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Abstract. In this paper, we show that the semi-linear elliptic systems of the form

$$
\begin{cases}-\Delta u-\mu \Delta v=g(x, v), & -\Delta v-\lambda \Delta u=f(x, u),  \tag{0.1}\\ u \in \Omega, \\ u=v=0, & x \in \partial \Omega\end{cases}
$$

possess at least one non-trivial solution pair $(u, v) \in H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \times H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$, where $\Omega$ is a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^{N}, \lambda$ and $\mu$ are non-negative numbers, $f(x, t)$ and $g(x, t)$ are continuous functions on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ and asymptotically linear at infinity.
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1. Introduction. In this paper, we consider the existence of non-trivial solutions of non-linear elliptic systems

$$
\begin{cases}-\Delta u-\mu \Delta v=g(x, v), & -\Delta v-\lambda \Delta u=f(x, u),  \tag{1.1}\\ u=v \in \Omega, \\ u=0, & x \in \partial \Omega,\end{cases}
$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{N}$ is a smooth bounded domain, $\lambda$ and $\mu$ are non-negative numbers, $f(x, t)$ and $g(x, t)$ are continuous functions on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ and asymptotically linear at infinity for $t$.

In the case of $\lambda=\mu=0$, in recent years, much attention has been paid to the existence of non-trivial solutions of problem (1.1) for the case that $f$ and $g$ are superlinear, see [1], [2], [3], [7] and references therein. In [4], G. Li and J. Yang considered the asymptotically linear elliptic systems

$$
-\Delta u+u=g(x, v), \quad-\Delta v+v=f(x, u), x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}
$$

it obtained a positive solution by using linking theorem under the Cerami compactness condition.

If $\lambda, \mu \neq 0$, the problem has some new features. First, by the Pohozaev-type identity, the parameters $\lambda$ and $\mu$ affect the sub-critical range of the growth of non-linear terms at infinity. Second, if $\lambda \mu<1$, the decomposition of the space in the framework involves the parameters, see $[\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{6}]$. Moreover, $f$ and $g$ are superlinear in [5] and are asymptotically linear in [6].

In this paper, we will consider asymptotically linear elliptic systems (1.1) in $E=$ $H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \times H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$ with parameters $\lambda, \mu$ satisfies $\lambda \mu>1$, which allow us to define an
equivalent norm on $E$. In fact, let $E$ be equipped with the norm

$$
\|z\|_{E}=\left(\int_{\Omega}\left(|\nabla u|^{2}+|\nabla v|^{2}\right) d x\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

where $z=(u, v)$. Since $\lambda \mu>1$, then there exists a real number $l>0$ such that $\lambda>l>\frac{1}{\mu}$ and we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\max \left\{\frac{1+\lambda}{2}, \frac{1+\mu}{2}\right\}\left(|\nabla u|^{2}+|\nabla v|^{2}\right) & \geq \nabla u \nabla v+\frac{\lambda}{2}|\nabla u|^{2}+\frac{\mu}{2}|\nabla v|^{2} \\
& \geq \min \left\{\frac{\lambda-l}{2}, \frac{\mu}{2}-\frac{1}{2 l}\right\}\left(|\nabla u|^{2}+|\nabla v|^{2}\right) . \tag{1.2}
\end{align*}
$$

Then we may introduce a new inner product on $E$ by the formula

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle(u, v),(\varphi, \psi)\rangle=\int_{\Omega}(\lambda \nabla u \nabla \varphi+\nabla u \nabla \psi+\nabla v \nabla \varphi+\mu \nabla v \nabla \psi) d x \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the corresponding norm is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|z\|=(\langle z, z\rangle)^{\frac{1}{2}}=\left(\int_{\Omega}\left(\lambda|\nabla u|^{2}+2 \nabla u \nabla v+\mu|\nabla v|^{2}\right) d x\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \forall z=(u, v) \in E . \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The norms $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_{E}$ are then equivalent if $\lambda \mu>1$ by (1.2).
We assume that $f$ and $g$ satisfy
(H1) $f, g \in C^{1}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}), f(x, t)=g(x, t)=0$ if $t \leq 0$.
(H2) $\lim _{t \rightarrow 0}(f(x, t) / t)=\lim _{t \rightarrow 0}(g(x, t) / t)=0$ uniformly with respect to $x \in \Omega$ and $f(x, t)>0, g(x, t)>0$ for $t>0, x \in \Omega$.
(H3) $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}(f(x, t) / t)=l>0, \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}(g(x, t) / t)=m>0$ uniformly in $x \in \Omega$.
(H4) $f(x, t) / t$ and $g(x, t) / t$ are non-decreasing in $t \geq 0$ for $x \in \Omega$.
Let $\lambda_{1}$ be the first eigenvalue of $\left(-\Delta, H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)\right)$ and $\varphi_{1}>0$ be the corresponding eigenfunction. Define $A=\min \left\{\frac{l}{1+\lambda}, \frac{m}{1+\mu}, \frac{m \lambda+\mu l-\sqrt{(m \lambda-\mu l)^{2}+4 m l}}{2(\lambda \mu-1)}\right\}$.

The main result of this paper is as follows:
Theorem 1.1. Suppose $(H 1)-(H 4)$ hold. If $\lambda \mu>1$ and $\lambda_{1}<A$, then the problem (1.1) possesses at least one non-trivial solution pair $z=(u, v) \in E$. Furthermore, problem (1.1) possesses the least energy non-trivial solution pair $z=(u, v) \in E$.

We will use Mountain Pass theorem to prove Theorem 1.1. As a by-product, we show that

$$
I^{\infty}=\inf \left\{I(z): I^{\prime}(z)=0, z=(u, v) \in E \backslash\{0\}\right\}
$$

is achieved by some $z_{0}=\left(u_{0}, v_{0}\right)$ with $u_{0} \not \equiv 0, v_{0} \not \equiv 0$.
Theorem 1.1 will be proved in Section 2.
2. Existence results. Suppose in this section $\lambda, \mu$ satisfies $\lambda \mu>1$ and $\lambda_{1}<A$. By $\left(H_{1}\right)-\left(H_{3}\right)$, it is easy to see that there is a $2<p<2 N /(N-2)$ if $N>2$ and $2<$ $p<+\infty$ if $N \leq 2$ and that for any $\epsilon>0$ there is a $c_{\epsilon}>0$ such that for $\forall(x, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
|f(x, t)|,|g(x, t)| \leq \epsilon|t|+c_{\epsilon}|t|^{p-1} . \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

So the corresponding energy function

$$
\begin{equation*}
I(u, v)=\frac{1}{2}\|z\|^{2}-\int_{\Omega} F(x, u) d x-\int_{\Omega} G(x, v) d x \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

is well defined on $E$ and class $C^{1}(E, \mathbb{R})$, where $F(x, t)=\int_{0}^{t} f(x, s) d s$ and $G(x, t)=$ $\int_{0}^{t} g(x, s) d s$. Moreover, the Fréchet derivative $I^{\prime}$ satisfying

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\langle I^{\prime}(u, v),(\varphi, \psi)\right\rangle= & \int_{\Omega}[\nabla u \nabla \psi+\nabla v \nabla \varphi+\lambda \nabla u \nabla \varphi+\mu \nabla v \nabla \psi] d x \\
& -\int_{\Omega} f(x, u) \varphi d x-\int_{\Omega} g(x, v) \psi d x \tag{2.3}
\end{align*}
$$

for $\forall(\varphi, \psi) \in E$.
Sequence $\left\{z_{n}\right\} \subset E$ is called the Palais-Smale sequence of a $C^{1}$ function $I$ on $E$ at level $c\left((P S)_{c}\right.$-sequence for short) if $I\left(z_{n}\right) \rightarrow c$ and $I^{\prime}\left(z_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. To get a $(P S)_{c}$-sequence, we will use the Mountain Pass theorem cited in [8].

Proposition 2.1. Let $E$ be a Hilbert space, $I \in C^{1}(E, \mathbb{R}), e \in E$ and $r>$ 0 such that $\|e\|>r$ and $b:=\inf _{\|z\|=r} I(z)>I(0) \geq I(e)$. Let $c$ be characterised by $c:=\inf _{\gamma \in \Gamma} \max _{\tau \in[0,1]} I(\gamma(\tau))$, where $\Gamma:=\{\gamma \in C([0,1], E): \gamma(0)=0, \gamma(1)=e\}$. Then, there exists a sequence $\left\{z_{n}\right\} \subset E$ such that $I\left(z_{n}\right) \rightarrow c$ and $I^{\prime}\left(z_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 2.1. Let $\left(H_{1}\right)-\left(H_{3}\right)$ hold. Then we have the following:
(a) There exist $\rho, \beta>0$ such that $I(z) \geq \beta$ for all $z \in E$ with $\|z\|=\rho$.
(b) There exists $e \in E$ with $\|e\| \geq \beta$ such that $I(e)<0$.

Proof. (a) It follows from (2.1) and the Sobolev embedding theorem that for any $\epsilon>0$ there is a $c_{\epsilon}>0$ such that

$$
\int_{\Omega} F(x, u) d x+\int_{\Omega} G(x, v) d x \leq c \epsilon\|z\|^{2}+c_{\epsilon}\|z\|^{p}
$$

for all $z=(u, v) \in E$. This, jointly with (2.2) implies (a).
(b) By Fatou's Lemma, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{I\left(t \varphi_{1}, t \varphi_{1}\right)}{t^{2}} & =\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega}(2+\lambda+\mu)\left|\nabla \varphi_{1}\right|^{2} d x-\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \frac{F\left(x, t \varphi_{1}\right)+G\left(x, t \varphi_{1}\right)}{t^{2}} d x \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega}(2+\lambda+\mu)\left|\nabla \varphi_{1}\right|^{2} d x-\int_{\Omega} \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F\left(x, t \varphi_{1}\right)+G\left(x, t \varphi_{1}\right)}{t^{2} \varphi_{1}^{2}} \varphi_{1}^{2} d x \\
& =\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega}(2+\lambda+\mu)\left|\nabla \varphi_{1}\right|^{2} d x-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega}(l+m) \varphi_{1}^{2} d x \\
& =\frac{1}{2}\left(2+\lambda+\mu-\frac{l+m}{\lambda_{1}}\right) \int_{\Omega}\left|\nabla \varphi_{1}\right|^{2} d x<0
\end{aligned}
$$

because of $\lambda_{1}<A$. So $I\left(t \varphi_{1}, t \varphi_{1}\right) \rightarrow-\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and part $(b)$ is proved.

Proposition 2.2. If $(u, v) \in H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \times H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$ is a non-trivial solution of (1.1), then we have $\lambda_{1} \leq \frac{m \lambda+\mu l-\sqrt{(m \lambda-\mu l)^{2}+4 m l}}{2(\lambda \mu-1)}$.

Proof. Let $k=\frac{\mu l-m \lambda+\sqrt{(m \lambda-\mu l)^{2}+4 m l}}{2 m}$. It is apparent that $(u, v)=(u, k \tilde{v})$ is a nontrivial solution pair of the problem

$$
\begin{cases}-\Delta u-\mu k \Delta \tilde{v}=g(x, k \tilde{v}), & -\Delta \tilde{v}-\frac{\lambda}{k} \Delta u=\frac{1}{k} f(x, u), \\ u=\tilde{v}=0, & x \in \Omega, \\ u \in \partial \Omega\end{cases}
$$

that is

$$
-\left(1+\frac{\lambda}{k}\right) \Delta\left(u+\frac{1+\mu k}{1+\frac{\lambda}{k}} \tilde{v}\right)=g(x, k \tilde{v})+\frac{1}{k} f(x, u)
$$

By $\left(H_{3}\right)$ and $\left(H_{4}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(1+\frac{\lambda}{k}\right) \int_{\Omega}\left|\nabla\left(u+\frac{1+\mu k}{1+\frac{\lambda}{k}} \tilde{v}\right)\right|^{2} d x & =\int_{\Omega}\left[g(x, k \tilde{v})+\frac{1}{k} f(x, u)\right]\left(u+\frac{1+\mu k}{1+\frac{\lambda}{k}} \tilde{v}\right) d x \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega}\left[m k \tilde{v}+\frac{l}{k} u\right]\left(u+\frac{1+\mu k}{1+\frac{\lambda}{k}} \tilde{v}\right) d x \\
& =\frac{l}{k} \int_{\Omega}\left(u+\frac{m k^{2}}{l} \tilde{v}\right)\left(u+\frac{1+\mu k}{1+\frac{\lambda}{k}} \tilde{v}\right) d x
\end{aligned}
$$

By the definition of $k$ we know that $\frac{1+\mu k}{1+\frac{\hat{\lambda}}{k}}=\frac{m k^{2}}{l}$, and hence

$$
\lambda_{1} \leq \frac{\frac{l}{k}}{1+\frac{\lambda}{k}}=\frac{l}{k+\lambda}=\frac{m \lambda+\mu l-\sqrt{(m \lambda-\mu l)^{2}+4 m l}}{2(\lambda \mu-1)}
$$

The proof is complete.
Proposition 2.3. Under assumptions $\left(H_{1}\right)-\left(H_{4}\right)$, problem (1.1) possesses at least one non-trivial solution pair $(u, v) \in E$.

Proof. Proposition 2.1 and Lemma 2.1 implies that there exists a $(P S)_{c}$-sequence $\left\{z_{n}\right\} \subset E$ for $I$, that is

$$
\begin{equation*}
I\left(z_{n}\right) \rightarrow c, \quad I^{\prime}\left(z_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0 \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c>0$. To get a non-trivial solution, we only need to show that $\left\{z_{n}\right\}$ is bounded in $E$. For this purpose, we suppose, by contradiction, that $\left\|z_{n}\right\| \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and let

$$
\begin{equation*}
t_{n}=\frac{2 \sqrt{c}}{\left\|z_{n}\right\|}, \quad w_{n}=t_{n} z_{n}=\frac{2 \sqrt{c} z_{n}}{\left\|z_{n}\right\|}=\left(\frac{2 \sqrt{c} u_{n}}{\left\|z_{n}\right\|}, \frac{2 \sqrt{c} v_{n}}{\left\|z_{n}\right\|}\right) \triangleq\left(w_{n}^{1}, w_{n}^{2}\right) . \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Obviously, $\left\{w_{n}\right\}$ is bounded in $E$. By extracting a sub-sequence, we may suppose that

$$
w_{n} \rightharpoonup w \in E, \quad w_{n} \rightarrow w \text { a.e. in } \Omega
$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $w=\left(w_{1}, w_{2}\right)$.

We claim that

$$
w \not \equiv 0 .
$$

In fact, by $\left(H_{2}\right)-\left(H_{4}\right)$, we see that there exists $M>0$ such that $|f(x, t) / t| \leq M$, $|g(x, t) / t| \leq M$ for all $x \in \Omega$ and $t \geq 0$. Supposing $w \equiv 0$, by Sobolev embedding theorem that, $w_{n}^{1} \rightarrow 0, w_{n}^{2} \rightarrow 0$ in $L^{2}(\Omega)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then it follows from (2.4) and (2.5) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
4 c & =\int_{\Omega}\left[\frac{f\left(x, u_{n}\right)}{u_{n}}\left|w_{n}^{1}\right|^{2}+\frac{g\left(x, v_{n}\right)}{v_{n}}\left|w_{n}^{2}\right|^{2}\right] d x+o(1) \\
& \leq M \int_{\Omega}\left[\left|w_{n}^{1}\right|^{2}+\left|w_{n}^{2}\right|^{2}\right] d x+o(1) \rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}
$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which is impossible as $c>0$. Hence, the claim is proved.
Set

$$
p_{n}(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
\frac{f\left(x, u_{n}\right)}{u_{n}} & \text { if } u_{n}(x)>0 ; \\
0 & \text { if } u_{n}(x) \leq 0,
\end{array} \quad q_{n}(x)= \begin{cases}\frac{g\left(x, v_{n}\right)}{v_{n}} & \text { if } v_{n}(x)>0 \\
0 & \text { if } v_{n}(x) \leq 0\end{cases}\right.
$$

By $\left(H_{2}\right)-\left(H_{4}\right)$, we see that

$$
0 \leq p_{n}(x) \leq l, \quad 0 \leq q_{n}(x) \leq m, \quad \forall x \in \Omega,
$$

and there exist two functions $p(x), q(x) \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ such that

$$
p_{n} \rightharpoonup p, q_{n} \rightharpoonup q \text { in } L^{2}(\Omega)
$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It results to

$$
p_{n}(x) w_{n}^{1} \rightharpoonup p(x) \max \left\{w^{1}(x), 0\right\}, q_{n}(x) w_{n}^{2} \rightharpoonup q(x) \max \left\{w^{2}(x), 0\right\} \text { in } L^{2}(\Omega)
$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\left\{z_{n}\right\}$ is a $(P S)_{c}$-sequence of $I$, then from (2.3) we have $\forall(\varphi, \psi) \in E$, so that

$$
\begin{aligned}
o(1)= & \int_{\Omega}\left[\nabla w_{n}^{1} \nabla \psi+\nabla w_{n}^{2} \nabla \varphi+\lambda \nabla w_{n}^{1} \nabla \varphi+\mu \nabla w_{n}^{2} \nabla \psi\right] d x \\
& -\int_{\Omega} p_{n}(x) w_{n}^{1} \varphi d x-\int_{\Omega} q_{n}(x) w_{n}^{2} \psi d x .
\end{aligned}
$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{\Omega}\left[\nabla w^{1} \nabla \psi+\nabla w^{2} \nabla \varphi+\lambda \nabla w^{1} \nabla \varphi+\mu \nabla w^{2} \nabla \psi\right] d x-\int_{\Omega} p(x) \max \left\{w^{1}, 0\right\} \varphi d x \\
& \quad-\int_{\Omega} q(x) \max \left\{w^{2}, 0\right\} \psi d x=0 \tag{2.6}
\end{align*}
$$

Therefore, $w^{1}$ and $w^{2}$ satisfy

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
-\Delta w^{1}-\mu \Delta w^{2}=q(x) \max \left\{w^{2}, 0\right\} \geq 0, x \in \Omega  \tag{2.7}\\
-\Delta w^{2}-\lambda \Delta w^{1}=p(x) \max \left\{w^{1}, 0\right\} \geq 0, x \in \Omega
\end{array}\right.
$$

Choosing $\left(\varphi_{1}, 0\right)$ as a test function in (2.6), we can get that

$$
\int_{\Omega}\left[\nabla w^{2} \nabla \varphi_{1}+\lambda \nabla w^{1} \nabla \varphi_{1}\right] d x=\int_{\Omega} p(x) \max \left\{w^{1}, 0\right\} \varphi_{1} d x=l \int_{\Omega \cap\left\{x: w^{1}(x)>0\right\}} w^{1} \varphi_{1} d x
$$

but

$$
\int_{\Omega}\left[\nabla w^{2} \nabla \varphi_{1}+\lambda \nabla w^{1} \nabla \varphi_{1}\right] d x=\int_{\Omega}\left[\lambda_{1} w^{2} \varphi_{1}+\lambda \lambda_{1} w^{1} \varphi_{1}\right] d x
$$

thus we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega \cap\left\{x: w^{1}(x)>0\right\}}\left(l-\lambda \lambda_{1}\right) w^{1} \varphi_{1} d x \leq \int_{\Omega \cap\left\{x: w^{2}(x)>0\right\}} \lambda_{1} w^{2} \varphi_{1} d x . \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Similarly, choosing $\left(0, \varphi_{1}\right)$ as a test function in (2.6), we can get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega \cap\left\{x: w^{2}(x)>0\right\}}\left(m-\mu \lambda_{1}\right) w^{2} \varphi_{1} d x \leq \int_{\Omega \cap\left\{x: w^{1}(x)>0\right\}} \lambda_{1} w^{1} \varphi_{1} d x . \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $\Omega \cap\left\{x: w^{2}(x)>0\right\}=\emptyset$, then from (2.7) we know that the maximum principle implies that $w^{1}=-\mu w^{2} \geq 0$ in $\Omega$, but $w=\left(w_{1}, w_{2}\right) \not \equiv 0$, so we must have $\Omega \cap\{x$ : $\left.w^{1}(x)>0\right\} \neq \emptyset$. Hence we can conclude from (2.8) that $l-\lambda \lambda_{1} \leq 0$, which contradicts $\lambda_{1}<A$. Therefore $\Omega \cap\left\{x: w^{2}(x)>0\right\} \neq \emptyset$. Similarly, we have $\Omega \cap\left\{x: w^{1}(x)>0\right\} \neq$ $\emptyset$. Thus, combining (2.8) and (2.9), we can get

$$
\left(l-\lambda \lambda_{1}\right)\left(m-\mu \lambda_{1}\right) \leq \lambda_{1}^{2},
$$

which is impossible since $\lambda_{1}<A$.
Thus, we must have $\left\|z_{n}\right\| \leq c<+\infty$ and the Proposition is proved.
The proof for Theorem 1.1 will be completed by the following Proposition.
Proposition 2.4. If $\left(H_{1}\right)-\left(H_{4}\right)$ hold, then $I^{\infty}$ is assumed.
Proof. By Proposition 2.3, we know that $I^{\infty}$ is well defined and finite. Now we show that $I^{\infty}$ is assumed. Using (2.1) and Sobolev embedding theorem, we get

$$
\|z\|^{2}=\int_{\Omega} f(x, u) u d x+\int_{\Omega} g(x, v) v d x \leq \epsilon c\|z\|^{2}+c_{\epsilon}\|z\|^{p} .
$$

When $\epsilon$ is small enough, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|z\| \geq c>0 \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Suppose now $z_{n}=\left(u_{n}, v_{n}\right) \not \equiv 0$ is a minimising sequence of $I^{\infty}$. By Proposition 2.3, we see that $\left\{z_{n}\right\}$ is uniformly bounded in $E$. So we may assume $z_{n} \rightarrow z=(u, v)$ in $E$ and $I^{\prime}(z)=0$. Since (2.10) implies $z \neq(0,0)$, it follows that $I^{\infty}=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} I\left(z_{n}\right)=I(z)$. Consequently, $I^{\infty}$ is assumed by $z \in E \backslash\{0\}$. The proof is complete.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. This is a direct consequence of Proposition 2.3 and 2.4.
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