

# Classification and Nondegeneracy of Cubic Nonlinear Schrödinger System in $\mathbb{R}$

Yujin Guo\*, Yong Luo<sup>†</sup> and Juncheng Wei<sup>‡</sup>

## Abstract

We study the following one-dimensional cubic nonlinear Schrödinger system:

$$u_i'' + 2\left(\sum_{k=1}^N u_k^2\right)u_i = -\mu_i u_i \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N,$$

where  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_N < 0$  and  $N \geq 2$ . In this paper, we mainly focus on the case  $N = 3$  and prove the following results: (i). The solutions of the system can be completely classified; (ii). Depending on the explicit values of  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 < 0$ , there exist two different classes of normalized solutions  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  satisfying  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_i^2 dx = 1$  for all  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , which are completely different from the case  $N = 2$ ; (iii). The linearized operator at any nontrivial solution of the system is non-degenerate. The conjectures on the explicit classification and nondegeneracy of solutions for the system are also given for the case  $N > 3$ . These address the questions of [R. Frank, D. Gontier and M. Lewin, CMP, 2021], where the complete classification and uniqueness results for the system were already proved for the case  $N = 2$ .

*Keywords:* Quantum systems; Integral systems; Complete classification; Nondegeneracy

## 1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the following one-dimensional cubic nonlinear Schrödinger system

$$u_i'' + 2\left(\sum_{k=1}^N u_k^2\right)u_i = -\mu_i u_i \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \quad u_i \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_N < 0$  and  $N \geq 2$ . The nonlinear Schrödinger system (1.1) arises from various physical situations (cf. [8, 14]), such as multiple-component Bose-Einstein condensates (cf. [11, 12]), nonlinear optics (cf. [21]), Langmuir waves (cf. [7]),

---

\*School of Mathematics and Statistics, Key Laboratory of Nonlinear Analysis & Applications (Ministry of Education), Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079, P. R. China. Y. J. Guo is partially supported by National Key R & D Program of China (Grant 2023YFA1010001), and NSF of China (Grants 12225106 and 12371113). Email: yguo@ccnu.edu.cn.

<sup>†</sup>School of Mathematics and Statistics, and Hubei Key Laboratory of Mathematical Sciences, Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079, P. R. China. Email: yluo@ccnu.edu.cn.

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Mathematics, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, NT, Hong Kong. J. Wei is partially supported by Hong Kong General Research Fund “New frontiers in singular limits of nonlinear partial differential equations”. Email address: jcwei@math.cuhk.edu.hk.

and so on. Especially, the system (1.1) can be used to model the ground states of  $N$ -component Bose gases, see [11, 12] and the references therein. On the other hand, the system (1.1) can be also employed to discuss the ground states of  $N$ -particle fermionic quantum systems, which were recently investigated in [5, 6, 8] and the references therein.

Another motivation of studying (1.1) is the relation with Lieb-Thirring inequality. We note from [5, 6] and Remark 1.1 below that the solutions  $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_N)$  of the system (1.1) are connected with the following finite-rank Lieb-Thirring inequality

$$\sum_{n=1}^N |\mu_n(-\Delta - V(x))|^\gamma \leq L_{\gamma,d}^{(N)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x)_+^{\gamma + \frac{d}{2}} dx, \quad V(x) \in L^{\gamma + \frac{d}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad (1.2)$$

in the critical case  $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $d = 1$ , where  $V(x)_+ = \max\{V(x), 0\}$  and  $\mu_n(-\Delta - V(x))$  denotes the  $n$ th min-max level of

$$-\Delta - V(x) = -\Delta - 2 \sum_{n=1}^N u_n^2 \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

so that it equals to the  $n$ th negative eigenvalue (counted with multiplicity) when it exists, and 0 otherwise. By the definition of (1.2), one can observe that the best constant  $L_{\gamma,d}^{(N)}$  of (1.2) satisfies  $L_{\gamma,d}^{(N)} \leq L_{\gamma,d}^{(N+1)}$  for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}^+$ . Especially, it was proved in [10, 18] that for the critical case  $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $d = 1$ , the best constant  $L_{\gamma,d}^{(N)}$  satisfies

$$L_{\frac{1}{2},1} := L_{\frac{1}{2},1}^{(\infty)} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} L_{\frac{1}{2},1}^{(N)} = \frac{1}{2},$$

where the constant  $L_{\gamma,d}$  is called the best Lieb-Thirring constant, see [5, 6, 8, 10, 18] and the references therein.

When  $N = 1$  and  $\mu_1 = -1$ , direct integration yields that up to the translation and the sign  $\pm$ , (1.1) admits a unique solution

$$u(x) \equiv \frac{1}{\cosh(x)}. \quad (1.3)$$

When  $N = 2$ , the system (1.1) was analyzed recently in [6], where the authors obtained the complete classification on the general solutions of (1.1) by applying Hirota's bilinearisation method (cf. [9, 15, 16]). Based on the classification on the general solutions of (1.1), the authors in [6] derived successfully the following interesting uniqueness, up to translations and the uncorrelated signs  $\pm$ , of normalized solutions for (1.1) in the case  $N = 2$ .

**Theorem A** ([6, Theorem 8]) *For  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 < 0$ , suppose  $u = (u_1, u_2) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  is a normalized solution of (1.1) with  $N = 2$ , in the sense that  $\|u_1\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = \|u_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = 1$ . Then it necessarily has  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 < 0$ , and up to translations,  $u$  satisfies*

$$u_1(x) \equiv \pm \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2 \cosh(x)}, \quad u_2(x) \equiv \pm \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2 \cosh(x)} \quad (1.4)$$

for two uncorrelated signs  $\pm$ .

The authors also conjectured in [6, Subsection 1.3] that the above mentioned results can be probably generalized to the system (1.1) for any  $N \geq 3$ . On the other hand, the

existing results show that it is usually very useful to know the complete classification and nondegeneracy of solutions for the system (1.1), which unfortunately seem very challenging for general situations, see [1, 2, 12, 13] and the references therein. Stimulated by these facts, the main purpose of this paper is to address the complete classification, the nondegeneracy and some other analytical properties of solutions for the system (1.1) with  $N \geq 3$ . It turns out that the analysis of the system (1.1) with  $N \geq 3$  is more complicated, for which one requires new approaches. More precisely, in this paper we are able to understand completely the case  $N = 3$  of the system (1.1), and we finally discuss some partial results, together with several conjectures, for the general case  $N > 3$  of the system (1.1).

In this paper, we first focus on the case  $N = 3$  of the system (1.1), which can be rewritten explicitly as the follow form:

$$\begin{cases} u_1'' + 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)u_1 = -\mu_1 u_1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ u_2'' + 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)u_2 = -\mu_2 u_2 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ u_3'' + 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)u_3 = -\mu_3 u_3 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

where  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 < 0$  are arbitrary. Based on Hirota's bilinearisation method (cf. [6, 9, 15, 16]), we shall employ the algebraic analysis to prove the following classification on general solutions of (1.5).

**Theorem 1.1.** *For  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 < 0$ , suppose  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  is a solution of (1.5) in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$ . Then there exists a unique vector  $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  can be written exactly as:*

$$u_i(x) = \frac{g_i(x)}{f(x)}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (1.6)$$

where  $g_i(x)$  and  $f(x)$  satisfy for  $\eta_i = \sqrt{|\mu_i|} > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} g_i(x) &= a_i e^{\eta_i x} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{a_i a_j^2 (\eta_i - \eta_j)}{4\eta_j^2 (\eta_i + \eta_j)} e^{(2\eta_j + \eta_i)x} \\ &+ \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq 3} \frac{a_i a_j^2 a_k^2 (\eta_j - \eta_k)^2 (\eta_i - \eta_j) (\eta_i - \eta_k)}{16\eta_j^2 \eta_k^2 (\eta_j + \eta_k)^2 (\eta_i + \eta_j) (\eta_i + \eta_k)} e^{(\eta_i + 2\eta_j + 2\eta_k)x}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= 1 + \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{a_j^2}{4\eta_j^2} e^{2\eta_j x} + \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq 3} \frac{a_j^2 a_k^2 (\eta_j - \eta_k)^2}{16\eta_j^2 \eta_k^2 (\eta_j + \eta_k)^2} e^{2(\eta_j + \eta_k)x} \\ &+ \frac{a_1^2 a_2^2 a_3^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_2)^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_3)^2 (\eta_2 - \eta_3)^2}{64\eta_1^2 \eta_2^2 \eta_3^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_2)^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_3)^2 (\eta_2 + \eta_3)^2} e^{2(\eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3)x}. \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 1.1.* In order to prove Theorem 1.1, we shall derive in Lemma 3.4 that if  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ , then the solution  $(u_1, u_2, u_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  of (1.1) with  $N = 3$  satisfies

$$2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_n^2(x) dx = 4\eta_n = 4\sqrt{|\mu_n|}, \quad n = 1, 2, 3.$$

This further implies that the solution  $(u_1, u_2, u_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  of (1.1) with  $N = 3$  satisfies

$$\sum_{n=1}^3 |\mu_n|^{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}} V(x)_+ dx, \quad V(x) = 2 \sum_{n=1}^3 u_n^2, \quad (1.7)$$

which seems related to the finite-rank Lieb-Thirring inequality (1.2).

Theorem 1.1 gives a similar classification of [6, Lemma 15], but the proof of Theorem 1.1 needs the more involved algebraic analysis. Actually, applying Hirota's bilinearisation method (cf. [9, 15, 16]), we shall first prove that any function  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  defined by (1.6) is a solution of (1.5). We then derive the associated integral system (2.13)–(2.15) by applying the symmetry of (1.5). Following (2.13)–(2.15), if  $\mu_2 = \mu_i$  holds for either  $i = 1$  or  $i = 3$  or  $i = 1, 3$ , see Proposition 2.3, then the proof of Theorem 1.1 follows essentially from the argument of [6, Lemma 15]. However, this unfortunately is not applied to the challenging general case  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ , see Subsection 2.1 for more details. Therefore, by algebraically analyzing the integral curves of the system (1.5), we shall complete in Section 3 the proof of Theorem 1.1 for the general case where  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ .

In the following we discuss several applications of Theorem 1.1. Since the normalized solutions of the system (1.5) were studied widely in recent few years, see [1, 2] and the references therein, we shall first employ Theorem 1.1 to establish the following refined classification on the normalized solutions of (1.5):

**Theorem 1.2.** *Suppose  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 < 0$ . Then (1.5) admits normalized solutions  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  satisfying  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_i^2 dx = 1$  for all  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , if and only if one of the following conditions holds:*

- (i).  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = -\frac{9}{4}$ ;
- (ii).  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = -1$  and  $\mu_3 = -\frac{1}{4}$ .

Moreover, if (i) holds, then up to translations, (1.5) admits a unique normalized solution, in the sense that

$$u_1(x) \equiv \pm \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2 \cosh(\frac{3x}{2})}, \quad u_2(x) \equiv \pm \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2 \cosh(\frac{3x}{2})}, \quad u_3(x) \equiv \pm \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2 \cosh(\frac{3x}{2})} \quad (1.8)$$

hold for three uncorrelated signs  $\pm$ . If (ii) holds, then up to translations, (1.5) admits infinitely many normalized solutions, which satisfy

$$\begin{cases} u_1(x) = \frac{Ae^x}{f(x)} \left(1 + \frac{B^2}{3} e^x\right), \\ u_2(x) = \pm \frac{Ae^x}{f(x)} \left(1 + \frac{B^2}{3} e^x\right), \\ u_3(x) = \frac{Be^{\frac{1}{2}x}}{f(x)} \left(1 - \frac{A^2}{6} e^{2x}\right), \end{cases} \quad (1.9)$$

together with

$$f(x) = 1 + B^2 e^x + \frac{A^2}{2} e^{2x} + \frac{A^2 B^2}{18} e^{3x}, \quad \forall A \neq 0, \quad \forall B \neq 0.$$

Theorem 1.2 shows that one cannot expect generally the uniqueness of normalized solutions for the system (1.5), which depends on the exact value of  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 < 0$ . This is different completely from the uniqueness of Theorem A, which was studied in [6, Theorem 8] for the case  $N = 2$  of the system (1.1). As other applications of Theorem 1.1, we further establish the following uniqueness of least energy normalized solutions for (1.5), and as well the nonexistence of orthonormal solutions  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  for (1.5), in the sense that  $(u_i, u_j) = \delta_{ij}$  holds for all  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq 3$ .

**Corollary 1.3.** *For  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 < 0$ , we have the following conclusions:*

- (i). *If  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  is a least energy normalized solution of (1.5), then it necessarily has  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = -\frac{9}{4}$ , and  $u$  must satisfy (1.8).*
- (ii). *The system (1.5) does not admit any orthonormal solution  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$ .*

One can note from Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.3 that the least energy normalized solutions of (1.5) must be unique, up to translations and the uncorrelated signs  $\pm$ . However, the higher energy normalized solutions of (1.5) must be either infinitely multiple or empty, which depends on the exact value of  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 < 0$ . These illustrate that the structure of normalized solutions for (1.5) is more complicated than that of the case  $N = 2$  for the system (1.1).

For any solution  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  of the system (1.5), we next consider the following linearized system of (1.5) at the solution  $u$ :

$$\begin{cases} \phi_1'' + 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)\phi_1 + 4(u_1\phi_1 + u_2\phi_2 + u_3\phi_3)u_1 = -\mu_1\phi_1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ \phi_2'' + 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)\phi_2 + 4(u_1\phi_1 + u_2\phi_2 + u_3\phi_3)u_2 = -\mu_2\phi_2 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ \phi_3'' + 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)\phi_3 + 4(u_1\phi_1 + u_2\phi_2 + u_3\phi_3)u_3 = -\mu_3\phi_3 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

where the parameters  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 < 0$  are as in (1.5). The existing works (cf. [1, 2, 12]) show that it is usually necessary to understand the structure of the solution  $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3)$  for (1.10) in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$ , in order to analyze the refined limiting behavior of nonlinear Schrödinger systems. Employing Theorem 1.1, we are actually able to prove the following nondegeneracy of the general solution  $u$  for (1.5).

**Theorem 1.4.** *For  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 < 0$ , consider the linearized system (1.10) at any solution  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  of (1.5) satisfying  $u_i \neq 0$  for all  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Then the linearized system (1.10) at  $u$  is non-degenerate, in the sense that the dimension of solutions for the linearized system (1.10) in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  is three.*

*Remark 1.2.* Applying [6, Section 5.2], the argument of proving Theorem 1.4 yields that any solution  $u$  of the system (1.1) with  $N = 2$  must be non-degenerate. We leave the detailed proof for this case to the interested reader.

Theorem 1.4 is another application of Theorem 1.1. As shown in Section 4, the proof of Theorem 1.4 also makes full use of the integral system (4.3)–(4.5), which is essentially the linearized version of (2.13)–(2.15) associated to the system (1.5). More precisely, the proof of Theorem 1.4 is divided into the following four different cases:

- Case 1.*  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ ;    *Case 2.*  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ ;
- Case 3.*  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 = \mu_3 < 0$ ;    *Case 4.*  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 < 0$ ;

Case 1 of Theorem 1.4 is proved directly by applying Theorem 1.1 and (4.3)–(4.5). In spite of this fact, the argument of addressing Case 1 does not work for the rest three cases. To address Cases 2 and 4 of Theorem 1.4, we shall actually utilize from Proposition 2.3 that for any solution  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  of (1.5),  $\mu_1 = \mu_2$  is the first eigenvalue of

$$L_u := -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} - 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2) \text{ in } L^2(\mathbb{R}),$$

where we also make full use of the fact that the non-degeneracy of the system (1.1) holds essentially for both  $N = 2$  and  $N = 1$ .

Unfortunately, it is more challenging to handle with the rest Case 3 of Theorem 1.4, for which case the parameter  $\mu_2 < 0$  is not the first eigenvalue of  $L_u$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ . Since  $\mu_2 = \mu_3 < 0$  holds for Case 3, the eigenvalue  $\mu_2$  of  $L_u$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$  may be multiple, which would lead to the degeneracy of solutions for the system (1.10). To exclude this possibility, in Section 4 we shall employ the comparison principle to analyze the limiting behavior of solutions  $v \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$  satisfying  $(L_u - \mu_2)v(x) = 0$  as  $x \rightarrow -\infty$ , from which we finally conclude that  $\mu_2 < 0$  must be a simple eigenvalue of  $L_u$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ . The rest proof of Case 3 is then similar to that of Case 2. As a byproduct, the proof of Theorem 1.4 implies that for any  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 \leq 0$ , each  $\mu_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) of (1.5) is always a simple eigenvalue of  $L_u$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ .

The last section of this paper is devoted to the  $N$ -component Schrödinger system (1.1), where  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_N < 0$  and  $N > 3$ . We shall mainly discuss whether all main results of the present paper can be generalized to the  $N$ -component Schrödinger system (1.1) with any  $N > 3$ . Roughly speaking, it is proved in Section 5 that the system (1.1) still admits the integral system for any  $N > 3$ , see Lemma 5.1 for more details. This stimulates us to guess in Conjecture 5.1 that the solutions of the system (1.1) can be still classified for any  $N > 3$ , see (5.4), whose proof is however involved with the more complicated algebraic analysis. Following Conjecture 5.1, one may further guess from Conjecture 5.2 that (1.1) does not admit any orthonormal solution  $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_N) \in (H^1(\mathbb{R}))^N$ , where  $(u_i, u_j) = \delta_{ij}$  holds for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq N$  and  $N > 3$ . Of course, motivated by Theorem 1.2, it is our another guess that for any  $N \geq 3$ , one cannot expect generally the uniqueness of normalized solutions for the system (1.1), which depends on the exact value of  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_N < 0$ . Finally, suppose  $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_N)$  is a solution of (1.1), then we consider the following linearized system of (1.1) around the solution  $u$ :

$$u_i'' + 2\left(\sum_{k=1}^N u_k^2\right)\phi_i + 4\left(\sum_{k=1}^N u_k\phi_k\right)u_i = -\mu_i\phi_i \text{ in } \mathbb{R}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N. \quad (1.11)$$

We finally discuss in Section 5 that if Conjecture 5.1 holds true, then we have the non-degeneracy of (1.11), see those around Theorem 5.2 for more details.

Lastly, we mention that the system (1.1) belongs to a large class of  $N$ -component Schrödinger systems

$$\Delta u_i + \sum_{j=1}^N \beta_{ij} u_j^2 u_i = -\mu_i u_i \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^d, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (1.12)$$

where  $\beta_{ij}, \mu_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $d \geq 1$  and  $N \geq 1$ . For the studies of (1.12) and its normalized solutions, we refer to [2–4, 12, 19, 20] and the references therein. However, this paper seems to be the first kind for a complete classification on the solutions of (1.12) with  $N \geq 3$ .

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we employ Hirota's bilinearisation method [9] to analyze the general solutions of (1.5), after which we shall classify in Subsection 2.1 the solutions of (1.5) for the degenerate cases. In Section 3, we first carry with the further analysis of general solutions for (1.5), based on which we shall complete in Subsection 3.1 the proofs of Theorems 1.1 & 1.2 and Corollary 1.3. Section 4 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.4 on the nondegeneracy of solutions for (1.5). Finally, we discuss in Section 5 whether all main results of the present paper can be extended generally to the  $N$ -component Schrödinger system (1.1).

## 2 Analysis of General Solutions

In this section, we first analyze the general solutions  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  of (1.5), where  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 < 0$ . In Subsection 2.1, we then further discuss the classification on the solutions of (1.5) for the degenerate cases where  $\mu_2 = \mu_i$  holds for either  $i = 1$  or  $i = 3$  or  $i = 1, 3$ .

Stimulated by [6, 15, 16], which employ Hirota's bilinearisation method [9], we set

$$u_i = \frac{g_i}{f}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (2.1)$$

It then follows from (1.5) that  $f$  and  $g_i$  satisfy

$$\begin{cases} fg_i'' + g_i f'' - 2f'g_i' + \mu_i f g_i = 0, & i = 1, 2, 3, \\ (f')^2 - f f'' + (g_1^2 + g_2^2 + g_3^2) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

Using Hirota's notation, this is of the form:

$$D(f, g_i) + \mu_i f g_i = 0, \quad D(f, f) = \frac{1}{2}(g_1^2 + g_2^2 + g_3^2), \quad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

where the bilinear form  $D(f, g)$  satisfies  $D(f, g) = f g'' + f'' g - 2f'g'$ . We consider the following formal expansions:

$$g_i = g_{i1}X + g_{i3}X^3 + g_{i5}X^5, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$f = 1 + f_2X^2 + f_4X^4 + f_6X^6, \quad (2.4)$$

so that

$$u_i = \frac{g_{i1}X + g_{i3}X^3 + g_{i5}X^5}{1 + f_2X^2 + f_4X^4 + f_6X^6}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (2.5)$$

We then analyze the following cascade of equations in powers of  $X$ : for  $\eta_i = \sqrt{|\mu_i|} > 0$ ,

$$g_{i1}'' + \mu_i g_{i1} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (\text{A-1})$$

$$-f_2'' + (g_{11}^2 + g_{21}^2 + g_{31}^2) = 0, \quad (\text{A-2})$$

$$g_{i3}'' + (f_2 g_{i1}'' + g_{i1} f_2'' - 2g_{i1}' f_2') + \mu_i (g_{i3} + g_{i1} f_2) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (\text{A-3})$$

$$-f_4'' + (f_2')^2 - f_2 f_2'' + 2(g_{11} g_{13} + g_{21} g_{23} + g_{31} g_{33}) = 0, \quad (\text{A-4})$$

$$g''_{i5} + (f_2 g''_{i3} + g_{i3} f''_2 - 2g'_{i3} f'_2) + (f_4 g''_{i1} + g_{i1} f''_4 - 2f'_4 g'_{i1}) + \mu_i (g_{i5} + f_2 g_{i3} + g_{i3} f_2 + f_4 g_{i1}) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (\text{A-5})$$

$$-f''_6 - (f_2 f''_4 + f_4 f''_2 - 2f'_2 f'_4) + \sum_{i=1}^3 (2g_{i1} g_{i5} + g_{i3}^2) = 0, \quad (\text{A-6})$$

$$(f_6 g''_{i1} + g_{i1} f''_6 - 2f'_6 g'_{i1}) + (f_4 g''_{i3} + g_{i3} f''_4 - 2f'_4 g'_{i3}) + (f_2 g''_{i5} + g_{i5} f''_2 - 2f'_2 g'_{i5}) + \mu_i (f_6 g_{i1} + f_4 g_{i3} + f_2 g_{i5}) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (\text{A-7})$$

$$(f'_4)^2 - f''_4 f_4 + (f_6 f''_2 + f_2 f''_6 - 2f'_2 f'_6) + 2(g_{13} g_{15} + g_{23} g_{25} + g_{33} g_{35}) = 0, \quad (\text{A-8})$$

$$(f_4 g''_{i5} + g_{i5} f''_4 - 2g'_{i5} f'_4) + (f_6 g''_{i3} + g_{i3} f''_6 - 2g'_{i3} f'_6) + \mu_i (f_4 g_{i5} + f_6 g_{i3}) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (\text{A-9})$$

$$-(f_6 f''_4 + f_4 f''_6 - 2f'_4 f'_6) + (g_{15}^2 + g_{25}^2 + g_{35}^2) = 0, \quad (\text{A-10})$$

$$(f_6 g''_{i5} + g_{i5} f''_6 - 2g'_{i5} f'_6) + \mu_i g_{i5} f_6 = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (\text{A-11})$$

$$(f'_6)^2 - f_6 f''_6 = 0. \quad (\text{A-12})$$

The following lemma solves the formal expansions of (2.3) and (2.4).

**Lemma 2.1.** *The equations (A-1)–(A-12) are solved by*

$$g_{i1} = a_i e^{\eta_i x}, \quad \eta_i = \sqrt{|\mu_i|} > 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (2.6)$$

$$f_2 = \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{a_j^2}{4\eta_j^2} e^{2\eta_j x}, \quad (2.7)$$

$$g_{i3} = \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{a_i a_j^2 (\eta_i - \eta_j)}{4\eta_j^2 (\eta_i + \eta_j)} e^{(2\eta_j + \eta_i)x}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (2.8)$$

$$f_4 = \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq 3} \frac{a_j^2 a_k^2 (\eta_j - \eta_k)^2}{16\eta_j^2 \eta_k^2 (\eta_j + \eta_k)^2} e^{2(\eta_j + \eta_k)x}, \quad (2.9)$$

$$g_{i5} = \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq 3} \frac{a_i a_j^2 a_k^2 (\eta_j - \eta_k)^2 (\eta_i - \eta_j) (\eta_i - \eta_k)}{16\eta_j^2 \eta_k^2 (\eta_j + \eta_k)^2 (\eta_i + \eta_j) (\eta_i + \eta_k)} e^{(\eta_i + 2\eta_j + 2\eta_k)x}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$f_6 = \frac{a_1^2 a_2^2 a_3^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_2)^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_3)^2 (\eta_2 - \eta_3)^2}{64\eta_1^2 \eta_2^2 \eta_3^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_2)^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_3)^2 (\eta_2 + \eta_3)^2} e^{2(\eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3)x}, \quad (2.11)$$

where  $a_1, a_2$  and  $a_3$  are arbitrary.

**Proof.** We first derive from (A-1) that  $g_{i1}$  satisfies (2.6), where  $a_1, a_2$  and  $a_3$  are arbitrary. Inserting the explicit form (2.6) into (A-2), we then obtain (2.7). Following the explicit forms (2.6) and (2.7), we have

$$g''_{i3} + \mu_i g_{i3} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{a_i a_j^2}{\eta_j} e^{(\eta_i + 2\eta_j)x} = 0,$$



which further yields (2.8). Substituting the explicit forms (2.6)–(2.8) into (A-4), it follows that

$$f_4'' - \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq 3} \frac{a_j^2 a_k^2 (\eta_j - \eta_k)^2}{4\eta_j^2 \eta_k^2} e^{2(\eta_j + \eta_k)x} = 0,$$

which implies that

$$f_4 = \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq 3} \frac{a_j^2 a_k^2 (\eta_j - \eta_k)^2}{16\eta_j^2 \eta_k^2 (\eta_j + \eta_k)^2} e^{2(\eta_j + \eta_k)x},$$

*i.e.*, (2.9) holds true. Similarly, we next substitute (2.6)–(2.9) into (A-5), which gives that

$$g_{i5}'' + \mu_i g_{i5} + \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq 3} \frac{a_i a_j^2 a_k^2 (\eta_i + \eta_j + \eta_k) (\eta_j - \eta_k)^2 (\eta_i - \eta_j) (\eta_k - \eta_i)}{4\eta_j^2 \eta_k^2 (\eta_j + \eta_k)^2 (\eta_i + \eta_j) (\eta_i + \eta_k)} e^{(\eta_i + 2\eta_j + 2\eta_k)x} = 0.$$

This yields that

$$g_{i5} = \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq 3} \frac{a_i a_j^2 a_k^2 (\eta_j - \eta_k)^2 (\eta_i - \eta_j) (\eta_i - \eta_k)}{16\eta_j^2 \eta_k^2 (\eta_j + \eta_k)^2 (\eta_i + \eta_j) (\eta_i + \eta_k)} e^{(\eta_i + 2\eta_j + 2\eta_k)x},$$

*i.e.*, (2.10) holds true.

Applying (2.6)–(2.10), we finally deduce from (A-6) that

$$\begin{aligned} f_6'' &= (2f_2' f_4' - f_2 f_4'' - f_4 f_2'') + \sum_{i=1}^3 (2g_{i1} g_{i5} + g_{i3}^2) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{a_i^2 a_j^2 a_k^2}{64\eta_i^2 \eta_j^2 \eta_k^2} \left( -\frac{(\eta_j + \eta_k - \eta_i)^2 (\eta_j - \eta_k)^2}{(\eta_j + \eta_k)^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{4(\eta_i - \eta_j)(\eta_i - \eta_k)\eta_i^2 (\eta_j^2 + \eta_k^2)}{(\eta_i + \eta_j)(\eta_i + \eta_k)(\eta_j + \eta_k)^2} \right) e^{2(\eta_i + \eta_j + \eta_k)x} \\ &:= \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{a_i^2 a_j^2 a_k^2}{64\eta_i^2 \eta_j^2 \eta_k^2} (A_{i,j,k} + B_{i,j,k}) e^{2(\eta_i + \eta_j + \eta_k)x}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

where

$$A_{i,j,k} := -\frac{(\eta_j + \eta_k - \eta_i)^2 (\eta_j - \eta_k)^2}{(\eta_j + \eta_k)^2},$$

and

$$B_{i,j,k} := \frac{4(\eta_i - \eta_j)(\eta_i - \eta_k)\eta_i^2 (\eta_j^2 + \eta_k^2)}{(\eta_i + \eta_j)(\eta_i + \eta_k)(\eta_j + \eta_k)^2}.$$

Note that the term

$$\frac{a_i^2 a_j^2 a_k^2}{64\eta_i^2 \eta_j^2 \eta_k^2} e^{2(\eta_i + \eta_j + \eta_k)x}$$

is invariant under the permutations of  $i, j, k$ .

One can check that if  $\{i, j, k\} \neq \{1, 2, 3\}$ , then

$$\sum_{\text{all permutations of } i,j,k} (A_{i,j,k} + B_{i,j,k}) = 0.$$

Therefore, we derive from (2.12) that

$$\begin{aligned} f_6'' &= \frac{a_1^2 a_2^2 a_3^2}{64 \eta_1^2 \eta_2^2 \eta_3^2} \sum_{\substack{\text{all permutations of } i, j, k, \\ \text{where } \{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}}} (A_{i, j, k} + B_{i, j, k}) e^{2(\eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3)x} \\ &= \frac{a_1^2 a_2^2 a_3^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3)^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_2)^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_3)^2 (\eta_2 - \eta_3)^2}{64 \eta_1^2 \eta_2^2 \eta_3^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_2)^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_3)^2 (\eta_2 + \eta_3)^2} e^{2(\eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3)x}, \end{aligned}$$

which further implies that

$$f_6 = \frac{a_1^2 a_2^2 a_3^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_2)^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_3)^2 (\eta_2 - \eta_3)^2}{64 \eta_1^2 \eta_2^2 \eta_3^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_2)^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_3)^2 (\eta_2 + \eta_3)^2} e^{2(\eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3)x}.$$

This proves (2.11), and we are done.  $\square$

Applying the symmetry of the system (1.5), we next derive the following three constants of motion for (1.5).

**Lemma 2.2.** *For  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 < 0$ , suppose  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  is a solution of (1.5) in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$ . Then we have the following three constants of motion:*

$$(u_1')^2 + (u_2')^2 + (u_3')^2 + (u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)^2 + \mu_1 u_1^2 + \mu_2 u_2^2 + \mu_3 u_3^2 = 0, \quad (2.13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &(u_1' u_2 - u_1 u_2')^2 + (u_1' u_3 - u_1 u_3')^2 + (u_3' u_2 - u_3 u_2')^2 \\ &+ (u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2) [(\mu_2 + \mu_3) u_1^2 + (\mu_1 + \mu_3) u_2^2 + (\mu_1 + \mu_2) u_3^2] \\ &+ [(\mu_2 + \mu_3) (u_1')^2 + (\mu_1 + \mu_3) (u_2')^2 + (\mu_1 + \mu_2) (u_3')^2] \\ &+ [\mu_1 (\mu_2 + \mu_3) u_1^2 + \mu_2 (\mu_1 + \mu_3) u_2^2 + \mu_3 (\mu_1 + \mu_2) u_3^2] = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mu_3 (u_1' u_2 - u_1 u_2')^2 + \mu_2 (u_1' u_3 - u_1 u_3')^2 + \mu_1 (u_3' u_2 - u_3 u_2')^2 \\ &+ (u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2) (\mu_2 \mu_3 u_1^2 + \mu_1 \mu_3 u_2^2 + \mu_1 \mu_2 u_3^2) \\ &+ [\mu_2 \mu_3 (u_1')^2 + \mu_1 \mu_3 (u_2')^2 + \mu_1 \mu_2 (u_3')^2] \\ &+ \mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3 (u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

**Proof.** Since  $(u_1, u_2, u_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 < 0$ , it is standard to deduce from (1.5) that both  $u_i$  and  $u_i'$  vanish at infinity, where  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Therefore, the above three identities can be derived in a similar way, i.e., by multiplying the  $j$ -th equation in (1.5) by an integrating factor, where  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , summing up the resulting identities, and finally taking the integration on  $\mathbb{R}$ .

To derive (2.13), more precisely, we multiply the  $j$ -th equation of (1.5) by  $u_j'$ , where  $j = 1, 2, 3$ . Then we add together the resulting identities and integrate it on  $\mathbb{R}$ , where we use the fact that both  $u_j$  and  $u_j'$  vanish at infinity. This thus gives (2.13).

To obtain (2.14), we multiply the  $j$ -th equation of (1.5) by

$$\sum_{1 \leq k \leq 3, k \neq j} [2u_k (u_j' u_k - u_j u_k') + 2\mu_k u_j'], \quad j = 1, 2, 3.$$

We then add together the resulting identities and integrate it on  $\mathbb{R}$  again, which thus yields (2.14).

Multiply the  $j$ -th equation of (1.5) by

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < k \leq 3, i \neq j, k \neq j} [2\mu_k u_i (u'_j u_i - u_j u'_i) + 2\mu_i u_k (u'_j u_k - u_j u'_k) + 2\mu_i \mu_k u'_j], \quad j = 1, 2, 3,$$

which then gives (2.15) in the similar way as above. This therefore completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

## 2.1 Classification of solutions for degenerate cases

In this subsection, we classify the solutions of (1.5) for the degenerate cases where  $\mu_2 = \mu_i$  holds for either  $i = 1$  or  $i = 3$  or  $i = 1, 3$ . Our main results of this subsection can be stated as the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.3.** *For  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 < 0$ , let  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  be a solution of (1.5), and denote  $\eta_i = \sqrt{|\mu_i|} > 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Then we have the following conclusions:*

(i.) *If  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ , then there exists  $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} u_1(x) = \frac{a_1 e^{\eta_1 x}}{f(x)} \left[ 1 + \frac{a_3^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_3)}{4\eta_3^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_3)} e^{2\eta_3 x} \right], \\ u_2(x) = \frac{a_2 e^{\eta_1 x}}{f(x)} \left[ 1 + \frac{a_3^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_3)}{4\eta_3^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_3)} e^{2\eta_3 x} \right], \\ u_3(x) = \frac{a_3 e^{\eta_3 x}}{f(x)} \left[ 1 + \frac{(a_1^2 + a_2^2) (\eta_3 - \eta_1)}{4\eta_1^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_3)} e^{2\eta_1 x} \right], \end{cases} \quad (2.16)$$

where  $f$  is given by

$$f(x) = 1 + \frac{a_3^2}{4\eta_3^2} e^{2\eta_3 x} + \frac{(a_1^2 + a_2^2)}{4\eta_1^2} e^{2\eta_1 x} + \frac{(a_1^2 + a_2^2) a_3^2 (\eta_3 - \eta_1)^2}{16\eta_1^2 \eta_3^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_3)^2} e^{2(\eta_1 + \eta_3)x}.$$

Furthermore, if  $u_1^2 + u_2^2 \not\equiv 0$  and  $u_3 \not\equiv 0$ , then we have  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} (u_1^2 + u_2^2) dx = 2\eta_1$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_3^2 dx = 2\eta_3$ .

(ii.) *If  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 = \mu_3 < 0$ , then there exists  $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} u_1(x) = \frac{a_1 e^{\eta_1 x}}{f(x)} \left[ 1 + \frac{(a_2^2 + a_3^2) (\eta_1 - \eta_3)}{4\eta_3^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_3)} e^{2\eta_3 x} \right], \\ u_2(x) = \frac{a_2 e^{\eta_2 x}}{f(x)} \left[ 1 + \frac{a_1^2 (\eta_2 - \eta_1)}{4\eta_1^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_2)} e^{2\eta_1 x} \right], \\ u_3(x) = \frac{a_3 e^{\eta_2 x}}{f(x)} \left[ 1 + \frac{a_1^2 (\eta_2 - \eta_1)}{4\eta_1^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_2)} e^{2\eta_1 x} \right], \end{cases} \quad (2.17)$$

where  $f$  is given by

$$f(x) = 1 + \frac{a_1^2}{4\eta_1^2} e^{2\eta_1 x} + \frac{(a_2^2 + a_3^2)}{4\eta_3^2} e^{2\eta_3 x} + \frac{a_1^2 (a_2^2 + a_3^2) (\eta_1 - \eta_3)^2}{16\eta_1^2 \eta_3^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_3)^2} e^{2(\eta_1 + \eta_3)x}.$$

Furthermore, if  $u_1 \not\equiv 0$  and  $u_2^2 + u_3^2 \not\equiv 0$ , then we have  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_1^2 dx = 2\eta_1$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} (u_2^2 + u_3^2) dx = 2\eta_2$ .

(iii.) If  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 < 0$ , then there exists  $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  satisfies

$$u_i(x) = \frac{a_i e^{\eta_1 x}}{f(x)}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (2.18)$$

where  $f(x)$  is given by

$$f(x) = 1 + \frac{(a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2)}{4\eta_1^2} e^{2\eta_1 x}.$$

Furthermore, if  $\sum_{i=1}^3 u_i^2 \neq 0$ , then we have  $\sum_{i=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_i^2 dx = 2\eta_1$ .

**Proof.** (i). Suppose  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ , then we have  $\mu_3 > \mu_0$ , where  $\mu_0 < 0$  is the lowest eigenvalue of  $-\partial_{xx} - 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Thus,  $u_3$  vanishes at some point, and hence we can suppose  $u_3(0) = 0$  by a suitable translation. Also, we may assume that  $u_3'(0) \neq 0$ , since otherwise we have  $u_3 \equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ , and a similar argument of [6, Lemma 15] further gives (2.16). Similarly, we may assume that  $u_2 \neq 0$ , since otherwise the classification (2.16) follows directly from [6, Lemma 15].

Since  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$  and  $u_2 \neq 0$ , we now claim that

$$u_1 \equiv k u_2 \quad \text{holds for some } k \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.19)$$

Indeed, because  $u_3(0) = 0$  and  $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ , we derive from (2.13) and (2.14) that

$$\begin{cases} u_1'(0)^2 + u_2'(0)^2 + u_3'(0)^2 = -[(u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2)^2 + \mu_1(u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2)], \\ [u_1'(0)u_2(0) - u_1(0)u_2'(0)]^2 + (\mu_1 + \mu_3)(u_1'(0)^2 + u_2'(0)^2) \\ + [u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2 + 2\mu_1]u_3'(0)^2 \\ = -(\mu_1 + \mu_3)[u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2]^2 - \mu_1(\mu_1 + \mu_3)(u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2). \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

Subtract (2.15) by the product between  $\mu_3$  and (2.14), and then add the product of  $\mu_3^2$  and (2.13). It thus yields that

$$[(u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2) - (\mu_3 - \mu_1)]u_3'(0)^2 = 0.$$

Since  $u_3'(0)^2 \neq 0$ , the above three equations give that

$$\begin{cases} u_1'(0)^2 + u_2'(0)^2 + u_3'(0)^2 = -[(u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2)^2 + \mu_1 u_1(0)^2 + \mu_2 u_2(0)^2], \\ [u_1'(0)u_2(0) - u_1(0)u_2'(0)]^2 + [u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2 + (\mu_1 - \mu_3)]u_3'(0)^2 = 0, \\ u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2 = (\mu_3 - \mu_1), \end{cases} \quad (2.21)$$

where the second equation is derived by subtracting the second equation of (2.20) from the product between  $\mu_1 + \mu_3$  and the first equation of (2.20).

By the last two equations of (2.21), it yields that

$$u_1'(0)u_2(0) - u_1(0)u_2'(0) = 0. \quad (2.22)$$

If  $u_2(0) = 0$ , then we derive from the last equation of (2.21) that  $u_1(0) \neq 0$ , and thus  $u_2'(0) = 0$  by (2.22), which implies that  $u_2 \equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ , a contradiction. Hence, it must have  $u_2(0) \neq 0$ . This means that there exists some  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$u_1(0) = ku_2(0). \quad (2.23)$$

If  $u_2'(0) \neq 0$ , then we get from (2.22) that

$$u_1'(0) : u_2'(0) = u_1(0) : u_2(0) = k \text{ holds for the above } k \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Set  $u_0 = u_1 - ku_2$ , so that  $u_0$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} u_0'' + 2Vu_0 + \mu_1 u_0 = 0, & \text{where } V = u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2, \\ u_0'(0) = u_0(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.24)$$

This further implies that  $u_0 \equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ , and hence the claim (2.19) holds. On the other hand, if  $u_2'(0) = 0$ , then we derive from (2.22) that  $u_1'(0) = 0$ . This means that  $u_1'(0) = ku_2'(0)$  still holds for the constant  $k$  of (2.23). Thus, the same argument as above shows that the claim (2.19) still holds.

Applying (2.19), the system (1.5) is equivalent to the following form

$$\begin{cases} u_1'' + 2[(1+k^2)u_1^2 + u_3^2]u_1 + \mu_1 u_1 = 0, \\ u_3'' + 2[(1+k^2)u_1^2 + u_3^2]u_3 + \mu_3 u_3 = 0, \\ u_2 \equiv ku_1, \quad u_3(0) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.25)$$

and the system (2.21) becomes

$$(1+k^2)u_1(0)^2 = (\mu_3 - \mu_1) \quad \text{and} \quad (1+k^2)u_1'(0)^2 + u_3'(0)^2 = -\mu_3(\mu_3 - \mu_1), \quad (2.26)$$

where  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  is as in (2.19). Let  $(\hat{u}_1, \hat{u}_2, \hat{u}_3) = (\hat{u}_1, k\hat{u}_1, \hat{u}_3)$  be a solution of (2.25) satisfying the form (2.16). We claim that for any solution  $(u_1, u_2, u_3) = (u_1, ku_1, u_3)$  of (2.25), there exist suitable constants  $a_1$  and  $a_3$  such that

$$u_j(0) = \hat{u}_j(0) \quad \text{and} \quad u_j'(0) = \hat{u}_j'(0), \quad j = 1, 3. \quad (2.27)$$

Once the claim (2.27) is true, the uniqueness of ODE implies from (2.25) that  $u_j(x) \equiv \hat{u}_j(x)$  holds for  $j = 1, 3$ , which therefore completes the proof of (2.16) in view of (2.19).

We next prove the above claim (2.27). Choose

$$a_1 = \sqrt{\frac{4\eta_1^2(\eta_1 + \eta_3)}{(1+k^2)(\eta_1 - \eta_3)}} \text{ sign } u_1(0). \quad (2.28)$$

Since  $u_1^2(0)$  is fixed by (2.26), we deduce from (2.16) and (2.28) that  $\text{sign}(a_1) = \text{sign}(u_1(0))$ ,

$$\hat{u}_1(0) = u_1(0), \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{u}_3(0) = 0 = u_3(0).$$

On the other hand, it yields from (2.16) that for  $\eta_i = \sqrt{|\mu_i|} > 0$ ,

$$\sqrt{1+k^2}\hat{u}_1'(0) = \frac{-a_1}{|a_1|} \sqrt{-\mu_3(\mu_3 - \mu_1)} \frac{4\eta_3^2(\eta_1 + \eta_3) - a_3^2(\eta_1 - \eta_3)}{4\eta_3^2(\eta_1 + \eta_3) + a_3^2(\eta_1 - \eta_3)}, \quad (2.29)$$

where the last quotient of the right side is a decreasing function of  $a_3^2$  from  $[0, \infty]$  to  $[-1, 1]$ . We then derive from (2.26) and (2.29) that there exists a constant  $a_3^2 \in (0, \infty)$  such that

$$\hat{u}'_1(0) = u'_1(0),$$

which determines the absolute value of  $a_3^2$ . Following this identity, the second identity of (2.26) further gives that

$$\hat{u}'_3(0)^2 = u'_3(0)^2,$$

where (2.16) is also used. The sign of  $a_3$  can be chosen so that  $\hat{u}'_3(0) = u'_3(0)$  holds true. This proves the claim (2.27). Hence,  $(u_1, u_2, u_3) \equiv (\hat{u}_1, \hat{u}_2, \hat{u}_3)$ , which completes the proof of (2.16).

Finally, one can calculate from (2.16) that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} (u_1^2 + u_2^2) dx = - \left( \frac{\frac{a_3^2 \eta_1}{2\eta_3^2} e^{2\eta_3 x} + 2\eta_1}{f(x)} \right)' = 2\eta_1,$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} (u_3^2) dx = - \left( \frac{\frac{(a_1^2 + a_2^2)\eta_3}{2\eta_1^2} e^{2\eta_1 x} + 2\eta_3}{f(x)} \right)' = 2\eta_3.$$

This completes the proof of (i).

(ii). Suppose  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 = \mu_3 < 0$ , then we have  $\mu_3 > \mu_1 \geq \mu_0$ , where  $\mu_0 < 0$  is the lowest eigenvalue of  $-\partial_{xx} - 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Thus,  $u_3$  vanishes at some point. As before, we may assume that  $u_3(0) = 0$  and  $u'_3(0) \neq 0$ , which then implies that  $u_3(x) \not\equiv 0$ .

Subtract (2.15) by the product of  $\mu_3$  and (2.14), and then add the product of  $\mu_3^2$  and (2.13). It thus yields that

$$u_2(0)^2 u'_3(0)^2 = 0, \tag{2.30}$$

which further implies that  $u_2(0) = 0$ , since  $u'_3(0) \neq 0$ . We hence have  $u_2(0) = u_3(0) = 0$ . Because  $u'_3(0) \neq 0$ , there exists some  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $u'_2(0) = k u'_3(0)$ . Set  $u_0 = u_2 - k u_3$ , so that  $u_0$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} u_0'' + 2V u_0 + \mu_2 u_0 = 0, & \text{where } V = u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2, \\ u_0'(0) = u_0(0) = 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.31}$$

Since  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 = \mu_3 < 0$  and  $u_3(x) \not\equiv 0$ , the same argument of (2.19) then yields from (2.31) that

$$u_2 \equiv k u_3 \text{ holds for the above } k \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.32}$$

Following (2.30) and (2.32), we derive from (2.13) and (2.14) that

$$u'_1(0)^2 + (1 + k^2) u'_3(0)^2 + u_1(0)^4 + \mu_1 u_1^2(0) = 0, \tag{2.33}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 + k^2) u_1(0)^2 u'_3(0)^2 + 2\mu_2 u_1(0)^4 + 2\mu_2 u_1'(0)^2 \\ & + (\mu_1 + \mu_2)(1 + k^2) u'_3(0)^2 + 2\mu_1 \mu_2 u_1(0)^2 = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.34}$$

We then deduce from above that

$$u_1^2(0) = (\mu_2 - \mu_1). \tag{2.35}$$

Substituting (2.35) into (2.33), we also have

$$u_1'(0)^2 + (1 + k^2)u_3'(0)^2 = -\mu_2(\mu_2 - \mu_1). \quad (2.36)$$

Similarly, let  $(\hat{u}_1, \hat{u}_2, \hat{u}_3)$  be a solution of (1.5) satisfying the form (2.17). We next claim that for any solution  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  of (1.5), there exist suitable constants  $a_1, a_2$  and  $a_3$  such that

$$u_j(0) = \hat{u}_j(0) \quad \text{and} \quad u_j'(0) = \hat{u}_j'(0), \quad j = 1, 2, 3. \quad (2.37)$$

As before, once the claim (2.37) is true, the uniqueness of ODE implies that  $u_j(x) \equiv \hat{u}_j(x)$  holds for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , which therefore completes the proof of (2.17).

We now address the proof of the claim (2.37). Set

$$a_1 = \sqrt{\frac{4\eta_1^2(\eta_1 + \eta_2)}{(\eta_1 - \eta_2)}} \operatorname{sign} u_1(0), \quad (2.38)$$

so that  $\operatorname{sign} a_1 = \operatorname{sign} u_1(0)$ . It then follows from (2.17) and (2.35) that

$$\hat{u}_i(0) = u_i(0) \quad \text{holds for} \quad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

since we have already known from those around (2.30) that  $u_2(0) = u_3(0) = 0$ . As for  $a_2$  and  $a_3$ , we calculate from (2.17) that for  $\eta_i = \sqrt{|\mu_i|} > 0$ ,

$$\hat{u}_1'(0) = \frac{-a_1}{|a_1|} \sqrt{-\mu_2(\mu_2 - \mu_1)} \frac{4\eta_2^2(\eta_1 + \eta_2) - (a_2^2 + a_3^2)(\eta_1 - \eta_2)}{4\eta_2^2(\eta_1 + \eta_2) + (a_2^2 + a_3^2)(\eta_1 - \eta_2)}, \quad (2.39)$$

where the last quotient of the right side is a decreasing function of  $a_2^2 + a_3^2$  from  $[0, \infty]$  to  $[-1, 1]$ . We then deduce from (2.36) and (2.39) that there exists a constant  $a_2^2 + a_3^2 \in (0, \infty)$  such that

$$\hat{u}_1'(0) = u_1'(0). \quad (2.40)$$

On the other hand, we derive from (2.36) that

$$u_2'(0)^2 + u_3'(0)^2 = \hat{u}_2'(0)^2 + \hat{u}_3'(0)^2.$$

Set

$$\operatorname{sign} a_2 = \operatorname{sign} u_2(0), \quad \operatorname{sign} a_3 = \operatorname{sign} u_3(0),$$

and

$$a_2^2 : a_3^2 = u_2'(0)^2 : u_3'(0)^2,$$

due to the fact that  $u_3'(0) \neq 0$ . By the forms of  $\hat{u}_2$  and  $\hat{u}_3$  in (2.17), it then gives that

$$\hat{u}_2'(0)^2 : \hat{u}_3'(0)^2 = u_2'(0)^2 : u_3'(0)^2.$$

We thus conclude from above that there exist suitable constants  $a_2$  and  $a_3$  such that

$$\hat{u}_2'(0) = u_2'(0), \quad \hat{u}_3'(0) = u_3'(0).$$

Applying (2.38) and (2.40), we further deduce from (2.35) and (2.36) that there exist suitable constants  $a_1, a_2$  and  $a_3$  such that  $u_j(0) = \hat{u}_j(0)$  and  $u_j'(0) = \hat{u}_j'(0)$  hold for

$j = 1, 2, 3$ , and hence the claim (2.37) holds true. As mentioned before, this thus completes the proof of (2.17).

Following (2.17), direct calculations yield that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} (u_2^2 + u_3^2) dx = - \left( \frac{\frac{a_1^2 \eta_3}{2\eta_1^2} e^{2\eta_1 x} + 2\eta_3}{f(x)} \right)' = 2\eta_2 = 2\eta_3,$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_1^2 dx = - \left( \frac{\frac{(a_3^2 + a_2^2)\eta_1}{2\eta_3^2} e^{2\eta_3 x} + 2\eta_1}{f(x)} \right)' = 2\eta_1,$$

which give that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_1^2 dx = 2\eta_1, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} (u_2^2 + u_3^2) dx = 2\eta_2.$$

This completes the proof of (ii).

(iii). Suppose  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 < 0$ . Subtracting (2.15) by the product between  $2\mu_1$  and (2.14), it yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & (u_1'(0)u_2(0) - u_1(0)u_2'(0))^2 + (u_1'(0)u_3(0) - u_1(0)u_3'(0))^2 \\ & + (u_3'(0)u_2(0) - u_3(0)u_2'(0))^2 = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which further implies that

$$\begin{aligned} u_1'(0)u_2(0) - u_1(0)u_2'(0) &= u_1'(0)u_3(0) - u_1(0)u_3'(0) \\ &= u_3'(0)u_2(0) - u_3(0)u_2'(0) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.41}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $u_3(x) \not\equiv 0$ . It then follows from (2.41) that there exist  $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$u_1(0) = k_1 u_3(0), \quad u_1'(0) = k_1 u_3'(0),$$

and

$$u_2(0) = k_2 u_3(0), \quad u_2'(0) = k_2 u_3'(0).$$

The same argument of (2.24) gives that  $u_1 \equiv k_1 u_3$  and  $u_2 \equiv k_2 u_3$ . Thus,  $u_3$  satisfies the following equation

$$u_3'' + 2(1 + k_1^2 + k_2^2)u_3^3 = -\mu_1 u_3,$$

which admits the following constant of motion:

$$(u_3')^2 + (1 + k_1^2 + k_2^2)u_3^4 + \mu_1 u_3^2 = 0.$$

Since  $u_3 \not\equiv 0$ , the above equation gives that  $u_3$  cannot change sign. Indeed, on the contrary, suppose  $u_3$  changes sign, after a suitable translation, then we may assume that  $u_3(0) = 0$ . Thus, we can deduce that  $u_3'(0) = 0$  and hence  $u_3 \equiv 0$ , a contradiction. Therefore,  $u_3$  is either positive or negative, which further yields that  $u_3$  is the unique positive (or negative) solution of

$$u'' + (1 + k_1^2 + k_2^2)u^3 + \mu_1 u^2 = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}.$$



Hence, (2.18) holds true, where  $\frac{1}{1+k_1^2+k_2^2} = \frac{a_3}{a_1^2+a_2^2+a_3^2}$ , and  $\frac{k_i}{1+k_1^2+k_2^2} = \frac{a_i}{a_1^2+a_2^2+a_3^2}$  holds for  $i = 1, 2$ . Direct computations further give that  $\sum_{i=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_i^2 dx = 2\eta_1$ . This completes the proof of Proposition 2.3.  $\square$

The above proof of Proposition 2.3 shows that if  $\mu_2 = \mu_i$  holds for either  $i = 1$  or  $i = 3$  or  $i = 1, 3$ , then the classification of general solutions for the system (1.5) follows essentially from the argument of [6, Lemma 15], which unfortunately is not applied to the general case  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ .

### 3 Classification of General Solutions

In this section we further analyze the properties of general solutions for (1.5), based on which we shall complete in Subsection 3.1 the proofs of Theorems 1.1 & 1.2 and Corollary 1.3. We start with the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.1.** *For  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ , suppose  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  is a solution of (1.5) satisfying  $u_3(x) \not\equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then we have the following conclusions:*

- (i). *If  $u_i(0) = u_3(0) = 0$  holds for either  $i = 1$  or  $2$ , then we have  $u_i \equiv 0$ .*
- (ii). *If  $u'_1(0) = u'_2(0) = u_3(0) = 0$ , then we have either  $u_1 \equiv 0$  or  $u_2 \equiv 0$ .*

**Proof.** By the assumption  $u_3(0) = 0$  of Lemma 3.1, we subtract (2.15) by the product between  $\mu_3$  and (2.14), and then add the product of  $\mu_3^2$  and (2.13). It thus yields that

$$(\mu_3 - \mu_2)u_1(0)^2 + (\mu_3 - \mu_1)u_2(0)^2 = (\mu_3 - \mu_1)(\mu_3 - \mu_2). \quad (3.1)$$

We next follow (3.1) to complete the proof.

(i). We only consider the case  $i = 1$ , so that  $u_1(0) = u_3(0) = 0$ , since the other case can be proved similarly. For this case, we first obtain from (3.1) that  $u_2(0)^2 = \mu_3 - \mu_2$ . Moreover, we derive from (2.13) and (2.14) that

$$\begin{cases} u'_1(0)^2 + u'_2(0)^2 + u'_3(0)^2 = -\mu_3(\mu_3 - \mu_2), \\ u'_2(0)^2 + u'_3(0)^2 = -\mu_3(\mu_3 - \mu_2), \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

which implies that  $u'_1(0) = 0$ . Hence  $u_1 \equiv 0$ , and we are done.

(ii). Suppose  $u'_1(0) = u'_2(0) = u_3(0) = 0$ , then we derive from (2.13), (2.14) and (3.1) that

$$\begin{cases} u'_3(0)^2 = -[(u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2)^2 + \mu_1 u_1(0)^2 + \mu_2 u_2(0)^2], \\ [u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2 + (\mu_2 - \mu_3)]u'_3(0)^2 \\ = -(\mu_2 - \mu_1)[u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2 + \mu_1]u_1(0)^2, \\ (\mu_3 - \mu_2)u_1(0)^2 + (\mu_3 - \mu_1)u_2(0)^2 = (\mu_3 - \mu_1)(\mu_3 - \mu_2). \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

By eliminating the variable  $u'_3(0)^2$  from the first two equations of (3.3), we obtain that

$$\begin{cases} [(u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2)^2 + \mu_1 u_1(0)^2 + \mu_2 u_2(0)^2] [u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2 + (\mu_2 - \mu_3)] \\ = (\mu_2 - \mu_1)[u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2 + \mu_1]u_1(0)^2, \\ (\mu_3 - \mu_2)u_1(0)^2 + (\mu_3 - \mu_1)u_2(0)^2 = (\mu_3 - \mu_1)(\mu_3 - \mu_2). \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

One can verify that the solution  $(u_1(0)^2, u_2(0)^2)$  of the above system has the following three different forms:

$$\begin{aligned} (u_1(0)^2, u_2(0)^2) &= (0, \mu_3 - \mu_2), \quad (u_1(0)^2, u_2(0)^2) = (\mu_3 - \mu_1, 0), \\ (u_1(0)^2, u_2(0)^2) &= \left( -\frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_3)\mu_1}{\mu_1 - \mu_2}, \frac{(\mu_2 - \mu_3)\mu_2}{\mu_1 - \mu_2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here the second component of the last one is negative, which is impossible. Therefore, we have either  $u_1(0) = 0$ , which implies that  $u_1(x) \equiv 0$ , or  $u_2(0) = 0$ , which implies that  $u_2(x) \equiv 0$ . Lemma 3.1 is therefore proved.  $\square$

In the following, we consider the last case where  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ , and

$$u_1(0) \neq 0, \quad u_2(0) \neq 0, \quad u'_i(0) \neq 0 \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq 2, \quad u_3(0) = 0, \quad u'_3(0) \neq 0. \quad (3.5)$$

Without loss of generality, the assumption of (3.5) is equivalent to the following form: there exist a constant  $p \in \mathbb{R}$  and a nonzero constant  $q \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$u_3(0) = 0, \quad \frac{u_2(0)}{u_1(0)} = q \neq 0, \quad u'_2(0) = pu'_1(0), \quad u'_1(0) \neq 0, \quad u'_3(0) \neq 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} f(p) &:= -\left\{ \frac{(1+q^2)^2(\mu_3 - \mu_1)(\mu_3 - \mu_2)}{(\mu_3 - \mu_2) + q^2(\mu_3 - \mu_1)} + \mu_1 + q^2\mu_2 \right\} \\ &\quad - (1+p^2) \frac{q^2(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2(\mu_1^2 q^2 - \mu_1\mu_3 q^2 + \mu_2^2 - \mu_2\mu_3)}{[(\mu_3 - \mu_2) + q^2(\mu_3 - \mu_1)][(\mu_3 - \mu_2)p - (\mu_3 - \mu_1)q]^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

We shall prove in (3.18) below that for any given  $q \neq 0$ ,  $f(p)$  admits exactly two different zero points denoted by  $\underline{p} = \underline{p}(q) < \bar{p} = \bar{p}(q)$ , i.e.,

$$f(\underline{p}) = f(\bar{p}) = 0, \quad \text{where } \underline{p} < \bar{p}. \quad (3.8)$$

We now address the following classification for the last case (3.6):

**Proposition 3.2.** *For  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ , suppose the function  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  satisfies (3.6) at  $x = 0$ . Then*

$$(u_1(0), u_2(0), u_3(0), u'_1(0), u'_2(0), u'_3(0))$$

*satisfies (2.13)–(2.15) at  $x = 0$ , if and only if*

$$q \neq 0, \quad p \in (\underline{p}, \bar{p}), \quad (3.9)$$

*where the constants  $\underline{p} = \underline{p}(q)$  and  $\bar{p} = \bar{p}(q)$  are as in (3.8). Moreover, if  $p$  satisfies (3.9), then (2.13)–(2.15) at  $x = 0$  admits at most the following four solutions:*

$$\begin{aligned} &(u_1(0), u_2(0), 0, u'_1(0), u'_2(0), u'_3(0)), \\ &(-u_1(0), -u_2(0), 0, -u'_1(0), -u'_2(0), u'_3(0)), \\ &(u_1(0), u_2(0), 0, u'_1(0), u'_2(0), -u'_3(0)), \\ &(-u_1(0), -u_2(0), 0, -u'_1(0), -u'_2(0), -u'_3(0)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

**Proof.** Suppose  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  is a solution of (2.13)–(2.15) satisfying (3.6) at  $x = 0$ , then the standard elliptic regularity theory gives that  $u \in C^1(\mathbb{R}) \times C^1(\mathbb{R}) \times C^1(\mathbb{R})$ . Applying (3.6), we derive from (2.13) and (2.14) that

$$\begin{cases} (1+p^2)u_1'(0)^2 + u_3'(0)^2 = -[(u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2)^2 + \mu_1 u_1(0)^2 + \mu_2 u_2(0)^2], \\ [(p-q)^2 u_1(0)^2 + (\mu_2 + \mu_3) + p^2(\mu_1 + \mu_3)]u_1'(0)^2 \\ + [u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2 + (\mu_1 + \mu_2)]u_3'(0)^2 \\ = -[u_1(0)^2 + u_2(0)^2][(\mu_2 + \mu_3)u_1(0)^2 + (\mu_1 + \mu_3)u_2(0)^2] \\ - [\mu_1(\mu_2 + \mu_3)u_1(0)^2 + \mu_2(\mu_1 + \mu_3)u_2(0)^2]. \end{cases} \quad (3.11)$$

Subtract (2.15) by the product of  $\mu_3$  and (2.14), and then add the product of  $\mu_3^2$  and (2.13). It thus yields that

$$[(\mu_3 - \mu_2)u_1(0)^2 + (\mu_3 - \mu_1)u_2(0)^2 - (\mu_3 - \mu_1)(\mu_3 - \mu_2)]u_3'(0)^2 = 0,$$

where  $u_3'(0) \neq 0$  in view of (3.6). Following the above three equations, we then deduce from (3.6) that

$$\begin{cases} (1+p^2)u_1'(0)^2 + u_3'(0)^2 = -[(1+q^2)^2 u_1(0)^2 + \mu_1 + q^2 \mu_2]u_1(0)^2, \\ [(p-q)^2 u_1(0)^2 - (\mu_1 - \mu_2)]u_1'(0)^2 + [(1+q^2)u_1(0)^2 + (\mu_2 - \mu_3)]u_3'(0)^2 \\ = (1+q^2)(\mu_1 - \mu_2)u_1(0)^4 + \mu_1(\mu_1 - \mu_2)u_1(0)^2, \\ [(\mu_3 - \mu_2) + q^2(\mu_3 - \mu_1)]u_1(0)^2 = (\mu_3 - \mu_1)(\mu_3 - \mu_2), \end{cases} \quad (3.12)$$

where the constants  $q$  and  $p$  are as in (3.6), and the second equation is derived by subtracting the second equation of (3.11) from the product between  $\mu_1 + \mu_3$  and the first equation of (3.11). Note that the values of  $u_1(0)^2$  and  $u_2(0)^2 = q^2 u_1(0)^2$  are determined by the last equation of (3.12).

By Cramer's Rule, we obtain from (3.12) that

$$u_1'(0)^2 = \frac{D_1}{D},$$

where

$$D = \det \begin{vmatrix} (1+p^2) & 1 \\ (p-q)^2 u_1(0)^2 - (\mu_1 - \mu_2) & (1+q^2)u_1(0)^2 + (\mu_2 - \mu_3) \end{vmatrix},$$

and

$$D_1 = \det \begin{vmatrix} -[(1+q^2)^2 u_1(0)^2 + \mu_1 + q^2 \mu_2]u_1(0)^2 & 1 \\ (1+q^2)(\mu_1 - \mu_2)u_1(0)^4 + \mu_1(\mu_1 - \mu_2)u_1(0)^2 & (1+q^2)u_1(0)^2 + (\mu_2 - \mu_3) \end{vmatrix}.$$

Direct calculations then yield from (3.12) that

$$\begin{aligned} D &= (pq+1)^2 u_1(0)^2 - [\mu_3 - \mu_1 + p^2(\mu_3 - \mu_2)] \\ &= [q^2 u_1(0)^2 - (\mu_3 - \mu_2)]p^2 + 2pqu_1(0)^2 + [u_1(0)^2 - (\mu_3 - \mu_1)] \\ &= -\frac{1}{(\mu_3 - \mu_2) + q^2(\mu_3 - \mu_1)} [(\mu_3 - \mu_2)p - (\mu_3 - \mu_1)q]^2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{D_1}{u_1(0)^2} &= (1+q^2)(\mu_1 - \mu_2)u_1(0)^2 + \mu_1(\mu_1 - \mu_2) + (1+q^2)^3u_1(0)^4 \\
&\quad + (\mu_2 - \mu_3)(1+q^2)^2u_1(0)^2 + (\mu_1 + \mu_2q^2)(1+q^2)u_1(0)^2 \\
&\quad + (\mu_1 + \mu_2q^2)(\mu_2 - \mu_3) \\
&= -\frac{q^2(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2(\mu_1^2q^2 - \mu_1\mu_3q^2 + \mu_2^2 - \mu_2\mu_3)}{[(\mu_3 - \mu_2) + q^2(\mu_3 - \mu_1)]^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \leq u_1'(0)^2 &= \frac{D_1}{D} \\
&= \frac{q^2(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2(\mu_3 - \mu_1)(\mu_3 - \mu_2)(\mu_1^2q^2 - \mu_1\mu_3q^2 + \mu_2^2 - \mu_2\mu_3)}{[(\mu_3 - \mu_2) + q^2(\mu_3 - \mu_1)]^2[(\mu_3 - \mu_2)p - (\mu_3 - \mu_1)q]^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Since  $\frac{D_1}{D}$  is positive for any  $p \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $0 \neq q \in \mathbb{R}$ , there is no restriction on  $p$  and  $q$  to ensure that  $u_1'(0)^2 > 0$ .

We next analyze  $u_3'(0)^2$  as follows. It follows from (3.12) and (3.13) that for any  $q \neq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \leq \frac{u_3'(0)^2}{u_1(0)^2} &= -[(1+q^2)^2u_1(0)^2 + \mu_1 + q^2\mu_2] \\
&\quad - (1+p^2)\frac{q^2(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2(\mu_1^2q^2 - \mu_1\mu_3q^2 + \mu_2^2 - \mu_2\mu_3)}{[(\mu_3 - \mu_2) + q^2(\mu_3 - \mu_1)][(\mu_3 - \mu_2)p - (\mu_3 - \mu_1)q]^2} \\
&= -\left\{ \frac{(1+q^2)^2(\mu_3 - \mu_1)(\mu_3 - \mu_2)}{(\mu_3 - \mu_2) + q^2(\mu_3 - \mu_1)} + \mu_1 + q^2\mu_2 \right\} \\
&\quad - \frac{q^2(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2(\mu_1^2q^2 - \mu_1\mu_3q^2 + \mu_2^2 - \mu_2\mu_3)}{[(\mu_3 - \mu_2) + q^2(\mu_3 - \mu_1)]} \frac{1+p^2}{[(\mu_3 - \mu_2)p - (\mu_3 - \mu_1)q]^2} \\
&:= f(p).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

For any  $q \neq 0$ , since  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ , the second term of  $f(p)$  is strictly negative, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1+p^2}{[(\mu_3 - \mu_2)p - (\mu_3 - \mu_1)q]^2} &= \frac{1}{[(\mu_3 - \mu_2)\frac{p}{\sqrt{1+p^2}} - (\mu_3 - \mu_1)q\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+p^2}}]^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{[(\mu_3 - \mu_2)^2 + (\mu_3 - \mu_1)^2q^2] \cos^2 \theta_p},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

where  $\theta_p \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}) \cup (\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi]$  denotes the angle between the vectors  $(\mu_3 - \mu_2, -(\mu_3 - \mu_1)q)$  and  $(\frac{p}{\sqrt{1+p^2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+p^2}})$ . It then implies from (3.14) and (3.15) that for any  $q \neq 0$ ,  $f(p)$

attains its maximal value, if and only if  $p \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfies  $\theta_p = 0$  or  $\pi$ , where

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{p \in \mathbb{R}} f(p) &= \frac{(q^2 + 1)^2(\mu_2 - \mu_3)(\mu_1 - \mu_3)}{\mu_2 - \mu_3 + q^2(\mu_1 - \mu_3)} - \mu_1 - \mu_2 q^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{q^2(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2(\mu_1^2 q^2 - \mu_1 \mu_3 q^2 + \mu_2^2 - \mu_2 \mu_3)}{[(\mu_3 - \mu_2) + q^2(\mu_3 - \mu_1)][(\mu_3 - \mu_2)^2 + (\mu_3 - \mu_1)^2 q^2]} \\
&= \frac{(q^2 + 1)^2(\mu_2 - \mu_3)(\mu_1 - \mu_3)}{\mu_2 - \mu_3 + q^2(\mu_1 - \mu_3)} - \mu_2 q^2 - \mu_1 \\
&\quad - \frac{q^2(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{(\mu_3 - \mu_2) + q^2(\mu_3 - \mu_1)} + \frac{q^2 \mu_3 (\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{(\mu_3 - \mu_2)^2 + q^2(\mu_3 - \mu_1)^2} \\
&= -\mu_3 \frac{[q^2(\mu_1 - \mu_3) + (\mu_2 - \mu_3)]^2}{(\mu_3 - \mu_1)^2 q^2 + (\mu_3 - \mu_2)^2} > 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Moreover, we deduce from (3.14) and (3.15) that for any  $q \neq 0$ ,  $f(p)$  is monotonically decreasing in  $\theta_p \in [0, \pi/2)$ , and  $f(p)$  is monotonically increasing in  $\theta_p \in (\pi/2, \pi]$ , where

$$\lim_{\theta_p \rightarrow \frac{\pi}{2}} f(p) = -\infty. \tag{3.17}$$

We thus conclude from (3.16) and (3.17) that for any  $q \neq 0$ ,  $f(p)$  admits exactly two different zero points denoted by  $\underline{p} = \underline{p}(q) < \bar{p} = \bar{p}(q)$ , *i.e.*,

$$f(\underline{p}) = f(\bar{p}) = 0, \quad \text{where } \underline{p} < \bar{p}. \tag{3.18}$$

This further shows from (3.14) that  $0 < u'_3(0)^2$ , *i.e.*,  $f(p) > 0$ , if and only if

$$p \in (\underline{p}, \bar{p}), \quad \text{where } \underline{p} = \underline{p}(q) < \bar{p} = \bar{p}(q) \text{ satisfy } f(\underline{p}) = f(\bar{p}) = 0. \tag{3.19}$$

Therefore, we conclude that the system (2.13)–(2.15) at  $x = 0$  admits a solution

$$(u_1(0), u_2(0), u_3(0), u'_1(0), u'_2(0), u'_3(0)),$$

if and only if  $q$  and  $p$  satisfy (3.9).

Finally, since  $u_3(0) = 0$ , if  $q$  and  $p$  satisfy (3.9), then one can verify from (3.6) and (3.12) that (2.13)–(2.15) admits at most four solutions of the form (3.10), due to the symmetry of (3.11) with respect to  $u_1(0)$ ,  $u_2(0)$ ,  $u'_1(0)$ , and  $u'_3(0)$ . This completes the proof of Proposition 3.2.  $\square$

For  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ , Proposition 3.2 implies that for  $\tilde{u}_3(0) = 0$  and  $\frac{\tilde{u}_2(0)}{\tilde{u}_1(0)} = q \neq 0$ , there exist *at most* four solutions

$$(u_1(0), u_2(0), u_3(0), u'_1(0), u'_2(0), u'_3(0))$$

of (2.13)–(2.15) satisfying (3.6) and (3.9). Since any solution  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  of (1.5) is uniquely determined by its initial condition  $(u_1(0), u_2(0), u_3(0), u'_1(0), u'_2(0), u'_3(0))$ , it follows from Proposition 3.2 that (1.5) admits at most four solutions satisfying (3.6) and (3.9). For  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ , in the following we further prove that (1.5) admits exactly four solutions, whose initial conditions satisfy (3.6) and (3.9). For this purpose, since any solution  $\tilde{u} = (\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \tilde{u}_3)$  of (1.5) can be written as  $\tilde{u}_i = \frac{q_i}{f}$  satisfying Lemma 2.1,

which is determined by  $a_1, a_2, a_3$ , it suffices to prove that for  $\tilde{u}_3(0) = 0$  and  $\frac{\tilde{u}_2(0)}{\tilde{u}_1(0)} = q \neq 0$ , there exist *at least* four vectors  $(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ , where  $a_i \neq 0$  holds for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , so that

$$(\tilde{u}_1(0), \tilde{u}_2(0), 0, \tilde{u}'_1(0), \tilde{u}'_2(0), \tilde{u}'_3(0)) \text{ satisfies (3.6) and (3.9)}. \quad (3.20)$$

In order to prove (3.20), suppose  $\tilde{u} = (\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \tilde{u}_3)$  is a solution of (1.5) and satisfies  $\tilde{u}'_3(0) \neq 0$ ,  $\tilde{u}_3(0) = 0$  and  $\frac{\tilde{u}_2(0)}{\tilde{u}_1(0)} = q \neq 0$ . Applying Lemma 2.1,  $u$  can be written as  $\tilde{u}_i = \frac{g_i}{f}$  in terms of  $a_1, a_2$  and  $a_3$ , and it then follows from (2.1) that  $a_1, a_2$  and  $a_3$  satisfy

$$1 + \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{a_1^2(\eta_3 - \eta_1)}{\eta_1^2(\eta_3 + \eta_1)} + \frac{a_2^2(\eta_3 - \eta_2)}{\eta_2^2(\eta_3 + \eta_2)} \right) + \frac{1}{16} \frac{a_1^2 a_2^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_2)^2 (\eta_3 - \eta_1) (\eta_3 - \eta_2)}{\eta_1^2 \eta_2^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_2)^2 (\eta_3 + \eta_1) (\eta_3 + \eta_2)} = 0, \quad (3.21)$$

and

$$\frac{a_2 \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{a_1^2(\eta_2 - \eta_1)}{\eta_1^2(\eta_2 + \eta_1)} + \frac{a_3^2(\eta_2 - \eta_3)}{\eta_3^2(\eta_2 + \eta_3)} \right) + \frac{1}{16} \frac{a_1^2 a_3^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_3)^2 (\eta_2 - \eta_1) (\eta_2 - \eta_3)}{\eta_1^2 \eta_3^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_3)^2 (\eta_2 + \eta_1) (\eta_2 + \eta_3)} \right]}{a_1 \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{a_2^2(\eta_1 - \eta_2)}{\eta_2^2(\eta_1 + \eta_2)} + \frac{a_3^2(\eta_1 - \eta_3)}{\eta_3^2(\eta_1 + \eta_3)} \right) + \frac{1}{16} \frac{a_2^2 a_3^2 (\eta_2 - \eta_3)^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_2) (\eta_1 - \eta_3)}{\eta_2^2 \eta_3^2 (\eta_2 + \eta_3)^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_2) (\eta_1 + \eta_3)} \right]} = q \neq 0, \quad (3.22)$$

where and below  $\eta_i = \sqrt{|\mu_i|} > 0$  holds for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . It yields from (3.22) that  $a_i \neq 0$  holds for all  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , due to the assumption  $\tilde{u}'_3(0) \neq 0$ . Denote

$$X = \frac{a_1}{\eta_1}, \quad Y = \frac{a_2}{\eta_2}, \quad Z = \frac{a_3}{\eta_3}, \quad (3.23)$$

and

$$0 < A_{12} = \frac{\eta_1 - \eta_2}{\eta_1 + \eta_2} < 1, \quad 0 < A_{13} = \frac{\eta_1 - \eta_3}{\eta_1 + \eta_3} < 1, \quad 0 < A_{23} = \frac{\eta_2 - \eta_3}{\eta_2 + \eta_3} < 1. \quad (3.24)$$

Thus, the problem  $(a_1, a_2, a_3)$  of (3.21) and (3.22) can be simplified as the problem  $(X, Y, Z)$  of

$$1 - \frac{1}{4} (A_{13} X^2 + A_{23} Y^2) + \frac{1}{16} A_{12}^2 A_{13} A_{23} X^2 Y^2 = 0, \quad (3.25)$$

and

$$\frac{\eta_2 Y \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{4} (-A_{12} X^2 + A_{23} Z^2) - \frac{1}{16} A_{13}^2 A_{12} A_{23} X^2 Z^2 \right]}{\eta_1 X \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{4} (A_{12} Y^2 + A_{13} Z^2) + \frac{1}{16} A_{23}^2 A_{12} A_{13} Y^2 Z^2 \right]} = q, \quad (3.26)$$

where  $q \neq 0$ ,  $X \neq 0$ ,  $Y \neq 0$ , and  $Z \neq 0$ . Denote the intersection of (3.25) and (3.26) by

$$S := \left\{ (X, Y, Z) : (X, Y, Z) \text{ satisfies (3.25) and (3.26),} \right. \\ \left. \text{where } X \neq 0, Y \neq 0, \text{ and } Z \neq 0 \right\}. \quad (3.27)$$

One can check from (3.25) that  $\frac{a_2}{a_1}$  is arbitrary. We then obtain from (3.26) that for any  $q \neq 0$ , there always exists a solution  $(X = X(a_1), Y = Y(a_2), Z = Z(a_3))$  satisfying the above system (3.25) and (3.26). Therefore, for any  $q \neq 0$ , we have  $S \neq \emptyset$ .

For any fixed  $q \neq 0$ , we define

$$p := \frac{\tilde{u}'_2(0)}{\tilde{u}'_1(0)}, \quad \text{so that (3.6) is fully satisfied.} \quad (3.28)$$

In order to analyze  $p$ , it is obvious from Lemma 2.1 that

$$p \text{ is a continuous function of } (X(a_1), Y(a_2), Z(a_3)).$$




Figure 1: The curves  $(X, Y)$  of (3.25).

Moreover, for any fixed  $q \neq 0$ ,  $p(X, Y, Z)$  can be thought of as:

$$p : \text{the curve } S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^1 \text{ is continuous.} \quad (3.29)$$

The following lemma shows that for any fixed  $q \neq 0$ , the range of  $p(X, Y, Z)$  along at least four connected branches of the curve  $S$  defined by (3.27) is equal to  $(\underline{p}, \bar{p})$ , where  $\underline{p} = \underline{p}(q) < \bar{p} = \bar{p}(q)$  are as in (3.8). This implies equivalently that for  $\tilde{u}_3(0) = 0$  and  $\frac{\tilde{u}_2(0)}{\tilde{u}_1(0)} = q \neq 0$ , there exist *at least* four vectors  $(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ , where  $a_i \neq 0$  holds for all  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , so that  $(\tilde{u}_1(0), \tilde{u}_2(0), 0, \tilde{u}'_1(0), \tilde{u}'_2(0), \tilde{u}'_3(0))$  also satisfies (3.9). Once Lemma 3.3 below is proved, this therefore completes the proof of (3.20) in view of (3.28).

**Lemma 3.3.** *For any fixed  $q \neq 0$ , let the curve  $S$  be defined by (3.27). Then  $S$  has four connected branches  $S_1, S_2, S_3$  and  $S_4$ , i.e.,  $S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3 \cup S_4 \subset S$ , along each of which the function  $p$  defined in (3.28) is onto  $(\underline{p}, \bar{p})$ , i.e.,  $p(S_i) = (\underline{p}, \bar{p})$  holds for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ .*

**Proof.** In view of (3.23) and (3.24), we rewrite (3.25) as

$$\left(\frac{1}{4}A_{13}A_{12}X^2 - \frac{1}{A_{12}}\right)\left(\frac{1}{4}A_{23}A_{12}Y^2 - \frac{1}{A_{12}}\right) = \frac{1}{A_{12}^2} - 1 > 0, \quad X \neq 0, \quad Y \neq 0, \quad (3.30)$$

which has eight connected branches in the  $XY$  plane, see above Figure 1. On the other hand, (3.26) can be regarded as

$$\begin{aligned} Z^2 &:= F(X, Y) \\ &= \frac{-4(A_{12}XY^2\eta_1q + A_{12}X^2Y\eta_2 + 4X\eta_1q - 4Y\eta_2)}{(A_{12}A_{13}A_{23}^2XY^2\eta_1q + A_{12}A_{13}^2A_{23}X^2Y\eta_2 + 4A_{13}X\eta_1q - 4A_{23}Y\eta_2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

where  $F(X, Y)$  is a rational function of  $X$  and  $Y$ , and continuous with respect to  $X$  and  $Y$  along each connected branch of (3.25).

Since  $S \neq \emptyset$ , we consider from (3.30) that the point  $(x_0, y_0, z_0) \in S$  satisfies

$$z_0 > 0, \quad \frac{1}{4}A_{13}A_{12}x_0^2 - \frac{1}{A_{12}} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{4}A_{23}A_{12}y_0^2 - \frac{1}{A_{12}} > 0, \quad (3.32)$$

which corresponds to a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on the bold black curve in the first quadrant of Figure 1. Set

$$S_1 := \{(x_0, y_0, z_0)\} \cup \{(x, y, z) : (x, y, z) \in S \text{ is connected with } (x_0, y_0, z_0)\}, \quad (3.33)$$

where  $(x_0, y_0, z_0)$  is as in (3.32). We now prove that

$$\sup \{x^2 + y^2 : (x, y, z) \in S_1 \subset S\} < \infty. \quad (3.34)$$

On the contrary, suppose (3.34) is false, then there exists a sequence  $\{(x_n, y_n, z_n)\} \subset S_1$  such that either  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n^2 = \infty$  or  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n^2 = \infty$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n^2 = \infty$ . Since  $(x_n, y_n)$  satisfies (3.25), we obtain from (3.30) that the sequence  $\{y_n\}$  is bounded uniformly in  $n$ . Thus, we derive from (3.31) that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z_n^2 = -\frac{4}{A_{13}^2 A_{23}} < 0,$$

which is impossible. Thus, (3.34) holds true.

Define the left endpoint  $T_1 = (x_1, y_1, z_1)$  and the right endpoint  $T_2 = (x_2, y_2, z_2)$  of  $S_1$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= \inf \{x : (x, y, z) \in S_1\}, \quad y_1 = \sup \{y : (x, y, z) \in S_1\}, \quad z_1 = \sqrt{F(x_1, y_1)}, \\ x_2 &= \sup \{x : (x, y, z) \in S_1\}, \quad y_2 = \inf \{y : (x, y, z) \in S_1\}, \quad z_2 = \sqrt{F(x_2, y_2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

where  $z_i = +\infty$  is defined for  $i = 1, 2$ , provided that  $(x_i, y_i)$  is a singular point of  $F(X, Y)$ . We next claim that the point  $z_i$  of (3.35) satisfies

$$z_i \in \{0, +\infty\}, \quad \text{where } i = 1, 2. \quad (3.36)$$

Indeed, on the contrary, suppose (3.36) is false. Without loss of generality, then we may assume from (3.32) that  $z_1 \in (0, +\infty)$  and  $F(x_1, y_1) = z_1^2$ . Taking a small enough  $\varepsilon > 0$  so that  $z_1^2 - \varepsilon > 0$ . Since  $F(X, Y)$  is continuous with respect to the curve (3.25), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &F^{-1}((z_1^2 - \varepsilon, z_1^2 + \varepsilon)) \\ &:= \{(x, y) \text{ satisfies (3.25) and (3.32) : } F(x, y) \in (z_1^2 - \varepsilon, z_1^2 + \varepsilon)\} \end{aligned}$$

is a one dimensional open set of the curve (3.25). Moreover, for any  $(x_3, y_3) \in F^{-1}((z_1^2 - \varepsilon, z_1^2 + \varepsilon))$ , it is obvious that  $(x_3, y_3, \sqrt{F(x_3, y_3)}) \in S_1$ . Since  $(x_1, y_1) \in F^{-1}((z_1^2 - \varepsilon, z_1^2 + \varepsilon))$ ,  $(x_1, y_1, z_1)$  is an interior point of  $S_1$ , which however contradicts with the fact that  $(x_1, y_1, z_1)$  is the left endpoint of  $S_1$ . Therefore, the claim (3.36) holds true.

It yields from (3.36) that if

$$(X, Y, Z) := \left( \frac{a_1}{\eta_1}, \frac{a_2}{\eta_2}, \frac{a_3}{\eta_3} \right) = (x_i, y_i, z_i), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where the point  $(x_i, y_i, z_i)$  is as in (3.35), then the expression of  $\tilde{u}'_3$  in Lemma 2.1 gives that  $\tilde{u}'_3(0) = 0$ , which implies from (3.14) that  $f(p) = \frac{\tilde{u}'_3(0)^2}{\tilde{u}_1(0)^2} = 0$ . This further yields from (3.8) that the point  $(x_i, y_i, z_i)$  of (3.35) satisfies either  $p(x_i, y_i, z_i) = \bar{p}$  or  $p(x_i, y_i, z_i) = \underline{p}$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , where  $\bar{p} < \underline{p}$  are as in (3.8).



We now claim that

$$\{p(x_1, y_1, z_1), p(x_2, y_2, z_2)\} = \{\underline{p}, \bar{p}\}, \quad (3.37)$$

where the point  $(x_i, y_i, z_i)$  is as in (3.35) for  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $\bar{p} < \underline{p}$  are as in (3.8). Indeed, suppose (3.37) is false. Without loss of generality, then we may assume from (3.37) that  $p(x_1, y_1, z_1) = p(x_2, y_2, z_2) = \underline{p}$ . Let  $M = \max_{(x,y,z) \in S_1} p(S_1) > \underline{p}$ . For any  $p_0 \in (\underline{p}, M)$ , we then obtain that there exist at least two points  $(x_4, y_4, z_4) \in S_1$  and  $(x_5, y_5, z_5) \in S_1$  such that  $p(x_4, y_4, z_4) = p(x_5, y_5, z_5) = p_0$ . Due to the symmetry of  $p$  in (3.28) with respect to  $z$ , we obtain that  $p(x_4, y_4, -z_4) = p(x_5, y_5, -z_5) = p_0$ . On the other hand, the expressions of  $\tilde{u}_1(x)$  and  $\tilde{u}_2(x)$  in Lemma 2.1 yield that  $p(x, y, z) = p(-x, -y, z)$ . By the symmetry of (3.25) and (3.26) with respect to  $(X, Y, Z)$ , we thus obtain that  $(-x_4, -y_4, \pm z_4)$ ,  $(-x_5, -y_5, \pm z_5)$ ,  $(x_4, y_4, -z_4)$ ,  $(x_5, y_5, -z_5) \in S$ , and

$$p(-x_4, -y_4, \pm z_4) = p(-x_5, -y_5, \pm z_5) = p(x_4, y_4, -z_4) = p(x_5, y_5, -z_5) = p_0.$$

We hence conclude from above that  $p(x, y, x) = p_0$  has at least eight solutions, which however contradicts with Proposition 3.2. Therefore, the claim (3.37) holds true.

Applying (3.37), we conclude immediately that  $p(S_1) = (\underline{p}, \bar{p})$ , due to the continuity of  $p$  with respect to  $S_1$ . By the symmetry of  $S$  and  $p(S_1) = (\underline{p}, \bar{p})$ , we obtain from Proposition 3.2 that  $S$  has exactly four connected branches, where  $S_1$  is given by (3.33),

$$S_2 := \{(x, y, z) : (x, y, -z) \in S_1\}, \quad S_3 := \{(x, y, z) : (-x, -y, -z) \in S_1\},$$

and

$$S_4 := \{(x, y, z) : (-x, -y, z) \in S_1\}.$$

Here the curve  $S_1$  of the  $XYZ$  space satisfies  $Z > 0$ , and its projection onto the  $XY$  plane is the bold black curve in the first quadrant of Figure 1, where the left endpoint is at  $(x_1, y_1)$  and the right endpoint is at  $(x_2, y_2)$ .  $S_2$  is the reflection of  $S_1$  about the  $XY$  plane.  $S_3$  and  $S_4$  are the symmetric curves of  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  with respect to the origin, respectively. Moreover, we have  $p(S_i) = p(S_1) = (\underline{p}, \bar{p})$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ , which completes the proof of Lemma 3.3.  $\square$

### 3.1 Proofs of main results

In this subsection, we first establish Theorem 1.1 on the classification of general solutions for (1.5). As the applications of Theorem 1.1, we then address the proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.3.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Suppose  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  is a solution of (1.5). If either  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$  or  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 = \mu_3 < 0$  or  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 < 0$ , then we derive from Proposition 2.3 that Theorem 1.1 holds true. Thus, the rest is to consider  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ , which implies that  $u_3$  changes sign. Hence, we may assume that  $u_3(0) = 0$  and  $u_3'(0) \neq 0$ , since otherwise we have  $u_3 \equiv 0$  and hence Theorem 1.1 follows directly from [6, Lemma 15]. Therefore, if  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ , then the proof of Theorem 1.1 is divided into the following four different cases:

- (i).  $u_i(0) = u_3(0) = 0$  holds for  $i = 1$  or  $2$ .
- (ii).  $u_1'(0) = u_2'(0) = u_3(0) = 0$ .

$$(iii). \frac{u_2(0)}{u_1(0)} = q \neq 0, \quad u_2'(0) = pu_1'(0), \quad u_1'(0) \neq 0, \quad u_3(0) = 0, \quad u_3'(0) \neq 0.$$

$$(iv). \frac{u_1(0)}{u_2(0)} = q \neq 0, \quad u_1'(0) = pu_2'(0), \quad u_2'(0) \neq 0, \quad u_3(0) = 0, \quad u_3'(0) \neq 0.$$

In the first two cases (i) and (ii), we derive from Lemma 3.1 that either  $u_1 \equiv 0$  or  $u_2 \equiv 0$ . Therefore, a similar argument of [6, Lemma 15] then yields Theorem 1.1, and we are done. Moreover, since the proof of case (iv) is very similar to that of case (iii), the rest is to address the proof of case (iii).

Indeed, suppose that case (iii) happens. It then follows from Proposition 3.2 that for any  $q \neq 0$  and  $p \in (\underline{p}, \bar{p})$ , there exist at most four solutions of (1.5). On the other hand, we obtain from Lemma 3.3 that for any  $q \neq 0$  and  $p \in (\underline{p}, \bar{p})$ , there exist at least four solutions of (1.5) satisfying (1.6). We thus conclude from above that for any  $q \neq 0$  and  $p \in (\underline{p}, \bar{p})$ , there exist exact four solutions for (1.5), which must satisfy (1.6). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.  $\square$

To discuss the applications of Theorem 1.1, we next give the following mass analysis of solutions for (1.5).

**Lemma 3.4.** *For  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ , suppose  $(u_1, u_2, u_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  is a solution of (1.5) satisfying  $u_i \neq 0$  for all  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Then it must have  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_i^2(x) dx = 2\eta_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ .*

**Proof.** Following Theorem 1.1, we claim that the identity

$$u_i^2(x) = -2\eta_i \left( \frac{1 + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^3 \frac{a_j^2}{4\eta_j^2} e^{2\eta_j x} + \sum_{j \neq i, k \neq i, 1 \leq j < k \leq 3} \frac{a_j^2 a_k^2 (\eta_j - \eta_k)^2}{16\eta_j^2 \eta_k^2 (\eta_j + \eta_k)^2} e^{2(\eta_j + \eta_k)x}}{f(x)} \right), \quad (3.38)$$

holds true for all  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , where  $f(x)$  is as in Theorem 1.1. One can check that if the identity (3.38) holds for all  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , then we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_i^2(x) dx = 2\eta_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

which thus proves the lemma.

In the following, we only need to prove the claim (3.38). Without loss of generality, we just prove the claim (3.38) for  $i = 1$ . Actually, we note from Theorem 1.1 that

$$g_1(x) = a_1 e^{\eta_1 x} \left\{ 1 + \frac{a_2^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_2)}{4\eta_2^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_2)} e^{2\eta_2 x} + \frac{a_3^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_3)}{4\eta_3^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_3)} e^{2\eta_3 x} + \frac{a_2^2 a_3^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_2) (\eta_1 - \eta_3) (\eta_2 - \eta_3)^2}{16\eta_2^2 \eta_3^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_2) (\eta_1 + \eta_3) (\eta_2 + \eta_3)^2} e^{2(\eta_2 + \eta_3)x} \right\} := a_1 e^{\eta_1 x} \hat{g}(x).$$

Define

$$\underline{f}(x) = 1 + \frac{a_2^2}{4\eta_2^2} e^{2\eta_2 x} + \frac{a_3^2}{4\eta_3^2} e^{2\eta_3 x} + \frac{a_2^2 a_3^2 (\eta_2 - \eta_3)^2}{16\eta_2^2 \eta_3^2 (\eta_2 + \eta_3)^2} e^{2(\eta_2 + \eta_3)x},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}(x) &= f(x) - \underline{f}(x) \\ &= \frac{a_1^2}{4\eta_1^2} e^{2\eta_1 x} \left\{ 1 + \frac{a_2^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_2)^2}{4\eta_2^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_2)^2} e^{2\eta_2 x} + \frac{a_3^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_3)^2}{4\eta_3^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_3)^2} e^{2\eta_3 x} + \frac{a_2^2 a_3^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_2)^2 (\eta_1 - \eta_3)^2 (\eta_2 - \eta_3)^2}{16\eta_2^2 \eta_3^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_2)^2 (\eta_1 + \eta_3)^2 (\eta_2 + \eta_3)^2} e^{2(\eta_2 + \eta_3)x} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We also set

$$[F(x), G(x)] := F'(x)G(x) - F(x)G'(x), \quad (3.39)$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} [F(x), F(x)] &= 0, \quad [F(x), G(x)] = -[G(x), F(x)], \\ \text{and } [F(x), H(x)F(x)] &= -H'(x)F^2(x). \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

We then derive from above that

$$\text{RHS of (3.38)} = -\frac{2\eta_1}{f^2} [\underline{f}(x), \bar{f}(x)],$$

and

$$\text{LHS of (3.38)} = -\frac{2\eta_1}{f^2} \left[ \hat{g}(x), \frac{a_1^2}{4\eta_1^2} e^{2\eta_1 x} \hat{g}(x) \right].$$

Applying (3.40), one can calculate that

$$[\underline{f}(x), \bar{f}(x)] = \left[ \hat{g}(x), \frac{a_1^2}{4\eta_1^2} e^{2\eta_1 x} \hat{g}(x) \right].$$

This proves the claim (3.38), and it therefore completes the proof of Lemma 3.4.  $\square$

By employing Theorem 1.1, we are now ready to address the proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.3.

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** Firstly, if  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = -\frac{9}{4}$ , then we derive from Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 1.1 that (1.5) admits normalized solutions  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  satisfying (1.6), where  $|a_1| = |a_2| = |a_3| = 1$ , and  $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = \eta_3 = \frac{3}{2}$ . Thus, up to the translation,  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  must be unique, in the sense that

$$u_1(x) \equiv \pm \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2 \cosh(\frac{3x}{2})}, \quad u_2(x) \equiv \pm \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2 \cosh(\frac{3x}{2})}, \quad u_3(x) \equiv \pm \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2 \cosh(\frac{3x}{2})}$$

hold for three uncorrelated signs  $\pm$ .

Similarly, if  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ , then we derive from Proposition 2.3 that any solution  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  of (1.5) satisfies  $u_1 \equiv ku_2$ ,  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} (u_1^2 + u_2^2) dx = 2\eta_1$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} (u_3^2) dx = 2\eta_3$ . Further, if  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_1^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_2^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_3^2 dx = 1$ , then we have  $u_1 \equiv \pm u_2$ ,  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = -1$  and  $\mu_3 = -\frac{1}{4}$ . In this case, we thus deduce from Theorem 1.1 that (1.5) admits infinitely many normalized solutions  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$ , which satisfy (1.9) for all  $A \neq 0$  and  $B \neq 0$ .

Additionally, if  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 = \mu_3 < 0$ , then we obtain from Proposition 2.3 that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_1^2 dx = 2\eta_1 > \int_{\mathbb{R}} (u_2^2 + u_3^2) dx = 2\eta_2$ , and hence  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_1^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_2^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_3^2 dx = 1$  cannot occur, which implies the nonexistence of normalized solutions for (1.5). Finally, if  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ , then we deduce from Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 3.4 that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_1^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_2^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_3^2 dx = 1$  cannot occur yet, which also implies the nonexistence of normalized solutions for (1.5). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 1.3.** (i). Suppose  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  is a least energy normalized solution of (1.5), and let  $E(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, u_1, u_2, u_3)$  be the corresponding energy of the solution  $u$ , *i.e.*,

$$E(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, u_1, u_2, u_3) := \sum_{k=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}} (u'_k)^2 dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \sum_{k=1}^3 (u_k)^2 \right)^2 dx. \quad (3.41)$$

Following Theorem 1.2, it suffices to show that

$$E\left(-\frac{9}{4}, -\frac{9}{4}, -\frac{9}{4}, u_1, u_2, u_3\right) < E\left(-1, -1, -\frac{1}{4}, u_1, u_2, u_3\right). \quad (3.42)$$

Indeed, if (3.42) holds true, then it implies that Theorem 1.2 (i) must occur. We thus conclude from Theorem 1.2 (i) that it necessarily has  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = -\frac{9}{4}$ , and  $u$  must satisfy (1.8).

To prove (3.42), we multiply the  $j$ -th equation in (1.5) by  $u_j$ , sum up the resulting identities, and finally integrate it on  $\mathbb{R}$ . We then obtain that

$$-\sum_{k=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}} (u'_k)^2 dx + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \sum_{k=1}^3 (u_k)^2 \right)^2 dx = -(\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \mu_3). \quad (3.43)$$

On the other hand, we derive from (2.13) that

$$\sum_{k=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}} (u'_k)^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \sum_{k=1}^3 u_k^2 \right)^2 dx = -(\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \mu_3). \quad (3.44)$$

It then yields from (3.43) and (3.44) that

$$\sum_{k=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}} (u'_k)^2 dx = -\frac{1}{3}(\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \mu_3), \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \sum_{k=1}^3 u_k^2 \right)^2 dx = -\frac{2}{3}(\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \mu_3),$$

which further implies that

$$E(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, u_1, u_2, u_3) = \frac{1}{3}(\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \mu_3).$$

Direct computations thus yield that

$$E\left(-\frac{9}{4}, -\frac{9}{4}, -\frac{9}{4}, u_1, u_2, u_3\right) = -\frac{9}{4} < E\left(-1, -1, -\frac{1}{4}, u_1, u_2, u_3\right) = -\frac{3}{4},$$

which proves (3.42), and we are done.

(ii). Following Theorem 1.2, we only need to prove the nonexistence of orthonormal solutions for the following two cases:

- (i).  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = -\frac{9}{4}$ ;
- (ii).  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = -1$  and  $\mu_3 = -\frac{1}{4}$ .

Actually, one can directly conclude from Proposition 2.3 that  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  cannot be orthogonal in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$  for each of above two cases, which hence proves Corollary 1.3.  $\square$

## 4 Nondegeneracy of the System (1.5)

The purpose of this section is to establish Theorem 1.4 on the nondegeneracy of solutions  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  for the system (1.5) satisfying  $u_i \not\equiv 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Towards this aim,

suppose that  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  satisfies the system (1.5), where  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$  are arbitrary. We define the operator

$$L_u := -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} - 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2) \text{ in } L^2(\mathbb{R}), \quad (4.1)$$

and consider the following linearized system of (1.5) around the solution  $u$ :

$$\begin{cases} \phi_1'' + 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)\phi_1 + 4(u_1\phi_1 + u_2\phi_2 + u_3\phi_3)u_1 = -\mu_1\phi_1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ \phi_2'' + 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)\phi_2 + 4(u_1\phi_1 + u_2\phi_2 + u_3\phi_3)u_2 = -\mu_2\phi_2 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ \phi_3'' + 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)\phi_3 + 4(u_1\phi_1 + u_2\phi_2 + u_3\phi_3)u_3 = -\mu_3\phi_3 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

We first address the following lemma on the constants of motion for  $(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3)$  satisfying (4.2), which is essentially the linearized version of Lemma 2.2.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Suppose  $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  is a solution of (4.2), then we have the following three constants of motion:*

$$\begin{aligned} u_1'\phi_1' + u_2'\phi_2' + u_3'\phi_3' + 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)(u_1\phi_1 + u_2\phi_2 + u_3\phi_3) \\ + \mu_1 u_1\phi_1 + \mu_2 u_2\phi_2 + \mu_3 u_3\phi_3 = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq 3} (u_j' u_k - u_j u_k') (\phi_j' u_k + u_j' \phi_k - \phi_j u_k' - u_j \phi_k') \\ + (u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2) [(\mu_2 + \mu_3)u_1\phi_1 + (\mu_1 + \mu_3)u_2\phi_2 + (\mu_1 + \mu_2)u_3\phi_3] \\ + (u_1\phi_1 + u_2\phi_2 + u_3\phi_3) [(\mu_2 + \mu_3)u_1^2 + (\mu_1 + \mu_3)u_2^2 + (\mu_1 + \mu_2)u_3^2] \\ + (\mu_2 + \mu_3)u_1'\phi_1' + (\mu_1 + \mu_3)u_2'\phi_2' + (\mu_1 + \mu_2)u_3'\phi_3' \\ + \mu_1(\mu_2 + \mu_3)u_1\phi_1 + \mu_2(\mu_1 + \mu_3)u_2\phi_2 + \mu_3(\mu_1 + \mu_2)u_3\phi_3 = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq 3, i \neq j, i \neq k} \mu_i (u_j' u_k - u_j u_k') (\phi_j' u_k + u_j' \phi_k - \phi_j u_k' - u_j \phi_k') \\ + (u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2) (\mu_2 \mu_3 u_1\phi_1 + \mu_1 \mu_3 u_2\phi_2 + \mu_1 \mu_2 u_3\phi_3) \\ + (u_1\phi_1 + u_2\phi_2 + u_3\phi_3) (\mu_2 \mu_3 u_1^2 + \mu_1 \mu_3 u_2^2 + \mu_1 \mu_2 u_3^2) \\ + \mu_2 \mu_3 u_1'\phi_1' + \mu_1 \mu_3 u_2'\phi_2' + \mu_1 \mu_2 u_3'\phi_3' + \mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3 (u_1\phi_1 + u_2\phi_2 + u_3\phi_3) = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

**Proof.** Since  $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  is a solution of (4.2), we deduce from (4.2) that  $\phi_j$  and  $\phi_j'$  vanish at infinity, where  $j = 1, 2, 3$ . We then get that  $\phi_j$ ,  $u_j$ ,  $\phi_j'$  and  $u_j'$  vanish at infinity, where  $j = 1, 2, 3$ . Thus, the three identities (4.3)–(4.5) can be proved similarly, for which we multiply the  $j$ -th equation of (4.2) and (1.5) by an integrating factor, respectively, add up the resulting identities, and finally integrate it on  $\mathbb{R}$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ .

To derive (4.3), we multiply the  $j$ -th equation of (4.2) and (1.5) by  $u_j'$  and  $\phi_j'$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , respectively. We then add together the resulting identities and integrate it on  $\mathbb{R}$ .

To obtain (4.4), we multiply the  $j$ -th equation of (4.2) and (1.5) by

$$\sum_{1 \leq k \leq 3, k \neq j} [(u'_j u_k - u_j u'_k) u_k + \mu_k u'_j]$$

and

$$\sum_{1 \leq k \leq 3, j \neq k} [(\phi'_j u_k - \phi_j u'_k + \phi_k u'_j - \phi'_k u_j) u_k + (u'_j u_k - u_j u'_k) \phi_k + \mu_k \phi'_j],$$

respectively, where  $1 \leq j \leq 3$ . We then add together the resulting identities and integrate it again on  $\mathbb{R}$ .

To get (4.5), similarly we multiply the  $j$ -th equation of (4.2) and (1.5) by

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < k \leq 3, i \neq j, k \neq j} [\mu_i (u'_j u_k - u_j u'_k) u_k + \mu_k (u'_j u_i - u_j u'_i) u_i + \mu_i \mu_k u'_j]$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{1 \leq i < k \leq 3, i \neq j, k \neq j} [\mu_i (\phi'_j u_k - \phi_j u'_k + \phi_k u'_j - \phi'_k u_j) u_k + \mu_i (u'_j u_k - u_j u'_k) \phi_k \\ & + \mu_k (\phi'_j u_i - \phi_j u'_i + \phi_i u'_j - \phi'_i u_j) u_i + \mu_k (u'_j u_i - u_j u'_i) \phi_i + \mu_i \mu_k u'_j], \end{aligned}$$

respectively, where  $1 \leq j \leq 3$ . We then add together the resulting identities and integrate it on  $\mathbb{R}$ . This proves Lemma 4.1.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.2.** For  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ , let

$$\mathcal{D} := \{(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) : (\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3) \text{ is a square integrable solution of (4.3) - (4.5)}\}, \quad (4.6)$$

then  $\mathcal{D}$  is a linear subspace in  $\mathbb{R}^6$  and satisfies  $\dim(\mathcal{D}) = 3$ .

**Proof.** It is obvious that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a linear space, and the rest is to prove that the dimension of  $\mathcal{D}$  is equal to three. Actually, it follows from Theorem 1.1 that for any solution  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  of (1.5), there exists a vector  $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$  satisfies (1.6). Applying (1.6), we can take a sufficiently large point  $-x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ,

$$u_i(x_0) = [1 + o(1)] a_i e^{\eta_i x_0}, \quad u'_i(x_0) = [1 + o(1)] \eta_i a_i e^{\eta_i x_0} \quad \text{as } -x_0 \rightarrow +\infty, \quad (4.7)$$

where  $\eta_i = \sqrt{|\mu_i|} > 0$ .

We derive from Lemma 4.1 that

$$(\phi_1(x_0), \phi_2(x_0), \phi_3(x_0), \phi'_1(x_0), \phi'_2(x_0), \phi'_3(x_0))$$

satisfies the linear homogeneous system (4.3)–(4.5), where the coefficient matrix  $D$  of

$$(\phi_1(x_0), \phi_2(x_0), \phi_3(x_0))$$

satisfies

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} [1 + o(1)] \mu_1 a_1 e^{\eta_1 x_0} & [1 + o(1)] \mu_2 a_2 e^{\eta_2 x_0} & [1 + o(1)] \mu_3 a_3 e^{\eta_3 x_0} \\ [1 + o(1)] \mu_1 (\mu_2 + \mu_3) a_1 e^{\eta_1 x_0} & [1 + o(1)] \mu_2 (\mu_1 + \mu_3) a_2 e^{\eta_2 x_0} & [1 + o(1)] (\mu_1 + \mu_2) \mu_3 a_3 e^{\eta_3 x_0} \\ [1 + o(1)] \mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3 a_1 e^{\eta_1 x_0} & [1 + o(1)] \mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3 a_2 e^{\eta_2 x_0} & [1 + o(1)] \mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3 a_3 e^{\eta_3 x_0} \end{bmatrix}$$

as  $-x_0 \rightarrow +\infty$ , where the exponential decay (4.7) is used. Since  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$  and  $u_i \neq 0$  holds for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , we calculate from above that

$$\det(D) = [1 + o(1)]\mu_1\mu_2\mu_3a_1a_2a_3(\mu_1 - \mu_2)(\mu_1 - \mu_3) \cdot (\mu_2 - \mu_3)e^{(\eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3)x_0} \neq 0 \quad \text{as } -x_0 \rightarrow +\infty,$$

which further implies that  $\text{Rank}(D) = 3$ . Hence, the dimension of the coefficient matrix of

$$(\phi_1(x_0), \phi_2(x_0), \phi_3(x_0), \phi_1'(x_0), \phi_2'(x_0), \phi_3'(x_0))$$

must be equal to 3. Therefore, we conclude from above that the dimension of

$$\left\{ (\phi_1(x_0), \phi_2(x_0), \phi_3(x_0), \phi_1'(x_0), \phi_2'(x_0), \phi_3'(x_0)) : (\phi_1(x_0), \phi_2(x_0), \phi_3(x_0), \phi_1'(x_0), \phi_2'(x_0), \phi_3'(x_0)) \text{ satisfies (4.2)} \right\}$$

must be equal to 3. Since  $(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3)$  satisfies the system (4.3)–(4.5), we deduce from (4.7) that  $(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$ , which is uniquely determined by  $(\phi_1(x_0), \phi_2(x_0), \phi_3(x_0), \phi_1'(x_0), \phi_2'(x_0), \phi_3'(x_0))$ . Thus, we conclude that  $\dim(\mathcal{D}) = 3$ , and we are done.  $\square$

Applying Proposition 2.3, we are next ready to establish Theorem 1.4.

**Proof of Theorem 1.4.** For convenience, we define  $\eta_i = \sqrt{|\mu_i|} > 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . We address the proof of Theorem 1.4 by studying separately the following four different cases:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Case 1. } & \mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0; & \text{Case 2. } & \mu_1 = \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0; \\ \text{Case 3. } & \mu_1 < \mu_2 = \mu_3 < 0; & \text{Case 4. } & \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 < 0; \end{aligned}$$

where  $u_i \neq 0$  always holds for all  $i = 1, 2, 3$ .

*Case 1.* Suppose  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ . Following Theorem 1.1, direct computations yield that there exist at least three linear independent solutions, *i.e.*, three tangent vectors of the solutions manifold with regard to  $(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ , of the linearized system (4.2) in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$ . Thus, the dimension of the solutions for the linearized system (4.2) is at least 3. On the other hand, we derive from Lemma 4.1 and Proposition 4.2 that the dimension of the solutions for the linearized system (4.2) is at most 3. Therefore, the dimension of the solutions for the linearized system (4.2) must be exactly equal to 3, and we are done for this case.

*Case 2.* Suppose  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 < \mu_3 < 0$ . We then deduce from Proposition 2.3 that there exists  $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $(u_1, u_2, u_3)$  satisfies (2.16) with  $a_i \neq 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . In view of (2.16), we define

$$\tilde{u}_1 = u_1 \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{u_2}{u_1}\right)^2} = \sqrt{1 + \frac{a_2^2}{a_1^2}} u_1, \quad (4.8)$$

and

$$\tilde{\phi}_1 = \phi_1 + \frac{a_2}{a_1} \phi_2, \quad \tilde{\phi}_3 = \sqrt{1 + \frac{a_2^2}{a_1^2}} \phi_3. \quad (4.9)$$

One can verify from (1.5) that  $(\tilde{u}_1, u_3)$  satisfies the following system

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}_1'' + 2(\tilde{u}_1^2 + u_3^2)\tilde{u}_1 = -\mu_1\tilde{u}_1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ u_3'' + 2(\tilde{u}_1^2 + u_3^2)u_3 = -\mu_3u_3 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}. \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

Additionally, it follows from (4.2) that  $(\tilde{\phi}_1, \tilde{\phi}_3)$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\phi}_1'' + 2(\tilde{u}_1^2 + u_3^2)\tilde{\phi}_1 + 4(\tilde{u}_1\tilde{\phi}_1 + u_3\tilde{\phi}_3)\tilde{u}_1 = -\mu_1\tilde{\phi}_1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ \tilde{\phi}_3'' + 2(\tilde{u}_1^2 + u_3^2)\tilde{\phi}_3 + 4(\tilde{u}_1\tilde{\phi}_1 + u_3\tilde{\phi}_3)u_3 = -\mu_3\tilde{\phi}_3 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}. \end{cases} \quad (4.11)$$

Since  $\mu_1 < \mu_3 < 0$  and  $(\tilde{u}_1, u_3) \neq (0, 0)$ , the same argument as above (i) implies that  $(\tilde{u}_1, u_3)$  is a non-degenerate critical point of the system (4.10), and the dimension of solutions  $(\tilde{\phi}_1, \tilde{\phi}_3)$  for (4.11) is two. Let  $v_1 = (v_{11}, v_{13})$  and  $v_2 = (v_{21}, v_{23})$  be the two linearly independent solutions of (4.11). Thus,  $(\tilde{\phi}_1, \tilde{\phi}_3)$  solves (4.11), if and only if

$$(\tilde{\phi}_1, \tilde{\phi}_3) = a(v_{11}, v_{13}) + b(v_{21}, v_{23}) \quad \text{holds for some } a, b \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.12)$$

Moreover, subtracting the second equation of (4.2) from the product between  $\frac{a_2}{a_1}$  and the first equation of (4.2), we obtain that

$$\left(\phi_2 - \frac{a_2}{a_1}\phi_1\right)'' + 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)\left(\phi_2 - \frac{a_2}{a_1}\phi_1\right) = -\mu_1\left(\phi_2 - \frac{a_2}{a_1}\phi_1\right) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.13)$$

We then follow from (4.8), (4.9) and (4.12) that (4.2) admits the following two linearly independent solutions

$$(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3) = \left(\frac{a_1^2}{a_1^2 + a_2^2}v_{11}, \frac{a_1a_2}{a_1^2 + a_2^2}v_{11}, \frac{a_1}{\sqrt{a_1^2 + a_2^2}}v_{13}\right) \quad (4.14)$$

and

$$(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3) = \left(\frac{a_1^2}{a_1^2 + a_2^2}v_{21}, \frac{a_1a_2}{a_1^2 + a_2^2}v_{21}, \frac{a_1}{\sqrt{a_1^2 + a_2^2}}v_{23}\right). \quad (4.15)$$

To seek for other nontrivial solutions  $(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3)$  of (4.2), we now assume that

$$(\tilde{\phi}_1, \tilde{\phi}_3) = \left(\phi_1 + \frac{a_2}{a_1}\phi_2, \sqrt{\frac{a_1^2 + a_2^2}{a_1^2}}\phi_3\right) = (0, 0), \quad (4.16)$$

which also implies that  $\phi_3 \equiv 0$ . Since it follows from (2.16) that  $u_1$  cannot change sign, we deduce that  $\mu_1 < 0$  is the first eigenvalue of  $L_u$  defined in (4.1). It then yields from (4.1) and (4.13) that  $\phi_2 - \frac{a_2}{a_1}\phi_1 \equiv Cu_1$  holds for some  $C_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ . If  $C_1 = 0$ , *i.e.*,  $\phi_2 - \frac{a_2}{a_1}\phi_1 \equiv 0$ , then we derive from (4.16) that  $(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3) = (0, 0, 0)$ , which is however trivial. Thus,  $\phi_2 - \frac{a_2}{a_1}\phi_1 \equiv Cu_1$  holds for some  $C_1 \neq 0$ . We then deduce from (4.16) that the third solution  $(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3)$  of (4.2) must satisfy

$$(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3) = k\left(-\frac{a_2}{a_1}u_1, u_1, 0\right) = k(-u_2, u_1, 0) \quad \text{for some } k \neq 0. \quad (4.17)$$

One can verify that those three solutions (4.14), (4.15) and (4.17) of (4.2) are linearly independent. Further, it follows from (4.11), (4.12) and (4.17) that any solution of (4.2) can be expressed as a linear combination of these three independent solutions. Hence, the dimension of solutions  $(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3)$  for (4.2) is exactly three. This proves the non-degeneracy of the system (1.5) in this case.

*Case 3.* Suppose  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 = \mu_3 < 0$ . We first prove that for any  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ , there exists a sufficiently large constant  $\bar{N} > 0$  such that

$$\left|\frac{u_0(x_1)}{e^{\eta_2 x_1}} - \frac{u_0(x_2)}{e^{\eta_2 x_2}}\right| < \varepsilon \quad \text{for any } x_2 < x_1 < -\bar{N}, \quad (4.18)$$



where  $u_0(x) \not\equiv 0$  is any solution of  $L_u = \mu_2 u$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ , and the operator  $L_u$  is defined in (4.1).

To prove (4.18), we note from Theorem 1.1 that

$$2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2) = 2[1 + o(1)]a_1^2 e^{2\eta_1 x} \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow -\infty,$$

which implies that there exists a sufficiently large constant  $N_1 > 0$  such that

$$2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2) \leq 4a_1^2 e^{2\eta_1 x}, \quad \forall x < -N_1. \quad (4.19)$$

Since  $u_0(x) \not\equiv 0$  is a solution of  $L_u = \mu_2 u$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ , we can choose a sufficiently large value  $-x_0 > N_1$  such that  $u_0(x_0) \neq 0$ . Moreover, for simplicity we may assume  $u_0(x_0) > 0$ . Taking  $U_1(x) := u_0(x_0)e^{-\eta_2 x_0} e^{\eta_2 x}$  as a comparison function, we have  $U_1(x_0) = u_0(x_0)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} (L_u - \mu_2)U_1 &= -\frac{d^2}{dx^2}U_1 - \mu_2 U_1 - 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)U_1 \\ &= -2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)U_1 < 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

By the comparison principle, we then obtain from above that

$$u_0(x) \geq U_1(x) = u_0(x_0)e^{-\eta_2 x_0} e^{\eta_2 x}, \quad x \leq x_0, \quad (4.20)$$

where  $-x_0 > N_1$  is sufficiently large.

On the other hand, we define for any  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ,

$$U_2(x) := \left[ u_0(x_0)e^{-\eta_2 x_0} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right] e^{\eta_2 x} - B e^{(\eta_2 + 2\eta_1)x},$$

where  $B = a_1^2 \eta_1^{-2} (\|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} e^{-\eta_2 x_0} + 1) > 0$ , and the sufficiently large constant  $-x_0 > N_1$  is as in (4.20). We then have for any  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} U_2(x_0) &= u_0(x_0) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} e^{\eta_2 x_0} - a_1^2 \eta_1^{-2} \left[ \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} e^{-\eta_2 x_0} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right] e^{(\eta_2 + 2\eta_1)x_0} \\ &\geq u_0(x_0) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} e^{\eta_2 x_0} - a_1^2 \eta_1^{-2} \left[ \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} e^{-\eta_2 x_0} + 1 \right] e^{(\eta_2 + 2\eta_1)x_0} \\ &= u_0(x_0) + e^{\eta_2 x_0} \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - a_1^2 \eta_1^{-2} \left[ \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} e^{(2\eta_1 - \eta_2)x_0} + e^{2\eta_1 x_0} \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $2\eta_1 - \eta_2 > 0$  and  $\eta_1 > 0$ , there exists a sufficiently large constant  $N_2 > 0$  such that

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{2} - a_1^2 \eta_1^{-2} \left[ \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} e^{(2\eta_1 - \eta_2)x_0} + e^{2\eta_1 x_0} \right] > 0 \quad \text{for all } x_0 < -N_2,$$

which implies that  $U_2(x_0) > u_0(x_0)$  holds for all  $x_0 < -N_2$ . Moreover, we obtain from (4.19) that

$$\begin{aligned} &(L_u - \mu_2)U_2 \\ &> -4a_1^2 \left[ u_0(x_0)e^{-\eta_2 x_0} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right] e^{(\eta_2 + 2\eta_1)x} + B[(\eta_2 + 2\eta_1)^2 - \eta_2^2] e^{(\eta_2 + 2\eta_1)x} \\ &> 4[B\eta_1^2 - a_1^2 (\|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} e^{-\eta_2 x_0} + 1)] e^{(\eta_2 + 2\eta_1)x} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

By the comparison principle, we then deduce from above that for all  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} u_0(x) \leq U_2(x) &= \left[ u_0(x_0)e^{-\eta_2 x_0} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right] e^{\eta_2 x} \\ &\quad - a_1^2 \eta_1^{-2} (\|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} e^{-\eta_2 x_0} + 1) e^{(\eta_2 + 2\eta_1)x}, \quad \forall x \leq x_0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

where  $-x_0 > \max\{N_1, N_2\}$  is sufficiently large. We now conclude from (4.20) and (4.21) that for all  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} u_0(x_0)e^{-\eta_2 x_0} &\leq \frac{u_0(x)}{e^{\eta_2 x}} \leq u_0(x_0)e^{-\eta_2 x_0} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - a_1^{-2}(\|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}e^{-\eta_2 x_0} + 1)e^{2\eta_1 x} \\ &\leq u_0(x_0)e^{-\eta_2 x_0} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad \text{if } x \leq x_0 < -\max\{N_1, N_2\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

which therefore gives that (4.18) hold true.

By Cauchy's convergence criteria, we further derive from (4.18) that if  $u_0(x) \not\equiv 0$  is a nonzero solution of  $L_u = \mu_2 u$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ , where the operator  $L_u$  is defined in (4.1), then  $u_0(x)$  satisfies

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{u_0(x)}{e^{\eta_2 x}} = A \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}. \quad (4.23)$$

Suppose now that  $v_1 \not\equiv 0$  and  $v_2 \not\equiv 0$  are two different solutions of  $(L_u - \mu_2)v = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Following (4.23), we may assume that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{v_i(x)}{e^{\eta_2 x}} = A_i \neq 0, \quad \text{where } i = 1, 2.$$

Set  $v_0 = v_1 - \frac{A_1}{A_2} v_2$ , which yields from above that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{v_0(x)}{e^{\eta_2 x}} = 0$  holds for  $\eta_2 > 0$ . This further implies that  $v_0 \equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . We therefore conclude that  $\mu_2$  is a simple eigenvalue of  $L_u$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ , where the operator  $L_u$  is defined in (4.1).

We derive from Proposition 2.3 (ii) that there exists  $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $(u_1, u_2, u_3)$  satisfies (2.17), where  $a_i \neq 0$  holds for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Denote

$$\tilde{u}_2 = u_2 \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{u_3}{u_2}\right)^2} = \sqrt{1 + \frac{a_3^2}{a_2^2}} u_2, \quad (4.24)$$

and

$$\tilde{\phi}_2 = \phi_2 + \frac{a_3}{a_2} \phi_3, \quad \tilde{\phi}_1 = \sqrt{1 + \frac{a_3^2}{a_2^2}} \phi_1. \quad (4.25)$$

Since  $\mu_2$  is a simple eigenvalue of  $L_u$  defined in (4.1), the rest proof is similar to that of Case 2. More precisely, we can conclude that (4.2) has exactly the following three linearly independent solutions:

$$(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3) = (0, -u_3, u_2), \quad (4.26)$$

$$(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3) = \left( \frac{a_2}{\sqrt{a_2^2 + a_3^2}} w_{11}, \frac{a_2^2}{a_2^2 + a_3^2} w_{12}, \frac{a_2 a_3}{a_2^2 + a_3^2} w_{12} \right), \quad (4.27)$$

and

$$(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3) = \left( \frac{a_2}{\sqrt{a_2^2 + a_3^2}} w_{21}, \frac{a_2^2}{a_2^2 + a_3^2} w_{22}, \frac{a_2 a_3}{a_2^2 + a_3^2} w_{22} \right), \quad (4.28)$$

where  $(w_{11}, w_{12})$  and  $(w_{21}, w_{22})$  are two linearly independent solutions of the following linearized system

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\phi}_1'' + 2(u_1^2 + \tilde{u}_2^2)\tilde{\phi}_1 + 4(u_1\tilde{\phi}_1 + \tilde{u}_2\tilde{\phi}_2)u_1 = -\mu_1\tilde{\phi}_1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ \tilde{\phi}_2'' + 2(u_1^2 + \tilde{u}_2^2)\tilde{\phi}_2 + 4(u_1\tilde{\phi}_1 + \tilde{u}_2\tilde{\phi}_2)\tilde{u}_2 = -\mu_2\tilde{\phi}_2 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}. \end{cases} \quad (4.29)$$

This proves the non-degeneracy of Case 3.

*Case 4.* Suppose  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 < 0$ . In this case, we deduce from Proposition 2.3 that there exists  $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  satisfying  $a_i \neq 0$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) such that  $(u_1, u_2, u_3)$  satisfies

$$u_i(x) = \frac{a_i e^{\eta_i x}}{f(x)}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

where and below  $\eta_i = \sqrt{|\mu_i|} > 0$  holds for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , and  $f(x)$  is given by

$$f(x) = 1 + \frac{(a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2)}{4\eta_1^2} e^{2\eta_1 x}.$$

Define

$$\tilde{u} = u_1 \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{u_2}{u_1}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{u_3}{u_1}\right)^2} = \sqrt{1 + \frac{a_2^2}{a_1^2} + \frac{a_3^2}{a_1^2}} u_1, \quad (4.30)$$

and

$$\tilde{\phi} = \phi_1 + \frac{a_2}{a_1} \phi_2 + \frac{a_3}{a_1} \phi_3, \quad (4.31)$$

so that

$$\tilde{u}'' + 2\tilde{u}^3 = -\mu_1 \tilde{u} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \quad (4.32)$$

and

$$\tilde{\phi}'' + 4\tilde{u}^2 \tilde{\phi} = -\mu_1 \tilde{\phi} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.33)$$

The nondegeneracy of (4.33) yields that there exists a constant  $C_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\tilde{\phi} = \phi_1 + \frac{a_2}{a_1} \phi_2 + \frac{a_3}{a_1} \phi_3 = C_0 \tilde{u}'.$$

Moreover, similar to (4.13), we have

$$\left(\phi_j - \frac{a_j}{a_1} \phi_1\right)'' + 2(u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2) \left(\phi_j - \frac{a_j}{a_1} \phi_1\right) = -\mu_1 \left(\phi_j - \frac{a_j}{a_1} \phi_1\right) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \quad j = 1, 2. \quad (4.34)$$

Since it follows from Proposition 2.3 (iii) that  $\mu_1 < 0$  is the first eigenvalue of  $L_u$  defined in (4.1), we obtain that there exist constants  $C_j \in \mathbb{R}$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) such that

$$\phi_j - \frac{a_j}{a_1} \phi_1 = C_j u_1, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

Similar to Case 2, we can further deduce that the system (4.2) admits the following three linearly independent solutions:

$$(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3) = (-u_2, u_1, 0), \quad (-u_2, 0, u_3) \quad \text{or} \quad (u_1', u_2', u_3'),$$

and any solution of (4.2) can be expressed as a linear combination of the above three solutions. This further proves the non-degeneracy of Case 4, which therefore completes the proof of Theorem 1.4.  $\square$

## 5 The General Case of $N > 3$

In this section, we discuss whether all main results of the present paper can be extended generally to the  $N$ -component Schrödinger system (1.1), where  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_N < 0$  and  $N > 3$ . We first have the following similar version of Lemma 2.2.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Suppose  $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_N) \in (H^1(\mathbb{R}))^N$  is a solution of (1.1), where  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_N < 0$  and  $N > 3$ . Then we have the following  $N$  constants of motion:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (u'_i)^2 + \left( \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^2 \right)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \mu_i u_i^2 = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \quad (5.1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq N} (u'_{j_1} u_{j_2} - u_{j_1} u'_{j_2})^2 + \left( \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^2 \right) \sum_{1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq N, j_1 \neq j_2} \mu_{j_1} u_{j_2}^2 \\ & + \sum_{1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq N, j_1 \neq j_2} \mu_{j_1} (u'_{j_2})^2 + \sum_{1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq N, j_1 \neq j_2} \mu_{j_1} \mu_{j_2} u_{j_2}^2 = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

and the  $k$ -th ( $3 \leq k \leq N$ ) identity satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_{k-2} \leq N, 1 \leq j_{k-1} < j_k \leq N, \\ \prod_{1 \leq l < m \leq k} (j_l - j_m) \neq 0}} \mu_{j_1} \mu_{j_2} \cdots \mu_{j_{k-2}} (u'_{j_{k-1}} u_{j_k} - u_{j_{k-1}} u'_{j_k})^2 \\ & + \left( \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^2 \right) \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_{k-1} \leq N, 1 \leq j_k \leq N, \prod_{1 \leq l < m \leq k} (j_l - j_m) \neq 0} \mu_{j_1} \mu_{j_2} \cdots \mu_{j_{k-1}} u_{j_k}^2 \\ & + \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_{k-1} \leq N, 1 \leq j_k \leq N, \prod_{1 \leq l < m \leq k} (j_l - j_m) \neq 0} \mu_{j_1} \mu_{j_2} \cdots \mu_{j_{k-1}} (u'_{j_k})^2 \\ & + \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_{k-1} \leq N, 1 \leq j_k \leq N, \prod_{1 \leq l < m \leq k} (j_l - j_m) \neq 0} \mu_{j_1} \mu_{j_2} \cdots \mu_{j_{k-1}} \mu_{j_k} u_{j_k}^2 = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

**Proof.** The process of proving Lemma 5.1 is very similar to that of Lemma 2.2. Especially, the  $k$ -th ( $3 \leq k \leq N$ ) identity (5.3) is obtained through multiplying the  $j$ -th of (1.5) by the following integral factor

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_{k-2} \leq N, 1 \leq j_{k-1} \leq N, \\ \prod_{1 \leq l < m \leq k} (j_l - j_m)(j_l - j)(j_m - j) \neq 0}} 2 \left[ \mu_{j_1} \mu_{j_2} \cdots \mu_{j_{k-2}} (u'_j u_{j_{k-1}} - u'_{j_{k-1}} u_j) u_{j_{k-1}} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\mu_{j_1} \mu_{j_2} \cdots \mu_{j_{k-1}}}{k-1} u'_j \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We leave the detailed proof to the interested reader.  $\square$

In view of Lemma 5.1, we then have the following two conjectures, which are expected to be involved with more complicated algebraic analysis.

**Conjecture 5.1.** *Suppose  $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_N) \in (H^1(\mathbb{R}))^N$  is a solution of (1.1), where  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_N < 0$  and  $N > 3$ . Then there exists a unique vector*

$(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$  such that the solution  $u$  satisfies

$$u_i(x) = \frac{g_i(x)}{f(x)}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (5.4)$$

where  $g_i(x)$  and  $f(x)$  satisfy for  $\eta_i = \sqrt{|\mu_i|} > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} g_i(x) &= a_i e^{\eta_i x} + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{a_i a_j^2 (\eta_i - \eta_j)}{4\eta_j^2 (\eta_i + \eta_j)} e^{(\eta_i + 2\eta_j)x} \\ &+ \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq N} \frac{a_i a_{j_1}^2 a_{j_2}^2 (\eta_{j_1} - \eta_{j_2})^2 (\eta_i - \eta_{j_1})(\eta_i - \eta_{j_2})}{4^2 \eta_{j_1}^2 \eta_{j_2}^2 (\eta_{j_1} + \eta_{j_2})^2 (\eta_i + \eta_{j_1})(\eta_i + \eta_{j_2})} e^{(\eta_i + 2\eta_{j_1} + 2\eta_{j_2})x} \\ &+ \dots \\ &+ \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_k \leq N} \frac{1}{4^k} \prod_{l=1}^k \frac{a_i a_{j_l}^2 (\eta_i - \eta_{j_l})}{\eta_{j_l}^2 (\eta_i + \eta_{j_l})} \prod_{1 \leq l < m \leq k} \frac{(\eta_{j_l} - \eta_{j_m})^2}{(\eta_{j_l} + \eta_{j_m})^2} e^{(\eta_i + 2\eta_{j_1} + 2\eta_{j_2} + \dots + 2\eta_{j_k})x} \\ &+ \dots \\ &+ \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_{N-1} \leq N} \frac{1}{4^{N-1}} \prod_{l=1}^{N-1} \frac{a_i a_{j_l}^2 (\eta_i - \eta_{j_l})}{\eta_{j_l}^2 (\eta_i + \eta_{j_l})} \\ &\quad \cdot \prod_{1 \leq l < m \leq N} \frac{(\eta_{j_l} - \eta_{j_m})^2}{(\eta_{j_l} + \eta_{j_m})^2} e^{(\eta_i + 2\eta_{j_1} + 2\eta_{j_2} + \dots + 2\eta_{j_N})x}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= 1 + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{a_j^2}{4\eta_j^2} e^{2\eta_j x} + \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq N} \frac{a_{j_1}^2 a_{j_2}^2 (\eta_{j_1} - \eta_{j_2})^2}{4^2 \eta_{j_1}^2 \eta_{j_2}^2 (\eta_{j_1} + \eta_{j_2})^2} e^{(2\eta_{j_1} + 2\eta_{j_2})x} \\ &+ \dots \\ &+ \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_k \leq N} \frac{1}{4^k} \prod_{1 \leq l < m \leq k} \frac{a_{j_l}^2 (\eta_{j_l} - \eta_{j_m})^2}{\eta_{j_l}^2 (\eta_{j_l} + \eta_{j_m})^2} e^{(2\eta_{j_1} + 2\eta_{j_2} + \dots + 2\eta_{j_k})x} \\ &+ \dots \\ &+ \sum_{j_1=1, j_2=2, \dots, j_N=N} \frac{1}{4^N} \prod_{1 \leq l < m \leq N} \frac{a_{j_l}^2 (\eta_{j_l} - \eta_{j_m})^2}{\eta_{j_l}^2 (\eta_{j_l} + \eta_{j_m})^2} e^{(2\eta_{j_1} + 2\eta_{j_2} + \dots + 2\eta_N)x}. \end{aligned}$$

**Conjecture 5.2.** For  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_N < 0$ , where  $N > 3$ , (1.1) does not admit any orthonormal solution  $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_N) \in (H^1(\mathbb{R}))^N$  satisfying  $(u_i, u_j) = \delta_{ij}$  for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq N$ .

For any solution  $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_N)$  of (1.1), we next consider the following linearized system of (1.1) around the solution  $u$ :

$$u_i'' + 2\left(\sum_{k=1}^N u_k^2\right)\phi_i + 4\left(\sum_{k=1}^N u_k \phi_k\right)u_i = -\mu_i \phi_i \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N. \quad (5.5)$$

If Conjecture 5.1 holds true, then we are able to prove the following non-degeneracy of (5.5).

**Theorem 5.2.** *Suppose  $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_N) \in (H^1(\mathbb{R}))^N$  is a solution of (1.1) satisfying  $u_i \not\equiv 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , where  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \dots < \mu_N < 0$  and  $N > 3$ . If Conjecture 5.1 holds true, then  $u$  is non-degenerate, in the sense that the dimension of solutions for the linearized system (5.5) in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times \dots \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$  is equal to  $N$ .*

**Proof.** Similar to Lemma 4.1, one can derive that  $(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_N)$  satisfies the following  $N$  constants of motion, which correspond to the linearized version of Lemma 5.1:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N u'_i \phi'_i + 2 \left( \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^2 \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^N u_i \phi_i \right) + \sum_{i=1}^N \mu_i u_i \phi_i = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \quad (5.6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq N} (u'_{j_1} u_{j_2} - u_{j_1} u'_{j_2}) (\phi'_{j_1} u_{j_2} + u'_{j_1} \phi_{j_2} - \phi_{j_1} u'_{j_2} - u_{j_1} \phi'_{j_2}) \\ & + \sum_{1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq N, j_1 \neq j_2} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^2 \right) \mu_{j_1} u_{j_2} \phi_{j_2} + \left( \sum_{i=1}^N u_i \phi_i \right) \mu_{j_1} u_{j_2}^2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

$$+ \sum_{1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq N, j_1 \neq j_2} \mu_{j_1} u'_{j_2} \phi'_{j_2} + \sum_{1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq N, j_1 \neq j_2} \mu_{j_1} \mu_{j_2} u_{j_2} \phi_{j_2} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R},$$

and the  $k$ -th ( $3 \leq k \leq N$ ) identity satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_{k-2} \leq N, 1 \leq j_{k-1} < j_k \leq N, \\ \prod_{1 \leq l < m \leq k} (j_l - j_m) \neq 0}} \mu_{j_1} \mu_{j_2} \cdots \mu_{j_{k-2}} (u'_{j_{k-1}} u_{j_k} - u_{j_{k-1}} u'_{j_k}) \\ & \quad \cdot \left[ (\phi'_{j_{k-1}} u_{j_k} + u'_{j_{k-1}} \phi_{j_k} - \phi_{j_{k-1}} u'_{j_k} - u_{j_{k-1}} \phi'_{j_k}) \right] \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^2 \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_{k-1} \leq N, 1 \leq j_k \leq N, \\ \prod_{1 \leq l < m \leq k} (j_l - j_m) \neq 0}} \mu_{j_1} \mu_{j_2} \cdots \mu_{j_{k-1}} u_{j_k} \phi_{j_k} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^N u_i \phi_i \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_{k-1} \leq N, 1 \leq j_k \leq N, \\ \prod_{1 \leq l < m \leq k} (j_l - j_m) \neq 0}} \mu_{j_1} \mu_{j_2} \cdots \mu_{j_{k-1}} u_{j_k}^2 \\ & + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_{k-1} \leq N, 1 \leq j_k \leq N, \\ \prod_{1 \leq l < m \leq k} (j_l - j_m) \neq 0}} \mu_{j_1} \mu_{j_2} \cdots \mu_{j_{k-1}} (u'_{j_k} \phi'_{j_k}) \\ & + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_{k-1} \leq N, 1 \leq j_k \leq N, \\ \prod_{1 \leq l < m \leq k} (j_l - j_m) \neq 0}} \mu_{j_1} \mu_{j_2} \cdots \mu_{j_{k-1}} \mu_{j_k} u_{j_k} \phi_{j_k} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

If Conjecture 5.1 holds true, then we can take a sufficiently large point  $-x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$  so that

$$u_i(x_0) = [1 + o(1)] a_i e^{\eta_i x_0}, \quad u'_i(x_0) = [1 + o(1)] \eta_i a_i e^{\eta_i x_0} \quad \text{as } -x_0 \rightarrow +\infty, \quad (5.9)$$

where  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Applying (5.6)–(5.8), the same argument of Proposition 4.2 then yields that Theorem 5.2 holds true, and we are done.  $\square$

We finally comment that the proof of Theorem 5.2 depends strongly on the assumption  $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \dots < \mu_N < 0$ . Stimulated by Theorem 1.4, we guess that if  $\mu_j = \mu_i$  holds for some  $i \neq j$ , then the non-degeneracy of Theorem 5.2 is still true for all  $N > 3$ , but its proof is more involved with the inductive analysis, which is also left to the interested reader.

## References

- [1] A. Ambrosetti and E. Colorado, *Standing waves of some coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. **75** (2007), 67–82.
- [2] T. Bartsch and N. Soave, *A natural constraint approach to normalized solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations and systems*, J. Funct. Anal. **272** (2017), 4998–5037.
- [3] T. Bartsch, X. Zhong and W. Zou, *Normalized solutions for a coupled Schrödinger system*, Math. Ann. **380** (2021), 1713–1740.
- [4] M. Clapp and A. Szulkin, *Normalized solutions to a non-variational Schrödinger system*, Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal. **61** (2023), 445–464.
- [5] R. Frank, D. Gontier and M. Lewin, *Optimizers for the finite-rank Lieb-Thirring inequality*, Amer. J. Math. (2024), accepted.
- [6] R. Frank, D. Gontier and M. Lewin, *The nonlinear Schrödinger equation for orthonormal functions II: application to Lieb–Thirring inequalities*, Commun. Math. Phys. **384** (2021), 1783–1828.
- [7] B. D. Fried and Y. H. Ichikawa, *On the nonlinear Schrödinger equation for Langmuir waves*, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **34** (1973), 1073–1082.
- [8] D. Gontier, M. Lewin and F. Q. Nazar, *The nonlinear Schrödinger equation for orthonormal functions: existence of ground states*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **240** (2021), 1203–1254.
- [9] R. Hirota, *Direct Methods in Soliton Theory*, Springer, Berlin (1980), pp. 157–176.
- [10] D. Hundertmark, E. H. Lieb and L. E. Thomas, *A sharp bound for an eigenvalue moment of the one-dimensional Schrödinger operator*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998), 719–731.
- [11] E. H. Lieb, R. Seiringer, J. P. Solovej and J. Yngvason, *The Mathematics of the Bose Gas and Its Condensation*, Oberwolfach Seminars, Birkhauser, (2005).
- [12] T. C. Lin and J. C. Wei, *Ground state of  $N$  coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $n \leq 3$* , Commun. Math. Phys. **255** (2005), 629–653.

- [13] C. S. Lin, J. C. Wei and D. Ye, *Classification and nondegeneracy of  $SU(n+1)$  Toda system with singular sources*, Invent. Math. **190** (2012), 169–207.
- [14] B. Malomed, *Encyclopedia of nonlinear science, in nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Routledge (2005), 639–642.
- [15] R. Radhakrishnan and M. Lakshmanan, *Bright and dark soliton solutions to coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, J. Phys. A **28** (1995), 2683–2692.
- [16] R. Ramakrishnan, S. Stalin and M. Lakshmanan, *Multihumped nondegenerate fundamental bright solitons in  $N$ -coupled nonlinear Schrödinger system*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **54** (2021), 14LT01.
- [17] A. O. Smirnov, E. A. Frolov and V. S. Gerdjikov, *Spectral curves for the multi-phase solutions of Manakov system*, IOP Conf. Series: Materials Science and Engineering, **862** (2020), 052041.
- [18] T. Weidl, *On the Lieb-Thirring constants  $L_{\gamma,1}$  for  $\gamma \geq 1/2$* , Comm. Math. Phys. **178** (1996), 135–146.
- [19] J. C. Wei, X. X. Zhong and W. M. Zou, *On Sirakov’s open problem and related topics*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. **23** (2022), no. 2, 959–992.
- [20] J. C. Wei and Y. Z. Wu, *Ground states of nonlinear Schrödinger systems with mixed couplings*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **141** (2020), 50–88.
- [21] V. E. Zakharov and A. B. Shabat, *Exact theory of two-dimensional self-focusing and one-dimensional self-modulation of waves in nonlinear media*, Sov. Phys. JETP **34** (1972), 62.