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## 1. Introduction

This paper studies the regularity problem of harmonic maps in higher dimensions. We consider maps from the unit ball $B$ in $\mathbf{R}^{n}(n>2)$ equipped with a metric $g$ into a compact submanifold $N^{m}$ of $\mathbf{R}^{k}$. We say that $u \in$ $L_{1}^{2}(B, N)$ if $u \in L_{1}^{2}\left(B, \mathbf{R}^{k}\right)$ and $u(x) \in N$ a.e $x \in B$. The energy $E(u)$ of $u$ is defined as $E(u)=\int_{B}|\nabla u|^{2} d v$. A weakly harmonic map is defined to be the weak solution to the formal Euler-Lagrange equations, which form a nonlinear elliptic system. The equations are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta u^{i}(x)=g^{\alpha \beta}(x) A^{i}\left(\frac{\partial y}{\partial x^{\alpha}}, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^{\beta}}\right), \quad i=1,2, \cdots, K, \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A_{u}(X, Y) \in\left(T_{u} N\right)^{\perp}$ is the second fundamental form of $N$ given by $A_{u}(X, Y)=\left(D_{X} Y\right)^{\perp} . X, Y$ are vector fields on $N$ in a neighborhood of $u \in N$.

It is easy to see that $u$ is harmonic if and only if $\left.(d / d t) E\left(u_{t}\right)\right|_{t=0}=0$, where $u_{t}$ is a 1-parameter family of maps defined by $u_{t}(x)=\Pi(u(x)+t \eta(x))$ $\forall \eta \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left(B, \mathbf{R}^{k}\right) . \Pi$ is the nearest point projection of $\mathbf{R}^{k}$ into $N$.

There is another type of variation that one may consider. One takes $u_{t}=u \circ \varphi_{t}$ for $\varphi_{t}$ a 1-parameter family of compactly supported $C^{1}$ diffeomorphisms of $B$ with $\varphi_{0}=\mathrm{Id} . E\left(u_{t}\right)$ is differentiable in $t$. If $u$ is always critical for this type of variations and if $u$ is harmonic, then $u$ is called a stationary map.

So far not much is known about the regularity of weak harmonic maps. For $n=2$ it is proved in [6] that a harmonic map with finite energy does not have isolated singularity. A theorem of [7] says that $u$ has no interior singularity if $u$ is stationary and $n=2$.

[^0]In this paper we generalize the result of [6] to higher dimensions. For $n>2$ we cannot expect the finiteness of total energy to be sufficient for the removability of isolated singularity. For example, take any harmonic map $w$ from $S^{n-1}$ into $N$ with finite energy $E(w)$. Define map $u: B \rightarrow N$ by $u(x)=w(x /|x|) . u$ is again harmonic with finite energy since $E(u)=$ $E(w) /(n-2)$. $u$ has singularity at 0 unless $w$ is constant.

We will assume the smallness of the total energy and show the apparent isolated singularity is removable. Our main result is

Main Theorem. Let $B$ be the unit ball $B(0) \subset \mathbf{R}^{n}$ with a smooth Riemannian metric $g$. Let $u$ be any harmonic map belonging to $C^{\infty}(B \backslash\{0\}, N)$. There exists a constant $\varepsilon>0$ independent of $u$ such that $u \in C^{\infty}(B, N)$ provided $E(u)=$ $\int_{B}|\nabla u|^{2} d v \leqslant \varepsilon$.

Our proof is based on the a priori estimates of $C^{2}$ harmonic maps obtained by R. Schoen and K. Uhlenbeck and a monotonicity inequality.

We will present some preliminary results in the next section. In §3 we will prove the theorem assuming that $u$ is stationary. In $\S 4$ we will prove that the monotonicity inequality is true for harmonic maps of finite energy with isolated singularity. This result then enables us to complete the proof of the theorem.

## 2. Preliminary results

Lemma 1 (monotonicity inequality). Suppose $u$ is a stationary map from $B$ into $N \subset \mathbf{R}^{k}$. For $n>2$ we have for $0<\sigma<\rho<\operatorname{dist}\left(x_{0}, \partial B\right)$

$$
\begin{gather*}
e^{C \Lambda \rho} \rho^{2-n} \int_{B_{\rho}\left(x_{0}\right)}|\nabla u|^{2} d x-e^{C \Lambda \sigma} \sigma^{2-n} \int_{B_{\sigma}\left(x_{0}\right)}|\nabla u|^{2} \\
\geqslant 2 \int_{B_{\rho}\left(x_{0}\right)-B_{\sigma}\left(x_{0}\right)} e^{C \Lambda \sigma}\left|x-x_{0}\right|^{2-n}\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right|^{2} d x, \tag{2.1}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $\Delta$ and $C$ are constants, $B_{\rho}\left(x_{0}\right)$ (and $B_{\sigma}\left(x_{0}\right)$ ) is the geodesic ball of radius $\rho$ (and $\sigma$ ) centered at $x_{0}$, respectively. For a proof one can read [5].

Lemma 2 [8]. Suppose $u \in C^{2}\left(B_{r}, N\right)$ is harmonic with respect to a metric $g$ on $B_{r}$. Suppose

$$
\Lambda^{-1} j\left(\delta_{\alpha \beta}\right) \leqslant g_{\alpha \beta} \leqslant \Lambda\left(\delta_{\alpha \beta}\right),\left|\partial_{\nu} g_{\alpha \beta}\right| \leqslant \Lambda r^{-1}
$$

There exists $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(\Lambda, n, N)>0$ such that if $r^{2-n} \int_{B_{r}}|\nabla u|^{2} \leqslant \varepsilon$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
r^{2} \sup _{B_{r / 2}}|\nabla u|^{2} \leqslant C r^{2-n} \int_{B_{r}}|\nabla u|^{2} . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The proof of Lemma 2 makes use of Lemma 1, noticing that " $C^{2}$ harmonic" implies "stationary". The smallness of the energy is used to ensure that a rescaled version $v$ of $u$ satisfying $e(v)(0)=1$ and $\sup e(v) \leqslant 4$ is defined in a ball $B_{r_{0}}$ with $r_{0} \leqslant 1$. The boundedness of $e(v)$ then enables one to use the linear elliptic estimates. Here $e(v)$ denotes the energy density. For details see [7].

Lemma 3 (First variation formula). For a smooth family $\varphi_{t}$ of diffeomorphisms which are the identity near $\partial B$ we let $u_{t}=u \circ \varphi_{t}$. We then have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\frac{d}{d t} E\left(u_{t}\right)\right|_{t=0}=-\int_{B}\left[|d u|^{2} \operatorname{div} X-2\left\langle d u\left(\nabla_{e_{i}} X\right), d u\left(e_{i}\right)\right\rangle\right] \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $X=$ variation vector field $=\left.(d / d t) \varphi_{t}\right|_{t=0}, e_{i}, i=1,2, \cdots, n$, form an orthonormal basis on $B$.

This is a standard result. One can prove it by a change of coordinates. We mention one more result.

Lemma 4 [4]. If the image of a harmonic map u lies in a local strictly convex coordinate chart on $N$, then $u$ is regular.

## 3. The regularity of stationary maps

In this section we prove the following result:
Proposition 1. If $u$ is a stationary map from $B^{n}$ into $N \subset \mathbf{R}^{k}, n>2$, with respect to a metric $g$, then there exists a constant $\varepsilon>0$ such that $u \in C^{\infty}(B, N)$ provided that

$$
E(u) \leqslant \varepsilon \quad \text { and } \quad u \in C^{\infty}(B-\{0\}, N) .
$$

Proof. By a change of scale we can reduce to the case that $g$ is close to the standard metric $g_{0}$. Thus we assume without loss of generality that

$$
g_{\alpha \beta}=\delta_{\alpha \beta}+O(\varepsilon), \quad \partial_{\nu} g_{\alpha \beta}=O(\varepsilon) \quad \text { in } B .
$$

Apply Lemma 2 to the ball $B_{r}(x)$ where $x \neq 0, r=|x| / 2$. We then get

$$
r^{2}|d u|^{2}(x) \leqslant C r^{2-n} \int_{B_{r}(x)}|\nabla u|^{2} \leqslant C E(u)
$$

In the second inequality we have used the montonicity lemma. Assume $E(u) \leqslant \varepsilon$. We have the estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
|d u|(x) \leqslant \frac{C \varepsilon^{1 / 2}}{|x|} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Take a ball of radius $r>0$ centered at 0 . Let $x, y \in \partial B_{r}(0)$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
|u(x)-u(y)| \leqslant \int_{\Gamma}|d u| \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon^{1 / 2} C}{r} \cdot \Lambda 2 \pi r=C \varepsilon^{1 / 2} \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Gamma$ is a geodesic on $\partial B_{r}(0)$ connecting $x$ to $y$ with length $\leqslant \Lambda 2 \pi r$. This shows that $\operatorname{Osc}\left(u, \partial B_{r}\right) \leqslant C \varepsilon^{1 / 2}$.

We want to compare $u$ with a linear harmonic map $h: B \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{k}$. To define $h$, we take $0^{\prime}=\bar{u}(1)$ as the origin of $\mathbf{R}^{k}$, where $\bar{u}(r)=f_{\partial B_{r}} \mu$ is the average of $u$ over $\partial B_{r}$. Let $\bar{C}$ be a constant so that $|A(\nabla u, \nabla u)| \leqslant \bar{C}|\nabla u|^{2}$. Let

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\lambda=\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Min}_{Q \in N}\left\{\operatorname { M a x } \left\{\mu \mid\left(B_{2 \mu}(Q) \cap N\right) \subset\right.\right. \text { a convex local } \\
\text { coordinate chart of } N\}\}
\end{array}
$$

where $B_{2 \mu}(Q)$ is the Euclidean ball of radius $2 \mu$ centered at $Q$. Let $\delta$ be the first point for which $\bar{u}(r)$ lies on $\partial B_{\lambda}\left(0^{\prime}\right)$, i.e., $\delta=\max \{r:|\bar{u}(r)-\bar{u}(1)|=\lambda\}$. We take the first coordinate axis in the direction $0^{\prime} \bar{u}(\delta)$.

Clearly $\lambda>0$. We claim that $\delta>0$ if 0 is not removable and $E(u) \leqslant \varepsilon$ for an $\varepsilon>0$ small. The reason is that $|u(x)-\bar{u}(|x|)| \leqslant C \cdot \varepsilon^{1 / 2}$ as a direct consequence of (3.2) and by definition $\bar{u}(|x|) \in B_{\lambda}\left(0^{\prime}\right) \forall x \in B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}$. Thus we can choose $\varepsilon$ small so that $u(x) \in B_{2 \lambda}\left(\Pi\left(0^{\prime}\right)\right) \forall x \in B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}$. Then $\delta=0$ would imply that the image of $u$ on $B_{1}$ lies in a convex local coordinate chart of $N$, hence $u$ would be regular.

Also $\delta$ is uniformly away from 1 for $\varepsilon$ small as a consequence of the a priori bound of the gradient (3.1). Indeed, we have

$$
\lambda=|\bar{u}(\delta)-\bar{u}(1)| \leqslant\left(\sup _{\delta \leqslant r \leqslant 1}|\nabla \bar{u}|\right)(1-\delta) \leqslant C \varepsilon^{1 / 2} / \delta
$$

hence $\delta \leqslant C \varepsilon^{1 / 2} \lambda^{-1}$.
Define $h: B \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{k}$ by $h(x)=\left(h_{1}(x), 0, \cdots, 0\right)$, where

$$
h_{1}(x)=h_{1}(|x|)=-\frac{\lambda}{\delta^{2-n}-1}+\frac{\lambda}{\delta^{2-n}-1}|x|^{2-n}
$$

Note that $\Delta_{g_{0}} h=0$ and $h(x)=\bar{u}(\delta)$ on $\partial B_{\delta}, h(x)=\bar{u}(1)=0^{\prime}$ on $\partial B_{1}$, where $\Delta_{g_{0}}$ is the Euclidean Laplacian.

Observe that for $n \geqslant 3$

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}}\left|\frac{\partial h}{\partial r}\right|^{2} r^{2-n} d v & =\int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}}\left|\frac{\partial h}{\partial r}\right|^{2} r^{2-n} \sqrt{g(x)} d x \geqslant C \int_{\delta}^{1}\left|h_{1}^{\prime}\right|^{2} r d r \\
& =C \frac{\lambda^{2}(n-2)}{2} \frac{\delta^{2-n}+1}{\delta^{2-n}-1} \geqslant \frac{C \lambda^{2}}{2}>0 . \tag{3.3}
\end{align*}
$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 1 we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}}\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right|^{2} r^{2-n} d V \leqslant C \int_{B}|\nabla u|^{2} d V=C E(u) \leqslant C \varepsilon \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Our plan is to show

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}}\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}-\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right|^{2} r^{2-n} d V \leqslant C \varepsilon^{1 / 2} \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is a contradiction to (3.3) and (3.4) for $\varepsilon$ small.
Applying Green's formula, we get (denoting $h_{1}=h, u_{1}=u$ )

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}} & r^{2-n}(h-u) \Delta(h-u) \\
= & \int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}} \nabla\left[r^{2-n}(h-u)\right] \cdot \nabla(h-u) \\
& -\int_{\partial B_{1} \cup \partial B_{\delta}} r^{2-n}(h-u) \frac{\partial(h-u)}{\partial r} \\
= & \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}} \nabla r^{2-n} \cdot \nabla|h-u|^{2}+\int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}} r^{2-n}|\nabla(h-u)|^{2} \\
& -\int_{\partial B_{1} \cup \partial B_{\delta}} r^{2-n}(h-u)\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial r}-\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right) \\
= & \frac{2-n}{2} \int_{\partial B_{1} \cup \partial B_{\delta}}|h-u|^{2} r^{2-n} \int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}} r^{2-n}|\nabla(h-u)|^{2} \\
& -\int_{\partial B_{1} \cup \partial B_{\delta}} r^{2-n}(h-u)\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial r}-\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right)-\frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}}|h-u|^{2} \Delta r^{2-n} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We get from this

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}} r^{2-n}|\nabla(h-u)|^{2} \\
&=\frac{2-n}{2} \int_{\partial B_{1} \cup \partial B_{\delta}}|h-u|^{2} r^{1-n}+\int_{\partial B_{1} \cup \partial B_{\delta}} r^{2-n}(h-u)\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial r}-\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right) \\
& \text { (3.6) } \quad+\int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}} r^{2-n}(h-u) \Delta u-\int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}} r^{2-n}(h-u) \Delta h \\
&+\frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{1} c d o \backslash B_{\delta}}|h-u|^{2} \Delta r^{2-n} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the fact $\sup _{\partial B_{8} \cup \partial B_{1}}|h-u| \leqslant C \varepsilon^{1 / 2}$, we can estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\int_{\partial B_{\delta}} r^{1-n}\right| h-\left.u\right|^{2} \mid \leqslant C \varepsilon \int_{\partial B_{1}} \delta^{1-n} \delta^{n-1} \leqslant C \varepsilon, \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{\partial B_{\delta}} r^{2-n} \mid h- & u\left|\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial r}-\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right)\right| \\
& \leqslant C \varepsilon^{1 / 2} \int_{\partial B_{1}} \delta^{2-n}\left[\lambda(n-2) \frac{\delta^{1-n}}{\delta^{2-n}-1}+\frac{\varepsilon^{1 / 2}}{\delta}\right] \delta^{n-1}  \tag{3.8}\\
& \leqslant \lambda C \varepsilon^{1 / 2}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have used the fact $\delta$ small to assert

$$
\frac{\delta^{1-n}}{\delta^{2-n}-1}=\frac{1}{\delta} \cdot \frac{1}{1-\delta^{2-n}} \leqslant C \delta^{-1}
$$

Similar estimates can be obtained at $\partial B_{1}$. To deal with the third term in (3.6), observe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sup _{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}}|h-u| & \leqslant \sup |h|+\sup |u-\bar{u}|+\sup \bar{u} \\
& \leqslant \lambda+C \varepsilon^{1 / 2}+\lambda \leqslant 2 \cdot \frac{1}{4 \bar{C}}+C \varepsilon^{1 / 2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Choose $\varepsilon$ small so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{C} \sup _{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}}|h-u| \leqslant \frac{1}{2}+\bar{C} \subset \varepsilon^{1 / 2} \leqslant 1 \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

We have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}} r^{2-n}(h-u) \Delta u\right| \leqslant\left(\int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}} r^{2-n}|\nabla u|^{2}\right) \bar{C} \sup _{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}}|h-u| . \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

The last two terms in (3.6) are bounded by $C \cdot \varepsilon^{1 / 2}$ as a consequence of our assumptions on $g_{\alpha \beta}$.

Since $h$ is a radial map we can write the left side of (3.6) as

$$
\int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}} r^{2-n}\left|\frac{\partial h}{\partial r}-\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right|^{2}+\int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}} r^{2-n}\left|D_{T} u\right|^{2},
$$

where $D_{T} u$ denotes the components tangential to $\partial B_{r}$. Absorbing the tangential term to the left, we get

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}} r^{2-n}\left|\frac{\partial h}{\partial r}-\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right|^{2}+\left(1-\bar{C} \sup _{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}}|h-u|\right) \int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}} r^{2-n}\left|D_{T} u\right|^{2} \\
& \quad \leqslant C \varepsilon^{1 / 2}+\bar{C} \sup _{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}}|h-u| \int_{B_{1} \backslash B_{\delta}} r^{2-n}\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right|^{2}  \tag{3.11}\\
& \quad \leqslant C \varepsilon^{1 / 2}+\varepsilon .
\end{align*}
$$

This inequality completes the proof.

## 4. Proof of the Main Theorem

We want to show the following extension of Lemma 1.
Proposition 2. If harmonic map $u$ is $C^{\infty}(B \backslash\{0\}, N)$ and if $E(u)<\infty$, then we have for $0<\rho_{1}<\rho_{2} \leqslant 1$
$e^{C \Lambda \rho_{2}} \rho_{2}^{2-n} \int_{B_{\rho_{2}}(0)}|\nabla u|^{2}-e^{C \Lambda \rho_{1}} \rho_{1}^{2-n} \int_{B_{\rho_{1}}(0)}|\nabla u|^{2} \geqslant \int_{B_{\rho_{2}}(0)-B_{\rho_{1}}(0)} e^{C \Lambda r} r^{2-n}\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right|^{2}$,
where $C$ and $\Lambda$ are constants.
Proof. Take $X_{\sigma}(x)=\psi_{\sigma}(|x|) \cdot \eta_{\tau}(|x|) \cdot|x| \cdot(\partial / \partial r)(x)$ for $\sigma>0, \tau>0$ in the first variation formula, where $\eta_{\tau} \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left([0,1], \mathbf{R}^{1}\right)$ will be chosen later, $\psi_{\sigma}$ is a cut-off function so that $\psi_{\sigma}$ is smooth and nonnegative, $\left|\psi_{\sigma}^{\prime}\right| \leqslant 2 \sigma^{-1}$ and

$$
\psi_{\sigma}(r) \begin{cases}=0 & \text { if } 0 \leqslant r \leqslant \sigma  \tag{4.2}\\ =1 & \text { if } r \geqslant 2 \sigma, \\ \leqslant 1 & \text { elsewhere }\end{cases}
$$

Define $u_{t, \sigma}: B \rightarrow N$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{t, \sigma}(x)=k u\left(x+t X_{\sigma}(x)\right) \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that $u_{t, \sigma}$ is smooth. Thus we have

$$
\left.\frac{d}{d t} E\left(u_{t, \sigma}\right)\right|_{t=0}=0 \quad \forall \sigma>0
$$

since $u$ is harmonic.
Let $\phi \in C^{\infty}\left(\mathbf{R}^{+}, \mathbf{R}^{1}\right)$ so that $\phi(r)=1$ for $r \in[0,1] ; \phi(r)=0$ for $r$ $\in\left[1+\sigma_{1}, \infty\right) ; \phi^{\prime}(r)<0\left(\sigma_{1}>0=\right.$ is fixed $)$. Choose $\eta_{\tau}(r)=\phi(r / \tau)$ for $\tau \in$ [ $\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}$ ] in $X_{\sigma}$. Choose an orthonormal basis $e_{1}, \cdots, e_{n-1}, e_{n}=\partial / \partial r$. We have

$$
\begin{gathered}
\nabla_{e_{i}} X_{\sigma}=\psi_{\sigma} \eta_{\tau} \nabla_{r e_{i}} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \quad \text { for } i=1,2, \cdots, n-1 \\
\nabla_{\partial / \partial r} X_{\sigma}=\left(\psi_{\sigma} \eta r\right)^{\prime} \frac{\partial}{\partial r}
\end{gathered}
$$

where the derivative is taken with respect to $r$.
Denote $x=x(r, \theta)$ and

$$
\varepsilon_{i j}(x)=\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\left\langle\nabla_{r e_{i}}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\right), e_{j}\right\rangle\right)(x), \quad i, j=1,2, \cdots, n-1 .
$$

Take a constant $\Lambda>0$ so that $\left|\varepsilon_{i j}(x)\right| \leqslant \Lambda \forall x \in B$. Then we have for $i, j=1,2, \cdots, n-1$

$$
\left\langle\nabla_{e_{i}} X_{\sigma}, e_{j}\right\rangle=\psi_{\sigma} \eta_{\tau} \delta_{i j}+\psi_{\sigma} \eta_{\tau} \int_{0}^{r} \varepsilon_{i j}\left(r^{\prime}, \varphi\right) d r^{\prime}
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{div} X_{\sigma} & =\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\left\langle\nabla e_{i} X_{\sigma}, e_{i}\right\rangle+\left\langle\nabla_{\partial / \partial r} X_{\sigma}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\right\rangle \\
& \geqslant\left(\psi_{\sigma} \eta_{\tau}\right)^{\prime} r+n \psi_{\sigma} \eta_{\tau}-(n-1) \psi_{\sigma} \eta_{\tau} \Lambda r
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\langle d u\left(\nabla_{e_{i}} X_{\sigma}\right), d u\left(e_{i}\right)\right\rangle \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\left\langle d u\left(\psi_{\sigma} \eta_{\tau} \nabla_{r e_{i}}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\right)\right), d u\left(e_{i}\right)\right\rangle \\
&+\left\langle d u\left(\nabla_{\partial / \partial r} X_{\sigma}\right), d u\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\right)\right\rangle \\
& \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \psi_{\sigma} \eta_{\tau}\left|d u\left(e_{i}\right)\right|^{2}+(n-1) \psi_{\sigma} \eta_{\tau} \Lambda r|d u|^{2}+\left(\psi_{\sigma} \eta_{\tau} r\right)^{\prime}\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right|^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus the first variation formula gives

$$
\begin{align*}
0 \geqslant & \int_{B}\left[\left(\psi_{\sigma} \eta_{\tau}\right)^{\prime} r+n \psi_{\sigma} \eta_{\tau}-(n-1) \psi_{\sigma} \eta_{\tau} \Lambda r\right]|d u|^{2} d v \\
& -2 \int_{B} \psi_{\sigma} \eta_{\tau}|d u|^{2} d v-2 \int_{B}\left(\psi_{\sigma} \eta_{\tau}\right)^{\prime} r\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right|^{2} d v  \tag{4.4}\\
& -2(n-1) \int_{B} \psi_{\sigma} \eta \Lambda r|d u|^{2} d v
\end{align*}
$$

## Claim.

$$
\int_{B}\left|\psi_{\sigma}^{\prime}\right| r|d u|^{2} \eta_{\tau} d v \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } \sigma \rightarrow 0
$$

To see this, use the estimate $|d u|^{2}(x) \leqslant C_{1} E(u) \sigma^{-2}$ for $x \in B_{2 \sigma} \backslash B_{\sigma}$. Since $\left|\psi_{\sigma}^{\prime}\right|(x)=0$ for $x \in B_{\sigma}$ or $x \in B \backslash B_{2 \sigma}$ and $\left|\psi_{\sigma}^{\prime}\right| \leqslant 2 \sigma^{-1}$, we get

$$
\int_{B}\left|\psi_{\sigma}^{\prime}\right| r|d u|^{2} \eta_{\tau} d v \leqslant C_{2} E(u) \sigma^{n} \sigma^{-1} \sigma^{-2} \sigma=C_{2} E(u) \sigma^{2-n}
$$

Since $n \geqslant 3$, the conclusion follows. Similarly one can show that $\lim _{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \int_{B} \psi_{\sigma} \eta_{\tau}|d u|^{2}=\int_{B} \eta_{\tau}|d u|^{2}$, etc. Letting $\sigma \rightarrow 0$, we get from (4.4)

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 \geqslant & \int_{B}\left(\eta_{\tau}^{\prime} r+n \eta_{\tau}-(n-1) \eta \Lambda r\right)|d u|^{2}-2 \int_{B} \eta|d u|^{2} \\
& -2 \int_{B} \eta^{\prime} r\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right|^{2}-2(n-1) \int_{B} \eta \Lambda r|d u|^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2 \tau \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \int_{B} \eta\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right|^{2} \leqslant 3(n-1) \int_{B} \eta r \Lambda|d u|^{2}+\tau \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \int_{B} \eta_{\tau}|d u|^{2}+(2-n) \int_{B} \eta|d u|^{2} \\
& \leqslant 3(n-1)\left(1+\sigma_{1}\right) \int_{B} \eta \Lambda|d u|^{2}+\tau \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \int_{B} \eta_{\tau}|d u|^{2}+(2-n) \int_{B} \eta|d u|^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Multiplying by $\tau^{1-n} e^{C \Lambda \tau}$ for $C=3(n-1)$, we have
$e^{C \Lambda \tau} 2 t^{2-n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \int_{B} \eta_{\tau}\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right|^{2} \leqslant \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}\left(e^{C \Lambda \tau} \tau^{2-n} \int_{B} \eta_{\tau}|d u|^{2}\right)+\sigma_{1} e^{C \Lambda \tau} C \tau^{2-n} \int_{B} \eta_{\tau}|d u|^{2}$.
Integrate over $\left[\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\right]$ and let $\sigma_{1} \rightarrow 0$. We then get

$$
e^{C \Lambda \rho_{1}} \rho_{1}^{2-n} \int_{B_{\rho_{1}}}|d u|^{2}-e^{C \Lambda \rho_{2}} \rho_{2}^{2-n} \int_{B_{\rho_{2}}}|d u|^{2} \geqslant 2 \int_{B_{\rho_{2} \backslash B_{\rho_{1}}}} e^{C \Lambda r} r^{2-n}\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right|^{2} .
$$

In the above computation we denote $B=B_{1}\left(x_{0}\right)$ and $B_{\rho_{2}}=B_{\rho_{2}}\left(x_{0}\right), B_{\rho_{2}}=$ $B_{\rho_{2}}\left(x_{0}\right)$.

Proof of the Main Theorem. Under the assumption of the theorem we have for $x \in B_{1} \backslash\{0\},|x|<1 / 2$,

$$
\frac{|x|^{2-n}}{2} \int_{B_{|x| / 2}(x)}|\nabla u|^{2} \leqslant C(2|x|)^{2-n} \int_{B_{2|x|}(0)}|\nabla u|^{2} \leqslant C E(u) .
$$

So the estimate (3.1) still holds. Here we have applied Proposition 2 with $\rho_{1}=2|x|, \rho_{2}=1$. Then the same argument in the proof of Proposition 1 can be carried through.
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