

# QUANTIZATION FOR A NONLINEAR DIRAC EQUATION

MIAOMIAO ZHU

(Communicated by Guofang Wei)

**ABSTRACT.** We study solutions of certain nonlinear Dirac-type equations on Riemann spin surfaces. We first improve an energy identity theorem for a sequence of such solutions with uniformly bounded energy in the case of a fixed domain. Then, we prove the corresponding energy identity in the case that the equations have constant coefficients and the domains possibly degenerate to a spin surface with only Neveu-Schwarz type nodes.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $M$  be a closed Riemann surface with a fixed spin structure. Let  $\Sigma M$  be the spinor bundle over  $M$  with a hermitian metric  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\Sigma M}$  and a compatible spin connection  $\nabla$ . Let  $\not{D}$  be the Dirac operator defined on  $\Gamma(\Sigma M)$ , i.e.,  $\not{D} := e_1 \cdot \nabla_{e_1} + e_2 \cdot \nabla_{e_2}$  for a local orthonormal frame  $\{e_1, e_2\}$  of  $TM$ .

We consider the following nonlinear Dirac-type equation on  $M$ :

$$(1.1) \quad \not{D}\psi = H_{jkl} \langle \psi^j, \psi^k \rangle \psi^l,$$

where  $\psi = (\psi^1, \psi^2, \dots, \psi^d), \psi^i \in \Gamma(\Sigma M)$  and  $H_{jkl} = (H_{jkl}^1, H_{jkl}^2, \dots, H_{jkl}^d) \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{C}^d)$ .

Nonlinear Dirac equations of the form (1.1) appear naturally in geometry and physics. First, consider the Dirac-harmonic map  $(\phi, \psi)$  with curvature term introduced by Chen-Jost-Wang [7, 8], which was derived from the nonlinear supersymmetric  $\sigma$ -model of quantum field theory, then the nonlinear Dirac equation for the spinor  $\psi$  reduces to (1.1) with  $H$  being real valued, when  $\phi$  is a constant map. Second, the generalized Weierstrass representation indicates that solutions to some Dirac equations of the form (1.1) can be used to express surfaces immersed in  $\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^4$  and some three-dimensional Lie groups:  $SU(2), \text{Nil}, \text{Sol}, \widetilde{SL}_2$  (see e.g. [16]). Third, Ammann-Humbert considered a similar Dirac equation to study the first conformal Dirac eigenvalue [3].

In order to discuss some analytic aspects of the equation (1.1), we recall that the energy of  $\psi \in \Gamma(\Sigma M)$  on a domain  $\Omega \subset M$  is defined by

$$(1.2) \quad E(\psi, \Omega) = \int_{\Omega} |\psi|^4 d\text{vol},$$

where  $|\psi| := \langle \psi, \psi \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Note that (1.1) and (1.2) are conformally invariant.

Chen-Jost-Wang [8] developed the basic geometric analysis tools for blow-up analysis of the solutions of (1.1) and proved an energy identity for a sequence of

---

Received by the editors July 9, 2015 and, in revised form, November 20, 2015.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 58J05, 53C27.

*Key words and phrases.* Dirac equation, energy identity, Neveu-Schwarz.

smooth solutions on a fixed domain with small uniform energy bound. For the energy identities of two-dimensional harmonic maps, pseudo-holomorphic curves, we refer to [9, 10, 14, 15, 18]. For the regularity issue of (1.1), we refer to Wang [17], where any weak solution to (1.1) was shown to be smooth.

In this article, we will prove the energy identity without assuming the small uniform energy bound. More precisely, we have the following:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $M$  be a closed Riemann surface with a fixed spin structure, and suppose that  $\psi_n$  is a sequence of smooth solutions of (1.1) on  $M$  with uniformly bounded energy  $E(\psi_n) = \int_M |\psi_n|^4 \leq \Lambda < \infty$ . Then there exist finitely many blow-up points  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_I\}$ , a solution  $\psi$  on  $M$  to (1.1) and finitely many solutions  $\xi^{i,l}$  on  $S^2$  of (1.1) with  $H_{jkm} \equiv H_{jkm}(x_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, I$ ;  $l = 1, 2, \dots, L_i$ , such that, after selection of a subsequence,  $\psi_n$  converges in  $C_{loc}^\infty$  to  $\psi$  on  $M \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_I\}$  and the following holds:*

$$(1.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\psi_n) = E(\psi) + \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{l=1}^{L_i} E(\xi^{i,l}).$$

Furthermore, we prove that the corresponding energy identity holds in the case that the domain converge to a possibly noncompact Riemann spin surface with all punctures (if there are any) of Neveu-Schwarz type.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $(M_n, c_n, \mathfrak{S}_n)$  be a sequence of closed Riemann spin surfaces of genus  $g > 1$  with complex structures  $c_n$  and spin structures  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ . Assume that  $(M_n, c_n, \mathfrak{S}_n)$  converges to a possibly noncompact Riemann spin surface  $(M, c, \mathfrak{S})$  with only Neveu-Schwarz type punctures (if there are any). Let  $\psi_n$  be a sequence of smooth solutions of (1.1) on  $M_n$  with  $H_{jkm} \equiv \text{const}$  and with uniformly bounded energy  $E(\psi_n, M_n) \leq \Lambda < \infty$ . Then there exist a solution  $\psi$  of (1.1) on  $(\overline{M}, \overline{c}, \overline{\mathfrak{S}})$ , where  $(\overline{M}, \overline{c}, \overline{\mathfrak{S}})$  is the normalization of  $(M, c, \mathfrak{S})$  and finitely many solutions  $\xi^k$  of (1.1) on  $S^2$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ , such that, after selection of a subsequence, the following holds:*

$$(1.4) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\psi_n) = E(\psi) + \sum_{k=1}^K E(\xi^k).$$

We remark that, in the simple case of  $d = 1$  and  $H \equiv 1$ , the equation (1.1) becomes

$$(1.5) \quad \not\partial \psi = |\psi|^2 \psi.$$

It is well known that any solution to (1.5) represents a branched conformal immersion in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  with constant mean curvature  $H \equiv 1$  (see cf. [1, 16]) and hence the concentrated energy in (1.3) and (1.4) can be explicitly quantized, i.e., in multiples of  $4\pi$ .

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

We collect some basic analytic properties for solutions of (1.1) proved in [8].

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $D$  be the unit disk. There exists a constant  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  such that*

(1) ( $\epsilon$ -regularity) *Let  $\psi$  be a smooth solution of (1.1) satisfying*

$$E(\psi, D) = \int_D |\psi|^4 < \epsilon_0.$$

Then, we have

$$\|\psi\|_{\bar{D},k,p} \leq C \|\psi\|_{D,0,4},$$

$\forall \tilde{D} \Subset D, p > 1$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , where  $C = C(\tilde{D}, k, p) > 0$  is a constant.

- (2) (*Singularity removability*) Let  $\psi$  be a smooth solution of (1.1) defined on  $D \setminus \{0\}$  with the nontrivial spin structure. If

$$E(\psi, D) = \int_D |\psi|^4 < \infty,$$

then  $\psi$  extends to a smooth solution of (1.1) on the whole  $D$ .

- (3) For any nontrivial solution  $\psi$  of (1.1) on  $S^2$ , we have

$$E(\psi) = \int_{S^2} |\psi|^4 \geq \epsilon_0.$$

**Remark 2.1.** Theorem 2.1 was proved in [8] for equation (1.1) with real valued  $H$  as well as certain complex valued  $H$  (Section 5. in [8]). It is easy to check that the results hold true also in the case of general complex valued  $H$ .

For the notion of the nontriviality of a spin structure on an annulus or a cylinder, we refer to [2–4]. Following the terminology introduced by Jarvis-Kimura-Vaintrob [11], the puncture  $\{0\}$  in (2) of Theorem 2.1 is said to be of Neveu-Schwarz type. If  $D \setminus \{0\}$  is equipped with the trivial spin structure, then the puncture  $\{0\}$  is said to be of Ramond type. See [21] for similar discussions.

Applying the analytic properties in Theorem 2.1, Chen-Jost-Wang [8] proved the following:

**Theorem 2.2.** Let  $M$  be a closed Riemann surface with a fixed spin structure, and suppose that  $\psi_n$  is a sequence of smooth solutions of (1.1) on  $M$  with real valued  $H$  and with uniformly bounded energy  $E(\psi_n) = \int_M |\psi_n|^4 \leq \Lambda < \infty$ , and assume that  $\psi_n$  weakly converges to some  $\psi$  in  $L^4(\Sigma M)$ . Then the blow-up set

$$S := \bigcap_{r>0} \left\{ x \in M \mid \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{D(x,r)} |\psi_n|^4 \geq \epsilon_0 \right\}$$

is a finite set of points  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_I\}$ , where  $\epsilon_0$  is as in Theorem 2.1. Furthermore, there exists a constant  $c_0 > 0$  depending only on  $M$  such that if

$$(2.1) \quad \sup_{M,i,j,k,l} |H_{jkl}^i| \sqrt{\Lambda} < c_0,$$

then there are finitely many solutions of (1.1) on  $S^2$ :  $\xi^{i,l}, i = 1, 2, \dots, I; l = 1, 2, \dots, L_i$ , after selection of a subsequence,  $\psi_n$  converges in  $C_{loc}^\infty$  to  $\psi$  on  $M \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_I\}$  and the following holds:

$$(2.2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\psi_n) = E(\psi) + \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{l=1}^{L_i} E(\xi^{i,l}).$$

## 3. ENERGY IDENTITY

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2.

First, we recall the following lemma proved in [6] (see [8] for a different proof):

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $\psi$  be a solution of*

$$\bar{\partial}\psi = f$$

*on the unit disk  $D$ , with  $\psi|_{\partial D} = \varphi$ , and  $f \in L^p(D)$ ,  $\varphi \in W^{1,p}(\partial D)$  for some  $p > 1$ ; then*

$$\|\psi\|_{D,1,p} \leq C(\|f\|_{D,0,p} + \|\varphi\|_{\partial D,1,p}),$$

*where  $C = C(p) > 0$  is a constant.*

Next, inspired by the proof of Theorem 4.2 in [8], we give the following lemma:

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\psi$  be a smooth solution of (1.1) on the annulus  $A_{r_1,r_2} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 | r_1 \leq |x| \leq r_2\}$ , where  $0 < r_1 < 2r_1 < r_2/2 < r_2 < 1$  and assume that*

$$\sup_{A_{r_1,r_2}, i,j,k,l} |H_{jkl}^i| \leq h_0 < \infty.$$

*Then we have*

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \left( \int_{A_{2r_1,r_2/2}} |\psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} &\leq C_0 \left( \int_{A_{r_1,r_2}} |\psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{A_{r_1,r_2}} |\psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ &\quad + C \left( \int_{A_{r_1,2r_1}} |\psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} + C \left( \int_{A_{r_2/2,r_2}} |\psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \left( \int_{A_{2r_1,r_2/2}} |\nabla \psi|^{\frac{4}{3}} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} &\leq C_0 \left( \int_{A_{r_1,r_2}} |\psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{A_{r_1,r_2}} |\psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ &\quad + C \left( \int_{A_{r_1,2r_1}} |\psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} + C \left( \int_{A_{r_2/2,r_2}} |\psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \end{aligned}$$

*where  $C_0, C$  are positive constants that do not depend on  $r_1, r_2$  and  $C_0 = C_0(h_0)$  depends on  $h_0$ .*

*Proof.* We will prove this lemma using some arguments from [8]. Let  $D$  be the unit disk. Choose a cut-off function  $\eta \in [0, 1]$  on  $D$  satisfying

$$(3.3) \quad \eta \in C_0^\infty(A_{r_1,r_2}) \quad ; \quad \eta \equiv 1 \text{ in } A_{2r_1,r_2/2},$$

$$(3.4) \quad |\nabla \eta| \leq 4/r_1 \text{ in } A_{r_1,2r_1} \quad ; \quad |\nabla \eta| \leq 4/r_2 \text{ in } A_{r_2/2,r_2}.$$

Then by the equation (1.1) and Lemma 3.1, we have

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\eta\psi\|_{D,1,4/3} &\leq C\|\bar{\partial}(\eta\psi)\|_{D,0,4/3} \\ &\leq C\|\eta\bar{\partial}\psi\|_{D,0,4/3} + C\|\nabla\eta|\psi|\|_{D,0,4/3} \\ &\leq Ch_0\|\psi\|_{A_{r_1,r_2},0,4}^2\|\eta\psi\|_{D,0,4} + C\|\nabla\eta|\psi|\|_{D,0,4/3}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (3.4) and Cauchy inequality that

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\nabla\eta|\psi|\|_{D,0,4/3} &\leq \|\nabla\eta|\psi|\|_{A_{r_1,2r_1},0,4/3} + \|\nabla\eta|\psi|\|_{A_{r_2/2,r_2},0,4/3} \\ &\leq C\|\psi\|_{A_{r_1,2r_1},0,4} + C\|\psi\|_{A_{r_2/2,r_2},0,4}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (3.3), we conclude from the Sobolev embedding theorem that

$$(3.7) \quad \|\psi\|_{A_{2r_1, r_2/2, 0, 4}} + \|\psi\|_{A_{2r_1, r_2/2, 1, 4/3}} \leq \|\eta\psi\|_{D, 0, 4} + \|\eta\psi\|_{D, 1, 4/3} \leq 2\|\eta\psi\|_{D, 1, 4/3}.$$

Combining (3.5), (3.6) and (3.7) gives (3.1) and (3.2).  $\square$

Now, let us recall the conformal transformation between an annulus and a cylinder (cf. [21]). Let  $(r, \theta)$  be the polar coordinates of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  centered at 0 and  $h_{eucl} = dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2$  be the Euclidean metric on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Equip the cylinder  $\mathbb{R}^1 \times S^1$  with the metric  $ds^2 = dt^2 + d\theta^2$ , where  $S^1 = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ . Then the following map  $f: \mathbb{R}^1 \times S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$

$$(3.8) \quad r = e^{-t}, \quad \theta = \theta, \quad (t, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^1 \times S^1,$$

is a conformal transformation. One can verify that

$$f^* h_{eucl} = e^{-2t} ds^2.$$

Given  $r_1 > r_2$ , then, the annulus  $A_{r_1, r_2} := \{re^{i\theta} | r_2 \leq r \leq r_1\}$  is mapped to the cylinder  $P_{t_1, t_2} := [t_1, t_2] \times S^1$ , where  $t_i = -\log r_i, i = 1, 2$ .

Let  $\psi$  be a solution of (1.1) defined on the annulus  $A_{r_1, r_2} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ . Set

$$\Psi := e^{-\frac{t}{2}} f^* \psi.$$

Then by the conformal invariance of (1.1),  $\Psi$  is a solution of (1.1) defined on the cylinder  $P_{t_1, t_2} \subset \mathbb{R}^1 \times S^1$ .

Denote by  $P_{T_1, T_2} = [T_1, T_2] \times S^1$  a cylinder with metric  $ds^2 = dt^2 + d\theta^2$  and with the spin structure being nontrivial along the boundary curves. Then we have the following cylindrical version of Lemma 3.2:

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $\Psi$  be a smooth solution of (1.1) on  $P_{T_1, T_2}$ , where  $T_2 - 1 > T_1 + 1 > 1$ . Assume that*

$$\sup_{P_{T_1, T_2}, i, j, k, l} |H_{jkl}^i| \leq h_0 < \infty.$$

*Then we have*

$$(3.9) \quad \left( \int_{P_{T_1+1, T_2-1}} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq C_0 \left( \int_{P_{T_1, T_2}} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{P_{T_1, T_2}} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ + C \left( \int_{P_{T_2-1, T_2}} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} + C \left( \int_{P_{T_1, T_1+1}} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}},$$

$$(3.10) \quad \left( \int_{P_{T_1+1, T_2-1}} |\nabla \Psi|^{\frac{4}{3}} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \leq C_0 \left( \int_{P_{T_1, T_2}} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{P_{T_1, T_2}} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ + C \left( \int_{P_{T_2-1, T_2}} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} + C \left( \int_{P_{T_1, T_1+1}} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}},$$

where  $C_0, C$  are positive constants that do not depend on  $T_1, T_2$  and  $C_0 = C_0(h_0)$  depends on  $h_0$ .

*Proof.* Applying the conformal transformation (3.8) to Lemma 3.2, then, (3.9), (3.10) are direct consequences of (3.1), (3.2).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Given a cylinder  $P_{T_1-1, T_2+1}$ , assume that*

$$\sup_{P_{T_1-1, T_2+1}, i, j, k, l} |H_{jkl}^i| \leq h_0 < \infty.$$

*Then there exists  $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(h_0) > 0$  such that if  $\Psi$  is a smooth solution of (1.1) defined on  $P_{T_1-1, T_2+1}$  and*

$$(3.11) \quad \int_{P_{T_1-1, T_2+1}} |\Psi|^4 \leq \Lambda < \infty,$$

$$(3.12) \quad \omega := \sup_{t \in [T_1-1, T_2]} \int_{[t, t+1] \times S^1} |\Psi|^4 \leq \epsilon_1,$$

*then*

$$(3.13) \quad \int_{P_{T_1, T_2}} |\Psi|^4 + \int_{P_{T_1, T_2}} |\nabla \Psi|^{\frac{4}{3}} \leq C(h_0, \Lambda) \omega^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

*Here,  $C(h_0, \Lambda)$  is a constant depending only on  $h_0$  and  $\Lambda$ , but not on  $T_1, T_2$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon_1 = \min\{\frac{1}{8C_0^2}, 1\}$ , where  $C_0 > 0$  is the constant in Lemma 3.3. Then by assumption (3.12), we have

$$(3.14) \quad \sup_{t \in [T_1-1, T_2]} \int_{[t, t+1] \times S^1} |\Psi|^4 \leq \epsilon_1 \leq \frac{1}{8C_0^2}.$$

Note that  $\mu(t) := \int_{[T_1, t] \times S^1} |\Psi|^4$  is a continuous and nondecreasing function defined on  $[T_1, T_2]$  and the energy of  $\Psi$  over  $P_{T_1-1, T_2+1}$  is bounded by  $\Lambda$ . With similar arguments as in [19] (Theorem 3.5, p. 134), we can separate  $P_{T_1, T_2}$  into finitely many parts as follows (cf. [21, Lemma 3.3]):

$$P_{T_1, T_2} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{N_0} P^n, P^n := [T^{n-1}, T^n] \times S^1, T^0 = T_1, T^{N_0} = T_2$$

such that  $N_0$  is an integer no larger than  $[8C_0^2\Lambda] + 1$ , and the following hold:

$$(3.15) \quad E(\Psi; P^n) \leq \frac{1}{4C_0^2}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, N_0.$$

Applying Lemma 3.3 to each part  $P^n$  gives

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \left( \int_{P^n} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} &\leq C_0 \left( \int_{[T^{n-1}-1, T^n+1] \times S^1} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{[T^{n-1}-1, T^n+1] \times S^1} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ &+ C \left( \int_{[T^{n-1}-1, T^{n-1}] \times S^1} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} + C \left( \int_{[T^n, T^n+1] \times S^1} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the definition of  $\omega$  (see (3.12)) that

$$(3.17) \quad \left( \int_{P^n} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq C_0 \left( \left( \int_{P^n} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \omega^{\frac{1}{2}} + \omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \left( \left( \int_{P^n} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} + \omega^{\frac{1}{4}} + \omega^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) + \omega^{\frac{1}{4}} + \omega^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

By the energy bound (3.11), we have

$$(3.18) \quad \left( \int_{P^n} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq C_0 \left( \int_{P^n} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{P^n} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} + C(h_0, \Lambda) (\omega^{\frac{1}{4}} + \omega^{\frac{1}{2}} + \omega^{\frac{3}{4}}).$$

Here  $C(h_0, \Lambda)$  depends on  $h_0$  and  $\Lambda$ . From (3.15), we can rewrite (3.18) as follows:

$$(3.19) \quad \left( \int_{P^n} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq C(h_0, \Lambda) (\omega^{\frac{1}{4}} + \omega^{\frac{1}{2}} + \omega^{\frac{3}{4}}).$$

Since  $\epsilon_1 \leq 1$ , by assumption (3.12), we get

$$\omega := \sup_{t \in [T_1-1, T_2]} \int_{[t, t+1] \times S^1} |\Psi|^4 \leq \epsilon_1 \leq 1.$$

Hence, we conclude from (3.19) that

$$\left( \int_{P^n} |\Psi|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq C(h_0, \Lambda) (\omega^{\frac{1}{4}} + \omega^{\frac{1}{2}} + \omega^{\frac{3}{4}}) \leq C(h_0, \Lambda) \omega^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

With similar arguments, we have (by (3.10) in Lemma 3.3)

$$\left( \int_{P^n} |\nabla \Psi|^{\frac{4}{3}} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \leq C(h_0, \Lambda) \omega^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Summing up the above estimates on  $P^n$  gives

$$(3.20) \quad \int_{P_{T_1, T_2}} |\Psi|^4 = \sum_{n=1}^{N_0} \int_{P^n} |\Psi|^4 \leq C(h_0, \Lambda) N_0 \omega \leq C(h_0, \Lambda) \omega^{\frac{1}{3}}$$

and

$$(3.21) \quad \int_{P_{T_1, T_2}} |\nabla \Psi|^{\frac{4}{3}} = \sum_{n=1}^{N_0} \int_{P^n} |\nabla \Psi|^{\frac{4}{3}} \leq C(h_0, \Lambda) N_0 \omega^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq C(h_0, \Lambda) \omega^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

(3.13) follows immediately from combining (3.20) and (3.21).  $\square$

Applying Lemma 3.4, we show Theorem 1.1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* The uniform energy bound  $E(\psi_n) = \int_M |\psi_n|^4 \leq \Lambda < \infty$  implies that  $\psi_n$  weakly subconverges to some  $\psi$  in  $L^4(\Sigma M)$ . By a standard covering argument and  $\epsilon$ -regularity, there exist finitely many blow-up points  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_I\}$  such that, after passing to subsequences,  $\psi_n$  converges in  $C_{loc}^\infty$  to  $\psi$  on  $M \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_I\}$ . It follows from the smoothness of  $\psi_n$  and the singularity removability that  $\psi$  extends to a smooth solution of (1.1) on  $M$ .

To prove the energy identity (1.3), we only need to consider the case that  $I = 1$  and  $L_1 = 1$ , because the general case can be reduced to the simplest case by induction. Following the arguments and notation as in the proof of Theorem 4.2 in [8] (see Theorem 3.6 in [5] for similar arguments), we only need to show that

$$(3.22) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\Psi_n, P_{T_0, T_n}) = 0,$$

where  $P_{T_0, T_n} = [T_0, T_n] \times S^1$ ,  $T_0 := |\log \delta|$ ,  $T_n := |\log \lambda_n R|$ ,  $\delta > 0$ ,  $R > 0$ . Here,  $\Psi_n$  are induced from the solutions  $\psi_n$  on anuli near the blow-up point under a conformal

transformation (cf. Theorem 4.2 in [8]) and hence  $\Psi_n$  are smooth solutions of (1.1) on  $P_{T_0-1, T_n+1}$  with corresponding  $\tilde{H}$  satisfying

$$\max_{n,i,j,k,l} \left\{ |\tilde{H}_{jkl}^i|(x) : x \in P_{T_0-1, T_n+1} \right\} \leq \max_{i,j,k,l} \left\{ |H_{jkl}^i|(x) : x \in M \right\} \leq C < +\infty.$$

Moreover, through a standard argument by contradiction, one can prove that

$$(3.23) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [T_0-1, T_n]_{[t, t+1] \times S^1}} \int |\Psi_n|^4 = 0,$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\int_{P_{T_0-1, T_n+1}} |\Psi_n|^4 \leq E(\psi_n, M_n) \leq \Lambda < \infty.$$

Then we can apply Lemma 3.4 ((3.23) implies that the condition (3.12) can be satisfied) to conclude that

$$(3.24) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int_{P_{T_0, T_n}} |\Psi|^4 + \int_{P_{T_0, T_n}} |\nabla \Psi|^{\frac{4}{3}} \right) = 0.$$

In particular, (3.22) holds. This completes the proof.  $\square$

Now, we consider a sequence of smooth solutions of (1.1) on long spin cylinders under certain assumptions and give the following proposition, which is analogous to the cases of harmonic maps and Dirac-harmonic maps (cf. Proposition 3.1 in [20] and Proposition 3.1 in [21]). The scheme of the proof is similar to the neck analysis for certain approximate harmonic maps by Ding-Tian [9].

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $\Psi_n$  be a sequence of smooth solutions of (1.1) defined on  $P_n$ , where  $P_n = [T_n^1, T_n^2] \times S^1$  is equipped with the nontrivial spin structure. Suppose that there is a constant  $C > 0$  such that*

$$\sup_{P_n, i, j, k, l} |H_{jkl}^i| \leq C < +\infty.$$

Assume that:

(1)

$$(3.25) \quad 1 \ll T_n^1 \ll T_n^2,$$

(2)

$$(3.26) \quad E(\Psi_n, P_n) \leq \Lambda < \infty,$$

(3)

$$(3.27) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(\Psi_n, P_{T_n^1, T_n^1+R}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(\Psi_n, P_{T_n^2-R, T_n^2}) = 0, \quad \forall R \geq 1,$$

where

$$\omega(\Psi, P_{T_1, T_2}) := \sup_{t \in [T_1, T_2-1]} \int_{[t, t+1] \times S^1} |\Psi|^4.$$



Then there are finitely many solutions of (1.1) on  $S^2$ :  $\zeta^{j,l}$ ,  $l = 1, 2, \dots, L_j$ ;  $j = 1, 2, \dots, K$ , such that after selection of a subsequence of  $(\Psi_n, P_n)$ , the following holds:

$$(3.28) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\Psi_n, P_n) = \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^{L_j} E(\zeta^{j,l}).$$

*Proof.* In view of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 2.1, with similar arguments as in [20] (Proposition 3.1), we can decompose  $P_n$  into neck domains  $\bigcup_{i=0}^K I_n^i$  and bubble domains  $\bigcup_{j=1}^K J_n^j$  (take subsequences if necessary):

$$(3.29) \quad P_n = \bigcup_{i=0}^K I_n^i \bigcup_{j=1}^K J_n^j,$$

where  $K$  is independent of  $n$ . Furthermore, we have

- (1) For each  $i$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(\Psi_n, I_n^i) = 0$ .
- (2) For each  $j$ , there are finitely many solutions of (1.1) on  $S^2$ :  $\zeta^{j,l}$ ,  $l = 1, 2, \dots, L_j$ , such that:

$$(3.30) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\Psi_n, J_n^j) = \sum_{l=1}^{L_j} E(\zeta^{j,l}).$$

Note that, here, some bubbles (solutions of (1.1) on  $\mathbb{R} \times S^1$ ) corresponding to collapsing homotopically nontrivial simple closed curves on  $P_n$  can possibly appear. Therefore, in order to apply the singularity removability result - Theorem 2.1 (2), the nontriviality of the spin structures along  $P_n$  should be required (see Proposition 3.1 in [21] for similar discussions).

We need to verify that, in the limit, the necks  $\Psi_n : I_n^i \rightarrow N$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, K$  contain no energy. It is not difficult to verify that, after passing to subsequences, the local energy of  $\Psi_n$  over a small neighborhood of the two boundary components of  $I_n^i$  can be arbitrarily small. Then, applying Lemma 3.4 gives

$$(3.31) \quad \sum_{i=0}^K E(\Psi_n, I_n^i) \leq C(\Lambda) \sum_{i=0}^K (\omega(\Psi_n, I_n^i))^{\frac{1}{3}} \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

(3.28) follows from combining (3.30) and (3.31).  $\square$

Now, we shall use Proposition 3.1 to prove Theorem 1.2.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* Recall that any closed surface of genus  $g > 1$  is of general type (cf. [20]). For each  $n$ , let  $h_n$  be the hyperbolic metric on  $M_n$  compatible with the complex structure  $c_n$ . As discussed in [20, 21], we can assume that  $(M_n, h_n, c_n)$  converges to a hyperbolic Riemann surface  $(M, h, c)$  by collapsing a possibly empty collection of finitely many pairwise disjoint simple closed geodesics  $\{\gamma_n^j, j \in J\}$  on  $M_n$ . Note that  $0 \leq |J| \leq 3g - 3$ . For each  $j$ , the geodesics  $\gamma_n^j$  degenerate into a pair of punctures  $(\mathcal{E}^{j,1}, \mathcal{E}^{j,2})$  and  $l_n^j := \text{length}(\gamma_n^j) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $P_n^j$  be the standard cylindrical collar about  $\gamma_n^j$  (cf. [20]), namely

$$P_n^j = \left[ \frac{2\pi}{l_n^j} \arctan(\sinh(\frac{l_n^j}{2})), \frac{2\pi}{l_n^j} (\pi - \arctan(\sinh(\frac{l_n^j}{2}))) \right] \times S^1$$

with metric  $ds^2 = (\frac{l_n^j}{2\pi \sin \frac{l_n^j t}{2\pi}})^2(dt^2 + d\theta^2)$ . Let  $\tau_n : M \rightarrow M_n \setminus \bigcup_{j \in J} \gamma_n^j$  be the corresponding diffeomorphisms realizing the convergence (cf. [20]). Let  $(\overline{M}, \bar{c})$  be the normalization of  $(M, c)$ .

Moreover, by taking subsequences, we can assume that  $\tau_n$  is compatible with the spin structures  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ , namely, the pull-back spin structure on the limit surface  $M$  is fixed. We denote it by  $\mathfrak{S}$ . In particular, for each  $j$ ,  $\mathfrak{S}$  is nontrivial or trivial along the pair of punctures  $(\mathcal{E}^{j,1}, \mathcal{E}^{j,2})$  if and only if  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  is nontrivial or trivial along the geodesic  $\gamma_n^j$  for all  $n$ . By assumption, all punctures of the limit spin surface  $(M, \mathfrak{S})$  are of Neveu-Schwarz type. It is equivalent to say that the spin structure  $\mathfrak{S}$  on  $M$  is nontrivial around all punctures of  $M$ . Thus,  $\mathfrak{S}$  extends to some spin structure  $\overline{\mathfrak{S}}$  on  $\overline{M}$  (cf. [2, 4, 21]).

As in [21] (see [13] for a more detailed explanation), by pulling back the geometric data via the diffeomorphisms  $\tau_n$ , we can fix the spinor bundle  $\Sigma M$  and think of the hyperbolic metrics and the compatible complex structures  $(h_n, c_n)$  as all living on the limit surface  $M$  and converging in  $C_{loc}^\infty$  to  $(h, c)$ . Let  $\nabla_n$  be the connection on  $\Sigma M$  coming from  $h_n$  and  $\nabla$  the connection on  $\Sigma M$  coming from  $h$ . Then, we can consider  $\psi_n$  as a sequence of solutions of (1.1) defined on  $(M, h_n, c_n, \mathfrak{S})$  with respect to  $(c_n, \nabla_n)$ .

Note that all estimates in Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 1.1 are uniform for the metrics  $h_n$  and the complex structures  $c_n$ . With similar arguments as in [20] (Theorem 1.1) and [21] (Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.2), we can apply Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 2.1 to prove that there exist finitely many blow-up points  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_I\}$  which are away from the punctures  $\{(\mathcal{E}^{j,1}, \mathcal{E}^{j,2}), j \in J\}$  and finitely many smooth solutions of (1.1) on  $S^2$ :  $\xi^{i,l}$ ,  $l = 1, 2, \dots, L_i$ , near the  $i$ -th blow-up point  $x_i$ ; a smooth solution  $\psi$  of (1.1) on  $(\overline{M}, \bar{c}, \overline{\mathfrak{S}})$ , such that, after selection of a subsequence, the following holds:

$$(3.32) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\psi_n) = E(\psi) + \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{l=1}^{L_i} E(\xi^{i,l}) + \sum_{j \in J} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\psi_n, P_n^{j,\delta}),$$

where  $P_n^{j,\delta}$  is the  $\delta$ -subcollars of  $P_n^j$ , for  $\delta \in [\frac{l_n^j}{2}, \text{arcsinh}(1)]$  (see the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [20]), namely,

$$P_n^{j,\delta} := [T_n^{1,j,\delta}, T_n^{2,j,\delta}] \times S^1 \subseteq P_n^j,$$

where

$$T_n^{1,j,\delta} = \frac{2\pi}{l_n^j} \arcsin\left(\frac{\sinh(\frac{l_n^j}{2})}{\sinh \delta}\right), \quad T_n^{2,j,\delta} = \frac{2\pi^2}{l_n^j} - \frac{2\pi}{l_n^j} \arcsin\left(\frac{\sinh(\frac{l_n^j}{2})}{\sinh \delta}\right).$$

In fact, for each fixed  $n$  and each fixed  $\delta \in [\frac{l_n^j}{2}, \text{arcsinh}(1)]$ ,  $P_n^{j,\delta}$  is exactly the  $j$ -th component of the  $\delta$ -thin part of the hyperbolic surface  $(M_n, h_n)$ .

To capture the concentrated energy at the punctures, i.e.,

$$\sum_{j \in J} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\psi_n, P_n^{j,\delta}),$$

we shall apply Proposition 3.1. By conformal invariance of the equation (1.1) and the energy functional (1.2), we equip  $P_n^j$  with the Euclidean metric. Then applying similar arguments as in [20] (Theorem 1.1) and [21] (Theorem 1.2), we can use Proposition 3.1 to show that there exist finitely many smooth solutions of (1.1)

on  $S^2$ :  $\zeta^{j,k}$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K_j$ ,  $j \in J$ , such that, after selection of a subsequence of  $(\psi_n, M_n)$ , we have

$$(3.33) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\psi_n, P_n^{j,\delta}) = \sum_{k=1}^{K_j} E(\zeta^{j,k}), \quad j \in J.$$

Finally, combining (3.32) and (3.33) gives the energy identity (1.4). Thus, we have finished the proof.  $\square$

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was carried out when the author was a graduate student at IMPRS “Mathematics in the Sciences”, supported by the Klaus Tschira Foundation. Part of the work has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)/ERC grant agreement No. 267087. The author would like to thank Professor Jürgen Jost and Professor Guofang Wang for advices and suggestions.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Bernd Ammann, *The smallest Dirac eigenvalue in a spin-conformal class and cmc immersions*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **17** (2009), no. 3, 429–479, DOI 10.4310/CAG.2009.v17.n3.a2. MR2550205 (2010k:53075)
- [2] Bernd Ammann and Christian Bär, *Dirac eigenvalue estimates on surfaces*, Math. Z. **240** (2002), no. 2, 423–449, DOI 10.1007/s002090100392. MR1900319 (2003g:58045)
- [3] Bernd Ammann and Emmanuel Humbert, *The first conformal Dirac eigenvalue on 2-dimensional tori*, J. Geom. Phys. **56** (2006), no. 4, 623–642, DOI 10.1016/j.geomphys.2005.04.007. MR2199284 (2007c:58044)
- [4] Christian Bär, *The Dirac operator on hyperbolic manifolds of finite volume*, J. Differential Geom. **54** (2000), no. 3, 439–488. MR1823312 (2002c:58048)
- [5] Qun Chen, Jürgen Jost, Jiayu Li, and Guofang Wang, *Regularity theorems and energy identities for Dirac-harmonic maps*, Math. Z. **251** (2005), no. 1, 61–84, DOI 10.1007/s00209-005-0788-7. MR2176464 (2007a:58013)
- [6] Qun Chen, Jürgen Jost, Jiayu Li, and Guofang Wang, *Dirac-harmonic maps*, Math. Z. **254** (2006), no. 2, 409–432, DOI 10.1007/s00209-006-0961-7. MR2262709 (2007k:58021)
- [7] Q. Chen, J. Jost, and G. Wang, *Liouville theorems for Dirac-harmonic maps*, J. Math. Phys. **48** (2007), no. 11, 113517, 13, DOI 10.1063/1.2809266. MR2370260 (2009e:58020)
- [8] Qun Chen, Jürgen Jost, and Guofang Wang, *Nonlinear Dirac equations on Riemann surfaces*, Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **33** (2008), no. 3, 253–270, DOI 10.1007/s10455-007-9084-6. MR2390834 (2009g:58026)
- [9] Weiyue Ding and Gang Tian, *Energy identity for a class of approximate harmonic maps from surfaces*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **3** (1995), no. 3-4, 543–554. MR1371209 (97e:58055)
- [10] Jürgen Jost, *Two-dimensional geometric variational problems*, Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York), John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1991. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. MR1100926 (92h:58045)
- [11] Tyler J. Jarvis, Takashi Kimura, and Arkady Vaintrob, *Moduli spaces of higher spin curves and integrable hierarchies*, Compositio Math. **126** (2001), no. 2, 157–212, DOI 10.1023/A:1017528003622. MR1827643 (2002d:14052)
- [12] H. Blaine Lawson Jr. and Marie-Louise Michelsohn, *Spin geometry*, Princeton Mathematical Series, vol. 38, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1989. MR1031992 (91g:53001)
- [13] John Lott, *Á-genus and collapsing*, J. Geom. Anal. **10** (2000), no. 3, 529–543, DOI 10.1007/BF02921948. MR1794576 (2001m:53082)
- [14] Thomas H. Parker, *Bubble tree convergence for harmonic maps*, J. Differential Geom. **44** (1996), no. 3, 595–633. MR1431008 (98k:58069)
- [15] Thomas H. Parker and Jon G. Wolfson, *Pseudo-holomorphic maps and bubble trees*, J. Geom. Anal. **3** (1993), no. 1, 63–98, DOI 10.1007/BF02921330. MR1197017 (95c:58032)

- [16] I. A. Taimanov, *The two-dimensional Dirac operator and the theory of surfaces* (Russian, with Russian summary), *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* **61** (2006), no. 1(367), 85–164, DOI 10.1070/RM2006v061n01ABEH004299; English transl., *Russian Math. Surveys* **61** (2006), no. 1, 79–159. MR2239773 (2007k:37098)
- [17] Changyou Wang, *A remark on nonlinear Dirac equations*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **138** (2010), no. 10, 3753–3758, DOI 10.1090/S0002-9939-10-10438-9. MR2661574 (2011g:58055)
- [18] Rugang Ye, *Gromov's compactness theorem for pseudo holomorphic curves*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **342** (1994), no. 2, 671–694, DOI 10.2307/2154647. MR1176088 (94f:58030)
- [19] Liang Zhao, *Energy identities for Dirac-harmonic maps*, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **28** (2007), no. 1, 121–138, DOI 10.1007/s00526-006-0035-z. MR2267756 (2007j:53069)
- [20] Miaomiao Zhu, *Harmonic maps from degenerating Riemann surfaces*, *Math. Z.* **264** (2010), no. 1, 63–85, DOI 10.1007/s00209-008-0452-0. MR2564932 (2011a:58031)
- [21] Miaomiao Zhu, *Dirac-harmonic maps from degenerating spin surfaces. I. The Neveu-Schwarz case*, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **35** (2009), no. 2, 169–189, DOI 10.1007/s00526-008-0201-6. MR2481821 (2010e:58015)

MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS IN THE SCIENCES, INSELSTR. 22, D-04103 LEIPZIG, GERMANY

*Current address:* Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Dongchuan Road 800, Shanghai 200240, People's Republic of China

*E-mail address:* mizhu@sjtu.edu.cn