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#### Abstract

We show the global well-posedness of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with periodically varying coefficients and a small parameter $\varepsilon>0$, which is used in opticalfiber communications. We also prove that the solutions converge to the solution for the Gabitov-Turitsyn or averaged equation as $\varepsilon$ tends to zero.


## 1. Introduction

We consider the nonlinear Schrödinger equation (NLS) with periodically varying coefficients

$$
\begin{equation*}
i \partial_{t} u+d(t) \partial_{x}^{2} u+c(t)|u|^{2} u=0 \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

which describes the behavior of a signal transmitted on an optical-fiber cable. Here, $x$ denotes the (retarded) time, $t$ the position along the cable, and periodic functions $d(\cdot)$ and $c(\cdot)$ the dispersion and the fiber loss/amplification along the cable respectively.

The original evolution of optical pulses in a dispersion managed system with lumped amplification is described by the nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$
i \partial_{t} E+d(t) \partial_{x}^{2} E+|E|^{2} E=i g(t) E
$$

The fiber loss and amplification coefficient along the cable is given by

$$
g(t)=-\frac{\Gamma}{2}+\Gamma \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \delta\left(t-t_{j}\right),
$$

where $\Gamma>0$ is the fiber loss, $t_{j}$ corresponds to the location of amplifiers, and $\delta(\cdot)$ is the Dirac delta function. For more information on this equation, see, e.g., [2]. Taking

$$
E(x, t)=u(x, t) \exp \left(\int_{0}^{t} g\left(t^{\prime}\right) d t^{\prime}\right)
$$

we obtain equation (1.1) with $c(t)=\exp \left(2 \int_{0}^{t} g\left(t^{\prime}\right) d t^{\prime}\right)$ provided that $g$ is a periodic function with mean zero.

The dispersion management with alternating sections of positive and negative dispersion in fibers was introduced in 1980, see [23]. It was successful to transfer the data at ultra-high speed over long distances, see, e.g., [1, 12, 14, 15, 22, 27. For more information on the dispersion management, see 26 and references therein.

In the strong dispersion management regime, the dispersion is given by

$$
d(t)=d_{\mathrm{av}}+\frac{1}{\varepsilon} d_{0}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right),
$$

[^0]where $d_{0}(\cdot)$ is the mean zero part of the dispersion which is a $2-$ periodic function satisfying
\[

d_{0}(t)=\left\{$$
\begin{aligned}
1, & 0 \leq t<1, \\
-1, & 1 \leq t<2,
\end{aligned}
$$\right.
\]

$d_{\mathrm{av}} \in \mathbb{R}$ the average dispersion over one period, and $\varepsilon>0$ a small parameter. The fiber loss and amplification is defined to be

$$
c(t)=G\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right),
$$

where $G$ is also a $2-$ periodic function given by

$$
G(t)=\exp \left(2 \int_{0}^{t}\left(-\frac{\Gamma}{2}+\Gamma \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \delta\left(t^{\prime}-2 j\right)\right) d t^{\prime}\right)
$$

The first main result of this paper is the well-posedness of the Cauchy problem

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
i \partial_{t} u+\left(d_{\mathrm{av}}+\frac{1}{\varepsilon} d_{0}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\right) \partial_{x}^{2} u+G\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)|u|^{2} u=0  \tag{1.2}\\
u(x, 0)=u_{0}(x)
\end{array}\right.
$$

Theorem 1.1 (Global well-posedness). Let $d_{\mathrm{av}} \in \mathbb{R}$. For every $u_{0} \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$, there exists a unique solution $u \in \mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{R}, H^{1}(\mathbb{R})\right.$ ) of (1.2). Moreover, $u$ depends continuously on the initial datum in the following sense. For every $M>0$, the map $u_{0} \mapsto u(t)$ from $H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$ to $\mathcal{C}\left([-M, M], H^{1}(\mathbb{R})\right)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous.

Now we change the variables $u=T_{D(t / \varepsilon)} v$ in (1.2) to obtain

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
i \partial_{t} v+d_{\mathrm{av}} \partial_{x}^{2} v+G\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) T_{D(t / \varepsilon)}^{-1}\left(\left|T_{D(t / \varepsilon)} v\right|^{2} T_{D(t / \varepsilon)} v\right)=0  \tag{1.3}\\
v(x, 0)=u_{0}(x)
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $D(t)=\int_{0}^{t} d_{0}\left(t^{\prime}\right) d t^{\prime}$ and $T_{t}$ is the solution operator for the free Schrödinger equation in dimension one. Note that since $d_{0}$ is a $2-$ periodic function with mean zero, $D$ is also 2 -periodic and, therefore, the map $t \mapsto T_{D(t / \varepsilon)}$ is $2 \varepsilon$-periodic.
For small $\varepsilon>0$, that is, in the regime of strong dispersion management, equation (1.3) contains the fast oscillating terms $T_{D(t / \varepsilon)}$ and $G(t / \varepsilon)$ in the nonlinearity and hence Gabitov and Turitsyn suggested averaging the equation over one period, see [14, 15]. This yields the following "averaged" equation

$$
i \partial_{t} v+d_{\mathrm{av}} \partial_{x}^{2} v+\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{2} G(\tau) T_{D(\tau)}^{-1}\left(\left|T_{D(\tau)} v\right|^{2} T_{D(\tau)} v\right) d \tau=0
$$

We make the change of variables $D(\tau)=r$, then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
i \partial_{t} v+d_{\mathrm{av}} \partial_{x}^{2} v+\int_{0}^{1} T_{r}^{-1}\left(\left|T_{r} v\right|^{2} T_{r} v\right) \psi(r) d r=0 \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\psi(r)=e^{-\Gamma} \cosh \Gamma(r-1)
$$

The well-posedness of the averaged equation (1.4) in $H^{s}(\mathbb{R})$ for all $s \geq 0$ is proved in [3] for a general dispersion profile. For more general nonlinearities including saturated nonlinearities, see [11.

The averaging procedure is rigorously justified in [28] when the fiber loss and amplification are not present. More precisely, it is shown that for $\varepsilon>0$, the solutions of (1.3) and (1.4) with the same initial datum in $H^{s}(\mathbb{R})$ stay $\varepsilon$-close in $H^{s-3}(\mathbb{R})$ for a long time in $O\left(\varepsilon^{-1}\right)$ when $s$ is sufficiently large. Note that the convergence is not shown in $H^{s}(\mathbb{R})$ where
the solutions exist. However, we prove that the solutions for (1.3) converge to the solution for (1.4) in $H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$, where the solutions exist, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Theorem 1.2 (Averaging Theorem). Let $d_{\mathrm{av}} \in \mathbb{R}, M>0$ and $v \in \mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{R}, H^{1}(\mathbb{R})\right)$ be the solution of the averaged equation (1.4) with the initial datum $v_{0} \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$. Then there exist $C>0$ and $\varepsilon_{0}>0$ such that if $0<\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_{0}$ and $\left\|u_{0}-v_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}(\mathbb{R})} \leq \varepsilon$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|v_{\varepsilon}-v\right\|_{\mathcal{C}\left([-M, M], H^{1}(\mathbb{R})\right)} \leq C \varepsilon, \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $v_{\varepsilon}$ is the solution of (1.3) with the initial datum $u_{0} \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$
In our main theorems, Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we prove the well-posedness of the Cauchy problem (1.2) and the validity of the averaging process in the strong dispersion, $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} d_{0}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)$, while the well-posedness of the averaged equation is already proved in [3]. There are analogous results for the fast dispersion, $d_{0}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)$, and the random dispersion, $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} d_{0}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^{2}}\right)$, with some centered stationary random process $d_{0}$, in [5] and [6], respectively.

We here remark some provable facts which are not dealt with in this paper. Related to standing wave solutions $v(x, t)=e^{i \omega t} f(x), \omega \in \mathbb{R}$, of the averaged equation (1.4), a constrained minimization problem is well studied. The existence of minimizers can be found in [10, 19 when $d_{\mathrm{av}} \geq 0$. One can easily show that every minimizer is a weak solution of the corresponding Euler-Lagrange equation. Each weak solution and its Fourier transform decay exponentially, which can be proven by modifying the proofs in [13, 17] a little. Particularly, every minimizer is smooth. Moreover, the set of ground states is orbitally stable, see [11, 18] as well as [8]. In the case $d_{\mathrm{av}}>0$, using the averaging theorem and the orbital stability, it is possible to obtain the stable soliton-like solution for (1.2).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we prove Theorem 1.1, the global wellposedness result in $H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$. We start by showing the local well-posedness in $H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$ and the global existence in $L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$. Although we do not have the energy conservation, we prove the existence of a global solution in $H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$ based on the mass conservation and the boundedness of the mixed norm of the solution for Strichartz admissible pairs. In Section 3, we prove Theorem [1.2, the averaging theorem. In Appendix A, we gather basic properties of the free Schrödinger time evolution to prove Theorem 1.1.

## 2. Well-Posedness

To begin with, let us introduce some notations. For $1 \leq p<\infty$, we use $L^{p}(\mathbb{R})$ to denote the Banach space of functions $f$ whose norm

$$
\|f\|_{L^{p}}:=\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}}|f(x)|^{p} d x\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}
$$

is finite with the essential supremum instead when $p=\infty$. The space $L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ is a Hilbert space with scalar product given by $\langle f, g\rangle=\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \overline{g(x)} d x$. We use $L_{t}^{q}\left(J, L_{x}^{p}(I)\right)$ to denote, for $1 \leq p, q<\infty$ and intervals $I, J \subset \mathbb{R}$, the Banach space of all functions $u$ with the mixed norm

$$
\|u\|_{L_{t}^{q}\left(J, L_{x}^{p}(I)\right)}:=\left(\int_{J}\left(\int_{I}|u(x, t)|^{p} d x\right)^{\frac{q}{p}} d t\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}
$$

If $p=\infty$ or $q=\infty$, use the usual modification. For notational simplicity, we use $L^{q}\left(J, L^{p}\right)$ for $L_{t}^{q}\left(J, L_{x}^{p}(\mathbb{R})\right)$. We say that $u \in L_{\text {loc }}^{q}\left(J, L^{p}\right)$ when $u \in L^{q}\left(\widetilde{J}, L^{p}\right)$ for every bounded interval $\widetilde{J} \subset J$.

The Fourier transform on $\mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$
\widehat{f}(\xi):=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i x \xi} f(x) d x
$$

for $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, the Schwartz space of infinitely smooth, rapidly decreasing functions. For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the Sobolev space $H^{s}(\mathbb{R})$ is defined as the space of all tempered distributions $f \in S^{\prime}(\mathbb{R})$ for which

$$
\|f\|_{H^{s}}:=\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left(1+\xi^{2}\right)^{s}|\widehat{f}(\xi)|^{2} d \xi\right)^{1 / 2}<\infty
$$

For a Banach space $X$ with norm $\|\cdot\|_{X}$ and an interval $J, C(J, X)$ is the space of all continuous functions $u: J \rightarrow X$. When $J$ is compact, it is a Banach space with norm

$$
\|u\|_{C(J, X)}=\sup _{t \in J}\|u(t)\|_{X}
$$

and $C^{1}(J, X)$ is the Banach space of all continuously differentiable functions $u: J \rightarrow X$.
Let $T_{t}$ denote the solution operator for the free Schrödinger equation in spatial dimension one. In terms of the Fourier transform, this is given by

$$
\widehat{T_{t} f}(\xi)=\widehat{e^{i t \partial_{x}^{2} f}}(\xi)=e^{-i t \xi^{2}} \widehat{f}(\xi)
$$

for $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, thus, one can express

$$
T_{t} f(x)=e^{i t \partial_{x}^{2}} f(x)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i x \xi} e^{-i t \xi^{2}} \widehat{f}(\xi) d \xi
$$

It is a unitary operator on $L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ and also on $H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$. Therefore, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$
\left\|T_{t} f\right\|_{L^{2}}=\|f\|_{L^{2}} \quad \text { and } \quad\left\|T_{t} f\right\|_{H^{1}}=\|f\|_{H^{1}}
$$

We use the notation $f \lesssim g$ when there exists a positive constant $C$ such that $f \leq C g$.
Now we prove the well-posedness of the Cauchy problem (1.2). Since the proof does not rely on the factor $\varepsilon$ in (1.2), we only consider the case $\varepsilon=1$,

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
i \partial_{t} u+\left(d_{\mathrm{av}}+d_{0}(t)\right) \partial_{x}^{2} u+G(t)|u|^{2} u=0  \tag{2.1}\\
u(x, 0)=u_{0}(x)
\end{array}\right.
$$

or, equivalently,

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
i \partial_{t} v+d_{\mathrm{av}} \partial_{x}^{2} v+G(t) T_{D(t)}^{-1}\left(\left|T_{D(t)} v\right|^{2} T_{D(t)} v\right)=0  \tag{2.2}\\
v(x, 0)=u_{0}(x)
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $u=T_{D(t)} v$. We first prove the local existence of a unique solution for the integral equation of (2.2),

$$
\begin{equation*}
v(t)=e^{i t d_{\mathrm{av}} \partial_{x}^{2}} u_{0}+i \int_{0}^{t} e^{i\left(t-t^{\prime}\right) d_{\mathrm{av}} \partial_{x}^{2}} Q\left(v\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right) d t^{\prime} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $u_{0} \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$, where

$$
Q(v)(t)=G(t) T_{D(t)}^{-1}\left(\left|T_{D(t)} v(t)\right|^{2} T_{D(t)} v(t)\right)
$$

Here and below, we use $C$ to denote various constants.

Lemma 2.1. For every $f, g \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|Q(f)(t)\|_{H^{1}} \lesssim\|G\|_{L^{\infty}}\|f\|_{H^{1}}^{3} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|Q(f)(t)-Q(g)(t)\|_{H^{1}} \lesssim\|G\|_{L^{\infty}}\left(\|f\|_{H^{1}}^{2}+\|g\|_{H^{1}}^{2}\right)\|f-g\|_{H^{1}} . \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. We define, for every $f_{1}, f_{2}, f_{3} \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$
Q\left(f_{1}, f_{2}, f_{3}\right)(t):=G(t) T_{D(t)}^{-1}\left(T_{D(t)} f_{1} \overline{T_{D(t)} f_{2}} T_{D(t)} f_{3}\right),
$$

which is multi-linear. Note that $Q(f)(t)=Q(f, f, f)(t)$ for any $f \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$. Since

$$
\|f g\|_{H^{1}} \leq C\|f\|_{H^{1}}\|g\|_{H^{1}}
$$

and $T_{D(s)}$ is unitary on $H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|Q\left(f_{1}, f_{2}, f_{3}\right)(t)\right\|_{H^{1}} \lesssim\|G\|_{L^{\infty}}\left\|f_{1}\right\|_{H^{1}}\left\|f_{2}\right\|_{H^{1}}\left\|f_{3}\right\|_{H^{1}} \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

which proves (2.4). Observing

$$
Q(f)(t)-Q(g)(t)=Q(f-g, f, f)(t)+Q(g, f-g, f)(t)+Q(g, g, f-g)(t),
$$

one can easily obtain (2.5) from (2.6).
Proposition 2.2. Let $d_{\mathrm{av}} \in \mathbb{R}$. For every $K>0$, there exist $M_{ \pm}>0$ such that for every initial datum $u_{0} \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$ with $\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq K$, there is a unique solution $v \in \mathcal{C}\left(\left[-M_{-}, M_{+}\right], H^{1}\right)$ of (2.3). Moreover,

$$
\|v(t)\|_{H^{1}} \leq 2 K \quad \text { for all } t \in\left[-M_{-}, M_{+}\right] .
$$

Corollary 2.3. Let $d_{\mathrm{av}} \in \mathbb{R}$. For any initial datum $u_{0} \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$, there exist maximal life times $T_{ \pm} \in(0, \infty]$ such that there is a unique solution $v \in \mathcal{C}\left(\left(-T_{-}, T_{+}\right), H^{1}\right)$ of (2.3). Moreover, the blow-up alternative for solutions holds: if $T_{+}$is finite, then

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow T_{+}}\|v(t)\|_{H^{1}}=\infty
$$

and if $T_{-}$is finite, then

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow-T_{-}}\|v(t)\|_{H^{1}}=\infty
$$

Proof of Proposition 2.2. Without loss of generality, we assume that $t>0$.
To prove the existence of a solution, we use a fixed point argument. For each $M>0$ and $a>0$, let

$$
B_{M, a}=\left\{v \in \mathcal{C}\left([0, M], H^{1}\right):\|v\|_{\mathcal{C}\left([0, M], H^{1}\right)} \leq a\right\}
$$

be equipped with the distance

$$
d(v, w)=\|v-w\|_{\mathcal{C}\left([0, M], H^{1}\right)} .
$$

Let $K>0$ and $u_{0} \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$ with $\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq K$ be fixed. Define the map $\Phi$ on $B_{M, a}$ by

$$
\Phi(v)(t)=e^{i t d_{\mathrm{av}} \partial_{x}^{2}} u_{0}+i \int_{0}^{t} e^{i\left(t-t^{\prime}\right) d_{\mathrm{av}} \partial_{x}^{2}} Q(v)\left(t^{\prime}\right) d t^{\prime}
$$

It follows from Lemma 2.1 that if $v(t), w(t) \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$, then

$$
\|\Phi(v)(t)\|_{H^{1}} \leq\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}}+\int_{0}^{t}\left\|Q(v)\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}} d t^{\prime} \leq\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}}+C \int_{0}^{M}\left\|v\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}}^{3} d t^{\prime}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
\|\Phi(v)(t)-\Phi(w)(t)\|_{H^{1}} & \leq \int_{0}^{t}\left\|Q(v)\left(t^{\prime}\right)-Q(w)\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}} d t^{\prime}  \tag{2.7}\\
& \leq C \int_{0}^{M}\left(\left\|v\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}}^{2}+\left\|w\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}}^{2}\right)\left\|v\left(t^{\prime}\right)-w\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}} d t^{\prime}
\end{align*}
$$

for every $0 \leq t \leq M$. Therefore, there is a positive constant $C$ such that for all $v, w \in B_{M, a}$,

$$
\|\Phi(v)\|_{\mathcal{C}\left([0, M], H^{1}\right)} \leq K+C M a^{3}
$$

and

$$
d(\Phi(v), \Phi(w)) \leq C M a^{2} d(v, w)
$$

Now set $a=2 K$ and choose $M_{+}>0$ satisfying

$$
C M_{+}(2 K)^{2}<\frac{1}{2}
$$

then we obtain that $\Phi$ is a contraction from $B_{M_{+}, 2 K}$ into itself. Thus, Banach's contraction mapping theorem shows that there exists a unique solution $v$ of (2.3) in $B_{M_{+}, 2 K}$ and, moreover,

$$
\|v\|_{\mathcal{C}\left(\left[0, M_{+}\right], H^{1}\right)} \leq 2 K .
$$

To show the uniqueness of a solution, let $v_{1}, v_{2} \in \mathcal{C}\left(\left[0, M_{+}\right], H^{1}\right)$ be solutions of (2.3). Then it follows from (2.5) that for every $t \in\left[0, M_{+}\right]$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|v_{1}(t)-v_{2}(t)\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq C\left(\left\|v_{1}\right\|_{\mathcal{C}\left(\left[0, M_{+}\right], H^{1}\right)}^{2}+\left\|v_{2}\right\|_{\mathcal{C}\left(\left[0, M_{+}\right], H^{1}\right)}^{2}\right) \int_{0}^{t}\left\|v_{1}\left(t^{\prime}\right)-v_{2}\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}} d t^{\prime} \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

which implies $\left\|v_{1}-v_{2}\right\|_{\mathcal{C}\left(\left[0, M_{+}\right], H^{1}\right)}=0$.
Proof of Corollary 2.3. Given the initial datum $0 \neq u_{0} \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$, let us define the maximal life time $T_{+}$by

$$
T_{+}=\sup \left\{M>0: \text { a unique solution of (2.3) exists in } \mathcal{C}\left([0, M], H^{1}\right)\right\} .
$$

Then it immediately follows from Proposition 2.2 that $T_{+} \in(0, \infty]$.
Note that if a solution exists in $\mathcal{C}\left([0, M], H^{1}\right)$ for any $M>0$, then it is a unique solution in $\mathcal{C}\left([0, M], H^{1}\right)$, by the same argument in the proof of the uniqueness in Proposition 2.2, Thus, there exists a unique solution $v \in \mathcal{C}\left(\left[0, T_{+}\right), H^{1}\right)$ of (2.3). To prove the blow-up alternative, let $T_{+}<\infty$. Suppose to the contrary that there exist a positive number $K$ and a sequence $\left\{t_{j}\right\}$ in $\left(0, T_{+}\right)$such that $\left\|v\left(t_{j}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq K$ and $t_{j} \rightarrow T_{+}$as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Then, by Proposition [2.2, there exists $M>0$ such that a unique solution of (2.3) with the initial datum $v\left(t_{j}\right)$ exists in $\mathcal{C}\left(\left[t_{j}, t_{j}+M\right], H^{1}\right)$ for all $j$. Since we can choose $j^{*}$ such that $t_{j^{*}}+M>T_{+}$, this contradicts the definition of $T_{+}$. The case of $T_{-}$can be done similarly.

Next, we show the continuous dependence of the solutions for (2.3) on the initial data to finish the local well-posedness. Indeed, the map $u_{0} \mapsto v(t)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous on $H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$.
Proposition 2.4. Let $d_{\mathrm{av}} \in \mathbb{R}$. For every $K>0$, there exists a positive constant $C$ such that for all initial data $v_{0}, w_{0} \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$ with $\left\|v_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}},\left\|w_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq K$, we have

$$
\|v-w\|_{\mathcal{C}\left(\left[-M_{-}, M_{+}\right], H^{1}\right)} \leq e^{C \max \left(M_{-}, M_{+}\right)}\left\|v_{0}-w_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}},
$$

where $v$ and $w$ are the corresponding local solutions of (2.3) with initial data $v_{0}, w_{0}$ on the time interval $\left[-M_{-}, M_{+}\right]$of existence, guaranteed by Proposition 2.2.

Proof. We consider positive $t$ only and fix $t \in\left(0, M_{+}\right]$. From Proposition [2.2, we know that

$$
\|v(t)\|_{H^{1}} \leq 2 K \quad \text { and } \quad\|w(t)\|_{H^{1}} \leq 2 K
$$

By a similar argument of (2.7), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|v(t)-w(t)\|_{H^{1}} & \leq\left\|v_{0}-w_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}}+\int_{0}^{t}\left\|Q(v)\left(t^{\prime}\right)-Q(w)\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}} d t^{\prime} \\
& \leq\left\|v_{0}-w_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}}+C \int_{0}^{t}\left(\left\|v\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}}^{2}+\left\|w\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}}^{2}\right)\left\|v\left(t^{\prime}\right)-w\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}} d t^{\prime} \\
& \leq\left\|v_{0}-w_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}}+C K^{2} \int_{0}^{t}\left\|v\left(t^{\prime}\right)-w\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}} d t^{\prime} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, it follows from Gronwall's inequality that

$$
\|v(t)-w(t)\|_{H^{1}} \leq e^{C K^{2} t}\left\|v_{0}-w_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq e^{C K^{2} M_{+}}\left\|v_{0}-w_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}}
$$

which completes the proof.
Remark 2.5. If we define the energy $E(v(t))$ of the solution $v$ for (2.2) by

$$
E(v(t))=\frac{d_{\mathrm{av}}}{2}\left\|\partial_{x} v(t)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}-\frac{G(t)}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}}\left|T_{D(t)} v(t)\right|^{4} d x
$$

then, however, the energy is neither conserved nor decreasing. Indeed, its derivative is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d E(v(t))}{d t}=-\frac{1}{4} G^{\prime}(t) \int_{\mathbb{R}}\left|T_{D(t)} v(t)\right|^{4} d x \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R} \backslash 2 \mathbb{Z}$. Note that $E(v(t))$ is not differentiable nor continuous at $t \in 2 \mathbb{Z}$.
If there is no fiber loss nor amplification, i.e., $G \equiv 1$, then $T_{ \pm}=\infty$ by the conservation of energy and the blow-up alternative, which immediately gives the global well-posedness. However, as you see in (2.9), the energy is no longer conserved in our case.

Now we consider the integral form of the Cauchy problem (2.1)

$$
\begin{equation*}
u(t)=U(0, t) u_{0}+i \int_{0}^{t} U\left(t^{\prime}, t\right)\left(G\left(t^{\prime}\right)\left|u\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right|^{2} u\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right) d t^{\prime} \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here and below, $U(0, t)$ is the solution operator for the linear Schrödinger equation associated with (2.1), i.e., for every $f \in L^{2}(\mathbb{R}), U(0, t) f$ solves the initial value problem

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
i \partial_{t} w+\left(d_{\mathrm{av}}+d_{0}(t)\right) \partial_{x}^{2} w=0 \\
w(x, 0)=f(x)
\end{array}\right.
$$

Next we define, for all $t_{0}, t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
U\left(t_{0}, t\right):=U(0, t)\left(U\left(0, t_{0}\right)\right)^{-1} \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

on $L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$. Then $U\left(t_{0}, t\right)$ is unitary on $L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ and also on $H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$, and therefore, for every $t, t_{0} \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$
\left\|U\left(t_{0}, t\right) f\right\|_{L^{2}}=\|f\|_{L^{2}} \quad \text { and } \quad\left\|U\left(t_{0}, t\right) f\right\|_{H^{1}}=\|f\|_{H^{1}}
$$

For more properties of $U\left(t_{0}, t\right)$, see Appendix A .
Note that, given $u_{0} \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$, there exists a unique solution $v \in \mathcal{C}\left(\left(-T_{-}, T_{+}\right), H^{1}\right)$ for equation (2.3) by Corollary 2.3. If we let $u=T_{D(t)} v$, then $u \in \mathcal{C}\left(\left(-T_{-}, T_{+}\right), H^{1}\right)$ solves equation (2.10) and the blow-up alternative holds since $\left\{T_{D(t)}: t \in \mathbb{R}\right\}$ is a strongly continuous group of unitary operators on $H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover, since $H^{1}(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$, we
have $u \in L^{\infty}\left(\left(-T_{-}, T_{+}\right), L^{2}\right) \cap L_{\mathrm{loc}}^{4}\left(\left(-T_{-}, T_{+}\right), L^{\infty}\right)$ and, therefore, by the Riesz-Thorin interpolation Theorem,

$$
\begin{equation*}
u \in L_{\mathrm{loc}}^{q}\left(\left(-T_{-}, T_{+}\right), L^{p}\right) \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every admissible pair $(p, q)$. Before we prove the global existence of a solution, we show the existence of a unique global solution of $(2.10)$ with the initial datum $u_{0} \in L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ when $d_{\text {av }} \neq \pm 1$. As usual, we use the Strichartz estimates(Lemma A.2) to prove the existence of a local solution for (2.10), see [7, 20] for example.

Proposition 2.6. Let $d_{\mathrm{av}} \neq \pm 1$. For any $u_{0} \in L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$, there exists a unique global solution $u \in \mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{R}, L^{2}\right) \cap L_{\text {loc }}^{6}\left(\mathbb{R}, L^{6}\right)$ of (2.10). Moreover, the solution $u$ satisfies

$$
\|u(t)\|_{L^{2}}=\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}} \quad \text { for all } t \in \mathbb{R}
$$

Furthermore, for every $M>0$ and admissible pair $(p, q)$, there exists a positive constant $C$ depending on $d_{\mathrm{av}}$ and $\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|u\|_{L^{q}\left([-M, M], L^{p}\right)} \leq C \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $0 \neq u_{0} \in L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ be fixed. Without loss of generality, we consider positive $t$ only. First, to prove the existence of a unique solution in $\mathcal{C}\left([0,1], L^{2}\right) \cap L^{6}\left([0,1], L^{6}\right)$ of (2.10), let us define the closed ball

$$
B_{M, a}:=\left\{u \in L^{\infty}\left([0, M], L^{2}\right) \cap L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right):\|u\|_{L^{\infty}\left([0, M], L^{2}\right)}+\|u\|_{L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)} \leq a\right\}
$$

equipped with the distance

$$
d(u, v)=\|u-v\|_{L^{\infty}\left([0, M], L^{2}\right)}+\|u-v\|_{L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)}
$$

for each $0<M \leq 1$ and $a>0$. Define the map $\Phi$ on $B_{M, a}$ by

$$
\Phi(u)(t)=U(0, t) u_{0}+i \int_{0}^{t} U\left(t^{\prime}, t\right)\left(G\left(t^{\prime}\right)\left|u\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right|^{2} u\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right) d t^{\prime}
$$

For appropriate values of $M$ and $a$, the map $\Phi$ is a contraction on $\left(B_{M, a}, d\right)$. Indeed, it follows from the Stricharz estimates(Lemma A.2) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$
\begin{align*}
\|\Phi(u)\|_{L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)} & \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}}+C\left\|G(\cdot)|u|^{2} u\right\|_{L^{1}\left([0, M], L^{2}\right)} \\
& \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}}+C M^{1 / 2}\|u\|_{L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)}^{3} \tag{2.14}
\end{align*}
$$

On the other hand, using the unitarity of $U(0, t)$ on $L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ and the argument used in (2.14), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\Phi(u)\|_{L^{\infty}\left([0, M], L^{2}\right)} & \leq\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}}+C\left\|G(\cdot)|u|^{2} u\right\|_{L^{1}\left([0, M], L^{2}\right)} \\
& \leq\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}}+C M^{1 / 2}\|u\|_{L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)}^{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

Next, noting

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\left|z_{1}\right|^{2} z_{1}-\left|z_{2}\right|^{2} z_{2}\right| \leq C\left(\left|z_{1}\right|^{2}+\left|z_{2}\right|^{2}\right)\left|z_{1}-z_{2}\right| \quad \text { for all } z_{1}, z_{2} \in \mathbb{C} \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

by the same arguments above, we get

$$
\begin{align*}
\|\Phi(u)-\Phi(v)\|_{L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)} & \leq C\left\|G(\cdot)\left(|u|^{2} u-|v|^{2} v\right)\right\|_{L^{1}\left([0, M], L^{2}\right)} \\
& \leq C \int_{0}^{M}\left(\|u(t)\|_{L^{6}}^{2}+\|v(t)\|_{L^{6}}^{2}\right)\|u(t)-v(t)\|_{L^{6}} d t  \tag{2.16}\\
& \leq C M^{1 / 2}\left(\|u\|_{L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)}^{2}+\|v\|_{L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)}^{2}\right)\|u-v\|_{L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\Phi(u)-\Phi(v)\|_{L^{\infty}\left([0, M], L^{2}\right)} & \leq C\left\|G(\cdot)\left(|u|^{2} u-|v|^{2} v\right)\right\|_{L^{1}\left([0, M], L^{2}\right)} \\
& \leq C M^{1 / 2}\left(\|u\|_{L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)}^{2}+\|v\|_{L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)}^{2}\right)\|u-v\|_{L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, we have a positive constant $C$ such that for all $u, v \in B_{M, a}$,

$$
\|\Phi(u)\|_{L^{\infty}\left([0, M], L^{2}\right)}+\|\Phi(u)\|_{L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)} \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}}+C M^{1 / 2} a^{3}
$$

and

$$
d(\Phi(u), \Phi(v)) \leq C M^{1 / 2} a^{2} d(u, v) .
$$

Now set $a=2 C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}}$ and choose $0<M \leq 1$ satisfying

$$
C M^{1 / 2}\left(2 C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}}\right)^{2}<\frac{1}{2}
$$

then we obtain that $\Phi$ is a contraction from $B_{M, 2 C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}}}$ into itself. Thus, $\Phi$ has a unique fixed point $u \in B_{M, 2 C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}}}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|u\|_{L^{\infty}\left([0, M], L^{2}\right)}+\|u\|_{L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)} \leq 2 C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}} . \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, the Stricharz estimates guarantee that $u$ is even in $\mathcal{C}\left([0, M], L^{2}\right) \cap L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)$.
To prove the uniqueness in $\mathcal{C}\left([0, M], L^{2}\right) \cap L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)$, it is enough to find a small $\delta>0$ so that the uniqueness is guaranteed in $\mathcal{C}\left([0, \delta], L^{2}\right) \cap L^{6}\left([0, \delta], L^{6}\right)$. Suppose that $u_{1}, u_{2} \in \mathcal{C}\left([0, \delta], L^{2}\right) \cap L^{6}\left([0, \delta], L^{6}\right)$ solve (2.10), for $0<\delta \leq M$. It follows from (2.16) that

$$
\left\|u_{1}-u_{2}\right\|_{L^{6}\left([0, \delta], L^{6}\right)} \leq C \delta^{1 / 2}\left(\left\|u_{1}\right\|_{L^{6}\left([0, \delta], L^{6}\right)}^{2}+\left\|u_{2}\right\|_{\left.L^{6}([0, \delta]] L^{6}\right)}^{2}\right)\left\|u_{1}-u_{2}\right\|_{L^{6}\left([0, \delta], L^{6}\right)} .
$$

Choosing $\delta>0$ small enough, we obtain

$$
\left\|u_{1}-u_{2}\right\|_{L^{6}\left([0, \delta], L^{6}\right)} \leq \frac{1}{2}\left\|u_{1}-u_{2}\right\|_{L^{6}\left([0, \delta], L^{6}\right)},
$$

which implies that $u_{1}=u_{2}$ on $\mathcal{C}\left([0, \delta], L^{2}\right) \cap L^{6}\left([0, \delta], L^{6}\right)$.
Let $u \in \mathcal{C}\left([0, M], L^{2}\right) \cap L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)$ be a unique solution of (2.10). We now show that $u \in L^{q}\left([0, M], L^{p}\right)$ for every admissible pair $(p, q)$. Applying the Strichartz estimates to (2.10) and the Hölder inequality with exponents $\frac{5}{2}$ and $\frac{5}{3}$ in $x$-integral and $t$-integral, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{L^{q}\left([0, M], L^{p}\right)} & \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}}+C\left\|G(\cdot)|u|^{2} u\right\|_{L^{6 / 5}\left([0, M], L^{6 / 5}\right)} \\
& \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}}+C\left(\int_{0}^{M}\|u(t)\|_{L^{2}}^{6 / 5}\|u(t)\|_{L^{6}}^{12 / 5} d t\right)^{5 / 6} \\
& \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}}+C M^{1 / 2}\|u\|_{L^{\infty}\left([0, M], L^{2}\right)}\|u\|_{L^{6}\left([0, M], L^{6}\right)}^{2} \\
& \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}}+C M^{1 / 2}\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{3},
\end{aligned}
$$

where (2.17) is used. Moreover, since $u$ satisfies the mass conservation, that is,

$$
\|u(t)\|_{L^{2}}=\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}} \quad \text { for all } t \in[0, M],
$$

one can iterate this argument to obtain a unique solution in $\mathcal{C}\left([0,1], L^{2}\right) \cap L^{6}\left([0,1], L^{6}\right)$ of (2.10). Iterating this process, we obtain a unique global solution and it satisfies (2.13).

Now we give the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem [1.1]. Let $u_{0} \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$ be fixed and let us consider positive times only. We first consider the case $d_{\mathrm{av}} \neq \pm 1$. Let $u \in \mathcal{C}\left([0, \infty), L^{2}\right) \cap L_{\text {loc }}^{6}\left([0, \infty), L^{6}\right)$ be the solution of (2.10), obtained in Proposition [2.6, On the other hand, Corollary 2.3 gives us the solution $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{C}\left(\left[0, T_{+}\right), H^{1}\right)$ for (2.10), where $T_{+}>0$ is the maximal life time. Moreover, we have $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{C}\left(\left[0, T_{+}\right), L^{2}\right) \cap L_{\text {loc }}^{6}\left(\left[0, T_{+}\right), L^{6}\right)$ from (2.12). By the uniqueness of a solution in $\mathcal{C}\left(\left[0, T_{+}\right), L^{2}\right) \cap L_{\text {loc }}^{6}\left(\left[0, T_{+}\right), L^{6}\right), u=\tilde{u}$ and, therefore, $u$ is also in $\mathcal{C}\left(\left[0, T_{+}\right), H^{1}\right)$ and it remains to show $T_{+}=\infty$.

Suppose to the contrary that $T_{+}<\infty$ and choose $n \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$ such that $n<T_{+} \leq n+1$. It follows from (2.13) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|u\|_{L^{q}\left(\left[n, T_{+}\right], L^{p}\right)}<\infty \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every admissible pair $(p, q)$.
For now, we assume to have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d}{d t}\left\|\partial_{x} u(t)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}=-2 G(t) \operatorname{Im} \int_{\mathbb{R}}\left(u(t) \overline{\partial_{x} u(t)}\right)^{2} d x \tag{2.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $t \in\left(n, T_{+}\right)$. Then, for every $t \in\left(n, T_{+}\right)$,

$$
\frac{d}{d t}\left\|\partial_{x} u(t)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \leq 2\|u(t)\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}\left\|\partial_{x} u(t)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}
$$

and, therefore, by Gronwall's inequality and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\partial_{x} u(t)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} & \leq\left\|\partial_{x} u(n)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \exp \left(2 \int_{n}^{t}\left\|u\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2} d t^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq\left\|\partial_{x} u(n)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \exp \left(2\|u\|_{L^{4}\left(\left[n, T_{+}\right), L^{\infty}\right)}^{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, we use (2.18) and the mass conservation to obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{n<t<T_{+}}\|u(t)\|_{H^{1}}^{2}<\infty \tag{2.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

which contradicts the blow-up alternative.
To finish this case, it remains to show (2.19). We use the twisted solution

$$
w(t)=(U(n, t))^{-1} u(t) .
$$

Since $u$ solves (2.10), $w$ solves

$$
w(t)=u(n)+i \int_{n}^{t}\left(U\left(n, t^{\prime}\right)\right)^{-1} G\left(t^{\prime}\right)\left|u\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right|^{2} u\left(t^{\prime}\right) d t^{\prime}
$$

and, therefore, $w$ is differentiable on $\left(n, T_{+}\right)$and

$$
\dot{w}(t)=\partial_{t} w(t)=i(U(n, t))^{-1} G(t)|u(t)|^{2} u(t)
$$

which is in $H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$. Using this, one sees that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d t}\left\|\partial_{x} u(t)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}=\frac{d}{d t}\left\|\partial_{x} w(t)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} & =2 \operatorname{Re}\left\langle\partial_{x} w(t), \partial_{x} \dot{w}(t)\right\rangle \\
& =-2 G(t) \operatorname{Im}\left\langle\partial_{x} u(t), \partial_{x}\left(|u(t)|^{2} u(t)\right)\right\rangle
\end{aligned}
$$

which yields (2.19).
Next, we assume that $d_{\mathrm{av}}=1$ and solve (2.1) recursively. First, we find a solution in $\mathcal{C}\left([0,1], H^{1}\right)$ of (2.1), i.e.,

$$
\begin{cases}i \partial_{t} u+2 \partial_{x}^{2} u+G(t)|u|^{2} u=0 & \text { for } t \in(0,1) \\ u=u_{0} & \text { for } t=0\end{cases}
$$

It is well-known that there exists a unique solution $u \in \mathcal{C}\left([0,1], H^{1}\right)$, for example, see [9]. Denote $u(1)$ by $u_{1}$ and solve the ordinary differential equation with the initial datum $u_{1}$

$$
\begin{cases}i \partial_{t} u+G(t)|u|^{2} u=0 & \text { for } t \in(1,2)  \tag{2.21}\\ u=u_{1} & \text { for } t=1\end{cases}
$$

of which solution is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
u(t)=u_{1} \exp \left(i\left|u_{1}\right| \int_{1}^{t} G\left(t^{\prime}\right) d t^{\prime}\right) . \tag{2.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here, we used that $|u(t)|=\left|u_{1}\right|$ for all $t \in(1,2)$. Indeed, multiplying the ordinary equation in (2.21) by $\bar{u}$ and taking the imaginary part of the resulting identity, we obtain $\partial_{t}|u(t)|^{2}=0$ for all $t \in(1,2)$. Noting that (2.22) has the limit at $t=2$, we continuously extend $u$ to $[1,2]$. Repeating this process completes the proof. The case $d_{\mathrm{av}}=-1$ is done similarly.

Remark 2.7. To get (2.19), one can use a formal calculation as follows:
$\left.\frac{d}{d t}\left\|\partial_{x} u(t)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}=-2 \operatorname{Re}\left\langle\partial_{x} u, \partial_{x} \partial_{t} u\right\rangle=2 \operatorname{Im}\left(\left(d_{\mathrm{av}}+d_{0}(t)\right)\left\langle\partial_{x} u, \partial_{x} \partial_{x}^{2} u\right\rangle+\left.G(t)\left\langle\partial_{x} u, \partial_{x}\right| u\right|^{2} u\right\rangle\right)$.
However, the scalar product $\left\langle\partial_{x} u, \partial_{x} \partial_{x}^{2} u\right\rangle$ in $L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ may not be defined for $u \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$ since $\partial_{x} u \in L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\partial_{x} \partial_{x}^{2} u=\partial_{x}^{3} u \in H^{-2}(\mathbb{R})$. Thus, as in [11], we used the twisting argument, see, also, [4, 24].

## 3. Averaging theorem

In this section, to prove the averaging theorem (Theorem 1.2), we compare the solutions of equations (1.3) and (1.4)

$$
\begin{equation*}
i \partial_{t} v+d_{\mathrm{av}} \partial_{x}^{2} v+Q_{\varepsilon}(v)=0, \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
i \partial_{t} v+d_{\mathrm{av}} \partial_{x}^{2} v+\langle Q\rangle(v)=0 \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

with close initial data $u_{0}, v_{0} \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$, where the nonlinearities are given by

$$
Q_{\varepsilon}(v):=G\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) T_{D(t / \varepsilon)}^{-1}\left(\left|T_{D(t / \varepsilon)} v\right|^{2} T_{D(t / \varepsilon)} v\right)
$$

and

$$
\langle Q\rangle(v):=\int_{0}^{1} T_{r}^{-1}\left(\left|T_{r} v\right|^{2} T_{r} v\right) \psi(r) d r,
$$

respectively. Recall that

$$
\psi(r)=e^{-\Gamma} \cosh \Gamma(r-1)
$$

We, first, show a lemma which is inspired by the proof of Theorem 4.1 in [28].
Lemma 3.1. For every $M>0$, if $v \in \mathcal{C}\left([-M, M], H^{1}\right)$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{t} e^{i d_{\mathrm{av}}\left(t-t^{\prime}\right) \partial_{x}^{2}} Q_{\varepsilon}\left(v\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right) d t^{\prime} \rightarrow \int_{0}^{t} e^{i d_{\mathrm{av}}\left(t-t^{\prime}\right) \partial_{x}^{2}}\langle Q\rangle\left(v\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right) d t^{\prime} \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

in $\mathcal{C}\left([-M, M], H^{1}\right)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.
Proof. We consider positive times only. Let $R_{\varepsilon}(v):=Q_{\varepsilon}(v)-\langle Q\rangle(v)$. Then, by the Plancherel identity, its Fourier transform in $x$ can be expressed by

$$
\widehat{R_{\varepsilon}(v)}(\xi, t)=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \delta\left(\xi_{1}-\xi_{2}+\xi_{3}-\xi\right) A_{\varepsilon}\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}, \xi_{3}, \xi, t\right) \hat{v}\left(\xi_{1}, t\right) \overline{\hat{v}\left(\xi_{2}, t\right)} \hat{v}\left(\xi_{3}, t\right) d \xi_{1} d \xi_{2} d \xi_{3}
$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in[0, M]$, where

$$
A_{\varepsilon}\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}, \xi_{3}, \xi, t\right):=G(t / \varepsilon) e^{-i D(t / \varepsilon)\left(\xi_{1}^{2}-\xi_{2}^{2}+\xi_{3}^{2}-\xi^{2}\right)}-\int_{0}^{1} e^{-i r\left(\xi_{1}^{2}-\xi_{2}^{2}+\xi_{3}^{2}-\xi^{2}\right)} \psi(r) d r
$$

Now, we define $B_{\varepsilon}: \mathbb{R}^{4} \times[0, M] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$
B_{\varepsilon}\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}, \xi_{3}, \xi, t\right):=\int_{0}^{t} A_{\varepsilon}\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}, \xi_{3}, \xi, t^{\prime}\right) d t^{\prime}
$$

then

$$
B_{\varepsilon}\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}, \xi_{3}, \xi, t\right)=\int_{0}^{t} A_{1}\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}, \xi_{3}, \xi, t^{\prime} / \varepsilon\right) d t^{\prime}=\varepsilon \int_{0}^{t / \varepsilon} A_{1}\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}, \xi_{3}, \xi, t^{\prime}\right) d t^{\prime}
$$

and therefore,

$$
\left|B_{\varepsilon}\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}, \xi_{3}, \xi, t\right)\right| \leq \varepsilon \int_{0}^{2}\left|A_{1}\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}, \xi_{3}, \xi, t^{\prime}\right)\right| d t^{\prime} \leq 4 \varepsilon
$$

since $A_{1}$ is a 2 -periodic function in $t$ with mean zero and bounded by 2 . Thus,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|B_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{4} \times[0, M]\right)} \leq 4 \varepsilon \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the same argument as in (2.7), for every $v_{1}, v_{2} \in \mathcal{C}\left([0, M], H^{1}(\mathbb{R})\right)$, we see

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\int_{0} e^{i d_{\mathrm{av}}\left(\cdot-t^{\prime}\right) \partial_{x}^{2}}\left(Q_{\varepsilon}\left(v_{1}\right)\left(t^{\prime}\right)-Q_{\varepsilon}\left(v_{2}\right)\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right) d t^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{\infty}\left([0, M], H^{1}\right)} \leq C M\left\|v_{1}-v_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}\left([0, M], H^{1}\right)} \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The estimate (3.5) also holds when $Q_{\varepsilon}$ is replaced by $\langle Q\rangle$. Therefore, by a density argument, it suffices to prove (3.3) for $v \in \mathcal{C}^{1}([0, M], \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}))$ only. Since

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} B_{\varepsilon}\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}, \xi_{3}, \xi, t\right)=A_{\varepsilon}\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}, \xi_{3}, \xi, t\right)
$$

for almost every $t \in[0, M]$, by the integration by parts, we obtain

$$
\int_{0}^{t} e^{i d_{\mathrm{av}}\left(t-t^{\prime}\right) \xi^{2}} \widehat{R_{\varepsilon}(v)}\left(\xi, t^{\prime}\right) d t^{\prime}=\widehat{\mathcal{I}_{1}(v)}(\xi, t)-\int_{0}^{t} e^{i \mathrm{dav}^{\left(t-t^{\prime}\right) \xi^{2}}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{I}_{2}(v)}\left(\xi, t^{\prime}\right)-i d_{\mathrm{av}} \widehat{\mathcal{I}_{3}(v)}\left(\xi, t^{\prime}\right)\right) d t^{\prime}, ., ~}
$$

where

$$
\begin{gathered}
\widehat{\mathcal{I}_{1}(v)}(\xi, t)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \delta\left(\xi_{1}-\xi_{2}+\xi_{3}-\xi\right) B_{\varepsilon}\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}, \xi_{3}, \xi, t\right) \hat{v}\left(\xi_{1}, t\right) \overline{\hat{v}\left(\xi_{2}, t\right)} \hat{v}\left(\xi_{3}, t\right) d \xi_{1} d \xi_{2} d \xi_{3} \\
\widehat{\mathcal{I}_{2}(v)}(\xi, t)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \delta\left(\xi_{1}-\xi_{2}+\xi_{3}-\xi\right) B_{\varepsilon}\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}, \xi_{3}, \xi, t\right) \partial_{t}\left(\hat{v}\left(\xi_{1}, t\right) \overline{\hat{v}\left(\xi_{2}, t\right)} \hat{v}\left(\xi_{3}, t\right)\right) d \xi_{1} d \xi_{2} d \xi_{3}
\end{gathered}
$$

and

$$
\widehat{\mathcal{I}_{3}(v)}(\xi, t)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \delta\left(\xi_{1}-\xi_{2}+\xi_{3}-\xi\right) B_{\varepsilon}\left(\xi_{1}, \xi_{2}, \xi_{3}, \xi, t\right) \xi^{2} \hat{v}\left(\xi_{1}, t\right) \overline{\hat{v}\left(\xi_{2}, t\right)} \hat{v}\left(\xi_{3}, t\right) d \xi_{1} d \xi_{2} d \xi_{3}
$$

Then, fix $t \in[0, M]$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\|\int_{0}^{t} e^{i d_{\mathrm{av}}\left(t-t^{\prime}\right) \partial_{x}^{2}} R_{\varepsilon}(v)\left(\cdot, t^{\prime}\right) d t^{\prime}\right\|_{H^{1}}=\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left(1+\xi^{2}\right)\left|\int_{0}^{t} e^{i d_{\mathrm{av}}\left(t-t^{\prime}\right) \xi^{2}} \widehat{R_{\varepsilon}(v)}\left(\xi, t^{\prime}\right) d t^{\prime}\right|^{2} d \xi\right)^{1 / 2} \\
& \lesssim\left\|\mathcal{I}_{1}(v)(\cdot, t)\right\|_{H^{1}}+\int_{0}^{t}\left(\left\|\mathcal{I}_{2}(v)\left(\cdot, t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}}+\left\|\mathcal{I}_{3}(v)\left(\cdot, t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}}\right) d t^{\prime} \tag{3.6}
\end{align*}
$$

where we use Minkowski's inequality. First, to get a bound of $\mathcal{I}_{1}(v)$, note

$$
\left|\widehat{\mathcal{I}_{1}(v)}(\xi, t)\right| \leq\left\|B_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{4} \times[0, M]\right)}\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2}} \hat{v}\left(\xi_{1}, t\right) \overline{\hat{v}\left(\xi_{2}, t\right)} \hat{v}\left(\xi-\xi_{1}+\xi_{2}, t\right) d \xi_{1} d \xi_{2}\right|
$$

for all $\xi$ and $t$. If we define $I\left(f_{1}, f_{2}, f_{3}\right)$ by its Fourier transform

$$
\widehat{I}\left(f_{1}, f_{2}, f_{3}\right)(\xi)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2}} \hat{f}_{1}\left(\xi_{1}\right) \overline{\hat{f}_{2}\left(\xi_{2}\right)} \hat{f}_{3}\left(\xi-\xi_{1}+\xi_{2}\right) d \xi_{1} d \xi_{2}
$$

for all $f_{1}, f_{2}, f_{3} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, then by a straightforward calculation, we obtain

$$
\left\|I\left(f_{1}, f_{2}, f_{3}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq C\left\|f_{1}\right\|_{H^{1}}\left\|f_{2}\right\|_{H^{1}}\left\|f_{3}\right\|_{H^{1}} .
$$

This together with (3.4), we have

$$
\left\|\mathcal{I}_{1}(v)(\cdot, t)\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq\left\|B_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{4} \times[0, M]\right)}\|I(v(t), v(t), v(t))\|_{H^{1}} \lesssim \varepsilon\|v(t)\|_{H^{1}}^{3}
$$

for all $t$. By a similar argument, we have

$$
\left\|\mathcal{I}_{2}(v)(\cdot, t)\right\|_{H^{1}} \lesssim \varepsilon\left\|\partial_{t} v(t)\right\|_{H^{1}}\|v(t)\|_{H^{1}}^{2}
$$

and

$$
\left\|\mathcal{I}_{3}(v)(\cdot, t)\right\|_{H^{1}} \lesssim \varepsilon\left(\left\|\partial_{x}^{2} v(t)\right\|_{H^{1}}\|v(t)\|_{H^{1}}^{2}+\left\|\partial_{x} v(t)\right\|_{H^{1}}^{2}\|v(t)\|_{H^{1}}\right)
$$

for all $t$. Substituting the last three inequalities into (3.6) completes the proof.
Now we are ready to give
Proof of Theorem 1.2. Fix $M>0$ and consider positive times only. Let

$$
K=2 \sup _{t \in[0, M]}\|v(t)\|_{H^{1}}
$$

and let $0<\varepsilon \leq \frac{K}{2}$ for now. Then we have $\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq K$ since $\left\|u_{0}-v_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq \varepsilon$ and $\left\|v_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq \frac{K}{2}$. Then, it follows from Proposition 2.2 that there exists $M_{+}=M_{+}(K)$, independent of $\varepsilon$, such that $v_{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{C}\left(\left[0, M_{+}\right], H^{1}(\mathbb{R})\right)$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{0<\varepsilon \leq \frac{K}{2}} \sup _{t \in\left[0, M_{+}\right]}\left\|v_{\varepsilon}(t)\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq 2 K . \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

We now prove that (1.5) holds on $\left[0, M_{+}\right]$, i.e., there exists $C>0$ such that

$$
\left\|v_{\varepsilon}-v\right\|_{\mathcal{C}\left([0, M+], H^{1}(\mathbb{R})\right)} \leq C \varepsilon .
$$

By Duhamel's formula, we have

$$
v_{\varepsilon}(t)-v(t)=e^{i d_{\mathrm{av}} t \partial_{x}^{2}}\left(u_{0}-v_{0}\right)+i \mathcal{I}_{1}(t)+i \mathcal{I}_{2}(t)
$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq M_{+}$, where

$$
\mathcal{I}_{1}(t)=\int_{0}^{t} e^{i d_{\mathrm{av}}\left(t-t^{\prime}\right) \partial_{x}^{2}}\left[Q_{\varepsilon}\left(v_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(t^{\prime}\right)-Q_{\varepsilon}(v)\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right] d t^{\prime}
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{I}_{2}(t)=\int_{0}^{t} e^{i d_{\mathrm{av}}\left(t-t^{\prime}\right) \partial_{x}^{2}}\left[Q_{\varepsilon}(v)\left(t^{\prime}\right)-\langle Q\rangle(v)\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right] d t^{\prime}
$$

It follows from Lemma 3.1 that there exists a constant $C>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{t \in\left[0, M_{+}\right]}\left\|\mathcal{I}_{2}(t)\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq C \varepsilon . \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

To bound $\mathcal{I}_{1}$, we use Minkowski's inequality and Lemma 2.1, then we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\|\mathcal{I}_{1}(t)\right\|_{H^{1}} & \leq \int_{0}^{t}\left\|Q_{\varepsilon}\left(v_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(t^{\prime}\right)-Q_{\varepsilon}(v)\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}} d t^{\prime} \\
& \lesssim \int_{0}^{t}\left(\left\|v_{\varepsilon}\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}}^{2}+\left\|v\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}}^{2}\right)\left\|v_{\varepsilon}\left(t^{\prime}\right)-v\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}} d t^{\prime} \tag{3.9}
\end{align*}
$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq M_{+}$. Since $\left\|u_{0}-v_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq \varepsilon$, it follows from (3.8) and (3.9) that, for all $0 \leq t \leq M_{+}$, there exist positive constants $C_{1}$, depending only on $K$, and $C_{2}$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|v_{\varepsilon}(t)-v(t)\right\|_{H^{1}} & \leq\left\|u_{0}-v_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}}+\left\|\mathcal{I}_{1}(t)\right\|_{H^{1}}+\left\|\mathcal{I}_{2}(t)\right\|_{H^{1}} \\
& \leq C_{2} \varepsilon+C_{1} \int_{0}^{t}\left\|v_{\varepsilon}\left(t^{\prime}\right)-v\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}} d t^{\prime} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, by Gronwall's inequality, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{t \in\left[0, M_{+}\right]}\left\|v_{\varepsilon}(t)-v(t)\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq C_{2} \varepsilon e^{C_{1} M_{+}} \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $M_{+} \geq M$, the proof is complete and now we assume that $M_{+}<M$. It follows from (3.10) and $v_{\varepsilon}-v \in \mathcal{C}\left(\left[0, M_{+}\right], H^{1}(\mathbb{R})\right)$ that

$$
\left\|v_{\varepsilon}\left(M_{+}\right)-v\left(M_{+}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq C_{2} \varepsilon e^{C_{1} M_{+}} .
$$

Now choose $\varepsilon_{1}>0$ such that $C_{2} \varepsilon_{1} e^{C_{1} M_{+}} \leq \frac{K}{2}$ and $\varepsilon_{1} \leq \frac{K}{2}$. Let $0<\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_{1}$. Then

$$
\left\|v_{\varepsilon}\left(M_{+}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq \frac{K}{2}+C_{2} \varepsilon e^{C_{1} M_{+}} \leq K
$$

Applying Proposition 2.2 to (2.3) with the initial datum $v_{\varepsilon}\left(M_{+}\right)$, which satisfies

$$
\sup _{0<\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_{1}}\left\|v_{\varepsilon}\left(M_{+}\right)\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq K
$$

we have

$$
\sup _{0<\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_{1}} \sup _{t \in\left[M_{+}, 2 M_{+}\right]}\left\|v_{\varepsilon}(t)\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq 2 K .
$$

Combining this and (3.7), we have

$$
\sup _{0<\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_{1}} \sup _{t \in\left[0,2 M_{+}\right]}\left\|v_{\varepsilon}(t)\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq 2 K .
$$

Repeat the above argument to obtain

$$
\sup _{t \in\left[0,2 M_{+}\right]}\left\|v_{\varepsilon}(t)-v(t)\right\|_{H^{1}} \leq C_{2} \varepsilon e^{2 C_{1} M_{+}} .
$$

Iterating this argument, we can choose $\varepsilon_{0}>0$ such that $C_{2} \varepsilon_{0} \exp \left(\left(\left\lfloor\frac{M}{M_{+}}\right\rfloor+1\right) C_{1} M_{+}\right) \leq \frac{K}{2}$ and $\varepsilon_{0} \leq \frac{K}{2}$ to get (1.5) with $C=C_{2} \exp \left(\left(\left\lfloor\frac{M}{M_{+}}\right\rfloor+2\right) C_{1} M_{+}\right)$, where $\lfloor a\rfloor=\max \{n \in \mathbb{Z}$ : $n \leq a\}$. This completes the proof.

## Appendix A. Linear propagator

For the reader's convenience, the properties of the linear propagator $U\left(t_{0}, t\right)$ defined in (2.11) are referred in this section, which can be also found in [3, 5.

Lemma A.1. Let $d_{\mathrm{av}} \neq \pm 1$. Then there exists a constant $C$ depending only on $d_{\mathrm{av}}$ such that

$$
\left\|U\left(t_{0}, t\right) f\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \leq C\left|t-t_{0}\right|^{-1 / 2}\|f\|_{L^{1}}
$$

for all $f \in L^{1}(\mathbb{R})$ and all distinct $t, t_{0}$ with $\lfloor t\rfloor=\left\lfloor t_{0}\right\rfloor$.
Proof. Using the kernel of the solution operator for the free Schrödinger equation

$$
\left(T_{t} f\right)(x)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{4 \pi i t}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i \frac{|x-y|^{2}}{4 t}} f(y) d y, \quad t \neq 0
$$

for Schwartz functions $f$, we obtain that

$$
\left\|U\left(t_{0}, t\right) f\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \leq \frac{\|f\|_{L^{1}}}{\left(4 \pi\left|\int_{t_{0}}^{t} d\left(t^{\prime}\right) d t^{\prime}\right|\right)^{1 / 2}}, \quad t \neq t_{0}
$$

Using this and the fact that for all $t$ and $t_{0}$ with $\lfloor t\rfloor=\left\lfloor t_{0}\right\rfloor$,

$$
\left|\int_{t_{0}}^{t} d\left(t^{\prime}\right) d t^{\prime}\right|= \begin{cases}\left|d_{\mathrm{av}}+1\right|\left|t-t_{0}\right|, & \left\lfloor t_{0}\right\rfloor \text { even }, \\ \left|d_{\mathrm{av}}-1\right|\left|t-t_{0}\right|, & \left\lfloor t_{0}\right\rfloor \text { odd },\end{cases}
$$

we complete the proof.
Using Lemma A. 1 and the unitarity of $U\left(t_{0}, t\right)$ on $L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$, via the well-known arguments, we obtain the one-dimensional Strichartz estimates on each time interval $[n, n+1]$, for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. For the classical Strichartz estimates, see, e.g., [25, 16, 21]. As usual, we say that a pair of exponents $(p, q)$ is admissible if $2 \leq p \leq \infty$ and

$$
\frac{1}{p}+\frac{2}{q}=\frac{1}{2}
$$

and, also, for every $p \geq 1$, denote by $p^{\prime}$ the Hölder conjugate, i.e.,

$$
\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{p^{\prime}}=1
$$

Lemma A.2. Assume $d_{\mathrm{av}} \neq \pm 1$. Let $(p, q)$ and $\left(p_{0}, q_{0}\right)$ be admissible pairs and $t_{0} \in[n, n+1]$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.
(i) If $f \in L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$, then the function $t \mapsto U\left(t_{0}, t\right) f$ on $[n, n+1]$ belongs to $L^{q}\left([n, n+1], L^{p}\right) \cap$ $\mathcal{C}\left([n, n+1], L^{2}\right)$. Moreover, there exists a constant $C$ depending only on $p$ and $d_{\mathrm{av}}$ such that for all $f \in L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$

$$
\left\|U\left(t_{0}, t\right) f\right\|_{L^{q}\left([n, n+1], L^{p}\right)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^{2}} .
$$

(ii) Let $I$ be an interval contained in $[n, n+1]$ and $t_{0} \in \bar{I}$. If $F \in L^{q_{0}^{\prime}}\left(I, L^{p_{0}^{\prime}}\right)$, then the function

$$
t \mapsto \int_{t_{0}}^{t} U\left(t^{\prime}, t\right) F\left(t^{\prime}\right) d t^{\prime}
$$

on I belongs to $L^{q}\left(I, L^{p}\right) \cap \mathcal{C}\left(\bar{I}, L^{2}\right)$. Moreover, there exists a constant $C$ depending only on $p, p_{0}$, and $d_{\mathrm{av}}$ such that for all $F \in L^{q_{0}^{\prime}}\left(I, L^{p_{0}^{\prime}}\right)$

$$
\left(\int_{I}\left\|\int_{t_{0}}^{t} U\left(t^{\prime}, t\right) F\left(\cdot, t^{\prime}\right) d t^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{p}}^{q} d t\right)^{1 / q} \leq C\left(\int_{I}\|F(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{p_{0}^{\prime}}}^{q_{0}^{\prime}} d t\right)^{1 / q_{0}^{\prime}} .
$$
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