



## Existence of Solutions for a $p$ -Laplacian System with a Nonresonance Condition Between the First and the Second Eigenvalues

Sara Dob, Hakim Lekhal, Messaoud Maouni

ABSTRACT: In this article, we study the existence of positive solutions for the quasilinear elliptic system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u(x) = f_1(x, v(x)) + h_1(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta_p v(x) = f_2(x, u(x)) + h_2(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where  $f_i(x, s)$ , ( $i = 1, 2$ ) locates between the first and the second eigenvalues of the  $p$ -Laplacian. To prove the existence of solutions, we use the Leray-Schauder degree.

Key Words: Quasi-elliptic equations, Degree-theoretic methods, Eigenvalues, Sobolev spaces.

### Contents

<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 A priori estimate</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3 Proof of the main result</b>	<b>7</b>

### 1. Introduction

Systems of quasilinear elliptic equations present some new and interesting phenomena, which are not present in the study of a single equation. Many publications have appeared concerning quasilinear elliptic systems we refer the readers to ([4], [10]).

In recent years, the eigenvalue problems for  $p$ -Laplacian operators have been extensively studied (see [3], [6], [7], [8]). The main purpose of this article is to prove the existence of solutions for a quasilinear elliptic system when the second terms on the two equations  $f_i(x, s)$ , ( $i = 1, 2$ ) locates between the first and the second eigenvalue of the  $p$ -Laplacian. This result can be seen as a generalization of the result obtained by A. Anane and N. Tsouli in [3].

In this paper, we study the existence of positive solution for the nonlinear elliptic system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u(x) = f_1(x, v(x)) + h_1(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta_p v(x) = f_2(x, u(x)) + h_2(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\Delta_p u = \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u)$  is the  $p$ -Laplacian operator with the exponent  $p$ ,  $1 < p < \infty$  and  $\Omega$  is a smooth bounded region in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  for  $n \geq 1$ .

Through this paper,  $h_i \in W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$  with  $i = 1, 2$  and  $p'$  the Hölder conjugate of  $p$ . As to the nonlinearities  $f_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), we assume that they are Carathéodory functions from  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\max_{|s| \leq R_i} |f_i(x, s)| \in L^{p'}(\Omega), \quad \forall R_i > 0, \quad (1.2)$$

$$\lambda_1 \leq l_i(x) \leq k_i(x) < \lambda_2 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega, \quad (1.3)$$

$\neq$

where

$$l_i(x) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \pm\infty} \inf \frac{f_i(x, s)}{|s|^{p-2}s}, \quad k_i(x) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \pm\infty} \sup \frac{f_i(x, s)}{|s|^{p-2}s},$$

and  $\lambda_1$  (resp.,  $\lambda_2$ ) is the first (resp., the second) eigenvalue of the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \lambda |u|^{p-2}u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

First inequality in (1.3) means: "less or equal almost everywhere with strict inequality on a set of positive measure". we also assume that the inequalities in (1.3) holds for  $i = 1, 2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \varepsilon_i > 0, \quad \exists \eta(\varepsilon_i) > 0 : \lambda_1 - \varepsilon_i \leq \frac{f_i(x, s)}{|s|^{p-2}s}, \quad \forall |s| \geq \eta(\varepsilon_i), \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega, \\ \forall \varepsilon_i > 0, \quad \exists \eta(\varepsilon_i) > 0 : \frac{f_i(x, s)}{|s|^{p-2}s} \leq \lambda_2 + \varepsilon_i, \quad \forall |s| \geq \eta(\varepsilon_i), \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

Recently, A. Anane and N. Tsouli [3] study the existence of solutions for the Dirichlet problem  $-\Delta_p u = f(x, u) + h(x)$  in  $\Omega$ ,  $u = 0$  in  $\partial\Omega$ , when  $f(x, u)$  locates between the first and the second eigenvalues of the  $p$ -Laplacian ( $\Delta_p$ ), using Leray-Schauder topological degree.

Their work is based on the absurd reasoning, they arrived at a contradiction by using different lemmas and the variation characterization of  $\lambda_2$ , more precisely the monotonicity of  $\lambda_2$ . Our work is based on the same method of proof.

The main result of this paper is the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1.** *For  $i = 1, 2$ , assume that  $f_i$  satisfies (1.2), (1.3) and (1.4). Then for any  $h_i \in W^{-1, p'}(\Omega)$ , (1.1) admits a weak solution  $(u, v)$  in  $W_0^{1, p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1, p}(\Omega)$ .*

As usual, a weak solution of system (1.1) is any  $(u, v) \in W_0^{1, p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1, p}(\Omega)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \varphi_1 dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^{p-2} \nabla v \nabla \varphi_2 dx = \int_{\Omega} f_1(x, v) \varphi_1 dx + \int_{\Omega} f_2(x, u) \varphi_2 dx \\ + \langle h_1, \varphi_1 \rangle + \langle h_2, \varphi_2 \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

for every  $\varphi_i \in W^{-1, p'}(\Omega)$ , ( $i = 1, 2$ ), where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the duality product between  $W^{-1, p'}(\Omega)$  and  $W_0^{1, p}(\Omega)$ .

Next, let us define by  $(T_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  the family of operators from  $W_0^{1, p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1, p}(\Omega)$  to  $W_0^{1, p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1, p}(\Omega)$  defined by

$$T_t(u, v) = \begin{pmatrix} T_{1t}(u, v) \\ T_{2t}(u, v) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\Delta_p^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & -\Delta_p^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} (1-t)\alpha_1 |u|^{p-2}u + t f_1(x, v) + t h_1 \\ (1-t)\alpha_2 |v|^{p-2}v + t f_2(x, u) + t h_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1.5)$$

where  $\alpha_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  are some fixed numbers with  $\lambda_1 < \alpha_i < \lambda_2$ .

We consider the space  $U = W_0^{1, p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1, p}(\Omega)$  endowed with the norm

$$\|(u, v)\|_U = \|u\|_{W_0^{1, p}(\Omega)}^p + \|v\|_{W_0^{1, p}(\Omega)}^p, \quad (1.6)$$

$V = L^p(\Omega) \times L^p(\Omega)$ ,  $Y = L^{p'}(\Omega) \times L^{p'}(\Omega)$  and  $Z = W^{-1, p'}(\Omega) \times W^{-1, p'}(\Omega)$ . In the sequel,  $\|\cdot\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)}$  will denote the usual norms on  $L^p(\Omega)$  and  $L^{p'}(\Omega)$ , respectively.

**Remark 1.2.** *Hypotheses (1.2) and (1.4) give us the growth conditions*

$$|f_i(x, s)| \leq a_i |s|^{p-1} + b_i(x) \quad \forall |s| \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega, \quad (1.7)$$

where  $a_i > 0$  and  $b_i(\cdot) \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$ .

**Remark 1.3.** Equations (1.2) and (1.4) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \varepsilon_i > 0, \quad \exists b_{\varepsilon_i} \in L^{p'}(\Omega) \text{ such that} \\ |s|^p(\lambda_1 - \varepsilon_i) - b_{\varepsilon_i}(x) \leq sf_i(x, s) \leq |s|^p(\lambda_2 + \varepsilon_i) - b_{\varepsilon_i}(x), \\ \forall s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (1.8)$$

**Lemma 1.4.**  $T_t$  is continuous and compact.

*Proof.* We have,  $T_t : U \rightarrow U$ ; to prove the Lemma, we have

$$U \hookrightarrow V \xrightarrow[A]{} Y \hookrightarrow Z \xrightarrow[S]{} U, \quad (1.9)$$

such that the Nemytskii operator

$$\begin{aligned} A : \quad V &\rightarrow Y \\ (u, v) &\mapsto (f_1(x, v), f_2(x, u)), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S : \quad Z &\rightarrow U \\ \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix} &\mapsto \begin{pmatrix} -\Delta_p^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & -\Delta_p^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f_1(x, v) \\ f_2(x, u) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

are continuous and compact. □

## 2. A priori estimate

To prove theorem (1.1), we first establish the following estimate:

$$\exists R > 0 \text{ such that } \forall t \in [0, 1], \forall (u, v) \in \partial B(0, R) \text{ such that } [I - T_t](u, v) \neq 0,$$

where  $B(0, R)$  denotes the ball of center 0 and radius  $R$  in  $U$ .

For, we assume by contradiction that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall n > 0, \quad \exists t_n \in [0, 1], \quad \exists (u_n, v_n) \in U \text{ with} \\ \|(u_n, v_n)\|_{1,p} = n \text{ such that } T_{t_n}(u_n, v_n) = (u_n, v_n). \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

Let  $w_n = (w_{1n}, w_{2n}) = (\frac{u_n}{n}, \frac{v_n}{n})$ . We still denoted by  $(w_n)$  the subsequence of  $(w_n)$  which converges weakly in  $U$ , strongly in  $V$  and a.e. in  $\Omega$  to  $w$ .

We can also suppose that  $t_n$  converges to  $t \in [0, 1]$ . That to reach a contradiction, we need the following lemmas.

**Lemma 2.1.** If the sequence  $g_n = (g_{1n}, g_{2n})$  are defined by

$$g_{in} = \frac{f_i(x, nw_{i+(-1)^{i+1}n})}{n^{p-1}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (2.2)$$

then  $g_{in}$  are bounded in  $L^{p'}(\Omega)$ , and they admit subsequences  $g_{in}$  converging weakly to some  $g_i$  in  $L^{p'}(\Omega)$ .

*Proof.* From (1.7), we have

$$|f_i(x, s)| \leq a_i |s|^{p-1} + b_i(x),$$

then

$$|g_{in}(x)| \leq a_i |w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}n}|^{p-1} + \frac{b_i(x)}{n^{p-1}};$$

as  $b_i(x)$  in  $L^{p'}(\Omega)$  and  $|w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}n}|^{p-1} \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$ , so  $g_{in}$  become bounded in  $L^{p'}(\Omega)$ .

Consequently, there exists a subsequence, still denoted by  $g_{in}$  converging weakly to  $g_i$  in  $L^{p'}(\Omega)$ . □

**Lemma 2.2.**  $w_i \neq 0$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .

*Proof.* We have that  $w_n$  verifies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{1n}|^p dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{2n}|^p dx &= (1-t_n) \left[ \alpha_1 \int_{\Omega} |w_{1n}|^p dx + \alpha_2 \int_{\Omega} |w_{2n}|^p dx \right] \\ &\quad + t_n \left[ \int_{\Omega} g_{1n}(x) w_{1n} dx + \int_{\Omega} g_{2n}(x) w_{2n} dx \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n^{p-1}} \langle h_1, w_{1n} \rangle + \frac{1}{n^{p-1}} \langle h_2, w_{2n} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

We get from lemma (2.1)

$$1 = (1-t) \left[ \alpha_1 \int_{\Omega} |w_1|^p dx + \alpha_2 \int_{\Omega} |w_2|^p dx \right] + t \left[ \int_{\Omega} g_1(x) w_1 dx + \int_{\Omega} g_2(x) w_2 dx \right]; \quad (2.4)$$

from the different properties of the weak and strong convergences we get that  $w_i \neq 0$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3.** Let  $A = \{x \in \Omega : w_i(x) \neq 0, (i = 1, 2)\}$ , then

$$g_i = 0 \text{ a.e. in } \Omega \setminus A \text{ where } i = 1, 2.$$

*Proof.* The inequality (1.7) gives us for every  $i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ )

$$|g_{in}(x)| \leq a_i |w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}n}|^{p-1} + \frac{b_i(x)}{n^{p-1}} \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega \setminus A, \quad (2.5)$$

so

$$\|g_{in}\|_{L^{p'}(\Omega \setminus A)} \leq a_i \|w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}n}\|_{L^p(\Omega \setminus A)}^{\frac{p}{p'}} + \frac{1}{n^{p-1}} \|b_i\|_{L^{p'}(\Omega \setminus A)}. \quad (2.6)$$

From lemma (2.2), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|g_{in}\|_{L^{p'}(\Omega \setminus A)} = 0. \quad (i = 1, 2) \quad (2.7)$$

Let  $D = \{x \in \Omega \setminus A : g_i \neq 0, (i = 1, 2)\}$ . By lemma (2.1) we get, for  $\phi_i(x) = \text{sign}[g_i(x)] \chi_D(x) \in L^p(D)$  such that

$$\chi_D(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & ; x \notin D, \\ 1 & ; x \in D, \end{cases}$$

that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_D g_{in}(x) \phi_i(x) dx = \int_D g_i(x) \phi_i(x) dx = \int_D |g_i(x)| dx, \quad (2.8)$$

but, we have by (2.7)

$$\int_D |g_i(x)| dx = 0, \quad (i = 1, 2) \quad (2.9)$$

consequently,  $\text{meas}(D) = 0$  which implies

$$g_i = 0 \text{ a.e. in } \Omega \setminus A \text{ where } i = 1, 2.$$

$\square$

**Lemma 2.4.** Let  $i = 1, 2$  and

$$\tilde{g}_i(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{g_i(x)}{|w(x)_{i+(-1)^{i+1}}|^{p-2} w(x)_{i+(-1)^{i+1}}} & \text{on } A, \\ \beta_i & \text{on } \Omega \setminus A, \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

where  $\beta_i$  are fixed numbers such that  $\lambda_1 < \beta_i < \lambda_2$ , then

$$\lambda_1 \leq \tilde{g}_i(x) < \lambda_2 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega. \quad (2.11)$$

*Proof.* For  $i = 1, 2$ , firstly we define new subsets as follow

$$\begin{aligned} B_{l_i} &= \{x \in A : w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}}(x)g_i(x) < l_i(x)|w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}}(x)|^p\}, \\ B_{k_i} &= \{x \in A : w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}}(x)g_i(x) > k_i(x)|w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}}(x)|^p\}, \end{aligned}$$

then we prove that  $meas(B_{l_i}) = meas(B_{k_i}) = 0$ .

By remark (1.3), we have that  $\forall \varepsilon_i > 0$ ,  $\exists b_{\varepsilon_i} \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$  such that

$$|w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}n}|^p(l_i - \varepsilon_i) - \frac{b_{\varepsilon_i}}{n^p} \leq w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}n}g_{in} \leq |w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}n}|^p(k_i + \varepsilon_i) + \frac{b_{\varepsilon_i}}{n^p}. \quad (2.12)$$

By integrating in the first inequality and letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we deduce

$$\int_{B_{l_i}} [w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}}(x)g_i(x) - |w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}}(x)|^p l_i(x)] dx \geq 0, \quad (2.13)$$

and from the definition of the subset  $B_{l_i}$ , we get

$$\int_{B_{l_i}} [w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}}(x)g_i(x) - |w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}}(x)|^p l_i(x)] dx < 0. \quad (2.14)$$

Whereupon

$$\int_{B_{l_i}} [w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}}(x)g_i(x) - |w_{i+(-1)^{i+1}}(x)|^p l_i(x)] dx = 0, \quad (2.15)$$

which implies  $meas(B_{l_i}) = 0$ . The second inequality give us  $meas(B_{k_i}) = 0$ .

In the second step, from the definition of  $\tilde{g}_i$ , we obtain

$$l_i(x) \leq \tilde{g}_i(x) \leq k_i(x) \text{ a.e. in } A, \quad (2.16)$$

and hypothesis (1.3) allow us to write

$$\lambda_1 \leq \tilde{g}_i(x) < \lambda_2 \text{ a.e. in } A. \quad (2.17)$$

Since  $\tilde{g}_i = \beta_i$  in  $\Omega \setminus A$ , then

$$\lambda_1 < \tilde{g}_i < \lambda_2 \text{ in } \Omega \setminus A. \quad (2.18)$$

The inequalities (2.17) and (2.18) leads to

$$\lambda_1 \leq \tilde{g}_i(x) < \lambda_2 \text{ a.e. in } \Omega. \quad (2.19)$$

From (2.18), (2.19) and the fact that  $mes(\Omega \setminus A) \neq 0$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &\leq \tilde{g}_i(x) < \lambda_2 \text{ a.e. in } \Omega. \\ &\neq \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 2.5.** *If  $i = 1, 2$ , then  $w_i$  is a solution of*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p w_i = m_i |w_i|^{p-2} w_i & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w_i = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

where  $m_i(x) = (1-t)\alpha_i + t\tilde{g}_{i+(-1)^{i+1}}(x)$ .

*Proof.* We first prove that  $w_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p w_i = (1-t)\alpha_i |w_i|^{p-2} w_i + t g_{i+(-1)^{i+1}} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w_i = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.21)$$

From [3], we have that  $w_{in}$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p w_{in} = (1-t_n) |w_{in}|^{p-2} w_{in} + t_n \left[ g_{i+(-1)^{i+1}n} + \frac{1}{n^{p-1}} h_i \right] & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w_{in} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.22)$$

We know that for  $i = 1, 2$ ,  $(-\Delta_p)(w_{in})$  are bounded in  $W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$ , so we can extract from it a subsequence  $(w_{in})$  (for simplicity of the notation), and a distribution  $L_i \in W^{-1,p'}$  such that

$$(-\Delta_p)(w_{in}) \xrightarrow[\text{weak}]{} L_i,$$

in particular

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \langle -\Delta_p w_{in}, w_i \rangle = \langle L_i, w_i \rangle.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \langle -\Delta_p w_{in}, w_{in} - w_i \rangle &= (1-t_n) \alpha_i \int_{\Omega} |w_{in}|^{p-2} w_{in} (w_{in} - w_i) dx \\ &\quad + t_n \left[ \int_{\Omega} g_{i+(-1)^{i+1}n} (w_{in} - w_i) dx + \frac{1}{n^{p-1}} \langle h_i, w_{in} - w_i \rangle \right], \end{aligned}$$

it holds

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \langle -\Delta_p w_{in}, w_{in} - w_i \rangle = 0.$$

But, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \langle -\Delta_p w_{in}, w_{in} - w_i \rangle &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \langle -\Delta_p w_{in}, w_{in} \rangle - \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \langle -\Delta_p w_{in}, w_i \rangle \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \langle -\Delta_p w_{in}, w_{in} \rangle - \langle L_i, w_i \rangle \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

consequently

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \langle -\Delta_p w_{in}, w_{in} \rangle = \langle L_i, w_i \rangle.$$

We also know that  $(-\Delta_p)$  is an operator of type  $(M)$ , so we get

$$L_i = -\Delta_p w_i.$$

Passing to the limit in (2.22) gives (2.21), but by lemma (2.3), we have

$$(1-t)\alpha_i |w_i|^{p-2} w_i + t g_{i+(-1)^{i+1}} = m_i |w_i|^{p-2} w_i \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega,$$

which implies that  $w_i$  is a solution of (2.20) for every  $i$  such that  $i = 1, 2$ .  $\square$

Now, we can prove our estimate.

To reach the contradiction, we set  $\lambda_1(\Omega, m_i(x))$  (resp.,  $\lambda_2(\Omega, m_i(x))$ ) to be the first (resp., the second) eigenvalue of the problem with weight

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

For  $i = 1, 2$ , we use lemma (2.4) and the fact that  $\lambda_1 < \alpha_i < \lambda_2$ , to get

$$\lambda_1 \leq m_i(x) < \lambda_2 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega;$$

$$\neq$$

now, by the strict monotonicity property of the first eigenvalue [9] and the second eigenvalue [2], we have

$$\lambda_1(\Omega, m_i) < \lambda_1(\Omega, \lambda_1) = 1,$$

and

$$1 = \lambda_2(\Omega, \lambda_2) < \lambda_2(\Omega, m_i),$$

so clearly

$$\lambda_1(\Omega, m_i) < 1 < \lambda_2(\Omega, m_i).$$

But by lemmas (2.2) and (2.5), for every  $i$  (such that  $i = 1, 2$ ), 1 is an eigenvalue of  $(-\Delta_p)$  for the weights  $m_i$ , which contradicts the definition of the second eigenvalues  $\lambda_2(\Omega, m_i)$ .

From above we deduce that the estimation holds true.

### 3. Proof of the main result

Using the homotopy invariance of the degree map, which through the homotopy  $T_t$  yields

$$\deg(I - T_0, B(0, R), 0) = \deg(I - T_1, B(0, R), 0).$$

As  $T_0$  is odd, so following the theory of Borsuk, we get that  $\deg(I - T_0, B(0, R), 0)$  is an odd integer and so nonzero. This implies that there exists  $(u, v) \in B(0, R)$  such that  $T_1(u, v) = (u, v)$ . Hence, system (1.1) has a positive solution.

This completes the proof.

### References

1. A. Anane and J. P. Gossez, *Strongly nonlinear elliptic problems near resonance: a variational approach*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, Vol. 15, No. 8, 1141-1159, (1990).
2. A. Anane and N. Tsouli, *On the second eigenvalue of the  $p$ -Laplacian*, Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, Vol. 343, 1-9, (1996).
3. A. Anane and N. Tsouli, *On a nonresonance condition between the first and the second eigenvalues for the  $p$ -Laplacian*, International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences (©Hindawi Publishing Corp), Vol. 26, No. 10, 625-634, (2001).
4. D. D. Hai, H. Wang, *Nontrivial solutions for  $p$ -Laplacian systems*, J. Math. Anal. Appl, Vol. 330, 186-194, (2007).
5. A. Dakkak and M. Moussaoui, *On the second eigencurve for the  $p$ -laplacian operator with weight*, Bol. Soc. Paran. Mat (3s.), Vol. 35, No. 1, 281-289, (2017).
6. H. Lakhal, B. Khodja, *Elliptic systems at resonance for jumping non-linearities*, Electronic Journal of Differential Equations, Vol. 2016, No. 70, 1-13.
7. Peter Lindqvist, *Notes on the  $p$ -Laplacian equation (second edition)*, Editor: Pekka Koskela, Department of Mathematics and Statistics P.O. Box 35 (MaD) FI-40014, University of Jyväskylä Finland, (2017).
8. Xudong Shang, Jihui Zhang, *Existence of positive solution for quasilinear elliptic system involving the  $p$ -Laplacian*, Electronic Journal of Differential Equations, Vol. 2009, No. 71, 1-7.
9. N. Tsouli, *Etude de l'ensemble nodal des fonctions propres et de la non-résonance pour l'opérateur  $p$ -Laplacien*, Ph.D. thesis, Université Mohammed I, Faculté des Sciences, Département de Maths, Oujda, Maroc, (1995).
10. J. Zhang, *Existence results for the positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic systems*, Appl. Math. Com, Vol. 153, No. 3, 833-842, (2004).

*Sara Dob,*  
*Laboratory of Applied Mathematics and History and Didactics of Mathematics (LAMAHS)*  
*Department of Mathematics,*  
*University 20 august 1955 Skikda,*  
*Algeria.*  
*E-mail address: dobsara@yahoo.com    s.dob@univ-skikda.dz*

*and*

*Hakim Lekhal,*  
*Laboratory of Applied Mathematics and History and Didactics of Mathematics (LAMAHS)*  
*Department of Mathematics,*  
*University 20 august 1955 Skikda,*  
*Algeria.*  
*E-mail address: H.lakhal@univ-skikda.dz*

*and*

*Messaoud Maouni,*  
*Laboratory of Applied Mathematics and History and Didactics of Mathematics (LAMAHS)*  
*Department of Mathematics,*  
*University 20 august 1955 Skikda,*  
*Algeria.*  
*E-mail address: m.maouni@univ-skikda.dz*