

ENERGY TRANSFER FOR SOLUTIONS TO THE NONLINEAR SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION ON IRRATIONAL TORI

ALEXANDER HRABSKI, YULIN PAN, GIGLIOLA STAFFILANI, AND BOBBY WILSON

ABSTRACT. We analyze the energy transfer for solutions to the defocusing cubic nonlinear Schrödinger (NLS) initial value problem on 2D irrational tori. Moreover we complement the analytic study with numerical experimentation. As a byproduct of our investigation we also prove that the quasi-resonant part of the NLS initial value problem we consider, in both the focusing and defocusing case, is globally well-posed for initial data of finite mass.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Notations	4
2.1. ℓ^2 Sobolev Spaces	4
3. Birkhoff Normal Forms	4
3.1. The Quasi-Resonance Condition and the Irrationality of the Torus	5
3.2. Functional Setting	8
3.3. Normal Form Theorem Statement	8
4. Dynamics of the Normalized System	12
4.1. Proof of Theorem 1.1	18
5. Numerical Study	19
5.1. Numerical Setup	19
5.2. Results	20
5.3. Kinematic Study on (Λ, τ) -quasi Resonant Sets	21
5.4. Discussions on Numerical Study	23
Appendix A. On the local existence of the flow associated to the auxiliary Hamiltonian	25
Appendix B. On the Finite-precision Representation of Irrational ω^2	27
References	28

1. INTRODUCTION

In this work we continue the study of energy transfer for solutions to defocusing and periodic nonlinear Schrödinger (NLS) equations that is conducted by analyzing the long time behaviour of the magnitude and support of the solution in the frequency space. This study can be viewed under the much wider umbrella of weak turbulence theory and was

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J10, 35Q55.

A. Hrabski was supported by the NSF grant DGE 1841052.

G. Staffilani was supported by the NSF grant DMS 1764403 and the Simons Foundation.

B. Wilson was supported by NSF grant DMS 1856124.

initiated in the form that inspired us for this work by Bourgain in [6]. In weak turbulence theory, given a solution $\psi(t, x)$ to a dispersive equation, one is interested in understanding the long time behaviour of the Fourier coefficients $|\hat{\psi}(t, k)|^2$, and in particular the migration of their Fourier support to higher frequencies k . In order to detect this migration, one may study the asymptotic behaviour in time of higher Sobolev norms of the solution $\psi(t, x)$. Several works have appeared in recent years concerning both the proof of polynomial in time upper bounds for higher Sobolev norms of solutions [28, 25, 26, 27, 11, 14, 13, 30, 31], and the constructions of solutions that exhibit a growth [10, 8, 19, 18, 20, 17, 21]. For some periodic linear equations with potential some of these time bounds have been proved to be almost sharp [4, 3, 2], namely that they could be at most logarithmic. But in general one is far from obtaining sharp results except when the domain is a mixed manifold as in [19], or when one considers irrational tori as we will show below. In this work we are interested in analyzing both analytically and numerically how the question of energy transfer may depend on the relative rationality of the periods of the solution at hand. In particular here we consider a 2D set up involving a defocusing cubic NLS, which is the simplest and still meaningful setting in which to perform such an analysis.

Let us then consider $\underline{\omega} = (\omega_1, \omega_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and $\mathbb{T}_{\underline{\omega}}^2 = \mathbb{R}/\omega_1\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\omega_2\mathbb{Z}$ the two-dimensional flat torus scaled by $\underline{\omega}$. If $\underline{\omega}$ satisfies

$$\frac{\omega_1^2}{\omega_2^2} \notin \mathbb{Q}$$

we stipulate that the torus is *irrational*, otherwise that is *rational*.

Let us also consider the NLS

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} i\partial_t \psi &= \Delta \psi - |\psi|^2 \psi, & x \in \mathbb{T}_{\underline{\omega}}^2, t \in \mathbb{R} \\ \psi(0) &= \psi_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T}_{\underline{\omega}}^2), \end{aligned}$$

where $H^s(\mathbb{T}_{\underline{\omega}}^2)$ represents the L^2 based Sobolev space of index s with norm $\|\cdot\|_s$. In [29] the third and fourth authors proved that if the torus is irrational then the construction in [10] and [8] of solutions for which high Sobolev norms are mildly growing cannot be performed since the set of resonant frequencies is not large enough, and in particular it does not contain certain diamond configurations that are necessary as stepping stones in the dynamics of those constructions. In that same paper [29] it was also remarked that in a 2D irrational torus the four-waves resonance relation among the frequencies splits into two uncoupled 1D resonance relations, one per each component of the frequency vector. We recall that in 1D problem (1) is integrable, and as a consequence solutions are uniformly bounded in any Sobolev norm. In [29] it was in fact conjectured that the 1D uncoupled resonant interactions mentioned above and the 1D integrability may be a possible explanation for the expected weaker growth of the Sobolev norms in the irrational setting. We will go back to this conjecture later in this paper in Remark 4. This weaker growth was also reported in the polynomial upper bounds obtained in [13, 14], where the authors proved that for 3D irrational tori the polynomial bounds in time have a smaller degree compared to the rational case. Intuitively this should not come as a surprise since the irrationality of the torus should mitigate the boundary effects when the wave solution interacts with the boundary itself. In a sense the relative irrationality of the periods should introduce some very faint dispersion. It is to be noted in fact that in \mathbb{R}^2 , where dispersion can act without any obstacle, recent results in [15] guarantee that the solution ψ of (1) scatters in any H^s norm for $s \geq 0$, and hence any Sobolev norm of solution ψ is uniformly bounded in time.

From the numerical experimentation point of view fewer results are at the moment available. We recall the work in [9], where the authors studied in greater detail the construction in [10], and the work in [22], where the first two authors of this paper evaluated the stationary spectrum and energy cascade on rational and irrational tori for the 2D Majda-McLaughlin-Tabak equation (with high-frequency dissipation). One of their important findings is that in fact the energy cascade on irrational tori is much less efficient than on rational ones.

We are now ready to state the main analytic results of this paper. The first theorem tells us that for arbitrarily large initial data supported in a compact set in the frequency space we can track how far the bulk of the support of the associated solution¹ may travel after time T .

Theorem 1.1. *Consider the torus $\mathbb{T}_{\underline{\omega}}^2$ where $\underline{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ is irrational. Fix $T > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $s > 1$, $N > 0$. Then for every $R > 0$ there exists $M = M_{T,R,\varepsilon,N,s} > 0$ such that if $\psi_0 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}_{\underline{\omega}}^2)$ with $\|\psi_0\|_s < R$ and $\text{supp } \hat{\psi}_0 \subset B_N$, where B_N is the ball centered at the origin and with radius N , and $\psi \in C([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{T}_{\underline{\omega}}^2))$ is the unique solution to (1), then*

$$\|F^{-1}(\chi_{B_M^c} \hat{\psi}(t))\|_s < \varepsilon$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. Moreover, for any $\delta > 0$, M can be defined to satisfy $M_{T,R,\varepsilon,N,s} \leq C_\delta (R\varepsilon^{-1})^{\delta/s} N^{24} T^{\delta+48}$. Here F^{-1} is the inverse Fourier transform and χ_A is the characteristic function for the set A .

The above theorem describes the existence of a frequency-space threshold, M , through which energy does not pass for solutions which are initially frequency localized. Furthermore, this threshold is primarily determined by the Sobolev norm of the initial data and the time passed. This phenomenon is observed in the numerical data as well, see Section 5.

As in the work of the last two authors in [29], also in this case to prove the theorem stated above we use a Birkhoff normal form analysis. Here though we combine it with a flexible definition of (quasi)resonance sets and a refined analysis of the reduced system (2) below. In particular for its solutions we prove a useful conservation law that tracks their behaviour outside squares in the frequency space, see Proposition 4.3. Compared with the results in [29], here we do not impose restrictions on the size of the data, and while in [29] the dependence of the barrier of energy growth with respect to the H^s norm of the initial datum was implicit, here we give a more explicit dependence on this norm, as well as on the geometric properties of its Fourier support.

One needed step in proving the the result above is the global well-posedness theorem below that is of independent interest.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that the torus $\mathbb{T}_{\underline{\omega}}^2$ is irrational. Consider the NLS initial value problem*

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} i\partial_t \psi &= \Delta \psi \pm (|\psi|^2 \psi)^*, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}_{\underline{\omega}}^2, t \in \mathbb{R} \\ \psi(0) &= \psi_0, \end{aligned}$$

in which $(|\psi|^2 \psi)^*$ indicates that the nonlinear interactions are only taking place on a quasi-resonant² set. Then (2) is globally well posed for $\psi_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T}_{\underline{\omega}}^2)$.

¹Note that the question of existence and uniqueness of smooth global solutions was solved in [5, 1].

²The definition of a quasi-resonant set is in Section 3.

Remark. We note here that in contrast the full NLS initial value problem (1) is not known to be well-posed in L^2 , not even locally in time. This is considered a hard open problem. In fact as for now, local well-posedness for the full NLS equation is available through Strichartz estimates for which $s > 0$ is necessary [5]. Below we restate this result in frequency space in Theorem 4.1, and we will see in its proof that the reason why one can prove well-posedness for (2) for $s = 0$ is because the irrationality of the torus decouples the components of the frequencies, so that the set up becomes in a sense one dimensional, and in 1D the periodic cubic NLS is globally wellposed in L^2 [5].

In addition to the theoretical result in Theorem 1.1, we also conduct numerical simulations to accompany the analysis depicted in this theorem, alongside comparisons with results on a rational torus. The simulations utilize a GPU-accelerated code to integrate (1) in time on rational or irrational tori. For given initial data size $\|\psi_0\|_s = R$, simulation (or evolution) time T and ε , we numerically find the critical value M such that $\|F^{-1}(\chi_{B_M^c} \hat{\psi}(t))\|_s = \varepsilon$. The value of M , as well as the growth of the Sobolev norm and evolution of energy spectrum, are compared between rational and irrational tori. All results consistently show that energy cascades to high frequency is slower on irrational tori than on rational tori, which is further explained in terms of a kinematic analysis on the quasi-resonant sets on the two types of domains.

We are concluding this section by summarizing the structure of the paper. In Section 2 we introduce the notation of Sobolev spaces for Fourier coefficients. In Section 3, we detail the resonances and quasi-resonances of the cubic NLS and construct a change-of-variables that normalizes the system. Section 4 is devoted to studying dynamics of the normalized system, including the proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. Finally, Section 5 contains a thorough discussion and presentation of the numerical simulations.

2. NOTATIONS

2.1. ℓ^2 Sobolev Spaces.

Definition 2.1. For $x = \{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ and $s \in [0, \infty)$, define the standard Sobolev norm as

$$\|x\|_s = \|x\|_{h^s} := \sqrt{\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |x_n|^2 \langle n \rangle^{2s}}$$

where $\langle n \rangle := \sqrt{|n|^2 + 1}$. Define $h^s(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ as

$$h^s := h^s(\mathbb{Z}^d) := \{x = \{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} : \|x\|_s < \infty\}.$$

Note that $h^0(\mathbb{Z}^d) = \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$.

Furthermore, for $R > 0$, $s \in [0, \infty)$, define

$$B_s(R) := \{x \in h^s : \|x\|_s \leq R\}.$$

3. BIRKHOFF NORMAL FORMS

From now on, without loss of generality we assume that $\underline{\omega} = (1, \omega) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ is a vector satisfying $(1, \omega^2) \cdot m \neq 0$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}^2$.

In this section, we start by recalling that our original NLS (1) can be viewed as an infinite dimensional Hamiltonian system where the unknowns are the Fourier coefficients $\hat{\psi}$ of the

original solution ψ . In this frame the associated infinite dimensional Hamiltonian is

$$(3) \quad H(\hat{\psi}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \lambda_k |\hat{\psi}_k|^2 + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k_1+k_2=k_3+k_4} \hat{\psi}_{k_1} \hat{\psi}_{k_2} \bar{\hat{\psi}}_{k_3} \bar{\hat{\psi}}_{k_4}$$

$$(4) \quad =: H_0 + P,$$

where, for $k = (m, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, $\lambda_k := m^2 + \omega^2 \ell^2$ are the eigenvalues of the Laplacian. In order to conduct our analysis we need to study not only the resonant set, but also what we define below to be “quasi-resonant” sets. These sets will be also analyzed numerically in Section 5. Our notion of quasi-resonance leads to unboundedness of the coordinate transformation used in normal forms. Typically, this is very hard to overcome, although work on normal forms for quasi-linear systems by Delort [12], and more recently by Feola and Montalto [16], provide examples of ways in which to construct genuine normal form maps. In our case, the difficulty of working with unbounded operators is mitigated by the high amount of regularity of the data that we are studying. In this way, the process that we will undergo to arrive at our final conclusion is akin to conducting one step of the iteration process by which KAM tori are constructed.

3.1. The Quasi-Resonance Condition and the Irrationality of the Torus. For any fixed $\Lambda > 0$ and $\tau > 1$, we say that any quartet of frequencies, $(\lambda_{k_1}, \lambda_{k_2}, \lambda_{k_3}, \lambda_{k_4})$, or the corresponding quartet of indices, (k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) , are (Λ, τ) -**quasi resonant** if they satisfy $k_1 + k_2 - k_3 - k_4 = 0$ and

$$(5) \quad |\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_{k_4}| \leq \frac{\Lambda}{(|k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2 + |k_4|^2)^{1+\tau}}$$

We say that a quartet, $(\lambda_{k_1}, \lambda_{k_2}, \lambda_{k_3}, \lambda_{k_4})$, is not quasi-resonant if (5) does not hold.

For completeness we also recall here that if $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 + k_4 = 0$ and $\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_{k_4} = 0$ then we say that the quartet, $(\lambda_{k_1}, \lambda_{k_2}, \lambda_{k_3}, \lambda_{k_4})$ is resonant.

One can represent the sum, $\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_{k_4}$ as $p + \omega^2 q$ where p is the sum of the squares of the first components of the indices and q represents the sum of the squares of the second components. For arbitrary irrational numbers ω^2 , there exists a decreasing function, $g : \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for all $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$

$$\left| \frac{p}{q} - \omega^2 \right| \geq g(q)$$

It will become apparent later that the rate of g determines the loss of regularity that one would expect from the normal form transformation associated with the dispersion relation λ_k . This also implies that the methods described below can be applied more generally than simply the generic irrational torus characterized by ω^2 . However, the precise formulation of the argument we present below in the case of irrational numbers that are well-approximated by rational numbers requires the use of analytic Hilbert spaces adapted to the rate of g .

Theorem 3.1. *There exists a full measure subset of \mathbb{R} , E , such that if $\alpha \in E$, then for any $C > 0$, $\tau > 0$ there are $N(\alpha, \tau, C)$ finitely many solutions to*

$$(6) \quad \left| \frac{p}{q} - \alpha \right| \leq \frac{C}{q^{2+\tau}}$$

for any $(p, q) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_+$.

The above theorem will provide control over the number of (Λ, τ) -quasi resonant quartets that are not resonant assuming that ω belongs to the generic set defined in Theorem 3.1. Since we would like to use Λ as a parameter, we will need to keep track of the parameter Λ on the size of the class of (Λ, τ) -quasi resonant quartets that are not resonant.

Corollary 3.2. *For any $\Lambda > 0$ and $\tau > 0$ there exist only finitely many quartets (k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) satisfying*

$$(7) \quad 0 < |\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_{k_4}| \leq \frac{\Lambda}{(|k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2 + |k_4|^2)^{1+\tau}}.$$

Moreover, there exists $C_\omega > 0$ such that for all $\tau > 1$ and $\Lambda > 1$, there are no quartets satisfying both

$$\max(|k_1|, |k_2|, |k_3|, |k_4|) > C_\omega \Lambda^{1/2(\tau-1)}$$

and inequality (7).

Proof. Let $k_i = (m_i, \ell_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and note the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_{k_4} &= m_1^2 + \omega^2 \ell_1^2 + m_2^2 + \omega^2 \ell_2^2 - (m_3^2 + \omega^2 \ell_3^2) - (m_4^2 + \omega^2 \ell_4^2) \\ &= m_1^2 + m_2^2 - m_3^2 - m_4^2 + \omega^2(\ell_1^2 + \ell_2^2 - \ell_3^2 - \ell_4^2) \end{aligned}$$

Let $p = m_1^2 + m_2^2 - m_3^2 - m_4^2$ and $q = \ell_1^2 + \ell_2^2 - \ell_3^2 - \ell_4^2$, which we can assume positive without loss of generality. Then Theorem 3.1 implies that for any $\Lambda > 0$ and $\tau > 0$ there are only finitely many $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ that satisfy

$$|p - \omega^2 q| \leq \Lambda q^{-(1+\tau)}$$

Since

$$\ell_1^2 + \ell_2^2 - \ell_3^2 - \ell_4^2 \leq \ell_1^2 + \ell_2^2 + \ell_3^2 + \ell_4^2 \leq |k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2 + |k_4|^2$$

we can conclude that there are only finitely many $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ satisfying

$$(8) \quad |p - \omega^2 q| \leq \frac{\Lambda}{(|k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2 + |k_4|^2)^{1+\tau}}$$

Now for any fixed $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, there are infinitely many quartets k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 such that $p = m_1^2 + m_2^2 - m_3^2 - m_4^2$ and $q = \ell_1^2 + \ell_2^2 - \ell_3^2 - \ell_4^2$. However, $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ implies that $|p - \omega^2 q| > 0$, so in order for (8) to be satisfied it is necessary that

$$|k_i| \leq \Lambda^{1/(2(1+\tau))} |p - \omega^2 q|^{-1/(2(1+\tau))}$$

for all $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Therefore, for every fixed $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ there are only finitely many quartets k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 such that (8) holds. Since there are only finitely many p and q satisfying the Diophantine inequality, (6), we have only finitely many quartets satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} |p - \omega^2 q| &\leq \frac{\Lambda}{(|k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2 + |k_4|^2)^{1+\tau}} \\ \Leftrightarrow 0 < |\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_{k_4}| &\leq \frac{\Lambda}{(|k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2 + |k_4|^2)^{1+\tau}} \end{aligned}$$

The preceding sentence also implies that there exists $M_{\omega, \Lambda, \tau} < \infty$ such that

$$M_{\omega, \Lambda, \tau} := \sup \left\{ \max_{i=1,2,3,4} |k_i| : (k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) \text{ satisfies (7)} \right\}$$

Now assume $\tau > 1$ and $\Lambda > 1$. From the above argument, there exists a $M_\omega := M_{\omega,1,1}$ such that there are no non-trivial solution to the inequality

$$|\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_{k_4}| \leq \frac{1}{(|k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2 + |k_4|^2)^2}$$

if $\max_{i=1,2,3,4} |k_i| > M_{\omega,1,1} =: M_\omega$.

Furthermore, if $\Lambda \cdot (|k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2 + |k_4|^2)^{-(\tau-1)} \leq 1$, then

$$\frac{\Lambda}{(|k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2 + |k_4|^2)^{1+\tau}} \leq \frac{1}{(|k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2 + |k_4|^2)^2}$$

which implies that there are no non-trivial solutions to the following inequality

$$|\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_{k_4}| \leq \frac{\Lambda}{(|k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2 + |k_4|^2)^{1+\tau}}$$

as long as

$$\max_{i=1,2,3,4} |k_i| > \max \left(M_\omega, \Lambda^{1/2(\tau-1)} \right).$$

Finally, since $M_\omega \Lambda^{1/2(\tau-1)} \geq \max \left(M_\omega, \Lambda^{1/2(\tau-1)} \right)$, it suffices to assume that

$$\max_{i=1,2,3,4} |k_i| > M_\omega \Lambda^{1/2(\tau-1)}.$$

We now set $C_\omega := M_\omega$. □

The following lemma characterizes the resonant quartets of frequencies. This characterization will be crucial to understanding the dynamics of the normalized system (22) below.

Lemma 3.3. *If*

$$\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_{k_4} = 0$$

and

$$k_1 + k_2 - k_3 - k_4 = 0$$

then the quartet (k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) forms an axis parallel rectangle in \mathbb{Z}^2 (possibly degenerate).

Proof. First, if $k_i = (m_i, \ell_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, then

$$\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_{k_4} = 0$$

can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^2 + \omega^2 \ell_1^2 + m_2^2 + \omega^2 \ell_2^2 - (m_3^2 + \omega^2 \ell_3^2) - (m_4^2 + \omega^2 \ell_4^2) &= 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow m_1^2 + m_2^2 - m_3^2 - m_4^2 + \omega^2(\ell_1^2 + \ell_2^2 - \ell_3^2 - \ell_4^2) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since ω^2 is irrational,

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^2 + m_2^2 - m_3^2 - m_4^2 &= 0 \text{ and} \\ \ell_1^2 + \ell_2^2 - \ell_3^2 - \ell_4^2 &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The condition $k_1 + k_2 - k_3 - k_4 = 0$ implies that $m_1 + m_2 - m_3 - m_4 = 0$ and $\ell_1 + \ell_2 - \ell_3 - \ell_4 = 0$. These identities imply that

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 = m_3 \text{ and } m_2 = m_4 \text{ or} \\ m_1 = m_4 \text{ and } m_2 = m_3 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_1 = \ell_3 \text{ and } \ell_2 = \ell_4 \text{ or} \\ \ell_1 = \ell_4 \text{ and } \ell_2 = \ell_3 \end{aligned}$$

In either combination k_1, k_2, k_3 , and k_4 form a (possibly degenerate) axis-parallel rectangle. \square

3.2. Functional Setting. For any Hamiltonian H , we let its corresponding Hamiltonian vector field be defined as

$$(9) \quad X_H(z) := J \begin{pmatrix} \partial_z H(z) \\ \partial_{\bar{z}} H(z) \end{pmatrix}$$

where the symplectic structure on h^s is

$$(10) \quad J = i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Id \\ -Id & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For two functions $H_1 : h^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $H_2 : h^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we define the Poisson Bracket, $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$, by

$$\begin{aligned} \{H_1, H_2\}(z) &:= i \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_n} H_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_n} H_2 - \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_n} H_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial z_n} H_2 \right) \\ &= i (\langle \partial_z H_1, \partial_{\bar{z}} H_2 \rangle - \langle \partial_{\bar{z}} H_1, \partial_z H_2 \rangle) \\ &= \langle JX_{H_1}, X_{H_2} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ represents the real ℓ^2 inner product adapted to the implicit dimension. Moreover, if $\Phi_{H_1}^t$ is the time- t flow map associated to H_1 , then

$$\frac{d}{dt} H_2 \circ \Phi_{H_1}^t = \{H_2, H_1\} \circ \Phi_{H_1}^t.$$

In the following theorem, τ refers to the parameter given in Theorem 3.1 and the definition of (Λ, τ) -quasi-resonance.

3.3. Normal Form Theorem Statement. We consider again the Hamiltonian

$$(11) \quad H(\hat{\psi}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \lambda_k |\hat{\psi}_k|^2 + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k_1 + k_2 = k_3 + k_4} \hat{\psi}_{k_1} \hat{\psi}_{k_2} \bar{\hat{\psi}}_{k_3} \bar{\hat{\psi}}_{k_4}$$

$$(12) \quad =: H_0 + P,$$

Proposition 3.4 (Birkhoff Normal Form of Order 4). *Consider the Hamiltonian $H = H_0 + P$ defined in (3). Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, $s > 1$ and $R > 0$. There exists $\Lambda > 0$ and a C^1 canonical transformation*

$$\mathcal{T} : B_{s+4(1+\tau)}(R) \rightarrow h^{s+4(1+\tau)} \subset h^s$$

which transforms H into

$$(13) \quad \tilde{H} := H \circ \mathcal{T} = H_0 + \mathcal{L} + \mathcal{R}.$$

Furthermore, the following properties are fulfilled:

(i) The transformation \mathcal{T} satisfies

$$(14) \quad \sup_{z \in B_{s+4(1+\tau)}(R)} \|z - \mathcal{T}(z)\|_{h^s} < \varepsilon;$$

(ii) \mathcal{L} is a homogeneous polynomial of degree 4; it is (Λ, τ) -quasi resonant (i.e. for every monomial, $z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} \bar{z}_{k_4}$ in \mathcal{L} , (k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) is (Λ, τ) -quasi resonant).

(iii) The remainder, \mathcal{R} , satisfies

$$\sup_{z \in B_{s+4(1+\tau)}(R)} \|i\partial_{\bar{z}}\mathcal{R}(z)\|_{h^s} \lesssim \Lambda^{-1}R^5$$

Finally, the canonical transformation is a C^2 smooth, symplectic invertible map from $B_{s+4(1+\tau)}(R)$ into a subset of h^s which contains the neighborhood of the origin of $h^{s+4(1+\tau)}$ and for which the same estimate (14) is fulfilled by the inverse canonical transformation.

Proof. As typical, we construct a Lie transform \mathcal{T} that eliminates the nonquasi-resonant part of order 4 in expression (3). Let χ be a homogeneous degree 4 polynomial in z . Assuming the Hamiltonian flow associated to χ is well-defined, C^1 in space and C^2 in time up to time 1, we can define the time- t flow map Φ_χ^t , the time-1 flow map $\mathcal{T} := \Phi_\chi^1$ and Taylor expand

$$(15) \quad (H_0 + P) \circ \mathcal{T} = H_0 + \{H_0, \chi\} + P \\ + \int_0^1 \{P, \chi\} \circ \Phi_\chi^t dt + \int_0^1 (1-t) \{\{H_0, \chi\}, \chi\} \circ \Phi_\chi^t dt$$

and the order four terms of the normalized system, $(H_0 + P) \circ \mathcal{T}$, are represented by the sum of terms $\{H_0, \chi\} + P$. The Hamiltonian vector field associated to χ will be constructed to lose derivatives (as will be shown in Lemma 3.5), in the sense that $X_\chi : h^{s+2(1+\tau)} \rightarrow h^s$. Therefore, Φ_χ^t is only C^2 in time if we assume that the target topology is weak enough. Specifically, one needs to view Φ_χ^t as a map from $h^{s+4(1+\tau)} \times [0, 1]$ to h^s in order to achieve sufficient regularity for the Taylor expansion (15) above.

We choose χ so that the only summands in the homogeneous polynomial $\{H_0, \chi\} + P$ correspond to quasi-resonant quartets of indexes. In particular, if χ has the representation

$$\chi(\{z_k\}) = \sum_{k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4} \chi_{k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4} z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} \bar{z}_{k_4}$$

then we define the coefficients by

$$\chi_{k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4} = \begin{cases} \frac{i}{4}(\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_{k_4})^{-1} & (k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) \text{ not } (\Lambda, \tau)\text{-quasi resonant} \\ 0 & (k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) \text{ } (\Lambda, \tau)\text{-quasi resonant} \end{cases}$$

We further define

$$(16) \quad \mathcal{L} := \{H_0, \chi\} + P.$$

Finally, we organize the remaining parts of the new Hamiltonian as

$$(17) \quad \mathcal{R} := \int_0^1 \{P, \chi\} \circ \Phi_\chi^t dt + \int_0^1 (1-t) \{\{H_0, \chi\}, \chi\} \circ \Phi_\chi^t dt$$

This completes the formal argument of the proof.

The auxiliary Hamiltonian χ can be written as

$$(18) \quad \chi(\{z_k\}) = \frac{i}{4} \sum_{k_1+k_2=k_3+k_4}^* \frac{1}{\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_{k_4}} z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} \bar{z}_{k_4},$$

where the sum is taken over all quartets (k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) that are not (Λ, τ) -quasi resonant. Furthermore, we define \mathcal{T} as the time 1 flow map associated to χ , $\mathcal{T} := \Phi_\chi^1$. Property (i), the regularity of \mathcal{T} , and invertibility of \mathcal{T} follow from Proposition 3.6 below. Property (iii) follows from Lemma 3.7. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\chi(\{z_k\})$ be as in (18). Then for $s > 1$, there exists $C = C_{\tau, \omega, s}$ such that*

$$\|(i\partial_{\bar{z}}\chi)(z)\|_s \leq C\Lambda^{-1}\|z\|_s^2\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}$$

Proof. We begin by writing the form of the expression $\|(i\partial_{\bar{z}}\chi)\|_s$ explicitly:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(i\partial_{\bar{z}}\chi)\|_s^2 &= \left\| \sum_{k=k_1+k_2-k_3}^* \frac{1}{\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_k} z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} \right\|_s^2 \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} (1 + |k|^2)^s \left| \sum_{k=k_1+k_2-k_3}^* \frac{1}{\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_k} z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} \right|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} (1 + |k|^2)^s \left(\sum_{k=k_1+k_2-k_3}^* \frac{1}{|\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_k|} |z_{k_1}| |z_{k_2}| |z_{k_3}| \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{1}{|\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_k|} \lesssim \Lambda^{-1} (|k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2)^{1+\tau}$$

for $\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_{k_4} \neq 0$ when $k = k_1 + k_2 - k_3$.

We can now continue with our original computation to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} (1 + |k|^2)^s \left(\sum_{k=k_1+k_2-k_3}^* \frac{1}{|\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_k|} |z_{k_1}| |z_{k_2}| |z_{k_3}| \right)^2 \\ &\leq C_\omega \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} (1 + |k|^2)^s \left(\sum_{k=k_1+k_2-k_3}^* \Lambda^{-1} (|k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2)^{1+\tau} |z_{k_1}| |z_{k_2}| |z_{k_3}| \right)^2 \\ &\lesssim C_{\tau, \omega} \Lambda^{-2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \left((1 + |k|^2)^s \sum_{k=k_1+k_2-k_3} |k_1|^{2+2\tau} |z_{k_1}| |z_{k_2}| |z_{k_3}| \right)^2 \\ &\leq C_{\tau, \omega, s} \Lambda^{-2} \|z\|_{h^s}^4 \|z\|_{h^{s+2(1+\tau)}}^2 \end{aligned}$$

\square

Considering the flow associated to χ on h^s , one can show that it is well-defined and continuous locally due to Kato [23]. A more detailed discussion appears in Appendix A. Chapter 1 of Kuksin's text, [24], discusses the well-posedness and basic estimates in the

particular case of quasi-linear Hamiltonian flows. The following argument is a corollary to this literature.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $s > 1$, and $R > 0$. Let $\chi(\{z_k\})$ be as in (18). There exists $\Lambda_0 > 0$ such that if $\Lambda > \Lambda_0$, then the system defined by*

$$(19) \quad \partial_t z_k = [(i\partial_{\bar{z}}\chi)(z)]_k = \sum_{k=k_1+k_2-k_3}^* \frac{-1}{\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_k} z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3}$$

has an unique solution $z \in C([0, 1]; h^{s+4(1+\tau)}) \cap C^1([0, 1]; h^{s+2(1+\tau)})$ for $z(0)$ in the neighborhood $B_{s+4(1+\tau)}(R)$. Moreover, we can say that

$$\sup_{z(0) \in B_{s+4(1+\tau)}(R)} \|z(0) - z(1)\|_{h^s} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Let $1 < s_1 < s_2 < s_3$ where $s_2 - s_1 > 2(1 + \tau)$ and $s_3 - s_2 > 2(1 + \tau)$. First, Lemma 3.5, implies the local existence in h^{s_2} for data in h^{s_3} . Then by Theorem 1.3 in [24], if the flow associated to χ is denoted by Φ^t , then

$$\sup_{z_0 \in B_{s_3}(R)} \frac{\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \|\Phi^t(z_0)\|_{s_2}}{\|z_0\|_{s_2}} \leq \exp\left(\sup_{z \in B_{s_3}(R)} \frac{2\|(i\partial_{\bar{z}}\chi)(z)\|_{s_2}}{\|z\|_{s_2}}\right) \leq \exp(2C\Lambda^{-1}R^2).$$

The last inequality is due to Lemma 3.5. Therefore, for $\Lambda \gtrsim \log(2)^{-1}2CR^2$, $\|z(1)\|_{s_2} \leq 2\|z(0)\|_{s_2}$.

Now, for stability, by Lemma 3.5,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{z(0) \in B_{s_3}(R)} \|z(0) - z(1)\|_{s_1} &\lesssim \sup_{z(0) \in B_{s_3}(R)} \int_0^1 \Lambda^{-1} \|z(t)\|_{s_1}^2 \|z(t)\|_{s_2} dt \\ &\leq \sup_{z(0) \in B_{s_3}(R)} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \Lambda^{-1} \|z(t)\|_{s_1}^2 \|z(t)\|_{s_2} \\ &\leq \sup_{z(0) \in B_{s_3}(R)} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \Lambda^{-1} \|z(t)\|_{s_2}^3 \\ &\leq \Lambda^{-1} 2^3 R^3. \end{aligned}$$

As long as Λ satisfies

$$(20) \quad \Lambda > 2^3 \varepsilon^{-1} R^3,$$

the stability is demonstrated. Thus we let $\Lambda_0 \geq \max(2^3 \varepsilon^{-1} R^3, \log(2)^{-1} 2CR^2)$. \square

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\mathcal{R}(\{z_k\})$ be as in (17). Then for $s > 1$, there exists $C = C_{\tau, \omega, s}$ such that*

$$\|X_{\mathcal{R}}(z)\|_s \leq C\Lambda^{-1}(1 + \Lambda^{-1}\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}^2)\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}^5$$

Proof. Recall, from (17), that

$$\mathcal{R} := \int_0^1 \{P, \chi\} \circ \Phi_{\chi}^t dt + \int_0^1 (1-t) \{\{H_0, \chi\}, \chi\} \circ \Phi_{\chi}^t dt.$$

Standard computations imply that

$$X_{\mathcal{R}} = \int_0^1 (D\Phi_{\chi}^{-t})[X_P, X_{\chi}] \circ \Phi_{\chi}^t dt + \int_0^1 (1-t)(D\Phi_{\chi}^{-t})[X_{\{H_0, \chi\}}, X_{\chi}] \circ \Phi_{\chi}^t dt.$$

Note that by the proof of Proposition 3.6 we have $\|\Phi_\chi^t(z)\|_{s+4(1+\tau)} \leq 2\|z\|_{s+4(1+\tau)}$. By Lemma 3.5, $D\Phi_\chi^{-t}$ is a bounded linear operator from $h^{s+2(1+\tau)}$ to h^s (for more information on unbounded operators/maps see the textbook of Kuksin [24]). One can see using a formal Duhamel expansion that the bound on $D\Phi_\chi^{-t}$ is give by.

$$\|D\Phi_\chi^{-t}(y)\|_s \lesssim \|y\|_s + \Lambda^{-1}\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}^2\|y\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}.$$

We also note that $\{H_0, \chi\} = \mathcal{L} - P$ since χ solves that homological equation, (16). Therefore,

$$\|X_{\{H_0, \chi\}}\|_s \leq \|X_{\mathcal{L}}\|_s + \|X_P\|_s$$

Moreover, since \mathcal{L} is a sum that has strictly less terms than P but the same coefficients, $\|X_{\mathcal{L}}\|_s \leq \|X_P\|_s$ and $\|DX_{\mathcal{L}}\|_s \leq \|DX_P\|_s$. Next, we have the following estimates using the fact that $s > 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|DX_P(y)\|_s &\lesssim \|z\|_s^2\|y\|_s \\ \|DX_\chi(y)\|_s &\lesssim \Lambda^{-1}(\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}\|z\|_s\|y\|_s + \|z\|_s^2\|y\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|[X_P, X_\chi]\|_s &= \|DX_P(X_\chi) - DX_\chi(X_P)\|_s \\ &\leq \|DX_P(X_\chi)\|_s + \|DX_\chi(X_P)\|_s \\ &\lesssim \|z\|_s^2\|X_\chi\|_s + \Lambda^{-1}(\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}\|z\|_s\|X_P\|_s + \|z\|_s^2\|X_P\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}) \\ &\lesssim \|z\|_s^2\Lambda^{-1}\|z\|_s^2\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)} + \Lambda^{-1}\left(\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}\|z\|_s\|z\|_s^3 + \|z\|_s^2\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}^3\right) \\ &= \Lambda^{-1}\left(\|z\|_s^4\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)} + \|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}\|z\|_s^4 + \|z\|_s^2\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}^3\right) \end{aligned}$$

and $\|DX_{\{H_0, \chi\}}\|_s \lesssim \|DX_P(y)\|_s \lesssim \|z\|_s^2\|y\|_s$ which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|[X_{\{H_0, \chi\}}, X_\chi]\|_s &= \|DX_{\{H_0, \chi\}}(X_\chi) - DX_\chi(X_{\{H_0, \chi\}})\|_s \\ &\leq \|DX_{\{H_0, \chi\}}(X_\chi)\|_s + \|DX_\chi(X_{\{H_0, \chi\}})\|_s \\ &\lesssim \|z\|_s^2\|X_\chi\|_s + \Lambda^{-1}(\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}\|z\|_s\|X_{\{H_0, \chi\}}\|_s + \|z\|_s^2\|X_{\{H_0, \chi\}}\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}) \\ &\lesssim \|z\|_s^2\Lambda^{-1}\|z\|_s^2\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)} + \Lambda^{-1}\left(\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}\|z\|_s\|z\|_s^3 + \|z\|_s^2\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}^3\right) \\ &= \Lambda^{-1}\left(\|z\|_s^4\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)} + \|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}\|z\|_s^4 + \|z\|_s^2\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}^3\right) \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\|X_{\mathcal{R}}(z)\|_s \lesssim \Lambda^{-1}(1 + \Lambda^{-1}\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}^2)\|z\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}^5$.

□

4. DYNAMICS OF THE NORMALIZED SYSTEM

We now study the dynamics of the normalized Hamiltonian \tilde{H} (from (13)):

$$\tilde{H} = H_0 + \mathcal{L} + \mathcal{R},$$

where \mathcal{L} is given by Lemma 3.4. The corresponding system of equations is

$$(21) \quad \dot{z}_k = i\lambda_k z_k + i \sum_{k=k_1+k_2-k_3}^{**} z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} + i\partial_{\bar{z}} \mathcal{R}(z),$$

where the \sum^{**} signifies that the sum is taken over (Λ, N) -quasi-resonant quartets that satisfy

$$(22) \quad |\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_{k_4}| \leq \frac{\Lambda}{(|k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2 + |k_4|^2)^{1+\tau}}.$$

We consider the truncation of (21) to the cubic and linear parts:

$$(23) \quad \dot{z}_k = i\lambda_k z_k + i \sum_{k=k_1+k_2-k_3}^{**} z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3}$$

Briefly focusing on the second term, Corollary 3.2 informs us that if the maximum of $|k|$, $|k_1|$, $|k_2|$, and $|k_3|$ is large enough (depending on Λ and ω), then the inequality $|\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_{k_4}| \leq \Lambda(|k|^2 + |k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2)^{-(1+\tau)}$ does not have any nontrivial solutions. Therefore, we can further decompose the second term in the following way:

$$(24) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ |\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_k| \leq \Lambda(|k|^2 + |k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2)^{-(1+\tau)}}} z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_k = 0}} z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} + \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \text{ and } |k|^2 + |k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2 < C_{\Lambda, \omega, \tau} \\ 0 \neq |\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_k| \leq \Lambda(|k|^2 + |k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2)^{-(1+\tau)}}} z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 3.2, $C_{\Lambda, \omega, \tau}$ can be set equal to $C_\omega \Lambda^{1/(2(\tau-1))}$.

We now restate Theorem 1.2 in the frequency space and we prove it.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $v_0 = \{v_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \in h^s$, $s \geq 0$. There exists a unique, global-in-time solution $z \in C^1([0, \infty); h^{s-2}) \cap C([0, \infty); h^s)$ to the Cauchy problem:*

$$(25) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{z}_k = i\lambda_k z_k + i \sum_{k=k_1+k_2-k_3}^{**} z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} \\ z(0) = v_0 \end{cases}$$

Proof. For the local well-posedness, we look for the fixed point in the convex set

$$D := \left\{ z \in C([0, T]; h^s) : z(0) = v_0 \text{ and } \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|z(t)\|_{\ell^2} \leq 10 \|z(0)\|_{\ell^2} \right\}$$

of the map $\mathcal{L} : C([0, T]; h^s) \rightarrow C([0, T]; h^s)$ defined (after a gauge transformation) by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(z)_k &:= z_k(0) - i \int_0^t d\sigma \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_k = 0}} z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3}(\sigma) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \text{ and } |k|^2 + |k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2 < C_{\Lambda, \omega, \tau} \\ 0 \neq |\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_k| \leq \Lambda(|k|^2 + |k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 + |k_3|^2)^{-(1+\tau)}}} e^{i\sigma(\lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_k)} z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3}(\sigma) \end{aligned}$$

We will ignore the estimate of the second sum since by Corollary 3.2 only finitely many frequencies are involved in that sum. We want to estimate

$$\left\| \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1}+\lambda_{k_2}-\lambda_{k_3}-\lambda_k=0}} z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} \right\|_{h^s}$$

and for this we use a duality argument. Assume that $\{y_k\} \in \ell^2$, then we estimate

$$\sum_k \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1}+\lambda_{k_2}-\lambda_{k_3}-\lambda_k=0}} |k|^s z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} \bar{y}_k.$$

If $k = (m, l)$ then we first approximate $|k|^s$ with $[(1 + |m|)^s + (1 + |\ell|)^s]$ and split the sum

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=(m,\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \left(\sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1}+\lambda_{k_2}-\lambda_{k_3}-\lambda_k=0}} |k|^s z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} \bar{y}_k \right) \\ & \sim \left(\sum_{(m,l)} \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1}+\lambda_{k_2}-\lambda_{k_3}-\lambda_k=0}} [(1 + |m|)^s + (1 + |\ell|)^s] z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} \bar{y}_k \right) \\ & = \left(\sum_{(m,l)} \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1}+\lambda_{k_2}-\lambda_{k_3}-\lambda_k=0}} [(1 + |m|)^s] z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} \bar{y}_k \right) \\ & \quad + \left(\sum_{(m,l)} \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1}+\lambda_{k_2}-\lambda_{k_3}-\lambda_k=0}} [(1 + |\ell|)^s] z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} \bar{y}_k \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now we perform a further splitting of the first term thanks to the irrationality of the torus (the second term is handled similarly):

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(m,\ell)} \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1}+\lambda_{k_2}-\lambda_{k_3}-\lambda_k=0}} (1 + |m|)^s z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \bar{z}_{k_3} \bar{y}_k \\ & = \sum_m \sum_{\substack{m=m_1+m_2-m_3 \\ m_1^2+m_2^2-m_3^2-m^2=0}} \sum_{\substack{\ell=\ell_1+\ell_2-\ell_3 \\ \ell_1^2+\ell_2^2-\ell_3^2-\ell^2=0}} (1 + |m|)^s z_{(m_1,\ell_1)} z_{(m_2,\ell_2)} \bar{z}_{(m_3,\ell_3)} \bar{y}_{(m,\ell)} \\ & = \sum_m \sum_{\substack{m=m_1+m_2-m_3 \\ m_1^2+m_2^2-m_3^2-m^2=0}} (1 + |m|)^s \sum_{\substack{\ell=\ell_1+\ell_2-\ell_3 \\ \ell_1^2+\ell_2^2-\ell_3^2-\ell^2=0}} z_{(m_1,\ell_1)} z_{(m_2,\ell_2)} \bar{z}_{(m_3,\ell_3)} \bar{y}_{(m,\ell)} \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, fix (m, m_1, m_2, m_3) with $m = m_1$, and $m_2 = m_3$. Then

$$\sum_{\substack{\ell=\ell_1+\ell_2-\ell_3 \\ \ell_1^2+\ell_2^2-\ell_3^2-\ell^2=0}} z_{(m_1,\ell_1)} z_{(m_2,\ell_2)} \bar{z}_{(m_3,\ell_3)} \bar{y}_{(m,\ell)} = \sum_{\substack{\ell=\ell_1+\ell_2-\ell_3 \\ \ell_1^2+\ell_2^2-\ell_3^2-\ell^2=0}} z_{(m,\ell_1)} z_{(m_2,\ell_2)} \bar{z}_{(m_2,\ell_3)} \bar{y}_{(m,\ell)}$$

and furthermore, there are two possibilities: $\ell = \ell_1$ and $\ell_2 = \ell_3$, or $\ell = \ell_2$ and $\ell_1 = \ell_3$. In the first case,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\ell=\ell_1+\ell_2-\ell_3 \\ \ell_1^2+\ell_2^2-\ell_3^2-\ell^2=0}} z_{(m,\ell_1)} z_{(m_2,\ell_2)} \bar{z}_{(m_2,\ell_3)} \bar{y}_{(m,\ell)} &= \sum_{\ell=\ell_1, \ell_2=\ell_3} z_{(m,\ell_1)} z_{(m_2,\ell_2)} \bar{z}_{(m_2,\ell_3)} \bar{y}_{(m,\ell)} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{\ell_2} |z_{(m_2,\ell_2)}|^2 \right) \left(\sum_{\ell} |z_{(m,\ell)}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{\ell} |y_{(m,\ell)}|^2 \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and to finish we sum in m_2 and use Cauchy-Schwarz in m . In the second case,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\ell=\ell_1+\ell_2-\ell_3 \\ \ell_1^2+\ell_2^2-\ell_3^2-\ell^2=0}} z_{(m,\ell_1)} z_{(m_2,\ell_2)} \bar{z}_{(m_2,\ell_3)} \bar{y}_{(m,\ell)} &= \sum_{\ell=\ell_2, \ell_1=\ell_3} z_{(m,\ell_1)} z_{(m_2,\ell_2)} \bar{z}_{(m_2,\ell_3)} \bar{y}_{(m,\ell)} \\ &= \left(\sum_{\ell} z_{(m_2,\ell)} \bar{y}_{(m,\ell)} \right) \left(\sum_{\ell_1} z_{(m,\ell_1)} \bar{z}_{(m_2,\ell_1)} \right) \\ &\lesssim \left(\sum_{\ell} |z_{(m_2,\ell)}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{\ell} |y_{(m,\ell)}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{\ell_1} |z_{(m,\ell_1)}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{\ell_1} |z_{(m_2,\ell_1)}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

and finally we use Cauchy-Schwarz in m, m_2 again. We hence obtain that for all $\{z_k\} \in D$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (26) \quad \sup_{[0,T]} \|\mathcal{L}(z)_k\|_{h^s} &\leq \|z_k(0)\|_{h^s} + CT \sup_{[0,T]} \|z_k\|_{h^s} \sup_{[0,T]} \|z_k\|_{\ell^2}^2 \\ &\leq \|z_k(0)\|_{h^s} + \sup_{[0,T]} \|z_k\|_{h^s} (10\|z_k(0)\|_{\ell^2})^2 CT. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if B is the ball in h^s centered at the origin with radius $r = 2\|z_k(0)\|_{h^s}$ and $T \sim (\|z_k(0)\|_{\ell^2})^{-2}$ small enough, then \mathcal{L} maps the ball centered at origin and radius B into itself. Now we want to show that in a smaller interval of time \mathcal{L} is a contraction on the ball B . So assume $\{z_k\} \in B$ and $\{w_k\} \in B$ and take $t \in [-\delta, \delta]$, where δ will be determined below. Then one can prove that

$$\sup_{[0,T]} \|\mathcal{L}(z)_k - \mathcal{L}(w)_k\|_{h^s} \leq C \sup_{[0,T]} \|z_k - w_k\|_{h^s} (\|z_k\|_{h^s} + \|w_k\|_{h^s})^2 C\delta$$

and by picking $\delta \sim r^{-2}$ small enough one indeed has a contraction in the ball, B , and hence a unique fixed point in the interval $[-\delta, \delta]$. By repeating the argument in (26) we can prove that on the larger interval $[-T, T]$ solutions with initial data $\{z_k(0)\}$ are bounded by B . Hence one can iterate this argument T/δ times with the same B to show the existence and uniqueness of solutions in the larger interval $[-T, T]$ since from (26) the initial data at any time in this interval is bounded in the norm h^s by the same constant r . In order to iterate to a global in time well-posedness it is enough to observe that the ℓ^2 norm of solution to our initial value problem is conserved and hence the same argument as the one above can

be repeated in the interval of time $[T, 2T]$ and by induction in $[(n-1)T, nT]$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This concludes the proof. \square

Next we want to show that the dynamics of the truncated and quasi-resonant NLS (23) with frequency localized data takes place in within a bounded ball. Before we begin to examine this dynamics, define the norm on \mathbb{Z}^2 :

$$|k|_\infty = \max(|m|, |\ell|) \text{ where } k = (m, \ell)$$

Note that $|k|_\infty \sim |k|$.

Definition 4.2. Let $M > 0$. Define the cut-off function $V_M : h^s \rightarrow h^s$ by

$$[V_M(z)]_k := \begin{cases} z_k & |k|_\infty > M \\ 0 & |k|_\infty \leq M. \end{cases}$$

and define an auxiliary cut-off norm:

$$(27) \quad N_M(z) := \sum_{\substack{k=(m,\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |m| > M}} [(1 + |m|^2)^s + (1 + |\ell|^2)^s] |z_k|^2 \\ + \sum_{\substack{k=(m,\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |\ell| > M}} [(1 + |m|^2)^s + (1 + |\ell|^2)^s] |z_k|^2$$

We note that since $C_s^{-1}(1 + |k|)^{2s} \leq (1 + |m|^2)^s + (1 + |\ell|^2)^s \leq C_s(1 + |k|)^{2s}$,

$$C_s^{-1} \|V_M z\|_{h^s}^2 \leq N_M(z) \leq C_s \|V_M z\|_{h^s}^2$$

Proposition 4.3. Let $\Lambda > 0$. There exists a $M_0 > 0$ such that if $M > M_0$ and $y(t)$ is a solution to (23), then

$$\frac{d}{dt} N_M(y) = 0$$

Proof. From Corollary 3.2, we can see that M_0 can be taken to be $C_\omega \Lambda^{1/(2(\tau-1))}$, then for $k = (m, \ell)$, $|m| > M$ or $|\ell| > M$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{y}_k &= i\lambda_k y_k + i \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1}+\lambda_{k_2}-\lambda_{k_3}-\lambda_k=0}} y_{k_1} y_{k_2} \bar{y}_{k_3} \\ &+ i \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \text{ and } |k|^2+|k_1|^2+|k_2|^2+|k_3|^2 < (\Lambda C_\omega^{-1})^{2/\tau} \\ 0 \neq |\lambda_{k_1}+\lambda_{k_2}-\lambda_{k_3}-\lambda_k| \leq \Lambda(|k|^2+|k_1|^2+|k_2|^2+|k_3|^2)^{-(1+\tau)}}} y_{k_1} y_{k_2} \bar{y}_{k_3} \\ &= i\lambda_k y_k + i \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1}+\lambda_{k_2}-\lambda_{k_3}-\lambda_k=0}} y_{k_1} y_{k_2} \bar{y}_{k_3} \end{aligned}$$

Via direct computation,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} N_M(y(t)) &= \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{\substack{k=(m,\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |m| > M}} [(1 + |m|^2)^s + (1 + |\ell|^2)^s] |y_k|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{\substack{k=(m,\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |\ell| > M}} [(1 + |m|^2)^s + (1 + |\ell|^2)^s] |y_k|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Due to symmetry, the first term can be represented in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{\substack{k=(m,\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |m| > M}} [(1 + |m|^2)^s + (1 + |\ell|^2)^s] |y_k|^2 \\ &= \sum_{\substack{k=(m,\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |m| > M}} [(1 + |m|^2)^s + (1 + |\ell|^2)^s] (\dot{y}_k \bar{y}_k + y_k \dot{\bar{y}}_k) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{k=(m,\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |m| > M}} \langle |k| \rangle \left(i \lambda_k y_k + i \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1}+\lambda_{k_2}-\lambda_{k_3}-\lambda_k=0}} y_{k_1} y_{k_2} \bar{y}_{k_3} \right) \bar{y}_k \\ &\quad + \langle |k| \rangle y_k \left(\overline{i \lambda_k y_k + i \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1}+\lambda_{k_2}-\lambda_{k_3}-\lambda_k=0}} y_{k_1} y_{k_2} \bar{y}_{k_3} \bar{y}_k}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\langle |k| \rangle := (1 + |m|^2)^s + (1 + |\ell|^2)^s$. Simplifying, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\substack{k=(m,\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |m| > M}} \langle |k| \rangle \left(i \lambda_k y_k + i \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1}+\lambda_{k_2}-\lambda_{k_3}-\lambda_k=0}} y_{k_1} y_{k_2} \bar{y}_{k_3} \right) \bar{y}_k \\ &\quad + y_k \left(\overline{i \lambda_k y_k + i \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1}+\lambda_{k_2}-\lambda_{k_3}-\lambda_k=0}} y_{k_1} y_{k_2} \bar{y}_{k_3} \bar{y}_k}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{k=(m,\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |m| > M}} i \langle |k| \rangle (|\lambda_k y_k|^2 - |\lambda_k y_k|^2) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{k=(m,\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |m| > M}} i \langle |k| \rangle \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1}+\lambda_{k_2}-\lambda_{k_3}-\lambda_k=0}} y_{k_1} y_{k_2} \bar{y}_{k_3} \bar{y}_k \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{k=(m,\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |m| > M}} -i \langle |k| \rangle \sum_{\substack{k=k_1+k_2-k_3 \\ \lambda_{k_1}+\lambda_{k_2}-\lambda_{k_3}-\lambda_k=0}} \bar{y}_{k_1} \bar{y}_{k_2} y_{k_3} y_k \end{aligned}$$

The remainder of the computation is the same as that of Theorem 4.1. \square

Remark. As in the proof of Theorem 4.1, the essence of the preceding argument is that the irrationality of the torus leads to a decoupling of the dynamics of the normalized equation into two (or more for higher dimensional tori) disassociated **resonant** cubic Nonlinear

Schrödinger systems. It is a simple computation to verify that the resonant cubic NLS Hamiltonian Poisson commutes with h^s norms in a similar fashion to what is shown in Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 4.3.

4.1. Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $\delta > 0$, $s > 1$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $T > 0$, and $\psi(0) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}_\omega^2)$. We assume that $\psi(0)$ has bounded Fourier support which implies that we can define N to satisfy

$$\text{supp } \hat{\psi}(0) \subset B_N \subset \mathbb{Z}^2.$$

Let τ satisfy $\tau \geq \max(100s/\delta, (100 + \delta)/\delta)$. Define R_0 and R by

$$R := \|\hat{\psi}(0)\|_s \geq N^{-4(1+\tau)} \|\hat{\psi}(0)\|_{s+4(1+\tau)}$$

and $R_0 := \max(T^{2(s+4(1+\tau))} N^{4(1+\tau)} \cdot \|\hat{\psi}(0)\|_s, 1)$. Furthermore, let $\{\hat{\psi}_k(t)\}$ be the solution to the Hamiltonian system associated to (3), that is the original NLS system. Local well-posedness via Strichartz estimates and a high-low argument [7, 6] implies that the $h^{s+4(1+\tau)}$ norm of $\hat{\psi}(t)$ is bounded³ by R_0 for $|t| \leq T$, (one can use better estimates for the growth in time [11], but those better estimates do not improve the following argument). Consider the Birkhoff normal form map, \mathcal{F} , defined in Proposition 3.4 on the ball of radius R_0 centered at the origin in $h^{s+4(1+\tau)}$.

Define $z(0) := \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\hat{\psi}(0))$. Then let $\{z_k(t)\}$ be the solution to the normalized Schrödinger equation, (21). Also, by the stability of the normal form map, $\|z(0)\|_s \leq 2R$ and up to time $|t| \lesssim T$, $\|z(t)\|_s \leq 2R_0$. For any $M > N$ we observe that it is not necessarily true that $\text{supp } z(0) \subset B_M$. However, by the stability of the normal form map, $\|V_M z(0)\|_s \leq \varepsilon$ for all $M > N$.

Recall that (21) has the associated Hamiltonian, $\tilde{H} = H_0 + \mathcal{L} + \mathcal{R}$. Each component of \tilde{H} is associated to its vector field defined by the identities $X_{\mathcal{L}}(z) := (i\partial_z \mathcal{L})(z)$ and $X_{\mathcal{R}}(z) := (i\partial_z \mathcal{R})(z)$

By Proposition 4.3, the function N_M defined in (27) Poisson commutes with the first two terms in the normalized Hamiltonian, \tilde{H} . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} N_M(z) &= \{N_M, H_0 + \mathcal{L} + \mathcal{R}\}(z) \\ &= \{N_M, \mathcal{R}\}(z) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.7 provides a bound for $X_{\mathcal{R}}$ which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (28) \quad \frac{d}{dt} N_M(z) &\leq |\{N_M, \mathcal{R}\}(z)| \\ &\lesssim \|X_{N_M}(z)\|_{\ell^2} \|X_{\mathcal{R}}(z)\|_{\ell^2} \lesssim \|z\|_{2s} \cdot \Lambda^{-1} \|z\|_{s+4(1+\tau)}^5 \leq \Lambda^{-1} \|z\|_{s+4(1+\tau)}^6 \lesssim \Lambda^{-1} R_0^6 \end{aligned}$$

where $\|z(t)\|_{s+4(1+\tau)} \lesssim R_0$ from earlier in the proof. This implies $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|V_M z(t)\|_s \leq 2\varepsilon$ if

$$(29) \quad \Lambda \gtrsim R_0^6 T \varepsilon^{-2} = R^6 T^{12(s+4(1+\tau))+1} N^{24(1+\tau)} \varepsilon^{-2}.$$

³In the cited works the explicit dependence of the polynomial bound in terms of the norm of the initial data is not explicit, but a simple rescaling argument shows that this dependence is linear.

Therefore, the stability of the normal form map gives that $\|V_M(z(t) - \hat{\psi}(t))\|_s \leq \varepsilon$, and as a consequence of Proposition 4.3 we have

$$\|V_M \hat{\psi}(t)\|_s \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

From Corollary 3.2, we must have $M > M_0$ where

$$M_0 = C_\omega \Lambda^{1/(2(\tau-1))}.$$

Therefore, according to inequality (29), M_0 must satisfy

$$M_0 \gtrsim R^{3/(\tau-1)} T^{(12s+1)/(2(\tau-1))} T^{24(\tau+1)/(\tau-1)} \varepsilon^{-1/(2(\tau-1))} N^{12 \frac{1+\tau}{\tau-1}}.$$

Before we set M_0 , we must confirm that the above inequality is the most extreme condition that M_0 must satisfy. From Proposition 3.6, we know that Λ must satisfy

$$\Lambda > \max \left(2^3 \varepsilon^{-1} \|z_0\|_{s+2(1+\tau)}^3, \log(2)^{-1} 2C \|z_0\|_{s+4(1+\tau)}^2 \right) \sim \max \left(\varepsilon^{-1} N^{6(1+\tau)} R^3, N^{8(1+\tau)} R^2 \right).$$

As long as $R > 1$, $N > 0$ and $\varepsilon \leq 1$, the above lower bound is less than the bound given in inequality (29).

Recalling that we assumed that $\tau \geq 100s/\delta$, and assuming $\varepsilon \leq 1$, we can conclude that $(\tau + 1)/(\tau - 1) \leq 2$ and

$$R^{3/(\tau-1)} T^{(12s+1)/(2(\tau-1))} T^{24(\tau+1)/(\tau-1)} \varepsilon^{-1/(2(\tau-1))} N^{12 \frac{1+\tau}{\tau-1}} \leq R^{\delta/s} T^{\delta+48} \varepsilon^{-\delta/s} N^{24}.$$

We can now take M as small as a constant multiple of $R^{\delta/s} T^{\delta+48} \varepsilon^{-\delta/s} N^{24}$ which completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

5. NUMERICAL STUDY

We now provide the details of our numerical simulation of (1) on the rational torus ($\omega^2 = 1$) and irrational torus ($\omega^2 = \sqrt{2}$), as well as our numerical study of Theorem 1.1 and the evolution of the Sobolev norm and energy spectrum on the two tori. It is demonstrated through a variety of metrics that the energy cascade process on the irrational torus is consistently slower than on the rational torus.

5.1. Numerical Setup. We compute the evolution of Fourier coefficients $\hat{\psi}_k$ according to (1) via a pseudospectral method on a domain of 512×512 modes (with 257×257 alias-free modes) [22]. The linear term is integrated analytically in time, with frequency definition $\lambda = m^2 + \omega^2 \ell^2$ providing explicit dependence on ω^2 on the two tori. The nonlinear term is integrated explicitly with a 4th order Runge-Kutta scheme. We begin with initial conditions

$$\hat{\psi}_{0,k} = \begin{cases} C \exp(i\phi_k) & -2 \leq |k|_\infty \leq 2, \quad k \neq (0,0) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

with $C \in \mathbb{R}$ chosen to yield a prescribed Sobolev norm $R = \|\hat{\psi}_0\|_s$ and $\phi_k \in [0, 2\pi]$ as uniformly-distributed random phases that are decorrelated with respect to k . In the numerical portion of this work, we use Sobolev index $s = 2$. The solver is validated by preservation of the Hamiltonian and verifying 4th order convergence with time step Δt .

We note that an irrational number cannot be exactly represented in our numerical simulation. Instead, our simulation of dynamics on an irrational torus is computed with ω^2 approximated by a double-precision floating-point number ω_*^2 . Nevertheless, a simple analysis shows that the use of ω_*^2 is sufficient to preserve Lemma 3.3, i.e., it does not create




FIGURE 1. The relationship between M and R for different ε on log-scale axes for $s = 2$ and $T = 20T_f$. Data for $\omega^2 = \sqrt{2}$ (—) and $\omega^2 = 1$ (---) are included.

spurious resonant quartets other than those in Lemma 3.3. The analysis is shown in Appendix B.

5.2. Results. We begin by generating data for both tori over a range of R for $T = 20T_f$, where $T_f = 2\pi$ is the fundamental period. For each R , M is computed for a range of ε such that $\|\chi_{B_M^c} \hat{\psi}(T)\|_s = \varepsilon$. These values of M are plotted against R for each ε in Figure 1. We find that M consistently takes a smaller value on the irrational torus than on the rational torus, indicating a slower cascade of energy when ω^2 is irrational. We also note that the differences in M between the two tori vary with R , taking smaller values near the small and large values of R in our tested range. We hypothesize that for large values of R , the quasi-resonances on the irrational torus are sufficient to cascade the energy for limited T , yielding a small difference in M when compared to the rational torus. For small values of R , even on the rational torus, the relatively small T is not sufficient for the energy to cascade to significantly larger M than on irrational torus. We also note that the relationship between M and R on rational torus yields approximately a power-law form. We solve $M = AR^\alpha$ in a least-squares sense for the rational torus data with $A = (15.5115, 12.2020, 8.6968)$ and $\alpha = (0.6074, 0.6411, 0.7124)$ for $\varepsilon = (10^{-8}, 10^{-6}, 10^{-4})$, respectively.

We next look at the full energy spectrum to resolve directional differences in evolution on the two tori. The 2D energy spectra of the initial condition and its evolution on both tori are reported in Figure 2 for $R = 1.8263$. Aside from an obvious difference in the spread of energy between the tori, we see a higher degree of anisotropy in the spectrum of the irrational torus than that of the rational torus. The irrational torus data develops toward an axes-parallel contour, mainly because of the absence of diamond-type resonant quartets [29]. We confirm that the rational torus exhibits isotropic evolution for all tested R , and that the irrational torus exhibits anisotropic evolution for even the highest tested R .




FIGURE 2. The 2D energy spectra of (a) the initial condition, (b) the irrational torus at $t = 20T_f$ and (c) the rational torus at $t = 20T_f$. Note that (b) and (c) share the color bar. The zero mode has amplitude 0, but is colored for simplicity.

The differences in spectral evolution are also reflected in the growth of the Sobolev norm $\|\hat{\psi}(t)\|_s$, which is plotted over $20T_f$ for both tori in figure 3. The norm on the irrational torus stays close to its initial value R , in contrast to the norm on the rational torus, which shows a steady growth. For all tested R , $\|\hat{\psi}(t)\|_s$ consistently grows faster on the rational torus than on the irrational torus. Growth of the Sobolev norm for irrational ω^2 is possible in higher regimes of R , as depicted in figure 4, which extends to $t = 100T_f$. For low R , oscillatory behavior of $\|\hat{\psi}(t)\|_s$ is resolved, while for higher R , we observe growth of the norm with a rate that increases with R .

5.3. Kinematic Study on (Λ, τ) -quasi Resonant Sets. All results in Section 6.2 indicate that the energy cascade on irrational tori is much less efficient than that on rational tori. This fact can be further understood from a kinematic analysis on the spreading of (Λ, τ) -quasi resonant sets on the two tori. By “kinematic” we refer to the study which only considers the modes that can be excited by (5) instead of the exact dynamics of (1). Specifically, we choose some initial active modes as the level-1 set, and keep searching for modes that can be excited by (Λ, τ) -quasi resonance in the next levels. The detailed numerical algorithm is summarized as follows:

- (1) Fix initial modes in level-1 set L_1 .
- (2) For each 3 modes in L_1 , find the 4th mode which forms a (Λ, τ) -quasi resonant quartet with the 3 modes and is outside L_1 . Put all such modes in L_2 .
- (3) For each 3 modes in $L_1 \cup L_2$, find the 4th mode which forms a (Λ, τ) -quasi resonant quartet with the 3 modes and is outside $L_1 \cup L_2$. Put all such modes in L_3 .




FIGURE 3. The growth of $\|\hat{\psi}(t)\|_s$ for $\omega^2 = \sqrt{2}$ (—) and $\omega^2 = 1$ (---)




FIGURE 4. The long-time growth of $\|\hat{\psi}(t)\|_s$ on the irrational torus for $R = 3.3343, 2.8390, 1.8263$ from top to bottom.

(4) Repeat procedure 3 to compute L_j for $j > 3$.

We note that this level definition and algorithm differ critically from the one considered in [9] which is defined specifically (and only) for resonant sets on the rational torus. Setting $L_1 = [-2, 2] \times [-2, 2]$, Figure 5 shows the results of the quasi-resonant sets for $\tau = 0.1$ and three different values of Λ on both rational and irrational tori. We compute the sets up to level $N = \min(6, \mathcal{N})$, where \mathcal{N} corresponds to the level for which no modes can be excited in the next level. This truncation of N has to be taken because otherwise the levels on

the rational torus extends to infinity due to the diamond-type resonance included in the (Λ, τ) -quasi resonance.

From Figure 5 we see that on the irrational torus the number of excited modes increase with the value of Λ . In particular, for $\Lambda = 10$, the cascade is disabled without any excited modes; for $\Lambda = 20$, the modes extend to level 4 in a rectangular region (the rectangular shape is due to the axis-parallel resonance); for $\Lambda = 30$, all six levels are filled with excited modes. In general, the excited modes on the irrational torus is much less in number and more anisotropic compared to those on the rational torus, consistent with our numerical results in §6.2. Moreover, the (Λ, τ) -quasi resonant sets on the rational torus does not depend on Λ in the tested range (for larger Λ outside the range, it indeed changes the sets). This is because the modal cascade on the rational torus is dominantly controlled by the (diamond-shape) exact resonance included in the (Λ, τ) -quasi resonance with any value of Λ .

5.4. Discussions on Numerical Study. We first conclude the numerical study with a summary of results. We study Theorem 1.1 to reveal significant differences in M between tori with $\omega^2 = 1$ and $\omega^2 = \sqrt{2}$, with M taking smaller values on the irrational torus for all tested values of R and ε . We then identify limited spectral growth and anisotropy in the 2D energy spectrum of the irrational torus. These findings are reflected also in the growth of $\|\hat{\psi}(t)\|_s$ on both tori, for which the rational torus growth rate exceeds that of the irrational torus. These findings are consistent with a kinematic analysis on the (Λ, τ) -quasi resonant sets on rational and irrational tori. All together, this numerical study demonstrates dramatic differences in the energy cascade capacity of the 2D NLS on rational and irrational tori.

We remark that the results obtained here should place some caveat to the numerics community who study wave turbulence using simulations with periodic boundary conditions. This type of simulations (sometimes referred to as idealized simulations) are widely used in different fields today, such as capillary waves, surface/internal gravity waves and plasma waves. With the rapid growth of computational power, a great effort in the numerics community is to push the resolution of such simulations, utilizing huge computational resources, in order to study the small-scale dynamics. The underlying “hope” is that this periodic-domain simulation represents the dynamics on a patch of an infinite domain featuring homogeneous turbulence (see figure 6). However, due to the results in this work, this “hope” may not become true under certain situations. A simple argument can be given as follows: If the periodic-domain simulation provides the same dynamics as the infinite domain, then the results should be consistent for different domain aspect ratios. This is clearly in contradiction with our results in this paper. In fact, how the energy propagates to small scales is critically related to the interaction of dispersion relation and domain aspect ratio, which should be taken into consideration in future applications of idealized simulation for studying wave turbulence.




FIGURE 5. levels of (Λ, τ) -quasi resonant sets for $L_1 = [-2, 2] \times [-2, 2]$, $\tau = 0.1$, computed up to level $N = \min(6, \mathcal{N})$, where \mathcal{N} corresponds to the level for which no modes can be excited in the next level. Left column: $\Lambda = 10, 20, 30$ on irrational torus from top to bottom; Right column: $\Lambda = 10, 20, 30$ on rational torus from top to bottom.




FIGURE 6. Periodic-domain simulation with the purpose to simulate one path of homogeneous turbulence in an infinite domain.

APPENDIX A. ON THE LOCAL EXISTENCE OF THE FLOW ASSOCIATED TO THE AUXILIARY HAMILTONIAN

First, we recall some properties of vector fields that are necessary for the statement of Kato's theorem. Let A be a linear operator on a Banach space X , then A generates a continuous semi-group, $U(t)$, if and only if A is densely defined, closed and accretive. Moreover, $U(t)\phi \in X$ is differentiable for $t \geq 0$ if and only if $\phi \in D(A)$ (Here, $D(A)$ represents the domain of A), $U(t)$ maps $D(A)$ into itself, and

$$\frac{d}{dt}U(t)\phi = -U(t)A\phi = AU(t)\phi.$$

Definition A.1 (Accretive, quasi-accretive). *We say that an operator $A : D(A) \subset X \rightarrow X$ is accretive if there exists $M \geq 1$ and $\beta \leq 0$ such that*

$$\|(A + \xi I)^{-k}\|_{X, D(A)} \leq M(\xi - \beta)^{-k}$$

for all $\xi > \beta$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $M = 1$, then A is quasi-accretive.

A time-dependent operator, $A(t)$, which is uniformly densely defined, accretive, and closed is said to be stable if

$$\left\| \prod_{j=1}^k (A(t_j) + \xi I)^{-1} \right\|_{X, D(A)} \leq M(\xi - \beta)^{-k}$$

for all $\xi > \beta$. Any $A(t)$ that is uniformly quasi-accretive is stable.

Assume that we have two Banach spaces X and Y where $Y \subset X$. Moreover, assume $Y \subset D(A(t))$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

Definition A.2 (Strong Evolution Operator). *A family of operators $U = \{U(t, s)\}$, defined on the triangle $\Delta := \{(t, s) : 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T\}$ is called a strong evolution operator for $A(t)$ if*

- (a) $U \in C(\Delta, B(Y))$.

- (b) $U(t, s)U(s, r) = U(t, r)$.
(c) $\frac{d}{dt}U(t, s) = -A(t)U(t, s)$, and $\frac{d}{dt}U \in C(\Delta; B(Y, X))$.

We arrive at Theorem 1.5 stated in Kato's manuscript:

Theorem A.3. *Assume that*

- (1) $A(t)$ is a stable family of generators in X , with constants M and β
(2) There is a family of $\mathbb{S} = \{S(t)\}$ of isomorphisms of Y onto X such that
(a)

$$S(t)A(t)S(t)^{-1} = A(t) + B(t)$$

(b)

$$S \in Lip([0, T]; (B(Y, X)))$$

(c)

$$B \in L^\infty([0, T]; B(X))$$

- (3) $A \in C([0, T]; B(Y, X))$.

Then there exists a unique strong evolution operator U associated to A .

We are interested in applying Kato's work to the quasi-linear equations of motion associated to the auxiliary Hamiltonian, χ , defined in Section 3. Consider three reflexive, separable real Banach spaces $Y \subset Z \subset X$ with inclusions continuous and dense. Assume that $\|\cdot\|_X \leq \|\cdot\|_Z \leq \|\cdot\|_Y$. Consider the equation

$$(30) \quad \frac{d}{dt}u + A(u)u = 0$$

Define the distance between two Banach spaces, $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ and $(X, |\cdot|)$, by

$$\text{dist}(\|\cdot\|, |\cdot|) := \log \left(\max \left(\sup_x \|x\|/|x|, \sup_x |x|/\|x\| \right) \right)$$

Theorem A.4 ([23] Theorem 3.1). *Let $W \subset Y$ be an open subset of Y , and for each $w \in W$, let $\|\cdot\|_w$ be a norm in X equivalent to the standard norm $\|\cdot\|_X$. Assume that $\|\cdot\|_w$ is bounded and smooth in $w \in W$ in the sense that there exists $\lambda > 0$ and $\mu > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(\|\cdot\|_w, \|\cdot\|_X) &\leq \lambda, \\ \text{dist}(\|\cdot\|_w, \|\cdot\|_{w'}) &\leq \mu\|w - w'\|_Z. \end{aligned}$$

We assume that for each $w \in W$ a quasi-accretive operator $A(w)$ is defined with respect to $X_w := (X, \|\cdot\|_w)$. We further assume

(1)

$$S(t)A(t)S(t)^{-1} = A(t) + B(t)$$

with $\|B(w)\|_X \leq \lambda$.

(2)

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(w)\|_{Y, Z} &\leq \lambda \\ \|A(w) - A(w')\|_{Y, X} &\leq \mu\|w - w'\|_X \end{aligned}$$

Then for each $\phi \in W$, there exist $T > 0$ and a unique solution u to (30) such that

$$u \in C([0, t]; W) \cap C^1([0, T]; Z)$$

APPENDIX B. ON THE FINITE-PRECISION REPRESENTATION OF IRRATIONAL ω^2

We denote a floating-point representation of ω^2 by ω_*^2 , with

$$\omega_*^2 = \frac{a}{b}$$

where $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ are relatively prime (all floating-point approximations can be written in this way). We consider a quartet (k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) with

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{k_1} + \lambda_{k_2} - \lambda_{k_3} - \lambda_{k_4} &= 0 \text{ and} \\ k_1 + k_2 - k_3 - k_4 &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

For $k_i = (m_i, \ell_i)$, recall that the first of these conditions can be written as

$$m_1^2 + m_2^2 - m_3^2 - m_4^2 + \omega_*^2(\ell_1^2 + \ell_2^2 - \ell_3^2 - \ell_4^2) = 0,$$

while the latter can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} m_4 &= m_1 + m_2 - m_3 \text{ and} \\ \ell_4 &= \ell_1 + \ell_2 - \ell_3. \end{aligned}$$

By substituting these conditions on m_4 and ℓ_4 into our first condition built on the dispersion relation, a single quadratic equation can be derived to describe the relationship between the components of our quartet. In its factored form, the equation is

$$\begin{aligned} (m_1 - m_3)(m_2 - m_3) &= -\omega_*^2(\ell_1 - \ell_3)(\ell_2 - \ell_3) \\ \Leftrightarrow \Delta m_{13} \Delta m_{23} &= -\omega_*^2 \Delta \ell_{13} \Delta \ell_{23}, \end{aligned}$$

where a Δ -notation is adopted for simplicity. As required by Lemma 3.3, equality may only hold for $\Delta m_{13} \Delta m_{23} = -\omega_*^2 \Delta \ell_{13} \Delta \ell_{23} = 0$ due to the irrationality of ω^2 . We require of our floating-point approximation this same property, namely that

$$b \Delta m_{13} \Delta m_{23} = -a \Delta \ell_{13} \Delta \ell_{23}$$

holds only if the LHS = RHS = 0. We will now identify a necessary condition on any quartet that violates this property. Consider the factorizations of $\Delta m_{13} \Delta m_{23}$ and $\Delta \ell_{13} \Delta \ell_{23}$ and assume

$$b \Delta m_{13} \Delta m_{23} = -a \Delta \ell_{13} \Delta \ell_{23} \neq 0.$$

Because a and b are relatively prime, $\Delta m_{13} \Delta m_{23}$ must have a as a factor and $\Delta \ell_{13} \Delta \ell_{23}$ must have b as a factor. Every quartet that would violate lemma 3.3 due to the floating-point approximation of ω^2 has this property.

Suppose $K = \max(\Delta m_{max}, \Delta \ell_{max})$ is the maximum difference in mode number possible on our bounded computational domain. If $K^2 < \max(a, b)$ then the only quartets on our domain that satisfy the resonance condition have LHS = RHS = 0. For our choices of $\omega^2 = \sqrt{2}$, $\omega_*^2 = 1.414213562373095$, and domain of 257×257 alias-free modes, we have $\max(a, b) = 282842712474619$ and $K^2 = 262144$. Thus, the property described by Lemma 3.3 is preserved in our simulation.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bourgain. Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations. I. Schrödinger equations. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 3(2):107–156, 1993.
- [2] J. Bourgain. Growth of Sobolev norms in linear Schrödinger equations with quasi-periodic potential. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 204(1):207–247, 1999.
- [3] J. Bourgain. On growth of Sobolev norms in linear Schrödinger equations with smooth time dependent potential. *J. Anal. Math.*, 77:315–348, 1999.
- [4] J. Bourgain. On long-time behaviour of solutions of linear Schrödinger equations with smooth time-dependent potential. In *Geometric aspects of functional analysis*, volume 1807 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 99–113. Springer, Berlin, 2003.
- [5] Jean Bourgain. Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA*, 3(3):209–262, 1993.
- [6] Jean Bourgain. On the growth in time of higher sobolev norms of smooth solutions of hamiltonian pde. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 1996(6):277–304, 1996.
- [7] Jean Bourgain. On strichartz’s inequalities and the nonlinear schrödinger equation on irrational tori. *Mathematical aspects of nonlinear dispersive equations*, 163:1–20, 2007.
- [8] Rémi Carles and Erwan Faou. Energy cascades for NLS on the torus. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 32(6):2063–2077, 2012.
- [9] J. Colliander, G. Simpson, and C. Sulem. Numerical simulations of the energy-supercritical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ.*, 7(2):279–296, 2010.
- [10] James Colliander, Markus Keel, Gigliola Staffilani, Hideo Takaoka, and Terence Tao. Transfer of energy to high frequencies in the cubic defocusing nonlinear schrödinger equation. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 181(1):39–113, 2010.
- [11] James Colliander, Soonsik Kwon, and Tadahiro Oh. A remark on normal forms and the “upside-down” I -method for periodic NLS: growth of higher Sobolev norms. *J. Anal. Math.*, 118(1):55–82, 2012.
- [12] Jean-Marc Delort. A quasi-linear birkhoff normal forms method. application to the quasi-linear klein-gordon equation on \mathbb{S}^1 . 2009.
- [13] Yu Deng. On growth of sobolev norms for energy critical nls on irrational tori: small energy case. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 72(4):801–834, 2019.
- [14] Yu Deng and Pierre Germain. Growth of solutions to nls on irrational tori. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2019(9):2919–2950, 2019.
- [15] Benjamin Dodson. Global well-posedness and scattering for the defocusing, L^2 -critical, nonlinear Schrödinger equation when $d = 2$. *Duke Math. J.*, 165(18):3435–3516, 2016.
- [16] Roberto Feola and Riccardo Montalto. Quadratic lifespan and growth of sobolev norms for derivative schrödinger equations on generic tori. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.10162*, 2021.
- [17] M. Guardia, E. Haus, and M. Procesi. Growth of Sobolev norms for the analytic NLS on \mathbb{T}^2 . *Adv. Math.*, 301:615–692, 2016.
- [18] Marcel Guardia, Zaher Hani, Emanuele Haus, Alberto Maspero, and Michela Procesi. A note on growth of Sobolev norms near quasiperiodic finite-gap tori for the 2D cubic NLS equation. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl.*, 30(4):865–880, 2019.
- [19] Zaher Hani, Benoit Pausader, Nikolay Tzvetkov, and Nicola Visciglia. Modified scattering for the cubic Schrödinger equation on product spaces and applications. *Forum Math. Pi*, 3:e4, 63, 2015.
- [20] Emanuele Haus and Alberto Maspero. Growth of Sobolev norms in time dependent semiclassical anharmonic oscillators. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 278(2):108316, 25, 2020.
- [21] Emanuele Haus and Michela Procesi. Growth of Sobolev norms for the quintic NLS on T^2 . *Anal. PDE*, 8(4):883–922, 2015.
- [22] Alexander Hrabski and Yulin Pan. Effect of discrete resonant manifold structure on discrete wave turbulence. *Physical Review E*, 102(4):041101, 2020.
- [23] Tosio Kato. Linear and quasi-linear equations of evolution of hyperbolic type. In *Hyperbolicity*, pages 125–191. Springer, 2011.
- [24] Sergej B Kuksin and Sergej Kuksin. *Analysis of hamiltonian PDEs*, volume 19. Clarendon Press, 2000.
- [25] Vedran Sohinger. Bounds on the growth of high Sobolev norms of solutions to nonlinear Schrödinger equations on \mathbb{R} . *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 60(5):1487–1516, 2011.
- [26] Vedran Sohinger. Bounds on the growth of high Sobolev norms of solutions to nonlinear Schrödinger equations on S^1 . *Differential Integral Equations*, 24(7-8):653–718, 2011.

- [27] Vedran Sohinger. Bounds on the growth of high Sobolev norms of solutions to 2D Hartree equations. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 32(10):3733–3771, 2012.
- [28] Gigliola Staffilani. On the growth of high Sobolev norms of solutions for KdV and Schrödinger equations. *Duke Math. J.*, 86(1):109–142, 1997.
- [29] Gigliola Staffilani and Bobby Wilson. Stability of the cubic nonlinear schrodinger equation on an irrational torus. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 52(2):1318–1342, 2020.
- [30] W.-M. Wang. Bounded Sobolev norms for linear Schrödinger equations under resonant perturbations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 254(11):2926–2946, 2008.
- [31] W.-M. Wang. Logarithmic bounds on Sobolev norms for time dependent linear Schrödinger equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 33(10-12):2164–2179, 2008.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL ARCHITECTURE AND MARINE ENGINEERING, ANN ARBOR, MI 48109, USA. EMAIL: AHRABSKI@UMICH.EDU.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL ARCHITECTURE AND MARINE ENGINEERING, ANN ARBOR, MI 48109, USA. EMAIL: YULINPAN@UMICH.EDU.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139, USA. EMAIL: GIGLIOLA@MATH.MIT.EDU

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BOX 354350, SEATTLE, WA 98195-4350, USA. EMAIL: BLWILSON@UW.EDU.