

# Uniqueness of ground states for combined power-type nonlinear scalar field equations involving the Sobolev critical exponent and a large frequency parameter in three and four dimensions

Takafumi Akahori\*, Miho Murata†

## Abstract

We prove the uniqueness of ground states for combined power-type nonlinear scalar field equations involving the Sobolev critical exponent and a large frequency parameter. This study is motivated by the paper [2] and aims to remove the restriction on dimension imposed there. In this paper, we employ the fixed-point argument developed in [7] to prove the uniqueness. Hence, the linearization around the Aubin-Talenti function plays a key role. Furthermore, we need some estimates for the associated perturbed resolvents (see Proposition 3.1).

**Mathematics Subject Classification** 35J20, 35B09, 35Q55

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Uniform estimates for perturbed resolvents</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Preliminaries . . . . .	10
3.2	Proof of Proposition 3.1 . . . . .	20
<b>4</b>	<b>Uniqueness</b>	<b>26</b>
4.1	Basic estimates . . . . .	30
4.2	Proof of Proposition 4.1 . . . . .	42
4.3	Proof of Proposition 4.2 . . . . .	50
<b>A</b>	<b>Compactness in Lebesgue spaces</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Completeness of <math>Y_q(\mathbf{R}, t)</math></b>	<b>63</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Elementary computations</b>	<b>64</b>

\*The corresponding author; Faculty of Engineering, Shizuoka University, Jyohoku 3-5-1, Hamamatsu-Shi, Shizuoka, 432-8561, Japan, E-mail: akahori.takafumi@shizuoka.ac.jp

†Faculty of Engineering, Shizuoka University, Jyohoku 3-5-1, Hamamatsu-Shi, Shizuoka, 432-8561, Japan, E-mail: murata.miho@shizuoka.ac.jp

# 1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the following equation:

$$-\Delta u + \omega u - |u|^{p-1}u - |u|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}u = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $d \geq 3$ ,  $1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$  and  $\omega > 0$ .

This study is motivated by the paper [2] and aims to remove the restriction on dimension imposed there. More precisely, our aim is to prove the uniqueness of ground states to (1.1) when  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\omega$  is large (see Theorem 1.1). We remark that when  $\omega$  is small, the uniqueness had been proved in [3] for all  $d \geq 3$ . We also remark that the properties of ground states to (1.1) are important in the study of the following nonlinear Schrödinger and Klein-Gordon equations (see [3, 4, 13]):

$$i \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \Delta u + |u|^{p-1}u + |u|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}u = 0, \quad (1.2)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - \Delta u + u - |u|^{p-1}u - |u|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}u = 0. \quad (1.3)$$

In order to describe our main result, we introduce a few symbols:

**Notation 1.1.** 1. For each  $d \geq 3$ , we use  $2^*$  to denote the Sobolev critical exponent, namely

$$2^* := \frac{2d}{d-2}. \quad (1.4)$$

2. For  $d \geq 3$ ,  $1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$  and  $\omega > 0$ , we define functionals  $\mathcal{S}_\omega$  and  $\mathcal{N}_\omega$  on  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  by

$$\mathcal{S}_\omega(u) := \frac{\omega}{2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{1}{p+1} \|u\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1} - \frac{1}{2^*} \|u\|_{L^{2^*}}^{2^*}, \quad (1.5)$$

$$\mathcal{N}_\omega(u) := \omega \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 - \|u\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1} - \|u\|_{L^{2^*}}^{2^*}. \quad (1.6)$$

Next, we clarify terminology:

**Definition 1.1.** 1. Let  $d \geq 3$ ,  $1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$  and  $\omega > 0$ . Then, by a ground state to (1.1), we mean a minimizer for the following variational problem:

$$\inf \{ \mathcal{S}_\omega(u) : u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \{0\}, \mathcal{N}_\omega(u) = 0 \}. \quad (1.7)$$

2. We use the term “radial” to mean radially symmetric about  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

We refer to a known result for the existence of a ground state to (1.1) (see, e.g., [2]):

**Proposition 1.1.** Assume either  $d = 3$  and  $3 < p < 5$ , or else  $d \geq 4$  and  $1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Then, for any  $\omega > 0$ , there exists a ground state to (1.1). Furthermore, for any  $\omega > 0$ , the following hold:

1. A ground state to (1.1) becomes a solution to (1.1) and is in  $C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .
2. For any ground state  $Q_\omega$  to (1.1), there exist  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$  and a positive radial function  $\Phi_\omega$  such that  $Q_\omega(x) = e^{i\theta} \Phi_\omega(x - y)$ ; In particular,  $\Phi_\omega$  is a positive radial ground state to (1.1).

3. Let  $\Phi_\omega$  be a positive radial ground state to (1.1). Then,  $\Phi_\omega = \Phi_\omega(x)$  is strictly decreasing as a function of  $|x|$ . In particular,  $\|\Phi_\omega\|_{L^\infty} = \Phi_\omega(0)$ .
4. For any positive radial ground state  $\Phi_\omega$  to (1.1), there exist  $\nu > 0$  and  $C > 0$  such that for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|\Phi_\omega(x)| + |\nabla\Phi_\omega(x)| + |\Delta\Phi_\omega(x)| \leq Ce^{-\nu|x|}. \quad (1.8)$$

In particular,  $\Phi_\omega \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

**Remark 1.1.** In [5], it is proved that if  $d = 3$  and  $1 < p \leq 3$ , then there exists  $\omega_c > 0$  such that for any  $\omega > \omega_c$ , there is no ground state to (1.1).

By Proposition 1.1, we may assume that a ground state to (1.1) is positive and radial. Now, we state the main result of this paper:

**Theorem 1.1.** Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{4}{d-2} - 1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ ; namely either  $d = 3$  and  $3 < p < 5$ , or  $d = 4$  and  $1 < p < 3$ . Then, there exists  $\omega_* > 0$  such that for any  $\omega > \omega_*$ , a positive radial ground state to (1.1) is unique.

**Remark 1.2.** 1. By the result of Pucci and Serrin [17] (see also Appendix C of [2]), we find that if  $3 \leq d \leq 6$  and  $\frac{4}{d-2} \leq p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ , then for any  $\omega > 0$ , a positive radial solution to (1.1) is unique; in particular, a positive radial ground state is unique.

2. In [2], it had been proved that if  $d \geq 5$  and  $1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ , then there exists  $\omega_* > 0$  such that for any  $\omega \geq \omega_*$ , a positive radial ground state to (1.1) is unique.

We give a proof of Theorem 1.1 in Section 4.

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Professor Hiroaki Kikuchi for helpful discussion. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 20K03697.

## 2 Preliminaries

We collect symbols used in this paper, with auxiliary results:

1. For  $d \geq 3$ ,  $1 < p < \frac{d-2}{d+2}$  and  $\omega > 0$ , the symbol  $\mathcal{G}_\omega$  denotes the set of positive radial ground states to (1.1).
2.  $L^2_{\text{real}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  denotes the real Hilbert space of complex-valued  $L^2$ -functions equipped with the inner product

$$\langle f, g \rangle := \Re \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) \overline{g(x)} dx.$$

3. For  $u, v \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , we define

$$(u, v) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(x) \overline{v(x)} dx. \quad (2.1)$$

4. We define the Fourier and inverse Fourier transformations to be that for  $u \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\mathcal{F}[u](\xi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-i\xi \cdot x} u(x) dx, \quad \mathcal{F}^{-1}[u](\xi) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\xi \cdot x} u(x) dx. \quad (2.2)$$

Then, the relationship between Fourier transformation and convolution (see Theorem 0.1.8 of [18]), and Parseval's identity (see Theorem 0.1.11 of [18]) are stated as

$$\mathcal{F}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(\cdot - y)v(y) dy\right] = \mathcal{F}[u]\mathcal{F}[v], \quad (2.3)$$

$$(u, v) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} (\mathcal{F}[u], \mathcal{F}[v]). \quad (2.4)$$

Furthermore, it is known (see, e.g., Theorem 2.4.6 of [10], or Theorem 5.9 of [16]\*) that for any  $0 < r < d$ ,

$$\mathcal{F}[|x|^{-r}](\xi) = C_r |\xi|^{-(d-r)}, \quad \text{with } C_r := \frac{2^{d-r} \pi^{\frac{d}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{d-r}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{r}{2})}. \quad (2.5)$$

5. We use  $W$  to denote the Aubin-Talenti function with  $W(0) = 1$ , namely

$$W(x) := \left(1 + \frac{|x|^2}{d(d-2)}\right)^{-\frac{d-2}{2}}. \quad (2.6)$$

Note that

$$W(x) \sim (1 + |x|)^{-(d-2)}, \quad \|W\|_{L_{\text{weak}}^{\frac{d}{d-2}}} < \infty, \quad (2.7)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ; in particular, if  $d = 3, 4$ , then  $W \notin L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . It is known that for  $d \geq 3$ ,  $W$  is a solution to the following equation:

$$\Delta u + |u|^{\frac{4}{d-2}} u = 0. \quad (2.8)$$

6. For  $d \geq 3$ , we define a potential function  $V$  as

$$V := -\frac{d+2}{d-2} W^{\frac{4}{d-2}}. \quad (2.9)$$

Note that  $V$  is negative. Observe from (2.7) that for any  $d \geq 3$ ,

$$|V(x)| \lesssim (1 + |x|)^{-4}, \quad (2.10)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ .

7. Let  $\lambda > 0$ . Then, we define the  $H^1$ -scaling operator  $T_\lambda$  by

$$T_\lambda[v](x) := \lambda^{-1} v(\lambda^{-\frac{2}{d-2}} x). \quad (2.11)$$

---

\*Notice that the definition of Fourier transformation in [10] and [16] is different from ours.

8. We use  $\Lambda W$  to denote the function defined as

$$\Lambda W := \frac{d-2}{2}W + x \cdot \nabla W = \left( \frac{d-2}{2} - \frac{|x|^2}{2d} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{|x|^2}{d(d-2)} \right)^{-\frac{d}{2}}. \quad (2.12)$$

Observe that

$$(-\Delta + V)\Lambda W = 0, \quad (2.13)$$

$$|\Lambda W(x)| \lesssim (1 + |x|)^{-(d-2)}, \quad (2.14)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ . In particular, (2.14) shows that if  $d = 3, 4$ , then  $\Lambda W \notin L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . A computation involving integration by parts shows that for any  $\max\{1, \frac{2}{d-2}\} < r < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ ,

$$\langle W^r, \Lambda W \rangle = \frac{-\{4 - (d-2)(r-1)\}}{2(r+1)} \|W\|_{L^{r+1}}^{r+1} < 0. \quad (2.15)$$

The function  $\Lambda W$  can be obtained from the  $H^1$ -scaling of  $W$ ; Precisely, we see that for any  $\lambda > 0$ ,

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} T_\lambda[W] = -\lambda^{-1} T_\lambda[W] - \frac{2}{d-2} T_\lambda[x \cdot \nabla W] = -\frac{2}{d-2} \lambda^{-1} T_\lambda[\Lambda W], \quad (2.16)$$

so that  $\Lambda W = -\frac{2}{d-2} \frac{d}{d\lambda} T_\lambda[W]|_{\lambda=1}$ .

Observe from the fundamental theorem of calculus and (2.16) that for any  $\mu > 0$ ,

$$T_\mu[W] - W = \int_1^\mu \frac{d}{d\lambda} T_\lambda[W] d\lambda = -\frac{2}{d-2} \int_1^\mu \lambda^{-1} T_\lambda[\Lambda W] d\lambda. \quad (2.17)$$

Furthermore, by (2.17) and the fundamental theorem of calculus, we see that for any  $\mu > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} T_\mu[W] - W + \frac{2}{d-2}(\mu-1)\Lambda W &= -\frac{2}{d-2} \int_1^\mu \int_1^\nu \frac{d}{d\lambda} \left( \lambda^{-1} T_\lambda[\Lambda W] \right) d\lambda d\nu \\ &= \frac{2}{d-2} \int_1^\mu \int_1^\nu \lambda^{-2} T_\lambda \left[ 2\Lambda W + \frac{2}{d-2} x \cdot \nabla \Lambda W \right] d\lambda d\nu. \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

9. We use  $\Gamma$  to denote the gamma function. Recall that  $\Gamma(\frac{5}{2}) = \frac{3\sqrt{\pi}}{4}$  and  $\Gamma(3) = 2$ .
10. For  $d \geq 3$ , we use  $(-\Delta)^{-1}$  to denote the operator defined to be that for any function  $f$  satisfying  $(1 + |x|)^{-(d-2)} f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$(-\Delta)^{-1} f(x) ga := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})}{(d-2)2\pi^{\frac{d}{2}}} |x-y|^{-(d-2)} f(y) dy. \quad (2.19)$$

Note that Hölder's inequality shows that if  $1 \leq r < \frac{d}{2}$  and  $f \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , then  $(1 + |x|)^{-(d-2)} f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . The Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality shows that for any  $1 < r < \frac{d}{2}$  ( $r \neq 1$ ) and  $f \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\|(-\Delta)^{-1} f\|_{L^{\frac{dr}{d-2r}}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r}, \quad (2.20)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $r$ . Furthermore, the standard theory for Poisson's equation (see, e.g., Theorem 6.21 of [16]) shows that for any  $1 \leq r < \frac{d}{2}$  and  $f \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$(-\Delta)(-\Delta)^{-1}f = f \quad \text{in the distribution sense.} \quad (2.21)$$

By (2.21) and  $(-\Delta + V)\Lambda W = 0$  (see (2.13)), we see that

$$(-\Delta)(-\Delta)^{-1}V\Lambda W = V\Lambda W = \Delta\Lambda W \quad \text{in the distribution sense,} \quad (2.22)$$

which implies that there exists a harmonic function  $h$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$(-\Delta)^{-1}V\Lambda W = -\Lambda W + h. \quad (2.23)$$

Note here that (2.20) shows that

$$\|(\Delta)^{-1}V\Lambda W\|_{L^{2^*}} \lesssim \|V\Lambda W\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}}} \lesssim 1, \quad (2.24)$$

whereas the maximum principle shows that a non-trivial harmonic function does not belong to  $L^{2^*}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Thus,  $h \equiv 0$  in (2.23) and therefore

$$(-\Delta)^{-1}V\Lambda W = -\Lambda W. \quad (2.25)$$

11. For  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ , we use  $L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  to denote the set of radially symmetric functions about  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  in  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .
12. For  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ , we define a set  $X_q$  as

$$X_q := \{f \in L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) : \langle f, V\Lambda W \rangle = 0\}. \quad (2.26)$$

We can verify that  $X_q$  is a closed subspace of  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Hence,  $X_q$  is a Banach space.

13. We define a function  $\delta$  on  $(0, \infty)$  by

$$\delta(s) := \begin{cases} s^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } d = 3, \\ \frac{1}{\log(1 + s^{-1})} & \text{if } d = 4. \end{cases} \quad (2.27)$$

A computation involving the spherical coordinates shows that for any  $s > 0$ ,

$$\int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{1}{(|\xi|^2 + s)|\xi|^2} d\xi = \frac{d\pi^{\frac{d}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2} + 1)} \begin{cases} s^{-\frac{1}{2}} \arctan(s^{-\frac{1}{2}}) & \text{if } d = 3, \\ \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + s^{-1}) & \text{if } d = 4. \end{cases} \quad (2.28)$$

Note here that  $\frac{d\pi^{\frac{d}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2} + 1)}$  is the surface area of unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Furthermore, we see that for any  $s > 0$ ,

$$\left| \frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan(s^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \right| \leq \int_{s^{-\frac{1}{2}}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1+t^2} dt \leq \int_{s^{-\frac{1}{2}}}^{\infty} t^{-2} dt \leq s^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.29)$$

Observe from (2.28) and (2.29) that for  $d = 3, 4$  and any  $s > 0$ ,

$$\left| \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{1}{(|\xi|^2 + s)|\xi|^2} d\xi - (5-d)\pi^2 \delta(s)^{-1} \right| \lesssim 1, \quad (2.30)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ .

14. We define a function  $\beta$  on  $(0, \infty)$  by

$$\beta(s) := \delta(s)^{-1}s, \quad (2.31)$$

where  $\delta$  is the function given in (2.27).

Note that  $\beta$  is strictly increasing on  $(0, \infty)$ , so that the inverse exists.

15. We use  $\alpha$  to denote the inverse function of  $\beta$ .

When  $d = 3$ ,  $\beta(s) = s^{\frac{1}{2}}$ ; Hence, the domain of  $\alpha$  is  $(0, \infty)$ .

When  $d = 4$ , the image of  $(0, \infty)$  by  $\beta$  is  $(0, 1)$  (see Lemma C.1); Hence, the domain of  $\alpha$  is  $(0, 1)$ .

Note that for any  $t$  in the domain of  $\alpha$ ,

$$t = \beta(\alpha(t)) = \delta(\alpha(t))^{-1}\alpha(t); \quad \text{or equivalently,} \quad \delta(\alpha(t)) = t^{-1}\alpha(t). \quad (2.32)$$

Since  $\beta$  is strictly increasing and  $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \beta(s) = 0$ , we see that  $\alpha$  is strictly increasing and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \alpha(t) = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \delta(\alpha(t)) = 0. \quad (2.33)$$

Furthermore, the following holds (see Lemma C.1):

$$\alpha(t) \begin{cases} = t^2 & \text{for } d = 3 \text{ and } 0 < t < \infty, \\ \sim \delta(t)t & \text{for } d = 4 \text{ and } 0 < t \leq T_0, \end{cases} \quad (2.34)$$

where  $T_0 > 0$  is some constant.

16. Let  $d \geq 3$  and  $p > 1$ . Furthermore, let  $t \geq 0$ ,  $s \geq 0$ , and let  $\eta$  be a function on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Then, we define  $N(\eta; t)$  and  $F(\eta; s, t)$  as

$$N(\eta; t) := |W + \eta|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}(W + \eta) - W^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}} - \frac{d+2}{d-2}W^{\frac{4}{d-2}}\eta \quad (2.35)$$

$$+ t\{|W + \eta|^{p-1}(W + \eta) - W^p\},$$

$$F(\eta; s, t) := -sW + tW^p + N(\eta; t). \quad (2.36)$$

17. For  $d \geq 3$  and functions  $\eta_1, \eta_2$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , we define  $D(\eta_1, \eta_2)$  as

$$D(\eta_1, \eta_2) := |W + \eta_1|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}(W + \eta_1) - |W + \eta_2|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}(W + \eta_2) - \frac{d+2}{d-2}W^{\frac{4}{d-2}}(\eta_1 - \eta_2). \quad (2.37)$$

18. For  $d \geq 3$ ,  $p > 1$  and functions  $\eta_1, \eta_2$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , we define  $E(\eta_1, \eta_2)$  as

$$E(\eta_1, \eta_2) := |W + \eta_1|^{p-1}(W + \eta_1) - |W + \eta_2|^{p-1}(W + \eta_2). \quad (2.38)$$

Next, we make some remarks about  $N(\eta; t)$ ,  $D(\eta_1, \eta_2)$  and  $E(\eta_1, \eta_2)$  (see (2.35), (2.37) and (2.38)). Let  $d \geq 3$ ,  $p > 1$ ,  $t_1, t_2 \geq 0$ , and let  $\eta_1, \eta_2$  be functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Then, the following hold:

1.

$$N(\eta_1; t_1) - N(\eta_2; t_2) = D(\eta_1, \eta_2) + t_2 E(\eta_1, \eta_2) + (t_1 - t_2) E(\eta_1, 0). \quad (2.39)$$

Note that  $D(\eta, \eta) = 0$  and  $E(\eta, \eta) = 0$ .

Observe from  $N(0; 0) = 0$  that

$$N(\eta_1; t_1) = D(\eta_1, 0) + t_1 E(\eta_1, 0). \quad (2.40)$$

Furthermore, observe from the fundamental theorem of calculus that

$$|D(\eta_1, \eta_2)| \lesssim (W + |\eta_1| + |\eta_2|)^{\frac{6-d}{d-2}} (|\eta_1| + |\eta_2|) |\eta_1 - \eta_2|, \quad (2.41)$$

$$|E(\eta_1, \eta_2)| \lesssim (W + |\eta_1| + |\eta_2|)^{p-1} |\eta_1 - \eta_2|, \quad (2.42)$$

where the first implicit constant depends only on  $d$ , and the second one does only on  $d$  and  $p$ .

We record well-known results for the resolvent of the Laplace operator. The standard theory for Yukawa's equation (see, e.g., Theorem 6.23 and Lemma 9.11 of [16]) shows the following:

1. For any  $d \geq 1$ ,  $s > 0$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$  and  $f \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$(-\Delta + s)^{-1} f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^\infty (4\pi t)^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4t}} e^{-st} dt f(y) dy. \quad (2.43)$$

Observe from (2.43) that if  $|f| \leq |g|$ , then

$$|(-\Delta + s)^{-1} f| \leq (-\Delta + s)^{-1} |g|. \quad (2.44)$$

Using integration by substitution, we see that for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ ,

$$\int_0^\infty (4\pi t)^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4t}} e^{-st} dt \leq \int_0^\infty (4\pi t)^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4t}} dt \lesssim |x|^{-(d-2)}, \quad (2.45)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ .

2. For any  $d \geq 1$ ,  $s > 0$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$  and  $f \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$(-\Delta + s)^{-1} f \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad (2.46)$$

$$(-\Delta + s)(-\Delta + s)^{-1} f = f \quad \text{in the distribution sense.} \quad (2.47)$$

Observe from (2.46) and (2.47) that  $(-\Delta + s)^{-1} f \in W^{2,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

3. For any  $d \geq 1$ ,  $s > 0$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$  and  $f \in W^{2,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$(-\Delta + s)^{-1} (-\Delta + s) f = f. \quad (2.48)$$

4. For any  $s > 0$  and  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\mathcal{F} \left[ \int_0^\infty (4\pi t)^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4t}} e^{-st} dt \right] (\xi) = (|\xi|^2 + s)^{-1}. \quad (2.49)$$



At the end of this section, we collect known results about ground states:

**Lemma 2.1** (Lemma 2.3 of [2]). *Assume either  $d = 3$  and  $3 < p < 5$ , or else  $d \geq 4$  and  $1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Then, we have*

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\Phi_\omega \in \mathcal{G}_\omega} \Phi_\omega(0) = \infty, \quad (2.50)$$

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\Phi_\omega \in \mathcal{G}_\omega} \omega \Phi_\omega(0)^{-(2^*-2)} = \lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\Phi_\omega \in \mathcal{G}_\omega} \Phi_\omega(0)^{-\{2^*-(p+1)\}} = 0. \quad (2.51)$$

**Lemma 2.2** (Proposition 2.1 and Corollary 3.1 of [2]). *Assume either  $d = 3$  and  $3 < p < 5$ , or else  $d \geq 4$  and  $1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Then, the following hold:*

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\Phi_\omega \in \mathcal{G}_\omega} \|T_{\Phi_\omega(0)}[\Phi_\omega] - W\|_{\dot{H}^1} = 0, \quad (2.52)$$

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\Phi_\omega \in \mathcal{G}_\omega} \|T_{\Phi_\omega(0)}[\Phi_\omega] - W\|_{L^r} = 0 \quad \text{for all } \frac{d}{d-2} < r < \infty. \quad (2.53)$$

**Lemma 2.3** (Proposition 3.1 of [2]). *Assume either  $d = 3$  and  $3 < p < 5$ , or else  $d \geq 4$ . Let  $1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Then, for any sufficiently large  $\omega$ , and any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,*

$$\sup_{\Phi_\omega \in \mathcal{G}_\omega} T_{\Phi_\omega(0)}[\Phi_\omega](x) \lesssim (1 + |x|)^{-(d-2)}, \quad (2.54)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $p$ .

### 3 Uniform estimates for perturbed resolvents

Our aim in this section is to prove the following proposition which plays a vital role for the proof of Theorem 1.1:

**Proposition 3.1.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$ , and let  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$ . If  $s > 0$  is sufficiently small dependently on  $d$  and  $q$ , then the inverse of the operator  $1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V: L^q_{\text{rad}}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^q_{\text{rad}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  exists; and the following estimates hold:*

1. *If  $f \in L^q_{\text{rad}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , then*

$$\| \{1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V\}^{-1}f \|_{L^q} \lesssim \delta(s)s^{-1} \|f\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.1)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

2. *If  $f \in X_q$ , then*

$$\| \{1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V\}^{-1}f \|_{L^q} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.2)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

**Remark 3.1.** 1. *When  $d = 3$ , the case  $q = \infty$  can be included in Proposition 3.1 (see Lemma 2.4 of [7]). On the other hand, from the point of view of Remark 3.5 below, when  $d = 4$ , it seems difficult to include the case  $q = \infty$ .*

2. *By the substitution of variables  $\tau = \beta(s) := \delta(s)^{-1}s$ , we may write (3.1) as*

$$\| \{1 + (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}V\}^{-1}f \|_{L^q} \lesssim \tau^{-1} \|f\|_{L^q}. \quad (3.3)$$

3. Observe from  $V = -\frac{d+2}{d-2}W^{\frac{4}{d-2}}$ ,  $W^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}} = (-\Delta)W$  and  $\Delta\Lambda W = V\Lambda W$  that

$$\langle W, V\Lambda W \rangle = -\frac{d+2}{d-2}\langle W^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}, \Lambda W \rangle = \frac{d+2}{d-2}\langle \Delta W, \Lambda W \rangle = \frac{d+2}{d-2}\langle W, V\Lambda W \rangle, \quad (3.4)$$

which implies  $\langle W, V\Lambda W \rangle = 0$ . Thus, we see that  $W \in X_q$  for all  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q \leq \infty$ .

We will prove Proposition 3.1 in Section 3.2.

### 3.1 Preliminaries

In this subsection, we give basic estimates for free and perturbed resolvents.

Let us begin by recalling the following fact (see, e.g., Section 5.2 of [9], and Proposition 2.2 of [8]):

**Lemma 3.1.** *Assume  $d \geq 3$ . Then, there exists  $e_0 > 0$  such that  $-e_0$  is the only one negative eigenvalue of the operator  $-\Delta + V: H^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Furthermore, the essential spectrum of  $-\Delta + V$  equals  $[0, \infty)$  (hence  $\sigma(-\Delta + V) = \{-e_0\} \cup [0, \infty)$ ), and*

$$\{u \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d): (-\Delta + V)u = 0 \text{ in the distribution sense}\} = \text{span}\{\Lambda W, \partial_1 W, \dots, \partial_d W\}, \quad (3.5)$$

where  $\partial_1 W, \dots, \partial_d W$  denote the partial derivatives of  $W$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$ . Let  $\frac{d}{d-2} < r \leq \infty$ . Then,*

$$\{u \in L^r_{\text{rad}}(\mathbb{R}^d): (-\Delta + V)u = 0 \text{ in the distribution sense}\} = \text{span}\{\Lambda W\}. \quad (3.6)$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.2.* Let  $u \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be a function such that  $\Delta u = Vu$  in the distribution sense. Notice that  $(1 + |x|)^{-(d-2)}Vu \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Hence, the formula (2.21) is available. Furthermore, we see from (2.21), (2.19), the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality and Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} &= \|\nabla(-\Delta)^{-1}Vu\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{x-y}{|x-y|^d} V(y)u(y) dy \right\|_{L^2} \leq \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x-y|^{-(d-1)} V(y)|u(y)| dy \right\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|Vu\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^r}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

so that  $u \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Thus, we find from Lemma 3.1 that the claim (3.6) is true.  $\square$

We record well-known inequalities for radial functions (see [19]):

**Lemma 3.3.** *Assume  $d \geq 3$ , and let  $g$  be a radial function on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Then, we have*

$$|x|^{\frac{d-2}{2}}|g(x)| \lesssim \|\nabla g\|_{L^2}, \quad (3.8)$$

$$|x|^{\frac{d-1}{2}}|g(x)| \lesssim \|g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.9)$$

**Remark 3.2.** *We see from Lemma 3.3 that for  $d = 3, 4$ ,*

$$|x||g(x)| \lesssim \|g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4-d}{2}} \|\nabla g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{d-2}{2}}. \quad (3.10)$$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Assume  $d \geq 1$ .*

1. *Let  $1 \leq q_1 \leq q_2 \leq \infty$  and  $d(\frac{1}{q_1} - \frac{1}{q_2}) < 2$ . Then, the following holds for all  $s > 0$ :*

$$\|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}\|_{L^{q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{q_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim s^{\frac{d}{2}(\frac{1}{q_1} - \frac{1}{q_2}) - 1}, \quad (3.11)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $q_1$  and  $q_2$ .

2. *Let  $1 < q_1 \leq q_2 < \infty$  and  $d(\frac{1}{q_1} - \frac{1}{q_2}) < 2$ . Then, the following holds for all  $s > 0$ :*

$$\|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}\|_{L_{\text{weak}}^{q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{q_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim s^{\frac{d}{2}(\frac{1}{q_1} - \frac{1}{q_2}) - 1}, \quad (3.12)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $q_1$  and  $q_2$ .

*Proof of Lemma 3.4.* First, we prove (3.11). Let  $1 \leq q_1 \leq q_2 \leq \infty$  and  $f \in L^{q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Then, it follows from Young's inequality and elementary computations that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}f\|_{L^{q_2}} &\lesssim \left\| \int_0^\infty (4\pi t)^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4t}} e^{-st} dt \right\|_{L^{\frac{q_1 q_2}{q_1 q_2 - (q_2 - q_1)}}} \|f\|_{L^{q_1}} \\ &\lesssim \int_0^\infty t^{-\frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{2}(1 + \frac{1}{q_2} - \frac{1}{q_1})} e^{-st} dt \|f\|_{L^{q_1}} \\ &= s^{\frac{d}{2}(\frac{1}{q_1} - \frac{1}{q_2}) - 1} \int_0^\infty r^{-\frac{d}{2}(\frac{1}{q_1} - \frac{1}{q_2})} e^{-r} dr \|f\|_{L^{q_1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$ ,  $q_1$  and  $q_2$ . The above right-hand side is finite if and only if  $\frac{d}{2}(\frac{1}{q_1} - \frac{1}{q_2}) < 1$ . Hence, we see that (3.11) holds. Similarly, by the weak Young inequality (see, e.g., (9) in Section 4.3 of [16]), we see that if  $1 < q_1 < q_2 < \infty$  and  $\frac{d}{2}(\frac{1}{q_1} - \frac{1}{q_2}) < 1$ , then (3.12) holds.  $\square$

Note that Lemma 3.4 does not deal with the case  $d(\frac{1}{q_1} - \frac{1}{q_2}) = 2$ . The following lemma compensates for Lemma 3.4:

**Lemma 3.5.** *Assume  $d \geq 3$ , and let  $s_0 \geq 0$ . If  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$ , then*

$$\|(-\Delta + s_0)^{-1}\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{d+2q}}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim 1, \quad (3.14)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

**Remark 3.3.** *Put  $r := \frac{dq}{d+2q}$ . Then,  $q = \frac{dr}{d-2r}$ ; and the condition  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$  is equivalent to  $1 < r < \frac{d}{2}$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 3.5.* When  $s_0 = 0$ , the claim is identical to (3.14). Assume  $s_0 > 0$ . Then, by (2.45) and Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev's inequality (see (2.20)), we see that

$$\|(-\Delta + s_0)^{-1}f\|_{L^q} \lesssim \| |x|^{-(d-2)} * |f| \|_{L^q} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{d+2q}}}, \quad (3.15)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Thus, we have proved the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.6.** Assume  $d \geq 3$ . Let  $s_0 \geq 0$  and  $0 < \varepsilon \leq d - 2$ . Then, the following inequality holds:

$$\|(-\Delta + s_0)^{-1}\|_{L^{\frac{d+\varepsilon}{2}} \cap L^{\frac{d-\varepsilon}{2}} \rightarrow L^\infty} \lesssim 1, \quad (3.16)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof of Lemma 3.6.* Let  $f \in L^{\frac{d+\varepsilon}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{\frac{d-\varepsilon}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Then, by (2.45) and Hölder's inequality, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\Delta + s_0)^{-1}f\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \| |x|^{-(d-2)} * f \|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \int_{|y| \leq 1} |y|^{-(d-2)} |f(x-y)| dy + \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \int_{1 \leq |y|} |y|^{-(d-2)} |f(x-y)| dy \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^{\frac{d+\varepsilon}{2}}} + \|f\|_{L^{\frac{d-\varepsilon}{2}}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{\frac{d+\varepsilon}{2} \cap \frac{d-\varepsilon}{2}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $\varepsilon$ . Thus, the claim is true.  $\square$

Let us recall the resolvent equation:

$$(-\Delta + s)^{-1} - (-\Delta + s_0)^{-1} = -(s - s_0)(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta + s_0)^{-1}. \quad (3.18)$$

This identity holds in the following sense:

**Lemma 3.7.** Assume  $d \geq 3$ . Let  $s > 0$  and  $s_0 \geq 0$ .

1. Let  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$ . Then, the resolvent identity (3.18) holds as an operator from  $L^{\frac{dq}{d+2q}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  to  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .
2. Let  $0 < \varepsilon \leq d - 2$ . Then, the resolvent identity (3.18) holds as an operator from  $L^{\frac{d+\varepsilon}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{\frac{d-\varepsilon}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  to  $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

**Remark 3.4.** Let  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q \leq \infty$ . Then, Lemma 3.7 together with  $|V(x)| \lesssim (1 + |x|)^{-4}$  shows that the following identity holds as an operator from  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  to  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ :

$$1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V = 1 + (-\Delta)^{-1}V - s(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}V. \quad (3.19)$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.7.* By (2.21), (2.47) and (2.48), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &(-\Delta + s)^{-1} - (-\Delta + s_0)^{-1} \\ &= \{(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta + s_0) - 1\}(-\Delta + s_0)^{-1} \\ &= \{(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta + s) - (s - s_0)(-\Delta + s)^{-1} - 1\}(-\Delta + s_0)^{-1} \\ &= -(s - s_0)(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta + s_0)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

Note that each identity in (3.20) can be justified by Lemma 3.4, Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6. Thus, the claims of the lemma are true.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.8.** Assume  $3 \leq d \leq 7$ . Let  $2 \leq q \leq \infty$  and  $s > 0$ . Then, the following inequality holds:

$$\|(1 - \Delta)(-\Delta + s)^{-1}V\|_{L^q \rightarrow L^2 \cap L^q} \lesssim 1 + |1 - s|s^{-1}, \quad (3.21)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ . In particular, if  $f \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , then

$$(-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vf \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (3.22)$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.8.* Let  $f \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Observe from  $|V(x)| \lesssim (1 + |x|)^{-4}$  (see (2.10)) that if  $3 \leq d \leq 7$ , then

$$\|Vf\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.23)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Then, by (2.47), Lemma 3.4 and (3.23), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 - \Delta)(-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vf\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} &= \{(-\Delta + s) + (1 - s)\}(-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vf\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} \\ &\leq \|Vf\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} + |1 - s| \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vf\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} \\ &\lesssim \|Vf\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} + |1 - s|s^{-1} \|Vf\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} \lesssim (1 + |1 - s|s^{-1}) \|f\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Thus, we have obtained the desired estimate.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.9.** *Assume  $3 \leq d \leq 5$ , and let  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q \leq \infty$ . Then,  $(-\Delta)^{-1}V$  is a compact operator from  $X_q$  to itself. In particular,  $(-\Delta)^{-1}V: X_q \rightarrow X_q$  is bounded.*

*Proof of Lemma 3.9.* We prove the lemma in two steps.

**Step 1.** We shall show that for any  $f \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\|(-\Delta)^{-1}Vf\|_{L^q} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.25)$$

$$\|\nabla(-\Delta)^{-1}Vf\|_{L^q} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.26)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

Assume  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$ , and let  $f \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Then, applying (2.20) as  $r = \frac{dq}{2q+d}$ , we see that that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{-1}Vf\|_{L^q} \lesssim \|Vf\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{2q+d}}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.27)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Furthermore, by (2.19) and the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality, we see that

$$\|\nabla(-\Delta)^{-1}Vf\|_{L^q} \lesssim \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x - y|^{-(d-1)} V(y) |f(y)| dy \right\|_{L^q} \lesssim \|Vf\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{q+d}}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.28)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

Next, assume  $q = \infty$ , and let  $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Then, Lemma 3.6 shows that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{-1}Vf\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|Vf\|_{L^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \cap L^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} \lesssim \|V\|_{L^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \cap L^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty}, \quad (3.29)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$ . Furthermore, by (2.19) and Hölder's inequality, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(-\Delta)^{-1}Vf\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^{-(d-1)} V(x - y) dy \right\|_{L^\infty} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \left\{ \int_{|y| \leq 1} |y|^{-(d-1)} dy + \left( \int_{1 \leq |y|} |y|^{-\frac{d(d-1)}{d-2}} dy \right)^{\frac{d-2}{d}} \|V\|_{L^{\frac{d}{2}}} \right\} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$ . Thus, we have proved (3.25) and (3.26).

**Step 2.** We shall finish the proof of the lemma.

We will use Lemma A.1. Let  $\{f_n\}$  be a bounded sequence in  $X_q$ . Observe from (3.25) that

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \|(-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n\|_{L^q} \lesssim \sup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n\|_{L^q} < \infty. \quad (3.31)$$

Furthermore, observe from the fundamental theorem of calculus and (3.26) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{y \rightarrow 0} \sup_{n \geq 1} \|(-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n - (-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n(\cdot + y)\|_{L^q} \\ &= \limsup_{y \rightarrow 0} \sup_{n \geq 1} \left\| \int_0^1 \frac{d}{d\theta} (-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n(\cdot + \theta y) d\theta \right\|_{L^q} \\ &= \limsup_{y \rightarrow 0} \sup_{n \geq 1} \left\| \int_0^1 [y \cdot \nabla (-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n](\cdot + \theta y) d\theta \right\|_{L^q} \\ &\leq \limsup_{y \rightarrow 0} \sup_{n \geq 1} |y| \|\nabla (-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n\|_{L^q} \lesssim \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} |y| \sup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n\|_{L^q} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

Note that  $(-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n$  is radial, as so is  $f_n$ . Let  $\varepsilon_0 := \min\{\frac{1}{2}(q - \frac{d}{d-2}), 1\}$ . When  $q \neq \infty$ , Lemma 3.3 shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \geq 1} \|(-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n(x)\|_{L^q(|x| \geq R)} \\ &\leq \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \geq 1} R^{-\frac{d-2}{2} \frac{\varepsilon_0}{d+\varepsilon_0}} \| |x|^{\frac{d-2}{2}} (-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n \|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{\varepsilon_0}{d+\varepsilon_0}} \|(-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{d+\varepsilon_0}}}^{\frac{d}{d+\varepsilon_0}} \\ &\lesssim \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \geq 1} R^{-\frac{(d-2)\varepsilon_0}{2(d+\varepsilon_0)}} \|\nabla (-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{\varepsilon_0}{d+\varepsilon_0}} \|(-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{d+\varepsilon_0}}}^{\frac{d}{d+\varepsilon_0}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Similarly, when  $q = \infty$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \geq 1} \|(-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n(x)\|_{L^\infty(|x| \geq R)} \\ &\leq \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \geq 1} R^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} \| |x|^{\frac{d-2}{2}} (-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n \|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \geq 1} R^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} \|\nabla (-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ .

Observe from  $3 \leq d \leq 5$  and  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q \leq \infty$  that  $\frac{2d}{d+2} < q$  and  $\frac{2dq}{(d+2)q-2d} > \frac{d}{4}$  ( $\frac{2d}{d+2} > \frac{d}{4}$  if  $q = \infty$ ). Hence, by (2.19), the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality, Hölder's one, and  $V(x) \sim (1 + |x|)^{-4}$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla (-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \| |x|^{-(d-1)} * V f_n \|_{L^2} \lesssim \|V f_n\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}}} \\ &\leq \|V\|_{L^{\frac{2dq}{(d+2)q-2d}}} \|f_n\|_{L^q} \lesssim \|f_n\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Similarly, if  $q \neq \infty$ , then

$$\|(-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{d+\varepsilon_0}}} \lesssim \|V f_n\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{d+2q+\varepsilon_0}}} \leq \|V\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{2q+\varepsilon_0}}} \|f_n\|_{L^q} \lesssim \|f_n\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.36)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

Plugging the estimates (3.35) and (3.36) into (3.33) ((3.35) into (3.34) if  $q = \infty$ ), we find that

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \geq 1} \|(-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n(x)\|_{L^q(|x| \geq R)} = 0. \quad (3.37)$$

Thus, it follows from Lemma A.1 that  $\{(-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n\}$  contains a convergent subsequence in  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . We denote the convergent subsequence by the same symbol as the original one, and the limit by  $g$ . Note that  $g \in L^q_{\text{rad}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

It remains to prove that the limit  $g$  satisfies the orthogonality condition  $\langle g, V \Lambda W \rangle = 0$ . Since  $V \Lambda W = \Delta \Lambda W$  and  $\langle f_n, V \Lambda W \rangle = 0$ , we can verify that for any  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\langle (-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n, V \Lambda W \rangle = \langle (-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n, -(-\Delta) \Lambda W \rangle = -\langle V f_n, \Lambda W \rangle = 0, \quad (3.38)$$

which together with  $V \Lambda W \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  yields

$$\langle g, V \Lambda W \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (-\Delta)^{-1} V f_n, V \Lambda W \rangle = 0. \quad (3.39)$$

Thus, we have completed the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.10.** *Assume  $3 \leq d \leq 5$  and  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q \leq \infty$ . Then, the inverse of  $1 + (-\Delta)^{-1} V$  exists as a bounded operator from  $X_q$  to itself.*

*Proof of Lemma 3.10.* We see from Lemma 3.9 that  $(-\Delta)^{-1} V$  is a compact operator from  $X_q$  to itself. Furthermore, by a standard theory of compact operators, if  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  is neither zero nor an eigenvalue of  $(-\Delta)^{-1} V$ , then  $z$  belongs to the resolvent. In particular, if  $-1$  is not an eigenvalue of  $(-\Delta)^{-1} V$ , then the inverse of  $1 + (-\Delta)^{-1} V$  exists as a bounded operator from  $X_q$  to itself. Hence, what we need to prove is that  $-1$  is not an eigenvalue. Suppose for contradiction that there exists  $f \in X_q$  such that  $(-\Delta)^{-1} V f = -f$ . Then, we can verify that for any  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\langle (-\Delta + V)f, \phi \rangle = \langle (-\Delta)\{f + (-\Delta)^{-1} V f\}, \phi \rangle = \langle f + (-\Delta)^{-1} V f, -\Delta \phi \rangle = 0. \quad (3.40)$$

Lemma 3.2 together with (3.40) implies that  $f = \kappa \Lambda W$  for some  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ . Furthermore, it follows from  $\langle f, V \Lambda W \rangle = 0$  and  $\langle \Lambda W, V \Lambda W \rangle \neq 0$  that  $\kappa = 0$ . Thus,  $f$  is trivial and therefore  $-1$  is not an eigenvalue of  $(-\Delta)^{-1} V$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.11.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$ . Then, the following holds for all  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$ ,  $f \in L^q_{\text{rad}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $s > 0$ :*

$$\left| \langle (-\Delta + s)^{-1} V f, |x|^{-(d-2)} \rangle - \frac{(5-d)\pi^{2-\frac{d}{2}}}{2^{d-2}\Gamma(\frac{d-2}{2})} \Re \mathcal{F}[V f](0) \delta(s)^{-1} \right| \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.41)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

**Remark 3.5.** *When  $d = 4$ , it is essential that  $q < \infty$  in Lemma 3.11; More precisely, since  $V \notin L^1(\mathbb{R}^4)$ ,  $\mathcal{F}[V f](0)$  makes no sense for  $f \in L^\infty_{\text{rad}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 3.11.* Let  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$ ,  $f \in L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $s > 0$ . Then, by (2.4), (2.5), (2.3), (2.43) and (2.49), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vf, |x|^{-(d-2)} \rangle &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{4\pi^{\frac{d}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{d-2}{2})} \langle (|\xi|^2 + s)^{-1} \mathcal{F}[Vf], |\xi|^{-2} \rangle \\ &= C_d \Re \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{\mathcal{F}[Vf](0)}{(|\xi|^2 + s)|\xi|^2} d\xi + C_d \Re \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{\mathcal{F}[Vf](\xi) - \mathcal{F}[Vf](0)}{(|\xi|^2 + s)|\xi|^2} d\xi \\ &\quad + C_d \Re \int_{1 \leq |\xi|} \frac{\mathcal{F}[Vf](\xi)}{(|\xi|^2 + s)|\xi|^2} d\xi, \end{aligned} \quad (3.42)$$

where  $C_d := \{2^{d-2} \pi^{\frac{d}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{d-2}{2})\}^{-1}$ .

Consider the first term on the right-hand side of (3.42). By (2.30) and  $|V(x)| \lesssim (1 + |x|)^{-4}$  (see (2.10)), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| C_d \Re \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{\mathcal{F}[Vf](0)}{(|\xi|^2 + s)|\xi|^2} d\xi - C_d (5-d) \pi^2 \Re \mathcal{F}[Vf](0) \delta(s)^{-1} \right| \\ &\lesssim |\mathcal{F}[Vf](0)| \leq \|Vf\|_{L^1} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.43)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Next, consider the second term on the right-hand side of (3.42). Observe that

$$\int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{\xi}{(|\xi|^2 + s)|\xi|^2} d\xi = 0. \quad (3.44)$$

Furthermore, observe that for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|e^{-ix \cdot \xi} - 1 + ix \cdot \xi| \leq 2 \min\{|x||\xi|, |x|^2|\xi|^2\}. \quad (3.45)$$

Fix a number  $\varepsilon_0$  such that  $4-d < \varepsilon_0 < 4 - \frac{d(q-1)}{q}$ ; The dependence of a constant on  $\varepsilon_0$  is absorbed into than on  $d$  and  $q$ . Observe from  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$  that  $0 < \varepsilon_0 < 2$ . Then, by (3.45),  $|V(x)| \lesssim (1 + |x|)^{-4}$ , Hölder's inequality, and  $\frac{q(4-\varepsilon_0)}{q-1} > d$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathcal{F}[Vf](\xi) - \mathcal{F}[Vf](0) - \xi \cdot \nabla \mathcal{F}[Vf](0)| \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (e^{-ix \cdot \xi} - 1 + ix \cdot \xi) V(x) f(x) dx \right| \\ &\lesssim |\xi|^{\varepsilon_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^{\varepsilon_0} (1 + |x|)^{-4} |f(x)| dx \\ &\lesssim |\xi|^{\varepsilon_0} \|(1 + |x|)^{-(4-\varepsilon_0)}\|_{L^{\frac{q}{q-1}}} \|f\|_{L^q} \lesssim |\xi|^{\varepsilon_0} \|f\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.46)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Hence, by (3.44), (3.46) and  $d - \varepsilon_0 < d$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{\mathcal{F}[Vf](\xi) - \mathcal{F}[Vf](0)}{(|\xi|^2 + s)|\xi|^2} d\xi \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{\mathcal{F}[Vf](\xi) - \mathcal{F}[Vf](0) - \xi \cdot \nabla \mathcal{F}[Vf](0)}{(|\xi|^2 + s)|\xi|^2} d\xi \right| \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^q} \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{|\xi|^{\varepsilon_0}}{(|\xi|^2 + s)|\xi|^2} d\xi \leq \|f\|_{L^q} \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} |\xi|^{-(4-\varepsilon_0)} d\xi \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$



where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

Consider the last term on the right-hand side of (3.42). By (3.10), Plancherel's theorem,  $|V(x)| \lesssim (1 + |x|)^{-4}$  and  $q > 2$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi|\mathcal{F}[Vf]\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \|\mathcal{F}[Vf]\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4-d}{2}} \|\nabla\mathcal{F}[Vf]\|_{L^2}^{\frac{d-2}{2}} = \|\mathcal{F}[Vf]\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4-d}{2}} \|\mathcal{F}[xVf]\|_{L^2}^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \|Vf\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4-d}{2}} \|x|Vf\|_{L^2}^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.48)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Using (3.48), we see that

$$\left| \int_{1 \leq |\xi|} \frac{\mathcal{F}[Vf](\xi)}{(|\xi|^2 + s)|\xi|^2} d\xi \right| \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q} \int_{1 \leq |\xi|} \frac{1}{|\xi|^5} d\xi \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.49)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

Now, combining (3.42), (3.43), (3.47) and (3.49), we find that (3.41) holds.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.12.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$ . Then, the following holds for all  $s > 0$ :*

$$\|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}\Lambda W\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 1 + \delta(s)^{-1}, \quad (3.50)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ .

*Proof of Lemma 3.12.* Observe from (2.49) and  $-\Lambda W = (-\Delta)^{-1}V\Lambda W$  (see (2.25)) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}\Lambda W\|_{L^\infty} &\sim \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{ix \cdot \xi} \frac{\mathcal{F}[V\Lambda W](\xi)}{(|\xi|^2 + s)|\xi|^2} d\xi \right\|_{L_x^\infty} \\ &\leq \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{|\mathcal{F}[V\Lambda W](\xi)|}{(|\xi|^2 + s)|\xi|^2} d\xi + \int_{1 \leq |\xi|} \frac{|\mathcal{F}[V\Lambda W](\xi)|}{(|\xi|^2 + s)|\xi|^2} d\xi, \end{aligned} \quad (3.51)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ .

Consider the first term on the right-hand side of (3.51). By (2.30), we see that

$$\int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{\mathcal{F}[V\Lambda W](\xi)}{(|\xi|^2 + s)|\xi|^2} d\xi \lesssim \{\delta(s)^{-1} + 1\} \|V\Lambda W\|_{L^1} \lesssim \delta(s)^{-1} + 1, \quad (3.52)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$ . Move on to the second term on the right-hand side of (3.51). By (3.10) and Plancherel's theorem, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi|\mathcal{F}[V\Lambda W]\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \|\mathcal{F}[V\Lambda W]\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4-d}{2}} \|\nabla\mathcal{F}[V\Lambda W]\|_{L^2}^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \\ &= \|\mathcal{F}[V\Lambda W]\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4-d}{2}} \|\mathcal{F}[xV\Lambda W]\|_{L^2}^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \lesssim \|V\Lambda W\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4-d}{2}} \|x|V\Lambda W\|_{L^2}^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \lesssim 1, \end{aligned} \quad (3.53)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$ . Hence, we find from (3.53) and  $d = 3, 4$  that

$$\int_{1 \leq |\xi|} \frac{|\mathcal{F}[V\Lambda W](\xi)|}{(|\xi|^2 + s)|\xi|^2} d\xi \lesssim \int_{1 \leq |\xi|} \frac{1}{|\xi|^5} d\xi \lesssim 1, \quad (3.54)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$ . Plugging (3.52) and (3.54) into (3.51), we obtain the desired estimate (3.50).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.13.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$ . Then, there exists a constant  $\mathcal{C} > 0$  depending only on  $d$  such that the following holds for all  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$ ,  $g \in L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $s > 0$ :*

$$|\langle (-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vg, \Lambda W \rangle + \mathcal{C}\mathfrak{R}\mathcal{F}[Vg](0)\delta(s)^{-1}| \lesssim \|g\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.55)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

*Proof of Lemma 3.13.* Decompose  $\Lambda W$  as

$$\Lambda W(x) = -\frac{|x|^2}{2d} \left( \frac{|x|^2}{d(d-2)} \right)^{-\frac{d}{2}} + \frac{d-2}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{|x|^2}{d(d-2)} \right)^{-\frac{d}{2}} + Z(x), \quad (3.56)$$

where

$$Z(x) := -\frac{|x|^2}{2d} \left( 1 + \frac{|x|^2}{d(d-2)} \right)^{-\frac{d}{2}} + \frac{|x|^2}{2d} \left( \frac{|x|^2}{d(d-2)} \right)^{-\frac{d}{2}}. \quad (3.57)$$

Let  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$ ,  $g \in L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $s > 0$ . Then, it follows from (3.56) that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vg, \Lambda W \rangle &= -\frac{\{d(d-2)\}^{\frac{d}{2}}}{2d} \langle (-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vg, |x|^{-(d-2)} \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{d-2}{2} \langle (-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vg, \left( 1 + \frac{|x|^2}{d(d-2)} \right)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle (-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vg, Z \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (3.58)$$

Consider the first term on the right-hand side of (3.58). Lemma 3.11 shows that there exists  $A > 0$  depending only on  $d$  such that

$$\left| -\frac{\{d(d-2)\}^{\frac{d}{2}}}{2d} \langle (-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vg, |x|^{-(d-2)} \rangle + A\mathfrak{R}\mathcal{F}[Vg](0)\delta(s)^{-1} \right| \lesssim \|g\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.59)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Consider the second term on the right-hand side of (3.58). Observe from  $d = 3, 4$  that  $\frac{4d}{2d-5} > \frac{d}{d-2}$ ,  $\frac{4d}{2d+5} > 1$  and  $\frac{4d}{2d+3} < \frac{d}{d-2} < q$ . Then, by Hölder's inequality and Lemma 3.5, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{d-2}{2} \langle (-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vg, \left( 1 + \frac{|x|^2}{d(d-2)} \right)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \rangle \right| \\ &\lesssim \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vg\|_{L^{\frac{4d}{2d-5}}} \|(1 + |x|)^{-d}\|_{L^{\frac{4d}{2d+5}}} \lesssim \|Vg\|_{L^{\frac{4d}{2d+3}}} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.60)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . It remains to estimate the last term on the right-hand side of (3.58). Observe from the fundamental theorem of calculus,  $\frac{4d}{2d+5}(d-1) < d$  and  $\frac{4d}{2d+5} > 1$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Z\|_{L^{\frac{4d}{2d+5}}} &= \left\| \frac{|x|^2}{4} \int_0^1 \left( \theta + \frac{|x|^2}{d(d-2)} \right)^{-\frac{d}{2}-1} d\theta \right\|_{L^{\frac{4d}{2d+5}}} \\ &\lesssim \int_0^1 \theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} d\theta \| |x|^{-(d-1)} \|_{L^{\frac{4d}{2d+5}}(|x| \leq 1)} + \| |x|^{-d} \|_{L^{\frac{4d}{2d+5}}(1 \leq |x|)} \lesssim 1, \end{aligned} \quad (3.61)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$ . Then, by (3.61) and the same computation as (3.60), we see that

$$|\langle (-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vg, Z \rangle| \lesssim \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vg\|_{L^{\frac{4d}{2d-5}}} \|Z\|_{L^{\frac{4d}{2d+5}}} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.62)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

Putting (3.58), (3.59), (3.60) and (3.62) together, we find that (3.55) holds.  $\square$

The following lemma can be proved in a way similar to Lemma 3.13:

**Lemma 3.14** (cf. Lemma 2.5 of [7]). *Assume  $d = 3, 4$ . Then, there exists a constant  $\mathcal{C} > 0$  depending only on  $d$  such that the following holds for all  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$ ,  $g \in L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $s > 0$ :*

$$|\langle (-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vg, W \rangle - \mathcal{C}\mathfrak{R}\mathcal{F}[Vg](0)\delta(s)^{-1}| \lesssim \|g\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.63)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

*Proof of Lemma 3.14.* Rewrite  $W$  as

$$W(x) = \left(\frac{|x|^2}{d(d-2)}\right)^{\frac{-(d-2)}{2}} + Z(x), \quad (3.64)$$

where

$$Z(x) := \left(1 + \frac{|x|^2}{d(d-2)}\right)^{\frac{-(d-2)}{2}} - \left(\frac{|x|^2}{d(d-2)}\right)^{\frac{-(d-2)}{2}}. \quad (3.65)$$

Then, it is easy to see that the same proof as Lemma 3.13 is applicable.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.15.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$ . Then, there exists a constant  $A_1 > 0$  depending only on  $d$  such that the following holds for all  $s > 0$ :*

$$|\langle (-\Delta + s)^{-1}W, V\Lambda W \rangle - A_1\delta(s)^{-1}| \lesssim 1, \quad (3.66)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ .

*Proof of Lemma 3.15.* Observe from (2.15) that

$$\mathfrak{R}\mathcal{F}[V\Lambda W](0) = -\frac{d+2}{d-2}\langle W^{\frac{4}{d-2}}, \Lambda W \rangle = \frac{d-2}{2}\|W\|_{L^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}}^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}. \quad (3.67)$$

Then, applying Lemma 3.14 as  $g = \Lambda W$  and  $q = 2^*$ , we find that the claim of the lemma is true.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.16** (cf. Lemma 2.5 of [7]). *Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{2}{d-2} < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Then, the following holds for all  $s > 0$  and  $\max\{1, \frac{d}{(d-2)p}\} < r < \frac{d}{2}$ :*

$$|\langle (-\Delta + s)^{-1}W^p, V\Lambda W \rangle - K_p| \lesssim s^{\frac{d}{2r}-1}, \quad (3.68)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $r$ , and

$$K_p := -\langle W^p, \Lambda W \rangle = \frac{4 - (d-2)(p-1)}{2(p+1)}\|W\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1}. \quad (3.69)$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.16.* Let  $s > 0$ . Observe from  $V\Lambda W = \Delta W$  (see (2.13)) that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (-\Delta + s)^{-1}W^p, V\Lambda W \rangle &= \langle W^p, (-\Delta + s)^{-1}\{ -(-\Delta + s) + s \}\Lambda W \rangle \\ &= -\langle W^p, \Lambda W \rangle + s\langle W^p, (-\Delta + s)^{-1}\Lambda W \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (3.70)$$

Furthermore, by Hölder's inequality and Lemma 3.4, we see that for any  $\max\{1, \frac{d}{(d-2)p}\} < r < \frac{d}{2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} s|\langle W^p, (-\Delta + s)^{-1}\Lambda W \rangle| &\leq s\|W^p\|_{L^r}\|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}\Lambda W\|_{L^{\frac{r}{r-1}}} \\ &\lesssim s^{\frac{d-2}{2} - \frac{d(r-1)}{2r}}\|\Lambda W\|_{L_{\text{weak}}^{\frac{d}{d-2}}} \lesssim s^{\frac{d}{2r}-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.71)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $r$ . Putting (3.70) and (3.71) together, and using (2.15), we obtain the desired estimate (3.68).  $\square$

### 3.2 Proof of Proposition 3.1

In this section, we give a proof of Proposition 3.1. Assume  $d = 3, 4$ , and let  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q \leq \infty$ .

We introduce operators  $Q$  and  $\Pi$  from  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  to itself as

$$Qf := \frac{\langle f, V\Lambda W \rangle}{\langle \Lambda W, V\Lambda W \rangle} \Lambda W, \quad \Pi f := \frac{\langle f, V\Lambda W \rangle}{\|V\Lambda W\|_{L^2}^2} V\Lambda W. \quad (3.72)$$

Observe that  $Q^2 = Q$ ,  $\Pi^2 = \Pi$ , and

$$\|Q\|_{L^q \rightarrow L^q} \lesssim 1, \quad (3.73)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Furthermore, it follows from  $(-\Delta)\Lambda W = -V\Lambda W$  that

$$\{1 + (-\Delta)^{-1}V\}Q = 0, \quad (3.74)$$

$$\Pi\{1 + (-\Delta)^{-1}V\} = 0. \quad (3.75)$$

**Lemma 3.17.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$ , and let  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q \leq \infty$ . Then, the following hold:*

$$X_q = (1 - Q)L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{(1 - Q)f : f \in L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)\},$$

$$X_q = (1 - \Pi)L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{(1 - \Pi)f : f \in L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)\}.$$

Furthermore,  $(1 - Q)|_{X_q}$  and  $(1 - \Pi)|_{X_q}$  are the identity maps, namely

$$(1 - Q)f = (1 - \Pi)f = f \quad \text{for all } f \in X_q. \quad (3.76)$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.17.* Observe that for any  $f \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\langle (1 - Q)f, V\Lambda W \rangle = 0. \quad (3.77)$$

Hence,  $(1 - Q)L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset X_q$ . On the other hand, if  $f \in X_q$ , then  $\langle f, V\Lambda W \rangle = 0$  and therefore  $f = Qf + (1 - Q)f = (1 - Q)f$ . Thus,  $X_q \subset (1 - Q)L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Similarly, we can prove  $(1 - \Pi)L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) = X_q$ .  $\square$

Next, for  $d \geq 3$  and  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q \leq \infty$ , we introduce linear subspaces  $\mathbf{X}_q$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_q$  of  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \times L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  equipped with the norms  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{X}_q}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{Y}_q}$  as

$$\mathbf{X}_q := X_q \times QL_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \|(f_1, f_2)\|_{\mathbf{X}_q} := \|f_1\|_{L^q} + \|f_2\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.78)$$

$$\mathbf{Y}_q := X_q \times \Pi L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \|(f_1, f_2)\|_{\mathbf{Y}_q} := \|f_1\|_{L^q} + \|f_2\|_{L^q}. \quad (3.79)$$

Furthermore, for  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we define operators  $B_\varepsilon : \mathbf{X}_q \rightarrow L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\mathbf{C} : L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}_q$  by

$$B_\varepsilon(f_1, f_2) := \varepsilon f_1 + f_2, \quad \text{for all } (f_1, f_2) \in \mathbf{X}_q, \quad (3.80)$$

$$\mathbf{C}f := ((1 - Q)f, \Pi f) \quad \text{for all } f \in L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (3.81)$$

**Lemma 3.18.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$ . Let  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q \leq \infty$ . Then, the following hold:*

1. For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $B_\varepsilon: \mathbf{X}_q \rightarrow L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is surjective.
2.  $\mathbf{C}: L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}_q$  is injective.

*Proof of Lemma 3.18.* Let  $g \in L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , and define  $f_1 := \varepsilon^{-1}(1 - Q)g$  and  $f_2 := Qg$ . Then, Lemma 3.17 shows that  $(f_1, f_2) \in \mathbf{X}_q$ . Furthermore, it is obvious that  $B_\varepsilon(f_1, f_2) = g$ . Hence,  $B_\varepsilon$  is surjective.

Let  $f \in L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Suppose  $\mathbf{C}f = 0$ , so that  $(1 - Q)f = 0$  and  $\Pi f = 0$ . In particular, we have  $f = Qf = c\Lambda W$  for some  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . Furthermore, this together with  $\Pi f = 0$  implies  $c = 0$ . Thus,  $f = 0$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  is injective.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.19.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$ . Then, all of the following hold:*

1. For any  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$  and  $s > 0$ ,

$$s \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}VQ\|_{L^q \rightarrow L^q} \lesssim s^{\frac{d-2}{2} - \frac{d}{2q}}, \quad (3.82)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

2. For any  $0 < s \leq 1$ ,

$$s \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}VQ\|_{L^\infty \rightarrow L^\infty} \lesssim \delta(s)^{-1}s, \quad (3.83)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ .

3. For any  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q \leq \infty$ ,  $\frac{d}{d-2} < r < \infty$  and  $0 < s \leq 1$ ,

$$s \|\Pi(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}V\|_{L_{\text{rad}}^r \rightarrow \Pi L_{\text{rad}}^q} \lesssim \delta(s)^{-1}s, \quad (3.84)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $q$  and  $r$  (independent of  $s$ ); If  $d = 3$ , then (3.84) still holds for  $r = \infty$ .

*Proof of Lemma 3.19.* We shall prove (3.82) and (3.83). Let  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q \leq \infty$ ,  $f \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $s > 0$ . Observe from  $(-\Delta)^{-1}V\Lambda W = -\Lambda W$  (see (2.25)) and Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} s \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}VQf\|_{L^q} &= s \frac{|\langle f, V\Lambda W \rangle|}{|\langle \Lambda W, V\Lambda W \rangle|} \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}V\Lambda W\|_{L^q} \\ &\lesssim s \|f\|_{L^q} \|(-\Delta + \alpha)^{-1}\Lambda W\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.85)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Assume  $q \neq \infty$ . Then, applying Lemma 3.4 to the right-hand side of (3.85), we see that

$$s \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}VQf\|_{L^q} \lesssim s^{\frac{d}{2}(\frac{d-2}{d} - \frac{1}{q})} \|f\|_{L^q} \|\Lambda W\|_{L_{\text{weak}}^{\frac{d}{d-2}}} \lesssim s^{\frac{d-2}{2} - \frac{d}{2q}} \|f\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.86)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Thus, (3.82) holds. When  $q = \infty$  and  $0 < s \leq 1$ , applying Lemma 3.12 to the right-hand side of (3.85), we see that

$$s \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}VQf\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim s\delta(s)^{-1} \|f\|_{L^\infty}, \quad (3.87)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ . Thus, (3.83) holds.

Next, we shall prove (3.84). Let  $g \in L_{\text{rad}}^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Observe from  $|V(x)| \lesssim (1+|x|)^{-4}$  and  $r < \infty$  that

$$|\mathcal{F}[Vg](0)| \leq \|Vg\|_{L^1} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^r}, \quad (3.88)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $r$ ; Note here that when  $d = 3$ , (3.88) still holds for  $r = \infty$ . Then, by  $(-\Delta)^{-1}V\Lambda W = -\Lambda W$ , Lemma 3.13 and (3.88), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} s\|\Pi(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}Vg\|_{L^q} &= s\|\Pi(-\Delta)^{-1}(-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vg\|_{L^q} \\ &= s \frac{|\langle (-\Delta)^{-1}(-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vg, V\Lambda W \rangle|}{\|V\Lambda W\|_{L^2}^2} \|V\Lambda W\|_{L^q} \\ &= s \frac{|\langle (-\Delta + s)^{-1}Vg, \Lambda W \rangle|}{\|V\Lambda W\|_{L^2}^2} \|V\Lambda W\|_{L^q} \lesssim s\delta(s)^{-1}\|g\|_{L^r}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.89)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $q$  and  $r$ . Thus, (3.84) holds.  $\square$

Now, we are in a position to prove Proposition 3.1:

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* Assume  $d = 3, 4$ . Let  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$ , and let  $0 < s < 1$  be a small number to be specified later. Furthermore, let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be a small constant to be chosen later dependently only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

Observe from Lemma 3.4 that  $1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V$  maps  $L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  to itself. Recall from Lemma 3.18 that  $B_\varepsilon: \mathbf{X}_q \rightarrow L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is surjective, and  $\mathbf{C}: L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}_q$  is injective. Then, we define an operator  $\mathbf{A}_\varepsilon(s)$  from  $\mathbf{X}_q$  to  $\mathbf{Y}_q$  as

$$\mathbf{A}_\varepsilon(s) := \mathbf{C}\{1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V\}B_\varepsilon. \quad (3.90)$$

By Lemma 3.12 of [14] (see Lemma C.3 in Appendix C), we see that if the inverse of  $\mathbf{A}_\varepsilon(s)$  exists, then the operator  $1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V: L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  has the inverse and

$$\{1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V\}^{-1} = B_\varepsilon\{\mathbf{A}_\varepsilon(s)\}^{-1}\mathbf{C}. \quad (3.91)$$

This fact is the main point of the proof.

Let  $(f_1, f_2) \in \mathbf{X}_q$ . We may write  $\mathbf{A}_\varepsilon(s)(f_1, f_2)$  as follows (we do not care about the distinction between column and row vectors):

$$\mathbf{A}_\varepsilon(s)(f_1, f_2) = (A_{11}f_1 + A_{12}f_2, A_{21}f_1 + A_{22}f_2) = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.92)$$

where

$$A_{11} := \varepsilon(1 - Q)\{1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V\}|_{X_q}, \quad (3.93)$$

$$A_{12} := (1 - Q)\{1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V\}Q, \quad (3.94)$$

$$A_{21} := \varepsilon\Pi\{1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V\}|_{X_q}, \quad (3.95)$$

$$A_{22} := \Pi\{1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V\}Q. \quad (3.96)$$

Recall that  $1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V: L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Then, observe from Lemma 3.17 and (3.73) that

$$A_{11}: X_q \rightarrow X_q, \quad A_{12}: QL_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow X_q. \quad (3.97)$$

Furthermore, it is obvious that

$$A_{21}: X_q \rightarrow \Pi L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad A_{22}: QL_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \Pi L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (3.98)$$

We divide the proof into several steps:

**Step 1.** We consider the operator  $A_{11}: X_q \rightarrow X_q$  (see (3.93)).

Observe from Lemma 3.10 that  $\{1 + (-\Delta)^{-1}V\}|_{X_q}: X_q \rightarrow X_q$  has the inverse, say  $K_1$ , such that

$$\|K_1\|_{X_q \rightarrow X_q} \lesssim 1, \quad (3.99)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Furthermore, (3.76) in Lemma 3.17 shows that

$$(1 - Q)\{1 + (-\Delta)^{-1}V\}|_{X_q} = \{1 + (-\Delta)^{-1}V\}|_{X_q}. \quad (3.100)$$

Then, by (3.19) and (3.100) we may rewrite  $A_{11}$  as

$$A_{11} = \varepsilon\{1 + (-\Delta)^{-1}V\}|_{X_q} + \varepsilon S_{11} = \varepsilon\{1 + (-\Delta)^{-1}V\}|_{X_q}\{1 + K_1 S_{11}\}, \quad (3.101)$$

where

$$S_{11} := -s(1 - Q)(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}V|_{X_q}. \quad (3.102)$$

Now, fix  $1 < r_0 < \frac{dq}{d+2q}$ ; The dependence of a constant on  $r_0$  can be absorbed into that on  $d$  and  $q$ . Note that  $q > \frac{dr_0}{d-2r_0}$ . Then, by (3.99), (3.73), Lemma 3.4 and (2.20), we see that for any  $f \in X_q$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|K_1 S_{11} f\|_{L^q} &\lesssim s \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}V f\|_{L^q} \lesssim s^{\frac{d}{2}(\frac{d-2r_0}{dr_0} - \frac{1}{q})} \|(-\Delta)^{-1}V f\|_{L^{\frac{dr_0}{d-2r_0}}} \\ &\lesssim s^{\frac{d}{2}(\frac{d-2r_0}{dr_0} - \frac{1}{q})} \|V f\|_{L^{r_0}} \lesssim s^{\frac{d}{2}(\frac{d-2r_0}{dr_0} - \frac{1}{q})} \|f\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.103)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $p$ . Observe from the computations in (3.103) and Lemma 3.17 that  $S_{11}: X_q \rightarrow X_q$ . Hence, the Neumann series shows that if  $s$  is sufficiently small dependently only on  $d$  and  $q$ , then the operator  $1 + K_1 S_{11}: X_q \rightarrow X_q$  has the inverse, say  $K_2$ , which satisfies

$$\|K_2\|_{X_q \rightarrow X_q} \leq (1 - \|K_1 S_{11}\|_{X_q \rightarrow X_q})^{-1} \lesssim 1, \quad (3.104)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ . We summarize:

$$A_{11}^{-1} = \varepsilon^{-1} K_2 K_1, \quad \|A_{11}^{-1}\|_{X_q \rightarrow X_q} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}, \quad (3.105)$$

where  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  are the inverses of  $(1 + (-\Delta)^{-1}V)|_{X_q}: X_q \rightarrow X_q$ , and  $1 + K_1 S_{11}: X_q \rightarrow X_q$ , respectively, and the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

**Step 2.** We consider the operator  $A_{12}: QL_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow X_q$  (see (3.94)). Our aim is to show that

$$\|A_{12}\|_{QL_{\text{rad}}^q \rightarrow X_q} \lesssim s^{\frac{d-2}{2} - \frac{d}{2q}}, \quad (3.106)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

Let  $f \in QL_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Then, by (3.19), (3.74) and (3.73), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_{12} f\|_{L^q} &= \|(1 - Q)\{1 + (-\Delta)^{-1}V - s(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}V\} Q f\|_{L^q} \\ &= \|(1 - Q)\{s(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}V\} Q f\|_{L^q} \\ &\lesssim s \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}V Q f\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.107)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Applying (3.82) in Lemma 3.19 to the right-hand side of (3.107), we obtain (3.106).

**Step 3.** We consider the operator  $A_{21}: X_q \rightarrow \Pi L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  (see (3.95)). By (3.19), (3.75), and (3.84) in Lemma 3.19 with  $r = q$ , we see that

$$\|A_{21}\|_{L_{\text{rad}}^q \rightarrow \Pi L_{\text{rad}}^q} \lesssim \varepsilon \delta(s)^{-1} s, \quad (3.108)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

**Step 4.** We consider the operator  $A_{22}: QL_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \Pi L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  (see (3.96)).

Let  $f \in QL_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Observe from (3.19), (3.74) and  $(-\Delta)^{-1}V\Lambda W = -\Lambda W$  (see (2.25)) that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{22}f &= -s\Pi(-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}VQf \\ &= -s \frac{\langle f, V\Lambda W \rangle}{\langle \Lambda W, V\Lambda W \rangle \|V\Lambda W\|_{L^2}^2} \langle (-\Delta + s)^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}V\Lambda W, V\Lambda W \rangle V\Lambda W \\ &= s \frac{\langle f, V\Lambda W \rangle}{\langle \Lambda W, V\Lambda W \rangle \|V\Lambda W\|_{L^2}^2} \langle \Lambda W, (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V\Lambda W \rangle V\Lambda W \\ &= s \frac{\langle \Lambda W, (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V\Lambda W \rangle}{\langle \Lambda W, V\Lambda W \rangle} \Pi f. \end{aligned} \quad (3.109)$$

Furthermore, applying Lemma 3.13 to the right-hand side of (3.109) as  $g = \Lambda W$ , we find that  $A_{22}f$  can be written as follows:

$$A_{22}f = \mathcal{C}_0 \delta(s)^{-1} s \Pi f + \mathcal{C}_1 s \Pi f, \quad (3.110)$$

where  $\mathcal{C}_0$  and  $\mathcal{C}_1$  are some constants depending only on  $d$ . Define the operator  $G$  with domain  $QL_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  as

$$G := \mathcal{C}_0 \delta(s)^{-1} s \Pi|_{QL_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (3.111)$$

Observe that  $G: QL_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \Pi L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is bijective, and the inverse  $G^{-1}: \Pi L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow QL_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is given by

$$G^{-1}g = \mathcal{C}_0^{-1} s^{-1} \delta(s) \frac{\langle g, \Lambda W \rangle}{\langle \Lambda W, V\Lambda W \rangle} \Lambda W. \quad (3.112)$$

Hence, we may write  $A_{22}: QL_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \Pi L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  as

$$A_{22} = G(1 + s\mathcal{C}_1 G^{-1}\Pi). \quad (3.113)$$

Observe that

$$\|s\mathcal{C}_1 G^{-1}\Pi f\|_{L^q} \lesssim \delta(s) |\langle \Pi f, \Lambda W \rangle| \|\Lambda W\|_{L^q} \lesssim \delta(s) |\langle f, V\Lambda W \rangle| \lesssim \delta(s) \|f\|_{L^q}, \quad (3.114)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Hence, the Neumann series shows that if  $s$  is sufficiently small dependently only on  $d$  and  $q$ , then the operator  $1 + s\mathcal{C}_1 G^{-1}\Pi: QL_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow QL_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  has the inverse, say  $L$ , such that

$$\|L\|_{QL_{\text{rad}}^q \rightarrow QL_{\text{rad}}^q} \lesssim 1, \quad (3.115)$$



where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Then, we see that

$$A_{22}^{-1} = LG^{-1}, \quad \|A_{22}^{-1}\|_{\Pi L_{\text{rad}}^q \rightarrow QL_{\text{rad}}^q} \lesssim \delta(s)s^{-1}, \quad (3.116)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

**Step 5.** We shall finish the proof. To this end, we define

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_\varepsilon := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & A_{11}^{-1}A_{12} \\ A_{22}^{-1}A_{21} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{I} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.117)$$

Note that  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_\varepsilon: \mathbf{X}_q \rightarrow \mathbf{X}_q$ . Observe from (3.92) that

$$\mathbf{A}_\varepsilon(s)(f_1, f_2) = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_\varepsilon \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for all } (f_1, f_2) \in \mathbf{X}_q. \quad (3.118)$$

By (3.105), (3.116), (3.106) and (3.108), we see that if  $s$  is sufficiently small depending only on  $d$  and  $q$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{I} - \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathbf{X}_q \rightarrow \mathbf{X}_q} &\leq \|A_{11}^{-1}A_{12}\|_{QL_{\text{rad}}^q \rightarrow X_q} + \|A_{22}^{-1}A_{21}\|_{X_q \rightarrow QL_{\text{rad}}^q} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}\|A_{12}\|_{QL_{\text{rad}}^q \rightarrow X_q} + \delta(s)s^{-1}\|A_{21}\|_{X_q \rightarrow \Pi L_{\text{rad}}^q} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}s^{\frac{d-2}{2}-\frac{d}{2q}} + \varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (3.119)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Thus, we find that there exist  $s_0 > 0$  and  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ , both depending only on  $d$  and  $q$ , such that for any  $0 < s < s_0$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{I} - \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\varepsilon_0}\|_{\mathbf{X}_q \rightarrow \mathbf{X}_q} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (3.120)$$

and  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\varepsilon_0}$  has the inverse  $\mathbf{D} := \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\varepsilon_0}^{-1}$  satisfying

$$\|\mathbf{D}\|_{\mathbf{X}_q \rightarrow \mathbf{X}_q} \leq 2. \quad (3.121)$$

The dependence of a constant on  $\varepsilon_0$  can be absorbed into that on  $d$  and  $q$ . Furthermore, we may assume that  $\varepsilon_0 \leq \delta(s_0)s_0^{-1}$ . Then, for any  $0 < s < s_0$ , the inverse of  $\mathbf{A}_{\varepsilon_0}(s)$  exists and is given by

$$\mathbf{A}_{\varepsilon_0}(s)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} D_{11} & D_{12} \\ D_{21} & D_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_{11}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{22}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.122)$$

where  $D_{jk}$  is the  $(j, k)$ -entry of  $\mathbf{D}$ . Furthermore, we see from (3.105), (3.116) and (3.121) that for any  $0 < s < s_0$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{A}_{\varepsilon_0}(s)^{-1}\|_{\mathbf{Y} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}} \lesssim \|A_{11}^{-1}\|_{X_q \rightarrow X_q} + \|A_{22}^{-1}\|_{\Pi L_{\text{rad}}^q \rightarrow QL_{\text{rad}}^q} \lesssim \delta(s)s^{-1}, \quad (3.123)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Thus, Lemma 3.12 of [14] (see Lemma C.3 in Appendix C) shows that for any  $0 < s < s_0$ , the inverse of  $1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V$  exists as an operator from  $L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  to itself and

$$\{1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V\}^{-1} = B_{\varepsilon_0} \mathbf{A}_{\varepsilon_0}(s)^{-1} \mathbf{C}. \quad (3.124)$$

Observe that

$$\|B_{\varepsilon_0}\|_{\mathbf{X}_q \rightarrow L_{\text{rad}}^q} \lesssim 1, \quad \|\mathbf{C}\|_{L_{\text{rad}}^q \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}} \lesssim 1. \quad (3.125)$$

Hence, we see from (3.123) through (3.125) that for any  $0 < s < s_0$ ,

$$\|\{1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V\}^{-1}\|_{L_{\text{rad}}^q \rightarrow L_{\text{rad}}^q} \lesssim \delta(s)s^{-1}, \quad (3.126)$$

which proves (3.1).

It remains to prove (3.2). Assume  $f \in X_q$ . Then,  $\Pi f = 0$  and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \{1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V\}^{-1}f &= B_{\varepsilon_0} \begin{pmatrix} D_{11} & D_{12} \\ D_{21} & D_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_{11}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{22}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}f \\ &= D_{11}A_{11}^{-1}(1 - Q)f + D_{21}A_{11}^{-1}(1 - Q)f. \end{aligned} \quad (3.127)$$

Then, (3.2) follows from (3.127), (3.105) with  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0$ , and (3.121). Thus, we have completed the proof.  $\square$

## 4 Uniqueness

In this section, we give a proof of Theorem 1.1. Our proof is based on the scaling argument and the fixed-point argument developed in [7]. We will see that “the uniqueness provided by the fixed-point argument” is helpful in proving the uniqueness of ground states to (1.1).

First, observe that if  $\Phi$  is a solution to (1.1) and  $\lambda > 0$ , then  $u := T_\lambda[\Phi]$  satisfies

$$-\Delta u + \omega\lambda^{-2^*+2}u - \lambda^{-2^*+p+1}|u|^{p-1}u - |u|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}u = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

For  $s > 0$  and  $t > 0$ , we consider a general form of (4.1):

$$-\Delta u + su - t|u|^{p-1}u - |u|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}u = 0. \quad (4.2)$$

When  $s = t = 0$ , (4.2) agrees with the equation (2.8). Hence, we may expect that (4.2) admits a ground state asymptotically looks like  $W$  as  $s, t \rightarrow 0$ .

We look for a radial solution to (4.2) of the form  $W + \eta$ , which leads us to

$$(-\Delta + V + s)\eta = -sW + tW^p + N(\eta; t), \quad (4.3)$$

where  $N(\eta; t)$  is the function defined by (2.35). By the decomposition  $-\Delta + V + s = (-\Delta + s)\{1 + (-\Delta + s)^{-1}V\}$ , and the substitution  $s = \alpha(\tau)$ , we can rewrite (4.3) as

$$\eta = \{1 + (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}V\}^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}F(\eta; \alpha(\tau), t), \quad (4.4)$$

where  $F(\eta; \alpha(\tau), t) := -\alpha(\tau)W + tW^p + N(\eta; t)$  (see (2.36)). The significance of the substitution  $s = \alpha(\tau)$  is that  $\alpha(\tau)$  is written as  $\tau\delta(\alpha(\tau))$  (see (2.32)); We will use this fact later (see (4.7) below). Note that a solution to (4.2) which asymptotically looks like  $W$  corresponds to a solution to (4.4) which vanishes as  $\tau \rightarrow 0$  (in  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for all  $q > \frac{d}{d-2}$ ). Furthermore, recall from Proposition 3.1 (see also (3.3) in Remark 3.1) that for any  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$ ,

$$\|\{1 + (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}V\}^{-1}\|_{L_{\text{rad}}^q \rightarrow L_{\text{rad}}^q} \lesssim \tau^{-1}, \quad (4.5)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ . From these point of view, we need to eliminate the singular behavior of a solution to (4.4) arising from (4.5). To this end, we require the following condition, as well as [7]:

$$\langle (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}F(\eta; \alpha(\tau), t), V\Lambda W \rangle = 0. \quad (4.6)$$

As a result, we consider the system of (4.4) and (4.6). We will find a solution by using Banach fixed-point theorem, as in [7]. To this end, using (2.36) and  $\alpha(\tau) = \tau\delta(\alpha(\tau))$  (see (2.32)), we rewrite (4.6) as

$$\tau = \frac{t\langle (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}W^p, V\Lambda W \rangle + \langle (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}N(\eta; t), V\Lambda W \rangle}{\delta(\alpha(\tau))\langle (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}W, V\Lambda W \rangle}. \quad (4.7)$$

Here, we introduce several symbols:

**Notation 4.1.** 1. For  $t > 0$ ,  $0 < \tau < 1$ , and  $\eta \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , we define  $\mathcal{X}(\tau)$ ,  $\mathcal{W}_p(\tau)$  and  $\mathcal{N}(t, \tau, \eta)$  as

$$\mathcal{X}(\tau) := \delta(\alpha(\tau))\langle (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}W, V\Lambda W \rangle, \quad (4.8)$$

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\tau) := \langle (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}W^p, V\Lambda W \rangle, \quad (4.9)$$

$$\mathcal{N}(t, \tau, \eta) := \langle (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}N(\eta; t), V\Lambda W \rangle. \quad (4.10)$$

2. For  $t > 0$ ,  $0 < \tau < 1$  and  $\eta \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , we define  $\mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta)$  as

$$\mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta) := \frac{t\mathcal{W}_p(\tau) + \mathcal{N}(t, \tau, \eta)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau)}. \quad (4.11)$$

3. For  $t > 0$ ,  $0 < \tau < 1$  and  $\eta \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , we define  $\mathfrak{g}(t; \tau, \eta)$  as

$$\mathfrak{g}(t; \tau, \eta) := \{1 + (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}V\}^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}F(\eta; \alpha(\tau), t). \quad (4.12)$$

4. We use  $A_1$  and  $K_p$  to denote the constants given in Lemma 3.15 and Lemma 3.16, respectively.

5. For  $t > 0$ , we define an interval  $I(t)$  as

$$I(t) := \left[ \frac{K_p}{2A_1}t, \frac{3K_p}{2A_1}t \right]. \quad (4.13)$$

In stead of  $I(t)$ , we may use any interval which contains  $\frac{K_p}{A_1}t$  and whose length is comparable to  $t$ .

6. For  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$  we define a number  $\Theta_q$  as

$$\Theta_q := \frac{d-2}{2} - \frac{d}{2q}. \quad (4.14)$$

7. For  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$ ,  $R > 0$  and  $0 < t < 1$ , we define  $Y_q(R, t)$  as

$$Y_q(R, t) := \left\{ \eta \in L^q_{\text{rad}}(\mathbb{R}^d) : \|\eta\|_{L^q} \leq R\alpha(t)^{\Theta_q} \right\}, \quad (4.15)$$

Note here that when  $d = 4$ ,  $\alpha$  is defined only on  $(0, 1)$  (see Lemma C.1).

**Remark 4.1.** Observe from  $s = \alpha(\beta(s))$  that

$$\delta(s)\langle(-\Delta + s)^{-1}W, V\Lambda W\rangle = \mathcal{X}(\beta(s)), \quad (4.16)$$

$$\langle(-\Delta + s)^{-1}W^p, V\Lambda W\rangle = \mathcal{W}_p(\beta(s)), \quad (4.17)$$

$$\langle(-\Delta + s)^{-1}N(\eta; t), V\Lambda W\rangle = \mathcal{N}(t, \beta(s), \eta). \quad (4.18)$$

**Remark 4.2.** 1. We can verify that for any  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$ ,  $R > 0$  and  $0 < t < 1$ , the set  $Y_q(R, t)$  is complete as a subspace of  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with the induced metric (see Section B).

2. Since  $\alpha(t)$  is strictly increasing on  $(0, 1)$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \alpha(t) = 0$  (see Section 2), we find that: for any  $\theta > 0$  and  $R > 0$ , there exists  $T(\theta, R) > 0$  depending only on  $\theta$  and  $R$  such that

$$(1 + R)^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}\alpha(t)^\theta \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } 0 < t \leq T(\theta, R). \quad (4.19)$$

Now, we use the symbols (4.11) and (4.12) to rewrite the system of the equations (4.4) and (4.6) as follows:

$$(\tau, \eta) = (\mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta), \mathfrak{g}(t; \tau, \eta)). \quad (4.20)$$

We can find a solution to (4.20):

**Proposition 4.1.** Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{4}{d-2} - 1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Let  $\max\{2^*, \frac{2^*}{p-1}\} < q < \infty$  and  $R > 0$ . Then, there exists  $0 < T_1(q, R) < 1$  depending only on  $d, p, q$  and  $R$  with the following property: for any  $0 < t < T_1(q, R)$ , the product metric space  $I(t) \times Y_q(R, t)$  admits one and only one solution  $(\tau_t, \eta_t)$  to (4.20). Furthermore,  $\tau_t$  is continuous and strictly increasing with respect to  $t$  on  $(0, T_1(q, R))$ .

Observe that if  $(\tau_t, \eta_t)$  is a solution to (4.20), then  $W + \eta_t$  is one to the following equation:

$$-\Delta u + \alpha(\tau_t)u - t|u|^{p-1}u - |u|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}u = 0. \quad (4.21)$$

We denote the action and Nehari functional associated with (4.21) by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_t(u) := \frac{\alpha(\tau_t)}{2}\|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{t}{p+1}\|u\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1} - \frac{1}{2^*}\|u\|_{L^{2^*}}^{2^*}, \quad (4.22)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_t(u) := \alpha(\tau_t)\|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 - t\|u\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1} - \|u\|_{L^{2^*}}^{2^*}. \quad (4.23)$$

Furthermore, we define  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$  as the set of all positive radial ground states to (4.21), namely,  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$  denotes the set of positive radial minimizers for the following variational problem:

$$\inf \{ \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_t(u) : u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \{0\}, \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_t(u) = 0 \}. \quad (4.24)$$

The following proposition is a key to proving the uniqueness of ground states to (1.1):

**Proposition 4.2** (cf. Lemma 3.11 of [7]). Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{4}{d-2} - 1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Let  $\max\{2^*, \frac{2^*}{p+3-2^*}\} < q < \infty$ . Furthermore, for  $R > 0$ , let  $T_1(q, R)$  denote the number given in Proposition 4.1. Then, there exist  $R_* > 0$  and  $0 < T_* < T_1(q, R_*)$ , both depending only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ , with the following property: Let  $0 < t < T_*$ , and let  $(\tau_t, \eta_t)$  be a unique solution to (4.20) in  $I(t) \times Y_q(R_*, t)$  (see Proposition 4.1). Then,  $W + \eta_t$  is a unique positive radial ground state to (4.21); in other words,  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t = \{W + \eta_t\}$ .

We give a proof of Proposition 4.2 in Section 4.3.

Now, we are in a position to prove Theorem 1.1:

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{4}{d-2} - 1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Fix  $\max\{2^*, \frac{2^*}{p+3-2^*}\} < q < \infty$ , so that the dependence of a constant on  $q$  can be absorbed into that on  $d$  and  $p$ . Then, by Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 4.2, we see that there exist  $R_* > 0$  and  $0 < T_* < 1$  depending only on  $d$  and  $p$  such that for any  $0 < t \leq T_*$ ,  $I(t) \times Y_q(R_*, t)$  admits a unique solution  $(\tau_t, \eta_t)$  to (4.20), and  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t = \{W + \eta_t\}$ .

We shall show that there exists  $\omega_* > 0$  with the following property: for any  $\omega > \omega_*$ , there exists  $0 < t(\omega) < T_*$  such that


$$\alpha(\tau_{t(\omega)}) = \omega t(\omega)^{\frac{2^*-2}{2^*-(p+1)}}. \quad (4.25)$$

Observe from  $\beta(s) = \delta(s)^{-1}s$  (see (2.31)) that for any  $0 < t < T_*$ ,

$$\beta(\omega t^{\frac{2^*-2}{2^*-(p+1)}}) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\omega} t^{\frac{2}{5-p}} & \text{if } d = 3, \\ \log(1 + \omega^{-1} t^{\frac{-2}{3-p}}) \omega t^{\frac{2}{3-p}} & \text{if } d = 4. \end{cases} \quad (4.26)$$

Then, by  $\tau_t \in I(t) := [\frac{K_p}{2A_1}t, \frac{3K_p}{2A_1}t]$  and (4.26), we find (see Figure 4) that there exists  $\omega_* > 0$  with the following property: for any  $\omega > \omega_*$ , there exists  $0 < t(\omega) < T_*$  such that

$$\tau_{t(\omega)} = \beta(\omega t(\omega)^{\frac{2^*-2}{2^*-(p+1)}}). \quad (4.27)$$



Since  $\alpha$  is the inverse function of  $\beta$ , (4.27) implies (4.25).

Now, we shall finish the proof of Theorem 1.1. Let  $\omega_*$  be a frequency found in the above, so that for any  $\omega > \omega_*$ , there exists  $0 < t(\omega) < T_*$  such that (4.25) holds. Suppose for contradiction that there exists  $\omega > \omega_*$  for which the equation (1.1) admits two distinct positive ground states, say  $\Phi_\omega$  and  $\Psi_\omega$ . Then, we define  $\lambda(\omega) > 0$  by

$$\lambda(\omega)^{-\{2^*-(p+1)\}} = t(\omega). \quad (4.28)$$

Furthermore, we define  $\tilde{\Phi}_\omega$  and  $\tilde{\Psi}_\omega$  as

$$\tilde{\Phi}_\omega := T_{\lambda(\omega)}[\Phi_\omega], \quad \tilde{\Psi}_\omega := T_{\lambda(\omega)}[\Psi_\omega], \quad (4.29)$$

where  $T_{\lambda(\omega)}$  is the scaling operator defined by (2.11). We shall derive a contradiction by showing that

$$\tilde{\Phi}_\omega, \tilde{\Psi}_\omega \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{t(\omega)}. \quad (4.30)$$

Indeed, (4.30) contradicts Proposition 4.2; Thus, the claim of Theorem 1.1 is true.

Let us prove (4.30). Observe from  $\mathcal{N}_\omega(\Phi_\omega) = 0$ , a computation involving the scaling, and (4.25) that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{t(\omega)}(\tilde{\Phi}_\omega) = 0, \quad (4.31)$$

where  $\mathcal{N}_\omega$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{t(\omega)}$  are the functionals defined by (1.6) and (4.23), respectively. Furthermore, (4.31) implies

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{t(\omega)}(\tilde{\Phi}_\omega) \geq \inf \{ \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{t(\omega)}(u) : u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \{0\}, \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{t(\omega)}(u) = 0 \}. \quad (4.32)$$

If  $\tilde{\Phi}_\omega$  were not in  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{t(\omega)}$ , then the equality failed in (4.32) and there existed a function  $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{t(\omega)}(u) < \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{t(\omega)}(\tilde{\Phi}_\omega), \quad (4.33)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{t(\omega)}(u) = 0. \quad (4.34)$$

Then, define  $U_\omega$  by  $U_\omega(x) := T_{\lambda(\omega)^{-1}}[u](x) = \lambda(\omega)u(\lambda(\omega)^{\frac{2}{d-2}}x)$ . By (4.25), (4.33), (4.34) and a computation involving the scaling, we see that

$$\mathcal{S}_\omega(U_\omega) < \mathcal{S}_\omega(\Phi_\omega), \quad \mathcal{N}_\omega(U_\omega) = 0. \quad (4.35)$$

However, (4.35) contradicts that  $\Phi$  is a ground state to (1.1). Thus, it must hold that  $\tilde{\Phi}_\omega \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{t(\omega)}$ . Similarly, we can verify that  $\Psi_\omega \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{t(\omega)}$ . Thus, we have proved (4.30), which completes the proof.  $\square$

#### 4.1 Basic estimates

In this section, we prepare several estimates for the proof of Proposition 4.1. In order to describe them, we use the following symbols:

**Notation 4.2.** 1. For  $d = 3, 4$ ,  $p > 1$  and  $q > 1$ , define a number  $\nu_q$  as

$$\nu_q := \begin{cases} \frac{d}{2q} & \text{if } d = 3, 4 \text{ and } \frac{d}{d-2} \leq p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}, \\ 1 - \frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{4} & \text{if } d = 3, 4 \text{ and } 1 < p < \frac{d}{d-2}. \end{cases} \quad (4.36)$$

Note that

$$\frac{(d-2)p-2}{2} > \frac{d-2}{2} - \nu_q. \quad (4.37)$$

Furthermore, if  $p > \frac{4}{d-2} - 1$  and  $q > \max\{2^*, \frac{2^*}{p-1}\}$ , then

$$\Theta_q - \nu_q > 0, \quad \Theta_q + \frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2} - 1 > 0. \quad (4.38)$$

2. For  $d = 3, 4$ ,  $p > \frac{4}{d-2} - 1$  and  $q > \max\{2^*, \frac{2^*}{p-1}\}$ , define  $\theta_q > 0$  as

$$\theta_q := \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \Theta_q - \nu_q, \Theta_q + \frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2} - 1 \right\}. \quad (4.39)$$

**Remark 4.3.** Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $p > \frac{4}{d-2} - 1$ , and let  $q > \max\{2^*, \frac{2^*}{p-1}\}$ . Then, we see from (2.34) that if  $t > 0$  is sufficiently small depending only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ , then

$$t \leq \alpha(t)^{\Theta_q}, \quad (4.40)$$

$$t^{-1} \alpha(t)^{2\Theta_q} \leq \alpha(t)^{\Theta_q - \nu_q}. \quad (4.41)$$

**Lemma 4.1.** Assume  $d = 3, 4$ . Let  $2^* < q < \infty$ . Then, for any  $R > 0, s > 0, 0 < t_1 \leq t_2 < 1, \eta_1 \in Y_q(R, t_1)$  and  $\eta_2 \in Y_q(R, t_2)$ , the following holds:

$$\|(-\Delta + s)^{-1} D(\eta_1, \eta_2)\|_{L^q} \lesssim \left\{ R\alpha(t_2)^{\Theta_q} + s^{\frac{2^*}{q}-1} R^{\frac{4}{d-2}} \alpha(t_2)^{\frac{4}{d-2}\Theta_q} \right\} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q}, \quad (4.42)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4.1.* Note that  $\frac{(6-d)dq}{(d-2)(2q-d)} > \frac{d}{d-2}$ . Hence, we see from (2.7) that

$$W \in L^{\frac{(6-d)dq}{(d-2)(2q-d)}}(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (4.43)$$

Furthermore, observe from  $0 < t_1 \leq t_2$  that

$$\max_{j=1,2} \|\eta_j\|_{L^q} \leq R\alpha(t_2)^{\Theta_q}. \quad (4.44)$$

Then, by (2.44), (2.41), Lemma 3.5, Lemma 3.4, Hölder's inequality, (4.43) and (4.44), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1} D(\eta_1, \eta_2)\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1} \{W^{\frac{6-d}{d-2}}(|\eta_1| + |\eta_2|) + (|\eta_1| + |\eta_2|)^{\frac{4}{d-2}}\} |\eta_1 - \eta_2|\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim \|W^{\frac{6-d}{d-2}}(|\eta_1| + |\eta_2|) |\eta_1 - \eta_2|\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{d+2q}}} + s^{\frac{2^*}{q}-1} \|(|\eta_1| + |\eta_2|)^{\frac{4}{d-2}} |\eta_1 - \eta_2|\|_{L^{\frac{(d-2)q}{d+2}}} \\ & \lesssim \|W\|_{L^{\frac{(6-d)dq}{(d-2)(2q-d)}}}^{\frac{6-d}{d-2}} \|(|\eta_1| + |\eta_2|)\|_{L^q} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q} + s^{\frac{2^*}{q}-1} \|(|\eta_1| + |\eta_2|)\|_{L^q}^{\frac{4}{d-2}} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim \{R\alpha(t_2)^{\Theta_q} + s^{\frac{2^*}{q}-1} R^{\frac{4}{d-2}} \alpha(t_2)^{\frac{4}{d-2}\Theta_q}\} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.45)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . This proves the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Let  $2^* \leq q < \infty$ . Then, for any  $R > 0, s > 0, 0 < t_1 \leq t_2 < 1, \eta_1 \in Y_q(R, t_1)$  and  $\eta_2 \in Y_q(R, t_2)$ , the following holds:

$$\|(-\Delta + s)^{-1} E(\eta_1, \eta_2)\|_{L^q} \lesssim \left\{ s^{-\nu_q} + s^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}-1} R^{p-1} \alpha(t_2)^{(p-1)\Theta_q} \right\} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q}, \quad (4.46)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4.2.* First, assume that  $1 < p < \frac{d}{d-2}$ . Let  $0 < \varepsilon_0 < \frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2}$ , and define  $q_0$  as

$$q_0 := \frac{dq}{d + (d-2)(p-1)q - 2q\varepsilon_0}. \quad (4.47)$$

Observe that  $1 < q_0 < q$  and  $\frac{d}{d-2} < \frac{(p-1)q_0q}{q-q_0}$ . Furthermore, by (2.7), we see that

$$W \in L^{\frac{(p-1)q_0q}{q-q_0}}(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (4.48)$$

Then, by (2.44), (2.42), Lemma 3.4, Hölder's inequality, (4.48) and  $\alpha(t_1) \leq \alpha(t_2)$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}E(\eta_1, \eta_2)\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim s^{\frac{d}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{q})-1} \|W^{p-1}|\eta_1 - \eta_2|\|_{L^{q_0}} + s^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}-1} \|\{|\eta_1| + |\eta_2|\}^{p-1}|\eta_1 - \eta_2|\|_{L^{\frac{q}{p}}} \\ & \lesssim s^{\frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2}-\varepsilon_0-1} \|W\|_{L^{\frac{(p-1)q_0q}{q-q_0}}}^{p-1} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q} + s^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}-1} \|\{|\eta_1| + |\eta_2|\}^{p-1}\|_{L^q} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim s^{-1} \left\{ s^{\frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2}-\varepsilon_0} + s^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}} R^{p-1} \alpha(t_2)^{(p-1)\Theta_q} \right\} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.49)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p, q$  and  $\varepsilon_0$ . Note that we may choose  $\varepsilon_0 = \frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{4}$  in (4.49).

Next, assume that  $\frac{d}{d-2} \leq p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Observe from the assumptions about  $p$  and  $q$  that

$$\frac{(p-1)dq}{2q-d} > \frac{d}{d-2} \geq \frac{d}{2}, \quad \frac{d(p-1)}{2q} < 1, \quad p < q. \quad (4.50)$$

Then, a computation similar to (4.49) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}E(\eta_1, \eta_2)\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim s^{\frac{d}{2}(\frac{2}{d} - \frac{1}{q})-1} \|W^{p-1}|\eta_1 - \eta_2|\|_{L^{\frac{d}{2}}} + s^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}-1} \|\{|\eta_1| + |\eta_2|\}^{p-1}|\eta_1 - \eta_2|\|_{L^{\frac{q}{p}}} \\ & \lesssim s^{-\frac{d}{2q}} \|W\|_{L^{\frac{(p-1)dq}{2q-d}}}^{p-1} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q} + s^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}-1} \|\{|\eta_1| + |\eta_2|\}^{p-1}\|_{L^q} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim s^{-1} \left\{ s^{1-\frac{d}{2q}} + s^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}} R^{p-1} \alpha(t_2)^{(p-1)\Theta_q} \right\} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.51)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ .

Putting (4.49) with  $\varepsilon_0 = \frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{4}$ , and (4.51), we find that (4.46) holds.  $\square$

The following lemma follows immediately from Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2, (2.40) and (2.39):

**Lemma 4.3.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{4}{d-2} - 1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Let  $2^* < q < \infty$ .*

1. *For any  $R > 0, s > 0, t > 0, 0 < t_0 < 1$  and  $\eta \in Y_q(R, t_0)$ , the following holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}N(\eta; t)\|_{L^q} & \lesssim R^2 \alpha(t_0)^{2\Theta_q} + s^{\frac{2^*}{q}-1} R^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}} \alpha(t_0)^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}\Theta_q} \\ & \quad + t \left\{ s^{-\nu_q} R \alpha(t_0)^{\Theta_q} + s^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}-1} R^p \alpha(t_0)^{p\Theta_q} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.52)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ .



2. For any  $R > 0$ ,  $s > 0$ ,  $t > 0$ ,  $0 < t_1 \leq t_2 < 1$ ,  $\eta_1 \in Y_q(R, t_1)$  and  $\eta_2 \in Y_q(R, t_2)$ , the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(-\Delta + s)^{-1}\{N(\eta_1; t) - N(\eta_2; t)\}\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim \{R\alpha(t_2)^{\Theta_q} + s^{\frac{2^*}{q}-1}R^{\frac{4}{d-2}}\alpha(t_2)^{\frac{4}{d-2}\Theta_q}\|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q} \\ & \quad + t\{s^{-\nu_q} + s^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}-1}R^{p-1}\alpha(t_2)^{(p-1)\Theta_q}\|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.53)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** Assume  $d = 3, 4$ . Then, there exists  $0 < T < 1$  depending only on  $d$  such that if  $0 < t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T$ , then

$$|\alpha(t_2) - \alpha(t_1)| \leq 2\delta(\alpha(t_2))|t_2 - t_1|, \quad (4.54)$$

$$|\delta(\alpha(t_2)) - \delta(\alpha(t_1))| \leq (1 + o_{t_1}(1))t_1^{-1}\delta(\alpha(t_1))\delta(\alpha(t_2))^{d-3}|t_2 - t_1|. \quad (4.55)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.4.* We may assume that  $d = 4$ , as the case  $d = 3$  ( $\alpha(t) = t^2$ ) is almost trivial. Thus,  $\delta(s) = \frac{1}{\log(1+s^{-1})}$ . Note that  $\frac{d\delta}{ds}(s) = \{(s + s^2)\log^2(1 + s^{-1})\}^{-1}$  and  $(s + s^2)\log^2(1 + s^{-1})$  is strictly increasing on (for instance) the interval  $(0, e^{-2})$ .

Let  $0 < t_1 \leq t_2 < 1$ . Then, by the fundamental theorem of calculus and (2.32), we see that if  $t_2 \leq \beta(e^{-2})$  (hence  $\alpha(t_2) \leq e^{-2}$ ), then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\alpha(t_2)) - \delta(\alpha(t_1)) &= \int_{\alpha(t_1)}^{\alpha(t_2)} \frac{1}{(s + s^2)\log^2(1 + s^{-1})} ds \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha(t_2) - \alpha(t_1)}{(\alpha(t_1) + \alpha(t_1)^2)\log^2(1 + \alpha(t_1)^{-1})} \\ &\leq \alpha(t_1)^{-1}\delta(\alpha(t_1))^2\{\alpha(t_2) - \alpha(t_1)\} = t_1^{-1}\delta(\alpha(t_1))\{\alpha(t_2) - \alpha(t_1)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.56)$$

Furthermore, by (2.32), we see that

$$\alpha(t_2) - \alpha(t_1) = \delta(\alpha(t_2))(t_2 - t_1) + \{\delta(\alpha(t_2)) - \delta(\alpha(t_1))\}t_1. \quad (4.57)$$

Plugging (4.56) into (4.57), we see that

$$\alpha(t_2) - \alpha(t_1) \leq \delta(\alpha(t_2))(t_2 - t_1) + \delta(\alpha(t_1))\{\alpha(t_2) - \alpha(t_1)\}, \quad (4.58)$$

which implies that

$$\alpha(t_2) - \alpha(t_1) \leq (1 + o_{t_1}(1))\delta(\alpha(t_2))(t_2 - t_1). \quad (4.59)$$

If  $t_1$  is sufficiently small depending only on  $d$ , then (4.59) yields (4.54). Furthermore, plugging (4.54) into (4.56), we obtain (4.55).  $\square$

Now, observe from Lemma 3.15, Lemma 3.16 and  $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \delta(s) = 0$  that if  $s > 0$  is sufficiently small depending only on  $d$  and  $p$ , then

$$|\delta(s)\langle(-\Delta + s)^{-1}W, V\Lambda W\rangle| \sim A_1 \sim 1, \quad (4.60)$$

$$|\langle(-\Delta + s)^{-1}W^p, V\Lambda W\rangle| \sim K_p \sim 1, \quad (4.61)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $p$ .

**Lemma 4.5.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$ . Then, the following holds for all  $0 < s_1 \leq s_2 < 1$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} & |\delta(s_1)\langle(-\Delta + s_1)^{-1}W, V\Lambda W\rangle - \delta(s_2)\langle(-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}W, V\Lambda W\rangle| \\ & \lesssim \log(1 + s_2^{-1})|s_1 - s_2| + |\delta(s_1) - \delta(s_2)|, \end{aligned} \quad (4.62)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4.5.* Since  $-\Delta W = W^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}$ , we may write the Fourier transform of  $W$  as

$$\mathcal{F}[W](\xi) = |\xi|^{-2}\mathcal{F}[W^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}](\xi). \quad (4.63)$$

Furthermore, using the spherical coordinate system, we can verify that

$$\left| \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{\delta(s_1)}{(|\xi|^2 + s_1)|\xi|^2} d\xi - \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{\delta(s_2)}{(|\xi|^2 + s_2)|\xi|^2} d\xi \right| \begin{cases} \lesssim |\delta(s_1) - \delta(s_2)| & \text{if } d = 3, \\ = 0 & \text{if } d = 4. \end{cases} \quad (4.64)$$

Next, we define a function  $g$  as

$$g := \mathcal{F}[V\Lambda W]\mathcal{F}[W^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}] = \mathcal{F}[V\Lambda W * W^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}]. \quad (4.65)$$

Observe from  $|V\Lambda W(x)| \sim (1 + |x|)^{-(d+2)}$  and  $|W^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}(x)| \sim (1 + |x|)^{-(d+2)}$  that

$$|V\Lambda W * W^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}(x)| \lesssim (1 + |x|)^{-(d+2)}. \quad (4.66)$$

Then, by (4.65) and (4.66), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |g(\xi) - g(0) - \xi \cdot \nabla g(0)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (e^{-ix \cdot \xi} - 1 + i\xi \cdot x) \mathcal{F}^{-1}[g](x) dx \right| \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \min\{|x||\xi|, |x|^2|\xi|^2\} |V\Lambda W * W^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}(x)| dx \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \min\{|x||\xi|, |x|^2|\xi|^2\} (1 + |x|)^{-(d+2)} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.67)$$

Now, we shall derive the desired estimate (4.62). We see from Parseval's identity,  $(-\Delta + s_j) = \mathcal{F}[ (|\xi|^2 + s_j) ] \mathcal{F}$ , (4.63) and (4.64) that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\delta(s_1)\langle R(s_1)W, V\Lambda W\rangle - \delta(s_2)\langle R(s_2)W, V\Lambda W\rangle| \\ &= |\langle \{\delta(s_1)R(s_1) - \delta(s_2)R(s_2)\} V\Lambda W, W \rangle| \\ &\lesssim \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ \frac{\delta(s_1)}{(|\xi|^2 + s_1)|\xi|^2} - \frac{\delta(s_2)}{(|\xi|^2 + s_2)|\xi|^2} \right\} g(\xi) d\xi \right| \\ &\lesssim \delta(s_1) \left| \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \left\{ \frac{g(\xi) - g(0)}{(|\xi|^2 + s_1)|\xi|^2} - \frac{g(\xi) - g(0)}{(|\xi|^2 + s_2)|\xi|^2} \right\} d\xi \right| + |\delta(s_1) - \delta(s_2)||g(0)| \\ &\quad + |\delta(s_1) - \delta(s_2)| \left| \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{g(\xi) - g(0)}{(|\xi|^2 + s_2)|\xi|^2} d\xi \right| \\ &\quad + \int_{1 \leq |\xi|} \left| \frac{\delta(s_1)}{(|\xi|^2 + s_1)|\xi|^2} - \frac{\delta(s_2)}{(|\xi|^2 + s_2)|\xi|^2} \right| |g(\xi)| d\xi. \end{aligned} \quad (4.68)$$

We consider the first term on the right-hand side of (4.68). We see from (3.44), (4.67), and Lemma C.2 in the appended section C that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta(s_1) \left| \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \left\{ \frac{g(\xi) - g(0)}{(|\xi|^2 + s_1)|\xi|^2} - \frac{g(\xi) - g(0)}{(|\xi|^2 + s_2)|\xi|^2} \right\} d\xi \right| \\
&= \delta(s_1) |s_1 - s_2| \left| \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{g(\xi) - g(0) - \xi \cdot \nabla g(0)}{(|\xi|^2 + s_1)(|\xi|^2 + s_2)|\xi|^2} d\xi \right| \\
&\lesssim \delta(s_1) |s_1 - s_2| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{\min\{|x||\xi|, |x|^2|\xi|^2\}}{(|\xi|^2 + s_1)(|\xi|^2 + s_2)|\xi|^2} (1 + |x|)^{-(d+2)} d\xi dx \\
&\lesssim |s_1 - s_2| \log(1 + s_2^{-2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.69}$$

Next, we consider the second term on the right-hand side of (4.68). We see from (4.66) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\delta(s_1) - \delta(s_2)| |g(0)| &\leq |\delta(s_1) - \delta(s_2)| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |V \Lambda W * W^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}(x)| dx \\
&\lesssim |\delta(s_1) - \delta(s_2)| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + |x|)^{-(d+2)} dx \lesssim |\delta(s_1) - \delta(s_2)|.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.70}$$

We move on to the third term on the right-hand side of (4.68). We see from (3.44) and (4.67) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\delta(s_1) - \delta(s_2)| \left| \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{g(\xi) - g(0)}{(|\xi|^2 + s_2)|\xi|^2} d\xi \right| \\
&= |\delta(s_1) - \delta(s_2)| \left| \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{g(\xi) - g(0) - \xi \cdot (\nabla g)(0)}{(|\xi|^2 + s_2)|\xi|^2} d\xi \right| \\
&\lesssim |\delta(s_1) - \delta(s_2)| \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{(|x||\xi|)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(|\xi|^2 + s_2)|\xi|^2} (1 + |x|)^{-(d+2)} dx d\xi \lesssim |\delta(s_1) - \delta(s_2)|.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.71}$$

It remains to estimate the last term on the right-hand side of (4.68). Note that  $g$  is radial. Furthermore, it follows from Remark 3.2 and (4.66) that

$$|\xi| |g(\xi)| \lesssim \|g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4-d}{2}} \|\nabla g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{d-2}{2}} = \|V \Lambda W * W^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4-d}{2}} \| |x| V \Lambda W * W^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}} \|_{L^2}^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \lesssim 1. \tag{4.72}$$

Hence, we see from (4.72) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{1 \leq |\xi|} \left| \frac{\delta(s_1)}{(|\xi|^2 + s_1)|\xi|^2} - \frac{\delta(s_2)}{(|\xi|^2 + s_2)|\xi|^2} \right| |g(\xi)| d\xi \\
&\leq \delta(s_1) \int_{1 \leq |\xi|} \left| \frac{1}{(|\xi|^2 + s_1)|\xi|^2} - \frac{1}{(|\xi|^2 + s_2)|\xi|^2} \right| |g(\xi)| d\xi \\
&\quad + |\delta(s_1) - \delta(s_2)| \int_{1 \leq |\xi|} \frac{|g(\xi)|}{(|\xi|^2 + s_2)|\xi|^2} d\xi \\
&\leq \delta(s_1) |s_1 - s_2| \int_{1 \leq |\xi|} \frac{1}{|\xi|^6} d\xi + |\delta(s_1) - \delta(s_2)| \int_{1 \leq |\xi|} \frac{1}{|\xi|^5} d\xi \\
&\lesssim \delta(s_1) |s_1 - s_2| + |\delta(s_1) - \delta(s_2)|.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.73}$$

Putting the estimates (4.68), (4.69), (4.70), (4.71) and (4.73) together, we obtain the desired estimate (4.62).  $\square$

**Lemma 4.6.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{2}{d-2} < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Let  $\max\{\frac{d}{(d-2)p}, \frac{d}{4}\} < r < \frac{d}{2}$ . Then, the following holds for all  $s_1, s_2 > 0$ :*

$$|\langle(-\Delta + s_1)^{-1}W^p, V\Lambda W\rangle - \langle(-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}W^p, V\Lambda W\rangle| \lesssim |s_1 - s_2|s_2^{\frac{d}{2r}-2}, \quad (4.74)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $r$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4.6.* Observe from (2.13) that for any  $s > 0$ ,

$$V\Lambda W = -(-\Delta + s)\Lambda W + s\Lambda W. \quad (4.75)$$

Then, by (4.75), Lemma 3.7, Hölder's inequality and Lemma 3.4, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle(-\Delta + s_1)^{-1}W^p, V\Lambda W\rangle - \langle(-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}W^p, V\Lambda W\rangle| \\ &= |s_1\langle W^p, (-\Delta + s_1)^{-1}\Lambda W\rangle - s_2\langle W^p, (-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}\Lambda W\rangle| \\ &\leq s_1|\langle W^p, \{(-\Delta + s_1)^{-1} - (-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}\}\Lambda W\rangle| \\ &\quad + |s_1 - s_2|\langle W^p, (-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}\Lambda W\rangle| \\ &\leq s_1|s_1 - s_2|\|(-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}W^p\|_{L^{\frac{d}{2}}}\|(-\Delta + s_1)^{-1}\Lambda W\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-2}}} \\ &\quad + |s_1 - s_2|\|W^p\|_{L^r}\|(-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}\Lambda W\|_{L^{\frac{r}{r-1}}} \\ &\lesssim s_1|s_1 - s_2|s_2^{\frac{d}{2r}-2}\|W^p\|_{L^r}s_1^{-1}\|\Lambda W\|_{L^{\frac{d}{\text{weak}}}} + |s_1 - s_2|\|W^p\|_{L^r}s_2^{\frac{d}{2r}-2}\|\Lambda W\|_{L^{\frac{d}{\text{weak}}}} \\ &\lesssim |s_1 - s_2|s_2^{\frac{d}{2r}-2}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.76)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $r$ . This proves the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.7.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{4}{d-2} - 1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Let  $2^* < q < \infty$ . Then, for any  $R > 0$ ,  $s_1, s_2 > 0$ ,  $t > 0$ ,  $0 < t_1 \leq t_2 < 1$ ,  $\eta_1 \in Y_q(R, t_1)$  and  $\eta_2 \in Y_q(R, t_2)$ , the following holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle(-\Delta + s_1)^{-1}N(\eta_1; t), V\Lambda W\rangle - \langle(-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}N(\eta_2; t), V\Lambda W\rangle| \\ &\lesssim s_1^{\frac{d}{2q}-1} \left\{ R^2\alpha(t_1)^{2\Theta_q} + s_2^{\frac{2^*}{q}-1} R^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}\alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}\Theta_q} \right\} |s_1 - s_2| \\ &\quad + ts_1^{\frac{d}{2q}-1} \left\{ s_2^{-\nu_q}R\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q} + s_2^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}-1} R^p\alpha(t_1)^{p\Theta_q} \right\} |s_1 - s_2| \\ &\quad + \left\{ R\alpha(t_2)^{\Theta_q} + s_2^{\frac{2^*}{q}-1} R^{\frac{4}{d-2}}\alpha(t_2)^{\frac{4}{d-2}\Theta_q} \right\} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q} \\ &\quad + t \left\{ s_2^{-\nu_q} + s_2^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}-1} R^{p-1}\alpha(t_2)^{(p-1)\Theta_q} \right\} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.77)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4.7.* Observe from an elementary computation and Lemma 3.7 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle (-\Delta + s_1)^{-1}N(\eta_1; t), V\Lambda W \rangle - \langle (-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}N(\eta_2; t), V\Lambda W \rangle \\
&= -(s_1 - s_2) \langle (-\Delta + s_1)^{-1}(-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}N(\eta_1; t), V\Lambda W \rangle \\
& \quad + \langle (-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}\{N(\eta_1; t) - N(\eta_2; t)\}, V\Lambda W \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.78}$$

Then, by Hölder's inequality and Lemma 3.4, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \langle (-\Delta + s_1)^{-1}N(\eta_1; t), V\Lambda W \rangle - \langle (-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}N(\eta_2; t), V\Lambda W \rangle \right| \\
& \leq |s_1 - s_2| \|(-\Delta + s_1)^{-1}V\Lambda W\|_{L^{\frac{q}{q-1}}} \|(-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}N(\eta_1; t)\|_{L^q} \\
& \quad + \|V\Lambda W\|_{L^{\frac{q}{q-1}}} \|(-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}\{N(\eta_1; t) - N(\eta_2; t)\}\|_{L^q} \\
& \lesssim |s_1 - s_2| s_1^{\frac{d}{2q}-1} \|V\Lambda W\|_{L^1} \|(-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}N(\eta_1; t)\|_{L^q} \\
& \quad + \|(-\Delta + s_2)^{-1}\{N(\eta_1; t) - N(\eta_2; t)\}\|_{L^q},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.79}$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Furthermore, applying Lemma 4.3 to the right-hand side of (4.79), we find that the claim of the lemma is true.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.8.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{4}{d-2} - 1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Let  $\max\{2^*, \frac{2^*}{p-1}\} < q < \infty$  and  $R > 0$ . Then, there exists  $0 < T(q, R) < 1$  depending only on  $d, p, q$  and  $R$  such that for any  $0 < t < T(q, R)$ ,  $(\tau, \eta) \in I(t) \times Y_q(R, t)$  and  $\max\{1, \frac{d}{(d-2)p}\} < r < \frac{d}{2}$ , the following estimate holds:*

$$\left| \mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta) - \frac{K_p}{A_1}t \right| \lesssim t \left\{ \alpha(t)^{\frac{d}{2r}-1} + \delta(\alpha(t)) + \alpha(t)^{\theta_q} \right\}, \tag{4.80}$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p, q$  and  $r$ .

**Remark 4.4.** *Fix  $\max\{1, \frac{d}{(d-2)p}\} < r < \frac{d}{2}$ , so that the dependence of a constant on  $r$  can be absorbed into that on  $d$  and  $p$ . Then, Lemma 4.8 shows that if  $0 < t < 1$  is sufficiently small depending only on  $d, p, q$  and  $R$ , then*

$$\mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta) \in I(t). \tag{4.81}$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.8.* Let  $\max\{1, \frac{d}{(d-2)p}\} < r < \frac{d}{2}$ . By (4.60), Hölder's inequality, Lemma 3.16 and Lemma 3.15 we see that for any sufficiently small  $t > 0$  depending only on  $d$  and  $p$ , and any  $(\tau, \eta) \in I(t) \times Y_q(R, t)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta) - \frac{K_p}{A_1}t \right| &= \left| \frac{t\mathcal{W}_p(\tau) + \mathcal{N}(t, \tau, \eta)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau)} - \frac{K_p}{A_1}t \right| \\
&\leq \left| \frac{tA_1\mathcal{W}_p(\tau) - K_p t\mathcal{X}(\tau)}{A_1\mathcal{X}(\tau)} \right| + \left| \frac{\mathcal{N}(t, \tau, \eta)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau)} \right| \\
&\lesssim t|A_1\{\mathcal{W}_p(\tau) - K_p\} - K_p\{\mathcal{X}(\tau) - A_1\}| + |\mathcal{N}(t, \tau, \eta)| \\
&\lesssim t|\mathcal{W}_p(\tau) - K_p| + t|\mathcal{X}(\tau) - A_1| + \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}N(\eta; t)\|_{L^q} \|V\Lambda W\|_{L^{\frac{q}{q-1}}} \\
&\lesssim t\alpha(\tau)^{\frac{d}{2r}-1} + t\delta(\alpha(\tau)) + \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}N(\eta; t)\|_{L^q},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.82}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p, q$  and  $r$ . Note here that  $\tau \in I(t)$  implies  $\alpha(\tau) \sim \alpha(t)$ . Hence, applying Lemma 4.3 to the right-hand side of (4.82) as  $s = \alpha(\tau)$ , and using (4.41),  $\Theta_q < 1$  (hence  $\frac{2^*}{q} - 1 + \frac{d+2}{d-2}\Theta_q > 2\Theta_q$ ), and (4.19) with  $\theta = \theta_q$ , we see that if  $t > 0$  is sufficiently small depending only on  $d, p, q$  and  $R$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{t\mathcal{W}_p(\tau) + \mathcal{N}(t, \tau, \eta)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau)} - \frac{K_p}{A_1}t \right| \\
& \lesssim t\alpha(\tau)^{\frac{d}{2r}-1} + t\delta(\alpha(\tau)) + R^2\alpha(t)^{2\Theta_q} + \alpha(\tau)^{\frac{2^*}{q}-1}R^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}\alpha(t)^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}\Theta_q} \\
& \quad + t \left\{ \alpha(\tau)^{-\nu_q}R\alpha(t)^{\Theta_q} + \alpha(\tau)^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}-1}R^p\alpha(t)^{p\Theta_q} \right\} \\
& \lesssim t\alpha(t)^{\frac{d}{2r}-1} + t\delta(\alpha(t)) + t\alpha(t)^{\frac{1}{2}\{\Theta_q-\nu_q\}} + t\alpha(t)^{\frac{1}{2}\{\Theta_q+\frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2}-1\}},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.83}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p, q$  and  $r$ . Thus, we have proved the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.9.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{4}{d-2} - 1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Let  $\max\{2^*, \frac{2^*}{p-1}\} < q < \infty$  and  $R > 0$ . Then, there exists  $0 < T(q, R) < 1$  depending only on  $d, p, q$  and  $R$  with the following property: Let  $0 < t_1 \leq t_2 < T(q, R)$ , and assume that  $t_2 \leq 2t_1$ . Furthermore, let  $(\tau_1, \eta_1) \in I(t_1) \times Y_q(R, t_1)$  and  $(\tau_2, \eta_2) \in I(t_2) \times Y_q(R, t_2)$ . Then, the following holds for all  $\max\{1, \frac{d}{(d-2)p}\} < r < \frac{d}{2}$ :*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathfrak{s}(t_2; \tau_2, \eta_2) - \mathfrak{s}(t_1; \tau_1, \eta_1) - \frac{K_p}{A_1}(t_2 - t_1) \right| \\
& \lesssim \left\{ \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d}{2r}-1} + \delta(\alpha(t_1)) + \alpha(t_1)^{\theta_q} \right\} |t_1 - t_2| \\
& \quad + \left\{ \delta(\alpha(t_1))^{d-2} + \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d}{2r}-1} + \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d}{2q}} \right\} |\tau_1 - \tau_2| + t_1\alpha(t_1)^{-\Theta_q+\theta_q} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.84}$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p, q$  and  $r$ .

**Remark 4.5.** *Fix  $\max\{1, \frac{d}{(d-2)p}\} < r < \frac{d}{2}$ , so that the dependence of a constant on  $r$  can be absorbed into that on  $d$  and  $p$ . Then, we may write (4.84) as*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathfrak{s}(t_2; \tau_2, \eta_2) - \mathfrak{s}(t_1; \tau_1, \eta_1) - \frac{K_p}{A_1}(t_2 - t_1) \right| \\
& \lesssim o_{t_1}(1) \{ |t_1 - t_2| + |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \} + t_1\alpha(t_1)^{-\Theta_q+\theta_q} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.85}$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4.9.* First, observe from the assumptions about  $t_1, t_2, \tau_1, \tau_2$  that if  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are sufficiently small depending only on  $d$  and  $p$ , then

$$\tau_1 \sim t_1 \sim \tau_2 \sim t_2, \quad \alpha(\tau_1) \sim \alpha(t_1) \sim \alpha(\tau_2) \sim \alpha(t_2), \tag{4.86}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $p$ .

Now, observe from (4.11) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathfrak{s}(t_2; \tau_2, \eta_2) - \mathfrak{s}(t_1; \tau_1, \eta_1) - \frac{K_p}{A_1}(t_2 - t_1) \right| \\
& \leq |t_2 - t_1| \left| \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(\tau_2)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_2)} - \frac{K_p}{A_1} \right| + \left| \frac{\mathcal{N}(t_2, \tau_2, \eta_2) - \mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_2, \eta_2)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_2)} \right| \\
& \quad + t_1 \left| \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(\tau_2)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_2)} - \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(\tau_1)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_1)} \right| + \left| \frac{\mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_2, \eta_2)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_2)} - \frac{\mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_1, \eta_1)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_1)} \right|.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.87}$$

We shall estimate each term on the right-hand side of (4.87) separately:

**Estimate for 1st term.** We shall derive an estimate for the first term on the right-hand side of (4.87). Let  $\max\{1, \frac{d}{(d-2)p}\} < r < \frac{d}{2}$ . Then, by (4.60), Lemma 3.15, Lemma 3.16 and (4.86), we see that for any

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(\tau_2)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_2)} - \frac{K_p}{A_1} \right| = \left| \frac{A_1 \mathcal{W}_p(\tau_2) - K_p \mathcal{X}(\tau_2)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_2) A_1} \right| \lesssim |A_1 \mathcal{W}_p(\tau_2) - K_p \mathcal{X}(\tau_2)| \\
& \leq A_1 | \langle (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1} W^p, V \Lambda W \rangle - K_p | \\
& \quad + K_p \delta(\alpha(\tau_2)) |A_1 \delta(\alpha(\tau_2))^{-1} - \langle (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1} W, V \Lambda W \rangle| \\
& \lesssim \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d}{2r}-1} + \delta(\alpha(t_1)),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.88}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $r$ . Thus, we find that if  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are sufficiently small depending only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ , then

$$|t_2 - t_1| \left| \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(\tau_2)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_2)} - \frac{K_p}{A_1} \right| \lesssim \{ \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d}{2r}-1} + \delta(\alpha(t_1)) \} |t_1 - t_2|, \tag{4.89}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $r$ .

**Estimate for 2nd term.** Consider the second term on the right-hand side of (4.87).

We see from (2.39) that

$$\mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_2, \eta_2) - \mathcal{N}(t_2, \tau_2, \eta_2) = (t_1 - t_2) \langle (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1} E(\eta_2, 0), V \Lambda W \rangle. \tag{4.90}$$

Then, by (4.60), (4.90), Hölder's inequality, Lemma 4.2 with  $s = \alpha(\tau_2)$ , (4.86) and (4.19) with  $\theta = \theta_q$ , we see that if  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are sufficiently small depending only on  $d, p, q$  and  $R$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{\mathcal{N}(t_2, \tau_2, \eta_2) - \mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_2, \eta_2)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_2)} \right| \lesssim |\mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_2, \eta_2) - \mathcal{N}(t_2, \tau_2, \eta_2)| \\
& \lesssim |t_1 - t_2| \| (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1} E(\eta_2, 0) \|_{L^q} \| V \Lambda W \|_{L^{\frac{q}{q-1}}} \\
& \lesssim |t_1 - t_2| \left\{ \alpha(\tau_2)^{-\nu_q} + \alpha(\tau_2)^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}-1} R^{p-1} \alpha(t_2)^{(p-1)\Theta_q} \right\} R \alpha(t_2)^{\Theta_q} \\
& \lesssim \left\{ \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{1}{2}\{\Theta_q - \nu_q\}} + \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{1}{2}\{\Theta_q + \frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2} - 1\}} \right\} |t_1 - t_2|,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.91}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ .

**Estimate for 3rd term.** Consider the third term on the right-hand side of (4.87). Let  $\max\{1, \frac{d}{(d-2)p}\} < r < \frac{d}{2}$ . Then, by (4.60), (4.61), Lemma 4.5, Lemma 4.6, (4.86), Lemma 4.4, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
t_1 \left| \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(\tau_2)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_2)} - \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(\tau_1)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_1)} \right| &= t_1 \left| \frac{\{\mathcal{X}(\tau_1) - \mathcal{X}(\tau_2)\} \mathcal{W}_p(\tau_2) - \mathcal{X}(\tau_2) \{\mathcal{W}_p(\tau_1) - \mathcal{W}_p(\tau_2)\}}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_1) \mathcal{X}(\tau_2)} \right| \\
&\lesssim t_1 |\mathcal{X}(\tau_1) - \mathcal{X}(\tau_2)| + t_1 |\mathcal{W}_p(\tau_1) - \mathcal{W}_p(\tau_2)| \\
&\lesssim t_1 \left\{ \log(1 + \alpha(t_1)^{-1}) + \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d}{2r}-2} \right\} |\alpha(\tau_1) - \alpha(\tau_2)| + t_1 |\delta(\alpha(\tau_1)) - \delta(\alpha(\tau_2))| \quad (4.92) \\
&\lesssim t_1 \left\{ \log(1 + \alpha(t_1)^{-1}) + \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d}{2r}-2} \right\} \delta(\alpha(t_1)) |\tau_1 - \tau_2| + \delta(\alpha(t_1))^{d-2} |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \\
&\lesssim \left\{ \delta(\alpha(t_1))^{d-2} + \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d}{2r}-1} \right\} |\tau_1 - \tau_2|,
\end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $r$ .

**Estimate for the last term.** We shall derive an estimate for the last term on the right-hand side of (4.87), and finish the proof of the lemma.

Observe from an elementary computation and (4.60) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \frac{\mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_2, \eta_2)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_2)} - \frac{\mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_1, \eta_1)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_1)} \right| \\
&\leq \left| \frac{\{\mathcal{X}(\tau_1) - \mathcal{X}(\tau_2)\} \mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_2, \eta_2)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_1) \mathcal{X}(\tau_2)} \right| + \left| \frac{\mathcal{X}(\tau_2) \{\mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_2, \eta_2) - \mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_1, \eta_1)\}}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_1) \mathcal{X}(\tau_2)} \right| \quad (4.93) \\
&\lesssim |\mathcal{X}(\tau_2) - \mathcal{X}(\tau_1)| |\mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_2, \eta_2)| + |\mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_2, \eta_2) - \mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_1, \eta_1)|,
\end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $p$ .

Consider the first term on the right-hand side of (4.93). By Lemma 4.5, (4.86), Lemma 4.4, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{X}(\tau_2) - \mathcal{X}(\tau_1)| &\lesssim \log(1 + \alpha(t_1)^{-1}) |\alpha(\tau_1) - \alpha(\tau_2)| + |\delta(\alpha(\tau_1)) - \delta(\alpha(\tau_2))| \\
&\lesssim \log(1 + \alpha(t_1)^{-1}) \delta(\alpha(t_1)) |\tau_1 - \tau_2| + t_1^{-1} \delta(\alpha(t_1))^{d-2} |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \quad (4.94) \\
&\lesssim \left\{ 1 + t_1^{-1} \delta(\alpha(t_1))^{d-2} \right\} |\tau_1 - \tau_2|,
\end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $p$ . Furthermore, by Hölder's inequality, Lemma 4.3, (4.86),  $\Theta_q \leq 1$ , (4.41), and (4.19) with  $\theta = \theta_q$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_2, \eta_2)| &\leq \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1} N(\eta_2; t_1)\|_{L^q} \|V \Lambda W\|_{L^{\frac{q}{q-1}}} \\
&\lesssim R^2 \alpha(t_1)^{2\Theta_q} + R^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}} \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q+1} + t_1 \left\{ R \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q-\nu_q} + R^p \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q + \frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2} - 1} \right\} \quad (4.95) \\
&\lesssim (R^2 + R^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}} + R) t_1 \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q-\nu_q} + t_1 R^p \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q + \frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2} - 1} \\
&\lesssim t_1 \left\{ \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{1}{2}\{\Theta_q-\nu_q\}} + \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{1}{2}\{\Theta_q + \frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2} - 1\}} \right\},
\end{aligned}$$



where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Then, we find from (4.94), (4.95) and  $t_1 \leq \delta(\alpha(t_1))^{d-2}$  that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{X}(\tau_2) - \mathcal{X}(\tau_1)| |\mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_2, \eta_2)| \\ & \lesssim \delta(\alpha(t_1))^{d-2} \left\{ \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{1}{2}\{\Theta_q - \nu_q\}} + \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{1}{2}\{\Theta_q + \frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2} - 1\}} \right\} |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \\ & \lesssim \delta(\alpha(t_1))^{d-2} |\tau_1 - \tau_2|, \end{aligned} \quad (4.96)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ .

It remains to estimate the the second term on the right-hand side of (4.93). By Lemma 4.7, (4.54) in Lemma 4.4, (4.86) and  $t_1^{-1}\alpha(t_1) = \delta(\alpha(t_1))$  (see (2.32)), (4.41),  $\Theta_q < 1$  and (4.37), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_2, \eta_2) - \mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_1, \eta_1)| \\ & \lesssim \left\{ R^2 \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q + \frac{d-2}{2} - 1} + R^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}} \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \right\} t_1^{-1} \alpha(t_1) |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \\ & \quad + \left\{ R \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d-2}{2} - \nu_q} + R^p \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{(d-2)p-2}{2}} \right\} |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \\ & \quad + \left\{ R \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q} + R^{\frac{4}{d-2}} \alpha(t_1) \right\} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q} \\ & \quad + t_1 \left\{ \alpha(t_1)^{-\nu_q} + R^{p-1} \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2} - 1} \right\} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim (R^2 + R + R^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}} + R^p) \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d-2}{2} - \nu_q} |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \\ & \quad + t_1 \left\{ (R + R^{\frac{4}{d-2}} + 1) \alpha(t_1)^{-\nu_q} + R^{p-1} \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2} - 1} \right\} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.97)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Furthermore, by (4.97), and (4.19) with  $\theta = \theta_q$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_2, \eta_2) - \mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_1, \eta_1)| \\ & \lesssim \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d}{2q} + \frac{1}{2}\{\Theta_q - \nu_q\}} |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \\ & \quad + t_1 \alpha(t_1)^{-\Theta_q} \left\{ \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{1}{2}\{\Theta_q - \nu_q\}} + \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{1}{2}\{\Theta_q + \frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2} - 1\}} \right\} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.98)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Then, plugging (4.96) and (4.98) into (4.93), we see that if  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are sufficiently small depending only on  $d, p, q$  and  $R$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{\mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_2, \eta_2)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_2)} - \frac{\mathcal{N}(t_1, \tau_1, \eta_1)}{\mathcal{X}(\tau_1)} \right| \\ & \lesssim \left\{ \delta(\alpha(t_1))^{d-2} + \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d}{2q}} \right\} |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \\ & \quad + t_1 \alpha(t_1)^{-\Theta_q} \left\{ \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{1}{2}\{\Theta_q - \nu_q\}} + \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{1}{2}\{\Theta_q + \frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2} - 1\}} \right\} \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.99)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ .

Now, putting (4.87), (4.89), (4.91), (4.92) and (4.99) together, we find that (4.84) holds. Thus, we have completed the proof.  $\square$

## 4.2 Proof of Proposition 4.1

In this section, we give a proof of Proposition 4.1. The following lemma plays an essential role to prove Proposition 4.1:

**Lemma 4.10.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{4}{d-2} - 1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Let  $\max\{2^*, \frac{2^*}{p-1}\} < q < \infty$  and  $R > 0$ . Then, there exists  $0 < T(q, R) < 1$  depending only on  $d, p, q$  and  $R$  such that the following estimates hold:*

1. *Let  $0 < t < T(q, R)$  and  $\eta \in Y_q(R, t)$ . Furthermore, let  $\tau \in I(t)$  with  $\tau = \mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta)$ . Then,*

$$\|\mathfrak{g}(t; \tau, \eta)\|_{L^q} \lesssim \alpha(t)^{\Theta_q}, \quad (4.100)$$

*where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ .*

2. *Let  $0 < t_1 \leq t_2 < T(q, R)$  with  $t_2 \leq 2t_1$ , and let  $\eta_1 \in Y_q(R, t_1)$  and  $\eta_2 \in Y_q(R, t_2)$ . Furthermore, let  $\tau_1 \in I(t_1)$  with  $\tau_1 = \mathfrak{s}(t_1; \tau_1, \eta_1)$ , and let  $\tau_2 \in I(t_2)$  with  $\tau_2 = \mathfrak{s}(t_2; \tau_2, \eta_2)$ . Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathfrak{g}(t_2; \tau_2, \eta_2) - \mathfrak{g}(t_1; \tau_1, \eta_1)\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim o_{t_1}(1)t_1^{-1}\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q}|t_2 - t_1| + |t_2 - t_1| + \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q}\|\eta_2 - \eta_1\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.101)$$

*where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 4.10.* By (2.36),  $\alpha(\mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta)) = \mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta)\delta(\alpha(\mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta)))$  (see (2.32)), and (4.8) through (4.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle (-\Delta + \alpha(\mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta)))^{-1}F(\eta; \alpha(\mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta)), t), V\Lambda W \rangle \\ & = -\mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta)\mathcal{X}(\mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta)) + t\mathcal{W}_p(\mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta)) + \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta)), \end{aligned} \quad (4.102)$$

which together with (4.11) implies that

$$\langle (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}F(\eta; \alpha(\tau), t), V\Lambda W \rangle = 0, \quad \text{provided } \tau = \mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta). \quad (4.103)$$

Now, we shall prove (4.100):

**Proof of (4.100).** Let  $0 < t < 1$  be a sufficiently small number to be specified in the middle of the proof, dependently on  $d, p, q$  and  $R$ . Furthermore, let  $\eta \in Y_q(R, t)$ , and let  $\tau \in I(t)$  with  $\tau = \mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta)$ . Then, (3.2) in Proposition 3.1 together with (4.103) shows that

$$\|\mathfrak{g}(t; \tau, \eta)\|_{L^q} \lesssim \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}F(\eta; \alpha(\tau), t)\|_{L^q}, \quad (4.104)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Furthermore, by Lemma 3.4, Lemma 3.5, (4.52) in Lemma 4.3,  $\tau \in I(t)$  (hence  $\tau \sim t$ ), and  $\Theta_q < 1$  (hence  $\frac{2^*}{q} - 1 +$

$\frac{d+2}{d-2}\Theta_q > 2\Theta_q$ ), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}F(\eta; \alpha(\tau), t)\|_{L^q} \\
& \leq \alpha(\tau)\|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}W\|_{L^q} + t\|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}W^p\|_{L^q} \\
& \quad + \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau))^{-1}N(\eta; t)\|_{L^q} \\
& \lesssim \alpha(\tau)^{\Theta_q}\|W\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-2}}_{\text{weak}}} + t\|W^p\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{d+2q}}} \\
& \quad + R^2\alpha(t)^{2\Theta_q} + \alpha(\tau)^{\frac{2^*}{q}-1}R^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}\alpha(t)^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}\Theta_q} \\
& \quad + t\left\{\alpha(\tau)^{-\nu_q}R\alpha(t)^{\Theta_q} + \alpha(\tau)^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}-1}R^p\alpha(t)^{p\Theta_q}\right\} \\
& \lesssim \alpha(t)^{\Theta_q} + (R^2 + R^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}})\alpha(t)^{2\Theta_q} + tR\alpha(t)^{\Theta_q-\nu_q} + tR^p\alpha(t)^{\Theta_q+\frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2}-1},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.105}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Plugging (4.105) into (4.104), and then using (4.19) with  $\theta = \theta_q$ , and (4.40), we see that if  $t$  is sufficiently small depending only on  $d, p, q$  and  $R$ , then

$$\|\mathfrak{g}(t; \tau, \eta)\|_{L^q} \lesssim \alpha(t)^{\Theta_q} + \alpha(t)^{2\Theta_q-\theta_q} + t\alpha(t)^{\theta_q} \lesssim \alpha(t)^{\Theta_q}, \tag{4.106}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Thus, we find that (4.100) holds.

Next, we shall prove (4.101):

**Proof of (4.101).** Let  $0 < t_1 \leq t_2 < 1$  with  $t_2 \leq 2t_1$ , and let  $\eta_1 \in Y_q(R, t_1)$  and  $\eta_2 \in Y_q(R, t_2)$ . We will specify  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  in the middle of the proof, dependently on  $d, p, q$  and  $R$ . Furthermore, let  $\tau_1 \in I(t_1)$  with  $\tau_1 = \mathfrak{s}(t_1; \tau_1, \eta_1)$ , and let  $\tau_2 \in I(t_2)$  with  $\tau_2 = \mathfrak{s}(t_2; \tau_2, \eta_2)$ . Observe from  $t_1 \leq t_2 \leq 2t_1$ ,  $\tau_1 \in I(t_1)$  and  $\tau_2 \in I(t_2)$  that

$$t_1 \sim \tau_1 \sim t_2 \sim \tau_2, \quad \alpha(t_1) \sim \alpha(\tau_1) \sim \alpha(t_2) \sim \alpha(\tau_2), \tag{4.107}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $p$ . By (4.103), we see that

$$\langle (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}F(\eta_1; \alpha(\tau_1), t_1) - (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}F(\eta_2; \alpha(\tau_2), t_2), V\Lambda W \rangle = 0. \tag{4.108}$$

Furthermore, Lemma 4.9 (see also Remark 4.5) together with  $\tau_j = \mathfrak{s}(t_j; \tau_j, \eta_j)$  shows that if  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are sufficiently small depending only on  $d, p, q$  and  $R$ , then

$$|\tau_2 - \tau_1| \lesssim o_{t_1}(1)|t_2 - t_1| + t_1\alpha(t_1)^{-\Theta_q+\theta_q}\|\eta_2 - \eta_1\|_{L^q}, \tag{4.109}$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ .

For notational convenience, we put

$$\mathcal{A}_j := 1 + (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_j))^{-1}V \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2. \tag{4.110}$$

Observe from  $\mathcal{A}_2 - \mathcal{A}_1 = \{(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1} - (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}\}V$  that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathfrak{g}(t_2; \tau_2, \eta_2) - \mathfrak{g}(t_1; \tau_1, \eta_1)\|_{L^q} \\
& \leq \|\mathcal{A}_1^{-1}\{(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}F(\eta_1; \alpha(\tau_1), t_1) - (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}F(\eta_2; \alpha(\tau_2), t_2)\}\|_{L^q} \\
& \quad + \|\mathcal{A}_1^{-1}\{(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1} - (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}\}V\mathfrak{g}(t_2; \tau_2, \eta_2)\|_{L^q}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.111}$$

Then, the desired estimate (4.101) follows from the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{A}_1^{-1}\{(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}F(\eta_1; \alpha(\tau_1), t_1) - (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}F(\eta_2; \alpha(\tau_2), t_2)\}\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim o_{t_1}(1)t_1^{-1}\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q}|t_1 - t_2| + |t_1 - t_2| + \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q}\|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.112)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ ; and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{A}_1^{-1}\{(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1} - (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}\}V\mathfrak{g}(t_2; \tau_2, \eta_2)\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim o_{t_1}(1)t_1^{-1}\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q}|t_2 - t_1| + \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q}\|\eta_2 - \eta_1\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.113)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ .

It remains to prove (4.112) and (4.113):

**Proof of (4.112).** By (3.2) in Proposition 3.1, and (4.108), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{A}_1^{-1}\{(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}F(\eta_1; \alpha(\tau_1), t_1) - (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}F(\eta_2; \alpha(\tau_2), t_2)\}\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}F(\eta_1; \alpha(\tau_1), t_1) - (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}F(\eta_2; \alpha(\tau_2), t_2)\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.114)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ . Furthermore, we estimate the right-hand side of (4.114) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}F(\eta_1; \alpha(\tau_1), t_1) - (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}F(\eta_2; \alpha(\tau_2), t_2)\|_{L^q} \\ & \leq \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}\{F(\eta_1; \alpha(\tau_1), t_1) - F(\eta_2; \alpha(\tau_2), t_2)\}\|_{L^q} \\ & \quad + \|\{(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1} - (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}\}F(\eta_2; \alpha(\tau_2), t_2)\|_{L^q}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.115)$$

Consider the first term on the right-hand side of (4.115). Observe that  $\frac{pdq}{d+2q} > \frac{d}{d-2}$  for  $p > \frac{4}{d-2} - 1$  and  $q > \frac{2^*}{p-1}$ . Hence, we see that

$$\|W^p\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{d+2q}}} \lesssim 1, \quad (4.116)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ . Furthermore, observe from (2.40) that

$$\begin{aligned} N(\eta_1; t_1) - N(\eta_2; t_2) &= N(\eta_1; t_1) - N(\eta_2; t_1) + N(\eta_2; t_1) - N(\eta_2; t_2) \\ &= N(\eta_1; t_1) - N(\eta_2; t_1) + (t_1 - t_2)E(\eta_2, 0). \end{aligned} \quad (4.117)$$

Then, by (2.36), (4.54) in Lemma 4.4, Lemma 3.4,  $\tau_1 \sim \tau_2 \sim t_1$  (see (4.107)), Lemma 3.5, (4.116) and (4.117), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}\{F(\eta_1; \alpha(\tau_1), t_1) - F(\eta_2; \alpha(\tau_2), t_2)\}\|_{L^q} \\ & \leq |\alpha(\tau_1) - \alpha(\tau_2)|\|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}W\|_{L^q} + |t_1 - t_2|\|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}W^p\|_{L^q} \\ & \quad + \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}\{N(\eta_1; t_1) - N(\eta_2; t_2)\}\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim \delta(\alpha(t_1))|t_1 - \tau_2|\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q-1}\|W\|_{L_{\text{weak}}^{\frac{d}{d-2}}} + |t_1 - t_2| \\ & \quad + \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}\{N(\eta_1; t_1) - N(\eta_2; t_1)\}\|_{L^q} \\ & \quad + |t_1 - t_2|\|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}E(\eta_2, 0)\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.118)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Recall from (2.32) that

$$\delta(\alpha(t_1)) = t_1^{-1}\alpha(t_1). \quad (4.119)$$

Then, by (4.109) and (4.119), we see that the first term on the right-hand side of (4.118) is estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta(\alpha(t_1))|\tau_1 - \tau_2|\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q-1}\|W\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-2}}_{\text{weak}}} \\ & \lesssim o_{t_1}(1)\delta(\alpha(t_1))|t_1 - t_2|\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q-1} + \delta(\alpha(t_1))t_1\alpha(t_1)^{\theta_q-1}\|\eta_2 - \eta_1\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim o_{t_1}(1)t_1^{-1}\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q}|t_1 - t_2| + \alpha(t_1)^{\theta_q}\|\eta_2 - \eta_1\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.120)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Applying Lemma 4.3 to the third term on the right-hand side of (4.118), and using (4.107), (4.40), (4.19) with  $\theta = \theta_q$ , and and the definition of  $\theta_q$  (see (4.39)), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}\{N(\eta_1; t_1) - N(\eta_2; t_1)\}\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim \{R\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q} + \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{2^*}{q}-1}R^{\frac{4}{d-2}}\alpha(t_1)^{\frac{4}{d-2}\Theta_q}\}\|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q} \\ & \quad + t_1\{\alpha(t_1)^{-\nu_q} + \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}-1}R^{p-1}\alpha(t_1)^{(p-1)\Theta_q}\}\|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim \{\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q-\theta_q} + \alpha(t_1)^{1-\theta_q}\}\|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q} \\ & \quad + \{\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q-\nu_q} + \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q+\frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2}-1-\theta_q}\}\|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim \alpha(t_1)^{\theta_q}\|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.121)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Furthermore, using Lemma 4.2, (4.107), (4.40), (4.19) with  $\theta = \theta_q$ , and the definition of  $\theta_q$  (see (4.39)), we see that the last term on the right-hand side of (4.118) is estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & |t_1 - t_2|\|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}E(\eta_2, 0)\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim |t_1 - t_2|\{\alpha(t_1)^{-\nu_q} + \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}-1}R^{p-1}\alpha(t_1)^{(p-1)\Theta_q}\}\|\eta_2\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim t_1^{-1}\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q}|t_1 - t_2|\left\{\alpha(t_1)^{-\nu_q} + R^{p-1}\alpha(t_1)^{\frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2}-1}\right\}R\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q} \\ & \lesssim t_1^{-1}|t_1 - t_2|\left\{\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q-\nu_q-\theta_q} + \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q+\frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2}-1-\theta_q}\right\}\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q} \\ & \lesssim \alpha(t_1)^{\theta_q}t_1^{-1}\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q}|t_1 - t_2| = o_{t_1}(1)t_1^{-1}\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q}|t_1 - t_2|, \end{aligned} \quad (4.122)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Plugging (4.120), (4.121) and (4.122) into (4.118), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}\{F(\eta_1; \alpha(\tau_1), t_1) - F(\eta_2; \alpha(\tau_2), t_2)\}\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim o_{t_1}(1)t_1^{-1}\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q}|t_1 - t_2| + |t_1 - t_2| + \alpha(t_1)^{\theta_q}\|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.123)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ .

Move on to the second term on the right-hand side of (4.115). By Lemma 3.7, (4.54) in Lemma 4.4, Lemma 3.4, (4.107) and  $\delta(\alpha(t_1)) = t_1^{-1}\alpha(t_1)$  (see (2.32)), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\{(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1} - (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}\}F(\eta_2; \alpha(\tau_2), t_2)\|_{L^q} \\
&= |\alpha(\tau_1) - \alpha(\tau_2)| \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}F(\eta_2; \alpha(\tau_2), t_2)\|_{L^q} \\
&\lesssim \delta(\alpha(t_1))|\tau_1 - \tau_2|\alpha(t_1)^{-1}\|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}F(\eta_2; \alpha(\tau_2), t_2)\|_{L^q} \\
&= t_1^{-1}|\tau_1 - \tau_2|\|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}F(\eta_2; \alpha(\tau_2), t_2)\|_{L^q},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.124}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Furthermore, by (2.36), Lemma 3.4, Lemma 3.5, Lemma 4.3, (4.116), (4.107), and (4.19) with  $\theta = \theta_q$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}F(\eta_2; \alpha(\tau_2), t_2)\|_{L^q} \\
&\lesssim \alpha(\tau_2)\|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}W\|_{L^q} + t_2\|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}W^p\|_{L^q} \\
&\quad + \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}N(\eta_2; t_2)\|_{L^q} \\
&\lesssim \alpha(\tau_2)\alpha(\tau_1)^{\Theta_q-1}\|W\|_{L_{\text{weak}}^{\frac{d}{d-2}}} + t_2\|W^p\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{d+2q}}} \\
&\quad + R^2\alpha(t_2)^{2\Theta_q} + \alpha(\tau_1)^{\frac{2^*}{q}-1}R^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}\alpha(t_2)^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}\Theta_q} \\
&\quad + t_2\{\alpha(\tau_1)^{-\nu_q}R\alpha(t_2)^{\Theta_q} + \alpha(\tau_1)^{\frac{d(p-1)}{2q}-1}R^p\alpha(t_2)^{p\Theta_q}\} \\
&\lesssim \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q} + t_1 + R^2\alpha(t_1)^{2\Theta_q} + R^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}}\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q+1} \\
&\quad + t_1\{R\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q-\nu_q} + R^p\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q+\frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2}-1}\} \\
&\lesssim \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q} + t_1 + \alpha(t_1)^{2\Theta_q-\theta_q} + \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q+1-\theta_q} \\
&\quad + t_1\{\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q-\nu_q-\theta_q} + \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q+\frac{(d-2)(p-1)}{2}-1-\theta_q}\} \\
&\lesssim \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q} + t_1 + t_1\alpha(t_1)^{\theta_q},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.125}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Plugging (4.109) and (4.125) into (4.124), and using  $t_1 \leq \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q}$  (see (4.40)), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\{(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1} - (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}\}F(\eta_2; \alpha(\tau_2), t_2)\|_{L^q} \\
&\lesssim t_1^{-1}\{o_{t_1}(1)|t_2 - t_1| + t_1\alpha(t_1)^{-\Theta_q+\theta_q}\|\eta_2 - \eta_1\|_{L^q}\}\{\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q} + t_1 + t_1\alpha(t_1)^{\theta_q}\} \\
&\lesssim o_{t_1}(1)t_1^{-1}\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q}|t_1 - t_2| + |t_1 - t_2| + \alpha(t_1)^{\theta_q}\|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^q},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.126}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ .

Now, putting (4.114), (4.115), (4.123) and (4.126) together, we find that (4.112) holds. **Proof of (4.113).** For notational convenience, we put

$$\mathfrak{g}_2 := \mathfrak{g}(t_2; \tau_2, \eta_2). \tag{4.127}$$

In order to treat the singularity comes from  $\mathcal{A}_1^{-1}$ , we will use the operator  $\Pi$  introduced in Section 3.2. Then, by Lemma 3.7, (4.54) in Lemma 4.4 and (4.107), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathcal{A}_1^{-1}\{(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1} - (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}\}V\mathfrak{g}(t_2; \tau_2, \eta_2)\|_{L^q} \\
&= |\alpha(\tau_1) - \alpha(\tau_2)|\|\mathcal{A}_1^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q} \\
&\lesssim \delta(\alpha(t_1))|\tau_1 - \tau_2|\|\mathcal{A}_1^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q}, \\
&\leq \delta(\alpha(t_1))|\tau_1 - \tau_2|\|\mathcal{A}_1^{-1}\Pi(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q} \\
&\quad + \delta(\alpha(t_1))|\tau_1 - \tau_2|\|\mathcal{A}_1^{-1}(1 - \Pi)(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.128}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

Consider the first term on the right-hand side of (4.128). By (3.1) in Proposition 3.1, and (4.107), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta(\alpha(t_1))|\tau_1 - \tau_2|\|\mathcal{A}_1^{-1}\Pi(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q} \\
&\lesssim \delta(\alpha(t_1))^2\alpha(t_1)^{-1}|\tau_1 - \tau_2|\|\Pi(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.129}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Observe from the definition of  $\Pi$  (see (3.72)) and  $V\Lambda W = \Delta\Lambda W = -(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))\Lambda W + \alpha(\tau_2)\Lambda W$  that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\Pi(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q} \\
&\lesssim |\langle(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2, V\Lambda W\rangle| \\
&\leq |\langle(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2, \Lambda W\rangle| \\
&\quad + |\langle(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2, \alpha(\tau_2)(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}\Lambda W\rangle|,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.130}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Applying Lemma 3.13 to the first term on the right-hand side of (4.130), and using  $V(x) \lesssim (1 + |x|)^{-4}$  (see (2.10)) and (4.107), we see that

$$|\langle(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2, \Lambda W\rangle| \lesssim \delta(\alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}\|V\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^1} + \|\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q} \lesssim \delta(\alpha(t_1))^{-1}\|\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q}, \tag{4.131}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . On the other hand, by Hölder's inequality, Lemma 3.4, (4.107) and  $V(x) \lesssim (1 + |x|)^{-4}$ , the second term on the right-hand side of (4.130) is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\langle(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2, \alpha(\tau_2)(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}\Lambda W\rangle| \\
&\lesssim \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{d+2q}}} \|\alpha(\tau_2)(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}\Lambda W\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{(d-2)q-d}}} \\
&\lesssim \alpha(\tau_1)^{\frac{d-2}{2} - \frac{d}{2q} - 1} \|V\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^1} \alpha(\tau_2)^{\frac{d}{2q}} \|\Lambda W\|_{L^{\frac{d}{\text{weak}}}} \lesssim \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d-2}{2} - 1} \|\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.132}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Putting (4.129), (4.130), (4.131) and (4.132) together, and using  $\delta(\alpha(t_1)) = t_1^{-1}\alpha(t_1)$  (see (2.32)) and (2.27), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta(\alpha(t_1))|\tau_1 - \tau_2|\|\mathcal{A}_1^{-1}\Pi(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q} \\
&\lesssim \delta(\alpha(t_1))^2\alpha(t_1)^{-1}|\tau_1 - \tau_2|\{\delta(\alpha(t_1))^{-1} + \alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d-2}{2} - 1}\}\|\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q} \\
&= |\tau_1 - \tau_2|\{t_1^{-1} + \delta(\alpha(t_1))t_1^{-1}\alpha(t_1)^{\frac{d-2}{2} - 1}\}\|\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q} \lesssim |\tau_1 - \tau_2|t_1^{-1}\|\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.133}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

Move on to the second term on the right-hand side of (4.128). Observe from the definition of  $\Pi$  (see (3.72)) that

$$\|1 - \Pi\|_{L^q \rightarrow L^q} \lesssim 1, \quad (4.134)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Note that the functions appear in what follows are radial, and recall from Lemma 3.17 that  $X_q = (1 - \Pi)L_{\text{rad}}^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Then, by (3.2) in Proposition 3.1, (4.134), Lemma 3.5, Lemma 3.4, (4.107) and  $\delta(\alpha(t_1)) = t_1^{-1}\alpha(t_1)$  (see (2.32)), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta(\alpha(t_1))|\tau_1 - \tau_2| \|\mathcal{A}_1^{-1}(1 - \Pi)(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim \delta(\alpha(t_1))|\tau_1 - \tau_2| \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim \delta(\alpha(t_1))|\tau_1 - \tau_2| \|(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}V\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{d+2q}}} \\ & \lesssim \delta(\alpha(t_1))|\tau_1 - \tau_2| \alpha(\tau_1)^{\frac{d-2}{2} - \frac{d}{2q} - 1} \|V\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^1} \\ & \lesssim \delta(\alpha(t_1))|\tau_1 - \tau_2| \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q - 1} \|\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q} = |\tau_1 - \tau_2| t_1^{-1} \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q} \|\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.135)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ .

Plugging (4.133) and (4.135) into (4.128), and using (4.109) and (4.106), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{A}_1^{-1}\{(-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_2))^{-1} - (-\Delta + \alpha(\tau_1))^{-1}\}V\mathfrak{g}(t_2; \tau_2, \eta_2)\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim |\tau_1 - \tau_2| t_1^{-1} \|\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q} + |\tau_1 - \tau_2| t_1^{-1} \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q} \|\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q} \lesssim |\tau_1 - \tau_2| t_1^{-1} \|\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim \{o_{t_1}(1)|t_2 - t_1| + t_1 \alpha(t_1)^{-\Theta_q + \theta_q} \|\eta_2 - \eta_1\|_{L^q}\} t_1^{-1} \|\mathfrak{g}_2\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim o_{t_1}(1) t_1^{-1} \alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q} |t_2 - t_1| + \alpha(t_1)^{\theta_q} \|\eta_2 - \eta_1\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.136)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ . Thus, we have proved (4.113) and completed the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

Now, we are in a position to prove Proposition 4.1:

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* First, we claim that if  $t > 0$  is sufficiently small depending only on  $d$ ,  $p$ ,  $q$  and  $R$ , then for any  $\eta \in Y_q(R, t)$ , the interval  $I(t)$  admits one and only one element  $\tau(t; \eta)$  such that

$$\tau(t; \eta) = \mathfrak{s}(t; \tau(t; \eta), \eta). \quad (4.137)$$

We prove this claim by applying the Banach fixed-point theorem to the mapping  $\tau \in I(t) \mapsto \mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta)$ , as in [7]. By Lemma 4.8 (see also Remark 4.4), we see that if  $t$  is sufficiently small depending only on  $d$ ,  $p$ ,  $q$  and  $R$ , then for any  $\eta \in Y_q(R, t)$  and  $\tau \in I(t)$ ,  $\mathfrak{s}(t; \tau, \eta) \in I(t)$ . Furthermore, applying Lemma 4.9 as  $t_1 = t_2 = t$  and  $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = \eta$  (see also Remark 4.5), we see that if  $t$  is sufficiently small depending only on  $d$ ,  $p$ ,  $q$  and  $R$ , then for any  $\eta \in Y_q(R, t)$  and  $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in I(t)$ ,

$$|\mathfrak{s}(t; \tau_2, \eta) - \mathfrak{s}(t; \tau_1, \eta)| \lesssim o_t(1) |\tau_1 - \tau_2|, \quad (4.138)$$



where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ . Then, the Banach fixed-point theorem shows that the claim is true.

Next, we claim that if  $t > 0$  is sufficiently small depending only on  $d$ ,  $p$ ,  $q$  and  $R$ , then  $Y_q(R, t)$  admits one and only one element  $\eta_t$  such that

$$\eta_t = \mathfrak{g}(t; \tau(t; \eta_t), \eta_t), \quad (4.139)$$

where  $\tau(t; \eta)$  denotes the unique number in  $I(t)$  satisfying (4.137). Indeed, applying Lemma 4.10 (use (4.101) as  $t_j = t$  and  $\tau_j = \tau(t; \eta_j)$ ), we see that the mapping  $\eta \in Y_q(R, t) \mapsto \mathfrak{g}(t; \tau(t; \eta), \eta)$  is contraction in the metric induced from  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Hence, the claim follows from the Banach fixed-point theorem.

By the above claims, we conclude that if  $t > 0$  is sufficiently small depending only on  $d$ ,  $p$ ,  $q$  and  $R$ , then  $I(t) \times Y_q(R, t)$  admits at least one solution to (4.20). Furthermore, the uniqueness of such a solution follows from Lemma 4.9 and Lemma 4.10; indeed, by these lemmas and (4.40), we see that if  $(\tau_t, \eta_t)$  and  $(\tilde{\tau}_t, \tilde{\eta}_t)$  are solutions to (4.20) in  $I(t) \times Y_q(R, t)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} & |\tau_t - \tilde{\tau}_t| + \|\eta_t - \tilde{\eta}_t\|_{L^q} \\ &= |\mathfrak{s}(t; \tau_t, \eta_t) - \mathfrak{s}(t; \tilde{\tau}_t, \tilde{\eta}_t)| + \|\mathfrak{g}(t; \tau_t, \eta_t) - \mathfrak{g}(t; \tilde{\tau}_t, \tilde{\eta}_t)\|_{L^q} \\ &\lesssim o_t(1)|\tau_t - \tilde{\tau}_t| + \alpha(t)^{\theta_q} \|\eta_t - \tilde{\eta}_t\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.140)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ . This estimate implies that if  $t > 0$  is sufficiently small depending only on  $d$ ,  $p$ ,  $q$  and  $R$ , then the uniqueness holds.

Now, for a sufficiently small  $t > 0$ , we use  $(\tau_t, \eta_t)$  to denote the unique solution to (4.20) in  $I(t) \times Y_q(R, t)$ .

We shall show that  $\tau_t$  and  $\eta_t$  are continuous with respect to  $t$ . Let  $t_0, t > 0$  be sufficiently small numbers with  $\frac{1}{2}t \leq t_0 \leq 2t$ . Then, by Lemma 4.9 (see also Remark 4.5), (4.40) and Lemma 4.10, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\tau_t - \tau_{t_0}| + \|\eta_t - \eta_{t_0}\|_{L^q} \\ &= |\mathfrak{s}(t; \tau_t, \eta_t) - \mathfrak{s}(t_0; \tau_{t_0}, \eta_{t_0})| + \|\mathfrak{g}(t; \tau_t, \eta_t) - \mathfrak{g}(t_0; \tau_{t_0}, \eta_{t_0})\|_{L^q} \\ &\lesssim o_{t_0}(1)|\tau_t - \tau_{t_0}| + \{1 + o_{t_0}(1)t_0^{-1}\alpha(t_0)^{\Theta_q}\}|t - t_0| + \alpha(t_0)^{\theta_q} \|\eta_t - \eta_{t_0}\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.141)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ . Note that if  $t_0$  is sufficiently small, then the first and last terms on the right-hand side of (4.141) can be absorbed into the left-hand side. Thus, (4.141) implies the continuity of  $\tau_t$  and  $\eta_t$ .

It remains to prove that  $\tau_t$  is strictly increasing with respect to  $t$ . Let  $0 < t_1 < t_2$  be sufficiently small numbers to be specified later, dependently on  $d$ ,  $p$ ,  $q$  and  $R$ . By the continuity of  $\tau_t$  with respect to  $t$ , we may assume that  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are sufficiently close; in particular, we may assume  $t_2 \leq 2t_1$ . Then, by  $\tau_{t_j} = \mathfrak{s}(t_j; \tau_{t_j}, \eta_{t_j})$ , Lemma 4.9 (see also Remark 4.5), (4.40), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{t_2} - \tau_{t_1} &\geq \frac{K_p}{A_1}(t_2 - t_1) - o_{t_1}(1)|t_2 - t_1| - o_{t_1}(1)|\tau_{t_2} - \tau_{t_1}| \\ &\quad - C_0 t_1 \alpha(t_1)^{-\Theta_q + \theta_q} \|\eta_{t_2} - \eta_{t_1}\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.142)$$

where  $C_0 > 0$  is some constant depending only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Furthermore, we find from Lemma 4.10 and  $\eta_{t_j} = \mathfrak{g}(t_j; \tau_{t_j}, \eta_{t_j})$  that

$$\|\eta_{t_2} - \eta_{t_1}\|_{L^q} \lesssim o_{t_1}(1)t_1^{-1}\alpha(t_1)^{\Theta_q}|t_2 - t_1| + |t_2 - t_1|, \quad (4.143)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Plugging (4.143) into (4.142), and using (4.40), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{t_2} - \tau_{t_1} &\geq \frac{K_p}{A_1}(t_2 - t_1) - o_{t_1}(1)|t_2 - t_1| - o_{t_1}(1)|\tau_{t_2} - \tau_{t_1}| \\ &\quad - C_0 o_{t_1}(1)\alpha(t_1)^{\theta_q}|t_2 - t_1| + C_0\alpha(t_1)^{\theta_q}|t_2 - t_1|, \end{aligned} \quad (4.144)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . This implies that  $\tau_t$  is strictly increasing with respect to  $t$ . Thus, we have completed the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

### 4.3 Proof of Proposition 4.2

In this section, we prove Proposition 4.2.

Recall that  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_t$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_t$  denote the action and Nehari functional associated with (4.24), respectively (see (4.22) and (4.23)). Furthermore, recall that  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$  denotes the set of positive radial minimizers for (4.24).

The existence of a minimizer for (4.24) follows from that for (1.1) via the  $H^1$ -scaling (see (4.1)); Precisely, we have:

**Lemma 4.11.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{4}{d-2} - 1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Let  $\max\{2^*, \frac{2^*}{p-1}\} < q < \infty$  and  $R > 0$ , and let  $T_1(q, R)$  be the number given in Proposition 4.1; hence for any  $0 < t < T_1(q, R)$ ,  $I(t) \times Y_q(R, t)$  admits a unique solution to (4.20), say  $(\tau_t, \eta_t)$ . Furthermore, let  $0 < t < T_1(q, R)$ , and define  $\lambda(t)$  and  $\omega(t)$  by*

$$\lambda(t)^{-2^*+p+1} = t, \quad \omega(t) = \alpha(\tau_t)\lambda(t)^{2^*-2} = \alpha(\tau_t)t^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}}. \quad (4.145)$$

Then, the following hold:

1. Let  $\Phi \in \mathcal{G}_{\omega(t)}$ ; Note that by Proposition 1.1,  $\mathcal{G}_{\omega(t)} \neq \emptyset$ . Then,  $T_{\lambda(t)}[\Phi] \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ ; Hence,  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t \neq \emptyset$ .
2. Let  $u \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ . Then,  $T_{\lambda(t)^{-1}}[u] \in \mathcal{G}_{\omega(t)}$ , and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_t(u) = \frac{1}{d}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{1}{d}\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (4.146)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.11.* We shall prove the first claim. Observe from a computation involving the scaling that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_t(T_{\lambda(t)}[\Phi]) = \mathcal{N}_{\omega(t)}(\Phi) = 0, \quad (4.147)$$

which implies that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_t(T_{\lambda(t)}[\Phi]) \geq \inf \{ \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_t(u) : u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \{0\}, \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_t(u) = 0 \}. \quad (4.148)$$

If the equality failed in (4.148), then we could take a function  $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_t(u_0) < \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_t(T_{\lambda(t)}[\Phi]), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_t(u_0) = 0. \quad (4.149)$$

Furthermore, (4.149) together with computations involving the scaling shows that

$$\mathcal{S}_{\omega(t)}(T_{\lambda(t)^{-1}}[u_0]) = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_t(u_0) < \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_t(T_{\lambda(t)}[\Phi]) = \mathcal{S}_{\omega(t)}(\Phi), \quad (4.150)$$

$$\mathcal{N}_{\omega(t)}(T_{\lambda(t)^{-1}}[u_0]) = \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_t(u_0) = 0. \quad (4.151)$$

However, (4.150) together with (4.151) contradicts  $\Phi \in \mathcal{G}_{\omega(t)}$ . Thus, the equality must hold in (4.148), which together with (4.147) shows that  $T_{\lambda(t)}[\Phi] \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ .

Move on to the second claim. As well as the first claim, we can verify that  $T_{\lambda(t)^{-1}}[u] \in \mathcal{G}_{\omega(t)}$ . It remains to prove (4.146). Observe from computations involving the scaling that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_t(u) = \mathcal{S}_{\omega(t)}(T_{\lambda(t)^{-1}}[u]), \quad \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} = \|\nabla T_{\lambda(t)^{-1}}[u]\|_{L^2}. \quad (4.152)$$

Then, by Lemma 2.2 of [2], and (4.152), we find that (4.146) holds.  $\square$

The following fact follows from the second claim in Lemma 4.11 (cf. Proposition 1.1):

**Corollary 4.1.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{4}{d-2} - 1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Let  $\max\{2^*, \frac{2^*}{p-1}\} < q < \infty$ ,  $R > 0$  and let  $T_1(q, R)$  be the number given in Proposition 4.1; hence for any  $0 < t < T_1(q, R)$ ,  $I(t) \times Y_q(R, t)$  admits a unique solution to (4.20), say  $(\tau_t, \eta_t)$ . Furthermore, let  $0 < t < T_1(q, R)$  and  $u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ . Then,  $u_t$  is a positive radial solution to (4.21). Furthermore,  $u_t \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , and  $u_t(x)$  is strictly decreasing as a function of  $|x|$ .*

Next, we give properties of ground states to (4.21) (Lemma 4.12 and Lemma 4.13):

**Lemma 4.12.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{4}{d-2} - 1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Let  $\max\{2^*, \frac{2^*}{p-1}\} < q < \infty$ ,  $R > 0$  and let  $T_1(q, R)$  be the number given in Proposition 4.1; hence for any  $0 < t < T_1(q, R)$ ,  $I(t) \times Y_q(R, t)$  admits a unique solution to (4.20), say  $(\tau_t, \eta_t)$ . Then, the following hold:*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \alpha(\tau_t) \frac{-\{2^* - (p+1)\}}{2^* - 2} t = 0, \quad (4.153)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sup_{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t} t \|u\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sup_{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t} \alpha(\tau_t) \|u\|_{L^2}^2 = 0. \quad (4.154)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.12.* By (2.34), the assumption about  $p$  and  $\tau_t \in I(t)$  (hence  $\tau_t \sim t$ ), we see that (4.153) holds.

We shall prove (4.154). Let  $0 < t < T_1(q, R)$  be a number to be taken  $t \rightarrow 0$ , and let  $u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ . Note that  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_t(u_t) = 0$ . Then, by (4.146) in Lemma 4.11, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 &\geq \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_t(u_t) - \frac{1}{p+1} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_t(u_t) \\ &= \frac{p-1}{2(p+1)} \alpha(\tau_t) \|u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{p-1}{2(p+1)} \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{2^* - (p+1)}{2^*(p+1)} \|u_t\|_{L^{2^*}}^{2^*}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.155)$$

Furthermore, by Hölder's inequality, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} t \|u_t\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1} &\leq t \|u_t\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2\{2^* - (p+1)\}}{2^* - 2}} \|u_t\|_{L^{2^*}}^{\frac{2^*(p-1)}{2^* - 2}} \\ &= \alpha(\tau_t) \frac{-\{2^* - (p+1)\}}{2^* - 2} t \left\{ \alpha(\tau_t) \|u_t\|_{L^2}^2 \right\}^{\frac{2^* - (p+1)}{2^* - 2}} \|u_t\|_{L^{2^*}}^{\frac{2^*(p-1)}{2^* - 2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.156)$$

Then, we find from (4.153), (4.155) and (4.156) that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} t \|u\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1} = 0. \quad (4.157)$$

Furthermore, a standard argument (see [6]) shows that the following ‘‘Pohozaev identity’’ holds for all  $u \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ :

$$\frac{1}{d} \alpha(\tau_t) \|u\|_{L^2}^2 = \frac{2^* - (p+1)}{2^*(p+1)} t \|u\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1}. \quad (4.158)$$

Putting (4.157) and (4.158) together, we find that (4.154) is true.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.13.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{4}{d-2} - 1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ . Let  $\max\{2^*, \frac{2^*}{p-1}\} < q < \infty$ ,  $R > 0$  and let  $T_1(q, R)$  be the number given in Proposition 4.1; hence for any  $0 < t < T_1(q, R)$ ,  $I(t) \times Y_q(R, t)$  admits a unique solution to (4.20), say  $(\tau_t, \eta_t)$ . Then, all of the following hold:*

1.

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \|T_{u(0)}[u] - W\|_{\dot{H}^1} = 0. \quad (4.159)$$

2. *If  $0 < t < T_1(q, R)$  is sufficiently small depending only on  $d, p, q$  and  $R$ , then*

$$\sup_{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t} |T_{u(0)}[u](x)| \lesssim (1 + |x|)^{-(d-2)}, \quad (4.160)$$

*where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $p$ ; in particular, for any  $u \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$  and  $\frac{d}{d-2} < r \leq \infty$ ,*

$$\|T_{u(0)}[u]\|_{L^r} \lesssim 1, \quad (4.161)$$

*where the implicit constant depends only on  $d, p$  and  $r$ .*

3.

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} u(0)^{-2^*+2} \alpha(\tau_t) = 0. \quad (4.162)$$

**Remark 4.6.** *By (4.159) and (4.161), we see that*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \|T_{u(0)}[u] - W\|_{L^r} = 0 \quad \text{for all } \frac{d}{d-2} < r < \infty. \quad (4.163)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.13.* Let  $0 < t < T_1(q, R)$  be a number to be taken  $t \rightarrow 0$ , and let  $u \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ . Define  $\lambda(t)$  and  $\omega(t)$  as in (4.145). Furthermore, put  $\Psi_{\omega(t)} := T_{\lambda(t)^{-1}}[u]$ . Then, Lemma 4.11 shows that  $\Psi_{\omega(t)} \in \mathcal{G}_{\omega(t)}$ . Observe that

$$T_{\Psi_{\omega(t)}(0)}[\Psi_{\omega(t)}] = T_{u(0)}[u]. \quad (4.164)$$

Furthermore, observe from (4.153) in Lemma 4.12 that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \omega(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \alpha(\tau_t)^{\frac{-(2^*-(p+1))}{2^*-2}} t^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} \right\} = \infty. \quad (4.165)$$

Then, (4.159) follows from  $\Psi_{\omega(t)} \in \mathcal{G}_{\omega(t)}$ , (4.164) and Lemma 2.2. Furthermore, (4.160) follows from Lemma 2.3.

It remains to prove the last claim (4.162). Suppose for contradiction that the claim is false. Then, we can take a sequence  $\{t_n\}$  with the following property:  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = 0$ , and for any  $n \geq 1$  there exists  $u_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{t_n}$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n(0)^{-2^*+2} \alpha(\tau_{t_n}) > 0. \quad (4.166)$$

Observe from a computation involving the scaling, and (4.154) in Lemma 4.12 that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n(0)^{-2^*+2} \alpha(\tau_{t_n}) \|T_{u_n(0)}[u_n]\|_{L^2}^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(\tau_{t_n}) \|u_n\|_{L^2}^2 = 0. \quad (4.167)$$

By (4.166) and (4.167), we see that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T_{u_n(0)}[u_n]\|_{L^2} = 0. \quad (4.168)$$

Furthermore, by (4.159), (4.161) and (4.168), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|W\|_{L^{2^*}} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T_{u_n(0)}[u_n]\|_{L^{2^*}} \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T_{u_n(0)}[u_n]\|_{L^2}^{\frac{d-2}{d}} \|T_{u_n(0)}[u_n]\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{2}{d}} \lesssim \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T_{u_n(0)}[u_n]\|_{L^2}^{\frac{d-2}{d}} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.169)$$

This is a contradiction. Thus, the claim (4.162) is true.  $\square$

We will prove Proposition 4.2 by showing that a minimizer for (4.24) coincides with the unique solution to (4.20) obtained in Proposition 4.1. The first step to accomplish this plan is the following lemma (cf. Lemma 3.8 in [7]):

**Lemma 4.14.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$  and  $\frac{4}{d-2} - 1 < p < \frac{4}{d-2} + 1$ . Let  $\max\{2^*, \frac{2^*}{p+3-2^*}\} < q < \infty$ . Furthermore, for  $R > 0$ , let  $T_1(q, R)$  denote the number given in Proposition 4.1. Then, there exist  $R_* > 0$  and  $0 < T_* < T_1(q, R_*)$ , both depending only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ , with the following property: For any  $0 < t < T_*$  and  $u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ , there exists  $\mu(t) = 1 + o_t(1)$  such that, denoting a unique solution to (4.20) in  $I(t) \times Y_q(R_*, t)$  by  $(\tau_t, \eta_t)$  (see Proposition 4.1), and defining  $\mu^\dagger(t)$ ,  $t^\dagger$ ,  $\alpha^\dagger(t)$  and  $\eta_t^\dagger$  as*

$$\mu^\dagger(t) := \mu(t)u_t(0), \quad (4.170)$$

$$t^\dagger := \mu^\dagger(t)^{-\{2^*-(p+1)\}} t, \quad \alpha^\dagger(t) := \mu^\dagger(t)^{-(2^*-2)} \alpha(\tau_t), \quad (4.171)$$

$$\eta_t^\dagger := T_{\mu^\dagger(t)}[u_t] - W, \quad (4.172)$$

we have the following:

1.

$$\langle (-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1} F(\eta_t^\dagger; \alpha^\dagger(t), t^\dagger), V \Lambda W \rangle = 0, \quad (4.173)$$

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \sup_{u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t} \alpha^\dagger(t) = 0, \quad \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \sup_{u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t} t^\dagger = 0, \quad (4.174)$$

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \sup_{u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t} \alpha^\dagger(t)^{\frac{-(2^*-(p+1))}{2^*-2}} t^\dagger = 0, \quad (4.175)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{\dot{H}^1} = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{L^r} = 0 \quad \text{for all } \frac{d}{d-2} < r < \infty. \quad (4.176)$$

2.

$$(\beta(\alpha^\dagger(t)), \eta_t^\dagger) \in I(t^\dagger) \times Y_q(R_*, t^\dagger). \quad (4.177)$$

3. If  $0 < t < T_*$ , then  $0 < t^\dagger < T_1(q, R_*)$ . Furthermore, let  $0 < t < T_*$ , and let  $(\tau_{t^\dagger}, \eta_{t^\dagger})$  denote a unique solution to (4.20) with  $t = t^\dagger$  in  $I(t^\dagger) \times Y_q(R_*, t^\dagger)$ . Then,

$$(\beta(\alpha^\dagger(t)), \eta_t^\dagger) = (\tau_{t^\dagger}, \eta_{t^\dagger}). \quad (4.178)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.14.* Since the proof is long, we divide it into three steps:

**Step 1.** Let  $R > 0$ . Then, we shall show that there exists  $0 < T_2(q, R) < T_1(q, R)$ , depending only on  $d, p, q$  and  $R$ , with the following property: For any  $0 < t < T_2(q, R)$  and  $u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ , there exists  $\mu(t) = 1 + o_t(1)$  such that defining  $\mu^\dagger(t), t^\dagger, \alpha^\dagger(t)$  and  $\eta_t^\dagger$  in the same manner as (4.170) through (4.172), we have (4.173) through (4.176).

First, observe from (4.162) in Lemma 4.13 that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sup_{u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t} \sup_{\frac{1}{2} \leq \mu \leq \frac{3}{2}} \{\mu u_t(0)\}^{-(2^*-2)} \alpha(\tau_t) = 0. \quad (4.179)$$

Furthermore, observe from (4.153) in Lemma 4.12 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sup_{u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t} \sup_{\mu > 0} (\{\mu u_t(0)\}^{-(2^*-2)} \alpha(\tau_t))^{\frac{-\{2^*-(p+1)\}}{2^*-2}} \{\mu u_t(0)\}^{-\{2^*-(p+1)\}} t \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \alpha(\tau_t)^{\frac{-\{2^*-(p+1)\}}{2^*-2}} t = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.180)$$

Next, let  $0 < T_2 < T_1(q, R)$  be a sufficiently small number to be specified in the middle of the proof, dependently on  $d, p, q$  and  $R$  (we will see that the dependence of  $T_2$  on  $q$  and  $R$  comes from the restriction  $T_2 < T_1(q, R)$  only). Furthermore, let  $0 < t < T_2$ ,  $u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$  and  $\frac{1}{2} < \mu < \frac{3}{2}$ . By Corollary 4.1 and a computation involving the scaling, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\Delta T_{\mu u_t(0)}[u_t] + \{\mu u_t(0)\}^{-(2^*-2)} \alpha(\tau_t) T_{\mu u_t(0)}[u_t] \\ & - \{\mu u_t(0)\}^{-\{2^*-(p+1)\}} t T_{\mu u_t(0)}[u_t]^p - T_{\mu u_t(0)}[u_t]^{\frac{d+2}{d-2}} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.181)$$

Define  $t(\mu), \alpha_t(\mu)$  and  $\eta_t(\mu)$  as

$$t(\mu) := \{\mu u_t(0)\}^{-\{2^*-(p+1)\}} t, \quad \alpha_t(\mu) := \{\mu u_t(0)\}^{-(2^*-2)} \alpha(\tau_t), \quad (4.182)$$

$$\eta_t(\mu) := T_{\mu u_t(0)}[u_t] - W. \quad (4.183)$$

By (4.179), we may assume that

$$\alpha_t(\mu) < 1, \quad \delta(\alpha_t(\mu)) < 1. \quad (4.184)$$

Observe from (4.181) and (4.4) that

$$(-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu) + V)\eta_t(\mu) = F(\eta_t(\mu); \alpha_t(\mu), t(\mu)). \quad (4.185)$$

Furthermore, observe from  $(-\Delta + V)\Lambda W = 0$  (see (2.13)) that

$$V\Lambda W = \alpha_t(\mu)\Lambda W - (-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))\Lambda W. \quad (4.186)$$

By (4.185) and (4.186), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle (-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1} F(\eta_t(\mu); \alpha_t(\mu), t(\mu)), V\Lambda W \rangle \\
&= \langle (-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1} (-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu) + V)\eta_t(\mu), V\Lambda W \rangle \\
&= \langle \eta_t(\mu), V\Lambda W \rangle + \langle (-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1} V\eta_t(\mu), V\Lambda W \rangle \\
&= \langle (-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1} V\eta_t(\mu), \alpha_t(\mu)\Lambda W \rangle = \langle \eta_t(\mu), \alpha_t(\mu)V(-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1}\Lambda W \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.187}$$

Note that  $\eta_t(\mu)$  can be written as

$$\eta_t(\mu) = T_\mu[T_{u_t(0)}[u_t] - W] + T_\mu[W] - W. \tag{4.188}$$

Plugging (4.188) into (4.187), we see that for any  $\mu > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle (-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1} F(\eta_t(\mu); \alpha_t(\mu), t(\mu)), V\Lambda W \rangle \\
&= \langle T_\mu[T_{u_t(0)}[u_t] - W], \alpha_t(\mu)V(-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1}\Lambda W \rangle \\
&\quad + \langle T_\mu[W] - W + \frac{2}{d-2}(\mu-1)\Lambda W, \alpha_t(\mu)V(-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1}\Lambda W \rangle \\
&\quad - \frac{2}{d-2}(\mu-1)\langle \Lambda W, \alpha_t(\mu)V(-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1}\Lambda W \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.189}$$

Furthermore, by (2.18), we may rewrite (4.189) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle (-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1} F(\eta_t(\mu); \alpha_t(\mu), t(\mu)), V\Lambda W \rangle \\
&= \langle T_\mu[T_{u_t(0)}[u] - W], \alpha_t(\mu)V(-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1}\Lambda W \rangle \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{d-2} \langle \int_1^\mu \int_1^\nu \lambda^{-2} T_\lambda [2\Lambda W + \frac{2}{d-2} x \cdot \nabla \Lambda W] d\lambda d\nu, \alpha_t(\mu)V(-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1}\Lambda W \rangle \\
&\quad - \frac{2}{d-2}(\mu-1)\langle \Lambda W, \alpha_t(\mu)V(-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1}\Lambda W \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.190}$$

Observe from the duality, Lemma 3.13, (4.184) and  $\beta(s) := \delta(s)^{-1}s$  that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\alpha_t(\mu)V(-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1}\Lambda W\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}}} = \sup_{\substack{g \in L^{2^*} \\ \|g\|_{L^{2^*}} = 1}} |\langle \alpha_t(\mu)V(-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1}\Lambda W, g \rangle| \\
&= \alpha_t(\mu) \sup_{\substack{g \in L^{2^*} \\ \|g\|_{L^{2^*}} = 1}} |\langle (-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1} Vg, \Lambda W \rangle| \\
&\lesssim \alpha_t(\mu) \sup_{\substack{g \in L^{2^*} \\ \|g\|_{L^{2^*}} = 1}} \{ \delta(\alpha_t(\mu))^{-1} \|V\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}}} \|g\|_{L^{2^*}} + \|g\|_{L^{2^*}} \} \lesssim \beta(\alpha_t(\mu)),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.191}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$ . Furthermore, by Hölder's inequality, a computation involving the scaling and (4.191), the first term on the right-hand side of (4.190) is estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\langle T_\mu[T_{u_t(0)}[u_t] - W], \alpha_t(\mu)V(-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1}\Lambda W \rangle| \\
&\lesssim \|T_{u_t(0)}[u_t] - W\|_{L^{2^*}} \beta(\alpha_t(\mu)),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.192}$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ . Similarly, the second term on the right-hand side of (4.190) is estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \left\langle \int_1^\mu \int_1^\nu \lambda^{-2} T_\lambda \left[ 2\Lambda W + \frac{2}{d-2} x \cdot \nabla \Lambda W \right] d\lambda d\nu, \alpha_t(\mu) V(-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1} \Lambda W \right\rangle \right| \\
& \lesssim \beta(\alpha_t(\mu)) \left\| \int_1^\mu \int_1^\nu \lambda^{-2} T_\lambda \left[ 2\Lambda W + \frac{2}{d-2} x \cdot \nabla \Lambda W \right] d\lambda d\nu \right\|_{L^{2^*}} \\
& \leq \beta(\alpha_t(\mu)) \int_1^\mu \int_1^\nu \lambda^{-2} \left\| 2\Lambda W + \frac{2}{d-2} x \cdot \nabla \Lambda W \right\|_{L^{2^*}} d\lambda d\nu \\
& \lesssim \beta(\alpha_t(\mu)) \int_1^\mu \int_1^\nu \lambda^{-2} d\lambda d\nu \lesssim \beta(\alpha_t(\mu)) |\mu - 1|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.193}$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$ . Consider the last term on the right-hand side of (4.190). Note that

$$\langle \Lambda W, \alpha_t(\mu) V(-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1} \Lambda W \rangle = \alpha_t(\mu) \langle (-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1} V \Lambda W, \Lambda W \rangle. \tag{4.194}$$

Furthermore, observe from (2.15) that  $\Re \mathcal{F}[V \Lambda W](0) = -\frac{d+2}{d-2} \langle W^{\frac{4}{d-2}}, \Lambda W \rangle > 0$ . Then, applying Lemma 3.13 to (4.194) as  $g = \Lambda W$  and  $q = 2^*$ , and using  $\beta(s) := \delta(s)^{-1} s$ , we see that there exists  $\mathcal{C}_0 > 0$  depending only on  $d$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| -\frac{2}{d-2} (\mu - 1) \langle \Lambda W, \alpha_t(\mu) V(-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1} \Lambda W \rangle - \mathcal{C}_0 \beta(\alpha_t(\mu)) (\mu - 1) \right| \\
& \lesssim \delta(\alpha_t(\mu)) \beta(\alpha_t(\mu)) |\mu - 1|,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.195}$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ .

Plugging (4.192), (4.193) and (4.195) into (4.190), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \langle (-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1} F(\eta_t(\mu); \alpha_t(\mu), t(\mu)), V \Lambda W \rangle - \mathcal{C}_0 \beta(\alpha_t(\mu)) \{\mu - 1\} \right| \\
& \leq C_1 \beta(\alpha_t(\mu)) \left\{ \sup_{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t} \|T_{u(0)}[u] - W\|_{L^{2^*}} + |\mu - 1|^2 + \delta(\alpha_t(\mu)) |\mu - 1| \right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.196}$$

where  $C_1 > 0$  is some constant depending only on  $d$ . Furthermore, by (4.196), (4.159) in Lemma 4.13 and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \delta(\alpha_t(\mu)) = 0$  (see (4.179)), we see that there exists  $T_2 > 0$  depending only on  $d$  and  $p$  such that for any  $0 < t < T_2$ ,  $u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$  and  $\frac{1}{2} < \mu < \frac{3}{2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \langle (-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu))^{-1} F(\eta_t(\mu); \alpha_t(\mu), t(\mu)), V \Lambda W \rangle - \mathcal{C}_0 \beta(\alpha_t(\mu)) \{\mu - 1\} \right| \\
& \leq \beta(\alpha_t(\mu)) \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{C}_0}{4(1+C_1)} + C_1 |\mu - 1|^2 + \frac{\mathcal{C}_0}{4} |\mu - 1| \right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.197}$$

which together with the intermediate value theorem implies that for any  $0 < t < T_2$  and  $u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ , there exists  $\mu(t) > 0$  with  $|\mu(t) - 1| \leq \frac{\min\{\mathcal{C}_0, 1\}}{4(1+C_1)}$  such that

$$\langle (-\Delta + \alpha_t(\mu(t)))^{-1} F(\eta_t(\mu(t)); \alpha_t(\mu(t)), t(\mu(t))), V \Lambda W \rangle = 0. \tag{4.198}$$

Furthermore, when  $\mu = \mu(t)$ , (4.196) together with (4.198) implies that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} |\mu(t) - 1| = 0. \tag{4.199}$$



Thus, we have proved that for any  $R > 0$ , there exists  $0 < T_2(q, R) < T_1(q, R)$  such that for any  $0 < t < T_2(q, R)$  and  $u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ , there exists  $\mu(t) = 1 + o_t(1)$  for which (4.173) holds. Define  $\mu^\dagger(t)$ ,  $t^\dagger$ ,  $\alpha^\dagger(t)$  and  $\eta_t^\dagger$  as in (4.170) through (4.172). Then, the claims (4.174) and (4.175) follows from (4.179) and (4.180); We remark that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sup_{u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t} t^\dagger = 0$  follows from  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sup_{u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t} \alpha^\dagger(t) = 0$  and (4.175).

It remains to prove (4.176). By the fundamental theorem of calculus (see (2.17)), a computation involving the scaling, (4.159) in Lemma 4.13, and  $\mu(t) = 1 + o_t(1)$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{\dot{H}^1} &\leq \|T_{\mu(t)}[T_{u_t(0)}[u_t] - W]\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|T_{\mu(t)}[W] - W\|_{\dot{H}^1} \\ &\lesssim \|T_{u_t(0)}[u_t] - W\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \int_1^{\mu(t)} \lambda^{-1} \|\Lambda W\|_{\dot{H}^1} d\lambda \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.200)$$

Similarly, using (4.163) instead of (4.159), we see that for any  $\frac{d}{d-2} < r < \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{L^r} &\lesssim \mu(t)^{\frac{2^*-r}{r}} \|T_{u_t(0)}[u_t] - W\|_{L^r} + \int_1^{\mu(t)} \lambda^{-1 + \frac{2^*-r}{r}} \|\Lambda W\|_{L^r} d\lambda \\ &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.201)$$

Thus, we have proved (4.176).

**Step 2.** Let  $R > 0$ , and let  $T_2(q, R)$  denote the number given in the previous step. Furthermore, let  $0 < t < T_2(q, R)$ ,  $u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ , and let  $\mu(t) = 1 + o_t(1)$  be a number such that (4.173) through (4.176) hold. Define  $\mu^\dagger(t)$ ,  $t^\dagger$ ,  $\alpha^\dagger(t)$  and  $\eta_t^\dagger$  as in (4.170) through (4.172). Then, our aim in this step is to show that, taking  $T_2(q, R)$  even smaller dependently on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ , we have

$$\|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{L^q} \lesssim \alpha^\dagger(t)^{\Theta_q} + t^\dagger, \quad (4.202)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ .

Note that  $\eta_t^\dagger$  satisfies

$$\eta_t^\dagger = \{1 + (-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1}V\}^{-1}(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1}F(\eta_t^\dagger; \alpha^\dagger(t), t^\dagger). \quad (4.203)$$

By (2.36), (3.12) in Lemma 3.4 with  $q_1 = \frac{d}{d-2}$ , Lemma 3.5,  $\frac{pdq}{d+2q} > \frac{d}{d-2}$  and (2.40), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1}F(\eta_t^\dagger; \alpha^\dagger(t), t^\dagger)\|_{L^q} \\ &\leq \alpha^\dagger(t) \|(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1}W\|_{L^q} + t^\dagger \|(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1}W^p\|_{L^q} \\ &\quad + \|(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1}N(\eta_t^\dagger; t^\dagger)\|_{L^q} \\ &\lesssim \alpha^\dagger(t)^{\Theta_q} + t^\dagger \\ &\quad + \|(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1}D(\eta_t^\dagger, 0)\|_{L^q} + t^\dagger \|(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1}E(\eta_t^\dagger, 0)\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.204)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ . Consider the third term on the right-hand side of (4.204). By (2.44), (2.41), Lemma 3.5, Hölder's inequality, (4.176),  $\frac{(6-d)dq}{(d-2)(2q-d)} > \frac{d}{d-2}$  and  $q > \frac{d}{d-2}$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1}D(\eta_t^\dagger, 0)\|_{L^q} \lesssim \|(W + |\eta_t^\dagger|)^{\frac{6-d}{d-2}} |\eta_t^\dagger|^2\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{d+2q}}} \\ &\lesssim \|(W + |\eta_t^\dagger|)^{\frac{6-d}{d-2}}\|_{L^{\frac{dq}{2q-d}}} \| |\eta_t^\dagger|^2 \|_{L^{\frac{q}{2}}} \lesssim \|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{L^q}^2 = o_t(1) \|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.205)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $q$ . Consider the last term on the right-hand side of (4.204). Introduce an exponent  $q_1$  as

$$q_1 := \frac{2^* q}{(p-1)q + 2^*} = \frac{2^*}{p-1 + \frac{2^*}{q}}. \quad (4.206)$$

Observe from  $q > \max\{2^*, \frac{2^*}{p-1}\}$  that

$$1 < q_1 < \frac{q}{2}, \quad \frac{d}{2} \left( \frac{1}{q_1} - \frac{1}{q} \right) - 1 = \frac{-\{2^* - (p+1)\}}{2^* - 2}, \quad \frac{d}{d-2} < \frac{(p-1)q_1 q}{q - q_1}. \quad (4.207)$$

Furthermore, observe from the last condition in (4.207) and (4.176) that

$$\|W\|_{L^{\frac{(p-1)q_1 q}{q-q_1}}} \lesssim 1, \quad \|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{L^{\frac{(p-1)q_1 q}{q-q_1}}} = o_t(1), \quad (4.208)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ . Then, by (2.44), (2.42), Lemma 3.4, Hölder's inequality, the second condition in (4.207), (4.208) and (4.175), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & t^\dagger \|(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1} E(\eta_t^\dagger, 0)\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim t^\dagger \alpha^\dagger(t)^{\frac{d}{2}(\frac{1}{q_1} - \frac{1}{q}) - 1} \|(W + |\eta_t^\dagger|)^{p-1} |\eta_t^\dagger|\|_{L^{q_1}} \\ & \leq t^\dagger \alpha^\dagger(t)^{\frac{-\{2^* - (p+1)\}}{2^* - 2}} \|(W + |\eta_t^\dagger|)^{p-1}\|_{L^{\frac{q_1 q}{q-q_1}}} \|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{L^q} \\ & \lesssim t^\dagger \alpha^\dagger(t)^{\frac{-\{2^* - (p+1)\}}{2^* - 2}} \|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{L^q} = o_t(1) \|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.209)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ .

Plugging (4.205) and (4.209) into (4.204), we see that

$$\|(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1} F(\eta_t^\dagger; \alpha^\dagger(t), t^\dagger)\|_{L^q} \lesssim \alpha^\dagger(t)^{\Theta_q} + t^\dagger + o_t(1) \|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{L^q}, \quad (4.210)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ . Furthermore, by (4.203), (4.173), Proposition 3.1 and (4.210), we see that

$$\|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{L^q} \lesssim \|(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1} F(\eta_t^\dagger; \alpha^\dagger(t), t^\dagger)\|_{L^q} \lesssim \alpha^\dagger(t)^{\Theta_q} + t^\dagger + o_t(1) \|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{L^q}, \quad (4.211)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ . Since the last term on the right-hand side of (4.211) can be absorbed into the left-hand side, (4.211) implies (4.202).

**Step 3.** We shall finish the proof of the lemma. Let  $R > 0$ , and let  $T_2(q, R)$  denote the same number as in the previous step. Then, for any  $0 < t < T_2(q, R)$  and  $u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ , we can take  $\mu(t) = 1 + o_t(1)$  for which (4.173) through (4.176) and (4.202) hold.

Note that since  $\alpha$  is the inverse function of  $\beta$ , we have

$$\alpha^\dagger(t) = \alpha(\beta(\alpha^\dagger(t))). \quad (4.212)$$

Observe from (4.173) that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle (-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1} F(\eta_t^\dagger; \alpha^\dagger(t), t^\dagger), V \Lambda W \rangle \\ &= -\alpha^\dagger(t) \langle (-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1} W, V \Lambda W \rangle + t^\dagger \langle (-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1} W^p, V \Lambda W \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle (-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1} D(\eta_t^\dagger, 0), V \Lambda W \rangle + t^\dagger \langle (-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1} E(\eta_t^\dagger, 0), V \Lambda W \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4.213)$$

Recall that  $\beta(s) = \delta(s)^{-1}s$ . Then, by Lemma 3.15 and Lemma 3.16, we see that

$$\alpha^\dagger(t)\langle(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1}W, V\Lambda W\rangle = A_1\beta(\alpha^\dagger(t)) + O(\alpha^\dagger(t)), \quad (4.214)$$

$$t^\dagger\langle(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1}W^p, V\Lambda W\rangle = K_p t^\dagger + o_t(1)t^\dagger. \quad (4.215)$$

By (4.205) and (4.202), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1}D(\eta_t^\dagger, 0), V\Lambda W\rangle| \\ & \leq \|(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1}D(\eta_t^\dagger, 0)\|_{L^q} \|V\Lambda W\|_{L^{\frac{q}{q-1}}} \lesssim \|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{L^q}^2 \lesssim \alpha^\dagger(t)^{2\Theta_q} + o_t(1)t^\dagger, \end{aligned} \quad (4.216)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Observe from  $q > \max\{2^*, \frac{2^*}{p+3-2^*}\}$  and  $p > \frac{4}{d-2} - 1$  that

$$\Theta_q - \frac{2^* - (p+1)}{2^* - 2} > 0, \quad 2\Theta_q > \frac{d-2}{2}. \quad (4.217)$$

By (4.209), (4.202), (4.217) and (4.175), we see

$$\begin{aligned} & t^\dagger|\langle(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1}E(\eta_t^\dagger, 0), V\Lambda W\rangle| \lesssim t^\dagger\|(-\Delta + \alpha^\dagger(t))^{-1}E(\eta_t^\dagger, 0)\|_{L^q} \\ & = t^\dagger\alpha^\dagger(t)^{\frac{-\{2^*-(p+1)\}}{2^*-2}}\|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{L^q} \lesssim t^\dagger\alpha^\dagger(t)^{\frac{-\{2^*-(p+1)\}}{2^*-2}}\{\alpha^\dagger(t)^{\Theta_q} + t^\dagger\} = o_t(1)t^\dagger, \end{aligned} \quad (4.218)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ .

Plugging (4.214), (4.215), (4.216) and (4.218) into (4.213), and using (4.212), (4.217) and (2.34), we see that

$$\left|\beta(\alpha^\dagger(t)) - \frac{K_p}{A_1}t^\dagger\right| \leq o_t(1)t^\dagger + O(\alpha^\dagger(t)) + \alpha^\dagger(t)^{2\Theta_q} \leq o_t(1)t^\dagger + o_t(1)\beta(\alpha^\dagger(t)). \quad (4.219)$$

This implies that  $\beta(\alpha^\dagger(t)) \in I(t^\dagger)$ . Furthermore, by (4.202), (4.212), (4.40) and  $\beta(\alpha^\dagger(t)) \in I(t^\dagger)$  (hence  $\beta(\alpha^\dagger(t)) \sim t^\dagger$ ), we see that

$$\|\eta_t^\dagger\|_{L^q} \lesssim \alpha^\dagger(t)^{\Theta_q} + t^\dagger \lesssim \alpha(\beta(\alpha^\dagger(t)))^{\Theta_q} + \alpha(t^\dagger)^{\Theta_q} \lesssim \alpha(t^\dagger)^{\Theta_q}, \quad (4.220)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ , so that there exists  $R_* > 0$  depending only on  $d, p$  and  $q$  such that

$$\eta_t^\dagger \in Y_q(R_*, t^\dagger). \quad (4.221)$$

Since  $R_*$  depends only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ , we may take  $R = R_*$  from the beginning of the proof; Put  $T_* := T_2(q, R_*)$ . Thus, we have proved the claims (4.173) through (4.177).

It remains to prove (4.178). By (4.212), (4.7) and (4.11), we may rewrite (4.173) as

$$\beta(\alpha^\dagger(t)) = \mathfrak{s}(t^\dagger; \beta(\alpha^\dagger(t)), \eta_t^\dagger). \quad (4.222)$$

Furthermore, by (4.212), we may write (4.203) as

$$\eta_t^\dagger = \mathfrak{g}(t^\dagger; \beta(\alpha^\dagger(t)), \eta_t^\dagger). \quad (4.223)$$

By (4.174), choosing  $T_*$  even smaller dependently only on  $d, p$  and  $q$ , we may assume that  $t^\dagger < T_1(q, R_*)$  for all  $0 < t < T_*$ . Then, the claim (4.178) follows from the uniqueness of solutions to (4.20) in  $I(t^\dagger) \times Y_q(R_*, t^\dagger)$  (see Proposition 4.1) and (4.177).

Thus, we have completed the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

Now, we are in a position to prove Proposition 4.2:

*Proof of Proposition 4.2.* We employ the idea from [7] (see the proof of Lemma 3.10 in [7]). For  $R > 0$ , let  $T_1(q, R)$  denote the number given by Proposition 4.1. Furthermore, for  $0 < t < T_1(q, R)$  and  $0 < \lambda < \frac{T_1(q, R)}{t}$ , let  $(\tau_{\lambda t}, \eta_{\lambda t})$  denote a unique solution to (4.20) with  $t = \lambda t$  in  $I(\lambda t) \times Y_q(R, \lambda t)$  (see Proposition 4.1). Then, for  $0 < t < T_1(q, R)$ , we define a function  $\Omega_t: (0, \frac{T_1(q, R)}{t}) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  by

$$\Omega_t(\lambda) := \lambda^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} \alpha(\tau_{\lambda t}). \quad (4.224)$$

Observe from the continuity of  $\tau_t$  with respect to  $t$  (see Proposition 4.1) that  $\Omega_t(\lambda)$  is continuous with respect to  $\lambda$ .

We claim:

**Claim.** Let  $R > 0$ , and let  $0 < t < T_1(q, R)$ ; We may choose  $T_1(q, R)$  even smaller, dependently on  $d, p, q$  and  $R$ , if necessary. Then,  $\Omega_t(\lambda)$  is injective on  $(0, \frac{T_1(q, R)}{t})$ .

To prove this claim, it suffices to show that  $\Omega_t(\lambda)$  is strictly decreasing with respect to  $\lambda$  on  $(0, \frac{T_1(q, R)}{t})$ . In addition, by the continuity of  $\Omega_t(\lambda)$ , it suffices to prove the following: There exists  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$  depending only on  $d, p$  and  $q$  such that if  $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \frac{T_1(q, R)}{t}$  and  $\lambda_2 < (1 + \varepsilon)\lambda_1$ , then

$$\Omega_t(\lambda_2) < \Omega_t(\lambda_1). \quad (4.225)$$

Let  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$  be a constant to be specified later, dependently on  $d, p$  and  $q$ . Furthermore, let  $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \frac{T_1(q, R)}{t}$ , and assume that  $\lambda_2 < (1 + \varepsilon)\lambda_1$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_t(\lambda_2) - \Omega_t(\lambda_1) &= \left\{ \lambda_2^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} - \lambda_1^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} \right\} \alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t}) \\ &\quad + \lambda_2^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} \left\{ \alpha(\tau_{\lambda_2 t}) - \alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t}) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.226)$$

Note that for each  $j = 1, 2$ ,  $(\tau_{\lambda_j t}, \eta_{\lambda_j t})$  is a unique solution to (4.20) with  $t = \lambda_j t$  in  $I(\lambda_j t) \times Y_q(R, \lambda_j t)$ ; in particular, we have

$$\tau_{\lambda_j t} = \mathfrak{s}(\lambda_j t; \tau_{\lambda_j t}, \eta_{\lambda_j t}), \quad \eta_{\lambda_j t} = \mathfrak{g}(\lambda_j t; \tau_{\lambda_j t}, \eta_{\lambda_j t}). \quad (4.227)$$

Furthermore, observe from  $\tau_{\lambda_j t} \in I(\lambda_j t)$  and  $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq 2\lambda_1$  ( $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ) that

$$\tau_{\lambda_1 t} \sim \lambda_1 t \sim \lambda_2 t \sim \tau_{\lambda_2 t}, \quad (4.228)$$

$$\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t}) \sim \alpha(\lambda_1 t) \sim \alpha(\lambda_2 t) \sim \alpha(\tau_{\lambda_2 t}), \quad (4.229)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on  $d$  and  $p$ .

We consider the first term on the right-hand side of (4.226). By an elementary computation, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_2^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} - \lambda_1^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} &= -\lambda_2^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_2^{\frac{2^*-2}{2^*-(p+1)}}}{\lambda_1^{\frac{2^*-2}{2^*-(p+1)}}} - 1 \right\} \\ &= -\lambda_2^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} \frac{2^* - 2}{2^* - (p + 1)} \lambda_1^{-1} (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) + \lambda_2^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} o(\lambda_1^{-1} |\lambda_2 - \lambda_1|). \end{aligned} \quad (4.230)$$

Furthermore, by  $\alpha(t) = \delta(\alpha(t))t$  (see (2.32)), (4.227) and Lemma 4.8, we see that

$$\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t}) = \delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t}))\tau_{\lambda_1 t} = \delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t}))\left\{\frac{K_p}{A_1}\lambda_1 t + o(\lambda_1 t)\right\}. \quad (4.231)$$

Putting (4.230) and (4.231) together, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{\lambda_2^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} - \lambda_1^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}}\right\}\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t}) \\ &= -\delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t}))\lambda_2^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}}\frac{2^*-2}{2^*-(p+1)}\left\{\frac{K_p}{A_1}\lambda_1 t + o(\lambda_1 t)\right\}\lambda_1^{-1}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \\ & \quad + \delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t}))\lambda_2^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}}\left\{\frac{K_p}{A_1}\lambda_1 t + o(\lambda_1 t)\right\}o(\lambda_1^{-1}|\lambda_2 - \lambda_1|). \end{aligned} \quad (4.232)$$

Next, we consider the second term on the right-hand side of (4.226). Since  $\tau_t$  is strictly increasing with respect to  $t$  (see Proposition 4.1),  $\tau_{\lambda_2 t} - \tau_{\lambda_1 t} = |\tau_{\lambda_2 t} - \tau_{\lambda_1 t}|$ . Hence, by  $\alpha(t) = \delta(\alpha(t))t$  (see (2.32)), (4.55) in Lemma 4.4, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha(\tau_{\lambda_2 t}) - \alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t}) \\ &= \{\delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_2 t})) - \delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t}))\}\tau_{\lambda_2 t} + \delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t}))\{\tau_{\lambda_2 t} - \tau_{\lambda_1 t}\} \\ &\leq \left\{(1 + o_{\lambda_1 t}(1))\frac{\tau_{\lambda_2 t}}{\tau_{\lambda_1 t}}\delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_2 t}))^{d-3} + 1\right\}\delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t}))\{\tau_{\lambda_2 t} - \tau_{\lambda_1 t}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.233)$$

Here, observe from  $\tau_{\lambda_j t} = \mathfrak{s}(\lambda_j t; \tau_{\lambda_j t}, \eta_{\lambda_j t})$  (see (4.227)) and Lemma 4.9 (see Remark 4.5) that

$$|\tau_{\lambda_2 t} - \tau_{\lambda_1 t}| \lesssim |\lambda_2 t - \lambda_1 t| + \lambda_1 t \alpha(\lambda_1 t)^{-\Theta_q + \theta_q} \|\eta_{\lambda_1 t} - \eta_{\lambda_2 t}\|_{L^q}, \quad (4.234)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ . Furthermore, Lemma 4.9 (see Remark 4.5) together with (4.234) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left|\tau_{\lambda_2 t} - \tau_{\lambda_1 t} - \frac{K_p}{A_1}\{\lambda_2 t - \lambda_1 t\}\right| \\ &\lesssim o_{\lambda_1 t}(1)|\lambda_2 t - \lambda_1 t| + \lambda_1 t \alpha(\lambda_1 t)^{-\Theta_q + \theta_q} \|\eta_{\lambda_1 t} - \eta_{\lambda_2 t}\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.235)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ . Observe from  $\eta_{\lambda_j t} = \mathfrak{g}(\lambda_j t; \tau_{\lambda_j t}, \eta_{\lambda_j t})$  (see (4.227)), and (4.101) in Lemma 4.10 that

$$\|\eta_{\lambda_1 t} - \eta_{\lambda_2 t}\|_{L^q} \lesssim \{o_{\lambda_1 t}(1)(\lambda_1 t)^{-1}\alpha(\lambda_1 t)^{\Theta_q} + 1\}|\lambda_1 t - \lambda_2 t|, \quad (4.236)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ . Plugging (4.236) into (4.235), and using (4.40), we see that

$$\tau_{\lambda_2 t} - \tau_{\lambda_1 t} = \frac{K_p}{A_1}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)t + o_{\lambda_1 t}(1)(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)t. \quad (4.237)$$

Furthermore, dividing both sides of (4.237) by  $\tau_{\lambda_1 t}$ , and using (4.228) and  $\lambda_2 \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\lambda_1$ , we see that

$$\frac{\tau_{\lambda_2 t}}{\tau_{\lambda_1 t}} - 1 \lesssim \frac{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}{\lambda_1} \leq \varepsilon, \quad (4.238)$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$  and  $p$ . We may write (4.238) as

$$\frac{\tau_{\lambda_2 t}}{\tau_{\lambda_1 t}} = 1 + O(\varepsilon). \quad (4.239)$$

Putting (4.233), (4.237) and (4.238) together, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_2^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} \left\{ \alpha(\tau_{\lambda_2 t}) - \alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t}) \right\} \\ & \leq \lambda_2^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} \left\{ (1 + o_{\lambda_1 t}(1) + O(\varepsilon)) \delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_2 t}))^{d-3} + 1 \right\} \delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t})) \\ & \quad \times \left\{ \frac{K_p}{A_1} + o_{\lambda_1 t}(1) \right\} (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)t. \end{aligned} \quad (4.240)$$

Now, plugging (4.232) and (4.240) into (4.226), and making a simple computation, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega_t(\lambda_2) - \Omega_t(\lambda_1) \\ & \leq -\delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t})) \lambda_2^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} \frac{2^* - 2}{2^* - (p+1)} \frac{K_p}{A_1} (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)t \\ & \quad + \delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t})) \lambda_2^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} o(|\lambda_2 - \lambda_1|t) \\ & \quad + \delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t})) \lambda_2^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} \left\{ \delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_2 t}))^{d-3} + 1 \right\} \frac{K_p}{A_1} (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)t \\ & \quad + \delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_1 t})) \lambda_2^{\frac{-(2^*-2)}{2^*-(p+1)}} \left\{ o_{\lambda_1 t}(1) + O(\varepsilon) \delta(\alpha(\tau_{\lambda_2 t}))^{d-3} \right\} |\lambda_2 - \lambda_1|t. \end{aligned} \quad (4.241)$$

We find from (4.241) that if  $t$  and  $\varepsilon$  are sufficiently small depending only on  $d$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ , then  $\Omega_t(\lambda_2) - \Omega_t(\lambda_1) < 0$ . Thus, we have proved that  $\Omega_t(\lambda)$  is strictly decreasing with respect to  $\lambda$ , which implies that  $\Omega_t$  is injective.

Now, we shall finish the proof of the proposition:

**End of the proof.** Let  $R_*$  and  $T_*$  be the numbers given in Lemma 4.14. Furthermore, let  $0 < t < T_*$ , and let  $(\tau_t, \eta_t)$  be a unique solution to (4.20) in  $I(t) \times Y_q(R_*, t)$  (see Proposition 4.1). Then, what we need to prove is that if  $u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ , then  $u_t = W + \eta_t$ .

Let  $u_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ . Then, Lemma 4.14 shows that there exists  $\mu(t) = 1 + o_t(1)$  such that, defining  $t^\dagger$ ,  $\alpha^\dagger(t)$  and  $\eta_t^\dagger$  as

$$t^\dagger := \{\mu(t)u_t(0)\}^{-2^*+p+1}t, \quad \alpha^\dagger(t) := \{\mu(t)u_t(0)\}^{-2^*+2}\alpha(\tau_t), \quad (4.242)$$

$$\eta_t^\dagger := T_{\mu(t)u_t(0)}[u_t] - W, \quad (4.243)$$

we have the following:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \alpha^\dagger(t) = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^\dagger = 0, \quad (4.244)$$

$$(\tau_{t^\dagger}, \eta_{t^\dagger}) = (\beta(\alpha^\dagger(t)), \eta_t^\dagger) \in I(t^\dagger) \times Y_q(R_*, t^\dagger), \quad (4.245)$$

where  $(\tau_{t^\dagger}, \eta_{t^\dagger})$  denotes a unique solution to (4.20) with  $t = t^\dagger$  in  $I(t^\dagger) \times Y_q(R_*, t^\dagger)$ . Since  $\alpha$  is the inverse function of  $\beta$ , (4.245) shows that

$$\alpha(\tau_{t^\dagger}) = \alpha(\beta(\alpha^\dagger(t))) = \alpha^\dagger(t). \quad (4.246)$$

Note that

$$\frac{t^\dagger}{t} = \{\mu(t)u_t(0)\}^{-2^*+p+1}. \quad (4.247)$$

Furthermore, observe from (4.247) and (4.246) that

$$\Omega_t\left(\frac{t^\dagger}{t}\right) = \{\mu(t)u_t(0)\}^{2^*-2}\alpha^\dagger(t) = \alpha(\tau_t) = \Omega_t(1). \quad (4.248)$$

Then, the injectivity of  $\Omega_t(\lambda)$  with respect to  $\lambda$ , together with (4.248) and (4.247), implies that  $\mu(t)u_t(0) = 1$ . Hence,  $t^\dagger = t$ . Furthermore, by  $t^\dagger = t$ ,  $\mu(t)u_t(0) = 1$ , (4.243) and (4.245), we see that  $\eta_t = \eta_{t^\dagger} = u_t - W$ . Thus, we have completed the proof.  $\square$

## A Compactness in Lebesgue spaces

We record a compactness theorem in Lebesgue spaces (see Proposition A.1 of [15]):

**Lemma A.1.** *Assume  $d \geq 1$ , and let  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ . A sequence  $\{f_n\}$  in  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  has a convergent subsequence if and only if it satisfies the following properties:*

1.

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n\|_{L^q} < \infty. \quad (A.1)$$

2.

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \sup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n(\cdot) - f_n(\cdot + y)\|_{L^q} = 0. \quad (A.2)$$

3.

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n\|_{L^q(|x| \geq R)} = 0. \quad (A.3)$$

**Remark A.1.** *Although Proposition A.1 of [15] does not refer to the case  $q = \infty$ , we may include this case in the statement. Note that when  $q = \infty$ , (A.2) implies that the sequence  $\{f_n\}$  is continuous; hence the limit along the subsequence is also continuous.*

## B Completeness of $Y_q(R, t)$

Let  $\frac{d}{d-2} < q < \infty$ ,  $R > 0$ ,  $0 < t < 1$ , and let  $Y_q(R, t)$  be a set defined by (4.15). Then, we shall show that  $Y_q(R, t)$  is complete with the metric induced from  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

Let  $\{\eta_n\}$  be a Cauchy sequence in  $Y_q(R, t)$ . Since  $L^q_{\text{rad}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is complete, there exists a radial function  $\eta_\infty \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_n = \eta_\infty \quad \text{strongly in } L^q(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (B.1)$$

Furthermore, we see that

$$\|\eta_\infty\|_{L^q} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\eta_n\|_{L^q} \leq R\alpha(t)^{\frac{d-2}{2} - \frac{d}{2q}}, \quad (B.2)$$

so that  $\eta_\infty \in Y_q(R, t)$ . Thus, we have proved the completeness.

## C Elementary computations

**Lemma C.1.** *Define a function  $\beta$  on  $(0, \infty)$  by  $\beta(s) := s \log(1 + s^{-1})$ . Then,  $\beta$  is strictly increasing on  $(0, \infty)$ , and the image of  $(0, \infty)$  by  $\beta$  is  $(0, 1)$ ; hence the inverse is defined on  $(0, 1)$ , say  $\alpha: (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ . Furthermore, there exists  $0 < T_0 < 1$  such that if  $0 < t \leq T_0$ , then*

$$\alpha(t) \sim \frac{t}{\log(1 + t^{-1})}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

*Proof of Lemma C.1.* We may write  $\beta$  as

$$\beta(s) = s \int_0^1 \frac{d}{d\theta} \log(s + \theta) d\theta = 1 - \int_0^1 \frac{\theta}{s + \theta} d\theta. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

This formula shows that  $\beta$  is strictly increasing on  $(0, \infty)$ ,  $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \beta(s) = 0$ , and  $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \beta(s) = 1$ . In particular, the image of  $(0, \infty)$  by  $\beta$  is  $(0, 1)$ .

Next, let  $\alpha: (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  be the inverse of  $\beta$ . Note that  $\alpha$  is strictly increasing, continuous, and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \alpha(t) = 0$ . Hence, there exists  $0 < T_0 < 1$  such that  $\alpha(t) \leq e^{-1}$  for all  $0 < t \leq T_0$ . Let  $0 < t \leq T_0$ , and put  $s := \alpha(t)$ . Note that  $0 < s \leq e^{-1}$  and  $\beta(s) = t$ . Then, observe from  $\beta(s) := s \log(1 + s^{-1})$  that  $s \leq t \leq s^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , which implies that

$$\frac{1}{2} \log(s^{-1}) \leq \log(t^{-1}) \leq \log(s^{-1}). \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Furthermore, it follows from  $0 < s, t \leq 1$ , (C.3) and  $s = \alpha(t)$  that

$$t = \beta(s) \sim s \log(s^{-1}) \sim s \log(t^{-1}) \sim \alpha(t) \log(1 + t^{-1}). \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Thus, we have prove the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma C.2.** *Assume  $d = 3, 4$ . Let  $0 < s_1 \leq s_2 < 1$ . Then, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{\min\{|x||\xi|, |x|^2|\xi|^2\}}{|\xi|^2(|\xi|^2 + s_1)(|\xi|^2 + s_2)} (1 + |x|)^{-(d+2)} d\xi dx \lesssim \log(1 + s_2^{-1}) \delta(s_2)^{-1}, \quad (\text{C.5})$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ .

*Proof of Lemma C.2.* Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \frac{\min\{|x||\xi|, |x|^2|\xi|^2\}}{|\xi|^2(|\xi|^2 + s_1)(|\xi|^2 + s_2)} (1 + |x|)^{-(d+2)} d\xi dx \\ & \lesssim \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{r^{d+1} \lambda^{d-1}}{(1+r)^{d+2} (\lambda^2 + s_1)(\lambda^2 + s_2)} d\lambda dr \\ & \quad + \int_1^\infty \int_0^{\frac{1}{r}} \frac{r^{d+1} \lambda^{d-1}}{(1+r)^{d+2} (\lambda^2 + s_1)(\lambda^2 + s_2)} d\lambda dr \\ & \quad + \int_1^\infty \int_{\frac{1}{r}}^1 \frac{r^d \lambda^{d-2}}{(1+r)^{d+2} (\lambda^2 + s_1)(\lambda^2 + s_2)} d\lambda dr, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.6})$$



where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ . Consider the first term on the right-hand side of (C.6). By an elementary computation, and (2.29) (only for  $d = 3$ ), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{r^{d+1} \lambda^{d-1}}{(1+r)^{d+2} (\lambda^2 + s_1)(\lambda^2 + s_2)} d\lambda dr \\ & \lesssim \int_0^1 \frac{\lambda^{d-1}}{(\lambda^2 + s_1)(\lambda^2 + s_2)} d\lambda \lesssim \int_0^1 \frac{\lambda^{d-3}}{\lambda^2 + s_2} d\lambda \lesssim \delta(s_2)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ . Next, consider the second term on the right-hand side of (C.6). By integration by substitution ( $\lambda = \sqrt{s_2} \mu$ ), elementary computations, and (2.29) (only for  $d = 3$ ), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_1^\infty \int_0^{\frac{1}{r}} \frac{r^{d+1} \lambda^{d-1}}{(1+r)^{d+2} (\lambda^2 + s_1)(\lambda^2 + s_2)} d\lambda dr \\ & \leq \int_1^\infty \int_0^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_2} r}} \frac{s_2^{\frac{d-4}{2}} \mu^{d-1}}{r(\mu^2 + \frac{s_1}{s_2})(\mu^2 + 1)} d\mu dr \\ & = \int_1^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_2}}} \int_0^1 \frac{s_2^{\frac{d-4}{2}} \mu^{d-1}}{r(\mu^2 + \frac{s_1}{s_2})(\mu^2 + 1)} d\mu dr + \int_1^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_2}}} \int_1^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_2} r}} \frac{s_2^{\frac{d-4}{2}} \mu^{d-1}}{r(\mu^2 + \frac{s_1}{s_2})(\mu^2 + 1)} d\mu dr \\ & \quad + \int_{\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_2}}}^\infty \int_0^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_2} r}} \frac{s_2^{\frac{d-4}{2}} \mu^{d-1}}{r(\mu^2 + \frac{s_1}{s_2})(\mu^2 + 1)} d\mu dr \\ & \leq \int_1^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_2}}} \frac{s_2^{\frac{d-4}{2}}}{r} dr + \int_1^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_2}}} \int_1^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_2}}} \frac{s_2^{\frac{d-4}{2}} \mu^{d-3}}{r(\mu^2 + 1)} d\mu dr + \int_{\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_2}}}^\infty \int_0^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_2} r}} \frac{s_2^{\frac{d-4}{2}}}{r} d\mu dr \\ & \lesssim \delta(s_2)^{-1} \log(1 + s_2^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ . Finally, we consider the last term on the right-hand side of (C.6). By change of the order of integrals, and (2.29) (only for  $d = 3$ ), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_1^\infty \int_{\frac{1}{r}}^1 \frac{r^d \lambda^{d-2}}{(1+r)^{d+2} (\lambda^2 + s_1)(\lambda^2 + s_2)} d\lambda dr \\ & \leq \int_1^\infty \int_{\frac{1}{r}}^1 \frac{\lambda^{d-2}}{r^2 (\lambda^2 + s_1)(\lambda^2 + s_2)} d\lambda dr = \int_0^1 \frac{\lambda^{d-2}}{(\lambda^2 + s_1)(\lambda^2 + s_2)} \int_{\frac{1}{\lambda}}^\infty \frac{1}{r^2} dr d\lambda \\ & = \int_0^1 \frac{\lambda^{d-1}}{(\lambda^2 + s_1)(\lambda^2 + s_2)} d\lambda \leq \int_0^1 \frac{\lambda^{d-3}}{\lambda^2 + s_2} d\lambda \lesssim \delta(s_2)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.9})$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $d$ .

Putting (C.6) through (C.9) together, we find that (C.5) holds.  $\square$

The following lemma is quoted from [14]:

**Lemma C.3** (Lemma 3.12 of [14]). *Let  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}$ ,  $\mathbf{X}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}$  be vector spaces. Let  $A: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ ,  $B: \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ ,  $C: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}$  be linear operators. Define  $\mathbf{A} := CAB$ . If  $\mathbf{A}^{-1}$  exists, then  $A^{-1} = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}^{-1}C$  provided  $B$  is surjective and  $C$  is injective.*

## References

- [1] Akahori, T., Ibrahim, S., Kikuchi, H., Linear instability and nondegeneracy of ground state for combined power-type nonlinear scalar field equations with the Sobolev critical exponent and large frequency parameter. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **150** (2020), 2417–2441.
- [2] Akahori, T. Ibrahim, S. Ikoma, N., Kikuchi, H. and Nawa, H., Uniqueness and non-degeneracy of ground states to nonlinear scalar field equations involving the Sobolev critical exponent in their nonlinearities for high frequencies. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **58** (2019), 32 pp.
- [3] Akahori, T., Ibrahim, S., Kikuchi, H. and Nawa, H., Global dynamics for a nonlinear Schrödinger equation above a ground state with small frequency. to appear in *Memoir of AMS.* (arXiv:1510.08034).
- [4] Akahori T., Ibrahim S., Kikuchi H. and Nawa H., Existence of a ground state and scattering for a nonlinear Schrödinger equation with critical growth. *Selecta Mathematica* **19** (2013), 545–609 .
- [5] Akahori, T. Ibrahim, S. Kikuchi, H. and Nawa, H., Non-existence of ground state and spectral gap for combined power-type nonlinear Schrödinger equations involving the Sobolev critical exponent in three space dimensions, preprint.
- [6] H. Berestycki and P. L. Lions, Nonlinear scalar field equations. I. Existence of a ground state. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **82** (1983), 313–345.
- [7] Coles, M. and Gustafson, S., Solitary waves and dynamics for subcritical perturbations of energy critical NLS. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* **56** (2020), 647–699.
- [8] Collot, C., Merle, F., Raphaël, P., Dynamics near the ground state for the energy critical nonlinear heat equation in large dimensions, *Commun. Math. Phys.* (2017).
- [9] Duyckaerts, T. and Merle, F., Dynamic of threshold solutions for energy-critical NLS. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **18** (2009), 1787–1840.
- [10] Grafakos, L., *Classical and modern Fourier analysis*, Pearson Education, Inc. (2004).
- [11] Gidas, B., Ni, W.M., Nirenberg, L., Symmetry of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , *Math. Anal. Appl.* (1981), 369–402.
- [12] Grillakis, M., Linearized instability for nonlinear Schrödinger and Klein-Gordon equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **41** (1988), 747–774.
- [13] Grillakis, M., Shatah, J. and Strauss, W. Stability theory of solitary waves in the presence of symmetry. I. *J. Funct. Anal.* **74** (1987), 160–197.
- [14] Jensen, A. and Kato, T., Spectral properties of Schrödinger operators and time-decay of the wave functions. *Duke Math. J.* **46** (1979), 583–611.
- [15] Killip R. and Visan M., *Nonlinear Schrödinger equations at critical regularity*, Clay Lecture Notes.

- [16] Lieb, E.H. and Loss, M., ANALYSIS, second edition, American Mathematical Society (2001).
- [17] Pucci, P., Serrin, J., Uniqueness of ground states for quasilinear elliptic operators. Indiana Univ. Math. J. **47** (1998), 501–528.
- [18] Sogge, C.D., Fourier Integrals in Classical Analysis, Cambridge university press (1993).
- [19] Strauss, W.A., Existence of solitary waves in higher dimensions. Commun. Math. Phys. **55** (1977) 149–162.