

# Stability of Big Solitons in a Competitive Power Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation

Jian Zhang , Mengxue Bai \*

*School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China,  
Chengdu 611731, China*

**Abstract:** By introducing and solving two correlative constrained variational problems as well as spectrum analysis, an approach to fix soliton frequency from the prescribed mass for nonlinear Schrödinger equations is found, and an open problem in normalized solutions is answered. Then existence and orbital stability of big solitons depending on frequencies for nonlinear Schrödinger equation with competitive power nonlinearity is proved for the first time. In addition multi-solitons of the equation with different speeds are constructed by stable big solitons.

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2010):** 35Q55; 35J50; 37K40.

**Keywords:** nonlinear Schrödinger equation; variational method; normalized solution; spectrum analysis; stability of soliton

---

\*Corresponding author. E-mail: mengxuebai@163.com

## 1 Introduction

Consider the competitive power nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$i\varphi_t + \Delta\varphi + |\varphi|^{\frac{4}{d}}\varphi - |\varphi|^{p-1}\varphi = 0, \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \quad (1.1)$$

with  $d \geq 2$  and  $1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$ . Here and hereafter we denote  $\frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+} = \infty$  for  $d = 2$  and  $\frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+} = \frac{d+2}{d-2}$  for  $d \geq 3$ . We also denote  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \cdot dx$  by  $\int \cdot dx$ ,  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  by  $L^2$  and  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  by  $H^1$ .

We are interested in solitons  $e^{i\omega t}u(x)$  of (1.1), where  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$  is called frequency of the soliton and  $u(x)$  satisfies the time-independent nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$\Delta u + |u|^{\frac{4}{d}}u - |u|^{p-1}u - \omega u = 0, \quad u \in H^1. \quad (1.2)$$

(1.1) is proposed and studied by many papers, such as Tao, Visan and Zhang [32] for global well-posedness and scattering; Soave [30] for normalized solutions; Le Coz, Martel and Raphaël [20] for minimal mass blow up solutions; Fukaya and Hayashi [12] for instability of solitons et al. Classic results of (1.2) come from Berestycki and Lions [5]; Gidas, Ni and Nirenberg [14]; McLeod [24]; Strauss [31]. A solution of (1.2) satisfying prescribed mass

$$\int |u|^2 dx = m, \quad m > 0 \quad (1.3)$$

is called normalized solution. Besides motivations in mathematical physics, normalized solutions are also of interest in the framework of ergodic Mean Field Games systems [10]. Recent studies on normalized solutions refer to [1, 2, 3, 30] et al. A crucial problem of normalized solutions is whether the mapping from prescribed mass  $m$  to soliton frequency  $\omega$  is injective, which still remains extensively open except for the equation with single power nonlinearity (see [7]). And this problem is also crucial for stability of solitons depending on frequencies instead of mass (see [15, 16, 30, 38]).

According to Berestycki and Lions [5] as well as McLeod [24], Fukuizumi [13] and Kawano [18] got that (1.2) possesses a unique positive radial solution  $Q_\omega(x)$  if and only if  $\omega \in (0, \omega_p)$ , where

$$\omega_p = \frac{2(p-1-4/d)}{(2+4/d)(p-1)} \left[ \frac{(p+1)4/d}{(2+4/d)(p-1)} \right]^{(4/d)/(p-1-4/d)}. \quad (1.4)$$

From Weinstein [35] and Kwong [19], the nonlinear scalar field equation

$$\Delta u + |u|^{\frac{4}{d}}u - u = 0, \quad u \in H^1 \quad (1.5)$$

possesses a unique positive radial solution denoted by  $q$ . The Hamilton functional related to (1.1) is that

$$E(u) = \int |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{d}} \int |u|^{2+\frac{4}{d}} dx + \frac{2}{p+1} \int |u|^{p+1} dx, \quad (1.6)$$

where  $u \in H^1$ . For  $u \in H^1$ , the Pohozaev functional related to (1.2) is that

$$I(u) = 2 \int |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{2d}{d+2} \int |u|^{2+\frac{4}{d}} dx + \frac{p-1}{p+1} d \int |u|^{p+1} dx. \quad (1.7)$$

For  $\int q^2 dx < m < \infty$ , we set the Cazenave-Lions type constrained variational problem (see [7])

$$d_m = \inf_{\{u \in H^1, \int |u|^2 dx = m\}} E(u). \quad (1.8)$$

We will prove that (1.8) possesses a minimizer  $Q_m \in H^1$ . Moreover there exists a Lagrange multiplier  $\omega_m \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $Q_m$  is the unique positive radial solution of (1.2) with  $\omega = \omega_m$ . Therefore we can define

$$\omega_q = \inf \{ \omega \in \mathbb{R} \mid \int Q_\omega^2 dx > \int q^2 dx \}. \quad (1.9)$$

and show that  $0 \leq \omega_q < \omega_p$ , where  $Q_\omega$  is the positive radial solution of (1.2). Now for  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$  and  $\int q^2 dx < m < \infty$ , we introduce the following constrained variational problem

$$d_\omega = \inf_{\{u \in H^1, \int q^2 dx < \int |u|^2 dx \leq m, I(u)=0\}} [E(u) + \omega \int |u|^2 dx]. \quad (1.10)$$

(1.10) is a multi-constrained variational problem. We can prove that (1.10) is solvable. (1.10) with (1.8) provides a new correlative variational framework, by which we can fix frequency from the prescribed mass for nonlinear Schrödinger equations. Combining with spectral analysis, we claim the following theorem.

**Theorem A.** A one-to-one mapping between  $m \in (\int q^2 dx, \infty)$  and  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$  is determined by  $m = \int Q_\omega^2 dx$ , where  $Q_\omega$  is the unique positive solution of (1.2) with  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ . Moreover for  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ ,

$$\frac{dm}{d\omega} = \frac{d}{d\omega} \int Q_\omega^2 dx > 0. \quad (1.11)$$

We see that Theorem A establishes a one-to-one mapping from prescribed mass to frequency in normalized solutions. The approach introduced in the present paper can be used to deal with more nonlinear Schrödinger equations, such as general double power nonlinear Schrödinger equations (see [20] and [30]), nonlinear Hartree equations (see [7]), nonlinear Schrödinger equations with potentials (see [2], [38] and [39] ) et al. We provide an approach to answer the aforementioned open problem in normalized solutions.

In the proof of Theorem A, we synchronously get stability of solitons depending on frequencies.

**Theorem B.** For  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ , there exists a big soliton  $e^{i\omega t} Q_\omega(x)$  of (1.1) satisfying  $\int Q_\omega^2(x) dx > \int q^2 dx$ , where  $Q_\omega$  is the unique positive solution of (1.2). Moreover the big soliton  $e^{i\omega t} Q_\omega(x)$  with  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$  is orbitally stable.

Since the stable soliton  $e^{i\omega t} Q_\omega(x)$  in Theorem B satisfies  $\int Q_\omega^2(x) dx > \int q^2 dx$ , we call it big soliton of (1.1). We see that Theorem A may directly deduce Theorem B ([15]). But indeed the proof of Theorem A in the present paper depends on Theorem B. Stability of solitons is a crucial topic in understanding the dynamics of nonlinear dispersive evolution equations [34]. We recall general nonlinear

Schrödinger equation

$$i\varphi_t + \Delta\varphi + f(|\varphi|^2)\varphi = 0. \quad (1.12)$$

When  $f(|\varphi|^2)\varphi = |\varphi|^{p-1}\varphi$  with  $1 + \frac{4}{d} \leq p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)_+}$ , that is mass critical or supercritical nonlinear case, the soliton  $e^{i\omega t}u(x)$  with  $\omega > 0$  is unstable to blow up (see [4], [35]). When  $f(|\varphi|^2)\varphi = |\varphi|^{p-1}\varphi$  with  $1 < p < 1 + \frac{4}{d}$ , that is mass subcritical nonlinear case, the soliton  $e^{i\omega t}u(x)$  with  $\omega > 0$  is orbitally stable (see [7]). When (1.12) has no scaling invariance, it becomes very difficult to prove stability of solitons depending on frequencies ([15], [16]). In this case, for  $f(|\varphi|^2)\varphi$  subject to mass subcritical nonlinearity, Weinstein [37] proved stability of solitons depending on frequencies by spectrum analysis. In Theorem B, for  $f(|\varphi|^2)\varphi$  subject to mass critical and supercritical nonlinearity, we get existence and stability of big solitons depending on frequencies by the new correlative variational framework introduced in the present paper. It is known that stability is substantially sought in global dynamics of nonlinear Schrödinger equations (see [26, 29]).

From Theorem B, in terms of the bootstrap argument and compactness method introduced by Martel, Merle and Tsai (see [22], [23] and [25]), we construct multi-solitons of (1.1) by stable big solitons.

**Theorem C.** For  $K \geq 2$  and  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ , taking  $\omega_k \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ ,  $\gamma_k \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $v_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $v_k \neq v_{k'}$  to  $k \neq k'$  and

$$R_k(t, x) = Q_{\omega_k}(x - x_k - v_k t) e^{i(\frac{1}{2}v_k x - \frac{1}{4}|v_k|^2 t + \omega_k t + \gamma_k)}, \quad (1.13)$$

there exists a solution  $\varphi(t, x)$  of (1.1) such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|\varphi(t) - \sum_{k=1}^K R_k(t)\|_{H^1} = 0. \quad (1.14)$$

The solution  $\varphi(t, x)$  of (1.1) holding (1.14) is called multi-soliton of (1.1).

Multi-solitons are concerned with the famous soliton resolution conjecture [34]. According to stability of solitons obtained in [7] and [37], Martel and Merle constructed multi-solitons with different speeds for (1.12) to mass subcritical nonlinearity and  $f(|\varphi|^2)\varphi$  subject to mass subcritical nonlinearity. Merle [25], Côte, Martel and Merle [11] constructed multi-solitons with different speeds by unstable solitons for (1.12) subject to mass critical and supercritical nonlinearities. Côte and Le Coz [9] constructed high speed excited multi-solitons of (1.12) by unstable solitons. In Theorem C, we get multi-solitons with different speeds constructed by stable big solitons for  $f(|\varphi|^2)\varphi$  subject to mass critical and supercritical nonlinearities. Soliton resolution conjecture remains still open for nonlinear Schrödinger equations, which depends on stability of multi-solitons of (1.12) (see [23]). In general, multi-solitons constructed by unstable solitons are unstable (see [9]). Thus, the existence of multi-solitons constructed by stable solitons is the first step to realize soliton resolution conjecture.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we show global well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for (1.1) in the energy space as well as the sufficient and necessary conditions for (1.2) to possess a unique positive radial solution. In section 3, we introduce and solve two correlative constrained variational problems. In section 4, we prove orbital stability of big solitons of (1.1) depending on frequencies and complete the proofs of Theorem A and Theorem B. In section 5, we construct multi-solitons with different speeds of (1.1) by stable big solitons.

## 2 Well-Posedness

For  $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ , we impose the initial data of (1.1) as follows.

$$\varphi(t_0, x) = \varphi_0(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad d \geq 2. \quad (2.1)$$

In  $H^1$ , we define the energy functional

$$E(\varphi) := \int |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx - \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{d}} \int |\varphi|^{2 + \frac{4}{d}} dx + \frac{2}{p+1} \int |\varphi|^{p+1} dx; \quad (2.2)$$

the mass functional

$$M(\varphi) := \int |\varphi|^2 dx; \quad (2.3)$$

the momentum functional

$$P(\varphi) := \text{Im} \int \bar{\varphi} \nabla \varphi dx. \quad (2.4)$$

**Theorem 2.1.** Let  $d \geq 2$ ,  $1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$  and  $\varphi_0 \in H^1$ . Then the Cauchy problem (1.1)-(2.1) possesses a unique global solution  $\varphi(t, x) \in C(\mathbb{R}, H^1)$  with mass conservation  $M(\varphi) = M(\varphi_0)$ , energy conservation  $E(\varphi) = E(\varphi_0)$  and momentum conservation  $P(\varphi) = P(\varphi_0)$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Proof.** By [6], for  $\varphi_0 \in H^1$ , there exists a unique solution  $\varphi(t, x)$  of the Cauchy problem (1.1)-(2.1) in  $C((-T, T); H^1)$  to some  $T > 0$  (maximal existence time). And  $\varphi(t, \cdot)$  satisfies mass conservation  $M(\varphi) = M(\varphi_0)$ , energy conservation  $E(\varphi) = E(\varphi_0)$  and momentum conservation  $P(\varphi) = P(\varphi_0)$  for all  $t \in (-T, T)$ . Furthermore one has the alternatives:  $T = \infty$  (global existence) or else  $T < \infty$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} = \infty$  (blow up).

Since  $1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$ , from the interpolation inequality for  $\varphi \in H^1$ , there exists  $0 < \theta < 1$  such that  $\frac{1}{2 + \frac{4}{d}} = \frac{\theta}{p+1} + \frac{1-\theta}{2}$  and

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^{2 + \frac{4}{d}}} \leq \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^{1-\theta} \cdot \|\varphi\|_{L^{p+1}}^\theta. \quad (2.5)$$

By Young inequality, it follows that for arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a number  $C(\varepsilon, p, \|\varphi\|_{L^2}) > 0$  depending on  $\varepsilon$ ,  $p$  and  $\|\varphi\|_{L^2}$  such that

$$\frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{d}} \int |\varphi|^{2 + \frac{4}{d}} dx \leq C(\varepsilon, p, \|\varphi\|_{L^2}) + \varepsilon \int |\varphi|^{p+1} dx. \quad (2.6)$$

Take  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{2}{p+1}$ , we have that there exists a number  $C(\varepsilon, d, p, \|\varphi\|_{L^2}) > 0$  depending on  $\varepsilon, d, p$  and  $\|\varphi\|_{L^2}$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} E(\varphi) &= \int |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx - \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{d}} \int |\varphi|^{2 + \frac{4}{d}} dx + \frac{2}{p+1} \int |\varphi|^{p+1} dx \\ &\geq \int |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx - C(\varepsilon, d, p, \|\varphi\|_{L^2}) + \left(\frac{2}{p+1} - \varepsilon\right) \int |\varphi|^{p+1} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

From mass and energy conservations, it follows that

$$\int |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx \leq E(\varphi_0) + C(\varepsilon, d, p, \|\varphi_0\|_{L^2}), \quad (2.8)$$

where  $C(\varepsilon, d, p, \|\varphi_0\|_{L^2})$  is a positive constant number depending on  $\varepsilon, d, p$  and  $\|\varphi_0\|_{L^2}$ . It yields that  $\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2}$  is bounded for  $t \in (-T, T)$  with any  $T < \infty$ . Therefore we get that  $\varphi(t, x)$  globally exists in  $t \in (-\infty, \infty)$ . Moreover, mass conservation, energy conservation and momentum conservation are true to all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

This proves Theorem 2.1.

By Weinstein [35] and Kwong [19], we state the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.2.** (1.5) possesses a unique positive radial solution  $q = q(x)$ . Moreover for  $d \geq 2$  and  $\phi \in H^1$ , one has that

$$\int |\phi|^{2 + \frac{4}{d}} dx \leq \frac{2+d}{d} \left(\int q^2 dx\right)^{-\frac{2}{d}} \left(\int |\nabla \phi|^2 dx\right) \left(\int |\phi|^2 dx\right)^{\frac{2}{d}}. \quad (2.9)$$

**Theorem 2.3.** Let  $d \geq 2, 1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$ . Then the necessary conditions for the nonlinear elliptic equation

$$\Delta u - \omega u + u|u|^{\frac{4}{d}} - u|u|^{p-1} = 0, \quad u \in H^1 \quad (2.10)$$

to possess non-trivial solutions are  $\omega > 0$  and  $\int |u|^2 dx > \int q^2 dx$ , where  $q$  is the unique positive radial solution of (1.5) and  $u$  is the non-trivial solution of (2.10).

**Proof.** Let  $u(x)$  be a non-trivial solution of (2.10). From the Pohozaev's identity (see [27]), we have that

$$\int \left(\frac{2d}{p+1} + 2 - d\right) |\nabla u|^2 + \left(\frac{d}{1 + \frac{2}{d}} - \frac{2d}{p+1}\right) |u|^{2 + \frac{4}{d}} + \left(\frac{2d}{p+1} - d\right) \omega |u|^2 dx = 0, \quad (2.11)$$

$$2 \int |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{2d}{d+2} \int |u|^{2+\frac{4}{d}} dx + \frac{(p-1)d}{p+1} \int |u|^{p+1} dx = 0. \quad (2.12)$$

Since  $d \geq 2$ ,  $1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$ , from (2.11) it follows  $\omega > 0$ . By (2.9) and (2.12), it follows that  $\int |u|^2 dx > \int q^2 dx$ .

This proves Theorem 2.3.

According to Gidas, Ni and Nirenberg [14], every positive solution of (2.10) is radially symmetric. From Berestycki and Lions [5], a positive radial solutions of (2.10) exists if and only if  $\omega > 0$  and there exists  $\zeta > 0$  such that

$$\int_0^\zeta (|s|^{\frac{4}{d}} s - |s|^{p-1} s - \omega s) ds > 0. \quad (2.13)$$

Then by Fukuizumi [13], Kawano [18] claims the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let  $d \geq 2$  and  $1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$ . Then (2.10) possesses a unique positive radial solution  $Q_\omega(x)$  if and only if  $\omega \in (0, \omega_p)$ , where  $\omega_p$  is defined as (1.4).

By uniqueness and decay estimates of the positive radial solutions (see [24] and [5]), we state the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.5.** Let  $\omega > 0$ ,  $d \geq 2$  and  $1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$ . If (2.10) possesses a positive radial solution  $Q_\omega(x)$ , then  $Q_\omega(x)$  has to be unique. Moreover  $Q_\omega(x)$  has exponential decay property for some positive constant  $C$ :

$$|\nabla Q_\omega(x)| + |Q_\omega(x)| \leq C e^{-\frac{\sqrt{\omega}}{2}|x|}. \quad (2.14)$$

### 3 Correlative Variational Framework

At first, we state a lemma on the Schwartz symmetric rearrangement (see [21]).

**Lemma 3.1.** For  $\phi \in H^1$ , let  $\phi^*$  be the Schwartz symmetrization of  $\phi$ . Then for  $d \geq 2$  and  $1 < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$ , one has that  $\phi^* \geq 0$ , a.e. in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ;  $\phi^*(x)$  is radially

symmetric; no-increasing and  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \phi^*(x) \rightarrow 0$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ; in addition,

$$\int |\nabla \phi^*|^2 dx \leq \int |\nabla \phi|^2 dx; \quad \int |\phi^*|^2 dx = \int |\phi|^2 dx; \quad (3.1)$$

$$\int |\phi^*|^{p+1} dx = \int |\phi|^{p+1} dx. \quad (3.2)$$

Then we state the radial compactness Lemma by Strauss [31].

**Lemma 3.2.** Put  $H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^d) = \{\phi(x) \in H^1, \phi(x) = \phi(|x|)\}$ . Then for  $d \geq 2$  and  $1 < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$ , the embedding  $H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is compact.

Now, we solve the following constrained variational problem.

**Theorem 3.3.** For  $d \geq 2$ ,  $1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$  and  $\int q^2 dx < m < \infty$ , where  $q$  is the unique positive radial solution of (1.5), we set the constrained variational problem

$$d_m := \inf_{\{u \in H^1, \int |u|^2 dx = m\}} E(u). \quad (3.3)$$

Then (3.3) possesses a positive minimizer  $Q_m \in H^1$ . Moreover there exists a unique  $\omega_m > 0$  such that  $Q_m$  is the unique positive radial solution of (2.10) with  $\omega = \omega_m$ .

**Proof.** Since

$$\int q^2 dx < \int |u|^2 dx = m < \infty, \quad (3.4)$$

With  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{2}{p+1}$ , from (2.7) it follows that

$$E(u) \geq -C(\varepsilon, d, p, \|u\|_{L^2}) > -\infty. \quad (3.5)$$

Then from (3.3)

$$d_m > -\infty. \quad (3.6)$$

Taking  $\mu = \frac{m}{\int q^2 dx}$ , from (3.4),  $\mu > 1$ . Let  $u(x) = \mu q$ . Then from (1.5) and (2.2)

$$E(u) = \mu^2(1 - \mu^2) \int |\nabla q|^2 dx + \frac{2}{p+1} \mu^{p+1} \int |q|^{p+1} dx. \quad (3.7)$$

Now, let  $Q(x) = \lambda^{\frac{d}{2}} \mu q(\lambda x)$ . Then there exists  $0 < \lambda \ll 1$  such that  $\int |Q|^2 dx = m$  and  $E(Q) < 0$  since  $\mu > 1$ . Therefore from (3.3),  $d_m < 0$ . Combining with (3.6), we have that

$$-\infty < d_m < 0. \quad (3.8)$$

Then we can take a minimizing sequence  $\{u_n \in H^1\}$  of the constrained variational problem (3.3) such that  $\int |u_n|^2 dx = m$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(u_n) = d_m. \quad (3.9)$$

Let  $u_n^*$  be the Schwartz symmetrization of  $u_n$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . By (2.2), (3.3) and Lemma 3.1, it follows that  $u_n^* \geq 0$ , a.e. in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\int |u_n^*|^2 dx = m$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(u_n^*) \leq d_m. \quad (3.10)$$

From (2.7), (3.4) and (3.6), it follows that a subsequence of  $\{u_n^*\}$  still denoted by  $\{u_n^*\}$  is a bounded sequence in  $H^1$ . Thus there exists a weak convergence subsequence of  $\{u_n^*\}$  still denoted by  $\{u_n^*\}$  such that as  $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$u_n^* \rightharpoonup v \text{ in } H^1, \quad u_n^*(x) \rightarrow v(x) \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.11)$$

From Lemma 3.2 it follows that

$$u_n^* \rightarrow v \text{ in } L^{2+\frac{4}{d}}(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (3.12)$$

By weak lower semi-continuity, we obtain that

$$\int |v|^2 dx \leq m, \quad E(v) \leq d_m. \quad (3.13)$$

(3.8) and (3.13) derive that  $E(v) < 0$ . It follows that  $v \not\equiv 0$ . Now let  $v_\lambda = v(\lambda x)$  for  $0 < \lambda < \infty$ , then

$$\int |v_\lambda|^2 dx = \lambda^{-d} \int |v|^2 dx, \quad (3.14)$$

$$E(v_\lambda) = \lambda^{2-d} \int |\nabla v|^2 dx - \lambda^{-d} \int \left( \frac{d}{d+2} |v|^{2+\frac{4}{d}} - \frac{2}{p+1} |v|^{p+1} \right) dx. \quad (3.15)$$

Since (3.13) and (3.14), there exists a  $\lambda_0 \in (0, 1]$  such that

$$\int |v_{\lambda_0}|^2 dx = m. \quad (3.16)$$

From  $E(v) < 0$  and  $\lambda_0 \in (0, 1]$ , (3.15) derives that

$$E(v_{\lambda_0}) \leq E(v) \leq d_m. \quad (3.17)$$

By (3.3) and (3.16), we have  $E(v_{\lambda_0}) \geq d_m$ . Then we deduce that  $\lambda_0 = 1$  and

$$\int |v|^2 dx = m, \quad E(v) = d_m. \quad (3.18)$$

Thus  $v(x)$  is a minimizer of (3.3). Put  $Q_m(x) = |v(x)|$ . Then  $Q_m(x) \geq 0$  is still a minimizer of (3.3). In terms of (3.3), there exists a unique Lagrange multiplier  $\omega_m \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $Q_m$  has to satisfy the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} [E(Q_m + \varepsilon\eta) + \omega_m \int |Q_m + \varepsilon\eta|^2 dx - m\omega_m] = 0, \quad \eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (3.19)$$

It follows that  $Q_m$  satisfies nonlinear elliptic equation (2.10) with  $\omega = \omega_m$ . Since  $Q_m(x) = |v(x)| \geq 0$  a.e in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , by the strong maximum principle we get that  $Q_m(x) = |v(x)| > 0$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Thus  $Q_m(x) = |v(x)|$  is a positive minimizer of (3.3). By Theorem 2.3, the Lagrange multiplier  $\omega_m > 0$ . From Lemma 2.5,  $Q_m$  is the unique positive radial solution of (2.10) with  $\omega = \omega_m$ .

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.3.

**Theorem 3.4.** Let  $q$  be the unique positive radial solution of (1.5) and  $Q_\omega$  be the positive radial solutions of (2.10). Define

$$\mu_q = \left\{ \omega \in \mathbb{R} \mid \int Q_\omega^2 dx > \int q^2 dx \right\}. \quad (3.20)$$

Then  $\mu_q$  is not empty. Moreover  $0 \leq \omega_q = \inf \mu_q < \omega_p$ .

**Proof.** By Theorem 3.3, the Lagrange multiplier  $\omega_m \in \mu_q$ . It follows that  $\mu_q$  is not empty. Then (1.9) and Lemma 2.4 deduce that  $0 \leq \omega_q = \inf \mu_q < \omega_p$ .

This proves Theorem 3.4.

**Theorem 3.5.** For  $\int q^2 dx < m < \infty$ , (3.3) has a unique positive radial minimizer  $Q_m \in H^1$ . Moreover the set of all solutions of (3.3) is  $S_m = \{e^{i\theta} Q_m(\cdot + y), \theta \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ . In addition, for arbitrary  $u \in S_m$ , there exists a unique  $\omega = \omega_m > 0$  such that  $\varphi(t, x) = e^{i\omega_m t} u(x)$  is a soliton of (1.1).

**Proof.** From Theorem 3.3, (3.3) has a positive radial minimizer  $Q_m \in H^1$ . Now suppose that  $v \in H^1$  is an arbitrary solution of (3.3). Let  $v = v^1 + iv^2$ , where  $v^1, v^2 \in H^1$  are real-valued. Then  $\tilde{v} = |v^1| + i|v^2|$  is still a solution of (3.3). Thus there exists a unique  $\omega_m > 0$  such that  $v$  and  $\tilde{v}$  satisfy (2.10). Then for  $j = 1, 2$ ,

$$\Delta v^j + |v|^{\frac{4}{d}} v^j - |v|^{p-1} v^j = \omega_m v^j \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (3.21)$$

$$\Delta |v^j| + |v|^{\frac{4}{d}} |v^j| - |v|^{p-1} |v^j| = \omega_m |v^j| \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.22)$$

This shows that  $\omega_m$  is the first eigenvalue of the operator  $\Delta + |v|^{\frac{4}{d}} - |v|^{p-1}$  acting over  $H^1$  and thus  $v^1, v^2, |v^1|$  and  $|v^2|$  are all multiples of a positive normalized eigenfunction  $v_0$  of  $\Delta + |v|^{\frac{4}{d}} - |v|^{p-1}$ , i.e.

$$\Delta v_0 + |v|^{\frac{4}{d}} v_0 - |v|^{p-1} v_0 = \omega_m v_0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \quad (3.23)$$

with

$$v_0 \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap H^1, \quad v_0 > 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \quad \text{and} \quad \int |v_0|^2 dx = m. \quad (3.24)$$

It is now obvious to deduce that:  $v = e^{i\theta} v_0$  for some  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$  and that  $v_0$  is still a solution of (3.3). In terms of Theorem 3.3,  $v_0$  is the unique positive radial solution of (2.10) for the above  $\omega = \omega_m$ . It follows that  $v_0 = Q_m(\cdot + y)$  for some  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Thus  $v = e^{i\theta} Q_m(\cdot + y)$  for some  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ . It is obvious that for any  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$e^{i\theta}Q_m(\cdot + y)$  is also a solution of (3.3). Therefore

$$S_m = \{e^{i\theta}Q_m(\cdot + y), \theta \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \quad (3.25)$$

is the set of all solutions of (3.3). Moreover for arbitrary  $u \in S_m$ , there exists a unique  $\omega = \omega_m > 0$  such that  $u$  is a solution of (2.10), which turns out that  $\varphi(t, x) = e^{i\omega_m t}u(x)$  is a soliton solution of (1.1).

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.5.

**Lemma 3.6.** For  $d \geq 2$ ,  $1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$  and  $u \in H^1 \setminus \{0\}$ , define the functional

$$I(u) = 2 \int |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{2d}{d+2} \int |u|^{2+\frac{4}{d}} dx + \frac{p-1}{p+1} d \int |u|^{p+1} dx. \quad (3.26)$$

For  $\lambda > 0$ , let  $u_\lambda = \lambda^{\frac{d}{2}} u(\lambda x)$ . Then to  $\omega > 0$ , we have that

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} [E(u_\lambda) + \omega \int |u_\lambda|^2 dx] = \frac{1}{\lambda} I(u_\lambda). \quad (3.27)$$

In addition  $E(u_\lambda) + \omega \int |u_\lambda|^2 dx$  attains the minimum at  $\lambda_0$  satisfying  $I(u_{\lambda_0}) = 0$ .

Moreover if  $u$  is a solution of (2.10), one has that  $I(u) = 0$ .

**Proof.** By a direct calculation, it is shown that (3.27) is true. In addition  $E(u_\lambda) + \omega \int |u_\lambda|^2 dx$  attains the minimum at  $\lambda_0$  satisfying  $I(u_{\lambda_0}) = 0$ . Moreover if  $u$  is a solution of (2.10), from (2.12), it follows that  $I(u) = 0$ .

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.6.

Now we introduce and solve the following correlative constrained variational problem.

**Theorem 3.7.** For  $d \geq 2$ ,  $1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$ ,  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$  and  $\int q^2 dx < m < \infty$ , we set the constrained variational problem

$$d_\omega = \inf_{\{u \in H^1, \int q^2 dx < \int |u|^2 dx \leq m, I(u)=0\}} [E(u) + \omega \int |u|^2 dx], \quad (3.28)$$

where  $\omega_p$  is defined as (1.4) and  $\omega_q$  is defined as (1.9). Then (3.28) possesses a positive minimizer  $Q_\omega \in H^1$ . Moreover  $Q_\omega$  is the unique positive radial solution of (2.10).

**Proof.** In the following we complete this proof by five steps.

Step 1.  $\{u \in H^1, \int q^2 dx < \int |u|^2 dx \leq m, I(u) = 0\}$  is not empty.

Since  $\int q^2 dx < m < \infty$ , from Theorem 3.3 it follows that there exists a positive minimizer  $Q_m(x) \in H^1$  such that  $\int Q_m(x)^2 dx = m$  and  $Q_m(x)$  satisfies (2.10) with  $\omega = \omega_m \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ . By Lemma 3.6 it follows that  $I(Q_m) = 0$ . Thus  $Q_m \in \{u \in H^1, \int q^2 dx < \int |u|^2 dx \leq m, I(u) = 0\}$ . Therefore the set  $\{u \in H^1, \int q^2 dx < \int |Q_m(x)|^2 dx \leq m, I(u) = 0\}$  is not empty.

Step 2.  $d_\omega > -\infty$ .

For  $\int q^2 dx < m < \infty$ , take  $u \in H^1$  satisfying  $I(u) = 0$  and  $\int q^2 dx < \int |u|^2 dx \leq m$ . For  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ , from (2.7)

$$\begin{aligned} E(u) + \omega \int |u|^2 dx &= \int |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{d}{d+2} \int |u|^{2+\frac{4}{d}} dx + \frac{2}{p+1} \int |u|^{p+1} dx + \omega \int |u|^2 dx \\ &\geq \int |\nabla u|^2 dx - C(\varepsilon, d, p, \|u\|_{L^2}) + \left(\frac{2}{p+1} - \varepsilon\right) \int |u|^{p+1} dx + \omega \int |u|^2 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

Taking  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{2}{p+1}$ , since  $\int q^2 dx < \int |u|^2 dx \leq m$ , by (3.29) we have that

$$E(u) + \omega \int |u|^2 dx \geq -C(\varepsilon, d, p, m) = \text{constant} > -\infty. \quad (3.30)$$

Therefore we deduce that  $d_\omega > -\infty$ .

Step 3. Minimizing sequence is bounded in  $H^1$ .

Let  $\{u_n\} \subset H^1$  be a minimizing sequence of (3.28). Then for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $I(u_n) = 0$ ,  $\int q^2 dx < \int |u_n(x)|^2 dx \leq m$  and

$$E(u_n) + \omega \int |u_n|^2 dx \rightarrow d_\omega, n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.31)$$

By (3.29) and (3.31), for  $n$  large enough we have that

$$\int |\nabla u_n|^2 dx < d_\omega + 1 + C(\varepsilon, d, p, m). \quad (3.32)$$

Combining with  $\int q^2 dx < \int |u_n(x)|^2 dx \leq m$ , we deduce that  $\{u_n\}$  is bounded in  $H^1$ .

Step 4. Existence of minimizer.

For a minimizing sequence  $\{u_n\}$  of (3.28), let  $u_n^*$  be the Schwartz symmetrization of  $u_n$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . By Lemma 3.1,  $u_n^* \geq 0$ , a.e. in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\{u_n^*\}$  is also bounded in  $H^1$ . In addition, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\int q^2 dx < \int (u_n^*)^2 dx \leq m$ ,

$$I(u_n^*) \leq 0, \quad E(u_n^*) + \omega \int (u_n^*)^2 dx \leq E(u_n) + \omega \int |u_n|^2 dx. \quad (3.33)$$

Moreover there exists a weak convergence subsequence of  $\{u_n^*\}$  stills denoted by  $\{u_n^*\}$  such that

$$u_n^* \rightharpoonup v \text{ in } H^1, \quad u_n^*(x) \rightarrow v(x) \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.34)$$

From Lemma 3.2, it follows that

$$u_n^* \rightarrow v \text{ in } L^{2+\frac{4}{d}}(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (3.35)$$

Applying weak lower semi-continuity, by (3.33), (3.34) and (3.35) we deduce that

$$\int |v|^2 dx \leq m, \quad I(v) \leq 0, \quad E(v) + \omega \int |v|^2 dx \leq d_\omega. \quad (3.36)$$

Now we claim that  $v \not\equiv 0$ .

Otherwise, (3.34) derives that

$$u_n^* \rightharpoonup 0 \text{ in } H^1, n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.37)$$

By (3.37), it deduces that

$$\int (u_n^*)^2 dx \rightarrow 0, n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.38)$$

This is contradictory with  $\int q^2 dx < \int (u_n^*)^2 dx = \int |u_n|^2 dx \leq m$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Now let  $v_\lambda = \lambda^{\frac{d}{2}} v(\lambda x)$  for  $\lambda > 0$ . By  $I(v) \leq 0$ , there exists  $\lambda_0 > 0$  such that  $I(v_{\lambda_0}) = 0$ . From Lemma 3.6, we have that

$$E(v_{\lambda_0}) + \omega \int |v_{\lambda_0}|^2 dx \leq E(v) + \omega \int |v|^2 dx. \quad (3.39)$$

On the other hand, by  $I(v_{\lambda_0}) = 0$ , (3.26) and Lemma 2.2 derive that

$$\int |v_{\lambda_0}|^2 dx > \int q^2 dx. \quad (3.40)$$

Combining with  $\int |v_{\lambda_0}|^2 dx = \int |v|^2 dx$ , it follows that

$$\int q^2 dx < \int |v_{\lambda_0}|^2 dx \leq m. \quad (3.41)$$

Therefore (3.28) derives that

$$d_\omega \leq E(v_{\lambda_0}) + \omega \int |v_{\lambda_0}|^2 dx. \quad (3.42)$$

Thus (3.36), (3.39) and (3.42) yield that

$$E(v) + \omega \int |v|^2 dx = E(v_{\lambda_0}) + \omega \int |v_{\lambda_0}|^2 dx = d_\omega. \quad (3.43)$$

It follows that  $\lambda_0 = 1$ . Therefore we conclude that

$$I(v) = 0, \quad E(v) + \omega \int |v|^2 dx = d_\omega. \quad (3.44)$$

Combining with (3.41), we get that  $v = v_{\lambda_0}$  with  $\lambda_0 = 1$  satisfies  $\int q^2 dx < \int |v|^2 dx \leq m$ . Thus  $v(x)$  is a minimizer of (3.28). Put  $Q_\omega(x) = |v(x)|$ . Then it is clear that  $Q_\omega(x)$  is still a minimizer of (3.28).

Step 5.  $Q_\omega(x)$  is the positive solution of (2.10).

In terms of (3.28), there exists a unique  $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $Q_\omega(x)$  satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation for  $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} [E(Q_\omega + \varepsilon\eta) + \omega \int |Q_\omega + \varepsilon\eta|^2 dx + \Lambda I(Q_\omega + \varepsilon\eta)] = 0. \quad (3.45)$$

It follows that

$$-\Delta Q_\omega - Q_\omega^{1+\frac{4}{d}} + Q_\omega^p + \omega Q_\omega + \Lambda[-2\Delta Q_\omega - 2Q_\omega^{1+\frac{4}{d}} + \frac{d}{2}(p-1)Q_\omega^p] = 0. \quad (3.46)$$

From (3.46), we have that

$$\int [1 + 2\Lambda] |\nabla Q_\omega|^2 + [-1 - 2\Lambda] Q_\omega^{2+\frac{4}{d}} + [1 + \frac{d}{2}\Lambda(p-1)] Q_\omega^{p+1} + \omega Q_\omega^2 dx = 0; \quad (3.47)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int \frac{d-2}{2}(1+2\Lambda)|\nabla Q_\omega|^2 - [1+2\Lambda]\frac{d^2}{d+4}Q_\omega^{2+\frac{4}{d}} \\ + [1+\frac{d}{2}\Lambda(p-1)]\frac{d}{p+1}Q_\omega^{p+1} + \frac{d}{2}\omega Q_\omega^2 dx = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.48)$$

By  $I(Q_\omega) = 0$ , (3.47) and (3.48), we have that

$$\Lambda \int -\frac{p-1}{p+1}[(p-1)d-4]|Q_\omega|^{p+1} dx = 0. \quad (3.49)$$

Since  $1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$  and  $Q_\omega(x) \not\equiv 0$ , we have  $\Lambda = 0$ .

From (3.46),  $Q_\omega(x) \geq 0$  is a solution of (2.10). Using the strong maximum principle we get that  $Q_\omega(x) > 0$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . In terms of Lemma 2.5,  $Q_\omega(x) = |v(x)|$  is the unique positive radial solution of (2.10). It turns that  $Q_\omega(x)$  is a positive minimizer of (3.28).

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.7.

**Theorem 3.8.** The variational problem (3.3) determines a one-to-one mapping between  $m \in (\int q^2 dx, \infty)$  and  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ . In detail, for  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$  and  $m = \int Q_\omega^2 dx$  with positive solution  $Q_\omega(x)$  of (2.10), one has that  $\frac{dm}{d\omega} = \frac{d}{d\omega} \int Q_\omega^2 dx \neq 0$ .

**Proof.** For arbitrary  $m \in (\int q^2 dx, \infty)$ , in terms of Theorem 3.3, the variational problem (3.3) determines a positive  $Q_m(x) \in H^1$  and a unique  $\omega_m$  satisfying (2.10) with  $\int Q_m^2 dx = m$ . By Lemma 2.4 and Theorem 3.4,  $\omega_m \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ .

Now suppose that there exists another  $\omega' \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$  such that  $\omega' \neq \omega_m$  and  $\int Q_{\omega'}^2 dx = m$  for the positive solution  $Q_{\omega'}(x)$  of (2.10) with  $\omega = \omega'$ . By Lemma 2.4,  $Q_{\omega'}(x) > 0$  is unique for (2.10) with  $\omega = \omega'$ . In addition,  $\omega' \neq \omega_m$  leads that  $Q_{\omega'}(x) \neq Q_m(x)$ . From Theorem 3.5,  $Q_{\omega'}(x)$  is not a minimizer of (3.3) since  $Q_m$  is the unique positive minimizer of (3.3). On the other hand, according to Theorem 3.7, that  $Q_{\omega'}(x)$  is the unique positive solution of (2.10) with  $\omega = \omega'$  derives that  $Q_{\omega'}(x)$  has to be the unique positive minimizer of the variational problem (3.28) with  $\omega = \omega'$ . We see that  $Q_m$  satisfies (2.10) with  $\omega = \omega_m$  and  $Q_{\omega'}$  satisfies (2.10) with  $\omega = \omega'$ . By Lemma 3.6, it follows that  $I(Q_m) = 0 = I(Q_{\omega'})$ .

Summarizing the above facts, we get that

$$\int Q_{\omega'}^2 dx = \int Q_m^2 dx = m; \quad (3.50)$$

$$I(Q_{\omega'}) = I(Q_m) = 0; \quad (3.51)$$

$$Q_m \text{ is the minimizer of (3.3);} \quad (3.52)$$

$$Q_{\omega'} \text{ is the minimizer of (3.28) with } \omega = \omega'. \quad (3.53)$$

Since  $Q_{\omega'}$  is not a minimizer of (3.3), by (3.50) and (3.52), Theorem 3.3 derives

$$E(Q_m) < E(Q_{\omega'}). \quad (3.54)$$

By (3.50), (3.51) and (3.53), Theorem 3.7 derives that

$$E(Q_{\omega'}) + \omega' \int Q_{\omega'}^2 dx \leq E(Q_m) + \omega' \int Q_m^2 dx. \quad (3.55)$$

From (3.50), it is clear that (3.54) is contradictory with (3.55). Therefore it is necessary that  $\omega_m = \omega'$ .

On the other hand, for arbitrary  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ , by Lemma 2.4 and Theorem 3.4, there exists a unique positive solution  $Q_\omega(x)$  of (2.10) such that  $\int Q_\omega^2 dx = m \in (\int q^2 dx, +\infty)$ . Therefore the variational problem (3.3) determines a one-to-one mapping between  $m \in (\int q^2 dx, +\infty)$  and  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ . It turns that for  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$  and the positive solution  $Q_\omega(x)$  of (2.10), we have that  $\frac{dm}{d\omega} = \frac{d}{d\omega} \int Q_\omega^2 dx \neq 0$ .

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.8.

**Theorem 3.9.** Let  $\mu$  be the set of all Lagrange multipliers corresponding to the all positive minimizers of (3.3). Then  $\mu = (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ , where  $\omega_p$  and  $\omega_q$  are defined as (1.4) and (1.9) respectively. In addition  $\mu_q = (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ , where  $\mu_q$  is defined as (3.20).

**Proof.** Theorem 3.4 derives that  $\mu \subset \mu_q \subset (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ . Now suppose that  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ . By Theorem 3.8, this  $\omega$  determines a unique  $m \in (\int q^2 dx, \infty)$ , and this  $m$  determines a unique  $\omega_m \in \mu$ . Then this  $\omega_m$  can only be  $\omega$ , that is  $\omega_m = \omega$ . Thus  $(\omega_q, \omega_p) \subset \mu$ . Therefore  $\mu = (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ . It follows that  $\mu = (\omega_q, \omega_p) = \mu_q$ .

This proves Theorem 3.9.

**Remark 3.10.** Theorem 3.8 shows that for  $\int q^2 dx < m < \infty$ , the normalized solution problem (2.10) with  $\int |u|^2 dx = m$  possesses a unique  $\omega_m \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$  such that  $Q_m$  is the unique positive solution of (2.10) with  $\omega = \omega_m$ . It gives a positive answer that for (2.10), the mapping from the prescribed mass  $m$  to the Lagrange multiplier, that is the soliton frequency  $\omega$  is injective. Moreover the approach introduced here can be used to deal with more nonlinear Schrödinger equations.

## 4 Orbital Stability of Big Solitons

We prove a new compactness theorem as follows.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let  $\{u_n\}$  be a minimizing sequence of (3.3). Then there exists a subsequence of  $\{u_n\}$ , still denoted by  $\{u_n\}$  such that  $u_n \rightarrow u$  in  $H^1$ .

**Proof.** By Theorem 3.3, one has that

$$\int |u_n|^2 dx = m, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}; \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(u_n) = d_m. \quad (4.1)$$

From (2.7) and (4.1), it yields that  $\{u_n\}$  is a bounded sequence in  $H^1$ . It follows that there exists a weak convergence subsequence of  $\{u_n\}$  still denoted by  $\{u_n\}$  such that as  $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$u_n \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } H^1, \quad u_n \rightarrow u(x) \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4.2)$$

Let  $u_n^*$  be the Schwartz symmetrization of  $u_n$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $u^*$  be the Schwartz

symmetrization of  $u$ . Now we claim that

$$u_n^*(x) \rightarrow u^*(x), \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4.3)$$

In fact, we take  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $u_n(x) \rightarrow u(x)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Then for arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for  $n > N$ ,  $|u_n(x) - u(x)| < \varepsilon$ . From [21],

$$\begin{aligned} |u_n^*(x) - u^*(x)| &= \left| \int_0^\infty \chi_{\{|u_n| > \tau\}}^*(x) d\tau - \int_0^\infty \chi_{\{|u| > \tau\}}^*(x) d\tau \right| \\ &= \left| \int_0^\infty [\chi_{\{|u_n| > \tau\}}^*(x) - \chi_{\{|u| > \tau\}}^*(x)] d\tau \right| \leq \int_0^\infty \chi_{\{|u_n| - |u| > \tau\}}^*(x) d\tau \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty \chi_{\{|u_n - u| > \tau\}}^*(x) d\tau \leq \int_0^\varepsilon 1 d\tau = \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $u_n^*(x) \rightarrow u^*(x)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Thus from (4.2), we get (4.3).

By Lemma 3.1,  $\{u_n^*\}$  is a bounded sequence in  $H^1$ . It follows that there exists a weak convergence subsequence of  $\{u_n^*\}$  still denoted by  $\{u_n^*\}$  such that

$$u_n^* \rightharpoonup v \text{ in } H^1, \quad u_n^* \rightarrow v(x), \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4.4)$$

By (4.3) and (4.4), we have that

$$u^*(x) = v(x), \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4.5)$$

It is clear that  $\{u_n^*\}$  is a minimizing sequence of (3.3), that is

$$\int |u_n^*|^2 dx = m, \quad E(u_n^*) \rightarrow d_m. \quad (4.6)$$

In terms of the proof of Theorem 3.3, by (4.4), (4.5), (4.6) and (3.18), we have that

$$\int |u^*|^2 dx = m, \quad E(u^*) = d_m. \quad (4.7)$$

From (4.4) and (4.5), Lemma 3.2 derives that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int |u_n^*|^{2+\frac{4}{d}} dx = \int |u^*|^{2+\frac{4}{d}} dx, \quad (4.8)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int |u_n^*|^{p+1} dx = \int |u^*|^{p+1} dx. \quad (4.9)$$

From (4.6), (4.7), (4.8) and (4.9), we deduce that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int |\nabla u_n^*|^2 dx = \int |\nabla u^*|^2 dx. \quad (4.10)$$

By Lemma 3.1, (4.1) and (4.7), we deduce that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int |\nabla u_n|^2 dx = \int |\nabla u^*|^2 dx. \quad (4.11)$$

From (4.2),

$$\int |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int |\nabla u_n|^2 dx. \quad (4.12)$$

Thus, (4.11), (4.12) and Lemma 3.1 conclude that

$$\int |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq \int |\nabla u^*|^2 dx \leq \int |\nabla u|^2 dx. \quad (4.13)$$

It follows that

$$\int |\nabla u|^2 dx = \int |\nabla u^*|^2 dx. \quad (4.14)$$

(4.11) and (4.14) derive that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int |\nabla u_n|^2 dx = \int |\nabla u|^2 dx. \quad (4.15)$$

By (4.1), (4.6), Lemma 3.1 and (4.15), it follows that

$$\|u_n\|_{H^1} \rightarrow \|u\|_{H^1}, \quad u \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.16)$$

Then, by (4.2) and (4.16), we deduce that

$$u_n \rightarrow u \text{ in } H^1.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 4.1.

**Theorem 4.2** The soliton  $e^{i\omega t}u(x)$  in Theorem 3.5 holds the orbital stability, i.e.:

for arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $\varphi_0 \in H^1$ , if

$$\inf_{\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R}^d\}} \|\varphi_0(\cdot) - e^{i\theta} u(\cdot + y)\|_{H^1} < \delta, \quad (4.17)$$

then the solution  $\varphi(t, x)$  of the Cauchy problem (1.1)-(2.1) satisfies

$$\inf_{\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R}^d\}} \|\varphi(t, \cdot) - e^{i\theta} u(\cdot + y)\|_{H^1} < \varepsilon, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.18)$$

**Proof.** By Theorem 3.5, it is clear that for arbitrary  $u \in S_m$  one has that

$$S_m = \{e^{i\theta} u(\cdot + y), \theta \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R}^d\}. \quad (4.19)$$

In terms of Theorem 2.1, for  $\varphi_0 \in H^1$  satisfying  $\int |\varphi_0|^2 dx = m > \int q^2 dx$ , the Cauchy problem (1.1)-(2.1) possesses a unique global solution  $\varphi(t, x) \in C(\mathbb{R}, H^1)$  with the mass conservation

$$\int |\varphi|^2 dx = \int |\varphi_0|^2 dx = m > \int q^2 dx.$$

and energy conservation  $E(\varphi) = E(\varphi_0)$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Now arguing by contradiction.

If the conclusion of Theorem 4.2 does not hold, then there exist  $\varepsilon > 0$ , a sequence  $(\varphi_0^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+}$  such that

$$\inf_{\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R}^d\}} \|\varphi_0^n - e^{i\theta} u(\cdot + y)\|_{H^1} < \frac{1}{n}, \quad (4.20)$$

and a sequence  $(t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+}$  such that

$$\inf_{\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R}^d\}} \|\varphi_n(t_n, \cdot) - e^{i\theta} u(\cdot + y)\|_{H^1} \geq \varepsilon, \quad (4.21)$$

where  $\varphi_n$  denotes the solution of the Cauchy problem (1.1)-(2.1) with initial datum  $\varphi_0^n$ . From (4.20) we yield that

$$\int |\varphi_0^n|^2 dx \rightarrow \int |u|^2 dx = m, \quad (4.22)$$

$$E(\varphi_0^n) \rightarrow E(u) = d_m. \quad (4.23)$$

Thus (4.22), (4.23) and the conservations of the mass and the energy derive that  $(\varphi_n(t_n, \cdot))_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+}$  is a minimizing sequence for the problem (3.3). Therefore Theorem 4.1, (4.22) and (4.23) derive that, there exists  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\varphi_n(t_n, \cdot) - e^{i\theta} u(\cdot + y)\|_{H^1} = 0. \quad (4.24)$$

This is contradictory with (4.21). Thus Theorem 4.2 is proved.

**Theorem 4.3.** Let  $\omega \in (0, \omega_p)$  and  $Q_\omega$  be a positive radial solution of (2.10). Then we have

$$\frac{d}{d\omega}E(Q_\omega) = -\omega \frac{d}{d\omega}M(Q_\omega) = -\omega \frac{d}{d\omega} \int Q_\omega^2 dx. \quad (4.25)$$

**Proof.** Since  $Q_\omega$  is a positive solution of (2.10), it follows that

$$\Delta Q_\omega + Q_\omega^{\frac{4}{d}+1} - Q_\omega^p - \omega Q_\omega = 0, \quad Q_\omega \in H^1. \quad (4.26)$$

From (2.2) and (4.26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\omega}E(Q_\omega) &= \frac{d}{d\omega} \left( \int |\nabla Q_\omega|^2 - \frac{1}{1+2/d} |Q_\omega|^{\frac{4}{d}+2} dx + \frac{2}{p+1} |Q_\omega|^{p+1} dx \right) \\ &= \int 2|\nabla Q_\omega| \frac{d}{d\omega} |\nabla Q_\omega| - 2Q_\omega^{\frac{4}{d}+1} \frac{d}{d\omega} Q_\omega + 2Q_\omega^p \frac{d}{d\omega} Q_\omega dx \\ &= \int -2\Delta Q_\omega \frac{d}{d\omega} Q_\omega - 2Q_\omega^{\frac{4}{d}+1} \frac{d}{d\omega} Q_\omega + 2Q_\omega^p \frac{d}{d\omega} Q_\omega dx \\ &= \int -2\omega Q_\omega \frac{d}{d\omega} Q_\omega dx = -\omega \int \frac{d}{d\omega} Q_\omega^2 dx = -\omega \frac{d}{d\omega} \int Q_\omega^2 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

Noting (2.3), this proves (4.25).

Let  $\omega \in (0, \omega_p)$  and  $Q_\omega(x)$  be the unique positive solution of (2.10). We set the scalar

$$D(\omega) = E(Q_\omega) + \omega M(Q_\omega) \quad (4.28)$$

and the linearized operator of (4.26)

$$H_\omega = -\Delta + \omega - \left(1 + \frac{4}{d}\right) Q_\omega^{\frac{4}{d}} + p Q_\omega^{p-1}. \quad (4.29)$$

It is clear that

$$H_\omega = \frac{1}{2} E''(Q_\omega) + \frac{1}{2} \omega M''(Q_\omega). \quad (4.30)$$

**Theorem 4.4.** Let  $\omega \in (0, \omega_p)$  and  $Q_\omega(x)$  be the unique positive solution of (2.10). Then the operator  $H_\omega$  has one negative simple eigenvalue and has its kernel spanned by  $iQ_\omega$ . Moreover the positive spectrum of  $H_\omega$  is bounded away from zero.

**Proof.** Since  $\omega \in (0, \omega_p)$ , By Lemma 2.4, there exists a unique positive radial function  $Q_\omega(x)$  satisfying (4.26). Now suppose that  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfies  $H_\omega Q_\omega = \lambda Q_\omega$ , that is

$$-\Delta Q_\omega + \omega Q_\omega - (1 + \frac{4}{d})Q_\omega^{\frac{4}{d}+1} + pQ_\omega^p = \lambda Q_\omega. \quad (4.31)$$

From (4.26), it follows that

$$-\frac{4}{d}Q_\omega^{\frac{4}{d}} + (p-1)Q_\omega^{p-1} = \lambda. \quad (4.32)$$

From Lemma 2.5,  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} Q_\omega(x) = 0$ . Thus by  $p > 1 + \frac{4}{d}$ , (4.32) yields that  $\lambda < 0$ .

Moreover by (4.32), we can uniquely determine  $\lambda$  as follows

$$\lambda = \lambda_- = [\int -\frac{4}{d}Q_\omega^{\frac{4}{d}+2} + (p-1)Q_\omega^{p+1} dx] / \int Q_\omega^2 dx. \quad (4.33)$$

Therefore we get that  $H_\omega$  has one negative simple eigenvalue  $\lambda_-$ . It follows that  $H_\omega(iQ_\omega) = \lambda_-(iQ_\omega)$ . From the uniqueness of  $Q_\omega$  we get that the kernel is spanned by  $iQ_\omega$ .

Now suppose that  $\lambda > 0$  and  $u \in H^1 \setminus \{0\}$  satisfying  $H_\omega u = \lambda u$ , that is

$$-\Delta u + \omega u - (1 + \frac{4}{d})Q_\omega^{\frac{4}{d}}u + pQ_\omega^{p-1}u = \lambda u. \quad (4.34)$$

By Lemma 2.5,

$$-(1 + \frac{4}{d})Q_\omega^{\frac{4}{d}} + pQ_\omega^{p-1} := g(x) = o(|x|^{-1}). \quad (4.35)$$

From Kato [17],  $-\Delta + g(x)$  has no positive eigenvalues. Thus (4.34) derives that  $\lambda \leq \omega$ . By Weyl's theorem on the essential spectrum, the rest of the spectrum of  $H_\omega$  is bounded away from zero (see [28]).

This proves Theorem 4.4.

By Theorem 4.4,  $H_\omega$  with  $T'(0) = i$  satisfies Assumption 3 in [15] for  $\omega \in (0, \omega_p)$ .

With  $J = -i$ ,  $X = H^1$  and  $E$  defined as (2.2), by Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 2.4,

(1.1) satisfies Assumption 1 and 2 in [15] for  $\omega \in (0, \omega_p)$ . Thus we can use Theorem 4.7 in [15] and get the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.5.** Let  $\omega \in (0, \omega_p)$  and  $Q_\omega(x)$  be the unique positive solution of (2.10).

If  $D''(\omega) = \frac{d^2}{d\omega^2}D(\omega) < 0$ , then the soliton  $e^{i\omega t}Q_\omega(x)$  of (1.1) is unstable.

Therefore we get the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.6.** Let  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$  and  $Q_\omega(x)$  be the unique positive solution of (2.10). Then we have that

$$\frac{d}{d\omega} \int Q_\omega^2 dx > 0. \quad (4.36)$$

**Proof.** From Theorem 4.3 and (4.28), we have that

$$D''(\omega) = \frac{d}{d\omega} \int Q_\omega^2 dx. \quad (4.37)$$

Since  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ , from Theorem 3.9 it follows that  $\omega \in \mu$ . In terms of Theorem 4.2, the soliton  $e^{i\omega t}Q_\omega(x)$  holds the orbital stability. By Lemma 4.5, we deduce that  $D''(\omega) \geq 0$ . From (4.37) it follows that  $\frac{d}{d\omega} \int Q_\omega^2 dx \geq 0$ . Set  $m(\omega) = \int Q_\omega^2 dx$ . From  $\omega \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ , Theorem 3.8 deduces that  $\frac{d}{d\omega} \int Q_\omega^2 dx = \frac{dm}{d\omega} \neq 0$ . Therefore we get that  $\frac{d}{d\omega} \int Q_\omega^2 dx > 0$ .

This proves Theorem 4.6.

**Proof of Theorem A.** Theorem 3.8 and Theorem 4.6 deduce that Theorem A is true.

**Proof of Theorem B.** By Theorem 3.3 and Theorem 4.2, it follows that Theorem B is true. On the other hand, Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.6 also deduce that Theorem B is true.

## 5 Construction of Multi-Solitons

It is clear that (1.1) admits the following symmetries.

Time-space translation invariance: if  $\varphi(t, x)$  satisfies (1.1), then for any  $(t_0, x_0) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\psi(t, x) = \varphi(t - t_0, x - x_0) \quad (5.1)$$

also satisfies (1.1).

Phase invariance: if  $\varphi(t, x)$  satisfies (1.1), then for any  $\gamma_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\psi(t, x) = \varphi(t, x)e^{i\gamma_0} \quad (5.2)$$

also satisfies (1.1).

Galilean invariance: if  $\varphi(t, x)$  satisfies (1.1), then for any  $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\psi(t, x) = \varphi(t, x - v_0 t)e^{i(\frac{1}{2}v_0 x - \frac{1}{4}|v_0|^2 t)} \quad (5.3)$$

also satisfies (1.1).

Let  $d \geq 2$ ,  $1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$ ,  $\omega_p$  defined by (1.4) and  $\omega_q$  defined by (1.9). For  $K \geq 2$  and  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ , we take  $\omega_k^0 \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ ,  $\gamma_k^0 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $x_k^0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $v_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $v_k \neq v_{k'}$  to  $k \neq k'$ . By Theorem B,

$$e^{i\omega_k^0 t} Q_{\omega_k^0}(x), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K \quad (5.4)$$

are the stable solitons of (1.1). Then in terms of the above symmetries, for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ ,

$$R_k(t, x) = Q_{\omega_k^0}(x - x_k^0 - v_k t)e^{i(\frac{1}{2}v_k x - \frac{1}{4}|v_k|^2 t + \omega_k^0 t + \gamma_k^0)}, \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \quad (5.5)$$

are also the solitons of (1.1).

Now we set

$$R(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K R_k(t, \cdot), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (5.6)$$

At first we state the main theorem in this section, that is the existence of multi-solitons of (1.1).

**Theorem 5.1.** Let  $d \geq 2$ ,  $1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$ . For  $K \geq 2$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , taking  $\omega_k^0 \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ ,  $\gamma_k^0 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $x_k^0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $v_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $v_k \neq v_{k'}$  to  $k \neq k'$  and

$$R_k(t, x) = Q_{\omega_k^0}(x - x_k^0 - v_k t) e^{i(\frac{1}{2}v_k x - \frac{1}{4}|v_k|^2 t + \omega_k^0 t + \gamma_k^0)} \quad (5.7)$$

with  $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , there exists a solution  $\varphi(t, x)$  of (1.1) such that

$$\forall t \geq 0, \|\varphi(t) - \sum_{k=1}^K R_k(t)\|_{H^1} \leq C e^{-\theta_0 t} \quad (5.8)$$

for some  $\theta_0 > 0$  and  $C > 0$ .

**Proof of Theorem C.** Theorem 5.1 directly deduces that Theorem C is true.

In the following, according to Martel, Merle and Tsai's way (see [22] and [23]), we prove Theorem 5.1.

Let  $T_n > 0$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n = +\infty$ . For  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , by Theorem 2.1, we can let  $\varphi_n$  be the unique global solution in  $H^1$  for the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t \varphi_n + \Delta \varphi_n + |\varphi_n|^{\frac{4}{d}} \varphi_n - |\varphi_n|^{p-1} \varphi_n = 0, & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \varphi_n(T_n, x) = R(T_n). \end{cases} \quad (5.9)$$

We first state the following claim.

**Claim 5.2.** (Claim 1 in [22]) Let  $\{v_k\}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$  be  $K$  vectors of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that for any  $k \neq k'$ ,  $v_k \neq v_{k'}$ . Then, there exists an orthonormal basis  $(e_1, \dots, e_d)$  of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that for any  $k \neq k'$ ,  $(v_k, e_1) \neq (v_{k'}, e_1)$ .

Without any restriction, we can assume that the direction  $e_1$  given by Claim 5.2 is  $x_1$ , since (1.1) is invariant by rotation. Therefore, we may assume that for any  $k \neq k'$ ,  $v_{k,1} \neq v_{k',1}$ . We suppose in fact that

$$v_{1,1} < v_{2,1} < \dots < v_{K,1}. \quad (5.10)$$

Since  $\omega_k^0 \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$  with  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , we can set  $\theta_0 > 0$  such that

$$\sqrt{\theta_0} = \frac{1}{16} \min\{v_{2,1} - v_{1,1}, \dots, v_{K,1} - v_{K-1,1}, \sqrt{\omega_1^0}, \dots, \sqrt{\omega_K^0}\}. \quad (5.11)$$

Now we state the following uniform estimates about the sequence  $\{\varphi_n\}$  in (5.9), which is the key point of the proof of Theorem 5.1.

**Proposition 5.3.** There exist  $T_0 > 0, C_0 > 0$  and  $\theta_0 > 0$  such that for all  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\forall t \in [T_0, T_n], \quad \|\varphi_n(t) - R(t)\|_{H^1} \leq C_0 e^{-\theta_0 t}. \quad (5.12)$$

By Proposition 5.3, the sequence  $\{\varphi_n\}$  has the following global bounded property.

**Lemma 5.4.** There exists a constant number  $C > 0$  such that for any  $t \in [T_0, T_n]$  and all  $n \geq 1$ ,  $\|\varphi_n(t)\|_{H^1} \leq C$ .

**Proof.** It is clear that  $\|R(t)\|_{H^1}$  is uniformly bounded by (5.6). From Proposition 5.3, we obtain the consequence directly.

Now we claim a strong compactness result in  $L^2$ .

**Claim 5.5.** (Claim 9 in [9]) Take  $\epsilon_0 > 0$ . There exists  $K_0 = K_0(\epsilon_0) > 0$  such that for all  $n$  large enough, we have

$$\int_{|x| > K_0} |\varphi_n(T_0, x)|^2 dx \leq \epsilon_0. \quad (5.13)$$

**Lemma 5.6.** There exists  $\psi_0 \in H^1$  such that up to a subsequence

$$\varphi_n(T_0) \rightarrow \psi_0 \text{ in } H^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty \quad (5.14)$$

for any  $0 \leq s < 1$ .

**Proof.** By Lemma 5.4, there exists  $\psi_0 \in H^1$  such that up to a subsequence,

$$\varphi_n(T_0) \rightharpoonup \psi_0 \text{ in } H^1 \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (5.15)$$

From Claim 5.5, it follows that

$$\varphi_n(T_0) \rightarrow \psi_0 \text{ in } L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (5.16)$$

We conclude that

$$\varphi_n(T_0) \rightarrow \psi_0 \text{ in } L^2 \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (5.17)$$

By interpolation we get (5.14).

This proves Lemma 5.6.

In terms of the uniform estimates Proposition 5.3 and the compactness result Lemma 5.6, we prove Theorem 5.1.

**Proof of Theorem 5.1.** Let  $\psi_0$  be given by Lemma 5.6. From  $1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$ , there exists  $0 < \sigma < 1$  such that  $1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < 1 + \frac{4}{d-2\sigma}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} & |(|z_1|^{\frac{4}{d}} z_1 - |z_1|^{p-1} z_1) - (|z_2|^{\frac{4}{d}} z_2 - |z_2|^{p-1} z_2)| \\ & \leq C(1 + |z_1|^{p-1} + |z_2|^{p-1})|z_1 - z_2| \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

for all  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ . This implies that the Cauchy problem of (1.1) with  $\varphi(T_0, x) = \psi_0$  is well-posed in  $H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^d)$  (see Theorem 5.1.1 in [6], also refer to [8] and [33]). Then we let  $\varphi(t, x) \in C([T_0, T], H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^d))$  be the corresponding maximal solution of (1.1) with  $\varphi(T_0, x) = \psi_0$ . Combining with Lemma 5.6, we can obtain

$$\varphi_n(t) \rightarrow \varphi(t) \text{ in } H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty$$

for any  $t \in [T_0, T)$ . By boundedness of  $\varphi_n(t)$  in  $H^1$ , we also have

$$\varphi_n(t) \rightharpoonup \varphi(t) \text{ in } H^1 \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty$$

for any  $t \in [T_0, T)$ . By Proposition 5.3, for any  $t \in [T_0, T)$ , we have

$$\|\varphi(t) - R(t)\|_{H^1} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\varphi_n(t) - R(t)\|_{H^1} \leq C_0 e^{-\theta_0 t}. \quad (5.19)$$

In particular, since  $R(t)$  is bounded in  $H^1$ , there exists  $C > 0$  such that for any  $t \in [T_0, T)$  we have

$$\|\varphi(t)\|_{H^1} \leq C_0 e^{-\theta_0 t} + \|R(t)\|_{H^1} \leq C. \quad (5.20)$$

Recall that, by the blow up alternative (see [6]), either  $T = +\infty$  or  $T < +\infty$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \|\varphi(t)\|_{H^1} = +\infty$ . Therefore (5.20) implies that  $T = +\infty$ . From (5.19) we

infer that for all  $t \in [T_0, +\infty)$  we have

$$\|\varphi(t) - R(t)\|_{H^1} \leq C_0 e^{-\theta_0 t}.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 5.1.

The proof of the uniform estimates Proposition 5.3 relies on a bootstrap argument. We first state the following bootstrap result.

**Proposition 5.7.** There exist  $A_0 > 0, \theta_0 > 0, T_0 > 0$  and  $N_0 > 0$  such that for all  $n \geq N_0$  and  $t^* \in [T_0, T_n]$ , if

$$\forall t \in [t^*, T_n], \quad \|\varphi_n(t) - R(t)\|_{H^1} \leq A_0 e^{-\theta_0 t}, \quad (5.21)$$

then

$$\forall t \in [t^*, T_n], \quad \|\varphi_n(t) - R(t)\|_{H^1} \leq \frac{A_0}{2} e^{-\theta_0 t}. \quad (5.22)$$

By Proposition 5.7, we deduce the uniform estimates Proposition 5.3.

**Proof of Proposition 5.3.**(Proposition 1 in [22]) Let  $t^*$  be the minimal time such that (5.21) holds:

$$t^* = \min\{\tau \in [T_0, T_n]; (5.21) \text{ holds for all } t \in [\tau, T_n]\}.$$

We prove by contradiction that  $t^* = T_0$ . Indeed, assume that  $t^* > T_0$ . Then

$$\|\varphi_n(t^*) - R(t^*)\|_{H^1} \leq A_0 e^{-\theta_0 t^*},$$

and by Proposition 5.7 we can improve this estimate in

$$\|\varphi_n(t^*) - R(t^*)\|_{H^1} \leq \frac{A_0}{2} e^{-\theta_0 t^*}.$$

Hence, by continuity of  $\varphi_n(t)$  in  $H^1$ , there exists  $T_0 \leq t^{**} < t^*$  such that (5.21) holds for all  $t \in [t^{**}, t^*]$ . This contradicts the minimality of  $t^*$ .

This completes the proof of Proposition 5.3.

Now we begin to prove Proposition 5.7 by a series of lemmas.

For  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , let  $\omega_k(t) \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$  and  $Q_{\omega_k(t)}(x)$  be the unique positive radial solutions of (2.10). To  $x_k^0, x_k(t), v_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\gamma_k(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , we set  $\tilde{x}_k(t) = x_k^0 + v_k t + x_k(t)$ ,  $\delta_k(t) = -\frac{1}{4}|v_k|^2 t + \omega_k^0 t + \gamma_k(t)$ ,

$$\tilde{R}_k(t) = Q_{\omega_k(t)}(\cdot - \tilde{x}_k(t))e^{i(\frac{1}{2}v_k x + \delta_k(t))}, \quad (5.23)$$

$$\tilde{R}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{R}_k(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon(t, \cdot) = \varphi_n(t, \cdot) - \tilde{R}(t). \quad (5.24)$$

**Lemma 5.8.** (Lemma 3 in [22]) There exists  $C_1 > 0$  such that if  $T_0$  is large enough, then there exists a unique  $C^1$  function  $(\omega_k, x_k, \gamma_k) : [t^*, T_n] \rightarrow (\omega_q, \omega_p) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ , for any  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$  such that

$$Re \int \tilde{R}_k(t) \bar{\varepsilon}(t) dx = Im \int \tilde{R}_k(t) \bar{\varepsilon}(t) dx = 0, \quad Re \int \nabla \tilde{R}_k(t) \bar{\varepsilon}(t) dx = 0, \quad (5.25)$$

$$\|\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1} + \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0| \leq C_1 A_0 e^{-\theta_0 t}, \quad (5.26)$$

$$|\dot{\omega}_k(t)|^2 + |\dot{x}_k(t)|^2 + |\dot{\gamma}_k(t) - (\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0)|^2 \leq C_1 \|\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + C_1 e^{-2\theta_0 t}. \quad (5.27)$$

**Claim 5.9.** (Claim 2 in [22]) Let  $z(t) \in H^1$  be a solution of (1.1). Let  $h : x_1 \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto h(x_1)$  be a  $C^3$  real-valued function of one variable such that  $h, h'$  and  $h'''$  are bounded. Then, for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int |z|^2 h(x_1) dx = Im \int \partial_{x_1} z \bar{z} h'(x_1) dx, \quad (5.28)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} Im \int \partial_{x_1} z \bar{z} h(x_1) dx &= \int |\partial_{x_1} z|^2 h'(x_1) dx - \frac{1}{4} \int |z|^2 h'''(x_1) dx \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{d+2} \int |z|^{2+\frac{4}{d}} h'(x_1) dx + \frac{p-1}{2(p+1)} \int |z|^{p+1} h'(x_1) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (5.29)$$

and for  $j = 2, \dots, d$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} Im \int \partial_{x_j} z \bar{z} h(x_1) dx = Re \int \partial_{x_j} z \partial_{x_1} \bar{z} h'(x_1) dx. \quad (5.30)$$

Since  $\varphi_n(T_n) = R(T_n)$  and at time  $t = T_n$  the decomposition in (5.24) is unique, it follows that

$$\varepsilon(T_n) \equiv 0, \quad \tilde{R}(T_n) \equiv R(T_n), \quad \omega_k(T_n) = \omega_k^0, \quad x_k(T_n) = 0, \quad \gamma_k(T_n) = \gamma_k^0. \quad (5.31)$$

Let  $Y(s)$  be a  $C^3$  function such that

$$0 \leq Y \leq 1, \quad Y' \geq 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}; \quad Y(s) = 0 \text{ for } s \leq -1; \quad Y(s) = 1 \text{ for } s > 1; \quad (5.32)$$

and satisfying for some constant  $C > 0$ ,

$$(Y'(s))^2 \leq CY(s), \quad (Y''(s))^2 \leq CY'(s) \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then consider

$$Y(s) = \frac{1}{16}(1+s)^4 \text{ for } s \geq -1 \text{ close to } -1,$$

and

$$Y(s) = 1 - \frac{1}{16}(1-s)^4 \text{ for } s \leq 1 \text{ close to } 1.$$

For all  $k = 2, \dots, K$ , let

$$\sigma_k = \frac{1}{2}(v_{k-1,1} + v_{k,1}).$$

For  $L > 0$  large enough to be fixed later, for any  $k = 2, \dots, K-1$ , let

$$y_k(t, x) = Y\left(\frac{x_1 - \sigma_k t}{L}\right) - Y\left(\frac{x_1 - \sigma_{k+1} t}{L}\right), \quad (5.33)$$

$$y_1(t, x) = 1 - Y\left(\frac{x_1 - \sigma_2 t}{L}\right), \quad y_K(t, x) = Y\left(\frac{x_1 - \sigma_K t}{L}\right). \quad (5.34)$$

Finally, set for all  $k = 1, \dots, K$ :

$$I_k(t) = \int |\varphi_n(t, x)|^2 y_k(t, x) dx, \quad M_k(t) = \text{Im} \int \nabla \varphi_n(t, x) \bar{\varphi}_n(t, x) y_k(t, x) dx. \quad (5.35)$$

The quantities  $I_k(t)$  and  $M_k(t)$  are local versions of the  $L^2$  norm and momentum.

Ordering the  $v_{k,1}$  as in (5.10) was useful to split the various solitons using only the coordinate  $x_1$ .

From (5.31) to (5.35), (5.21) and Claim 5.9 deduce the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.10.** (Lemma 4 in [22]) Let  $L > 0$ . There exists  $C > 0$  such that if  $L$  and  $T_0$  are large enough, then for all  $k = 2, \dots, K$ ,  $t \in [t^*, T_n]$ , we have

$$|I_k(T_n) - I_k(t)| + |M_k(T_n) - M_k(t)| \leq \frac{CA_0^2}{L} e^{-2\theta_0 t}, \quad k = 2, \dots, K. \quad (5.36)$$

**Claim 5.11.** (Claim 3 in [22]) There exists  $C > 0$  such that for any  $t \in [t^*, T_n]$ ,

$$|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0| \leq C \|\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C \left( \frac{A_0^2}{L} + 1 \right) e^{-2\theta_0 t}. \quad (5.37)$$

**Proof.** From (5.24) and (5.35), we have

$$I_k(t) = \int |\tilde{R}(t)|^2 y_k(t) dx + 2Re \int \tilde{R}(t) \bar{\varepsilon}(t) y_k(t) dx + \int |\varepsilon(t)|^2 y_k(t) dx.$$

By the exponential decay of each  $Q_{\omega_k(t)}$ , the orthogonality  $\int \tilde{R}_k(t) \bar{\varepsilon}(t) dx = 0$  and the property of support of  $y_k$ , we have

$$I_k(t) = \int |\varphi_n(t)|^2 y_k(t) dx = \int Q_{\omega_k(t)}^2 dx + \int |\varepsilon(t)|^2 y_k(t) dx + O(e^{-2\theta_0 t}).$$

From the result of Lemma 5.10, we have

$$|I_k(t) - I_k(T_n)| \leq \frac{CA_0^2}{L} e^{-2\theta_0 t}.$$

Thus, by  $\omega_k(T_n) = \omega_k^0$  and  $\varepsilon(T_n) \equiv 0$ , we obtain

$$\left| \int Q_{\omega_k(t)}^2 dx - \int Q_{\omega_k^0}^2 dx \right| \leq C \|\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C \left( \frac{A_0^2}{L} + 1 \right) e^{-2\theta_0 t}. \quad (5.38)$$

Recall that  $\frac{d}{d\omega} \int Q_\omega^2 dx|_{\omega=\omega_k^0} > 0$ , then we assume  $\omega_k(t)$  is close to  $\omega_k^0$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} (\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0) \left( \frac{d}{d\omega} \int Q_\omega^2 dx|_{\omega=\omega_k^0} \right) &= \int Q_{\omega_k(t)}^2 dx - \int Q_{\omega_k^0}^2 dx \\ &\quad - \beta(\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0)(\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0)^2 \end{aligned}$$

with  $\beta(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , which implies that for some constant  $C = C(\omega_k^0)$ ,

$$|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0| \leq C \left| \int Q_{\omega_k(t)}^2 dx - \int Q_{\omega_k^0}^2 dx \right|. \quad (5.39)$$

Therefore by (5.38) and (5.39), we have

$$|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0| \leq C \|\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C \left( \frac{A_0^2}{L} + 1 \right) e^{-2\theta_0 t}.$$

This proves Claim 5.11.

The following lemma gives a coercivity property of  $H_{\omega_k^0}$ .

**Lemma 5.12.** Let  $d \geq 2$ ,  $1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$  and  $\omega_k^0 \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ . Then there exists  $\lambda > 0$  such that for any real-valued  $v \in H^1$  satisfying  $Re(Q_{\omega_k^0}, v) = Im(Q_{\omega_k^0}, v) = 0$  and  $Re(\nabla Q_{\omega_k^0}, v) = 0$ , one has that

$$(H_{\omega_k^0} v, v) \geq \lambda \|v\|_{H^1}^2, \quad (5.40)$$

where  $H_{\omega_k^0}$  is defined as (4.30) with  $\omega = \omega_k^0$ .

**Proof.** By (4.37) and Theorem 4.6, we have that  $D''(\omega_k^0) > 0$ . From Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 3.31 in [15], we get this result.

**Lemma 5.13.** Let  $d \geq 2$  and  $1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \frac{d+2}{(d-2)^+}$ . For  $\omega_k^0 \in (\omega_q, \omega_p)$ ,  $\omega_k(t)$  close to  $\omega_k^0$  and  $\Gamma_{\omega_k^0}(z) = E(z) + \omega_k^0 M(z)$ , we have

$$|\Gamma_{\omega_k^0}(Q_{\omega_k(t)}) - \Gamma_{\omega_k^0}(Q_{\omega_k^0})| \leq C |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0|^2. \quad (5.41)$$

**Proof.** By (2.2) and (2.3), we have

$$\Gamma_{\omega_k^0}(Q_{\omega_k(t)}) = E(Q_{\omega_k(t)}) + \omega_k^0 \int |Q_{\omega_k(t)}|^2 dx. \quad (5.42)$$

By Taylor expansion of  $\Gamma_{\omega_k^0}(Q_{\omega_k(t)})$ , (5.42), Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.6,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\omega_k^0}(Q_{\omega_k(t)}) &= \Gamma_{\omega_k^0}(Q_{\omega_k^0}) - (\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0)^2 \frac{d}{d\omega} \int Q_{\omega}^2 dx \Big|_{\omega=\omega_k^0} \\ &\quad + |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0|^2 \beta(|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0|). \end{aligned} \quad (5.43)$$

By (5.43), Theorem 4.6 and  $\omega_k(t)$  close to  $\omega_k^0$ , there exists  $C = C(\omega_k^0) > 0$  such that

$$|\Gamma_{\omega_k^0}(Q_{\omega_k(t)}) - \Gamma_{\omega_k^0}(Q_{\omega_k^0})| \leq C |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0|^2.$$

This proves Lemma 5.13.

Now we set

$$J(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K [(\omega_k^0 + \frac{1}{4}|v_k|^2)I_k(t) - v_k M_k(t)] \quad (5.44)$$

and

$$G(t) = E(\varphi_n(t)) + J(t). \quad (5.45)$$

By (5.33), (5.34), (5.35), Lemma 2.4 and 2.5 as well as Lemma 5.12 and 5.13, we directly deduce the following lemmas.

**Lemma 5.14.** (Lemma 6(i) in [22]) For all  $t \in [t^*, T_n]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} G(t) &= \sum_{k=1}^K [E(Q_{\omega_k^0}) + \omega_k^0 \int Q_{\omega_k^0}^2 dx] + P(\varepsilon(t), \varepsilon(t)) + \sum_{k=1}^K O(|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0|^2) \\ &\quad + \|\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1}^2 \beta(\|\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1}) + O(e^{-2\theta_0 t}) \end{aligned} \quad (5.46)$$

with  $\beta(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} P(\varepsilon(t), \varepsilon(t)) &= \int |\nabla \varepsilon(t)|^2 dx - \sum_{k=1}^K [\int |\tilde{R}_k(t)|^{\frac{4}{d}} |\varepsilon(t)|^2 + \frac{4}{d} |\tilde{R}_k(t)|^{\frac{4}{d}-2} [Re(\overline{\tilde{R}_k(t)} \varepsilon(t))]^2 dx] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^K [(\omega_k(t) + \frac{1}{4}|v_k|^2) \int |\varepsilon(t)|^2 y_k(t) dx - v_k \cdot Im \int \nabla \varepsilon(t) \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}(t) y_k(t) dx] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^K [\int |\tilde{R}_k(t)|^{p-1} |\varepsilon(t)|^2 + (p-1) |\tilde{R}_k(t)|^{p-3} [Re(\overline{\tilde{R}_k(t)} \varepsilon(t))]^2 dx]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.47)$$

**Lemma 5.15.** (Lemma 4.1 in [23]) There exists  $\lambda > 0$  such that

$$P(\varepsilon(t), \varepsilon(t)) \geq \lambda \|\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1}^2, \quad t \in [t^*, T_n]. \quad (5.48)$$

Combining with Lemma 5.10, Lemma 5.11, Lemma 5.14 and Lemma 5.15, we can deduce the following lemma according to Martel and Merle's way [22].

**Lemma 5.16.** (Lemma 5 in [23]) For any  $t \in [t^*, T_n]$ ,

$$\|\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0| + |x_k(t)|^2 + |\gamma_k(t) - \gamma_k^0|^2 \leq C \left( \frac{A_0^2}{L} + 1 \right) e^{-2\theta_0 t}. \quad (5.49)$$

**Lemma 5.17.** For any  $t \in [t^*, T_n]$ , there exists  $C > 0$  such that

$$\|R(t) - \tilde{R}(t)\|_{H^1} \leq C \sum_{k=1}^K (|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0| + |x_k(t)| + |\gamma_k(t) - \gamma_k^0|). \quad (5.50)$$

**Proof.** By (5.5) and (5.23),

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}_k(t) - R_k(t) &= Q_{\omega_k(t)}(x - \tilde{x}_k(t))e^{i(\frac{1}{2}v_k x + \delta_k(t))} - Q_{\omega_k^0}(x - \tilde{x}_k^0)e^{i(\frac{1}{2}v_k x + \delta_k^0)} \\ &= \nabla Q_{\omega_k(t)}(\eta_k)e^{i(\frac{1}{2}v_k x + \delta_k(t))}x_k(t) + iQ_{\omega_k(t)}(x - \tilde{x}_k(t))e^{i\zeta_k}(\gamma_k(t) - \gamma_k^0) \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial Q_{\omega_k(t)}}{\partial \omega}(x - \tilde{x}_k(t))|_{\omega=\xi_k}e^{i(\frac{1}{2}v_k x + \delta_k(t))}(\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0), \end{aligned} \quad (5.51)$$

where  $\eta_k$  is between  $x - \tilde{x}_k^0$  and  $x - \tilde{x}_k(t)$ ,  $\zeta_k$  is between  $\gamma_k^0$  and  $\gamma_k(t)$ ,  $\xi_k$  is between  $\omega_k^0$  and  $\omega_k(t)$ . Thus

$$\|R(t) - \tilde{R}(t)\|_{H^1} \leq C \sum_{k=1}^K (|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0| + |x_k(t)| + |\gamma_k(t) - \gamma_k^0|).$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 5.17.

**Proof of Proposition 5.7.** From Lemma 5.16, we get for all  $t \in [t^*, T_n]$

$$\begin{aligned} \|R(t) - \tilde{R}(t)\|_{H^1}^2 &\leq C \sum_{k=1}^K (|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0|^2 + |\gamma_k(t) - \gamma_k^0|^2 + |x_k(t)|^2) \\ &\leq C \left( \frac{A_0^2}{L} + 1 \right) e^{-2\theta_0 t}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.52)$$

By Lemma 5.17 and (5.52), we have

$$\|\varphi_n(t) - R(t)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq 2\|\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + 2\|\tilde{R}(t) - R(t)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C \left( \frac{A_0^2}{L} + 1 \right) e^{-2\theta_0 t},$$

where  $C > 0$  does not depend on  $A_0$ . Now we choose  $A_0^2 > 8C$ ,  $L = A_0^2$ , and  $T_0$

large enough. It follows that

$$\|\varphi_n(t) - R(t)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq 2Ce^{-2\theta_0 t} \leq \frac{A_0^2}{4}e^{-2\theta_0 t}.$$

Therefore, the conclusion is that for any  $t \in [t^*, T_n]$ ,

$$\|\varphi_n(t) - R(t)\|_{H^1} \leq \frac{A_0}{2}e^{-\theta_0 t}.$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 5.7.

#### **Acknowledgment.**

This research is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China 11871138.

## **References**

- [1] Bartsch, T., Jeanjean, L., Soave, N. (2016). Normalized solutions for a system of coupled cubic Schrödinger equations on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . *J. Math. Pures Appl* (9), 106: 583-614.
- [2] Bartsch, T., Molle, R., Rizzi, M., Verzini, G., (2021). Normalized solutions of mass supercritical Schrödinger equations with potential. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 46(9): 1729-1756.
- [3] Bartsch, T., Zhong, X., Zou, W. M. 2020. Normalized solutions for a system of coupled Schrödinger system. *Math. Ann.* 380(3-4): 1713-1740.
- [4] Berestycki, H., Cazenave, T. (1981). Instabilité des états stationnaires dans les équations de Schrödinger et de Klein-Gordon non linéaires. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* 293: 489-492.
- [5] Berestycki, H., Lions, P. L. (1983). Nonlinear scalar field equations. *Arch. Rational Math. Anal.*, 82: 313-375.
- [6] Cazenave, T. (2003). Semilinear Schrödinger equations. *Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 10. New York University, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York; American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI.
- [7] Cazenave, T., Lions, P. L. (1982). Orbital stability of standing waves for some nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 85(4): 549-561.

- [8] Cazenave, T., Weissler, F. B. (1990). The Cauchy problem for the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in  $H^s$ , *Nonlinear Anal.* 14(10): 807-836.
- [9] Côte, R., Le Coz, S. (2011). High-speed excited multi-solitons in nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 96: 135-166.
- [10] Cirant, M., Verzini, G. (2017). Bifurcation and segregation in quadratic two-populations mean field games systems. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* 23, no. 3, 1145-1177.
- [11] Côte, R., Martel, Y., Merle, F. (2011). Construction of multi-soliton solutions for the  $L^2$ -supercritical gkdv and NLS equations. *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana.* 27(1): 273-302.
- [12] Fukaya, N., Hayashi, M. (2021). Instability of algebraic standing waves for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with double power nonlinearities. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society.* 374: 1421-1447.
- [13] Fukuizumi, R. (2003). Stability and instability of standing waves for nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Tohoku Mathematical Publications.* No. 25.
- [14] Gidas, B., Ni, W. M., Nirenberg, L. (1979). Symmetry and related properties via the maximal principle. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 68: 209-243.
- [15] Grillakis, M., Shatah, J., Strauss, W. A. (1987). Stability theory of solitary waves in the presence of symmetry, I. *J. Funct. Anal.* 74(1): 160-197.
- [16] Grillakis, M., Shatah, J., Strauss, W. A. (1990). Stability theory of solitary waves in the presence of symmetry,II. *J. Funct. Anal.* 94(2): 308-348.
- [17] Kato, T. (1959). Growth properties of solutions of the reduced wave equation with a variable coefficient. *Comm, Pure Appl. Math.* 12: 403-425.

- [18] Kawano, S. (2011). Uniqueness of positive solutions to semilinear elliptic equations with double power nonlinearities. *Differential Integral Equations*. 24(24): 201-207.
- [19] Kwong, M. K. (1989). Uniqueness of positive solutions of  $\Delta u - u + u^p = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 105(3): 243-266.
- [20] Le Coz, S., Martel, Y., Raphaël, P. (2016) Minimal mass blow up solutions for a double power nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana*. 32(3): 795-833.
- [21] Lieb, E. H., Loss, M. (2000). *Analysis, Graduate Studies in Mathematics Volume 14*, American Mathematical Society.
- [22] Martel, Y., Merle, F. (2006). Multi solitary waves for nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *Ann. I. H. Poincaré-AN*. 23: 849-864.
- [23] Martel, Y., Merle, F., Tsai, T. P. (2006). Stability in  $H^1$  of the sum of  $K$  solitary waves for some nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Duke Mathematical Journal*. 133(3): 405-466.
- [24] McLeod, K., (1993). Uniqueness of positive radial solutions of  $\Delta u + f(u) = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . II, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 339 495-505.
- [25] Merle, F. (1990). Construction of solutions with exactly  $k$  blow-up points for the Schrödinger equation with critical nonlinearity. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 129 (2): 223-240.
- [26] Nakanishi, K., Schlag, W. (2012). Global dynamics above the ground state energy for the cubic NLS equation in 3D. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*. 44(1-2): 1-45.

- [27] Pohozaev, S. I. (1965). Eigenfunctions of the equations of the  $\Delta u + \lambda f(u) = 0$ . Sov. Math. Doklady. 165: 1408-1411.
- [28] Reed, M., Simon, B. (1978). Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics. Vol. IV, Academic Press, New York.
- [29] Schlag, W. (2009). Stable manifolds for an orbitally unstable NLS. Ann. of Math. (2) 169, no. 1: 139-227.
- [30] Soave, N. (2020). Normalized ground states for the NLS equation with combined nonlinearities. J. Differential Equations. 269: 6941-6987.
- [31] Strauss, W. A. (1977). Existence of solitary waves in higher dimensions. Comm. Math. Phys. 55(2): 149-162.
- [32] Tao, T., Visan, M., Zhang, X. (2007). The nonlinear Schrödinger equation with combined power-type nonlinearities. Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 32(8): 1281-1343.
- [33] Tsutsumi, Y. (1987).  $L^2$ -solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger equations and nonlinear group, Funkcial. Ekvac. 30: 115-125.
- [34] Tao, T. (2009). Why are solitons stable?. Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society. 46(1): 1-33.
- [35] Weinstein, M. I. (1983). Nonlinear Schrödinger equations and sharp interpolations estimates. Comm. Math. Phys. 87: 567-576.
- [36] Weinstein, M. I. (1985). Modulation stability of ground states of nonlinear Schrödinger equations. SIAM J. Math. Anal. 16: 472-491.
- [37] Weinstein, M. I. (1986). Lyapunov stability of ground states of nonlinear dispersive evolution equations. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 39: 51-68.

- [38] Zhang, J. (2000). Stability of attractive Bose-Einstein condensates, *Journal of Statistical Physics.* (3-4) 101: 731-746.
- [39] Zhang, J. (2005). Sharp threshold for blowup and global existence in nonlinear Schrödinger equations under a harmonic potential. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 30: 1429-1443.