On the limit $p \to \infty$ of global minimizers for a $p$-Ginzburg–Landau-type energy

Yaniv Almoga$^{a,*}$, Leonid Berlyand$^b$, Dmitry Golovaty$^c$, Itai Shafrir$^d$

$^a$ Department of Mathematics, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA
$^b$ Department of Mathematics, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA
$^c$ Department of Theoretical and Applied Mathematics, The University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325, USA
$^d$ Department of Mathematics, Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, 32000 Haifa, Israel

Received 18 July 2012; received in revised form 27 November 2012; accepted 7 December 2012
Available online 21 January 2013

Abstract

We study the limit $p \to \infty$ of global minimizers for a $p$-Ginzburg–Landau-type energy

$$E_p(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^p + \frac{1}{2}(1 - |u|^2)^2.$$ 

The minimization is carried over maps on $\mathbb{R}^2$ that vanish at the origin and are of degree one at infinity. We prove locally uniform convergence of the minimizers on $\mathbb{R}^2$ and obtain an explicit formula for the limit on $B(0, \sqrt{2})$. Some generalizations to dimension $N \geq 3$ are presented as well.

© 2013 Elsevier Masson SAS. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

For any $d \in \mathbb{Z}$, $N \geq 2$ and $p > N$ consider the class of maps

$$\mathcal{E}_p^d = \{ u \in W^{1,p}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^N): E_p(u) < \infty, \deg(u) = d \} ,$$

where

$$E_p(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^p + \frac{1}{2}(1 - |u|^2)^2.$$ 

By $\deg(u)$ we mean the degree of $u$ “at infinity”, which is properly defined since by Morrey’s inequality (cf. [4, Theorem 9.12]), for any map $u \in W^{1,p}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^p < \infty$ we have

$$u \in C^\alpha_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2), \quad \text{where } \alpha = 1 - N/p$$

$^*$ Corresponding author. 
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Theorem 1. Our first main result is the following (from Sandier [8]). One way of inquiring whether the global minimizer $u$ appears to be that $R$ (except, perhaps, for a set of measure zero in $\mathbb{R}^2$) and

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq C_{p,N} \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)}|x - y|^\alpha, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (1)$$

In fact, according to the proof given in [4], one can select

$$C_{p,N} = \frac{2^{2-N/p}}{1 - N/p}. \quad (2)$$

It then easily follows (see [1] for the case $N = 2$; the proof for any integer value of $N > 2$ is identical) that

$$\lim_{|x| \to \infty} |u(x)| = 1. \quad (3)$$

Consequently, $u$ has a well-defined degree, $\deg(u)$, equal to the degree of the $S^{N-1}$-valued map $\frac{u}{|u|}$ on any large circle $|z| = R$, $R \gg 1$.

In what follows, we assume that $N = 2$ and, whenever appropriate, interpret $\mathbb{R}^2$-valued functions as complex-valued functions of the variable $z = x + iy$. We will return to the case $N \geq 3$ at the end of the Introduction and present some partial results for this case (Section 4).

For any $d \in \mathbb{Z}$, let

$$I_p(d) = \inf \{ E_p(u) : u \in \mathcal{E}_p^d \}. \quad (4)$$

It has been established in [1] that $I_p(1)$ is attained for each $p > 2$ and $N = 2$. Denote by $u_p$ a global minimizer of $E_p$ in $\mathcal{E}_p^1$. It is clear that $E_p$ is invariant with respect to translations and rotations. However, it is still unknown whether uniqueness of the minimizer $u_p$, modulo the above symmetries, is guaranteed. Such a uniqueness result would imply that, up to a translation and a rotation, $u_p$ must take the form $f(r)e^{i\theta}$ (with $r = |x|$). Note that radial symmetry of a nontrivial local minimizer in the case $p = 2$ was established by Mironescu in [7] (with a contribution from Sandier [8]). One way of inquiring whether the global minimizer $u_p$ is radially symmetric or not for $p > 2$, is by looking at the limiting behavior of $\{u_p\}_{p>2}$ as $p \to \infty$, which is the focus of the present contribution. We have already studied in [2] the behavior of minimizers in the class of radially symmetric functions when $p$ is large and, in addition, showed their local stability for $2 < p \leq 4$. The results presented in this work seem to support the radial symmetry conjecture (as in the case $p = 2$ [7]); indeed, in the limit $p \to \infty$, we obtain the same asymptotic behavior for $u_p$ as in the case of radially symmetric minimizers [2].

In view of the translational and rotational invariance properties of $E_p$, we may assume for each $p > 2$ that

$$u_p(0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u_p(1) \in [0, \infty). \quad (5)$$

Our first main result is the following

**Theorem 1.** For each $p > 2$, let $u_p$ denote a minimizer of $E_p$ in $\mathcal{E}_p^1$ satisfying (5). Then, for a sequence $p_n \to \infty$, we have $u_{p_n} \to u_\infty$ in $C_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and weakly in $\bigcap_{p>1} W^{1,p}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$, where $u_\infty$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases}
    u_\infty(z) = \frac{z}{\sqrt{2}} & \text{on } B(0, \sqrt{2}) = \{|z| < \sqrt{2}\}, \\
    |u_\infty(z)| = 1 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B(0, \sqrt{2}).
\end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Furthermore, the convergence $|u_{p_n}| \to |u_\infty|$ is uniform on $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Theorem 1 fails to identify the values in $S^1$ that the map $u_\infty$ assumes on $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B(0, \sqrt{2})$. A natural conjecture appears to be that $u_\infty(z) = \frac{z}{\sqrt{2}}$ on $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B(0, \sqrt{2})$, i.e., that $u_\infty = F$ where

$$F(z) = \begin{cases}
    \frac{z}{\sqrt{2}} & \text{on } B(0, \sqrt{2}), \\
    \frac{z}{|z|} & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B(0, \sqrt{2}).
\end{cases} \quad (7)$$

For simplicity, whenever appropriate, we will use the abbreviated notation $u_p$ for $u_{p_n}$. Our second main result establishes explicit estimates for the rate of convergence of $u_p$ to $u_\infty$ inside the disc $B(0, \sqrt{2})$. 

Theorem 2. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, for every $\beta < 1$ and $a < \sqrt{2}$, there exists $C_{\beta,a} > 0$ such that for all $p > 2$,

$$
\|u_p - u_\infty\|_{L^\infty(B(0,a))} \leq \frac{C_{\beta,a}}{p^{\beta/2}}.
$$

Finally we consider the minimization of $E_p$ in dimensions higher than 2. Although it is presently unknown whether $I_p(1)$ is attained for every $p > N \geq 3$, by using the same technique as in the proof of Theorem 1 we can show that the minimizer of $E_p$ exists for sufficiently large values of $p$:

Theorem 3. For every $N \geq 3$ there exists $p_N$ such that for every $p > p_N$ the minimum value $I_p(1)$ of $E_p$ is attained in $E_p^1$ by some $u_p \in W^{1,p}_0(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^N)$.

In view of Theorem 3 it makes sense to investigate the asymptotic behavior of the set of minimizers $\{u_p\}_{p > 2}$ as $p$ tends to infinity for every $N \geq 3$. This is presented in the following

Theorem 4. For each $p > p_N$, let $u_p$ denote a minimizer of $E_p$ in $E_p^1$ satisfying $u_p(0) = 0$. Then, for a sequence $p_n \to \infty$, we have

$$
u \to u_\infty \text{ in } C_\text{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ and weakly in } \bigcap_{p>1} W^{1,p}_\text{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^N),
$$

where $u_\infty$ satisfies

$$
\begin{cases}
  u_\infty(x) = \frac{\mathcal{U}_x}{\sqrt{N}} & \text{on } B(0, \sqrt{N}), \\
  |u_\infty(x)| = 1 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(0, \sqrt{N}),
\end{cases}
$$

for some orthogonal $N \times N$ matrix $\mathcal{U}$ with $\det(\mathcal{U}) = 1$. We also have

$$
\|\nabla u_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)} = 1
$$

and the convergence $|u_p| \to |u_\infty|$ is uniform on $\mathbb{R}^N$.

Remark 1.1. We may alternatively state that (subsequences of) minimizers of $E_p$ over $E_p^1$ satisfying $u(0) = 0$ converge to a minimizer for the following problem:

$$
\inf_{u \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^N), u(0) = 0, \|\nabla u\|_\infty \leq 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (1 - |u|^2)^2.
$$

The latter result can, most probably, be appropriately formulated in terms of $\Gamma$-convergence. Theorem 4 shows that the minimizers of (12) are given by the set of maps in $W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^N)$ satisfying (10)–(11). The infinite size of this set is the source of our difficulty in identifying the limit map $u_\infty$ outside the ball $B(0, \sqrt{N})$. To confirm the natural conjecture that $u_\infty(x) = \frac{\mathcal{U}_x}{\sqrt{N}}$ for $|x| > \sqrt{N}$, a more delicate analysis of the energies $E_p(u_p)$ or of the Euler–Lagrange equation satisfied by $u_p$ is required. In fact, our present arguments can be used to prove the same convergence result as in Theorem 4 not only for the minimizers $\{u_p\}$, but also for a sequence of “almost minimizers” $\{v_p\}$, satisfying $E_p(v_p) \leq I_p(1) + o(1)$ as $p \to \infty$.

2. Proof of Theorem 1

We first recall the upper-bound for the energy that was proved in [2] using the test function $U_p(re^{i\theta}) = f_p(r)e^{i\theta}$ with

$$
f_p(r) = \begin{cases}
  \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(1 - \frac{\ln p}{p}\right)r, & r < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{1 - \frac{\ln p}{p}}, \\
  1, & r \geq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{1 - \frac{\ln p}{p}}.
\end{cases}
$$
Lemma 2.1. We have
\[ I_p(1) \leq \frac{\pi}{3} + C \frac{\ln p}{p}, \quad \forall p > 3. \]  
(13)

Remark 2.1. From (13) we clearly obtain that
\[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_p|^p \leq C, \quad \forall p > 3, \]  
(14)
where \( C \) is independent of \( p \). While this estimate is sufficient for our purpose, it should be noted that one can derive a more precise estimate
\[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_p|^p = \frac{2}{p} I_p(1) \leq \frac{C}{p}, \]  
via a Pohozaev-type identity (see [1, Lemma 4.1]).

Our next lemma provides a key estimate that will lead to a lower-bound for \( I_p(1) \).

Lemma 2.2. Let \( \rho \in (0, 1) \) be a regular value of \( u_p \) (which by Sard’s lemma holds for almost every \( \rho \)) and set
\[ A_{\rho} = \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |u_p(z)| < \rho \}. \]  
(15)
Then, for any component \( V_\rho \) of \( A_{\rho} \) with \( \deg(u, \partial V_\rho) = d \), we have for large \( p \)
\[ \int_{V_\rho} \left(1 - |u_p|^2\right)^2 \geq |d| \left\{ 4\pi \left(\frac{\rho^4}{2} - \frac{\rho^6}{3}\right) + o(1) \right\}, \]  
(16)
where \( o(1) \) denotes a quantity that tends to zero as \( p \) goes to infinity, uniformly for \( \rho \in (0, 1) \).

Proof. Since \( \rho \) is a regular value of \( u_p \), we can conclude from (3) that \( \partial V_\rho \) is a finite union of closed and simple \( C^1 \)-curves, and hence \( \deg(u, \partial V_\rho) \) is well-defined. Since the image of \( V_\rho \) by \( u_\rho \) covers the disc \( B(0, \rho) \) (algebraically) \( d \) times, it follows by Hölder’s inequality that
\[ \pi |d| \rho^2 = \int_{V_\rho} (u_p)_x \times (u_p)_y \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{V_\rho} |\nabla u_p|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \mu(V_\rho)^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \left( \int_{V_\rho} |\nabla u_p|^p \right)^{\frac{2}{p}}. \]  
(17)
where \( \mu \) denotes the Lebesgue measure in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \), which, in turn, yields
\[ \mu(V_\rho) \geq \frac{(2\pi |d| \rho^2)^{\frac{2}{p-2}}}{\left(\int_{V_\rho} |\nabla u_p|^p \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}}}. \]  
(18)
From (18) and (14), we get
\[ \int_{V_\rho} \left(1 - |u_p|^2\right)^2 = \int_{(1-\rho^2)^2} \mu(\{(1 - |u_p|^2)^2 > t\} \cap V_\rho) dt \]
\[ = \int_0^\rho 4\pi(1 - r^2) \mu(A_r \cap V_\rho) dr \geq \int_0^\rho 4\pi(1 - r^2) \frac{(2\pi |d| \rho^2)^{\frac{p}{p-2}}}{\left(\int_{V_\rho} |\nabla u_p|^p \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}}} dr \]
\[ \geq |d| \left\{ \int_0^\rho 4\pi(1 - r^2)(2\pi r^2) dr + o(1) \right\} = |d| \left\{ 4\pi \left(\frac{\rho^4}{2} - \frac{\rho^6}{3}\right) + o(1) \right\}. \quad \Box \]  
(19)
Corollary 2.1. There exist \( \rho_0 \in (\frac{3}{4}, 1) \), \( p_0 \) and \( R_0 \) such that for all \( p > p_0 \) the set \( A_{\rho_0} \) has a component \( V_{\rho_0} \subset B(0, R_0) \) for which \( \deg(u, \partial V_{\rho_0}) = 1 \) and \( |u_p| \geq \frac{1}{2} \) on \( \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus V_{\rho_0} \).

Proof. Note that by (2) one can select uniformly bounded \( C_{p,2} \) in (1) for \( p \geq 3 \). This fact, together with (14) implies equicontinuity of the maps \( \{u_p\}_{p \geq 3} \) on \( \mathbb{R}^2 \). Therefore, there exists \( \lambda > 0 \) such that

\[
|u_p(z_0)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \implies |u_p(z)| \leq \frac{3}{4} \quad \text{on} \quad B(z_0, \lambda) \quad \implies \quad \int_{B(z_0, \lambda)} (1 - |u_p|^2)^2 \geq \nu := \pi \lambda^2 \left( \frac{7}{16} \right)^2.
\]  

Fix \( \rho_0 \in (\frac{3}{4}, 1) \) such that

\[
4\pi \left( \frac{\rho_0^4}{2} - \frac{\rho_0^6}{3} \right) > \max \left( \frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{2\pi}{3} - \nu \right).
\]

Let \( V_{\rho_0} \) be a component of \( A_{\rho_0} \) with \( \deg(u_p, \partial V_{\rho_0}) \neq 0 \) (we may assume w.l.o.g. that \( \rho_0 \) is a regular value of \( u_p \)). By (13), (16) and (21), it follows that there can be only one such component when \( p \) is sufficiently large (and thus \( \deg(u_p, \partial V_{\rho_0}) = 1 \)). Moreover, by (20) and (21), on any other component of \( A_{\rho_0} \) (if there is one) we must have \( |u_p| > \frac{1}{2} \).

It remains necessary to show that \( V_{\rho_0} \) is embedded in a sufficiently large disc. Similarly to (20), there exists \( \lambda_0 > 0 \) such that

\[
|u_p(z_0)| \leq \rho_0 \implies |u_p(z)| \leq \frac{1 + \rho_0}{2} \quad \text{on} \quad B(z_0, \lambda_0)
\]

\[
\implies \int_{B(z_0, \lambda_0)} (1 - |u_p|^2)^2 \geq \nu_0 := \pi \lambda_0^2 \left( 1 - \left( \frac{1 + \rho_0}{2} \right)^2 \right)^2.
\]

Since \( V_{\rho_0} \) is connected and \( 0 \in V_{\rho_0} \), the set \( \{|z| : z \in V_{\rho_0}\} \) is the interval \([0, R]\) for some positive \( R \). For any integer \( k \) for which \( 2k\lambda_0 \leq R \) there exists a set of points \( \{z_j\}_{j=0}^{k-1} \subset V_{\rho_0} \) with \( |z_j| = 2j\lambda_0 \). By (22) and (13) we have for sufficiently large \( p \) that

\[
k\nu_0 \leq \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \int_{B(z_j, \lambda_0)} (1 - |u_p|^2)^2 < c_0 := \frac{2\pi}{3} + 1.
\]

It follows that \( R \) is bounded from above by \( R_0 := 2\lambda_0(c_0 + 1) \). \( \square \)

In order to complete the proof of Theorem 1 we need to establish the convergence of \( \{u_{p_n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \) to \( u_\infty \) and to identify the limit. We begin with the following lemma

Lemma 2.3. For a sequence \( p_n \to \infty \) we have

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} u_{p_n} = u_\infty \quad \text{in} \quad C_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2) \quad \text{and weakly in} \quad \bigcap_{p > 1} W^{1,p}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2).
\]

Furthermore, the limit map \( u_\infty \) is a degree-one map in \( W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2) \) satisfying also (5) and

\[
\|\nabla u_\infty\|_\infty \leq 1.
\]

Proof. Fix any \( q > 3 \). Since \( \|u_p\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1 \) (see [1]), we have by (13) on each disc \( B(0, m), m \geq 1 \), that

\[
\|u_p\|_{W^{1,q}(B(0,m))} \leq C_m, \quad p > q.
\]

It follows that for all \( m \geq 1 \), there exists a sequence \( p_\alpha \uparrow \infty \), such that \( \{u_{p_\alpha}\} \) converges weakly in \( W^{1,q}(B(0,m)) \) to a limit \( u_\infty \). By Morrey’s theorem, the convergence holds in \( C(B(0,m)) \) as well. Since the latter is true for every \( m \geq 1 \),
and every $q > 3$, we may apply a diagonal subsequence argument to find a subsequence satisfying (23). The fact that $u_\infty$ has degree one too follows from (23) and Corollary 2.1.

Finally, in order to prove (24), it suffices to note that for any disc $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, $\lambda > 1$ and $q > 1$, we have by (14) and the weak lower semicontinuity of the $L^q$-norm,

$$\lambda^q \mu(\{|\nabla u_\infty| > \lambda\} \cap B) \leq \int_B |\nabla u_p|^q \leq \liminf_{p \to \infty} \mu(B)^{1-1/q} \left(\int_B |\nabla u_p|^p\right)^{q/p} \leq \mu(B).$$

(25)

Letting $q$ tend to $\infty$ in (25) yields $\mu(\{|\nabla u_\infty| > \lambda\} \cap B) = 0$. The conclusion (24) follows since the disc $B$ and $\lambda > 1$ are arbitrary. $\square$

A similar argument to the one used in the proof of Lemma 2.2 yields

**Proposition 1.**

$$\lim_{p \to \infty} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 - |u_p|^2)^2 = \lim_{p \to \infty} I_p(1) = \frac{\pi}{3} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 - |F|^2)^2,$$

where $F$ is as defined in (7).

**Proof.** As in (18) we have

$$\mu(A_\rho) \geq \frac{(2\pi \rho^2)^{\frac{p}{p-2}}}{\left(\int_{A_\rho} |\nabla u_p|^p\right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

Therefore,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 - |u_p|^2)^2 = \int_0^1 \mu((1 - |u_p|^2)^2 > t) \, dt$$

$$\geq \int_0^1 4\rho(1 - \rho^2) \mu(A_\rho) \, d\rho \geq \int_0^1 4\rho(1 - \rho^2) \frac{(2\pi \rho^2)^{\frac{p}{p-2}}}{\left(\int_{A_\rho} |\nabla u_p|^p\right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}}} \, d\rho.$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

Since $\int_{A_\rho} |\nabla u_p|^p \leq I_p(1) \leq C$, taking the limit inferior of both sides of (27) yields, with the aid of (7)

$$\liminf_{p \to \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 - |u_p|^2)^2 \geq \int_0^1 4\rho(1 - \rho^2) \left(\liminf_{p \to \infty} (2\pi \rho^2)^{\frac{p}{p-2}}\right) \, d\rho$$

$$= \int_0^1 4\rho(1 - \rho^2) \mu(|F| < \rho) \, d\rho = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 - |F|^2)^2 = \frac{2\pi}{3},$$

(28)

and the proposition follows by combining (28) with (13). $\square$

**Remark 2.2.** In fact, for any $d$ we have $\lim_{p \to \infty} I_p(d) = \frac{|d|}{3}$ (see Proposition 2 in Section 4).

We can now complete the proof of Theorem 1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.** For each $\rho \in (0, 1]$, let $D_\rho = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^2: |u_\infty(z)| < \rho\}$. Using arguments similar to those used to establish Proposition 1, we obtain
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 - |u_\infty|^2)^2 \geq \frac{1}{\mu} \mu((1 - |u_\infty|^2)^2 > t) dt = \int_0^1 4\rho (1 - \rho^2) \mu(D_\rho) d\rho. \tag{29}
\]

Since \(\deg(u_\infty) = 1\) by Lemma 2.3, using (24) yields
\[
\pi \rho^2 \leq \left| \int_{D_\rho} (u_\infty)_x \times (u_\infty)_y \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{D_\rho} |\nabla u_\infty|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \mu(D_\rho). \tag{30}
\]

From (29)–(30) it follows that
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 - |u_\infty|^2)^2 \geq \frac{1}{\mu} \int_0^1 8 \pi \rho (1 - \rho^2) \rho^2 d\rho = \frac{2\pi}{3}. \tag{31}
\]

On the other hand, by Lemma 2.3 and Proposition 1, for every \(R > 0\)
\[
\int_{B(0,R)} (1 - |u_\infty|^2)^2 = \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{B(0,R)} (1 - |u_{p_n}|^2)^2 \leq \frac{2\pi}{3},
\]
which together with (31) implies that
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 - |u_\infty|^2)^2 = \frac{2\pi}{3}. \tag{32}
\]

Therefore, for any \(\rho \in (0, 1)\), pointwise equalities between the integrands in (30) must hold almost everywhere in \(D_\rho\). It follows that
\[
\left\{ (u_\infty)_x \perp (u_\infty)_y, \quad |(u_\infty)_x| = |(u_\infty)_y| \quad \text{and} \quad |(u_\infty)_x|^2 + |(u_\infty)_y|^2 = 1, \right. \left. \quad \text{sign}\{(u_\infty)_x \times (u_\infty)_y\} \equiv \sigma \in \{-1, 1\}, \right. \tag{33}
\]
a.e. in \(D_1\). From (33) we conclude that \(u_\infty\) is a conformal map a.e. in \(D_1\) (it cannot be anti-conformal because \(\deg(u_\infty) = 1\)). Hence, \(u_\infty\) must be of the form \(u_\infty(z) = az + b\) with \(|a| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\). Since \(u_\infty\) satisfies (5), we finally conclude that (6) holds.

Finally, to prove that \(|u_\rho| \to |u_\infty|\) uniformly on \(\mathbb{R}^2\) assume, on the contrary, that for some \(\rho_0 < 1\) there exists a sequence \(\{z_n\}_{n=1}^\infty\) with \(|z_n| \to \infty\) such that \(|u_{p_n}(z_n)| \leq \rho_0\) for all \(n\). But then using (22) we are led immediately to a contradiction with Proposition 1 since we have already established that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 - |u_{p_n}|^2)^2 = \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{B(0,\sqrt{2})} (1 - |u_{p_n}|^2)^2 = \frac{2\pi}{3}. \quad \square
\]

3. Proof of Theorem 2

Let
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - i \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right), \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right).
\]

We begin with a simple lemma that establishes the existence of an approximate holomorphic map for a given map \(u\) such that the \(L^2\)-norm of \(\frac{\partial u}{\partial z}\) is “small”. To this end we introduce some additional notation. For a function \(f \in L^1(\Omega)\) we denote by \(f_\Omega\) its average value over \(\Omega\), i.e.,
\[
f_\Omega = \frac{1}{\mu(\Omega)} \int_\Omega f.
\]
We further set \(\nabla_\perp u = (u_y, -u_x)\).
Lemma 3.1. Let $\Omega$ be a bounded, simply connected domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with $\partial \Omega \in C^1$. Let $u = u_r + i u_i \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$ satisfy
\[
\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u + i \nabla u|^2 \leq \epsilon^2.
\tag{34}
\]
for some $\epsilon > 0$. Then, there exists $v$ which is holomorphic in $\Omega$ and such that $v_\Omega = u_\Omega$,
\[
\int_{\Omega} |\nabla (u - v)|^2 \leq 4\epsilon^2
\tag{35}
\]
and
\[
\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla (u - v)|^2.
\tag{36}
\]

Proof. Consider the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \{ U \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{C}) : U_\Omega = 0 \}$ with the norm $\| U \|^2_{\mathcal{H}} = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla U|^2$ and its closed subspace $\mathcal{K} = \{ V \in \mathcal{H} : V \text{ is holomorphic in } \Omega \}$. Let $v = V + u_\Omega$ where $V \in \mathcal{K}$ is the nearest point projection of $u - u_\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$ on $\mathcal{K}$. Clearly $v$ satisfies (36). To prove (35), it is sufficient, in view of the definition of $v$, to construct a single function $\tilde{v} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$, which is holomorphic in $\Omega$, and satisfies
\[
\int_{\Omega} |\nabla (u - \tilde{v})|^2 \leq 4\epsilon^2.
\tag{37}
\]
Set $\tilde{v} = \tilde{v}_r + i \tilde{v}_i$ where $\tilde{v}_r \in H^1_0(\Omega, \mathbb{C}) + u_r$ is harmonic and $\tilde{v}_i$ is the conjugate harmonic function to $\tilde{v}_r$ satisfying $(\tilde{v}_i)_\Omega = (u_i)_\Omega$. Let $\phi \in C^\infty_0(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$. Clearly,
\[
\int_{\Omega} \nabla \phi \cdot \nabla \perp w = 0, \quad \forall w \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{C}),
\tag{38}
\]
and since $\tilde{v}$ is harmonic, we have
\[
\int_{\Omega} \nabla \tilde{\phi} \cdot \nabla \tilde{v} = 0.
\tag{39}
\]
By density of $C^\infty_0(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$ in $H^1_0(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$, (38)–(39) hold for every $\phi \in H^1_0(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$. In particular, employing the identity
\[
\nabla \tilde{v} + i \nabla \perp \tilde{v} = 0,
\tag{40}
\]
and using (38) we obtain for $\phi = u_r - \tilde{v}_r$ that
\[
\| \nabla (u_r - \tilde{v}_r) \|_2^2 = \Re \int_{\Omega} \nabla (u_r - \tilde{v}_r) \cdot \nabla (u - \tilde{v}) = \Re \int_{\Omega} \nabla (u_r - \tilde{v}_r) \cdot \left\{ \nabla (u - \tilde{v}) + i \nabla \perp (u - \tilde{v}) \right\}
\]
\[
= \Re \int_{\Omega} \nabla (u_r - \tilde{v}_r) \cdot (\nabla u + i \nabla \perp u) \leq \| \nabla (u_r - \tilde{v}_r) \| \| \nabla u + i \nabla \perp u \|.
\tag{41}
\]
Hence, by (34) and (41),
\[
\| \nabla (u_r - \tilde{v}_r) \|_2 \leq \epsilon.
\tag{42}
\]
Set $w = u - \tilde{v}$. By (34) and (40)
\[
\| \nabla w + i \nabla \perp w \|_2 \leq \epsilon.
\tag{43}
\]
However, as $w_r$ is real we have by (42)
\[
\| \nabla w_r + i \nabla \perp w_r \|_2 = \sqrt{2} \| \nabla w_r \|_2 \leq \sqrt{2} \epsilon.
\tag{44}
\]
Since
\[ \nabla w + i \nabla_\perp w = \nabla w_r + i \nabla_\perp w_r + i (\nabla w_i + i \nabla_\perp w_i), \]
we get from (43)–(44) that
\[ \| \nabla w_i \|_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \| \nabla w + i \nabla_\perp w \|_2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \| \nabla w + i \nabla_\perp w \|_2 + \| \nabla w_r + i \nabla_\perp w_r \|_2 \right) \leq \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \epsilon, \]
which together with (42) clearly implies (37) \( \Box \)

By Poincaré inequality and (35) we immediately deduce:

**Corollary 3.1.** Let \( v \) be given by Lemma 3.1. Then,
\[ \| u - v \|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \epsilon, \] (45)
where \( C \) depends only on \( \Omega \).

**Lemma 3.2.** Let \( f \) be holomorphic in \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \). Suppose that for every disc \( B(x_0, s) \subset \Omega \) we have
\[ \left( \frac{|f|^2}{2} - 1 \right) \leq \epsilon, \] (46)
for some \( \epsilon > 0 \). Then,
\[ \| f \|_{L^\infty(\Omega_s)}^2 \leq 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(B(x_0, s))}, \]
where
\[ \Omega_s = \{ x \in \Omega \mid d(x, \partial \Omega) > s \}. \]

**Proof.** As \( f \) is holomorphic, \( |f|^2 \) is subharmonic. By the mean value principle we obtain for any \( x_0 \in \Omega_s \)
\[ |f(x_0)|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\mu(B(x_0, s))} \int_{B(x_0, s)} |f|^2 = 1 + \frac{1}{\mu(B(x_0, s))} \int_{B(x_0, s)} \left( |f|^2 - 1 \right), \] (47)
from which the lemma easily follows. \( \Box \)

**Lemma 3.3.** Let \( f \) be holomorphic in \( B_R = B(0, R) \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \). Suppose that
\[ \left( 1 - |f|^2 \right) \leq \epsilon, \] (48)
for some \( \epsilon > 0 \). Suppose further that
\[ \| f \|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2 \leq 1 + \epsilon. \] (49)
Then, there exist \( \alpha \in [-\pi, \pi) \) and \( C > 0 \), depending only on \( R \), such that
\[ |f(x) - e^{i\alpha}| \leq C \frac{\epsilon}{d_x}, \quad x \in B_R, \] (50)
where \( d_x = R - |x| \).

**Proof.** By (48)–(49),
\[ \int_{B_R} \left| |f|^2 - 1 - \epsilon \right| = \int_{B_R} \left( 1 - |f|^2 \right) + \pi R^2 \epsilon \leq C \epsilon, \]
hence,
\[ \int_{B_R} |f|^2 - 1 | \leq C \epsilon \]  \tag{51}

(we denote by \( C \) and \( c \) different constants, depending on \( R \) only). Since the function \(|f|^2 - 1|\) is subharmonic, we deduce from (51) that for every \( x \in B_R \),
\[ ||f(x)||^2 - 1| \leq \frac{1}{\pi d_x^2} \int_{B(x,d_x)} |f|^2 - 1| \leq \frac{c \epsilon}{d_x^2}. \]  \tag{52}

It follows in particular that
\[ |f(x)|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad |x| \leq R - \sqrt{2c \epsilon}. \]  \tag{53}

In \( B(0, R - \sqrt{2c \epsilon}) \) we may write then \( f = e^{U+iV} \), where \( V \) is the conjugate harmonic function of \( U \) that satisfies \( V(0) \in [-\pi, \pi) \). By (52) we have
\[ |U(x)| \leq \frac{C \epsilon}{d_x^2}, \quad |x| \leq R - \sqrt{2c \epsilon}. \]  \tag{54}

From (54) we get an interior estimate for the derivatives of \( U \) (see (2.31) in [5]):
\[ |\nabla U(x)| \leq \frac{C \epsilon}{d_x^3}, \quad |x| \leq R - \sqrt{4c \epsilon}. \]  \tag{55}

Note that by the Cauchy–Riemann equations, (55) holds for \( V \) as well, i.e.,
\[ |\nabla V(x)| \leq \frac{C \epsilon}{d_x^3}, \quad |x| \leq R - \sqrt{4c \epsilon}. \]  \tag{56}

For any \( x \in B(0, R - \sqrt{4c \epsilon}) \setminus \{0\} \) we obtain, using (56), the estimate
\[ |V(x) - V(0)| \leq \frac{R}{d_x} \int_{d_x}^{R} |\nabla V((R-s)\frac{x}{|x|})| ds \leq \frac{C \epsilon}{d_x^2} \int_{d_x}^{R} \frac{ds}{s^3} \leq \frac{C \epsilon}{d_x^2}. \]  \tag{57}

Therefore, setting \( \alpha = V(0) \) and using (54) and (57), we obtain for every \( x \in B(0, R - \sqrt{4c \epsilon}) \) that
\[ |f(x) - e^{i\alpha}| \leq |f(x) - e^{iV(x)}| + |e^{iV(x)} - e^{iV(0)}| \leq |e^{U(x)} - 1| + |V(x) - V(0)| \leq \frac{C \epsilon}{d_x^2}. \]

For \( x \in B_R \setminus B(0, R - \sqrt{4c \epsilon}) \), i.e., when \( d_x \leq \sqrt{4c \epsilon} \), we have clearly \(|f(x) - e^{i\alpha}| \leq 2 + \epsilon\), so choosing \( C \) big enough yields (50) for all \( x \in B_R \). \qed

Let \( A_{\rho} \) be defined in (15). The following lemma lists some of its properties.

**Lemma 3.4.** There exist \( p_0 > 2 \) and \( C > 0 \) such that for all \( p > p_0 \) and \( \rho > \frac{1}{2} \) we have
\[ \mu(A_{\rho}) \geq 2\pi \rho^2 \left( 1 - \frac{C}{p} \right), \]  \tag{58a}
\[ \int_0^1 \rho (1 - \rho^2) |\mu(A_{\rho}) - 2\pi \rho^2| \, d\rho \leq C \ln \frac{p}{\rho}. \]  \tag{58b}
Proof. The estimate (58a) follows directly from (26) and (14). Since by (58a)
\[ \mu(A_\rho) \geq |\mu(A_\rho) - 2\pi \rho^2| + 2\pi \rho^2 - \frac{C}{p}, \]
we obtain using (27) that
\[ I_p(1) \geq \int_0^1 2\rho (1 - \rho^2) \mu(A_\rho) d\rho \geq \int_0^1 2\rho (1 - \rho^2) |\mu(A_\rho) - 2\pi \rho^2| d\rho + \frac{\pi}{3} - \frac{C}{p}. \]
Combining the above with (13) yields (58b).

Lemma 3.5. Let \( \ln p/p < \delta_p < 1/4 \). There exists \( 1 - 2\delta_p < \rho < 1 - \delta_p \), such that for all \( p > p_0 \)
\[ \int_{A_\rho} |\nabla u_p + i \nabla_\perp u_p|^2 \leq C \delta_p^{-2} \ln \frac{p}{p}. \] (59)

Proof. By (58b) there exists \( 1 - 2\delta_p < \rho < 1 - \delta_p \) such that
\[ |\mu(A_\rho) - 2\pi \rho^2| \leq C \delta_p^{-2} \ln \frac{p}{p}. \] (60)
Applying (60) yields
\[ \frac{1}{4} \int_{A_\rho} |\nabla u_p + i \nabla_\perp u_p|^2 = \int_{A_\rho} \left[ \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u_p|^2 - (u_p)_x \times (u_p)_y \right] \]
\[ = \int_{A_\rho} \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u_p|^2 - \pi \rho^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \int_{A_\rho} |\nabla u_p|^p \right)^{2/p} \mu(A_\rho)^{1-2/p} - \pi \rho^2 \]
\[ \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{C}{p} \right) \left( 2\pi \rho^2 + C \delta_p^{-2} \ln \frac{p}{p} \right)^{1-2/p} - \pi \rho^2 \leq \frac{C \ln p}{\delta_p^p / p}. \] (61)

Proof of Theorem 2. Set \( \eta = \frac{\sqrt{2} - a}{10} \) and then
\[ b_j = a + j \eta, \quad j = 1, \ldots, 9. \]
Let \( \rho \) be given by Lemma 3.5 for \( \delta_p = \eta / \sqrt{2} \), so that \( \rho \in (b_8 / \sqrt{2}, b_9 / \sqrt{2}) \). We can also assume without loss of generality that \( \rho \) is a regular value for \( |u_p| \). By Theorem 1 we have for sufficiently large \( p \),
\[ B(0, b_8) \subset A_\rho \subset B(0, b_9). \] (62)
By (62) and Lemma 3.5 we have
\[ \int_{B(0, b_8)} |\nabla u_p + i \nabla_\perp u_p|^2 \leq \int_{A_\rho} |\nabla u_p + i \nabla_\perp u_p|^2 \leq \frac{C}{(a - \sqrt{2})^2} \frac{\ln p}{p} = C_a \frac{\ln p}{p}. \]
Applying Corollary 3.1 yields the existence of a holomorphic function \( v_p \) in \( B(0, b_8) \) such that \( (v_p)_{B(0, b_8)} = (u_p)_{B(0, b_8)} \) and such that (36) holds with \( u = u_p, v = v_p \) and
\[ \|u_p - v_p\|_{H^1(B(0, b_8))} \leq C_a \frac{\ln p}{p}. \] (63)
We denote \( w_p(z) = \sqrt{2} v'_p(z) \) (where \( v' = \frac{\partial v}{\partial z} \) is the derivative of the holomorphic map \( v_p \)) and note that \( |w_p(z)| = |\nabla v_p(z)| \). As \( a \) is kept fixed, we suppress in the sequel the dependence of the constants on \( a \).

For any ball \( B \subset B(0, b_8) \) we apply the same estimates as in (17),
\[
\int_B |\nabla u_p|^2 - 1 \leq \left( \int_{B(0,b_4)} |\nabla u_p|^p \right)^{2/p} \mu(B)^{1-2/p} - \mu(B) \leq (1 + C/p)(\mu(B))^{1-2/p} - \mu(B) \leq \frac{C}{p}.
\]

Combining the above with (36) yields
\[
\int_B (|w_p|^2 - 1) = \int B \left( |\nabla v_p|^2 - 1 \right) \leq \int_B |\nabla u_p|^2 - 1 \leq \frac{C}{p}, \quad \forall B \subset B(0,b_8).
\]

By Lemma 3.2 it then follows that
\[
\|w_p\|_{L^\infty(B(0,b_7))} \leq 1 + \frac{C_1}{p}.
\]

Next, we apply Lemma 3.5 again, this time with \(\delta_p = \frac{3\eta}{\sqrt{2}}\), to find a corresponding \(\tilde{\rho} \in (b_4/\sqrt{2}, b_7/\sqrt{2})\). For \(p\) large we have \(B(0,b_4) \subset A_{\tilde{\rho}} \subset B(0,b_7)\). Arguing as in (17) we obtain, using (60),
\[
\int_{A_{\tilde{\rho}}} |\nabla u_p|^2 - 1 \geq 2 \int_{A_{\tilde{\rho}}} (u_p)_x \times (u_p)_y - \mu(A_{\tilde{\rho}}) \geq 2\pi \tilde{\rho}^2 - \mu(A_{\tilde{\rho}}) \geq -C \frac{\ln p}{p}.
\]

By (36), once again, we have that
\[
\int_{A_{\tilde{\rho}}} (|w_p|^2 - 1) \geq -C \frac{\ln p}{p}.
\]

Next, we apply the same argument as the one used in the beginning of the proof of Lemma 3.3 to obtain, using (64) and (65),
\[
\int_{A_{\tilde{\rho}}} |w_p|^2 - 1 - \frac{C_1}{p} = \int_{A_{\tilde{\rho}}} \left( 1 - \frac{C_1}{p} - |w_p|^2 \right) \leq C \frac{\ln p}{p}.
\]

Hence, also
\[
\int_{B(0,b_4)} |w_p|^2 - 1 \leq \int_{A_{\tilde{\rho}}} |w_p|^2 - 1 \leq C \frac{\ln p}{p}.
\]

We can now use (64) and (66) and apply Lemma 3.3 to obtain the existence of \(\alpha_p \in [-\pi, \pi)\) such that
\[
|w_p(z) - e^{i\alpha_p}| \leq C \frac{\ln p}{p}, \quad z \in B(0,a).
\]

Consequently, there exists a constant \(\gamma_p\) such that
\[
|\sqrt{2} v_p(z) - e^{i\alpha_p} z - \gamma_p| \leq C \frac{\ln p}{p}, \quad z \in B(0,a).
\]

Set
\[
U = u_p - v_p.
\]

For every \(q > 2\) we have for \(p > q\), by (63), (68), and the fact that \(|u_p| \leq 1\),
\[
\|U\|_{L^q(B(0,a))} \leq \|U\|_{L^\infty(B(0,a))} \|U\|_{L^2(B(0,a))} \leq C \left( \frac{\ln p}{p} \right).
\]

Furthermore, by Hölder’s inequality, (67), (63) and (13) we have that
\[
\|\nabla U\|_{L^q(B(0,a))} \leq \|\nabla U\|_{L^2(B(0,a))} \|\nabla U\|_{L^p(B(0,a))} \leq C \left( \frac{\ln p}{p} \right)^{\frac{q-2}{p-2}}.
\]
Consequently, for each fixed $q > 2$ we have
\[
\|U\|_{W^{1,q}(B(0,a))} \leq C \left( \frac{\ln p}{p} \right)^{\frac{p-q}{q(p-2)}}.
\]  
(69)

By Sobolev embedding the bound in (69) holds also for $\|U\|_{L^{\infty}(B(0,a))}$ and, in particular, we get that for every $0 < \beta < 1$,
\[
\|U\|_{L^{\infty}(B(0,a))} \leq C_\beta p^{-\beta/2}.
\]  
(70)

Combining (70) and (68) we obtain that
\[
\left| \sqrt{2}u_p(z) - e^{i\alpha_p}z - \gamma_p \right| \leq C_\beta p^{-\beta/2}, \quad z \in B(0,a).
\]  
(71)

Substituting $z = 1$ into (71) we obtain using (5) that $|\alpha_p| \leq C_\beta p^{-\beta/2}$ and (8) follows.

4. The problem in dimension $N \geq 3$

This section is mainly devoted to the proofs of Theorem 3 and Theorem 4. We begin with the computation of $\lim_{p \to \infty} I_p(d)$. Denote by $\omega_N$ the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^N$. It turns out that the constant
\[
\tau_N := \frac{4\omega_N}{(N+2)(N+4)} N^{N/2}
\]  
(72)
generalizes the constant $\frac{\pi}{3}$ in (13) for dimensions higher than $N = 2$.

**Proposition 2.** We have
\[
\lim_{p \to \infty} I_p(d) = |d| \tau_N.
\]  
(73)

**Proof.** (i) First we establish an upper bound. When $d = 1$, following a construction similar to the one used in the proof of Lemma 2.1, we define a map $U_p$ by
\[
U_p(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{r_p}, & |x| < r_p, \\ \frac{x}{|x|}, & |x| \geq r_p, \end{cases}
\]  
(74)

with $r_p := \frac{\sqrt{N}}{1-\frac{2p}{p}}$. A direct computation shows that for $p \geq N + 1$ we have
\[
E_p(U_p) \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B(0,r_p)} (1 - |U_p|^2)^2 + C \frac{\ln p}{p} = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\sqrt{N}} \left( 1 - \frac{r^2}{N} \right)^2 N \omega_N r^{N-1} dr + C \frac{\ln p}{p}
\]
\[
= \frac{4\omega_N}{(N+2)(N+4)} N^{N/2} + C \frac{\ln p}{p}.
\]  
(75)

Next we turn to the case $d > 1$. Fix distinct points $q_1, \ldots, q_d$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with
\[
\delta := \frac{1}{4} \min \left\{ |q_i - q_j| : i \neq j \right\} > 4\sqrt{N}.
\]

Fix $K$ satisfying
\[
K > \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} |q_j| + 4\delta.
\]
and set \( \Omega = B(0, K) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^d \overline{B(q_j, \delta)} \). Fix a smooth map \( V : \overline{\Omega} \to S^{N-1} \) satisfying
\[
V(x) = \frac{x - q_j}{|x - q_j|} \quad \text{on } \partial B(q_j, \delta), \quad j = 1, \ldots, d.
\]

Let \( M = \| \nabla V \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \) and fix \( R > M \sqrt{N - 1} \). We finally define
\[
W_p(x) = \begin{cases} 
U_p(x - R q_j), & x \in B(R q_j, r_p), \ j = 1, \ldots, d, \\
\frac{x - R q_j}{|x - R q_j|}, & x \in B(R q_j, R \delta) \setminus B(R q_j, r_p), \ j = 1, \ldots, d, \\
V(x/R), & x \in R \Omega, \\
V(K \frac{x}{R}), & x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(0, R K).
\end{cases}
\]

By our construction \( \| \nabla W_p \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^d B(q_j, r_p))} \leq y < 1 \), and hence, it follows from (75) that
\[
E_p(W_p) \leq d \tau_N + o(1), \tag{76}
\]
which is the desired upper bound.

(ii) We next obtain a lower bound. Assume that \( d \geq 1 \) and let \( u \) denote a map in \( E^d_p \). We attempt to prove that
\[
E_p(u) \geq d \tau_N + o(1) \quad \text{as } p \to \infty, \tag{77}
\]
where \( o(1) \) is a quantity that goes to zero when \( p \) goes to infinity (i.e., it is independent of \( u \)). We establish (77) for \( u \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^N) \). The proof for any \( u \in E^d_p \) then follows by density. Furthermore, in view of (76), we may suppose that
\[
E_p(u) \leq d \tau_N + 1. \tag{78}
\]

We continue to argue as in the proof of Lemma 2.2. Given a regular value \( \rho \in (0, 1) \) of \( u \), let \( V_\rho \) denote a component or a finite union of components of \( A_\rho = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^N : |u(x)| < \rho \} \) with \( \text{deg}(u, \partial V_\rho) = D \). We claim that
\[
\int_{V_\rho} \left( 1 - |u|^2 \right)^2 \geq |D| \left\{ 4 \omega_N N^{N/2} \left( \frac{\rho^{N+2}}{N+2} - \frac{\rho^{N+4}}{N+4} \right) + o(1) \right\}. \tag{79}
\]
as \( p \to \infty \), where the decay of the \( o(1) \) term is uniform on \( \rho \in (0, 1) \). To obtain the generalization of (17) to any \( N \), we use Hadamard’s inequality and the inequality of arithmetic and geometric means (see [3] for both inequalities) as follows:
\[
|D| \omega_N \rho^N = \left| \int_{V_\rho} \det(\nabla u) \right| \leq \int_{V_\rho} \prod_{j=1}^N \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j} \right| \leq \frac{1}{N^{N/2}} \int_{V_\rho} |\nabla u|^N \leq \frac{1}{N^{N/2}} \mu(V_\rho)^{\frac{p-N}{p}} \left( \int_{V_\rho} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{N}{p}}. \tag{80}
\]

From (80) we get a lower bound for \( \mu(V_\rho) \) which yields (79) by the same argument as in (19) (thanks to (78) we have a bound for \( \int_{V_\rho} |\nabla u|^p \)). Finally we apply (79) with \( V_\rho = A_\rho \) (so that \( D = d \)) and let \( \rho \uparrow 1^- \) to obtain (77).

We next prove Theorem 3, or the existence of a minimizer in (4) for sufficiently large values of \( p \) (we emphasize that for \( N = 2 \) this existence has been established in [1] for any \( p > 2 \), hence we expect it to hold for any \( p > N \) when \( N \geq 3 \)).

**Proof of Theorem 3.** For any fixed \( p \geq N + 1 \) consider a minimizing sequence \( \{ v_n \} \subset E_1 \). We may assume that these maps are smooth, satisfy \( v_n(0) = 0 \) and thanks to (77) that
\[
E_p(v_n) \leq I_p(1) + \frac{1}{n} \leq C, \quad \forall n. \tag{81}
\]
Combined together, (81) and Morrey’s inequality (1) imply equicontinuity of the sequence \( \{ v_n \} \). Hence we can repeat with slight modifications (e.g., using (79) instead of (16)) the arguments of Corollary 2.1 to arrive at an analogous
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Thus equalities must hold between all integrals in (85), and hence also, almost everywhere, between the integrands. Consequently, the rows of the Jacobian matrix $\nabla u_\infty$ are orthogonal to each other a.e. in $D_1$, and each row has norm equal to $\sqrt{N}$ and the sign of $\det(\nabla u_\infty)$ must be constant (and hence positive because the degree of $u_\infty$ is equal to 1).

In particular we deduce that $u_\infty$ is conformal in the sense that it is a weak solution of the Cauchy–Riemann system in $D_1$ as defined in [6, Chapter 5]. Namely, $u_\infty \in W^{1,N}_{\text{loc}}(D_1, \mathbb{R}^N)$ (in our case it belongs even to $W^{1,\infty}$), $\det(\nabla u_\infty)$ has constant sign in $D_1$ and

$$\nabla u_\infty \cdot \nabla u_\infty = (\det(\nabla u_\infty))^{2/N} \mathbf{1} \quad \text{a.e. in } D_1. \quad (88)$$

The generalization of Liouville’s theorem for this case (see [6, Chapter 5]) implies that $u_\infty$ must be a “Möbius map”, i.e., of the form

$$u_\infty(x) = b + \frac{\alpha \mathcal{U}(x-a)}{|x-a|^\epsilon} \quad (89)$$

for some $b \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus D_1$, $\mathcal{U}$ an orthogonal matrix and $\epsilon$ is either 0 or 2. However, since in our case we already know that

$$|\nabla u_\infty(x)| = 1 \quad \text{a.e. in } D_1, \quad (90)$$

it follows that $\epsilon = 0$ in (89). Using the fact that $u_\infty(0) = 0$ and $\det(\nabla u_\infty) > 0$ in conjunction with (90), leads to (10). From (90) we conclude that the inequality in (83) is, in fact, an equality and (11) readily follows. Finally, the uniform convergence of $|u_\mu|$ follows as in the case $N = 2$. □
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