Commun. Math. Phys. 277, 573–576 (2008)
Digital Object Identifier (DOI) 10.1007/s00220-007-0365-5

Communications in
**Mathematical
Physics**

Erratum

Ground State of N Coupled Nonlinear Schrodinger Equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \leq 3$

Tai-Chia Lin[1,2], **Juncheng Wei**[3]

[1] Department of Mathematics, National Taiwan University, Taipei 106, Taiwan
[2] National Center of Theoretical Sciences, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu, Taiwan.
E-mail: tclin@math.ccu.edu.tw
[3] Department of Mathematics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong.
E-mail: wei@math.cuhk.edu.hk

Received: 4 May 2006 / Accepted: 23 August 2007

Commun. Math. Phys. **255**(3), 629–653 (2005)

Certain statements in [1] need to be reformulated. The reason is that the infimum in Lemma 3 on p. 636 and the infimum c' on p. 642 may not be finite. Throughout the whole paper [1] due to physical considerations, the coupling constants β_{ij}'s satisfy $\beta_{ij} = \beta_{ji}$, for $i \neq j$. In [1], Theorem 2 should be restated as follows:

Theorem 2. *There exists $\beta_0 > 0$ depending on λ_j's, μ_j's, n and N such that if $0 < \beta_{ij} < \beta_0$, $\beta_{ij} = \beta_{ji}$, $\forall i \neq j$ and the matrix Σ (defined at (1.9) of [1]) is positively definite, then there exists a ground state solution $(u_1^0, \ldots, u_N^0)$. All u_j^0's are positive, radially symmetric and strictly decreasing.*

Theorem 3 of [1] should also be restated as follows:

Theorem 3. *There exists $\beta_0 > 0$ depending on λ_j's, μ_j's, n and N such that if the matrix Σ is positively definite, $\beta_{ij} = \beta_{ji}$, $\forall i \neq j$ and*

$$\beta_{i_0 j} < 0, \quad \forall j \neq i_0, \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < \beta_{ij} < \beta_0, \quad \forall i \neq i_0, \, j \in \{i, i_0\},$$

for some $i_0 \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, then the ground state solution to (1.2) doesn't exist.

The reason for this correction is that the current form of Lemma 3 is incorrect. We now modify the statement by setting

$$E_\lambda^1[u] = \frac{1}{4} \int_{R^n} (|\nabla u|^2 + \lambda u^2). \tag{0.1}$$

Then the revised Lemma 3 can be stated as follows:

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:10.1007/s00220-005-1313-x.

Lemma 3. $\inf_{u\in N'_{\lambda,\mu}} E^1_\lambda[u]$ *is attained only by* $w_{\lambda,\mu}$.

The proof is similar by noting that

$$\int_{R^n}(|\nabla u_0|^2+\lambda u_0^2)=2<\nabla E^1_\lambda[u_0],u_0>.$$

For the proof of Theorem 1, we replace $I_{\lambda_j,\mu_j}[u_j]$ by $E^1_{\lambda_j}[u_j]$ and note that if c is attained by some $(u_1^0,\ldots,u_N^0)\in\mathbf{N}$, then $(u_1^0,\ldots,u_N^0)$ satisfies (1.2). In fact, let

$$G_j[\mathbf{u}]=\int_{R^n}\left(|\nabla u_j|^2+\lambda_j u_j^2-\mu_j u_j^4\right)-\sum_{i\neq j}\int_{R^n}\beta_{ij}u_i^2u_j^2.$$

Then there are Lagrange multipliers $\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_N$ such that

$$\nabla E+\sum_{j=1}^N\alpha_j\nabla G_j=0,$$

which implies that

$$\sum_{j=1}^N\alpha_j\beta_{ij}\int_{R^n}(u_i^0)^2(u_j^0)^2=0. \tag{0.2}$$

Since $(u_1^0,\ldots,u_N^0)\in\mathbf{N}$, we have

$$\sum_{i\neq j}|\beta_{ij}|\int_{R^n}(u_i^0)^2(u_j^0)^2<\int_{R^n}\beta_{jj}(u_j^0)^4,$$

which implies that the matrix $(\int_{R^n}\beta_{ij}(u_i^0)^2(u_j^0)^2)$ is diagonally dominant, and hence from (0.2), we deduce that $\alpha_1=\cdots=\alpha_N=0$. The rest is the same as in [1].

For the proof of Theorem 2, we remark that

$$c=\inf_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathbf{N}}E[\mathbf{u}]=\inf_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathbf{N}}E^1[\mathbf{u}]\geq\inf_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathbf{N}'}E^1[\mathbf{u}]:=c' \tag{0.3}$$

and replace $E[u_1,\ldots,u_N]$ by $E^1[u_1,\ldots,u_N]$ in the rest of the proof, where E^1 is defined by

$$E^1[\mathbf{u}]=\frac{1}{4}\sum_{j=1}^N\int_{R^n}(|\nabla u_j|^2+\lambda_j u_j^2). \tag{0.4}$$

As in our paper, we can show that a minimizer $(u_1,\ldots,u_N)$ of c' exists. Since $\beta_{ij}<\beta_0$, by the same proof as those of Lemma 2.1 of [2], we infer that

$$C_1\leq\int_{R^n}u_j^4\leq C_2,\ j=1,\ldots,N, \tag{0.5}$$

where C_1 and C_2 are positive constants depending on n,N,λ_j,β_{ij}.

We now claim that $(u_1, \ldots, u_N) \in \mathbf{N}$. To this end, let $(\sqrt{t_1}u_1, \ldots, \sqrt{t_N}u_N) \in \mathbf{N}$, where each $t_j > 0$. Then $(\sqrt{t_1}, \ldots, \sqrt{t_N})$ satisfies

$$\int_{R^n} (|\nabla u_j|^2 + \lambda_j u_j^2) = t_j \int_{R^n} \mu_j u_j^4 + \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^{N} \int_{R^n} t_i \beta_{ij} u_i^2 u_j^2, \quad j = 1, \ldots, N.$$

Consequently,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{R^n} (|\nabla u_j|^2 + \lambda_j u_j^2) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} t_j \left(\int_{R^n} \mu_j u_j^4 + \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^{N} \int_{R^n} \beta_{ij} u_i^2 u_j^2 \right). \tag{0.6}$$

Here we have used the fact that $\beta_{ij} = \beta_{ji}$.

Due to $(\sqrt{t_1}u_1, \ldots, \sqrt{t_N}u_N) \in \mathbf{N} \subset \mathbf{N}^{'}$, we have

$$c^{'} \leq E^1[\sqrt{t_1}u_1, \ldots, \sqrt{t_N}u_N],$$

and hence

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} (t_j - 1) \int_{R^n} (|\nabla u_j|^2 + \lambda_j u_j^2) \geq 0,$$

i.e.

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{R^n} (|\nabla u_j|^2 + \lambda_j u_j^2) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{N} t_j \int_{R^n} (|\nabla u_j|^2 + \lambda_j u_j^2). \tag{0.7}$$

Substituting (0.6) into the left-hand side of (0.7), and regrouping all the terms, we obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} t_j \left[\int_{R^n} u_j^4 + \sum_{i \neq j} \beta_{ij} \int_{R^n} u_i^2 u_j^2 - \int_{R^n} (|\nabla u_j|^2 + \lambda_j u_j^2) \right] \leq 0.$$

Each of the terms above are nonnegative. Since $(u_1, \ldots, u_N) \in \mathbf{N}^{'}$ and each $t_j > 0$, we obtain that

$$\int_{R^n} u_j^4 + \sum_{i \neq j} \beta_{ij} u_i^2 u_j^2 = \int_{R^n} (|\nabla u_j|^2 + \lambda_j u_j^2), \quad \forall j = 1, \ldots, N.$$

Therefore, $(u_1, \ldots, u_N) \in \mathbf{N}$ and hence $(u_1, \ldots, u_N)$ also attains c. By the same proof of Lemma 2.2 of [2], $(u_1, \ldots, u_N)$ is a critical point of $E[\mathbf{u}]$. The rest of proof then follows. (It is remarkable that this argument has been used in the proof of Lemma 2.2 in [2].) Actually, we have shown that

$$\inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{N}} E[\mathbf{u}] = \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{N}} E^1[\mathbf{u}] = \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{N}^{'}} E^1[\mathbf{u}]. \tag{0.8}$$

The main idea for the proof of Theorem 3 remains unchanged. Here we modify the proof of Theorem 3 as follows: By (0.8), (6.6) can be replaced by

$$E_*^1[u_2, \ldots, u_N] \geq \inf_{(u_2,\ldots,u_N) \in N_1} E_*^1[u_2, \ldots, u_N] = \inf_{(u_2,\ldots,u_N) \in N_1} E'[u_2, dots, u_N] = c_1, \tag{0.9}$$

where

$$E_*^1[u_2, \cdots, u_N] = \frac{1}{4}\sum_{j=2}^{N}\int_{R^n}(|\nabla u_j|^2 + \lambda_j u_j^2).$$

Besides, the revised Lemma 3 may imply

$$E_{\lambda_1}^1[u_1] \geq E_{\lambda_1}^1[w_{\lambda_1,\mu_1}]. \tag{0.10}$$

Thus by (0.8)–(0.10), we have

$$\inf_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathbf{N}} E[\mathbf{u}] = \inf_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathbf{N}} E^1[\mathbf{u}] \geq E_{\lambda_1}^1[w_{\lambda_1,\mu_1}] + c_1. \tag{0.11}$$

However, by (6.10),

$$\inf_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathbf{N}} E[\mathbf{u}] \leq I_{\lambda_1,\mu_1}[w_{\lambda_1,\mu_1}] + c_1 < E_{\lambda_1}^1[w_{\lambda_1,\mu_1}] + c_1,$$

which may contradict (0.11). Therefore, we may complete the proof of Theorem 3.

Acknowledgements. The authors want to express their sincere thanks to B. Sirakov for the comments on our previous paper [1].

References

1. Lin, T.C., Wei, J.C.: Ground state of N coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \leq 3$. Commun. Math. Phys. **255**(3), 629–653 (2005)
2. Lin, T.C., Wei, J.: Spikes in two coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations. Ann. I. H. Poincaré Analyse. Non. **22**(4), 403–439 (2005)

Communicated by M. Aizenman