

## PRINCIPAL EIGENVALUE FOR QUASILINEAR COOPERATIVE ELLIPTIC SYSTEMS

LIAMIDI LEADI

Institut de Mathématiques et de Sciences Physiques  
Université d'Abomey-Calavi, 01 BP 613, Porto-Novo, Benin Republic

HUMBERTO RAMOS QUOIRIN

Universidad de Santiago de Chile, Casilla 307, Correo 2, Santiago, Chile

(Submitted by: Klaus Schmitt)

**Abstract.** We study the first eigenvalue of a  $\lambda$ -dependent cooperative elliptic system involving two quasilinear operators. By variational arguments, we find an expression for the limit of this eigenvalue as  $\lambda \rightarrow -\infty$ , which improves and extends (for gradient quasilinear systems) a result proved by Álvarez Caudevilla-López Gómez [4] and Dancer [9]. We apply this result to deduce the existence of strictly principal eigenvalues (i.e., whose eigenfunctions have both components positive) of a weighted system and extend the results proved in Cuesta-Ramos Quoirin [7] for the scalar case.

### 1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE MAIN RESULTS

Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded domain of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and  $\alpha, \beta, p, q$  be constants such that

$$\alpha \geq 0, \beta \geq 0, p > 1, q > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} = 1.$$

In this article, we study the eigenvalue system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u - \lambda a(x)|u|^{p-2}u - b(x)|u|^{\alpha-1}u|v|^{\beta}v & = \mu|u|^{p-2}u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta_q v - \lambda d(x)|v|^{q-2}v - b(x)|u|^{\alpha}u|v|^{\beta-1}v & = \mu|v|^{q-2}v & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\Delta_p u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u)$  is the  $p$ -Laplacian operator and  $\lambda$  is a real parameter. The coefficients  $a, d$  are allowed to change sign in  $\Omega$ , while  $b$  is assumed to be non-negative in  $\Omega$ , so the above system is cooperative.

The motivation for considering (1.1) is twofold. Firstly, we are interested in studying its first eigencurve, which is a  $\lambda$ -dependent curve set as the first

---

Accepted for publication: April 2011.

AMS Subject Classifications: 35J, 35P30, 35J50.

eigenvalue of (1.1). The study of the behavior of this curve goes back to [13] in the linear scalar case and allows one to deduce the existence of positive solutions (on both components) for the system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u - b(x)|u|^{\alpha-1}u|v|^\beta v = \lambda a(x)|u|^{p-2}u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta_q v - b(x)|u|^\alpha u|v|^{\beta-1}v = \lambda d(x)|v|^{q-2}v & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

It is important to note that (1.2) has “semitrivial” solutions of the form  $(u, 0)$  and  $(0, v)$ , and consequently  $\lambda_{1,p}(a)$  and  $\lambda_{1,q}(d)$  are “semitrivial” principal eigenvalues of (1.2). Here  $\lambda_{1,p}(m)$  is the positive principal eigenvalue of

$$-\Delta_p u = \lambda m(x)|u|^{p-2}u, \quad u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

In view of this fact, let us agree to say that an eigenvalue of (1.1) or (1.2) is **strictly principal** if it associated to an eigenfunction  $(u, v)$  such that  $u, v > 0$ . Principal eigenvalues of quasilinear systems such as (1.1) and (1.2) have been investigated by several authors over the last years (see, e.g., [10, 16, 17]).

In [7], the authors have investigated the scalar version of (1.2), which reads

$$(P_m) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p u + V(x)|u|^{p-2}u = \lambda m(x)|u|^{p-2}u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

They proved that the existence of principal eigenvalues for this equation depends on the value

$$\alpha(V, m) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^p + V(x)|u|^p) : u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), \int_{\Omega} |u|^p = 1, \int_{\Omega} m(x)|u|^p = 0 \right\}.$$

Roughly speaking, the positivity of  $\alpha(V, m)$  is a necessary and sufficient condition for  $(P_m)$  to admit a principal eigenvalue. In addition, it is shown that if  $m \geq 0$  and  $\Omega_0^m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Omega \setminus \text{supp } m$  is sufficiently regular, then  $\alpha(V, m)$  is the first eigenvalue of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u + V(x)|u|^{p-2}u = \lambda|u|^{p-2}u & \text{in } \Omega_0^m, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega_0^m. \end{cases}$$

This result, for a general second-order uniformly elliptic and linear operator, but under stronger assumptions on  $m$  and  $\Omega_0^m$ , has been established in [14].

The second motivation for studying (1.1) comes from [2, 4, 5, 9], where the main issue addressed is the asymptotic behavior of the first eigenvalue

of the linear cooperative system

$$\begin{cases} (L_1 + \lambda a)u - bv = \tau u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ (L_2 + \lambda d)v - cu = \tau v & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

Here  $L_k u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\partial_i(\alpha_{ij}^k \partial_j u) + \beta_i^k \partial_i u + \gamma^k$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , are two uniformly strongly elliptic operators; i.e.,  $\alpha_{ij}^k(x)\eta_i\eta_j \geq \sigma|\eta|^2$  for some  $\sigma > 0$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , and every  $x \in \Omega$  and  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . Moreover,  $\alpha_{ij}^k, \beta_i^k, \gamma^k, a, b, c, d \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ ,  $a, d \geq 0$ , and  $b, c > 0$  almost everywhere in  $\Omega$ . This system is important in population dynamics models where the species are cooperative and the environment is nonhomogeneous in the space variable, as discussed in [3, 4, 9].

In [9], the author improves the main result of [4]. He assumes that  $\Omega$  can be decomposed in two parts  $A_1, Z_1$  such that  $A_1$  is open and

$$(H_D) \quad \begin{cases} \Omega = \bar{A}_1 \cup Z_1, & \bar{Z}_1 = \Omega \setminus \bar{A}_1 \\ a \equiv 0 \text{ on } \bar{A}_1, & a > 0 \text{ a.e. on } Z_1 \\ H_0^1(A_1) = \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega); u = 0 \text{ a.e. on } \Omega \setminus \bar{A}_1\}. \end{cases}$$

The latter assumption is a regularity condition on  $A_1$ , which is discussed for instance in [8, 11]. Moreover,  $A_1$  has only finitely many components. A similar decomposition is assumed involving  $A_2$ , the set where  $d$  vanishes. Let  $\tau(\lambda)$  denote the first eigenvalue of (1.3). The author shows that  $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \tau(\lambda) = \hat{\tau}$ , where  $\hat{\tau}$  is the first eigenvalue of

$$\begin{cases} L_1 u - bPv = \tau u, \\ L_2 v - cPu = \tau v, \\ u \in H_0^1(A_1), v \in H_0^1(A_2). \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

Here  $P\psi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \chi_{A_1 \cap A_2} \psi$ , where  $\chi$  is the characteristic function. Moreover,

$$\hat{\tau} \leq \min\{\hat{\lambda}_1(A_1), \hat{\lambda}_1(A_2)\},$$

where  $\hat{\lambda}_1(A_k)$  is the principal eigenvalue of  $L_k u = \lambda u$ ,  $u \in H_0^1(A_k)$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ . An alternative proof of this result by a  $\Gamma$ -convergence approach and under simpler assumptions has been provided by [2].

Given a measurable function  $w$  defined on  $\Omega$ , we set  $\Omega_0^w \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Omega \setminus \text{supp } w$ , where  $\text{supp } w$  denotes the support of  $w$  in the measurable sense.

One of our purposes here is to simplify as much as possible the above decomposition condition on  $\Omega$ . To this aim, we shall assume a regularity condition on the sets where  $a$  and  $d$  vanish. More precisely, we use the notion of  $p$ -stability, which we recall now.

An open set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  is said to be  $p$ -stable (in the capacity sense) if, for every  $u \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ ,

$$u = 0 \text{ quasi-everywhere in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \bar{E} \implies u = 0 \text{ quasi-everywhere in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus E. \tag{1.5}$$

Let  $E$  be an open subset of  $\Omega$ . Recall the following characterization of  $W_0^{1,p}(E)$  (cf. [12, Theorem 3.3.42]):

$$u \in W_0^{1,p}(E) \iff u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \text{ and } \tilde{u} = 0 \text{ quasi-everywhere on } \Omega \setminus E,$$

where  $\tilde{u}$  denotes the unique quasi-continuous representative of  $u$ . From (1.5), it follows that if  $E$  is a  $p$ -stable subset of  $\Omega$  then

$$u \in W_0^{1,p}(E) \iff u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \text{ and } \tilde{u} = 0 \text{ quasi-everywhere on } \Omega \setminus \bar{E}. \tag{1.6}$$

Therefore, if  $a \geq 0$  and  $\Omega_0^a$  is  $p$ -stable then we can deduce that  $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega_0^a)$  whenever  $\int_{\Omega} a(x)|u|^p = 0$  (as shown in the proof of [7, Proposition 11]). Note also that the third assumption in  $(H_D)$  is equivalent to (1.6). Let us remark that any Lipschitzian domain (more generally, any domain satisfying the uniform exterior cone property) is a  $p$ -stable set. We refer to [6, 12] for other characterizations of  $p$ -stable sets and more details on this subject.

In contrast with [2, 4, 9], our method is solely variational, and, as a consequence, we only deal with the gradient version of (1.3). However, our approach works in a quasilinear setting and applies also if  $a$  or  $d$  change sign.

The system (1.1) is a particular case of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u - \lambda a(x)|u|^{p-2}u - b(x)|u|^{\alpha-1}u|v|^{\beta}v & = \mu|u|^{p-2}u & \text{in } \Omega \\ -\Delta_q v - \lambda d(x)|v|^{q-2}v - c(x)|u|^{\alpha}u|v|^{\beta-1}v & = \mu|v|^{q-2}v & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.7}$$

which reduces to (1.3) when  $\alpha = \beta = 0$ ,  $p = q = 2$  and  $L_1 = L_2 = -\Delta$ . Actually, (1.7) is a gradient-type system if and only if  $b = c$ , in which case it reduces to (1.1).

We assume throughout this work that the weights  $a, b, d$  satisfy the following conditions:

- (H1)  $a \in L^r(\Omega)$  where  $\begin{cases} r > N/p & \text{if } 1 < p \leq N, \\ r > 1 & \text{if } p > N. \end{cases}$
- (H2)  $d \in L^s(\Omega)$  where  $\begin{cases} s > N/q & \text{if } 1 < q \leq N, \\ r > 1 & \text{if } q > N. \end{cases}$
- (H3)  $b(x) \in L^r(\Omega) \cap L^s(\Omega)$  and  $b(x) \geq 0$  in  $\Omega$ .

We refer to  $(u, v) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega) \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$  as a (weak) eigenfunction of (1.1) associated to the eigenvalue  $\mu$  provided

$$\int_{\Omega} \left( |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \phi - \lambda a(x) |u|^{p-2} u \phi - b(x) |u|^{\alpha-1} |v|^{\beta+1} u \phi \right) = \mu \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p-2} u \phi$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} \left( |\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v \nabla \psi - \lambda d(x) |v|^{q-2} v \psi - b(x) |v|^{\beta-1} |u|^{\alpha+1} v \psi \right) = \mu \int_{\Omega} |v|^{q-2} v \psi$$

for every  $(\phi, \psi) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ . These equalities are equivalent to

$$\nabla J_{\lambda}(u, v) = \mu \nabla I(u, v),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\lambda}(u, v) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^p - \lambda a(x) |u|^p) \\ &\quad + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla v|^q - \lambda d(x) |v|^q) - \int_{\Omega} b(x) |u|^{\alpha+1} |v|^{\beta+1}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$I(u, v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} |u|^p + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} |v|^q \right). \tag{1.8}$$

These functionals are respectively weakly lower semi-continuous and weakly continuous on  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$  whenever (H1) – (H3) are satisfied. For convenience, we also set

$$\begin{aligned} A(u) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\Omega} a(x) |u|^p, \quad D(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\Omega} d(x) |v|^q, \quad \text{and} \\ B(u, v) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\Omega} b(x) |u|^{\alpha+1} |v|^{\beta+1}, \end{aligned}$$

for  $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$  and  $v \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ . Let

$$\mathcal{M} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(u, v) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega) : I(u, v) = 1\}, \tag{1.9}$$

which is a  $C^1$  submanifold of  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ . By the Lagrange multipliers rule, critical points of  $J_{\lambda}$  constrained to  $\mathcal{M}$  correspond to eigenfunctions of (1.1).

We state now our main results.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Under (H1), (H2) and (H3), the system (1.1) has a first eigenvalue, which is given by*

$$\mu_1(\lambda) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{M}} J_{\lambda}(u, v). \tag{1.10}$$

Moreover,  $\mu_1(\lambda)$  is the only strictly principal eigenvalue of (1.1), it is simple (i.e., given two eigenfunctions  $(u, v)$ ,  $(u_0, v_0)$  associated to  $\mu_1(\lambda)$ , there is a positive constant  $k$  such that  $u = ku_0$  and  $v = k^{p/q}v_0$ ), and the following properties hold:

(1)  $\sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \mu_1(\lambda) = \theta$ , where

$$\theta = \theta(a, b, d) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf \left\{ J_0(u, v) : I(u, v) = 1, \frac{\alpha + 1}{p}A(u) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q}D(v) = 0 \right\}.$$

(2) If  $a, d \geq 0$ , then  $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow -\infty} \mu_1(\lambda) = \theta$ . If, in addition,  $\Omega_0^a$  and  $\Omega_0^d$  are non-empty and  $p$ -stable then  $\theta$  is the first eigenvalue of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u - b(x)|u|^{\alpha-1}u|v|^\beta v = \nu|u|^{p-2}u, \\ -\Delta_q v - b(x)|u|^\alpha u|v|^{\beta-1}v = \nu|v|^{q-2}v, \\ u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega_0^a), v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega_0^d), \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

and  $\theta \leq \min\{\lambda_{1,p}(\Omega_0^a), \lambda_{1,q}(\Omega_0^d)\}$ , where  $\lambda_{1,p}(\tilde{\Omega})$  denotes the first eigenvalue of  $-\Delta_p$  in  $\tilde{\Omega}$ . Moreover, equality holds if  $\Omega_0^a \cap \Omega_0^d = \emptyset$ .

Note that the second statement in the above theorem extends to (1.1) the result proved in [2, 4, 9] for the linear self-adjoint case, without any decomposition assumption related to the zero sets of  $a$  and  $d$ .

Using the properties of  $\mu_1(\lambda)$ , we derive a condition that guarantees the existence of strictly principal eigenvalues of (1.2) (since these ones are precisely the zeros of  $\mu_1$ ).

**Theorem 1.2.** *Assume (H1), (H2) and (H3).*

(1) *If  $a, d \geq 0$ , then there exists a strictly principal eigenvalue of (1.2) if and only if  $\theta > 0$ . In this case the strictly principal eigenvalue is unique and is characterized by*

$$\lambda_1 = \lambda_1(a, b, d) = \inf_{\mathcal{M}_{a,d}^+} J_0(u, v), \quad (1.12)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_{a,d}^+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(u, v) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega) : \frac{\alpha + 1}{p}A(u) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q}D(v) = 1\}.$$

(2) *If either  $a^- \not\equiv 0$  or  $d^- \not\equiv 0$  then there exists a strictly principal eigenvalue of (1.2) if and only if  $\theta \geq 0$ . More precisely*

(a) *If  $\theta > 0$ , then (1.2) admits exactly two strictly principal eigenvalues  $\lambda_{-1} < \lambda_1$ , with  $\lambda_1$  given by (1.12) and*

$$\lambda_{-1} = \lambda_{-1}(a, b, d) = - \inf_{\mathcal{M}_{a,d}^-} J_0(u, v) \quad (1.13)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_{a,d}^- \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(u, v) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega) : \frac{\alpha + 1}{p}A(u) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q}D(v) = -1\}.$$

(b) If  $\theta = 0$ , then (1.2) has a unique strictly principal eigenvalue  $\lambda_1$  given by

$$\lambda_1 = \lambda_1(a, b, d) = \inf_{\mathcal{M}_{a,d}^+} J_0(u, v) = - \inf_{\mathcal{M}_{a,d}^-} J_0(u, v).$$

These infima are not achieved. Moreover, any function  $(u, v)$  in  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$  satisfying

$$u, v \not\equiv 0 \text{ and } \frac{\alpha + 1}{p}A(u) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q}D(v) = 0 \tag{1.14}$$

is an eigenfunction associated to  $\lambda_1$ .

The above theorem extends to (1.3) the result proved in [7, Theorem 7], for the scalar case.

The Lebesgue norm in  $L^r(\Omega)$  will be denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_r$  and the usual norm of  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$  by  $\|\cdot\|$ . The weak convergence is denoted by  $\rightharpoonup$ . The positive and negative part of  $u$  are defined by  $u^\pm := \max\{\pm u, 0\}$ .

## 2. PROOF OF THE RESULTS

We start by minimizing  $J_\lambda$  on  $\mathcal{M}$ . For this purpose, we need the following inequality, which is similar to [7, Lemma 2].

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $(\omega_1, \omega_2) \in L^r(\Omega) \times L^s(\Omega)$ , with  $r, s$  satisfying (H1) and (H2) respectively. If  $\omega_1, \omega_2 > 0$  on  $\Omega$  then there exist three positive constants  $C_1, C_2, C_3$  such that*

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^p + |\nabla v|^q) \leq C_1 J_\lambda(u, v) + C_2 \int_{\Omega} \omega_1 |u|^p + C_3 \int_{\Omega} \omega_2 |v|^q \tag{2.1}$$

for every  $(u, v) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ .

**Proof.** By Hölder’s inequality, we have

$$|A(u)| \leq \|a\|_r \|u\|_{pr'}^p, \quad |D(v)| \leq \|d\|_s \|v\|_{qs'}^q,$$

$$\begin{aligned} B(u, v) &\leq \int_{\Omega} b(x) \left[ \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} |u|^p + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} |v|^q \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} \|b\|_r \|u\|_{pr'}^p + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} \|b\|_s \|v\|_{qs'}^q. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, according to the proof of [7, Lemma 2], for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exist  $M_\varepsilon, M'_\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$\|u\|_{p r'}^p \leq \varepsilon \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p + M_\varepsilon \int_\Omega \omega_1 |u|^p, \quad \|v\|_{q s'}^q \leq \varepsilon \int_\Omega |\nabla v|^q + M'_\varepsilon \int_\Omega \omega_2 |v|^q. \quad (2.2)$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} \int_\Omega |\nabla v|^q \\ &= J_\lambda(u, v) + \lambda \left[ \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} A(u) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} D(v) \right] + B(u, v) \\ &\leq J_\lambda(u, v) + \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} (\|\lambda\| \|a\|_r + \|b\|_r) \|u\|_{p r'}^p + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} (\|\lambda\| \|d\|_s + \|b\|_s) \|v\|_{q s'}^q. \end{aligned}$$

We set  $k_1 = \frac{\alpha+1}{p} (\|\lambda\| \|a\|_r + \|b\|_r)$ ,  $k_2 = \frac{\beta+1}{q} (\|\lambda\| \|d\|_s + \|b\|_s)$  and  $k = \max(k_1, k_2)$ . From (2.2), one gets

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} \int_\Omega |\nabla v|^q \\ &\leq J_\lambda(u, v) + \varepsilon k \int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^p + |\nabla v|^q) + k M_\varepsilon \int_\Omega \omega_1 |u|^p + k M'_\varepsilon \int_\Omega \omega_2 |v|^q. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be such that  $k_3 = \min\{\frac{\alpha+1}{p} - \varepsilon k, \frac{\beta+1}{q} - \varepsilon k\} > 0$ . Then

$$0 \leq k_3 \int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^p + |\nabla v|^q) \leq J_\lambda(u, v) + k M_\varepsilon \int_\Omega \omega_1 |u|^p + k M'_\varepsilon \int_\Omega \omega_2 |v|^q,$$

and the result follows. □

We can now follow the standard minimization procedure.

**Proposition 2.2.** *Assume (H1), (H2) and (H3). Then  $\mu_1(\lambda)$  defined in (1.10) is the least eigenvalue of (1.1) and is a strictly principal eigenvalue.*

**Proof.** Let us first show that  $J_\lambda$  is bounded below on  $\mathcal{M}$ . Indeed, taking  $\omega_1 = \omega_2 \equiv 1$  in (2.1), we have

$$0 \leq \int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^p + |\nabla v|^q) \leq C_1 J_\lambda(u, v) + C \int_\Omega (|u|^p + |v|^q), \quad (2.3)$$

where  $C = \max(C_2, C_3)$ . Thus,

$$C_1 J_\lambda(u, v) + C \geq 0 \quad \text{for every } (u, v) \in \mathcal{M},$$

so that  $J_\lambda$  is bounded below on  $\mathcal{M}$ . In addition, any sequence  $(u_n, v_n)$  that minimizes  $J_\lambda$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  is bounded in  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ . Thus there exists

$(u_0, v_0) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$  such that, up to a subsequence,  $(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow (u_0, v_0)$  in  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ , and  $(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow (u_0, v_0)$  in  $L^p(\Omega) \times L^q(\Omega)$  and in  $L^{p'}(\Omega) \times L^{q'}(\Omega)$ . Hence

$$J_\lambda(u_0, v_0) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} J_\lambda(u_n, v_n) = \mu_1(\lambda) \text{ and } (u_0, v_0) \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Consequently,  $J_\lambda(u_0, v_0) = \mu_1(\lambda)$ . By the Lagrange multipliers rule,  $\mu_1(\lambda)$  is an eigenvalue for (1.1). Moreover  $J_\lambda(|u|, |v|) = J_\lambda(u, v)$  for any  $(u, v)$ , so that  $\mu_1(\lambda)$  admits a componentwise nonnegative eigenfunction. From the Harnack inequality (cf. [15]), we deduce that  $u_0, v_0 > 0$  in  $\Omega$ ; i.e.,  $\mu_1(\lambda)$  is a strictly principal eigenvalue.  $\square$

The following lemma shows that  $\mu_1(\lambda)$  is the only strictly principal eigenvalue of (1.1) and is simple, in the sense that there is a unique eigenfunction  $(u_\lambda, v_\lambda)$  associated to  $\mu_1(\lambda)$  such that  $u_\lambda, v_\lambda > 0$  and  $I(u_\lambda, v_\lambda) = 1$ . Such  $(u_\lambda, v_\lambda)$  is said to be  $I$ -normalized. Note that up to now the condition  $b(x) \geq 0$  was not employed yet.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Assume (H1), (H2) and (H3).*

(1) *Let  $(u, v), (u_0, v_0) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$  be two eigenfunctions of (1.1) associated to  $\mu_1(\lambda)$ . Assume also that  $u, v \geq 0$  and  $u_0, v_0 > 0$  in  $\Omega$ . Then there exists a positive constant  $k$  such that  $u = ku_0$  and  $v = k^{p/q}v_0$ .*

(2)  *$\mu_1(\lambda)$  is the only strictly principal eigenvalue of (1.1). Moreover, there is exactly one eigenfunction  $(u_\lambda, v_\lambda)$  associated to  $\mu_1(\lambda)$  such that  $u_\lambda, v_\lambda > 0$  and  $I(u_\lambda, v_\lambda) = 1$ .*

**Proof.** (1) Let us set

$$L(\xi, \phi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\nabla \xi|^p + (p - 1) \frac{\xi^p}{\phi^p} |\nabla \phi|^p - p \frac{\xi^{p-1}}{\phi^{p-1}} |\nabla \phi|^{p-2} \nabla \phi \nabla \xi,$$

and

$$R(\xi, \phi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\nabla \xi|^p - |\nabla \phi|^{p-2} \nabla \left( \frac{\xi^p}{\phi^{p-1}} \right) \nabla \phi.$$

for any  $\xi \geq 0$  and  $\phi > 0$  two almost everywhere differentiable functions. By Picone's identity (see [1]),  $0 \leq L = R$  and, if  $\frac{\xi}{\phi} \in W_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ , then  $L(\xi, \phi) = 0$  if and only if  $\xi$  and  $\phi$  are colinear (the regularity condition  $\frac{\xi}{\phi} \in W_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega)$  is needed to infer that  $\frac{\xi}{\phi}$  is constant if  $\nabla(\frac{\xi}{\phi}) = 0$ ). We apply Picone's identity to  $u$  and  $u_0 + \varepsilon$ , as well as to  $v$  and  $v_0 + \varepsilon$ , for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By integration we find

$$0 \leq \int_\Omega L(u, u_0 + \varepsilon) = \int_\Omega R(u, u_0 + \varepsilon)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \int_{\Omega} \left[ |\nabla u|^p - |\nabla u_0|^{p-2} \nabla \left( \frac{u^p}{(u_0 + \varepsilon)^{p-1}} \right) \nabla u_0 \right] \\
 &= \mu \int_{\Omega} |u|^p + \lambda \int_{\Omega} a(x) |u|^p + \int_{\Omega} b(x) u^{\alpha+1} v^{\beta+1} - \mu \int_{\Omega} u_0^{p-1} \frac{u^p}{(u_0 + \varepsilon)^{p-1}} \\
 &\quad - \lambda \int_{\Omega} a(x) u_0^{p-1} \frac{u^p}{(u_0 + \varepsilon)^{p-1}} - \int_{\Omega} b(x) u_0^{\alpha} v_0^{\beta+1} \frac{u^p}{(u_0 + \varepsilon)^{p-1}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

We let  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  to get

$$0 \leq \int_{\Omega} L(u, u_0) \leq \int_{\Omega} b(x) [u^{\alpha+1} v^{\beta+1} - u_0^{\alpha-p+1} v_0^{\beta+1} u^p]. \tag{2.4}$$

Similarly, one gets

$$0 \leq \int_{\Omega} L(v, v_0) \leq \int_{\Omega} b(x) [u^{\alpha+1} v^{\beta+1} - u_0^{\alpha+1} v_0^{\beta-q+1} v^q]. \tag{2.5}$$

Since  $\frac{\alpha+1}{p} + \frac{\beta+1}{q} = 1$ , multiplying (2.4) by  $\frac{\alpha+1}{p}$  and (2.5) by  $\frac{\beta+1}{q}$  and adding up, we get

$$0 \leq \frac{\alpha+1}{p} L(u, u_0) + \frac{\beta+1}{q} L(v, v_0) \leq \int_{\Omega} b(x) Q(u, u_0, v, v_0), \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$Q(u, u_0, v, v_0) = u^{\alpha+1} v^{\beta+1} - \frac{\alpha+1}{p} u_0^{\alpha-p+1} v_0^{\beta+1} u^p - \frac{\beta+1}{q} u_0^{\alpha+1} v_0^{\beta-q+1} v^q.$$

Arguing as in [1], we write

$$u^{\alpha+1} v^{\beta+1} = \left( u^{\alpha+1} \frac{v_0^{\theta_2}}{u_0^{\theta_1}} \right) \left( v^{\beta+1} \frac{u_0^{\theta_1}}{v_0^{\theta_2}} \right),$$

with  $\theta_1 = \frac{(\alpha+1)(\beta+1)}{q}$  and  $\theta_2 = \frac{(\alpha+1)(\beta+1)}{p}$ . By Young's inequality, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
 u^{\alpha+1} v^{\beta+1} &\leq \frac{\alpha+1}{p} \left( u^{\alpha+1} \frac{v_0^{\theta_2}}{u_0^{\theta_1}} \right)^{\frac{p}{\alpha+1}} + \frac{\beta+1}{q} \left( v^{\beta+1} \frac{u_0^{\theta_1}}{v_0^{\theta_2}} \right)^{\frac{q}{\beta+1}} \tag{2.7} \\
 &= \frac{\alpha+1}{p} u^p u_0^{\alpha-p+1} v_0^{\beta+1} + \frac{\beta+1}{q} v^q u_0^{\alpha+1} v_0^{\beta-q+1},
 \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,  $Q(u, u_0, v, v_0) \leq 0$ . Since  $b(x) \geq 0$ , from (2.6), we get  $L(u, u_0) = L(v, v_0) = 0$ . Hence  $u = k u_0$  and  $v = \delta v_0$ , for some positive constants  $k, \delta$ . Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 k^{p-1} (-\Delta_p u_0) &= -\Delta_p u \\
 &= \lambda a(x) k^{p-1} u_0^{p-1} + b(x) k^{\alpha} \delta^{\beta+1} u_0^{\alpha} v_0^{\beta+1} + \mu_1(\lambda) k^{p-1} u_0^{p-1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Dividing this equation by  $k^{p-1}$  and using the equation satisfied by  $u_0$ , we find  $k^{\alpha-p+1}\delta^{\beta+1} = 1$ . Similarly, from the equations satisfied by  $v$  and  $v_0$ , we get  $k^{\alpha+1}\delta^{\beta-q+1} = 1$ , and thus  $\delta = k^{\frac{p}{q}}$ .

(2) Let  $(u_\lambda, v_\lambda)$  be an eigenfunction associated to  $\mu_1(\lambda)$  with  $u_\lambda, v_\lambda \geq 0$ , and let  $(u, v)$  be associated to some eigenvalue  $\nu$  of (1.1), with  $u, v > 0$ . Normalizing it, we can assume that  $I(u, v) = 1$ . It is easily seen that  $\nu \geq \mu_1(\lambda)$ . Arguing as before, one has

$$0 \leq \int_\Omega L(u_\lambda, u) \leq (\mu_1(\lambda) - \nu) \int_\Omega |u_\lambda|^p + \int_\Omega b(x)[u_\lambda^{\alpha+1}v_\lambda^{\beta+1} - u^{\alpha-p+1}v^{\beta+1}u^p]$$

$$0 \leq \int_\Omega L(v_\lambda, v) \leq (\mu_1(\lambda) - \nu) \int_\Omega |v_\lambda|^q + \int_\Omega b(x)[u_\lambda^{\alpha+1}v_\lambda^{\beta+1} - u^{\alpha+1}v^{\beta-q+1}v^q],$$

and

$$0 \leq (\mu_1(\lambda) - \nu) \int_\Omega \left( \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} |u_\lambda|^p + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} |v_\lambda|^q \right) + \int_\Omega b(x)Q(u, u_\lambda, v, v_\lambda).$$

Since  $\nu \geq \mu_1(\lambda)$ , we find once again  $L(u_\lambda, u) = L(v_\lambda, v) = 0$ , so  $u_\lambda = ku$  and  $v_\lambda = k^{\frac{p}{q}}v$ . But as  $I(u, v) = I(u_\lambda, v_\lambda) = 1$ , it follows that  $k = 1$  and consequently  $\nu = \mu_1(\lambda)$  and  $(u, v) = (u_\lambda, v_\lambda)$ .  $\square$

Next, we give some properties of  $\mu_1(\lambda)$  as a function of  $\lambda$ . These ones are simple adaptations of [7, Proposition 6]. In particular, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

**Proposition 2.4.** (1)  $\mu_1 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is concave and differentiable. Moreover,

$$\mu_1'(\lambda) = -\left( \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} A(u_\lambda) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} D(v_\lambda) \right) \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.8}$$

Here  $(u_\lambda, v_\lambda)$  is the  $I$ -normalized eigenfunction associated to  $\mu_1(\lambda)$  with  $u_\lambda, v_\lambda > 0$ .

(2) If either  $a^\pm \neq 0$  or  $d^\pm \neq 0$ , then  $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \pm\infty} \mu_1(\lambda) = -\infty$ .

(3) If  $a, d \geq 0$ , then  $\mu_1$  is strictly decreasing.

(4)  $\sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \mu_1(\lambda) = \theta$ . Moreover, if  $a, d > 0$  on  $\Omega$ , then  $\theta = \infty$ . Otherwise,  $\theta$  is achieved by some  $(\xi_0, \zeta_0) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$  such that  $\xi_0, \zeta_0 \geq 0$ .

(5) If  $a, d \geq 0$  and  $\Omega_0^a, \Omega_0^d$  are  $p$ -stable, then  $\theta$  is the first eigenvalue of (1.11) and  $\theta \leq \min\{\lambda_{1,p}(\Omega_0^a), \lambda_{1,q}(\Omega_0^d)\}$ . Moreover, equality holds if  $\Omega_0^a \cap \Omega_0^d = \emptyset$ .

**Proof.** (1) The concavity of  $\mu_1$  follows from the linearity of  $J_\lambda(u, v)$  as a function of  $\lambda$ . In particular  $\mu_1$  is continuous. Now let  $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda$  and

$(u_n, v_n), (u_\lambda, v_\lambda)$  be the  $I$ -normalized and componentwise positive eigenfunctions associated to  $\mu_1(\lambda_n), \mu_1(\lambda)$ , respectively. Since the weights  $\lambda_n a, \lambda_n d$  are uniformly bounded in  $L^r(\Omega)$  and  $L^s(\Omega)$  respectively, we apply Lemma 2.1 with  $\omega_1 = \omega_2 \equiv 1$  to get

$$0 \leq \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_n|^p + |\nabla v_n|^q) \leq C_1 J_{\lambda_n}(u_n, v_n) + C_2 = C_1 \mu_1(\lambda_n) + C_2.$$

So we infer that  $(u_n, v_n)$  is a bounded sequence in  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ . Hence there exists  $(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$  such that, up to a subsequence,  $u_n \rightharpoonup \bar{u}$  in  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ ,  $v_n \rightharpoonup \bar{v}$  in  $W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ ,  $u_n \rightarrow \bar{u}$  in  $L^{p'}(\Omega)$  and  $v_n \rightarrow \bar{v}$  in  $L^{q'}(\Omega)$ . Then  $I(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) = 1$  and from

$$\mu_1(\lambda) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mu_1(\lambda_n) \geq J_{\lambda}(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \geq \mu_1(\lambda)$$

we derive that  $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) = (u_\lambda, v_\lambda)$ . Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1(\lambda_n) &= J_{\lambda_n}(u_n, v_n) = J_{\lambda}(u_n, v_n) + (\lambda - \lambda_n) \left( \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} A(u_n) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} D(v_n) \right) \\ &\geq \mu_1(\lambda) + (\lambda - \lambda_n) \left( \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} A(u_n) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} D(v_n) \right) \end{aligned}$$

and replacing  $\lambda$  (respectively  $\varphi$ ) by  $\lambda_n$  (respectively  $\varphi_n$ ) in this inequality we have, for  $\lambda_n > \lambda$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} - \left( \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} A(u_n) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} D(v_n) \right) &\leq \frac{\mu_1(\lambda_n) - \mu_1(\lambda)}{\lambda_n - \lambda} \\ &\leq - \left( \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} A(u_\lambda) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} D(v_\lambda) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  we get (2.8). A similar argument holds if  $\lambda_n < \lambda$ .

(2) Since  $a^+ \not\equiv 0$  (respectively  $d^+ \not\equiv 0$ ) there exists a function  $\xi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$  (respectively  $\zeta \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ ) such that  $A(\xi) > 0$  and  $I(\xi, 0) = 1$  (respectively  $D(\zeta) > 0$  and  $I(0, \zeta) = 1$ ). Then, for every  $\lambda > 0$  we have

$$\mu_1(\lambda) \leq \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \xi|^p - \lambda A(\xi) \right) \rightarrow -\infty \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow +\infty.$$

$$\text{(respectively } \mu_1(\lambda) \leq \frac{\beta + 1}{q} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \zeta|^q - \lambda D(\zeta) \right) \rightarrow -\infty \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow +\infty).$$

A similar proof holds if either  $a^- \not\equiv 0$  or  $d^- \not\equiv 0$ .

(3) This result follows clearly from the fact that  $\frac{\alpha+1}{p} A(u_\lambda) + \frac{\beta+1}{q} D(v_\lambda) > 0$  for every  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . Indeed, if  $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ , then  $\mu_1(\lambda_1) = J_{\lambda_1}(u_{\lambda_1}, v_{\lambda_1}) > J_{\lambda_2}(u_{\lambda_1}, v_{\lambda_1}) \geq \mu_1(\lambda_2)$ .

(4) Let us prove that  $\sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \mu_1(\lambda) = \theta$ . First of all, it is clear that  $\theta \geq \mu_1(\lambda)$  for every  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and that  $\theta = +\infty$  if and only if  $a, d > 0$  on  $\Omega$ . We distinguish two cases:

(a)  $a, d \geq 0$ . In this case we know that  $\mu_1(\lambda)$  is strictly decreasing so that

$$\sup \mu_1(\lambda) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow -\infty} \mu(\lambda). \tag{2.9}$$

Let  $\lambda_n \rightarrow -\infty$  when  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and let  $(u_n, v_n)$  be the  $I$ -normalized eigenfunction associated to  $\mu_1(\lambda_n)$ . From (2.3), we have

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_n|^p + |\nabla v_n|^q) \leq C_1 \mu_1(\lambda_n) + C$$

for every  $\lambda_n \leq 0$ . Thus  $(u_n, v_n)$  is bounded in  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ , and there exists  $(u, v) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$  such that, up to a subsequence,  $(u_n, v_n) \rightharpoonup (u, v)$  in  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ , and  $(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow (u, v)$  in  $L^{p'}(\Omega) \times L^{q'}(\Omega)$ . Thus  $I(u, v) = 1$  and

$$\theta \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_1(\lambda_n) \geq J_0(u, v) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n \left( \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} A(u_n) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} D(v_n) \right). \tag{2.10}$$

If  $a, d > 0$  on  $\Omega$ , then

$$\frac{\alpha + 1}{p} A(u_n) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} D(v_n) \rightarrow \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} A(u) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} D(v) > 0,$$

so, from (2.10),  $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow -\infty} \mu_1(\lambda) = +\infty = \theta$ . Otherwise  $\theta < +\infty$ , so that  $\mu_1$  is bounded from above and we conclude from (2.10) that

$$\frac{\alpha + 1}{p} A(u) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} D(v) = 0.$$

Therefore,  $(u, v)$  is admissible in the definition of  $\theta$  and, still from (2.10), we get

$$\theta \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_1(\lambda_n) \geq J_0(u, v) \geq \theta$$

and the result follows.

(b)  $a^- \neq 0$  or  $d^- \neq 0$ . In this case it follows from (1) and (2) that  $\mu_1$  is bounded from above. Then  $\sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \mu_1(\lambda)$  is achieved at some  $\lambda_0$  that satisfies

$$0 = \mu_1'(\lambda_0) = - \left( \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} A(u_{\lambda_0}) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} D(v_{\lambda_0}) \right).$$

We conclude that  $(u_{\lambda_0}, v_{\lambda_0})$  is admissible in the definition of  $\theta$ , and thus

$$\theta \leq J_0(u_{\lambda_0}, v_{\lambda_0}) = \mu_1(\lambda_0) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \mu_1(\lambda).$$

Then the conclusion follows.

It remains to show that  $\theta$  is achieved whenever it is finite. Let  $(u_n, v_n)$  be a minimizing sequence for  $\theta$ . Lemma 2.1 with  $\omega_1 \equiv \omega_2 \equiv 1$  shows that  $(u_n, v_n)$  is bounded in  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ . Up to a subsequence,  $(u_n, v_n) \rightharpoonup (u_0, v_0)$  in  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ , and  $(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow (u_0, v_0)$  in  $L^{p'}(\Omega) \times L^{q'}(\Omega)$ . A standard minimization argument shows that  $\theta$  is achieved by  $(u_0, v_0)$ .

(5) Let  $\theta$  be achieved by  $(u_0, v_0)$ ; i.e.,

$$J_0(u_0, v_0) = \theta, \quad I(u_0, v_0) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\alpha + 1}{p}A(u_0) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q}D(v_0) = 0.$$

Since  $a, d \geq 0$  almost everywhere in  $\Omega$ , it follows that  $A(u_0) = D(v_0) = 0$ . From the  $p$ -stability assumption on  $\Omega_0^a$  and  $\Omega_0^d$ , we infer that  $u_0 \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega_0^a)$  and  $v_0 \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega_0^d)$ . Thus

$$\theta = \min\{\tilde{J}_0(u, v) : (u, v) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega_0^a) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega_0^d), \tilde{I}(u, v) = 1\}, \quad (2.11)$$

where  $\tilde{J}_0, \tilde{I}$  are the restrictions of  $J_0, I$  to  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega_0^a) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega_0^d)$ , respectively. By the Lagrange multipliers rule,  $((u_0, v_0), \theta)$  solves (1.11). Moreover, by (2.11),  $\theta$  is the first eigenvalue of (1.11). As  $\lambda_{1,p}(\Omega_0^a)$  and  $\lambda_{1,q}(\Omega_0^d)$  are eigenvalues of (1.11), we obtain  $\theta \leq \min\{\lambda_{1,p}(\Omega_0^a), \lambda_{1,q}(\Omega_0^d)\}$ . Finally, if  $\Omega_0^a \cap \Omega_0^d = \emptyset$  then (1.11) reduces to the non-coupled system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \nu|u|^{p-2}u, \\ -\Delta_q v = \nu|v|^{q-2}v, \\ u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega_0^a), v \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega_0^d), \end{cases} \quad (2.12)$$

whose first eigenvalue is clearly  $\min\{\lambda_{1,p}(\Omega_0^a), \lambda_{1,q}(\Omega_0^d)\}$ . □

We are now in position to prove Theorem 1.2.

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** (1) By (3) and (4) of Proposition 2.4, it is clear that  $\theta > 0$  is a necessary and sufficient condition for the curve  $\mu_1(\lambda)$  to vanish at some unique value  $\lambda_1$ . It follows that

$$J_0(u, v) \geq \lambda_1 \left( \frac{\alpha + 1}{p}A(u) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q}D(v) \right)$$

for every  $u, v$  such that  $I(u, v) = 1$ . Moreover, equality holds for  $(u, v) = (u_{\lambda_1}, v_{\lambda_1})$ . From (2.8), we know that  $\frac{\alpha+1}{p}A(u_{\lambda_1}) + \frac{\beta+1}{q}D(v_{\lambda_1}) > 0$ , so we can set

$$\tilde{u} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{u_{\lambda_1}}{\left(\frac{\alpha+1}{p}A(u_{\lambda_1}) + \frac{\beta+1}{q}D(v_{\lambda_1})\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{v} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{v_{\lambda_1}}{\left(\frac{\alpha+1}{p}A(u_{\lambda_1}) + \frac{\beta+1}{q}D(v_{\lambda_1})\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}}.$$

Thus,  $J_0(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = \lambda_1$  and consequently (1.12) is proved.

(2) By Proposition 2.4-(2),  $\mu_1(\lambda)$  is concave and differentiable and  $\mu_1(\lambda) \rightarrow -\infty$  when  $\lambda \rightarrow \pm\infty$ . Thus, if  $\theta > 0$  then  $\mu_1(\tilde{\lambda}) = 0$  for some  $\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}$  which provides a strictly principal eigenvalue of (1.2). Conversely, if (1.2) has a strictly principal eigenvalue, say  $\lambda$ , then  $0 = \mu_1(\lambda) \leq \theta$ .

(a) If  $\theta > 0$ , then  $\mu_1(\lambda)$  vanishes twice, let us say at  $\lambda_{-1} < \lambda_1$ . We claim that  $\mu'_1(\lambda_{-1}) > 0$ . Indeed, assume that

$$\mu'_1(\lambda_{-1}) = -\left[\frac{\alpha + 1}{p}A(u_{-1}) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q}D(v_{-1})\right] = 0,$$

where  $(u_{-1}, v_{-1})$  is the  $I$ -normalized eigenfunction associated to  $\lambda_{-1}$ . Then  $(u_{-1}, v_{-1})$  is an admissible couple in the definition of  $\theta$  and we have

$$\theta \leq J_0(u_{-1}, v_{-1}) = \mu_1(\lambda_{-1}) = 0,$$

a contradiction. Thus, we have shown that

$$\frac{\alpha + 1}{p}A(u_{-1}) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q}D(v_{-1}) < 0.$$

After a renormalization we can assume that

$$\frac{\alpha + 1}{p}A(u_{-1}) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q}D(v_{-1}) = -1.$$

Then formula (1.13) is directly deduced from the definition of  $\mu_1(\lambda)$ . A similar argument holds for  $\lambda_1$  and we omit it.

(b) If  $\theta = 0$ , then  $\mu_1(\lambda_0) = 0$  at some  $\lambda_0$  providing a strictly principal eigenvalue of 1.2. Moreover,  $\lambda_0$  is unique and is a global maximum point of  $\mu$ , so

$$\mu'_1(\lambda_0) = -\left[\frac{\alpha + 1}{p}A(u_{\lambda_0}) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q}D(v_{\lambda_0})\right] = 0.$$

Let us prove that  $\lambda_0 = \inf_{\mathcal{M}_{a,d}^+} J_0$ . Take  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{M}_{a,d}^+$  and assume that  $u, v \geq 0$  by replacing  $u, v$  by  $|u|, |v|$  if necessary. Picone's identity applied to  $u_T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{u, T\}$  and  $u_{\lambda_0} + \varepsilon$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_{\Omega} L(u_T, u_{\lambda_0} + \varepsilon) = \int_{\Omega} R(u_T, u_{\lambda_0} + \varepsilon) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \left[ |\nabla u_T|^p - |\nabla u_{\lambda_0}|^{p-2} \nabla \left( \frac{u_T^p}{(u_{\lambda_0} + \varepsilon)^{p-1}} \right) \nabla u_{\lambda_0} \right] \\ &= \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_T|^p - \lambda_0 \int_{\Omega} a(x) \left( \frac{u_T^p}{(u_{\lambda_0} + \varepsilon)^{p-1}} \right) u_{\lambda_0}^{p-1} \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega} b(x) \left( \frac{u_T^p}{(u_{\lambda_0} + \varepsilon)^{p-1}} \right) u_{\lambda_0}^{\alpha} v_{\lambda_0}^{\beta+1}. \end{aligned}$$

In a similar way, applying Picone’s identity to  $v_T = \min\{v, T\}$  and  $v_{\lambda_0} + \varepsilon$ , one gets

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_{\Omega} L(v_T, v_{\lambda_0} + \varepsilon) = \int_{\Omega} R(v_T, v_{\lambda_0} + \varepsilon) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \left[ |\nabla v_T|^q - |\nabla v_{\lambda_0}|^{q-2} \nabla \left( \frac{v_T^q}{(v_{\lambda_0} + \varepsilon)^{q-1}} \right) \nabla v_{\lambda_0} \right] \\ &= \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_T|^q - \lambda_0 \int_{\Omega} d(x) \left( \frac{v_T^q}{(v_{\lambda_0} + \varepsilon)^{q-1}} \right) v_{\lambda_0}^{q-1} \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega} b(x) \left( \frac{v_T^q}{(v_{\lambda_0} + \varepsilon)^{q-1}} \right) u_{\lambda_0}^{\alpha+1} v_{\lambda_0}^{\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we let  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  and  $T \rightarrow \infty$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_{\Omega} L(u, u_{\lambda_0}) \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p - \lambda_0 A(u) - \int_{\Omega} b(x) u^p u_{\lambda_0}^{\alpha-p+1} v_{\lambda_0}^{\beta+1}, \\ 0 &\leq \int_{\Omega} L(v, v_{\lambda_0}) \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^q - \lambda_0 D(v) - \int_{\Omega} b(x) v^q u_{\lambda_0}^{\alpha+1} v_{\lambda_0}^{\beta-q+1}, \end{aligned}$$

and consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\alpha + 1}{p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^q - \lambda_0 \left[ \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} A(u) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} D(v) \right] \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega} b(x) \left[ \frac{\alpha + 1}{p} u^p u_{\lambda_0}^{\alpha-p+1} v_{\lambda_0}^{\beta+1} + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} v^q u_{\lambda_0}^{\alpha+1} v_{\lambda_0}^{\beta-q+1} \right] \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using (2.7) (where we replace  $u_0, v_0$  by  $u_{\lambda_0}, v_{\lambda_0}$  respectively), we deduce that  $J_0(u, v) \geq \lambda_0$  for every  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{M}_{a,d}^+$ . Consider now the sequence  $(u_n, v_n) \in \mathcal{M}_{a,d}^+$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} u_n &= \frac{u_{\lambda_0} + \frac{\psi}{n}}{\left( \frac{\alpha+1}{p} A(u_{\lambda_0} + \frac{\psi}{n}) + \frac{\beta+1}{q} D(v_{\lambda_0} + \frac{\eta}{n}) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}}, \\ v_n &= \frac{v_{\lambda_0} + \frac{\eta}{n}}{\left( \frac{\alpha+1}{p} A(u_{\lambda_0} + \frac{\psi}{n}) + \frac{\beta+1}{q} D(v_{\lambda_0} + \frac{\eta}{n}) \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

where  $\psi, \eta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  are positive such that

$$\frac{\alpha + 1}{p} A(\psi) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q} D(\eta) > 0, \quad \int_{\Omega} a(x) u_{\lambda_0}^{p-1} \psi > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} d(x) v_{\lambda_0}^{q-1} \eta > 0.$$

One can easily see that

$$\frac{\alpha + 1}{p}A\left(u_{\lambda_0} + \frac{\psi}{n}\right) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q}D\left(v_{\lambda_0} + \frac{\eta}{n}\right) > 0$$

for  $n$  large enough. Moreover, by the mean value theorem, for such  $n$  we can find  $0 < t_n, s_n, x_n, y_n < \frac{1}{n}$  such that

$$J_0\left(u_{\lambda_0} + \frac{\psi}{n}, v_{\lambda_0} + \frac{\eta}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n} \left[ \left\langle \frac{\partial J_0}{\partial u}(u_{\lambda_0} + t_n\psi), \psi \right\rangle + \left\langle \frac{\partial J_0}{\partial v}(v_{\lambda_0} + s_n\eta), \eta \right\rangle \right]$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\alpha + 1}{p}A\left(u_{\lambda_0} + \frac{\psi}{n}\right) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q}D\left(v_{\lambda_0} + \frac{\eta}{n}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \left[ (\alpha + 1) \int_{\Omega} a(x)|u_{\lambda_0} + x_n\psi|^{p-1}\psi + (\beta + 1) \int_{\Omega} d(x)|v_{\lambda_0} + y_n\eta|^{q-1}\eta \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$J_0(u_n, v_n) = \frac{J_0(u_{\lambda_0} + \frac{\psi}{n}, v_{\lambda_0} + \frac{\eta}{n})}{\frac{\alpha+1}{p}A(u_{\lambda_0} + \frac{\psi}{n}) + \frac{\beta+1}{q}D(v_{\lambda_0} + \frac{\eta}{n})} \longrightarrow \lambda_0.$$

Since  $(u_{\lambda_0}, v_{\lambda_0})$  satisfies (1.14) it is clear that  $\lambda_0$  is not achieved. By repeating the above argument for  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{M}_{a,d}^-$  and  $\psi, \eta < 0$  such that

$$\frac{\alpha + 1}{p}A(\psi) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q}D(\eta) < 0, \quad \int_{\Omega} a(x)u_{\lambda_0}^{p-1}\psi < 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} d(x)v_{\lambda_0}^{q-1}\eta < 0,$$

we can show that  $\lambda_0 = \inf_{\mathcal{M}_{a,b}^-} J_0$ . Finally if  $(u, v)$  is such that

$$J_0(u, v) = \frac{\alpha + 1}{p}A(u) + \frac{\beta + 1}{q}D(v) = 0,$$

after  $I$ -normalization, one has  $I(u, v) = 1$  and

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \mu_1(\lambda) = 0 = J_0(u, v) = J_{\lambda_0}(u, v) \geq \mu_1(\lambda_0) = 0,$$

so  $(u, v)$  achieves  $\mu_1(\lambda_0)$ . Then  $u = cu_{\lambda_0}$  and  $v = c^{\frac{p}{q}}v_{\lambda_0}$  for some positive constant  $c$  and the result follows. We put  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_0$ .  $\square$

### REFERENCES

- [1] W. Allegretto and Y-X. Huang, *A Picone's identity for the  $p$ -laplacian and applications*, Nonlinear Analysis TMA, 32 (1998), 819–830.
- [2] P. Álvarez-Caudevilla and A. Lemenant, *Asymptotic analysis for some linear eigenvalue problems via Gamma-Convergence*, Adv. Differential Equations, 15 (2010), 649–688.

- [3] P. Álvarez-Caudevilla and J. López-Gómez, *Metasolutions in cooperative systems*, *Nonlinear Anal., Real World Appl.*, 9 (2008), 1119–1157.
- [4] P. Álvarez-Caudevilla and J. López-Gómez, *Asymptotic behaviour of principal eigenvalues for a class of cooperative systems*, *J. Differential Equations*, 244 (2008), 1093–1113.
- [5] P. Álvarez Caudevilla and J. López-Gómez, *Corrigendum to “Asymptotic behaviour of principal eigenvalues for a class of cooperative systems”*, *J. Differential Equations* 244 (2008), 1093–1113, *J. Differential Equations*, 245 (2008), 566–567.
- [6] D. Bucur and G. Buttazzo, *Variational methods in shape optimization problems*, *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*, 65. Birkhuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2005.
- [7] M. Cuesta and H. Ramos Quoirin, *A weighted eigenvalue problem for the p-laplacian plus a potential*, *Nonlinear differential equations and applications*, 16 (2009), 469–491.
- [8] E.N. Dancer, *Some remarks on classical problems and fine properties of Sobolev spaces*, *Differential Integral Equations*, 9 (1996), 437–446.
- [9] E.N. Dancer, *On the least point of the spectrum of certain cooperative linear systems with a large parameter*, *J. Differential Equations*, 250 (2011), 33–38.
- [10] J. Fleckinger, R.F. Manásevich, N.M. Stavrakakis, and F. de Thélin, *Principal eigenvalues for some quasilinear elliptic equations on  $\mathbb{R}^N$* , *Adv. Differential Equations*, 2 (1997), 981–1003.
- [11] L.I. Hedberg, *Spectral synthesis and stability in Sobolev spaces*, in “Euclidean Harmonic Analysis,” *Proc. Sem.*, Univ. Maryland, College Park, MD, 1979, in: *Lecture Notes in Math.*, vol. 779, Springer, Berlin, 1980, pp. 73–103.
- [12] A. Henrot and M. Pierre, “Variation et optimisation de formes. Une analyse géométrique,” *Collection: Mathématiques et Applications*, Vol. 48, Springer 2005.
- [13] P. Hess and T. Kato, *On some linear and nonlinear eigenvalue problems with an indefinite weight function*, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 5 (1980), 999–1030.
- [14] J. López-Gómez, *The maximum principle and the existence of principal eigenvalues for some linear weighted eigenvalue problems*, *J. Differential Equations*, 127 (1996) 263–294.
- [15] J. Serrin, *Local behavior of solutions of quasilinear equations*, *Acta Mathematica*, 111 (1962), 247–302.
- [16] N.M. Stavrakakis and N.B. Zographopoulos, *Bifurcation results for quasilinear elliptic systems*, *Adv. Differential Equations*, 8 (2003), 315–336.
- [17] F. de Thélin, *Première valeur propre d’un système elliptique non linéaire*, *First eigenvalue of a nonlinear elliptic system*, *Rev. Mat. Apl.*, 13 (1992), 1–8.