Asymptotic stability of N-soliton states of NLS

I. Rodnianski, W. Schlag and A. Soffer *

November 1, 2002

Abstract

The asymptotic stability and asymptotic completeness of NLS solitons is proved, for small perturbations of arbitrary number of non-colliding solitons.

1 Introduction

The nonlinear Schrödinger equation has in general (exponentially) localized solutions in space, provided the nonlinearity has a negative (attractive) part. This is due to a remarkable cancellation of the dispersive effect of the linear part with the focusing caused by the attractive nonlinearity. To find such solutions, we look for time periodic solutions:

$$\text{(NLS)} \qquad i\,\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = -\triangle\psi + \beta(|\psi|^2)\psi \qquad x\in\mathbb{R}^n \qquad \psi \equiv e^{i\omega t}\,\psi_\omega(x)\,.$$

It follows that ϕ_ω, if it exists, solves the equation

$$\text{(ENLS)} \qquad -\omega\psi_\omega = -\triangle\psi_\omega + \beta(|\psi_\omega|^2)\psi_\omega$$

In general, for ψ_ω to be localized (at least as L^2 function) we need $\omega>0$.

The general existence theory for this elliptic problem has been studied in great detail. In the case $\beta(s^2)\equiv -\lambda|s|^{p-1}$ there are rather extensive results. The existence theory initiated in [Cof] and followed in [Str] also implies in many cases that there is a range of ω for such solutions, that the lowest energy (ω) family of solutions. We will refer to a positive radial lowest energy solution as a ground sate. In [BL] Berestycki-Lions proved the existence of a ground state in three or more dimensions under the conditions that $g(s)\equiv\beta(s^2)s$ is odd,

$$0\le \lim_{s\to+\infty}\frac{g(s)}{s^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}},$$

and such that there exists $0<s_0<\infty$, with $G(s_0)>0$, for

$$G(s)\equiv -2\int_0^s g(s)ds$$

*The research of I.R. was partially conducted during the period he served as a Clay Mathematics Institute Long-Term Prize Fellow. He was also supported in part by the NSF grant DMS-0107791. W.S. was partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-0070538 and a Sloan Fellowship. A.S. was partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-0100490.

The question of uniqueness of the ground state has been studied in [**?**], [Kw], [**?**]. It follows from the results of McLeod that if the nonilnearity satisfies the condition

the ground state is unique.

The exponential decay usually follows from properties of eigenfunctions of Schrödinger operators.

Next, it is easy to see that if $\psi_\omega(t,x) = e^{i\omega t}\phi_\omega(x)$ is a solution of (NLS), then for any vector $\vec{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the function $\psi_\omega(t, x-\vec{a})$ is also a solution. More generally, the equation NLS is invariant under Galilean transformations, and therefore we can construct solutions which are moving with arbitrary velocity $\vec{v}$ from ψ_ω. As a result we obtain a family of exact spatially exponentially localized solutions

$$\psi_{\vec{v},\gamma,D,\omega} = e^{i\vec{v}\cdot x - \frac{1}{2}(|v|^2-\omega)t + \imath ga}\phi_\omega(x - \vec{v}t - D)$$

parametrized by a constant $2n+2$ dimensional vector $(\vec{v}, \gamma, D, \omega)$. We shall call them solitons.

The natural question now is: can we construct solutions of N solitons moving away from each other with some constant velocity. We give an affirmative answer to this question for a natural class of NLS equations. The methods we use may be applied to other classes of equations with solitary type solutions and other symmetry groups (e.g. Lorentz instead of Galilean), if and whenever certain linear L^p decay estimates can be verified for the linearized operators around one such soliton. A detailed analysis of such L^p estimates for NLS was recently given in [**?**].

To explain the method of proof, we need to explain the notion of asymptotic stability and completeness for such equations. Suppose we take the initial data of NLS to be an exact ground state $\phi_\omega(x)$, plus a small perturbation R_0. What is then the expected behavior of the solution? If the solution $\psi(t)$ stays near the soliton $\psi_\omega(t) = e^{i\omega t}\phi_\omega(x)$ up to a phase and translation for all times (in H^1 norm) we say that the soliton ψ_ω is orbitally stable. If, as time goes to infinity, the solution in fact converges in L^2 to a nearby soliton we say that the solution is asymptotically stable.

Our goal is to show that the configurations of N-solitons moving away from such other are asymptotically stable under small perturbations. The asymptotic stability of one soliton solutions of NLS and other equations has been the subject of much work in the last 10-15 years. It was first shown for NLS with an extra attractive potential term in [SW1]- [**?**], [PW], for one NLS soliton in 1 dim in [**?**] and in dimensions $n \geq 3$ in [Cu],...; for NLS-Hartree in [FTY], KdV ??

In cases where the soliton solution can have more than one manifestation (that is, can be excited) asymptotic stability, was proved for NLS with attractive potential in [**?**], see also [**?**], [**?**]. The main conditions we need on the solitons, besides being exponentially localized (and smooth) is linear stability and spectral assumptions (related to L^p decay).

The notion of linear stability is borrowed here from dynamical systems: we linearize the equation around a soliton. The resulting linear operator which generates the approximate linear glow around the soliton should lead to a stable dynamics. This follows from spectral and L^2 properties of the corresponding linear operator.

In many cases it turns out that stability and linear stability are equivalent for solitons [Stu].

To appreciate the problem of linear stability (and spectral theory) notice that when we linearize around a soliton ω, using $\psi \equiv e^{i\theta}\omega + R$ the resulting "linear" operator acting on R, has $\overline{R}$ contribution as well as time dependent phase contribution, coming for $e^{i\theta}$. We then complexify the space to $(R, \overline{R})$ and remove the $e^{i\theta}$ dependence by some matrix time dependent unitary transformation. We are then left with a matrix operator of the type

$$\mathcal{H} = \begin{pmatrix} L+ & W \\ -\overline{W} & -L- \end{pmatrix}$$

acting on $L^2 \times L^2$, $L+, L-$ self adjoint perturbations by exponentially localized functions of $-\triangle$. W is also exp. localized, but not small in general. Hence $\mathcal{H}$ is non-self adjoint. Therefore, linear stability

$$\text{(LS)} \qquad \| U(t)\psi \|_{L^2} \equiv \| e^{i\mathcal{H}t}\, \psi \|_{L^2} < \infty \text{ for } t$$

fails in general. Using general arguments [?] one can sometimes prove that $\sigma(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathbb{R}$, but due to the lack of self-adjointness we cannot conclude stability. Careful analysis of the spectrum of $\mathcal{H}$ on $\mathbb{R}$, shows that it consists of cont. spec., that we can find using Weyl's criterion, and finitely many eigenvalues and generalized eigenvalues (at zero). The detailed analysis of the spectrum is described in Appendix A. It mostly reviews the known arguments and methods which are needed to imply the spectral and stability assumption we need. It also includes some technical improvements of known results and some generalizations. In particular, we show directly that the generalized eigenvectors at zero, are exponentially decaying, without using the explicit formulas for them (which are not always available).

Linear stability in the sense (LS) is then expected to hold only for initial states ψ which are orthogonal to the space of eigenvectors and generalized eigenvectors of $\mathcal{H}$. In this, linear stability has been proved for certain classes of NLS; the most comprehensive results in this direction, based on Liapunov theory are due to Weinstein [We1]- [We2]. See also [CaL], [?], [Sh], [?], [Gr], [SuSu], [Stu].

Clearly, stability is necessary to have, before proving asymptotic-stability. So among our assumptions it is included in the sense (LS). We also need further spectral assumptions on $\mathcal{H}$, partly to insure that [?] holds and imply the L^p estimates:

$$\text{(LP 1)} \qquad \| e^{i\mathcal{H}t}\, \psi \|_{L^\infty} \le t^{-n/2} \| \psi \|_{L^1 \cap L^2}$$

for $\psi \perp N$, the space of e.values + gen.e.values, and

$$\| U(t)\psi \|_{L^\infty} \le t^{-u/2} \| \psi \|_{L^1 \cap L^2}$$

where $U(t)$ is the solution of the linear equation with N solitons as potentials:

$$i\partial_t U = \left(\sum_{i=2}^{N} \mathcal{H}_i(t) \right) \cup + \mathcal{H}_0\, U \cup (0) = I\,.$$

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} L^1+ & W_1 \\ -\overline{W}_1 & -L^1_- \end{pmatrix} \qquad \mathcal{H}_i = \begin{pmatrix} L^i_+ & W_i(t) \\ -\overline{W}_i(t) & L^i_- \end{pmatrix}$$

$\mathcal{H}_i$ - is the linearization around the i-soliton. It is t-dependent, since it is moving relative to others.

Next, we need some nonlinear assumptions: the first condition is the following monotonicity condition

$$\partial_\omega\,(\psi_\omega, \psi_\omega)\;>\;0$$

which is known to imply (nonlinear) stability in most cases [**?**], [Stu], and is sometimes equivalent to (LS) [Stu]. The second important condition is required to prove asymptotic stability and scattering. For this, we need that $F(|\psi|)$ vanishes as $|\psi|\to 0$ at least as fast as $|\psi|^{1+\frac{2}{n}}$, $n\geq 3$. Examples of $F(|\psi|)$ for which stability holds or expected to hold and satisfy this last condition are not of the monomial type! This is because for such powers, the nonlinearity is supercritical (w.r.t. L^2) and it is then known [CaL], [ShSt], [**?**], [We2] that the monomial solitons are generally unstable.

Nonmonomials examples are of the type $-|\psi|^{p-1}g(|\psi|)$ and $-|\psi|^{p-1}+\alpha|\psi|^{q-1}$ with proper choice of p, α, q, see [Sh]. In the first example, we choose $g(|\psi|)$ to be approximately 1, except that it vanishes near zero, fast enough.

A final few comments on the method of proof: similar to previous works [BP1], [Pe], [Cu] we begin with an .... for the solution as a sum of modulated N-solitons plus a small perturbation Z. We then impose orthogonality conditions $Z=(R,\overline{R})$, relative to each soliton (in its reference frame). The modulated parameters of the solitons are denoted by $\vec{\sigma}(t)$. We then construct solutions, via contraction mapping in the space where $\vec{\sigma}(t)$ satisfies some decay, swellness, and asymptotic behavior. At each stage of the analysis we linearize and orthogonalize relative to the solitons at $t=\infty$, that is around the solitons determined by $\vec{\sigma}(\infty)$. Our approach removes the need to estimate objects with powers of x; we can then solve the problem in L^p spaces. In particular, our assumptions on R at the time zero are in $L^1\cap L^2$ but not in weighted spaces as in previous works. We also get stronger decay estimates onthe remainder terms, namely the optimal $t^{-n/2}$ decay in L^∞.

2 Statement of results

Consider

$$i\partial_t\psi+\frac{1}{2}\triangle\psi+\beta(|\psi|^2)\psi=0 \tag{2.1}$$

in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n\geq 3$ [$n=3$ or $n\geq 3$??], with initial data ⟵

$$\psi_0(x)=\sum_{j=1}^{k} w_j(0,x)+R_0(x). \tag{2.2}$$

[comment on existence of solutions to NLS??] Here w_j are solitons ⟵

$$\begin{aligned} w_j(t,x)=w(t,x;\sigma_j(0)) &= e^{i\theta_j(t,x)}\phi(x-x_j(t),\alpha_j(0)) && (2.3)\\ \theta_j(t,x) &= v_j(0)\cdot x-\frac{1}{2}(|v_j(0)|^2-\alpha_j^2(0))t+\gamma_j(0) && (2.4)\\ x_j(t) &= v_j(0)t+D_j(0). && (2.5)\end{aligned}$$

It is well-known that if $\phi=\phi(\cdot,\alpha)$ satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2}\triangle\phi-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}\phi+\beta(|\phi|^2)\phi=0 \tag{2.6}$$

then w_j as in (2.3) satisfies (2.1) with arbitrary constant parameters $\sigma_j(0) = (v_j(0), D_j(0), \gamma_j(0), \alpha_j(0))$. Solutions of (2.6) are known to exist under suitable conditions on β for certain $\alpha > 0$ and $2 \le p \le 1 + \frac{4}{n-2}$ [Need to introduce β, p, references to Sulem-Sulem or original references???]. Moreover, there $\longleftarrow$ exists a unique positive solution, called the ground state, which is the one that we choose. It decays like $e^{-\alpha|x|}$. The solitons $w_j(\sigma_j(0))$ can be generated from the particular solution $e^{it\frac{\alpha_j(0)^2}{2}}\phi(x;\alpha_j(0))$ of (2.1) by means of the Galilean transformation

$$\mathfrak{g}_{v,D}(t) = e^{-i\frac{|v|^2}{2}t} e^{-ix\cdot v} e^{i(D+tv)p} \tag{2.7}$$

where $p = -i\nabla$, followed by a modulation. Indeed,

$$w(t, x; \sigma_j(0)) = e^{i\gamma} \mathfrak{g}_{-v_j(0),-D_j(0)}(t)\; e^{it\frac{\alpha_j(0)^2}{2}} \phi(x; \alpha_j(0)). \tag{2.8}$$

Our goal is to prove asymptotic stability of noninteracting multi-soliton states. More precisely, we show that provided R_0 is sufficiently small in a suitable norm and provided the $\sigma_j(0)$ satisfy the separation and stability conditions (see below), there exist curves $\sigma_j(t) = (v_j(t), D_j(t), \gamma_j(t), \alpha_j(t))$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2n+2}$ so that

$$\Big\| \psi(t) - \sum_{j=1}^{k} w_j(t, x; \sigma_j(t)) \Big\|_\infty \lesssim |t|^{-\frac{n}{2}} \tag{2.9}$$

where $w_j(t, x; \sigma_j(t))$ denotes the soliton solution from (2.3) with parameters

$$\theta_j(t, x) \;=\; v_j(t)\cdot x - \int_0^t \frac{1}{2}(|v_j|^2 - \alpha_j^2)(s)\, ds + \gamma_j(t) \tag{2.10}$$

$$x_j(t) \;=\; \int_0^t v_j(s)\, ds + D_j(t). \tag{2.11}$$

In what follows, the notation $w_j(t, x; \sigma_j(t))$ or simply $w_j(\sigma_j(t))$, corresponds to the soliton moving along the time-dependent curve $\sigma_j(t)$ in the parameter space according to (2.10) and (2.11), while $w_j(\sigma)$ denotes the true soliton moving along the straight line determined by an arbitrary constant σ as in (2.4) and (2.5).

In order to ensure that the solitons do not interact we assume that their initial positions $D_j(0)$ and initial velocities $v_j(0)$ are such that for all $t \ge 0$ one has the <u>separation condition</u>

$$|D_j(0) + v_j(0)t - D_\ell(0) - v_\ell(0)t| \ge (L + ct), \qquad \forall j \ne \ell = 1, .., k \tag{2.12}$$

with some sufficiently large constant L and a positive constant c. We also impose the <u>nonlinear stability condition</u> (or convexity condition) (see [Sh], [**?**], [We1]). [need to explain the meaning of "stability" here?? more background on this topic in general?? other references???] $\longleftarrow$

$$\langle \partial_\alpha \phi(\cdot;\alpha), \phi(\cdot;\alpha)\rangle > 0, \qquad \forall \alpha : \min_{j=1,..,k} |\alpha - \alpha_j(0)| < c \tag{2.13}$$

for some positive constant c. The condition that the L^2 norm (alternatively the energy) of the ground state is an increasing (decreasing) function of the parameter α is known to play the crucial role in the issue of the orbital stability of 1-soliton solutions of NLS and NKLG (nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation), see [Sh], [**?**], [We1], and first appeared in the work of Shatah. Heuristically speaking, the soliton is orbitally stable of condition (2.13) holds and unstable if instead the opposite strict inequality is satisfied. The known examples of when the nonlinear stability condition can be verified are limited to the case of a monomial subcritical nonlinearities

$$\beta(s^2) = s^{p-1}, \quad 1 < p < 1 + \frac{4}{n}, \quad \forall\alpha \neq 0 \tag{2.14}$$

and the nonlinearity of the mixed type (see [Sh])

$$\beta(s^2) = s^2 - s^4, \quad \alpha????$$

In our paper we find a new class of nonlinearities satisfying condition (2.13). These nonlinearities lie "near" the subcritical monomials of (9.27) but vanish much faster near $s = 0$. More precisely we consider functions

$$\beta_\theta(s^2) = s^{p-1}\frac{s^{3-p}}{\theta + s^{3-p}} \tag{2.15}$$

with a constant $\theta > 0$ and prove that given a sufficiently small neighborhood U in the space of parameter α there exists a sufficiently small value θ_0 such that for all $\theta < \theta_0$ and all $\alpha \in U$ the ground state of β_θ corresponding to α satisfies the nonlinear stability condition (see section ???).

We note that the higher rate of vanishing of $\beta(s^2)$ at $s = 0$ is important for asymptotic stability. In particular, it should be mentioned that if the power p in the monomial example (9.27) is too low $(p < 1 + \frac{2}{n})$ even the scattering theory (asymptotic stability of a trivial solution) fails.

Let $\alpha_{\min} = \min_{1\le j\le k}\alpha_j(0) - c$. In our main theorem we will introduce a small constant ϵ which measures the size of the initial perturbation. It will be understood henceforth that

$$\alpha_{\min} L \geq |\log\epsilon|. \tag{2.16}$$

We collect the individual parameter curves $\sigma_j(t)$ from above into a single curve $\sigma(t) := (\sigma_1(t), \ldots, \sigma_k(t))$. Given the initial value $\sigma(0)$ we introduce the set of <u>admissible curves</u> $\sigma(t)$ as those C^1 curves that remain in a small neighborhood of $\sigma(0)$ for all times and converge to their final value $\sigma(\infty) = \lim_{t\to+\infty}\sigma(t)$. In particular, the separation and nonlinear stability conditions can be assumed to hold uniformly along the admissible curve $\sigma(t)$. We shall also impose the condition that for an admissible curve $\sigma(t)$

$$\int_0^\infty\int_s^\infty |\dot v_j(\tau)\cdot v_j(\tau) - \dot\alpha(\tau)_j\alpha_j(\tau)|\,d\tau\,ds < \infty, \qquad \int_0^\infty\int_s^\infty |\dot v_j(\tau)|\,d\tau\,ds < \infty \tag{2.17}$$

for all $1 \le j \le k$. We will write $w_j(\sigma(t)) = w_j(t,x;\sigma(t)) = e^{i\theta_j(\sigma(t))}\phi_j(\sigma(t))$ where $\phi_j(\sigma(t)) = \phi(t,x;\sigma_j(t)) = \phi(x - x_j(t);\alpha_j(t))$. Linearizing the equation (2.1) around the state $w = \sum_{j=1}^k w_j,\ \psi = w + R$ one obtains the following system of equations for $Z = \binom{R}{\bar R}$:

$$i\partial_t Z + H(t,\sigma(t))Z \;=\; F. \tag{2.18}$$

Here $H(t,\sigma(t))$ is the time-dependent matrix Hamiltonian

$$(2.19)\qquad H(t,\sigma(t)) = H_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{k}\begin{pmatrix} \beta(|w_j(\sigma(t))|^2)+\beta'(|w_j(\sigma(t))|^2)|w_j(\sigma(t))|^2 & \beta'(|w_j(\sigma(t))|^2)w_j^2(\sigma(t)) \\ -\beta'(|w_j(\sigma(t))|^2)\bar{w}_j^2(\sigma(t)) & -\beta(|w_j(\sigma(t))|^2)-\beta'(|w_j(\sigma(t))|^2)|w_j(\sigma(t))|^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$H_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\triangle & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2}\triangle \end{pmatrix}$$

and the right-hand side F depends on $\dot{\sigma}$, w, and nonlinearly on Z. For a given admissible path $\sigma(t)$ we shall introduce the reference Hamiltonian $H(t,\sigma)$

$$(2.20)\qquad H(t,\sigma) = H_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{k}\begin{pmatrix} \beta(|w_j(\sigma)|^2)+\beta'(|w_j(\sigma)|^2)|w_j(\sigma)|^2 & \beta'(|w_j(\sigma)|^2)w_j^2(\sigma) \\ -\beta'(|w_j(\sigma)|^2)\bar{w}_j^2(\sigma) & -\beta(|w_j(\sigma)|^2)-\beta'(|w_j(\sigma)|^2)|w_j(\sigma)|^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\sigma = (\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_k)$, $\sigma_j = (v_j, D_j, \gamma_j, \alpha_j)$ is a constant vector determined by the curve $\sigma(t)$, see (3.7) and (3.8) below. We refer to Hamiltonians of the form (2.20) as matrix charge transfer Hamiltonians. They are discussed in more detail in Section 11, as well as in [RSS]. Recall that $w_j(\sigma)$ denotes the soliton moving along the straight line determined by the constant parameters σ_j. The proof of our nonlinear scattering theorem, see Theorem 2.2 below, relies on the dispersive estimates for matrix charge transfer Hamiltonians that were obtained in [RSS], see also Section 11 below. For these estimates to hold, one needs to impose certain spectral conditions on the stationary Hamiltonians

$$(2.21)\qquad H_j(\sigma) := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\triangle - \frac{\alpha^2}{2} + \beta(\phi_j(\sigma)^2)+\beta'(\phi_j(\sigma)^2)\phi_j(\sigma)^2 & \beta'(\phi_j(\sigma)^2)\phi_j^2(\sigma) \\ -\beta'(\phi_j(\sigma)^2)\phi_j^2(\sigma) & -\frac{1}{2}\triangle + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} - \beta(\phi_j(\sigma)^2)-\beta'(\phi_j(\sigma)^2)\phi_j(\sigma)^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\phi_j(\sigma) = \phi(x,\alpha_j)$, see (2.6). These Hamiltonians arise from the matrix charge transfer problem by applying a Galilei transform to the j^{th} matrix potential in (2.20) so that that potential becomes stationary (strictly speaking, this also requires a modulation which leads to the spectral shift in (2.21)). We impose the spectral assumption as described by the following definition.

Definition 2.1. *We say that the spectral assumption holds, provided*

- 0 *is the only point of the discrete spectrum of* $H_j(\sigma)$*,*
- *each of the* $H_j(\sigma)$ *is admissible in the sense of Definition 11.1 below and the stability condition* (11.3) *holds.*

While the second condition is known to hold generically in an appropriate sense, see Section 11, the first condition is more restrictive and not believed to hold generically. Under these conditions our main result is as follows.

Theorem 2.2. *Impose the separation and nonlinear stability conditions, see* (2.12) *and* (2.13)*, as well as the spectral assumption from above. Suppose* ψ *is the solution of* (2.1) *with initial condition* (2.2)*. Then there exists a positive* ϵ *such that for* R_0 *satisfying the smallness assumption*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{s} \|\nabla^k R_0\|_{L^1 \cap L^2} < \epsilon \tag{2.22}$$

for some integer $s > \frac{n}{2}$*, there exists an admissible path* $\sigma(t)$ *such that*

$$\Big\| \psi(t) - \sum_{j=1}^{k} w_j(t, x; \sigma_j(t)) \Big\|_\infty \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}}$$

as $t \to \infty$*. In particular, the soliton parameters* $\sigma_j(t)$ *converge to limiting values as* $t \to \infty$*.*

[describe results of Buslaev-Perelman, and Cuccagna??? Compare them to this?? Any other historical background? Is this going to be the introduction??] $\longleftarrow$

3 Reduction to the matrix charge transfer model

For the sake of simplicity we consider the case of two solitons, i.e., $k = 2$. Setting $w_1(\sigma(t)) + w_2(\sigma(t)) = w$ and $\psi = w + R$, (2.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & i\partial_t R + \frac{1}{2}\triangle R + (\beta(|w|^2) + \beta'(|w|^2)|w|^2)R + \beta'(|w|^2)w^2 \bar{R} \\ & = -(i\partial_t w + \frac{1}{2}\triangle w + \beta(|w|^2)w) + O(|w|^{p-2}|R|^2) + O(|R|^p). \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} i\partial_t w + \frac{1}{2}\triangle w + \beta(|w|^2)w \quad = \quad & -\sum_{j=1}^{2} \Big[\big(\dot{v}_j(t)\cdot x + \dot{\gamma}_j(t)\big) w_j(\sigma(t)) + ie^{i\theta_j(\sigma(t))}\nabla\phi_j(\sigma(t))\cdot \dot{D}_j(t) \\ & - ie^{i\theta_j(\sigma(t))}\partial_\alpha \phi_j(\sigma(t))\dot{\alpha}_j(t)\Big] + O(w_1 w_2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & i\partial_t R + \frac{1}{2}\triangle R + (\beta(|w|^2) + \beta'(|w|^2)|w|^2)R + \beta'(|w|^2)w^2 \bar{R} \\ = \quad & i\partial_t R + \frac{1}{2}\triangle R + \sum_{j=1}^{2}\Big[\beta(|w_j(\sigma(t))|^2) + \beta'(|w_j(\sigma(t))|^2)|w_j(\sigma(t))|^2\Big]R + \sum_{j=1}^{2}\beta'(|w_j(\sigma(t))|^2)w_j(\sigma(t))^2\bar{R} \\ & + O(w_1(\sigma(t))w_2(\sigma(t)))R. \end{aligned}$$

Rewriting the equation (3.1) as a system for $Z = (R, \bar{R})$ therefore leads to

$$i\partial_t Z + H(\sigma(t))Z \quad = \quad \dot{\Sigma} W(\sigma(t)) + O(w_1 w_2)Z + O(w_1 w_2) + O(|w|^{p-2}|Z|^2) + O(|Z|^p). \tag{3.3}$$

Here $H(\sigma(t))$ is the time-dependent matrix Hamiltonian from (2.19) and

$$\dot{\Sigma} W(\sigma(t)) = \begin{pmatrix} f \\ -\bar{f} \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.4}$$

where

$$f = \sum_{j=1}^{2} \Big[(\dot{v}_j(t) \cdot x + \dot{\gamma}_j(t)) w_j(\sigma(t)) + i e^{i\theta_j(\sigma(t))} \nabla \phi_j(\sigma(t)) \cdot \dot{D}_j(t) - i e^{i\theta_j(\sigma(t))} \partial_\alpha \phi_j(\sigma(t)) \dot{\alpha}_j(t) \Big] \tag{3.5}$$

Given the admissible curve $\sigma(t)$ we introduce the reference Hamiltonian $H(t, \sigma)$ "at infinity"

$$\begin{aligned} & H(t,\sigma) = H_0 + \\ & \sum_{j=1}^{2} \begin{pmatrix} \beta(|w_j(\sigma)|^2) + \beta'(|w_j(\sigma)|^2)|w_j(\sigma)|^2 & \beta'(|w_j(\sigma)|^2) w_j^2(\sigma) \\ -\beta'(|w_j(\sigma)|^2)\bar{w}_j^2(\sigma) & -\beta(|w_j(\sigma)|^2) - \beta'(|w_j(\sigma)|^2)|w_j(\sigma)|^2 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k)$, $\sigma_j = (v_j, D_j, \gamma_j, \alpha_j)$ is the constant vector determined by the curve $\sigma(t)$ in the following fashion:

$$v_j = v_j(\infty), \qquad D_j = D_j(\infty) - \int_0^\infty \int_s^\infty \dot{v}_j(\tau)\, d\tau\, ds, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\gamma_j = \gamma_j(\infty) + \int_0^\infty \int_s^\infty (\dot{v}_j(\tau) \cdot v_j(\tau) - \dot{\alpha}_j(\tau)\alpha_j(\tau))\, d\tau\, ds, \qquad \alpha_j = \alpha_j(\infty). \tag{3.8}$$

In view of the condition (2.17), σ is well-defined. Recall that $w_j(\sigma)$ is the soliton moving along the straight line determined by the constant parameters σ_j.

For $j = 1, \dots, k$ we introduce the Hamiltonians

$$H_j(t,\sigma) = H_0 + \begin{pmatrix} \beta(|w_j(\sigma)|^2) + \beta'(|w_j(\sigma)|^2)|w_j(\sigma)|^2 & \beta'(|w_j(\sigma)|^2) w_j^2(\sigma) \\ -\beta'(|w_j(\sigma)|^2)\bar{w}_j^2(\sigma) & -\beta(|w_j(\sigma)|^2) - \beta'(|w_j(\sigma)|^2)|w_j(\sigma)|^2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.9}$$

together with their stationary counterparts

$$\begin{aligned} & H_j(\sigma) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\triangle - \frac{\alpha^2}{2} + \beta(\phi_j(\sigma)^2) + \beta'(\phi_j(\sigma)^2)\phi_j(\sigma)^2 & \beta'(\phi_j(\sigma)^2)\phi_j^2(\sigma) \\ -\beta'(\phi_j(\sigma)^2)\phi_j^2(\sigma) & -\frac{1}{2}\triangle + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} - \beta(\phi_j(\sigma)^2) - \beta'(\phi_j(\sigma)^2)\phi_j(\sigma)^2 \end{pmatrix} \\ & (3.10) \qquad \phi_j(\sigma) = \phi(x, \alpha_j) \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma relates the evolutions corresponding to the Hamiltonians $H_j(t, \sigma)$ and $H_j(\sigma)$ by means of a modified Gallilean transformation.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $U_j(t, \sigma)$ be the solution operator of the equation*

$$\begin{aligned} & i\partial_t U_j(t,\sigma) + H_j(t,\sigma) U_j(t,\sigma) = 0, \\ & U_j(0,\sigma) = I \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

and $e^{itH_j(\sigma)}$ be the corresponding propagator for the time-independent matrix Hamiltonian $H_j(\sigma)$. Then

$$U_j(t,\sigma) = \mathcal{G}^*_{v_j,D_j}(t) \mathcal{M}_j^*(t,\sigma) e^{itH_j(\sigma)} \mathcal{M}_j(0,\sigma) \mathcal{G}_{v_j,D_j}(0) \tag{3.12}$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{v_j,D_j}(t)$ *is the diagonal matrix Galilean transformation*

$$\mathcal{G}_{v_j,D_j}(t)\begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{g}_{v_j,D_j}(t) f_1 \\ \overline{\mathfrak{g}_{v_j,D_j}(t) \bar{f}_2} \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.13}$$

and

$$\mathcal{M}_j(t,\sigma) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\frac{\alpha_j^2}{2}t - i(v_j\cdot D_j+\gamma_j)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\frac{\alpha_j^2}{2}t + i(v_j\cdot D_j+\gamma_j)} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.14}$$

Proof. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} i\dot{U}_j &= i\dot{\mathcal{G}}^*_{v_j,D_j}(t)\mathcal{M}^*_j(t)e^{itH_j(\sigma)}\mathcal{M}_j(0)\mathcal{G}_{v_j,D_j}(0) + \mathcal{G}^*_{v_j,D_j}(t) i\dot{\mathcal{M}}^*_j(t)e^{itH_j(\sigma)}\mathcal{M}_j(0)\mathcal{G}_{v_j,D_j}(0) \\ &\quad -\mathcal{G}^*_{v_j,D_j}(t)\mathcal{M}^*_j(t)H_j(\sigma)e^{itH_j(\sigma)}\mathcal{M}_j(0)\mathcal{G}_{v_j,D_j}(0). \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Clearly,

$$i\dot{\mathcal{M}}^*_j(t) = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\alpha_j^2}{2}\, e^{i\frac{\alpha_j^2}{2}t + i(v_j\cdot D_j+\gamma_j)} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\alpha_j^2}{2}\, e^{-i\frac{\alpha_j^2}{2}t - i(v_j\cdot D_j+\gamma_j)} \end{pmatrix},$$

whereas one checks that

$$i\dot{\mathcal{G}}^*_{v_j,D_j}(t)\begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix} = i\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\mathfrak{g}}^*_{v_j,D_j} f_1 \\ \overline{\dot{\mathfrak{g}}^*_{v_j,D_j} \bar{f}_2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -(v_j^2/2 - v_j\cdot p)\, \mathfrak{g}^*_{v_j,D_j} f_1 \\ (v_j^2/2 + v_j\cdot p)\, \overline{\mathfrak{g}^*_{v_j,D_j} \bar{f}_2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Finally, we need to move $H_j(\sigma)$ to the left in (3.15). We consider the differential operator separately from the matrix potential, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} H_j(t,\sigma) &= H_0 + \begin{pmatrix} U_j(x-x_j(t)) & e^{2i\theta_j(t,x)}W_j(x-x_j(t)) \\ -e^{-2i\theta_j(t,x)}W_j(x-x_j(t)) & -U_j(x-x_j(t)) \end{pmatrix} \\ H_j(\sigma) &= H_0 + \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\alpha_j^2}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\alpha_j^2}{2} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} U_j & W_j \\ -W_j & -U_j \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

where $x_j(t), \theta_j(t)$ are as in (2.5), (2.4), and $U_j = \beta(\phi_j(\sigma)^2) + \beta'(\phi_j(\sigma)^2)\phi_j(\sigma)^2$, $W_j = \beta'(\phi_j(\sigma)^2)\phi_j^2(\sigma)$. Note that, on the one hand, $\mathcal{M}_j$ commutes with all matrices in (3.16) that do not involve U_j, W_j. On the other hand, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &H_0\mathcal{G}^*_{v_j,D_j}(t)\begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix} - \mathcal{G}^*_{v_j,D_j}(t)\left[H_0 + \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\alpha_j^2}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\alpha_j^2}{2} \end{pmatrix}\right]\begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\alpha_j^2\, \mathfrak{g}^*_{v_j,D_j}(t) f_1 \\ -\frac{1}{2}\alpha_j^2\, \overline{\mathfrak{g}^*_{v_j,D_j}(t)\bar{f}_2} \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} e^{i\frac{v_j^2}{2}t}\triangle\Big(e^{ix\cdot v_j}\, e^{-iv_j\cdot(D_j+tv_j)}\, f_1(x-tv_j-D_j)\Big) - e^{i\frac{v_j^2}{2}t}\, e^{ix\cdot v_j}\, e^{-iv_j\cdot(D_j+tv_j)}\triangle f_1(x-tv_j-D_j) \\ -e^{-i\frac{v_j^2}{2}t}\triangle\Big(e^{-ix\cdot v_j}\, e^{iv_j\cdot(D_j+tv_j)}\, f_2(x-tv_j-D_j)\Big) + e^{-i\frac{v_j^2}{2}t}\, e^{-ix\cdot v_j}\, e^{iv_j\cdot(D_j+tv_j)}\triangle f_2(x-tv_j-D_j) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(v_j^2+\alpha_j^2)\, \mathfrak{g}^*_{v_j,D_j}(t) f_1 - v_j\cdot p\, \mathfrak{g}^*_{v_j,D_j}(t) f_1 \\ -\frac{1}{2}(v_j^2+\alpha_j^2)\, \overline{\mathfrak{g}^*_{v_j,D_j}(t)\bar{f}_2} - v_j\cdot p\, \overline{\mathfrak{g}^*_{v_j,D_j}(t)\bar{f}_2} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we need to deal with the matrix potentials. Write $\mathcal{M}(t) := \mathcal{M}_j(t,\sigma) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\omega(t)/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\omega(t)/2} \end{pmatrix}$ and set $\rho = t|\vec v_j|^2 + 2x\cdot\vec v_j$. Then (omitting the index j for simplicity)

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{M}(t)\mathcal{G}_{\vec v,D}(t)\begin{pmatrix} U(\cdot-\vec vt-D) & e^{2i\theta}W(\cdot-\vec vt-D) \\ -e^{-2i\theta}W(\cdot-\vec vt-D) & -U(\cdot-\vec vt-D) \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix} \\
= &\begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\omega(t)/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\omega(t)/2} \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{g}_{\vec v,D}(t)U(\cdot-\vec vt-D)f_1 + \mathfrak{g}_{\vec v,D}(t)e^{2i\theta}W(\cdot-\vec vt-D)f_2 \\ -\overline{\mathfrak{g}_{\vec v,D}(t)e^{2i\theta}W(\cdot-\vec vt-D)\overline{f_1}} - \overline{\mathfrak{g}_{\vec v,D}(t)U(\cdot-\vec vt-D)\overline{f_2}} \end{pmatrix} \\
= &\begin{pmatrix} U\mathfrak{g}_{\vec v,D}(t)(e^{-i\omega(t)/2}f_1) + We^{-i(v^2t+2x\cdot\vec v)}e^{i(2\theta(t,\cdot+t\vec v+D)-\omega)}\overline{\mathfrak{g}_{\vec v,D}(t)\overline{e^{i\omega(t)/2}f_2}} \\ -We^{i(v^2t+2x\cdot\vec v)}e^{i(\omega-2\theta(t,\cdot+t\vec v+D))}\,\mathfrak{g}_{\vec v,D}(t)(e^{-i\omega(t)/2}f_1) - U\,\overline{\mathfrak{g}_{\vec v,D}(t)\overline{e^{i\omega(t)/2}f_2}} \end{pmatrix} \\
= &\begin{pmatrix} U & e^{i(2\theta(t,\cdot+t\vec v+D)-\omega-\rho)}W \\ -e^{-i(2\theta(t,\cdot+t\vec v+D)-\omega-\rho)}W & -U \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\omega(t)/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\omega(t)/2} \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{g}_{\vec v}(t)f_1 \\ \overline{\mathfrak{g}_{\vec v,D}(t)\overline{f_2}} \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Now $2\theta(t,\cdot+t\vec v+D) - \rho - \omega = 2\vec v\cdot x + (|\vec v|^2+\alpha^2)t + 2\gamma + 2\vec v\cdot D - t|\vec v|^2 - 2x\cdot\vec v - \omega = 0$ by definition of ω, i.e., $\omega = \alpha^2 t + 2\gamma + 2\vec v\cdot D$. Adding these expressions shows that

$$i\dot U_j(t,\sigma) + H_j(t,\sigma)U_j(t,\sigma) = 0,$$

as claimed. $\square$

4 The nullspaces of $H_j(\sigma)$ and $H_j^*(\sigma)$

In view of Section 11 below (see in particular Definition 11.1 as well as (11.2)) we will need to understand the generalized eigenspaces of the stationary operators $H_j(\sigma)$ from (13.1). By our spectral assumption, see Definition 2.1 above, only generalized eigenspaces at 0 are allowed. We denote these spaces by $N_j(\sigma)$ and refer to them as nullspaces. Thus, $N_j(\sigma) = \ker\big(H_j(\sigma)^2\big)$ and by (11.2) one has the direct (but not orthogonal) decomposition

$$L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) = N_j^*(\sigma)^\perp + N_j(\sigma),$$

where $N_j^*(\sigma) = \ker\big(H_j^*(\sigma)^2\big)$. The (nonorthogonal) projection onto $N_j^*(\sigma)^\perp$ associated with this decomposition is denoted by $P_j(\sigma)$. While the evolution $e^{itH_j(\sigma)}$ is *unbounded* on L^2 as $t\to\infty$, it is known in many cases that it remains bounded on $\mathrm{Ran}(P_j(\sigma))$. In Section 11 this is referred to as the *linear stability assumption*. The following results go back to Weinstein's work on modulational stability [We1]. [give a proof of this???? other references???] $\longleftarrow$

Proposition 4.1. *Let $H_j(\sigma)$ be as in* (13.1) *then*

- *The nullspace $N_j^*(\sigma)$ of $H_j^*(\sigma)$ is given by the the following vector valued $2n+2$ functions ξ_j^m, $m =$*

$1, .., 2n+2$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\xi_j^m = \begin{pmatrix} u_j^m \\ \bar{u}_j^m \end{pmatrix}, && \\
&u_j^1 = \phi_j(\cdot;\sigma), && H_j^*(\sigma)\xi_j^1 = 0, \\
&u_j^2 = i\frac{2}{\alpha_j}\partial_\alpha \phi_j(\cdot;\sigma), && H_j^*(\sigma)\xi_j^2 = -i\xi_j^1, \\
&u_j^m = i\partial_{x_{m-2}}\phi_j(\cdot;\sigma), && H_j^*(\sigma)\xi_j^m = 0, \quad m = 3, .., n+2, \\
&u_j^m = x_{m-n-2}\phi_j(\cdot;\sigma), && H_j^*(\sigma)\xi_j^m = -2i\xi_j^{m-n}, \quad m = n+3, .., 2n+2
\end{aligned}$$

- *Let*

  $$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

  Then J is an isomorphism between the nullspaces of $H_j^*(\sigma)$ and $H_j(\sigma)$. In particular, the nullspace of $H_j(\sigma)$ has a basis $\{J\xi_j^m \mid 1 \le m \le 2n+2\}$.

- *One has the stability property*

  $$\sup_t \left\| e^{itH_j(\sigma)} P_j(\sigma) \right\|_{2\to 2} < \infty$$

  where $P_j(\sigma)$ is the projection onto $N_j^*(\sigma)^\perp$ as introduced above.

5 Estimates for the linearized problem

In (3.3) we obtained the system

(5.1)
$$i\partial_t Z + H(t,\sigma)Z = \big(H(\sigma(t)) - H(t,\sigma)\big)Z + \dot{\Sigma} W(\sigma(t)) + O(w_1 w_2)Z + O(w_1 w_2) + O(|w|^{p-2}|Z|^2) + O(|Z|^p),$$

The point of rewriting (3.3) in this form is to be able to use the dispersive estimates that were obtained in [RSS] for (perturbed) matrix charge transfer Hamiltonians, see also Sections 11. 12.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $Z(t,x)$ solve the equation*

(5.2)
$$\begin{aligned} &i\partial_t Z + H(t,\sigma)Z = F, \\ &Z(0,\cdot) = Z_0(\cdot) \end{aligned}$$

where the matrix charge transfer Hamiltonian $H(t,\sigma)$ satisfies the conditions of Definition 11.2. Assume that Z satisfies

(5.3)
$$\|(\mathrm{Id} - P_j(\sigma))\mathcal{M}_j(\sigma,t)\mathcal{G}_{v_j,D_j}(t)Z(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2} \le B(1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}}, \quad \forall j = 1,\ldots,k,$$

with some positive constant B, where $\mathcal{M}_j(\sigma,t)$ and $\mathcal{G}_{v_j,D_j}(t)$ are as in Lemma 3.1. Then Z verifies the following decay estimate

(5.4)
$$\|Z(\cdot)\|_{L^2+L^\infty} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \Big(\|Z_0\|_{L^1\cap L^2} + \|F\| + B \Big)$$

for $t>0$ with

$$\|\!|F|\!\|:=\sup_{t\geq 0}\Big[\int_0^t\|F(s)\|_{L^1}\,ds+(1+t)^{\frac{n}{2}+1}\|F(t)\|_{L^2}\Big].$$

In addition, we also have the L^2 estimate

$$\|Z(t)\|_{L^2}\lesssim\|Z_0\|_{L^1\cap L^2}+\|\!|F|\!\|+B \tag{5.5}$$

For the proof see [RSS] and Section 11 below. In particular, note that (5.3) is related to the characterization of scattering states in Definition 11.4.

In the applications the inhomogeneous term F is a nonlinear expression which depends Z. Therefore, in addition to the estimates (5.4) and (5.5) we shall need corresponding estimates for the derivatives of Z.

For an integer $s\geq 0$ we define Banach spaces $\mathcal{X}_s$ and $\mathcal{Y}_s$ of functions of (t,x)

$$\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{X}_s} = \sup_{t\geq 0}\Big(\|\psi(t,\cdot)\|_{H^s}+(1+t)^{\frac{n}{2}}\sum_{k=0}^{s}\|\nabla^k\psi(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2+L^\infty}\Big) \tag{5.6}$$

$$\|F\|_{\mathcal{Y}_s} = \sup_{t\geq 0}\sum_{k=0}^{s}\Big(\int_0^t\|\nabla^kF(\tau,\cdot)\|_{L^1}\,d\tau+(1+t)^{\frac{n}{2}+1}\|\nabla^kF(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2}\Big) \tag{5.7}$$

The generalization of the estimates of Theorem 5.1 is given by the following Theorem (see section 12, in particular Proposition 12.3, for the proof).

Theorem 5.2. *Under assumptions of Theorem 5.1 we have that for any integer $s\geq 0$*

$$\|Z\|_{\mathcal{X}_s}\lesssim\sum_{k=0}^{s}\|\nabla^kZ(0,\cdot)\|_{L^1\cap L^2}+\|F\|_{\mathcal{Y}_s}+B \tag{5.8}$$

We apply Theorem 5.2 to the equation (5.1). This will, in particular, lead to our main result, i.e., that $\|Z(t)\|_\infty\lesssim t^{-\frac{n}{2}}$ as $t\to\infty$. We need to ensure that Z is a scattering solution relative to each of the channels of the charge transfer Hamiltonian $H(t,\sigma)$, in the sense of the estimate (5.3). Analogous to Buslaev, Perelman [BP1] this will be accomplished by an appropriate choice of the path $\sigma(t)$, to be made in the following section.

6 Modulation equations

In their analysis of the stability relative to one soliton, Buslaev and Perelman [BP1], [BP2], and Cuccagna [Cu] derive the equations for $\dot\sigma$ by imposing an orthogonality condition on the perturbation Z for all times. More precisely, they make the ansatz

$$\psi=e^{i\theta(t,\sigma(t))}(w(\sigma(t))+R) \tag{6.1}$$

where $e^{i\theta(t,\sigma(t))}w(\sigma(t))$ is a single soliton evolving along a nonlinear set of parameters. The removal of the phase from the perturbation R leads to an equation which is simply the translation of the equation involving the stationary Hamiltonian (2.21) to the point $vt + D$. This in turn makes it very easy to formulate the orthogonality conditions: At time t, the function $R(\cdot + vt + D)$ in (6.1) needs to be perpendicular to all elements of the generalized eigenspaces of all $H_j(\sigma)^*$ as in (2.21), where σ is equal to the parameters $\sigma(t)$ at time t.

In the multi-soliton case the removal of the phases by means of this ansatz is not available, since distinct solitons carry distinct phases. As already indicated above, we work with the representation

$$\psi(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} w_j(t, \sigma(t)) + R,$$

which forces us to formulate the orthogonality condition in terms of a set of functions that is moving along with the solitons $w_j(t, \sigma(t))$. We now define these functions.

Definition 6.1. *Let $\sigma(t)$ be an admissible path and define $\theta_j(t, x; \sigma)$ and $x_j(t; \sigma)$ as in* (2.10) *and* (2.11). *Also, set $\phi_j(t, x; \sigma(t)) = \phi(x - x_j(t, \sigma(t)); \alpha_j(t))$. Then we let*

$$\xi_j^m(t, x; \sigma) = \begin{pmatrix} u_j^m(t, x; \sigma(t)) \\ \bar{u}_j^m(t, x; \sigma(t)) \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} u_j^1(t, x; \sigma) &= w_j(t, x; \sigma) = e^{i\theta_j(t,x;\sigma)}\, \phi_j(t, x; \sigma) \\ u_j^2(t, x; \sigma) &= \frac{2i}{\alpha_j}\, e^{i\theta_j(t,x;\sigma)}\, \partial_\alpha \phi_j(t, x; \sigma) \\ u_j^m(t, x; \sigma) &= ie^{i\theta_j(t,x;\sigma)}\, \partial_{x_{m-2}} \phi_j(t, x; \sigma) \quad \textit{for} \quad 3 \le m \le n+2 \\ u_j^m(t, x; \sigma) &= e^{i\theta_j(t,x;\sigma)}\, (x^{m-n-2} - x_j^{m-n-2}(t; \sigma))\phi_j(t, x; \sigma), \ \textit{for} \quad n+3 \le m \le 2n+2. \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

The following proposition should be thought of as a time-dependent version of Proposition 4.1. More precisely, if σ is a *fixed* set of parameters, then one can define an alternate set of vectors, $\tilde{\xi}_j^m$, say, by applying appropriate Gallilei transforms to the stationary vectors in Proposition 4.1. For example, take some ξ_j^m so that $H_j^*(\sigma)\xi_j^m = 0$. Then the corresponding $\tilde{\xi}_j^m$ satisfies

$$i\partial_t \tilde{\xi}_j^m + H_j(t, \sigma)\tilde{\xi}_j^m = 0,$$

with $H_j(t, \sigma)$ as in (3.9). Naturally, one would therefore expect that

$$i\partial_t \xi_j^m + H(\sigma(t))\xi_j^m = O(\dot{\sigma}_j) + O(e^{-ct}),$$

where $H(\sigma(t))$ is as in (2.19) (the exponentially decaying term appears because of interactions between solitons). The following proposition shows that this indeed holds, but as in [Cu] we will work with a modified set of parameters $\tilde{\sigma}_j(t) = (v_j, D_j, \alpha_j, \tilde{\gamma}_j)$ where

$$\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}_j(t) = \dot{\gamma}_j(t) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{m=1}^{n} \dot{v}_j^m(t) x_j^m(t, \sigma). \tag{6.3}$$

The point of this modification is that the $\dot\Sigma W(\sigma(t))$ term in (5.1) and (3.3) can be rewritten as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\dot\Sigma W(\sigma(t)) &= \sum_{j=1}^{k}\Big[\dot{\tilde\gamma}_j(t)J\xi_j^1(t,x;\sigma) - \frac{\alpha_j}{2}\dot\alpha_j(t)J\xi_j^2(t,x;\sigma)\Big] + \\
&\quad \sum_{j=1}^{k}\sum_{m=1}^{n}\Big[\dot D_j^m(t)J\xi_j^{m+2}(t,x;\sigma) + \frac{1}{2}\dot v_j^m(t)J\xi_j^{m+n+2}(t,x;\sigma)\Big], \qquad (6.4)
\end{aligned}
$$

where ξ_j^m are as in Definition 6.1. This is of course due to the fact that passing to $\tilde\gamma_j$ allows us to change from x to $x - x_j(t;\sigma)$ in (3.5).

Proposition 6.2. *Let $\sigma(t)$ be an admissible path and define $\xi_j^m(t,x;\sigma)$ as in Definition 6.1. Then*

$$
\begin{aligned}
i\partial_t\xi_j^1 + H_j^*(\sigma(t))\xi_j^1 &= O\big(\dot{\tilde\sigma}(|\phi_j| + |D\phi_j|)\big) \\
i\partial_t\xi_j^2 + H_j^*(\sigma(t))\xi_j^2 &= i\xi_j^1 + O\big(\dot{\tilde\sigma}(|\phi_j| + |D\phi_j| + |D^2\phi_j|)\big) \\
i\partial_t\xi_j^m + H_j^*(\sigma(t))\xi_j^m &= O\big(\dot{\tilde\sigma}(|\phi_j| + |D\phi_j| + |D^2\phi_j|)\big) \quad \text{for } \; 3 \le m \le n+2 \\
i\partial_t\xi_j^m + H_j^*(\sigma(t))\xi_j^m &= -2i\xi_j^{m-n-2} + O\big(\dot{\tilde\sigma}(|\phi_j| + |D\phi_j| + |D^2\phi_j|)\big) \; \text{for } \; n+3 \le m \le 2n+2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Here D refers to either spatial derivatives ∂_{x^ℓ} or derivatives ∂_α. Moreover, as in Definition 6.1, the function ϕ_j needs to be evaluated at $x - x_j(t;\sigma)$, $\alpha_j(t)$.

Proof. This is verified by direct differentiation of the functions in Definition 6.1. □

The following proposition collects the modulation equations for the path $\sigma(t)$ that are obtained by taking scalar products of (2.19) with the basis elements ξ_j^m from the null space of $H_j^*(\sigma)$. This will of course use (6.4).

Proposition 6.3. *Let Z satisfy the system* (3.3). *Suppose that for all $t \ge 0$,*

$$\langle Z(t), \xi_j^m(t)\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all} \;\; j, m \qquad (6.5)$$

where ξ_j^m is as in Definition 6.1. Then the path $\tilde\sigma(t) := (v_j(t), D_j(t), \tilde\gamma_j(t), \alpha_j(t))$, $j = 1, .., n$ satisfies *the following system of equations:*

$$
\begin{aligned}
-2i\dot{\alpha}_j(t)\Big\langle \phi_j(\sigma),\, \partial_\alpha\phi_j(\sigma)\Big\rangle + O(\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}\|Z(t)\|_{L^2+L^\infty}) &= \sum_{r\neq j}\Big\langle V_r(t,\sigma)Z,\, \xi_j^1(t,\cdot;\sigma)\Big\rangle + \\
&\Big\langle \Big(O(w_1w_2)Z + O(w_1w_2) + O(|w|^{p-2}|Z|^2) + O(|Z|^p)\Big),\, \xi_j^1(t,\cdot;\sigma)\Big\rangle, \\
2i\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}_j(t)\Big\langle \phi_j(\sigma),\, \partial_\alpha\phi_j(\sigma)\Big\rangle + O(\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}\|Z(t)\|_{L^2+L^\infty}) &= \sum_{r\neq j}\Big\langle V_r(t,\sigma)Z,\, \xi_j^2(t,\cdot;\sigma)\Big\rangle + \\
&\Big\langle \Big(O(w_1w_2)Z + O(w_1w_2) + O(|w|^{p-2}|Z|^2) + O(|Z|^p)\Big),\, \xi_j^2(t,\cdot;\sigma)\Big\rangle, \\
\dot{v}_j^m(t)\|\phi_j(\sigma)\|_2^2 + O(\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}\|Z(t)\|_{L^2+L^\infty}) &= \sum_{r\neq j}\Big\langle V_r(t,\sigma)Z,\, \xi_j^{m+2}(t,\cdot;\sigma)\Big\rangle + \\
&\Big\langle \Big(O(w_1w_2)Z + O(w_1w_2) + O(|w|^{p-2}|Z|^2) + O(|Z|^p)\Big),\, \xi_j^{m+2}(t,\cdot;\sigma)\Big\rangle, \\
\dot{D}_j^m(t)\|\phi_j(\sigma)\|_2^2 + O(\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}\|Z(t)\|_{L^2+L^\infty}) &= \sum_{r\neq j}\Big\langle V_r(t,\sigma)Z,\, \xi_j^{n+m+2}(t,\cdot;\sigma)\Big\rangle + \\
&\Big\langle \Big(O(w_1w_2)Z + O(w_1w_2) + O(|w|^{p-2}|Z|^2) + O(|Z|^p)\Big),\, \xi_j^{n+m+2}(t,\cdot;\sigma)\Big\rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}
$$

Proof. Differentiating (6.5) yields

$$\langle i\partial_t Z, \xi_j^m(t)\rangle = \langle Z, i\partial_t\xi_j^m(t)\rangle.$$

Taking scalar products of (3.3) thus leads to

$$\langle Z, i\partial_t\xi_j^m\rangle + \langle Z, H^*(\sigma(t))\xi_j^m\rangle = \Big\langle \dot{\Sigma}W(\sigma(t)), \xi_j^m\Big\rangle + \Big\langle O(w_1w_2)Z + O(w_1w_2) + O(|w|^{p-2}|Z|^2) + O(|Z|^p), \xi_j^m\Big\rangle.$$

In view of the explicit expressions (6.2) one has

$$
\begin{aligned}
\langle J\xi_j^2(t,\cdot;\sigma),\, \xi_j^1(t,\cdot;\sigma)\rangle &= -2i\langle\phi_j(\sigma),\, \partial_\alpha\phi_j(\sigma)\rangle \\
\langle J\xi_j^m(t,\cdot;\sigma),\, \xi_j^1(t,\cdot;\sigma)\rangle &= 0 \quad \text{for} \quad m\neq 2 \\
\langle J\xi_j^m(t,\cdot;\sigma),\, \xi_j^2(t,\cdot;\sigma)\rangle &= 0 \quad \text{for} \quad m\neq 1 \\
\langle J\xi_j^{m+2}(t,\cdot;\sigma),\, \xi_j^{m+n+2}(t,\cdot;\sigma)\rangle &= -2i\|\phi_j(\sigma)\|_2^2 \quad \text{for} \quad 3\le m\le n+2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, the proposition follows by taking inner products in (6.4). Note that the terms containing $\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}\|Z(t)\|_{L^2+L^\infty}$ appear from Proposition 6.2. $\square$

7 Bootstrap assumptions

The proof of our main theorem relies on the bootstrap assumptions on the admissible path $\sigma(t)$ and the size of the perturbation $Z(t,x) = \binom{R(t,x)}{\bar{R}(t,x)}$. in the norms of the spaces $\mathcal{X}_s$ defined in (5.6).

<u>Bootstrap assumptions</u>

There exists a small constant $\delta = \delta(\epsilon)$ dependent on the size of the initial data R_0 and the initial separation of the solitons $w_j(0, x; \sigma(0))$, see (2.12), and a sufficiently large constant C_0 such that for some integer $s > \frac{n}{2}$

$$|\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}(t)| \le \delta^2 (1+t)^{-n}, \quad \forall t \ge 0, \tag{7.1}$$

$$\|Z\|_{\mathcal{X}_s} \le \delta C_0^{-1} \tag{7.2}$$

Remark 7.1. The bootstrap assumption (7.1) together with the definition (6.3) implies that

$$|\dot{\gamma}(t)| \le \delta^2 (1+t)^{-n+1} \tag{7.3}$$

Remark 7.2. The bootsrtrap assumption (7.2) together with Lemma 9.4 implies that

$$\|Z(t)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \delta C_0^{-1} (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}}, \tag{7.4}$$

$$\|Z(t)\|_{H^s} \lesssim \delta C_0^{-1} \tag{7.5}$$

The bootstrap assumption (7.1) strengthens the notion of the admissible path. In particular, it allows us to estimate the deviation between the path $x_j(t, \sigma(t))$ corresponding to the path $\sigma(t)$ and the straight line $x_j(t, \sigma)$ determined by the constant parameter σ which was defined from $\sigma(t)$ in (3.7) and (3.8). This estimate will play an important role in our analysis.

Lemma 7.3. *Let $\sigma(t)$ be an admissible path satisfying the bootstrap assumption* (7.1) *and let σ be a constant parameter vector as in* (3.7) *and* (3.8). *Then*

$$|x_j(t) - tv_j - D_j| \lesssim \delta^2 (1+t)^{-n+2} \tag{7.6}$$

Proof. By our choice of v_j and D_j one has that

$$|x_j(t) - tv_j - D_j| \lesssim \int_t^\infty \int_s^\infty |\dot{v}_j(\tau)|\, d\tau + \int_t^\infty |\dot{D}_j(s)|\, ds$$

and the lemma follows from (7.1). ∎

We then have the following corollary. To formulate it, we need the localizing functions

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_0(x) &= \exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2}\alpha_{\min}(1+|x|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big) \\ \chi(t, x; \sigma) &= \sum_{j=1}^k \chi_0(x - x_j(t, \sigma)). \end{aligned} \tag{7.7}$$

Here $\alpha_{\min} > 0$ satisfies $\inf_{t \ge 0, 1 \le j \le k} \alpha_j(t) > \alpha_{\min}$ for any admissible path $\sigma(t)$ starting at σ_0. The exponent $\alpha_{\min}$ arises because of the decay rate of the ground state of (2.6).

Corollary 7.4. *Let $\sigma(t)$ be an admissible path satisfying the bootstrap assumption* (7.1). *With the parameters σ as in* (3.7) *and* (3.8) *one has*

$$\Big| H(t, \sigma) - H(\sigma(t)) \Big| \lesssim \delta^2 (1+t)^{2-n}\, \chi(t, x; \sigma), \tag{7.8}$$

where $H(t, \sigma)$ and $H(\sigma(t))$ are the Hamiltonians from (3.6) *and* (2.19).

Proof. The difference

$$H(t,\sigma) - H(\sigma(t))$$

is a sum of matrix valued potentials that are exponentially localized around the solitons $w_j(\sigma(t))$ or $w_j(t,\sigma)$, respectively. By the previous lemma, we can assume that the potential is localized around the union of the straight paths $x_j(t,\sigma)$. Since $v_j = v_j(\infty), \alpha_j = \alpha_j(\infty)$,

$$\Big|[H(t,\sigma) - H(\sigma(t))]\Big| \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{k} \Big| tv_j + D_j - \int_0^t v_j(s)\,ds - D_j(t)\Big| \chi_0(x - x_j(t,\sigma)) \tag{7.9}$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^{k} \Big| \frac{1}{2}\int_t^\infty \dot{v}_j(s)\cdot x\,ds - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \int_s^\infty (\dot{v}_j(s)\cdot v_j(s) - \dot{\alpha}_j(s)\alpha_j(s))\,ds + \gamma_j - \gamma_j(t)\Big| \chi_0(x - x_j(t,\sigma)). \tag{7.10}$$

The term (7.9) arises as the difference of two paths, whereas (7.10) is the difference of the phases, i.e.,

$$|e^{i\theta_j(t,x;\sigma)} - e^{i\theta_j(t,x;\sigma(t))}|.$$

In view of the definitions of D_j, γ_j from (3.7) and (3.8) one has

(7.11)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|H(t,\sigma) - H(\sigma(t))\Big| \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{k} \Big(\int_t^\infty \int_s^\infty |\dot{v}_j(\tau)|\,d\tau + \int_t^\infty |\dot{D}_j(s)|\,ds \Big) \chi_0(x - x_j(t,\sigma)) \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^{k} \Big(\int_t^\infty \int_s^\infty |\dot{v}_j(\tau)\cdot v_j(\tau) - \dot{\alpha}_j(s)\alpha_j(s)|\,d\tau\,ds + \int_t^\infty |\dot{\gamma}_j(s)|\,ds + \int_t^\infty |\dot{v}_j(s)|\,ds|x| \Big) \chi_0(x - x_j(t,\sigma)) \\
&\lesssim \delta^2 (1+t)^{2-n}\, \chi(t,x;\sigma).
\end{aligned}$$

For the final inequality one uses (7.3) and the fact that

$$|x|\chi_0(x - x_j(t,\sigma)) \lesssim t.$$

The corollary follows. $\square$

8 Solving the modulation equations

Our goal is to show that the system in Proposition 6.3 has a solution $\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}(t)$ that satisfies the bootstrap assumptions (7.1). This requires some care, as the right-hand side in Proposition 6.3 involves the perturbation Z. We will therefore first verify that the system of modulation equations is consistent with the bootstrap assumptions (7.1) and (7.2). In what follows, we will use both paths $\tilde{\sigma}(t)$ and $\sigma(t)$. By definition, see (6.3),

$$\tilde{\gamma}_j(t) = -\int_t^\infty \Big[\dot{\gamma}_j(s) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{m=1}^{n} \dot{v}_j^m(s) x_j^m(s,\sigma) \Big]\,ds.$$

The integration is well-defined provided $\tilde{\sigma}$ satisfies the bootstrap assumption. Indeed, in that case $|v_j(t)| \lesssim (1+t)^{-n}$ and since $|x_j(t)| \lesssim 1+t$, the integral is absolutely convergent. Finally, recall the property (7.3) of the derivatives.

Lemma 8.1. *Suppose the separation and nonlinear stability conditions hold, see* (2.12) *and* (2.13). *Let* $\tilde{\sigma}, Z$ *be* any *choice of functions that satisfy the bootstrap assumptions for sufficiently small* $\delta > 0$. *If the inhomogeneous terms of the system* (6.6) *are defined by means of these functions, then this system has a solution* $\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}$ *that satisfies* (7.1) *with* $\delta/2$ *for all times.*

Proof. By the nonlinear stability condition (2.13), the left-hand side of (6.6) is of the form $B_j(t)\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}_j(t)$ with an invertible matrix $B_j(t)$. The O-term is a harmless perturbation of the matrix given by the main terms on the left-hand side, provided δ is chosen sufficiently small. This easily follows from the smallness of Z given by (7.2). We need to verify that the right-hand side of (6.6) decays like $\delta^2(1+t)^{-n}$. We consider only the first equation in (6.6), the others being the same. The terms $\langle V_r(t,\sigma)Z, \xi_j^1(t,\cdot;\sigma)\rangle$ for $r \neq j$ and $w_1 w_2$ are governed by the interaction of two *different* solitons. In view of the separation condition (2.12) and the exponential localization of the solitons, we have

$$|\dot{\alpha}_j(t)| \lesssim e^{-\alpha_{\min}(L+ct)}(1 + \|Z(t)\|_{L^2+L^\infty}) + \|Z(t)\|^2_{L^2+L^\infty} + \|Z(t)\|^p_{L^2+L^\infty} \tag{8.1}$$

$$\lesssim \delta C_0^{-1}(1+t)^{-n}\left(\epsilon + \delta C_0^{-1} + \delta^{p-1}C_0^{-(p-1)}\right) \leq \left(\frac{\delta}{2}\right)^2 (1+t)^{-n} \tag{8.2}$$

where we have used the estimate (7.4), the condition (2.16), $L\alpha_{\min} \geq |\log \epsilon|$, and that $p \geq 2$. □

9 Solving the Z equation

In this section we verify the bootstrap assumptions (7.2) for the perturbation Z. This together with the already verified bootstrap estimates for $\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}$ will also lead to the existence of the function $Z(t)$ asserted in our main result. At this point we recall the imposed orthogonality conditions (6.5)

$$\langle Z(t), \xi_j^m(t)\rangle = 0 \ \text{ for all } \ j, m \tag{9.1}$$

with $\xi_j^m(t,x,\sigma)$ is as in Definition 6.1. We next rewrite the equation (3.3) for Z in the form

$$i\partial_t Z + H(t,\sigma)Z = F, \tag{9.2}$$

$$F = \big(H(t,\sigma) - H(\sigma(t))\big)Z + \dot{\Sigma}W(\sigma(t)) + O(w_1w_2)Z + O(w_1w_2) + O(|w|^{p-2}|Z|^2) + O(|Z|^p) \tag{9.3}$$

with the reference hamiltonian $H(t,\sigma)$ as defined in (3.6). To verify the bootstrap assumption (7.2) we apply the the dispersive estimate for the inhomogeneous charge transfer problem stated in Theorem 5.2. The following lemma shows that the orthogonality conditions (6.5) imply that Z is asymptotically orthogonal to the bound states of $H_j^*(\sigma)$, as required in Theorem 5.2.

Lemma 9.1. *Let* Z *be a solution of* (9.2) *satisfying the orthogonality conditions* (9.1). *Then* Z *is asymptotically orthogonal to the null spaces of the hamiltonians* $H_j^*(\sigma)$ *in the sense of* (5.3). *In fact,*

$$\|P_{N_j}(\sigma)\mathcal{G}_{v_j,D_j}(t)Z(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \delta^3(1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}-1}, \quad \forall j = 1,..,k \tag{9.4}$$

Proof. By the assumption $Z(t)$ is orthogonal to the vectors $\xi_j^m(t,x;\sigma) = \mathcal{G}^*_{v_j(t),D_j(t)}(t)\xi_j^m(\alpha_j(t))$, while (9.4) is equivalent to the estimates

$$|\langle \mathcal{G}^*_{v_j,D_j}(t)\xi_j^m(\alpha_j), Z(t)\rangle| \lesssim \delta^3(1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}-1}, \quad \forall j, m$$

Here $\xi_j^m(\alpha_j(t))$ and $\xi_j^m(\alpha)$ refers to the elements of the null spaces $N_j(\sigma(t))$ and $N_j(\sigma)$ of the respective stationary hamiltonians $H_j^*(\sigma(t))$ and $H_j^*(\sigma)$. The desired estimate would then follow from the bootstrap assumption (7.2), in particular (7.4), and the inequality

$$\|\mathcal{G}^*_{v_j,D_j}(t)\xi_j^m(\alpha_j) - \mathcal{G}^*_{v_j(t),D_j(t)}(t)\xi_j^m(\alpha_j(t))\|_{L^1} \lesssim \delta^2(1+t)^{-1} \tag{9.5}$$

The vectors ξ_j^m are composed of the functions derived from the bound state ϕ. In particular, $\xi_j^1 = \binom{\phi}{\phi}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{G}^*_{v_j,D_j}(t)\xi_j^1(\alpha_j) - \mathcal{G}^*_{v_j(t),D_j(t)}\xi_j^1(\alpha_j(t))| =& 2|e^{i(\frac12 v_j\cdot x - \frac14(|v_j|^2-\alpha_j^2)t+\gamma_j)}\phi(x-v_jt-D_j) - \\ & e^{i(\frac12 v_j(t)\cdot x - \frac14\int_0^t(|v_j(\tau)|^2-\alpha_j(\tau)^2)\,d\tau+\gamma_j(t))}\phi(x-x_j(t))| \end{aligned} \tag{9.6}$$

According to Lemma 7.3, $|x_j(t)-v_jt-D_j| \lesssim \delta^2(1+t)^{-n+2}$. Similarly, (7.10) of Corollary 7.4 gives the estimate for the difference of the phases appearing in (9.6)

$$|e^{i\theta_j(t,x;\sigma)} - e^{i\theta_j(t,x;\sigma(t))}| \lesssim \delta^2(1+t)^{-n+2}$$

The estimate (9.5) follows immediately since $n \geq 3$. $\square$

We now in the position to aplly Theorem 5.2 to establish the improved $\mathcal{X}_s$ estimates for $Z(t)$.

Lemma 9.2. *Let Z be a solution of the equation* (9.2) *satisfying the bootstrap assumption* (7.2) *with some sufficiently small constants δ and C_0^{-1}. We also assume (due to Lemma 8.1) that the admissible path $\sigma(t)$ obeys the estimate* (7.1). *Then we have the following estimate*

$$\|Z(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}_s} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}C_0^{-1} \tag{9.7}$$

Proof. Perturbation Z is a solution of the inhomogeneous charge transfer problem (9.2)

$$\begin{aligned} & i\partial_t Z + H(t,\sigma)Z = F, \\ & F := \big(H(t,\sigma) - H(\sigma(t))\big)Z + \dot\Sigma W(\sigma(t)) + O(w_1w_2)Z + O(w_1w_2) + O(|w|^{p-2}|Z|^2) + O(|Z|^p) \end{aligned} \tag{9.8}$$

Lemma 9.1 shows that Z is asymptotically orthogonal (with the constant δ^3) to the null spaces of the hamiltonians $H_j^*(\sigma)$. Therefore, Theorem 5.2 gives the estimate

$$\|Z(\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{X}_s} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^s \|\nabla^k Z_0\|_{L^1\cap L^2} + \|F\|_{\mathcal{Y}_s} + \delta^3 \tag{9.9}$$

with

$$\|F\|_{\mathcal{Y}_s} = \sup_{t\geq 0}\Big(\sum_{k=0}^s \int_0^t \|\nabla^k F(\tau,\cdot)\|_{L^1}\,d\tau + (1+t)^{\frac n2+1}\|F(t,\cdot)\|_{H^s}\Big) \tag{9.10}$$

By the assumptions on the initial data $\sum_{k=0}^s \|\nabla^k Z_0\|_{L^1\cap L^2} \leq \epsilon << \delta$. Therefore. to obtain the conclusion of Lemma 9.2 it would suffice to verify that

$$\|F\|_{\mathcal{Y}_s} \lesssim \delta^2 \tag{9.11}$$

with F defined as in (9.8). The next two sections are devoted to verifying that (9.11) holds. $\square$

9.1 Algebra estimates

In this section we establish several simple lemmas designed to ease the task of estimating the $\mathcal{Y}_s$ norm of $F = F(Z, w, \sigma)$ in terms of the $\mathcal{X}_s$ norms of Z.

We begin with the following characterization of the space $L^q + L^\infty$.

Lemma 9.3. *If function f belongs to the space $L^q + L^\infty$ for some $1 \le q < \infty$ then there exists a measurable set K and the functions f_q, f_∞ such that*

$$f = f_q + f_\infty, \tag{9.12}$$

$$f_q = \chi_K f, \qquad f_\infty = \chi_{^cK} f, \tag{9.13}$$

$$\|f_q\|_{L^2} \le \frac{3}{2}\|f\|_{L^2+L^\infty}, \qquad \|f_\infty\|_{L^\infty} \le 3\|f\|_{L^2+L^\infty} \tag{9.14}$$

In addition, the measure of the set K, $m(K) \le 1/2^q$.

Proof. Define the set

$$K = \{x : \, |f(x)| \ge 3\|f\|_{L^q+L^\infty}\}$$

Clearly,

$$\|f_\infty\|_{L^\infty} = \|\chi_{^cK} f\|_{L^\infty} \le 3\|f\|_{L^2+L^\infty}$$

Since $f \in L^q + L^\infty$ so is the the function $f_q = \chi_K f$. Moreover,

$$\|f_q\|_{L^q+L^\infty} \le \|f\|_{L^q+L^\infty} \tag{9.15}$$

According to the defintion of $L^q + L^\infty$ there exist functions h, g such that

$$\begin{aligned} &f_q = h + g, \\ &\|h\|_{L^q} \le \|f_q\|_{L^q+L^\infty}, \qquad \|g\|_{L^\infty} \le \|f_q\|_{L^q+L^\infty} \end{aligned} \tag{9.16}$$

On the support of f_q we have that $|f_q(x)| \ge 3\|f\|_{L^q+L^\infty}$. On the other hand, in view of (9.15) and (9.16), $|g(x)| \le \|f\|_{L^q+L^\infty}$. It then follows that $|h(x)| \ge 2\|f\|_{L^q+L^\infty}$. Furthemore,

$$\|h\|_{L^q} \ge 2m(K)^{\frac{1}{q}}\|f\|_{L^q+L^\infty} \ge 2\|g\|_{L^q}$$

The first inequality together with (9.15) and (9.16) implies that $m(K) \le 1/2^q$. In addition, it also follows that

$$\|f_q\|_{L^q} \le \|h\|_{L^q} + \|g\|_{L^q} \le \frac{3}{2}\|h\|_{L^q} \le \frac{3}{2}\|f\|_{L^q+L^\infty}$$

as desired. $\square$

We now formulate a version of the Sobolev estimate tailored to the use of the space $L^2 + L^\infty$.

Lemma 9.4. *Let s be a positive ninteger. Then for any nonnegative integer $k \le s$ and any $q \in [2, q_k]$, where*

$$\frac{1}{q_k} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{s-k}{n}, \qquad \text{if } k > s - \frac{n}{2} \tag{9.17}$$
$$q_k = \infty, \qquad \text{if } k < s - \frac{n}{2}$$

and $q \in [2, \infty)$ if $k = s - \frac{n}{2}$ the following estimates hold true

$$\|\nabla^k f\|_{L^q + L^\infty} \lesssim \sum_{l=0}^{s} \|\nabla^l f\|_{L^2 + L^\infty} \le (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \|f\|_{\mathcal{X}_s} \tag{9.18}$$

In particular, if $s > \frac{n}{2}$

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \|f\|_{\mathcal{X}_s} \tag{9.19}$$

Proof. By duality and density it suffices to show that

$$\|f\|_{L^1 \cap L^2} \lesssim \sum_{l=0}^{s-k} \|\nabla^l f\|_{L^1 \cap L^{q'}}$$

The L^1 estimate is trivial while the the estimate for the L^2 norm follows from the standard Sobolev embedding $W^{k-l,q'} \subset L^2$, which holds for the range of parameters (k, l, q) described in the Lemma. $\square$

Next are the estimates of the nonlinear quantities arising in (9.8) in terms of the $\mathcal{X}_s$ norm.

Lemma 9.5. *Let $\gamma(\tau)$ be a smooth function whcih obeys the estimates*

$$|\gamma^{(l)}(\tau)| \lesssim \tau^{(\frac{p-1}{2} - l)_+} \tag{9.20}$$

for some $p \ge 2 + \frac{2}{n}$ and all non-negative integer l. Here $r_+ = r$ if $r \ge 0$ and $r_+ = 0$ if $r < 0$. Then for any $s > \frac{n}{2}$ and any non-negative integer $k \le s$

$$\|\nabla^k \Big(\gamma(|f|^2) f\Big)\|_{L^1} \lesssim (1+t)^{-1} (\|f\|^p_{\mathcal{X}_s} + \|f\|^{2k+1+(p-1-2k)_+}_{\mathcal{X}_s}), \tag{9.21}$$

$$\|\nabla^k \Big(\gamma(|f|^2) f\Big)\|_{L^2} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}-1} (\|f\|^p_{\mathcal{X}_s} + \|f\|^{2k+1+(p-1-2k)_+}_{\mathcal{X}_s}) \tag{9.22}$$

In addition, if γ is a smooth function obeying (9.20) for some $p \ge 2$ and $\zeta(x)$ is an exponentially localized smooth function then for any $q \in [1, 2]$

$$\|\nabla^k \Big(\zeta\, \gamma(|f|^2) f\Big)\|_{L^q} \lesssim (1+t)^{-n} (\|f\|^p_{\mathcal{X}_s} + \|f\|^{2k+1+(p-1-2k)_+}_{\mathcal{X}_s}) \tag{9.23}$$

Remark 9.6. It will become clear from the proof below that if the function γ satisfies (9.20) for some $p > 2 + \frac{2}{n}$ then the estimate (9.21) holds with a better rate of decay in t. In particular,

$$\int_0^\infty \|\nabla^k\Big(\gamma(|f|^2)f\Big)\|_{L^1}dt \lesssim \|f\|^p_{\mathcal{X}_s} + \|f\|^{2k+1}_{\mathcal{X}_s} \tag{9.24}$$

Proof. According to the Leibnitz rule

$$\nabla^k\Big(\gamma(|f|^2)f\Big) = \sum_{l=0}^k \sum_{m_1+\ldots+m_{2l+1}=k} C_{l\vec{m}}\gamma^{(l)}(|f|^2)\nabla^{m_1}f\nabla^{m_2}f\ldots\nabla^{m_{2l+1}}f$$

with some positive integer constants $C_{l\vec{m}}$ and non-negative vectors $\vec{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_{2l+1})$. We may assume that $m_{2l+1} \geq m_{2l} \geq \ldots \geq m_1$. Define

$$q_{m_r} = (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{s - m_r}{n})^{-1} \tag{9.25}$$

for $m_r \geq s - \frac{n}{2}$ and $q_{m_r} = \infty$ otherwise. With the above definition the Sobolev embeddings $H^s \subset W^{m_r,q_{m_r}}$ and $W^{s,2} + W^{s,\infty} \subset W^{m_r,q_{m_r}} + W^{m_r,\infty}$ hold true [1] by Lemma 9.4. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\nabla^k\Big(\gamma(|f|^2)f\Big)\|_{L^1} \lesssim \|\gamma(|f|^2)|\nabla^k f|^{1-\frac{2}{n}}\|_{L^1\cap L^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}\|\nabla^k f\|^{\frac{2}{n}}_{L^2+L^\infty} + \\
&\sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{m_1+\ldots+m_{2l+1}=k} \|\gamma^{(l)}(|f|^2)\nabla^{m_1}f\ldots\nabla^{m_{2l}}f\|_{L^1\cap L^{q'_{m_{2l+1}}}}\Big(\|f\|_{L^2+L^\infty} + \|\nabla^s f\|_{L^2+L^\infty}\Big)
\end{aligned} \tag{9.26}$$

We claim for $l > 0$ that there exist 2 sets of parameters $q^1_{m_r}$ and $q^2_{m_r}$ for $r = 1, .., 2l+1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&2 \leq q^{1,2}_{m_r} \leq q_{m_r}, \qquad \forall r = 1, \ldots, 2l+1, \\
&\sum_{r=1}^{2l} \frac{1}{q^1_{m_r}} = 1, \qquad \sum_{r=1}^{2l} \frac{1}{q^2_{m_r}} = \frac{1}{q'_{m_{2l+1}}}
\end{aligned} \tag{9.27}$$

To prove the claim we let τ be the number of m_r for $r = 1, .., 2l$ such that $m_r \geq s - \frac{n}{2}$. Observe that

$$\sum_{r=1:m_r\geq s-\frac{n}{2}}^{2l} m_r \leq k - m_{2l+1}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{r=1}^{2l} \frac{1}{q_{m_r}} &\leq \frac{\tau}{2} - \frac{\tau s - k + m_{2l+1}}{n} \leq -\tau(\frac{s}{n} - \frac{1}{2}) + \frac{k - m_{2l+1}}{n} \\
&\leq -\tau(\frac{s}{n} - \frac{1}{2}) - \frac{s-k}{n} + \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{1}{q'_{m_{2l+1}}}
\end{aligned}$$

[1] In the case of $m_r = s - \frac{n}{2}$ the value of q_{m_r} can be set arbitrarily large but different from ∞. However, since it does not affect the following argument, we set $q_{m_r} = \infty$ for simplicity.

The inequality in the second line above follows since $m_{2l+1} \geq s - \frac{n}{2}$, which holds if $\tau > 0$. On the other hand

$$\sum_{r=1}^{2l} \frac{1}{2} = l \geq 1$$

and the claim immediately follows,provided that $l > 0$. Thus using the sequence $q^1_{m_r}$ to handle the L^1 norm in (9.26) and $q^2_{m_r}$ for the $L^{q'_{m_{2l+1}}}$ norm, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla^k\Big(\gamma(|f|^2)f\Big)\|_{L^1} \lesssim & \|\gamma(|f|^2)|\nabla^k f|^{1-\frac{2}{n}}\|_{L^1\cap L^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}\|\nabla^k f\|^{\frac{2}{n}}_{L^2+L^\infty}+ \\ & \sum_{l=1}^{k}\sum_{m_1+\ldots+m_{2l+1}=k}\|\gamma^{(l)}(|f|^2)\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla^{m_1}f\|_{L^{q^1_{m_1}}\cap L^{q^2_{m_1}}}\ldots\|\nabla^{m_{2l}}f\|_{L^{q^1_{m_{2l}}}\cap L^{q^2_{m_{2l}}}}\|\nabla^s f\|_{L^2+L^\infty}\end{aligned}$$

By Hölder inequality

$$\|\gamma(|f|^2)|\nabla^k f|^{1-\frac{2}{n}}\|_{L^1\cap L^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} \lesssim \|\nabla^k f\|^{1-\frac{2}{n}}_{L^2}\|f\|_{L^{(p-1)\frac{2n}{n+2}}\cap L^{2(p-1)}} \lesssim \|f\|^{p-\frac{2}{n}}_{H^s}$$

provided that $p \geq 2 + \frac{2}{n}$, which is dictated by the condition that $(p-1)\frac{2n}{n+2} \geq 2$. Finally, using the property (9.27) together with the estimate (9.20) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla^k\Big(\gamma(|f|^2)f\Big)\|_{L^1} &\lesssim \|f\|^{p-\frac{2}{n}}_{H^s}\|\nabla^k f\|^{\frac{2}{n}}_{L^2+L^\infty} + (\|f\|^{p-1}_{H^s} + \|f\|^{2k+(p-1-2k)_+}_{H^s})\|\nabla^s f\|_{L^2+L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim t^{-1}(\|f\|^p_{\mathcal{X}_s} + \|f\|^{2k+1-(p-1-2k)_+}_{\mathcal{X}_s})+\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla^k\Big(\gamma(|f|^2)f\Big)\|_{L^2} \lesssim & \|\gamma(|f|^2)\|_{L^2\cap L^\infty}\|\nabla^k f\|_{L^2+L^\infty}+ \\ & \sum_{l=1}^{k}\sum_{m_1+\ldots+m_{2l+1}=k}\|\gamma^{(l)}(|f|^2)\nabla^{m_1}f\ldots\nabla^{m_{2l}}f\|_{L^2\cap L^{\frac{2q_{m_{2l+1}}}{q_{m_{2l+1}}-2}}}\big(\|f\|_{L^2+L^\infty}+\|\nabla^s f\|_{L^2+L^\infty}\big)\end{aligned} \tag{9.28}$$

To estimate the first term in (9.28) we note that

$$\|\gamma(|f|^2\|_{L^2\cap L^\infty} \leq \|f\|^{p-1}_{L^\infty\cap L^{2(p-1)}} \leq \|f\|^{p-2}_{L^\infty}\|f\|_{L^2\cap L^\infty} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}(p-2)}\|f\|^{p-1}_{\mathcal{X}_s},$$

where the second inequality gollows from interpolating $L^{2(p-1)}$ between L^2 and L^∞ and the last inequality is a consequence of Lemma 9.4 and definition of the space $\mathcal{X}_s$. Thus

$$\|\gamma(|f|^2)\|_{L^2\cap L^\infty}\|\nabla^k f\|_{L^2+L^\infty} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}(p-1)}\|f\|^p_{\mathcal{X}_s} \tag{9.29}$$

Furthermore, using definition (9.25) we have that

$$\frac{2q_{m_{2l+1}}}{q_{m_{2l+1}}-2} = \frac{n}{s-m_{2l+1}}$$

Then

$$\|\gamma^{(l)}(|f|^2)\nabla^{m_1} f \dots \nabla^{m_{2l}} f\|_{L^2\cap L^{\frac{n}{s-m_{2l+1}}}} \lesssim \|\nabla^{m_1} f\|_{L^{q_{m_1}}+L^\infty} \times \tag{9.30}$$
$$\|\gamma^{(l)}(|f|^2)\nabla^{m_2} f \dots \nabla^{m_{2l}} f\|_{L^2\cap L^{\frac{n}{s-m_{2l+1}}}\cap L^{\frac{2q_{m_1}}{q_{m_1}-2}}\cap L^{\frac{nq_{m_1}}{q_{m_1}(s-m_{2l+1})-n}}}$$

Using the definition of q_{m_1} from (9.25) and the assumption that $m_1 \le m_{2l+1}$ we infer that the last norm reduces to the one of the space

$$L^2 \cap L^{\frac{n}{s-m_{2l+1}}}, \qquad \text{for } m_1 \le s - \frac{n}{2},$$
$$L^2 \cap L^{\frac{n}{s-m_{2l+1}+(s-m_1-\frac{n}{2})}}, \qquad \text{for } m_1 > s - \frac{n}{2}$$

We now let τ be the number of m_r for $r = 2, .., 2l$ such that $m_r \ge s - \frac{n}{2}$. Observe that since $s > \frac{n}{2}$ and $s \ge k$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{r=2}^{2l} \frac{1}{q_{m_r}} &\le \frac{\tau}{2} - \frac{s\tau - k + m_{2l+1} + m_1}{n}\\ &= -\tau\left(\frac{s}{n} - \frac{1}{2}\right) + \frac{k - m_{2l+1} - m_1}{n}\\ &\le \min\left\{\frac{s - m_{2l+1}}{n}, \frac{(s - m_{2l+1} - m_1) + s - \frac{n}{2}}{n}\right\}\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand
$$\sum_{r=2}^{2l} \frac{1}{2} = l - \frac{1}{2} \ge \frac{1}{2}$$

It therefore follows that there exist 2 sets of parameters $q^1_{m_r}$ and $q^2_{m_r}$ for $r = 1, \dots, 2l$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}&2 \le q^{1,2}_{m_r} \le q_{m_r}, \qquad \forall r = 2, \dots, 2l\\ &\sum_{r=2}^{2l} \frac{1}{q^1_{m_r}} = 2,\\ &\sum_{r=2}^{2l} \frac{1}{q^2_{m_r}} = \frac{(s - m_{2l+1} - m_1) + s - \frac{n}{2}}{n} \ \text{ or } \ \frac{s - m_{2l+1}}{n}\end{aligned} \tag{9.31}$$

In either case, with the help of Lemma 9.4, we can estimate

$$\|\gamma^{(l)}(|f|^2)\nabla^{m_2} f \dots \nabla^{m_{2l}} f\|_{L^2\cap L^{\frac{n}{s-m_{2l+1}}}\cap L^{\frac{2q_{m_1}}{q_{m_1}-2}}\cap L^{\frac{nq_{m_1}}{q_{m_1}(s-m_{2l+1})-n}}} \lesssim \|f\|^{(p-1-2l)_+ + 2l-1}_{H^s}$$

It therefore follows that the second term in (9.28) is

$$\lesssim (1+t)^{-n} \sum_{l=1}^{k} \|f\|^{(p-1-2l)_+ + 2l+1}_{\mathcal{X}_s} \tag{9.32}$$

Now combining this with (9.29), and using the condition that $p \geq 2 + \frac{2}{n}$, we infer that

$$\|\nabla^k\Big(\gamma(|f|^2)f\Big)\|_{L^2} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}-1}(\|f\|^p_{\mathcal{X}_s} + \|f\|^{2k+1+(p-1-2k)_+}_{\mathcal{X}_s})$$

The proof of (9.23) proceeds along the lines of the argument for the L^2 estimate (9.22). We first observe that since $\zeta(x)$ is an exponentially localized function, the L^q estimate for $1 \leq q \leq 2$ can be reduced to the L^2 estimate. We then note that the condition that $p \geq 2 + \frac{2}{n}$ was only used in the estimate (9.29) which now takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}\|\gamma(|f|^2)\,\zeta\|_{L^2\cap L^\infty}\|\nabla^k f\|_{L^2+L^\infty} &\lesssim \|\gamma(|f|^2)\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla^k f\|_{L^2+L^\infty}\\ &\lesssim \|f^{p-1}\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla^k f\|_{L^2+L^\infty}\\ &\lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}p}\|f\|^p_{\mathcal{X}_s}\end{aligned}$$

The remaining estimates already have the desired form (9.32).

9.2 L^1 estimates

In this section we verify that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{s}\int_0^\infty \|\nabla^k F(t,\cdot)\|_{L^1}\,dt \lesssim \delta^2$$

with F as in (9.8).

By Corollary 7.4 we have

$$\Big|H(t,\sigma) - H(\sigma(t))\Big| \lesssim \delta^2(1+t)^{2-n}\,\chi(t,x;\sigma), \tag{9.33}$$

where $\chi(t,x;\sigma)$ is a smooth cut-off function localized around the union of the paths $x_j(t,\sigma) = v_j t + D_j$. Moreover, the spatial derivatives of the above difference also satisfy the same estimates. Using the bootstrap assumptions (7.2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=0}^{s}\int_0^\infty \|\nabla^k\Big(\Big[H(\tau,\sigma)-H(\sigma(\tau))\Big]Z(\tau)\Big)\|_{L^1}\,d\tau &\lesssim \delta^2\sum_{k=0}^{s}\int_0^\infty \|\nabla^k Z(\tau)\|_{L^2+L^\infty}(1+\tau)^{2-n}\,d\tau\\ &\lesssim \delta^3 C_0^{-1}\int_0^\infty (1+t)^{2-n-\frac{n}{2}} \lesssim \delta^3\end{aligned} \tag{9.34}$$

The term $\dot\Sigma W(\sigma(t))$ obeys the pointwise bound

$$|\dot\Sigma W(\sigma(t))| \lesssim \max_j |\dot{\tilde\sigma}_j(t)|\chi(t,x;\sigma)$$

This can be easily seen from the equation (6.4) and Lemma 7.3. The same estimate also holds for the spatial derivatives of the quantity above. Thus, with the help of the already verified estimate (7.1) we infer that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{s}\int_0^\infty \|\nabla^k\Big(\dot\Sigma W(\sigma(\tau))\Big)\|_{L^1}\,d\tau \lesssim \delta^2\int_0^t (1+t)^{-n} \lesssim \delta^2 \tag{9.35}$$

The estimates for the $O(w_1w_2)Z$ and $O(w_1w_2)$ terms in (9.8) are straightforward due to the separation and the exponential localization of the solitons w_1 and w_2, e.g.

$$\sum_{k=0}^{s}\int_0^\infty \|O\Big(\nabla^k(w_1w_2)\Big)\|_{L^1} \lesssim \int_0^t e^{-\alpha_{\min}(L+\tau)}\,d\tau \le \frac{e^{-\alpha_{\min}L}}{\alpha_{\min}} \le \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha_{\min}} \le \delta^2 \tag{9.36}$$

Here we have used the separation assumption (2.12) and the condition (2.16), $\alpha_{\min}L \ge |\log\epsilon|$.

The exponential localization of the multi-soliton state w, the bootstrap assumptions (7.2) and the estimate (9.23) of Lemma 9.5 yield the estimate

$$\sum_{k=0}^{s}\int_0^\infty \|O\Big(\nabla^k(|w|^{p-2}Z^2)\Big)\|_{L^1}\,d\tau \lesssim \delta^2 C_0^{-2}\int_0^t (1+\tau)^{-n}\,d\tau \lesssim \delta^2 \tag{9.37}$$

Finally, with the help of (9.21) (more specifically using the improvement (9.24) of the Remark 9.6), we obtain

$$\sum_{k=0}^{s}\int_0^\infty \|\nabla^k(Z^p(\tau))\|_{L^1}\,d\tau \lesssim \|Z\|_{\mathcal{X}_s}^p \lesssim \delta^p \tag{9.38}$$

9.3 L^2 estimates

In this subsection we establish the estimate

$$\|F(t,\cdot)\|_{H^s} \lesssim \delta^2(1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}-1}$$

The arguments follows closely those of the previous section. Using the estimates (9.33), (9.23) and the bootstrap assumptions (7.2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Big(H(\tau,\sigma)-H(\sigma(\tau))\Big)Z(t)\|_{H^s} &\lesssim \delta^2(1+t)^{2-n}\sum_{k=0}^{s}\|\nabla^k Z(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2+L^\infty}\\ &\lesssim \delta^3(1+t)^{2-n-\frac{n}{2}} \lesssim \delta^3(1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}-1}\end{aligned} \tag{9.39}$$

where the last inequality follows since $n\ge 3$. Similar to (9.35)

$$\|\dot\Sigma W(\sigma(t))\|_{H^s} \lesssim \delta^2(1+t)^{-n} \lesssim \delta^2(1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}-1} \tag{9.40}$$

The estimates for the $O(w_1w_2)Z$ and $O(w_1w_2)$ terms again follow from the separation and the exponential localization of the solitons w_1 and w_2,

$$\|O(w_1w_2)\|_{H^s} \lesssim e^{-\alpha_{\min}(L+t)} \lesssim \delta^2(1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}-1} \tag{9.41}$$

The exponential localization of the multi-soliton state w together with the estimate (9.23) of Lemma 9.5 and the bootstrap assumption (7.2), also give the estimate

$$\|O(|w|^{p-2}Z^2)\|_{H^s} \lesssim \delta^2(1+t)^{-n} \lesssim \delta^2(1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}-1} \tag{9.42}$$

Finally, using the estimate (9.22) of Lemma 9.5, we obtain

$$\|Z^p(t)\|_{H^s} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}-1}\|Z\|_{\mathcal{X}_s}^p \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}-1}\delta^p \tag{9.43}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 9.2.

□

10 Existence

In Lemmas 8.1 and 9.2 we establsihed the estimates

$$|\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}| \le \frac{1}{2}\delta^2(1+t)^{-n} \tag{10.1}$$

for the admissible path $\sigma(t)$ and

$$\|Z\|_{\mathcal{X}_s} \le \delta^2 \tag{10.2}$$

for the solution $Z(t,x)$ of the noninear inhomogeneous matrix charge transfer problem (9.2), under the bootstrap assumptions (7.1), (7.2)

$$|\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}| \le \frac{1}{2}\delta^2(1+t)^{-n}, \tag{10.3}$$

$$\|Z\|_{\mathcal{X}_s} \le \delta C_0^{-1} \tag{10.4}$$

and the condition that Z is asymptotically orthogonal to the null spaces of the hamiltonians $H_j^*(\sigma)$ with the constant δ^2. In this section we shall show that these are sufficient to establish the existence of the desired admissible path and the perturbation R. We prove existence by iteration. We shall define a sequence of admissble paths $\sigma^{(n)}(t)$ and approximate solutions $Z^{(n)}(t)$ for $n = 1, \dots$ according to the following rules. Set

$$\sigma^{(1)}(t) = \sigma(0)$$

to be the constant path coinciding with the initial data $\sigma(0)$ common to all admissible paths. We now define functions $Z^1(t,x)$ and $\sigma^2(t)$ to be a solution of the following *linear* system

$$\begin{aligned}
&i\partial_t Z^{(1)} + H(t,\sigma^{(1)})Z^{(1)} = \dot{\Sigma}^{(2)} W(\sigma^{(1)}(t)) + O(w_1^{(1)} w_2^{(1)}),\\
&Z^{(1)}(0,x) = Z_0(x),\\
&\left\langle \dot{\Sigma}^{(2)} W(\sigma^{(1)}(t)), \xi_j^m \right\rangle = \left\langle O(w_1^{(n-1)} w_2^{(n-1)}), \xi_j^m \right\rangle + O(\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1)} \xi_j^m Z^{(1)}).
\end{aligned}$$

In other words, in the nonlinear equation (9.2) we replace the dependence on the admissible path $\sigma(t)$ by the dependence on the already defined path $\sigma^{(1)}(t)$ and remove the terms containing Z from the right hand side of the equation. The equation (**??**) determining $\sigma^{(2)}(t)$ essentially ensures that $\langle Z^{(1)}(t), \xi_j^m(t)\rangle = 0$.

In general, we define

$$i\partial_t Z^{(n)} + H(\sigma^{(n)}(t))Z^{(n)} = \dot{\Sigma}^{(n+1)} W(\sigma^{(n)}(t)) + O(w_1^{(n)} w_2^{(n)}) + O(w_1^{(n)} w_2^{(n)}) Z^{(n-1)} \tag{10.5}$$

$$+ O(|w^{(n)}|^{p-2} |Z^{(n-1)}|^2) + O(|Z^{(n-1)}|^p) =: F^{(n)}, \tag{10.6}$$

$$Z^{(n)}(0,x) = Z_0(x)$$

$$\left\langle \dot{\Sigma}^{(n+1)} W(\sigma^{(n)}(t)), \xi_j^m \right\rangle = \Big\langle O(w_1^{(n)} w_2^{(n)}) Z^{(n-1)} +$$

$$O(w_1^{(n)} w_2^{(n)}) + O(|w^{(n)}|^{p-2} |Z^{(n-1)}|^2) + O(|Z^{(n-1)}|^p), \xi_j^m \Big\rangle + O(\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}^{(n)}(t) \xi_j^m Z^{(n)}). \tag{10.7}$$

Leaving the issue of existence for the moment we utilize the bootstrap estimates proved in previous sections. We shall assume that σ^n and Z^{n-1} satisfy (10.3) and (10.4) to prove the estimates (10.1) and (10.2) for $\sigma^{(n+1)}$ and $Z^{(n)}$. First we estimate $\dot{\sigma}^{(n+1)}$ in terms of $Z^{(n)}$. Arguing essentially as in Lemma 8.1 we infer that the path $\sigma^{(n+1)}(t)$ satisfies the estimate

$$|\dot{\sigma}^{(n+1)}(t)| \leq \delta^2(1+t)^{-n}(\frac{1}{4} + \|Z^{(n)}(t)\|_{L^2+L^\infty})$$

Once the estimate on $\sigma^{(n+1)}(t)$ has been established we consider the $Z^{(n)}$ equation. First, by construction $Z^{(n)}$ is orthogonal to ξ_j^m (defined relative to the path $\sigma^{(n)}(t)$).

$$\|Z^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{X}_s} \lesssim \delta^2\|Z^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{X}_s} + \delta^2$$

and the desired estimates on $Z^{(n)}$ and $\sigma^{(n)}$ follow.

Therefore, we can choose a convergent subsequence of the paths $\sigma^{(k)}(t) \to \sigma(t)$ and a weekly convergent in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ subsequence $Z^{(k)} \to Z$. We multiply the equation (10.6) by a smooth compactly supported function $\zeta(x)$, integrate of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and pass to the limit usnig that on any compact set $Z^{(k)} \to Z$ strongly in $H^{s'}$ for any $s' < s$. In particular, since $s > \frac{n}{2}$, $Z^k \to Z$ pointwise. It will follow that Z is a solution of the equation

$$\begin{aligned} &i\partial_t Z + H(\sigma(t))Z = \dot{\Sigma}W(\sigma(t)) + O(w_1w_2) + O(w_1w_2)Z + O(|w|^{p-2}|Z|^2) + O(|Z|^p), \\ &Z(0,x) == Z_0(x) \end{aligned} \tag{10.8}$$

We also pass to the limit in the equation (10.7) to obtain

$$\left\langle \dot{\Sigma}W(\sigma(t)), \xi_j^m \right\rangle = \left\langle O(w_1w_2)Z + O(w_1w_2) + O(|w|^{p-2}|Z|^2) + O(|Z|^p) + O(\dot{\sigma}(t)Z), \xi_j^m \right\rangle. \tag{10.9}$$

Comparing equations (10.8) and (10.9) we conclude that

$$\langle Z(t), \xi_j^m(t)\rangle = 0$$

for all j, m. Therefore, the function $\psi = R + w_1 + w_2$ solves the original NLS and by uniqueness, say in L^2, ψ is our original solution.

To show existence of the solution $Z^{(n)}, \sigma^{(n+1)}$ of the linear system (10.6), (10.7) we first construct the solution on a small time interval. We note that the "system" (10.7) for $\dot{\sigma}^{(n+1)}$ can be resolved algebraically due to the spatial separation of the paths $\sigma_j^{(n)}(t)$. Therefore, for simplicity we can replace the system (10.6), (10.7) by the following caricature:

$$\begin{aligned} &i\partial_t z + \frac{1}{2}\triangle z = V(t,x)z + \omega(t)a(t,x), \\ &\omega(t) = \langle z, b(t,\cdot)\rangle + f(t) \end{aligned}$$

Here V, a, b, f are sufficiently smooth given functions. We eliminate $\omega(t)$ and infer that

$$i\partial_t z + \frac{1}{2}\triangle z = V(t,x)z + \langle z, b'(t,\cdot)\rangle a(t,x) + F(t,x)$$

Using the standard energy estimates we obtain that

$$\|z(t)\|_{H^s} \leq \|z_0\|_{H^s} + C_1 t \sup_{\tau \leq t} \|z(\tau)\|_{H^s} + C_2,$$

where the constants C_1 and C_2 depend on the given functions. Therefore, we can establish the existence of the solution on the time interval of size $\frac{1}{2}C_1^{-1}$ by means of the standard contraction argument. Then we can repeat this argument indefinitely thus constructing a global *classical* solution.

11 Appendix: The linearized problem

11.1 Estimates for matrix charge transfer models

In this section we recall some of the estimates from Sections 7 and 8 from our companion paper [RSS]. First, consider the case of a system with a single matrix potential:

$$i\partial_t \begin{pmatrix} \psi_1 \\ \psi_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} H+U & -W \\ W & -H-U \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_1 \\ \psi_2 \end{pmatrix} = 0 \tag{11.1}$$

with U, W real-valued and $H = \frac{1}{2}\triangle - \mu$, $\mu > 0$. We say that $A := \begin{pmatrix} H+U & -W \\ W & -H-U \end{pmatrix}$ is <u>*admissible*</u> iff the conditions of the following Definition 11.1 hold.

Definition 11.1. *Let A be as above with U, W real-valued and exponentially decaying. The operator A on* $\mathrm{Dom}(A) = H^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \times H^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset \mathcal{H} := L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *is* admissible *provided*

- $\mathrm{spec}(A) \subset \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\mathrm{spec}(A) \cap (-\mu, \mu) = \{\omega_\ell \mid 0 \leq \ell \leq M\}$*, for some $M < \infty$ where $\omega_0 = 0$ and all ω_j are distinct eigenvalues. There are no eigenvalues in* $\mathrm{spec}_{ess}(A) = (-\infty, -\mu] \cup [\mu, \infty)$.
- *For $1 \leq \ell \leq M$, $L_\ell :=$* $\ker(A - \omega_\ell)^2 = \ker(A - \omega_\ell)$*, and* $\ker(A) \subsetneq \ker(A^2) = \ker(A^3) =: L_0$*. Moreover, these spaces are finite dimensional.*
- *The ranges* $\mathrm{Ran}(A - \omega_\ell)$ *for $1 \leq \ell \leq M$ and* $\mathrm{Ran}(A^2)$ *are closed.*
- *The spaces L_ℓ are spanned by exponentially decreasing functions in $\mathcal{H}$ (say with bound $e^{-\varepsilon_0|x|}$).*
- *The points $\pm\mu$ are not resonances of A.*
- *All these assumptions hold as well for the adjoint A^*. We denote the corresponding (generalized) eigenspaces by L_ℓ^*.*

We will discuss these conditions in detail in the following subsection 11.2. It is possible to establish some of these properties by means of "abstract" methods (for example, the exponential decay of elements of generalized eigenspaces via a variant of Agmon's argument, or the closedness of $\mathrm{Ran}(A-\omega_\ell)$ from Fredholm's theory), whereas others can be reduced to statements concerning certain semi-linear elliptic operators L_+, L_-, see (11.30) (for example, that the spectrum is real or that only 0 can have a generalized eigenspace). However, we will not prove that L_+, L_- have the required properties.

[is this all we'll say about L_+, L_- ???? Hopefully not] $\longleftarrow$

Another condition that we will not deal with in this paper is the absence of imbedded eigenvalues in the essential spectrum. This property will remain an assumption.

It is shown in [RSS], Lemma 7.2 that under these conditions there is a direct sum decomposition

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{j=0}^{M} L_j + \Big(\sum_{j=0}^{M} L_j^*\Big)^{\perp} \tag{11.2}$$

and we denote by P_s the induced projection onto $\left(\sum_{j=0}^{M} L_j^*\right)^{\perp}$. In general, P_s is non-orthogonal. The letter "s" here stands for "scattering" (subspace). It is known that $\mathrm{Ran}(P_s)$ plays the role of the scattering states for the evolution e^{itA}. Indeed, the main result from Section 7 in [RSS] is that if A is admissible and the <u>linear stability condition</u>

$$\sup_t \|e^{itA} P_s\|_{2\to 2} < \infty \tag{11.3}$$

holds, and also $\|\hat{V}\|_1 < \infty$, then one has the dispersive bound

$$\|e^{itA} P_s \psi_0\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim |t|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\psi_0\|_{L^1\cap L^2}. \tag{11.4}$$

Next, we recall the notion of matrix charge transfer models from Section 8 in [RSS].

Definition 11.2. *By a* matrix charge transfer model *we mean a system*

$$\begin{aligned} & i\partial_t \vec{\psi} + \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\triangle & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2}\triangle \end{pmatrix} \vec{\psi} + \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} V_j(\cdot - \vec{v}_j t)\vec{\psi} = 0 \\ & \vec{\psi}|_{t=0} = \vec{\psi}_0, \end{aligned} \tag{11.5}$$

where $\vec{v}_j$ are distinct vectors in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and V_j are matrix potentials of the form

$$V_j(t,x) = \begin{pmatrix} U_j(x) & -e^{i\theta_j(t,x)} W_j(x) \\ e^{-i\theta_j(t,x)} W_j(x) & -U_j(x) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\theta_j(t,x) = (|\vec{v}_j|^2 + \alpha_j^2)t + 2x\cdot\vec{v}_j + \gamma_j$, $\alpha_j, \gamma_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha_j \neq 0$. Furthermore, we require that each

$$H_j = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\triangle - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_j^2 + U_j & -W_j \\ W_j & -\frac{1}{2}\triangle + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_j^2 - U_j \end{pmatrix}$$

be admissible in the sense of Definition 11.1 and that it satisfy the linear stability condition (11.3).

It is clear that the Hamiltonian in (2.20) is of this form. As in Lemma 3.1 above one now verifies the following. The Galilei transforms $\mathcal{G}_{\vec{v}} := \mathcal{G}_{\vec{v},0}$ are defined as in (3.13), i.e.,

$$\mathcal{G}_{\vec{v}}(t)\begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{g}_{\vec{v},0}(t) f_1 \\ \overline{\mathfrak{g}_{\vec{v},0}(t)\bar{f}_2} \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\mathfrak{g}_{\vec{v},0}(t) = e^{-i\frac{|\vec{v}|^2}{2}t} e^{-ix\cdot\vec{v}} e^{it\vec{v}\cdot p}$.

Lemma 11.3. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and set*

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} \frac12\triangle - \frac12\alpha^2 + U & -W \\ W & -\frac12\triangle + \frac12\alpha^2 - U \end{pmatrix}$$

with real-valued U, W. Moreover, let $\vec{v} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $\theta(t,x) = (|\vec{v}\,|^2 + \alpha^2)t + 2x\cdot\vec{v} + \gamma$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and define

$$H(t) := \begin{pmatrix} \frac12\triangle + U(\cdot - \vec{v}t) & -e^{i\theta(t,\cdot-\vec{v}t)}W(\cdot - \vec{v}t) \\ e^{-i\theta(t,\cdot-\vec{v}t)}W(\cdot - \vec{v}t) & -\frac12\triangle - U(\cdot - \vec{v}t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $\mathcal{S}(t)$, $\mathcal{S}(0) = Id$, denote the propagator of the system

$$i\partial_t\mathcal{S}(t) + H(t)\mathcal{S}(t) = 0.$$

Finally, let

$$\mathcal{M}(t) = \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\gamma}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\omega(t)/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\omega(t)/2} \end{pmatrix} \tag{11.6}$$

where $\omega(t) = \alpha^2 t + \gamma$. Then

$$\mathcal{S}(t) = \mathcal{G}_{\vec{v},0}(t)^{-1}\mathcal{M}(t)^{-1}e^{itA}\mathcal{M}(0)\mathcal{G}_{\vec{v},0}(0). \tag{11.7}$$

Proof. One has

$$i\partial_t\mathcal{M}(t)\mathcal{G}_{\vec{v}}(t)\mathcal{S}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac12\dot\omega & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac12\dot\omega \end{pmatrix}\mathcal{M}(t)\mathcal{G}_{\vec{v}}(t)\mathcal{S}(t) + \mathcal{M}(t)i\dot{\mathcal{G}}_{\vec{v}}(t)\mathcal{S}(t) - \mathcal{M}(t)\mathcal{G}_{\vec{v}}(t)H(t)\mathcal{S}(t). \tag{11.8}$$

Let $\rho(t,x) = t|\vec{v}\,|^2 + 2x\cdot\vec{v}$. One now checks the following properties by differentiation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(t)i\dot{\mathcal{G}}_{\vec{v}}(t) &= -\begin{pmatrix} \frac12|\vec{v}\,|^2 + \vec{v}\cdot\vec{p} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac12|\vec{v}\,|^2 + \vec{v}\cdot\vec{p} \end{pmatrix}\mathcal{M}(t)\mathcal{G}_{\vec{v}}(t) \\ \mathcal{M}(t)\mathcal{G}_{\vec{v}}(t)H(t) &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac12\triangle + U & -e^{i(\theta-\rho-\omega)}W \\ e^{-i(\theta-\rho-\omega)}W & -\frac12\triangle - U \end{pmatrix}\mathcal{M}(t)\mathcal{G}_{\vec{v}}(t) \\ &\quad -\begin{pmatrix} \frac12|\vec{v}\,|^2 + \vec{v}\cdot\vec{p} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac12|\vec{v}\,|^2 + \vec{v}\cdot\vec{p} \end{pmatrix}\mathcal{M}(t)\mathcal{G}_{\vec{v}}(t). \end{aligned} \tag{11.9}$$

The right-hand side of (11.9) arises as follows. First, the Galilei transform introduces a factor of $e^{-ix\cdot\vec{v}}$, which needs to be commuted with $\frac12\triangle$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac12\triangle\Big(e^{-ix\cdot\vec{v}}f\Big) &= -\frac12|\vec{v}|^2e^{-ix\cdot\vec{v}}f - e^{-ix\cdot\vec{v}}i\vec{v}\cdot\vec{\nabla}f + \frac12e^{-ix\cdot\vec{v}}\triangle f \\ &= \frac12|\vec{v}|^2e^{-ix\cdot\vec{v}}f - i\vec{v}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\Big(fe^{-ix\cdot\vec{v}}\Big) + \frac12e^{-ix\cdot\vec{v}}\triangle f \\ &= \Big(\frac12|\vec{v}|^2 + \vec{v}\cdot\vec{p}\Big)\Big(fe^{-ix\cdot\vec{v}}\Big) + \frac12e^{-ix\cdot\vec{v}}\triangle f, \end{aligned}$$

one obtains the final term on the right-hand side of (11.9). It remains to check the terms involving the potentials (for simplicity $\theta(\cdot - t\vec{v}) = \theta(t, \cdot - \vec{v}t)$):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{M}(t)\mathcal{G}_{\vec{v}}(t) \begin{pmatrix} U(\cdot - \vec{v}t) & -e^{i\theta(t,\cdot-\vec{v}t)}W(\cdot - \vec{v}t) \\ e^{-i\theta(t,\cdot-\vec{v}t)}W(\cdot - \vec{v}t) & -U(\cdot - \vec{v}t) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix} \\
= &\begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\omega(t)/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\omega(t)/2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{g}_{\vec{v}}(t)U(\cdot - \vec{v}t)f_1 - \mathfrak{g}_{\vec{v}}(t)e^{i\theta(\cdot-\vec{v}t)}W(\cdot - \vec{v}t)f_2 \\ \overline{\mathfrak{g}_{\vec{v}}(t)e^{i\theta(\cdot-\vec{v}t)}W(\cdot - \vec{v}t)\overline{f_1}} - \overline{\mathfrak{g}_{\vec{v}}(t)U(\cdot - \vec{v}t)\overline{f_2}} \end{pmatrix} \\
= &\begin{pmatrix} U\,\mathfrak{g}_{\vec{v}}(t)(e^{-i\omega(t)/2}f_1) - We^{-i(v^2t+2x\cdot\vec{v})}e^{i(\theta-\omega)}\,\overline{\mathfrak{g}_{\vec{v}}(t)\overline{e^{i\omega(t)/2}f_2}} \\ We^{i(v^2t+2x\cdot\vec{v})}e^{i(\omega-\theta)}\;\mathfrak{g}_{\vec{v}}(t)(e^{-i\omega(t)/2}f_1) - U\;\overline{\mathfrak{g}_{\vec{v}}(t)\overline{e^{i\omega(t)/2}f_2}} \end{pmatrix} \\
= &\begin{pmatrix} U & -e^{i(\theta-\omega-\rho)}W \\ e^{-i(\theta-\omega-\rho)}W & -U \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\omega(t)/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\omega(t)/2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{g}_{\vec{v}}(t)f_1 \\ \overline{\mathfrak{g}_{\vec{v}}(t)\overline{f_2}} \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed. In view of our definitions, $\theta - \rho - \omega = 0$. Since $\dot{\omega} = \alpha^2$, the lemma follows by inserting (11.9) into (11.8). $\square$

In order to prove our main dispersive estimates for such matrix charge transfer problems we need to formulate a condition which ensures that the initial condition belongs to the stable subspace. To do so, let $P_s(H_j)$ and $P_b(H_j)$ be the projectors induced by the decomposition (11.2) for the operator H_j. Abusing terminology somewhat, we refer to $\mathrm{Ran}(P_b(H_j))$ as the *bound states* of H_j.

Definition 11.4. *Let* $U(t)\vec{\psi}_0 = \vec{\psi}(t, \cdot)$ *be the solution of* (11.5). *We say that* $\vec{\psi}_0$ *is a* scattering state *relative to* H_j *if*

$$\|P_b(H_j, t)U(t)\vec{\psi}_0\|_{L^2} \to 0 \text{ as } t \to +\infty.$$

Here

$$P_b(H_j, t) := \mathcal{G}_{\vec{v}_j}(t)^{-1}\mathcal{M}_j(t)^{-1}P_b(H_j)\,\mathcal{M}_j(t)\mathcal{G}_{\vec{v}_j}(t) \tag{11.10}$$

with $\mathcal{M}_j(t) = \mathcal{M}_{\alpha_j,\gamma_j}(t)$ *as in* (11.6).

The formula (11.10) is of course motivated by (11.7). Clearly, $P_b(H_j, t)$ is the projection onto the bound states of H_j that have been translated to the position of the matrix potential $V_j(\cdot - t\vec{v}_j)$. Equivalently, one can think of it as translating the solution of (11.5) from that position to the origin, projecting onto the bound states of H_j, and then translating back.
We now formulate our decay estimate for matrix charge transfer models, see Theorem 8.6 in [RSS].

Theorem 11.5. *Consider the matrix charge transfer model as in Definition 11.2. Let* $U(t)$ *denote the propagator of the equation* (11.5). *Then for any initial data* $\vec{\psi}_0 \in L^1 \cap L^2$, *which is a scattering state relative to each* H_j *in the sense of Definition 11.4, one has the decay estimates*

$$\|U(t)\vec{\psi}_0\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \langle t\rangle^{-\frac{3}{2}}\|\vec{\psi}_0\|_{L^1\cap L^2}. \tag{11.11}$$

For technical reasons, we need the estimate (11.11) for perturbed matrix charge transfer equations, as described in the following corollary. This is discussed in Remark 8.6 in [RSS].

Corollary 11.6. *Let $\vec{\psi}$ be a solution of the equation*

$$i\partial_t \vec{\psi} + \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\triangle & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2}\triangle \end{pmatrix} \vec{\psi} + \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} V_j(\cdot - \vec{v_j}t)\vec{\psi} + V_0(t,x)\vec{\psi} = 0 \tag{11.12}$$
$$\vec{\psi}|_{t=0} = \vec{\psi}_0,$$

where everything is the same as in Definition 11.2 up to the perturbation $V_0(t,x)$ which satisfies

$$\sup_t \|V_0(t,\cdot)\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty} < \varepsilon.$$

Let $\tilde{U}(t)$ denote the propagator of the equation (11.12)*. Then for any initial data $\vec{\psi}_0 \in L^1 \cap L^2$, which is a scattering state relative to each H_j in the sense of Definition 11.4 (with $U(t)$ replaced by $\tilde{U}(t)$), one has the decay estimates*

$$\|\tilde{U}(t)\vec{\psi}_0\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \langle t\rangle^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\vec{\psi}_0\|_{L^1\cap L^2} \tag{11.13}$$

provided ε is sufficiently small.

[state the inhomogeneous estimates etc...] . $\longleftarrow$

11.2 The spectral assumptions

In order for the linear estimates to apply, we need to impose the conditions in Definition 11.1 as well as the linear stability assumption 11.3 on the operators from (2.21). The admissibility conditions of Definition 11.1 were motivated to a large extent by Buslaev and Perelman [BP1], who built on earlier work of Weinstein [We1]. We now analyse these conditions in detail. As before,

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} H+U & -W \\ W & -H-U \end{pmatrix} = B + V \tag{11.14}$$

where U, W are real-valued, $H = \frac{1}{2}\triangle - \mu$ with $\mu > 0$, and V is the matrix potential consisting of U, W. We first dispense with some general spectral properties of A.

Lemma 11.7. *Let the matrix potential V be bounded and go to zero at infinity. Then $(A-z)^{-1}$ is a meromorphic function in $\Omega := \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, -\mu] \cup [\mu, \infty)$. The poles are eigenvalues of A of finite multiplicity and* $\mathrm{Ran}(A-z)$ *is closed for all $z \in \Omega$. Finally, the complement of Ω agrees with the essential spectrum of A, i.e.,* $\mathrm{spec}_{\mathrm{ess}}(A) = (-\infty, -\mu] \cup [\mu, \infty)$*.*

Proof. Suppose that $z \in \Omega$. Then $B - z$ is invertible, and $A - z = \Big(1 + V(B-z)^{-1}\Big)(B-z)$. Since $V(B-z)^{-1}$ is analytic and compact in that region of z's, the analytic Fredholm theorem implies that $1 + V(B-z)^{-1}$ is invertible for all but a discrete set of z's in Ω. Furthermore, the poles a precisely eigenvalues of A of finite multiplicity. It is also a general property that the ranges $\mathrm{Ran}(1+V(B-z)^{-1})$ are closed. Indeed, if K is any compact operator on a Banach space, then it is well-known and also easy to see that $\mathrm{Ran}(I-K)$ is closed. Since $B-z$ has a bounded inverse for all $z \in \Omega$, this implies that $\mathrm{Ran}(A-z)$ is closed, as claimed. Conjugating by the matrix $P = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i \\ 1 & -i \end{pmatrix}$ leads to the Hamiltonians

$$\tilde{A} := P^{-1}AP = i\begin{pmatrix} 0 & H+V_1 \\ -H-V_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \tilde{B} + V, \quad \tilde{B} = i\begin{pmatrix} 0 & H \\ -H & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V = i\begin{pmatrix} 0 & V_1 \\ -V_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{11.15}$$

where $V_1 = U + W$ and $V_2 = U - W$. The system (11.15) corresponds to writing a vector in terms of real and imaginary parts, whereas (11.28) corresponds to working with the solution itself and its conjugate. By means of the matrix $J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ one can also write

$$\tilde{B} = \begin{pmatrix} H & 0 \\ 0 & H \end{pmatrix} J, \quad \tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} H+V_1 & 0 \\ 0 & H+V_2 \end{pmatrix} J.$$

Since $\tilde{B}^* = \tilde{B}$ it follows that $\mathrm{spec}(\tilde{B}) \subset \mathbb{R}$. One checks that for $\Re z \neq 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tilde{B}-z)^{-1} &= (\tilde{B}+z)\begin{pmatrix} (H^2-z^2)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (H^2-z^2)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} (H^2-z^2)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (H^2-z^2)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}(\tilde{B}+z) \qquad (11.16) \\
(\tilde{A}-z)^{-1} &= (\tilde{B}-z)^{-1} - (\tilde{B}-z)^{-1}W_1\Big[1 + W_2 J(\tilde{B}-z)^{-1}W_1\Big]^{-1} W_2 J(\tilde{B}-z)^{-1} \qquad (11.17)
\end{aligned}$$

where W_1 and W_2 are the following matrix potentials that go to zero at infinity:

$$W_1 = \begin{pmatrix} |V_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & |V_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad W_2 = \begin{pmatrix} |V_1|^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{sign}(V_1) & 0 \\ 0 & |V_2|^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{sign}(V_2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The inverse of the operator in brackets exists if $z = it$ with t large, for example. Moreover, by the assumed decay of the potential the entire operator that is being subtracted from the right-hand side is compact in that case. One is therefore in a position to apply Weyl's criterion, see Theorem XIII.14 in [RS4], whence

$$\mathrm{spec}_{\mathrm{ess}}(A) = \mathrm{spec}_{\mathrm{ess}}(\tilde{A}) = (-\infty, -\mu] \cup [\mu, \infty). \tag{11.18}$$

The identity (11.17) goes back to Grillakis [Gr]. □

Next, we need to locate possible eigenvalues of A or equivalently, $\tilde{A}$. This will not be done on the same general level, but require analysis of L_+, L_- from (11.30). But we first discuss another general property of the matrix operator A.

Lemma 11.8. *Let A be as in* (11.14) *with U, W continuous and W exponentially decaying, whereas U is only required to tend to zero. If $f \in \ker(A-E)^k$ for some $-\mu < E < \mu$ and some positive integer k, then f decays exponentially.*

Proof. We want to emphasize that the following result is "abstract" and does not rely on any special structure of the matrix potential or on any properties of L_+ or L_-. We will use a variant of Agmon's argument [Ag]. More precisely, suppose that for some $-\mu < E < \mu$, there are $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} (\triangle - \mu + U)\psi_1 - W\psi_2 &= E\psi_1 \\ W\psi_1 + (-\triangle + \mu - U)\psi_2 &= E\psi_2. \end{aligned} \tag{11.19}$$

As usual, U, W are real-valued and exponentially decaying, $\mu > 0$. Suppose $|W(x)| \lesssim e^{-b|x|}$. Then define the Agmon metrics

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_E^{\pm}(x) &= \inf_{\gamma:0\to x} L_{\mathrm{Ag}}^{\pm}(\gamma) \\ L_{\mathrm{Ag}}^{\pm}(\gamma) &= \int_0^1 \min\Big(\sqrt{(\mu \pm E - U(\gamma(t)))_+},\, b/2\Big)\|\dot\gamma(t)\|\,dt \end{aligned} \tag{11.20}$$

where $\gamma(t)$ is a C^1-curve with $t \in [0,1]$, and the infimum is to be taken over such curves that connect $0, x$. These functions satisfy

$$|\nabla \rho_E^{\pm}(x)| \le \sqrt{(\mu \pm E - U(x))_+}. \tag{11.21}$$

Moreover, one has $\rho_E^{\pm}(x) \le b|x|/2$ by construction. Now fix some small $\varepsilon > 0$ and set $\omega^{\pm}(x) := e^{2(1-\varepsilon)\rho_E^{\pm}(x)}$. Our goal is to show that

$$\int \Big[\omega^+(x)|\psi_1(x)|^2 + \omega^-(x)|\psi_2(x)|^2\Big]\,dx < \infty. \tag{11.22}$$

Not only does this exponential decay in the mean suffice for our applications (cf. Section 7 in [RSS]), but it can also be improved to pointwise decay using regularity estimates for ψ_1, ψ_2. We do not elaborate on this, see for example [Ag] and Hislop, Sigal [HiSig].

Fix R arbitrary and large. For technical reasons, we set

$$\rho_{E,R}^{\pm}(x) := \min\Big(2(1-\varepsilon)\rho_E^{\pm}(x), R\Big), \quad \omega_R^{\pm}(x) := e^{\rho_{E,R}^{\pm}(x)}.$$

Notice that (11.21) remains valid in this case, and also that $\rho_E^{\pm}(x) \le \min(b|x|/2, R)$. Furthermore, by choice of E there is a smooth functions ϕ that is equal to one for large x so that

$$\operatorname{supp}(\phi) \subset \{\mu + E - U > 0\} \cap \{\mu - E - U > 0\}.$$

It will therefore suffice to prove the following modified form of (11.22):

$$\sup_R \int \Big[\omega_R^+(x)|\psi_1(x)|^2 + \omega_R^-(x)|\psi_2(x)|^2\Big]\phi^2(x)\,dx < \infty. \tag{11.23}$$

All constants in the following argument will be independent of R. By construction, there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\delta \int \omega_R^+(x)|\psi_1(x)|^2\phi^2(x)\,dx \le \int \omega_R^+(x)(\mu+E-U(x))|\psi_1(x)|^2\phi^2(x)\,dx \tag{11.24}$$

$$= \int \omega_R^+(x)(\triangle\psi_1 - W\psi_2)(x)\bar\psi_1(x)\phi^2(x)\,dx$$

$$= -\int \nabla(\omega_R^+(x)\phi^2(x))\nabla\psi_1(x)\bar\psi_1(x)\,dx - \int \omega_R^+(x)\phi^2(x)|\nabla\psi_1(x)|^2\,dx \tag{11.25}$$

$$- \int \omega_R^+(x)W(x)\psi_1(x)\bar\psi_2(x)\phi^2(x)\,dx. \tag{11.26}$$

As far as the final term (11.26) is concerned, notice that $\sup_{x,R}|\omega_R^+(x)\phi^2(x)W(x)| \lesssim 1$ by construction, whence $|(11.26)| \lesssim \|\psi_1\|_2\|\psi_2\|_2$. Furthermore, by (11.21) and Cauchy-Schwarz, the first integral in (11.25) satisfies

$$\Big|\int \nabla(\omega_R^+(x)\phi^2(x))\nabla\psi_1(x)\bar\psi_1(x)\,dx\Big|$$

$$\le 2(1-\varepsilon)\Big(\int \omega_R^+(x)(\mu+E-U(x))\phi^2(x)|\psi_1(x)|^2\,dx\Big)^{\frac12}\Big(\int \omega_R^+(x)\phi(x)^2\,|\nabla\psi_1(x)|^2\,dx\Big)^{\frac12} \tag{11.27}$$

$$+2\Big(\int \omega_R^+(x)\phi^2(x)|\nabla\psi_1(x)|^2\,dx\Big)^{\frac12}\Big(\int \omega_R^+(x)|\nabla\phi(x)|^2\,|\psi_1(x)|^2\,dx\Big)^{\frac12}$$

Since the first integral in (11.27) is the same as that in (11.24), inserting (11.27) into (11.25) yields after some simple manipulations

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon\int \omega_R^+(x)(\mu+E-U(x))|\psi_1(x)|^2\phi^2(x)\,dx \quad &\le \quad \varepsilon^{-1}\int \omega_R^+(x)|\nabla\phi(x)|^2\,|\psi_1(x)|^2\,dx \\ &\quad - \int \omega_R^+(x)\phi(x)^2W(x)\psi_2(x)\,\bar\psi_1(x)\,dx.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\nabla\phi$ has compact support, and by our previous considerations involving ω_R^+W, the entire right-hand side is bounded independently of R, and thus also (11.24). A symmetric argument applies to the integral with ψ_2, and (11.23), (11.22) hold. This method also shows that functions belonging to generalized eigenspaces decay exponentially. Indeed, suppose $(A-E)\vec g = 0$ and $(A-E)\vec f = \vec g$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(\triangle - \mu + U)f_1 - Wf_2 \quad &= \quad Ef_1 + g_1 \\ Wf_1 + (-\triangle + \mu - U)f_2 \quad &= \quad Ef_2 + g_2\end{aligned}$$

with g_1, g_2 exponentially decaying. Decreasing the value of b in (11.20) if necessay allows one to use the same argument as before to prove (11.22) for $\vec f$. By induction, one then deals with all values of k as in the statement of the lemma. $\square$

We now need to specialize A from (11.14) to the form (2.21), i.e.,

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \frac12\triangle - \frac{\alpha^2}{2} + \beta(\phi^2) + \beta'(\phi^2)\phi^2 & \beta'(\phi^2)\phi^2 \\ -\beta'(\phi^2)\phi^2 & -\frac12\triangle + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} - \beta(\phi^2) - \beta'(\phi^2)\phi^2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{11.28}$$

As shown in Section 2, these are the stationary Hamiltonians derived from the linearization of NLS, see (2.21) and Lemma 11.3. Let $\alpha > 0$ and ϕ be a solution of

$$\frac{1}{2}\triangle\phi - \frac{\alpha^2}{2}\phi + \beta(\phi^2)\phi = 0 \tag{11.29}$$

which is positive and radially symmetric. Such a solution is known to exist and to be unique if $\beta(u) = |u|^\sigma$ provided $0 < \sigma < \frac{2}{d-2}$ and is referred to as the "ground state". In our case we will need to *assume* the existence and uniqueness of ϕ, together with several other properties.

[is that all we can say ???] ⟵

To formulate those properties, let

$$L_- := -\frac{1}{2}\triangle + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} - \beta(\phi^2), \qquad L_+ := -\frac{1}{2}\triangle + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} - \beta(\phi^2) - 2\beta'(\phi^2)\phi^2 \tag{11.30}$$

with domains $\mathrm{Dom}(L_+) = \mathrm{Dom}(L_-) = H^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ so that

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -iL_- \\ iL_+ & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{11.31}$$

with $\mathrm{Dom}(\tilde{A}) = H^2(\mathbb{R}^n)\times H^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Here $\tilde{A}$ is obtained by conjugating A with the matrix P, see (11.31). For simplicity, however, we no longer distinguish between A and $\tilde{A}$, i.e., we set $A = \tilde{A}$. The spectrum of $L_\pm$ on $[\mu,\infty)$ is purely absolutely continuous, and below $\mu = \frac{\alpha^2}{2} > 0$ there are at most a finite number of eigenvalues of finite multiplicity (by Birman-Schwinger). Clearly,

$$L_-\phi = 0, \quad L_+(\partial_j\phi) = 0,\ 1 \le j \le n, \quad L_+(\partial_\alpha\phi) = -\alpha\phi, \tag{11.32}$$

whee the final propery is formal. We now collect some crucial properties discovered by M. Weinstein.

Definition 11.9. $\boxed{\textbf{Spectral assumptions on the scalar elliptic operators } L_+ \textbf{ and } L_- :}$ *L_- has a unique positive, radial and exponentially decaying solution $\phi = \phi(\cdot;\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in (\alpha_0 - c_0, \alpha_0 + c_0)$. Moreover, ϕ is smooth in both variables and $\|\partial_\alpha\phi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\partial_\alpha^2\phi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} < \infty$. The kernels have the following explicit form:*

$$\ker(L_-) = \mathrm{span}\{\phi\} \quad \textit{and} \quad \ker(L_+) = \mathrm{span}\{\partial_j\phi \mid 1 \le j \le n\}.$$

The operator L_+ has a single negative eigenvalue E_1 with a unique ground state $\psi \ge 0$, whereas L_- is nonnegative. Furthermore, the nonlinear stability condition $\langle \partial_\alpha\phi(\cdot;\alpha), \phi(\cdot;\alpha)\rangle > 0$ holds, see (2.13).

We would like to emphasize that these properties have been shown to hold by Weinstein [We1] and [We2] in case of power nonlinearities, i.e., $\beta(u) = |u|^\sigma$, $0 < \sigma < \frac{2}{d-2}$.

[any other cases known??]. ⟵

Lemma 11.10. *Impose the spectral assumption on L_+ and L_- from Definition 11.9. Then* $\mathrm{spec}(A) \subset \mathbb{R}$*, the only eigenvalue that admits a generalized eigenspace is* 0*, and* $\mathrm{Ran}(A^2)$ *is closed.*

Proof. Consider

$$A^2 = \begin{pmatrix} T^* & 0 \\ 0 & T \end{pmatrix}, \quad T = L_+L_- \tag{11.33}$$

with domain $H^4(\mathbb{R}^n) = W^{4,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Following [BP1], we first show that any eigenvalue of T, and therefore also of $\mathrm{spec}(A^2)$ is real, and then under the assumption (2.13), that it is nonnegative. Because of (11.18), the latter then implies that $\mathrm{spec}(A)$ is real, as required in Definition 11.1. Clearly, $T\phi = 0$. Let $\psi \notin \mathrm{span}\{\phi\}$, $T\psi = E\psi$. Let $\psi = \psi_1 + c\phi$, $\psi_1 \perp \phi$. Then

$$L_-^{\frac{1}{2}} L_+ L_-^{\frac{1}{2}} L_-^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi_1 = E L_-^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi_1,$$

so that $L_-^{\frac{1}{2}}\psi_1 \neq 0$ is an eigenfunction of the symmetric operator $L_-^{\frac{1}{2}} L_+ L_-^{\frac{1}{2}}$ (with domain $H^4(\mathbb{R}^n)$), and thus E is real. Hence any eigenvalue of A can only be real or purely imaginary. Since $\phi \perp \ker(L_+)$ by our assumption concerning L_+, the function

$$g(E) := \langle (L_+ - E)^{-1}\phi, \phi\rangle$$

is well-defined on an interval of the form (E_1, E_2) for some $E_2 > 0$. Moreover,

$$g'(E) = \|(L_+ - E)^{-1}\phi\|^2 > 0$$

so that $g(E)$ is strictly increasing on the interval. Finally,

$$g(0) = -\frac{1}{\alpha}\langle \partial_\alpha \phi, \phi\rangle < 0 \tag{11.34}$$

in view of (11.32) and (2.13). Now suppose that A^2 has a negative eigenvalue. Then by the preceding, so does T, and therefore also $L_-^{\frac{1}{2}} L_+ L_-^{\frac{1}{2}}$. More precisely, the argument from before implies that there is $\chi \in \ker(L_-)^\perp$, $\chi \neq 0$, so that

$$\langle L_-^{\frac{1}{2}} L_+ L_-^{\frac{1}{2}} \chi, \chi\rangle = \langle L_+\psi, \psi\rangle < 0$$

with $\psi = L_-^{\frac{1}{2}}\chi$. Let $P_-^\perp$ denote the projection onto the orthogonal complement of $\ker(L_-) = \mathrm{span}(\phi)$. By the Rayleigh principle this implies that the self-adjoint operator $P_-^\perp L_+ P_-^\perp$ has a negative eigenvalue, say $E_3 < 0$. Thus $L_+\psi = E_3\psi + c\phi$ for some $\psi \perp \phi$. If $c = 0$, then $E_3 = E_1$ so that $\psi > 0$ as the ground state of L_+. But then $\langle \phi, \psi\rangle > 0$, which is impossible. So $c \neq 0$, and one therefore obtains

$$(L_+ - E_3)^{-1}\phi = \frac{1}{c}\psi \quad \Longrightarrow \quad g(E_3) = 0.$$

But this contradicts (11.34) by strict monotonicity of g. Thus A^2 does not have any negative eigenvalues, which implies that A does not have imaginary eigenvalues. Hence all eigenvalues of A are real, as desired.

We now turn to generalized eigenspaces. Suppose $A\psi = E\psi + \chi$, where $E \neq 0$, $(A - E)\chi = 0$ and $\chi \neq 0$. This is equivalent to saying that A has a generalized eigenspace at E. Then $\psi, \chi \in \mathrm{Dom}(A^2)$, and moreover

$$(A^2 - E^2)\chi = 0, \quad (A^2 - E^2)\psi = (A - E)\chi + 2E\chi = 2E\chi,$$

so that A^2 would have a generalized eigenspace at E, and therefore also T. Hence, suppose $T\psi = E\psi$, with $E \neq 0$, $\psi \neq 0$. If $(T-E)\chi = c\psi$ with $c \neq 0$, then

$$(L_-^{\frac12} L_+ L_-^{\frac12} - E) L_-^{\frac12}\chi_1 = cL_-^{\frac12}\psi_1 \neq 0, \qquad (L_-^{\frac12} L_+ L_-^{\frac12} - E)^2 L_-^{\frac12}\chi_1 = cL_-^{\frac12}(L_+L_- - E)\psi = 0$$

where ψ_1, χ_1 denote the projections of ψ, χ onto the orthogonal complement of ϕ. But $L_-^{\frac12}\psi_1 \neq 0$ since $E \neq 0$ and thus E would have to be a generalized eigenvalue of $L_-^{\frac12} L_+ L_-^{\frac12}$, which is impossible. So only $E = 0$ can have a generalized eigenspace. Here we used the property that $L_-^{\frac12} L_+ L_-^{\frac12}$ is self-adjoint on its domain $H^4(\mathbb{R}^n)$. While symmetry is obvious, self-adjointness on $H^4(\mathbb{R}^n)$ requires a bit more care. Suppose $\langle L_-^{\frac12} L_+ L_-^{\frac12} f, g\rangle = \langle f, h\rangle$ for all $f \in H^4(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and some fixed $g, h \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Taking $f \in \ker(L_-)$ shows that $P_-^{\perp} h = h$, i.e., that $h \in (\ker(L_-^{\frac12}))^{\perp}$. By the Fredholm alternative applied to the self-adjoint operator $L_-^{\frac12}$, one can write $h = L_-^{\frac12} h_1$ with some $h_1 \in \mathrm{Dom}(L_-^{\frac12}) = H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Note that h_1 is defined only up to an element in $\ker(L_-^{\frac12})$, i.e., $h_1 + c\phi$ has the same property for any constant c. Thus

$$\langle L_-^{\frac12} L_+ L_-^{\frac12} f, g\rangle = \langle f, L_-^{\frac12}(h_1 + c\phi)\rangle = \langle L_-^{\frac12} f, h_1 + c\phi\rangle$$

for all $f \in H^4(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Equivalently, setting $f_1 = L_-^{\frac12} f$, one has

$$\langle L_-^{\frac12} L_+ f_1, g\rangle = \langle f_1, h_1 + c\phi\rangle.$$

Note that the class of f_1 are all functions in $H^3(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $f_1 \perp \phi$. We now want to remove the latter restriction, which can be achieved by a suitable choice of c. Indeed, in order to achieve

$$\langle L_-^{\frac12} L_+ (f_1 + \lambda\phi), g\rangle = \langle f_1 + \lambda\phi, h_1 + c\phi\rangle$$

for all $f_1 \in H^3(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $f_1 \perp \phi$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ one chooses c such that

$$\langle L_-^{\frac12} L_+ \phi, g\rangle = \langle \phi, h_1 + c\phi\rangle,$$

which can be done since $\langle \phi, \phi\rangle > 0$. Renaming $h_1 + c\phi$ into h_1, one thus arrives at

$$\langle L_-^{\frac12} L_+ f_1, g\rangle = \langle f_1, h_1\rangle \quad \text{for all} \quad f_1 \in H^3(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{11.35}$$

Recall that $h = L_-^{\frac12} h_1$. One can now continue this procedure. Indeed, since (11.35) implies that $h_1 \perp \ker(L_+)$, one can write $h_1 = L_+ h_2 = L_+(h_2 + \sum_{j=1}^k c_j\psi_j)$, where $\ker(L_+) = \mathrm{span}\{\psi_j\}_{j=1}^k$ and $h_2 \in H^3(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (in fact, $\psi_j = \partial_j\phi$ by our assumption). As before, the constants $\{c_j\}$ are chosen in such a way that

$$\Big\langle L_-^{\frac12}(L_+ f_1 + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j\psi_j), g\Big\rangle = \Big\langle L_+ f_1 + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j\psi_j, h_2 + \sum_{j=1}^k c_j\psi_j\Big\rangle$$

for all λ_j. This can be done because of the invertibility of the Gram matrix of $\{\psi_j\}_{j=1}^k$. Hence

$$\langle L_-^{\frac12} f_2, g\rangle = \langle f_2, h_2\rangle \quad \text{for all} \quad f_2 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Moreover, $h = L_-^{\frac{1}{2}} L_+ h_2$ with $h_2 \in H^3(\mathbb{R}^n)$. By the self-adjointness of $L_-^{\frac{1}{2}}$ this implies that $h_2 = L_-^{\frac{1}{2}} g$. It follows that $g \in H^4(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $h = L_-^{\frac{1}{2}} L_+ L_-^{\frac{1}{2}} g$ as desired.

Finally, we show that $Ran(A^2)$ is closed. By (11.33) it suffices to show that the ranges of both $T = L_+ L_-$ and $T^* = L_- L_+$ are closed with domain $H^4(\mathbb{R}^n)$. We will first verify that these operators are closed on this domain. Indeed, they each can be written in the form $\triangle^2 + F_1 \triangle + \triangle F_2 + F_3$. Since for M large

$$\|(\triangle^2 + M + F_1\triangle + \triangle F_2 + F_3) f\|_2 \geq \|(\triangle^2 + M) f\|_2 - C\|f\|_{W^{2,2}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\|(\triangle^2 + M) f\|_2 \gtrsim \|f\|_{W^{4,2}},$$

one concludes that $T + M$, $T^* + M$ are closed, and therefore also T, T^*. Next, let P_- and P_+ be the projections onto $\ker(L_-)$ and $\ker(L_+)$, respectively. Then $L_- L_+ = L_- P_-^{\perp} L_+ P_+^{\perp}$. Now

$$P_-^{\perp} L_+ f = L_+ f - \|\phi\|^{-2} \langle L_+ f, \phi \rangle \phi = L_+ \Big(f - \|\phi\|^{-2} \langle f, L_+ \phi \rangle \tilde{\phi} \Big), \tag{11.36}$$

where we have written $\phi = L_+ \tilde{\phi}$, $\tilde{\phi} \in \ker(L_+)^{\perp} = \mathrm{Ran}(P_+^{\perp})$ by virtue of the fact that

$$\phi \in \mathrm{Ran}(L_+) = \overline{\mathrm{Ran}(L_+)} = \ker(L_+)^{\perp} = \mathrm{span}\{\partial_j \phi\}^{\perp}.$$

The last equality here is Weinstein's characterization, more precisely, our assumption on L_+. Define

$$\tilde{\phi} := P_+^{\perp} \tilde{\phi}_1, \quad Qf := f - \|\phi\|^{-2} \langle f, L_+ \phi \rangle \tilde{\phi}, \quad \tilde{Q} f := f - \|\phi\|^{-2} \langle f, P_+^{\perp} L_+ \phi \rangle \tilde{\phi}_1$$

so that (11.36) gives

$$P_-^{\perp} L_+ P_+^{\perp} = L_+ Q P_+^{\perp} = L_+ P_+^{\perp} \tilde{Q} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad L_- L_+ = L_- L_+ P_+^{\perp} \tilde{Q}.$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \|T^* f\|_2 &= \|L_- P_-^{\perp} L_+ P_+^{\perp} f\|_2 \geq c_1 \, \|P_-^{\perp} L_+ P_+^{\perp} f\|_2 \\ &= c_1 \, \|L_+ Q P_+^{\perp} f\|_2 = c_1 \, \|L_+ P_+^{\perp} \tilde{Q} f\|_2 \geq c_1 c_2 \, \|P_+^{\perp} \tilde{Q} f\|_2, \end{aligned} \tag{11.37}$$

where the existence of $c_1, c_2 > 0$ follows from the self-adjointness of L_-, L_+. Hence, if $T^* f_n = T^* P_+^{\perp} \tilde{Q} f_n \to h$ in L^2, then by (11.37) and linearity $P_+^{\perp} \tilde{Q} f_n \to g$ in L^2. Since T^* was shown to be closed, it follows that $h = T^* g$, and $\mathrm{Ran}(T^*)$ is closed. A similar argument shows that $\mathrm{Ran}(T)$ is closed. $\square$

Next, we derive the *linear stability assumption* as well as the structure of the generalized eigenspaces of A and A^* from our spectral assumptions on L_-, L_+. From the spectral assumptions in Definition 11.9 as well as

$$L_- \phi = 0, \; L_-(x_j \phi) = -\partial_j \phi, \; L_+(\partial_j \phi) = 0, \; L_+(\partial_\alpha \phi) = -\alpha \phi$$

it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\ker(A) &= \operatorname{span}\Big\{\begin{pmatrix}0\\ \phi\end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix}\partial_j\phi\\ 0\end{pmatrix} : 1\le j\le n\Big\}\\
\ker(A^*) &= \operatorname{span}\Big\{\begin{pmatrix}\phi\\ 0\end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix}0\\ \partial_j\phi\end{pmatrix} : 1\le j\le n\Big\}\\
\mathcal{N}(A) &:= \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty}\ker(A^k) \supset \operatorname{span}\Big\{\begin{pmatrix}0\\ \phi\end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix}\partial_\alpha\phi\\ 0\end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix}0\\ x_j\phi\end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix}\partial_j\phi\\ 0\end{pmatrix} : 1\le j\le n\Big\} =: \mathcal{M} \qquad (11.38)\\
\mathcal{N}(A^*) &:= \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty}\ker((A^*)^k) \supset \operatorname{span}\Big\{\begin{pmatrix}\phi\\ 0\end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix}0\\ \partial_\alpha\phi\end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix}x_j\phi\\ 0\end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix}0\\ \partial_j\phi\end{pmatrix} : 1\le j\le n\Big\} =: \mathcal{M}_*. \qquad (11.39)
\end{aligned}
$$

One of our goals is to show that equality holds in the last two relations. This is the same as the structure statement made in Proposition 4.1, but one needs to apply the matrix $P = \begin{pmatrix}1 & i\\ 1 & -i\end{pmatrix}$ to pass between these two representations.

Now suppose that $i\partial_t\vec{\psi} + A\vec{\psi} = 0$. This can be written as $\partial_t\vec{\psi} + JM\vec{\psi} = 0$ where $J = \begin{pmatrix}0 & -1\\ 1 & 0\end{pmatrix}$ and $M = \begin{pmatrix}L_+ & 0\\ 0 & L_-\end{pmatrix}$. Therefore,

$$
\frac{d}{dt}\langle\vec{\psi}, M\vec{\psi}\rangle = 2\Re\langle\partial_t\vec{\psi}, M\vec{\psi}\rangle = -2\Re\langle JM\vec{\psi}, M\vec{\psi}\rangle = 0
$$

by anti-selfadjointness of J. In other words,

$$
Q(\vec{\psi}) := \langle L_+\psi_1, \psi_1\rangle + \langle L_-\psi_2, \psi_2\rangle
$$

is constant in time if $\vec{\psi}(t) = e^{itA}\vec{\psi}(0)$ (here $\vec{\psi} = \binom{\psi_1}{\psi_2}$). Although the previous calculation calculation bascially required classical solutions, it is clear that its natural setting are $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$-solutions. In that case one needs to interpret the form $Q(\vec{\psi})$ via

$$
\begin{aligned}
\langle L_+\psi_1, \psi_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla\psi_1\|_2^2 + \frac{\alpha^2}{2}\|\psi_1\|_2^2 - \langle\beta(\phi^2)\psi_1, \psi_1\rangle\\
\langle L_-\psi_2, \psi_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla\psi_2\|_2^2 + \frac{\alpha^2}{2}\|\psi_2\|_2^2 - \langle(\beta(\phi^2) + 2\beta'(\phi^2)\phi^2)\psi_2, \psi_2\rangle. \qquad (11.40)
\end{aligned}
$$

In what follows, we will tacitly make this interpretation whenever it is needed. The following lemmas are due to Weinstein [We1].

Lemma 11.11. *Impose the spectral assumptions on L_+, L_- from Definition 11.9. Then $\langle L_+f, f\rangle \ge 0$ for all $f \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $f \perp \phi$.*

This is a special case of Lemma E.1 in [We1], and we refer the reader to that paper for the proof.

Lemma 11.12. *Impose the spectral assumptions on L_+, L_- from Definition 11.9. Then there exist constants $c = c(\alpha, \beta) > 0$ such that for all $\vec{\psi} \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$,* *1.* $\langle L_-\psi_2, \psi_2\rangle \geq c\|\psi_2\|_2^2$ *if* $\psi_2 \perp \partial_\alpha\phi$, $\psi_2 \perp \partial_j\phi$

2. $\langle L_+\psi_1, \psi_1\rangle \geq c\|\psi_1\|_2^2$ *if* $\psi_1 \perp \phi$, $\psi_1 \perp x_j\phi$.

The constant $c(\alpha, \beta)$ *can be taken to be uniform in* α *in the following sense: If* α_0 *satisfies Definition 11.9, then there exists* $\delta > 0$ *so that 1. and 2. above hold for all* $|\alpha-\alpha_0| < \delta$ *with* $c(\alpha, \beta) > \frac{1}{2}c(\alpha_0, \beta)$*.*

Proof. Consider the minimization problems

$$\inf_{f\in H^1}\langle L_- f, f\rangle \qquad \text{subject to constraints } \ \|f\|_2 = 1,\ f \perp \partial_\alpha\phi,\ f \perp \partial_j\phi \tag{11.41}$$

$$\inf_{g\in H^1}\langle L_+ g, g\rangle \qquad \text{subject to constraints } \ \|g\|_2 = 1,\ g \perp \phi,\ g \perp x_j\phi. \tag{11.42}$$

As usual, one would like to establish the existence of minimizers by means of passing to weak limits in minimizing sequences. While such sequences are bounded in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, this is not enough to guarantee strong convergence in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ because some (or all) of the L^2-mass might escape to infinity. Using the fact that the quadratic forms in question are perturbations of $\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla f\|_2^2 + \frac{\alpha^2}{2}\|f\|_2^2$ by a potential that decays at infinity, one can easily exclude that *all* the L^2-mass escapes to infinity. One then proceeds to show that the remaining piece of the limit, normalized to have L^2-norm one, is a minimizer. This, however, is a simple consequence of the nonnegativity of L_- and L_+, the latter under the constraint $f \perp \phi$, see Lemma 11.11 above. This argument is presented in all details in [We1], page 478 for the case of power nonlinearities. But the same argument also applies to the general nonlinearities considered here, and we do not write it out.

Assume therefore that f_0 is a minimizer of (11.41) with $\|f_0\|_2 = 1$, $f_0 \perp \partial_\alpha\phi$, $f_0 \perp \partial_j\phi$. Then

$$L_- f_0 = \lambda_0 f_0 + c_0\partial_\alpha\phi + \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j\partial_j\phi \tag{11.43}$$

for some Lagrange mulitpliers $\lambda_0, c_0, \ldots, c_n$. Clearly, λ_0 agrees with the minimum sought, and therefore it suffices to show that $\lambda_0 > 0$. If $\lambda_0 = 0$, then taking the scalar product of (11.43) with ϕ implies that $c_0 = 0$ (using that $\langle\partial_\alpha\phi, \phi\rangle > 0$). Taking scalar products with $x_k\phi$ shows that also $c_k = 0$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$. Thus $L_- f_0 = 0$, which would imply that $f_0 = \gamma\phi$ for some $\gamma \neq 0$. However, this is impossible because of $f_0 \perp \partial_\alpha\phi$.

Proceeding in the same manner for L_+, one arrives at the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$L_+ g_0 = \lambda_0 g_0 + c_0\phi + \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j x_j\phi.$$

As before, λ_0 is the minimum on the left-hand side of (11.42) and thus $\lambda_0 \geq 0$ by Lemma 11.11. If $\lambda_0 = 0$, then taking scalar products with $\partial_k\phi$ leads to $c_k = 0$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$. Hence $L_+ g_0 = c_0\phi$ which implies that

$$g_0 = -\frac{c_0}{\alpha}\partial_\alpha\phi + \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} b_\ell\partial_\ell\phi.$$

Taking scalar products of this line with ϕ and $x_j\phi$ shows that $c_0 = 0$ and $b_\ell = 0$ for all $1 \le \ell \le n$, respectively. But then $g_0 = 0$ which is impossible.

Since the constants $c(\alpha, \beta) > 0$ were obtained by contradiction, one has no control on their dependence on α. However, let $|\alpha - \alpha_0| < \delta$ be as in Definition 11.9. Suppose $\|f\|_2 = 1$ satisfies $f \perp \phi(\cdot, \alpha)$, $f \perp x_j\phi(\cdot, \alpha)$. Then there is

$$h \in \mathrm{span}\Big\{\phi(\cdot, \alpha),\, \phi(\cdot, \alpha_0),\, x_j\phi(\cdot, \alpha),\, x_j\phi(\cdot, \alpha_0) \;:\; 1 \le j \le n\Big\}$$

so that $f + h \perp \phi(\cdot, \alpha_0)$ and $f + h \perp x_j\phi(\cdot, \alpha_0)$. Moreover, since $\|\partial_\alpha \phi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\partial_\alpha^2 \phi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} < \infty$ one can take $\|h\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ as small as desired provided δ is chosen small enough. One can therefore use inequality 2. from this lemma at α_0 for $f + h$ to obtain a similar bound for f at α. $\square$

The following corollary proves the crucial *linear stability assumption* contingent upon the spectral assumptions on L_+, L_- from above (and thus, in particular, contingent upon the nonlinear stability assumption). Strictly speaking, the following corollary gives a stronger statement than (11.3), since the range of P_s is potentially smaller than needed for the stability to hold.

Corollary 11.13. *Impose the spectral assumptions on L_+, L_- from Definition 11.9. Then there exist constants $C = C(\alpha, \beta) < \infty$ so that for all $\vec{\psi}_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$*

$$\|e^{itA}\vec{\psi}_0\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C\|\vec{\psi}_0\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \textit{provided} \quad \vec{\psi} \in \mathcal{M}_*^\perp. \tag{11.44}$$

Here $\mathcal{M}_*$ is the A^*-invariant subspace from (11.39). *Moreover, the same bound holds for $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$-norms for any real s with s-dependent constants (and thus in particular for $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$). Analogous statements hold for e^{itA^*}. Finally, the constants $C(\alpha, \beta)$ can be taken to be uniform in α in the following sense: If α_0 satisfies Definition 11.9, then there exists $\delta > 0$ so that* (11.44) *holds for all $|\alpha - \alpha_0| < \delta$ with $C(\alpha, \beta) < 2C(\alpha_0, \beta)$.*

Proof. Let $\vec{\psi}(t) = e^{itA}\vec{\psi}_0$. By Lemma 11.12 one has

$$Q(\vec{\psi}_0) = Q(\vec{\psi}(t)) \ge c\,\|\vec{\psi}(t)\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$$

provided that $\vec{\psi}_0 \in \mathcal{M}_*^\perp$. Since clearly $Q(\vec{\psi}_0) \le C\|\vec{\psi}_0\|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ one concludes that (11.44) holds with $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ on the left-hand side. In order to pass to $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ write

$$\begin{aligned} \langle L_- f, f\rangle &= (1-\varepsilon)\langle L_- f, f\rangle + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\|\nabla f\|_2^2 + \varepsilon\frac{\alpha^2}{2}\|f\|_2^2 - \varepsilon\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \beta(\phi^2(x))|f(x)|^2\,dx \\ &\ge \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\|\nabla f\|_2^2 + c(1-\varepsilon)\|f\|_2^2 + \varepsilon(\alpha^2/2 - \|\beta\|_\infty)\|f\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \tag{11.45}$$

where the constant c in (11.45) is the one from Lemma 11.12. Taking ε small enough, one sees that the third term can be absorbed into the second. Thus the entire right-hand side of (11.45) admits the lower bound $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\|f\|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}$. The same argument applies to L_+, and (11.44) follows. The uniformity statement concerning the constants $C(\alpha, \beta)$ is an immediate consequence of the analogous statement in Lemma 11.12. To obtain (11.44) for all H^s spaces note first that

$$C_\ell^{-1}\,\|\vec{\psi}\|_{H^{2\ell}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le \|(A + iM)^\ell\vec{\psi}\|_2 \le C_\ell\,\|\vec{\psi}\|_{H^{2\ell}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \tag{11.46}$$

for all integers ℓ and sufficiently large $M = M(\ell)$. Indeed, to check the lower bound for $\ell = 1$ one can use $(A + iM)^{-1} = (B + iM)^{-1}\Big[1 + V(B + iM)^{-1}\Big]^{-1}$. The inverse of the operator in brackets exists provided M is large and it is a bounded operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Taking powers of this relation allows one to deal with all $\ell \geq 1$ (in our case V is C^∞ which is needed here). Since $\mathcal{M}_*$ is A^*-invariant and therefore $\mathcal{M}_*^\perp$ is A-invariant, inserting (11.46) into (11.44) allows one to pass to all odd integers s. The case of general s then follows by interpolation. Finally, since all arguments in this section apply equally well to A^* as A, the corollary follows. $\square$

This corollary has an important implication concerning the structure of the root spaces as required in Proposition 4.1.

Corollary 11.14. *Impose the spectral assumptions on L_+, L_- from Definition 11.9. Then equality holds in the relation concerning the root spaces* (11.38) *and* (11.39). *In particular, one has* $\ker(A^2) = \ker(A^3)$ *and* $\ker((A^*)^2) = \ker((A^*)^3)$.

Proof. Suppose $\dim(\mathcal{N}(A)) > 2n + 2$. Then there exists $\vec{\psi}_0 \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ such that $\vec{\psi}_0 \in \mathcal{M}_*^\perp$. This is because a system of $2n+2$ equations in $2n+3$ variables always has a nonzero solution. Since $\partial_\alpha\phi \not\perp \phi$ and $\partial_j\phi \not\perp x_j\phi$, one checks that $\vec{\psi}_0 \notin \ker(A)$. Therefore, $\vec{\psi}_0 \in \ker(A^k) \setminus \ker(A^{k-1})$ for some $k \geq 2$. Expanding e^{itA} into a series implies that $\|e^{itA}\vec{\psi}_0\|_2 > c\,t^{k-1}$ for some constant $c > 0$, which contradicts Corollary 11.13. Therefore, $\dim(\mathcal{N}(A)) \leq 2n + 2$. Since moreover $\phi > 0$ and $\langle \partial_\alpha\phi, \phi\rangle > 0$ imply that the $2n + 2$ vectors on the right-hand side of (11.38) are linearly independent, equality must hold as claimed. Analogously for (11.39). $\square$

Next, we need to show that resonances for A do not occur at $\pm\frac{\alpha^2}{2}$ up to finitely many choices of α. [perhaps that's too ambitious??]. $\longleftarrow$

First, we need to recall from [RSS] what is meant by a resonance in this particular case. From now on, we restrict ourselves to *odd* dimensions $n \geq 3$, since only that case was presented in [RSS]. We shall also revert to writing systems in the form

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} H & 0 \\ 0 & -H \end{pmatrix},\; A = B + V,\; V = \begin{pmatrix} U & -W \\ W & -U \end{pmatrix}$$

where U, W are real-valued and exponentially decaying and $H = \frac{1}{2}\triangle - \frac{\alpha^2}{2}$. The operator E_ε stands for multiplication with $e^{-\varepsilon\rho(x)}$ with $\rho(x) = |x|$ for large x. It is shown in [RSS], based on work of Rauch [Rau], that the weighted resolvents

$$F_\varepsilon(z) := E_\varepsilon(iB - z)^{-1}E_\varepsilon \;\text{ and }\; G_\varepsilon(z) := E_\varepsilon(iA - z)^{-1}E_\varepsilon,$$

can be continued meromorphically across the boundary of their orginal domain of definition $\Re z > 0$. See Lemmas 7.7 and Corollary 7.8 of that paper. Moreover, $F_\varepsilon(i\alpha^2/2 - i\zeta^2)$ and $F_\varepsilon(-i\alpha^2/2 + i\zeta^2)$ are analytic on $|\zeta| < \varepsilon/4$. By the analytic continuation of the resolvent identity,

$$G_\varepsilon(i\alpha^2/2 - i\zeta^2) = \Big[1 + F_\varepsilon(i\alpha^2/2 - i\zeta^2)E_\varepsilon^{-2}V\Big]^{-1}F_\varepsilon(i\alpha^2/2 - i\zeta^2). \tag{11.47}$$

The analytic Fredholm alternative applies to the operator in brackets on the region $|\zeta| < \varepsilon/4$.

[This needs to be finished; I want to argue then that no resonance at $\pm\mu$ implies that the eigenvalues can't accumulate at the edges. This has not been ruled out yet, but I had rather do this w/o bringing in absence of resonances.]. $\longleftarrow$

12 Generalized decay estimates for the charge transfer model

Consider the time-dependent matrix charge transfer problem

$$i\partial_t\vec{\psi} + H(\sigma,t)\vec{\psi} = F$$

where the matrix charge transfer Hamiltonian $H(\sigma,t)$ is of the form

$$H(\sigma,t) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\triangle & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2}\triangle \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} V_j(\cdot - \vec{v_j}t)$$

where $\vec{v}_j$ are distinct vectors in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and V_j are matrix potentials of the form

$$V_j(t,x) = \begin{pmatrix} U_j(x) & -e^{i\theta_j(t,x)}W_j(x) \\ e^{-i\theta_j(t,x)}W_j(x) & -U_j(x) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\theta_j(t,x) = (|\vec{v}_j|^2 + \alpha_j^2)t + 2x\cdot\vec{v}_j + \gamma_j$, $\alpha_j, \gamma_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha_j \neq 0$. Our goal is to extend the dispersive estimate

$$\|\vec{\psi}(t)\|_{L^2+L^\infty} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}}\Big(\|\vec{\psi}_0\|_{L^1\cap L^2} + |||F||| + B\Big) \tag{12.1}$$

with

$$|||F||| := \sup_{t\geq 0}\int_0^t \|F(\tau)\|_{L^1}\,d\tau + (1+t)^{\frac{n}{2}+1}\|F(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2} \tag{12.2}$$

to the corresponding estimates for the derivatives of $\vec{\psi}(t)$. The estimate (12.1) holds only for the solutions $\vec{\psi}(t)$ which are scattering states, i.e., for $\vec{\psi}$ obeying the a priori condition that

$$\|P_b(H_j,t)\vec{\psi}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq B(1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}}$$

for all $j = 1,..,\nu$. Our first lemma shows that the functions

$$\vec{\psi}_k(t) := \nabla^k\vec{\psi}(t), \qquad k \in Z_+$$

are scattering states as well.

Lemma 12.1. *The functions $\vec{\psi}_k(t)$ obey the estimates*

$$\|P_b(H_j,t)\vec{\psi}_k(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim C_k(1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \tag{12.3}$$

Proof. Let $\vec{\eta}(x)$ be an arbitrary C^∞ exponentially localized function. Then for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \vec{\psi}_k(t,x) \cdot \vec{\eta}(x-y)\, dx = (-1)^k \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \vec{\psi}(t,x) \nabla^k \vec{\eta}\,(x-y)\, dx \lesssim \|\vec{\psi}(t)\|_{L^2+L^\infty} \|\nabla^k \vec{\eta}\,\|_{L^1\cap L^2} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}}$$

Now recall that the projection

$$P_b(H_j,t) := \mathcal{G}_{\vec{v}_j}(t)^{-1} \mathcal{M}_j(t)^{-1} P_b(H_j)\, \mathcal{M}_j(t) \mathcal{G}_{\vec{v}_j}(t)$$

with the $P_b(H_j$ is given exlicitly

$$P_b(H_j) f = \sum_{\alpha\beta} c_{\alpha\beta} u_\alpha (f, v_\beta)$$

where $c_{\alpha\beta}$ are given constants and u_α, v_β are exponentially localized functions. The result now follows. ☐

Proposition 12.2. *The functions $\vec{\psi}_k = \nabla^k \vec{\psi}$ satisfy the $L^2 + L^\infty$ dispersive estimate*

$$\|\nabla^k \vec{\psi}(t)\|_{L^2+L^\infty} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \sum_{\ell=0}^{k} \Big(\|\nabla^\ell \vec{\psi}_0\|_{L^1\cap L^2} + |||\nabla^\ell F||| + B \Big) \tag{12.4}$$

Proof. We have already shown that $\nabla^k \psi$ is a scattering state. Moreover, differentiating the equation k times we obtain

$$i\partial_t \nabla^k \vec{\psi} + H(t,\sigma) \nabla^k \vec{\psi} = F_k := \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} G_\ell(t,x) \nabla^\ell \vec{\psi} + \nabla^k F$$

where $G_\ell(t,x)$ are smooth exponentially localized potentials uniformly bounded in time. Therefore ∇^k is a scattering state solving an inhomogeneous charge transfer problem. Using the estimate (12.1) we then have

$$\|\nabla^k \vec{\psi}(t)\|_{L^2+L^\infty} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \Big(\|\nabla^k \vec{\psi}_0\|_{L^1\cap L^2} + |||F_k(\tau)||| + B \Big) \tag{12.5}$$

We use that for any $p \in [1,2]$

$$\|G_\ell(t,x) \nabla^\ell \vec{\psi}\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|\nabla^\ell \vec{\psi}\|_{L^2+L^\infty}$$

Proceeding by induction on k we conclude that for any $\ell < k$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \|G_\ell(t,x) \nabla^\ell \vec{\psi}\|_{L^1} &\lesssim \int_0^t (1+\tau)^{-\frac{n}{2}}\, d\tau \sum_{m=0}^{\ell} \Big(\|\nabla^m \vec{\psi}_0\|_{L^1\cap L^2} + |||\nabla^m F||| \Big) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{m=0}^{\ell} (\|\nabla^m \vec{\psi}_0\|_{L^1\cap L^2} + |||\nabla^m F|||) \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$(1+t)^{\frac{n}{2}} \|G_\ell(t,x) \nabla^\ell \vec{\psi}(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \sum_{m=0}^{\ell} (\|\nabla^m \vec{\psi}_0\|_{L^1\cap L^2} + |||\nabla^m F|||)$$

The result now follows from (12.5) and the inequality

$$|||F_k(\tau)||| \le |||\nabla^k F||| + \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} |||G_\ell(t,x)\nabla^\ell \vec{\psi}|||$$

$\square$

We recall the definition of the Banach spaces $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ of functions of (t,x) from (5.6), (5.7)

$$\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{X}_s} = \sup_{t\ge 0}\Big(\|\psi(t,\cdot)\|_{H^s} + (1+t)^{\frac{n}{2}}\sum_{k=0}^{s}\|\nabla^k\psi(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2+L^\infty}\Big) \tag{12.6}$$

$$\|F\|_{\mathcal{Y}_s} = \sup_{t\ge 0}\sum_{k=0}^{s}\Big(\int_0^t \|\nabla^k F(\tau,\cdot)\|_{L^1}\,d\tau + (1+t)^{\frac{n}{2}+1}\|\nabla^k F(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2}\Big) \tag{12.7}$$

We can summarize our estimates for the charge transfer model in the following proposition.

Proposition 12.3. *Let $\vec{\psi}$ be a solution of the matrix charge transfer problem*

$$i\partial_t\vec{\psi} + H(t,\sigma)\vec{\psi} = F$$

satisfying the condition that for every $j = 1,..,\nu$

$$\|P_b(H_j(\sigma,t))\vec{\psi}\|_{L^2} \lesssim B(1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \tag{12.8}$$

Then for any integer $s\ge 0$

$$\|\vec{\psi}\|_{\mathcal{X}_s} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{s}\|\nabla^k\psi(0,\cdot)\|_{L^1\cap L^2} + \|F\|_{\mathcal{Y}_s} + B \tag{12.9}$$

13 Existence of a ground state and the nonlinear stability condition

The existence of a ground state for the problem

$$-\frac{1}{2}\triangle\phi - \beta(|\phi|^2)\phi + \frac{\alpha^2}{2}\phi = 0 \tag{13.1}$$

for $\alpha\neq 0$ had been establsihed by Berestycki and Lions under the following conditions on the function β:

1. $0 \ge \overline{\lim}_{s\to+\infty}\beta(s)s^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} \ge +\infty$
2. There exists $s_0>0$ such that $G(s_0) = \int_0^{s_0}\beta(s^2)s\,ds - \frac{\alpha^2}{4}s_0^2 > 0$

Moreover, in the case when the function $\beta(s)$ satisfies a stronger condition that

$$\lim_{s\to+\infty}\beta(s)s^{-\frac{2}{n-2}}=0 \tag{13.2}$$

a ground state can be constructed from a solution of the constrained minimization problem for the following functional:

$$J[u]=\Big\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}|\nabla u|^2\ :\ W[u]=\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}G(u)=1\Big\} \tag{13.3}$$

If w is a minimum it solves the equation

$$-\frac{1}{2}\triangle w-\lambda(\beta(w^2)w-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}w)=0$$

where the Lagrange multiplier λ is determined from the condition that $W[w]=1$. We can then find a ground state via rescaling

$$\phi(x)=w(\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}x) \tag{13.4}$$

Observe that it is possible to choose w a positive spherically symmetric function. We now consider the case of the monomial subcritical nonlinearity $\beta(s)=s^{\frac{p-1}{2}}$ with $p<\frac{n+2}{n-2}$. By the results of Coffman, McLeod-Serrin, and Kwong there exists a unique positive radial solution of the equation (13.1) for $\alpha\neq 0$. Let w denote the corresponding minimumizer of the functional J.

”Uniqueness of a minimizer”

Definition 13.1. *Given $\gamma>0$ and w the minimizer of J corresponding to the unique ground state ϕ define*

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(\gamma)=\inf\big\{\theta\ :\ &\textit{for any positive non-increasing radial function } u \textit{ with the}\\ &\textit{property that } \|u-w\|_{H^1}\geq\theta\ \textit{ we have that } J[u]\geq J[w]+\gamma\big\}\end{aligned} \tag{13.5}$$

We now make the following claim

Lemma 13.2. *Function $\theta(\gamma)\to 0$ as $\gamma\to 0$.*

Proof. We argue by contradiction. Assume that there exists a sequence $\gamma_k\to 0$, a positive constant θ, and positive radial functions u_{γ_k} such that $\|u_{\gamma_k}-w\|_{H^1}\geq\theta$ but $J[u_{\gamma_k}]<J[w]+\gamma_k$. Then the sequence $u_{\gamma_k,\theta}$ is minimizing for the functional J. This implies that

$$\|\nabla u_{\gamma_k}\|_{L^2}\to\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}$$

Using the constraint $W[u_{\gamma_k}]=1$ it is not difficult to show that the sequence u_{γ_k} is uniformly bounded in H^1, see [BL]. Thus without loss of generality we assume that $u_{\gamma_k}\to u$ weakly in H^1 for some radial non-increasing function u. Therefore, u is another minimizer of the functional J and its rescaled version is a non-increasing radial solution of the equation (13.1). By the strong maximum principle it is positive[2] and therefore a ground state. Since the ground state is unique, after rescaling back we conclude that $u = w$. Therefore, we have constructed a sequence u_{γ_k} with the properties that

$$u_{\gamma_k} \to w \quad \text{weakly in} \quad H^1, \tag{13.6}$$
$$\nabla u_{\gamma_k} \to \nabla w \quad \text{in} \quad L^2, \tag{13.7}$$
$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_{\gamma_k}|^{p+1} = 1 + \frac{\alpha^2}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_{\gamma_k}|^2, \tag{13.8}$$
$$\|u_{\gamma_k} - w\|_{H^1} \ge \theta \tag{13.9}$$

Since $2 < p+1 \le \frac{2n}{n-2}$, conditions (13.6) and (13.7) imply that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_{\gamma_k}|^{p+1} \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |w|^{p+1}$$

Thus from (13.8)

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_{\gamma_k}|^2 \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |w|^2$$

and with the help of (13.6) and (13.7) we conclude that $u_{\gamma_k} \to w$ in H^1. This contradicts (13.9). $\square$

We now consider the ground state problem

$$-\frac{1}{2}\triangle\phi_\epsilon - \beta_\epsilon(|\phi_\epsilon|^2)\phi_\epsilon + \frac{\alpha^2}{2}\phi_\epsilon = 0 \tag{gr$_\epsilon$}$$

for the nonlinearities

$$\beta_\epsilon(s^2) = -s^{p-1}\frac{s^{3-p}}{\epsilon + s^{3-p}} \tag{13.10}$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any $p \in (1,3)$. Define

$$G_\epsilon(\tau) = \int_0^\tau \beta(s^2)s\,ds - \frac{\alpha^2}{4}\tau^2, \tag{13.11}$$
$$W_\epsilon[u] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} G_\epsilon(u(x))\,dx \tag{13.12}$$

Lemma 13.3. *We have the following estimate*

$$|W_\epsilon[u] - W_0[u]| \lesssim \epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(|u|^2 + |u|^{p+1}\right) \tag{13.13}$$

Proof. Estimate (13.13) immediately follows from the inequality

$$|G_\epsilon(\tau) - G_0(\tau)| \le \tau^{p+1}\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon + \tau^{3-p}} = \epsilon\tau^{2p-4}\frac{\tau^{3-p}}{\epsilon + \tau^{3-p}} \tag{13.14}$$

[2] The minimizer u cannot be identically zero since one can show that the minimum is attained on the function satisfying the constraint $W[u] = 1$, see [BL].

since the above expression can ne bounded by

$$\min\left\{\epsilon\tau^{2p-4}, \tau^{p+1}\right\}$$

Thus using the first term for the values of $\tau \geq \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ so that $\tau^{p-3} \leq \epsilon^{\frac{p-3}{2}}$ (since $p < 3$), and the second term when $\tau \leq \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ so that $\tau^{p-1} \leq \epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2}}$, we obtain (13.14). □

"Continuity of ground states"

We now consider the variational problem

$$J_\epsilon[u] = \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u|^2 : \; W_\epsilon[u] = 1 \right\} \tag{13.15}$$

Proposition 13.4. *Let ϕ be the ground state of the problem (gr_0). Then for any sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a positive constant $\delta' = \delta'(\epsilon) \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$, and a ground state ϕ_ϵ of (gr_ϵ) such that $\|\phi_\epsilon - \phi\|_{H^1} < \delta'$.*

Proof. We start by choosing a sufficiently large constant M such that for all sufficiently small ϵ any minimizer of J_ϵ is contained in a ball $B_{M/2}$ of radius $M/2$ in the space H^1. In particular, using (13.13) we will assume that for $u \in B_M$

$$|W_\epsilon[u] - W_0[u]| \lesssim \epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \tag{13.16}$$

We now observe the following trivial property of the contraint functionals $W_\epsilon[u]$: for any $\epsilon \geq 0$ and an arbitrary $\mu \neq 0$

$$W_\epsilon[u(x)] = \mu^n W_\epsilon[u(\frac{x}{\mu})] \tag{13.17}$$

We now fix a sufficiently small of $\epsilon > 0$. Let w be the minimizer of the variational problem $J = J_0$ corresponding to the unique ground state ϕ. The function w satisfies the constraint $W_0[w] = 1$. Therefore, using the rescaling property (13.17) and (13.16) we can show that there exists $\mu = \mu(w)$ with the property that

$$\begin{gathered} W_\epsilon[w(\frac{x}{\mu})] = 1, \\ |\mu - 1| \leq \epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2n}} \end{gathered} \tag{13.18}$$

Moreover,

$$J_\epsilon[w(\frac{x}{\mu})] = \mu^{n-2} J_0[w(x)] = J_0[w] + O(\epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2n}}) \tag{13.19}$$

We now claim that there exists a small positive $\delta = \delta(\epsilon) \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$, such that for any positive non-increasing radial function u satisfying the constraint $W_\epsilon[u] = 1$ and the property that

$$\|u - w(\frac{x}{\mu})\|_{H^1} \geq \delta \tag{13.20}$$

we have

$$J_\epsilon[u] \geq J_\epsilon[w(\frac{x}{\mu})] + \epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2n}} \tag{13.21}$$

Assume for the moment that the claim holds. Then (13.20) and (13.21) imply that J_ϵ has a minimizer in the δ neighborhood of the function $w(\frac{x}{\mu})$. We denote this minimizer by w_ϵ. Then (13.18) implies that

$$\|w_\epsilon - w\|_{H^1} \leq \|w_\epsilon - w(\frac{x}{\mu})\|_{H^1} + \|w - w(\frac{x}{\mu})\|_{H^1} \leq \delta + \|w - w(\frac{x}{\mu})\|_{H^1}$$

Observe that $\|w - w(\frac{x}{\mu})\|_{H^1} \to 0$ as $\mu \to 1$, which follows by the density argument and the fact that it is easily satisfied on functions of compact support[3]. Define the function $a_w(\epsilon)$:

$$a_w(\epsilon) := \sup_{|\mu-1|\leq\epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2n}}} \|w - w(\frac{x}{\mu})\|_{H^1}, \qquad a_w(\epsilon) \to 0 \quad \text{as } \epsilon \to 0 \tag{13.22}$$

Therefore,

$$\|w_\epsilon - w\|_{H^1} \lesssim \delta + a_w(\epsilon) \tag{13.23}$$

The functions w_ϵ, w are the solutions of the Euler-Lagrange equations

$$-\frac{1}{2}\triangle w_\epsilon - \lambda_\epsilon\big(\beta_\epsilon(w_\epsilon)^2)w_\epsilon - \frac{\alpha^2}{2}w_\epsilon\big) = 0, \tag{13.24}$$

$$-\frac{1}{2}\triangle w - \lambda\big(\beta_0(w)^2)w - \frac{\alpha^2}{2}w\big) = 0, \tag{13.25}$$

where the lagrange multipliers λ_ϵ, λ are determined from the conditions that $W_\epsilon[w_\epsilon] = W_0[w] = 1$. We multiply the equations (13.24) and (13.25) by w_ϵ and w correspondingly, integrate by parts, and subtract one from another. Using the estimate

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \big|\beta_\epsilon(w_\epsilon)^2)w_\epsilon^2 - \beta(w_\epsilon)^2)w_\epsilon^2\big| \lesssim \epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2}},$$

which is essentially the same as the estimate (13.16), and the estimate (13.23) we obtain that

$$(\lambda - \lambda_\epsilon)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\beta_0(w)^2)w^2 - \frac{\alpha^2}{2}w^2\big) = O(\delta) + O(\epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2}}) + a_w(\epsilon) \tag{13.26}$$

Recall that $\beta_0(w^2) = w^{p-1}$. The condition that $W[w] = 1$ implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\frac{1}{p+1}|w|^{p+1} - \frac{\alpha^2}{4}|w|^2) = 1$$

Thus,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\beta_0(w)^2)w^2 - \frac{\alpha^2}{2}w^2\big) = 2 + \frac{p-1}{p+1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |w|^{p+1} \geq 2$$

[3]In fact, the minimizer w is smooth and localized in space and thus one could even give the precise dependence on μ

This allows us to conclude that

$$|\lambda - \lambda_\epsilon| \le \delta + \epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2}} + a_w(\epsilon) \tag{13.27}$$

Finally, recall that the ground states ϕ_ϵ and ϕ are obtained by the rescaling of the minimizers w_ϵ and w.

$$\phi_\epsilon(x) = w_\epsilon(\lambda_\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} x), \qquad \phi(x) = w(\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} x)$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\phi_\epsilon - \phi\|_{H^1} &\lesssim \|w_\epsilon(\lambda_\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} x) - w(\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} x)\|_{H^1} \\
&= \lambda_\epsilon^{\frac{n}{2}} \|w_\epsilon(x) - w\big((\frac{\lambda_\epsilon}{\lambda})^{\frac{1}{2}} x\big)\|_{H^1} \\
&\le \lambda_\epsilon^{\frac{n}{2}} \|w_\epsilon(x) - w(x)\|_{H^1} + \|w(x) - w\big((\frac{\lambda_\epsilon}{\lambda})^{\frac{1}{2}} x\big)\|_{H^1}
\end{aligned}$$

By (13.27) the constants λ_ϵ are uniformly bounded in terms of the absolute constant λ, which depends only on w. Noreover, $\lambda_\epsilon \to \lambda$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. We appeal again to the H^1 modulus of continuity of the minimizer w and define the function [4]

$$b_w(\epsilon, \delta) := \sup_{|\mu - 1| \le \delta + \epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2}} + a_w(\epsilon)} \|w(x) - w(\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} x)\|_{H^1} \tag{13.28}$$

The function $b_w(\epsilon, \delta) \to 0$ as $\epsilon, \delta \to 0$. Therefore, since we have already proved in (13.23) that w_ϵ is close to w in H^1, we obtain

$$\|\phi_\epsilon - \phi\|_{H^1} \lesssim \delta + \epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2}} + a_w(\epsilon) + b_w(\epsilon, \delta) \tag{13.29}$$

Since by the claim $\delta = \delta(\epsilon) \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$ and the functions $a_w(\epsilon)$, $b_w(\epsilon, \delta)$ also have this property we obtain the desired conclusion.

It remains to prove the claim (13.20), (13.21). Let u be as in the claim, i.e., $u \in B_M$ and $W_\epsilon[u] = 1$, and

$$\|u - w(\frac{x}{\mu})\|_{H^1} \ge \delta. \tag{13.30}$$

for some δ to be chosen below. Similar to (13.18) we can find a constant $\nu = \nu(u)$ such that

$$W_0[u(\frac{x}{\nu})] = 1, \qquad J_0[u(\frac{x}{\nu})] = J_\epsilon[u] + O(\epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2} n}), \tag{13.31}$$

$$|\nu - 1| \le \epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2n}} \tag{13.32}$$

[4]One can show that $\alpha \ne 0$ the Lagrange multiplier $\lambda \ne 0$. This follows from the following argument. By interpolation for $p \le \frac{n+2}{n-2}$

$$\int w^{p+1} \le \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^{n\frac{p-1}{2}} \|w\|_{L^2}^{p+1-n\frac{p-1}{2}}$$

Thus for $n > 2$ the power $p + 1 - n\frac{p-1}{2} < 2$ and using Cauchy-Schwarz, constraint $W[w] = 1$ and the assumption that $\alpha \ne 0$, we can show that $\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} \ge c$ for some positive constant c. Repeating argument determining the Lagrange multiplier we verify that $\lambda \ne 0$

Using (13.18), (13.30), (13.32), and defini tion (13.22) we infer that

$$(13.33)\quad \|u(\frac{x}{\nu})-w\|_{H^1}\geq\|u(\frac{x}{\nu})-w(\frac{x}{\mu\nu})\|_{H^1}-\|w(\frac{x}{\nu\mu})-w(x)\|_{H^1}\geq\nu^{\frac{n}{2}}\delta-a_w(\epsilon)\geq\delta-\epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2n}}\delta-a_w(\epsilon)$$

We now use Lemma 13.2 for the variational problem $J=J_0$. This gives a function $\theta(\gamma)$, with the property that $\theta(\gamma)\to 0$ as $\gamma\to 0$, such that for any radial non-increasing positive v with the property that $\|v-w\|_{H^1}\geq\theta(\gamma)$ and $W_0[v]=1$ we have $J_0[v]\geq J_0[w]+\gamma$. We set

$$\gamma=5\epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2n}},\qquad \delta=\theta(\gamma)+\epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2n}}+a_w(\epsilon)$$

It follows from Definition 13.1 of $\theta(\gamma)$ and (13.33) that with these choices, function $u(\frac{x}{\nu})$ verifies the inequality

$$J_0[u(\frac{x}{\nu})]\geq J_0[w]+5\epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2n}}$$

Finally, using (13.19) and (13.31) we obtain

$$J_\epsilon[u]\geq J_\epsilon[w(\frac{x}{\mu})]+3\epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2n}}$$

It remains to note that the constant δ in (13.20) has been chosen

$$\delta=\theta(\epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{4n}})+\epsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2n}}+a_w(\epsilon)$$

and by Lemma 13.2 and (13.22) it goes to zero as $\epsilon\to 0$, as claimed. $\square$

From now on we restric the values of p to the subcritical case

$$(13.34)\qquad \boxed{p\leq 1+\frac{4}{n}}$$

Recall definition of the operator L_+^ϵ associated with the ground state ϕ_ϵ.

$$(13.35)\qquad L_+^\epsilon=-\frac{1}{2}\triangle-\beta_\epsilon(\phi_\epsilon^2)-2\beta_\epsilon'(\phi_\epsilon^2)\phi_\epsilon^2+\frac{\alpha^2}{2}$$

Denote

$$(13.36)\qquad V_\epsilon=\beta_\epsilon(\phi_\epsilon^2)+2\beta_\epsilon'(\phi_\epsilon^2)\phi_\epsilon^2$$

Uisng the definition of β_ϵ we compute V_ϵ explicitly

$$(13.37)\qquad V_\epsilon=3\phi_\epsilon^{p-1}\frac{\phi_\epsilon^{3-p}}{\epsilon+\phi_\epsilon^{3-p}}-(3-p)\phi_\epsilon^{p-1}\Big(\frac{\phi_\epsilon^{3-p}}{\epsilon+\phi_\epsilon^{3-p}}\Big)^2$$

Uniform properties of ground states ϕ_ϵ guaranteed by the Proposition 13.4 imply the following result.

Lemma 13.5. *For any $p\in(1,1+\frac{4}{n}]$ there exists a $q=q(p)$ in the interval $q\in[\frac{n}{2},\infty)$ such that*

$$(13.38)\qquad \|V_\epsilon-V_0\|_{L^q}\to 0,\quad \epsilon\to 0$$

Proof. We have a pointwise bound

$$|V_\epsilon - p\phi_\epsilon^{p-1}| \lesssim \phi_\epsilon^{p-1}\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon+\phi_\epsilon^{3-p}} \leq \min\left\{\phi_\epsilon^{p-1}, \epsilon\phi_\epsilon^{2p-4}\right\} \leq \epsilon^{+}\phi_\epsilon^{p-1-}$$

In addition, since $\phi_\epsilon \to \phi$ in H^1 we have that $\phi_\epsilon^{p-1} \to \phi^{p-1}$ in the space $L^{\frac{2}{p-1}} \cap L^{\frac{2n}{(n-2)(p-1)}}$. Since

$$|V_\epsilon - V_0| \leq |V_\epsilon - p\phi_\epsilon^{p-1}| + p|\phi_\epsilon^{p-1} - \phi^{p-1}|$$

we obtain the desired conclusion for any q in the interval $q \in (\frac{2}{p-1}, \frac{2n}{(n-2)(p-1)}]$. The existence of the Lebesque exponent q in the desired interval now follows from the restrictions (13.34) on p. □

Corollary 13.6. *The operators*

$$\begin{aligned}(L_+^\epsilon - L_+)(-\triangle+1)^{-1} &: \ L^2 \to L^2,\\ (-\triangle+1)^{-1}(L_+^\epsilon - L_+) &: \ L^2 \to H^1\end{aligned}$$

with the norm converging to 0 *as* $\epsilon \to 0$.

Proof. The difference $L_+^\epsilon - L_+ = V_\epsilon - V_0$. The result now follows from Lemma 13.5, Sobolev embeddings, and Hölder inequality. □

"Everything follows from perturbation theory"

Theorem 13.7. *Let ϕ_ϵ be ground states constructed in Proposition 13.4. Assume that the ground state ϕ_0 is stable then for all sufficiently small ϵ the ground states ϕ_ϵ are also stable.*

Proof. The nonlinear stability condition for the a ground state $\phi_\epsilon(\alpha)$ requires that

$$\langle\phi_\epsilon, (L_+^\epsilon)^{-1}\phi_\epsilon\rangle < 0 \tag{13.39}$$

where the operators L_+^ϵ are obtained by linearizing at ϕ_ϵ. Condition (13.39) is meaningful provided that ϕ_ϵ is othogonal to the kernel of L_+^ϵ. We start by examining the spectrum of the operator L_+. As we know (?) L^+ has a unique negative eigenvalue, the zero eigenvalue has multiplicity n and the corresponding eiegenspace is spanned by the function $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\phi$. The rest of the spectrum is contained in the set $[\frac{\alpha^2}{2}, \infty)$. Therefore, in the case $\alpha \neq 0$ the spectrum $\Sigma(L_+)$ of L_+ has an isolated discrete component (in fact two components). We can construct an eigenspace projector P_0 of an isolated component of the discrete spectrum

$$P_0 = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_\gamma (L_+ - z)^{-1}\, dz \tag{13.40}$$

with an arbitrary curve γ encircling the desired spectral set and such that $\gamma \cap \Sigma(L_+) = 0$. Consider now the resolvent of L_+^ϵ at z such that $\operatorname{dist}(z, \Sigma(L_+)) \geq C$ for some sufficiently small constant C, which only depends on L_+. We have

$$(L_+^\epsilon - z)^{-1} = (L_+ - z)^{-1} - (L_+^\epsilon - z)^{-1}(L_+^\epsilon - L_+)(L_+ - z)^{-1} \tag{13.41}$$

It is not difficult to show that for such z

$$\|(L_+ - z)^{-1} f\|_{H^2} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2}$$

Therefore, using Corollary 13.6 we can conclude from (13.41) that

$$\|(L_+^\epsilon - z)^{-1}\| \le 2\|(L_+ - z)^{-1}\|$$

and thus $z \notin \Sigma(L_+^\epsilon)$. Moreover,

$$\|(L_+^\epsilon - z)^{-1} - (L_+ - z)^{-1}\| \le c(\epsilon) \tag{13.42}$$

for any $z: \ \operatorname{dist}(z, \Sigma(L_+)) \ge C$. By Corollary 13.6 the constant $c(\epsilon) \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. Therefore, for the same path γ as in (13.40) we can define

$$P_\epsilon = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma (L_+^\epsilon - z)^{-1} \, dz \tag{13.43}$$

Moreover, for all sufficiently small $\epsilon \ge 0$ the rank of P_ϵ remains constant. Thus, for any sufficiently small ϵ the operator L_+^ϵ has a unique simple negative eigenvalue and a zero eigenspace of dimension n. Since we know that the functions $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\phi_\epsilon$ are contained in that subspace, they, in fact, span it. Therefore, ϕ_ϵ is orthogonal to the kernel of L_+^ϵ and the expression (13.39) is well defined.

For any sufficiently small $\epsilon \ge 0$ we set Q_ϵ to be a projection on the orthogonal complement of the null eiegnespace of L_+^ϵ. Let $\lambda \notin \cup_\epsilon \Sigma(L_+^\epsilon)$. Define the operators

$$K_\epsilon(\lambda) := Q_0 (L_+^\epsilon - \lambda)^{-1} Q_\epsilon - (L_+ - \lambda)^{-1} Q_0 \tag{13.44}$$

It follows from (13.42) and the properties of the spectrum of L_+ that for all small $\epsilon \ge 0$ and *all* $\langle$ such that $|\langle| \le C$

$$\|(L_+^\epsilon - \lambda)^{-1} Q_\epsilon\| \le \frac{1}{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \Sigma(L_+^\epsilon) \setminus \{0\}\big)} \le C' \tag{13.45}$$

for some universal constant C', determined by the operator L_+. Also note that

$$\|Q_\epsilon - Q_0\| \le c(\epsilon) \tag{13.46}$$

This is a consequence of (13.42) and the definition

$$Q_\epsilon = I - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma (L_+^\epsilon - z')^{-1} \, dz'$$

with a short path γ around the origin. Using the resolvent identity

$$(L_+^\epsilon - z)^{-1} = (L_+ - z)^{-1} + (L_+ - z)^{-1}(L_+^\epsilon - L_+)(L_+^\epsilon - z)^{-1}$$

we obtain that for any $\lambda \notin \cup_\epsilon \Sigma(L_+^\epsilon)$

$$\begin{aligned} K_\epsilon(\lambda) =& Q_0(L_+ - \lambda)^{-1} Q_\epsilon - (L_+ - \lambda)^{-1} Q_0 + Q_0 (L_+ - \lambda)^{-1}(L_+^\epsilon - L_+)(L_+^\epsilon - \lambda)^{-1} Q_\epsilon = \\ & (L_+ - \lambda)^{-1} Q_0 (Q_\epsilon - Q_0) + (L_+ - \lambda)^{-1} Q_0 (L_+^\epsilon - L_+)(L_+^\epsilon - \lambda)^{-1} Q_\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Using Corollary 13.6, (13.45), and (13.46) we infer that for any $\lambda \le c$ and $\lambda \notin \cup_\epsilon \Sigma(L_+^\epsilon)$

$$\|K_\epsilon(\lambda)\| \le c(\epsilon)(1 + \|(L_+ - \lambda)^{-1} Q_0(-\triangle + 1)\|) \le c(\epsilon) \tag{13.47}$$

uniformly in λ. The last inequality follows since the operator norm of $(L_+ - \lambda)^{-1} Q_0(-\triangle + 1)$ is bounded by a universal constant dependent on L_+ only. This can be seen as follows. Since V_0 is a smooth ponetial and $(L_+ - \lambda)^{-1} Q_0$ is bounded on L^2 we can replace the operator $(-\triangle + 1)$ by $(L_+ - \lambda)$ and the result follows immediately.

We now test the operator $K_\epsilon(\lambda)$ on the ground state ϕ_ϵ.

$$K_\epsilon(\lambda)\phi_\epsilon = Q_0(L_+^\epsilon - \lambda)^{-1}\phi_\epsilon - (L_+ - \lambda)^{-1}\phi + (L_+ - \lambda)^{-1} Q_0(\phi - \phi_\epsilon)$$

Coupling the above identity with ϕ.

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \phi_\epsilon, (L_+^\epsilon - \lambda)^{-1}\phi_\epsilon\rangle - \langle \phi, (L_+ - \lambda)^{-1}\phi\rangle &= \langle \phi, K_\epsilon(\lambda)\phi_\epsilon\rangle + \langle (\phi_\epsilon - \phi_0), (L_+^\epsilon - \lambda)^{-1}\phi_\epsilon\rangle \\ &+ \langle \phi, (L_+ - \lambda)^{-1} Q_0(\phi - \phi_\epsilon)\rangle = O(c(\epsilon))\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $Q_\epsilon \phi_\epsilon = \phi_\epsilon$, the bound (13.45), and the estimate $\|\phi_\epsilon - \phi\|_{H^1}$, which follows from Proposition 13.4. The above holds uniformly for all $|\lambda| \le c$ and $\lambda \notin \cup_\epsilon \Sigma(L_+^\epsilon)$. Passing to the limit $\lambda \to 0$, say from the upper half-plane, we obtain that for all sufficiently small $\epsilon \ge 0$

$$\langle \phi_\epsilon, (L_+^\epsilon)^{-1}\phi_\epsilon\rangle = \langle \phi, L_+^{-1}\phi\rangle + O(c(\epsilon)) < 0$$

The last inequality follows since by the assumption ϕ is a stable ground state, i.e., $\langle \phi, L_+^{-1}\phi\rangle < 0$. $\square$

References

[Ag] Agmon, S. *Lectures on exponential decay of solutions of second-order elliptic equations: bounds on eigenfunctions of N-body Schrödinger operators.* Mathematical Notes, 29. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1982.

[BL] H. Berestycki, P.L. Lions, *Existence d'oudes solitaires daus les problemes nonlineares du type Klein-Gordon.* C.R. Acad. Sci. 288 (1979), no. 7, 395–398.

[BP1] Buslaev, V. S., Perelman, G. S. *Scattering for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation: states that are close to a soliton.* (Russian) Algebra i Analiz 4 (1992), no. 6, 63–102; translation in St. Petersburg Math. J. 4 (1993), no. 6, 1111–1142.

[BP2] Buslaev, V. S., Perelman, G. S. *On the stability of solitary waves for nonlinear Schrödinger equations. Nonlinear evolution equations,* 75–98, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, 164, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1995.

[CaL] Cazenave, T., Lions, P.-L. em Orbital stability of standing waves for some nonlinear Schrödinger equations. Comm. Math. Phys. 85 (1982), 549–561

[Cof] Coffman, C. V. *Uniqueness of positive solutions of* $\triangle u - u + u^3 = 0$ *and a variational characterization of other solutions.* Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. 46 (1972), 81–95

[Cu] Cuccagna, S. *Stabilization of solutions to nonlinear Schrödinger equations.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 54 (2001), no. 9, 1110–1145.

[FTY] Fröhlich, J., Tsai, T. P., Yau, H. T. *Dynamics of solitons in the nonlinear Hartree equation*, preprint.

[GNN] Gidas B., Ni W. M., Nirenberg L. *Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle.* Comm. Math. Phys. 68 (1979), no. 3, 209–243.

[Gr] Grillakis, M. *Analysis of the linearization around a critical point of an infinite dimensional Hamiltonian system.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 41 (1988), no. 6, 747–774.

[GSS1] Grillakis, M., Shatah, J., Strauss, W. *Stability theory of solitary waves in the presence of symmetry. I.* J. Funct. Anal. 74 (1987), no. 1, 160–197.

[GSS2] Grillakis, M., Shatah, J., Strauss, W. *Stability theory of solitary waves in the presence of symmetry. II.* J. Funct. Anal. 94 (1990), 308–348.

[HiSig] Hislop, P. D., Sigal, I. M. *Introduction to spectral theory. With applications to Schrödinger operators.* Applied Mathematical Sciences, 113. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.

[JPR] Jones, C. K. R. T., Putterman, S. J., Roberts, P. H. *Motions in a Bose condensate: V. Stability of solitary wave solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equation in two and three dimensions.* J. Phys. A 19 (1986), 2991–3011

[Kw] Kwong, M. K. *Uniqueness of positive solutions of* $\triangle u - u + u^p = 0$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^n$. Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. 65 (1989), 243–266

[McS] McLeod, K., Serrin, J. *Nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Uniqueness of positive solutions of* $\triangle u + f(u) = 0$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^n$. Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. 99 (1987), 115–145

[Pe] Perelman, G. *Some Results on the Scattering of Weakly Interacting Solitons for Nonlinear Schrödinger Equations* in "Spectral theory, microlocal analysis, singular manifolds", Akad. Verlag (1997), 78–137.

[PW] Pillet, C. A., Wayne, C. E. *Invariant manifolds for a class of dispersive, Hamiltonian, partial differential equations.* J. Diff. Eq. 141 (1997), no. 2, 310–326

[Rau] Rauch, J. *Local decay of scattering solutions to Schrödinger's equation.* Comm. Math. Phys. 61 (1978), 149–168.

[RS4] Reed, M., Simon, B. *Methods of modern mathematical physics. IV.* Academic Press [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London, 1979.

[RSS] Rodnianski, I., Schlag, W., Soffer, A. *Dispersive Analysis of Charge Transfer Models*, preprint 2002, submitted to CPAM

[Sh] Shatah, J. *Stable standing waves of nonlinear Klein-Gordon equations.* Comm. Math. Phys. 91 (1983), no. 3, 313–327

[ShSt] Shatah, J., Strauss, W. *Instability of nonlinear bound states.* Comm. Math. Phys. 100 (1985), no. 2, 173–190.

[SW1] Soffer, A., Weinstein, M. *Multichannel nonlinear scattering for nonintegrable equations.* Comm. Math. Phys. 133 (1990), 119–146

[SW2] Soffer, A., Weinstein, M. *Multichannel nonlinear scattering, II. The case of anysotropic potentials and data.* J. Diff. Eq. 98 (1992), 376–390

[Str] Straus, W. *Existence of solitary waves in higher dimensions.* Comm. Math. Phys. 55 (1977), 149–162

[Stu] Stubbe, J. *On the linear stability of solitary waves in Hamiltonian systems with symmetry.* in Integrable Systems and Applications, M. Balabane, P. Lochak, C. Sulem (Eds.), Lecture Notes in Physics, 342 (1988), 328–335

[SuSu] Sulem, C., Sulem, P.-L. *The nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Self-focusing and wave collapse.* Applied Mathematical Sciences, 139. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.

[We1] Weinstein, Michael I. *Modulational stability of ground states of nonlinear Schrödinger equations.* SIAM J. Math. Anal. 16 (1985), no. 3, 472–491.

[We2] Weinstein, Michael I. *Lyapunov stability of ground states of nonlinear dispersive evolution equations.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 39 (1986), no. 1, 51–67.

Rodnianski: Institute for Advanced Study and Department of Mathematics, Princeton University, Princeton N.J. 08544, U.S.A.
email: **irod@math.princeton.edu**

Schlag: Division of Astronomy, Mathematics, and Physics, 253-37 Caltech, Pasadena, CA 91125, U.S.A.
email: **schlag@its.caltech.edu**

Soffer: Mathematics Department, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J. 08903, U.S.A.
email: **soffer@math.rutgers.edu**