

## PREPRINT

## A nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation on a star graph

Nataliia Goloshchapova

Institute of Mathematics, University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

## Correspondence

Email: nataliia@ime.usp.br

## Present Address

R. do Matão, 1010, São Paulo - SP, 05508-090

## Summary

We study local well-posedness and orbital stability/instability of standing waves for a first order system associated with a nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation on a star graph. The proof of the well-posedness uses a classical fixed point argument and the Hille-Yosida theorem. Stability study relies on the linearization approach and recent results for the NLS equation with the  $\delta$ -interaction on a star graph.

## KEYWORDS:

$\delta$ -interaction, nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation, orbital stability, standing wave, star graph.

## 1 | INTRODUCTION

The study of differential equations on graphs is a rapidly developing area (see [7] and the references therein). It is motivated by various physical applications involving wave propagation in narrow waveguides. Graphs arise as approximations of multi-dimensional narrow waveguides when their thickness parameters converge to zero. A large part of the literature is devoted to linear equations on graphs, with special emphasis on the Schrödinger equation describing the so-called quantum graphs. The models on a star graph  $\Gamma$  constituted by  $N$  half-lines joined at the vertex  $v = 0$  are one of the simplest. Recently a certain amount of research work has been done on the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with the  $\delta$ -interaction (NLS- $\delta$ ) on  $\Gamma$  (see [4, 8, 18], and the references therein):

$$i\partial_t \mathbf{u}(t, x) = H_\alpha \mathbf{u}(t, x) - |\mathbf{u}(t, x)|^{p-1} \mathbf{u}(t, x), \quad (1.1)$$

where  $p > 1$ ,  $\mathbf{u}(t, x) = (u_j(t, x))_{j=1}^N : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$ , and  $H_\alpha$  is the self-adjoint operator on  $L^2(\Gamma)$  defined by

$$(H_\alpha \mathbf{v})(x) = \left( -v_j''(x) \right)_{j=1}^N, \quad x > 0, \quad \mathbf{v} = (v_j)_{j=1}^N, \quad (1.2)$$

$$\text{dom}(H_\alpha) = \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in H^2(\Gamma) : v_1(0) = \dots = v_N(0), \sum_{j=1}^N v_j'(0) = \alpha v_1(0) \right\}.$$

The NLS- $\delta$  equation has been studied in the context of well-posedness, variational properties, existence, and stability of standing waves. In his survey [18] about the NLS on graphs, Noja along with the model (1.1), mentioned (as one of the main examples of PDEs on the star graph) the following nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation with the  $\delta$ -interaction (NKG- $\delta$ ):

$$-\partial_t^2 \mathbf{u}(t, x) = H_\alpha \mathbf{u}(t, x) + m^2 \mathbf{u}(t, x) - |\mathbf{u}(t, x)|^{p-1} \mathbf{u}(t, x). \quad (1.3)$$

On each edge of the graph (i.e. on each half-line) we have

$$-\partial_x^2 u_j(t, x) = -\partial_x^2 u_j(t, x) + m^2 u_j(t, x) - |u_j(t, x)|^{p-1} u_j(t, x), \quad x > 0, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, N\},$$

moreover, the vectors  $\mathbf{u}(t, 0) = (u_j(t, 0))_{j=1}^N$  and  $\mathbf{u}'(t, 0) = (u_j'(t, 0))_{j=1}^N$  satisfy the conditions in (1.2). To our knowledge, the NKG- $\delta$  equation has never been studied in the context of well-posedness and stability of standing waves.

In the present paper we aim to initiate this study. The stability/instability study of standing wave solutions of the NKG equation in homogeneous media (in  $n$  space dimensions) was started by Shatah in [23, 24], and then continued in [14, 19]. We rely on

the recent research [9], where the authors considered the nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation with  $\delta$ -potentials on  $\mathbb{R}$

$$-\partial_t^2 u(t, x) = -\partial_x^2 u(t, x) + m^2 u(t, x) + \gamma \delta(x) u(t, x) + i\alpha \delta(x) \partial_t u(t, x) - |u(t, x)|^{p-1} u(t, x),$$

$\gamma, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\delta(x)$  is Dirac delta function.

We prove local well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for a first order Hamiltonian system associated with (1.3), using classical approach related on the theory of  $C_0$  semigroups (see [10, 20] for the detailed exposition). In particular, it has been shown that certain operator  $A - \beta$  associated with equation (1.3) is dissipative.

The main goal is the study of orbital stability of the standing wave solutions  $\mathbf{u}(t, x) = e^{i\omega t} \boldsymbol{\varphi}(x)$  to (1.3), where the profile  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(x)$  is a real-valued vector function. The profile  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(x)$  satisfies the following stationary equation

$$H_\alpha \boldsymbol{\varphi} + (m^2 - \omega^2) \boldsymbol{\varphi} - |\boldsymbol{\varphi}|^{p-1} \boldsymbol{\varphi} = 0. \quad (1.4)$$

Applying [1, Theorem 4], one gets the description of real-valued vector solutions to (1.4).

**Theorem 1.1.** Let  $[s]$  denote the integer part of  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\alpha \neq 0$ . Then equation (1.4) has  $\left\lfloor \frac{N-1}{2} \right\rfloor + 1$  (up to permutations of the edges of  $\Gamma$ ) real-valued vector solutions  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha = (\tilde{\varphi}_{k,j})_{j=1}^N$ ,  $k \in \left\{ 0, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{N-1}{2} \right\rfloor \right\}$ , which are given by

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{k,j}(x) = \begin{cases} \left[ \frac{(p+1)(m^2 - \omega^2)}{2} \operatorname{sech}^2 \left( \frac{(p-1)\sqrt{m^2 - \omega^2}}{2} x - c_k \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{p-1}}, & j = 1, \dots, k; \\ \left[ \frac{(p+1)(m^2 - \omega^2)}{2} \operatorname{sech}^2 \left( \frac{(p-1)\sqrt{m^2 - \omega^2}}{2} x + c_k \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{p-1}}, & j = k+1, \dots, N, \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

where  $c_k = \tanh^{-1} \left( \frac{\alpha}{(2k-N)\sqrt{m^2 - \omega^2}} \right)$ , and  $m^2 - \omega^2 > \frac{\alpha^2}{(N-2k)^2}$ .

In Theorem 3.17 we provide a sufficient condition on the parameters  $\omega, m, \alpha, k, N$  to get the orbital stability/instability of the standing waves  $e^{i\omega t} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha(x)$ . The orbital stability is studied in the context of a Hamiltonian system associated with the NKG- $\delta$  equation. Its investigation relies on the classical works by Grillakis, Shatah, and Strauss [12, 13] and recent work [25] by Stuart. The proof of stability/instability result essentially uses spectral analysis of certain self-adjoint Schrödinger operators on the star graph. This analysis was elaborated extensively in papers [3, 4] devoted to the stability study of standing waves for the NLS- $\delta$  equation. The principal ingredients of the spectral analysis are the analytic perturbation theory and the extension theory of symmetric operators.

### Notation.

Let  $L$  be a densely defined symmetric operator in some Hilbert space. The deficiency numbers of  $L$  are defined by  $n_\pm(L) := \dim \ker(L^* \mp iI)$ . The number of negative eigenvalues counting multiplicities (*the Morse index*) is denoted by  $n(L)$ .

We regard  $L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$  as a real Hilbert space with the inner product

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)} = \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} u \bar{v} dx,$$

and  $H^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$  as the Sobolev space with the inner product

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_+)} = \langle u, v \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)} + \langle u', v' \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)}.$$

We consider the star graph  $\Gamma$  constituted by  $N$  half-lines  $\mathbb{R}_+$  attached to a common vertex  $v = 0$ . The function  $\mathbf{w}$  acting on  $\Gamma$  is represented by the vector  $(w_j)_{j=1}^N$ , where each scalar function  $w_j$  is defined on  $[0, \infty)$ . For  $\mathbf{w} = (w_j)_{j=1}^N$  on  $\Gamma$ , we will abbreviate

$$\int_{\Gamma} \mathbf{w} dx = \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} w_j dx.$$

On the graph we define the following spaces

$$L^q(\Gamma) = \bigoplus_{j=1}^N L^q(\mathbb{R}_+), \quad 1 \leq q \leq \infty, \quad H^1(\Gamma) = \bigoplus_{j=1}^N H^1(\mathbb{R}_+), \quad H^2(\Gamma) = \bigoplus_{j=1}^N H^2(\mathbb{R}_+).$$

The corresponding  $L^2$ - and  $H^1$ -inner products are defined by

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} = \operatorname{Re} \int_{\Gamma} \mathbf{u} \bar{\mathbf{v}} dx, \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_{H^1(\Gamma)} = \operatorname{Re} \left[ \int_{\Gamma} \mathbf{u} \bar{\mathbf{v}} dx + \int_{\Gamma} \mathbf{u}' \bar{\mathbf{v}}' dx \right].$$

By  $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$  we denote the space

$$\mathcal{E}(\Gamma) = \{ \mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Gamma) : v_1(0) = \dots = v_N(0) \}.$$

The dual space for  $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{E}^*(\Gamma)$ .

Set  $X = \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \times L^2(\Gamma) = \{ (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) : \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{E}(\Gamma), \mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Gamma) \}$  for the real Hilbert space with the inner product

$$\langle (\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1), (\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_2) \rangle_X = \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2 \rangle_{H^1(\Gamma)} + \langle \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2 \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}.$$

Its dual  $X^*$  is identified with  $\mathcal{E}^*(\Gamma) \times L^2(\Gamma)$ , and the duality pairing is denoted by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{X^* \times X}$ . For  $k \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$  we define the spaces

$$\begin{aligned} L_k^2(\Gamma) &= \{ \mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Gamma) : v_1(x) = \dots = v_k(x), v_{k+1}(x) = \dots = v_N(x), x \geq 0 \}, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) &= \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \cap L_k^2(\Gamma), \quad X_k = \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) \times L_k^2(\Gamma). \end{aligned}$$

If  $k = 0$ , then  $L_{\text{eq}}^2(\Gamma) = L_0^2(\Gamma)$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{eq}}(\Gamma) = \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \cap L_{\text{eq}}^2(\Gamma)$ , and  $X_{\text{eq}} = \mathcal{E}_{\text{eq}}(\Gamma) \times L_{\text{eq}}^2(\Gamma)$ .

## 2 | LOCAL WELL-POSEDNESS

We consider the following Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t^2 \mathbf{u}(t, x) = H_\alpha \mathbf{u}(t, x) + m^2 \mathbf{u}(t, x) - |\mathbf{u}|^{p-1} \mathbf{u}, \\ \mathbf{u}(0, x) = \mathbf{u}_0(x), \\ \partial_t \mathbf{u}(0, x) = \mathbf{u}_1(x). \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Let us reformulate (2.1) as a first order system on  $X$ . Denoting  $\mathbf{v} = \partial_t \mathbf{u}$ ,  $\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ ,  $F(\mathbf{U}) = (0, |\mathbf{u}|^{p-1} \mathbf{u})$ , and  $\mathbf{U}_0 = (\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1)$ , we formally get from (2.1)

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{U}(t) = A \mathbf{U}(t) + F(\mathbf{U}(t)), \\ \mathbf{U}(0) = \mathbf{U}_0, \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Id_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ -H_\alpha - m^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \operatorname{dom}(A) &= \left\{ (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in H^2(\Gamma) \times \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) : \right. \\ &\quad \left. u_1(0) = \dots = u_N(0), \sum_{j=1}^N u_j'(0) = \alpha u_1(0) \right\} = \operatorname{dom}(H_\alpha) \times \mathcal{E}(\Gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Below we will prove existence and uniqueness of a weak solution  $\mathbf{U}(t) \in C([0, T], X)$  to system (2.2) (see [5] for the definition of a weak solution). The proof is in the spirit of [10, Chapter 4]. First, we prove that operator  $A$  generates strongly continuous semigroup on  $X$ .

**Proposition 2.1.** The operator  $A$  generates  $C_0$ -semigroup on  $X$ . Moreover, there exist  $M \geq 0$  and  $\beta \geq 0$  such that for all  $t \geq 0$  the following estimate holds

$$\|e^{tA}\| \leq M e^{\beta t}. \quad (2.3)$$

*Proof.* Our aim is to apply [20, Chapter I, Corollary 3.8]. We need to prove density of  $\operatorname{dom}(A)$  in  $X$ .

*Step 1.* Let  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in X$ . Obviously there exists a sequence  $\{\mathbf{v}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$  such that  $\mathbf{v}_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}$  in  $L^2(\Gamma)$  (indeed,  $\operatorname{dom}(H_\alpha) \subset \mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$  and  $\operatorname{dom}(H_\alpha) = L^2(\Gamma)$ ). We need to show that there exists a sequence  $\{\mathbf{u}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \operatorname{dom}(H_\alpha)$  such that  $\mathbf{u}_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$  in

$H^1(\Gamma)$ . Consider the following self-adjoint operator  $H_0$  in  $L^2(\Gamma)$  (with the Kirchhoff conditions)

$$(H_0 \mathbf{w})(x) = \left( -w_j''(x) \right)_{j=1}^N, \quad x > 0, \quad \mathbf{w} = (w_j)_{j=1}^N, \\ \text{dom}(H_0) = \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in H^2(\Gamma) : w_1(0) = \dots = w_N(0), \sum_{j=1}^N w_j'(0) = 0 \right\}. \quad (2.4)$$

We show that there exists a sequence  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \text{dom}(H_0)$  such that  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{u}$  in  $H^1(\Gamma)$ , that is,  $\overline{\text{dom}(H_0)} = \mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$ . It is sufficient to show that orthogonal complement of  $\text{dom}(H_0)$  in  $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$  is  $\{0\}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{z} \in \text{dom}(H_0)^\perp$  in  $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$ , hence for any  $\mathbf{w} \in \text{dom}(H_0)$

$$\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle_{H^1(\Gamma)} = \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \langle \mathbf{w}', \mathbf{z}' \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ = \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} - \text{Re} \left( \sum_{j=1}^N w_j'(0) \bar{z}_j(0) \right) - \langle \mathbf{w}'', \mathbf{z} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} = \langle -\mathbf{w}'' + \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} = 0.$$

The last equality implies  $\mathbf{z} \in \text{ran}(H_0 + 1)^\perp = \ker(H_0 + 1) = \{0\}$ .

We modify the sequence  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  to get another one  $\{\mathbf{u}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \text{dom}(H_\alpha)$  that approximates  $\mathbf{u}$  in  $H^1(\Gamma)$ . Define the sequence  $\{\zeta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  by  $\zeta_n = (1 + \frac{\alpha x}{N} e^{-nx^2})_{j=1}^N$ . Let us show that  $\{\mathbf{u}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty := \{\zeta_n \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \text{dom}(H_\alpha)$  and  $\mathbf{u}_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{u}$  in  $H^1(\Gamma)$ . It is easily seen that

$$u_{jn}(0) = \tilde{u}_{jn}(0), \quad u'_{jn}(0) = \frac{\alpha}{N} \tilde{u}_{jn}(0) + \tilde{u}'_{jn}(0),$$

which yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^N u'_{jn}(0) = \sum_{j=1}^N \left( \frac{\alpha}{N} \tilde{u}_{jn}(0) + \tilde{u}'_{jn}(0) \right) = \alpha \tilde{u}_{1n}(0) = \alpha u_{1n}(0).$$

Therefore,  $\{\mathbf{u}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \text{dom}(H_\alpha)$ . Observing that

$$\|\zeta_n - \mathbf{1}\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad \|\zeta'_n\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

we conclude  $\|\mathbf{u}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_n\|_{H^1(\Gamma)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ , consequently  $\|\mathbf{u}_n - \mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(\Gamma)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ . Finally,  $\|(\mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{v}_n) - (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})\|_X \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ .

*Step 2.* To prove inequality (3.21) on the resolvent  $(A - \lambda)^{-1}$  in [20, Chapter I], we introduce alternative equivalent norm on  $X$ . It is known that  $\inf \sigma(H_\alpha) = \begin{cases} 0, & \alpha \geq 0, \\ -\frac{\alpha^2}{N^2}, & \alpha < 0. \end{cases}$  See, for example, Proposition 3.6 below for the proof of the identity  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_\alpha) = [0, \infty)$ . The analysis of the discrete spectrum is trivial.

Given  $\mu^2 > -\inf \sigma(H_\alpha)$ , then denoting

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{1,\mu}^2 := \|\mathbf{u}'\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + \mu^2 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + \alpha |u_1(0)|^2,$$

by the Sobolev embedding and inequality

$$\|\mathbf{u}'\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + \alpha |u_1(0)|^2 \geq \inf \sigma(H_\alpha) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2, \quad (2.5)$$

we get

$$C_1 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(\Gamma)} \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1,\mu} \leq C_2 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(\Gamma)}.$$

Therefore, the quadratic form defined on  $X$  by

$$\|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})\|_{X,\mu}^2 = \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1,\mu}^2 + \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2$$

gives a norm on  $X$  equivalent to  $\|\cdot\|_X$ . The corresponding inner product is given by

$$\langle (\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1), (\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_2) \rangle_{X,\mu} = \langle \mathbf{u}'_1, \mathbf{u}'_2 \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \mu^2 \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2 \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \alpha \text{Re}(u_{11}(0) \bar{u}_{12}(0)) + \langle \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2 \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}.$$

*Step 3.* Suppose that  $\mu$  is such that  $\mu^2 > m^2$ . Let  $\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in \text{dom}(A)$ , then

$$\langle A\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U} \rangle_{X,\mu} = \langle \mathbf{v}', \mathbf{u}' \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \mu^2 \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \alpha \text{Re}(v_1(0) \bar{u}_1(0)) + \langle \mathbf{u}'', \mathbf{v} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} - m^2 \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ = \langle \mathbf{v}', \mathbf{u}' \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} + (\mu^2 - m^2) \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \alpha \text{Re}(v_1(0) \bar{u}_1(0)) - \langle \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}' \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} - \alpha \text{Re}(u_1(0) \bar{v}_1(0)) \\ = (\mu^2 - m^2) \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}.$$

Hence

$$|\langle A\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U} \rangle_{X,\mu}| = (\mu^2 - m^2) |\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}| \leq \frac{\mu^2 - m^2}{2} (\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2).$$

Observing that

$$\|\mathbf{U}\|_{X,\mu}^2 = \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1,\mu}^2 + \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 \geq C_1^2 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(\Gamma)}^2 + \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 \geq C(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2),$$

for  $\beta \geq 0$  large enough one gets

$$\langle (A - \beta)\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U} \rangle_{X,\mu} \leq 0.$$

Therefore, by [10, Proposition 2.4.2], the operator  $A - \beta$  is dissipative. By dissipativity, for  $\lambda > \beta$  one easily gets

$$\begin{aligned} \|(A - \lambda)\mathbf{U}\|_{X,\mu}^2 &= 2(\beta - \lambda)\langle (A - \beta)\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U} \rangle_{X,\mu} + \|(A - \beta)\mathbf{U}\|_{X,\mu}^2 + (\lambda - \beta)^2 \|\mathbf{U}\|_{X,\mu}^2 \\ &\geq \|(A - \beta)\mathbf{U}\|_{X,\mu}^2 + (\lambda - \beta)^2 \|\mathbf{U}\|_{X,\mu}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

The above inequality implies that  $\ker(A - \lambda) = \{0\}$ . We show that  $A - \lambda$  is surjective, i.e.  $\text{ran}(A - \lambda) = X$ . Let  $\mathbf{F} = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \in X$ .

We prove that there exists  $\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in \text{dom}(A)$  such that  $(A - \lambda)\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{F}$  or equivalently 
$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v} = \lambda\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{f}, \\ -H_\alpha \mathbf{u} - (m^2 + \lambda^2)\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{g} + \lambda\mathbf{f}. \end{cases}$$

It is obvious that for  $\lambda > \beta > \sqrt{\mu^2 - m^2}$  the equation  $-H_\alpha \mathbf{u} - (m^2 + \lambda^2)\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{g} + \lambda\mathbf{f}$  has a unique solution  $\mathbf{u} = -(H_\alpha + m^2 + \lambda^2)^{-1}(\mathbf{g} + \lambda\mathbf{f})$  (indeed,  $-\lambda^2 - m^2 \in \rho(H_\alpha)$ ), and therefore  $\mathbf{v} = -\lambda(H_\alpha + m^2 + \lambda^2)^{-1}(\mathbf{g} + \lambda\mathbf{f}) + \mathbf{f}$ . This implies  $\text{ran}(A - \lambda) = X$ , and finally, by estimate (2.6), the operator  $A - \lambda$  has a bounded everywhere defined inverse, i.e.

$$\|(A - \lambda)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda - \beta}.$$

In particular, for  $\beta$  large enough  $(\beta, \infty) \subset \rho(A)$ , and hence  $A$  is closed. Recalling that  $\overline{\text{dom}(A)} = X$ , by corollary of the Hille-Yosida theorem (see [20, Chapter I, Corollary 3.8]),  $A$  generates a  $C_0$  semigroup on  $(X, \|\cdot\|_{X,\mu})$ . Moreover, for  $t \geq 0$  and  $\mathbf{U} \in X$ , we have

$$\|e^{tA}\mathbf{U}\|_{X,\mu} \leq e^{\beta t} \|\mathbf{U}\|_{X,\mu}.$$

By equivalence of the norms, there exists  $M > 0$  such that

$$\|e^{tA}\mathbf{U}\|_X \leq M e^{\beta t} \|\mathbf{U}\|_X.$$

□

*Remark 2.2.* Observe that analogously one might show that for  $\beta$  large enough  $(\beta, \infty) \subset \rho(-A)$  and  $\|(-A - \lambda)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda - \beta}$ , and therefore

$$\|e^{-tA}\| \leq M e^{\beta t}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \|e^{tA}\| \leq M e^{-\beta t}, \quad t \leq 0.$$

Hence

$$\|e^{tA}\| \leq M e^{\beta|t|}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

*Remark 2.3.* The fact that  $\overline{\text{dom}(H_\alpha)} = \mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$  can be shown alternatively applying the Representation Theorem [16, Chapter VI, Theorem 2.1]. Namely, one can use that  $\text{dom}(H_\alpha)$  is a core of the form

$$t_\alpha(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \langle \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}' \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \alpha \text{Re}(u_1(0)\overline{v_1(0)}), \quad \text{dom}(t_\alpha) = \mathcal{E}(\Gamma).$$

Using Proposition 2.1, we obtain the following well-posedness theorem.

**Theorem 2.4.** Let  $p > 1$ . Then

(i) for any  $\mathbf{U}_0 = (\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1) \in X$  there exists  $T > 0$  such that problem (2.2) has a unique weak solution  $\mathbf{U}(t) = (\mathbf{u}(t), \mathbf{v}(t)) \in C([0, T], X)$ ;

(ii) problem (2.2) has a maximal solution defined on an interval of the form  $[0, T_{\max})$ , and the following blow-up alternative holds: either  $T_{\max} = \infty$  or  $T_{\max} < \infty$  and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow T_{\max}} \|\mathbf{U}(t)\|_X = \infty;$$

(iii) for each  $T \in (0, T_{\max})$  the mapping  $\mathbf{U}_0 \in X \mapsto \mathbf{U}(t) \in C([0, T], X)$  is continuous;

(iv) the solution  $\mathbf{U}(t)$  satisfies conservation of charge and energy:

$$E(\mathbf{U}(t)) = E(\mathbf{U}_0), \quad Q(\mathbf{U}(t)) = Q(\mathbf{U}_0) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T_{\max}).$$

where

$$E(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{u}'\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} |u_1(0)|^2 + \frac{m^2}{2} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 - \frac{1}{p+1} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^{p+1}(\Gamma)}^{p+1} + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2,$$

$$Q(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \operatorname{Im} \int_{\Gamma} \mathbf{u} \bar{\mathbf{v}} dx.$$

*Proof.* (i) Firstly, we prove that the nonlinearity  $F$  is Lipschitz continuous on bounded sets of  $X$ , i.e.

$$\|F(\mathbf{U}) - F(\mathbf{W})\|_X \leq C(R) \|\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{W}\|_X, \quad (2.7)$$

for  $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W} \in X$ ,  $R > 0$  with  $\|\mathbf{U}\|_X \leq R$ ,  $\|\mathbf{W}\|_X \leq R$ .

For  $\mathbf{u} = (u_j)_{j=1}^N$  and  $\mathbf{w} = (w_j)_{j=1}^N$  one has

$$|u_j|^{p-1}u_j - |w_j|^{p-1}w_j \leq C(|u_j|^{p-1} + |w_j|^{p-1})|u_j - w_j|,$$

which implies

$$\||\mathbf{u}|^{p-1}\mathbf{u} - |\mathbf{w}|^{p-1}\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \leq C_1(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma)}^{p-1} + \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma)}^{p-1})\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}.$$

Therefore, by the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (see formula (2.3) in [1]),

$$\|\Psi\|_{L^p(\Gamma)} \leq C\|\Psi'\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}}\|\Psi\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{p}}, \quad p \in [2, \infty], \quad \Psi \in H^1(\Gamma),$$

we have

$$\||\mathbf{u}|^{p-1}\mathbf{u} - |\mathbf{w}|^{p-1}\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \leq C(R)\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}.$$

Hence for  $\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ ,  $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}) \in X$

$$\|F(\mathbf{U}) - F(\mathbf{W})\|_X = \||\mathbf{u}|^{p-1}\mathbf{u} - |\mathbf{w}|^{p-1}\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \leq C(R)\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \leq C(R)\|\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{W}\|_X.$$

Secondly, we show the existence of the solution. Now let  $R$  and  $T$  be two positive constants to be defined later. Consider the set

$$X_R := \{\mathbf{U}(t) \in C([0, T], X) : \|\mathbf{U}(t)\|_X \leq R\},$$

and the metric

$$d(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) := \max_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{U}(t) - \mathbf{V}(t)\|_X.$$

Observe that  $(X_R, d)$  is a complete metric space. Now we define the map

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{U})(t) = e^{tA}\mathbf{U}_0 + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} F(\mathbf{U}(s)) ds.$$

It is obvious that  $\mathcal{H} : X_R \mapsto C([0, T], X)$ . We choose  $T$  in order to guarantee invariance of  $X_R$  for the mapping  $\mathcal{H}$ . By (2.3) and (2.7), we get

$$\|\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{U})(t)\|_X \leq \|e^{tA}\mathbf{U}_0\|_X + \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)A} F(\mathbf{U}(s))\|_X ds \leq M e^{\beta T} \|\mathbf{U}_0\|_X + TC(R) M e^{\beta T} R.$$

Let  $\frac{R}{4} = M \|\mathbf{U}_0\|_X$ . By choosing  $T$  small enough (for example, take  $T \leq \min\left\{\frac{\ln 2}{\beta}, \frac{1}{4C(R)M}\right\}$ ), we get

$$\|\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{U})(t)\|_X \leq R.$$

And finally, we need to choose  $T$  to get the contraction property of  $\mathcal{H}$ . For  $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \in X_R$  one has

$$\|\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{U})(t) - \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{V})(t)\|_X \leq \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)A} (F(\mathbf{U}(s)) - F(\mathbf{V}(s)))\|_X ds \leq M e^{T\beta} C(R) T d(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}).$$

It is easily seen that  $T$  can be chosen small enough to satisfy  $M e^{T\beta} C(R) T < 1$ . Thus, the existence of the solution is established by the Banach fixed point theorem.

Thirdly, we prove the uniqueness of the solution. It follows from Gronwall's lemma. Indeed, suppose that  $\mathbf{U}_1, \mathbf{U}_2 \in C([0, T], X)$  are two solutions and  $\|\mathbf{U}_j(t)\|_X \leq K$ ,  $j \in \{1, 2\}, t \in [0, T]$ . Then

$$\|\mathbf{U}_1(t) - \mathbf{U}_2(t)\|_X \leq \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)A} (F(\mathbf{U}_1(s)) - F(\mathbf{U}_2(s)))\|_X ds \leq M e^{T\beta} C(K) \int_0^t \|\mathbf{U}_1(s) - \mathbf{U}_2(s)\|_X ds,$$

hence  $\mathbf{U}_1(t) = \mathbf{U}_2(t)$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ .

(ii) The blow-up alternative follows by a bootstrap argument (see [10, Theorem 4.3.4]).

(iii) Repeating the proof of [10, Proposition 4.3.7], we can show lower semicontinuity of  $T : X \rightarrow (0, \infty]$  and continuous dependence: if  $\mathbf{U}_0^n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{U}_0$  in  $X$  and  $T < T_{\max}$ , then  $\mathbf{U}^n(t) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{U}(t)$  in  $C([0, T], X)$ .

(iv) Finally, we show the conservation laws. Firstly, observe that, using [10, Corollary 1.4.41] and [10, Proposition 4.1.6], one can prove the regularity property: for  $\mathbf{U}_0 \in \text{dom}(A)$ , there exists  $T > 0$  such that problem (2.2) has a unique solution  $\mathbf{U}(t) \in C([0, T], \text{dom}(A)) \cap C^1([0, T], X)$  (see also [10, Proposition 4.3.9]). Secondly, let us prove that the conservation of charge and energy hold for the solution  $\mathbf{U}(t) = (\mathbf{u}(t), \partial_t \mathbf{u}(t))$  with  $\mathbf{U}_0 \in \text{dom}(A)$ . Using the regularity property, one shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} Q(\mathbf{U}(t)) &= \text{Im} \int_{\Gamma} \overline{\mathbf{u}} \partial_t^2 \mathbf{u} dx, \\ \frac{d}{dt} E(\mathbf{U}(t)) &= \langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}, \partial_t^2 \mathbf{u} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \langle H_\alpha \mathbf{u} + m^2 \mathbf{u} - |\mathbf{u}|^{p-1} \mathbf{u}, \partial_t \mathbf{u} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}. \end{aligned}$$

From (1.3) we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} Q(\mathbf{U}(t)) = \text{Im} \int_{\Gamma} \overline{\mathbf{u}} \partial_t^2 \mathbf{u} dx = \text{Im} \left[ - \int_{\Gamma} \overline{\mathbf{u}} H_\alpha \mathbf{u} dx - m^2 \int_{\Gamma} \overline{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u} dx + \int_{\Gamma} \overline{\mathbf{u}} g(\mathbf{u}) dx \right] = 0,$$

hence the charge is conserved.

Multiplying (2.2) by  $(\partial_t^2 \mathbf{u}, -\overline{\partial_t \mathbf{u}})$  and integrating over  $\Gamma$ , we obtain

$$0 = \langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}, \partial_t^2 \mathbf{u} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} - \langle \partial_t^2 \mathbf{u}, \partial_t \mathbf{u} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} = \langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}, \partial_t^2 \mathbf{u} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \langle H_\alpha \mathbf{u} + m^2 \mathbf{u} - |\mathbf{u}|^{p-1} \mathbf{u}, \partial_t \mathbf{u} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)},$$

therefore, the energy is conserved.

Consider now  $\mathbf{U}_0 \in X$ , then there exists a unique solution  $\mathbf{U}(t) \in C([0, T], X)$ . Take  $\{\mathbf{U}_0^n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \text{dom}(A)$  such that  $\mathbf{U}_0^n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{U}_0$  in  $X$ . By the regularity property,

$$\mathbf{U}^n(t) \in C([0, T^n], \text{dom}(A)) \cap C^1([0, T^n], X), \quad T^n < T_{\max}^n.$$

For each  $\mathbf{U}^n(t)$  the conservation laws hold:

$$E(\mathbf{U}^n(t)) = E(\mathbf{U}_0^n), \quad Q(\mathbf{U}^n(t)) = Q(\mathbf{U}_0^n), \quad t \in [0, T_{\max}^n]. \quad (2.8)$$

By continuous dependence and lower semicontinuity of  $T$  we have that  $\mathbf{U}^n(t) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{U}(t)$  in  $X$  for any  $0 \leq t \leq T < T_{\max}^n$  (as  $n$  is sufficiently large). Passing to the limit in (2.8), we obtain the result.  $\square$

*Remark 2.5.* It is interesting to note that the conservation laws might be alternatively proved using [11, Theorem 6.8]. We need to show that the triple  $(X, \text{dom}(A), \mathcal{J})$ , where

$$\mathcal{J} : X \rightarrow X^*, \quad \mathcal{J}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = (-\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}),$$

is a symplectic Banach triple (see [11, Definition 6.5]). It is easily seen that  $\mathcal{J}$  is a symplector. In order to apply [11, Theorem 6.8] we need to prove that  $E, Q \in \text{Dif}(\text{dom}(A), \mathcal{J})$ . It means that  $E$  and  $Q$  have to be differentiable on  $\text{dom}(A)$  and  $E'(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}), Q'(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  have to belong to  $\text{ran}(\mathcal{J})$  for any  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in \text{dom}(A)$ . A simple check shows that for  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in \text{dom}(A)$  one gets

$$E'(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = (-\mathbf{u}'' + m^2 \mathbf{u} - |\mathbf{u}|^{p-1} \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}), \quad Q'(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = (i\mathbf{v}, -i\mathbf{u}), \quad (2.9)$$

and obviously  $E'(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}), Q'(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in \text{ran}(\mathcal{J})$ .

To conclude the proof of the conservation laws we need to observe that  $\{E, E\}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \{Q, E\}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = 0$  for all  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in \text{dom}(A)$ , where  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$  is the Poisson bracket defined by

$$\{E, E\}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \langle E'(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}), \mathcal{J}^{-1} E'(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \rangle_{X^* \times X}, \quad \{Q, E\}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \langle Q'(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}), \mathcal{J}^{-1} E'(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \rangle_{X^* \times X}.$$

*Remark 2.6.* Using definition of  $\mathcal{J}$  and  $E$ , we can reformulate the system  $\partial_t \mathbf{U}(t) = A\mathbf{U}(t) + F(\mathbf{U}(t))$  in the Hamiltonian form

$$\mathcal{J}\partial_t \mathbf{U}(t) = E'(\mathbf{U}(t)). \quad (2.10)$$

We finish this section by proving that problem (2.2) is well-posed in  $X_k$ .

**Lemma 2.7.** Let  $k \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ . For any  $\mathbf{U}_0 = (\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1) \in X_k$  there exists  $T > 0$  such that (2.2) has a unique solution  $\mathbf{U}(t) = (\mathbf{u}(t), \mathbf{v}(t)) \in C([0, T], X_k)$ .

*Proof.* It is sufficient to prove that the corresponding  $C_0$  semigroup  $e^{tA}$  preserves the space  $X_k$ , that is,  $e^{tA}X_k \subseteq X_k$ . Equivalently this fact means that the solution to the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{U}(t) = A\mathbf{U}(t), \\ \mathbf{U}(0) = \mathbf{U}_0, \end{cases} \quad (2.11)$$

belongs to  $C([0, T], X_k)$  for  $\mathbf{U}_0 \in X_k$ . Suppose that  $k \geq 2$ . Let

$$\mathbf{U}(t) = e^{tA}\mathbf{U}_0 = \left( (u_j(t))_{j=1}^N, (v_j(t))_{j=1}^N \right) = \left( (u_1(t), \dots, u_N(t)), (v_1(t), \dots, v_N(t)) \right)$$

be a solution to (2.11). Then the function

$$\mathbf{V}(t) = \left( (u_2(t), u_1(t), u_3(t), \dots, u_N(t)), (v_2(t), v_1(t), v_3(t), \dots, v_N(t)) \right)$$

is a solution to (2.11) as well. Indeed, the linear equation in (2.11) is invariant under the transposition of two first elements of the vector solution  $\mathbf{U}(t)$ . By uniqueness  $\mathbf{U}(t) = \mathbf{V}(t)$ , therefore,  $u_1(t) = u_2(t)$  and  $v_1(t) = v_2(t)$ . Repeating the process, one gets  $u_1(t) = \dots = u_k(t)$ ,  $v_1(t) = \dots = v_k(t)$ . □

*Remark 2.8.* The invariance property  $e^{tA}X_k \subseteq X_k$  might be alternatively shown by involving functional calculus.

By [20, Chapter I, Corollary 7.5], for  $\mathbf{W} \in \text{dom}(A^2)$  we have

$$e^{tA}\mathbf{W} = \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma-i\infty}^{\gamma+i\infty} e^{\lambda t} (A - \lambda)^{-1} \mathbf{W} d\lambda, \quad (2.12)$$

where  $\gamma > \beta$  with  $\beta$  from (2.3). Let  $\lambda \in (\beta, \infty)$ . We have

$$A - \lambda = \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda Id_{\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)} & Id_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ -H_\alpha - m^2 & -\lambda Id_{L^2(\Gamma)} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By a direct computation with operator-valued matrices,

$$(A - \lambda)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda(H_\alpha + \lambda^2 + m^2)^{-1} & -(H_\alpha + \lambda^2 + m^2)^{-1} \\ (H_\alpha + m^2)(H_\alpha + \lambda^2 + m^2)^{-1} & -\lambda(H_\alpha + \lambda^2 + m^2)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.13)$$

Observe that for  $\beta$  large enough  $-\lambda^2 \in \rho(H_\alpha + m^2)$ . Using formula (17) in [6] and denoting  $z = \sqrt{m^2 + \lambda^2}$ , we get

$$((H_\alpha + \lambda^2 + m^2)^{-1} \mathbf{w})_j = \tilde{c}_j e^{-zx} + \frac{1}{2z} \int_0^\infty w_j(y) e^{-|x-y|z} dy.$$

Analogously to [4, Lemma 2.3], if  $\mathbf{w} \in L_k^2(\Gamma)$ , then  $\tilde{c}_1 = \dots = \tilde{c}_k$  and  $\tilde{c}_{k+1} = \dots = \tilde{c}_N$ , consequently  $(H_\alpha + \lambda^2 + m^2)^{-1} \mathbf{w} \in L_k^2(\Gamma)$ . Hence, by (2.13),  $(A - \lambda)^{-1} \mathbf{W} \in \text{dom}(A) \cap X_k$  for  $\mathbf{W} \in X_k$ . From (2.12) we get that  $e^{tA}(\text{dom}(A^2) \cap X_k) \subseteq X_k$ . By [20, Chapter I, Theorem 2.7],  $\text{dom}(A^2) = X$  which implies  $\text{dom}(A^2) \cap X_k = X_k$ , therefore,  $e^{tA}X_k \subseteq X_k$ . □

### 3 | STABILITY PROPERTIES OF STANDING WAVES

In this section we study stability/instability of the standing waves  $e^{i\omega t} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha$  is defined by (1.5). Orbital stability is understood in the following sense.



**Definition 3.1.** The standing wave  $\mathbf{u}(t, x) = e^{i\omega t} \boldsymbol{\varphi}(x)$  is said to be *orbitally stable* if for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\eta > 0$  with the following property. If  $(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1) \in X$  satisfies  $\|(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1) - (\boldsymbol{\varphi}, i\omega \boldsymbol{\varphi})\|_X < \eta$ , then the solution  $\mathbf{U}(t)$  of (2.10) with  $\mathbf{U}(0) = (\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1)$  exists globally, and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \|\mathbf{U}(t) - e^{i\theta}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}, i\omega \boldsymbol{\varphi})\|_X < \varepsilon.$$

Otherwise, the standing wave  $\mathbf{u}(t, x) = e^{i\omega t} \boldsymbol{\varphi}(x)$  is said to be *orbitally unstable*.

In the sequel we will use the notation  $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha = (\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha, i\omega \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha)$ .

### 3.1 | Stability approach

Below we will introduce basic ingredients of the classical theory by [12, 13] (see also [11, 25]). The key object is the Lyapunov functional  $S_\omega \in C^2(X, \mathbb{R})$  defined by

$$S_\omega(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = E(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) + \omega Q(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}).$$

From (2.9) one concludes that  $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha$  is a critical point of  $S_\omega$ . Let  $\mathcal{R} : X \rightarrow X^*$  be the Riesz isomorphism. A principal role in the stability/instability study is played by the spectral properties of the operator  $\mathcal{R}^{-1} S_\omega''(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha) : X \rightarrow X$ . In what follows we will denote  $\mathcal{L}_k^\alpha := \mathcal{R}^{-1} S_\omega''(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha)$ . Since  $S_\omega''(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha) : X \rightarrow X^*$  is bounded and symmetric, the operator  $\mathcal{L}_k^\alpha : X \rightarrow X$  is bounded and self-adjoint, i.e.

$$\langle \mathcal{L}_k^\alpha \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \rangle_X = \langle S_\omega''(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha) \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \rangle_{X^* \times X} = \langle S_\omega''(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha) \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{U} \rangle_{X^* \times X} = \langle \mathbf{U}, \mathcal{L}_k^\alpha \mathbf{V} \rangle_X, \quad \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \in X.$$

Above we also have used the fact that  $X$  is a real Hilbert space.

We consider the following list of assumptions about the spectrum of  $\mathcal{L}_k^\alpha$  :

- (A1)  $n(\mathcal{L}_k^\alpha) = 1$ ;
- (A2)  $n(\mathcal{L}_k^\alpha) = 2$ ;
- (A3)  $\ker(\mathcal{L}_k^\alpha) = \text{span}\{i\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha\}$ ;
- (A4) apart from the non-positive eigenvalues,  $\sigma(\mathcal{L}_k^\alpha)$  is positive and bounded away from zero.

We also define the notion of linear instability.

**Definition 3.2.** The standing wave  $e^{i\omega t} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha$  is *linearly unstable* if  $\mathbf{0}$  is a linearly unstable solution for the linearized equation

$$\mathcal{J} \partial_t \mathbf{V}(t) = S_\omega''(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha) \mathbf{V}(t)$$

in the sense of Lyapunov.

Due to [12, 13], one can formulate the following stability/instability result.

**Theorem 3.3.** Let assumptions (A3), (A4) be valid, then the following two assertions hold.

- (i) Suppose that  $\partial_\omega Q(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha)|_{\omega=\omega_0} > 0$ .
  - If, in addition, the assumption (A1) holds, then the standing wave  $e^{i\omega_0 t} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega_0}^\alpha$  is orbitally stable.
  - If, in addition, the assumption (A2) holds, then the standing wave  $e^{i\omega_0 t} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega_0}^\alpha$  is linearly unstable.
- (ii) Suppose that  $\partial_\omega Q(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha)|_{\omega=\omega_0} < 0$  and (A1) holds, then the standing wave  $e^{i\omega_0 t} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega_0}^\alpha$  is orbitally unstable.

It is standard to verify that for  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in X$

$$S_\omega''(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha)(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \left( \tilde{H}_\alpha \mathbf{u} + m^2 \mathbf{u} - (\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha)^{p-1} \mathbf{u} - (p-1)(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha)^{p-1} \text{Re}(\mathbf{u}) + i\omega \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} - i\omega \mathbf{u} \right).$$

Here the operator  $\tilde{H}_\alpha$  is understood in the following sense: since bilinear form  $t_\alpha(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2) = \langle \mathbf{u}_1', \mathbf{u}_2' \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \alpha \text{Re}(u_{11}(0) \overline{u_{12}(0)})$  is bounded on  $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$ , there exists a unique bounded operator  $\tilde{H}_\alpha : \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^*(\Gamma)$  such that  $t_\alpha(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2) = \langle \tilde{H}_\alpha \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)^* \times \mathcal{E}(\Gamma)}$ .

Commonly in stability study one substitutes the operator  $\mathcal{L}_k^\alpha$  acting on  $X$  by the self-adjoint operator acting in  $L^2(\Gamma) \times L^2(\Gamma)$  (with the real inner product). Namely, this operator is associated (by the Representation Theorem [16, Chapter VI, Theorem 2.1]) with the closed, densely defined, bounded from below bilinear form

$$\begin{aligned} b_k(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) &= \langle S''_\omega(\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha) \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \rangle_{X^* \times X} \\ &= \operatorname{Re} \left[ \alpha u_1(0) \overline{w_1(0)} + \int_\Gamma \left( \mathbf{u}' \overline{\mathbf{w}'} + m^2 \mathbf{u} \overline{\mathbf{w}} - (\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha)^{p-1} \mathbf{u} \overline{\mathbf{w}} - (p-1)(\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha)^{p-1} \operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{u}) \overline{\mathbf{w}} \right) dx \right] \\ &\quad + \operatorname{Re} \left[ \int_\Gamma \mathbf{v} \overline{\mathbf{z}} dx + \omega \int_\Gamma (i \mathbf{v} \overline{\mathbf{w}} - i \mathbf{u} \overline{\mathbf{z}}) dx \right], \quad \mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}), \mathbf{V} = (\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}) \in X. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

**Proposition 3.4.** The self-adjoint operator associated in  $L^2(\Gamma) \times L^2(\Gamma)$  with the bilinear form  $b_k(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} L_k^\alpha(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) &= \left( H_\alpha \mathbf{u} + m^2 \mathbf{u} - (\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha)^{p-1} \mathbf{u} - (p-1)(\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha)^{p-1} \operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{u}) + i\omega \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} - i\omega \mathbf{u} \right), \\ \operatorname{dom}(L_k^\alpha) &= \operatorname{dom}(H_\alpha) \times L^2(\Gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,  $\ker(\mathcal{L}_k^\alpha) = \ker(L_k^\alpha)$ ,  $n(\mathcal{L}_k^\alpha) = n(L_k^\alpha)$ , and

$$\inf \sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_k^\alpha) > 0 \Rightarrow \inf \sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{L}_k^\alpha) > 0.$$

*Proof.* Denote by  $\mathcal{T}_k$  the self-adjoint operator associated with the bilinear form  $b_k(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{dom}(\mathcal{T}_k) &= \{ \mathbf{U} \in X : \exists \mathbf{W} \in L^2(\Gamma) \times L^2(\Gamma) \text{ s.t. } \forall \mathbf{V} \in X, b_k(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) = \langle \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{V} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma) \times L^2(\Gamma)} \}, \\ \mathcal{T}_k \mathbf{U} &= \mathbf{W}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easily seen that  $\operatorname{dom}(L_k^\alpha) \subseteq \operatorname{dom}(\mathcal{T}_k)$  and  $L_k^\alpha \mathbf{U} = \mathcal{T}_k \mathbf{U}$  for  $\mathbf{U} \in \operatorname{dom}(L_k^\alpha)$ . Indeed,  $b_k(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) = \langle L_k^\alpha \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma) \times L^2(\Gamma)}$  for all  $\mathbf{U} \in \operatorname{dom}(L_k^\alpha)$  and  $\mathbf{V} \in X$ . We need to show that  $\operatorname{dom}(\mathcal{T}_k) \subseteq \operatorname{dom}(L_k^\alpha)$ . Let  $\hat{\mathbf{U}} = (\hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) = \left( (\hat{u}_j)_{j=1}^N, (\hat{v}_j)_{j=1}^N \right) \in \operatorname{dom}(\mathcal{T}_k)$ . Observe that, by the definition of  $\operatorname{dom}(\mathcal{T}_k)$ , the functional  $f_k(\mathbf{V}) = b_k(\hat{\mathbf{U}}, \mathbf{V}) = \langle \hat{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{V} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma) \times L^2(\Gamma)}$  is linear and continuous on  $L^2(\Gamma) \times L^2(\Gamma)$ . Given  $\mathbf{V} = (\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{0})$  with  $\mathbf{w} = (w_j)_{j=1}^N \in C_0^\infty(\Gamma) = \bigoplus_{j=1}^N C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ , then integrating by parts in (3.1) and using continuity of  $f_k$ , one gets that  $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in H^2(\Gamma)$ . Finally, observing  $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in H^2(\Gamma)$ , integrating by parts in (3.1) with  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$  such that  $w_1(0) \neq 0$ , and using continuity of  $f_k$  again, we arrive at the conclusion that

$$g_k(\mathbf{V}) = \operatorname{Re} \left[ \left( \alpha \hat{u}_1(0) - \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{u}'_j(0) \right) \overline{w_1(0)} \right]$$

has to be a continuous functional on  $L^2(\Gamma) \times L^2(\Gamma)$ . This is true only if  $\alpha \hat{u}_1(0) - \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{u}'_j(0) = 0$ , therefore,  $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in \operatorname{dom}(H_\alpha)$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{U}} \in \operatorname{dom}(L_k^\alpha)$ .

The second part of the proposition follows by [25, Lemma 5.4]. To apply Lemma 5.4, we only need to prove that inequality (G) (Gårding's-type inequality) holds, that is, there exist  $\varepsilon, C > 0$  such that

$$\langle S''_\omega(\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha) \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{V} \rangle_{X^* \times X} \geq \varepsilon \|\mathbf{V}\|_X^2 - C \|\mathbf{V}\|_{L^2(\Gamma) \times L^2(\Gamma)}^2, \quad \mathbf{V} = (\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}) \in X. \quad (3.2)$$

From (3.1) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle S''_\omega(\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha) \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{V} \rangle_{X^* \times X} &= \alpha |w_1(0)|^2 + \int_\Gamma \left( |\mathbf{w}'|^2 + m^2 |\mathbf{w}|^2 - (\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha)^{p-1} |\mathbf{w}|^2 - (p-1)(\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha)^{p-1} (\operatorname{Re} \mathbf{w})^2 \right) dx + \int_\Gamma |\mathbf{z}|^2 dx \\ &\quad - 2\omega \int_\Gamma \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{z} \overline{\mathbf{w}}) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Moreover, by (2.5), we deduce

$$\alpha |w_1(0)|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_\Gamma |\mathbf{w}'|^2 dx = \frac{1}{2} \left( 2\alpha |w_1(0)|^2 + \int_\Gamma |\mathbf{w}'|^2 dx \right) \geq \frac{-2\alpha^2}{N^2} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}.$$

Denoting  $M = \|\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma)}$ , we obtain from (3.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle S''_\omega(\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{V}) \rangle_{X^* \times X} &\geq \int_\Gamma \left( \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{w}'|^2 + m^2 |\mathbf{w}|^2 + |\mathbf{z}|^2 \right) dx - \int_\Gamma (pM^{p-1} |\mathbf{w}|^2 - 2\omega |\mathbf{z}| |\mathbf{w}|) dx - \frac{2\alpha^2}{N^2} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ &\geq \min\left\{\frac{1}{2}, m^2\right\} \left( \|\mathbf{w}\|_{H^1(\Gamma)}^2 + \|\mathbf{z}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 \right) - \left( pM^{p-1} + \frac{2\alpha^2}{N^2} + |\omega| \right) \left( \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + \|\mathbf{z}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

and therefore (3.2) holds.  $\square$

### 3.2 | Spectral properties of $L_k^\alpha$

Another standard step in the stability study is to express the operator  $L_k^\alpha$  in more convenient form using two operators acting on real-valued functions. Let  $\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in \text{dom}(L_k^\alpha)$  and  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 + i\mathbf{u}_2$ ,  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_1 + i\mathbf{v}_2$  with real-valued vector functions  $\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_j$ ,  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} L_k^\alpha(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) &= \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + m^2 - (\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha)^{p-1} - (p-1)(\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha)^{p-1} \text{Re}(\cdot) i\omega \\ -i\omega \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1 + i\mathbf{u}_2 \\ \mathbf{v}_1 + i\mathbf{v}_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (-\mathbf{u}_1'' + m^2 \mathbf{u}_1 - p(\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha)^{p-1} \mathbf{u}_1 - \omega \mathbf{v}_2) + i(-\mathbf{u}_2'' + m^2 \mathbf{u}_2 - (\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha)^{p-1} \mathbf{u}_2 + \omega \mathbf{v}_1) \\ (\omega \mathbf{u}_2 + \mathbf{v}_1) + i(-\omega \mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{v}_2) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the complex-valued vector function  $\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  by the corresponding quadruplet of real-valued functions  $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2)$ , and substituting  $L_k^\alpha(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = (\mathbf{f}_1 + i\mathbf{f}_2, \mathbf{g}_1 + i\mathbf{g}_2) \in L^2(\Gamma) \times L^2(\Gamma)$  by the quadruplet  $(\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2, \mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2)$ , we can interpret the operator  $L_k^\alpha$  as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f}_1 \\ \mathbf{f}_2 \\ \mathbf{g}_1 \\ \mathbf{g}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} L_{1,k}^\alpha + \omega^2 & 0 & 0 & -\omega \\ 0 & L_{2,k}^\alpha + \omega^2 & \omega & 0 \\ 0 & \omega & 1 & 0 \\ -\omega & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{u}_2 \\ \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L_{1,k}^\alpha \mathbf{u} &= -\mathbf{u}'' + (m^2 - \omega^2) \mathbf{u} - p(\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha)^{p-1} \mathbf{u}, \\ L_{2,k}^\alpha \mathbf{u} &= -\mathbf{u}'' + (m^2 - \omega^2) \mathbf{u} - (\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha)^{p-1} \mathbf{u}, \quad \text{dom}(L_{j,k}^\alpha) = \text{dom}(H_\alpha), \quad j \in \{1, 2\}. \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 3.5.* From (3.4) we deduce

$$(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = (\mathbf{u}_1 + i\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_1 + i\mathbf{v}_2) \in \ker(L_k^\alpha) \iff \begin{cases} \mathbf{u}_1 \in \ker(L_{1,k}^\alpha), \\ \mathbf{u}_2 \in \ker(L_{2,k}^\alpha), \\ \mathbf{v}_1 = -\omega \mathbf{u}_2, \\ \mathbf{v}_2 = \omega \mathbf{u}_1. \end{cases}$$

Assuming that the operators  $L_{1,k}^\alpha$  and  $L_{2,k}^\alpha$  act as usual on  $L^2(\Gamma, \mathbb{C})$  with the usual complex structure, one can prove the following result on the relation between their spectra and the spectrum of  $L_k^\alpha$ .

**Proposition 3.6.** Let  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{1\}$  and  $\mu(\lambda) := \lambda + \frac{\lambda\omega^2}{1-\lambda}$ . Assume also that  $k \in \left\{0, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{N-1}{2} \right\rfloor\right\}$  and  $m^2 - \omega^2 > \frac{\alpha^2}{(N-2k)^2}$ . Then the following assertions hold.

- (i)  $\lambda \in \sigma(L_k^\alpha) \iff \mu(\lambda) \in \sigma(L_{1,k}^\alpha) \cup \sigma(L_{2,k}^\alpha)$ .
- (ii)  $\dim(\ker(L_k^\alpha - \lambda)) = \dim(\ker(L_{1,k}^\alpha - \mu(\lambda))) + \dim(\ker(L_{2,k}^\alpha - \mu(\lambda)))$ , consequently  $n(L_k^\alpha) = n(L_{1,k}^\alpha) + n(L_{2,k}^\alpha)$ .
- (iii)  $\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_k^\alpha) \iff \mu(\lambda) \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_{1,k}^\alpha) \cup \sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_{2,k}^\alpha)$ .
- (iv) Let  $\mu_-(\lambda)$  and  $\mu_+(\lambda)$  be the restrictions of  $\mu(\lambda)$  to  $(-\infty, 1)$  and  $(1, \infty)$  respectively. Then
 
$$\sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_k^\alpha) \setminus \{1\} = \mu_-^{-1} \left( \sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_{1,k}^\alpha) \cup \sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_{2,k}^\alpha) \right) \cup \mu_+^{-1} \left( \sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_{1,k}^\alpha) \cup \sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_{2,k}^\alpha) \right). \quad (3.5)$$
- (v)  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_{1,k}^\alpha) \cup \sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_{2,k}^\alpha) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_{1,k}^\alpha) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_{2,k}^\alpha) = [m^2 - \omega^2, \infty)$ .

(vi)  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_k^\alpha) = [\sigma_1, 1] \cup [\sigma_2, \infty)$ , where  $\sigma_1 = \mu_-^{-1}(m^2 - \omega^2) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\sigma_2 = \mu_+^{-1}(m^2 - \omega^2) \in (1, \infty)$ .

*Proof.* The proof of items (i) – (iii) repeats the proof of [9, Proposition 4.5] (one just needs to substitute the operator  $\mathcal{L}_\beta$  by  $L_k^\alpha$ , the operator  $L_\beta^-$  by  $L_{2,k}^\alpha$ , and the operator  $L_\beta^+$  by  $L_{1,k}^\alpha$ ). The key point is that for  $\lambda \neq 1$ ,

$$(L_k^\alpha - \lambda)(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \iff \begin{cases} (L_{1,k}^\alpha + \omega^2 - \lambda)\mathbf{u}_1 - \omega\mathbf{v}_2 = \mathbf{f}_1, \\ (L_{2,k}^\alpha + \omega^2 - \lambda)\mathbf{u}_2 + \omega\mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{f}_2, \\ (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{v}_1 + \omega\mathbf{u}_2 = \mathbf{g}_1, \\ (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{v}_2 - \omega\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{g}_2. \end{cases}$$

$$\iff \begin{cases} (L_{1,k}^\alpha - \mu(\lambda))\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{f}_1 + \frac{\omega}{1-\lambda}\mathbf{g}_2, \\ (L_{2,k}^\alpha - \mu(\lambda))\mathbf{u}_2 = \mathbf{f}_2 - \frac{\omega}{1-\lambda}\mathbf{g}_1, \\ \mathbf{v}_1 = \frac{1}{1-\lambda}(\mathbf{g}_1 - \omega\mathbf{u}_2), \\ \mathbf{v}_2 = \frac{1}{1-\lambda}(\mathbf{g}_2 + \omega\mathbf{u}_1). \end{cases}$$

Item (iv) follows from (iii) and the fact that  $\mu_-$  and  $\mu_+$  are increasing bijections.

Item (v) seems natural, but we didn't manage to find its proof in the literature. Firstly, consider the self-adjoint operator

$$(H_\infty \mathbf{v})(x) = \left( -v_j''(x) \right)_{j=1}^N, \quad x > 0, \quad \mathbf{v} = (v_j)_{j=1}^N,$$

$$\text{dom}(H_\infty) = \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in H^2(\Gamma) : v_1(0) = \dots = v_N(0) = 0 \right\}.$$

Observe that  $H_\infty = \bigoplus_{j=1}^N h_\infty$ , where

$$(h_\infty v)(x) = -v''(x), \quad x > 0, \quad \text{dom}(h_\infty) = \left\{ v \in H^2(\mathbb{R}_+) : v(0) = 0 \right\}.$$

Therefore,  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_\infty) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(h_\infty) = [0, \infty)$ . Secondly, notice that the operator  $H_\alpha$  defined by (1.2) and the operator  $H_\infty$  are self-adjoint extensions of the symmetric operator

$$(\tilde{H}_0 \mathbf{v})(x) = \left( -v_j''(x) \right)_{j=1}^N, \quad x > 0, \quad \mathbf{v} = (v_j)_{j=1}^N,$$

$$\text{dom}(\tilde{H}_0) = \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in H^2(\Gamma) : v_1(0) = \dots = v_N(0) = 0, \sum_{j=1}^N v_j'(0) = 0 \right\}.$$

The operator has equal deficiency indices  $n_\pm(\tilde{H}_0) = 1$  (see [4, proof of Theorem 3.5-(iii)]), therefore, by Krein's resolvent formula, the operator  $(H_\alpha - \lambda)^{-1} - (H_\infty - \lambda)^{-1}$ ,  $\lambda \in \rho(H_\infty) \cap \rho(H_\alpha)$ , is of rank one (see [2, Appendix A, Theorem A.2]). Then, by Weyl's theorem [21, Theorem XIII.14],  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_\alpha) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_\infty) = [0, \infty)$ , and consequently  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_\alpha + m^2 - \omega^2) = [m^2 - \omega^2, \infty)$ . The operator of multiplication by  $(\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha)^{p-1}$  is relatively  $(H_\alpha + m^2 - \omega^2)$ -compact (for the idea of the proof see, for instance, [22, Proposition 8.20]). Therefore,  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_{1,k}^\alpha) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_{2,k}^\alpha) = [m^2 - \omega^2, \infty)$  (see Corollary 2 of [21, Theorem XIII.14]).

Finally, by (v),  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_{1,k}^\alpha) \cup \sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_{2,k}^\alpha)$  contains a neighborhood of  $+\infty$ . Since  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_k^\alpha)$  is closed, (3.5) yields (vi).  $\square$

*Remark 3.7.* The equality  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_\alpha) = [0, \infty)$  might be shown using classical Weyl's criterion (see [22, Proposition 8.11]). Let  $H_0$  be defined by (2.4). It is easily seen that  $H_0 \geq 0$ , therefore,  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_0) \subseteq \sigma(H_0) \subseteq [0, \infty)$ . We can prove that  $[0, \infty) \subseteq \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_0)$ .

Given  $\lambda > 0$ . Then, by Weyl's criterion,  $\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_0)$  if, and only if, there exists a sequence  $\{\mathbf{x}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \text{dom}(H_0)$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|(H_0 - \lambda)\mathbf{x}_n\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}}{\|\mathbf{x}_n\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}} = 0, \quad (3.6)$$

and  $\mathbf{x}_n / \|\mathbf{x}_n\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}$  tends weakly to  $\mathbf{0}$  in  $L^2(\Gamma)$ .

We fix a function  $\phi(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$  such that

$$\phi(x) \geq 0, \quad \phi(x) = 1 \text{ for } 1/4 \leq x \leq 1/2, \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(x) = 0 \text{ for } x \geq 1.$$

We set

$$\phi_n(x) = \phi\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(x - n^2)\right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then

$$\text{supp } \phi_n \subseteq (n^2, n^2 + \sqrt{n}), \text{ and } \text{supp } \phi_k \cap \text{supp } \phi_j = \emptyset, \text{ for } k \neq j, \ k, j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It is easily seen that

$$\mathbf{x}_n = \left( e^{i\sqrt{\lambda}x} \phi_n(x), 0, \dots, 0 \right)$$

serves for (3.6). Hence  $\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_0)$  and  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_0) = [0, \infty)$  by closedness of the essential spectrum. Then, by Weyl's theorem [21, Theorem XIII.14],  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_\alpha) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_0) = [0, \infty)$ .  $\square$

### 3.3 | Spectral properties of $L_{1,k}^\alpha$ and $L_{2,k}^\alpha$

**Proposition 3.8.** Let  $\alpha \neq 0, k \in \left\{0, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{N-1}{2} \right\rfloor\right\}$ , and  $m^2 - \omega^2 > \frac{\alpha^2}{(N-2k)^2}$ . Then

$$(i) \ker(L_{2,k}^\alpha) = \text{span}\{\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha\} \text{ and } L_{2,k}^\alpha \geq 0;$$

$$(ii) \ker(L_{1,k}^\alpha) = \{\mathbf{0}\};$$

$$(iii) \ker(L_k^\alpha) = \{i\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha\}.$$

*Proof.* For the proof of (i), (ii) see [4, Proposition 1] (with  $\omega$  substituted by  $m^2 - \omega^2$ ). The proof of (iii) follows from (i), (ii), and Remark 3.5.  $\square$

The description of the negative spectrum of  $L_{1,k}^\alpha$  might be obtained as in [4, Theorem 3.4] and [3, Proposition 3.17]. For the reader's convenience we provide the principal steps of the proofs.

Consider the following self-adjoint Schrödinger operator on  $L^2(\Gamma)$  with the Kirchhoff condition at  $v = 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} L_1^0 \mathbf{v} &= -\mathbf{v}'' + (m^2 - \omega^2)\mathbf{v} - p\varphi_0^{p-1}\mathbf{v}, \\ \text{dom}(L_1^0) &= \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in H^2(\Gamma) : v_1(0) = \dots = v_N(0), \sum_{j=1}^N v_j'(0) = 0 \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where  $\varphi_0$  is the half-soliton solution for the classical NLS model,

$$\varphi_0(x) = \left[ \frac{(p+1)(m^2 - \omega^2)}{2} \text{sech}^2 \left( \frac{(p-1)\sqrt{m^2 - \omega^2}}{2} x \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{p-1}}.$$

From the definition of the profiles  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha$  in (1.5) one gets

$$\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha \xrightarrow{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_0 \text{ in } H^1(\Gamma),$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_0 = (\varphi_0)_{j=1}^N$ . To study negative spectrum of  $L_{1,k}^\alpha$ , we apply the analytic perturbation theory. Hence first we need to describe spectral properties of  $L_1^0$  (which is the limiting value of  $L_{1,k}^\alpha$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ ).

**Theorem 3.9.** Let  $L_1^0$  be defined by (3.7) and  $k \in \left\{1, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{N-1}{2} \right\rfloor\right\}$ . Then

$$(i) \ker(L_1^0) = \text{span}\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,1}, \dots, \hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,N-1}\}, \text{ where}$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,j} = (0, \dots, 0, \varphi_0', -\varphi_0', 0, \dots, 0);$$

$$(ii) \text{ in the space } L_k^2(\Gamma) \text{ we have } \ker(L_1^0) = \text{span}\{\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k}\}, \text{ i.e. } \ker(L_1^0|_{L_k^2(\Gamma)}) = \text{span}\{\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k}\}, \text{ where}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k} = \left( \frac{N-k}{k} \varphi_0', \dots, \frac{N-k}{k} \varphi_0', -\varphi_0', \dots, -\varphi_0' \right); \quad (3.8)$$

$$(iii) \ n(L_1^0) = n(L_1^0|_{L_k^2(\Gamma)}) = 1;$$

$$(iv) \text{ the rest of the spectrum of } L_1^0 \text{ is positive and bounded away from zero.}$$

*Proof.* For the proof of (i) – (iii) see [4, Theorem 3.5]. As in the proof of Proposition 3.6-(v), one might show that  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(L_1^0) = [m^2 - \omega^2, \infty)$  and therefore (iv) holds.  $\square$

One of the principal facts for the investigation of the negative spectrum of the operator  $L_{1,k}^\alpha$  is the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.10.** Let  $k \in \left\{1, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{N-1}{2} \right\rfloor\right\}$ . As a function of  $\alpha$ ,  $(L_{1,k}^\alpha)$  is a real-analytic family of self-adjoint operators of type (B) in the sense of Kato.

The above lemma and Theorem 3.9 lead to the next result.

**Proposition 3.11.** Let  $k \in \left\{1, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{N-1}{2} \right\rfloor\right\}$ . Then there exist  $\alpha_0 > 0$  and two analytic functions  $\lambda_k : (-\alpha_0, \alpha_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbf{f}_k : (-\alpha_0, \alpha_0) \rightarrow L_k^2(\Gamma)$  such that

- (i)  $\lambda_k(0) = 0$  and  $\mathbf{f}_k(0) = \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k}$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k}$  is defined by (3.8);
- (ii) for all  $\alpha \in (-\alpha_0, \alpha_0)$ ,  $\lambda_k(\alpha)$  is the simple isolated second eigenvalue of  $L_{1,k}^\alpha$  in  $L_k^2(\Gamma)$ , and  $\mathbf{f}_k(\alpha)$  is the associated eigenvector for  $\lambda_k(\alpha)$ ;
- (iii)  $\alpha_0$  can be chosen small enough to ensure that for  $\alpha \in (-\alpha_0, \alpha_0)$  the spectrum of  $L_{1,k}^\alpha$  in  $L_k^2(\Gamma)$  is positive, except at most the first two eigenvalues.

*Proof.* It is implied by the Kato-Rellich theorem (see [21, Theorem XII.8]). For the details see the proof of [4, Proposition 2].  $\square$

The next proposition provides characterization of  $n(L_{1,k}^\alpha|_{L_k^2(\Gamma)})$  for small  $\alpha$ .

**Proposition 3.12.** Let  $k \in \left\{1, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{N-1}{2} \right\rfloor\right\}$ . There exists  $0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_0$  such that  $\lambda_k(\alpha) < 0$  for any  $\alpha \in (-\alpha_1, 0)$ , and  $\lambda_k(\alpha) > 0$  for any  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_1)$ . Therefore,  $n(L_{1,k}^\alpha|_{L_k^2(\Gamma)}) = 2$  for  $\alpha < 0$ , and  $n(L_{1,k}^\alpha|_{L_k^2(\Gamma)}) = 1$  for  $\alpha > 0$  if  $\alpha$  is small enough.

*Proof.* From Taylor's theorem we have the expansions

$$\lambda_k(\alpha) = \lambda_{0,k}\alpha + O(\alpha^2) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{f}_k(\alpha) = \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k} + \alpha \mathbf{f}_{0,k} + \mathbf{O}(\alpha^2), \quad (3.9)$$

where  $\lambda_{0,k} = \lambda'_k(0) \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbf{f}_{0,k} = \partial_\alpha \mathbf{f}_k(\alpha)|_{\alpha=0} \in L_k^2(\Gamma)$ . The desired result will follow if we show that  $\lambda_{0,k} > 0$ . We compute  $\langle L_{1,k}^\alpha \mathbf{f}_k(\alpha), \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}$  in two different ways.

Note that for  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha$  defined by (1.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha &= \boldsymbol{\varphi}_0 + \alpha \mathbf{g}_{0,k} + \mathbf{O}(\alpha^2), \\ \mathbf{g}_{0,k} &= \partial_\alpha \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha|_{\alpha=0} = \frac{2}{(p-1)(N-2k)(m^2 - \omega^2)} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi'_0 \\ \vdots \\ \varphi'_0 \\ \vdots \\ \varphi'_0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

From (3.9) we obtain

$$\langle L_{1,k}^\alpha \mathbf{f}_k(\alpha), \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} = \lambda_{0,k}\alpha \|\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + O(\alpha^2). \quad (3.11)$$

By  $L_1^0 \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k} = \mathbf{0}$  and (3.9) we get

$$L_{1,k}^\alpha \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k} = p \left( (\boldsymbol{\varphi}_0)^{p-1} - (\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k,\omega}^\alpha)^{p-1} \right) \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k} = -\alpha p(p-1)(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_0)^{p-2} \mathbf{g}_{0,k} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k} + \mathbf{O}(\alpha^2). \quad (3.12)$$

The operations in the last equality are componentwise. Equations (3.12), (3.10), and  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k} \in \text{dom}(H_\alpha)$  lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \langle L_{1,k}^\alpha \mathbf{f}_k(\alpha), \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} &= \langle \mathbf{f}_k(\alpha), L_{1,k}^\alpha \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} = -\langle \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k}, \alpha p(p-1)(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_0)^{p-2} \mathbf{g}_{0,k} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,k} \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} + O(\alpha^2) \\ &= -\alpha p(p-1) \left( \frac{(N-k)^2}{k} - (N-k) \right) \frac{2}{(p-1)(N-2k)(m^2 - \omega^2)} \int_0^\infty (\varphi'_0)^3 \varphi_0^{p-2} dx + O(\alpha^2) \\ &= -2\alpha p \frac{N-k}{k(m^2 - \omega^2)} \int_0^\infty (\varphi'_0)^3 \varphi_0^{p-2} dx + O(\alpha^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Finally, combining (3.13) and (3.11), we obtain

$$\lambda_{0,k} = \frac{-2p \frac{N-k}{k(m^2-\omega^2)} \int_0^\infty (\varphi'_0)^3 \varphi_0^{p-2} dx}{\|\varphi_{0,k}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2} + O(\alpha).$$

It follows that  $\lambda_{0,k}$  is positive for sufficiently small  $|\alpha|$  (due to the negativity of  $\varphi'_0$  on  $\mathbb{R}_+$ ), which in view of (3.9) ends the proof.  $\square$

Summarizing the above results, we obtain the following characterization of the negative spectrum of  $L_{1,k}^\alpha$ .

**Proposition 3.13.** (i) Let  $k \in \left\{1, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{N-1}{2} \right\rfloor\right\}$ .

(a) If  $\alpha > 0$ , then  $n(L_{1,k}^\alpha|_{L^2_k(\Gamma)}) = 1$ .

(b) If  $\alpha < 0$ , then  $n(L_{1,k}^\alpha|_{L^2_k(\Gamma)}) = 2$ .

(ii) Let  $k = 0$ .

(a) If  $\alpha < 0$ , then  $n(L_{1,0}^\alpha) = 1$  in  $L^2(\Gamma)$ .

(b) If  $\alpha > 0$ , then  $n(L_{1,0}^\alpha|_{L^2_{\text{eq}}(\Gamma)}) = 1$ .

*Proof.* (i) The proof of the proposition is analogous to the one of [4, Proposition 4]. It uses Proposition 3.12 and a classical continuation argument based on the Riesz projection.

(ii) (a) Observe that the operator  $L_{1,0}^\alpha$  is the self-adjoint extension of the non-negative symmetric operator

$$L_0 \mathbf{v} = L_{1,0}^\alpha \mathbf{v}, \quad \mathbf{v} \in \text{dom}(L_0),$$

$$\text{dom}(L_0) = \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in H^2(\Gamma) : v_1(0) = \dots = v_N(0) = 0, \sum_{j=1}^N v'_j(0) = 0 \right\},$$

with deficiency indices  $n_\pm(L_0) = 1$  (see the proof of [3, Theorem 3.12-(iii)]). Hence  $n(L_{1,0}^\alpha) \leq 1$  by [17, §14, Theorem 16].

Since  $\langle L_{1,0}^\alpha \varphi_{0,\omega}^\alpha, \varphi_{0,\omega}^\alpha \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} = -(p-1) \|\varphi_{0,\omega}^\alpha\|_{L^{p+1}(\Gamma)}^{p+1} < 0$ , we get the equality  $n(L_{1,0}^\alpha) = 1$ .

(b) Consider the restriction  $L_{1,0}^\alpha|_{L^2_{\text{eq}}(\Gamma)}$  as the self-adjoint extension of the following symmetric operator

$$\tilde{L}_0 \mathbf{v} = L_{1,0}^\alpha \mathbf{v}, \quad \mathbf{v} \in \text{dom}(\tilde{L}_0),$$

$$\text{dom}(\tilde{L}_0) = \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in \text{dom}(H_\alpha) \cap L^2_{\text{eq}}(\Gamma) : v_1(b_0) = \dots = v_N(b_0) = 0 \right\},$$

where  $b_0 = -\frac{2}{(p-1)\sqrt{m^2-\omega^2}}c_0$ , and  $c_0$  is defined in (1.5). Let us prove that  $\tilde{L}_0$  is non-negative. Observe that every component of the vector  $\mathbf{v} = (v_j)_{j=1}^N \in H^2(\Gamma)$  satisfies the identity

$$-v_j'' + \omega v_j - p(\tilde{\varphi}_{0,j})^{p-1} v_j = \frac{-1}{\tilde{\varphi}_{0,j}'} \frac{d}{dx} \left[ (\tilde{\varphi}_{0,j}')^2 \frac{d}{dx} \left( \frac{v_j}{\tilde{\varphi}_{0,j}'} \right) \right], \quad x \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{b_0\}.$$

Using the above equality and integrating by parts, we get for  $\mathbf{v} \in \text{dom}(\tilde{L}_0)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{L}_0 \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_{L^2_{\text{eq}}(\Gamma)} &= N \left( \int_0^{b_0^-} + \int_{b_0^+}^{+\infty} \right) (\tilde{\varphi}_{0,1}')^2 \left| \frac{d}{dx} \left( \frac{v_1}{\tilde{\varphi}_{0,1}'} \right) \right|^2 dx + N \left[ -v_1' \bar{v}_1 + |v_1|^2 \frac{\tilde{\varphi}_{0,1}''}{\tilde{\varphi}_{0,1}'} \right]_0^\infty \\ &+ N \left[ v_1' \bar{v}_1 - |v_1|^2 \frac{\tilde{\varphi}_{0,1}''}{\tilde{\varphi}_{0,1}'} \right]_{b_0^-}^{b_0^+} = N \left( \int_0^{b_0^-} + \int_{b_0^+}^{+\infty} \right) (\tilde{\varphi}_{0,1}')^2 \left| \frac{d}{dx} \left( \frac{v_1}{\tilde{\varphi}_{0,1}'} \right) \right|^2 dx \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The deficiency indices of  $\tilde{L}_0$  are

$$n_\pm(\tilde{L}_0) = \dim(\text{dom}(L_{1,0}^\alpha|_{L^2_{\text{eq}}(\Gamma)})) - \dim(\text{dom}(\tilde{L}_0)) = 1.$$

Therefore,  $n(L_{1,0}^\alpha|_{L^2_{\text{eq}}(\Gamma)}) \leq 1$  by [17, §14, Theorem 16]. One also has that  $\varphi_{0,\omega}^\alpha \in L^2_{\text{eq}}(\Gamma)$  and  $\langle L_{1,0}^\alpha \varphi_{0,\omega}^\alpha, \varphi_{0,\omega}^\alpha \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} = -(p-1) \|\varphi_{0,\omega}^\alpha\|_{L^{p+1}(\Gamma)}^{p+1} < 0$ . Hence  $n(L_{1,0}^\alpha|_{L^2_{\text{eq}}(\Gamma)}) = 1$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.14.** In [3], we considered the NLS equation with the  $\delta$ -interaction on the star graph  $\Gamma$ . In particular, we proved [3, Theorem 1.1] on the orbital instability of the profile  $\Phi_{\alpha,\delta} = \varphi_{0,\omega}^\alpha$  (where  $m^2 - \omega^2$  has to be substituted by  $\omega$ ). Using the proof of item (ii) – (b), we may complete the result of Theorem 1.1 in [3]. Indeed, one may deduce analogously that  $n(\mathbf{L}_{1,\alpha}|_{L_{\text{eq}}^2(\Gamma)}) = 1$ , where the operator  $\mathbf{L}_{1,\alpha}$  is defined in [3, Subsection 3.1]. Using Proposition 3.17 and Proposition 3.19 (ii) – (2), (3) in [3], we can affirm for  $\alpha > 0$  the following two results.

- (i) Let  $3 < p < 5$ , then there exists  $\omega_2 > \frac{\alpha^2}{N^2}$  such that  $e^{i\omega t}\Phi_{\alpha,\delta}$  is orbitally unstable in  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{eq}}(\Gamma)$  and therefore in  $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$  for  $\omega \in (\frac{\alpha^2}{N^2}, \omega_2)$ . Moreover,  $e^{i\omega t}\Phi_{\alpha,\delta}$  is orbitally stable in  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{eq}}(\Gamma)$  for  $\omega > \omega_2$ .
- (ii) Let  $p \geq 5$ , then  $e^{i\omega t}\Phi_{\alpha,\delta}$  is orbitally unstable in  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{eq}}(\Gamma)$ , and therefore in  $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$  for  $\omega > \frac{\alpha^2}{N^2}$ .

**Remark 3.15.** Using the approach of [15] (see Theorem 3.1), one may show that in  $L^2(\Gamma)$ ,

$$n(L_{1,k}^\alpha) = \begin{cases} k+1, & \text{for } \alpha < 0, \\ N-k, & \text{for } \alpha > 0, \end{cases} \quad k \in \left\{0, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{N-1}{2} \right\rfloor\right\}.$$

### 3.4 | Slope condition

Let  $k \in \left\{0, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{N-1}{2} \right\rfloor\right\}$ . In this subsection we study the sign of  $\partial_\omega Q(\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha)$ . By the definition of  $Q$  and  $\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha = (\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha, i\omega\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha)$ , we get (see [4, Proposition 5])

$$Q(\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha) = -\omega \|\varphi_{k,\omega}^\alpha\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 = Q_{k,1}(\omega)Q_{k,2}(\omega), \quad (3.14)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{k,1}(\omega) &= -2\omega \left(\frac{p+1}{2}\right)^{\frac{2}{p-1}} \frac{(m^2 - \omega^2)^{\frac{5-p}{2(p-1)}}}{p-1}, \\ Q_{k,2}(\omega) &= \int_{\frac{-\alpha}{(2k-N)\sqrt{m^2-\omega^2}}}^1 k(1-t^2)^{\frac{3-p}{p-1}} dt + \int_{\frac{\alpha}{(2k-N)\sqrt{m^2-\omega^2}}}^1 (N-k)(1-t^2)^{\frac{3-p}{p-1}} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Using the above formulas for  $Q(\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha)$ , we obtain the result.

**Lemma 3.16.** Let  $1 < p < 5$ .

- (i)  $\partial_\omega Q(\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha) > 0$  for

$$\alpha < 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \omega \in \left(-m, \frac{-m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}\right) \cup \left(\frac{m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}, m\right).$$

- (ii)  $\partial_\omega Q(\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha) < 0$  for

$$\alpha > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \omega \in \left(\frac{-m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}, 0\right) \cup \left(0, \frac{m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}\right).$$

*Proof.* By (3.14),  $\partial_\omega Q(\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha) = Q'_{k,1}(\omega)Q_{k,2}(\omega) + Q_{k,1}(\omega)Q'_{k,2}(\omega)$ . From (3.15) we get

$$\begin{aligned} Q'_{k,1}(\omega) &= \frac{2}{p-1} \left(\frac{p+1}{2}\right)^{\frac{2}{p-1}} (m^2 - \omega^2)^{\frac{7-3p}{2(p-1)}} \left(\frac{4\omega^2}{p-1} - m^2\right), \\ Q'_{k,2}(\omega) &= \left(1 - \frac{\alpha^2}{(2k-N)^2(m^2 - \omega^2)}\right)^{\frac{3-p}{p-1}} \frac{\alpha\omega}{(m^2 - \omega^2)^{3/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $Q_{k,2}(\omega) > 0$  for any  $\omega$  and  $\alpha$ . It is easily seen that

$$\begin{cases} Q'_{k,1}(\omega) > 0, \\ Q_{k,2}(\omega) > 0, \\ Q'_{k,2}(\omega) < 0, \\ Q_{k,1}(\omega) < 0 \end{cases} \iff \begin{cases} \alpha < 0, \\ \omega \in \left(\frac{m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}, m\right) \end{cases}$$



implies  $\partial_\omega Q(\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha) > 0$ . Analogously

$$\begin{cases} Q'_{k,1}(\omega) > 0, \\ Q_{k,2}(\omega) > 0, \\ Q'_{k,2}(\omega) > 0, \\ Q_{k,1}(\omega) > 0 \end{cases} \iff \begin{cases} \alpha < 0, \\ \omega \in \left(-m, \frac{-m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}\right) \end{cases}$$

yields  $\partial_\omega Q(\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha) > 0$ . Finally, (i) holds.

To show (ii), observe that

$$\begin{cases} Q'_{k,1}(\omega) < 0, \\ Q_{k,2}(\omega) > 0, \\ Q'_{k,2}(\omega) > 0, \\ Q_{k,1}(\omega) < 0 \end{cases} \iff \begin{cases} \alpha > 0, \\ \omega \in \left(0, \frac{m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}\right) \end{cases}$$

implies  $\partial_\omega Q(\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha) < 0$ , and

$$\begin{cases} Q'_{k,1}(\omega) < 0, \\ Q_{k,2}(\omega) > 0, \\ Q'_{k,2}(\omega) < 0, \\ Q_{k,1}(\omega) > 0 \end{cases} \iff \begin{cases} \alpha > 0, \\ \omega \in \left(\frac{-m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}, 0\right) \end{cases}$$

yields  $\partial_\omega Q(\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha) < 0$ . □

Combining Lemma 2.7, Theorem 3.3, Proposition 3.4, Proposition 3.6, Proposition 3.8, and Proposition 3.13, we get stability/instability result.

**Theorem 3.17.** Assume that  $1 < p < 5$  and  $m > 0$ .

(i) Let  $k \in \left\{1, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{N-1}{2} \right\rfloor\right\}$  and  $m^2 - \omega^2 > \frac{\alpha^2}{(N-2k)^2}$ .

(a) For  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\omega \in \left(\frac{-m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}, 0\right) \cup \left(0, \frac{m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}\right)$  the standing wave  $e^{i\omega t} \Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha$  is orbitally unstable in  $X_k$  and therefore in  $X$ .

(b) For  $\alpha < 0$  and  $\omega \in \left(-m, \frac{-m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}\right) \cup \left(\frac{m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}, m\right)$  (if such  $\omega$  exists) the standing wave  $e^{i\omega t} \Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha$  is linearly unstable.

(ii) Let  $k = 0$  and  $m^2 - \omega^2 > \frac{\alpha^2}{N^2}$ .

(a) For  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\omega \in \left(\frac{-m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}, 0\right) \cup \left(0, \frac{m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}\right)$  the standing wave  $e^{i\omega t} \Phi_{0,\omega}^\alpha$  is orbitally unstable in  $X_{\text{eq}}$  and therefore in  $X$ .

(b) For  $\alpha < 0$  and  $\omega \in \left(-m, \frac{-m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}\right) \cup \left(\frac{m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}, m\right)$  (if such  $\omega$  exists) the standing wave  $e^{i\omega t} \Phi_{0,\omega}^\alpha$  is orbitally stable in  $X$ .

*Proof.* Observe that, by Proposition 3.4, Proposition 3.6-(vi), Proposition 3.8-(iii), assumptions (A3) and (A4) are satisfied.

(i) (a) By Proposition 3.13-(i), for  $\alpha > 0$  we have  $n(L_{1,k}^\alpha|_{L_k^2(\Gamma)}) = 1$ . If additionally  $\omega \in \left(\frac{-m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}, 0\right) \cup \left(0, \frac{m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}\right)$ , then  $\partial_\omega Q(\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha) < 0$  (see Lemma 3.16-(ii)).

By Proposition 3.4, 3.8-(i) and 3.6-(ii), we obtain  $n(\mathcal{L}_k^\alpha|_{X_k}) = 1$ . Finally, by Theorem 3.3-(ii), we get orbital instability of  $e^{i\omega t} \Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha$  in  $X_k$  since (2.2) is well-posed in  $X_k$  by Lemma 2.7. Consequently  $e^{i\omega t} \Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha$  is orbitally unstable in  $X$ .

(b) By Proposition 3.13-(i), for  $\alpha < 0$  we have  $n(L_{1,k}^\alpha|_{L_k^2(\Gamma)}) = 2$  and analogously to the previous case  $n(\mathcal{L}_k^\alpha|_{X_k}) = 2$ . If additionally  $\omega \in \left(-m, \frac{-m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}\right) \cup \left(\frac{m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}, m\right)$ , then  $\partial_\omega Q(\Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha) > 0$  (see Lemma 3.16-(i)). Finally, by Theorem 3.3-(i), we get linear instability of  $e^{i\omega t} \Phi_{k,\omega}^\alpha$ .

(ii) (a) By Proposition 3.13-(ii), for  $\alpha > 0$  we have  $n(L_{1,k}^\alpha|_{L_{\text{eq}}^2(\Gamma)}) = 1$ , and therefore  $n(\mathcal{L}_k^\alpha|_{X_{\text{eq}}}) = 1$ . If additionally  $\omega \in \left(\frac{-m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}, 0\right) \cup \left(0, \frac{m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}\right)$ , then  $\partial_\omega Q(\Phi_{0,\omega}^\alpha) < 0$  (see Lemma 3.16-(ii)).

Finally, by Theorem 3.3-(ii), we get orbital instability of  $e^{i\omega t}\varphi_{0,\omega}^\alpha$  in  $X_{\text{eq}}$  since (2.2) is well-posed in  $X_{\text{eq}}$  by Lemma 2.7. Consequently  $e^{i\omega t}\varphi_{0,\omega}^\alpha$  is orbitally unstable in  $X$ .

(b) By Proposition 3.13-(ii), for  $\alpha < 0$  we have  $n(L_{1,k}^\alpha) = 1$  and consequently  $n(\mathcal{L}_k^\alpha) = 1$ . If additionally  $\omega \in \left(-m, \frac{-m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}\right) \cup \left(\frac{m\sqrt{p-1}}{2}, m\right)$ , then  $\partial_\omega Q(\Phi_{0,\omega}^\alpha) > 0$  (see Lemma 3.16-(i)). By Theorem 3.3-(i), we get orbital stability of  $e^{i\omega t}\varphi_{0,\omega}^\alpha$  in  $X$ .

□

## References

- [1] R. Adami, C. Cacciapuoti, D. Finco, D. Noja, *Variational properties and orbital stability of standing waves for NLS equation on a star graph*, J. Differential Equations **257** (2014), no. 10, 3738–3777.
- [2] S. Albeverio, F. Gesztesy, R. Hoegh-Krohn, and H. Holden, *Solvable Models in Quantum Mechanics*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, 2005.
- [3] J. Angulo, N. Goloshchapova, *Extension theory approach in the stability of the standing waves for the NLS equation with point interactions on a star graph*, Advances in Differential Equations **23** (2018), 793–846.
- [4] J. Angulo, N. Goloshchapova, *On the orbital instability of excited states for the NLS equation with the  $\delta$ -interaction on a star graph*, Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems **38** (2018), no. 10, 5039–5066.
- [5] J.M. Ball, *Strongly continuous semigroups, weak solution and the variation of constants formula*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **63** (1977), 370–373.
- [6] V. Banica, L.I. Ignat, *Dispersion for the Schrödinger equation on the line with multiple Dirac delta potentials and on delta trees*, Anal. Partial Differ. Equ. **7** (2014), no. 4, 903–927.
- [7] G. Berkolaiko and P. Kuchment, *Introduction to quantum graphs*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 186, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013.
- [8] C. Cacciapuoti, D. Finco, and D. Noja, *Ground state and orbital stability for the NLS equation on a general starlike graph with potentials*, Nonlinearity **30** (2017), 3271–3303.
- [9] E. Csobo, F. Genoud, M. Ohta, J. Royer, *Stability of Standing Waves for a Nonlinear Klein-Gordon Equation with Delta Potentials*, arXiv:1810.04874v1.
- [10] T. Cazenave, A. Haraux, *An Introduction to Semilinear Evolution Equations*, Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications 13, Oxford University Press, 1998.
- [11] S. De Bièvre, F. Genoud, S. Rota-Nodari, *Orbital stability: analysis meets geometry, in Nonlinear optical and atomic systems*, arXiv:1407.5951v2.
- [12] M. Grillakis, J. Shatah and W. Strauss, *Stability theory of solitary waves in the presence of symmetry. I*, J. Funct. Anal. **74** (1987), no. 1, 160–197.
- [13] M. Grillakis, J. Shatah and W. Strauss, *Stability theory of solitary waves in the presence of symmetry. II*, J. Funct. Anal. **94** (1990), no. 2, 308–348.
- [14] L. Jeanjean, S. Le Coz, *Instability for standing waves of nonlinear Klein-Gordon equations via mountain-pass arguments*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **361** (2009), 5401–5416.
- [15] A. Kairzhan, *Orbital instability of standing waves for NLS equation on star graphs*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **147** (2019), 2911–2924.
- [16] T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, Die Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 132, Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, 1966.
- [17] M.A. Naimark, *Linear Differential Operators. Part II. Linear Differential Operators in Hilbert Space*, Frederick Ungar, New York, 1968.
- [18] D. Noja, *Nonlinear Schrödinger equation on graphs: recent results and open problems*, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci. **372** (2014), 20130002, 20 pp.

- [19] M. Ohta, G. Todorova, *Strong instability of standing waves for the nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation and the Klein-Gordon-Zakharov system*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **38** (2007), 1912–1931.
- [20] A. Pazy, *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*, Applied Mathematical Sciences 44, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.
- [21] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics. IV. Analysis of Operators*, Academic Press, New York, 1978.
- [22] K. Schmüdgen, *Unbounded Self-adjoint Operators on Hilbert Space*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 265, Springer, Dordrecht, 2012.
- [23] J. Shatah, *Stable standing waves of nonlinear Klein-Gordon equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **91** (1983), 313–327.
- [24] J. Shatah, *Unstable ground state of nonlinear Klein-Gordon equations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **290** (1985), 701–710.
- [25] C. A. Stuart, *Lectures on the Orbital Stability of Standing Waves and Application to the Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation*, Milan Journal of Mathematics **76** (2008), 329–399.

