

1 (90)

A LIOUVILLE-TYPE THEOREM FOR  
ELLIPTIC SYSTEMS

*Djairo G. de Figueiredo*  
and  
*Patricio L. Felmer*

Dezembro

RP 65/92

IRT-IMECC  
IM/4136

**Relatório de Pesquisa**

**Instituto de Matemática  
Estatística e Ciência da Computação**



**UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL DE CAMPINAS**  
**Campinas - São Paulo - Brasil**

R.P.  
IM/65/92

**ABSTRACT** - A priori estimates for solutions of superlinear elliptic problems can be established by a blow up technique. Such a method has been used by Gidas Spruck [GS1] for the case of a single equation. Similar arguments can also be used in the case of systems. We refer to the work of Jie Qing [J] and M. A. Souto [S]. As in the scalar case, the treatment of systems poses the question of the validity of a result which is referred as a Liouville-type theorem for solutions of systems of elliptic equations in  $R^N$ . In this paper we establish one such result.

IMECC - UNICAMP  
Universidade Estadual de Campinas  
CP 6065  
13081 Campinas SP  
Brasil

O conteúdo do presente Relatório de Pesquisa é de única responsabilidade dos autores

Dezembro 1992

I. M. E. C. C.  
B I B L I O T E C A

# A Liouville-type Theorem for Elliptic Systems

Djairo G. de Figueiredo\*  
IMECC UNICAMP  
Caixa Postal 6065  
13081 Campinas, S.P.  
Brasil

Patricio L. Felmer\*  
Depto. Ing. Matemática, FCFM  
Universidad de Chile  
Casilla 170, Correo 3  
Santiago Chile

---

\* The first author was partially supported by CNPq and the second by Fondecyt and D.T.I. University of Chile.

**§0. Introduction.** A priori estimates for solutions of superlinear elliptic problems can be established by a blow up technique. Such a method has been used by Gidas-Spruck [GS1] for the case of a single equation. Similar arguments can also be used in the case of systems. We refer to the work of Jie Qing [J] and M. A. Souto [S]. As in the scalar case, the treatment of systems poses the question of the validity of a result which is referred as a Liouville-type theorem for solutions of systems of elliptic equations in  $R^N$ . Let us make precise this question.

We consider the elliptic system

$$(0.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = v^\alpha \\ -\Delta v = u^\beta \end{cases}$$

in the whole of  $R^N$ ,  $N \geq 3$ . The question is to determine for which values of the exponents  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  the only nonnegative solution  $(u, v)$  of (0.1) is  $(u, v) = (0, 0)$ . The notion of solution here is taken in the classical sense, i.e.,  $u, v \in C^2(R^N)$ . In the case of a single equation

$$(0.2) \quad \Delta u + u^p = 0, \quad u \geq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad R^N$$

it has been proved in [GS2] that the only solution of (0.2) is  $u = 0$  when

$$(0.3) \quad 1 \leq p < \frac{N+2}{N-2}, \quad N \geq 3.$$

In dimension  $N = 2$ , a similar conclusion holds for  $0 \leq p < \infty$ . This is a special case of the result that asserts that any superharmonic function bounded below in the whole plane  $R^2$  is necessarily constant, see [PW, Theorem 29, p. 130]. It is also well known that in the critical case,  $p = (N+2)/(N-2)$ , problem (0.2) has a two-parameter family of solutions given by:

$$(0.4) \quad u(x) = \frac{[N(N-2)\lambda^2]^{\frac{N-2}{4}}}{[\lambda^2 + |x - x_0|^2]^{\frac{N-2}{2}}}.$$

We see then that the critical exponent, in the scalar case, plays an important role in the validity of the Liouville-type theorem for equation (0.2). It is natural to conjecture that in the case of system (0.1) the condition (0.3) is replaced by

$$(0.5) \quad 1 \geq \frac{1}{\alpha+1} + \frac{1}{\beta+1} > \frac{N-2}{N}.$$

The basis of this conjecture lies on the fact that the existence of positive solutions for the Dirichlet problem for system (0.1) in a bounded domain holds true if condition (0.5)

is satisfied, see [CFM, FF, HV]. If this conjecture were true we would have a complete analogy with the scalar case. A further argument in favor of this conjecture is a theorem of Mitidieri [M; Thm 3.2] which states that (0.1) has no nontrivial *radial* positive solutions of class  $C^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ ,  $N \geq 3$ , provided  $1 < \alpha \leq \beta$  and (0.5) holds. The result proved here is the following

**Theorem.** A) If  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\beta > 0$  are such that

$$(0.6) \quad \alpha, \beta \leq \frac{N+2}{N-2}, \quad \text{but both are not equal to } \frac{N+2}{N-2},$$

then the only nonnegative  $C^2$  solution of (0.1) in the whole of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  is the trivial one:  $u = 0, v = 0$ .

B) If  $\alpha = \beta = \frac{N+2}{N-2}$ , then  $u$  and  $v$  are radially symmetric with respect to some point of  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .

**Remark.** In [S] it was proved that (0.1) has no nontrivial nonnegative  $C^2$  solutions in the whole of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  provided

$$(0.7) \quad \alpha, \beta > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\alpha+1} + \frac{1}{\beta+1} \geq \frac{N-2}{N-1}.$$

We see then that this establishes the conjecture in a hyperbolic region of the plane  $(\alpha, \beta)$  which is smaller than the one set in (0.5). However (and this is important to stress) such region contains points which are not included in the region defined in (0.6). Souto's argument in [S] is based on the nonexistence of positive solutions in the whole of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  of the inequality

$$(0.8) \quad \Delta u + u^\sigma \leq 0$$

when  $\sigma \leq N/(N-2)$ . This fact was proved by Gidas [G]. The conjecture would be proved if we had this nonexistence result (for inequality (0.8)) up to  $(N+2)/(N-2)$ . We do not know if such a result is true. In [J] there are some Liouville-type theorems although his results apply to more general nonlinearities, they do not cover our result.

An important feature of the present paper is to show how the Method of Moving Planes, as developed by Gidas-Ni-Nirenberg [GNN], and more recently by Berestycki-Nirenberg [BN], can be used to produce rather simple and elegant proofs of Liouville-type

theorems for systems. The main difficulty stems from the fact that the domains, where the solutions are considered, are unbounded, in fact  $R^N$ . In such cases it is not clear where we can start the procedure, see details in Section 2. The present work has been motivated by recent papers by Caffarelli-Gidas-Spruck [CGS] and Chen and Li [CL], where Liouville-type theorems for a single equation (results formerly proved by Gidas-Spruck [GS2]) have received a treatment by the Method of Moving Planes.

The authors would like to thank Manuel del Pino for useful conversations.

**§1. Some general facts about superharmonic (subharmonic) functions.** Let us recall the so called Hadamard Three Spheres Theorem, see [PW; p. 131]:

“Let  $\Omega$  be an open set containing the set

$$\{x \in R^N : r_1 \leq |x| \leq r_2\}, \quad N \geq 3$$

and  $u \in C^2(\Omega)$  with  $\Delta u \geq 0$ . For  $r_1 \leq r \leq r_2$ , let

$$M(r) = \max\{u(x) : |x| = r\}.$$

Then

$$(1.1) \quad M(r) \leq \frac{M(r_1)(r^{2-N} - r_2^{2-N}) + M(r_2)(r_1^{2-N} - r^{2-N})}{r_1^{2-N} - r_2^{2-N}},$$

for any  $r$  in  $[r_1, r_2]$ .”

The proof of this result is very simple. Let  $\varphi(r) = a + br^{2-N}$ . Choose  $a$  and  $b$  such that  $\varphi(r_1) = M(r_1)$  and  $\varphi(r_2) = M(r_2)$ . Let  $v(x) = u(x) - \varphi(|x|)$ , and use the maximum principle for subharmonic functions.

**Lemma 1.1.** Let  $u \in C^2(R^N \setminus \{0\})$  such that  $u < 0$  and  $\Delta u \geq 0$ . Then, for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , one has

$$(1.2) \quad u(x) \leq M(\varepsilon) \quad , \quad 0 < |x| \leq \varepsilon$$

$$(1.3) \quad u(x) \leq \frac{M(\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{N-2}}{|x|^{N-2}} \quad , \quad |x| \geq \varepsilon.$$

**Proof.** Letting  $r_1 \rightarrow 0$  in (1.1) we obtain  $M(r) \leq M(r_2)$ , for all  $0 < r < r_2$ , which implies (1.2) by taking  $r_2 = \varepsilon$ . Letting  $r_2 \rightarrow +\infty$  in (1.1) we get  $M(r)r^{N-2} \leq M(r_1)r_1^{N-2}$ , for all  $r \geq r_1$ , which gives (1.3) by taking  $r_1 = \varepsilon$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 1.1.** Let  $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$  be such that  $u > 0$  and  $\Delta u \leq 0$  in the whole of  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Let

$$w(x) = \frac{1}{|x|^{N-2}} u\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right)$$

be its Kelvin transform. Then, for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there are positive constants  $b_\varepsilon$  and  $c_\varepsilon$  such that

$$(1.4) \quad w(x) \geq c_\varepsilon \quad , \quad 0 < |x| \leq \varepsilon$$

$$(1.5) \quad \frac{\varepsilon^{N-2} c_\varepsilon}{|x|^{N-2}} \leq w(x) \leq \frac{b_\varepsilon}{|x|^{N-2}} \quad , \quad |x| \geq \varepsilon .$$

**Proof.** The function  $-w$  satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 1.1. Choosing  $c_\varepsilon = \min\{w(x) : |x| = \varepsilon\}$  we obtain (1.4) and the lower bound in (1.5). Choosing  $b_\varepsilon = \max\{u(y) : |y| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}\}$  we obtain the upper bound in (1.5).  $\square$

**§2. Some auxiliary facts.** Let  $u > 0$  and  $v > 0$  be  $C^2$  solutions of system (0.1) with both  $\alpha$  and  $\beta \leq (N+2)/(N-2)$ . Let us introduce their Kelvin transforms

$$w(x) = \frac{1}{|x|^{N-2}} u\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right) \quad , \quad z(x) = \frac{1}{|x|^{N-2}} v\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right)$$

which are defined for  $x \neq 0$ . One verifies that  $w$  and  $z$  satisfy the system

$$(2.1) \quad \Delta w + \frac{1}{|x|^{N+2-\alpha(N-2)}} z^\alpha = 0$$

$$(2.2) \quad \Delta z + \frac{1}{|x|^{N+2-\beta(N-2)}} w^\beta = 0 .$$

We shall use the method of moving planes, and let us start by considering planes parallel to  $x_1 = 0$ , coming from  $-\infty$ . For each real  $\lambda$  let us define

$$\Sigma_\lambda = \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N : x_1 < \lambda\} \quad , \quad T_\lambda = \partial\Sigma_\lambda$$

and  $x^\lambda$  as the reflection of  $x$  about the plane  $T_\lambda$ . Let  $e_\lambda = (2\lambda, 0, \dots, 0)$ . In what follows we consider  $\lambda \leq 0$  and let  $\tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda = \Sigma_\lambda \setminus \{e_\lambda\}$ . In  $\tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$  we define the following functions

$$w_\lambda(x) = w(x^\lambda) \quad , \quad z_\lambda(x) = z(x^\lambda)$$

$$W_\lambda(x) = w_\lambda(x) - w(x) \quad , \quad Z_\lambda(x) = z_\lambda(x) - z(x)$$

The first step in the use of the method of moving planes is to show that we can start the process. That is, there exists a  $\lambda < 0$  such that  $W_\lambda(x) \geq 0$  and  $Z_\lambda(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$ . Unfortunately, this cannot be shown as we shall see shortly. However this can be achieved with a slight modification of these functions. Let us explain that.

For  $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$  we have

$$(2.3) \quad \Delta w(x) + \frac{1}{|x|^{N+2-\alpha(N-2)}} z^\alpha(x) = 0$$

$$(2.4) \quad \Delta w(x^\lambda) + \frac{1}{|x^\lambda|^{N+2-\alpha(N-2)}} z^\alpha(x^\lambda) = 0.$$

Using the invariance of the Laplacian under a reflection and the fact that  $|x^\lambda| \leq |x|$ , it follows from (2.4)

$$(2.5) \quad \Delta w_\lambda(x) + \frac{1}{|x|^{N+2-\alpha(N-2)}} z_\lambda^\alpha(x) \leq 0.$$

Hence we get from (2.3) and (2.5)

$$\Delta W_\lambda(x) + \frac{1}{|x|^{N+2-\alpha(N-2)}} (z_\lambda^\alpha(x) - z^\alpha(x)) \leq 0$$

which, using the mean value theorem, can be written as

$$(2.6) \quad \Delta W_\lambda(x) + c(x; \lambda) Z_\lambda(x) \leq 0$$

where

$$c(x; \lambda) = \frac{\alpha}{|x|^{N+2-\alpha(N-2)}} (\psi(x; \lambda))^{\alpha-1}$$

and  $\psi(x; \lambda)$  is a real number between  $z_\lambda(x)$  and  $z(x)$ . Similarly, we obtain

$$(2.7) \quad \Delta Z_\lambda(x) + \hat{c}(x; \lambda) W_\lambda(x) \leq 0$$

where

$$\hat{c}(x; \lambda) = \frac{\beta}{|x|^{N+2-\beta(N-2)}} (\hat{\psi}(x; \lambda))^{\beta-1}$$



and  $\hat{\psi}(x; \lambda)$  is a real number between  $w_\lambda(x)$  and  $w(x)$ . We would like to infer that  $W_\lambda(x) \geq 0$  and  $Z_\lambda(x) \geq 0$ , for some  $\lambda < 0$  and all  $x \in \Sigma_\lambda$  but we observe that system (2.6)–(2.7) is not amenable for application of maximum principles. In order to obtain a system satisfying the hypothesis of maximum principles (see, for instance, [PW] or [FM]) we introduce the function  $g$  and show that the functions

$$\bar{W}_\lambda(x) = \frac{W_\lambda(x)}{g(x)} \quad , \quad \bar{Z}_\lambda(x) = \frac{Z_\lambda(x)}{g(x)} \quad ,$$

where  $g(x) = \sqrt{1 - x_1}$  for all  $x$  such that  $x_1 < 0$ , satisfy the following system of inequalities

$$(2.8) \quad \Delta \bar{W}_\lambda + 2 \frac{\nabla g}{g} \cdot \nabla \bar{W}_\lambda + \frac{\Delta g}{g} \bar{W}_\lambda + c(x; \lambda) \bar{Z}_\lambda \leq 0$$

$$(2.9) \quad \Delta \bar{Z}_\lambda + 2 \frac{\nabla g}{g} \cdot \nabla \bar{Z}_\lambda + \frac{\Delta g}{g} \bar{Z}_\lambda + \hat{c}(x; \lambda) \bar{W}_\lambda \leq 0 \quad .$$

The latter system is cooperative, since both  $c(x; \lambda)$  and  $\hat{c}(x; \lambda)$  are positive. Thus we can apply the maximum principle (Thm... in [FM]) provided

$$(2.10) \quad \frac{\Delta g(x)}{g(x)} + c(x; \lambda) \leq 0 \quad , \quad \frac{\Delta g(x)}{g(x)} + \hat{c}(x; \lambda) \leq 0 \quad .$$

Our purpose next is to prove the

**Proposition 2.1.** There exists  $\lambda^* \leq 0$  such that for all  $\lambda \leq \lambda^*$ ,  $\bar{W}_\lambda(x) \geq 0$  and  $\bar{Z}_\lambda(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$ .

We shall use in the proof of the above proposition some properties of  $\bar{W}_\lambda$  (and a similar set of properties of  $\bar{Z}_\lambda$ ), which are collected in the lemmas below. We consider  $\lambda < 0$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** (i) If  $\bar{W}_\lambda(x) > 0$  for all  $x$  in some punctured ball  $\dot{B}_\epsilon(e_\lambda) \subset \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$ , and if

$$c_\lambda =: \inf\{\bar{W}_\lambda(x) : x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda\} < 0$$

then  $\bar{W}_\lambda$  attains its infimum in  $\tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$ .

(ii) There exists  $\bar{\lambda} < 0$ , such that if  $\lambda < \bar{\lambda}$  and  $c(\lambda) < 0$ , then  $\bar{W}_\lambda$  attains its infimum in  $\tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$ .

**Proof.** (i) Since  $\overline{W}_\lambda(x) \rightarrow 0$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ , we can find  $r_1 > 0$  such that  $W_\lambda(x) \geq \frac{1}{2}c(\lambda)$  for  $|x| > r_1$ . Thus  $W_\lambda$  attains its infimum on the compact set  $\overline{B_{r_1}}(0) \cap (\overline{\Sigma_\lambda} \setminus B_\varepsilon(\varepsilon_\lambda))$ . Since  $W_\lambda$  vanishes on  $T_\lambda$ , the result follows. (iii) Using Corollary 1.1 we find positive numbers  $c_1$  and  $r$  such that  $w(x) \geq c_1$ , for  $0 < |x| \leq 1$ , and  $w(x) \leq \frac{c_1}{2}$  for  $|x| \geq r$ . Choose  $\bar{\lambda} = \min\{-r, -1\}$ . Then for  $\lambda \leq \bar{\lambda}$ .

$$\overline{W}_\lambda(x) \geq \frac{1}{g(x)} \left( c_1 - \frac{c_1}{2} \right) > 0 \quad \text{if } x \in B_1(\varepsilon_\lambda). \quad \square$$

**Lemma 2.2.** (i) There is a positive constant  $d_\lambda$ , depending only on  $w$  and  $\lambda$ , such that

$$(2.11) \quad \hat{c}(x; \lambda) \leq \frac{\beta d_\lambda^{\beta-1}}{|x|^4}$$

for all  $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda - B_1(\varepsilon_\lambda)$ , where  $\overline{W}_\lambda(x) < 0$ .

(ii) There is an  $R_\lambda > 0$ , depending only on  $\lambda$  and  $w$ , such that

$$(2.12) \quad \frac{\Delta g(x)}{g(x)} + \hat{c}(x; \lambda) < 0$$

for all  $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda \setminus B_{R_\lambda}(0)$ , where  $\overline{W}_\lambda(x) < 0$ .

**Proof.** (i) If  $\beta \geq 1$ , it follows from  $\overline{W}_\lambda(x) < 0$  that  $w_\lambda(x) \leq \hat{\psi}(x; \lambda) \leq w(x)$ . We then estimate  $w(x)$  using inequality (1.5) of Corollary 1.1. We see that  $d_\lambda$  can be taken as  $\max\{u(y) : |y| \leq |\lambda|^{-1}\}$ . Then  $\hat{\psi}(x; \lambda) \leq \frac{d_\lambda}{|x|^{N-2}}$ . Using the definition of  $\hat{c}(x; \lambda)$  we obtain (2.11) readily. Actually, inequality (2.11) holds for all  $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$ .

If  $0 < \beta < 1$  then we estimate  $w_\lambda(x) = w(x^\lambda)$  using the other part of inequality (1.5) to obtain

$$w_\lambda(x) \geq \frac{d_\lambda}{|x^\lambda|^{N-2}} \geq \frac{d_\lambda}{|x|^{N-2}}$$

where  $d_\lambda = \min\{w(x) : |x| = 1\}$ . From here we obtain (2.11) since  $\beta - 1 < 0$ .

(ii) Observe that

$$\frac{\Delta g(x)}{g(x)} = -\frac{1}{4(1-x_1)^2} \leq -\frac{1}{8(1+x_1^2)}.$$

So (2.12) follows immediately from the above inequality together with (2.11).  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3.** There exists  $\lambda^* \leq \bar{\lambda}$  such that, for all  $\lambda \leq \lambda^*$ , inequality (2.12) holds for all  $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$ , where  $\bar{W}_\lambda(x) < 0$ .

**Proof.** We first observe that  $d_\lambda \leq d_\mu$  if  $\lambda \leq \mu \leq 0$ . So for all  $\lambda \leq \bar{\lambda}$  we estimate

$$(2.13) \quad \frac{\Delta g(x)}{g(x)} + \hat{c}(x; \lambda) \leq -\frac{1}{8(1+x_1^2)} + \frac{\beta d_\lambda^{\beta-1}}{|x|^4}$$

for all  $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$ , where  $\bar{W}_\lambda(x) < 0$ . Hence the right side of (2.13) is negative if  $|x| > R_{\bar{\lambda}}$  (as in Lemma 2.2(ii)). Now take  $\lambda^*$  such that  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda^*} \subset \{x \in R^N : |x| > R_{\bar{\lambda}}\}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.4.** Assume that there is  $x_0 \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$  such that

$$\bar{W}_\lambda(x_0) = \inf\{\bar{W}_\lambda(x) : x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda\} < 0.$$

Then  $\bar{Z}_\lambda(x_0) < 0$ . If moreover  $|x_0| > R_\lambda$  (as in the version of Lemma 2.2(ii) for  $\bar{Z}_\lambda$ ), then  $\bar{Z}_\lambda(x_0) < \bar{W}_\lambda(x_0)$ .

**Proof.** Since  $\nabla \bar{W}_\lambda(x_0) = 0$  and  $\Delta \bar{W}_\lambda(x_0) \geq 0$ , it follows from (2.8) that

$$(2.14) \quad \frac{\Delta g(x_0)}{g(x_0)} \bar{W}_\lambda(x_0) + c(x_0; \lambda) \bar{Z}_\lambda(x_0) \leq 0,$$

which implies that  $\bar{Z}_\lambda(x_0) < 0$ . Next we can write (2.14) as

$$(2.15) \quad \left[ \frac{\Delta g(x_0)}{g(x_0)} + c(x_0; \lambda) \right] \bar{W}_\lambda(x_0) + c(x_0; \lambda) \left[ \bar{Z}_\lambda(x_0) - \bar{W}_\lambda(x_0) \right] \leq 0.$$

As we said before an analogue to Lemma 2.2 holds for  $\bar{Z}_\lambda$ . So the first bracket is negative, and the conclusion follows.  $\square$

**Proof of Proposition 2.1.** Let us assume by contradiction, that for some  $\lambda \leq \lambda^*$  ( $\lambda^*$  = least of the two  $\lambda^*$ 's, the one defined in Lemma 2.3 and the one from the version of Lemma 2.3 for  $\bar{Z}_\lambda$ ), we have

$$(2.16) \quad \bar{W}_\lambda(x) < 0, \text{ for some } x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda \text{ or } \bar{Z}_\lambda(x) < 0, \text{ for some } x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda.$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\bar{W}_\lambda(x) < 0$  for some  $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$ . The argument below shows that the conjunction *or* in (2.16) can be replaced by *and*. Indeed,

since  $\lambda^* \leq \bar{\lambda}$ , the assumption  $\bar{W}_\lambda(x) < 0$ , for some  $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$ , implies via Lemma 2.1(ii) that the infimum of  $\bar{W}_\lambda$  is attained at a point  $x_0$  in  $\bar{W}_\lambda$ ; and Lemma 2.4 states that  $Z_\lambda(x_0) < 0$ .

Next we use Lemma 2.3 to see that the first bracket in (2.15) is negative, and then

$$(2.17) \quad \bar{Z}_\lambda(x_0) < \bar{W}_\lambda(x_0) .$$

Now we do a similar argument with  $\bar{Z}_\lambda$  and conclude that

$$(2.18) \quad \bar{W}_\lambda(x_1) < \bar{Z}_\lambda(x_1)$$

where  $x_1 \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda$  is the point where  $\bar{Z}_\lambda$  attains its infimum. Finally we use (2.17), (2.18) and the fact that  $\bar{Z}_\lambda(x_1) \leq \bar{Z}_\lambda(x_0)$  and  $\bar{W}_\lambda(x_0) \leq \bar{W}_\lambda(x_1)$  to come to a contradiction.  $\square$

We next define

$$\lambda_0 = \sup\{\lambda < 0 : \bar{W}_\lambda(x) \geq 0 \text{ and } \bar{Z}_\lambda(x) \geq 0, \forall x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_\lambda\} .$$

**Proposition 2.2.** If  $\lambda_0 < 0$ , then  $\bar{W}_{\lambda_0}(x) \equiv 0$  and  $\bar{Z}_{\lambda_0}(x) \equiv 0$  for all  $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}$ .

**Remark.** It follows readily from Proposition 2.2 that both  $w$  and  $z$  are symmetric with respect to the hyperplane  $T_{\lambda_0}$ .

**Proof of Proposition 2.2.** By continuity we see that  $\bar{W}_{\lambda_0}(x) \geq 0$  and  $\bar{Z}_{\lambda_0}(x) \geq 0$  for  $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}$ . Now observe that if  $\bar{Z}_{\lambda_0}(x) \equiv 0$ , it follows from (2.9) that  $\bar{W}_{\lambda_0}(x) \leq 0$ , which will imply  $\bar{W}_{\lambda_0}(x) \equiv 0$ . So if we assume, by contradiction, that the conclusion of Proposition 2.2 is not true, we conclude that both  $\bar{W}_{\lambda_0}(x)$  and  $\bar{Z}_{\lambda_0}(x)$  are not identically zero. It follows from (2.8) that

$$\Delta \bar{W}_{\lambda_0}(x) + 2 \frac{\nabla g(x)}{g(x)} \cdot \nabla \bar{W}_{\lambda_0}(x) + \frac{\Delta g(x)}{g(x)} \bar{W}_{\lambda_0}(x) \leq 0$$

for all  $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}$ . So by the maximum principle (recall that  $\bar{W}_{\lambda_0}(x) \geq 0$ ) we see that  $\bar{W}_{\lambda_0}(x) > 0$  for  $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}$ . Similarly  $\bar{Z}_{\lambda_0}(x) > 0$  for  $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}$ .

Next using the Hopf maximum principle we obtain that

$$(2.19) \quad \frac{\partial \bar{W}_{\lambda_0}}{\partial \nu} < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \bar{Z}_{\lambda_0}}{\partial \nu} < 0$$

on the boundary  $T_{\lambda_0}$ . (Here  $\partial/\partial\nu$  is  $\partial/\partial x_1$ ). We shall see presently that this is impossible. From the definition of  $\lambda_0$ , we conclude that there exist a sequence of real numbers  $\lambda_k \rightarrow \lambda_0$ , with  $\lambda_k > \lambda_0$ , and a sequence of points in  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_k}$ , where  $\overline{W}_{\lambda_k}$  or  $\overline{Z}_{\lambda_k}$  is negative. Since  $W_{\lambda_0}(x)$  satisfies (2.6) and  $Z_{\lambda_0}(x) > 0$  for  $x \in \tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}$ , we conclude that  $W_{\lambda_0}(x)$  is superharmonic in  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}$ . In particular  $W_{\lambda_0}$  is superharmonic in  $B_{2R}(e_{\lambda_0}) \setminus \{e_{\lambda_0}\}$ , where  $2R = |\lambda_0|$ . The argument in the proof of Lemma 1.1 shows that there exists  $c_0 > 0$  such that

$$W_{\lambda_0}(x) \geq c_0, \text{ if } x \in B_R(e_{\lambda_0}) \setminus \{e_{\lambda_0}\}.$$

A similar argument shows that

$$Z_{\lambda_0}(x) \geq c_0, \text{ if } x \in B_R(e_{\lambda_0}) \setminus \{e_{\lambda_0}\}.$$

(We may choose the same  $c$ , or decrease it). So

$$\overline{W}_{\lambda_0}(x) \geq \tilde{c}_0 > 0, \quad \overline{Z}_{\lambda_0}(x) \geq \tilde{c}_0 > 0, \text{ if } x \in B_R(e_{\lambda_0}) \setminus \{e_{\lambda_0}\}.$$

By continuity we have

$$(2.20) \quad \overline{W}_{\lambda_k}(x) \geq \frac{\tilde{c}_0}{2}, \quad \overline{Z}_{\lambda_k}(x) \geq \frac{\tilde{c}_0}{2}, \text{ if } x \in B_{R/2}(e_{\lambda_k}) \setminus \{e_{\lambda_k}\},$$

for  $k$  sufficiently large.

It follows from Lemma 2.1(i) (using (2.20)) and Lemma 2.4 that for  $k$  sufficiently large both  $\overline{W}_{\lambda_k}$  and  $\overline{Z}_{\lambda_k}$  attain their negative infima in  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_k}$ . [Recall that we are using the contradiction hypothesis that  $\overline{W}_{\lambda_k}$  or  $\overline{Z}_{\lambda_k}$  is negative somewhere in  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_k}$ ]. Let us denote by  $x_k$  and  $y_k$ , respectively, the points of minima of  $\overline{W}_{\lambda_k}$  and  $\overline{Z}_{\lambda_k}$ . It follows from Lemma 2.4 that at least one of the sequences,  $\{x_k\}$  or  $\{y_k\}$  is bounded. Assume that  $\{x_k\}$  is bounded and passing to a subsequence assume that  $x_k \rightarrow \bar{x}$ . By continuity we have that  $\nabla \overline{W}_{\lambda_0}(\bar{x}) = 0$  and  $\overline{W}_{\lambda_0}(\bar{x}) \leq 0$ . Since  $\bar{x} \neq e_{\lambda_0}$  and  $\overline{W}_{\lambda_0}(x) > 0$  in  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\lambda_0}$ , we conclude that  $\bar{x} \in T_{\lambda_0}$ , which contradicts the fact observed before that  $\frac{\partial \overline{W}_{\lambda_0}}{\partial \nu} < 0$  on  $T_{\lambda_0}$ .

A similar argument if we assume  $\{y_k\}$  bounded.  $\square$

**§3. Proof of the theorem.** We first prove **Part A**. Performing the moving plane procedure we have two possibilities:

(i) If  $\lambda_0 < 0$ , it follows from Proposition 2.2 that  $w$  and  $z$  are symmetric with respect to the plane  $T_{\lambda_0}$ . But looking at equations (2.1) and (2.2) we realize that this is impossible.

(ii) If  $\lambda_0 = 0$ , we conclude that  $w_0(x) \geq w(x)$  and  $z_0(x) \geq z(x)$  for all  $x \in \Sigma_0$ . We can perform the procedure from the right and we will reach a  $\lambda'_0 = 0$ , [ $\lambda'_0$  cannot be positive, in virtue of an argument as in (i) above], from which we get  $w(x) \geq w_0(x)$  and  $z(x) \geq z_0(x)$  for all  $x \in \Sigma_0$ . So  $w$  and  $z$  are symmetric with respect to the plane  $x_1 = 0$ .

(iii) This reasoning can be made from any direction. And so the only possibility would be that both  $w$  and  $z$  are radially symmetric with respect to the origin 0. But 0 was chosen arbitrarily when we perform the Kelvin transform. Thus  $u$  and  $v$  are radially symmetric with respect to any point. Then they would be constant and from the equations we finally obtain  $u = v = 0$ .

**Part B.** We show that  $w$  and  $z$  are symmetric with respect to some plane parallel to  $x_1 = 0$ . Indeed, if  $\lambda_0 < 0$ , this follows from Proposition 2.2, and in this case the plane is  $T_{\lambda_0}$ . If  $\lambda_0 = 0$ , we perform the moving plane procedure from the right and find a corresponding  $\lambda'_0 \geq 0$ . If  $\lambda'_0 > 0$ , an analogue to Proposition 2.2 shows that  $w$  and  $z$  are symmetric with respect to  $T_{\lambda'_0}$ . If  $\lambda'_0 = 0$  we proceed as in (ii) above to conclude that both  $w$  and  $z$  are symmetric with respect to  $x_1 = 0$ . We perform this moving plane procedure taking planes perpendicular to any direction, and for each direction  $\gamma \in R^N$ ,  $|\gamma| = 1$  we find a plane  $T_\gamma$  with the property that both  $w$  and  $z$  are symmetric with respect to  $T_\gamma$ . A simple argument shows that all these planes intersect at a single point, or  $w = z = 0$ .  $\square$

## References

- [BN] H. Berestycki, and L. Nirenberg, "On the method of moving planes and the sliding method". Bol. Soc. Bras. Mat. Vol. 22 (1991) p. 1-22.
- [CFM] Ph. Clément, D. G. de Figueiredo, and E. Mitidieri, "Positive solutions of semilinear elliptic systems". Comm. PDE 17 (1992), p. 923-940.

- [FM] D. G. de Figueiredo and P. L. Felmer, "On Superquadratic Elliptic Systems". To appear.
- [FF] D. G. de Figueiredo and E. Mitidieri, "Maximum Principles for cooperative elliptic systems". CRAS, Paris 310 (1990), p. 49-52.
- [HV] J. Hulshof and R. van der Vorst, "Differential Systems with Strongly Indefinite Variational Structure". To appear.
- [GNN] B. Gidas, W.-M. Ni, and L. Nirenberg, "Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle". *Comm. Math. Phys.* 68 (1979) p. 209-243.
- [GS1] B. Gidas and J. Spruck, "A priori bounds for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations", *Comm. in PDE* vol. 6 (1981), p. 883-901.
- [GS2] B. Gidas and J. Spruck, "Global and local behavior of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations". *Comm. Pure App. Math.* XXXIV (1981), p. 525-598.
- [J] Qing Jie, "A priori estimates for positive solutions of semilinear elliptic systems", *J. Partial Diff. Eq.*, vol. 1, no. 2, series A (1988) p. 61-70.
- [M] E. Mitidieri. "A Rellich type identity and applications". To appear in *Comm. PDE*.
- [PW] M. H. Protter and H. F. Weinberger, "Maximum principles in differential equations", Prentice Hall (1967).
- [S] M. A. Souto, "Sobre a existência de soluções positivas para sistemas cooperativos não lineares". PhD thesis, UNICAMP (1992).

## RELATÓRIOS DE PESQUISA — 1992

- 01/92 Uniform Approximation the: Non-locally Convex Case — *João B. Prolla.*
- 02/92 Compactificação de  $L_{\text{loc}}^1(Q)$  com  $\tau$  Finito — *A. M. Sette and J. C. Cifuentes.*
- 03/92 Um Modelo para Aquisição da Especificação — *Cecilia Inés Sosa Arias and Ariadne Carvalho.*
- 04/92 Convergence Estimates for the Wavelet Galerkin Method — *Sônia M. Gomes and Elsa Cortina.*
- 05/92 Optimal Chemotherapy: A Case Study with Drug Resistance, Saturation Effect and Toxicity — *M. I. S. Costa, J. L. Boldrini and R. C. Bassanezi.*
- 06/92 On the Paper "Cauchy Completeness of Elementary Logic" of D. Mundici and A. M. Sette — *J. C. Cifuentes.*
- 07/92 What is the EM Algorithm for Maximum Likelihood Estimation in PET and How to Accelerate it — *Alvaro R. De Pierro.*
- 08/92 Bifurcation from infinity and multiple solutions for an elliptic system — *Raffaele Chiappinelli and Djairo G. de Figueiredo.*
- 09/92 Approximation Processes for Vector-Valued Continuous Functions — *João B. Prolla.*
- 10/92 Aplicação do Método de Fraïssé à Compactificação de Lógicas com Quantificadores Co-filtro — *A. M. Sette and J. C. Cifuentes.*
- 11/92 Absolutely Summing Holomorphic Mappings — *Mário C. Matos.*
- 12/92 The Feynman-Dyson Proof of Maxwell Equations and Magnetic Monopoles — *Adolfo A. Jr. and Waldyr A. R. Jr.*
- 13/92 A Generalized Dirac's Quantization Condition for Phenomenological Non-abelian Magnetic Monopoles — *Adolfo M. Jr. and Waldyr A. R. Jr.*
- 14/92 Multiplicity Results for the 1-Dimensional Generalized  $p$ -Laplacian — *Pedro Ubilla.*
- 15/92 Nowhere Vanishing Torsion Closed Curves Always Hide Twice — *Sueli R. Costa. and Maria Del Carmen R. Fuster.*
- 16/92 Uniform Approximation of Continuous Convex-Cone Valued Functions — *João B. Prolla.*
- 17/92 Monotonically Dominated Operators on Convex Cones — *A. O. Chiacchio, J. B. Prolla, M. L. B. Queiroz and M. S. M. Roversi.*
- 18/92 Testing the Concept of a Photon as an Extended Object in a Variation of Francon's Experiment — *V. Buonanno, A. J. R. Madureira and L. C. B. Ryff.*
- 19/92 A New Trust Region Algorithm for Bound Constrained Minimization — *Ana Friedlander, José Mario Martínez and Sandra A. Santos.*



- 20/92 A Priori Estimates for Positive Solutions of Semilinear Elliptic Systems Via Hardy-Sobolev Inequalities — Ph. Clément, D.G. de Figueiredo and E. Mitidieri.
- 21/92 On the Resolution of Linearly Constrained Convex Minimization Problems — Ana Friedlander, José Mario Martínez and Sandra A. Santos.
- 22/92 Convergência no Espectro Real de um Auel — J. C. Cifuentes.
- 23/92 Parallel Methods for Large Least Norm Problems — Alvaro R. De Pierro. and Jose M. Lopes.
- 24/92 A Generalization of Dirac Non Linear Electrodynamics, and Spinning Charged Particles — Waldyr A. Rodrigues Jr., Jayme Vaz Jr. and Erasmo Recami.
- 25/92 Bifurcation of Certain Singularities of Sliding Vector Fields — Marco Antonio Teixeira.
- 26/92 Density of Infimum-Stable Convex Cone — João B. Prolla.
- 27/92 An Extended Decomposition Through Formalization in Product Spaces — Alvaro R. De Pierro.
- 28/92 Accelerating Iterative Algorithms for Symmetric Linear Complementarity Problems — Alvaro R. De Pierro and José Marcos López.
- 29/92 Free Maxwell Equations, Dirac Equation, and Non-Dispersive de Broglie Wave-packets — Waldyr A. Rodrigues Jr., Jayme Vaz Jr. and Erasmo Recami.
- 30/92 New Results on the Equivalence of Regularization and Truncated Iteration for Ill-posed Problems — Reginaldo J. Santos
- 31/92 Topological Defects: A Distribution Theory Approach — Patricio S. Letelier and Anzhong Wang.
- 32/92 Some Applications of the Generalized Khintchine's Inequality — Mário C. Matos.
- 33/92 A Technique for Finding The Center of A Polytope — Antonio Carlos Moretti.
- 34/92 On The Convergence of the Column-Updating Method — José Mario Martínez.
- 35/92 Post-Linear Formalism For Gravitating Strings: Crossed Straight Strings Collision — D. V. Gal'tsov, Yu. V. Grats and P. S. Letelier.
- 36/92 A Simple Model of Life Expectancy With Subjective Parameters — R. C. Bassanezi and L. C. Barros.
- 37/92 On the Growth of Caiman Crocodilus Yacare: A Strategy for Optimal Farming — Alejandro B. Engel and R. C. Bassanezi.
- 38/92 The Dirac Operator and the Structure of Riemann-Cartan-Weyl Spaces — Quintino A. G. de Souza and Waldyr A. Rodrigues, Jr.
- 39/92 On the Nature of the Gravitational Field — Waldyr A. Rodrigues, Jr. and Quintino A. G. de Souza.
- 40/92 Spinning Strings and Cosmic Dislocations — D. V. Gal'tsov and P. S. Letelier.
- 41/92 Natural Ultrabornological, Non-Complete, Normed Function Spaces — Antonio Gilioli (edited by Klaus Floret and Chaim S. Hönig).
- 42/92 Parallel and Semi-Parallel Immersions Into Space Forms — Francesco Mercuri.

- 43/92 Periodic Motions of Sucker Rod Pumping Systems — *Aloisio Freiria Neves and José Luiz Boldrini.*
- 44/92 Algorithms for Solving Nonlinear Systems of Equations — *José Mario Martínez.*
- 45/92 Spin and Electron Structure — *Matej Pavišić, Erasmo Recami, Waldyr A. Rodrigues Jr. and G. Daniele Maccarrone, Fabio Raciti, Giovanni Salci.*
- 46/92 The Initial Value Problem For the Boussinesq Equations in a Time-Dependent Domain — *Carlos Conca Rozende and Marko Rojas Medar.*
- 47/92 A New Expansion for Jacobi Function — *E. Capelas de Oliveira.*
- 48/92 On the Equivalence of Convergences of Fuzzy Sets — *Marko Rojas Medar and Heriberto Román Flores.*
- 49/92 Monotonicity and Symmetry of Solutions of Elliptic Systems in General Domains — *Djairo G. de Figueiredo.*
- 50/92 Tendências em Programação Não Linear de Grande Porte — *José Mario Martínez.*
- 51/92 Teoría y Práctica en Optimización Numérica — *José Mario Martínez.*
- 52/92 The Clifford Bundle and the Nature of the Gravitational Field — *Waldyr A. Rodrigues Jr. and Quintino A. G. de Souza.*
- 53/92 Completamento e Compactificação de Espaços Zero-Dimensionais — *J. C. Cifuentes.*
- 54/92 Some Results on Polarized Partition Relations of Higher Dimension — *Walter Alexandre Carnielli and Carlos Augusto Di Prisco.*
- 55/92 The Generalized Wave Equation: Revisited — *G. C. Ducati and E. Capelas de Oliveira.*
- 56/92 The Four-Vertex Theorem for Constant Curvature Manifolds — *Sueli I. R. Costa and Marcelo Firer.*
- 57/92 The Riemann-Cartan-Weyl Geometry Generated by a Dirac-Hestenes Spinor Field — *Diego Lucio Rapoport-Campodónico, Waldyr A. Rodrigues, Jr., Quintino A. G. de Souza and Jayme Vaz Jr.*
- 58/92 On the Equivalence of Dirac and Maxwell Equations, and Quantum Mechanics — *Jayme Vaz Jr. and Waldyr A. Rodrigues.*
- 59/92 Convergência Fraca de Medidas em Espaços Métricos Separáveis e Completos — *Mario Antonio Gneri.*
- 60/92 Homoclinic Orbits for a Quasilinear Hamiltonian System — *Pedro Ubilla.*
- 61/92 Quasi-Newton Methods and the Solution of Some Fluid Mechanics Problems — *Márcia A. Gomes - Ruggiero, Daniel N. Kozakevich and José Mario Martínez.*
- 62/92 A New Construction of the Casimir Operators for the Fantappiò-de Sitter Group — *E. A. Notté Cuello and E. Capelas de Oliveira.*
- 63/92 Stationary Solutions for Generalized Boussinesq Models — *Sebastián A. Lorea and José Luiz Boldrini.*
- 64/92 Compactness of Topological Spaces of Models — *Xavier Caicedo.*