

GROUND STATE NORMALIZED SOLUTION TO SCHÖDINGER SYSTEMS WITH GENERAL NONLINEARITIES AND POTENTIALS

YINBIN DENG, QIHAN HE, AND XUEXIU ZHONG

ABSTRACT. In present paper, we study the following Schrödinger systems

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_1 + V_1(x)u_1 + \lambda_1 u_1 = \partial_1 G(u_1, u_2) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ -\Delta u_2 + V_2(x)u_2 + \lambda_2 u_2 = \partial_2 G(u_1, u_2) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ 0 < u_1, u_2 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N), N \geq 1, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^2 dx = a_1, \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^2 dx = a_2, \end{cases}$$

where the potentials $V_\iota(x)$ ($\iota = 1, 2$) are given functions and the nonlinearities $G(u_1, u_2)$ are considered of the form

$$\begin{cases} G(u_1, u_2) := \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{\mu_i}{p_i} |u_1|^{p_i} + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\nu_j}{q_j} |u_2|^{q_j} + \sum_{k=1}^n \beta_k |u_1|^{r_{1,k}} |u_2|^{r_{2,k}}, \quad \ell, m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0^+, \\ \mu_i, \nu_j, \beta_k > 0, 2 + \frac{4}{N} > r_{1,k} + r_{2,k}, p_i, q_j > 2, r_{1,k}, r_{2,k} > 1, \\ i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell; j = 1, 2, \dots, m; k = 1, 2, \dots, n. \end{cases}$$

Under some assumptions on V_ι ($\iota = 1, 2$) and the parameters, we can show the existence of ground state normalized solution $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2; u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^2)$ to the above mass sub-critical problem for any given $a_1 > 0, a_2 > 0$. Here our nonlinearities are general. The potentials $V_1(x)$ and $V_2(x)$ are also very general such that $\inf_{ess} \sigma(-\Delta + V_\iota) > -\infty$, which are allowed to be singular at some points.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35J50, 35J20, 35J61, 35Q55.

1. INTRODUCTION

The time-dependent system of coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations

$$\begin{cases} -i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Phi_1 = \Delta \Phi_1 - V_1(x) \Phi_1 + \partial_1 F(|\Phi_1|^2, |\Phi_2|^2) \Phi_1, \\ -i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Phi_2 = \Delta \Phi_2 - V_2(x) \Phi_2 + \partial_2 F(|\Phi_1|^2, |\Phi_2|^2) \Phi_2, \\ \Phi_\iota = \Phi_\iota(x, t) \in \mathbb{C}, \iota = 1, 2, \end{cases} \quad (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R} \quad (1.1)$$

appear in mean-field models for binary mixtures of Bose-Einstein condensates or models for binary mixtures of ultracold quantum gases of fermion atoms, such as Bose-Fermi mixtures and Fermi-Fermi mixtures, see [1, 2, 15, 29] and the references therein.

Key words and phrases. Nonlinear Schrödinger system; Ground state normalized solution; Mass sub-critical growth; Potentials.

The research was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11801581, 11931012, 12061012), Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (2021A1515010034), Guangzhou Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (202102020225), Province Natural Science Fund of Guangdong (2018A030310082).

The ansatz $\Phi_\iota(x, t) = e^{i\lambda_\iota t} u_\iota(x)$, $\iota = 1, 2$ for solitary wave solutions leads to the following elliptic system:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_1 + V_1(x)u_1 + \lambda_1 u_1 = \partial_1 G(u_1, u_2) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ -\Delta u_2 + V_2(x)u_2 + \lambda_2 u_2 = \partial_2 G(u_1, u_2) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ u_1, u_2 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N), N \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

In (1.2), if λ_1 and λ_2 are given, we call it the *fixed frequency problem*. There are many mathematical theories and tools applied to study it. For example, one can apply the variational method to look for the critical points of the associated energy functional

$$\Psi[u_1, u_2] := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla u_\iota|^2 + (V_\iota(x) + \lambda_\iota)u_\iota^2] dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1, u_2) dx.$$

On the other hand, one also can use the topological methods to deal with (1.2), such as the fixed point theory, bifurcation or the Lyapunov-Schmidt reduction. The *fixed frequency problem* has been widely investigated by many authors for the decades, and it is impossible to summarize it here since the related literature is huge.

An important and well-known feature of (1.1) is conservation of masses: the L^2 -norms $\|\Phi_1(\cdot, t)\|_2$, $\|\Phi_2(\cdot, t)\|_2$ of solutions are independent of $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore a natural approach to find the solutions of (1.2) consists in finding critical points of the energy $J[u_1, u_2]$ under the the following masses constraint

$$(u_1, u_2) \in \tilde{S}_{a_1, a_2} := \left\{ (u_1, u_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}} : \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_\iota^2 dx = a_\iota, \iota = 1, 2 \right\}, \quad (1.3)$$

where

$$J[u_1, u_2] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla u_\iota|^2 + V_\iota(x)u_\iota^2] dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1, u_2) dx, \quad (1.4)$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}} := \left\{ (u_1, u_2) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V_\iota(x)u_\iota^2 dx < \infty, \iota = 1, 2 \right\}.$$

Then the parameters λ_1 and λ_2 appear as Lagrange multipliers. We call the problem (1.2) with (1.3) the *fixed mass problem*, and a solution of (1.2) satisfying the prescribed mass constraint (1.3), we call it *normalized solution*.

System (1.2) with (1.3) can be seen as a counterpart of the following prescribed mass problem

$$-\Delta u + (V(x) + \lambda)u = g(u) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N, \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u^2 dx = a > 0. \quad (1.5)$$

The prescribed mass problem is a research hotspot recently. The readers may refer to [4, 7, 21, 23, 27, 28, 30, 31, 36, 37, 39] and the references therein.

Basing on the above results, we discover that even though a series of theories and tools related to *fixed frequency problem* have been developed, such as fixed point theory, bifurcation, the Lyapunov-Schmidt reduction, Nehari manifold method, mountain pass theory and many other linking theories, these theories and tools can not be used directly to the *fixed mass problem*. For the *fixed mass problem*, the normalization constraint (1.3) certainly brings too much trouble in mathematical treatment. Comparing to the *fixed frequency problem*, the *fixed mass problem* possesses the following technical difficulties when dealing with it:

- (1) One can not use the usual Nehari manifold method since the frequency is unknown;

- (2) The existence of bounded Palais-Smale sequences requires new arguments;
- (3) The Lagrange multipliers have to be controlled;
- (4) For the *fixed frequency problem*, usually a nontrivial weak limit is also a solution. However, for the *fixed mass problem*, a nontrivial weak limit may be not a solution since the constraint condition may be not satisfied.
- (5) There is a number $\bar{p} = 2 + \frac{4}{N}$, called the mass critical exponent, affecting the geometry of the functional heavily.

Due to the importance of the normalized solutions to (1.2) with (1.3), many researchers have focused their attention on this problem and obtained some very meaningful results. Bartsch, Jeanjean, Soave [6] and Bartsch, Soave [8] considered the following system case

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \lambda_1 u = \mu_1 u^3 + \beta uv^2 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3, \\ -\Delta v + \lambda_2 v = \mu_2 v^3 + \beta u^2 v & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u^2 = a, \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v^2 = b \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

with $\beta > 0$ and $\beta < 0$ respectively, they found solutions to (1.6) for specific range of β depending on a, b . Later in [10], Bartsch, Zhong and Zou presented a new approach based on the fixed point index in cones, bifurcation theory and the continuation method, and obtained the existence of normalized solution for $\beta > 0$ belonging to much better ranges, which is independent of the prescribed masses a and b . For more results about (1.6), see also [9] and the references therein.

In [35], Shibata introduced a new rearrangement inequality. And then applied the rearrangement inequality to prove the convergence of any minimizing sequences for a minimizing problem of the form

$$\tilde{E}_{a_1, a_2} := \inf_{(u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}} \tilde{J}[u_1, u_2] \quad (1.7)$$

where

$$S_{a_1, a_2} := \left\{ (u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{H} = H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_\nu^2 dx = a_\nu, \nu = 1, 2 \right\},$$

$$\tilde{J}[u_1, u_2] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\nu=1}^2 \|\nabla u_\nu\|_2^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(|u_1|^2, |u_2|^2) dx,$$

and the function $G(s, t)$ satisfies various assumptions and is of mass sub-critical.

For the following important and much more general system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \lambda_1 u = \mu_1 |u|^{p-2} u + \beta r_1 |u|^{r_1-2} |v|^{r_2} u & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ -\Delta v + \lambda_2 v = \mu_2 |v|^{q-2} v + \beta r_2 |u|^{r_1} |v|^{r_2-2} v & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u^2 = a, \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v^2 = b, \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

Gou and Jeanjean [17] proved the pre-compactness of the minimizing sequences up to translation for mass sub-critical problems. In [18], the authors also studied the mass super-critical case. Some mass mixed cases are also considered by Bartsch and Jeanjean [5]. Recently, Li and Zou [24] also studied (1.8) for $N = 3, 4$, and the nonlinearities are of mixed terms which involves Sobolev critical exponent. We also note that when $G(u, v) := \frac{\mu_1}{p} |u|^p + \frac{\mu_2}{q} |v|^q + \beta |u|^{r_1} |v|^{r_2}$ involves linear coupled terms, it has its own difficulties in mathematical processing.

For the mass sub-critical case, we refer to Chen and Zou [12]. And for the mass mixed case, we refer to Chen, Zhong and Zou [13].

When the system involves potentials, it will become very complicated in mathematical processing. Let us consider the following system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_1 + V_1(x)u_1 + \lambda_1 u_1 = \mu_1 |u_1|^{p_1-2} u_1 + \beta r_1 |u_1|^{r_1-2} |u_2|^{r_2} u_1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ -\Delta u_2 + V_2(x)u_2 + \lambda_2 u_2 = \nu_1 |u_2|^{q_1-2} u_2 + \beta r_2 |u_1|^{r_1} |u_2|^{r_2-2} u_2 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_\iota^2 = a_\iota > 0, \quad \iota = 1, 2, N \geq 1, \end{cases} \quad (1.9)$$

as we know, the first result is given by Guo, Li, Wei and Zeng [19], where the authors considered the mass critical case. In [19], they assumed that $N = 2, p_1 = q_1 = 4, r_1 = r_2 = 2$ and $0 \leq V_i \in C_{loc}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ ($i = 1, 2$) satisfies that for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V_i(x) = \infty, \text{ both } \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} V_i(x) = 0 \text{ and } \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} (V_1(x) + V_2(x)) \text{ are attained,}$$

and showed the existence of normalized solutions to (1.9) when μ_1, ν_1, β are appropriately small positive constants. Recently, Ikoma and Miyamoto [22] gave a progress in this direction. They assumed that $V_i \in C(\mathbb{R}^N), V_i(x) \leq \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V_i(x) =: V_{i,\infty}$ ($i = 1, 2$) and discussed the compactness of any minimizing sequence and the existence of normalized solutions for the mass sub-critical case. However, Ikoma and Miyamoto only considered the case of $r_1 = r_2$ and assumed that both $V_1(x)$ and $V_2(x)$ are bounded, or one of them is bounded and the other one is coercive. In particular, the potentials are bounded from below there.

Based on these observations, we shall study the existence of ground state normalized solution to systems with much more general potentials which are allowed to be singular at some points and also make contributions to get rid of the constraint that $r_1 = r_2$. Precisely, we are concerned with the existence of real numbers $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u_1, u_2 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ that solve the following system:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_1 + V_1(x)u_1 + \lambda_1 u_1 = \partial_1 G(u_1, u_2) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ -\Delta u_2 + V_2(x)u_2 + \lambda_2 u_2 = \partial_2 G(u_1, u_2) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^2 dx = a_1 > 0, \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^2 dx = a_2 > 0, \\ u_1, u_2 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N), N \geq 1, \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} G(u_1, u_2) := \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{\mu_i}{p_i} |u_1|^{p_i} + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\nu_j}{q_j} |u_2|^{q_j} + \sum_{k=1}^n \beta_k |u_1|^{r_{1,k}} |u_2|^{r_{2,k}}, \quad \ell, m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0^+, \\ \mu_i, \nu_j, \beta_k > 0, \quad 2 + \frac{4}{N} > r_{1,k} + r_{2,k}, p_i, q_j > 2, \quad r_{1,k}, r_{2,k} > 1, \\ i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell; j = 1, 2, \dots, m; k = 1, 2, \dots, n. \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

and $V_1(x), V_2(x)$ satisfy the following assumption:

(VH1) For $\iota = 1, 2$, $V_\iota(x) \leq 0$ in \mathbb{R}^N and $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V_\iota(x) = 0$. Furthermore, there exist some $\sigma_\iota \in [0, 1)$ and $\tau_\iota \geq 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{V_\iota}^2 \leq \sigma_\iota \|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \tau_\iota \|u\|_2^2, \quad \forall u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, -V_\iota(x)dx), \iota = 1, 2,$$

where

$$\|u\|_V := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} -V(x)|u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (1.12)$$

Remark 1.1. We note that for the bounded potentials $V_\iota(x) \leq 0$ with $-\tau_\iota := \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} V_\iota(x) > -\infty$, then $\|u\|_{V_\iota}^2 \leq \tau_\iota \|u\|_2^2$, and thus (VH1) holds naturally. Another important application for unbounded potential is that $V_\iota(x) = -\frac{\kappa_\iota}{|x|^{s_\iota}}$ with $s_\iota \in (0, 2), \kappa_\iota > 0$ or $s_\iota = 2, \kappa_\iota \in (0, \frac{(N-2)^2}{4})$ for $N \geq 3$. In particular, the Coulomb potential is within our consideration, which is very important in physics. On the other hand, we emphasize that our argument is indeed valid for general G of the form

$$G(u_1, u_2) = \frac{\mu_1}{p_1} |u_1|^{p_1} + \frac{\nu_1}{q_1} |u_2|^{q_1} + \beta_1 |u_1|^{r_{1,1}} |u_2|^{r_{2,1}} + F(u_1, u_2)$$

with some suitable assumptions on $F(u_1, u_2)$ and $r_{1,1} \neq r_{2,1}$ is allowed.

Before stating our results, we give a definition.

Definition 1.2. For given $a_1 > 0, a_2 > 0$, a solution $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, u_1, u_2)$ to (1.10) is called ground state normalized solution, or least energy normalized solution, if

$$J[u_1, u_2] = \min \left\{ J[v_1, v_2] : (\hat{\lambda}_1, \hat{\lambda}_2, v_1, v_2) \text{ solves (1.10)} \right\}.$$

Firstly, we are concerned with the radial potential case that

(VH2) $V_\iota(x) = V_\iota(|x|), \iota = 1, 2$ are non-decreasing functions with respect to $r = |x|$.

Our first main result is stated as following:

Theorem 1.3. Suppose that (VH1) – (VH2) hold and $G(s, t)$ is given by (1.11). Then problem (1.10) has a ground state normalized solution $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, u_1, u_2)$ with $\lambda_1 \geq 0, \lambda_2 \geq 0$ and $(u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{rad}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, where $\mathcal{H}^{\text{rad}} \subset \mathcal{H}$ denotes the radial subspace.

When the potential $V_\iota(x)$ is not of radial, we can not work in the radial subspace as [5, 17], etc. In order to state our next main theorem, without loss of generality, we assume that

$$p_1 \leq p_i, q_1 \leq q_j, r_{1,1} \leq r_{1,k}, r_{2,1} \leq r_{2,k} \text{ for } i \geq 1, j \geq 1, k \geq 1. \quad (1.13)$$

For the technical reason (see Remark 1.5 below), we require the following assumption in addition.

$$\text{When } N \geq 5, \text{ we suppose further that } p_1, q_1 \in \left(2, 2 + \frac{2}{N-2} \right]. \quad (1.14)$$

Here comes our another main theorem focused on the case that $V_\iota(x)$ is not necessary radial.

Theorem 1.4. Suppose that (VH1) holds and $G(s, t)$ is given by (1.11) satisfying (1.13) and (1.14). Then for any $a_1 > 0, a_2 > 0$, Problem (1.10) has a ground state normalized solution $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, u_1, u_2)$ with $\lambda_1 > 0, \lambda_2 > 0, (u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{H}$ and $u_1 > 0, u_2 > 0$ in \mathbb{R}^N .

Remark 1.5. For these Lagrange multipliers λ_1 and λ_2 , from a physical point of view it represents the chemical potentials of standing waves. We point out that there are situations in the Bose-Einstein condensate theory that requires the chemical potentials are positive, see [26, 32]. By a well-known result own to Frank H. Clarke (see [14, Theorem 1]), we always have that $\lambda_1 \geq 0$ and $\lambda_2 \geq 0$, see also Proposition 3.7 in Section 3. When $V_\iota(x)$ is not of radial, to prove the strict binding inequality, we need a sharp decay estimation of the positive solution.

And that the positiveness of the Lagrange multipliers plays an crucial role. Hence, we need to exclude the case of $\lambda_\iota = 0$ ($\iota = 1, 2$). Just because of this, we need to use the known Liouville type result. Observing that $\partial_\iota G(u_1, u_2) \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R}^N , $\iota = 1, 2$. So by the known Liouville type results, one can see that $\lambda_\iota > 0$ provided $1 \leq N \leq 4$. From a mathematical point of view, it seems that $\lambda_\iota = 0$ may happen for high dimension case without any other condition. However, if suppose $p_1, q_1 \in (2, 2 + \frac{2}{N-2}]$ in addition to the assumptions, one can also exclude the case of $\lambda_\iota = 0$, see for instance [20, Lemma A.2]. For our case, see Lemma 7.4 in Section 7.

For the mass sub-critical problem (1.10), it is easy to see that the corresponding functional is bounded from below on the masses constrained manifold (see Lemma 2.3), which admits us to apply the minimizing argument. But the compactness is not easy to show. Comparing with [22], our nonlinearities are more general and both $V_1(x)$ and $V_2(x)$ can be allowed to be singular at some points, which brings much more difficulties to us in mathematical processing. To obtain the compactness, we need to show the strict sub-additive inequality, which urges us to prove Proposition 6.5: If $(u_1, u_2) \neq (0, 0)$ is a nonnegative solution to (5.1) and $(\omega_1, \omega_2) \neq (0, 0)$ is a nonnegative solution to (5.9), then there exists some $(\phi_1, \phi_2) \in \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$(\|\phi_1\|_2^2, \|\phi_2\|_2^2) = (\|u_1\|_2^2 + \|\omega_1\|_2^2, \|u_2\|_2^2 + \|\omega_2\|_2^2) \text{ and } J[\phi_1, \phi_2] < J[u_1, u_2] + I[\omega_1, \omega_2]. \quad (1.15)$$

To get Proposition 6.5, we need a sharp decay estimations of the positive solutions to (5.1) and (5.9) (See Proposition 5.4). A better interaction estimation for the couples terms is also crucial, see Lemma 6.4. The general nonlinearities also make the calculations very complicated when we show the Proposition 6.5.

The paper is organized as follows. We collect and prove a few basic facts about the minimizing sequence related to (1.10) in Section 2. In Section 3, we shall prove some properties of C_{a_1, a_2} , such as the monotonicity, continuity and binding inequality. In Section 4, we shall focus on the radial case and prove Theorem 1.3 via the rearrangement argument. For the non-radial case, to establish the strict binding inequality, a better decay estimation of the positive solutions is necessary. So in Section 5, we shall give a sharp decay estimations of the positive solutions for the *fixed frequency problem*. Basing on these results, we can prove the strict binding inequality in Section 6 (see Proposition 6.5). Finally in Section 7, we apply the standard concentration compactness argument to prove Theorem 1.4.

Throughout the paper we use the notation $\|u\|_p$ to denote the L^p -norm, and simply write $\mathcal{H} = H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. \mathcal{H}^{rad} denotes the radial subspace. The notation \rightharpoonup denotes weak convergence in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ or \mathcal{H} . Capital latter C stands for positive constant which may depend on some parameters, whose precise value can change from line to line.

2. SOME PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we summarize several results that will be used in the rest discussion.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that $G(s, t)$ is given by (1.11). Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists some $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$G(s, t) \leq C_\varepsilon(s^2 + t^2) + \varepsilon(s^{2+\frac{4}{N}} + t^{2+\frac{4}{N}}), \forall (s, t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2. \quad (2.1)$$

Proof. It follows from Young inequality that

$$s^{r_{1,k}} t^{r_{2,k}} \leq \frac{1}{r_{1,k} + r_{2,k}} r_{1,k}^{\frac{r_{1,k}}{r_{1,k} + r_{2,k}}} r_{2,k}^{\frac{r_{2,k}}{r_{1,k} + r_{2,k}}} (s^{r_{1,k} + r_{2,k}} + t^{r_{1,k} + r_{2,k}}).$$

On the other hand, let $p \in (2, 2 + \frac{4}{N})$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists some $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$y^p \leq C_\varepsilon y^2 + \varepsilon y^{2+\frac{4}{N}}, \quad \forall y \geq 0. \quad (2.2)$$

It is easy to check that (2.1) holds by using (1.11). \square

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that (VH1) holds and $G(s, t)$ is given by (1.11). Let $\sigma := \frac{1 - \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}}{2} > 0$ determined by (VH1). Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists some $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} J[u_1, u_2] &\geq \sigma(\|\nabla u_1\|_2^2 + \|\nabla u_2\|_2^2) - C_\varepsilon(\|u_1\|_2^2 + \|u_2\|_2^2) \\ &\quad - \varepsilon \left(\|\nabla u_1\|_2^2 \|u_1\|_2^{\frac{4}{N}} + \|\nabla u_2\|_2^2 \|u_2\|_2^{\frac{4}{N}} \right), \quad \forall (u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{H}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, we have that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists some $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$G(u_1, u_2) \leq C_\varepsilon(|u_1|^2 + |u_2|^2) + \varepsilon(|u_1|^{2+\frac{4}{N}} + |u_2|^{2+\frac{4}{N}}). \quad (2.3)$$

So we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1, u_2) dx \leq C_\varepsilon (\|u_1\|_2^2 + \|u_2\|_2^2) + \varepsilon \left(\|u_1\|_{2+\frac{4}{N}}^{2+\frac{4}{N}} + \|u_2\|_{2+\frac{4}{N}}^{2+\frac{4}{N}} \right). \quad (2.4)$$

By Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, there exists some $C(N) > 0$ such that

$$\|v\|_{2+\frac{4}{N}}^{2+\frac{4}{N}} \leq C(N) \|\nabla v\|_2^2 \|v\|_2^{\frac{4}{N}}, \quad \forall v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N). \quad (2.5)$$

Under the assumption (VH1), we have that

$$\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2 \geq (1 - \sigma_\iota) \|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 - \tau_\iota \|u_\iota\|_2^2, \quad \iota = 1, 2. \quad (2.6)$$

So by (2.4), (2.5), (2.6), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} J[u_1, u_2] &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 (\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1, u_2) dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 [(1 - \sigma_\iota) \|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 - \tau_\iota \|u_\iota\|_2^2] - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1, u_2) dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 [(1 - \sigma_\iota) \|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 - \tau_\iota \|u_\iota\|_2^2] - C_\varepsilon (\|u_1\|_2^2 + \|u_2\|_2^2) \\ &\quad - \varepsilon \left(\|u_1\|_{2+\frac{4}{N}}^{2+\frac{4}{N}} + \|u_2\|_{2+\frac{4}{N}}^{2+\frac{4}{N}} \right) \\ &\geq \sigma(\|\nabla u_1\|_2^2 + \|\nabla u_2\|_2^2) - \left(\frac{\tau_1}{2} + C_\varepsilon\right) \|u_1\|_2^2 - \left(\frac{\tau_2}{2} + C_\varepsilon\right) \|u_2\|_2^2 \\ &\quad - \varepsilon C(N) \left(\|\nabla u_1\|_2^2 \|u_1\|_2^{\frac{4}{N}} + \|\nabla u_2\|_2^2 \|u_2\|_2^{\frac{4}{N}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Replaced $\varepsilon C(N)$ by ε , and redefine C_ε , we finish the proof. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that (VH1) holds and $G(s, t)$ is given by (1.11). For any $a_1 \geq 0, a_2 \geq 0$,*

$$C_{a_1, a_2} := \inf_{(u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}} J[u_1, u_2] > -\infty.$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.2, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists some $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} J[u_1, u_2] &\geq \sigma(\|\nabla u_1\|_2^2 + \|\nabla u_2\|_2^2) - C_\varepsilon(\|u_1\|_2^2 + \|u_2\|_2^2) \\ &\quad - \varepsilon \left(\|\nabla u_1\|_2^2 \|u_1\|_2^{\frac{4}{N}} + \|\nabla u_2\|_2^2 \|u_2\|_2^{\frac{4}{N}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

So for any $(u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}$, we choose $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that $\varepsilon a_i^{\frac{2}{N}} < \frac{\sigma}{2}$, $i = 1, 2$. For such a fixed ε , we have

$$J[u_1, u_2] \geq \frac{\sigma}{2}(\|\nabla u_1\|_2^2 + \|\nabla u_2\|_2^2) - C_\varepsilon(\|u_1\|_2^2 + \|u_2\|_2^2) > -C_\varepsilon(a_1 + a_2), \forall (u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}.$$

Hence,

$$C_{a_1, a_2} := \inf_{(u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}} J[u_1, u_2] \geq -C_\varepsilon(a_1 + a_2) > -\infty.$$

□

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that (VH1) holds and $G(s, t)$ is given by (1.11). Then any L^2 -bounded sequence $\{(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta})\}$ with $\sup_{\vartheta \in \mathbb{N}} J[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] < \infty$ is also bounded in \mathcal{H} .*

Proof. Let $\{(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta})\}$ be a L^2 -bounded sequence, i.e., $\|u_{i,\vartheta}\|_2^2 \leq M_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Suppose that $J[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] \leq M_3$, $\forall \vartheta \in \mathbb{N}$. Recalling Lemma 2.2, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists some $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} M_3 &\geq J[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] \geq \sigma(\|\nabla u_{1,\vartheta}\|_2^2 + \|\nabla u_{2,\vartheta}\|_2^2) - C_\varepsilon(\|u_{1,\vartheta}\|_2^2 + \|u_{2,\vartheta}\|_2^2) \\ &\quad - \varepsilon \left(\|\nabla u_{1,\vartheta}\|_2^2 \|u_{1,\vartheta}\|_2^{\frac{4}{N}} + \|\nabla u_{2,\vartheta}\|_2^2 \|u_{2,\vartheta}\|_2^{\frac{4}{N}} \right) \\ &\geq \sigma(\|\nabla u_{1,\vartheta}\|_2^2 + \|\nabla u_{2,\vartheta}\|_2^2) - C_\varepsilon(M_1 + M_2) \\ &\quad - \varepsilon \left(M_1^{\frac{2}{N}} \|\nabla u_{1,\vartheta}\|_2^2 + M_2^{\frac{2}{N}} \|\nabla u_{2,\vartheta}\|_2^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

We can take $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that $\varepsilon M_i^{\frac{2}{N}} < \frac{1}{2}\sigma$, $i = 1, 2$. Then it follows that

$$\sup_{\vartheta \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{i=1}^2 \|\nabla u_{i,\vartheta}\|_2^2 < \infty, \quad (2.7)$$

and this implies that the sequence $\{(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta})\}_{\vartheta=1}^\infty$ is bounded in \mathcal{H} . □

Remark 2.5.

(i) *Suppose that (VH1) holds and $G(s, t)$ is given by (1.11). For any given $a_1 > 0, a_2 > 0$, by Lemma 2.3 and Ekeland's variational principle, the existence of Palais-Smale minimizing sequence is trivial. Furthermore, by Lemma 2.4, this Palais-Smale minimizing sequence is also bounded in \mathcal{H} . So the main difficulty of mass sub-critical problem is the compactness.*

(ii) *Define*

$$I[u_1, u_2] := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 \|\nabla u_i\|_2^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1, u_2) dx, \forall (u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{H}, \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$E_{a_1, a_2} := \inf_{(u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}} I[u_1, u_2]. \quad (2.9)$$

It is equivalent to take $V_1(x) \equiv V_2(x) \equiv 0$ in $J[u_1, u_2]$ (which means that $\sigma_\iota = 0, \tau_\iota = 0$ and $\sigma := \frac{1 - \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}}{2} = \frac{1}{2}$). So we have a sequence of conclusions for $I[u_1, u_2]$ and E_{a_1, a_2} , as that in Lemmas 2.2-2.4.

3. SOME PROPERTIES OF C_{a_1, a_2} AND E_{a_1, a_2}

In this section, we shall establish some basic properties of C_{a_1, a_2} and E_{a_1, a_2} including monotonicity, continuity and binding inequality.

Observing that $J[u_1, u_2] = I[u_1, u_2] - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2$, so we have $C_{a_1, a_2} \leq E_{a_1, a_2}$. Recalling the fiber map

$$u(x) \mapsto (t \star u)(x) := t^{\frac{N}{2}} u(tx), \quad (3.1)$$

for $(t, u) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, which preserves the L^2 -norm, we have the following result.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that (VH1) holds and $G(s, t)$ is given by (1.11). For any $a_1 \geq 0, a_2 \geq 0$ and $(a_1, a_2) \neq (0, 0)$, then $C_{a_1, a_2} \leq E_{a_1, a_2} < 0$. In particular, if E_{a_1, a_2} is attained, and $V_\iota(x) \not\equiv 0, \iota = 1, 2$, then $C_{a_1, a_2} < E_{a_1, a_2} < 0$.*

Proof. Letting $(u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}$, we remark that $t \star (u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}$ for any $t > 0$. A direct computation shows that

$$I[t \star (u_1, u_2)] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 t^2 - t^{-N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(t^{\frac{N}{2}} u_1, t^{\frac{N}{2}} u_2) dx. \quad (3.2)$$

Noting that

$$G(t^{\frac{N}{2}} u_1, t^{\frac{N}{2}} u_2) = o(1) t^N (|u_1|^2 + |u_2|^2), \text{ as } t \rightarrow 0^+,$$

we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} I[t \star (u_1, u_2)] = 0$. On the other hand, for $t > 0$ small enough, by (1.11), there exists some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{I[t \star (u_1, u_2)]}{t^2} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 - t^{-N-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(t^{\frac{N}{2}} u_1, t^{\frac{N}{2}} u_2) dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 - \varepsilon_0 t^{-N-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{\mu_1}{p_1} |t^{\frac{N}{2}} u_1|^{p_1} + \frac{\nu_1}{q_1} |t^{\frac{N}{2}} u_2|^{q_1} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 - \varepsilon_0 \frac{\mu_1}{p_1} \|u_1\|_{p_1}^{p_1} t^{\frac{N}{2} p_1 - N - 2} - \varepsilon_0 \frac{\nu_1}{q_1} \|u_2\|_{q_1}^{q_1} t^{\frac{N}{2} q_1 - N - 2}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $p_1, q_1 \in (2, 2 + \frac{4}{N})$, we have that $\frac{N}{2} p_1 - N - 2 < 0, \frac{N}{2} q_1 - N - 2 < 0$. By $(a_1, a_2) \neq (0, 0)$, at least one of $\|u_1\|_{p_1}^{p_1}$ and $\|u_2\|_{q_1}^{q_1}$ is positive. Hence, there exists some $t_0 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{d}{dt} I[t \star (u_1, u_2)] < 0, \quad \forall t \in (0, t_0), \quad (3.3)$$

which implies that $I[t \star (u_1, u_2)] < 0 \quad \forall t \in (0, t_0)$. Recalling that $J[u_1, u_2] = I[u_1, u_2] - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2 \leq I[u_1, u_2]$, we have that

$$C_{a_1, a_2} := \inf_{(u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}} J[u_1, u_2] \leq E_{a_1, a_2} := \inf_{(u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}} I[u_1, u_2] < 0.$$

In particular, if E_{a_1, a_2} is attained, we can take $(0, 0) \neq (u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}$ with $u_1 \geq 0, u_2 \geq 0$ such that $I[u_1, u_2] = E_{a_1, a_2}$. A standard elliptic estimation shows the solution is of classical.

So by strong maximum principle, it is easy to see that at least one of u_1 and u_2 is positive in \mathbb{R}^N . Then by $V_\iota(x) \leq 0$ but $V_\iota(x) \not\equiv 0, \iota = 1, 2$, we obtain that

$$C_{a_1, a_2} \leq J[u_1, u_2] = I[u_1, u_2] - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2 < E_{a_1, a_2} < 0.$$

□

Lemma 3.2. For $(a_1, a_2), (b_1, b_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we have

$$C_{a_1+b_1, a_2+b_2} \leq C_{a_1, a_2} + E_{b_1, b_2} \text{ and } E_{a_1+b_1, a_2+b_2} \leq E_{a_1, a_2} + E_{b_1, b_2}.$$

Proof. We only prove $C_{a_1+b_1, a_2+b_2} \leq C_{a_1, a_2} + E_{b_1, b_2}$, and $E_{a_1+b_1, a_2+b_2} \leq E_{a_1, a_2} + E_{b_1, b_2}$ can be proved by taking $V_1(x) \equiv V_2(x) \equiv 0$. If $(a_1, a_2) = (0, 0)$ or $(b_1, b_2) = (0, 0)$, it is trivial. Next, we suppose that $(a_1, a_2) \neq (0, 0)$ and $(b_1, b_2) \neq (0, 0)$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, by density, we can take some $(u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}, (v_1, v_2) \in S_{b_1, b_2}$ with $u_\iota, v_\iota \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N), \iota = 1, 2$, such that

$$C_{a_1, a_2} \leq J[u_1, u_2] < C_{a_1, a_2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{ and } E_{b_1, b_2} \leq I[v_1, v_2] < E_{b_1, b_2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Let $(v_{1,R}, v_{2,R}) := (v_1(\cdot - R\mathbf{e}_1), v_2(\cdot - R\mathbf{e}_1))$. Take some $R_0 > 0$ large enough such that

$$(\text{supp } u_1 \cup \text{supp } u_2) \cap (\text{supp } v_{1,R_0} \cup \text{supp } v_{2,R_0}) = \emptyset.$$

Then we have that $(u_1 + v_{1,R}, u_2 + v_{2,R}) \in S_{a_1+b_1, a_2+b_2}, \forall R \geq R_0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} J[u_1 + v_{1,R}, u_2 + v_{2,R}] &= J[u_1, u_2] + J[v_{1,R}, v_{2,R}] \leq J[u_1, u_2] + I[v_{1,R}, v_{2,R}] \\ &= J[u_1, u_2] + I[v_1, v_2] \leq C_{a_1, a_2} + E_{b_1, b_2} + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrary of ε , we obtain that $C_{a_1+b_1, a_2+b_2} \leq C_{a_1, a_2} + E_{b_1, b_2}$. □

Corollary 3.3. For $(a_1, a_2), (b_1, b_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ with $(b_1, b_2) \neq (0, 0)$, then $C_{a_1+b_1, a_2+b_2} < C_{a_1, a_2}$ and $E_{a_1+b_1, a_2+b_2} < E_{a_1, a_2}$.

Proof. Recalling Lemma 3.1, we have $E_{b_1, b_2} < 0$ for $(b_1, b_2) \neq (0, 0)$. Then by Lemma 3.2, one can see that $C_{a_1+b_1, a_2+b_2} < C_{a_1, a_2}$ and $E_{a_1+b_1, a_2+b_2} < E_{a_1, a_2}$. □

Lemma 3.4. Suppose that (VH1) holds and $G(s, t)$ is given by (1.11). Let $\{(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta})\}$ be bounded in \mathcal{H} with $(\|u_{1,\vartheta}\|_2^2, \|u_{2,\vartheta}\|_2^2) \rightarrow (a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. Then we have

$$\liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] \geq C_{a_1, a_2} \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$\liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} I[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] \geq E_{a_1, a_2}. \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. We only prove (3.4). If $a_1 = a_2 = 0$, then we have that $(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Since $\{(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta})\}$ is bounded in \mathcal{H} , by Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, one can see that $u_{\iota,\vartheta} \rightarrow 0$ in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $2 \leq p < 2^*$ and $\iota = 1, 2$. Hence,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}) dx \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \vartheta \rightarrow \infty.$$

By (VH1), we obtain that

$$\liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] \geq 0 = C_{0,0}.$$

If $a_1 = 0 < a_2$, we have that $u_{1,\vartheta} \rightarrow 0$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Then by Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality again, $u_{1,\vartheta} \rightarrow 0$ in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $2 \leq p < 2^*$. By mean value theorem, there exists some $0 \leq v_{1,\vartheta}(x) \leq u_{1,\vartheta}$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(0, u_{2,\vartheta}) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_1 G(v_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}) u_{1,\vartheta} dx \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Hence,

$$\liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] \geq \liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[0, u_{2,\vartheta}].$$

By $\|u_{2,\vartheta}\|_2^2 \rightarrow a_2 > 0$, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\|u_{2,\vartheta}\|_2 > 0$ for all $\vartheta \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $v_{2,\vartheta} := \frac{\sqrt{a_2}}{\|u_{2,\vartheta}\|_2} u_{2,\vartheta}$, $\forall \vartheta \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have that

$$\|v_{2,\vartheta}\|_2^2 = a_2, u_{2,\vartheta} = t_\vartheta v_{2,\vartheta} \text{ with } t_\vartheta \rightarrow 1. \quad (3.7)$$

Then we have

$$\|\nabla u_{2,\vartheta}\|_2^2 - \|u_{2,\vartheta}\|_{V_2}^2 = t_\vartheta^2 [\|\nabla v_{2,\vartheta}\|_2^2 - \|v_{2,\vartheta}\|_{V_2}^2] = (1 + o(1)) [\|\nabla v_{2,\vartheta}\|_2^2 - \|v_{2,\vartheta}\|_{V_2}^2], \quad (3.8)$$

and by mean value theorem, there exists some $\eta_\vartheta(x) \in [\min\{t_\vartheta, 1\}, \max\{t_\vartheta, 1\}]$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(0, u_{2,\vartheta}) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(0, v_{2,\vartheta}) dx = (t_\vartheta - 1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_2 G(0, \eta_\vartheta v_{2,\vartheta}) v_{2,\vartheta} dx \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Hence,

$$\liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] \geq \liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[0, v_{2,\vartheta}] \geq C_{0,a_2}.$$

We remark that the case of $a_1 > 0 = a_2$ can be proved similarly as above.

Finally, we consider the case of $a_1 > 0, a_2 > 0$. We let

$$v_{\iota,\vartheta} = \frac{\sqrt{a_\iota}}{\|u_{\iota,\vartheta}\|_2} u_{\iota,\vartheta}, \text{ and } t_{\iota,\vartheta} := \frac{\|u_{\iota,\vartheta}\|_2}{\sqrt{a_\iota}}, \quad \iota = 1, 2.$$

Then we have that $u_{\iota,\vartheta} = t_{\iota,\vartheta} v_{\iota,\vartheta}$ with $\|v_{\iota,\vartheta}\|_2^2 = a_\iota, \forall \vartheta \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t_{\iota,\vartheta} = 1 + o(1)$ as $\vartheta \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, similar to (3.8), for $\iota = 1, 2$, we also have

$$\|\nabla u_{\iota,\vartheta}\|_2^2 - \|u_{\iota,\vartheta}\|_{V_\iota}^2 = (1 + o(1)) [\|\nabla v_{\iota,\vartheta}\|_2^2 - \|v_{\iota,\vartheta}\|_{V_\iota}^2]. \quad (3.10)$$

On the other hand, there exist $\eta_{\iota,\vartheta}(x) \in [\min\{t_{\iota,\vartheta}, 1\}, \max\{t_{\iota,\vartheta}, 1\}]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(v_{1,\vartheta}, v_{2,\vartheta}) dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_{1,\vartheta}, v_{2,\vartheta}) dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_{1,\vartheta}, v_{2,\vartheta}) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(v_{1,\vartheta}, v_{2,\vartheta}) dx \\ &= (t_{2,\vartheta} - 1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_2 G(u_{1,\vartheta}, \eta_{2,\vartheta} v_{2,\vartheta}) v_{2,\vartheta} dx \\ &\quad + (t_{1,\vartheta} - 1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_2 G(\eta_{1,\vartheta} v_{1,\vartheta}, v_{2,\vartheta}) v_{1,\vartheta} dx \\ &= o(1). \end{aligned}$$

We obtain that

$$\liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] \geq \liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[v_{1,\vartheta}, v_{2,\vartheta}] \geq C_{a_1, a_2}.$$

□

Corollary 3.5. *Suppose that (VH1) holds and $G(s, t)$ is given by (1.11). Then C_{a_1, a_2} and E_{a_1, a_2} is continuous with respect to $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$.*

Proof. We only prove the continuity of C_{a_1, a_2} . Let $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. For any sequence $(a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}) \in (\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ with $(a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}) \rightarrow (a_1, a_2)$, we shall prove that

$$\lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} C_{a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}} = C_{a_1, a_2}. \quad (3.11)$$

Firstly, $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists (u_{1, \vartheta}, u_{2, \vartheta}) \in S_{a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}}$ such that $C_{a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}} \leq J[u_{1, \vartheta}, u_{2, \vartheta}] \leq C_{a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}} + \varepsilon$. Noting that $C_{a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}} \leq 0$, by Lemma 2.4, $(u_{1, \vartheta}, u_{2, \vartheta})$ is bounded in \mathcal{H} . Then by Lemma 3.4, we have that

$$\liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} C_{a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}} \geq \liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[u_{1, \vartheta}, u_{2, \vartheta}] - \varepsilon \geq C_{a_1, a_2} - \varepsilon.$$

By the arbitrary of ε , we obtain that

$$\liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} C_{a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}} \geq C_{a_1, a_2}. \quad (3.12)$$

If $a_1 > 0, a_2 > 0$, we put $t_{\iota, \vartheta} = \left(\frac{a_{\iota, \vartheta}}{a_{\iota}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $\iota = 1, 2$. $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists (u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}$ such that $J[u_1, u_2] \leq C_{a_1, a_2} + \varepsilon$. Then $(t_{1, \vartheta} u_1, t_{2, \vartheta} u_2) \in S_{a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}}$ and thus $C_{a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}} \leq J[t_{1, \vartheta} u_1, t_{2, \vartheta} u_2]$. Observing that $t_{\iota, \vartheta} = 1 + o(1), \iota = 1, 2$, we obtain that

$$\limsup_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} C_{a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}} \leq \limsup_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[t_{1, \vartheta} u_1, t_{2, \vartheta} u_2] = J[u_1, u_2] \leq C_{a_1, a_2} + \varepsilon.$$

By the arbitrary of ε , we obtain that

$$\limsup_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} C_{a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}} \leq C_{a_1, a_2}. \quad (3.13)$$

Therefore, by (3.12) and (3.13), we obtain that (3.11) holds.

If $a_1 = a_2 = 0$, we have $C_{a_1, a_2} = 0$. By Lemma 3.1, it is trivial that $\limsup_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} C_{a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}} \leq 0$, combing with (3.12), we see that the assertion (3.11) also holds.

If $a_1 = 0, a_2 > 0$. Let $t_{\vartheta} := \left(\frac{a_{2, \vartheta}}{a_2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\omega \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $\|\omega\|_2^2 = 1$. For $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists u_2 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $\|u_2\|_2^2 = a_2$ and $J[0, u_2] \leq C_{0, a_2} + \varepsilon$. Then we see that $(\sqrt{a_{1, \vartheta}} \omega, t_{\vartheta} u_2) \in S_{a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}}$, thus

$$C_{a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}} \leq J[\sqrt{a_{1, \vartheta}} \omega, t_{\vartheta} u_2]. \quad (3.14)$$

Noting that $a_{1, \vartheta} \rightarrow 0$, we can prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} C_{a_{1, \vartheta}, a_{2, \vartheta}} &\leq \limsup_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[\sqrt{a_{1, \vartheta}} \omega, t_{\vartheta} u_2] = \limsup_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[0, t_{\vartheta} u_2] \\ &= J[0, u_2] \leq C_{0, a_2} + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Then by the arbitrary of ε and (3.12), we also prove (3.11).

And the case of $a_1 > 0, a_2 = 0$ can be proved similarly. \square

Noting that S_{a_1, a_2} is not weak closed, for this reason we introduce a new set

$$B_{a_1, a_2} := \left\{ (u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{H} : \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_{\iota}^2 dx \leq a_{\iota}, \iota = 1, 2 \right\}, \forall (a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2. \quad (3.15)$$

Then it is clear that B_{a_1, a_2} is weak closed (compact). Define

$$D_{a_1, a_2} := \inf_{u \in B_{a_1, a_2}} J[u_1, u_2] \text{ and } F_{a_1, a_2} := \inf_{(u_1, u_2) \in B_{a_1, a_2}} I[u_1, u_2]. \quad (3.16)$$

Lemma 3.6. *For any $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we have that $C_{a_1, a_2} = D_{a_1, a_2}$ and $E_{a_1, a_2} = F_{a_1, a_2}$.*

Proof. We only prove $C_{a_1, a_2} = D_{a_1, a_2}$. The case of $(a_1, a_2) = (0, 0)$ is trivial. For $(a_1, a_2) \neq (0, 0)$, observing that $S_{a_1, a_2} \subset B_{a_1, a_2}$, we have that $D_{a_1, a_2} \leq C_{a_1, a_2}$. If $D_{a_1, a_2} \neq C_{a_1, a_2}$, then $D_{a_1, a_2} < C_{a_1, a_2}$. And thus there exists some $(u_1, u_2) \in B_{a_1, a_2}$ such that

$$D_{a_1, a_2} \leq J[u_1, u_2] < C_{a_1, a_2}.$$

It is clearly that $(u_1, u_2) \in B_{a_1, a_2} \setminus S_{a_1, a_2}$. Put $b_\iota := \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_\iota^2 dx, \iota = 1, 2$. Then $(u_1, u_2) \in S_{b_1, b_2}$. Furthermore, It is easy to see that $a_\iota - b_\iota \geq 0, \iota = 1, 2$ and $(a_1 - b_1, a_2 - b_2) \neq (0, 0)$. Then it follows that

$$C_{b_1, b_2} = \inf_{(v_1, v_2) \in S_{b_1, b_2}} J[v_1, v_2] \leq J[u_1, u_2] < C_{a_1, a_2},$$

a contradiction to Corollary 3.3. \square

For the convenience to estimate the Lagrange multipliers, we prefer to give the following result directly without proof, which essentially own to Frank H. Clarke(see [14, Theorem 1]).

Proposition 3.7. *If (u_1, u_2) attains D_{a_1, a_2} , then there exists $\lambda_\iota \geq 0, \iota = 1, 2$ such that*

$$J'[u_1, u_2] + \lambda_1(u_1, 0) + \lambda_2(0, u_2) = 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{H}^*.$$

That is, (u_1, u_2) solves equation (1.10) with $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0$. Furthermore, we have

$$\lambda_\iota (\|u_\iota\|_2^2 - a_\iota) = 0, \quad \iota = 1, 2.$$

4. RADIAL POTENTIAL CASE AND PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

In this Section, we focus on the radial case and prove Theorem 1.3 via the rearrangement argument. Some properties relate to the rearrangement are provided first.

Remark 4.1. *It is easy to see that for any fixed $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\partial_1 G(s, t)$ is increasing by $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Similarly, for any fixed $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\partial_2 G(s, t)$ is increasing by $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$ under the assumption (1.11).*

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that $G(s, t)$ is given by (1.11). Let u_1, u_2 be nonnegative functions on \mathbb{R}^N , vanishing at infinity and let u_1^* and u_2^* be their symmetric-decreasing rearrangements. Then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1^*, u_2^*) dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1, u_2) dx. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. Noting that $G(0, 0) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1, u_2) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [G(u_1, u_2) - G(0, u_2) + G(0, u_2) - G(0, 0)] dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dx \int_0^{u_1(x)} \partial_1 G(s, u_2(x)) ds + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dx \int_0^{u_2(x)} \partial_2 G(0, t) dt \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dx \int_0^\infty \partial_1 G(s, u_2(x)) \chi_{\{x: u_1(x) > s\}}(x) ds \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dx \int_0^\infty \partial_2 G(0, t) \chi_{\{x: u_2(x) > t\}}(x) dt \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dx \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \chi_{\{x: \partial_1 G(s, u_2(x)) > r\}}(x) \chi_{\{x: u_1(x) > s\}}(x) dr ds \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dx \int_0^\infty \partial_2 G(0, t) \chi_{\{x: u_2(x) > t\}}(x) dt \\
& = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty |\{x : \partial_1 G(s, u_2(x)) > r\} \cap \{x : u_1(x) > s\}| dr ds \\
& \quad + \int_0^\infty \partial_2 G(0, t) |\{x : u_2(x) > t\}| dt.
\end{aligned}$$

For $r, s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we put

$$t(r, s) := \begin{cases} \sup\{t : \partial_1 G(s, t) \leq r\}, & \text{if } \{t : \partial_1 G(s, t) \leq r\} \neq \emptyset, \\ -\infty & \text{if } \{t : \partial_1 G(s, t) \leq r\} = \emptyset. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

Then by Remark 4.1, we have that $\partial_1 G(s, u_2(x)) > r$ if and only if $u_2(x) > t(r, s)$. So

$$|\{x : \partial_1 G(s, u_2(x)) > r\} \cap \{x : u_1(x) > s\}| = |\{x : u_2(x) > t(r, s)\} \cap \{x : u_1(x) > s\}|, \quad (4.3)$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1, u_2) dx & = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty |\{x : u_2(x) > t(r, s)\} \cap \{x : u_1(x) > s\}| dr ds \\
& \quad + \int_0^\infty \partial_2 G(0, t) |\{x : u_2(x) > t\}| dt.
\end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1^*, u_2^*) dx & = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty |\{x : u_2^*(x) > t(r, s)\} \cap \{x : u_1^*(x) > s\}| dr ds \\
& \quad + \int_0^\infty \partial_2 G(0, t) |\{x : u_2^*(x) > t\}| dt.
\end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Recalling the definition of symmetric-decreasing rearrangement, we have that $\forall t, s \geq 0$,

$$\begin{cases} |\{x : u_2^*(x) > t\}| = |\{x : u_2(x) > t\}|, \\ |\{x : u_1^*(x) > s\}| = |\{x : u_1(x) > s\}|, \\ |\{x : u_2^*(x) > t(r, s)\}| = |\{x : u_2(x) > t(r, s)\}|, \end{cases}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\{x : u_2^*(x) > t(r, s)\} \cap \{x : u_1^*(x) > s\}| \\
& = \min \{|\{x : u_2^*(x) > t(r, s)\}|, |\{x : u_1^*(x) > s\}|\} \\
& = \min \{|\{x : u_2(x) > t(r, s)\}|, |\{x : u_1(x) > s\}|\} \\
& \geq |\{x : u_2(x) > t(r, s)\} \cap \{x : u_1(x) > s\}|.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, one can see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1^*, u_2^*) dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1, u_2) dx.$$

□

We note that under the assumption of (VH2), $|V_\nu(x)|, \nu = 1, 2$ are symmetric decreasing functions, i.e.,

$$-V_\nu(x) = |V_\nu(x)| = |V_\nu|^*(x), \nu = 1, 2.$$

Then by the simplest rearrangement inequality (see [25, Theorem 3.4]), we have that

$$\|u^*\|_{V_\iota}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |V_\iota(x)| u^{*2}(x) dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |V_\iota(x)| u^2(x) dx = \|u\|_{V_\iota}^2, \iota = 1, 2, \forall u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N). \quad (4.6)$$

Define

$$C_{a_1, a_2}^{rad} := \inf_{(u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}^{rad}} J[u_1, u_2], \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$D_{a_1, a_2}^{rad} := \inf_{(u_1, u_2) \in B_{a_1, a_2}^{rad}} J[u_1, u_2], \quad (4.8)$$

where $S_{a_1, a_2}^{rad} := S_{a_1, a_2} \cap \mathcal{H}^{rad}$, $B_{a_1, a_2}^{rad} := B_{a_1, a_2} \cap \mathcal{H}^{rad}$. Then we have the following result.

Lemma 4.3. *Under the assumptions (VH2) and (1.11), we have that*

$$C_{a_1, a_2} = C_{a_1, a_2}^{rad} = D_{a_1, a_2} = D_{a_1, a_2}^{rad}, \forall a_1 > 0, a_2 > 0.$$

Proof. It is only need to prove $C_{a_1, a_2} = C_{a_1, a_2}^{rad}$ due to Lemma 3.6. It is trivial that $C_{a_1, a_2}^{rad} \geq C_{a_1, a_2}$ since $S_{a_1, a_2}^{rad} \subset S_{a_1, a_2}$. On the other hand, for any $(u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}$, we have $(u_1^*, u_2^*) \in S_{a_1, a_2}^{rad}$. Recalling the Pólya-Szegő inequality, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_\iota^*|^2 dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_\iota|^2 dx, \iota = 1, 2. \quad (4.9)$$

Under the assumption (VH2), by Lemma 4.2, combining with the formulas (4.6) and (4.9), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} C_{a_1, a_2}^{rad} \leq J[u_1^*, u_2^*] &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 (\|\nabla u_\iota^*\|_2^2 - \|u_\iota^*\|_{V_\iota}^2) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1^*, u_2^*) dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 (\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1, u_2) dx \\ &= J[u_1, u_2]. \end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrary of $(u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}$, we obtain the opposite inequality $C_{a_1, a_2}^{rad} \leq C_{a_1, a_2}$. Hence,

$$C_{a_1, a_2}^{rad} = C_{a_1, a_2}.$$

□

Now we are ready to prove our Theorem 1.3: Under the assumptions, by Lemma 4.3 and Remark 2.5-(i), there exists $\{(u_{1, \vartheta}, u_{2, \vartheta})\} \subset \mathcal{H}^{rad}$ such that $\|u_{\iota, \vartheta}\|_2^2 = a_\iota, \iota = 1, 2, \forall \vartheta \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$J[u_{1, \vartheta}, u_{2, \vartheta}] \rightarrow C_{a_1, a_2} = D_{a_1, a_2} \text{ as } \vartheta \rightarrow \infty.$$

Up to a subsequence, we assume that $(u_{1, \vartheta}, u_{2, \vartheta}) \rightharpoonup (u_1, u_2)$ in \mathcal{H} and

$$(u_{1, \vartheta}, u_{2, \vartheta}) \rightarrow (u_1, u_2) \text{ in } L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^N) \times L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^N), (u_{1, \vartheta}, u_{2, \vartheta}) \rightarrow (u_1, u_2) \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

By the Brézis-Lieb lemma [11], we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_{1, \vartheta}, u_{2, \vartheta}) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1, u_2) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_{1, \vartheta} - u_1, u_{2, \vartheta} - u_2) dx + o(1). \quad (4.10)$$

Noting that the embedding $H^{1,rad}(\mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow L^q(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is compact for $2 < q < 2^*$, provided $N \geq 2$. In particular, if $N = 1$, we can take $\{(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta})\}$ as non-increasing functions of $|x|$. That is,

$$u_{\iota,\vartheta}(x) = u_{\iota,\vartheta}^*(x), \iota = 1, 2, \forall \vartheta \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then up to a subsequence, we can also have that $u_{\iota,\vartheta} \rightarrow u_\iota$ in $L^q(\mathbb{R})$, $\forall 2 < q \leq \infty, \iota = 1, 2$ (see [33, Proposition 1.7.1]). Essentially, it is due to the fact that

$$u_{\iota,\vartheta}(x) = u_{\iota,\vartheta}(|x|) \leq C \|u_{\iota,\vartheta}\|_2 |x|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow 0$$

as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly in $\vartheta \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\iota = 1, 2$. So by Lemma 2.1, we have that

$$\lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_{1,\vartheta} - u_1, u_{2,\vartheta} - u_2) dx = 0. \quad (4.11)$$

It follows from (4.10) and (4.11) that

$$\lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1, u_2) dx. \quad (4.12)$$

On the other hand, by the weak lower semi-continuity of norm and $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V_\iota(x) = 0$, one can prove that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_\iota|^2 + V_\iota(x) |u_\iota|^2 dx \leq \liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_{\iota,\vartheta}|^2 + V_\iota(x) |u_{\iota,\vartheta}|^2 dx, \iota = 1, 2. \quad (4.13)$$

Hence, by (4.12) and (4.13), we have that

$$J[u_1, u_2] \leq \lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] = C_{a_1, a_2} = D_{a_1, a_2}. \quad (4.14)$$

It is clear that $(u_1, u_2) \in B_{a_1, a_2}$. Put $b_\iota = \|u_\iota\|_2^2, \iota = 1, 2$, then $(u_1, u_2) \in S_{b_1, b_2}$ with $b_1 \leq a_1, b_2 \leq a_2$, and thus

$$D_{a_1, a_2} \leq C_{b_1, b_2} \leq J[u_1, u_2] \leq C_{a_1, a_2}.$$

If $(u_1, u_2) \in B_{a_1, a_2} \setminus S_{a_1, a_2}$, we have $a_\iota - b_\iota \geq 0, \iota = 1, 2$ and $(a_1 - b_1, a_2 - b_2) \neq (0, 0)$, then by Corollary 3.3, we have that $C_{b_1, b_2} > C_{a_1, a_2}$, a contradiction. Hence, we have that $(u_1, u_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}$ with $J[u_1, u_2] = C_{a_1, a_2}$. Finally by Proposition 3.7, $\lambda_\iota \geq 0$ ($\iota = 1, 2$), and we finish the proof of Theorem 1.3. \square

Corollary 4.4. *For any $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, E_{a_1, a_2} is attained.*

Proof. By taking $V_\iota(x) \equiv 0, \iota = 1, 2$, then it follows Theorem 1.3 that E_{a_1, a_2} is attained by some nonnegative symmetric decreasing function of $|x|$. \square

5. THE SHARP DECAY ESTIMATION OF POSITIVE SOLUTION

In this section, we shall give the sharp decay estimation of the positive solution for the *fixed frequency problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_1 + V_1(x)u_1 + \lambda_1 u_1 = \partial_1 G(u_1, u_2) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ -\Delta u_2 + V_2(x)u_2 + \lambda_2 u_2 = \partial_2 G(u_1, u_2) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

where $G(s, t)$ is given by (1.11) with the parameters satisfying (1.13) and V_1, V_2 are given potentials.

The following Lemma is due to Ikoma and Miyamoto [22, Lemma 3.3], which is a variant of [3, Proposition 1.2]

Lemma 5.1. (cf. [22]) Let $0 \leq f(x), g(x)$ satisfy $f, g \in C(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} (1 + |x|)^\alpha e^{\beta|x|} g(x) = c \in [0, \infty), f(x) \leq C e^{-\gamma|x|} \text{ for each } |x| \geq 1$$

for some $\alpha \geq 0, 0 \leq \beta < \gamma$. Then

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (1 + r)^\alpha e^{\beta r} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g(r\omega - y) f(y) dy = c \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(y) e^{\beta\omega \cdot y} dy \text{ uniformly with respect to } \omega \in \mathcal{S}^{N-1}.$$

Corollary 5.2. Let $\lambda > 0$ and G_λ be the Green function of $-\Delta + \lambda$ in \mathbb{R}^N . Then for any $0 < \nu < \lambda$ and $t > 0$,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (1 + r)^t e^{\nu r} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G_\lambda(r\omega - y) (1 + |y|)^{-t} e^{-\nu|y|} dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G_\lambda(y) e^{\nu\omega \cdot y} dy > 0 \quad (5.2)$$

uniformly with respect to $\omega \in \mathcal{S}^{N-1}$.

Proof. For $\eta = \frac{\lambda - \nu}{2} > 0$, we have $\nu + \eta = \frac{\lambda + \nu}{2} < \lambda$. By comparison principle, one can find some $C > 0$ such that

$$G_\lambda(x) \leq C e^{-(\nu + \eta)|x|} \text{ for each } |x| \geq 1.$$

So we can put $g(x) = (1 + |x|)^{-t} e^{-\nu|x|}, f(x) = G_\lambda(x)$. And then apply Lemma 5.1 with $\alpha = t, \beta = \nu$, one can see that (5.2) holds uniformly with respect to $\omega \in \mathcal{S}^{N-1}$. Here we use the property of convolution $[f \star g](r\omega) = [g \star f](r\omega)$ and note that $c = 1$ in this application. \square

Lemma 5.3. Let $G(s, t)$ be given by (1.11) with the parameters satisfying (1.13). We simply write $(r_{1,1}, r_{2,1})$ by (r_1, r_2) . Then there exists some $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \partial_1 G(s, t) \geq C(s^{p_1-1} + s^{r_1-1} t^{r_2}) \\ \partial_2 G(s, t) \geq C(t^{q_1-1} + s^{r_1} t^{r_2-1}) \end{cases} \text{ for any } (s, t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2. \quad (5.3)$$

Furthermore, for any $M > 0$, there exists $C_M > 0$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \partial_1 G(s, t) \leq C_M (s^{p_1-1} + s^{r_1-1} (s+t)^{r_2}) \\ \partial_2 G(s, t) \leq C_M (t^{q_1-1} + t^{r_2-1} (s+t)^{r_1}) \end{cases} \text{ for } (s, t) \in [0, M] \times [0, M]. \quad (5.4)$$

Proof. It is trivial. \square

Basing on (5.3) and (5.4) with $p_1, q_1 > 2, r_1, r_2 > 1$, we can obtain the sharp decay estimation of the positive solution for the fixed frequency problem (5.1). Precisely, we have the following result.

Proposition 5.4. Suppose $G(s, t)$ satisfies (5.3) and (5.4) with $p_1, q_1 > 2, r_1, r_2 > 1$. Assume $V_1(x), V_2(x) \leq 0$ with $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V_i(x) = 0, i = 1, 2$. Let $(u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{H}$ be a nonnegative solution of (5.1) with $\lambda_1 > 0, \lambda_2 > 0$. Then we have the following sharp decay estimations.

(i) Assume $u_1 \not\equiv 0$. Put

$$\bar{\lambda}_1 := \min \left\{ \lambda_1, \frac{r_2^2}{(2 - r_1)_+^2} \lambda_2 \right\}.$$

Then for any $0 < \nu_2 < \bar{\lambda}_1 < \nu_1$, there exists $C_{\nu_2} \geq C_{\nu_1} > 0$ such that

$$C_{\nu_1} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_1}|x|} \leq u_1(x) \leq C_{\nu_2} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_2}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (5.5)$$

In particular, if $\bar{\lambda}_1 = \lambda_1$, the lower bound can be improved as that there exists some $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$c_1(1 + |x|)^{-\frac{N-1}{2}} e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1}|x|} \leq u_1(x) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (5.6)$$

(ii) Assume $u_2 \neq 0$. Put

$$\bar{\lambda}_2 := \min \left\{ \lambda_2, \frac{r_1^2}{(2 - r_2)_+^2} \lambda_1 \right\}.$$

Then for any $0 < \nu_2 < \bar{\lambda}_2 < \nu_1$, there exists $C_{\nu_2} \geq C_{\nu_1} > 0$ such that

$$C_{\nu_1} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_1}|x|} \leq u_2(x) \leq C_{\nu_2} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_2}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (5.7)$$

In particular, if $\bar{\lambda}_2 = \lambda_2$, the lower bound can be improved as that there exists some $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$c_2(1 + |x|)^{-\frac{N-1}{2}} e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_2}|x|} \leq u_2(x) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (5.8)$$

The proof of this proposition is long but necessary. In order to avoid readers getting lost in this complex proof detail, we tend to give its proof in the Appendix A.

Corollary 5.5. *Suppose $G(s, t)$ satisfying (5.3) and (5.4) with $p_1, q_1 > 2, r_1, r_2 > 1$. Assume $V_1(x), V_2(x) \leq 0$ with $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V_i(x) = 0, i = 1, 2$. Let $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$. Suppose that (u_1, u_2) is a nonnegative nontrivial solution to (5.1) and (ω_1, ω_2) is a nonnegative nontrivial solution to*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \omega_1 + \lambda_1 \omega_1 = \partial_1 G(\omega_1, \omega_2) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ -\Delta \omega_2 + \lambda_2 \omega_2 = \partial_2 G(\omega_1, \omega_2) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \end{cases} \quad (5.9)$$

Define

$$\omega_{\iota, R}(x) := \omega_{\iota}(x - R\mathbf{e}_1), \quad \iota = 1, 2. \quad (5.10)$$

We have the following conclusions:

(i) If $u_1 \neq 0$ and $\omega_1 \neq 0$, then for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$, we can find some $c > 0$ independent of λ and another $C_{\lambda} > 0$ such that

$$c(1 + R)^{-\frac{N-1}{2}} e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1}R} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1 \omega_{1, R} dx \leq C_{\lambda} e^{-\sqrt{\lambda}R}. \quad (5.11)$$

Furthermore, if $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$, and $u_2 \neq 0$ and $\omega_2 \neq 0$, then (5.11) also holds for $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2 \omega_{2, R} dx$. And if $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$, then we can find some $\theta_1 > 1$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2 \omega_{2, R} dx \leq C \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1 \omega_{1, R} dx \right)^{\theta_1}. \quad (5.12)$$

(ii) Suppose $\bar{\lambda}_2 = \lambda_2$. If $u_2 \neq 0$ and $\omega_2 \neq 0$, then for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_2)$, we can find some $c > 0$ independent of λ and another $C_{\lambda} > 0$ such that

$$c(1 + R)^{-\frac{N-1}{2}} e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_2}R} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2 \omega_{2, R} dx \leq C_{\lambda} e^{-\sqrt{\lambda}R}. \quad (5.13)$$

(iii) Suppose $\bar{\lambda}_2 < \lambda_2$. If $u_2 \neq 0$ and $\omega_2 \neq 0$, then for any $0 < \nu_1 < \bar{\lambda}_2 < \nu_2$, there exists $C_{\nu_1}, C_{\nu_2} > 0$ such that

$$C_{\nu_2} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_2}R} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2 \omega_{2, R} dx \leq C_{\nu_1} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_1}R}. \quad (5.14)$$

(iv) If $u_1 \neq 0, u_2 \neq 0, \omega_1 \neq 0$ and $\omega_2 \neq 0$, then for any $\gamma_1 \geq r_1, \gamma_2 \geq r_2$ with $\eta \in (0, \min\{r_1 - 1, r_2 - 1\})$, there exists some $\theta = \theta_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \eta} \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^{1+\eta} \omega_{1,R}^{\gamma_1-1-\eta} \omega_{2,R}^{\gamma_2} = o\left(\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1 \omega_{1,R} dx\right)^\theta\right), \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^{1+\eta} \omega_{1,R}^{\gamma_1} \omega_{2,R}^{\gamma_2-1-\eta} = o\left(\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1 \omega_{1,R} dx\right)^\theta\right). \end{cases} \quad (5.15)$$

Proof. (i) When $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$, by Proposition 5.4, we see that $\bar{\lambda}_1 = \lambda_1$. And then for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$, we have

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} e^{\sqrt{\lambda}|x|} u_1(x) = 0, \omega_1(x) \leq C_\lambda e^{-\sqrt{\frac{\lambda+\lambda_1}{2}}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Then by Lemma 5.1, we have that

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} e^{\sqrt{\lambda}R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1(R\omega - y) \omega_1(y) dy = 0 \text{ uniformly with respect to } \omega \in \mathcal{S}^{N-1}.$$

It follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1 \omega_{1,R} dx = o(e^{-\sqrt{\lambda}R}) \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence, we can find some $C_\lambda > 0$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1 \omega_{1,R} dx \leq C_\lambda e^{-\sqrt{\lambda}R}$. On the other hand, by Proposition 5.4 again, there exists some $c > 0$ such that

$$c(1 + |x|)^{-\frac{N-1}{2}} e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1}|x|} \leq u_1(x), ce^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1+1}|x|} \leq \omega_1(x).$$

Then by Lemma 5.1 again, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & (1+R)^{\frac{N-1}{2}} e^{\sqrt{\lambda_1}R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1 \omega_{1,R} dx \\ &= (1+R)^{\frac{N-1}{2}} e^{\sqrt{\lambda_1}R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1(x + R\mathbf{e}_1) \omega_1(x) dx \\ &\geq c^2 (1+R)^{\frac{N-1}{2}} e^{\sqrt{\lambda_1}R} \\ &\quad \times \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (1 + |x + R\mathbf{e}_1|)^{-\frac{N-1}{2}} e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1}|x+R\mathbf{e}_1|} e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1+1}|x|} dx \\ &\rightarrow c^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1+1}|x|} e^{\sqrt{\lambda_1}\mathbf{e}_1 \cdot y} dy > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the assertion of (5.11) holds.

Finally, if $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$, we can take $\varepsilon > 0$ small such that $\lambda_1 + 3\varepsilon < \bar{\lambda}_2$. Then, we have that

$$0 \leq u_2(x) \leq C e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1+2\varepsilon}|x|}, \omega_2(x) \leq C e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1+3\varepsilon}|x|}.$$

Hence, Lemma 5.1 yields $\sigma_{2,R} = o(e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1+\varepsilon}R})$ as $R \rightarrow +\infty$. Thus, we can find some $\theta_1 > 1$ and $C > 0$ such that (5.12) holds.

(ii) When $\bar{\lambda}_2 = \lambda_2$, by Proposition 5.4, (5.13) can be proved as (5.11).

(iii) Suppose $\bar{\lambda}_2 < \lambda_2$. Then for any $0 < \nu_1 < \bar{\lambda}_2 < \nu_2$, we can find some $C, c > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} u_2(x) e^{\sqrt{\nu_1}|x|} = 0, \omega_2(x) \leq C e^{-\sqrt{\frac{\nu_1+\lambda_2}{2}}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

and

$$ce^{-\sqrt{\nu_2}|x|} \leq u_2(x), ce^{-\sqrt{\nu_2+1}|x|} \leq \omega_2(x).$$

We have that

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} e^{\sqrt{\nu_1}R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2 \omega_{2,R} dx = 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\sqrt{\nu_2}R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2 \omega_{2,R} dx &\geq c^2 e^{\sqrt{\nu_2}R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_2}|x|} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_2+1}|x-R\mathbf{e}_1|} dx \\ &= c^2 e^{\sqrt{\nu_2}R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_2}|x+R\mathbf{e}_1|} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_2+1}|x|} dx \\ &\rightarrow c^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_2+1}|x|} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_2}\mathbf{e}_1 \cdot x} dx > 0 \text{ as } R \rightarrow +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, there exists $C_{\nu_1} > 0, C_{\nu_2} > 0$ such that (5.14) holds.

(iv) Thanks to $1 + \eta > 1, \gamma_1 - 1 - \eta + r_2 > r_2 > 1$ and Proposition 5.4, we may find an $\eta_1 > 0$ such that

$$\omega_1^{\gamma_1-1-\eta} \omega_2^{\gamma_2}(x) + u_1^{1+\eta}(x) \leq C e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1+\eta_1}|x|}. \quad (5.16)$$

Therefore, exploiting Lemma 5.1, combining with the conclusion (i) above (see formula (5.11)), we can find some $\tilde{\theta}_1 \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^{1+\eta} \omega_{1,R}^{\gamma_1-1-\eta} \omega_{2,R}^{\gamma_2} = o\left(\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1 \omega_{1,R} dx\right)^{\tilde{\theta}_1}\right).$$

Similarly, we may find some $\tilde{\theta}_2 \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^{1+\eta} \omega_{1,R}^{\gamma_1} \omega_{2,R}^{\gamma_2-1-\eta} = o\left(\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1 \omega_{1,R} dx\right)^{\tilde{\theta}_2}\right).$$

Then we can take $\theta := \min\{\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_2\}$. □

Remark 5.6. We emphasize that $V_\iota(x) \equiv 0$ is within our consideration in Proposition 5.4.

6. THE STRICT BINDING INEQUALITY

In this Section, we shall prove the strict binding inequality associated with the functionals J and I basing on sharp decay estimations of the positive solutions for the *fixed frequency problem* (5.1) obtained in Section 5.

Lemma 6.1. (cf. [3, Lemma 2.1]) *If $p > 2$, there exists some $C_p > 0$ such that for any $a, b \geq 0$,*

$$(a + b)^p \geq a^p + b^p + pa^{p-1}b + pab^{p-1} - C_p a^{\frac{p}{2}} b^{\frac{p}{2}}. \quad (6.1)$$

In [22], Ikoma and Miyamoto gave the interaction estimation for the couples terms $(a_1 + b_1)^{\gamma_1} (a_2 + b_2)^{\gamma_2}$ with $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 > 1$. In present paper, we shall give the interaction estimation for the general couples terms $(a_1 + b_1)^{\gamma_1} (a_2 + b_2)^{\gamma_2}$, that $\gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2$ is allowed.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\gamma_1 > 1, \gamma_2 > 1$. For any $0 < \eta < \min\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\} - 1$, There exists some $C_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \eta} > 0$ such that for any $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,*

$$\begin{aligned} (1+x)^{\gamma_1} (1+y)^{\gamma_2} &\geq 1 + x^{\gamma_1} y^{\gamma_2} + \gamma_1 x + \gamma_2 y \\ &\quad - C_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \eta} (x^{\gamma_1-1-\eta} y^{\gamma_2} + x^{\gamma_1} y^{\gamma_2-1-\eta}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

Proof. Observing that for $\gamma > 1$, one can see that

$$\begin{cases} x^{\gamma-1} < \gamma, & \forall 0 < x < \gamma^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \\ x^{\gamma-1} > \gamma, & \forall x > \gamma^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}. \end{cases}$$

Then for any $(x, y) \in \left[0, \gamma_1^{\frac{1}{\gamma_1-1}}\right] \times \left[0, \gamma_2^{\frac{1}{\gamma_2-1}}\right]$, by Bernoulli inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} (1+x)^{\gamma_1}(1+y)^{\gamma_2} &\geq (1+\gamma_1 x)(1+\gamma_2 y) \\ &= 1 + \gamma_1 x + \gamma_2 y + (\gamma_1 x) \cdot (\gamma_2 y) \\ &\geq 1 + \gamma_1 x + \gamma_2 y + x^{\gamma_1} y^{\gamma_2}, \end{aligned}$$

the assertion (6.2) holds.

For $(x, y) \in (\gamma_1^{\frac{1}{\gamma_1-1}}, \infty) \times (\gamma_2^{\frac{1}{\gamma_2-1}}, \infty)$, we can take $C = C_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \eta}$ large enough such that

$$\frac{2}{C} < \min \left\{ \gamma_1^{\frac{\gamma_1-1-\eta}{\gamma_1-1}}, \gamma_2^{\frac{\gamma_2-1-\eta}{\gamma_2-1}} \right\}.$$

And then

$$C(x^{\gamma_1-1-\eta} y^{\gamma_2} + x^{\gamma_1} y^{\gamma_2-1-\eta}) \geq 2y^{\gamma_2} + 2x^{\gamma_1} > 1 + \gamma_1 x + \gamma_2 y.$$

Since $(1+x)^{\gamma_1}(1+y)^{\gamma_2} > x^{\gamma_1} y^{\gamma_2}$, we have that

$$(1+x)^{\gamma_1}(1+y)^{\gamma_2} > 1 + \gamma_1 x + \gamma_2 y + x^{\gamma_1} y^{\gamma_2} - C(x^{\gamma_1-1-\eta} y^{\gamma_2} + x^{\gamma_1} y^{\gamma_2-1-\eta}).$$

Hence the assertion (6.2) also holds.

For $y \in (\gamma_2^{\frac{1}{\gamma_2-1}}, +\infty)$, by the mean value theorem, there exists some $z \in [y, y+1]$ such that

$$(1+y)^{\gamma_2} - y^{\gamma_2} = \gamma_2 z^{\gamma_2-1} \geq \gamma_2 y^{\gamma_2-1} > \gamma_2^2 > 1,$$

which implies that $(1+y)^{\gamma_2} > 1 + y^{\gamma_2}$. So if $(x, y) \in [0, \gamma_1^{\frac{1}{\gamma_1-1}}] \times (\gamma_2^{\frac{1}{\gamma_2-1}}, +\infty)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1+x)^{\gamma_1}(1+y)^{\gamma_2} &> (1+\gamma_1 x) \cdot (1+y^{\gamma_2}) \\ &= 1 + \gamma_1 x + \gamma_1 x y^{\gamma_2} + y^{\gamma_2} \\ &\geq 1 + \gamma_1 x + x^{\gamma_1} y^{\gamma_2} + \gamma_2 y. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the assertion (6.2) also holds. The case of $(x, y) \in (\gamma_1^{\frac{1}{\gamma_1-1}}, +\infty) \times [0, \gamma_2^{\frac{1}{\gamma_2-1}}]$ can be proved similarly. \square

Corollary 6.3. *Let $\gamma_1 > 1, \gamma_2 > 1$. For any $0 < \eta < \min\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\} - 1$, There exists some $C_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \eta} > 0$ such that for any $a_\iota, b_\iota \geq 0, \iota = 1, 2$,*

$$\begin{aligned} (a_1 + b_1)^{\gamma_1} (a_2 + b_2)^{\gamma_2} &\geq a_1^{\gamma_1} a_2^{\gamma_2} + \gamma_1 a_1^{\gamma_1-1} a_2^{\gamma_2} b_1 + \gamma_2 a_1^{\gamma_1} a_2^{\gamma_2-1} b_2 + b_1^{\gamma_1} b_2^{\gamma_2} \\ &\quad - C_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \eta} \left\{ a_1^{1+\eta} b_1^{\gamma_1-1-\eta} b_2^{\gamma_2} + a_2^{1+\eta} b_2^{\gamma_2-1-\eta} b_1^{\gamma_1} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

Furthermore, if $a_1 = 0$ or $b_1 = 0$, we have that

$$(a_1 + b_1)^{\gamma_1} (a_2 + b_2)^{\gamma_2} \geq a_1^{\gamma_1} a_2^{\gamma_2} + \gamma_1 a_1^{\gamma_1-1} a_2^{\gamma_2} b_1 + \gamma_2 a_1^{\gamma_1} a_2^{\gamma_2-1} b_2 + b_1^{\gamma_1} b_2^{\gamma_2}. \quad (6.4)$$

Proof. If $(a_1 + b_1) = 0$ or $(a_2 + b_2) = 0$, it is trivial. So we only need to consider the case of $(a_1 + b_1) > 0$ and $(a_2 + b_2) > 0$. Therefore, without loss of generality, we can assume that $a_1 > 0$ and $a_2 > 0$, since $a_\iota, b_\iota \geq 0$, $\iota = 1, 2$. By putting $x = \frac{b_1}{a_1}, y = \frac{b_2}{a_2}$ in (6.2), we can get the inequalities (6.3).

In particular, if $b_1 = 0$, then

$$-C_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \eta} \left\{ a_1^{1+\eta} b_1^{\gamma_1-1-\eta} b_2^{\gamma_2} + a_2^{1+\eta} b_2^{\gamma_2-1-\eta} b_1^{\gamma_1} \right\} = 0,$$

and thus (6.4) holds. If $a_1 = 0$, by $b_1^{\gamma_1} (a_2 + b_2)^{\gamma_2} \geq b_1^{\gamma_1} b_2^{\gamma_2}$, (6.4) also holds. \square

Put $a_\iota := \|u_\iota\|_2^2$, $b_\iota := \|\omega_\iota\|_2^2$. Define

$$\omega_{\iota,R} := \omega_\iota(\cdot - R\mathbf{e}_1), \quad \iota = 1, 2, \quad (6.5)$$

$$\sigma_{\iota,R} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_\iota \omega_{\iota,R} dx, \quad \iota = 1, 2. \quad (6.6)$$

We remark that if $u_\iota \equiv 0$ or $\omega_\iota \equiv 0$, we have that $\sigma_{\iota,R} \equiv 0, \forall R \in \mathbb{R}_+$. If $u_\iota \not\equiv 0$ and $\omega_\iota \not\equiv 0$, by the strong maximum principle, it holds that $u_\iota(x) > 0, \omega_\iota(x) > 0$ in \mathbb{R}^N . And thus

$$\sigma_{\iota,R} > 0 \text{ and } \sigma_{\iota,R} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.7)$$

Let

$$\tau_{\iota,R}^2 := \frac{a_\iota + b_\iota}{a_\iota + b_\iota + 2\sigma_{\iota,R}} = 1 - \frac{2}{a_\iota + b_\iota} \sigma_{\iota,R} + O(\sigma_{\iota,R}^2) \quad (6.8)$$

and $\tau_{\iota,R} = 1$ if $\sigma_{\iota,R} = 0$. Then one can see that

$$\tau_{\iota,R} = 1 - \frac{1}{a_\iota + b_\iota} \sigma_{\iota,R} + O(\sigma_{\iota,R}^2) \quad (6.9)$$

and

$$\|\tau_{\iota,R}(u_\iota + \omega_{\iota,R})\|_2^2 = a_\iota + b_\iota, \quad \iota = 1, 2. \quad (6.10)$$

Lemma 6.4. *Suppose that (VH1) holds and $G(s, t)$ is given by (1.11) with the parameters satisfying (1.13). Let $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$. Assume that $(u_1, u_2) \neq (0, 0)$ is a nonnegative solution to (5.1) and $(\omega_1, \omega_2) \neq (0, 0)$ is a nonnegative solution to (5.9). We have the following interaction estimation.*

(i) For $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$, there exists some $\theta(p_i) \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{\mu_i}{p_i} \tau_{1,R}^{p_i} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_1 + \omega_{1,R})^{p_i} dx \\ & \leq -\frac{\mu_i}{p_i} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^{p_i} + \omega_{1,R}^{p_i} dx \right] - \mu_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{p_i-1} \omega_{1,R} + u_1 \omega_{1,R}^{p_i-1} \right] dx \\ & \quad + \frac{\mu_i \sigma_{1,R}}{a_1 + b_1} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^{p_i} + \omega_{1,R}^{p_i} dx \right] + o(\sigma_{1,R}^{\theta(p_i)}). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) For $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, there exists some $\theta(q_j) \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{\nu_j}{q_j} \tau_{2,R}^{q_j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_2 + \omega_{2,R})^{q_j} dx \\ & \leq -\frac{\nu_j}{q_j} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^{q_j} + \omega_{2,R}^{q_j} dx \right] - \nu_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_2^{q_j-1} \omega_{2,R} + u_2 \omega_{2,R}^{q_j-1} \right] dx \\ & \quad + \frac{\nu_j \sigma_{2,R}}{a_2 + b_2} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^{q_j} + \omega_{2,R}^{q_j} dx \right] + o(\sigma_{2,R}^{\theta(q_j)}). \end{aligned}$$

(iii) If $\sigma_{1,R} > 0$, for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, there exists some $\theta = \theta(r_{1,k}, r_{2,k}) \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\beta_k \tau_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \tau_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_1 + \omega_{1,R})^{r_{1,k}} (u_2 + \omega_{2,R})^{r_{2,k}} dx \\ & \leq -\beta_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + r_{1,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}-1} u_2^{r_{2,k}} \omega_{1,R} + r_{2,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}-1} \omega_{2,R} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx \\ & + \frac{\beta_k r_{1,k}}{a_1 + b_1} \sigma_{1,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx \\ & + \frac{\beta_k r_{2,k}}{a_2 + b_2} \sigma_{2,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx + o(\sigma_{1,R}^\theta) \end{aligned}$$

And if $\sigma_{1,R} = 0$, for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, there exists some $\theta = \theta(r_{1,k}, r_{2,k}) \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\beta_k \tau_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \tau_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_1 + \omega_{1,R})^{r_{1,k}} (u_2 + \omega_{2,R})^{r_{2,k}} dx \\ & \leq -\beta_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + r_{2,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}-1} \omega_{2,R} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx \\ & + \frac{\beta_k r_{2,k}}{a_2 + b_2} \sigma_{2,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx + o(\sigma_{2,R}^\theta). \end{aligned}$$

This lemma gives a good intersection estimation, which plays a crucial role in the proof of strict binding inequality. Its proof required a sequence of complicated calculations. We shall give the details in Appendix B. Basing on these estimations, we obtain the following strict binding inequality. The proof of the following proposition will be given in Appendix C.

Proposition 6.5. *Suppose that (VH1) holds and $G(s, t)$ is given by (1.11) with the parameters satisfying (1.13). Let $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$. Suppose that $(u_1, u_2) \neq (0, 0)$ is a nonnegative solution to (5.1) and $(\omega_1, \omega_2) \neq (0, 0)$ is a nonnegative solution to (5.9). Then there exists some $(\phi_1, \phi_2) \in \mathcal{H}$ such that*

$$(\|\phi_1\|_2^2, \|\phi_2\|_2^2) = (\|u_1\|_2^2 + \|\omega_1\|_2^2, \|u_2\|_2^2 + \|\omega_2\|_2^2) \text{ and } J[\phi_1, \phi_2] < J[u_1, u_2] + I[\omega_1, \omega_2]. \quad (6.11)$$

7. COMPACTNESS ANALYSIS AND PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

In this section, we shall apply the standard concentration compactness argument to prove Theorem 1.4.

Remark 7.1. *We remark that for $a_1 > 0, a_2 > 0$, S_{a_1, a_2} is a Hilbert manifold with codimension 2. And for any minimizing sequence $\{(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta})\}_{\vartheta=1}^\infty \subset S_{a_1, a_2}$, by Ekeland's variational principle for J and $\{(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta})\}$ on S_{a_1, a_2} , there exist $\{(v_{1,\vartheta}, v_{2,\vartheta})\} \subset S_{a_1, a_2}$ and $\{\lambda_{1,\vartheta}, \lambda_{2,\vartheta}\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\|(u_{1,\vartheta} - v_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta} - v_{2,\vartheta})\|_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$J'[v_{1,\vartheta}, v_{2,\vartheta}] + \lambda_{1,\vartheta}(v_{1,\vartheta}, 0) + \lambda_{2,\vartheta}(0, v_{2,\vartheta}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ strongly in } \mathcal{H}^* \text{ as } \vartheta \rightarrow \infty.$$

See also [22, Lemma 2.3].

For $a_1 > 0, a_2 > 0$. Let us take any minimizing sequence $\{(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta})\}_{\vartheta=1}^\infty \subset S_{a_1, a_2}$ for C_{a_1, a_2} . Since $J[u_1, u_2] = J[|u_1|, |u_2|]$, $\{(|u_{1,\vartheta}|, |u_{2,\vartheta}|)\}_{\vartheta=1}^\infty$ is also a minimizing sequence. Hence, we may suppose that $\{u_{\iota, \vartheta}\}$ ($\iota = 1, 2, \vartheta \in \mathbb{N}$) are nonnegative functions. By Remark 7.1, without loss of generality, we may suppose further that

$$J'[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] + (\lambda_{1,\vartheta} u_{1,\vartheta}, \lambda_{2,\vartheta} u_{2,\vartheta}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{H}^*. \quad (7.1)$$

Lemma 7.2. *Suppose that (VH1) holds and $G(s, t)$ is given by (1.11). For any given $a_1 > 0, a_2 > 0$, let $\{(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta})\}_{\vartheta=1}^\infty \subset S_{a_1, a_2}$ be a minimizing sequence such that $u_{\iota, \vartheta}, \iota = 1, 2, \vartheta \in \mathbb{N}$ are nonnegative functions and (7.1) holds, then $\{(\lambda_{1,\vartheta}, \lambda_{2,\vartheta})\}$ is bounded.*

Proof. Recalling that $\{(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta})\}$ are bounded in \mathcal{H} (see Remark 2.5), by

$$\lambda_{1,\vartheta} = -\frac{J'[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}](u_{1,\vartheta}, 0)}{a_1},$$

we see that $\{\lambda_{1,\vartheta}\}_{\vartheta=1}^\infty$ is bounded. Similarly, by

$$\lambda_{2,\vartheta} = -\frac{J'[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}](0, u_{2,\vartheta})}{a_2},$$

we obtain that $\{\lambda_{2,\vartheta}\}_{\vartheta=1}^\infty$ is also bounded. \square

Lemma 7.3. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 7.2, let $Q^N := [0, 1]^N$. Then*

$$\liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^N} \|u_{\iota, \vartheta}\|_{L^2(Q^{N+y})} > 0, \quad \iota = 1, 2. \quad (7.2)$$

Proof. We only prove the case of $\iota = 1$. And the case of $\iota = 2$ can be proved in a same way. Let us suppose

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^N} \|u_{1,\vartheta}\|_{L^2(Q^{N+y})} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \vartheta \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then we infer that $u_{1,\vartheta} \rightarrow 0$ strongly in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for any $2 < p < 2^*$ (See [38, Lemma 1.21]). Therefore, similar to (3.6), we can prove that

$$\liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}) dx = \liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(0, u_{2,\vartheta}) dx, \quad (7.3)$$

which implies that

$$C_{a_1, a_2} = \lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] \geq \liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[0, u_{2,\vartheta}] \geq C_{0, a_2}. \quad (7.4)$$

On the other hand, by Corollary 3.3 and $a_1 > 0$, we have that $C_{a_1, a_2} < C_{0, a_2}$, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 7.4. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 7.2, up to a subsequence, we assume that $(\lambda_{1,\vartheta}, \lambda_{2,\vartheta}) \rightarrow (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$. If $N \geq 5$, we suppose further (1.13) and (1.14). Then $\lambda_1 > 0, \lambda_2 > 0$.*

Proof. We only prove $\lambda_1 > 0$. From Lemma 7.3, we deduce that there exists $y_\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} \|\phi_\vartheta(x)\|_{L^2(Q^N)} =: \delta > 0$, where $\phi_\vartheta(x) := u_{1,\vartheta}(x + y_\vartheta)$. Up to a subsequence, there exists some $0 \not\equiv \phi_0(x) \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R}^N such that $\phi_\vartheta(x) \rightharpoonup \phi_0(x)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. If $\lambda_1 \leq 0$, we have that

$$-\Delta \phi_0 \geq \mu_1 \phi_0^{p_1-1} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (7.5)$$

By the strong maximum principle, $\phi_0 > 0$ in \mathbb{R}^N . However, if $1 \leq N \leq 4$, (7.5) implies that

$$-\Delta \phi_0 \geq 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N, \phi_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N), \quad (7.6)$$

a contradiction to [20, Lemma A.2]. If $N \geq 5$, by (1.14), we see that $p_1 - 1 \leq \frac{N}{N-2}$. Then follows by [34, Theorem 8.4] that (7.5) does not have any positive solution, also a contradiction. Hence, we prove that $\lambda_1 > 0$. \square

In the following, without loss of generality, we may assume that $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$, $(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}) \rightharpoonup (u_1, u_2)$ weakly in \mathcal{H} and $\lambda_{\iota,\vartheta} \rightarrow \lambda_\iota$, $\iota = 1, 2$. Remark that $\|u_\iota\|_2^2 \leq a_\iota$, $\iota = 1, 2$, and notice that

$$(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}) \rightarrow (u_1, u_2) \text{ strongly in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^N) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$$

if $(\|u_1\|_2^2, \|u_2\|_2^2) = (a_1, a_2)$. Recalling $\{(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta})\}$ is bounded in \mathcal{H} , by the well known Brezis-Lieb Lemma and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, one can prove that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}) dx \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1, u_2) dx. \quad (7.7)$$

On the other hand, by $V_\iota(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ and the weak lower semicontinuity of norm, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} C_{a_1, a_2} &= \lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] \\ &= \lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \sum_{\iota=1}^2 [\|\nabla u_{\iota,\vartheta}\|_2^2 - \|u_{\iota,\vartheta}\|_{V_\iota}^2] - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}) dx \right\} \\ &\geq \sum_{\iota=1}^2 [\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2] - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1, u_2) dx \\ &= J[u_1, u_2] \geq C_{a_1, a_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $(u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}) \rightarrow (u_1, u_2)$ strongly in \mathcal{H} and $J[u_1, u_2] = C_{a_1, a_2}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.4: It is sufficient to prove that $(\|u_1\|_2^2, \|u_2\|_2^2) = (a_1, a_2)$. We argue by contradiction and suppose that

$$(\|u_1\|_2^2, \|u_2\|_2^2) =: (b_1, b_2) \neq (a_1, a_2).$$

Firstly we prove

Lemma 7.5. $(u_1, u_2) \neq (0, 0)$ and $(b_1, b_2) \neq (0, 0)$.

Proof. Suppose that $(u_1, u_2) = (0, 0)$, then we also have $(b_1, b_2) = (0, 0)$. Remark that $u_{\iota,\vartheta} \rightarrow 0$ in $L_{loc}^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $2 \leq p < 2^*$ and $\iota = 1, 2$. So by $V_\iota(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, one can prove that

$$\|u_{\iota,\vartheta}\|_{V_\iota}^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \vartheta \rightarrow \infty, \iota = 1, 2.$$

Hence,

$$C_{a_1, a_2} = \lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] = \lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} I[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] \geq E_{a_1, a_2},$$

a contradiction to Lemma 3.1 and Corollary 4.4. \square

Secondly we prove

Lemma 7.6. Let $Q^N := [0, 1]^N$. Then

$$\liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^N} [\|u_{1,\vartheta} - u_1\|_{L^2(Q^N+y)} + \|u_{2,\vartheta} - u_2\|_{L^2(Q^N+y)}] > 0. \quad (7.8)$$

Proof. Suppose that $\liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left[\|u_{1,\vartheta} - u_1\|_{L^2(Q^{N+y})} + \|u_{2,\vartheta} - u_2\|_{L^2(Q^{N+y})} \right] = 0$. Then by [38, Lemma 1.21] again, we have that $u_{\iota,\vartheta} \rightarrow u_\iota$ strongly in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for any $2 < p < 2^*$ and $\iota = 1, 2$. On the other hand, $V_\iota(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ and $u_{\iota,\vartheta} \rightarrow u_\iota$ in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $\iota = 1, 2$. Therefore,

$$C_{b_1, b_2} \leq J[u_1, u_2] \leq \liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] = C_{a_1, a_2}, \quad (7.9)$$

a contradiction to Corollary 3.3, due to the fact $(0, 0) \neq (a_1 - b_1, a_2 - b_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. \square

Then by Lemma 7.6, we may find $y_\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $|y_\vartheta| \rightarrow \infty$ and up to a subsequence,

$$\|u_{1,\vartheta}\|_{L^2(Q^{N+y_\vartheta})} + \|u_{2,\vartheta}\|_{L^2(Q^{N+y_\vartheta})} \rightarrow c_0 > 0.$$

So we may assume that $(u_{1,\vartheta}(\cdot + y_\vartheta), u_{2,\vartheta}(\cdot + y_\vartheta)) \rightharpoonup (\omega_1, \omega_2)$ weakly in \mathcal{H} . We remark that

$$(\omega_1, \omega_2) \neq (0, 0). \quad (7.10)$$

By $|y_\vartheta| \rightarrow \infty$, one can prove that

$$\|u_{\iota,\vartheta} - u_\iota - \omega_\iota(\cdot - y_\vartheta)\|_2^2 = \|u_{\iota,\vartheta}\|_2^2 - \|u_\iota\|_2^2 - \|\omega_\iota\|_2^2 + o(1), \iota = 1, 2. \quad (7.11)$$

In particular, put $c_\iota := \|\omega_\iota\|_2^2$, $\iota = 1, 2$. Then we have

$$c_\iota := \|\omega_\iota\|_2^2 \leq \liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} (\|u_{\iota,\vartheta}\|_2^2 - \|u_\iota\|_2^2) = a_\iota - b_\iota, \iota = 1, 2. \quad (7.12)$$

Next, we show

Lemma 7.7. $(a_1, a_2) = (b_1, b_2) + (c_1, c_2)$, $J[u_1, u_2] = C_{b_1, b_2}$, $I[\omega_1, \omega_2] = E_{c_1, c_2}$ and

$$C_{a_1, a_2} = C_{b_1, b_2} + E_{c_1, c_2}. \quad (7.13)$$

Proof. Suppose that

$$\lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \|u_{\iota,\vartheta} - u_\iota - \omega_\iota(\cdot - y_\vartheta)\|_2^2 > 0.$$

Then we see that

$$(b_1 + c_1, b_2 + c_2) \neq (a_1, a_2).$$

By Brezis-Lieb Lemma again, combing with (7.11) and $V_\iota(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, one can prove that

$$\begin{aligned} & J[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] - J[u_1, u_2] - J[\omega_1(\cdot - y_\vartheta), \omega_2(\cdot - y_\vartheta)] \\ & \quad - J[u_{1,\vartheta} - u_1 - \omega_1(\cdot - y_\vartheta), u_{2,\vartheta} - u_2 - \omega_2(\cdot - y_\vartheta)] \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned} \quad (7.14)$$

and

$$\lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[\omega_1(\cdot - y_\vartheta), \omega_2(\cdot - y_\vartheta)] = I[\omega_1, \omega_2] \geq E_{c_1, c_2}. \quad (7.15)$$

Put $\delta_\iota := \lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} \|u_{\iota,\vartheta} - u_\iota - \omega_\iota(\cdot - y_\vartheta)\|_2^2$, then by (7.11), we have

$$\delta_\iota = a_\iota - b_\iota - c_\iota \geq 0, \iota = 1, 2. \quad (7.16)$$

Since $u_{i,\vartheta} - u_i - \omega_i(\cdot - y_\vartheta) \rightarrow 0$ in $L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $2 \leq p < 2^*$ and $V_i(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & J[u_{1,\vartheta} - u_1 - \omega_1(\cdot - y_\vartheta), u_{2,\vartheta} - u_2 - \omega_2(\cdot - y_\vartheta)] \\ & - I[u_{1,\vartheta} - u_1 - \omega_1(\cdot - y_\vartheta), u_{2,\vartheta} - u_2 - \omega_2(\cdot - y_\vartheta)] \\ & = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 \|u_{i,\vartheta} - u_i - \omega_i(\cdot - y_\vartheta)\|_{V_i}^2 \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

And then it follows Lemma 3.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[u_{1,\vartheta} - u_1 - \omega_1(\cdot - y_\vartheta), u_{2,\vartheta} - u_2 - \omega_2(\cdot - y_\vartheta)] \\ & = \liminf_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} I[u_{1,\vartheta} - u_1 - \omega_1(\cdot - y_\vartheta), u_{2,\vartheta} - u_2 - \omega_2(\cdot - y_\vartheta)] \geq E_{\delta_1, \delta_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.17)$$

By the formulas (7.14)- (7.17), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} C_{a_1, a_2} & = \lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} J[u_{1,\vartheta}, u_{2,\vartheta}] \\ & = \lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \infty} \{J[u_1, u_2] + J[\omega_1(\cdot - y_\vartheta), \omega_2(\cdot - y_\vartheta)] \\ & \quad + J[u_{1,\vartheta} - u_1 - \omega_1(\cdot - y_\vartheta), u_{2,\vartheta} - u_2 - \omega_2(\cdot - y_\vartheta)]\} \\ & \geq C_{b_1, b_2} + E_{c_1, c_2} + E_{\delta_1, \delta_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.18)$$

However, by Corollary 4.4, we may assume that E_{c_1, c_2} and E_{δ_1, δ_2} are attained by some nonnegative symmetry decreasing functions (ϕ_1, ϕ_2) and (ψ_1, ψ_2) respectively. We recall the coupled rearrangement of u and v , which is introduced by M. Shibata [35]. Then one can see that

$$(\phi_1 \star \psi_1, \phi_2 \star \psi_2) \in S_{c_1 + \delta_1, c_2 + \delta_2}$$

and

$$E_{c_1 + \delta_1, c_2 + \delta_2} \leq I[\phi_1 \star \psi_1, \phi_2 \star \psi_2] < I[\phi_1, \phi_2] + I[\psi_1, \psi_2] = E_{c_1, c_2} + E_{\delta_1, \delta_2},$$

see [35, Theorem 2.4].

Therefore,

$$C_{b_1, b_2} + E_{c_1, c_2} + E_{\delta_1, \delta_2} > C_{b_1, b_2} + E_{c_1 + \delta_1, c_2 + \delta_2} \geq C_{b_1 + c_1 + \delta_1, b_2 + c_2 + \delta_2} = C_{a_1, a_2},$$

a contradiction to (7.18). Hence, we prove that $\delta_i = 0, i = 1, 2$. That is,

$$(a_1, a_2) = (b_1, b_2) + (c_1, c_2).$$

Again by (7.15), (7.18) and

$$C_{b_1, b_2} + E_{c_1, c_2} \geq C_{b_1 + c_1, b_2 + c_2} = C_{a_1, a_2},$$

we see that

$$J[u_1, u_2] = C_{b_1, b_2}, \quad I[\omega_1, \omega_2] = E_{c_1, c_2} \quad \text{and} \quad C_{a_1, a_2} = C_{b_1, b_2} + E_{c_1, c_2}.$$

□

Now, we see that on the contrary hypothesis $(b_1, b_2) \neq (a_1, a_2)$, we obtain that $(0, 0) \neq (u_1, u_2), (0, 0) \neq (\omega_1, \omega_2)$. Recalling (7.1), $|y_\vartheta| \rightarrow \infty$ and $V_i(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, we see that

$(u_1, u_2) \neq (0, 0)$ is a nonnegative solution to (5.1) and $(\omega_1, \omega_2) \neq (0, 0)$ is a nonnegative solution to (5.9). Then by Proposition 6.5, there exists some $(\phi_1, \phi_2) \in \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$(\|\phi_1\|_2^2, \|\phi_2\|_2^2) = (\|u_1\|_2^2 + \|\omega_1\|_2^2, \|u_2\|_2^2 + \|\omega_2\|_2^2) \text{ and } J[\phi_1, \phi_2] < J[u_1, u_2] + I[\omega_1, \omega_2].$$

We see that $(\phi_1, \phi_2) \in S_{a_1, a_2}$. On the other hand, by Lemma 7.7, we have $J[u_1, u_2] = C_{b_1, b_2}$ and $I[\omega_1, \omega_2] = E_{c_1, c_2}$. Hence,

$$C_{a_1, a_2} \leq J[\phi_1, \phi_2] < J[u_1, u_2] + I[\omega_1, \omega_2] = C_{b_1, b_2} + E_{c_1, c_2},$$

a contradiction to (7.13).

To sum up, we can prove that $(b_1, b_2) = (a_1, a_2)$ and $J[u_1, u_2] = C_{a_1, a_2}$.

8. APPENDIX A

In this appendix, we give the detailed proof of Proposition 5.4.

Without loss of generality, we assume that $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$. By $r_1, r_2 > 1$, we have that $\bar{\lambda}_1 = \lambda_1$ and $\bar{\lambda}_2 = \min \left\{ \lambda_2, \frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)_+^2} \lambda_1 \right\}$.

(i) Put $u(x) := u_1(x) + u_2(x)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u + \lambda_1 u &= \partial_1 G(u_1, u_2) + \partial_2 G(u_1, u_2) - V_1(x)u_1 - V_2(x)u_2 + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)u_2 \\ &\leq \partial_1 G(u_1, u_2) + \partial_2 G(u_1, u_2) - V_1(x)u_1 - V_2(x)u_2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from $V_1(x), V_2(x) \leq 0$ that

$$-\Delta u + [\lambda_1 + V_1(x) + V_2(x)]u \leq \partial_1 G(u_1, u_2) + \partial_2 G(u_1, u_2). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

We can take some $R_1 > 0$ large enough such that

$$u(x) := u_1(x) + u_2(x) < 1 \text{ for } |x| \geq R_1.$$

By (5.4), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1 G(u_1, u_2) + \partial_2 G(u_1, u_2) &\leq C_1 \left(u_1^{p_1-1} + u_1^{r_1-1} (u_1 + u_2)^{r_2} + u_2^{q_1-1} + u_2^{r_2-1} (u_1 + u_2)^{r_1} \right) \\ &\leq C_{R_1} u^p \text{ for } |x| \geq R_1, \end{aligned}$$

where $p := \min\{p_1 - 1, q_1 - 1, r_1 + r_2 - 1\} > 1$. Then by (A.1), we obtain that

$$-\Delta u + [\lambda_1 + V_1(x) + V_2(x) - C_{R_1} u^{p-1}]u \leq 0 \text{ for } |x| \geq R_1. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

So for any $0 < \nu_2 < \lambda_1$, by $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V_\nu(x) = 0, \nu = 1, 2$, we can take some $R_2 > R_1$ such that

$$\lambda_1 + V_1(x) + V_2(x) - C_{R_1} u^{p-1} > \nu_2 \text{ for } |x| \geq R_2.$$

Hence, we have

$$-\Delta u + \nu_2 u \leq 0 \text{ in } B_{R_2}^c. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Then by the comparison principle, we have that $u(x) \leq C e^{-\sqrt{\nu_2}|x|}$ in $B_{R_2}^c$. Therefore, we can find some $C_{\nu_2} > 0$ such that $u_1(x) \leq u(x) \leq C_{\nu_2} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_2}|x|}$ in \mathbb{R}^N .

On the other hand, by (5.3), we see that $\partial_1 G(u_1, u_2) \geq 0$, and thus

$$-\Delta u_1 + \lambda_1 u_1 = \partial_1 G(u_1, u_2) - V_1(x)u_1 \geq 0 = -\Delta G_{\lambda_1} + \lambda_1 G_{\lambda_1} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

where G_{λ_1} is the Green function for $-\Delta + \lambda_1$ in \mathbb{R}^N . It is known (see [16, 22] for instance) that

$$\begin{cases} G_{\lambda_1} \in C(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^N), G_{\lambda_1}(x) > 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}, \\ \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} G_{\lambda_1}(x) |x|^{\frac{N-1}{2}} e^{\sqrt{\lambda_1}|x|} = \gamma_0 \in (0, \infty). \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Using the comparison principle again, one can prove that

$$c_1(1 + |x|)^{-\frac{N-1}{2}} e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1}|x|} \leq u_1(x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ and some } c_1 > 0,$$

and hence (5.6) holds. Noting that for any $\nu_1 > \lambda_1$, it is trivial to find some $C_{\nu_1} > 0$ such that

$$C_{\nu_1} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_1}|x|} \leq c_1(1 + |x|)^{-\frac{N-1}{2}} e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Hence, for any $0 < \nu_2 < \lambda_1 < \nu_1$, we can find some $C_{\nu_1}, C_{\nu_2} > 0$ such that

$$C_{\nu_1} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_1}|x|} \leq u_1(x) \leq C_{\nu_2} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_2}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

We note that $C_{\nu_2} \geq C_{\nu_1}$ is trivial by putting $x = 0$. Hence, (5.5) holds and we finish the proof of (i).

(ii) We note that (5.8) is trivial by the proof of (i). Next, we focus on the proof of (5.7). We divide the proof into different cases.

Case for $r_2 \geq 2$: In this case, we have that $\bar{\lambda}_2 = \lambda_2$. Firstly, we take some $R_1 > 0$ large enough such that

$$u_1(x) + u_2(x) \leq 1, \quad \partial_2 G(u_1, u_2) \leq C_1(u_2^{q_1-1} + u_2^{r_2-1}[u_1 + u_2]^{r_1}) \text{ for } |x| \geq R_1.$$

It follows that

$$-\Delta u_2 + [\lambda_2 + V_2(x) - C_1 u_2^{q_1-2} - C_1 u_2^{r_2-2}[u_1 + u_2]^{r_1}] u_2 \leq 0 \text{ for } |x| \geq R_1. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

By $r_2 \geq 2$, we have that

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} [\lambda_2 + V_2(x) - C_1 u_2(x)^{q_1-2} - C_1 u_2(x)^{r_2-2}[u_1(x) + u_2(x)]^{r_1}] = \lambda_2.$$

So for any $0 < \nu_2 < \lambda_2$, by the comparison principle, we can find some $C_{\nu_2} > 0$ such that

$$u_2(x) \leq C_{\nu_2} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_2}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

And we note that the lower bound can be proved as (i). Hence, (5.7) holds for $r_2 \geq 2$.

Case for $1 < r_2 < 2$: We firstly prove the upper bound of $u_2(x)$ in (5.7). Noting that we can find some $C > 0$ such that

$$\partial_2 G(u_1(x), u_2(x)) \leq C \{u_2(x)^{q_1-1} + u_2(x)^{r_2-1}[u_1(x) + u_2(x)]^{r_1}\} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Put $f_0(x) := \partial_2 G(u_1(x), u_2(x))$. Observing that for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$, there exists some C_λ such that $u_1(x) + u_2(x) \leq C_\lambda e^{-\sqrt{\lambda}|x|}$ in \mathbb{R}^N . So we see that

$$f_0(x) \leq C_\lambda (e^{-(q_1-1)\sqrt{\lambda}|x|} + e^{-(r_1+r_2-1)\sqrt{\lambda}|x|}).$$

Since both $q_1 - 1 > 1$ and $r_1 + r_2 - 1 > 1$, we can take $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{\lambda_1}{2})$ small enough, such that

$$\sqrt{\xi_{1,\varepsilon}} := \min\{(q_1 - 1)\sqrt{\lambda_1 - \varepsilon}, (r_1 + r_2 - 1)\sqrt{\lambda_1 - \varepsilon}\} > \sqrt{\lambda_1}.$$

Noting that

$$-\Delta e^{-\sqrt{\nu}|x|} + (\lambda_2 + V_2(x)) e^{-\sqrt{\nu}|x|} = \left(\lambda_2 + V_2(x) - \nu - \frac{N-1}{|x|} \sqrt{\nu} \right) e^{-\sqrt{\nu}|x|}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

for any $\nu \in (0, \min\{\lambda_2, \xi_{1,\varepsilon}\})$, one can find some $R_\nu > 0$ large enough such that

$$\left(\lambda_2 + V_2(x) - \nu - \frac{N-1}{|x|}\sqrt{\nu}\right) e^{-\sqrt{\nu}|x|} \geq f_0(x) \text{ for } |x| \geq R_\nu. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Then by the comparison principle again, one can prove that for any $\nu \in (0, \min\{\lambda_2, \xi_{1,\varepsilon}\})$, there exists some $C_\nu > 0$ such that

$$u_2(x) \leq C_\nu e^{-\sqrt{\nu}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

In particular, if $\xi_{1,\varepsilon} < \lambda_2$, one can improve the statement that

$$u_2(x) \leq C_\varepsilon e^{-\sqrt{\xi_{1,\varepsilon}}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

So if $\xi_{1,\varepsilon} \geq \lambda_2$, the upper bound of $u_2(x)$ in (5.7) holds. If $\xi_{1,\varepsilon} < \lambda_2$, noting that $\xi_{1,\varepsilon} > \lambda_1$, so by such argument, we can improve the decay of u_2 from $e^{-\sqrt{\lambda}|x|}$ with $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ to $e^{-\sqrt{\lambda}|x|}$ with $\lambda \in (0, \xi_{1,\varepsilon})$. For each $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{\lambda_1}{2})$, we set

$$\sqrt{\xi_{n+1,\varepsilon}} := \min \left\{ (q_1 - 1)\sqrt{\xi_{n,\varepsilon}}, r_1\sqrt{\lambda_1 - \varepsilon} + (r_2 - 1)\sqrt{\xi_{n,\varepsilon}} \right\}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Suppose that $\xi_{n,\varepsilon} < \lambda_2$, then we have $f_0(x) \leq C_{n+1,\varepsilon} e^{-\sqrt{\xi_{n+1,\varepsilon}}|x|}$ in \mathbb{R}^N . Apply a similar argument as (A.6)-(A.9), one can prove that for any $\nu \in (0, \min\{\lambda_2, \xi_{n+1,\varepsilon}\})$,

$$u_2(x) \leq C_\nu e^{-\sqrt{\nu}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

In particular, if $\xi_{n+1,\varepsilon} < \lambda_2$,

$$u_2(x) \leq C_\varepsilon e^{-\sqrt{\xi_{n+1,\varepsilon}}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

By solving the equation

$$r_1\sqrt{\lambda_1} + (r_2 - 1)\sqrt{t} = \sqrt{t}, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

we have that $t = \frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2}\lambda_1$. So if $\lambda_3 := \frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2}\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$, we can take $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ small enough such that $\frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2}(\lambda_1 - \varepsilon_0) > \lambda_2$. Since $q_1 - 1 > 1$, we have that

$$\sqrt{s} < (q_1 - 1)\sqrt{s} \text{ for any } s > 0 \quad (\text{A.14})$$

and

$$\sqrt{s} < r_1\sqrt{\lambda_1 - \varepsilon_0} + (r_2 - 1)\sqrt{s} \text{ iff } s < \frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2}(\lambda_1 - \varepsilon_0). \quad (\text{A.15})$$

So if $\xi_{n,\varepsilon_0} \leq \lambda_2$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then by (A.10), (A.14) and (A.15), we see that $\{\xi_{n,\varepsilon_0}\}$ is an increasing sequence with upper bound λ_2 . Let $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have that

$$\sqrt{\xi_{\infty,\varepsilon_0}} = r_1\sqrt{\lambda_1} + (r_2 - 1)\sqrt{\xi_{\infty,\varepsilon_0}},$$

which implies $\xi_{\infty,\varepsilon_0} = \lambda_3 \leq \lambda_2$, a contradiction. Hence, there must exists some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\xi_{n_0,\varepsilon_0} > \lambda_2$. Therefore, for the case of $1 < r_2 < 2$ with $\frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2}\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$, we have $\bar{\lambda}_2 = \lambda_2$. And for any $0 < \nu_2 < \lambda_2$, we can find some $C_{\nu_2} > 0$ such that $u_2(x) \leq C_{\nu_2} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_2}|x|}$ in \mathbb{R}^N . And we note that the lower bound can be proved as (i). Hence, (5.7) holds for $1 < r_2 < 2$ with $\frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2}\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$.

Finally, we focus on the case of $1 < r_2 < 2$ with $\frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2}\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$. In this case, we have $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ and $\bar{\lambda}_2 = \frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2}\lambda_1$. We take ξ_1 satisfying that $\lambda_1 < \xi_1 < \frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2}\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$ and fix an $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \frac{\lambda_1}{2})$ small enough such that

$$\lambda_1 < \xi_1 < \frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2}(\lambda_1 - \varepsilon_1). \quad (\text{A.16})$$

We argue as above and define $\{\xi_{n,\varepsilon}\}$ inductively by (A.10) with $\xi_{1,\varepsilon} := \xi_1 - \varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$. Then one can check that $\{\xi_{n,\varepsilon}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is an increasing sequence such that

$$\xi_{n,\varepsilon} \uparrow \xi_{\infty,\varepsilon} := \frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2}(\lambda_1 - \varepsilon).$$

Hence, for any $\nu \in (0, \bar{\lambda}_2)$, we can take $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ small enough such that

$$\nu < \frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2}(\lambda_1 - \varepsilon_0) = \xi_{\infty,\varepsilon_0},$$

which implies that there exists some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\min\{\xi_{n_0,\varepsilon_0}, \lambda_2\} = \xi_{n_0,\varepsilon_0} > \nu$. Then we can find some $C_\nu > 0$ such that $u_2(x) \leq C_\nu e^{-\sqrt{\nu}|x|}$ in \mathbb{R}^N .

If $\frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2}\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2$, we have $\bar{\lambda}_2 = \lambda_2$, the lower bound can be proved as (i). So we suppose that $\bar{\lambda}_2 := \frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2}\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$. We can prove the lower bound by a similar inductively way. Firstly, we note that for any $\nu > \lambda_2$, as in (i), one can find some $C_\nu > 0$ such that

$$u_2(x) \geq C_\nu e^{-\sqrt{\nu}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Hence, we only need to consider $\bar{\lambda}_2 < \nu \leq \lambda_2$ in the following. Put

$$\sqrt{\eta_1} := r_1 \sqrt{\lambda_1} + (r_2 - 1) \sqrt{\lambda_2} < \sqrt{\lambda_2}.$$

Then by (5.3), we have

$$f_0(x) \geq C_2(u_2^{q_1-1} + u_2^{r_2-1}u_1^{r_1}) \geq \tilde{c}_1(1+|x|)^{-\alpha_1}e^{-\sqrt{\eta_1}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \quad (\text{A.18})$$

with $\alpha_1 := (r_1 + r_2 - 1)\frac{N-1}{2} > 0$. Recalling the Green function of G_{λ_2} , by

$$-\Delta u_2 + \lambda_2 u_2 = -V_2(x)u_2 + f_0(x) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

and $V_2(x) \leq 0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} u_2(x) &= G_{\lambda_2} \star [-V_2(x)u_2 + f_0(x)] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G_{\lambda_2}(x-y)[-V_2(y)u_2(y) + f_0(y)]dy \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G_{\lambda_2}(x-y)f_0(y)dy \\ &\geq \tilde{c}_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G_{\lambda_2}(x-y)(1+|x|)^{-\alpha_1}e^{-\sqrt{\eta_1}|y|}dy \end{aligned}$$

Then by Corollary 5.2, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (1+r)^{\alpha_1} e^{\sqrt{\eta_1}r} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G_{\lambda_2}(r\omega - y)(1+|x|)^{-\alpha_1} e^{-\sqrt{\eta_1}|y|} dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G_{\lambda_2}(y) e^{\sqrt{\eta_1}\omega \cdot y} dy > 0 \text{ uniformly with respect to } \omega \in \mathcal{S}^{N-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can find some $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$u_2(x) \geq c_1(1 + |x|)^{-\alpha_1} e^{-\sqrt{\eta_1}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

If $\nu > \eta_1$, by (A.19), we can find some $C_\nu > 0$ such that $u_2(x) \geq C_\nu e^{-\sqrt{\nu}|x|}$ in \mathbb{R}^N . If $\eta_n \geq \nu$, inductively, we define

$$\sqrt{\eta_{n+1}} := r_1 \sqrt{\lambda_1} + (r_2 - 1) \sqrt{\eta_n}. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

We can find some $c_n > 0, \alpha_n > 0$ such that

$$u_2(x) \geq c_n(1 + |x|)^{-\alpha_n} e^{-\sqrt{\eta_n}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

If there exists some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\eta_{n_0} < \nu$, our assertion holds. Suppose that $\eta_n \geq \nu$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\eta_n > \frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2} \lambda_1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Observing that

$$r_1 \sqrt{\lambda_1} + (r_2 - 1) \sqrt{t} < \sqrt{t} \text{ iff } t > \frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2} \lambda_1, \quad (\text{A.22})$$

we see that $\{\eta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is an decreasing sequence. Thus, $\eta_n \leq \eta_1 < \lambda_2$ holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, Corollary 5.2 is applied for every step in the induction. Let $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain that

$$\frac{r_1^2}{(2-r_2)^2} \lambda_1 = \eta_\infty := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_n \geq \nu,$$

a contradiction to $\nu > \bar{\lambda}_2$. We complete the proof.

9. APPENDIX B

In this appendix, we give the proof of Lemma 6.4.

(i) If $u_1 \equiv 0$ or $\omega_1 \equiv 0$, then we have $\sigma_{1,R} \equiv 0$ and $\tau_{1,R} \equiv 1$. So the assertion of (i) holds automatically. Next, we assume that $u_1 > 0$ and $\omega_1 > 0$ in \mathbb{R}^N . By Lemma 6.1 and the formula (6.9) that

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\mu_i}{p_i} \tau_{1,R}^{p_i} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_1 + \omega_{1,R})^{p_i} dx &\leq -\frac{\mu_i}{p_i} \left(1 - \frac{p_i}{a_1 + b_1} \sigma_{1,R} \right) \\ &\times \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{p_i} + \omega_{1,R}^{p_i} + p_i u_1^{p_i-1} \omega_{1,R} + p_i u_1 \omega_{1,R}^{p_i-1} - C_{p_i} u_1^{\frac{p_i}{2}} \omega_{1,R}^{\frac{p_i}{2}} \right] dx + O(\sigma_{1,R}^2). \end{aligned}$$

By proposition 5.4, for any $\nu < \sqrt{\lambda_1}$, there exists some $C_\nu > 0$ such that

$$u_1(x) + \omega_1(x) \leq C_\nu e^{-\sqrt{\nu}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Then thanks to $\frac{p_i}{2} > 1$ and $p_i - 1 > 1$, we can find some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$u_1^{\frac{p_i}{2}}(x) + \omega_1^{\frac{p_i}{2}}(x) \leq C_\varepsilon e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1 + \varepsilon}|x|} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

and

$$u_1^{p_i-1}(x) \leq C_\varepsilon e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1 + \varepsilon}|x|}, \omega_1^{p_i-1}(x) \leq C_\varepsilon e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1 + \varepsilon}|x|}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Then by Lemma 5.1, we have that

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^{p_i-1} \omega_{1,R} dx \leq C e^{\sqrt{\lambda_1 - \varepsilon} R}, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1 \omega_{1,R}^{p_i-1} dx \leq C e^{\sqrt{\lambda_1 - \varepsilon} R}, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^{\frac{p_i}{2}} \omega_{1,R}^{\frac{p_i}{2}} dx \leq C e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} R}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

It follows from (5.11) that $c(1+R)^{-\frac{N-1}{2}}e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1}R} \leq \sigma_{1,R}$. So we can find some $\theta(p_i) \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\sigma_{1,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{p_i-1} \omega_{1,R} + u_1 \omega_{1,R}^{p_i-1} \right] dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^{\frac{p_i}{2}} \omega_{1,R}^{\frac{p_i}{2}} dx = o(\sigma_{1,R}^{\theta(p_i)}) \text{ as } R \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Hence, the assertion of (i) holds.

(ii) Recalling the definition of $\bar{\lambda}_2$, by proposition 5.4, for any $\nu < \bar{\lambda}_2$, there exists some $C_\nu > 0$ such that

$$u_2(x) + \omega_2(x) \leq C_\nu e^{-\sqrt{\nu}|x|} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Then thanks to $\frac{q_j}{2} > 1$ and $q_j - 1 > 1$, we can find some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$u_2^{\frac{q_j}{2}}(x) + \omega_2^{\frac{q_j}{2}}(x) \leq C_\varepsilon e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_2+\varepsilon}|x|} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$u_2^{q_j-1}(x) \leq C_\varepsilon e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_2+\varepsilon}|x|}, \omega_2^{q_j-1}(x) \leq C_\varepsilon e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_2+\varepsilon}|x|}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Then by Lemma 5.1 again, we have that

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^{q_j-1} \omega_{2,R} dx \leq C e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_2-\varepsilon}R}, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2 \omega_{2,R}^{q_j-1} dx \leq C e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_2-\varepsilon}R}, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^{\frac{q_j}{2}} \omega_{2,R}^{\frac{q_j}{2}} dx \leq C e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_2+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}R}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

On the other hand, by Corollary 5.5-(iii), we have that $\tilde{C}_\varepsilon e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_2+\frac{\varepsilon}{4}}R} \leq \sigma_{2,R}$. So we can also find some $\theta(q_j) \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\sigma_{2,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_2^{q_j-1} \omega_{2,R} + u_2 \omega_{2,R}^{q_j-1} \right] dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^{\frac{q_j}{2}} \omega_{2,R}^{\frac{q_j}{2}} dx = o(\sigma_{2,R}^{\theta(q_j)}). \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Hence, similar to (i), we can prove (ii).

(iii) If $0 = \sigma_{1,R} < \sigma_{2,R}$, remark that either $u_1 \equiv 0$ or $\omega_{1,R} \equiv 0$. Then by (6.4) and (6.9), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\beta_k \tau_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \tau_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_1 + \omega_{1,R})^{r_{1,k}} (u_2 + \omega_{2,R})^{r_{2,k}} dx \\ & \leq -\beta_k \left(1 - \frac{r_{2,k}}{a_2 + b_2} \sigma_{2,R} + O(\sigma_{2,R}^2) \right) \\ & \quad \times \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + r_{2,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}-1} \omega_{2,R} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that if $u_1 \equiv 0$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} r_{2,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}-1} \omega_{2,R} dx = 0.$$

And if $u_1 > 0$, we can find some $\varepsilon > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}-1}(x) \leq C e^{-\sqrt{\varepsilon}|x|}, \omega_2(x) \leq C e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_2-\varepsilon}|x|}.$$

It follows Lemma 5.1 that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}-1} \omega_{2,R} dx \leq C e^{-\sqrt{\varepsilon}R}.$$

So we may find some $\theta \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\sigma_{2,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}-1} \omega_{2,R} dx = o(\sigma_{2,R}^\theta). \quad (\text{B.9})$$

And thus

$$\begin{aligned} & -\beta_k \tau_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \tau_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_1 + \omega_{1,R})^{r_{1,k}} (u_2 + \omega_{2,R})^{r_{2,k}} dx \\ & \leq -\beta_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + r_{2,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}-1} \omega_{2,R} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx \\ & \quad + \frac{\beta_k r_{2,k}}{a_2 + b_2} \sigma_{2,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx + o(\sigma_{2,R}^\theta). \end{aligned}$$

If $\sigma_{1,R} > 0$, by Corollary 6.3, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_1 + \omega_{1,R})^{r_{1,k}} (u_2 + \omega_{2,R})^{r_{2,k}} dx \\ & \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + r_{1,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}-1} u_2^{r_{2,k}} \omega_{1,R} + r_{2,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}-1} \omega_{2,R} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx \\ & \quad - C_{r_{1,k}, r_{2,k}, \eta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{1+\eta} \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}-1-\eta} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} + u_2^{1+\eta} \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}-1-\eta} \right] dx. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to $1 + \eta > 1$ and $r_{1,k} - 1 - \eta + r_{2,k} > 1$, we can find some $\eta_1 > 0$ such that

$$u_1^{1+\eta}(x) + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}-1-\eta} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}}(x) \leq C e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1 + \eta_1}|x|}.$$

Then by Lemma 5.1 and (5.11), we may find some $\tilde{\theta}_1 \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^{1+\eta} \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}-1-\eta} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} dx = o(\sigma_{1,R}^{\tilde{\theta}_1}) \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty.$$

Similarly, we can also find some $\tilde{\theta}_2 \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^{1+\eta} \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}-1-\eta} dx = o(\sigma_{1,R}^{\tilde{\theta}_2}) \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty.$$

On the other hand, similar to the proof of (B.9), combing with Corollary 5.5-(i), we may find some $\tilde{\theta}_3 \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\sigma_{\iota,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[r_{1,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}-1} u_2^{r_{2,k}} \omega_{1,R} + r_{2,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}-1} \omega_{2,R} \right] dx = o(\sigma_{1,R}^{\tilde{\theta}_3}), \quad \iota = 1, 2. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Hence, there exists some $\theta \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\beta_k \tau_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \tau_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_1 + \omega_{1,R})^{r_{1,k}} (u_2 + \omega_{2,R})^{r_{2,k}} dx \\ & \leq -\beta_k \left(1 - \frac{r_{1,k}}{a_1 + b_1} \sigma_{1,R} + O(\sigma_{1,R}^2) \right) \left(1 - \frac{r_{2,k}}{a_2 + b_2} \sigma_{2,R} + O(\sigma_{2,R}^2) \right) \\ & \quad \times \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + r_{1,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}-1} u_2^{r_{2,k}} \omega_{1,R} + r_{2,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}-1} \omega_{2,R} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx \right. \\ & \quad \left. - C_{r_{1,k}, r_{2,k}, \eta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{1+\eta} \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}-1-\eta} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} + u_2^{1+\eta} \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}-1-\eta} \right] dx \right\} \\ & = -\beta_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + r_{1,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}-1} u_2^{r_{2,k}} \omega_{1,R} + r_{2,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}-1} \omega_{2,R} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + \frac{\beta_k r_{1,k}}{a_1 + b_1} \sigma_{1,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx \\
 & + \frac{\beta_k r_{2,k}}{a_2 + b_2} \sigma_{2,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx + o(\sigma_{1,R}^\theta).
 \end{aligned}$$

10. APPENDIX C

In this appendix, we give the proof of Proposition 6.5.

For $\iota = 1, 2$, put $a_\iota := \|u_\iota\|_2^2$, $b_\iota := \|\omega_\iota\|_2^2$. Let $\omega_{\iota,R} := \omega_\iota(\cdot - R\mathbf{e}_1)$ and $\sigma_{\iota,R} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_\iota \omega_{\iota,R} dx$.

Let $\tau_{\iota,R} := \sqrt{\frac{a_\iota + b_\iota}{a_\iota + b_\iota + 2\sigma_{\iota,R}}}$. For $\iota = 1, 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\tau_{\iota,R}^2}{2} \|\nabla(u_\iota + \omega_{\iota,R})\|_2^2 - \frac{\tau_{\iota,R}^2}{2} \|u_\iota + \omega_{\iota,R}\|_{V_\iota}^2 \\
 & = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{2\sigma_{\iota,R}}{a_\iota + b_\iota} + O(\sigma_{\iota,R}^2) \right) \left\{ (\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2 + 2\langle \nabla u_\iota, \nabla \omega_{\iota,R} \rangle_{L^2}) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. - (\|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2 + \|\omega_{\iota,R}\|_{V_\iota}^2 + 2\langle u_\iota, \omega_{\iota,R} \rangle_{V_\iota}) \right\} \\
 & = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ (\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2 + 2\langle \nabla u_\iota, \nabla \omega_{\iota,R} \rangle_{L^2}) - (\|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2 + \|\omega_{\iota,R}\|_{V_\iota}^2 + 2\langle u_\iota, \omega_{\iota,R} \rangle_{V_\iota}) \right\} \\
 & \quad - \frac{\sigma_{\iota,R}}{a_\iota + b_\iota} \left\{ (\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2) - (\|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2 + \|\omega_{\iota,R}\|_{V_\iota}^2) \right\} + O(\sigma_{\iota,R}^2) \\
 & \quad + O(\sigma_{\iota,R} (\langle \nabla u_\iota, \nabla \omega_{\iota,R} \rangle_{L^2} - \langle u_\iota, \omega_{\iota,R} \rangle_{V_\iota})) \\
 & = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ (\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2 + 2\langle \nabla u_\iota, \nabla \omega_{\iota,R} \rangle_{L^2}) - (\|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2 + 2\langle u_\iota, \omega_{\iota,R} \rangle_{V_\iota}) \right\} \\
 & \quad - \frac{\sigma_{\iota,R}}{a_\iota + b_\iota} \left\{ (\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2) - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2 \right\} + O(\sigma_{\iota,R}^2) \\
 & \quad + O(\sigma_{\iota,R} (\langle \nabla u_\iota, \nabla \omega_{\iota,R} \rangle_{L^2} - \langle u_\iota, \omega_{\iota,R} \rangle_{V_\iota})) - \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sigma_{\iota,R}}{a_\iota + b_\iota} \right) \|\omega_{\iota,R}\|_{V_\iota}^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that (u_1, u_2) is a solution to (5.1), we have

$$\begin{cases} \langle \nabla u_1, \nabla \omega_{1,R} \rangle_{L^2} - \langle u_1, \omega_{1,R} \rangle_{V_1} = -\lambda_1 \sigma_{1,R} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_1 G(u_1, u_2) \omega_{1,R} dx, \\ \langle \nabla u_2, \nabla \omega_{2,R} \rangle_{L^2} - \langle u_2, \omega_{2,R} \rangle_{V_2} = -\lambda_2 \sigma_{2,R} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_2 G(u_1, u_2) \omega_{2,R} dx. \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

When $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$, due to $p_i - 1 > 1$, $q_j - 1 > 1$, $r_{1,k} + r_{2,k} - 1 > 1$, apply a similar argument of Lemma 6.4, we can find some $\theta \in (1, 2)$ such that if $\sigma_{1,R} > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sigma_{\iota,R} (\langle \nabla u_\iota, \nabla \omega_{\iota,R} \rangle_{L^2} - \langle u_\iota, \omega_{\iota,R} \rangle_{V_\iota}) \\
 & = -\lambda_\iota \sigma_{\iota,R}^2 + \sigma_{\iota,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_\iota G(u_1, u_2) \omega_{\iota,R} dx = o(\sigma_{1,R}^\theta), \iota = 1, 2,
 \end{aligned}$$

and if $\sigma_{1,R} = 0 < \sigma_{2,R}$,

$$\sigma_{2,R} (\langle \nabla u_2, \nabla \omega_{2,R} \rangle_{L^2} - \langle u_2, \omega_{2,R} \rangle_{V_2}) = o(\sigma_{2,R}^\theta).$$

On the other hand, by $\sigma_{\iota,R} \rightarrow 0$ as $R \rightarrow \infty$, we consider $R > 0$ large enough such that

$$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sigma_{\iota,R}}{a_\iota + b_\iota} > 0, \iota = 1, 2.$$

Hence, if $\sigma_{1,R} \neq 0$, then for $\iota = 1, 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\tau_{\iota,R}^2}{2} \|\nabla(u_\iota + \omega_{\iota,R})\|_2^2 - \frac{\tau_{\iota,R}^2}{2} \|u_\iota + \omega_{\iota,R}\|_{V_\iota}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2 - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2 \right\} - \lambda_\iota \sigma_{\iota,R} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_\iota G(u_1, u_2) \omega_{\iota,R} dx \\ & \quad - \frac{\sigma_{\iota,R}}{a_\iota + b_\iota} \left\{ (\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2) - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2 \right\} + o(\sigma_{1,R}^\theta). \end{aligned}$$

And if $\sigma_{1,R} = 0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\tau_{2,R}^2}{2} \|\nabla(u_2 + \omega_{2,R})\|_2^2 - \frac{\tau_{2,R}^2}{2} \|u_2 + \omega_{2,R}\|_{V_2}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \|\nabla u_2\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_2\|_2^2 - \|u_2\|_{V_2}^2 \right\} - \lambda_2 \sigma_{2,R} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_2 G(u_1, u_2) \omega_{2,R} dx \\ & \quad - \frac{\sigma_{2,R}}{a_2 + b_2} \left\{ (\|\nabla u_2\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_2\|_2^2) - \|u_2\|_{V_2}^2 \right\} + o(\sigma_{2,R}^\theta), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\tau_{1,R}^2}{2} \|\nabla(u_1 + \omega_{1,R})\|_2^2 - \frac{\tau_{1,R}^2}{2} \|u_1 + \omega_{1,R}\|_{V_1}^2 \\ & = \|\nabla(u_1 + \omega_{1,R})\|_2^2 - \|u_1 + \omega_{1,R}\|_{V_1}^2 \\ & = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} [\|\nabla u_1\|_2^2 - \|u_1\|_{V_1}^2] & \text{if } \omega_1 = 0, \\ \frac{1}{2} [\|\nabla \omega_1\|_2^2 - \|\omega_{1,R}\|_{V_1}^2] & \text{if } u_1 = 0 \end{cases} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \|\nabla u_1\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_1\|_2^2 - \|u_1\|_{V_1}^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In the following, we shall prove that there exists some $R > 0$ such that

$$J(\tau_{1,R}(u_1 + \omega_{1,R}), \tau_{2,R}(u_2 + \omega_{2,R})) < J[u_1, u_2] + I[\omega_1, \omega_2]. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

We divide the proof into three cases.

Case 1: $\sigma_{1,R} = 0, \sigma_{2,R} = 0$ In this case, we have that $\tau_{1,R} \equiv \tau_{2,R} \equiv 1, \forall R > 0$. Remark that either $u_1 = \omega_2 = 0$ or $u_2 = \omega_1 = 0$. We only prove the case of $u_1 = \omega_2 = 0$. By

$$G(\omega_{1,R}, u_2) > G(\omega_{1,R}, 0) + G(0, u_2) = G(\omega_{1,R}, \omega_{2,R}) + G(u_1, u_2),$$

we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & J(\tau_{1,R}(u_1 + \omega_{1,R}), \tau_{2,R}(u_2 + \omega_{2,R})) = J[\omega_{1,R}, u_2] \\ & = \frac{1}{2} [\|\nabla \omega_{1,R}\|_2^2 - \|\omega_{1,R}\|_{V_1}^2] + \frac{1}{2} [\|\nabla u_2\|_2^2 - \|u_2\|_{V_2}^2] - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(\omega_{1,R}, u_2) dx \\ & < \frac{1}{2} [\|\nabla \omega_{1,R}\|_2^2 - \|\omega_{1,R}\|_{V_1}^2] - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(\omega_{1,R}, 0) dx \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} [\|\nabla u_2\|_2^2 - \|u_2\|_{V_2}^2] - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(0, u_2) dx \\ & < \frac{1}{2} [\|\nabla u_2\|_2^2 - \|u_2\|_{V_2}^2] - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(0, u_2) dx \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \omega_{1,R}\|_2^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(\omega_{1,R}, 0) dx \end{aligned}$$

$$=J[0, u_2] + I[\omega_1, 0].$$

The assertion (C.2) holds.

Case 2: $\sigma_{1,R} = 0$ and $\sigma_{2,R} > 0$ In this case, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \frac{\tau_{\iota,R}^2}{2} \|\nabla(u_\iota + \omega_{\iota,R})\|_2^2 - \frac{\tau_{\iota,R}^2}{2} \|u_\iota + \omega_{\iota,R}\|_{V_\iota}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 [\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2 - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2] - \lambda_2 \sigma_{2,R} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_2 G(u_1, u_2) \omega_{2,R} dx \\ & \quad - \frac{\sigma_{2,R}}{a_2 + b_2} [(\|\nabla u_2\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_2\|_2^2) - \|u_2\|_{V_2}^2] + o(\sigma_{2,R}^\theta). \end{aligned}$$

Then combing with Lemma 6.4, we can find some common $\theta \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & J[\tau_{1,R}(u_1 + \omega_{1,R}), \tau_{2,R}(u_2 + \omega_{2,R})] = J[u_1 + \omega_{1,R}, \tau_{2,R}(u_2 + \omega_{2,R})] \\ & = \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \frac{\tau_{\iota,R}^2}{2} \|\nabla(u_\iota + \omega_{\iota,R})\|_2^2 - \frac{\tau_{\iota,R}^2}{2} \|u_\iota + \omega_{\iota,R}\|_{V_\iota}^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(u_1 + \omega_{1,R}, \tau_{2,R}(u_2 + \omega_{2,R})) dx \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 [\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2 - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2] - \lambda_2 \sigma_{2,R} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_2 G(u_1, u_2) \omega_{2,R} dx \\ & \quad - \frac{\sigma_{2,R}}{a_2 + b_2} [(\|\nabla u_2\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_2\|_2^2) - \|u_2\|_{V_2}^2] + o(\sigma_{2,R}^\theta) \\ & \quad - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{\mu_i}{p_i} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^{p_i} + \omega_{1,R}^{p_i} dx \right] \\ & \quad - \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\nu_j}{q_j} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^{q_j} + \omega_{2,R}^{q_j} dx \right] - \sum_{j=1}^m \nu_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [u_2^{q_j-1} \omega_{2,R} + u_2 \omega_{2,R}^{q_j-1}] dx \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\nu_j \sigma_{2,R}}{a_2 + b_2} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^{q_j} + \omega_{2,R}^{q_j} dx \right] + o(\sigma_{2,R}^\theta) \\ & \quad - \sum_{k=1}^n \beta_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}}] dx - \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k r_{2,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}-1} \omega_{2,R} dx \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\beta_k r_{2,k}}{a_2 + b_2} \sigma_{2,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}}] dx + o(\sigma_{2,R}^\theta). \end{aligned}$$

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\iota=1}^2 [\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2 - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2] - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{\mu_i}{p_i} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^{p_i} + \omega_{1,R}^{p_i} dx \right] \\ & \quad - \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\nu_j}{q_j} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^{q_j} + \omega_{2,R}^{q_j} dx \right] - \sum_{k=1}^n \beta_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}}] dx \\ & = J[u_1, u_2] + I[\omega_1, \omega_2], \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\lambda_2\sigma_{2,R} - \frac{\sigma_{2,R}}{a_2 + b_2} \left\{ (\|\nabla u_2\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_2\|_2^2) - \|u_2\|_{V_2}^2 \right\} \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\nu_j \sigma_{2,R}}{a_2 + b_2} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^{q_j} + \omega_{2,R}^{q_j} dx \right] \\
& + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\beta_k r_{2,k}}{a_2 + b_2} \sigma_{2,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx \\
& = -\lambda_2\sigma_{2,R} - \frac{\sigma_{2,R}}{a_2 + b_2} \left\{ (\|\nabla u_2\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_2\|_2^2) - \|u_2\|_{V_2}^2 \right\} \\
& - \frac{\sigma_{2,R}}{a_2 + b_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [\partial_2 G(u_1, u_2) u_2 + \partial_2 G(\omega_{1,R}, \omega_{2,R}) \omega_{2,R}] dx \\
& = -\lambda_2\sigma_{2,R} - \frac{\sigma_{2,R}}{a_2 + b_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [\partial_2 G(u_1, u_2) u_2 + \partial_2 G(\omega_1, \omega_2) \omega_2] dx \\
& - \frac{\sigma_{2,R}}{a_2 + b_2} \left\{ -\lambda_2 a_2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_2 G(u_1, u_2) u_2 dx - \lambda_2 b_2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_2 G(\omega_1, \omega_2) \omega_2 dx \right\} \\
& = 0
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_2 G(u_1, u_2) \omega_{2,R} dx - \sum_{j=1}^m \nu_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_2^{q_j-1} \omega_{2,R} + u_2 \omega_{2,R}^{q_j-1} \right] dx \\
& - \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k r_{2,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}-1} \omega_{2,R} dx \\
& = - \sum_{j=1}^m \nu_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2 \omega_{2,R}^{q_j-1} dx,
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& J[\tau_{1,R}(u_1 + \omega_{1,R}), \tau_{2,R}(u_2 + \omega_{2,R})] - J[u_1, u_2] - I[\omega_1, \omega_2] \\
& = - \sum_{j=1}^m \nu_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2 \omega_{2,R}^{q_j-1} dx + o(\sigma_{2,R}^\theta). \tag{C.3}
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling Corollary 5.5 that for any $\nu_1 < \bar{\lambda}_2$, we have that $\sigma_{2,R} \leq C_{\nu_1} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_1} R}$. So by $\theta > 1$, we can find some suitable $\eta_1 > 0$ such that

$$\sigma_{2,R}^\theta \leq C e^{-\sqrt{\bar{\lambda}_2 + \eta_1} R}. \tag{C.4}$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 5.4 and Lemma 5.1, for any $\nu_2 > \bar{\lambda}_2$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2 \omega_{2,R}^{q_1-1} dx \geq C_{\nu_2} e^{-\sqrt{\nu_2} R}. \tag{C.5}$$

In particular, we can take $\nu_2 = \bar{\lambda}_2 + \frac{\eta_1}{2} \in (\bar{\lambda}_2, \bar{\lambda}_2 + \eta_1)$. Then one can see that

$$\sigma_{2,R}^\theta \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2 \omega_{2,R}^{q_1-1} dx \right)^{-1} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty, \tag{C.6}$$

which implies that

$$-\sum_{j=1}^m \nu_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2 \omega_{2,R}^{q_j-1} dx + o(\sigma_{2,R}^\theta) < 0 \text{ for large } R.$$

Hence, for R large enough, by (C.3) we have that

$$J[\tau_{1,R}(u_1 + \omega_{1,R}), \tau_{2,R}(u_2 + \omega_{2,R})] < J[u_1, u_2] + I[\omega_1, \omega_2].$$

The assertion (C.2) also holds.

Case 3: $\sigma_{1,R} > 0$ In this case, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \left[\frac{\tau_{\iota,R}^2}{2} \|\nabla(u_\iota + \omega_{\iota,R})\|_2^2 - \frac{\tau_{\iota,R}^2}{2} \|u_\iota + \omega_{\iota,R}\|_{V_\iota}^2 \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{2} [\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2 - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2] - \lambda_\iota \sigma_{\iota,R} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_\iota G(u_1, u_2) \omega_{\iota,R} dx \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{\sigma_{\iota,R}}{a_\iota + b_\iota} [(\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2) - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2] \right\} + o(\sigma_{1,R}^\theta). \end{aligned}$$

Then combining with Lemma 6.4, we can find some common $\theta \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & J[\tau_{1,R}(u_1 + \omega_{1,R}), \tau_{2,R}(u_2 + \omega_{2,R})] \\ & = \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \left[\frac{\tau_{\iota,R}^2}{2} \|\nabla(u_\iota + \omega_{\iota,R})\|_2^2 - \frac{\tau_{\iota,R}^2}{2} \|u_\iota + \omega_{\iota,R}\|_{V_\iota}^2 \right] - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(\tau_{1,R}(u_1 + \omega_{1,R}), \tau_{2,R}(u_2 + \omega_{2,R})) dx \\ & \leq \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{2} [\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2 - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2] - \lambda_\iota \sigma_{\iota,R} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_\iota G(u_1, u_2) \omega_{\iota,R} dx \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{\sigma_{\iota,R}}{a_\iota + b_\iota} [(\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2) - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2] \right\} + o(\sigma_{1,R}^\theta) \\ & \quad - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{\mu_i}{p_i} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^{p_i} + \omega_{1,R}^{p_i} dx \right] - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{p_i-1} \omega_{1,R} + u_1 \omega_{1,R}^{p_i-1} \right] dx \\ & \quad + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{\mu_i \sigma_{1,R}}{a_1 + b_1} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^{p_i} + \omega_{1,R}^{p_i} dx \right] + o(\sigma_{1,R}^\theta) \\ & \quad - \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\nu_j}{q_j} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^{q_j} + \omega_{2,R}^{q_j} dx \right] - \sum_{j=1}^m \nu_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_2^{q_j-1} \omega_{2,R} + u_2 \omega_{2,R}^{q_j-1} \right] dx \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\nu_j \sigma_{2,R}}{a_2 + b_2} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^{q_j} + \omega_{2,R}^{q_j} dx \right] + o(\sigma_{2,R}^\theta) \\ & \quad - \sum_{k=1}^n \beta_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + r_{1,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}-1} u_2^{r_{2,k}} \omega_{1,R} + r_{2,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}-1} \omega_{2,R} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\beta_k r_{1,k}}{a_1 + b_1} \sigma_{1,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\beta_k r_{2,k}}{a_2 + b_2} \sigma_{2,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx + o(\sigma_{1,R}^\theta).$$

Noting that firstly we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \frac{1}{2} \left[\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2 - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2 \right] - \sum_{i=1}^\ell \frac{\mu_i}{p_i} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^{p_i} + \omega_{1,R}^{p_i} dx \right] \\ & - \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\nu_j}{q_j} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^{q_j} + \omega_{2,R}^{q_j} dx \right] - \sum_{k=1}^n \beta_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx \\ & = J[u_1, u_2] + I[\omega_1, \omega_2]. \end{aligned}$$

Secondly, by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \left\{ -\lambda_\iota \sigma_{\iota,R} - \frac{\sigma_{\iota,R}}{a_\iota + b_\iota} \left[(\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2) - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2 \right] \right\} \\ & = \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \left\{ -\lambda_\iota \sigma_{\iota,R} - \frac{\sigma_{\iota,R}}{a_\iota + b_\iota} \left[-\lambda_\iota a_\iota + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_\iota G(u_1, u_2) u_\iota dx - \lambda_\iota b_\iota + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_\iota G(\omega_1, \omega_2) \omega_\iota dx \right] \right\} \\ & = \sum_{\iota=1}^2 -\frac{\sigma_{\iota,R}}{a_\iota + b_\iota} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_\iota G(u_1, u_2) u_\iota dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_\iota G(\omega_1, \omega_2) \omega_\iota dx \right], \end{aligned}$$

we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \left\{ -\lambda_\iota \sigma_{\iota,R} - \frac{\sigma_{\iota,R}}{a_\iota + b_\iota} \left[(\|\nabla u_\iota\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \omega_\iota\|_2^2) - \|u_\iota\|_{V_\iota}^2 \right] \right\} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^\ell \frac{\mu_i \sigma_{1,R}}{a_1 + b_1} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1^{p_i} + \omega_{1,R}^{p_i} dx \right] + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\nu_j \sigma_{2,R}}{a_2 + b_2} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2^{q_j} + \omega_{2,R}^{q_j} dx \right] \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\beta_k r_{1,k}}{a_1 + b_1} \sigma_{1,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\beta_k r_{2,k}}{a_2 + b_2} \sigma_{2,R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}} + \omega_{1,R}^{r_{1,k}} \omega_{2,R}^{r_{2,k}} \right] dx = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thirdly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\iota=1}^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_\iota G(u_1, u_2) \omega_{\iota,R} dx - \sum_{i=1}^\ell \mu_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_1^{p_i-1} \omega_{1,R} + u_1 \omega_{1,R}^{p_i-1} \right] dx \\ & - \sum_{j=1}^m \nu_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u_2^{q_j-1} \omega_{2,R} + u_2 \omega_{2,R}^{q_j-1} \right] dx \\ & - \sum_{k=1}^n \beta_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[r_{1,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}-1} u_2^{r_{2,k}} \omega_{1,R} + r_{2,k} u_1^{r_{1,k}} u_2^{r_{2,k}-1} \omega_{2,R} \right] dx \\ & = - \sum_{i=1}^\ell \mu_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1 \omega_{1,R}^{p_i-1} dx - \sum_{j=1}^m \nu_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2 \omega_{2,R}^{q_j-1} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & J[\tau_{1,R}(u_1 + \omega_{1,R}), \tau_{2,R}(u_2 + \omega_{2,R})] - J[u_1, u_2] - I[\omega_1, \omega_2] \\ &= - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1 \omega_{1,R}^{p_i-1} dx - \sum_{j=1}^m \nu_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_2 \omega_{2,R}^{q_j-1} dx + o(\sigma_{1,R}^\theta), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

here we use the fact $o(\sigma_{2,R}^\theta) = o(\sigma_{1,R}^\theta)$ due to Corollary 5.5. Then applying a similar argument as the Case 2, we can prove that

$$\sigma_{1,R}^\theta \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_1 \omega_{1,R}^{p_1-1} dx \right)^{-1} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{C.8})$$

Hence, by (C.7) and (C.8), for $R > 0$ large enough, we have that

$$J[\tau_{1,R}(u_1 + \omega_{1,R}), \tau_{2,R}(u_2 + \omega_{2,R})] < J[u_1, u_2] + I[\omega_1, \omega_2].$$

The assertion (C.2) also holds.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. K. Adhikari: Superfluid Fermi-Fermi mixture: phase diagram, stability, and soliton formation. *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 053609,2007. [1](#)
- [2] V. S. Bagnato, D. J. Frantzeskakis, P. G. Kevrekidis, B. A. Malomed and D. Mihalache. Bose-Einstein condensation: twenty years after. *Roman. Rep. Phys.* **67**, 5-50,2015. [1](#)
- [3] A. Bahri and Y. Y. Li: On a min-max procedure for the existence of a positive solution for certain scalar field equations in \mathbb{R}^N . *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* **6** no. 1-2, 1-15, 1990. [16](#), [20](#)
- [4] T. Bartsch and S. de Valeriola: Normalized solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **100**(1), 75-83, 2013. [2](#)
- [5] T. Bartsch and L. Jeanjean: Normalized solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger systems. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **148** (2), 225-242, 2018. [3](#), [5](#)
- [6] 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.*, (9) **106**(4), 583-614, 2016. [3](#)
- [7] T. Bartsch, R. Molle, M. Rizzi and G. Verzini: Normalized solutions of mass supercritical Schrödinger equations with potential, *Comm. PDE*, (2021), DOI:10.1080/03605302.2021.1893747. [2](#)
- [8] T. Bartsch and N. Soave: A natural constraint approach to normalized solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations and systems, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 272(12), 4998-5037, 2017. [3](#)
- [9] T. Bartsch and N. Soave: Multiple normalized solutions for a competing system of Schrödinger equations, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations.*, **58**(1), 22, 2019. [3](#)
- [10] T. Bartsch, X. X. Zhong and W. M. Zou: Normalized solutions for a coupled Schrödinger system, *Math. Ann.*, 380, no.3-4, 1713-1740,2021. [3](#)
- [11] H. Brézis and E. H. Lieb: A relation between pointwise convergence of functions and convergence of functionals. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **88**(3), 486-490, 1983. [15](#)
- [12] Z. Chen and W. M. Zou: Normalized solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger systems with linear couples, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **499**, 2021. [4](#)
- [13] Z. Chen, X. X. Zhong and W. M. Zou: Normalized solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger systems with special mass-mixed terms: The linear couple case, arXiv:2107.12564v2. [4](#)
- [14] F. H. Clarke: A new approach to Lagrange multipliers. *Math. Oper. Res.* **1**(2),165-174,1976. [5](#), [13](#)
- [15] B. D. Esry, C. H. Greene, J. P. Burke Jr and J. L. Bohn: Hartree-Fock theory for double condensates. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 3594,1997. [1](#)
- [16] B. Gidas, W. M. Ni and L. Nirenberg:Symmetry of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations in \mathbb{R}^n . Mathematical analysis and applications, Part A, pp. 369C402, *Adv. in Math. Suppl. Stud.*, **7a**, Academic Press, New York-London, 1981. [29](#)
- [17] T. Gou and L. Jeanjean: Existence and orbital stability of standing waves for nonlinear Schrödinger systems, *Nonlinear Anal.*,**144**, 10-22, 2016. [3](#), [5](#)

- [18] T. Gou and L. Jeanjean: Multiple positive normalized solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger systems. *Nonlinearity* **31**(2), 2319–2345, 2018. [3](#)
- [19] Y. Guo, S. Li, J. Wei and X. Zeng: Ground states of two-component attractive Bose-Einstein condensates I: Existence and uniqueness. *J. Funct. Anal.* **1**, 183-230, 2019. [4](#)
- [20] N. Ikoma: Compactness of minimizing sequences in nonlinear Schrödinger systems under multiconstraint conditions. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.* **14**, 115-136, 2014. [6](#), [25](#)
- [21] N. Ikoma and Y. Miyamoto : Stable standing waves of nonlinear Schrödinger equations with potentials and general nonlinearities. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, **59**(2), 48, 2020. [2](#)
- [22] N. Ikoma and Y. Miyamoto: The compactness of minimizing sequences for a nonlinear Schrödinger system with potentials, to appear. [4](#), [6](#), [16](#), [17](#), [20](#), [23](#), [29](#)
- [23] N. Ikoma and K. Tanaka: A note on deformation argument for L^2 normalized solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations and systems, *Adv. Differ. Equ.*, **24**, 609-646, 2019. [2](#)
- [24] H. W. Li and W. M. Zou: Normalized ground states for semilinear elliptic system with critical and subcritical nonlinearities, to appear [3](#)
- [25] E. H. Lieb and M. Loss: Analysis, seconded., Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 14, *American Mathematical Society*, Providence, RI, 2001. [15](#)
- [26] E. H. Lieb, R. Seiringer, J. P. Solovej and J. Yngvason: The mathematics of the Bose Gas and its condensation. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2005. [5](#)
- [27] L. Jeanjean: Existence of solutions with prescribed norm for semilinear elliptic equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, **28**(10), 1633-1659, 1997. [2](#)
- [28] L. Jeanjean and S. S. Lu: A mass supercritical problem revisited, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, **59**, 174, 2020. [2](#)
- [29] B. Malomed: Multi-component Bose-Einstein condensates: theory. In Emergent nonlinear phenomena in Bose-Einstein condensation (ed. P. G. Kevrekidis, D. J. Frantzeskakis and R. Carretero-Gonzalez), pp. 287-305, 2008. [1](#)
- [30] J. Mederski and B. Bieganowski: Normalized ground states of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with at least mass critical growth, arXiv: 2002.08344v1 [2](#)
- [31] B. Pellacci, A. Pistoia, G. Vaira and G. Verzini: Normalized concentrating solutions to nonlinear elliptic problems. arXiv:1910.03961 [2](#)
- [32] L. Pitaevskii and S. Stringari: Bose-Einstein condensation. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003. [5](#)
- [33] T. Cazenave: Semilinear Schrödinger Equations, Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol.10, New York University, *Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences/American Mathematical Society*, New York/Providence, RI, 2003. [16](#)
- [34] P. Quittner and P. Souplet: Superlinear parabolic problems. Blow-up, global existence and steady states. *Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basler Lehrbücher. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel*, 2007. [25](#)
- [35] M. Shibata: A new rearrangement inequality and its application for L^2 -constraint minimizing problems. *Math. Z.* **287** (1-2), 341-359, 2017. [3](#), [27](#)
- [36] N. Soave: Normalized ground states for the NLS equation with combined nonlinearities, *J. Differential Equations*, **287**, 341-359, 2017. [2](#)
- [37] N. Soave: Normalized ground states for the NLS equation with combined nonlinearities: the Sobolev critical case, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **279**, 2020. [2](#)
- [38] M. Willem: Minimax theorems. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, **24**. *Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA*, 1996. [24](#), [26](#)
- [39] X. X. Zhong and W. M. Zou: A new deduce of the strict binding inequality and its application: Ground state normalized solution to Schrödinger equations with potential, arXiv:2107.12558v2. [2](#)

(Y. B. Deng)

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS & HUBEI KEY LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES,
CENTRAL CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, WUHAN 430079, P. R. CHINA.

Email address: ybdeng@mail.ccnu.edu.cn

(Q. H. He)

COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATION SCIENCE, GUANGXI CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH, GUANGXI UNIVERSITY, NANNING, 530003, P. R. CHINA.

Email address: heqihan277@163.com

(X. X. Zhong)

SOUTH CHINA RESEARCH CENTER FOR APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES, SOUTH CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, GUANGZHOU 510631, P. R. CHINA.

Email address: zhongxuexiu1989@163.com, zhongxuexiu1989@hotmail.com