

**THE NONLINEAR SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION FOR
ORTHONORMAL FUNCTIONS:
I. EXISTENCE OF GROUND STATES**

DAVID GONTIER, MATHIEU LEWIN, AND FAIZAN Q. NAZAR

ABSTRACT. We study the nonlinear Schrödinger equation for systems of N orthonormal functions. We prove the existence of ground states for all N when the exponent p of the non linearity is not too large, and for an infinite sequence N_j tending to infinity in the whole range of possible p 's, in dimensions $d \geq 1$. This allows us to prove that translational symmetry is broken for a quantum crystal in the Kohn-Sham model with a large Dirac exchange constant.

© 2020 by the authors. This paper may be reproduced, in its entirety, for non-commercial purposes.

1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE MAIN RESULTS

1.1. Ground states for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation. The *nonlinear Schrödinger equation* (NLS) is one of the most famous nonlinear partial differential equation and it naturally occurs in a variety of physical situations [Mal05], including Bose-Einstein condensation [PS03], nonlinear optics [ZS72, Man74], water waves [Zak68], Langmuir waves in plasmas [TY69, FI73] and many others. We quickly recall here some of its mathematical properties before turning to its generalisation to systems of orthonormal functions, which is appropriate for quantum mechanical systems.

An *NLS ground state* is by definition a positive solution $Q \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_+)$ to the stationary NLS equation in \mathbb{R}^d ,

$$(-\Delta - Q^{2p-2})Q = \mu Q, \quad (1)$$

for some $\mu < 0$, which we normalise so that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Q(x)^2 dx = 1$. It is known [Cof72, Kwo89, McL93, Tao06, Fra13] that (1) admits a *unique* positive solution Q , up to translations, whenever

$$1 < p < \begin{cases} \infty & \text{in dimensions } d = 1, 2, \\ \frac{d}{d-2} & \text{in dimensions } d \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, this solution is non-degenerate [Wei85], which plays an important role for the behaviour of the associated time-dependent Schrödinger equation

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u = (-\Delta - |u|^{2p-2}) u,$$

of which Q is a stationary state. Since $Q > 0$ with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Q(x)^2 dx = 1$, the Lagrange multiplier μ must necessarily be the lowest eigenvalue of the operator $-\Delta - Q^{2p-2}$, see [LL01, Cor. 11.9] and [RS78, Sec. 12]. By scaling we find that the (unique) solution Q_λ satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Q_\lambda(x)^2 dx = \lambda$ solves the same equation (1) with μ replaced by

$$\mu(\lambda) = \mu \lambda^{\frac{2}{d} \frac{p-1}{1+\frac{2}{d}-p}}. \quad (2)$$

Date: February 13, 2020.

Under the additional condition

$$1 < p < 1 + \frac{2}{d},$$

it is useful to introduce the associated NLS functional

$$\mathcal{E}(u) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u(x)|^2 dx - \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(x)|^{2p} dx. \quad (3)$$

Then Q_λ is solution to the minimisation problem

$$I(d, p, \lambda) := \min \left\{ \mathcal{E}(u), \quad u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u|^2 = \lambda \right\}. \quad (4)$$

When the values of d and p are clear from the context, we will omit them in our notation and write

$$I(\lambda) := I(d, p, \lambda).$$

Since $1 < p < 1 + \frac{2}{d}$, $I(\lambda)$ is indeed bounded from below. For larger p 's one has to optimise a different function related to the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality [Wei83]. This explains the denomination *ground state*.

By scaling one finds that

$$I(\lambda) = I(1) \lambda^{1 + \frac{2}{d} \frac{p-1}{1 + \frac{2}{d} - p}}. \quad (5)$$

Since the exponent is greater than 1 with $I(1) < 0$, this implies immediately that $\lambda \mapsto I(\lambda)$ is strictly concave over \mathbb{R}_+ and that

$$I(\lambda) < I(\lambda - \lambda') + I(\lambda'), \quad \forall 0 < \lambda' < \lambda. \quad (6)$$

These so-called *binding inequalities* guarantee the existence of a minimiser, by the concentration-compactness method [Lio82, Lio84a, Lio84b, Fra13].

1.2. The case of orthonormal functions. When studying fermionic particles like electrons or all the other elementary quantum particles of nature, one is naturally led to deal with systems of orthonormal functions [LS10], that is, $u_1, \dots, u_N \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C})$ with $\langle u_j, u_k \rangle = \delta_{jk}$. In this paper we study the nonlinear Schrödinger equation for such orthonormal systems, which could be also called the *fermionic NLS equation*. It takes the form

$$\left(-\Delta - \left(\sum_{j=1}^N |u_j|^2 \right)^{p-1} \right) u_j = \mu_j u_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, N. \quad (7)$$

This is a system of N coupled partial differential equations, where the coupling involves only the *density*

$$\rho(x) = \sum_{j=1}^N |u_j(x)|^2$$

of the N particles. Similar equations have been studied in the mathematical [LW05, AC06, BW06, BWW07] and physical [Man74, KF16, ZY18] literature, but the constraint $\langle u_j, u_k \rangle = \delta_{jk}$ is often not assumed.

Equation (7) has several invariances. The first is the invariance under the non-compact group of space translations and it corresponds to replacing all the functions u_j by $u_j(\cdot - \tau)$ for some $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Similarly for the rotations. On the other hand, the multiplication by a phase for $N = 1$ is here replaced by the action of the (compact) group $U(N)$ of space-independent $N \times N$ unitary matrices, in the manner

$$U \in U(N) \mapsto U \cdot (u_1, \dots, u_N) = \left(\sum_{k=1}^N U_{kj} u_k \right)_{j=1}^N.$$

This action does not affect the constraint, nor the density ρ , hence it preserves the mean-field operator $-\Delta - \rho^{p-1}$. However it has the effect of transforming the diagonal matrix $\underline{\mu} = \text{diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N)$ of Lagrange multipliers into $U\underline{\mu}U^*$. Although it could seem more appropriate to start with a general hermitian matrix of multipliers $(\mu_{jk})_{1 \leq j, k \leq N}$ associated with the constraint $\langle u_j, u_k \rangle = \delta_{jk}$, we have for convenience chosen in (7) a gauge in which this matrix is diagonal.

Definition 1 (Ground state). *A ground state is a system $(u_1, \dots, u_N) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, orthonormal in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which solves the equations (7) where*

$$\mu_1 < \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_N \leq 0$$

are the N first eigenvalues of the operator $-\Delta - \rho^{p-1}$, counted with multiplicity.

This definition coincides with the (strict) positivity of Q in the case $N = 1$, since the first eigenvalue μ_1 is always non-degenerate with a positive eigenfunction, when it exists. Our definition for $N \geq 2$ is further discussed in light of the N -particle problem in Remark 8 below.

It is interesting to determine the values of p and N (depending on the dimension $d \geq 1$) for which ground states exist. In this article, we focus on the case $1 < p < 1 + \frac{2}{d}$, which can be recast into a minimisation problem. Ground states have recently been constructed in [HKY19] for $p > 1 + \frac{2}{d}$ but the value of the corresponding N is not known and it may even be infinite. An even more difficult question is that of the uniqueness of ground states (up to symmetries), when they exist. We believe that in dimension $d = 1$, ground states are always unique up to translations whenever they exist. In higher dimensions, uniqueness could in principle hold only for some specific ‘magic’ numbers N , like in the periodic table of the elements. Numerical simulations in dimension $d = 2$ presented later in Figure 2 suggest on the contrary that the system is never invariant under rotations, hence minimisers are probably never unique in this case.

From now on, we assume

$$1 < p < 1 + \frac{2}{d}.$$

The case $p = 1 + 2/d$ will be handled in the second part [FGL20] of this work, in dimensions $d \geq 3$. As in the $N = 1$ case, ground states naturally occur as minimisers of the associated nonlinear functional

$$\mathcal{E}(u_1, \dots, u_N) = \sum_{n=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u_n(x)|^2 dx - \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\sum_{n=1}^N |u_n(x)|^2 \right)^p dx. \quad (8)$$

This paper is devoted to the study of the associated minimisation problem

$$J(N) = \inf \left\{ \mathcal{E}(u_1, \dots, u_N), \quad u_1, \dots, u_N \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C}), \langle u_j, u_k \rangle_{L^2} = \delta_{jk} \right\}. \quad (9)$$

For $N = 1$, we recover $J(1) = I(1)$. Unfortunately, there is no simple formula such as (5) for $J(N)$. This is because of the orthonormality constraint, which prevents us from multiplying u_j by a positive constant, as one does for $I(N)$ to obtain (5).

The goal of the present article is to prove that $J(N)$ admits minimisers, for some values of p and N . Following [Lew11] and as is usual in the study of nonlinear elliptic minimisation problems, our main strategy is to prove the so-called *binding inequalities*. Indeed, as we recall in Theorem 14, if $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that the following binding inequalities hold:

$$J(N) < J(N - K) + J(K), \quad \text{for all } K = 1, \dots, N - 1, \quad (10)$$

then $J(N)$ has a minimiser.

We prove later in Proposition 16 that minimisers of $J(N)$ are indeed ground states. Therefore, the problem boils down to proving the binding inequalities (10). We believe that the following holds.

Conjecture 2 (Binding). *For every $N \geq 2$ and every*

$$1 < p < \min\left(2, 1 + \frac{2}{d}\right),$$

the binding inequalities (10) hold. In particular, $J(N)$ admits a minimiser, which is a ground state for (7).

We were not able to prove Conjecture 2 in the whole range of parameters. We prove in this paper two weaker results. The first one is that the conjecture holds for p close enough to 1.

Theorem 3 (Binding and existence of ground states for small p). *For all $d \geq 1$, there exists $1 < p_c(d) \leq 1 + \frac{2}{d}$ such that, for all*

$$1 < p < p_c(d),$$

the binding inequalities (10) hold for all $N \geq 2$. In particular, for all $1 < p < p_c(d)$ and all $N \geq 2$ there exists a minimiser (u_1, \dots, u_N) for $J(N)$, which is a ground state. It solves the nonlinear system (7) where the corresponding multipliers satisfy

$$\mu_1 < \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 \leq \dots \leq \mu_N < 0$$

and are the N first eigenvalues of the Schrödinger operator $-\Delta - (\sum_{n=1}^N |u_n|^2)^{p-1}$, counted with multiplicity.

In the proof in Section 2.5 we give an explicit lower bound of the critical exponent $p_c(d)$. A numerical evaluation of this definition gives

$$p_c(d) > \begin{cases} 1.629 & \text{for } d = 1, \\ 1.560 & \text{for } d = 2, \\ 1.402 & \text{for } d = 3. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

In particular, we are able to cover the important case $p = 4/3$ in dimension $d = 3$, which is the object of Section 3. These bounds show that the critical $p_c(d)$ is not so close to 1 and let us think that $p_c(d) = \min(2, 1 + 2/d)$ should hold.

Our second result can cover the whole range $1 < p < \min(2, 1 + \frac{1}{d})$, but is valid only for an infinite sequence $N_j \rightarrow \infty$, including the two-particle case $N = 2$.

Theorem 4 (Binding and existence of ground states for all p). *Let $d \geq 1$ and*

$$1 < p < \min\left(2, 1 + \frac{2}{d}\right).$$

Then there exists an infinite increasing sequence of integers

$$N_1 = 1, N_2 = 2 < N_3 < \dots < N_j < \dots$$

for which the binding inequalities (10) hold. For any such $N = N_j$, $J(N)$ has a minimiser (u_1, \dots, u_N) which satisfies the same properties as in Theorem 3.

When $p = 1 + 2/d$ the system has an additional invariance and it is not appropriate to fix the constant in front of the nonlinear term $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\sum_{j=1}^N |u_j|^2)^p$ in (8) to be $1/p$. If we study the minimisation problem similar to (9) with a constant $\alpha > 0$ in front of the nonlinear term, we obtain that there exists a critical $\alpha_c(N) > 0$ such that $J(N) = 0$ for $\alpha \leq \alpha_c(N)$ and $J(N) = -\infty$ for $\alpha > \alpha_c(N)$. There are no minimisers for $0 \leq \alpha < \alpha_c(N)$. In the second part [FGL20] of this work, we will prove a result similar to Theorem 4 for $\alpha = \alpha_c(N_j)$ with $N_j \rightarrow \infty$, in dimension $d \geq 3$.

On the other hand, the threshold $p = 2$ appears naturally in our proof when we evaluate the interaction between two ground states placed far away (Proposition 20). So our results do not cover the case $2 \leq p < 3$ in dimension $d = 1$. Actually, binding probably never holds for $p \in [2, 3)$ in 1D.

Conjecture 5 (Absence of binding in 1D for $p \in [2, 3)$). *In dimension $d = 1$, for all $2 \leq p < 3$ and all $N \geq 2$, $J(N)$ does not have minimiser, and we have*

$$J(N) = NJ(1).$$

In the second part of this work [FGL20] we will prove the conjecture for $p = 2$ in dimension $d = 1$.

Theorem 6 (Non-existence for $d = 1, p = 2$ [FGL20]). *Let $d = 1$ and $p = 2$. Then we have $J(N) = NJ(1)$ for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. In addition, $J(N)$ admits no minimiser for $N \geq 2$.*

In [FGL20] we also explain that Conjecture 5 follows from another conjecture from [LT76] that the Lieb-Thirring best constant coincides with the Gagliardo-Nirenberg constant when the eigenvalues are raised to the power $1 \leq \kappa \leq 3/2$. This has been proved in [LT76] for $\kappa = 3/2$ and this is how Theorem 6 is obtained in [FGL20].

Several tools of nonlinear analysis have been generalised to systems of orthonormal functions, which can also be seen as random fields [Suz15, CS18]. The most celebrated example is the *Lieb-Thirring inequality* [LT75, LT76, LS10, FHJT19] which states that

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u_n(x)|^2 dx \geq c_{\text{LT}}(d) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\sum_{n=1}^N |u_n(x)|^2 \right)^{1+\frac{2}{d}} dx \quad (12)$$

where the positive constant $c_{\text{LT}}(d) > 0$ is independent of N . This important inequality replaces the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality for large orthonormal systems. It will play a role in our analysis in Section 1.3. Other Gagliardo-Nirenberg-type inequalities were considered in [Lie83]. More recently, the Strichartz inequality has been extended to orthonormal systems in [FLLS14, FS17, BHL⁺17] and it has played a central role for the existence and the long time behaviour of infinite systems [LS15, LS14, CHP17a, CHP17b, CS18]. After all these works on systems of orthonormal functions, investigating ground states of the fermionic NLS equation (7) seems a natural next step. There are many open questions and we hope that our paper will stimulate more work on the problem. The fermionic NLS time-dependent equation for $N = +\infty$ has been studied in [CHP17b]

Let us briefly explain our main strategy of proof for Theorems 3 and 4. Assuming that $J(N)$ and $J(M)$ have minimisers, the proof of the binding inequality $J(N + M) < J(N) + J(M)$ requires to investigate the interaction of these two minimisers placed far away. Since the μ_j are all negative, the u_j all decay exponentially fast at infinity, essentially like $\exp(-\sqrt{-\mu_j}|x|)$, so that this interaction is exponentially small. It is somewhat reminiscent of [CL92, CL93a, CL93b, BL90, BL97]. In particular, the decay at infinity of the total density ρ_N (resp. ρ_M) is determined by the last eigenvalue μ_N (resp. μ_M). We were able to prove that this interaction is attractive under the additional constraint that

$$1 < p < 1 + \sqrt{\frac{\min(|\mu_N|, |\mu_M|)}{\max(|\mu_N|, |\mu_M|)}}.$$

To prove Theorem 3, we derive universal lower and upper bounds (independent of N) on the last eigenvalue μ_N . This gives a critical exponent $p_c(d)$ below which

binding holds. To prove Theorem 4, we observe that if $N = M$, then we can choose the same minimiser for $J(N)$ and $J(M)$ so that $\mu_N = \mu_M$. In this simpler case the interaction is attractive whenever $1 < p < \min(2, 1 + 2/d)$. So if $J(N)$ has a minimiser, then

$$J(2N) < 2J(N). \quad (13)$$

Since there are ground states for $N = 1$, we deduce that there are ground states for $N = 2$. In Section 2.6 below we explain how to deduce that binding holds for an infinite sequence $N_j \rightarrow \infty$ based on the sole inequality (13).

As an application, in Section 3 we use (13) to prove translational symmetry breaking of the Kohn-Sham model for a crystal with a large Dirac exchange coefficient. This result is in the same spirit as the recent work [Ric18] by Ricaud on the Thomas-Fermi-von Weizsäcker model, and it was indeed our first motivation for studying the fermionic NLS equation (7). This problem naturally brings the case $d = 3$ and $p = 4/3$.

Remark 7. If we rescale all the u_n in the manner $\alpha^{d/2}u_n(\alpha x)$ and optimise over α we obtain the inequality

$$N^{\frac{2}{d(p-1)}-1} \sum_{n=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u_n(x)|^2 dx \geq c(d, p, N) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\sum_{n=1}^N |u_n(x)|^2 \right)^p dx \right)^{\frac{2}{d(p-1)}} \quad (14)$$

with the best constant

$$c(d, p, N) = \left(\frac{N}{-J(N)} \right)^{\frac{1+\frac{2}{d}-p}{p-1}} \left(\frac{d}{2p} \right)^{\frac{2}{d(p-1)}} (p-1) \left(1 + \frac{2}{d} - p \right)^{\frac{1+\frac{2}{d}-p}{p-1}}. \quad (15)$$

The constant $c(d, p, N)$ has a finite limit when $N \rightarrow \infty$, as we will see in the next section. Our theorems give the existence of optimisers for this inequality (either for small p or for a subsequence $N_j \rightarrow \infty$). The (non-sharp) inequality (14) easily follows from the Lieb-Thirring inequality, using $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{n=1}^N |u_n|^2 = N$ together with Hölder's inequality. See [FGL20] for more about (14) and its link with Lieb-Thirring inequalities.

Remark 8 (Interpretation in terms of N -particles). For a wave function $\Psi \in L^2((\mathbb{R}^d)^N, \mathbb{C})$ with $\|\Psi\|_{L^2((\mathbb{R}^d)^N, \mathbb{C})} = 1$, consider the energy functional

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{QM}}(\Psi) := \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^N} |\nabla \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_N)|^2 dx_1 \cdots dx_N - \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_\Psi(x)^p dx \quad (16)$$

where the density ρ_Ψ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\Psi(x) = & \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{N-1}} |\Psi(x, x_2, \dots, x_N)|^2 dx_2 \cdots dx_N + \cdots \\ & \cdots + \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{N-1}} |\Psi(x_1, x_2, \dots, x)|^2 dx_1 \cdots dx_{N-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Minimisation problems involving functionals of the type (16) (posed on the N -particle space with a nonlinear term depending on ρ_Ψ) have been studied in [Lew11]. Here, without further constraints on Ψ , the minimum of \mathcal{E}_{QM} on the unit sphere is attained for a symmetric (that is, bosonic) wave function, which forms a Bose-Einstein condensate on the NLS ground state Q_N/\sqrt{N} defined in (4):

$$\Psi(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \frac{e^{i\theta}}{N^{\frac{N}{2}}} Q_N(x_1) \cdots Q_N(x_N).$$

This is a simple consequence of the Hoffmann-Ostenhof inequality [HH77]

$$\int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^N} |\nabla \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_N)|^2 dx_1 \cdots dx_N \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \sqrt{\rho_\Psi}(x)|^2 dx$$

which implies that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{QM}}(\Psi) \geq \mathcal{E}(\sqrt{\rho_\Psi})$$

where we recall that \mathcal{E} is the NLS energy (3). In other words, the unconstrained N -particle problem is the same as the NLS problem for one function (4). Note that when $N \rightarrow \infty$ the system collapses since Q_N is a rescaling of Q by the factor $N^{-(p-1)/(d+2-dp)}$.

The situation is different if we restrict the minimisation to anti-symmetric (that is, fermionic) wave functions. From the arguments in [Lew11] and in this paper, it follows that minimisers are Slater determinants (also called Hartree-Fock states), that is, of the form

$$\Psi(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N!}} \det(u_j(x_k))_{1 \leq j, k \leq N}$$

where u_1, \dots, u_N form an orthonormal system in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Slater determinants are the least correlated wave functions compatible with the anti-symmetric constraint. These wave functions satisfy that $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QM}}(\Psi) = \mathcal{E}(u_1, \dots, u_N)$, our NLS functional in (8). The N -particle interpretation of $J(N)$ in (9) is therefore that it corresponds to minimising \mathcal{E}_{QM} over anti-symmetric wave functions. In this light our Definition 1 of a ‘ground state’ is justified since the corresponding N -particle wave function Ψ is indeed a minimiser of the \mathcal{E}_{QM} , in the anti-symmetric subspace. On the contrary to the bosonic case, the fermionic model is stable (extensive) since $J(N)$ behaves like N in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, as discussed in the next section.

1.3. The large- N limit. Let $d \geq 1$ and $1 < p < 1 + \frac{2}{d}$. From the Lieb-Thirring inequality (12), we have

$$J(N) \geq \inf_{\substack{\rho \geq 0 \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho = N}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(c_{\text{LT}}(d) \rho(x)^{1+\frac{2}{d}} - \frac{1}{p} \rho(x)^p \right) dx,$$

and the last minimisation problem can be solved explicitly.

Lemma 9. *We have*

$$\inf_{\substack{\rho \geq 0 \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho = N}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(C \rho(x)^{1+\frac{2}{d}} - \frac{1}{p} \rho(x)^p \right) dx = -N \left(1 + \frac{2}{d} - p \right) \frac{d}{2p} \left(\frac{d(p-1)}{2pC} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{1+\frac{2}{d}-p}}.$$

Proof. First, we notice that there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the map

$$\rho \mapsto C \rho^{1+\frac{2}{d}} - \frac{1}{p} \rho^p + \alpha \rho$$

is positive and vanishes only at $\rho = 0$ and some $\rho_* > 0$. This implies that any minimiser $\rho(\cdot)$ must have values in $\{0, \rho_*\}$, hence is of the form $\rho(x) = \rho_* \mathbf{1}_\Omega(x)$, where Ω is a Borel set with $|\Omega| \rho_* = N$. Optimising in ρ_* gives the result. \square

We deduce that

$$\frac{J(N)}{N} \geq e_{\text{LT}}(d, p) := - \left(1 + \frac{2}{d} - p \right) \frac{d}{2p} \left(\frac{d(p-1)}{2p c_{\text{LT}}(d)} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{1+\frac{2}{d}-p}}. \quad (17)$$

In addition, we will prove later in Lemma 12 that $J(N) \leq J(N-K) + J(K)$ for every integer $K = 1, \dots, N-1$. We deduce first that $J(N)/N \leq J(1) = I(1) < 0$.

Also, since the function $N \mapsto J(N)$ is subadditive and bounded from below by a constant times N we conclude that the limit

$$\boxed{\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{J(N)}{N} = \inf_{N \geq 1} \frac{J(N)}{N} =: e(d, p) > -\infty} \quad (18)$$

exists, and satisfies $e_{\text{LT}}(d, p) \leq e(d, p) \leq I(d, p, N = 1) < 0$. The behaviour in N found in (18) is therefore very different from the ‘bosonic’ case recalled above in (5) (Remark 8). In the later case, $I(N)$ behaves super-linearly in N and the exponent depends on p and d . On the contrary, for systems of orthonormal functions (fermions), $J(N)$ behaves linearly for all admissible p and d .

By Remark 8, the number $e(d, p)$ should be interpreted as the energy per particle of an infinite system of fermions interacting through the local nonlinearity $\rho(x)^p/p$. It is an interesting question to determine this limit as well as the shape of the corresponding minimisers in the limit. Should ρ become constant, then we can predict the value of $e(d, p)$ by semi-classical analysis. Indeed, if ρ is essentially constant over a large domain Ω , then u_1, \dots, u_N are close to the N first eigenfunctions of the Laplacian over Ω , due to the nonlinear equation (7). But the total kinetic energy of these N first eigenfunctions is approximately given by Weyl’s formula $c_{\text{TF}} \rho^{1+\frac{2}{d}} |\Omega|$ with the Thomas-Fermi constant

$$c_{\text{TF}} = \frac{4\pi^2 d}{(d+2)} \left(\frac{d}{|\mathbb{S}^{d-1}|} \right)^{\frac{2}{d}}.$$

As in Lemma 9, this yields the Thomas-Fermi energy of the NLS system at any finite N

$$\min_{\substack{\rho \geq 0 \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho = N}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(c_{\text{TF}} \rho(x)^{1+\frac{2}{d}} - \frac{1}{p} \rho(x)^p \right) dx = N e_{\text{TF}}(d, p) \quad (19)$$

with

$$e_{\text{TF}}(d, p) = - \left(1 + \frac{2}{d} - p \right) \frac{d}{2p} \left(\frac{d(p-1)}{2pc_{\text{TF}}} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{1+\frac{2}{d}-p}}. \quad (20)$$

Minimisers of the Thomas-Fermi problem (19) are not unique at all, even up to translations. They are given by $\rho_{\text{TF}}(d, p) \mathbb{1}_{\Omega}$ for any Borel set Ω of volume $|\Omega| = N/\rho_{\text{TF}}(d, p)$, as seen in the proof of Lemma 9. There is no binding in NLS Thomas-Fermi theory and the energy is perfectly additive.

The following is a justification of the intuitive fact that the Thomas-Fermi problem is an upper bound to the true NLS system.

Lemma 10. *Let $d \geq 1$ and $1 < p < 1 + 2/d$. Then we have $e(d, p) \leq e_{\text{TF}}(d, p)$.*

Proof. Let C_L be the cube of side length L centered at the origin and let $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_+)$ be such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \chi = 1$. Denote

$$u_k(x) = L^{-\frac{d}{2}} \sqrt{\mathbb{1}_{C_L} * \chi} e^{-ik \cdot x}$$

for $k \in (2\pi/L)\mathbb{Z}^d$. It turns out that these functions are orthonormal, since

$$\langle u_k, u_{k'} \rangle = L^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_{C_L} * \chi e^{i(k-k') \cdot x} dx = (2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}} \widehat{\mathbb{1}_{C_L} * \chi}(k - k') = 0.$$

A computation gives that the kinetic energy of each such function is equal to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u_k(x)|^2 = |k|^2 + \frac{1}{L^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \sqrt{\mathbb{1}_{C_L} * \chi}(x)|^2 dx.$$

The second term is a $O(1/L)$ since the function $\mathbb{1}_{C_L} * \chi$ is equal to 1 inside C_L , at a distance of order one to its boundary, and vanishes outside at a similar distance.

Taking $N \approx |C_L| \rho_{\text{TF}} = L^d \rho_{\text{TF}}$ such functions, each with a different k , we find the energy

$$\mathcal{E}(u_{k_1}, \dots, u_{k_N}) = \sum_{j=1}^N k_j^2 - \frac{N^p}{pL^{dp}} \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\mathbb{1}_{C_L} * \chi)^p}_{=L^d + O(L^{d-1})} + O\left(\frac{N}{L}\right).$$

The first term is minimum when we take for the k_j all the points of $(2\pi/L)\mathbb{Z}^d$ in a ball of fixed radius R , where R is chosen so that there are N points (we find $R \approx \frac{1}{(2\pi)} \left(\frac{d\rho_{\text{TF}}}{|\mathbb{S}^{d-1}|}\right)^{1/d}$). Taking the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ gives the result. \square

From Lemma 10 we have an upper bound on $e(d, p)$ involving the Thomas-Fermi constant c_{TF} and the exact same lower bound involving the best Lieb-Thirring constant c_{LT} . More specifically, we proved that

$$e_{\text{LT}}(d, p) \leq e(d, p) \leq \min \{e_{\text{TF}}(d, p), I(d, p, N = 1)\} < 0.$$

The Lieb-Thirring conjecture [LT76, FGL20] states that in dimensions $d \geq 3$, one has $c_{\text{LT}} = c_{\text{TF}}$. In this case, we would have

$$e(d, p) = e_{\text{TF}}(d, p) \quad \text{for all } 1 < p < 1 + \frac{2}{d}. \quad (21)$$

The density ρ_N of the ground state for N fermions should form a large cluster which is essentially constant in the bulk, and converge in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ to a constant over the whole space.

On the contrary, in dimensions $d = 1, 2$ it is known that $c_{\text{LT}} \neq c_{\text{TF}}$ and the system should not converge to a constant. We expect the system to be crystallised for all $1 < p < 2$. By Theorem 6, in dimension $d = 1$ the period should probably increase when $p \rightarrow 2^-$ whereas the density ρ in each cell converges to Q^2 (the NLS ground state for $N = 1$). In dimension $d = 1$, the periodicity of minimisers is confirmed by a numerical simulation reported on in Figure 1. Showing such a fact is an interesting open problem [BL15]. In dimension $d = 2$, we could not run the computations for a too large value of N but the numerical results for $N \leq 7$ presented in Figure 2 seem to already suggest that the particles crystallise on a triangular lattice, as is often the case in two dimensions [BL15].




FIGURE 1. Numerical computation of the density $\rho = \sum_{n=1}^N |u_n|^2$ of the minimiser for $J(N)$ in dimension $d = 1$ with $N = 15$ and $p = 1.3$. The system exhibits a crystallised phase with 15 local maxima.




FIGURE 2. Numerical computation of the density $\sum_{j=1}^N |u_j(x)|^2$ of the minimiser of $J(N)$ for N varying between 1 and 7 in dimension $d = 2$ with $p = 1.5$.




FIGURE 3. Plot of $J(N)/N$ as a function of N in dimension $d = 2$ for $p = 1.5$. It is unclear whether $J(7)/7$ is smaller than $J(6)/6$, due to numerical errors.

2. PROOF OF THEOREMS 3 AND 4

2.1. Relaxation via density matrices. Here we introduce the relaxation of $J(N)$ using density matrices, a classical tool in the context of variational problems involving orthonormal functions [Lie81, Sol91, Bac92, Bac93, BLLS94, BLS94, FLSS07, Lew11]. Let $\gamma = \gamma^* \geq 0$ be a non-negative self-adjoint operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, with $\text{Tr}(\gamma) = \lambda > 0$. Then γ is compact and, by the spectral theorem, it can be diagonalised in the form

$$\gamma = \sum_{i \geq 1} n_i |u_i\rangle\langle u_i|$$

for a system (u_i) of orthonormal functions, with $n_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i \geq 1} n_i = \lambda$. Its kinetic energy is defined by (we set $P_j := -i\partial_{x_j}$)

$$\text{Tr}(-\Delta\gamma) := \sum_{j=1}^d \text{Tr}(P_j \gamma P_j) = \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{i \geq 1} n_i \|P_j u_i\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{i \geq 1} n_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u_i(x)|^2 dx,$$

and we assume it to be finite. The left side really makes sense under stronger assumptions on γ , but we use this notation in what follows for simplicity. The corresponding density is defined by

$$\rho_\gamma(x) := \sum_{i \geq 1} n_i |u_i(x)|^2.$$

This is a non-negative integrable function with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_\gamma(x) dx = \text{Tr}(\gamma) = \lambda$. The Lieb-Thirring inequality for operators [LT75, LT76, LS10] states that $\rho_\gamma \in L^{1+2/d}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, with

$$\|\gamma\|^{\frac{2}{d}} \text{Tr}(-\Delta\gamma) \geq c_{\text{LT}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_\gamma(x)^{1+\frac{2}{d}} dx \quad (22)$$

where $\|\gamma\| = \max(n_i)$ is the operator norm of γ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. When γ is an orthogonal projection,

$$\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^N |u_i\rangle\langle u_i|, \quad (23)$$

this reduces to the inequality mentioned in (12). On the other hand, the Hoffmann-Ostenhof [HH77] inequality states that

$$\text{Tr}(-\Delta\gamma) \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \sqrt{\rho_\gamma(x)}|^2 dx, \quad (24)$$

which implies, by the Sobolev inequality, that

$$\rho_\gamma \in \begin{cases} (L^1 \cap L^\infty)(\mathbb{R}^d) & \text{when } d = 1, \\ L^q(\mathbb{R}^d) & \text{for all } 1 \leq q < \infty \text{ when } d = 2, \\ (L^1 \cap L^{\frac{d}{d-2}})(\mathbb{R}^d) & \text{when } d \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

In what follows, we assume that $\|\gamma\| = 1$, and we introduce the NLS energy of any such operator γ by

$$\mathcal{E}(\gamma) := \text{Tr}(-\Delta\gamma) - \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_\gamma(x)^p dx. \quad (25)$$

We use the same notation \mathcal{E} as we did for the case of one or N functions, since we think that there cannot be any confusion. When $\gamma = |u\rangle\langle u|$ is a rank-one operator, we recover the usual NLS energy of one function. When γ is an orthonormal projection as in (23) we obtain the energy $\mathcal{E}(u_1, \dots, u_N)$ introduced in (8). We introduce the minimisation problem

$$J(\lambda) := \inf \{ \mathcal{E}(\gamma) : 0 \leq \gamma = \gamma^* \leq 1, \text{Tr}(\gamma) = \lambda, \text{Tr}(-\Delta)\gamma < \infty \}. \quad (26)$$

The following well-known result in the spirit of [Lie81] states that $J(N)$ coincides with our previously defined problem for orthonormal functions. This is based on the important fact that the energy is concave in γ , hence always attains its minimum on the extreme points of a convex set.

Lemma 11. *Let $d \geq 1$ and $1 < p < 1 + 2/d$. The minimisation problem $J(\lambda)$ defined in (26) is bounded from below for every $\lambda > 0$. Let N be the smallest integer such that $N \geq \lambda$. Then we have*

$$J(\lambda) = \inf \left\{ \mathcal{E}(\gamma) : \gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} |u_i\rangle\langle u_i| + (\lambda - N + 1)|u_N\rangle\langle u_N|, \right. \\ \left. (u_1, \dots, u_N) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)^N \text{ is orthonormal in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \right\}. \quad (27)$$

In particular,

- (i) for every integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $J(N)$ coincides with (9),
- (ii) for every $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, we have $J(\lambda) = I(\lambda)$, given by the NLS formula (5).

Proof. That $J(\lambda)$ is bounded from below for all $\lambda \geq 0$ when $1 < p < 1 + 2/d$ follows from the Lieb-Thirring inequality (22) by the same argument as in (17).

Let us first prove that we can restrict the minimisation problem to finite rank operators. Let $\gamma = \sum_{i \geq 1} n_i |u_i\rangle\langle u_i|$ be any admissible operator. Then the operator

$$\gamma_K := \sum_{i=1}^K n_i |u_i\rangle\langle u_i| + \left(\sum_{i \geq K+1} n_i \right) |u_{K+1}\rangle\langle u_{K+1}|$$

is also admissible and converges to γ when $K \rightarrow \infty$, in the trace norm. We even have

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr}(-\Delta)\gamma_K = \text{Tr}(-\Delta)\gamma.$$

The trace-class convergence implies $\rho_K \rightarrow \rho$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and since ρ_K is bounded in $L^{1+2/d}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by the Lieb-Thirring inequality (22), we have $\rho_K \rightarrow \rho$ in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Hence $\mathcal{E}(\gamma_K) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\gamma)$ and the infimum can be restricted to finite-rank operators, as wanted

Let now $\gamma = \sum_{i \geq 1} n_i |u_i\rangle\langle u_i|$ be any finite-rank admissible operator with $0 \leq n_i \leq 1$ and $\sum_{i \geq 1} n_i = \lambda$, and assume that there are two n_i , say n_1 and n_2 , which belong to the open interval $(0, 1)$. Consider the new operator obtained by varying these two occupation numbers

$$\tilde{\gamma}_t := \gamma + t(|u_1\rangle\langle u_1| - |u_2\rangle\langle u_2|)$$

which is admissible as soon as $\max(-n_1, n_2 - 1) \leq t \leq \min(1 - n_1, n_2)$. The energy of $\tilde{\gamma}_t$ is concave in t , hence the minimum over t must be attained at the boundary of the interval, where one of the two occupation numbers of $\tilde{\gamma}_t$ is equal to either 0 or 1. The new operator $\tilde{\gamma}_t$ has an energy which is lower than or equal to that of γ and it has at least one occupation number in the open interval $(0, 1)$ less. Arguing by induction we can therefore find an operator γ' of the form in (27) so that $\mathcal{E}(\gamma') \leq \mathcal{E}(\gamma)$. So the minimisation problem can be restricted to such γ' 's.

If $\lambda = N$ is an integer, the minimisation set contains only orthogonal projections, and we recover the minimisation problem introduced in (9). If $0 < \lambda \leq 1$ then we can take $\gamma = \lambda|u\rangle\langle u|$. Its energy equals the NLS energy of $\sqrt{\lambda}u$. Therefore the optimum is for $u = u_\lambda/\sqrt{\lambda}$ and the minimal energy is equal to $I(\lambda)$. If $\lambda = 0$ then the set is reduced to $\gamma = 0$ and we find $J(0) = 0$. \square

2.2. Binding inequalities and existence of a minimiser. Here are some standard observations.

Lemma 12 (Properties of $J(\lambda)$). *Let $d \geq 1$ and $1 < p < 1 + 2/d$. Then*

(i) **(lower bound)** *There is $C > 0$ such that, for all $\lambda > 0$, we have*

$$-C\lambda \leq J(\lambda) < 0.$$

(ii) **(sub-additivity)** *For all $0 \leq \lambda' \leq \lambda$, we have*

$$J(\lambda) \leq J(\lambda') + J(\lambda - \lambda').$$

(iii) **(monotonicity and continuity)** *The function $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto J(\lambda)$ is decreasing and continuous.*

(iv) **(concavity)** *It is concave on each interval $(N - 1, N)$ with $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$.*

Proof. From the Lieb-Thirring inequality (22) we have like in Lemma 9

$$J(\lambda) \geq \inf_{\substack{\rho \geq 0 \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho = \lambda}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(c_{\text{LT}} \rho(x)^{1+\frac{2}{d}} - \frac{1}{p} \rho(x)^p \right) dx \geq -\lambda e_{\text{LT}}(d, p).$$

To conclude the proof of (i), we now show that $J(\lambda)$ is negative. Let γ be any admissible operator for $J(\lambda)$ and set $\gamma_a = U_a \gamma U_a^*$ where U_a is the dilation unitary operator by the scaling factor a , that is, in terms of operator kernels $\gamma_a(x, y) := a^d \gamma(ax, ay)$. We then have $0 \leq \gamma_a \leq 1$, $\text{Tr}(\gamma_a) = \lambda$, and

$$\mathcal{E}(\gamma_a) = a^2 \text{Tr}(-\Delta \gamma) - \frac{a^{d(p-1)}}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_\gamma^p, \quad (28)$$

which is negative for a small enough since $d(p-1) < 2$.

We turn to the proof of (ii). Take any two operators of the special form in (27)

$$\gamma_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} |u_i\rangle\langle u_i| + (\lambda' - N + 1)|u_N\rangle\langle u_N|,$$

and

$$\gamma_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} |v_j\rangle\langle v_j| + (\lambda - \lambda' - M + 1)|v_M\rangle\langle v_M|$$

with respectively λ' and $\lambda - \lambda'$ particles. We then place γ_2 far away. This can be done by first translating all the functions v_j into $v_j(\cdot - \tau)$ but then we have to make the functions $(u_1, \dots, u_N, v_1, \dots, v_M)$ all orthonormal. This is automatic for τ large enough if the functions have a compact support, which we could assume by density in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Here we use another argument that will be useful later on. We consider the Gram matrix

$$G_\tau = \begin{pmatrix} I_N & S_\tau \\ S_\tau^* & I_M \end{pmatrix}, \quad S_\tau = \left(\langle u_i, v_j(\cdot - \tau) \rangle \right)_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq N \\ 1 \leq j \leq M}}$$

and let

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_1^{(\tau)} \\ \vdots \\ u_N^{(\tau)} \\ v_1^{(\tau)} \\ \vdots \\ v_M^{(\tau)} \end{pmatrix} = (G_\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ \vdots \\ u_N \\ v_1(\cdot - \tau) \\ \vdots \\ v_M(\cdot - \tau) \end{pmatrix},$$




FIGURE 4. Numerical computation of the functions $\lambda \mapsto J(\lambda)$ (left) and $\lambda \mapsto J(\lambda)/\lambda$ (right) in dimension $d = 1$ with $p = 1.3$. The function has the behaviour described in Remark 13.

which is an $(N + M)$ -orthonormal system. We then introduce the admissible operator

$$\gamma^{(\tau)} = \sum_{i=1}^N |u_i^{(\tau)}\rangle\langle u_i^{(\tau)}| + (\lambda' - N)|u_N^{(\tau)}\rangle\langle u_N^{(\tau)}| + \sum_{j=1}^M |v_j^{(\tau)}\rangle\langle v_j^{(\tau)}| + (\lambda - \lambda' - M)|v_M^{(\tau)}\rangle\langle v_M^{(\tau)}|$$

which has trace $\text{Tr}(\gamma^{(\tau)}) = \lambda$. Since the matrix G_τ tends to I_{N+M} when $|\tau| \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\left\| u_i^{(\tau)} - u_i \right\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \left\| v_j^{(\tau)} - v_j(\cdot - \tau) \right\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \rightarrow 0$$

which proves that

$$\lim_{|\tau| \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\gamma^{(\tau)}) = \mathcal{E}(\gamma_1) + \mathcal{E}(\gamma_2).$$

Hence $J(\lambda) \leq \mathcal{E}(\gamma_1) + \mathcal{E}(\gamma_2)$. After optimising over γ_1 and γ_2 using (27) we conclude that $J(\lambda) \leq J(\lambda') + J(\lambda - \lambda')$.

The monotonicity in (iii) follows from the fact that $J(\lambda - \lambda') < 0$ by (i), hence $J(\lambda) < J(\lambda')$ for $0 < \lambda' < \lambda$. The proof of continuity is classical and is left to the reader.

Finally we prove concavity on each interval $(N - 1, N)$ with $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $N - 1 \leq \lambda_1 < \lambda < \lambda_2 \leq N$, and let $t \in (0, 1)$ be such that $\lambda = t\lambda_1 + (1 - t)\lambda_2$. For any admissible γ of the form in (27) with $\text{Tr}(\gamma) = \lambda$, we can write $\gamma = t\gamma_1 + (1 - t)\gamma_2$ with

$$\gamma_{1,2} = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} |u_i\rangle\langle u_i| + (\lambda_{1,2} - N + 1)|u_N\rangle\langle u_N|.$$

Since \mathcal{E} is concave, this implies $\mathcal{E}(\gamma) \geq t\mathcal{E}(\gamma_1) + (1 - t)\mathcal{E}(\gamma_2) \geq tJ(\lambda_1) + (1 - t)J(\lambda_2)$. Minimising over γ yields the desired concavity. \square

Remark 13 (Concavity on \mathbb{R}_+). *The concavity over \mathbb{R}_+ is not expected to hold in general. Intuitively, for $\lambda \in (N - 1, N)$ the derivative $J'(\lambda)$ should be equal to the last (partially) filled eigenvalue μ_N (see (33) below for a one-sided estimate). However at $\lambda = N \in \mathbb{N}$ we expect that $J'(N)_- = \mu_N$ whereas $J'(N)_+ = \mu_{N+1}$ which respectively correspond to the last filled eigenvalue when we decrease the mass or to the next eigenvalue to be filled when we increase it. Since $\mu_{N+1} \geq \mu_N$, J is not expected to be concave except when $\mu_N = \mu_{N+1}$.*

A numerical computation in dimension $d = 1$ in Figure 4 below confirms that J is not concave over \mathbb{R}_+ . Also $\lambda \mapsto J(\lambda)/\lambda$ is not decreasing, except when restricted to integers.

The next theorem follows from using the concentration-compactness technique for operators [Fri03, FLSS07, Lew11] and from the concavity of $J(\lambda)$ on each $(N - 1, N)$. It also follows from a profile decomposition similar to that used in [HKY19]. We will not write the proof in this paper.

Theorem 14 (Existence under the binding condition [Lew11, Thm. 27]). *Let $d \geq 1$ and $1 < p < 1 + 2/d$. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that the following binding inequalities hold:*

$$\forall 1 \leq k \leq N - 1, \quad J(N) < J(k) + J(N - k). \quad (29)$$

Then, the problem $J(N)$ has a minimiser.

In usual concentration compactness theory, one requires the continuous binding inequality

$$\forall 0 < \lambda' < N, \quad J(N) < J(\lambda') + J(N - \lambda').$$

But these inequalities follow from the discrete one (29) because the function $\lambda' \mapsto J(\lambda') + J(N - \lambda')$ is concave over each interval $(k, k + 1)$ (Lemma 12), hence its minimum is attained either at $\lambda' = k$ or at $\lambda' = k + 1$.

Remark 15 (Non-integer case). *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be such that*

$$\forall 1 \leq k \leq N, \quad J(N + \alpha) < J(k) + J(N - k + \alpha).$$

By the concentration-compactness method one can conclude that $J(N + \alpha)$ has a minimiser. Note that $k = N$ is included in the above conditions.

2.3. Properties of minimisers. Here we state some general properties of minimisers, assuming they exist.

Proposition 16 (Euler-Lagrange equations). *Let $d \geq 1$ and $1 < p < 1 + 2/d$. If $J(\lambda)$ admits minimisers then it possesses one which is of the form in (27), with (orthonormal) real-valued eigenfunctions:*

$$\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} |u_i\rangle\langle u_i| + (\lambda - N + 1)|u_N\rangle\langle u_N|,$$

where N is the smallest integer such that $N \geq \lambda$. The u_i are the N first eigenfunctions of the operator $-\Delta - \rho_\gamma^{p-1}$, counted with multiplicity:

$$(-\Delta - \rho_\gamma^{p-1}) u_i = \mu_i u_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N$$

with $\mu_1 < \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_N < 0$. In particular, $-\Delta - \rho_\gamma^{p-1}$ has at least N negative eigenvalues. The functions u_i are real-analytic and tend to zero at infinity. Finally, we have the estimate

$$\frac{2p - d(p-1)}{2 - d(p-1)} \frac{J(\lambda)}{\lambda} \leq \mu_N \leq J(1)(\lambda - N + 1)^{\frac{2}{d} \frac{p-1}{1 + \frac{2}{d} - p}} < 0 \quad (30)$$

on the last filled eigenvalue.

In the proof of the proposition, we are going to use the following remark which follows from the concavity of \mathcal{E} .

Lemma 17 (A general inequality). *Let $d \geq 1$ and $1 < p < 1 + 2/d$. Let $0 \leq \gamma = \gamma^* \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \gamma' = (\gamma')^* \leq 1$ be two admissible operators. Then we have*

$$\mathcal{E}(\gamma') \leq \mathcal{E}(\gamma) + \text{Tr } H_\gamma(\gamma' - \gamma) \quad (31)$$

where

$$H_\gamma := -\Delta - \rho_\gamma^{p-1}$$

is self-adjoint on $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and the trace in (31) is understood in the quadratic form sense.

Proof of Lemma 17. The proof of (31) follows from the equality

$$\mathcal{E}(\gamma') = \mathcal{E}(\gamma) + \text{Tr}(-\Delta - \rho_\gamma^{p-1})(\gamma' - \gamma) - \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\rho_{\gamma'}^p - \rho_\gamma^p - p\rho_\gamma^{p-1}(\rho_{\gamma'} - \rho_\gamma) \right),$$

and the fact that the last integrand is non-negative by the convexity of $x \mapsto x^p$.

Let us prove that H_γ is self-adjoint. From (24) we have $\rho_\gamma \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $1 < p < \infty$ in dimensions $d = 1, 2$ and for $1 < p < 1 + 2/(d-2)$ in dimensions $d \geq 3$. In particular, $\rho_\gamma^{p-1} \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $1/(p-1) < r < \infty$ in dimensions $d = 1, 2$ and for

$$\frac{1}{p-1} < r < \frac{1 + \frac{2}{d-2}}{p-1}, \quad \text{where} \quad \frac{1 + \frac{2}{d-2}}{p-1} > \frac{d}{2} \left(1 + \frac{2}{d-2} \right) > \max \left(2, \frac{d}{2} \right)$$

in dimensions $d \geq 3$. From the Rellich-Kato and Weyl theorems, this shows that the operator $H_\gamma = -\Delta - \rho_\gamma^{p-1}$ is self-adjoint on $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and that its essential spectrum equals $[0, \infty)$. \square

With Lemma 17 at hand we can write the

Proof of Proposition 16. We split the proof into several steps.

Step 1: Equation. Let γ be a minimiser for $J(\lambda)$. Noticing that

$$\mathcal{E}(\gamma) = \mathcal{E} \left(\frac{\gamma + \bar{\gamma}}{2} \right)$$

we may assume that γ is real, which means that $\bar{\gamma} = \gamma$. Its eigenfunctions can therefore be chosen real.

Let γ' be any other admissible operator of trace $\lambda = \text{Tr}(\gamma')$. Using (31) and the fact that $\mathcal{E}(\gamma') \geq \mathcal{E}(\gamma)$ we deduce that

$$\text{Tr} H_\gamma(\gamma' - \gamma) \geq 0.$$

In other words, γ also solves the linear minimisation problem

$$\inf_{\text{Tr}(\gamma')=\lambda} \text{Tr}(H_\gamma \gamma'). \quad (32)$$

Minimisers of the linear problem (32) exist only when H_γ has at least N non-positive eigenvalues, and are all of the form

$$\gamma' = \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, \mu_N)}(H_\gamma) + \delta$$

with $0 \leq \delta = \delta^* \leq \mathbb{1}_{\{\mu_N\}}(H_\gamma)$ and $\delta \neq 0$. This is called the *aufbau principle* in quantum chemistry. The eigenvalues are filled starting from the bottom and only the last eigenvalue can be partially filled. Our minimiser γ must therefore be of this form. Note that H_γ is real since ρ_γ is a real function, therefore $\mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, \mu_N)}(H_\gamma)$ is real as well. We conclude that $\delta = \bar{\delta}$. It remains to show that δ is a projection plus a rank-one operator. In the next step we prove that $\mu_N < 0$, which already implies that δ must be finite rank.

Step 2: Estimates on μ_N . We first show that $\mu_N < 0 = \min \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_\gamma)$. We consider $\gamma' = \gamma - t|u_N\rangle\langle u_N|$, which is admissible for $0 \leq t \leq (\lambda - N + 1) \leq 1$. From (31) we have¹

$$J(\lambda - t) \leq \mathcal{E}(\gamma') \leq \mathcal{E}(\gamma) - \mu_N t = J(\lambda) - \mu_N t. \quad (33)$$

Using $J(\lambda - t) \geq J(\lambda) - J(t)$ and the explicit formula for $J(t) = I(t)$ in (5) we obtain the inequality

$$\mu_N \leq \frac{J(\lambda - N + 1)}{\lambda - N + 1} = J(1)(\lambda - N + 1)^{\frac{2}{d} \frac{p-1}{1 + \frac{2}{d} - p}} < 0.$$

¹This inequality also implies $J'(\lambda)_- = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{J(\lambda - t) - J(\lambda)}{-t} \geq \mu_N$, see Remark 13.

Next we derive the lower bound (30) on μ_N . To this end we use the virial theorem. Let γ_a be the rescaled operator as in (28). Then the function

$$a \mapsto \mathcal{E}(\gamma_a) = a^2 \text{Tr}(-\Delta\gamma) - \frac{a^{d(p-1)}}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_\gamma^p$$

must attain its minimum at $a = 1$. Writing that the derivative vanishes at this point we find the virial identity

$$\text{Tr}(-\Delta\gamma) = \frac{d(p-1)}{2p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_\gamma^p.$$

This gives

$$J(\lambda) = \mathcal{E}(\gamma) = \frac{d(p-1)-2}{2p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_\gamma^p \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Tr}(H_\gamma\gamma) = \frac{d(p-1)-2p}{2p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_\gamma^p,$$

so that

$$\frac{2p-d(p-1)}{2-d(p-1)} J(\lambda) = \text{Tr}(H_\gamma\gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \mu_i + (\lambda - N + 1)\mu_N \leq \lambda\mu_N, \quad (34)$$

where the last inequality comes from the fact that $\mu_i \leq \mu_N$ for all i . We obtain as wanted

$$\mu_N \geq \frac{2p-d(p-1)}{2-d(p-1)} \frac{J(\lambda)}{\lambda}.$$

Step 3: Regularity. Note that the first eigenfunction u_1 of H_γ is always positive and non-degenerate. Therefore $\rho_\gamma > 0$. Since we now have a system of finitely many coupled Partial Differential Equations, the real-analyticity of the u_i 's follows from classical results [Mor58].

Step 4. Form of δ . To prove that $\delta = \bar{\delta}$ is a finite rank projection plus a rank-one operator, we assume by contradiction that δ has two eigenvalues $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in (0, 1)$ with corresponding orthonormal real-valued eigenfunctions u_i, u_j and we vary the corresponding eigenvalues linearly like $\delta_1 + t, \delta_2 - t$, as we did in the proof of Lemma 11. The energy is concave in t , hence must be constant since γ is a minimiser. The non-linear term is even strictly concave, unless $|u_i| = |u_j|$. Since these are real-analytic real-valued functions, it would imply $u_i = \pm u_j$ everywhere, a contradiction. Therefore, at most one eigenvalue of δ can be in $(0, 1)$ and this concludes the proof of Proposition 16. \square

Remark 18. *The upper bounds on μ_N in (30) deteriorates when $\lambda \rightarrow (N-1)^+$. We were not able to bound $J'(N)_+$, as it probably requires the evaluation of $\mu_{N+1}(\lambda)$, which may vanish as $\lambda \rightarrow N^+$.*

Using the Euler-Lagrange equation, we can prove that the functions u_i (and therefore the density ρ) are exponentially decaying. Actually, we may provide lower bounds as well. This is not obvious, because the functions u_i have non trivial nodal sets for $i \geq 2$. Only u_1 is positive everywhere. Following the work by Bardos and Merigot [BM77] (see also [HOHOS85]), we introduce, for $f \in L^q_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C})$, the q -spherical average

$$[f]_q(x) := \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |f(|x|\omega)|^q d\sigma(\omega) \right)^{1/q}.$$

Lemma 19 (Decay of minimisers at infinity). *Let $d \geq 1$ and $1 < p < 1 + 2/d$. Let γ be a real minimiser of $J(\lambda)$ of the form (27), with density $\rho = \rho_\gamma$. Then we have the bounds*

$$\frac{1}{C} \frac{e^{-2\sqrt{|\mu_N||x|}}}{1 + |x|^{d-1}} \leq [\rho]_1(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(x) + |\nabla\rho(x)| \leq C \frac{e^{-2\sqrt{|\mu_N||x|}}}{1 + |x|^{d-1}}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Similarly, for the eigenfunctions, we have, for all $1 \leq i \leq N$,

$$\frac{1}{C} \frac{e^{-\sqrt{|\mu_i||x|}}}{1 + |x|^{\frac{d-1}{2}}} \leq [u_i]_2(x) \quad \text{and} \quad |u_i(x)| + |\nabla u_i(x)| \leq C \frac{e^{-\sqrt{|\mu_i||x|}}}{1 + |x|^{\frac{d-1}{2}}}.$$

Proof of Lemma 19. We have

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta\rho &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^N (u_i(-\Delta u_i) - |\nabla u_i|^2) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^N (\mu_i |u_i|^2 + \rho^{p-1} |u_i|^2 - |\nabla u_i|^2) \\ &\leq 2\mu_N \rho + 2\rho^p, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\mu_i \leq \mu_N < 0$ in the last inequality. Since ρ goes to 0 at infinity, there exists $R > 0$ such that $\rho^p(x) < \frac{1}{2} |\mu_N| \rho(x)$ for all $|x| > R$. In particular, we have

$$(-\Delta + |\mu_N|) \rho \leq 0, \quad |x| > R.$$

Together with the fact that ρ is bounded, this proves the pointwise upper bound (see for instance [LL01, Chapter 9.9])

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \rho(x) \leq C \frac{e^{-\sqrt{|\mu_N||x|}}}{1 + |x|^{\frac{d-1}{2}}}.$$

Hence, the potential $-\rho^{p-1}$ is exponentially decaying at infinity. We are now in the setting of [HOHOS5, Theorem 2.1], and the result follows. \square

2.4. Proof of binding. We now focus on the proof of the binding inequality $J(\lambda + \lambda') < J(\lambda) + J(\lambda')$. The usual proof is to consider minimisers for $J(\lambda)$ and for $J(\lambda')$, and to construct from them a good candidate for $J(\lambda + \lambda')$ by putting these two minimisers far from each other. In our case, all quantities are exponentially decaying, which makes the evaluation of the interaction quite delicate. The following is the heart of the paper.

Proposition 20 (Exponentially small binding). *Let $d \geq 1$, $1 < p < 1 + 2/d$ and $\lambda, \lambda' > 0$. Assume $J(\lambda)$ and $J(\lambda')$ admits the respective minimisers γ and γ' , satisfying the properties in Proposition 16. Let $\mu = \mu_N$ and $\mu' = \mu'_M$ be the associated last filled eigenvalue of H_γ and $H_{\gamma'}$. Then, under the additional condition*

$$1 < p < 1 + \sqrt{\frac{\min\{|\mu|, |\mu'|\}}{\max\{|\mu|, |\mu'|\}}}, \quad (35)$$

we have the binding inequality $J(\lambda + \lambda') < J(\lambda) + J(\lambda')$.

Proof. We only write the proof in the integer case $\lambda = N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda' = M \in \mathbb{N}$ for clarity. The arguments are exactly the same in the non-integer case, but the notation is a bit more heavy.

Let $\gamma := \sum_{i=1}^N |u_i\rangle\langle u_i|$ and $\gamma' := \sum_{j=1}^M |v_j\rangle\langle v_j|$ be two real minimisers for $J(N)$ and $J(M)$ respectively. For $R > 0$, we set $v_{j,R}(x) := v_j(x - Re_1)$ where $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, and we introduce the Gram matrix

$$S_R = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I}_N & E_R \\ E_R^* & \mathbb{I}_M \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{with} \quad E_{ij}^R := \langle u_i, v_{j,R} \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_i(x) v_j(x - Re_1) dx,$$

as we did in the proof of Lemma 12. Since the functions u_i and v_j are exponentially decaying, E_R goes to 0, and the overlap matrix S_R is invertible for R large enough.

The frame

$$\begin{pmatrix} \psi_{1,R} \\ \vdots \\ \psi_{N+M,R} \end{pmatrix} = (S_R)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ \vdots \\ u_N \\ v_{1,R} \\ \vdots \\ v_{M,R} \end{pmatrix}$$

is orthonormal. Our trial state is the orthogonal projection onto this frame, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_R &= \sum_{i=1}^N |\psi_{i,R}\rangle\langle\psi_{i,R}| + \sum_{k=1}^M |\psi_{N+k,R}\rangle\langle\psi_{N+k,R}| \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^N (S_R^{-1})_{ij} |u_i\rangle\langle u_j| + \sum_{k,\ell=1}^M (S_R^{-1})_{N+k,N+\ell} |v_{k,R}\rangle\langle v_{\ell,R}| \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^M \left((S_R^{-1})_{i,N+k} |u_i\rangle\langle v_{k,R}| + (S_R^{-1})_{N+k,i} |v_{k,R}\rangle\langle u_i| \right). \end{aligned}$$

To compute $\mathcal{E}(\gamma_R)$, we consider the Taylor expansion with respect to

$$e_R := \max_{i,j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_i(x)| |v_j(x - Re_1)| dx.$$

We have

$$(S_R)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I}_N & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{I}_M \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & E_R \\ E_R^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} E_R E_R^* & 0 \\ 0 & E_R^* E_R \end{pmatrix} + O(e_R^3).$$

This gives, to second order, and with $\gamma'_R(x, y) = \gamma'(x - Re_1, y - Re_1)$ the translation of γ'

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_R &= \gamma' + \gamma'_R - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M E_{ij}^R (|u_i\rangle\langle v_{j,R}| + |v_{j,R}\rangle\langle u_i|) + \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^M |E_{ik}^R u_i\rangle\langle E_{jk}^R u_j| + \sum_{j,k=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^N |E_{ij}^R v_{j,R}\rangle\langle E_{ik}^R v_{k,R}| + O_{\|\cdot\|_{1,1}}(e_R^3), \quad (36) \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\gamma\|_{1,1} = \text{Tr}|\sqrt{1 - \Delta}\gamma\sqrt{1 - \Delta}|$ is the Sobolev-type trace norm. Let us evaluate the different terms in the energy. For the kinetic energy, we obtain (recall that everything is real-valued)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(-\Delta\gamma_R) - \text{Tr}(-\Delta\gamma) - \text{Tr}(-\Delta\gamma') &= -2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M E_{ij}^R \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla u_i \cdot \nabla v_{j,R} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^M E_{ik}^R E_{jk}^R \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla u_i \cdot \nabla u_j + \sum_{j,k=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^N E_{ij}^R E_{ik}^R \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla v_j \cdot \nabla v_k + O(e_R^3). \quad (37) \end{aligned}$$

In order to express this difference in terms of the densities only, we use the Euler-Lagrange equations (7). We have

$$(-\Delta - \rho^{p-1})u_i = \mu_i u_i \quad \text{and} \quad (-\Delta - (\rho'_R)^{p-1})v_{j,R} = \mu'_j v_{j,R},$$

with $\rho = \rho_\gamma$ and $\rho'_R = \rho_{\gamma'}(\cdot - Re_1)$. This gives

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla u_i \cdot \nabla v_{j,R} = \mu_i E_{ij}^R + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho^{p-1} u_i v_{j,R}, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla v_{j,R} \nabla u_i = \mu'_j E_{ij}^R + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\rho'_R)^{p-1} v_{j,R} u_i, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla u_i \cdot \nabla u_j = \mu_i \delta_{ij} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho^{p-1} u_i u_j, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla v_{j,R} \cdot \nabla v_{k,R} = \mu'_j \delta_{jk} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\rho'_R)^{p-1} v_{j,R} v_{k,R}. \end{cases}$$

Plugging these relations in (37), and using that the terms involving μ_i and μ'_j cancel, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(-\Delta \gamma_R) - \text{Tr}(-\Delta \gamma) - \text{Tr}(-\Delta \gamma') &= - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M E_{ij}^R \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\rho^{p-1} u_i v_{j,R} + (\rho'_R)^{p-1} v_{j,R} u_i) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^M \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho^{p-1} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N E_{ij}^R u_i \right|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\rho')^{p-1} \left| \sum_{j=1}^M E_{ij}^R v_j \right|^2 + O(e_R^3). \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

We now compute the difference for the term $\int \rho^p$. We first find an expression for ρ_R , the density of γ_R . From (36), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_R &= \rho + \rho'_R - 2 \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M E_{ij}^R u_i v_{j,R} + \sum_{j=1}^M \left| \sum_{i=1}^N E_{ij}^R u_i \right|^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \sum_{j=1}^M E_{ij}^R v_j \right|^2 + o_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}(e_R^2). \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_R^p &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\rho + \rho'_R)^p - 2p \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\rho + \rho'_R)^{p-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M E_{ij}^R u_i v_{j,R} \\ &\quad + p \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\rho + \rho'_R)^{p-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \left| \sum_{i=1}^N E_{ij}^R u_i \right|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \sum_{j=1}^M E_{ij}^R v_j \right|^2 \right) + o(e_R^2). \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $(\rho + \rho'_R)^{(p-1)} - \rho^{p-1} - (\rho'_R)^{p-1} \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the final difference in energy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\gamma_R) - J(N) - J(M) &= -\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left((\rho + \rho'_R)^p - \rho^p - (\rho'_R)^p \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M E_{ij}^R \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\rho^{p-1} + (\rho'_R)^{p-1}) u_i v_{j,R} + o(e_R^2). \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

In this expression, the first term is negative from the concavity of $x \mapsto -x^p$. The second term comes from the orthonormalisation procedure. We do not know the sign of this term, but it can be positive, as is seen from the case $N = M = 1$.

We set $\varepsilon := \sqrt{|\mu_N|}$ and $\varepsilon' := \sqrt{|\mu_M|}$ and assume, without loss of generality, that $\varepsilon' \leq \varepsilon$. We recall that we work under the condition that

$$1 < p < 1 + \frac{\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon}$$

and claim that then the first term on the right of (39) wins over the second and over the $o(e_R^2)$. From Lemma 19, the spherical average of ρ is bounded below in terms of $(1 + |x|)^{1-d}e^{-2\varepsilon|x|}$. This means that for any large enough r , there exists at least one x_r on the sphere of radius r such that $\rho(x_r) \geq c(1+r)^{1-d}e^{-2\varepsilon r}$. The same lemma provides the upper bound $|\nabla\rho(x)| \leq C(1+r)^{1-d}e^{-2\varepsilon r}$ and this implies that

$$\rho(x) \geq \frac{c}{2(1+r)^{d-1}}e^{-2\varepsilon r}$$

on the ball $B(x_r, \eta)$ with $\eta = c/(2C)$. The same property holds for ρ' . Therefore, after rotating our trial states γ and γ' appropriately, we may assume that

$$\rho(x) \geq c'R^{1-d}e^{-2\frac{\varepsilon\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon+\varepsilon'}R}, \quad \rho'_R(x) \geq c'R^{1-d}e^{-2\frac{\varepsilon\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon+\varepsilon'}R}$$

for all $x \in B(x^*, \eta)$, the ball placed at the point

$$x^* = \frac{\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon + \varepsilon'}Re_1.$$

The new constant c' only depends on $\varepsilon, \varepsilon'$. Since the function $(x, y) \mapsto (x+y)^p - x^p - y^p$ is increasing in x and in y separately for $p > 1$, we deduce that

$$[(\rho + \rho'_R)^p - \rho^p - (\rho'_R)^p](x) \geq c^p(2^p - 1)R^{p(1-d)}e^{-2p\frac{\varepsilon\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon+\varepsilon'}R},$$

for all $x \in B(x^*, \eta)$. This yields the lower bound on the first term in (39)

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left((\rho + \rho'_R)^p - \rho^p - (\rho'_R)^p \right) \geq |B_\eta|(c')^p R^{p(1-d)}e^{-2p\frac{\varepsilon\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon+\varepsilon'}R}. \quad (40)$$

On the other hand, we can control the second term in (39) using the (pointwise) exponential decay of the eigenfunctions. We use the following simple estimate.

Lemma 21. *Let $d \geq 1$ and $0 \leq \varepsilon' \leq \varepsilon$. Then for all $R \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\varepsilon|x|}e^{-\varepsilon'|R-x|} dx \leq C(1 + |R|^d)e^{-\varepsilon'|R|}.$$

Proof. Using the triangle inequality $|x - y| \geq ||x| - |y||$ we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\varepsilon|x|}e^{-\varepsilon'|R\omega-x|} dx \leq |\mathbb{S}^{d-1}| \int_0^\infty e^{-\varepsilon r}e^{-\varepsilon'|R-r|}r^{d-1} dr$$

for all $R > 0$ and all $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. For $r \in [0, R]$ we have

$$e^{-\varepsilon r}e^{-\varepsilon'|R-r|} = e^{(\varepsilon'-\varepsilon)r}e^{-\varepsilon'R} \leq e^{-\varepsilon'R}$$

and therefore

$$\int_0^R e^{-\varepsilon r}e^{-\varepsilon'|R-r|}r^{d-1} dr \leq \frac{R^d}{d}e^{-\varepsilon'R}.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$|\mathbb{S}^{d-1}| \int_R^\infty e^{-\varepsilon r}e^{-\varepsilon'(r-R)}r^{d-1} dr \leq e^{-R\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\varepsilon'|R\omega-x|} dx \leq C(\varepsilon')^{-d}e^{-R\varepsilon}.$$

□

The estimate in Lemma 21 is not sharp but captures the correct exponents, which is enough for our purpose. For instance, for the E_{ij}^R term, we have, using Lemma 19,

$$|E_{ij}^R| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_i||v_{j,R}| \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\sqrt{|\mu_i||x|}}e^{-\sqrt{|\mu'_j||x-Re_1|}} \leq C(1 + R^d)e^{-\varepsilon'R}.$$

Similarly, we get

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_i \overline{v_{j,R}} \rho^{p-1} \right| \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\sqrt{|\mu_i||x|}}e^{-\sqrt{|\mu'_j||x-Re_1|}}e^{-2\varepsilon(p-1)|x|} \leq C(1 + R^d)e^{-\varepsilon'R},$$

since $\varepsilon' \leq \varepsilon \leq \sqrt{|\mu_i|} \leq \sqrt{|\mu_i|} + 2(p-1)\varepsilon$. This gives

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M E_{ij}^R \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\rho^{p-1} + (\rho'_R)^{p-1}) u_i v_{j,R} \right| \leq C(1 + R^{2d})e^{-2\varepsilon'R}.$$

Similarly, we have $e_R^2 = O(R^{2d}e^{-2\varepsilon'R})$. Finally, under the hypothesis $p < 1 + \varepsilon'/\varepsilon$, we have $2\varepsilon' > 2p \frac{\varepsilon\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon + \varepsilon'}$, so the first (negative) term on the right side of (39) is the leading term, and we obtain $J(N+M) < J(N) + J(M)$ as claimed. This concludes the proof of Proposition 20. \square

One immediate consequence of Proposition 20 is the case $\lambda = \lambda'$, where the condition (35) is always satisfied whenever $p < 2$. Since $J(1) = I(1)$ always has a minimiser, we also conclude that $J(2)$ always has one, for $p < 2$.

Corollary 22. *Let $d \geq 1$ and $1 < p < \min\{2, 1 + 2/d\}$. Then, if $J(\lambda)$ has a minimiser, we have $J(2\lambda) < 2J(\lambda)$. In particular, $J(2) < 2J(1)$ and $J(2)$ has a minimiser.*

2.5. Proof of Theorem 3. Assume that $J(N)$ and $J(M)$ have minimisers and let μ_N , resp. μ'_M be the corresponding last filled eigenvalues. From (30) in the integer case $\lambda = N$, and the fact that $0 > J(N)/N \geq e(d, p) \geq e_{\text{LT}}(d, p)$, we have

$$\sqrt{\frac{\min\{|\mu_N|, |\mu'_M|\}}{\max\{|\mu_N|, |\mu'_M|\}}} \geq \sqrt{\frac{|I(d, p, 1)|}{|e(d, p)|}} \sqrt{\frac{2-d(p-1)}{2p-d(p-1)}} \geq \sqrt{\frac{|I(d, p, 1)|}{|e_{\text{LT}}(d, p)|}} \sqrt{\frac{2-d(p-1)}{2p-d(p-1)}}.$$

Let $p_c(d) \in (1, 2)$ be the first zero of the function

$$p \mapsto 1 + \sqrt{\frac{|I(d, p, 1)|}{|e_{\text{LT}}(d, p)|}} \sqrt{\frac{2-d(p-1)}{2p-d(p-1)}} - p.$$

Using that $e_{\text{LT}}(d, p)$ and $I(d, p, 1)$ have a finite limit when $p \rightarrow 1^+$ one deduces that $p_c(d) > 1$. Hence, if $J(N)$ and $J(M)$ have minimisers and if $1 < p < p_c(d)$, then $J(N+M) < J(N) + J(M)$ by Proposition 20.

Since we already know that $J(1) = I(1)$ has a minimiser, we can deduce by induction on N that binding holds and that $J(N)$ has a minimiser for all N , when $1 < p < p_c(d)$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 3. \square

Remark 23. *In order to evaluate $p_c(d)$ numerically, we need to know $I(d, p, 1)$ (which amounts to numerically solving an ordinary differential equation, since u_1 is radial) and the Lieb-Thirring constant c_{LT} . Using the last estimates on c_{LT} from [FHJT19] we obtain the values (11) for $p_c(d)$ in dimensions $d = 1, 2, 3$.*

2.6. Proof of Theorem 4. We now prove that $J(N)$ has a minimiser for an infinity of integers $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Let us now call $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{N}$ the set of integers n which satisfies the binding inequalities $J(n) < J(k) + J(n-k)$ for all $k = 1, \dots, n-1$. In particular, $J(n)$ has a minimiser for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$. For $1 < p < \min(2, 1 + 2/d)$ we already know that $1, 2 \in \mathcal{N}$. Our goal is to show that \mathcal{N} is not finite.

If $N \notin \mathcal{N}$, then there is $1 \leq k \leq N-1$ so that $J(N) = J(k) + J(N-k)$. If $k \notin \mathcal{N}$ or $N-k \notin \mathcal{N}$, we can further decompose $J(k)$ or $J(N-k)$, and so on, until we obtain a decomposition of the form

$$J(N) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} k_n J(n), \quad N = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} k_n n, \quad k_n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (41)$$

But Proposition 20 implies that $J(2n) < 2J(n)$ for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$, since $J(n)$ has a minimiser. Similarly, for $k \geq 2$, $J(kn) \leq (k-2)J(n) + J(2n) < kJ(n)$. We deduce that the coefficients k_n in (41) must all be equal to 0 or 1. Now \mathcal{N} cannot be finite

otherwise we would not be able to write all the $N \notin \mathcal{N}$ as in (41). This concludes the proof that \mathcal{N} is infinite. \square

Using similar arguments, we can prove the following result. We no longer assume that $J(\lambda)$ has a minimiser here.

Corollary 24. *Let $d \geq 1$ and $1 < p < \min\{2, 1 + \frac{2}{d}\}$. For all $\lambda > 0$ and all $m \geq 2$ we have $J(m\lambda) < mJ(\lambda)$. In particular, we have*

$$\frac{J(\lambda)}{\lambda} > \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{J(n)}{n} = e(d, p) \quad (42)$$

for all $\lambda > 0$.

Proof. If $J(\lambda)$ has a minimiser, this was already proved in Corollary 22. If $J(\lambda)$ does not have a minimiser, then, according to Remark 15, there is an integer $1 \leq k \leq \lambda$ so that $J(\lambda) = J(k) + J(\lambda - k)$. By further decomposing $J(k)$, we can therefore write as in (41),

$$J(\lambda) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} k_n J(n) + J(\lambda - k), \quad \lambda = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} k_n n + (\lambda - k), \quad k_n \in \{0, 1\},$$

and at least one k_n has value 1. So we have, as before

$$mJ(\lambda) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} mk_n J(n) + mJ(\lambda - k) > \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} k_n J(mn) + J(m(\lambda - k)) \geq J(m\lambda).$$

\square

3. APPLICATION: SYMMETRY BREAKING FOR A CRYSTAL IN THE KOHN-SHAM MODEL WITH LARGE DIRAC EXCHANGE

In this section we explain how the previous results can be used to prove symmetry breaking for an infinite periodic system, within a simple Kohn-Sham model with a Dirac (a.k.a. Slater) term. The results of this section are similar to a recent work by Ricaud [Ric18] on the Thomas-Fermi-von Weisäcker model, so some technical details will be omitted for shortness. The main difference is that we deal with operators instead of functions. Our results can be generalised to other contexts, such as the symmetry breaking in the dissociation of the di-hydrogen molecule considered in [HHL⁺19].

3.1. Notation and main results. Everywhere in this section we fix the dimension $d = 3$. Let \mathcal{R} be a lattice of \mathbb{R}^3 , with unit cell denoted by \mathbb{K} and dual lattice by \mathcal{R}^* . We consider the infinite system obtained by placing one point nucleus of charge $Z = N$ at each site of this lattice,² together with an infinite sea of quantum electrons in a periodic state. We assume that the system is locally neutral, which means that the number of electrons per unit volume must be equal to $N|\mathbb{K}|^{-1}$. Our goal is to determine whether these electrons will have the same periodicity \mathcal{R} as the lattice of the nuclei or whether it is more favourable energetically to place them with a different period. In the latter case we say that there is *spatial symmetry breaking*. More specifically, we will study whether the $(\ell\mathcal{R})$ -periodic electronic ground state is \mathcal{R} -periodic or not, for $\ell \geq 2$.

We recall that an \mathcal{R} -periodic density matrix γ is a self-adjoint operator $0 \leq \gamma = \gamma^* \leq 1$ (we neglect the spin for simplicity) which commutes with all the translations of the lattice \mathcal{R} :

$$\forall R \in \mathcal{R}, \quad \tau_R \gamma = \gamma \tau_R.$$

²More generally we could place several nuclei of charges z_1, \dots, z_M in each unit cell, so that the total charge is $\sum_{m=1}^M z_m = N$.

Here τ_R is the unitary operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ defined by $(\tau_R f)(x) := f(x - R)$. We restrict ourselves to density matrices which have a finite trace and a finite kinetic energy per unit volume, which means that γ and $\sqrt{-\Delta}\gamma\sqrt{-\Delta}$ are locally trace-class. The density of γ is the unique \mathcal{R} -periodic function $\rho_\gamma \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}_+)$ such that

$$\text{Tr}(\chi\gamma\chi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi(x)^2 \rho_\gamma(x) dx$$

for every $\chi \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ of compact support. Any such density matrix γ represents an infinite periodic system of electrons. The number of electrons per unit cell is defined by

$$\underline{\text{Tr}}_{\mathcal{R}}(\gamma) := \text{Tr}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{K}}\gamma\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{K}}) = \int_{\mathbb{K}} \rho_\gamma(x) dx,$$

and we fix it to be equal to N for neutrality.

In this section we work with electronic density matrices which are $(\ell\mathcal{R})$ -periodic for some $\ell \geq 1$. All the previous definitions are easily extended to the case $\ell \geq 2$. Our main goal is to determine whether an $(\ell\mathcal{R})$ -periodic minimiser is necessarily \mathcal{R} -periodic or not. The functional to minimise is the Kohn-Sham energy per unit cell which is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{c,\ell}^{\text{KS}}(\gamma) := & \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\ell\mathcal{R}}(-\Delta\gamma) - N \int_{\ell\mathbb{K}} G_{\mathcal{R}}(x)\rho_\gamma(x) dx + \frac{1}{2}D_{\ell\mathcal{R}}(\rho_\gamma, \rho_\gamma) \\ & - \frac{3c}{4} \int_{\ell\mathbb{K}} \rho_\gamma(x)^{\frac{4}{3}} dx \quad (43) \end{aligned}$$

for any $(\ell\mathcal{R})$ -periodic density matrix γ . The first term is the kinetic energy per unit cell $\ell\mathbb{K}$, interpreted in the sense of quadratic forms. The second term is the interaction between the $(\ell\mathcal{R})$ -periodic electrons and the lattice \mathcal{R} of the nuclei of charge $Z = N$. The function $G_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the \mathcal{R} -periodic Green's function, solution to the periodic Laplace equation

$$-\Delta G_{\mathcal{R}} = 4\pi \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} (\delta_R - |\mathbb{K}|^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{K}} G_{\mathcal{R}} = 0. \quad (44)$$

In other words, $NG_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the (screened) Coulomb potential of the infinite lattice of nuclei. The third term in (43) is the Coulomb interaction between the electrons in the Hartree approximation and it reads

$$D_{\ell\mathcal{R}}(f, g) := \int_{\ell\mathbb{K}} \int_{\ell\mathbb{K}} G_{\ell\mathcal{R}}(x-y) f(x) g(y) dx dy$$

where $G_{\ell\mathcal{R}}$ is defined similarly as in (44) with \mathcal{R} replaced by $\ell\mathcal{R}$ and \mathbb{K} replaced by $\ell\mathbb{K}$. Finally, the last term of (43) is the Dirac or Slater term. This term is an approximation of the exchange-correlation energy of γ , in terms of the density ρ_γ only. The parameter $c \geq 0$ usually has a fixed value given by physical considerations (for the exchange part of the energy the constant is about 0.9 without spin). Here, we change the value of c , and compare the resulting energies for different values of the periodicity ℓ of the electrons.

The minimisation problem to be considered reads

$$\boxed{E^{\text{KS}}(c, \ell) := \min \left\{ \mathcal{E}_{c,\ell}^{\text{KS}}(\gamma), \gamma \text{ } (\ell\mathcal{R})\text{-periodic density matrix, } \int_{\ell\mathbb{K}} \rho_\gamma = \ell^3 N \right\}.} \quad (45)$$

The existence of minimisers easily follows from the direct method of the calculus of variations, since the problem is posed on the compact set $\ell\mathbb{K}$ [CLL01, CDL08a].

An \mathcal{R} -periodic state is of course $(\ell\mathcal{R})$ -periodic and its Kohn-Sham energy is found to be equal to $\mathcal{E}_{c,\ell}^{\text{KS}}(\gamma) = \ell^3 \mathcal{E}_{c,1}^{\text{KS}}(\gamma)$. In particular we deduce that

$$E^{\text{KS}}(c, \ell) \leq \ell^3 E^{\text{KS}}(c, 1)$$

for every $\ell \geq 1$ and every $c \geq 0$.

Definition 25 (Symmetry breaking). *We say that there is spatial symmetry breaking for the Dirac-Kohn-Sham model with parameter $c \geq 0$ if there exists $\ell \geq 2$ such that*

$$\boxed{\frac{E^{\text{KS}}(c, \ell)}{\ell^3} < E^{\text{KS}}(c, 1).}$$

The definition means that any ℓ -periodic minimiser has a lower energy per unit volume than the 1-periodic state. It does not mean that the electrons will necessarily be in this ℓ -periodic state. But at least we can deduce that they will not be in the 1-periodic state. Spatial symmetry has to be broken.

The case $c = 0$ is studied at length in [CLL01] and in [CDL08a, App. A]. In this situation the energy $\gamma \mapsto \mathcal{E}_{0,\ell}^{\text{KS}}(\gamma)$ is convex and the problem $E^{\text{KS}}(0, \ell)$ admits a unique minimiser $\gamma_{0,\ell}$ for every $\ell \geq 1$. This state solves the nonlinear equation

$$\gamma_{0,\ell} = \mathbf{1} \left(-\Delta - NG_{\mathcal{R}} + \rho_{\gamma_{0,\ell}} * G_{\ell\mathcal{R}} \leq \varepsilon_{0,\ell} \right) \quad (46)$$

where $\varepsilon_{0,\ell}$ is a Lagrange multiplier chosen to enforce the constraint that $\gamma_{0,\ell}$ has $N\ell^3$ electrons per unit cell. In addition, it is unique in the sense that any $(\ell\mathcal{R})$ -periodic solution to equation (46) for some $\varepsilon_{0,\ell}$ with the right number of electrons $N\ell^3$ must be equal to $\gamma_{0,\ell}$. Since the \mathcal{R} -periodic state $\gamma_{0,1}$ with $\ell = 1$ is a solution for all $\ell \geq 2$, it follows that

$$\gamma_{0,\ell} = \gamma_{0,1} \text{ and } \varepsilon_{0,\ell} = \varepsilon_{0,1}, \quad \text{for all } \ell \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ when } c = 0$$

and therefore that

$$E^{\text{KS}}(0, \ell) = \ell^3 E^{\text{KS}}(0, 1), \quad \text{for all } \ell \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ when } c = 0.$$

No symmetry breaking occurs for $c = 0$. For latter purposes, we mention that the system is called an *insulator* when $\varepsilon_{0,1}$ can be chosen in a spectral gap of the operator $-\Delta - NG_{\mathcal{R}} + \rho_{\gamma_{0,1}} * G_{\mathcal{R}}$ in (46) and that it is a *metal* otherwise. Which of the two cases occurs depends on the shape of the lattice \mathcal{R} and on the number of particles N per unit cell.

The Dirac term is not convex when $c > 0$. It is natural to expect that symmetry will not be broken for c small enough whereas it could be broken for large c . This is confirmed by the following result.

Theorem 26 (Occurrence of symmetry breaking). *Let \mathcal{R} be a lattice in \mathbb{R}^3 and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. There is a critical $c^* = c^*(\mathcal{R}, N) \in [0, \infty)$ such that, for all $c > c^*$, the system breaks spatial symmetry. In addition, if the system is insulating at $c = 0$, then $c^* > 0$: there exists $c_0^* > 0$ such that $E^{\text{KS}}(\ell, c) = \ell^3 E^{\text{KS}}(1, c)$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $c < c_0^*$.*

The spirit of the result is exactly the same as [Ric18] in the Thomas-Fermi-von Weisäcker case. For c very large the kinetic energy and the Dirac term dominate, the other terms being of lower order. The very large constant c has the effect of concentrating the electrons at the scale $1/c$. After rescaling length by a factor $1/c$ about a blow-up point, in the limit the problem converges to the fermionic NLS problem in the whole space with $p = 4/3$. This is the content of the following result.

Proposition 27 (Convergence to the NLS problem in \mathbb{R}^3). *Let \mathcal{R} be a lattice in \mathbb{R}^3 and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. For all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E^{\text{KS}}(c, \ell)}{c^2} = J(\ell^3 N)$$

where $J(\ell^3 N)$ is defined as in (9) with $d = 3$ and $p = 4/3$.

In Theorem 3 and in Corollary 24 we have proved that $J(\ell^3 N) < \ell^3 J(N)$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$. This shows that for c large enough $E^{\text{KS}}(c, \ell) < \ell^3 E^{\text{KS}}(c, 1)$, hence that there is symmetry breaking. The intuitive picture is that it is more favourable to concentrate $\ell^3 N$ particles at one point rather than having ℓ^3 bumps of N concentrated electrons, as is the case for the \mathcal{R} -periodic minimiser placed in the $(\ell\mathcal{R})$ -periodic energy. This is how we can prove the first part of Theorem 26.

Remark 28. *Following the approach of [Ric18] and using Theorem 3, it is also possible to prove that minimisers γ_c for $E^{\text{KS}}(c, 1)$ behave as $U_c \gamma_c U_{c^{-1}} \rightarrow \gamma$ where γ minimises $J(N)$ and U_c is the dilation operator defined by $(U_c f)(x) = c^{3/2} f(cx)$. Recall that since $\frac{4}{3} < p_c(d=3)$ (see Theorem 3), such minimisers γ always exist. In other words, the electrons concentrate at the origin where the nucleus is placed, in the unit cell \mathbb{K} . For $E^{\text{KS}}(c, \ell)$ the result is similar but the $\ell^3 N$ electrons concentrate at one of the ℓ^3 nuclei of the larger unit cell $\ell\mathbb{K}$. Finally, we have the expansion*

$$E^{\text{KS}}(c, \ell) = J(\ell^3 N) c^2 + c \min_{\substack{\gamma \text{ min.} \\ \text{for } J(\ell^3 N)}} \left(- \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\rho_\gamma(x)}{|x|} dx + \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\rho_\gamma(x) \rho_\gamma(y)}{|x-y|} dx dy \right) + o(c).$$

In the next section we outline the proof of Proposition 27 whereas in Section 3.3 we quickly discuss the absence of symmetry breaking for c small enough, under the additional assumption that the system is an insulator at $c = 0$ (second part of the theorem).

3.2. Sketch of the proof of Proposition 27. We set for simplicity $\ell = 1$ (the proof is similar in the general case). For $\tilde{\gamma}$ an \mathcal{R} -periodic density matrix, we call $\gamma_c = U_c \tilde{\gamma} U_{c^{-1}}$ the rescaled operator whose kernel is

$$\gamma_c(x, y) := c^{-3} \tilde{\gamma}(x/c, y/c). \quad (47)$$

Using that $G_{c\mathcal{R}}(x) = c^{-1} G_{\mathcal{R}}(c^{-1}x)$, we obtain the following scaling relations:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\text{Tr}}_{c\mathcal{R}}(\gamma_c) &= \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\mathcal{R}}(\tilde{\gamma}), & \int_{c\mathbb{K}} G_{c\mathcal{R}} \rho_c &= \frac{1}{c} \int_{\mathbb{K}} G_{\mathcal{R}} \check{\rho}, & D_{c\mathcal{R}}(\rho_c, \rho_c) &= \frac{1}{c} D_{\mathcal{R}}(\check{\rho}, \check{\rho}), \\ \underline{\text{Tr}}_{c\mathcal{R}}(-\Delta \gamma_c) &= \frac{1}{c^2} \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\mathcal{R}}(-\Delta \tilde{\gamma}), & \int_{c\mathbb{K}} \rho_c^{4/3} &= \frac{1}{c^2} \left(c \int_{\mathbb{K}} \check{\rho}^{4/3} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We deduce that the energy of $\tilde{\gamma}$ can be re-expressed as

$$\mathcal{E}_{c,1}^{\text{KS}}(\tilde{\gamma}) := c^2 \mathcal{E}_{c\mathcal{R}}(\gamma_c) + c \mathcal{F}_{c\mathcal{R}}(\gamma_c), \quad (48)$$

with

$$\mathcal{E}_{c\mathcal{R}}(\gamma_c) := \underline{\text{Tr}}_{c\mathcal{R}}(-\Delta \gamma_c) - \frac{3}{4} \int_{c\mathbb{K}} \rho_c^{4/3}, \quad \mathcal{F}_{c\mathcal{R}}(\gamma_c) := -N \int_{c\mathbb{K}} G_{c\mathcal{R}} \rho_c + D_{c\mathbb{K}}(\rho_c, \rho_c).$$

The energy $\mathcal{E}_{c\mathcal{R}}$ is similar to the NLS energy \mathcal{E} in (25) except that the problem is restricted to the flat torus of size ℓ , instead of being posed over the whole of \mathbb{R}^3 .

Step 1. Let us first prove that

$$\limsup_{c \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E^{\text{KS}}(c, 1)}{c^2} \leq J(N) \quad (49)$$

Let γ be a smooth rank- N projector of compact support such that³ $\mathcal{E}(\gamma) \leq J(N) + \varepsilon$. This state can be used as a trial state in the rescaled box $c\mathbb{K}$, as soon as its support is strictly included in $c\mathbb{K}$. This amounts to $(c\mathcal{R})$ -periodising γ in the usual manner. Then $\mathcal{E}_{c\mathcal{R}}(\gamma) = \mathcal{E}(\gamma)$ whereas

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}_{c\mathcal{R}}(\gamma) = -N \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\rho_\gamma(x)}{|x|} dx + \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\rho_\gamma(x)\rho_\gamma(y)}{|x-y|} dx dy.$$

Hence

$$E^{\text{KS}}(c, 1) \leq c^2(J(N) + \varepsilon) + O(c).$$

The claimed bound (49) follows after taking $c \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Step 2. To prove the other inequality

$$\liminf_{c \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E^{\text{KS}}(c, 1)}{c^2} \geq J(N) \quad (50)$$

we consider a minimiser $\check{\gamma}_c$ for $E^{\text{KS}}(c, 1)$ and call γ_c the rescaled operator as in (47). From the previous step and the positivity of the Hartree term, we have for c large enough

$$\underline{\text{Tr}}_{\mathcal{R}}(-\Delta\check{\gamma}_c) - N \int_{\mathbb{K}} G_{\mathcal{R}}\check{\rho}_c - \frac{3c}{4} \int_{\mathbb{K}} \check{\rho}_c^{4/3} \leq c^2 \frac{J(N)}{2}. \quad (51)$$

Using the Gagliardo-Nirenberg and Hoffmann-Ostenhof periodic inequalities, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{K}} \check{\rho}_c^{4/3} \leq C_1 N^{5/6} \left(\int_{\mathbb{K}} \rho_c + \int_{\mathbb{K}} |\nabla \sqrt{\rho_c}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C_2 N^{5/6} \left(N + \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\mathcal{R}}(-\Delta\check{\gamma}_c) \right)^{1/2}.$$

Similarly, to control the potential energy, we use that $G_{\mathcal{R}} \leq |x|^{-1} + C$, and obtain by Hardy's inequality

$$\int_{\mathbb{K}} G_{\mathcal{R}}\check{\rho}_c \leq C_2 \sqrt{N} \left(N + \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\mathcal{R}}(-\Delta\check{\gamma}_c) \right)^{1/2}.$$

Inserting in (51) this gives $\underline{\text{Tr}}(-\Delta\check{\gamma}_c) = O(c^2)$ and hence after scaling we obtain

$$\underline{\text{Tr}}(-\Delta\gamma_c) = O(1), \quad \int_{c\mathbb{K}} G_{c\mathcal{R}}\rho_c = O(1).$$

This gives

$$E^{\text{KS}}(c, 1) \geq c^2 \mathcal{E}_{c\mathcal{R}}(\gamma_c) + O(c).$$

The last step is to show that

$$\liminf_{c \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_{c\mathcal{R}}(\gamma_c) \geq J(N). \quad (52)$$

To prove (52) we decompose γ_c into bubbles. We use the operator version of the bubble decomposition, which has implicitly appeared several times in the literature and can be read with full details in the recent work [HKY19, Theorem 3.1]. The present setting is slightly different from [HKY19] due to the periodic boundary

³To obtain such a γ one can start with a trial state $\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^N |u_i\rangle\langle u_i|$ and then truncate and regularise the u_i 's. The new functions can be orthonormalised using the same procedure as in Lemma 12.

condition but the proof is similar, see, e.g., [Ric18] in the case of functions. For operators the result is that there exists a sequence of density matrices $\{\gamma^{(1)}, \gamma^{(2)}, \dots\}$ over \mathbb{R}^3 with $\text{Tr}(-\Delta\gamma^{(i)}) < \infty$ such that

$$N \geq \sum_i \text{Tr}(\gamma^{(i)}),$$

$$\liminf_{c \rightarrow \infty} \underline{\text{Tr}}_{c\mathcal{R}}(-\Delta\gamma_c) \geq \sum_i \text{Tr}(-\Delta\gamma^{(i)})$$

and

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \int_{c\mathbb{K}} \rho_{\gamma_c}^{\frac{4}{3}} = \sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho_{\gamma^{(i)}}^{\frac{4}{3}}.$$

The Dirac term decomposes exactly since $4/3$ is a sub-critical power, whereas for the mass and the kinetic energy one only obtains lower bounds. The missing mass and kinetic energy are contained in the *vanishing* part of γ_c , to employ the vocabulary of the concentration-compactness method. Each $\gamma^{(i)}$ is constructed as the strong local limit of $\chi_{i,c}(\cdot + x_{i,c})\gamma_c\chi_{i,c}(\cdot + x_{i,c})$ for some translation $x_{i,c}$ and some localisation function $\chi_{i,c}$, with $|x_{i,c} - x_{j,c}| \rightarrow \infty$ when $i \neq j$, up to subsequences. Using the subadditivity of J proved in Lemma 12, we deduce that

$$\liminf_{c \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_{c\mathcal{R}}(\gamma_c) \geq \sum_i \mathcal{E}(\gamma^{(i)}) \geq \sum_i J(\text{Tr}(\gamma^{(i)})) \geq J\left(\sum_i \text{Tr}(\gamma^{(i)})\right) \geq J(N). \quad (53)$$

This concludes our sketch of the proof of Proposition 27. \square

3.3. Proof of the second point of Theorem 26: stability for small c . When $c = 0$, we have recalled from [CDL08a, App. A] that the minimisation problem $E^{\text{KS}}(0, 1)$ admits a unique minimiser, which we denote here by γ_0 (it was called $\gamma_{0,1}$ above). It solves the nonlinear operator equation

$$\gamma_0 = \mathbb{1}(H_0 \leq \varepsilon_0)$$

where ε_0 is a Lagrange multiplier and

$$H_0 := -\Delta - NG_{\mathcal{R}} + \rho_0 * G_{\mathcal{R}}.$$

The assumption that the system is an insulator means that ε_0 belongs to a spectral gap of the operator H_0 . For simplicity, we denote by

$$a := \max \sigma(H_0) \cap (-\infty, \varepsilon_0), \quad b := \min \sigma(H_0) \cap (\varepsilon_0, \infty)$$

and we choose $\varepsilon_0 = (a + b)/2$. The length of the gap is $g := b - a > 0$. We also denote by

$$\alpha := \min_{\mathbb{K}} \rho_0 > 0$$

the minimal value of the periodic density. That it is strictly positive follows from the expression of ρ_0 after Bloch-Floquet transform and from the fact that the corresponding eigenfunction is positive for the quasi-momentum $\xi = 0$ [CDL08a].

The following shows that the gap does not close and the density stays strictly positive for c small enough.

Lemma 29 (Stability of the gap). *There is $c_1 > 0$ such that, for all $0 \leq c < c_1$, any minimiser γ_c for $E^{\text{KS}}(c, 1)$ satisfies*

$$\min_{\mathbb{K}} \rho_c > \frac{\alpha}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{dist}(\sigma(H_c), \varepsilon_0) > \frac{g}{4},$$

where we set $\rho_c := \rho_{\gamma_c}$, and

$$H_c := -\Delta - NG_{\mathcal{R}} + \rho_c * G_{\mathcal{R}} - c\rho_c^{1/3}.$$

Finally, we have $\gamma_c = \mathbf{1}(H_c < \varepsilon_0)$ and there is $C > 0$ independent of $c < c_1$ so that the following operator inequality holds:

$$C^{-1}(1 - \Delta) \leq |H_c - \varepsilon_F| \leq C(1 - \Delta). \quad (54)$$

Proof. Let $c_n \rightarrow 0^+$. The energy $c \mapsto E^{\text{KS}}(c, 1)$ is continuous at $c = 0$ and any minimiser γ_{c_n} is a minimising sequence for $E^{\text{KS}}(0, 1)$. Hence it must converge to the unique minimiser γ_0 weakly and

$$\lim_{c_n \rightarrow 0^+} \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\mathcal{R}}(-\Delta \gamma_{c_n}) = \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\mathcal{R}}(-\Delta \gamma_0).$$

This implies that $\rho_{c_n} \rightarrow \rho_0$ strongly in $L^1 \cap L^3(\mathbb{K})$. Then we write the associated mean-field operator in the form

$$H_{c_n} = -\Delta - NG_{\mathcal{R}} + \rho_{c_n} * G_{\mathcal{R}} - c_n \rho_{c_n}^{1/3} = H_0 + (\rho_{c_n} - \rho_0) * G_{\mathcal{R}} - c_n \rho_{c_n}^{1/3}$$

and estimate the operator norms of the last two terms by

$$\|(\rho_{c_n} - \rho_0) * G_{\mathcal{R}}(1 - \Delta)^{-1}\| \leq \|\rho_{c_n} - \rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{K})} \|G_{\mathcal{R}}(1 - \Delta)^{-1}\| \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$\|\rho_{c_n}^{1/3}(1 - \Delta)^{-1}\| \leq C \|\rho_{c_n}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{K})}^{1/3}.$$

With similar estimates we know that $(H_0 + C)(1 - \Delta)^{-1}$ and $(H_0 + C)^{-1}(1 - \Delta)$ are bounded for C large enough, locally uniformly in c , see [CDL08a]. By the Rellich-Kato theorem, this proves that the spectrum of H_{c_n} converges to that of H_0 . In particular, H_{c_n} has a gap around ε_0 , independent of c_n for c_n small enough. To conclude we have therefore shown that there exists $c_1 > 0$ so that any minimiser γ_c for $E^{\text{KS}}(c, 1)$ has a mean-field operator H_c with the gap $g/4$ around ε_0 . This implies (54) by [CDL08a, Lem. 3].

Let then γ_c be any such minimiser for $c < c_1$. Since the family $H(t) = H_0 + t(\rho_c - \rho_0) * G_{\mathcal{R}} - t\rho_c^{1/3}$ has a gap for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and the rank of a continuous family of orthogonal projectors is always constant, we obtain

$$\underline{\text{Tr}}_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{1}(H_c \leq \varepsilon_0) = N.$$

By [CDL08a] we know that $\gamma_c = \mathbf{1}(H_c \leq \varepsilon_c)$ where ε_c is the unique Lagrange multiplier chosen such that $\underline{\text{Tr}}(\gamma_c) = N$, and we conclude that $\varepsilon_c = \varepsilon_0$ is independent of c . In particular $\gamma_c = \mathbf{1}(H_c \leq \varepsilon_0)$.

Finally, we have

$$\underline{\text{Tr}}(C + H_c)\gamma_c(C + H_c) \leq (C + \varepsilon_0)^2 N.$$

Since $(H_0 + C)(1 - \Delta)^{-1}$ and $(H_0 + C)^{-1}(1 - \Delta)$ are bounded, this shows that $\underline{\text{Tr}}(1 - \Delta)\gamma_c(1 - \Delta) \leq C$ uniformly in $c < c_1$. This implies that ρ_c is bounded in $W^{2,1}(\mathbb{K})$ and therefore we have $\rho_c \rightarrow \rho_0$ in $L^\infty(\mathbb{K})$ when $c \rightarrow 0^+$. In particular $\rho_c \geq \alpha/2 > 0$ for c small enough. \square

Next we use the properties of minimisers for $c < c_1$ in Lemma 29 to show that it is indeed unique, for every $\ell \geq 1$.

Lemma 30. *There is $c_2 > 0$ so that $E^{\text{KS}}(c, 1)$ has a unique minimiser γ_c , satisfying the properties of Lemma 29. This minimiser is also the unique minimiser for $E^{\text{KS}}(c, \ell)$ for all $\ell \geq 1$, hence there is no symmetry breaking for $c < c_2$.*

Proof. We use the framework developed in [BBHS99, HLS05, CDL08a, CDL08b, FLLS12]. Let γ_c be any minimiser for $E^{\text{KS}}(c, 1)$ with $c < c_1$ and let γ be any other

$(\ell\mathcal{R})$ -periodic density matrix. Using $\underline{\text{Tr}}_{\ell\mathcal{R}}\gamma = \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\ell\mathcal{R}}\gamma_c = \ell^3 N$, we can rewrite and estimate the difference of the two energies as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}_{c,\ell}^{\text{KS}}(\gamma) - \mathcal{E}_{c,\ell}^{\text{KS}}(\gamma_c) \\ &= \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\ell\mathcal{R}}(H_c - \varepsilon_0)Q + \frac{1}{2}D_{\ell\mathcal{R}}(\rho_Q, \rho_Q) - \frac{3}{4}c \int_{\ell\mathbb{K}} \left((\rho_c + \rho_Q)^{\frac{4}{3}} - \rho_c^{\frac{4}{3}} - \frac{4}{3}\rho_c^{\frac{1}{3}}\rho_Q \right) \\ &\geq \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\ell\mathcal{R}}(H_c - \varepsilon_0)Q + \frac{1}{2}D_{\ell\mathcal{R}}(\rho_Q, \rho_Q) - cK \int_{\ell\mathbb{K}} \min\left(\rho_Q^2, \rho_Q^{\frac{4}{3}}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where $Q := \gamma - \gamma_c$. In the second line we have used that

$$(1+t)^{4/3} - 1 - \frac{4}{3}t \leq C \min(t^{4/3}, t^2)$$

for all $t \geq -1$ and that $\rho_c \geq \alpha/2$. Our goal is to show that (55) is non-negative and vanishes only at $\gamma = \gamma_c$. This follows immediately if we can prove that

$$\int_{\ell\mathbb{K}} \min\left(\rho_Q^2, \rho_Q^{\frac{4}{3}}\right) \leq C \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\ell\mathcal{R}}(H_c - \varepsilon_0)Q. \quad (56)$$

The result then follows under the assumption that $c < c_2 := \min(c_1, (2CK)^{-1})$.

To prove (56) we introduce

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{--} &:= \gamma_c Q \gamma_c, & Q^{-+} &:= \gamma_c Q (1 - \gamma_c), \\ Q^{+-} &:= (1 - \gamma_c) Q \gamma_c, & Q^{++} &:= (1 - \gamma_c) Q (1 - \gamma_c) \end{aligned}$$

and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\ell\mathcal{R}}(H_c - \varepsilon_0)Q &= \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\ell\mathcal{R}}|H_c - \varepsilon_0|(Q^{++} - Q^{--}) \\ &\geq C \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\ell\mathcal{R}}(1 - \Delta)(Q^{++} - Q^{--}) \geq C \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\ell\mathcal{R}}(1 - \Delta)Q^2. \end{aligned}$$

We have used Bach's inequality $Q^2 \leq Q^{++} - Q^{--}$ from [BBHS99].

For $q = Q^{++}, Q^{--}$ we use the Lieb-Thirring inequality which implies

$$\underline{\text{Tr}}_{\ell\mathcal{R}}(1 - \Delta)q \geq C \int_{\ell\mathbb{K}} \rho_q + \rho_q^{\frac{5}{3}} \geq 2C \int_{\ell\mathbb{K}} \rho_q^{\frac{4}{3}}$$

and provides the desired bound on the two densities $\rho_{Q^{++}}$ and $\rho_{Q^{--}}$.

For Q^{+-} and Q^{-+} the argument is slightly more involved. Following [CDL08a, Prop. 1] we claim that

$$\int_{\ell\mathbb{K}} \rho_{Q^{+-}}^2 + \rho_{Q^{-+}}^2 \leq C \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\ell\mathcal{R}}Q^2 \quad (57)$$

where the constant C is independent of ℓ . The argument goes by duality in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\ell\mathbb{K}} \rho_{Q^{+-}} V \right| &= \left| \underline{\text{Tr}}_{\ell\mathcal{R}}(\gamma_c V (1 - \gamma_c) Q) \right| \leq \|Q\|_{\mathfrak{S}^2(L^2(\ell\mathbb{K}))} \|\gamma_c V\|_{\mathfrak{S}^2(L^2(\ell\mathbb{K}))} \\ &\leq \|Q\|_{\mathfrak{S}^2(L^2(\ell\mathbb{K}))} \|\gamma_c(1 - \Delta)\| \|(1 - \Delta)^{-1}V\|_{\mathfrak{S}^2(L^2(\ell\mathbb{K}))}, \end{aligned}$$

with $\mathfrak{S}^2(\mathfrak{H})$ the Hilbert-Schmidt norm on a Hilbert space \mathfrak{H} . We have

$$\|\gamma(1 - \Delta)\| \leq \|\gamma(H_c - i)\| \|(H_c + i)^{-1}(1 - \Delta)\| \leq K,$$

for a constant K independent of c . We obtain an upper bound involving

$$\|(1 - \Delta)^{-1}V\|_{\mathfrak{S}^2(L^2(\ell\mathbb{K}))}^2 = \frac{1}{\ell^3} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{R}^*/\ell} \frac{1}{(1 + |k|^2)^2} \int_{\ell\mathbb{K}} V^2 \leq C \int_{\ell\mathbb{K}} V^2.$$

This concludes our sketch of the proof of (57), hence of (56) and of the corollary. \square

Acknowledgement. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement MDF’T 725528 of M.L.).

REFERENCES

- [AC06] A. AMBROSETTI AND E. COLORADO, *Bound and ground states of coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, 342 (2006), pp. 453–458.
- [Bac92] V. BACH, *Error bound for the Hartree-Fock energy of atoms and molecules*, Commun. Math. Phys., 147 (1992), pp. 527–548.
- [Bac93] ———, *Accuracy of mean field approximations for atoms and molecules*, Comm. Math. Phys., 155 (1993), pp. 295–310.
- [BBHS99] V. BACH, J. M. BARBAROUX, B. HELFFER, AND H. SIEDENTOP, *On the stability of the relativistic electron-positron field*, Commun. Math. Phys., 201 (1999), pp. 445–460.
- [BLLS94] V. BACH, E. H. LIEB, M. LOSS, AND J. P. SOLOVEJ, *There are no unfilled shells in unrestricted Hartree-Fock theory*, Phys. Rev. Lett., 72 (1994), pp. 2981–2983.
- [BLS94] V. BACH, E. H. LIEB, AND J. P. SOLOVEJ, *Generalized Hartree-Fock theory and the Hubbard model*, J. Statist. Phys., 76 (1994), pp. 3–89.
- [BL90] A. BAHRI AND Y. Y. LI, *On a min-max procedure for the existence of a positive solution for certain scalar field equations in \mathbf{R}^N* , Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana, 6 (1990), pp. 1–15.
- [BL97] A. BAHRI AND P.-L. LIONS, *On the existence of a positive solution of semilinear elliptic equations in unbounded domains*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 14 (1997), pp. 365–413.
- [BM77] C. BARDOS AND M. MERIGOT, *Asymptotic decay of the solution of a second-order elliptic equation in an unbounded domain. applications to the spectral properties of a hamiltonian*, Proc. R. Soc. Edinburgh A, 76 (1977), pp. 323–344.
- [BW06] T. BARTSCH AND Z.-Q. WANG, *Note on ground states of nonlinear Schrödinger systems*, J. Partial Differential Equations, 19 (2006), pp. 200–207.
- [BWW07] T. BARTSCH, Z.-Q. WANG, AND J. WEI, *Bound states for a coupled Schrödinger system*, J. Fixed Point Theory Appl., 2 (2007), pp. 353–367.
- [BHL⁺17] N. BEZ, Y. HONG, S. LEE, S. NAKAMURA, AND Y. SAWANO, *On the Strichartz estimates for orthonormal systems of initial data with regularity*, ArXiv e-prints, (2017).
- [BL15] X. BLANC AND M. LEWIN, *The crystallization conjecture: A review*, EMS Surv. Math. Sci., 2 (2015), pp. 219–306.
- [CDL08a] É. CANCÈS, A. DELEURENCE, AND M. LEWIN, *A new approach to the modelling of local defects in crystals: the reduced Hartree-Fock case*, Commun. Math. Phys., 281 (2008), pp. 129–177.
- [CDL08b] ———, *Non-perturbative embedding of local defects in crystalline materials*, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter, 20 (2008), p. 294213.
- [CLL01] I. CATTO, C. LE BRIS, AND P.-L. LIONS, *On the thermodynamic limit for Hartree-Fock type models*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 18 (2001), pp. 687–760.
- [CL92] I. CATTO AND P.-L. LIONS, *Binding of atoms and stability of molecules in Hartree and Thomas-Fermi type theories. I. A necessary and sufficient condition for the stability of general molecular systems*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 17 (1992), pp. 1051–1110.
- [CL93a] ———, *Binding of atoms and stability of molecules in Hartree and Thomas-Fermi type theories. II. Stability is equivalent to the binding of neutral subsystems*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 18 (1993), pp. 305–354.
- [CL93b] ———, *Binding of atoms and stability of molecules in Hartree and Thomas-Fermi type theories. III. Binding of neutral subsystems*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 18 (1993), pp. 381–429.
- [CHP17a] T. CHEN, Y. HONG, AND N. PAVLOVIĆ, *Global Well-Posedness of the NLS System for Infinitely Many Fermions*, Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis, 224 (2017), pp. 91–123.
- [CHP17b] ———, *On the scattering problem for infinitely many fermions in dimensions $d \geq 3$ at positive temperature*, Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (C) Non Linear Analysis, (2017).
- [Cof72] C. V. COFFMAN, *Uniqueness of the ground state solution for $\Delta u - u + u^3 = 0$ and a variational characterization of other solutions*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 46 (1972), pp. 81–95.
- [CS18] C. COLLOT AND A.-S. DE SUZZONI, *Stability of equilibria for a Hartree equation for random fields*, arXiv e-prints, (2018), p. arXiv:1811.03150.

- [Fra13] R. L. FRANK, *Ground states of semi-linear PDE*. Lecture notes from the “Summer-school on Current Topics in Mathematical Physics”, CIRM Marseille, Sept. 2013., 2013.
- [FGL20] R. L. FRANK, D. GONTIER, AND M. LEWIN, *The nonlinear Schrödinger equation for orthonormal functions II. Application to Lieb-Thirring inequalities*, (2020).
- [FHJT19] R. L. FRANK, D. HUNDERTMARK, M. JEX, AND P. THÀNH NAM, *The Lieb-Thirring inequality revisited*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), in press (2019), p. arXiv:1808.09017.
- [FLLS12] R. L. FRANK, M. LEWIN, E. H. LIEB, AND R. SEIRINGER, *A positive density analogue of the Lieb-Thirring inequality*, Duke Math. J., 162 (2012), pp. 435–495.
- [FLLS14] ———, *Strichartz inequality for orthonormal functions*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), 16 (2014), pp. 1507–1526.
- [FLSS07] R. L. FRANK, E. H. LIEB, R. SEIRINGER, AND H. SIEDENTOP, *Müller’s exchange-correlation energy in density-matrix-functional theory*, Phys. Rev. A, 76 (2007), p. 052517.
- [FS17] R. L. FRANK AND J. SABIN, *Restriction theorems for orthonormal functions, Strichartz inequalities, and uniform Sobolev estimates*, Amer. Math. J., 139 (2017), pp. 1649–1691.
- [FI73] B. D. FRIED AND Y. H. ICHIKAWA, *On the Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation for Langmuir Waves*, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn., 34 (1973), pp. 1073–1082.
- [Fri03] G. FRIESECKE, *The multiconfiguration equations for atoms and molecules: charge quantization and existence of solutions*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 169 (2003), pp. 35–71.
- [HLS05] C. HAINZL, M. LEWIN, AND É. SÉRÉ, *Existence of a stable polarized vacuum in the Bogoliubov-Dirac-Fock approximation*, Commun. Math. Phys., 257 (2005), pp. 515–562.
- [HH77] M. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF AND T. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF, *Schrödinger inequalities and asymptotic behavior of the electron density of atoms and molecules*, Phys. Rev. A, 16 (1977), pp. 1782–1785.
- [HOHOS85] M. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF, T. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF, AND J. SWETINA, *Pointwise bounds on the asymptotics of spherically averaged l^2 -solutions of one-body Schrödinger equations*, Ann. IHP A, 42 (1985), pp. 341–361.
- [HHL⁺19] M. HOLST, H. HU, J. LU, J. MARZUOLA, D. SONG, AND J. WEARE, *Symmetry Breaking in Density Functional Theory due to Dirac Exchange for a Hydrogen Molecule*. Preprint arXiv:1902.03497, 2019.
- [HKY19] Y. HONG, S. KWON, AND H. YOON, *Global existence versus finite time blowup dichotomy for the system of nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl., 125 (2019), pp. 283–320.
- [KF16] P. KEVREKIDIS AND D. FRANTZESKAKIS, *Solitons in coupled nonlinear Schrödinger models: A survey of recent developments*, Reviews in Physics, 1 (2016), pp. 140 – 153.
- [Kwo89] M. K. KWONG, *Uniqueness of positive solutions of $\Delta u - u + u^p = 0$ in \mathbf{R}^n* , Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 105 (1989), pp. 243–266.
- [Lew11] M. LEWIN, *Geometric methods for nonlinear many-body quantum systems*, J. Funct. Anal., 260 (2011), pp. 3535–3595.
- [LS14] M. LEWIN AND J. SABIN, *The Hartree equation for infinitely many particles. II. Dispersion and scattering in 2D*, Analysis & PDE, 7 (2014), pp. 1339–1363.
- [LS15] ———, *The Hartree equation for infinitely many particles. I. Well-posedness theory*, Comm. Math. Phys., 334 (2015), pp. 117–170.
- [Lie81] E. H. LIEB, *Variational principle for many-fermion systems*, Phys. Rev. Lett., 46 (1981), pp. 457–459.
- [Lie83] ———, *An L^p bound for the Riesz and Bessel potentials of orthonormal functions*, J. Funct. Anal., 51 (1983), pp. 159–165.
- [LL01] E. H. LIEB AND M. LOSS, *Analysis*, vol. 14 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2nd ed., 2001.
- [LS10] E. H. LIEB AND R. SEIRINGER, *The Stability of Matter in Quantum Mechanics*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2010.
- [LT75] E. H. LIEB AND W. E. THIRRING, *Bound on kinetic energy of fermions which proves stability of matter*, Phys. Rev. Lett., 35 (1975), pp. 687–689.
- [LT76] ———, *Inequalities for the moments of the eigenvalues of the Schrödinger hamiltonian and their relation to Sobolev inequalities*, Studies in Mathematical Physics, Princeton University Press, 1976, pp. 269–303.
- [Lio82] P.-L. LIONS, *Principe de concentration-compacité en calcul des variations*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math., 294 (1982), pp. 261–264.

- [Lio84a] ———, *The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The locally compact case, Part I*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 1 (1984), pp. 109–149.
- [Lio84b] ———, *The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The locally compact case, Part II*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 1 (1984), pp. 223–283.
- [LW05] T.-C. LIN AND J. WEI, *Ground state of N coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations in \mathbf{R}^n , $n \leq 3$* , Comm. Math. Phys., 255 (2005), pp. 629–653.
- [Mal05] B. MALOMED, *Encyclopedia of Nonlinear Science*, Routledge, 2005, ch. Nonlinear Schrödinger Equations, pp. 639–642.
- [Man74] S. V. MANAKOV, *On the theory of two-dimensional stationary self-focusing of electromagnetic waves*, Soviet Phys. JETP, 38 (1974), pp. 505–516.
- [McL93] K. MCLEOD, *Uniqueness of positive radial solutions of $\Delta u + f(u) = 0$ in \mathbf{R}^n . II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 339 (1993), pp. 495–505.
- [Mor58] J. C. B. MORREY, *On the analyticity of the solutions of analytic non-linear elliptic systems of partial differential equations. I. Analyticity in the interior.*, Amer. J. Math., 80 (1958), pp. 198–218.
- [PS03] L. P. PITAEVSKII AND S. STRINGARI, *Bose-Einstein condensation*, no. 116, Oxford University Press, 2003.
- [RS78] M. REED AND B. SIMON, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics. IV. Analysis of operators*, Academic Press, New York, 1978.
- [Ric18] J. RICAUD, *Symmetry breaking in the periodic Thomas-Fermi-Dirac-von Weizsäcker model*, Ann. Henri Poincaré, 19 (2018), pp. 3129–3177.
- [Sol91] J. P. SOLOVEJ, *Proof of the ionization conjecture in a reduced Hartree-Fock model*, Invent. Math., 104 (1991), pp. 291–311.
- [Suz15] A.-S. DE SUZZONI, *An equation on random variables and systems of fermions*, arXiv e-prints, (2015).
- [Tao06] T. TAO, *Nonlinear dispersive equations*, vol. 106 of CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC, 2006. Local and global analysis.
- [TY69] T. TANIUTI AND N. YAJIMA, *Perturbation method for a nonlinear wave modulation. I*, J. Mathematical Phys., 10 (1969), pp. 1369–1372.
- [Wei83] M. I. WEINSTEIN, *Nonlinear Schrödinger equations and sharp interpolation estimates*, Comm. Math. Phys., 87 (1983), pp. 567–576.
- [Wei85] ———, *Modulational stability of ground states of nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 16 (1985), pp. 472–491.
- [Zak68] V. E. ZAKHAROV, *Stability of periodic waves of finite amplitude on the surface of a deep fluid*, J. Appl. Mech. Tech. Phys., 9 (1968), pp. 190–194.
- [ZS72] V. E. ZAKHAROV AND A. B. SHABAT, *Exact Theory of Two-dimensional Self-focusing and One-dimensional Self-modulation of Waves in Nonlinear Media*, Soviet Phys. JETP, 34 (1972), p. 62.
- [ZY18] G. ZHANG AND Z. YAN, *The n -component nonlinear Schrödinger equations: dark-bright mixed n - and high-order solitons and breathers, and dynamics*, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A, 474 (2018), p. 20170688.

CEREMADE, UNIVERSITY OF PARIS-DAUPHINE, PSL UNIVERSITY, 75016 PARIS, FRANCE
E-mail address: gontier@ceremade.dauphine.fr

CNRS AND CEREMADE, UNIVERSITY OF PARIS-DAUPHINE, PSL UNIVERSITY, 75016 PARIS, FRANCE
E-mail address: mathieu.lewin@math.cnrs.fr

CEREMADE, UNIVERSITY OF PARIS-DAUPHINE, PSL UNIVERSITY, 75016 PARIS, FRANCE
E-mail address: nazar@ceremade.dauphine.fr