

# ON SOME SINGULARLY PERTURBED ELLIPTIC SYSTEMS MODELING PARTIAL SEGREGATION: UNIFORM HÖLDER ESTIMATES AND BASIC PROPERTIES OF THE LIMITS

NICOLA SOAVE AND SUSANNA TERRACINI

**ABSTRACT.** We prove uniform Hölder estimates in a class of singularly perturbed competition-diffusion elliptic systems, with the particular feature that the interactions between the components occur three by three (ternary interactions). These systems are associated to the minimization of Gross-Pitaevski energies modeling ternary mixture of ultracold gases and other multicomponent liquids and gases. We address the question whether this regularity holds uniformly throughout the approximation process up to the limiting profiles, answering positively. A very relevant feature of limiting profiles in this process is that they are only partially segregated, giving rise to new phenomena of geometric pattern formation and optimal regularity.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Various phenomena in physics, biology, chemistry, or pure mathematics can be described using reaction-diffusion systems with strongly competitive interaction. The intensity of this competition is parametrised by a singular perturbation coefficient  $\beta$ : as  $\beta$  tends to infinity, the densities tend to segregate, giving rise to the formation of geometric patterns in the domain. The study of the asymptotic behavior of solutions in the singular perturbation limit, as well as the properties of the limiting profile in terms of density regularity and geometry of the free boundary, has been the subject of extensive research (we postpone a detailed review of what is known in the literature to the following paragraphs). A common feature of almost all the published contributions is that they focus on the case of strong binary interactions (species interact pairwise) and give rise, in the limit, to models featuring full segregation, namely in the limit different densities have disjoint positivity sets. In this paper we deal instead with a variational model with *ternary interactions* yielding to *partial segregation* in the limit. We emphasize that phase separation driven by multiple interactions has come to the fore in recent physical literature on multicomponent liquids and gases and calls for mathematical explanation (cfr e.g. [LQZ24, Pet14] and references therein).

In the simplest possible setting, let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be a bounded smooth domain, and let  $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3)$  be a triplet of nonnegative Lipschitz continuous functions in  $\overline{\Omega}$  satisfying the *partial segregation condition*

$$(1.1) \quad \psi_1 \psi_2 \psi_3 \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \overline{\Omega};$$

namely,  $\psi_1$ ,  $\psi_2$  and  $\psi_3$  cannot be all positive at the same point  $x_0$ , but their positivity sets can overlap pairwise. Our goal is to analyze the asymptotic behavior as  $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$  of solutions to the boundary value

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35R35; 35B25 (35J61; 35J47)).

*Key words and phrases.* Competition-diffusion systems, ternary interactions, Alt-Caffarelli-Friedman monotonicity formula; singularly perturbed elliptic systems; Liouville-type theorems.

N.S. is partially supported by the PRIN Project no. 2022R537CS “Nodal Optimization, NOnlinear elliptic equations, NOnlocal geometric problems, with a focus on regularity (*NO<sup>3</sup>*)”, and S. T. is partially supported by the PRIN 2022 project 20227HX33Z – *Pattern formation in nonlinear phenomena*, funded by European Union - Next Generation EU within the PRIN 2022 program (D.D. 104 - 02/02/2022 Ministero dell’Università e della Ricerca, Italy). Both authors are affiliated to the INDAM - GNAMPA group.

Declarations of interest: none.

problem

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u_i = \beta u_i \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^3 u_j^2, & u_i > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \\ u_i = \psi_i & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . It is well established that, for every  $\beta > 0$  fixed, a classical solution  $\mathbf{u}_\beta$  of the problem can be found by minimizing the energy with a ternary interaction term

$$J_\beta(\mathbf{u}, \Omega) := \int_\Omega \left( \sum_{i=1}^3 |\nabla u_i|^2 + \beta \prod_{j=1}^3 u_j^2 \right) dx$$

in a Sobolev space of functions with fixed traces. It is also plain that, by minimality,

$$J_\beta(\mathbf{u}_\beta, \Omega) \leq J_\beta(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \Omega) = \int_\Omega \sum_{i=1}^3 |\nabla \psi_i|^2 dx,$$

thanks to the partial segregation condition of  $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ . This implies that, up to a subsequence,  $\mathbf{u}_\beta \rightharpoonup \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  weakly in  $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3)$ , and that the limit itself satisfies the partial segregation condition  $\tilde{u}_1 \tilde{u}_2 \tilde{u}_3 \equiv 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega$ . We address the following natural issues, closely related to each other:

- (i) since  $\mathbf{u}_\beta$  is smooth for each  $\beta > 0$  fixed, can we prove uniform-in- $\beta$  a priori bounds in some Hölder or higher-order Sobolev space?
- (ii) Can we describe the properties and the regularity of the limit  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ ?
- (iii) Can we describe the properties and the regularity of the *free boundary*  $\bigcup_1^3 \partial\{\tilde{u}_i > 0\}$  and of the nodal set  $\{x \in \Omega : u_i(x) = 0 = u_j(x) \text{ for at least two indexes } i \neq j\}$ ?

These questions will be answered in this paper and in its companion [ST24] (Part 2). More precisely, in this paper we establish uniform Hölder bounds for family of minimizers, with a small exponent  $\bar{\nu}$ , and derive the basic properties of the limiting profile. In [ST24], we better investigate the optimal regularity of the limit, and discuss the geometry of the free boundary and its regularity.

**1.1. Main results.** As said, our goal is to describe the asymptotic behavior, as  $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$ , of minimal solutions to (1.2), with the boundary data  $\boldsymbol{\psi}$  satisfying the partial segregation condition (1.1). Actually, we consider a more general setting which allows to deal with family of solutions defined on different domains. Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be a domain (not necessarily bounded), and let  $\{\mathbf{u}_\beta = (u_{1,\beta}, u_{2,\beta}, u_{3,\beta})\}_{\beta > 1} \subset H_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$  be a family of weak solutions to

$$(1.3) \quad \Delta u_i = \beta u_i \prod_{j \neq i} u_j^2, \quad u_i > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \text{ for } i = 1, 2, 3,$$

under the following assumptions:

- (h1)  $\{\mathbf{u}_\beta\}$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty(\Omega)$ , namely  $\|\mathbf{u}_\beta\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C$  for a positive constant  $C > 0$  independent of  $\beta$ .
- (h2)  $\mathbf{u}_\beta$  is a minimizer of (1.3) with respect to variations with compact support, in the sense for every  $\Omega' \subset\subset \Omega$

$$J_\beta(\mathbf{u}_\beta, \Omega') \leq J_\beta(\mathbf{u}_\beta + \boldsymbol{\varphi}, \Omega') \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\varphi} \in H_0^1(\Omega', \mathbb{R}^3),$$

where

$$(1.4) \quad J_\beta(\mathbf{u}, \Omega') := \int_{\Omega'} \sum_{i=1}^3 |\nabla u_i|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\Omega'} \prod_{j=1}^3 u_j^2 dx.$$

Our aim is to prove the validity of uniform  $C^{0,\alpha}$  bounds, for some “small”  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , and to characterize the basic properties of the limit problem.

**Theorem 1.1** (Local uniform bounds in Hölder spaces). *Let  $\mathbf{u}_\beta = (u_{1,\beta}, u_{2,\beta}, u_{3,\beta})$  be a solution of (1.3) at fixed  $\beta > 1$ . Suppose that (h1) and (h2) hold. Then there exists  $\bar{\nu} \in (0, 1)$  depending on the dimension only such that, for every compact set  $K \subset\subset \Omega$ , and for every  $\alpha \in (0, \bar{\nu})$ , we have that*

$$\|\mathbf{u}_\beta\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(K)} \leq C.$$

Moreover, as  $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$

$$\mathbf{u}_\beta \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \quad \text{in } H_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega) \text{ and in } C_{\text{loc}}^{0,\alpha}(\Omega), \text{ for every } \alpha \in (0, \bar{\nu}), \text{ and}$$

$$\beta \int_{\omega} \prod_{j=1}^3 u_{j,\beta}^2 dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for every } \omega \subset\subset \Omega$$

up to a subsequence.

It is immediate to check that such assumptions are satisfied if  $\{\mathbf{u}_\beta\}$  is a family of solutions to (1.2) obtained by minimizing  $J_\beta(\cdot, \Omega)$  in a space of functions with fixed Lipschitz traces. In such case, we can prove that the uniform bounds extend *up to the boundary*, and the limiting profile can be characterized as minimizer of a natural limit problem.

**Theorem 1.2** (Minimizers with fixed traces). *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be a bounded domain with  $C^1$  boundary, let  $\psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2, \psi_3)$  be a nonnegative Lipschitz continuous function on  $\bar{\Omega}$  satisfying the partial segregation condition (1.1). For every  $\beta > 1$  fixed, let  $\mathbf{u}_\beta = (u_{1,\beta}, u_{2,\beta}, u_{3,\beta})$  be a minimizer of  $J_\beta(\cdot, \Omega)$  in*

$$H_\psi := \{\mathbf{u} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3) : \mathbf{u} - \psi \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3)\}.$$

Then there exists a universal  $\bar{\nu} \in (0, 1)$  depending on the dimension only such that

$$(1.5) \quad \|\mathbf{u}_\beta\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C,$$

with  $C > 0$  independent of  $\beta$ . Moreover, as  $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$

$$\mathbf{u}_\beta \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \quad \text{in } H^1(\Omega) \text{ and in } C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}), \text{ for every } \alpha \in (0, \bar{\nu}), \text{ and}$$

$$\beta \int_{\Omega} \prod_{j=1}^3 u_{j,\beta}^2 dx \rightarrow 0$$

up to a subsequence. Finally, the limit  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  is a minimizer for the problem

$$(1.6) \quad c_\infty := \min \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_j|^2 dx \mid \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{u} - \psi \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3) \\ u_1 u_2 u_3 \equiv 0 \text{ in } \Omega \end{array} \right\}.$$

**Remark 1.3.** The threshold  $\bar{\nu}$  is defined in terms of an optimal “overlapping partition problem” on the sphere, and more precisely we have  $\bar{\nu} = \alpha_{3,N}/3$ , with  $\alpha_{3,N}$  defined by (2.1) ahead. In Section 2, we will show that  $\alpha_{3,N} \leq 2$ , so that Theorem 1.1 provides uniform Hölder bounds for exponents smaller than  $\bar{\nu} \leq 2/3$ . This is a suboptimal result. The determination of the optimal exponent will be the subject of analysis in our next work [ST24], but we can anticipate here that we will prove to be  $3/4$ . We point out that, in the derivation of the optimal uniform bounds, a key point will be Theorem 1.1 here, complemented with an *improvement of regularity* argument.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is based on a contradiction argument and on a delicate blow-up analysis, and rests on two pillars, which we believe are findings of independent interest and liable to further applications. The first is a proper multiple-phases Alt-Caffarelli-Friedman type monotonicity formula (Theorem 2.5) tailored for the case of partially segregated densities, and its perturbed version. The second backbone is a Liouville type theorem for entire solutions to (1.3) clarifying the existence of minimal growth of its non-trivial solutions. Here is a statement, immediately following from Theorem 3.6:

**Corollary 1.4** (Liouville type Theorem). *Let  $k \geq 3$  and  $N \geq 2$  be positive integers, and, for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , let  $u_i \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^N)$  be nonnegative functions satisfying the following system of PDEs*

$$\Delta u_i = M u_i \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^k u_j^2, \quad u_i > 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

for some  $M > 0$ . There exists  $\bar{\nu} \in (0, 1)$ , depending only on the dimension  $N$  and the number of components  $k$ , such that, if

$$0 \leq u_i(x) \leq C(1 + |x|^\alpha) \quad \text{for every } x \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

with  $\alpha < \bar{\nu}$ , then at least one component  $u_i$  vanishes identically and all others are constant.

In other words, three phases can coexist, in a ternary interaction regime, only featuring a spatial growth greater than or equal to  $|x|^{\bar{\nu}}$ . We will prove in the forthcoming [ST24] that the optimal exponent is exactly  $\bar{\nu} = 3/4$ , hence smaller than one, while we know that in the regime of two-by-two interactions the minimal growth exponent is  $3/2$  (cf. [ST15]).

Once that Theorem 1.1 is established, it is not difficult to derive the basic properties of the limiting profiles. It is convenient to define at first a class of triplets  $\mathbf{v} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  satisfying the partial segregation condition.

**Definition 1.5.** Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be a domain. We denote by  $\mathcal{L}(\Omega)$  the set of nonnegative functions  $\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3) \cap C(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $\mathbf{v} \neq 0$ , satisfying the following conditions: there exist sequences  $M_n \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $\{\mathbf{v}_n\} \subset H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3)$ , with  $v_{i,n} > 0$  in  $\Omega$ , such that

(i)  $\mathbf{v}_n$  is a minimizer of  $J_{M_n}$  with respect to variations with fixed trace in  $\Omega$ , namely

$$J_{M_n}(\mathbf{v}_n, \Omega) \leq J_{M_n}(\mathbf{v}_n + \boldsymbol{\varphi}, \Omega) \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\varphi} \in H_0^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3).$$

(ii)  $\mathbf{v}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{v}$  strongly in  $H^1(\Omega)$ , and in  $C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ .

(iii) As  $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\int_{\Omega} M_n \prod_{j=1}^3 v_{j,n}^2 dx \rightarrow 0.$$

We denote by  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$  the set of functions  $\mathbf{v}$  such that  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{L}(\omega)$  for every  $\omega \subset\subset \Omega$ .

**Remark 1.6.** The second part of Theorem 1.1 can be now summarize by saying that, up to a subsequence  $\mathbf{u}_\beta \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega) \cup \{0\}$  as  $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$ .

**Theorem 1.7** (Hölder continuity and Local Pohožaev identity for limiting profiles). *Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ . Then  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in C^{0,\alpha}(\Omega) \cap H_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$ , for every  $\alpha \in (0, \bar{\nu})$ ,*

$$(1.7) \quad \Delta \tilde{u}_i = 0 \quad \text{in } \{u_i > 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{u}_1 \tilde{u}_2 \tilde{u}_3 \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

and the following domain variation formula (or local Pohozaev identity) holds:

$$(1.8) \quad \int_{S_r(x_0)} \sum_i |\nabla \tilde{u}_i|^2 d\sigma = \frac{N-2}{r} \int_{B_r(x_0)} \sum_i |\nabla \tilde{u}_i|^2 dx + 2 \int_{S_r(x_0)} \sum_i (\partial_\nu \tilde{u}_i)^2 d\sigma,$$

whenever  $B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega$ .

Theorem 1.7 collects the *main extremality conditions* satisfied by the limiting profiles of system (1.2). They will be used in [ST24] in order to study the free-boundary and the optimal regularity.

**Remark 1.8.** One may wonder whether Theorem 1.7 - and hence also the subsequent analysis in [ST24] - holds for any minimizer for  $c_\infty$  (defined in (1.6)), or not. Notice that it is not clear that any such minimizer can be approximated by solutions to (1.2), and hence may not stay in  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ . Using a simple and standard penalization argument, one can easily prove that *all energy minimizers* among

configurations with partial segregation as in (1.6) enjoy the same properties as stated in the theorem. The penalization procedure does not present substantial difficulties, but it does cause an additional term to appear in equation (1.2), leading to some purely technical, sometimes cumbersome, complications. For this reason, we have decided to omit the details. The interested reader can refer to [ST19] for a similar situation, where all steps are made explicit.

The present contribution and the forthcoming [ST24] are among the first attempts to study partial segregation phenomena in a systematic way. As far as we know, partial segregation models was previously studied only in [BBF22, CR07]. In [CR07], the authors focused on uniform-in- $\beta$  Hölder bounds (for some small exponent  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ) for uniformly bounded solutions of rather general systems of type

$$L_i u_i = -\beta A_i(x) F(u_1, \dots, u_k), \quad F(u_1, \dots, u_k) = \prod_{j=1}^k u_j^{\alpha_j},$$

where  $L_i$  is an elliptic operator with possibly variable coefficient, and  $A_i$  are smooth and positive. The case

$$(1.9) \quad \Delta u_i = \beta \prod_{j=1}^k u_j$$

is included in their analysis. Notice that the function  $F(u_1, \dots, u_k)$  appearing on the right hand side is the same for all the components; this is a key feature in their analysis (and marks a significant difference with our case). In [BBF22], the authors conducted a more thorough analysis of the properties of the limiting profiles for system (1.9). Contrary to our case, such profiles appear to be Lipschitz continuous, while we show (cf. [ST24], Part 2) the maximal exponent of Hölder continuity to be strictly less than one, thus preventing boundedness of the gradients.

**1.2. Two-by-two interactions.** To give an idea of the scope of our results and the new difficulties to be overcome, let us now make some comparisons with the case, already extensively dealt with in the literature, of binary interactions and the resulting total segregation limit configurations. This serves also as motivation for our study. When condition (1.1) is replaced by the *(full) segregation condition*

$$\phi_i \phi_j \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \text{ for every } i \neq j$$

(namely the positivity sets of  $\phi_i$  and  $\phi_j$  are disjoint), problem

$$(1.10) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u_i = \beta u_i \sum_{j \neq i} u_j^2, & u_i > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \\ u_i = \phi_i & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

was studied in [CL08, NTTV10, Wan14], see also [CL07, CTV03, CTV05b, DWZ12, STTZ16, TT12]. Also in this case one can find a solution  $\mathbf{v}_\beta$  by minimizing the associated functional, and prove that a family of (positive) minimizers weakly converges in  $H^1$  to a fully segregated nonnegative function  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ , namely  $\bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j \equiv 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega$ , for every  $i \neq j$ . At this point, one can consider the same questions (i)-(iii) raised before. The picture is now well understood, and optimal results are available. It is not difficult to show that  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$  is a *harmonic map into a singular space*, in the sense that it is a minimizer for

$$\min \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^3 |\nabla u_i|^2 dx \mid \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{u} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3), \quad u_i = \phi_i \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \\ u_i u_j \equiv 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega, \text{ for every } i \neq j \end{array} \right\}.$$

Notice that the target space is

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x_i x_j = 0 \quad \text{for every } i \neq j, \text{ and } x_i > 0 \text{ for every } i\},$$

which is a singular space with non-positive curvature in the sense of Alexandrov, see [GS92]. Here we see another fundamental difference with the case under investigation in this paper; in our case the

target, not being geodesically convex, cannot have non-positive curvature. This aspect will be further explored in the forthcoming [ST24]. Regarding uniform a priori bounds, it is proved that  $\{\mathbf{u}_\beta : \beta > 1\}$  is bounded in  $C_{\text{loc}}^{0,\alpha}(\Omega)$ , for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Despite the fact that each function  $\mathbf{v}_\beta$  is smooth, this is almost optimal, since the optimal regularity for the limit  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$  turns out to be the Lipschitz continuity. The uniform boundedness in  $C_{\text{loc}}^{0,\alpha}$  entails a number of consequences: it is clear that, up to a subsequence,  $\mathbf{v}_\beta \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{u}}$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^{0,\alpha}(\Omega)$ , for every  $\alpha$ . Moreover, it also allows to prove the strong  $H_{\text{loc}}^1$  convergence, and to derive the basic properties of the limit  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ : it satisfies

$$(1.11) \quad \Delta \bar{u}_i = 0 \quad \text{in } \{u_i > 0\}, \quad \text{and} \quad u_i u_j \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \text{for every } i \neq j,$$

and, in view of the variational structure of problem (1.10), the *domain variation formula* (or *local Pohozaev identity*) (1.8) holds whenever  $B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega$ . Notice that the domain variation formula is the same as the one arising in the partial segregation model, but the fact that it is coupled with the condition of total or partial segregation results in significant differences in the way it can be exploited. In both cases, it is worth to remark that this identity keeps track of the interaction between the different components in the singular limit, an interaction that is lost at the pointwise level (see (1.7) or (1.11)), and it has been the key ingredient to study the free boundary regularity in full segregation models: the free boundary  $\Gamma := \bigcup \partial\{\bar{u}_i > 0\}$  and the *nodal set*  $\{\bar{\mathbf{u}} = 0\}$  (set of points where all the components vanish) coincide;  $\Gamma$  has Hausdorff dimension  $N - 1$  and, more precisely, it splits into a regular part, which is a collection of  $C^{1,\alpha}$ -hypersurfaces, and a singular set of dimension at most  $N - 2$  (optimal); the regular part  $\mathcal{R}$  is characterized by the fact that for any point  $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}$  there exists a radius  $\rho > 0$  such that exactly two components, say  $\bar{u}_1$  and  $\bar{u}_2$ , do not vanish identically in  $B_\rho(x_0)$ , and  $\bar{u}_1 - \bar{u}_2$  is harmonic in  $B_\rho(x_0)$ . Finally, in dimension  $N = 2$  the singular set is discrete, and the regular part consists in a locally finite collection of curves meeting with equal angles at singular points.

We also refer to [Alp20, SZ15, SZ17] for further results such as uniform *Lipschitz* bounds, sharp pointwise decay estimates for solutions to (1.10), and fine properties of the singular set in higher dimension.

The aforementioned results admit an extension into more general contexts: they also holds for non-minimal, sign changing, solutions of systems with reaction terms and *competing groups* of components. We refer the interested reader to [STTZ16] for more details. Moreover, the same issues were considered for system (1.10) with the Laplacian replaced by the fractional Laplacian [TVZ16, TVZ14, TZ20], for systems with *long range interaction* [CPQ17, STTZ18, STZ23], for asymmetric systems with different operators for each component [ST23], and for systems with non-variational interaction [CTV05a, CKL09, TT12], such as

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u_i = \beta u_i \sum_{j \neq i} u_j, & u_i > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \\ u_i = \phi_i & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

In general, the results obtained depend on the particular problem considered, but a common feature is that all these models describe phenomena of full segregation, namely, at each point at most one component of the limiting profile can be non-zero.

**Structure of the paper.** In Section 2, we prove an Alt-Caffarelli-Friedman monotonicity formula tailored for the case of partially segregated densities, and its perturbed version. These monotonicity formulas are used in Section 3 to prove some Liouville-type theorems. The core of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is the content of Section 4. Sections 5 and 6 are devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.7, respectively.

**Basic notation.** We conclude this introduction with some basic notation which will be used throughout the rest of the paper.

- We denote by  $B_r(x_0)$  the ball of center  $x_0$  and radius  $r$ , and by  $S_r(x_0)$  its boundary.

- For  $u \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^{N-1})$ , we consider the optimal value

$$\lambda(u) := \inf \left\{ \frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}} |\nabla \varphi|^2 d\sigma}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}} \varphi^2 d\sigma} \mid \varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^{N-1} \setminus \{0\}) \text{ and } \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\{\varphi \neq 0\} \cap \{u = 0\}) = 0. \right\}.$$

where  $d\sigma = d\sigma_x$  and  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$  stands for the usual  $(N-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure. Notice that, if  $u$  is also continuous, then  $\lambda(u)$  is the first eigenvalue of the Laplace-Beltrami operator with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition on the open set  $\{\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1} : u(\xi) > 0\}$ .

- For  $u \in H^1(S_r(x_0))$ , we set  $u_{x_0,r}(\xi) = u(x_0 + r\xi) \in H^1(S_1) \simeq H^1(\mathbb{S}^{N-1})$ .
- We define  $\gamma : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$

$$\gamma(t) := \sqrt{\left(\frac{N-2}{2}\right)^2 + t} - \frac{N-2}{2}.$$

- For  $N \geq 3$  and  $\delta > 0$ , we define  $\phi_\delta : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  and  $\Phi_\delta : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  by

$$(1.12) \quad \phi_\delta(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{N}{2}\delta^{2-N} + \frac{2-N}{2}\delta^{-N}r^2 & \text{if } 0 \leq r \leq \delta \\ r^{2-N} & \text{if } r > \delta, \end{cases} \quad \Phi_\delta(x) = \phi_\delta(|x|).$$

$\Phi_\delta$  is a  $C^1$  positive superharmonic function in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .

- We often use the vector notation  $\mathbf{u} := (u_1, \dots, u_k)$  for functions  $\mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ . Moreover, we denote by  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k-1}$  the vector obtained from  $\mathbf{u}$  by erasing the  $i$ -th component.
- We say that a function  $v$  is *globally  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous in an open set  $\Omega$* , for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , if the Hölder seminorm

$$[v]_{C^{0,\alpha}(\Omega)} := \sup_{\substack{x \neq y \\ x, y \in \Omega}} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha}$$

is finite. No limitation on the  $L^\infty$  norm of  $v$  is required.

## 2. AN ALT-CAFFARELLI-FRIEDMAN MONOTONICITY FORMULA FOR PARTIALLY SEGREGATED PHASES

The purpose of this section is to establish an ACF-type monotonicity formula for vector valued non-negative subharmonic functions satisfying the partial segregation condition, and some variants.

For  $N \geq 2$ , we define

$$I(u, x_0, r) := \int_{B_r(x_0)} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{|x - x_0|^{N-2}} dx,$$

and

$$J_\nu(u_1, \dots, u_k, x_0, r) := \frac{1}{r^{2\nu}} \prod_{j=1}^k I(u_j, x_0, r)$$

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(B_R)$  be nonnegative, and such that  $\Delta u \geq 0$  in  $B_R$ . Then, for almost every  $r > 0$  such that  $B_r(x_0) \subset\subset B_R$ , we have*

$$\int_{S_r(x_0)} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{|x - x_0|^{N-2}} d\sigma \geq \frac{2\gamma(\lambda(u_{x_0,r}))}{r} \int_{B_r(x_0)} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{|x - x_0|^{N-2}} dx.$$

where  $u_{x_0,r} = u(x_0 + r\xi)$ .

The proof of the lemma is rather standard. We refer to [PSU12, Chapter 2] for a proof under an extra continuity assumption, and to [Vel14, Proof of Theorem 1.3] and [ST23, Lemma 2.2] for the general case.

**Remark 2.2.** Notice that the lemma is valid also in the case when  $\lambda(u_{x_0,r}) = 0$ , which takes place when  $u > 0$  everywhere on  $S_r(x_0)$ . Indeed, in such a situation the left hand side of the inequality is nonnegative, and the right-hand side is 0, being

$$\lambda(u_{x_0,r}) = \lambda_1(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) = 0.$$



We study now the following optimization problem with partial segregation:

$$(2.1) \quad \alpha_{k,N} := \inf \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma(\lambda(u_j)) \mid \begin{array}{l} u_j \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \\ \int_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}} u_1^2 \cdots u_k^2 d\sigma = 0. \end{array} \right\},$$

with the convention that  $\lambda(u) = +\infty$  if  $u \equiv 0$  on  $\mathbb{S}^{N-1}$  (this gives some continuity to  $\lambda(\cdot)$  since, if  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\{u_n > 0\}) \rightarrow 0$ , then  $\lambda(u_n) \rightarrow +\infty$  by the Sobolev inequality). The infimum is greater than or equal to 0, since we are minimizing the sum of non-negative quantities. We also recall that  $\alpha_{2,N} = 2$  (this is the content of the Friedland-Hayman inequality<sup>1</sup>), and the optimal value is reached if and only if  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are 1-homogeneous functions supported on disjoint half-spherical caps (see [PSU12, Chapter 2] and references therein for more details).

**Lemma 2.3.** *It results that  $0 < \alpha_{k,N} \leq 2$ .*

*Proof.* We first prove that  $\alpha_{k,N} > 0$ . Suppose by contradiction that  $\alpha_{k,N} = 0$ . Then there exists a minimizing sequence of  $L^2$ -normalized functions  $\{(u_{1,n}, \dots, u_{k,n})\} \subset H^1(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}, \mathbb{R}^k)$  such that as  $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}} |\nabla u_{j,n}|^2 d\sigma \rightarrow 0, \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}} u_{j,n}^2 d\sigma = 1, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, k$$

and for every  $n$

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}} u_{1,n}^2 \cdots u_{k,n}^2 d\sigma = 0.$$

We deduce that up to a subsequence  $(u_{1,n}, \dots, u_{k,n})$  tends to  $(u_1, \dots, u_k)$  weakly in  $H^1(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}, \mathbb{R}^k)$ , strongly in  $L^2(\mathbb{S}^{N-1}, \mathbb{R}^k)$ , and almost everywhere on  $\mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ . Therefore

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}} |\nabla u_j|^2 d\sigma = 0, \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}} u_j^2 d\sigma = 1, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, k,$$

whence it follows that all the components  $u_i$  are equal to the same constant  $c_N$  on  $\mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ ; but on the other hand, by Fatou's lemma, we also have

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}} u_1^2 \cdots u_k^2 d\sigma = 0,$$

which gives a contradiction.

Let us prove now that  $\alpha_{k,N} \leq 2$ . To this purpose, we choose  $(u_1, \dots, u_k)$  as follows:

$$u_j(x) = \begin{cases} x_1^+ & \text{if } j = 1 \\ x_1^- & \text{if } j = 2 \\ c & \text{if } j \neq 1, 2, \end{cases}$$

where  $c > 0$ , as admissible competitor for  $\alpha_{k,N}$ . Recalling that  $\lambda(c) = 0$ , we obtain

$$\alpha_{k,N} \leq \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma(\lambda(u_j)) = \gamma(\lambda(x_1^+)) + \gamma(\lambda(x_1^-)) = 2\gamma(N-1) = 2,$$

which is the desired estimate.  $\square$

**Remark 2.4.** In dimension  $N = 2$  (and hence also in higher dimension), one may consider the following competitor, having all non-constant components:

$$u_1(\theta) = \begin{cases} \sin\left(\frac{k}{2(k-1)}\theta\right) & \text{if } x \in [0, \frac{2\pi}{k}(k-1)] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

<sup>1</sup>The Friedland-Hayman inequality is usually stated in a slightly different form, involving partitions of the sphere in disjoint open sets. However, in light of the condition  $\int_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}} u_1^2 u_2^2 d\sigma = 0$ , it is not difficult to check that the inequality is equivalent to the fact that  $\alpha_{2,N} = 2$ .



and

$$u_2(\theta) = u_1 \left( \theta - \frac{2\pi}{k} \right), \quad \dots, \quad u_k(\theta) = u_1 \left( \theta - (k-1) \frac{2\pi}{k} \right).$$

Then

$$\prod_{j=1}^k u_j \equiv 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda(u_1) = \dots = \lambda(u_k) = \frac{k^2}{4(k-1)^2},$$

so that

$$\alpha_{k,2} \leq \frac{k^2}{2(k-1)}.$$

However, this number is greater than 2, for every  $k \geq 3$ .

The main result of this section is the following:

**Theorem 2.5** (ACF-type monotonicity formula). *Let  $B_R \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ , and  $u_1, \dots, u_k \in H^1(B_R)$  be such that*

$$\Delta u_j \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u_j \geq 0 \quad \text{in } B_R,$$

with

$$\int_{B_R} u_1^2 \dots u_k^2 dx = 0$$

For  $\nu := \alpha_{k,N}$ , the function  $r \mapsto J_\nu(u_1, \dots, u_k, x_0, r)$  is monotone non-decreasing.

*Proof.* The function  $J(r) := J_{\alpha_{k,N}}(u_1, \dots, u_k, x_0, r)$  is absolutely continuous in  $r$ , and hence a.e.  $r \in (0, \rho := \text{dist}(x_0, \partial B_R))$  is a Lebesgue point of  $J$ . Moreover, for a.e.  $r \in (0, \rho)$  the restrictions  $u_j|_{S_r(x_0)}$  are functions in  $H^1(S_r(x_0))$ , and

$$\int_{S_r(x_0)} u_1^2 \dots u_k^2 d\sigma = 0.$$

We compute the derivative of  $J$  with respect to the radius, denoted by  $J'$ , in any point  $r$  for which both the above properties are satisfied, and in addition Lemma 2.1 holds, and verify that  $J'(r) \geq 0$ .

We suppose that  $I(u_j, x_0, r) > 0$  for every  $j$ , otherwise the fact that  $J'(r) \geq 0$  follows simply from the non-negativity of  $J$ .

Let  $u_{j,x_0,r}(\cdot) = u_j(x_0 + r \cdot)$ . By assumption  $\int_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}} u_{1,x_0,r}^2 \dots u_{k,x_0,r}^2 d\sigma = 0$  for a.e.  $r$ , and, by Lemma 2.1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{J'(r)}{J(r)} &= \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{I'(u_j, x_0, r)}{I(u_j, x_0, r)} - \frac{2\alpha_{k,N}}{r} = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\int_{S_r(x_0)} |\nabla u_j|^2 |x|^{2-N} d\sigma}{\int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u_j|^2 |x|^{2-N} dx} - \frac{2\alpha_{k,N}}{r} \\ &\geq \frac{2}{r} \left( \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma(\lambda(u_{j,x_0,r})) - \alpha_{k,N} \right) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is the desired result.  $\square$

**2.1. Perturbed monotonicity formula.** In this subsection we generalize the previous monotonicity formula in order to deal with non-segregated solutions of a class of elliptic systems. Recall that, for  $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_k)$ , we denote by  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i$  the vector obtained by erasing the  $i$ -th component from  $\mathbf{u}$ . We consider

$$(2.2) \quad -\Delta u_i + u_i^{q_i} g_i(x, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i) = 0, \quad u_i > 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \quad i = 1, \dots, k,$$

where  $q_i \geq 1$  for every  $i$ , under the following assumptions on  $g_i \in C(\mathbb{R}^N \times ([0, +\infty))^{k-1}, [0, +\infty))$ :

- (H1)  $\bar{g}_i(\hat{\mathbf{t}}_i) := \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} g_i(x, \hat{\mathbf{t}}_i)$  is a continuous function, with the property that  $\bar{g}_i(\hat{\mathbf{t}}_i) > 0$  if  $t_j > 0$  for every  $j$ , and  $\bar{g}_i(\hat{\mathbf{t}}_i) = 0$  if at least one component of  $\hat{\mathbf{t}}_i$  vanishes. Even more, we suppose that  $g_i(x, \hat{\mathbf{t}}_i) = 0$  for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , if one component of  $\hat{\mathbf{t}}_i$  vanishes.

(H2) For every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $g_i(x, \cdot)$  is monotone non-decreasing in all its variables.

A prototypical example is

$$g_i(x, \hat{\mathbf{t}}_i) = b(x) \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^k t_j^{p_{ij}}, \quad \text{with } \inf_{\mathbb{R}^N} b > 0 \text{ and } p_{ij} > 0.$$

For  $\mathbf{u}$  solving (2.2),  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and  $r > 0$ , we use the following notation

$$\tilde{I}_i(\mathbf{u}, x_0, r) := \int_{B_r(x_0)} \left( |\nabla u_i|^2 + u_i^{q_i+1} g_i(x, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i) \right) |x - x_0|^{2-N} dx.$$

**Theorem 2.6** (Perturbed monotonicity formula). *Let  $\mathbf{u} \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^k) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^k)$  satisfy (2.2), with  $q_1, \dots, q_k \geq 1$ , and  $g_i : \mathbb{R}^N \times ([0, +\infty))^{k-1} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  continuous and satisfying (H1) and (H2). For  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $\nu := \alpha_{k,N}$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\bar{r} > 0$  such that the function*

$$r \mapsto \tilde{J}_{\nu-\varepsilon}(\mathbf{u}, x_0, r) := \frac{1}{r^{2(\nu-\varepsilon)}} \prod_{j=1}^k \tilde{I}_j(\mathbf{u}, x_0, r)$$

is monotone non-decreasing for  $r > \bar{r}$ .

For the proof, we start with an estimate similar to the one in Lemma 2.1. We introduce

$$\Lambda_i(x_0, r) = \frac{r^2 \int_{S_r(x_0)} \left( |\nabla_{\theta} u_i|^2 + u_i^{q_i+1} g_i(x, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i) \right) d\sigma}{\int_{S_r(x_0)} u_i^2 d\sigma}, \quad i = 1, \dots, k,$$

which are well defined for a.e.  $r$ .

**Lemma 2.7.** *In the previous setting, for every  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and a.e.  $r > 0$*

$$\int_{S_r(x_0)} \left( |\nabla u_i|^2 + u_i^{q_i+1} g_i(x, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i) \right) |x - x_0|^{2-N} d\sigma \geq \frac{2\gamma(\Lambda_i(x_0, r))}{r} \tilde{I}_i(\mathbf{u}, x_0, r).$$

The proof is analogue to the one of Lemma 2.1, we refer the interested reader to [ST15, Lemma 5.1] (see also [CTV05a, Lemma 7.3] or [NTTV10, Lemma 2.5]) for the details.

*Proof of Theorem 2.6.* The proof is similar to the one of [ST15, Lemma 5.2] (see also [CTV05a, Lemma 7.3], [NTTV10, Lemma 2.5]). Without loss of generality, we fix  $x_0 = 0$ . As in the proof of Theorem 2.5, thanks to Lemma 2.7, we have

$$\frac{\tilde{J}'(r)}{\tilde{J}(r)} \geq \frac{2}{r} \left( \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma(\Lambda_j(x_0, r)) - (\alpha_{k,N} - \varepsilon) \right),$$

and the thesis follows if we show that the right hand side is non-negative for  $r$  sufficiently large. Suppose by contradiction that this is not true: then there exists  $r_n \rightarrow +\infty$  such that

$$(2.3) \quad \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma(\Lambda_j(x_0, r_n)) < \alpha_{k,N} - \varepsilon,$$

and, in particular,  $\{\Lambda_i(x_0, r_n)\}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, k$ ) are bounded sequences. Without loss, from now on we fix  $x_0 = 0$  to ease the notation. Let

$$u_{i,n}(x) = \frac{u_i(r_n x)}{\left( \frac{1}{r_n^{N-1}} \int_{S_{r_n}} u_i^2 d\sigma \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

We have that

$$\int_{S_1} |\nabla_{\theta} u_{i,n}|^2 d\sigma \leq \Lambda_i(0, r_n),$$

so that  $\{\mathbf{u}_n\}$  is bounded in  $H^1(S_1, \mathbb{R}^k)$ ; moreover

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{S_1} u_{1,n}^{q_1+1} \bar{g}_1 \left( \left( \frac{1}{r_n^{N-1}} \int_{S_{r_n}} u_2^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} u_{2,n}, \dots, \left( \frac{1}{r_n^{N-1}} \int_{S_{r_n}} u_k^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} u_{k,n} \right) d\sigma \\ & \leq \frac{r_n^2 \int_{S_{r_n}} u_1^{q_1+1} g_1(x, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_1) d\sigma}{\int_{S_{r_n}} u_1^2 d\sigma} \cdot \frac{1}{r_n^2 \left( \frac{1}{r_n^{N-1}} \int_{S_{r_n}} u_1^2 d\sigma \right)^{\frac{q_1-1}{2}}} \\ & \leq \frac{\Lambda_1(0, r_n)}{r_n^2 \left( \frac{1}{r_n^{N-1}} \int_{S_{r_n}} u_1^2 d\sigma \right)^{\frac{q_1-1}{2}}} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where we used assumption (H1) and the subharmonicity of  $u_1$ , which ensures that

$$\frac{1}{r_n^{N-1}} \int_{S_{r_n}} u_i^2 d\sigma \geq u_i^2(0) > 0 \quad \forall n.$$

Similar estimates also holds for the index 1 replaced by any  $i = 2, \dots, k$ . Therefore, we deduce that up to a subsequence  $\mathbf{u}_n \rightharpoonup \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  weakly in  $H^1(S_1)$ , strongly in  $L^2(S_1)$ , and  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ -almost everywhere, where  $\tilde{u}_1 \cdots \tilde{u}_k = 0$   $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ -a.e. on  $S_1$ : indeed, the previous estimates, Fatou's lemma, and the assumptions on  $g_i$  ensure that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{S_1} \tilde{u}_1^{q_1+1} \bar{g}_1(\delta \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i) d\sigma \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S_1} u_{1,n}^{q_1+1} \bar{g}_1(\delta \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{i,n}) d\sigma \\ & \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S_1} u_{1,n}^{q_1+1} \bar{g}_1 \left( \left( \frac{1}{r_n^{N-1}} \int_{S_{r_n}} u_2^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} u_{2,n}, \dots, \left( \frac{1}{r_n^{N-1}} \int_{S_{r_n}} u_k^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} u_{k,n} \right) d\sigma = 0, \end{aligned}$$

so that in  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ -a.e. point of  $S_1$  one component  $\tilde{u}_i$  must vanish.

Coming back to (2.3), we obtain by definitions of  $\alpha_{k,N}$  and  $\gamma$

$$\alpha_{k,N} \leq \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma(\lambda(\tilde{u}_j)) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma(\Lambda_j(0, r_n)) < \alpha_{k,N} - \varepsilon,$$

which is a contradiction.  $\square$

### 3. LIOUVILLE-TYPE THEOREMS

The validity of the ACF monotonicity formulae proved in Section 2 allows us to obtain some nonexistence results. We first recall some preliminaries.

**3.1. Essentially known results.** In this section we recall some useful preliminary results which are probably known, and will be often used in the next sections. At first, we recall the following estimate proved in [CTV05a, Lemma 4.4].

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $R > 0$ , and let  $u \in H^1(B_{2R})$  satisfy*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u \leq -Mu & \text{in } B_{2R} \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } B_{2R} \\ u \leq A & \text{on } \partial B_{2R}, \end{cases}$$

for some  $A, M > 0$ . Then there exists  $C > 0$  such that

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq CAe^{-\frac{R\sqrt{M}}{2}}.$$

Now we state some Liouville-type theorems for globally Hölder continuous solutions of certain elliptic problems. Recall that, for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , we say that  $v$  is globally  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  if the seminorm  $[v]_{C^{0,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^N)}$  is finite (no limitation on the  $L^\infty$  norm of  $v$  is required).

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , and let  $w$  be a globally  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous function in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Suppose moreover that one the following equation is satisfied by  $w$ :*

- (i) either  $\Delta w = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ ;
- (ii) or  $\Delta w = \lambda$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ;
- (iii) or else  $\Delta w = \lambda w$  with  $\lambda > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .

Then  $w$  must be constant and, in case (iii),  $w \equiv 0$ .

*Proof.* Point (i) is the classical Liouville theorem for harmonic functions.

(ii) For a fixed  $h \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , let  $\varphi(x) := w(x+h) - w(x)$ , defined for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ . Plainly,  $\varphi$  is harmonic and globally Hölder continuous. Therefore, it must be equal to a constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , which implies that

$$w(x+h) = w(x) + c \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

By taking the derivative of both sides with respect to  $x_i$ , we infer that

$$\partial_{x_i} w(x+h) = \partial_{x_i} w(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Since this holds true for every  $h \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , all the partial derivatives  $\partial_{x_i} w$  must be constant on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . On the other hand, the global Hölder continuity implies that  $w$  has at most strictly sublinear growth at infinity, and hence such partial derivatives must vanish everywhere.

(iii) Notice that  $\Delta w^+ \geq \lambda w^+$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , by Kato's inequality. Since  $0 \leq w^+(x) \leq C(1 + |x|^\alpha)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , by Lemma 3.1 we deduce that for every  $R > 0$  there exists  $C > 0$  (independent of  $R$ ) such that

$$w^+(x) \leq C(1 + (2R)^\alpha)e^{-\frac{1}{2}R\sqrt{\lambda}} \quad \text{for every } x \in B_R.$$

By taking the limit as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ , we deduce that  $w^+ \equiv 0$ . In a similar way, we can also show that  $w^- \equiv 0$ .  $\square$

Now we recall some Liouville-type theorems for systems with 2 components.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , and let  $u, v \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^N)$  be globally  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous functions in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Suppose moreover that one the following equation is satisfied by  $(u, v)$ :*

- (i) either

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = \lambda u v^2 \\ \Delta v = \lambda u^2 v, \end{cases} \quad u, v \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

with  $\lambda > 0$ ;

- (ii) or

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u \geq 0 \\ \Delta v \geq 0 \\ uv \equiv 0, \end{cases} \quad u, v \geq 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Then one component of  $(u, v)$  must vanish; moreover, in case (i), the other must be constant.

These results are proved in [NTTV10, Section 2].

**3.2. Liouville theorem for partially segregated functions.** We aim to obtain some Liouville-type theorems similar to Proposition 3.3 for systems modelling partial segregation. The first main result of this section is the following:

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $k \geq 3$  and  $N \geq 2$  be positive integers, and let  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_{k,N}/k)$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , let  $u_i \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^N)$  be globally  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous functions in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , such that*

$$-\Delta u_i \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u_i \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

and moreover the partial segregation condition holds:

$$\prod_{j=1}^k u_j \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Then at least one function  $u_j$  must be constant.

*Proof.* By using the monotonicity formula we show that this provides a contradiction, following the same strategy developed in [NTTV10, Proposition 2.2].

Let us suppose by contradiction that  $u_i$  is non-constant in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, k$ . This implies that there exists  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and  $\bar{r} > 0$  sufficiently large such that  $I(u_i, x_0, \bar{r}) > 0$  for every  $i$ , so that, by the monotonicity formula in Theorem 2.5,

$$\prod_{j=1}^k I(u_j, x_0, r) \geq C_1 r^{2\alpha_{k,N}} \quad \text{for } r > \bar{r},$$

with  $C_1 > 0$ . Let now  $r > \bar{r}$ , and consider a radial smooth cutoff function  $\eta$  such that  $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$ ,  $\eta = 1$  in  $B_r(x_0)$ ,  $\eta = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{2r}(x_0)$ , and  $|\nabla \eta| \leq C/r$ . By testing the inequality satisfied by  $u_i$  with  $\eta^2 \Phi_\delta(x - x_0) u_i$  (with  $\Phi_\delta$  defined in (1.12)), and proceeding as in [NTTV10, Proof of Proposition 2.2], we obtain

$$I(u_i, x_0, r) \leq C_2 r^{2\alpha},$$

with  $C_2 > 0$ . By combining the former inequalities, we conclude that for  $r > \bar{r}$

$$C_1 r^{2\alpha_{k,N}} \leq C_2 r^{2k\alpha},$$

which is a contradiction for large  $r$  since  $k\alpha < \alpha_{k,N}$ . □

In the next section, we will use the following variant.

**Corollary 3.5.** *Let  $N \geq 2$  be a positive integer, and let  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_{3,N}/3)$ . For  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , let  $u_i \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^N)$  be globally  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous functions in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , such that*

$$-\Delta u_i \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u_i \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

and moreover the partial segregation condition holds:

$$u_1 u_2 u_3 \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Then at least one component  $u_i$  vanishes identically.

*Proof.* By Theorem 3.4, at least one component  $u_i$  is constant,  $u_i \equiv c \in \mathbb{R}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . If  $c = 0$ , then the proof is complete. Suppose instead that  $c > 0$ . Then the remaining components, which we denote by  $u$  and  $v$ , satisfy system (3.1), and hence by Proposition 3.3 one of them must vanish identically. □

**3.3. Liouville theorem for solutions to certain elliptic systems.** The second main result of this section is the following:

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let  $k \geq 3$  and  $N \geq 2$  be positive integers, and, for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , let  $u_i \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^N)$  be nonnegative functions satisfying a system of type (2.2) in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , where  $q_1, \dots, q_k \geq 1$ , and the coupling terms  $g_i$  satisfy assumptions (H1) and (H2). Assume moreover that*

$$0 \leq u_i(x) \leq C(1 + |x|^\alpha) \quad \text{for every } x \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

with  $\alpha < \alpha_{k,N}/k$ . Then at least one component  $u_i$  vanishes identically.

*Proof.* Suppose by contradiction that all the components are non-trivial. By the maximum principle, we have that  $u_i > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  for every  $i$ . Let  $0 < \varepsilon < \alpha_{k,N} - k\alpha$ . Then, by Theorem 2.6, there exist  $C, \bar{r} > 0$  such that

$$(3.2) \quad \prod_{j=1}^k \tilde{I}_j(\mathbf{u}, 0, r) \geq Cr^{2(\alpha_{k,N} - \varepsilon)}$$

for  $r > \bar{r}$ . On the other hand, let  $\eta$  be a cutoff function as in the proof of Theorem 3.4, and let  $\Phi_\delta$  be defined in (1.12). By testing the inequality satisfied by  $u_i$  by  $\eta^2 \Phi_\delta u_i$ , we obtain (as in [NTTV10, Proposition 2.6] or [ST23, Theorem 3.4])

$$\tilde{I}_i(\mathbf{u}, 0, r) \leq Cr^{2\alpha}$$

for  $r > 1$  and for every  $i$ . This gives a contradiction with (3.2) for  $r$  large, since  $k\alpha < \alpha_{k,N} - \varepsilon$ .  $\square$

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is the content of the rest of this section. The general strategy is inspired by [CTV05a, NTTV10, STTZ16, TVZ16, Wan14]. However, we have to substantially modify the argument in order to deal with our interaction term modeling partial segregation.

Without loss of generality, we suppose that  $\Omega \supset B_3$ , and we aim at proving the uniform Hölder bound in  $B_1$ . We know that

$$\sup_{i=1,2,3} \|u_{i,\beta}\|_{L^\infty(B_2)} \leq C < +\infty$$

independently on  $\beta$ . Let  $\eta \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  be a radially decreasing cut-off function such that  $\eta \equiv 1$  in  $\overline{B_1}$ ,  $\eta \equiv 0$  in  $B_3 \setminus B_2$ .

We fix  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_{3,N}/3)$ , and aim at proving that the family  $\{\eta \mathbf{u}_\beta\}_{\beta > 1}$  admits a uniform bound on the  $\alpha$ -Hölder semi-norm, that is, there exists  $C > 0$ , independent of  $\beta$ , such that

$$(4.1) \quad \sup_{i=1,2,3} \sup_{\substack{x \neq y \\ x, y \in B_3}} \frac{|(\eta u_{i,\beta})(x) - (\eta u_{i,\beta})(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha} \leq C.$$

Since  $\eta \equiv 1$  in  $\overline{B_1}$ , once (4.1) is proved, Theorem 1.1 follows.

Let us assume by contradiction that there exists a sequence  $\beta_n \rightarrow +\infty$  and a corresponding sequence  $\{\mathbf{u}_n := \mathbf{u}_{\beta_n}\}$  such that

$$L_n := \sup_{i=1,2,3} \sup_{\substack{x \neq y \\ x, y \in B_3}} \frac{|(\eta u_{i,n})(x) - (\eta u_{i,n})(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Since, for  $\beta_n$  fixed, the functions  $\mathbf{u}_{i,n}$  are smooth, we may assume that up to a relabelling the supremum is achieved for  $i = 1$  and at a pair of points  $x_n, y_n \in \overline{B_2}$ , with  $x_n \neq y_n$ . As  $\{\mathbf{u}_n\}$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty(B_2)$ , we have that

$$|x_n - y_n|^\alpha = \frac{|(\eta u_{1,n})(x_n) - (\eta u_{1,n})(y_n)|}{L_n} \leq \frac{C}{L_n} \rightarrow 0$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

4.1. **Blow-up analysis.** The contradiction argument is based on two blow-up sequences:

$$v_{i,n}(x) := \eta(x_n) \frac{u_{i,n}(x_n + r_n x)}{L_n r_n^\alpha} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{v}_{i,n}(x) := \frac{(\eta u_{i,n})(x_n + r_n x)}{L_n r_n^\alpha},$$

where

$$r_n := |x_n - y_n| \rightarrow 0^+,$$

both defined on the scaled domain

$$\frac{\Omega - x_n}{r_n} \supset \frac{B_3 - x_n}{r_n} =: \Omega_n \supset B_{1/r_n},$$

which exhaust  $\mathbb{R}^N$  as  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ .

Now, the function  $\bar{\mathbf{v}}_n$  is the one for which the Hölder quotient is normalized (see Lemma 4.1-(1) ahead), however it satisfies a rather complicated system. On the other hand,  $\mathbf{v}_n$  satisfies a simple system related to (1.3), but it may not be have bounded seminorm. We will also check that both blow-up functions have (locally) comparable  $L^\infty$  norms and oscillations, and this allows to interchange information from one function to the other. This idea was firstly used in the context of singularly perturbed elliptic systems with full competition by K. Wang [Wan14] (see also [STTZ16]).

Basic properties of the blow-up sequences are collected in the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.1.** *In the previous setting, it results that:*

(i) *the sequence  $\{\bar{\mathbf{v}}_n\}$  has uniformly bounded  $\alpha$ -Hölder semi-norm in  $\Omega_n$ , and in particular*

$$\sup_{i=1,2,3} \sup_{\substack{x \neq y \\ x, y \in \Omega_n}} \frac{|\bar{v}_{i,n}(x) - \bar{v}_{i,n}(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha} = \frac{|\bar{v}_{1,n}(0) - \bar{v}_{1,n}\left(\frac{y_n - x_n}{r_n}\right)|}{\left|\frac{y_n - x_n}{r_n}\right|^\alpha} = 1$$

for every  $n$ .

(ii)  *$v_{i,n}$  is a solution of*

$$(4.2) \quad \Delta v_{i,n} = M_n v_{i,n} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{j,n}^2, \quad v_{i,n} > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_n,$$

where

$$M_n := \beta_n r_n^{2+4\alpha} \left( \frac{L_n}{\eta(x_n)} \right)^4.$$

(iii) *for every open set  $\omega \subset \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  we have*

$$\sup_K |\mathbf{v}_n - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_n| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

(iv) *for every compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ , and for every  $n$  so large that  $\Omega_n \supset K$ , we have*

$$|v_{i,n}(x) - v_{i,n}(y)| \leq o_n(1) + |x - y|^\alpha \quad \text{for every } x, y \in K,$$

where  $o_n(1) \rightarrow 0$  uniformly on  $x, y \in K$ ; in particular  $\{v_{i,n}\}$  has uniformly bounded oscillation in any compact set.

(v)  *$\mathbf{v}_n$  is a minimizer of (4.2) with respect to variations with compact support, namely for every  $\Omega' \subset \subset \mathbb{R}^N$*

$$J_{M_n}(\mathbf{v}_n, \Omega') \leq J_{M_n}(\mathbf{v}_n + \varphi, \Omega') \quad \forall \varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega', \mathbb{R}^3),$$

for sufficiently large  $n$ , where  $J_{M_n}(\mathbf{u}, \Omega)$  is defined as in (1.4).

*Proof.* The proof of points (i), (ii) and (v) is trivial. As far as (iii) is concerned, since  $\eta$  is globally Lipschitz continuous with constant denoted by  $l$ , and  $\{u_{i,n}\}$  is uniformly bounded in  $K$ , we have

$$|v_{i,n}(x) - \bar{v}_{i,n}(x)| = \frac{|u_{i,n}(x_n + r_n x)|}{L_n r_n^\alpha} |\eta(x_n) - \eta(x_n + r_n x)| \leq \frac{l M r_n^{1-\alpha}}{L_n} |x|,$$



where we recall that  $\|u_{i,n}\|_{L^\infty(B_3)} \leq M$  for every  $i$  and  $n$ . Finally, for (iv) we use point (iii) and the uniform Hölder boundedness of the sequence  $\{\bar{\mathbf{v}}_n\}$ .  $\square$

In the next statement we collect some useful properties which take place when one component is bounded at 0.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Suppose that  $\{v_{i,n}(0)\}$  is bounded. Then there exists a function  $v_i \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , globally  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous, such that, up to a subsequence:*

- (i)  $v_{i,n}, \bar{v}_{i,n} \rightarrow v_i$  locally uniformly on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ ;
- (ii)  $v_i$  is non-constant in  $B_1$  if  $i = 1$ ;
- (iii) for every  $\omega \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^N$  compact there exists  $C > 0$  such that

$$M_n \int_{\omega} \left( \prod_{j \neq i} v_{j,n}^2 \right) v_{i,n} dx \leq C$$

- (iv)  $v_{i,n} \rightarrow v_i$  strongly in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ .

*Proof.* Point (i) follows directly from Ascoli-Arzelà theorem and Lemma 4.1. Point (ii) is a consequence of the definition of  $\{\bar{\mathbf{v}}_n\}$ . Concerning point (iii), let us test the equation for  $v_{i,n}$  with a cutoff function  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . We obtain

$$M_n \int_{\Omega_n} \left( \prod_{j \neq i} v_{j,n}^2 \right) v_{i,n} \varphi dx = \int_{\Omega_n} v_{i,n} \Delta \varphi dx,$$

whence the desired estimate follows. Finally, for point (iv), let us test the equation for  $v_{i,n}$  with  $v_{i,n} \varphi^2$ , where  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is an arbitrary non-negative cutoff function. We obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_n} \left( |\nabla v_{i,n}|^2 \varphi^2 + 2v_{i,n} \varphi \nabla v_{i,n} \cdot \nabla \varphi + M_n \varphi^2 \prod_{j=1}^3 v_{j,n}^2 \right) dx = 0.$$

This implies that

$$\int_{\Omega_n} |\nabla v_{i,n}|^2 \varphi^2 dx \leq 4 \int_{\Omega_n} v_{i,n}^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx,$$

which entails the boundedness of  $\{v_{i,n}\}$  in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , and hence up to a subsequence  $v_{i,n} \rightharpoonup v_i$  weakly in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . To show the strong convergence, we test the equation for  $v_{i,n}$  with  $(v_{i,n} - v_i) \varphi$ , where  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is an arbitrary non-negative cutoff function, and observe that

$$\int_{\Omega_n} \varphi \nabla v_{i,n} \cdot \nabla (v_{i,n} - v_i) dx \leq \|v_{i,n} - v_i\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp}(\varphi))} \int_{\Omega_n} \left( |\nabla v_{i,n} \cdot \nabla \varphi| + M_n \varphi v_{i,n} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{j,n}^2 \right) dx.$$

The previous points ensure that the right hand side tends to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore

$$\lim_n \int_{\Omega_n} \varphi (|\nabla v_{i,n}|^2 - |\nabla v_i|^2) dx = \lim_n \int_{\Omega_n} \varphi \nabla v_{i,n} \cdot \nabla (v_{i,n} - v_i) dx = 0,$$

and the proof is complete.  $\square$

The previous lemma shows that the boundedness of  $\{v_{i,n}(0)\}$  entails several consequences. On the other hand, we do not know whether this property holds or not. If not, we will often use the following statement.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let*

$$\mathbf{w}_n(x) := \mathbf{v}_n(x) - \mathbf{v}_n(0), \quad \bar{\mathbf{w}}_n(x) := \bar{\mathbf{v}}_n(x) - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_n(0).$$

*Then there exists a function  $\mathbf{w}$ , globally  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , such that  $\mathbf{w}_n, \bar{\mathbf{w}}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{w}$  locally uniformly in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Moreover,  $w_1$  is non-constant.*

*Proof.* The local uniform convergence  $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{w}$  follows directly by the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem and the uniform bound on the  $C^{0,\alpha}$  seminorm of  $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_n$ . Moreover the  $\alpha$ -Hölder seminorm of  $\mathbf{w}$  is equal to 1, and  $w_1$  is non-constant. The fact that also  $\mathbf{w}_n$  converges to  $\mathbf{w}$  is a consequence of Lemma 4.1-(iii).  $\square$

In the next lemmas we focus on what happens if at least one component is unbounded. We will reach a contradiction in all the possible cases.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Suppose that up to a subsequence  $v_{i,n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$ . Then for every  $r > 0$  there exists  $C > 0$  such that*

$$M_n v_{i,n}(0) \int_{B_r} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{j,n}^2 dx \leq C.$$

*Proof.* We define

$$\begin{aligned} H_{i,n}(r) &:= \frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \int_{S_r} v_{i,n}^2 d\sigma, \\ E_{i,n}(r) &:= \frac{1}{r^{N-2}} \int_{S_r} \left( |\nabla v_{i,n}|^2 + M_n \prod_{j=1}^3 v_{j,n}^2 \right) dx \end{aligned}$$

By multiplying the equation of  $v_{i,n}$  by  $v_{i,n}$ , and integrating on  $B_r$ , we see that

$$\int_{B_r} \left( |\nabla v_{i,n}|^2 + M_n \prod_{j=1}^3 v_{j,n}^2 \right) dx = \int_{S_r} v_{i,n} \partial_\nu v_{i,n} d\sigma,$$

whence

$$H'_{i,n}(r) = \frac{2}{r} E_{i,n}(r).$$

Therefore, integrating from  $r/2$  to  $r$  we obtain

$$(4.3) \quad H_{i,n}(r) - H_{i,n}\left(\frac{r}{2}\right) = \int_{r/2}^r \frac{2}{s} E_{i,n}(s) ds.$$

Now, the left hand side can be estimated from above thanks to Lemma 4.1 - properties (i) and (iv):

$$H_{i,n}(r) - H_{i,n}\left(\frac{r}{2}\right) = \int_{S_1} \left( v_{i,n}^2(ry) - v_{i,n}^2\left(\frac{r}{2}y\right) \right) dy \leq C(r) (v_{i,n}(0) + 1) \leq C_1(r) v_{i,n}(0).$$

Moreover, the right hand side of (4.3) can be estimated from below as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{r/2}^r \frac{2}{s} E_{i,n}(s) ds &\geq \frac{r}{2} \min_{s \in [\frac{r}{2}, r]} \frac{2}{s} E_{i,n}(s) \\ &\geq r M_n \min_{s \in [\frac{r}{2}, r]} \frac{1}{s^{N-1}} \int_{B_s} \prod_{j=1}^3 v_{j,n}^2 dx \\ &\geq C_2(r) M_n v_{i,n}^2(0) \int_{B_{r/2}} \frac{v_{i,n}^2}{v_{i,n}^2(0)} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{j,n}^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $v_{i,n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$  and the oscillation of  $v_{i,n}$  is locally uniformly bounded, we have that  $v_{i,n}/v_{i,n}(0) \rightarrow 1$  uniformly on  $B_{r/2}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, coming back to (4.3), we finally infer that

$$M_n v_{i,n}^2(0) \int_{B_{r/2}} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{j,n}^2 dx \leq C(r) v_{i,n}(0),$$

whence the thesis follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5.** *Suppose that up to a subsequence  $v_{i_1,n}(0), v_{i_2,n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$  for a couple of indexes  $i_1, i_2 \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Then*

$$M_n v_{i_1,n}^2(0) v_{i_2,n}^2(0) \leq C$$

for a positive constant  $C > 0$  independent of  $n$ .

*Proof.* We argue by contradiction, and suppose that up to a subsequence  $M_n v_{i_1,n}^2(0) v_{i_2,n}^2(0) \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Step 1)* Let  $\underline{i} \in \{1, 2, 3\} \setminus \{i_1, i_2\}$ . For any  $R > 1$ , we claim that  $\|v_{\underline{i},n}\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \leq C$  for a positive constant  $C > 0$  depending only on  $R$ .

First of all, since  $v_{j,n}$  has locally bounded oscillation for each  $i$  (Lemma 4.1), we have that  $v_{j,n} \rightarrow +\infty$  locally uniformly for  $j = i_1, i_2$ . Moreover, there exists  $C_R > 0$  depending on  $R$  but not on  $n$  such that

$$(4.4) \quad I_n := M_n \inf_{B_R} v_{i_1,n}^2 v_{i_2,n}^2 \geq M_n (v_{i_1,n}(0) - C_R)^2 (v_{i_2,n}(0) - C_R)^2 \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Let us test the equation of  $v_{\underline{i},n}$  with  $v_{\underline{i},n} \varphi^2$ , with  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$  such that  $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$ ,  $\varphi \equiv 1$  in  $B_R$ , and  $\text{supp}(\varphi) \subset B_{2R}$ : we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_n} \left( |\nabla v_{i,n}|^2 \varphi^2 + 2v_{i,n} \varphi \nabla v_{i,n} \cdot \nabla \varphi + M_n \varphi^2 \prod_{j=1}^3 v_{j,n}^2 \right) dx = 0,$$

whence by standard computations

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} C_R I_n \inf_{B_R} v_{\underline{i},n}^2 &\leq M_n \int_{B_R} \prod_{j=1}^3 v_{j,n}^2 dx \leq \int_{\Omega_n} \left( \frac{1}{2} |\nabla v_{\underline{i},n}|^2 \varphi^2 + M_n \varphi^2 \prod_{j=1}^3 v_{j,n}^2 \right) dx \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\Omega_n} v_{\underline{i},n}^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx \leq C_R \sup_{B_{2R}} v_{\underline{i},n}^2, \end{aligned}$$

for some  $C_R > 0$ . We also observe that  $\inf_{B_R} v_{\underline{i},n} \geq \sup_{B_{2R}} v_{\underline{i},n} - C_R$ , with  $C_R > 0$  (once again, we used the fact that  $\mathbf{v}_n$  has locally bounded oscillation). Therefore, (4.5) yields

$$I_n \sup_{B_{2R}} v_{\underline{i},n}^2 \leq C_R \left( \sup_{B_{2R}} v_{\underline{i},n}^2 + I_n \sup_{B_{2R}} v_{\underline{i},n} \right),$$

which, in view of (4.4), is possible only if  $\sup_{B_{2R}} v_{\underline{i},n}^2$  is bounded, as claimed.

*Step 2)* Conclusion of the proof.

By definition of  $I_n$ , we have that

$$-\Delta v_{\underline{i},n} \leq -I_n v_{\underline{i},n} \quad \text{in } B_R.$$

By Lemma 3.1, Step 1, and recalling that  $I_n \rightarrow +\infty$ , we infer that

$$\sup_{B_{R/2}} v_{\underline{i},n} \leq C \sup_{B_R} v_{\underline{i},n} e^{-\frac{R\sqrt{I_n}}{2}} \rightarrow 0$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $R > 1$  was arbitrarily chosen,  $v_{\underline{i},n} \rightarrow 0$  locally uniformly in the whole space  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Together with Lemma 4.2, this rules out the case  $\underline{i} = 1$ . Thus, without loss of generality, we can suppose that  $\underline{i} = 3$ ,  $i_1 = 1$ ,  $i_2 = 2$ .

Let now  $R > 1$ , and  $\bar{x}_n \in \overline{B_R}$  such that

$$M_n v_{1,n}^2 v_{2,n}^2(\bar{x}_n) = I_n,$$

where  $I_n$  is defined in (4.4). Since  $\{\mathbf{v}_n\}$  has locally bounded oscillation, while  $v_{1,n}, v_{2,n} \rightarrow +\infty$  locally uniformly, we have that

$$M_n (v_{1,n} v_{2,n}(x))^2 \leq (v_{1,n}(\bar{x}_n) + C_R)^2 (v_{2,n}(\bar{x}_n) + C_R)^2 \leq 2M_n (v_{1,n} v_{2,n}(\bar{x}_n))^2 = 2I_n$$

for every  $x \in B_R$ . Using once again that  $v_{1,n} \rightarrow +\infty$  locally uniformly, while  $\{v_{3,n}\}$  is locally bounded, we deduce that there exists  $C_R > 0$  such that

$$|\Delta v_{1,n}(x)| \leq M_n v_{1,n}^2(x) \prod_{j \neq 1} v_{j,n}^2(x) \leq M_n (v_{1,n} v_{2,n}(x))^2 C_R e^{-C_R \sqrt{I_n}} \leq C_R I_n e^{-C_R \sqrt{I_n}} \quad \forall x \in B_R.$$

If we consider  $w_{1,n} := v_{1,n} - v_{1,n}(0)$ , as in Lemma 4.3, this implies that  $w_{1,n} \rightarrow w_1$  locally uniformly in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , with  $w_1$  globally Hölder continuous, non-constant, and harmonic. Indeed,  $|\Delta w_{1,n}| = |\Delta v_{1,n}| \rightarrow 0$  locally uniformly in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . By the classical Liouville theorem for harmonic functions, this is the desired contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.6.** *It is not possible that  $v_{i,n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$  for every  $i = 1, 2, 3$ .*

*Proof.* By contradiction, we suppose that  $v_{i,n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$  for every  $i$ . Then  $v_{i,n}(z) \rightarrow +\infty$  for every  $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$  as well; more precisely, since  $v_{j,n}$  has locally bounded oscillation, we have that

$$(4.6) \quad \frac{v_{j,n}}{v_{j,n}(0)} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{uniformly on any compact set.}$$

Thus, for any  $r > 0$ , we have that

$$\int_{B_r} \prod_{j \neq 1} \left( \frac{v_{j,n}}{v_{j,n}(0)} \right)^2 dx \rightarrow 1$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and by Lemma 4.4

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} M_n v_{1,n}(0) \prod_{j \neq 1} v_{j,n}^2(0) &\leq 2M_n v_{1,n}(0) \prod_{j \neq 1} v_{j,n}^2(0) \int_{B_r} \prod_{j \neq 1} \left( \frac{v_{j,n}}{v_{j,n}(0)} \right)^2 dx \\ &= 2M_n v_{1,n}(0) \int_{B_r} \prod_{j \neq 1} v_{j,n}^2 dx \leq C, \end{aligned}$$

with  $C$  independent of  $n$ ; namely, the right hand side in the equation of  $v_{1,n}$  is bounded at 0. Actually, thanks to (4.6) and (4.7), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} &|M_n v_{1,n}(z) v_{2,n}^2(z) v_{3,n}^2(z) - M_n v_{1,n}(0) v_{2,n}^2(0) v_{3,n}^2(0)| \\ &= M_n v_{1,n}(0) v_{2,n}^2(0) v_{3,n}^2(0) \left| 1 - \frac{v_{1,n}(z) v_{2,n}^2(z) v_{3,n}^2(z)}{v_{1,n}(0) v_{2,n}^2(0) v_{3,n}^2(0)} \right| \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , uniformly in  $z \in B_r$ , for every  $r > 0$ . Therefore, there exists a constant  $\lambda \geq 0$  such that, up to a subsequence,

$$\Delta v_{1,n} \rightarrow \lambda \quad \text{locally uniformly in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

By Lemma 4.3,  $w_{1,n}(x) := v_{1,n}(x) - v_{1,n}(0)$  converges locally uniformly to a limit function  $w_1$ , non-constant and globally Hölder continuous, which moreover satisfies

$$\Delta w_1 = \lambda \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

By Proposition 3.2, this is the desired contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.7.** *It is not possible that exactly two components  $v_{i_1,n}(0), v_{i_2,n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$ .*

*Proof.* In case  $v_{i_1,n}(0), v_{i_2,n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$  for a couple of indexes  $i_1, i_2 \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , we know by Lemma 4.5 that

$$M_n v_{i_1,n}^2(0) v_{i_2,n}^2(0) \leq C.$$

As in the previous proof, we have that  $v_{j,n}/v_{j,n}(0) \rightarrow 1$  locally uniformly, for  $j = i_1, i_2$ , whence it follows that

$$|M_n v_{i_1,n}^2 v_{i_2,n}^2 - M_n v_{i_1,n}^2(0) v_{i_2,n}^2(0)| \rightarrow 0$$

uniformly on any compact set of  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Therefore, there exists a constant  $\lambda \geq 0$  such that, up to a subsequence,  $M_n v_{i_1, n}^2 v_{i_2, n}^2 \rightarrow \lambda$  locally uniformly in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . In turn, this implies that the last component  $v_{i_3, n}$ , which is bounded at 0 (and hence in any compact set), converges locally uniformly to a function  $v_{i_3}$  which is nonnegative, globally Hölder continuous, and satisfies  $\Delta v_{i_3} = \lambda v_{i_3}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  (see Lemma 4.2). But then  $v_{i_3} \equiv 0$ , by Proposition 3.2, and this rules out the possibility that  $i_3 = 1$ .

Now, without loss of generality, we suppose that  $i_3 = 3$ . We have that

$$M_n v_{1, n}(x) v_{2, n}^2(x) v_{3, n}^2(x) \leq C M_n v_{1, n}^2(x) v_{2, n}^2(x) v_{3, n}^2(x) \leq C v_{3, n}^2(x);$$

hence  $\Delta v_{1, n} \rightarrow 0$  locally uniformly in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , which in turn implies that the function  $w_{1, n}$ , defined in Lemma 4.3, converges to a harmonic limit  $w_1$ . Since moreover  $w_1$  is also globally Hölder continuous and non-constant, this is a contradiction.  $\square$

In what follows we focus at ruling out the possibility that exactly one component is unbounded at 0. To this end, the following preliminary results will be useful.

**Lemma 4.8.** *Let  $\mathbf{w}_n$  be defined in Lemma 4.3. Suppose in addition that  $\Delta w_{i, n} \rightarrow 0$  in  $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  for an index  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Then  $w_{i, n} \rightarrow w_i$  strongly in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , and  $w_i$  is harmonic.*

*Proof.* Let  $r > 0$ . It is not difficult to check that  $\{w_{i, n}\}$  is bounded in  $H^1(B_r)$ : indeed, for any  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_r)$ , we have

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla w_{i, n}|^2 \varphi^2 dx = -2 \int_{B_r} \varphi w_{i, n} \nabla w_{i, n} \cdot \nabla \varphi dx - \int_{B_r} w_{i, n} \varphi^2 \Delta w_{i, n} dx,$$

whence

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla w_{i, n}|^2 \varphi^2 dx \leq C \int_{B_r} w_{i, n}^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx + C \|w_{i, n}\|_{L^\infty(B_r)} \|\Delta w_{i, n}\|_{L^1(B_r)},$$

which gives the boundedness in  $H^1(B_r)$  (recall that the sequence  $\{w_{i, n}\}$  is locally bounded in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , by definition). Since  $r$  was arbitrarily chosen, we infer that up to a subsequence  $w_{i, n} \rightharpoonup w_i$  weakly in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . The strong convergence in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  can be proved at this point exactly as in Lemma 4.2 (we multiply the equation for  $w_{i, n}$  by  $(w_{i, n} - w_i)\varphi$ , and exploit the convergence  $w_{i, n} \rightarrow w_i$  in  $L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$  and the boundedness of  $\|\Delta w_{1, n}\|_{L^1(B_r)}$ ). The fact that the  $w_i$  is harmonic follows now by taking the limit in the equation

$$\int_{\Omega_n} \nabla w_{i, n} \cdot \nabla \varphi dx = \int_{\Omega_n} (-\Delta w_{i, n}) \varphi dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N). \quad \square$$

The next lemma is an important consequence of the minimality of  $\mathbf{v}_n$ .

**Lemma 4.9.** *Suppose that there exist  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and  $R > \rho > 0$  such that the following holds for two indexes  $i$  and  $j$ :  $v_{j, n} \rightarrow 0$  uniformly in  $B_R(x_0)$  and in  $H^1(B_R(x_0))$ , and  $v_{i, n} \rightarrow v_i$  uniformly in  $B_R(x_0)$ , with  $v_i|_{S_\rho(x_0)} \not\equiv 0$ . Then  $v_i > 0$  in  $B_\rho(x_0)$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we fix  $x_0 = 0$ ,  $j = 3$ , and  $i = 1$  (in this proof we will not use that  $v_1$  is non-constant, hence the same proof works for every possible choice of  $i$  and  $j$ ). We suppose by contradiction that  $\{v_1 = 0\} \cap B_\rho \neq \emptyset$ , and, exploiting this fact, we will find a contradiction with the minimality of  $\mathbf{v}_n$ , Lemma 4.1-(v).

Let

$$c_n := J_{M_n}(\mathbf{v}_n, B_R) = \inf \{J_{M_n}(\mathbf{u}, B_R) : \mathbf{u} \in H^1(B_R, \mathbb{R}^3) \text{ such that } \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}_n \in H_0^1(B_R, \mathbb{R}^3)\}.$$

Let  $\eta \in C^1(\overline{B_R})$  be a radial cut-off function with the following properties:  $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$ ,  $\eta$  is radially increasing,  $\eta \equiv 0$  in  $B_\rho$ ,  $\eta = 1$  on  $S_R$ . We define a competitor  $\tilde{v}_n$  by defining

$$\tilde{v}_{1, n} := \begin{cases} v_{1, n} & \text{in } B_R \setminus B_\rho \\ \text{harmonic extension of } v_{1, n} \text{ on } S_\rho & \text{in } B_\rho, \end{cases} \quad \tilde{v}_{2, n} := v_{2, n}, \quad \tilde{v}_{3, n} := \eta v_{3, n}.$$

By taking the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we have that  $\tilde{v}_{1,n} \rightarrow \tilde{v}_1$  in  $H^1(B_R) \cap C(\overline{B_R})$ , where

$$\tilde{v}_1 := \begin{cases} v_1 & \text{in } B_R \setminus B_\rho \\ \text{harmonic extension of } v_1 \text{ on } S_\rho & \text{in } B_\rho. \end{cases}$$

Since  $v_1|_{S_\rho} \not\equiv 0$ , by the maximum principle we have that  $\tilde{v}_1 > 0$  in  $B_\rho$ , and hence  $\tilde{v}_1 \neq v_1$ . This implies, by the Dirichlet principle, that

$$\int_{B_\rho} |\nabla \tilde{v}_1|^2 dx < \int_{B_\rho} |\nabla v_1|^2 dx,$$

and by  $H^1$ -convergence we deduce that there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$(4.8) \quad \int_{B_R} (|\nabla \tilde{v}_{1,n}|^2 - |\nabla v_{1,n}|^2) dx \leq -\delta,$$

for every  $n$  large enough. Moreover, since  $\tilde{v}_{3,n} \equiv 0$  in  $B_\rho \supset \{\tilde{v}_{1,n} \neq v_{1,n}\}$ , and  $\tilde{v}_{3,n} \leq v_{3,n}$  in  $B_R$ , we have that

$$(4.9) \quad \int_{B_R} M_n \prod_{j=1}^3 \tilde{v}_{j,n}^2 dx = \int_{B_R \setminus B_\rho} M_n v_{1,n}^2 v_{2,n}^2 \tilde{v}_{3,n}^2 dx \leq \int_{B_R} M_n \prod_{j=1}^3 v_{j,n}^2 dx.$$

Finally, by using the fact that  $v_{3,n} \rightarrow 0$  in  $H^1(B_R(x_0))$ , we deduce that

$$(4.10) \quad \int_{B_R} (|\nabla \tilde{v}_{3,n}|^2 - |\nabla v_{3,n}|^2) dx \rightarrow 0$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, by (4.8)-(4.10), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} c_n &\leq J_{M_n}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_n, B_R) \\ &\leq J_{M_n}(\mathbf{v}_n, B_R) + \int_{B_R} (|\nabla \tilde{v}_{1,n}|^2 - |\nabla v_{1,n}|^2) dx + \int_{B_R} (|\nabla \tilde{v}_{3,n}|^2 - |\nabla v_{3,n}|^2) dx \\ &\leq c_n - \delta + o_n(1) \end{aligned}$$

(where  $o_n(1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ), which is a contradiction for sufficiently large  $n$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.10.** *It is not possible that there exists exactly one component  $v_{\underline{i},n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$  (with the remaining ones being bounded at 0), which in addition satisfies*

$$M_n v_{\underline{i},n}^2(0) \leq C.$$

*Proof.* We argue by contradiction. If  $v_{\underline{i},n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $M_n v_{\underline{i},n}^2(0) \leq C$ , then necessarily  $M_n \rightarrow 0$ , and  $\{M_n v_{\underline{i},n}^2\}$  is locally bounded, since  $\{v_{\underline{i},n}\}$  has locally bounded oscillation. More precisely

$$M_n v_{\underline{i},n}^2(x) = M_n v_{\underline{i},n}^2(0)(1 + o_n(1)),$$

locally uniformly in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , and hence up to a subsequence  $M_n v_{\underline{i},n}^2 \rightarrow \lambda$  locally uniformly in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , where  $\lambda \geq 0$  is a constant. This implies that the other components  $\{v_{i_1,n}\}$  and  $\{v_{i_2,n}\}$ , which are bounded at 0, and for which the conclusion of Lemma 4.2 holds true, are such that  $(v_{i_1,n}, v_{i_2,n}) \rightarrow (v_{i_1}, v_{i_2})$  locally uniformly and in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , and the limit functions  $v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}$  are globally Hölder continuous in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v_{i_1} = \lambda v_{i_1} v_{i_2}^2 \\ \Delta v_{i_2} = \lambda v_{i_1}^2 v_{i_2} \\ v_{i_1}, v_{i_2} \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

By Proposition 3.3 (or by the classical Liouville theorem in case  $\lambda = 0$ ), we deduce that  $v_{i_1}$  and  $v_{i_2}$  are both constant, and hence it is necessary that  $\underline{i} = 1$  (see Lemma 4.2 again).

Now, let  $r > 0$  be arbitrarily chosen. By Lemma 4.2, there exists  $C > 0$  such that

$$M_n \int_{B_r} v_{1,n}^2 v_{2,n}^2 v_{3,n} dx \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{B_r} v_{3,n} \leq C.$$

Then, using the fact that  $\inf_{B_r} v_{1,n} \rightarrow +\infty$ , we obtain

$$M_n \int_{B_r} v_{1,n} v_{2,n}^2 v_{3,n} dx \leq C M_n \int_{B_r} \frac{v_{1,n}^2}{\inf_{B_r} v_{1,n}} v_{2,n}^2 v_{3,n} dx \leq \frac{C}{\inf_{B_r} v_{1,n}} \rightarrow 0,$$

which in turn gives  $\|\Delta v_{1,n}\|_{L^1(B_r)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . If we consider the function  $w_{1,n} := v_{1,n} - v_{1,n}(0)$ , since  $\Delta w_{1,n} = \Delta v_{1,n}$ , Lemmas 4.3 and 4.8 imply that  $w_{1,n} \rightarrow w_1$  locally uniformly and strongly in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , with  $w_1$  globally Hölder continuous, harmonic, and non-constant. This is the desired contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.11.** *It is not possible that there exists exactly one component  $v_{i,n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$  (with the remaining ones being bounded at 0).*

*Proof.* We will split the proof into three steps. We argue by contradiction, and suppose that there exists exactly one component  $v_{i,n}$  such that  $v_{i,n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$ . Thanks to Lemma 4.10, up to a subsequence we can suppose in addition that

$$M_n v_{i,n}^2(0) \rightarrow +\infty,$$

and, since  $v_{i,n}$  has locally bounded oscillation, we have in fact that

$$\min_K M_n v_{i,n}^2 \rightarrow +\infty \quad \forall K \subset \mathbb{R}^N \text{ compact.}$$

Instead the other components  $v_{i_1,n}$  and  $v_{i_2,n}$  are bounded at 0, and hence the conclusions of Lemma 4.2 hold for them.

*Step 1)* One component, say  $v_{i_2}$ , vanishes identically, and the other satisfies

$$\Delta v_{i_1} = 0 \quad \text{in } \{v_{i_1} > 0\}.$$

Moreover,

$$(4.11) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_n \int_{B_r} \prod_{j=1}^3 v_{j,n}^2 dx = 0,$$

for every  $r > 0$ .

We claim at first that the limits  $v_{i_1}$  and  $v_{i_2}$  satisfy the segregation condition  $v_{i_1} v_{i_2} \equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . We take  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$  such that  $v_{i_1}(x_0) > 0$ , and we show that  $v_{i_2}(x_0) = 0$ ; since the role of  $v_{i_1}$  and  $v_{i_2}$  can be exchanged, the claim follows. By continuity and uniform local convergence, if  $v_{i_1}(x_0) > 0$ , then there exist  $\rho, \delta > 0$  such that

$$v_{i_1,n}(x) \geq \delta \quad \text{for every } x \in B_{2\rho}(x_0), \text{ for every } n \text{ large.}$$

Therefore, denoting by

$$I_n := \inf_{B_{2\rho}(x_0)} M_n v_{i,n}^2 \rightarrow +\infty,$$

we have that

$$-\Delta v_{i_2,n} \leq -\delta^2 I_n v_{i_2,n}, \quad v_{i_2,n} \geq 0 \quad \text{in } B_{2\rho}(x_0),$$

and moreover  $v_{i_2,n}$  is bounded in  $B_{2\rho}(x_0)$ . The decay estimate in Lemma 3.1 gives

$$\sup_{B_\rho(x_0)} v_{i_2,n} \leq C e^{-C\sqrt{I_n}} \rightarrow 0$$

(the constant  $C > 0$  depends on  $\rho$ , but not on  $n$ ), and in particular  $v_{i_2}(x_0) = 0$ .



This estimate also allows to show that  $v_{i_1}$  is harmonic when positive: indeed,  $\{v_{i_1} > 0\}$  is open by continuity; if  $B_{2\rho}(x_0) \subset \{v_{i_1} > 0\}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in B_\rho(x_0)} |\Delta v_{i_1, n}(x)| &= \sup_{x \in B_\rho(x_0)} M_n v_{\underline{i}, n}^2(x) v_{i_2, n}^2(x) v_{i_1, n}(x) \\ &\leq CI_n(1 + o_n(1))e^{-C\sqrt{T_n}} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (we used once again that  $v_{\underline{i}, n}$  has locally bounded oscillation, so that  $\sup_{B_\rho(x_0)} M_n v_{\underline{i}, n}^2 = I_n(1 + o_n(1))$ ).

To sum up,

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v_{i_1} = 0 & \text{in } \{v_{i_1} > 0\} \\ \Delta v_{i_2} = 0 & \text{in } \{v_{i_2} > 0\} \\ v_{i_1}, v_{i_2} \geq 0, \quad v_{i_1} v_{i_2} \equiv 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \end{cases}$$

and  $v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}$  are globally Hölder continuous in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . By Proposition 3.3, one component, say  $v_{i_2}$ , vanishes identically.

To complete the proof of Step 1, it remains to prove that (4.11) holds. By the segregation condition,  $B_r \subset (B_r \cap \{v_{i_1} = 0\}) \cup (B_r \cap \{v_{i_2} = 0\})$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} M_n \int_{B_r} \prod_{j=1}^3 v_{j, n}^2 dx &\leq \|v_{i_1, n}\|_{L^\infty(\{v_{i_1}=0\} \cap B_r)} M_n \int_{B_r} v_{i_1, n} \prod_{j \neq i_1} v_{j, n}^2 dx \\ &\quad + \|v_{i_2, n}\|_{L^\infty(\{v_{i_2}=0\} \cap B_r)} M_n \int_{B_r} v_{i_2, n} \prod_{j \neq i_2} v_{j, n}^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

and (4.11) follows, since the two integrals on the right hand side are bounded by Lemma 4.2.

Notice that, since  $v_{i_2} \equiv 0$ , we have that necessarily  $i_2 \neq 1$ . Therefore, from now on we assume that  $i_2 = 2$ , without loss of generality.

*Step 2)*  $\underline{i} = 3$  and  $i_1 = 1$ .

Let us consider the functions  $w_{\underline{i}, n}$  introduced in Lemma 4.3. We aim at showing that the limit  $w_{\underline{i}}$  is constant. By Lemma 4.2, we know that

$$M_n \int_{B_r} v_{\underline{i}, n}^2 v_{i_2, n}^2 v_{i_1, n} dx \leq C$$

for every  $r > 0$ , since  $v_{i_1, n}$  is bounded at 0. Instead  $v_{\underline{i}, n} \rightarrow +\infty$  locally uniformly, whence

$$M_n \int_{B_r} v_{\underline{i}, n} v_{i_2, n}^2 v_{i_1, n}^2 dx \leq CM_n \int_{B_r} \frac{v_{\underline{i}, n}^2}{\inf_{B_r} v_{\underline{i}, n}} v_{i_2, n}^2 v_{i_1, n} dx \leq \frac{C}{\inf_{B_r} v_{\underline{i}, n}} \rightarrow 0.$$

We infer that  $\Delta w_{\underline{i}, n} = \Delta v_{\underline{i}, n} \rightarrow 0$  in  $L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , and Lemma 4.8 ensures that  $w_{\underline{i}}$  is harmonic in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ ; being also globally Hölder continuous, it must be constant.

What we proved so far implies that, under the assumptions of the lemma, the following limits take place locally uniformly:  $v_{2, n} \rightarrow 0$ ,  $v_{3, n} \rightarrow +\infty$  with  $w_{3, n} \rightarrow w_3 \equiv \text{const.}$ , and  $v_{1, n} \rightarrow v_1$  non-constant in  $B_1$ . Moreover, all the previous limits but the second one are also strong in  $H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , and (4.11) holds.

*Step 3)* Conclusion of the proof.

Since  $v_1$  is non-constant, and hence non-trivial, in any ball  $B_\rho$  with  $\rho > 1$ , while  $v_{2, n} \rightarrow 0$ , the assumptions of Lemma 4.9 are satisfied. Therefore,  $v_1 > 0$  in  $B_\rho$  for every  $\rho > 1$ , namely  $v_1 > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . It is then a harmonic function in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , globally Hölder continuous, and non-constant, a contradiction.  $\square$

At this stage, by Lemmas 4.6, 4.7 and 4.11, we deduce that the sequence  $\{\mathbf{v}_n(0)\}$  is bounded. In particular, the conclusions in Lemma 4.2 hold for all the components.

**Lemma 4.12.** *It is not possible that both  $\{\mathbf{v}_n(0)\}$  and  $\{M_n\}$  are bounded.*

*Proof.* If  $\{\mathbf{v}_n(0)\}$  and  $\{M_n\}$  are both bounded, then up to a subsequence  $M_n \rightarrow M \geq 0$  and  $\mathbf{v}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{v}$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^0(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , and the limit function  $(v_1, v_2, v_3)$  is globally  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous, with  $v_1$  non-constant, and satisfy the system

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta v_i = M v_i \prod_{j \neq i} v_j^2 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \\ v_i \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \end{cases}$$

If  $M = 0$ , then  $v_1$  is harmonic, globally Hölder continuous, and non-constant, a contradiction. We focus then on the case when  $M > 0$ . By the maximum principle, either  $v_i > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , or  $v_i \equiv 0$ , and by Theorem 3.6 at least one component between  $v_2$  and  $v_3$  must vanish identically, since  $\alpha < \alpha_{3,N}/3$  by assumption ( $v_1$  cannot vanish identically, since it is non-constant). Hence, also in this case  $v_1$  is harmonic, globally Hölder continuous, and non-constant, a contradiction again.  $\square$

It remains to consider the case when  $\{\mathbf{v}_n(0)\}$  is bounded and  $M_n \rightarrow +\infty$  up to a subsequence.

**Lemma 4.13.** *It is not possible that  $\{\mathbf{v}_n(0)\}$  is bounded and  $\{M_n\}$  is unbounded.*

*Proof.* Let  $\{\mathbf{v}_n(0)\}$  be bounded, and  $M_n \rightarrow +\infty$ . By Lemma 4.2, we deduce that the limits  $v_i$  are subharmonic functions such that  $v_1 v_2 v_3 \equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Therefore,  $(v_1, v_2, v_3)$  satisfies the assumptions of Corollary 3.5, whence it follows that one component must vanish identically. We cannot have  $v_1 \equiv 0$ , since it is non-constant. For concreteness, let  $v_3 \equiv 0$  from now on.

Suppose that  $v_1(x_0) > 0$ . We claim that  $v_1$  is harmonic in a neighborhood of  $x_0$ . To prove the claim, let  $r > 0$ . Since  $v_1 v_2 v_3 \equiv 0$ ,

$$B_r \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^3 (B_r \cap \{v_i = 0\}),$$

and by local uniform convergence and Lemma 4.2 we infer that

$$(4.13) \quad M_n \int_{B_r} v_{1,n}^2 v_{2,n}^2 v_{3,n}^2 dx \leq \sum_{i=1}^3 \|v_{i,n}\|_{L^\infty(B_r \cap \{v_i=0\})} \int_{B_r} M_n v_{i,n} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{j,n}^2 dx \rightarrow 0.$$

Now, by continuity and local uniform convergence, there exists  $\rho, \delta > 0$  such that

$$\inf_{B_\rho(x_0)} v_{1,n} \geq \delta \quad \text{for } n \text{ sufficiently large.}$$

Therefore, using also (4.13), we obtain

$$\|\Delta v_{1,n}\|_{L^1(B_\rho(x_0))} = M_n \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} v_{1,n} v_{2,n}^2 v_{3,n}^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{\delta} M_n \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} v_{1,n}^2 v_{2,n}^2 v_{3,n}^2 dx \rightarrow 0,$$

and recalling that  $v_{1,n} \rightarrow v_1$  in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , we deduce that  $v_1$  is harmonic in  $B_\rho(x_0)$ . This argument shows that  $v_1$  is harmonic in its positivity set. The same holds for  $v_2$ .

We are ready to reach a contradiction. Since  $v_1$  is non-constant, and hence non-trivial, in any ball  $B_\rho$  with  $\rho > 1$ , while  $v_{3,n} \rightarrow 0$ , the assumptions of Lemma 4.9 are satisfied (notice that, if  $v_1$  is non-trivial in  $B_\rho$ , then  $v_1|_{S_\rho} \neq 0$  by subharmonicity). Therefore,  $v_1 > 0$  in  $B_\rho$  for every  $\rho > 1$ , namely  $v_1 > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . It is then a harmonic function in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , globally Hölder continuous, and non-constant, a contradiction.  $\square$

*Conclusion of the proof of Theorem 1.1.* Lemmas 4.1-4.13 imply that  $\{\mathbf{u}_\beta\}$  is bounded in  $C_{\text{loc}}^{0,\alpha}(\Omega)$ , as claimed. This is true for every  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_{3,N}/3)$ . In turn, by the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem, the local  $C^{0,\alpha}$  convergence to some limit  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$  follows, up to a subsequence.

The other properties can be proved as in Lemmas 4.1 and 4.13. We only give a sketch. By testing the equation for  $u_{i,\beta}$  with a cutoff function  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , we obtain

$$\beta \int_{\Omega} \left( \prod_{j \neq i} u_{j,\beta}^2 \right) u_{i,\beta} \varphi dx = \int_{\Omega} u_{i,\beta} \Delta \varphi dx \leq C.$$

Thus, by local uniform convergence as  $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$ , the limit  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  satisfies the partial segregation condition  $u_1 u_2 u_3 \equiv 0$  in  $\Omega$ .

In order to show the strong  $H_{\text{loc}}^1$  convergence, we test at first the equation for  $u_{i,\beta}$  with  $u_{i,\beta}\varphi^2$ , where  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$  is an arbitrary non-negative cutoff function, and integrate by parts. As in Lemma 4.1, we obtain boundedness in  $H^1(\omega)$  for every  $\omega \subset\subset \Omega$ , whence weak  $H_{\text{loc}}^1$ -convergence follows. The strong convergence can be proved by testing the equation for  $u_{i,\beta}$  with  $(u_{i,\beta} - u_i)\varphi$ , and integrating by parts (see Lemma 4.1 again).

At this point, the fact that for every  $\omega \subset\subset \Omega$

$$M_\beta \int_\omega \prod_{j=1}^3 u_{j,\beta}^2 dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for every } K \subset\subset \Omega \text{ compact}$$

can be proved exactly as in Lemma 4.13. □

**Remark 4.14.** For future convenience, we point out that the limitation  $\alpha < \bar{\nu} = \alpha_{3,N}/3$  in Theorem 1.1 plays a role only in Lemmas 4.12 and 4.13, where we apply Theorem 3.6 and Corollary 3.5. In particular, we can increase the threshold  $\bar{\nu}$  in Theorem 1.1 by establishing improved Liouville type theorems for globally Hölder continuous solutions to (4.12), minimal with respect to variations of the associated energy with compact support (it is plain that, if  $\{M_n\}$  is bounded, so that  $M_n \rightarrow M \geq 0$  up to a subsequence, the limiting profile  $\mathbf{v}$  is itself minimal for the associated energy) and improved Liouville type theorems for globally Hölder continuous functions in  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . This observation will be used in the proof of optimal regularity, see [ST24].

## 5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

In the first part of this section, we focus on the uniform Hölder estimates up to the boundary. This is the most delicate point in Theorem 1.2. The rest of the proof is rather standard, and will be the content of Subsection 5.2

**5.1. Uniform Hölder estimates up to the boundary.** The strategy is analogue to the one used in the proof of Theorem 1.1. By minimality, each  $\mathbf{u}_\beta$  solves system (1.2) for the corresponding value of  $\beta$ . In particular,  $u_{i,\beta}$  is subharmonic, and hence

$$\sup_\beta \sup_{i=1,2,3} u_{i,\beta} \leq \|\psi\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)} < +\infty,$$

namely  $\{\mathbf{u}_\beta\}$  satisfies assumption (h1) of Theorem 1.1. Plainly,  $\{\mathbf{u}_\beta\}$  also satisfies assumption (h2).

Now, for  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_{3,N}/3)$  fixed, we aim at proving that the family  $\{\mathbf{u}_\beta\}_{\beta>1}$  admits a uniform bound on the  $\alpha$ -Hölder semi-norm, that is, there exists  $C > 0$ , independent of  $\beta$ , such that

$$\sup_{i=1,2,3} \sup_{\substack{x \neq y \\ x,y \in \bar{\Omega}}} \frac{|u_{i,\beta}(x) - u_{i,\beta}(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha} \leq C.$$

Let us assume by contradiction that there exists a sequence  $\beta_n \rightarrow +\infty$  and a corresponding sequence  $\{\mathbf{u}_n := \mathbf{u}_{\beta_n}\}$  such that

$$L_n := \sup_{i=1,2,3} \sup_{\substack{x \neq y \\ x,y \in B_3}} \frac{|u_{i,n}(x) - u_{i,n}(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

As in Theorem 1.1, up to a relabelling, the supremum is achieved for  $i = 1$  and at a pair of points  $x_n, y_n \in \bar{\Omega}$ , with  $x_n \neq y_n$  and  $|x_n - y_n| \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We consider the blow-up sequence

$$v_{i,n}(x) := \frac{u_{i,n}(x_n + r_n x)}{L_n r_n^\alpha}, \quad \text{where } r_n := |x_n - y_n| \rightarrow 0^+, \quad \text{and } x \in \frac{\Omega - x_n}{r_n} =: \Omega_n,$$

and we have two different possibilities according to the fact that  $\text{dist}(x_n, \partial\Omega)/r_n$  is bounded or not. In the latter case, the scaled domains  $\Omega_n$  exhaust  $\mathbb{R}^N$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and the contradiction is reached proceeding exactly as in the proof of Theorem 1.1. If instead  $\text{dist}(x_n, \partial\Omega)/r_n$  remains bounded, then  $\Omega_n$  tends to a half-space  $\Omega_\infty$  and the previous proof has to be conveniently modified. At first, we observe that properties (i) and (v) of Lemma 4.1 still hold in the present setting. Regarding property (ii), we have that

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v_{i,n} = M_n v_{i,n} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{j,n}^2, & v_{i,n} > 0 & \text{in } \Omega_n \\ v_{i,n} = \psi_{i,n} & & \text{on } \partial\Omega_n, \end{cases}$$

where

$$M_n := \beta_n r_n^{2+4\alpha} L_n^4, \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_{i,n}(x) := \frac{\psi_i(x_n + r_n x)}{r_n^\alpha L_n}.$$

Since  $\psi_n$  is a Hölder scaling of a fixed Lipschitz functions, and since  $\{\mathbf{v}_n\}$  has bounded  $\alpha$ -Hölder seminorm, we can derive important information about the limiting behavior at the boundary of the half-space. We refer to [ST23, Lemma 4.3] for the proof.

**Lemma 5.1.** *It is possible to extend  $\mathbf{v}_n$  outside  $\Omega_n$  in a Lipschitz fashion, in such a way that:*

- (i) *If  $\{v_{i,n}(0)\}$  is bounded, then  $v_{i,n} \rightarrow v_i$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^{0,\alpha'}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  for every  $0 < \alpha' < \alpha$ , up to a subsequence; moreover, the limit function  $v_i$  attains a constant value on the boundary  $\partial\Omega_\infty$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\{v_{i,n}(0)\}$  is unbounded, then  $w_{i,n}(x) := v_{i,n}(x) - v_{i,n}(0)$  converges to  $w_i$  in  $C_{\text{loc}}^{0,\alpha'}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  for every  $0 < \alpha' < \alpha$ , up to a subsequence; moreover, the limit function  $w_i$  attains a constant value on the boundary  $\partial\Omega_\infty$ .*

**Remark 5.2.** Furthermore, if  $\{v_{i,n}(0)\}$  is bounded, then the thesis of Lemma 4.2 holds, with the only differences that in point (iii) we have to require  $\omega \subset\subset \Omega_\infty$ , and in (iv) we have convergence in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega_\infty)$ .

At this point the idea is to proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, discussing all the possible cases (all the components are unbounded at 0, exactly 2 components are unbounded at 0, etc.), and obtaining a contradiction in all of them. In this perspective, it is important to observe that, thanks to the partial segregation condition and to the uniform boundedness of the  $\alpha$ -Hölder seminorm, for every  $R > 1$  at least one component of  $\mathbf{v}_n$ , say  $v_{i_n,n}$ , must vanish on some points of  $\partial\Omega_\infty \cap B_R$ . Since  $i_n$  varies in the set of indexes  $\{1, 2, 3\}$ , which is discrete, up to a subsequence we can suppose that  $i_n = \underline{i}$  for every  $n$ . Thus, Lemma 5.1 ensures that  $v_{\underline{i}}$ , being constant on  $\partial\Omega_\infty$ , vanishes on the whole  $\partial\Omega_\infty$ . Moreover, recalling that  $\{\mathbf{v}_n\}$  has locally bounded oscillation,  $\{v_{\underline{i},n}\}$  is locally bounded in  $\Omega_\infty$ . We can actually prove a much stronger statement:

**Lemma 5.3.** *We have that  $v_{\underline{i}} \equiv 0$  in  $\Omega_\infty$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss, suppose that  $\Omega_\infty = \mathbb{R}_+^N$ . We know that  $v := v_{\underline{i}}$  is subharmonic in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$ ,  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous up to the boundary, with  $v = 0$  on  $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^N$ . We extend  $v$  as the trivial function outside of  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$ , and we claim that such extension, still denoted by  $v$ , is subharmonic on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Indeed, for any function  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$  with  $\phi \geq 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , and for any  $x_0 \in \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N$  and  $r > 0$ , we have that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r(x_0)} v \Delta \phi \, dx &= \int_{B_r(x_0) \cap \{x_N > \varepsilon\}} v \Delta \phi \, dx + \int_{B_r(x_0) \cap \{x_N < -\varepsilon\}} v \Delta \phi \, dx + \int_{B_r(x_0) \cap \{|x_N| < \varepsilon\}} v \Delta \phi \, dx \\ &= \int_{B_r(x_0) \cap \{x_N > \varepsilon\}} v \Delta \phi \, dx + O(\varepsilon^{1+\alpha}) \geq -C\varepsilon^{1+\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

and the subharmonicity follows. Now, since  $v$  is subharmonic and continuous in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , it is in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  (see e.g. [PSU12, Exercise 2.3]).

Let us define  $v'$  as the even reflection of  $v$  across  $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^N$ . Clearly,  $v$  and  $v'$  are subharmonic continuous function in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , with disjoint positivity sets, globally Hölder continuous. Therefore, by Proposition 3.3, one of them vanishes identically. By definition of  $v'$ , we infer that  $v = v_{\underline{i}} \equiv 0$ , as desired.  $\square$

The previous lemma is extremely useful: it ensures that, when  $\Omega_n$  tends to a half-space, one component is not only bounded, but it vanishes identically in the limit. From now on, for the sake of concreteness, we suppose that  $\underline{i} = 3$ , so that  $v_{3,n} \rightarrow v_3 \equiv 0$  locally uniformly (notice that it cannot be  $\underline{i} = 1$ , since  $v_{1,n}$  has constant oscillation equal to 1 in  $\overline{B_1} \cap \overline{\Omega_\infty}$ ).

Now, in order to show the validity of estimate (1.5), we have to reach a contradiction in the following cases:

- (i) exactly two components are unbounded at 0;
- (ii) exactly one component is unbounded at 0;
- (iii)  $\{\mathbf{v}_n(0)\}$  is bounded.

We will frequently use the following elementary result (see [ST23, Lemma 4.2]).

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $H$  be a half-space, and suppose that  $v \in C^0(\overline{H}) \cap C^2(H)$  is a harmonic function in  $H$ , with  $v|_{\partial H} = \text{const.}$ , and  $v$  globally  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Then  $v$  is constant in  $H$ .*

We can proceed with the core of the proof of Estimate (1.5).

**Lemma 5.5.** *Suppose that up to a subsequence  $v_{1,n}(0), v_{2,n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$ . Then*

$$M_n v_{1,n}^2(0) v_{2,n}^2(0) \leq C$$

for a positive constant  $C > 0$  independent of  $n$ .

*Proof.* The proof is similar to the one of Lemma 4.5. We argue by contradiction, and suppose that up to a subsequence  $M_n v_{1,n}^2(0) v_{2,n}^2(0) \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Since  $\{\mathbf{v}_n\}$  has local bounded oscillation, for every  $x_0 \in \Omega_\infty$  and  $R > 1$  we have that

$$\inf_{\partial\Omega_n \cap B_R(x_0)} v_{1,n}, \quad \inf_{\partial\Omega_n \cap B_R} v_{2,n} \rightarrow +\infty.$$

By partial segregation of the boundary datum, this implies that  $v_{3,n}|_{\partial\Omega_n \cap B_R(x_0)} = 0$ , so that we can extend  $v_{3,n}$  as the 0 function on  $B_R(x_0) \setminus \Omega_n$ , obtaining a continuous subsolution to

$$-\Delta v_{3,n} \leq -I_n v_{3,n} \quad \text{in the whole } B_R(x_0),$$

where

$$I_n := M_n \inf_{B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega_n} v_{i_1,n}^2 v_{i_2,n}^2 \geq M_n (v_{i_1,n}(0) - C_R)^2 (v_{i_2,n}(0) - C_R)^2 \rightarrow +\infty.$$

By Lemma 3.1, and recalling that  $v_{3,n} \rightarrow 0$  and  $I_n \rightarrow +\infty$ , we infer that

$$\sup_{B_{R/2}(x_0) \cap \Omega_n} v_{3,n} \leq C \sup_{B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega_n} v_{3,n} e^{-\frac{R\sqrt{I_n}}{2}} \rightarrow 0.$$

As in Lemma 4.5, this estimate allows to show that

$$|\Delta v_{1,n}(x)| \leq M_n v_{1,n}^2(x) \prod_{j \neq 1} v_{j,n}^2(x) \leq M_n (v_{1,n} v_{2,n}(x))^2 C_R e^{-C_R \sqrt{I_n}} \leq C_R I_n e^{-C_R \sqrt{I_n}}$$

for every  $x \in B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega_n$ , for every  $R > 1$  and  $x_0 \in \Omega_\infty$ . In particular, this holds true in a neighborhood of  $x_0$ , where we recall that  $x_0 \in \Omega_\infty$  was arbitrarily chosen. This means that, if we consider  $w_{1,n} := v_{1,n} - v_{1,n}(0)$ , then  $w_{1,n} \rightarrow w_1$  locally uniformly in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , with  $w_1$  globally Hölder continuous in  $\Omega_\infty$ , non-constant, constant on the boundary (recall Lemma 5.1), and harmonic. Indeed,  $|\Delta w_{1,n}| = |\Delta v_{1,n}| \rightarrow 0$  locally uniformly in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . By Lemma 5.4, this is the desired contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.6.** *It is not possible that  $v_{1,n}(0), v_{2,n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$ .*

*Proof.* In case  $v_{1,n}(0), v_{2,n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$ , we know by Lemma 5.5 that

$$M_n v_{1,n}^2(0) v_{2,n}^2(0) \leq C.$$

Since  $v_{j,n}/v_{j,n}(0) \rightarrow 1$  locally uniformly, for  $j = 1, 2$ , it follows that

$$|M_n v_{1,n}^2 v_{2,n}^2 - M_n v_{1,n}^2(0) v_{2,n}^2(0)| \rightarrow 0$$

uniformly on any compact set of  $\Omega_\infty$ . Therefore,  $M_n v_{1,n}^2 v_{2,n}^2$  is in turn locally bounded, and recalling that  $v_{3,n} \rightarrow v_3 \equiv 0$  locally uniformly, we deduce that

$$M_n v_{1,n}(x) v_{2,n}^2(x) v_{3,n}^2(x) \leq C M_n v_{1,n}^2(x) v_{2,n}^2(x) v_{3,n}^2(x) \leq C v_{3,n}^2(x) \rightarrow 0;$$

hence  $\Delta v_{1,n} \rightarrow 0$  locally uniformly in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , which in turn implies that the function  $w_{1,n} = v_{1,n} - v_{1,n}(0)$  converges to a harmonic limit  $w_1$ . Since moreover  $w_1$  is also globally Hölder continuous and non-constant, but constant on the boundary of  $\partial\Omega_\infty$ , Lemma 5.4 gives a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.7.** *It is not possible that there exists exactly one component  $v_{j,n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$  (with the remaining ones being bounded at 0), which in addition satisfies*

$$M_n v_{j,n}^2(0) \leq C.$$

*Proof.* We denote by  $j \in \{1, 2\}$  the index such that  $v_{j,n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$  up to a subsequence, and  $i$  the other. Since  $v_{j,n}/v_{j,n}(0) \rightarrow 1$  locally uniformly in  $\Omega_\infty$ , we have that  $\{M_n v_{j,n}^2\}$  is locally bounded as well, and in fact

$$|M_n v_{j,n}^2 - M_n v_{j,n}^2(0)| \rightarrow 0$$

uniformly on any compact set of  $\Omega_\infty$ . Therefore, by taking the limit in the equation for  $v_{i,n}$ , we deduce that there exists a constant  $\lambda \geq 0$  such that

$$\Delta v_i = \lambda v_3^2 v_i = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_\infty.$$

Since we also know by Lemma 5.1 that  $v_i$  is constant on  $\partial\Omega_\infty$ , and globally Hölder continuous, Lemma 5.4 implies that  $v_i$  is constant, and hence  $i = 2$  and  $j = 1$ . At this point, exactly as in the conclusion of the proof of Lemma 4.10, we can prove that  $\Delta v_{1,n} \rightarrow 0$  in  $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega_\infty)$ , and Lemma 4.8 ensures that  $w_{1,n} = v_{1,n} - v_{1,n}(0)$  converges to a harmonic limit  $w_1$ . This gives a contradiction as usual.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.8.** *It is not possible that there exists exactly one component  $v_{j,n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$  (with the remaining ones being bounded at 0).*

*Proof.* We denote by  $j \in \{1, 2\}$  the index such that  $v_{j,n}(0) \rightarrow +\infty$  up to a subsequence, and  $i$  the other. By Lemma 5.7, we have that  $M_n v_{j,n}^2(0) \rightarrow +\infty$ . We claim that  $v_i$  is harmonic when positive. To prove the claim, notice that, by continuity and uniform local convergence, if  $x_0 \in \Omega_\infty$  and  $v_i(x_0) > 0$ , then there exist  $\rho, \delta > 0$  such that

$$v_{i,n}(x) \geq \delta \quad \text{for every } x \in B_{2\rho}(x_0) \subset \Omega_\infty, \text{ for every } n \text{ large.}$$

Therefore, denoting by

$$I_n := \inf_{B_{2\rho}(x_0)} M_n v_{j,n}^2 \rightarrow +\infty,$$

we have that

$$-\Delta v_{3,n} \leq -\delta^2 I_n v_{3,n}, \quad v_{3,n} \geq 0 \quad \text{in } B_{2\rho}(x_0),$$

and moreover  $v_{3,n}$  is bounded in  $B_{2\rho}(x_0)$ . The decay estimate in Lemma 3.1 gives

$$\sup_{B_\rho(x_0)} v_{3,n} \leq C e^{-C\sqrt{I_n}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in B_\rho(x_0)} |\Delta v_{i,n}(x)| &= \sup_{x \in B_\rho(x_0)} M_n v_{j,n}^2(x) v_{3,n}^2(x) v_{i,n}(x) \\ &\leq C I_n (1 + o_n(1)) e^{-C\sqrt{I_n}} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (we used once again that  $v_{j,n}$  has locally bounded oscillation), and the claim follows.

Now,  $\Delta v_i = 0$  in  $\{v_i > 0\}$ ,  $v_i$  is constant on  $\partial\Omega_\infty$ , and  $v_i$  is globally Hölder continuous in  $\overline{\Omega_\infty}$ . If  $v_i = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega_\infty$ , then as in Lemma 5.3 we conclude that  $v_i \equiv 0$  in  $\Omega_\infty$ , and necessarily  $i = 2$  and  $j = 1$ . If instead  $v_i = c > 0$  on  $\partial\Omega_\infty$ , then the global Hölder continuity implies that  $v_i \geq c/2$  in a tubular neighborhood of  $\partial\Omega_\infty$ . Using this fact and Lemma 4.9 (which holds true provided that  $B_R(x_0) \subset \Omega_\infty$ ), it is not difficult to deduce that  $v_i > 0$  in the whole half-space  $\Omega_\infty$ . As a result,  $v_i$  must be constant, and also in this case  $i = 2$  and  $j = 1$ .

To sum up, we have that  $v_{1,n} \rightarrow +\infty$  locally uniformly, while  $v_{2,n} \rightarrow \text{const.}$  and  $v_{3,n} \rightarrow 0$  locally uniformly. Recall also that, thanks to the boundedness of  $\{v_{3,n}(0)\}$ , for every  $\omega \subset\subset \Omega_\infty$  we have

$$M_n \int_\omega v_{1,n}^2 v_{2,n}^2 v_{3,n} dx \leq C$$

(see Remark 5.2). Therefore,

$$M_n \int_\omega v_{1,n}^2 v_{2,n}^2 v_{3,n}^2 dx \rightarrow 0,$$

whence it follows that

$$M_n \int_\omega v_{1,n} v_{2,n}^2 v_{3,n}^2 dx \leq M_n \int_\omega \frac{v_{1,n}^2}{\inf_\omega v_{1,n}} v_{2,n}^2 v_{3,n}^2 dx \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence  $\Delta v_{1,n} \rightarrow 0$  locally uniformly in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , the function  $w_{1,n} = v_{1,n} - v_{1,n}(0)$  converges to a harmonic limit  $w_1$ , and  $w_1$  is also globally Hölder continuous and non-constant, but constant on  $\partial\Omega_\infty$ , in contradiction with Lemma 5.4.  $\square$

*Conclusion of the proof of the uniform Hölder estimate of  $\{\mathbf{u}_\beta\}$ .* It remains to show that it is not possible that  $\{\mathbf{v}_n(0)\}$  is bounded. Suppose that this is the case, and suppose moreover that  $\{M_n\}$  is bounded. Then, up to a subsequence,  $\mathbf{v}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{v}$  locally uniformly in  $\Omega_\infty$ ,  $M_n \rightarrow M \geq 0$ , and  $\mathbf{v}$  solves

$$\Delta v_i = M v_i \prod_{j \neq i} v_j^2 \quad \text{in } \Omega_\infty.$$

We also know that  $v_3 \equiv 0$ , and hence  $v_1$  is harmonic in a half-space, globally Hölder continuous, non-constant, with constant boundary datum, a contradiction. Suppose now that  $M_n \rightarrow +\infty$ . As in Lemma 4.13, we show that  $v_1$  is harmonic when positive, and, being non-constant (and hence non-trivial), Lemma 4.9 ensures that  $v_1 > 0$  in  $\Omega_\infty$ . Thus, we reach the same contradiction as before, and the proof of the validity of the uniform Hölder estimate up to the boundary is complete.  $\square$

**5.2. Conclusion of the proof of Theorem 1.2.** Theorem 1.1 and the uniform Hölder estimate up to the boundary imply that up to a subsequence  $\mathbf{u}_\beta \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$  and in  $C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ , for every  $\alpha \in (0, \bar{\nu})$ . The only things to prove are that the limit is minimal for the problem, and that the  $H^1$  convergence is global in  $\Omega$ . Let us set

$$c_\beta := \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in H_\psi} J_\beta(\mathbf{u}, \Omega),$$

and recall the definition of  $c_\infty$  given in (1.6). We observe that, if  $\mathbf{u}$  satisfies the partial segregation condition, then  $J_\beta(\mathbf{u}, \Omega)$  is independent of  $\beta$ , and is equal to the Dirichlet energy of  $\mathbf{u}$ . Therefore  $c_\beta \leq c_\infty$ . Then, by the minimality of  $\mathbf{u}_\beta$ , for every  $\beta > 1$  we have  $J_\beta(\mathbf{u}_\beta) \leq c_\infty$ . Since moreover  $u_{i,\beta} \equiv \psi_i$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , the uniform  $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3)$  boundedness of  $\{\mathbf{u}_\beta\}$  follows. Hence, up to a subsequence,  $\mathbf{u}_\beta \rightharpoonup \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  weakly in  $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3)$  and a.e. in  $\Omega$ , and we recall that  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  satisfies the partial segregation condition.

Now, by the the minimality of  $\mathbf{u}_\beta$  and weak convergence,

$$\begin{aligned} c_\infty &\leq \sum_{i=1}^3 \int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde{u}_i|^2 dx \leq \liminf_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^3 \int_\Omega |\nabla u_{i,\beta}|^2 dx \\ &\leq \limsup_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} J_\beta(\mathbf{u}_\beta, \Omega) = \limsup_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} c_\beta \leq c_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

This means that all the previous inequalities are indeed equalities, and in particular:



- $\|\nabla u_{i,\beta}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow \|\nabla u_i\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ , which together with the weak convergence and the fact that  $\mathbf{u}_\beta = \psi$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , for every  $\beta$ , ensures that  $\mathbf{u}_\beta \rightarrow \mathbf{u}$  strongly in  $H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^k)$  (recall that  $\Omega$  is bounded);
- we have that

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_{i,\beta}|^2 = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} J_\beta(\mathbf{u}_\beta, \Omega),$$

so that

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow +\infty} \beta \int_{\Omega} \prod_{j=1}^3 u_{j,\beta}^2 dx = 0.$$

- we have that

$$c_\infty = \sum_{i=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \tilde{u}_i|^2 dx,$$

which proves the minimality of  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ .

## 6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.7

We start with a preliminary result. Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be a domain,  $M > 0$ , and let  $\mathbf{v} \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathbf{v} \neq 0$ , satisfy

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta v_i = M v_i \prod_{j \neq i} v_j^2 & \text{in } \Omega \\ v_i \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 6.1** (Local Pohozaev identity). *For every  $x_0 \in \Omega$  and  $r \in (0, \text{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega))$ , we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} r \int_{S_r(x_0)} \left( \sum_{i=1}^3 |\nabla v_i|^2 + M \prod_{j=1}^3 v_j^2 \right) d\sigma &= (N-2) \int_{B_r(x_0)} \sum_{i=1}^3 |\nabla v_i|^2 dx \\ &+ N \int_{B_r(x_0)} M \prod_{j=1}^3 v_j^2 dx + 2r \int_{S_r(x_0)} \sum_{i=1}^3 (\partial_\nu v_i)^2 d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We multiply the equation for  $v_i$  by  $\nabla v_i(x) \cdot (x - x_0)$ , integrate over  $B_r(x_0)$ , and take the sum over  $i$  from 1 to 3: we obtain

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} \left( \sum_i \nabla v_i \cdot \nabla(\nabla v_i \cdot (x - x_0)) + M \sum_i v_i \nabla v_i \cdot (x - x_0) \prod_{j \neq i} v_j^2 \right) dx = r \int_{S_r(x_0)} \sum_i (\partial_\nu v_i)^2 d\sigma$$

Now standard computations as in the classical Pohozaev identity give the result.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.7.* Plainly, by minimality, each  $\mathbf{v}_n$  solves system (6.1) in  $\Omega$  with  $M = M_n \rightarrow +\infty$ . The regularity of  $\mathbf{v}$  follows then by Theorem 1.1. Let  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be a compact set. By (iii) and the local uniform convergence, we deduce that  $v_1 v_2 v_3 \equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Moreover, exactly as in Lemma 4.13, points (ii) and (iii) in Definition 1.5 allow to prove that each  $v_i$  is harmonic in its positivity set.

Let now  $x_0 \in \Omega$  and  $r \in (0, (\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega)))$ . We observe that, by Lemma 6.1, for  $r_0 < r$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_{r_0, r}(x_0)} \left( \sum_{i=1}^3 |\nabla v_{i,n}|^2 + M_n \prod_{j=1}^3 v_{j,n}^2 \right) dx &= \int_{r_0}^r \frac{N-2}{s} \int_{B_s(x_0)} \sum_{i=1}^3 |\nabla v_{i,n}|^2 dx ds \\ &+ \int_{r_0}^r \frac{N}{s} \int_{B_s(x_0)} M_n \prod_{j=1}^3 v_{j,n}^2 dx ds + 2 \int_{A_{r_0, r}(x_0)} \sum_{i=1}^3 \left( \nabla v_{i,n} \cdot \frac{x - x_0}{|x - x_0|} \right)^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

where  $A_{r_0,r}(x_0) := B_r(x_0) \setminus \overline{B_{r_0}(x_0)}$ . Recalling points (ii) and (iii) in the definition of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ , we can take the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , by dominated convergence, and deduce that

$$\int_{A_{r_0,r}(x_0)} \sum_{i=1}^3 |\nabla v_i|^2 dx = \int_{r_0}^r \frac{N-2}{s} \int_{B_s(x_0)} \sum_{i=1}^3 |\nabla v_i|^2 dx ds + 2 \int_{A_{r_0,r}(x_0)} \sum_{i=1}^3 \left( \nabla v_i \cdot \frac{x-x_0}{|x-x_0|} \right)^2 dx,$$

for every  $r_0 < r$ . By the fundamental theorem of calculus, this completes the proof.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [Alp20] Omur Alper. On the singular set of free interface in an optimal partition problem. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 73(4):855–915, 2020.
- [BBF22] Farid Bozorgnia, Martin Burger, and Morteza Fotouhi. On a class of singularly perturbed elliptic systems with asymptotic phase segregation. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 42(7):3539–3556, 2022.
- [CKL09] Luis A. Caffarelli, Aram L. Karakhanyan, and Fang-Hua Lin. The geometry of solutions to a segregation problem for nondivergence systems. *J. Fixed Point Theory Appl.*, 5(2):319–351, 2009.
- [CL07] Luis A. Caffarelli and Fang-Hua Lin. An optimal partition problem for eigenvalues. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 31(1-2):5–18, 2007.
- [CL08] Luis A. Caffarelli and Fang-Hua Lin. Singularly perturbed elliptic systems and multi-valued harmonic functions with free boundaries. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 21(3):847–862, 2008.
- [CPQ17] Luis A. Caffarelli, Stefania Patrizi, and Veronica Quitalo. On a long range segregation model. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 19(12):3575–3628, 2017.
- [CR07] Luis A. Caffarelli and Jean-Michel Roquejoffre. Uniform Hölder estimates in a class of elliptic systems and applications to singular limits in models for diffusion flames. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 183(3):457–487, 2007.
- [CTV03] Monica Conti, Susanna Terracini, and Gianmaria Verzini. An optimal partition problem related to nonlinear eigenvalues. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 198(1):160–196, 2003.
- [CTV05a] Monica Conti, Susanna Terracini, and Gianmaria Verzini. Asymptotic estimates for the spatial segregation of competitive systems. *Adv. Math.*, 195(2):524–560, 2005.
- [CTV05b] Monica Conti, Susanna Terracini, and Gianmaria Verzini. A variational problem for the spatial segregation of reaction-diffusion systems. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 54(3):779–815, 2005.
- [DWZ12] Edward N. Dancer, Kelei Wang, and Zhitao Zhang. The limit equation for the Gross-Pitaevskii equations and S. Terracini’s conjecture. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 262(3):1087–1131, 2012.
- [GS92] Mikhail Gromov and Richard Schoen. Harmonic maps into singular spaces and  $p$ -adic superrigidity for lattices in groups of rank one. *Publ. Math., Inst. Hautes Étud. Sci.*, 76:165–246, 1992.
- [LQZ24] Chengjie Luo, Yicheng Qiang, and David Zwicker. Beyond pairwise: Higher-order physical interactions affect phase separation in multicomponent liquids. *Phys. Rev. Res.*, 6:033002, Jul 2024.
- [NTTV10] Benedetta Noris, Hugo Tavares, Susanna Terracini, and Gianmaria Verzini. Uniform Hölder bounds for nonlinear Schrödinger systems with strong competition. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 63(3):267–302, 2010.
- [Pet14] D. S. Petrov. Three-body interacting bosons in free space. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 112:103201, Mar 2014.
- [PSU12] Arshak Petrosyan, Henrik Shahgholian, and Nina Uraltseva. *Regularity of free boundaries in obstacle-type problems*, volume 136 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.
- [ST15] Nicola Soave and Susanna Terracini. Liouville theorems and 1-dimensional symmetry for solutions of an elliptic system modelling phase separation. *Adv. Math.*, 279:29–66, 2015.
- [ST19] Nicola Soave and Susanna Terracini. The nodal set of solutions to some elliptic problems: Singular nonlinearities. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 128:264–296, 2019.
- [ST23] Nicola Soave and Susanna Terracini. An anisotropic monotonicity formula, with applications to some segregation problems. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 25(9):3727–3765, 2023.
- [ST24] Nicola Soave and Susanna Terracini. Part 2, in preparation. 2024.
- [STTZ16] Nicola Soave, Hugo Tavares, Susanna Terracini, and Alessandro Zilio. Hölder bounds and regularity of emerging free boundaries for strongly competing Schrödinger equations with nontrivial grouping. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 138:388–427, 2016.
- [STTZ18] Nicola Soave, Hugo Tavares, Susanna Terracini, and Alessandro Zilio. Variational problems with long-range interaction. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 228(3):743–772, 2018.
- [STZ23] Nicola Soave, Hugo Tavares, and Alessandro Zilio. Free boundary problems with long-range interactions: uniform Lipschitz estimates in the radius. *Math. Ann.*, 386(1-2):551–585, 2023.
- [SZ15] Nicola Soave and Alessandro Zilio. Uniform bounds for strongly competing systems: the optimal Lipschitz case. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 218(2):647–697, 2015.
- [SZ17] Nicola Soave and Alessandro Zilio. On phase separation in systems of coupled elliptic equations: asymptotic analysis and geometric aspects. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 34(3):625–654, 2017.

- [TT12] Hugo Tavares and Susanna Terracini. Regularity of the nodal set of segregated critical configurations under a weak reflection law. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 45(3-4):273–317, 2012.
- [TVZ14] Susanna Terracini, Gianmaria Verzini, and Alessandro Zilio. Uniform Hölder regularity with small exponent in competition-fractional diffusion systems. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 34(6):2669–2691, 2014.
- [TVZ16] Susanna Terracini, Gianmaria Verzini, and Alessandro Zilio. Uniform Hölder bounds for strongly competing systems involving the square root of the laplacian. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 18(12):2865–2924, 2016.
- [TZ20] Giorgio Tortone and Alessandro Zilio. Regularity results for segregated configurations involving fractional Laplacian. *Nonlinear Anal., Theory Methods Appl., Ser. A, Theory Methods*, 193:27, 2020. Id/No 111532.
- [Vel14] Bozhidar Velichkov. A note on the monotonicity formula of Caffarelli-Jerison-Kenig. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl.*, 25(2):165–189, 2014.
- [Wan14] Kelei Wang. On the De Giorgi type conjecture for an elliptic system modeling phase separation. *Commun. Partial Differ. Equations*, 39(4):696–739, 2014.

NICOLA SOAVE AND SUSANNA TERRACINI  
DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA “GIUSEPPE PEANO”, UNIVERSITÀ DI TORINO,  
VIA CARLO ALBERTO 10, 10123 TORINO, ITALY  
*Email address:* nicola.soave@unito.it, susanna.terracini@unito.it