

ON DISPERSIVE QUANTIZATION AND FRACTALIZATION FOR THE KAWAHARA EQUATION

SEONGYEON KIM

ABSTRACT. We study the dichotomy phenomena of solutions to the Kawahara equation with bounded variation initial data. This phenomena, called Talbot effect, are that at rational times the solution is quantized, while at irrational times it is a continuous nowhere differentiable function with fractal profile. Such is unknown for the Kawahara equation yet, which is a fifth-order KdV type equation. For the purpose, we obtain smoothing estimates for the nonlinear Duhamel solution, which, combined the known results on the linear solution, mathematically describes the Talbot effect.

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1836, H. F. Talbot [29] experimentally discovered that when an incident plane wave passes through a periodic grating, the image of the diffracted wave is refocused and recovers the initial grating with certain periodicity. Later the time period, which is called Talbot distance d_T , was calculated by Rayleigh [26] as $d_T = a^2\lambda$, where a is the spacing of the grating and λ is the wavelength of the incident wave.

The mathematical studies of the Talbot effect have been conducted to observe the dichotomous phenomena between dispersive *quantization* and *fractalization* of solutions to linear dispersive PDEs. In [3, 5], Berry and his collaborators found that if initial data is a step function, at $t \in \pi\mathbb{Q}$ the solution of the linear Schrödinger equation is piecewise constant, but discontinuous, whereas at $t \notin \pi\mathbb{Q}$ it is a continuous but nowhere differentiable fractal-like functions. In particular, Berry and Klein [4] mathematically justified the Talbot effect by showing that at every $t \in d_T\mathbb{Q}$ a finite copies of the grating pattern reappear, whereas at every $t \notin d_T\mathbb{Q}$ the images have a fractal nowhere differentiable profile.

Furthermore, many authors showed that the striking quantization/fractalization dichotomous phenomenon at rational/irrational times appears in linear dispersive equations with integer coefficients polynomial dispersion relation on the torus. Under the assumption that the initial data is of bounded variation, Oskolkov [25] proved that at $t \in \pi\mathbb{Q}$ the solution of any linear dispersive PDEs on \mathbb{T} (in particular the linear Schrödinger and Airy equations) is a bounded function with at most countably

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 35B45; Secondary: 35Q53.

Key words and phrases. Talbot effect, Kawahara equation.

This research was supported by a KIAS Individual Grant (MG082901) at Korea Institute for Advanced Study.

many discontinuities if initial data contain discontinuities. Whereas the solution is a continuous but nowhere differentiable function at $t \notin \pi\mathbb{Q}$. Later, Kapitanski and Rodnianski [19] showed the solutions to the linear Schrödinger equation have better regularity at $t \notin \pi\mathbb{Q}$. The quantization phenomenon at $t \in \pi\mathbb{Q}$ was explicitly expressed by Taylor [30]. Indeed, he showed that the solution $e^{it\partial_{xx}}g$ is a finite linear sum of translates of the delta functions with the coefficients being Gauss sums if g is the delta function. This result was generalized by Olver [24] for arbitrary order linear dispersive PDEs whose dispersion relation is a polynomial with integer coefficients.

Another mathematical analysis of the Talbot effect is to determine the fractal dimension¹ of the graph of solutions that quantifies the fractalization behavior. In fact, Berry [3] conjectured that for the n -dimensional linear Schrödinger equation, the graphs of $\Re u(x, t)$, $\Im u(x, t)$ and $|u(x, t)|^2$ have fractal dimension $D = n + \frac{1}{2}$ at most all irrational times t . Rodnianski [27] proved that for every bounded variation $g \notin \cup_{\epsilon>0} H^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}$, the graphs of the real and imaginary parts of the solution $e^{it\partial_{xx}}g$ have fractal dimension $D = \frac{3}{2}$ at most all irrational times, by which partially justified Berry's conjecture in one dimension. Later, in [8], Chousionis, Erdoğan and Tzirakis extended this result to general linear dispersive equations with integer coefficient polynomial dispersion of degree d by considering initial data in larger class $BV \setminus \bigcup_{\epsilon>0} H^{\sigma_0+\epsilon}$, $\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma_0 < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2d}$ (see also [13]). They also settled Berry's conjecture in one dimension proving that the dimension of the graph of $|e^{it\partial_{xx}}g|^2$ is $3/2$ at almost all $t \notin \pi\mathbb{Q}$ if g is a step function with jumps only at rational points.

Until recently, it has been shown that nonlinear dispersive equations also exhibit the remarkable phenomena that the solution is quantized at $t \in \pi\mathbb{Q}$, while at $t \notin \pi\mathbb{Q}$ it is a continuous nowhere differentiable function with fractal profile. The results concerning the nonlinear Schrödinger and the Korteweg-de Vries (KdV) equations can be found in [12, 11, 8, 14, 7]. The key ingredient in treating nonlinearity is to obtain smoothing estimate for the nonlinear part, which, combined with the known results on the linear part (see [25, 27, 13] and references therein), gives the quantization and fractalization results as well as fractal dimension. Based on this framework, we investigate the quantized and fractal behavior of solutions to the following Kawahara equation on the torus:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u + \partial_x^5 u + \alpha \partial_x^3 u + u \partial_x u &= 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/(2\pi\mathbb{Z}), \quad t \geq 0, \\ u(x, 0) &= g(x) \in H^s(\mathbb{T}), \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\alpha = -1, 0, 1$ and u is real-valued. This fifth-order KdV type equation has been derived to model the shallow water waves with surface tension and the magneto-sound propagation in plasma (see e.g. [18, 21, 23]).

The first result is on the dichotomy between rational and irrational times.

¹The *fractal dimension*, also called *upper Minkowski dimension*, of a set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log(N(S, \epsilon))}{\log(1/\epsilon)},$$

where $N(S, \epsilon)$ is the minimum number of balls of radius ϵ required to cover S .

Theorem 1.1. *Let g be of bounded variation (BV) and u be the solution to (1.1). If $t \notin \pi\mathbb{Q}$ then $u(x, t)$ is a continuous function of x . If $t \in \pi\mathbb{Q}$ and g has at least one discontinuity on \mathbb{T} , then $u(x, t)$ is a bounded function with at most countably many discontinuity. If g is continuous, the $u(x, t) \in C_t^0 C_x^0$.*

We also calculate the fractal dimension of the graph of the solution at irrational time slices in terms of regularity of initial data.

Theorem 1.2. *Let u be a solution to (1.1) with $g \in BV$. Suppose that²*

$$\sigma_0 := \sup\{\sigma \in \mathbb{R} : g \in H^\sigma\} < \frac{17}{32}.$$

Then, for almost all $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \pi\mathbb{Q}$, the graph of the solution has upper Minkowski dimension $D \in [\frac{33}{16} - 2\sigma_0, \frac{31}{16}]$. Moreover, the graph of $|u(x, t)|^2$ has upper Minkowski dimension at most $\frac{31}{16}$.

We close the introduction with some notations. We define the Fourier sequence of 2π -periodic function f by $\hat{f}(k) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-ikx} f(x) dx$. For every $s \geq 0$, H^s denotes the Sobolev space on $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_{H^s} := \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle k \rangle^{2s} |\hat{f}(k)|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

where $\langle k \rangle = (1 + |k|^2)^{1/2}$. Throughout this paper, if a Banach space of functions \mathcal{B}^s is decreasing (in the sense of the set inclusion) with respect to a regularity index $s \in \mathbb{R}$, then we use the following notation

$$\mathcal{B}^{s+} := \bigcup_{\epsilon > 0} \mathcal{B}^{s+\epsilon}, \quad \mathcal{B}^{s-} := \bigcap_{\epsilon > 0} \mathcal{B}^{s-\epsilon}.$$

In particular, $\mathcal{B}^+ := \mathcal{B}^{0+}$. For example, \mathcal{B}^s contains the Sobolev space H^s , the Besov space $B_{p,\infty}^s$ and the Hölder space C^s . In inequalities, the letter C stands for a positive constant which may be different at each occurrence. We also denote $A \lesssim B$ to mean $A \leq CB$ with unspecified constants $C > 0$.

Outline of the paper. In Section 2 we state the smoothing estimate (Proposition 2.1) for the nonlinear part which is crucially used in proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. Then we prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 by looking at linear and non-linear evolutions of the solution separately; the non-linear evolution lies in a smoother space by nonlinear smoothing property (Proposition 2.1), which, combined with the known results on the linear evolution. In Section 3, we establish local well-posedness for (1.1) and we prove the smoothing estimate in Section 4. For the purpose, we may assume that the initial data satisfies the mean-zero property (and so does the solution by the momentum conservation), since u can be replaced by $v = u - \int_{\mathbb{T}} g(x) dx$ using a harmless first order term $[\int_{\mathbb{T}} g(x) dx] \partial_x v$. Indeed, this assumption is removed by changing the linear operator in (1.1) from $-\partial_x^5 - \alpha \partial_x^3$ to $-\partial_x^5 - \alpha \partial_x^3 - [\int_{\mathbb{T}} g(x) dx] \partial_x$. We note that when adapting the methods will be used in proofs after this replacement, nothing changes

²Since $g \in BV$ it follows that $\sigma_0 \geq 1/2$.

in all the calculations. This observation was introduced by Bourgain in [6] (see also [9, 11]).

2. TALBOT EFFECT FOR THE KAWAHARA EQUATION

In this section we prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. Let us first formally decompose the solution to (1.1) as

$$u(x, t) = e^{Lt}g + \mathcal{N}(x, t) \quad (2.1)$$

where $L = -\partial_x^5 - \alpha\partial_x^3 - [\int_{\mathbb{T}} g(x)dx]\partial_x$ and $\mathcal{N}(x, t)$ is the nonlinear Duhamel term of the solution. Here, the first order term in L is arisen in removing the mean-zero assumption, and does not affect in the proofs at all, as mentioned in Section 1.

The key ingredient of the proofs is the following smoothing property for $\mathcal{N}(x, t)$, which will be shown in Section 4:

Proposition 2.1. *Let $s > -1/2$, $0 \leq s_1 < \min(s+2, 3s+2)$. Let u be the solution to (1.1). Then we have*

$$\mathcal{N}(x, t) \in C_t^0 H_x^{s_1}.$$

2.1. Proof of Theorem 1.1. Since $g \in BV$ we see $g \in H^{\frac{1}{2}-}$. Then, by making use of the Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\mathcal{N}(x, t) \in C_t^0 H_x^{\frac{5}{2}-}.$$

From the Sobolev embedding

$$H^s \hookrightarrow C^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{for } s > \frac{1}{2}, \quad (2.2)$$

we also have

$$\mathcal{N}(x, t) \in C_t^0 C_x^{2-}. \quad (2.3)$$

To handle the linear solution $e^{Lt}g$, we make use of the following known result due to Oskolkov [25]:

Theorem 2.2. *Let $L = -\partial_x^5 - \alpha\partial_x^3 - [\int_{\mathbb{T}} g(x)dx]\partial_x$ and suppose that $g \in BV$.*

- (i) *If $t \notin \pi\mathbb{Q}$, then $e^{Lt}g$ is a continuous function of x . If $t \in \pi\mathbb{Q}$ and g has at least one discontinuity on \mathbb{T} , then $e^{Lt}g$ is a bounded function with at most countably many discontinuities.*
- (ii) *If g is continuous, then $e^{Lt}g \in C_t^0 C_x^0$.*

Remark 2.3. In fact, it is known that the theorem holds for one dimensional dispersive equations with polynomial dispersion relation in [25]. The quantization results in [4, 30, 24] says that the linear solution $e^{Lt}g$ is a linear combination of finitely many translates of the initial data g when $t \in \pi\mathbb{Q}$ (see [13, Theorem 2.14]). Thus, when $t \in \pi\mathbb{Q}$ and $g \in BV$ has at least one discontinuity, $e^{Lt}g \in BV$ and the possible discontinuities are at most countable.

For $t \notin \pi\mathbb{Q}$, combining Theorem 2.2 (i) and (2.3) with (2.1) we conclude that $u(x, t)$ is also continuous. If $t \in \pi\mathbb{Q}$ and g is discontinuous, then $e^{Lt}g$ is of bounded variation with at most countably many discontinuities by Theorem 2.2 (i) and Remark 2.3. Combining this with (2.3), we conclude that the solution is a discontinuous bounded function with at most countable discontinuity.

If g is continuous, then $e^{Lt}g$ is also continuous on $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ by Theorem 2.2 (ii). Therefore, combining with (2.3) we see that $u(x, t) \in C_t^0 C_x^0$.

2.2. Proof of Theorem 1.2. We begin by introducing the Besov space and its properties that we need. Let $\phi \in C_0^\infty([-2, -1/2] \cup [1/2, 2])$ be such that $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \phi(2^{-j}t) = 1$ for $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, and let $\phi_0(t) := 1 - \sum_{j \geq 1} \phi(2^{-j}t)$. We denote by P_j the projections defined by

$$P_0 f(x) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \phi_0(k) \hat{f}(k) e^{ikx}, \quad P_j f(x) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \phi(2^{-j}k) \hat{f}(k) e^{ikx}, \quad j \geq 1.$$

For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $s \geq 0$, the Besov space $B_{p,\infty}^s$ on the periodic domain \mathbb{T} is defined via the norm

$$\|f\|_{B_{p,\infty}^s} := \sup_{j \geq 0} 2^{sj} \|P_j f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T})}.$$

It is well-known that $B_{\infty,\infty}^\alpha = C^\alpha$ for $\alpha \in (0, \infty) \setminus \mathbb{N}$ and $H^\alpha \in B_{1,\infty}^\alpha$ for $\alpha \geq 0$ (see e.g., [28, 2]). By complex interpolation between Besov spaces (see [2, Theorem 6.4.5]) and Hölder's inequality, we have, for $s_1 \neq s_2$,

$$(B_{1,\infty}^{s_1}, B_{\infty,\infty}^{s_2})_{[\frac{1}{2}]} = B_{2,\infty}^{\frac{s_1+s_2}{2}} \hookrightarrow B_{2,2}^{\frac{s_1+s_2}{2}-} = H^{\frac{s_1+s_2}{2}-}. \quad (2.4)$$

Now we state the following theorem of Chousionis–Erdogan–Tzirakis [8] (see also [13]) which is useful to prove Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma_0 < \frac{17}{32}$. If $g \in BV \setminus H^{\sigma_0+}$, then for almost all $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \pi\mathbb{Q}$, we have $e^{Lt}g \in C^{\frac{1}{16}-} \setminus B_{1,\infty}^{2\sigma_0-\frac{1}{16}+}$.*

We first prove the upper bound of D is $\frac{31}{16}$. Since $g \in H^{\sigma_0-}$ by the definition of σ_0 , we have

$$\mathcal{N}(\cdot, t) \in H^{\sigma_0+2-}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \quad (2.5)$$

by Proposition 2.1. Hence, by the Sobolev embedding (2.2) we have

$$\mathcal{N}(\cdot, t) \in C^{\sigma_0+\frac{3}{2}-}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.6)$$

On the other hand, by Theorem 2.4, we have

$$e^{Lt}g \in C^{\frac{1}{16}-} \quad \text{for almost all } t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \pi\mathbb{Q}. \quad (2.7)$$

Hence, from (2.1), (2.6) and (2.7) we have

$$u(\cdot, t) \in C^{\min(\sigma_0+\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{16})-} = C^{\frac{1}{16}-} \quad \text{for almost all } t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \pi\mathbb{Q}. \quad (2.8)$$

We now use the following classical result on the upper Minkowski dimension for Hölder continuous functions:

Lemma 2.5. [15, Corollary 11.2] *Let $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. If a function $f : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is in C^α , then the upper Minkowski dimension of the graph of f is at most $2 - \alpha$.*

Indeed, applying (2.8) to Lemma 2.5, the upper Minkowski dimension of the graph of $u(x, t)$ is at most $2 - 1/16 = 31/16$. Just by replacing $u(x, t)$ with $|u(x, t)|^2$ in the argument employed for obtaining (2.8), it follows that the upper bound of D is at most $31/16$.

It remains to prove that the lower bound of D is $\frac{33}{16} - 2\sigma_0$. The lower bound follows from the following theorem of Deliu–Jawerth [10]:

Theorem 2.6 ([10]). *Let $0 < s < 1$. If $f: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and $f \notin B_{1,\infty}^{s+}$, then the upper Minkowski dimension of the graph of f is at least $2 - s$.*

Since $g \notin H^{\sigma_0+}$ and $\|g\|_{H^s} = \|e^{Lt}g\|_{H^s}$, one can easily see that $e^{Lt}g \notin H^{\sigma_0+}$. From (2.7) with $C^{\frac{1}{16}-} = B_{\infty,\infty}^{\frac{1}{16}-}$ and the embedding $B_{1,\infty}^{s_1} \cap B_{\infty,\infty}^{s_2} \subset H^{\frac{s_1+s_2}{2}-}$ (see (2.4)), we have

$$e^{Lt}g \notin B_{1,\infty}^{2\sigma_0 - \frac{1}{16}+} \quad (2.9)$$

for almost all $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \pi\mathbb{Q}$. On the other hand, by (2.5) with $H^{\sigma_0+2-} \in B_{1,\infty}^{\sigma_0+2-}$, we see, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathcal{N}(\cdot, t) \in B_{1,\infty}^{\sigma_0+2-}. \quad (2.10)$$

Combining (2.9) and (2.10), then we have

$$u(\cdot, t) = \underbrace{e^{Lt}g}_{\notin B_{1,\infty}^{2\sigma_0 - \frac{1}{16}+} \text{ for a.e. } t} + \underbrace{\mathcal{N}(\cdot, t)}_{\in B_{1,\infty}^{\sigma_0+2-} \text{ for all } t}.$$

Hence we conclude that if $2\sigma_0 - \frac{1}{16} < \sigma_0 + 2$, then for almost all $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \pi\mathbb{Q}$ the solution does not belong to $B_{1,\infty}^{2\sigma_0 - \frac{1}{16}+}$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.6, the graph of the solution has Minkowski dimension at least $2 - (2\sigma_0 - \frac{1}{16}) = \frac{33}{16} - 2\sigma_0$.

3. LOCAL WELL-POSEDNESS

In this section, we establish the local well-posedness of the Cauchy problem (1.1). We first review known results for the Cauchy problem (1.1). In [17], Hirayama proved that the solution is locally well-posed in $\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{T})$ for $s \geq -1$ by making use of the argument employed for the KdV equation in [22]. Kato [20] improved the result to $s \geq -3/2$, and proved global well-posedness for $s \geq -1$ as well as C^3 -ill-posedness for $s < -3/2$.

Before stating our well-posedness result, we introduce appropriate function spaces. Let $X^{s,b}$ denote the Bourgain space under the norm

$$\|u\|_{X^{s,b}} := \|\langle k \rangle^s \langle \tau + k^5 - \alpha k^3 \rangle^b \widehat{u}(k, \tau)\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2}.$$

We also define, for $\delta \geq 0$, the restricted space $X_\delta^{s,b}$ by the norm

$$\|u\|_{X_\delta^{s,b}} := \inf_{\tilde{u}=u \text{ on } t \in [0, \delta]} \|\tilde{u}\|_{X^{s,b}}.$$

We further introduce the Y^s - and Z^s -spaces based on the ideas of Bourgain [6] (cf. [16, 9]),

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{Y^s} &:= \|u\|_{X^{s, \frac{1}{2}}} + \|\langle k \rangle^s \widehat{u}(k, \tau)\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^1}, \\ \|u\|_{Z^s} &:= \|u\|_{X^{s, -\frac{1}{2}}} + \left\| \frac{\langle k \rangle^s \widehat{u}(k, \tau)}{\langle \tau + k^5 - \alpha k^3 \rangle} \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^1}. \end{aligned}$$

One defines Y_δ^s , Z_δ^s accordingly. We note that if $u \in Y^s$ then $u \in L_t^\infty H_x^s$ (In fact, Y^s embeds into $C_t H_x^s$); the $X^{s, \frac{1}{2}}$ -norm alone fails to control the $L_t^\infty H_x^s$ -norm of the solution.

The following theorem shows the local well-posedness of (1.1) in H^s with $s \geq 0$.

Theorem 3.1. *The Cauchy problem (1.1) is locally well-posed in H^s for any $s \geq 0$. Namely, there exist $\delta > 0$ and a unique solution $u \in C([0, \delta]; H^s(\mathbb{T})) \cap Y_\delta^s$ with*

$$\|u\|_{X_\delta^{s, \frac{1}{2}}} \leq \|u\|_{Y_\delta^s} \lesssim \|g\|_{H^s}. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We may assume that the initial data $g(x)$ satisfies the mean-zero property, as mentioned in Section 1. By Duhamel's principle, we wish to have a unique fixed point of the mapping $\Phi : Y_\delta^s \rightarrow Y_\delta^s$ given by

$$\Phi(u) = e^{-(\partial_x^5 + \alpha \partial_x^3)t} g - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t e^{-(\partial_x^5 + \alpha \partial_x^3)(t-t')} \partial_x(u^2) dt'. \quad (3.2)$$

Then we will make use of the following lemmas to show that Φ defines a contraction map on

$$\mathcal{S} := \{u \in Y_\delta^s : \|u\|_{Y_\delta^s} \leq M\}.$$

Lemma 3.2 ([1]). *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$. For any $\delta < 1$, the following estimates hold:*

$$\|e^{-(\partial_x^5 + \alpha \partial_x^3)t} g\|_{Y_\delta^s} \lesssim \|g\|_{H^s}, \quad (3.3)$$

$$\left\| \int_0^t e^{-(\partial_x^5 + \alpha \partial_x^3)(t-t')} F(\cdot, t') dt' \right\|_{Y_\delta^s} \lesssim \|F\|_{Z_\delta^s}. \quad (3.4)$$

Lemma 3.3 ([1]). *Let $s \geq 0$ and $-1/2 < b < b' < 1/2$. For any $\delta < 1$, the following estimates hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{X_\delta^{s, b}} &\lesssim_{b, b'} \delta^{b'-b} \|u\|_{X_\delta^{s, b'}}, \\ \|u\|_{Z_\delta^s} &\lesssim \delta^{1-} \|u\|_{Y_\delta^s}, \\ \|\partial_x(u_1 u_2)\|_{Z_\delta^s} &\lesssim_{\alpha, s} \|u_1\|_{X_\delta^{s, \frac{3}{10}}} \|u_2\|_{X_\delta^{s, \frac{3}{10}}} \end{aligned}$$

where u_1, u_2 are mean-zero functions.

We first show that $\Phi(u) \in Y_\delta^s$ for $u \in Y_\delta^s$. For this, we apply (3.3) and (3.4) to the linear term and the Duhamel term in (3.2) respectively to get

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{-(\partial_x^5 + \alpha \partial_x^3)t} g\|_{Y_\delta^s} &\leq C \|g\|_{H^s}, \\ \left\| \int_0^t e^{-(\partial_x^5 + \alpha \partial_x^3)(t-t')} F(u)(\cdot, t') dt' \right\|_{Y_\delta^s} &\leq C \|\partial_x(u^2)\|_{Z_\delta^s}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Using Lemma 3.3, we bound the right-hand side of (3.5) as

$$C\|\partial_x(u^2)\|_{Z_\delta^s} \leq C\|u\|_{X_\delta^{s, \frac{3}{10}}}^2 \leq C\delta^{\frac{2}{5}-}\|u\|_{X_\delta^{s, \frac{1}{2}-}}^2.$$

Since $\|u\|_{X_\delta^{s, \frac{1}{2}-}} \leq \|u\|_{X_\delta^{s, \frac{1}{2}}} \leq \|u\|_{Y_\delta^s}$, we therefore get

$$\|\Phi(u)\|_{Y_\delta^s} \leq C\|g\|_{H^s} + C\delta^{\frac{2}{5}-}M^2.$$

If we fix $M = 2C\|g\|_{H^s}$ and take δ sufficiently small such that

$$C\delta^{\frac{2}{5}-}M \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (3.6)$$

then we get $\|\Phi(u)\|_{Y_\delta^s} \leq M$.

Next we show that Φ is a contraction on \mathcal{S} . Again using Lemma 3.3, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(u) - \Phi(v)\|_{Y_\delta^s} &\leq C\|\partial_x(u^2 - v^2)\|_{Z_\delta^s} \\ &\leq C\delta^{\frac{2}{5}-}\|u + v\|_{Y_\delta^s}\|u - v\|_{Y_\delta^s} \\ &\leq C\delta^{\frac{2}{5}-}M\|u - v\|_{Y_\delta^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence Φ is a contraction on \mathcal{S} since we are taking δ so that (3.6) holds. Therefore, by the contraction mapping principle, there exists a unique solution $u \in Y_\delta^s$ for given initial data $g \in H^s$ with $s \geq 0$. \square

4. SMOOTHING ESTIMATES: PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.1.

This final section is devoted to proving Proposition 2.1. For the purpose, we first write the equation (1.1) on the Fourier transform side as in (4.2) and substitute $u_k(t) = w_k(t)e^{-i(k^5 - \alpha k^3)t}$. We then use differentiation by parts to drag the phase down from the oscillation arising in this process. This makes it possible to utilize decay from the resulting large denominators. On the other hand, the order of the nonlinearity is increased from quadratic to cubic, but we decompose the related trilinear term into two parts, resonant and nonresonant terms, and use the restricted norm method of Bourgain to control the delicate nonresonant ones.

4.1. Representation of Fourier coefficients of the solution. The following lemma gives an expression of the solution to (1.1) on the Fourier transform side.

Lemma 4.1. *The solution u to (1.1) is represented in the following form:*

$$\begin{aligned} u_k(t) &= e^{-i(k^5 - \alpha k^3)t}g_k + \mathcal{B}(u, u)_k(t) - e^{-i(k^5 - \alpha k^3)t}\mathcal{B}(u, u)_k(0) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t e^{-i(k^5 - \alpha k^3)(t-r)}\rho(u)_k dr + \int_0^t e^{-i(k^5 - \alpha k^3)(t-r)}\sigma(u)_k dr \\ &\quad + \int_0^t e^{-i(k^5 - \alpha k^3)(t-r)}\mathcal{R}(u)_k(r) dr, \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where for $k \neq 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}(\phi, \psi)_k &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} \frac{\phi_{k_1} \psi_{k_2}}{k_1 k_2 \{5(k_1^2 + k_2^2 + k_1 k_2) - 3\alpha\}}, \\ \rho(u)_k &= \frac{i|u_k|^2 u_k}{2(15k^2 - 3\alpha)k}, \quad \sigma(u)_k = -iu_k \sum_{|j| \neq |k|} \frac{|u_j|^2}{j\{5(k^2 - kj + j^2) - 3\alpha\}}, \\ \mathcal{R}(u)_k &= -\frac{i}{2} \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2+k_3=k \\ (k_1+k_2)(k_2+k_3)(k_3+k_1) \neq 0}} \frac{u_{k_1} u_{k_2} u_{k_3}}{k_1 \{5(k_1^2 + (k_2 + k_3)^2 + k_1(k_2 + k_3)) - 3\alpha\}},\end{aligned}$$

and $\mathcal{B}(\phi, \psi)_0 = \rho(u)_0 = \sigma(u)_0 = \mathcal{R}(u)_0 = 0$.

Proof. Applying the Fourier transform to the equation (1.1) implies

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u_k = -ik^5 u_k + i\alpha k^3 u_k - \frac{ik}{2} \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} u_{k_1} u_{k_2}, \\ u_k(0) = g_k. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

Since u satisfies the mean-zero assumption (see Section 1), there are no zero harmonics in this equation. Using the transformation $u_k(t) = w_k(t)e^{-i(k^5 - \alpha k^3)t}$ and the identities

$$\begin{aligned}k_1^3 + k_2^3 &= (k_1 + k_2)^3 - 3k_1 k_2 (k_1 + k_2), \\ k_1^5 + k_2^5 &= (k_1 + k_2)^5 - 5k_1 k_2 (k_1 + k_2)(k_1^2 + k_2^2 + k_1 k_2),\end{aligned}$$

the equation (4.2) can be written in the form

$$\partial_t w_k = -\frac{ik}{2} \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} e^{i\{5(k_1^2+k_2^2+k_1 k_2)-3\alpha\}k_1 k_2 t} w_{k_1} w_{k_2}. \quad (4.3)$$

Using differentiation by parts with $e^{at} = \partial_t(\frac{1}{a}e^{at})$, we then rewrite (4.3) as

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t w_k &= -\partial_t \left(\sum_{k_1+k_2=k} \frac{e^{ik_1 k_2 k \{5(k_1^2+k_2^2+k_1 k_2)-3\alpha\}t} w_{k_1} w_{k_2}}{2k_1 k_2 \{5(k_1^2+k_2^2+k_1 k_2)-3\alpha\}} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} \frac{e^{ik_1 k_2 k \{5(k_1^2+k_2^2+k_1 k_2)-3\alpha\}t} w_{k_1} \partial_t w_{k_2}}{k_1 k_2 \{5(k_1^2+k_2^2+k_1 k_2)-3\alpha\}}.\end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Since $w_0 = 0$, k_1 and k_2 in the sums above are not zero. Now, let us define $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\phi, \psi)_k = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} \frac{e^{ik_1 k_2 k \{5(k_1^2+k_2^2+k_1 k_2)-3\alpha\}t} \phi_{k_1} \psi_{k_2}}{k_1 k_2 \{5(k_1^2+k_2^2+k_1 k_2)-3\alpha\}}.$$

Then we rewrite the equation (4.4) as follows:

$$\partial_t (w - \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(w, w))_k = \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} \frac{e^{ik_1 k_2 k \{5(k_1^2+k_2^2+k_1 k_2)-3\alpha\}t} w_{k_1} \partial_t w_{k_2}}{k_1 k_2 \{5(k_1^2+k_2^2+k_1 k_2)-3\alpha\}}. \quad (4.5)$$

Substituting (4.3) into the sum in (4.5), we see

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} \frac{e^{ik_1k_2k\{5(k_1^2+k_2^2+k_1k_2)-3\alpha\}t} w_{k_1} \partial_t w_{k_2}}{k_1k_2\{5(k_1^2+k_2^2+k_1k_2)-3\alpha\}} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2+k_3=k \\ k_2+k_3 \neq 0}} \frac{e^{it\theta(k_1,k_2,k_3)(k_1+k_2)(k_2+k_3)(k_3+k_1)}}{2k_1\{5(k_1^2+(k_2+k_3)^2+k_1(k_2+k_3))-3\alpha\}} w_{k_1} w_{k_2} w_{k_3}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

where $\theta(k_1, k_2, k_3) = 5(k_1^2 + k_2^2 + k_3^2 + k_1k_2 + k_2k_3 + k_3k_1) - 3\alpha$. Combining (4.5) and (4.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t(w - \tilde{B}(w, w))_k \\ &= -\frac{i}{2} \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2+k_3=k \\ k_2+k_3 \neq 0}} \frac{e^{it\theta(k_1,k_2,k_3)(k_1+k_2)(k_2+k_3)(k_3+k_1)}}{k_1\{5(k_1^2+(k_2+k_3)^2+k_1(k_2+k_3))-3\alpha\}} w_{k_1} w_{k_2} w_{k_3}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Since $\theta(k_1, k_2, k_3) \neq 0$, the set on which the phase vanishes is the disjoint union of the following sets:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \{k_1 + k_2 = 0, k_3 + k_1 = 0, k_2 + k_3 \neq 0\} = \{k_1 = -k, k_2 = k, k_3 = k\}, \\ S_2 &= \{k_1 + k_2 = 0, k_3 + k_1 \neq 0, k_2 + k_3 \neq 0\} = \{k_1 = j, k_2 = -j, k_3 = k, |j| \neq |k|\}, \\ S_3 &= \{k_3 + k_1 = 0, k_1 + k_2 \neq 0, k_2 + k_3 \neq 0\} = \{k_1 = j, k_2 = k, k_3 = -j, |j| \neq |k|\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us define $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(u)_k = -\frac{i}{2} \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2+k_3=k \\ (k_1+k_2)(k_2+k_3)(k_3+k_1) \neq 0}} \frac{e^{it\theta(k_1,k_2,k_3)(k_1+k_2)(k_2+k_3)(k_3+k_1)} u_{k_1} u_{k_2} u_{k_3}}{k_1\{5(k_1^2+(k_2+k_3)^2+k_1(k_2+k_3))-3\alpha\}}.$$

Then (4.7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t(w - \tilde{B}(w, w))_k \\ &= -\frac{i}{2} \sum_{l=1}^3 \sum_{S_l} \frac{w_{k_1} w_{k_2} w_{k_3}}{k_1\{5(k_1^2+(k_2+k_3)^2+k_1(k_2+k_3))-3\alpha\}} + \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(w)_k \\ &= \frac{i|w_k|^2 w_k}{2(15k^2 - 3\alpha)k} - iw_k \sum_{|j| \neq |k|} \frac{|w_j|^2}{j\{5(k^2 - kj + j^2) - 3\alpha\}} + \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(w)_k. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Now, integrating (4.8) from 0 to t , we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_k(t) - w_k(0) &= \tilde{B}(w, w)_k(t) - \tilde{B}(w, w)_k(0) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \rho(w)_k(r) dr + \int_0^t \sigma(w)_k(r) dr + \int_0^t \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(w)_k(r) dr. \end{aligned}$$

Transforming back to the u variable, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u_k(t) - e^{-i(k^5 - \alpha k^3)t} g_k &= \mathcal{B}(u, u)_k(t) - e^{-i(k^5 - \alpha k^3)t} \mathcal{B}(u, u)_k(0) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t e^{-i(k^5 - \alpha k^3)(t-r)} (\rho(u)_k(r) + \sigma(u)_k(r)) dr \\ &\quad + \int_0^t e^{-i(k^5 - \alpha k^3)(t-r)} \mathcal{R}(u)_k(r) dr \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

4.2. Estimates for $\mathcal{B}, \rho, \sigma$ and \mathcal{R} . Now we obtain the following multilinear estimates, Proposition 4.2, which will be used to finish the proof of the smoothing estimates (Proposition 2.1):

Proposition 4.2. *Let $s > -1/2$. For $s_1 \leq s + 3$, we have*

$$\|\mathcal{B}(\phi, \psi)\|_{H^{s_1}} \lesssim_\alpha \|\phi\|_{H^s} \|\psi\|_{H^s}, \quad (4.9)$$

and for $s_1 \leq s + 2$, we have

$$\|\rho(u)\|_{H^{s_1}} \lesssim_\alpha \|u\|_{H^s}^3, \quad \|\sigma(u)\|_{H^{s_1}} \lesssim_\alpha \|u\|_{H^s}^3. \quad (4.10)$$

For $0 \leq s_1 < \min(s + 2, 3s + 2)$ we have

$$\|\mathcal{R}(u)\|_{X_\delta^{s_1, -1/2+\epsilon}} \lesssim_{\alpha, \epsilon} \|u\|_{X_\delta^{s, 1/2}}^3. \quad (4.11)$$

4.2.1. Proof of (4.9). By symmetry, one can restrict the sum in \mathcal{B} to $|k_1| \geq |k_2|$. Since $s > -1/2$ and

$$5(k_1^2 + k_2^2 + k_1 k_2) - 3\alpha \sim_\alpha \left(k_2 + \frac{k_1}{2}\right)^2 + \frac{3k_1^2}{4} \geq k_1^2 \gtrsim k^2,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{B}(\phi, \psi)\|_{H^{s_1}} &\leq \left\| |k|^{s_1} \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2=k \\ |k_1| \geq |k_2|}} \frac{|\phi_{k_1} \psi_{k_2}|}{|5(k_1^2 + k_2^2 + k_1 k_2) - 3\alpha| |k_1 k_2|} \right\|_{l_k^2} \\ &\lesssim_\alpha \left\| \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2=k \\ |k_1| \geq |k_2|}} \frac{|\phi_{k_1}| |k_1|^s |\psi_{k_2}| |k_2|^s |k|^{s_1-s-3}}{|k_2|^{s+1}} \right\|_{l_k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

For $s > -1/2$ and $s_1 \leq s + 3$, by Young's inequality and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality the right-hand side is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2=k \\ |k_1| \geq |k_2|}} \frac{|\phi_{k_1}| |k_1|^s |\psi_{k_2}| |k_2|^s |k|^{s_1-s-3}}{|k_2|^{s+1}} \right\|_{l_k^2} &\leq \left\| \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2=k \\ |k_1| \geq |k_2|}} \frac{|\phi_{k_1}| |k_1|^s |\psi_{k_2}| |k_2|^s}{|k_2|^{s+1}} \right\|_{l_k^2} \\ &\leq \|\phi\|_{H^s} \|k\|_{l_k^2}^s \left\| \frac{|\psi_k| |k|^s}{|k|^{s+1}} \right\|_{l_k^1} \\ &\leq \|\phi\|_{H^s} \|k\|_{l_k^2}^{-s-1} \|\psi\|_{H^s} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{H^s} \|\psi\|_{H^s} \end{aligned}$$

which implies the desired estimate.

4.2.2. *Proof of (4.10).* For $s_1 \leq s + 2$, using the inclusion property for l^p -spaces we obtain the first inequality of (4.10):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho(u)\|_{H^{s_1}} &= \left\| \frac{|u_k|^3 |k|^{3s} |k|^{s_1-3s}}{2|15k^2 - 3\alpha||k|} \right\|_{l_k^2} \lesssim_\alpha \left\| |u_k|^3 |k|^{3s} |k|^{s_1-3s-3} \right\|_{l_k^2} \\ &\leq \| |u_k|^3 |k|^{3s} \|_{l_k^2} = \| |u_k| |k|^s \|_{l_k^6}^3 \leq \|u\|_{H^s}^3. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the left-hand side of the second inequality in (4.10) is bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(u)\|_{H^{s_1}} &\leq \left\| |k|^{s_1-s} |u_k| |k|^s \sum_{|j| \neq |k|} \frac{|u_j|^2 |j|^{2s} |j|^{-2s}}{|j| |5(k^2 - kj + j^2) - 3\alpha|} \right\|_{l_k^2} \\ &\leq \sup_{k, j \neq 0} \frac{|k|^{s_1-s}}{|j|^{2s+1} |5(k^2 - kj + j^2) - 3\alpha|} \|u\|_{H^s} \sum_{|j| \neq |k|} |u_j|^2 |j|^{2s} \\ &\leq \sup_{k, j \neq 0} \frac{|k|^{s_1-s}}{|j|^{2s+1} |5(k^2 - kj + j^2) - 3\alpha|} \|u\|_{H^s}^3. \end{aligned}$$

For the last inequality, we used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. For $s \geq -1/2$ and $s_1 \leq s + 2$,

$$\sup_{k, j \neq 0} \frac{|k|^{s_1-s}}{|j|^{2s+1} |5(k^2 - kj + j^2) - 3\alpha|} \lesssim_\alpha \sup_{k, j \neq 0} \frac{|k|^{s_1-s-2}}{|j|^{2s+1}} \lesssim 1$$

since $k^2 + j^2 - kj = \frac{1}{2}(k^2 + j^2 + (k-j)^2) > \frac{1}{2}k^2$. This completes the proof.

4.2.3. *Proof of (4.11).* It suffices to show the statement with a local-in-time function u . By duality, we prove

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \mathcal{R}(u)(x, t) h(x, t) dx dt \right| &= \left| \sum_{k, m} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}(k, m) \widehat{h}(-k, -m) \right| \lesssim_{\alpha, \epsilon} \|u\|_{X^{s, \frac{1}{2}}}^3 \|h\|_{X^{-s_1, \frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

First, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\widehat{\mathcal{R}}(k, m) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2+k_3=k \\ (k_1+k_2)(k_2+k_3)(k_3+k_1) \neq 0}} \sum_{m_1+m_2+m_3=m} \frac{-i \widehat{u}(k_1, m_1) \widehat{u}(k_2, m_2) \widehat{u}(k_3, m_3)}{2k_1 \{5(k_1^2 + (k_2+k_3)^2 + k_1(k_2+k_3)) - 3\alpha\}}. \end{aligned}$$

We let

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &:= \{(k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) \in \mathbb{Z}^4 : k_1 + k_2 + k_3 + k_4 = 0, (k_1 + k_2)(k_2 + k_3)(k_3 + k_1) \neq 0\}, \\ \Omega &:= \{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) \in \mathbb{Z}^4 : m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + m_4 = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

and set

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(k_i, m_i) &:= |\widehat{u}(k_i, m_i)| |k_i|^s \langle m_i + k_i^5 - \alpha k_i^3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \\ f_4(k, m) &:= |\widehat{h}(k_4, m_4)| |k_4|^{-s_1} \langle m_4 + k_4^5 - \alpha k_4^3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}, \\ \langle m_n + k_n^5 - \alpha k_n^3 \rangle &= \max_{i=1,2,3,4} \langle m_i + k_i^5 - \alpha k_i^3 \rangle, \\ S &:= \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \setminus \{n\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then (4.12) follows from the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\Phi, \Omega} \frac{|k_1 k_2 k_3|^{-s} |k_4|^{s_1} \prod_{i=1}^4 f_i(k_i, m_i)}{|k_1| |5(k_1^2 + (k_2 + k_3)^2 + k_1(k_2 + k_3)) - 3\alpha| \prod_{i=1}^4 \langle m_i + k_i^5 - \alpha k_i^3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}} \\ \lesssim_{\alpha, \epsilon} \prod_{i=1}^4 \|f_i\|. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Now we prove (4.13). Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |5(k_1^2 + k_2^2 + k_3^2 + k_1 k_2 + k_2 k_3 + k_3 k_1) - 3\alpha| \\ \gtrsim_{\alpha} |k_1 + k_2|^2 + |k_2 + k_3|^2 + |k_3 + k_1|^2 \\ \gtrsim (|k_1 + k_2| |k_2 + k_3| |k_3 + k_1|)^{\frac{2}{3}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Together with (4.14), making use of the following two inequalities which will be shown later:

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^4 \langle m_i + k_i^5 - \alpha k_i^3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \\ \gtrsim (|k_1 + k_2| |k_2 + k_3| |k_3 + k_1|)^{\frac{5}{6} - \frac{35}{3}\epsilon} \prod_{i \in S} \langle m_i + k_i^5 - \alpha k_i^3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

and for $0 \leq s_1 < \min(s+2, 3s+2)$ (sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$)

$$\frac{|k_1 k_2 k_3|^{-s} |k_4|^{s_1}}{|k_1| (|k_1 + k_2| |k_2 + k_3| |k_3 + k_1|)^{\frac{3}{2} - \frac{35}{3}\epsilon}} \lesssim |k_1 k_2 k_3 k_4|^{-\epsilon}, \quad (4.16)$$

the left-hand side of (4.13) is bounded by

$$\sum_{\Phi, \Omega} \frac{|k_1 k_2 k_3 k_4|^{-\epsilon} \prod_{i=1}^4 f_i(k_i, m_i)}{\prod_{i \in S} \langle m_i + k_i^5 - \alpha k_i^3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}}. \quad (4.17)$$

We may eliminate $|k_1|^{-\epsilon}$ from (4.17) and then use the following lemma from [1] to bound (4.17):

Lemma 4.3. *For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $b > 1/2$, we have*

$$\|\chi_{[0, \delta]}(t)u\|_{L_{t,x}^6(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T})} \lesssim_{\alpha, \epsilon, b} \|u\|_{X_{\delta}^{\epsilon, b}}.$$

Indeed, by the convolution structure, using Plancherel's theorem and Hölder's inequality as well as Lemma 4.3, (4.17) is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\Phi, \Omega} \frac{|k_2 k_3 k_4|^{-\epsilon} \prod_{i=1}^4 f_i(m_i, k_i)}{\prod_{i \in S} \langle m_i + k_i^5 - \alpha k_i^3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon}} \\ & \leq \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \left| \check{f}_1(x, t) \prod_{i=2}^4 \left(\frac{f_i |k_i|^{-\epsilon}}{\langle m_i + k_i^5 - \alpha k_i^3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon}} \right)^\vee (x, t) \right| dx dt \\ & \leq \|f_1\|_{L^2} \prod_{i=2}^4 \left\| \left(\frac{f_i |k|^{-\epsilon}}{\langle m + k^5 - \alpha k^3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon}} \right)^\vee \right\|_{L^6} \lesssim_{\alpha, \epsilon} \prod_{i=1}^4 \|f_i\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

It remains to prove (4.15) and (4.16), and so we first show (4.15). Using $m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + m_4 = 0$ and $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 + k_4 = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^4 m_i + k_i^5 - \alpha k_i^3 \\ & = -(k_1 + k_2)(k_2 + k_3)(k_3 + k_1) \{5(k_1^2 + k_2^2 + k_3^2 + k_1 k_2 + k_2 k_3 + k_3 k_1) - 3\alpha\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by (4.14)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle m_n + k_n^5 - \alpha k_n^3 \rangle & \gtrsim \sum_{i=1}^4 |m_i + k_i^5 - \alpha k_i^3| \geq \left| \sum_{i=1}^4 m_i + k_i^5 - \alpha k_i^3 \right| \\ & \gtrsim (|k_1 + k_2| |k_2 + k_3| |k_3 + k_1|)^{\frac{5}{3}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

By using (4.18), we then have

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{i=1}^4 \langle m_i + k_i^5 - \alpha k_i^3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon} \\ & = \langle m_n + k_n^5 - \alpha k_n^3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon} \prod_{i \in S} \langle m_i + k_i^5 - \alpha k_i^3 \rangle^{-2\epsilon} \langle m_i + k_i^5 - \alpha k_i^3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon} \\ & \geq \langle m_n + k_n^5 - \alpha k_n^3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - 7\epsilon} \prod_{i \in S} \langle m_i + k_i^5 - \alpha k_i^3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon} \\ & \gtrsim_{\alpha} (|k_1 + k_2| |k_2 + k_3| |k_3 + k_1|)^{\frac{5}{6} - \frac{35}{3}\epsilon} \prod_{i \in S} \langle m_i + k_i^5 - \alpha k_i^3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (4.15).

Finally, we prove (4.16). We first note that

$$|k_1 + k_2| |k_2 + k_3| |k_3 + k_1| \gtrsim |k_i|, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4, \quad (4.19)$$

since $(k_1 + k_2)(k_2 + k_3)(k_3 + k_1) \neq 0$ and $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 + k_4 = 0$. From (4.19), the desired inequality (4.16) follows from

$$\frac{|k_1 k_2 k_3|^{-s} |k_4|^{s_1}}{|k_1| (|k_1 + k_2| |k_2 + k_3| |k_3 + k_1|)^{\frac{3}{2} - \frac{47}{3}\epsilon}} \lesssim 1.$$

Using $|k_1||k_1 + k_2| \gtrsim |k_2|$ and $|k_1||k_1 + k_3||k_2 + k_3| \gtrsim |k_2|$, and by symmetry of k_2, k_3 , we see

$$\begin{aligned} & |k_1|(|k_1 + k_2||k_2 + k_3||k_3 + k_1|)^{\frac{3}{2} - \frac{47}{3}\epsilon} \\ &= |k_1|(|k_1 + k_2||k_2 + k_3||k_3 + k_1|)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{47}{3}\epsilon} |k_1 + k_2||k_2 + k_3||k_3 + k_1| \gtrsim M^{2-47\epsilon} \end{aligned}$$

where $M = \max\{|k_1|, |k_2|, |k_3|\}$. Thus we also see

$$\frac{|k_1 k_2 k_3|^{-s} |k_4|^{s_1}}{|k_1|(|k_1 + k_2||k_2 + k_3||k_3 + k_1|)^{\frac{3}{2} - \frac{47}{3}\epsilon}} \lesssim \frac{|k_1 k_2 k_3|^{-s} |k_4|^{s_1}}{M^{2-47\epsilon}}. \quad (4.20)$$

Since

$$|k_1 k_2 k_3|^{-s} \leq \begin{cases} M^{-s} & \text{if } s \geq 0, \\ M^{-3s} & \text{if } s \leq 0, \end{cases}$$

we have $|k_1 k_2 k_3|^{-s} \leq M^{-\min(s, 3s)}$. Using this, for $0 \leq s_1 < \min(s + 2, 3s + 2)$ and sufficiently small ϵ , the right-hand side of (4.20) is bounded as

$$M^{-\min(s, 3s) + s_1 - 2 + 47\epsilon} \lesssim 1.$$

This completes the proof.

4.3. The last step of the proof. Now we finish the proof of Proposition 2.1. Applying the estimates in Proposition 4.2 to the equation (4.1), we obtain for $s > -\frac{1}{2}$ and $0 \leq s_1 < \min(s + 2, 3s + 2)$

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t) - e^{Lt} g\|_{H^{s_1}} &\lesssim_\alpha \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|g\|_{H^s}^2 + \int_0^t \|u(r)\|_{H^s}^2 dr + \int_0^t \|u(r)\|_{H^s}^3 dr \\ &\quad + \left\| \int_0^t e^{L(t-r)} \mathcal{R}(u)(r) dr \right\|_{H^{s_1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

Now we handle the last term in (4.21) using the embedding

$$X_\delta^{s,b} \subset L_t^\infty H_x^s([0, \delta] \times \mathbb{T}), \quad b > 1/2,$$

and the following lemma from [16]:

Lemma 4.4. *Let $b > 1/2$. Then for any $\delta < 1$,*

$$\left\| \int_0^t e^{L(t-r)} F(r) dr \right\|_{X_\delta^{s,b}} \lesssim_b \|F\|_{X_\delta^{s,b-1}}.$$

For $b > 1/2$ and $t < \delta$ with δ given in Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_0^t e^{L(t-r)} \mathcal{R}(u)(r) dr \right\|_{H^{s_1}} &\leq \left\| \int_0^t e^{L(t-r)} \mathcal{R}(u)(r) dr \right\|_{L_{t \in [0, \delta]}^\infty H_x^{s_1}} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \int_0^t e^{L(t-r)} \mathcal{R}(u)(r) dr \right\|_{X_\delta^{s_1, b}} \\ &\lesssim_b \|\mathcal{R}(u)\|_{X_\delta^{s_1, b-1}} \lesssim_{\alpha, b} \|u\|_{X_\delta^{s, 1/2}}^3. \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

Here we used (4.11) for the last inequality.

Combining (4.21) and (4.22), we see that for $t < \delta$,

$$\|u(t) - e^{Lt}g\|_{H^{s_1}} \lesssim \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|g\|_{H^s}^2 + \int_0^t (\|u(r)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|u(r)\|_{H^s}^3) dr + \|u\|_{X_\delta^{s,1/2}}^3.$$

The implicit constants in the rest of proof depend on $\|g\|_{H^s}$. Now, fix t large. For $r \leq t$, we have $\|u(r)\|_{H^s} \lesssim T(r) \leq T(t)$. Here, without loss of generality, we assume $T(t) \geq 1$. From the local bound (3.1), we see for any $j \leq t/\delta$

$$\|u\|_{X_{[(j-1)\delta, j\delta]}^{s,1/2}} \lesssim \|u((j-1)\delta)\|_{H^s} \lesssim T(t).$$

Consequently, we have that if we choose $\delta \approx T(t)^{-\frac{5}{2}}$

$$\|u(j\delta) - e^{\delta L}u((j-1)\delta)\|_{H^{s_1}} \lesssim T(t)^3.$$

Using this we obtain with $J = t/\delta$

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(J\delta) - e^{J\delta L}g\|_{H^{s_1}} &\leq \sum_{j=1}^J \|e^{(J-j)\delta L}u(j\delta) - e^{(J-j+1)\delta L}u((j-1)\delta)\|_{H^{s_1}} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^J \|u(j\delta) - e^{\delta L}u((j-1)\delta)\|_{H^{s_1}} \\ &\lesssim JT(t)^3 \approx tT(t)^{\frac{11}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. Taking similar steps to above one can easily show the continuity of $u(t) - e^{Lt}g$ in H^{s_1} .

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Ahn, S. Kim and I. Seo, *Global attractor for the weakly damped forced Kawahara equation on the torus*, arXiv:2205.04642
- [2] J. Bergh, and J. Löfström, *Interpolation spaces. An introduction*. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, No. 223. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1976.
- [3] M. V. Berry, *Quantum fractals in boxes*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 29 (1996), 6617–6629.
- [4] M. V. Berry and S. Klein, *Integer, fractional and fractal Talbot effects*, J. Mod. Opt. 43 (1996), 2139–2164
- [5] M. V. Berry, I. Marzoli and W. Schleich, *Quantum carpets, carpets of light*, Phys. World 14 (6) (2001), 39–44.
- [6] J. Bourgain, *Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations. II. The KdV-equation.*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 3 (1993), 209–262.
- [7] G. Chen and P. J. Olver, *Numerical simulation of nonlinear dispersive quantization* Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 34 (2014), no. 3, 991–1008.
- [8] V. Chousionis, M. B. Erdoğan and N. Tzirakis, *Fractal solutions of linear and nonlinear dispersive partial differential equations*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) 110 (2015), 543–564.
- [9] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao, *Sharp Global Well-Posedness for KdV and Modified KdV on \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{T}* , J. Amer. Math. Soc. 16 (2003), 705–749.
- [10] A. Deliu and B. Jawerth, *Geometrical dimension versus smoothness*, Constr. Approx. 8 (1992), 211–222.
- [11] M. B. Erdoğan and N. Tzirakis, *Global smoothing for the periodic KdV evolution*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 2013, 4589–4614.

- [12] M. B. Erdoğan and N. Tzirakis, *Talbot effect for the cubic non-linear Schrödinger equation on the torus*, Math. Res. Lett. 20 (2013), 1081–1090.
- [13] M. B. Erdoğan and N. Tzirakis, *Dispersive partial differential equations*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, 86. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2016.
- [14] M. B. Erdoğan and G. Shakan, *Fractal solutions of dispersive partial differential equations on the torus*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) 25 (2019), Paper No. 11, 26 pp.
- [15] K. Falconer, *Fractal geometry*, Mathematical foundations and applications. Third edition. John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 2014.
- [16] J. Ginibre, Y. Tsutsumi, and G. Velo, *On the Cauchy problem for the Zakharov system*, J. Funct. Anal. 151 (1997), 384–436.
- [17] H. Hirayama, *Local well-posedness for the periodic higher order KdV type equations*, NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. 19 (2012), 677–693.
- [18] J. K. Hunter and J. Scheurle, *Existence of perturbed solitary wave solutions to a model equation for water waves*, Phys. D 32 (1988), 253–268.
- [19] L. Kapitanski and I. Rodnianski, *Does a quantum particle know the time?*, Emerging applications of number theory, IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications 109 (eds D. Hejhal, J. Friedman, M. C. Gutzwiller and A. M. Odlyzko; Springer, New York, 1999), 355–371.
- [20] T. Kato, *Low regularity well-posedness for the periodic Kawahara equation*, Differential Integral Equations 25 (2012), 1011–1036.
- [21] T. Kawahara, *Oscillatory solitary waves in dispersive media*, J. Phys. Soc. Jap. 33 (1972), 260–264.
- [22] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega, *A bilinear estimate with applications to the KdV equation*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 9 (1996), 573–603.
- [23] S. Kichenassamy and P. J. Olver, *Existence and nonexistence of solitary wave solutions to higher-order model evolution equations*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 23 (1992), 1141–1166.
- [24] P. J. Olver, *Dispersive quantization*, Amer. Math. Monthly 117 (2010), 599–610.
- [25] K. I. Oskolkov, *A class of I. M. Vinogradov's series and its applications in harmonic analysis*. Progress in approximation theory (Tampa, FL, 1990), 353–402, Springer Ser. Comput. Math., 19, Springer, New York, 1992.
- [26] L. Rayleigh, *On copying diffraction-gratings, and on some phenomena connected therewith*, Philos. Mag. 11 (1881), 196–205.
- [27] I. Rodnianski, *Fractal solutions of the Schrödinger equation*, Contemp. Math. 255 (2000), 181–187.
- [28] H.-J. Schmeisser and H. Triebel, *Topics in Fourier analysis and function spaces*, A Wiley-Interscience Publication, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1987.
- [29] H. F. Talbot, *Facts relating to optical science. No. IV*, Philos. Mag. 9 (1836), 401–407.
- [30] M. Taylor, *The Schrödinger equation on spheres*, Pacific J. Math. 209 (2003), 145–155.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, KOREA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, SEOUL 02455, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Email address: synkim@kias.re.kr