Properties of the minimizers for a constrained minimization problem arising in Kirchhoff equation
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Abstract Let $a > 0, b > 0$ and $V(x) \geq 0$ be a coercive function in $\mathbb{R}^2$. We study the following constrained minimization problem on a suitable weighted Sobolev space $\mathcal{H}$:

$$e_a(b) := \inf \left\{ E^b_a(u) : u \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^2 \, dx = 1 \right\},$$

where $E^b_a(u)$ is a Kirchhoff type energy functional defined on $\mathcal{H}$ by

$$E^b_a(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 + V(x)u^2 \, dx + \frac{b}{4} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \right)^2 - \frac{a}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^4 \, dx.$$

It is known that, for some $a^* > 0$, $e_a(b)$ has no minimizer if $b = 0$ and $a \geq a^*$, but $e_a(b)$ has always a minimizer for any $a \geq 0$ if $b > 0$. The aim of this paper is to investigate the limit behaviors of the minimizers of $e_a(b)$ as $b \to 0^+$. Moreover, the uniqueness of the minimizers of $e_a(b)$ is also discussed for $b$ close to 0.
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1 Introduction

In this paper, we are concerned with the following constrained minimization problem:

$$e_a(b) := \inf \left\{ E^b_a(u) : u \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \triangleq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^2 \, dx = 1 \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{H}$ is a weighted Sobolev space given by

$$\mathcal{H} \triangleq \left\{ u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)u^2 \, dx < \infty \right\}$$

for some nonnegative $V(x) \in L^\infty_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.
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and $E^b_a(u)$ is a Kirchhoff type energy functional as follows

$$E^b_a(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left( |\nabla u|^2 + V(x)u^2 \right) dx + \frac{b}{4} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^2 - \frac{a}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^4 dx, \; u \in \mathcal{H}, \quad (1.2)$$

$a$ and $b$ are positive parameters.

The above minimization problem arises in studying the following elliptic eigenvalue problem

$$- \left( 1 + b \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right) \Delta u + V(x)u = a|u|^2u + \mu u, \; \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \; \mu \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (1.3)$$

which is essentially a stationary (time independent) Kirchhoff equation, see e.g., [1, 6, 18] for more backgrounds. For bounded $V(x)$, problem (1.3) had been studied in many papers, see e.g., [15, 17, 20] and the references therein.

It is known that a minimizer of problem (1.1) corresponds a solution of (1.3) with $\mu$ being a suitable Lagrange multiplier. When $b = 0$, (1.3) with given $\|u\|_2$ becomes the famous Gross-Pitaevskii (GP) equation (time independent case) which is important in the study of Bose-Einstein condensates (BEC), see, e.g., [5]. For this reason, problem (1.1) or (1.3) with $b = 0$ has received a lot of interest in mathematics in recent years, see e.g., [2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 26, 28], provided $V(x)$ is a coercive potential, that is,

$$V(x) \in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^+), \quad \lim_{|x| \to \infty} V(x) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} V(x) = 0. \quad (1.4)$$

So, in order to compare more clearly the results of Kirchhoff problem (1.1) ($b > 0$) with that of GP equation [2, 7], that is, $b = 0$ in (1.1), in this paper we only consider problem (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^2$, but it is not difficult to extend our results of the paper to $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$) by using the results of [11].

Under (1.4), in [2, 7, 28], the authors proved that problem (1.1) with $b = 0$ has a minimizer if $a \in [0, a^*)$ and has no minimizer if $a \geq a^*$, where $a^* = \|Q\|^2_2$ and $Q(x)$ is the unique (up to translations) radially symmetric positive solution of the equation

$$- \Delta u + u = u^3, \; u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2). \quad (1.5)$$

Moreover, the concentration and symmetry breaking of minimizers were also studied in [7, 10] as $a \nearrow a^*$ under different types of trapping potential, and the uniqueness of minimizers was proved in [8] as $a$ close to $a^*$. But, when $b \neq 0$, it was proved in a very recent paper [11] that (1.1) has always a minimizer for all $a \geq 0$ and $b > 0$, that is, for each $b > 0$ there is a minimizer for $e_a(b)$. Therefore, a nature question is what would happened if $b \to 0^+$? Intuitively, we may expect that the minimizers of $e_a(b)(b > 0)$ should converge to a minimizer of $e_a(0)$ (i.e., $e_a(b)$ with $b = 0$). However, this may not be true at least for $a \geq a^*$, because $e_a(0)$ has no minimizer if $a \geq a^*$.

The aim of this paper is to give some detailed information on the limit behavior of the minimizers of $e_a(b)(b > 0)$ as $b \to 0^+$. Moreover, we are also interested in the uniqueness of minimizers of $e_a(b)$ with $b > 0$ being small enough and any given $a \in [a^*, +\infty)$. However, due to the presence of the nonlocal term $(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 dx)^2$ in (1.2), the methods used in [7, 10] can not be followed directly in our case. Particularly, in discussing the uniqueness of the minimizers for $e_a(b)$ with $b > 0$ and close to 0, we have to encounter much more complicated and technical
calculations than in [8]. To overcome these difficulties, we need to use some new ideas in getting the energy estimates and proving the uniqueness of $e_a(b)$. Before giving the main results of the paper, we introduce the following auxiliary functional

$$
\overline{E}_a^b(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx + \frac{b}{4} \left( \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \right)^2 - \frac{a}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^4 \, dx,
$$

(1.6)

and the constrained minimization problem

$$
\overline{e}_a(b) := \inf \left\{ \overline{E}_a^b(u) : u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^2 \, dx = 1 \right\}.
$$

(1.7)

When $b > 0$, it was proved in [11, Theorem 1.1] that $\overline{e}_a(b)$ in (1.7) has a minimizer if and only if $a > a^*$, but $e_a(b)$ in (1.1) has always a minimizer for any $a \geq 0$, see, e.g., [11, Theorem 1.2]. Since $|\nabla u| = |\nabla||u|$ holds for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, without loss of generality, we always suppose that minimizers of $e_a(b)$ and $\overline{e}_a(b)$ are nonnegative. Now, we state our results as follows.

**Theorem 1.1.** Suppose that $V(x)$ satisfies (1.4) and $V(x) \in C_{\text{loc}}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. For any given $a \geq a^*$, let $u_k$ be a nonnegative minimizer of $e_a(b_k)$ with $b_k \to 0^+$. Then, there exists a subsequence of $\{u_k\}$, still denoted by $\{u_k\}$, such that each $u_k$ has a unique global maximum point $z_k$ satisfying

$$
\lim_{k \to \infty} z_k = x_0 \text{ with } x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ and } V(x_0) = 0,
$$

(1.8)

$$
\lim_{k \to +\infty} e_k u_k(\varepsilon_k x + z_k) = \frac{Q(x)}{\sqrt[4]{a^*}} \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^2),
$$

(1.9)

where $Q(x)$ is the unique positive solution of (1.5), and $e_k \to 0^+$ which is given by

$$
e_k = \begin{cases} 
\left( \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_k|^2 \, dx \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \text{for } a = a^*, \\
\left( \frac{b_k}{a^*} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{for } a > a^*.
\end{cases}
$$

(1.10)

Moreover, if $a > a^*$,

$$
e_a(b_k) = -\frac{1}{4 b_k} \left( \frac{a - a^*}{a^*} \right)^2 (1 + o(1)) \text{ as } k \to \infty.
$$

(1.11)

**Remark 1.1.** If $V(x)$ satisfies (1.4), it is known by [3, Theorem 2.1] or [23, Theorem XIII.67] that the embedding from $\mathcal{H}$ into $L^s(\mathbb{R}^2)(2 \leq s < \infty)$ is compact. Hence, for $a \in [0, a^*)$, similar to the proof of Theorem 1.4 in [11], we know that a minimizer $u_b$ of (1.1) must converge to a minimizer $u_0$ of $e_a(0)$ as $b \to 0^+$.

For $a \geq a^*$, Theorem 1.1 shows that the nonnegative minimizers of (1.1) concentrate at a global minimum point of $V(x)$ as $b \to 0^+$. But, under the general coercive condition (1.4), it seems impossible to have more detailed information about the location of $x_0$ and the blowup rates of $e_k$. Motivated by [7, 9, 10], in what follows, we give some additional assumptions on $V(x)$, with which we may refine the results of Theorem 1.1 by establishing the optimal energy estimates of $e_a(b)$. 

3
Definition 1.2. A function $f(x)$ is called homogeneous of degree $q \in \mathbb{R}^+$ (about the origin) if there exists some $q > 0$ such that

$$f(tx) = t^q f(x), \quad \text{in} \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ for any } t > 0.$$ 

The above definition implies that if $f(x) \in C(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^+)$ is homogeneous of degree $q > 0$, then

$$0 \leq f(x) \leq C|x|^q \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where $C$ denotes the maximum of $f(x)$ on $\partial B_1(0)$. Moreover, if $f(x) \to \infty$ as $|x| \to \infty$, then 0 is the unique minimum point of $f(x)$.

Inspired by [7], we assume that $V(x)$ has exactly $m$ global minimum points, namely

$$Z := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) = 0\} = \{x_1, x_2, ..., x_m\}, \quad \text{where } m \geq 1. \quad (1.12)$$

We then assume that $V(x)$ is almost homogeneous of degree $p_i > 0$ around $x_i$, i.e., there exists some $V_i(x) \in C^2_\text{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying

$$\lim_{|x| \to 0} V_i(x) = \infty,$$

which is homogeneous of degree $p_i > 0$, such that

$$\lim_{x \to 0} \frac{V(x + x_i)}{V_i(x)} = 1, \quad i = 1, 2, ..., m. \quad (1.13)$$

Additionally, we define $H_i(y)$ by

$$H_i(y) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_i(x + y)Q^2(x)dx, \quad i = 1, 2, ..., m. \quad (1.14)$$

Set

$$p := \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} p_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{Z} := \{x_i \in Z : p_i = p\} \subset Z. \quad (1.15)$$

Define

$$\lambda_0 := \min_{i \in \Lambda} \lambda_i, \quad \text{where} \quad \lambda_i := \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^2} H_i(y) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda := \{i : x_i \in \overline{Z}\} \quad (1.16)$$

Denote

$$Z_0 := \{x_i \in \overline{Z} : \lambda_i = \lambda_0\} \quad (1.17)$$

the set of the flattest minimum points of $V(x)$. Under the above assumptions, our following theorem gives a precise description on the concentration behavior of the minimizers of (1.1) as $b \to 0^+$.

Theorem 1.3. Assume that $V(x)$ satisfies conditions (1.4) and (1.13). For $a \geq a^*$, let $u_k$ be a nonnegative minimizer of $e_{u}(b_k)$ as in Theorem 1.1 with $b_k \to 0^+$ and $z_k$ be the unique maximum point of $u_k$. Then,

$$\lim_{k \to +\infty} \overline{\epsilon}_k u_k(\overline{\epsilon}_k x + z_k) = \frac{O(x)}{\sqrt{a^*}} \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^2), \quad (1.18)$$

where $\overline{\epsilon}_k$ is given by

$$\overline{\epsilon}_k := \begin{cases} \left(\frac{2ba^*}{p_k}\right)^{1/p_k} & \text{for } a = a^*, \\ \left(\frac{2a^*}{a-a^*}\right)^{1/2} & \text{for } a > a^*, \end{cases} \quad (1.19)$$
and $z_k$ satisfies

$$
\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{z_k - x_0}{\epsilon_k} = y_0
$$

(1.20)

with $x_0 = x_{i_0} \in Z_0$ for some $1 \leq i_0 \leq m$, and $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfying $H_{i_0}(y_0) = \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^2} H_{i_0}(y) = \lambda_0$.

Moreover, if $a = a^*$,

$$
\lim_{k \to \infty} e_a(b_k) \frac{b_k}{b_{k-0}} = \frac{4 + p}{4p} \left( \frac{p}{2a^*} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}}.
$$

(1.21)

Theorem 1.3 shows that the nonnegative minimizers of $e_a(b)$ must concentrate at one of the flattest global minimum point of $V(x)$, as $b \to 0^+$. Different from the discussions in [7], in our case the nonlocal term $(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 dx)^2$ causes some new difficulties in analyzing the asymptotic behavior of the nonnegative minimizers for $e_a(b)$.

Finally, we are concerned with the uniqueness of the minimizers of $e_a(b)$ as $b$ close to 0, under some further assumptions of $V(x)$. Motivated by the uniqueness results addressed in [8], we assume that $V(x)$ has a unique flattest global minimum point, i.e., $Z_0$ defined in (1.17) contains only one element. Our uniqueness results can be stated as follows.

**Theorem 1.4.** Suppose that $V(x) \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfies (1.4) and (1.13). Let $Z_0$ in (1.17) have only one point $x_1$, and

$$
y_0 \text{ is the unique and non-degenerate critical point of } H_1(y) \text{ defined by (1.14).}
$$

(1.22)

If there exist $\delta > 0$ and $R_0 > 0$ such that

$$
V(x) \leq C e^{\delta|x|}, \text{ if } |x| \text{ is large},
$$

(1.23)

and

$$
\frac{\partial V(x + x_1)}{\partial x_j} = \frac{\partial V_1(x)}{\partial x_j} + W_j(x) \text{ and } |W_j(x)| \leq C|x|^{s_j} \text{ in } B_{R_0}(0),
$$

(1.24)

where $s_j > p - 1$ for $j = 1, 2$. Then, for $a \geq a^*$, there exists a unique nonnegative minimizer for $e_a(b)$ as $b > 0$ being small enough.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, $\overline{e}_a(b)$ is calculated, then the relation between $e_a(b)$ and $\overline{e}_a(b)$ is established as $b \to 0^+$, and the proof of Theorem 1.1 is finally given under general coercive potential $V(x)$ in (1.4). In Section 3, Theorem 1.3 is proved based on some detailed energy estimates of $e_a(b)$. In Section 4, we prove the uniqueness of the minimizers for $e_a(b)$ by contradiction and some techniques on the local Pohozaev identities.

## 2 Concentration behavior under general coercive potential.

First of all, we recall the following Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality [25]

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^4 dx \leq \frac{2}{a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^2 dx, \text{ } u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2),
$$

(2.1)
where the equality holds when \( u = Q(x) \), the unique positive solution of (1.5). Moreover, it follows from (1.5) and (2.1) that
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |Q|^2 \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla Q|^2 \, dx = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |Q|^4 \, dx, \tag{2.2}
\]
and from Proposition 4.1 of [13] that
\[
Q(x), \ |\nabla Q(x)| = O(|x|^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-|x|}) \text{ as } |x| \to \infty. \tag{2.3}
\]

**Lemma 2.1.** For any given \( a > a^* \), by the definition of (1.7), we have
\[
\bar{u}_a(b) = -\frac{1}{4b} \left( \frac{a - a^*}{a^*} \right)^2, \tag{2.4}
\]
and the unique (up to translations) nonnegative minimizer of \( \bar{u}_a(b) \) must be of the form
\[
\bar{u}_a(x) = \frac{r_b}{\sqrt{a^*}} Q(r_b^{-\frac{1}{2}} x), \text{ where } r_b = \frac{a - a^*}{ba^*}. \tag{2.5}
\]

**Proof.** For any \( u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \) satisfying \( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^2 \, dx = 1 \), it follows from (1.6) and (2.1) that
\[
\bar{E}^b_a(u) \geq \frac{b}{4} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \right)^2 - \frac{a - a^*}{2a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx. \]
Set
\[
h(r) = \frac{b}{4} r^2 - \frac{a - a^*}{2a^*} r, \quad r \in [0, +\infty). \tag{2.6}
\]
By simple calculation, we know that \( h(r) \) attains its global minimum at \( r_b = \frac{a - a^*}{ba^*} \), hence
\[
\bar{E}^b_a(u) \geq h(r_b) = -\frac{1}{4b} \left( \frac{a - a^*}{a^*} \right)^2. \tag{2.7}
\]
This implies that
\[
\bar{u}_a(b) \geq h(r_b) = -\frac{1}{4b} \left( \frac{a - a^*}{a^*} \right)^2. \tag{2.7}
\]

On the other hand, take \( u_t(x) = \frac{r}{\sqrt{a}} Q(t x) (t > 0) \), then \( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_t|^2 \, dx = 1 \), it follows from (2.2) that
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_t|^2 \, dx = \frac{r^2}{a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla Q|^2 \, dx = r^2, \tag{2.8}
\]
and
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_t|^4 \, dx = \frac{r^2}{(a^*)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |Q|^4 \, dx = \frac{2r^2}{a^*}. \tag{2.9}
\]
Hence,
\[
\bar{E}^b_a(b) \leq \bar{E}^b_a(u_t) = \frac{b}{4} r^4 - \frac{a - a^*}{2a^*} r^2 = h(r^2),
\]
where \( h(\cdot) \) is given by (2.6). Therefore, let \( t = \frac{1}{h} \), we see that

\[
\overline{e}_a(b) \leq h(r_b) = -\frac{1}{4b} \left( \frac{a-a^*}{a^*} \right)^2,
\]

(2.10)

this and (2.7) imply that (2.4) holds. Moreover, \( \overline{e}_a(b) \) is attained by \( \overline{u}_b(x) = \frac{r_b^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{\alpha^*}} Q(r_b^{\frac{1}{2}} x) \), and the proof is completed by the uniqueness (e.g., Theorem 1.1 in [27]) of positive minimizer for \( \overline{e}_a(b) \). □

**Lemma 2.2.** For any given \( a > a^* \), let \( V(x) \) satisfy (1.4) and let \( u_b \) be a nonnegative minimizer of \( e_a(b) \). Then,

\[
0 \leq e_a(b) - \overline{e}_a(b) \to 0 \text{ as } b \to 0^+,
\]

(2.11)

and

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|u_b|^2 dx \to 0 \text{ as } b \to 0^+.
\]

(2.12)

**Proof.** By the definition of \( e_a(b) \) and \( \overline{e}_a(b) \), it is easy to see that

\[
e_a(b) - \overline{e}_a(b) \geq 0.
\]

Now, we turn to giving an upper bound for \( e_a(b) - \overline{e}_a(b) \). Let \( 0 \leq \xi(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2) \) be a cut-off function such that

\[
\xi(x) \equiv 1 \text{ if } |x| \leq 1, \quad \xi(x) \equiv 0 \text{ if } |x| \geq 2, \text{ and } 0 \leq \xi(x) \leq 1, \text{ if } 1 \leq |x| \leq 2.
\]

(2.13)

For any \( x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \), set

\[
\overline{u}_b(x) = A_b \xi(x-x_0) \overline{u}_b(x-x_0),
\]

(2.14)

where \( \overline{u}_b(x) \) is defined in (2.5), and \( A_b > 0 \) is chosen so that \( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\overline{u}_b|^2 dx = 1 \). By the exponential decay property of \( Q(x) \) in (2.3) and the definition of (2.5), we have

\[
0 \leq A_b^2 - 1 = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |1 - \xi^2(r_b^{-\frac{1}{2}} x)|Q^2(x)dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \xi^2(r_b^{-\frac{1}{2}} x)Q^2(x)dx} \leq Ce^{-2r_b^\frac{1}{2}} \text{ as } b \to 0^+.
\]

(2.15)

Then,

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\overline{u}_b|^4 dx = A_b^4 \frac{r_b}{(\alpha^*)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \xi^4(r_b^{-\frac{1}{2}} x)Q^4(x)dx \geq \frac{r_b}{(\alpha^*)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Q^4(x)dx - Ce^{-2r_b^\frac{1}{2}}
\]

(2.16)

and

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|\overline{u}_b|^2(x)dx = \frac{A_b^2}{\alpha^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(r_b^{-\frac{1}{2}} x + x_0)\xi^2(r_b^{-\frac{1}{2}} x)Q^2(x)dx = V(x_0) + o(1),
\]

(2.17)
where \( o(1) \to 0 \) as \( b \to 0^+ \). Similarly, we have
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \tilde{u}_b|^2 \, dx \leq \frac{r_b}{a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla Q(x)|^2 \, dx + C e^{-2r_b^2} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \tilde{u}_b|^2 \, dx + C e^{-2r_b^2} \text{ as } b \to 0^+. \tag{2.18}
\]
Taking \( x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) such that \( V(x_0) = 0 \), then the above estimates show that
\[
0 \leq e_a(b) - \overline{e}_a(b) \leq E_a^b(\tilde{u}_b) - E_a^b(\bar{u}_b) = E_a^b(\tilde{u}_b) - E_a^b(\bar{u}_b) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|\tilde{u}_b|^2 \, dx
\leq \frac{1}{2} V(x_0) + C e^{-2r_b^2} + o(1) \to 0, \text{ as } b \to 0^+,
\]
and hence (2.11) holds. Moreover, since \( u_b \) is a minimizer for \( e_a(b) \), we know that
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|u_b|^2 \, dx = E_a^b(u_b) - E_a^b(\tilde{u}_b) \leq e_a(b) - \overline{e}_a(b) \to 0 \text{ as } b \to 0^+.
\]
This implies (2.12) holds and the proof of the lemma is completed. \( \square \)

**Lemma 2.3.** For any given \( a > a^* \), let \( V(x) \) satisfy (1.4) and let \( u_b \) be a nonnegative minimizer of \( e_a(b) \). Then,
\[
\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_b|^2 \, dx}{r_b} \to 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_b|^4 \, dx}{r_b} \to \frac{2}{a^*} \text{ as } b \to 0^+, \tag{2.19}
\]
where \( r_b \) is defined in (2.5).

**Proof.** By contradiction, if there exits some \( \theta \geq 0 \) and \( \theta \neq 1 \) such that
\[
\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_b|^2 \, dx}{r_b} \to \theta \text{ as } b \to 0^+.
\]
Then, there is always a contradiction for both \( \theta \in [0, 1) \) and \( \theta > 1 \).

In fact, if \( \theta \in [0, 1) \), then there exists \( \epsilon > 0 \) such that \( \delta \leq \theta + \epsilon < 1 \) and \( \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_b|^2 \, dx}{r_b} \leq \delta \) as \( b \to 0^+ \). It follows from (2.1), (2.4) and (2.11) that
\[
0 > e_a(b) = E_a^b(u_b) \geq h\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_b|^2 \, dx \right) \geq h(\delta r_b) \geq h(r_b) = \overline{e}_a(b) \text{ as } b \text{ close to } 0,
\]
where \( h(\cdot) \) defined as (2.6) and \( h(r) \) has a unique minimum point at \( r_b \). Hence,
\[
\lim_{b \to 0^+} \frac{e_a(b)}{h(r_b)} \leq \lim_{b \to 0^+} \frac{h(\delta r_b)}{h(r_b)} = \lim_{b \to 0^+} \frac{b^2 \delta^2 r_b^2 - a-a^* \delta r_b}{b^2 \delta^2 r_b^2 - a-a^* \delta r_b} = -\delta^2 + 2\delta \in (0, 1) \text{ for all } \delta \in [0, 1). \tag{2.20}
\]
Moreover, (2.10) and (2.11) indicate that
\[
\lim_{b \to 0^+} \frac{e_a(b)}{h(r_b)} = \lim_{b \to 0^+} \frac{\overline{e}_a(b) + o(1)}{\overline{e}_a(b)} = 1,
\]
which contradict (2.20).
Similarly, if \( \theta > 1 \), we have also a contradiction, and hence \( \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_b|^2 \, dx}{r_b} \to 1 \) as \( b \to 0^+ \). Since \( u_b \) is a minimizer for \( e_a(b) \), we have

\[
e_a(b) = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} [|\nabla u_b|^2 + V(x)u_b^2] \, dx}{2r_b} + \frac{b \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_b|^2 \, dx \right)^2}{4r_b} - \frac{a \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_b|^4 \, dx}{4r_b}.
\]

Applying (2.5), \( r_b \to \infty \) as \( b \to 0^+ \) and \( br_b = \frac{a - a^*}{a} \). It then follows from Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 that

\[
\frac{a \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_b|^4 \, dx}{4r_b} \to \frac{a}{2a^*} \text{ as } b \to 0^+,
\]

that is, \( \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_b|^4 \, dx}{r_b} \to \frac{2}{a} \) as \( b \to 0^+ \) and the lemma is proved. \( \square \)

Our next lemma is to give the energy behaviors as \( b \to 0^+ \) in the case of \( a = a^* \).

**Lemma 2.4.** If \( a = a^* \), let \( V(x) \) satisfy (1.4) and let \( u_b \) be a nonnegative minimizer of \( e_a'(b) \), then

\[
e_a'(b) \to e_a'(0) = 0 \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_b|^2 \, dx \to +\infty, \text{ as } b \to 0^+.
\]

(2.21)

\[
b \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_b|^2 \, dx \right)^2 \to 0 \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|u_b|^2 \, dx \to 0, \text{ as } b \to 0^+.
\]

(2.22)

**Proof.** By Theorem 1 of [7], \( e_{a^*}'(0) = 0 \). It then follows from (1.1) and (2.1) that

\[
e_a'(b) = E_{a^*}'(u_b) \geq \frac{b}{4} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_b|^2 \, dx \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|u_b|^2 \, dx > e_{a^*}'(0) = 0.
\]

(2.23)

Let \( \xi(x) \) be the same cut-off function as (2.13). For any \( x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) and \( \tau > 0 \), set

\[
u_\tau(x) = \frac{A_{\tau^2}}{\sqrt{a^*}} \xi(x - x_0) Q(\tau(x - x_0)),
\]

(2.24)

where \( A_{\tau^2} > 0 \) is chosen so that \( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_\tau|^2 \, dx = 1 \). Then, for \( \tau \) large enough, similar to (2.15)–(2.18), we have

\[
0 \leq A_{\tau^2}^2 - 1 \leq C e^{-2\tau} \text{ as } \tau \to \infty,
\]

(2.25)

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_\tau|^2 \, dx \leq \tau^2 + C e^{-2\tau} \text{ as } \tau \to \infty,
\]

(2.26)

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_\tau|^4 \, dx \geq \frac{2\tau^2}{a^*} - C e^{-4\tau} \text{ as } \tau \to \infty,
\]

(2.27)

and

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|u_\tau|^2 \, dx = V(x_0) + o(1).
\]

(2.28)

where \( o(1) \to 0 \) as \( \tau \to +\infty \). Then, the above estimates show that

\[
0 < e_{a^*}'(b) \leq E_{a^*}'(u_\tau) \leq \frac{b}{4} \tau^4 + \frac{1}{2} V(x_0) + C e^{-2\tau} + o(1).
\]

(2.29)
Taking \( x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) such that \( V(x_0) = 0 \), using (2.23)–(2.29) and letting \( b \to 0^+ \) and \( \tau \to +\infty \), we have

\[
0 < e_{\alpha}(b) \to 0 \text{ as } b \to 0^+,
\]

and (2.23) implies that

\[
b \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_b|^2 dx \right)^2 \to 0, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|u_b|^2 dx \to 0 \text{ as } b \to 0^+.
\]

Next, we claim that

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_b|^2 dx \to +\infty \text{ as } b \to 0^+.
\]

Otherwise, if (2.32) is false, then there exists a sequence of \( \{b_k\} \) with \( b_k \xrightarrow{k \to \infty} 0^+ \) such that the sequence \( \{u_k\} \) is bounded in \( \mathcal{H} \) since (2.31), where \( u_k \equiv u_{b_k} \). By the compact embedding results mentioned in Remark 1.1, passing to a subsequence, there exists \( u_0 \in \mathcal{H} \) such that

\[
u_k \rightharpoonup u_0 \text{ in } \mathcal{H} \quad \text{and} \quad u_k \to u_0 \text{ in } L^s(\mathbb{R}^2), \text{ as } k \to \infty, \text{ for } s \in [2, +\infty).
\]

Then,

\[
e_{\alpha}(0) \leq E_{\alpha}^0(u_0) \leq \liminf_{k \to \infty} E_{\alpha}^{b_k}(u_k) = \lim_{k \to \infty} e_{\alpha}(b_k) = 0 = e_{\alpha}(0).
\]

This means that \( u_0 \) is a minimizer of \( e_{\alpha}(0) \), which contradicts Theorem 1.1 of [7], and hence (2.32) holds.

\[\Box\]

**Lemma 2.5.** Suppose that \( V(x) \) satisfies (1.4). For any given \( a \geq a^* \), let \( u_k \) be a nonnegative minimizer of \( e_{\alpha}(b_k) \) as in Theorem 1.1 and \( z_k \) be a global maximum point of \( u_k \), where \( b_k \xrightarrow{k \to \infty} 0^+ \). Set

\[
w_k(x) = e_k u_k(e_k x + z_k), \text{ where } e_k \text{ is defined by (1.10)}.
\]

Then,

\[
\liminf_{k \to \infty} \int_{B_r(0)} |w_k|^2 dx \geq M > 0 \text{ for some } M > 0.
\]

Moreover, passing to a subsequence, there exists a \( z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) such that

\[
z_k \to z_0 \text{ as } k \to \infty, \text{ and } V(z_0) = 0.
\]

**Proof.** Since \( u_k \) is a nonnegative minimizer for \( e_{\alpha}(b_k) \). Then, \( u_k(x) \) satisfies the following Euler-Lagrange equation

\[
-\left( 1 + b_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx \right) \Delta u_k + V(x)u_k = \mu_k u_k + a u_k^3, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2,
\]

where \( \mu_k \in \mathbb{R} \) is a suitable Lagrange multiplier associated to \( u_k \), and

\[
e_{\alpha}(b_k) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} [V(x)u_k + V(x)|u_k|^2] dx + \frac{b_k}{4} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx \right)^2 - a \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_k|^4 dx.
\]
Moreover,
\[ \mu_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|\nabla u_k|^2 + V(x)|u_k|^2)dx + b_k \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx \right)^2 - a \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_k|^4 dx. \]  
(2.39)

If \( a = a^* \), we deduce from (1.10), (2.38)-(2.39) and Lemma 2.4 that
\[ \begin{align*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla w_k|^2 dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |w_k|^2 dx = 1, \\
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |w_k|^4 dx &= \epsilon_k^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_k|^4 dx \to \frac{2}{a^*} \text{ as } k \to \infty.
\end{align*} \]
(2.40)

If \( a > a^* \), it follows from (1.10), (2.34) and Lemma 2.3 that
\[ \begin{align*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |w_k|^2 dx &= 1, \epsilon_k^2 = r_{B_k}^{-1}, \\
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla w_k|^2 dx &= \epsilon_k^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx}{r_{B_k}} \to 1 \text{ as } k \to \infty, \\
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |w_k|^4 dx &= \epsilon_k^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_k|^4 dx = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_k|^4 dx}{r_{B_k}} \to \frac{2}{a} \text{ as } k \to \infty.
\end{align*} \]
(2.41)

Hence, for any given \( a \geq a^* \), combining (2.39) and the above estimates, we see that
\[ \mu_k \epsilon_k^2 \to -\frac{a}{a^*} \text{ as } k \to \infty. \]
(2.42)

Since \( u_k \) satisfies (2.37), by the definition of \( w_k \) in (2.34), we know that \( w_k(x) \) satisfies
\[ -\left(1 + b_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx\right) \Delta w_k + \epsilon_k^2 V(\epsilon_k x + z_k) w_k(x) = \mu_k \epsilon_k^2 w_k(x) + aw_k^2(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2. \]
(2.43)

Hence, as \( k \) large enough, it follows from (2.42) that
\[ -\Delta w_k - c(x)w_k \leq 0, \quad \text{where } c(x) = aw_k^2(x). \]
(2.44)

Applying De-Giorgi-Nash-Morse theory (similar to the proof of [16, Theorem 4.1]), we deduce that
\[ \max_{B_{\xi}(\xi)} w_k(x) \leq C \left( \int_{B_{\xi}(\xi)} |w_k|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \]
(2.45)

where \( \xi \) is an arbitrary point in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) and \( C \) is a constant depending only on the bound of \( ||w_k||_{L^4(B_{\xi}(\xi))} \).

Since \( z_k \) is a global maximum point of \( u_k \), \( 0 \) is a global maximum point of \( w_k \). We claim that there exists some \( \eta > 0 \) such that
\[ w_k(0) \geq \eta \quad \text{for } k \text{ large enough}. \]
(2.46)

If (2.46) is false, then for any \( r > 0 \), passing to a subsequence if necessary, we have
\[ \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^2} \int_{B(y,r)} |w_k|^2(x)dx \to 0 \text{ as } k \to \infty. \]
Then, the vanishing Lemma 1.21 in [24] shows that \( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |w_k|^4 \, dx \to 0 \) as \( k \to \infty \), which contradicts (2.40) and (2.41). Hence, (2.46) holds, and (2.35) follows from (2.45) and (2.46).

Next, using (2.12) and (2.22), we know that

\[
0 = \liminf_{k \to \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(e_k x + z_k)|w_k|^2 \, dx \geq \liminf_{k \to \infty} \int_{B_2(0)} V(e_k x + z_k)|w_k|^2 \, dx.
\]

Since \( V(x) \to \infty \) as \( |x| \to \infty \), (2.35) implies that \( \{z_k\} \) is a bounded sequence in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \), and passing to a subsequence if necessary, there exists \( z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) such that (2.36) holds

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 1.1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Let \( u_k \) be a nonnegative minimizer of \( e_a(b_k) \) for \( a \geq a^* \) and \( w_k(x) \) be defined in (2.34). It follows from (2.40) and (2.41) that \( \{w_k\} \) is a bounded sequence in \( H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \), and passing to subsequence, there exists \( w_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \) such that

\[
w_k \rightharpoonup w_0 \geq 0 \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ as } k \to \infty.
\]

Moreover, since \( w_k(x) \) satisfies (2.43), applying (2.42) and passing to the weak limit, we know that \( w_0(x) \) satisfies, in the weak sense,

\[-\Delta w_0 + w_0(x) = a^* w_0^+(x), \; x \in \mathbb{R}^2.\]  

(2.48)

Furthermore, (2.35) implies that \( w_0(x) \neq 0 \), and \( w_0(x) > 0 \) since the strong maximum principle. Comparing (1.5) and (2.48), the uniqueness of positive solution of (1.5) shows that

\[w_0(x) = \frac{Q(|x - x_0|)}{\sqrt{a^*}} \text{ for some } x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2,\]

(2.49)

where \( Q(x) \) is the unique positive solution of (1.5). Moreover, by (2.1) we have

\[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla w_0|^2 \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} w_0^2 \, dx = 1.\]

(2.50)

It then follows from (2.41), (2.42) and (2.47) that

\[w_k \to w_0 = \frac{Q(|x - x_0|)}{\sqrt{a^*}} \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ as } k \to \infty.\]

(2.47)

Since \( V(x) \in C^\alpha_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^+) \) for some \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \). Similar to the Proof of Theorem 1.2 in [10], we know from (2.43) and (2.50) that

\[w_k \to w_0 \text{ in } C^\alpha_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ as } k \to \infty \text{ for some } \alpha \in (0, 1).\]

(2.51)

By (2.34), \( x = 0 \) is a critical (global maximum) point of \( w_k(x) \) for all \( k > 0 \), it is also a critical point of \( w_0 \) by (2.51). Since \( Q(x) \) is radially symmetric about the origin and strictly monotonous about \( |x| \) (see e.g., [13, 21, 25]), then \( w_0(x) \) has a unique global maximum point \( x = 0 \) and \( x_0 = 0 \). Hence,

\[w_0(x) = \frac{Q(|x|)}{\sqrt{a^*}}.\]

Moreover, using (2.51), similar to the proof of [9, Theorem 1.1], we deduce that \( z_k \) is the unique maximum point of \( u_k \) and \( z_k \) goes to a global minimum point of \( V(x) \) as \( k \to \infty \) by (2.36).
3 Concentration behavior for homogeneous type potential.

The aim of this section is to show that, if some more information on the global minimum point of \( V(x) \) is given, such as (1.12) and (1.13), then we may have more precise description on the concentration behavior for the minimizers of (1.1) as \( b \to 0^+ \), i.e., Theorem 1.3. To prove this theorem, we need some detailed energy estimates on \( e_{\alpha}(b) \) for \( a = a^* \) as \( b \to 0^+ \).

**Lemma 3.1.** Let \( V(x) \) satisfy (1.4) and (1.12)–(1.13). If \( a = a^* \), then

\[
\limsup_{b \to 0^+} \frac{e_{\alpha}(b)}{b^{\frac{4}{p+4}}} \leq \frac{p + 4}{4p} \left( \frac{p\lambda_0}{2a^*} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}},
\]

where \( p \) and \( \lambda_0 \) are given by (1.15) and (1.16), respectively.

**Proof.** Let \( u_{\tau}(x) \) be given by (2.24) and let \( x_0 \in \mathcal{Z}_0 \), where \( \mathcal{Z}_0 \) is defined in (1.17). Then, it follows from (1.13) and (2.25)–(2.27) that

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|u_\tau|^2 \, dx = \frac{A_2^2}{||Q||^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x/\tau + x_0)\xi^2(x/\tau)Q^2(x)\, dx
\]

\[
= \frac{A_2^2}{||Q||^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x/\tau + x_0) \frac{V_0(x/\tau)}{V_0(x/\tau)} \xi^2(x/\tau)Q^2(x)\, dx
\]

\[
= \frac{\lambda_0}{a^*\tau^p} (1 + o(1)) \text{ as } \tau \to \infty,
\]

and

\[
e_{\alpha}(b) \leq E^b_{\alpha}(u_{\tau}) = \frac{b}{4} \tau^4 + \frac{\lambda_0}{2a^*\tau^p} (1 + o(1)) + Ce^{-2\tau} \text{ as } \tau \to \infty.
\]

Take \( \tau = \left( \frac{p\lambda_0}{2a^*b} \right)^{\frac{1}{p+4}} \), then \( \tau \to \infty \) as \( b \to 0^+ \). It follows from (3.2) and (3.3) that

\[
e_{\alpha}(b) \leq \frac{b^{\frac{p}{p+4}}}{4} \left( \frac{p\lambda_0}{2a^*} \right)^{\frac{4}{p+4}} + \frac{b^{\frac{p}{p+4}}}{p} \left( \frac{p\lambda_0}{2a^*} \right)^{\frac{4}{p+4}} (1 + o(1)) + Ce^{-2\tau} \text{ as } b \to 0^+.
\]

This shows that

\[
\limsup_{b \to 0^+} \frac{e_{\alpha}(b)}{b^{\frac{4}{p+4}}} \leq \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{p\lambda_0}{2a^*} \right)^{\frac{4}{p+4}} + \frac{1}{p} \left( \frac{p\lambda_0}{2a^*} \right)^{\frac{4}{p+4}} = \frac{p + 4}{4p} \left( \frac{p\lambda_0}{2a^*} \right)^{\frac{4}{p+4}}.
\]

\( \square \)

Now, we come to prove Theorem 1.3.

**Proof of Theorem 1.3.** Case I: \( a = a^* \). By Lemma 3.1, we know that \( \limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{e_{\alpha}(b_k)}{b_k^{\frac{4}{p+4}}} \) has a upper estimates. Therefore, we need only to show that the limit has the same lower bound to prove (1.21) of Theorem 1.3. Let \( u_k \) be a nonnegative minimizer for \( e_{\alpha}(b_k) \) and \( w_k(x) \) be defined by (2.34), where \( b_k \to 0^+ \). Then, passing to a subsequence, we know from Theorem 1.1 that
each $u_k$ has a unique maximum point $z_k$ such that $z_k \rightarrow x_0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ with $V(x_0) = 0$. We may assume $x_0 = x_{i_0}$ for some $1 \leq i_0 \leq m$.

We claim that

$$p_{i_0} = p \text{ and } \left\{ \frac{z_k - x_{i_0}}{\epsilon_k} \right\} \text{ is bounded}, \hspace{1cm} (3.4)$$

where $\epsilon_k$ is given by (1.10). Otherwise, if $p_{i_0} < p$ or $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{z_k - x_{i_0}}{\epsilon_k} \right\} = +\infty$, then using $V_{i_0}(tx) = t^{p_{i_0}}V_{i_0}(tx)$, (1.9) and (1.13) imply that, for any $M > 0$ large enough,

$$\lim inf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\epsilon_k^p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x) |u_k|^2 dx = \lim inf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\epsilon_k^p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(\epsilon_k x + z_k) |w_k|^2 dx$$

$$= \lim inf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\epsilon_k^p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(\epsilon_k x + z_k) V_{i_0} \left( x + \frac{z_k - x_{i_0}}{\epsilon_k} \right) |w_k|^2 dx \geq M.$$

Hence, by the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (2.1) and Young inequality, we see that

$$e_{a'}(b_k) = E_{a'}^{b_k}(u_k) \geq \frac{b_k}{4\epsilon_k^2} + \frac{M}{2} \epsilon_k^p \geq C M^{\frac{4}{p+2}} b_k^{\frac{2}{p+2}}, \hspace{1cm} (3.5)$$

which contradicts (3.1) if $M > 0$ large enough. So, (3.4) is proved. Therefore, passing to a subsequence, we may assume that there exists $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that

$$\frac{z_k - x_{i_0}}{\epsilon_k} \rightarrow y_0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty. \hspace{1cm} (3.6)$$

It follows from (1.9) and (1.13) that

$$\lim inf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\epsilon_k^p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x) |u_k|^2 dx = \lim inf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\epsilon_k^p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(\epsilon_k x + z_k) |w_k|^2 dx$$

$$= \lim inf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\epsilon_k^p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{V(\epsilon_k x + z_k)}{V_{i_0}(\epsilon_k x + z_k - x_{i_0})} V_{i_0} \left( x + \frac{z_k - x_{i_0}}{\epsilon_k} \right) |w_k|^2 dx$$

$$\geq \frac{\lambda_{i_0}}{a^*} \geq \frac{\lambda_0}{a^*}. \hspace{1cm} (3.7)$$

This and Young inequality imply that

$$e_{a'}(b_k) = E_{a'}^{b_k}(u_k) \geq \frac{b_k}{4\epsilon_k^2} + \frac{\lambda_0 \epsilon_k^p}{2a^*} (1 + o(1)) \geq \frac{b_k^{\frac{p}{p+2}} (p + 4)(1 + o(1))}{4p} \left( \frac{p \lambda_0}{2a^*} \right)^{\frac{1}{p+2}}.$$

Hence,

$$\lim inf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e_{a'}(b_k)}{b_k^{\frac{p}{p+2}}} \geq \frac{p + 4}{4p} \left( \frac{p \lambda_0}{2a^*} \right)^{\frac{1}{p+2}}, \hspace{1cm} (3.8)$$
where the equality holds if and only if \( \lambda_{i_0} = \lambda_0 \), \( H_{i_0}(y_0) = \lambda_0 \) and

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{e_k}{\xi_k} = 1, \text{ where } \xi_k \text{ defined in (1.19)}.
\] (3.9)

Moreover, it follows from Lemma 3.1 that

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{e_a(b_k)}{\xi_k^{\frac{a}{2}}} = \frac{p + 4}{4p} \left( \frac{p \lambda_0}{2a^*} \right)^\frac{a}{p}. \tag{3.10}
\]

This shows that all inequalities in (3.7) and (3.8) become equalities, and \( H_{i_0}(y_0) = \lambda_{i_0} = \lambda_0 \).

Therefore, (1.18) follows from (1.9) and (3.9). Also (1.20) follows from (3.6).

**Case II**: \( a > a^* \). Take \( x_{i_0} \in Z_0 \) and \( y_0 \) satisfying \( H_{i_0}(y_0) = \lambda_0 \). Let

\[
\hat{\nu}_k(x) = A_k \xi(x - x_{i_0} - \hat{\xi}_k y_0) \hat{\nu}_k(x - x_{i_0} - \hat{\xi}_k y_0),
\]

where \( \hat{\nu}_k(x) \triangleq \hat{\nu}_k(x) \) and \( \xi(x) \) are defined in (2.5) and (2.13), respectively. Note from (1.19) and (2.5) that \( \hat{\xi}_k = \frac{-1}{k^\lambda} \). Then, similar to (2.15)--(2.18), it follows (1.13) and the dominated convergence theorem that

\[
e_a(b_k) - \xi_k^{b_k} \leq E_a(b_k) - \xi_k^{b_k} \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x) |\hat{\nu}_k|^2 dx + O(e^{-\hat{\xi}_k})
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(\xi_k x + x_{i_0} + \hat{\xi}_k y_0) \xi^2(\xi_k x) Q^2(x) dx + O(e^{-\hat{\xi}_k})
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(\xi_k x + x_{i_0} + \hat{\xi}_k y_0) \frac{V_0(\xi_k x + \hat{\xi}_k y_0) \xi^2(\xi_k x) Q^2(x) dx + O(e^{-\hat{\xi}_k})}{V_0(\xi_k x + \hat{\xi}_k y_0)}
\]

\[
= \frac{\xi_k^p}{2a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(\xi_k x + x_{i_0} + \hat{\xi}_k y_0) \frac{V_0(\xi_k x + \hat{\xi}_k y_0) \xi^2(\xi_k x) Q^2(x) dx + O(e^{-\hat{\xi}_k})}{V_0(\xi_k x + \hat{\xi}_k y_0)}
\]

\[
= \frac{\xi_k^p}{2a^*} (1 + o(1)) \text{ as } k \to \infty.
\]

This implies that

\[
\limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{e_a(b_k) - \xi_k^{b_k}}{\xi_k^p} \leq \frac{\lambda_0}{2a^*}. \tag{3.11}
\]

Let \( u_k \) be a nonnegative minimizer of \( e_a(b_k) \), passing to a subsequence, we know from Theorem 1.1 that each \( u_k \) has a unique maximum point \( z_k \) such that \( z_k \to x_0 \) as \( k \to \infty \) with \( V(x_0) = 0 \).

We may assume \( x_0 = x_{i_0} \) for some \( 1 \leq i_0 \leq m \). It follows from (1.9) and (1.13) that

\[
\liminf_{k \to \infty} \frac{e_a(b_k) - \xi_k^{b_k}}{\xi_k^p} \geq \liminf_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{2e_k^p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x) |u_k|^2 dx
\]

\[
= \liminf_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{2e_k^p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(\xi_k x + z_k) |w_k(x)|^2 dx
\]

\[
= \liminf_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{2e_k^{p-d}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(\xi_k x + z_k - x_{i_0} + x_{i_0}) \frac{V_0(\xi_k x + z_k - x_{i_0})}{V_0(\xi_k x + z_k - x_{i_0})} |w_k(x)|^2 dx.
\] (3.12)
Combining (3.11) and (3.12), we deduce from (1.4) and (1.13) that \( p_{i_0} = p \) and \( \left( \frac{z_k - x_{i_0}}{\epsilon_k} \right) \) is a bounded sequence in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \). So, we may assume that there exists \( y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) such that

\[
\frac{z_k - x_{i_0}}{\epsilon_k} \to y_0 \text{ as } k \to \infty. \tag{3.13}
\]

Using (1.9) and (1.13) we know that

\[
\liminf_{k \to \infty} \frac{e_\alpha(b_k) - \tau_\alpha(b_k)}{\epsilon_k} \geq \frac{1}{2a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x + y_0)Q^2(x)dx \geq \frac{\lambda_{i_0}^*}{2a^*} \geq \frac{\lambda_0}{2a^*}, \tag{3.14}
\]

where (3.14) becomes equalities if and only if \( \lambda_{i_0} = \lambda_0 \) and \( H_{i_0}(y_0) = \lambda_0 \). Combining (3.11) and (3.14), we have

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{e_\alpha(b_k) - \tau_\alpha(b_k)}{\epsilon_k} = \frac{\lambda_0}{2a^*}.
\]

Therefore, (3.14) becomes equalities, and hence (1.20) holds by (3.13). \( \square \)

4 Uniqueness of minimizers—Proof of Theorem 1.4.

In this section, we come to prove Theorem 1.4, that is, the uniqueness of the minimizers of \( e_\alpha(b) \) when \( b > 0 \) small enough. For this purpose, we argue by contradiction. If for any given \( a \geq a^* \), there exist two different nonnegative minimizers \( u_{1,k} \) and \( u_{2,k} \) for \( e_\alpha(b_k) \). Let \( z_{1,k} \) and \( z_{2,k} \) be the unique maximum point of \( u_{1,k} \) and \( u_{2,k} \), respectively. By (2.37), the minimizers \( u_{i,k} \) satisfy the following equation

\[
- \left( 1 + b_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_{i,k}|^2 dx \right) \Delta u_{i,k} + V(x)u_{i,k} = \mu_{i,k}u_{i,k} + au_{i,k}^3, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \ i = 1, 2, \tag{4.1}
\]

where \( \mu_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R} \) is a suitable lagrange multiplier. Since \( u_{1,k}(x) \neq u_{2,k}(x) \), set

\[
\overline{u}_{i,k}(x) = \sqrt[2]{\epsilon_k} u_{i,k}(\epsilon_k x + z_{1,k}), \quad i = 1, 2, \tag{4.2}
\]

and

\[
\overline{\eta}_k(x) = \frac{\overline{u}_{1,k}(x) - \overline{u}_{2,k}(x)}{||\overline{u}_{1,k} - \overline{u}_{2,k}||_{L^\infty}}. \tag{4.3}
\]

It follows from Theorem 1.3 that

\[
\overline{u}_{i,k}(x) \to Q(x) \text{ uniformly in } \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ as } k \to \infty.
\]

Moreover, \( \overline{u}_{i,k} \) and \( \overline{\eta}_k \) satisfy

\[
- \left( 1 + \frac{b_k}{a^* \epsilon_k^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \overline{u}_{i,k}|^2 dx \right) \Delta \overline{u}_{i,k} + \epsilon_k^2 V(\epsilon_k x + z_{1,k})\overline{u}_{i,k} = \mu_{i,k} \epsilon_k^2 \overline{u}_{i,k} + \frac{a}{a^*} \epsilon_k^3 u_{i,k}^3, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \ i = 1, 2, \tag{4.4}
\]

and

\[
- \left( 1 + \frac{b_k}{a^* \epsilon_k^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \overline{u}_{2,k}|^2 dx \right) \Delta \overline{\eta}_k - \frac{b_k}{a^* \epsilon_k^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(\overline{u}_{1,k} + \overline{u}_{2,k}) \overline{\eta}_k dx \Delta \overline{u}_{1,k} + \epsilon_k^2 V(\epsilon_k x + z_{1,k})\overline{\eta}_k = \mu_{1,k} \epsilon_k^2 \overline{\eta}_k + \frac{\overline{g}_k(x)}{\epsilon_k} + f_k(x), \tag{4.5}
\]

\[16\]
where
\[
\overline{u}_k(x) = \frac{\mu_{1,k} - \mu_{2,k}}{\|u_{1,k} - \overline{u}_{2,k}\|_{L^\infty}} \overline{u}_{2,k} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{f}_k(x) = \frac{a\eta_k}{a^*} (\overline{u}_{1,k} + \overline{u}_{1,k} \overline{u}_{2,k} + \overline{u}_{2,k}^2).
\] (4.6)

The following lemma gives the decay estimates on \( \overline{u}_{i,k} \) and \( |\nabla \overline{u}_{i,k}| \) \((i = 1, 2)\), which are required in proving Theorem 1.4.

**Lemma 4.1.** Let \( a \geq a^* \) and \( V(x) \) satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.4. If \( u_{i,k} \) \((i = 1, 2)\) are two nonnegative minimizers of \( e_a(b_k) \) with \( b_k \xrightarrow{k \to \infty} 0^+ \). Then, up to a subsequence, we have
\[
\overline{u}_{i,k}(x) \leq Ce^{-\frac{|x|}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla \overline{u}_{i,k}(x)| \leq Ce^{-\frac{|x|}{4}} \quad \text{as} \quad |x| \to \infty, \quad i = 1, 2,
\] (4.7)
where \( C > 0 \) is a constant independent of \( k \).

**Proof.** By (1.10), (2.42) and (3.9), we know that
\[
\mu_{i,k} \epsilon_k^2 \to -\frac{a}{a^*} \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.
\] (4.8)

From (4.4), one can derive that
\[
-\Delta \overline{u}_{i,k} \leq c_{i,k}(x) \overline{u}_{i,k} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \text{where} \quad c_{i,k}(x) = \frac{a}{a^*} \overline{u}_{i,k}^2.
\]

Applying De-Giorgi-Nash-Morse theory(similar to the proof of [16, Theorem 4.1]), we have
\[
\overline{u}_{i,k}(x) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad |x| \to \infty \quad \text{uniformly on} \quad k.
\] (4.9)

Using (4.4) and (4.8)–(4.9), we obtain that there exists a constant \( R > 0 \) large enough such that
\[
-\Delta \overline{u}_{i,k} + \frac{1}{2} \overline{u}_{i,k} \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{u}_{i,k} \leq Ce^{-\frac{|x|}{4}} \quad \text{for} \quad |x| \geq R,
\]
where \( C > 0 \) is a constant independent of \( k \). Comparing \( \overline{u}_{i,k} \) with \( e^{-\frac{|x|}{2}} \), and the comparison principle implies that
\[
\overline{u}_{i,k}(x) \leq Ce^{-\frac{|x|}{4}} \quad \text{for} \quad |x| \geq R.
\]

Furthermore, since \( V(x) \) satisfies (1.23), we have
\[
|\epsilon_k^2 V(\overline{e}_k x + z_{1,k})\overline{u}_{i,k}| \leq Ce^{-\frac{|x|}{4}} \quad \text{for} \quad |x| \geq R.
\]

Then, applying the local elliptic estimates (e.g., (3.15) in [14]) and the above estimates yield that
\[
|\nabla \overline{u}_{i,k}(x)| \leq Ce^{-\frac{|x|}{4}} \quad \text{for} \quad |x| \geq R.
\]

\[ \square \]

The next lemma is to give the limit behavior of \( \overline{u}_k \).
Lemma 4.2. If \( a \geq a^* \) and all the assumptions of Theorem 1.4 hold, then passing to a subsequence, we have
\[
\overline{\eta}_k \to \overline{\eta}_0 \text{ in } C^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ as } k \to \infty. \tag{4.10}
\]
Moreover,
\[
\overline{\eta}_0(x) = d_0(Q + x \cdot \nabla Q) + \sum_{i=1}^{2} d_i \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_i}, \text{ if } a = a^*, \tag{4.11}
\]
and
\[
\overline{\eta}_0(x) = h_0 Q + h_0 x \cdot \nabla Q + \sum_{i=1}^{2} h_i \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_i}, \text{ if } a > a^*, \tag{4.12}
\]
where \( d_0, d_1, d_2 \) and \( h_0, h_1, h_2 \) are some constants.

Proof. Since \( ||\overline{\eta}_k||_{L^\infty} = 1 \), it follows from (4.3), (4.5)–(4.6) and the standard elliptic regularity theory that there exists \( C > 0 \), independent of \( k \), such that
\[
||\overline{\eta}_k||_{C^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C \text{ for some } \alpha \in (0, 1).
\]
Therefore, passing to a subsequence, there exists some function \( \overline{\eta}_0(x) \in C^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2) \) such that
\[
\overline{\eta}_k \to \overline{\eta}_0 \text{ in } C^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ as } k \to \infty.
\]
Applying (4.1) and (4.2), we know that
\[
\mu_{i,k} \varepsilon_k^2 = \frac{\mu_{1,k} - \mu_{2,k}}{||\overline{\eta}_k||_{L^\infty}} \overline{\eta}_k
\]
\[
= \frac{b_k}{2 \varepsilon_k^2 (a^*)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|\nabla u_{1,k}|^2 + |\nabla u_{2,k}|^2) dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla (u_{1,k} + u_{2,k}) \cdot \nabla \overline{\eta}_k dx \tag{4.14}
\]
\[
= \frac{\alpha a_k^2}{2 (a^*)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (a_{1,k}^2 + a_{2,k}^2) (a_{1,k}^2 + a_{2,k}^2) \overline{\eta}_k dx.
\]
By the definition of (1.19), we see that
\[
\frac{b_k}{\varepsilon_k} = \frac{a - a^*}{a^*}, \text{ if } a > a^*, \text{ and } \frac{b_k}{\varepsilon_k} \to 0 \text{ as } k \to \infty \text{ if } a = a^*. \tag{4.15}
\]
Thus, let \( k \to \infty \) in (4.5), it follows from (4.6), (4.14) and (4.15) that \( \overline{\eta}_0 \) satisfies
\[
- \Delta \overline{\eta}_0 + (1 - 3Q^2) \overline{\eta}_0 = -\frac{2}{a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Q^3 \overline{\eta}_0 dx Q, \text{ if } a = a^*, \tag{4.16}
\]
and
\[-\Delta \eta_0 + (1 - 3Q^2)\eta_0 = \frac{2(a - a^\ast)}{aa^\ast} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla \cdot \nabla \eta_0 d\mathit{Q} + \frac{2(a - a^\ast)}{aa^\ast} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla \cdot \nabla \eta_0 d\mathit{Q} \]
\[-\frac{2}{a^\ast} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Q^3 \eta_0 d\mathit{Q}, \text{ if } a > a^\ast.\]  
(4.17)

Let \( \Gamma := -\Delta + (1 - 3Q^2), \) and it is easy check that \( \Gamma(Q + x \cdot \nabla \mathit{Q}) = -2\mathit{Q} \) and \( \Gamma(x \cdot \nabla \mathit{Q}) = -2\Delta \mathit{Q}. \) Moreover, recall from [19, 22] that

\[ \ker \Gamma = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathit{Q}}{\partial x_1}, \frac{\partial \mathit{Q}}{\partial x_2} \right\}. \]

Then, (4.16) and (4.17) imply that

\[ \eta_0(x) = d_0(Q + x \cdot \nabla \mathit{Q}) + \sum_{i=1}^2 d_i \frac{\partial \mathit{Q}}{\partial x_i}, \text{ if } a = a^\ast, \]

and

\[ \eta_0(x) = h_0 Q + h_0 x \cdot \nabla \mathit{Q} + \sum_{i=1}^2 h_i \frac{\partial \mathit{Q}}{\partial x_i}, \text{ if } a > a^\ast, \]

where \( d_0, d_1, d_2 \) and \( h_0, h_1, h_2 \) are constants. \( \square \)

**Lemma 4.3.** If \( a \geq a^\ast \) and all assumptions of Theorem 1.4 hold, then

\[ d_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_j}(x \cdot \nabla Q^2) dx - \sum_{i=1}^2 d_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial^2 V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} Q^2 dx = 0, \text{ if } a = a^\ast, \]  
(4.18)

and

\[ h_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_j}(x \cdot \nabla Q^2) dx - \sum_{i=1}^2 h_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial^2 V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} Q^2 dx = 0, \text{ if } a > a^\ast, \]  
(4.19)

where \( V_1(x) \) is given by (1.13) and \( j = 1, 2. \)

**Proof.** Denote

\[ \bar{u}_{i,k}(x) = \sqrt{a^\ast} \varepsilon_{i,k} u_{i,k}(x) \text{ and } \bar{\eta}_k = \frac{\bar{u}_{1,k} - \bar{u}_{2,k}}{||\bar{u}_{1,k} - \bar{u}_{2,k}||_{L^\infty}}, \text{ i.e., } \]

\[ i = 1, 2. \]  
(4.20)

It follows from (4.2) that

\[ \bar{u}_{i,k}(x) = \bar{u}_{i,k}(\varepsilon_{i,k}x + z_{i,k}) \rightarrow Q(x) \text{ uniformly in } x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty. \]  
(4.21)

We claim that, for any \( x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2, \) there exists a small \( \delta > 0 \) such that

\[ \bar{\varepsilon}_k^2 \int_{\partial B_{\delta}(x_0)} |\nabla \bar{\eta}_k|^2 dS + \bar{\varepsilon}_k^2 \int_{\partial B_{\delta}(x_0)} V(x) \bar{\eta}_k^2 dS + \int_{\partial B_{\delta}(x_0)} \bar{\eta}_k^2 dS \leq O(\varepsilon_k) \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty, \]  
(4.22)
Similar to (4.4)–(4.6), it follows from (4.1) that \( \widetilde{u}_{i,k} \) and \( \widetilde{\eta}_k \) satisfy
\[
\begin{align*}
-\frac{\varepsilon_k^2}{a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \widetilde{u}_{i,k}|^2 dx + \frac{\varepsilon_k^2}{a^*} V(x) \Delta \widetilde{u}_{i,k} = \mu_{i,k} \varepsilon_k^2 \widetilde{u}_{i,k} + \frac{a}{a^*} \widetilde{\eta}_k^3, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \; i = 1, 2
\end{align*}
\]
and
\[
\begin{align*}
-\frac{2\varepsilon_k^2}{a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|\nabla \widetilde{u}_{1,k}|^2 + |\nabla \widetilde{u}_{2,k}|^2) dx + \frac{\varepsilon_k^2}{a^*} V(x) \Delta \widetilde{\eta}_k + 2\varepsilon_k^2 V(x) \widetilde{\eta}_k

&- \frac{b_k}{a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla(\widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \widetilde{u}_{2,k}) \cdot \nabla \widetilde{\eta}_k dx \Delta(\widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \widetilde{u}_{2,k}) \\
&= (\mu_{1,k} + \mu_{2,k}) \varepsilon_k^2 \widetilde{\eta}_k + \tilde{g}_k(x) + \tilde{f}_k(x),
\end{align*}
\]
where
\[
\tilde{g}_k(x) = \frac{\varepsilon_k^2}{a^*} \frac{\mu_{1,k} - \mu_{2,k}}{\|\widetilde{u}_{1,k} - \widetilde{u}_{2,k}\|_{L^\infty}} (\widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \widetilde{u}_{2,k}) \text{ and } \tilde{f}_k(x) = \frac{2a}{a^*} (\widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \widetilde{u}_{2,k}) \widetilde{\eta}_k^3.
\]
Moreover,
\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{g}_k(x) &= \frac{\varepsilon_k^2}{a^*} \frac{\mu_{1,k} - \mu_{2,k}}{\|\widetilde{u}_{1,k} - \widetilde{u}_{2,k}\|_{L^\infty}} (\widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \widetilde{u}_{2,k}) \\
&= -\frac{b_k}{2\varepsilon_k^2(a^*)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|\nabla \widetilde{u}_{1,k}|^2 + |\nabla \widetilde{u}_{2,k}|^2) dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla(\widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \widetilde{u}_{2,k}) \nabla \widetilde{\eta}_k dx (\widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \widetilde{u}_{2,k}) \\
&- \frac{a}{2(a^*)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (\nabla \widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \nabla \widetilde{u}_{2,k})(\nabla \widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \nabla \widetilde{u}_{2,k}) \nabla \widetilde{\eta}_k dx (\widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \widetilde{u}_{2,k}).
\end{align*}
\]
Multiplying (4.24) by \( \widetilde{\eta}_k \) and integrating over \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) we have
\[
\begin{align*}
\left( \frac{2\varepsilon_k^2}{a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|\nabla \widetilde{u}_{1,k}|^2 + |\nabla \widetilde{u}_{2,k}|^2) dx \right) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \widetilde{\eta}_k|^2 dx + \frac{b_k}{a^*} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla(\widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \widetilde{u}_{2,k}) \nabla \widetilde{\eta}_k dx \right) \right)^2

&+ 2\varepsilon_k^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x) \widetilde{\eta}_k^2 dx - (\mu_{1,k} + \mu_{2,k}) \varepsilon_k^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widetilde{\eta}_k^2 dx

&= \frac{b_k}{2(a^*)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|\nabla \widetilde{u}_{1,k}|^2 + |\nabla \widetilde{u}_{2,k}|^2) dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla(\widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \widetilde{u}_{2,k}) \nabla \widetilde{\eta}_k dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (\widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \widetilde{u}_{2,k}) \widetilde{\eta}_k dx

&- \frac{a}{2(a^*)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (\nabla \widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \nabla \widetilde{u}_{2,k})(\nabla \widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \nabla \widetilde{u}_{2,k}) \widetilde{\eta}_k dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (\widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \widetilde{u}_{2,k}) \widetilde{\eta}_k dx

&+ \frac{2a}{a^*} \varepsilon_k^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (\nabla \widetilde{u}_{1,k} + \nabla \widetilde{u}_{2,k}) \nabla \widetilde{\eta}_k dx = O(1),
\end{align*}
\]
since \( |\widetilde{\eta}_k| \) is bounded uniformly in \( k \), and \( \widetilde{u}_{i,k} \) decay exponentially as \( |x| \to \infty \), \( i = 1, 2 \). Then, (1.19) and (4.8) mean that
\[
\begin{align*}
\varepsilon_k^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \widetilde{\eta}_k|^2 dx + \varepsilon_k^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x) \widetilde{\eta}_k^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widetilde{\eta}_k^2 dx \leq O(1) \quad \text{as } k \to \infty.
\end{align*}
\]
This and Lemma 4.5 in [4] show that for any \( x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \), there exists a small \( \delta > 0 \) such that
\[
\begin{align*}
\varepsilon_k^2 \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_0)} |\nabla \widetilde{\eta}_k|^2 dS + \varepsilon_k^2 \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_0)} V(x) \widetilde{\eta}_k^2 dS + \int_{\partial B_\delta(x_0)} \widetilde{\eta}_k^2 dS \leq O(1) \quad \text{as } k \to \infty.
\end{align*}
\]
Hence, (4.22) is proved.

Multiplying (4.23) by $\frac{\partial \bar{u}_{i,k}}{\partial x_j}$ and integrating over $B_\delta(z_{1,k})$, where $i, j = 1, 2, j = 1, 2,$ and $\delta$ is given by (4.22), we see that

\[-\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\varepsilon_k} + \frac{b_k}{a^*}\right) \int_{B_\delta(z_{1,k})} |\nabla \bar{u}_{i,k}|^2 dx \right] \int_{B_\delta(z_{1,k})} \Delta \bar{u}_{i,k} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_{i,k}}{\partial x_j} dx + \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\varepsilon_k} \int_{B_\delta(z_{1,k})} V(x) \frac{\partial \bar{u}_{i,k}^2}{\partial x_j} dx \right) + \int_{B_\delta(z_{1,k})} V(x) \frac{\partial \bar{u}_{i,k}^2}{\partial x_j} dx \]

\[-\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\varepsilon_k} + \frac{b_k}{a^*}\right) \int_{B_\delta(z_{1,k})} |\nabla \bar{u}_{i,k}|^2 dx + \frac{a}{4a^*} \int_{B_\delta(z_{1,k})} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_{i,k}^4}{\partial x_j} dx. \quad (4.29)\]

By calculations, we know that

\[
\int_{B_\delta(z_{1,k})} \Delta \bar{u}_{i,k} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_{i,k}}{\partial x_j} dx = \sum_{m=1}^{2} \int_{B_\delta(z_{1,k})} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_{i,k}}{\partial x_m} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_{i,k}}{\partial x_j} dx 
\]

\[
-\left[\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\varepsilon_k} + \frac{b_k}{a^*}\right] \int_{B_\delta(z_{1,k})} |\nabla \bar{u}_{i,k}|^2 dx + \frac{a}{4a^*} \int_{B_\delta(z_{1,k})} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_{i,k}^4}{\partial x_j} dx \quad (4.30)\]

and

\[
\int_{B_\delta(z_{1,k})} V(x) \frac{\partial \bar{u}_{i,k}^2}{\partial x_j} dx = \int_{\partial B_\delta(z_{1,k})} V(x) \bar{u}_{i,k}^2 \nu_j dS - \int_{\partial B_\delta(z_{1,k})} \frac{\partial V(x)}{\partial x_j} \bar{u}_{i,k}^2 dS. \quad (4.31)\]

Then, by (4.29)–(4.31) we have

\[
\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\varepsilon_k} \int_{B_\delta(z_{1,k})} \frac{\partial V(x)}{\partial x_j} \bar{u}_{i,k}^2 dS 
\]

\[
= \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\varepsilon_k} \int_{\partial B_\delta(z_{1,k})} V(x) \bar{u}_{i,k}^2 \nu_j dS - \frac{\mu_k \varepsilon^2}{2} \int_{\partial B_\delta(z_{1,k})} \bar{u}_{i,k}^2 \nu_j dS - \frac{a}{4a^*} \int_{\partial B_\delta(z_{1,k})} \bar{u}_{i,k}^4 \nu_j dS 
\]

\[-\left[\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\varepsilon_k} + \frac{b_k}{a^*}\right] \int_{\partial B_\delta(z_{1,k})} |\nabla \bar{u}_{i,k}|^2 \nu_j dS \right] \int_{\partial B_\delta(z_{1,k})} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_{i,k} \partial \bar{u}_{i,k}^2}{\partial x_j} dS \quad (4.32)\]

Moreover, we have

\[
\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\varepsilon_k} \int_{B_\delta(z_{1,k})} \frac{\partial V(x)}{\partial x_j} (\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k}) \bar{\bar{m}}_k dS = I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 + I_5 + I_6, \quad (4.32)\]

where

\[
I_1 = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\varepsilon_k} \int_{\partial B_\delta(z_{1,k})} V(x)(\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k}) \bar{\bar{m}}_k \nu_j dS. \quad (4.33)\]
\[ I_2 = -\frac{\mu_{1,k} \varepsilon_k^2}{2} \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} (\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k}) \eta_k \nu_j dS - \frac{\varepsilon_k^2 (\mu_{1,k} - \mu_{2,k})}{2 \|u_{1,k} - u_{2,k}\|_{L^\infty}} \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} \bar{u}_{2,k} \nu_j dS, \] (4.34)

\[ I_3 = -\frac{a}{4a^*} \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} (\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k})(\bar{u}_{1,k}^2 + \bar{u}_{2,k}^2) \eta_k \nu_j dS, \] (4.35)

\[ I_4 = -\left( \frac{\varepsilon_k^2}{2} + \frac{b_k}{2a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \bar{u}_{1,k}|^2 dx \right) \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} \nabla (\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k}) \cdot \nabla \eta_k \nu_j dS, \] (4.36)

\[ I_5 = \left( \frac{\varepsilon_k^2}{2} + \frac{b_k}{2a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \bar{u}_{1,k}|^2 dx \right) \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} \nabla (\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k}) \cdot \nabla \eta_k \nu_j dS, \] (4.37)

and

\[ I_6 = -\frac{b_k}{a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla (\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k}) \cdot \nabla \eta_k \nu_j \left[ \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_{2,k}}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial \eta_k}{\partial \nu} dS - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} |\nabla \bar{u}_{2,k}|^2 \nu_j dS \right]. \] (4.38)

Using (4.15) and (4.26), there exists a constant \( C > 0 \), independent of \( k \), such that

\[ \frac{\varepsilon_k^2 \|\mu_{1,k} - \mu_{2,k}\|_{L^\infty}}{\|u_{1,k} - u_{2,k}\|_{L^\infty}} \leq C. \] (4.39)

Then, using the Hölder inequality, we can derive from (4.7), (4.22) and the above estimates that there exists a constant \( C > 0 \), independent of \( k \), such that

\[ |I_1| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_k^2}{2} \left( \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} V(x) \eta_k^2 dS \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} V(x)(\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k})^2 dS \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = o(e^{-\frac{C}{\varepsilon_k}}). \] (4.40)

Similarly, using (4.7), (4.8) and (4.22) again, one can obtain that

\[ |I_2| \leq C \left( \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} (\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k})^2 dS \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} \eta_k^2 dS \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} \bar{u}_{2,k}^2 dS = o(e^{-\frac{C}{\varepsilon_k}}), \] (4.41)

\[ |I_3| \leq C \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} (\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k})(\bar{u}_{1,k}^2 + \bar{u}_{2,k}^2) dS = o(e^{-\frac{C}{\varepsilon_k}}), \] (4.42)

\[ |I_4| \leq o(1) \left( \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} |\nabla \eta_k|^2 dS \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} |\nabla \bar{u}_{1,k}|^2 dS \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left( \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} |\nabla \bar{u}_{2,k}|^2 dS \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = o(e^{-\frac{C}{\varepsilon_k}}), \] (4.43)

\[ |I_5| \leq C \left( \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} |\nabla (\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k})|^2 dS \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} |\nabla \eta_k|^2 dS \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = o(e^{-\frac{C}{\varepsilon_k}}), \] (4.44)

and

\[ |I_6| \leq o(1) \int_{\partial B_d(z_{1,k})} |\nabla \bar{u}_{2,k}|^2 dS = o(e^{-\frac{C}{\varepsilon_k}}). \] (4.45)
Applying (1.22), (1.24) and (4.40)–(4.45), we can deduce from (4.32) that

$$o(e^{-\frac{\epsilon_k^2}{\epsilon_k^r}}) = \frac{\epsilon_k^2}{2} \int_{B_\delta(z_{1,k})} \frac{\partial V(x)}{\partial x_j} (\tilde{u}_{1,k} + \tilde{u}_{2,k}) \eta_k dx$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon_k^4}{2} \int_{B_{\frac{\delta}{\epsilon_k^r}}(0)} \frac{\partial V(\epsilon_k[x + (z_{1,k} - x_1)/\epsilon_k] + x_1)}{\partial \epsilon_k x_j} (\tilde{u}_{1,k} + \tilde{u}_{2,k}) \eta_k dx$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon_k^{p+3}}{2} \int_{B_{\frac{\delta}{\epsilon_k^r}}(0)} \frac{\partial V_1(x + (z_{1,k} - x_1)/\epsilon_k)}{\partial x_j} (\tilde{u}_{1,k} + \tilde{u}_{2,k}) \eta_k dx$$

$$+ \frac{\epsilon_k^4}{2} \int_{B_{\frac{\delta}{\epsilon_k^r}}(0)} W_j(\epsilon_k x + z_{1,k} - x_1)(\tilde{u}_{1,k} + \tilde{u}_{2,k}) \eta_k dx$$

$$= (1 + o(1))\epsilon_k^{p+3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_j} Q\eta_0 dx.$$

Therefore, (4.18) and (4.19) can be obtained by considering the cases $a = a^*$ and $a > a^*$, respectively.

If $a = a^*$, it follows from (1.22), (4.11) and (4.46) that

$$0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_j} Q\eta_0 dx$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_j} Q \left[ d_0(Q + x \cdot \nabla Q) + \sum_{i=1}^2 d_i \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_i} \right] dx$$

$$= d_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_j} Q^2 dx + \frac{d_0}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_j} (x \cdot \nabla Q^2) dx$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 d_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial Q^2}{\partial x_i} dx$$

$$= d_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_j} (x \cdot \nabla Q^2) dx - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 d_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial^2 V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} Q^2 dx,$$

which gives (4.18).
If $a > a^*$, it follows from (1.22), (4.12) and (4.46) that

$$0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_j} Q_0 dx$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_j} Q \left( h_0 Q + \sum_{i=1}^2 h_i \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_i} \right) dx$$

$$= h_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_j} Q^2 dx + \frac{h_0}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left( \partial V_1(x + y_0) \right) (x \cdot \nabla Q^2) dx$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 h_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial Q^2}{\partial x_i} dx$$

$$= \frac{h_0}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_j} (x \cdot \nabla Q^2) dx - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 h_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial^2 V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} Q^2 dx,$$

which gives (4.19).

Finally, we give the proof of Theorem 1.4. □

**Proof of Theorem 1.4.** The key step of proving the theorem is to show that $d_0 = 0$ in (4.18) and $h_0 = h_0 = 0$ in (4.19).

For this purpose, multiplying (4.23) by $(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_{i,k}$ and integrating over $B_0(z_{1,k})$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $\delta > 0$ being small enough as before, then we have

$$- \left( \frac{\epsilon_k^2}{a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \tilde{u}_{i,k}|^2 dx \right) \int_{B_0(z_{1,k})} \Delta \tilde{u}_{i,k} [(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_{i,k}] dx$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_0(z_{1,k})} V(x) [(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_{i,k}^2] dx$$

$$= \frac{\mu_{i,k} \epsilon_k^2}{2} \int_{B_0(z_{1,k})} (x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_{i,k}^2 dx + \frac{\alpha}{4a^*} \int_{B_0(z_{1,k})} (x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_{i,k}^2 dx.$$

Using the integration by parts, we know that

$$T_i \triangleq \int_{B_0(z_{1,k})} \Delta \tilde{u}_{i,k} [(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_{i,k}] dx$$

$$= \int_{\partial B_0(z_{1,k})} \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_{i,k}}{\partial \nu} [(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_{i,k}] dS - \int_{B_0(z_{1,k})} \nabla \tilde{u}_{i,k} \cdot \nabla [(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_{i,k}] dx$$

$$= \int_{\partial B_0(z_{1,k})} \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_{i,k}}{\partial \nu} [(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_{i,k}] dS - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_0(z_{1,k})} [(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_{i,k}]^2 dS,$$

$$\int_{B_0(z_{1,k})} V(x) [(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_{i,k}^2] dx$$

$$= \int_{\partial B_0(z_{1,k})} V(x) [(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_{i,k}^2] dS - \int_{B_0(z_{1,k})} \left[ \nabla V(x) \cdot (x - z_{1,k}) + 2V(x) \tilde{u}_{i,k}^2 \right] dx,$$
\[
\int_{B_{\delta}(z_{1,k})} (x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nabla \overline{u}_{i,k}^2 \, dx = \int_{\partial B_{\delta}(z_{1,k})} [(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nu] \overline{u}_{i,k}^2 \, dS - 2 \int_{B_{\delta}(z_{1,k})} \overline{u}_{i,k}^2 \, dx, \tag{4.50}
\]

and

\[
\int_{B_{\delta}(z_{1,k})} (x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_{i,k}^2 \, dx = \int_{\partial B_{\delta}(z_{1,k})} [(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nu] \tilde{u}_{i,k}^2 \, dS - 2 \int_{B_{\delta}(z_{1,k})} \tilde{u}_{i,k}^2 \, dx. \tag{4.51}
\]

On the other hand, we know from (4.13) that

\[
\mu_{i,k} \epsilon_k^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \overline{u}_{i,k}^2 \, dx = 2a^4 \epsilon_k^2 e_\alpha(b_k) + \frac{b_k}{2a^5} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \overline{u}_{i,k}|^2 \, dx \right)^2 - \frac{a}{2a^5} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \overline{u}_{i,k}^4 \, dx. \tag{4.52}
\]

Then, (4.47)–(4.52) yield that

\[
\begin{align*}
- \left( \epsilon_k^2 + \frac{b_k}{a^5} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \overline{u}_{i,k}|^2 \, dx \right) T_i + \frac{\epsilon_k^2}{2} \int_{\partial B_{\delta}(z_{1,k})} V(x)((x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nu) \overline{u}_{i,k}^2 \, dS \\
- \frac{\epsilon_k^2}{2} \int_{B_{\delta}(z_{1,k})} \nabla V(x) \cdot (x - z_{1,k}) \overline{u}_{i,k}^2 \, dx - \epsilon_k \int_{B_{\delta}(z_{1,k})} V(x) \overline{u}_{i,k}^2 \, dx \\
= \frac{\mu_{i,k} \epsilon_k^2}{2} \int_{\partial B_{\delta}(z_{1,k})} [(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nu] \overline{u}_{i,k}^2 \, dS - \mu_{i,k} \epsilon_k^2 \int_{B_{\delta}(z_{1,k})} \overline{u}_{i,k}^2 \, dx \\
+ \frac{a}{4a^5} \int_{\partial B_{\delta}(z_{1,k})} [(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nu] \overline{u}_{i,k}^2 \, dS - \frac{a}{2a^5} \int_{B_{\delta}(z_{1,k})} \overline{u}_{i,k}^4 \, dx.
\end{align*}
\tag{4.53}
\]

This and (4.10) imply that

\[
K_1 + K_2 + K_3 + K_4 = \frac{b_k}{2a^5} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|\nabla \overline{u}_{1,k}|^2 + |\nabla \overline{u}_{2,k}|^2) \, dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla (\overline{u}_{1,k} + \overline{u}_{2,k}) \cdot \nabla \eta \, dx \\
= \frac{b_k}{2a^5} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|\nabla \overline{u}_{1,k}|^2 + |\nabla \overline{u}_{2,k}|^2) \, dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla (\overline{u}_{1,k} + \overline{u}_{2,k}) \cdot \nabla \eta \, dx \tag{4.54}
\]

\[
= 2(1 + o(1)) b_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla Q \cdot \nabla \eta \, dx.
\]
where
\[
K_1 = \frac{\left( \epsilon_k^2 + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \bar{u}_{1,k}|^2 dx \right) T_1 - \left( \epsilon_k^2 + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \bar{u}_{2,k}|^2 dx \right) T_2}{\|\bar{u}_{1,k} - \bar{u}_{2,k}\|_{L^\infty}}
\]
\[
- \frac{\epsilon_k^2}{2} \int_{\partial B_o(z_{1,k})} V(x)[(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nu)](\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k})\eta_k dS
\]
\[
+ \frac{\mu_1 \epsilon_k^2}{2} \int_{\partial B_o(z_{1,k})} [(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nu]|\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k}|\eta_k dS
\]
\[
+ \frac{\epsilon_k^2 (\mu_1 \mu_2)}{2}\|\bar{u}_{1,k} - \bar{u}_{2,k}\|_{L^\infty} \int_{\partial B_o(z_{1,k})} [(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nu]|\bar{u}_{2,k}|^2 dS
\]
\[
+ \frac{a}{4 \alpha^*} \int_{\partial B_o(z_{1,k})} [(x - z_{1,k}) \cdot \nu](\bar{u}_{1,k}^2 + \bar{u}_{2,k}^2)(\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k})\eta_k dS
\]
\[
+ \frac{a}{2 \alpha^*} \int_{\Omega^2 \setminus B_o(z_{1,k})} (\bar{u}_{1,k}^2 + \bar{u}_{2,k}^2)(\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k})\eta_k dS,
\]
\[
K_2 = \frac{\epsilon_k^2}{2} \int_{B_o(z_{1,k})} [\nabla V(x) \cdot x](\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k})\eta_k dx,
\]
\[
K_3 = -\frac{\epsilon_k^2}{2} \int_{B_o(z_{1,k})} [\nabla V(x) \cdot z_{1,k}](\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k})\eta_k dx,
\]
and
\[
K_4 = \epsilon_k^2 \int_{B_o(z_{1,k})} V(x)(\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k})\eta_k dx.
\]

Using (4.7)–(4.8), (4.22) and (4.39), similar procedure to that of (4.40)–(4.45), we can deduce that
\[
K_1 = o(e^{-\epsilon_k^2}) \text{ as } k \to \infty.
\]  

(4.55)

Moreover, (4.46) indicates that
\[
o(e^{-\epsilon_k^2}) = \frac{\epsilon_k^2}{2} \int_{B_o(z_{1,k})} \frac{\partial V(x)}{\partial x_j} (\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k})\eta_k dx, \quad j = 1, 2,
\]
and hence
\[
K_3 = o(e^{-\epsilon_k^2}) \text{ as } k \to \infty.
\]  

(4.56)

Since \(Z_0\) defined by (1.17) has only one point \(x_1\) by the assumptions of Theorem 1.4, and \(\nabla V_1(x)\)
\[ x = pV_1(x). \] Then, it follows from (1.24) and (4.46) that

\[
K_2 = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \int_{B_{\varepsilon}(z_1, k)} \left[ \nabla V(x - x_1 + x_1) \cdot (x - x_1) \right] (u_{1,k} + \tilde{u}_{2,k}) \eta_h dx \\
+ \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \int_{B_{\varepsilon}(z_1, k)} \left[ \nabla V(x) \cdot x_1 \right] (u_{1,k} + \tilde{u}_{2,k}) \eta_h dx \\
= \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \int_{B_{\varepsilon}(z_1, k)} \left\{ \left[ \nabla V_1(x - x_1) + W(x - x_1) \right] \cdot (x - x_1) \right\} (u_{1,k} + \tilde{u}_{2,k}) \eta_h dx + o(e^{-\frac{C_1}{\varepsilon}}) \quad (4.57)
\]

\[
= \frac{p(1 + o(1))}{2} \varepsilon^{p+4} \int_{B_{\varepsilon}(0)} V_1 \left( x + \frac{z_{1,k} - x_1}{\varepsilon_k} \right) (u_{1,k} + \tilde{u}_{2,k}) \eta_h dx + o(e^{-\frac{C_1}{\varepsilon}})
\]

\[
= p(1 + o(1))\varepsilon^{p+4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0)Q\eta_0 dx,
\]

and

\[
K_4 = \frac{\varepsilon^4}{\varepsilon_k} \int_{B_{\varepsilon}(z_1, k)} \frac{V(\varepsilon_k x + z_{1,k} - x_1 + x_1)}{V_1(\varepsilon_k x + z_{1,k} - x_1)} V_1(\varepsilon_k x + z_{1,k} - x_1) (u_{1,k} + \tilde{u}_{2,k}) \eta_h dx
\]

\[
= \varepsilon^{p+4} \int_{B_{\varepsilon}(0)} \frac{V(\varepsilon_k x + z_{1,k} - x_1 + x_1)}{V_1(\varepsilon_k x + z_{1,k} - x_1)} V_1 \left( x + \frac{z_{1,k} - x_1}{\varepsilon_k} \right) (u_{1,k} + \tilde{u}_{2,k}) \eta_h dx \quad (4.58)
\]

\[
= 2(1 + o(1))\varepsilon^{p+4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0)Q\eta_0 dx,
\]

where \( W(x) = (W_1(x), W_2(x)) \).

Therefore, \( d_0 = 0 \) in (4.18) and \( h_0 = \eta_0 = 0 \) in (4.19) can be obtained by considering the cases of \( a = a^* \) and \( a > a^* \), respectively.
If \( a = a^* \), it follows from (1.13), (1.22) and (4.11) that

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0)Q\mathbf{\eta}_0dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0)Q \left[d_0(Q + x \cdot \nabla Q) + \sum_{i=1}^{2} d_i \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_i} \right] dx
\]

\[
= d_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0)Q(Q + x \cdot \nabla Q)dx + \sum_{i=1}^{2} d_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0) \frac{\partial Q^2}{\partial x_i} dx
\]

\[
= d_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0)Q^2dx + \frac{d_0}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0)(x \cdot \nabla Q^2)dx
\]

\[
- \sum_{i=1}^{2} d_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_i} Q^2 dx
\]

\[
= d_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0)Q^2dx - \frac{d_0}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Q^2[2V_1(x + y_0) + x \cdot \nabla V_1(x + y_0)]dx
\]

\[
= \frac{pd_0}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0)Q^2dx + \frac{d_0}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Q^2[y_0 \cdot \nabla V_1(x + y_0)]dx
\]

\[
= -\frac{pd_0\lambda_0}{2}. \quad (4.59)
\]

where \( \lambda_0 \) is given by (1.16). Moreover, (4.11) implies that

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla Q \cdot \nabla \mathbf{\eta}_0dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla Q \cdot \nabla \left[d_0(Q + x \cdot \nabla Q) + \sum_{i=1}^{2} d_i \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_i} \right] dx
\]

\[
= d_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla Q|^2 dx + d_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla Q \cdot \nabla (x \cdot \nabla Q)dx + \sum_{i=1}^{2} d_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla Q \cdot \nabla \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_i} dx
\]

\[
= a^*d_0. \quad (4.60)
\]

Therefore, for the case of \( a = a^* \), we see from (1.19), (4.54)–(4.60) that

\[
o(e^{-\frac{c_k}{a^*}}) = \frac{b_k}{2a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|\nabla \bar{u}_{1,k}|^2 + |\nabla \bar{u}_{2,k}|^2)dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla (\bar{u}_{1,k} + \bar{u}_{2,k}) \cdot \nabla \eta_k dx - K_2 - K_4
\]

\[
= pd_0\lambda_0(1 + o(1))\bar{\epsilon}_{k}^{p+4} + \frac{p^2d_0\lambda_0}{2}(1 + o(1))\bar{\epsilon}_{k}^{p+4} + pd_0\lambda_0(1 + o(1))\bar{\epsilon}_{k}^{p+4}
\]

\[
= \frac{pd_0\lambda_0(p + 4)}{2}(1 + o(1))\bar{\epsilon}_{k}^{p+4}. \quad (4.61)
\]
On the other hand, if \( a > a^* \), it follows from (1.13), (1.22) and (4.12) that

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0) Q \, \eta_0 \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0) Q \left( h_0 Q + \overline{h}_0 x \cdot \nabla Q + \sum_{i=1}^{2} h_i \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_i} \right) dx
\]

\[
= h_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0) Q^2 \, dx + \frac{\overline{h}_0}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0) (x \cdot \nabla Q^2) \, dx
\]

\[
- \sum_{i=1}^{2} h_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_i} Q^2 \, dx
\]

\[
= h_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0) Q^2 \, dx + \frac{\overline{h}_0}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Q^2 [V_1(x + y_0) + x \cdot \nabla V_1(x + y_0)] \, dx
\]

\[
= (h_0 - \overline{h}_0) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0) Q^2 \, dx - \frac{\overline{h}_0}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Q^2 [(x + y_0) \cdot \nabla V_1(x + y_0)] \, dx
\]

\[
+ \frac{\overline{h}_0}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Q^2[y_0 \cdot \nabla V_1(x + y_0)] \, dx
\]

\[
= \frac{2h_0 - 2\overline{h}_0 - \overline{p} \overline{h}_0}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1(x + y_0) Q^2 \, dx = \frac{(2h_0 - 2\overline{h}_0 - \overline{p} \overline{h}_0) \lambda_0}{2}.
\]

Moreover, (4.12) implies that

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla Q \cdot \nabla \eta_0 \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla Q \cdot \nabla \left[ h_0 Q + \overline{h}_0 x \cdot \nabla Q + \sum_{i=1}^{2} h_i \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_i} \right] \, dx
\]

\[
= h_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla Q^2 \, dx + \overline{h}_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla Q \cdot \nabla (x \cdot \nabla Q) \, dx + \sum_{i=1}^{2} h_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla Q \cdot \nabla \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_i} \, dx \tag{4.63}
\]

\[
= a^* h_0.
\]

Hence, for the case of \( a > a^* \), we see from (1.19), (4.54)–(4.58) and (4.62)–(4.63) that

\[
\alpha (e^{-\frac{K_1}{2a}}) = \frac{b_k}{2a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|\nabla u_{1,k}|^2 + |\nabla u_{2,k}|^2) \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla (u_{1,k} + u_{2,k}) \cdot \nabla \overline{v}_k \, dx - K_2 - K_4
\]

\[
= 2h_0 (a - a^*) (1 + o(1)) \varepsilon_k^2 - \frac{(2h_0 - 2\overline{h}_0 - \overline{p} \overline{h}_0) \lambda_0}{2} (1 + o(1)) \varepsilon_k^{p+4} \tag{4.64}
\]

\[
= 2h_0 (a - a^*) (1 + o(1)) \varepsilon_k^2.
\]

So, \( d_0 = h_0 = 0 \) follows from (4.61) and (4.64).

Moreover, for the case of \( a > a^* \), it follows from (4.17), (4.63) and \( h_0 = 0 \) that \( \overline{v}_0 \) satisfies (4.16). Hence, \( \overline{v}_0 \) must be of the form of (4.11) and \( h_0 = \overline{h}_0 = 0 \). Particularly, using (4.18) and (4.19), we know that

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{2} d_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial^2 V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} Q^2 \, dx = 0,
\]
and
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{2} h_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\partial^2 V_1(x + y_0)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} Q^2 \, dx = 0. \]

This indicates that \( d_1 = d_2 = 0 \) and \( h_1 = h_2 = 0 \) due to the non-degeneracy assumption (1.22), hence \( \eta_0 \equiv 0 \) for \( a \geq a^* \).

On the other hand, if \( a \geq a^* \), we claim that \( \eta_0 \equiv 0 \) can not occur. Indeed, let \( y_k \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) be the maximum point of \( \eta_k \), where \( \| \eta_k \|_{L^\infty} = 1 \). Applying the maximum principle to (4.5), we see that \( |y_k| \leq C \) for all \( k \) due to the exponential decay as (4.7). Therefore, (4.10) implies that \( \eta_0 \neq 0 \) on \( \mathbb{R}^2 \). So, our assumption that \( u_{1,k} \neq u_{2,k} \) is false, and we complete the proof of Theorem 1.4. □
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