

MINIMAL MASS BLOW-UP SOLUTIONS FOR NONLINEAR SCHRÖDINGER EQUATIONS WITH A POTENTIAL

NAOKI MATSUI

ABSTRACT. We consider the following nonlinear Schrödinger equation with a real-valued potential:

$$i \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \Delta u + |u|^{\frac{4}{N}} u - V u = 0$$

in \mathbb{R}^N . If an initial value u_0 has subcritical mass ($\|u_0\|_2 < \|Q\|_2$), then the corresponding solution is global. Here, Q is the ground state of the mass-critical problem ($V = 0$). We study the existence of an initial value with critical mass ($\|u_0\|_2 = \|Q\|_2$) for which the corresponding solution blows up. A previous study demonstrate the existence of an initial value for which the corresponding solution blows up when $N = 1$ or 2 . In this work, without any restrictions on the number of dimensions N , we construct a critical-mass initial value for which the corresponding solution blows up in finite time and derive its blow-up rate.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the following nonlinear Schrödinger equation with a real-valued potential:

$$(NLS) \quad \begin{cases} i \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \Delta u + |u|^{\frac{4}{N}} u - V u = 0, \\ u(t_0) = u_0 \end{cases}$$

in \mathbb{R}^N . It is well known that if

$$(1) \quad V \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N) + L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \left(p \geq 1 \text{ and } p > \frac{N}{2} \right),$$

then (NLS) is locally well-posed in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. This means that for any $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, there exists a unique maximal solution $u \in C^1((-T_*, T^*), H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^N)) \cap C((-T_*, T^*), H^1(\mathbb{R}^N))$. Moreover, the mass (i.e., L^2 -norm) and energy E of the solution are conserved by the flow, where

$$E(u) := \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2 + \frac{4}{N}} \|u\|_{2 + \frac{4}{N}}^{2 + \frac{4}{N}} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(x) |u(x)|^2 dx.$$

Furthermore, there is a blow-up alternative

$$T^* < \infty \Rightarrow \lim_{t \nearrow T^*} \|\nabla u(t)\|_2^2 = \infty.$$

In this paper, we investigate the conditions for a potential V in relation to the existence of minimal mass blow-up solution.

1.1. Case: V is a constant. Firstly, we describe the results in the case where V is a constant. We define $u(t, x) := u_V(t, x)e^{iVt}$, where u_V is a solution for (NLS). Then, u is a solution for (NLS) with $V = 0$. Therefore, we may assume that $V = 0$.

According to a classical variational argument ([13]), there exists a unique classical solution of

$$-\Delta Q + Q - |Q|^{\frac{4}{N}} Q = 0, \quad Q \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N), \quad Q > 0, \quad Q \text{ is radial}$$

Date: December 29, 2020.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35Q55.

Key words and phrases. blow-up rate, critical exponent, critical mass, minimal mass blow-up, nonlinear Schrödinger equation, potential type.

(see [2, 4]) which is called the ground state. For $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, if $\|u\|_2 = \|Q\|_2$ ($\|u\|_2 < \|Q\|_2$, $\|u\|_2 > \|Q\|_2$), we say that u has a critical mass (subcritical mass, supercritical mass, respectively). Here, $E_{\text{crit}}(Q) = 0$ holds, where E_{crit} is the energy when $V = 0$. Moreover, the ground state Q attains the optimal constant for the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality

$$\|u\|_{2+\frac{4}{N}}^{2+\frac{4}{N}} \leq \left(1 + \frac{2}{N}\right) \left(\frac{\|u\|_2}{\|Q\|_2}\right)^{\frac{4}{N}} \|\nabla u\|_2^2.$$

Therefore, for any $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$,

$$E_{\text{crit}}(u) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u\|_2^2 \left(1 - \left(\frac{\|u\|_2}{\|Q\|_2}\right)^{\frac{4}{N}}\right).$$

This inequality means that for any initial value with subcritical mass, the corresponding solution for (NLS) is global and bounded in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Regarding critical mass, we consider

$$S(t, x) := \frac{1}{|t|^{\frac{N}{2}}} Q\left(\frac{x}{t}\right) e^{-\frac{i}{t}} e^{i\frac{|x|^2}{4t}},$$

which is the solitary wave solution $u(t, x) = Q(x)e^{it}$ to which the pseudo-conformal transformation

$$u(t, x) \mapsto \frac{1}{|t|^{\frac{N}{2}}} u\left(-\frac{1}{t}, \pm \frac{x}{t}\right) e^{i\frac{|x|^2}{4t}}$$

applied. Then, S is also a solution for (NLS) and

$$\|S(t)\|_2 = \|Q\|_2, \quad \|\nabla S(t)\|_2 \sim \frac{1}{|t|} \quad (t \nearrow 0),$$

meaning S is a minimal-mass blow-up solution. Furthermore, up to the symmetries of the flow, the only critical-mass finite blow-up solution for (NLS) is S ([6]).

Regarding supercritical mass, there exists a solution for (NLS) such that

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_2 \sim \sqrt{\frac{\log|\log|T^* - t||}{T^* - t}} \quad (t \nearrow T^*)$$

([8, 9]).

1.2. Main results. For a potential V , we consider the following:

$$(2) \quad V \in (L^p(\mathbb{R}^N) + L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \left(p \geq 1 \text{ and } p > \frac{N}{2}\right),$$

$$(3) \quad \nabla V \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^N) + L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad (q \geq 2 \text{ and } q > N).$$

Theorem 1.1 (Existence of a minimal-mass blow-up solution). For a potential V , we assume that (2) and (3) hold. Then, there exist $t_0 < 0$ and a critical-mass radial initial value $u(t_0) \in \Sigma^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that the corresponding solution u for (NLS) blows up at $T^* = 0$. Moreover,

$$\left\| u(t) - \frac{1}{\lambda(t)^{\frac{N}{2}}} Q\left(\frac{x+w(t)}{\lambda(t)}\right) e^{-i\frac{b(t)}{4} \frac{|x+w(t)|^2}{\lambda(t)^2} + i\gamma(t)} \right\|_{\Sigma^1} \rightarrow 0 \quad (t \nearrow 0)$$

holds for some positive-valued C^1 function λ , real-valued C^1 functions b and γ , and \mathbb{R}^N -valued C^1 function w such that

$$\lambda(t) = |t|(1 + o(1)), \quad b(t) = |t|(1 + o(1)), \quad \gamma(t)^{-1} = O(|t|^{-1}), \quad |w(t)| = o(|t|)$$

as $t \nearrow 0$.

Here, Σ^1 is defined as

$$\Sigma^1 := \{u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \mid xu \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)\}.$$

Remark. In contrast, if V satisfies (1) and an initial value has subcritical mass, then the corresponding solution for (NLS) is global and bounded in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. This can be proved classically. Therefore, the solution of Theorem 1.1 is a minimal-mass blow-up solution.

Furthermore, for a potential V , we consider the following:

$$(4) \quad x \cdot \nabla V \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^N) + L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \left(q \geq 1 \text{ and } q > \frac{N}{2} \right),$$

$$(5) \quad \nabla V \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^N) + L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \left(q \geq 2 \text{ and } q > \frac{N}{2} \right),$$

$$(6) \quad V + \frac{1}{2}x \cdot \nabla V \geq 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Theorem 1.2. For a potential V , we assume that (1), (4) and (6) hold. Then, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists an initial value $u_0 \in \Sigma^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $\|u_0\|_2 = \|Q\|_2 + \delta$ and the corresponding solution blows up in finite time.

See Appendix A for the proof.

For comparison with Theorem 1.1, we also introduce the following corollary:

Corollary 1.3. For a potential V , we assume that (1), (5) and (6) hold. Then, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists an initial value $u_0 \in \Sigma^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $\|u_0\|_2 = \|Q\|_2 + \delta$ and the corresponding solution blows up in finite time.

1.3. Outline of proof. We will now outline the proof for Theorem 1.1.

In Section 2, we describe some basic statements that are used in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

In Section 3, we introduce the *decomposition* of functions.

From Section 4 to Section 8, we prove Theorem 1.1 using the technique described in Le Coz-Martel-Raphaël [5] and Martel-Szeftel [11].

In Section 4, we set an initial value and decompose the corresponding solution for (NLS) into a core part and remainder part. By rescaling the time variable, we consider the equation for the remainder part in rescaled time and estimate the modulation equations of the parameters for decomposition.

In Section 5, by using the coercivity of the linearised Schrödinger operator, we estimate the energy of the remainder part.

In Section 6, by using bootstrapping, we justify the arguments in Sections 5.

In Section 7, we restore the time variable.

In Section 8, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

1.4. Previous results. The work by Banica-Carles-Duyckaerts [1] present the following result for

$$(INLS) \quad \begin{cases} i \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \Delta u + g|u|^{\frac{4}{N}}u - Vu = 0, \\ u(0) = u_0. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 1.4 ([1]). Let $N = 1$ or 2 , $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R})$, and $g \in C^4(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R})$. Assume $(\frac{\partial}{\partial x})^\beta V \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ ($|\beta| \leq 2$), $(\frac{\partial}{\partial x})^\beta g \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ ($|\beta| \leq 4$), and

$$g(0) = 1, \quad \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_j}(0) = \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x_j \partial x_k}(0) = 0 \quad (1 \leq j, k \leq N).$$

Then, there exist $T > 0$ and a solution $u \in C((0, T), \Sigma^1)$ for (INLS) such that

$$\left\| u(t) - \frac{1}{\lambda(t)^{\frac{N}{2}}} Q \left(\frac{x + x(t)}{\lambda(t)} \right) e^{i \frac{|x+x(t)|^2}{4t} - i\theta(\frac{1}{t})} \right\|_{\Sigma^1} \rightarrow 0 \quad (t \searrow 0),$$

where θ and λ are continuous real-valued functions and x is a continuous \mathbb{R}^N -valued function such that

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(\tau) &= \tau + o(\tau) \quad \text{as } \tau \rightarrow +\infty, \\ \lambda(t) &\sim t \text{ and } |x(t)| = o(t) \quad \text{as } t \searrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Regarding unbounded potentials in (NLS), similar results are obtained for $V(x) = E \cdot x$ with $E \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ([10]) and for $V(x) = -\omega|x|^2$ with $\omega > 0$ ([12]).

Finally, we introduce the result of Le Coz, Martel, and Raphaël [5] based on the methodology of seminal work of Raphaël and Szeftel [11] for

$$\text{(DPNLS)} \quad \begin{cases} i \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \Delta u + |u|^{\frac{4}{N}} u + \epsilon |u|^{p-1} u = 0, \\ u(0) = u_0. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 1.5 ([5]). Let $N = 1, 2, 3$, $1 < p < 1 + \frac{4}{N}$, and $\epsilon = 1$. Then, for any energy level $E_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, there exist $t_0 < 0$ and a radially symmetric initial value $u_0(t_0) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with

$$\|u(t)\|_2 = \|Q\|_2, \quad E(u(t_0)) = E_0$$

such that the corresponding solution u for (DPNLS) blows up at $T^* = 0$ with a blow-up rate of

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_2 = \frac{C(p) + o_{t \nearrow 0}(t)}{|t|^\sigma},$$

where $\sigma = \frac{4}{4+N(p-1)}$ and $C(p) > 0$.

1.5. Comments regarding the main result. We present some comments regarding Theorem 1.1 below.

We compare Theorem 1.1 to Theorem 1.4 with $g = 1$. In terms of dimensions, Theorem 1.1 has no restrictions. Based on the lack of regularity of the nonlinearity $|u|^{\frac{4}{N}} u$, Theorem 1.4 needs $N = 1$ or 2 (in Banica-Carles-Duyckaerts [1], it was claimed that the argument of [1] should work for dimensions of $N \geq 3$). Although Theorem 1.1 is not unaffected by a lack of regularity, we have successfully resolved this issue by using the properties of the ground state. Regarding potentials, Theorem 1.1 requires less differentiability and integrability than Theorem 1.4. Indeed, $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ satisfies our assumptions. We believe that it is difficult to further loosen the differentiability and integrability.

We do not investigate the uniqueness of blow-up rates. If a blow-up rate is unique, then Theorem 1.1 suggests that the effects of the behaviour of a potential at infinity are small in terms of the blow-up rate.

We compare the techniques used in this paper to those presented in Le Coz-Martel-Raphaël [5] and Martel-Szeftel [11]. The authors of [5, 11] applied a *truncation* procedure to the Morawetz functional. Slightly different from these, we do not use the Morawetz functional. Therefore, we modify the form and energy of the remainder part in Section 3 and 5, respectively. As a result, we work directly with the virial functional without the truncation. Moreover, although [5, 11] constructed a complex blow-up profile, we use the ground state as a blow-up profile. Furthermore, the authors of [5] stated that (DPNLS) is well posed in H^s for some $s \in [0, 1)$. However, it is not obvious that (NLS) is well-posed in H^s . Therefore, we use Lemma C.1 rather than prove well-posedness in H^s . Consequently, we provide a simpler and more generalisable proof.

1.6. Notations. Unless otherwise noted, we define

$$(u, v)_2 := \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u(x) \bar{v}(x) dx, \quad \|u\|_p := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u(x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad f(z) := |z|^{\frac{4}{N}} z, \quad F(z) := \frac{1}{2 + \frac{4}{N}} |z|^{2 + \frac{4}{N}}.$$

By identifying \mathbb{C} with \mathbb{R}^2 , we denote the differentials of f and F df and dF , respectively. We define

$$\Lambda := \frac{N}{2} + x \cdot \nabla, \quad L_+ := -\Delta + 1 - \left(1 + \frac{4}{N}\right) Q^{\frac{4}{N}}, \quad L_- := -\Delta + 1 - Q^{\frac{4}{N}}.$$

Then,

$$(7) \quad L_- Q = 0, \quad L_+ (\Lambda Q) = -2Q, \quad L_- (|x|^2 Q) = -4\Lambda Q, \quad L_+ \rho = |x|^2 Q$$

hold, where ρ is the unique radial Schwartz solution of $L_+ \rho = |x|^2 Q$. Furthermore, there exists $\mu > 0$ such that for any $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$,

$$\langle L_+ \operatorname{Re} u, \operatorname{Re} u \rangle + \langle L_- \operatorname{Im} u, \operatorname{Im} u \rangle \geq \mu \|u\|_{H^1}^2 - \frac{1}{\mu} \left((\operatorname{Re} u, Q)_2^2 + |(\operatorname{Re} u, xQ)_2|^2 + (\operatorname{Re} u, |x|^2 Q)_2^2 + (\operatorname{Im} u, \rho)_2^2 \right)$$

(e.g., see [7, 8, 11, 14]). We introduce

$$\Sigma^m := \{u \in H^m(\mathbb{R}^N) \mid |x|^m u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)\}.$$

Finally, we use \lesssim and \gtrsim when the inequalities hold except for non-essential positive constant differences and \approx when \lesssim and \gtrsim hold.

2. PRELIMINARIES

For the notation defined in Section 1.6, the following properties are used without proof.

Proposition 2.1. For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$, there exists a constant $C_\alpha > 0$ such that $\left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right)^\alpha Q(x) \right| \leq C_\alpha Q(x)$ (Appendix B). Similarly, $\left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right)^\alpha \rho(x) \right| \leq C_\alpha (1 + |x|)^{\kappa_\alpha} Q(x)$ holds (e.g., [5]).

Lemma 2.2. For the ground state Q ,

$$(Q, \rho)_2 = \frac{1}{2} \| |x|^2 Q \|_2^2$$

holds.

Lemma 2.3. For an appropriate function w ,

$$(|x|^2 w, \Lambda w)_2 = - \| |x| w \|_2^2, \quad (w, \Lambda w)_2 = 0, \quad (-\Delta w, \Lambda w)_2 = \| \nabla w \|_2^2, \quad (|w|^p w, \Lambda w)_2 = \frac{Np}{2(p+2)} \| w \|_{p+2}^{p+2}$$

holds.

Lemma 2.4 (Properties of F and f). For F and f ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \operatorname{Re}} &= \operatorname{Re} f, & \frac{\partial F}{\partial \operatorname{Im}} &= \operatorname{Im} f, & \frac{\partial \operatorname{Re} f}{\partial \operatorname{Im}} &= \frac{\partial \operatorname{Im} f}{\partial \operatorname{Re}}, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial s} F(z(s)) &= f(z(s)) \cdot \frac{\partial z}{\partial s} = \operatorname{Re} \left(f(z(s)) \frac{\partial z}{\partial s} \right), \\ dF(z)(w) &= f(z) \cdot w = \operatorname{Re} (f(z) \bar{w}), \\ df(z)(w_1) \cdot w_2 &= df(z)(w_2) \cdot w_1, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial s} dF(z(s))(w(s)) &= df(z(s))(w(s)) \cdot \frac{\partial z}{\partial s} + f(z(s)) \cdot \frac{\partial w}{\partial s}, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial w} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (F(z(x) + w(x)) - F(z(x)) - dF(z(x))(w(x))) dx &= f(z + w) - f(z), \\ L_+ (\operatorname{Re} Z) + iL_- (\operatorname{Im} Z) &= -\Delta Z + Z - df(Q)(Z) \end{aligned}$$

holds. When identifying \mathbb{C} with \mathbb{R}^2 , \cdot is the inner product of \mathbb{R}^2 .

In this paper, we proceed using a simplified version of the technique presented in Le Coz, Martel, and Raphaël [5] and Martel and Szeftel [11]. We can assume that $V(0) = 0$ (see Section 1.1).

Proposition 2.5 (Estimate of an error term). Let λ be such that $0 < \lambda \ll 1$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Moreover, we define $\Psi(y) := \lambda^2 V(\lambda y - w) Q(y)$ and $\kappa := 1 - \frac{N}{q}$. Then, there exists a sufficiently small constant $\epsilon' > 0$ such that

$$\left\| e^{\epsilon' |y|} \Psi \right\|_2 + \left\| e^{\epsilon' |y|} \nabla \Psi \right\|_2 \lesssim \lambda^{1+\kappa} (\lambda + |w|)$$

holds. Additionally,

$$\left\| e^{\epsilon' |y|} \Psi \right\|_{H^1} \lesssim \lambda^{1+\kappa} (\lambda + |w|).$$

proof. By using Taylor's expansion, we write

$$V(\lambda y - w) = \sum_{j=1}^N R_j(\lambda y - w)(\lambda y_j - w), \quad R_j(\lambda y - w) := \int_0^1 \frac{\partial V}{\partial x_j}(\tau(\lambda y - w)) d\tau.$$

Therefore,

$$|\Psi(y)| \leq \lambda^2(\lambda|y| + |w|) \sum_{j=1}^N |R_j(\lambda y - w)| Q(y),$$

$$|\nabla \Psi(y)| \leq \lambda^3 |\nabla V(\lambda y - w)| Q(y) + \lambda^2(\lambda|y| + |w|) \sum_{j=1}^N |R_j(\lambda y - w)| |\nabla Q(y)|.$$

Based on (3) and the exponential decay of Q (Theorem 8.1.1 in [3]), there exists a sufficiently small constant $\epsilon' > 0$ such that

$$\left\| e^{\epsilon'|y|} \nabla V(\tau(\lambda y - w)) (1 + |y|) Q \right\|_2 \lesssim \tau^{-\frac{N}{r_j}} \lambda^{-\frac{N}{r_j}} + 1.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\left\| e^{\epsilon'|y|} \Psi \right\|_2 + \left\| e^{\epsilon'|y|} \nabla \Psi \right\|_2 \lesssim \lambda^{1+\kappa} (\lambda + |w|).$$

□

3. DECOMPOSITION OF FUNCTIONS

Here, we describe the decomposition of functions. See Appendix D for the proof. Also see [5, 8].

Lemma 3.1 (Decomposition). There exist constants $\bar{\lambda}, \bar{b}, \bar{\gamma}, \bar{w} > 0$ such that the following logic holds.

Let I be an interval and $\delta > 0$ be sufficiently small. We assume $u \in C(I, H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)) \cap C^1(I, H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^N))$ satisfy that there exist functions $\lambda \in \text{Map}(I, (0, \infty))$, $\gamma \in \text{Map}(I, \mathbb{R})$, and $w \in \text{Map}(I, \mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

$$\forall t \in I, \left\| \lambda(t)^{\frac{N}{2}} u(t, \lambda(t)y - w(t)) e^{i\gamma(t)} - Q \right\|_{H^1} < \delta.$$

Then, (given $\tilde{\gamma}(0)$) there exist unique functions $\tilde{\lambda} \in C^1(I, (0, \infty))$, $\tilde{b}, \tilde{\gamma} \in C^1(I, \mathbb{R})$, and $\tilde{w} \in C^1(I, \mathbb{R}^N)$, that are independent of λ, γ and w , such that

$$(8) \quad u(t, x) = \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}(t)^{\frac{N}{2}}} (Q + \tilde{\varepsilon}) \left(t, \frac{x + \tilde{w}(t)}{\tilde{\lambda}(t)} \right) e^{-i\frac{b(t)}{4} \frac{|x + \tilde{w}(t)|^2}{\tilde{\lambda}(t)^2} + i\tilde{\gamma}(t)},$$

$$(9) \quad \tilde{\lambda}(t) \in (\lambda(t)(1 - \bar{\lambda}), \lambda(t)(1 + \bar{\lambda})),$$

$$(10) \quad \tilde{b}(t) \in (-\bar{b}, \bar{b}),$$

$$(11) \quad \tilde{\gamma}(t) \in \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} (-\bar{\gamma} - \gamma(t) + 2m\pi, \bar{\gamma} - \gamma(t) + 2m\pi),$$

$$(12) \quad \tilde{w}_j(t) \in \left(-\tilde{\lambda}(t)\bar{w} + w_j(t), \tilde{\lambda}(t)\bar{w} + w_j(t) \right)$$

hold and $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ satisfies the orthogonal conditions

$$(\tilde{\varepsilon}, i\Lambda Q)_2 = (\tilde{\varepsilon}, |y|^2 Q)_2 = (\tilde{\varepsilon}, i\rho)_2 = 0, \quad (\tilde{\varepsilon}, \nabla Q)_2 = 0$$

in I . In particular, $\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{b}$, and \tilde{w} are unique within functions and $\tilde{\gamma}$ is unique within continuous functions (and is unique within functions under modulo 2π).

4. UNIFORMITY ESTIMATES FOR MODULATION TERMS

In this section, we estimate *modulation terms*.

For $t_1 < 0$ that is sufficiently close to 0, we define $s_1 := -t_1^{-1}$, $\lambda_1 = b_1 = s_1^{-1}$, and $\gamma_1 = w_{j,1} = 0$. Let $u(t)$ be the solution for (NLS) with an initial value

$$(13) \quad u(t_1, x) := \frac{1}{\lambda_1^{\frac{N}{2}}} Q \left(\frac{x}{\lambda_1} \right) e^{-i\frac{b_1}{4} \frac{|x|^2}{\lambda_1^2}}.$$

Then, since u satisfies the assumption of Lemma 3.1 in a neighbourhood of t_1 , there exist a decomposition parameters $\tilde{\lambda}_{t_1}$, \tilde{b}_{t_1} , $\tilde{\gamma}_{t_1}$, \tilde{w}_{t_1} , and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{t_1}$ such that (8) in a neighbourhood I of t_1 . We define the rescaled time s_{t_1} by

$$s_{t_1}(t) := s_1 - \int_t^{t_1} \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_{t_1}(\tau)^2} d\tau.$$

Then, we define an inverse function $s_{t_1}^{-1} : s_{t_1}(I) \rightarrow I$. Moreover, we define

$$\begin{aligned} t_{t_1} &:= s_{t_1}^{-1}, & \lambda_{t_1}(s) &:= \tilde{\lambda}_{t_1}(t_{t_1}(s)), & b_{t_1}(s) &:= \tilde{b}_{t_1}(t_{t_1}(s)), \\ \gamma_{t_1}(s) &:= \tilde{\gamma}_{t_1}(t_{t_1}(s)), & w_{t_1}(s) &:= \tilde{w}_{t_1}(t_{t_1}(s)), & \varepsilon_{t_1}(s, y) &:= \tilde{\varepsilon}_{t_1}(t_{t_1}(s), y). \end{aligned}$$

If there is no risk of confusion, the subscript t_1 is omitted. In particular, it should be noted that $u \in C((-T_*, T^*), \Sigma^2(\mathbb{R}^N))$ and $|x|\nabla u \in C((-T_*, T^*), L^2(\mathbb{R}^N))$. Furthermore, let I_{t_1} be the maximal interval such that a decomposition as (8) is obtained and we define $J_{s_1} := s(I_{t_1})$. Additionally, let $s_0 (\leq s_1)$ be sufficiently large and let $s' := \max\{s_0, \inf J_{s_1}\}$.

Let $1 < M < L \leq 1 + \frac{\kappa}{2}$, $0 < M' < \min\{L - 1, M\}$, and s_* be defined as

$$s_* := \inf \{ \sigma \in (s', s_1] \mid (14) \text{ holds on } [\sigma, s_1] \},$$

where

$$(14) \quad \|\varepsilon(s)\|_{H^1}^2 + b(s)^2 \| |x|\varepsilon(s) \|_2^2 < s^{-2L}, \quad |s\lambda(s) - 1| < s^{-M}, \quad |sb(s) - 1| < s^{-M'}, \quad |w(s)| < s^{-1}.$$

Finally, we define

$$\text{Mod} := \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial s} + b, \frac{\partial b}{\partial s} + b^2, 1 - \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial s}, \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial w}{\partial s} \right).$$

In the following discussion, the constant $\epsilon > 0$ is a sufficiently small constant. If necessary, s_0 and s_1 are recalculated in response to $\epsilon > 0$.

Lemma 4.1. For $s \in (s_*, s_1]$,

$$s^{-1} (1 - s^{-M}) < \lambda(s) < s^{-1} (1 + s^{-M}), \quad s^{-1} (1 - s^{-M'}) < \lambda(s) < s^{-1} (1 + s^{-M'})$$

holds.

Corollary 4.2. For $s \in (s_*, s_1]$,

$$s^{-1} (1 - \epsilon) < \lambda(s), b(s) < s^{-1} (1 + \epsilon)$$

holds.

Lemma 4.3 (The equation for ε). In J_{s_1} ,

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi = & i \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial s} + \Delta \varepsilon - \varepsilon + f(Q + \varepsilon) - f(Q) - \lambda^2 V(\lambda y - w) \varepsilon \\ & - i \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial s} + b \right) \Lambda(Q + \varepsilon) + \left(1 - \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial s} \right) (Q + \varepsilon) + \left(\frac{\partial b}{\partial s} + b^2 \right) \frac{|y|^2}{4} (Q + \varepsilon) \\ & - \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial s} + b \right) b \frac{|y|^2}{2} (Q + \varepsilon) + i \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial w}{\partial s} \cdot \nabla(Q + \varepsilon) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{b}{\lambda} \frac{\partial w}{\partial s} \cdot y(Q + \varepsilon) \end{aligned}$$

holds.

proof. This result can be proven via direct calculation. □

Lemma 4.4 (Estimation of modulation terms). For $s \in (s_*, s_1]$,

$$(16) \quad (\varepsilon(s), Q)_2 = -\frac{1}{2} \|\varepsilon(s)\|_2^2,$$

$$(17) \quad |\text{Mod}(s)| \lesssim s^{-2L}$$

holds.

proof. According to the mass conservation, we have

$$(\varepsilon, Q)_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\|u\|_2^2 - \|Q\|_2^2 - \|\varepsilon\|_2^2 \right) = -\frac{1}{2} \|\varepsilon\|_2^2,$$

meaning (16) holds.

According to orthogonal properties,

$$(18) \quad 0 = \frac{d}{ds} (i\varepsilon, \Lambda Q)_2 = \left(i \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial s}, \Lambda Q \right)_2$$

$$(19) \quad = \frac{d}{ds} (i\varepsilon, i|y|^2 Q)_2 = \left(i \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial s}, i|y|^2 Q \right)_2$$

$$(20) \quad = \frac{d}{ds} (i\varepsilon, \rho)_2 = \left(i \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial s}, \rho \right)_2$$

$$(21) \quad = \frac{d}{ds} \left(i\varepsilon, i \frac{\partial Q}{\partial y_j} \right)_2 = \left(i \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial s}, i \frac{\partial Q}{\partial y_j} \right)_2$$

holds.

For the first line on the right side of (15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & -\Delta \varepsilon + \varepsilon - (f(Q + \varepsilon) - f(Q)) + \lambda^2 V(\lambda y - w)\varepsilon \\ & = L_+ \operatorname{Re} \varepsilon + iL_- \operatorname{Im} \varepsilon - (f(Q + \varepsilon) - f(Q) - df(Q)(\varepsilon)) + \lambda^2 V(\lambda y - w)\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} i \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial s} & = L_+ \operatorname{Re} \varepsilon + iL_- \operatorname{Im} \varepsilon - (f(Q + \varepsilon) - f(Q) - df(Q)(\varepsilon)) + \lambda^2 V(\lambda y - w)\varepsilon \\ & \quad + i \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial s} + b \right) \Lambda(Q + \varepsilon) - \left(1 - \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial s} \right) (Q + \varepsilon) - \left(\frac{\partial b}{\partial s} + b^2 \right) \frac{|y|^2}{4} (Q + \varepsilon) \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial s} + b \right) b \frac{|y|^2}{2} (Q + \varepsilon) - i \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial w}{\partial s} \cdot \nabla(Q + \varepsilon) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{b}{\lambda} \frac{\partial w}{\partial s} \cdot y(Q + \varepsilon) + \Psi. \end{aligned}$$

For $w = \Lambda Q$, $i|y|^2 Q$, ρ , $\frac{\partial Q}{\partial y_j}$, or $y_j Q$,

$$|f(Q + \varepsilon) - f(Q) - df(Q)(\varepsilon)| |w| \lesssim |\varepsilon|^2, \quad |(\lambda^2 V(\lambda y - w)\varepsilon, w)_2| \lesssim \lambda^{2+\kappa} \|\varepsilon\|_2$$

holds.

For (18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (L_+ \operatorname{Re} \varepsilon + iL_- \operatorname{Im} \varepsilon, \Lambda Q)_2 & = (\operatorname{Re} \varepsilon, L_+ \Lambda Q)_2 = -2 (\operatorname{Re} \varepsilon, Q)_2 = -2 (\varepsilon, Q)_2 = \|\varepsilon\|_2^2, \\ (|y|^2(Q + \varepsilon), \Lambda Q)_2 & = (\varepsilon, |y|^2 \Lambda Q)_2 - \||y|Q\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4} \||y|Q\|_2^2 \left(\frac{\partial b}{\partial s} + b^2 \right) = - \left(\left(\frac{\partial b}{\partial s} + b^2 \right) \frac{|y|^2}{4} Q, \Lambda Q \right)_2 \\ & = \left(i \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial s} - L_+ \operatorname{Re} \varepsilon - iL_- \operatorname{Im} \varepsilon + f(Q + \varepsilon) - f(Q) - df(Q)(\varepsilon) - \lambda^2 V(\lambda y - w)\varepsilon \right. \\ & \quad \left. - i \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial s} + b \right) \Lambda(Q + \varepsilon) + \left(1 - \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial s} \right) (Q + \varepsilon) + \left(\frac{\partial b}{\partial s} + b^2 \right) \frac{|y|^2}{4} \varepsilon - \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial s} + b \right) b \frac{|y|^2}{2} (Q + \varepsilon) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + i \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial w}{\partial s} \cdot \nabla(Q + \varepsilon) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{b}{\lambda} \frac{\partial w}{\partial s} \cdot y(Q + \varepsilon) - \Psi, \Lambda Q \right)_2 \end{aligned}$$

and we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial b}{\partial s} + b^2 \right| \lesssim s^{-2L} + \epsilon |\operatorname{Mod}(s)|.$$

Consequently, by doing the same calculations for (19), (20), and (21), we have

$$|\text{Mod}(s)| \lesssim s^{-2L} + \epsilon |\text{Mod}(s)|.$$

□

5. MODIFIED ENERGY FUNCTION

In this section, we proceed with a modified version of the technique presented in Le Coz, Martel, and Raphaël [5] and Martel and Szeftel [11]. For $m, e', \epsilon_1 > 0$, let $1 < 1 + \epsilon_1 < \frac{m}{2} \leq L$ and $e' < \frac{m\mu\epsilon_1}{4}$, and define

$$\begin{aligned} H(s, \epsilon) &:= \frac{1}{2} \|\epsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + e'b^2 \| |y|\epsilon \|_2^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (F(Q + \epsilon) - F(Q) - dF(Q)(\epsilon)) dy + \frac{1}{2} \lambda^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(\lambda y - w) |\epsilon|^2 dy, \\ S(s, \epsilon) &:= \frac{1}{\lambda^m} H(s, \epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where μ is a constant representing the coercivity of L_+ and L_- .

Lemma 5.1 (Coercivity of H). For $s \in (s_*, s_1]$,

$$H(s, \epsilon) \geq \left(\frac{\mu}{2} - \epsilon\right) \|\epsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + e'b^2 \| |y|\epsilon \|_2^2$$

holds.

proof. First, we have

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(F(Q + \epsilon) - F(Q) - dF(Q)(\epsilon) - \frac{1}{2} d^2 F(Q)(\epsilon, \epsilon) \right) dy \right| \lesssim \|\epsilon\|_{H^1}^3 + \|\epsilon\|_{H^1}^{2+\frac{4}{N}}.$$

Furthermore, according to (2), we have

$$(22) \quad \left| \lambda^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(\lambda y - w) |\epsilon|^2 dy \right| \lesssim s^{-\kappa'} \|\epsilon\|_{H^1}^2$$

for some $\kappa' > 0$. Finally, since

$$\|\epsilon\|_{H^1}^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} d^2 F(Q)(\epsilon, \epsilon) dy = (L_+ \text{Re } \epsilon, \text{Re } \epsilon)_2 + (L_- \text{Im } \epsilon, \text{Im } \epsilon)_2,$$

we have

$$H(s, \epsilon) \geq \frac{\mu}{2} \|\epsilon\|_{H^1}^2 - C s^{-\kappa'} \|\epsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + e'b^2 \| |y|\epsilon \|_2^2.$$

Consequently, we obtain Lemma 5.1 if s_0 is sufficiently large. □

Corollary 5.2 (Estimation of S). For $s \in (s_*, s_1]$,

$$\frac{1}{\lambda^m} \left(\left(\frac{\mu}{2} - \epsilon\right) \|\epsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + e'b^2 \| |y|\epsilon \|_2^2 \right) \leq S(s, \epsilon) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^m} \left((C_2 + \epsilon) \|\epsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + e'b^2 \| |y|\epsilon \|_2^2 \right)$$

holds.

Lemma 5.3. For $s \in (s_*, s_1]$,

$$(23) \quad |(f(Q + \epsilon) - f(Q), \Lambda \epsilon)_2| \lesssim \|\epsilon\|_{H^1}^2,$$

$$(24) \quad |\lambda^2 (V(\lambda y - w)\epsilon, \Lambda \epsilon)_2| = \frac{1}{2} |\lambda^3 (y \cdot (\nabla V)(\lambda y - w)\epsilon, \epsilon)_2| \lesssim s^{-(1+\kappa)} (\|\epsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + b^2 \| |y|\epsilon \|_2^2)$$

holds.

proof. For (23), see Section 5.4 in [5].

For (24), since a straightforward calculation shows

$$(V(\lambda y - w)\epsilon, \Lambda \epsilon)_2 = -\frac{1}{2} (\lambda y \cdot (\nabla V)(\lambda y - w)\epsilon, \epsilon)_2,$$

we have

$$|\lambda^2 (V(\lambda y - w)\epsilon, \Lambda \epsilon)_2| \lesssim s^{-(1+\kappa)} b \|\epsilon\|_{H^1} \| |y|\epsilon \|_2 \lesssim s^{-(1+\kappa)} (\|\epsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + b^2 \| |y|\epsilon \|_2^2).$$

□

Lemma 5.4 (Derivative of H in time). Let $\kappa'' = \frac{L-1}{2}$. Then, for $s \in (s_*, s_1]$,

$$\frac{d}{ds}H(s, \varepsilon(s)) \geq -\frac{2e'}{\varepsilon_1}b\|\nabla\varepsilon\|_2^2 - 2(1 + \varepsilon + \varepsilon_1)e'b^3\|y|\varepsilon\|_2^2 - \varepsilon b \left(\|\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + b^2\|y|\varepsilon\|_2^2 \right) - \varepsilon bs^{-(2L+\kappa'')}$$

holds.

proof. Firstly,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds}H(s, \varepsilon(s)) &= \frac{\partial H}{\partial s}(s, \varepsilon(s)) + \left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}(s, \varepsilon(s)), i \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial s}(s) \right)_2, \\ \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}(s, \varepsilon) &= -\Delta\varepsilon + \varepsilon + 2e'b^2|y|^2\varepsilon - (f(Q + \varepsilon) - f(Q)) + \lambda^2V(\lambda y - w)\varepsilon \\ &= L_+ \operatorname{Re}\varepsilon + iL_- \operatorname{Im}\varepsilon + 2e'b^2|y|^2\varepsilon - (f(Q + \varepsilon) - f(Q) - df(Q)(\varepsilon)) + \lambda^2V(\lambda y - w)\varepsilon, \\ \frac{\partial H}{\partial s}(s, \varepsilon) &= 2e'b \frac{\partial b}{\partial s} \|y|\varepsilon\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial s} \lambda^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(\lambda y - w)|\varepsilon|^2 dy \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\lambda} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial s} \lambda^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \lambda y \cdot (\nabla V)(\lambda y - w)|\varepsilon|^2 dy + \frac{1}{2} \lambda^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial w}{\partial s} \cdot (\nabla V)(\lambda y - w)|\varepsilon|^2 dy. \end{aligned}$$

holds. Additionally, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Mod}_{\text{op}}v &:= i \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial s} + b \right) \Lambda v + \left(1 - \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial s} \right) v + \left(\frac{\partial b}{\partial s} + b^2 \right) \frac{|y|^2}{4} v + \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial s} + b \right) b \frac{|y|^2}{2} v \\ &\quad - i \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial w}{\partial s} \cdot \nabla v - \frac{1}{2} \frac{b}{\lambda} \frac{\partial w}{\partial s} \cdot yv. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$i \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial s} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon} - 2e'b^2|y|^2\varepsilon + \operatorname{Mod}_{\text{op}}(Q + \varepsilon) + \Psi.$$

holds.

Then, we have

$$2e'b \frac{\partial b}{\partial s} \|y|\varepsilon\|_2^2 \geq -2e'(1 + \varepsilon)b^3 \|y|\varepsilon\|_2^2.$$

According to (22) and Lemma 5.3, we have

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial s} \geq -2e'(1 + \varepsilon)b^3 \|y|\varepsilon\|_2^2 - \varepsilon b \left(\|\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + b^2\|y|\varepsilon\|_2^2 \right).$$

Next, since $\frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$,

$$\left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon} \right) = 0.$$

holds.

For $\left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, -2e'b^2|y|^2\varepsilon \right)_2$,

$$\left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, -2e'b^2|y|^2\varepsilon \right)_2 = -4e'b^2(i\nabla\varepsilon, y\varepsilon)_2 + \left(i(|Q + \varepsilon|^{\frac{4}{N}} - Q^{\frac{4}{N}})Q, -2e'b^2|y|^2\varepsilon \right)_2.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, -2e'b^2|y|^2\varepsilon \right)_2 \right| &\leq 4e'b^2 \|y|\varepsilon\|_2 \|\nabla\varepsilon\|_2 + 2Ce'b^2\|\varepsilon\|_2^2 \\ &\leq 4e'b^2 \|y|\varepsilon\|_2 \|\nabla\varepsilon\|_2 + \varepsilon e'b\|\varepsilon\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

For $\left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, \operatorname{Mod}_{\text{op}}Q \right)_2$, by using orthogonal properties and (7), we have

$$\left| \left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, i\Lambda Q \right)_2 \right| + \left| \left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, Q \right)_2 \right| + \left| \left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, |y|^2Q \right)_2 \right| + \left| \left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, i \frac{\partial Q}{\partial y_j} \right)_2 \right| + \left| \left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, by_j Q \right)_2 \right| \lesssim \|\varepsilon\|_2^2 + s^{-(L+1)}.$$

Therefore, based on the definition of $\text{Mod}_{\text{op}}Q$ and (17), we have

$$\left| \left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, \text{Mod}_{\text{op}}Q \right)_2 \right| \lesssim |\text{Mod}(s)| \left(\|\varepsilon\|_2^2 + s^{-(L+1)} \right) \leq \epsilon b \|\varepsilon\|_2^2 + C s^{-(3L+1)}.$$

For $(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, \text{Mod}_{\text{op}}\varepsilon)_2$, based on Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 5.3, we have

$$\left| \left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, i\Lambda\varepsilon \right)_2 \right| \lesssim \|\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + b^2 \|\cdot\| \cdot \|\varepsilon\|_2^2.$$

Next,

$$\left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, \varepsilon \right)_2 = \left((|Q + \varepsilon|^{\frac{4}{N}} - Q^{\frac{4}{N}}) Q, i\varepsilon \right)_2.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\left| \left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, \varepsilon \right)_2 \right| \lesssim \|\varepsilon\|_2^2.$$

Next, since

$$\left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, i \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial y_j} \right)_2 = -2e' b^2 (y_j \varepsilon, \varepsilon)_2 - \left(f(Q + \varepsilon) - f(Q), \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial y_j} \right)_2 - \frac{\lambda^3}{2} \left(\frac{\partial V}{\partial y_j} (\lambda y - w) \varepsilon, \varepsilon \right)_2$$

and

$$\left(f(Q + \varepsilon), \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial y_j} \right)_2 = - \left(f(Q + \varepsilon), \frac{\partial Q}{\partial y_j} \right)_2, \quad \left(f(Q), \frac{\partial Q}{\partial y_j} \right)_2 = 0,$$

we have

$$\left| \left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, i \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial y_j} \right)_2 \right| \lesssim s^{-L}$$

Finally,

$$\left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, y_j \varepsilon \right)_2 = -2 \left(\frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial y_j}, i\varepsilon \right)_2 + \left((|Q + \varepsilon|^{\frac{4}{N}} - Q^{\frac{4}{N}}) Q, i y_j \varepsilon \right)_2.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\left| \left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, y_j \varepsilon \right)_2 \right| \lesssim \|\varepsilon\|_2^2.$$

According to the definition of $\text{Mod}_{\text{op}}\varepsilon$ and (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, \text{Mod}_{\text{op}}\varepsilon \right)_2 \right| &\leq C |\text{Mod}(s)| \left(\|\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + b^2 \| |y| \varepsilon \|_2^2 + \| |y| \varepsilon \|_2 \|\nabla \varepsilon\|_2 + C s^{-L} \right) \\ &\leq \epsilon b \left(\|\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + b^2 \| |y| \varepsilon \|_2^2 \right) + C s^{-3L}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have

$$\left| \left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, \Psi \right)_2 \right| \lesssim s^{-3L}.$$

Consequently, since $L = 1 + 2\kappa''$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left(i \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon}, i \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial s} \right)_2 \right| &\leq 4e' b^2 \| |y| \varepsilon \|_2 \|\nabla \varepsilon\|_2 + \epsilon b \left(\|\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + b^2 \| |y| \varepsilon \|_2^2 \right) + C s^{-3L} \\ &\leq 4e' b^2 \| |y| \varepsilon \|_2 \|\nabla \varepsilon\|_2 + \epsilon b \left(\|\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + b^2 \| |y| \varepsilon \|_2^2 \right) + \epsilon b s^{-(2L+\kappa'')} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} H(s, \varepsilon(s)) &\geq -2e'(1 + \varepsilon) b^3 \| |y| \varepsilon \|_2^2 - \epsilon b \|\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 - 4e' b^2 \|\cdot\| \cdot \|\varepsilon\|_2 \|\nabla \varepsilon\|_2 - \epsilon b \left(\|\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + b^2 \| |y| \varepsilon \|_2^2 \right) - \epsilon b s^{-(2L+\kappa'')} \\ &\geq -2(1 + \epsilon + \epsilon_1) e' b^3 \| |y| \varepsilon \|_2^2 - 2 \frac{e'}{\epsilon_1} b \|\nabla \varepsilon\|_2^2 - \epsilon b \left(\|\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + b^2 \| |y| \varepsilon \|_2^2 \right) - \epsilon b s^{-(2L+\kappa'')}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.5 (Derivative of S in time). There exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{d}{ds}S(s, \varepsilon(s)) \geq \frac{b}{\lambda^m} \left(C_1 \left(\|\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + b^2 \| |y| \varepsilon \|_2^2 \right) - \varepsilon s^{-(2L+\kappa'')} \right)$$

holds for $s \in (s_*, s_1]$, where $C_1 > 0$ depends solely on m, μ, e' , and ε_1 .

proof. According to Lemma 5.4, (17), and Lemma 5.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds}S(s, \varepsilon(s)) &= m \frac{b}{\lambda^m} H(s, \varepsilon(s)) - m \frac{1}{\lambda^m} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial s} + b \right) H(s, \varepsilon(s)) + \frac{1}{\lambda^m} \frac{d}{ds} H(s, \varepsilon(s)) \\ &\geq \frac{b}{\lambda^m} \left(\left(\frac{m\mu}{2} - \frac{2e'}{\varepsilon_1} - \varepsilon \right) \|\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + ((m - 2(1 + \varepsilon + \varepsilon_1))e' - \varepsilon)b^2 \| |y| \varepsilon \|_2^2 - \varepsilon s^{-(2L+\kappa'')} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\frac{m\mu}{2} - \frac{2e'}{\varepsilon_1} - \varepsilon > 0$ and $(m - 2(1 + \varepsilon + \varepsilon_1))e' - \varepsilon > 0$ holds based on the definition of m, e', ε_1 . Therefore we obtain Lemma 5.5 if ε is sufficiently small. \square

6. BOOTSTRAP

In this section, we use the estimates obtained in Section 5 and the bootstrap to establish the estimates of the parameters.

Lemma 6.1 (Re-estimation). Let 1^- be a constant that is strictly less than 1. Then, for $s \in (s_*, s_1]$,

$$(25) \quad \|\varepsilon(s)\|_{H^1}^2 + b(s)^2 \| |y| \varepsilon(s) \|_2^2 \lesssim s^{-(2L+\kappa'')},$$

$$(26) \quad |s\lambda(s) - 1| < 1^- s^{-M},$$

$$(27) \quad |sb(s) - 1| < 1^- s^{-M'},$$

$$(28) \quad |w(s)| \lesssim s^{-2L}$$

hold.

proof. We prove (25) by contradiction. Let $C_\dagger > 0$ be sufficiently large and define

$$s_\dagger := \inf \left\{ \sigma \in (s_*, s_1] \mid \|\varepsilon(\tau)\|_{H^1}^2 + b(\tau)^2 \| |y| \varepsilon(\tau) \|_2^2 \leq C_\dagger \tau^{-(2L+\kappa'')} \quad (\tau \in [\sigma, s_1]) \right\}.$$

Then, $s_\dagger < s_1$ holds. Here, we assume that $s_\dagger > s_*$. Then, we have

$$\|\varepsilon(s_\dagger)\|_{H^1}^2 + b(s_\dagger)^2 \| |y| \varepsilon(s_\dagger) \|_2^2 = C_\dagger s_\dagger^{-(2L+\kappa'')}.$$

Let $C_\ddagger > 0$ be sufficiently small and define

$$s_\ddagger := \sup \left\{ \sigma \in (s_*, s_1] \mid \|\varepsilon(\tau)\|_{H^1}^2 + b(\tau)^2 \| |y| \varepsilon(\tau) \|_2^2 \geq C_\ddagger \tau^{-(2L+\kappa'')} \quad (\tau \in [s_\dagger, \sigma]) \right\}.$$

Then, $s_\ddagger > s_\dagger$ holds. Furthermore,

$$\|\varepsilon(s_\ddagger)\|_{H^1}^2 + b(s_\ddagger)^2 \| |y| \varepsilon(s_\ddagger) \|_2^2 = C_\ddagger s_\ddagger^{-(2L+\kappa'')}.$$

Then, according to Corollary 5.2 and Lemma 5.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{C'_1}{\lambda^m} \left(\|\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + b^2 \| |y| \varepsilon \|_2^2 \right) &\leq S(s, \varepsilon) \leq \frac{C'_2}{\lambda^m} \left(\|\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + b^2 \| |y| \varepsilon \|_2^2 \right), \\ \frac{C_1 b}{\lambda^m} \left(\left(\|\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 + b^2 \| |y| \varepsilon \|_2^2 \right) - \varepsilon s^{-(2L+\kappa'')} \right) &\leq \frac{d}{ds} S(s, \varepsilon(s)) \end{aligned}$$

for $s \in (s_*, s_1]$. Here, by setting ϵ to be sufficiently small in response to C_1 and C_{\dagger} , $S(\cdot, \epsilon(\cdot))$ is monotonically increasing on $[s_{\dagger}, s_1]$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_1' C_{\dagger} s_{\dagger}^{-(2L+\kappa'')} &= C_1' \left(\|\epsilon(s_{\dagger})\|_{H^1}^2 + b(s_{\dagger})^2 \| |y| \epsilon(s_{\dagger}) \|_2^2 \right) \leq \lambda(s_{\dagger})^m S(s_{\dagger}, \epsilon(s_{\dagger})) \leq \lambda(s_{\dagger})^m S(s_{\dagger}, \epsilon(s_{\dagger})) \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda(s_{\dagger})^m}{\lambda(s_{\dagger}^*)^m} C_2' \left(\|\epsilon(s_{\dagger}^*)\|_{H^1}^2 + b(s_{\dagger}^*)^2 \| |y| \epsilon(s_{\dagger}^*) \|_2^2 \right) = \frac{\lambda(s_{\dagger})^m}{\lambda(s_{\dagger}^*)^m} C_2' C_{\dagger} s_{\dagger}^{-(2L+\kappa'')} \\ &\leq (1+\epsilon) C_2' C_{\dagger} \left(\frac{s_{\dagger}^*}{s_{\dagger}} \right)^{-(2L-m+\kappa'')} s_{\dagger}^{-(2L+\kappa'')}. \end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, we have $C_1' C_{\dagger} \leq (1+\epsilon) C_2' C_{\dagger}$, which yields a contradiction if C_{\dagger} is sufficiently large. Consequently, $s_{\dagger} \leq s_*$. Moreover, since $s_* \leq s_{\dagger}$ clearly holds by definition, we have $s_* = s_{\dagger}$. Therefore, (25) holds.

Next, we prove (26). Since

$$\left| \frac{d}{ds} (s\lambda) \right| \leq s^{-1} (1+\epsilon) \left(s^{-M} + C s^{-(2L-1)} \right) \leq (1+\epsilon) s^{-(M+1)}$$

and $\lambda(s_1) = s_1^{-1}$, we have

$$|s\lambda - 1| \leq \int_s^{s_1} (1+\epsilon) \sigma^{-(M+1)} d\sigma \leq \frac{1+\epsilon}{M} s^{-M}.$$

Therefore, (26) holds if $M > 1$ and ϵ is sufficiently small.

Next, we prove (27). Since

$$\left| \frac{b}{\lambda} - 1 \right| = \left| \int_{s_1}^s \frac{d}{ds} \left| \frac{b}{\lambda} \right| d\sigma \right| \leq C(1+\epsilon) \int_s^{s_1} \sigma^{-(2L-1)} d\sigma \leq \frac{C(1+\epsilon)}{2L-2} s^{-2(L-1)},$$

we have

$$|sb - s\lambda| \leq \frac{C(1+\epsilon)}{2L-2} s^{-2(L-1)} \leq \epsilon s^{-(L-1)}.$$

Consequently, we have

$$|sb - 1| \leq |sb - s\lambda| + |s\lambda - 1| \leq \epsilon s^{-(L-1)} + 1 - s^{-M}.$$

Therefore, (27) holds based on the relationships between L , M , and M' .

Finally, we prove (28). Since

$$|w(s)| \leq \int_s^{s_1} \lambda(\sigma) |\text{Mod}(\sigma)| d\sigma \lesssim s^{-2L},$$

(28) holds. □

Corollary 6.2. If s_0 is sufficiently large, then $s_* = s'$.

Lemma 6.3. If s_0 is sufficiently large, then $s' = s_0$.

proof. Proving $s' \leq s_0$ is sufficient if s_0 is sufficiently large. We prove $s' \leq s_0$ by contradiction. Assume that for any $s_0 \gg 1$, there exists $s_1 > s_0$ such that $s' > s_0$. In the following analysis, we consider the initial value in response to such s_1 and the corresponding solution for (NLS).

Let $t' := \inf I_{t_1}$. By definition, $s' = \inf J_{s_1} > s_0$ holds. Furthermore, if s_0 is sufficiently large, then we have

$$\left\| \lambda(s)^{\frac{N}{2}} u(s, \lambda(s)y - w(s)) e^{-i\gamma(s)} - Q \right\|_{H^1} = \|\epsilon(s)\|_{H^1} \leq \frac{\delta}{4}$$

for $s \in (s', s_1]$. Since $t_{t_1}((s', s_1]) = (t', t_1]$, we have

$$\left\| \tilde{\lambda}(t)^{\frac{N}{2}} u(t, \tilde{\lambda}(t)y - \tilde{w}(t)) e^{-i\tilde{\gamma}(t)} - Q \right\|_{H^1} \leq \frac{\delta}{4}$$

for $t \in (t', t_1]$. We consider three cases $t' > -T_*$, $t' = -T_* > -\infty$, and $t' = -\infty$.

First, in the case of $t' > -T_*$, λ is bounded on $(s', s_1]$ and $\tilde{\lambda}$ is bounded on $(t', t_1]$ according to (14) and Lemma 6.2. Furthermore, since u is continuous in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ at t' ,

$$\left\| \tilde{\lambda}(t)^{\frac{N}{2}} u(t', \tilde{\lambda}(t)y - \tilde{w}(t)) e^{-i\tilde{\gamma}(t)} - \tilde{\lambda}(t)^{\frac{N}{2}} u(t, \tilde{\lambda}(t)y - \tilde{w}(t)) e^{-i\tilde{\gamma}(t)} \right\|_{H^1} \rightarrow 0 \quad (t \rightarrow t')$$

holds. Therefore, by setting t sufficiently close to t' , we have

$$\left\| \tilde{\lambda}(t)^{\frac{N}{2}} u(t'), \tilde{\lambda}(t)y - \tilde{w}(t)e^{-i\tilde{\gamma}(t)} - Q \right\|_{H^1} < \delta.$$

Accordingly, there exists a decomposition of u in a neighbourhood I of t' according to the continuity of u at t' and Lemma 3.1. It contradicts the maximality of I_{t_1} .

Next, in the case of $t' = -T_* > -\infty$, $\|\nabla u(t)\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$ ($t \searrow t'$) holds according to the blow-up alternative. Additionally, $\|\nabla u(s)\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$ ($s \searrow s'$) also holds. Then, since

$$\|u(s)\|_2 + \lambda(s)\|\nabla u(s)\|_2 \lesssim \left\| \lambda(s)^{\frac{N}{2}} u(s), \lambda(s)y - w(s)e^{-i\gamma(s)} \right\|_{H^1} \lesssim 1,$$

we have $\lambda(s) \rightarrow 0$ ($s \searrow s'$). Therefore, we have

$$|s\lambda(s) - 1| \rightarrow 1, \quad s^{-M} \rightarrow s'^{-M} < s_0^{-M} \quad (s \searrow s').$$

Therefore, since s_0 is sufficiently large, we have a contradiction.

Finally, in the case of $t' = -\infty$, there exists a sequence $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ that converges to s' such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{dt}{ds}(s_n) = \infty$. Then, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(s_n) = \infty$ holds according to $\frac{dt}{ds}(s) = \lambda(s)^2$. Therefore, we have

$$|s_n \lambda(s_n) - 1| \rightarrow \infty, \quad s_n^{-M} \rightarrow s'^{-M} < s_0^{-M} < 1 \quad (n \rightarrow \infty),$$

which yield a contradiction.

Consequently, we have $s' \leq s_0$ if s_0 is sufficiently large. \square

7. CONVERSION OF ESTIMATES

In this section, we rewrite the estimates obtained for the time variable s in Lemma 6.1 into an estimates for the time variable t .

Lemma 7.1 (Interval). *If s_0 is sufficiently large, then there exists $t_0 < 0$ that is sufficiently close to 0 such that*

$$[t_0, t_1] \subset s_{t_1}^{-1}([s_0, s_1]), \quad |s_{t_1}(t)^{-1} - |t|| \lesssim |t|^{M+1} \quad (t \in [t_0, t_1])$$

hold for $t_1 \in (t_0, 0)$.

proof. Firstly, $[t_{t_1}(s_0), t_1] = s_{t_1}^{-1}([s_0, s_1])$. For $s \in [s_0, s_1]$, we have

$$t_1 - t_{t_1}(s) = s^{-1} - s_1^{-1} + \int_s^{s_1} \sigma^{-2} (\sigma \lambda_{t_1}(\sigma) + 1) (\sigma \lambda_{t_1}(\sigma) - 1) d\sigma$$

since $-s_1^{-1} = t_1 = t_{t_1}(s_1)$. Therefore, we have

$$(29) \quad |t_{t_1}(s)| \leq s^{-1} (1 + 3s^{-M}) \leq 2s^{-1}.$$

Similarly,

$$(30) \quad |t_{t_1}(s)| \geq s^{-1} (1 - 3s^{-M}) \geq \frac{1}{2}s^{-1}.$$

Accordingly, we have $\frac{1}{2}|t_{t_1}(s)| \leq s^{-1} \leq 2|t_{t_1}(s)|$. According to $s_{t_1}^{-1} = t_{t_1}$, we have

$$(31) \quad \frac{1}{2}|t| \leq s_{t_1}(t)^{-1} \leq 2|t|.$$

Consequently, according to (29) and (30), we have

$$|t| - s_{t_1}(t)^{-1} \leq 3s_{t_1}(t)^{-(M+1)} \leq 3 \cdot 2^{M+1}|t|^{M+1}.$$

Furthermore, since

$$t_{t_1}(s_0) = -|t_{t_1}(s_0)| \leq -\frac{1}{2}s_{t_1}(t_{t_1}(s_0))^{-1} = -\frac{1}{2}s_0^{-1},$$

it is sufficient that we calculate $t_0 = -\frac{1}{2}s_0^{-1}$. \square

Lemma 7.2 (Conversion of estimates). For $t \in [t_0, t_1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\lambda}_{t_1}(t) &= |t| \left(1 + \epsilon_{\tilde{\lambda}, t_1}(t)\right), \quad \tilde{b}_{t_1}(t) = |t| \left(1 + \epsilon_{\tilde{b}, t_1}(t)\right), \quad |\tilde{w}_{t_1}(t)| \lesssim |t|^{2L}, \\ \|\tilde{\epsilon}_{t_1}(t)\|_{H^1} &\lesssim |t|^{L+\frac{\kappa''}{2}}, \quad \| |y| \tilde{\epsilon}_{t_1}(t) \|_2 \lesssim |t|^{L+\frac{\kappa''}{2}-1}\end{aligned}$$

holds. Furthermore,

$$\sup_{t_1 \in [t, 0)} \left| \epsilon_{\tilde{\lambda}, t_1}(t) \right| \lesssim |t|^M, \quad \sup_{t_1 \in [t, 0)} \left| \epsilon_{\tilde{b}, t_1}(t) \right| \lesssim |t|^{M'}.$$

proof. Firstly, we define $\epsilon_{\tilde{\lambda}, t_1}(t) := \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{t_1}(t)}{|t|} - 1$. According to (31) and Lemma 7.1, we have

$$\left| \epsilon_{\tilde{\lambda}, t_1}(t) \right| = \left| \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{t_1}(t)}{|t|} - 1 \right| = \left| \left(s_{t_1}(t) \tilde{\lambda}_{t_1}(t) - 1 \right) \frac{1}{s_{t_1}(t)|t|} + \frac{1}{s_{t_1}(t)|t|} - 1 \right| \lesssim |t|^M.$$

Similarly, we have estimates of $\tilde{b}_{t_1}(t)$ and $\tilde{w}_{t_1}(t)$. \square

8. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $(t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (t_0, 0)$ be a monotonically increasing sequence such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = 0$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, u_n is the solution for (NLS) with an initial value

$$u_n(t_n, x) := \frac{1}{\lambda_{1,n}^{\frac{N}{2}}} Q \left(\frac{x}{\lambda_{1,n}} \right) e^{-i \frac{b_{1,n}}{4} \frac{|x|^2}{\lambda_{1,n}^2}}$$

at t_n , where $b_{1,n} = \lambda_{1,n} = s_n^{-1} = -t_n$.

According to Lemma 3.1 with an initial value $\tilde{\gamma}_n(t_n) = 0$, there exists a decomposition

$$u_n(t, x) = \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)^{\frac{N}{2}}} (Q + \tilde{\epsilon}_n) \left(t, \frac{x + \tilde{w}_n(t)}{\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)} \right) e^{-i \tilde{b}_n(t) \frac{1}{4} \frac{|x + \tilde{w}_n(t)|^2}{\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)^2} + i \tilde{\gamma}_n(t)}$$

on $[t_0, t_n]$. Then, $(u_n(t_0))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in Σ^1 . Therefore, up to a subsequence, there exists $u_\infty(t_0) \in \Sigma^1$ such that

$$u_n(t_0) \rightarrow u_\infty(t_0) \quad \text{in } \Sigma^1 \quad (n \rightarrow \infty).$$

Let $\chi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a monotonically increasing cutoff function such that $\chi = 0$ on $[0, 1]$ and $\chi = 1$ on $[2, \infty)$. For $R > 0$, $\chi_R : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is defined as $\chi_R(x) = \chi\left(\frac{|x|}{R}\right)$. For any $\delta > 0$, by taking a sufficiently large $R > 0$ that is independent of n ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_n(t_n)|^2 \chi_R^2 dx \leq \delta.$$

holds. See [5] for details of the proof of this inequality.

For any $R > 0$, since

$$\|u_n(t_0)(1 - \chi_R)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} = \|u_n(t_0)(1 - \chi_R)\|_{H^1(B(0, 2R))},$$

we have

$$u_n(t_0)(1 - \chi_R) \rightarrow u_\infty(t_0)(1 - \chi_R) \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty).$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n(t_0) - u_\infty(t_0)\|_2 &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n(t_0)(1 - \chi_R) - u_\infty(t_0)(1 - \chi_R)\|_2 + \|u_n(t_0)\chi_R\|_2 + \|u_\infty(t_0)\chi_R\|_2 \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|u_n(t_0)\chi_R\|_2 \rightarrow 0 \quad (R \rightarrow \infty)\end{aligned}$$

holds, meaning $u_n(t_0) \rightarrow u_\infty(t_0)$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Let u_∞ be the solution for (NLS) with an initial value $u_\infty(t_0)$ and T^* be the supremum of the maximal existence interval of u_∞ . Moreover, we define $T := \min\{0, T^*\}$. Then, for any $T' \in [t_0, T)$, $[t_0, T'] \subset [t_0, t_n]$ if n is sufficiently large. Then, there exists n_0 such that

$$\sup_{n \geq n_0} \|u_n\|_{L^\infty([t_0, T'], \Sigma^1)} \lesssim (1 + |T'|^{-1}) (1 + |t_0|^L)$$

holds. According to Lemma C.1,

$$u_n \rightarrow u_\infty \quad \text{in } C([t_0, T'], L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty)$$

holds. In particular, $u_n(t) \rightarrow u_\infty(t)$ in Σ^1 for any $t \in [t_0, T)$. Furthermore, we have

$$\|u_\infty(t)\|_2 = \|u_\infty(t_0)\|_2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n(t_0)\|_2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n(t_n)\|_2 = \|Q\|_2.$$

Based on weak convergence in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and Lemma 3.1, we decompose u_∞ to

$$u_\infty(t, x) = \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_\infty(t)^{\frac{N}{2}}} (Q + \tilde{\varepsilon}_\infty) \left(t, \frac{x + \tilde{w}_\infty(t)}{\tilde{\lambda}_\infty(t)} \right) e^{-i\tilde{b}_\infty(t) \frac{1}{4} \frac{|x + \tilde{w}_\infty(t)|^2}{\tilde{\lambda}_\infty(t)^2} + i\tilde{\gamma}_\infty(t)}$$

on $[t_0, T)$, where an initial value of $\tilde{\gamma}_\infty$ is $\gamma_\infty(t_0) \in (|t_0|^{-1} - \pi, |t_0|^{-1} + \pi] \cap \tilde{\gamma}(u_\infty(t_0))$ (which is unique, see Appendix D). Furthermore, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\tilde{\lambda}_n(t) \rightarrow \tilde{\lambda}_\infty(t), \quad \tilde{b}_n(t) \rightarrow \tilde{b}_\infty(t), \quad \tilde{w}_n(t) \rightarrow \tilde{w}_\infty(t), \quad e^{i\tilde{\gamma}_n(t)} \rightarrow e^{i\tilde{\gamma}_\infty(t)}, \quad \tilde{\varepsilon}_n(t) \rightarrow \tilde{\varepsilon}_\infty(t) \quad \text{in } \Sigma^1$$

holds for any $t \in [t_0, T)$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}_\infty(t) &= |t| (1 + \epsilon_{\tilde{\lambda},0}(t)), & \tilde{b}_\infty(t) &= |t| (1 + \epsilon_{\tilde{b},0}(t)), & |\tilde{w}_\infty(t)| &\lesssim |t|^{2L} \\ \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_\infty(t)\|_{H^1} &\lesssim |t|^{L + \frac{\kappa''}{2}}, & \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_\infty(t)\|_2 &\lesssim |t|^{L + \frac{\kappa''}{2} - 1}, \\ |\epsilon_{\tilde{\lambda},0}(t)| &\lesssim |t|^M, & |\epsilon_{\tilde{b},0}(t)| &\lesssim |t|^{M'} \end{aligned}$$

from a uniform estimate of Lemma 7.2. Consequently, we obtain Theorem 1.1. \square

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

Firstly, we prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Firstly, for any Σ^1 -solution u of (NLS), we have

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \|x|u(t)\|_2^2 = 16E(u_0) - 8 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (V + x \cdot \nabla V) |u(t)|^2 dx \leq 16E(u_0).$$

Let be $Q_{a,b}(x) := a^{\frac{N}{2}} Q(ax)$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(Q_{a,b}) &= a^{2b-N} \left(\frac{b^2}{2} \|Q\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2 + \frac{4}{N}} \|Q\|_{2 + \frac{4}{N}}^{2 + \frac{4}{N}} + \frac{a^{-2}}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V \left(\frac{x}{b} \right) Q^2 dx \right) \\ &\leq a^{2b-N} \left(\frac{b^2}{2} \|Q\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2 + \frac{4}{N}} \|Q\|_{2 + \frac{4}{N}}^{2 + \frac{4}{N}} + Ca^{-2} \left(b^{\frac{N}{p}} + 1 \right) \|Q\|_{H^1}^2 \right), \\ \|Q_{a,b}\|_2 &= b^{-\frac{N}{2}} \|Q\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there exists $b < 1$ such that $\|Q_{a,b}\|_2 = \|Q\|_2 + \delta$. Moreover, if a is sufficiently large, then $E(Q_{a,b}) < 0$ holds. Consequently, the solution u for (NLS) with $u_0 = Q_{a,b}$ blows up at finite time. \square

Secondly, we outline the proof of Corollary 1.3.

Outline of proof of Corollary 1.3. The solution u is defined in proof of Theorem 1.2 belongs to $C(I, \Sigma^2)$. Then,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (V + x \cdot \nabla V) |u|^2 dx < \infty$$

holds according to (5). Consequently, we similarly obtain Corollary 1.3. \square

APPENDIX B. FACTS REGARDING THE GROUND STATE

In this section, we describe the properties of the ground state Q .

Proposition B.1. If r is sufficiently large, then $|\nabla Q| \approx Q$ holds, where $r = |x|$.

proof. Since $-\Delta Q + Q - Q^{\frac{4}{N}+1} = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 Q}{\partial r^2} + \frac{N-1}{r} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial r} - Q + Q^{\frac{4}{N}+1} = 0 &\Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r^{N-1} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial r} \right) - Q + Q^{\frac{4}{N}+1} = 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r^{N-1} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial r} \right) = r^{N-1} Q (1 - Q^{\frac{4}{N}}) \end{aligned}$$

holds. Since the right side of the last equation is positive if $r \geq r_0$ for a sufficiently large r_0 , $r^{N-1} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial r}$ is monotonically increasing. Moreover, since $\left| r^{N-1} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial r} \right| \leq |x|^{N-1} |\nabla Q| \rightarrow 0$ ($r \rightarrow \infty$), we have

$$r^{N-1} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial r} < 0 \quad (r \geq r_0).$$

In particular, $\frac{\partial Q}{\partial r} < 0$ holds. Furthermore,

$$\frac{\partial^2 Q}{\partial r^2} = -\frac{N-1}{r} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial r} + Q \left(1 - Q^{\frac{4}{N}} \right) > 0 \quad (r \geq r_0)$$

holds and we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial r} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} Q^2 + \frac{1}{\frac{4}{N}+2} Q^{\frac{4}{N}+2} \right) = -\frac{N-1}{r} \left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial r} \right)^2 < 0 \quad (r \geq r_0).$$

Therefore, since $\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial r} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} Q^2 + \frac{1}{\frac{4}{N}+2} Q^{\frac{4}{N}+2} \rightarrow 0$ ($r \rightarrow \infty$),

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial r} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} Q^2 + \frac{1}{\frac{4}{N}+2} Q^{\frac{4}{N}+2} \geq 0 \quad (r \geq r_0)$$

holds. Accordingly, there exists $r_1 > r_0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial r} \right)^2 \geq Q^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\frac{4}{N}+2} Q^{\frac{4}{N}} \right) \geq \frac{1}{4} Q^2 \quad (r \geq r_1)$$

holds. Since

$$\frac{\partial^2 Q}{\partial r^2} + \frac{N-1}{r} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial r} + \frac{Q}{\frac{\partial Q}{\partial r}} - \frac{Q^{\frac{4}{N}+2}}{\frac{\partial Q}{\partial r}} = 0 \quad (r \geq r_1),$$

we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial^2 Q}{\partial r^2} \right| \leq \frac{N-1}{r} + \left| \frac{Q}{\frac{\partial Q}{\partial r}} \right| (1 + Q^{\frac{4}{N}+1}) \leq \frac{N-1}{r_1} + \sqrt{2} (1 + Q^{\frac{4}{N}+1}) \lesssim 1 \quad (r \geq r_1)$$

and since $\frac{\partial Q}{\partial r} < 0 < \frac{\partial^2 Q}{\partial r^2}$ ($r \geq r_1$), we have

$$0 < \frac{\partial^2 Q}{\partial r^2} < -C \frac{\partial Q}{\partial r} \quad (r \geq r_1).$$

Consequently, by integrating on $[r, \infty)$, we have $\left| \frac{\partial Q}{\partial r} \right| \leq CQ$ ($r \geq r_1$). □

Proposition B.2. For any $R > 0$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$, there exists $C_{\alpha, R} > 0$ such that $\left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right)^\alpha Q \right| \leq C_{\alpha, R} Q$ holds in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(0, R)$. □

proof. This proposition is proved by induction. □

Corollary B.3. There exists a $C_\alpha > 0$ such that $\left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right)^\alpha Q \right| \leq C_\alpha Q$ holds in \mathbb{R}^N .

proof. This corollary must be true since $Q \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$. □

APPENDIX C. A FACT REGARDING THE SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION

In this section, we describe a certain continuous dependence on the initial values used in the proof of Theorem 1.1. For notations, see [3].

We consider a more general Schrödinger equation

$$(GNLS) \quad \begin{cases} i \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \Delta u + g(u) = 0, \\ u(0) = u_0. \end{cases}$$

For $g = g_1 + \dots + g_k$, we consider the following assumptions:

(C1) For some $G_j \in C^1(H^1(\mathbb{R}^N), \mathbb{R})$, $G_j' = g_j$.

(C2) There exists $r, \rho \in [2, 2^*)$ such that for any $M < \infty$, there exists $L_j(M) < \infty$ such that for any $u, v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, if $\|u\|_{H^1} + \|v\|_{H^1} \leq M$, then $\|g_j(u) - g_j(v)\|_{\rho_j} \leq L_j(M)\|u - v\|_{r_j}$ holds.

Lemma C.1. Let be $g = g_1 + \dots + g_j$ and each g_j satisfies (C1) and (C2). For a sequence $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, let the corresponding solution for (GNLS) be $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and u , respectively. Moreover, we assume that $\varphi_n \rightarrow \varphi$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and that for any bounded and closed interval $J \subset (-T_{\min}(\varphi), T_{\max}(\varphi))$, there exists an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sup_{n \geq m} \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(J, H^1)} < \infty$. Then,

$$u_n \rightarrow u \quad \text{in } C(J, L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)).$$

In particular, $u_n(t) \rightarrow u(t)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for any $t \in I$.

proof. We may assume that $T_1, T_2 > 0$ and $J = [-T_1, T_2]$. Then, we define

$$M := \|u\|_{L^\infty(J, H^1)} + \sup_{n \geq m} \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(J, H^1)}.$$

Furthermore, we define

$$\mathcal{G}_j(u)(t) := i \int_0^t \mathcal{T}(t-s) g_j(u(s)) ds, \quad \mathcal{H}(u)(t) := \mathcal{T}(t)\varphi + \mathcal{G}_1(u)(t) + \dots + \mathcal{G}_k(u)(t).$$

Similarly, we define $\mathcal{G}_j(u_n)$ and $\mathcal{H}(u_n)$. According to Duhamel's principle, we have $u = \mathcal{H}(u)$ and $u_n = \mathcal{H}(u_n)$.

Let $n \geq m$, $0 < T \leq \min\{T_1, T_2\}$, and (q, r) , (q_j, r_j) , and (γ_j, ρ_j) be admissible pairs. Then, based on the Strichartz estimate and assumptions regarding g_j , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}(t)\varphi_n - \mathcal{T}(t)\varphi\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}, L^r)} &\leq C\|\varphi_n - \varphi\|_{L^2}, \\ \|\mathcal{G}_j(u_n) - \mathcal{G}_j(u)\|_{L^q((-T, T), L^r)} &\leq C\|g_j(u_n) - g_j(u)\|_{L^{\gamma_j'}((-T, T), L^{\rho_j'})} \\ &\leq C(M)\|u_n - u\|_{L^{\gamma_j'}((-T, T), L^{r_j})} \\ &\leq C(M)(2T)^{\frac{1}{\gamma_j} - \frac{1}{q_j}} \|u_n - u\|_{L^{q_j}((-T, T), L^{r_j})}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\frac{1}{\gamma_j} - \frac{1}{q_j} > 0$.

For $v, w \in C([-T, T], H^1(\mathbb{R}^N))$, we define

$$d(v, w) := \|v - w\|_{L^\infty((-T, T), L^2)} + \|v - w\|_{L^{q_1}((-T, T), L^{r_1})} + \dots + \|v - w\|_{L^{q_k}((-T, T), L^{r_k})}.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(u_n, u) &= d(\mathcal{H}(u_n), \mathcal{H}(u)) \leq d(\mathcal{T}(t)\varphi_n, \mathcal{T}(t)\varphi) + d(\mathcal{G}_1(u_n), \mathcal{G}_1(u)) + \dots + d(\mathcal{G}_k(u_n), \mathcal{G}_k(u)) \\ &\leq C\|\varphi_n - \varphi\|_{L^2} + C(M) \sum_{j=1}^k T^{\frac{1}{\gamma_j} - \frac{1}{q_j}} \|u_n - u\|_{L^{q_j}((-T, T), L^{r_j})} \\ &\leq C\|\varphi_n - \varphi\|_{L^2} + d(u_n, u) C(M) \sum_{j=1}^k T^{\frac{1}{\gamma_j} - \frac{1}{q_j}}. \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, since there exists a $T(M) > 0$ such that $C(M) \sum_{j=1}^k T(M)^{\frac{1}{\gamma_j} - \frac{1}{q_j}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\|u_n - u\|_{L^\infty((-T, T), L^2)} \leq d(u_n, u) \leq C \|\varphi_n - \varphi\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0 \quad (n \rightarrow \infty)$$

holds. Therefore, we have

$$u_n \rightarrow u \quad \text{in } C([-T(M), T(M)], L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)),$$

which yields a conclusion by repetition since $T(M)$ is only dependent on M and admissible pairs.

Finally, we have $(u_n(t))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and converges to $u(t) (\in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N))$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for any $t \in I$. Since $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is reflexive, $(u_n(t))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ weakly converges to $u(t)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. \square

APPENDIX D. PROOF OF LEMMA 3.1

In this section, we prove Lemma 3.1. Unless otherwise noted, the notations in this section are unrelated to the definitions in other chapters and sections.

Definition D.1. For $\lambda > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, define $T_{\lambda, \gamma, y} : H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ as

$$T_{\lambda, \gamma, y} u := \lambda^{\frac{N}{2}} u(\lambda \cdot - y) e^{i\gamma}.$$

Definition D.2. Define

$$L_\Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^N) := \{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N) \mid \Lambda u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)\},$$

where $\Lambda := \frac{N}{2} + x \cdot \nabla$.

Proposition D.3. For $T_{\lambda, \gamma, y}$, the following properties hold:

- (i): $\|T_{\lambda, \gamma, y} u\|_2 = \|u\|_2$, $\|\nabla T_{\lambda, \gamma, y} u\|_2 = \lambda \|\nabla u\|_2$.
- (ii): $T_{\lambda, \gamma, y} \in \mathcal{L}(H^1(\mathbb{R}^N))$.
- (iii): $T_{\lambda_1, \gamma_1, y_1} T_{\lambda_2, \gamma_2, y_2} = T_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2, \gamma_1 + \gamma_2, \lambda_2 y_1 + y_2}$.
- (iv): For any $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \ni (\gamma, y) \mapsto T_{1, \gamma, y} u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is Lipschitz continuous.
- (v): For any $u \in L_\Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\mathbb{R} \ni \lambda \mapsto T_{\lambda, 0, 0} u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous.

Definition D.4. Let X be a normed space. For $x \in X$ and $r > 0$, we define

$$B_X(x, r) := \{y \in X \mid \|x - y\|_X < r\}.$$

Lemma D.5. For any $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\delta \in (0, \|\nabla u\|_2)$, $v \in B_{H^1}(u, \delta)$, $\lambda > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, if $T_{\lambda, \gamma, y} v \in B_{H^1}(u, \delta)$, then

$$\lambda \leq \frac{\|\nabla u\|_2 + \delta}{\|\nabla u\|_2 - \delta}$$

holds.

proof. If $u = 0$, then this lemma clearly holds. Therefore, we may assume $u \neq 0$. Then, we have

$$\delta \geq |\lambda \|\nabla u\|_2 - \|\nabla u\|_2| - \lambda \|\nabla u - \nabla v\|_2 \geq \lambda \|\nabla u\|_2 - \|\nabla u\|_2 - \lambda \delta,$$

which yields the conclusion. \square

Corollary D.6. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \setminus \{0\}$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $v \in B_{H^1}(u, \delta)$, $\lambda > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, if $T_{\lambda, \gamma, y} v \in B_{H^1}(u, \delta)$, then $|1 - \lambda| < \varepsilon$.

proof. We define $\delta := \frac{1}{8} \min\{2\|\nabla u\|_2, \varepsilon\|\nabla u\|_2\}$. If $T_{\lambda, \gamma, y} v \in B_{H^1}(u, \delta)$, then we have $\lambda \leq 3$ according to Lemma D.5. Therefore, we have

$$\delta \geq |\lambda - 1| \|\nabla u\|_2 - \lambda \delta \geq |\lambda - 1| \|\nabla u\|_2 - 3\delta.$$

Therefore, we obtain $|1 - \lambda| < \varepsilon$. \square

Lemma D.7. For any $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|y| \geq r} \sup_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}} (T_{1, \gamma, y} u, u) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{|y| \geq r} \inf_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}} (T_{1, \gamma, y} u, u) = 0$$

holds.

proof. This lemma be proven based on the denseness of $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$. \square

Lemma D.8. For any $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$, there exists $R > 0$ such that for any $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_2)$, $v \in B_{L^2}(u, \delta)$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, if $T_{1,\gamma,y}v \in B_{L^2}(u, \delta)$, then $|y| < R$ holds.

proof. There exists $R > 0$ such that $\sup_{|y| \geq R} \sup_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}} (T_{1,\gamma,y}u, u)_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_2^2$ according to Lemma D.7. Therefore, $(T_{1,\gamma,y}u, u)_2 > \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_2^2$ implies $|y| < R$. Since $\|T_{1,\gamma,y}u - u\|_2 < 2\delta$, we have

$$4\delta^2 > \|T_{1,\gamma,y}u - u\|_2^2 = \|T_{1,\gamma,y}u\|_2^2 - 2(T_{1,\gamma,y}u, u)_2 + \|u\|_2^2 = 2\|u\|_2^2 - 2(T_{1,\gamma,y}u, u)_2.$$

Therefore, we have $(T_{1,\gamma,y}u, u)_2 > \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_2^2$. \square

Lemma D.9. For any $u \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\gamma \in (-\pi, \pi]$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, if $(\gamma, y) \neq (0, 0)$ and $T_{1,\gamma,y}u = u$, then $u = 0$ holds.

proof. If $y = 0$, then we have $\gamma \neq 0$ and $(e^{i\gamma} - 1)u = 0$, meaning $u = 0$.

If $y \neq 0$, we may assume that $y = e_1$ by rotating, where e_1 is the standard basis. Here, $|u|$ is a periodic function with a period e_1 . Therefore, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u(x)|^p dx = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{[n, n+1] \times \mathbb{R}^{N-1}} |u(x)|^p dx = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{N-1}} |u(x)|^p dx.$$

Accordingly, we have $\int_{[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{N-1}} |u(x)|^p dx = 0$ since $u \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Consequently, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u(x)|^p dx = 0$ holds. \square

Corollary D.10. For any $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \setminus \{0\}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $v \in B_{L^2}(u, \delta)$, $\gamma \in (-\pi, \pi]$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, if $T_{1,\gamma,y}v \in B_{L^2}(u, \delta)$, then $|\gamma| + |y| < \varepsilon$ holds.

proof. We assume that for any $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, $v_n \in B_{L^2}(u, \frac{1}{n})$, $\gamma_n \in (-\pi, \pi]$, and $y_n \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\|T_{1,\gamma_n,y_n}v_n - u\|_2 < \frac{1}{n}$ and $|\gamma_n| + |y_n| \geq \varepsilon$. Then, $\|T_{1,\gamma_n,y_n}u - u\|_2 < \frac{2}{n}$ holds. Moreover, $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded by Lemma D.8. $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is clearly a bounded sequence. Therefore, there exist convergent subsequences $(y_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\gamma_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ whose limits are denoted as y_0 and γ_0 , respectively. According to Proposition D.3 (iv), we have

$$\|T_{1,\gamma_0,y_0}u - u\|_2 \leq \|T_{1,\gamma_0,y_0}u - T_{1,\gamma_{n_k},y_{n_k}}u\|_2 + \|T_{1,\gamma_{n_k},y_{n_k}}u - u\|_2 \rightarrow 0 \quad (k \rightarrow \infty).$$

Therefore, $T_{1,\gamma_0,y_0}u = u$. On the other hand, $|y_0| + |\gamma_0| \geq \varepsilon > 0$ holds, meaning $y_0 \neq 0$ or $\gamma_0 \neq 0$. Therefore, we have $u = 0$ according to Lemma D.9. \square

Proposition D.11. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^N) \setminus \{0\}$, there exists $\delta > 0$ for any $v \in B_{H^1}(u, \delta)$, $\lambda > 0$, $\gamma \in (-\pi, \pi]$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ if $T_{\lambda,\gamma,y}v \in B_{H^1}(u, \delta)$, then $|1 - \lambda| + |\gamma| + |y| < \varepsilon$ holds.

proof. According to Corollary D.10, there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that for any $v \in B_{L^2}(u, \delta_1)$, $\gamma \in (-\pi, \pi]$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, if $T_{1,\gamma,y}v \in B_{L^2}(u, \delta_1)$, then $|\gamma| + |y| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ holds. According to Proposition D.3 (v), there exists $\delta_2 > 0$ such that if $|1 - \lambda| < \delta_2$, then $\|u - T_{\lambda,0,0}u\|_2 < \frac{\delta_1}{2}$ holds. According to Corollary D.6, there exists $\delta_3 > 0$ such that for any $v \in B_{H^1}(u, \delta_3)$, $\lambda > 0$, $\gamma \in (-\pi, \pi]$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, if $T_{\lambda,\gamma,y}v \in B_{H^1}(u, \delta_3)$, then $|1 - \lambda| < \min\{\delta_2, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\}$ holds.

We define $\delta := \min\{\frac{\delta_1}{6}, \delta_3\}$. Then, for any $v \in B_{H^1}(u, \delta)$, $\lambda > 0$, $\gamma \in (-\pi, \pi]$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, if $T_{\lambda,\gamma,y}v \in B_{H^1}(u, \delta)$, then $\|u - T_{\lambda,0,0}u\|_2 < \frac{\delta_1}{2}$ holds. Additionally,

$$\|T_{1,\gamma,y}v - u\|_2 \leq 2\|u - v\|_2 + \|T_{\lambda,\gamma,y}v - u\|_2 + \|u - T_{\lambda,0,0}u\|_2 < \frac{\delta_1}{2} + \frac{\delta_1}{2} = \delta_1.$$

Therefore, we have $|\gamma| + |y| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, which yields $|1 - \lambda| + |\gamma| + |y| < \varepsilon$. \square

In the following analysis, the definitions of Q and ρ are as described above. In other words, Q is the positive H^1 -solution of $-\Delta Q + Q - |Q|^{\frac{4}{N}}Q = 0$ and ρ is the radial Schwartz solution of $L_+\rho = |x|^2Q$.

Definition D.12. We define $\tilde{\varepsilon} : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^N \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $S : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^N \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\varepsilon}(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}, u) &:= \tilde{\lambda}^{\frac{N}{2}}u(\tilde{\lambda} \cdot -\tilde{w})e^{i\tilde{b}\frac{|\cdot|^2}{4} - i\tilde{\gamma}} - Q, \\ S(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}, u) &:= \left(\left(\tilde{\varepsilon}(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}, u), i\Lambda Q \right)_2, \left(\tilde{\varepsilon}(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}, u), |\cdot|^2 Q \right)_2, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(\tilde{\varepsilon}(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}, u), i\rho \right)_2, \left(\tilde{\varepsilon}(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}, u), \nabla Q \right)_2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

respectively.

Proposition D.13. There exist $R, \bar{b}, \bar{w} > 0$, $\bar{\gamma} \in (0, \pi)$, $\bar{\lambda} \in (0, 1)$, and a unique function $\tilde{S} : B_{H^1}(Q, R) \rightarrow (1 - \bar{\lambda}, 1 + \bar{\lambda}) \times (-\bar{b}, \bar{b}) \times (-\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}) \times B_{\mathbb{R}^N}(0, \bar{w})$ such that $\tilde{S}(Q) = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ and $S(\tilde{S}(v), v) = 0$ for any $v \in B_{H^1}(Q, R)$. Furthermore, \tilde{S} is a C^1 function.

proof. This proposition be proven using the implicit function theorem (see Lemma 2 in [8]). \square

Definition D.14. For any $\delta > 0$, we define

$$U_\delta := \left\{ u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \mid \inf_{\lambda > 0, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, w \in \mathbb{R}^N} \|\lambda^{\frac{N}{2}} u(t, \lambda y - w) e^{i\gamma} - Q\|_{H^1} < \delta \right\}.$$

Proposition D.15. There exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $u \in B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)$, $\lambda > 0$, $\gamma \in (-\pi, \pi]$, and $w \in \mathbb{R}^N$, if $T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} u \in B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)$, then

$$\tilde{\lambda}(u) = \lambda \tilde{\lambda}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} u), \quad \tilde{b}(u) = \tilde{b}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} u), \quad \tilde{\gamma}(u) = \tilde{\gamma}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} u) + \gamma, \quad \tilde{w}(u) = \lambda \tilde{w}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} u) + w.$$

holds.

proof. Similar to the proof of Proposition D.13, there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{S}(B_{H^1}(Q, \delta_1)) \subset \left(1 - \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}, 1 + \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}\right) \times (-\bar{b}, \bar{b}) \times \left(-\frac{\bar{\gamma}}{2}, \frac{\bar{\gamma}}{2}\right) \times B_{\mathbb{R}^N}\left(0, \frac{\bar{w}}{3}\right)$$

holds. According to proposition D.11, there exists $\delta_2 > 0$ such that for any $u \in B_{H^1}(Q, \delta_2)$, $\lambda > 0$, $\gamma \in (-\pi, \pi]$, and $w \in \mathbb{R}^N$, if $T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} u \in B_{H^1}(Q, \delta_2)$, then $|1 - \lambda| + |\gamma| + |w| < \min\{\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2+\bar{\lambda}}, \frac{1}{2}\bar{\gamma}, \frac{1}{2}\bar{w}\}$ holds.

We define $\delta := \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$. If $T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} u \in B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)$, then we have

$$0 = S(\tilde{S}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} u), T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} u) = S(\lambda \tilde{\lambda}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} u), \tilde{b}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} u), \tilde{\gamma}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} u) + \gamma, \lambda \tilde{w}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} u) + w, u).$$

According to $\delta \leq \delta_2$,

$$1 - \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2 - \bar{\lambda}} < \lambda < 1 + \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2 + \bar{\lambda}}$$

holds and we have

$$\lambda \tilde{\lambda}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, 0} u) \in (1 - \bar{\lambda}, 1 + \bar{\lambda}), \quad \tilde{\gamma}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, 0} u) + \gamma \in (-\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}), \quad \lambda \tilde{w}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} u) + w \in B_{\mathbb{R}^N}(0, \bar{w}).$$

Therefore, based on the uniqueness of \tilde{S} , we have

$$\tilde{S}(u) = (\lambda \tilde{\lambda}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, 0} u), \tilde{b}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, 0} u), \tilde{\gamma}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, 0} u) + \gamma, \lambda \tilde{w}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, 0} u) + w),$$

which is the conclusion of Proposition D.15. \square

Corollary D.16. Consider \tilde{S} from Proposition D.13 and δ from Proposition D.15. Then, the domain of \tilde{S} is extended to U_δ . This extension is unique and \tilde{S} is a C^1 function, where $\tilde{\gamma}$ is a polyvalent function.

proof. For any $u \in U_\delta$, there exists $\lambda > 0$, $\gamma \in (-\pi, \pi]$, and $w \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $T_{\lambda, \gamma, 0} u \in B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)$ holds. Then, by defining

$$\tilde{S}(u) := (\lambda \tilde{\lambda}(T_{\lambda, \gamma, w} u), \tilde{b}(T_{\lambda, \gamma, w} u), \tilde{\gamma}(T_{\lambda, \gamma, w} u) - \gamma, \lambda \tilde{w}(T_{\lambda, \gamma, w} u) + w),$$

$\tilde{\lambda}$, \tilde{b} , and \tilde{w} are well defined and $\tilde{\gamma}$ is also well defined under modulo 2π . Indeed, if $T_{\lambda_1, \gamma_1, w_1} u, T_{\lambda_2, \gamma_2, w_2} u \in B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)$, then since there exists a unique $\hat{\gamma} \in (-\pi, \pi]$ such that $\gamma_2 - \gamma_1 \equiv \hat{\gamma}$ under modulo 2π , according to Proposition D.15, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 \tilde{\lambda}(T_{\lambda_1, \gamma_1, w_1} u) &= \lambda_1 \tilde{\lambda}\left(T_{\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}, \gamma_2 - \gamma_1, \frac{w_2 - w_1}{\lambda_1}} T_{\lambda_1, \gamma_1, w_1} u\right) = \lambda_2 \tilde{\lambda}(T_{\lambda_2, \gamma_2, w_2} u), \\ \tilde{\gamma}(T_{\lambda_1, \gamma_1, w_1} u) - \gamma_1 &= \tilde{\gamma}\left(T_{\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}, \hat{\gamma}, \frac{w_2 - w_1}{\lambda_1}} T_{\lambda_1, \gamma_1, w_1} u\right) - \hat{\gamma} - \gamma_1 \equiv \tilde{\gamma}(T_{\lambda_2, \gamma_2, w_2} u) - \gamma_2, \\ \tilde{b}(T_{\lambda_1, \gamma_1, w_1} u) &= \tilde{b}\left(T_{\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}, \gamma_2 - \gamma_1, \frac{w_2 - w_1}{\lambda_1}} T_{\lambda_1, \gamma_1, w_1} u\right) = \tilde{b}(T_{\lambda_2, \gamma_2, w_2} u), \\ \lambda_1 \tilde{w}(T_{\lambda_1, \gamma_1, w_1} u) + w_1 &= \lambda_1 \tilde{w}\left(T_{\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}, \gamma_2 - \gamma_1, \frac{w_2 - w_1}{\lambda_1}} T_{\lambda_1, \gamma_1, w_1} u\right) + w_1 = \lambda_2 \tilde{w}(T_{\lambda_2, \gamma_2, w_2} u) + w_2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\tilde{\lambda}$, \tilde{b} , and \tilde{w} are well defined and $\tilde{\gamma}$ is also well defined under modulo 2π .

For any $u \in U_\delta$, if $T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}u \in B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)$, then for any $v \in B_{H^1}(u, r)$, $T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}v \in B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)$, where $r := \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}}(\delta - \|T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}u - Q\|_{H^1})$. Since $\tilde{\lambda}$, \tilde{b} , $\tilde{\gamma}$, and \tilde{w} are C^1 functions in $B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)$ and $T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}$ is a bounded operator,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\lambda}'(u)(v) &= \lambda \tilde{\lambda}'(T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}u)(T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}v), & \tilde{b}'(u)(v) &= \tilde{b}'(T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}u)(T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}v), \\ \tilde{\gamma}'(u)(v) &= \tilde{\gamma}'(T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}u)(T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}v), & \tilde{w}'(u)(v) &= \tilde{w}'(T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}u)(T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}v)\end{aligned}$$

hold for any $v \in B_{H^1}(u, r)$. Additionally, $\tilde{\lambda}'$, \tilde{b}' , $\tilde{\gamma}'$, and \tilde{w}' are continuous in $B_{H^1}(u, r)$, and $T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}$ is also continuous from $B_{H^1}(u, r)$ to $B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)$. Therefore, $\tilde{\lambda}$, \tilde{b} , $\tilde{\gamma}$, and \tilde{w} are C^1 functions in U_δ .

Finally, we prove the uniqueness of the extension of $\tilde{\lambda}$, \tilde{b} , and \tilde{w} . Let three functions $\bar{\lambda}$, \bar{b} , and \bar{w} that are extended to U_δ satisfy $S(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{b}, \tilde{\gamma}, \bar{w}, \cdot) = 0$. Then, for any $u \in U_\delta$, there exist $\lambda > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and $w \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}u \in B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)$ holds and

$$S\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\bar{\lambda}(u), \bar{b}(u), \tilde{\gamma}(u) - \gamma, \frac{\bar{w}(u) - w}{\lambda}, T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}u\right) = S(\bar{\lambda}(u), \bar{b}(u), \tilde{\gamma}(u), \bar{w}(u), u) = 0.$$

According to the property of uniqueness on $B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\lambda}\bar{\lambda}(u) = \tilde{\lambda}(T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}u), \quad \bar{b}(u) = \tilde{b}(T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}u), \quad \frac{\bar{w}(u) - w}{\lambda} = \tilde{w}(T_{\lambda,\gamma,w}u).$$

Therefore, $\bar{\lambda} = \tilde{\lambda}$, $\bar{b} = \tilde{b}$, and $\bar{w} = \tilde{w}$ in U_δ . □

Theorem D.17. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval containing 0 and Γ be the principal value of $\tilde{\gamma}$ that has range $(-\pi, \pi]$. Then, for any $u \in C(I, U_\delta)$, there exists a unique $\gamma \in C(I, \mathbb{R})$ that satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \forall t \in I, \gamma(t) \in \tilde{\gamma}(u(t)), \\ \gamma(0) = \Gamma(u(0)), \end{cases}$$

where δ and $\tilde{\gamma}$ come from Proposition D.15 and Corollary D.16, respectively. Furthermore, if $u \in C^1(I, U_\delta)$, then γ is a C^1 function.

proof. According to Proposition D.13, $\Gamma(B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)) \subset (-\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma})$ holds. In particular, $\bar{\gamma} < \pi$. Based on the definition of u , for any $t \in I$, there exist $\lambda_t > 0$ and $\gamma_t \in (-\pi, \pi]$ such that $T_{\lambda_t, \gamma_t, 0}u(t) \in B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)$. According to the continuity of Γ , there exists $\delta_t > 0$ such that $\Gamma(B_{H^1}(T_{\lambda_t, \gamma_t, 0}u(t), \delta_t)) \subset (-\pi, \pi)$. According to the proof of Corollary D.16, there exists $\delta'_t > 0$ such that $T_{\lambda_t, \gamma_t, 0}B_{H^1}(u(t), \delta'_t) \subset B_{H^1}(T_{\lambda_t, \gamma_t, 0}u(t), \delta_t)$. According to the continuity of u , there exists $\delta''_t > 0$ such that $u((t - \delta''_t, t + \delta''_t)) \subset B_{H^1}(u(t), \delta'_t)$. We define $I_{t_0} := (t_0 - \delta''_{t_0}, t_0 + \delta''_{t_0})$ for $t_0 \in I$ and

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{t_0}(t) := \{\Gamma(T_{\lambda_{t_0}, \gamma_{t_0}, 0}u(t)) - \gamma_{t_0} - 2n\pi \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

for $t \in I_{t_0}$. According to the definition of $\tilde{\gamma}$, $\tilde{\gamma}_{t_0}(t) = \tilde{\gamma}(u(t))$ holds. Let define

$$J_{t_0, n} := \bigcup_{t \in I_{t_0}} \{\Gamma(T_{\lambda_{t_0}, \gamma_{t_0}, 0}u(t)) - \gamma_{t_0} - 2n\pi\}.$$

Then, using $\Gamma(T_{\lambda_{t_0}, \gamma_{t_0}, 0}u(I_{t_0})) \subset (-\pi, \pi)$, we have $J_{t_0, n} \subset (-\pi - \gamma_{t_0} - 2n\pi, \pi - \gamma_{t_0} - 2n\pi)$. Therefore, if $n \neq m$, then $J_{t_0, n} \cap J_{t_0, m} = \emptyset$.

Let define

$$\mathcal{U} := \{I_t \mid t \in I \cap \mathbb{Q}\}.$$

Then, \mathcal{U} is countable and open covering of I . Furthermore, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U}_0 &:= \{I_0\}, \\ \mathcal{U}_n &:= \left\{ I_t \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \bigcup_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{U}_k \mid I_t \cap \bigcup_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{U}_k \neq \emptyset, t \geq 0 \right\}, \\ \mathcal{U}_{-n} &:= \left\{ I_t \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \bigcup_{k=0}^{-n+1} \mathcal{U}_k \mid I_t \cap \bigcup_{k=0}^{-n+1} \mathcal{U}_k \neq \emptyset, t \leq 0 \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

For $t_0 \in I$ and $\theta \in \tilde{\gamma}(u(t_0))$, we define $\gamma^{t_0} \in C(I_{t_0}, \mathbb{R})$ that satisfies

$$(CND) \quad \begin{cases} \forall t \in I_{t_0}, \tilde{\gamma}^{t_0}(t) \in \tilde{\gamma}(u(t)), \\ \gamma^{t_0}(t_0) = \theta. \end{cases}$$

Since $\gamma^{t_0}(t_0) = \theta$, there exists a unique $n_{t_0, \theta} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\theta = \Gamma(T_{\lambda_{t_0}, \gamma_{t_0}, 0} u(t_0)) - \gamma_{t_0} - 2n_{t_0, \theta} \pi$. Let define $\gamma^{t_0}(t) := \Gamma(T_{\lambda_{t_0}, \gamma_{t_0}, 0} u(t)) - \gamma_{t_0} - 2n_{t_0, \theta} \pi$. Then, γ^{t_0} satisfies (CND).

If $\bar{\gamma}^{t_0} \in C(I_{t_0}, \mathbb{R})$ also satisfies (CND), then we have

$$\gamma^{t_0}(I_{t_0}), \bar{\gamma}^{t_0}(I_{t_0}) \subset \bigcup_{t \in I_{t_0}} \tilde{\gamma}(u(t)) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} J_{t_0, n}.$$

Since γ^{t_0} and $\bar{\gamma}^{t_0}$ are continuous and I_{t_0} is connected, $\gamma^{t_0}(I_{t_0})$ and $\bar{\gamma}^{t_0}(I_{t_0})$ are also connected. Furthermore, there exists an $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\gamma^{t_0}(I_{t_0}), \bar{\gamma}^{t_0}(I_{t_0}) \subset \gamma^{t_0}(I_{t_0}) \cup \bar{\gamma}^{t_0}(I_{t_0}) \subset J_{t_0, n}.$$

holds since $\gamma^{t_0}(I_{t_0}) \cup \bar{\gamma}^{t_0}(I_{t_0})$ is connected and $J_{t_0, n}$ are disjoint. Therefore, we have $\gamma^{t_0}(t), \bar{\gamma}^{t_0}(t) \in J_{t_0, n} \cap \tilde{\gamma}(u(t))$. Here, $J_{t_0, n} \cap \tilde{\gamma}(u(t))$ is a singleton according to $\tilde{\gamma}(u(t)) = \tilde{\gamma}(u(t))$. Therefore, we have $\gamma^{t_0}(t) = \bar{\gamma}^{t_0}(t)$, meaning a γ^{t_0} that satisfies (CND) is unique.

Next, let $I_{t_1} \cap I_{t_2} \neq \emptyset$ for $t_1, t_2 \in I$. Furthermore, let γ^{t_k} be defined on I_{t_k} and $\gamma^{t_1}(s) = \gamma^{t_2}(s)$ for some $s \in I_{t_1} \cap I_{t_2}$. Then, based on the construction and uniqueness of the function that satisfies (CND), there exists a unique $n_{t_k, \gamma^{t_k}(s)}$ such that

$$\gamma^{t_1}(t) = \Gamma(T_{\lambda_{t_1}, \gamma_{t_1}, 0} u(t)) - \gamma_{t_1} - 2n_{t_1, \gamma^{t_1}(s)} \pi, \quad \gamma^{t_2}(t) = \Gamma(T_{\lambda_{t_2}, \gamma_{t_2}, 0} u(t)) - \gamma_{t_2} - 2n_{t_2, \gamma^{t_2}(s)} \pi$$

holds. For $t \in I_{t_1} \cap I_{t_2}$, according to Proposition D.15, we have

$$\Gamma(T_{\lambda_{t_2}, \gamma_{t_2}, 0} u(t)) - \gamma_{t_2} = \begin{cases} \Gamma(T_{\lambda_{t_1}, \gamma_{t_1}, 0} u(t)) - \gamma_{t_1} + 2\pi, & (\gamma_{t_1} - \gamma_{t_2} > \pi) \\ \Gamma(T_{\lambda_{t_1}, \gamma_{t_1}, 0} u(t)) - \gamma_{t_1}, & (\gamma_{t_1} - \gamma_{t_2} \in (-\pi, \pi]) \\ \Gamma(T_{\lambda_{t_1}, \gamma_{t_1}, 0} u(t)) - \gamma_{t_1} - 2\pi. & (\gamma_{t_1} - \gamma_{t_2} \leq -\pi) \end{cases}$$

Therefore, since $\gamma^{t_1}(s) = \gamma^{t_2}(s)$,

$$-2n_{t_1, \gamma^{t_1}(s)} \pi = \begin{cases} -2(n_{t_2, \gamma^{t_2}(s)} - 1)\pi, & (\gamma_{t_1} - \gamma_{t_2} > \pi) \\ -2n_{t_2, \gamma^{t_2}(s)} \pi, & (\gamma_{t_1} - \gamma_{t_2} \in (-\pi, \pi]) \\ -2(n_{t_2, \gamma^{t_2}(s)} + 1)\pi. & (\gamma_{t_1} - \gamma_{t_2} \leq -\pi) \end{cases}$$

Accordingly, $\gamma^{t_1} = \gamma^{t_2}$ on $I_{t_1} \cap I_{t_2}$.

Finally, we construct γ . Firstly, a unique continuous function $\gamma^0 \in C(I_0, \mathbb{R})$ that satisfies (CND) with $\theta = \Gamma(u(0))$. If $\gamma^n \in C(\bigcup_{k=0}^n \mathcal{U}_k, \mathbb{R})$ is defined for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then there exists $s \in I_{t_{n+1}}$ such that $\gamma^n(s)$ is defined for any $t_{n+1} \in I \cap \mathbb{Q}$ such that $I_{t_{n+1}} \in \mathcal{U}_{n+1}$. Here, we suppose that $\gamma^{t_{n+1}}$ is also defined for some $t'_{n+1} \in I \cap \mathbb{Q}$ such that $I'_{t'_{n+1}} \in \mathcal{U}_{n+1}$. Then, $(\bigcup_{k=0}^n \mathcal{U}_k) \cap I_{t_{n+1}} \cap I'_{t'_{n+1}}$ is not empty since I_t is an interval. Therefore, we have $\gamma^n = \gamma^{t_{n+1}} = \gamma^{t'_{n+1}}$ on $(\bigcup_{k=0}^n \mathcal{U}_k) \cap I_{t_{n+1}} \cap I'_{t'_{n+1}}$. Accordingly, γ^n be extended to $\bigcup_{k=0}^{n+1} \mathcal{U}_k$ and denoted by γ^{n+1} .

Similarly, we define γ^{-n} . Then, we define

$$\gamma(t) := \gamma^n(t) \quad \left(n \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ s.t. } t \in \bigcup_{k=0}^n \mathcal{U}_k \right)$$

since $\gamma^n = \gamma^m$ on $(\bigcup_{k=0}^n \mathcal{U}_k) \cap (\bigcup_{k=0}^m \mathcal{U}_k)$ for any $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Furthermore, γ satisfies claim of the theorem and is unique by construction.

Finally, if $u \in C^1(I, U_\delta)$, then γ is also a C^1 function since Γ is a C^1 function. \square

Corollary D.18. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval containing 0. Then, for any $u \in C(I, U_\delta)$, there exists $\tilde{\lambda} \in C(I, (0, \infty))$, $\tilde{b}, \tilde{\gamma} \in C(I, \mathbb{R})$, and $\tilde{w} \in C(I, \mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

$$\tilde{S}(u(t)) = (\tilde{\lambda}(t), \tilde{b}(t), \tilde{\gamma}(t), \tilde{w}(t)), \quad \tilde{\gamma}(0) \in (-\pi, \pi]$$

holds.

proof. According to Corollary D.16, defining $\tilde{\lambda}(t) := \tilde{\lambda}(u(t))$, $\tilde{b}(t) = \tilde{b}(u(t))$, and $\tilde{w}(t) = \tilde{w}(u(t))$ is sufficient. On the other hand, $\tilde{\gamma}$ is obtained according to Theorem D.17. \square

Definition D.19. We define $T_{\tilde{\lambda}, -\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}} : H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{H^{-1}} : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^N \times H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, and $S_{H^{-1}} : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^N \times H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ as

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\tilde{\lambda}, -\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}} u &:= \langle u, T_{\tilde{\lambda}, -\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}} \cdot \rangle, \quad \tilde{\varepsilon}_{H^{-1}}(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}, u) := e^{i\tilde{b}\frac{|u|^2}{4}} T_{\tilde{\lambda}, -\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}} u - \iota(Q), \\ S_{H^{-1}}(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}, u) &:= \left(\langle \tilde{\varepsilon}_{H^{-1}}(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}, u), i\Lambda Q \rangle, \langle \tilde{\varepsilon}_{H^{-1}}(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}, u), |\cdot|^2 Q \rangle, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \langle \tilde{\varepsilon}_{H^{-1}}(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}, u), i\rho \rangle, \langle \tilde{\varepsilon}_{H^{-1}}(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}, u), \nabla Q \rangle \right), \end{aligned}$$

respectively, where $\iota : H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \ni u \mapsto (u, \cdot)_2 \in H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Proposition D.20. There exist $R_{H^{-1}}, \bar{b}_{H^{-1}}, \bar{w}_{H^{-1}} > 0$, $\bar{\gamma}_{H^{-1}} \in (0, \pi)$, $\bar{\lambda}_{H^{-1}} \in (0, 1)$, and a unique function $\tilde{S}_{H^{-1}} : B_{H^{-1}}(\iota(Q), R_{H^{-1}}) \rightarrow (1 - \bar{\lambda}_{H^{-1}}, 1 + \bar{\lambda}_{H^{-1}}) \times (-\bar{b}_{H^{-1}}, \bar{b}_{H^{-1}}) \times (-\bar{\gamma}_{H^{-1}}, \bar{\gamma}_{H^{-1}}) \times B_{\mathbb{R}^N}(0, \bar{w}_{H^{-1}})$ such that $\tilde{S}_{H^{-1}}(\iota(Q)) = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ and $S_{H^{-1}}(\tilde{S}_{H^{-1}}(v), v) = 0$ for any $v \in B_{H^{-1}}(\iota(Q), R)$. Furthermore, $\tilde{S}_{H^{-1}}$ is a C^1 function.

proof. This proof is similar to that of Proposition D.13. \square

Corollary D.21. If $u \in C(I, U_\delta) \cap C^1(I, H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^N))$, then $\tilde{\lambda}$, \tilde{b} , $\tilde{\gamma}$, and \tilde{w} from Corollary D.16 are C^1 functions.

proof. We assume that $\iota(B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)) \subset B_{H^{-1}}(\iota(Q), R_{H^{-1}})$ since δ is sufficiently small. According to the definition of U_δ , there exist $\tilde{\lambda}$, $\tilde{\gamma}$, and \tilde{w} such that $T_{\tilde{\lambda}, -\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}} u \in B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)$ holds.

If $v \in B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)$, then we have

$$0 = S(\tilde{S}(v), v) = S_{H^{-1}}(\tilde{S}_{H^{-1}}(\iota(v)), \iota(v))$$

according to $T_{\tilde{\lambda}, -\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}} \circ \iota = \iota \circ T_{\tilde{\lambda}, -\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{w}}$ and the definition of $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{H^{-1}}$ and $S_{H^{-1}}$. Then, we have $\tilde{\lambda}_{H^{-1}}(\iota(v)) = \tilde{\lambda}(v)$ for any $v \in U_\delta$ based on the uniqueness of $\tilde{\lambda}_{H^{-1}}$ or $\tilde{\lambda}$. Similarly, we have $\tilde{\gamma}_{H^{-1}}(\iota(v)) = \tilde{\gamma}(v)$ and $\tilde{b}_{H^{-1}}(\iota(v)) = \tilde{b}(v)$.

According to the definition of U_δ , there exist λ , γ , and w such that $T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} v \in B_{H^1}(Q, \delta)$ for any $v \in U_\delta$. Therefore, according to the definition of the extension of $\tilde{\lambda}$, we have

$$\tilde{\lambda}(v) = \lambda \tilde{\lambda}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} v) = \lambda \tilde{\lambda}_{H^{-1}}(\iota(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} v)) = \lambda \tilde{\lambda}_{H^{-1}}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, w} \iota(v)).$$

Since this equality holds in a neighbourhood U of v , differentiating v yields

$$\tilde{\lambda}'(v) = \lambda \tilde{\lambda}'_{H^{-1}}(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, 0} \iota(v))(T_{\lambda, -\gamma, 0} \iota(\cdot)).$$

Therefore, $\tilde{\lambda}(u) \in C^1(I)$. Similarly, $\tilde{\gamma}$, \tilde{b} , and \tilde{w} yield the conclusion. \square

Finally, we prove Lemma 3.1.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. The existence of a decomposition holds according to Corollary D.18 and Corollary D.21. Therefore, to prove Lemma 3.1, it is enough to prove that this decomposition satisfies from (9) to (12). Indeed, we assume that there exist $\lambda \in \text{Map}(I, (0, \infty))$, $\gamma \in \text{Map}(I, \mathbb{R})$, and $w \in \text{Map}(I, \mathbb{R}^N)$ that satisfy

$$\left\| \lambda(t)^{\frac{N}{2}} u(t, \lambda(t)y - w) e^{i\gamma(t)} - Q \right\|_{H^1} < \delta.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}(T_{\lambda(t), \gamma(t), w(t)} u(t)) &\in (1 - \bar{\lambda}, 1 + \bar{\lambda}), \quad \tilde{\gamma}(T_{\lambda(t), \gamma(t), w(t)} u(t)) \in (-\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}), \\ \tilde{b}(T_{\lambda(t), \gamma(t), w(t)} u(t)) &\in (-\bar{b}, \bar{b}), \quad \tilde{w}(T_{\lambda(t), \gamma(t), w(t)} u(t)) \in B_{\mathbb{R}^N}(0, \bar{w}) \end{aligned}$$

hold according to the definition of $\tilde{\lambda}$, $\tilde{\gamma}$, \tilde{b} , and \tilde{w} . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}(t) &= \tilde{\lambda}(u(t)) = \lambda(t) \tilde{\lambda}(T_{\lambda(t), \gamma(t), w(t)} u(t)) \in (\lambda(t)(1 - \bar{\lambda}), \lambda(t)(1 + \bar{\lambda})), \\ \tilde{b}(t) &= \tilde{b}(u(t)) = \tilde{b}(T_{\lambda(t), \gamma(t), w(t)} u(t)) \in (-\bar{b}, \bar{b}), \\ \tilde{w}(t) &= \tilde{w}(u(t)) = \lambda(t) \tilde{w}(T_{\lambda(t), \gamma(t), w(t)} u(t)) + w(t) \in B_{\mathbb{R}^N}(w(t), \lambda(t)\bar{w}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\tilde{\gamma}(t) + \gamma(t) \in \tilde{\gamma}(u(t)) = \tilde{\gamma}(T_{\lambda(t), \gamma(t), 0}u(t))$$

holds. Therefore,

$$\tilde{\gamma}(t) \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (-\bar{\gamma} - \gamma(t) + 2n\pi, \bar{\gamma} - \gamma(t) + 2n\pi).$$

If $\hat{\lambda} \in \text{Map}(I, (0, \infty))$, $\hat{\gamma} \in C(I, \mathbb{R})$, $\hat{b} \in \text{Map}(I, \mathbb{R})$, and $\hat{w} \in \text{Map}(I, \mathbb{R}^N)$ also satisfy from (9) to (12), then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\hat{\lambda}(t)}{\lambda(t)} &\in (1 - \bar{\lambda}, 1 + \bar{\lambda}), \quad \hat{\gamma}(t) + \gamma(t) \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (-\bar{\gamma} + 2n\pi, \bar{\gamma} + 2n\pi), \\ \hat{b}(t) &\in (-\bar{b}, \bar{b}), \quad \frac{\hat{w}(t) - w(t)}{\lambda(t)} \in B_{\mathbb{R}^N}(0, \bar{w}) \end{aligned}$$

hold. Based on the uniqueness of the implicit function theorem, we have

$$\frac{\hat{\lambda}(t)}{\lambda(t)} = \tilde{\lambda}(T_{\lambda(t), \gamma(t), w(t)}u(t)) = \frac{\tilde{\lambda}(u(t))}{\lambda(t)} = \frac{\tilde{\lambda}(t)}{\lambda(t)}.$$

Therefore, $\hat{\lambda} = \tilde{\lambda}$ holds. Similarly, $\hat{b} = \tilde{b}$ and $\hat{w} = \tilde{w}$ hold. For $\hat{\gamma}$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\hat{\gamma}(t) + \gamma(t) - 2n\pi \in (-\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma})$. Therefore, we have $\hat{\gamma}(t) = \tilde{\gamma}(T_{\lambda(t), \gamma(t), 0}u(t)) - \gamma(t) + 2n\pi \in \tilde{\gamma}(u(t))$ according to the uniqueness of the implicit function theorem. Therefore, the continuous function in $\tilde{\gamma}(u(t))$ is defined at each point and is unique for the given initial value by Theorem D.17. Therefore, we have $\hat{\gamma} = \tilde{\gamma}$.

Finally, the decompositions that satisfy from (9) to (12) are only those defined in Corollary D.18 and Corollary D.21. Therefore, according to the argument above, the parameters are independent of $\lambda \in \text{Map}(I, (0, \infty))$ and $\gamma \in \text{Map}(I, \mathbb{R})$. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to thank Masahito Ohta and Noriyoshi Fukaya for their support in writing this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Banica, R. Carles and T. Duyckaerts. Minimal blow-up solutions to the mass-critical inhomogeneous NLS equation. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 36 (2011), no. 3, 487–531.
- [2] H. Berestycki and P.-L. Lions. Nonlinear scalar field equations. I. Existence of a ground state. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 82 (1983), no. 4, 313–345.
- [3] T. Cazenave. *Semilinear Schrödinger equations*. Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 10. New York University, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York; American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [4] M. K. Kwong. Uniqueness of positive solutions of $\Delta u - u + u^p = 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n . *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 105 (1989), no. 3, 243–266.
- [5] S. Le Coz, Y. Martel and P. Raphaël. Minimal mass blow up solutions for a double power nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* 32 (2016), no. 3, 795–833.
- [6] F. Merle. Determination of blow-up solutions with minimal mass for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with critical power. *Duke Math. J.* 69 (1993), no. 2, 427–454.
- [7] F. Merle and P. Raphael. On universality of blow-up profile for L^2 critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Invent. Math.* 156 (2004), no. 3, 565–672.
- [8] F. Merle and P. Raphael. The blow-up dynamic and upper bound on the blow-up rate for critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Ann. of Math. (2)* 161 (2005), no. 1, 157–222.
- [9] F. Merle and P. Raphael. On a sharp lower bound on the blow-up rate for the L^2 critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 19 (2006), no. 1, 37–90.
- [10] Y. Nakamura and C. Rémi. Nonlinear Schrödinger equations with Stark potential. *Hokkaido Math. J.* 33 (2004), no. 3,
- [11] P. Raphaël and J. Szeftel. Existence and uniqueness of minimal blow-up solutions to an inhomogeneous mass critical NLS. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 24 (2011), no. 2, 471–546.
- [12] C. Rémi. Nonlinear Schrödinger equations with repulsive harmonic potential and applications. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 35 (2003), no. 4, 823–843.
- [13] M. Weinstein. Nonlinear Schrödinger equations and sharp interpolation estimates. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 87 (1982/83), no. 4, 567–576.
- [14] M. Weinstein. Lyapunov stability of ground states of nonlinear dispersive evolution equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 39 (1986), no. 1, 51–67. 719-729.

(N. Mastui) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TOKYO UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE, 1-3 KAGURAZAKA, SHINJUKU-KU, TOKYO 162-8601,
JAPAN
Email address, N. Matsui: 1120703@ed.tus.ac.jp