

Symmetry of Convex Solutions to Fully Nonlinear Elliptic Systems: Unbounded Domains*

Weijun Zhang^{1†} Zhitao Zhang^{2,3,4‡}

¹ School of Mathematics, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510275, People's Republic of China,

² Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science,
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, People's Republic of China,

³ School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Chinese
Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, People's Republic of China,

⁴ School of Mathematical Science, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang 212013, People's Republic of China.

Abstract

In this paper, we are concerned with the monotonic and symmetric properties of convex solutions Monge-Ampère systems for instance, considering

$$\det(D^2u^i) = f^i(x, \mathbf{u}, \nabla u^i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq m,$$

over unbounded domains of various cases, including the whole spaces \mathbb{R}^n , the half spaces \mathbb{R}_+^n and the unbounded tube shape domains in \mathbb{R}^n . We obtain monotonic and symmetric properties of the solutions to the problem with respect to the geometry of domains and the monotonic and symmetric properties of right-hand side terms. The proof is based on carefully using the moving plane method together with various maximum principles and Hopf's lemmas.

Key words: Monge-Ampère type systems; Moving plane method; Symmetry.

AMS Subject Classification(2010): 35J47, 35J60, 35B06.

*Supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (11771428, ????????)

†Email: zhangweij3@mail.sysu.edu.cn

‡Corresponding author. Email: zzt@math.ac.cn

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the following Monge-Ampère systems:

$$\det(D^2u^i(x)) = f^i(x, \mathbf{u}(x), \nabla u^i(x)), \text{ in } \Omega, 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m)$, and $\mathbf{f} = (f^1, \dots, f^m)$, $n, m \in \mathbb{N}^*$, satisfy some suitable conditions in different cases.

1.1 Background

The monotonicity and symmetry of solutions to nonlinear partial differential equations has many applications in mathematics, such as ensure the uniqueness of solution of some nonlinear elliptic equations as we see in [21]; derive the a-priori bound or the behaviors at the infinity for solutions to nonlinear elliptic equations; discover the bifurcation phenomenon [23, 24], especially the situations when symmetry breaking; determine the geometry of a manifolds [1] and so on. See [3, 4, 22] and the reference therein for more examples.

These properties have been studied in many years by many mathematician, see [8, 9, 12, 13] and the reference therein. However, to the best of our knowledge, there are few papers concerning as for Monge-Ampère equations, especially the case of unbounded domains, except [6, 16].

Our principal goal of this paper is to give a rather complete and general version of monotonic and symmetric results to the Monge-Ampère system over unbounded domains of various cases, including the whole spaces \mathbb{R}^n , the half spaces \mathbb{R}_+^n and the unbounded tube shape domains in \mathbb{R}^n . The cases of bounded domains can be seen here [21].

1.2 Main Results

The main results about symmetry are formally stated as below, in fact we get a more general results about monotonicity, more detail could be seen in Section 3 to 5.

In order to state our main results, we need firstly introduce some basic hypotheses on $f^i : \bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(x, \mathbf{z}, p) \rightarrow f^i(x, \mathbf{z}, p)$, where $\mathbf{z} = (z^1, \dots, z^m)$. We suppose that for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, $f^i \in C(\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$, furthermore satisfying some of the following in different situations.

In order to assure the ellipticity of (1.1), we need the following two kinds of positive conditions:

$$(F_1) \quad f^i(x, \mathbf{z}, p) > 0, \forall (x, \mathbf{z}, p) \in (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n);$$

$$(F_2) \quad f^i(x, \mathbf{z}, p) \geq c_f > 0, \forall (x, \mathbf{z}, p) \in (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n);$$

Remark 1.1. (F_2) , which is in order to assure the uniformly ellipticity of (1.1), is stronger than (F_1) , which is merely assure the ellipticity of (1.1).

Next, when Ω assume to be convex in one direction, denote as \mathbf{e}_1 , we can study whether the solutions to (1.1) will be having some monotonicity, hence we need the following monotonicity kind conditions on \mathbf{f} :

$$(F_3) \quad f^i \text{ is non-decreasing in } z^i, \text{ whenever the remaining components } z^j, j \neq i, \text{ and } x, p \text{ fixed};$$

$$(F_4) \quad f^i \text{ is non-increasing in } z^j, j \neq i, \text{ whenever the remaining components } z^k, k \neq j, \text{ and } x, p \text{ fixed};$$

$$(F_5) \quad f^i \text{ is locally uniformly Lipschitz continuous in the component } p, \text{ whenever } x, \mathbf{z} \text{ fixed};$$

$$(F_6) \quad f^i(y_1, x', \mathbf{z}, \bar{p}) \geq f^i(x, \mathbf{z}, p), \forall \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^m, p \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and } x = (x_1, x') \in \Omega \text{ such that } p_1 \leq 0, x_1 \leq 0 \text{ with } x_1 \leq y_1 \leq -x_1, \text{ where } \bar{p} := (-p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n);$$

In order to determine the consistency of the symmetric center of each u^i , we sometimes use the following conditions instead of (F_4) .

$$(F_7) \quad \forall I, J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, m\}, I, J \neq \emptyset, I \cap J = \emptyset, I \cup J = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}, \exists i_0 \in I, j_0 \in J, \text{ denote the set of } x \in \Omega \text{ as } A_f^{i_0, j_0} \text{ such that } f^{i_0} \text{ is strictly decreasing with respect to } z^{j_0} \text{ whenever the remaining components } z^k, k \neq i_0, j_0, \text{ and } p \text{ fixed, we have } |A_f^{i_0, j_0}| > 0.$$

Remark 1.2. Condition (F_4) is called the weak coupled condition or cooperative condition, and condition (F_7) is called the strong coupled condition, both are insuring the solutions u^i to have the same monotonicity or symmetry, while the latter one can also determine the consistency of the symmetric center.

Furthermore, when Ω assume to be symmetric in \mathbf{e}_1 , we can study whether the solutions to (1.1) will be having some symmetry along \mathbf{e}_1 , we need to strengthen (F_6) .

$$(F_8) \quad f^i(x, \mathbf{z}, p) = f^i(|x_1|, x_2, \dots, x_n, \mathbf{z}, |p_1|, p_2, \dots, p_n), \forall (x, \mathbf{z}, p) \in (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n);$$

At last, when Ω assume to be symmetric in all directions, we can study whether the solutions to eq. (1.1) will be radially symmetry, we need to strengthen (F_8) .

(F₉) $f^i(x, \mathbf{z}, p) = f^i(Ox, \mathbf{z}, O'p)$, $\forall O, O' \in O(n)$, $\forall (x, \mathbf{z}, p) \in (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, where $O(n)$ is the n-th order orthogonal group;

For the convenience, we denote

$$\widetilde{d}_{ij}(x, \mathbf{z}, p, h) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{h} (f^i(x, \mathbf{z} + h\mathbf{e}_j, p) - f^i(x, \mathbf{z}, p)), & h \neq 0, \\ 0, & h = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

$$\text{and } \widetilde{D} := \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{d}_{11} & \cdots & \widetilde{d}_{1m} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \widetilde{d}_{m1} & \cdots & \widetilde{d}_{mm} \end{pmatrix},$$

Remark 1.3. By (F₃) and (F₄), we have $\text{sgn}(\widetilde{d}_{ij} \cdot h) = -\text{sgn}(h)$, and $\widetilde{d}_{ij} \leq 0$, $\forall i, j = 1, \dots, m$, $i \neq j$, while $\widetilde{d}_{ii} \geq 0$, $\forall i = 1, \dots, m$.

Denote \widetilde{D}_i be the i -th ordered minor of \widetilde{D} , we need to require some positivity on it at the infinity:

$$(F_{10}) \quad \widetilde{D}_h^i := \lim_{|x|^{-1} + \sum_{j=1}^m |z^j|^{-1} \rightarrow 0} \inf_{h \in \mathbb{R}} \widetilde{D}_i(x, z^1, \dots, z^m, 0, h) > 0.$$

Remark 1.4. Condition (F₁₀) can be used to describe the behaviors of u^i at the infinity. In particular, if \widetilde{D} is symmetric, then by Sylvester's criteria, condition (F₁₀) is equivalent to:

$$\lim_{|x|^{-1} + \sum_{j=1}^m |z^j|^{-1} \rightarrow 0} \inf_{h \in \mathbb{R}} \widetilde{D}(x, z^1, \dots, z^m, 0, h) \text{ is positive definite.}$$

Now we begin to state our main results about symmetry.

For the case of $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$, we mainly consider the entire problem,

$$\begin{cases} \det(D^2 u^i) = f^i(x, \mathbf{u}, \nabla u^i), & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \lim_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} u^i(x) = \infty, & 1 \leq i \leq m, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

We have the main results as follow,

Theorem 1.5. *Assume \mathbf{f} satisfy (F₁), (F₃), (F₅), (F₇), (F₉) and (F₁₀). Let $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m)$ be a group of $[C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)]^m$ strictly convex solutions of (1.3) satisfying some*

growth conditions as in Section 3, then each u^i must be radially symmetric and strictly increasing respect to the some point in \mathbb{R}^n .

More precisely, denote the rotating center as $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $r = |x - x^*|$, then for $i = 1 \dots, m$, each u^i must be like

$$u^i(x) = u^i(r), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

moreover,

$$\frac{du^i}{dr}(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

For the case of $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^n$, we consider the Neumann problem in the half space. Denote $x = (x', x_n)$, $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, $x_n \geq 0$, and $r = |x'|$, for all $1 \leq i \leq m$,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \det(D^2 u^i) = f^i(x, \mathbf{u}, \nabla u^i), & x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n, \\ u^i(x) > 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n, \\ \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_n}(x) = h^i(r), & x \in \partial \mathbb{R}_+^n, \\ \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} u^i(x) = \infty, & \end{array} \right. \quad (1.4)$$

We have the main results as follow,

Theorem 1.6. *Assume \mathbf{f} satisfy (F_2) , (F_5) , (F_7) , (F_9) , (F_{10}) and (F_n) , \mathbf{h} satisfy (H) . Let $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m)$ be a group of $[C^2(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n}, \mathbb{R}_+)]^m$ strictly convex solutions to (1.4) satisfying some growth conditions as in Section 3, then each u^i must be radially symmetric and strictly increasing respect to some point in \mathbb{R}_+^n .*

More precisely, denote the rotating center as $x^* = ((x^*)', x_n^*) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, and $r = |x' - (x^*)'|$, then for $i = 1 \dots, m$, each u^i must be like

$$u^i(x) = u^i(r, x_n), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n,$$

moreover,

$$\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial r}(r, x_n) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

For the case of unbounded tubes, we mainly consider the following constant-boundary Dirichlet problem for (1.1) on C_∞ ,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \det(D^2 u^i) = f^i(x, \mathbf{u}, \nabla u^i), & x \in C_\infty, \\ u^i = h^i, & x \in \partial C_\infty, \\ \lim_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} u^i(x) = \infty, & i = 1, \dots, m. \end{array} \right. \quad (1.5)$$

where h^i satisfy $\lim_{|x_n| \rightarrow +\infty} h^i(x) = \infty$.

We have the main results as follow,

Theorem 1.7. *Let $C_\infty = \Omega \times (-\infty, \infty)$ be a infinite cylinder in \mathbb{R}^n , $\Omega = B_R$ be a arbitrary ball with radius R in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} . Assume \mathbf{f} satisfy (F_1) , (F_3) , (F_4) , (F_5) , (F_9) and (F_{10}) . Let $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m) \in [C^2(\overline{C_\infty})]^m$ be a group of strictly convex solutions to (1.5) satisfying some growth conditions as in Section 3 and 5, then each u^i must be radially symmetric and strictly increasing respect to the axis crossing the center of B_R .*

More precisely, denote the center of B_R as $x^ = ((x^*)', x_n^*) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and denote $r = |x' - (x^*)'|$, then for $i = 1 \dots, m$, each u^i must be*

$$u^i(x) = u^i(r, x_n), \quad x \in C_\infty,$$

moreover,

$$\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial r}(r, x_n) > 0, \quad x \in C_\infty.$$

We mainly follow the moving plane method with concrete procedures proposed by Troy [20] and Busca [2], and recently developed by Ma-Liu [14–16]. Various maximum principles and Hopf's lemmas are repeatedly used in the proof.

With respect to the cases of unbounded domains, we mainly improve the existing result by reducing the smoothness condition on the right-hand side f^i from C^1 to Lipschitz continuous. In particular, we simplify the assumptions in [16] for the case of whole spaces, while our results for the case of half spaces and of the unbounded tube shape domains are new. The method is spiritually similar to [18], where symmetry properties were obtained for positive solutions to certain fully nonlinear elliptic systems mainly dominated by Pucci operators.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present some preliminary results for the moving plane method. Section 3 to 5 are concerned with the cases of unbounded tubes, the whole spaces and the half spaces, respectively. More specifically, in Section 3, we study the entire problem of Monge-Ampère systems in the whole space; in Section 4, we deal with the Neumann boundary problem of Monge-Ampère systems in the half space; and Section 5 is devoted to the case of unbounded tube shape domains.

2 Some Preliminaries

Note that, in what follows, we always consider the classical solutions to the problem, that is, the solutions being twice continuously differentiable up to the boundary. This is

always the case if each $f^i(x, \mathbf{u}(x), \nabla u^i(x))$ is $C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$ as a function of x by the standard regularity theory of Monge-Ampère equation; see [5, 7, 10, 11]. And in order to assure the ellipticity of the equations, the solutions are always considered to be strictly convex.

Here are some notations preparing for the moving plane method. Fixed a direction vector $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|\nu| = 1$, and a real number $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we defined the related half space

$$\Sigma_{\lambda, \nu} := \{x \in \Omega \mid x \cdot \nu < \lambda\},$$

and the corresponding hyperplane

$$T_{\lambda, \nu} := \{x \in \Omega \mid x \cdot \nu = \lambda\}.$$

Let $x_{\lambda, \nu}$ be the reflection of $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ through $T_{\lambda, \nu}$, that is

$$x_{\lambda, \nu} := x + 2(\lambda - x \cdot \nu)\nu.$$

correspondingly, for any set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, let A'_λ be the reflection through $T_{\lambda, \nu}$, that is

$$A'_\lambda := \{x_{\lambda, \nu} = x + 2(\lambda - x \cdot \nu)\nu \mid x \in A\}.$$

We denote that for a invertible matrix M , $M^{jk} := (M^{-1})_{jk}$, and for two matrices M_1, M_2 , denoted the Frobenius inner product as

$$\langle M_1, M_2 \rangle_F := \sum_{j, k=1}^n (M_1)_{jk} (M_2)_{jk} = \text{tr}(M_1^T M_2),$$

especially, if one of them is symmetric, then $\langle M_1, M_2 \rangle_F = \text{tr}(M_1 M_2)$.

For a function $u \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$, we define the reflected function $u_{\lambda, \nu}(x)$ through $T_{\lambda, \nu}$ as follow,

$$u_{\lambda, \nu}(x) := u(x_{\lambda, \nu}) = u(x + 2(\lambda - x \cdot \nu)\nu),$$

and we have

$$\frac{\partial u_{\lambda, \nu}}{\partial x_j}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}(x_{\lambda, \nu})(\delta_{ij} - 2\nu_i \nu_j) = \nabla u(x_{\lambda, \nu}) \cdot \mu'_j,$$

where $\mu'_j := (-2\nu_1 \nu_j, \dots, 1 - 2\nu_j^2, \dots, -2\nu_n \nu_j)$, and then

$$\frac{\partial^2 u_{\lambda, \nu}}{\partial x_k \partial x_j}(x) = \nabla \left(\frac{\partial u_{\lambda, \nu}}{\partial x_j}(x) \right) \cdot \mu'_k = \nabla (\nabla u(x_{\lambda, \nu}) \cdot \mu'_k) \cdot \mu'_j = \langle D^2(x_{\lambda, \nu}), (\mu'_k)^T \mu'_j \rangle_F,$$

thus

$$\nabla u_{\lambda,\nu}(x) = \nabla u(x_{\lambda,\nu}) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 - 2\nu_1^2 & -2\nu_1\nu_2 & \cdots & -2\nu_1\nu_n \\ -2\nu_2\nu_1 & 1 - 2\nu_2^2 & \cdots & -2\nu_2\nu_n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -2\nu_n\nu_1 & -2\nu_n\nu_2 & \cdots & 1 - 2\nu_n^2 \end{pmatrix} = \nabla u(x_{\lambda,\nu}) \cdot (I - 2\nu^T\nu),$$

And we at last define the difference function $U_\lambda(x)$

$$U_{\lambda,\nu}(x) := u_{\lambda,\nu}(x) - u(x).$$

Once if the domain is somehow convex in one direction, for example $\nu = e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, in this case, for shortly, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} T_\lambda &:= T_{\lambda,e_1} = \{x \in \Omega \mid x_1 = \lambda\}, \\ \Sigma_\lambda &:= \Sigma_{\lambda,e_1} = \{x \in \Omega \mid x_1 < \lambda\}, \\ x_\lambda &:= x_{\lambda,e_1} = (2\lambda - x_1, x'), \text{ where } x' = (x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \\ u_\lambda(x) &:= u_{\lambda,e_1}(x) = u(2\lambda - x_1, x'). \end{aligned}$$

We can easily see that

$$\nabla u_\lambda(x) = \left(-\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}(x_\lambda), \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2}(x_\lambda), \dots, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_n}(x_\lambda) \right) = \nabla u(x_\lambda) \cdot \bar{D},$$

and the Hessian matrix of u_λ is

$$D^2 u_\lambda(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_1^2}(x_\lambda) & -\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2}(x_\lambda) & \cdots & -\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_1 \partial x_n}(x_\lambda) \\ -\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_2 \partial x_1}(x_\lambda) & \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_2^2}(x_\lambda) & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_2 \partial x_n}(x_\lambda) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_n \partial x_1}(x_\lambda) & \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_n \partial x_2}(x_\lambda) & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_n \partial x_n}(x_\lambda) \end{pmatrix} = \bar{D}^T D^2 u(x_\lambda) \bar{D},$$

where $\bar{D} = \text{diag}\{-1, 1, \dots, 1\}$. Note that $|\nabla u_\lambda(x)| = |\nabla u(x_\lambda)|$ and the eigenvalue of $D^2 u_\lambda(x)$ are the same as $D^2 u(x_\lambda)$, especially,

$$\det(D^2 u_\lambda(x)) = \det(D^2 u(x_\lambda)). \quad (2.1)$$

And we define the difference function in direction x_1 ,

$$U_\lambda(x) := U_{\lambda,e_1}(x) = u_\lambda(x) - u(x).$$

Note that at the special case $x = x_\lambda$, that is, $x \in \overline{T}_\lambda$, we have the following useful results:

$$\nabla U_\lambda(x) = \left(-2 \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}(x), 0, \dots, 0 \right); \quad (2.2)$$

$$D^2 U_\lambda(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -2 \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2}(x) & \cdots & -2 \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_1 \partial x_n}(x) \\ -2 \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_2 \partial x_1}(x) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -2 \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_n \partial x_1}(x) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.3)$$

Now we are ready to do some preliminary calculations for (1.1). Firstly, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial q_{ij}} \det(M) = \det(M) M^{ij}, \quad \forall M \text{ being positive definite}, \quad (2.4)$$

then by the integral form of mean value theorem, we have

$$\det(D^2 u_\lambda^i(x)) - \det(D^2 u^i(x)) = \langle \mathbf{A}^i(x), D^2 U_\lambda^i(x) \rangle_F = \text{tr} \left(\mathbf{A}^i(x) D^2 U_\lambda^i(x) \right), \quad (2.5)$$

where $\mathbf{A}^i(x) := (a_{jk}^i(x))_{j,k=1}^n$ with

$$a_{jk}^i(x) := \int_0^1 \det((1-t)D^2 u_\lambda^i(x) + tD^2 u^i(x)) ((1-t)D^2 u_\lambda^i(x) + tD^2 u^i(x))^{jk} dt. \quad (2.6)$$

On the other hand, $\forall \lambda < 0$, $x \in \Sigma_\lambda$, we have $x_1 < (x_\lambda)_1 < -x_1$, hence by (2.1) and (F6), $\forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda$ such that $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(x) \leq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det(D^2 u_\lambda^i(x)) &= \det(D^2 u^i(x_\lambda)) \\ &= f^i(x_\lambda, \mathbf{u}(x_\lambda), \nabla u^i(x_\lambda)) \\ &= f^i(x_\lambda, \mathbf{u}_\lambda(x), \overline{\nabla u_\lambda^i(x)}) \\ &\geq f^i(x, \mathbf{u}_\lambda(x), \nabla u_\lambda^i(x)), \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

hence by (F₃), (F₄) and (F₅), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \det(D^2 u_\lambda^i) - \det(D^2 u^i) \\
& \geq f^i(x, \mathbf{u}_\lambda, \nabla u_\lambda^i) - f^i(x, \mathbf{u}, \nabla u^i) \\
& = f^i(x, \mathbf{u}_\lambda, \nabla u_\lambda^i) - f^i(x, \mathbf{u}, \nabla u_\lambda^i) + f^i(x, \mathbf{u}, \nabla u_\lambda^i) - f^i(x, \mathbf{u}, \nabla u^i) \\
& = f^i(x, \mathbf{u}_\lambda, \nabla u_\lambda^i) - f^i(x, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u_\lambda^{m-1}, u^m, \nabla u_\lambda^i) + \dots \\
& \quad + f^i(x, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u_\lambda^i, \dots, u^m, \nabla u_\lambda^i) - f^i(x, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u^i, \dots, u^m, \nabla u_\lambda^i) + \dots \\
& \quad + f^i(x, u_\lambda^1, u^2, \dots, u^m, \nabla u_\lambda^i) - f^i(x, \mathbf{u}, \nabla u_\lambda^i) \\
& \quad + f^i(x, \mathbf{u}, \nabla u_\lambda^i) - f^i(x, \mathbf{u}, \nabla u^i) \\
& \geq \widetilde{d}_{im}(x, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u_\lambda^{m-1}, u^m, \nabla u_\lambda^i, U_\lambda^m) U_\lambda^m + \dots \\
& \quad + \widetilde{d}_{ii}(x, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u^i, \dots, u^m, \nabla u_\lambda^i, U_\lambda^i) U_\lambda^i + \dots \\
& \quad + \widetilde{d}_{i1}(x, \mathbf{u}, \nabla u_\lambda^i, U_\lambda^1) U_\lambda^1 - h_{f^i, p} |\nabla U_\lambda^i|,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

where d_{ij} are defined as (1.2), and $h_{f^i, p}$ is the Lipschitz constants of f^i in (F₅).

Then combining (2.5) and (2.8) we can obtain an elliptic inequality of U_λ^i in Σ_λ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{A}^i(x) D^2 U_\lambda^i(x) \right) + \mathbf{B}^i(x) \cdot \nabla U_\lambda^i(x) \\
& \geq \sum_{j=1}^m \widetilde{d}_{ij}(x, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u^j, \dots, u^m, \nabla U_\lambda^i, U_\lambda^j) U_\lambda^j,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

with $\mathbf{A}^i(x)$ defined as (2.6), and

$$\mathbf{B}^i(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{h_{f^i, p}}{|\nabla U_\lambda^i(x)|} \chi_{\{|\nabla U_\lambda^i(x)| \neq 0\}} \nabla U_\lambda^i(x), \tag{2.10}$$

Next we give some lemmas here for convenience. In the procedure of using moving plane methods, the following strong maximum principle and Hopf's Lemma will be crucial. The proof of it can be found in [10].

Lemma 2.1 (Maximum Principle & Hopf's Lemma). *Let $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain, $w \in C^2(\Omega)$ be a non-positive solution in Ω to the following elliptic inequality*

$$\operatorname{tr} (A(x) D^2 w(x)) + \mathbf{B}(x) \cdot \nabla w(x) + c(x) w(x) \geq 0,$$

where $A(x) := (a_{ij}(x))_{i,j=1}^n$, $\mathbf{B}(x) := (b_i(x))_{i=1}^n$, and $a_{ij}, b_i, c \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$ with $A(x)$ is locally positive definite in Ω . Then either $w \equiv 0$ or $w < 0$ in Ω .

Moreover, if $w(x_0) > 0$ for some $x_0 \in \Omega$, and $w(\bar{x}) = 0$ for some $\bar{x} \in \partial\Omega$, near which w is continuously differentiable, then

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu}(\bar{x}) > 0,$$

where ν is the unit outer normal of $\partial\Omega$.

In our case, since the domain we dealing with may not satisfy the interior ball condition, we will use the boundary point Hopf lemma at a corner instead, which is the content of the following lemma in [8] (due to Serrin [19]).

Lemma 2.2 (Serrin's Corner Lemma). *Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{R}^n with the origin Q on its boundary. Assume that near Q the boundary consists of two transversally intersecting C^2 hypersurfaces $\{\rho = 0\}$ and $\{\sigma = 0\}$. Suppose $\rho, \sigma < 0$ in Ω . Let w be a function in $C^2(\bar{\Omega})$, with $w < 0$ in Ω , $w(Q) = 0$, satisfying the differential inequality*

$$a_{ij}w_{x_i x_j} + b_i(x)w_{x_i} + c(x)w \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega,$$

with uniformly bounded coefficients satisfying $a_{ij}\xi_i\xi_j \geq c_0|\xi|^2$. Assume

$$a_{ij}\rho_{x_i}\sigma_{x_j} \geq 0 \text{ at } Q. \tag{2.11}$$

If this is zero, assume furthermore that $a_{ij} \in C^2$ in $\bar{\Omega}$ near Q , and that

$$D(a_{ij}\rho_{x_i}\sigma_{x_j}) = 0 \text{ at } Q,$$

for any first order derivative D at Q tangent to the submanifold $\{\rho = 0\} \cap \{\sigma = 0\}$. Then, for any direction s at Q which enters Ω transversally to each hypersurface,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial w}{\partial s} &< 0 \text{ at } Q \text{ in case of strict inequality in (2.11),} \\ \frac{\partial w}{\partial s} &< 0 \text{ or } \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial s^2} < 0 \text{ at } Q \text{ in case of equality in (2.11).} \end{aligned}$$

In order to overcome the difficulties coming from coupling systems, we need the following lemma of linear algebra.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $M = (m_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n$ be a real matrix, satisfying $m_{ij} \leq 0, i \neq j$. Assume all the principal ordered minors of M are positive definite, denote its adjointed matrix as $\text{adj}(M)$, then*

- (i) all the same order minors of M are positive definite,
- (ii) all the algebraic remainders of M are non-negative definite, that is $\text{adj}(M)_{ij} \geq 0$.

In order to overcome the difficulties coming from unboundedness of domains, we need two more conditions on u^i at the infinity. For $u^i \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we denote the radial derivative as

$$\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial r}(x) := \langle \nabla u^i(x), \frac{x}{|x|} \rangle,$$

the tangential derivative as

$$\nabla_\tau(x) := \nabla u^i(x) - \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial r}(x) \frac{x}{|x|},$$

We need the following condition inspired by [17]:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial r}(x) &> 0, \\ |\nabla_\tau(x)| &= o\left(\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial r}(x)\right) \text{ as } |x| \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

Recall that $x_{0,\nu} = -2(x \cdot \nu)\nu + x$, we also require that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \cdot \nu \rightarrow -\infty} u^i(x_{0,\nu}) - u^i(x) &\leq 0, \\ \text{equivalently, } \lim_{x \cdot \nu \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{u^i(x_{0,\nu})}{u^i(x)} &\leq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

3 The Whole Space $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$.

In this case, we consider the following entire problem:

$$\begin{cases} \det(D^2 u^i) = f^i(x, \mathbf{u}, \nabla u^i), & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \lim_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} u^i(x) = \infty, & 1 \leq i \leq m, \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

The behavior of u^i at the infinity as above are natural since we always assume u^i to be strictly convex.




Figure 1: The whole space

3.1 Main Theorem

We begin to state our main theorems.

When \mathbf{f} being monotonic in one direction, assumed as \mathbf{e}_1 , we can start to examine whether the solution to the system (3.1) will satisfy the corresponding monotonicity along this direction. The main results are the following.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume \mathbf{f} satisfy (F_1) , (F_3) , (F_4) , (F_5) , (F_6) and (F_{10}) . Let $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m)$ be a group of $[C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)]^m$ strictly convex solutions of (3.1) satisfying (2.12) and (2.13), then there exists $t_1 \leq 0$ such that for each u^i ,*

$$u^i(x_1, x') \geq u^i(2t_1 - x_1, x') \text{ and } \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(x) < 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ with } x_1 < t_1.$$

Furthermore, if $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(t_1, x') = 0$ for some $x \in \{x_1 = t_1\}$, with $t_1 = 0$ (or $t_1 < 0$), then such (or all) u^i must be symmetric with respect to $\{x_1 = t_1\}$ and strictly decreasing in x_1 direction with $x_1 < t_1$, that is,

$$u^i(x) = u^i(|x_1 - t_1|, x'), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

moreover,

$$\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1} < 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ with } x_1 < t_1.$$

If we assume more symmetry on \mathbf{f} (substituting (F_6) with (F_8)), we can furthermore immediately have the following, by using Theorem 3.1 again with $\mathbf{u}_{t_1} := (u_{t_1}^i)$. (Note

that in this case, the inequalities (2.7),(2.8) will be slightly different to obtain the same result.)

Theorem 3.2. *Assume \mathbf{f} satisfy (F_1) , (F_3) , (F_5) , (F_7) , (F_8) and (F_{10}) . Let $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m)$ be a group of $[C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)]^m$ strictly convex solutions of (3.1) satisfying (2.12) and (2.13), then there exists $t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for each u^i must be symmetric with respect to $\{x_1 = t_1\}$ and strictly decreasing in x_1 direction with $x_1 < t_1$.*

More precisely, for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, each u^i must be like

$$u^i(x) = u^i(|x_1 - t_1|, x'), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

moreover,

$$\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1} < 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ with } x_1 < t_1.$$

Especially, if we substitute (F_6) to the symmetric one (F_9) , then by using Theorem 3.1 with respect to all directions in \mathbb{R}^n , we have:

Corollary 3.3. *Assume \mathbf{f} satisfy (F_1) , (F_3) , (F_5) , (F_7) , (F_9) and (F_{10}) . Let $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m)$ be a group of $[C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)]^m$ strictly convex solutions of (3.1) satisfying (2.12) and (2.13), then each u^i must be radially symmetric and strictly increasing respect to the some point in \mathbb{R}^n .*

More precisely, denote the rotating center as $x^ \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $r = |x - x^*|$, then for $i = 1 \dots, m$, each u^i must be like*

$$u^i(x) = u^i(r), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

moreover,

$$\frac{du^i}{dr}(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

3.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

We are now in a position to prove the theorem.

By the same procedure in calculating (2.9), we can obtain an elliptic inequality of U_λ^i in Σ_λ : $\forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda$ such that $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(x) \leq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr} \left(\mathbf{A}^i(x) D^2 U_\lambda^i(x) \right) + \mathbf{B}^i(x) \cdot \nabla U_\lambda^i(x) \\ & \geq \sum_{j=1}^m \widetilde{d}_{ij}(x, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u^j, \dots, u^m, \nabla U_\lambda^i, U_\lambda^j) U_\lambda^j, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where $\mathbf{A}^i(x) := (a_{jk}^i(x))_{j,k=1}^n$ with

$$a_{jk}^i(x) := \int_0^1 \det((1-t)D^2u_\lambda^i(x) + tD^2u^i(x)) ((1-t)D^2u_\lambda^i(x) + tD^2u^i(x))^{jk} dt,$$

are strictly positive definite due to the strictly convexity of u^i and (F_1) , and together with

$$\mathbf{B}^i(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{h_{f^i,p}}{|\nabla U_\lambda^i(x)|} \chi_{\{|\nabla U_\lambda^i(x)| \neq 0\}} \nabla U_\lambda^i(x)$$

are all locally bounded due to the twice differentiable continuity of u^i .

We firstly prove some lemmas.

We prove the same strong maximum principle as in [21].

Lemma 3.4. *Assume \mathbf{f} satisfy (F_1) , (F_3) , (F_4) , (F_5) , (F_6) , let \mathbf{u} be $[C^2(\Omega)]^m$ strictly convex solutions to (3.1), if*

$$U_\lambda^i \leq 0, \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1} \leq 0, \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda, \forall i = 1, \dots, m,$$

then either

$$U_\lambda^i < 0, \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda, \forall i = 1, \dots, m,$$

or

$$U_\lambda^i \equiv 0, \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda, \forall i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Next, we describe the behaviors of U_λ^i at the infinity

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m)$ satisfy (2.12) and (2.13), then for all $\lambda < 0$,*

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty, x_1 < \lambda} U_\lambda^i(x) \leq 0, \forall i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Proof. By (2.12),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1} &= \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial r} \frac{x_1}{|x|} + \left(\nabla u^i - \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial r} \frac{x}{|x|} \right) \cdot \mathbf{e}_1 \\ &= \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial r} \left(\frac{x_1}{|x|} + o(1) \right), \text{ as } |x| \rightarrow \infty, \forall i = 1, \dots, m, \end{aligned}$$

Hence for all $\lambda < 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
U_\lambda^i(x) &= u^i(2\lambda - x_1, x') - u^i(x) \\
&= u^i(2\lambda - x_1, x') - u^i(-x_1, x') + u^i(-x_1, x') - u^i(x) \\
&= 2\lambda \int_0^1 \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1} (2(1-t)\lambda - x_1, x') dt + u^i(-x_1, x') - u^i(x) \\
&= 2\lambda \int_0^1 \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial r} \left(\frac{2(1-t)\lambda - x_1}{|x|} + o(1) \right) dt + u^i(-x_1, x') - u^i(x), \text{ as } |x| \rightarrow \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

Noticing that $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial r} > 0$, as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, hence for x_1 sufficiently small such that $x_1 < 2\lambda$, then by (2.13),

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty, x_1 < 2\lambda} U_\lambda^i(x) \leq 0.$$

On the other hand, for $\lambda < 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
U_\lambda^i(x) &= u^i(2\lambda - x_1, x') - u^i(x_1, x') \\
&= 2(\lambda - x_1) \int_0^1 \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1} (2t(\lambda - x_1) + x_1, x') dt \\
&= 2(\lambda - x_1) \int_0^1 \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial r} \left(\frac{2t(\lambda - x_1) + x_1}{|x|} + o(1) \right) dt, \text{ as } |x| \rightarrow \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

Noticing that $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial r} > 0$, as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, hence for x_1 sufficiently small such that $2\lambda < x_1 < \lambda$, we have

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty, 2\lambda < x_1 < \lambda} U_\lambda^i(x) \leq 0.$$

□

Remark 3.6. This lemma is in order to ensure the super-mum of U_λ^i on Σ_λ can be achieved inside Σ_λ , not just a sequence of maximizers. This version is the axis symmetric case, in fact we can weaken the condition (2.12) and (2.13) if we only consider one direction.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m)$ be a group of strictly convex solutions to (1.1), \mathbf{f} satisfy (F_{10}) , then exists $\tilde{R} > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $|x| > \tilde{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$,*

$$\tilde{D}_i(x, z^1, \dots, z^m, 0, h) > 0, \forall h \in \mathbb{R}$$

where z^k lies in the segment between $u_\lambda^k(x)$ and $u^k(x)$, $k = 1, \dots, m$.

Proof. Noting that $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} u^i(x) = \infty$, and then by (F_{10}) . \square

We are now on the position of proving the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We begin to move the hyperplane parallel to T_λ coming from the $-\infty$.

Step 1: There exists a real number $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, such that $U_\mu^i|_{\Sigma_\mu} \leq 0, \forall i = 1, \dots, m, \forall \mu < \lambda$.

If not, suppose that $\forall \lambda < 0$, exists $y_0 \in \Sigma_\lambda$ such that for some i_0 , $U_\lambda^{i_0}(y_0) > 0$. Denote index set $J := \{j = 1, \dots, m \mid U_\lambda^j(x) \leq 0, \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda\} \subsetneq \{1, \dots, m\}$, and $I := \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus J$. Without lost of generality, we can assume $I = \{1, \dots, l\}$, $J = \{l+1, \dots, m\}$, $l = |I|$.

Noting that $\sup_{\Sigma_\lambda} U_\lambda^i > 0, \forall i \in I$. By Lemma 3.5, we can choose $\{y_i\}_{i \in I} \subset \overline{\Sigma_\lambda}$ such that

$$U_\lambda^i(y_i) = \max_{y \in \overline{\Sigma_\lambda}} U_\lambda^i(y) > 0.$$

For fixed $i \in I$, $U_\lambda^i|_{T_\lambda} = 0$ shows that $y_i \in \Sigma_\lambda$, hence $\nabla U_\lambda^i(y_i) = 0$, and $D^2 U_\lambda^i(y_i) \leq 0$. Then the i -th equation in (3.2) at y_i transforms to

$$0 \geq \sum_{j=1}^m \widetilde{d}_{ij}(y_i, u_\lambda^1(y_i), \dots, u^j(y_i), \dots, u^m(y_i), 0, U_\lambda^j(y_i)) U_\lambda^j(y_i), \quad (3.3)$$

By Remark 1.3, definition of J and $U_\lambda^j(y_i) \leq U_\lambda^j(y_j), \forall j \in I$, (3.3) becomes

$$0 \geq \sum_{j \in I} \widetilde{d}_{ij}(y_i, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u^j, \dots, u^m, 0, U_\lambda^j(y_i)) U_\lambda^j(y_j). \quad (3.4)$$

We will prove that $U_\lambda^j(y_j) \leq 0, \forall j \in I$, which will be contradictory to the choice of y_i . Rewrite (3.4) as

$$MU = V, \quad (3.5)$$

where $U := (U_\lambda^1(y_1), \dots, U_\lambda^l(y_l))$, $V := (v_1, \dots, v_l)$, $M := (m_{ij})_{i,j=1}^l$, satisfying

$$v_i \leq 0, m_{ij} := \widetilde{d}_{ij}(y_i, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u^j, \dots, u^m, 0, U_\lambda^j(y_i)) \leq 0, i, j = 1, \dots, l, i \neq j.$$

We can assume $\lambda < -\tilde{R}$, where \tilde{R} defined in Lemma 3.7, then $\Sigma_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\tilde{R}}(0)$, hence by Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 2.3, M is invertable, hence by (3.5) we can solve $U = M^{-1}V$,

by Cramer's law and Lemma 2.3, together with Lemma 3.7, we have

$$U_\lambda^j(y_j) = M^{jk} v_k = \frac{1}{\det M} \sum_{k=1}^l \text{adj}(M)_{jk} v_k \leq 0, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, l.$$

Next we continue to move T_λ by increasing λ , as long as $U_\lambda^i(x) \leq 0$ holds for all i on Σ_Λ , we define

$$\Lambda := \sup \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \mid U_\mu^i(x) \leq 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\mu, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, m, \quad \forall \mu < \lambda \}.$$

Step 1 shows that $\Lambda > -\infty$. On the other hand $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} u^i(x) = \infty$, for sufficiently large R , we have $u^i(x) > u^i(0)$, $\forall |x| > R$, hence $\Lambda < +\infty$, therefore Λ is finite. Since all the terms are continuous with respect to λ , we have

$$U_\Lambda^i(x) \leq 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\Lambda, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (3.6)$$

In particular, $U_\mu^i \leq 0, \forall \mu \leq \Lambda$, hence $\forall x \in \Sigma_\Lambda$, $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(x) \leq 0$ by covering argument. By (3.2) and Remark 1.3, we have on Σ_Λ ,

$$\text{tr} \left(\mathbf{A}^i(x) D^2 U_\Lambda^i(x) \right) + \mathbf{B}^i(x) \cdot \nabla U_\Lambda^i(x) - \widetilde{d}_{ii}(x) U_\Lambda^i(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (3.7)$$

Since all the coefficient of (3.7) are locally bounded, by Lemma 2.1, we have $\forall i = 1, \dots, m$, either

$$\begin{aligned} & U_\Lambda^i(x) < 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\Lambda, \\ & \text{or } U_\Lambda^i(x) \equiv 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\Lambda. \end{aligned}$$

If the former one happens, we also have

$$\frac{\partial U_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1}(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in T_\Lambda.$$

Now, if $\Lambda = 0$, we have $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(0, x') = 0$ for some $x \in \{x_1 = 0\}$, hence $U_\Lambda^i(x) \equiv 0, \forall x \in \Sigma_\Lambda$.

Next, we discuss the case of $\Lambda < 0$.

Step 2: We will prove that $U_\Lambda^i \equiv 0$ on Σ_Λ for at least one i .

As the discussion above, we only need to exclude the case that all the U_Λ^i on Σ_Λ are strictly negative, with directional derivative along x_1 being strictly positive on T_Λ . Assume this is happening.

By definition of Λ , there exists a sequence of $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}$ and a sequence of $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, such that $\lambda_k \in (\Lambda, 0)$, satisfying $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k = \Lambda$, and $y_k \in \Sigma_{\lambda_k}$, such that at least for one i , $U_{\lambda_k}^i(y_k) > 0$. By Lemma 3.5, we can choose $\{y_k\} \subset \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_k}} \setminus \Sigma_\Lambda$, such that

$$U_{\lambda_k}^i(y_k) = \max_{y \in \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_k}}} U_{\lambda_k}^i(y) > 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (3.8)$$

There two cases will happen.

Case 1 the sequence $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ exists bounded subsequence, that is $x_k \rightarrow x^* \in \overline{\Sigma_\Lambda}$.

By continuity of u^i , $U_\Lambda^i(x^*) \geq 0$, Hence by $U_\Lambda^i|_{\Sigma_\Lambda} < 0$ we have $x^* \in T_\Lambda$. By mean value theorem,

$$0 \leq U_\Lambda^i(x_k) = 2 \frac{\partial u_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1}(\xi_k)(\lambda_k - x_{k,1}),$$

where ξ_k lies in the segment connecting x_k and $x_k^{\lambda_k}$, which shows $\frac{\partial u_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1}(\xi_k) \geq 0$, hence

$$\frac{\partial u_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1}(x^*) \geq 0,$$

By continuity of u^i , this is contradictory to $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}|_{T_\Lambda} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial U_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1}|_{T_\Lambda} < 0$.

Case 2 $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |y_k| = +\infty$. In this case, we can choose $k^* > 0$ such that $\forall k > k^*$, $|y_k| > \tilde{R}$, where \tilde{R} as in Lemma 3.7. Then for each $y_k, k > k^*$, the argument similar to **Step 1** will give a contradiction.

Step 3: We need to prove all the $U_\Lambda^i \equiv 0$ on Σ_Λ .

By **Step 2**, denote $I := \{i \mid U_\Lambda^i|_{\Sigma_\Lambda} \equiv 0\}$, $J := \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus I$. If $J \neq \emptyset$, by (F7), there exists $i_0 \in I, j_0 \in J$, such that

$$\left| \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f^{i_0} \text{ strictly decreasing with respect to } z^{j_0}, \text{ as } z^k, k \neq i_0, j_0, \text{ fixed} \right\} \right| > 0,$$

that is there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, such that

$$\widetilde{d_{i_0 j_0}}(x_0, u_\Lambda^1(x_0), \dots, u^j(x_0), \dots, u^m(x_0), 0, U_\Lambda^{j_0}(x_0)) U_\Lambda^{j_0}(x_0) < 0.$$

If $x_0 \in \Sigma_\Lambda$, then by Lemma 3.4 and (3.2), together with $\widetilde{d_{ij}} \leq 0, i \neq j$ in Remark 1.3, and (3.6) show that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \sum_{j \neq i_0} \widetilde{d_{i_0 j}} U_\Lambda^j = \sum_{j \in J} \widetilde{d_{i_0 j}} U_\Lambda^j \\ &\geq \widetilde{d_{i_0 j_0}} U_\Lambda^{j_0} > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

If $x_0 \in \Sigma_\Lambda^\Lambda$, consider the elliptic inequality of Σ_Λ^Λ on U_Λ^i should be

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{A}^i(x) D^2 U_\Lambda^i(x) \right) + \mathbf{B}^i(x) \cdot \nabla U_\Lambda^i(x) \\ \geq \sum_{j=1}^m -\widetilde{d}_{ij}(x, u_\Lambda^1, \dots, u^j, \dots, u^m, \nabla U_\Lambda^i, U_\Lambda^j) U_\Lambda^j. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that for $j \in J$, U_Λ^j should be strictly positive on Σ_Λ^Λ , hence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \sum_{j \neq i_0} -\widetilde{d}_{i_0 j} U_\Lambda^j = \sum_{j \in J} -\widetilde{d}_{i_0 j} U_\Lambda^j \\ &\geq -\widetilde{d}_{i_0 j_0} U_\Lambda^{j_0} > 0, \end{aligned}$$

by the same reason, which comes out a contradiction again. Hence $J = \emptyset$, that is all the $U_\Lambda^i \equiv 0$ hold on Σ_Λ . □

4 The Half Space $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^n$.




Figure 2: The half space

In this case, we consider the following Neumann problem in the half space $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^n$, $n \geq 2$. Denote $x = (x', x_n)$, $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, $x_n \geq 0$, and $r = |x'|$, for all $1 \leq i \leq m$,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \det(D^2 u^i) = f^i(x, \mathbf{u}, \nabla u^i), & x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n, \\ u^i(x) > 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n, \\ \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_n}(x) = h^i(r), & x \in \partial \mathbb{R}_+^n, \\ \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} u^i(x) = \infty, & \end{array} \right. \quad (4.1)$$

We have here a hypothesis on the boundary condition:

$$(H) \quad h^i(r) \in C^1([0, +\infty)), \quad \frac{\partial h^i}{\partial r} \leq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

The behavior of u^i at the infinity as above are natural since we always assume u^i to be strictly convex.

We need one more technical condition of \mathbf{f} ,

$$(F_n) \quad f^i \text{ is non-decreasing with respect to } z^i \text{ and strictly increasing on } \{x_n = 0\} \text{ such that } \widetilde{d}_{ii} \geq d > 0, \text{ as } z^k, k \neq i, x, p \text{ fixed;}$$

4.1 Main Theorem

The main results are the following.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume \mathbf{f} satisfy (F_2) , (F_4) , (F_5) , (F_6) , (F_{10}) and (F_n) , \mathbf{h} satisfy (H) . Let $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m)$ be a group of $[C^2(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n}, \mathbb{R}_+)]^m$ strictly convex solutions to (4.1) satisfying (2.12) and (2.13), then there exists $t_1 \leq 0$ such that for each u^i ,*

$$u^i(x_1, x'', x_n) \geq u^i(2t_1 - x_1, x'', x_n), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \text{ with } x_1 < t_1$$

where $x'' = (x_2, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, and

$$\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1} < 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \text{ with } x_1 < t_1.$$

Furthermore, if $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(t_1, x') = 0$ for some $x \in \{x_1 = t_1\}$, with $t_1 = 0$ (or $t_1 < 0$) then such (or all) u^i must be symmetric with respect to $\{x_1 = t_1\}$ and strictly decreasing in x_1 direction with $x_1 < t_1$, that is,

$$u^i(x) = u^i(|x_1 - t_1|, x'', x_n), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n,$$

moreover,

$$\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1} < 0, \quad \forall x \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \mid x_1 < t_1\}.$$

If we assume more symmetry on f^i (substituting (F_6) with (F_8)), we can furthermore immediately have the following, by using Theorem 4.1 again with $\mathbf{u}_{t_1} := (u_{t_1}^i)$. (Note that in this case, the inequalities (2.7),(2.8) will be slightly different to obtain the same result.)

Theorem 4.2. *Assume \mathbf{f} satisfy (F_2) , (F_5) , (F_7) , (F_8) , (F_{10}) and (F_n) , \mathbf{h} satisfy (H) . Let $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m)$ be a group of $[C^2(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n}, \mathbb{R}_+)]^m$ strictly convex solutions to (4.1) satisfying (2.12) and (2.13), then there exists $t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for each u^i must be symmetric with respect to $\{x_1 = t_1\}$ and strictly decreasing in x_1 direction with $x_1 < t_1$.*

More precisely, for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, each u^i must be like

$$u^i(x) = u^i(|x_1 - t_1|, x'', x_n), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n,$$

moreover,

$$\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1} < 0, \quad \forall x \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \mid x_1 < t_1\}.$$

Especially, if we substitute (F_6) to the symmetric one (F_9) , then by using Theorem 4.1 respect to all directions in \mathbb{R}^n , we have:

Corollary 4.3. *Assume \mathbf{f} satisfy (F_2) , (F_5) , (F_7) , (F_9) , (F_{10}) and (F_n) , \mathbf{h} satisfy (H) . Let $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m)$ be a group of $[C^2(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n}, \mathbb{R}_+)]^m$ strictly convex solutions to (4.1) satisfying (2.12) and (2.13), then each u^i must be radially symmetric and strictly increasing respect to some point in \mathbb{R}_+^n .*

More precisely, denote the rotating center as $x^ = ((x^*)', x_n^*) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, and $r = |x' - (x^*)'|$, then for $i = 1 \dots, m$, each u^i must be like*

$$u^i(x) = u^i(r, x_n), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n,$$

moreover,

$$\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial r}(r, x_n) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

4.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1

In what follows, we shall use the method of moving plane. We start by considering hyper-planes parallel to $\{x_1 = 0\}$, coming from $-\infty$. To proceed, for each $\lambda \leq 0$, we

define

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_\lambda &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \mid x_1 < \lambda\}, \\ T_\lambda &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \mid x_1 = \lambda\}, \\ P_\lambda &:= \partial\Sigma_\lambda \setminus T_\lambda = \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, 0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \mid x_1 < \lambda\}.\end{aligned}$$

For any point $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n) \in \Sigma_\lambda$, let $x_\lambda = (2\lambda - x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n)$ be the reflected point with respect to the plane T_λ . Define the reflected function by

$$u_\lambda(x) := u(x_\lambda)$$

and introduce the function

$$U_\lambda(x) := u_\lambda(x) - u(x) \text{ on } \overline{\Sigma_\lambda}.$$

By the same procedure in calculating (2.9), we can obtain an elliptic inequality of U_λ^i in Σ_λ : $\forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda$ such that $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(x) \leq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\text{tr} \left(\mathbf{A}^i(x) D^2 U_\lambda^i(x) \right) + \mathbf{B}^i(x) \cdot \nabla U_\lambda^i(x) \\ \geq \sum_{j=1}^m \widetilde{d}_{ij}(x, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u^j, \dots, u^m, \nabla U_\lambda^i, U_\lambda^j) U_\lambda^j,\end{aligned}\tag{4.2}$$

where $\mathbf{A}^i(x) := (a_{jk}^i(x))_{j,k=1}^n$ with

$$a_{jk}^i(x) := \int_0^1 \det \left((1-t) D^2 u_\lambda^i(x) + t D^2 u^i(x) \right) \left((1-t) D^2 u_\lambda^i(x) + t D^2 u^i(x) \right)^{jk} dt,$$

are strictly positive definite due to the strictly convexity of u^i and (F_1) , and together with

$$\mathbf{B}^i(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{h_{f^i,p}}{|\nabla U_\lambda^i(x)|} \chi_{\{|\nabla U_\lambda^i(x)| \neq 0\}} \nabla U_\lambda^i(x)$$

are all locally bounded due to the twice differentiable continuity of u^i .

For all $\lambda < 0$, the fact that $|x_\lambda| \leq |x|$ together with assumption (H) lead us to U_λ^i on the boundary that

$$U_\lambda^i(x) = 0, \quad x \in \overline{T_\lambda},\tag{4.3}$$

$$\frac{\partial U_\lambda^i}{\partial x_n} = h^i(|x_\lambda|) - h^i(|x|) \geq 0, \quad x \in P_\lambda.\tag{4.4}$$

Next we prove a preliminary lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m) \in [C^2(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n}, \mathbb{R}_+)]^m$ be a group of strictly convex solutions to (4.1) satisfying the conditions in Theorem 4.1, then $\forall \lambda < 0$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, if the maximum point of U_λ^i on $\overline{\Sigma_\lambda}$ exists and the maximum is positive, then such point must be lying inside Σ_λ . That is, if $U_\lambda^i(y_1) = \max_{y \in \overline{\Sigma_\lambda}} U_\lambda^i(y) > 0$, then $y_1 \in \Sigma_\lambda$.*

Proof. Let $y_1 \in \partial \Sigma_\lambda$ such that $U_\lambda^i(y_1) = \max_{y \in \overline{\Sigma_\lambda}} U_\lambda^i(y) > 0$. By (4.3), we only need to show that $y_1 \notin P_\lambda$.

By continuity, we can choose $r > 0$ such that

$$U_\lambda^i(y) > \frac{1}{2} U_\lambda^i(y_1) > 0, \forall y \in B_r(y_1) \cap \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n}.$$

Furthermore, since $U_\lambda^i|_{T_\lambda} = 0$, we can suppose there exists at least one another point $y_2 \in \overline{B_r(y_1)} \cap \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n}$ such that $U_\lambda^i(y_2) < \frac{3}{4} U_\lambda^i(y_1)$, this ensure that $U_\lambda^i(x)$ will not be constant in $B_r(y_1) \cap \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n}$.

Let $\overline{U}_\lambda^i(x) = U_\lambda^i(x) - C^i$, where $C^i > 0$ to be determined. By (4.2), we deduce the elliptic inequality of \overline{U}_λ^i on $B_r(y_1) \cap \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^n}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{A}^i(x) D^2 \overline{U}_\lambda^i(x) \right) + \mathbf{B}^i(x) \cdot \nabla \overline{U}_\lambda^i(x) - \widetilde{d}_{ii}(x) \overline{U}_\lambda^i(x) \\ & \geq \sum_{j \neq i} \widetilde{d}_{ij}(x, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u^j, \dots, u^m, \nabla U_\lambda^i, U_\lambda^j) U_\lambda^j(x) + \widetilde{d}_{ii}(x) C^i, \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

For $j = 1, \dots, m$, each $u^j(x) \in C^1(\overline{B_r(y_1)})$, therefore u_λ^j , U_λ^j , and ∇U_λ^i are bounded on $\overline{B_r(y_1)}$, by continuity of f^i , so are they on $\overline{B_r(y_1)}$. Hence exists $M_j^i > 0$, such that for all $x \in \overline{B_r(y_1)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \widetilde{d}_{ij}(x, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u^j, \dots, u^m, \nabla U_\lambda^i, U_\lambda^j) U_\lambda^j \right| \\ & = \left| f^i(x, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u_\lambda^j, \dots, u^m, \nabla U_\lambda^i) - f^i(x, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u^j, \dots, u^m, \nabla U_\lambda^i) \right| < 2M_j^i. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by (F_n) , $\min_{x \in \overline{B_r(y_1)}} \widetilde{d}_{ii}(x) > 0$, choosing $C^i > \max \left\{ \frac{2 \sum_{j=1}^m M_j^i}{\min_{x \in \overline{B_r(y_1)}} \widetilde{d}_{ii}(x)}, U_\lambda^i(y_1) \right\} > 0$,

such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j \neq i} \widetilde{d}_{ij}(x, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u^j, \dots, u^m, \nabla U_\lambda^i, U_\lambda^j) U_\lambda^j(x) + \widetilde{d}_{ii}(x) C^i \\ & \geq -2 \sum_{j=1}^m M_j^i + \min_{x \in \overline{B_r(y_1)}} \widetilde{d}_{ii}(x) C^i > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (4.5) becomes

$$\operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{A}^i(x) D^2 \overline{U}_\lambda^i(x) \right) + \mathbf{B}^i(x) \cdot \nabla \overline{U}_\lambda^i(x) - \widetilde{d}_{ii}(x) \overline{U}_\lambda^i(x) > 0.$$

By using Lemma 2.1 on $\overline{U}_\lambda^i(x) < 0$ over $B_r(y_1) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, noting that y_1 is the maximum point of $\overline{U}_\lambda^i(x)$ on $\overline{B_r(y_1)} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, we have

$$\frac{\partial \overline{U}_\lambda^i}{\partial x_n}(y_1) < 0.$$

However, if $y_1 \in P_\lambda$, combining with (4.4) and by directly calculating we have

$$\frac{\partial \overline{U}_\lambda^i}{\partial x_n}(y_1) = \frac{\partial U_\lambda^i}{\partial x_n}(y_1) \geq 0,$$

which is a contradiction. \square

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We will apply the moving plane method in three steps.

Step 1: there exist a real number $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $U_\mu^i|_{\Sigma_\mu} \leq 0, \forall i = 1, \dots, m, \forall \mu < \lambda$.

Assume for contradiction that $\forall \lambda < 0$, there exists $y_0 \in \Sigma_\lambda$ such that $U_\lambda^{i_0}(y_0) > 0$ for some i_0 . We set $J := \{j = 1, \dots, m \mid U_\lambda^j \leq 0, \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda\} \subsetneq \{1, \dots, m\}$, and $I := \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus J$. Up to a permutation of the indices, we can assume $I = \{1, \dots, l\}$, $J = \{l+1, \dots, m\}$, $l = |I|$.

Note that $\sup_{\Sigma_\lambda} U_\lambda^i > 0, \forall i \in I$. By Lemma 3.5, we may take $\{y_i\}_{i \in I} \subset \overline{\Sigma_\lambda} \setminus T_\lambda$ such that

$$U_\lambda^i(y_i) = \max_{y \in \overline{\Sigma_\lambda}} U_\lambda^i(y) > 0.$$

For fixed $i \in I$, by Lemma 4.4, y_i lies in the interior of Σ_λ , hence $\nabla U_\lambda^i(y_i) = 0$, and $D^2 U_\lambda^i(y_i) \leq 0$. Then the i -th equation in (4.2) at y_i becomes

$$0 \geq \sum_{j=1}^m \widetilde{d}_{ij}(y_i, u_\lambda^1(y_i), \dots, u^j(y_i), \dots, u^m(y_i), 0, U_\lambda^j(y_i)) U_\lambda^j(y_i), \quad (4.6)$$

By Remark 1.3, definition of J and $U_\lambda^j(y_i) \leq U_\lambda^j(y_j), \forall j \in I$, (4.6) becomes

$$0 \geq \sum_{j \in I} \widetilde{d}_{ij}(y_i, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u^j, \dots, u^m, 0, U_\lambda^j(y_i)) U_\lambda^j(y_j). \quad (4.7)$$

Next we will prove that $U_\lambda^j(y_j) \leq 0, \forall j \in I$, which will be contradictory to the choice of y_i . Rewrite (4.7) as

$$MU = V, \quad (4.8)$$

where $U := (U_\lambda^1(y_1), \dots, U_\lambda^l(y_l))$, $V := (v_1, \dots, v_l)$, $M := (m_{ij})_{i,j=1}^l$, satisfying

$$v_i \leq 0, m_{ij} := \widetilde{d}_{ij}(y_i, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u^j, \dots, u^m, 0, U_\lambda^j(y_i)) \leq 0, i, j = 1, \dots, l.$$

We can assume $\lambda < -\widetilde{R}$, where \widetilde{R} as in Lemma 3.7, then $\Sigma_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\widetilde{R}}(0)$, hence by Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 2.3, M is invertable, we can then solve $U = M^{-1}V$ by (4.8), together with Cramer's law and Lemma 2.3, Lemma 3.7, we have

$$U_\lambda^j(y_j) = M^{jk} v_k = \frac{1}{\det M} \sum_{k=1}^l \text{adj}(M)_{jk} v_k \leq 0, \forall j = 1, \dots, l.$$

Next we continue to move T_λ by increasing λ , as long as $U_\lambda^i(x) \leq 0$ holds for all i on Σ_Λ , we define

$$\Lambda := \sup\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \mid U_\mu^i(x) \leq 0, \forall x \in \Sigma_\mu, \forall i = 1, \dots, m, \forall \mu < \lambda\}.$$

Step 1 shows that $\Lambda > -\infty$. On the other hand $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} u^i(x) = \infty$, for sufficiently large R , we have $u^i(x) > u^i(0), \forall |x| > R$, hence $\Lambda < +\infty$, therefore Λ is finite. Since all the terms are continuous with respect to λ , we have

$$U_\Lambda^i(x) \leq 0, \forall x \in \Sigma_\Lambda, \forall i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (4.9)$$

In particular, $U_\mu^i \leq 0, \forall \mu \leq \Lambda$, hence $\forall x \in \Sigma_\Lambda, \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(x) \leq 0$, by covering argument. By (4.2) and Remark 1.3, we have on Σ_Λ ,

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^i(x) D^2 U_\Lambda^i(x)) + \mathbf{B}^i(x) \cdot \nabla U_\Lambda^i(x) - \widetilde{d}^{ii}(x) U_\Lambda^i(x) \geq 0, \forall i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (4.10)$$

Since all the coefficient of (4.10) are locally bounded, by Lemma 2.1, we have $\forall i = 1, \dots, m$, either

$$U_\Lambda^i(x) < 0, \forall x \in \Sigma_\Lambda,$$

or $U_\Lambda^i(x) \equiv 0, \forall x \in \Sigma_\Lambda.$

If the former one happens, we also have

$$\frac{\partial U_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1}(x) > 0, \forall x \in T_\Lambda.$$

Noting that the Neumann boundary condition shows that $U_\Lambda^i|_{P_\Lambda} < 0$. In fact, assume $U_\Lambda^i|_{P_\Lambda} = 0$, by Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\frac{\partial U_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_n}(x) < 0, x \in P_\Lambda,$$

which is contradictory to (4.4). Hence

$$U_\Lambda^i(x) < 0, x \in P_\Lambda.$$

Now, if $\Lambda = 0$, we have $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(0, x') = 0$ for some $x \in \{x_1 = 0\}$, hence $U_\Lambda^i(x) \equiv 0, \forall x \in \Sigma_\Lambda$.

Next, we discuss the case of $\Lambda < 0$.

Step 2: We will prove that $U_\Lambda^i \equiv 0$ on Σ_Λ for at least one i .

As the discussion above, we only need to exclude the case that all the U_Λ^i on Σ_Λ are strictly negative, with directional derivative along x_1 being strictly positive on T_Λ . Assume this is happening.

By definition of Λ , there exists a sequence of $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}$ and a sequence of $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$, such that $\lambda_k \in (\Lambda, 0)$, satisfying $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k = \Lambda$, and $y_k \in \Sigma_{\lambda_k}$, such that at least for one i , $U_{\lambda_k}^i(y_k) \geq 0$. By Lemma 3.5, we can choose $\{y_k\} \subset \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_k}} \setminus \Sigma_\Lambda$, such that

$$U_{\lambda_k}^i(y_k) = \max_{y \in \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_k}}} U_{\lambda_k}^i(y) > 0, k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (4.11)$$

There two cases will happen.

Case 1 the sequence $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ has bounded subsequence.

Without lost of generality, we can assume

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y_k = y_0 \in \bigcap_{k=1}^{+\infty} \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_k}} \setminus \Sigma_\Lambda = \overline{T_\Lambda},$$

We claim that $\frac{\partial U_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1}(y_0) > 0$.

If $y_0 \in T_\Lambda$, then by Lemma 2.1 we are done. Next, consider $y_0 \in \overline{P_\Lambda} \cap \overline{T_\Lambda}$. In fact, for any $Q \in \overline{P_\Lambda} \cap \overline{T_\Lambda}$, we have $U_\Lambda^i(Q) = 0$, hence

$$\frac{\partial U_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1}(Q) \geq 0.$$

Let $s = -\mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_n$, at Q , locally we can regard as $\{\rho \equiv x_1 - \Lambda = 0\}$ intersect with $\{\sigma \equiv x_n = 0\}$, noticing that (2.1) and (2.6) shows that $a_{1j} = 0, \forall j = 2, \dots, n$, and then $a_{ij}\rho_i\sigma_j = 0$, hence at Q , by using Lemma 2.2 on (4.10), we have either

$$\frac{\partial U_\Lambda^i}{\partial s}(Q) = -\frac{\partial U_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1}(Q) + \frac{\partial U_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_n}(Q) < 0, \quad (4.12)$$

or

$$\frac{\partial^2 U_\Lambda^i}{\partial s^2}(Q) = \frac{\partial^2 U_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1^2}(Q) - 2\frac{\partial^2 U_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1 \partial x_n}(Q) + \frac{\partial^2 U_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_n^2}(Q) < 0. \quad (4.13)$$

For (4.1), with (H), by direct calculations showing that

$$\frac{\partial^2 U_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1 \partial x_n}(Q) = -2\frac{\Lambda}{|Q|} \frac{\partial h^i}{\partial r}(|Q|) \leq 0, \quad (4.14)$$

Hence by (2.2), (2.3), (4.13), (4.14), only (4.12) can hold, hence

$$\frac{\partial U_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1}(Q) > 0. \quad (4.15)$$

Let Q be y_0 , we prove the claim.

Next, by mean value theorem

$$0 < U_{\lambda_k}^i(y_k) = u^i(y_k^{\lambda_k}) - u^i(y_k) = 2\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(\xi_k)(\lambda_k - y_{k,1}) < 0,$$

where ξ_k lies in the segment connecting y_k and $y_k^{\lambda_k}$, noticing that the last strict less than sign can be achieved by sufficiently large k pushing ξ_k near y_0 close enough, which is a contradiction.

Case 2 $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |y_k| = +\infty$. In this case, we can choose $k^* > 0$ such that $\forall k > k^*$, $|y_k| > \tilde{R}$, where \tilde{R} as in Lemma 3.7. Then for each $y_k, k > k^*$, the argument similar to **Step 1** will give a contradiction.

Step 3: We need to prove all the $U_\Lambda^i \equiv 0$ on Σ_Λ .

By **Step 2**, denote $I := \{i \mid U_\Lambda^i|_{\Sigma_\Lambda} \equiv 0\}$, $J := \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus I$. If $J \neq \emptyset$, by (F7), there exists $i_0 \in I, j_0 \in J$, such that

$$\left| \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \mid f^{i_0} \text{ strictly decreasing with respect to } z^{j_0}, \text{ as } z^k, k \neq i_0, j_0, \text{ pfixed} \right\} \right| > 0,$$

that is there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, such that

$$\widetilde{d_{i_0 j_0}}(x_0, u_\Lambda^1(x_0), \dots, u^j(x_0), \dots, u^m(x_0), 0, U_\Lambda^{j_0}(x_0)) U_\Lambda^{j_0}(x_0) < 0.$$

If $x_0 \in \Sigma_\Lambda$, then by Lemma 3.4 and (4.2), together with $\widetilde{d}_{ij} \leq 0, i \neq j$ in Remark 1.3, and (4.9) show that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \sum_{j \neq i_0} \widetilde{d}_{i_0 j} U_\Lambda^j = \sum_{j \in J} \widetilde{d}_{i_0 j} U_\Lambda^j \\ &\geq \widetilde{d}_{i_0 j_0} U_\Lambda^{j_0} > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

If $x_0 \in \Sigma_\Lambda^A$, consider the elliptic inequality of Σ_Λ^A on U_Λ^i should be

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{A}^i(x) D^2 U_\Lambda^i(x) \right) + \mathbf{B}^i(x) \cdot \nabla U_\Lambda^i(x) \\ \geq \sum_{j=1}^m -\widetilde{d}_{ij}(x, u_\Lambda^1, \dots, u^j, \dots, u^m, \nabla U_\Lambda^i, U_\Lambda^j) U_\Lambda^j. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that for $j \in J$, U_Λ^j should be strictly positive on Σ_Λ^A , hence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \sum_{j \neq i_0} -\widetilde{d}_{i_0 j} U_\Lambda^j = \sum_{j \in J} -\widetilde{d}_{i_0 j} U_\Lambda^j \\ &\geq -\widetilde{d}_{i_0 j_0} U_\Lambda^{j_0} > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which figures out a contradiction again. Hence $J = \emptyset$, that is all the $U_\Lambda^i \equiv 0$ hold on Σ_Λ . \square

5 Unbounded Tube Shape Domains

Now we turn our attention on the unbounded tubes, any tubes in \mathbb{R}^n can always regarded as $C_\infty := \Omega \times (-\infty, \infty)$ up to rotations and translations, where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ is a bounded simply connected domain, we assume $\partial\Omega \in C^2$.

In this case, we mainly consider the following constant-boundary Dirichlet problem for (1.1) on C_∞ ,

$$\begin{cases} \det(D^2 u^i) = f^i(x, \mathbf{u}, \nabla u^i), & x \in C_\infty, \\ u^i = h^i, & x \in \partial C_\infty, \\ \lim_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} u^i(x) = \infty, & i = 1, \dots, m. \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

where h^i satisfy $\lim_{|x_n| \rightarrow +\infty} h^i(x) = \infty$.

The behavior of u^i at the infinity as above are natural since we always assume u^i to be strictly convex.

In this case, we need only a weakened condition instead of (2.12):

For $u^i \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we denote

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial |x_n|}(x) &:= \langle \nabla u^i(x), \mathbf{e}_n \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_n, \frac{x}{|x|} \rangle, \\ \nabla_{\tau'}(x) &:= \nabla u^i(x) - \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial |x_n|}(x) \frac{x}{|x|},\end{aligned}$$

We require that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{|x_n| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial |x_n|}(x) &> 0, \\ |\nabla_{\tau'}(x)| &= o\left(\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial |x_n|}(x)\right) \text{ as } |x_n| \rightarrow \infty.\end{aligned}\tag{5.2}$$

Similar to the case of bounded tubes [21], when we move the hyperplane $\{x_1 = \lambda\}$ along \mathbf{e}_1 from left negative infinity, denote $\lambda_0 := \inf\{x_1 \mid x \in C_\infty\}$. Then we can define similarly the

$$\Lambda_0 := \sup\left\{\lambda > \lambda_0 \mid \Sigma_\lambda^\lambda \subset \Omega\right\},$$

with two probably happened situations, and define Λ_1, Λ_2 respectively.

5.1 Main Theorem

We now state our main theorem for case of unbounded tubes.

When Ω being convex in one direction, assumed as \mathbf{e}_1 , and the nonlinear term \mathbf{f} satisfies some corresponding monotonic conditions in this direction, we can start to examine whether the solution of the system (5.1) will satisfy the corresponding monotonicity along this direction. The main results are the following.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $C_\infty = \Omega \times (-\infty, \infty)$ be a unbounded tubes in \mathbb{R}^n , where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ is a C^2 bounded simply connected domain being convex along with \mathbf{e}_1 . Assume \mathbf{f} satisfy (F_2) , (F_3) , (F_4) , (F_5) , (F_6) and (F_{10}) . Let $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m) \in [C^2(\overline{C_\infty})]^m$ be a group of strictly convex solutions to (5.1) satisfying (2.13) and (5.2), then each u^i on $\{x \in C_\infty \mid x_1 < \Lambda_0\}$ must be*

$$u^i(x_1, x') \geq u^i(2\Lambda_0 - x_1, x') \text{ and } \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(x) < 0.$$

Furthermore, if

$$\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(\Lambda_0, x') = 0 \text{ for some } x \in \{x_1 = \Lambda_0\}, \quad (5.3)$$

then such u^i must be symmetric with respect to $\{x_1 = \Lambda_0\}$ and strictly decreasing in \mathbf{e}_1 direction with $x_1 < \Lambda_0$, more precisely,

$$u^i(x) = u^i(|x_1 - \Lambda_0|, x'), \text{ in } \{x \in C_\infty \mid |x_1 - \Lambda_0| < \Lambda_0 - \lambda_0\},$$

moreover,

$$\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(x) < 0, \text{ in } \{x \in C_\infty \mid x_1 < \Lambda_0\}.$$

If we assume more symmetry condition on Ω and \mathbf{f} (substituting (F_6) with (F_8)) to satisfy (5.3), we can furthermore immediately have the following, by using Theorem 5.1 again with $\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0} := (u^i_{\Lambda_0})$. (Noting that in this case, the inequalities (2.7),(2.8) will be slightly different to obtain the same result.)

Theorem 5.2. *Let $C_\infty = \Omega \times (-\infty, \infty)$ be a unbounded tubes in \mathbb{R}^n , where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ is a C^2 bounded simply connected domain being convex along with \mathbf{e}_1 . Assume \mathbf{f} satisfy (F_2) , (F_3) , (F_4) , (F_5) , (F_8) and (F_{10}) . Let $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m) \in [C^2(\overline{C_\infty})]^m$ be a group of strictly convex solutions to (5.1) satisfying (2.13) and (5.2), then each u^i must be symmetric with respect to $\{x_1 = \Lambda_0\}$, and strictly decreasing in $\{x_1 < \Lambda_0\}$ in \mathbf{e}_1 direction with $x_1 < \Lambda_0$.*

More precisely, for all $i = 1, \dots, m$,

$$u^i(x) = u^i(|x_1 - \Lambda_0|, x'), \text{ in } \{x \in C_\infty \mid |x_1 - \Lambda_0| < \Lambda_0 - \lambda_0\},$$

moreover,

$$\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(x) < 0, \text{ in } \{x \in C_\infty \mid x_1 < \Lambda_0\}.$$

Especially, when Ω is a ball, that is C_∞ being a infinite cylinder, if we substitute (F_6) to the symmetric ones (F_9) , then by using Theorem 5.1 respect to all directions in \mathbb{R}^n , we have immediately that

Corollary 5.3. *Let $C_\infty = \Omega \times (-\infty, \infty)$ be a infinite cylinder in \mathbb{R}^n , $\Omega = B_R$ be a arbitrary ball with radius R in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} . Assume \mathbf{f} satisfy (F_1) , (F_3) , (F_4) , (F_5) , (F_9)*

and (F_{10}) . Let $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m) \in [C^2(\overline{C_\infty})]^m$ be a group of strictly convex solutions to (5.1) satisfying (2.13) and (5.2), then each must be radially symmetric and strictly increasing respect to the axis crossing the center of B_R .

More precisely, denote the center of B_R as $x^* = ((x^*)', x_n^*) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and denote $r = |x' - (x^*)'|$, then for $i = 1 \dots, m$, each u^i must be

$$u^i(x) = u^i(r, x_n), \quad x \in C_\infty,$$

moreover,

$$\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial r}(r, x_n) > 0, \quad x \in C_\infty.$$

5.2 Proof of Theorem 5.1

By the same procedure in calculating (2.9), we can obtain an elliptic inequality of U_λ^i in Σ_λ : $\forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda$ such that $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(x) \leq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{A}^i(x) D^2 U_\lambda^i(x) \right) + \mathbf{B}^i(x) \cdot \nabla U_\lambda^i(x) \\ \geq \sum_{j=1}^m \widetilde{d}_{ij}(x, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u^j, \dots, u^m, \nabla U_\lambda^i, U_\lambda^j) U_\lambda^j, \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

where $\mathbf{A}^i(x) := \left(a_{jk}^i(x) \right)_{j,k=1}^n$,

$$a_{jk}^i(x) := \int_0^1 \det \left((1-t) D^2 u_\lambda^i(x) + t D^2 u^i(x) \right) \left((1-t) D^2 u_\lambda^i(x) + t D^2 u^i(x) \right)^{jk} dt,$$

are strictly positive definite due to the strictly convexity of u^i and (F_1) , and together with

$$\mathbf{B}^i(x) := \frac{h_{f^i,p}}{|\nabla U_\lambda^i(x)|} \chi_{\{|\nabla U_\lambda^i(x)| \neq 0\}} \nabla U_\lambda^i(x)$$

are all locally bounded due to the twice differentiable continuity of u^i .

Next we prove a preliminary lemma.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^m)$ satisfy (2.13) and (5.2), then for all $\lambda < 0$,*

$$\lim_{|x_n| \rightarrow \infty, x_1 < \lambda} U_\lambda^i(x) \leq 0, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Proof. By (5.2)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1} &= \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial |x_n|} \frac{x_1}{|x|} + \left(\nabla u^i - \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial |x_n|} \frac{x}{|x|} \right) \cdot \mathbf{e}_1 \\ &= \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial |x_n|} \left(\frac{x_1}{|x|} + o(1) \right), \text{ as } |x_n| \rightarrow \infty, \forall i = 1, \dots, m,\end{aligned}$$

hence for all $\lambda < 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}U_\lambda^i(x) &= u^i(2\lambda - x_1, x') - u^i(x) \\ &= u^i(2\lambda - x_1, x') - u^i(-x_1, x') + u^i(-x_1, x') - u^i(x) \\ &= 2\lambda \int_0^1 \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1} (2(1-t)\lambda - x_1, x') dt + u^i(-x_1, x') - u^i(x) \\ &= 2\lambda \int_0^1 \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial |x_n|} \left(\frac{2(1-t)\lambda - x_1}{|x|} + o(1) \right) dt + u^i(-x_1, x') - u^i(x), \text{ as } |x_n| \rightarrow \infty,\end{aligned}$$

Noticing that $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial |x_n|} > 0$, as $|x_n| \rightarrow \infty$, hence for x_1 sufficiently small such that $x_1 < 2\lambda$, by (2.13), we have

$$\lim_{|x_n| \rightarrow \infty, x_1 < 2\lambda} U_\lambda^i(x) \leq 0.$$

On the other hand, for $\lambda < 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}U_\lambda^i(x) &= u^i(2\lambda - x_1, x') - u^i(x_1, x') \\ &= 2(\lambda - x_1) \int_0^1 \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1} (2t(\lambda - x_1) + x_1, x') dt \\ &= 2(\lambda - x_1) \int_0^1 \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial |x_n|} \left(\frac{2t(\lambda - x_1) + x_1}{|x|} + o(1) \right) dt, \text{ as } |x_n| \rightarrow \infty,\end{aligned}$$

Noticing that $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial |x_n|} > 0$, as $|x_n| \rightarrow \infty$, hence for x_1 sufficiently small such that $2\lambda < x_1 < \lambda$, we have

$$\lim_{|x_n| \rightarrow \infty, 2\lambda < x_1 < \lambda} U_\lambda^i(x) \leq 0.$$

□

Remark 5.5. This lemma is in order to ensure the super-mum of U_λ^i on Σ_λ can be achieved inside Σ_λ , not just a sequence of maximizers along x_n being infinity. This version is the axis symmetric case, in fact we can weaken the condition (2.13) if we only consider one direction.

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We will apply the moving plane method in three steps.

Step 1: there exist a real number $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $U_\mu^i|_{\Sigma_\mu} \leq 0, \forall i = 1, \dots, m, \forall \mu < \lambda$.

Firstly, consider $\Sigma_\lambda^{\tilde{R}} := \Sigma_\lambda \cap \{|x| \leq \tilde{R}\}$, where \tilde{R} is given by Lemma 3.7. Without lost of generality, we can assume $\partial\Sigma_\lambda^{\tilde{R}} \cap C_\infty$ being C^2 . (If not, we can generate a larger C^2 surface along with the boundary covering $\Sigma_\lambda^{\tilde{R}}$.)

For any $x \in \{x_1 = \lambda_0\} \cap \partial C_\infty$, by maximum principle, locally we have $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(x) < 0$, hence by the continuity of ∇u^i up to the boundary, for sufficiently small $\epsilon_x > 0$, we must have

$$\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1} < 0, x \in C_\infty \cap B_{\epsilon_x}(x), \forall i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Noting that $\{x_1 = \lambda_0\} \cap \partial C_\infty$ is a compact set, hence we must have finite cover of it by $\{B_{\epsilon_x}(x)\}$, denoted as $\{B_{\epsilon_{x_i}}(x_i)\}_{i=1}^K$.

Now denote

$$C_\infty^\epsilon := C_\infty \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^K B_{\epsilon_{x_i}}(x_i),$$

we have

$$\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(x) < 0, x \in C_\infty^\epsilon, \forall i = 1, \dots, m,$$

hence when λ sufficiently close to λ_0 (such that $\Sigma_\lambda \cup \Sigma_\lambda^\lambda \subset C_\infty^\epsilon$, fix such λ , denote as λ' , For any $\mu \in (\lambda_0, \lambda')$, we have

$$U_\mu^i(x) = \int_{x_1}^{2\mu-x_1} \frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(s, x') ds < 0, x \in \Sigma_\mu.$$

Consider $\Sigma_\lambda^{\tilde{R}^c} := \Sigma_\lambda \setminus \{|x| \leq \tilde{R}\}$, we assume that the goal of the step is not true, that is, assume $\forall \lambda < 0$, exists $y_0 \in \Sigma_\lambda^{\tilde{R}^c}$ such that for some i_0 , $U_\lambda^{i_0}(y_0) > 0$. We denote the index set $J := \{j = 1, \dots, m \mid U_\lambda^j(x) \leq 0, \forall x \in \Sigma_\lambda^{\tilde{R}^c}\} \subsetneq \{1, \dots, m\}$, and $I := \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus J$. Without lost of generality, we can assume $I = \{1, \dots, l\}$, $J = \{l+1, \dots, m\}$, $l = |I|$.

Noticing that $\sup_{\Sigma_\lambda} U_\lambda^i > 0, \forall i \in I$. By Lemma 5.4, we can choose $\{y_i\}_{i \in I} \subset \overline{\Sigma_\lambda^{\tilde{R}^c}}$ such that

$$U_\lambda^i(y_i) = \max_{y \in \Sigma_\lambda^{\tilde{R}^c}} U_\lambda^i(y) > 0.$$

For fixed $i \in I$, by $U_\lambda^i|_{T_\lambda} = 0$, $y_i \in \Sigma_{\tilde{R}^c}$, hence $\nabla U_\lambda^i(y_i) = 0$, and $D^2 U_\lambda^i(y_i) \leq 0$. Therefore the i -th equation in (5.4) at y_i becomes

$$0 \geq \sum_{j=1}^m \widetilde{d}_{ij}(y_i, u_\lambda^1(y_i), \dots, u^j(y_i), \dots, u^m(y_i), 0, U_\lambda^j(y_i)) U_\lambda^j(y_i), \quad (5.5)$$

by Remark 1.3, definition of J and $U_\lambda^j(y_i) \leq U_\lambda^j(y_j), \forall j \in I$, (5.5) becomes

$$0 \geq \sum_{j \in I} \widetilde{d}_{ij}(y_i, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u^j, \dots, u^m, 0, U_\lambda^j(y_i)) U_\lambda^j(y_j). \quad (5.6)$$

We will prove next that $U_\lambda^j(y_j) \leq 0, \forall j \in I$, which will be a contradiction to the choice of y_i . Rewrite (5.6) as

$$MU = V, \quad (5.7)$$

where $U := (U_\lambda^1(y_1), \dots, U_\lambda^l(y_l))$, $V := (v_1, \dots, v_l)$, $M := (m_{ij})_{i,j=1}^l$, satisfy

$$v_i \leq 0, m_{ij} := \widetilde{d}_{ij}(y_i, u_\lambda^1, \dots, u^j, \dots, u^m, 0, U_\lambda^j(y_i)) \leq 0, i, j = 1, \dots, l.$$

Noticing that $\Sigma_{\tilde{R}^c} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\tilde{R}}(0)$, by Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 2.3, M is invertable, hence by (5.7) we can solve $U = M^{-1}V$, by Cramer's law and Lemma 2.3, together with Lemma 3.7, we have

$$U_\lambda^j(y_j) = M^{jk} v_k = \frac{1}{\det M} \sum_{k=1}^l \text{adj}(M)_{jk} v_k \leq 0, \forall j = 1, \dots, l,$$

which is contradictory to the choice of y_i . Hence exists $\lambda'' < 0$ such that $U_\mu^i|_{\Sigma_{\tilde{R}^c}} \leq 0, \forall i = 1, \dots, m, \forall \mu < \lambda$,

Take $\lambda := \min\{\lambda', \lambda''\}$ we finish **Step 1**.

Next we continue to move T_λ by increasing λ , as long as $U_\lambda^i(x) \leq 0$ holds for all i on Σ_Λ . We define

$$\Lambda := \sup\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \mid U_\mu^i(x) \leq 0, \forall x \in \Sigma_\mu, \forall i = 1, \dots, m, \forall \mu < \lambda\}.$$

Since all the terms are continuous with respect to λ , we have

$$U_\Lambda^i(x) \leq 0, \forall x \in \Sigma_\Lambda, \forall i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (5.8)$$

In particular, $U_\mu^i \leq 0, \forall \mu \leq \Lambda$, hence by covering argument, $\forall x \in \Sigma_\Lambda$, we have $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(x) \leq 0$, hence by (5.4) and Remark 1.3, on Σ_Λ ,

$$\operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{A}^i(x) D^2 U_\Lambda^i(x) \right) + \mathbf{B}^i(x) \cdot \nabla U_\Lambda^i(x) - \widetilde{d}^{ii}(x) U_\Lambda^i(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (5.9)$$

Since all the coefficient of (5.9) are locally bounded, by Lemma 2.1, we have $\forall i = 1, \dots, m$, either

$$\begin{aligned} U_\Lambda^i(x) &< 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\Lambda, \\ \text{or } U_\Lambda^i(x) &\equiv 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_\Lambda. \end{aligned}$$

If the former one happens, we also have

$$\frac{\partial U_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1}(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in T_\Lambda.$$

Step 2: We need to prove $\Lambda = \Lambda_0$.

By definition of Λ , there exists a sequence of $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}$ and a sequence of $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, such that $\lambda_k \in (\Lambda, 0)$, satisfying $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k = \Lambda$, and $y_k \in \Sigma_{\lambda_k}$, such that at least for one i , $U_{\lambda_k}^i(y_k) > 0$. By Lemma 5.4, we can choose $\{y_k\} \subset \overline{\Sigma_{\lambda_k}} \setminus \Sigma_\Lambda$, such that

$$U_{\lambda_k}^i(y_k) = \max_{y \in \Sigma_{\lambda_k}} U_{\lambda_k}^i(y) > 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (5.10)$$

There two cases will happen.

Case 1 the sequence $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ exists bounded subsequence, that is $x_k \rightarrow x^* \in \overline{\Sigma_\Lambda}$.

By continuity of u^i , $U_\Lambda^i(x^*) \geq 0$, Hence by $U_\Lambda^i|_{\Sigma_\Lambda} < 0$ we have $x^* \in T_\Lambda$. By mean value theorem,

$$0 \leq U_\Lambda^i(x_k) = 2 \frac{\partial u_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1}(\xi_k)(\lambda_k - x_{k,1}),$$

where ξ_k lies in the segment connecting x_k and $x_k^{\lambda_k}$, which shows $\frac{\partial u_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1}(\xi_k) \geq 0$, hence

$$\frac{\partial u_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1}(x^*) \geq 0,$$

By continuity of u^i , this is contradictory to $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}|_{T_\Lambda} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial U_\Lambda^i}{\partial x_1}|_{T_\Lambda} < 0$.

Case 2 $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |y_k| = +\infty$. In this case, we can choose $k^* > 0$ such that $\forall k > k^*$, $|y_k| > \widetilde{R}$, where \widetilde{R} as in Lemma 3.7. Then for each $y_k, k > k^*$, the argument similar to the second part of **Step 1** will give a contradiction.

Step 3: Now $\Lambda = \Lambda_0$, hence by continuity of u^i , $U_\Lambda^i \leq 0$, and $\forall \lambda < \Lambda$, by using Lemma 3.4 on Σ_λ , and by covering argument shows that $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1} < 0$ on $\{x \in C_\infty \mid x_1 < \Lambda_0\}$.

For the second part assertion in the theorem, noting that (5.4) also holds on Σ_Λ , hence if $\frac{\partial u^i}{\partial x_1}(\Lambda_0, x') = 0$ for some $x \in \{x_1 = \Lambda_0\}$, then by Lemma 3.4 again, $U_\Lambda^i \equiv 0$ on Σ_Λ . \square

6 Acknowledgements

References

- [1] A. D. Alexandrov. A characteristic property of spheres. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata. Serie Quarta*, 58:303–315, 1962.
- [2] J. Busca and B. Sirakov. Symmetry results for semilinear elliptic systems in the whole space. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 163(1):41–56, 2000.
- [3] W. Chen and C. Li. Moving planes, moving spheres, and a priori estimates. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 195(1):1–13, 2003.
- [4] W. Chen and C. Li. *Methods on nonlinear elliptic equations*, volume 4 of *AIMS Series on Differential Equations & Dynamical Systems*. American Institute of Mathematical Sciences (AIMS), Springfield, MO, 2010.
- [5] S. Y. Cheng and S. T. Yau. On the regularity of the Monge-Ampère equation $\det(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}) = F(x, u)$. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 30(1):41–68, 1977.
- [6] F. Cui and H. Jian. Symmetry of solutions to a class of Monge-Ampère equations. *Communications on Pure and Applied Analysis*, 18(3):1247–1259, 2019.
- [7] A. Figalli. *The Monge-Ampère equation and its applications*. Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2017.
- [8] B. Gidas, W.-M. Ni, and L. Nirenberg. Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 68(3):209–243, Oct. 1979.
- [9] B. Gidas, W. M. Ni, and L. Nirenberg. Symmetry of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations in \mathbb{R}^n . In *Mathematical analysis and applications, Part A*, volume 7 of *Adv. in Math. Suppl. Stud.*, pages 369–402. Academic Press, New York-London, 1981.

- [10] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
- [11] N. Q. Le and O. Savin. Schauder estimates for degenerate Monge-Ampère equations and smoothness of the eigenfunctions. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 207(1):389–423, 2017.
- [12] C. Li. Monotonicity and Symmetry of Solutions of Fully Nonlinear Elliptic Equations on Bounded domains. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 16(2-3):491–526, Jan. 1991. Publisher: Informa UK Limited.
- [13] C. Li. Monotonicity and symmetry of solutions of fully nonlinear elliptic equations on unbounded domains. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 16(4-5):585–615, Jan. 1991. Publisher: Informa UK Limited.
- [14] B. Liu and L. Ma. Symmetry results for decay solutions of semilinear elliptic systems on half spaces. *Nonlinear Analysis. Theory, Methods & Applications. An International Multidisciplinary Journal*, 75(6):3167–3177, 2012.
- [15] B. Liu and L. Ma. Symmetry results for elliptic Schrödinger systems on half spaces. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 401(1):259–268, 2013.
- [16] L. Ma and B. Liu. Symmetry results for decay solutions of elliptic systems in the whole space. *Advances in Mathematics*, 225(6):3052–3063, 2010.
- [17] A. Porretta and L. Véron. Symmetry of large solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations in a ball. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 236(2):581–591, 2006.
- [18] E. M. d. Santos and G. Nornberg. Symmetry properties of positive solutions for fully nonlinear elliptic systems. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 269(5):4175–4191, Aug. 2020. Publisher: Elsevier BV.
- [19] J. Serrin. A symmetry problem in potential theory. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 43:304–318, 1971.
- [20] W. C. Troy. Symmetry properties in systems of semilinear elliptic equations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 42(3):400–413, 1981.
- [21] W. Zhang and Z. Zhang. Symmetry of convex solutions to fully nonlinear elliptic systems: Bounded domains. 2024. to appear.
- [22] Z. Zhang. *Variational, topological, and partial order methods with their applications*, volume 29. Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.

- [23] Z. Zhang and Z. Qi. On a power-type coupled system of Monge-Ampère equations. *Topological Methods in Nonlinear Analysis*, 46(2):717–729, 2015.
- [24] Z. Zhang and K. Wang. Existence and non-existence of solutions for a class of Monge–Ampère equations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 246(7):2849–2875, Apr. 2009. Publisher: Elsevier BV.