.4.* Suppose that either  $k \leq n - 4$  or  $k = n - 3 \leq 2$ . With similar methods as in Section 5 one can show that under these dimension restrictions any  $L^p$  solution of (6) on the model spaces is also  $L^2$ . This implies that  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(2)} \geq \Lambda_{n,k}^{(1)}$  in these dimensions, and hence

$$\Lambda_{n,k} = \Lambda_{n,k}^{(1)}.$$

In the case  $k = n - 3 \geq 4$  there are  $L^p$ -solutions of (6) on  $\mathbb{H}_1^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  which are not  $L^2$ .

**3.3. Proof of  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(1)} > 0$ .** The proof proceeds in several steps. We first introduce a conformal Yamabe invariant for non-compact manifolds and show that it gives a lower bound for  $\mu^{(1)}$ . We then conclude by studying this conformal invariant.

Let  $(N, h)$  be a Riemannian manifold which is not necessarily compact or complete. We define the conformal Yamabe invariant  $\mu^{(0)}$  of  $(N, h)$  following Schoen-Yau [40, Section 2], see also [21], as

$$\mu^{(0)}(N, h) := \inf J^h(u)$$

where  $J^h$  is defined in (1) and the infimum runs over the set of all non-zero compactly supported smooth functions  $u$  on  $N$ . If  $h$  and  $\tilde{h}$  are conformal metrics on  $N$  it follows from (3) that  $\mu^{(0)}(N, h) = \mu^{(0)}(N, \tilde{h})$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $0 \leq k \leq n - 3$ . Then*

$$\mu^{(1)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}) \geq \mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1})$$

for all  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $u \in \Omega^{(1)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1})$  is a solution of (6) on  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  with  $\mu = \mu(u)$  close to  $\mu^{(1)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1})$ . Let  $\chi_\alpha$  be a cut-off function on  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  depending only on the distance  $r$  to a fixed point, such that  $\chi_\alpha(r) = 1$  for  $r \leq \alpha$ ,  $\chi_\alpha(r) = 0$  for  $r \geq \alpha + 2$ , and  $|d\chi_\alpha| \leq 1$ . We are going to see that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} J^{G_c}(\chi_\alpha u) = \mu \|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1})}^{p-2} \leq \mu. \quad (7)$$

Integrating by parts and using Equations (6) and (65) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}} (\chi_\alpha u) L^{G_c}(\chi_\alpha u) dv^{G_c} &= \int_{\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}} \chi_\alpha^2 u L^{G_c} u dv^{G_c} \\ &\quad + a \int_{\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}} |d\chi_\alpha|^2 u^2 dv^{G_c} \\ &= \mu \int_{\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}} \chi_\alpha^2 u^p dv^{G_c} \\ &\quad + a \int_{\text{Supp}(d\chi_\alpha)} |d\chi_\alpha|^2 u^2 dv^{G_c}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $u \in L^2(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1})$  and  $|d\chi_\alpha| \leq 1$  the last integral goes to zero as  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$  and we conclude that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}} (\chi_\alpha u) L^{G_c}(\chi_\alpha u) dv^{G_c} = \mu \|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1})}^p.$$

Going back to the definition of  $J^{G_c}$  we easily get (7), and Lemma 3.5 follows.  $\square$

We define

$$\Lambda_{n,k}^{(0)} := \inf_{c \in [-1,1]} \mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}).$$

Then Lemma 3.5 tells us that  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(1)} \geq \Lambda_{n,k}^{(0)}$ , so we are done if we prove that  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(0)} > 0$ . To do this we need two lemmas.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $0 \leq k \leq n - 3$ . Then*

$$\mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_1^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}) = \mu(\mathbb{S}^n).$$

*Proof.* The inequality  $\mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_1^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}) \leq \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$  is completely analogous to [7, Lemma 3]. As we do not need this inequality later, we skip the proof. To prove the opposite inequality  $\mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_1^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}) \geq \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$  we use Proposition 3.1 and the conformal invariance of  $\mu^{(0)}$ , and we obtain

$$\mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_1^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}) = \mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \mathbb{S}^k).$$

Clearly  $\mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \mathbb{S}^k) \geq \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$  as the infimum defining the left hand side runs over a smaller set of functions, see [40, Lemma 2.1].  $\square$

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $0 \leq k \leq n - 2$  and  $0 < c_0 \leq c_1$ . Then*

$$\mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_{c_0}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}) \geq \left(\frac{c_0}{c_1}\right)^{\frac{2(n-k-1)}{n}} \mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_{c_1}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $c > 0$ . Setting  $s = ct + \ln c$  we see that

$$G_c = e^{2ct}\xi^k + dt^2 + \sigma^{n-k-1} = \frac{1}{c^2} (e^{2s}\xi^k + ds^2) + \sigma^{n-k-1}.$$

Hence  $G_c$  is conformal to the metric

$$\tilde{G}_c := e^{2s}\xi^k + ds^2 + c^2\sigma^{n-k-1}$$

and by the conformal invariance of  $\mu^{(0)}$  we get that

$$\mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_{c_i}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}) = \mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}, \tilde{G}_{c_i})$$

for  $i = 0, 1$ . In these coordinates we easily compute that  $\text{Scal}^{\tilde{G}_{c_0}} \geq \text{Scal}^{\tilde{G}_{c_1}}$ ,  $|du|_{\tilde{G}_{c_0}}^2 \geq |du|_{\tilde{G}_{c_1}}^2$ , and  $dv^{\tilde{G}_{c_0}} = \left(\frac{c_0}{c_1}\right)^{n-k-1} dv^{\tilde{G}_{c_1}}$ . We conclude that

$$J^{\tilde{G}_{c_0}}(u) \geq \left(\frac{c_0}{c_1}\right)^{\frac{2(n-k-1)}{n}} J^{\tilde{G}_{c_1}}(u)$$

for all functions  $u$  on  $\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  and Lemma 3.7 follows.  $\square$

If we set  $c_1 = 1$  and use Lemma 3.6 together with (4) we get the following result.

**Corollary 3.8.** *For  $c_0 > 0$  we have*

$$\inf_{c \in [c_0, 1]} \mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}) \geq n(n-1)\omega_n^{2/n} c_0^{4/n}.$$

Finally, we are ready to prove that  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(0)}$  is positive.

**Theorem 3.9.** *Let  $0 \leq k \leq n - 3$ . Then  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(0)} > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Choose  $c_0 > 0$  small enough so that  $\text{Scal}^{G_{c_0}} > 0$ . We then have  $\text{Scal}^{G_c} \geq \text{Scal}^{G_{c_0}}$  for all  $c \in [0, c_0]$ . Hence

$$\mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}) \geq \inf \frac{\int_{\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}} (a|du|_{G_c}^2 + \text{Scal}^{G_{c_0}} u^2) dv^{G_c}}{\|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1})}^2}.$$

By Hebey [18, Theorem 4.6, page 64], there exists a constant  $A > 0$  such that for all  $c \in [0, c_0]$  and all smooth non-zero functions  $u$  compactly supported in  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  we have

$$\|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1})}^2 \leq A \int_{\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}} (|du|_{G_c}^2 + u^2) dv^{G_c}.$$

This implies that

$$\mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}) \geq \frac{1}{A} \min \{a, \text{Scal}^{G_{c_0}}\} > 0$$

for all  $c \in [0, c_0]$ , and together with Lemma 3.7 we obtain that

$$\inf_{c \in [0, 1]} \mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}) > 0.$$

Since  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  and  $\mathbb{H}_{-c}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  are isometric we have

$$\Lambda_{n,k}^{(0)} = \inf_{c \in [-1,1]} \mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}) > 0.$$

This ends the proof of Theorem 3.9.  $\square$

As an immediate consequence we obtain that  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(1)}$  is positive.

**Corollary 3.10.** *Let  $0 \leq k \leq n - 3$ . Then  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(1)} > 0$ .*

**3.4. Proof of  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(2)} > 0$ .**

**Theorem 3.11.** *Let  $0 \leq k \leq n - 3$ . Then  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(2)} > 0$ .*

*Proof.* We prove this by contradiction. Assume that there exists a sequence  $(c_i)$  of  $c_i \in [-1, 1]$  for which  $\mu_i := \mu^{(2)}(\mathbb{H}_{c_i}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1})$  tends to a limit  $l \leq 0$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . After removing the indices  $i$  for which  $\mu_i$  is infinite we get for every  $i$  a positive solution  $u_i \in \Omega^2(\mathbb{H}_{c_i}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1})$  of the equation

$$L^{G_{c_i}} u_i = \mu_i u_i^{p-1}.$$

By definition of  $\Omega^{(2)}(\mathbb{H}_{c_i}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1})$  we have

$$\frac{(n-k-2)^2(n-1)}{8(n-2)} \leq \mu_i \|u_i\|_{L^\infty}^{p-2}, \quad (8)$$

which implies that  $\mu_i > 0$ . We conclude that  $l := \lim_i \mu_i = 0$ . We cannot assume that  $\|u_i\|_{L^\infty}$  is attained but we can choose points  $x_i \in \mathbb{H}_{c_i}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  such that  $u_i(x_i) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|u_i\|_{L^\infty}$ . Moreover, we can compose the functions  $u_i$  with isometries so that all the  $x_i$  are the same point  $x$ . From (8) we get

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{(n-k-2)^2(n-1)}{8(n-2)\mu_i} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-2}} \leq u_i(x).$$

We define  $m_i := u_i(x)$ . Since  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mu_i = 0$  we have  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} m_i = \infty$ . Restricting to a subsequence we can assume that  $c := \lim_i c_i \in [-1, 1]$  exists. Define  $\tilde{g}_i := m_i^{\frac{4}{n-2}} G_{c_i}$ . We apply Lemma 4.1 with  $\alpha = 1/i$ ,  $(V, \gamma_\alpha) = \mathbb{H}_{c_i}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$ ,  $(V, \gamma_0) = \mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$ ,  $q_\alpha = x_i = x$ , and  $b_\alpha = m_i^{\frac{2}{n-2}}$ . For  $r > 0$  we obtain diffeomorphisms

$$\Theta_i : B^n(r) \rightarrow B^{G_{c_i}}(x, m_i^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r)$$

such that the sequence  $\Theta_i^*(\tilde{g}_i)$  tends to the flat metric  $\xi^n$  on  $B^n(r)$ . We let  $\tilde{u}_i := m_i^{-1} u_i$ . By (2) we then have

$$L^{\tilde{g}_i} \tilde{u}_i = \mu_i \tilde{u}_i^{p-1}$$

on  $B^{G_{c_i}}(x_i, m_i^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B^{G_{c_i}}(x_i, m_i^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r)} \tilde{u}_i^p dv^{\tilde{g}_i} &= \int_{B^{G_{c_i}}(x_i, m_i^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r)} u_i^p dv^{G_{c_i}} \\ &\leq \int_N u_i^p dv^{G_{c_i}} \\ &\leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used  $dv^{\tilde{g}_i} = m_i^p dv^{G_{c_i}}$ . The last inequality comes from the fact that any function in  $\Omega^{(2)}(\mathbb{H}_{c_i}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1})$  has  $L^p$ -norm smaller than 1. Since

$$\Theta_i : (B^n(r), \Theta_i^*(\tilde{g}_i)) \rightarrow (B^{G_{c_i}}(x, m_i^{-\frac{2}{n-2}}r), \tilde{g}_i)$$

is an isometry we redefine  $\tilde{u}_i$  as  $\tilde{u}_i \circ \Theta_i$  which gives us solutions of

$$L^{\Theta_i^*(\tilde{g}_i)} \tilde{u}_i = \mu_i \tilde{u}_i^{p-1}$$

on  $B^n(r)$  with  $\int_{B^n(r)} \tilde{u}_i^p dv^{\Theta_i^*(\tilde{g}_i)} \leq 1$ . Since  $\|\tilde{u}_i\|_{L^\infty(B^n(r))} = \tilde{u}_i(0) = 1$  we can apply Lemma 4.2 with  $V = \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\alpha = 1/i$ ,  $g_\alpha = \Theta_i^*(\tilde{g}_i)$ , and  $u_\alpha = \tilde{u}_i$  (we can apply this lemma since each compact set of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is contained in some ball  $B^n(r)$ ). This shows that there exists a non-negative  $C^2$  function  $u$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  which does not vanish identically (since  $u(0) = 1$ ) and which satisfies

$$L^{\xi^n} u = a \Delta^{\xi^n} u = \bar{\mu} u^{p-1}$$

where  $\bar{\mu} = 0$ . By (12) we further have

$$\int_{B^n(r)} u^p dv^{\xi^n} = \lim_{i \rightarrow 0} \int_{B^{G_{c_i}}(x, m_i^{-\frac{2}{n-2}}r)} u_i^p dv^{G_{c_i}} \leq 1$$

for any  $r > 0$ . In particular,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u^p dv^{\xi^n} \leq 1.$$

Lemma 4.3 below then implies the contradiction  $0 = \bar{\mu} \geq \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$ . This proves that  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(2)}$  is positive.  $\square$

**3.5. The constants  $\Lambda_{n,0}$ .** Now we show that  $\Lambda_{n,0} = \mu(\mathbb{S}^n) = n(n-1)\omega_n^{2/n}$ . The corresponding model spaces  $\mathbb{H}_c^1 \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  carry the standard product metric  $dt^2 + \sigma^{n-1}$  of  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , independently of  $c \in [-1, 1]$ . Thus  $\Lambda_{n,0}^{(i)} = \mu^{(i)}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ . Proposition 3.1 yields a conformal diffeomorphism from the cylinder  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  to  $\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \mathbb{S}^0$ , the  $n$ -sphere with North and South pole removed.

**Lemma 3.12.**

$$\Lambda_{n,0}^{(i)} \leq \mu(\mathbb{S}^n) = n(n-1)\omega_n^{2/n}$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ .

*Proof.* We use the notation of Proposition 3.1 with  $k = 0$ . Then the standard metric on  $S^n$  is

$$\sigma^n = (\sin s)^2(dt^2 + \sigma^{n-1}) = (\cosh t)^{-2}(dt^2 + \sigma^{n-1}).$$

It follows that  $(\omega_n)^{-2/n}(\cosh t)^{-2}(dt^2 + \sigma^{n-1})$  is a (non-complete) metric of volume 1 and scalar curvature  $n(n-1)\omega_n^{2/n} = \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$  on  $\mathbb{H}_c^1 \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1} = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ . This is equivalent to saying that

$$u(t) := \omega_n^{-\frac{n-2}{2n}} (\cosh t)^{-\frac{n-2}{2}}$$

is a solution of (6) with  $\mu = \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$  and  $\|u\|_{L^p} = 1$  on  $\mathbb{H}_c^1 \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ . Clearly we have  $u \in L^2$ , and  $\|u\|_{L^\infty} = \omega_n^{-\frac{n-2}{2n}} < \infty$ . Thus  $u \in \Omega^{(1)}(\mathbb{H}_c^1 \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ . This implies  $\Lambda_{n,0}^{(1)} \leq n(n-1)\omega_n^{2/n}$ .

Further, we have

$$\mu(\mathbb{S}^n) \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{p-2} = n(n-1) > \frac{(n-0-2)^2(n-1)}{8(n-2)},$$



and thus  $u \in \Omega^{(2)}(\mathbb{H}_c^1 \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1})$  which implies  $\Lambda_{n,0}^{(2)} \leq n(n-1)\omega_n^{2/n}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.13.** *Let  $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1})$  be a solution of (6) on  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  with  $\|u\|_{L^p} \leq 1$ ,  $u \not\equiv 0$ . Then  $\mu \geq \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$ .*

*Proof.* As above  $\sigma^n = (\sin s)^2(dt^2 + \sigma^{n-1})$ . If  $u$  solves (6) with  $h = dt^2 + \sigma^{n-1}$  then  $\tilde{u} := (\sin s)^{-\frac{n-2}{2}}u$  solves

$$L^{\sigma^n} \tilde{u} = \mu \tilde{u}^{p-1}.$$

Further  $\tilde{u}^p dv^{\sigma^n} = u^p dv^h$ , hence  $\nu := \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^p(S^n \setminus S^0, \sigma^n)} \leq 1$ . For  $\alpha > 0$  we choose a smooth cut-off function  $\chi_\alpha : S^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$  that is 1 on  $S^n \setminus U_\alpha(S^0)$ , with support disjoint from  $S^0$ , and with  $|d\chi|_{\sigma^n} \leq 2/\alpha$ . Then using (65) in Appendix C we see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} (\chi_\alpha \tilde{u}) L^{\sigma^n} (\chi_\alpha \tilde{u}) dv^{\sigma^n} = \mu \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} u^p \chi_\alpha^2 dv^{\sigma^n} + a \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} |d\chi|_{\sigma^n}^2 \tilde{u}^2 dv^{\sigma^n}.$$

The first summand tends to  $\mu \nu^p$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ . By Hölder's inequality the second summand is bounded by

$$\frac{4a}{\alpha^2} \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^p(U_\alpha(S^0) \setminus S^0, \sigma^n)}^2 \text{Vol}(U_\alpha(S^0) \setminus S^0, \sigma^n)^{2/n} \leq C \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^p(U_\alpha(S^0) \setminus S^0, \sigma^n)}^2 \rightarrow 0$$

as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ . Together with  $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \|\chi_\alpha \tilde{u}\|_{L^p(S^n \setminus S^0, \sigma^n)} = \nu$  we obtain

$$\mu(\mathbb{S}^n) \leq J^{\sigma^n}(\chi_\alpha \tilde{u}) \rightarrow \mu \nu^{p-2} \leq \mu$$

as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

This lemma obviously implies  $\Lambda_{n,0}^{(i)} \geq \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , and thus we have

$$\Lambda_{n,0} = \Lambda_{n,0}^{(1)} = \Lambda_{n,0}^{(2)} = \mu(\mathbb{S}^n).$$

**3.6. Speculation about  $\Lambda_{n,k}$  for  $k \geq 1$ .** We want to speculate about two relations that seem likely to us although we have no proof. Conformally, the model spaces  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  can be viewed as an interpolation between  $\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  (for  $c = 0$ ) and the sphere  $\mathbb{S}^n$  (for  $c = 1$ ). Since the sphere has the largest possible value of the conformal Yamabe invariant we could hope that the function  $c \mapsto \mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1})$  is increasing for  $c \in [0, 1]$ , or in particular

$$\mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}) \leq \mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1})$$

for all  $c \in [-1, 1]$ . This would imply

$$\Lambda_{n,k} = \mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}).$$

To formulate the second potential relation we define the following variant of  $\mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1})$ :

$$\mu_{\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1}}^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k}) := \inf\{J^{G_c}(u) \mid u \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1})\}.$$

Here  $J^{G_c}$  is the functional of  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$ , but we only evaluate it for functions that are constant along the sphere  $\mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$ . We ask, similarly to the Question formulated in [2, Page 4], whether

$$\mu_{\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1}}^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k}) = \mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k}).$$

It seems likely to us that the answer is yes, if and only if  $|c| \leq 1$ .

An affirmative answer for  $|c| \leq 1$  would imply, using a reflection argument, that we can restrict not only to functions that are constant along the sphere, but even

to radial functions. Here a radial function is defined as a function of the form  $u(x, y) = u(d_{\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1}}(x))$  where  $d_{\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1}}(x)$  is the distance from  $x$  to a fixed point in  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1}$ . The constants  $\Lambda_{n,k}$  could then be calculated numerically. For example we would obtain

$$\Lambda_{4,1} = \mu^{(0)}(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^2) = 59.4 \dots$$

and thus  $\sigma(S^2 \times S^2) \geq 59.4 \dots$ , which should be compared to  $\mu(\mathbb{S}^4) = 61.5 \dots$  and  $\mu(\mathbb{S}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^2) = 50.2 \dots$

#### 4. LIMIT SPACES AND LIMIT SOLUTIONS

In the proofs of the main theorems we will construct limit solutions of the Yamabe equation on certain limit spaces. For this we need the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $V$  be an  $n$ -dimensional manifold. Let  $(q_\alpha)$  be a sequence of points in  $V$  which converges to a point  $q$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ . Let  $(\gamma_\alpha)$  be a sequence of metrics defined on a neighborhood  $O$  of  $q$  which converges to a metric  $\gamma_0$  in the  $C^2(O)$ -topology. Finally, let  $(b_\alpha)$  be a sequence of positive real numbers such that  $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} b_\alpha = \infty$ . Then for  $r > 0$  there exists for  $\alpha$  small enough a diffeomorphism*

$$\Theta_\alpha : B^n(r) \rightarrow B^{\gamma_\alpha}(q_\alpha, b_\alpha^{-1}r)$$

with  $\Theta_\alpha(0) = q_\alpha$  such that the metric  $\Theta_\alpha^*(b_\alpha^2 \gamma_\alpha)$  tends to the flat metric  $\xi^n$  in  $C^2(B^n(r))$ .

*Proof.* Denote by  $\exp_{q_\alpha}^{\gamma_\alpha} : U_\alpha \rightarrow O_\alpha$  the exponential map at the point  $q_\alpha$  defined with respect to the metric  $\gamma_\alpha$ . Here  $O_\alpha$  is a neighborhood of  $q_\alpha$  in  $V$  and  $U_\alpha$  is a neighborhood of the origin in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We set

$$\Theta_\alpha : B^n(r) \ni x \mapsto \exp_{q_\alpha}^{\gamma_\alpha}(b_\alpha^{-1}x) \in B^{\gamma_\alpha}(q_\alpha, b_\alpha^{-1}r).$$

It is easily checked that  $\Theta_\alpha$  is the desired diffeomorphism.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $V$  be an  $n$ -dimensional manifold. Let  $(g_\alpha)$  be a sequence of metrics which converges to a metric  $g$  in  $C^2$  on all compact sets  $K \subset V$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ . Assume that  $(U_\alpha)$  is an increasing sequence of subdomains of  $V$  such that  $\bigcup_\alpha U_\alpha = V$ . Let  $u_\alpha \in C^2(U_\alpha)$  be a sequence of positive functions such that  $\|u_\alpha\|_{L^\infty(U_\alpha)}$  is bounded independently of  $\alpha$ . We assume*

$$L^{g_\alpha} u_\alpha = \mu_\alpha u_\alpha^{p-1} \tag{9}$$

where the  $\mu_\alpha$  are numbers tending to  $\bar{\mu}$ . Then there exists a non-negative function  $u \in C^2(V)$ , satisfying

$$L^g u = \bar{\mu} u^{p-1} \tag{10}$$

on  $V$  and a subsequence of  $u_\alpha$  which tends to  $u$  in  $C^1$  on each open set  $\Omega \subset V$  with compact closure. In particular

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(K)} = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \|u_\alpha\|_{L^\infty(K)}, \tag{11}$$

and

$$\int_K u^r dv^g = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \int_K u_\alpha^r dv^{g_\alpha} \tag{12}$$

for any compact set  $K$  and any  $r \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* Let  $K$  be a compact subset of  $V$  and let  $\Omega$  be an open set with smooth boundary and compact closure in  $V$  such that  $K \subset \Omega$ . From equation (9) and the boundedness of  $\|u_\alpha\|_\infty$  we see with standard results on elliptic regularity (see e.g. [13]) that  $(u_\alpha)$  is bounded in the Sobolev space  $H^{2,2n}(\Omega, g)$ , i.e. all derivatives of  $u_\alpha|_\Omega$  up to second order are bounded in  $L^{2n}(\Omega)$ . As this Sobolev space embeds compactly into  $C^1(\Omega)$ , a subsequence of  $(u_\alpha)$  converges in  $C^1(\Omega)$  to a function  $u^\Omega \in C^1(\Omega)$ ,  $u^\Omega \geq 0$ , depending on  $\Omega$ . Let  $\varphi \in C^\infty(\Omega)$  be compactly supported in  $\Omega$ . Multiplying Equation (9) by  $\varphi$  and integrating over  $\Omega$ , we obtain that  $u^\Omega$  satisfies Equation (10) weakly on  $\Omega$ . By standard regularity results  $u^\Omega \in C^2(\Omega)$  and satisfies Equation (10).

Now we choose an increasing sequence of compact sets  $K_m$  such that  $\bigcup_m K_m = V$ . Using the above arguments and taking successive subsequences it follows that  $(u_\alpha)$  converges to functions  $u_m \in C^2(K_m)$  which solve Equation (10) and satisfy  $u_m \geq 0$  and  $u_m|_{K_{m-1}} = u_{m-1}$ . We define  $u$  on  $V$  by  $u = u_m$  on  $K_m$ . By taking a diagonal subsequence of  $(u_\alpha)$  we get that  $(u_\alpha)$  tends to  $u$  in  $C^1$  on any compact set  $K \subset V$ . This ends the proof of Lemma 4.2.  $\square$

The next Lemma is useful when the sequence of metrics in Lemma 4.2 converges to the flat metric  $\xi^n$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\xi^n$  be the standard flat metric on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and assume that  $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ,  $u \geq 0$ ,  $u \not\equiv 0$  satisfies*

$$L^{\xi^n} u = \mu u^{p-1} \quad (13)$$

for some  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ . Assume in addition that  $u \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and that

$$\|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 1.$$

Then  $\mu \geq \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$ .

*Proof.* The map  $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\varphi(t, x) = e^t x$ , is a conformal diffeomorphism with

$$dt^2 + \sigma^{n-1} = e^{-2t} \varphi^* \xi^n.$$

Thus if  $u$  is a solution of (13), then  $\hat{u} := e^{(n-2)t/2} u \circ \varphi$  is a solution of  $L^{dt^2 + \sigma^{n-1}} \hat{u} = \mu \hat{u}^{p-1}$  and  $\|\hat{u}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1})} = \|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 1$ . The result now follows from Lemma 3.13.  $\square$

## 5. $L^2$ -ESTIMATES ON $WS$ -BUNDLES

Manifolds with a certain structure of a double bundle will appear in the proofs of our main results. In this section we derive  $L^2$ -estimates for solutions to a perturbed Yamabe equation on a  $WS$ -bundle.

**5.1. Definition and statement of the result.** Let  $n \geq 1$  and  $0 \leq k \leq n - 3$  be integers. Let  $W$  be a closed manifold of dimension  $k$  and let  $I$  be an interval. By a  $WS$ -bundle we will mean the product  $P := I \times W \times S^{n-k-1}$  equipped with a metric of the form

$$g_{WS} = dt^2 + e^{2\varphi(t)} h_t + \sigma^{n-k-1} \quad (14)$$

where  $h_t$  is a smooth family of metrics on  $W$  depending on  $t \in I$  and  $\varphi$  is a function on  $I$ . Let  $\pi : P \rightarrow I$  be the projection onto the first factor and let  $F_t := \pi^{-1}(t) = \{t\} \times W \times S^{n-k-1}$ . The metric induced on  $F_t$  is  $g_t := e^{2\varphi(t)} h_t + \sigma^{n-k-1}$ . Let  $H_t$

be the mean curvature of  $F_t$  in  $P$ , that is  $H_t \partial_t$  is the mean curvature vector of  $F_t$ . The mean curvature is given by the following formula

$$H_t = -\frac{k}{n-1} \varphi'(t) - e(h_t) \quad (15)$$

with  $e(h_t) := \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}_{h_t}(\partial_t h_t)$ . Clearly,  $e(h_t) = 0$  if  $t \mapsto h_t$  is constant. The derivative of the volume element  $dv^{g_t}$  of  $F_t$  is

$$\partial_t dv^{g_t} = -(n-1)H_t dv^{g_t}.$$

It is straightforward to check that the scalar curvatures of  $g_{\text{WS}}$  and  $h_t$  are related by (see Appendix B for details)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Scal}^{g_{\text{WS}}} &= e^{-2\varphi(t)} \text{Scal}^{h_t} + (n-k-1)(n-k-2) \\ &\quad - k(k+1)\varphi'(t)^2 - 2k\varphi''(t) - (k+1)\varphi'(t) \text{tr}(h_t^{-1} \partial_t h_t) \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{4} \text{tr}((h_t^{-1} \partial_t h_t)^2) - \frac{1}{4} \text{tr}(h_t^{-1} \partial_t h_t)^2 - \text{tr}_{h_t}(\partial_t^2 h_t). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

**Definition 5.1.** We say that condition  $(A_t)$  holds if the following assumptions are true:

- 1.)  $t \mapsto h_t$  is constant,
- 2.)  $e^{-2\varphi(t)} \inf_{x \in W} \text{Scal}^{h_t}(x) \geq -\frac{n-k-2}{32} a$ ,
- 3.)  $|\varphi'(t)| \leq 1$ ,
- 4.)  $0 \leq -2k\varphi''(t) \leq \frac{1}{2}(n-1)(n-k-2)^2$ .

Similarly, we say that condition  $(B_t)$  holds if the following assumptions are true:

- 1.)  $t \mapsto \varphi(t)$  is constant,
- 2.)  $\inf_{x \in F_t} \text{Scal}^{g_{\text{WS}}}(x) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{Scal}^{\sigma^{n-k-1}} = \frac{1}{2}(n-k-1)(n-k-2)$ ,
- 3.)  $\frac{(n-1)^2}{2} e(h_t)^2 + \frac{n-1}{2} \partial_t e(h_t) \geq -\frac{3}{64}(n-k-2)$ .

Let  $P$  be  $WS$ -bundle equipped with a metric  $G$  which is close to  $g_{\text{WS}}$  in a sense to be made precise later. Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$  be such that  $[\alpha, \beta] \subset I$ . Our goal is to derive an estimate for the distribution of  $L^2$ -norm of a positive solution to the Yamabe equation

$$L^G u = \mu u^{p-1}.$$

If we write this equation in terms of the metric  $g_{\text{WS}}$  we get a perturbed version of the Yamabe equation for  $g_{\text{WS}}$ . We assume that we have a smooth positive solution  $u$  of the equation

$$L^{g_{\text{WS}}} u = a \Delta^{g_{\text{WS}}} u + \text{Scal}^{g_{\text{WS}}} u = \mu u^{p-1} + d^* A(du) + Xu + \epsilon \partial_t u - su \quad (17)$$

where  $s, \epsilon \in C^\infty(P)$ ,  $A \in \text{End}(T^*P)$ , and  $X \in \Gamma(TP)$  are perturbation terms coming from the difference between  $G$  and  $g_{\text{WS}}$ . We assume that the endomorphism  $A$  is symmetric and that  $X$  and  $A$  are vertical, that is  $dt(X) = 0$  and  $A(dt) = 0$ .

**Theorem 5.2.** *Assume that  $P$  carries a metric  $g_{\text{WS}}$  of the form (14). Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$  be such that  $[\alpha, \beta] \subset I$ . Assume further that for each  $t \in I$  either condition  $(A_t)$  or condition  $(B_t)$  is true. We also assume that  $u$  is a positive solution of (17) satisfying*

$$\mu \|u\|_{L^\infty(P)}^{p-2} \leq \frac{(n-k-2)^2(n-1)}{8(n-2)}. \quad (18)$$

Then there exists  $c_0 > 0$  independent of  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\varphi$ , such that if

$$\|A\|_{L^\infty(P)}, \|X\|_{L^\infty(P)}, \|s\|_{L^\infty(P)}, \|\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(P)}, \|e(h_t)\|_{L^\infty(P)} \leq c_0$$

then

$$\int_{\pi^{-1}((\alpha+\gamma, \beta-\gamma))} u^2 dv^{g_{\text{WS}}} \leq \frac{4\|u\|_{L^\infty}^2}{n-k-2} (\text{Vol}^{g_\alpha}(F_\alpha) + \text{Vol}^{g_\beta}(F_\beta)),$$

where  $\gamma := \frac{\sqrt{32}}{n-k-2}$ .

Note that this theorem only gives information when  $\beta - \alpha > 2\gamma$ .

**5.2. Proof of Theorem 5.2.** For the proof of Theorem 5.2 we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Suppose  $T$  is a positive number. Let  $w : [-T - \gamma, T + \gamma] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a smooth positive function satisfying*

$$w''(t) \geq \frac{w(t)}{\gamma^2}. \quad (19)$$

Then

$$\int_{-T}^T w(t)^m dt \leq \frac{\gamma}{m} (w(T + \gamma)^m + w(-T - \gamma)^m) \quad (20)$$

for all  $m \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* Assume that  $w|_{[-T-\gamma, T+\gamma]}$  attains its minimum in  $t_0$ . Since  $w'' \geq w/\gamma^2 > 0$  we have  $w'(t) > 0$  for  $t \in (t_0, T + \gamma)$ , and  $w'(t) < 0$  for  $t \in (-T - \gamma, t_0)$ . We first study the case when  $t_0 \in (-T, T)$ . We define  $W(t) := w(t) + \gamma w'(t)$ . As  $w$  and  $w'$  are increasing we get

$$\begin{aligned} W(T) &= w(T) + \int_T^{T+\gamma} w'(t) dt \\ &\leq w(T) + \int_T^{T+\gamma} w'(t) dt \\ &= w(T + \gamma). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

From (19) we see that  $W'(t) \geq W(t)/\gamma$ , or  $\partial_t \ln W(t) \geq 1/\gamma$ . Integrating this relation between  $t \in (t_0, T)$  and  $T$  we get

$$W(t) \leq e^{-\frac{T-t}{\gamma}} W(T).$$

Using that  $w \leq W$  on  $(t_0, T)$  together with (21) we obtain

$$w(t) \leq W(t) \leq e^{-\frac{T-t}{\gamma}} w(T + \gamma),$$

and hence

$$w(t)^m \leq e^{-m\frac{T-t}{\gamma}} w(T + \gamma)^m$$

for all  $t \in [t_0, T]$  and  $m \geq 1$ . Integrating this relation over  $t \in [t_0, T]$  we get

$$\int_{t_0}^T w(t)^m dt \leq \frac{\gamma(1 - e^{-m\frac{T-t_0}{\gamma}})}{m} w(T + \gamma)^m \leq \frac{\gamma}{m} w(T + \gamma)^m. \quad (22)$$

Similarly we conclude that

$$\int_{-T}^{t_0} w(t)^m dt \leq \frac{\gamma}{m} w(-T - \gamma)^m. \quad (23)$$

This proves relation (20) in this case. In the case that  $t_0 \leq -T$  relation (22) remains valid. Using

$$\int_{-T}^T w(t)^m dt \leq \int_{t_0}^T w(t)^m dt$$

and

$$w(T + \gamma)^m \leq w(T + \gamma)^m + w(-T - \gamma)^m,$$

we obtain relation (20). We proceed in a similar way using (23) in case  $t_0 \geq T$ . This ends the proof of Lemma 5.3.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 5.2.* The Laplacian  $\Delta^{g_{\text{WS}}}$  on  $P$  is related to the Laplacian  $\Delta^{g_t}$  on  $F_t$  through the formula

$$\Delta^{g_{\text{WS}}} = \Delta^{g_t} - \partial_t^2 + (n-1)H_t \partial_t,$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{F_t} u \Delta^{g_{\text{WS}}} u dv^{g_t} &= \int_{F_t} (u \Delta^{g_t} u - u(\partial_t^2 u) + (n-1)H_t u(\partial_t u)) dv^{g_t} \\ &= \int_{F_t} (|d_{\text{vert}} u|^2 - u(\partial_t^2 u) + (n-1)H_t u(\partial_t u)) dv^{g_t}. \end{aligned}$$

Together with (17) we get

$$\begin{aligned} a \int_{F_t} u \partial_t^2 u dv^{g_t} &= \int_{F_t} \left( a |d_{\text{vert}} u|^2 + a(n-1)H_t u \partial_t u \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \langle d_{\text{vert}} u, A(d_{\text{vert}} u) \rangle - uXu - \epsilon u \partial_t u \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\text{Scal}^{g_{\text{WS}}} + s)u^2 - \mu u^p \right) dv^{g_t}. \end{aligned}$$

In the following we denote by  $\delta(c_0)$  a positive constant which goes to 0 if  $c_0$  tends to 0 and whose convergence depends only on  $n$ ,  $\mu$ , and  $h$ . We set  $S_t := \inf_{F_t} \text{Scal}^{g_{\text{WS}}}$ . If we use the inequality  $2 \int |ab| \leq \int (a^2 + b^2)$  to simplify the terms involving  $X$  and  $\epsilon$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} a \int_{F_t} u \partial_t^2 u dv^{g_t} &\geq \int_{F_t} \left( (a - \delta(c_0)) |d_{\text{vert}} u|^2 + a(n-1)H_t u \partial_t u \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \delta(c_0)(\partial_t u)^2 + (S_t - \delta(c_0))u^2 - \mu u^p \right) dv^{g_t}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $c_0$  is small enough so that  $a - \delta(c_0) > 0$  we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} a \int_{F_t} \left( u \partial_t^2 u - (n-1)H_t u(\partial_t u) \right) dv^{g_t} &\geq (S_t - \delta(c_0))w(t)^2 \\ &\quad - \int_{F_t} \left( \delta(c_0)(\partial_t u)^2 + \mu u^p \right) dv^{g_t}. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

We define

$$w(t) := \|u\|_{L^2(F_t)} = \left( \int_{F_t} u^2 dv^{g_t} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Differentiating this we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2w'(t)w(t) &= \partial_t \int_{F_t} u^2 dv^{g_t} \\ &= \int_{F_t} \left( 2u(\partial_t u) - (n-1)H_t u^2 \right) dv^{g_t}. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

We now assume that  $(A_t)$  holds. Then (15) tells us that

$$H_t = -\frac{k}{n-1}\varphi'(t),$$

so (25) becomes

$$w'(t)w(t) = \int_{F_t} u(\partial_t u) dv^{g_t} + \frac{k}{2}\varphi'(t)w(t)^2. \quad (26)$$

We differentiate this and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} w'(t)^2 + w''(t)w(t) &= \int_{F_t} (\partial_t u)^2 dv^{g_t} \\ &\quad + \int_{F_t} \left( u\partial_t^2 u - (n-1)H_t u\partial_t u \right) dv^{g_t} \\ &\quad + \frac{k}{2}\varphi''(t)w(t)^2 + k\varphi'(t)w'(t)w(t). \end{aligned}$$

From (24) we get

$$\begin{aligned} w'(t)^2 + w''(t)w(t) &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a}\right) \int_{F_t} (\partial_t u)^2 dv^{g_t} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{a}(S_t - \delta(c_0)) + \frac{k}{2}\varphi''(t)\right) w(t)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{a} \int_{F_t} \mu u^p dv^{g_t} + k\varphi'(t)w'(t)w(t). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

We now use (26) to get

$$\begin{aligned} w(t)^2 \int_{F_t} (\partial_t u)^2 dv^{g_t} &\geq \left( \int_{F_t} u(\partial_t u) dv^{g_t} \right)^2 \\ &= \left( w'(t)w(t) - \frac{k}{2}\varphi'(t)w(t)^2 \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

or

$$\int_{F_t} (\partial_t u)^2 dv^{g_t} \geq \left( w'(t) - \frac{k}{2}\varphi'(t)w(t) \right)^2. \quad (28)$$

From assumption (18) it follows that

$$\frac{\mu}{a} \int_{F_t} u^p dv^{g_t} \leq \frac{(n-k-2)^2}{32} w(t)^2. \quad (29)$$

Inserting (28) and (29) into (27) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} w'(t)^2 + w''(t)w(t) &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a}\right) \left( w'(t) - \frac{k}{2}\varphi'(t)w(t) \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{a}(S_t - \delta(c_0)) + \frac{k}{2}\varphi''(t)\right) w(t)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{(n-k-2)^2}{32} w(t)^2 + k\varphi'(t)w'(t)w(t), \end{aligned}$$

or after some rearranging,

$$\begin{aligned} w''(t)w(t) &\geq -\frac{\delta(c_0)}{a} \left( w'(t) - \frac{k}{2}\varphi'(t)w(t) \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \left( \frac{1}{a}(S_t - \delta(c_0)) + \frac{k}{2}\varphi''(t) + \frac{k^2}{4}\varphi'(t)^2 - \frac{(n-k-2)^2}{32} \right) w(t)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Next we estimate the coefficient of  $w(t)^2$  in the last line of (30). We denote this coefficient by  $D$ . Using (16) and assumption 1.) of  $(A_t)$ , which tells us that  $e(h_t) = 0$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} D &= \frac{1}{a} \left( e^{-2\varphi(t)} \text{Scal}^{h_t} - k(k+1)\varphi'(t)^2 - 2k\varphi''(t) + (n-k-1)(n-k-2) \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a} + \frac{k}{2}\varphi''(t) + \frac{k^2}{4}\varphi'(t)^2 - \frac{(n-k-2)^2}{32} \\ &= \frac{1}{a} e^{-2\varphi(t)} \text{Scal}^{h_t} + \frac{1}{a} \left( (n-k-1)(n-k-2) - \delta(c_0) \right) + \frac{k}{2(n-1)}\varphi''(t) \\ &\quad - \frac{k}{4(n-1)}(n-k-2)\varphi'(t)^2 - \frac{(n-k-2)^2}{32}. \end{aligned}$$

From assumptions 2.) and 3.) of  $(A_t)$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} D &\geq -\frac{n-k-2}{32} + \frac{1}{a} \left( (n-k-1)(n-k-2) - \delta(c_0) \right) + \frac{k}{2(n-1)}\varphi''(t) \\ &\quad - \frac{k}{4(n-1)}(n-k-2) - \frac{(n-k-2)^2}{32} \\ &= \frac{1}{4(n-1)} \left( (n-1)(n-k-2)^2 + 2k\varphi''(t) \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{n-k-2}{32} - \frac{(n-k-2)^2}{32} - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a}. \end{aligned}$$

Using 4.) of  $(A_t)$  and  $n-k-2 \geq 1$  we further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} D &\geq \frac{1}{4(n-1)} \left( \frac{1}{2}(n-1)(n-k-2)^2 \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{(n-k-2)^2}{32} - \frac{(n-k-2)^2}{32} - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a} \\ &= \frac{(n-k-2)^2}{16} - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a}. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting this in (30) we get

$$\begin{aligned} w''(t)w(t) &\geq -\frac{\delta(c_0)}{a} \left( w'(t) - \frac{k}{2}\varphi'(t)w(t) \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \left( \frac{(n-k-2)^2}{16} - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a} \right) w(t)^2 \\ &\geq -\frac{2\delta(c_0)}{a} w'(t)^2 \\ &\quad + \left( -\frac{2\delta(c_0)}{a} \frac{k^2}{4}\varphi'(t)^2 + \frac{(n-k-2)^2}{16} - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a} \right) w(t)^2, \end{aligned}$$



where we also used the elementary inequality  $(a - b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ . Again using assumption 3.) of  $(A_t)$  we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} w''(t)w(t) &\geq -\frac{2\delta(c_0)}{a}w'(t)^2 \\ &\quad + \left( \frac{(n-k-2)^2}{16} - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a} \left( 1 + \frac{k^2}{2} \right) \right) w(t)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Fix a small positive number  $\hat{\delta}$ . Choose  $c_0$  small so that  $\delta(c_0)$  is also small. Then (31) tells us that

$$w''(t)w(t) \geq \frac{(n-k-2)^2}{32}w(t)^2 - \hat{\delta}w'(t)^2. \quad (32)$$

Define  $v(t) := w(t)^{1+\hat{\delta}}$ . This function satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} v''(t) &= (1 + \hat{\delta})w''(t)w(t)^{\hat{\delta}} + \hat{\delta}(1 + \hat{\delta})w'(t)^2w(t)^{\hat{\delta}-1} \\ &\geq (1 + \hat{\delta})\frac{(n-k-2)^2}{32}w(t)^{1+\hat{\delta}} \\ &\geq \frac{(n-k-2)^2}{32}v(t). \end{aligned}$$

Next we assume that  $(B_t)$  holds. Then (15) becomes

$$H_t = -e(h_t),$$

and from (25) we get

$$w'(t)w(t) = \int_{F_t} \left( u(\partial_t u) + \frac{n-1}{2}e(h_t)u^2 \right) dv^{g_t}. \quad (33)$$

Differentiating this we get

$$\begin{aligned} w'(t)^2 + w''(t)w(t) &= \int_{F_t} \left( (\partial_t u)^2 + (n-1)e(h_t)u\partial_t u \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \frac{(n-1)^2}{2}e(h_t)^2 + \frac{n-1}{2}\partial_t e(h_t) \right) u^2 \right) dv^{g_t} \\ &\quad + \int_{F_t} (u\partial_t^2 u - (n-1)H_t u\partial_t u) dv^{g_t}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we use (24) followed by assumptions 2.) and 3.) of  $(B_t)$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
w'(t)^2 + w''(t)w(t) &\geq \int_{F_t} \left( (\partial_t u)^2 + (n-1)e(h_t)u\partial_t u \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left( \frac{(n-1)^2}{2}e(h_t)^2 + \frac{n-1}{2}\partial_t e(h_t) \right) u^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a}(\partial_t u)^2 - \frac{\mu}{a}u^p \right) dv^{g_t} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{a}(S_t - \delta(c_0))w(t)^2 \\
&\geq \int_{F_t} \left( \left( 1 - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a} \right) (\partial_t u)^2 + (n-1)e(h_t)u\partial_t u - \frac{\mu}{a}u^p \right) dv^{g_t} \\
&\quad + \left( \frac{1}{2a}(n-k-1)(n-k-2) - \frac{3}{64}(n-k-2) - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a} \right) w(t)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

From (29) we further get

$$\begin{aligned}
w'(t)^2 + w''(t)w(t) &\geq \int_{F_t} \left( \left( 1 - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a} \right) (\partial_t u)^2 + (n-1)e(h_t)u\partial_t u \right) dv^{g_t} \\
&\quad + \left( \frac{1}{2a}(n-k-1)(n-k-2) - \frac{3}{64}(n-k-2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{32}(n-k-2)^2 - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a} \right) w(t)^2 \\
&\geq \int_{F_t} \left( \left( 1 - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a} \right) (\partial_t u)^2 + (n-1)e(h_t)u\partial_t u \right) dv^{g_t} \quad (34) \\
&\quad + \left( \frac{1}{32}(n-k-2)(n-k-3/2) - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a} \right) w(t)^2 \\
&\geq \int_{F_t} \left( \left( 1 - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a} \right) (\partial_t u)^2 + (n-1)e(h_t)u\partial_t u \right) dv^{g_t} \\
&\quad + \left( \frac{1}{32}(n-k-2)^2 + \frac{1}{64} - \frac{\delta(c_0)}{a} \right) w(t)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We set  $E_t := \sup_{F_t} |e(h_t)|$  and use (33) to compute

$$\begin{aligned}
w(t)^2 \int_{F_t} (\partial_t u)^2 dv^{g_t} &\geq \left( \int_{F_t} u(\partial_t u) dv^{g_t} \right)^2 \\
&= \left( w'(t)w(t) - \frac{n-1}{2} \int_{F_t} e(h_t)u^2 dv^{g_t} \right)^2 \\
&= (w'(t)w(t))^2 + \left( \frac{n-1}{2} \int_{F_t} e(h_t)u^2 dv^{g_t} \right)^2 \\
&\quad - (n-1)w'(t)w(t) \int_{F_t} e(h_t)u^2 dv^{g_t} \\
&\geq w'(t)^2 w(t)^2 - \left( \frac{n-1}{2} \right)^2 E_t^2 w(t)^4 \\
&\quad - (n-1)|w'(t)w(t)| \int_{F_t} |e(h_t)|u^2 dv^{g_t} \\
&\geq w'(t)^2 w(t)^2 - \left( \frac{n-1}{2} \right)^2 E_t^2 w(t)^4 \\
&\quad - (n-1)E_t |w'(t)w(t)|^3.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we divide by  $w(t)^2$  and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{F_t} (\partial_t u)^2 dv^{g_t} &\geq w'(t)^2 - \left( \frac{n-1}{2} \right)^2 E_t^2 w(t)^2 - (n-1)E_t |w'(t)w(t)| \\
&\geq w'(t)^2 - \left( \frac{n-1}{2} \right)^2 E_t^2 w(t)^2 - \frac{n-1}{2} E_t (w'(t)^2 + w(t)^2) \\
&= \left( 1 - \frac{n-1}{2} E_t \right) w'(t)^2 - \left( \frac{n-1}{2} E_t + \left( \frac{n-1}{2} \right)^2 E_t^2 \right) w(t)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{F_t} e(h_t)u\partial_t u dv^{g_t} \right| &\leq \int_{F_t} |e(h_t)u\partial_t u| dv^{g_t} \\
&\leq E_t \int_{F_t} |u\partial_t u| dv^{g_t} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} E_t \int_{F_t} (u^2 + (\partial_t u)^2) dv^{g_t},
\end{aligned}$$

so

$$\int_{F_t} (n-1)e(h_t)u\partial_t u dv^{g_t} \geq -\frac{n-1}{2} E_t \int_{F_t} (u^2 + (\partial_t u)^2) dv^{g_t}. \tag{36}$$

Fix a small number  $\hat{\delta} > 0$ . We insert (35) and (36) in (34) and choose  $c_0$  small enough so that  $\delta(c_0)$  and  $E_t$  are small. Then we get that  $w(t)$  satisfies the same inequality (32) as we obtained under the assumption  $(A_t)$ . We have showed that in both cases  $(A_t)$  and  $(B_t)$  the function  $v(t) = w(t)^{1+\hat{\delta}}$  satisfies

$$v''(t) \geq v(t)/\gamma^2$$

since  $\frac{32}{(n-k-2)^2} = \gamma^2$ .

Now we apply Lemma 5.3 to the function  $\tilde{v}(t) := v(t + \frac{\beta+\alpha}{2})$  with  $T = \frac{\beta-\alpha}{2} - \gamma$  and  $m = \frac{2}{1+\delta}$ . From this we obtain

$$\frac{\gamma}{m} (\tilde{v}(T + \gamma)^m + \tilde{v}(-T - \gamma)^m) \geq \int_{-T}^T \tilde{v}^m dt. \quad (37)$$

We further have

$$\int_{-T}^T \tilde{v}^m dt = \int_{-\frac{\beta-\alpha}{2}+\gamma}^{\frac{\beta-\alpha}{2}-\gamma} \left( w^{(1+\delta)} \right)^m \left( t + \frac{\beta+\alpha}{2} \right) dt$$

We set  $s = t + \frac{\beta+\alpha}{2}$  and we obtain

$$\int_{-T}^T \tilde{v}^m dt = \int_{\alpha+\gamma}^{\beta-\gamma} w^2 ds.$$

From the definition of  $w$  we obtain

$$\int_{-T}^T \tilde{v}^m dt = \int_{\pi^{-1}((\alpha+\gamma, \beta-\gamma))} u^2 dv^{g_{\text{WS}}}.$$

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{v}(T + b)^m + \tilde{v}(-T - b)^m) &= \int_{F_\alpha} u^2 dv^{g_\alpha} + \int_{F_\beta} u^2 dv^{g_\beta} \\ &\leq \|u\|_{L^\infty(P)}^2 (\text{Vol}^{g_\alpha}(F_\alpha) + \text{Vol}^{g_\beta}(F_\beta)). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $\hat{\delta}$  small we may assume  $m \geq \sqrt{2}$ . This together with (37) and  $\gamma = \frac{\sqrt{32}}{n-k-2}$  gives us

$$\int_{\pi^{-1}((\alpha+\gamma, \beta-\gamma))} u^2 dv^{g_{\text{WS}}} \leq \frac{4\|u\|_{L^\infty}^2}{n-k-2} (\text{Vol}^{g_\alpha}(F_\alpha) + \text{Vol}^{g_\beta}(F_\beta)).$$

This proves Theorem 5.2.  $\square$

## 6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

**6.1. Stronger version of Theorem 1.3.** In this section we prove the following Theorem 6.1. By taking the supremum over all conformal classes Theorem 6.1 implies Theorem 1.3.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Suppose that  $(M_1, g_1)$  and  $(M_2, g_2)$  are compact Riemannian manifolds of dimension  $n$ . Let  $N$  be obtained from  $M_1, M_2$ , by a connected sum along  $W$  as described in Section 2. Then there is a family of metrics  $g_\theta$ ,  $\theta \in (0, \theta_0)$  on  $N$  satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} \min \{ \mu(M_1 \amalg M_2, g_1 \amalg g_2), \Lambda_{n,k} \} &\leq \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \mu(N, g_\theta) \\ &\leq \limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \mu(N, g_\theta) \leq \mu(M_1 \amalg M_2, g_1 \amalg g_2). \end{aligned}$$

In the following we define suitable metrics  $g_\theta$ , and then we show that they satisfy these inequalities.




FIGURE 1. Hierarchy of parameters

**6.2. Definition of the metrics  $g_\theta$ .** We continue to use the notation of Section 2. In the following,  $C$  denotes a constant which might change its value between lines. Recall that  $(M, g) = (M_1 \amalg M_2, g_1 \amalg g_2)$ . For  $i = 1, 2$  we define the metric  $h_i$  as the restriction of  $g_i$  to  $W'_i = w_i(W \times \{0\})$ , and we set  $h := h_1 \amalg h_2$  on  $W' = W'_1 \amalg W'_2$ . As already explained, the normal exponential map of  $W' \subset M$  defines a diffeomorphism

$$w_i : W \times B^{n-k}(R_{\max}) \rightarrow U_i(R_{\max}), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

which decomposes  $U(R_{\max}) = U_1(R_{\max}) \amalg U_2(R_{\max})$  as a product  $W' \times B^{n-k}(R_{\max})$ . In general the Riemannian metric  $g$  does not have a corresponding product structure, and we introduce an error term  $T$  measuring the difference from the product metric. If  $r$  denotes the distance function to  $W'$ , then the metric  $g$  can be written as

$$g = h + \xi^{n-k} + T = h + dr^2 + r^2 \sigma^{n-k-1} + T \quad (38)$$

on  $U(R_{\max}) \setminus W' \cong W' \times (0, R_{\max}) \times S^{n-k-1}$ . Here  $T$  is a symmetric  $(2, 0)$ -tensor vanishing on  $W'$  (in the sense of sections of  $(T^*M \otimes T^*M)|_{W'}$ ). We also define the product metric

$$g' := h + \xi^{n-k} = h + dr^2 + r^2 \sigma^{n-k-1}, \quad (39)$$

on  $U(R_{\max}) \setminus W'$ . Thus  $g = g' + T$ . Since  $T$  vanishes on  $W'$  we have

$$|T(X, Y)| \leq Cr |X|_{g'} |Y|_{g'} \quad (40)$$

for any  $X, Y \in T_x M$  where  $x \in U(R_{\max})$ . Since  $T$  is smooth we have

$$|(\nabla_U T)(X, Y)| \leq C |X|_{g'} |Y|_{g'} |U|_{g'},$$

and

$$|(\nabla_{U,V}^2 T)(X, Y)| \leq C |X|_{g'} |Y|_{g'} |U|_{g'} |V|_{g'},$$


for  $X, Y, U, V \in T_x M$ . We define  $T_i := T|_{M_i}$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

For a fixed  $R_0 \in (0, R_{\max})$ ,  $R_0 < 1$  we choose a smooth positive function  $F : M \setminus W' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \in M_i \setminus U_i(R_{\max}); \\ r_i(x)^{-1}, & \text{if } x \in U_i(R_0) \setminus W'. \end{cases}$$

Next we choose small numbers  $\theta, \delta_0 \in (0, R_0)$  with  $\theta > \delta_0 > 0$ . Here ‘‘small’’ means that for a given small number  $\theta$  we choose a number  $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\theta) \in (0, \theta)$  such that all arguments which need  $\delta_0$  to be small will hold, see Figure 1. For any  $\theta > 0$  and sufficiently small  $\delta_0$  there is  $A_\theta \in [\theta^{-1}, (\delta_0)^{-1})$  and a smooth function  $f : U(R_{\max}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  depending only on the coordinate  $r$  such that

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} -\ln r(x), & \text{if } x \in U(R_{\max}) \setminus U(\theta); \\ \ln A_\theta, & \text{if } x \in U(\delta_0), \end{cases}$$

FIGURE 2. The function  $f$ 

and such that

$$\left| r \frac{df}{dr} \right| = \left| \frac{df}{d(\ln r)} \right| \leq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| r \frac{d}{dr} \left( r \frac{df}{dr} \right) \right\|_{L^\infty} = \left\| \frac{d^2 f}{d^2(\ln r)} \right\|_{L^\infty} \rightarrow 0 \quad (41)$$

as  $\theta \rightarrow 0$ . See Figure 2.

We set  $\epsilon = e^{-A_\theta} \delta_0$ . We can and will assume that  $\epsilon < 1$ .

Let  $N$  be obtained from  $M$  by a connected sum along  $W$  with parameter  $\epsilon$ , as described in Section 2. In particular,  $U_\epsilon^N(s) = (U(s) \setminus U(\epsilon)) / \sim$  for all  $s \geq \epsilon$ . On the set  $U_\epsilon^N(R_{\max}) = (U(R_{\max}) \setminus U(\epsilon)) / \sim$  we define the variable  $t$  by

$$t := \begin{cases} -\ln r_1 + \ln \epsilon, & \text{on } U_1(R_{\max}) \setminus U_1(\epsilon); \\ \ln r_2 - \ln \epsilon, & \text{on } U_2(R_{\max}) \setminus U_2(\epsilon). \end{cases}$$

Note that  $t \leq 0$  on  $U_1(R_{\max}) \setminus U_1(\epsilon)$  and  $t \geq 0$  on  $U_2(R_{\max}) \setminus U_2(\epsilon)$ , with  $t = 0$  precisely on the common boundary  $\partial U_1(\epsilon)$  identified with  $\partial U_2(\epsilon)$  in  $N$ . It follows that

$$r_i = e^{|t| + \ln \epsilon} = \epsilon e^{|t|}.$$

We can assume that  $t : U_\epsilon^N(R_{\max}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is smooth. Expressed in the variable  $t$  we have


$$F(x) = \epsilon^{-1} e^{-|t|}$$

for  $x \in U(R_0) \setminus U^N(\theta)$ , or in other words if  $|t| + \ln \epsilon \leq \ln R_0$ . Then Equation (38) tells us that

$$F^2 g = \epsilon^{-2} e^{-2|t|} (h + T) + dt^2 + \sigma^{n-k-1}$$

on  $U(R_0) \setminus U^N(\theta)$ . If we view  $f$  as a function of  $t$ , then

$$f(t) = \begin{cases} -|t| - \ln \epsilon, & \text{if } \ln \theta - \ln \epsilon \leq |t| \leq \ln R_{\max} - \ln \epsilon; \\ \ln A_\theta, & \text{if } |t| \leq \ln \delta_0 - \ln \epsilon; \end{cases}$$

FIGURE 3. The metrics  $g_\theta$ 

and  $|df/dt| \leq 1$ ,  $\|d^2f/dt^2\|_{L^\infty} \rightarrow 0$ . We choose a cut-off function  $\chi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $\chi = 0$  on  $(-\infty, -1]$ ,  $|d\chi| \leq 1$ , and  $\chi = 1$  on  $[1, \infty)$ . With these choices we define

$$g_\theta := \begin{cases} F^2 g_i, & \text{on } M_i \setminus U_i(\theta); \\ e^{2f(t)}(h_i + T_i) + dt^2 + \sigma^{n-k-1}, & \text{on } U_i(\theta) \setminus U_i(\delta_0); \\ A_\theta^2 \chi(t/A_\theta)(h_2 + T_2) + A_\theta^2(1 - \chi(t/A_\theta))(h_1 + T_1) \\ \quad + dt^2 + \sigma^{n-k-1}, & \text{on } U_\epsilon^N(\delta_0). \end{cases}$$

On  $U^N(R_0)$  we write  $g_\theta$  as

$$g_\theta = e^{2f(t)} \tilde{h}_t + dt^2 + \sigma^{n-k-1} + \tilde{T}_t,$$

where the metric  $\tilde{h}_t$  is defined by

$$\tilde{h}_t := \chi(t/A_\theta)h_2 + (1 - \chi(t/A_\theta))h_1,$$

for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , and where the error term  $\tilde{T}_t$  is equal to

$$\tilde{T}_t := e^{2f(t)} (\chi(t/A_\theta)T_2 + (1 - \chi(t/A_\theta))T_1).$$

See also Figure 3. On  $U^N(R_0)$  we also define the metric without error term

$$g'_\theta := g_\theta - \tilde{T}_t = e^{2f(t)}\tilde{h}_t + dt^2 + \sigma^{n-k-1}. \quad (42)$$

An upper bound for the error term  $\tilde{T}_t$  will be needed in the following. We claim that

$$|X|_{g'} \leq Ce^{-f(t)}|X|_{g'_\theta} \quad (43)$$

for  $X \in T_x N$ , where  $g'$  is the metric defined by (39). To prove the claim, we decompose  $X$  in a radial part, a part parallel to  $W'$ , and a part parallel to  $S^{n-k-1}$ . This decomposition is orthogonal with respect to both  $g'$  and  $g'_\theta$ . For  $X = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} = \pm \epsilon e^{|t|} \frac{\partial}{\partial r}$  we have that  $1 = |X|_{g'_\theta}$  and  $|X|_{g'} = \epsilon e^{|t|} \leq e^{-f(t)}$  since  $f(t) \leq -|t| - \ln \epsilon$ . The argument is similar if  $X$  is parallel to  $S^{n-k-1}$ . If  $X$  is tangent to  $W'$ , then  $|X|_g = |X|_h \leq C|X|_{\tilde{h}_t} \leq Ce^{-f(t)}|X|_{g'_\theta}$ , and the claim follows.

The Relations (40) and (43) imply

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{T}_t(X, Y)| &\leq Ce^{2f(t)}|T(X, Y)| \\ &\leq Ce^{2f(t)}r|X|_{g'}|Y|_{g'} \\ &\leq Cr|X|_{g'_\theta}|X|_{g'_\theta} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $X, Y$ . In other words this means

$$|\tilde{T}_t|_{g'_\theta} \leq Cr = C\epsilon e^{|t|} \leq Ce^{-f(t)}. \quad (44)$$

Further, one can calculate that

$$|\nabla \tilde{T}_t|_{g'_\theta} \leq Ce^{-f(t)}, \quad (45)$$

and

$$|\nabla^2 \tilde{T}_t|_{g'_\theta} \leq Ce^{-f(t)}. \quad (46)$$

Here  $\nabla$  denotes the Levi-Civita-connection with respect to  $g'_\theta$ . In particular we see with Corollary A.2

$$|\text{Scal}^{g_\theta} - \text{Scal}^{g'_\theta}| \leq Ce^{-f(t)}. \quad (47)$$

**6.3. Geometric description of the new metrics.** In this subsection we collect some facts about the geometry of  $F^2g$  and  $g'_\theta$  introduced in the previous subsection. Most of the results are not needed for the proof of our result, but are useful to understand the underlying geometric concept of the argument. We will thus skip most of the proofs in this subsection.

The first proposition explains the special role of  $\mathbb{H}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$ .

**Proposition 6.2.** *Let  $x_i$  be a sequence of points in  $M \setminus W$ , converging to  $W$ . Then the Riemann tensor of  $F^2g$  in  $x_i$  converges to the Riemann tensor of  $\mathbb{H}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$ . The covariant derivative of the Riemann tensor of  $F^2g$  converges to zero. For any fixed  $R > 0$  these convergences are uniform on balls (with respect to the metric  $F^2g$ ) of radius  $R$ .*



It follows that for any fixed  $R > 0$  the balls  $(B^{F^2g}(x_i, R), x_i, F^2g)$  converge to a ball of radius  $R$  in  $\mathbb{H}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  in the  $C^{2,\alpha}$ -topology of Riemannian manifolds with base point. This topology has its origins in Cheeger's finiteness theorem [11] and in the work of Gromov [14], [15]. The article by Petersen [34, Pages 167–202] is a good introduction to the subject.

In the limit  $r \rightarrow 0$  (or equivalently  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ) the  $W$ -component of the metric  $F^2g$  grows exponentially. The motivation for introducing the function  $f$  into the definition of  $g_\theta$  is to slow down this exponential growth: the diameter of the  $W$ -component with respect to  $g_\theta$  is then bounded by  $A_\theta \text{diam}(W, g)$ , where  $\text{diam}(W, g)$  is the diameter of  $W$  with respect to  $g$ . This slowing down has to be done carefully in order to get nice limit spaces. The properties claimed for  $f$  imply the following result.

**Proposition 6.3.** *Let  $\theta_i$  be a sequence of positive numbers tending to zero, and let  $x_i \in U_\epsilon^N(R_{max})$  be a sequence of points such that the limit  $c := \lim(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}f)(t(x_i))$  exists. Then the Riemann tensor of  $g_{\theta_i}$  in  $x_i$  converges to the Riemann tensor of  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$ . The covariant derivative of the Riemann tensor of  $g_{\theta_i}$  converges to zero. For any fixed  $R > 0$  these convergences are uniform on balls (with respect to the metric  $g_{\theta_i}$ ) of radius  $R$ .*

From this proposition it follows that the balls  $(B^{F^2g}(x_i, R), x_i, F^2g)$  converge to a ball of radius  $R$  in  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  in the  $C^{2,\alpha}$ -topology of Riemannian manifolds with base point. Thus, we get an explanation why the spaces  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  appear as limit spaces.

The sectional curvature of  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1}$  is  $-c^2$ . Hence the sectional curvatures of the product  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}$  are in the interval  $[-c^2, 1]$ . Using this fact we can prove the following Proposition.

**Proposition 6.4.** *The scalar curvatures of  $g_\theta$  and  $g'_\theta$  are bounded by a constant independent of  $\theta$ .*

*Proof.* The metric  $g'_\theta$  is the metric of a  $WS$ -bundle. Hence (16) is valid. We calculate  $\partial_t \tilde{h}_t = (1/A_\theta)\chi'(t/A_\theta)(h_2 - h_1)$  and  $\partial_t^2 \tilde{h}_t = (1/A_\theta)^2\chi''(t/A_\theta)(h_2 - h_1)$ . This implies  $|\text{tr}_{\tilde{h}_t} \partial_t \tilde{h}_t| \leq C/A_\theta$ ,  $|\text{tr}(\tilde{h}_t^{-1} \partial_t \tilde{h}_t)^2| \leq C/A_\theta^2$ , and  $|\text{tr}_{\tilde{h}_t} \partial_t^2 \tilde{h}_t| \leq C/A_\theta^2$ . From (16) it follows that  $\text{Scal}^{g'_\theta}$  is bounded. Equation (47) then implies that  $\text{Scal}^{g_\theta}$  is bounded.  $\square$

The geometry close to the gluing of  $M_1 \setminus U_1(\epsilon)$  with  $M_2 \setminus U_2(\epsilon)$  is described by the following simple proposition.

**Proposition 6.5.** *Let  $H$  be the metric on  $W \times (-1, 1)$  given by  $(\chi(t)h_2 + (1 - \chi(t))h_1) + dt^2$ . Then  $(U^N(\delta_0), g'_\theta)$  is isometric to  $(W \times (-1, 1) \times \mathbb{S}^{n-k-1}, A_\theta^2 H + \sigma^{n-k-1})$ .*

**6.4. Proof of Theorem 6.1.** The metrics  $g_\theta$  are defined for small  $\theta > 0$  as described above. In order to prove Theorem 6.1 it is sufficient to prove

$$\min \{ \mu(M, g), \Lambda_{n,k} \} \leq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mu(N, g_{\theta_i}) \leq \mu(M, g)$$

for any sequence  $\theta_i \rightarrow 0$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$  for which  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mu(N, g_{\theta_i})$  exists. Recall that  $(M, g) = (M_1 \amalg M_2, g_1 \amalg g_2)$ .

The upper bound on  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mu(N, g_{\theta_i})$  is easy to prove. The proof of the lower bound is more complicated, our arguments for this part are inspired by the compactness-concentration principle in analysis, see for example [12].

For each metric  $g_\theta$  we have a solution of the Yamabe equation (5). We take a sequence of  $\theta$  tending to 0. Following the compactness-concentration principle, this sequence of solutions can concentrate in points or converge to a non-trivial solution or do both at the same time. The concentration in points can be used to construct a non-trivial solution on a sphere by blowing up the metrics.

In our situation we may have concentration in a fixed point (subcase I.1) or in a wandering point (subcase I.2), and we may have convergence to a non-trivial solution on the original manifold (subcase II.1.2) or in the attached part (subcases II.1.1 and II.2). In each of these cases we obtain a different lower bound for  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mu(N, g_{\theta_i})$ : In the subcases I.1 and I.2 the lower bound is  $\mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$ , in subcase II.1.2 it is  $\mu(M, g)$ , and in the subcases II.1.1 and II.2 we obtain  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(1)}$  and  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(2)}$  as lower bounds. Together these cases give the lower bound of Theorem 6.1.

The cases here are not exclusive. For example it is possible that the solutions may both concentrate in a point and converge to a non-trivial solution on the original manifold.

In our arguments we will often pass to subsequences. To avoid complicated notation we write  $\theta \rightarrow 0$  for a sequence  $(\theta_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  converging to zero, and we will pass successively to subsequences without changing notation. Similarly  $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} h(\theta)$  should be read as  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} h(\theta_i)$ .

We set  $\mu := \mu(M, g)$  and  $\mu_\theta := \mu(N, g_\theta)$ . From Theorem 1.1 we have

$$\mu, \mu_\theta \leq \mu(\mathbb{S}^n). \quad (48)$$

After passing to a subsequence, the limit

$$\bar{\mu} := \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \mu_\theta \in [-\infty, \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)]$$

exists. Let  $J := J^g$  and  $J_\theta := J^{g_\theta}$  be defined as in (1).

We start with the easier part of the argument, namely with

$$\bar{\mu} \leq \mu. \quad (49)$$

For this let  $\alpha > 0$  be a small number. We choose a smooth cut-off function  $\chi_\alpha$  on  $M$  such that  $\chi_\alpha = 1$  on  $M \setminus U(2\alpha)$ ,  $|d\chi_\alpha| \leq 2/\alpha$ , and  $\chi_\alpha = 0$  on  $U(\alpha)$ . Let  $u$  be a smooth non-zero function such that  $J(u) \leq \mu + \delta$  where  $\delta$  is a small positive number. On the support of  $\chi_\alpha$  the metrics  $g$  and  $g_\theta$  are conformal since  $g_\theta = F^2 g$  and hence by (3) we have

$$\mu_\theta \leq J_\theta \left( \chi_\alpha F^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} u \right) = J(\chi_\alpha u)$$

for  $\theta < \alpha$ . It is straightforward to compute that  $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} J(\chi_\alpha u) = J(u) \leq \mu + \delta$ . From this Relation (49) follows.

Now we turn to the more difficult part of the proof, namely the inequality

$$\bar{\mu} \geq \min \{ \mu, \Lambda_{n,k} \}. \quad (50)$$

In the case  $\bar{\mu} = \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$  this inequality follows trivially from (48). Hence we assume  $\bar{\mu} < \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$  in the following, which implies  $\mu_\theta < \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$  if  $\theta$  is sufficiently small. From Theorem 1.2 we know that there exist positive functions  $u_\theta \in C^2(M)$  such that

$$L^{g_\theta} u_\theta = \mu_\theta u_\theta^{p-1}, \quad (51)$$

and

$$\int_N u_\theta^p dv^{g_\theta} = 1.$$

We begin by proving a lemma which yields a bound of the  $L^2$ -norm of  $u_\theta$  in terms of the  $L^\infty$ -norm. This result is non-trivial since  $\text{Vol}(N, g_\theta) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\theta \rightarrow 0$ .

**Lemma 6.6.** *Assume that there exists  $b > 0$  such that*

$$\mu_\theta \sup_{U^N(b)} u_\theta^{p-2} \leq \frac{(n-k-2)^2(n-1)}{8(n-2)}$$

for  $\theta$  small enough. Then there exist constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  independent of  $\theta$  such that

$$\int_N u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta} \leq c_1 \|u_\theta\|_{L^\infty(N)}^2 + c_2$$

for all sufficiently small  $\theta$ . In particular, if  $\|u_\theta\|_{L^\infty(N)}$  is bounded, so is  $\|u_\theta\|_{L^2(N)}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\tilde{r} \in (0, b)$  be fixed and set  $P = U(\tilde{r})$ . Then  $P$  is a  $WS$ -bundle where, with the notation of Section 5,  $I = (\alpha, \beta)$  with  $\alpha = -\ln \tilde{r} + \ln \epsilon$  and  $\beta = \ln \tilde{r} - \ln \epsilon$ . On  $P$  we have two natural metrics:  $g_\theta$  and  $g_{\text{WS}} = g'_\theta = g_\theta - \tilde{T}_t$ . The metric  $g_{\text{WS}}$  has exactly the form (14) with  $\varphi = f$  and  $h_t = \tilde{h}_t$ . Let  $\theta$  be small enough and let  $t \in (-\ln \tilde{r} + \ln \epsilon, -\ln \delta_0 + \ln \epsilon) \cup (\ln \delta_0 - \ln \epsilon, \ln \tilde{r} - \ln \epsilon)$ . Then assumption  $(A_t)$  of Theorem 5.2 is true. Now, again if  $\theta$  is small enough, we have for all  $t \in (-\ln \delta_0 + \ln \epsilon, \ln \delta_0 - \ln \epsilon)$  the relation  $\text{Scal}^{g_{\text{WS}}} = \text{Scal}^{\sigma^{n-k-1}} + O(1/A_\theta)$ . The error term  $e(\tilde{h}_t)$  from  $(B_t)$  in this case satisfies

$$|e(\tilde{h}_t)| \leq \left| \text{tr}_{\tilde{h}_t} \partial_t \tilde{h}_t \right| = \left| \text{tr}_{\tilde{h}_t} \left( \chi'(t/A_\theta) \frac{h_2 - h_1}{A_\theta} \right) \right| \leq \frac{C}{A_\theta},$$

and

$$|\partial_t e(\tilde{h}_t)| = \left| \text{tr} \left( \tilde{h}_t^{-1} (\partial_t \tilde{h}_t) \tilde{h}_t^{-1} (\partial_t \tilde{h}_t) \right) \right| + \left| \text{tr}_{\tilde{h}_t} \partial_t^2 \tilde{h}_t \right| \leq \frac{C}{A_\theta^2}.$$

Because of  $1/A_\theta \leq \theta$  condition  $(B_t)$  is true. Equation (51) is written in the metric  $g_\theta$ . Using the expression of the Laplacian in local coordinates,

$$\Delta^{g_\theta} u = - \sum_{i,j} (\det g_\theta)^{-1/2} \partial_i \left( g_\theta^{ij} (\det g_\theta)^{1/2} \partial_j u \right),$$

one can check that if we write Equation (51) in the metric  $g_{\text{WS}}$  we obtain an equation of the form (17) with  $\mu = \mu_\theta$ . Together with (44), (45) and (47), one verifies that the error terms satisfy

$$|A(x)|_{g_{\text{WS}}}, |X(x)|_{g_{\text{WS}}}, |s(x)|_{g_{\text{WS}}}, |\epsilon(x)|_{g_{\text{WS}}} \leq C e^{-f(t)},$$

where  $|\cdot|_{g_{\text{WS}}}$  denotes the pointwise norm at a point in  $U^N(R_0)$ , and where  $C$  is a constant independent of  $\theta$ . In particular for any  $c_0 > 0$ , we obtain

$$|A(x)|_{g_{\text{WS}}}, |X(x)|_{g_{\text{WS}}}, |s(x)|_{g_{\text{WS}}}, |e(\tilde{h}_t)(x)|_{g_{\text{WS}}}, |\epsilon(x)|_{g_{\text{WS}}} \leq c_0$$

on  $U^N(\theta)$  for small  $\theta$ . These estimates allow us to apply Theorem 5.2. By the assumptions of Lemma 6.6, if  $\tilde{r} \in (0, b)$  is small enough, Assumption (18) of Theorem 5.2 is true. Thus, all hypotheses of Theorem 5.2 hold for  $\alpha := -\ln \tilde{r} + \ln \epsilon$ ,  $\beta := \ln \tilde{r} - \ln \epsilon$ , and hence

$$\int_{P'} u_\theta^2 dv^{g_{\text{WS}}} \leq \frac{4 \|u_\theta\|_{L^\infty}^2}{n-k-2} (\text{Vol}^{g_\alpha}(F_\alpha) + \text{Vol}^{g_\beta}(F_\beta)).$$

where  $P' := U^N(\tilde{r}e^{-\gamma})$ . Now observe that

$$C := \frac{4}{n-k-2} (\text{Vol}^{g_\alpha}(F_\alpha) + \text{Vol}^{g_\beta}(F_\beta))$$

does not depend on  $\theta$  (since  $F_\alpha$  and  $F_\beta$  correspond to the hypersurface  $r = \tilde{r}$ ). This implies that

$$\int_{P'} u_\theta^2 dv^{g^{\text{ws}}} \leq C \|u_\theta\|_{L^\infty(N)}^2$$

where  $C > 0$  is independent of  $\theta$ . Since if  $\tilde{r}$  is small enough, we clearly have

$$dv^{g^\theta} \leq 2dv^{g^{\text{ws}}},$$

and we obtain that

$$\int_{P'} u_\theta^2 dv^{g^\theta} \leq c_1 \|u_\theta\|_{L^\infty(N)}^2$$

where  $c_1 := 2C > 0$  is independent of  $\theta$ . Now observe that  $\text{Vol}^{g^\theta}(N \setminus P')$  is bounded by a constant independent of  $\theta$ . Using the Hölder inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_N u_\theta^2 dv^{g^\theta} &= \int_{P'} u_\theta^2 dv^{g^\theta} + \int_{N \setminus P'} u_\theta^2 dv^{g^\theta} \\ &\leq c_1 \|u_\theta\|_{L^\infty(N)}^2 + \text{Vol}^{g^\theta}(N \setminus P')^{\frac{2}{n}} \left( \int_{N \setminus P'} u_\theta^p dv \right)^{\frac{n-2}{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\|u_\theta\|_{L^p(N)} = 1$ , this proves Lemma 6.6 with  $c_1$  as defined above and with  $c_2 := \text{Vol}^{g^\theta}(N \setminus P')^{\frac{2}{n}}$ . For small  $\theta$ , the metric  $g_\theta|_{N \setminus P'}$  is independent of  $\theta$ , and thus  $c_2$  does not depend on  $\theta$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 6.7.**

$$\liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \|u_\theta\|_{L^\infty(N)} > 0.$$

*Proof.* We set  $m_\theta := \|u_\theta\|_{L^\infty(N)}$  and we choose  $x_\theta$  in  $N$  such that  $u_\theta(x_\theta) = m_\theta$ . In order to prove the corollary by contradiction we assume  $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} m_\theta = 0$ . Then since  $\mu_\theta \leq \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$  the assumption of Lemma 6.6 is satisfied for all  $b > 0$  for which  $U^N(b)$  is defined. We get the contradiction

$$1 = \int_N u_\theta^p dv^{g^\theta} \leq m_\theta^{p-2} \int_N u_\theta^2 dv^{g^\theta} \leq m_\theta^{p-2} (c_1 m_\theta^2 + c_2) \rightarrow 0$$

as  $\theta \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 6.8.**

$$\bar{\mu} = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \mu_\theta > -\infty.$$

*Proof.* Choose  $x_\theta$  as above. We then have  $\Delta^{g^\theta} u_\theta(x_\theta) \geq 0$ , which together with (51) gives us

$$\text{Scal}^{g^\theta}(x_\theta) \|u_\theta\|_{L^\infty(N)} \leq \mu_\theta \|u_\theta\|_{L^\infty(N)}^{p-1}.$$

Proposition 6.4 and the previous corollary then imply that  $\mu_\theta$  is bounded from below.  $\square$

In addition, by Theorem 1.1,  $\mu_\theta$  is bounded from above by  $\mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$ . It follows that  $\bar{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}$ . The rest of the proof is divided into cases.

**Case I.**  $\limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \|u_\theta\|_{L^\infty(N)} = \infty$ .

As before we set  $m_\theta := \|u_\theta\|_{L^\infty(N)}$  and we choose  $x_\theta \in N$  with  $u_\theta(x_\theta) = m_\theta$ . After taking a subsequence we can assume that  $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} m_\theta = \infty$ . We consider two subcases.

**Subcase I.1.** There exists  $b > 0$  such that  $x_\theta \in N \setminus U^N(b)$  for an infinite number of  $\theta$ .

We recall that  $N \setminus U^N(b) = N_\epsilon \setminus U_\epsilon^N(b) = M_1 \amalg M_2 \setminus U(b)$ . By taking a subsequence we can assume that there exists  $\bar{x} \in M_1 \amalg M_2 \setminus U(b)$  such that  $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} x_\theta = \bar{x}$ . We let  $\tilde{g}_\theta := m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g_\theta$ . In a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{x}$  the metric  $g_\theta = F^2 g$  does not depend on  $\theta$ . We apply Lemma 4.1 with  $O = U$ ,  $\alpha = \theta$ ,  $q_\alpha = x_\theta$ ,  $q = \bar{x}$ ,  $\gamma_\alpha = g_\theta = F^2 g$ , and  $b_\alpha = m_\theta^{\frac{2}{n-2}}$ . Let  $r > 0$ . For  $\theta$  small enough Lemma 4.1 gives us a diffeomorphism

$$\Theta_\theta : B^n(r) \rightarrow B^{g_\theta}(x_\theta, m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r)$$

such that the sequence of metrics  $(\Theta_\theta^*(\tilde{g}_\theta))$  tends to the flat metric  $\xi^n$  in  $C^2(B^n(r))$ . We let  $\tilde{u}_\theta := m_\theta^{-1} u_\theta$ . By (2) we then have

$$L^{\tilde{g}_\theta} \tilde{u}_\theta = \mu_\theta \tilde{u}_\theta^{p-1}$$

on  $B^{g_\theta}(x_\theta, m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B^{g_\theta}(x_\theta, m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r)} \tilde{u}_\theta^p dv^{\tilde{g}_\theta} &= \int_{B^{g_\theta}(x_\theta, m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r)} u_\theta^p dv^{g_\theta} \\ &\leq \int_N u_\theta^p dv^{g_\theta} \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that  $dv^{\tilde{g}_\theta} = m_\theta^p dv^{g_\theta}$ . Since

$$\Theta_\theta : (B^n(r), \Theta_\theta^*(\tilde{g}_\theta)) \rightarrow (B^{g_\theta}(x_\theta, m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r), \tilde{g}_\theta)$$

is an isometry we can consider  $\tilde{u}_\theta$  as a solution of

$$L^{\Theta_\theta^*(\tilde{g}_\theta)} \tilde{u}_\theta = \mu_\theta \tilde{u}_\theta^{p-1}$$

on  $B^n(r)$  with  $\int_{B^n(r)} \tilde{u}_\theta^p dv^{\Theta_\theta^*(\tilde{g}_\theta)} \leq 1$ . Since  $\|\tilde{u}_\theta\|_{L^\infty(B^n(r))} = |\tilde{u}_\theta(0)| = 1$  we can apply Lemma 4.2 with  $V = \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\alpha = \theta$ ,  $g_\alpha = \Theta_\theta^*(\tilde{g}_\theta)$ , and  $u_\alpha = \tilde{u}_\theta$  (we can apply this lemma since each compact set of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is contained in some ball  $B^n(r)$ ). This shows that there exists a non-negative function  $u \not\equiv 0$  (since  $u(0) = 1$ ) of class  $C^2$  on  $(\mathbb{R}^n, \xi^n)$  which satisfies

$$L^{\xi^n} u = a \Delta^{\xi^n} u = \bar{\mu} u^{p-1}.$$

By (12) we further have

$$\int_{B^n(r)} u^p dv^{\xi^n} = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \int_{B^{g_\theta}(x_\theta, m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r)} u_\theta^p dv^{g_\theta} \leq 1$$

for any  $r > 0$ . In particular,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u^p dv^{\xi^n} \leq 1.$$

From Lemma 4.3, we get that  $\bar{\mu} \geq \mu(\mathbb{S}^n) \geq \min\{\mu, \Lambda_{n,k}\}$ . We have proved (50) in this subcase.

**Subcase I.2.** For all  $b > 0$  it holds that  $x_\theta \in U^N(b)$  for  $\theta$  sufficiently small.

The subset  $U^N(b)$  is diffeomorphic to  $W \times I \times S^{n-k-1}$  where  $I$  is an interval. We identify

$$x_\theta = (y_\theta, t_\theta, z_\theta)$$

where  $y_\theta \in W$ ,  $t_\theta \in (-\ln R_0 + \ln \epsilon, -\ln \epsilon + \ln R_0)$ , and  $z_\theta \in S^{n-k-1}$ . By taking a subsequence we can assume that  $y_\theta$ ,  $\frac{t_\theta}{A_\theta}$ , and  $z_\theta$  converge respectively to  $y \in W$ ,  $T \in [-\infty, +\infty]$ , and  $z \in S^{n-k-1}$ . First we apply Lemma 4.1 with  $V = W$ ,  $\alpha = \theta$ ,  $q_\alpha = y_\theta$ ,  $q = y$ ,  $\gamma_\alpha = \tilde{h}_{t_\theta}$ ,  $\gamma_0 = \tilde{h}_T$  (we define  $\tilde{h}_{-\infty} = h_1$  and  $\tilde{h}_{+\infty} = h_2$ ), and  $b_\alpha = m_\theta^{\frac{2}{n-2}} e^{f(t_\theta)}$ . The lemma provides diffeomorphisms

$$\Theta_\theta^y : B^k(r) \rightarrow B^{\tilde{h}_{t_\theta}}(y_\theta, m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} e^{-f(t_\theta)} r)$$

for  $r > 0$  such that  $(\Theta_\theta^y)^*(m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} e^{2f(t_\theta)} \tilde{h}_{t_\theta})$  tends to the flat metric  $\xi^k$  on  $B^k(r)$  as  $\theta \rightarrow 0$ . Second we apply Lemma 4.1 with  $V = S^{n-k-1}$ ,  $\alpha = \theta$ ,  $q_\alpha = z_\theta$ ,  $\gamma_\alpha = \gamma_0 = \sigma^{n-k-1}$ , and  $b_\alpha = m_\theta^{\frac{2}{n-2}}$ . For  $r' > 0$  we get diffeomorphisms

$$\Theta_\theta^z : B^{n-k-1}(r') \rightarrow B^{\sigma^{n-k-1}}(z_\theta, m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r')$$

such that  $(\Theta_\theta^z)^*(m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \sigma^{n-k-1})$  converges to  $\xi^{n-k-1}$  on  $B^{n-k-1}(r')$  as  $\theta \rightarrow 0$ . For  $r, r', r'' > 0$  we define

$$\begin{aligned} U_\theta(r, r', r'') &:= B^{\tilde{h}_{t_\theta}}(y_\theta, m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} e^{-f(t_\theta)} r) \times [t_\theta - m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r'', t_\theta + m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r''] \\ &\quad \times B^{\sigma^{n-k-1}}(z_\theta, m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r'), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Theta_\theta : B^k(r) \times [-r'', r''] \times B^{n-k-1}(r') \rightarrow U_\theta(r, r', r'')$$

by

$$\Theta_\theta(y, s, z) := (\Theta_\theta^y(y), t(s), \Theta_\theta^z(z)),$$

where  $t(s) := t_\theta + m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} s$ . By construction  $\Theta_\theta$  is a diffeomorphism, and we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_\theta^*(m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g_\theta) &= (\Theta_\theta^y)^*(m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} e^{2f(t)} \tilde{h}_t) + ds^2 \\ &\quad + (\Theta_\theta^z)^*(m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \sigma^{n-k-1}) + \Theta_\theta^*(m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \tilde{T}_t). \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Next we study the first term on the right hand side of (52). Note that it is here evaluated at  $t$ , while we have information above when evaluated at  $t_\theta$ . By construction of  $f(t)$  one can verify that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \left\| \frac{e^{f(t_\theta)}}{e^{f(t)}} - 1 \right\|_{C^2([t_\theta - m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r'', t_\theta + m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r''])} = 0$$

since  $\frac{df}{dt}$  and  $\frac{d^2f}{dt^2}$  are uniformly bounded. Moreover it is clear that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \left\| \tilde{h}_t - \tilde{h}_{t_\theta} \right\|_{C^2(B^{\tilde{h}_{t_\theta}}(y_\theta, m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} e^{-f(t_\theta)} r))} = 0$$

uniformly in  $t \in [t_\theta - m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r'', t_\theta + m_\theta^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} r'']$ . As a consequence

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \left\| (\Theta_\theta^y)^* \left( m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \left( e^{2f(t)} \tilde{h}_t - e^{2f(t_\theta)} \tilde{h}_{t_\theta} \right) \right) \right\|_{C^2(B^k(r))} = 0$$

uniformly in  $t$ . This implies that the sequence  $(\Theta_\theta^y)^*(m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} e^{2f(t)} \tilde{h}_t)$  tends to the flat metric  $\xi^k$  in  $C^2(B^k(r))$  uniformly in  $t$  as  $\theta \rightarrow 0$ . We also know that the sequence  $(\Theta_\theta^z)^*(m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \sigma^{n-k-1})$  tends to  $\xi^{n-k-1}$  in  $C^2(B^{n-k-1}(r'))$  as  $\theta \rightarrow 0$ . Recall from (42) that  $g'_\theta = g_\theta - \tilde{T}_t$ , we have proved that  $\Theta_\theta^*(m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g'_\theta)$  tends to the flat metric in  $C^2(B^k(r) \times [-r'', r''] \times B^{n-k-1}(r'))$ . Finally we are going to show that the last term of (52) tends to zero in  $C^2$ . It follows from (44) that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \left\| \Theta_\theta^*(m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \tilde{T}_t) \right\| = 0. \quad (53)$$

Indeed, (44) tells us that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \Theta_\theta^*(m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \tilde{T}_t)(X, Y) \right| &= m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \left| \tilde{T}_t(\Theta_{\theta^*}(X), \Theta_{\theta^*}(Y)) \right| \\ &\leq Cr m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} |\Theta_{\theta^*}(X)|_{g'_\theta} |\Theta_{\theta^*}(Y)|_{g'_\theta} \\ &\leq Cr |X|_{\Theta_\theta^*(m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g'_\theta)} |Y|_{\Theta_\theta^*(m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g'_\theta)}, \end{aligned}$$

and since  $\Theta_\theta^*(m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g'_\theta)$  tends to the flat metric we get (53). Doing the same with  $\nabla \tilde{T}_t$  and  $\nabla^2 \tilde{T}_t$  using (45) and (46), we obtain that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \Theta_\theta^*(m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \tilde{T}_t) = 0 \quad (54)$$

in  $C^2(B^k(r) \times [-r'', r''] \times B^{n-k-1}(r'))$ . Returning to (52) we see that the sequence  $\Theta_\theta^*(m_\theta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g_\theta)$  tends to  $\xi^n = \xi^k + ds^2 + \xi^{n-k-1}$  on  $B^k(r) \times [-r'', r''] \times B^{n-k-1}(r')$ . We proceed as in Subcase I.1 to show that  $\bar{\mu} \geq \mu(\mathbb{S}^n) \geq \min\{\mu, \Lambda_{n,k}\}$ , which proves Relation (50) in the present subcase. This ends the proof of Theorem 6.1 in Case I.

**Case II.** There exists a constant  $C_1$  such that  $\|u_\theta\|_{L^\infty(N)} \leq C_1$  for all  $\theta$ .

As in Case I we consider two subcases.

**Subcase II.1.** There exists  $b > 0$  such that

$$\liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \left( \mu_\theta \sup_{U^N(b)} u_\theta^{p-2} \right) < \frac{(n-k-2)^2(n-1)}{8(n-2)}.$$

By restricting to a subsequence we can assume that

$$\mu_\theta \sup_{U^N(b)} u_\theta^{p-2} < \frac{(n-k-2)^2(n-1)}{8(n-2)}$$

for all  $\theta$ . Lemma 6.6 tells us that there is a constant  $A_0 > 0$  such that

$$\|u_\theta\|_{L^2(N, g_\theta)} \leq A_0. \quad (55)$$

We split the treatment of Subcase II.1. into two subsubcases.

**Subsubcase II.1.1.**  $\limsup_{b \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{U^N(b)} u_\theta > 0$ .

We set  $D_0 := \frac{1}{2} \limsup_{b \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{U^N(b)} u_\theta > 0$ . Then there are sequences  $(b_i)$  and  $(\theta_i)$  of positive numbers converging to 0 such that

$$\sup_{U^N(b_i)} u_{\theta_i} \geq D_0,$$

for all  $i$ . For brevity of notation we write  $\theta$  for  $\theta_i$  and  $b_\theta$  for  $b_i$ . Let  $x'_\theta \in \overline{U^N(b_\theta)}$  be such that

$$u_\theta(x'_\theta) \geq D_0. \quad (56)$$

As in Subcase I.2 above we write  $x'_\theta = (y_\theta, t_\theta, z_\theta)$  where  $y_\theta \in W$ ,  $t_\theta \in (-\ln R_0 + \ln \epsilon, -\ln \epsilon + \ln R_0)$ , and  $z_\theta \in S^{n-k-1}$ . By restricting to a subsequence we can assume that  $y_\theta$ ,  $\frac{t_\theta}{A_\theta}$ , and  $z_\theta$  converge respectively to  $y \in W$ ,  $T \in [-\infty, +\infty]$ , and  $z \in S^{n-k-1}$ . We apply Lemma 4.1 with  $V = W$ ,  $\alpha = \theta$ ,  $q_\alpha = y_\theta$ ,  $q = y$ ,  $\gamma_\alpha = \tilde{h}_{t_\theta}$ ,  $\gamma_0 = \tilde{h}_T$ , and  $b_\alpha = e^{f(t_\theta)}$  and conclude that there is a diffeomorphism

$$\Theta_\theta^y : B^k(r) \rightarrow B^{\tilde{h}_{t_\theta}}(y_\theta, e^{-f(t_\theta)}r)$$

for  $r > 0$  such that  $(\Theta_\theta^y)^*(e^{2f(t_\theta)}\tilde{h}_{t_\theta})$  converges to the flat metric  $\xi^k$  on  $B^k(r)$ . For  $r, r' > 0$  we define

$$U_\theta(r, r') := B^{\tilde{h}_{t_\theta}}(y_\theta, e^{-f(t_\theta)}r) \times [t_\theta - r', t_\theta + r'] \times S^{n-k-1},$$

and

$$\Theta_\theta : B^k(r) \times [-r', r'] \times S^{n-k-1} \rightarrow U_\theta(r, r')$$

by

$$\Theta_\theta(y, s, z) := (\Theta_\theta^y(y), t(s), z),$$

where  $t(s) := t_\theta + s$ . By construction,  $\Theta_\theta$  is a diffeomorphism, and we see that

$$\Theta_\theta^*(g_\theta) = \frac{e^{2f(t)}}{e^{2f(t_\theta)}} (\Theta_\theta^y)^*(e^{2f(t_\theta)}\tilde{h}_{t_\theta}) + ds^2 + \sigma^{n-k-1} + \Theta_\theta^*(\tilde{T}_t) \quad (57)$$

We will now find the limit of  $\Theta_\theta^*(g_\theta)$  in the  $C^2$  topology. We define  $c := \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} f'(t_\theta)$ .

**Lemma 6.9.** *For fixed  $r, r' > 0$  the sequence of metrics  $\Theta_\theta^*(g_\theta)$  tends to  $G_c = \eta_c^{k+1} + \sigma^{n-k-1} = e^{2cs}\xi^k + ds^2 + \sigma^{n-k-1}$  in  $C^2(B^k(r) \times [-r', r'] \times S^{n-k-1})$ .*

As this lemma coincides with [4, Lemma 4.1] we only sketch the proof.

*Proof.* The intermediate value theorem tells us that

$$|f(t) - f(t_\theta) - f'(t_\theta)(t - t_\theta)| \leq \frac{r'^2}{2} \max_{s \in [t_\theta - r', t_\theta + r']} |f''(s)|$$

for all  $t \in [t_\theta - r', t_\theta + r']$ . Because of (41) we also have  $\|f''\|_{L^\infty} \rightarrow 0$  for  $\theta \rightarrow 0$ , and hence

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \|f(t) - f(t_\theta) - f'(t_\theta)(t - t_\theta)\|_{C^0([t_\theta - r', t_\theta + r'])} = 0$$

for  $r'$  fixed. Further we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d}{dt} (f(t) - f(t_\theta) - f'(t_\theta)(t - t_\theta)) \right| &= |f'(t) - f'(t_\theta)| \\ &= \left| \int_{t_\theta}^t f''(s) ds \right| \\ &\leq r' \max_{s \in [t_\theta - r', t_\theta + r']} |f''(s)| \\ &\rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $\theta \rightarrow 0$ , and finally

$$\left| \frac{d^2}{dt^2} (f(t) - f(t_\theta) - f'(t_\theta)(t - t_\theta)) \right| = |f''(t)| \rightarrow 0$$



as  $\theta \rightarrow 0$ . Together with  $c = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} f'(t_\theta)$  we have shown that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \|f(t) - f(t_\theta) - c(t - t_\theta)\|_{C^2([t_\theta - r', t_\theta + r'])} = 0.$$

Hence

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \left\| e^{f(t) - f(t_\theta)} - e^{c(t - t_\theta)} \right\|_{C^2([t_\theta - r', t_\theta + r'])} = 0.$$

We now write  $e^{2f(t)} \tilde{h}_t = e^{2f(t)} (\tilde{h}_t - \tilde{h}_{t_\theta}) + \frac{e^{2f(t)}}{e^{2f(t_\theta)}} e^{2f(t_\theta)} \tilde{h}_{t_\theta}$ . Using the fact that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \left\| \tilde{h}_t - \tilde{h}_{t_\theta} \right\|_{C^2(B^{\tilde{h}_{t_\theta}}(y_\theta, e^{-f(t_\theta)} r))} = 0$$

uniformly for  $t \in [t_\theta - r', t_\theta + r']$  we get that the sequence  $\frac{e^{2f(t)}}{e^{2f(t_\theta)}} (\Theta_\theta^y)^* (e^{2f(t_\theta)} \tilde{h}_t)$  tends to  $e^{2cs} \zeta^k$  in  $C^2(B^k(r))$  where again  $s = t - t_\theta \in [-r', r']$ . Finally, proceeding exactly as we did to get Relation (54), we have that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \Theta_\theta^*(\tilde{T}_t) = 0$$

in  $C^2(B^k(r) \times [-r', r'] \times S^{n-k-1})$ . Going back to (57) this proves Lemma 6.9.  $\square$

We continue with the proof of Subsubcase II.1.1. As in Subcases I.1 and I.2 we apply Lemma 4.2 with  $(V, g) = (\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \times S^{n-k-1}, G_c)$ ,  $\alpha = \theta$ , and  $g_\alpha = \Theta_\theta^*(g_\theta)$  (we can apply this lemma since any compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \times S^{n-k-1}$  is contained in some  $B^k(r) \times [-r', r'] \times S^{n-k-1}$ ). We obtain a  $C^2$  function  $u \geq 0$  which is a solution of

$$L^{G_c} u = \bar{\mu} u^{p-1}$$

on  $\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \times S^{n-k-1}$ . From (12) it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \times S^{n-k-1}} u^p dv^{G_c} \leq 1.$$

From (11) it follows that  $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \times S^{n-k-1})$ . With (56), we see that  $u(0) \geq D_0$  and thus,  $u \not\equiv 0$ . By (55), we also get that  $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \times S^{n-k-1})$ . By the definition of  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(1)}$  we have that  $\bar{\mu} \geq \Lambda_{n,k}^{(1)} \geq \Lambda_{n,k}$ . This ends the proof of Theorem 6.1 in this subsubcase.

**Subsubcase II.1.2.**  $\lim_{b \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{U^N(b)} u_\theta = 0$ .

The proof in this subsubcase proceeds in several steps.

**Step 1.** We prove  $\lim_{b \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \int_{U^N(b)} u_\theta^p dv^{g_\theta} = 0$ .

Let  $b > 0$ . Using (55) we have

$$\int_{U^N(b)} u_\theta^p dv^{g_\theta} \leq A_0 \sup_{U^N(b)} u_\theta^{p-2}$$

where the constant  $A_0$  is independent of  $b$  and  $\theta$ . Step 1 follows.

**Step 2.** We show  $\liminf_{b \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \int_{U^N(2b) \setminus U^N(b)} u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta} = 0$ .

Let

$$d_0 := \liminf_{b \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \int_{U^N(2b) \setminus U^N(b)} u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta}.$$

We prove this step by contradiction and assume that  $d_0 > 0$ . Then there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for all  $b \in (0, \delta]$ ,

$$\liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \int_{U^N(2b) \setminus U^N(b)} u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta} \geq \frac{d_0}{2}.$$

For  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  we set  $V_m := U(2^{-m}\delta) \setminus U(2^{-(m+1)}\delta)$ . In particular we have

$$\liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \int_{V_m} u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta} \geq \frac{d_0}{2}$$

for all  $m$ . Let  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $m \neq m'$  the sets  $V_m$  and  $V_{m'}$  are disjoint. Hence we can write

$$\int_N u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta} \geq \int_{\bigcup_{m=0}^{N_0} V_m} u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta} \geq \sum_{m=0}^{N_0} \int_{V_m} u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta}$$

for  $\theta$  small enough. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \int_N u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta} &\geq \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \sum_{m=0}^{N_0} \int_{V_m} u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta} \\ &\geq \sum_{m=0}^{N_0} \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \int_{V_m} u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta} \\ &\geq (N_0 + 1) \frac{d_0}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $N_0$  is arbitrary, this contradicts that  $(u_\theta)$  is bounded in  $L^2(N)$  and proves Step 2.

**Step 3. Conclusion.**

Let  $d_0 > 0$ . By Steps 1 and 2 we can find  $b > 0$  such that after passing to a subsequence, we have for all  $\theta$  close to 0

$$\int_{N \setminus U^N(2b)} u_\theta^p dv^{g_\theta} \geq 1 - d_0 \quad (58)$$

and

$$\int_{U^N(2b) \setminus U^N(b)} u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta} \leq d_0. \quad (59)$$

Let  $\chi \in C^\infty(M)$ ,  $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ , be a cut-off function equal to 0 on  $U^N(b)$  and equal to 1 on  $N \setminus U^N(2b)$ . Since the set  $U^N(2b) \setminus U^N(b)$  corresponds to  $t \in [t_0 - \ln 2, t_0] \cup [t_1, t_1 + \ln 2]$  with  $t_0 = -\ln b + \ln \epsilon$  and  $t_1 = \ln b - \ln \epsilon$  we can assume that

$$|d\chi|_{g_\theta} \leq 2 \ln 2. \quad (60)$$

We will use the function  $\chi u_\theta$  to estimate  $\mu$ . This function is supported in  $N \setminus U^N(b)$ . If  $\theta$  is smaller than  $b$ , then  $(N \setminus U^N(b), g_\theta)$  is isometric to  $(M \setminus U^M(b), F^2 g)$ . In other words  $(N \setminus U^N(b), g_\theta)$  is conformally equivalent to  $(M \setminus U^M(b), g)$ . Relation (3) implies that

$$\mu \leq J_\theta(\chi u_\theta) = \frac{\int_N (a|d(\chi u_\theta)|_{g_\theta}^2 + \text{Scal}^{g_\theta}(\chi u_\theta)^2) dv^{g_\theta}}{\left(\int_N (\chi u_\theta)^p dv^{g_\theta}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{n}}}. \quad (61)$$

We multiply Equation (51) by  $\chi^2 u_\theta$  and integrate over  $N$ . From (65) we see that

$$\int_N |d(\chi u_\theta)|_{g_\theta}^2 dv^{g_\theta} = \int_N \chi^2 u_\theta \Delta^{g_\theta} u_\theta dv^{g_\theta} + \int_N |d\chi|_{g_\theta}^2 u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta},$$

and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_N (a|d(\chi u_\theta)|_{g_\theta}^2 + \text{Scal}^{g_\theta}(\chi u_\theta)^2) dv^{g_\theta} &= \mu_\theta \int_N u_\theta^p \chi^2 dv^{g_\theta} + a \int_N |d\chi|_{g_\theta}^2 u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta} \\ &\leq \mu_\theta \int_N u_\theta^p dv^{g_\theta} + |\mu_\theta| \int_{U^N(2b)} u_\theta^p dv^{g_\theta} \\ &\quad + a \int_N |d\chi|_{g_\theta}^2 u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (59) and (60), we have

$$\int_N |d\chi|_{g_\theta}^2 u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta} = \int_{U^N(2b) \setminus U^N(b)} |d\chi|_{g_\theta}^2 u_\theta^2 dv^{g_\theta} \leq 4(\ln 2)^2 d_0.$$

Relation (58) implies  $\int_{U^N(2b)} u_\theta^p dv^{g_\theta} \leq d_0$ . Together with  $\int_N u_\theta^p dv^{g_\theta} = 1$

$$\int_N (a|d(\chi u_\theta)|_{g_\theta}^2 + \text{Scal}^{g_\theta}(\chi u_\theta)^2) dv^{g_\theta} \leq \mu_\theta + |\mu_\theta| d_0 + 4(\ln 2)^2 a d_0. \quad (62)$$

In addition, by Relation (58),

$$\int_N (\chi u_\theta)^p dv^{g_\theta} \geq 1 - d_0. \quad (63)$$

Plugging (62) and (63) in (61) we get

$$\mu \leq \frac{\mu_\theta + |\mu_\theta| d_0 + 4(\ln 2)^2 a d_0}{(1 - d_0)^{\frac{n-2}{n}}}$$

for small  $\theta$ . By taking the limit  $\theta \rightarrow 0$  we can replace  $\mu_\theta$  by  $\bar{\mu}$  in this inequality. Since  $d_0$  can be chosen arbitrarily small we finally obtain  $\mu \leq \bar{\mu}$ . This proves Theorem 6.1 in Subcase II.1.

**Subcase II.2.** For all  $b > 0$ , we have

$$\liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \left( \mu_\theta \sup_{U^N(b)} u_\theta^{p-2} \right) \geq \frac{(n-k-2)^2(n-1)}{8(n-2)}.$$

Hence, we can construct a subsequence of  $\theta$  and a sequence  $(b_\theta)$  of positive numbers converging to 0 with

$$\liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \left( \mu_\theta \sup_{U^N(b_\theta)} u_\theta^{p-2} \right) \geq \frac{(n-k-2)^2(n-1)}{8(n-2)}.$$

Choose a point  $x''_\theta \in \overline{U^N(b_\theta)}$  such that  $u_\theta(x''_\theta) = \sup_{U^N(b_\theta)} u_\theta$ . Since  $\mu_\theta \leq \mu(\mathbb{S}^n)$ , we have

$$u_\theta(x''_\theta) \geq D_1 := \left( \frac{(n-k-2)^2(n-1)}{8\mu(\mathbb{S}^n)(n-2)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-2}}.$$

With similar arguments as in Subcase II.1.1 (just replace  $x'_\theta$  by  $x''_\theta$  and  $D_0$  by  $D_1$ ), we get the existence of a  $C^2$  function  $u \geq 0$  which is a solution of

$$L^{G_c} u = \bar{\mu} u^{p-1}$$

on  $\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times S^{n-k-1}$ . As in Subsubcase II.1.1,  $u \neq 0$ ,  $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{H}_c^{k+1} \times S^{n-k-1})$ , and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \times S^{n-k-1}} u^p dv^{G_c} \leq 1.$$

Moreover, the assumption of Subcase II.2 implies that

$$\bar{\mu} u^{p-2}(0) = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \mu_\theta u_\theta^{p-2}(x_\theta'') \geq \frac{(n-k-2)^2(n-1)}{8(n-2)}.$$

By the definition of  $\Lambda_{n,k}^{(2)}$  we have that  $\bar{\mu} \geq \Lambda_{n,k}^{(2)} \geq \Lambda_{n,k}$ .

#### APPENDIX A. SCALAR CURVATURE

In this section  $U$  denotes an open subset of a manifold and  $q \in U$  a fixed point.

**Proposition A.1.** *Let  $g$  be a Riemannian metric on  $U$  and  $T$  a symmetric 2-tensor such that  $\tilde{g} := g + T$  is also a Riemannian metric. Then the scalar curvature  $\text{Scal}^{\tilde{g}}(q)$  of  $\tilde{g}$  in  $q \in U$  is a smooth function of the Riemann tensor  $R^g(q)$  of  $g$  at  $q$ ,  $T(q)$ ,  $\nabla^g T(q)$ , and  $(\nabla^g)^2 T(q)$ . Moreover, the operator  $T \mapsto \text{Scal}^{g+T}(q)$  is a quasilinear partial differential operator of second order.*

*Proof.* The proof is straightforward, we will just give a sketch using notation from [5] which coincides with that of [19]. We denote the components of the curvature tensors of  $g$  and  $\tilde{g}$  by

$$R_{ijkl} = g(R^g(\partial_k, \partial_l)\partial_j, \partial_i), \quad \tilde{R}_{ijkl} = \tilde{g}(R^{\tilde{g}}(\partial_k, \partial_l)\partial_j, \partial_i).$$

We work in normal coordinates for the metric  $g$  centered in  $q$ , indices of partial derivatives in coordinates are added and separated with  $,$  and covariant ones with respect to  $g$  separated with  $;$ . In particular  $T = T_{ij} dx^i dx^j$ ,

$$T_{kl;i} = (\nabla_i T)(\partial_k, \partial_l) = \partial_i T_{kl} - T_{ml} \Gamma_{ik}^m - T_{km} \Gamma_{il}^m.$$

At the point  $q$  we have  $\tilde{g}_{kl,i} = T_{kl;i}$ . As explained in [5, Formula (13)] we have

$$\nabla_\alpha \Gamma_{ij}^k = \partial_\alpha \Gamma_{ij}^k = -\frac{1}{3} (R_{ik\alpha j} + R_{i\alpha k j})$$

at the point  $q$ . Hence in that point,

$$T_{kl;rs} = (\nabla_{rs}^2 T)(\partial_k, \partial_l) = \partial_r \partial_s T_{kl} + \frac{1}{3} T_{ml} (R_{smrk} + R_{srmk}) + \frac{1}{3} T_{mk} (R_{smrl} + R_{srml}).$$

In order to calculate the scalar curvature  $\text{Scal}^{\tilde{g}}(q)$  of  $\tilde{g}$  in  $q$  we use the curvature formula as in [19] and contract twice. We obtain

$$\text{Scal}^{\tilde{g}}(q) = \tilde{g}^{ik} \tilde{g}^{jm} (\tilde{g}_{km,ij} - \tilde{g}_{ki,mj}) + P(\tilde{g}^{rm}, \tilde{g}_{ij,k}) \quad (64)$$

where  $P$  is a polynomial expression in  $\tilde{g}^{-1}$  and  $\partial \tilde{g}$  that is cubic in  $\tilde{g}^{-1} = \tilde{g}^{rm}$  and quadratic in  $\tilde{g}_{ij,k}$ . Note that formula (64) holds for an arbitrary metric in arbitrary coordinates. The polynomial  $P$  vanishes for  $T = 0$  in normal coordinates for  $g$ .  $\square$

**Corollary A.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{R} \subset T_q^* M \otimes T_q^* M \otimes T_q^* M \otimes T_q M$  be a bounded set of curvature tensors. Then there is an  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $C \in \mathbb{R}$  such that for all metrics  $g$  on  $U$  with  $R^g|_q \in \mathcal{R}$  we have: if*

$$\max_{i \in \{0,1,2\}} |(\nabla^g)^i T(q)| < \epsilon,$$

then

$$|\text{Scal}^{g+T}(q) - \text{Scal}^g(q)| \leq C \left( |(\nabla^g)^2 T(q)| + \|\nabla^g T(q)\|^2 + |T(q)| \right).$$

## APPENDIX B. DETAILS FOR EQUATION (16)

We compute the scalar curvature of the metric  $dt^2 + e^{2\varphi(t)}h_t$  on  $I \times W$ . This is a generalized cylinder metric as studied in [8]. In the following computations we use the notation from [8], so  $g_t = e^{2\varphi(t)}h_t$  and we have

$$\dot{g}_t = 2\varphi'(t)e^{2\varphi(t)}h_t + e^{2\varphi(t)}\partial_t h_t,$$

and

$$\ddot{g}_t = (2\varphi''(t) + 4\varphi'(t)^2)e^{2\varphi(t)}h_t + 4\varphi'(t)e^{2\varphi(t)}\partial_t h_t + e^{2\varphi(t)}\partial_t^2 h_t.$$

This implies that the shape operator  $S$  of the hypersurfaces of constant  $t$  is given by

$$S = -\varphi' - \frac{1}{2}h_t^{-1}\partial_t h_t,$$

so

$$\text{tr}(S^2) = k\varphi'(t)^2 + \varphi'(t)\text{tr}(h_t^{-1}\partial_t h_t) + \frac{1}{4}\text{tr}((h_t^{-1}\partial_t h_t)^2),$$

and

$$\text{tr}(S) = k\varphi'(t) + \text{tr}(h_t^{-1}\partial_t h_t) + \frac{1}{4}\text{tr}(h_t^{-1}\partial_t h_t).$$

Further

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_{g_t}\ddot{g}_t &= (2\varphi''(t) + 4\varphi'(t)^2)k + 4\varphi'(t)\text{tr}_{h_t}(\partial_t h_t) + \text{tr}_{h_t}(\partial_t^2 h_t) \\ &= (2\varphi''(t) + 4\varphi'(t)^2)k + 4\varphi'(t)\text{tr}(h_t^{-1}\partial_t h_t) + \text{tr}_{h_t}(\partial_t^2 h_t). \end{aligned}$$

From [8, Proposition 4.1, (21)] we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Scal}^{e^{2\varphi(t)}h_t+dt^2} &= \text{Scal}^{e^{2\varphi(t)}h_t} + 3\text{tr}(S^2) - \text{tr}(S)^2 - \text{tr}_{g_t}\ddot{g}_t \\ &= e^{-2\varphi(t)}\text{Scal}^{h_t} - k(k+1)\varphi'(t)^2 - (k+1)\varphi'(t)\text{tr}(h_t^{-1}\partial_t h_t) \\ &\quad - 2k\varphi''(t) + \frac{3}{4}\text{tr}((h_t^{-1}\partial_t h_t)^2) - \frac{1}{4}\text{tr}(h_t^{-1}\partial_t h_t)^2 - \text{tr}_{h_t}(\partial_t^2 h_t). \end{aligned}$$

When we add the scalar curvature of  $\sigma^{n-k-1}$  we get Formula (16) for the scalar curvature of  $g_{\text{WS}} = dt^2 + e^{2\varphi(t)}h_t + \sigma^{n-k-1}$ .

## APPENDIX C. A CUT-OFF FORMULA

Here we state a formula used several times in the article. Assume that  $u$  and  $\chi$  are smooth functions on a Riemannian manifold  $(N, h)$ , and that  $\chi$  has compact support. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_N |d(\chi u)|^2 dv^h &= \int_N (u^2|d\chi|^2 + \langle u d\chi, \chi du \rangle + \langle \chi du, d(\chi u) \rangle) dv^h \\ &= \int_N (u^2|d\chi|^2 + \chi u \langle d\chi, du \rangle + \langle du, \chi d(\chi u) \rangle) dv^h \\ &= \int_N (u^2|d\chi|^2 + \chi u \langle d\chi, du \rangle + \langle du, d(\chi^2 u) - \chi u d\chi \rangle) dv^h \quad (65) \\ &= \int_N (u^2|d\chi|^2 + \langle du, d(\chi^2 u) \rangle) dv^h \\ &= \int_N (u^2|d\chi|^2 + \chi^2 u \Delta u) dv^h. \end{aligned}$$

## REFERENCES

- [1] K. Akutagawa and B. Botvinnik, *Yamabe metrics on cylindrical manifolds*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **13** (2003), no. 2, 259–333.
- [2] K. Akutagawa, L. Florit, and J. Petean, *On the Yamabe constant of riemannian products*, *Comm. Anal. Geom.* **15** (2008), 947–969.
- [3] K. Akutagawa and A. Neves, *3-manifolds with Yamabe invariant greater than that of  $\mathbb{R}P^3$* , *J. Differential Geom.* **75** (2007), no. 3, 359–386.
- [4] B. Ammann, M. Dahl, and E. Humbert, *Surgery and the spinorial  $\tau$ -invariant*, Preprint, ArXiv 0710.5673, 2007, accepted in *Comm. Part. Diff. Equations*.
- [5] B. Ammann, J. F. Grosjean, E. Humbert, and B. Morel, *A spinorial analogue of Aubin’s inequality*, *Math. Z.* **260** (2008), 127–151.
- [6] M. T. Anderson, *Canonical metrics on 3-manifolds and 4-manifolds*, *Asian J. Math.* **10** (2006), 127–163.
- [7] T. Aubin, *Équations différentielles non linéaires et problème de Yamabe concernant la courbure scalaire.*, *J. Math. Pur. Appl.*, IX. Ser. **55** (1976), 269–296.
- [8] C. Bär, P. Gauduchon, and A. Moroianu, *Generalized cylinders in semi-riemannian and spin geometry*, *Math. Z.* **249** (2005), 545–580.
- [9] B. Botvinnik and J. Rosenberg, *The Yamabe invariant for non-simply connected manifolds*, *J. Differential Geom.* **62** (2002), 175–208.
- [10] H. L. Bray and A. Neves, *Classification of prime 3-manifolds with Yamabe invariant greater than  $\mathbb{R}P^3$* , *Ann. of Math. (2)* **159** (2004), no. 1, 407–424.
- [11] J. Cheeger, *Finiteness theorems for Riemannian manifolds*, *Amer. J. Math.* **92** (1970), 61–74.
- [12] L. C. Evans, *Weak convergence methods for nonlinear partial differential equations*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, vol. 74, AMS, 1990.
- [13] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, no. 224, Springer-Verlag, 1977.
- [14] M. Gromov, *Structures métriques pour les variétés Riemanniennes*, CEDIC, Paris, 1981.
- [15] ———, *Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1999.
- [16] M. Gromov and H. B. Lawson, *The classification of simply connected manifolds of positive scalar curvature*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **111** (1980), no. 3, 423–434.
- [17] M. J. Gursky and C. LeBrun, *Yamabe invariants and  $\text{Spin}^c$  structures*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **8** (1998), no. 6, 965–977.
- [18] E. Hebey, *Sobolev spaces on Riemannian manifolds*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1635, Berlin: Springer, 1996.
- [19] ———, *Introduction à l’analyse non-linéaire sur les variétés*, Diderot Editeur, Arts et Sciences, out of print, no longer sold, 1997.
- [20] D. Joyce, *Constant scalar curvature metrics on connected sums*, *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.* (2003), no. 7, 405–450.
- [21] S. Kim, *An obstruction to the conformal compactification of Riemannian manifolds*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **128** (2000), no. 6, 1833–1838.
- [22] O. Kobayashi, *On large scalar curvature*, research report **11**, Dept. Math. Keio Univ., 1985.
- [23] ———, *Scalar curvature of a metric with unit volume*, *Math. Ann.* **279** (1987), no. 2, 253–265.
- [24] A. A. Kosinski, *Differential manifolds*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 138, Academic Press Inc., Boston, MA, 1993.
- [25] C. LeBrun, *Four-manifolds without Einstein metrics*, *Math. Res. Lett.* **3** (1996), no. 2, 133–147.
- [26] ———, *Einstein metrics and the Yamabe problem*, Trends in mathematical physics (Knoxville, TN, 1998), AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math., vol. 13, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999, pp. 353–376.
- [27] ———, *Kodaira dimension and the Yamabe problem*, *Comm. Anal. Geom.* **7** (1999), no. 1, 133–156.
- [28] ———, *Einstein metrics, complex surfaces, and symplectic 4-manifolds*, preprint arxiv:0803.3743, 2008, to appear in *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*
- [29] J. M. Lee and T. H. Parker, *The Yamabe problem*, *Bull. Am. Math. Soc., New Ser.* **17** (1987), 37–91.

- [30] L. Mazzei, *Generalized connected sum construction for nonzero constant scalar curvature metrics*, Comm. Part. Diff. Equations **33** (2008), 1–17.
- [31] ———, *Generalized connected sum construction for scalar flat metrics*, Tech. report.
- [32] J. Petean, *The Yamabe invariant of simply connected manifolds*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **523** (2000), 225–231.
- [33] J. Petean and G. Yun, *Surgery and the Yamabe invariant*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **9** (1999), no. 6, 1189–1199.
- [34] P. Petersen, *Convergence theorems in Riemannian geometry*, Comparison geometry (Berkeley, CA, 1993–94), Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., vol. 30, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997, pp. 167–202.
- [35] J. Rosenberg, S. Stolz, *Metrics of positive scalar curvature and connections with surgery*, Surveys on surgery theory, Vol. 2, 353–386, Ann. of Math. Stud., 149, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 2001.
- [36] R. Schoen, *Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to constant scalar curvature*, J. Diff. Geom. **20** (1984), 479–495.
- [37] ———, *Recent progress in geometric partial differential equations*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 1, 2 (Berkeley, Calif., 1986) (Providence, RI), Amer. Math. Soc., 1987, pp. 121–130.
- [38] ———, *Variational theory for the total scalar curvature functional for Riemannian metrics and related topics*, Topics in calculus of variations, Lect. 2nd Sess., Montecatini/Italy 1987, Lect. Notes Math. 1365, 120–154, 1989.
- [39] R. Schoen and S.-T. Yau, *On the structure of manifolds with positive scalar curvature*, Manuscripta Math. **28** (1979), no. 1-3, 159–183.
- [40] ———, *Conformally flat manifolds, Kleinian groups and scalar curvature.*, Invent. Math. **92** (1988), 47–71.
- [41] ———, *Lectures on differential geometry.*, Conference Proceedings and Lecture Notes in Geometry and Topology. 1. Cambridge, MA: International Press. v, 414 p. , 1994.
- [42] N. S. Trudinger, *Remarks concerning the conformal deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa, Sci. Fis. Mat., III. Ser. **22** (1968), 265–274.
- [43] H. Yamabe, *On a deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds.*, Osaka Math. J. **12** (1960), 21–37.

NWF I – MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT REGENSBURG, 93040 REGENSBURG, GERMANY  
*E-mail address:* `bernd.ammann@mathematik.uni-regensburg.de`

INSTITUTIONEN FÖR MATEMATIK, KUNGLIGA TEKNISKA HÖGSKOLAN, 100 44 STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN  
*E-mail address:* `dahl@math.kth.se`

INSTITUT ÉLIE CARTAN, BP 239, UNIVERSITÉ DE NANCY 1, 54506 VANDOEUVRE-LÈS-NANCY CEDEX, FRANCE  
*E-mail address:* `humbert@iecn.u-nancy.fr`