GLOBAL REGULARITY FOR THE NONLINEAR WAVE EQUATION WITH SLIGHTLY SUPERCritical POWER
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Abstract. We consider the defocusing nonlinear wave equation $\Box u = |u|^{p-1}u$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, \infty)$. We prove that for any initial datum with a scaling-subcritical norm bounded by $M_0$ the equation is globally well-posed for $p = 5 + \delta$ where $\delta \in (0, \delta_0(M_0))$.

1. Introduction

We consider the Cauchy problem for the nonlinear defocusing wave equation on $\mathbb{R}^3$, that is

$$
\begin{cases}
\Box u = |u|^{p-1}u \\
(u, \partial_t u)(\cdot, 0) = (u_0, u_1) \in (\dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2) \times H^1,
\end{cases}
$$

where $u : \mathbb{R}^3 \times I \to \mathbb{R}$, $p > 1$ and $\Box = -\partial_{tt} + \Delta$ is the D’Alembertian. For sufficiently regular solutions of (1) the energy

$$
E(u)(t) := \int \frac{1}{2} |\partial_t u|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{|u|^{p+1}}{p+1} \, dx
$$

is conserved, i.e. $E(t) = E$. Moreover, there is a natural scaling associated to (1): For $\lambda > 0$ the map

$$
u \mapsto u_\lambda(t, x) = \lambda^{\frac{2}{p-2}} u(\lambda x, \lambda t)
$$

preserves solutions of (1). Correspondingly, the energy rescales like $E(u_\lambda)(t) = \lambda^{5-p} E(u)(t)$ and hence the equation is energy-supercritical for $p > 5$. Our goal is to show that given any (possibly large) initial data $(u_0, u_1)$, the supercritical nonlinear defocusing wave equation (1) is globally well-posed at least for an open interval of exponents $p \in [5, 5 + \delta_0]$.

Theorem 1.1. Let $\|(u_0, u_1)\|_{\dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1} \leq M_0$. Then there exists $\delta_0 = \delta_0(M_0) > 0$ such that for any $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ there exists a global solution $u$ of (1) with $p = 5 + \delta$ from the initial data $(u_0, u_1)$. Moreover, there exists a universal constant $C > 1$ such that for any time $t$

$$
\|(u, \partial_t u)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1} \leq \|(u_0, u_1)\|_{\dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1} e^{C(1 + (CE(u))^{CE(u)})^{352}}
$$

and we have the global spacetime bound

$$
\|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R})} \leq C(1 + (CE(u))^{CE(u)})^{352}.
$$

In particular, the solution scatters as $t \to \pm \infty$. 

1
Global regularity and scattering for the energy-critical regime was established in [16, 7]. The classical results in the critical case were recently improved to obtain explicit double exponential bounds [19] and to allow a critical nonlinearity with an extra logarithmic factor \( f(u) = u^5 \log(2 + u^2) \) in the case of spherical symmetric data [18]. Exploiting the method introduced in [19], [12] could remove the assumption of spherical symmetry for slightly log-log-supercritical growth. In two-dimensions, global regularity has also been established for the slightly supercritical nonlinearity \( f(u) = u^p \) in [17]. For the classical supercritical nonlinearity \( f(u) = |u|^{p-1}u \) with \( p > 5 \), global existence and scattering of solutions still holds for small data in scaling-invariant spaces, for instance in \( \dot{H}^{s_p} \times \dot{H}^{s_p-1} \) where

\[
s_p := 1 + \frac{\delta}{2(p-1)}
\]
is the critical Sobolev exponent. For general large data however, the problem of global regularity and scattering is still open: Apart from conditional regularity results in terms of the critical Sobolev exponent \( p \), global solutions have been built only from particular classes of initial data [10, 3] or for a nonlinearity satisfying the null condition as in [21, 11].

Our result should be seen in line with [19, 12] pushing global regularity in a slightly supercritical regime. Although the nonlinearity considered in [19, 12] has a logarithmically supercritical growth at infinity, it still comes, up to lower order terms, with the scaling associated to the critical case \( p = 5 \). Correspondingly, both the scaling invariant quantities of the critical regime, as well as some logarithmically higher integrability, are controlled by the energy. Instead, we consider the supercritical nonlinearity (1) and achieve global existence and scattering by paying the price of working on bounded sets of initial data, as previously done for other equations, such as SQG [6] and Navier-Stokes [5]. As in [12, 6, 5], the crucial ingredient of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is a (quantitative) long-time estimate. In the spherically symmetric case, the classical Morawetz inequality gives an a priori spacetime bound as long as the solution exists. The following result replaces this long-time estimate in the absence of symmetry assumptions.

**Theorem 1.2** (A priori spacetime bound). There exists universal constant \( C \geq 1 \) such that for any solution \( (u, \partial_t u) \in L^\infty(J, (\dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1)(\mathbb{R}^3)) \) of (1) with \( p = 5 + \delta > 0 \), \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), denoting \( M_0 := ||u||_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times J)}, E := E(u) \) and \( L := ||(u, \partial_t u)||_{L^\infty(J, (\dot{H}^{s_p} \times \dot{H}^{s_p-1})(\mathbb{R}^3))} \) the following holds.

- if \( \min\{EM^{\frac{\delta}{2}}, L\} < c_0 \), then \( ||u||_{L^{2(p-1)}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times J)} \leq 1 \)
- if \( \min\{EM^{\frac{\delta}{2}}, L\} \geq c_0 \) and \( (CEM^{\frac{\delta}{2}}L)^{176} \leq 2^{\frac{1}{2}}, \) then

\[
||u||_{L^{2(p-1)}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times J)} \leq (CEM^{\frac{\delta}{2}}L)^{C(EM^{\frac{\delta}{2}}L)^{176}}. \tag{3}
\]

**Corollary 1.3.** There exists a universal constant \( C \geq 1 \) such that the following holds. Let \( M_0 > 0 \) given. Then there exists \( \delta_0 = \delta_0(M_0) > 0 \) such that for any solution \( (u, \partial_t u) \in L^\infty(J, (\dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1)(\mathbb{R}^3)) \) of (1) with \( p = 5 + \delta > 0 \), \( \delta \in (0, \delta_0] \) and with \( ||(u, \partial_t u)||_{L^\infty(J, (\dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1)(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq M_0 \), we have the a priori spacetime bound

\[
||u||_{L^{2(p-1)}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times J)} \leq \max\left\{ 1, (CE(u)M^{\frac{\delta}{2}}_0)^{C(E(u)M^{\frac{\delta}{2}}_0)^{352}} \right\}. \tag{4}
\]
Remark 1.4. From the proof, we observe that $\delta_0$ has the following dependence as $M_0 \to \infty$: There exists $C' \geq 1$ such that

$$
\delta_0 := \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\ln 2}{\ln M_0}, \frac{\ln 2}{\ln (C' E)(C' E)^{352}} \right\}.
$$

Theorem 1.1 follows from Corollary 1.3 and a continuity argument, taking advantage of the fact that, if on one side the estimate (4) involves in the right-hand side higher order norms of the solution itself, which we a priori don’t control for large times, on the other side they appear only to the power $\delta$ and hence can be kept under control for $\delta$ small. As regards the initial data, the statement of Theorem 1.1 is written for simplicity with $(u_0, u_1) \in \dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1$ but a similar result would hold just above the critical threshold, namely for $(u_0, u_1) \in \dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^{1+\epsilon} \times H^\epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Correspondingly, $\delta_0$ would also depend on $\epsilon$.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 follows instead the scheme introduced in [19] to obtain double exponential bounds on critical Strichartz norms based on Bourgain’s “induction on energy” method [4]. In [12], the scheme has been successfully applied to a log-supercritical equation assuming a (subcritical) a priori bound $M$ on $\|u\|_{L^\infty([R^3 \times J])}$: Indeed, it was noticed that the induction on the energy, which does not allow to include the a priori bound $M$, can actually be bypassed by a simpler ad-hoc argument. We will use the latter strategy also in our case. Rather than controlling a $L^4 L_{12}$ norm as performed in the mentioned papers, we estimate $L^2(p-1)$ norm, which is scaling-critical for every $p$. To follow their line of proof, we need to overcome some issues related to the supercritical nature of our equation: For instance, a fundamental use of the equation in all critical global regularity results is the localized energy equality and the subsequent potential energy decay, first used in [16, 7, 13]. In the supercritical regime, the localized energy inequality becomes less powerful, since the nonlinear term is estimated this time in terms of a power of the length of the time interval besides the energy itself (see Lemma 4.5). To be able to still take advantage of this localized energy inequality, we need a control on the length of the so called unexceptional intervals which was not derived before in [19, 12] and seems to work in the supercritical case only. To achieve this control, we introduce another scaling invariant norm of $u$ accounting for more differentiability, namely $L^\infty \dot{H}^{s_p}$. This quantity, which appear in the final estimate (3), was not needed in [19, 12]. It turns out fundamental to bound the length of unexceptional intervals by performing a mass concentration in $\dot{H}^{s_p}$, rather than in $\dot{H}^1$ (see Lemma 6.2) and thereby obtaining an upper bound on the mass concentration radius.

The strategy of proof of Theorem 1.1 is very flexible and we plan to apply it in a future work to the radial supercritical Schrödinger equation.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Energy-flux equality. With the notation of [14], we introduce the forward-in-time wave cone, the truncated cone and their boundaries centered at $z_0 = (x_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$
K(z_0) := \{ z = (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : |x - x_0| \leq t - t_0 \},
$$

$$
K^s(z_0) := K(z_0) \cap (\mathbb{R}^3 \times [s, t]),
$$

$$
M^s_0(z_0) := \{ z = (x, r) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times (s, t) : |x - x_0| = r - t_0 \},
$$

$$
D(t; z_0) := K(z_0) \cap (\mathbb{R}^3 \times t).
$$
Correspondingly, we introduce the localized energy as well as the energy flux

\[ E(u; D(t; z_0)) := \int_{D(t; z_0)} \frac{1}{2} |\partial_t u|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{|u|^{p+1}}{p+1} \, dx. \]

\[ \text{Flux}(u, M^t_s(z_0)) := \int_{M^t_s(z_0)} \frac{1}{2} \left| \nabla u - \frac{x-x_0}{|x-x_0|} \partial_t u \right|^2 + \frac{|u|^{p+1}}{p+1} \, d\sigma. \]

Let us recall, that for any sufficiently regular solution we have the energy-flux identity

\[ E(u; D(t; z_0)) + \text{Flux}(u; M^t_s(z_0)) = E(u; D(s; z_0)) \]  

for any \(0 < s < t\). Indeed, (5) is obtained by integration of \((|u|^{p-1}u)\partial_t u\) on \(K^t_s(z_0)\), see for instance [14]. Whenever \(z_0 = (0, 0)\), we will not write the dependence on \(z_0\), we will write \(\Gamma_+(I)\) for the forward wave cone centered in 0 and truncated by \(I\)

\[ \Gamma_+(I) := \{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} : |x| < t, t \in I\}, \]

and we denote \(e(t) := E(u; D(t))\). We can then rewrite (5) for any \(0 < s < t\)

\[ e(t) - e(s) = \int_{M^t_s} \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u - \frac{x}{t} \partial_t u|^2 + \frac{|u|^{p+1}}{p+1} \, d\sigma. \]

2.2. Strichartz estimates. Let \(u : \mathbb{R}^3 \times I \to \mathbb{R}\) solve the linear wave equation \(\Box u = F\). Let \(m \in [1, 3/2]\). Then for any \((q, r) \in (2, \infty) \times [1, \infty)\) wave-\(m\)-admissible and for any conjugate pair \((\tilde{q}, \tilde{r}) \in [1, +\infty) \times [1, +\infty)\) with

\[ \frac{1}{\tilde{q}} + \frac{3}{\tilde{r}} - 2 = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{3}{r} = \frac{3}{2} - m \]  

we have

\[ \|u\|_{L^q(I, L^r')} + \|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L^\infty(I, H^m \times H^{m-1})} \leq C \left( \|(u, \partial_t u)(t_0)\|_{H^m_\sigma \times H^{m-1}_\sigma} + \|F\|_{L^{\tilde{q}}(I, L^{\tilde{r}})} \right), \]  

where \(t_0 \in I\) is a generic time. Notice that \((q, r) = (2(p-1), 2(p-1))\) is wave-\(s_p\)-admissible and all \((q, r)\) wave-\(s_p\)-admissible are scaling-critical. Moreover, the constant \(C\) can be taken independent on \(m \in [1, 5/4]\).

2.3. Localized Strichartz estimates. By the finite speed of propagation, we can localize the above Strichartz estimates on wave cones. Let \(I = [a, b]\) and \(m \in [1, \frac{3}{4})\). For any solution \(u : \mathbb{R}^3 \times I \to \mathbb{R}\) of a linear wave equation \(\Box u = F\), we have for any \((q, r)\) wave-\(m\)-admissible and any conjugate pair \((\tilde{q}, \tilde{r})\) satisfying (6) the localized estimate

\[ \|u\|_{L^q(I, L^r_\Gamma)} \lesssim \|(u, \partial_t u)(b)\|_{(H^m \times H^{m-1})(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|F\|_{L^{\tilde{q}}L^{\tilde{r}}(\Gamma_+(I))}. \]  

As a consequence, if \(I = [a, b] = J_1 \cup J_2\), we have

\[ \|u\|_{L^qL^r_\Gamma(J_1 \cup J_2)} \lesssim \|(u, \partial_t u)(b)\|_{(H^m \times H^{m-1})(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|F\|_{L^{\tilde{q}}L^{\tilde{r}}(\Gamma_+(J_1 \cup J_2))}. \]
2.4. Littlewood-Paley projection. We follow the presentation of [20]. Fix \( \phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \) radially symmetric, \( 0 \leq \phi \leq 1 \) such that \( \text{supp} \phi \subseteq B_2(0) \) and \( \phi \equiv 1 \) on \( B_1(0) \). For \( N \in 2^\mathbb{Z} \), introduce the Fourier multipliers

\[
\widehat{P_{\leq N} f}(\xi) := \phi(\xi/N) \hat{f}(\xi) ,
\quad \widehat{P_{> N} f}(\xi) := (1 - \phi(\xi/N)) \hat{f}(\xi) ,
\quad \widehat{P_N f}(\xi) := (\phi(\xi/N) - \phi(2\xi/N)) \hat{f}(\xi) .
\]

The above projections can equivalently be written as convolution operators and Young inequality shows that the Littlewood-Paley projections are bounded on \( L^p \) for any \( 1 \leq p \leq +\infty \). Moreover, we have the Bernstein’s inequalities

\[
\| P_{\leq N} f \|_{L^2_p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim_{p,q} N^{d(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})} \| P_{\leq N} f \|_{L^p_q(\mathbb{R}^d)}
\]

for \( 1 \leq p \leq q \leq +\infty \) and the same holds with \( P_N f \) in place of \( P_{\leq N} f \). Moreover, for \( 1 < p < +\infty \) we also recall the fundamental Paley-Littlewood inequality

\[
\| f \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \sim \left( \sum_{N \in 2^\mathbb{Z}} | P_N f |^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \| f \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{10}
\]

2.5. Dependence of constants. In the rest of the paper, all constants will be independent on the choice of \( \delta \in [0, 1) \). We keep the estimates in scaling invariant form (for instance, in all the statements of the Lemmas in Sections 3–6). We write the terms in the estimate in terms of simpler scaling invariant quantities, such as \( E \| u \|^{\frac{3}{2}}_{L^\infty}, \| u \|_{L^2_{(p-1)}}, \| u \|_{L^\infty H^p}, ET^\diamond \) (see for instance (16)).

3. Spacetime norm bound under a scaling invariant smallness assumption

We recall that the nonlinear wave equation has bounded \( L^{2(p-1)} \) norm if we assume a suitable smallness on the solution, which must be in terms of scaling invariant quantities. We will need it in terms of the critical \( H^3 \) norm as well as a combination of the energy and the \( L^\infty \) norm.

Lemma 3.1. Let \( p = 5 + \delta \) for \( \delta \in (0, 1) \) and consider a solution \((u, \partial_t u) \in L^\infty(I, \hat{H}^1 \cap \hat{H}^2 \times H^1)\) to (1). Assume additionally that \( \| u \|_{L^\infty(I, L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I))} \leq M \). There exists a universal \( 0 < c_0 < 1 \) such that if

\[
EM^{\frac{\delta}{2}} \leq c_0 \text{ or } \| (u, \partial_t u) \|_{L^\infty(I, (\hat{H}^p+ \times \hat{H}^p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq c_0 ,
\]

then

\[
\| u \|_{L^{2(p-1)}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I)} \leq 1 . \tag{11}
\]

Proof. Let us first assume that \( EM^{\frac{\delta}{2}} \leq c_0 \) for a \( c_0 < 1 \) yet to be chosen. By interpolation

\[
\| u \|_{L^{2(p-1)}} \leq \| u \|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{\delta}{p-1}} \| u \|_{L^2}^{1 - \frac{\delta}{p-1}} .
\]

We notice that (8, 8) is wave-1-admissible. By Strichartz (7) (with \( m = 1 \) and \((\tilde{q}, \tilde{r}) = (2, \frac{2}{\delta})\)), Hölder and the Sobolev embedding \( \hat{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \hookrightarrow L^6(\mathbb{R}^3) \) we have

\[
\| u \|_{L^2_{(p-1)}} \lesssim E^{\frac{\delta}{2}} + \| u \|_{L^2_{L^2 L^3/2}}^{p-1} E^{\frac{\delta}{2}} + \| u \|_{L^6 L^6} \| u \|_{L^\infty L^6} \lesssim E^{\frac{\delta}{2}} \left( 1 + \| u \|_{L^{2(p-1)}}^{p-1} \right) .
\]
Summarizing, we have obtained that for a $C \geq 1$
\[ \|u\|_{L^2(p-1)} \leq C(M^{\frac{1}{2}}E)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}(1 + \|u\|_{L^2(\rho^{p-1})}), \]
from which (11) follows setting $c_0 := (4C)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} < 1$.

Let us now assume that $\|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L^\infty(\dot{H}^p \times \dot{H}^{p-1})} \leq c'_0$ for a $0 < c'_0 < 1$. Observing that $(2(p-1), 2(p-1))$ is wave-s$_p$-admissible, we have by Strichartz (7) (with $m = s_p$ and $(\tilde{q}, \tilde{r}) = (2, \frac{6(p-1)}{3p+1})$), Hölder and the Sobolev embedding $\dot{H}^p(\mathbb{R}^3) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{3(p-1)}{2p-1}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$
\[ \|u\|_{L^2(p-1)} \lesssim \|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L^\infty(\dot{H}^p \times \dot{H}^{p-1})} + \|u\|_{L^2(\rho^{p-1})}^{p-1} \|u\|_{L^2(\rho^{p-1})}^{1/(3p+1)} \]
\[ \lesssim \|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L^\infty(\dot{H}^p \times \dot{H}^{p-1})} + \|u\|_{L^{\frac{2}{3}}(\rho^{p-1})} \|u\|_{L^\infty L^3(\rho^{p-1})/2} \]
\[ \lesssim \|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L^\infty(\dot{H}^p \times \dot{H}^{p-1})}(1 + \|u\|_{L^2(p-1)}). \]
Calling $C'$ the constant in the above inequality, (11) follows by setting $c'_0 := (4C')^{-1}$. \hfill \Box

4. Spacetime norm decay in forward wave cones

The goal of this section is to prove the following proposition, which individuates a subinterval $J$ (of quantified length) with small $L^2(p-1)$ norm of $u$ in any sufficiently large given interval $I = [T_1, T_2]$. The main difference to the energy-critical case $p = 5$ \cite[Corollary 4.11]{haffter} lies in the fact that the largeness requirement on $I$ can no longer be reached by simply choosing $T_2$ big enough (see Remark 4.3).

**Proposition 4.1** (Spacetime-norm decay). Let $p = 5 + \delta$ with $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $I = [T_1, T_2] \subset (0, \infty)$ and consider a solution $(u, \partial_t u) \in L^\infty(I, \dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times \dot{H}^1)$ to (1). Assume that $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I)} \leq M$. There exists a universal constant $0 < C_2 < 1$ such that if $0 < \eta < 1$ is such that
\[ \eta < C_2 (EM^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{3(p-1)}} \]
then the following holds for any $A$ satisfying
\[ A > (C_2 \eta^{-1})^{\frac{12(p-1)}{5}} (EM^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{14}{5}} : \]
(13)

If $T_1$ and $T_2$ are such that
\[ \frac{T_2}{T_1} \geq A^{3(C_2 \eta^{-1})^{-\frac{6(p-1)(p+1)}{5}} (EM^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{9p+10}{10}} \max\{(C_2 \eta^{-1})^{-\frac{6(p-1)}{5}} (EM^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{9p-1}{10}}, (M^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\frac{9}{2p-1}})^{\frac{9}{2p-1}}\}}, \]
\[ \text{(14)} \]
then there exists a subinterval $J = [t', A t'] \subseteq I$ with
\[ \|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\Gamma_+(J))} \leq \eta. \]
Remark 4.2 (Simplified assumptions in the large energy regime). In the large energy regime $EM^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq c_0$, with $c_0$ defined through Lemma 3.1, the hypothesis (12) can be simplified to
\[ \eta < C_2 c_0^{\frac{7}{3(p-1)}} := c'_0, \]
where we observe that $0 < c_0 \leq 1$. Moreover, the assumption (14) can be replaced by the stronger condition

$$\frac{T_2}{T_1} \geq A^{3(C_2\eta^{-1})} \left( \frac{6(p-1)(p+1)}{M} \right)^{\frac{2p+13}{5(p+1)}} \max\{c_0^{-\frac{p-1}{2}}, (M^{-\frac{2p}{p+1}} T_2)^{\frac{5}{2}}\}. \quad (15)$$

**Remark 4.3.** The assumptions of Proposition 4.1 are clearly verified as an upper bound on $T_1$ for any fixed $\eta$ satisfying (12), $A$ satisfying (13) and $T_2$ satisfying (14). However this will not be the spirit of the application of this Proposition: we will rather fix $T_1$ and consider (14) as a condition on $T_2$ and $\delta$. This condition may sound strange since, when all other parameters are fixed, (14) is not verified for large $T_2$. On the other side, we will instead fix $T_2 := T_1 A^{3(C_2\eta^{-1})} \left( \frac{6(p-1)(p+1)}{M} \right)^{\frac{2p+13}{5(p+1)}}$ and notice that (14) is verified for $\delta$ sufficiently small.

As a first step to the proof of Proposition 4.1, we show that if the $L^2(p-1)$ norm of $u$ in a strip is bounded from below, the Strichartz estimates imply a lower bound on the $L^\infty L^{p+1}$ norm in the same interval.

**Lemma 4.4.** (Lower bound on local and global potential energy.) Let $p = 5 + \delta$ with $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $\eta \in (0, 1]$. Consider a solution $(u, \partial_t u) \in L^\infty(I, H^1 \cap H^2 \times H^1)$ to (1). Assume that $\|u\|_{L^{2(p-1)}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I)} \geq \eta$ and $\|u\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I)} \leq M$. Then there exists $0 < C_1 \leq 1$ universal such that

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(I, L^{p+1})} \geq C_1 \eta^{\frac{12}{p}(p-1)(M^{\frac{5}{7}} E)^{-\frac{5}{7}} M^{-\frac{2p}{7}}. \quad (16)$$

Moreover, by finite speed of propagation the same estimate can be obtained by replacing $\mathbb{R}^3 \times I$ by any truncated forward wave cone $\Gamma_+ (I)$.

**Proof.** Let $0 < \eta \leq 1$. By shrinking $I$, we can assume w.l.o.g. that $\|u\|_{L^{2(p-1)}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I)} = \eta$. We observe that we control all wave-1-admissible spacetime norms with the energy. Indeed, fix $(q, r)$ wave-1-admissible. By the Strichartz estimate (7) with $m = 1$ and Hölder

$$\|u\|_{L^q L^r} \lesssim E^\frac{1}{2} + \|u^{p-1} u\|_{L^2 L^{q/2}} \lesssim E^\frac{1}{2} + \|u\|_{L^{\infty} L^{6}} \|u^{p-1}\|_{L^2 L^6} \lesssim E^\frac{1}{2} + E^\frac{1}{2} \eta^{p-1} \lesssim E^\frac{1}{2}. \quad (17)$$

We observe that the pair $(3, 18)$ is wave-1-admissible and that $(3, 18)$ and $(\infty, p+1)$ interpolate to $\left((\frac{8}{6}(p+1) + 3, \frac{8}{6}(p+1) + 3) = (8 + \frac{5}{6} \delta, 8 + \frac{5}{6} \delta). \right.$ By interpolation and (17), we thus have

$$\|u\|_{L^{2(p-1)}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I)} \leq \|u\|_{L^8 L^8} \|u^{\delta + \frac{5}{8} \delta}\|_{L^{\infty} L^3} \lesssim M^{\frac{5}{7} \delta} \|u\|_{L^6 L^{p+1}} \|u^{p-1}\|_{L^3 L^{18}} \lesssim (M^{\frac{5}{7}} E)^{\frac{5}{7}} M^{\frac{2p}{7}} \|u^{p-1}\|_{L^{\infty} L^{p+1}}. \quad \Box$$

We now come to a localized energy inequality of Morawetz-type which, in the critical case $p = 5$, implies the potential energy decay and hence it is crucial for the global regularity in the critical case [7, 16]. In the supercritical case, the former localized energy inequality degenerates and will only lead to some decay estimate on bounded intervals: indeed the presence of the extra term $b^{\frac{p}{p+1}}$ in the right-hand side of (18) below makes the inequality interesting only when an estimate on the length of the interval is at hand.

**Lemma 4.5.** Let $\delta \in [0, 1)$ and $p = 5 + \delta$. For any $0 < a < b$ and any weak finite energy solution $(u, \partial_t u) \in C([a, b], H^1 \cap L^{p+1}) \cap L^p([a, b], L^{2p}) \times C([a, b], L^2)$ of (1), we have

$$\int_{|x| \leq b} |u(x, b)|^{p+1} \, dx \lesssim \frac{a}{b} E + e(b) - e(a) + b^{\frac{p}{p+1}} (e(b) - e(a))^{\frac{p}{p+1}}. \quad (18)$$
Proof. Let us first assume that \( u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times [a, b]) \) is a classical solution of (1). We follow the notation of [13, 2] and introduce the quantities

\[
Q_0 := \frac{1}{2} \left( \left( \partial_t u \right)^2 + |\nabla u|^2 \right) + \frac{|u|^{p+1}}{p+1} + \partial_t u \left( \frac{x}{t} \cdot \nabla u \right) \]

\[
P_0 := \frac{x}{t} \left( \frac{\left( \partial_t u \right)^2}{2} - \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} - \frac{|u|^{p+1}}{p+1} \right) + \nabla u \left( \partial_t u + \frac{x}{t} \cdot \nabla u + \frac{u}{t} \right) \]

\[
R_0 := \left( 1 - \frac{4}{p+1} \right) |u|^{p+1}. \]

Observe \( R_0 \geq 0 \). Multiplying (1) by \( (t \partial_t u + x \cdot \nabla u + u) \) one obtains \( \partial_t (t Q_0 + \partial_t u u) - \text{div}(t P_0) + R_0 = 0 \), see [14, Chapter 2.3]. Integrating on \( K_a^b \) (recall the definitions in Section 2), we obtain

\[
b \int_{D(b)} Q_0 \, dx - a \int_{D(a)} Q_0 \, dx + \int_{K_a^b} R_0 \, dx \, dt = \int_{D(b)} \partial_t uu \, dx + \int_{D(a)} uu \, dx + \int_{M_a^b} \left( t Q_0 + \partial_t u u + t P_0 \cdot \frac{x}{|x|} \right) \frac{dx}{\sqrt{2}} \]

\[
= \int_{M_a^b} t \left( \partial_t u + \frac{x}{t} \cdot \nabla u + \frac{u}{t} \right) \frac{dx}{\sqrt{2}}, \tag{19} \]

where in the second equality we used the computations of [2, Section 2] for \( p = 5 \) to rewrite the last addendum on the right-hand side. Indeed, on \( M_a^b \) the integrand \( t Q_0 + \partial_t u + P_0 \cdot \frac{x}{|x|} = t(\partial_t u)^2 + 2\partial_t u x \cdot \nabla u + \partial_t u, u \) is now independent of \( p \). Proceeding as [1], we estimate on \( K_a^b \)

\[
\partial_t u \frac{x}{t} \cdot \nabla u \leq \frac{(\partial_t u)^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{x}{t} \cdot \nabla u \right)^2 \leq \frac{(\partial_t u)^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2. \tag{20} \]

We infer from (19)-(20), the positivity of \( R_0 \) and the conservation of the energy that

\[
\int_{D(b)} \frac{|u|^{p+1}}{p+1} \, dx \leq \frac{a}{b} \int_{D(a)} Q_0 \, dx + \frac{1}{b} \int_{M_a^b} t \left( \partial_t u + \frac{x}{t} \cdot \nabla u + \frac{u}{t} \right) \frac{dx}{\sqrt{2}} \]

\[
\leq \frac{a}{b} \int_{D(a)} \left( \frac{|u|^{p+1}}{p+1} + (\partial_t u)^2 + |\nabla u|^2 \right) \, dx + \frac{1}{b} \int_{M_a^b} t \left( \partial_t u + \frac{x}{t} \cdot \nabla u + \frac{u}{t} \right) \frac{dx}{\sqrt{2}} \]

\[
\leq \frac{a}{b} E + \frac{1}{b} \int_{M_a^b} t \left( \partial_t u + \frac{x}{t} \cdot \nabla u + \frac{u}{t} \right) \frac{dx}{\sqrt{2}}. \]

The last term on the right-hand side we estimate as in [1]: We use (5) to bound

\[
\frac{1}{b} \int_{M_a^b} t \left( \partial_t u + \frac{x}{t} \cdot \nabla u + \frac{u}{t} \right)^2 \frac{dx}{\sqrt{2}} \leq 2(e(b) - e(a)) + 2 \int_{M_a^b} \frac{u^2}{t^2} \frac{dx}{\sqrt{2}}. \]

The main difference with respect to the energy-critical regime is the estimate of the second addendum which now deteriorates with \( b \). Indeed, we estimate by Hölder

\[
\int_{M_a^b} \frac{u^2}{t^2} \frac{dx}{\sqrt{2}} \leq b^{\frac{1}{p+1}} \left( \int_{M_a^b} \frac{|u|^{p+1}}{p+1} \frac{dx}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^{\frac{p+1}{p+1}} \lesssim b^{\frac{1}{p+1}} (e(b) - e(a))^{\frac{p+1}{2}}, \]

Collecting terms, we have obtained (18) for classical solutions \( u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times [a, b]) \).
If $u$ is a weak finite energy solution of (1) as in the statement, we proceed as in [1]: we fix a family of mollifiers $\{\rho_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon > 0}$ in space and define $u_\epsilon := u * \rho_\epsilon$. Then, setting $f_\epsilon = -|u|^{p-1} u_\epsilon + (u|^{p-1} u) * \rho_\epsilon$, $u_\epsilon \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times [a, b])$ is a classical solution of

$$\Box u_\epsilon = |u_\epsilon|^{p-1} u_\epsilon + f_\epsilon. \quad (21)$$

By assumption, $f_\epsilon \in L^1([a, b], L^2)$ can be treated as a source term. We then deduce (18) by proving the analogous local energy inequality for a nonlinear wave equation with right-hand side (21) and pass to the limit $\epsilon \to 0$. We refer to [1, Lemma 2.3] for details. □

Lemma 4.5 can be viewed as decay estimate for the potential energy. Again, when compared to the critical case [19, Corollary 4.10], the supercriticality of the equation weakens the decay by introducing a new dependence on $T_2$, the endpoint of the interval to which the decay estimate is applied, which deteriorates as $T_2 \to +\infty$.

**Proposition 4.6** (Potential energy decay in forward wave cones). Let $I = [T_1, T_2] \subset (0, +\infty)$ and consider a solution $(u, \partial_t u) \in L^\infty(I, H^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1)$ to (1) with $p = 5 + \delta$ for some $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Let $0 < \theta$ such that

$$ET_2^{-\frac{\theta}{p+1}} \theta^{-(p+1)} > 1. \quad (22)$$

Let $A > 0$ be such that

$$A \geq ET_2^{-\frac{\delta}{p+1}} \theta^{-(p+1)} \quad \text{and} \quad A^3 ET_2^{-\frac{\theta}{p+1}} \theta^{-(p+1)} \max\{1, \theta^{-\frac{(n+1)(p-1)}{p}}\} T_1 \leq T_2, \quad (23)$$

then there exists a subinterval of the form $J = [\theta', A\theta']$ such that

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty L^{p+1}(\Gamma_+(J))} \lesssim T_2^{\frac{\theta}{(p-1)(p+1)}}. \quad \theta.$$

Notice that $\theta$ in the previous statement is not dimensional.

**Proof.** Let $\theta > 0$ be as in (22) and fix $A \geq ET_2^{-\frac{\delta}{p+1}} \theta^{-(p+1)}$. Let $N$ be chosen later be such that $A^{2N} T_1 \leq T_2$, namely

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^N [A^{2(n-1)} T_1, A^{2n} T_1] \subseteq I.$$

Since $e$ is non-decreasing in time (see (5)), we have $e(A^{2n} t) - e(A^{2(n-1)} t) \geq 0$ for all $n$ and

$$0 \leq \sum_{n=1}^N e(A^{2n} T_1) - e(A^{2(n-1)} T_1) = e(A^{2N} T_1) - e(T_1) \leq E.$$

Hence there exists $n_0 \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ such that $e(A^{2n_0} T_1) - e(A^{2(n_0-1)} T_1) \leq E N^{-1}$. Splitting the interval $[A^{2(n_0-1)} T_1, A^{2n_0} T_1] = [A^{2(n_0-1)} T_1, A^{2n_0-1} T_1] \cup [A^{2n_0-1} T_1, A^{2n_0} T_1]$ we have, applying Lemma 4.5 with $a := A^{2(n_0-1)} T_1$ and varying $b \in [A^{2n_0-1} T_1, A^{2n_0} T_1]$, that

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty L^{p+1}([\Gamma_+([A^{2n_0-1} T_1, A^{2n_0} T_1])]} \lesssim \frac{1}{A} E + E N^{-1} + (A^{2n_0} T_1)^{\frac{\delta}{p+1}} (E N^{-1})^{\frac{2}{p+1}}$$

$$\lesssim T_2^{\frac{\theta}{p+1}} \theta^{p+1} + E N^{-1} + T_2^{\frac{\theta}{p+1}} (E N^{-1})^{\frac{2}{p+1}}$$

$$\lesssim T_2^{\frac{\theta}{p+1}} \theta^{p+1},$$
provided \((EN^{-1})_{\frac{p}{p+1}} \leq T_2^{\frac{2a}{p-p+1}} \theta^{p+1}\) and \(EN^{-1} \leq T_2^{\frac{4a}{p-p+1}} \theta^{p+1}\), or equivalently,

\[
ET_2^{\frac{4a}{p-p+1}} \theta^{-p} \theta^{-(p+1)} \max\{1, \theta^{-(p+1)}(\frac{p}{p-1})\} \leq N.
\]

For the latter, we have to ask that \([T_1, A^{2N}T_1] \subseteq [T_1, T_2]\), which is enforced by the second requirement in (23).

**Proof of Proposition 4.1.** Fix \(0 < \theta\) yet to be determined such that \(\theta^{p-1} > 1\). Fix \(A \geq ET_2^{\frac{4a}{p-p+1}} \theta^{-(p+1)}\) and assume that (23) holds. By Proposition 4.6, there exists a subinterval \(J\) of the form \(J := [t', A't']\) and \(C' \geq 1\) such that

\[
\|u\|_{L^\infty L^p_\Gamma(J)} \leq C' T_2^{\frac{4a}{p-p+1}} \theta.
\]  

(24)

We claim that if we choose \(\theta\) appropriately, we have \(\|u\|_{L^2(p-1)_\Gamma(J)} \leq \eta\). Indeed, assume by contradiction that \(\|u\|_{L^2(p-1)_\Gamma(J)} \geq \eta\). Then we have from Lemma 4.4

\[
\|u\|_{L^\infty L^p_\Gamma(J)} \geq C_1 \eta \frac{12(p-1)}{5(p-1)} (M \frac{2a}{E})^{-\frac{a}{5(p-1)}} M^{-\frac{2a}{2(p-1)}} T_2^{\frac{4a}{2(p-1)}},
\]

Choosing \(\theta\) to be

\[
\theta := \frac{C_1}{2C'} \eta \frac{12(p-1)}{5(p-1)} (M \frac{2a}{E})^{-\frac{a}{5(p-1)}} M^{-\frac{2a}{2(p-1)}} T_2^{\frac{4a}{2(p-1)}},
\]

we reach a contradiction with (24). Let us now verify the hypothesis on \(\theta\): We observe that

\[
ET_2^{\frac{4a}{p-p+1}} \theta^{-(p+1)} = (C_1(2C')^{-1})^{-1} \theta^{-(p+1)} \eta^{-\frac{6(p-1)}{5}} (EM \frac{2a}{E})^{\frac{7}{10}},
\]

such that hypothesis (22) is enforced, if

\[
0 < \eta < (C_1^{-1} 2C') \frac{5(p-1)}{12(p-1)} (EM \frac{2a}{E})^{\frac{7}{10}}.
\]

This explains the hypothesis (12) and (13) with the choice \(C_2 := (C_1^{-1} 2C') \frac{5(p-1)}{12(p-1)}\). We also rewrite the largeness hypothesis on \(I\), namely the second formula in (23), in terms of \(\eta\)

\[
\theta^{-(p+1)(p-1)/2} = (C_1(2C')^{-1})^{-1} \eta^{-\frac{6(p-1)}{5}} (EM \frac{2a}{E})^{\frac{7}{10}} M^{-\frac{2a}{2(p-1)}} T_2^{\frac{4a}{2(p-1)}},
\]

so that

\[
\max\{1, \theta^{-(p+1)(p-1)/2}\} = (C_2 \eta^{-1})^{-\frac{9(p-1)}{8}} (EM \frac{2a}{E})^{\frac{4}{10}} \eta^{-\frac{6(p-1)}{5}} (EM \frac{2a}{E})^{\frac{7}{10}} M^{-\frac{2a}{2(p-1)}} T_2^{\frac{4a}{2(p-1)}}.
\]

This shows that (14) implies the second inequality in (23).
5. Asymptotic stability

Let $u : \mathbb{R}^3 \times I \to \mathbb{R}$ solve an inhomogeneous wave equation $\Box u = F$. We now introduce the free evolution $u_{t_0}$ from time $t_0$, that is the unique solution of the free wave equation $\Box u_{t_0} = 0$ which agrees with $u$ at time $t_0$, that is $(u, \partial_t u)(t_0) = (u, \partial_t u)(t_0)$. We recall that, from solving the linear wave equation in Fourier space, we have the representation formula

$$u_{t_0}(t) = \cos(t\sqrt{-\Delta})u(t_0) + \frac{\sin(t\sqrt{-\Delta})}{\sqrt{-\Delta}}\partial_t u(t_0),$$

where we use Fourier multiplier notation (see for instance [15]). From this representation as well as the Strichartz estimates (7), it follows that for any $m \in [1, \frac{3}{2}]$ and any $(p, q)$ satisfying (6) we have the estimate

$$\|(u_{t_0}, \partial_t u_{t_0})\|_{L^{\infty}(I, \dot{H}^m \times \dot{H}^{m-1})} + \|u_{t_0}\|_{L^2(I, \dot{H}^{p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I))} \lesssim \|(u, \partial_t u)(t_0)\|_{\dot{H}^m \times \dot{H}^{m-1}}. \quad (25)$$

From Duhamel’s principle it follows that we can write for $t \in I$

$$u(t) = u_{t_0}(t) + \int_{t_0}^t \frac{\sin((t-t')\sqrt{-\Delta})}{\sqrt{-\Delta}}F(t') dt'.$$

(26)

We recall from [14, Chapter 4] that for $t \neq t'$ we have the explicit expression

$$\frac{\sin((t-t')\sqrt{-\Delta})}{\sqrt{-\Delta}}F(t') = \frac{1}{4\pi(t-t')} \int_{|x-x'|=|t-t'|} F(t', x') d\mathcal{H}^2(x').$$

We recall that the linear evolution enjoys asymptotic stability in the following sense.

**Lemma 5.1** (Asymptotic stability for the linear evolution). Let $p = 5 + \delta$ with $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Let $u$ a solution to (1) on $\mathbb{R}^3 \times I'$ with $\|u\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I')} \leq M$. Then for any $I = [t_1, t_2] \subseteq I'$ and any $t \in I' \setminus I$ we have that

$$\|u_{t_1, t_2}(t) - u_{t_1, t}(t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim (EM^{\frac{\delta}{2}})^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} \text{dist}(t, I)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}.$$

**Proof.** From (5) we deduce that

$$\partial_t c(t) \gtrsim \int_{|x|=t} \frac{|u(y, t)|^{p+1}}{p+1} d\mathcal{H}^2(y).$$

Integrating in time, by translation invariance and time reversibility, we have

$$\int_{I} \int_{|x'-x|=|t-t'|} |u(x', t')|^{p+1} d\mathcal{H}^2(x') dt' \lesssim E$$

for any $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times I'$. Using (26), we write for $t \in I' \setminus I$

$$u_{t_1, t_2}(t) - u_{t_1, t}(t) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{|x'-x|=|t-t'|} |u(x', t')|^p d\mathcal{H}^2(x') dt'.$$
We apply Hölder with \( \frac{3(p-1)}{2p}, \frac{3(p-1)}{p-3} = \left( \frac{p+1+\frac{2}{p}}{1+\frac{4}{p}} \right) \) to estimate for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \)

\[
|u_{t,t_2}(x,t) - u_{t,t_1}(x,t)| \lesssim \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \left( \int_{|x-x'|=|t-t'|} |u(x',t')|^p \, dH^2(x') \, dt' \right)^{\frac{2p}{3(p-1)}} \left( \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{dt'}{|t-t'|^{\frac{3(p-1)}{p-3}-2}} \right)^{\frac{p-3}{3(p-1)}}
\]

\[
\lesssim \left( \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{|x-x'|=|t-t'|} |u|^p + v \right) \, dH^2(x') \, dt' \left( \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{dt'}{|t-t'|^{\frac{3(p-1)}{p-3}-2}} \right)^{\frac{p-3}{3(p-1)}}
\]

\[
\lesssim \left( \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{|x-x'|=|t-t'|} |u|^{p+1} \, dH^2(x') \, dt' \right)^{\frac{2p}{3(p-1)}} \left( \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{dt'}{|t-t'|^{\frac{3(p-1)}{p-3}-2}} \right)^{\frac{p-3}{3(p-1)}}
\]

\[
\lesssim (M \delta E)^{\frac{2p}{3(p-1)}} \text{dist}(t, I)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}.
\]

The importance of the above asymptotic stability lies in the following corollary.

**Corollary 5.2.** Let \( p = 5 + \delta \) with \( \delta \in (0, 1) \) and \( I = [t_-, t_+] \). Consider a solution \( (u, \partial_t u) \in L^\infty(I, \dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times \dot{H}^1) \) to (1) and assume that \( \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I)} \leq M \). Consider \( I_1 = [t_1, t_2] \) and \( I_2 = [t_2, t_3] \) for any \( t_- \leq t_1 < t_2 < t_3 \leq t_+ \). Then

\[
\|u_{t,t_3} - u_{t,t_+}\|_{L^{2(p-1)}(\Gamma_+(I_1))} \lesssim \frac{1}{|I_1|^{\frac{1}{3(p-1)}}} \left( EM \delta \right)^{\frac{2p}{3(p-1)}} \|u\|_{L^{\infty}(I, (\dot{H}^p \times \dot{H}^{p-1}))}^\frac{1}{3}.
\]

**Proof.** We observe that the pair \((\infty, \frac{2}{3}(p-1))\) is wave-admissible, where we recall that \( s_p := 1 + \frac{\delta}{2(p-1)} \) is the critical Sobolev regularity of (1). We estimate by Hölder

\[
\|u_{t,t_3} - u_{t,t_+}\|_{L^{2(p-1)}(\Gamma_+(I_1))} \lesssim \frac{1}{|I_1|^{\frac{1}{3(p-1)}}} \|u_{t,t_2} - u_{t,t_3}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I_1)} \|u_{t,t_3} - u_{t,t_+}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I_1)}^{\frac{1}{3}}.
\]

Observe that \( v := u_{t,t_3} - u_{t,t_+} \) solves \( \Box v = 0 \) with \( v(t_3) = u(t_3) - u_{t,t_+}(t_3) \). Hence by the Strichartz estimates (7) and (25) we have

\[
\|v\|_{L^\infty L^{\frac{4}{3}(p-1)}(\Gamma_+(I_1))} \lesssim \|(v, \partial_t v)(t_3)\|_{\dot{H}^p \times \dot{H}^{p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}
\]

\[
\lesssim \|(u, \partial_t u)(t_3)\|_{\dot{H}^p \times \dot{H}^{p-1}} + \|(u_{t,t_+}, \partial_t u_{t,t_+})(t_3)\|_{\dot{H}^p \times \dot{H}^{p-1}}
\]

\[
\lesssim \|(u, \partial_t u)(t_3)\|_{\dot{H}^p \times \dot{H}^{p-1}} + \|(u, \partial_t u)(t_+)\|_{\dot{H}^p \times \dot{H}^{p-1}}
\]

\[
\lesssim \|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L^{\infty}(I, (\dot{H}^p \times \dot{H}^{p-1}))}.
\]

\[\square\]

### 6. A reverse Sobolev inequality and mass concentration

The section is devoted to prove that, if \( u \) solves (1), then there exists a suitable ball with controlled size which contains an amount of \( L^2 \) norm, quantified in terms of \( \|u\|_{L^2(p-1)} \) and \( \|u\|_{H^p} \). A key ingredient in the proof is the reverse Sobolev inequality of Tao, generalized for any \( s \in (0, \frac{4}{3}) \). We present the proof for completeness, since the original argument used the fact that \( p \) was integer.
Proposition 6.1. Let $0 < s < \frac{3}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{q} := \frac{1}{s} - \frac{3}{4}$. Let $f \in \dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Then there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $0 < r \leq \frac{3}{2s}$ such that

$$\left(\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{B(x,r)} |f|^2(y) \, dy\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \|P_{\geq N} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \|f\|_{\dot{H}^s}^{1 - \left(\frac{3}{2s}\right)^2}. \tag{27}$$

Proof. By replacing $f$ with $\tilde{f}(x) := \frac{1}{\|f\|_{\dot{H}^s}} f(x)$ we can assume w.l.o.g. that $\|f\|_{\dot{H}^s} = 1$.

**Step 1:** Let $g \in \dot{H}^s$ with $\|g\|_{\dot{H}^s} \leq 1$. Then there exists $N \in 2^\mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\|g\|_{L^q} \lesssim \|P_N g\|_{L^q}, \tag{28}$$

and as a consequence

$$\|g\|_{L^q}^{\frac{2}{q}} \lesssim \|P_N g\|_{L^q}. \tag{29}$$

From (10), Plancherel’s theorem and the hypothesis $\|g\|_{\dot{H}^s} \leq 1$, we infer that

$$\sum_{N \in 2^\mathbb{Z}} N^{2s} \|P_N g\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim 1. \tag{30}$$

By interpolation, (30) and the definition of $q$ we see that (29) is a consequence of (28); indeed

$$\|P_N g\|_{L^q} \leq \|P_N g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2}{q}} \|P_N g\|_{L^{\infty}}^{\frac{d}{q}} = N^{-\frac{2d}{q}} \left(\int |P_N g(x)|^q \, dx\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \|P_N g\|_{L^{\infty}} \lesssim N^{-\frac{2d}{q}} \|P_N g\|_{L^\infty}. \tag{31}$$

We are left to prove (28). Let us fix $M \in \mathbb{N}$ big enough such that $\frac{3}{2} \in (M - 1, M]$. With this choice of $M$, we ensure the subadditivity of the map $x \mapsto x^{\frac{2d}{q}}$. We then write using the hypothesis, (10), the aforementioned subadditivity, a reordering and Hölder

$$\|g\|_{L^q}^{q} \lesssim \left(\sum_{M \in 2^\mathbb{Z}} |P_M g(x)|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} dx = \int \prod_{i=1}^{M} \left(\sum_{N_i \in 2^\mathbb{Z}} |P_{N_i} g(x)|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} dx$$

$$\leq \prod_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{N_i \in 2^\mathbb{Z}} |P_{N_i} g(x)| \lesssim \sum_{N_1 \leq \cdots \leq N_M} \int \prod_{i=1}^{M} |P_{N_i} g(x)|^{\frac{q}{q}} dx$$

$$\lesssim \left(\sup_{N \in 2^\mathbb{Z}} \|P_N g\|_{L^q}\right)^{q(M-2)} M \sum_{N_1 \leq \cdots \leq N_M} \left(\int |P_{N_1} g(x)|^{q} \, dx\right)^{\frac{q}{q}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

In all sums on $N_1 \leq \cdots \leq N_M$, we intend that each $N_i$ belongs to $2^\mathbb{Z}$. We claim that the second factor is bounded by a constant. Indeed, we estimate the last integral for fixed $N_1$ and $N_M$ using Hölder by

$$\left(\int |P_{N_1} g(x)|^{q} |P_{N_M} g(x)|^{q} \, dx\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \left(\|P_{N_1} g\|_{L^q}^{M} \int |P_{N_1} g(x)|^{\frac{q-M}{2}} \, dx\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \|P_{N_1} g\|_{L^q} \|P_{N_1} g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{q-M}{2}} \|P_{N_M} g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{q-M}{2}} \|P_{N_M} g\|_{L^2}.$$

By Bernstein’s inequality (9) and the definition of $q$, we have that

$$\|P_{N_1} g\|_{L^q} \|P_{N_M} g\|_{L^2} \lesssim N_1^{\frac{q-M}{2}} \|P_{N_1} g\|_{L^2} \|P_{N_M} g\|_{L^2} = N_1^{\frac{q-M}{2}} \|P_{N_1} g\|_{L^2} \|P_{N_M} g\|_{L^2}.$$
Combining the three estimates, we deduce that
\[
\|g\|_{L^q}^q \lesssim \left( \sup_{N \in 2^\mathbb{Z}} \|P_N g\|_{L^s} \right)^{q-2} \sum_{N_1 \leq \cdots \leq N_M} \|P_{N_1} g\|_{L^\infty} \|P_{N_M} g\|_{L^2} \\
\lesssim \left( \sup_{N \in 2^\mathbb{Z}} \|P_N g\|_{L^s} \right)^{q-2} \sum_{N_1 \leq \cdots \leq N_M} N_1^{3-s} N_M^{s-\frac{3}{2}} \left( N_1^{2s} \|P_{N_1} g\|_{L^2} + N_M^{2s} \|P_{N_M} g\|_{L^2} \right). \tag{31}
\]

Let us consider the first addendum on the right-hand side (the second is handled analogously):
\[
\sum_{N_1 \leq \cdots \leq N_M} N_1^{3-s} N_M^{s-\frac{3}{2}} \|P_{N_1} g\|_{L^2} \leq \sum_{n_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{2n_1 s} \|P_{2^{n_1}} g\|_{L^2} \sum_{n_M = n_1}^{\infty} (n_M - n_1)^{M-2-\frac{3}{2} + (\frac{3}{2}-s)(n_M-n_1)} \\
\lesssim \sum_{n_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{2n_1 s} \|P_{2^{n_1}} g\|_{L^2} \lesssim 1,
\]
where we used that for fixed $s \in (0, \frac{3}{2})$ the series $\|P_{2^{n_1}} g\|_{L^2} \sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} n^{M-2-\frac{3}{2} + (\frac{3}{2}-s)n}$ converges for every $M \in \mathbb{N}$ as well as (30). We conclude from (31) that $\|g\|_{L^q}^q = \|g\|_{L^q} \lesssim \sup_{N \in 2^\mathbb{Z}} \|P_N g\|_{L^q}$, which implies (28).

**Step 2:** Let $\tilde{N}, N \in 2^\mathbb{Z}$ and define $\psi_N := \tilde{N}^3 \psi(\tilde{N} x)$ where $\psi$ is a bump function supported in $B_1(0)$ whose Fourier transform has magnitude $\sim 1$ on $B_{100}(0)$. Then we can rewrite
\[
P_{\tilde{N}} P_{\geq N} f = \tilde{P}_N \langle f \ast \psi_N \rangle,
\]
where $\tilde{P}_N$ is a Fourier multiplier which is bounded on $L^\infty$.

The claimed identity of Fourier multipliers follows by setting $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{P}_N)(\xi) := \Psi(\xi/\tilde{N})$, where
\[
\Psi(\xi) := (\varphi(\xi) - \varphi(2 \xi))(1 - \varphi(\xi N/N)) \varphi(\xi)^{-1}.
\]
To verify that $\tilde{P}_N$ is bounded on $L^\infty$, for $g \in L^\infty$ we estimate by Young and a change of variables
\[
\|\tilde{P}_N g\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\Psi(\xi/\tilde{N}))(\xi)\|_{L^1} \|g\|_{L^\infty} = \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\Psi)\|_{L^1} \|g\|_{L^\infty}.
\]
Observe that $\Psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, so that $\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\Psi)\|_{L^1} < +\infty$.

**Step 3:** Conclusion of the proof.

We apply Step 1 to $g = P_{\geq N} f$ to deduce that there exist $\tilde{N} \in 2^\mathbb{Z}$ such that
\[
\|P_{\geq N} f\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|P_N P_{\geq N} f\|_{L^\infty}.
\]
We observe that $\tilde{N} \geq \frac{N}{2}$ because otherwise $P_{\tilde{N}} P_{\geq N} f = 0$. By Step 2, we deduce that there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that
\[
\|P_{\geq N} f\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|\psi_N \ast f(x)\| \leq \tilde{N}^\frac{3}{2} \left( \int_{B(x,1/\tilde{N})} f^2(y) \, dy \right)^\frac{1}{2} \|\psi\|_{L^2}.
\]
Combining the two inequalities, we obtain the claimed inequality (27) with $r := \frac{1}{\tilde{N}} \in (0, \frac{3}{2})$. \hfill \Box

The proposition above will be applied with $s = s_p$; the choice of $s \neq 1$ is in turn fundamental in the main theorem, since it allows to give an upper bound on the $r_0$ given by the mass concentration only in terms of $E, M, \|u\|_{L^\infty} H^{s_p}$. 
Lemma 6.2 (Mass concentration). Let $p = 5 + \delta$ for $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and let $0 < \eta \leq 1$. Assume $\|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I)} \geq \eta$ and $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I)} \leq M$. Then, for any $1 \leq s \leq s_p := 1 + \frac{\delta}{2(p-1)}$ there exists $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times I$ and $r > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{r^{2s}} \int_{B(x,r)} u^2(y, t) \, dy \gtrsim \|u\|_{L^\infty(I, H^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3))}^{-\alpha_0} M^{-s p - \gamma} \eta^{-\alpha_2},$$

(32)

where $\alpha_i = \alpha_i(s) \geq 0$ are defined as $\alpha_0 := (p - 2) \frac{s - 1}{s - 1}$, $\alpha_1 := \frac{3}{10} \gamma (3 - 2s) + \frac{7 - 2p - s}{2sp - 1}$ and $\alpha_2 := \frac{3 - 2s - 2(p - 1)\gamma}{s}$. Moreover,

$$|I| \gtrsim \eta^{2(p-1)} \|u\|^{-\alpha_0}_{L^\infty(I, H^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3))} \left(EM^4\right)^{-\alpha_1} M^{-\frac{(p-1)}{4}},$$

(33)

where $\alpha_1(s) \geq 0$ are defined as $\alpha'_0 := 2(p-1) - \frac{(s-1)(p-1)p+1}{s}$ and $\alpha'_1 := \frac{(s-1)(p-1)}{\delta}$.

Proof. Fix $1 \leq s \leq s_p = 1 + \frac{\delta}{2(p-1)}$ and set $\frac{1}{q} : = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{s}$, the conjugate Sobolev exponent. By shrinking $I$, we can always assume that $\|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I)} = \eta$. Recalling the proof of Lemma 4.4, we have that for any $(q, r)$ wave-1-admissible

$$\|u\|_{L^{q,r}} \lesssim E^{\frac{1}{2}} .$$

(34)

Step 1: We find a frequency scale $N \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ where $\|P_{\leq N} u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I)} \gtrsim \eta$.

By Hölder and Bernstein (9) with exponents $2(p-1)$ and $\frac{6(p-1)}{s+3} \in [6, q^*]$ we estimate

$$\|P_{\leq N} u\|_{L^2(p-1)} \lesssim |I| \eta^{2(p-1)} \|P_{\leq N} u\|_{L^\infty L^2(p-1)} \lesssim |I| \eta^{2(p-1)} N \|u\|_{L^\infty L^{2(p-1)}} .$$

We observe that by interpolation and the Sobolev embedding of $H^{s_p} \hookrightarrow L^\frac{3(p-1)}{2}$ that

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty L^\frac{6(p-1)}{s+3}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty H^{s_p}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty H^\frac{s+3}{2}} \left(EM^4\right)^{-\frac{s}{2}} M^{-\frac{(s-1)}{4}} .$$

Thus if we choose the frequency scale $N \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$|I| \eta^{2(p-1)} N \|u\|_{L^\infty H^{s_p}} \lesssim \left(EM^4\right)^{-\frac{s}{2}} M^{-\frac{(s-1)}{4}} = c \eta$$

(35)

for a universal small constant $0 < c << 1$, we can ensure that $\|P_{\geq N} u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I)} \gtrsim \eta$.

Step 2: We deduce a lower bound of $\|P_{\geq N} u\|_{L^\infty(I, L^q(\mathbb{R}^3))}$ in terms of $\eta, E, M$.

Observe that the pair $(3, 18)$ is wave-1-admissible and that $(3, 18)$ and $(\infty, q)$ interpolate to $\left(\frac{5}{6}q + 3, \frac{5}{6}q + 3\right)$. Using (34) and (35), we have by Hölder

$$\eta^{2(p-1)} \gtrsim \|P_{\geq N} u\|_{L^2(p-1)} \lesssim \|P_{\geq N} u\|_{L^{\infty L^2}}^{2(p-1)} \left(\frac{2(q+3)}{5}\right) \|P_{\geq N} u\|_{L^{\infty L^q}}^{\frac{5}{6}q+3} \|P_{\geq N} u\|_{L^{\infty L^q}}^{\frac{5}{6}q+3} \|P_{\geq N} u\|_{L^{\infty L^q}}^{\frac{5}{6}q+3} .$$
hence after some easy algebraic manipulations
\[ \| P_{\geq N} u \|_{L^\infty L^s} \gtrsim \eta^{\frac{2}{3} (p-1) (M^{\frac{d}{2}} E)^{\frac{2}{3} (3-2s) M^{\frac{1}{2}} (s_p-s) (p-1)}}. \]

**Step 3:** We apply the reverse Sobolev of Proposition 6.1 to conclude that there exists \((x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times I\) and \(0 < r \leq \frac{2}{3}\) such that
\[ \frac{1}{r^{2s}} \int_{B(x, r)} u^2(y, t) \, dy \gtrsim \| u \|_{L^\infty (I, H^s(\mathbb{R}^3))}^{2-\gamma} \left( \eta^{\frac{3}{5} (p-1) (M^{\frac{d}{2}} E)^{\frac{3}{5} (3-2s) M^{\frac{1}{2}} (s_p-s) (p-1)}} \right)^\gamma, \] (36)
where \(\gamma := \frac{9}{2s}\). Moreover from (35) we get
\[ |I| = \frac{(c_2)^{2(p-1)} M^{(s-1)(p-1)} N^{(s-1)(p-1)}}{\| u \|_{L^\infty H^{s+p}}^{2(p-1)}} \gtrsim \eta^{2(p-1)} M^{(s-1)(p-1)} N^{s} \| u \|_{L^\infty H^{s+p}}^{2(p-1)} \frac{(EM^2)^{2(p-1)}}{(EM^2)^{s-1}} r^s. \]

We now rewrite (36): By interpolation and energy conservation,
\[ \| u \|_{L^\infty H^s} \leq E \frac{\| u \|_{L^\infty H^s}^{2(s-1)(p-1)}}{r^{2(s-1)(p-1)}}. \]

Observe that \(\gamma \geq 2\) for \(s \in (0, \frac{3}{2})\). Thus we have that
\[ \| u \|_{L^\infty H^s}^{2-\gamma} \gtrsim \left( M^{\frac{d}{2}} E \right)^{(s_p-s)(p-1)(2-\gamma)} \| u \|_{L^\infty H^{s+p}}^{2(s-1)(p-1)(2-\gamma)} M^{(s-1)(p-1)(\gamma-2)} \frac{1}{r^s} \],
so that
\[ \frac{1}{r^{2s}} \int_{B(x, r)} u^2(y, t) \, dy \gtrsim \| u \|_{L^\infty H^{s+p}}^{-(\gamma-2) \frac{2(s-1)}{p-1}} \left( M^{\frac{d}{2}} E \right)^{-\frac{1}{2} \gamma (3-2s) + \frac{3}{5} \gamma (p-1)(s_p-s)} M^{-(s_p-s) (p-1)} \eta^{\frac{4}{2s} 2(p-1) \gamma}. \]

\[ \square \]

**Remark 6.3** (Optimization of exponents on \(\eta, \| u \|_{L^\infty H^{s+p}}\) and \(EM^{\frac{d}{2}}\)). Whilst the free powers of \(M\) in (32) and (33) are fixed by scaling, the other powers come from interpolation and can be optimized. Since we are not aiming at an optimal double exponential bound, we can take in Step 2 of the proof of Lemma 6.2 any Strichartz-1-admissible \((q', r')\) (here: (3, 18)) such that \((\infty, q)\) and \((q', r')\) interpolate to \((\tilde{r}, \tilde{r})\) with \(\tilde{r} \leq 2(p-1)\). Alternatively, to optimize the exponents \(\alpha_1\) and \(\alpha_2\), we first suppose that the endpoint \((2, \infty)\) was Strichartz-1-admissible, interpolate in Step 2 between \((2, \infty)\) and \((\infty, q)\) and conclude in Step 3 as before. We then approximate \((2, \infty)\) by wave-1-admissible pairs \((2 + \epsilon, \frac{6(2 + \epsilon)}{\tilde{r}})\). Letting \(\epsilon \to 0\), we can reach in this way \(\alpha_1(s) = \frac{4-2s}{6} (\gamma +) + \frac{2-2s}{2} \frac{s_p-s}{s_p-1}\) and \(\alpha_2(s) = \frac{2-2s}{3} (p-1) + \).

In the very same way, the free exponents in Lemma 4.4 can be optimized. Proceeding in this way, we would obtain the lower bound:
\[ \| u \|_{L^\infty L^{p+1}}^{p+1} \gtrsim \eta^{2(p-1) + (EM^{\frac{d}{2}})^{-1} (p-1) + M^{-\frac{d}{2}}}. \]
7. Proof of Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.3

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let \( p = 5 + \delta \) with \( \delta \in (0,1) \), \( J = [t_-, t_+] \) and consider a solution \( (u, \partial_t u) \in L^\infty(J, ((H^1 \cap \dot{H}^2) \times H^1)(\mathbb{R}^3)) \) to (1) as in the statement. If either \( EM^{\frac{5}{2}} < c_0 \) or \( L < c_0 \), then we conclude by Lemma 3.1 that \( \| u \|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times J)} \leq 1 \). For the rest of the argument, we thus may assume the lower bound

\[
\min \{ EM^{\frac{5}{2}}, L \} \geq c_0,
\]

where \( c_0 > 0 \) is the universal constant given by Lemma 3.1. Let \( C > 2c_0^{-2} \) be a universal constant that will be fixed at the end of the proof. The inequality imposed on \( C \) guarantees that \( CLEM^{5/2} > 2 \).

Moreover, we may assume w.l.o.g. that \( \| u \|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times J)} \geq 1 \). We then split \( J \) into subintervals \( J_1, \ldots, J_l \) such that

- \( \| u \|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times J_i)} = 1 \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, l - 1 \),
- \( \| u \|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times J_l)} \leq 1 \).

We call \( J_i \) exceptional if

\[
\| u_{t \to} \|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times J_i)} + \| u_{t \to} \|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times J_i)} \geq B_{exc}^{-1},
\]

for some \( B_{exc} \geq 1 \) yet to be defined. We have by Strichartz estimates (7) that

\[
\| u_{t \to} \|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times J_i)} \leq L.
\]

In particular, \( J \) cannot consist of too many exceptional intervals. More precisely, calling the number of exceptional intervals \( N_{exc} := |\{ i \in \{1, \ldots, l \} : J_i \text{ exceptional} \}| \), we have the bound

\[
N_{exc} \lesssim LB_{exc}.
\]

Between two exceptional intervals there can lie a chain \( K = J_{i_0} \cup \cdots \cup J_{i_1} \) of unexceptional intervals. However, since a chain \( K \) of unexceptional intervals has to be confined between two exceptional intervals (or one of its endpoints is \( t_- \) or \( t_+ \)), the number of chains of unexceptional intervals \( N_{chain} \) is comparable to \( N_{exc} \), that is

\[
N_{chain} \lesssim N_{exc}.
\]

For a chain \( K = J_{i_0} \cup \cdots \cup J_{i_1} \) of unexceptional intervals, we define \( N(K) := i_1 + 1 - i_0 \) to be the number of intervals it is made of. Summarizing, we have that

\[
\| u \|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times J)} \leq N_{exc} + N_{chain} \sup_K N(K) \lesssim LB_{exc}(1 + \sup_K N(K)).
\]

The proof is thus concluded with the following lemma and with the choice of \( B_{exc} \) in (37) below.

**Lemma 7.1.** There exists a universal constant \( C \geq 1 \) such that the following holds.

Consider a solution \( (u, \partial_t u) \in L^\infty(J, ((H^1 \cap \dot{H}^2) \times H^1)(\mathbb{R}^3)) \) of (1) with \( p = 5 + \delta \), \( \delta \in (0,1) \). Define \( M := \| u \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times J)}, E := E(u) \) and \( L := \| (u, \partial_t u) \|_{L^\infty(J, (H^p \cap \dot{H}^{p-1})(\mathbb{R}^3))} \) on \( J = [t_-, t_+] \) and set

\[
B_{exc} := \left( CLEM^{\frac{5}{2}} L \right)^{C(EM^{\frac{5}{2}} L)^{176}}.
\]
Assume that $B_{\text{exc}}^\frac{2}{s} \leq 2$ and that
\[
\min\{EM^\frac{2}{s}, L\} \geq c_0.\tag{38}
\]
Then for any chain of unexceptional intervals, that is for any $K = J_{i_0} \cup \cdots \cup J_{i_1} \subseteq J$ with
\[
\|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times J)} = 1,
\]
\[
\|u_{t_+}\|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times J)} + \|u_{t_-}\|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times J)} \leq B_{\text{exc}}^{-1}
\]
for all $i \in \{i_0, \ldots, i_1\}$, we have the estimate
\[
N(K) \lesssim B_{\text{exc}}.
\]
Proof of Lemma 7.1. Step 0: Let $\alpha_0, \alpha_0', \alpha_1$ and $\alpha_1'$ be defined through Lemma 6.2 for $s = s_p$, that is with $\gamma := 2 \left(\frac{\alpha}{2s_p}\right)^2 \in [7/2, 9/2]$
\[
\alpha_0 = \gamma - 2 \in \left[\frac{3}{2}, \frac{5}{2}\right], \quad \alpha_1 = \frac{6\gamma}{5(p-1)} \in \left[\frac{3}{4}, \frac{3}{2}\right], \quad \alpha_0' = 5 + \frac{3}{2} \delta \in [5, \frac{13}{2}] \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_1' = \frac{1}{2}. \tag{40}
\]
We prove that there exists $(t_0, x_0, r_0) \in K \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, +\infty)$ such that
\begin{enumerate}[(i)]
  \item mass concentrates in $B(x_0, r_0)$ at time $t_0$, i.e.
  \[
  \frac{1}{r_0^{2s_p}} \int_{B(x_0, r_0)} u^2(y, t_0) \, dy \geq C_6L^{-\alpha_0}(EM^\frac{2}{s})^{-\alpha_1}, \tag{41}
  \]
  \item the length of the $J_i$ is uniformly bounded from below in terms of $r_0$, i.e. for all $i = i_0, \ldots, i_1$
  \[
  |J_i| \geq C_7L^{-\alpha_0}(EM^\frac{2}{s})^{-\alpha_1'} M^\frac{2}{s} r_0^{s_p}. \tag{42}
  \]
\end{enumerate}
From (i), we immediately also deduce the lower bound on the mass concentration radius
\[
r_0 \gtrsim \left(L^{-\alpha_0}(EM^\frac{2}{s})^{-\alpha_1}\right)^{\frac{2s_p-1}{2s_p}} \frac{M^{-\frac{2s_p}{2s_p}}}{\alpha_1}. \tag{43}
\]
By (39), we can apply the mass concentration Lemma 6.2 with $\eta = 1$ and $s = s_p$ to find that for any $i \in \{i_0, \ldots, i_1\}$ there exists $(t_i, x_i, r_i) \in J_i \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, +\infty)$ such that
\[
\frac{1}{r_i^{2s_p}} \int_{B(x_i, r_i)} u^2(y, t_i) \, dy \geq C_6L^{-\alpha_0}(EM^\frac{2}{s})^{-\alpha_1},
\]
\[
|J_i| \geq C_7L^{-\alpha_0}(EM^\frac{2}{s})^{-\alpha_1'} M^\frac{2}{s} r_i^{s_p}. \]
Defining the minimal mass concentration radius $r_0 := \min_{i \in \{i_0, \ldots, i_1\}} r_i$ and calling the associated point in spacetime $(x_0, t_0)$ we reached (i) and (ii). The lower bound on the mass concentration radius (43) is a consequence of the simple observation that the left-hand side of (41) can be bounded from above, up to constants, by $r_0^{3-2s_p} M^2 = r_0^{\frac{1}{s_p}} M^2$. By time and space translation symmetry, we can assume that w.l.o.g. that $x_0 = 0$ and that $t_0 = r_0$ such that $B(x_0, r_0) \times \{t_0\}$ lies in the forward wave cone centered in $(0, 0)$. In view of (ii) it is enough to prove that
\[
|K| \lesssim L^{-\alpha_0}(EM^\frac{2}{s})^{-\alpha_1'} M^\frac{2}{s} B_{\text{exc}} r_0^{s_p}.
\]
Moreover, by time reversal symmetry, it is enough to estimate $K_+ := K \cap [t_0, +\infty)$, i.e. to show
\[
|K_+| \lesssim L^{-\alpha_0}(EM^\frac{2}{s})^{-\alpha_1'} M^\frac{2}{s} B_{\text{exc}} r_0^{s_p}. \tag{44}
\]
Step 1: We find a cylinder $B(x_0,r_0) \times \tilde{J}_0 \subseteq \Gamma_+(K_+)$ in spacetime such that

(i) mass still concentrates in $B(x_0,r_0)$ for any $t \in \tilde{J}_0$, i.e. for $t \in \tilde{J}_0$ it holds

$$\frac{1}{r_0^{2p}} \int_{B(x_0,r_0)} u^2(y,t) \, dy \geq \frac{C_6}{2} L^{-a_0}(M^\frac{\delta}{2}E)^{-\alpha_1},$$  \hspace{1cm} (45)$$

(ii) $\tilde{J}_0$ has controlled length, i.e. $L^{-a_0}(M^\frac{\delta}{2}E)^{-\alpha_1+1} M^\frac{\delta}{2}r_0^{s_p} \lesssim |\tilde{J}_0| \leq M^\frac{\delta}{2}r_0^{s_p}$,

(iii) $\tilde{J}_0$ does not carry too much of the spacetime norm. More precisely,

$$\|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \tilde{J}_0)}^{2(p-1)} \lesssim L^{\alpha_0} - \frac{n-2}{2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (46)$$

The local mass is Lipschitz in time with Lipschitz constant at most $\|\partial_t u\|_{L^\infty(I;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} \lesssim E^\frac{1}{2}$. More precisely, we have that

$$\left| \left( \int_{B(x_0,r_0)} u^2(y,t) \, dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \left( \int_{B(x_0,r_0)} u^2(y,t_0) \, dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right| \lesssim E^\frac{1}{2} |t - t_0|.$$$$

In particular, if $E^\frac{1}{2} |t - t_0| \leq c_1 L^{-a_0}(M^\frac{\delta}{2}E)^{-\alpha_1+1} r_0^{s_p}$ for a universal $0 < c_1 << 1$ yet to be chosen sufficiently small, then we still have the mass concentration on the bubble $B(x_0,r_0) \times \tilde{J}_0$, where

$$\tilde{J}_0 := [0,t_0 + c_1 L^{-a_0}(M^\frac{\delta}{2}E)^{-\alpha_1+1} M^\frac{\delta}{2}r_0^{s_p}].$$$$

More precisely, for any $t \in \tilde{J}_0$ (45) holds. We observe that

$$|\tilde{J}_0| = c_1 M^\frac{\delta}{2} L^{-a_0}(EM^\frac{\delta}{2})^{-\frac{1}{2} (\alpha_1+1)} r_0^{s_p} \leq c_1 c_0^{-\frac{1}{2}(a_0 + \alpha_1+1)} M^\frac{\delta}{2} r_0^{s_p},$$  \hspace{1cm} (47)$$

such that we can choose $c_1 < c_0^{\frac{1}{4}}$ to ensure (ii). Finally, if $K_+ \subseteq \tilde{J}_0$ is a strict subset, then $|K_+| \leq |\tilde{J}_0|$ and (44) holds (for big enough constants in the definition of $B_{exc}$). Thus we can assume that $\tilde{J}_0 \subseteq K_+$ and hence $B(x_0,r_0) \times \tilde{J}_0 \subseteq \Gamma_+(K_+)$. Finally, let us argue that $\tilde{J}_0$ cannot be covered by too many unexceptional intervals and thus cannot carry too much spacetime norm. Indeed, from (42), (47) and (38) we deduce that $\tilde{J}_0$ can be covered by at most

$$\frac{c_1 L^{-a_0}(EM^\frac{\delta}{2})^{-\frac{1}{2} (\alpha_1+1)} M^\frac{\delta}{2} r_0^{s_p}}{C_7 L^{-a_0}(EM^\frac{\delta}{2})^{-\alpha_1} M^\frac{\delta}{2} r_0^{s_p}} \lesssim L^{\alpha_0} - \frac{n-2}{2}$$

many intervals of the family $\{J_i\}_{i=0}^1$. Hence by (39) we deduce (46).

Step 2: Let

$$\tilde{\eta} := c_2 (LEM^\frac{\delta}{2})^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} \in (0,c_0^{\frac{1}{4}}),$$  \hspace{1cm} (48)$$

with $c_0^{\frac{1}{4}}$ defined through Remark 4.2 (so that $\tilde{\eta}$ is admissible for the spacetime norm decay on large intervals). For a suitable choice of the universal constant $c_2$, we truncate $\Gamma_+(K_+)$ into wave cones $\{\Gamma_+(J_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ such that

(i) each of them carries substantial spacetime norm $\tilde{\eta}$, i.e. $\|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\Gamma_+(J_i))} = \tilde{\eta}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$ and $\|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\Gamma_+(J_k))} \leq \tilde{\eta}$,

(ii) the first interval is not too long, that is $J_1 \subseteq J_k$.

For an $\tilde{\eta}$ yet to be chosen, we will truncate $\Gamma_+(K_+)$ into wave cones $\{\Gamma_+(J_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ such that

$$\|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\Gamma_+(J_i))} = \tilde{\eta}$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$ and $\|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\Gamma_+(J_k))} \leq \tilde{\eta}$. We come to the choice of $\tilde{\eta}$.
Let us estimate the spacetime norm on the mass concentration cylinder from above
\[
\int_{\tilde{J}_0} \int_{B(x_0, r_0)} u^2(y, t) \, dy \, dt \lesssim \left( \int_{\Gamma_+(\tilde{J}_0)} |u|^{2(p-1)}(y, t) \, dy \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} |\tilde{J}_0|^{\frac{2-2p}{p-1}} r_0^{\frac{2(p-2)}{p-1}}.
\]
and from below, using (45),
\[
\int_{\tilde{J}_0} \int_{B(x_0, r_0)} u^2(y, t) \, dy \, dt \gtrsim |\tilde{J}_0| L^{-\alpha_0}(M^\frac{\delta}{2} E)^{-\alpha_1} r_0^{2p}.
\]
We have obtained, using the definition of \( \tilde{J}_0 \) from Step 1, that
\[
\|u\|_{L^{2(p-1)}(\Gamma_+(\tilde{J}_0))} \gtrsim (L^{-\alpha_0}(EM^\frac{\delta}{2})^{-\alpha_1})^{\frac{2p-2}{4p-2}} (E^{-1} r_0^{\frac{\delta}{p-1}})^{\frac{1}{4p-2}}.
\]
Using (46), we obtain an upper bound on \( r_0 \), that is
\[
r_0^\delta \lesssim \left( L^{\alpha_0} (EM^\frac{\delta}{2})^\alpha \right)^{(2p-1)(p-1)} E^{p-1} \|u\|_{L^{2(p-1)}(\Gamma_+(\tilde{J}_0))}^{4(p-1)^2}
\lesssim \left( L^{\alpha_0} (EM^\frac{\delta}{2})^\alpha \right)^{(2p-1)(p-1)} E^{p-1} (a_0'^{\alpha_0} - \frac{3\alpha}{p} - 2p-2 p(p-1)^2)
= M^{-\frac{\delta(p-1)}{2}} L^{2(p-1)(\alpha_0(p-1) + \alpha_0')} (EM^\frac{\delta}{2})^{(p-1)(\alpha_1(2p-1)+1)}.
\]
On the other hand, using the lower bound on \( r_0 \) given by (43), we can estimate furthermore, recalling (38) and (40), that
\[
\|u\|_{L^{2(p-1)}(\Gamma_+(\tilde{J}_0))} \gtrsim (L^{-\alpha_0}(EM^\frac{\delta}{2})^{-\alpha_1})^{\frac{2p-2}{4p-2}} (E^{-1} r_0^{\frac{\delta}{p-1}})^{\frac{1}{4p-2}}
= L^{-\frac{\alpha_0}{16} (EM^\frac{\delta}{2})^-1 (\frac{\alpha_1}{16} + \frac{1}{4p-2})}
\gtrsim (LEM^\frac{\delta}{2})^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}.
\]
Thus choosing \( \tilde{\eta} := c_2 (LEM^\frac{\delta}{2})^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} \), for a small universal constant \( 0 < c_2 < 1 \), we ensure that \( \tilde{J}_1 \subset \tilde{J}_0 \). Choosing \( c_2 \) even smaller, namely \( c_2 \leq c_0' c_0^3 \), we ensure that \( \tilde{\eta} \in (0, c_0') \), with \( c_0' \) given by Remark 4.2.

*Step 3: We prove the following dichotomy (analogous to [19, Lemma 5.2]).* Let \( j \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\} \). Then, for some universal constants \( C_8 > 8 \) and \( C_9 < 1 \), either
\[
|\tilde{J}_{j+1}| \leq C_8 \tilde{\eta}^{-15} |\tilde{J}_j|
\]
or
\[
|\tilde{J}_j| \geq C_9 \tilde{\eta}^3 M^\frac{\delta}{2} B_{exc} r_0^{sp}.
\]
Consider two subsequent intervals \( \tilde{J}_j = [t_{j-1}, t_j] \) and \( \tilde{J}_{j+1} = [t_j, t_{j+1}] \) for some \( j \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\} \). We have by the localized Strichartz estimates (8) (with \( (\tilde{q}, \tilde{r}) = (2, \frac{6(p-1)}{3p+1}) \) and \( v := u - u_{l,t_{j+1}} \)
solving \( \square v = |u|^{p-1}u \) with initial datum \((v, \partial_t v)(t_{j+1}) = (0,0)\) and Hölder that
\[
\|u - u_{|t_{j+1}}\|_{L^2(q-1)(\Gamma_+(J_j))} \lesssim \|u\|^{p-1\|u\|_{L^\infty L^r(\Gamma_+(J_j)) \cup J_{j+1})})
\lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty L^\infty(\Gamma(K_0(\tilde{J}_j \cup \tilde{J}_{j+1}))}
\lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty L^\infty(\Gamma(K_0(\tilde{J}_j \cup \tilde{J}_{j+1}))}
\lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty L^\infty(\tilde{J}_j \cup \tilde{J}_{j+1})}
\lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty L^\infty(\tilde{J}_j \cup \tilde{J}_{j+1})}
\lesssim \left(EM^2\frac{2}{p-1} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-1}} \eta^{p-1}.
\]
Using (38) and (48), we have that
\[
\tilde{\eta} \eta^2 (EM^2) \frac{2}{p-1} \eta^{p-2} \leq \frac{c_2}{p-1} L^- \eta^{p-2} \eta^{p-2} \leq \left(c_2 c_0^{-1}\right) \frac{4}{p-1} \eta^{p-2} \leq \left(c_2 c_0^{-1}\right) \frac{4}{p-1} \leq \left(c_2 c_0^{-1}\right) \frac{4}{p-1},
\]
where we recall that from the choice of \(c_0\) in Lemma 3.1, it is clear that it beats also the constant arising from Strichartz estimates. We infer \(\|u - u_{|t_{j+1}}\|_{L^2(p-1)(\Gamma_+(J_j))} \leq \tilde{\eta}\). Since \(\|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\Gamma_+(J_j))} = \tilde{\eta}\) by construction, the triangular inequality implies that
\[
\|u_{|t_{j+1}}\|_{L^2(p-1)(\Gamma_+(J_j))} \geq \tilde{\eta}.
\]
This now gives raise to a dichotomy: either \(\|u_{|t_{j+1}} - u_{|t_{j+1}}\|_{L^2(p-1)(\Gamma_+(J_j))} \geq \tilde{\eta}\) or the scattering solution \(u_{|t_{j+1}}\) is non-negligible \(\|u_{|t_{j+1}}\|_{L^2(p-1)(\Gamma_+(J_j))} \geq \tilde{\eta}\).

Case 1: Assume \(\|u_{|t_{j+1}} - u_{|t_{j+1}}\|_{L^2(p-1)(\Gamma_+(J_j))} \geq \tilde{\eta}\). Then in view of Corollary 5.2, we have
\[
|\tilde{J}_{j+1}| \lesssim \eta^{-2(p-1)}(EM^2) \frac{2}{p-1} \eta^{p-2} \eta^{p-2} \lesssim \tilde{\eta}^{-2(p-1)}(EM^2) \frac{2}{p-1} \tilde{\eta}^{-15} \tilde{\eta}^{-15} |\tilde{J}_j|,
\]
where in the second inequality we used (38) and in the last the definition (48).

Case 2: Assume \(\|u_{|t_{j+1}}\|_{L^2(p-1)(\Gamma_+(J_j))} \geq \tilde{\eta}\). Recall that \(K_+\) consists of unexceptional intervals. Hence we need at least \(\tilde{\eta}B_{\text{exc}}\) many of them to cover \(\tilde{J}_j\). Recalling the lower bound on the length of unexceptional intervals, the definition of \(\tilde{\eta}\), (38) and that \(\alpha_0 > \alpha_1\) from (40), we have
\[
|\tilde{J}_j| \geq C_\gamma \frac{\eta}{\eta} (EM^2) \frac{2}{p-1} (\tilde{\eta})^{-\alpha_1} M^{2} B_{\text{exc}} t_0^{\alpha_1}
\geq C_\gamma \frac{\eta}{\eta} (EM^2) \frac{2}{p-1} (\tilde{\eta})^{-\alpha_1} M^{2} B_{\text{exc}} t_0^{\alpha_1}
\geq C_\gamma \eta^{1+\frac{2}{3}} \frac{2}{3} \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} c_0 c_0^{\alpha_1} M^{2} B_{\text{exc}} t_0^{\alpha_1}
\geq C_\gamma \eta^{1+\frac{2}{3}} \frac{2}{3} \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} c_0 c_0^{\alpha_1} M^{2} B_{\text{exc}} t_0^{\alpha_1}
\]
where in the last inequality we introduced a universal constant \(C_\gamma \leq C_\gamma \eta^{1+\frac{2}{3}} \frac{2}{3} \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} c_0 c_0^{\alpha_1} M^{2} B_{\text{exc}} t_0^{\alpha_1}.

Step 4: We show that
\[
|K_+| \leq C_\gamma \eta^{1+\frac{2}{3}} \frac{2}{3} \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} c_0 c_0^{\alpha_1} M^{2} B_{\text{exc}} t_0^{\alpha_1}.
\]
Since \(0 < \tilde{\eta} \leq 1\), this implies in particular that \(|K_+| \leq C_\gamma M^{2} B_{\text{exc}} t_0^{\alpha_1}\) and we achieved (44), thereby concluding the proof.

Let us therefore assume by contradiction that \(|K_+| > C_\gamma \eta^{1+\frac{2}{3}} \frac{2}{3} \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} c_0 c_0^{\alpha_1} M^{2} B_{\text{exc}} t_0^{\alpha_1}\). We call \(\tilde{J}_{j_1}\) the first
interval for which \(|J_1 \cup \cdots \cup J_{j_1}| > C_9 \tilde{\eta}^{14} M^{4} B_{exc} r_0^{sp}\). We observe that up to choosing the constant \(C\) in the definition of \(B_{exc}\) big enough, we may assume that

\[
\tilde{\eta}^{14} B_{exc} > \max \left\{ \frac{2}{C_9}, 1 \right\}.
\]

By the definition of \(j_1\), we then have

(i) \(j_1 \neq 1\). Indeed, by Step 1 and Step 2, \(|\tilde{J}_1| \leq |\tilde{J}_0| \leq M^{\frac{4}{p}} r_0^{sp}\).

(ii) For every \(j \in \{1, \ldots, j_1 - 1\}\) we have \(|\tilde{J}_{j+1}| \leq C_9 \tilde{\eta}^{-15} |\tilde{J}_{j}|\). This follows from Step 3 since the second option in the dichotomy is ruled out.

Let us call \([T_1, T_2] := \tilde{J}_2 \cup \cdots \tilde{J}_{j_1-1}\). We want to apply the spacetime norm decay result of Proposition 4.1 on \(I = [T_1, T_2]\) with \(\eta = \frac{\tilde{\eta}}{4}\). Recall that by choice of \(\tilde{\eta}\) in Step 2, we have that \(\tilde{\eta} \in (0, c_0^2)\) is admissible for the spacetime norm decay. We need thus a lower bound on the length of \(I\). By construction, Step 2 and (ii)

\[
C_9 \tilde{\eta}^{14} M^{4} B_{exc} r_0^{sp} \leq |\tilde{J}_1| + \cdots + |\tilde{J}_{j_1}| \leq M^{\frac{4}{p}} r_0^{sp} + (T_2 - T_1) + C_9 \tilde{\eta}^{-15} (T_2 - T_1),
\]

so that

\[
T_2 - T_1 \geq \frac{1}{2C_9} \tilde{\eta}^{14} M^{4} B_{exc} r_0^{sp}.
\]

On the other hand, we have from Step 2 and the lower bound on \(r_0\) (43)

\[
T_1 \leq r_0 + M^{\frac{4}{p}} r_0^{sp} = M^{\frac{4}{p}} r_0^{sp} (1 + r_0^{-sp} M^{-\delta}) \lesssim M^{\frac{4}{p}} r_0^{sp} \left(1 + (L_0 (EM^{\frac{4}{p}})^{(p-1)})^{\frac{2r}{p}} \right)
\]

\[
\lesssim M^{\frac{4}{p}} r_0^{sp} \tilde{\eta}^{-\frac{2(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1)\delta}{3(p-1)}} \lesssim \tilde{\eta}^{-\frac{1}{4}} M^{\frac{4}{p}} r_0^{sp}.
\]

Summarizing, we have obtained

\[
\frac{T_2}{T_1} \geq \frac{T_2 - T_1}{T_1} \geq C_{10} \tilde{\eta}^{21} B_{exc}.
\]

(51)

We now claim that to reach a contradiction, it is enough to find \(A\) and a constant \(C \geq 1\) such that we can verify the following three requirements:

(R1) \(A\) satisfies the hypothesis (13) of Proposition 4.1, that is \(A > (4C_2 \tilde{\eta}^{-1})^{\frac{12(p-1)}{5}} (EM^{\frac{4}{p}})^{\frac{14}{3}}\).

(R2) The interval \(I\) is sufficiently large to apply Proposition 4.1, i.e. (14) is verified. In view of (51), we can enforce (15) if

\[
B_{exc} = (CEM^{\frac{4}{p}} L)^{C(EM^{\frac{4}{p}} L)^{176}} \geq C_10 \tilde{\eta}^{-21} A^{3(4C_2 \tilde{\eta}^{-1})^{\frac{6(p-1)(p+1)}{5}} (EM^{\frac{4}{p}})^{\frac{9p + 20}{p}} \max \{c_0^{-1} (M^{\frac{4}{p}} f_2)^{\frac{4}{p}} \}}.
\]

(R3) Moreover \(\sqrt{A} > 2C_9 \tilde{\eta}^{-15}\).

Observe that (R3) ensures in particular that \(A > 4\). If (R1)-(R3) hold, we are in the position to conclude the proof following [12]. The difficulty in the supercritical case instead relies in verifying the requirements (R1)-(R3). Indeed, if (R1)-(R3) hold, we infer from Proposition 4.1 that there exists \([t_{1}', A't_{1}'] \subseteq \tilde{J}_2 \cup \cdots \tilde{J}_{j_1-1}\) such that

\[
\|u\|_{L^{2(p-1)}(\Gamma_+([t_{1}', A't_{1}']))} \leq \frac{\tilde{\eta}}{4}.
\]
In particular, $[t'_j, At'_j]$ is covered by at most two consecutive intervals of the family $\{J_j\}_{j=2}^{j-1}$. We claim that then there exists $j \in \{2, \ldots, j_1 - 1\}$ such that

$$|\tilde{J}_j| \geq \frac{\sqrt{A}}{2}|\tilde{j}_{j-1}|. \quad (52)$$

Notice that in view of (R3), the claim contradicts (ii) such that we reached a contradiction. Indeed, assume first, that $[t'_j, At'_j]$ is covered by one interval $\tilde{J}_j$ for some $j \in \{2, \ldots, j_1 - 1\}$. Then, recalling that $A > 4$, we have

$$|\tilde{J}_j| \geq t'_1(A - 1) \geq \frac{A}{2}t'_1 \geq \frac{A}{2}|\tilde{j}_{j-1}| \geq \frac{\sqrt{A}}{2}|\tilde{j}_{j-1}|.$$

Assume now that $[t'_j, At'_j]$ is covered by two intervals $\tilde{J}_j = [a_j, b_j]$ and $\tilde{J}_{j+1} = [a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}]$ for some $j \in \{2, \ldots, j_1 - 2\}$. We consider two cases. First, if $b_j \leq \sqrt{At'_j}$, then $|\tilde{J}_{j+1}| \geq t'_1(A - \sqrt{A})$ and $|\tilde{J}_j| \leq \sqrt{At'_1}$ such that

$$|\tilde{J}_{j+1}| \geq (\sqrt{A} - 1)|\tilde{J}_j| \geq \frac{\sqrt{A}}{2}|\tilde{J}_j|.$$

Second, if $b_j > \sqrt{At'_1}$, then $|\tilde{J}_j| \geq (\sqrt{A} - 1)t'_1$ and $|\tilde{J}_{j-1}| \leq t'_1$ such that

$$|\tilde{J}_j| \geq (\sqrt{A} - 1)|\tilde{J}_{j-1}| \geq \frac{\sqrt{A}}{2}|\tilde{J}_{j-1}|.$$

This proves (52).

To conclude the proof, we are left to verify the requirements (R1)-(R3) by choosing $A$ and $C$. We observe that the right-hand side of (R1) can be bounded from above using (48) and (38) by

$$(4C_2\tilde{\eta}^{-1})^{12(\frac{p-1}{2})} (EM^\frac{p}{2}) \frac{M^4}{\tilde{\eta}} \leq C_{11}\tilde{\eta}^{-14},$$

such that (R1) and (R3) are enforced if we set

$$A := C_{12}\tilde{\eta}^{-30}$$

for $C_{12} := \max\{3C_8, C_{11}\}^2$. We are left to verify (R2). We observe that from (50)

$$T_2 = T_1 + (T_2 - T_1) \lesssim \tilde{\eta}^{-1} M^{\frac{4}{5} r_0^{s_p}} + \tilde{\eta}^{\frac{11}{8}} M^{\frac{4}{5} r_0^{s_p}} B_{exc} r_0^{s_p} \lesssim M^{\frac{4}{5} r_0^{s_p}} B_{exc} r_0^{s_p}. $$

Combining this with the upper bound on $r_0$ in (49) and using (40), we obtain

$$(M^{\frac{4}{8} \bar{b}} T_2)^{\frac{4}{5}} \lesssim (M^{\frac{4}{8} \bar{b}} B_{exc} r_0^{s_p})^{\frac{4}{5}}$$

$\lesssim B_{exc}^{\frac{4}{5}} (r_0^{s_p}(p-1)(\alpha_0(p-1)+\alpha'_0) (EM^\frac{p}{2}) \frac{M^4}{\tilde{\eta}} (p-1)(\alpha_1(2p-1)+1))

$\lesssim B_{exc}^{\frac{4}{5}} (EM^\frac{p}{2} L)^{105}

$\lesssim C_{13}B_{exc}\tilde{\eta}^{-70}.$
We now bound the right-hand side of (R2) from above using again (48) and (38) by
\[
C_{12}^{-1} \tilde{\eta}^{-21} (C_{12} \tilde{\eta}^{-30})^{3}(4C_{2} \tilde{\eta}^{-1})^{42}(EM_{\tilde{\eta}})_{2} \max\{c_{0}^{-1}, (M_{\eta}^{-1} - T_{2})^{-1}\} \\
\leq C_{10}^{-1} \tilde{\eta}^{-21} (C_{12} \tilde{\eta}^{-30})^{3}C_{13}(4C_{2} \tilde{\eta}^{-1})^{42}(c_{2}c_{0}^{-1} \tilde{\eta}^{-1})^{9\eta_{10}^{10} - 70 B_{\text{exc}}^{3}} \\
\leq (C' EM_{\tilde{\eta}} L)^{C' \tilde{\eta}^{-117} B_{\text{exc}}^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\
\leq (C EM_{\tilde{\eta}} L)^{C(EM_{\tilde{\eta}} L)^{176} B_{\text{exc}}^{\frac{3}{2}}},
\]
for a big enough constant $C, C' \geq 1$. We now define $B_{\text{exc}}$ to be
\[
B_{\text{exc}} := (C EM_{\tilde{\eta}} L)^{C(EM_{\tilde{\eta}} L)^{176}}.
\]
for the same constant $C$. With this definition, (R2) is enforced since we assumed $B_{\text{exc}}^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq 2$. \hfill $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 1.3.** Consider a solution $(u, \partial_{t} u) \in L^{\infty}(J, (H^{1} \cap \dot{H}^{2})'(\mathbb{R}^{3}))$ of (1) with $p = 5 + \delta$ for $\delta \in [0, 1)$ and with $\|(u, \partial_{t} u)\|_{L^{\infty}(J, (H^{1} \cap \dot{H}^{2})'(\mathbb{R}^{3}))} \leq M_{0}$. By interpolation, conservation of the energy and the Sobolev embeddings $(H^{1} \cap \dot{H}^{2})(\mathbb{R}^{3}) \hookrightarrow W^{1,6}(\mathbb{R}^{3}) \hookrightarrow L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{3})$, we observe
\[
L := \|(u, \partial_{t} u)\|_{L^{\infty}(J, \dot{H}^{p} \times \dot{H}^{p-1})} \leq E^{1-\frac{\delta}{2(p-1)} M_{0}^{\frac{\delta}{2(p-1)}}},
\]
\[
M := \|u\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{3} \times J)} \leq C_{S} M_{0}.
\]
By Theorem 1.2, if $\min\{EM_{\tilde{\eta}}^{\frac{\delta}{2}}, L \} < c_{0}$, then $\|u\|_{L^{2(p-1)}(\mathbb{R}^{3} \times J)} \leq 1$. Otherwise, we may assume $\min\{EM_{\tilde{\eta}}^{\frac{\delta}{2}}, L \} \geq c_{0}$ and we fix $0 \leq \delta \leq \min\{1, \frac{\ln 2}{\ln M_{0}}\}$. We estimate as above
\[
EM_{\tilde{\eta}} L \leq C_{S}^{\frac{\delta}{2(1+\frac{\delta}{2(p-1)})}} c_{0}^{-\frac{\delta}{2(p-1)} E^{2} M_{0}^{\delta(1-\frac{p+1}{4(p-1)})}} \leq 2 C_{S} c_{0}^{-1} E^{2} =: (C' E)^{2},
\]
for $C' := (2C_{S} c_{0}^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Thus the Corollary follows, if we can meet the smallness requirement of Theorem 1.2 which now reads, setting $\tilde{C} := \sqrt{C C'}$,
\[
\left( (CE)^{2} (C'E)^{352} \right)^{\delta} \leq 2.
\]
The latter holds defining
\[
\delta_{0} := \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\ln 2}{\ln M_{0}}, \frac{\ln 2}{\ln (CE) 2 (C'E)^{352}} \right\}.
\]
Observe that $\delta_{0}$ depends only on $M_{0}$ since $E = E(u_{0}, u_{1})$ depends on the initial data only. \hfill $\square$

8. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

By time reversibility, it is enough to consider forward-in-time solutions. Thanks to classical local-wellposedness and existence theory [15], the proof of Theorem 1.1 consists in establishing an a priori bound on $\|(u, \partial_{t} u)\|_{L^{\infty}([0,T], H^{1} \cap \dot{H}^{2})}$ which is uniform in $T$. 
Lemma 8.1 (Local boundedness). Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $p = 5 + \delta$ and consider a solution $(u, \partial_t u) \in L^\infty(I, \dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1)$ to (1) on $I = [t_0, t_1]$. Then there exists a universal constant $C_I \geq 1$ such that if

$$\|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I)} < C_I^{-1},$$

then

$$\|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L^\infty(I, \dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1)} \leq C_I \|(u, \partial_t u)(t_0)\|_{H^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1}.$$

**Proof.** For $t \in I$, define $Z(t) := \|(u, \partial_t u)(t)\|_{H^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1}$. By Strichartz estimates (7), Hölder and the Sobolev embedding of $\dot{H}^1 \to L^6$ we have

$$Z(t) \leq Z(t_0) + \|u\|_{L^2([t_0, t], L^{3/2})}^{p-1} \|u\|_{L^2([t_0, t], L^3)}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2([t_0, t], L^3)}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2([t_0, t], L^3)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq Z(t_0) + \|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times [t_0, t])}^{p-1} \sup_{t' \in [t_0, t]} Z(t').$$

We set $Y(t) := \sup_{t' \in [t_0, t]} Z(t')$. Observe that $Y$ is non-decreasing, continuous, $Y(t_0) = Z(t_0)$ and

$$Y(t) \leq C \left( Z(t_0) + \|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I)} Y(t) \right)$$

for any $t \in I$. Setting $C_I := 2C$, we have by monotonicity that $Y(t) \leq C_I Z(t_0)$ for all $t \in [t_0, t]$ where $t := \sup\{t \in [t_0, t_1] : Y(t) \leq C_I Z(t_1)\}$. We claim that if $\|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I)} \leq C_I^{-1}$, then $t = t_1$. Assume by contradiction that $t < t_1$. By continuity $\dot{Y}(t) = C_I Z(t_0)$ and by the validity of (54) at $t$, we obtain

$$C_I Z(t_0) = Y(t) \leq C_I Z(t_0) + C \|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I)} Y(t) + 2C Z(t_0) = C_I Z(t_0),$$

which is a contradiction. \qed

We achieve an a priori bound on $(u, \partial_t u)$ in $L^\infty([0, T], \dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1)$, uniform in $T$, by iterating Lemma 8.1 on a partition $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^N$ of $[0, T]$, where the smallness assumption (53)

$$\|u\|_{L^2(p-1)(\mathbb{R}^3 \times I_n)} < C_I^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}$$

is satisfied by construction. Corollary 1.3 is crucial to control $N$, independent on $T$, in terms of a double exponential in $E$ and $\|u, \partial_t u\|_{L^{\infty} \dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1}$. The crucial observation is that in the limit as $\delta \to 0$, $N$ is a double exponential of the energy which in turn is controlled by the initial data only. This will allow to iterate the local bound obtained in Lemma 8.1 on bounded sets of initial data for $\delta$ small enough.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Fix $(u_0, u_1) \in \dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1$. Consider $(u, \partial_t u)$ solution to (1) with $p = 5 + \delta$ for $\delta \in (0, 1)$. We introduce the set

$$\mathcal{F} := \left\{ T \in [0, +\infty) : \|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L^\infty([0, T], \dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1)} \leq M_0 \right\},$$

for some $M_0 = M_0(\|(u_0, u_1)\|_{\dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1})$ yet to be chosen large enough. We claim that $\mathcal{F} = [0, +\infty)$. For $M_0 \geq \|(u_0, u_1)\|_{\dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1}$, it is clear that $0 \in \mathcal{F}$ and by continuity, that $\mathcal{F}$ is a closed set. We show openness. Let $T \in \mathcal{F}$. By continuity, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all $T' \in [0, T + \epsilon)$ we have

$$\|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L^\infty([0, T'], \dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2 \times H^1)} \leq 2M_0.$$
Fix such a $T'$ and let us show that $T' \in \mathcal{F}$. If $\delta \leq \delta_0(2M_0)$, with $\delta_0$ given through Corollary 1.3, then
\[
\|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times [0,T'])} \leq \max \left\{ 1, (CE(2M_0)^{\frac{4}{3}})^{352} \right\}. \tag{55}
\]
We can split $[0,T']$ into subintervals $\{J_i\}_{i=1}^N$ such that
- $\|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times J_i)} = \frac{1}{2} C_i^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N - 1$,
- $\|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times J_N)} \leq \frac{1}{2} C_i^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$,
and we deduce by iterating Lemma 8.1 that
\[
\|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L^\infty([0,T'], H^1 \cap H^2 \times H^1)} \leq C_i^N \|(u_0, u_1)\|_{H^1 \cap H^2 \times H^1}. \tag{56}
\]
Moreover, from (55) we have the upper bound
\[
N \leq 2C_i^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \max \left\{ 1, (CE(2M_0)^{\frac{4}{3}})^{352} \right\}. \tag{57}
\]
We want to show that with an appropriate choice of $M_0 = M_0(||(u_0, u_1)||_{H^1 \cap H^2 \times H^1})$ and of $\delta = \delta(||(u_0, u_1)||_{H^1 \cap H^2 \times H^1})$, we have
\[
N \leq (\ln C_i)^{-1} \ln(M_0/||u_0, u_1||_{H^1 \cap H^2 \times H^1}), \tag{58}
\]
which in view of (56) implies $\|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L^\infty([0,T'], H^1 \cap H^2 \times H^1)} \leq M_0$ concluding the proof. Observe that for $M_0$ fixed, we have that the right-hand side of (57) as $\delta \to 0$ converges, more precisely
\[
\lim_{\delta \to 0} 2C_i^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \max \left\{ 1, (CE(2M_0)^{\frac{4}{3}})^{352} \right\} = 2C_i^{\frac{1}{2}} \max \left\{ 1, (CE)^{CE^{352}} \right\}. \tag{59}
\]
We now choose $M_0$ such that the right-hand side of (58) exceeds (59) by a factor 2, that is we choose $M_0(E, ||u_0, u_1||_{H^1 \cap H^2 \times H^1})$ such that
\[
(\ln C_i)^{-1} \ln(M_0/||u_0, u_1||_{H^1 \cap H^2 \times H^1}) \geq 4C_i^{\frac{1}{2}} \max \left\{ 1, (CE)^{CE^{352}} \right\}
\]
or, equivalently,
\[
M_0 \geq ||(u_0, u_1)||_{H^1 \cap H^2 \times H^1} 4C_i^{\frac{1}{2}} \ln(C_i) \max \left\{ 1, (CE)^{CE^{352}} \right\}. \tag{60}
\]
Finally, by (57) we can choose $\tilde{\delta}_0 = \delta_0(M_0) < \delta_0(2M_0)$ even smaller such that for all $\delta \in (0, \tilde{\delta}_0)$ we have
\[
N \leq 4C_i^{\frac{1}{2}} \max \left\{ 1, (CE)^{CE^{352}} \right\}. \tag{60}
\]
This finishes the proof that $F = [0, +\infty)$ and in particular the solution $(u, \partial_t u)$ cannot blow-up. Recalling the choice of $M_0$, we then obtain (2). As a byproduct of the upper bound (60) on $N$, independent on the size of the interval, we also obtain that
\[
\|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times (0, +\infty))} \leq \frac{1}{2} C_i^{\frac{1}{p-1}} 4C_i^{\frac{1}{2}} \max \left\{ 1, (CE)^{CE^{352}} \right\} \leq 2 \max \left\{ 1, (CE)^{CE^{352}} \right\},
\]
where we used that $C_i \geq 1$. \hfill \square
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