

# AN EXAMPLE IN THE VANISHING DISCOUNT PROBLEM FOR MONOTONE SYSTEMS OF HAMILTON-JACOBI EQUATIONS

HITOSHI ISHII

**ABSTRACT.** In recent years, there have been many contributions to the vanishing discount problem for Hamilton-Jacobi equations. In the case of the scalar equation, B. Ziliotto [Convergence of the solutions of the discounted Hamilton-Jacobi equation: a counterexample. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 128 (2019), 330-338] has given an example of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation having non-convex Hamiltonian in the gradient variable, for which the full convergence of the solutions does not hold as the discount factor tends to zero. We give an example of the nonlinear monotone system of Hamilton-Jacobi equations having convex Hamiltonians in the gradient variable, for which the whole family convergence of the solutions does not hold.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Proof of Theorem 2	6
Acknowledgments	15
References	15

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the system of Hamilton-Jacobi equations

$$(1) \quad \begin{cases} \lambda u_1(x) + H_1(Du_1(x)) + B_1(u_1(x), u_2(x)) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{T}^n, \\ \lambda u_2(x) + H_2(Du_2(x)) + B_2(u_1(x), u_2(x)) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{T}^n, \end{cases}$$

where  $\lambda > 0$  is a given constant, called the discount factor, and the functions  $H_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $B_i : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , with  $i = 1, 2$ , are given continuous functions.

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35B40, 35D40, 35F50, 49L25 .

*Key words and phrases.* systems of Hamilton-Jacobi equations, vanishing discount, full convergence.

In a recent paper [5], the authors have investigated the vanishing discount problem for a nonlinear monotone system of Hamilton-Jacobi equations

$$(2) \quad \begin{cases} \lambda u_1(x) + G_1(x, Du_1(x), u_1(x), u_2(x), \dots, u_m(x)) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{T}^n, \\ \vdots \\ \lambda u_m(x) + G_m(x, Du_m(x), u_1(x), u_2(x), \dots, u_m(x)) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{T}^n, \end{cases}$$

and established under some hypotheses on  $G_i \in C(\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m)$  that, when  $u^\lambda = (u_1^\lambda, \dots, u_m^\lambda) \in C(\mathbb{T}^n)^m$  denoting the (viscosity) solution of (2), the whole family  $(u^\lambda)_{\lambda>0}$  converges in  $C(\mathbb{T}^n)^m$  to some  $u^0 \in C(\mathbb{T}^n)^m$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0+$ . The constant  $\lambda > 0$  in the above system is the so-called discount factor.

The hypotheses on  $G_i$  are the convexity, coercivity, and monotonicity of  $G_i$  as well as the solvability of (2), with  $\lambda = 0$ . Here the convexity of  $G_i$  is meant that the functions  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \ni (p, u) \mapsto G_i(x, p, u)$  are convex. We refer to [5] for the precise statements of the hypotheses.

Before [5], there have been many contributions to the question about the full convergence in the vanishing discount problem, which we refer to [1, 3–8] and the references therein.

In the case of the scalar equation, B. Ziliotto [9] has recently shown an example of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation having non-convex Hamiltonian in the gradient variable for which the whole family convergence does not hold.

Our purpose in this paper is that, by adapting the idea of Ziliotto [9] to the system (2), we give an example of  $B_i$  such that, if  $H_1(0) = H_2(0) = 0$ , then the solutions of the system (2), with  $\lambda > 0$ , are bounded but do not converge to a single point as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0+$ .

Motivated by [9], we fix  $d > 1$ , set

$$\gamma = \frac{d}{1+d},$$

choose  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  so that

$$\gamma + 4^{-K} < 1,$$

and write

$$\mathbb{I} = \{1, 2\}, \quad \mathbb{N}_K = \{k \in \mathbb{N} : k \geq K\}, \quad \mathcal{A} = \{\gamma + 4^{-k} : k \in \mathbb{N}_K\} \cup \{\gamma\}, \quad \mathcal{B} = \{0, 1\},$$

and set for  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} C(\alpha, \beta) &= (c_{ij}(\alpha, \beta))_{i,j \in \mathbb{I}} \\ &:= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha + \beta - 2\alpha\beta & -(\alpha + \beta - 2\alpha\beta) \\ -(\alpha + \beta - 2\alpha\beta) & \alpha + \beta - 2\alpha\beta \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we define  $L_i : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , with  $i \in \mathbb{I}$ , by

$$L_1(\alpha, \beta) = \alpha\beta + d^2(1 - \alpha)(1 - \beta), \quad L_2(\alpha, \beta) = -\alpha\beta - d^2(1 - \alpha)(1 - \beta).$$

Note that  $\mathcal{A} \subset (0, 1)$  and  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  are compact subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$  and that for all  $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$(3) \quad \begin{cases} c_{11}(\alpha, \beta) + c_{12}(\alpha, \beta) = c_{21}(\alpha, \beta) + c_{22}(\alpha, \beta) = 0, \\ c_{11}(\alpha, \beta) = c_{22}(\alpha, \beta) > 0 \quad \text{if } (\alpha, \beta) \in (0, 1) \times [0, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Let  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ . Consider the problem of finding  $u = (u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  such that

$$(4) \quad \begin{cases} \lambda u_1 + B_1(u_1, u_2) = 0, \\ \lambda u_2 + B_2(u_1, u_2) = 0. \end{cases}$$

where  $B_i : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , with  $i \in \mathbb{I}$ , are the continuous functions given by

$$(5) \quad B_i(u_1, u_2) = \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} (c_{i1}(\alpha, \beta)u_1 + c_{i2}(\alpha, \beta)u_2 - L_i(\alpha, \beta)).$$

For later convenience, we set for  $(i, \alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{I} \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$  and  $(u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ ,

$$b_i(\alpha, \beta, u_1, u_2) = c_{i1}(\alpha, \beta)u_1 + c_{i2}(\alpha, \beta)u_2 - L_i(\alpha, \beta).$$

It is clear that the functions  $b_i$  are continuous on  $[0, 1] \times [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ .

Although our main concern is the system (4), for the argument below we need to treat a more general form of (4), that is, the system

$$(6) \quad \begin{cases} \lambda u_1 + A_1(u_1, u_2) = g_1, \\ \lambda u_2 + A_2(u_1, u_2) = g_2, \end{cases}$$

where  $(g_1, g_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  is a given vector,  $A_i$ , with  $i \in \mathbb{I}$ , are defined by

$$A_i(u_1, u_2) = \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_i} \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}_i} b_i(\alpha, \beta, u_1, u_2),$$

and  $\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{B}_i$ , with  $i \in \mathbb{I}$ , are given compact subsets of  $[0, 1]$ . If we take  $g_i = 0$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}$ , and  $\mathcal{B}_i = \mathcal{B}$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{I}$ , (6) is exactly the system (4).

We note that the mapping  $A : (u_1, u_2) \mapsto (A_1(u_1, u_2), A_2(u_1, u_2))$  is monotone in the sense that for any  $(u_1, u_2), (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , if  $u_j - v_j \geq u_k - v_k$ , where  $j \neq k$ , then  $A_j(u_1, u_2) \geq A_j(v_1, v_2)$ . Indeed, assuming, for instance, that  $u_1 - v_1 \geq u_2 - v_2$ , we observe that for any  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1$  and some  $\bar{\beta}(\alpha) \in \mathcal{B}_1$ ,

$$A_1(u_1, u_2) \geq \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} b_1(\alpha, \beta, u_1, u_2) = b_1(\alpha, \bar{\beta}(\alpha), u_1, u_2),$$

while for some  $\bar{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}_1$ ,

$$A_1(v_1, v_2) = \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} b_1(\bar{\alpha}, \beta, v_1, v_2) \leq b_1(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}(\bar{\alpha}), v_1, v_2).$$

Combining the above two, using (3), and writing  $\bar{\beta} = \bar{\beta}(\bar{\alpha})$ , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(u_1, u_2) - A_1(v_1, v_2) &\geq b_1(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}, u_1, u_2) - b_1(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}, v_1, v_2) \\ &= c_{11}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})(u_1 - v_1) + c_{12}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})(u_2 - v_2) \\ &\geq c_{11}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})(u_1 - v_1) + c_{12}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})(u_1 - v_1) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that  $A$  is monotone.

With the fact that  $A$  is monotone, the following proposition is well-known.

**Proposition 1.** *There exists a unique solution  $(u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  of (6). Moreover, if  $(v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  satisfies*

$$(7) \quad \lambda v_1 + A_1(v_1, v_2) \leq g_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda v_2 + A_2(v_1, v_2) \leq g_2,$$

(resp.,

$$(8) \quad \lambda v_1 + A_1(v_1, v_2) \geq g_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda v_2 + A_2(v_1, v_2) \geq g_2),$$

then  $v_1 \leq u_1$  and  $v_2 \leq u_2$  (resp.,  $u_1 \leq v_1$  and  $u_2 \leq v_2$ ).

For completeness, we provide below proof of the above proposition.

*Proof.* We first show the second claim in Proposition 1, that is, the comparison claim. Let  $(u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  be a solution of (6) and let  $(v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  satisfy either (7) or (8).

We treat only the case of (7); the proof of the other case is similar. We argue by contradiction, and hence suppose that either  $v_1 > u_1$  or  $v_2 > u_2$ . Assume, for instance, that  $v_1 - u_1 \geq v_2 - u_2$ . By the monotonicity of  $A$ , we have  $A_1(v_1, v_2) \geq A_1(u_1, u_2)$ . Hence, by (6) and (7), we deduce that

$$0 \geq \lambda(v_1 - u_1) + A_1(v_1, v_2) - A_1(u_1, u_2) \geq \lambda(v_1 - u_1),$$

which contradicts that  $v_1 > u_1$ . Thus, we have  $v_1 \leq u_1$  and  $v_2 \leq u_2$ . The uniqueness of the solution of (6) is now evident.

Next, we show that there exists a solution of (6). We choose a constant  $R > 0$  such that  $\max_{i \in \mathbb{I}} (\|L_i\|_\infty + |g_i|) \leq \lambda R$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  denotes the sup-norm, and deduce with the help of (3) that  $(v_1, v_2) = -(R, R)$  (resp.,  $(v_1, v_2) = (R, R)$ ) satisfies (7) (resp., (8)). It is easily seen that

$A : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is Lipschitz continuous. Let  $M \geq 0$  be a Lipschitz constant of  $A$ , and consider the problem of finding  $(u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  that satisfies

$$(9) \quad (\lambda + M)u_1 + A_1(u_1, u_2) = f_1 \quad \text{and} \quad (\lambda + M)u_2 + A_2(u_1, u_2) = f_2,$$

where  $(f_1, f_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  is a fixed vector. By the Banach fixed-point theorem, (9) has a unique solution.

We define inductively a sequence of points  $(u_1^{(j)}, u_2^{(j)}) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , with  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , by setting  $(u_1^{(1)}, u_2^{(1)}) = -(R, R)$  and, when  $(u_1^{(j-1)}, u_2^{(j-1)})$  is given, solving (9) for  $(u_1, u_2)$ , with

$$(f_1, f_2) = (g_1, g_2) + M(u_1^{(j-1)}, u_2^{(j-1)}),$$

to set  $(u_1^{(j)}, u_2^{(j)}) := (u_1, u_2)$ .

Note that  $(v_1, v_2) = (R, R)$  (resp.,  $(v_1, v_2) = -(R, R)$ ) satisfies

$$(\lambda + M)v_1 + A_1(v_1, v_2) \geq g_1 + MR \quad \text{and} \quad (\lambda + M)v_2 + A_2(v_1, v_2) \geq g_2 + MR,$$

$$(\text{resp.}, \quad (\lambda + M)v_1 + A_1(v_1, v_2) \leq g_1 - MR \quad \text{and} \quad (\lambda + M)v_2 + A_2(v_1, v_2) \leq g_2 - MR. )$$

Applying the comparison assertion of Proposition 1, with  $\lambda$  and  $g_i$  replaced respectively by  $\lambda + M$  and  $g_i + Mu_i^{(1)}$ , we obtain  $-R \leq u_1^{(2)} \leq R$  and  $-R \leq u_2^{(2)} \leq R$ . It is easily seen by induction that  $-R \leq u_1^{(j)} \leq R$  and  $-R \leq u_2^{(j)} \leq R$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Moreover, if we assume that  $u_1^{(j+1)} \geq u_1^{(j)}$  and  $u_2^{(j+1)} \geq u_2^{(j)}$  for some  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , then

$$(\lambda + M)u_1^{(j+2)} + A_1(u_1^{(j+2)}, u_2^{(j+2)}) = g_1 + Mu_1^{(j+1)} \geq g_1 + Mu_1^{(j)},$$

$$(\lambda + M)u_2^{(j+2)} + A_2(u_1^{(j+2)}, u_2^{(j+2)}) = g_2 + Mu_2^{(j+1)} \geq g_2 + Mu_2^{(j)},$$

and, by the comparison argument as above, we deduce that  $u_1^{(j+2)} \geq u_1^{(j+1)}$  and  $u_2^{(j+2)} \geq u_2^{(j+1)}$ . By induction, we conclude that  $u_1^{(j+1)} \geq u_1^{(j)}$  and  $u_2^{(j+1)} \geq u_2^{(j)}$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ .

We now know that the sequences  $(u_1^{(j)})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(u_2^{(j)})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  are convergent. Let  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  denote the respective limits, and we note that

$$(\lambda + M)u_1 + A_1(u_1, u_2) = Mu_1 \quad \text{and} \quad (\lambda + M)u_2 + A_2(u_1, u_2) = Mu_2,$$

to conclude that  $(u_1, u_2)$  is a solution of (6). □

We note that if  $(X_\lambda, Y_\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  is the unique solution of (4) and if  $H_1(0) = H_2(0) = 0$ , the pair of constant functions  $u_1(x) = X_\lambda$  and  $u_2(x) = Y_\lambda$  is a solution of (1). As is well-known (see, for instance, [5] and the references therein), (1) has a unique (viscosity) solution, and hence, the pair  $(X_\lambda, Y_\lambda)$  is the unique solution of (1).

The main result of this paper is the following two theorems.

**Theorem 2.** *For any  $\lambda > 0$ , let  $(X_\lambda, Y_\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  be the solution of (4). Then (i) the set of points  $(X_\lambda, Y_\lambda)$ , with  $\lambda > 0$ , is bounded in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . (ii) We have*

$$\liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} X_\lambda \leq \frac{d}{2} < \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} X_\lambda, \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} Y_\lambda \leq -\frac{d}{2} < \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} Y_\lambda.$$

*In particular, the family of the pairs  $(X_\lambda, Y_\lambda)$  does not converge as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0+$ .*

As noted before the theorem, the following is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.

**Theorem 3.** *Assume that  $H_1(0) = H_2(0) = 0$ . For any  $\lambda > 0$ , let  $(u_{\lambda,1}, u_{\lambda,2})$  be the (viscosity) solution of (1). Then, the functions  $u_{\lambda,i}$  are constants, the family of the points  $(u_{\lambda,1}, u_{\lambda,2})$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  is bounded, and it does not converge as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0+$ .*

Notice that the convexity of  $H_i$  in the above theorem is irrelevant, and, for example, one may take  $H_i(p) = |p|^2$  for  $i \in \mathbb{I}$ , which are convex functions.

We remark that a claim similar to Theorem 3 is valid when one replaces  $H_i(p)$  by degenerate elliptic operators  $F_i(p, M)$  (see [2] for an overview on the viscosity solution approach to fully nonlinear degenerate elliptic equations), where  $M$  is the variable corresponding to the Hessian matrices of unknown functions.

In the next and final section, we give the proof of Theorem 2.

## 2. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

This section is entirely devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.

For any  $\lambda > 0$ , let  $(X_\lambda, Y_\lambda)$  denote the solution of (4).

*Proof of Theorem 2, (i).* We show first that  $(d/2, -d/2)$  is a solution of

$$B_1(u_1, u_2) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad B_2(u_1, u_2) = 0.$$

To see this, we observe that for any  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} b_1(\alpha, 0, d/2, -d/2) &= (d + d^2)(\alpha - \gamma), \\ b_1(\alpha, 1, d/2, -d/2) &= -(1 + d)(\alpha - \gamma), \\ b_2(\alpha, 0, d/2, -d/2) &= -(d + d^2)(\alpha - \gamma), \\ b_2(\alpha, 1, d/2, -d/2) &= (1 + d)(\alpha - \gamma), \end{aligned}$$

and hence, we get

$$B_1(d/2, -d/2) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad B_2(d/2, -d/2) = 0.$$

By (3), we see that  $B_i(u_1 + r, u_2 + r) = B_i(u_1, u_2)$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{I}$ ,  $(u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ . Hence, we have

$$B_i(d, 0) = B_i(0, -d) = 0 \quad \text{for } i \in \mathbb{I},$$

which shows that for any  $\lambda > 0$ , if  $(v_1, v_2) = (d, 0)$  (resp.,  $(v_1, v_2) = (0, -d)$ ) satisfies

$$\lambda v_i + B_i(v_1, v_2) \geq 0 \quad (\text{resp.}, \quad \lambda v_i + B_i(v_1, v_2) \leq 0) \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathbb{I}.$$

By the comparison assertion of Proposition 1, we deduce that

$$0 \leq X_\lambda \leq d \quad \text{and} \quad -d \leq Y_\lambda \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } \lambda > 0,$$

which proves that the set of  $(X_\lambda, Y_\lambda)$ , with  $\lambda > 0$ , is bounded in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.** *We have*

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} (X_\lambda - Y_\lambda) = d.$$

*Proof.* Set  $Z_\lambda = X_\lambda - Y_\lambda$  and

$$B(u) = \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} (c_{11}(\alpha, \beta)u - L_1(\alpha, \beta)) - \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} (-c_{22}(\alpha, \beta)u - L_2(\alpha, \beta)).$$

Noting that for any  $(u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ ,

$$B_1(u_1, u_2) = \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} (c_{11}(\alpha, \beta)(u_1 - u_2) - L_1(\alpha, \beta)),$$

$$B_2(u_1, u_2) = \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} (-c_{22}(\alpha, \beta)(u_1 - u_2) - L_1(\alpha, \beta)),$$

we find that  $B_1(u_1, u_2) - B_2(u_1, u_2) = B(u_1 - u_2)$  for all  $(u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , and

$$(10) \quad \lambda Z_\lambda + B(Z_\lambda) = 0.$$

Since  $c_{11}(\alpha, \beta) = c_{22}(\alpha, \beta) = \alpha + \beta - 2\alpha\beta > (\alpha - \beta)^2 > 0$  for all  $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ , the function  $B$  is (strictly) increasing on  $\mathbb{R}$ .

Thanks to the claim (i) of Theorem 2, the family  $(Z_\lambda)_{\lambda > 0}$  has a limit point  $Z_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0+$ . It follows from (10) and the continuity of  $B$  that

$$B(Z_0) = 0.$$

Since  $B$  is increasing,  $Z_0$  is a unique zero of the function  $B$ , which implies

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} Z_\lambda = Z_0.$$

On the other hand, the proof of (i) of Theorem 2 shows that  $B_1(d/2, -d/2) = B_2(d/2, -d/2) = 0$ , which implies that  $B(d) = 0$  and  $Z_0 = d$ . Thus, we conclude that  $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} Z_\lambda = d$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2, (ii).* By Lemma 4, we have

$$\liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} Y_\lambda = \liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} X_\lambda + \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} (Y_\lambda - X_\lambda) = \liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} X_\lambda - d.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} Y_\lambda = \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} X_\lambda - d.$$

Hence, we only need to prove that

$$(11) \quad \liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} X_\lambda \leq \frac{d}{2} < \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} X_\lambda.$$

We fix  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ , and consider the linear problem

$$(12) \quad \begin{cases} \lambda X + c_{11}(\alpha_1, \beta_1)X + c_{12}(\alpha_1, \beta_1)Y - L_1(\alpha_1, \beta_1) = 0, \\ \lambda Y + c_{21}(\alpha_2, \beta_2)X + c_{22}(\alpha_2, \beta_2)Y - L_2(\alpha_2, \beta_2) = 0. \end{cases}$$

When  $(\beta_1, \beta_2) = (0, 0)$ , (12) reads

$$\begin{cases} \lambda X = -\alpha_1 X + \alpha_1 Y + d^2(1 - \alpha_1), \\ \lambda Y = \alpha_2 X - \alpha_2 Y - d^2(1 - \alpha_2). \end{cases}$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} X &= -\frac{d^2((\alpha_1 - 1)\lambda + \alpha_1 - \alpha_2)}{\lambda(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \lambda)}, \\ Y &= \frac{d^2((\alpha_2 - 1)\lambda - \alpha_1 + \alpha_2)}{\lambda(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \lambda)}. \end{aligned}$$

When  $(\beta_1, \beta_2) = (0, 1)$ , we have

$$\begin{cases} \lambda X = -\alpha_1 X + \alpha_1 Y + d^2(1 - \alpha_1), \\ \lambda Y = (1 - \alpha_2)X - (1 - \alpha_2)Y - \alpha_2, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \frac{-\alpha_1 \alpha_2 + d^2((- \alpha_1 + 1)\lambda + \alpha_1 \alpha_2 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 + 1)}{\lambda(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 + \lambda + 1)}, \\ Y &= \frac{-\alpha_2 \lambda - \alpha_1 \alpha_2 + d^2(\alpha_1 \alpha_2 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 + 1)}{\lambda(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 + \lambda + 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

When  $(\beta_1, \beta_2) = (1, 0)$ ,

$$\begin{cases} \lambda X = -(1 - \alpha_1)X + (1 - \alpha_1)Y + \alpha_1, \\ \lambda Y = \alpha_2 X - \alpha_2 Y - d^2(1 - \alpha_2), \end{cases}$$

and

$$X = \frac{\alpha_1 \lambda + \alpha_1 \alpha_2 + d^2(-\alpha_1 \alpha_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - 1)}{\lambda(-\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \lambda + 1)},$$



$$Y = \frac{-\alpha_1\alpha_2 + d^2((- \alpha_2 + 1)\lambda + \alpha_1\alpha_2 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 + 1)}{\lambda(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \lambda - 1)}.$$

When  $(\beta_1, \beta_2) = (1, 1)$ , we have

$$\begin{cases} \lambda X = -(1 - \alpha_1)X + (1 - \alpha_1)Y + \alpha_1, \\ \lambda Y = (1 - \alpha_2)X - (1 - \alpha_2)Y - \alpha_2, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \frac{\alpha_1\lambda + \alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{\lambda(-\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 + \lambda + 2)}, \\ Y &= \frac{-\alpha_1 + \alpha_2\lambda + \alpha_2}{\lambda(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - \lambda - 2)}. \end{aligned}$$

In what follows, for the solution  $(X, Y)$  of (12), we write

$$X = X(\lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2), \quad Y = Y(\lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2).$$

We set

$$\theta = \frac{4(d+1)}{d-1},$$

and, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\rho_n = 4^{-n-K}, \quad \lambda_n = \theta 4^{-n-K} = \theta \rho_n.$$

We write

$$p(\lambda) = \gamma + \theta^{-1}\lambda \quad \text{for } \lambda > 0,$$

and note that  $p(\lambda_n) = \gamma + \rho_n \in \mathcal{A}$  and, since  $d^2(\gamma^2 - 2\gamma + 1) - \gamma^2 = 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d^2(p(\lambda_n)^2 - 2p(\lambda_n) + 1) - p(\lambda_n)^2 &= d^2(2(\gamma - 1)\rho_n + \rho_n^2) - 2\gamma\rho_n - \rho_n^2 \\ &= -2d\rho_n + \rho_n^2(d^2 - 1). \end{aligned}$$

We compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X(\lambda_n, p(\lambda_n), p(\lambda_n), 0, 0) &= - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d^2\lambda_n(p(\lambda_n) - 1)}{\lambda_n(2p(\lambda_n) + \lambda_n)} = - \frac{d^2(\gamma - 1)}{2\gamma} = \frac{d}{2}, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X(\lambda_n, p(\lambda_n), p(\lambda_n), 0, 1) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-p(\lambda_n)^2 + d^2((1 - p(\lambda_n))\lambda_n + p(\lambda_n)^2 - 2p(\lambda_n) + 1)}{\lambda_n} \\ &= -d^2(\gamma - 1) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d^2(p(\lambda_n)^2 - 2p(\lambda_n) + 1) - p(\lambda_n)^2}{\theta\rho_n} \\ &= \frac{d^2}{1+d} - 2\theta^{-1}d = \frac{d}{2}, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X(\lambda_n, p(\lambda_n), p(\lambda_n), 1, 0) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p(\lambda_n)\lambda_n + p(\lambda_n)^2 - d^2(p(\lambda_n)^2 - 2p(\lambda_n) + 1)}{\lambda_n} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \gamma - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d^2(p(\lambda_n)^2 - 2p(\lambda_n) + 1) - p(\lambda_n)^2}{\theta \rho_n} \\
&= \gamma + 2\theta^{-1}d = \frac{d}{2},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X(\lambda_n, p(\lambda_n), p(\lambda_n), 1, 1) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p(\lambda_n)\lambda_n}{\lambda_n(-2p(\lambda_n) + \lambda_n + 2)} = \frac{\gamma}{2(1 - \gamma)} = \frac{d}{2}.$$

We set  $(X_n, Y_n) := (X_{\lambda_n}, Y_{\lambda_n})$ , so that

$$\lambda_n X_n + B_1(X_n, Y_n) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_n Y_n + B_2(X_n, Y_n) = 0.$$

We have for any  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$\lambda_n X_n + \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} b_1(\alpha, \beta, X_n, Y_n) \leq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_n Y_n + \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} b_2(\alpha, \beta, X_n, Y_n) \leq 0,$$

and, in particular,

$$\lambda_n X_n + \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} b_1(p(\lambda_n), \beta, X_n, Y_n) \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_n Y_n + \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} b_2(p(\lambda_n), \beta, X_n, Y_n) \leq 0.$$

We select  $\beta_{n,1}, \beta_{n,2} \in \mathcal{B}$  so that

$$\lambda_n X_n + b_1(p(\lambda_n), \beta_{n,1}, X_n, Y_n) \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_n Y_n + b_2(p(\lambda_n), \beta_{n,2}, X_n, Y_n) \leq 0.$$

The comparison assertion of Proposition 1, with  $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A}_2 = \{p(\lambda_n)\}$  and  $\mathcal{B}_i = \{\beta_{n,i}\}$ , yields

$$X_n \leq X(\lambda_n, p(\lambda_n), p(\lambda_n), \beta_{n,1}, \beta_{n,2}) \quad \text{and} \quad Y_n \leq Y(\lambda_n, p(\lambda_n), p(\lambda_n), \beta_{n,1}, \beta_{n,2}).$$

Combining all together, we find that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n \leq \frac{d}{2}.$$

In particular, we have

$$(13) \quad \liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} X_\lambda \leq \frac{d}{2}.$$

To proceed the proof, we check the monotonicity of  $X(\lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2)$  as a function of  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$ .

We use the notation: for  $Z = X$  or  $Z = Y$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_1 Z(\lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2) &= \partial_t Z(\lambda, t, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2) \Big|_{t=\alpha_1}, \\
\partial_2 Z(\lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2) &= \partial_t Z(\lambda, \alpha_1, t, \beta_1, \beta_2) \Big|_{t=\alpha_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By simple computation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (14) \quad & \partial_1 X(\lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, 0, 0) = -\frac{d^2(\lambda+2)(\lambda+\alpha_2)}{\lambda(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\lambda)^2} < 0, \\
 & \partial_2 X(\lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, 0, 0) = \frac{d^2\alpha_1(\lambda+2)}{\lambda(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\lambda)^2} > 0, \\
 & \partial_1 X(\lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, 0, 1) = -\frac{(\lambda+1-\alpha_2)(d^2(\lambda+2-\alpha_2)+\alpha_2)}{\lambda(\alpha_1-\alpha_2+\lambda+1)^2} < 0, \\
 & \partial_2 X(\lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, 0, 1) = -\frac{\alpha_1(\lambda+d^2(1-\alpha_1)+\alpha_1+1)}{\lambda(\alpha_1-\alpha_2+\lambda+1)^2} < 0, \\
 & \partial_1 X(\lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, 1, 0) = \frac{(\lambda+\alpha_2)(\lambda+d^2(1-\alpha_2)+\alpha_2+d^2+1)}{\lambda(\alpha_1-\alpha_2+\lambda+1)^2} > 0, \\
 & \partial_2 X(\lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, 1, 0) = \frac{(1-\alpha_1)(d^2(\lambda-\alpha_1+2)+\alpha_1)}{\lambda(\alpha_1-\alpha_2+\lambda+1)^2} > 0, \\
 & \partial_1 X(\lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, 1, 1) = \frac{(\lambda+2)(\lambda-\alpha_2+1)}{\lambda(-\alpha_1-\alpha_2+\lambda+2)^2} > 0, \\
 & \partial_2 X(\lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, 1, 1) = -\frac{(1-\alpha_1)(\lambda+2)}{\lambda(-\alpha_1-\alpha_2+\lambda+2)^2} < 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now, set

$$\tau := \frac{10(d+1)}{d-1}, \quad \rho_n = 4^{-n-K}, \quad \mu_n = 2\tau\rho_n,$$

and write  $q(\lambda) = \gamma + \tau^{-1}\lambda$  for  $\lambda > 0$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 q(\mu_n/2) &= \gamma + \rho_n, & q(2\mu_n) &= \gamma + 4\rho_n, \\
 d^2(q(\mu_n/2)^2 - 2q(\mu_n/2) + 1) - q(\mu_n/2)^2 &= -2d\rho_n + (d^2 - 1)\rho_n^2, \\
 d^2(q(2\mu_n)^2 - 2q(2\mu_n) + 1) - q(2\mu_n)^2 &= -8d\rho_n + 16(d^2 - 1)\rho_n^2, \\
 d^2(q(\mu_n/2)q(2\mu_n) - q(\mu_n/2) - q(2\mu_n) + 1) - q(\mu_n/2)q(2\mu_n) &= -5d\rho_n + 4(d^2 - 1)\rho_n^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

We compute by using the above equalities that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X(\mu_n, q(\mu_n/2), q(2\mu_n), 0, 0) = \\
 & = -\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d^2(q(\mu_n/2) - 1)}{q(\mu_n/2) + q(2\mu_n)} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d^2(q(\mu_n/2) - q(2\mu_n))}{\mu_n(q(\mu_n/2) + q(2\mu_n))} \\
 & = \frac{d^2(1-\gamma)}{2\gamma} + \frac{3d^2}{2\tau\gamma} = \frac{d}{2} + \frac{3d(d-1)}{20} > \frac{d}{2}, \\
 & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X(\mu_n, q(\mu_n/2), q(\mu_n/2), 0, 1) \\
 & = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d^2(-q(\mu_n/2) + 1)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-q(\mu_n/2)^2 + d^2(q(\mu_n/2)^2 - 2q(\mu_n/2) + 1)}{\mu_n} \\
& = d^2(1 - \gamma) - \frac{2d}{\tau} = \frac{d}{2} + \frac{3d(d-1)}{10(d+1)} > \frac{d}{2}, \\
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X(\mu_n, q(2\mu_n), q(2\mu_n), 1, 0) \\
& = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(2\mu_n) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-q(2\mu_n)^2 + d^2(q(2\mu_n)^2 - 2q(2\mu_n) + 1)}{\mu_n} \\
& = \gamma + \frac{8d}{\tau} = \frac{d}{2} + \frac{3d(d-1)}{10(d+1)} > \frac{d}{2}, \\
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X(\mu_n, q(2\mu_n), q(\mu_n/2), 1, 1) \\
& = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{q(2\mu_n)}{-q(2\mu_n) - q(\mu_n/2) + 2} + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{q(2\mu_n) - q(\mu_n/2)}{\mu_n(-q(2\mu_n) - q(\mu_n/2) + 2)} \\
& = \frac{\gamma}{2(1-\gamma)} + \frac{3}{2\tau(1-\gamma)} = \frac{d}{2} + \frac{3(d-1)}{20} > \frac{d}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

We set

$$\begin{aligned}
x_n = \min\{ & X(\mu_n, q(\mu_n/2), q(2\mu_n), 0, 0), X(\mu_n, q(\mu_n/2), q(\mu_n/2), 0, 1), \\
& X(\mu_n, q(2\mu_n), q(2\mu_n), 1, 0), X(\mu_n, q(2\mu_n), q(\mu_n/2), 1, 1) \}.
\end{aligned}$$

For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , set  $(\hat{X}_n, \hat{Y}_n) := (X_{\mu_n}, Y_{\mu_n})$  and note

$$\mu_n \hat{X}_n + B_1(\hat{X}_n, \hat{Y}_n) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_n \hat{Y}_n + B_2(\hat{X}_n, \hat{Y}_n) = 0.$$

We select  $\hat{\alpha}_{n,1}, \hat{\alpha}_{n,2} \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\hat{\beta}_{n,1}, \hat{\beta}_{n,2} \in \mathcal{B}$  so that

$$\begin{cases} \mu_n \hat{X}_n + b_1(\hat{\alpha}_{n,1}, \hat{\beta}_{n,1}, \hat{X}_n, \hat{Y}_n) = 0, \\ \mu_n \hat{Y}_n + b_2(\hat{\alpha}_{n,2}, \hat{\beta}_{n,2}, \hat{X}_n, \hat{Y}_n) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Accordingly, we have

$$\hat{X}_n = X(\mu_n, \hat{\alpha}_{n,1}, \hat{\alpha}_{n,2}, \hat{\beta}_{n,1}, \hat{\beta}_{n,2}) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{Y}_n = X(\mu_n, \hat{\alpha}_{n,1}, \hat{\alpha}_{n,2}, \hat{\beta}_{n,1}, \hat{\beta}_{n,2}).$$

Note that  $q(\mu_n/2), q(2\mu_n) \in \mathcal{A}$  and that if  $t \in (q(\mu_n/2), q(2\mu_n))$ , then  $t \notin \mathcal{A}$ . The monotonicity of  $X$  (see (14)) shows that for any  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ , if  $\alpha_1 \geq q(\mu_n)$  and  $\alpha_2 \geq q(\mu_n)$ , then

$$X(\mu_n, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, 1, 0) \geq X(\mu_n, q(2\mu_n), q(2\mu_n), 1, 0) \geq x_n,$$

if  $\alpha_1 > q(\mu_n)$  and  $\alpha_2 \leq q(\mu_n)$ , then

$$X(\mu_n, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, 1, 1) \geq X(\mu_n, q(2\mu_n), q(\mu_n/2), 1, 1) \geq x_n,$$

if  $\alpha_1 \leq q(\mu_n)$  and  $\alpha_2 \geq q(\mu_n)$ , then

$$X(\mu_n, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, 0, 0) \geq X(\mu_n, q(\mu_n/2), q(2\mu_n), 0, 0) \geq x_n,$$

and, if  $\alpha_1 \leq q(\mu_n/2)$  and  $\alpha_2 \leq q(\mu_n/2)$ , then

$$X(\mu_n, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, 0, 1) \geq X(\lambda, q(\mu_n/2), q(\mu_n/2), 0, 1) \geq x_n.$$

Hence, we deduce that

$$\widehat{X}_n = X(\mu_n, \hat{\alpha}_{n,1}, \hat{\alpha}_{n,2}, \hat{\beta}_{n,1}, \hat{\beta}_{n,2}) \geq x_n.$$

From these, we conclude that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{X}_n \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n > \frac{d}{2},$$

which ensures that

$$\limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} X_\lambda > \frac{d}{2}.$$

The proof is now complete. □

**Proposition 5.** *We have*

$$\liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} X_\lambda = \frac{d}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} Y_\lambda = -\frac{d}{2}.$$

*Proof.* As in the proof of (13), we set

$$\theta = \frac{4(d+1)}{d-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad p(\rho) = \gamma + \rho \quad \text{for } \rho > 0.$$

Let  $X(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2)$  be the function as in the proof of Theorem 2, (ii) for  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ . Noting that  $p(\rho) = \gamma + \rho \in (0, 1)$  and that

$$\begin{aligned} d^2(p(\rho)^2 - 2p(\rho) + 1) - p(\rho)^2 &= d^2(2(\gamma - 1)\rho + \rho^2) - 2\gamma\rho - \rho^2 \\ &= -2d\rho + \rho^2(d^2 - 1), \end{aligned}$$

we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0+} X(\theta\rho, p(\rho), p(\rho), 0, 0) &= - \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0+} \frac{d^2\theta\rho(p(\rho) - 1)}{\theta\rho(2p(\rho) + \theta\rho)} = -\frac{d^2(\gamma - 1)}{2\gamma} = \frac{d}{2}, \\ \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0+} X(\theta\rho, p(\rho), p(\rho), 0, 1) &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0+} \frac{-p(\rho)^2 + d^2((1 - p(\rho))\theta\rho + p(\rho)^2 - 2p(\rho) + 1)}{\theta\rho} \\ &= d^2(1 - \gamma) - \frac{2d}{\theta} = \frac{d}{2}, \\ \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0+} X(\theta\rho, p(\rho), p(\rho), 1, 0) &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0+} \frac{p(\rho)\theta\rho + p(\rho)^2 - d^2(p(\rho)^2 - 2p(\rho) + 1)}{\theta\rho} \\ &= \gamma - \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0+} \frac{d^2(p(\rho)^2 - 2p(\rho) + 1) - p(\rho)^2}{\theta\rho} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \gamma + 2\theta^{-1}d = \frac{d}{2},$$

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0+} X(\theta\rho, p(\rho), p(\rho), 1, 1) = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0+} \frac{p(\rho)\theta\rho}{\theta\rho(-2p(\rho) + \theta\rho + 2)} = \frac{\gamma}{2(1-\gamma)} = \frac{d}{2}.$$

Thus, setting

$$x(\rho) = \min\{X(\theta\rho, p(\rho), p(\rho), 1, 0), X(\theta\rho, p(\lambda), p(\lambda), 1, 1), \\ X(\theta\rho, p(\rho), p(\rho), 0, 0), X(\theta\rho, p(\rho), p(\rho), 0, 1)\},$$

we have

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0+} x(\rho) = \frac{d}{2}.$$

For any  $\lambda > 0$ , we select  $\alpha_{\lambda,1}, \alpha_{\lambda,2} \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\beta_{\lambda,1}, \beta_{\lambda,2} \in \mathcal{B}$  so that

$$\begin{cases} \lambda X_\lambda + b_1(\alpha_{\lambda,1}, \beta_{\lambda,1}, X_\lambda, Y_\lambda) = 0, \\ \lambda Y_\lambda + b_2(\alpha_{\lambda,2}, \beta_{\lambda,2}, X_\lambda, Y_\lambda) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Accordingly, we have

$$X_\lambda = X(\lambda, \alpha_{\lambda,1}, \alpha_{\lambda,2}, \beta_{\lambda,1}, \beta_{\lambda,2}) \quad \text{and} \quad Y_\lambda = X(\lambda, \alpha_{\lambda,1}, \alpha_{\lambda,2}, \beta_{\lambda,1}, \beta_{\lambda,2}).$$

The monotonicity of  $X$  (see (14)) shows that for any  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ , if  $\alpha_1 \geq p(\rho)$  and  $\alpha_2 \geq p(\rho)$ , then

$$X(\theta\rho, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, 1, 0) \geq X(\theta\rho, p(\rho), p(\rho), 1, 0) \geq x(\rho),$$

if  $\alpha_1 > p(\rho)$  and  $\alpha_2 \leq p(\rho)$ , then

$$X(\theta\rho, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, 1, 1) \geq X(\theta\rho, p(\lambda), p(\lambda), 1, 1) \geq x(\rho),$$

if  $\alpha_1 \leq p(\rho)$  and  $\alpha_2 \geq p(\rho)$ , then

$$X(\theta\rho, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, 0, 0) \geq X(\theta\rho, p(\rho), p(\rho), 0, 0) \geq x(\rho),$$

and, if  $\alpha_1 \leq p(\rho)$  and  $\alpha_2 \leq p(\rho)$ , then

$$X(\theta\rho, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, 0, 1) \geq X(\theta\rho, p(\rho), p(\rho), 0, 1) \geq x(\rho).$$

Hence, we deduce that

$$X_{\theta\rho} = X(\theta\rho, \alpha_{\rho,1}, \alpha_{\rho,2}, \beta_{\rho,1}, \beta_{\rho,2}) \geq x(\rho),$$

and conclude that

$$\liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0+} X_\lambda \geq \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0+} x(\rho) = \frac{d}{2},$$

which finishes the proof. □

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author was supported in part by the JSPS Grants KAKENHI No. 16H03948, No. 20K03688, No. 20H01817 and No. 21H00717. He thanks Wolfram Alpha for helping him checking his computation.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Q. Chen, W. Cheng, H. Ishii, and K. Zhao, *Vanishing contact structure problem and convergence of the viscosity solutions*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **44** (2019), no. 9, 801–836, DOI 10.1080/03605302.2019.1608561. MR3952779
- [2] M. G. Crandall, H. Ishii, and P.-L. Lions, *User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **27** (1992), no. 1, 1–67, DOI 10.1090/S0273-0979-1992-00266-5. MR1118699
- [3] A. Davini, A. Fathi, R. Iturriaga, and M. Zavidovique, *Convergence of the solutions of the discounted Hamilton-Jacobi equation: convergence of the discounted solutions*, Invent. Math. **206** (2016), no. 1, 29–55, DOI 10.1007/s00222-016-0648-6. MR3556524
- [4] A. Davini and M. Zavidovique, *Convergence of the solutions of discounted Hamilton-Jacobi systems*, Adv. Calc. Var. Online publication (2019), DOI 10.1515/acv-2018-0037.
- [5] H. Ishii and L. Jin, *The vanishing discount problem for monotone systems of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. Part 2: nonlinear coupling*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations.
- [6] H. Ishii, H. Mitake, and H. V. Tran, *The vanishing discount problem and viscosity Mather measures. Part 1: The problem on a torus*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **108** (2017), no. 2, 125–149, DOI 10.1016/j.matpur.2016.10.013 (English, with English and French summaries). MR3670619
- [7] ———, *The vanishing discount problem and viscosity Mather measures. Part 2: Boundary value problems*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **108** (2017), no. 3, 261–305, DOI 10.1016/j.matpur.2016.11.002 (English, with English and French summaries). MR3682741
- [8] H. Ishii and A. Siconolfi, *The vanishing discount problem for Hamilton-Jacobi equations in the Euclidean space*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, , posted on 29 Jan 2020, DOI 10.1080/03605302.2019.1710845.
- [9] B. Ziliotto, *Convergence of the solutions of the discounted Hamilton-Jacobi equation: a counterexample*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **128** (2019), 330–338, DOI 10.1016/j.matpur.2019.04.005 (English, with English and French summaries). MR3980854

(HITOSHI ISHII) INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE

TSUDA UNIVERSITY

2-1-1 TSUDA, KODAIRA, TOKYO, 187-8577 JAPAN.

Email address: hitoshi.ishii@waseda.jp