

OPTIMAL CONDITIONS FOR L^∞ -REGULARITY AND A PRIORI ESTIMATES FOR ELLIPTIC SYSTEMS, II: $n(\geq 3)$ COMPONENTS

LI YUXIANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we present a bootstrap procedure for general elliptic systems with $n(\geq 3)$ components. Combining with the L^p - L^q -estimates, it yields the optimal L^∞ -regularity conditions for the three well-known types of weak solutions: H_0^1 -solutions, L^1 -solutions and L_δ^1 -solutions. Thanks to the linear theory in $L_\delta^p(\Omega)$, it also yields the optimal conditions for a priori estimates for L_δ^1 -solutions. Based on the a priori estimates, we improve known existence theorems for some classes of elliptic systems.

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to present an alternate-bootstrap procedure to obtain L^∞ -regularity and a priori estimates for solutions of semilinear elliptic systems with $n(\geq 3)$ components. This method enables us to obtain the optimal L^∞ -regularity conditions for the three well-known types of weak solutions: H_0^1 -solutions, L^1 -solutions and L_δ^1 -solutions of elliptic systems (for their definitions, see Section 2). Combining with the linear theory in L_δ^p -spaces, our method also enables us to obtain a priori estimates for L_δ^1 -solutions, therefore to obtain new existence theorems for various classes of elliptic systems.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a smoothly bounded domain and $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n) : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be Carathéodory functions. Denote $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. Let us consider the Dirichlet system of the form

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta \mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{f}(x, \mathbf{u}), & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{u} &= 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

A typical case is

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u_i &= \prod_{j=1}^n u_j^{p_{ij}}, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_i &= 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, n) \quad (1.2)$$

The existence theory of system (1.1) was raised as an important question in the survey paper [Lions] by Lions. Since then, many authors have contributed to this question, see for instance [C, CFMT, FY, Lou, M, PQS, QS, TV, SZ₂, Zou₂] and the references therein. Since system (1.1) is generally of nonvariational structure, the proof of existence by fixed point theorems is essentially reduced to deriving a priori estimates for all possible solutions. There are several methods for the derivation of a priori estimates: (a) The method of Rellich-Pohozaev identities and moving planes, see [CFM, FLN]; (b) The scaling or blow-up methods, which proceeds by contradiction with some known Liouville-type theorems, see [BM, CFMT,

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J25, 35J55, 35J60, 35B45, 35B65.

Key words and phrases. Elliptic systems, optimality, L^∞ -regularity, a priori estimates, existence.

Supported in part by National Natural Science Foundation of China 10601012 and Southeast University Award Program for Outstanding Young Teachers 2005.

FY, GS, Lou, So, Zou] and references therein, for the related Liouville-type results, see [BM, BuM, CMM, F, FF, M, PQS, RZ, So, SZ, SZ₂] and the references therein; (c) The method of Hardy-Sobolev inequalities, see [BT, CFM₂, C, CFS, GW]. For the detailed comments of the above methods, we refer to [QS], see also a survey paper [S₂].

Recently, Quittner & Souplet [QS] developed an alternate-bootstrap procedure for deriving a priori estimates in the scale of weighted Lebesgue spaces $L^p_\delta(\Omega)$ for system (1.1) ($n = 2$) with

$$\begin{aligned} -h_1(x) &\leq f_1 \leq C_1(|u_2|^p + |u_1|^\gamma) + h_2(x), \\ -h_1(x) &\leq f_2 \leq C_1(|u_1|^q + |u_2|^\sigma) + h_2(x), \end{aligned} \quad u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad x \in \Omega, \quad (1.3)$$

where $p, q > 0$, $pq > 1$, $\gamma, \sigma \geq 1$, $C_1 > 0$, $h_1 \in L^1_\delta(\Omega)$, $h_2 \in L^\theta$ with $\theta > d/2$. They obtained the optimal conditions for L^∞ -regularities and a priori estimates for L^1_δ -solutions. In [L], Li developed another more powerful alternate-bootstrap procedure for system (1.1) with

$$\begin{aligned} |f_1| &\leq C_1(|u_1|^r |u_2|^p + |u_1|^\gamma) + h(x), \\ |f_2| &\leq C_1(|u_1|^q |u_2|^s + |u_2|^\sigma) + h(x), \end{aligned} \quad u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad x \in \Omega, \quad (1.4)$$

where $r, s \geq 0$, $p, q > 0$, $pq > (1-r)(1-s)$, $\gamma, \sigma > 0$, $C_1 > 0$ and the regularity of h depends on the type of weak solutions considered. Since the bootstrap procedure is only based on the L^m - L^k -estimates in the linear theories of weak solutions, he obtained the optimal L^∞ -regularity conditions for the three well-known types of weak solutions: H^1_0 -solutions, L^1 -solutions and L^1_δ -solutions and the optimal condition for a priori estimates for L^1_δ -solutions of system (1.1).

This paper is a continuation of [L] and mainly concerned with the L^∞ -regularities and a priori estimates of the weak solutions of system (1.1) with $n(n \geq 3)$ components. Since the bootstrap procedure in [L] seems not to be generalized to apply to general system (1.1) with $n(\geq 3)$ components, here we develop a new bootstrap procedure for system (1.1) with

$$|f_i| \leq C_1 \left(\prod_{j=1}^n u_j^{p_{ij}} + u_i^{r_i} \right) + h(x), \quad (1 \leq i \leq n) \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad x \in \Omega, \quad (1.5)$$

where $p_{ij} \geq 0$, $r_i \geq 0$ ($1 \leq i, j \leq n$), $C_1 > 0$ and the regularity of h will be specified later. More importantly, our bootstrap procedure is also only based on the L^m - L^k -estimates in the linear theories of weak solutions, so we are also able to obtain the optimal L^∞ -regularity conditions for the three well-known types of weak solutions and the optimal condition for a priori estimates for L^1_δ -solutions of system (1.1).

Comparing with the above methods, the advantages of the alternate-bootstrap method is obvious. First it only requires an upper bounds of \mathbf{f} ; secondly it is only based on the L^m - L^k -estimates in the linear theories of weak solutions, so it can apply to any type of weak solutions which have L^m - L^k -estimates; thirdly, it can yields the optimal conditions for the L^∞ -regularity and a priori estimates.

Set $P = (p_{ij})$ be the matrix of exponents. Let I be the unit matrix. We assume that

$$\begin{aligned} p_{ij} &\geq 0 \quad (1 \leq i, j \leq n), \quad I - P \text{ is an irreducible matrix, } |I - P| < 0, \\ &\text{each principal sub - matrix of rank } \leq n - 1 \text{ is a nonsingular } M - \text{matrix.} \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

For the definition and some properties of M -matrices, see [BP]. According to the definition of M -matrix, all of the principal minors of rank $\leq n - 1$ of $I - P$ is nonnegative. M -matrices

have appeared in the blow-up of solutions of parabolic systems with n components, see [LX, LLX, WW] and the references therein.

1.1. Optimal conditions for L^∞ -regularity. Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)^T$ be the solution of the linear system

$$(I - P)\alpha = -\mathbf{1}$$

where $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T$. Under assumption (1.6), $\alpha_i > 0$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$). For $n = 2$, we have

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{p_{12} + 1 - p_{22}}{p_{12}p_{21} - (1 - p_{11})(1 - p_{22})}, \quad \alpha_2 = \frac{p_{21} + 1 - p_{11}}{p_{12}p_{21} - (1 - p_{11})(1 - p_{22})},$$

which are related to its scaling properties of system (1.2) (see for instance [CFMT]) and appear for instance in [DE, Wang, Zh] in the study of blow-up for its the parabolic counterpart.

For the L^∞ -regularity, we obtain the following theorems.

Theorem 1.1. (Optimal L^∞ -regularity for H_0^1 -solutions)

Assume that \mathbf{f} satisfy (1.5) with (1.6).

(i) If

$$\max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} \alpha_i > \frac{d-2}{4}, \quad \max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} r_i < \frac{d+2}{d-2}, \quad h \in L^\theta(\Omega), \quad \theta > \frac{d}{2}, \quad (1.7)$$

then any H_0^1 -solution \mathbf{u} of system (1.1) belongs to $L^\infty(\Omega)$;

(ii) If $d \geq 3$ and

$$\max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} \alpha_i < \frac{d-2}{4}, \quad (1.8)$$

system (1.1) in B_1 , the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^d , with $f_i = \prod_{j=1}^n (u_j + c_j)^{p_{ij}}$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) for some c_j ($1 \leq j \leq n$) admits a positive H_0^1 -solution \mathbf{u} such that $u_i \notin L^\infty(B_1)$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$).

Theorem 1.2. (Optimal L^∞ -regularity for L^1 -solutions)

Assume that \mathbf{f} satisfy (1.5) with (1.6).

(i) If

$$\max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} \alpha_i > \frac{d-2}{2}, \quad \max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} r_i < \frac{d}{d-2}, \quad h \in L^\theta(\Omega), \quad \theta > \frac{d}{2}, \quad (1.9)$$

then any L^1 -solution \mathbf{u} of system (1.1) belongs to $L^\infty(\Omega)$;

(ii) If $d \geq 3$ and

$$\max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} \alpha_i < \frac{d-2}{2}, \quad (1.10)$$

system (1.1) in B_1 , the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^d , with $f_i = \prod_{j=1}^n (u_j + c_j)^{p_{ij}}$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) for some c_j ($1 \leq j \leq n$) admits a positive L^1 -solution \mathbf{u} such that $u_i \notin L^\infty(B_1)$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$).

Theorem 1.3. (Optimal L^∞ -regularity for L_δ^1 -solutions)

Assume that \mathbf{f} satisfy (1.5) with (1.6).

(i) If

$$\max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} \alpha_i > \frac{d-1}{2}, \quad \max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} r_i < \frac{d+1}{d-1}, \quad h \in L_\delta^\theta(\Omega), \quad \theta > \frac{d+1}{2}, \quad (1.11)$$

then any H_0^1 -solution \mathbf{u} of system (1.1) belongs to $L^\infty(\Omega)$;

(ii) If $d \geq 2$ and

$$\max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} \alpha_i < \frac{d-1}{2}, \quad (1.12)$$

there exist functions $a_i \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $a_i \geq 0$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) such that system (1.1) with $f_i = a_i \prod_{j=1}^n u_j^{p_{ij}}$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) admits a positive L_δ^1 -solution \mathbf{u} such that $u_i \notin L^\infty(\Omega)$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$).

Our theorems are closely related to the three critical exponents:

$$p_S := \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } d \leq 2, \\ (d+2)/(d-2) & \text{if } d \geq 3, \end{cases}$$

$$p_{sg} := \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } d \leq 2, \\ d/(d-2) & \text{if } d \geq 3, \end{cases}$$

$$p_{BT} := \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } d \leq 1, \\ (d+1)/(d-1) & \text{if } d \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

p_S is the Sobolev exponent. p_{sg} and p_{BT} appear in study of L^1 -solutions and L_δ^1 -solutions of scalar elliptic equations respectively. Note that

$$\frac{d-2}{4} = \frac{1}{p_S - 1}, \quad \frac{d-2}{2} = \frac{1}{p_{sg} - 1}, \quad \frac{d-1}{2} = \frac{1}{p_{BT} - 1}.$$

So if we write each critical exponent as p_c , the optimal conditions for L^∞ -regularity of the above three types of weak solutions have a consistent form $\max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} \alpha_i > 1/(p_c - 1)$ and $\max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} r_i < p_c$.

In order to justify the above relations, let us recall the optimal L^∞ -regularity for the scalar equation

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u &= f(x, u), & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \quad (1.13)$$

where $|f| \leq C(1 + |u|^p)$ with $p \geq 1$. It is well-known that the Sobolev exponent p_S plays an important role in the optimal L^∞ -regularity and a priori estimates of the H_0^1 -solutions, see [FLN, GS, JL, ZZ] and the references therein. Any H_0^1 -solution of (1.13) belongs to $L^\infty(\Omega)$ if and only if $p \leq p_S$, see for instance [BK, St]. For the L^1 -solutions, the critical exponent is p_{sg} . Any L^1 -solution of (1.13) belongs to $L^\infty(\Omega)$ if and only if $p < p_{sg}$, see for instance [A, NS, P].

The critical exponent p_{BT} first appeared in the work of Brézis & Turner in [BT]. They obtained a priori estimates for all positive H_0^1 -solutions of (1.13) for $p < p_{BT}$ using the method of Hardy-Sobolev inequalities. However the meaning of p_{BT} was clarified only recently. It was shown by Souplet [S, Theorem 3.1] that p_{BT} is the critical exponent for the L^∞ -regularity of L_δ^1 -solutions of (1.13) by constructing an unbounded solution with $f = a(x)u^p$ for some $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $a \geq 0$ if $p > p_{BT}$. The critical case $p = p_{BT}$ was recently shown to belong to the singular case for $f = u^p$, see [DMP], also [MR] for related results. Moreover, the results of [S] was extended to the case $f = u^p$ when $p > p_{BT}$ is close to p_{BT} .

If we set $\alpha = 1/(p-1)$, i.e., the solution of $(p-1)\alpha = 1$, the optimal conditions for L^∞ -regularity of the above three types of weak solutions also have a consistent form $\alpha > 1/(p_c - 1)$. For more detailed discussions, we refer to the book [QS₂, Chapter I].

Using the bootstrap procedure they developed based on linear theory in $L^p_\delta(\Omega)$, Quittner & Souplet [QS, Theorem 2.1] obtained similar L^∞ -regularity condition as Theorem 1.3 (i) assuming that f_1, f_2 satisfy (1.3). In [S, Theorem 3.3], Souplet proved a similar result as in Theorem 1.3 (ii) in the case $f_1 = a_1(x)u_2^{p_{12}}$ and $f_2 = a_2(x)u_1^{p_{21}}$ for some functions $a_1, a_2 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $a_1, a_2 \geq 0$. In [L], using the bootstrap procedure he developed, Li obtained Theorem 1.1-1.3 for system (1.1) with f_1, f_2 satisfying (1.4). From assumption (1.6), we know that $p_{ii} < 1$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$), so our Theorem 1.1-1.3 (i) for $n = 2$ is a little weaker than those in [L], where only $p_{ii} < p_c$ ($i = 1, 2$) is required.

1.2. Optimal conditions for a priori estimates and existence theorems. Combining with the linear theory in L^p_δ -spaces, developed in [FSW], see also [BV], our bootstrap procedure enables us to obtain a priori estimates for system (1.1) with \mathbf{f} satisfying (1.5) and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f_i \geq -C_2 \sum_{i=1}^n u_i - h_1(x), \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad x \in \Omega, \quad (1.14)$$

where $C_2 > 0$, $h_1 \in L^1_\delta(\Omega)$. By an a priori estimate, we mean an estimate of the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|_\infty \leq C \quad (1.15)$$

for all possible nonnegative solutions of (1.1) (in a given set of functions), with some constant C independent of \mathbf{u} . Our main result of the a priori estimates is the following theorem.

Theorem 1.4. *Let f, g satisfy (1.5) and (1.14) with (1.6) and (1.11). Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for any nonnegative solution \mathbf{u} of (1.1) satisfying*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|_{L^1_\delta} \leq M, \quad (1.16)$$

it follows that $\mathbf{u} \in [L^\infty(\Omega)]^n$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|_{L^\infty} \leq C.$$

The constant C depends only on $M, \Omega, P, r_i, C_1, C_2$.

Remark 1.1. (1.11) is optimal for the a priori estimates for the L^1_δ -solutions of the system (1.1) under the assumptions (1.5) and (1.14) with (1.6), see Theorem 1.3 (ii).

Theorem 1.4 in hand, we are able to obtain general existence theorems for system (1.1). Consider the system (1.1), subject to (1.5) with (1.6) and the superlinearity condition

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f_i \geq \lambda \sum_{i=1}^n u_i - C_1, \quad u_i \geq 0 \quad (1 \leq i \leq n), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad (1.17)$$

where $C_1 > 0$, $\lambda > \lambda_1$, the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta$ in $H^1_0(\Omega)$.

Theorem 1.5. *Assume that \mathbf{f} satisfy (1.5) and (1.17) with (1.6) and (1.11). Then*

- (a) *any nonnegative L^1_δ -solution \mathbf{u} of (1.1) belongs to $L^\infty(\Omega)$ and satisfies the a priori estimate (1.15);*

(b) system (1.1) admits a positive L^1_δ -solution \mathbf{u} if in addition \mathbf{f} satisfy

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f_i = o\left(\sum_{i=1}^n u_i\right), \quad \text{as } \mathbf{u} \rightarrow 0^+, \quad (1.18)$$

uniformly in $x \in \Omega$.

For $n = 2$, under assumptions (1.4), (1.17), similar results as the above theorem was obtained in [L], see also [QS, CFM₂, F, FY, Zou] for more related results.

The second existence theorem is about the system

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u_i &= a_i(x) \prod_{j=1}^n u_j^{p_{ij}} - b_i(x)u_i, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_i &= 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, n) \quad (1.19)$$

where P satisfies (1.6), $a_i, b_i \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $a_i \geq 0$, $\int_\Omega a_i > 0$, $\inf\{\text{spec}(-\Delta + b_i)\} > 0$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$).

Theorem 1.6. *Assume that*

$$\max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} \alpha_i > \frac{d-1}{2}. \quad (1.20)$$

Then

- (a) any nonnegative L^1_δ -solution \mathbf{u} of (1.19) belongs to $L^\infty(\Omega)$ and satisfies the a priori estimate (1.15);
- (b) system (1.19) admits a positive L^1_δ -solution \mathbf{u} .

For $n = 2$, Theorem 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6 were proved in [L] for system (1.1) with f_1, f_2 satisfying (1.4). A similar result as Theorem 1.4 for system (1.1) with f_1, f_2 satisfying (1.3) was proved in [QS, Theorem 2.1]. For system (1.2) with $n = 2$, a similar existence result as Theorem 1.6 was proved in [QS, Theorem 1.4] but under more stronger assumptions.

To the author's knowledge, in order to obtain a priori estimates for system (1.1) with n ($n \geq 3$) components, conditions such as $|\mathbf{f}(x, \mathbf{u})| \leq C(1 + |\mathbf{u}|^\sigma)$ or system (1.1) is of variational structure were often assumed. Using a simple bootstrap procedure, Nussbaum [N] obtained a priori estimates (1.15) for system (1.1) assuming that $|\mathbf{f}(x, \mathbf{u})| \leq C(1 + |\mathbf{u}|^\sigma)$, where $\sigma \leq d/(d-1)$. Also using a simple bootstrap procedure, Cosner [C] obtained a priori estimates (1.15) assuming that $|\mathbf{f}(x, \mathbf{u})| \leq C(1 + |\mathbf{u}|^\sigma)$, where $\sigma \leq (d+1)/(d-1)$. His results are more close to ours. For system (1.1) of variational structure, we refer to [BG, Se] and the references therein.

Remark 1.2. Consider system (1.1) with boundary conditions of the form $u_{i\nu} = a_i u_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$), where $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u_{i\nu}$ denotes the derivative of u_i with respect to the outer unit normal on $\partial\Omega$. If, for example, \mathbf{f} satisfy

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f_i \geq C_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_1(a_i) u_i \right) - C_2, \quad u_i \geq 0, \quad x \in \Omega,$$

where $C_1 > 1$, $C_2 \geq 0$ and $\lambda_1(a_i)$ denotes the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta$ with boundary conditions $u_{i\nu} = a_i u_i$, then it is easy to deduce that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|_{L^1} \leq M,$$

with M independent of \mathbf{u} . The proof of Theorem 2.4 (in Section 2) implies (1.15). Using this a priori estimate, we also have a similar existence theorem of L^1 -solutions of system (1.1) with Neumann conditions as Theorem 1.5.

Applying Theorem 1.6, we have a existence corollary for system (1.2).

Corollary 1.7. *Assume that (1.6) and (1.20) hold. Then system (1.2) admits a positive classical solution \mathbf{u} .*

Using the blow-up method, Zou [Zou₂, Theorem 1.1] obtained a priori estimates (1.15) for system (1.2) assuming that $p_{ii} \geq 1$, $\sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij} \leq (d+2)/(d-2)_+$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) and $I - P$ is nonsingular. Using the a priori estimate, he obtained an existence theorem for system (1.2) with $n = 2$. See also [Guo] for related results.

In next two sections, we present our bootstrap procedure. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.1-1.3. In Section 5, we prove Theorem 1.4-1.6.

2. THE BOOTSTRAP PROCEDURE FOR SYSTEM WITH THREE COMPONENTS

In what follows we give the definitions of three types of weak solutions of system (1.1), see [QS₂, Chapter I].

Definition 2.1. (i) By an H_0^1 -solution of system (1.1), we mean a vector \mathbf{u} with

$$\mathbf{u} \in [H_0^1(\Omega)]^n, \quad \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \mathbf{u}) \in [H^{-1}(\Omega)]^n,$$

satisfying

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \varphi = \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \mathbf{u}) \varphi, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

(ii) By an L^1 -solution of system (1.1), we mean a vector \mathbf{u} with

$$\mathbf{u} \in [L^1(\Omega)]^n, \quad \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \mathbf{u}) \in [L^1(\Omega)]^n,$$

satisfying

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbf{u} \Delta \varphi = \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \mathbf{u}) \varphi, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C^2(\bar{\Omega}), \varphi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \quad (2.1)$$

(iii) Set $\delta(x) := \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$ and $L_{\delta}^1(\Omega) := L^1(\Omega; \delta(x)dx)$. By an L_{δ}^1 -solution of system (1.1), we mean a vector \mathbf{u} with

$$\mathbf{u} \in [L^1(\Omega)]^n, \quad \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \mathbf{u}) \in [L_{\delta}^1(\Omega)]^n,$$

satisfying (2.1).

The three types of weak solutions of the scalar equation (1.13) and the linear equation

$$-\Delta u = \phi, \quad \text{in } \Omega; \quad u = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad (2.2)$$

are defined similarly. According to [BCMR, Lemma 1], if $\phi \in L_{\delta}^1(\Omega)$, (2.2) admits a unique L_{δ}^1 -solution $u \in L^1(\Omega)$. Moreover, $\|u\|_{L^1} \leq C\|\phi\|_{L_{\delta}^1}$ and $\phi \geq 0$ a.e. implies $u \geq 0$ a.e.

The most important regularity results for L^1 -solutions of the linear equation (2.2) is the following L^m - L^k -estimates.

Proposition 2.1. (see for instance [QS₂, Proposition 47.5]) *Let $1 \leq m \leq k \leq \infty$ satisfy*

$$\frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{k} < \frac{2}{d}. \quad (2.3)$$

Let $u \in L^1(\Omega)$ be the unique L^1 -solution of (2.2). If $\phi \in L^m(\Omega)$, then $u \in L^k(\Omega)$ and satisfies the estimate $\|u\|_{L^k} \leq C(\Omega, m, k)\|\phi\|_{L^m}$.

It is well known that the condition (2.3) is optimal. For example, let $\Omega = B_1$ be the unit ball. For $1 \leq m < k \leq \infty$, let $d/k < \theta < d/m - 2$, which follows from $1/m - 1/k > 2/d$. Then $U(r) = r^{-\theta} - 1$ is the unique L^1 -solution of $-\Delta U = \phi := \theta(d - \theta - 2)r^{-\theta-2}$. But $\phi \in L^m(B_1)$ and $U \notin L^k(B_1)$, see also [QS₂, Chapter I].

Obviously, Proposition 2.1 holds for the H_0^1 -solution of (2.2). But it is not convenient to derive the optimal condition for L^∞ -regularity of the H_0^1 -solutions of system (1.1). We have the following L^m - L^k -estimates for H_0^1 -solutions. Let $d \geq 3$, set $2_* := 2d/(d+2)$. It is the conjugate number of the Sobolev imbedding exponent, $2d/(d-2)$.

Proposition 2.2. ([L, Proposition 2.2]) *Let $1 \leq m \leq k \leq \infty$ satisfy*

$$\frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{k} < \frac{4}{d+2}. \quad (2.4)$$

*Let $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ be the unique H_0^1 -solution of (2.2). If $\phi \in L^{2_*m}(\Omega)$, then $u \in L^{2_*k}(\Omega)$ and satisfies the estimate $\|u\|_{L^{2_*k}} \leq C(\Omega, m, k)\|\phi\|_{L^{2_*m}}$.*

The above proposition in hand, the L^∞ -regularity of the H_0^1 -solutions of (1.13) with $|f| \leq C(1 + |u|^p)$ with $1 \leq p < p_S$ follows immediately from a simple bootstrap argument. It is much simpler than the usual proof, see [BK, St, QS₂].

For all $1 \leq k \leq \infty$, define the spaces $L_\delta^k(\Omega) = L^k(\Omega; \delta(x)dx)$. For $1 \leq k < \infty$, $L_\delta^k(\Omega)$ is endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{L_\delta^k} = \left(\int_\Omega |u(x)|^k \delta(x) dx \right)^{1/k}.$$

Note that $L_\delta^\infty(\Omega) = L^\infty(\Omega; dx)$, with the same norm $\|u\|_\infty$. For the L_δ^1 -solutions, we have the following regularity result.

Proposition 2.3. (see [FSW], also [QS, QS₂]) *Let $1 \leq m \leq k \leq \infty$ satisfy*

$$\frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{k} < \frac{2}{d+1}. \quad (2.5)$$

Let $u \in L^1(\Omega)$ be the unique L_δ^1 -solution of (2.2). If $\phi \in L_\delta^m(\Omega)$, then $u \in L_\delta^k(\Omega)$ and satisfies the estimate $\|u\|_{L_\delta^k} \leq C(\Omega, m, k)\|\phi\|_{L_\delta^m}$.

The condition (2.5) is optimal, since for $1 \leq m < k \leq \infty$ and $1/m - 1/k > 2/(d+1)$, there exists $\phi \in L_\delta^m(\Omega)$ such that $u \notin L_\delta^k(\Omega)$, where u is the unique L_δ^1 -solution of (2.2), see [S, Theorem 2.1].

Remark 2.1. According to Proposition 2.1-2.3, the assumptions of h in Theorem 1.1-1.3 (i) are natural.

In order to give a uniform proof of Theorem 1.1-1.3 (i), we write the three critical exponents p_S , p_{sg} , p_{BT} as p_c . Denote B^k the spaces $L^{2_*k}(\Omega)$, $L^k(\Omega)$, $L_\delta^k(\Omega)$, and $\|\cdot\|_{B^k}$ in B^k the

norms $\|\cdot\|_{L^{2^*k}}$, $\|\cdot\|_{L^k}$, $\|\cdot\|_{L^k_\delta}$. Note that (2.3)-(2.5) can be written in one form

$$\frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{k} < \frac{1}{p'_c}, \quad (2.6)$$

where $1/p'_c + 1/p_c = 1$. The optimal conditions of L^∞ -regularity in Theorem 1.1-1.3 (i) can also be written in one form

$$\max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} \alpha_i > 1/(p_c - 1), \quad \max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} r_i < p_c, \quad h \in B^\theta, \quad \theta > p'_c. \quad (2.7)$$

The following theorem is our main regularity result for the three types of weak solutions.

Theorem 2.4. *Assume that \mathbf{f} satisfy (1.5) with (1.6) and (2.7). Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for any (H^1_0, L^1, L^1_δ) -solution \mathbf{u} of system (1.1) satisfying*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|_{B^k} \leq M_1(k), \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq k < p_c, \quad (2.8)$$

it follows that $\mathbf{u} \in [L^\infty(\Omega)]^n$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|_{L^\infty} \leq C.$$

The constant C depends only on $M_1(k), \Omega, P, r_i, C_1$.

In this section we shall first prove Theorem 2.4 for $n = 3$. The first lemma guarantees that there exists an equation for the bootstrap to initialize. We prove the lemma for system with arbitrary unknown functions. Denote $\Lambda^j = -|I - P|\alpha_j > 0$. According to Cramer's law, Λ^j is the determinant of the matrix $I - P$ whose j -column is replaced by $\mathbf{1}$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\sum_{j=1}^n p_{1j}$ is the smallest, i.e., for any $i : 2 \leq i \leq n$, $\sum_{j=1}^n p_{1j} \leq \sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij}$. In the following, $C = C(M_1, P, r_i, \Omega, C_1)$ is different from line to line, but it is independent of \mathbf{u} satisfying (2.8). For simplicity, we denote by $|\cdot|_k$ the norm $\|\cdot\|_{B^k}$.

Lemma 2.5. *Assume that (1.6) and (2.7) hold and $\sum_{j=1}^n p_{1j}$ is the smallest.*

- (1) *If α_1 is the largest, then $\sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij}$ is same for $1 \leq i \leq n$;*
- (2) *If there exists $i : 2 \leq i \leq n$, such that $\sum_{j=1}^n p_{1j} < \sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij}$, then α_1 can't be the largest;*
- (3) $\sum_{j=1}^n p_{1j} < p_c$.

Proof. According to the Cramer's law

$$(p_{11} - 1)\Lambda^1 + p_{12}\Lambda^2 + \dots + p_{1n}\Lambda^n = -|I - P|.$$

If α_1 is the largest, then

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^n p_{1j} - 1\right)\Lambda^1 \geq -|I - P|. \quad (2.9)$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
-|I - P| &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^n p_{1j} - 1\right)A_{11} + \left(\sum_{j=1}^n p_{2j} - 1\right)A_{21} + \cdots + \left(\sum_{j=1}^n p_{nj} - 1\right)A_{n1} \\
&\geq \left(\sum_{j=1}^n p_{1j} - 1\right) \sum_{i=1}^n A_{i1} \\
&= \left(\sum_{j=1}^n p_{1j} - 1\right)\Lambda^1,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

where A_{i1} is the algebraic minor of rank $= n-1$ of $I-P$ at $(i, 1)$. According to the assumption (1.6), $A_{i1} > 0$ for all $i : 1 \leq i \leq n$, so (2.10) holds. Therefore we have

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^n p_{1j} - 1\right)\Lambda^1 = -|I - P|.$$

So “=” in (2.10) holds, which implies (1). If the condition in (2) is satisfied, then “>” in (2.10) holds, which is contrary to (2.9). Thus α_1 can't be the largest.

For (3), we note that (2.10) holds for any Λ^j , $1 \leq j \leq n$, i.e.,

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^n p_{1j} - 1\right)\Lambda^j \leq -|I - P|.$$

So we have

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^n p_{1j} - 1\right) \max_j \Lambda^j \leq -|I - P|.$$

Thus (2.7) implies (3). □

If Lemma 2.5 (1) holds, the boundedness of \mathbf{u} is easy to obtain. In fact, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.6. *Under the assumption of Theorem 2.4, if Lemma 2.5 (1) holds, then the conclusions in Theorem 2.4 hold.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.5 (3), we have

$$A := \sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij} < p_c, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

So there exist

$$\begin{aligned}
k &: A \vee r < k < p_c, \\
\eta &: \eta > 1, \text{ close to } 1,
\end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\frac{A \vee r}{k} - \frac{1}{\eta k} < \frac{1}{p'_c},$$

where $r := \max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} r_i$. Multiplying the LHS by $1/\eta^m$, we also have

$$\frac{A \vee r}{\eta^m k} - \frac{1}{\eta^{m+1} k} < \frac{1}{p'_c}. \tag{2.11}$$

For $m \geq 0$, set

$$\frac{1}{\rho_m} = \frac{A}{\eta^m k} < 1, \quad \frac{1}{\varrho_m} = \frac{r}{\eta^m k} < 1.$$

For m large enough, we have $\rho_m \wedge \varrho_m > p'_c$. Denote $m_0 = \min\{m : \rho_m \wedge \varrho_m > p'_c\}$. We claim that after m_0 -th bootstrap on system (1.1), we arrive at the desired result $\sum_{i=1}^n |u_i|_{L^\infty} \leq C$.

According to (2.8), we have $|u_i|_k \leq C$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. If $m_0 = 0$, we can take k such that $p'_c < \rho_0 \wedge \varrho_0 = k/[A \vee r] \leq \theta$. Then applying Proposition 2.1-2.3, using the i -th equation of system (1.1), we obtain for all $1 \leq i \leq n$

$$\begin{aligned} |u_i|_\infty &\leq C |f_i|_{\rho_0 \wedge \varrho_0} \\ &\leq C \left(\prod_{j=1}^n |u_j|^{p_{ij}}|_{\rho_0 \wedge \varrho_0} + \|u_i\|^{r_i}|_{\rho_0 \wedge \varrho_0} \right) + |h|_{\rho_0 \wedge \varrho_0} \\ &\leq C \left(\prod_{j=1}^n |u_j|^{p_{ij}}|_{\rho_0} + \|u_i\|^{r_i}|_{\varrho_0} + 1 \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\prod_{j=1}^n |u_j|_k^{p_{ij}} + |u_i|_k^{r_i} + 1 \right) \\ &\leq C. \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

Now we consider $m_0 > 0$. If we have got the estimate $|u_i|_{\eta^m k} \leq C$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) for some $0 \leq m < m_0$, then applying Proposition 2.1-2.3, using (2.11) and the i -th equation of system (1.1), we obtain for all $1 \leq i \leq n$

$$\begin{aligned} |u_i|_{\eta^{m+1}k} &\leq C |f_i|_{\rho_m \wedge \varrho_m} \\ &\leq C \left(\prod_{j=1}^n |u_j|^{p_{ij}}|_{\rho_m \wedge \varrho_m} + \|u_i\|^{r_i}|_{\rho_m \wedge \varrho_m} \right) + |h|_{\rho_m \wedge \varrho_m} \\ &\leq C \left(\prod_{j=1}^n |u_j|^{p_{ij}}|_{\rho_m} + \|u_i\|^{r_i}|_{\varrho_m} + 1 \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\prod_{j=1}^n |u_j|_{\eta^m k}^{p_{ij}} + |u_i|_{\eta^m k}^{r_i} + 1 \right) \\ &\leq C. \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

So we have $|u_i|_{\eta^{m_0}k} \leq C$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. We can take $\mathbf{m} : m_0 - 1 < \mathbf{m} \leq m_0$ such that $p'_c < \rho_{\mathbf{m}} \wedge \varrho_{\mathbf{m}} \leq \theta$. A similar argument to (2.12) yields $|u_i|_\infty \leq C$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. \square

Remark 2.2. If, instead of (2.7), we assume that $\sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij} < p_c$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, as in [C, Zou₂], from the above lemma, we immediately have $|u_i|_\infty \leq C$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

In the following we consider the case where α_1 isn't the largest. Without loss of the generality, we assume that α_3 is the largest. So according to (2.7), we have

$$\alpha_3 > 1/(p_c - 1). \tag{2.14}$$

From Lemma 2.5 (3), there exist $k : (p_{11} + p_{12} + p_{13}) \vee r_1 < k < p_c$ and $k_1 : k_1 > p_c$ such that

$$\frac{(p_{11} + p_{12} + p_{13}) \vee r_1}{k} - \frac{1}{k_1} < \frac{1}{p'_c}.$$

Applying Proposition 2.1-2.3 and the first equation of system (1.1), similar to (2.13) ($i = 1$), we have $|u_1|_{k_1} \leq C$. However, the result is not sufficient for the bootstrap on other equations. In the next lemma, we shall use only the first equation of system (1.1) to improve the integrability of u_1 . The improved integrability of u_1 is sufficient for the bootstrap on other equations.

Lemma 2.7. *Let k^* be the solution of*

$$\frac{p_{11}}{k^*} + \frac{p_{12} + p_{13}}{p_c} - \frac{1}{k^*} = \frac{1}{p'_c}. \quad (2.15)$$

- (1) *If k^* is positive, then $k^* > p_c$ and, for any $1 \leq k_1 < k^*$, we have $|u_1|_{k_1} \leq C$;*
- (2) *If $k^* = \infty$, then for any $1 \leq k_1 < \infty$, $|u_1|_{k_1} \leq C$;*
- (3) *If k^* is negative, then $|u_1|_\infty \leq C$.*

Proof. (1) According to Lemma 2.5 (3) and the definition of k^* , for any $K : p_c < K < k^*$ sufficiently close to k^* , there exist $k : (p_{11} + p_{12} + p_{13}) \vee r_1 < k < p_c$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_{11}}{k} + \frac{p_{12} + p_{13}}{k} - \frac{1}{k} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \\ \frac{p_{11}}{K} + \frac{p_{12} + p_{13}}{k} - \frac{1}{K} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

and

$$\frac{p_{11}}{k} - \frac{1}{k} < \frac{p_{11}}{K} - \frac{1}{K}. \quad (\text{since } p_{11} < 1) \quad (2.17)$$

We construct a sequence $\{K^m : m \geq 1\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_{11}}{K^{m-1}} - \frac{1}{K^m} &= \tau^m \left(\frac{p_{11}}{k} - \frac{1}{k} \right) + (1 - \tau^m) \left(\frac{p_{11}}{K} - \frac{1}{K} \right) \equiv h_m, \quad K^0 = k, \\ m &= 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau : 0 < \tau < 1$ will be determined later. From (2.17), we know that h_m is increasing. Since $k < p_c < K$, there exists $\tau : \tau < 1$, close enough to 1, such that

$$\frac{1}{K^1} = \frac{p_{11}}{k} - \tau \left(\frac{p_{11}}{k} - \frac{1}{k} \right) - (1 - \tau) \left(\frac{p_{11}}{K} - \frac{1}{K} \right) > \frac{1}{K}.$$

Therefore, it is easy to verify by the induction method that

$$\frac{1}{K^m} > \frac{1}{K} \quad \text{for } m = 2, 3, \dots,$$

which implies that $\{K^m : m \geq 1\}$ is a positive sequence. According to the construction, the positivity of the sequence implies that $\{K^m : m \geq 1\}$ is an increasing sequence. Obviously, $K^m \rightarrow K$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. From (2.16) and the construction of K^m , we have

$$\frac{p_{11}}{K^{m-1}} + \frac{p_{12} + p_{13}}{k} - \frac{1}{K^m} < \frac{1}{p'_c}, \quad m \geq 1. \quad (2.18)$$

We can assume that $\{K^m : m \geq 1\}$ also satisfies

$$\frac{r_1}{K^{m-1}} - \frac{1}{K^m} < \frac{1}{p'_c}, \quad m \geq 1. \quad (2.19)$$

Otherwise, we can construct another increasing sequence $\{L^m : m \geq 1\}$ such that

$$\frac{r_1}{L^{m-1}} - \frac{1}{L^m} < \frac{1}{p'_c}.$$

For example, we can set $L^m = K - \tau^m(K - k)$ ($m \geq 1$), for $\tau < 1$, close enough to 1. Inserting $\{L^m : m \geq 1\}$ into $\{K^m : m \geq 1\}$, we can get an increasing sequence, also denoted by $\{K^m : m \geq 1\}$, which satisfies (2.18) and (2.19).

Set

$$\frac{1}{\rho_m} = \frac{p_{11}}{K^m} + \frac{p_{12} + p_{13}}{k} < 1, \quad \frac{1}{\varrho_m} = \frac{r_1}{K^m} < 1,$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{\rho_m} > \frac{p_{11}}{k^*} + \frac{p_{12} + p_{13}}{p_c} > \frac{1}{p'_c}.$$

So $\rho_m \wedge \varrho_m < p'_c < \theta$. Then $|h|_{\rho_m \wedge \varrho_m} \leq C|h|_\theta \leq C$ for all $m \geq 0$.

We already have $|u_1|_k \leq C$, $|u_2|_k \leq C$, $|u_3|_k \leq C$ from (2.8). If we have got $|u_1|_{K^m} \leq C$ for some $m \geq 0$, applying Proposition 2.1-2.3, using (2.18), (2.19) and the first equation of system (1.1), a similar argument as (2.13) ($i = 1$) yields that $|u_1|_{K^{m+1}} \leq C$. So, for any integer $m \geq 0$, there holds $|u_1|_{K^m} \leq C$. Noting $K^m \rightarrow K$, (1) is proved.

(2) The above proof is also valid for any K sufficiently large.

(3) The negativity of k^* implies that $p_{12} + p_{13} < p_c/p'_c$, so for K large enough, there holds

$$\frac{p_{11}}{K} + \frac{p_{12} + p_{13}}{p_c} < \frac{1}{p'_c}, \quad \frac{r_1}{K} < \frac{1}{p'_c}.$$

For such K , there exist $k : (p_{11} + p_{12} + p_{13}) \vee r_1 < k < p_c$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_{11}}{k} + \frac{p_{12} + p_{13}}{k} - \frac{1}{k} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \\ \frac{p_{11}}{K} + \frac{p_{12} + p_{13}}{k} - \frac{1}{K} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\{K^m : m \geq 1\}$, ρ_m, ϱ_m be as in (1). For m large enough, we have $\rho_m \wedge \varrho_m > p'_c$. Denote $m_0 = \min\{m : \rho_m \wedge \varrho_m > p'_c\}$. We claim that after m_0 -th bootstrap on the first equation of system (1.1), we arrive that $|u_1|_{L^\infty} \leq C$. The argument is similar to that of Lemma 2.6. We omit it. \square

We first consider the case where k^* is positive, which implies that $p_{12} + p_{13} > p_c/p'_c$. A careful computation yields

$$\frac{\begin{vmatrix} 1 - p_{11} & p_{12} + p_{13} \\ -p_{21} & p_{22} + p_{23} - 1 \end{vmatrix}}{\begin{vmatrix} 1 - p_{11} & 1 \\ -p_{21} & 1 \end{vmatrix}} \leq \frac{-|I - P|}{\Lambda^3} = \frac{1}{\alpha_3} < \frac{p_c}{p'_c},$$

which is proved in Lemma 3.1, is equivalent to inequality

$$\frac{p_{21}}{k^*} + \frac{p_{22} + p_{23}}{p_c} < 1. \quad (2.20)$$

From this inequality, there exist $k_1 : p_c < k_1 < k^*$, $k : r_2 < k < p_c$ and $k_2 : k_2 > p_c$ such that

$$\frac{p_{21}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{22} + p_{23}}{k} < 1, \quad \frac{p_{21}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{22} + p_{23}}{k} - \frac{1}{k_2} < \frac{1}{p'_c}, \quad \frac{r_2}{k} - \frac{1}{k_2} < \frac{1}{p'_c}.$$

Setting

$$\frac{1}{\rho} = \frac{p_{21}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{22} + p_{23}}{k} < 1, \quad \frac{1}{\varrho} = \frac{r_2}{k} < 1,$$

applying Proposition 2.1-2.3, a similar argument as (2.13) ($i = 2$), we have $|u_2|_{k_2} \leq C$. So the integrability of u_2 is improved. However, generally, the estimates $|u_1|_{k_1} \leq C$ and $|u_2|_{k_2} \leq C$ are not sufficient for the bootstrap on the third equation. The next lemma asserts that, using only the first two equations of system (1.1), the integrability of u_1 and u_2 can be improved for the bootstrap on the third equation.

Lemma 2.8. *Let (k_1^*, k_2^*) be the solution of the following linear system*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_{12}}{k_2^*} + \frac{p_{13}}{p_c} - \frac{1 - p_{11}}{k_1^*} &= \frac{1}{p'_c}, \\ \frac{p_{21}}{k_1^*} + \frac{p_{23}}{p_c} - \frac{1 - p_{22}}{k_2^*} &= \frac{1}{p'_c}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

- (1) *If $0 < k_1^*, k_2^* \leq \infty$, then $k_1^* > k^*$, $k_2^* > p_c$ and, for any $1 \leq k_1 < k_1^*$, $1 \leq k_2 < k_2^*$, we have $|u_1|_{k_1}, |u_2|_{k_2} \leq C$;*
- (2) *If k_1^* or k_2^* is negative, then $|u_1|_\infty \leq C$ or $|u_2|_\infty \leq C$.*

Proof. (1) We first consider $0 < k_1^*, k_2^* < \infty$. A simple computation yields $k_1^* > k^*$, $k_2^* > p_c$. Fix any $K_1 : k^* < K_1 < k_1^*$ sufficiently close to k_1^* and $K_2 : p_c < K_2 < k_2^*$ sufficiently close to k_2^* such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_{12}}{K_2} - \frac{1 - p_{11}}{K_1} &< \frac{p_{12}}{k_2^*} - \frac{1 - p_{11}}{k_1^*}, \\ \frac{p_{21}}{K_1} - \frac{1 - p_{22}}{K_2} &< \frac{p_{21}}{k_1^*} - \frac{1 - p_{22}}{k_2^*}, \end{aligned}$$

due to $p_{12}p_{21} < (1 - p_{11})(1 - p_{22})$. According to the definition of k_1^*, k_2^* , there exists $k : r_1 \vee r_2 < k < p_c$ close enough to p_c such that

$$\frac{p_{12}}{K_2} + \frac{p_{13}}{k} - \frac{1 - p_{11}}{K_1} < \frac{1}{p'_c}, \tag{2.22-1}$$

$$\frac{p_{21}}{K_1} + \frac{p_{23}}{k} - \frac{1 - p_{22}}{K_2} < \frac{1}{p'_c}. \tag{2.22-2}$$

For such k , (2.15) and (2.20) imply that there exist $k_1 : p_c < k_1 < k_1^*$ close enough to k_1^* such that

$$\frac{p_{12}}{k} + \frac{p_{13}}{k} - \frac{1 - p_{11}}{k_1} < \frac{1}{p'_c}, \tag{2.23-1}$$

$$\frac{p_{21}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{23}}{k} - \frac{1 - p_{22}}{k} < \frac{1}{p'_c}. \tag{2.23-2}$$

For K_1, K_2 close enough to K_1^*, K_2^* respectively, we also have

$$\frac{p_{11}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{12}}{k} - \frac{1}{k_1} < \frac{p_{11}}{K_1} + \frac{p_{12}}{K_2} - \frac{1}{K_1}, \quad (2.24-1)$$

$$\frac{p_{21}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{22}}{k} - \frac{1}{k} < \frac{p_{21}}{K_1} + \frac{p_{22}}{K_2} - \frac{1}{K_2}. \quad (2.24-2)$$

Let (K_1^m, K_2^m) be the sequence constructed below:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{p_{11}}{K_1^{m-1}} + \frac{p_{12}}{K_2^m} - \frac{1}{K_1^m} \\ &= \tau^m \left(\frac{p_{11}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{12}}{k} - \frac{1}{k_1} \right) + (1 - \tau^m) \left(\frac{p_{11}}{K_1} + \frac{p_{12}}{K_2} - \frac{1}{K_1} \right) \equiv h_m, \\ & \frac{p_{21}}{K_1^{m-1}} + \frac{p_{22}}{K_2^{m-1}} - \frac{1}{K_2^m} \\ &= \tau^m \left(\frac{p_{21}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{22}}{k} - \frac{1}{k} \right) + (1 - \tau^m) \left(\frac{p_{21}}{K_1} + \frac{p_{22}}{K_2} - \frac{1}{K_2} \right) \equiv l_m, \\ & K_1^0 = k_1, K_2^0 = k \\ & m = 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau : 0 < \tau < 1$ will be determined later. (2.24-1)-(2.24-2) implies that h_m, l_m are increasing. A simple computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K_2^m} &= \frac{p_{21}}{K_1^{m-1}} + \frac{p_{22}}{K_2^{m-1}} - l_m, \\ \frac{1}{K_1^m} &= \frac{p_{11} + p_{12}p_{21}}{K_1^{m-1}} + \frac{p_{12}p_{22}}{K_2^{m-1}} - p_{12}l_m - h_m, \\ & m = 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned}$$

from which we can deduce that

$$\frac{1}{K_1^m} > \frac{1}{K_1}, \quad \frac{1}{K_2^m} > \frac{1}{K_2}, \quad m = 2, 3, \dots$$

if

$$\frac{1}{K_1^1} > \frac{1}{K_1}, \quad \frac{1}{K_2^1} > \frac{1}{K_2}.$$

A small perturbation of the definition of K_1^1, K_2^1 with respect to $\tau = 1$ gives the above inequalities for $\tau : \tau < 1$ close enough to 1. Since $K_1^m, K_2^m > 0$ and h_m, l_m are increasing, from the definition, we know that K_1^m, K_2^m are also increasing. Furthermore, $K_1^m \rightarrow K_1, K_2^m \rightarrow K_2$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Interpolating between (2.22-1) and (2.23-1), (2.22-2) and (2.23-2), we have

$$\frac{p_{11}}{K_1^{m-1}} + \frac{p_{12}}{K_2^m} + \frac{p_{13}}{k} - \frac{1}{K_1^m} < \frac{1}{p'_c}, \quad (2.25-1)$$

$$\frac{p_{21}}{K_1^{m-1}} + \frac{p_{22}}{K_2^{m-1}} + \frac{p_{23}}{k} - \frac{1}{K_2^m} < \frac{1}{p'_c}, \quad (2.25-2)$$

for all $m \geq 1$. Similar to Lemma 2.7 (1), we also assume that

$$\frac{r_1}{K_1^{m-1}} - \frac{1}{K_1^m} < \frac{1}{p'_c},$$

$$\frac{r_2}{K_2^{m-1}} - \frac{1}{K_2^m} < \frac{1}{p'_c},$$

for all $m \geq 1$.

Set

$$\frac{1}{\rho_m} = \frac{p_{11}}{K_1^{m-1}} + \frac{p_{12}}{K_2^m} + \frac{p_{13}}{k} < 1, \quad \frac{1}{\varrho_m} = \frac{r_1}{K_1^{m-1}} < 1,$$

$$\frac{1}{\mu_m} = \frac{p_{21}}{K_1^{m-1}} + \frac{p_{22}}{K_2^{m-1}} + \frac{p_{23}}{k} < 1, \quad \frac{1}{\nu_m} = \frac{r_2}{K_2^{m-1}} < 1.$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{\rho_m} > \frac{p_{11}}{k_1^*} + \frac{p_{12}}{k_2^*} + \frac{p_{13}}{p_c} > \frac{1}{p'_c}, \quad \frac{1}{\mu_m} > \frac{p_{21}}{k_1^*} + \frac{p_{22}}{k_2^*} + \frac{p_{23}}{p_c} > \frac{1}{p'_c}.$$

So $\rho_m \wedge \varrho_m < p'_c < \theta$ and $\mu_m \wedge \nu_m < p'_c < \theta$. Then $|h|_{\mu_m \wedge \nu_m}, |h|_{\rho_m \wedge \varrho_m} \leq C|h|_\theta \leq C$ for all $m \geq 0$.

We already have $|u_1|_{k_1} \leq C$ from Lemma 2.7 and $|u_2|_k \leq C$, $|u_3|_k \leq C$ from (2.8). If we have got $|u_1|_{K_1^m} \leq C$ and $|u_2|_{K_2^m} \leq C$ for some $m \geq 0$, applying Proposition 2.1-2.3, using (2.25-2) and the second equation of system (1.1), a similar argument as (2.13) ($i = 2$) yields that $|u_2|_{K_2^{m+1}} \leq C$ and, using (2.25-1) and the first equation, we obtain $|u_1|_{K_1^{m+1}} \leq C$. So, for any integer $m \geq 0$, there holds $|u_1|_{K_1^m} \leq C$ and $|u_2|_{K_2^m} \leq C$. Noting $K_1^m \rightarrow K_1$ and $K_2^m \rightarrow K_2$, (1) is proved for $0 < k_1^*, k_2^* < \infty$.

If $k_1^* = \infty$ or $k_2^* = \infty$, the above proof is valid for any K_1 or K_2 sufficient large.

(2) If k_1^* is negative, we necessarily have

$$(1 - p_{22})p_{13} + p_{12}p_{23} < \frac{p_c}{p'_c}(1 - p_{22} + p_{12}). \quad (2.26)$$

If k_2^* is negative, we necessarily have

$$p_{21}p_{13} + (1 - p_{11})p_{23} < \frac{p_c}{p'_c}(1 - p_{11} + p_{21}). \quad (2.27)$$

Without loss of generality, we assume k_1^* is negative. From (2.26), there are three possibilities: $p_{13} < p_c/p'_c$, $p_{13} > p_c/p'_c$ or $p_{13} = p_c/p'_c$.

Case I. $p_{13} < p_c/p'_c$. Let K_2^* be the positive solution of

$$\frac{p_{12}}{K_2^*} + \frac{p_{13}}{p_c} = \frac{1}{p'_c}.$$

Since $p_{12} + p_{13} > p_c/p'_c$, we have $K_2^* > p_c$. The inequality

$$\frac{p_{22}}{K_2^*} + \frac{p_{23}}{p_c} - \frac{1}{K_2^*} < \frac{1}{p'_c}$$

is equivalent to (2.26). So there exist $K_2 : K_2 > K_2^*$ sufficiently close to K_2^* and $k : r_1 \vee r_2 < k < p_c$ sufficiently close to p_c such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_{12}}{K_2} + \frac{p_{13}}{k} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \\ \frac{p_{22}}{K_2} + \frac{p_{23}}{k} - \frac{1}{K_2} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}. \end{aligned}$$

For such K_2 fixed, take K_1 large enough such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_{11}}{K_1} + \frac{p_{12}}{K_2} + \frac{p_{13}}{k} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \quad \frac{r_1}{K_1} < \frac{1}{p'_c} \\ \frac{p_{21}}{K_1} + \frac{p_{22}}{K_2} + \frac{p_{23}}{k} - \frac{1}{K_2} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}. \end{aligned}$$

So we also have (2.22-1)-(2.22-2).

Let (K_1^m, K_2^m) be as in (1). In order for (h_m, l_m) to be increasing, (2.24-1)-(2.24-2) should be satisfied for $K_1 = \infty$. In fact, when $k = p_c, k_1 = k^*, K_2 = K_2^*$, (2.24-1) is equivalent to the equation defining k^* and (2.24-2) is equivalent to $p_{12} + p_{13} > p_c/p'_c$. Then a small perturbation for these parameters will give the desired inequalities. Let $\rho_m, \varrho_m, \mu_m, \nu_m$ be as in (1). Since $K_1^m \rightarrow K_1$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, for m large enough, we have $\rho_m \wedge \varrho_m > p'_c$. Denote $m_0 = \min\{m : (\rho_m \wedge \varrho_m) \vee (\mu_m \wedge \nu_m) > p'_c\}$. We may assume that $\rho_{m_0} \wedge \varrho_{m_0} > p'_c$. We claim that after m_0 -th alternate bootstrap on the first two equations of system (1.1), we shall arrive at the desired result $|u_1|_\infty \leq C$. The argument is similar to Lemma 2.6.

Case II. $p_{13} > p_c/p'_c$. In this case we necessarily have $k_2^* < 0$, i.e., (2.27) is satisfied, since $p_{12}p_{21} < (1 - p_{11})(1 - p_{22})$. Let $K_1^* : K_1^* > k^*$ be the positive solution of

$$\frac{p_{13}}{p_c} - \frac{1 - p_{11}}{K_1^*} = \frac{1}{p'_c}.$$

The inequality

$$\frac{p_{21}}{K_1^*} + \frac{p_{23}}{p_c} < \frac{1}{p'_c}$$

is equivalent to (2.27). So there exist $K_1 : K_1 < K_1^*$ sufficiently close to K_1^* and $k : r_1 \vee r_2 < k < p_c$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_{11}}{K_1} + \frac{p_{13}}{k} - \frac{1}{K_1} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \\ \frac{p_{21}}{K_1} + \frac{p_{23}}{k} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}. \end{aligned}$$

For such K_1 fixed, take K_2 large enough such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_{11}}{K_1} + \frac{p_{12}}{K_2} + \frac{p_{13}}{k} - \frac{1}{K_1} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \\ \frac{p_{21}}{K_1} + \frac{p_{22}}{K_2} + \frac{p_{23}}{k} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \quad \frac{r_2}{K_2} < \frac{1}{p'_c}. \end{aligned}$$

So we also have (2.22-1)-(2.22-2).

Let (K_1^m, K_2^m) be as in (1). In order for (h_m, l_m) to be increasing, (2.24-1)-(2.24-2) should be satisfied for $K_2 = \infty$. In fact, when $k = p_c, k_1 = k^*, K_1 = K_1^*$, (2.24-1) is also equivalent to the equation defining k^* and (2.24-2) is equivalent to $p_{12}p_{21} < (1 - p_{11})(1 - p_{22})$. Then a

small perturbation for these parameters will give the desired inequalities. Let $\rho_m, \varrho_m, \mu_m, \nu_m$ be as in (1). Since $K_2^m \rightarrow K_2$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, for m large enough, we have $\mu_m \wedge \nu_m > p'_c$. Denote $m_0 = \min\{m : (\rho_m \wedge \varrho_m) \vee (\mu_m \wedge \nu_m) > p'_c\}$. We may assume that $\mu_{m_0} \wedge \nu_{m_0} > p'_c$. We claim that after m_0 -th alternate bootstrap on the first two equations of system (1.1), we shall arrive at the desired result $|u_2|_\infty \leq C$. The argument is similar to Lemma 2.6.

Case III. $p_{13} = p_c/p'_c$. The proof is similar to Case II. The difference is that we can take K_1 to be arbitrary large. \square

Lemma 2.7 and Lemma 2.8 in hand, we can prove Theorem 2.4 for $n = 3$.

Proof of Theorem 2.4 for $n = 3$.

Case I. k^* or k_1^* or k_2^* is negative. From Lemma 2.7 and 2.8, we know that $|u_1|_\infty \leq C$ or $|u_2|_\infty \leq C$. We assume that $|u_1|_\infty \leq C$. Then f_2, f_3 satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} |f_2| &\leq C(|u_2|^{p_{22}}|u_3|^{p_{23}} + |u_2|^{r_2}) + h(x), \\ |f_3| &\leq C(|u_2|^{p_{23}}|u_3|^{p_{33}} + |u_3|^{r_3}) + h(x), \end{aligned} \quad u, v \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \Omega,$$

We consider the system formed by the second and third equations of system (1.1). According to (1.6), there hold $p_{22} < 1, p_{33} < 1$ and $p_{23}p_{32} < (1 - p_{22})(1 - p_{33})$. From [L, Theorem 2.7], we obtain $|u_2|_\infty \leq C$ and $|u_3|_\infty \leq C$.

Case II. k^*, k_1^*, k_2^* is nonnegative, and one of them is ∞ . From Lemma 2.7 and 2.8, we know that $|u_1|_{k_1} \leq C$ or $|u_2|_{k_2} \leq C$ for all $1 \leq k_1, k_2 < \infty$. We assume that $|u_1|_{k_1} \leq C$ for all $1 \leq k_1, k_2 < \infty$. Noting that $p_{21}/k_1, p_{31}/k_1 \ll 1$ for sufficiently large k_1 , from the proof of [L, Theorem 2.7], we also obtain $|u_2|_\infty \leq C$ and $|u_3|_\infty \leq C$. Then a simple bootstrap argument on the first equation gives $|u_1|_\infty \leq C$.

Case III. k^*, k_1^*, k_2^* are all positive. A careful computation yields that (2.14) is equivalent to

$$\frac{p_{31}}{k_1^*} + \frac{p_{32}}{k_2^*} + \frac{p_{33}}{p_c} < 1, \quad (2.28)$$

Combining with the definition of k_1^*, k_2^* , there exist $k_1 : r_1 < k_1 < k_1^*, k_2 : r_2 < k_2 < k_2^*, k_3 : r_3 < k_3 < p_c$ and $\eta > 1$ close to 1 such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_{11}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{12}}{\eta k_2} + \frac{p_{13}}{\eta k_3} - \frac{1}{\eta k_1} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \quad \frac{r_1}{k_1} - \frac{1}{\eta k_1} < \frac{1}{p'_c}, \\ \frac{p_{21}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{22}}{k_2} + \frac{p_{23}}{\eta k_3} - \frac{1}{\eta k_2} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \quad \frac{r_2}{k_2} - \frac{1}{\eta k_2} < \frac{1}{p'_c}, \\ \frac{p_{31}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{32}}{k_2} + \frac{p_{33}}{k_3} - \frac{1}{\eta k_3} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \quad \frac{r_3}{k_3} - \frac{1}{\eta k_3} < \frac{1}{p'_c}, \\ \frac{p_{31}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{32}}{k_2} + \frac{p_{33}}{k_3} &< 1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.29)$$

Multiplying LHS of the above inequalities by $1/\eta^m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_{11}}{\eta^m k_1} + \frac{p_{12}}{\eta^{m+1} k_2} + \frac{p_{13}}{\eta^{m+1} k_3} - \frac{1}{\eta^{m+1} k_1} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \\ \frac{r_1}{\eta^m k_1} - \frac{1}{\eta^{m+1} k_1} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.30-1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_{21}}{\eta^m k_1} + \frac{p_{22}}{\eta^m k_2} + \frac{p_{23}}{\eta^{m+1} k_3} - \frac{1}{\eta^{m+1} k_2} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \\ \frac{r_2}{\eta^m k_2} - \frac{1}{\eta^{m+1} k_2} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.30-2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_{31}}{\eta^m k_1} + \frac{p_{32}}{\eta^m k_2} + \frac{p_{33}}{\eta^m k_3} - \frac{1}{\eta^{m+1} k_3} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \\ \frac{r_3}{\eta^m k_3} - \frac{1}{\eta^{m+1} k_3} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.30-3)$$

for all integer $m \geq 0$.

Set

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\zeta_m} = \frac{p_{11}}{\eta^m k_1} + \frac{p_{12}}{\eta^{m+1} k_2} + \frac{p_{13}}{\eta^{m+1} k_3} &< 1, \quad \frac{1}{\xi_m} = \frac{r_1}{\eta^m k_1} < 1, \\ \frac{1}{\mu_m} = \frac{p_{21}}{\eta^m k_1} + \frac{p_{22}}{\eta^m k_2} + \frac{p_{23}}{\eta^{m+1} k_3} &< 1, \quad \frac{1}{\nu_m} = \frac{r_2}{\eta^m k_2} < 1, \\ \frac{1}{\rho_m} = \frac{p_{31}}{\eta^m k_1} + \frac{p_{32}}{\eta^m k_2} + \frac{p_{33}}{\eta^m k_3} &< 1, \quad \frac{1}{\varrho_m} = \frac{r_3}{\eta^m k_3} < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\eta > 1$, for m large enough, we have $\zeta_m \wedge \xi_m > p'_c$, $\mu_m \wedge \nu_m > p'_c$ and $\rho_m \wedge \varrho_m > p'_c$. Denote $m_0 = \min\{m : (\zeta_m \wedge \xi_m) \vee (\mu_m \wedge \nu_m) \vee (\rho_m \wedge \varrho_m) > p'_c\}$. We may assume that $\rho_{m_0} \wedge \varrho_{m_0} > p'_c$. We claim that after m_0 -th alternate bootstrap on system (1.1), we shall arrive at the desired result $|u_3|_\infty \leq C$. The argument is similar to Lemma 2.6, we omit it. Then Theorem 2.4 follows from a similar argument in Case I. \square

Remark 2.3. Theorem 2.4 can be extended to the case where $|I - P| \geq 0$. In this case $\max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3\} > 1/(p_c - 1)$ in (2.7) should be replaced by $-|I - P| < (p_c - 1) \max\{\Lambda^1, \Lambda^2, \Lambda^3\}$, which is automatically satisfied since $\Lambda^1, \Lambda^2, \Lambda^3 > 0$. Noting that (2.28) is equivalent to this condition, the proof is word by word the same as the proof of Theorem 2.4.

3. THE BOOTSTRAP PROCEDURE FOR SYSTEM WITH $n(n \geq 4)$ COMPONENTS

According to Lemma 2.5, we may assume that α_n is the largest. We first prove a lemma which asserts that the bootstrap on one equation by one equation is possible. For $2 \leq r \leq n$, set

$$Q_r = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - p_{11} & -p_{12} & \cdots & -p_{1,r-1} & -\sum_{j=r}^n p_{1j} \\ -p_{21} & 1 - p_{22} & \cdots & -p_{2,r-1} & -\sum_{j=r}^n p_{2j} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ -p_{r,1} & -p_{r,2} & \cdots & -p_{r,r-1} & 1 - \sum_{j=r}^n p_{rj} \end{pmatrix}_{r \times r}$$

Let Λ_r^j be the determinant of the matrix Q_r whose j -column is replaced by $\mathbf{1}$.

Lemma 3.1. *Without loss of generality, assume that for all $2 \leq r \leq n$,*

$$\Lambda_r^j \leq \Lambda_r^r, \quad 1 \leq j \leq r-1. \quad (3.1)$$

Then

$$\frac{-|Q_2|}{\Lambda_2^2} \leq \dots \leq \frac{-|Q_r|}{\Lambda_r^r} \leq \dots \leq \frac{-|Q_n|}{\Lambda_n^n} = \frac{1}{\alpha_n} < p_c - 1. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. We only prove

$$\frac{-|Q_{n-1}|}{\Lambda_{n-1}^{n-1}} \leq \frac{-|Q_n|}{\Lambda_n^n}.$$

According to Cramer's law, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - p_{11})\Lambda_n^1 - p_{12}\Lambda_n^2 - \dots - p_{1n}\Lambda_n^n &= |Q_n| \\ -p_{21}\Lambda_n^1 + (1 - p_{22})\Lambda_n^2 - \dots - p_{2n}\Lambda_n^n &= |Q_n| \\ \dots & \\ -p_{n-1,1}\Lambda_n^1 - p_{n-1,2}\Lambda_n^2 - \dots - p_{n-1,n}\Lambda_n^n &= |Q_n|. \end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned} -|Q_n| &= \frac{\begin{vmatrix} 1 - p_{11} & \dots & -p_{1,n-2} & p_{1,n-1}\Lambda_n^{n-1} + p_{1,n}\Lambda_n^n \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ -p_{n-1,1} & \dots & -p_{n-1,n-2} & (p_{n-1,n-1} - 1)\Lambda_n^{n-1} + p_{n-1,n}\Lambda_n^n \end{vmatrix}}{\begin{vmatrix} 1 - p_{11} & \dots & -p_{1,n-2} & 1 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & 1 \\ -p_{n-1,1} & \dots & -p_{n-1,n-2} & 1 \end{vmatrix}} \\ &\geq \frac{\Lambda_n^n \begin{vmatrix} 1 - p_{11} & \dots & -p_{1,n-2} & p_{1,n-1} + p_{1,n} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ -p_{n-1,1} & \dots & -p_{n-1,n-2} & (p_{n-1,n-1} - 1) + p_{n-1,n} \end{vmatrix}}{\begin{vmatrix} 1 - p_{11} & \dots & -p_{1,n-2} & 1 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & 1 \\ -p_{n-1,1} & \dots & -p_{n-1,n-2} & 1 \end{vmatrix}} \\ &= \frac{-|Q_{n-1}|}{\Lambda_{n-1}^{n-1}} \Lambda_n^n, \end{aligned}$$

since the coefficient of Λ_n^{n-1} is negative. The proof of other inequalities is similar. If (3.1) is not satisfied, we have other line of the inequalities. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Let $1 \leq r \leq n-1$ and, let $(I - P)_{r \times r}$ be the principal sub-matrix of rank = r formed by first r rows and first r columns. Denote

$$B_r = \left(\frac{1}{p'_c} - \frac{\sum_{j=r+1}^n p_{1j}}{p_c}, \frac{1}{p'_c} - \frac{\sum_{j=r+1}^n p_{2j}}{p_c}, \dots, \frac{1}{p'_c} - \frac{\sum_{j=r+1}^n p_{rj}}{p_c} \right)^T.$$

Let $X_r = (k_{r1}^*, k_{r2}^*, \dots, k_{rr}^*)^T$ be the solution of the following linear system

$$(I - P)_{r \times r} X_r = B_r. \quad (3.3)$$

Case I. k_{11}^* , the solution of

$$\frac{p_{11}}{k_{11}^*} + \frac{\sum_{i=2}^n p_{1i}}{p_c} - \frac{1}{k_{11}^*} = \frac{1}{p'_c},$$

is negative. Similar to Lemma 2.7 (3), we can prove that $\|u_1\|_\infty \leq C$. From (1.6), the matrix $(I - P)_1$, which is $I - P$ without first row and first column, is a nonsingular M -matrix. According to Remark 2.3, we can assume that Theorem 2.4 holds for system (1.1) with $n - 1$ components if $|I - P| > 0$, where P is its exponent matrix. Therefore Theorem 2.4 holds for system (1.1) with n components by the induction method.

Case II. $k_{11}^* = \infty$. Similar to Lemma 2.8 (2), it can be proved that $\|u_1\|_{k_1} \leq C$ for all $1 \leq k_1 < \infty$. Noting $p_{i1}/k_1 \ll 1$ ($i \neq 1$) for k_{11} large enough, a similar argument as in Case I yields Theorem 2.4.

Case III. There exists $r_0 : 2 \leq r_0 \leq n - 1$ such that $k_{r_0,s}^* < 0$ for some $1 \leq s \leq r_0$ and, $0 < k_{r,s}^* < \infty$ for all $r < r_0$. Similar to Lemma 2.7 (3), it is can be proved that $\|u_1\|_{k_1} \leq C$ for all $1 \leq k_1 < k_{11}^*$. Using this result and $-|Q_2|/\Lambda_2^2 < p_c - 1$, the first inequality of (3.2), similar to Lemma 2.8 (1), it is can be proved that $\|u_1\|_{k_1} \leq C$ for $1 \leq k_1 < k_{21}^*$ and $\|u_2\|_{k_2} \leq C$ for $1 \leq k_2 < k_{22}^*$. Step by step, using the inequality (3.2) and the previous result, similar to Lemma 2.8, we can prove that $\|u_i\|_{k_i} \leq C$ for $1 \leq k_i < k_{r_0-1,i}^*$, $1 \leq i \leq r_0 - 1$. Using this result and the r_0 -th inequality of (3.2), similar to Lemma 2.8 (2), it is can be proved that there exists $i_0 : 1 \leq i_0 \leq r_0$ such that $\|u_{i_0}\|_\infty \leq C$. A similar argument as in Case I yields Theorem 2.4 by the induction method.

Case IV. There exists $r_0 : 2 \leq r_0 \leq n - 1$ such that $k_{r_0,s}^* > 0$ for all $1 \leq s \leq r_0$, $k_{r_0,s}^* = \infty$ for some $1 \leq s \leq r_0$ and, $0 < k_{r,s}^* < \infty$ for all $r < r_0$. Using the inequality (3.2), by similar arguments as in Case III and Lemma 2.8 (1), it can be proved that there exists $i_0 : 1 \leq i_0 \leq r_0$ such that $|u_{i_0}|_{k_{i_0}} \leq C$ for all $1 \leq k_{i_0} < \infty$. Noting $p_{i,i_0}/k_{i_0} \ll 1$ ($i \neq i_0$) for k_{i_0} large enough, a similar argument as in Case I yields Theorem 2.4 by the induction method.

Case V. $0 < k_{rs}^* < \infty$ for all $1 \leq r \leq n - 1, 1 \leq s \leq r$. Using the inequality (3.2), by similar arguments as in Case III and Lemma 2.8 (1), it can be proved that for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$, $|u_i|_{k_i} \leq C$ for any $1 \leq k_i < k_{ni}^*$. From (3.3) with $r = n - 1$, there exist $k_1 : p_c < k_1 < k_1^*$, $k_2 : p_c < k_2 < k_2^*, \dots, k_{n-1} : p_c < k_{n-1} < k_{n-1}^*, k_n : r_n < k_n < p_c$ and $\eta > 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{p_{11}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{12}}{\eta k_2} + \frac{p_{13}}{\eta k_3} + \dots + \frac{p_{1n}}{\eta k_n} - \frac{1}{\eta k_1} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, & \frac{r_1}{k_1} - \frac{1}{\eta k_1} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \\
\frac{p_{21}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{22}}{k_2} + \frac{p_{23}}{\eta k_3} + \dots + \frac{p_{2n}}{\eta k_n} - \frac{1}{\eta k_2} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, & \frac{r_2}{k_2} - \frac{1}{\eta k_2} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \\
\frac{p_{31}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{32}}{k_2} + \frac{p_{33}}{k_3} + \dots + \frac{p_{3n}}{\eta k_n} - \frac{1}{\eta k_3} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, & \frac{r_3}{k_3} - \frac{1}{\eta k_3} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \\
&&&& \vdots \\
\frac{p_{n1}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{n2}}{k_2} + \frac{p_{n3}}{k_3} + \dots + \frac{p_{nn}}{k_n} - \frac{1}{\eta k_n} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, & \frac{r_n}{k_n} - \frac{1}{\eta k_n} &< \frac{1}{p'_c}, \\
&& \frac{p_{n1}}{k_1} + \frac{p_{n2}}{k_2} + \frac{p_{n3}}{k_3} + \dots + \frac{p_{nn}}{k_n} &< 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

In fact, the last inequality with $k_i = k_{ni}^*$ ($1 \leq i \leq n - 1$) and $k_n = p_c$ is equivalent to $\alpha_n > p_c - 1$. So it is just a small perturbation with respect to k_{ni}^* . The rest inequalities are small perturbations of system (3.3). Multiplying LHS of the above inequalities by $1/\eta^m$,

we have

$$\frac{p_{11}}{\eta^m k_1} + \frac{p_{12}}{\eta^{m+1} k_2} + \frac{p_{13}}{\eta^{m+1} k_3} + \cdots + \frac{p_{1n}}{\eta^{m+1} k_n} - \frac{1}{\eta^{m+1} k_1} < \frac{1}{p'_c},$$

$$\frac{r_1}{\eta^m k_1} - \frac{1}{\eta^{m+1} k_1} < \frac{1}{p'_c},$$
(3.5-1)

$$\frac{p_{21}}{\eta^m k_1} + \frac{p_{22}}{\eta^m k_2} + \frac{p_{23}}{\eta^{m+1} k_3} + \cdots + \frac{p_{2n}}{\eta^{m+1} k_n} - \frac{1}{\eta^{m+1} k_2} < \frac{1}{p'_c},$$

$$\frac{r_2}{\eta^m k_2} - \frac{1}{\eta^{m+1} k_2} < \frac{1}{p'_c},$$
(3.5-2)

$$\frac{p_{31}}{\eta^m k_1} + \frac{p_{32}}{\eta^m k_2} + \frac{p_{33}}{\eta^m k_3} + \cdots + \frac{p_{3n}}{\eta^{m+1} k_n} - \frac{1}{\eta^{m+1} k_3} < \frac{1}{p'_c},$$

$$\frac{r_3}{\eta^m k_3} - \frac{1}{\eta^{m+1} k_3} < \frac{1}{p'_c},$$
(3.5-3)

$$\vdots$$

$$\frac{p_{n1}}{\eta^m k_1} + \frac{p_{n2}}{\eta^m k_2} + \frac{p_{n3}}{\eta^m k_3} + \cdots + \frac{p_{nn}}{\eta^m k_n} - \frac{1}{\eta^{m+1} k_n} < \frac{1}{p'_c},$$

$$\frac{r_n}{\eta^m k_n} - \frac{1}{\eta^{m+1} k_n} < \frac{1}{p'_c},$$
(3.5-4)

for all integer $m \geq 0$.

Set

$$\frac{1}{\rho_m^i} = \frac{p_{i1}}{\eta^m k_1} + \cdots + \frac{p_{ii}}{\eta^m k_i} + \frac{p_{i,i+1}}{\eta^{m+1} k_{i+1}} + \cdots + \frac{p_{in}}{\eta^{m+1} k_n} < 1, \quad \frac{1}{\varrho_m^i} = \frac{r_i}{\eta^m k_i} < 1.$$

Since $\eta > 1$, for m large enough, we have $\rho_m^i \wedge \varrho_m^i > p'_c$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Denote $m_0 = \min\{m : \max\{\rho_m^i \wedge \varrho_m^i : 1 \leq i \leq n\} > p'_c\}$. We may assume that $\rho_{m_0}^n \wedge \varrho_{m_0}^n > p'_c$. We claim that after m_0 -th alternate bootstrap on system (1.1), we shall arrive at the desired result $|u_n|_\infty \leq C$. The argument is similar to Lemma 2.6, we omit it. Then a similar argument as in Case I yields Theorem 2.4. \square

4. L^∞ -REGULARITY

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1-1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.1

(i) If $d = 1, 2$, the L^∞ -regularity of H_0^1 -solutions follows directly from the Sobolev imbedding theorem and Proposition 2.1. If $d \geq 3$, since $\mathbf{u} \in [H_0^1(\Omega)]^n$, we have (2.8) from the Sobolev imbedding theorem. Then the L^∞ -regularity follows from Theorem 2.4 with $p_c = (d+2)/(d-2)$ and $B^1 = L^{2^*}(\Omega)$ according to (1.7).

(ii) Let $u_i = c_i(|x|^{-2\alpha_i} - 1)$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$), where c_i are determined by $\prod_{j=1}^n c_j^{p_{ij}} = 2c_i \alpha_i (d - 2 - 2\alpha_i)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Since $\alpha_i < (d-2)/4 < (d-2)/2$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$), we have $c_i > 0$. Obviously, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$

$$-\Delta u_i = 2c_i \alpha_i (d - 2 - 2\alpha_i) |x|^{-2\alpha_i - 2} = \prod_{j=1}^n c_j^{p_{ij}} |x|^{-2 \sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij} \alpha_j} = \prod_{j=1}^n (u_j + c_j)^{p_{ij}}.$$

It is easy to verify that \mathbf{u} is an H_0^1 -solution of system (1.1) in B_1 with $f_i = \prod_{j=1}^n (u_j + c_j)^{p_{ij}}$.
 \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2

(i) If $d = 1, 2$, the L^∞ -regularity of L^1 -solutions follows directly from Proposition 2.1. If $d \geq 3$, since $\mathbf{f}(\cdot, \mathbf{u}) \in [L^1(\Omega)]^n$, we have (2.8) from Proposition 2.1. Then the L^∞ -regularity follows from Theorem 2.4 with $p_c = d/(d-2)$ and $B^1 = L^1(\Omega)$ according to (1.9).

(ii) Since $\alpha_i < (d-2)/2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, \mathbf{u} constructed in the proof of Theorem 1.1 (ii) is also a L^1 -solution of system (1.1) in B_1 with $f_i = \prod_{j=1}^n (u_j + c_j)^{p_{ij}}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3

(i) If $d = 1$, the L^∞ -regularity of L_δ^1 -solutions follows directly from Proposition 2.3. If $d \geq 2$, we have (2.8) since $\mathbf{f}(\cdot, \mathbf{u}) \in [L_\delta^1(\Omega)]^n$ from Proposition 2.3. Then the L^∞ -regularity follows from Theorem 2.4 with $p_c = (d+1)/(d-1)$ and $B^1 = L_\delta^1(\Omega)$ according to (1.11).

(ii) Assume that $0 \in \partial\Omega$. Let $-1 < \theta < (d-1)/2$. Let Σ_1 be a revolution cone of vertex zero and $\Sigma := \Sigma_1 \cap B_R \in \Omega$ for sufficiently small $R > 0$. Then $\phi = |x|^{-2(\theta+1)} \mathbf{1}_\Sigma \in L_\delta^1(\Omega)$ and according to [S, Lemma 5.1], the solution $U > 0$ of (2.2) satisfies $U \geq C|x|^{-2\theta} \mathbf{1}_\Sigma$. Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)^T$ be the solution of the linear system

$$(I - P)\alpha = -\mathbf{1}.$$

By assumption (1.12), we have $0 < \alpha_i < (d-1)/2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Set $\phi_i = |x|^{-2(\alpha_i+1)} \mathbf{1}_\Sigma$, and $u_i > 0$ be the corresponding solutions of (2.2). We have $u_i \notin L^\infty$, and

$$\prod_{j=1}^n u_j^{p_{ij}} \geq C_i |x|^{-2(\sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij} \alpha_j)} \mathbf{1}_\Sigma = C |x|^{-2(\alpha_i+1)} \mathbf{1}_\Sigma = C_i \phi_i.$$

Setting $a_i(x) = \phi_i / (\prod_{j=1}^n u_j^{p_{ij}}) \geq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, we get

$$-\Delta u_i = \phi_i = a_i(x) \prod_{j=1}^n u_j^{p_{ij}}, \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

and $a_i(x) \leq 1/C_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$; hence $a_i \in L^\infty$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. \square

5. A PRIORI ESTIMATES OF L_δ^1 -SOLUTIONS AND EXISTENCE THEOREMS

In order to prove Theorem 1.4, we recall a special property of the L_δ^1 -solutions, which is a consequence of Proposition 2.3, see [QS, Proposition 2.2, 2.3].

Proposition 5.1. *Let \mathbf{u} be the L_δ^1 -solution of system (1.1) with \mathbf{f} satisfying (1.14) and let $1 \leq k < p_{BT}$. Then $\mathbf{u} \in [L_\delta^k(\Omega)]^n$ and satisfies the estimate $\sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|_{L_\delta^k} \leq C(\Omega, k, C_2) \sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|_{L_\delta^1}$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of [QS, Proposition 2.2]. Let $\varphi_1(x)$ be the first eigenfunction of $-\Delta$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Recall that

$$c_1 \delta(x) \leq \varphi_1(x) \leq c_2 \delta(x), \quad x \in \Omega,$$

for some $c_1, c_2 > 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^n |f_i| \varphi_1 &= \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^n |\Delta u_i| \varphi_1 = 2 \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^n ((\Delta u_i)_+) \varphi_1 - \int_{\Omega} \varphi_1 \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta u_i \\
&\leq 2 \int_{\Omega} (C_2 \sum_{i=1}^n u_{i+} + h_+) \varphi_1 + \lambda_1 \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \varphi_1 \\
&\leq C(\Omega, C_2) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|u_{i+}\|_{L_{\delta}^1} + \|h_+\|_{L_{\delta}^1} \right) \\
&\leq C(\Omega, C_2) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|_{L_{\delta}^1} + \|h\|_{L_{\delta}^1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 2.3 with $m = 1$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|_{L_{\delta}^k} \leq C(\Omega, k, C_2) \sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|_{L_{\delta}^1}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.4.

Since \mathbf{f} satisfies (1.14), from Proposition 5.1, (2.8) can be deduced by (1.16). So this theorem follows immediately from Theorem 2.4 with $p_c = (d+1)/(d-1)$ and $B^1 = L_{\delta}^1(\Omega)$ according to (1.11). □

From Theorem 1.4, in order to obtain the a priori estimate (1.15), we only have to obtain, for all L_{δ}^1 -solutions \mathbf{u} of system (1.1), $\sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|_{L_{\delta}^1} \leq M$ for some M independent of \mathbf{u} . In the following we give some propositions which assert the a priori estimate (1.15).

Proposition 5.2. [QS, Proposition 3.1] *If \mathbf{f} satisfies (1.17) with $\lambda > \lambda_1$, then any nonnegative L_{δ}^1 -solution of system (1.1) satisfies (1.16) with M independent of \mathbf{u} .*

The following proposition gives the uniform L_{δ}^1 -estimates of the L_{δ}^1 -solutions of system (1.19).

Proposition 5.3. *Any nonnegative L_{δ}^1 -solution \mathbf{u} of system (1.19) satisfies (1.16) with M independent of \mathbf{u} .*

Proof. We use the idea of [S, Proposition 4.1]. Denote $G(x, y)$, $V(x, y)$ the Green functions in Ω for $-\Delta$ and $-\Delta + q(x)$. If $\inf\{\text{spec}(-\Delta + q)\} > 0$, by [Zhao, Theorem 8], there exists a positive constant $C = C(\Omega, q)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{C}G(x, y) \leq V(x, y) \leq CG(x, y).$$

By [BC, Lemma 3.2], we know that

$$G(x, y) \geq C\delta(x)\delta(y) \quad \text{for } x, y \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

So we also have

$$V(x, y) \geq C\delta(x)\delta(y) \quad \text{for } x, y \in \overline{\Omega},$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Denote $\varphi_q(x)$ the first eigenfunction of $-\Delta + q(x)$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and λ_q the first eigenvalue. Recall that

$$c_1\delta(x) \leq \varphi_q(x) \leq c_2\delta(x), \quad x \in \Omega,$$

for some $c_1, c_2 > 0$. Let w be the solution of the linear equation

$$-\Delta w + q(x)w = \phi(x), \quad x \in \Omega; \quad w = 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega.$$

If $\phi \in L_\delta^1$ is nonnegative, then we have

$$w = \int_\Omega V(x, y)\phi(x) \geq C \left(\int_\Omega \phi\delta \right) \delta \geq C \left(\int_\Omega \phi\varphi_q \right) \varphi_q$$

with C depending only on $\Omega, q(x)$. Let \mathbf{u} be a nonnegative weak solution of system (1.1). Set

$$A_i = \int_\Omega a_i(x) \prod_{j=1}^n u_j^{p_{ij}} \varphi_{b_i}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Then we have

$$u_i \geq CA_i \varphi_{b_i}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Therefore we obtain

$$A_i \geq C \left(\int_\Omega a \varphi_{b_i} \prod_{j=1}^n \varphi_{b_j}^{p_{ij}} \right) \prod_{j=1}^n A_j^{p_{ij}} \geq C \prod_{j=1}^n A_j^{p_{ij}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Denote $A = (\ln A_1, \ln A_2, \dots, \ln A_n)^T$. We have

$$(I - P)A \geq B,$$

where $B = (C, C, \dots, C)^T$. Thanks to the assumption (1.6) as to $I - P$, the solution of the linear equation $(I - P)A = B$ has the property: If $B \leq 0$, then $A \geq 0$; If $B \geq 0$, then $A \leq 0$. So we obtain $\sum_{i=1}^n A_i \leq C$. Using φ_{b_i} as a testing function, we easily obtain $\sum_{i=1}^n \int_\Omega u_i \varphi_{b_i} = \sum_{i=1}^n A_i \leq C$. The proof is complete. \square

Now we can prove our existence theorems. The proof is standard, see [QS]. For the readers' convenience, we give the details.

Proof of Theorem 1.5.

(a) This is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.4 and Proposition 5.2.

(b) Let K be the positive cone in $X := [L^\infty(\Omega)]^n$ and let $S : X \rightarrow X : \phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) \mapsto \mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)$ be the solution operator of the linear problem

$$-\Delta \mathbf{u} = \phi, \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

Since any nonnegative solution of (1.1) is in L^∞ by part (a), the problem (1.1) is equivalent to the equation $\mathbf{u} = T(\mathbf{u})$, where $T : X \rightarrow X$ is a compact operator defined by $T(\mathbf{u}) = S(\mathbf{f}(\cdot, \mathbf{u}))$. Let $W \subset K$ be relatively open, $Tz \neq z$ for $z \in \overline{W} \setminus W$, and let $i_K(T, W)$ be the fixed point index of T with respect to W and K (see [AF] the definition and basic properties of this index).

If $W_\varepsilon = \{\mathbf{u} \in K : \|\mathbf{u}\|_X < \varepsilon\}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough, then (1.18) guarantees $H_1(\mu, \mathbf{u}) \neq \mathbf{u}$ for any $\mu \in [0, 1]$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \overline{W_\varepsilon} \setminus W_\varepsilon$, where

$$H_1(\mu, \mathbf{u}) = \mu T(\mathbf{u}) = S(\mu \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \mathbf{u})).$$

Therefore,

$$i_K(T, W_\varepsilon) = i_K(H_1(1, \cdot), W_\varepsilon) = i_K(H_1(0, \cdot), W_\varepsilon) = i_K(0, W_\varepsilon) = 1.$$

On the other hand, if $R > 0$ is large, then our a priori estimates guarantee $H_2(\mu, \mathbf{u}) \neq \mathbf{u}$ for any $\mu \in [0, \lambda_1]$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \overline{W_R} \setminus W_R$, where

$$H_2(\mu, \mathbf{u}) = S(\mathbf{f}(\cdot, \mathbf{u}) + \mu(\mathbf{u} + 1)).$$

Using φ_1 as a testing function we easily see that $H_2(\lambda_1, \mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u}$ does not possess nonnegative solutions, hence

$$i_K(T, W_R) = i_K(H_2(\lambda_1, \cdot), W_R) = 0.$$

Consequently, $i_K(T, W_R \setminus \overline{W_\varepsilon}) = -1$, which implies existence of a positive solution of (1.1). The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.6.

(a) This is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.4 and Proposition 5.3.

(b) Let K, X, W_ε be the same as in the proof of Theorem 1.5 (b), let S be the solution operator of the linear problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u_i + b_i(x)u_i &= \phi_i, \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_i &= 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \end{aligned}$$

Let us show that $H_1(\mu, \mathbf{u}) \neq \mathbf{u}$ for any $\mu \in [0, 1]$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \overline{W_\varepsilon} \setminus W_\varepsilon$, where

$$H_1(\mu, \mathbf{u}) = \mu T(\mathbf{u}) = S(\mu \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \mathbf{u})).$$

Assume by contrary $\mathbf{u} \in \overline{W_\varepsilon} \setminus W_\varepsilon$, $H_1(\mu, \mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u}$. Then $\mathbf{u} \neq 0$ and the standard L^z -estimates (with $z > N/2$) guarantee

$$\|u_i\|_\infty \leq C \prod_{j=1}^n \|u_j\|_\infty^{p_{ij}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Similar to the argument in the proof of Proposition 5.3, we have $\|\mathbf{u}\|_\infty > \varepsilon$ for ε small enough. Consequently,

$$i_K(T, W_\varepsilon) = i_K(H_1(1, \cdot), W_\varepsilon) = i_K(H_1(0, \cdot), W_\varepsilon) = i_K(0, W_\varepsilon) = 1.$$

On the other hand, if $R > 0$ is large, then our a priori estimates guarantee $H_2(\mu, \mathbf{u}) \neq \mathbf{u}$ for any $\mu \in [0, \lambda_{b_1}]$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \overline{W_R} \setminus W_R$, where

$$H_2(\mu, \mathbf{u}) = S(f_1(\cdot, \mathbf{u}) + \mu(u_1 + 1), f_2(\cdot, \mathbf{u}), \dots, f_n(\cdot, \mathbf{u})).$$

Using φ_{b_1} as a testing function we easily see that $H_2(\lambda_{b_1}, \mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u}$ does not possess nonnegative solutions, hence

$$i_K(T, W_R) = i_K(H_2(\lambda_{b_1}, \cdot), W_R) = 0.$$

Consequently, $i_K(T, W_R \setminus \overline{W_\varepsilon}) = -1$, which implies existence of a positive solution of (1.1). \square

Acknowledgements. Li Yuxiang is grateful to Professor Philippe Souplet for many helpful discussions and remarks during the preparation of this paper and, for his warm reception and many helps when Li visited the second address.

REFERENCES

- [A] Aviles, P., *On isolated singularities in some nonlinear partial differential equations*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **32** (1983), 773-791. MR0711867
- [AF] Alves, C.O. and de Figueiredo, D.G., *Nonvariational elliptic systems*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **8** (2002), 289-302. MR1897684
- [BC] Brézis, H. and Cabré, X., *Some simple nonlinear PDE's without solutions*, Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. Sez. B Artic. Ric. Mat. (8) **1** (1998), 223-262. MR1638143
- [BCMR] Brézis, H., Cazenave, T., Martel, Y. and Ramiandrisoa, A., *Blow up for $u_t - \Delta u = g(u)$ revisited*, Adv. Differential Equations **1** (1996), 73-90. MR1357955
- [BG] Bartscha, T. and Guo, Y., *Existence and nonexistence results for critical growth polyharmonic elliptic systems*, J. Differential Equations **220** (2006), 531-543.
- [BK] Brézis, H. and Kato, T., *Remarks on the Schrödinger operator with singular complex potentials*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **58** (1979), 137-151. MR0539217
- [BM] Birindelli, I. and Mitidieri, E., *Liouville theorems for elliptic inequalities and applications*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh **128A** (1998), 1217-1247. MR1664101
- [BuM] Busca, J. and Manasevich, R., *A Liouville-type theorem for Lane-Emden system*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **51** (2002), 37-51. MR1896155
- [BP] Berman, A. and Plemmons, R.J., *Nonnegative matrices in the mathematical sciences*, Academic Press, New York, London, 1979.
- [BT] Brézis, H. and Turner, R.E.L., *On a class of superlinear elliptic problems*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **2** (1977), 601-614. MR0509489
- [BV] Bidaut-Véron, M.-F. and Vivier, L., *An elliptic semilinear equation with source term involving boundary measures: the subcritical case*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **16** (2000), 477-513. MR1813326
- [C] Cosner, C., *Positive solutions for superlinear elliptic systems without variational structure*, Nonlinear Anal. **8** (1984), 1427-1436. MR0769404
- [CFM] Clement, Ph., de Figueiredo, D.G. and Mitidieri, E., *Positive solutions of semilinear elliptic systems*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **17** (1992), 923-940. MR1177298
- [CFM₂] Clement, Ph., de Figueiredo, D.G. and Mitidieri, E., *A priori estimates for positive solutions of semilinear elliptic systems via Hardy-Sobolev inequalities*, Pitman Res. Notes Math. **343** (1996), 73-91. MR1417272
- [CFMT] Clement, Ph., Fleckinger, J., Mitidieri, E. and de Thélin, F., *Existence of positive solutions for a nonvariational quasilinear elliptic system*, J. Differential Equations **166** (2000), 455-477. MR1781264
- [CMM] Clement, Ph., Manasevich, R. and Mitidieri, E., *Positive solutions for a quasilinear system via blow up*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **18** (1993), 2071-2106. MR1249135
- [CFS] Cuesta, M., de Figueiredo, D.G. and Srikanth, P.N., *On a resonant-superlinear elliptic problem*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **17** (2003), 221-233. MR1989831
- [DE] Dickstein, F. and Escobedo, M., *A maximum principle for semilinear parabolic systems and applications*, Nonlinear Anal. **45** (2001), 825-837. MR1845028
- [DMP] Del Pino, M., Musso, M. and Pacard, P., *Boundary singularities for weak solutions of semilinear elliptic problems*, J. Funct. Anal. **253** (2007), 241-272. MR2362423
- [F] de Figueiredo, D.G., *Semilinear elliptic systems*. Nonlinear Functional Analysis and Applications to Differential Equations, Trieste 1997, World Sci. Publishing, River Edge, N.J., 1998, pp. 122-152.
- [FF] de Figueiredo, D.G. and Felmer, P., *A Liouville-type theorem for elliptic systems*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) **21** (1994), 387-397. MR1310633
- [FLN] de Figueiredo, D.G., Lions, P.-L. and Nussbaum, R.D., *A priori estimates and existence of positive solutions of semilinear elliptic equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **61** (1982), 41-63. MR0664341
- [FSW] Fila, M., Souplet, Ph. and Weissler, F., *Linear and nonlinear heat equations in L^p_δ spaces and universal bounds for global solutions*, Math. Ann. **320** (2001), 87-113. MR1835063
- [FY] de Figueiredo, D.G. and Yang, J., *A priori bounds for positive solutions of a non-variational elliptic system*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **26** (2001), 2305-2321. MR1876419
- [Gi] Giaquinta, M., *Introduction to regularity theory for nonlinear elliptic systems*, Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1993.

- [Guo] Guo, Z.-M., *On the existence of positive solutions for a class of semilinear elliptic systems*, J. Partial Differential Equations **10** (1997), 193-212. MR1471113
- [GS] Gidas, B. and Spruck, J., *A priori bounds for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **6** (1981), 883-901. MR0619749
- [GW] Gu, Y.-G. and Wang, M.-X., *A semilinear parabolic system arising in the nuclear reactors*, Chinese Sci. Bull. **39** (1994), 1588-1592.
- [L] Li, Y.-X., *Optimal conditions for L^∞ -regularity and a priori estimates for elliptic systems, I: two components*, submitted.
- [LX] Li, Y.-X. and Xie, Ch.-H., *Quasilinear parabolic systems of several components*, Math. Ann. **327** (2003), 395-407. MR2015077
- [LLX] Li, Y.-X., Liu, Q.-L. and Xie, Ch.-H., *Semilinear reaction diffusion systems of several components*, J. Differential Equations **187** (2003), 510-519. MR1949453
- [Lions] Lions, P.L., *On the existence of positive solutions of semilinear elliptic equations*, SIAM Rev. **24** (1982), 441-467. MR0678562
- [Lou] Lou, Y., *Necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of positive solutions of certain cooperative system*, Nonlinear Anal. **26** (1996), 1079-1095. MR1375651
- [JL] Joseph, D.D. and Lundgren, T.S., *Quasilinear Dirichlet problems driven by positive sources*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **49** (1972/73), 241-269. MR0340701
- [M] Mitidieri, E., *Nonexistence of positive solutions of semilinear elliptic systems in R^N* , Differential Integral Equations **9** (1996), 465-479. MR1371702
- [MR] McKenna, P.J. and Reichel, J., *A priori bounds for semilinear equations and a new class of critical exponents for Lipschitz domains*, J. Funct. Anal. **244** (2007), 220-246. MR2294482
- [N] Nussbaum, R., *Positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic boundary value problems*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **51** (1975), 461-482. MR0382850
- [NS] Ni, W.-M. and Sacks, P., *Singular behavior in nonlinear parabolic equations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **287** (1985), 657-671. MR0768731
- [P] Pacard, F., *Existence and convergence of positive weak solutions of $-\Delta u = u^{n/(n-2)}$ in bounded domains of \mathbf{R}^n , $n \geq 3$* , Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **1** (1993), 243-265. MR1261546
- [PQS] Polacik, P., Quittner, P. and Souplet, Ph., *Singularity and decay estimates in superlinear problems via Liouville-type theorems, I. Elliptic equations and systems*, Duke Math. J. **139** (2007), 555-579. MR2350853
- [QS] Quittner, P. and Souplet, Ph., *A priori estimates and existence for elliptic systems via bootstrap in weighted Lebesgue spaces*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **174** (2004), 49-81. MR2092996
- [QS₂] Quittner, P. and Souplet, Ph., *Superlinear parabolic problems: blow-up, global existence and steady states*, Birkhäuser Advanced Texts, Basel, Boston, Berlin, 2007.
- [RZ] Reichel, W. and Zou, H.-H., *Non-existence results for semilinear cooperative elliptic systems via moving spheres*, J. Differential Equations **161** (2000), 219-243. MR1740363
- [Se] Sever, M., *An existence theorem for some semilinear elliptic systems*, J. Differential Equations **226** (2006), 572-593. MR2237692
- [S] Souplet, Ph., *Optimal regularity conditions for elliptic problems via L^p_δ -spaces*, Duke Math. J. **127** (2005), 175-192. MR2126499
- [S₂] Souplet, Ph., *A survey on L^p_δ spaces and their applications to nonlinear elliptic and parabolic problems*, GAKUTO International Ser. Math. Sci. Appl. (Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations Their Appl.) **20** (2004), 464-479. MR2087491
- [St] Struwe, M., *Variational methods. Applications to nonlinear partial differential equations and Hamiltonian systems*, Springer, Berlin, 2000.
- [So] Souto, M., *A priori estimate and existence of positive solutions of nonlinear cooperative elliptic system*, Differential Integral Equations **8** (1995), 1245-1258. MR1325555
- [SZ] Serrin, J. and Zou, H.-H., *Non-existence of positive solutions of Lane-Emden systems*, Differential Integral Equations **9** (1996), 635-653. MR1401429
- [SZ₂] Serrin, J. and Zou, H.-H., *Existence of positive solutions of the Lane-Emden system*, Atti Sem. Mat. Fis. Univ. Modena **46** suppl. (1998), 369-380. MR1645728
- [TV] de Thélin, F. and Vélin, J., *Existence and nonexistence of nontrivial solutions for some nonlinear elliptic systems* Rev. Mat. Univ. Complut. Madrid **6** (1993), 153-194. MR1245030

- [Wang] Wang, M.-X., *Global existence and finite time blow up for a reaction-diffusion system*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys. **51** (2000), 160-167. MR1745297
- [WW] M. X. Wang and Y. M. Wang, *Reaction-diffusion systems with nonlinear boundary conditions*, Sci. China Ser. A **39**(1996), 834-840. MR1417890
- [Zou] Zou, H.-H., *A priori estimates for a semilinear elliptic systems without variational structure and their applications*, Math. Ann. **323** (2002), 713-735. MR1924277
- [Zou₂] Zou, H.-H., *A priori estimates and existence for strongly coupled semilinear cooperative elliptic systems*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **31** (2006), 735–773. MR2233039
- [Zh] Zheng, S.-N., *Nonexistence of positive solutions to a semilinear elliptic system and blowup estimates for a reaction-diffusion system*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **232** (1999), 293-311. MR1683140
- [Zhao] Zhao, Z.-X., *Green function for Schrödinger operator and conditioned Feynman-Kac gauge*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **116** (1986), 309-334. MR0842803
- [ZZ] Zhao, P.-H. and Zhong, C.-K., *On the infinitely many positive solutions of a supercritical elliptic problem*, Nonlinear Anal. **44** (2001), 123-139. MR1815695

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SOUTHEAST UNIVERSITY, NANJING 210096, P. R. CHINA, AND,
LABORATOIRE ANALYSE, GÉOMÉTRIE ET APPLICATIONS, INSTITUT GALILÉE, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS-NORD
93430 VILLETANEUSE, FRANCE

E-mail address: lieyx@seu.edu.cn