

# A NEW CLASS OF TRAVELING SOLITONS FOR CUBIC FRACTIONAL NONLINEAR SCHRÖDINGER EQUATIONS

YOUNGHUN HONG AND YANNICK SIRE

ABSTRACT. We consider the one-dimensional cubic fractional nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$i\partial_t u - (-\Delta)^\sigma u + |u|^2 u = 0,$$

where  $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  and the operator  $(-\Delta)^\sigma$  is the fractional Laplacian of symbol  $|\xi|^{2\sigma}$ . Despite the lack of any Galilean-type invariance, we construct a new class of traveling soliton solutions of the form

$$u(t, x) = e^{-it(|k|^{2\sigma} - \omega^{2\sigma})} Q_{\omega, k}(x - 2t\sigma|k|^{2\sigma-2}k), \quad k \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \omega > 0$$

by a rather involved variational argument.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Reduction to the Case $k = 1$ , Gagliardo-Nirenberg Inequality for $\mathcal{P}_1$ and Minimization Problem	4
3. Existence of a Static Ground State	7
4. Proof of Theorem 1.1	11
4.1. Two-bubble decomposition	11
4.2. Concentration	13
4.3. Dichotomy	16
4.4. Spreading out	19
4.5. Regularity	20
Appendix A. Properties of the Fourier Multiplier operator $\mathcal{P}_k$	20
Appendix B. Pohozaev Identities	22
Acknowledgements	22
References	22

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is devoted to the investigation of the one-dimensional cubic focusing fractional nonlinear Schrödinger equations (NLS)

$$i\partial_t u - (-\Delta)^\sigma u + |u|^2 u = 0, \quad (\text{NLS}_\sigma)$$

where  $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ . The fractional Schrödinger equations have been introduced by Laskin [Las02] in the context of quantum mechanics, generalizing the Feynman integral using Levy processes (see [Ber96] for an account on Levy processes). Moreover, the fractional NLS has been investigated in [CHHO13, HS15, COX11, GW14, CHKL14, FL13, FLS15] (see also references therein).

The goal of the present work is to construct a family of traveling solitons for the fractional NLS.

In the Laplacian case ( $\sigma = 1$ ), traveling solitons can be formed easily by boosting static solitons by the Galilean transformation. Precisely, a static soliton for the cubic NLS is given by  $e^{it\omega^2} Q_\omega(x)$  with  $\omega > 0$ , where  $Q_\omega(x) = \sqrt{2}\omega \operatorname{sech}(\omega x)$  is the ground state for the nonlinear elliptic equation

$$-\Delta u + \omega^2 u - |u|^2 u = 0.$$

Then, since the equation is invariant under the Galilean transformation

$$u(t, x) \mapsto e^{-it|k|^2} e^{ik \cdot x} u(t, x - 2tk), \quad k \in \mathbb{R},$$

boosting a static solution, we obtain a traveling soliton

$$e^{-it(|k|^2 - \omega^2)} e^{ik \cdot x} Q_\omega(x - 2tk)$$

with a velocity of  $2k$ .

In the fractional case, the ground state  $Q_\omega$  for the elliptic equation

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma u + \omega^2 u - |u|^2 u = 0 \quad (1.1)$$

is known to exist when  $\frac{1}{4} < \sigma < 1$  [FL13, Proposition 1.1], and thus  $e^{it\omega^{2\sigma}} Q_\omega(x)$  is a static soliton solution to the fractional NLS. However, contrary to the Laplacian case, one cannot construct a traveling soliton simply by boosting a static soliton, since the equation does not have any exact Galilean-type invariance due to the non-locality of the fractional Laplacian  $(-\Delta)^\sigma$ .

Nevertheless, as observed in [HS15], the fractional NLS is *almost invariant* under the pseudo-Galilean transformation

$$\mathcal{G}_k : u(t, x) \mapsto e^{-it|k|^{2\sigma}} e^{ik \cdot x} u(t, x - 2t\sigma|k|^{2(\sigma-1)}k) \quad (1.2)$$

for smooth solutions.

By almost invariance we mean: if  $u(t)$  solves  $(\text{NLS}_\sigma)$ , then  $\tilde{u}(t) = \mathcal{G}_k u(t)$  obeys  $(\text{NLS}_\sigma)$  with an error term

$$i\partial_t \tilde{u} + (-\Delta)^\sigma \tilde{u} + \omega|\tilde{u}|^{p-1} \tilde{u} = e^{it|v|^{2\sigma}} e^{-ik \cdot x} (\mathcal{E}u)(t, x - 2\sigma t|k|^{2(\sigma-1)}k), \quad (1.3)$$

where

$$\widehat{\mathcal{E}u}(\xi) = E(\xi)\hat{u}(\xi)$$

with

$$E(\xi) = |\xi - v|^{2\sigma} - |\xi|^{2\sigma} - |v|^{2\sigma} + 2\sigma|v|^{2(\sigma-1)}v \cdot \xi.$$

Therefore, it is still natural to consider an ansatz of the form

$$u_{\omega,k}(t, x) = e^{-it(|k|^{2\sigma} - \omega^{2\sigma})} e^{ik \cdot x} Q_{\omega,k}(x - 2t\sigma|k|^{2\sigma-2}k), \quad (1.4)$$

which will lead to a natural family of moving solitons with frequency  $\omega$  and speed  $k$ . The profile  $Q_{\omega,k}$  then solves the pseudo-differential equation

$$\mathcal{P}_k Q_{\omega,k} + \omega^{2\sigma} Q_{\omega,k} - |Q_{\omega,k}|^2 Q_{\omega,k} = 0, \quad (1.5)$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}_k = e^{-ik \cdot x} (-\Delta)^\sigma e^{ik \cdot x} - |k|^{2\sigma} + 2i\sigma|k|^{2\sigma-2}k \cdot \nabla_x.$$

In this paper, we establish existence of a solution  $Q_{\omega,k}$  to the equation (1.5) and the traveling soliton  $e^{it\omega^{2\sigma}} Q_{\omega,k}(x)$  for the fractional NLS.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ . For any  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ , there exists  $Q_{\omega,k} \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$  solving (1.5) for some  $\omega > 0$ . Furthermore, we have  $Q_{\omega,k} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ .*

*Remark 1.2.* In the book [SS99], an exact solution of the standard NLS equation is also found. However, here in our context, we consider more general equations, i.e. nonlocal ones, and our solutions are also exact but differ substantially from the ones of Sulem and Sulem.

The key observation to prove the theorem is that the pseudo-differential operator  $\mathcal{P}_k$  is an elliptic operator. Indeed,  $\mathcal{P}_k$  is a Fourier multiplier,  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}_k f}(\xi) = p_k(\xi)\hat{f}(\xi)$ , with the symbol

$$p_k(\xi) = |\xi + k|^{2\sigma} - |k|^{2\sigma} - 2\sigma|k|^{2\sigma-2}k \cdot \xi.$$

So, we have  $p_k(0) = 0$ . Differentiating  $p_k(\xi)$ , we get or  $k \neq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} p'_k(\xi) &= 2\sigma|\xi + k|^{2\sigma-2}(\xi + k) - 2\sigma|k|^{2\sigma-2}k &\Rightarrow p'_k(0) &= 0, \\ p''_k(\xi) &= 2\sigma(2\sigma - 1)|\xi + k|^{2\sigma-2} &\Rightarrow p''_k(\xi) &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

Thus,  $p_k(\xi)$  is non-negative for all  $\xi$  for  $\sigma > 1/2$ .

This fact allows us to apply the variational approach as in [Wei83] for instance. It is however more involved, since the symbol of the operator  $\mathcal{P}_k$  can be described differently according to low and high frequencies. Indeed, by (1.6), we find the asymptotics of the symbol  $p_k(\xi)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} p_k(\xi) &= |\xi|^{2\sigma} + O(|\xi|^{2\sigma-1}) && \text{as } \xi \rightarrow \infty, \\ p_k(\xi) &= \sigma(2\sigma - 1)|k|^{2\sigma-2}|\xi|^2 + O(|\xi|^3) && \text{as } \xi \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

Therefore, the operator  $\mathcal{P}_k$  behaves like  $(-\Delta)^\sigma$  in high frequencies, and it behaves like  $\sigma(2\sigma - 1)|k|^{2\sigma-2}(-\Delta)$  in low frequencies.

Taking the inhomogeneity of the operator  $\mathcal{P}_k$  into account, we will introduce a new Weinstein functional  $\mathcal{W}$  (see (2.3)) associated with the Gagliardo-Nirenberg type inequality (Theorem 2.1), and then we will achieve the existence of a profile  $Q_{\omega,k}$  as a minimizer for the functional  $\mathcal{W}$ .

*Remark 1.3.* Our proof does not allow to treat the case  $\sigma \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ , since the operator  $\mathcal{P}_k$  becomes degenerate. Indeed, the symbol of  $\mathcal{P}_k$  is not positive definite. In particular, the second derivative of the symbol vanishes when  $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$  (see (1.7)). We are not aware even of numerical computations dealing with  $\sigma \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ .

*Remark 1.4.* When  $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ , in [KLR13], the authors constructed moving solitons using the ansatz

$$u(t, x) = e^{it} Q_v(x - vt), \quad |v| < 1. \quad (1.8)$$

It is easy to check that if  $u(t)$  solves the fractional NLS, then the profile  $Q_v$  solves a time-independent equation that is elliptic if  $|v| < 1$ , while it is not elliptic if  $|v| \geq 1$ . As mentioned above, when  $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ , one cannot construct a traveling soliton using the ansatz (1.4). However, when  $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ , the ansatz (1.8) is not appropriate, since in this case,  $Q_v$  solves the non-elliptic equation. We also remark that contrary to the half-Laplacian case, if  $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ , one can construct traveling solitons at any speed.

We now describe the general strategy of the proof:

- We first derive a Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality for a suitable operator.
- We then introduce the functional to be minimized. The Euler-Lagrange equation of this functional gives us precisely the equation under consideration.
- By means of a profile decomposition, we provide the existence of a minimizer for this functional.

*Remark 1.5.* In the paper [ABS97], a detailed study of some problems in fluid dynamics is performed. It happens that our result Theorem 1.1 is contained in this paper. Indeed, in [ABS97], Theorem 3.1 provides the existence of traveling waves for a model involving a pseudo-differential operator. Following the remarks page 1248, our pseudo-differential operators satisfies the necessary conditions so that their theorem applies. In spite of this, we emphasize that our proof is different from the one of Albert *et* and that it comes from a different context.

## 2. REDUCTION TO THE CASE $k = 1$ , GAGLIARDO-NIRENBERG INEQUALITY FOR $\mathcal{P}_1$ AND MINIMIZATION PROBLEM

For notational conveniences, we drop the index  $\omega$  in  $Q_{\omega,k}$ . Let  $Q_k(x) = |k|^\sigma Q_1(kx)$ . Then, by scaling, one has

$$(\mathcal{P}_k Q_k)(x) = |k|^{3\sigma} (\mathcal{P}_1 Q_1)(kx) \quad (2.1)$$

Indeed, taking the Fourier transform

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{(\mathcal{P}_k Q_k)}(\xi) &= (|\xi + k|^{2\sigma} - |k|^{2\sigma} - 2\sigma|k|^{2\sigma-2}k \cdot \xi)|k|^{\sigma-1}\hat{Q}_1\left(\frac{\xi}{k}\right) \\ &= |k|^{3\sigma-1}\left(\left|\frac{\xi}{k} + 1\right|^{2\sigma} - 1 - 2\sigma\frac{\xi}{k}\right)\hat{Q}_1\left(\frac{\xi}{k}\right) \\ &= |k|^{3\sigma-1}(\mathcal{P}_1 Q_1)^\wedge\left(\frac{\xi}{k}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $Q_1$  solves

$$\mathcal{P}_1 Q_1 + \omega^{2\sigma} Q_1 - |Q_1|^2 Q_1 = 0$$

if and only if  $Q_k$  solves

$$\left\{ \mathcal{P}_k Q_k + (|k|^{2\sigma} \omega^{2\sigma}) Q_k - |Q_k|^2 Q_k \right\}(x) = |k|^{3\sigma} \left\{ \mathcal{P}_1 Q_1 + \omega^{2\sigma} Q_1 - |Q_1|^2 Q_1 \right\}(kx) = 0.$$

Therefore, without loss of generality, we reduce our study to the case  $k = 1$ .

Now we state the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality associated with the operator  $\mathcal{P}_1$ .

**Theorem 2.1** (Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality for  $\mathcal{P}_1$ ). *For  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^4}^4 &\lesssim \|u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2} u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} + \alpha \|u\|_{L^2}^3 \|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2} u\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad - \left\{ \|u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2} u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \right\}^{1-\theta} \left\{ \alpha \|u\|_{L^2}^3 \|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2} u\|_{L^2} \right\}^\theta, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha = \alpha(\sigma) = 1/\sqrt{\sigma(2\sigma-1)}$ .

*Proof.* By Young's inequality, it suffices to show that

$$\|u\|_{L^4}^4 \lesssim \|u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2} u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} + \alpha \|u\|_{L^2}^3 \|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2} u\|_{L^2}.$$

Indeed, denoting

$$a = \|u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2} u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}, \quad b = \alpha \|u\|_{L^2}^3 \|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2} u\|_{L^2},$$

the inequality writes

$$\|u\|_{L^4}^4 \lesssim a + b - a^{1-\theta} b^\theta.$$

If one proves that  $\|u\|_{L^4}^4 \lesssim a + b$ , then using Young's inequality  $a^{1-\theta} b^\theta \leq (1-\theta)a + \theta b$ , one gets

$$\|u\|_{L^4}^4 \lesssim a + ab - a^{1-\theta} b^\theta + (1-\theta)a + \theta b.$$

Therefore, relabeling the constants, this gives the desired result.

Let  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty$  be a smooth cut-off such that  $\varphi = 1$  on  $[-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}]$  and  $\text{supp } \varphi \subset [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ . We denote by  $P_{\leq 1/2}$  the low frequency projection, i.e.,  $\widehat{P_{\leq 1/2} f}(\xi) = \varphi(\xi)\hat{f}(\xi)$ , and let  $P_{> 1/2} = 1 - P_{\leq 1/2}$  be the high frequency projection. Then, by the standard Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities

$$\|u\|_{L^4}^4 \lesssim \|u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|^\sigma u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}, \quad \|u\|_{L^4}^4 \lesssim \|u\|_{L^2}^3 \|\nabla|u\|_{L^2} \quad (2.2)$$

and by Lemma A.3, we prove that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{L^4}^4 &\lesssim \|P_{>1/2}u\|_{L^4}^4 + \|P_{\leq 1/2}u\|_{L^4}^4 \\
&\lesssim \|P_{>1/2}u\|_{L^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}}}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|^\sigma P_{>1/2}u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} + \|P_{\leq 1/2}u\|_{L^2}^3 \|\nabla P_{\leq 1/2}u\|_{L^2} \\
&\lesssim \|u\|_{L^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}}}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2}u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} + \|u\|_{L^2}^3 \|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2}u\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constants may depend on  $\sigma$ .  $\square$

Next, we introduce the functionals to be minimized. Let  $\theta \in (0, 1)$  be a number sufficiently close to 1. We define  $\mathcal{W}(u)$  by

$$\mathcal{W}(u) := W_1(u) + W_2(u) - W_3(u), \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$W_1(u) := \frac{\|u\|_{L^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}}}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2}u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|u\|_{L^4}^4}, \quad W_2(u) := \alpha \frac{\|u\|_{L^2}^3 \|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2}u\|_{L^2}}{\|u\|_{L^4}^4}$$

and

$$W_3(u) = W_1(u)^{1-\theta} W_2(u)^\theta.$$

*Remark 2.2.* In view of the previous Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, it is natural to consider the functional  $\mathcal{W}$ . The reason why we introduced the interpolation term  $W_3$  comes from the fact that we will construct the moving soliton using a profile decomposition and to reach a contradiction we need to somehow use minimization properties of well-known ground states associated to our problem. This third term  $W_3$  will help in getting the contradiction. Notice that since  $\theta$  will be taken close to 1, the third term  $W_3$  is close to  $W_2$ .

We will find a moving soliton from the minimization problem

$$\frac{1}{c_{GN}} = \inf_{u \in H^1} \mathcal{W}(u).$$

Note that  $c_{GN}$  gives the sharp constant for Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (Theorem 2.1).

We now show that any minimizer of the minimization problem is a weak solution of the desired Euler-Lagrange equation.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Suppose that  $u$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{W}(u)$  in  $H^\sigma$ . Then,  $u$  is a weak solution to*

$$\mathcal{P}_1 u + au - bu^3 = 0$$

for some  $a, b > 0$ . Thus,  $Q_1 = b^{1/2}u$  solves

$$\mathcal{P}_1 Q_1 + \omega^{2\sigma} Q_1 - Q_1^3 = 0, \quad \omega = a^{1/2\sigma}.$$

*Proof.* If  $u$  is a minimizer, then for any compactly supported function  $v$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left. \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} W_1(u + \epsilon v) \\
&= \left. \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} \frac{(\|u + \epsilon v\|_{L^2}^2)^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{2\sigma}} (\|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2}(u + \epsilon v)\|_{L^2}^2)^{\frac{1}{2\sigma}}}{\|u + \epsilon v\|_{L^4}^4} \\
&= \frac{(4\sigma-1)W_1(u)}{2\sigma\|u\|_{L^2}^2} \left. \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} \|u + \epsilon v\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{W_1(u)}{2\sigma\|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2}u\|_{L^2}^2} \left. \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} \|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2}(u + \epsilon v)\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{W_1(u)}{\|u\|_{L^4}^4} \left. \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} \|u + \epsilon v\|_{L^4}^4 \\
&= \frac{(4\sigma-1)W_1(u)}{\sigma\|u\|_{L^2}^2} \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} u\bar{v}dx + \frac{W_1(u)}{\sigma\|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2}u\|_{L^2}^2} \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\mathcal{P}_1 u)\bar{v}dx - \frac{W_1(u)}{\|u\|_{L^4}^4} \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u|^2 u\bar{v}dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we compute  $\left. \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} W_2(u + \epsilon v)$  and  $\left. \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} W_3(u + \epsilon v)$ . Then, collecting all, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left. \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} \mathcal{W}(u + \epsilon v) \\
&= \frac{1}{\|u\|_{L^2}^2} \left\{ \frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma} W_1(u) + 3W_2(u) - \left( \frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}(1-\theta) + 3\theta \right) W_3(u) \right\} \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} u\bar{v}dx \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2}u\|_{L^2}^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sigma} W_1(u) + W_2(u) - \left( \frac{1}{\sigma}(1-\theta) + \theta \right) W_3(u) \right\} \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\mathcal{P}_1 u)\bar{v}dx \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\|u\|_{L^4}^4} \left\{ W_1(u) + W_2(u) - W_3(u) \right\} \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^3\bar{v}dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

By Young's inequality, one can show that all the terms in front of the integrals are nonnegative, provided that  $\theta < 1$  is close enough to 1. Hence,  $u$  solves  $\operatorname{Re}\{\mathcal{P}_1 u + au - bu^3\} = 0$ . Similarly, computing  $\left. \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} \mathcal{W}(u + i\epsilon v) = 0$ , we prove that  $\operatorname{Im}\{\mathcal{P}_1 u + au - bu^3\} = 0$ .  $\square$

### 3. EXISTENCE OF A STATIC GROUND STATE

In this section, in order to illustrate our strategy to prove the main theorem, we give a proof of existence of a static ground state, which is a well-known fact in the literature (see for instance [FL13] and the references therein).

**Theorem 3.1** (Existence of a static ground state). *For  $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{4}, 1]$ , there exists a minimizer  $Q \in H^\sigma$  for the Weinstein functional*

$$W(u) := \frac{\|u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|\sigma u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|u\|_{L^4}^4}$$

such that  $Q$  solves the ground state equation

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma Q + Q - Q^3 = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

We will prove the theorem by the standard concentration-compactness argument, developed by P.L. Lions [Lio85a, Lio85b], in the form of the bubble decomposition as in [Gér98] (see also [HK05, ?]).

**Proposition 3.2** (Bubble decomposition). *Let  $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{4}, 1]$ . Suppose that  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be a bounded sequence in  $H^\sigma$ . Then there exist a subsequence of  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  (still denoted by  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ ), a family of sequences of translation parameters  $\{x_n^j\}_{n=1}^\infty$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ , and a sequence of  $H^\sigma$  functions  $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  such that for every  $J \geq 1$ ,*

$$u_n(x) = \sum_{j=1}^J \phi^j(x - x_n^j) + R_n^J$$

satisfying the following properties:

(i) (Asymptotic orthogonality) For each  $j \neq j'$ ,  $|x_n^j - x_n^{j'}| \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, for  $0 \leq j \leq J$ ,  $R_n^J(\cdot + x_n^j) \rightarrow 0$  in  $H^\sigma$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

(ii) (Remainder estimate)

$$\lim_{J \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|R_n^J\|_{L^4} = 0.$$

(iii) (Asymptotic Pythagorean expansions)

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_n\|_{L^2}^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^J \|\phi^j\|_{L^2}^2 + \|R_n^J\|_{L^2}^2 + o_n(1), \\ \|\nabla|\sigma u_n\|_{L^2}^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^J \|\nabla|\sigma \phi^j\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla|\sigma R_n^J\|_{L^2}^2 + o_n(1), \\ \|u_n\|_{L^4}^4 &= \sum_{j=1}^J \|\phi^j\|_{L^4}^4 + \|R_n^J\|_{L^4}^4 + o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Theorem 3.1. Step 1. (Formulation of a two-bubble decomposition)* Let  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be a minimizing sequence in  $H^\sigma$  for  $W(u)$ , i.e.,  $W(u_n) \rightarrow \frac{1}{c_{GN}}$ , where  $c_{GN}$  is the sharp constant for the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality

$$\|u\|_{L^4}^4 \leq c \|u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|\sigma u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}. \quad (3.2)$$

Since the functional  $W(u)$  is invariant under multiplication by a constant and scaling, i.e.,  $W(\alpha u(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda})) = W(u)$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\lambda > 0$ , replacing  $u_n$  by  $\alpha_n u_n(\lambda_n \cdot)$  with  $\alpha_n = \frac{\lambda_n^{1/2}}{\|u_n\|_{L^2}}$  and  $\lambda_n = \left(\frac{\|u_n\|_{L^2}}{\|\nabla|\sigma u_n\|_{L^2}}\right)^{1/\sigma}$ , we may assume that  $\|u_n\|_{L^2} = \|\nabla|\sigma u_n\|_{L^2} = 1$  for each  $n$ . Obviously,  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is bounded in  $H^\sigma$ .

Now, applying the bubble decomposition (Proposition 3.2) with  $J = 1$  to the bounded sequence  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , extracting a subsequence, we write

$$u_n = \phi(\cdot - x_n) + R_n, \quad \phi \neq 0.$$



Indeed, if there is no such non-zero  $\phi$  ( $\Rightarrow u_n = R_n$ ), then by Proposition 3.2 (ii),

$$W(u_n) = \frac{\|u_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|\cdot|^\sigma u_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|u_n\|_{L^4}^4} = \frac{1}{\|R_n\|_{L^4}^4} \rightarrow \infty,$$

which contradicts the minimality of  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ . Moreover, we may replace  $u_n$  by  $u_n(\cdot + x_n)$  because of translation invariance of the functional  $W$ , i.e.,  $W((u(\cdot - b))) = W(u)$  for  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ . As a result, we get a two-bubble decomposition

$$u_n = \phi + R_n$$

with the properties in Proposition 3.2. Here, extracting a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that  $\|R_n\|_{L^2}$ ,  $\|\nabla|\cdot|^\sigma R_n\|_{L^2}$  and  $\|R_n\|_{L^4}^4$  are convergent as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Suppose that  $R_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $H^\sigma$ . Then,  $\phi$  is a minimizer for  $W(u)$ , because if  $u_n \rightarrow \phi$  in  $H^\sigma$  (so,  $u_n \rightarrow \phi$  in  $L^4$  by the Sobolev imbedding), then

$$\frac{1}{c_{GN}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} W(u_n) = \frac{\|u_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|\cdot|^\sigma u_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|u_n\|_{L^4}^4} = \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|\cdot|^\sigma \phi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|\phi\|_{L^4}^4} = W(\phi).$$

Thus, we only need to preclude the dichotomy scenario that  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  has two non-negligible profiles, in other words,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|R_n\|_{L^2}, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla|\cdot|^\sigma R_n\|_{L^2} \geq \epsilon > 0. \quad (3.3)$$

*Step 2. (Elimination of the dichotomy scenario)* Suppose that (3.3) holds. Then, we aim to deduce a contradiction by showing that  $\frac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=1} W(t\phi + R_n) > c > 0$ . Indeed, if so, there exists small  $\delta > 0$  such that  $W((1 - \delta)\phi + R_n) \leq W(u_n) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\delta$ , which contradicts the minimality of  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ .

To this end, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\bigg|_{t=1} \|t\phi + R_n\|_{L^2}^2 &= \frac{d}{dt}\bigg|_{t=1} \left\{ t^2 \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + 2t \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi \overline{R_n} dx + \|R_n\|_{L^2}^2 \right\} \\ &= 2\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi \overline{R_n} dx \\ &= 2\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + o_n(1) \quad (\text{by Proposition 3.2 (ii)}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

and similarly,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\bigg|_{t=1} \|\nabla|\cdot|^\sigma(t\phi + R_n)\|_{L^2}^2 = \dots = 2\|\nabla|\cdot|^\sigma \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + o_n(1). \quad (3.5)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\bigg|_{t=1} \|t\phi + R_n\|_{L^4}^4 = 4\|\phi\|_{L^4}^4 + \text{cross terms}. \quad (3.6)$$

We claim that each cross term in (3.6) converges to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and thus

$$\frac{d}{dt}\bigg|_{t=1} \|t\phi + R_n\|_{L^4}^4 = 4\|\phi\|_{L^4}^4 + o_n(1). \quad (3.7)$$

Among cross terms in (3.6), we only consider

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi |R_n|^2 \overline{R_n} dx,$$

since other cross terms can be treated similarly. By the profile decomposition, passing to a subsequence,

$$u_n(x) = \phi + R_n = \phi + \sum_{j=2}^J \phi^j(x - x_n^j) + R_n^J(x),$$

where  $|x_n^j| \rightarrow \infty$  (since the first profile  $\phi$  is not translated) and  $|x_n^j - x_n^{j'}| \rightarrow \infty$  for  $j \neq j'$ . Thus, by the asymptotic orthogonality of  $\{x_n^j\}_{n=1}^\infty$  and Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi |R_n|^2 \overline{R_n} dx \right| &\leq \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3=2}^J \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(x) \overline{\phi^{j_1}(\cdot - x_n^{j_1})} \phi^{j_2}(x - x_n^{j_2}) \overline{\phi^{j_3}(\cdot - x_n^{j_3})} dx \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi |R_n^J|^2 \overline{R_n^J} dx \right| \\ &\leq o_n(1) + \|\phi\|_{L^4} \|R_n^J\|_{L^4}^3 \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n, J \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.4), (3.5) and (3.7), we compute

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=1} W(t\phi + R_n) \\ &= \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=1} \frac{\|t\phi + R_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|\sigma(t\phi + R_n)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|t\phi + R_n\|_{L^4}^4} \\ &= \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=1} \frac{\left\{ t^2 \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|R_n\|_{L^2}^2 \right\}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{2\sigma}} \left\{ t^2 \|\nabla|\sigma\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla|\sigma R_n\|_{L^2}^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2\sigma}}}{t^4 \|\phi\|_{L^4}^4 + \|R_n\|_{L^4}^4} + o_n(1) \quad (3.8) \\ &= \dots \\ &= W(u_n) \left\{ \frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma} \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|u_n\|_{L^2}^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{\|\nabla|\sigma\phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|\nabla|\sigma u_n\|_{L^2}^2} - 4 \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^4}^4}{\|u_n\|_{L^4}^4} \right\} + o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

Then, by the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (3.2), the choice of  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  ( $W(u_n) \rightarrow \frac{1}{c_{GN}}$ ) and Young's inequality  $ab \leq \frac{4\sigma-1}{4\sigma} a^{\frac{4\sigma}{4\sigma-1}} + \frac{1}{4\sigma} b^{4\sigma}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^4}^4}{\|u_n\|_{L^4}^4} &\leq \frac{c_{GN} \|\phi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|\sigma\phi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{c_{GN} \|u_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|\sigma u_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}} + o_n(1) \\ &= \left( \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}}{\|u_n\|_{L^2}} \right)^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \left( \frac{\|\nabla|\sigma\phi\|_{L^2}}{\|\nabla|\sigma u_n\|_{L^2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} + o_n(1) \\ &\leq \frac{4\sigma-1}{4\sigma} \left( \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}}{\|u_n\|_{L^2}} \right)^4 + \frac{1}{4\sigma} \left( \frac{\|\nabla|\sigma\phi\|_{L^2}}{\|\nabla|\sigma u_n\|_{L^2}} \right)^4 + o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting this inequality into (3.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=1} W(t\phi + R_n) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{c_{GN}} \left\{ \frac{4\sigma - 1}{\sigma} \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|u_n\|_{L^2}^2} \left(1 - \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|u_n\|_{L^2}^2}\right) + \frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{\| |\nabla|^\sigma \phi \|_{L^2}^2}{\| |\nabla|^\sigma u_n \|_{L^2}^2} \left(1 - \frac{\| |\nabla|^\sigma \phi \|_{L^2}^2}{\| |\nabla|^\sigma u_n \|_{L^2}^2}\right) \right\} + o_n(1) \\ & = \frac{1}{c_{GN}} \left\{ \frac{4\sigma - 1}{\sigma} \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 \|R_n\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\sigma} \| |\nabla|^\sigma \phi \|_{L^2}^2 \| |\nabla|^\sigma R_n \|_{L^2}^2 \right\} + o_n(1), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last identity, we used Proposition 3.2 (iv) and  $\|u_n\|_{L^2} = \| |\nabla|^\sigma u_n \|_{L^2} = 1$ . Therefore, by the assumption (3.3), we conclude that

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=1} W(t\phi + R_n) \geq \frac{4\sigma - 1}{c_{GN}\sigma} \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 \epsilon + o_n(1), \text{ or } \geq \frac{1}{c_{GN}\sigma} \| |\nabla|^\sigma \phi \|_{L^2}^2 \epsilon + o_n(1),$$

which contradicts from minimality of  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ .

*Step 3. (Euler-Lagrange equation)* From Step 1 and 2, we obtained a minimizer for the Weinstein functional  $W(u)$ . Hence, modifying the minimizer  $\phi$  by  $Q = \alpha\phi(\lambda \cdot)$  as in the proof of Lemma 2.3, one can show that there is a minimizer solving the equation (3.1).  $\square$

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

We prove our main theorem following the argument in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

**4.1. Two-bubble decomposition.** The first step is to formulate a two-bubble decomposition for a minimizing sequence. The main difference from the two-bubble decomposition in the previous section is that it has a scaling parameter  $\lambda_n$  (see (4.1)). The reason we need  $\lambda_n$  is that unlike the previous case, one cannot modify a minimizing sequence easily by scaling to make it bounded in  $H^\sigma$ , because the Weinstein functional  $\mathcal{W}(u)$  is not scaling-invariant.

**Lemma 4.1** (Two-bubble decomposition). *There exist a minimizing sequence  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  for the Weinstein functional  $\mathcal{W}(u)$  and a sequence of scaling parameters  $\{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , with  $\lambda_n = 1$ ,  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$  or  $\lambda_n \rightarrow +\infty$ , such that*

$$v_n(x) := u_n(\lambda_n x) = \phi(x) + R_n(x), \quad \phi \neq 0, \quad (4.1)$$

satisfying the asymptotic Pythagorean expansions,

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_n\|_{L^2}^2 &= \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|R_n\|_{L^2}^2 + o_n(1), \\ \| |\nabla|^\sigma v_n \|_{L^2}^2 &= \| |\nabla|^\sigma \phi \|_{L^2}^2 + \|R_n\|_{L^2}^2 + o_n(1), \\ \| \mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} v_n \|_{L^2}^2 &= \| \mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} \phi \|_{L^2}^2 + \| \mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} R_n \|_{L^2}^2 + o_n(1), \\ \|v_n\|_{L^4}^4 &= \|\phi\|_{L^4}^4 + \|R_n\|_{L^4}^4 + o_n(1). \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset H^\sigma$  be a minimizing sequence for the Weinstein functional  $\mathcal{W}(u)$ . Then, as we did in the proof of Theorem 3.1, for each  $n$ , we can find  $\alpha_n, \mu_n > 0$  such that

$$\|\alpha_n u_n(\mu_n \cdot)\|_{L^2} = \| |\nabla|^\sigma (\alpha_n u_n(\mu_n \cdot)) \|_{L^2} = 1.$$

Since  $\mathcal{W}(\alpha u) = \mathcal{W}(u)$ , replacing  $u_n$  by  $\alpha_n u_n$ , we may assume that  $\alpha_n = 1$ . Moreover, passing to a subsequence, we may assume that  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu_* \in [0, +\infty)$  or  $\mu_n \rightarrow +\infty$ . If  $\mu_* \in (0, +\infty)$ , we set  $v_n = u_n$  and  $\lambda_n = 1$ . Otherwise, we set  $v_n = u_n(\lambda_n \cdot)$  with  $\lambda_n = \mu_n$ . Then,  $v_n = u_n(\lambda_n \cdot)$  satisfies

$$\|v_n\|_{L^2} \sim \|\nabla|^\sigma v_n\|_{L^2} \sim 1, \text{ and } \lambda_n = 1, \lambda_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ or } \lambda_n \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (4.3)$$

Thus, by Proposition 3.2, passing to a subsequence, we can write  $v_n = \phi(\cdot - x_n) + R_n$ . Moreover, by the translation invariance of  $\mathcal{W}(u)$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{W}(u(\cdot - a)) = \mathcal{W}(u)$ , replacing  $u_n$  by  $u_n(\cdot + x_n)$ , we obtain a simpler two-bubble decomposition

$$u_n(\lambda_n \cdot) = v_n = \phi + R_n$$

satisfying (4.2) except the third identity.

To show that there is a two-bubble decomposition with  $\phi \neq 0$ , we assume that there is no such  $\phi$  for contradiction, in other word,  $v_n = R_n$ . Then, by Proposition 3.2 (ii) with  $R_n = R_n^J$ , we have  $\|v_n\|_{L^4} \rightarrow 0$  up to a subsequence. When  $\lambda_n = 1$  or  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ , we deduce a contradiction to the minimality of  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  by showing  $W_1(u_n) \rightarrow \infty$ . Indeed, by scaling and (4.3), we have

$$W_1(u_n) = \frac{\|v_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n})^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} \sim \frac{\|(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n})^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4}.$$

Suppose that  $\lambda_n = 1$ . Then, by modifying the proof of Lemma A.3 (ii), one can show that  $p_1(\xi) \sim_c |\xi|^{2\sigma}$  for  $|\xi| \geq c$ . Thus, for sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathcal{P}_1)^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^2 &\geq \int_{|\xi| \geq c} p_1(\xi) |\hat{v}_n(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &\sim_c \int_{|\xi| \geq c} |\xi|^{2\sigma} |\hat{v}_n(\xi)|^2 d\xi = \|\nabla|^\sigma v_n\|_{L^2}^2 - \int_{|\xi| \leq c} |\xi|^{2\sigma} |\hat{v}_n(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &\geq \|\nabla|^\sigma v_n\|_{L^2}^2 - c^{2\sigma} \|v_n\|_{L^2}^2 \geq \delta > 0, \end{aligned}$$

provided that  $c > 0$  is small enough. Similarly, if  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ , by Lemma A.3 (ii),

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n})^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2} &\geq \int_{|\xi| \geq c\lambda_n} p_{\lambda_n}(\xi) |\hat{v}_n(\xi)|^2 d\xi \sim_c \int_{|\xi| \geq c\lambda_n} |\xi|^{2\sigma} |\hat{v}_n(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &\geq \int_{|\xi| \geq c} |\xi|^{2\sigma} |\hat{v}_n(\xi)|^2 d\xi = \|\nabla|^\sigma v_n\|_{L^2}^2 - \int_{|\xi| \leq c} |\xi|^{2\sigma} |\hat{v}_n(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &\geq \|\nabla|^\sigma v_n\|_{L^2}^2 - c^{2\sigma} \|v_n\|_{L^2}^2 \geq \delta > 0. \end{aligned}$$

In both cases, we obtain

$$W_1(u_n) \gtrsim \frac{1}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} \rightarrow \infty.$$

Suppose that  $\lambda_n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then by scaling and (4.3), we write

$$W_2(u_n) = \frac{\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} \|v_n\|_{L^2}^3 \|(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n})^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} \sim \frac{\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} \|(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n})^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4}.$$

We claim that if  $|\xi| \geq c$ , then

$$p_{\lambda_n}(\xi) \gtrsim_c \lambda_n^{2\sigma-2} |\xi|^{2\sigma}.$$

Indeed, if  $|\xi| \geq \frac{\lambda_n}{2}$ , then it follows from Lemma A.3 (ii) that  $|p_{\lambda_n}(\xi)| \sim |\xi|^{2\sigma}$ . If  $c \leq |\xi| \leq \frac{\lambda_n}{2}$ , then using the second order Taylor expansion, one can show that  $p_{\lambda_n}(\xi) = \lambda_n^{2\sigma} (|\frac{\xi}{\lambda_n} + 1|^{2\sigma} - 1 - 2\sigma \frac{\xi}{\lambda_n}) \sim \lambda_n^{2\sigma} (\frac{\xi}{\lambda_n})^2 = \lambda_n^{2\sigma-2} |\xi|^2 \gtrsim_c \lambda_n^{2\sigma-2} |\xi|^{2\sigma}$ . Therefore, by the claim, we prove that

$$\begin{aligned} W_2(u_n) &\gtrsim_c \frac{1}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} \left\{ \int_{|\xi| \geq c} |\xi|^{2\sigma} |\hat{v}_n(\xi)|^2 d\xi \right\}^{1/2} \\ &= \frac{1}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} \left\{ \|\nabla|\cdot|^\sigma v_n\|_{L^2}^2 - \int_{|\xi| \leq c} |\xi|^{2\sigma} |\hat{v}_n(\xi)|^2 d\xi \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\geq \frac{\left\{ \|\nabla|\cdot|^\sigma v_n\|_{L^2}^2 - c^{2\sigma} \|v_n\|_{L^2}^2 \right\}^{1/2}}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} \geq \frac{\delta}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

For the third identity in (4.2), expanding its left hand side, we see that it suffices to show that the cross term  $\langle \mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n} \phi, R_n \rangle_{L^2}$  converges to zero. It is obvious when  $\lambda_n = 1$ . Suppose that  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ . Then, since  $\|R_n\|_{H^\sigma}$  is bounded and  $R_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $H^\sigma$ , it is enough to show that  $\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\sigma} \mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n} \phi$  converges in  $L^2$ . Indeed, by Lemma A.3 (iii), we have a point-wise bound  $|\langle \xi \rangle^{-\sigma} p_{\lambda_n}(\xi)| \lesssim \langle \xi \rangle^\sigma$ , where the implicit constant is independent on  $n$ . Therefore, it follows from the dominated convergence theorem that  $\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\sigma} \mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n} \phi \rightarrow \phi$  in  $L^2$ . Suppose that  $\lambda_n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then, given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\phi_\epsilon \in H^\sigma$  such that  $\|\phi - \phi_\epsilon\|_{H^\sigma} \leq \epsilon$  and  $\hat{\phi}_\epsilon$  is supported in  $\{c \leq |\xi| \leq C\}$ . Thus, by Lemma A.3 (iii), we have

$$\langle \mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}(\phi - \phi_\epsilon), R_n \rangle_{L^2} \leq \|\langle \nabla \rangle^{-\sigma} (\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n})^{1/2} (\phi - \phi_\epsilon)\|_{L^2} \|R_n\|_{H^\sigma} \lesssim \|\phi - \phi_\epsilon\|_{H^\sigma} \leq \epsilon.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n} \phi_\epsilon, R_n \rangle_{L^2} &= \langle p_{\lambda_n} \hat{\phi}_\epsilon, \hat{R}_n \rangle_{L^2} = \lambda_n^{2\sigma} \langle (|1 + \frac{\xi}{\lambda_n}|^{2\sigma} - 1 - 2\sigma \frac{\xi}{\lambda_n}) \hat{\phi}_\epsilon, \hat{R}_n \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= \lambda_n^{2\sigma-2} \sigma(2\sigma-1) \langle -\Delta \phi_\epsilon, R_n \rangle_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \lambda_n^{2\sigma-2} \langle (|1 + \frac{\xi}{\lambda_n}|^{2\sigma} - 1 - 2\sigma \frac{\xi}{\lambda_n} - \sigma(2\sigma-1) \frac{\xi^2}{\lambda_n^2}) \hat{\phi}_\epsilon, \hat{R}_n \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= I_n + II_n. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that  $I_n$  converges to zero, since  $\langle -\Delta \phi_\epsilon, R_n \rangle_{L^2} \leq \|\Delta \phi_\epsilon\|_{L^2} \|R_n\|_{L^2} \lesssim \epsilon$  and  $\lambda_n^{2\sigma-2} \rightarrow 0$ . Moreover, using the dominated convergence theorem as above, one can show that  $II_n$  converges to zero. Since  $\epsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, we conclude that  $\langle \mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n} \phi, R_n \rangle_{L^2} \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

**4.2. Concentration.** For contradiction, we assume that  $u_n = v_n(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n})$  with  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ . Then, we prove that

$$\mathcal{W}(u_n) \rightarrow \frac{\|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|\cdot|^\sigma Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^4}^4}, \quad (4.4)$$

where  $Q_{(\sigma)}$  is the ground state for the elliptic equation

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma Q_{(\sigma)} + Q_{(\sigma)} - Q_{(\sigma)}^3 = 0.$$

Indeed, by scaling,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_1(u_n) &= \frac{\|v_n\|_{L^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}}}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n})^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} + \alpha \lambda_n^{2-2\sigma} \frac{\|v_n\|_{L^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}}}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n})^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} \\ &\quad - \left( \frac{\|v_n\|_{L^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}}}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n})^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} \right)^{1-\theta} \left( \alpha \lambda_n^{2-2\sigma} \frac{\|v_n\|_{L^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}}}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n})^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} \right)^{\theta}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

We claim that

$$\|(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n})^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^2 = \|\nabla|\sigma v_n\|_{L^2}^2 + o_n(1).$$

To show the claim, we write

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n})^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\nabla|\sigma v_n\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= \int_{|\xi| \leq C\lambda_n} + \int_{|\xi| \geq C\lambda_n} (|\xi + \lambda_n|^{2\sigma} - \lambda_n^{2\sigma} - 2\sigma \lambda_n^{2\sigma-1} \xi - |\xi|^{2\sigma}) |\hat{v}_n(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &= I_n + II_n. \end{aligned}$$

Using Taylor series, one can show that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $C > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} II_n &= \int_{\frac{\lambda_n}{|\xi|} \leq \frac{1}{C}} |\xi|^{2\sigma} \left( \left| 1 + \frac{\lambda_n}{|\xi|} \right|^{2\sigma} - \left( \frac{\lambda_n}{|\xi|} \right)^{2\sigma} - 2\sigma \left( \frac{\lambda_n}{|\xi|} \right)^{2\sigma-1} - 1 \right) |\hat{v}_n(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{C^{2\sigma-1}} \|\nabla|\sigma v_n\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{C^{2\sigma-1}} \lesssim \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, given  $C > 0$ , sending  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we get

$$I_n \lesssim (C\lambda_n)^{2\sigma} \|v_n\|_{L^2}^2 \sim (C\lambda_n)^{2\sigma} \rightarrow 0.$$

Going back to (4.5), by the claim with  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ , we obtain

$$\mathcal{W}_1(u_n) = \frac{\|v_n\|_{L^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}}}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|\sigma v_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} + o_n(1).$$

Then, (4.4) follows from the minimization property of  $Q_{(\sigma)}$ , i.e.,

$$\frac{\|u\|_{L^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}}}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|\sigma u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|u\|_{L^4}^4} \geq \frac{\|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}}}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|\sigma Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^4}^4}$$

(see Theorem 3.1).

Next, we deduce a contradiction by showing that

$$\mathcal{W}(Q_{(\sigma)}) < \frac{\|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}}}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|\sigma Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^4}^4}.$$

To this end, we claim that there exists  $c \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2} Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^2 = c \|\nabla|\sigma Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (4.6)$$

where  $c$  may depend on  $Q_{(\sigma)}$ . Indeed, by Plancherel theorem and the symmetry of  $Q_{(\sigma)}$ , we write

$$\|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2}Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_1(\xi)|\hat{Q}_{(\sigma)}(\xi)|^2 d\xi = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\xi)|\hat{Q}_{(\sigma)}(\xi)|^2 d\xi, \quad (4.7)$$

where  $g(\xi) := \frac{1}{2}(p_1(\xi) + p_1(-\xi))$  is an even function. Thus, it suffices to show that  $g(\xi) < |\xi|^{2\sigma}$ . Indeed, if  $0 < \xi < 1$ , then using Taylor series, we write

$$\begin{aligned} g(\xi) &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ |\xi + 1|^{2\sigma} + |\xi - 1|^{2\sigma} \right\} - 1 \\ &= \left\{ 1 + \frac{2\sigma(2\sigma-1)}{2!} \xi^2 + \frac{2\sigma(2\sigma-1)(2\sigma-2)(2\sigma-3)}{4!} \xi^4 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{2\sigma(2\sigma-1)(2\sigma-2)(2\sigma-3)(2\sigma-4)(2\sigma-5)}{6!} \xi^6 + \dots \right\} - 1 \\ &= |\xi|^{2\sigma} \left\{ \frac{2\sigma(2\sigma-1)}{2!} \xi^{2-2\sigma} + \frac{2\sigma(2\sigma-1)(2\sigma-2)(2\sigma-3)}{4!} \xi^{4-2\sigma} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{2\sigma(2\sigma-1)(2\sigma-2)(2\sigma-3)(2\sigma-4)(2\sigma-5)}{6!} \xi^{6-2\sigma} + \dots \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We observe that the power series  $\{\dots\}(\xi)$  is absolutely convergent and it is increasing on the interval  $(0, 1)$ . Moreover, we have

$$0 < 2^{2\sigma-1} - 1 < 1, \quad (4.8)$$

since  $2^{2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}-1} - 1 = 0$ ,  $2^{2 \cdot 1-1} - 1 = 1$  and  $\frac{d}{d\sigma}(2^{2\sigma-1} - 1) = 2^{2\sigma} \ln 2 > 0$ . Therefore, we obtain

$$g(\xi) = \{\dots\}(\xi)|\xi|^{2\sigma} \leq \{\dots\}(1)|\xi|^{2\sigma} = g(1)|\xi|^{2\sigma} = (2^{2\sigma-1} - 1)|\xi|^{2\sigma} < |\xi|^{2\sigma}.$$

On the other hand, if  $\xi > 1$ , we write

$$\begin{aligned} g(\xi) &= \frac{1}{2} |\xi|^{2\sigma} \left\{ \left| 1 + \frac{1}{\xi} \right|^{2\sigma} + \left| 1 - \frac{1}{\xi} \right|^{2\sigma} \right\} - 1 \\ &= |\xi|^{2\sigma} - 1 + \left\{ \frac{2\sigma(2\sigma-1)}{2!} \frac{1}{\xi^2} + \frac{2\sigma(2\sigma-1)(2\sigma-2)(2\sigma-3)}{4!} \frac{1}{\xi^4} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{2\sigma(2\sigma-1)(2\sigma-2)(2\sigma-3)(2\sigma-4)(2\sigma-5)}{6!} \frac{1}{\xi^6} + \dots \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the Laurent series  $\{\dots\}(\xi)$  is absolutely convergent, and it is decreasing on  $(1, +\infty)$ .

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(\xi) &= |\xi|^{2\sigma} - 1 + \{\dots\}(\xi) \\ &\leq |\xi|^{2\sigma} - 1 + \{\dots\}(1) = |\xi|^{2\sigma} - 1 + g(1) \\ &= |\xi|^{2\sigma} - 1 + (2^{2\sigma-1} - 1) = |\xi|^{2\sigma} - (2 - 2^{2\sigma-1}) \\ &< |\xi|^{2\sigma} \quad (\text{by (4.8)}). \end{aligned}$$

By the claim (4.6), we obtain

$$W_1(Q_{(\sigma)}) = c^{1/2\sigma} \frac{\|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|^\sigma Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^4}^4}.$$

Moreover, by (4.6) and the Pohozaev identities (Lemma B.1),

$$\begin{aligned} W_2(Q(\sigma)) &= c^{1/2} \alpha \frac{\|Q(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^3 \|\nabla|^\sigma Q(\sigma)\|_{L^2}}{\|Q(\sigma)\|_{L^4}^4} \\ &= c^{1/2} (4\sigma - 1)^{\frac{1-\sigma}{2\sigma}} \alpha \frac{\|Q(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|^\sigma Q(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|Q(\sigma)\|_{L^4}^4}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha = \alpha(\sigma) = 1/\sqrt{\sigma(2\sigma-1)}$ . Since  $W_3(u) = W_1(u)^{1-\theta} W_2(u)^\theta$ , collecting all, we get

$$\mathcal{W}(Q(\sigma)) = h(\theta) \cdot \frac{\|Q(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|^\sigma Q(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|Q(\sigma)\|_{L^4}^4},$$

where

$$h(\theta) = \left( c^{1/2\sigma} + c^{1/2} (4\sigma - 1)^{\frac{1-\sigma}{2\sigma}} \alpha - (c^{1/2\sigma})^{1-\theta} (c^{1/2} (4\sigma - 1)^{\frac{1-\sigma}{2\sigma}} \alpha)^\theta \right).$$

Observe that  $h(1) = c^{1/2\sigma} < 1$ . Hence, by continuity of  $h(\theta)$ , there exists  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , depending on  $\sigma$ , such that  $h(\theta) < 1$ . This contradicts the (4.4).

**4.3. Dichotomy.** Now, we show that a dichotomy does not occur, in other words,  $R_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $H^\sigma$ . For contradiction, we assume that  $R_n$  is not negligible in  $H^\sigma$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  so that by (4.2), either

$$0 < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|v_n\|_{L^2}^2} = 1 - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|R_n\|_{L^2}^2}{\|v_n\|_{L^2}^2} < 1 \quad (4.9)$$

or

$$0 < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} \phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^2} = 1 - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} R_n\|_{L^2}^2}{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^2} < 1 \quad (4.10)$$

holds up to a subsequence. Suppose that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|v_n\|_{L^2}^2} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} \phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^2}. \quad (4.11)$$

Define  $f_n(t) = \mathcal{W}(t\phi(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n}) + R_n(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n}))$ . We will show that  $f'_n(1) \geq \delta > 0$  for sufficiently large  $n$ . Then, there exists  $t \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\mathcal{W}(t\phi(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n}) + R_n(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n})) \leq \frac{1}{c_{GN}} - \delta(1-t) + o_n(1)$ , which contradicts the minimality of  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ . If (4.11) does not hold, by (4.9) and (4.10), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|R_n\|_{L^2}^2}{\|v_n\|_{L^2}^2} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} R_n\|_{L^2}^2}{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^2}.$$

Then, switching the roles of  $\phi$  and  $R_n$  in the definition of  $f_n(t)$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{W}(\phi(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n}) + tR_n(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n}))$ , we can deduce a contradiction by the same argument.



We compute  $f'_n(1)$  using asymptotic orthogonality (4.2) as in (3.8):

$$\begin{aligned} f'_n(1) &= W_1(u_n) \left\{ \frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma} \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|v_n\|_{L^2}^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} \phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^2} - 4 \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^4}^4}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} \right\} \\ &\quad + W_2(u_n) \left\{ 3 \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|v_n\|_{L^2}^2} + \frac{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} \phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^2} - 4 \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^4}^4}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} \right\} \\ &\quad - W_3(u_n) \left\{ \left( \frac{(4\sigma-1)(1-\theta)}{\sigma} + 3\theta \right) \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|v_n\|_{L^2}^2} + \left( \frac{1-\theta}{\sigma} + \theta \right) \frac{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} \phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^2} - 4 \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^4}^4}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} \right\} + o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

By the trivial estimate  $W_3 = W_1^{1-\theta} W_2^\theta \leq (1-\theta)W_1 + \theta W_2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f'_n(1) &\geq \theta W_1 \left\{ \left( \frac{5\sigma-2}{\sigma} + \frac{1-\sigma}{\sigma} \theta \right) \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|v_n\|_{L^2}^2} + \left( \frac{2-\sigma}{\sigma} - \frac{1-\sigma}{\sigma} \theta \right) \frac{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} \phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^2} - 4 \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^4}^4}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} \right\} \\ &\quad + (1-\theta) W_2 \left\{ \left( 3 + \frac{1-\sigma}{\sigma} \theta \right) \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|v_n\|_{L^2}^2} + \left( 1 - \frac{1-\sigma}{\sigma} \theta \right) \frac{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} \phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^2} - 4 \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^4}^4}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} \right\} + o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

For notational convenience, let

$$A = \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|v_n\|_{L^2}^2}, \quad B = \frac{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} \phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^2}, \quad C = \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^4}^4}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4}, \quad W_1 = W_1(u_n), \quad W_2 = W_2(u_n), \quad W_3 = W_3(u_n).$$

Choosing  $\theta < 1$  sufficiently close to 1, we write

$$f'_n(1) \geq \theta W_1 \left\{ \frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}^- A + \frac{1}{\sigma}^+ B - 4C \right\} + (1-\theta) W_2 \left\{ \frac{1+2\sigma}{\sigma}^- A + \frac{2\sigma-1}{\sigma}^+ B - 4C \right\} + o_n(1),$$

where  $a^+$  is a preselected number that is greater than  $a$  but sufficiently close to  $a$  depending only on  $\theta$ , and similarly for  $b^-$ . Here,  $\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}^- + \frac{1}{\sigma}^+ = 4$  and  $\frac{1+2\sigma}{\sigma}^- + \frac{2\sigma-1}{\sigma}^+ = 4$ .

We will estimate  $C = \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^4}^4}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4}$  using the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.2.** *For  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , let  $\ell(s) = 1 + s - s^\theta$ .*

(i) *If  $\theta^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}} \leq s_1 \leq s_2$ , then  $\ell(s_1) \leq \ell(s_2)$ .*

(ii) *If  $0 \leq s_1 \leq \theta^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}}$  and  $s_1 \leq s_2$ , then  $\ell(s_1) \leq (1 - \theta^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}}(1-\theta))^{-1} \ell(s_2)$ .*

*Proof.* Observe that  $\ell$  is convex on  $[0, +\infty)$ ,  $\ell(0) = 1$  and  $\ell(s)$  has a critical number  $\theta^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}}$ , where  $\ell$  has an absolute minimum  $\ell(\theta^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}}) = 1 - \theta^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}}(1-\theta)$ . The lemma then follows.  $\square$

*Remark 4.3.*  $\theta^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}} \rightarrow 1/e$  and  $(1 - \theta^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}}(1-\theta))^{-1} \rightarrow 1$  as  $\theta \rightarrow 1^-$ .

Let

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \|\phi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} \phi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}, & y &= \alpha \|\phi\|_{L^2}^3 \|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} \phi\|_{L^2}, \\ X &= \|v_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}, & Y &= \alpha \|v_n\|_{L^2}^3 \|\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n}^{1/2} v_n\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By minimality of  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  and scaling, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{c_{GN}} &= \mathcal{W}(u_n) + o_n(1) \\ &= W_1(v_n(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n})) + W_2(v_n(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n})) - W_1(v_n(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n}))^{1-\theta} W_2(v_n(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n}))^\theta + o_n(1) \\ &= \dots = \frac{X + (\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} Y) - X^{1-\theta} (\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} Y)^\theta}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} + o_n(1) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$\frac{1}{c_{GN}} \leq \mathcal{W}(\phi(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n})) = \frac{x + (\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} y) - x^{1-\theta} (\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} y)^\theta}{\|\phi\|_{L^4}^4}.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^4}^4}{\|v_n\|_{L^4}^4} \leq \frac{x + (\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} y) - x^{1-\theta} (\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} y)^\theta}{X + (\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} Y) - X^{1-\theta} (\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} Y)^\theta} + o_n(1) \\ &= \frac{x}{X} \frac{1 + \frac{\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} y}{x} - (\frac{\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} y}{x})^\theta}{1 + \frac{\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} Y}{X} - (\frac{\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} Y}{X})^\theta} + o_n(1) = \frac{x}{X} \frac{\ell(\frac{\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} y}{x})}{\ell(\frac{\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} Y}{X})} + o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

By the assumption (4.11), we have  $\frac{y}{Y} \leq \frac{x}{X}$  ( $\Rightarrow \frac{y}{x} \leq \frac{Y}{X}$ ).

Suppose that  $\lambda_n \rightarrow +\infty$  or  $\lambda_n = 1$  and  $\theta^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}} \leq \frac{y}{x}$  (in both cases,  $\theta^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}} \leq \frac{\lambda_n^{1-\sigma} y}{x}$  for large  $n$ ). Then, by Lemma 4.2 ( $\Rightarrow C \leq \frac{x}{X} = A^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{2\sigma}} B^{\frac{1}{2\sigma}}$ ) and Young's inequalities, we get

$$\begin{aligned} f'_n(1) &\geq \theta W_1 \left\{ \frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma} A + \frac{1}{\sigma} B - 4 \left( \frac{4\sigma-1}{4\sigma} A^{2^+} + \frac{1}{4\sigma} B^{2^-} \right) \right\} \\ &\quad + (1-\theta) W_2 \left\{ \frac{1+2\sigma}{\sigma} A + \frac{2\sigma-1}{\sigma} B - 4 \left( \frac{1+2\sigma}{4\sigma} A^{\frac{8\sigma-2}{1+2\sigma}^+} + \frac{2\sigma-1}{4\sigma} B^{\frac{2}{2\sigma-1}^-} \right) \right\} + o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

Here, Young's inequalities are applied so that  $\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma} = 4 \cdot \frac{4\sigma-1}{4\sigma}$ ,  $\frac{1}{\sigma} = 4 \cdot \frac{1}{4\sigma}$ ,  $\frac{1+2\sigma}{\sigma} = 4 \cdot \frac{1+2\sigma}{4\sigma}$  and  $\frac{2\sigma-1}{\sigma} = 4 \cdot \frac{2\sigma-1}{4\sigma}$ . Note that  $\frac{8\sigma-2}{1+2\sigma} > 1$  and  $\frac{2}{2\sigma-1} > 1$ , since  $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ . Therefore, by the assumption (4.11) ( $\Rightarrow 0 < A < 1$  or  $0 < B < 1$ ), we conclude that  $f'_n(1) > \delta > 0$  for sufficiently large  $n$ .

Suppose that  $\lambda_n = 1$ ,  $\frac{y}{x} \leq \theta^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}}$  and  $\theta$  is sufficiently close to 1. We claim that  $A \leq (\alpha e^+)^{-\frac{2\sigma}{1-\sigma}} 3^{2\sigma}$ . By the assumption, we have

$$\frac{y}{x} = \frac{\alpha \|\phi\|_{L^2}^3 \|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2} \phi\|_{L^2}}{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2} \phi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}} = \alpha \left\{ \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2} \phi\|_{L^2}^2} \right\}^{\frac{1-\sigma}{2\sigma}} \leq \theta^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}} = \frac{1}{e^+}.$$

Hence,  $A = \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2}{\|v_n\|_{L^2}^2} = \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq (\alpha e^+)^{-\frac{2\sigma}{1-\sigma}} \|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2} \phi\|_{L^2}^2$ . Moreover, we have

$$\|\mathcal{P}_1^{1/2} f\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 3^{2\sigma} \|\nabla|^\sigma f\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (4.12)$$

equivalently,  $p_1(\xi) \leq 3^{2\sigma} |\xi|^{2\sigma}$ . Indeed, if  $\xi \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , then  $|\xi + 1| \leq |\xi| + 1 \leq 3|\xi|$ , so  $p_1(\xi) \leq 3^{2\sigma} |\xi|^{2\sigma} - 1 - 2\sigma\xi \leq 3^{2\sigma} |\xi|^{2\sigma}$ . If  $\xi \leq -\frac{1}{2}$ , then  $|\xi + 1| \leq |\xi|$ , so  $p_1(\xi) \leq |\xi|^{2\sigma} - 1 - 2\sigma\xi \leq (1 + 2\sigma \cdot 2^{2\sigma-1}) |\xi|^{2\sigma} \leq 3^{2\sigma} |\xi|^{2\sigma}$ . If  $|\xi| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , then by the mean value theorem,

$p_1(\xi) \leq 1 + 2\sigma\xi + \sigma(2\sigma - 1)2^{2-2\sigma}\xi^2 - 1 - 2\sigma\xi \leq \sigma(2\sigma - 1)|\xi|^{2\sigma}$ . Thus, by (4.12) with  $\|v_n\|_{L^2}^2 = \|\nabla v_n\|_{L^2}^2 = 1$ , we prove that

$$A \leq (\alpha e)^{-\frac{2\sigma}{1-\sigma}} 3^{2\sigma} \|\nabla|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq (\alpha e^+)^{-\frac{2\sigma}{1-\sigma}} 3^{2\sigma} \|\nabla|^\sigma v_n\|_{L^2}^2 \leq (\alpha e^+)^{-\frac{2\sigma}{1-\sigma}} 3^{2\sigma}.$$

Finally, by Lemma 4.2 ( $\Rightarrow C \leq \frac{x}{X} = 1^+ \cdot A^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{2\sigma}} B^{\frac{1}{2\sigma}}$ ), Young's inequalities as above and the claim, we get

$$\begin{aligned} f'_n(1) &\geq \theta W_1 \left\{ \frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}^- A + \frac{1}{\sigma}^+ B - 4^+ \left( \frac{4\sigma-1}{4\sigma} A^2 + \frac{1}{4\sigma} B^2 \right) \right\} \\ &\quad + (1-\theta) W_2 \left\{ \frac{1+2\sigma}{\sigma}^- A + \frac{2\sigma-1}{\sigma}^+ B - 4^+ \left( \frac{1+2\sigma}{4\sigma} A^{\frac{8\sigma-2}{1+2\sigma}} + \frac{2\sigma-1}{4\sigma} B^{\frac{2}{2\sigma-1}} \right) \right\} + o_n(1) \\ &\geq \delta > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\frac{1}{\sigma}^+ = 4^+ \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma}$  and  $\frac{2\sigma-1}{\sigma}^+ = 4^+ \cdot \frac{2\sigma-1}{\sigma}$ . Here, we used the fact that  $0 < A < (\alpha e)^{-\frac{2\sigma}{1-\sigma}} 3^{2\sigma} < 1$ .

**4.4. Spreading out.** By Section 4.3,  $\{\phi(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n})\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is also a minimizing sequence. Then it is enough to show that this minimizing sequence is not spread out ( $\lambda_n \rightarrow +\infty$ ), because if  $\lambda_n = 1$ , then  $\phi$  minimizes  $\mathcal{W}(u)$ .

For contradiction, we assume that  $\lambda_n \rightarrow \infty$  so that  $u_n$  is concentrated in low frequencies for large  $n$ . Since  $\mathcal{P}_k \approx \sigma(2\sigma - 1)(-\Delta)$  in low frequencies (Lemma A.2 (i)), we have

$$W_1(u_n) = \frac{\|\phi(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n})\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla\phi(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n})\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|\phi(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n})\|_{L^4}^4} + o_n(1) = \lambda_n^{1-\frac{1}{\sigma}} \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|\phi\|_{L^4}^4} + o_n(1) \rightarrow 0$$

and thus  $W_3(u_n) = W_1(u_n)^{1-\theta} W_2(u_n)^\theta \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, for sufficiently large  $n$ , by scaling,

$$\mathcal{W}(u_n) = W_2(u_n) + o_n(1) = \frac{\|\phi(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n})\|_{L^2}^3 \|\nabla\phi(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n})\|_{L^2}}{\|\phi(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n})\|_{L^4}^4} + o_n(1) = \frac{\|\phi\|_{L^2}^3 \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2}}{\|\phi\|_{L^4}^4} + o_n(1).$$

We note that  $\phi$  should be contained in  $H^1$  (not only in  $H^\sigma$ ), because if  $\|\phi\|_{H^1} = \infty$ , then  $\mathcal{W}(u_n) \rightarrow \infty$ , which contradicts the minimality of  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ . Let  $Q_{(1)}$  be the ground state for the nonlinear elliptic equation

$$-\Delta Q_{(1)} + Q_{(1)} - Q_{(1)}^3 = 0.$$

Then, it follows from the minimization property of  $Q_{(1)}$  that

$$\mathcal{W}(u_n) \rightarrow \frac{\|Q_{(1)}\|_{L^2}^3 \|\nabla Q_{(1)}\|_{L^2}}{\|Q_{(1)}\|_{L^4}^4}.$$

By the interpolation inequality

$$\|\nabla|^\sigma Q_{(1)}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|Q_{(1)}\|_{L^2}^{2-2\sigma} \|\nabla Q_{(1)}\|_{L^2}^{2\sigma}$$

and the minimization property of  $Q_{(\sigma)}$ , we get

$$\mathcal{W}(u_n) \geq \frac{\|Q_{(1)}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|^\sigma Q_{(1)}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|Q_{(1)}\|_{L^4}^4} + o_n(1) > \frac{\|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|^\sigma Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^4}^4} + \delta$$

for some  $\delta > 0$ . However, it makes a contradiction to the minimality of  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , since by (4.4), if  $\lambda'_n \rightarrow 0$ , then

$$\mathcal{W}(Q_{(\sigma)}(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda'_n})) \rightarrow \frac{\|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \|\nabla|^\sigma Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}}{\|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^4}^4}.$$

**4.5. Regularity.** The regularity follows from standard arguments. Since  $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ , then  $u$  is continuous and even, by Morrey embedding, it is  $C_{loc}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})$ . Hence one has that

$$\mathcal{P}_1 u \in C^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}).$$

Then the result follows by standard elliptic regularity and bootstrap.

#### APPENDIX A. PROPERTIES OF THE FOURIER MULTIPLIER OPERATOR $\mathcal{P}_k$

We collect properties of the Fourier multiplier operator  $\mathcal{P}_k$  defined by

$$(\mathcal{P}_k f)^\wedge(\xi) = p_k(\xi) \hat{f}(\xi),$$

where

$$p_k(\xi) = |\xi + k|^{2\sigma} - |k|^{2\sigma} - 2\sigma|k|^{2\sigma-2}k \cdot \xi.$$

**Lemma A.1** (Asymptotics of  $p_k$ ). *Suppose that  $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  and  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $k \neq 0$ .*

(i) (Low frequencies)

$$p_k(\xi) = \sigma(2\sigma - 1)|k|^{2\sigma-2}|\xi|^2 \left(1 + O_{k,\sigma}(|\xi|)\right) \quad \text{as } \xi \rightarrow 0.$$

(ii) (High frequencies)

$$p_k(\xi) = |\xi|^{2\sigma} \left(1 + O_{k,\sigma}\left(\frac{1}{|\xi|}\right)\right) \quad \text{as } \xi \rightarrow \infty.$$

*Proof.* For (i), we compute

$$\begin{aligned} p_k(\xi) &= |\xi + k|^{2\sigma} - |k|^{2\sigma} - 2\sigma|k|^{2\sigma-2}k \cdot \xi && \implies p_k(0) = 0, \\ p'_k(\xi) &= 2\sigma|\xi + k|^{2\sigma-2}(\xi + k) - 2\sigma|k|^{2\sigma-2}k && \implies p'_k(0) = 0, \\ p''_k(\xi) &= 2\sigma(2\sigma - 1)|\xi + k|^{2\sigma-2} && \implies p''_k(0) = 2\sigma(2\sigma - 1)|k|^{2\sigma-2}, \\ p'''_k(\xi) &= 2\sigma(2\sigma - 1)(2\sigma - 2)|\xi + k|^{2\sigma-3}(\xi + k) && \implies |p'''_k(\xi)| \lesssim_{k,\sigma} 1 \text{ for } |\xi| \leq \frac{|k|}{2}, \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

where the implicit constant depends on  $k$  and  $\sigma$ . Thus, by the third order Taylor series expansion, we prove (i). For (ii), we write

$$\frac{p_k(\xi)}{|\xi|^{2\sigma}} = \left|1 + \frac{k}{|\xi|}\right|^{2\sigma} - \left(\frac{|k|}{|\xi|}\right)^{2\sigma} - 2\sigma\left(\frac{|k|}{|\xi|}\right)^{2\sigma-2}\frac{|k|}{|\xi|} \cdot \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}.$$

Then, using the third order Taylor series expansion for  $\frac{p_k(\xi)}{|\xi|^{2\sigma}}$  with  $\frac{k}{|\xi|}$  being small, we prove the high frequency asymptotics.  $\square$

Using Lemma A.1, we prove that  $\mathcal{P}_k \approx \sigma(2\sigma - 1)|k|^{2\sigma-2}(-\Delta)$  in low frequencies, and  $\mathcal{P}_k \approx (-\Delta)^\sigma$  in high frequencies in the following sense.

**Lemma A.2** (Limiting behavior of  $\mathcal{P}_k$ ). *Suppose that  $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  and  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $k \neq 0$ .*

(i) (Low frequencies) For any  $\phi \in H^1$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} (\mathcal{P}_k \phi(\frac{x}{\lambda_n})) \overline{\phi(\frac{x}{\lambda_n})} dx - \sigma(2\sigma - 1)|k|^{2\sigma-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} ((-\Delta)\phi(\frac{x}{\lambda_n})) \overline{\phi(\frac{x}{\lambda_n})} dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \lambda_n \rightarrow \infty.$$

(ii) (High frequencies) For any  $\phi \in H^\sigma$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} (\mathcal{P}_k \phi(\frac{x}{\lambda_n})) \overline{\phi(\frac{x}{\lambda_n})} dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}} ((-\Delta)^\sigma \phi(\frac{x}{\lambda_n})) \overline{\phi(\frac{x}{\lambda_n})} dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \lambda_n \rightarrow 0.$$

*Proof.* By Plancherel theorem, change of the variables, Lemma A.1 (i) and the dominate convergence theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\mathcal{P}_k \phi(\frac{x}{\lambda_n})) \overline{\phi(\frac{x}{\lambda_n})} dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} (|\xi + k|^{2\sigma} - |k|^{2\sigma} - 2\sigma|k|^{2\sigma-2}k \cdot \xi) |\lambda_n \hat{\phi}(\lambda_n \xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &= \lambda_n \int_{\mathbb{R}} (|\frac{\xi}{\lambda_n} + k|^{2\sigma} - |k|^{2\sigma} - 2\sigma|k|^{2\sigma-2}k \cdot \frac{\xi}{\lambda_n}) |\hat{\phi}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &= \lambda_n \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(2\sigma - 1)|k|^{2\sigma-2} |\frac{\xi}{\lambda_n}|^2 |\hat{\phi}(\xi)|^2 d\xi + o_n(1) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(2\sigma - 1)|k|^{2\sigma-2} |\xi|^2 |\lambda_n \hat{\phi}(\lambda_n \xi)|^2 d\xi + o_n(1) \\ &= \sigma(2\sigma - 1)|k|^{2\sigma-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} ((-\Delta)\phi(\frac{x}{\lambda_n})) \overline{\phi(\frac{x}{\lambda_n})} dx + o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we prove (ii).  $\square$

In all frequencies,  $\mathcal{P}_k$  is bounded by  $(-\Delta)^\sigma$  up to constant multiple.

**Lemma A.3** (Bounds for  $p_k$ ). *Let  $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  and  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $k \neq 0$ . Then,  $p_k$  satisfies the following bounds whose implicit constants do not depend on  $k$ .*

(i) (Low frequencies)  $p_k(\xi) \sim 2\sigma(2\sigma - 1)|k|^{2\sigma-2}|\xi|^2$  for  $|\xi| \leq \frac{|k|}{2}$ .

(ii) (High frequencies)  $p_k(\xi) \sim |\xi|^{2\sigma}$  for  $|\xi| \geq \frac{|k|}{2}$ .

(iii) (Upper bound)  $p_k(\xi) \lesssim |\xi|^{2\sigma}$  for all  $\xi$ .

*Proof.* We observe from (A.1) that  $p_k(\xi)$  is a strictly convex function having only one critical number 0 with the absolute minimum  $p_k(0) = 0$ .

(i) Suppose that  $|\xi| \leq \frac{|k|}{2}$ . Then, by (A.1),  $|p_k''(\xi)| \sim 2\sigma(2\sigma - 1)|k|^{2\sigma-2}$ . Thus, by the second order Taylor expansion, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} p_k(\xi) &\sim p_k(0) + p_k'(0)\xi + p_k''(\xi_*)|\xi|^2 \quad (\text{for some } \xi_* \in (0, \xi)) \\ &\sim 2\sigma(2\sigma - 1)|k|^{2\sigma-2}|\xi|^2. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) If  $|\xi| \geq 2|k|$ , by the second order Taylor series expansion as in (i), we can prove that

$$p_k(\xi) = |\xi|^{2\sigma} \left\{ 1 + \frac{k}{|\xi|} |^{2\sigma} - \left(\frac{|k|}{|\xi|}\right)^{2\sigma} - 2\sigma \frac{\xi}{|k|} \right\} \sim |\xi|^{2\sigma}.$$

Suppose that  $\frac{|k|}{2} \leq |\xi| \leq 2|k|$ . Then,

$$\min_{\frac{|k|}{2} \leq |\xi| \leq 2|k|} p_k(\xi) = \min_{\xi = \pm \frac{|k|}{2}} p_k(\xi) = \min \left\{ \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{2\sigma} - 1 - \sigma, \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2\sigma} - 1 + \sigma \right\} |k|^{2\sigma} \geq |\xi|^{2\sigma}.$$

Thus,  $p_k(\xi) \gtrsim |\xi|^{2\sigma}$ . Similarly, we can show that  $\max_{\frac{|k|}{2} \leq |\xi| \leq 2|k|} p_k(\xi) \sim |k|^{2\sigma}$ , which implies that  $p_k(\xi) \lesssim |\xi|^{2\sigma}$ .

(iii) follows immediately from (i) and (ii).  $\square$

## APPENDIX B. POHOZAEV IDENTITIES

**Lemma B.1** (Pohozaev identities). *Let  $Q_{(\sigma)}$  is a solution to the nonlinear elliptic equation  $(-\Delta)^\sigma Q_{(\sigma)} + Q_{(\sigma)} - Q_{(\sigma)}^3 = 0$ . Then,*

$$\|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{4\sigma - 1} \|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^4}^4 = \frac{4\sigma}{4\sigma - 1} \|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

*Proof.* Multiplying the equation by  $Q_{(\sigma)}$  (and  $x \cdot \nabla Q_{(\sigma)}$ ), integrating over  $\mathbb{R}$  and then applying integration by parts, we obtain

$$\|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma}^2 + \|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^2 - \|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^4}^4 = 0, \quad -\left(\frac{1}{2} - \sigma\right) \|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{4} \|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^4}^4 = 0.$$

Here, for the second identity, we use  $(-\Delta)^\sigma(xf) = x(-\Delta)^\sigma f - 2\sigma(-\Delta)^{\sigma-2} \nabla f$ . Solving the equation for  $\|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma}^2$  and  $\|Q_{(\sigma)}\|_{L^4}^4$ , we prove the lemma.  $\square$

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Y.H. would like to thank IHÉS for their hospitality and support while he visited in the summer of 2014. Y.S. would like to thank the hospitality of the Department of Mathematics at University of Texas at Austin where part of the work was initiated. Y.S. acknowledges the support of ANR grants "HAB" and "NONLOCAL".

## REFERENCES

- [ABS97] J. P. Albert, J. L. Bona, and J.-C. Saut. Model equations for waves in stratified fluids. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A*, 453(1961):1233–1260, 1997.
- [Ber96] Jean Bertoin. *Lévy processes*, volume 121 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [CHHO13] Yonggeun Cho, Hichem Hajaiej, Gyeongha Hwang, and Tohru Ozawa. On the Cauchy problem of fractional Schrödinger equation with Hartree type nonlinearity. *Funkcial. Ekvac.*, 56(2):193–224, 2013.
- [CHKL14] Y Cho, G Hwang, S. Kwon, and S. Lee. Well-posedness and ill-posedness for the cubic fractional schrödinger equations. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1311.0082>, 2014.
- [COX11] Yonggeun Cho, Tohru Ozawa, and Suxia Xia. Remarks on some dispersive estimates. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 10(4):1121–1128, 2011.

- [FL13] Rupert L. Frank and Enno Lenzmann. Uniqueness of non-linear ground states for fractional Laplacians in  $\mathbb{R}$ . *Acta Math.*, 210(2):261–318, 2013.
- [FLS15] R. Frank, E. Lenzmann, and L. Silvestre. Uniqueness of radial solutions for the fractional laplacian. *to appear CPAM*, 2015.
- [Gér98] Patrick Gérard. Description du défaut de compacité de l’injection de Sobolev. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 3:213–233 (electronic), 1998.
- [GW14] Z Guo and Y. Wang. Improved strichartz estimates for a class of dispersive equations in the radial case and their applications to nonlinear schrödinger and wave equation. *to appear J. Anal. Math.*, 2014.
- [HK05] Taoufik Hmidi and Sahbi Keraani. Blowup theory for the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equations revisited. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, (46):2815–2828, 2005.
- [HS15] Y. Hong and Y. Sire. On the fractional schrödinger equation in sobolev spaces. *To appear CPAA*, 2015.
- [KLR13] Joachim Krieger, Enno Lenzmann, and Pierre Raphaël. Nondispersive solutions to the  $L^2$ -critical half-wave equation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 209(1):61–129, 2013.
- [Las02] Nick Laskin. Fractional Schrödinger equation. *Phys. Rev. E (3)*, 66(5):056108, 7, 2002.
- [Lio85a] P.-L. Lions. The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The limit case. I. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 1(1):145–201, 1985.
- [Lio85b] P.-L. Lions. The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The limit case. II. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 1(2):45–121, 1985.
- [SS99] Catherine Sulem and Pierre-Louis Sulem. *The nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, volume 139 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999. Self-focusing and wave collapse.
- [Wei83] Michael I. Weinstein. Nonlinear Schrödinger equations and sharp interpolation estimates. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 87(4):567–576, 1982/83.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN

UNIVERSITÉ AIX-MARSEILLE, I2M, UMR 7353, MARSEILLE, FRANCE