

# Positive normalized solutions to nonlinear elliptic systems in $\mathbb{R}^4$ with critical Sobolev exponent\*

**Xiao Luo<sup>1</sup>, Xiaolong Yang<sup>2</sup>, Wenming Zou<sup>3</sup>**

*1. School of Mathematics, Hefei University of Technology, Hefei, 230009, P. R. China.*

*2. School of Mathematics and Statistics, Central China Normal University, Wuhan, 430079, P. R. China.*

*3. Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, P. R. China.*

---

\*Luo and Yang are supported by NSFC (No. 11901147) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities of China (No. JZ2020HG TB0030). Zou is supported by NSFC (No. 20171301826, 20181301532).

## Abstract

In this paper, we consider the existence and asymptotic behavior on mass of the positive solutions to the following system:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \lambda_1 u = \mu_1 u^3 + \alpha_1 |u|^{p-2} u + \beta v^2 u & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^4, \\ -\Delta v + \lambda_2 v = \mu_2 v^3 + \alpha_2 |v|^{p-2} v + \beta u^2 v & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^4, \end{cases}$$

under the mass constraint

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u^2 = a_1^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} v^2 = a_2^2,$$

where  $a_1, a_2$  are prescribed,  $\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta > 0$ ;  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $p \in (2, 4)$  and  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  appear as Lagrange multipliers. Firstly, we establish a non-existence result for the repulsive interaction case, i.e.,  $\alpha_i < 0 (i = 1, 2)$ . Then turning to the case of  $\alpha_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$ , if  $2 < p < 3$ , we show that the problem admits a ground state and an excited state, which are characterized respectively by a local minimizer and a mountain-pass critical point of the corresponding energy functional. Moreover, we give a precise asymptotic behavior of these two solutions as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$ . This seems to be the first contribution regarding the multiplicity as well as the synchronized mass collapse behavior of the normalized solutions to Schrödinger systems with Sobolev critical exponent. When  $3 \leq p < 4$ , we prove an existence as well as non-existence ( $p = 3$ ) results of the ground states, which are characterized by constrained mountain-pass critical points of the corresponding energy functional. Furthermore, precise asymptotic behaviors of the ground states are obtained when the masses of whose two components vanish and cluster to a upper bound (or infinity), respectively.

**Keywords:** Elliptic systems; Sobolev critical; Normalized solutions; Asymptotic behavior.

**2010 Mathematics Subject Classification:** 35J50, 35B33, 35B09, 35B40.

# 1 Introduction

In this paper, for prescribed  $a_1, a_2 > 0$ , we study the existence of solutions  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$  satisfying

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \lambda_1 u = \mu_1 u^3 + \alpha_1 |u|^{p-2} u + \beta v^2 u, \\ -\Delta v + \lambda_2 v = \mu_2 v^3 + \alpha_2 |v|^{p-2} v + \beta u^2 v, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u^2 = a_1^2, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} v^2 = a_2^2, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta > 0$  and  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Equation (1.1) is closely related to the following focusing time-dependent nonlinear Schrödinger system

$$\begin{cases} -i\partial_t \Phi_1 = \Delta \Phi_1 + \mu_1 |\Phi_1|^2 \Phi_1 + \alpha_1 |\Phi_1|^{p-2} \Phi_1 + \beta |\Phi_2|^2 \Phi_1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^4, \\ -i\partial_t \Phi_2 = \Delta \Phi_2 + \mu_2 |\Phi_2|^2 \Phi_2 + \alpha_2 |\Phi_2|^{p-2} \Phi_2 + \beta |\Phi_1|^2 \Phi_2 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^4. \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

Indeed, setting  $\Phi_1(t, x) = e^{i\lambda_1 t} u(x)$  and  $\Phi_2(t, x) = e^{i\lambda_2 t} v(x)$ , if  $(u, v)$  is a nontrivial solution of (1.1), then  $(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$  is a solitary wave solution of (1.3). Physically, system (1.3) has the nature of conservation of mass, i.e., the  $L^2$ -norms  $\|\Phi_1(t, \cdot)\|_2^2$  and  $\|\Phi_2(t, \cdot)\|_2^2$  of solutions are independent of  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Problems with prescribed masses (the former constraint) appear in nonlinear optics, where the mass represents the power supply, and in the theory of Bose-Einstein condensates, where it represents the total number of particles (see [2, 12, 13, 16, 37]). In particular, the positive sign of  $\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta$  stays for attractive interaction, while the negative sign stays for repulsive interaction.

When  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$ , system (1.1) becomes the following so-called Gross-Pitaevskii equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \lambda_1 u = \mu_1 u^3 + \beta v^2 u & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ -\Delta v + \lambda_2 v = \mu_2 v^3 + \beta u^2 v & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

which governs various physical phenomena, for instance binary mixtures of Bose-Einstein condensates, or the propagation of mutually incoherent wave packets in nonlinear optics, see [16, 37]. Recently, normalized solutions to system (1.4) have attracted much attention of researchers e.g. [5, 6, 7, 8]. Bartsch, Jeanjean, Soave [5] and Bartsch, Soave [6] dealt with  $\beta > 0$  and  $\beta < 0$  respectively, they found solutions to (1.4)-(1.2) for specific range of  $\beta$  depending on  $a_1, a_2$ . In addition, Bartsch, Zhong and Zou [8] studied (1.2)-(1.4) for  $\beta > 0$  belonging to much better ranges independent of the masses  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ , they adopted a new approach based on bifurcation theory and the continuation method. Bartsch and Soave [7] proved the existence of infinitely many normalized solutions to (1.4) with  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 > 0$  and  $\beta \leq -\mu_1$  by using a suitable minimax argument. For normalized solutions of nonlinear elliptic systems with more general nonlinearities, we refer the reader to [4, 15, 25, 29].

For  $\beta = 0$ , system (1.1) reduces to the following single energy (Sobolev) critical Schrödinger equation

$$-\Delta u = \lambda u + \mu|u|^{q-2}u + |u|^{2^*-2}u, \quad u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N), \quad (1.5)$$

where  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $2 < q < 2^* = \frac{2N}{(N-2)_+}$ . If  $\mu > 0$ , it was proved in [34] that if the product of  $\mu$  and the mass is well controlled, there is a normalized ground state to (1.5). In addition, Soave [34] raised an open question on how to obtain the second normalized solution to (1.5) since the associated energy functional constrained on the  $L^2$ -sphere admits a convex-concave geometry. It is worth pointing out that, Jeanjean, Le [20] solved this open question for  $N \geq 4$ . Recently, Wei and Wu [38] proved the existence of normalized solutions of mountain-pass type of (1.5) for  $N \geq 3$  and  $2 < q < 2 + \frac{4}{N}$ . Moreover, in [38], they also got the precisely asymptotic behaviors of ground states and mountain-pass solutions as  $\mu \rightarrow 0$  or  $\mu$  goes to its upper bound. These studies answer some open questions proposed by Soave in [34].

Elliptic systems with the doubly critical exponent have been investigated by many authors (c.f. [10, 11, 24, 31, 32, 42, 36] and the references therein). However, much less is known when the  $L^2$ -norms  $\|u\|_2, \|v\|_2$  are prescribed. Recently, Li, Zou in [25] and Mederski, Schino in [29] considered normalized solutions to coupled Schrödinger systems with a wide class of nonlinearities including the Sobolev critical terms. Here, we have to emphasize that the system considered by Li and Zou in [25] contains only a single critical nonlinearity, and coupled terms of the systems considered by Mederski and Schino in [29] must be Sobolev subcritical. In this paper, we study the existence of normalized solutions to problem (1.1) with doubly Sobolev critical exponent involving coupling terms.

One can get solutions to (1.1)-(1.2) by looking for critical points  $(u, v) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$  of the energy functional

$$I(u, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \frac{1}{2} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) - \frac{1}{4} (\mu_1 |u|^4 + \mu_2 |v|^4) - \frac{\alpha_1}{p} |u|^p - \frac{\alpha_2}{p} |v|^p - \frac{\beta}{2} |u|^2 |v|^2 \quad (1.6)$$

constrained on the sphere  $S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ , where

$$S(a) := \left\{ u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^2 = a^2 \right\}, \quad (1.7)$$

and  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$  in (1.1) appear as the Lagrange multipliers with respect to the mass constraints.

If  $\alpha_i < 0 (i = 1, 2)$ , we have the following non-existence result.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\mu_i, a_i, \beta > 0 (i = 1, 2)$ ,  $2 < p < 4$ . If  $\alpha_i < 0 (i = 1, 2)$ , then problem (1.1)-(1.2) has no positive solution  $(u, v) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$  and no non-trivial radial solution for  $p > \frac{8}{3}$ .*

Next, we consider the case  $\alpha_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$ . By the  $L^2$ -norm preserving dilations  $s \star u(x) = e^{2s} u(e^s x)$  with  $s > 0$ , it is easy to know that  $\bar{p} := 3$  is the  $L^2$ -critical

exponent of (1.1). We say that  $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})$  is a normalized ground state of (1.1)-(1.2) if  $dI|_{S(a_1) \times S(a_2)}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = 0$  and

$$I(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = \inf \{ I(u, v) : dI|_{S(a_1) \times S(a_2)}(u, v) = 0 \text{ and } (u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2) \}.$$

If  $(u, v) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$  is a weak solution of (1.1), then the Pohozaev identity holds true:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{a_1, a_2}(u, v) =: & \|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|u\|_4^4 - \mu_2 \|v\|_4^4 \\ & - \gamma_p \alpha_1 \|u\|_p^p - \gamma_p \alpha_2 \|v\|_p^p - 2\beta \|uv\|_2^2 \end{aligned} \quad (1.8)$$

for  $\gamma_p = \frac{2(p-2)}{p}$ . Since  $2 < p < 4$ , we have  $\inf_{S(a_1) \times S(a_2)} I(u, v) = -\infty$ . In spirit of Bartsch and Soave in [6], we introduce the following Pohozaev set:

$$\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2} = \{ (u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2) : P_{a_1, a_2}(u, v) = 0 \}. \quad (1.9)$$

For  $u \in S(a)$  and  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , it follows that  $s \star u \in S(a)$ . Define  $s \star (u, v) = (s \star u, s \star v)$ . The Pohozaev set  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$  is quite related to the fiber maps

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi_{(u, v)}(s) \\ & := I(s \star (u, v)) \\ & = \frac{e^{2s}}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) - \frac{e^{4s}}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\mu_1 |u|^4 + \mu_2 |v|^4 + 2\beta |u|^2 |v|^2) \\ & \quad - \frac{e^{p\gamma_p s}}{p} \alpha_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^p - \frac{e^{p\gamma_p s}}{p} \alpha_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |v|^p. \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

For  $(u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$  and  $s \in (0, \infty)$ , we have

$$\Psi'_{u, v}(s) = P_{a_1, a_2}(s \star (u, v)), \quad (1.11)$$

where  $P_{a_1, a_2}$  is defined by (1.8). We shall see that the critical points of  $\Psi_{u, v}(s)$  allow to project a function on  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$ . Thus, the monotonicity and convexity properties of  $\Psi_{u, v}(s)$  strongly affect the structure of  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$  can be divided into the disjoint union  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2} = \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+ \cup \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0 \cup \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+ & := \{ (u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2} : \Psi''_{(u, v)}(0) > 0 \}, \\ \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0 & := \{ (u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2} : \Psi''_{(u, v)}(0) = 0 \}, \\ \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^- & := \{ (u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2} : \Psi''_{(u, v)}(0) < 0 \}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.12)$$

Let

$$m^\pm(a_1, a_2) = \inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^\pm} I(u, v).$$

In the spirit of Soave [34] and Jeanjean, Le [20], we see that the presence of the mass subcritical terms  $\alpha_1 |u|^{p-2}u, \alpha_2 |v|^{p-2}v$  causes a convex-concave geometry of  $I|_{S(a_1) \times S(a_2)}$  if  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$  and  $a_1, a_2 > 0$  are small. In view of this, if  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$ , it is natural to introduce a suitable local minimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} m^+(a_1, a_2) & := \inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+} I(u, v) \\ & = \inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}} I(u, v) = \inf_{(u, v) \in V(a_1, a_2)} I(u, v) < 0, \end{aligned} \quad (1.13)$$

where

$$V(a_1, a_2) := \{(u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2) : [\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} < \rho_0\},$$

see Section 3 for details.

Our main results are as follows. If  $\alpha_i, \mu_i, \beta > 0 (i = 1, 2)$  and  $2 < p < 4$ , we first consider the existence and asymptotic behaviour of ground states to (1.1)-(1.2). Let  $w_p$  be the unique positive solution of

$$-\Delta w + w = |w|^{p-2}w \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^4. \quad (1.14)$$

For  $2 < p < 4$ , the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (see [40]) is

$$\|u\|_p \leq C_p \|\nabla u\|_2^{\gamma_p} \|u\|_2^{1-\gamma_p}, \quad \forall u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4), \quad (1.15)$$

where  $C_p > 0$  is a constant and  $\gamma_p = \frac{2(p-2)}{p}$ . Define

$$T(a_1, a_2) := \alpha_1 a_1^{4-p} + \alpha_2 a_2^{4-p} \quad (1.16)$$

and

$$\gamma_1 := \frac{p}{2(4-p)|C_p|^p} \left[ \frac{2(3-p)S_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta}^2}{4-p} \right]^{3-p}, \quad (1.17)$$

where

$$S_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta} := \inf_{(u, v) \in [D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^4)]^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2)}{[\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\mu_1 |u|^4 + \mu_2 |v|^4 + 2\beta |u|^2 |v|^2)]^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \quad (1.18)$$

To state the next theorem, we use the notation  $c \sim d$  which means that  $C'd \leq c \leq Cd$  and  $c \lesssim d$  means  $c \leq Cd$ . We have

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$ ,  $\beta > 0$  and  $2 < p < 3$ , and  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$ .*

1. *Then (1.1)-(1.2) has a positive ground state  $(u_{a_1}, v_{a_2})$ , which is a local minimizer of  $I$  on  $V(a_1, a_2)$ .*

2. *For any ground state  $(u_{a_1}, v_{a_2}) \in V(a_1, a_2)$ , we have*

$$\left( \left( \frac{L_1}{\alpha_1} \right)^{-\frac{1}{p-2}} u_{a_1} \left( L_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} x \right), \left( \frac{L_2}{\alpha_2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{p-2}} v_{a_2} \left( L_2^{-\frac{1}{2}} x \right) \right) \rightarrow (w_p, w_p) \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2),$$

$$\text{as } (a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0) \text{ and } a_1 \sim a_2, \text{ where } L_1 = \left( \frac{\alpha_1^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \alpha_1^{\frac{2}{p-2}} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{6-2p}} \text{ and } L_2 = \left( \frac{\alpha_2^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \alpha_2^{\frac{2}{p-2}} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{6-2p}}.$$

Next, for  $2 < p < 3$ , we study the existence and asymptotic behaviour of the second solution of (1.1)-(1.2). Denote

$$S = \inf_{u \in D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^4) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|\nabla u\|_2^2}{\|u\|_4^2}.$$

From [35], we know that  $\mathcal{S}$  is attained by the Aubin-Talanti bubbles

$$U_\varepsilon(x) := \frac{2\sqrt{2}\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^2 + |x|^2}, \quad \varepsilon > 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^4. \quad (1.19)$$

Then  $U_\varepsilon$  satisfies  $-\Delta u = u^3$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla U_\varepsilon|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |U_\varepsilon|^4 = \mathcal{S}^2$ . On the other hand, if  $0 < \beta < \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$  or  $\beta > \max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$  (see Lemma 2.6), the pair

$$\left( \sqrt{\frac{\beta - \mu_2}{\beta^2 - \mu_1\mu_2}} U_\varepsilon, \sqrt{\frac{\beta - \mu_1}{\beta^2 - \mu_1\mu_2}} U_\varepsilon \right)$$

is the least energy solutions to the following elliptic system:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \mu_1 u^3 + \beta v^2 u, & x \in \mathbb{R}^4, \\ -\Delta v = \mu_2 v^3 + \beta u^2 v, & x \in \mathbb{R}^4, \\ u, v \in D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^4), \end{cases} \quad (1.20)$$

we refer to Section 2 for more details.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$ ,  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$ ,  $2 < p < 3$ , and  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$ .*

1. *Then there exists a positive mountain pass type solution  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-)$  to (1.1)-(1.2), and*

$$I(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) = m^-(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow \frac{2\beta - \mu_1 - \mu_2}{4(\beta^2 - \mu_1\mu_2)} \mathcal{S}^2 \text{ as } (a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0).$$

2. *Moreover, there exists  $\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} > 0$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & (\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} u_{a_1}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x), \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} v_{a_2}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x)) \\ & \rightarrow \left( \sqrt{\frac{\beta - \mu_2}{\beta^2 - \mu_1\mu_2}} U_{\varepsilon_0}, \sqrt{\frac{\beta - \mu_1}{\beta^2 - \mu_1\mu_2}} U_{\varepsilon_0} \right) \end{aligned}$$

*in  $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ , for some  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$  up to a subsequence.*

**Remark 1.1.** *Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 indicate that when the lower power perturbation terms are mass subcritical with a product of the perturbation coefficients and masses being controlled from above, problem (1.1) possesses at least two normalized solutions, one ground state and one excited state (whose energy is strictly larger than that of ground state). Furthermore, by making appropriate scalings, two components of the ground state both converge to the unique positive solution of  $-\Delta w + w = |w|^{p-2}w$ ;*

two components of the excited state both converge to the Aubin-Talanti bubble in related Sobolev spaces, as the masses of two components vanish at the same rate. As far as we know, this is the first result on the multiplicity as well as detailed synchronized mass collapse behavior of normalized solutions to Schrödinger systems with Sobolev critical exponent. The condition  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$  in Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 not only ensures that the corresponding energy functional  $I$  admits a convex-concave geometry, but also guarantees that the Pohozaev manifold  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$  is a natural constraint, on which the critical points of  $I$  are indeed normalized solutions to problem (1.1). The value range of coupling coefficient  $\beta$  in Theorem 1.3 (1) is used to prove

$$m^-(a_1, a_2) < \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2 + m^+(a_1, a_2)$$

i.e., the mountain pass energy level is less than the usual critical threshold plus the ground state energy, and thus ensures the compactness of PS sequence and a mountain pass type solution follows. The condition  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$  in Theorem 1.3 (2) also guarantees that the corresponding limiting system (1.20) has a unique ground state solution up to translation and dilation. With the help of this uniqueness result, precise synchronized mass collapse behavior of the mountain pass type solution can be obtained.

If  $p = 3$ ,  $w_3$  is the unique positive solution of (1.14), then we get the following existence and non-existence results.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$ ,  $p = 3$ , there exists  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that if  $\beta > \beta_0$  and  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$ , then the following conclusions hold.*

1. *If  $0 < \alpha_i a_i < \|w_3\|_2 (i = 1, 2)$ , then (1.1)-(1.2) has a positive ground state solution. However, for  $\alpha_1 a_1 \geq \|w_3\|_2$  and  $\alpha_2 a_2 \geq \|w_3\|_2$ , then (1.1)-(1.2) has no ground states.*
2. *If  $0 < \alpha_i a_i < \|w_3\|_2 (i = 1, 2)$ , then for any ground state  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-)$  of (1.1)-(1.2), there exist  $\nu_1, \nu_2 > 0$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \left( \frac{a_1}{\|w_3\|_2} \right) r_1^2 u_{a_1}^- \left( \frac{a_1}{\|w_3\|_2} r_1 x \right), \left( \frac{a_2}{\|w_3\|_2} \right) r_2^2 v_{a_2}^- \left( \frac{a_2}{\|w_3\|_2} r_2 x \right) \right) \\ & \rightarrow (\nu_1 w_3(\sqrt{\nu_1} x), \nu_2 w_3(\sqrt{\nu_2} x)), \end{aligned}$$

in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow \left( \frac{\|w_3\|_2}{\alpha_1}, \frac{\|w_3\|_2}{\alpha_2} \right)$  and  $\left( 1 - \frac{\alpha_1 a_1}{\|w_3\|_2} \right) \sim \left( 1 - \frac{\alpha_2 a_2}{\|w_3\|_2} \right)$ , up to a subsequence, where  $r_1 = \left( 1 - \frac{\alpha_1 a_1}{\|w_3\|_2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $r_2 = \left( 1 - \frac{\alpha_2 a_2}{\|w_3\|_2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ .

3. *Moreover, there exists  $\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} > 0$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & (\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} u_{a_1}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x), \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} v_{a_2}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x)) \\ & \rightarrow \left( \sqrt{\frac{\beta - \mu_2}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}} U_{\varepsilon_0}, \sqrt{\frac{\beta - \mu_1}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}} U_{\varepsilon_0} \right) \end{aligned}$$

in  $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ , for some  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$ , up to a subsequence.

**Remark 1.2.** For single Sobolev critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation (1.5) with  $q = 2 + \frac{4}{N}$ , there exists a critical mass  $a^* > 0$  such that if  $0 < a < a^*$  then (1.5) has normalized ground state solutions, while if  $a^* \leq a$ , (1.5) has no normalized ground states (see [27, 34, 38]). However, for coupled system (1.1), such a mass threshold is not obtained in Theorem 1.4. The main reason is that there is a competitive relationship between the two components of system (1.1). In proving the non-existence result of Theorem 1.4, the monotonicity approach developed in [38] cannot be used directly, because the monotonicity of  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$  with  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  seems difficult to prove. Motivated by [27, 38], we choose appropriate functions to prove that  $m^-(a_1, a_2) = 0$  when  $\alpha_1 a_1 \geq \|w_3\|_2$  and  $\alpha_2 a_2 \geq \|w_3\|_2$ , and then by contradiction (1.1)-(1.2) has no normalized ground state solution. In addition, similar as in the proof of Theorem 1.3 (2), the precisely asymptotic behaviors of the normalized ground states solutions are also proved.

If  $3 < p < 4$ , then  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2} = \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$ , and we could find at least one normalized solution to (1.1)-(1.2) on  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$ . Moreover, we give the asymptotic behavior of the normalized ground state solutions as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (+\infty, +\infty)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$ .

**Theorem 1.5.** Let  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$ ,  $3 < p < 4$ , and there exists  $\beta_1 > 0$  such that when  $\beta > \beta_1$  and  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$ , then we have the following results.

1. The problem (1.1)-(1.2) has a positive ground state solution.
2. For  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (+\infty, +\infty)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$ , then for any ground state  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ , we have

$$\left( \left( \frac{L_1}{\alpha_1} \right)^{-\frac{1}{p-2}} u_{a_1}^-(L_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} x), \left( \frac{L_2}{\alpha_2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{p-2}} v_{a_2}^-(L_2^{-\frac{1}{2}} x) \right) \rightarrow (w_p, w_p) \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2),$$

$$\text{where } L_1 = \left( \frac{a_1^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \alpha_1^{\frac{2}{p-2}} \right)^{-\frac{p-2}{2p-6}} \text{ and } L_2 = \left( \frac{a_2^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \alpha_2^{\frac{2}{p-2}} \right)^{-\frac{p-2}{2p-6}}.$$

3. In addition, there exists  $\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} u_{a_1}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x), \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} v_{a_2}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x) \right) \\ & \rightarrow \left( \sqrt{\frac{\beta - \mu_2}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}} U_{\varepsilon_0}, \sqrt{\frac{\beta - \mu_1}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}} U_{\varepsilon_0} \right), \end{aligned}$$

in  $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ , for some  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$ , up to a subsequence.

**Remark 1.3.** Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 indicate that problem (1.1) possesses at least one normalized ground state solution once the system has a lower order perturbation of

the mass critical term. Furthermore, a precise asymptotic behavior of the normalized ground state is obtained when the masses of the two components cluster either to an upper bound or to infinity at the same rate. The conditions  $\beta > \beta_0 > 0$  and  $\beta > \beta_1 > 0$  in these two theorems are used to prove that the ground state energy  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$  of coupled system (1.1) is less than that of the related single equations. This revision of the energy threshold excludes the semitrivial solutions and guarantees the compactness of minimizing sequence at the energy level  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$ .

**Remark 1.4.** *The arguments in this paper can be applied to*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_i + \lambda_i u_i = \alpha_i |u_i|^{p_i-2} u_i + \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_{i,j} u_j^2 u_i & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^4, \\ u_i \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4), & i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \end{cases}$$

under the constraint  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_i^2 = a_i^2$  where  $a_i (i \in \{1, \dots, k\})$  is prescribed,  $\beta_{i,j} = \beta_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\beta_{i,j} > 0 (\forall i, j)$ ,  $2 < p_i < 4$ ,  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ; where  $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$  appear as the Lagrange multipliers. In addition,  $p_i$  is divided into three cases

$$(H_0) \ 2 < p_i < 3; \quad (H_1) \ p_i = 3; \quad (H_2) \ 3 < p_i < 4,$$

for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ .

This paper is organized as follows, in Section 2, we give some preliminary results. The proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are given in Section 3. In Sections 4, 5 and 6, we prove Theorems 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5, respectively.

**Notations:**  $L^p = L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$  ( $1 < p \leq \infty$ ) is the Lebesgue space with the standard norm  $\|u\|_p = (\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u(x)|^p dx)^{1/p}$ . We use “ $\rightarrow$ ” and “ $\rightharpoonup$ ” to denote the strong and weak convergence in the related function spaces respectively.  $C$ ,  $C'$  and  $C_i$  will denote positive constants.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we give some preliminaries. We have the Sobolev inequality

$$\mathcal{S} \|u\|_4^2 \leq \|\nabla u\|_2^2, \quad \forall u \in D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^4),$$

where  $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^4)$  is the completion of  $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$  with respect to the norm  $\|u\|_{D^{1,2}} := \|\nabla u\|_2$ . If  $p = 4$ ,  $\gamma_4 = 1$ , then  $\mathcal{S} = |\mathcal{C}_4|^{-2}$ . For nonlinear Schrödinger equation with critical nonlinearities

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \lambda u = \alpha |u|^{p-2} u + \mu u^3, & u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4), \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^2 = a^2, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\mu, \alpha > 0$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . The solutions of (2.1) are critical points of the functional

$$\mathcal{A}_{p,\mu,\alpha}(u) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^p - \frac{\mu}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^4$$

on  $S(a)$ . Moreover, we introduce the Pohozaev manifold for the scalar equation:

$$\mathcal{T}_{a,p,\mu,\alpha} := \left\{ u \in S(a) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u|^2 = \mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^4 + \alpha \gamma_p \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^p \right\}. \quad (2.2)$$

The  $L^2$ -Pohozaev manifold  $\mathcal{T}_{a,p,\mu,\alpha}$  is closely related to the fibering maps

$$\bar{\Psi}_u(s) = \mathcal{A}_{p,\mu,\alpha}(s \star u) = \frac{e^{2s}}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u|^2 - \frac{\alpha e^{p\gamma_p s}}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^p - \frac{\mu e^{4s}}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^4.$$

Similar to the partition of  $L^2$ -Pohozaev manifold  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1,a_2}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_{a,p,\mu,\alpha}$  can also be divided into the disjoint union  $\mathcal{T}_{a,p,\mu,\alpha} = \mathcal{T}_{a,p,\mu,\alpha}^+ \cup \mathcal{T}_{a,p,\mu,\alpha}^0 \cup \mathcal{T}_{a,p,\mu,\alpha}^-$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{a,p,\mu,\alpha}^+ &:= \{(u, v) \in \mathcal{T}_{a,p,\mu,\alpha} : \bar{\Psi}_u''(0) > 0\}, \\ \mathcal{T}_{a,p,\mu,\alpha}^0 &:= \{(u, v) \in \mathcal{T}_{a,p,\mu,\alpha} : \bar{\Psi}_u''(0) = 0\}, \\ \mathcal{T}_{a,p,\mu,\alpha}^- &:= \{(u, v) \in \mathcal{T}_{a,p,\mu,\alpha} : \bar{\Psi}_u''(0) < 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$m_{p,\mu,\alpha}^\pm(a) := \inf_{u \in \mathcal{T}_{a,p,\mu,\alpha}^\pm} \mathcal{A}_{p,\mu,\alpha}(u). \quad (2.3)$$

Let

$$m^\pm(a_1, 0) = m_{p,\mu_1,\alpha_1}^\pm(a_1) \quad \text{and} \quad m^\pm(0, a_2) = m_{p,\mu_2,\alpha_2}^\pm(a_2). \quad (2.4)$$

We have the following already known results.

**Lemma 2.1.** ([34, Theorem 1.1]; [38, Theorem 1.1]; [27, Theorem 1.4]) *Let  $2 < p < 3$  and  $\mu, a, \alpha > 0$  in (2.1), there exists  $\tau(\alpha, p) > 0$  such that if  $\mu a^{p-p\gamma_p} \leq \tau(\alpha, p)$  then  $m_{p,\mu,\alpha}^\pm(a) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{T}_{a,p,\mu,\alpha}^\pm} \mathcal{A}_{p,\mu,\alpha}(u) < 0$  and it can be attained by some  $u_{a,\mu,\alpha}^\pm$  which is real valued, positive, radially symmetric and radially decreasing. Moreover,  $m_{p,\mu,\alpha}^\pm(a)$  is strictly decreasing with respect to  $a > 0$ .*

**Lemma 2.2.** ([25, Corollary B.1]) *Suppose  $(u, v) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$  is a nonnegative solution of (1.1)-(1.2) with  $2 < p < 4$ , then  $(u, v)$  is a smooth solution.*

**Lemma 2.3.** ([25, Lemma 2.3]) *Suppose  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$  and  $(u, v) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$  is a nonnegative solution of (1.1)-(1.2) with  $2 < p < 4$ , then  $u > 0$  implies  $\lambda_1 > 0$ ;  $v > 0$  implies  $\lambda_2 > 0$ .*

**Lemma 2.4.** ([15, Lemma 2.4]) *If  $(u_n, v_n) \rightharpoonup (u, v)$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ , then up to a subsequence,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u_n|^2 |v_n|^2 - |u_n - u|^2 |v_n - v|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^2 |v|^2 + o(1).$$

**Lemma 2.5.** ([23, Chapter 3]) *Let  $u^*, v^*$  denote the symmetric decreasing rearrangement of  $u, v$  respectively, and  $u, v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4)$ . Then we have*

$$\|\nabla u^*\|_2 \leq \|\nabla u\|_2, \quad \|u^*\|_p = \|u\|_p \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u^*|^2 |v^*|^2 \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^2 |v|^2.$$

From [10, 31, 32, 39], we get the least energy solutions to (1.20). Note that (1.20) has semi-trivial solutions  $(\mu_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}U_\varepsilon, 0)$  and  $(0, \mu_2^{-\frac{1}{2}}U_\varepsilon)$ . Here, we are only interested in the nontrivial solutions of (1.20), this is  $(\sqrt{k_1}U_\varepsilon, \sqrt{k_2}U_\varepsilon)$ , where  $U_\varepsilon$  is defined in (1.19),  $k_1 = \frac{\beta - \mu_2}{\beta^2 - \mu_1\mu_2}$  and  $k_2 = \frac{\beta - \mu_1}{\beta^2 - \mu_1\mu_2}$ . The main results in this aspect are summarized below. Next, we turn to the related limiting elliptic system (1.20).

**Lemma 2.6.** ([10, Theorems 1.5 and 4.1]). *Let  $\mu_1, \mu_2 > 0$ .*

1. *If  $\beta < 0$ , then  $\mathcal{S}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta}$  is not attained.*
2. *If  $0 < \beta < \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$  or  $\beta > \max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$ , then any positive least energy solution  $(u, v)$  of (1.20) must be of the form*

$$(u, v) = (\sqrt{k_1}U_\varepsilon, \sqrt{k_2}U_\varepsilon).$$

3. *If  $\beta \in [\min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}]$  and  $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$ , (1.20) does not have a non-trivial nonnegative solution.*

Solutions to (1.20) correspond to critical points of the functional

$$J(u, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \frac{1}{2} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) - \frac{1}{4} (\mu_1 |u|^4 + \mu_2 |v|^4 + 2\beta |u|^2 |v|^2), \quad u, v \in D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^4).$$

From Lemma 2.1 of [31] or [10], if  $0 < \beta < \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$  or  $\beta > \max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$ ,  $(u_0, v_0)$  is a least energy solution of (1.20), we have

$$J(u_0, v_0) = \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{S}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta} = \sqrt{k_1 + k_2} \mathcal{S}.$$

We observe that the functional  $I(u, v)$  defined in (1.6) is well defined. Throughout this paper, we denote

$$D_1 = \frac{1}{4\mathcal{S}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta}^2}, \quad D_2 = \frac{\alpha_1}{p} |\mathcal{C}_p|^p a_1^{4-p} \quad \text{and} \quad D_3 = \frac{\alpha_2}{p} |\mathcal{C}_p|^p a_2^{4-p}. \quad (2.5)$$

Then we have

$$\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \mu_1 |u|^4 + \mu_2 |v|^4 + 2\beta |u|^2 |v|^2 \leq D_1 \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 \right)^2, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_1 |u|^p \leq D_2 \|\nabla u\|_2^{2(p-2)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_2 |v|^p \leq D_3 \|\nabla v\|_2^{2(p-2)}. \quad (2.7)$$

Substituting (2.6)-(2.7) into (1.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I(u, v) &\geq \frac{1}{2} (\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2) - D_1 (\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2)^2 \\ &\quad - D_2 \|\nabla u\|_2^{2(p-2)} - D_3 \|\nabla v\|_2^{2(p-2)} \\ &\geq h(\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

where  $h(\rho) : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by

$$h(\rho) = \frac{1}{2}\rho^2 - D_1\rho^4 - (D_2 + D_3)\rho^{2(p-2)}, \quad \forall \rho \geq 0. \quad (2.9)$$

Recall the definitions of  $T(a_1, a_2)$  and  $\gamma_1$  in (1.16).

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i (i = 1, 2)$ ,  $\beta > 0$ ,  $2 < p < 3$  and  $\rho_0 = \left[\frac{3-p}{2(4-p)D_1}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ .*

(i) *If  $T(a_1, a_2) < \gamma_1$ , then  $h(\rho)$  has a local minimum at negative level and a global maximum at positive level. Moreover, there exist  $R_0 = R_0(a_1, a_2)$  and  $R_1 = R_1(a_1, a_2)$  such that*

$$0 < R_0 < \rho_0 < R_1, \quad h(R_0) = 0 = h(R_1); \quad h(\rho) > 0 \Leftrightarrow \rho \in (R_0, R_1).$$

(ii) *If  $T(a_1, a_2) = \gamma_1$ , then  $h(\rho)$  has a local minimum at negative level and a global maximum at level 0. Moreover, we have  $h(\rho^*) = 0$  and  $h(\rho) < 0 \Leftrightarrow \rho \in (0, \rho^*) \cup (\rho^*, +\infty)$ .*

*Proof.* (i) We first prove that  $h$  has exactly two critical points. In fact,

$$h'(\rho) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \phi_1(\rho) = 2(p-2)(D_2 + D_3), \quad \text{with} \quad \phi_1(\rho) = \rho^{6-2p} - 4D_1\rho^{8-2p}.$$

We have,  $\phi_1(\rho) \nearrow$  on  $[0, \bar{\rho})$ ,  $\searrow$  on  $(\bar{\rho}, +\infty)$ , where  $\bar{\rho} = \left[\frac{3-p}{4(4-p)D_1}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Since  $2 < p < 3$ , we get  $\max_{\rho \geq 0} \phi_1(\rho) = \phi_1(\bar{\rho}) = \frac{1}{4-p}\bar{\rho}^{6-2p} > 2(p-2)(D_2 + D_3)$  if and only if

$$\alpha_1 a_1^{4-p} + \alpha_2 a_2^{4-p} < \gamma_0 := \frac{p}{2(p-2)(4-p)|\mathcal{C}_p|^p} \left[ \frac{(3-p)S_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta}^2}{4-p} \right]^{3-p}.$$

By  $\phi_1(0^+) = 0^+$  and  $\phi_1(+\infty) = -\infty$ , we see that  $h$  has exactly two critical points if  $T(a_1, a_2) := \alpha_1 a_1^{4-p} + \alpha_2 a_2^{4-p} < \gamma_0$ .

Notice that

$$h(\rho) > 0 \Leftrightarrow \psi_1(\rho) > D_2 + D_3, \quad \text{with} \quad \psi_1(\rho) = \frac{1}{2}\rho^{6-2p} - D_1\rho^{8-2p}.$$

It is not difficult to check that  $\psi_1(\rho) \nearrow$  on  $[0, \rho_0)$ ,  $\searrow$  on  $(\rho_0, +\infty)$ , where  $\rho_0 = \left[\frac{3-p}{2(4-p)D_1}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . We have  $\max_{\rho \geq 0} \psi_1(\rho) = \psi_1(\rho_0) = \frac{1}{2(4-p)}\rho_0^{6-2p} > D_2 + D_3$  provided

$$\alpha_1 a_1^{4-p} + \alpha_2 a_2^{4-p} < \gamma_1 := \frac{p}{2(4-p)|\mathcal{C}_p|^p} \left[ \frac{2(3-p)S_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta}^2}{4-p} \right]^{3-p}.$$

We have  $h(\rho) > 0$  on an open interval  $(R_0, R_1)$  if and only if  $T(a_1, a_2) := \alpha_1 a_1^{4-p} + \alpha_2 a_2^{4-p} < \gamma_1$ . It follows from Lemma 5.2 of [33] that

$$(p-2)2^{3-p} < 1 \Leftrightarrow \gamma_1 < \gamma_0.$$

Combined with  $h(0^+) = 0^-$  and  $h(+\infty) = -\infty$ , we see that  $h$  has a local minimum point at negative level in  $(0, R_0)$  and a global maximum point at positive level in  $(R_0, R_1)$ .

(ii) Similar to the proof of (i), we deduce that

$$R_0 = \bar{\rho} = \rho_0 = R_1, \quad \psi_1(\rho_0) = D_2 + D_3, \quad \phi_1(\bar{\rho}) > 2(p-2)(D_2 + D_3).$$

□

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i (i = 1, 2)$ ,  $\beta > 0$  and  $2 < p < 3$ ,  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$ . Then, for fixed  $(u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ ,  $\Psi_{(u,v)}(s)$  has exactly two critical points in  $(0, \infty)$ .*

*Proof.* By (1.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{(u,v)}(s) &= \frac{e^{2s}}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) - \frac{e^{4s}}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\mu_1 |u|^4 + \mu_2 |v|^4 + 2\beta |u|^2 |v|^2) \\ &\quad - \frac{e^{p\gamma_p s}}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_1 |u|^p - \frac{e^{p\gamma_p s}}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_2 |v|^p. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Let  $t = e^s$ ,  $A_1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2)$ ,  $A_2 = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\mu_1 |u|^4 + \mu_2 |v|^4 + 2\beta |u|^2 |v|^2)$ ,  $A_3 = \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_1 |u|^p$  and  $A_4 = \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_2 |v|^p$ . Moreover, from (2.6)-(2.7), we have  $A_2 \leq D_1 |A_1|^2$ ,  $A_3 \leq D_2 |A_1|^{p-2}$  and  $A_4 \leq D_3 |A_1|^{p-2}$ . Then we can rewrite (2.10) as

$$\begin{aligned} l(t) &= \frac{A_1}{2} t^2 - A_2 t^4 - (A_3 + A_4) t^{2(p-2)} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} (A_1^{\frac{1}{2}} t)^2 - D_1 (A_1^{\frac{1}{2}} t)^4 - (D_2 + D_3) (A_1^{\frac{1}{2}} t)^{2(p-2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the calculation in Lemma 2.7, we can prove  $\Psi_{(u,v)}(s)$  has exactly two critical points in  $(0, \infty)$ . □

### 3 Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

In this section, we first study the case  $\alpha_i < 0 (i = 1, 2)$ ,  $2 < p < 4$ ,  $\mu_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$  and  $\beta > 0$ .

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** If  $\alpha_i < 0 (i = 1, 2)$ , let  $(u, v)$  be a constraint critical point of  $I$  on  $S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$  and  $u, v > 0$ . Therefore,  $(u, v)$  solves (1.1)-(1.2) for some  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ . By the Pohozaev identity  $P_{a_1, a_2}(u, v) = 0$ , we have

$$\lambda_1 \|u\|_2^2 + \lambda_2 \|v\|_2^2 = \alpha_1 (1 - \gamma_p) \|u\|_p^p + \alpha_2 (1 - \gamma_p) \|v\|_p^p.$$

Then one of the  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$  is negative. Without loss of generality, we assume  $\lambda_1 < 0, \alpha_1 < 0$ . It follows from Lemma 2.2 that  $(u, v)$  is smooth, and is in  $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4) \times L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$ ; thus,  $|\Delta u|, |\Delta v| \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$  as well, and stand gradient estimates for the Poisson equation (see formula (3.15) in [14]) imply that  $|\nabla u|, |\nabla v| \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$ . Combining the fact that  $u, v \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ , we get  $u(x), v(x) \rightarrow 0$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus, we have

$$-\Delta u = (-\lambda_1 + \alpha_1 |u|^{p-2} + \mu_1 u^2 + \beta v^2) u \geq \frac{-\lambda_1}{2} u > 0$$

for  $|x| > R_0$ , with  $R_0 > 0$  large enough, and then  $u$  is superharmonic at infinity. From the Hadamard three spheres theorem [30, Chapter 2], this implies that the function  $m(r) := \min_{|x|=r} u(x)$  satisfies

$$m(r) \geq \frac{m(r_1)(r^{-2} - r_2^{-2}) + m(r_2)(r_1^{-2} - r^{-2})}{r_1^{-2} - r_2^{-2}} \quad \forall R_0 < r_1 < r < r_2.$$

Since  $u$  decays at infinity, we have that  $m(r_2) \rightarrow 0$  as  $r_2 \rightarrow +\infty$ , it is not difficult to see that  $r \mapsto r^2 m(r)$  is monotone non-decreasing for  $r > R_0$ . Moreover,  $m(r) > 0$  for every  $r > 0$  because  $u > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ . Thus,

$$m(r) \geq m(R_0)R_0^2 \cdot r^{-2} \quad \forall r > R_0,$$

and we deduce that

$$\|u\|_2^2 \geq C \int_{R_0}^{+\infty} |m(r)|^2 r^3 dr \geq C \int_{R_0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{r} dr = +\infty,$$

with  $C > 0$ . This is a contradiction. Then we know that (1.1)-(1.2) has no positive solution for  $\alpha_i < 0 (i = 1, 2)$ .

If  $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4)$  is a radial function, by [3, Radial Lemma A.II], there exist  $C > 0$  and  $R_1 > 0$  such that

$$|u(x)| \leq C|x|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \quad \text{for } |x| \geq R_1.$$

If  $\alpha_i < 0 (i = 1, 2)$ , let  $(u, v)$  be a non-trivial radial solution of (1.1)-(1.2). Similarly, we assume  $\lambda_1 < 0$ . Setting  $p(x) = -\alpha_1|u|^{p-2} - \mu_1 u^2 - \beta v^2$ , then

$$-\Delta u + p(x)u = -\lambda_1 u. \quad (3.1)$$

Since  $p > \frac{8}{3}$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} |x|p(x) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} [C|x|^{-\frac{3p}{2}+4} + C|x|^{-2}] = 0.$$

By Kato's result [22], i.e., Schrödinger operator  $H = -\Delta + p(x)$  has no positive eigenvalue with an  $L^2$ -eigenfunction if  $p(x) = o(|x|^{-1})$ , then (3.1) has no solution. We show that (1.1)-(1.2) has no non-trivial radial solution for  $p > \frac{8}{3}$  and  $\alpha_i < 0 (i = 1, 2)$ .  $\square$

In the following, we deal with the case  $2 < p < 3$ ,  $\alpha_i, \mu_i, a_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$ ,  $\beta > 0$  and prove Theorem 1.2. The first step consists in showing that  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$  is a manifold.

**Lemma 3.1.** *If  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$ , then  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0 = \emptyset$ , and the set  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$  is a  $C^1$ -submanifold of codimension 1 in  $S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ , hence it is a  $C^1$ -submanifold of codimension 3 in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ .*

*Proof.* It is sufficient to prove that  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0 = \emptyset$  holds. Indeed, if  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0 = \emptyset$ , we show that  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$  is a  $C^1$ -submanifold of codimension 1 in  $S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ . From (1.9), we know that  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$  is defined by  $P_{a_1, a_2}(u, v) = 0$ ,  $G_1(u) = 0$  and  $G_2(v) = 0$ , where

$$G_1(u) = \|u\|_2^2 - a_1^2 \quad \text{and} \quad G_2(v) = \|v\|_2^2 - a_2^2.$$

Since  $P_{a_1, a_2}$ ,  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are class of  $C^1$ , the proof is completed by showing that  $d(P_{a_1, a_2}, G_1, G_2) : H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  is a surjective. If this is not true, then  $dP_{a_1, a_2}$  has to be linearly dependent from  $dG_1$  and  $dG_2$ , i.e., there exist  $\bar{v}_1, \bar{v}_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $(u, v)$  is a solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \bar{v}_1 u = 2\mu_1 u^3 + \frac{p\gamma_p}{2}\alpha_1 |u|^{p-2}u + 2\beta v^2 u & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^4, \\ -\Delta v + \bar{v}_2 v = 2\mu_2 v^3 + \frac{p\gamma_p}{2}\alpha_2 |v|^{p-2}v + 2\beta u^2 v & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^4, \\ \|u\|_2^2 = a_1^2, \quad \|v\|_2^2 = a_2^2. \end{cases}$$

By the Pohozaev identity for above equation, we get

$$2(\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2) = 4\mu_1 \|u\|_4^4 + 4\mu_2 \|v\|_4^4 + p\gamma_p^2 \alpha_1 \|u\|_p^p + p\gamma_p^2 \alpha_2 \|v\|_p^p + 8\beta \|uv\|_2^2,$$

which contradicts with  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0 = \emptyset$ .

Next, we only need to prove that  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0 = \emptyset$  provided that  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$ . We argue by contradiction, suppose that there is a pair  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} E(t) &:= t\Psi'_{(u,v)}(0) - \Psi''_{(u,v)}(0) \\ &= (t-2) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 - (t-4)\mu_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^4 - (t-4)\mu_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |v|^4 \\ &\quad - (t-p\gamma_p)\gamma_p \alpha_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^p - (t-p\gamma_p)\gamma_p \alpha_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |v|^p - 2\beta(t-4) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^2 |v|^2 \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

If  $2 < p < 3$ , we have  $p\gamma_p < 2$ . It follows from  $E(p\gamma_p) = 0$  that

$$\begin{aligned} (2-p\gamma_p) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 &= (4-p\gamma_p)\mu_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^4 + (4-p\gamma_p)\mu_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |v|^4 \\ &\quad + 2\beta(4-p\gamma_p) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^2 |v|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Let  $\rho = [\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , by (2.6) and (3.2), we can infer that  $\rho \geq \left(\frac{3-p}{4(4-p)D_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Since  $E(4) = 0$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2 &= (4-p\gamma_p)\gamma_p \alpha_1 \rho^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^p + (4-p\gamma_p)\gamma_p \alpha_2 \rho^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |v|^p \\ &\leq (4-p\gamma_p)p\gamma_p D_2 \rho^{2(p-2)-2} + (4-p\gamma_p)p\gamma_p D_3 \rho^{2(p-2)-2} \\ &\leq C'(p)(\alpha_1 a_1^{4-p} + \alpha_2 a_2^{4-p}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where  $C'(p) = \frac{4(4-p)(p-2)|C_p|^p}{p} \left(\frac{4-p}{(3-p)S_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta}^2}\right)^{3-p}$  and  $p\gamma_p = 2(p-2)$ . Since  $T(a_1, a_2) = \alpha_1 a_1^{4-p} + \alpha_2 a_2^{4-p} \leq \gamma_1 < \gamma_0$  with  $\gamma_0 = \frac{2}{C'(p)}$ , then this contradicts with (3.3). Thus,  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0 = \emptyset$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *If  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$ , for  $(u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ , then the function  $\Psi_{(a_1, a_2)}(s)$  has exactly two critical points  $s_{(u,v)} < t_{(u,v)} \in \mathbb{R}$  and two zeros  $c_{(u,v)} < d_{(u,v)}$  with  $s_{(u,v)} < c_{(u,v)} < t_{(u,v)} < d_{(u,v)}$ . Moreover;*

(1)  $s_{(u,v)} \star (u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+$  and  $t_{(u,v)} \star (u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$ . Moreover, if  $s \star (u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{(a_1, a_2)}$ , then either  $s = s_{(u,v)}$  or  $s = t_{(u,v)}$ .

(2)  $s_{(u,v)} < \log \frac{R_0}{[\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}}$  and

$$\Psi_{(u,v)}(s_{(u,v)}) = \inf \left\{ \Psi_{(u,v)}(s) : s \in \left( -\infty, \log \frac{R_0}{[\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right\} < 0.$$

(3)  $I(t_{(u,v)} \star (u, v)) = \max_{s \in \mathbb{R}} I(s \star (u, v)) > 0$ .

(4) The maps  $(u, v) \mapsto s_{(u,v)} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $(u, v) \mapsto t_{(u,v)} \in \mathbb{R}$  are of class  $C^1$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ , from (1.11), we have  $s \star (u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{(a_1, a_2)}$  if and only if  $\Psi'_{(u,v)}(s) = 0$ . By (2.8), we get

$$\Psi_{(u,v)}(s) = I(s \star (u, v)) \geq h(e^s [\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Therefore,  $\Psi_{(u,v)}(s)$  is positive on  $\left( \log \frac{R_0}{[\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \log \frac{R_1}{[\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)$  and  $\Psi_{(u,v)}(-\infty) = 0^-$ ,  $\Psi_{(u,v)}(+\infty) = -\infty$ , thus we can see that  $\Psi_{(u,v)}(s)$  has a local minimum point  $s_{(u,v)}$  at negative level in  $\left( -\infty, \log \frac{R_0}{[\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)$  and has a global maximum point  $t_{(u,v)}$  at positive level in  $\left( \log \frac{R_0}{[\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \log \frac{R_1}{[\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)$ .

It follows from Lemma 2.8 that  $\Psi_{(u,v)}(s)$  has no other critical points.

Since  $\Psi''_{(u,v)}(s_{(u,v)}) \geq 0$ ,  $\Psi''_{(u,v)}(t_{(u,v)}) \leq 0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0 = \emptyset$ , we know that  $s_{(u,v)} \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+$  and  $t_{(u,v)} \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$ . By the monotonicity and the behavior at infinity of  $\Psi_{(u,v)}(s)$ , we get that  $\Psi_{(u,v)}(s)$  has exactly zeros  $c_{(u,v)} < d_{(u,v)}$  with  $s_{(u,v)} < c_{(u,v)} < t_{(u,v)} < d_{(u,v)}$ . Thus, the conclusions (1)-(3) follows from these facts above. Finally, applying the Implicit Function Theorem to the  $C^1$  function  $g_{(u,v)} : \mathbb{R} \times S(a_1) \times S(a_2) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $g_{(u,v)}(s) = \Psi'_{(u,v)}(s)$ . Therefore, we have that  $(u, v) \mapsto s_{(u,v)}$  is of class  $C^1$  because  $g_{(u,v)}(s_{(u,v)}) = 0$  and  $\partial_s g_{(u,v)}(s_{(u,v)}) = \Psi''_{(u,v)}(s_{(u,v)}) > 0$ . Similarly, we can prove that  $(u, v) \mapsto t_{(u,v)} \in \mathbb{R}$  is of class  $C^1$ .  $\square$

Let  $T(a_1, a_2) > 0$  and  $\rho_0$  be given in Lemma 2.7. Note that by Lemma 2.7, we have that  $f(a_1, a_2, \rho_0) = h(\rho_0) \geq 0$  for all  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$ . Define

$$B_{\rho_0} := \{(u, v) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2) : [\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} < \rho_0\},$$

and

$$V(a_1, a_2) := (S(a_1) \times S(a_2)) \cap B_{\rho_0}.$$

Thus, we can define the local minimization problem: for any  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$ ,

$$m(a_1, a_2) := \inf_{(u,v) \in V(a_1, a_2)} I(u, v).$$

**Corollary 3.3.** *If  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$ , the set  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+$  is contained in  $V(a_1, a_2)$  and*

$$m(a_1, a_2) = m^+(a_1, a_2) = \inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+} I(u, v) = \inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+} I(u, v).$$

*Proof.* For  $(u, v) \in V(a_1, a_2)$ , we have

$$I(u, v) \geq h(\left(\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}) \geq \min_{\rho \in [0, \rho_0]} h(\rho) > -\infty.$$

Let  $(u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ , there exists  $s_0 \ll -1$  such that  $s_0 \star (u, v) \in B_{\rho_0}$  and  $I(s_0 \star (u, v)) < 0$ . Hence, we get  $m(a_1, a_2) \in (-\infty, 0)$ . From Lemma 3.2, we have  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+ \subset V(a_1, a_2)$ , and then  $m(a_1, a_2) \leq \inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+} I(u, v)$ .

In addition, if  $(u, v) \in V(a_1, a_2)$ ,  $s_{(u, v)} \star (u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+ \subset V(a_1, a_2)$ , we get  $I(s_{(u, v)} \star (u, v)) = \min \{I(s \star (u, v)) : s \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } s \star (u, v) \in V(a_1, a_2)\} \leq I(u, v)$ , and it follows that  $\inf_{\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+} I(u, v) \leq m(a_1, a_2)$ . By Lemma 3.2,  $I(u, v) > 0$  on  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$ , we conclude that  $m(a_1, a_2) = \inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+} I(u, v) = \inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+} I(u, v)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *If  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$ , then*

$$m(a_1, a_2) < \min \{m^+(a_1, 0), m^+(0, a_2)\} < 0,$$

where  $m^+(a_1, 0)$  and  $m^+(0, a_2)$  are defined in (2.4).

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.1,  $m^+(a_1, 0) < 0$ ,  $m^+(a_1, 0)$  can be achieved by  $u^* \in S(a_1)$  and  $u^*$  is radially symmetric and decreasing. We choose a proper test function  $v \in S(a_2)$  such that  $(u^*, s \star v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$  with  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . It follows from (2.9) that

$$h(\rho) < h_1(\rho) = \frac{1}{2}\rho^2 - \frac{\mu_1}{4\mathcal{S}^2}\rho^4 - \frac{\alpha_1}{p}|\mathcal{C}_p|^p a_1^{4-p} \rho^{2(p-2)},$$

where we have used the fact that  $\mathcal{S}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta}^2 < \min\{\frac{1}{\mu_1}, \frac{1}{\mu_2}\}\mathcal{S}^2$ . By direct calculations, there exists  $0 < \hat{\rho} < R_0$  such that  $h_1(\hat{\rho}) = 0$ . In [19, 20], it has been proved that

$$m^+(a_1, 0) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{T}_{a_1, p, \mu_1, \alpha_1}^+} \mathcal{A}_{p, \mu_1, \alpha_1}(u) = \inf_{u \in S(a_1) \cap B_{\hat{\rho}}} \mathcal{A}_{p, \mu_1, \alpha_1}(u).$$

Then, we have

$$\|\nabla u^*\|_2 \leq \hat{\rho} < R_0 < \rho_0.$$

Since  $h(R_0) = h(R_1) = 0$  and the monotonicity of  $h(\rho)$ , we deduce that  $(u^*, s \star v) \in V(a_1, a_2)$  for  $s \ll -1$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} m(a_1, a_2) &= \inf_{(u, v) \in V(a_1, a_2)} I(u, v) \leq I(u^*, s \star v) \\ &\leq \mathcal{A}_{p, \mu_1, \alpha_1}(u^*) + \frac{e^{2s}}{2}\|\nabla v\|_2^2 - \frac{e^{p\gamma_p s}}{p}\|v\|_p^p - \frac{e^{4s}}{4}\|v\|_4^4 - \frac{\beta}{2}\|u^*(s \star v)\|_2^2 \\ &< \mathcal{A}_{p, \mu_1, \alpha_1}(u^*) = m^+(a_1, 0), \end{aligned}$$

because  $p\gamma_p < 2$ . On the other hand, we similarly get that  $m(a_1, a_2) < m^+(0, a_2)$ . Hence, the proof is completed.  $\square$

The main aim of this section is the following results.

**Lemma 3.5.** *If  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$  and*

$$m^+(a_1, a_2) < \min \{m^+(a_1, 0), m^+(0, a_2)\} < 0,$$

*then  $m^+(a_1, a_2)$  can be achieved by some function  $(u_{a_1}, v_{a_2}) \in V(a_1, a_2)$  which is real valued, positive, radially symmetric and radially decreasing.*

*Proof.* Let  $\{(u_n, v_n)\} \subset \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+$  be a minimizing sequence of  $m^+(a_1, a_2)$ . From Lemma 2.5, then by taking  $(|u_n|, |v_n|)$  and adapting the Schwarz symmetrization to  $(|u_n|, |v_n|)$  if necessary, we can obtain a new minimizing sequence (up to a subsequence), such that  $(u_n, v_n)$  are all real valued, nonnegative, radially symmetric and decreasing in  $r = |x|$ . We first prove that  $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$  is bounded in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ . Since  $P_{a_1, a_2}(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|u_n\|_4^4 - \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 - \gamma_p \alpha_1 \|u_n\|_p^p \\ & - \gamma_p \alpha_2 \|v_n\|_p^p - 2\beta \|u_n v_n\|_2^2 = o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

By Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and (2.7), we get

$$\begin{aligned} I(u_n, v_n) &= \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2 - \frac{\alpha_1}{p} \left(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u_n|^p \\ & \quad - \frac{\alpha_2}{p} \left(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |v_n|^p \\ & \geq \frac{1}{4} (\|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2) - \left(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4}\right) D_2 \|\nabla u_n\|_2^{p\gamma_p} \\ & \quad - \left(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4}\right) D_3 \|\nabla v_n\|_2^{p\gamma_p}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4} (\|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2) \\ & \leq \left(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4}\right) D_2 \|\nabla u_n\|_2^{p\gamma_p} + \left(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4}\right) D_3 \|\nabla v_n\|_2^{p\gamma_p} + m^+(a_1, a_2) + o_n(1), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$  is bounded. By the compact embedding of  $H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^4)$  into  $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^4)$  for  $2 < p_1 < 4$ , there exists  $(u, v)$  such that  $(u_n, v_n) \rightharpoonup (u, v)$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ ,  $u_n \rightarrow u$  in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^4)$  and  $v_n \rightarrow v$  in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^4)$ . Therefore,  $u, v \geq 0$  are radial functions. By the Lagrange multiplier's rule (see [9, Lemma 3]), we know that there exists a sequence  $\{(\lambda_{1,n}, \lambda_{2,n})\} \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \nabla u_n \nabla \phi + \lambda_{1,n} u_n \phi - \mu_1 (u_n)^3 \phi - \alpha_1 |u_n|^{p-2} u_n \phi - \beta |v_n|^2 u_n \phi = o_n(1) \|\phi\|, \tag{3.5}$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \nabla v_n \nabla \varphi + \lambda_{2,n} v_n \varphi - \mu_2 (v_n)^3 \varphi - \alpha_2 |v_n|^{p-2} v_n \varphi - \beta |u_n|^2 v_n \varphi = o_n(1) \|\varphi\|, \quad (3.6)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , for every  $(\phi, \varphi) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ . In particular, if we take  $(\phi, \varphi) = (u_n, v_n)$ ,  $(\lambda_{1,n}, \lambda_{2,n})$  is bounded. Up to a subsequence,  $(\lambda_{1,n}, \lambda_{2,n}) \rightarrow (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ . Passing to the limit in (3.5)-(3.6), then  $(u, v)$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \lambda_1 u = \mu_1 u^3 + \alpha_1 |u|^{p-2} u + \beta v^2 u, \\ -\Delta v + \lambda_2 v = \mu_2 v^3 + \alpha_2 |v|^{p-2} v + \beta u^2 v. \end{cases}$$

By  $P_{a_1, a_2}(u, v) = 0$ ,

$$\lambda_1 \|u\|_2^2 + \lambda_2 \|v\|_2^2 = (1 - \gamma_p) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_1 |u|^p + (1 - \gamma_p) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_2 |v|^p. \quad (3.7)$$

From (3.5)-(3.6) and  $P_{a_1, a_2}(u_n, v_n) = o_n(1)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 a_1^2 + \lambda_2 a_2^2 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_1 \|u_n\|_2^2 + \lambda_2 \|v_n\|_2^2 \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - \gamma_p) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_1 |u_n|^p + (1 - \gamma_p) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_2 |v_n|^p \\ &= (1 - \gamma_p) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_1 |u|^p + (1 - \gamma_p) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_2 |v|^p. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

We claim that  $u \neq 0$  and  $v \neq 0$ .

**Case 1.** If  $u = 0$  and  $v = 0$ , then  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_1 |u_n|^p \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_2 |v_n|^p \rightarrow 0$ , we have

$$P_{a_1, a_2}(u_n, v_n) = \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|u_n\|_4^4 - \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 - 2\beta \|u_n v_n\|_2^2 + o_n(1) = o_n(1).$$

Therefore,

$$m^+(a_1, a_2) + o_n(1) = I(u_n, v_n) = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2 + o_n(1) \geq 0,$$

this contradicts the fact that  $m^+(a_1, a_2) < 0$ .

**Case 2.** If  $u \neq 0$  and  $v = 0$ , then  $v_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^4)$ . Let  $\bar{u}_n = u_n - u$ ,  $\bar{u}_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^4)$ . By the maximum principle (see [17, Theorem 2.10]),  $u$  is a positive solution of (2.1). It follows from Lemma 2.1 that  $m^+(a_1, 0) \leq m^+(\|u\|_2, 0)$ . By the Brézis-Lieb Lemma [41], we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{a_1, a_2}(u_n, v_n) &= \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|u_n\|_4^4 - \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 - \gamma_p \alpha_1 \|u_n\|_p^p \\ &\quad - 2\beta \|u_n v_n\|_2^2 + o_n(1) \\ &= \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|\bar{u}_n\|_4^4 - \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 - 2\beta \|\bar{u}_n v_n\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + \|\nabla u\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|u\|_4^4 - \gamma_p \alpha_1 \|u\|_p^p + o_n(1) \\ &= \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|\bar{u}_n\|_4^4 - \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 - 2\beta \|\bar{u}_n v_n\|_2^2 + o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
m^+(a_1, a_2) + o_n(1) &= I(u_n, v_n) = I(\bar{u}_n, v_n) + I(u, 0) + o_n(1) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\nabla \bar{u}_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2) + m^+(\|u\|_2, 0) + o_n(1) \\
&\geq m^+(a_1, 0),
\end{aligned}$$

which contradicts our assumption on  $m^+(a_1, a_2)$ .

**Case 3.** If  $u = 0$  and  $v \neq 0$ . The analysis similar to that in the proof of Case 2 shows that  $m^+(a_1, a_2) \geq m^+(0, a_2) + o_n(1)$ , we also have a contradiction.

Therefore,  $u \neq 0$  and  $v \neq 0$ . It remains to show that  $m^+(a_1, a_2)$  is achieved. By the maximum principle (see [17, Theorem 2.10]),  $u, v > 0$ . Then, from Lemma 2.3, we get  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$ . Moreover, combining (3.7) with (3.8), we have

$$\lambda_1 a_1^2 + \lambda_2 a_2^2 = \lambda_1 \|u\|_2^2 + \lambda_2 \|v\|_2^2. \quad (3.9)$$

Since  $\|u\|_2^2 \leq a_1^2$  and  $\|v\|_2^2 \leq a_2^2$ , it follows from (3.9) that  $\|u\|_2^2 = a_1^2$  and  $\|v\|_2^2 = a_2^2$ , and hence  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$ . Let  $(\bar{u}_n, \bar{v}_n) = (u_n - u, v_n - v)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
o_n(1) &= P_{a_1, a_2}(u_n, v_n) = P_{a_1, a_2}(\bar{u}_n, \bar{v}_n) + P_{a_1, a_2}(u, v) + o_n(1) \\
&= \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \bar{v}_n\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|\bar{u}_n\|_4^4 - \mu_2 \|\bar{v}_n\|_4^4 - 2\beta \|\bar{u}_n \bar{v}_n\|_2^2 + o_n(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
m^+(a_1, a_2) + o_n(1) &= I(u_n, v_n) = I(\bar{u}_n, \bar{v}_n) + I(u, v) + o_n(1) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\nabla \bar{u}_n|^2 + |\nabla \bar{v}_n|^2) + m^+(a_1, a_2) + o_n(1) \\
&\geq m^+(a_1, a_2) + o_n(1).
\end{aligned}$$

We then conclude that  $I(u, v) = m^+(a_1, a_2)$  and  $(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow (u, v)$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ . Then, we have proved that  $m^+(a_1, a_2)$  can be attained by some  $(u_{a_1}, v_{a_2})$  which is real valued, positive, radially symmetric and decreasing in  $r = |x|$ .  $\square$

In the following, we derive a better upper bound of  $m^+(a_1, a_2)$ . We consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \lambda u = \alpha_1 |u|^{p-2} u \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^4, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^2 = a_1^2, \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

where  $\alpha_1 > 0$  and  $2 < p < 3$ . Define  $I_0(u) = \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u\|_2^2 - \frac{\alpha_1}{p} \|u\|_p^p$ , then solutions  $u$  of (3.10) can be found as minimizers of

$$m_0(a_1) = \inf_{u \in S(a_1)} I_0(u) > -\infty,$$

where  $\lambda$  is a Lagrange multiplier. From [21], we obtain that (3.10) has a unique positive solution  $(\lambda, u_{p,\alpha_1})$  given by

$$\lambda = \left( \frac{a_1^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \alpha_1^{\frac{2}{p-2}} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{6-2p}}, \quad u_{p,\alpha_1} = \left( \frac{\lambda}{\alpha_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-2}} w_p(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} x), \quad (3.11)$$

where  $w_p$  is the unique positive solution of (1.14).

By direct calculations, we have the following corollaries.

**Corollary 3.6.** *Let  $a_1 > 0$ ,  $\alpha_1 > 0$  and  $p \in (2, 3)$ . Then, we have*

$$m_0(a_1) = I_0(u_{p,\alpha_1}) = -K_{p,\alpha_1} \cdot a_1^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}} < 0,$$

where  $K_{p,\alpha_1} := \frac{3-p}{4-p} \|w_p\|_2^{\frac{2-p}{3-p}} \alpha_1^{\frac{1}{3-p}} > 0$ .

If  $\alpha_1 := \alpha_2$  and  $a_1 := a_2$  in (3.10), the analogues of  $u_{p,\alpha_1}$  will be denoted by  $u_{p,\alpha_2}$  respectively. Combining Lemma 3.4 with Corollary 3.6, we have

**Corollary 3.7.** *Let  $a_i, \alpha_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$  and  $2 < p < 3$ . If  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$ , then we have*

$$m^+(a_1, a_2) < \min \left\{ -K_{p,\alpha_1} \cdot a_1^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}}, -K_{p,\alpha_2} \cdot a_2^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}} \right\},$$

where  $K_{p,\alpha_1} := \frac{3-p}{4-p} \|w_p\|_2^{\frac{2-p}{3-p}} \alpha_1^{\frac{1}{3-p}} > 0$  and  $K_{p,\alpha_2} := \frac{3-p}{4-p} \|w_p\|_2^{\frac{2-p}{3-p}} \alpha_2^{\frac{1}{3-p}} > 0$ .

Next, we prove the asymptotic behaviour of the ground states to (1.1)-(1.2).

**Lemma 3.8.** *For any fixed  $\alpha_i, \mu_i, a_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$ ,  $\beta > 0$  and  $2 < p < 3$ . Letting  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$ , then for any ground state  $(u_{a_1}, v_{a_2})$  of (1.1)-(1.2), we have*

$$\left( \left( \frac{L_1}{\alpha_1} \right)^{-\frac{1}{p-2}} u_{a_1} \left( L_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} x \right), \left( \frac{L_2}{\alpha_2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{p-2}} v_{a_2} \left( L_2^{-\frac{1}{2}} x \right) \right) \rightarrow (w_p, w_p) \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2),$$

where  $w_p$  is defined as above,  $L_1 = \left( \frac{a_1^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \alpha_1^{\frac{2}{p-2}} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{6-2p}}$  and  $L_2 = \left( \frac{a_2^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \alpha_2^{\frac{2}{p-2}} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{6-2p}}$ .

*Proof.* For  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, \beta > 0 (i = 1, 2)$  fixed, let  $(a_{1,k}, a_{2,k}) \rightarrow (0^+, 0^+)$  as  $k \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $(u_{a_{1,k}}, v_{a_{2,k}}) \in V(a_{1,k}, a_{2,k})$  be a minimizer of  $m^+(a_{1,k}, a_{2,k})$  for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $V(a_{1,k}, a_{2,k}) = \{(u, v) \in S(a_{1,k}) \times S(a_{2,k}) : [\|\nabla u_{a_{1,k}}\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_{2,k}}\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} < \rho_0\}$ . By Lemma 3.5, we can suppose that  $\{(u_{a_{1,k}}, v_{a_{2,k}})\}$  is positive and radially symmetric, i.e.,  $0 < u_{a_{1,k}}, v_{a_{2,k}} \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^4)$ . From Lemma 2.7, we have  $\rho_0 \rightarrow 0$  as  $(a_{1,k}, a_{2,k}) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ . So  $\|\nabla u_{a_{1,k}}\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_{2,k}}\|_2^2 \rightarrow 0$  as well. In addition,

$$0 > m^+(a_{1,k}, a_{2,k}) + o_k(1) = I(u_{a_{1,k}}, v_{a_{2,k}}) \geq h([\|\nabla u_{a_{1,k}}\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_{2,k}}\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}) \rightarrow 0,$$

it follows that  $m^+(a_{1,k}, a_{2,k}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $(a_{1,k}, a_{2,k}) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ . Since  $P_{a_{1,k}, a_{2,k}}(u_{a_{1,k}}, v_{a_{2,k}}) = 0$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I(u_{a_{1,k}}, v_{a_{2,k}}) &= \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u_{a_{1,k}}|^2 + |\nabla v_{a_{2,k}}|^2 - \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{\gamma_p}{4}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_1 |u_{a_{1,k}}|^p \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{\gamma_p}{4}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_2 |v_{a_{2,k}}|^p \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p\gamma_p}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u_{a_{1,k}}|^2 + |\nabla v_{a_{2,k}}|^2 \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{p\gamma_p}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\mu_1 |u_{a_{1,k}}|^4 + \mu_2 |v_{a_{2,k}}|^4 \\
&\quad + 2\beta |u_{a_{1,k}}|^2 |v_{a_{2,k}}|^2) \\
&\leq \min \left\{ -K_{p,\alpha_1} \cdot a_{1,k}^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}}, -K_{p,\alpha_2} \cdot a_{2,k}^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, there exist  $C_i, C'_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$  such that

$$C_1 a_{1,k}^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}} + C_2 a_{2,k}^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u_{a_{1,k}}|^2 + |\nabla v_{a_{2,k}}|^2 \leq C'_1 a_{1,k}^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}} + C'_2 a_{2,k}^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}}. \quad (3.12)$$

Moreover, from (3.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\mu_1 |u_{a_{1,k}}|^4 + \mu_2 |v_{a_{2,k}}|^4 + 2\beta |u_{a_{1,k}}|^2 |v_{a_{2,k}}|^2) \\
&\leq \mathcal{S}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta}^2 \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u_{a_{1,k}}|^2 + |\nabla v_{a_{2,k}}|^2 \right)^2 \\
&\leq C a_{1,k}^{\frac{2(4-p)}{3-p}} + C' a_{2,k}^{\frac{2(4-p)}{3-p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The Lagrange multipliers rule implies the existence of some  $\lambda_{1,k}, \lambda_{2,k} \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \nabla u_{a_{1,k}} \nabla \phi + \lambda_{1,k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_{a_{1,k}} \phi &= \alpha_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u_{a_{1,k}}|^{p-2} u_{a_{1,k}} \phi + \mu_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (u_{a_{1,k}})^3 \phi \\
&\quad + \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |v_{a_{2,k}}|^2 u_{a_{1,k}} \phi, \\
\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \nabla v_{a_{2,k}} \nabla \psi + \lambda_{2,k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} v_{a_{2,k}} \psi &= \alpha_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |v_{a_{2,k}}|^{p-2} v_{a_{2,k}} \psi + \mu_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (v_{a_{2,k}})^3 \psi \\
&\quad + \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u_{a_{1,k}}|^2 v_{a_{2,k}} \psi,
\end{aligned}$$

for each  $\phi, \psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4)$ . Taking  $\phi = u_{a_{1,k}}$  and  $\psi = v_{a_{2,k}}$ , we get

$$\lambda_{1,k} a_{1,k}^2 = -[\|\nabla u_{a_{1,k}}\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|u_{a_{1,k}}\|_4^4 - \beta \|u_{a_{1,k}} v_{a_{2,k}}\|_2^2 - \alpha_1 \|u_{a_{1,k}}\|_p^p],$$

and

$$\lambda_{2,k} a_{2,k}^2 = -[\|\nabla v_{a_{2,k}}\|_2^2 - \mu_2 \|v_{a_{2,k}}\|_4^4 - \beta \|v_{a_{2,k}} u_{a_{1,k}}\|_2^2 - \alpha_2 \|v_{a_{2,k}}\|_p^p],$$

hence that

$$2K_{p,\alpha_1} \cdot a_{1,k}^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}} \leq \lambda_{1,k} a_{1,k}^2 + \lambda_{2,k} a_{2,k}^2 \quad \text{or} \quad 2K_{p,\alpha_2} \cdot a_{2,k}^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}} \leq \lambda_{1,k} a_{1,k}^2 + \lambda_{2,k} a_{2,k}^2, \quad (3.13)$$

and finally that  $\lambda_{1,k} \gtrsim a_{1,k}^{\frac{p-2}{3-p}}$  and  $\lambda_{2,k} \gtrsim a_{2,k}^{\frac{p-2}{3-p}}$ . In addition, by  $P_{a_1,k,a_2,k}(u_{a_1,k}, v_{a_2,k}) = 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & C a_{1,k}^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}} + C' a_{2,k}^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}} \\ & \leq \lambda_{1,k} a_{1,k}^2 + \lambda_{2,k} a_{2,k}^2 \\ & = -(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma_p}) [\|\nabla u_{a_1,k}\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2,k}\|_2^2] + (1 - \frac{1}{\gamma_p}) [\mu_1 \|u_{a_1,k}\|_4^4 \\ & \quad + \mu_2 \|v_{a_2,k}\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u_{a_1,k} v_{a_2,k}\|_2^2] \\ & \leq -(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma_p}) [\|\nabla u_{a_1,k}\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2,k}\|_2^2] \leq C_1 a_{1,k}^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}} + C'_1 a_{2,k}^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Therefore, from (3.13)-(3.14), there are  $\lambda_{1,k} \sim a_{1,k}^{\frac{p-2}{3-p}}$  and  $\lambda_{2,k} \sim a_{2,k}^{\frac{p-2}{3-p}}$  as  $(a_{1,k}, a_{2,k}) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  and  $a_{1,k} \sim a_{2,k}$ . Moreover, we also have  $\|u_{a_1,k}\|_p^p \sim a_{1,k}^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}}$  and  $\|v_{a_2,k}\|_p^p \sim a_{2,k}^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}}$ . Define

$$\tilde{u}_{a_1,k} = \frac{1}{\theta_{1,k}} u_{a_1,k} \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_{1,k}} x \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{v}_{a_2,k} = \frac{1}{\theta_{2,k}} v_{a_2,k} \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_{2,k}} x \right),$$

where

$$\theta_{1,k} = \left( \frac{a_{1,k}^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{6-2p}} \alpha_1^{\frac{1}{3-p}}, \quad \theta_{2,k} = \left( \frac{a_{2,k}^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{6-2p}} \alpha_2^{\frac{1}{3-p}},$$

and

$$\gamma_{1,k} = \left( \frac{a_{1,k}^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4(3-p)}} \alpha_1^{\frac{1}{6-2p}}, \quad \gamma_{2,k} = \left( \frac{a_{2,k}^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4(3-p)}} \alpha_2^{\frac{1}{6-2p}}.$$

Then,

$$\|\nabla \tilde{u}_{a_1,k}\|_2^2 = \frac{\gamma_{1,k}^2}{\theta_{1,k}^2} \|\nabla u_{a_1,k}\|_2^2 = \left[ \frac{a_{1,k}}{\|w_p\|_2} \right]^{\frac{p-4}{3-p}} \frac{1}{\alpha_1^{3-p}} \|\nabla u_{a_1,k}\|_2^2, \quad (3.15)$$

$$\|\nabla \tilde{v}_{a_2,k}\|_2^2 = \frac{\gamma_{2,k}^2}{\theta_{2,k}^2} \|\nabla v_{a_2,k}\|_2^2 = \left[ \frac{a_{2,k}}{\|w_p\|_2} \right]^{\frac{p-4}{3-p}} \frac{1}{\alpha_2^{3-p}} \|\nabla v_{a_2,k}\|_2^2, \quad (3.16)$$

$$\|\tilde{u}_{a_1,k}\|_2^2 = \frac{\gamma_{1,k}^4}{\theta_{1,k}^2} \|u_{a_1,k}\|_2^2 = \|w_p\|_2^2, \quad \|\tilde{v}_{a_2,k}\|_2^2 = \frac{\gamma_{2,k}^4}{\theta_{2,k}^2} \|v_{a_2,k}\|_2^2 = \|w_p\|_2^2,$$

and

$$\|\tilde{u}_{a_1,k}\|_p^p = \frac{\gamma_{1,k}^4}{\theta_{1,k}^p} \|u_{a_1,k}\|_p^p = \frac{\|w_p\|_2^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}}}{\alpha_1^{\frac{p-2}{3-p}}} \frac{\|u_{a_1,k}\|_p^p}{a_{1,k}^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}}},$$

$$\|\tilde{v}_{a_{2,k}}\|_p^p = \frac{\gamma_{2,k}^4}{\theta_{2,k}^p} \|v_{a_{2,k}}\|_2^2 = \frac{\|w_p\|_2^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}}}{\alpha_2^{\frac{p-2}{3-p}}} \frac{\|v_{a_{2,k}}\|_p^p}{a_{2,k}^{\frac{4-p}{3-p}}}.$$

We note that such an additional assumption is appropriate for  $a_{1,k} \sim a_{2,k}$  as  $(a_{1,k}, a_{2,k}) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ . We see that  $(\tilde{u}_{a_{1,k}}, \tilde{v}_{a_{2,k}})$  solves

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \tilde{u}_{a_{1,k}} + \frac{\lambda_{1,k}}{\gamma_{1,k}^2} \tilde{u}_{a_{1,k}} = \mu_1 \frac{\theta_{1,k}^2}{\gamma_{1,k}^2} \tilde{u}_{a_{1,k}}^3 + \alpha_1 \frac{\theta_{1,k}^{p-2}}{\gamma_{1,k}^2} |\tilde{u}_{a_{1,k}}|^{p-2} \tilde{u}_{a_{1,k}} + \beta \frac{\theta_{2,k}^2}{\gamma_{1,k}^2} \tilde{v}_{a_{2,k}}^2 \tilde{u}_{a_{1,k}}, \\ -\Delta \tilde{v}_{a_{2,k}} + \frac{\lambda_{2,k}}{\gamma_{2,k}^2} \tilde{v}_{a_{2,k}} = \mu_2 \frac{\theta_{2,k}^2}{\gamma_{2,k}^2} \tilde{v}_{a_{2,k}}^3 + \alpha_2 \frac{\theta_{2,k}^{p-2}}{\gamma_{2,k}^2} |\tilde{v}_{a_{2,k}}|^{p-2} \tilde{v}_{a_{2,k}} + \beta \frac{\theta_{1,k}^2}{\gamma_{2,k}^2} \tilde{u}_{a_{1,k}}^2 \tilde{v}_{a_{2,k}}. \end{cases} \quad (3.17)$$

The assumption  $a_{1,k} \sim a_{2,k}$  is used to ensure that  $\frac{\theta_{2,k}^2}{\gamma_{1,k}^2} \rightarrow 0$  and  $\frac{\theta_{1,k}^2}{\gamma_{2,k}^2} \rightarrow 0$  as  $(a_{1,k}, a_{2,k}) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ . From the asymptotic properties of  $\lambda_{1,k}, \lambda_{2,k}, \theta_{1,k}, \theta_{2,k}, \gamma_{1,k}, \gamma_{2,k}$ , there exist  $\lambda_1^*, \lambda_2^* > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda_{1,k}}{\gamma_{1,k}^2} &\rightarrow \lambda_1^*, & \frac{\theta_{1,k}^2}{\gamma_{1,k}^2} &\rightarrow 0, & \alpha_1 \frac{\theta_{1,k}^{p-2}}{\gamma_{1,k}^2} &\rightarrow 1, & \frac{\theta_{2,k}^2}{\gamma_{1,k}^2} &\rightarrow 0; \\ \frac{\lambda_{2,k}}{\gamma_{2,k}^2} &\rightarrow \lambda_2^*, & \frac{\theta_{2,k}^2}{\gamma_{2,k}^2} &\rightarrow 0, & \alpha_2 \frac{\theta_{2,k}^{p-2}}{\gamma_{2,k}^2} &\rightarrow 1, & \frac{\theta_{1,k}^2}{\gamma_{2,k}^2} &\rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Since (3.12) and (3.15)-(3.16), there exists  $(u_0, v_0) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$  such that

$$(\tilde{u}_{a_{1,k}}, \tilde{v}_{a_{2,k}}) \rightharpoonup (u_0, v_0) \quad \text{in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2).$$

Therefore,  $(u_0, v_0)$  solves

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \lambda_1^* u - |u|^{p-2} u = 0, \\ -\Delta v + \lambda_2^* v - |v|^{p-2} v = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.18)$$

Since  $0 \leq u_0, v_0$  and  $(u_0, v_0) \neq (0, 0)$ , it follows from the strong maximum principle that  $0 < u_0, v_0$ . We know that

$$u_0 = (\lambda_1^*)^{\frac{1}{p-2}} w_p(\sqrt{\lambda_1^*} x), \quad v_0 = (\lambda_2^*)^{\frac{1}{p-2}} w_p(\sqrt{\lambda_2^*} x)$$

is the unique positive solution of (3.18) (see [28, 21]). Testing (3.17) and (3.18) with  $\tilde{u}_{a_{1,k}} - u_0, \tilde{v}_{a_{2,k}} - v_0$  respectively, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla(\tilde{u}_{a_{1,k}} - u_0)|^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left( \frac{\lambda_{1,k}}{\gamma_{1,k}^2} \tilde{u}_{a_{1,k}} - \lambda_1^* u_0 \right) (\tilde{u}_{a_{1,k}} - u_0) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla(\tilde{u}_{a_{1,k}} - u_0)|^2 + \lambda_1^* |\tilde{u}_{a_{1,k}} - u_0|^2 + o_k(1) = o_k(1), \\ &\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla(\tilde{v}_{a_{2,k}} - v_0)|^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left( \frac{\lambda_{2,k}}{\gamma_{2,k}^2} \tilde{v}_{a_{2,k}} - \lambda_2^* v_0 \right) (\tilde{v}_{a_{2,k}} - v_0) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla(\tilde{v}_{a_{2,k}} - v_0)|^2 + \lambda_2^* |\tilde{v}_{a_{2,k}} - v_0|^2 + o_k(1) = o_k(1). \end{aligned}$$

We deduce that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{u}_{a_1, k}\|_2^2 = \|u_0\|_2^2 = \|w_p\|_2^2$  and  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{v}_{a_2, k}\|_2^2 = \|v_0\|_2^2 = \|w_p\|_2^2$ , hence that

$$(\lambda_1^*)^{\frac{6-2p}{p-2}} \|w_p\|_2^2 = \|u_0\|_2^2 = \|w_p\|_2^2, \quad (\lambda_2^*)^{\frac{6-2p}{p-2}} \|w_p\|_2^2 = \|v_0\|_2^2 = \|w_p\|_2^2,$$

and finally that  $\lambda_1^* = 1$  and  $\lambda_2^* = 1$ . Since  $(w_p, w_p)$  is unique,  $(\tilde{u}_{a_1, k}, \tilde{v}_{a_2, k}) \rightarrow (w_p, w_p)$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$  as  $(a_{1, k}, a_{2, k}) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  and  $a_{1, k} \sim a_{2, k}$ . Then, by direct calculations, there exist  $L_1 = \left(\frac{a_1^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \alpha_1^{\frac{2}{p-2}}\right)^{\frac{p-2}{6-2p}}$  and  $L_2 = \left(\frac{a_2^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \alpha_2^{\frac{2}{p-2}}\right)^{\frac{p-2}{6-2p}}$  such that

$$(\tilde{u}_{a_1, k}, \tilde{v}_{a_2, k}) = \left( \left(\frac{L_1}{\alpha_1}\right)^{-\frac{1}{p-2}} u_{a_1}(L_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} x), \left(\frac{L_2}{\alpha_2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{p-2}} v_{a_2}(L_2^{-\frac{1}{2}} x) \right).$$

□

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** It follows from Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.5 that there is a local minimizer of  $I$  on  $V(a_1, a_2)$ . The item 2 of Theorem 1.2 follows from Lemma 3.8. □

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1.3

In this section, we follow the approach of [38]. By Theorem 1.2,  $\mu_i, \alpha_i > 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ),  $\beta > 0$  and  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$ ,  $(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$  is a local minimum point of  $I$  restricted on  $S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ , i.e.,  $I(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) = m^+(a_1, a_2)$ . We can suppose that  $(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$  is a positive and radially symmetric decreasing function. Using the ground state  $(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$ , we can not only obtain a good energy estimate  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$  for  $2 < p < 3$ , but also recover the compactness of minimizing sequence at energy  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $2 < p < 3$ ,  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i > 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), and  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$ . Then for  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$ ,*

$$0 < m^-(a_1, a_2) = \inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-} I(u, v) < m^+(a_1, a_2) + \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2,$$

where  $k_1 = \frac{\beta - \mu_2}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$  and  $k_2 = \frac{\beta - \mu_1}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$ .

*Proof.* From (1.19),  $U_\varepsilon = \frac{2\sqrt{2}\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^2 + |x|^2}$ , taking a radially decreasing cut-off function  $\xi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$  such that  $\xi \equiv 1$  in  $B_1$ ,  $\xi \equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_2$ , and let  $W_\varepsilon(x) = \xi(x)U_\varepsilon(x)$ . We have (see [1]),

$$\|\nabla W_\varepsilon\|_2^2 = \mathcal{S}^2 + O(\varepsilon^2), \quad \|W_\varepsilon\|_4^4 = \mathcal{S}^2 + O(\varepsilon^4), \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$\|W_\varepsilon\|_p^p = O(\varepsilon^{4-p}), \quad \|W_\varepsilon\|_2^2 = O(\varepsilon^2 |\ln \varepsilon|). \quad (4.2)$$

Setting

$$(\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}, \widehat{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}) = (\bar{u} + t_1 W_\varepsilon, \bar{v} + t_2 W_\varepsilon), \quad (\overline{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}, \overline{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}) = (s_1 \widehat{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}(s_1 x), s_2 \widehat{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}(s_2 x)),$$

where  $t_1, t_2 > 0$  and  $\frac{t_1}{a_1^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u} W_\varepsilon = \frac{t_2}{a_2^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{v} W_\varepsilon$ . It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \bar{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}\|_2^2 &= \|\nabla \widehat{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}\|_2^2, & \|\bar{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}\|_4^4 &= \|\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}\|_4^4, \\ \|\bar{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}\|_2^2 &= (s_1)^{-2} \|\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}\|_2^2, & \|\bar{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}\|_p^p &= (s_1)^{p-4} \|\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}\|_p^p. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \bar{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_2^2 &= \|\nabla \widehat{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_2^2, & \|\bar{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_4^4 &= \|\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_4^4, \\ \|\bar{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_2^2 &= (s_2)^{-2} \|\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_2^2, & \|\bar{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_p^p &= (s_2)^{p-4} \|\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_p^p. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

In particular,

$$\|\bar{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1} \bar{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_2^2 = s_1^2 s_2^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}(s_1 x)|^2 |\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}(s_2 x)|^2. \quad (4.5)$$

We choose  $s_1 = \frac{\|\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}\|_2}{a_1}$  and  $s_2 = \frac{\|\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_2}{a_2}$ , then  $(\bar{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}, \bar{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ . From Lemma 3.2, there exists  $\tau_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\tau_\varepsilon \star (\bar{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}, \bar{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{2\tau_\varepsilon} [\|\nabla \bar{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \bar{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_2^2] \\ &= e^{4\tau_\varepsilon} [\mu_1 \|\bar{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|\bar{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|\bar{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1} \bar{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_2^2] \\ &+ e^{p\gamma_p \tau_\varepsilon} [\alpha_1 \gamma_p \|\bar{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}\|_p^p + \alpha_2 \gamma_p \|\bar{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_p^p]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Since  $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+$ , we have that  $\tau_\varepsilon > 0$  for  $t_1 = t_2 = 0$ . By (4.1)-(4.2) and (4.6), we get  $\tau_\varepsilon \rightarrow -\infty$  as  $t_1, t_2 \rightarrow +\infty$  uniformly for  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small. It follows from Lemma 3.2 that  $\tau_\varepsilon$  is unique and continuous for  $(\bar{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}, \bar{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2})$ , and then there exist  $t_1(\varepsilon), t_2(\varepsilon) > 0$  such that  $\tau_\varepsilon = 0$ . Therefore, we have

$$m^-(a_1, a_2) \leq \sup_{t_1, t_2 \geq 0} I(\bar{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}, \bar{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}).$$

By (4.1)-(4.5), there exists  $t_0 > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} I(\bar{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}, \bar{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}) &= \frac{1}{2} (\|\nabla \widehat{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \widehat{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_2^2) - \frac{1}{4} (\mu_1 \|\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_4^4 \\ &+ 2\beta s_1^2 s_2^2 \|\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}(s_1 x) \widehat{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}(s_2 x)\|_2^2) - \frac{\alpha_1}{p} s_1^{p\gamma_p - p} \|\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}\|_p^p \\ &- \frac{\alpha_2}{p} s_2^{p\gamma_p - p} \|\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_p^p \\ &\leq m^+(a_1, a_2) + \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2 - \sigma, \end{aligned}$$

for  $0 < t_1, t_2 < \frac{1}{t_0}$  and  $t_1, t_2 > t_0$  with  $\sigma > 0$ . By Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u} W_\varepsilon = O\left(\varepsilon^3 \int_1^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \frac{|r|^3}{1 + |r|^2}\right) = O(\varepsilon),$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u} W_\varepsilon^3 = O(\varepsilon \int_1^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \frac{|r|^3}{(1+|r|^2)^3}) = O(\varepsilon).$$

Moreover,

$$s_1^2 = \frac{\|\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon,t_1}\|_2^2}{a_1^2} = 1 + \frac{2t_1}{a_1^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u} W_\varepsilon + \frac{t_1^2}{a_1^2} \|W_\varepsilon\|_2^2 = 1 + O(\varepsilon), \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$s_2^2 = \frac{\|\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon,t_2}\|_2^2}{a_2^2} = 1 + \frac{2t_2}{a_2^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{v} W_\varepsilon + \frac{t_2^2}{a_2^2} \|W_\varepsilon\|_2^2 = 1 + O(\varepsilon), \quad (4.8)$$

for  $\frac{1}{t_0} < t_1, t_2 < t_0$ . By direct calculations, we use the fact that  $(a+b)^4 \geq a^4 + b^4 + 4a^3b + 4ab^3$  for all  $a, b \geq 0$ , and  $(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$  is a positive solution of (1.1) for  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} & I(\overline{W}_{\varepsilon,t_1}, \overline{V}_{\varepsilon,t_2}) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} [\|\nabla \widehat{W}_{\varepsilon,t_1}\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \widehat{V}_{\varepsilon,t_2}\|_2^2] - \frac{1}{4} [\mu_1 \|\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon,t_1}\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon,t_2}\|_4^4] \\ & \quad - \frac{\alpha_1}{p} s_1^{p\gamma_p-p} \|\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon,t_1}\|_p^p \\ & \quad - \frac{\alpha_2}{p} s_2^{p\gamma_p-p} \|\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon,t_2}\|_p^p - \frac{\beta}{2} s_1^2 s_2^2 \|\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon,t_1}(s_1x) \widehat{V}_{\varepsilon,t_2}(s_2x)\|_2^2 \\ & \leq I(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) - \frac{\beta}{2} (s_1^2 s_2^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon,t_1}(s_1x)|^2 |\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon,t_2}(s_2x)|^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon,t_1}(x)|^2 |\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon,t_2}(x)|^2) \\ & \quad + I(t_1 W_\varepsilon, t_2 W_\varepsilon) - \mu_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u} (t_1 W_\varepsilon)^3 - \mu_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{v} (t_2 W_\varepsilon)^3 \\ & \quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} [t_1 \nabla \bar{u} + t_2 \nabla \bar{v}] \nabla W_\varepsilon \\ & \quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} [t_1 \alpha_1 |\bar{u}|^{p-1} + t_2 \alpha_2 |\bar{v}|^{p-1} + t_1 \mu_1 |\bar{u}|^3 + t_2 \mu_2 |\bar{v}|^3 + t_1 \beta |\bar{v}|^2 \bar{u} + t_2 \beta |\bar{u}|^2 \bar{v}] W_\varepsilon \\ & \quad + \frac{\alpha_1(1-\gamma_p)}{a_1^2} \|\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon,t_1}\|_p^p \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u} t_1 W_\varepsilon \\ & \quad + \frac{\alpha_2(1-\gamma_p)}{a_2^2} \|\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon,t_2}\|_p^p \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{v} t_2 W_\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2 |\ln \varepsilon|) \\ & \leq m^+(a_1, a_2) + I(t_1 W_\varepsilon, t_2 W_\varepsilon) - t_1 (\lambda_1 - \frac{\alpha_1(1-\gamma_p)}{a_1^2} \|\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon,t_1}\|_p^p) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u} W_\varepsilon \\ & \quad - t_2 (\lambda_2 - \frac{\alpha_2(1-\gamma_p)}{a_2^2} \|\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon,t_2}\|_p^p) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{v} W_\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2 |\ln \varepsilon|) - O(\varepsilon) \\ & \quad - \frac{\beta}{2} (s_1^2 s_2^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon,t_1}(s_1x)|^2 |\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon,t_2}(s_2x)|^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon,t_1}(x)|^2 |\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon,t_2}(x)|^2). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemma 2.6 that

$$\begin{aligned} I(t_1 W_\varepsilon, t_2 W_\varepsilon) &= \frac{t_1^2 + t_2^2}{2} \|\nabla W_\varepsilon\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{4} \|W_\varepsilon\|_4^4 (\mu_1 t_1^4 + \mu_2 t_2^4 + 2\beta t_1^2 t_2^2) - O(\varepsilon^{4-p}) \\ &\leq \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2 - O(\varepsilon^{4-p}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $k_1 = \frac{\beta - \mu_2}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$  and  $k_2 = \frac{\beta - \mu_1}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$ . Since  $(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$  is the ground state solution of (1.1)-(1.2),

$$\lambda_1 a_1^2 + \lambda_2 a_2^2 = \alpha_1 (1 - \gamma_p) \|\bar{u}\|_p^p + \alpha_2 (1 - \gamma_p) \|\bar{v}\|_p^p.$$

The assumption  $\frac{t_1}{a_1^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u} W_\varepsilon = \frac{t_2}{a_2^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{v} W_\varepsilon$  is applied to ensure that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\lambda_1 a_1^2 - \alpha_1 (1 - \gamma_p) \|\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}\|_p^p) \frac{t_1}{a_1^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u} W_\varepsilon + (\lambda_2 a_2^2 - \alpha_2 (1 - \gamma_p) \|\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}\|_p^p) \frac{t_2}{a_2^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{v} W_\varepsilon \\ &\leq C \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\bar{u}|^{p-1} W_\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^{4-p}) \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{u} W_\varepsilon + C \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\bar{v}|^{p-1} W_\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^{4-p}) \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \bar{v} W_\varepsilon \\ &= O(\varepsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

In view of (4.7), (4.8) and using Fatou Lemma, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}(x)|^2 |\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}(x)|^2 \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} s_1^2 s_2^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\widehat{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}(s_1 x)|^2 |\widehat{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}(s_2 x)|^2. \quad (4.9)$$

Therefore, for  $\varepsilon$  small enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(\overline{W}_{\varepsilon, t_1}, \overline{V}_{\varepsilon, t_2}) &\leq m^+(a_1, a_2) + \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2 - O(\varepsilon^{4-p}) - O(\varepsilon) + O(\varepsilon^2 |\ln \varepsilon|) \\ &< m^+(a_1, a_2) + \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $2 < p < 3$ ,  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i > 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ),  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$ . Then for  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$ ,*

$$m^-(a_1, a_2) < \min \{m^-(a_1, 0), m^-(0, a_2)\},$$

where  $m^-(a_1, 0)$  and  $m^-(0, a_2)$  are defined in (2.4).

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.1,  $m^-(a_1, 0)$  can be achieved by  $u^* \in S(a_1)$ . We choose a proper test function  $v \in S(a_2)$  such that  $(u^*, s \star v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$  with  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . In [20, 42], it has been proved that

$$m^-(a_1, 0) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{T}_{a_1, p, \mu_1, \alpha_1}^-} \mathcal{A}_{p, \mu_1, \alpha_1}(u).$$

From Lemma 3.2, there exists  $t_s \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $t_s \star (u^*, s \star v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla u^*\|_2^2 + \|\nabla(s \star v)\|_2^2 \\ &= e^{(p\gamma_p - 2)t_s} [\alpha_1 \|u^*\|_p^p + \alpha_2 \|s \star v\|_p^p] \\ &\quad + e^{2t_s} [\mu_1 \|u^*\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|s \star v\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u^*(s \star v)\|_2^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

By (4.10), we obtain that  $e^{ts}$  is bounded as  $s \rightarrow -\infty$ . If  $s \ll -1$ , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} m^-(a_1, a_2) &= \inf_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-} I(u, v) \leq I(t_s \star (u^*, s \star v)) \\ &\leq \mathcal{A}_{p, \mu_1, \alpha_1}(t_s \star u^*) + \frac{e^{2t_s}}{2} \|\nabla s \star v\|_2^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{e^{p\gamma_p t_s}}{p} \|s \star v\|_p^p - \frac{e^{4t_s}}{4} \|s \star v\|_4^4 - \frac{\beta e^{4t_s}}{2} \|u^*(s \star v)\|_2^2 \\ &< \mathcal{A}_{p, \mu_1, \alpha_1}(u^*) = m^-(a_1, 0), \end{aligned}$$

because  $p\gamma_p < 2$ . On the other hand, we similarly get that  $m^-(a_1, a_2) < m^-(0, a_2)$ . Hence, the proof is completed.  $\square$

With the help of Lemmas 4.1-4.2, we can prove the existence of the second solution.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $2 < p < 3$ ,  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i > 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ),  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$ . If  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$  and*

$$0 < m^-(a_1, a_2) < \min \left\{ m^+(a_1, a_2) + \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2, m^-(a_1, 0), m^-(0, a_2) \right\},$$

where  $k_1 = \frac{\beta - \mu_2}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$  and  $k_2 = \frac{\beta - \mu_1}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$ , then  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$  can be achieved by some function  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$  which is real valued, positive, radially symmetric and radially decreasing.

*Proof.* Since the proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.5, we only sketch it. Let  $\{(u_n, v_n)\} \subset \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$  be a minimizing sequence. We assume that  $(u_n, v_n)$  are all real valued, nonnegative, radially symmetric and decreasing in  $r = |x|$ . Moreover,  $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$  is bounded in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ , and  $(u_n, v_n) \rightharpoonup (u, v)$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ . We need to prove that  $u \neq 0$  or  $v \neq 0$ .

**Case 1.** If  $u = 0$  and  $v = 0$ , then  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_1 |u_n|^p \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_2 |v_n|^p \rightarrow 0$ , we have

$$P_{a_1, a_2}(u_n, v_n) = \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|u_n\|_4^4 - \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 - 2\beta \|u_n v_n\|_2^2 = o_n(1).$$

By (1.18), we have

$$\sqrt{k_1 + k_2} \mathcal{S} (\mu_1 \|u_n\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u_n v_n\|_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2. \quad (4.11)$$

Then, we distinguish the two cases:

$$\text{either (i) } \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ or (ii) } \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 \rightarrow l > 0.$$

If (i) holds, we have that  $I(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow 0$  which contradicts the fact that  $m^-(a_1, a_2) > 0$ . If (ii) holds, we deduce from (4.11) that

$$\|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 \geq (k_1 + k_2) \mathcal{S}^2 + o_n(1).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} m^-(a_1, a_2) + o_n(1) &= I(u_n, v_n) = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2 + o_n(1) \\ &\geq \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2 + o_n(1), \end{aligned}$$

this contradicts  $m^-(a_1, a_2) < m^+(a_1, a_2) + \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2$ .

**Case 2.** If  $u \neq 0$  and  $v = 0$ , then  $v_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^4)$ . Let  $\bar{u}_n = u_n - u$ ,  $\bar{u}_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^4)$ . By the maximum principle (see [17, Theorem 2.10]),  $u$  is a positive solution of (2.1), then  $m^-(a_1, 0) \leq m^-(\|u\|_2, 0)$ . By the Brézis-Lieb Lemma [41], we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} &P_{a_1, a_2}(u_n, v_n) \\ &= \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|u_n\|_4^4 - \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 - \gamma_p \alpha_1 \|u_n\|_p^p - 2\beta \|u_n v_n\|_2^2 + o_n(1) \\ &= \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|\bar{u}_n\|_4^4 - \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 - 2\beta \|\bar{u}_n v_n\|_2^2 + o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

Again by (1.18), we have

$$\sqrt{k_1 + k_2} \mathcal{S} (\mu_1 \|\bar{u}_n\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|\bar{u}_n v_n\|_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2.$$

Similarly, we distinguish the two cases:

$$\text{either (i) } \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ or (ii) } \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 \rightarrow l > 0.$$

If (i) holds, we have  $I(\bar{u}_n, v_n) \rightarrow 0$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} m^-(a_1, a_2) + o_n(1) &= I(u_n, v_n) = I(\bar{u}_n, v_n) + I(u, 0) + o_n(1) \\ &= I(u, 0) + o_n(1) \geq m^-(a_1, 0). \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction. If (ii) holds,

$$\begin{aligned} m^-(a_1, a_2) + o_n(1) &= I(u_n, v_n) = I(\bar{u}_n, v_n) + I(u, 0) + o_n(1) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\nabla \bar{u}_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2) + m^+(\|u\|_2, 0) + o_n(1) \\ &\geq \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2 + m^+(a_1, 0) \\ &\geq \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2 + m^+(a_1, a_2), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts our assumption on  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$ .

**Case 3.** If  $u = 0$  and  $v \neq 0$ . The analysis similar to that in the proof of Case 2, we also have a contradiction.

Therefore,  $u \neq 0$  and  $v \neq 0$ . It remains to show that  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$  is achieved. It follows from the same computations in (3.5)-(3.8) that there exist  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$  such that

$$\lambda_1 a_1^2 + \lambda_2 a_2^2 = \lambda_1 \|u\|_2^2 + \lambda_2 \|v\|_2^2. \quad (4.12)$$

Since  $\|u\|_2^2 \leq a_1^2$  and  $\|v\|_2^2 \leq a_2^2$ , it follows from (4.12) that  $\|u\|_2^2 = a_1^2$  and  $\|v\|_2^2 = a_2^2$ , and hence  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$ . Let  $(\bar{u}_n, \bar{v}_n) = (u_n - u, v_n - v)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} o_n(1) &= P_{a_1, a_2}(u_n, v_n) = P_{a_1, a_2}(\bar{u}_n, \bar{v}_n) + P_{a_1, a_2}(u, v) + o_n(1) \\ &= \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \bar{v}_n\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|\bar{u}_n\|_4^4 - \mu_2 \|\bar{v}_n\|_4^4 - 2\beta \|\bar{u}_n \bar{v}_n\|_2^2 + o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

Here again we have the two cases:

$$\text{either (i) } \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \bar{v}_n\|_2^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ or (ii) } \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \bar{v}_n\|_2^2 \rightarrow l > 0.$$

If (ii) holds,

$$\begin{aligned} m^-(a_1, a_2) + o_n(1) &= I(u_n, v_n) = I(\bar{u}_n, \bar{v}_n) + I(u, v) + o_n(1) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\nabla \bar{u}_n|^2 + |\nabla \bar{v}_n|^2) + m^+(a_1, a_2) + o_n(1) \\ &\geq \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2 + m^+(a_1, a_2) + o_n(1), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Then (i) holds, we conclude that  $I(u, v) = m^-(a_1, a_2)$  and  $(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow (u, v)$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ . Therefore, we have proved that  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$  can be attained by some  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-)$  which is real valued, positive, radially symmetric and decreasing in  $r = |x|$ .  $\square$

In the following, we study the asymptotic behavior of the second solution for (1.1)-(1.2) as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $2 < p < 3$ ,  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i > 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ),  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$ . If  $T(a_1, a_2) \leq \gamma_1$ , then*

$$I(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) = m^-(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2 \text{ as } (a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0).$$

Moreover, there exists  $\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} > 0$  such that

$$(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} u_{a_1}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x), \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} v_{a_2}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x)) \rightarrow (\sqrt{k_1} U_{\varepsilon_0}, \sqrt{k_2} U_{\varepsilon_0})$$

in  $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ , for some  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$  up to a subsequence, where  $k_1 = \frac{\beta - \mu_2}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$  and  $k_2 = \frac{\beta - \mu_1}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $P(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) = 0$ , using the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} I(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) &= \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u_{a_1}^-|^2 + |\nabla v_{a_2}^-|^2 - \frac{\alpha_1}{p} \left(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u_{a_1}^-|^p \\ &\quad - \frac{\alpha_2}{p} \left(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |v_{a_2}^-|^p, \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} (\|\nabla u_{a_1}^- \|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^- \|_2^2) - \left(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4}\right) D_2 \|\nabla u_{a_1}^- \|_2^{2(p-2)} \\ &\quad - \left(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4}\right) D_3 \|\nabla v_{a_2}^- \|_2^{2(p-2)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.1,  $I(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) < m^+(a_1, a_2) + \frac{k_1+k_2}{4}\mathcal{S}^2$ , we have that  $\{(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-)\} \subset H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$  is bounded. Using the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality again,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u_{a_1}^-|^p &\leq |\mathcal{C}_p|^p a_1^{4-p} \|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^{2(p-2)} \rightarrow 0, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |v_{a_2}^-|^p &\leq |\mathcal{C}_p|^p a_2^{4-p} \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^{2(p-2)} \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ . Therefore, it follows from  $P(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) = 0$  that

$$\|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2 = \mu_1 \|u_{a_1}^-\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_{a_2}^-\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u_{a_1}^- v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2 + o(1).$$

From (1.18), we have

$$\sqrt{k_1 + k_2} \mathcal{S} (\mu_1 \|u_{a_1}^-\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_{a_2}^-\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u_{a_1}^- v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2.$$

Thus, we distinguish the two cases:

$$\text{either (i) } \|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ or (ii) } \|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2 \rightarrow l > 0.$$

We claim that (i) is impossible. In fact, since  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2\|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + 2\|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2 &< 4[\mu_1 \|u_{a_1}^-\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_{a_2}^-\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u_{a_1}^- v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2] \\ &\quad + p\gamma_p^2 \alpha_1 \|u_{a_1}^-\|_p^p + p\gamma_p^2 \alpha_2 \|v_{a_2}^-\|_p^p. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2 &< \frac{4-p\gamma_p}{2-p\gamma_p} [\mu_1 \|u_{a_1}^-\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_{a_2}^-\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u_{a_1}^- v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2] \\ &\leq \frac{4-p\gamma_p}{2-p\gamma_p} \frac{1}{(k_1+k_2)\mathcal{S}^2} [\|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2]^2. \end{aligned}$$

The claim is proved. Therefore, (ii) holds, and  $l \geq (k_1 + k_2)\mathcal{S}^2$ . Moreover, by [20],  $m^-(a_1, 0) \rightarrow \frac{\mu_1}{4}\mathcal{S}^2$  as  $a_1 \rightarrow 0$ , and  $m^-(0, a_2) \rightarrow \frac{\mu_2}{4}\mathcal{S}^2$  as  $a_2 \rightarrow 0$ . We obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{k_1+k_2}{4}\mathcal{S}^2 + m^+(a_1, a_2) &> m^-(a_1, a_2) = I(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u_{a_1}^-|^2 + |\nabla v_{a_2}^-|^2 - \frac{\alpha_1}{p} (1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4}) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u_{a_1}^-|^p \\ &\quad - \frac{\alpha_2}{p} (1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4}) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |v_{a_2}^-|^p \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u_{a_1}^-|^2 + |\nabla v_{a_2}^-|^2 + o(1) \\ &\geq \frac{k_1+k_2}{4}\mathcal{S}^2 + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account that  $m^+(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow 0$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ . Thus, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2 &\rightarrow (k_1 + k_2)\mathcal{S}^2, \\ \mu_1 \|u_{a_1}^-\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_{a_2}^-\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u_{a_1}^- v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2 &\rightarrow (k_1 + k_2)\mathcal{S}^2, \end{aligned}$$

as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ . It follows that, up to a subsequence,  $\{(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-)\}$  is a minimizing sequence of the minimizing problem (1.18). From Lemma 3.2,  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-)$  is radially symmetric. By [41, Theorem 1.41] or [24, Lemma 3.5], up to a subsequence, there exists  $\sigma_1 := \sigma_1(a_1, a_2)$  such that for some  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ ,

$$u_1(x) = \sigma_1 u_{a_1}^-(\sigma_1 x) \rightarrow \sqrt{k_1} U_{\varepsilon_0} \quad \text{and} \quad v_1(x) = \sigma_1 v_{a_2}^-(\sigma_1 x) \rightarrow \sqrt{k_2} U_{\varepsilon_0} \quad (4.13)$$

in  $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ , as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ . Since  $\|U_{\varepsilon_0}\|_2^2 \notin L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ ,  $\|u_1\|_2^2 = \frac{a_1^2}{\sigma_1^2}$  and  $\|v_1\|_2^2 = \frac{a_2^2}{\sigma_1^2}$ , by the Fatou lemma, we have  $\sigma_1 = o(a_1)$ ,  $\sigma_1 = o(a_2)$  and  $\|u_1\|_2^2 \rightarrow +\infty$ ,  $\|v_1\|_2^2 \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ .

Therefore, we get that  $(u_1, v_1)$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_1 + \lambda_1 \sigma_1^2 u_1 = \mu_1 u_1^3 + \alpha_1 \sigma_1^{4-p} |u_1|^{p-2} u_1 + \beta v_1^2 u_1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^4, \\ -\Delta v_1 + \lambda_2 \sigma_1^2 v_1 = \mu_2 v_1^3 + \alpha_2 \sigma_1^{4-p} |v_1|^{p-2} v_1 + \beta u_1^2 v_1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^4, \end{cases} \quad (4.14)$$

where  $\lambda_1 := \lambda_{1,a_1,a_2}$  and  $\lambda_2 := \lambda_{2,a_1,a_2}$ . We note that such an additional assumption is appropriate for the case  $a_1 \sim a_2$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ . By  $P_{a_1,a_2}(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) = 0$ , we have

$$\lambda_1 \sigma_1^2 \|u_1\|_2^2 + \lambda_2 \sigma_1^2 \|v_1\|_2^2 = (1 - \gamma_p) \alpha_1 \sigma_1^{4-p} \|u_1\|_p^p + (1 - \gamma_p) \alpha_2 \sigma_1^{4-p} \|v_1\|_p^p.$$

Since  $2 < p < 3$ , it follows that  $\lambda_1 \sigma_1^2 = o(\sigma_1^{4-p})$  and  $\lambda_2 \sigma_1^2 = o(\sigma_1^{4-p})$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$ . This follows by the same methods as in Lemma 2.2, hence

$$(u_1, v_1) \rightarrow (\sqrt{k_1} U_{\varepsilon_0}, \sqrt{k_2} U_{\varepsilon_0}) \quad \text{in } C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^4) \times C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^4). \quad (4.15)$$

In what follows, we follow the ideas in [42] to drive a uniformly upper bound of  $(u_1, v_1)$ . We define

$$\bar{u}_1 := \frac{1}{u_1(0)} u_1(\sqrt{u_1(0)} x), \quad \bar{v}_1 := \frac{1}{v_1(0)} v_1(\sqrt{v_1(0)} x).$$

Since  $(u_1, v_1)$  is radial, a direct computation shows that  $(\bar{u}_1, \bar{v}_1)$  solve

$$\begin{cases} -\bar{u}_1'' - \frac{3}{r} \bar{u}_1' = f(\bar{u}_1, \bar{v}_1) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^4, \\ -\bar{v}_1'' - \frac{3}{r} \bar{v}_1' = g(\bar{u}_1, \bar{v}_1) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^4, \end{cases} \quad (4.16)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f(\bar{u}_1, \bar{v}_1) &= -\lambda_1 \sigma_1^2 u_1(0) \bar{u}_1 + \mu_1 [u_1(0)]^3 \bar{u}_1^3 + \alpha_1 \sigma_1^{4-p} [u_1(0)]^{p-1} |\bar{u}_1|^{p-2} \bar{u}_1 \\ &\quad + \beta [v_1(0)]^2 u_1(0) \bar{v}_1^2 \bar{u}_1, \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} g(\bar{u}_1, \bar{v}_1) &= -\lambda_2 \sigma_1^2 v_1(0) \bar{v}_1 + \mu_2 [v_1(0)]^3 \bar{v}_1^3 + \alpha_2 \sigma_1^{4-p} [v_1(0)]^{p-1} |\bar{v}_1|^{p-2} \bar{v}_1 \\ &\quad + \beta [u_1(0)]^2 v_1(0) \bar{u}_1^2 \bar{v}_1. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$H_1(r) = r^4(\bar{u}'_1)^2 + 2r^3\bar{u}_1\bar{u}'_1 + \frac{1}{2}r^4\bar{u}_1f(\bar{u}_1, \bar{v}_1),$$

and

$$H_2(r) = r^4(\bar{v}'_1)^2 + 2r^3\bar{v}_1\bar{v}'_1 + \frac{1}{2}r^4\bar{v}_1g(\bar{u}_1, \bar{v}_1).$$

By direct calculations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H'_1(r) &= 4r^3(\bar{u}'_1)^2 + 2r^4\bar{u}'_1\bar{u}''_1 + 6r^2\bar{u}_1\bar{u}'_1 + 2r^3[(\bar{u}'_1)^2 + \bar{u}_1\bar{u}''_1] + 2r^3\bar{u}_1f(\bar{u}_1, \bar{v}_1) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}r^4[\bar{u}'_1f(\bar{u}_1, \bar{v}_1) + \bar{u}_1\frac{\partial f(\bar{u}_1, \bar{v}_1)}{\partial r}]. \end{aligned}$$

From (4.15)-(4.17), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} H'_1(r) &= r^4u_1(0)\bar{u}_1\bar{u}'_1[\lambda_1\sigma_1^2 - \frac{4-p}{2}\alpha_1\sigma_1^{4-p}[u_1(0)]^{p-2}|\bar{u}_1|^{p-2}] \\ &\quad + r^4\beta[v_1(0)]^2u_1(0)\bar{u}_1\bar{v}_1[\bar{v}'_1\bar{u}_1 - \bar{u}'_1\bar{v}_1] \\ &= r^4\sigma_1^{4-p}u_1(0)\bar{u}_1\bar{u}'_1[o(1) - \frac{4-p}{2}\alpha_1|\sqrt{k_1}U_{\varepsilon_0}|^{p-2}] + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

for  $\varepsilon_0$  small enough. Moreover,  $u_1, v_1$  exponentially decays to zero as  $r \rightarrow +\infty$  (see [42]), then  $\lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} H_1(r) = 0$ . Since  $u_1, v_1 > 0$ ,  $\bar{u}'_1, \bar{v}'_1 < 0$ , there exists  $r_1 := r(a_1, a_2) > 0$ ,  $H'_1(r_1) > 0$  for  $0 < r < r_1$  and  $H'_1(r) < 0$  for  $r > r_1$ . Therefore,  $H_1(r) > H_1(0) = 0$  for all  $r > 0$ . Let

$$\Psi(r) = \frac{-\bar{u}'_1}{r|\bar{u}_1|^2}.$$

By (4.16), we deduce that

$$\Psi'(r) = 2r^{-5}\bar{u}_1^{-3}H_1(r) > 0, \quad \forall r > 0.$$

It follows from (4.16) once more that

$$\Psi(r) > \Psi(0) = -\bar{u}''_1(0) = \frac{d}{4}, \quad (4.18)$$

where

$$d = -\lambda_1\sigma_1^2u_1(0) + \mu_1[u_1(0)]^3 + \alpha_1\sigma_1^{4-p}[u_1(0)]^{p-1} + \beta[v_1(0)]^2u_1(0).$$

Let  $Z(r) = \frac{1}{1+\frac{d}{8}r^2}$ , then we have

$$\frac{-Z'(r)}{[Z(r)]^2} = \frac{d}{4}r. \quad (4.19)$$

From (4.18)-(4.19), we get that

$$\frac{\bar{u}'_1(r)}{[\bar{u}_1(r)]^2} \leq \frac{Z'(r)}{[Z(r)]^2} \quad \forall r > 0,$$

which together with (4.15), implies

$$u_1(r) \lesssim \frac{1}{1+r^2} \quad \forall r > 0, \quad (4.20)$$

uniformly for  $a_1, a_2 > 0$  sufficiently small and  $a_1 \sim a_2$ .

Similarly, we can deduce that

$$v_1(r) \lesssim \frac{1}{1+r^2} \quad \forall r > 0, \quad (4.21)$$

uniformly for  $a_1, a_2 > 0$  sufficiently small and  $a_1 \sim a_2$ . Then for  $2 < p < 3$ , we get

$$\|u_1\|_p^p \lesssim \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{r^3}{(1+r^2)^p} \lesssim 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|v_1\|_p^p \lesssim \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{r^3}{(1+r^2)^p} \lesssim 1.$$

By the Fatou lemma,  $\|u_1\|_p^p \geq \|\sqrt{k_1}U_{\varepsilon_0}\|_p^p \gtrsim 1 + o(1)$  and  $\|v_1\|_p^p \geq \|\sqrt{k_2}U_{\varepsilon_0}\|_p^p \gtrsim 1 + o(1)$ . Thus,  $\|u_1\|_p^p \sim 1$ ,  $\|v_1\|_p^p \sim 1$ , and

$$\lambda_1 a_1^2 \sim \sigma_1^{4-p} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_2 a_2^2 \sim \sigma_1^{4-p},$$

where  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$ .

Let us define

$$V_\varepsilon(x) = \sqrt{k_1}U_\varepsilon\phi(R_\varepsilon^{-1}x) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{V}_\varepsilon(x) = \sqrt{k_2}U_\varepsilon\phi(\bar{R}_\varepsilon^{-1}x),$$

where  $U_\varepsilon$  is defined in (1.19),  $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$  is a radially decreasing cut-off function with  $\phi \equiv 1$  in  $B_1$ ,  $\phi \equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_2$ , and  $R_\varepsilon, \bar{R}_\varepsilon$  are chosen such that  $(V_\varepsilon, \bar{V}_\varepsilon) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ . We choose  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small and then

$$a_1^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\sqrt{k_1}U_\varepsilon\phi(R_\varepsilon^{-1}x)|^2 \sim \varepsilon^2 \int_1^{R_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1}} \frac{1}{r} \sim \varepsilon^2 \ln(R_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1}), \quad (4.22)$$

$$a_2^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\sqrt{k_2}U_\varepsilon\phi(\bar{R}_\varepsilon^{-1}x)|^2 \sim \varepsilon^2 \int_1^{\bar{R}_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1}} \frac{1}{r} \sim \varepsilon^2 \ln(\bar{R}_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1}), \quad (4.23)$$

which implies  $R_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1} \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $\bar{R}_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1} \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . From we have

$$\|\nabla V_\varepsilon\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_2^2 = (k_1 + k_2)\mathcal{S}^2 + O((R_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}) + O((\bar{R}_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}),$$

$$\alpha_1\|V_\varepsilon\|_p^p + \alpha_2\|\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_p^p + 2\beta\|V_\varepsilon\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_2^2 = (k_1 + k_2)\mathcal{S}^2 + O((R_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-4}) + O((\bar{R}_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-4}),$$

and

$$\|V_\varepsilon\|_p^p \sim \varepsilon^{4-p}, \quad \|\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_p^p \sim \varepsilon^{4-p},$$

for  $\varepsilon$  small enough. By Lemma 3.2, there exists  $t_0 := t_0(V_\varepsilon, \bar{V}_\varepsilon) > 0$  such that  $t_0 \star (V_\varepsilon, \bar{V}_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$ . For convenience, we replace  $e^{t_0}$  by  $t_1$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla V_\varepsilon\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_2^2 \\ &= t_1^2 [\mu_1\|V_\varepsilon\|_4^4 + \mu_2\|\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_4^4 + 2\beta\|V_\varepsilon\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_2^2] + t_1^{\gamma_p-2} [\gamma_p\alpha_1\|V_\varepsilon\|_p^p + \gamma_p\alpha_2\|\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_p^p] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$2\|\nabla V_\varepsilon\|_2^2 + 2\|\nabla \bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_2^2 < 4t_1^2[\mu_1\|V_\varepsilon\|_4^4 + \mu_2\|\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_4^4 + 2\beta\|V_\varepsilon\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_2^2] \\ + t_1^{p\gamma_p-2}[p\gamma_p^2\alpha_1\|V_\varepsilon\|_p^p + p\gamma_p^2\alpha_2\|\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_p^p].$$

Therefore,  $\{t_1(V_\varepsilon, \bar{V}_\varepsilon)\}$  is uniformly bounded and bounded from below away from 0 for all  $\varepsilon, a_1, a_2$  sufficiently small. Hence,

$$(k_1 + k_2)\mathcal{S}^2[1 - t_1^2] \\ = [\gamma_p\alpha_1\|V_\varepsilon\|_p^p + \gamma_p\alpha_2\|\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_p^p]t_1^{p\gamma_p-2} + O((R_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}) + O((\bar{R}_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}).$$

It follows that

$$t_1 = 1 - (1 + o(1))\frac{\gamma_p\alpha_1\|V_\varepsilon\|_p^p + \gamma_p\alpha_2\|\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_p^p + O((R_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}) + O((\bar{R}_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2})}{2(k_1 + k_2)\mathcal{S}^2}. \quad (4.24)$$

From (4.24), we can infer that

$$m^-(a_1, a_2) \leq I(t_0 \star (V_\varepsilon, \bar{V}_\varepsilon)) \\ \leq \frac{t_1^2}{4}(k_1 + k_2)\mathcal{S}^2 - \frac{\alpha_1}{p}(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4})(t_1)^{p\gamma_p}\|V_\varepsilon\|_p^p \\ - \frac{\alpha_2}{p}(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4})(t_1)^{p\gamma_p}\|\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_p^p + O((R_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}) + O((\bar{R}_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}) \\ = \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4}\mathcal{S}^2 - \frac{\alpha_1\gamma_p\|V_\varepsilon\|_p^p + \alpha_2\gamma_p\|\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_p^p}{4} - \frac{\alpha_1}{p}(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4})\|V_\varepsilon\|_p^p \\ - \frac{\alpha_2}{p}(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4})\|\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_p^p + O((R_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}) + O((\bar{R}_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}) \\ = \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4}\mathcal{S}^2 - \frac{\alpha_1}{p}\|V_\varepsilon\|_p^p - \frac{\alpha_2}{p}\|\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_p^p \\ + O((R_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}) + O((\bar{R}_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}). \quad (4.25)$$

Since  $m^-(a_1, a_2) = I(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) = \frac{1}{4}[\|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2] - \frac{\alpha_1}{p}(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4})\|u_{a_1}^-\|_p^p - \frac{\alpha_2}{p}(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4})\|v_{a_2}^-\|_p^p$ , from (4.25), we get

$$\frac{1}{4}[\|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2] - \frac{\alpha_1}{p}(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4})\|u_{a_1}^-\|_p^p - \frac{\alpha_2}{p}(1 - \frac{p\gamma_p}{4})\|v_{a_2}^-\|_p^p \\ \leq \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4}\mathcal{S}^2 - \frac{\alpha_1}{p}\|V_\varepsilon\|_p^p - \frac{\alpha_2}{p}\|\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_p^p + O((R_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}) + O((\bar{R}_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}). \quad (4.26)$$

By  $P_{a_1, a_2}(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) = 0$ , we know that

$$\sqrt{k_1 + k_2}\mathcal{S} \leq \frac{\|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2}{[\alpha_1\|u_{a_1}^-\|_p^p + \alpha_2\|v_{a_2}^-\|_p^p + 2\beta\|u_{a_1}^-v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2]^{1/2}} \\ = (\|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2 - \alpha_1\gamma_p\|u_{a_1}^-\|_p^p - \alpha_2\gamma_p\|v_{a_2}^-\|_p^p)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ + \frac{\alpha_1\gamma_p\|u_{a_1}^-\|_p^p + \alpha_2\gamma_p\|v_{a_2}^-\|_p^p}{\sqrt{k_1 + k_2}\mathcal{S}} \\ + O((R_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}) + O((\bar{R}_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}),$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2 &\geq \left[ \sqrt{k_1 + k_2} \mathcal{S} - \frac{\alpha_1 \gamma_p \|u_{a_1}^-\|_p^p + \alpha_2 \gamma_p \|v_{a_2}^-\|_p^p}{\sqrt{k_1 + k_2} \mathcal{S}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + O((R_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}) + O((\bar{R}_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}) \right]^2 \\
&\quad + \alpha_1 \gamma_p \|u_{a_1}^-\|_p^p + \alpha_2 \gamma_p \|v_{a_2}^-\|_p^p \\
&\geq (k_1 + k_2) \mathcal{S}^2 - \alpha_1 \gamma_p \|u_{a_1}^-\|_p^p - \alpha_2 \gamma_p \|v_{a_2}^-\|_p^p \\
&\quad + O((R_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}) + O((\bar{R}_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

From (4.25)–(4.27), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_1 \|u_{a_1}^-\|_p^p + \alpha_2 \|v_{a_2}^-\|_p^p &\gtrsim \alpha_1 \|V_\varepsilon\|_p^p + \alpha_2 \|\bar{V}_\varepsilon\|_p^p - O((R_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}) - O((\bar{R}_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}) \\
&\gtrsim \varepsilon^{4-p} + \varepsilon^{4-p} - O((R_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}) - O((\bar{R}_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{-1})^{-2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

By (4.22)–(4.23), we choose  $\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}$  such that  $\|u_{a_1}^-\|_p^p + \|v_{a_2}^-\|_p^p \gtrsim \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}^{4-p}$ . Define

$$w_1 = \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} u_{a_1}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x) \quad \text{and} \quad w_2 = \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} v_{a_2}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x), \tag{4.29}$$

then  $\|\nabla w_1\|_2^2 \sim 1$ ,  $\|\nabla w_2\|_2^2 \sim 1$ ,  $\|w_1\|_4^4 \sim 1$ ,  $\|w_2\|_4^4 \sim 1$  and  $\|w_1\|_p^p + \|w_2\|_p^p \gtrsim 1$ . By (4.13), it is easy to see that  $\sigma_1^{4-p} \|u_1\|_p^p = \|u_{a_1}^-\|_p^p = \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}^{4-p} \|w_1\|_p^p$  and  $\sigma_1^{4-p} \|v_1\|_p^p = \|v_{a_2}^-\|_p^p = \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}^{4-p} \|w_2\|_p^p$ . Then, we have  $\sigma_1 \gtrsim \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}$ .

Next, we need to prove that  $\sigma_1 \lesssim \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}$ , then

$$\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} u_{a_1}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x) \rightarrow \sqrt{k_1} U_{\varepsilon_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} v_{a_2}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x) \rightarrow \sqrt{k_2} U_{\varepsilon_0} \quad \text{in } D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^4),$$

as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$ .

In fact, we know that

$$w_1(x) = \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}}{\sigma_1} \right) u_1 \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}}{\sigma_1} x \right) \quad \text{and} \quad w_2(x) = \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}}{\sigma_1} \right) v_1 \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}}{\sigma_1} x \right)$$

and  $(\bar{w}_1, \bar{w}_2)$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \bar{w}_1 = h_1(\bar{w}_1, \bar{w}_2) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^4, \\ -\Delta \bar{w}_2 = h_2(\bar{w}_1, \bar{w}_2) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^4, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\bar{w}_1 = \frac{1}{w_1(0)} w_1 \left( \frac{1}{w_1(0)} x \right), \quad \bar{w}_2 = \frac{1}{w_2(0)} w_2 \left( \frac{1}{w_2(0)} x \right),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
h_1(\bar{w}_1, \bar{w}_2) &= -\lambda_1 \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}^2 w_1^{-2}(0) \bar{w}_1 \\
&\quad + \mu_1 \bar{w}_1^3 + \alpha_1 \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}^{4-p} [w_1(0)]^{p-4} |\bar{w}_1|^{p-2} \bar{w}_1 + \beta [w_2(0)]^2 w_1^{-2}(0) \bar{w}_2^2 \bar{w}_1,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
h_2(\bar{w}_1, \bar{w}_2) &= -\lambda_2 \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}^2 w_2^{-2}(0) \bar{w}_2 \\
&\quad + \mu_2 \bar{w}_2^3 + \alpha_2 \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}^{4-p} [w_2(0)]^{p-4} |\bar{w}_2|^{p-2} \bar{w}_2 + \beta [w_1(0)]^2 w_2^{-2}(0) \bar{w}_1^2 \bar{w}_2.
\end{aligned}$$

By similar arguments as used for (4.20)-(4.21), we have

$$w_1 \lesssim \frac{w_1(0)}{1 + b_1 r^2} \quad \text{and} \quad w_2 \lesssim \frac{w_2(0)}{1 + b_2 r^2},$$

where

$$b_1 = -\lambda_1 \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}^2 w_1^{-2}(0) + \mu_1 + \alpha_1 \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}^{4-p} [w_1(0)]^{p-4} + \beta [w_2(0)]^2 w_1^{-2}(0),$$

and

$$b_2 = -\lambda_2 \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}^2 w_2^{-2}(0) + \mu_2 + \alpha_2 \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}^{4-p} [w_2(0)]^{p-4} + \beta [w_1(0)]^2 w_2^{-2}(0).$$

It follows from (4.29) that  $b_1 \sim 1$ ,  $b_2 \sim 1$ , and then

$$\|w_1\|_p^p \lesssim \left(\frac{\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}}{\sigma_1}\right)^p \quad \text{and} \quad \|w_2\|_p^p \lesssim \left(\frac{\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}}{\sigma_1}\right)^p,$$

for  $2 < p < 3$ . Therefore,  $\sigma_1 \lesssim \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2}$ .

Finally, there exists  $\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} > 0$  such that

$$(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} u_{a_1}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x), \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} v_{a_2}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x)) \rightarrow (\sqrt{k_1} U_{\varepsilon_0}, \sqrt{k_2} U_{\varepsilon_0}) \quad \text{in } D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2),$$

for some  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$ . We complete the proof.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.3.** From Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4, we can obtain Theorem 1.3.  $\square$

## 5 Mass-critical perturbation

In this section, we deal with the case  $p = 3$ ,  $\alpha_i, \mu_i > 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) and  $\beta > 0$ . We recall the decomposition of  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2} = \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+ \cup \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0 \cup \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$  (see (1.12)). From the definition of  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0$ , this is  $\Psi'_{(u,v)}(0) = \Psi''_{(u,v)}(0) = 0$ , then necessarily  $\|\nabla u\|_2^2 = \|\nabla v\|_2^2 = 0$ , which is not possible because  $(u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0 = \emptyset$ . By Lemma 3.1, we can also check that  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$  is a smooth manifold of codimension 1 in  $S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ .

Let  $\phi_0$  be a minimizer of Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (1.15) with  $p = 3$ . Then, from [40],  $\phi_0$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \phi_0 + \frac{1}{2} \phi_0 = |\phi_0| \phi_0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^4, \\ \phi_0(x) > 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^4. \end{cases}$$

By the well-known uniqueness result (cf. [21]) and the scaling invariance of (1.14), we have  $\phi_0(x) = \frac{1}{2} w_3(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}})$ , and

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_3|^3} = \frac{\|\nabla \phi_0\|_2^2 \|\phi_0\|_2}{\|\phi_0\|_3^3} = \frac{2\|w_3\|_2}{3}.$$

**Lemma 5.1.** *If  $0 < \alpha_i a_i < \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), for all  $(u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ , there exists  $t_{(u,v)}$  such that  $t_{(u,v)} \star (u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$ . Further,  $t_{(u,v)}$  is the unique critical point of the function  $\Psi_{(u,v)}$  and is a strict maximum point at positive level. Moreover:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2} = \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$  and  $P_{a_1, a_2}(u, v) < 0$  iff  $t_{(u,v)} < 0$ .
- (2)  $\Psi_{(u,v)}$  is strictly increasing in  $(-\infty, t_{(u,v)})$ .
- (3) The map  $(u, v) \mapsto t_{(u,v)} \in \mathbb{R}$  is of class  $C^1$ .

*Proof.* Since  $p = 3$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{(u,v)}(s) &= e^{2s} \left[ \left( \frac{\|\nabla u\|_2^2}{2} - \frac{\alpha_1 \|u\|_3^3}{3} \right) + \left( \frac{\|\nabla v\|_2^2}{2} - \frac{\alpha_2 \|v\|_3^3}{3} \right) \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{e^{4s}}{4} \left( \mu_1 \|u\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|uv\|_2^2 \right) \\ &\geq \frac{e^{2s}}{2} \left[ \|\nabla u\|_2^2 \left( 1 - \frac{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3} \alpha_1 a_1 \right) + \|\nabla v\|_2^2 \left( 1 - \frac{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3} \alpha_2 a_2 \right) \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{e^{4s}}{4} \left( \mu_1 \|u\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|uv\|_2^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $s \star (u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$  if and only if  $\Psi'_{(u,v)}(s) = 0$ . It's easy to see that if  $\left[ \|\nabla u\|_2^2 \left( 1 - \frac{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3} \alpha_1 a_1 \right) + \|\nabla v\|_2^2 \left( 1 - \frac{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3} \alpha_2 a_2 \right) \right]$  is positive, then  $\Psi_{(u,v)}(s)$  has a unique critical point  $t_{(u,v)}$ , which is a strict maximum point at positive level. Therefore, under the condition of  $0 < \alpha_i a_i < \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), we know that  $\left[ \frac{\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2}{2} - \frac{\alpha_1 \|u\|_3^3 + \alpha_2 \|v\|_3^3}{3} \right] > 0$ . If  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$ , then  $t_{(u,v)}$  is a maximum point, we have that  $\Psi''_{(u,v)}(t_{(u,v)}) \leq 0$ . Since  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0 = \emptyset$ , we have  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$ . To prove that the map  $(u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2) \mapsto t_{(u,v)} \in \mathbb{R}$  is of class  $C^1$ , we can apply the implicit function theorem as in Lemma 3.2. Finally,  $\Psi'_{(u,v)}(s) < 0$  if and only if  $s > t_{(u,v)}$ , then  $P_{a_1, a_2}(u, v) = \Psi'_{(u,v)}(0) < 0$  if and only if  $t_{(u,v)} < 0$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.2.** *Assume  $p = 3$ ,  $\alpha_i, \mu_i, a_i > 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) and  $\beta > 0$ . Let  $0 < \alpha_i a_i < \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), then*

$$m^-(a_1, a_2) := \inf_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-} I(u, v) > 0.$$

*Proof.* If  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$ , then by Gagliardo-Nirenberg and the Sobolev inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2 &< 2[\mu_1 \|u\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|uv\|_2^2] + \frac{2\alpha_1}{3} \|u\|_3^3 + \frac{2\alpha_2}{3} \|v\|_3^3 \\ &\leq 8D_1 [\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2]^2 + \frac{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3} (\alpha_1 a_1 \|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \alpha_2 a_2 \|\nabla v\|_2^2). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,  $0 < \alpha_i a_i < \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) and  $\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2 \neq 0$  (since  $(u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ ), we get

$$\inf_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-} \|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2 \geq C > 0.$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}
m^-(a_1, a_2) &= \inf_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-} I(u, v) \\
&= \inf_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-} \frac{1}{4} [\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2 - \frac{2\alpha_1}{3}\|u\|_3^3 - \frac{2\alpha_2}{3}\|v\|_3^3] \\
&\geq \inf_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-} \left[ \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3 \alpha_1 a_1}{3}\right) \|\nabla u\|_2^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3 \alpha_2 a_2}{3}\right) \|\nabla v\|_2^2 \right] \\
&\geq C > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

From the above lemmas, then  $I|_{S(a_1) \times S(a_2)}$  has a mountain pass geometry. We need an estimate from above on

$$m^-(a_1, a_2) = \inf_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-} I(u, v) = \inf_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-} I(u, v).$$

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $p = 3$ ,  $\alpha_i, \mu_i, a_i > 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), and  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$ . If  $0 < \alpha_i a_i < \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), then*

$$0 < m^-(a_1, a_2) < \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2,$$

where  $k_1 = \frac{\beta - \mu_2}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$  and  $k_2 = \frac{\beta - \mu_1}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$ .

*Proof.* From (1.19),  $U_\varepsilon = \frac{2\sqrt{2}\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^2 + |x|^2}$ , taking a radially decreasing cut-off function  $\xi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$  such that  $\xi \equiv 1$  in  $B_1$ ,  $\xi \equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus B_2$ , and let  $W_\varepsilon(x) = \xi(x)U_\varepsilon(x)$ . We have (see [1]),

$$\|\nabla W_\varepsilon\|_2^2 = \mathcal{S}^2 + O(\varepsilon^2), \quad \|W_\varepsilon\|_4^4 = \mathcal{S}^2 + O(\varepsilon^4), \quad (5.1)$$

and

$$\|W_\varepsilon\|_3^3 = O(\varepsilon), \quad \|W_\varepsilon\|_2^2 = O(\varepsilon^2 |\ln \varepsilon|). \quad (5.2)$$

Setting

$$(\overline{W}_\varepsilon, \overline{V}_\varepsilon) = \left( a_1 \frac{W_\varepsilon}{\|W_\varepsilon\|_2}, a_2 \frac{W_\varepsilon}{\|W_\varepsilon\|_2} \right),$$

then  $(\overline{W}_\varepsilon, \overline{V}_\varepsilon) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ . From Lemma 5.1, there exists  $\tau_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\tau_\varepsilon \star (\overline{W}_\varepsilon, \overline{V}_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$ , this implies that

$$m^-(a_1, a_2) \leq I(\tau_\varepsilon \star (\overline{W}_\varepsilon, \overline{V}_\varepsilon)) = \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}} I(t \star (\overline{W}_\varepsilon, \overline{V}_\varepsilon)),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{2\tau_\varepsilon} [\|\nabla \overline{W}_\varepsilon\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \overline{V}_\varepsilon\|_2^2] &= e^{4\tau_\varepsilon} [\mu_1 \|\overline{W}_\varepsilon\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|\overline{V}_\varepsilon\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|\overline{W}_\varepsilon \overline{V}_\varepsilon\|_2^2] \\
&\quad + e^{2\tau_\varepsilon} \left( \frac{2\alpha_1}{3} \|\overline{W}_\varepsilon\|_3^3 + \frac{2\alpha_2}{3} \|\overline{V}_\varepsilon\|_3^3 \right). \quad (5.3)
\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{2\tau_\varepsilon} [\mu_1 \|\overline{W}_\varepsilon\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|\overline{V}_\varepsilon\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|\overline{W}_\varepsilon \overline{V}_\varepsilon\|_2^2] \\ & \geq \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha_1 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3 a_1}{3}\right) \|\nabla \overline{W}_\varepsilon\|_2^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha_2 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3 a_2}{3}\right) \|\nabla \overline{V}_\varepsilon\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Therefore, for  $\varepsilon$  small enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(\tau_\varepsilon \star (\overline{W}_\varepsilon, \overline{V}_\varepsilon)) &= \frac{e^{2\tau_\varepsilon}}{2} (\|\nabla \overline{W}_\varepsilon\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \overline{V}_\varepsilon\|_2^2) \\ &\quad - \frac{e^{4\tau_\varepsilon}}{4} (\|\overline{W}_\varepsilon\|_4^4 + \|\overline{V}_\varepsilon\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|\overline{W}_\varepsilon \overline{V}_\varepsilon\|_2^2) \\ &\quad - \frac{e^{2\tau_\varepsilon}}{2} (\alpha_1 \|\overline{W}_\varepsilon\|_3^3 + \alpha_2 \|\overline{V}_\varepsilon\|_3^3) \\ &\leq \max_{s_1, s_2 > 0} \frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2}{2} \|\nabla W_\varepsilon\|_2^2 - \frac{(\mu_1 s_1^4 + \mu_2 s_2^4 + 2\rho s_1^2 s_2^2)}{4} \|W_\varepsilon\|_4^4 \\ &\quad - \frac{e^{2\tau_\varepsilon}}{2} (\alpha_1 \|\overline{W}_\varepsilon\|_3^3 + \alpha_2 \|\overline{V}_\varepsilon\|_3^3) \end{aligned}$$

where  $s_1 = \frac{e^{\tau_\varepsilon} a_1}{\|W_\varepsilon\|_2}$  and  $s_2 = \frac{e^{\tau_\varepsilon} a_2}{\|W_\varepsilon\|_2}$ . Define

$$f(s_1, s_2) = \frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2}{2} \|\nabla W_\varepsilon\|_2^2 - \frac{(\mu_1 s_1^4 + \mu_2 s_2^4 + 2\rho s_1^2 s_2^2)}{4} \|W_\varepsilon\|_4^4.$$

Using that, for all  $0 < s_1, s_2$ ,

$$\max_{s_1, s_2 > 0} f(s_1, s_2) \leq \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} S^2 + O(\varepsilon^2).$$

Finally, by (5.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{e^{2\tau_\varepsilon}}{2} (\alpha_1 \|\overline{W}_\varepsilon\|_3^3 + \alpha_2 \|\overline{V}_\varepsilon\|_3^3) &= \frac{e^{2\tau_\varepsilon}}{2} \frac{\alpha_1 a_1^3 + \alpha_2 a_2^3}{\|W_\varepsilon\|_2^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |W_\varepsilon|^3 \\ &\geq \frac{C}{\|W_\varepsilon\|_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |W_\varepsilon|^3 \\ &\geq C |\ln \varepsilon|^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we deduce that

$$m^-(a_1, a_2) \leq \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}} I(t \star (\overline{W}_\varepsilon, \overline{V}_\varepsilon)) < \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} S^2.$$

□

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $p = 3$ ,  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i > 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) and  $0 < \alpha_i a_i < \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), there exists  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that*

$$m^-(a_1, a_2) < \min \{m^-(a_1, 0), m^-(0, a_2)\},$$

for any  $\beta > \beta_0$ , where  $m^-(a_1, 0)$  and  $m^-(0, a_2)$  are defined in (2.4).

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.1,  $m^-(a_1, 0)$  can be achieved by  $u^* \in S(a_1)$ , and  $m^-(0, a_2)$  can be achieved by  $v^* \in S(a_2)$ . Moreover,  $u^*$  and  $v^*$  are positive, radially symmetric and radially decreasing functions. From Section 2, it is easy to see that

$$\mathcal{A}_{p,\mu_1,\alpha_1}(s \star u^*) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_{p,\mu_2,\alpha_2}(s \star v^*) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow -\infty.$$

Therefore, there exists an  $s_0 \ll -1$  which is independent of  $\beta$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{s < s_0} I(s \star (u, v)) &< \max_{s < s_0} \mathcal{A}_{p,\mu_1,\alpha_1}(s \star u^*) + \mathcal{A}_{p,\mu_2,\alpha_2}(s \star v^*) \\ &< \min \{m^-(a_1, 0), m^-(0, a_2)\}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $s \geq s_0$ , then the intersection term can be bounded from below:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |s \star u^*|^2 |s \star v^*|^2 = e^{4s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u^*|^2 |v^*|^2 \geq K e^{4s_0},$$

where  $K > 0$ . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{s \geq s_0} I(s \star (u, v)) &\leq \max_{s \geq s_0} \mathcal{A}_{p,\mu_1,\alpha_1}(s \star u^*) + \mathcal{A}_{p,\mu_2,\alpha_2}(s \star v^*) - K e^{4s_0} \beta \\ &\leq m^-(a_1, 0) + m^-(0, a_2) - K e^{4s_0} \beta. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that there exists  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that

$$\max_{s \geq s_0} I(s \star (u, v)) < \min \{m^-(a_1, 0), m^-(0, a_2)\} \quad \text{for all } \beta > \beta_0.$$

□

By using the same techniques as that in Lemma 3.5, we can prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $p = 3$ ,  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$ , there exists a  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that  $\beta > \beta_0$  and  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$ . If  $0 < \alpha_i a_i < \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3} (i = 1, 2)$  and*

$$0 < m^-(a_1, a_2) < \min \left\{ \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2, m^-(a_1, 0), m^-(0, a_2) \right\},$$

where  $m^-(a_1, 0)$  and  $m^-(0, a_2)$  are defined in (2.4),  $k_1 = \frac{\beta - \mu_2}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$  and  $k_2 = \frac{\beta - \mu_1}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$ , then  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$  can be achieved by some function  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$  which is real valued, positive, radially symmetric and radially decreasing.

*Proof.* Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.5. Let  $\{(u_n, v_n)\} \subset \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$  be a minimizing sequence. We also assume that  $(u_n, v_n)$  are all real valued, nonnegative, radially symmetric and decreasing in  $r = |x|$ . Since  $P_{a_1, a_2}(u_n, v_n) = o_n(1)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 - \frac{2\alpha_1}{3} \|u_n\|_3^3 \\ &- \frac{2\alpha_2}{3} \|v_n\|_3^3 - \mu_1 \|u_n\|_4^4 - \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 - 2\beta \|u_n v_n\|_2^2 = o_n(1). \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Thus,

$$m^-(a_1, a_2) = I(u_n, v_n) = \frac{1}{4} [\mu_1 \|u_n\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u_n v_n\|_2^2] + o_n(1),$$

and by the Hölder's inequality, we get  $\alpha_1 \|u_n\|_3^3 + \alpha_2 \|v_n\|_3^3$  and  $\mu_1 \|u_n\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u_n v_n\|_2^2$  are bounded. Hence, it follows from (5.5) that  $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$  is bounded in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ . There exists  $(u, v) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$  such that  $(u_n, v_n) \rightharpoonup (u, v)$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ . We need to prove that  $u \neq 0$  and  $v \neq 0$ .

**Case 1.** If  $u = 0$  and  $v = 0$ , then  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_1 |u_n|^3 \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \alpha_2 |v_n|^3 \rightarrow 0$ , we have

$$P_{a_1, a_2}(u_n, v_n) = \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|u_n\|_4^4 - \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 - 2\beta \|u_n v_n\|_2^2 = o_n(1).$$

By (1.18), we have

$$\sqrt{k_1 + k_2} \mathcal{S} (\mu_1 \|u_n\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u_n v_n\|_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2. \quad (5.6)$$

Then, we distinguish the two cases:

$$\text{either (i) } \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ or (ii) } \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 \rightarrow l > 0.$$

If (i) holds, we have that  $I(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow 0$  which contradicts the fact that  $m^-(a_1, a_2) > 0$ . If (ii) holds, we deduce (5.6) that

$$\|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 \geq (k_1 + k_2) \mathcal{S}^2 + o_n(1).$$

Therefore,

$$m^-(a_1, a_2) + o_n(1) = I(u_n, v_n) = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2 \geq \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2,$$

this contradicts  $m^-(a_1, a_2) < \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2$ .

**Case 2.** If  $u \neq 0$  and  $v = 0$ , then  $v_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^3(\mathbb{R}^4)$ . Let  $\bar{u}_n = u_n - u$ ,  $\bar{u}_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^3(\mathbb{R}^4)$ . By the maximum principle (see [17, Theorem 2.10]),  $u$  is a positive solution of (2.1), then  $m^-(a_1, 0) \leq m^-(\|u\|_2, 0)$ . By the Brézis-Lieb Lemma [41], we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{a_1, a_2}(u_n, v_n) &= \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|u_n\|_4^4 - \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 \\ &\quad - \gamma_p \alpha_1 \|u_n\|_p^p - 2\beta \|u_n v_n\|_2^2 + o_n(1) \\ &= \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|\bar{u}_n\|_4^4 - \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 - 2\beta \|\bar{u}_n v_n\|_2^2 + o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

By (1.18), we have

$$\sqrt{k_1 + k_2} \mathcal{S} (\mu_1 \|\bar{u}_n\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|\bar{u}_n v_n\|_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2.$$

Then, we distinguish the two cases:

$$\text{either (i) } \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ or (ii) } \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 \rightarrow l > 0.$$

If (i) holds, we have  $I(\bar{u}_n, v_n) \rightarrow 0$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} m^-(a_1, a_2) + o_n(1) &= I(u_n, v_n) = I(\bar{u}_n, v_n) + I(u, 0) + o_n(1) \\ &= I(u, 0) + o_n(1) \geq m^-(a_1, 0). \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction. If (ii) holds,

$$\begin{aligned} m^-(a_1, a_2) + o_n(1) &= I(u_n, v_n) = I(\bar{u}_n, v_n) + I(u, 0) + o_n(1) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\nabla \bar{u}_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2) + \frac{\mu_1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |u|^4 + o_n(1) \\ &\geq \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts our assumption on  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$ .

**Case 3.** If  $u = 0$  and  $v \neq 0$ . Analysis similar to that in the proof of Case 2, we also have a contradiction.

Therefore,  $u \neq 0$  and  $v \neq 0$ . It remains to show that  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$  is achieved. It follows from the same computations in (3.5)-(3.8) that there exist  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$  such that

$$\lambda_1 a_1^2 + \lambda_2 a_2^2 = \lambda_1 \|u\|_2^2 + \lambda_2 \|v\|_2^2. \quad (5.7)$$

Since  $\|u\|_2^2 \leq a_1^2$  and  $\|v\|_2^2 \leq a_2^2$ , it follows from (5.7) that  $\|u\|_2^2 = a_1^2$  and  $\|v\|_2^2 = a_2^2$ , and hence  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$ . Let  $(\bar{u}_n, \bar{v}_n) = (u_n - u, v_n - v)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} o_n(1) &= P_{a_1, a_2}(u_n, v_n) = P_{a_1, a_2}(\bar{u}_n, \bar{v}_n) + P_{a_1, a_2}(u, v) + o_n(1) \\ &= \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \bar{v}_n\|_2^2 - \mu_1 \|\bar{u}_n\|_4^4 - \mu_2 \|\bar{v}_n\|_4^4 - 2\beta \|\bar{u}_n \bar{v}_n\|_2^2 + o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

Here again we distinguish the two cases:

$$\text{either (i) } \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \bar{v}_n\|_2^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ or (ii) } \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \bar{v}_n\|_2^2 \rightarrow l > 0.$$

If (ii) holds,

$$\begin{aligned} m^-(a_1, a_2) + o_n(1) &= I(u_n, v_n) = I(\bar{u}_n, \bar{v}_n) + I(u, v) + o_n(1) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (|\nabla \bar{u}_n|^2 + |\nabla \bar{v}_n|^2) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\mu_1 |u|^4 + \mu_2 |v|^4) + o_n(1) \\ &\geq \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2 + o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

We then conclude that  $I(u, v) = m^-(a_1, a_2)$  and  $(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow (u, v)$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ . Therefore, we have proved that  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$  can be attained by some  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-)$  which is real valued, positive, radially symmetric and decreasing in  $r = |x|$ .  $\square$

In the following, we study the nonexistence of ground states for the case  $\alpha_1 a_1 \geq \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  and  $\alpha_2 a_2 \geq \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$ . We follow the ideas of [42] and [27, Lemma 3.2].

**Lemma 5.6.** *Let  $p = 3$ ,  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$ , there exists a  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that  $\beta > \beta_0$  and  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$ . If  $\alpha_1 a_1 \geq \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  and  $\alpha_2 a_2 \geq \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$ , we have*

$$m^-(a_1, a_2) = 0.$$

Moreover,  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$  can not be achieved and therefore (1.1)-(1.2) has no ground states.

*Proof.* For all  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$ , we can choose  $(u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$  such that (see [33, Lemma 3.3])

$$\|\nabla u\|_2^2 > \frac{2\alpha_1}{3}\|u\|_3^3 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla v\|_2^2 > \frac{2\alpha_2}{3}\|v\|_3^3.$$

**Case 1** ( $\alpha_1 a_1 = \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  and  $\alpha_2 a_2 = \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$ ).

Since the assumption  $\frac{2\alpha_1}{3}a_1 = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  and  $\frac{2\alpha_2}{3}a_2 = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$ , for any  $(u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ , we have

$$\frac{2\alpha_1}{3}\|u\|_3^3 + \frac{2\alpha_2}{3}\|v\|_3^3 \leq \frac{2\alpha_1}{3}|\mathcal{C}_3|^3 a_1 \|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \frac{2\alpha_2}{3}|\mathcal{C}_3|^3 a_2 \|\nabla v\|_2^2 = \|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2.$$

Let  $\{Q_n\}$  is a minimizing sequence of (see [21, 40])

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_3|^3} := \inf_{u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|\nabla u\|_2^2 \|u\|_2}{\|u\|_3^3}. \quad (5.8)$$

Then by scaling  $u_n(x) := a_1 t_n^2 \|Q_n\|_2^{-1} Q_n(t_n x)$  and  $v_n(x) := a_2 s_n^2 \|Q_n\|_2^{-1} Q_n(s_n x)$  if necessary, we may assume that  $\|u_n\|_2^2 = a_1^2$ ,  $\|u_n\|_3^3 = 1$  and  $\|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 = |\mathcal{C}_3|^{-3} (a_1)^{-1} + o_n(1)$ . Similarly,  $\|v_n\|_2^2 = a_2^2$ ,  $\|v_n\|_3^3 = 1$  and  $\|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 = |\mathcal{C}_3|^{-3} (a_2)^{-1} + o_n(1)$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(s) &= e^{2s} \left( \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 - \frac{2\alpha_1 \|u_n\|_3^3 + 2\alpha_2 \|v_n\|_3^3}{3} \right) \\ &\quad - e^{4s} \left( \mu_1 \|u_n\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u_n v_n\|_2^2 \right) \\ &= e^{2s} \left( |\mathcal{C}_3|^{-3} (a_1)^{-1} - \frac{2\alpha_1}{3} + |\mathcal{C}_3|^{-3} (a_2)^{-1} - \frac{2\alpha_2}{3} + o_n(1) \right) \\ &\quad - e^{4s} \left( \mu_1 \|u_n\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u_n v_n\|_2^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.1, there exists a unique  $s_{a_1, a_2} \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $h(s_{a_1, a_2}) = 0$  for  $0 < \alpha_i a_i < \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ). Therefore,  $s_{a_1, a_2} \star (u_n, v_n) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$  for  $0 < \alpha_i a_i < \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ). Since  $\|u_n\|_3^3 = 1$  and  $\|v_n\|_3^3 = 1$ , by Hölder inequality,  $\|u_n\|_4^4 \gtrsim 1$  and  $\|v_n\|_4^4 \gtrsim 1$ . It follows that  $s_{a_1, a_2} \rightarrow -\infty$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (\frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3 \alpha_1}, \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3 \alpha_2})$ , which implies

$$I(s_{a_1, a_2} \star (u_n, v_n)) = \frac{1}{4} e^{4s_{a_1, a_2}} [\mu_1 \|u_n\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_n\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u_n v_n\|_2^2] = o_n(1)$$

as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow \left(\frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3\alpha_1}, \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3\alpha_2}\right)$ . Thus, we get  $m^-(a_1, a_2) \leq 0$  for  $(a_1, a_2) = \left(\frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3\alpha_1}, \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3\alpha_2}\right)$ . Moreover,

$$I(u, v) = \frac{1}{4}[\mu_1\|u\|_4^4 + \mu_2\|v\|_4^4 + 2\beta\|uv\|_2^2] \geq 0, \quad \forall (u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}. \quad (5.9)$$

Thus, we get  $m^-(a_1, a_2) = 0$  for case 1.

**Case 2** ( $\alpha_1 a_1 > \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  and  $\alpha_2 a_2 \geq \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$ ) or ( $\alpha_1 a_1 \geq \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  and  $\alpha_2 a_2 > \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$ ).

We first consider the case  $\alpha_1 a_1 > \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  and  $\alpha_2 a_2 \geq \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$ . For any  $(u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$  with  $\|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 > \frac{2\alpha_1}{3}\|u_n\|_3^3 + \frac{2\alpha_2}{3}\|v_n\|_3^3$ , there exists a unique  $\tau \in (0, \infty)$  such that  $P_{a_1, a_2}(\tau \star (u, v)) = 0$ . Hence, we have

$$e^{2\tau} \left( \|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2 - \frac{2\alpha_1\|u\|_3^3 + 2\alpha_2\|v\|_3^3}{3} \right) = e^{4\tau} \left( \mu_1\|u\|_4^4 + \mu_2\|v\|_4^4 + 2\beta\|uv\|_2^2 \right),$$

and then

$$I(\tau \star (u, v)) = \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2 - \frac{2\alpha_1}{3}\|u\|_3^3 - \frac{2\alpha_2}{3}\|v\|_3^3}{[\mu_1\|u\|_4^4 + \mu_2\|v\|_4^4 + 2\beta\|uv\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)^2.$$

If  $(u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$  with  $\|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2\alpha_1}{3}\|u_n\|_3^3 + \frac{2\alpha_2}{3}\|v_n\|_3^3$ , then there does not exist  $\tau \in (0, \infty)$  such that  $P_{a_1, a_2}(\tau \star (u, v)) = 0$ , and  $\Psi_{(u, v)}(s)$  is negative and is strictly decreasing on  $(0, \infty)$ . To complete the proof it suffices to find  $\{(u_n, v_n)\} \subset S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$  with

$$\|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 > \frac{2\alpha_1}{3}\|u_n\|_3^3 + \frac{2\alpha_2}{3}\|v_n\|_3^3, \quad (5.10)$$

and

$$\frac{\|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 - \frac{2\alpha_1}{3}\|u_n\|_3^3 - \frac{2\alpha_2}{3}\|v_n\|_3^3}{[\mu_1\|u_n\|_4^4 + \mu_2\|v_n\|_4^4 + 2\beta\|u_n v_n\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.11)$$

Define

$$f(u) := \frac{\|\nabla u\|_2^2 \|u\|_2}{\|u\|_3^3}.$$

By (5.8), for any  $M > \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$ , there exists  $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^4) \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $f(u) = M$ . For any  $\alpha, \beta > 0$ , we define  $\tilde{u}(x) := \alpha u(\beta x)$ . By direct calculations, we have

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_2 = \alpha\beta^{-2}\|u\|_2, \quad \|\tilde{u}\|_3 = \alpha\beta^{-4/3}\|u\|_3, \quad \|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_2 = \alpha\beta^{-1}\|\nabla u\|_2$$

and  $f(\tilde{u}) = M$ . So we can choose  $\alpha = \frac{1}{\|u\|_3} \left( \frac{\|u\|_2}{\alpha_1 \|u\|_3} \right)^2$  and  $\beta = \left( \frac{\|u\|_2}{\alpha_1 \|u\|_3} \right)^{3/2}$  such that  $\|\tilde{u}\|_2^2 = \alpha_1^2$  and  $\|\tilde{u}\|_3 = 1$ .

We distinguish the two cases:

$$\text{either (i) } \alpha_2 a_2 > \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3} \quad \text{or (ii) } \alpha_2 a_2 = \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}.$$

If (i) holds, for any  $N > \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$ , we choose  $\tilde{v}$  such that  $f(\tilde{v}) = N$ ,  $\|\tilde{v}\|_2^2 = a_2^2$  and  $\|\tilde{v}\|_3 = 1$ . Under the assumption  $\frac{2\alpha_1}{3}a_1 > \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  and  $\frac{2\alpha_2}{3}a_2 > \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$ . Thus, there exist  $\{A_n\}, \{B_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$  with  $A_n, B_n > 0$ , and  $A_n \rightarrow 0, B_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  such that

$$M_n := \left(\frac{2\alpha_1}{3} + A_n\right)a_1 > \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_3|^3} \quad \text{and} \quad N_n := \left(\frac{2\alpha_2}{3} + B_n\right)a_2 > \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}.$$

For such chosen  $M_n$ , we choose  $\{(u_n, v_n)\} \subset H^1(\mathbb{R}^4) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^4)$  such that  $\|u_n\|_2^2 = a_1^2$ ,  $\|u_n\|_3 = 1$  and  $f(u_n) = M_n$ . Similarly,  $\|v_n\|_2^2 = a_2^2$ ,  $\|v_n\|_3 = 1$  and  $f(v_n) = N_n$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 &= \left(\frac{2\alpha_1}{3} + A_n\right)\|u_n\|_3^3 > \frac{2\alpha_1}{3}\|u_n\|_3^3, \\ \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 &= \left(\frac{2\alpha_2}{3} + B_n\right)\|v_n\|_3^3 > \frac{2\alpha_2}{3}\|v_n\|_3^3, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 - \frac{2\alpha_1}{3}\|u_n\|_3^3 - \frac{2\alpha_2}{3}\|v_n\|_3^3}{[\mu_1\|u_n\|_4^4 + \mu_2\|v_n\|_4^4 + 2\beta\|u_nv_n\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &= \frac{A_n\|u_n\|_3^3 + B_n\|v_n\|_3^3}{[\mu_1\|u_n\|_4^4 + \mu_1\|v_n\|_4^4 + 2\beta\|u_nv_n\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

If (ii) holds, similar as in case (1), there exists  $\bar{v}_n$  such that  $\|\bar{v}_n\|_2^2 = a_2^2$ ,  $\|\bar{v}_n\|_3^3 = 1$  and  $\|\nabla \bar{v}_n\|_2^2 = |\mathcal{C}_3|^{-3}a_2 + o_n(1)$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \bar{v}_n\|_2^2 - \frac{2\alpha_1}{3}\|u_n\|_3^3 - \frac{2\alpha_2}{3}\|\bar{v}_n\|_3^3}{[\mu_1\|u_n\|_4^4 + \mu_2\|\bar{v}_n\|_4^4 + 2\beta\|u_n\bar{v}_n\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &= \frac{A_n\|u_n\|_3^3 + o_n(1)}{[\mu_1\|u_n\|_4^4 + \mu_1\|v_n\|_4^4 + 2\beta\|u_nv_n\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus, we get  $m^-(a_1, a_2) = 0$  for case (2).

Suppose by contradiction that  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$  is attained by some  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-)$  for case  $\alpha_1 a_1 \geq \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  and  $\alpha_2 a_2 \geq \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$ . By (5.9), then  $\|u_{a_1}^-\|_4^4 = \|v_{a_2}^-\|_4^4 = 0$ , which is a contradiction with  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ . Thus,  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$  can not be attained for  $\alpha_1 a_1 \geq \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$  and  $\alpha_2 a_2 \geq \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.7.** *Let  $p = 3$ ,  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$ , there exists a  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that  $\beta > \beta_0$  and  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$ . If  $\alpha_i a_i < \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3} (i = 1, 2)$ , for any ground state  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-)$  of (1.1)-(1.2), there exist  $\nu_1, \nu_2 > 0$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\left( \left(\frac{a_1}{\|w_3\|_2}\right) r_1^2 u_{a_1}^- \left(\frac{a_1}{\|w_3\|_2} r_1 x\right), \left(\frac{a_2}{\|w_3\|_2}\right) r_2^2 v_{a_2}^- \left(\frac{a_2}{\|w_3\|_2} r_2 x\right) \right) \\ &\rightarrow (\nu_1 w_3(\sqrt{\nu_1} x), \nu_2 w_3(\sqrt{\nu_2} x)), \end{aligned}$$

in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (\frac{3}{2\alpha_1|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}, \frac{3}{2\alpha_2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3})$  and  $1 - \frac{2\alpha_1 a_1 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3} \sim 1 - \frac{2\alpha_2 a_2 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3}$  up to a subsequence, where  $r_1 = (1 - \frac{2\alpha_1 a_1 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $r_2 = (1 - \frac{2\alpha_2 a_2 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ .

*Proof.* We choose  $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = (\frac{a_1}{\|w_3\|_2} w_3, \frac{a_2}{\|w_3\|_2} w_3) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$  as a test function of  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$ . There exists a unique  $\tau \in (0, \infty)$  such that  $P_{a_1, a_2}(\tau \star (\varphi_1, \varphi_2)) = 0$ . Hence, we have

$$I(\tau \star (\varphi_1, \varphi_2)) = \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\|\nabla \varphi_1\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \varphi_2\|_2^2 - \frac{2\alpha_1}{3} \|\varphi_1\|_3^3 - \frac{2\alpha_2}{3} \|\varphi_2\|_3^3}{[\mu_1 \|\varphi_1\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|\varphi_2\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|\varphi_1 \varphi_2\|_2^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)^2,$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} & m^-(a_1, a_2) \\ & \leq I(\tau \star (\varphi_1, \varphi_2)) \\ & \leq \frac{\max\{a_1^4, a_2^4\} \|\nabla w_3\|_2^4}{4[\mu_1 a_1^4 + \mu_2 a_2^4 + 2\beta a_1^2 a_2^2] \|w_3\|_4^4} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha_1 a_1 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3}\right) + \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha_2 a_2 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3}\right) \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$  and the Gagliardo-Nirenberg and the Sobolev inequalities that

$$\left(1 - \frac{2\alpha_1 a_1 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3}\right) + \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha_2 a_2 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3}\right) \lesssim \frac{1}{\mathcal{S}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta}^2} (\|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & (\|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2) \\ & \lesssim \frac{\max\{a_1^4, a_2^4\} \|\nabla w_3\|_2^4}{[\mu_1 a_1^4 + \mu_2 a_2^4 + 2\beta a_1^2 a_2^2] \|w_3\|_4^4} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha_1 a_1 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3}\right) + \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha_2 a_2 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3}\right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By the Pohozaev identity, we have

$$\lambda_1 a_1^2 + \lambda_2 a_2^2 = \frac{2\alpha_1}{3} \|u_{a_1}^-\|_3^3 + \frac{2\alpha_2}{3} \|v_{a_2}^-\|_3^3 \sim \left[ \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha_1 a_1 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3}\right) + \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha_2 a_2 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3}\right) \right].$$

Let  $r_1 = (1 - \frac{2\alpha_1 a_1 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ ,  $r_2 = (1 - \frac{2\alpha_2 a_2 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  and

$$(u_{r_1}, v_{r_2}) = \left( \frac{a_1}{\|w_3\|_2} r_1^2 u_{a_1}^- \left( \frac{a_1}{\|w_3\|_2} r_1 x \right), \frac{a_2}{\|w_3\|_2} r_2^2 v_{a_2}^- \left( \frac{a_2}{\|w_3\|_2} r_2 x \right) \right).$$

By direct calculation,  $\{(u_{r_1}, v_{r_2})\}$  is bounded and  $(u_{r_1}, v_{r_2})$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_{r_1} + \lambda_1 r_1^2 \frac{a_1^2}{\|w_3\|_2^2} u_{r_1} = \mu_1 r_1^{-2} u_{r_1}^3 + \alpha_1 \frac{a_1}{\|w_3\|_2} u_{r_1}^2 + \beta \frac{a_1^2}{a_2^2} r_2^{-4} r_1^2 v_{r_2}^2 u_{r_1}, \\ -\Delta v_{r_2} + \lambda_2 r_2^2 \frac{a_2^2}{\|w_3\|_2^2} v_{r_2} = \mu_1 r_2^{-2} v_{r_2}^3 + \alpha_1 \frac{a_2}{\|w_3\|_2} v_{r_2}^2 + \beta \frac{a_2^2}{a_1^2} r_1^{-4} r_2^2 u_{r_1}^2 v_{r_2}. \end{cases}$$

Similar to the proof in Lemma 3.8, we deduce that

$$(u_{r_1}, v_{r_2}) \rightarrow (\nu_1 w_3(\sqrt{\nu_1} x), \nu_2 w_3(\sqrt{\nu_2} x))$$

strongly in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (\frac{3}{2\alpha_1|\mathcal{C}_3|^3}, \frac{3}{2\alpha_2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3})$  and  $1 - \frac{2\alpha_1 a_1 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3} \sim 1 - \frac{2\alpha_2 a_2 |\mathcal{C}_3|^3}{3}$  up to a subsequence for some  $\nu_1, \nu_2 > 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.8.** *Let  $p = 3$ ,  $\mu_i, \alpha_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$ , there exists a  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that  $\beta > \beta_0$  and  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$ . If  $\alpha_i a_i < \frac{3}{2|\mathcal{C}_3|^3} (i = 1, 2)$ , for any ground state  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-)$  of (1.1)-(1.2), then*

$$I(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) = m^-(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2 \text{ as } (a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0).$$

Moreover, there exists  $\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} > 0$  such that

$$(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} u_{a_1}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x), \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} v_{a_2}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x)) \rightarrow (\sqrt{k_1} U_{\varepsilon_0}, \sqrt{k_2} U_{\varepsilon_0})$$

in  $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ , for some  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$  up to a subsequence, where  $k_1 = \frac{\beta - \mu_2}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$  and  $k_2 = \frac{\beta - \mu_1}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$ .

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Lemma 4.4, thus we focus only on the differences. By  $P_{a_1, a_2}(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2 \\ & > I(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) \\ & = \frac{1}{4} (\|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2 - \frac{2}{3} \alpha_1 \|u_{a_1}^-\|_3^3 - \frac{2}{3} \alpha_2 \|v_{a_2}^-\|_3^3) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{4} (1 - \frac{2\alpha_1 a_1}{3} |\mathcal{C}_3|^3) \|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{4} (1 - \frac{2\alpha_2 a_2}{3} |\mathcal{C}_3|^3) \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

then  $\{(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-)\}$  is bounded in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ . We claim that  $l \neq 0$ . Indeed, if  $l = 0$ , by  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$  and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2 \\ & < 2[\mu_1 \|u_{a_1}^-\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_{a_2}^-\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u_{a_1}^- v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2] + \frac{2\alpha_1}{3} \|u_{a_1}^-\|_3^3 + \frac{2\alpha_2}{3} \|v_{a_2}^-\|_3^3, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain a contradiction:

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \frac{2\alpha_1 a_1}{3} |\mathcal{C}_3|^3) \|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + (1 - \frac{2\alpha_2 a_2}{3} |\mathcal{C}_3|^3) \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2 \\ & < \frac{2}{\mathcal{S}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta}^2} [\|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $l > 0$  and then  $I(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) \rightarrow \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ . The rest of the proof runs as before.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.4.** The proof is finished when we combine Lemmas 5.5 and 5.6.  $\square$

## 6 Mass-supercritical perturbation

In this section, we fix  $3 < p < 4$ ,  $\alpha_i, \mu_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$  and  $\beta > 0$ . We recall the decomposition of  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2} = \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^+ \cup \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0 \cup \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$  (see (1.12)). From the definition

of  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0$ , this is  $\Psi'_{(u, v)}(0) = \Psi''_{(u, v)}(0) = 0$ , we have

$$-(p\gamma_p - 2)\gamma_p [\alpha_1 \|u\|_p^p + \alpha_2 \|v\|_p^p] = 2[\mu_1 \|u\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|uv\|_2^2],$$

which is not possible. Then  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^0 = \emptyset$ . By Lemma 3.1, we can also check that  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$  is a smooth manifold of codimension 1 in  $S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ .

**Lemma 6.1.** *For all  $(u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ , there exists  $t_{(u, v)}$  such that  $t_{(u, v)} \star (u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$ .  $t_{(u, v)}$  is the unique critical point of the function  $\Psi_{(u, v)}$  and is a strict maximum point at positive level. Moreover:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2} = \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$  and  $P_{a_1, a_2}(u, v) < 0$  iff  $t_{(u, v)} < 0$ .
- (2)  $\Psi_{(u, v)}$  is strictly increasing in  $(-\infty, t_{(u, v)})$ .
- (3) The map  $(u, v) \mapsto t_{(u, v)} \in \mathbb{R}$  is of class  $C^1$ .

*Proof.* The proof is the same as that of Lemma 6.1 [34]. □

**Lemma 6.2.** *Assume  $3 < p < 4$ ,  $\alpha_i, \mu_i, a_i > 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) and  $\beta > 0$ . For any  $a_1, a_2 > 0$ , then*

$$m^-(a_1, a_2) := \inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}} I(u, v) > 0.$$

*Proof.* If  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}$ , then by the Gagliardo-Nirenberg and the Sobolev inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2 &= \mu_1 \|u\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|uv\|_2^2 + \alpha_1 \gamma_p \|u\|_p^p + \alpha_2 \gamma_p \|v\|_p^p \\ &\leq D_1 [\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2]^2 + (D_2 + D_3) [\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2]^{\frac{p\gamma_p}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, from the above inequality and  $\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2 \neq 0$  (since  $(u, v) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$ ), we get that

$$\inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}} \|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2 \geq C > 0.$$

Therefore, from  $P_{a_1, a_2}(u, v) = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} m^-(a_1, a_2) &= \inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}} I(u, v) \\ &= \inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}} \frac{1}{4} [\mu_1 \|u\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|uv\|_2^2] \\ &\quad + \frac{p\gamma_p - 2}{2p} [\alpha_1 \|u\|_p^p + \alpha_2 \|v\|_p^p] \\ &\geq C \inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}} \|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v\|_2^2 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 6.3.** *Let  $3 < p < 4$ ,  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i > 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) and  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$ . For any  $a_1, a_2 > 0$ , then*

$$0 < m^-(a_1, a_2) < \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2,$$

where  $k_1 = \frac{\beta - \mu_2}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$  and  $k_2 = \frac{\beta - \mu_1}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$ .

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Lemma 5.3.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.4.** *Let  $3 < p < 4$ ,  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$ , there exists  $\beta_1 > 0$  such that*

$$m^-(a_1, a_2) < \min \{m^-(a_1, 0), m^-(0, a_2)\},$$

*for any  $\beta > \beta_1$ , where  $m^-(a_1, 0)$  and  $m^-(0, a_2)$  are defined in (2.4).*

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Lemma 5.4.  $\square$

By using the same techniques as that in Lemma 5.5, we can prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.5.** *Let  $3 < p < 4$ ,  $\mu_i, \alpha_i > 0 (i = 1, 2)$ , there exists  $\beta_1 > 0$  such that  $\beta > \beta_1$  and  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$ . For any  $a_1, a_2 > 0$ , if*

$$0 < m^-(a_1, a_2) < \min \left\{ \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} S^2, m^-(a_1, 0), m^-(0, a_2) \right\},$$

*where  $m^-(a_1, 0)$  and  $m^-(0, a_2)$  are defined in (2.4),  $k_1 = \frac{\beta - \mu_2}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$  and  $k_2 = \frac{\beta - \mu_1}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$ , then  $m^-(a_1, a_2)$  can be achieved by some function  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) \in S(a_1) \times S(a_2)$  which is real valued, positive, radially symmetric and radially decreasing.*

In the following, we study the asymptotic behavior of the minimizers of

$$I(u, v) \Big|_{S(a_1) \times S(a_2)} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$$

as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (+\infty, +\infty)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$ . By direct calculations, we also have the following corollaries. If  $3 < p < 4$ , (3.10) also has a unique positive solution  $(\lambda, u_{p, \alpha_1})$  (see (3.11)).

**Corollary 6.6.** *Let  $a_1 > 0$ ,  $\alpha_1 > 0$  and  $p \in (3, 4)$ . Then, we have*

$$0 < I_0(u_{p, \alpha_1}) = K_{p, \alpha_1} \cdot a_1^{-\frac{4-p}{p-3}},$$

*where  $K_{p, \alpha_1} := \frac{p-3}{4-p} \|w_p\|_2^{\frac{p-2}{p-3}} \alpha_1^{\frac{1}{3-p}} > 0$ .*

**Corollary 6.7.** *Let  $a_1, a_2 > 0$ ,  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$  and  $3 < p < 4$ . Then, we have*

$$0 < m^-(a_1, a_2) < K_{p, \alpha_1} \cdot a_1^{-\frac{4-p}{p-3}} + K_{p, \alpha_2} \cdot a_2^{-\frac{4-p}{p-3}}$$

*where  $K_{p, \alpha_1} := \frac{p-3}{4-p} \|w_p\|_2^{\frac{p-2}{p-3}} \alpha_1^{\frac{1}{3-p}} > 0$  and  $K_{p, \alpha_2} := \frac{p-3}{4-p} \|w_p\|_2^{\frac{p-2}{p-3}} \alpha_2^{\frac{1}{3-p}} > 0$ .*

**Lemma 6.8.** *Assume  $3 < p < 4$ ,  $\mu_i, \alpha_i > 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), there exists  $\beta_1 > 0$  such that  $\beta > \beta_1$  and  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$ . Let  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-)$  be the minimizer of  $I(u, v)|_{S(a_1) \times S(a_2)}$  in  $\mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$  for any  $a_1, a_2 > 0$ . Then*

$$\left( \left( \frac{L_1}{\alpha_1} \right)^{-\frac{1}{p-2}} u_{a_1}^-(L_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} x), \left( \frac{L_2}{\alpha_2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{p-2}} v_{a_2}^-(L_2^{-\frac{1}{2}} x) \right) \rightarrow (w_p, w_p) \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2),$$

as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (+\infty, +\infty)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$ , where  $w_p$  is defined in (1.14) and

$$L_1 = \left( \frac{a_1^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \alpha_1^{\frac{2}{p-2}} \right)^{-\frac{p-2}{2p-6}}; \quad L_2 = \left( \frac{a_2^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \alpha_2^{\frac{2}{p-2}} \right)^{-\frac{p-2}{2p-6}}.$$

*Proof.* Since the proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.8, we only sketch it. By Lemma 6.5, we can suppose that  $\{(u_{a_1, n}^-, v_{a_2, n}^-)\}$  is positive and radially symmetric, i.e.,  $0 < u_{a_1, n}^-, v_{a_2, n}^- \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^4)$ . Moreover,

$$0 < m^-(a_{1, n}, a_{2, n}) + o_n(1) = I(u_{a_1, n}^-, v_{a_2, n}^-) \leq K_{p, \alpha_1} a_{1, n}^{-\frac{4-p}{p-3}} + K_{p, \alpha_2} a_{2, n}^{-\frac{4-p}{p-3}},$$

it follows that  $m^-(a_{1, n}, a_{2, n}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $(a_{1, n}, a_{2, n}) \rightarrow (+\infty, +\infty)$ , and  $\|\nabla u_{a_1, n}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2, n}^-\|_2^2 \rightarrow 0$  as  $(a_{1, n}, a_{2, n}) \rightarrow (+\infty, +\infty)$ . Since  $P_{a_1, n, a_2, n}(u_{a_1, n}^-, v_{a_2, n}^-) = 0$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} I(u_{a_1, n}^-, v_{a_2, n}^-) &= \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p\gamma_p} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u_{a_1, n}^-|^2 + |\nabla v_{a_2, n}^-|^2 \\ &\quad - \left( \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{p\gamma_p} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\mu_1 |u_{a_1, n}^-|^4 + \mu_2 |v_{a_2, n}^-|^4 \\ &\quad + 2\beta |u_{a_1, n}^-|^2 |v_{a_2, n}^-|^2) \\ &\leq K_{p, \alpha_1} a_{1, n}^{-\frac{4-p}{p-3}} + K_{p, \alpha_2} a_{2, n}^{-\frac{4-p}{p-3}}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we use the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} (\mu_1 |u_{a_1, n}^-|^4 + \mu_2 |v_{a_2, n}^-|^4 + 2\beta |u_{a_1, n}^-|^2 |v_{a_2, n}^-|^2) \\ &\leq S_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta}^2 \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u_{a_1, n}^-|^2 + |\nabla v_{a_2, n}^-|^2 \right)^2 \\ &\leq C a_{1, n}^{-\frac{2(4-p)}{p-3}} + C' a_{2, n}^{-\frac{2(4-p)}{p-3}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$(1 + o_n(1)) (\alpha_1 \gamma_p a_{1, n}^{p-p\gamma_p} |\mathcal{C}_p|^p + \alpha_2 \gamma_p a_{2, n}^{p-p\gamma_p} |\mathcal{C}_p|^p)^{-\frac{2}{p\gamma_p-2}} \leq \|\nabla u_{a_1, n}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2, n}^-\|_2^2.$$

There exist  $C_i, C'_i > 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) such that

$$C_1 a_{1, n}^{-\frac{4-p}{p-3}} + C_2 a_{2, n}^{-\frac{4-p}{p-3}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\nabla u_{a_1, n}^-|^2 + |\nabla v_{a_2, n}^-|^2 \leq C'_1 a_{1, n}^{-\frac{4-p}{p-3}} + C'_2 a_{2, n}^{-\frac{4-p}{p-3}}.$$

In addition, by  $P_{a_{1,n}, a_{2,n}}(u_{a_{1,n}}^-, v_{a_{2,n}}^-) = 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{1,n} a_{1,n}^2 + \lambda_{2,n} a_{2,n}^2 &= (1 - \gamma_p) \alpha_1 \|u_{a_{1,n}}^-\|_p^p + (1 - \gamma_p) \alpha_2 \|v_{a_{2,n}}^-\|_p^p \\ &= (1 + o_n(1)) (C_1 a_{1,n}^{-\frac{4-p}{p-3}} + C_1' a_{2,n}^{-\frac{4-p}{p-3}}).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there exist  $\lambda_{1,n} \sim a_{1,n}^{-\frac{p-2}{p-3}}$  and  $\lambda_{2,n} \sim a_{2,n}^{-\frac{p-2}{p-3}}$  as  $(a_{1,n}, a_{2,n}) \rightarrow (+\infty, +\infty)$  and  $a_{1,n} \sim a_{2,n}$ . Define

$$\tilde{u}_{a_{1,n}}^- = \frac{1}{\theta_{1,n}} u_{a_{1,n}}^- \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_{1,n}} x \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{v}_{a_{2,n}}^- = \frac{1}{\theta_{2,n}} v_{a_{2,n}}^- \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_{2,n}} x \right),$$

where

$$\theta_{1,n} = \left( \frac{a_{1,n}^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2p-6}} \alpha_1^{-\frac{1}{p-3}}, \quad \theta_{2,n} = \left( \frac{a_{2,n}^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2p-6}} \alpha_2^{-\frac{1}{p-3}},$$

and

$$\gamma_{1,n} = \left( \frac{a_{1,n}^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \right)^{-\frac{p-2}{4(p-3)}} \alpha_1^{-\frac{1}{2p-6}}, \quad \gamma_{2,n} = \left( \frac{a_{2,n}^2}{\|w_p\|_2^2} \right)^{-\frac{p-2}{4(p-3)}} \alpha_2^{-\frac{1}{2p-6}}.$$

By similar arguments as used in Lemma 3.8, we have  $(\tilde{u}_{a_{1,n}}^-, \tilde{v}_{a_{2,n}}^-) \rightarrow (w_p, w_p)$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (+\infty, +\infty)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.9.** *Let  $3 < p < 4$ ,  $\mu_i, \alpha_i, a_i > 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), there exists a  $\beta_1 > 0$  such that  $\beta > \beta_1$  and  $\beta \in (0, \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}) \cup (\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \infty)$ . If  $a_1, a_2 > 0$ , for any ground state  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-)$  of (1.1)-(1.2), then*

$$I(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) = m^-(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow \frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2 \quad \text{as } (a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0).$$

Moreover, there exists  $\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} > 0$  such that

$$(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} u_{a_1}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x), \varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} v_{a_2}^-(\varepsilon_{a_1, a_2} x)) \rightarrow (\sqrt{k_1} U_{\varepsilon_0}, \sqrt{k_2} U_{\varepsilon_0})$$

in  $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ , for some  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$  and  $a_1 \sim a_2$  up to a subsequence, where  $k_1 = \frac{\beta - \mu_2}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$  and  $k_2 = \frac{\beta - \mu_1}{\beta^2 - \mu_1 \mu_2}$ .

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Lemma 4.4, thus we focus only on the differences. By  $P_{a_1, a_2}(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{k_1 + k_2}{4} \mathcal{S}^2 > I(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) &= \frac{1}{4} (\mu_1 \|u_{a_1}^-\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_{a_2}^-\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u_{a_1}^- v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p} \left( \frac{p\gamma_p}{2} - 1 \right) (\alpha_1 \|u_{a_1}^-\|_p^p + \alpha_2 \|v_{a_2}^-\|_p^p),\end{aligned}$$

since  $p\gamma_p > 2$ , we deduce that  $\{(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-)\}$  is bounded in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^4(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ , and hence, since  $P_{a_1, a_2}(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) = 0$ , it is also bounded in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^2)$ . We claim that  $l \neq 0$ . Indeed, if  $l = 0$ , by  $(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) \in \mathcal{P}_{a_1, a_2}^-$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned}2\|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + 2\|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2 \\ < 4[\mu_1 \|u_{a_1}^-\|_4^4 + \mu_2 \|v_{a_2}^-\|_4^4 + 2\beta \|u_{a_1}^- v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2] + \alpha_1 p \gamma_p^2 \|u_{a_1}^-\|_p^p + \alpha_2 p \gamma_p^2 \|v_{a_2}^-\|_p^p,\end{aligned}$$

we obtain a contradiction:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2 &< \frac{2}{\mathcal{S}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \beta}^2} [\|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^2 + \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^2]^2 \\ &+ p\gamma_p^2 |\mathcal{C}_p|^p [a_1^{p-p\gamma_p} \|\nabla u_{a_1}^-\|_2^{p\gamma_p} + a_2^{p-p\gamma_p} \|\nabla v_{a_2}^-\|_2^{p\gamma_p}]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $l > 0$ , we obtain that  $I(u_{a_1}^-, v_{a_2}^-) \rightarrow \frac{k_1+k_2}{4}\mathcal{S}^2$  as  $(a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ . The rest of the proof runs as before.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.5.** The proof is finished when we combine Lemma 6.5 and Lemmas 6.8-6.9.  $\square$

## References

- [1] A. Ambrosetti, H. Brézis and G. Cerami. Combined effects of concave and convex nonlinearities in some elliptic problems. *J. Funct. Anal.*, **122**(1994), 519–543.
- [2] N. Akhmediev and A. Ankiewicz. Partially coherent solitons on a finite background. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **82**(1999), 2661–2664.
- [3] H. Berestycki and P.-L. Lions. Nonlinear scalar field equations. I. Existence of a ground state. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, **82**(4)(1983), 313–345.
- [4] T. Bartsch and L. Jeanjean. Normalized solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger systems. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, **148**(2018), No. 2, 225–242.
- [5] T. Bartsch, L. Jeanjean and N. Soave. Normalized solutions for a system of coupled cubic Schrödinger equations on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, **106**(9)(2016), No. 4, 583–614.
- [6] T. Bartsch and N. Soave. A natural constraint approach to normalized solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations and systems. *J. Funct. Anal.*, **272**(2017), No. 12, 4998–5037.
- [7] T. Bartsch, N. Soave, Multiple normalized solutions for a competing system of Schrödinger equations, *Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ.*, **58**(2019), No. 1, 24 pp.
- [8] T. Barstch, X. Zhong and W. Zou. Normalized solutions for a coupled Schrödinger system. *Math. Ann.*, (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00208-020-02000-w>.
- [9] H. Berestycki and P.-L. Lions. Nonlinear scalar field equations. II. Existence of infinitely many solutions. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **82**(4)(1983), 347–375.

- [10] Z. Chen and W. Zou. Positive least energy solutions and phase separation for coupled Schrödinger equations with critical exponent. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **205**(2012), No. 2, 515–551.
- [11] Z. Chen and W. Zou. Existence and symmetry of positive ground states for a doubly critical Schrödinger system. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **367**(2015), 3599–3646.
- [12] B. D. Esry, C. H. Greene, J. P. Burke Jr. and J. L. Bohn. Hartree-Fock theory for double condensates. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **78**(1997), 3594–3597.
- [13] D. J. Frantzeskakis. Dark solitons in atomic Bose-Einstein condensates: from theory to experiments. *J. Phys. A Math. Theory*, **43**(2010), 213001.
- [14] D. Gilbarg and N.S. Trudinger, Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order, second edition, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften (Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences), vol. 224, Springer-Verlag, *Berlin* (1983).
- [15] T. Gou and L. Jeanjean. Multiple positive normalized solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger systems. *Nonlinearity*, **31**(2018), No. 5, 2319–2345.
- [16] D. Hall, M. Matthews, J. Ensher, C. Wieman and E. Cornell. Dynamics of component separation in a binary mixture of Bose-Einstein condensates. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **81**(1998), 1539–1542.
- [17] Q. Han and F. Lin. Elliptic Partial Differential Equations, Volume 1 of Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 2nd edn. Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, *New York* (2011).
- [18] L. Jeanjean. Existence of solutions with prescribed norm for semilinear elliptic equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, **28**(10)(1997), 1633–1659.
- [19] L. Jeanjean, J. Jendrej, T.T. Le and N. Viscilia. Orbital stability of ground states for a Sobolev critical Schrödinger equation. (2020), arXiv:2008.12084.
- [20] L. Jeanjean and T.T. Le. Multiple normalized solutions for a Sobolev critical Schrödinger equation. *Math. Ann.*, (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00208-021-02228-0>.
- [21] M. Kwong. Uniqueness of positive solutions of  $\Delta u - u + u^p = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **105**(1989), 243–266.
- [22] T. Kato. Growth properties of solutions of the reduced wave equation with a variable coefficient. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **12**(1959), 403–425.
- [23] E. H. Lieb and M. Loss. Analysis, volume 14 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, (2001).

- [24] H. D. Liu and Z. L. Liu. A coupled Schrödinger system with critical exponent. *Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ.*, **59**(2020), 28pp.
- [25] H. W. Li and W. M. Zou. Normalized ground states for semilinear elliptic systems with critical and subcritical nonlinearities. (2020), arXiv:2006.14387v3.
- [26] X. Luo and T. Yang. Ground states for 3D dipolar Bose-Einstein condensate involving quantum fluctuations and three-body losses. (2020), arXiv:2011.00804v1.
- [27] X. F. Li. Studies of normalized solutions to Schrödinger equations with Sobolev critical exponent and combined nonlinearities. (2021), arXiv:2104.12997.
- [28] Y. Li and W.-M. Ni, Radial symmetry of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . *Commun. Partial Diff. Equ.*, **18**(1993), 1043–1054.
- [29] J. Mederski and J. Schino, Least energy solutions to a cooperative system of Schrödinger equations with prescribed  $L^2$ -bounds: at least  $L^2$ -critical growth. (2021), arXiv:2101.02611.
- [30] M. H. Protter and H. F. Weinberger. Maximum principles in differential equations. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., (1967).
- [31] S. Peng, Y. Peng and Z-Q. Wang. On elliptic systems with Sobolev critical growth. *Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ.*, **55**(2016), 30pp.
- [32] Y. F. Peng. On elliptic systems with Sobolev critical exponent. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **36**(2016), No. 6, 3357–3373.
- [33] N. Soave. Normalized ground states for the NLS equation with combined nonlinearities. *J. Differ. Equ.*, **269**(2020), No. 9, 6941–6987.
- [34] N. Soave. Normalized ground states for the NLS equation with combined nonlinearities: the Sobolev critical case. *J. Funct. Anal.*, **279**(2019), No. 6, 108610.
- [35] G. Talenti. Best constant in Sobolev inequality. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.*, **110**(1976), 353–372.
- [36] H. Tavares and S. You. Existence of least energy positive solutions to Schrödinger systems with mixed competition and cooperation terms: the critical case. *Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ.*, **59**(2020), No. 1, 35pp.
- [37] S. Terracini and G. Verzini. Multipulse phases in k-mixtures of Bose-Einstein condensates. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **194**(2009), 717–741.
- [38] J. C. Wei and Y. Z. Wu. Normalized solutions for Schrödinger equations with critical Sobolev exponent and mixed nonlinearities. (2021), arXiv:2102.04030v1.

- [39] J. C. Wei and W. Yao. Note on uniqueness of positive solutions for some coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, **11**(2011), 1003–1011.
- [40] M. Weinstein. Nonlinear Schrödinger equations and sharp interpolation estimates. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, **87**(1983), 567–576.
- [41] M. Willem. Minimax Theorems. Birkhäuser, *Basel* (1996).
- [42] Y. Z. Wu and W. M. Zou. Spikes of the two-component elliptic system in  $\mathbb{R}^4$  with the critical Sobolev exponent. *Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ.*, **58**(2019), 44pp.