

On Elliptic Systems involving critical Hardy-Sobolev exponents (Part I)

X. Zhong & W. Zou*

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University,
Beijing 100084, China
wzou@math.tsinghua.edu.cn

Abstract

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 3$) be an open domain. By using variational methods, we consider the following elliptic systems involving multiple Hardy-Sobolev critical exponents,

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u - \lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)-2}u}{|x|^{s_1}} = \kappa \alpha \frac{1}{|x|^{s_2}} |u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^\beta & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta v - \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s_1)-2}v}{|x|^{s_1}} = \kappa \beta \frac{1}{|x|^{s_2}} |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \kappa > 0, (u, v) \in \mathcal{D} := D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega), \end{cases}$$

where $s_1, s_2 \in (0, 2), \alpha > 1, \beta > 1, \lambda > 0, \mu > 0, \kappa \neq 0, \alpha + \beta \leq 2^*(s_2)$. Here, $2^*(s) := \frac{2(N-s)}{N-2}$ is the critical Hardy-Sobolev exponent. We mainly study this critical elliptic systems with $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s_2)$ and Ω is a cone (especially $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^N$ or $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$). We will establish a sequence of fundamental and interesting results including regularity, symmetry, existence and nonexistence .etc.

Key words: Elliptic system, Sharp constant, Hardy-Sobolev exponent, Existence, Nonexistence, Ground state solution, Infinite many sign-changing solution.

*Supported by NSFC(11025106, 11371212, 11271386) and the Both-Side Tsinghua Fund.

Content:

1. Introduction
2. Interpolation Inequalities
3. Regularity, Symmetry and Decay Estimation
4. Nehari Manifold
5. Nonexistence of Nontrivial Ground State Solution
6. Preliminaries for the Existence Results
 - 6.1. Existence of positive solution for a special case : $\lambda = \mu \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)-2}{2}}$
 - 6.2. Estimation on $c_0 := \inf_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{N}} \Phi(u, v)$
7. The case of $s_1 = s_2 = s \in (0, 2)$
 - 7.1. Approximating problems
 - 7.2. Pohozaev Identity and Proof of Theorem 7.1
 - 7.3. Existence of positive ground state solutions
 - 7.4. Uniqueness and Nonexistence of positive ground state solutions
 - 7.5. Further results about cones
 - 7.6. Existence of infinitely many sign-changing solutions
 - 7.7. Further results about general domains

1 Introduction

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 3$) be an open domain. We study the following nonlinear elliptic systems

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u - \lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)-2}u}{|x|^{s_1}} = \kappa \alpha \frac{1}{|x|^{s_2}} |u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^\beta & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta v - \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s_1)-2}v}{|x|^{s_1}} = \kappa \beta \frac{1}{|x|^{s_2}} |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \kappa > 0, (u, v) \in \mathcal{D} := D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega), \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $s_1, s_2 \in (0, 2)$, $\alpha > 1, \beta > 1, \lambda > 0, \mu > 0, \kappa \neq 0, \alpha + \beta \leq 2^*(s_2) := \frac{2(N-s_2)}{N-2}$.

The interest in nonlinear Schrödinger systems is motivated by applications to nonlinear optics, plasma physics, condensed matter physics, etc. For example, the coupled nonlinear Schrödinger systems arise in the description of several physical phenomena such as the propagation of pulses in birefringent optical fibers and Kerr-like photorefractive media, see [2, 10, 15, 22, 23, 27], etc. The problem comes from the physical phenomenon with a clear practical significance. Research on solutions under different situations, not only correspond to different Physical interpretation, but also has a pure mathematical theoretical significance, with a high scientific value. Hence, the coupled nonlinear Schrödinger systems are widely studied in recently years, we refer the readers to [1, 3, 19, 21, 24, 28, 29] and the references therein.

For any $s \in [0, 2]$, we define the measure $d\mu_s := \frac{1}{|x|^s} dx$ and $\|u\|_{p,s}^p = \int_{\Omega} |u|^p d\mu_s$.

We also use the notations $\|u\|_p = \|u\|_{p,0}$. The Hardy-Sobolev inequality [5, 7, 13] asserts that $D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow L^{2^*(s)}(\mathbb{R}^N, d\mu_s)$ is an embedding for $s \in [0, 2]$. For a general open domain Ω , there exists a positive constant $C(s, \Omega)$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 \geq C(s, \Omega) \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}, \quad u \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega).$$

Define $\mu_{s_1}(\Omega)$ as

$$\mu_{s_1}(\Omega) = \inf \left\{ \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s_1)}}}; u \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\} \right\}. \quad (1.2)$$

Consider the case of $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^N$, it is well known that the extremal function of $\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ is parallel to the ground state solution of the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)-2}u}{|x|^{s_1}} & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N. \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

We note that the existence of ground state solution of (6.1) for $0 < s_1 < 2$ is solved by Ghoussoub and Robert [12]. They also gave out some properties about the regularity, symmetry and decay estimates. And the instanton $U(x) := C(\kappa + |x|^{2-s_2})^{-\frac{N-2}{2-s_2}}$ for $0 \leq s_2 < 2$ is a ground state solution to (1.4) below (see [17] and [26]):

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + \frac{u^{2^*(s_2)-1}}{|x|^{s_2}} = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ u > 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \text{ and } u \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } |x| \rightarrow +\infty. \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

That $0 \in \partial\Omega$ has become a hot research topic in recent years as the curvature at 0 plays an important role, see [8, 11, 12, 14] .etc. A lot of sufficient conditions are given to ensure that $\mu_{s_1}(\Omega) < \mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ in these papers. It is standard to apply the blow-up analysis to obtain that $\mu_{s_1}(\Omega)$ can be achieved by some positive $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ (e.g., see [11, Corollary 3.2]), which is a ground state solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)-2}u}{|x|^{s_1}} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

and the ground state value equals $\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}\right)\mu_{s_1}(\Omega)^{\frac{N-s_1}{2-s_1}}$.

However, there seem to be no article involves the system case with Hardy-Sobolev critical exponents which we are going to deal with. It is well known that the main difficulty is the lack of compactness inherent in these problems involving Hardy-Sobolev critical exponents. And the compactness concentration argument (see [20] .etc.) is a powerful tool to handle with these critical problems. It is also well known that the compactness concentration argument depends heavily on the limit problem. Consider a bounded domain Ω , if $0 \notin \bar{\Omega}$, we see that $\frac{1}{|x|^{s_i}}, i = 1, 2$ are regular. We are interested in the case of that $0 \in \bar{\Omega}$. It is easy to see that when $0 \in \Omega$, the limit domain is \mathbb{R}^N , and when $0 \in \partial\Omega$, the limit domain is usually a cone. Especially when $\partial\Omega$ possesses a suitable regularity (e.g, $\partial\Omega \in C^2$ at $x = 0$), the limit domain is \mathbb{R}_+^N after a suitable rotation. Hence, in present paper, we mainly study the critical elliptic systems (1.1) with $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s_2)$ and Ω is a cone. Here a cone in \mathbb{R}^N is a domain Ω with Lipschitz boundary and such that $tx \in \Omega$ for every $t > 0$ and $x \in \Omega$. We will establish a sequence of fundamental and interesting results including regularity, symmetry, existence and nonexistence .etc.

Since there are a large number of conclusions, we do not intend to list them here. This paper is organized as follows:

In Section 2, we will give out a type of interpolation inequalities which are essentially the well known Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequalities [5], which are useful for us in Section 3.

In Section 3, we will study the regularity, symmetry and decay Estimation about the nonnegative solutions of (1.1). Taking \mathbb{R}_+^N as a specific example, we will study the regularity based on Moser's iteration technique (see Proposition 3.1). And by the well-known method of moving planes, we obtain the symmetry result (see Proposition 3.3). Due to the Kelvin transformation, we get the decay Estimation (see Proposition 3.2).

In Section 4, we study the basic properties of the corresponding Nehari manifold.

In Section 5, we will give a nonexistence of nontrivial ground state solution for the case $s_2 \geq s_1$ with some other assumptions (see Theorem 5.1).

In Section 6, we will give a existence of positive solution result for a special case :

$\lambda = \mu \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)-2}{2}}$, see Corollary 6.1. And give a sequence of preliminaries for the existence result which are not only useful for us to study the case of $s_1 = s_2$ in Section 7, but also the case of $s_1 \neq s_2$ in a forthcoming paper.

In Section 7, we will focus on the case of $s_1 = s_2 = s \in (0, 2)$. In this case, the nonlinearities are homogeneous which enable us to define the following constant

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) := \inf_{(u,v) \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} (\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s}) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}}, \quad (1.5)$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}} := \{(u, v) \in \mathcal{D} : \int_{\Omega} (\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s}) dx > 0\}. \quad (1.6)$$

When $\kappa < 0$, we will prove that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ has no nontrivial extremals (see Lemma 7.2). Hence, we will focus on the case of $\kappa > 0$. It is easy to see that (1.1) possesses a least energy solution if and only if $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is achieved (see Remark 7.2). In present paper, different from the classical blow up analysis, we develop a new method to study the system case which is also approached by a ‘‘subcritical’’ problem essentially. Combining with Pohozaev identity, we finally obtain that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is always attained (see Theorem 7.1). And under some further assumptions, we can exclude the semitrivial extremal, in other words, (1.1) possesses a positive ground state solution (ϕ, ψ) (see Theorem 7.2). Moreover, we will prove that the positive ground state solution is ‘‘unique’’ in the sense of $\phi = C(t_0)U, v = t_0 C(t_0)U$, where $t_0 > 0$ is the minimum point of $g(t) := \frac{1+t^2}{[\lambda + \mu t^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa t^\beta]^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}}$ and $C(t_0) :=$

$$[S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)]^{\frac{1}{2^*(s)-2}} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda + \mu t_0^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa t_0^\beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2^*(s)}}. \quad \text{And } U \text{ is the ground state so-}$$

lution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \mu_s(\Omega) \frac{u^{2^*(s)-1}}{|x|^s} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Hence, if U is unique and t_0 is also unique, we see that (ϕ, ψ) is unique. The details we refer to Theorem 7.3. Note that for some cases, (ϕ, ψ) is not unique, e.g, when t_0 is not unique. Taking a special case $N = 3, s = 1, \alpha = \beta = 2, \lambda = \mu = 2\kappa$ as an example, we see that $g(t)$ is a constant function, we will give out all the positive ground state solutions (see Theorem 7.4). In subsection 7.5, we will study the monotonicity of $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n)$, when Ω_n is a monotonous sequence of cones. We also consider the case of that Ω is a general domain. In subsection 7.6, as an application of Theorem 7.2, we will construct a sequence of sign-changing solution on a cone Ω by gluing together suitable signed solutions corresponding to each sub-cone (see Theorem 7.6). To close this paper, we will also give some results about general domains, included the achieved results and non-attained results. It is worth mentioning that, since a lot of properties

about the cones are studied in the previous subsections of section 7, we will give a way to compute $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ approaching by a sequence of cones and also give a way to judge when $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is achieved (see Theorem 7.8 and Corollary 7.4).

2 Interpolation Inequalities

For $s_1 \neq s_2$, we note that there is no embedding relationship between $L^{2^*(s_1)}(\Omega, d\mu_{s_1})$ and $L^{2^*(s_2)}(\Omega, d\mu_{s_2})$ for any domain Ω with $0 \in \bar{\Omega}$. Moreover, if $p < 2^*(s)$, $|\Omega| = \infty$, whether the integral of $\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^p}{|x|^s} dx$ is well defined in E or F is unknown. Hence, we are going to establish some interpolation inequalities in this section.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 3$) be an open set. Assume that $0 \leq s_1 < s_2 < s_3 \leq 2$, then there exists $\theta = \frac{(N-s_1)(s_3-s_2)}{(N-s_2)(s_3-s_1)} \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$|u|_{2^*(s_2), s_2} \leq |u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{\theta} |u|_{2^*(s_3), s_3}^{1-\theta} \quad (2.1)$$

for all $u \in L^{2^*(s_1)}(\Omega, \frac{dx}{|x|^{s_1}}) \cap L^{2^*(s_3)}(\Omega, \frac{dx}{|x|^{s_3}})$.

Proof. Define $\varrho = \frac{s_3-s_2}{s_3-s_1}$, then $1 - \varrho = \frac{s_2-s_1}{s_3-s_1}$. A direct calculation shows that

$$s_2 = \varrho s_1 + (1 - \varrho) s_3 \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$2^*(s_2) = \varrho 2^*(s_1) + (1 - \varrho) 2^*(s_3). \quad (2.3)$$

It follows from the Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_2)}}{|x|^{s_2}} dx &= \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} \right)^{\varrho} \left(\frac{|u|^{2^*(s_3)}}{|x|^{s_3}} \right)^{1-\varrho} dx \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx \right)^{\varrho} \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_3)}}{|x|^{s_3}} dx \right)^{1-\varrho}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\theta := \frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_2)} \varrho$, then by (2.3) again, $1 - \theta = \frac{2^*(s_3)}{2^*(s_2)} (1 - \varrho)$. Then we obtain that

$$|u|_{2^*(s_2), s_2} \leq |u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{\theta} |u|_{2^*(s_3), s_3}^{1-\theta}$$

for all $u \in L^{2^*(s_1)}(\Omega, \frac{dx}{|x|^{s_1}}) \cap L^{2^*(s_3)}(\Omega, \frac{dx}{|x|^{s_3}})$, where

$$\theta = \frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_2)} \varrho = \frac{(N-s_1)(s_3-s_2)}{(N-s_2)(s_3-s_1)} \in (0, 1)$$

has the following properties. Firstly, we note that $\theta > 0$ since $s_1 < s_2 < s_3 \leq 2 < N$. Secondly,

$$\theta < 1 \Leftrightarrow (N-s_1)(s_3-s_2) < (N-s_2)(s_3-s_1) \Leftrightarrow (s_2-s_1)(N-s_3) > 0.$$

□

Define

$$\vartheta(s_1, s_2) := \frac{N(s_2 - s_1)}{s_2(N - s_1)} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s_1 \leq s_2 \leq 2. \quad (2.4)$$

Corollary 2.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 3$) be an open set. Assume $0 \leq s_1 < 2$. Then for any $s_2 \in [s_1, 2]$ and $\theta \in [\vartheta(s_1, s_2), 1]$, there exists $C(\theta) > 0$ such that*

$$|u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1} \leq C(\theta) \|u\|^\theta |u|_{2^*(s_2), s_2}^{1-\theta} \quad (2.5)$$

for all $u \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$, where $\|u\| := (\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 dx)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Proof. If $s_2 = s_1 = s$, $\vartheta(s_1, s_2) = 0$, (2.5) is a direct conclusion of Hardy-Sobolev inequality and the best constant $C(\theta) = \mu_s(\Omega)^{-\frac{\theta}{2}}$, $\forall \theta \in [0, 1]$, where $\mu_s(\Omega)$ is defined by (1.2). If $s_1 = 0$, then $\vartheta(s_1, s_2) = 1$, $\theta = 1$ and (2.5) is just the well-known Sobolev inequality.

Next, we assume that $0 < s_1 < s_2 \leq 2$. We also note that if $\theta = 1$, (2.5) is just the well-known Sobolev inequality. Hence, next we always assume that $\theta < 1$. Define

$$\tilde{s} := s_2 - \frac{(N - s_2)(s_2 - s_1)}{\theta(N - s_1) - (s_2 - s_1)}.$$

Note $\theta \in [\vartheta(s_1, s_2), 1)$, we have that $0 \leq \tilde{s} < s_1 < s_2 \leq 2$. Then by Proposition 2.1, we have

$$|u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1} \leq |u|_{2^*(\tilde{s}), \tilde{s}}^\theta |u|_{2^*(s_2), s_2}^{1-\theta}.$$

Recalling the Hardy-Sobolev inequality, we have

$$|u|_{2^*(\tilde{s}), \tilde{s}} \leq \mu_{\tilde{s}}(\Omega)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|.$$

Hence, there exists a $C(\theta) > 0$ such that

$$|u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1} \leq C(\theta) \|u\|^\theta |u|_{2^*(s_2), s_2}^{1-\theta}.$$

□

Define

$$\varsigma(s_1, s_2) := \frac{(N - s_1)(2 - s_2)}{(N - s_2)(2 - s_1)} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s_1 \leq s_2 \leq 2. \quad (2.6)$$

Corollary 2.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 3$) be an open set. Assume $0 < s_2 \leq 2$. Then for any $s_1 \in [0, s_2]$ and $\sigma \in [0, \varsigma(s_1, s_2)]$, there exists a $C(\sigma) > 0$ such that*

$$|u|_{2^*(s_2), s_2} \leq C(\sigma) \|u\|^{1-\sigma} |u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^\sigma \quad (2.7)$$

for all $u \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$

Proof. We only need to consider that case of $s_1 < s_2$ and $\sigma > 0$. Define

$$\bar{s} := s_1 + \frac{(N - s_1)(s_2 - s_1)}{(N - s_1) - (N - s_2)\sigma}.$$

Recall that $\sigma \in (0, \varsigma(s_1, s_2)]$, we have $0 \leq s_1 < s_2 < \bar{s} \leq 2$. Then by Proposition 2.1, we have

$$|u|_{2^*(s_2), s_2} \leq |u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^\sigma |u|_{2^*(\bar{s}), \bar{s}}^{1-\sigma}.$$

Recalling the Hardy-Sobolev inequality, we have $|u|_{2^*(\bar{s}), \bar{s}} \leq \mu_{\bar{s}}(\Omega)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|$. Hence, there exists a $C(\sigma) > 0$ such that

$$|u|_{2^*(s_2), s_2} \leq C(\sigma) \|u\|^{1-\sigma} |u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^\sigma.$$

□

Remark 2.1. *The above Corollary 2.1 and Corollary 2.2 are essentially the well known KKN inequality. However, basing on the Proposition 2.1, our proofs are very concise. Moreover, the expressions of (2.5) and (2.7) are very convenient in our applications.*

3 Regularity, Symmetry and Decay Estimation

In this section, we will study the regularity, symmetry and decay estimation about the positive solutions. Without loss of generality, we only consider $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^N$ and the arguments are valid for general cone.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that $0 < s_1 \leq s_2 < 2$, $0 < u \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ and $|u|^{2^*(s_1)-1}/|x|^{s_1} \in L^q(B_1^+)$ for all $1 \leq q < q_1$, where $B_1^+ := B_1(0) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$. Then $|u|^{2^*(s_2)-1}/|x|^{s_2} \in L^q(B_1^+)$ for all $1 \leq q < \frac{N(N+2-2s_1)q_1}{N(N+2-2s_2)+(s_2-s_1)q_1}$. And if $|u|^{2^*(s_1)-1}/|x|^{s_1} \in L^q(B_1^+)$ for all $1 \leq q < \infty$, we have $|u|^{2^*(s_2)-1}/|x|^{s_2} \in L^q(B_1^+)$ for all $1 \leq q < \frac{N(N+2-2s_1)}{(N+2)(s_2-s_1)}$.*

Proof. When $q < \frac{N(N+2-2s_1)q_1}{N(N+2-2s_2)+(N+2)(s_2-s_1)q_1}$ and $0 < s_1 \leq s_2 < 2$, we see that

$$\frac{2^*(s_2) - 1}{2^*(s_1) - 1} \frac{q}{q_1} < 1 - \frac{s_2 q - \frac{2^*(s_2)-1}{2^*(s_1)-1} s_1 q}{N} \leq 1.$$

Then we can take some $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\frac{2^*(s_2) - 1}{2^*(s_1) - 1} \frac{q}{q_1} < \theta < 1 - \frac{s_2 q - \frac{2^*(s_2)-1}{2^*(s_1)-1} s_1 q}{N}.$$

Let

$$t = \frac{s_2 q - \frac{2^*(s_2)-1}{2^*(s_1)-1} q s_1}{1 - \theta}, \quad \tilde{q} = \frac{1}{\theta} \frac{2^*(s_2) - 1}{2^*(s_1) - 1} q.$$

Then by the choice of θ , we have $t < N$ and $\tilde{q} < q_1$. Hence, by the Hölder inequality, we have

$$\int_{B_1^+} \frac{u^{(2^*(s_2)-1)q}}{|x|^{s_2q}} dx \leq \left(\int_{B_1^+} \frac{u^{(2^*(s_1)-1)\tilde{q}}}{|x|^{s_1\tilde{q}}} dx \right)^\theta \left(\int_{B_1^+} \frac{1}{|x|^t} \right)^{1-\theta} < +\infty. \quad (3.1)$$

It is easy to see that $\frac{N(N+2-2s_1)q_1}{N(N+2-2s_2)+(N+2)(s_2-s_1)q_1}$ increasing by q_1 and goes to $\frac{N(N+2-2s_1)}{(N+2)(s_2-s_1)}$ as $q_1 \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that $0 < s_2 \leq s_1 < 2$, $0 < u \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ and $|u|^{2^*(s_1)-1}/|x|^{s_1} \in L^q(B_1^+)$ for all $1 \leq q < q_1$, where $B_1^+ := B_1(0) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$. Then $|u|^{2^*(s_2)-1}/|x|^{s_2} \in L^q(B_1^+)$ for all $1 \leq q < \frac{2^*(s_1)-1}{2^*(s_2)-1}q_1$.*

Proof. For any $1 \leq q < \frac{2^*(s_1)-1}{2^*(s_2)-1}q_1$, we set $t = \frac{2^*(s_2)-1}{2^*(s_1)-1}s_1q - s_2q$ and $\tilde{q} = \frac{2^*(s_2)-1}{2^*(s_1)-1}q$. Then under the assumptions, it is easy to see that $t \geq 0$ and $1 < \tilde{q} < q_1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_1^+} \frac{u^{(2^*(s_2)-1)q}}{|x|^{s_2q}} dx &= \int_{B_1^+} \frac{u^{(2^*(s_1)-1)\tilde{q}}}{|x|^{s_1\tilde{q}}} |x|^t dx \\ &\leq \int_{B_1^+} \frac{u^{(2^*(s_1)-1)\tilde{q}}}{|x|^{s_1\tilde{q}}} dx < +\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

\square

We note that for some subset Ω_1 and some $q \geq 1$ such that

$$|u|^{2^*(s_2)-1}/|x|^{s_2}, |v|^{2^*(s_2)-1}/|x|^{s_2} \in L^q(\Omega_1),$$

then by Hölder inequality, we also have $\frac{|u|^{t_1}|v|^{t_2}}{|x|^{s_2}} \in L^q(\Omega_1)$ provided $0 < t_1, t_2 < 2^*(s_2) - 1$ and $t_1 + t_2 = 2^*(s_2) - 1$. Hence, we can obtain the following result:

Proposition 3.1. *Assume $s_1, s_2 \in (0, 2)$, $\kappa > 0$, $\alpha > 1$, $\beta > 1$, $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s_2)$, then any positive solution (u, v) of*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u - \lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)-2}u}{|x|^{s_1}} = \kappa \alpha \frac{1}{|x|^{s_2}} |u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^\beta & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ -\Delta v - \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s_1)-2}v}{|x|^{s_1}} = \kappa \beta \frac{1}{|x|^{s_2}} |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ \kappa > 0, (u, v) \in \mathcal{D} := D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \times D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N), \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

satisfying the following properties:

- (i) if $0 < \max\{s_1, s_2\} < \frac{N+2}{N}$, $u, v \in C^2(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$;
- (ii) if $\max\{s_1, s_2\} = \frac{N+2}{N}$, $u, v \in C^{1,\gamma}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ for all $0 < \gamma < 1$;
- (iii) if $\max\{s_1, s_2\} > \frac{N+2}{N}$, $u, v \in C^{1,\gamma}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ for all $0 < \gamma < \frac{N(2-\max\{s_1, s_2\})}{N-2}$.

Proof. The results can be proved by a modify of [18, The proof of Lemma 2.6], we note that [25, Lemma B.3] will be used instead of [4, Lemma 1.5], which is also based on Moser's iteration technique. Since the system case is much more complicated, we prefer to give the details as following:

Indeed, it is enough to consider the regularity theorem at $0 \in \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N$. By [25, Lemma B.3], u, v are locally bounded. Let $B_1^+ := B_1(0) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$. We see that there exists some $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x)|^{2^*(s_1)-1}/|x|^{s_1} &\leq C|x|^{-s_1}, |v(x)|^{2^*(s_1)-1}/|x|^{s_1} \leq C|x|^{-s_1}, \\ |u(x)|^{2^*(s_2)-1}/|x|^{s_2} &\leq C|x|^{-s_2}, |v(x)|^{2^*(s_2)-1}/|x|^{s_2} \leq C|x|^{-s_2} \text{ for } x \in B_1^+. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Hence

$$|u|^{2^*(s_1)-1}/|x|^{s_1}, |v|^{2^*(s_1)-1}/|x|^{s_1} \in L^q(B_1^+) \text{ for all } 1 \leq q < \frac{N}{s_1}$$

and

$$\kappa\alpha \frac{1}{|x|^{s_2}} |u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^\beta, \kappa\beta \frac{1}{|x|^{s_2}} |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v \in L^q(B_1^+) \text{ for all } 1 \leq q < \frac{N}{s_2}.$$

Set $s_{max} = \max\{s_1, s_2\}$ and $s_{min} = \min\{s_1, s_2\}$. Then we have that $u, v \in W^{2,q}(B_1^+)$ for all $1 \leq q < \frac{N}{s_{max}}$. Denote

$$\tau_u := \sup\{\tau; \sup_{B_1^+} (|u(x)|/|x|^\tau) < \infty, 0 < \tau < 1\},$$

$$\tau_v := \sup\{\tau; \sup_{B_1^+} (|v(x)|/|x|^\tau) < \infty, 0 < \tau < 1\}.$$

and

$$\tau_0 := \min\{\tau_u, \tau_v\}.$$

Step 1: We prove that $\tau_0 = 1$, i.e., $\tau_u = \tau_v = 1$.

Case 1: $s_{max} \leq 1$: By the Sobolev embedding, we have $u, v \in C^\tau(\overline{B_1^+})$ for any $0 < \tau < 1$. Hence, $\tau_0 = 1$ in this case.

Case 2: $s_{max} > 1$: For this case, we have $u, v \in C^\tau(\overline{B_1^+})$ for all $0 < \tau < \min\{2 - s_{max}, 1\}$. Then by the definition, we have $2 - s_{max} \leq \tau_0 \leq 1$. For any $0 < \tau < \tau_0$, we have $|u(x)| \leq C|x|^\tau$ and $|v(x)| \leq C|x|^\tau$ for $x \in \overline{B_1^+}$, then for any $x \in B_1^+$, there exists some $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x)|^{2^*(s_1)-1}/|x|^{s_1} &\leq C|x|^{(2^*(s_1)-1)\tau-s_1}, |v(x)|^{2^*(s_1)-1}/|x|^{s_1} \leq C|x|^{(2^*(s_1)-1)\tau-s_1} \\ |u(x)|^{2^*(s_2)-1}/|x|^{s_2} &\leq C|x|^{(2^*(s_2)-1)\tau-s_2}, |v(x)|^{2^*(s_2)-1}/|x|^{s_2} \leq C|x|^{(2^*(s_2)-1)\tau-s_2} \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Suppose $\tau_0 < 1$, then by (3.5), there must hold $(2^*(s_{max}) - 1)\tau_0 - s_{max} < 0$. Otherwise,

$$|u|^{2^*(s_{max})-1}/|x|^{s_{max}} \in L^q(B_1^+), |v|^{2^*(s_{max})-1}/|x|^{s_{max}} \in L^q(B_1^+) \text{ for all } 1 \leq q < \infty.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.2 and Hölder inequality, it is easy to prove that

$$\kappa\alpha \frac{1}{|x|^{s_2}} |u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^\beta, \kappa\beta \frac{1}{|x|^{s_2}} |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v \in L^q(B_1^+) \text{ for all } 1 \leq q < \infty.$$

It follows that $u \in W^{2,q}(B_{1/2}^+)$ for any $1 \leq q < \infty$ and then by the Sobolev embedding again we have $\tau_0 = 1$, a contradiction.

Therefore $(2^*(s_{max}) - 1)\tau_0 - s_{max} < 0$ is proved and thus we have

$$|u|^{2^*(s_{max})-1}/|x|^{s_{max}}, |v|^{2^*(s_{max})-1}/|x|^{s_{max}} \in L^q(B_1^+)$$

$$\text{for all } 1 \leq q < \frac{N}{s_{max} - (2^*(s_{max}) - 1)\tau_0}.$$

Subcase 2.1: If $s_{min} \leq 1$ or $(2^*(s_{min}) - 1)\tau_0 - s_{min} \geq 0$, we have

$$|u|^{2^*(s_{min})-1}/|x|^{s_{min}}, |v|^{2^*(s_{min})-1}/|x|^{s_{min}} \in L^q(B_1^+)$$

for all $1 \leq q < N$. We claim that $s_{max} - (2^*(s_{max}) - 1)\tau_0 > 1$. If not, we see that $u, v \in W^{2,q}(B_1^+)$ for all $1 \leq q < N$, and then by Sobolev embedding, we obtain that $\tau_0 = 1$, a contradiction. Hence, we have $u, v \in W^{2,q}(B_1^+)$ for all $1 \leq q < \frac{N}{s_{max} - (2^*(s_{max}) - 1)\tau_0}$, and by Sobolev embedding again, we have $u, v \in C^\tau(\overline{B_{1/2}^+})$ for all $0 < \tau < \min\{2 - [s_{max} - (2^*(s_{max}) - 1)\tau_0], 1\}$. Then by the definition of τ_0 , we should have

$$2 - [s_{max} - (2^*(s_{max}) - 1)\tau_0] \leq \tau_0$$

which implies that

$$2 - s_{max} + (2^*(s_{max}) - 2)\tau_0 \leq 0.$$

But $s_{max} < 2, 2^*(s_{max}) > 2, \tau_0 > 0$, a contradiction again.

Subcase 2.2: If $1 < s_{min} \leq s_{max} < 2$ and $(2^*(s_{min}) - 1)\tau_0 - s_{min} < 0$, by Lemma 3.2 again, $|u|^{2^*(s_{min})-1}/|x|^{s_{min}}, |v|^{2^*(s_{min})-1}/|x|^{s_{min}} \in L^q(B_1^+)$ for all $1 \leq q < \frac{2^*(s_{max})-1}{2^*(s_{min})-1} \frac{N}{s_{max} - (2^*(s_{max}) - 1)\tau_0}$. On the other hand, by the definition of τ_0 ,

we have that $|u|^{2^*(s_{min})-1}/|x|^{s_{min}}, |v|^{2^*(s_{min})-1}/|x|^{s_{min}} \in L^q(B_1^+)$ for all $1 \leq q < \frac{N}{s_{min} - (2^*(s_{min}) - 1)\tau_0}$. Thus, $|u|^{2^*(s_{min})-1}/|x|^{s_{min}}, |v|^{2^*(s_{min})-1}/|x|^{s_{min}} \in L^q(B_1^+)$

for all $1 \leq q < \max\left\{\frac{N}{s_{min} - (2^*(s_{min}) - 1)\tau_0}, \frac{2^*(s_{max})-1}{2^*(s_{min})-1} \frac{N}{s_{max} - (2^*(s_{max}) - 1)\tau_0}\right\}$.

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2^*(s_{max}) - 1}{2^*(s_{min}) - 1} \frac{N}{s_{max} - (2^*(s_{max}) - 1)\tau_0} \\ & \leq \frac{N}{s_{max} - (2^*(s_{max}) - 1)\tau_0} \\ & \leq \frac{N}{s_{min} - (2^*(s_{min}) - 1)\tau_0}, \end{aligned}$$

we have $|u|^{2^*(s_{min})-1}/|x|^{s_{min}}, |v|^{2^*(s_{min})-1}/|x|^{s_{min}} \in L^q(B_1^+)$ for all $1 \leq q < \frac{N}{s_{min} - (2^*(s_{min}) - 1)\tau_0}$ and it follows that $u, v \in W^{2,q}(B_1^+)$ for $1 \leq q < \frac{N}{s_{max} - (2^*(s_{max}) - 1)\tau_0}$.

Then apply the similar arguments as the subcase 2.1, we can deduce a contradiction.

Hence, $\tau_0 = 1$ is proved and then $\tau_u = \tau_v = 1$, i.e., for any $0 < \tau < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x)|^{2^*(s_1)-1}/|x|^{s_1} & \leq C|x|^{(2^*(s_1)-1)\tau-s_1}, \quad |v(x)|^{2^*(s_1)-1}/|x|^{s_1} \leq C|x|^{(2^*(s_1)-1)\tau-s_1} \\ |u(x)|^{2^*(s_2)-1}/|x|^{s_2} & \leq C|x|^{(2^*(s_2)-1)\tau-s_2}, \quad |v(x)|^{2^*(s_2)-1}/|x|^{s_2} \leq C|x|^{(2^*(s_2)-1)\tau-s_2} \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Step 2: We prove that $u, v \in W^{2,q}(B_1^+)$ for all $1 \leq q < \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } 2^*(s_{max}) - 1 - s_{max} \geq 0 \\ \frac{N}{1+s_{max}-2^*(s_{max})} & \text{if } 2^*(s_{max}) - 1 - s_{max} < 0 \end{cases}$.

Case 1: $2^*(s_{max}) - 1 - s_{max} \geq 0$, i.e., $s_{max} \leq \frac{N+2}{N}$. By taking τ close to 1, we see that

$$|u|^{2^*(s_1)-1}/|x|^{s_1}, |v|^{2^*(s_1)-1}/|x|^{s_1}, |u|^{2^*(s_2)-1}/|x|^{s_2}, |v|^{2^*(s_2)-1}/|x|^{s_2} \in L^q(B_1^+) \text{ for all } 1 < q < \infty$$

At the same time, by Hölder inequality,

$$\kappa\alpha \frac{1}{|x|^{s_2}} |u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^\beta, \quad \kappa\beta \frac{1}{|x|^{s_2}} |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v \in L^q(B_1^+) \text{ for all } 1 \leq q < \infty$$

Hence, $u, v \in W^{2,q}(B_{\frac{1}{2}}^+)$ for all $1 \leq q < \infty$.

Case 2: $2^*(s_{max}) - 1 - s_{max} < 0$, i.e., $\frac{N+2}{N} < s_{max} < 2$. In this case, we have

$$|u|^{2^*(s_{max})-1}/|x|^{s_{max}}, |v|^{2^*(s_{max})-1}/|x|^{s_{max}} \in L^q(B_1^+) \text{ for all } 1 < q < \frac{N}{1+s_{max}-2^*(s_{max})}.$$

Subcase 2.1: $2^*(s_{min}) - 1 - s_{min} \geq 0$. We see that

$$|u|^{2^*(s_{min})-1}/|x|^{s_{min}}, |v|^{2^*(s_{min})-1}/|x|^{s_{min}} \in L^q(B_1^+) \text{ for all } 1 < q < \infty.$$

Then $u, v \in W^{2,q}(B_1^+)$ for all $1 \leq q < \frac{N}{1+s_{max}-2^*(s_{max})}$.

Subcase 2.2: $2^*(s_{min}) - 1 - s_{min} < 0$. We have

$$|u|^{2^*(s_{min})-1}/|x|^{s_{min}}, |v|^{2^*(s_{min})-1}/|x|^{s_{min}} \in L^q(B_1^+) \text{ for all } 1 < q < \frac{N}{1+s_{min}-2^*(s_{min})}.$$

Since $\frac{N}{1+s_{min}-2^*(s_{min})} \geq \frac{N}{1+s_{max}-2^*(s_{max})}$, we also obtain that $u, v \in W^{2,q}(B_1^+)$ for all $1 \leq q < \frac{N}{1+s_{max}-2^*(s_{max})}$.

Step 3: By the Sobolev embedding ,

$$u, v \in C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{B_{1/2}^+}) \text{ for all } 0 < \gamma < 1 \text{ if } s_{max} \leq \frac{N+2}{N}.$$

In particular, in the case $s_{max} < \frac{N+2}{N}$, there exists $q_0 > N$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u\|_{W^{3,q_0}(B_{1/2}^+)} \\ & \leq C(1 + \|\frac{u^{2^*(s_1)-2}\nabla u}{|x|^{s_1}}\|_{L^{q_0}(B_1^+)} + \|\frac{u^{2^*(s_1)-1}}{|x|^{s_1+1}}\|_{L^{q_0}(B_1^+)} + \|\frac{u^{\alpha-2}v^\beta\nabla u}{|x|^{s_2}}\|_{L^{q_0}(B_1^+)}) \\ & \quad + \|\frac{u^{\alpha-1}v^{\beta-1}\nabla v}{|x|^{s_2}}\|_{L^{q_0}(B_1^+)} + \|\frac{u^{\alpha-1}v^\beta}{|x|^{s_2+1}}\|_{L^{q_0}(B_1^+)}) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain that $u \in C^2(\overline{B_{1/2}^+})$. Similarly, we can also prove that $v \in C^2(\overline{B_{1/2}^+})$.

If $s_{max} > \frac{N}{N+2}$, note that $\frac{N}{1+s_{max}-2^*(s_{max})} > N$, by taking τ close to 1, we have $u, v \in C^{1,\gamma}(B_{1/2}^+)$ for all $0 < \gamma < 1 - [1 + s_{max} - 2^*(s_{max})] = \frac{N(2-s_{max})}{N-2}$. \square

Proposition 3.2. *Assume that $s_1, s_2 \in (0, 2), \kappa > 0, \alpha > 1, \beta > 1, \alpha + \beta = 2^*(s_2)$. Let (u, v) be a positive solution of (3.3), then there exists a constant C such that $|u(x)|, |v(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|^{-(N-1)})$ and $|\nabla u(x)|, |\nabla v(x)| \leq C|x|^{-N}$.*

Proof. Recalling the Kelvin transformation:

$$u^*(y) := |y|^{-(N-2)}u(\frac{y}{|y|^2}), v^*(y) := |y|^{-(N-2)}v(\frac{y}{|y|^2}). \quad (3.7)$$

It is well known that

$$\Delta u^*(y) = \frac{1}{|y|^{N+2}}(\Delta u)(\frac{y}{|y|^2}) \text{ and } \Delta v^*(y) = \frac{1}{|y|^{N+2}}(\Delta v)(\frac{y}{|y|^2}). \quad (3.8)$$

Hence, a direct computation shows that (u^*, v^*) is also a positive solution to the same question.

By Proposition 3.1, we see that $u^*, v^* \in C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Then $|u^*(y)|, |v^*(y)| \leq C|y|$ for $y \in B_1^+$. Then by going back to (u, v) , we see that $|u(y)|, |v(y)| \leq C|y|^{-(N-1)}$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$. And it is standard to apply the gradient estimate, we obtain that $|\nabla u(y)|, |\nabla v(y)| \leq C|y|^{-N}$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$. \square

Proposition 3.3. *Assume that $s_1, s_2 \in (0, 2), \kappa > 0, \alpha > 1, \beta > 1, \alpha + \beta = 2^*(s_2)$. Let (u, v) be a positive solution of (3.3). Then we have that $u \circ \sigma = u, v \circ \sigma = v$ for all isometry of \mathbb{R}^N such that $\sigma(\mathbb{R}_+^N) = \mathbb{R}_+^N$. In particular, $(u(x', x_N), v(x', x_N))$ is axially symmetric with respect to the x_N -axis, i.e., $u(x', x_N) = u(|x'|, x_N)$ and $v(x', x_N) = v(|x'|, x_N)$.*

Proof. We prove the result by the well-known method of moving planes which is also applied to investigated a single equation by Ghossoub and Robert [12, Theorem 1.2]. However, the system case is much more complicated.

Denote by \vec{e}_N the N^{th} vector of the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^N and consider the open ball $D := B_{\frac{1}{2}}(\frac{1}{2}\vec{e}_N)$. Set

$$\begin{cases} \varphi(x) := |x|^{2-N} u(-\vec{e}_N + \frac{x}{|x|^2}), \\ \psi(x) := |x|^{2-N} v(-\vec{e}_N + \frac{x}{|x|^2}) \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

for all $x \in \bar{D} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\varphi(0) = \psi(0) = 0$. By Proposition 3.1, $\varphi(x), \psi(x) \in C^2(D) \cap C^1(\bar{D} \setminus \{0\})$. We note that it is easy to see that $\varphi(x) > 0, \psi(x) > 0$ in D and $\varphi(x) = \psi(x) = 0$ on $\partial D \setminus \{0\}$. On the other hand, by Proposition 3.2, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\varphi(x) \leq C|x|, \psi(x) \leq C|x| \text{ for all } x \in \bar{D} \setminus \{0\}. \quad (3.10)$$

Since $\varphi(0) = \psi(0) = 0$, we have that $\varphi(x), \psi(x) \in C^0(\bar{D})$. By a direct computation, $(\varphi(x), \psi(x))$ satisfies the following equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\varphi - \lambda \frac{\varphi^{2^*(s_1)-1}}{|x-|x|^2\vec{e}_N|^{s_1}} = \kappa\alpha \frac{\varphi^{\alpha-1}\psi^\beta}{|x-|x|^2\vec{e}_N|^{s_2}} \\ -\Delta\psi - \mu \frac{\psi^{2^*(s_1)-1}}{|x-|x|^2\vec{e}_N|^{s_1}} = \kappa\beta \frac{\varphi^\alpha\psi^{\beta-1}}{|x-|x|^2\vec{e}_N|^{s_2}} \end{cases} \text{ in } D. \quad (3.11)$$

Noting that

$$|x - |x|^2\vec{e}_N| = |x||x - \vec{e}_N|, \quad (3.12)$$

we have

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\varphi - \lambda \frac{\varphi^{2^*(s_1)-1}}{|x|^{s_1}|x-\vec{e}_N|^{s_1}} = \kappa\alpha \frac{\varphi^{\alpha-1}\psi^\beta}{|x|^{s_2}|x-\vec{e}_N|^{s_2}} \\ -\Delta\psi - \mu \frac{\psi^{2^*(s_1)-1}}{|x|^{s_1}|x-\vec{e}_N|^{s_1}} = \kappa\beta \frac{\varphi^\alpha\psi^{\beta-1}}{|x|^{s_1}|x-\vec{e}_N|^{s_1}} \end{cases} \text{ in } D. \quad (3.13)$$

Since $\vec{e}_N \in \partial D \setminus \{0\}$ and $\varphi(x), \psi(x) \in C^1(\bar{D} \setminus \{0\}) \cap C^0(\bar{D})$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\varphi(x) \leq C|x - \vec{e}_N|, \psi(x) \leq C|x - \vec{e}_N| \text{ for all } x \in \bar{D}. \quad (3.14)$$

Noting that $2^*(s_i) - 1 - s_i > -N$ for $i = 1, 2$, then by (3.10), (3.13), (3.14) and standard elliptic theory, we obtain that $\varphi(x), \psi(x) \in C^1(\bar{D})$. By $\varphi(x) > 0, \psi(x) > 0$ in D , we obtain that $\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu} < 0, \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\nu} < 0$ on ∂D , where ν denotes the outward unit normal to D at $x \in \partial D$.

For any $\eta \geq 0$ and any $x = (x_1, x')$ in \mathbb{R}^N , where $x' = (x_2, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$, we let

$$x_\eta = (2\eta - x_1, x') \text{ and } D_\eta := \{x \in D | x_\eta \in D\}. \quad (3.15)$$

We say that (P_η) holds if

$$D_\eta \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \varphi(x) \geq \varphi(x_\eta), \psi(x) \geq \psi(x_\eta) \text{ for all } x \in D_\eta \text{ such that } x_1 \leq \eta.$$

Step 1: We shall prove that (P_η) holds if $\eta < \frac{1}{2}$ and close to $\frac{1}{2}$ sufficiently.

Indeed, it is easily to follow the Hopf's Lemma (see the arguments above) that there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that (P_η) holds for $\eta \in (\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon_0, \frac{1}{2})$.

Now, we let

$$\sigma := \min\{\eta \geq 0; (P_\delta) \text{ holds for all } \delta \in (\eta, \frac{1}{2})\}. \quad (3.16)$$

Step 2: We shall prove that $\sigma = 0$.

We prove it by way of negation. Assume that $\sigma > 0$, then we see that $D_\sigma \neq \emptyset$ and that (P_σ) holds. Now, we set

$$\hat{\varphi}(x) := \varphi(x) - \varphi(x_\sigma) \text{ and } \hat{\psi}(x) := \psi(x) - \psi(x_\sigma). \quad (3.17)$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta \hat{\varphi} &= [-\Delta \varphi(x)] - [-\Delta \varphi(x_\sigma)] \\ &= \lambda \frac{(\varphi(x))^{2^*(s_1)-1}}{|x - |x|^2 \vec{e}_N|^s_1} + \kappa \alpha \frac{(\varphi(x))^{\alpha-1} (\psi(x))^\beta}{|x - |x|^2 \vec{e}_N|^s_2} \\ &\quad - \lambda \frac{(\varphi(x_\sigma))^{2^*(s_1)-1}}{|x_\sigma - |x_\sigma|^2 \vec{e}_N|^s_1} - \kappa \alpha \frac{(\varphi(x_\sigma))^{\alpha-1} (\psi(x_\sigma))^\beta}{|x_\sigma - |x_\sigma|^2 \vec{e}_N|^s_2} \\ &\geq \lambda (\varphi(x_\sigma))^{2^*(s_1)-1} \left[\frac{1}{|x - |x|^2 \vec{e}_N|^s_1} - \frac{1}{|x_\sigma - |x_\sigma|^2 \vec{e}_N|^s_1} \right] \\ &\quad + \kappa \alpha (\varphi(x_\sigma))^{\alpha-1} (\psi(x))^\beta \left[\frac{1}{|x - |x|^2 \vec{e}_N|^s_2} - \frac{1}{|x_\sigma - |x_\sigma|^2 \vec{e}_N|^s_2} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

for all $x \in D_\sigma \cap \{x_1 < \sigma\}$. Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} &|x_\sigma + |x_\sigma|^2 \vec{e}_N|^2 - |x + |x|^2 \vec{e}_N|^2 \\ &= (|x_\sigma|^2 - |x|^2)(1 + |x_\sigma|^2 + |x|^2 + 2x_N) \\ &= 4\sigma(\sigma - x_1)(1 + |x_\sigma|^2 + |x|^2 + 2x_N), \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

we obtain that

$$-\Delta \hat{\varphi}(x) > 0 \text{ for all } x \in D_\sigma \cap \{x_1 < \sigma\}. \quad (3.20)$$

Similarly, we also have

$$-\Delta \hat{\psi}(x) > 0 \text{ for all } x \in D_\sigma \cap \{x_1 < \sigma\}. \quad (3.21)$$

Then by the Hopf's Lemma and the strong comparison principle, we have

$$\hat{\varphi}, \hat{\psi} > 0 \text{ in } D_\sigma \cap \{x_1 < \sigma\} \text{ and } \frac{\partial \hat{\varphi}}{\partial \nu}, \frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial \nu} < 0 \text{ on } D_\sigma \cap \{x_1 = \sigma\}. \quad (3.22)$$

Here we use the assumption $\sigma > 0$. By definition, there exists a subsequence $\{\sigma_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ and a sequence $\{x^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset D$ such that $\sigma_i < \sigma$, $x^i \in D_{\sigma_i}$, $(x^i)_1 < \sigma_i$, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_i = \sigma$ and

$$\varphi(x^i) < \varphi((x^i)_{\sigma_i}) \text{ or } \psi(x^i) < \psi((x^i)_{\sigma_i}). \quad (3.23)$$

Up to a subsequence, we may assume that $\varphi(x^i) < \varphi((x^i)_{\sigma_i})$ without loss of generality. Since $\{x^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, going to a subsequence again, we assume that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x^i = x \in \overline{D_\sigma} \cap \{x_1 \leq \sigma\}$ due to the choice of $\{x^i\}$. Then we have $\varphi(x) \leq \varphi(x_\sigma)$, i.e., $\hat{\varphi}(x) \leq 0$. Combining with (3.23), we obtain that $\hat{\varphi}(x) = 0$ and then $x \in \partial(D_\sigma \cap \{x_1 < \sigma\})$.

Case 1: If $x \in \partial D$, then $\varphi(x) = 0$. It follows that $\varphi(x_\sigma) = 0$. Since $x_\sigma \in D$ and $\varphi > 0$ in D , we also have $x_\sigma \in \partial D$. We say that $x = x_\sigma$. If not, x and x_σ are symmetric with respect to the hyperplane $x_1 = \sigma$. This is impossible since that D is a ball, $\sigma > 0$ and $x, x_\sigma \in \partial D$. Now recalling that $\varphi \in C^1$, by the mean value theorem, there exists a sequence $\tau_i \in ((x^i)_1, 2\sigma_i - (x^i)_1)$ such that

$$\varphi(x^i) - \varphi((x^i)_{\sigma_i}) = 2\partial_1 \varphi(\tau_i, (x^i)^i) ((x^i)_1 - \sigma_i). \quad (3.24)$$

Using the facts $(x^i)_1 < \sigma_i$ and $\varphi(x^i) < \varphi((x^i)_{\sigma_i})$, we let i go to infinity and then obtain that

$$\partial_1 \varphi(x) \geq 0. \quad (3.25)$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1 \varphi(x) &= \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \nu} \langle \nu(x), \vec{e}_1 \rangle \\ &= \frac{\sigma}{|x - \frac{1}{2} \vec{e}_N|} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \nu} < 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

a contradiction. Here we use the assumption $\sigma > 0$ again and the fact $x_1 = \sigma$ since $x = x_\sigma$.

Case 2: If $x \in D$, since $\varphi(x) = \varphi(x_\sigma) > 0$, we have $x_\sigma \in D$. Since $x \in \partial(D_\sigma \cap \{x_1 < \sigma\})$, we have $x \in D \cap \{x_1 = \sigma\}$. Then apply the similar arguments in Case 1, we can also obtain that $\partial_1 \varphi(x) \geq 0$. On the other hand, by (3.23), we have $2\partial_1 \varphi(x) = \partial_1 \hat{\varphi}(x) < 0$, also a contradiction.

Hence, $\sigma = 0$ is proved.

Step 3: By Step 2, $\sigma = 0$, we have

$$\varphi(x_1, x') \geq \varphi(-x_1, x'), \psi(x_1, x') \geq \psi(-x_1, x') \text{ for all } x \in D_0 = D. \quad (3.27)$$

Apply the same argument one can obtain the reverse inequality. Thus,

$$\varphi(x_1, x') = \varphi(-x_1, x'), \psi(x_1, x') = \psi(-x_1, x') \text{ for all } x \in D. \quad (3.28)$$

Hence, φ and ψ are symmetric with respect to the hyperplane $\{x_1 = 0\}$. Noting that the arguments above are valid for any hyperplane containing $\frac{\nu}{|\nu|}$. By going back to (u, v) , we obtain the conclusions of this proposition. \square

Remark 3.1. (Open problem) When Ω is a general cone, it is easy to see that the arguments of Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2 are still valid. For any given unit versor ν in \mathbb{R}^N , let

$$\Omega = \Omega_\theta := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x \cdot \nu > |x| \cos \theta\}, \theta \in (0, \pi]. \quad (3.29)$$

We believe that the positive solution still possesses a similar symmetry as Proposition 3.3, i.e., (u, v) is axially symmetric with respect to the versor ν . It remains an interesting open problem.

Assume $1 < p < N$, $-\infty < t < N - p$, we denote by $D_t^{1,p}(\Omega)$ the completion of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ with respect to the norm

$$\|u\| := \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u|^p}{|x|^t} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad (3.30)$$

Then we have the following result:

Proposition 3.4. *If F is a closed subset of a k -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^N with $k < N - t - p$, then $D_t^{1,p}(\Omega) = D_t^{1,p}(\Omega \setminus F)$. In particular, $D_t^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) = D_t^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\})$ provided $N - t - p > 0$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$. Notice that $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus F) \subseteq C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, by the definition, it is easy to see that $D_t^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus F) \subseteq D_t^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

On the other hand, for any $u \in D_t^{1,p}(\Omega)$. There exists a sequence $\{\varphi_n\} \subset C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

$$\|\varphi_n - u\|^p = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|\nabla(\varphi_n - u)|^p}{|x|^t} dx \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.31)$$

If there exists a subsequence of $\{\varphi_{n_k}\}$ such that $\text{supp}(\varphi_{n_k}) \cap F = \emptyset$, then $\{\varphi_{n_k}\} \subseteq C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus F)$, and it follows that $u \in D_t^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus F)$ and the proof is completed. Hence, we may assume that $\text{supp}(\varphi_n) \cap F \neq \emptyset$ for any n without loss of generality. Now, for any fixed n , we may choose a suitable cutoff function χ_δ such that $\chi_\delta = 0$ in F_δ , $\chi_\delta = 1$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus F_{2\delta}$, $\chi_\delta \in (0, 1)$ in $(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus F_\delta) \cap F_{2\delta}$, $|\nabla \chi_\delta| \leq \frac{2}{\delta}$, where $F \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and

$$F_\delta := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : \text{dist}(x, F) < \delta\}.$$

We note that $\chi_\delta \varphi_n \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus F)$ for all $\delta > 0$.

Now, we estimate $\|\chi_\delta \varphi_n - \varphi_n\|^p$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|\nabla(\chi_\delta \varphi_n - \varphi_n)|^p}{|x|^t} dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{[|\nabla(\chi_\delta - 1)^2 \varphi_n^2| + 2\nabla(\chi_\delta - 1) \cdot \nabla \varphi_n (\chi_\delta - 1) \varphi_n + (\chi_\delta - 1)^2 |\nabla \varphi_n|^2]^{\frac{p}{2}}}{|x|^t} dx \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{[2(|\nabla(\chi_\delta - 1)^2 \varphi_n^2| + (\chi_\delta - 1)^2 |\nabla \varphi_n|^2)]^{\frac{p}{2}}}{|x|^t} dx \\
&\leq 2^p \int_{\text{supp}(\varphi_n) \cap F_{2\delta}} \frac{|\nabla \chi_\delta|^p}{|x|^t} |\varphi_n^p| dx + 2^p \int_{\text{supp}(\varphi_n)} |\chi_\delta - 1|^p \frac{|\nabla \varphi_n|^p}{|x|^t} dx \\
&:= I + II.
\end{aligned}$$

By the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, it is easy to see that

$$II = 2^p \int_{\text{supp}(\varphi_n)} |\chi_\delta - 1|^p \frac{|\nabla \varphi_n|^p}{|x|^t} dx \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \delta \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.32)$$

Recalling that $|\nabla \chi_\delta| \leq \frac{2}{\delta}$, there exists some $c_n > 0$ independent of δ such that

$$I = 2^p \int_{\text{supp}(\varphi_n) \cap F_{2\delta}} \frac{|\nabla \chi_\delta|^p}{|x|^\mu} |\varphi_n^p| dx \leq c_n \left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)^p \delta^{N-k-\mu}. \quad (3.33)$$

Hence, when $k < N - t - p$, we also have

$$I \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \delta \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.34)$$

Hence, we can take some δ_n small enough such that

$$\|\chi_{\delta_n} \varphi_n - \varphi_n\|^p \leq \frac{1}{n}. \quad (3.35)$$

Now, we let $u_n := \chi_{\delta_n} \varphi_n \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus F)$, we see that $\|u_n - u\|^p \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, $u \in D_t^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus F)$. Thus, $D_t^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) \subseteq D_t^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus F)$.

Especially, when $N - t - p > 0$, take $k = 0$, we see that $D_t^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) = D_t^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\})$ and the proof is completed. \square

4 Nehari Manifold

Let $\mathcal{D} := D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \times D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. For $(u, v) \in \mathcal{D}$, we define the norm

$$\|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{D}} = (\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $\|u\| := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for $u \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. A pair of function (u, v) is said to be a weak solution of (3.3) if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \nabla \varphi_1 + \nabla v \nabla \varphi_2 dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)-2} u \varphi_1}{|x|^{s_1}} dx - \mu \int_{\Omega} \frac{|v|^{2^*(s_1)-2} v \varphi_2}{|x|^{s_1}} dx \\ & - \kappa \alpha \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^{\beta} \varphi_1}{|x|^{s_2}} dx - \kappa \beta \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{\alpha} |v|^{\beta-2} v \varphi_2}{|x|^{s_2}} dx = 0 \text{ for all } (\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \mathcal{D}. \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding energy functional of problem (3.3) is defined as

$$\Phi(u, v) = \frac{1}{2}a(u, v) - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}b(u, v) - \kappa c(u, v)$$

for all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{D}$, where

$$\begin{cases} a(u, v) := \|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2, \\ b(u, v) := \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx + \mu \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|v|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx, \\ c(u, v) := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^{\alpha} |v|^{\beta}}{|x|^{s_2}} dx. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

We consider the corresponding Nehari manifold

$$\mathcal{N} := \{(u, v) \in \mathcal{D} \setminus (0, 0) \mid J(u, v) = 0\}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J(u, v) &:= \langle \Phi'(u, v), (u, v) \rangle \\ &= a(u, v) - b(u, v) - \kappa(\alpha + \beta)c(u, v) \end{aligned}$$

and $\Phi'(u, v)$ denotes the Fréchet derivative of Φ at (u, v) and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the duality product between \mathcal{D} and its dual space \mathcal{D}^* .

Lemma 4.1. *Assume $s_1, s_2 \in (0, 2)$, $\lambda, \mu \in (0, +\infty)$, $\alpha > 1, \beta > 1$ and $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s_2)$. Then for any $(u, v) \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$, there exists a unique $t = t_{(u,v)} > 0$ such that $t(u, v) = (tu, tv) \in \mathcal{N}$ if one of the following assumptions is satisfied:*

- (i) $\kappa > 0$.
- (ii) $\kappa < 0$ and $s_2 > s_1$.
- (iii) $s_2 = s_1$ and $\kappa < 0$ small enough.

Moreover, \mathcal{N} is closed and bounded away from 0.

Proof. For any $(u, v) \in \mathcal{D}$, we use the notations defined by (4.1) and we will write them as a, b, c for simplicity. It is easy to see that for any $(u, v) \neq (0, 0)$, we have $a > 0, b > 0, c \geq 0$. For any $(u, v) \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ and $t > 0$, we have

$$\Phi(tu, tv) = \frac{1}{2}at^2 - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}bt^{2^*(s_1)} - \kappa ct^{2^*(s_2)}. \quad (4.2)$$

Denote $\frac{d\Phi(tu, tv)}{dt} := -tg(t)$, where

$$g(t) = bt^{2^*(s_1)-2} + \kappa 2^*(s_2)ct^{2^*(s_2)-2} - a.$$

For the cases of (i) and (ii), it is easy to see that $g(+\infty) = +\infty$ and $g(0) = -a < 0$. Also for the case (iii), by the Young inequality, one can prove that there exists some $C > 0$ such that $c(u, v) \leq Cb(u, v)$ for all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{D}$. Thus, for the case of $s_2 = s_1$, if $\kappa < 0$ with $|\kappa|$ small enough, we obtain that

$$b(u, v) + 2^*(s_2)\kappa c(u, v) > 0 \text{ for all } (u, v) \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}. \quad (4.3)$$

Hence, we also have $g(+\infty) = +\infty$ and $g(0) = -a < 0$.

Thus, we obtain that there exists some $t > 0$ such that $g(t) = 0$ due to the continuity of $g(t)$. It follows that $tu \in \mathcal{N}$. By the Hardy-Sobolev inequality and the Young inequality, there exists some $C > 0$ such that

$$b(u, v) \leq C\|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{D}}^{2^*(s_1)}, \quad c(u, v) \leq C\|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{D}}^{2^*(s_2)}.$$

Let $(u, v) \in \mathcal{N}$, since $2^*(s_1) > 2, i = 1, 2$, we have

$$a = b + \kappa(2^*(s_2))c \leq C\left(a^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2}} + a^{\frac{2^*(s_2)}{2}}\right),$$

which implies that there exists some $\delta_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{D}} = a^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \delta_0 \text{ for all } (u, v) \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (4.4)$$

Thus, \mathcal{N} is bounded away from $(0, 0)$ and obviously \mathcal{N} is closed.

For any $(u, v) \neq (0, 0)$, let $t_0 := \inf\{t | g(t) = 0, t > 0\}$. Then we see that $t_0 > 0$ and $g(t_0) = 0$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $t_0 = 1$, that is, $g(t) < 0$ for $0 < t < 1$ and $g(1) = 0 = b + \kappa 2^*(s_2)c - a$. We note that

$$g'(t) = (2^*(s_1) - 2)bt^{2^*(s_1)-3} + \kappa 2^*(s_2)(2^*(s_2) - 2)ct^{2^*(s_2)-3}.$$

(i) If $\kappa > 0$, then $g'(t) > 0$ for all $t > 0$.

(ii) If $\kappa < 0, s_2 > s_1$, recalling that $0 = b + \kappa 2^*(s_2)c - a$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g'(t) &\equiv (2^*(s_1) - 2)bt^{2^*(s_1)-3} + \kappa 2^*(s_2)(2^*(s_2) - 2)ct^{2^*(s_2)-3} \\ &= \left[(2^*(s_1) - 2)bt^{2^*(s_1)-2^*(s_2)} + \kappa 2^*(s_2)(2^*(s_2) - 2)c \right] t^{2^*(s_2)-3} \\ &=: h(t)t^{2^*(s_2)-3}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$h(t) = (2^*(s_1) - 2)bt^{2^*(s_1)-2^*(s_2)} + \kappa 2^*(s_2)(2^*(s_2) - 2)c.$$

When $t > 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(t) &> (2^*(s_1) - 2)b + \kappa 2^*(s_2)(2^*(s_2) - 2)c \\ &= (2^*(s_1) - 2)(a - \kappa 2^*(s_2)c) + \kappa 2^*(s_2)(2^*(s_2) - 2)c \\ &= (2^*(s_1) - 2)a - \kappa 2^*(s_2)(2^*(s_1) - 2^*(s_2))c \\ &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $g'(t) > 0$ for all $t > 1$.

(iii) If $\kappa < 0$, $s_2 = s_1$, similar to the arguments as case (ii) above, we know

$$h(t) = (2^*(s_1) - 2)(b + 2^*(s_1)\kappa c) > 0$$

when κ is small enough by (4.3).

The arguments above imply that $g(t) > 0$ for $t > 1$. Hence, $t = 1$ is the unique solution of $g(t) = 0$. It follows that for any $(u, v) \neq (0, 0)$, there exists a unique $t_{(u,v)} > 0$ such that $t_{(u,v)}(u, v) \in \mathcal{N}$ and

$$\Phi(t_{(u,v)}u, t_{(u,v)}v) = \max_{t>0} \Phi(tu, tv).$$

□

Lemma 4.2. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 4.1, any $(PS)_m$ sequence of $\Phi(u, v)$ i.e.*

$$\begin{cases} \Phi(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow m \\ \Phi'(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{D}^* \end{cases}$$

is bounded in \mathcal{D} .

Proof. Let $\{(u_n, v_n)\} \subset \mathcal{D}$ be a $(PS)_m$ sequence of $\Phi(u, v)$. We are tend to use the previous marks a, b, c and denote $a(u_n, v_n), b(u_n, v_n), c(u_n, v_n)$ by a_n, b_n, c_n for the simplicity. Then we have

$$\Phi(u_n, v_n) = \frac{1}{2}a_n - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}b_n - \kappa c_n = m + o(1) \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$J(u_n, v_n) = a_n - b_n - \kappa(\alpha + \beta)c_n = o(1)\|(u_n, v_n)\|_{\mathcal{D}}. \quad (4.6)$$

(1) If $\kappa > 0$, for the case of $s_2 \leq s_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & m + o(1)(1 + \|(u_n, v_n)\|_{\mathcal{D}}) \\ &= \Phi(u_n, v_n) - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}J(u_n, v_n) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}\right)a_n + \left(\frac{2^*(s_2)}{2^*(s_1)} - 1\right)c_n \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}\right)\|(u_n, v_n)\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 \end{aligned}$$

and for the case of $s_2 > s_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & m + o(1)(1 + \|(u_n, v_n)\|_{\mathcal{D}}) \\ &= \Phi(u_n, v_n) - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)}J(u_n, v_n) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)}\right)a_n + \left(\frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}\right)b_n \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)}\right)\|(u_n, v_n)\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

(2) If $\kappa < 0$, $s_2 \geq s_1$, similarly we obtain that

$$m + o(1)(1 + \|(u_n, v_n)\|_{\mathcal{D}}) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)}\right) \|(u_n, v_n)\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2.$$

Based on the above arguments, we can see that $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ is bounded in \mathcal{D} . \square

Lemma 4.3. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 4.1, let $\{(u_n, v_n)\} \subset \mathcal{N}$ be a $(PS)_c$ sequence for $\Phi|_{\mathcal{N}}$, i.e., $\Phi(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow c$ and $\Phi'|_{\mathcal{N}}(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow 0$ in \mathcal{D}^* . Then $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ is also a $(PS)_c$ sequence for Φ .*

Proof. For any $(u, v) \in \mathcal{N}$, we will follow the previous marks a, b, c defined by (4.1). Then we have

$$a - b - \kappa 2^*(s_2)c = 0$$

and

$$\langle J'(u, v), (u, v) \rangle = 2a - 2^*(s_1)b - \kappa(2^*(s_2))^2 c.$$

(1) If $\kappa > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle J'(u, v), (u, v) \rangle &= 2[b + \kappa 2^*(s_2)c] - 2^*(s_1)b - \kappa(2^*(s_2))^2 c \\ &= [2 - 2^*(s_1)]b + (2 - 2^*(s_2))2^*(s_2)\kappa c \\ &< \max\{2 - 2^*(s_1), 2 - 2^*(s_2)\}[b + 2^*(s_2)\kappa c] \\ &= \max\{2 - 2^*(s_1), 2 - 2^*(s_2)\}a. \end{aligned}$$

(2) If $\kappa < 0$, $s_2 \geq s_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle J'(u, v), (u, v) \rangle &= 2a - 2^*(s_1)[a - \kappa(\alpha + \beta)c] - \kappa(\alpha + \beta)^2 c \\ &= [2 - 2^*(s_1)]a + \kappa[2^*(s_1) - \alpha - \beta](\alpha + \beta)c \\ &\leq [2 - 2^*(s_1)]a. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (4.4), we obtain that

$$\langle J'(u, v), (u, v) \rangle \leq \max\{2 - 2^*(s_1), 2 - \alpha - \beta\} \delta_0^2 < 0 \text{ for all } (u, v) \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (4.7)$$

where δ_0 is given by (4.4). By the similar arguments as in Lemma 4.2, we can prove that $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ is bounded in \mathcal{D} . Let $\{t_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a sequence of multipliers satisfying

$$\Phi'(u_n, v_n) = \Phi'|_{\mathcal{N}}(u_n, v_n) + t_n J'(u_n, v_n).$$

Testing by (u_n, v_n) , we obtain that

$$t_n \langle J'(u_n, v_n), (u_n, v_n) \rangle \rightarrow 0.$$

Recalling (4.7), we obtain $t_n \rightarrow 0$. We can also have that $J'(u_n, v_n)$ is bounded due to the boundedness of (u_n, v_n) . Hence, it follows that $\Phi'(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow 0$ in \mathcal{D}^* . \square

Define

$$c_0 := \inf_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{N}} \Phi(u, v) \quad (4.8)$$

and

$$\eta := \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_{max})},$$

where $s_{max} := \max\{s_1, s_2\}$. From the arguments in the proof of Lemma 4.2, we obtain that

$$c_0 \geq \eta \|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2. \quad (4.9)$$

Combined with Lemma 4.1, we have

$$c_0 \geq \eta \delta_0^2, \quad (4.10)$$

where δ_0 is given by (4.4). If m_0 is achieved by some $(u, v) \in \mathcal{N}$, then (u, v) is a ground state solution of (3.3).

5 Nonexistence of Nontrivial Ground State Solution

Denote

$$\mu_s(\mathbb{R}_+^N) := \inf \left\{ \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx}{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} : u \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \setminus \{0\} \right\}, \quad (5.1)$$

by the result of Egnell [9], $\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ is achieved. And the extremals are parallel to $U(x)$, a ground state solution of the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \frac{u^{2^*(s_1)-1}}{|x|^{s_1}} & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N. \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

Define the function

$$\Psi_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{\lambda}{2^*(s_1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx. \quad (5.3)$$

Then a direct computation show that u is a least energy critical point of Ψ_λ if and only if

$$u = U_\lambda := \left(\frac{\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}{\lambda} \right)^{\frac{1}{2^*(s_1)-2}} U, \quad (5.4)$$

where U is a ground state solution of (5.2). And the corresponding ground state value is denoted by

$$m_\lambda = \Psi_\lambda(U_\lambda) = \left[\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)} \right] (\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N))^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_1)-2}} \lambda^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s_1)-2}}. \quad (5.5)$$

Then we see that m_λ is decreasing by λ and

$$c_0 \leq \min\{m_\lambda, m_\mu\}, \quad (5.6)$$

where c_0 is defined by (4.8).

Theorem 5.1. Assume that $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s_2)$. If one of the following is satisfied:

- (i) $\kappa < 0, s_2 \geq s_1$;
- (ii) $\min\{\alpha, \beta\} \frac{(N-s_1)(2-s_2)}{(N-s_2)(2-s_1)} > 2, s_2 \geq s_1$ and $\kappa > 0$ small enough,

we have

$$c_0 = \min\{m_\lambda, m_\mu\}.$$

Moreover, c_0 is achieved by and only by semitrivial solution

$$\begin{cases} (U_\lambda, 0) & \text{if } \lambda > \mu \\ (0, U_\mu) & \text{if } \lambda < \mu \\ (U_\lambda, 0) \text{ or } (0, U_\lambda) & \text{if } \lambda = \mu, \end{cases}$$

where U_λ, U_μ are defined by (5.4).

Remark 5.1. If $s_1 = s_2 = s \in (0, 2)$, $\min\{\alpha, \beta\} > 2$, we see that $N = 3$, indeed the assumptions of that “ κ is small enough” can be removed (see Theorem 7.4).

Proof. Without loss of generality, we only prove the case of $\lambda > \mu$. By (5.6), we see that $c_0 \leq m_\lambda$ by . By (4.10), we also have $c_0 > 0$. Now, we proceed by contradiction. Assume that c_0 is achieved by some $(u, v) \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $u \neq 0, v \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $u \geq 0, v \geq 0$ since c_0 is the least energy.

(i) If $\kappa < 0$, we obtain that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla u|^2 - \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx = \kappa \alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^{s_2}} dx \leq 0.$$

Recalling that

$$\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s_1)-2}} \leq \|u\|^2,$$

if $u \neq 0$, we obtain that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx \geq \left(\frac{\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}{\lambda} \right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_1)-2}}. \quad (5.7)$$

Then by $s_2 \geq s_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} \right) \|u\|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)} \right) \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx \\ & \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} \right) \mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s_1)-2}} + \left(\frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)} \right) \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx \\ & \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} \right) \lambda^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s_1)-2}} \left(\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_1)-2}} + \left(\frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)} \right) \lambda^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s_1)-2}} \left(\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_1)-2}} \\ & = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)} \right) \lambda^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s_1)-2}} \left(\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_1)-2}} \\ & = m_\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if $v \neq 0$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|v|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx \geq \left(\frac{\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}{\mu} \right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_1)-2}}. \quad (5.8)$$

and

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} \right) \|v\|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)} \right) \mu \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|v|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx \geq m_\mu > m_\lambda.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 = \Phi(u, v) &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} \right) a(u, v) + \left(\frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)} \right) b(u, v) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} \right) \|u\|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)} \right) \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} \right) \|v\|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)} \right) \mu \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|v|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx \\ &\geq \begin{cases} m_\lambda & \text{if } v = 0 \\ m_\lambda + m_\mu & \text{if } v \neq 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $c_0 = m_\lambda$ is proved and we see that $v = 0$, i.e., $(u, v) = (U_\lambda, 0)$.

(ii) If $\kappa > 0$, denote

$$\sigma := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx, \quad \delta := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|v|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx.$$

Then we have

$$\sigma \leq \left(\frac{\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}{\lambda} \right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_1)-2}}.$$

If not, apply above similar arguments, we have

$$\Phi(u, v) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} \right) \|u\|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)} \right) \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx > m_\lambda,$$

a contradiction. Similarly, we also have

$$\delta \leq \left(\frac{\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}{\mu} \right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_1)-2}}.$$

Similar to the arguments of Lemma4.1, we have $\Phi(u, v) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} \right) \|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2$.

Hence, $\|u\|^2, \|v\|^2 \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} \right)^{-1} c_0$. By Corrolary2.2, under the assumption of $\min\{\alpha, \beta\} \frac{(N-s_1)(2-s_2)}{(N-s_2)(2-s_1)} > 2$, we can choose some proper $\eta_1 \geq 2, \eta_2 \geq 2$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^{s_2}} dx \leq C |u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{\eta_1} = C \sigma^{\frac{\eta_1}{2^*(s_1)}} \quad (5.9)$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^{s_2}} dx \leq C |v|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{\eta_2} = C \delta^{\frac{\eta_2}{2^*(s_1)}}. \quad (5.10)$$

It follows that there exists some $C > 0$ such that

$$\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \sigma^{\frac{2}{2^*(s_1)}} - \lambda \sigma \leq \kappa C \sigma^{\frac{\eta_1}{2^*(s_1)}} \quad (5.11)$$

and

$$\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \delta^{\frac{2}{2^*(s_1)}} - \mu \delta \leq \kappa C \delta^{\frac{\eta_2}{2^*(s_1)}}. \quad (5.12)$$

Define $g_i : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+, i = 1, 2$ with

$$g_1(t) := \lambda t^{\frac{2^*(s_1)-2}{2^*(s_1)}} + \kappa C t^{\frac{\eta_1-2}{2^*(s_1)}}$$

and

$$g_2(t) := \mu t^{\frac{2^*(s_1)-2}{2^*(s_1)}} + \kappa C t^{\frac{\eta_2-2}{2^*(s_1)}}.$$

Since $\eta_1, \eta_2 \geq 2$, $g_i(t)$ is strictly increasing relate to t . It is easy to check that there exists some $\kappa_0 > 0$ such that when $\kappa < \kappa_0$, a direct calculation shows that

$$g_1\left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_1)-2}}\right) < \mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$$

and

$$g_2\left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_1)-2}}\right) < \mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N).$$

Hence, if $\sigma \neq 0, \delta \neq 0$, by (5.11) and (5.12), we obtain that

$$\sigma > \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_1)-2}}$$

and

$$\delta > \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_1)-2}}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)}\right) \|u\|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}\right) \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx \\ & \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)}\right) \mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \sigma^{\frac{2}{2^*(s_1)}} + \left(\frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}\right) \lambda \sigma \\ & \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)}\right) \mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_1)-2}}\right]^{\frac{2}{2^*(s_1)}} \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}\right) \lambda \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_1)-2}} \\ & > \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}\right) \lambda^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s_1)-2}} \mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2^*(s_1)-2}} \\ & = \frac{1}{2} m_\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)}\right)\|v\|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}\right)\mu \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|v|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx > \frac{1}{2}m_\mu > \frac{1}{2}m_\lambda.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(u, v) &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)}\right)\|u\|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}\right)\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_2)}\right)\|v\|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2^*(s_2)} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}\right)\mu \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|v|^{2^*(s_1)}}{|x|^{s_1}} dx \\ &> m_\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

The arguments above imply that $\sigma = 0$ or $\delta = 0$, i.e., $u = 0$ or $v = 0$. If $u = 0$, then $v \neq 0$ is a critical point of Ψ_μ and then $\Phi(u, v) = \Psi_\mu(v) \geq m_\mu > m_\lambda$, also a contradiction. Thus, we obtain that $u \neq 0, v = 0$. Hence u is a critical point of Ψ_λ , and $c_0 = \Phi(u, v) = \Psi_\lambda(u) \geq m_\lambda$. Then, we have $c_0 = m_\lambda$ and $u = U_\lambda$. \square

6 Preliminaries for the Existence Results

Remark 6.1. *Without loss of generality, we only consider the case of $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^N$. And the results of this section are still valid for any domain Ω such that $\mu_{s_1}(\Omega)$ is attained.*

Since problem (3.3) possesses semitrivial solutions, i.e., $u \neq 0, v = 0$ or $u = 0, v \neq 0$. We are interested in the nontrivial solutions. So, it is necessary to recall the following result for a single equation due to Ghoussoub and Robert [12, Theorem 1.2] (see also [14, Lemma 2.1], [18, Lemma 2.6]):

Lemma 6.1. *Let $u \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ be an entire solution to the problem*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + \frac{u^{2^*(s_1)-1}}{|x|^{s_1}} = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ u > 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \text{ and } u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N. \end{cases} \quad (6.1)$$

Then, the following hold:

(i)

$$\begin{cases} u \in C^2(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N}) & \text{if } s_1 < 1 + \frac{2}{N}, \\ u \in C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N}) & \text{for all } 0 < \beta < 1 \text{ if } s_1 = 1 + \frac{2}{N}, \\ u \in C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N}) & \text{for all } 0 < \beta < \frac{N(2-s_1)}{N-2} \text{ if } s_1 > 1 + \frac{2}{N}. \end{cases}$$

(ii) *There is a constant C such that $|u(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)^{1-N}$ and $|\nabla u(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)^{-N}$.*

(iii) *$u(x', x_N)$ is axially symmetric with respect to the x_N -axis, i.e., $u(x', x_N) = u(|x'|, x_N)$, where $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{N-1})$.*

6.1 Existence of positive solution for a special case : $\lambda = \mu\left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)-2}{2}}$

The following result is essentially due to [16, Theorem 1.2]:

Lemma 6.2. *Let $N \geq 3$, $s_1, s_2 \in (0, 2)$, $\lambda > 0$, $\alpha > 1$, $\beta > 1$ and $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s_2)$. Then the following problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w - \lambda \frac{w^{2^*(s_1)-1}}{|x|^{s_1}} - \kappa \alpha \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \frac{w^{2^*(s_2)-1}}{|x|^{s_2}} = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ w(x) \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N), \quad w(x) > 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N. \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

has a least-energy solution provided further one of the following holds:

- (i) $0 < s_1 < s_2 < 2$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (ii) $s_1 > s_2$ and $\kappa \geq 0$.
- (iii) $s_1 = s_2$ and $\kappa > -\lambda \frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{\beta}{2}}$.

Remark 6.2. *The case of $\kappa = 0$ or $s_1 = s_2$ with $\kappa > -\lambda \frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{\beta}{2}}$, (6.2) is essentially the problem (6.1). And the existence result was firstly given by Egnell [9].*

Corollary 6.1. *Let $N \geq 3$, $s_1, s_2 \in (0, 2)$, $\mu \geq 0$, $\kappa \neq 0$, $\alpha > 1$, $\beta > 1$ and $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s_2)$. If $\lambda = \mu\left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2}}$, then $(w, \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}}w)$ is a positive solution of (3.3) provided further one of the following holds:*

- (i) $0 < s_1 < s_2 < 2$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$.
- (ii) $s_1 > s_2$ and $\kappa > 0$.
- (iii) $s_1 = s_2$ and $\kappa > -\lambda \frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{\beta}{2}}$.

Here w is a least-energy solution of (6.2).

Proof. By a direct computation. We omit the details. □

Corollary 6.2. *Assume that $N \geq 3$, $\alpha > 1$, $\beta > 1$, $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s_2)$, $\lambda = \mu\left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{2^*(s_1)}{2}} > 0$ and one of the following holds*

- (i) $0 < s_1 < s_2 < 2$, $\kappa < 0$,
- (ii) $s_1 = s_2 \in (0, 2)$, $-\lambda \frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} < \kappa < 0$,
- (iii) $\min\{\alpha, \beta\} \frac{(N-s_1)(2-s_2)}{(N-s_2)(2-s_1)} > 2$, $s_2 \geq s_1$ and $\kappa > 0$ small enough.

Then $(w, \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}}w)$ is a positive solution to equation (3.3) but problem (3.3) has no non-trivial ground state solution.

Proof. It is a direct conclusion follows by Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 6.1. □

6.2 Estimation on $c_0 := \inf_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{N}} \Phi(u, v)$

In this subsection, we aim to give an estimation on c_0 included the cases of $s_1 = s_2$ and $s_1 \neq s_2$. These results are useful to prove the existence of positive ground state solution. The case of $s_1 = s_2$ we refer to subsection 7.3 in present paper. Since the case of $s_1 \neq s_2$ is much more complicated, we will study it in a forthcoming paper.

Let $1 < \alpha, 1 < \beta, \alpha + \beta = 2^*(s_2)$. Let $u = U_\lambda$ be a function defined by (5.4). Then we have $u > 0$ in \mathbb{R}_+^N and

$$c(u, v) := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^{s_2}} dx > 0 \quad \forall v \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \setminus \{0\}.$$

Assume that the assumptions of Lemma 4.1 are satisfied, i.e., one of the following holds:

- (i) $\kappa > 0$,
- (ii) $\kappa < 0$ and $s_2 > s_1$,
- (iii) $s_2 = s_1$ and $\kappa < 0$ small enough,

then we see that for any $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a unique positive number $t(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that $(t(\varepsilon)u, t(\varepsilon)\varepsilon v) \in \mathcal{N}$. The function $t(\varepsilon) : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ is implicitly defined by the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|^2 + \varepsilon^2 \|v\|^2 &= \left[\lambda |u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{2^*(s_1)} + \mu |v|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{2^*(s_1)} |\varepsilon|^{2^*(s_1)} \right] [t(\varepsilon)]^{2^*(s_1)-2} \\ &\quad + \kappa 2^*(s_2) c(u, v) [t(\varepsilon)]^{2^*(s_2)-2} |\varepsilon|^\beta. \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

We notice that $t(0) = 1$. Moreover, from the Implicit Function Theorem, it follows that $t(\varepsilon) \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ and $t'(\varepsilon) = \frac{P_v(\varepsilon)}{Q_v(\varepsilon)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_v(\varepsilon) &:= [2^*(s_1) - 2] \left[\lambda |u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{2^*(s_1)} + \mu |v|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{2^*(s_1)} |s|^{2^*(s_1)} \right] [t(\varepsilon)]^{2^*(s_1)-3} \\ &\quad + \kappa 2^*(s_2) [2^*(s_2) - 2] c(u, v) [t(\varepsilon)]^{2^*(s_2)-3} |\varepsilon|^\beta \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} P_v(\varepsilon) &:= 2 \|v\|^2 \varepsilon - 2^*(s_1) \mu |v|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{2^*(s_1)} [t(\varepsilon)]^{2^*(s_1)-2} |\varepsilon|^{2^*(s_1)-2} \varepsilon \\ &\quad - \kappa 2^*(s_2) \beta c(u, v) [t(\varepsilon)]^{2^*(s_2)-2} |\varepsilon|^{\beta-2} \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6.3. (The case of $\beta < 2$) Assume that $1 < \alpha, 1 < \beta < 2, \alpha + \beta = 2^*(s_2)$ and one of the following holds:

- (i) $\kappa > 0$,
- (ii) $\kappa < 0$ and $s_2 > s_1$.
- (iii) $s_2 = s_1$ and $\kappa < 0$ small enough.

Let $u = U_\lambda := \left(\frac{\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*(s_1)-2}} U$, where U is a ground state solution of (5.2). Then

(a) if $\kappa < 0$, $(u, 0)$ is a local minimum point of Φ in \mathcal{N} .

(b) if $\kappa > 0$, then

$$c_0 := \inf_{(\phi, \varphi) \in \mathcal{N}} \Phi(\phi, \varphi) < \Phi(u, 0) = \Psi_\lambda(u) = m_\lambda.$$

Proof. When $\beta < 2$, we have

$$P_v(\varepsilon) = -\kappa 2^*(s_2) \beta c(u, v) |\varepsilon|^{\beta-2} \varepsilon (1 + o(1)) \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$Q_v(\varepsilon) = \left([2^*(s_1) - 2] \lambda |u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{2^*(s_1)} \right) (1 + o(1)) \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence,

$$t'(\varepsilon) = -M(v) \beta |\varepsilon|^{\beta-2} \varepsilon (1 + o(1)),$$

where

$$M(v) := \frac{\kappa 2^*(s_2) c(u, v)}{[2^*(s_1) - 2] \lambda |u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{2^*(s_1)}}.$$

By the Taylor formula, we obtain that

$$t(\varepsilon) = 1 - M(v) |\varepsilon|^\beta (1 + o(1)),$$

$$[t(\varepsilon)]^{2^*(s_1)} = 1 - 2^*(s_1) M(v) |\varepsilon|^\beta (1 + o(1)),$$

and

$$[t(\varepsilon)]^{2^*(s_2)} = 1 - 2^*(s_2) M(v) |\varepsilon|^\beta (1 + o(1)).$$

Noting that for any $(\phi, \varphi) \in \mathcal{N}$, we have

$$\Phi(\phi, \varphi) = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}\right) b(\phi, \varphi) + \frac{2^*(s_2) - 2}{2} \kappa c(\phi, \varphi),$$

where $b(\phi, \varphi), c(\phi, \varphi)$ are defined by (4.1). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi(t(\varepsilon)u, t(\varepsilon)v) - \Phi(u, 0) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}\right) \left[\lambda |u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{2^*(s_1)} [t(\varepsilon)]^{2^*(s_1)} + \mu |v|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{2^*(s_1)} [t(\varepsilon)]^{2^*(s_1)} |\varepsilon|^{2^*(s_1)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \lambda |u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{2^*(s_1)} \right] + \frac{2^*(s_2) - 2}{2} \kappa c(u, v) [t(\varepsilon)]^{2^*(s_2)} |\varepsilon|^\beta \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}\right) \lambda |u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{2^*(s_1)} [-2^*(s_1) M(v)] |\varepsilon|^\beta (1 + o(1)) \\ & \quad + \frac{2^*(s_2) - 2}{2} \kappa c(u, v) [t(\varepsilon)]^{2^*(s_2)} |\varepsilon|^\beta \\ &= -\frac{\kappa 2^*(s_2)}{2} c(u, v) |\varepsilon|^\beta (1 + o(1)) + \frac{2^*(s_2) - 2}{2} \kappa c(u, v) (1 + o(1)) |\varepsilon|^\beta \\ &= -\kappa |\varepsilon|^\beta c(u, v) (1 + o(1)), \end{aligned}$$

which implies the results since $c(u, v) > 0$ for any $0 \neq v \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. \square

Lemma 6.4. (the case of $\beta > 2$) Assume that $1 < \alpha, 2 < \beta, \alpha + \beta = 2^*(s_2)$ and one of the following holds:

- (i) $\kappa > 0$.
- (ii) $\kappa < 0$ and $s_2 > s_1$.
- (iii) $s_2 = s_1$ and $\kappa < 0$ small enough.

Let $u = U_\lambda := \left(\frac{\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*(s_1)-2}} U$, where U is a ground state solution of (5.2). Then $(u, 0)$ is a local minimum point of Φ in \mathcal{N} .

Proof. When $\beta > 2$, we have

$$P_v(\varepsilon) = 2\|v\|^2\varepsilon(1 + o(1))$$

and

$$Q_v(\varepsilon) = \left([2^*(s_1) - 2]\lambda|u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{2^*(s_1)}\right)(1 + o(1)).$$

Hence,

$$t'(\varepsilon) = 2\tilde{M}(v)\varepsilon(1 + o(1)),$$

where

$$\tilde{M}(v) := \frac{\|v\|^2}{[2^*(s_1) - 2]\lambda|u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{2^*(s_1)}}.$$

By the Taylor formula, we obtain that

$$t(\varepsilon) = 1 + \tilde{M}(v)|\varepsilon|^2(1 + o(1)),$$

$$[t(\varepsilon)]^{2^*(s_1)} = 1 + 2^*(s_1)\tilde{M}(v)|\varepsilon|^2(1 + o(1)),$$

and

$$[t(\varepsilon)]^{2^*(s_2)} = 1 + 2^*(s_2)\tilde{M}(v)|\varepsilon|^2(1 + o(1)).$$

Hence a direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi(t(\varepsilon)u, t(\varepsilon)\varepsilon v) - \Phi(u, 0) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s_1)}\right)\lambda|u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{2^*(s_1)} [2^*(s_1)\tilde{M}(v)]|\varepsilon|^2(1 + o(1)) + o(|\varepsilon|^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\|v\|^2|\varepsilon|^2(1 + o(1)) \\ &> 0 \text{ when } \varepsilon \text{ is small enough.} \end{aligned}$$

□

Define $\eta_1 := \inf_{v \in \Xi} \|v\|^2$, where

$$\Xi := \left\{v \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|U_\lambda|^\alpha |v|^2}{|x|^{s_2}} dx = 1\right\}.$$

We note that by Hardy Sobolev inequality, $U_\lambda \in L^{2^*(s_2)}(\mathbb{R}_+^N, \frac{dx}{|x|^{s_2}})$, then by Hölder inequality, $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|U_\lambda|^\alpha |v|^2}{|x|^{s_2}} dx$ is well define for all $v \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ when $\alpha = 2^*(s_2) - 2$.

Define $\langle \phi, \psi \rangle := \int_\Omega \frac{|U_\lambda|^\alpha \phi \psi}{|x|^{s_2}} dx$, then it is easy to check that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is an inner product. We say that ϕ and ψ are orthogonal if and only if $\langle \phi, \psi \rangle = 0$. Then we have the following result:

Lemma 6.5. *Assume that $1 < \alpha = 2^*(s_2) - 2, \beta = 2$, then there exists $\eta_1 > 0$ and some $0 < v \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ such that*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v = \eta_1 \frac{|U_\lambda|^\alpha}{|x|^{s_2}} v & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}_+^N. \end{cases} \quad (6.4)$$

Furthermore, the eigenvalue η_1 is simple and we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|U_\lambda|^\alpha |v|^2}{|x|^{s_2}} dx \leq \frac{1}{\eta_1} \|v\|^2 \text{ for all } v \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N). \quad (6.5)$$

In particular, if $s_1 = s_2 = s$, we have

$$\eta_1 = \lambda, \quad (6.6)$$

and it is only attained by $v = U_\lambda$.

Proof. It is easy to see that $\eta_1 \geq 0$ under our assumptions. Let $\{v_n\} \subset \Xi$ be such that $\|v_n\|^2 \rightarrow \eta_1$. Then $\{v_n\}$ is bounded in $D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. Going to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that $v_n \rightharpoonup v_0$ in $D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ and $v_n \rightarrow v_0$ a.e in \mathbb{R}_+^N . By Hölder inequality, we have

$$\left| \int_\Lambda \frac{u^\alpha v_n^2 - u^\alpha v_0^2}{|x|^{s_2}} dx \right| \leq \left(\int_\Lambda \frac{u^{\alpha+2}}{|x|^{s_2}} dx \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2}} \left(\int_\Lambda \frac{|v_n^2 - v_0^2|^{\frac{\alpha+2}{2}}}{|x|^{s_2}} \right)^{\frac{2}{\alpha+2}} \rightarrow 0$$

as $|\Lambda| \rightarrow 0$ due to the absolute continuity of the integral and the boundness of v_n . Similar, we also have that $\{\frac{u^\alpha v_n^2}{|x|^{s_2}}\}$ is a tight sequence, i.e., for $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists some $R_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N \cap B_{R_\varepsilon}^c} \frac{u^\alpha v_n^2}{|x|^{s_2}} dx \right| \leq \varepsilon \text{ uniformly for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (6.7)$$

Combine with the Egoroff Theorem, it is easy to prove that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{u^\alpha v_n^2}{|x|^{s_2}} dx \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{u^\alpha v_0^2}{|x|^{s_2}} dx. \quad (6.8)$$

Hence, we prove that

$$D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \mapsto \mathbb{R} \text{ with } \chi(v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^2}{|x|^{s_2}} dx$$

is weak continuous, which implies that Ξ is weak closed. Hence $v_0 \in \Xi$ and we have

$$\|v_0\|^2 \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|v_n\|^2 = \eta_1.$$

On the other hand, by the definition of η_1 and $v_0 \in \Xi$, we have

$$\|v_0\|^2 \geq \eta_1.$$

Thus, v_0 is a minimizer of $\|v\|^2$ constraint on Ξ . It is easy to see that $|v_0|$ is also a minimizer. Hence, we may assume that $v_0 \geq 0$ without loss of generality. We see that there exists some Lagrange multiplier $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$-\Delta v_0 = \eta \frac{|u|^\alpha v_0}{|x|^{s_2}}.$$

It follows that $\eta = \eta_1$. Since $v_0 \in \Xi$, we get that $v_0 \neq 0$ and $\eta_1 > 0$.

Let $a(x) := \eta_1 \frac{|u|^\alpha}{|x|^{s_2}}$, it is easy to see that $a(x) \in L_{loc}^{\frac{N}{2}}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. Then the Brézis-Kato theorem in [4] implies that $v \in L_{loc}^r(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ for all $1 \leq r < \infty$. Then $v_0 \in W_{loc}^{2,r}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ for all $1 \leq r < \infty$. By the elliptic regularity theory, $v_0 \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. Finally, by the maximum principle, we obtain that v_0 is positive. Finally, (6.5) is an easy conclusion from the definition of η_1 .

It is standard to prove that η_1 is simple, we omit the details. Next, we will compute that value of η_1 when $s_1 = s_2 = s$. A direct computation shows that

$$-\Delta U_\lambda = \lambda \frac{U_\lambda^{2^*(s)-1}}{|x|^s}. \quad (6.9)$$

Testing (6.4) by U_λ , we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} (\nabla v \cdot \nabla U_\lambda) dx = \eta_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{U_\lambda^\alpha}{|x|^s} v U_\lambda dx. \quad (6.10)$$

And testing (6.9) by v , we also have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} (\nabla U_\lambda \cdot \nabla v) dx = \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{U_\lambda^\alpha}{|x|^s} U_\lambda v dx \quad (6.11)$$

Hence,

$$(\eta_1 - \lambda) \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{U_\lambda^\alpha}{|x|^s} U_\lambda v dx = 0. \quad (6.12)$$

Since v and U_λ are positive, we obtain that $\eta_1 = \lambda$. \square

Lemma 6.6. (the case of $\beta = 2$) Assume that $1 < \alpha = 2^*(s_2) - 2$, $\beta = 2$ and one of the following holds:

- (i) $\kappa > 0$.
- (ii) $\kappa < 0$ and $s_2 > s_1$.

(iii) $s_2 = s_1$ and $\kappa < 0$ small enough.

Let $u = U_\lambda := \left(\frac{\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*(s_1)-2}} U$, where U is a ground state solution of (5.2). Then there exists a positive $k_0 = \frac{\eta_1}{2^*(s_2)}$ such that

(a) if $\kappa < 0$, $(u, 0)$ is a local minimum point of Φ in \mathcal{N} .

(b) if $0 < \kappa < k_0$, then $(u, 0)$ is a local minimum point of Φ in \mathcal{N} .

(c) if $\kappa > k_0$,

$$c_0 := \inf_{(\phi, \varphi) \in \mathcal{N}} \Phi(\phi, \varphi) < \Phi(u, 0) = \Psi_\lambda(u) = m_\lambda,$$

where $\eta_1 := \inf_{v \in \Xi} \|v\|^2$, with

$$\Xi := \{v \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^2}{|x|^{s_2}} dx = 1\}.$$

Proof. In this case, we have

$$P_v(\varepsilon) = 2\left(\|v\|^2 - \kappa 2^*(s_2)c(u, v)\right)\varepsilon(1 + o(1))$$

and

$$Q_v(\varepsilon) = \left([2^*(s_1) - 2]\lambda |u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{2^*(s_1)}\right)(1 + o(1)).$$

Hence,

$$t'(\varepsilon) = 2\bar{M}(v)\varepsilon(1 + o(1)),$$

where

$$\bar{M}(v) := \frac{\|v\|^2 - \kappa 2^*(s_2)c(u, v)}{[2^*(s_1) - 2]\lambda |u|_{2^*(s_1), s_1}^{2^*(s_1)}}.$$

Similar to the arguments above, we obtain that

$$\Phi(t(s)u, t(s)sv) - \Phi(u, 0) = \frac{1}{2}(\|v\|^2 - \kappa 2^*(s_2)c(u, v))|s|^2(1 + o(1)).$$

If $\kappa < 0$, we obtain the result of (a).

Since $u > 0$ is given, by Lemma 6.5, we have

$$c(u, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^2}{|x|^{s_2}} dx \leq \frac{1}{\eta_1} \|v\|^2 \text{ for all } v \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N). \quad (6.13)$$

Define

$$k_0 := \frac{\eta_1}{2^*(s_2)}.$$

Hence, when $\kappa < k_0$, we have

$$\|v\|^2 - 2^*(s_2)\kappa c(u, v) > 0 \text{ for all } v \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \setminus \{0\},$$

which implies (b). For $\kappa > k_0 = \frac{\eta_1}{2^*(s_2)}$, by the definition of η_1 , there exists some $v \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$\|v\|^2 - \kappa 2^*(s_2)c(u, v) < 0.$$

and then it follows (c). \square

Summarize the above conclusions, we obtain the following result:

Corollary 6.3. *Assume that $1 < \alpha, 1 < \beta, \alpha + \beta \leq 2^*(s_2)$ and one of the following holds:*

- (i) $\kappa > 0$.
- (ii) $\kappa < 0$ and $s_2 > s_1$.
- (iii) $s_2 = s_1$ and $\kappa < 0$ small enough.

Let $u = U_\lambda := \left(\frac{\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*(s_1)-2}} U$, where U is a ground state solution of (5.2). Then

(1) if $\kappa < 0$ or $\beta > 2$ or $\beta = 2$ with $\kappa < \frac{\eta_1}{2^*(s_2)}$, $(u, 0)$ is a local minimum point of Φ in \mathcal{N} .

(2) if $\beta < 2, \kappa > 0$ or $\beta = 2$ with $\kappa > \frac{\eta_1}{2^*(s_2)}$, then

$$c_0 := \inf_{(\phi, \varphi) \in \mathcal{N}} \Phi(\phi, \varphi) < \Phi(u, 0) = \Psi_\lambda(u) = m_\lambda.$$

where η_1 is defined as that in Lemma 6.5. In particular, $\eta_1 = \lambda$ if $s_1 = s_2 = s$.

Apply the similar arguments, we can obtain the following result:

Corollary 6.4. *Assume that $1 < \alpha, 1 < \beta, \alpha + \beta \leq 2^*(s_2)$ and one of the following holds:*

- (i) $\kappa > 0$.
- (ii) $\kappa < 0$ and $s_2 > s_1$.
- (iii) $s_2 = s_1$ and $\kappa < 0$ small enough.

Let $v = U_\mu := \left(\frac{\mu_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*(s_1)-2}} U$, where U is a ground state solution of (5.2). Then

(1) if $\kappa < 0$ or $\alpha > 2$ or $\alpha = 2$ with $\kappa < \frac{\eta_2}{2^*(s_2)}$, $(0, v)$ is a local minimum point of Φ in \mathcal{N} .

(2) if $\alpha < 2, \kappa > 0$ or $\alpha = 2$ with $\kappa > \frac{\eta_2}{2^*(s_2)}$, then

$$c_0 := \inf_{(\phi, \varphi) \in \mathcal{N}} \Phi(\phi, \varphi) < \Phi(0, v) = \Psi_\mu(v) = m_\mu.$$

where $\eta_2 := \inf_{u \in \Theta} \|u\|^2$, and $\Theta := \{u \in D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \frac{|u|^2 |v|^\beta}{|x|^{s_2}} dx = 1\}$. In particular $\eta_2 = \mu$ if $s_1 = s_2 = s$.

7 The case of $s_1 = s_2 = s \in (0, 2)$

In this section, we focus on the case of $s_1 = s_2 = s \in (0, 2)$, and the case $s_1 \neq s_2$ will be studied in Part II. That is, we study the following problem here

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u - \lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)-2} u}{|x|^s} = \kappa \alpha \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^\beta & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta v - \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)-2} v}{|x|^s} = \kappa \beta \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \kappa > 0, (u, v) \in \mathcal{D} := D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega), \end{cases} \quad (7.1)$$

Lemma 7.1. Assume that $\alpha > 0, \beta > 0, \lambda > 0, \mu > 0$, then there exists a best constant

$$\kappa(\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu) = (\alpha + \beta) \left(\frac{\lambda}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}} \left(\frac{\mu}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta}} \quad (7.2)$$

such that

$$\kappa(\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu) \int_{\Omega} |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta d\nu \leq \lambda \int_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha+\beta} d\nu + \mu \int_{\Omega} |v|^{\alpha+\beta} d\nu$$

for all $(u, v) \in L^{\alpha+\beta}(\Omega, d\nu) \times L^{\alpha+\beta}(\Omega, d\nu)$.

Proof. By Young's inequality with ε ,

$$xy \leq \varepsilon x^p + C(\varepsilon) y^q \quad (x, y > 0, \varepsilon > 0) \quad (7.3)$$

where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1, C(\varepsilon) = (\varepsilon p)^{-q/p} q^{-1}$. Take $x = |u|^\alpha, y = |v|^\beta, \varepsilon = \frac{1}{\alpha + \beta} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta}} \alpha^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}} \beta^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta}}$ and $p = \frac{\alpha+\beta}{\alpha}, q = \frac{\alpha+\beta}{\beta}$, then we obtain that

$$|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta \leq \frac{1}{\kappa(\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu)} (\lambda |u|^{\alpha+\beta} + \mu |v|^{\alpha+\beta}) \quad (7.4)$$

Hence, for all $(u, v) \in L^{\alpha+\beta}(\Omega, d\nu) \times L^{\alpha+\beta}(\Omega, d\nu)$, we have

$$\kappa(\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu) \int_{\Omega} |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta d\nu \leq \lambda \int_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha+\beta} d\nu + \mu \int_{\Omega} |v|^{\alpha+\beta} d\nu. \quad (7.5)$$

And we note that when (u, tu) with $t = \left(\frac{\lambda\beta}{\mu\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha+\beta}}$, the constant $\kappa(\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu)$ is attained. Hence, $\kappa(\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu)$ is the best constant. \square

Noting that for the special case $s_1 = s_2 = s \in (0, 2)$ and $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$, the nonlinearities are homogeneous which enable us to define the following constant

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) := \inf_{(u,v) \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} (\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s}) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}},} \quad (7.6)$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}} := \{(u, v) \in \mathcal{D} : \int_{\Omega} (\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s}) dx > 0\}. \quad (7.7)$$

Denote

$$\mu_s(\Omega) := \inf \left\{ \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} : u \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\} \right\}, \quad (7.8)$$

then $\mu_s(\Omega)$ can be attained when $0 < s < 2$ (see [9]). Noting that $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \times \{0\} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\{0\} \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$, by the definition, we have that

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \leq (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega). \quad (7.9)$$

And by Young's inequality, it is easy to see that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) > 0$. Moreover, we have the following result:

Lemma 7.2. $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega)$ when $\kappa \leq 0$ and only can be attained by

$$\begin{cases} (U, 0) & \text{if } \lambda > \mu; \\ (0, U) & \text{if } \lambda < \mu; \\ (U, 0) \text{ or } (0, U) & \text{if } \lambda = \mu, \end{cases}$$

where U is an extremal function of $\mu_s(\Omega)$.

Proof. By (7.9), we only need to prove the reverse inequality. Indeed, for any $(u, v) \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} (\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s}) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\ & \geq \frac{\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} (\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s}) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\ & \geq (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} (\frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s}) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\ & \geq (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega) \frac{\left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} + \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}}{\left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\ & \geq (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega). \end{aligned} \quad (7.10)$$

By taking the infimum over $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$, we obtain that

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \geq (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega).$$

Moreover, by the processes of (7.10), we see that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is only achieved by

$$\begin{cases} (U, 0) & \text{if } \lambda > \mu; \\ (0, U) & \text{if } \lambda < \mu; \\ (U, 0) \text{ or } (0, U) & \text{if } \lambda = \mu, \end{cases}$$

where U is an extremal function of $\mu_s(\Omega)$. \square

Lemma 7.3. $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{D} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ when $\kappa > -(\frac{\lambda}{\alpha})^{\frac{\alpha}{2^*(s)}} (\frac{\mu}{\beta})^{\frac{\beta}{2^*(s)}}$.

Proof. By Lemma 7.1, if $\kappa > -(\frac{\lambda}{\alpha})^{\frac{\alpha}{2^*(s)}} (\frac{\mu}{\beta})^{\frac{\beta}{2^*(s)}}$, then there exists some $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \geq C \left(\int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} \right) dx \right). \quad (7.11)$$

Thereby this lemma is proved. \square

Basing on Lemma 7.2, next we only need to consider that $\kappa > 0$, and by Lemma 7.3, we see that $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{D} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$. We obtain the following result:

Theorem 7.1. *Let Ω be a cone in \mathbb{R}^N (especially, $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$) or $0 \notin \bar{\Omega}$, $0 < s < 2$, $\alpha > 1$, $\beta > 1$, $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$, then $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is always achieved by some nonnegative function (u, v) .*

When study the critical problem about a single equation, saying (P) , the classical method is blow up analysis. It usually contains the following steps:

- Step 1: Consider a modified subcritical problem in a subdomain, say (P_ε) , usually the domain is chosen as a convex one;
- Step 2: Study the existence of positive solution u_ε of the modified problem (P_ε) and the regularity;
- Step 3: By the standard Pohozaev identity, u_ε must blow up as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$;
- Step 4: Apply the standard blowing up argument to obtain the existence of positive solution of (P) ;
- Step 5: For some proper problem, one may also prove the existence of least-energy solution. Basing on the step 4, the solution set is a nonempty set. By taking a minimizing sequence of the solution set, one is only need to prove the sequence possesses a nontrivial weak limit up to a subsequence.

To see a specific example, we refer the readers to [16, Section 3]. We note that in Step 3, to obtain the weak convergence, one only needs that $\{u_\varepsilon\}$ is bounded and thus for some problem one usually only needs to prove that the corresponding energy c_ε is bounded. And it is not necessary to care about the specific upper bound. However, for the system case, we are interested in nontrivial solution. We need to exclude the semi-trivial limit in Step 4 or Step 5. Hence, a further estimation about the upper bound of energy c_ε is required which bring much trouble to us. Hence, in the present paper, we prefer to apply a different method to study the system case which is also approached by a ‘‘subcritical’’ problem essentially.

7.1 Approximating problems

$\forall \varepsilon > 0$, set

$$a_\varepsilon(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|x|^{\frac{1}{s}-\varepsilon}} & \text{for } |x| < 1, \\ \frac{1}{|x|^{\frac{1}{s}+\varepsilon}} & \text{for } |x| \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (7.12)$$

We also denote $a_0(x) = \frac{1}{|x|^{\frac{1}{s}}}$.

Lemma 7.4. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$, for any $u \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$, $\int_\Omega a_\varepsilon(x)|u|^{2^*(s)} dx$ is well defined and decreasing by ε .*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_2 \geq 0$. By the definition of $a_\varepsilon(x)$, it is easy to obtain the result by noting that $a_{\varepsilon_1}(x) < a_{\varepsilon_2}(x) \leq a_0(x)$. \square

We also note that for any compact set $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega$ such that $0 \notin \bar{\Omega}_1$, $a_\varepsilon(x) \rightarrow a_0(x)$ uniformly on Ω_1 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, we consider the ground state solution to the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u - \lambda a_\varepsilon(x)|u|^{2^*(s)-2}u = \kappa \alpha a_\varepsilon(x)|u|^{\alpha-2}u|v|^\beta & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta v - \mu a_\varepsilon(x)|v|^{2^*(s)-2}v = \kappa \beta a_\varepsilon(x)|u|^\alpha|v|^{\beta-2}v & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \kappa > 0, (u, v) \in \mathcal{D} := D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega), \end{cases} \quad (7.13)$$

Consider the following variational problem

$$\text{minimize } \int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx \text{ when } \int_\Omega a_\varepsilon(x) [\lambda|u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu|v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s)\kappa|u|^\alpha|v|^\beta] dx = 1. \quad (7.14)$$

We let $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega)$ be the minimize value of (7.14), then we have:

Lemma 7.5. *$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega)$ is increasing with relate to ε and $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$.*

Proof. By the definition of $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega)$ and $a_\varepsilon(x)$, it is easy to see that

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^{\varepsilon_1}(\Omega) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^{\varepsilon_2}(\Omega) \text{ for aly } \varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_2 \geq 0.$$

Hence, we have

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega). \quad (7.15)$$

On the other hand, for any $\eta > 0$, there exists $(u, v) \in C_c^\infty(\Omega) \times C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} a_0(x) [\lambda |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta] dx = 1$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx < S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega) + \eta.$$

Since $a_\varepsilon(x) \rightarrow a_0(x)$ in $L^\infty(\text{supp}(u))$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega) \\ &= \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} a_\varepsilon(x) [\lambda |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta] dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\ &= \frac{\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} a_0(x) [\lambda |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta] dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx \\ &< S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega) + \eta. \end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrariness of η , we have

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega) \leq S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega). \quad (7.16)$$

Thus the proof is completed by (7.15) and (7.16). \square

Let $L^p(\Omega, a_\varepsilon(x)dx)$ denotes the space of L^p -integrable functions with respect to the measure $a_\varepsilon(x)dx$ and the corresponding norm is indicated by

$$|u|_{p, \varepsilon} := \left(\int_{\Omega} a_\varepsilon(x) |u|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad p > 1.$$

Then we have the following compact embedding result:

Lemma 7.6. *For any $\varepsilon \in (0, s)$, the embedding $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{2^*(s)}(\Omega, a_\varepsilon(x)dx)$ is compact.*

Proof. Let $\{u_n\} \subset D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ be a bounded sequence. Up to a subsequence, we may assume that $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and $u_n \rightarrow u$ a.e. in Ω . Then for any $R > 1$, we have

$$\int_{\Omega \cap B_R^c} a_\varepsilon(x) |u|^{2^*(s)} dx \leq \frac{1}{R^\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega \cap B_R^c} a_0 |u|^{2^*(s)} dx \rightarrow 0, \quad (7.17)$$

uniformly for all n as $R \rightarrow +\infty$.

Noting that $2^*(s) < 2^*(s - \varepsilon)$, $2^*(s) < 2^* := \frac{2N}{N-2}$, by Rellich-Kondrachov compact theorem, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega \cap B_R} a_\varepsilon(x) |u_n - u|^{2^*(s)} dx = 0. \quad (7.18)$$

By (7.17) and (7.18), we prove this Lemma. \square

Lemma 7.7. For any $\varepsilon \in (0, s)$, $S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega)$ is attained by some extremal $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)$, i.e.,

$$\int_{\Omega} a_\varepsilon(x) [\lambda |u_\varepsilon|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v_\varepsilon|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u_\varepsilon|^\alpha |v_\varepsilon|^\beta] dx = 1$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 + |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2) dx = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega).$$

Moreover, $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)$ satisfies the following equation:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega) \left(\lambda a_\varepsilon(x) |u|^{2^*(s)-2} u + \kappa \alpha a_\varepsilon(x) |u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^\beta \right) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta v = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega) \left(\mu a_\varepsilon(x) |v|^{2^*(s)-2} v + \kappa \beta a_\varepsilon(x) |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v \right) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u \geq 0, v \geq 0, (u, v) \in \mathcal{D} := D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega), \end{cases} \quad (7.19)$$

Proof. Let $\{u_{n,\varepsilon}\} \subset \mathcal{D}$ be a minimizing sequence, i.e,

$$\int_{\Omega} a_\varepsilon(x) [\lambda |u_{n,\varepsilon}|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v_{n,\varepsilon}|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u_{n,\varepsilon}|^\alpha |v_{n,\varepsilon}|^\beta] dx = 1$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_{n,\varepsilon}|^2 + |\nabla v_{n,\varepsilon}|^2) dx \rightarrow S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega) \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Then we see that $\{(u_{n,\varepsilon}\}$ and $v_{n,\varepsilon}\}$ are bounded in $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$. By Lemma 7.6, we see that up to a subsequence $u_{n,\varepsilon} \rightarrow u_\varepsilon$ and $v_{n,\varepsilon} \rightarrow v_\varepsilon$ in $L^{2^*(s)}(\Omega, a_\varepsilon(x) dx)$. Hence

$$\int_{\Omega} a_\varepsilon(x) [\lambda |u_\varepsilon|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v_\varepsilon|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u_\varepsilon|^\alpha |v_\varepsilon|^\beta] dx = 1.$$

Then by the definition of $S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega)$, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 + |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2) dx \geq S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega).$$

On the other hand, by the weak semi-continuous of a norm (or Fatou's Lemma), we have

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 + |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2) dx \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_{n,\varepsilon}|^2 + |\nabla v_{n,\varepsilon}|^2) dx = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega).$$

Hence, $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)$ is a minimizer of $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $u_{n,\varepsilon} \geq 0$ and $v_{n,\varepsilon} \geq 0$ for all n . Then since $u_{n,\varepsilon} \rightarrow u_\varepsilon, v_{n,\varepsilon} \rightarrow v_\varepsilon$ a.e in Ω , we obtain that $u_\varepsilon \geq 0, v_\varepsilon \geq 0$ a.e in Ω .

There exists some Lagrange multiplier $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_\varepsilon = \Lambda \left(\lambda a_\varepsilon(x) |u_\varepsilon|^{2^*(s)-2} u_\varepsilon + \kappa \alpha a_\varepsilon(x) |u_\varepsilon|^{\alpha-2} u_\varepsilon |v_\varepsilon|^\beta \right) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta v_\varepsilon = \Lambda \left(\mu a_\varepsilon(x) |v_\varepsilon|^{2^*(s)-2} v_\varepsilon + \kappa \beta a_\varepsilon(x) |u_\varepsilon|^\alpha |v_\varepsilon|^{\beta-2} v_\varepsilon \right) & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases}$$

Testing by $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)$, we obtain that $\Lambda = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega)$. \square

Lemma 7.8. For $\varepsilon \in (0, s)$, assume $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)$ is a solution to (7.19) given by Lemma 7.7. Then:

- (i) The family $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)$ is bounded in \mathcal{D} ;
- (ii) Up to a subsequence, we have $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u, v_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup v$ in $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and $u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u, v_\varepsilon \rightarrow v$ a.e in Ω as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.
- (iii) (u, v) given in (ii) weakly solve

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \left(\lambda a_0(x) |u|^{2^*(s)-2} u + \kappa \alpha a_0(x) |u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^\beta \right) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta v = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \left(\mu a_0(x) |v|^{2^*(s)-2} v + \kappa \beta a_0(x) |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v \right) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u \geq 0, v \geq 0, (u, v) \in \mathcal{D}, \end{cases} \quad (7.20)$$

- (iv) If $(u, v) \neq (0, 0)$, then

$$\int_{\Omega} a_0(x) [\lambda |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta] dx = 1$$

and $u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u$ and $v_\varepsilon \rightarrow v$ strongly in $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Moreover, (u, v) is a extremal function of $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$.

Proof. (i) follows by Lemma 7.5 and (ii) is trivial;

(iii) Without loss of generality, we assume that $\varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. For any $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega), \psi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, since $(u_{\varepsilon_k}, v_{\varepsilon_k})$ is a solution of (7.19) with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_k$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (\nabla u_{\varepsilon_k} \cdot \nabla \phi + \nabla v_{\varepsilon_k} \cdot \nabla \psi) dx \\ &= S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^{\varepsilon_k}(\Omega) \int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda a_\varepsilon(x) |u_\varepsilon|^{2^*(s)-2} u_\varepsilon \phi + \kappa \alpha a_\varepsilon(x) |u_\varepsilon|^{\alpha-2} u_\varepsilon |v_\varepsilon|^\beta \phi \right) dx \\ & \quad + S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^{\varepsilon_k}(\Omega) \int_{\Omega} \left(\mu a_\varepsilon(x) |v_\varepsilon|^{2^*(s)-2} v_\varepsilon \psi + \kappa \beta a_\varepsilon(x) |u_\varepsilon|^\alpha |v_\varepsilon|^{\beta-2} v_\varepsilon \psi \right) dx \quad (7.21) \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $a_{\varepsilon_k}(x) \rightarrow a_0(x)$ in $L^\infty(\text{sppt}(\phi) \cup \text{sppt}(\psi))$ and $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^{\varepsilon_k}(\Omega) \rightarrow S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, let $k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (\nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi + \nabla v \cdot \nabla \psi) dx \\ &= S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda a_0(x) |u|^{2^*(s)-2} u \phi + \kappa \alpha a_0(x) |u|^{\alpha-2} u \phi |v|^\beta \right) dx \\ & \quad + S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \int_{\Omega} \left(\mu a_0(x) |v|^{2^*(s)-2} v \psi + \kappa \beta a_0(x) |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v \psi \right) dx \end{aligned} \quad (7.22)$$

Then by the arbitrary of (ϕ, ψ) , we obtain that (u, v) weakly solve (7.20).

(iv) By Fatou's lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} a_0(x) [\lambda |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta] dx \\ & \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} a_{\varepsilon_k}(x) [\lambda |u_{\varepsilon_k}|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v_{\varepsilon_k}|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u_{\varepsilon_k}|^\alpha |v_{\varepsilon_k}|^\beta] dx = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (7.23)$$

If $\int_{\Omega} a_0(x) [\lambda |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta] dx \neq 1$, since $(u, v) \neq (0, 0)$, we have

$$0 < \int_{\Omega} a_0(x) [\lambda |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta] dx < 1.$$

Hence, by (iii) and the definition of $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) &= \frac{\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx}{\int_{\Omega} a_0(x) [\lambda |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta] dx} \\ &> \frac{\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} a_0(x) [\lambda |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta] dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\ &\geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega), \end{aligned} \quad (7.24)$$

a contradiction. Hence, $\int_{\Omega} a_0(x) [\lambda |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta] dx = 1$. And it follows that

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_{\varepsilon_k}|^2 + |\nabla v_{\varepsilon_k}|^2) \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx \quad (7.25)$$

which implies that $u_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow u, v_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow v$ in $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$. \square

7.2 Pohozaev Identity and Proof of Theorem 7.1

Proposition 7.1. *Let $(u, v) \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ be a solution of the system*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u &= G_u(x, u, v) \\ -\Delta v &= G_v(x, u, v) \end{cases}$$

and

$$G(x, u, v) = \int_0^u G_s(x, s, v) ds + G(x, 0, v) = \int_0^v G_t(x, u, t) dt + G(x, u, 0)$$

is such that $G(x, 0, 0) \equiv 0$, $G(\cdot, u(\cdot), v(\cdot))$ and $x_i G_{x_i}(\cdot, u(\cdot), v(\cdot))$ are in $L^1(\Omega)$, then (u, v) satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\partial\Omega} |\nabla(u, v)|^2 x \cdot \nu d\sigma \\ &= 2N \int_{\Omega} G(x, u, v) dx + 2 \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\Omega} x_i G_{x_i}(x, u, v) dx - (N-2) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u, v)|^2 dx, \end{aligned} \quad (7.26)$$

where Ω is a regular domain in \mathbb{R}^N , ν denotes the unitary exterior normal vector to $\partial\Omega$ and $|\nabla(u, v)|^2 := |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2$. Moreover, if $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ or a cone, then

$$2N \int_{\Omega} G(x, u, v) dx + 2 \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\Omega} x_i G_{x_i}(x, u, v) dx = (N-2) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u, v)|^2 dx. \quad (7.27)$$

Proof. Since (u, v) is a solution, then we have

$$0 = (-\Delta u + G_u(x, u, v))x \cdot \nabla u = (-\Delta v + G_v(x, u, v))x \cdot \nabla v. \quad (7.28)$$

It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u x \cdot \nabla u &= -\operatorname{div}(\nabla u x \cdot \nabla u - x \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2}) - \frac{N-2}{2} |\nabla u|^2, \\ -\Delta v x \cdot \nabla v &= -\operatorname{div}(\nabla v x \cdot \nabla v - x \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{2}) - \frac{N-2}{2} |\nabla v|^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$G_u(x, u, v)x \cdot \nabla u + G_v(x, u, v)x \cdot \nabla v = \operatorname{div}(xG(x, u, v)) - NG(x, u, v) - \sum_{i=1}^N x_i G_{x_i}(x, u, v).$$

Integrating by parts, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\partial\Omega} \left(\sigma G(\sigma, u, v) + (\nabla u \sigma \cdot \nabla u - \sigma \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2}) + (\nabla v \sigma \cdot \nabla v - \sigma \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{2}) \right) \cdot \nu d\sigma \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \left(NG(x, u, v) - \frac{N-2}{2} |\nabla(u, v)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N x_i G_{x_i}(x, u, v) \right) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (7.29)$$

When $u = v = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we have

$$\nabla u = \nabla u \cdot \nu \nu, \nabla v = \nabla v \cdot \nu \nu. \quad (7.30)$$

Then by (7.29), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\partial\Omega} (G(\sigma, u, v) + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla(u, v)|^2)\sigma \cdot \nu d\sigma \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (NG(x, u, v) - \frac{N-2}{2}|\nabla(u, v)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N x_i G_{x_i}(x, u, v)) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (7.31)$$

Moreover, since $G(x, 0, 0) \equiv 0$, if $u = v = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we have $G(\sigma, u, v) \equiv 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, then we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial\Omega} |\nabla(u, v)|^2 \sigma \cdot \nu d\sigma = \int_{\Omega} (NG(x, u, v) - \frac{N-2}{2}|\nabla(u, v)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N x_i G_{x_i}(x, u, v)) dx, \quad (7.32)$$

which is equivalent to (7.26). Using polar coordinate transformation, since $|\nabla(u, v)| \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla(u, v)|^2 dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_{\partial B_r(0)} (|\nabla u(r, \theta)|^2 + |\nabla v(r, \theta)|^2) d\theta r^{N-1} dr \\ &= \int_0^\infty \zeta(r) dr < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta(r) := \int_{\partial B_r(0)} (|\nabla u(r, \theta)|^2 + |\nabla v(r, \theta)|^2) d\theta r^{N-1} \geq 0$, then by the absolute continuity, there exists $r_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\zeta(r_n) \rightarrow 0$. Since $N \geq 3$, we have

$$\int_{\partial B_{r_n}(0)} (|\nabla u(r_n, \theta)|^2 + |\nabla v(r_n, \theta)|^2) r_n d\theta \rightarrow 0,$$

which implies that

$$\int_{\partial B_R(0)} |\nabla(u, v)|^2 \sigma \cdot \nu d\sigma \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty. \quad (7.33)$$

Since $|G(x, u, v)| \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, then by the the similar arguments, we obtain that

$$\int_{\partial B_R(0)} G(\sigma, u, v) \sigma \cdot \nu d\sigma \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty. \quad (7.34)$$

When considering $\Omega = B_R(0)$ in (7.29), it follows that $\nu = \frac{x}{|x|}$, $\sigma \cdot \nu = |x|$, $0 \leq (\nabla u \sigma \cdot \nabla u) \cdot \nu \leq |\nabla u|^2 \sigma \cdot \nu$. Hence by (7.33), we have

$$\int_{\partial B_R(0)} (\nabla u \sigma \cdot \nabla u - \sigma \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2}) \cdot \nu d\sigma \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } R \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (7.35)$$

Similarly, we also have

$$\int_{\partial B_R(0)} (\nabla v \sigma \cdot \nabla v - \sigma \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{2}) \cdot \nu d\sigma \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } R \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (7.36)$$

Finally, by the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, when $R \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\int_{B_R(0)} |\nabla(u, v)|^2 dx \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla(u, v)|^2 dx$, $\int_{B_R(0)} G(x, u, v) dx \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(x, u, v) dx$, and

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \int_{B_R(0)} x_i G_{x_i}(x, u, v) dx \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x_i G_{x_i}(x, u, v) dx,$$

Combining with these results and (7.29),(7.34),(7.35),(7.36) we obtain (7.27). The case of that Ω is a cone, we have $x \cdot \nu \equiv 0$ for $x \in \partial\Omega$, then (7.27) follows by (7.26) easily. \square

Corollary 7.1. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < s < 2$ and $a_\varepsilon(x)$ be defined by (7.12). Suppose that $\alpha > 1, \beta > 1, \alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$ and Ω is a cone. Then any solution (u, v) of*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega) \left(\lambda a_\varepsilon(x) |u|^{2^*(s)-2} u + \kappa \alpha a_\varepsilon(x) |u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^\beta \right) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta v = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega) \left(\mu a_\varepsilon(x) |v|^{2^*(s)-2} v + \kappa \beta a_\varepsilon(x) |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v \right) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u \geq 0, v \geq 0, (u, v) \in \mathcal{D} := D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega), \end{cases} \quad (7.37)$$

satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega \cap B_1} \left[\frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} a_\varepsilon(x) |u|^{2^*(s)} + \frac{\mu}{2^*(s)} a_\varepsilon(x) |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa a_\varepsilon(x) |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta \right] dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega \cap B_1^c} \left[\frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} a_\varepsilon(x) |u|^{2^*(s)} + \frac{\mu}{2^*(s)} a_\varepsilon(x) |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa a_\varepsilon(x) |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta \right] dx. \end{aligned} \quad (7.38)$$

Proof. Let

$$G(x, u, v) := S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega) \left[\frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} a_\varepsilon(x) |u|^{2^*(s)} + \frac{\mu}{2^*(s)} a_\varepsilon(x) |v|^{2^*(s)} + \kappa a_\varepsilon(x) |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta \right]. \quad (7.39)$$

Noting that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} a_\varepsilon(x) = \begin{cases} -(s - \varepsilon) \frac{1}{|x|^{s+2-\varepsilon}} x_i & \text{for } |x| < 1, \\ -(s + \varepsilon) \frac{1}{|x|^{s+2+\varepsilon}} x_i & \text{for } |x| > 1, \end{cases} \quad (7.40)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_i \cdot G_{x_i}(x, u, v) &= S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega) \left[\frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} |u|^{2^*(s)} + \frac{\mu}{2^*(s)} |v|^{2^*(s)} + \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta \right] x_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} a_\varepsilon(x) \\ &= \begin{cases} -(s - \varepsilon) S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega) \left[\frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} |u|^{2^*(s)} + \frac{\mu}{2^*(s)} |v|^{2^*(s)} + \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta \right] \frac{1}{|x|^{s+2-\varepsilon}} x_i^2 & \text{if } |x| < 1, \\ -(s + \varepsilon) S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^\varepsilon(\Omega) \left[\frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} |u|^{2^*(s)} + \frac{\mu}{2^*(s)} |v|^{2^*(s)} + \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta \right] \frac{1}{|x|^{s+2+\varepsilon}} x_i^2 & \text{if } |x| > 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (7.41)$$

Hence, by Proposition 7.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& -2(N-s) \int_{\Omega} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^{\varepsilon}(\Omega) \left[\frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} a_{\varepsilon}(x) |u|^{2^*(s)} + \frac{\mu}{2^*(s)} a_{\varepsilon}(x) |v|^{2^*(s)} + \kappa a_{\varepsilon}(x) |u|^{\alpha} |v|^{\beta} \right] dx \\
& + (N-2) \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx \\
= & 2\varepsilon \int_{\Omega \cap B_1} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^{\varepsilon}(\Omega) \left[\frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} a_{\varepsilon}(x) |u|^{2^*(s)} + \frac{\mu}{2^*(s)} a_{\varepsilon}(x) |v|^{2^*(s)} + \kappa a_{\varepsilon}(x) |u|^{\alpha} |v|^{\beta} \right] dx \\
& - 2\varepsilon \int_{\Omega \cap B_1^c} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^{\varepsilon}(\Omega) \left[\frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} a_{\varepsilon}(x) |u|^{2^*(s)} + \frac{\mu}{2^*(s)} a_{\varepsilon}(x) |v|^{2^*(s)} + \kappa a_{\varepsilon}(x) |u|^{\alpha} |v|^{\beta} \right] dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.42}$$

On the other hand, since (u, v) is a solution, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx \\
= & S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^{\varepsilon}(\Omega) \int_{\Omega} [\lambda a_{\varepsilon}(x) |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu a_{\varepsilon}(x) |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa a_{\varepsilon}(x) |u|^{\alpha} |v|^{\beta}] dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.43}$$

Recalling that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^{\varepsilon}(\Omega) > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, by (7.42) and (7.43), we obtain (7.38). \square

Corollary 7.2. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < s < 2$ and $a_{\varepsilon}(x)$ be defined by (7.12). Suppose that $\alpha > 1, \beta > 1, \alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$ and Ω is a cone. Let $(u_{\varepsilon}, v_{\varepsilon})$ be a solution to (7.19) given by Lemma 7.7. Then up to a subsequence, there exists some $(u, v) \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $u_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow u, v_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow v$ strongly in $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.8, we only need to prove that $(u, v) \neq (0, 0)$. Now, we proceed by contradiction. We assume that $u = v = 0$. Let $\chi(x) \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega)$ be a cut-off function such that $\chi(x) \equiv 1$ in $B_{\frac{r}{2}} \cap \Omega$, $\chi(x) \equiv 0$ in $\Omega \setminus B_r$, recalling the Rellich-Kondrachov compact theorem and $2 < 2^*(s) < 2^* := \frac{2N}{N-2}$, we have $u_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ in $L^t(\Omega_1)$ for all $1 < t < 2^*$ if $0 \notin \bar{\Omega}_1$. Hence, it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} [\lambda a_{\varepsilon}(x) |\chi u_{\varepsilon}|^{2^*(s)} + \mu a_{\varepsilon}(x) |\chi v_{\varepsilon}|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa a_{\varepsilon}(x) |\chi u_{\varepsilon}|^{\alpha} |\chi v_{\varepsilon}|^{\beta}] dx \\
= & \int_{\Omega \cap B_r} [\lambda a_{\varepsilon}(x) |u_{\varepsilon}|^{2^*(s)} + \mu a_{\varepsilon}(x) |v_{\varepsilon}|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa a_{\varepsilon}(x) |u_{\varepsilon}|^{\alpha} |v_{\varepsilon}|^{\beta}] dx + o(1) \\
= & \eta_r + o(1).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.44}$$

On the other hand, by the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla(\chi u_{\varepsilon})|^2 + |\nabla(\chi v_{\varepsilon})|^2) dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega} (|(\nabla\chi)u_{\varepsilon} + \chi\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 + |(\nabla\chi)v_{\varepsilon} + \chi\nabla v_{\varepsilon}|^2) dx \\
&\leq \left(\left(\int_{\Omega} |(\nabla\chi)|^2 u_{\varepsilon}^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\int_{\Omega} |\chi|^2 |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left(\int_{\Omega} |(\nabla\chi)|^2 v_{\varepsilon}^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\int_{\Omega} |\chi|^2 |\nabla v_{\varepsilon}|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^2 \\
&= \int_{\Omega \cap B_r} (|\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 + |\nabla v_{\varepsilon}|^2) dx + o(1) \\
&:= \sigma_r + o(1). \tag{7.45}
\end{aligned}$$

By (7.44) and 7.45, we obtain that

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^{\varepsilon}(\Omega)(\eta_r + o(1))^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \leq \sigma_r + o(1). \tag{7.46}$$

Similarly, we take $\tilde{\chi}(x) \in C^{\infty}(\Omega)$ such that $\tilde{\chi}(x) \equiv 0$ in $B_r \cap \Omega$ and $\tilde{\chi} \equiv 1$ in $\Omega \setminus B_{2r}$. Then by repeating the above steps, we obtain that

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^{\varepsilon}(\Omega)(1 - \eta_r + o(1))^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^{\varepsilon} - \sigma_r + o(1). \tag{7.47}$$

By (7.46) and (7.47), we deduce that

$$(\eta_r + o(1))^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} + (1 - \eta_r + o(1))^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \leq 1. \tag{7.48}$$

Notice that $h(t) := t^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} + (1-t)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}$ satisfying that $\min_{t \in [0,1]} h(t) = 1$ and only achieved by $t = 0$ or $t = 1$. Hence, we obtain that $\eta_r \equiv 0$ or $\eta_r \equiv 1$ for any $r > 0$.

But by Corollary 7.1, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, s)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega \cap B_1} [\lambda a_{\varepsilon}(x)|u_{\varepsilon}|^{2^*(s)} + \mu a_{\varepsilon}(x)|v_{\varepsilon}|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s)\kappa a_{\varepsilon}(x)|u_{\varepsilon}|^{\alpha}|v_{\varepsilon}|^{\beta}] dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega \cap B_1^c} [\lambda a_{\varepsilon}(x)|u_{\varepsilon}|^{2^*(s)} + \mu a_{\varepsilon}(x)|v_{\varepsilon}|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s)\kappa a_{\varepsilon}(x)|u_{\varepsilon}|^{\alpha}|v_{\varepsilon}|^{\beta}] dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Combined with the fact of that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega \cap B_1} [\lambda a_{\varepsilon}(x)|u_{\varepsilon}|^{2^*(s)} + \mu a_{\varepsilon}(x)|v_{\varepsilon}|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s)\kappa a_{\varepsilon}(x)|u_{\varepsilon}|^{\alpha}|v_{\varepsilon}|^{\beta}] dx \\
&+ \int_{\Omega \cap B_1^c} [\lambda a_{\varepsilon}(x)|u_{\varepsilon}|^{2^*(s)} + \mu a_{\varepsilon}(x)|v_{\varepsilon}|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s)\kappa a_{\varepsilon}(x)|u_{\varepsilon}|^{\alpha}|v_{\varepsilon}|^{\beta}] dx = 1,
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega \cap B_1} [\lambda a_\varepsilon(x) |u_\varepsilon|^{2^*(s)} + \mu a_\varepsilon(x) |v_\varepsilon|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa a_\varepsilon(x) |u_\varepsilon|^\alpha |v_\varepsilon|^\beta] dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega \cap B_1^c} [\lambda a_\varepsilon(x) |u_\varepsilon|^{2^*(s)} + \mu a_\varepsilon(x) |v_\varepsilon|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa a_\varepsilon(x) |u_\varepsilon|^\alpha |v_\varepsilon|^\beta] dx \\
&= \frac{1}{2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.49}$$

Hence, we have $\eta_r \equiv \frac{1}{2}$ for any $r > 0$, a contradiction. \square

Proof of Theorem 7.1: Let $(u_{\varepsilon_k}, v_{\varepsilon_k})$ be a solution to (7.19) with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_k$ given by Lemma 7.7 and $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Up to a subsequence, we may assume that $u_{\varepsilon_k} \rightharpoonup u, v_{\varepsilon_k} \rightharpoonup v$ in $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and $u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u, v_\varepsilon \rightarrow v$ a.e. in Ω (see Lemma 7.8). Then if $0 \notin \bar{\Omega}$, by Rellich-Kondrachov compact theorem, it is easy to see that $u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u, v_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow v$ strongly in $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$. And when Ω is a cone, by Corollary 7.2, we also obtain that $u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u, v_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow v$ strongly in $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$. By (iv) of Lemma 7.8, we obtain that (u, v) is an extremal of $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$, the proof is completed. \square

Remark 7.1. When Ω is a cone, let (u, v) be the extremal obtained as limit of $(u_{\varepsilon_k}, v_{\varepsilon_k})$, the solution to (7.19) with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_k$ given by Lemma 7.7. Then by Lemma 7.8, Corollary 7.2 and the formula (7.49), we see that (u, v) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega \cap B_1} [\lambda a_0(x) |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu a_0(x) |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa a_0(x) |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta] dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega \cap B_1^c} [\lambda a_0(x) |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu a_0(x) |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa a_0(x) |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta] dx \\
&= \frac{1}{2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.50}$$

7.3 Existence of positive ground state solutions

Remark 7.2. Assume that (u, v) is an extremal of $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{|x|^s} [\lambda |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta] dx = 1$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega).$$

Then it is easy to prove that $(\phi, \psi) := ((S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega))^{\frac{1}{2^*(s)-2}} u, (S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega))^{\frac{1}{2^*(s)-2}} v)$ is a ground state solution to problem (7.1). And the corresponding energy

$$c_0 = \Phi(\phi, \psi) = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s)} \right) [S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)]^{\frac{2^*(s)}{2^*(s)-2}}.$$

□

By (7.9), we always have $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \leq (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega)$. And when Ω is a cone and $s \in (0, 2)$, $\alpha > 1$, $\beta > 1$, $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$, by Theorem 7.1, $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is always attained. However, if $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega)$, $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ can be achieved by semi-trivial function. Hence, to obtain the existence of positive ground state solution to problem (7.1), we only need to search some sufficient conditions to ensure the following strictly inequality:

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) < (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega). \quad (7.51)$$

We obtain the following existence theorem:

Theorem 7.2. *Let Ω be a cone in \mathbb{R}^N (especially, $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$) or $0 \notin \bar{\Omega}$, $s \in (0, 2)$, $\kappa > 0$, $\alpha > 1$, $\beta > 1$, $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$. Then problem (1.1) possesses a positive ground state solution (ϕ, ψ) provided further one of the following conditions:*

$$(a.1) \quad \lambda > \mu, 1 < \beta < 2 \text{ or } \begin{cases} \beta = 2 \\ \kappa > \frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} \end{cases} ;$$

$$(a.2) \quad \lambda = \mu, \min\{\alpha, \beta\} < 2 \text{ or } \begin{cases} \min\{\alpha, \beta\} = 2, \\ \kappa > \frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} \end{cases} ;$$

$$(a.3) \quad \lambda < \mu, 1 < \alpha < 2 \text{ or } \begin{cases} \alpha = 2 \\ \kappa > \frac{\mu}{2^*(s)} \end{cases} .$$

Moreover, when Ω is a cone, we have the following regularity and decay propositions:

$$(b.1) \quad \text{if } 0 < s < \frac{N+2}{N}, \phi, \psi \in C^2(\bar{\Omega});$$

$$(b.2) \quad \text{if } s = \frac{N+2}{N}, \phi, \psi \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega) \text{ for all } 0 < \gamma < 1;$$

$$(b.3) \quad \text{if } s > \frac{N+2}{N}, \phi, \psi \in C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega) \text{ for all } 0 < \gamma < \frac{N(2-s)}{N-2}.$$

and there exists a constant C such that $|\phi(x)|, |\psi(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|^{-(N-1)})$ and $|\nabla\phi(x)|, |\nabla\psi(x)| \leq C|x|^{-N}$. In particular, if $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^N$, $(\phi(x), \psi(x))$ is axially symmetric with respect to the x_N -axis, i.e., $(\phi(x), \psi(x)) = (\phi(x', x_N), \psi(x', x_N)) = (\phi(|x'|, x_N), \psi(|x'|, x_N))$.

Remark 7.3. *The conditions (a.1) – (a.3) assumed in Theorem 7.2 are some sufficient conditions to ensure the inequality (7.51) (see Lemma 7.10). But they are not necessary conditions. For example, for the case of $\lambda > \mu$ and $1 < \alpha < 2$ is not enough to exclude that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) < \lambda^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega)$, i.e., (7.51) may also satisfy.*

Define the functional

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(u, v) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2^*(s)} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{|x|^s} [\lambda |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta] dx \end{aligned} \quad (7.52)$$

and the corresponding Nehari manifold

$$\mathcal{N} := \{(u, v) \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{0, 0\} : J(u, v) = 0\} \quad (7.53)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J(u, v) &:= \langle \Phi'(u, v), (u, v) \rangle \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx - \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{|x|^s} [\lambda |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta] dx. \end{aligned} \quad (7.54)$$

By Lemma 4.1, \mathcal{N} is well defined. Define

$$c_0 := \inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{N}} \Phi(u, v), \quad (7.55)$$

then basing on the results of Section 4 and Section 6, we see that

$$0 < c_0 \leq \left[\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s)} \right] [\mu_s(\Omega)]^{\frac{2^*(s)}{2^*(s)-2}} (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)-2}}. \quad (7.56)$$

Moreover, we have the following result:

Lemma 7.9. *Let Ω be a cone of \mathbb{R}^N or $0 \notin \bar{\Omega}$. Assume that $\kappa > 0, s \in (0, 2), \alpha > 1, \beta > 1, \alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$ and let c_0 be defined by (7.55), then we have*

$$c_0 < \left[\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s)} \right] (\mu_s(\Omega))^{\frac{2^*(s)}{2^*(s)-2}} (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)-2}} \quad (7.57)$$

if and only if

$$S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega) < (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega). \quad (7.58)$$

Proof. A direct computation shows that

$$c_0 = \left[\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s)} \right] (S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega))^{\frac{2^*(s)}{2^*(s)-2}}. \quad (7.59)$$

□

Then combining with the conclusions of Section 6, we have the following result:

Lemma 7.10. *Let Ω be a cone in \mathbb{R}^N (especially, $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$) or $0 \notin \bar{\Omega}, s \in (0, 2), \kappa > 0, \alpha > 1, \beta > 1, \alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$. Then we have $S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega) < (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega)$, if one of the following holds:*

- (i) $\lambda > \mu, 1 < \beta < 2$ or $\begin{cases} \beta = 2 \\ \kappa > \frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} \end{cases}$;
- (ii) $\lambda = \mu, \min\{\alpha, \beta\} < 2$ or $\begin{cases} \min\{\alpha, \beta\} = 2, \\ \kappa > \frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} \end{cases}$;

$$(iii) \quad \lambda < \mu, 1 < \alpha < 2 \text{ or } \begin{cases} \alpha = 2 \\ \kappa > \frac{\mu}{2^*(s)} \end{cases}.$$

Proof. It follows by Corollary 6.3, Corollary 6.4, Lemma 6.5 and Lemma 7.9. \square

Proof of Theorem 7.2: Under the assumptions of Theorem 7.2, firstly by Theorem 7.1, $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is attained by some (u, v) such that u, v are nonnegative functions such that $(u, v) \neq (0, 0)$. On the other hand, by Lemma 7.10, we have

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) < (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega).$$

Hence, we see that $u \neq 0, v \neq 0$. By Remark 7.2,

$$(\phi, \psi) := ((S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega))^{\frac{1}{2^*(s)-2}} u, (S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega))^{\frac{1}{2^*(s)-2}} v)$$

is a ground state solution of problem (1.1). Then by the strong maximum principle, it is easy to see that $\phi > 0, \psi > 0$ in Ω .

We note that the arguments in Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2 are valid for general cone. Combining with Proposition 3.3, we complete the proof. \square

7.4 Uniqueness and Nonexistence of positive ground state solutions

Define

$$G(u, v) := \frac{\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} (\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s}) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}, \quad (u, v) \neq (0, 0) \quad (7.60)$$

then we have

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = \inf_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{(0,0)\}} G(u, v). \quad (7.61)$$

For any $u \neq 0, v \neq 0$ and $t \geq 0$, we have

$$G(u, tv) = \frac{\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 t^2) dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} (\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} t^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s} t^\beta) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \quad (7.62)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} G(u, tu) &= \frac{\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 t^2) dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} (\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} t^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |u|^\beta}{|x|^s} t^\beta) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\ &= \frac{1 + t^2}{[\lambda + \mu t^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa t^\beta]^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\ &:= g(t) \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.63)$$

We define $g(+\infty) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} g(t) = \mu^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}$, then we see that

$$G(0, v) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} G(v, tv) = g(+\infty) \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}}.$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega) &= \inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}} G(u, v) \\ &\leq \inf_{u \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)} \inf_{t \in [0, +\infty)} G(u, tu) \\ &= \inf_{t \in [0, +\infty)} g(t) \inf_{u \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\ &= \inf_{t \in [0, +\infty)} g(t) \mu_s(\Omega). \end{aligned} \quad (7.64)$$

Moreover, we can obtain the follow precise result:

Lemma 7.11. $S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega) = \inf_{t \in [0, +\infty)} g(t) \mu_s(\Omega)$, where

$$g(t) := \frac{1 + t^2}{[\lambda + \mu t^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa t^{\beta}]^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}}. \quad (7.65)$$

Proof. By (7.64), we only need to prove the reverse inequality. Now, let $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ be a minimizing sequence of $S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega)$. Since $G(u, v) = G(tu, tv)$ for all $t > 0$, without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} \right) \equiv 1,$$

and

$$G(u_n, v_n) = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega) + o(1).$$

Case 1: $\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx = 0$. Since $\{v_n\}$ is bounded in $L^{2^*(s)}(\Omega, \frac{dx}{|x|^s})$, by Hölder inequality, up to a subsequence, we see that

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u_n|^{\alpha} |v_n|^{\beta}}{|x|^s} \right) dx = \mu \int_{\Omega} \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx + o(1) = \mu + o(1).$$

Hence,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G(u, v_n) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G(0, v_n).$$

We see that $(0, v_n)$ is also a minimizing sequence of $S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega)$. Hence, it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega) &= \mu^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega) \\ &= g(+\infty) \mu_s(\Omega) \\ &\geq \inf_{t \in (0, +\infty)} g(t) \mu_s(\Omega). \end{aligned} \quad (7.66)$$

Case 2: $\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx = 0$. Similarly to Case 1, we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) &= \lambda^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega) \\ &= g(0) \mu_s(\Omega) \\ &\geq \inf_{t \in [0, +\infty)} g(t) \mu_s(\Omega). \end{aligned} \quad (7.67)$$

Case 3: Up to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx = \delta > 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx = 1 - \delta > 0$. Let $t_n > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{|t_n u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx,$$

then we see that $\{t_n\}$ is bounded and away from 0. Up to a subsequence, we may assume that $t_n \rightarrow t_0 = \left(\frac{\delta}{1-\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*(s)}}$. Now let $w_n = \frac{1}{t_n} v_n$, then we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{|w_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx \quad (7.68)$$

and by Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u_n|^\alpha |w_n|^\beta}{|x|^s} dx &\leq \frac{\alpha}{2^*(s)} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx + \frac{\beta}{2^*(s)} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|w_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{|w_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (7.69)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
G(u_n, v_n) &= G(u_n, t_n w_n) \\
&= \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} (\lambda \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu t_n^{2^*(s)} \frac{|w_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa t_n^\beta \frac{|u_n|^\alpha |w_n|^\beta}{|x|^s}) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\
&\quad + \frac{\int_{\Omega} t_n^2 |\nabla w_n|^2 dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} (\lambda \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu t_n^{2^*(s)} \frac{|w_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa t_n^\beta \frac{|u_n|^\alpha |w_n|^\beta}{|x|^s}) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\left[\lambda + \mu t_n^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa t_n^\beta \right]^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\
&\quad + \frac{t_n^2}{\left[\lambda + \mu t_n^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa t_n^\beta \right]^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_n|^2 dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|w_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\left[\lambda + \mu t_n^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa t_n^\beta \right]^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \mu_s(\Omega) + \frac{t_n^2}{\left[\lambda + \mu t_n^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa t_n^\beta \right]^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \mu_s(\Omega) \\
&= g(t_n) \mu_s(\Omega). \tag{7.70}
\end{aligned}$$

Let $n \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain that

$$S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega) \geq g(t_0) \mu_s(\Omega) \geq \inf_{t \in (0, +\infty)} g(t) \mu_s(\Omega).$$

Thereby $S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega) = \inf_{t \in (0, +\infty)} g(t) \mu_s(\Omega)$ is proved. \square

Basing on Lemma 7.11, we can propose the ‘‘uniqueness’’ type result as following:

Theorem 7.3. *Let Ω be a cone in \mathbb{R}^N (especially, $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$) or $0 \notin \bar{\Omega}$, $s \in (0, 2)$, $\kappa > 0$, $\alpha > 1$, $\beta > 1$, $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$. Let (ϕ, ψ) be a positive ground state solution to problem (7.1), then $\phi = C(t_0)U$, $v = t_0 C(t_0)U$, where U is the ground state solution of*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \mu_s(\Omega) \frac{u^{2^*(s)-1}}{|x|^s} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{7.71}$$

while $t_0 > 0$ satisfies that

$$g(t_0) = \inf_{t \in (0, +\infty)} g(t) \tag{7.72}$$

and

$$C(t_0) := [S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega)]^{\frac{1}{2^*(s)-2}} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda + \mu t_0^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa t_0^\beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2^*(s)}}. \tag{7.73}$$

Proof. By the processes of Case 3 in the proof of Lemma 7.11, if $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is attained by some nontrivial function (u, v) , i.e., $u \neq 0, v \neq 0$. Then there exists some $t_0 > 0$ such that $v = t_0 u$ where u is a minimizer of $\mu_s(\Omega)$ and t_0 satisfies $g(t_0) = \inf_{t \in (0, +\infty)} g(t)$.

Now assume that $u = CU, v = t_0 CU$, then a direct computation shows that

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{|x|^s} [\lambda |u|^{2^*(s)} + \mu |v|^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa |u|^\alpha |v|^\beta] dx = 1$$

if and only if

$$C = \left(\frac{1}{\lambda + \mu t_0^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa t_0^\beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2^*(s)}}.$$

Finally by Remark 7.2, we see that $\phi = [S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)]^{\frac{1}{2^*(s)-2}} u, \psi = [S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)]^{\frac{1}{2^*(s)-2}} v$. And we complete the proof. \square

Remark 7.4. We note that problem (7.1) possesses a positive ground state solution is a necessary condition but not a sufficient condition of that

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) < (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega).$$

Next, we will give a counter-example that $N = 3, s = 1, \alpha = \beta = 2, \lambda = \mu = 2\kappa$, the details see the following Theorem 7.4.

Theorem 7.4. Let Ω be a cone in \mathbb{R}^3 or $0 \notin \bar{\Omega}, 0 < s < 2$. Then for the case of $s = 1, \alpha = \beta = 2, \lambda = \mu = 2\kappa > 0$, the extremals of $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ are given by

$$\mathcal{A} := \{(t_1 U, t_2 U) : t_1 \geq 0, t_2 \geq 0, (t_1, t_2) \neq (0, 0) \text{ and } U \text{ is a extremal of } \mu_s(\Omega)\}. \quad (7.74)$$

And for the other cases satisfying that $\alpha > 2$ or $\begin{cases} \alpha = 2 \\ \mu \geq 2\kappa \end{cases}, \beta > 2$ or $\begin{cases} \beta = 2 \\ \lambda \geq 2\kappa \end{cases}$,

then $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ has no nontrivial extremal.

Proof. We proceed by contradiction. Assume that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ has a nontrivial extremal (u, v) , then by Lemma 7.11 (see case 3 of the proof), we see that there exists some $t_0 > 0$ such that $v = t_0 u$ and u is a extremal of $\mu_s(\Omega)$. Moreover, t_0 attained

the minimum of $g(t)$. Since $\alpha > 2$ or $\begin{cases} \alpha = 2 \\ \mu \geq 2\kappa \end{cases}, \beta > 2$ or $\begin{cases} \beta = 2 \\ \lambda \geq 2\kappa \end{cases}$, we see that $g''(0) \geq 0$ and $g'(t) < 0$ for t large enough. Hence, $\{t > 0 : g'(t) = 0\}$ has at least 3 solutions $\{t_1, t_2, t_3\}$ such that $0 < t_1 < t_2 = t_0 < t_3 < \infty$. A direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} g'(t) &= \frac{-2\mu t^{2^*(s)-1} + 2\kappa \alpha t^{\beta+1} - 2\kappa \beta t^{\beta-1} + 2\lambda t}{[\lambda + \mu t^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa t^\beta]^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)+1}}} \\ &= \frac{-2t}{[\lambda + \mu t^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s) \kappa t^\beta]^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)+1}}} (\mu t^{2^*(s)-2} - \kappa \alpha t^\beta + \kappa \beta t^{\beta-2} - \lambda) \end{aligned} \quad (7.75)$$

Define

$$h(t) := \mu t^{2^*(s)-2} - \kappa \alpha t^\beta + \kappa \beta t^{\beta-2} - \lambda, \quad (7.76)$$

then we obtain that $\{t > 0 : h(t) = 0\}$ has at least 3 solutions $\{t_1, t_2, t_3\}$ such that $0 < t_1 < t_2 = t_0 < t_3 < \infty$.

Case 1: $\beta = 2$ and $2\kappa - \lambda \leq 0$: For this case, $h(t) = \mu t^{2^*(s)-2} - \kappa \alpha t^2 + 2\kappa - \lambda$. By Rolle's mean value theorem, $\{t > 0 : h'(t) = 0\}$ has at least two solutions \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_2 such that

$$t_1 < \tilde{t}_1 < t_2 = t_0 < \tilde{t}_2 < t_3.$$

Note that $\{t > 0 : h'(t) = 0\}$ is equivalent to that $\{t > 0 : \mu[2^*(s) - 2]t^{2^*(s)-4} - 2\kappa\alpha = 0\}$. Note that $\{t > 0 : \mu[2^*(s) - 2]t^{2^*(s)-4} - 2\kappa\alpha = 0\}$ has a unique solution if $2^*(s) \neq 4$, a contradiction. Hence, $2^*(s) = 4$ and $\mu = 2\kappa$. Recalling that $2^*(s) = \frac{2(N-s)}{N-2}$, $s \in (0, 2)$, we obtain that $N = 3$, $s = 1$, $\alpha = 2^*(s) - \beta = 2$. Then

$$g(t_0) = \frac{1 + t_0^2}{[\lambda + 2\kappa t_0^4 + 4\kappa t_0^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}, \quad (7.77)$$

which implies that

$$\lambda = \mu = 2\kappa.$$

And it follows that $g(t) \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}$. Hence, when $N = 3$, $s = 1$, $\alpha = \beta = 2$, $\lambda = \mu = 2\kappa$,

the extremals of $S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega)$ are given by (7.74). And $\{(\phi, \psi) = \sqrt{\frac{\mu_s(\Omega)}{2\kappa(1+t^2)}}(U, tU), t > 0\}$ are all the ground state solutions of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u - 2\kappa \frac{|u|^2 u}{|x|} = 2\kappa \frac{uv^2}{|x|} \text{ in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta v - 2\kappa \frac{|v|^2 v}{|x|} = 2\kappa \frac{u^2 v}{|x|} \text{ in } \Omega, \\ \kappa > 0, u, v \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega). \end{cases} \quad (7.78)$$

where U is the ground state solution of (7.71).

Case 2: $\beta > 2$: For this case, $h(t) = \mu t^{2^*(s)-2} - \kappa \alpha t^\beta + \kappa \beta t^{\beta-2} - \lambda$, similarly we see that $\{h(t) = 0, t > 0\}$ has at least three roots $t_1 < t_2 = t_0 < t_3$. It follow that $\{h'(t), t > 0\}$ has at least two roots \tilde{t}_1 and \tilde{t}_2 , which implies that $\{p(t) = 0, t > 0\}$ has at least two solutions. And here $p(t)$ is defined as

$$p(t) := \mu[2^*(s) - 2]t^{2^*(s)-\beta} - \kappa \alpha \beta t^2 + \kappa \beta(\beta - 2). \quad (7.79)$$

A direct computation shows that $p''(t) > 0$ when $\alpha > 2$. Hence $\{p(t) = 0, t > 0\}$ could not have more than one solution, a contradiction. And if $\beta > 2$, $\alpha = 2$, we have $p(t) = [\mu[2^*(s) - 2] - \kappa \alpha \beta]t^2 + \kappa \beta(\beta - 2)$ which also has at most one positive root, a contradiction again.

We note that for the case of $\mu > \lambda$, we will take

$$\tilde{g}(t) := g\left(\frac{1}{t}\right) = \frac{1 + t^2}{[\mu + \lambda t^{2^*(s)} + 2^*(s)\kappa t^\alpha]^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}}$$

and the arguments above can repeated (β is replaced by α now). We complete the proof. \square

Corollary 7.3. *Let Ω be a cone in \mathbb{R}^3 or $0 \notin \bar{\Omega}$, $0 < s < 2$. Furthermore, assume that $\alpha > 2$ or $\begin{cases} \alpha = 2 \\ \mu \geq 2\kappa \end{cases}$, $\beta > 2$ or $\begin{cases} \beta = 2 \\ \lambda \geq 2\kappa \end{cases}$, then $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega)$.*

Proof. For the special case $N = 3$, $s = 1$, $\alpha = \beta = 2$, $\lambda = \mu = 2\kappa$, a direct computation show it. And for the other cases, if $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \neq (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega)$. Then there must hold that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) < (\max\{\lambda, \mu\})^{-\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \mu_s(\Omega)$. By Theorem 7.1 and Lemma , $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$, can be achieved by some nontrivial extremal (u, v) , a contradiction to Theorem 7.4. \square

7.5 Further results about cones

Assume that $0 < s < 2$, $\alpha > 1$, $\beta > 1$, $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$, basing on the results of Theorem 7.1, we see that when Ω is a cone, $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is always achieved. In this subsection, we always assume that Ω is a cone. And we shall investigate more properties about $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$.

Let us begin with a remark:

Remark 7.5. *Assume that Ω_1, Ω_2 are domains of \mathbb{R}^N and $\Omega_1 \subseteq \Omega_2$, then it is easy to see that $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_1) \subseteq D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_2)$. Then by the definition of $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ (see the formula (7.6)), we see that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_1) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_2)$.*

Lemma 7.12. *Let $\{\Omega_n\}$ be a sequence of cones.*

(i) *$\{\Omega_n\}$ is a increasing sequence, i.e., $\Omega_n \subseteq \Omega_{n+1}$, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_n) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega),$$

where

$$\Omega = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_n = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \Omega_n.$$

(ii) *$\{\Omega_n\}$ is a decreasing sequence, i.e., $\Omega_n \supseteq \Omega_{n+1}$, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_n) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega),$$

where

$$\Omega = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \Omega_n.$$

and we denote that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = +\infty$ if $meas(\Omega) = 0$.

Proof. (i) By Remark 7.5, we see that $\{S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n)\}$ is a decreasing nonnegative sequence. Hence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n)$ exists. Also by Remark 7.5 and $\Omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \Omega_i \supseteq \Omega_n, \forall n$, we have

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n). \quad (7.80)$$

On the other hand, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\exists (u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) \in C_c^\infty(\Omega) \times C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 + |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2] dx < S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) + \varepsilon \quad (7.81)$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_\varepsilon|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_\varepsilon|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u_\varepsilon|^\alpha |v_\varepsilon|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx = 1. \quad (7.82)$$

Then there exists some N_0 large enough such that

$$u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon \in C_c^\infty(\Omega_n) \text{ for all } n \geq N_0. \quad (7.83)$$

Hence, by the definition of $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n)$ again, we have

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) < S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) + \varepsilon \text{ for all } n \geq N_0. \quad (7.84)$$

Let n goes to infinity, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) + \varepsilon. \quad (7.85)$$

By the arbitrary of ε , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega). \quad (7.86)$$

(7.80) and (7.86) say that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_n) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega). \quad (7.87)$$

(ii) By Remark 7.5, we see that $\{S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n)\}$ is a increasing sequence. Let us denote $\bar{S} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n)$. For any n , let (u_n, v_n) be the extremal function to $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ by Theorem 7.1. We can extend u_n and v_n by 0 out side Ω_n . By Remark 7.1, we have $\int_{\Omega_\pi} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u_n|^\alpha |v_n|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \equiv 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_\pi \cap B_1} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u_n|^\alpha |v_n|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega_\pi \setminus B_1} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u_n|^\alpha |v_n|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.88)$$

Case 1— $meas(\Omega) = 0$: In this case, we shall prove that $\bar{S} = \infty$. Now, we proceed by contradiction. If $\bar{S} < \infty$, $\{u_n\}, \{v_n\}$ are bounded sequences in $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_1)$. Then up to a subsequence, we may assume that $u_n \rightharpoonup u, v_n \rightharpoonup v$ in $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_1)$ and $u_n \rightarrow u, v_n \rightarrow v$ a.e. in Ω_1 . Since $meas(\bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \Omega_n) = 0$, we get $u = 0, v = 0$. On the other hand, by applying the same argument as Corollary 7.2, we can obtain that $u_n \rightarrow u, v_n \rightarrow v$ in $L^{2^*(s)}(\Omega_1, \frac{dx}{|x|^s})$. Then we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx = 1, \quad (7.89)$$

a contradiction. Hence $\bar{S} = \infty$.

Case 2— Ω is a cone: In this case, by Theorem 7.1, $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is well defined and can be achieved. Notice that for any n , we have $\Omega \subseteq \Omega_n$, by Remark 7.5 again, we have $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$. Hence

$$\bar{S} \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega). \quad (7.90)$$

Thus, $\{u_n\}, \{v_n\}$ are bounded in $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_1)$ for this case. Arguing as before, it is easy to see the weak limit $u \neq 0, v \neq 0$ and

$$0 < \int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \leq 1. \quad (7.91)$$

We claim that (u, v) weak solve

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \bar{S} \left(\lambda \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^{2^*(s)-2} u + \kappa \alpha \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^\beta \right) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta v = \bar{S} \left(\mu \frac{1}{|x|^s} |v|^{2^*(s)-2} v + \kappa \beta \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v \right) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u \geq 0, v \geq 0, (u, v) \in \mathcal{D} := D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega), \end{cases} \quad (7.92)$$

Since $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ is dense in $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$, we only need to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi + \nabla v \cdot \nabla \psi \\ &= \bar{S} \int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)-1} \phi}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)-1} \psi}{|x|^s} + \kappa \alpha \frac{|u|^{\alpha-2} u \phi |v|^\beta}{|x|^s} + \kappa \beta \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v \psi}{|x|^s} \right) dx \\ & \text{for all } (\phi, \psi) \in C_c^\infty(\Omega) \times C_c^\infty(\Omega). \end{aligned} \quad (7.93)$$

Now, let $(\phi, \psi) \in C_c^\infty(\Omega) \times C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ fixed. Notice that $\Omega \subseteq \Omega_n$, we have $\phi, \psi \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_n), \forall n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_n} \nabla u_n \cdot \nabla \phi + \nabla v_n \cdot \nabla \psi \\ &= S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) \int_{\Omega_n} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)-1} \phi}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)-1} \psi}{|x|^s} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \kappa \alpha \frac{|u_n|^{\alpha-2} u_n \phi |v_n|^\beta}{|x|^s} + \kappa \beta \frac{|u_n|^\alpha |v_n|^{\beta-2} v_n \psi}{|x|^s} \right) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (7.94)$$

Since $\text{supp}(\phi) \text{supp}(\psi) \subseteq \Omega$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_n} \nabla u_n \cdot \nabla \phi + \nabla v_n \cdot \nabla \psi \\ &= S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) \int_{\Omega_n} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)-1} \phi}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)-1} \psi}{|x|^s} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \kappa \alpha \frac{|u_n|^{\alpha-2} u_n \phi |v_n|^\beta}{|x|^s} + \kappa \beta \frac{|u_n|^\alpha |v_n|^{\beta-2} v_n \psi}{|x|^s} \right) dx. \text{ for all } n. \end{aligned} \quad (7.95)$$

Then apply the similar arguments as Corollary 7.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi + \nabla v \cdot \nabla \psi \\ &= \bar{S} \int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)-1} \phi}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)-1} \psi}{|x|^s} + \kappa \alpha \frac{|u|^{\alpha-2} u \phi |v|^{\beta}}{|x|^s} + \kappa \beta \frac{|u|^{\alpha} |v|^{\beta-2} v \psi}{|x|^s} \right) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (7.96)$$

Thereby the claim is proved. By (7.91) and $2 < 2^*(s)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega) \\ & \leq \frac{\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2] dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^{\alpha} |v|^{\beta}}{|x|^s} \right) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\ & \leq \frac{\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2] dx}{\int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^{\alpha} |v|^{\beta}}{|x|^s} \right) dx} = \bar{S}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.97)$$

(7.90) and (7.97) say that

$$S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega) = \bar{S} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega_n)$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^{\alpha} |v|^{\beta}}{|x|^s} \right) dx = 1.$$

Hence, (u, v) is a extremal function of $S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega)$. The proof is completed. \square

Define

$$\underline{S}_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu} := \inf \{ S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega) : \Omega \text{ is a cone properly contained in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\} \}. \quad (7.98)$$

For any given unit versor ν in \mathbb{R}^N , let

$$\Omega_{\theta} := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x \cdot \nu > |x| \cos \theta \}, \theta \in (0, \pi]. \quad (7.99)$$

Then we have the following result:

Lemma 7.13.

$$S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega_{\pi}) = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ for } N \geq 4.$$

Proof. Take $F = \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega_{\pi}$, $F_n := F \cap \overline{B_n(0)}$. We note that F_n is a closed subset of a 1-dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^N and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n = F$. Then by Proposition 3.4, $D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus F_n) = D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for any n . Then it follows that $D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus F) = D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. That is $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_{\pi}) = D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Hence, $S_{p,a,b}(\Omega_{\pi}) = S_{p,a,b}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. \square

Theorem 7.5. *For every $\tau \geq \underline{S}_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}$, there exists a cone Ω in \mathbb{R}^N such that $S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega) = \tau$. Moreover, when $N \geq 4$, we have $\underline{S}_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu} = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.*

Proof. Define a mapping $\tau : (0, \pi] \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\}$ with $\tau(\theta) = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega_\theta)$. Then by Remark 7.5, we see that the mapping τ is decreasing with related to θ . By the basic knowledge in real analysis, $\tau(\theta)$ is continuous for a.e $\theta \in (0, \pi]$. Furthermore, we can strengthen the conclusion. Indeed, let $\theta \in (0, \pi)$ fixed. For any $\theta_n \uparrow \theta$, by (i) of Lemma 7.12, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau(\theta_n) = \tau(\theta). \quad (7.100)$$

On the other hand, for any $\theta_n \downarrow \theta$, by (ii) of Lemma 7.12, we also obtain (7.100). Hence, τ is continuous in $(0, \pi)$. In addition, $\tau(\theta_n) \downarrow S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega_\pi) = \underline{S}_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}$ as $\theta_n \uparrow \pi$ and $\tau(\theta_n) \uparrow +\infty$ as $\theta_n \downarrow 0$.

Especially, when $N \geq 4$, by Lemma 7.13, we have that

$$\underline{S}_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu} = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega_\pi) = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

□

7.6 Existence of infinitely many sign-changing solutions

In this subsection, we will study the existence of infinitely many solutions as an application of Theorem 7.2.

Theorem 7.6. *Assume $s \in (0, 2)$, $\kappa > 0$, $\alpha > 1$, $\beta > 1$, $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$, and let Ω_θ as the defined by (7.99) for some fixed $\theta \in (0, \pi]$, then the problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u - \lambda \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^{2^*(s)-2} u = \kappa \alpha \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^\beta & \text{in } \Omega_\theta, \theta \in (0, \pi], \\ -\Delta v - \mu \frac{1}{|x|^s} |v|^{2^*(s)-2} v = \kappa \beta \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v & \text{in } \Omega_\theta, \\ u \geq 0, v \geq 0, (u, v) \in \mathcal{D} := D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_\theta) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_\theta), \end{cases} \quad (7.101)$$

possesses a sequence of sign changing solutions $\{(u_k, v_k)\}$ different modulo rotations around v if one of the following holds:

$$(a.1) \quad \lambda > \mu, 1 < \beta < 2 \text{ or } \begin{cases} \beta = 2 \\ \kappa > \frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} \end{cases};$$

$$(a.2) \quad \lambda = \mu, \min\{\alpha, \beta\} < 2 \text{ or } \begin{cases} \min\{\alpha, \beta\} = 2, \\ \kappa > \frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} \end{cases};$$

$$(a.3) \quad \lambda < \mu, 1 < \alpha < 2 \text{ or } \begin{cases} \alpha = 2 \\ \kappa > \frac{\mu}{2^*(s)} \end{cases}.$$

Moreover, we have $c_k \rightarrow +\infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ where

$$\begin{aligned} c_k := & \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_\theta} [|\nabla u_k|^2 + |\nabla v_k|^2] dx \\ & - \frac{1}{2^*(s)} \int_{\Omega_\theta} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_k|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_k|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u_k|^\alpha |v_k|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \end{aligned} \quad (7.102)$$

and satisfies $\frac{c_k}{2^{k(N-1)}} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. The idea is inspired by[6]. We will construct a solution on Ω_θ by gluing together suitable signed solutions corresponding to each sub-cone. Using the spherical coordinates, we writhe $S^{n-1} = \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{N-1} : \theta_i \in S^1, i = 1, \dots, N-1\}$. For any fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we set

$$\Sigma_j^{(k)} = \left(\frac{j}{2^{k-1}}\theta - \theta, \frac{j+1}{2^{k-1}}\theta - \theta\right) \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, 2^k - 1$$

and for every choice of $(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{N-1}) \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2^k - 1\}^{N-1}$,

$$\Omega_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)} := \left\{x \in \Omega_\theta : \frac{x}{|x|} \in \Sigma_{j_1}^{(k)} \times \dots \times \Sigma_{j_{N-1}}^{(k)}\right\}.$$

Due to Theorem 7.2, we can take $(u_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)}, v_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)}) \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)}) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)})$ as the positive ground state solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \beta}(\Omega_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)}) \left(\lambda \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^{2^*(s)-2} u + \kappa \alpha \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^\beta \right) & \text{in } \Omega_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)}, \\ -\Delta v = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \beta}(\Omega_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)}) \left(\mu \frac{1}{|x|^s} |v|^{2^*(s)-2} v + \kappa \beta \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v \right) & \text{in } \Omega_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)}, \\ u \geq 0, v \geq 0, (u, v) \in \mathcal{D} := D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)}) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)}), \end{cases}$$

We can extend every $u_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)}$ and $v_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)}$ outside $\Omega_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)}$ by 0 and now we set

$$u^{(k)} := \sum_{j_1=0}^{2^k-1} \dots \sum_{j_{N-1}=0}^{2^k-1} (-1)^{j_1+\dots+j_{N-1}} u_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)} \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_\theta)$$

and

$$v^{(k)} := \sum_{j_1=0}^{2^k-1} \dots \sum_{j_{N-1}=0}^{2^k-1} (-1)^{j_1+\dots+j_{N-1}} v_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)} \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_\theta)$$

Notice that for any two different choices $(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{N-1}) \neq (\tilde{j}_1, \tilde{j}_2, \dots, \tilde{j}_{N-1})$, there exists some rotation $R \in O(\mathbb{R}^N)$, the Orthogonal transformation, such that

$$\Omega_{\tilde{j}_1, \dots, \tilde{j}_{N-1}}^{(k)} = R(\Omega_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)}).$$

Hence, we have

$$S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \beta}(\Omega_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)}) = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \beta}(\Omega_{\tilde{j}_1, \dots, \tilde{j}_{N-1}}^{(k)}).$$

Then it follows that $(u^{(k)}, v^{(k)})$ weak solve

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \beta}(\Omega_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)}) \left(\lambda \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^{2^*(s)-2} u + \kappa \alpha \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^\beta \right) & \text{in } \Omega_\theta, \\ -\Delta v = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \beta}(\Omega_{j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}}^{(k)}) \left(\mu \frac{1}{|x|^s} |v|^{2^*(s)-2} v + \kappa \beta \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v \right) & \text{in } \Omega_\theta, \\ u \geq 0, v \geq 0, (u, v) \in \mathcal{D} := D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_\theta) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_\theta). \end{cases}$$

Noting that $2^*(s) > 2$, after a scaling, let

$$u_k := \left(S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\beta}(\Omega_{j_1,\dots,j_{N-1}}^{(k)}) \right)^{\frac{1}{2^*(s)-2}} u^{(k)}, \quad v_k := \left(S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\beta}(\Omega_{j_1,\dots,j_{N-1}}^{(k)}) \right)^{\frac{1}{2^*(s)-2}} v^{(k)}$$

then (u_k, v_k) weak solve (7.101). By the construction of u_k and v_k , it is easy to see that (u_k, v_k) is sign changing solutions and $\{(u_k, v_k)\}$ are different modulo rotations around ν .

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_k &:= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_\theta} [|\nabla u_k|^2 + |\nabla v_k|^2] dx \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2^*(s)} \int_{\Omega_\theta} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_k|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_k|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u_k|^\alpha |v_k|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s)} \right) \int_{\Omega_\theta} [|\nabla u_k|^2 + |\nabla v_k|^2] dx \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s)} \right) \left(S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_{j_1,\dots,j_{N-1}}^{(k)}) \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)-2}} \int_{\Omega_\theta} [|\nabla u^{(k)}|^2 + |\nabla v^{(k)}|^2] dx \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s)} \right) \left(S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_{j_1,\dots,j_{N-1}}^{(k)}) \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)-2}} \sum_{j_1=0}^{2^k-1} \cdots \sum_{j_{N-1}=0}^{2^k-1} \int_{\Omega_{j_1,\dots,j_{N-1}}^{(k)}} \\ &\quad [|\nabla u_{j_1,\dots,j_{N-1}}^{(k)}|^2 + |\nabla v_{j_1,\dots,j_{N-1}}^{(k)}|^2] dx \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s)} \right) \left(S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_{j_1,\dots,j_{N-1}}^{(k)}) \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)-2}} 2^{k(N-1)} \int_{\Omega_{0,\dots,0}} [|\nabla u_{0,\dots,0}^{(k)}|^2 + |\nabla v_{0,\dots,0}^{(k)}|^2] dx \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s)} \right) \left(S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_{j_1,\dots,j_{N-1}}^{(k)}) \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)-2}} 2^{k(N-1)} \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7.12, $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_{j_1,\dots,j_{N-1}}^{(k)}) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Recalling that $2^*(s) > 2$ again, we obtain that

$$\frac{c_k}{2^{k(N-1)}} \rightarrow +\infty.$$

□

Apply the same argument as the proof of Theorem 7.6, we can also state the following result:

Theorem 7.7. *Assume $s \in (0, 2)$, $\kappa > 0$, $\alpha > 1$, $\beta > 1$, $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$, then the problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u - \lambda \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^{2^*(s)-2} u = \kappa \alpha \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^\beta & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ -\Delta v - \mu \frac{1}{|x|^s} |v|^{2^*(s)-2} v = \kappa \beta \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ u \geq 0, v \geq 0, (u, v) \in \mathcal{D} := D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \times D_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N), \end{cases} \quad (7.103)$$

possesses a sequence of sign changing solutions $\{(u_k, v_k)\}$ if one of the following holds:

$$(a.1) \quad \lambda > \mu, 1 < \beta < 2 \text{ or } \begin{cases} \beta = 2 \\ \kappa > \frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} \end{cases} ;$$

$$(a.2) \quad \lambda = \mu, \min\{\alpha, \beta\} < 2 \text{ or } \begin{cases} \min\{\alpha, \beta\} = 2, \\ \kappa > \frac{\lambda}{2^*(s)} \end{cases} ;$$

$$(a.3) \quad \lambda < \mu, 1 < \alpha < 2 \text{ or } \begin{cases} \alpha = 2 \\ \kappa > \frac{\mu}{2^*(s)} \end{cases} .$$

Moreover, $c_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ where

$$c_k := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla u_k|^2 + |\nabla v_k|^2] dx - \frac{1}{2^*(s)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_k|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_k|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u_k|^\alpha |v_k|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx$$

and satisfies $\frac{c_k}{2^{k(N-1)}} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 7.6. It is clear that this kind arguments can be adapted also to the case of a cone with suitable symmetry properties.

7.7 Further results about general domains

Remark 7.7. Given a general open domain Ω , we let $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ be defined by (7.6) if $\Omega \neq \emptyset$ and $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\emptyset) = +\infty$. The results of this section only focus on that whether $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ can be achieved and give some operational way to compute the value of $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$. However, we do not exclude the semitrivial extremals. To obtain a further results, i.e., whether the extremal is positive, depends on the values $\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu, \kappa$ (see subsection 7.3 and 7.4).

We note that Ω can be written as a union of a sequence of domains, $\Omega = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \Omega_n$.

Lemma 7.14. Assume $\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j = \emptyset \forall i \neq j$, then we have

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = \inf_{n \geq 1} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n).$$

Proof. For any n , since $\Omega_n \subseteq \Omega$, we have

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \text{ for all } n.$$

Hence,

$$\inf_{n \geq 1} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega). \quad (7.104)$$

On the other hand, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists some

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx = 1 \quad (7.105)$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2] dx < S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) + \varepsilon. \quad (7.106)$$

Set $u_n = u|_{\Omega_n}$, $v_n = v|_{\Omega_n}$, since $\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$, we have $(u_n, v_n) \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_n) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega_n)$ and $u = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n$, $v = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} v_n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_n} [|\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2] dx \\ & \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) \left(\int_{\Omega_n} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u_n|^\alpha |v_n|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \\ & \geq \left(\inf_{n \geq 1} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) \right) \left(\int_{\Omega_n} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u_n|^\alpha |v_n|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \\ & \geq \left(\inf_{n \geq 1} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) \right) \int_{\Omega_n} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u_n|^\alpha |v_n|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \end{aligned}$$

since $\frac{2}{2^*(s)} < 1$ and $\int_{\Omega_n} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u_n|^\alpha |v_n|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \leq 1$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2] dx \\ & = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Omega_n} [|\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2] dx \\ & \geq \left(\inf_{n \geq 1} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) \right) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Omega_n} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u_n|^\alpha |v_n|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \\ & = \left(\inf_{n \geq 1} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) \right) \int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \\ & = \inf_{n \geq 1} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\inf_{n \geq 1} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) + \varepsilon.$$

By the arbitrary, we have

$$\inf_{n \geq 1} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_n) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega). \quad (7.107)$$

By (7.104) and (7.107), we complete the proof. \square

Next, for $r > 0$, we set

$$\Omega_r := \Omega \cap B_r \quad (7.108)$$

and

$$\Omega^r := \Omega \setminus B_r. \quad (7.109)$$

By Remark 7.5, we see that the mapping $r \mapsto S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_r)$ is non increasing and the mapping $r \mapsto S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega^r)$ is non decreasing. Hence, we can define

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_r)$$

and

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega) := \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega^r).$$

Remark 7.8. *It is easy to see that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega)$ and $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega)$ still have the monotonicity property. Precisely, if $\Omega_1 \subseteq \Omega_2$, then we have $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega_1) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega_2)$ and $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega_1) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega_2)$.*

Theorem 7.8. *Assume that $s \in (0, 2)$, $\kappa > 0$, $\alpha > 1$, $\beta > 1$, $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$ and Ω is a domain of \mathbb{R}^N . Let $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ be a minimizing sequence, i.e.,*

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u_n|^\alpha |v_n|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \equiv 1$$

and $\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2] dx \rightarrow S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then one of the following happens:

- (a) *there exists some $(u, v) \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ such that $u_n \rightarrow u$, $v_n \rightarrow v$ strongly in $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and $(u, v) \neq (0, 0)$ is a extremal function of $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$;*
- (b) *Going to a subsequence if necessary, we set*

$$\eta := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_r} \left(\lambda \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u_n|^\alpha |v_n|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx.$$

Then

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega) \eta^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} + S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega) (1 - \eta)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega). \quad (7.110)$$

Proof. It is easy to see that (u, v) is a extremal function of $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ if and only if (u, v) is a ground state solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\beta}(\Omega) \left(\lambda \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^{2^*(s)-2} u + \kappa \alpha \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^{\alpha-2} |v|^\beta \right) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta v = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\beta}(\Omega) \left(\mu \frac{1}{|x|^s} |v|^{2^*(s)-2} v + \kappa \beta \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v \right) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u \geq 0, v \geq 0, (u, v) \in \mathcal{D} := D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega), \end{cases} \quad (7.111)$$

Since $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ is a minimizing sequence, we have that $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ is a bounded $(PS)_d$ sequence with $d = (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*(s)}) S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\beta}(\Omega)$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $u_n \rightharpoonup u$, $v_n \rightharpoonup v$ in $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and $u_n \rightarrow u$, $v_n \rightarrow v$ a.e. in Ω . Then it is easy to see that we see that (u, v) weak solve (7.111) and

$$0 \leq \int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \leq 1,$$

$$\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2] dx \leq S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega).$$

Case 1: If $(u, v) \neq (0, 0)$, we shall prove that (a) happens. In this case, (u, v) is a non-trivial solution (or semi-trivial solution) of (7.111). We claim $\int_{\Omega} (\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s}) dx = 1$. If not, $0 < \int_{\Omega} (\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s}) dx < 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega) \\ &= \frac{\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2] dx}{\int_{\Omega} (\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s}) dx} \\ &> \frac{\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2] dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} (\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s}) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\ &\geq S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Hence, $\int_{\Omega} (\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s}) dx = 1$ and $\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2] dx = S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega)$. That is, (u, v) is a extremal function of $S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}(\Omega)$. We also note that by following $\|u_n - u\| = \|u_n\| - \|u\| + o(1)$, $\|v_n - v\| = \|v_n\| - \|v\| + o(1)$, we see that $u_n \rightarrow u, v_n \rightarrow v$ in $D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$.

Case 2: If $(u, v) = (0, 0)$, we shall prove that (b) happens. The idea is similar to the proof of Lemma 7.8 and Corollary 7.2. Going to a subsequence if necessary, we set

$$\Lambda_0 := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_r} [|\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2] dx$$

and

$$\Lambda^\infty := \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_r} [|\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2] dx.$$

Recalling the Rellich-Kondrachov compact theorem and $2 < 2^*(s) < 2^* := \frac{2N}{N-2}$, we have $(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ in $L_{loc}^t(\Omega) \times L_{loc}^t(\Omega)$ for all $1 < t < 2^*$. Hence,

$$\int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx = o(1), \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} dx = o(1) \text{ for any bounded domain } \tilde{\Omega} \subset \Omega \text{ such that } 0 \notin \overline{\tilde{\Omega}} \quad (7.112)$$

Hence, we obtain that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_r} (\lambda \frac{|u_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v_n|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u_n|^\alpha |v_n|^\beta}{|x|^s}) dx = 1 - \eta. \quad (7.113)$$

Similar to the formula (7.46), we have

$$S_{\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu}^0(\Omega) \eta^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \leq \Lambda_0. \quad (7.114)$$

and similar to the formula(7.47), we have

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega)(1-\eta)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \leq \Lambda^\infty. \quad (7.115)$$

Then by (7.114) and (7.115), we have

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega)\eta^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} + S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega)(1-\eta)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}} \leq \Lambda_0 + \Lambda^\infty \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega). \quad (7.116)$$

□

Theorem 7.8 is a kind of concentration compactness principle, original spirit we refer to [20]. Basing on Theorem7.8, we have the following using result:

Corollary 7.4. *Assume that $s \in (0, 2)$, $\kappa > 0$, $\alpha > 1$, $\beta > 1$, $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$ and Ω is a domain of \mathbb{R}^N . Then we always have*

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \leq \min\{S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega), S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega)\} \quad (7.117)$$

Moreover, if $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) < \min\{S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega), S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega)\}$, then $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ can be achieved.

Proof. We note that $\Omega_r \subseteq \Omega$, $\Omega^r \subseteq \Omega$, by the monotonicity property, for any $r > 0$, we have

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_r) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega^r)$$

which deduce (7.117). Moreover, if $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) < \min\{S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega), S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega)\}$, then (7.110) will never meet. Hence, only case (a) of Theorem7.8 happens. Thus, $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is achieved. □

Furthermore, we have the following result:

Corollary 7.5. *Assume that $s \in (0, 2)$, $\kappa > 0$, $\alpha > 1$, $\beta > 1$, $\alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$ and Ω is a domain of \mathbb{R}^N . If $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ can not be achieved, then at least one of the following holds:*

$$(i) \quad S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_r) \text{ for } \forall r > 0.$$

$$(ii) \quad S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega^r) \text{ for } \forall r > 0.$$

Proof. When $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is not attained, by Corollary7.4, we have

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = \min\{S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega), S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega)\}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega)$, then we have

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega).$$

Next, we shall prove that case (i) holds. If not, assume that there exists some $r_0 > 0$ such that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \neq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_{r_0})$, then by the monotonicity property, we have $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) < S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_{r_0}) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega_{r_0}) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega)$, a contradiction. □

Remark 7.9. We note that the inverse statement of Corollary 7.5 is not true. For example, by Theorem 7.1, when Ω is a cone, $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is attained provided $1 < \alpha, 1 < \beta, \alpha + \beta = 2^*(s), s \in (0, 2), \kappa > 0$. However, we still have the following result.

Lemma 7.15. Assume that $s \in (0, 2), \kappa > 0, \alpha > 1, \beta > 1, \alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$, then

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_r) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega^r) \text{ for any } r > 0 \text{ if } \Omega \text{ is a cone of } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Especially,

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\mathbb{R}^N) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(B_r) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_r) \text{ for any } r > 0$$

and $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for general domain with $0 \in \Omega$ or Ω is an exterior domain.

Furthermore, let A be a cone of \mathbb{R}^N , and $\Omega = A \setminus F$, where F is a closed subset of A such that $0 \notin F$ or F is bounded. Then $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A)$.

Proof. We only prove $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_r)$ and the other is similar. By the monotonicity property, we see that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_r)$. Next, we shall prove the opposite inequality. By Theorem 7.1, $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is attained. Now, let $(u, v) \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ be a extremal function of $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$. We also let $\chi_\rho(x) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be a cut-off function such that $\chi_\rho(x) \equiv 1$ in $B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}$, $\chi_\rho(x) \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_\rho$, $|\nabla \chi_\rho(x)| \leq \frac{4}{\rho}$ and define $\phi_\rho := \chi_\rho(x)u(x), \psi_\rho := \chi_\rho(x)v(x) \in C_c^\infty(\Omega_\rho)$. It is easy to see that

$$\int_\Omega [|\nabla \phi_\rho|^2 + |\nabla \psi_\rho|^2] dx \rightarrow \int_\Omega [|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2] dx = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_\Omega \left(\lambda \frac{|\phi_\rho|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|\psi_\rho|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|\phi_\rho|^\alpha |\psi_\rho|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \\ & \rightarrow \int_\Omega \left(\lambda \frac{|u|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|v|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|u|^\alpha |v|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \\ & = 1 \end{aligned}$$

as $\rho \rightarrow +\infty$. Then $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, there exists some $\rho_0 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\int_\Omega [|\nabla \phi_{\rho_0}|^2 + |\nabla \psi_{\rho_0}|^2] dx}{\left(\int_\Omega \left(\lambda \frac{|\phi_{\rho_0}|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|\psi_{\rho_0}|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|\phi_{\rho_0}|^\alpha |\psi_{\rho_0}|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) + \varepsilon.$$

Now, consider $\tilde{u}_r(x) := \phi_{\rho_0}(\frac{\rho_0}{r}x)$, $\tilde{v}_r(x) := \psi_{\rho_0}(\frac{\rho_0}{r}x) \in C_c^\infty(\Omega_r)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} S_{p,a,b}(\Omega_r) &\leq \frac{\int_{\Omega_r} [|\nabla \tilde{u}_r(x)|^2 + |\nabla \tilde{v}_r(x)|^2] dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega_r} \left(\lambda \frac{|\tilde{u}_r(x)|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|\tilde{v}_r(x)|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|\tilde{u}_r(x)|^\alpha |\tilde{v}_r(x)|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\ &= \frac{\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla \phi_{\rho_0}|^2 + |\nabla \psi_{\rho_0}|^2] dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} \left(\lambda \frac{|\phi_{\rho_0}|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + \mu \frac{|\psi_{\rho_0}|^{2^*(s)}}{|x|^s} + 2^*(s) \kappa \frac{|\phi_{\rho_0}|^\alpha |\psi_{\rho_0}|^\beta}{|x|^s} \right) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(s)}}} \\ &\leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrary of ε , we obtain the opposite inequality

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_r) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega).$$

Especially, take $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$, we see that

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\mathbb{R}^N) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(B_r) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_r) \text{ for any } r > 0.$$

Hence, when $0 \in \Omega$, then there exists some $r > 0$ such that $B_r \subset \Omega$, then

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(B_r) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\mathbb{R}^N) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(B_r).$$

And if Ω is an exterior domain, there exists some $r > 0$ such that $(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_r) \subset \Omega$, by the monotonicity property again, we have

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_r) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\mathbb{R}^N) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_r).$$

Furthermore, A is a cone and $\Omega = A \setminus F \subset A$, then we have

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A).$$

If $0 \notin F$, then there exists some $r > 0$ such that $\Omega_r = A_r$, then

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_r) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A_r) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A),$$

Hence, we have

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A).$$

If F is bounded, then there exist some $r > 0$ such that $\Omega^r = A^r$, then

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega^r) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A^r) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A),$$

which also obtain that

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A).$$

□

To study a general domain well proceeding by cones, we introduce the following marks:

$$\mathcal{A}^0(\Omega) := \{A : A \text{ is a cone and there exists some } r > 0 \text{ such that } \Omega_r \subseteq A\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}^\infty(\Omega) := \{A : A \text{ is a cone and there exists some } r > 0 \text{ such that } \Omega^r \subseteq A\}.$$

Notice that $\mathbb{R}^N \in \mathcal{A}^0(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}^\infty(\Omega)$, $\mathcal{A}^0(\Omega) \neq \emptyset$, $\mathcal{A}^\infty(\Omega) \neq \emptyset$. Then we can define

$$\tilde{S}_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega) := \sup\{S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A) : A \in \mathcal{A}^0(\Omega)\}$$

and

$$\tilde{S}_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega) := \sup\{S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A) : A \in \mathcal{A}^\infty(\Omega)\}.$$

Lemma 7.16.

$$\tilde{S}_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega), \tilde{S}_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega).$$

Proof. We only prove $\tilde{S}_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega)$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists some $A \in \mathcal{A}^0(\Omega)$ such that

$$\tilde{S}_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega) - \varepsilon < S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A). \quad (7.118)$$

By the definition of $\mathcal{A}^0(\Omega)$, there exists some $r > 0$ such that

$$\Omega_r \subset A.$$

Then by the monotonicity property, we have

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_r) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega). \quad (7.119)$$

By (7.118),(7.119) and the arbitrary of ε , we obtain that

$$\tilde{S}_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega)$$

□

Remark 7.10. By Corollary 7.4, if we can prove that

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) < \min\{S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega), S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega)\},$$

then $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is attained. Since a lot of properties about cones have been studied in Section 7 (subsections 7.1-7.6). Lemma 7.16 supplies a useful way to compute $\min\{S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega)$ and $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega)\}$. Here, we prefer to give some examples, which are also given by some authors when study a single equation.

Example 1: Ω is bounded with $0 \notin \bar{\Omega}$, then by $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\emptyset) = +\infty$, we see that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega) = +\infty$. Hence, $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) < \min\{S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega), S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega)\}$ and $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is attained which can also deduce by Theorem 7.1.

The following examples are also given by Caldiroli, Paolo and Musina, Roberta[6], when they study the case of $p = 2, b = 0, a \in (-1, 0)$. What interesting is that the similar results still hold for our case (a slight modification on Example 3).

Example 2: $0 \in \Omega$ is a cusp point, i.e., there exists a unit versor ν such that $\forall \theta \in (0, \pi), \exists r_\theta > 0$ such that $\Omega_{r_\theta} \subseteq \Omega_\theta$. Notice that

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega_{r_\theta}) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_{r_\theta}).$$

On the other hand,

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_{r_\theta}) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_\theta) \rightarrow +\infty \text{ as } \theta \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence,

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega) = +\infty.$$

Example 3: $\Omega = \Lambda \times \mathbb{R}^{N-k}, 1 \leq k < n$ where Λ is an open bounded domain of \mathbb{R}^k . Then there exists some $r > 0$ such that $\Lambda \subset B_r^k$, the ball with radial r in \mathbb{R}^k . Now, we let $A_n := \{(tx', tx'') \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{N-k} | t > 0, x' \in B_r^k, |x''|_{N-k} \geq n\}$, then it is easy to see that $\{A_n\}$ are cones such that $A_n \supseteq A_{n+1}, \forall n$ and $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \subset \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{N-k}$.

Thus, $meas(\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n) = 0$. By (ii) of Lemma 7.12, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A_n) = +\infty$. Define $\tilde{\Omega} = B_r^k \times \mathbb{R}^{N-k}$, then it is easy to see that $\Omega \subset \tilde{\Omega}$. Moreover, for any n , there exists some $r_n > \sqrt{r^2 + n^2} > 0$ such that $\tilde{\Omega}^{r_n} \subset A_n$ where $\tilde{\Omega}^{r_n}$ is defined by (7.109). Indeed, for any $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \tilde{\Omega} \setminus A_n$, we have $|x_1|_k < r$ and $\frac{|x_2|_{N-k}}{|x_1|_k} \leq \frac{n}{r}$, thus $|x_2|_{N-k} \leq n$. Then it follows that $|x|_N \leq \sqrt{r^2 + n^2}$. Hence, $\Omega^{r_n} \subset \tilde{\Omega}^{r_n} \subset A_n$. Then by the monotonicity property we have $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega^{r_n}) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\tilde{\Omega}^{r_n}) \geq S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A_n) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Hence $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^{+\infty}(\Omega) = \infty$.

Lemma 7.17. Assume that $s \in (0, 2), \kappa > 0, \alpha > 1, \beta > 1, \alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$, and $\Omega = \Lambda \times \mathbb{R}^{N-k}, 1 \leq k < n$ where Λ is an open bounded domain of \mathbb{R}^k with $0 \notin \bar{\Lambda}$. Then $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is attained.

Proof. By Example 3, we see that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega) = +\infty$. By $0 \notin \bar{\Lambda}$, we have $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega) = +\infty$. Then by Corollary 7.4, we obtain the final result. \square

Basing on the result of Lemma 7.15 and maximum principle, we can obtain the following interesting results.

Corollary 7.6. Assume that $N \geq 3, s \in (0, 2), \kappa > 0, \alpha > 1, \beta > 1, \alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$, and let Ω be a general domain of \mathbb{R}^N .

- (i) If $0 \in \Omega$, then $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is not attained unless $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$;
- (ii) If Ω is an exterior domain, then $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is not attained unless $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$;
- (iii) If $\Omega = A \cup U$ where U is an open bounded set with $0 \notin \bar{U}$ and A is a cone of \mathbb{R}^N , then $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) < S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega)$ and $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is attained.

Proof. For the case of (i) and (ii), by Lemma 7.15, we see that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Then by maximum principle, it is easy to see that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is not attained unless $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$. For the case of (iii), since U is bounded and $0 \notin \bar{U}$, there exists $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that $\Omega_{r_1} = A_{r_1}, \Omega_{r_2} = A_{r_2}$. Hence $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A)$. If $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) < \min\{S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega)\}$, then by Corollary 7.4, $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is attained and the proof is completed. If not, by Corollary 7.4 again, $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = \min\{S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^0(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}^\infty(\Omega)\}$, Hence, $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A)$. By maximum principle again, $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(A)$ is not attained, a contradiction with Theorem 7.1. \square

Theorem 7.9. *Assume that $N \geq 3, s \in (0, 2), \kappa > 0, \alpha > 1, \beta > 1, \alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is an open bounded domain. If $0 \in \Omega$, then $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is not attained.*

Proof. Since Ω is bounded, there exists some $r > 0$ such that $\Omega \subset B_r(0)$. When $0 \in \Omega$, by Lemma 7.15, we have

$$S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(B_r(0)) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

By way of negation, assume that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is attained and let $(u, v) \in D_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \times D_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ be an extremal function. We may assume that $u \geq 0, v \geq 0$. By extending u and v outside Ω by 0, then we see that (u, v) is also an extremal function of $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(B_r(0))$. Hence, $(u, v) \neq (0, 0)$ is a nonnegative weak solution to the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = S_{p,a,b}(B_r(0)) \left(\lambda \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^{2^*(s)-2} u + \kappa \alpha \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^{\alpha-2} u |v|^\beta \right) & \text{in } B_r(0), \\ -\Delta v = S_{p,a,b}(B_r(0)) \left(\mu \frac{1}{|x|^s} |v|^{2^*(s)-2} v + \kappa \beta \frac{1}{|x|^s} |u|^\alpha |v|^{\beta-2} v \right) & \text{in } B_r(0), \\ u \geq 0, v \geq 0, (u, v) \in \mathcal{D} := D_0^{1,2}(B_r(0)) \times D_0^{1,2}(B_r(0)), \end{cases} \quad (7.120)$$

On the other hand, since $B_r(0)$ is a star-shaped domain, by Proposition 7.1 (see the formula (7.26)), problem (7.120) has no nontrivial solution even semi-trivial solution, a contradiction. Hence, we obtain that $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega)$ is not attained. \square

Corollary 7.7. *Assume that $N \geq 3, s \in (0, 2), \kappa > 0, \alpha > 1, \beta > 1, \alpha + \beta = 2^*(s)$, if there exists some $r_1, r_2 > 0$ and $\theta \in (0, \pi]$ such that*

$$(\Omega_\theta \cap B_{r_1}(0)) \subsetneq \Omega \subsetneq (\Omega_\theta \cap B_{r_2}(0)),$$

then $S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega) = S_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda,\mu}(\Omega_\theta)$ and is not attained.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 7.9, we omit the details. \square

References

- [1] B. Abdellaoui, V. Felli, and I. Peral. Some remarks on systems of elliptic equations doubly critical in the whole $\{\mathbb{R}\}^N$. Calculus of variations and partial differential equations, 34(1):97–137, 2009.

- [2] N. Akhmediev and A. Ankiewicz. Partially coherent solitons on a finite background. Physical review letters, 82(13):2661, 1999.
- [3] A. Ambrosetti and E. Colorado. Bound and ground states of coupled nonlinear schrödinger equations. Comptes Rendus Mathématique, 342(7):453–458, 2006.
- [4] H. Brezis and T. Kato. Remarks on the schrodinger operator with singular complex potentials. Technical report, DTIC Document, 1978.
- [5] L. Caffarelli, R. Kohn, and L. Nirenberg. First order interpolation inequalities with weights. Compositio Mathematica, 53(3):259–275, 1984.
- [6] P. Caldiroli and R. Musina. On the existence of extremal functions for a weighted Sobolev embedding with critical exponent. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 8(4):365–387, 1999.
- [7] F. Catrina and Z.-Q. Wang. On the caffarelli-kohn-nirenberg inequalities: sharp constants, existence (and nonexistence), and symmetry of extremal functions. Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics, 54(2):229–258, 2001.
- [8] J.-L. Chern and C.-S. Lin. Minimizers of caffarelli–kohn–nirenberg inequalities with the singularity on the boundary. Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis, 197(2):401–432, 2010.
- [9] H. Egnell. Positive solutions of semilinear equations in cones. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 330(1):191–201, 1992.
- [10] S. G. Evangelides Jr, L. F. Mollenauer, J. P. Gordon, and N. S. Bergano. Polarization multiplexing with solitons. Lightwave Technology, Journal of, 10(1):28–35, 1992.
- [11] N. Ghoussoub and X. Kang. Hardy–sobolev critical elliptic equations with boundary singularities. In Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (C) Non Linear Analysis, volume 21, pages 767–793. Elsevier, 2004.
- [12] N. Ghoussoub and F. Robert. The effect of curvature on the best constant in the hardy–sobolev inequalities. Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA, 16(6):1201–1245, 2006.
- [13] N. Ghoussoub and C. Yuan. Multiple solutions for quasi-linear pdes involving the critical sobolev and hardy exponents. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 352(12):5703–5743, 2000.
- [14] C.-H. Hsia, C.-S. Lin, and H. Wadade. Revisiting an idea of brézis and nirenberg. Journal of Functional Analysis, 259(7):1816–1849, 2010.
- [15] I. P. Kaminow. Polarization in optical fibers. IEEE Journal of Quantum Electronics, 17:15–22, 1981.
- [16] Y. Li and C.-S. Lin. A nonlinear elliptic pde with two sobolev–hardy critical exponents. Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis, 203(3):943–968, 2012.

- [17] E. H. Lieb. Sharp constants in the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev and related inequalities. Ann. of Math. (2), 118(2):349–374, 1983.
- [18] C.-S. Lin, H. Wadade, et al. Minimizing problems for the hardy-sobolev type inequality with the singularity on the boundary. Tohoku Mathematical Journal, 64(1):79–103, 2012.
- [19] T.-C. Lin and J. Wei. Ground state of n coupled nonlinear schrödinger equations in \mathbb{R}^n , $n \leq 3$. Communications in mathematical physics, 255(3):629–653, 2005.
- [20] P.-L. Lions. The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. the limit case, part 2. Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana, 1(2):45–121, 1985.
- [21] L. Maia, E. Montefusco, and B. Pellacci. Positive solutions for a weakly coupled nonlinear schrödinger system. Journal of Differential Equations, 229(2):743–767, 2006.
- [22] C. R. Menyuk. Nonlinear pulse propagation in birefringent optical fibers. Quantum Electronics, IEEE Journal of, 23(2):174–176, 1987.
- [23] C. R. Menyuk. Pulse propagation in an elliptically birefringent kerr medium. Quantum Electronics, IEEE Journal of, 25(12):2674–2682, 1989.
- [24] B. Sirakov. Least energy solitary waves for a system of nonlinear schrödinger equations in $\{\mathbb{R}^n\}$. Communications in mathematical physics, 271(1):199–221, 2007.
- [25] M. Struwe. Variational methods: applications to nonlinear partial differential equations and Hamiltonian systems, volume 34. Springer, 2008.
- [26] G. Talenti. Best constant in Sobolev inequality. Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4), 110:353–372, 1976.
- [27] P. Wai, C. R. Menyuk, and H. Chen. Stability of solitons in randomly varying birefringent fibers. Optics letters, 16(16):1231–1233, 1991.
- [28] X. Zhong and W. Zou. Critical Schrödinger systems in \mathbb{R}^N with indefinite weight and Hardy potential. Differential Integral Equations, 28(1-2):119–154, 2015.
- [29] X. Zhong and W. Zou. On coupled schrödinger systems with double critical exponents and indefinite weights. preprint arXiv:1503.08917v1 [math.AP] 31 Mar 2015.