

Multiple positive solutions for a double phase system with singular nonlinearity

Yizhe Feng¹ and Zhanbing Bai^{1*}†

¹College of Mathematics and System Science, Shandong University of Science and Technology, Qingdao, 266590, Shandong, China.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): zhanbingbai@163.com;

Contributing authors: yzfeng2021@163.com;

†These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

In this paper, we study a class of double phase systems which contain the singular and mixed nonlinear terms. Unlike the single equation, the mixed nonlinear terms make the problem more complicate. The geometry of the fibering mapping has multiple possibilities. To overcome the difficulties posed by the mixed nonlinear terms, we need to repeatedly construct concave functions, discuss different cases, and use the properties of concave functions and basic inequalities such as Hölder inequality, Poincaré's inequality and Young's inequality. By the use of the Nehari manifold, the existence and multiplicity of positive solutions which have nonnegative energy are obtained.

Keywords: Double phase system; Fibering map; Nehari manifold; Musielak-Orlicz space; Positive solution

MSC Classification: 05J50 , 03H10 , 35D30

1 Introduction

In this work, the multiplicity of solutions to a class of double phase systems with m equations and Dirichlet boundary value condition of the type

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\Delta_p y_1 - \operatorname{div}(\eta |\nabla y_1|^{q-2} \nabla y_1) \\ \quad = a_1(z) |y_1|^{-1-\nu} y_1 + \lambda(\kappa_1 + 1) |y_1|^{\kappa_1-1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} \dots |y_m|^{\kappa_m+1}, \quad z \in \Omega, \\ -\Delta_p y_2 - \operatorname{div}(\eta |\nabla y_2|^{q-2} \nabla y_2) \\ \quad = a_2(z) |y_2|^{-1-\nu} y_2 + \lambda(\kappa_2 + 1) |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2-1} y_3 \dots |y_m|^{\kappa_m+1}, \quad z \in \Omega, \\ \quad \vdots \\ -\Delta_p y_m - \operatorname{div}(\eta |\nabla y_m|^{q-2} \nabla y_m) \\ \quad = a_m(z) |y_m|^{-1-\nu} y_m + \lambda(\kappa_m + 1) |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} \dots |y_m|^{\kappa_m-1} y_m, \quad z \in \Omega, \\ y_1 = y_2 = \dots = y_m = 0, \quad z \in \partial\Omega \end{array} \right. \quad (1)$$

is investigated, where $m \geq 2$, $\lambda > 0$ and $0 < \nu < 1 < p < q < \kappa_i + 1 < p^*$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, m$); $\Delta_p y = \operatorname{div}(|\nabla y|^{p-2} \nabla y)$; $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$ is a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary $\partial\Omega$.

In 1986, Zhikov [1] first introduced the double phase operator that appear in (1) which is denoted by

$$y \mapsto \operatorname{div}(|\nabla y|^{p-2} \nabla y + \eta(z) |\nabla y|^{q-2} \nabla y), \quad y \in W^{1,\mathcal{H}}, \quad (2)$$

in order to describe the hardening properties of strongly anisotropic materials which change drastically at some of their points. Zhikov introduced the related energy functional defined by

$$y \mapsto \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{p} |\nabla y|^p + \frac{\eta(z)}{q} |\nabla y|^q \right) dz. \quad (3)$$

The variational integral functional (3) intervene in Homogenization theory and Elasticity, and also be used to describe the new examples of Lavrentiev's phenomenon [2, 6]. The energy density

$$\rho_{(p,q)}(y, z) = \frac{1}{p} |y|^p + \frac{\eta(z)}{q} |y|^q$$

of (3) change their ellipticity rate according to the point, the geometry of a composite made of two materials with their power hardening exponents p and q , respectively, are depended on the modulation coefficient $\eta(\cdot)$. The “ (p, q) -phase” refers to $\eta(z) > 0$, $q > p$, and ρ exhibits a polynomial growth of order q with respect to the gradient variable z . The growth is at rate p when $\eta(z) = 0$ and this is called “ p -phase”. Subsequently, many scholars have studied the functionals in (2), Marcellini [7, 8] proved (2) also belongs to the integrative functional class with non-standard growth conditions, and

other. We provide readers the works of Baroni, et al [9, 10], Colombo and Mingione [11, 12] to learn more.

The problem of form (2) also appeared in many physics issues, notably the flow of non-Newtonian fluids. Liu and Dai [14] used the motion of a non-Newtonian fluid between two planks as a model to explore the relationship between the double phase operator and internal friction. Denote by v the speed of this fluid at some layer, F the internal frictional force in the opposite direction to v , S the contact area between the plate and the fluid, and the viscosity coefficient μ is defined by $\mu := |\nabla y|^{p-2} + \eta(z)|\nabla y|^{q-2}$. By using Newton's viscosity law, he obtained

$$\frac{\operatorname{div} \vec{F}}{S} = \operatorname{div}((|\nabla y|^{p-2} + \eta(z)|\nabla y|^{q-2})\nabla y). \quad (4)$$

Let $F \equiv 0$ in (4), and is actually the Euler equation of functional (2). In addition, double phase operator also appears in the study of torsional creep [35] and glacial sliding [36].

In 2018, Liu and Dai [13] used variational method to obtain the existence and multiplicity of solutions for the following double phase problem in Musielak-Orlicz spaces

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p y - \operatorname{div}(\eta(z)|\nabla y|^{q-2}\nabla y) = f(z, y), & z \in \Omega, \\ x = 0, & z \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

In 2022, Liu and Dai [16] studied the above problem where

$$f(z, y) = a(z)y^{-\nu} + \lambda y^{r-1}, \quad 0 < \nu < 1, \quad p < q < r < p^*.$$

It is obvious that f is no longer a Carathéodory function (because of the singular term). By using Nehari manifold, the existence of two positive solutions of the problem has been proved. Then in [15], they studied the same equation as [19] with $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ instead of in the bounded domain Ω . We present readers [20, 22–32] to learn more about the existence and multiplicity results of double phase problems.

However, the above research on the double phase problem is with respect to a single equation, only a few system of equations for the double phase problem has been studied. In 2021, Bahrouni and Rădulescu [4] studied the following singular double phase system with variable growth and baouendi-grushin operator

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{G(z_1, z_2)} y_1 + |y_1|^{q(z)-2} y_1 + |y_1|^{p(z)-2} y_1 = a_1 y_1^{-\nu_1} - b\alpha |y_2|^\beta |y_1|^{\alpha-2} y_1, \\ -\Delta_{G(z_1, z_2)} y_2 + |y_2|^{q(z)-2} y_2 + |y_2|^{p(z)-2} y_2 = a_2 y_2^{-\nu_2} - b\beta |y_1|^\alpha |y_2|^{\beta-2} y_2, \end{cases}$$

where $z = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $a_1, a_2, b, p, q, \alpha, \beta \in C(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$, $\nu_1, \nu_2 : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (0, 1)$. He established a related compactness property, and obtained the existence of at least one weak solution. For double phase systems containing convection terms, Marino

4 *Existence of the solution for a double phase system*

and Winkert in [3] studied the following double phase system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{p_1} y_1 - \operatorname{div}(\eta_1(z)|\nabla y_1|^{q_1-2}\nabla y_1) = f_1(z, y_1, y_2, \nabla y_1, \nabla y_2), & z \in \Omega, \\ -\Delta_{p_2} y_2 - \operatorname{div}(\eta_2(z)|\nabla y_2|^{q_2-2}\nabla y_2) = f_2(z, y_1, y_2, \nabla y_1, \nabla y_2), & z \in \Omega, \\ y_1 = y_2 = 0, & z \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

The existence and uniqueness of the weak solution of the system (5) is obtained by using the surjectivity result for pseudomonotone operators. Then, in 2022, Guarnotta, et al [5] studied (5) with variable growth and nonlinear boundary condition. By using the sub-supersolution method, they obtained infinitely many solutions. The methods of the above works are completely different from ours.

Motivated by above research, in this paper, we consider the study of a system shown in (1) with singular and nonlinear terms. Unlike the single equation, the mixed nonlinear terms can complicate the problem, some new ideas and techniques are needed.

- (1) The geometry of the fibering mapping has multiple possibilities, we need to discuss the mixed nonlinear terms in different cases depending on their energies to determine the geometry of the fibering mapping.
- (2) To prove that the limit of the minimizing sequence is not zero, we discuss different cases and prove it by the combination of a series of inequalities, instead of getting the conclusion directly from one inequality.

Also, To overcome the difficulties posed by the mixed nonlinear terms, we repeatedly construct concave functions, discuss different cases, and use the properties of concave functions and basic inequalities such as Hölder inequality, Poincaré's inequality and Young's inequality.

For the sake of simplicity, we can concentrate the argument on the case that $m = 2$. In Section 2, we recall the main properties on the theory of Musielak-Orlicz spaces and give some definitions of the fibering map and the Nehari manifold. In Section 3, some lemmas and propositions are given which are required for the existence results, and then we prove the main existence theorem (see Theorem 3.2). Finally, in Theorem 3.3 we generalize the results of Theorem 3.2 to the case that $m > 2$.

The following hypotheses $(H_1) - (H_3)$ will be assumed,

- (H_1) : $1 < p < n$, $p < q < p^*$, where $p^* = \frac{np}{n-p}$ and $\eta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow [0, \infty) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\eta(z) \geq 0$;
- (H_2) : $a_i \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $a_i(z) > 0$ for a.e. $z \in \Omega$, $i = 1, \dots, m$;
- (H_3) : $\sum_{i=1}^m \kappa_i + m < p^*$.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we recall some results of Musielak-Orlicz spaces. These results are from [13, 16, 29, 31].

Let $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ be the Sobolev space equipped with the norm

$$\|y\|_{1,p} = \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla y|^p dz \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

For $(y_1, y_2) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, let

$$\|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} = \|y_1\|_{1,p}^p + \|y_2\|_{1,p}^p.$$

Denote by $\|\cdot\|_p$ the norm of $L^p(\Omega)$. Then one has

$$\|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} = \|y_1\|_{1,p}^p + \|y_2\|_{1,p}^p = \|\nabla y_1\|_p^p + \|\nabla y_2\|_p^p.$$

Denote the maximum norm of \mathbb{R}^n by $|\cdot|$.

Let $L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ defined as

$$L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) = \{y \mid y : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ is measurable and } \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(y) < +\infty\}$$

be the Musielak-Orlicz space with Luxemburg norm

$$\|y\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \inf \left\{ \tau > 0 : \rho_{\mathcal{H}} \left(\frac{y}{\tau} \right) \leq 1 \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{H} : \Omega \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be the function defined as

$$\mathcal{H}(z, t) = t^p + \eta(z)t^q,$$

and the modular function $\rho_{\mathcal{H}} : L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(y) := \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{H}(z, |y(z)|) dz = \int_{\Omega} (|y(z)|^p + \eta(z)|y(z)|^q) dz. \quad (6)$$

The space $L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ is a reflexive Banach, see Proposition 2.14 of [13].

The seminormed space $L_{\eta}^q(\Omega)$ is defined as

$$L_{\eta}^q(\Omega) = \left\{ y \mid y : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ is measurable and } \int_{\Omega} \eta(z)|y(z)|^q dz < +\infty \right\},$$

endowed with the seminorm

$$\|y\|_{q,\eta} = \left(\int_{\Omega} \eta(z)|y(z)|^q dz \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

The space $L_{\eta}^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ is defined as well.

6 *Existence of the solution for a double phase system*

Let $W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ be the Musielak-Orlicz Sobolev space which defined as

$$W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) = \{y \in L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) : |\nabla y| \in L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)\}$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|y\|_{1,\mathcal{H}} = \|\nabla y\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|y\|_{\mathcal{H}},$$

where $\|\nabla y\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \|\nabla y\|_{\mathcal{H}}$. Let $W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ be defined as the completion of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in $W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$. Thanks to Proposition 2.16(ii) of Crespo–Blanco [29] or Proposition 2.2 of R. Arora [21], we know $\|\nabla y\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ is an equivalent norm on $W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ when assumption (H_1) be satisfied.

Furthermore, both $W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ and $W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ are uniformly concave Banach spaces, see Proposition 2.14 and Proposition 2.18(ii) of Crespo–Blanco [29].

For $(y_1, y_2) \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$, let

$$\|(y_1, y_2)\| = \|\nabla y_1\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|\nabla y_2\|_{\mathcal{H}},$$

and

$$\|(y_1, y_2)\|_{q,\eta} = \|y_1\|_{q,\eta}^q + \|y_2\|_{q,\eta}^q.$$

Thus, it is clearly that

$$\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_1) + \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_2) = \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} + \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q,\eta}.$$

The following embedding results from Propositions 2.17 and 2.19 of Crespo–Blanco [29] or Proposition 2.2 of R. Arora [21] are critical to our article.

Lemma 2.1 (Proposition 2.2, [21]) *Let (H_1) be satisfied. Then the following embeddings hold:*

- (i): $L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^r(\Omega)$ and $W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$ are continuous for all $r \in [1, p]$;
- (ii): $W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^r(\Omega)$ is continuous for all $r \in [1, p^*]$;
- (iii): $W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^r(\Omega)$ is compact for all $r \in [1, p^*]$;
- (iv): $L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L_\eta^q(\Omega)$ is continuous;
- (v): $L^q(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ is continuous.

Lemma 2.2 (Proposition 2.1, [13]) *The \mathcal{H} -modular has the following properties*

- (i): For $y \neq 0$, then $\|y\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \lambda \Leftrightarrow \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\frac{y}{\lambda}) = 1$;
- (ii): $\|y\|_{\mathcal{H}} < 1$ (resp. > 1 ; $= 1$) $\Leftrightarrow \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(y) < 1$ (resp. > 1 ; $= 1$);
- (iii): $\|y\|_{\mathcal{H}} < 1 \Rightarrow \|y\|_{\mathcal{H}}^q \leq \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(y) \leq \|y\|_{\mathcal{H}}^p$; $\|y\|_{\mathcal{H}} > 1 \Rightarrow \|y\|_{\mathcal{H}}^p \leq \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(y) \leq \|y\|_{\mathcal{H}}^q$;
- (iv): $\|y\|_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow 0 \Leftrightarrow \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(y) \rightarrow 0$; $\|y\|_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow +\infty \Leftrightarrow \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(y) \rightarrow +\infty$.

Lemma 2.3 (Theorem A.3.2, [37], Poincaré's inequality) *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded open set and $1 \leq p < n$, then for given $q \in [1, p^*]$, there exists $C = C(n, p, q, \Omega) > 0$ such that*

$$\|y\|_q \leq C \|\nabla y\|_p, \quad \forall y \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

Lemma 2.4 (Theorem A.5.1, [37]) Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded open set with C^1 boundary $\partial\Omega$ and $1 \leq p < n$, then for any $1 \leq q < p^*$,

$$W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow L^q(\Omega).$$

We say that $(y_1, y_2) \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ is a weak solution of (1), if for any $(h, w) \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$, there holds $(a_1 y_1^{-\nu} h, a_2 y_2^{-\nu} w) \in L^1(\Omega) \times L^1(\Omega)$ for $y_1, y_2 > 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_1|^{p-2} (\nabla y_1, \nabla h) dz + \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_1|^{q-2} (\nabla y_1, \nabla h) dz - \int_{\Omega} a_1 y_1^{-\nu} h dz \\ & + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_2|^{p-2} (\nabla y_2, \nabla w) dz + \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_2|^{q-2} (\nabla y_2, \nabla w) dz - \int_{\Omega} a_2 y_2^{-\nu} w dz \\ & - \lambda (\kappa_1 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} h dz - \lambda (\kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2} w dz = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let the energy functional $J : W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as

$$\begin{aligned} J(y_1, y_2) &= \frac{1}{p} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} + \frac{1}{q} \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q,\eta} - \frac{1}{1-\nu} \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz \\ & - \lambda \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz. \end{aligned}$$

Then the derivative of J at (y_1, y_2) with direction (h, w) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle J'(y_1, y_2), (h, w) \rangle &= \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_1|^{p-2} (\nabla y_1, \nabla h) dz + \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_1|^{q-2} (\nabla y_1, \nabla h) dz \\ & - \int_{\Omega} a_1 |y_1|^{-1-\nu} y_1 h dz - \lambda (\kappa_1 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1-1} y_1 |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} h dz \\ & + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_2|^{p-2} (\nabla y_2, \nabla w) dz + \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_2|^{q-2} (\nabla y_2, \nabla w) dz \\ & - \int_{\Omega} a_2 |y_2|^{-1-\nu} y_2 w dz - \lambda (\kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2-1} y_2 w dz. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Let Nehari manifold defined by

$$\mathcal{N}_{\lambda} = \left\{ (y_1, y_2) \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \setminus \{(0, 0)\} : \langle J'(y_1, y_2), (y_1, y_2) \rangle = 0 \right\}.$$

Obviously, all critical points of J are on the Nehari manifold, so, \mathcal{N}_{λ} contains all weak solutions of (1). In order to better understand Nehari manifold, we define a

8 *Existence of the solution for a double phase system*

function $\psi_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = J(ty_1, ty_2)$ for $(y_1, y_2) \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) &= t^{p-1} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1, p} + t^{q-1} \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q, \eta} \\ &\quad - t^{-\nu} \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz \\ &\quad - \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2)t^{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1} \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1 + 1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2 + 1} dz. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we give an equivalent definition of \mathcal{N}_λ as

$$\mathcal{N}_\lambda = \left\{ (y_1, y_2) \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \setminus \{(0, 0)\} : \psi'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) \Big|_{t=1} = 0 \right\}. \quad (8)$$

Furthermore, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \psi''_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) &= (p-1)t^{p-2} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1, p} + (q-1)t^{q-2} \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q, \eta} \\ &\quad + \nu t^{-\nu-1} \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz \\ &\quad - \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2)(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1)t^{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2} \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1 + 1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2 + 1} dz. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Hence, we can divide \mathcal{N}_λ into three disjoint subsets:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_\lambda^+ &= \left\{ (y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda : \psi''_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) \Big|_{t=1} > 0 \right\}, \\ \mathcal{N}_\lambda^0 &= \left\{ (y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda : \psi''_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) \Big|_{t=1} = 0 \right\}, \\ \mathcal{N}_\lambda^- &= \left\{ (y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda : \psi''_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) \Big|_{t=1} < 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definitions of \mathcal{N}_λ , \mathcal{N}_λ^+ , \mathcal{N}_λ^- , and the function $\psi_{(y_1, y_2)}(t)$, the following lemma clearly holds.

Lemma 2.5 *Let $(y_1, y_2) \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$, then for $t > 0$, $t(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda$ if and only if $\psi'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = 0$; $t(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^+$ if and only if $\psi'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = 0$ and $\psi''_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) > 0$; $t(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^-$ if and only if $\psi'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = 0$ and $\psi''_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) < 0$.*

We will prove that when the parameter λ within a certain range, the two solutions of (1) are in sets \mathcal{N}_λ^+ and \mathcal{N}_λ^- , respectively.

3 The existence and multiplicity

Firstly, we study the properties of the energy functional J on \mathcal{N}_λ , \mathcal{N}_λ^+ , \mathcal{N}_λ^- , respectively, and prove that $\mathcal{N}_\lambda^0 = \emptyset$ when λ is small enough. Secondly, we prove the existence of convergent subsequences on \mathcal{N}_λ^+ and \mathcal{N}_λ^- , respectively. Thirdly, it is proved that both two convergence points in \mathcal{N}_λ^+ and \mathcal{N}_λ^- , respectively, are the solutions of (1). Finally, we generalize the results of the system (1) to the case of $m > 2$.

Lemma 3.1 *Suppose $\lambda > 0$ and assumptions (H_1) , (H_2) hold, then $J(y_1, y_2)|_{\mathcal{N}_\lambda}$ is coercive.*

Proof From the definition of the Nehari manifold, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz &= \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} + \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q,\eta} \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account that (H_1) , (H_2) hold, and the fact $p < q < \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} J(y_1, y_2) &= \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} \right) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_1|^p dz + \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} \right) \|\nabla y_1\|_{q,\eta}^q \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} \right) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_2|^p dz + \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} \right) \|\nabla y_2\|_{q,\eta}^q \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} - \frac{1}{1-\nu} \right) \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} \right) [\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_1) + \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_2)] \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} - \frac{1}{1-\nu} \right) \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz \end{aligned}$$

The following three cases are discussed.

Case (1): $\|\nabla y_1\|_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \infty$, $\|\nabla y_2\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ bounded.

By the use of Lemma 2.2(iii), Hölder inequality, Poincaré's inequality and Lemma 2.1(i), one has

$$\begin{aligned} J(y_1, y_2) &\geq \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} \right) \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_1) - C_1 \|y_1\|_{1,p}^{1-\nu} - C_2 \|y_2\|_{1,p}^{1-\nu} \\ &\geq C \|\nabla y_1\|_{\mathcal{H}}^p - C_1 \|y_1\|_{1,p}^{1-\nu} - C_2 \|y_2\|_{1,p}^{1-\nu} \\ &\geq C \|\nabla y_1\|_{\mathcal{H}}^p - C_3 \|\nabla y_1\|_{\mathcal{H}}^{1-\nu} - C_4 \|\nabla y_2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^{1-\nu}, \end{aligned}$$

where C, C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 are positive constants. It is worth noting that C_1, C_2 comes from Hölder inequality and Poincaré's inequality. Since $p > 1 - \nu > 0$, we have $J(y_1, y_2) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\|\nabla y_1\|_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \infty$.

Case (2): $\|\nabla y_1\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ bounded, $\|\nabla y_2\|_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \infty$.

$$\begin{aligned}
J(y_1, y_2) &\geq \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} \right) \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_2) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} - \frac{1}{1 - \nu} \right) \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz \\
&\geq C \|\nabla y_2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^p - C_3 \|\nabla y_1\|_{\mathcal{H}}^{1-\nu} - C_4 \|\nabla y_2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^{1-\nu},
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $J(y_1, y_2) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\|\nabla y_2\|_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \infty$.

Case (3): $\|\nabla y_1\|_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \infty, \|\nabla y_2\|_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \infty$.

$$\begin{aligned}
J(y_1, y_2) &\geq \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} \right) [\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_1) + \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_2)] \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} - \frac{1}{1 - \nu} \right) \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz \\
&\geq C \|\nabla y_1\|_{\mathcal{H}}^p + C \|\nabla y_2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^p - C_3 \|\nabla y_1\|_{\mathcal{H}}^{1-\nu} - C_4 \|\nabla y_2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^{1-\nu},
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $J(y_1, y_2) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\|\nabla y_1\|_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \infty$ and $\|\nabla y_2\|_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \infty$.

Again since the definition of $\|(y_1, y_2)\|$, we know that $\|(y_1, y_2)\| \rightarrow \infty$ if and only if $\|\nabla y_1\|_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \infty$ or $\|\nabla y_2\|_{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \infty$, so the functional $J(y_1, y_2)$ is coercive on \mathcal{N}_{λ} . \square

Lemma 3.2 *Suppose the assumptions $(H_1), (H_2), (H_3)$ hold, then there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^0 = \emptyset$ for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$.*

Proof If $\lambda > 0$ such that $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^0 \neq \emptyset$, then, by the definition of \mathcal{N}_{λ} , for any $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^0 \subset \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2)(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz \\
&= (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1) \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} + (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1) \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q,\eta} \\
&\quad - (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz.
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Combing with (10) and the definition of \mathcal{N}_{λ}^0 , there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 - p) \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} + (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 - q) \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q,\eta} \\
&\quad - (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + \nu + 1) \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz.
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

By using Hölder inequality, Poincaré's inequality, assumption (H_2) , and the fact that the function $t^{\frac{1-\nu}{p}}$ is concave about t , there is

$$\int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz \leq C_1 \|y_1\|_{1,p}^{1-\nu} + C_2 \|y_2\|_{1,p}^{1-\nu} \leq C_4 \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p}^{\frac{1-\nu}{p}}, \tag{12}$$

which combining (11) yields

$$\|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} \leq \left(\frac{(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + \nu + 1)C_4}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 - p} \right)^{\frac{p}{p+\gamma-1}} := C_5. \tag{13}$$

Again since $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^0$, and $(H_1), (H_2), (H_3)$ hold, one has

$$(p-1) \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} \leq \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2)(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz,$$

which means

$$(p-1)\|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} \leq \lambda C_6 \|y_1\|_{1,p}^{\kappa_1+1} \|y_2\|_{1,p}^{\kappa_2+1} \leq \lambda C_7 \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p}^{\frac{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2}{p}}, \quad (14)$$

where C_6, C_7 are two positive constants. In fact, by assumption (H_3) , we know $\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 < p^*$, hence $\frac{p^*}{\kappa_1+1} - \frac{p^*}{p^*-(\kappa_2+1)} > 0$. Given ϵ_0 such that

$$0 < \epsilon_0 < \frac{p^*}{\kappa_1+1} - \frac{p^*}{p^*-(\kappa_2+1)}, \quad (15)$$

let

$$m_1 := p^* - \epsilon_0(\kappa_1 + 1), \quad m_2 := \frac{[p^* - \epsilon_0(\kappa_1 + 1)](\kappa_2 + 1)}{p^* - (\epsilon_0 + 1)(\kappa_1 + 1)}.$$

Then, $m_1 \in (\kappa_1 + 1, p^*)$, $m_2 \in (\kappa_2 + 1, p^*)$. By using Hölder inequality and Poincaré's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz &\leq C_8 \|y_1\|_{m_1}^{\kappa_1+1} \|y_2\|_{m_2}^{\kappa_2+1} \\ &\leq C_9 \|y_1\|_{1,p}^{\kappa_1+1} \|y_2\|_{1,p}^{\kappa_2+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

here, C_8, C_9 are two positive constants. By Young's inequality and the properties of concave function $t \rightarrow t^{1/p}$, one has,

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_1\|_{1,p}^{\frac{\kappa_1+1}{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2}} \|y_2\|_{1,p}^{\frac{\kappa_2+1}{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2}} &\leq \frac{(\kappa_1+1)\|y_1\|_{1,p}}{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2} + \frac{(\kappa_2+1)\|y_2\|_{1,p}}{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2} \\ &\leq \|y_1\|_{1,p} + \|y_2\|_{1,p} \leq C_{10} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p}^{\frac{1}{p}}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

here C_{10} is a positive constant. From (16) and (17) we know that (14) holds.

From (14) we have

$$\lambda \geq (p-1)C_7^{-1} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p}^{1-\frac{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2}{p}} = (p-1)C_7^{-1} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p}^{\frac{p-(\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2)}{p}}. \quad (18)$$

Now, $\frac{p-(\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2)}{p} < 0$ and by (13), one has $\|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} \leq C_5$. Thus, (18) comes to

$$\lambda \geq (p-1)C_7^{-1} C_5^{-\frac{p-(\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2)}{p}}.$$

Then the lemma holds with $\lambda_0 := (p-1)C_7^{-1} C_5^{-\frac{p-(\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2)}{p}}$. \square

Lemma 3.3 *Suppose the assumptions $(H_1), (H_2)$ hold and $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^+ \neq \emptyset$, then for all $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^+$, $J(y_1, y_2) < 0$.*

Proof For $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^+$, by the definition of \mathcal{N}_{λ}^+ , there holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2)(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz \\ &\leq (p-1)\|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} + (q-1)\|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q,\eta} \\ &\quad + \nu \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

12 *Existence of the solution for a double phase system*

Again since $\mathcal{N}_\lambda^+ \subset \mathcal{N}_\lambda$, from the definition of \mathcal{N}_λ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu \int_{\Omega} \left[a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu} \right] dz = & \nu \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} + \nu \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q,\eta} \\ & - \lambda \nu (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Using (19) in (20), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz \leq & \frac{p-1+\nu}{(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2)(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1 + \nu)} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} \\ & + \frac{q-1+\nu}{(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2)(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1 + \nu)} \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q,\eta}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Combining the definition of the functional $J(y_1, y_2)$ with (20), (21), for all $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^+$,

$$\begin{aligned} J(y_1, y_2) &= \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{1-\nu} \right) \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} + \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{1-\nu} \right) \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q,\eta} \\ &\quad + \lambda \left[\frac{(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2)}{1-\nu} - 1 \right] \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{1-\nu} \right) \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} + \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{1-\nu} \right) \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q,\eta} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{1-\nu} \frac{p-1+\nu}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} + \frac{1}{1-\nu} \frac{q-1+\nu}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q,\eta} \\ &= \frac{p-1+\nu}{1-\nu} \left(\frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} - \frac{1}{p} \right) \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} \\ &\quad + \frac{q-1+\nu}{1-\nu} \left(\frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} - \frac{1}{q} \right) \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q,\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $1 < p < q < \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2$, we have $J(y_1, y_2) < 0$. Which means $\inf_{\mathcal{N}_\lambda^+} J(y_1, y_2) < 0$. \square

Lemma 3.4 *Suppose the assumptions (H_1) , (H_2) , (H_3) hold. If $\mathcal{N}_\lambda^- \neq \emptyset$ for some $\lambda > 0$, then there exists $\lambda_1 > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^-$, $J(y_1, y_2) > 0$.*

Proof On the one hand, for $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^-$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (p-1)\|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} &< \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2)(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz \\ &\quad - (q-1)\|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q,\eta} \\ &\quad - \nu \int_{\Omega} \left[a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu} \right] dz. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Since $\nu > 0$, $q > 1$, and (H_1) , (H_2) hold, one has

$$(p-1)\|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} < \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2)(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz. \quad (23)$$

Combining with (14), we can get for some $C_{11} > 0$, (23) comes to

$$\|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} < \lambda C_{11} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p}^{\frac{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2}{p}}. \quad (24)$$

On the other hand, suppose there exists a point $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^-$ and $J(y_1, y_2) \leq 0$, i.e.,

$$J(y_1, y_2) = \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla y_1|^p + |\nabla y_2|^p) dz + \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_1|^q dz + \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_2|^q dz - \frac{1}{1-\nu} \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz - \lambda \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz \leq 0. \quad (25)$$

Again since $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^- \subset \mathcal{N}_\lambda$, from the definition of \mathcal{N}_λ , one has

$$-\lambda \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz = -\frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} - \frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q,\eta} + \frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz. \quad (26)$$

Using (26) in (25) to get

$$\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2}\right) \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} + \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2}\right) \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q,\eta} + \left(\frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} - \frac{1}{1-\nu}\right) \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz \leq 0.$$

Taking into account that $q < \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2$ and (H_1) holds, we have

$$\|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} \leq \frac{p(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + \nu + 1)}{(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 - p)(1 - \nu)} \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz.$$

Thus, using (H_2) , and proceeding as in the proof of (12), for some positive constants C_{12}, C_{13} and C_{14} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} &\leq C_{12} (\|y_1\|_p^{1-\nu} + \|y_2\|_p^{1-\nu}) \\ &\leq C_{13} (\|y_1\|_{1,p}^{1-\nu} + \|y_2\|_{1,p}^{1-\nu}) \\ &\leq C_{14} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p}^{\frac{1-\nu}{p}}, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

here we have used the Poincaré's inequality and that the function $t \rightarrow t^{\frac{1-\nu}{p}}$ is concave. Combining (24) and (27), we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{\lambda C_{11}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 - p}} < C_{14}^{\frac{1}{p + \nu - 1}}.$$

Thus, since $1 < p < \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2$, we get

$$\lambda > C_{11}^{-1} C_{14}^{-\frac{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 - p}{p - 1 + \nu}}.$$

Then the lemma holds with $\lambda_1 := C_{11}^{-1} C_{14}^{-\frac{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 - p}{p - 1 + \nu}}$. \square

Lemma 3.5 *Suppose the assumptions (H_1) , (H_2) , (H_3) hold and $(y_1, y_2) \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ with $\int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz > 0$, then there exists $\tilde{\lambda}_0 > 0$ such that for $\lambda \in (0, \tilde{\lambda}_0)$, there exist two positive constants t_1, t_2 such that $t_1 < t_2$, $t_1(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^+$, $t_2(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^-$.*

14 *Existence of the solution for a double phase system*

Proof For a given $(y_1, y_2) \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ with $\int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz > 0$, define the function $\tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) := t^{p-1-(\kappa_1+\kappa_2+1)} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} - t^{-\nu-(\kappa_1+\kappa_2+1)} \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz.$$

Now we discuss the geometry of $\tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(t)$. If $\tilde{F}'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} (p - \kappa_1 - \kappa_2 - 2)t^{p-\kappa_1-\kappa_2-3} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p} \\ = (-\nu - \kappa_1 - \kappa_2 - 1)t^{-\nu-\kappa_1-\kappa_2-2} \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz. \end{aligned}$$

Then the unique stationary point, denoted by \tilde{t}_0 , of the function $\tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(t)$ can be solved as

$$\tilde{t}_0 = \left[\frac{(\nu + \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz}{(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 - p) \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p}} \right]^{\frac{1}{p+\nu-1}},$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(\tilde{t}_0) \\ = \frac{p + \nu - 1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 - p} \left[\frac{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 - p}{\nu + \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1} \right]^{\frac{\nu + \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1}{p + \nu - 1}} \frac{(\|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p})^{\frac{\nu + \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1}{p + \nu - 1}}}{\left\{ \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz \right\}^{\frac{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 - p}{p + \nu - 1}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Exactly as in the proof of the inequality (12) (and also of the inequality (14)), by using (H_2) , the Poincaré's inequality and Hölder inequalities, and the fact that $t \rightarrow t^{(1-\nu)/p}$ is a concave function, we get

$$\int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz \leq C_{15} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p}^{\frac{1-\nu}{p}}, \quad (29)$$

$$\lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz \leq \frac{\lambda C_7}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p}^{\frac{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2}{p}}. \quad (30)$$

Combining (28) with (29) and (30), we have for some positive constants C_{16} and C_{17} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(\tilde{t}_0) - \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz \\ \geq \frac{p + \nu - 1}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 - p} \left[\frac{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 - p}{\nu + \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1} \right]^{\frac{\nu + \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1}{p + \nu - 1}} \frac{(\|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p})^{\frac{\nu + \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1}{p + \nu - 1}}}{\left[C_{15} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p}^{\frac{1-\nu}{p}} \right]^{\frac{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 - p}{p + \nu - 1}}} \\ - \frac{\lambda C_7}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p}^{\frac{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2}{p}} \\ = (C_{16} - \lambda C_{17}) \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1,p}^{\frac{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2}{p}}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Set $\tilde{\lambda}_0 = \frac{C_{16}}{C_{17}} > 0$ which independent of (y_1, y_2) and λ , then for every $\lambda \in (0, \tilde{\lambda}_0)$, one has

$$\tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(\tilde{t}_0) - \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dx > 0.$$

Now we consider, for $\lambda \in (0, \tilde{\lambda}_0)$, the function $F_{(y_1, y_2)} : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) := \tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) + t^{q-1-(\kappa_1+\kappa_2+1)} \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q, \eta}.$$

Taking into account (H_1) holds and the fact that $\nu + \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1 > \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 - p > \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2 - q > 0$, we have

$$F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) \geq \tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(t), \quad \forall t \in (0, +\infty),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = -\infty, \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

It is clearly that, for any $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) &= t^{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+1} \left[F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) - \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz \right], \quad (32) \\ \psi''_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) &= (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1) t^{\kappa_1+\kappa_2} \left[F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) - \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz \right] \\ &\quad + t^{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+1} F'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t). \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Thus, combining (32) and (33) with Lemma 2.5, it follows that if $t > 0$ satisfies $F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz$ and $F'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) > 0$ (respectively $F'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) < 0$), then $t(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^+$ (resp. $t(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-$).

Since $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = -\infty$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = 0$ and $F_{(y_1, y_2)}(\tilde{t}_0) \geq \tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(\tilde{t}_0) > 0$, it follows that there exists a point $t_0 \in (0, +\infty)$ where $F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t)$ attains its maximum value. Such a t_0 is clearly a critical point of $F_{(y_1, y_2)}$ (that is, $F'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t_0) = 0$). Now we prove that t_0 is the unique critical point of $F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t)$. Define $F_1 : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$F_1(t) := t^{\nu+\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2} F'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) + (-\nu - \kappa_1 - \kappa_2 - 1) \int_{\Omega} \left[a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu} \right] dz. \quad (34)$$

From the definition of $F'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t)$, (34) becomes

$$F_1(t) = (p - \kappa_1 - \kappa_2 - 2) t^{p+\nu-1} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1, p} + (q - \kappa_1 - \kappa_2 - 2) t^{q+\nu-1} \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q, \eta} \quad (35)$$

Obviously, from the definition of $F_1(t)$, one has for any $t > 0$,

$$F'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = 0 \Leftrightarrow F_1(t) - (-\nu - \kappa_1 - \kappa_2 - 1) \int_{\Omega} \left[a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu} \right] dz = 0.$$

From (35) and $\nu < p < q < \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2$, one has for any $t > 0$,

$$F'_1(t) < 0.$$

Then F_1 is injective, and so, by the above equivalence, t_0 is the unique critical point of $F_{(y_1, y_2)}$. From this fact, and since $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = -\infty$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = 0$, and

$$F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t_0) = \max_{t \in (0, \infty)} F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t), \quad (36)$$

it follows that $F'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) > 0$ for any $t \in (0, t_0)$ and that $F'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) < 0$ for any $t \in (t_0, \infty)$. Now,

$$F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t_0) \geq F_{(y_1, y_2)}(\tilde{t}_0) \geq \tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(\tilde{t}_0) > \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz > 0, \quad (37)$$

16 *Existence of the solution for a double phase system*

thus we can find unique $t_1 < t_0$ such that

$$F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t_1) = \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz, \quad F'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t_1) > 0,$$

so, $t_1(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^+$.

Similarly, there exists unique $t_2 > t_0$ such that

$$F_{(y_1, y_2)}(t_2) = \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2) \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz, \quad F'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t_2) < 0,$$

thus $t_2(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-$.

Moreover, we can shown that $\psi_{(y_1, y_2)}(t)$ attains its maximum value at $t = t_2$ and its minimum value at $t = t_1$. In fact, since $F_{(y_1, y_2)}$ is strictly increasing on $(0, t_0)$ and strictly decreasing on (t_0, ∞) , from (32) and $t_1 < t_0 < t_2$, one has the sign of $\psi'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t)$ is constant on each one of the intervals $(0, t_1)$, (t_1, t_2) and (t_2, ∞) . Again since $\psi'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) > 0$ for $t \in (t_1, t_2)$ it follows that $\psi'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) < 0$ for $t \in (0, t_1)$, and similar arguments give that $\psi'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) > 0$ for all $t \in (t_1, t_2)$ and $\psi'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) < 0$ for all $t \in (t_2, \infty)$. \square

Lemma 3.6 *Suppose the assumptions (H_1) , (H_2) , (H_3) hold and $\lambda \in (0, \tilde{\lambda}_0)$. If $(y_1, y_2) \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$, then there exists a unique constant $t_3 > 0$ such that $t_3(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^+$.*

Proof If $\int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz > 0$, then Lemma 3.5 gives the required t_3 , and an inspection of the proof of Lemma 3.5 gives also that such a t_3 is unique.

If $\int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz = 0$. Let $(y_1, y_2) \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$, define function $\tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) := t^{p-1} \|(y_1, y_2)\|_{1, p} - t^{-\nu} \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2|^{1-\nu}] dz.$$

Since $p - 1 > 0 > -\nu$, then we have $\tilde{F}'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) > 0$ for any $t > 0$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = -\infty, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = +\infty.$$

Since

$$\psi'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = \tilde{F}_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) + t^{q-1} \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2)\|_{q, \eta},$$

and $q > 1$, it follows that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \psi'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = -\infty$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \psi'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) = +\infty$, and that $\psi''_{(y_1, y_2)}(t) > 0$ for any $t > 0$. Then there exists a unique $t_3 > 0$ such that $\psi'_{(y_1, y_2)}(t_3) = 0$ and $\psi''_{(y_1, y_2)}(t_3) > 0$, and so, by Lemma 2.5, there exists a unique $t_3 > 0$ such that $t_3(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^+$. \square

Let $\lambda^* = \min\{\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \tilde{\lambda}_0\}$.

Lemma 3.7 *Suppose the assumptions (H_1) , (H_2) , (H_3) hold, then for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, there exists $(y_{1*}, y_{2*}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-$ such that*

$$J(y_{1*}, y_{2*}) = \inf_{(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-} J(y_1, y_2).$$

Proof Choose $(y_1, y_2) \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ satisfied $\int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} dz > 0$. So, by Lemma 3.5, one has $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^- \neq \emptyset$ and, by Lemma 3.1, $J|_{\mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-}$ is bounded from below. Now let us consider a minimizing sequence $(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-$ such that when $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$J(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) \searrow \inf_{(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-} J(y_1, y_2).$$

By Lemma 3.1 both sequences $\{y_{1n}\}$ and $\{y_{2n}\}$ are bounded in $W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ and so, by the reflexivity of $W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$, there exist $(y_{1*}, y_{2*}) \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ and a suitable subsequence, still denoted by $\{(y_{1n}, y_{2n})\}$ such that

$$(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) \rightharpoonup (y_{1*}, y_{2*}) \text{ in } W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega),$$

and from Lemma 2.1(iii),

$$y_{1n} \rightarrow y_{1*} \text{ in } L^r(\Omega), \quad y_{2n} \rightarrow y_{2*} \text{ in } L^r(\Omega), \quad 1 \leq r < p^*.$$

Since $1 < p < p^*$ and the assumption (H_3) holds, [17] gives the fact

$$\int_{\Omega} |y_{1n}|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_{2n}|^{\kappa_2+1} dz \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2+1} dz, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

We claim that $y_{1*} \neq 0$ and $y_{2*} \neq 0$. In fact, since $(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-$, we have (23). Let m_1 and m_2 be defined as the proof of Lemma 3.2,

$$m_1 = p^* - \epsilon_0(\kappa_1 + 1), \quad m_2 = \frac{[p^* - \epsilon_0(\kappa_1 + 1)](\kappa_2 + 1)}{p^* - (\epsilon_0 + 1)(\kappa_1 + 1)}.$$

By using Poincaré's inequality and (16), (23) comes to

$$\begin{aligned} C_{18} (\|y_{1n}\|_{m_1}^p + \|y_{2n}\|_{m_2}^p) &\leq (p-1) \|(y_{1n}, y_{2n})\|_{1,p} \\ &\leq \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2)(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_{1n}|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_{2n}|^{\kappa_2+1} dz \quad (38) \\ &\leq \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2)(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1) C_8 \|y_{1n}\|_{m_1}^{\kappa_1+1} \|y_{2n}\|_{m_2}^{\kappa_2+1}, \end{aligned}$$

here, C_{18} is a positive constant. Again since $(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-$, we know $(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) \neq \{(0, 0)\}$. Thus, for some $C_{19} := (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2)(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1) C_8 > 0$, (38) comes to

$$C_{18} \leq \lambda C_{19} \frac{\|y_{1n}\|_{m_1}^{\kappa_1+1} \|y_{2n}\|_{m_2}^{\kappa_2+1}}{\|y_{1n}\|_{m_1}^p + \|y_{2n}\|_{m_2}^p}. \quad (39)$$

By the use of Young's inequality and the properties of concave function $t \rightarrow t^{1/p}$, one has for some positive constant C_{20} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_{1n}\|_{m_1}^{\frac{\kappa_1+1}{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2}} \|y_{2n}\|_{m_2}^{\frac{\kappa_2+1}{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2}} &\leq \frac{(\kappa_1+1)\|y_{1n}\|_{m_1}}{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2} + \frac{(\kappa_2+1)\|y_{2n}\|_{m_2}}{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2} \\ &\leq \|y_{1n}\|_{m_1} + \|y_{2n}\|_{m_2} \leq C_{20} (\|y_{1n}\|_{m_1}^p + \|y_{2n}\|_{m_2}^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Then from (39) and (40), we have

$$\left(\frac{C_{18}}{\lambda C_{19} C_{20}^{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2}} \right)^{\frac{p}{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2}} \leq (\|y_{1n}\|_{m_1}^p + \|y_{2n}\|_{m_2}^p). \quad (41)$$

By taking $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}$, we know $y_{1*} \neq 0$ or $y_{2*} \neq 0$. For case of $y_{1*} = 0$ and $y_{2*} \neq 0$, thus there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough such that $\|y_{2n}\|_{m_2} \neq 0$ for all $n \geq N$. Then

$$\|y_{1n}\|_{m_1}^p + \|y_{2n}\|_{m_2}^p \geq \|y_{2n}\|_{m_2}^p > 0 \quad \text{for } n \geq N,$$

hence for $n \geq N$, (39) comes to

$$C_{18} \leq \lambda C_{19} \|y_{1n}\|_{m_1}^{\kappa_1+1} \|y_{2n}\|_{m_2}^{\kappa_2+1-p}.$$

By taking $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}$, we get $C_{18} \leq 0$, a contradiction. Thus $y_{1*} \neq 0$. The proof of the fact that $y_{2*} \neq 0$ is similar, and we omit it.

Now we take $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}$ in (38) to obtain that $\int_{\Omega} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2+1} dx > 0$. Then, by Lemma 3.5, there exists $t_2 > 0$ such that $t_2(y_{1*}, y_{2*}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-$.

Now, we prove that, after pass to a subsequence if necessary, $\{(y_{1n}, y_{2n})\}$ converges strongly in $W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ to (y_{1*}, y_{2*}) . To do it, it is enough to show that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1n}) \leq \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1*}) \text{ and } \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2n}) \leq \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2*}). \quad (42)$$

Indeed, if (42) holds, we can assume, after pass to a subsequence if necessary, (still denoted by (y_{1n}, y_{2n})), that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1n}) \leq \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1*}), \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2n}) \leq \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2*}).$$

Since $(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) \rightharpoonup (y_{1*}, y_{2*})$ in $W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ and since the integrand function of $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}$ is uniformly convex, it follows from the weak lower semi-continuity of the norms and seminorms and Lemma 2.2(iv) that (see [20], Page 13)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) - (y_{1*}, y_{2*})\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [\|\nabla(y_{1n} - y_{1*})\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|\nabla(y_{2n} - y_{2*})\|_{\mathcal{H}}] = 0.$$

Which means $\{(y_{1n}, y_{2n})\}$ converges strongly in $W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ to (y_{1*}, y_{2*}) .

To prove (42) we proceed by contradiction. Suppose that either $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1n}) > \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1*})$ or $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2n}) > \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2*})$. We may have the following three cases:

Case (a): $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1n}) > \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1*}), \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2n}) = \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2*}).$

Case (b): $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1n}) = \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1*}), \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2n}) > \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2*}).$

Case (c): $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1n}) > \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1*}), \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2n}) > \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2*}).$

For Case (a), according to $(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-$, by Lemma 3.5, we have $J(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) = \max_{t \in (0, \infty)} J(ty_{1n}, ty_{2n})$. By use of the weak lower semi-continuity of the norms and seminorms and Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\inf_{\mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-} J(y_1, y_2) \leq J(t_2 y_{1*}, t_2 y_{2*}) < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} J(t_2 y_{1n}, t_2 y_{2n}) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} J(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) = \inf_{\mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-} J(y_1, y_2).$$

This is a contradiction.

The proof for the Cases (b) and (c) are similar to the given for the Case (a) and we omit them. Thus $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1n}) \leq \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1*}), \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2n}) \leq \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2*})$, and then, $(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) \rightarrow (y_{1*}, y_{2*})$ in $W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$. According to the continuity of $J(y_1, y_2)$, one has $J(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) \rightarrow J(y_{1*}, y_{2*})$, thus $J(y_{1*}, y_{2*}) = \inf_{\mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-} J(y_1, y_2)$.

Since $\psi''_{(y_{1n}, y_{2n})}(1) < 0$, by taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain $\psi''_{(y_{1*}, y_{2*})}(1) \leq 0$. Again since Lemma 3.2, we know $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^0 = \emptyset$ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$. So, $(y_{1*}, y_{2*}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-$.

Since $J(|y_1|, |y_2|) = J(y_1, y_2)$, we may assume that y_{1*}, y_{2*} are nonnegative. □

Lemma 3.8 *Suppose the assumptions (H_1) , (H_2) , (H_3) hold, then for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, there exists $(y_1^*, y_2^*) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^+$ such that*

$$J(y_1^*, y_2^*) = \inf_{(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^+} J(y_1, y_2),$$

and $y_1^*(z), y_2^*(z) \geq 0$ for a.e. $z \in \Omega$.

Proof As in the proof of Lemma 3.7 there exist $(y_1^*, y_2^*) \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$, and a subsequence, still denoted by (y_{1n}, y_{2n}) , such that $(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) \rightharpoonup (y_1^*, y_2^*)$ in $W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$. So, from the weak lower semi-continuity of the involved norms and seminorms, and using the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, as well as Lemma 3.6, we get

$$J(y_1^*, y_2^*) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} J(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) < 0 = J(0, 0),$$

thus, $(y_1^*, y_2^*) \neq \{(0, 0)\}$, and then, according to Lemma 3.6, we can find $t_2(y_1^*, y_2^*) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^+$.

Now we prove that, after pass to a further subsequence if necessary, $(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) \rightarrow (y_1^*, y_2^*)$ in $W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$. Proceeding as in the proof of Lemma 3.7, it is enough to see that each one of the following three cases is impossible,

- Case (a): $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1n}) > \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_1^*)$, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2n}) = \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_2^*)$.
Case (b): $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1n}) = \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_1^*)$, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2n}) > \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_2^*)$.
Case (c): $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{1n}) > \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_1^*)$, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_{2n}) > \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nabla y_2^*)$.

For Case (a), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi'_{(y_{1n}, y_{2n})}(t_2) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ t_2^{p-1} \|(y_{1n}, y_{2n})\|_{1,p} + t_2^{q-1} \|(\nabla y_{1n}, \nabla y_{2n})\|_{q,\eta} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - t_2^{-\nu} \int_{\Omega} [|y_{1n}|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_{2n}|^{1-\nu}] dz \right. \\ &\quad \left. - t_2^{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1} \lambda (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2) \int_{\Omega} |y_{1n}|^{\kappa_1 + 1} |y_{2n}|^{\kappa_2 + 1} dz \right\} \\ &> t_2^{p-1} \|(y_1^*, y_2^*)\|_{1,p} + t_2^{q-1} \|(\nabla y_1^*, \nabla y_2^*)\|_{q,\eta} \\ &\quad - t_2^{-\nu} \int_{\Omega} [a_1 |y_1^*|^{1-\nu} + a_2 |y_2^*|^{1-\nu}] dz \\ &\quad - t_2^{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1} \lambda (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2) \int_{\Omega} |y_1^*|^{\kappa_1 + 1} |y_2^*|^{\kappa_2 + 1} dz \\ &= 0, \quad (\text{because of } (t_2 y_1^*, t_2 y_2^*) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^+ \subset \mathcal{N}_\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Which means

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi'_{(y_{1n}, y_{2n})}(t_2) > \psi'_{(y_1^*, y_2^*)}(t_2).$$

Thus there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n > n_0$, $\psi'_{(y_{1n}, y_{2n})}(t_2) > 0$. According to $(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^+ \subset \mathcal{N}_\lambda$ and (32), one has for all $0 < t < 1$,

$$\psi'_{(y_{1n}, y_{2n})}(t) < 0.$$

Thus $t_2 > 1$ and $\psi'_{(y_1^*, y_2^*)}(t) < 0$ for all $t \in (0, t_2)$. Again since $(t_2 y_1^*, t_2 y_2^*) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^+$, we have

$$\inf_{\mathcal{N}_\lambda^+} J(y_1, y_2) \leq J(t_2 y_1^*, t_2 y_2^*) \leq J(y_1^*, y_2^*) < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} J(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) = \inf_{\mathcal{N}_\lambda^+} J(y_1, y_2).$$

This is a contradiction. A similar contradiction is reached also in the Cases (b) and (c). So $(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) \rightarrow (y_1^*, y_2^*)$ in $W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$. We argue as in the proof of Lemma 3.7 and using $\psi''_{(y_{1n}, y_{2n})}(1) > 0$ (because of $(y_{1n}, y_{2n}) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^+$), we obtain $(y_1^*, y_2^*) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^+$ and $J(y_1^*, y_2^*) = \inf_{\mathcal{N}_\lambda^+} J(y_1, y_2)$. The proof is complete. \square

Inspired by Lemma 3 of [33], we have the following results.

Lemma 3.9 *Suppose the assumptions (H_1) , (H_2) hold, then for $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^+$, there exist a small enough positive constant ϵ and a functional denoted by*

$$\xi : B_\epsilon(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+,$$

which is continuous and satisfied $\xi(0, 0) = 1$, and for all $(x_1, x_2) \in B_\epsilon(0)$,

$$\xi(x_1, x_2)(y_1 + x_1, y_2 + x_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^+,$$

here, $B_\epsilon(0) := \{(y_1, y_2) \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \mid \|(y_1, y_2)\| < \epsilon\}$.

Proof Given $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^+$, define the functional $\tilde{H}(x_1, x_2, t) : W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\tilde{H}(x_1, x_2, t) := t^\nu \psi'_{(y_1+x_1, y_2+x_2)}(t).$$

Because $(y_1 + x_1, y_2 + x_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^+$, we have $\tilde{H}(0, 0, 1) = 0$, $\frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial t}(0, 0, 1) > 0$. Using implicit function theorem to \tilde{H} at $(0, 0, 1)$ (see, Berger [38]), there exist $0 < \delta < 1$, $\epsilon > 0$ and a continuous functional $\xi : B_\epsilon(0) \rightarrow [1 - \delta, 1 + \delta]$ such that $\xi(0, 0) = 1$ and

$$\tilde{H}(x_1, x_2, \xi(x_1, x_2)) = 0, \quad \forall (x_1, x_2) \in B_\epsilon(0). \quad (43)$$

Hence we know $\xi(x_1, x_2)(y_1 + x_1, y_2 + x_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda$.

Now we prove that $\xi(x_1, x_2)(y_1 + x_1, y_2 + x_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^+$ for any $(x_1, x_2) \in B_\epsilon(0)$. Since

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial t}(x_1, x_2, t) = \nu t^{\nu-1} \psi'_{(y_1+x_1, y_2+x_2)}(t) + t^\nu \psi''_{(y_1+x_1, y_2+x_2)}(t),$$

and $\xi(x_1, x_2)(y_1 + x_1, y_2 + x_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda$, we have, for all $\|(x_1, x_2)\| < \epsilon$,

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial t}(x_1, x_2, \xi(x_1, x_2)) = \xi(x_1, x_2)^\nu \psi''_{(y_1+x_1, y_2+x_2)}(\xi(x_1, x_2)).$$

Taking into account that $\frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial t}(0, 0, 1) > 0$, $\xi(0, 0) = 1$ and that ξ and $\psi''_{(y_1+x_1, y_2+x_2)}(t)$ are continuous on $B_\epsilon(0)$ and on $(0, \infty)$, respectively, by diminishing ϵ if necessary, we have

$$\xi(x_1, x_2)(y_1 + x_1, y_2 + x_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^+,$$

for all $(x_1, x_2) \in B_\epsilon(0)$. □

Lemma 3.10 *Suppose the assumptions (H_1) , (H_2) , (H_3) hold, then for $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^-$, there exist a small enough positive constant ϵ and a functional denoted by*

$$\xi_1 : B_\epsilon(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+,$$

which is continuous and satisfied $\xi_1(0, 0) = 1$ and for all $(x_1, x_2) \in B_\epsilon(0)$,

$$\xi_1(x_1, x_2)(y_1 + x_1, y_2 + x_2) \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^-.$$

Proof Combining with Lemma 3.7 and the similarly proof process of Lemma 3.9, we can end this proof. □

Lemma 3.11 *Suppose the assumptions (H_1) , (H_2) , (H_3) hold, and $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, then there exists $\delta^* \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that for all $(h, w) \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$, $t \in [0, \delta^*]$,*

$$J(\xi_1(th, tw)(y_{1*}, y_{2*})) \leq J(\xi_1(th, tw)(y_{1*} + th, y_{2*} + tw)).$$

Proof Given $(h, w) \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$, define a function $f_{(h,w)}(t) : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} f_{(h,w)}(t) &:= (p-1)\|(y_{1*} + th, y_{2*} + tw)\|_{1,p} + (q-1)\|(\nabla y_{1*} + t\nabla h, \nabla y_{2*} + t\nabla w)\|_{q,\eta} \\ &\quad + \nu \int_{\Omega} [a_1|y_{1*} + th|^{1-\nu} + a_2|y_{2*} + tw|^{1-\nu}] dz \\ &\quad - \lambda(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2)(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_{1*} + th|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_{2*} + tw|^{\kappa_2+1} dz, \end{aligned}$$

where (y_{1*}, y_{2*}) given by Lemma 3.7.

Since $(y_{1*}, y_{2*}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-$, one has

$$f_{(h,w)}(0) = \psi''_{(y_{1*}, y_{2*})}(1) < 0.$$

By the continuity of the function $f_{(h,w)}(t)$, it can be obtained that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\psi''_{(y_{1*}+th, y_{2*}+tw)}(1) = f_{(h,w)}(t) < 0, \quad \forall t \in [0, \delta].$$

From Lemma 3.10, for $(y_{1*}, y_{2*}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-$, we can find $\epsilon > 0$, $0 < \delta^* < \delta$ and a continuous functional

$$\xi_1 : B_{\epsilon}(0) \rightarrow (0, +\infty),$$

such that for all $t \in [0, \delta^*]$, $(th, tw) \in B_{\epsilon}(0)$ and $\xi_1(th, tw)(y_{1*} + th, y_{2*} + tw) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-$ with

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \xi_1(th, tw) = 1.$$

Thus, for $t \in [0, \delta^*]$, one has

$$\psi''_{(y_{1*}+th, y_{2*}+tw)}(1) < 0, \quad \psi_{(y_{1*}+th, y_{2*}+tw)}(\xi_1(th, tw)) \geq \psi_{(y_{1*}+th, y_{2*}+tw)}(1).$$

Hence, let $t \in [0, \delta^*]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{(y_{1*}, y_{2*})}(\xi_1(th, tw)) &\leq \psi_{(y_{1*}, y_{2*})}(1) = J(y_{1*}, y_{2*}) \\ &= \inf_{\mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-} J(y_1, y_2) \leq J(\xi_1(th, tw)(y_{1*} + th, y_{2*} + tw)). \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 3.12 *Suppose the assumptions (H_1) , (H_2) hold, and $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, then there exists $\delta^* \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that for all $(h, w) \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$, $t \in [0, \delta^*]$*

$$J(y_1^*, y_2^*) \leq J(y_1^* + th, y_2^* + tw).$$

Proof Combining with Lemma 3.8, 3.9 and the similarly proof process of Lemma 3.11 or Proposition 3.5 in [30], one has for $t \in [0, \delta^*]$,

$$\psi''_{(y_1^*+th, y_2^*+tw)}(1) > 0, \quad \psi_{(y_1^*+th, y_2^*+tw)}(\xi_1(th, tw)) \leq \psi_{(y_1^*+th, y_2^*+tw)}(1).$$

Hence, let $t \in [0, \delta^*]$, we have

$$\psi_{(y_1^*, y_2^*)}(1) = J(y_1^*, y_2^*) = \inf_{\mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^+} J(y_1, y_2) \leq J(\xi_1(th, tw)(y_1^* + th, y_2^* + tw))$$

$$= \psi_{(y_1^*+th, y_2^*+tw)}(\xi_1(th, tw)) \leq \psi_{(y_1^*+th, y_2^*+tw)}(1) = J(y_1^* + th, y_2^* + tw).$$

The proof is complete. \square

Theorem 3.1 *Suppose the assumptions (H_1) , (H_2) , (H_3) hold, $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, then (y_{1*}, y_{2*}) is a positive weak solution of problem (1) such that $J(y_{1*}, y_{2*}) \geq 0$.*

Proof Firstly, we prove that $y_{1*}, y_{2*} > 0$, a.e. $z \in \Omega$.

By Lemma 3.8, we have $y_{1*}, y_{2*} \geq 0$, a.e. $z \in \Omega$. Suppose that there exists a set $\mathcal{H}_1 \subset \Omega$ such that $y_{1*} = 0$ for $z \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $\text{meas } \mathcal{H}_1 > 0$ or set $\mathcal{H}_2 \subset \Omega$ such that $y_{2*} = 0$ for $z \in \mathcal{H}_2$ and $\text{meas } \mathcal{H}_2 > 0$, (*meas* stands for the measure). Let $(h, w) \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ with $h \geq 0, w \geq 0$, and $0 < t < \delta^*$. By the definition of the functional $J(y_1, y_2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{t} [J(\xi_1(th, tw)(y_{1*} + th, y_{2*} + tw)) - J(\xi_1(th, tw)(y_{1*}, y_{2*}))] \\ &= \frac{\xi_1(th, tw)^p}{pt} [\|(y_{1*} + th, y_{2*} + tw)\|_{1,p} - \|(y_{1*}, y_{2*})\|_{1,p}] \\ &+ \frac{\xi_1(th, tw)^q}{qt} \int_{\Omega} \eta [|\nabla(y_{1*} + th)|^q dz - |\nabla y_{1*}|^q] dz \\ &+ \frac{\xi_1(th, tw)^q}{qt} \int_{\Omega} \eta [|\nabla(y_{2*} + tw)|^q dz - |\nabla y_{2*}|^q] dz \\ &- \frac{\xi_1(th, tw)^{1-\nu} t^{-\nu}}{1-\nu} \int_{\mathcal{H}_1} a_1 h^{1-\nu} dz \\ &- \frac{\xi_1(th, tw)^{1-\nu}}{(1-\nu)t} \int_{\Omega \setminus \mathcal{H}_1} a_1 [(y_{1*} + th)^{1-\nu} - y_{1*}^{1-\nu}] dz \\ &- \frac{\xi_1(th, tw)^{1-\nu}}{(1-\nu)t} \int_{\Omega} a_2 [(y_{2*} + tw)^{1-\nu} - y_{2*}^{1-\nu}] dz \\ &- \frac{\lambda \xi_1(th, tw)^{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2}}{t} \int_{\Omega} [|y_{1*} + th|^{\kappa_1 + 1} |y_{2*} + tw|^{\kappa_2 + 1} - |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1 + 1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2 + 1}] dz. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, as $t \rightarrow 0$, by using the L'hôpital's rule and the fact $0 < \nu < 1$, we have

$$\frac{1}{t} [J(\xi_1(th, tw)(y_{1*} + th, y_{2*} + tw)) - J(\xi_1(th, tw)(y_{1*}, y_{2*}))] \rightarrow -\infty.$$

This is a contradiction to Lemma 3.11. Hence $y_{1*} > 0$ a.e. $z \in \Omega$. Similarly we have $y_{2*} > 0$ a.e. $z \in \Omega$.

Secondly, we prove that for $(h, w) \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ and $h \geq 0, w \geq 0$, then

$$(a_1 y_{1*}^{-\nu} h, a_2 y_{2*}^{-\nu} w) \in L^1(\Omega) \times L^1(\Omega),$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_{1*}|^{p-2} \nabla y_{1*} \cdot \nabla h dz + \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_{1*}|^{q-2} \nabla y_{1*} \cdot \nabla h dz \\ & \geq \int_{\Omega} a_1 y_{1*}^{-\nu} h dz + \lambda(\kappa_1 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2 + 1} h dz, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_{2*}|^{p-2} \nabla y_{2*} \cdot \nabla w dz + \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_{2*}|^{q-2} \nabla y_{2*} \cdot \nabla w dz \\ & \geq \int_{\Omega} a_2 y_{2*}^{-\nu} w dz + \lambda(\kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1 + 1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2} w dz. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Given $0 \leq h, w \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$, choosing $\{t_n\} \in (0, 1]$ as a decreasing sequence such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = 0$. We have that, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the function

$$u_n(z) = a_1 \frac{[y_{1*}(z) + t_n h(z)]^{1-\nu} - y_{1*}(z)^{1-\nu}}{t_n}$$

is measurable and nonnegative, and for a.e. $z \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n(z) = (1 - \nu) a_1 y_{1*}(z)^{-\nu} h(z).$$

Thus

$$\int_{\Omega} a_1 y_{1*}(z)^{-\nu} h(z) dz \leq \frac{1}{1 - \nu} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} u_n(z) dz, \quad (47)$$

here, the Fatou's lemma is used.

Applying again Lemma 3.11 and letting $w = 0$, one has for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large, there is

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \frac{J(\xi_1(t_n h, 0)(y_{1*} + t_n h, y_{2*})) - J(\xi_1(t_n h, 0)(y_{1*}, y_{2*}))}{t_n} \\ &= \frac{\xi_1(t_n h, 0)^p}{p} \frac{(\|y_{1*} + t_n h\|_{1,p}^p - \|y_{1*}\|_{1,p}^p)}{t_n} - \frac{\xi_1(t_n h, 0)^\nu}{1 - \nu} \int_{\Omega} u_n dz \\ &\quad + \frac{\xi_1(t_n h, 0)^q}{q} \frac{\int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla(y_{1*} + t_n h)|^q dz - \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_{1*}|^q dz}{t_n} \\ &\quad - \lambda \xi_1(t_n h, 0)^{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |y_{1*} + t_n h|^{\kappa_1 + 1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2 + 1} dz - \int_{\Omega} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1 + 1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2 + 1} dz}{t_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\xi_1(t_n h, 0)^\nu}{1 - \nu} \int_{\Omega} u_n(z) dz \\ &\leq \frac{\xi_1(t_n h, 0)^p}{p} \frac{\|y_{1*} + t_n h\|_{1,p}^p - \|y_{1*}\|_{1,p}^p}{t_n} \\ &\quad + \frac{\xi_1(t_n h, 0)^q}{q} \frac{\int_{\Omega} \eta [|\nabla(y_{1*} + t_n h)|^q - |\nabla y_{1*}|^q] dz}{t_n} \\ &\quad - \lambda \xi_1(t_n h, 0)^{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |y_{1*} + t_n h|^{\kappa_1 + 1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2 + 1} - |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1 + 1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2 + 1} dz}{t_n}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

We take $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}$ in (48), and using (47) and the fact that the limit, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, of the right side of (48) exists (and that it is finite), we get that $a_1 y_{1*}^{-\nu} h \in L^1(\Omega)$ for any nonnegative $h \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ and that (45) holds. Letting $h = 0$, a similar proof gives that $a_2 y_{2*}^{-\nu} w \in L^1(\Omega)$ for any nonnegative $w \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ and that (46) hold.

Thirdly, we prove (y_{1*}, y_{2*}) is a weak solution of problem (1). Given $h_* \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$, $w_* \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ and replace h, w in (45), (46) with $(y_{1*} + th)_+, (y_{2*} + tw)_+$, respectively, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_{1*}|^{p-2} \nabla y_{1*} \cdot \nabla (y_{1*} + th)_+ dz + \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_{1*}|^{q-2} \nabla y_{1*} \cdot \nabla (y_{1*} + th)_+ dz \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_{2*}|^{p-2} \nabla y_{2*} \cdot \nabla (y_{2*} + tw)_+ dz + \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_{2*}|^{q-2} \nabla y_{2*} \cdot \nabla (y_{2*} + tw)_+ dz \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega} a_1 y_{1*}^{-\nu} (y_{1*} + th)_+ dz - \lambda (\kappa_1 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2 + 1} (y_{1*} + th)_+ dz \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega} a_2 y_{2*}^{-\nu} (y_{2*} + tw)_+ dz - \lambda (\kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1 + 1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2} (y_{2*} + tw)_+ dz \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_{1*}|^{p-2} \nabla y_{1*} \cdot \nabla (y_{1*} + th_*) dz \\
& - \int_{\{y_{1*} + th_* < 0\}} |\nabla y_{1*}|^{p-2} \nabla y_{1*} \cdot \nabla (y_{1*} + th_*) dz \\
& + \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_{1*}|^{q-2} \nabla y_{1*} \cdot \nabla (y_{1*} + th_*) dz \\
& - \int_{\{y_{1*} + th_* < 0\}} \eta |\nabla y_{1*}|^{q-2} \nabla y_{1*} \cdot \nabla (y_{1*} + th_*) dz \\
& + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_{2*}|^{p-2} \nabla y_{2*} \cdot \nabla (y_{2*} + tw_*) dz \\
& - \int_{\{y_{2*} + tw_* < 0\}} |\nabla y_{2*}|^{p-2} \nabla y_{2*} \cdot \nabla (y_{2*} + tw_*) dz \\
& + \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_{2*}|^{q-2} \nabla y_{2*} \cdot \nabla (y_{2*} + tw_*) dz \\
& - \int_{\{y_{2*} + tw_* < 0\}} \eta |\nabla y_{2*}|^{q-2} \nabla y_{2*} \cdot \nabla (y_{2*} + tw_*) dz \\
& - \int_{\Omega} a_1 y_{1*}^{-\nu} (y_{1*} + th_*) dz + \int_{\{y_{1*} + th_* < 0\}} a_1 y_{1*}^{-\nu} (y_{1*} + th_*) dz \\
& - \lambda(\kappa_1 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2+1} (y_{1*} + th_*) dz \\
& + \lambda(\kappa_1 + 1) \int_{\{y_{1*} + th_* < 0\}} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2+1} (y_{1*} + th_*) dz \\
& - \int_{\Omega} a_2 y_{2*}^{-\nu} (y_{2*} + tw_*) dz + \int_{\{y_{2*} + tw_* < 0\}} a_2 y_{2*}^{-\nu} (y_{2*} + tw_*) dz \\
& - \lambda(\kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2} (y_{2*} + tw_*) dz \\
& + \lambda(\kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\{y_{2*} + tw_* < 0\}} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2} (y_{2*} + tw_*) dz \geq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Since $(y_{1*}, y_{2*}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}$ and $y_{1*}(z) > 0$, $y_{2*}(z) > 0$ for *a.e.* $z \in \Omega$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_{1*}|^p dz + \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_{1*}|^q dz \\
& - \int_{\Omega} a_1 y_{1*}^{1-\nu} dz - \lambda(\kappa_1 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2+1} dz \\
& + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_{2*}|^p dz + \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_{2*}|^q dz \\
& - \int_{\Omega} a_2 y_{2*}^{1-\nu} dz - \lambda(\kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2+1} dz.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (49) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& t \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_{1*}|^{p-2} \nabla y_{1*} \cdot \nabla h_* dz - t \int_{\{y_{1*} + th_* < 0\}} |\nabla y_{1*}|^{p-2} \nabla y_{1*} \cdot \nabla h_* dz \\
& + t \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_{1*}|^{q-2} \nabla y_{1*} \cdot \nabla h_* dz - t \int_{\{y_{1*} + th_* < 0\}} \eta |\nabla y_{1*}|^{q-2} \nabla y_{1*} \cdot \nabla h_* dz \\
& + t \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_{2*}|^{p-2} \nabla y_{2*} \cdot \nabla w_* dz - t \int_{\{y_{2*} + tw_* < 0\}} |\nabla y_{2*}|^{p-2} \nabla y_{2*} \cdot \nabla w_* dz \\
& + t \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_{2*}|^{q-2} \nabla y_{2*} \cdot \nabla w_* dz - t \int_{\{y_{2*} + tw_* < 0\}} \eta |\nabla y_{2*}|^{q-2} \nabla y_{2*} \cdot \nabla w_* dz \\
& - t \int_{\Omega} a_1 y_{1*}^{-\nu} h_* dz - t \lambda (\kappa_1 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2 + 1} h_* dz \\
& - t \int_{\Omega} a_2 y_{2*}^{-\nu} w_* dz - t \lambda (\kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1 + 1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2} w_* dz \geq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Dividing (50) by t , passing to the limit $t \rightarrow 0$, we have $meas\{y_{1*} + th_* < 0\} \rightarrow 0$ and $meas\{y_{2*} + tw_* < 0\} \rightarrow 0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_{1*}|^{p-2} \nabla y_{1*} \cdot \nabla h_* dz + \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_{1*}|^{q-2} \nabla y_{1*} \cdot \nabla h_* dz \\
& + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_{2*}|^{p-2} \nabla y_{2*} \cdot \nabla w_* dz + \int_{\Omega} \eta |\nabla y_{2*}|^{q-2} \nabla y_{2*} \cdot \nabla w_* dz \\
& - \int_{\Omega} a_1 y_{1*}^{-\nu} h_* dz + \lambda (\kappa_1 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2 + 1} h_* dz \\
& - \int_{\Omega} a_2 y_{2*}^{-\nu} w_* dz + \lambda (\kappa_2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} |y_{1*}|^{\kappa_1 + 1} |y_{2*}|^{\kappa_2} w_* dz \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the arbitrary of h_* and w_* , then the above inequality is equal to 0. Hence (y_{1*}, y_{2*}) is a positive solution of system (1) and from Lemma 3.4, there holds $J(y_{1*}, y_{2*}) \geq 0$. \square

Theorem 3.2 *Suppose the assumptions (H_1) , (H_2) , (H_3) hold, then there exists a positive constant λ^* such that for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, system (1) has at least two positive weak solutions (y_1^*, y_2^*) , $(y_{1*}, y_{2*}) \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ such that $J(y_1^*, y_2^*) < 0 \leq J(y_{1*}, y_{2*})$.*

Proof Proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, but using now Lemma 3.12 instead of Lemma 3.11, we obtain that $(y_1^*, y_2^*) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^+$ is a positive weak solution of the problem (1) and from Lemma 3.3, one has $J(y_1^*, y_2^*) < 0$. Also, by Theorem 3.1, $(y_{1*}, y_{2*}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}^-$ is another positive weak solution of system (1) and, by Lemma 3.4, $J(y_{1*}, y_{2*}) \geq 0$. Thus the proof is complete. \square

Next, we generalize the results of the system (1) to the case of $m > 2$.

Let $Y = [W_0^{1, \mathcal{H}}(\Omega)]^m$ equipped with norm

$$\|(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m)\|_{Y,1} = \|y_1\|_{1,p}^p + \|y_2\|_{1,p}^p + \dots + \|y_m\|_{1,p}^p.$$

$$\|(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m)\|_{Y,2} = \|\nabla y_1\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|\nabla y_2\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \dots + \|\nabla y_m\|_{\mathcal{H}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m)\|_{Y,3} &= \|y_1\|_{q,\eta}^q + \|y_2\|_{q,\eta}^q + \dots + \|y_m\|_{q,\eta}^q \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \eta |y_1|^q dz + \int_{\Omega} \eta |y_2|^q dz + \dots + \int_{\Omega} \eta |y_m|^q dz. \end{aligned}$$

Let the energy functional $J : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} J(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m) &= \frac{1}{p} \|(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m)\|_{Y,1} + \frac{1}{q} \|(\nabla y_1, \nabla y_2, \dots, \nabla y_m)\|_{Y,3} \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1-\nu} \int_{\Omega} a_i |y_i|^{1-\nu} dz \\ &\quad - \lambda \int_{\Omega} |y_1|^{\kappa_1+1} |y_2|^{\kappa_2+1} \dots |y_m|^{\kappa_m+1} dz. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.3 *Suppose the assumptions (H_1) , (H_2) , (H_3) hold, then there exists a positive constant λ^{**} such that for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^{**})$, system (1) has at least two positive weak solutions*

$$(y_1^*, y_2^*, \dots, y_m^*), (y_{1*}, y_{2*}, \dots, y_{m*}) \in Y$$

such that

$$J(y_1^*, y_2^*, \dots, y_m^*) < 0 \leq J(y_{1*}, y_{2*}, \dots, y_{m*}).$$

Proof By checking the proof of Theorem 3.2, we only need to generalize (14) of Lemma 3.2 to the following inequality,

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \kappa_i + m \right) \int_{\Omega} \prod_{i=1}^m |y_i|^{\kappa_i+1} dz \leq C_{21} \|(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m)\|_{Y,1}^{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \kappa_i + m}{p}}. \quad (51)$$

In fact, from assumption (H_6) and (4.1)-(4.4) of Lemma 4.1 in [18], one has

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i + m \right) \int_{\Omega} \prod_{i=1}^m |y_i|^{\kappa_i+1} dz \leq C_{22} \prod_{i=1}^m \|y_i\|_{1,p}^{\kappa_i+1}. \quad (52)$$

For case of $i = 3$. Combining with (14), there is

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\|y_1\|_{1,p}^{\kappa_1+1} \|y_2\|_{1,p}^{\kappa_2+1} \|y_3\|_{1,p}^{\kappa_3+1} \right)^{\frac{1}{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+\kappa_3+3}} \\ &\leq C_{23} \left(\|y_1\|_{1,p}^p + \|y_2\|_{1,p}^p \right)^{\frac{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2}{p(\kappa_1+\kappa_2+\kappa_3+3)}} \|y_3\|_{1,p}^{\frac{\kappa_3+1}{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+\kappa_3+3}}. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

By Young's inequality and the properties of concave function $t \rightarrow t^{1/p}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\|y_1\|_{1,p}^p + \|y_2\|_{1,p}^p \right)^{\frac{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2}{p(\kappa_1+\kappa_2+\kappa_3+3)}} \|y_3\|_{1,p}^{\frac{\kappa_3+1}{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+\kappa_3+3}} \\ &\leq \frac{(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2)(\|y_1\|_{1,p}^p + \|y_2\|_{1,p}^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + \kappa_3 + 3} + \frac{(\kappa_3 + 1)\|y_3\|_{1,p}}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + \kappa_3 + 3} \\ &\leq (\|y_1\|_{1,p}^p + \|y_2\|_{1,p}^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \|y_3\|_{1,p} \\ &\leq C_{24} \left(\|y_1\|_{1,p}^p + \|y_2\|_{1,p}^p + \|y_3\|_{1,p}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, (53) comes to

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_1\|_{1,p}^{\kappa_1+1} \|y_2\|_{1,p}^{\kappa_2+1} \|y_3\|_{1,p}^{\kappa_3+1} &\leq C_{19} (\|y_1\|_{1,p}^p + \|y_2\|_{1,p}^p)^{\frac{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+2}{p}} \|y_3\|_{1,p}^{\kappa_3+1} \\ &\leq C_{25} (\|y_1\|_{1,p}^p + \|y_2\|_{1,p}^p + \|y_3\|_{1,p}^p)^{\frac{\kappa_1+\kappa_2+\kappa_3+3}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using the recursive method, we can see that for case of $i = m$, one has

$$\prod_{i=1}^m \|y_i\|_{1,p}^{\kappa_i+1} \leq C_{26} \|(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m)\|_{Y,1}^{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \kappa_i + m}{p}}, \quad (54)$$

here $C_{22}, C_{23}, C_{24}, C_{25}, C_{26}$ are positive constants. Combining (52) with (54), we can deduce (51) and the proof of Theorem 3.3 is complete. \square

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we generalize the double phase problem from a single equation to a system with singular and superlinear terms and by using of the Nehari method, the existence of two positive weak solutions is obtained. It is worth mentioning that the system we are considering is actually a special case of the following system can be considered in the future,

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p y - \operatorname{div}(\eta |\nabla y|^{q-2} \nabla y) = f(z, y), & z \in \Omega, \\ y = 0, & z \in \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (55)$$

where $y \in [W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)]^m$; $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $p_i < q_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, m$) and $\eta \in \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\eta_i(z) \geq 0$ ($i = 1, \dots, m$) for a.e. $z \in \Omega$. Additionally, double phase systems with more kinds of nonlinear terms are also worthy of further study.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to sincerely thank the referees for their valuable comments, which helped improve the initial manuscript.

Funding

This research was supported by NSFC grant number 11571207, Shandong Provincial Natural Science Foundation number ZR2021MA064 and the Taishan Scholar project.

Declarations

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

References

- [1] V.V. Zhikov. Averaging of functionals of the calculus of variations and elasticity theory, *Izv Akad Nauk SSSR, Ser Mat.* **50(4)** (1986) 675–710.
- [2] V.V. Zhikov. On Lavrentiev’s phenomenon, *Russian J. Math. Phys.* **3** (1995) 249–269.
- [3] G. Marino, P. Winkert. Existence and uniqueness of elliptic systems with double phase operators and convection terms. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **492(1)** (2020) 124423.
- [4] A. Bahrouni, V.D. Rădulescu. Singular double-phase systems with variable growth for the Baouendi-Grushin operator. *Discret. Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **41(9)** (2021) 4283.
- [5] U. Guarnotta, R. Livrea, P. Winkert. The sub-supersolution method for variable exponent double phase systems with nonlinear boundary conditions. arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.01108, 2022.
- [6] V.V. Zhikov. On some variational problems, *Russian J. Math. Phys.* **5(1)** (1997) 105–116.
- [7] P. Marcellini. Regularity and existence of solutions of elliptic equations with p, q -growth conditions, *J. Differ. Equations* **90(1)** (1991) 1–30.
- [8] P. Marcellini. Regularity of minimizers of integrals of the calculus of variations with nonstandard growth conditions, *Arch. Ration. Mech. An.* **105(3)** (1989) 267–284.
- [9] P. Baroni, M. Colombo, G. Mingione. Harnack inequalities for double phase functionals, *Nonlinear Anal - Theor.* **121** (2015) 206–222.
- [10] P. Baroni, M. Colombo, G. Mingione. Regularity for general functionals with double phase, *Calc. Var. Partial Dif.* **57(2)** (2018) 1–48.
- [11] M. Colombo, G. Mingione. Bounded minimisers of double phase variational integrals, *Arch. Ration. Mech. An.* **218(1)** (2015) 219–273.
- [12] M. Colombo, G. Mingione. Regularity for double phase variational problems, *Arch. Ration. Mech. An.* **215(2)** (2015) 443–496.
- [13] W. Liu, G. Dai. Existence and multiplicity results for double phase problem, *J. Differ. Equations* **265(9)** (2018) 4311–4334.

- [14] W. Liu, G. Dai. Three ground state solutions for double phase problem, *J. Math. Phys.* **59**(12) (2018) 121503.
- [15] W. Liu, G. Dai. Multiplicity results for double phase problems in \mathbb{R}^n , *J. Math. Phys.* **61**(9) (2020) 091508.
- [16] W. Liu, G. Dai, N. S. Papageorgiou, et al. Existence of solutions for singular double phase problems via the Nehari manifold method, *Anal. Math. Phys.* **12**(3) (2022) 12–75.
- [17] Y. Guo, M. Wang. Existence of multiple positive solutions for a p -Laplacian system with sign-changing weight functions, *Comput. Math. Appl.* **55**(4) (2008) 636–653.
- [18] S.H. Rasouli, M. Choubin. The Nehari manifold approach for a class of $n \times n$ nonlinear elliptic systems. *Monatsh. Math.* **173**(4) (2014) 605–623.
- [19] N.S. Papageorgiou, D.D. Repovš, C. Vetro. Positive solutions for singular double phase problems, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **501**(1) (2021) 123896.
- [20] R. Arora, A. Fiscella, T. Mukherjee, et al. On double phase Kirchhoff problems with singular nonlinearity, arXiv preprint arXiv: 2111.07565, 2021.
- [21] R. Arora, A. Fiscella, T. Mukherjee, et al. On critical double phase Kirchhoff problems with singular nonlinearity, *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo, II. Ser.* **71** (2022) 1079–1106.
- [22] S. Zeng, Y. Bai, L. Gasiński, P. Winkert. Existence results for double phase implicit obstacle problems involving multivalued operators, *Calc. Var. Partial Dif.* **59**(5) (2020) 1–18.
- [23] S. Zeng, L. Gasiński, P. Winkert, Y. Bai. Existence of solutions for double phase obstacle problems with multivalued convection term, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **501**(1) (2021) 123997.
- [24] L. Gasiński, P. Winkert. Existence and uniqueness results for double phase problems with convection term, *J. Differ. Equations* **268**(8) (2020) 4183–4193.
- [25] L. Gasiński, P. Winkert. Sign changing solution for a double phase problem with nonlinear boundary condition via the Nehari manifold, *J. Differ. Equations* **274** (2021) 1037–1066.
- [26] A. Bahrouni, V.D. Rădulescu, P. Winkert. Double phase problems with variable growth and convection for the Baouendi-Grushin operator, *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.* **71**(6) (2020) 1–15.

- [27] C. Farkas, P. Winkert. An existence result for singular Finsler double phase problems, *J. Differ. Equations* **286** (2021) 455–473.
- [28] C. Farkas, A. Fiscella, P. Winkert. Singular Finsler double phase problems with nonlinear boundary condition, *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.* **21(4)** (2021) 809–825.
- [29] Á. Crespo-Blanco, L. Gasiński, P. Harjulehto, et al. A new class of double phase variable exponent problems: existence and uniqueness, arXiv preprint arXiv: 2103.08928, 2021.
- [30] Á. Crespo-Blanco, N.S. Papageorgiou, P. Winkert. Parametric superlinear double phase problems with singular term and critical growth on the boundary, *Math. Method. Appl. Sci.* **45(4)** (2022) 2276–2298.
- [31] F. Colasuonno, M. Squassina. Eigenvalues for double phase variational integrals, *Ann. Mat. Pur. Appl.* **195(6)** (2016) 1917–1959.
- [32] S.S. Byun, J. Oh. Regularity results for generalized double phase functionals, *Anal. PDE.* **13(5)** (2020) 1269–1300.
- [33] Y. Sun, S. Wu, Y. Long. Combined effects of singular and superlinear nonlinearities in some singular boundary value problems. *J. Differ. Equations* **176(2)** (2001) 511–531.
- [34] C. Atkinson, K. Ali. Some boundary value problems for the Bingham model. *J. Non.-Newton. Fluid Mech.* **41(3)** (1992) 339–363.
- [35] C. Atkinson. On a family of torsional creep problems. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **410** (1990) 1–22.
- [36] R. Showalter, N. Walkington. Diffusion of fluid in a fissured medium with microstructure. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **22** (1991) 1702–1722.
- [37] M. Wang. *Nonlinear Elliptic Equations*, Science Press, 2010.
- [38] M. Berger. *Nonlinearity and functional analysis*, Academic Press, New York-London, 1997.
- [39] E. Hewitt, K. Stromberg. *Real and Abstract Analysis*, Springer, New York, 1965.