

ON BLOW UP FOR A CLASS OF RADIAL HARTREE TYPE EQUATIONS

SHUMAO WANG

ABSTRACT. We study a class of Hartree type equations and prove a quantitative blow up rate for their blow up solutions. This is an analogue of the result by Merle and Raphaël on 3d NLS.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the Cauchy problem for the focusing Hartree equation for $d = 3$:

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \Delta u = -(V * |u|^2)u, & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0 \in \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1. \end{cases}$$

Here $V(x)$ is a real valued function, problem (1.1) has three conservation laws:

- Mass:

$$(1.2) \quad M(u(t)) = M(u_0) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u(t)|^2 dx,$$

- Energy:

$$(1.3) \quad E(u(t)) = E(u_0) := \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 dx - \frac{1}{4} \int (V * |u|^2)(t, x) |u(t, x)|^2 dx,$$

- Momentum:

$$(1.4) \quad P(u(t)) = P(u_0) := \text{Im} \int \bar{u} \nabla u(t) dx.$$

We will focus on radial V and radial initial data u_0 throughout the article.

1.1. Setting of the problem and statement of the main result. For the equation (1.1), it describes the dynamics of the mean-field limits of many-body quantum systems, such as coherent states, condensates. In particular, it provides effective model for quantum systems with long-range interactions. Readers can refer to [24, 15, 12] for more information about the physical background of the equation. Besides its physical importance, a lot of mathematical interest for equation (1.1) lies in its connection and similarity to cubic NLS,

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \Delta u = -|u|^2 u. & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0. \end{cases}$$

In particular, when $V(x) = \delta(x)$, then (1.1) formally becomes (1.5). From this perspective, if one obtains some result for (1.5), it is reasonable to expect that a similar result holds for (1.1). It is also well-expected that one can generalize a result to a cubic NLS from a Hartree type model. And this is the main purpose of the current article. However, the Hartree equation differs from cubic NLS mainly in two ways,

Key words and phrases. Hartree type equations; blow up rate.

- Equation (1.1) does not necessarily enjoy the scaling symmetry¹, which is one of the most important property for (1.5).
- Due to the convolution structure in (1.1), it is non-local.

The study of blow up problem for focusing NLS (and other nonlinear dispersive PDEs) has been an active research field. Classical virial argument by Glassey in [14] implies the existence of many blow up solutions. Constructive blow up solutions and universality of blow up solutions under certain regime have attracted a lot of researchers, see for examples [31, 29, 32, 27, 39]. But very few can be said about general blow up solutions, i.e. solutions without a size constraint, and it is very hard. In [33], Merle and Raphaël consider the nonlinear Schrödinger equation (1.5), and proved that,

Theorem 1.1. *Let $u_0 \in \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1$ be radial. Assume that the corresponding solution to (1.5) blows up in finite time T , then there exists a constant $\gamma > 0$ such that*²

$$(1.6) \quad \|u(t)\|_{L^3} \geq C(u_0) |\log(T-t)|^\gamma$$

for t close enough to T .

Remark 1.2. Merle and Raphaël have proved a more general result for a larger class of Schrödinger equations. Indeed they cover all the mass-supercritical and energy-subcritical cases for $d \geq 3$.

Remark 1.3. \dot{H}^{s_c} with $s_c = \frac{1}{2}$ is the critical norm of (1.5), i.e. this norm is invariant under the natural scaling of (1.5). Note that one has, via Sobolev embedding, $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \hookrightarrow L^3(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

When the scaling index $s_c = 0$, we say it is mass-critical; $s_c = 1$ corresponds to the energy-critical case; in this article we focus on the case with $0 < s_c < 1$, i.e. mass supercritical and energy subcritical case.

Remark 1.4. The estimate (1.6) may be rephrased as: there is no type II³ blow up solution to (1.5), for radial initial data in $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1$.

Thus, all such finite time blow up solutions do not fall into the regime of Soliton Resolution Conjecture, which formally predicts all type II blow up solutions to nonlinear dispersive equation will decouple into solitary wave living at different scales and a regular term.

The main result of the current article is to prove an analogous result for a class of Hartree type equations.

Theorem 1.5. *Consider the equation*

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \Delta u = -(V * |u|^2)u. & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0 \in \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1. \end{cases}$$

where u_0 is a radial function. Assume $V(x)$ is a radial function satisfying

$$(1.8) \quad \sum x_j \partial_{x_j} V(x) \leq -\alpha V(x)$$

for some $\alpha \in (2, +\infty)$, and assume the integrability condition

$$(1.9) \quad V(x) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3), \quad \sum x_j \partial_{x_j} V(x) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3),$$

and the following pointwise bound

$$(1.10) \quad \left| \sum x_j \partial_{x_j} V(x) \right| \leq \frac{C}{|x|^3}.$$

¹If $u(t, x)$ solves (1.5), so does $u_\lambda(t, x) := \frac{1}{\lambda} u(\frac{t}{\lambda^2}, \frac{x}{\lambda})$.

²They obtain (1.6) for $\gamma = \frac{1}{12}$.

³a type II blow up solution means its critical norm remains bounded when t tends to the blow up time T , i.e. $\limsup_{t \nearrow T} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{s_c}} < +\infty$, and a blow up solution is type I if it is not type II.

If $u(t)$ blows up in finite time T , then there exists a constant $\gamma > 0$ such that ⁴

$$(1.11) \quad \|u(t)\|_{L^3} \geq C(u_0) |\log(T-t)|^\gamma$$

for t close enough to T .

Remark 1.6. Assumption (1.9) seems natural. Assumptions (1.8) and (1.10) are due to technical reasons.

Remark 1.7. In order to connect virial identity with energy, we have assumed the condition (1.8) holds. From (1.8), we note that either

$$(1.12) \quad V(x) \geq \frac{c_V}{|x|^\alpha}$$

at a neighborhood of the origin or $V(x)$ is non-positive. Note that $V(x)$ can not be non-positive because in this case there exist no blow up solutions due to energy conservation law.

Remark 1.8. Under the assumption (1.8), by the following virial identity,

$$(1.13) \quad \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \int |x|^2 |u|^2 = 8 \int |\nabla u|^2 + 4 \int x_j |u|^2 \partial_j (V * |u|^2) dx,$$

one could easily derive blow up solutions with negative energy. For the completeness of the article, we have supplemented the proof of this part in Appendix A.

Remark 1.9. The assumptions on $V(x)$ can be relaxed. Indeed, (1.8) and $V(x) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ imply $\sum x_j \partial_{x_j} V(x) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

Remark 1.10. We give an example which satisfies the conditions (1.8), (1.9), and (1.10) i.e. the object of the above analysis is not \emptyset ,

$$(1.14) \quad V(Z) = \frac{1}{|Z|^3 |\log Z|^\alpha} \chi(Z), \text{ for } \alpha > 1,$$

with

$$\chi(Z) = \begin{cases} 1 & Z \leq \delta \\ 0 & Z \geq 2\delta \end{cases} \text{ for some } \delta \text{ small enough.}$$

We review a series of related work regarding Hartree type equations and NLS,

- mass-critical case

In the 1990s, Merle's work [27] had given the characteristic in H^1 for the blow-up solutions with minimal mass in nonlinear Schrödinger equation⁵,

$$(1.15) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \Delta u = -|u|^{\frac{4}{d}} u. & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0. \end{cases}$$

And Dodson improved this result in L^2 setting in [6, 7]. The parallel result in Hartree-equation setting can be found in [23] and [35].

⁴Note that (1.11) implies

$$\|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \geq C(u_0) |\log(T-t)|^\gamma$$

in $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ setting and our method could give $\gamma = \frac{2}{31+\varepsilon}$, $\forall \varepsilon > 0$.

⁵The ground state associated to (1.15) is the unique positive solution to

$$\Delta Q + Q^{1+\frac{4}{d}} = Q,$$

which supply a stationary solution to (1.15) with $u(t, x) = e^{it} Q(x)$.

When the mass is below the ground state $Q(x)$, Weinstein proved the solution is global and scattering in H^1 in [41] and Dodson improved this result to L^2 setting in [4].

When the mass is beyond the ground state, Bourgain and Wang in [1] constructed a type of blow up solutions with the blow up rate $\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \sim \frac{1}{T-t}$. Besides, another type of blow up solutions, the log-log blow up solutions, are suggested numerically by Landman, Papanicolaou, Sulem, Sulem in [21]. This kind of solutions blow up in finite time with the rate $\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \sim (\frac{\log|\log(T-t)|}{T-t})^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Perelman firstly constructed this kind of solutions in her work [37]. After that, the log-log blow-up solutions have been studied in depth and comprehensively by Merle and Raphaël in a series of work [31, 29, 32, 28, 30, 39]. They give a more complete portrayal of the blow up rate in the vicinity of the ground state solution and a classification of the blow up solutions.

We should remark, for the mass-critical focusing NLS, when the mass is much larger than threshold, Merle constructed a k -points blow up solution in [26], and readers can also refer to [38, 11] for the study of weakly interacting multi bubbles blow up dynamics for NLS. Besides, Martel and Raphaël in [25] constructed a multi-bubbles blow up solution, with the rate $\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \sim \frac{\log(T-t)}{T-t}$ due to strong interactions.

- mass-supercritical and energy-subcritical case

Between this range, for the focusing 3d cubic NLS, Merle and Raphaël in [33] gave a universal blow-up lower bound in the radial case. Besides, towards this model, there is a series of work concerning the following quantity,⁶

$$M\Xi := \frac{M[u]E[u]}{M[Q]E[Q]},$$

readers can refer to for [16, 8, 17] when $M\Xi \in (0, 1)$, [9] for $M\Xi = 1$ and [36, 10] in the case $M\Xi > 1$.

For the focusing Hartree equation, readers may also refer to [13] in this range. Our result is also a step toward understanding some universal blow up behaviour and the connection between NLS and Hartree type equations.

- energy-critical case

For the focusing energy-critical Schrödinger equation, Kenig and Merle in [9] used a concentration compactness argument and a rigidity theorem to prove any radial solutions $u(t)$ in $d = 3, 4, 5$ which satisfy $E(u_0) < E(W)$ and $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^1} < \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}$ ⁷ must be global and scatter. For the nonradial case, readers can refer to [5] in $d = 4$ and [19] $d \geq 5$.

Returning to the Hartree-equation setting, [22] treated the focusing case, and proved a parallel result with [19].

1.2. A review of Merle and Raphael's work in [33] and the connection with our result. Since our work rely on the method developed by Merle and Raphaël in [33], let us review some points and highlight the main quantities in their analysis. There is also some interesting work related to this topic, one can refer to [40] for Navier Stokes equation, [20] for focusing nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation and [25] for inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation.

In this subsection, in order to make the idea of the article more concise and clear, we only review a weaker version of Merle and Raphaël. More precisely, we impose the following non-positive energy assumption for Theorem 1.1,

$$E(u_0) \leq 0,$$

⁶ $M(u) := \int |u|^2$ and $E(u) := \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u|^2 - \frac{1}{4} \int |u|^4$. And Q is the unique H^1 radial positive solution of

$$\Delta Q - \frac{1}{2}Q + |Q|^2Q = 0.$$

⁷The $W(x)$ is the unique radial positive solution in \dot{H}^1 to

$$\Delta W + |W|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}W = 0,$$

with $d \geq 3$.

and the critical norm under consideration becomes $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Towards the nonlinear Schrödinger equation (1.5), for t close enough to the blow up time T , we renormalize $u(t)$ with its \dot{H}^1 norm, i.e. let

$$(1.16) \quad \lambda_u(t) = \left(\frac{1}{\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}} \right)^2,$$

and define the renormalization of $u(t)$:

$$(1.17) \quad v(\tau, x) = \lambda_u(t) \bar{u}(t - \lambda_u(t)^2 \tau, \lambda_u(t) x).$$

From local theory of NLS, we note that

$$(1.18) \quad \lambda_u(t) \lesssim \sqrt{T-t}.$$

Then a long time behaviour of blow up dynamics has been transformed into a Cauchy problem that satisfies the following special conditions:

$$(1.19) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_\tau v + \Delta v(\tau, x) = |v|^2 v(\tau, x), & (\tau, x) \in [0, \frac{1}{\lambda_u(t)}] \times \mathbb{R}^3, \\ v(\tau, x) |_{\tau=0} = \lambda_u(t) \bar{u}(t, \lambda_u(t) x), \end{cases}$$

with

$$(1.20) \quad \|v(0, x)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

$$(1.21) \quad \|v(0, x)\|_{\dot{H}^1} = 1,$$

and the non-positive energy

$$(1.22) \quad E(v_0) \leq 0.$$

Let

$$(1.23) \quad N(t) = -\log \lambda_u(t),$$

we could conclude, Merle and Raphaël converted Theorem 1.1 into proving the following conclusion, there exists a universal constant $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$(1.24) \quad \|v(0, x)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \geq N^\gamma.$$

The above analysis reduces the difficulty of the problem to some extent. We know that the blow up behaviour of the solution is a long-time dynamic behaviour, and there are few tools that can be directly applied to characterize the explosion. However, if we are now looking at the local behaviour of the solution, then a rich local theory of the solutions can be applied, making the problem possible.

From the above analysis, it is also a very natural thing to give the connection between the lower bounds of the blow up rate of the Schrödinger equation and Hartree equation, which also gives the possibility to apply the local theory.

To further explain the work by Merle and Raphaël, we now introduce the following notations, the scaling invariant Morrey-Campanato norm

$$(1.25) \quad \rho(u, R) = \sup_{R' \geq R} \frac{1}{R'} \int_{R' \leq |x| \leq 2R'} |u(x)| dx,$$

a quantity related to the initial data,

$$M_0 = \frac{4\|v(0)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}}}{C_{GN}},$$

where C_{GN} is a universal constant related to Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and a similar definition to (1.16),

$$(1.26) \quad \lambda_v(\tau) = \frac{1}{\|v(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2}.$$

In order to achieve the goal (1.24), there are three steps need to be implemented,

Step 1. Uniform control of the ρ norm and the dispersive estimate.

To achieve the first goal, we give the following proposition,

Proposition 1.11. *Let $v(\tau) \in C([0, e^N], \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1)$ be a radially symmetric solution to (1.5) where N is a sufficiently large number and (1.22), (1.21) hold. Then there exist universal constants C_1, α_1 and α_2 such that the following hold, $\forall \tau_0 \in [0, e^N]$,*

(i) *the uniform control of the ρ norm:*

$$(1.27) \quad \rho(v(\tau_0), C_1 M_0^{\alpha_1} \sqrt{\tau_0}) \leq C_1 M_0^2.$$

(ii) *the dispersive estimate:*

$$(1.28) \quad \int_0^{\tau_0} (\tau_0 - \tau) \|v(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 d\tau \leq C_1 M_0^{\alpha_2} \tau_0^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

Moreover, if we assume $M_0^{\alpha_2} < e^{\frac{\sqrt{N}}{2}}$, there exist a sequence of $\{\tau_i\}$ with $\tau_i \in [0, e^i]$ and $i \in \{\sqrt{N}, \sqrt{N} + 1, \dots, N\}$ with the following bounds holds,

$$(1.29) \quad \frac{\sqrt{\tau_i}}{\lambda_v(\tau_i)} \leq C_1 M_0^{\alpha_2} \text{ and } \lambda_v(\tau_i) \in \left[\frac{1}{10C_1 M_0^{\alpha_2}} e^{\frac{i-1}{2}}, \frac{10}{C_1 M_0^{\alpha_2}} e^{\frac{i}{2}} \right].$$

There are two points we should note,

Remark 1.12. $\begin{cases} \alpha_1 = 1, \\ \alpha_2 = 5 \end{cases}$ is an allowable value of the above proposition, and it is related to the blow up rate in Theorem 1.1, we could see it more clearly to achieve step 2.

Remark 1.13. The conclusion (1.29) in proposition 1.11 is a direct inference of (1.28) with the help of (1.21). Since (1.28) only gives an estimate of the decay of $\|v(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^1}$ in the average sense, we can only get (1.29) at some special time rather than a pointwise estimate.

Step 2. Lower bound on a weighted local L^2 norm of $v(0)$.

Now we are ready to give a uniform lower bound on a weighted local L^2 norm of $v(0)$,

Proposition 1.14. *Let $v(\tau)$ satisfies the conditions in proposition (1.11) and $\{\tau_i\}$ are chosen in proposition (1.11), then the following weighted L^2 norm on a sufficiently large ball holds,*

$$(1.30) \quad \frac{1}{\lambda_v(\tau_i)} \int_{|x| \leq M_0^{2+2\alpha_2} \lambda_v(\tau_i)} |v(0)|^2 \geq c_3,$$

where c_3 is a universal constant.

Remark 1.15. The idea of proof is the following: first we derive the lower bound at time $\tau = \tau_i$ with the aid of non-positive energy constraint, i.e.

$$(1.31) \quad \frac{1}{\lambda_v(\tau_i)} \int_{|x| \leq M_0^{2+2\alpha_2} \lambda_v(\tau_i)} |v(\tau_i)|^2 \geq 2c_3.$$

Second, thanks to (1.27) and (1.28), we conclude the difference between $\tau = 0$ and $\tau = \tau_i$ is sufficiently small, i.e. $\exists \varepsilon > 0$ small enough, such that

$$(1.32) \quad \left| \frac{1}{\lambda(\tau_i)} \int_{|x| \leq M_0^{2+2\alpha_2} \lambda_v(\tau_i)} |v(\tau_i)|^2 - \frac{1}{\lambda(\tau_i)} \int_{|x| \leq M_0^{2+2\alpha_2} \lambda_v(\tau_i)} |v(0)|^2 \right| < \varepsilon.$$

Combining (1.31) and (1.32), we derive the final conclusion (1.30).

Remark 1.16. The lower bound (1.30) has implied the choice of γ in Theorem 1.1. A straightforward algebraic computation of our analysis implies

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{4 + 2\alpha_2 + \varepsilon},$$

for $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, i.e we could derive $\gamma = \frac{1}{14+\varepsilon}$ in this setting while Merle and Raphaël in [33] give

$$(1.33) \quad \gamma = \frac{1}{12}.$$

Step 3. The construction of N^γ disjoint annuli.

Now we are going to construct sufficiently many disjoint annuli. We need to pay attention to the following two points,

- These N^γ annuli are disjoint.
- At each annulus, the similar lower bound still holds in (1.30).

A direct computation by Hölder inequality implies the following choice of the size of annuli satisfies the second point,

$$\mathcal{C}_i := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \frac{\lambda_v(\tau_i)}{M_0^{2+\alpha_2}} \leq |x| \leq \lambda_v(\tau_i) M_0^{2+\alpha_2}\}.$$

In order to satisfy the first point above, we need to choose the number p such that

$$\frac{\lambda_v(\tau_{i+p})}{M_0^{2+\alpha_2}} \geq \lambda_v(\tau_i) M_0^{2+\alpha_2}.$$

Thanks to (1.29), we can choose p such that $e^{\frac{p}{2}} \approx M_0^{4+2\alpha_2}$ which gives the derived choice of N^γ disjoint annuli. Based on the above three steps, we have the following technical remark,

Remark 1.17. The condition (1.22) can be weakened by another three assumptions, and the stronger version will be stated in section 3. Here we are only using condition (1.22) to state this proposition for convenience.

Now we want to talk about the relation in this paper between NLS and Hartree equation,

- Using the above techniques for proving Theorem 1.1, we can obtain result that is parallel in the Hartree equation, which is also the purpose of our article.
- If we get the conclusion in Hartree equation directly, then we can approximate δ function by doing a suitable scaling transformation of the potential function $V(x)$ ⁸,

$$(1.34) \quad V_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} V\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right), \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

After using the mature local theory⁹, we prove that the Schrödinger equation is also valid in this case.

The above two points give a connection between NLS and Hartree equation, and we supply complete proof in section 3.

⁸We should note that the conditions (1.8), (1.9), (1.10) is invariant under the transformation (1.34).

⁹The above three steps are local versions for the dynamics of the solutions, so we could apply local theory.

1.3. Strategy and structure of the paper. We use the robust strategy by Merle and Raphaël in [33]. We should note that there are two key points:

(1) The additional error terms.

The condition (1.9) is natural assumption in our problem setting, and the role of the condition (1.8) is to connect the energy (1.3) with the virial identity (1.13). Another assumption (1.10) is technical, because we need to control additional error terms which do not exist in the Schrödinger-equation setting. As in the Schrödinger equation, the “potential function” is $\delta(x)$. However, in our setting, $V(x)$ belongs to $L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. So, when the blow-up phenomenon happens, there are some additional error terms we should treat. We give a priori control on two channels which helps us to overcome this difficulty. For more details, one can see step 2 in Proposition 2.2.

(2) The difficulty caused by the no-scaling property of $V(x)$.

Since we treat the no-scaling case for the potential function $V(x)$, we should check carefully the constants chosen in Proposition 2.2 and 2.4. After the renormalization of $u(t)$, $v^{\lambda(t)}(\tau, x) := \lambda_u(t)\bar{u}(t - \lambda_u^2(t)\tau, \lambda_u(t)x)$ at different time t satisfy different equations

$$(1.35) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_\tau v^{\lambda(t)} + \Delta v^{\lambda(t)} = -(V_{\lambda(t)} * |v^{\lambda(t)}|^2)v^{\lambda(t)}. & (\tau, x) \in [0, \frac{t}{\lambda(t)^2}] \times \mathbb{R}^3, \quad V_{\lambda(t)}(x) = \lambda(t)^3 V(\lambda(t)x), \\ v^{\lambda(t)}|_{\tau=0} = \lambda(t)\bar{u}(t, \lambda(t)x) \in \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1, \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda_u(t) = (\frac{1}{\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}})^2$. For these $v^{\lambda(t)}(\tau, x)$, we should give a uniform estimate which is independent of the time t . We will deal with this very carefully both in Proposition 2.2 and 2.4, which is also the core of our analysis. Here, we explain from two aspects why the potential function does not have scaling invariant property will not have an essential impact for our analysis.

(i) The renormalization of $u(t)$

$v^{\lambda(t)}(\tau, x)$ defined above satisfies equation (1.35), and it also follows the law of conservation of energy:

$$(1.36) \quad \begin{aligned} E^\lambda(v^{\lambda(t)}(\tau)) &= E^\lambda(v^{\lambda(t)}(0)) = \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla v^{\lambda(t)}(0, x)|^2 dx - \frac{1}{4} \int (V_{\lambda(t)} * |v^{\lambda(t)}|^2)(0, x) |v^{\lambda(t)}|^2(0, x) dx \\ &= \lambda(t) \left[\frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 dx - \frac{1}{4} \int (V * |u|^2) |u|^2(t, x) dx \right] \\ &= \lambda(t) E(u(t)). \end{aligned}$$

(1.36) implies we still obtain the scaling invariant property for the energy conservation law although $V(x)$ does not own it.

(ii) The scaling for the potential function $V(x)$.

A direct computation implies

$$(1.37) \quad \left| \sum x_j \partial_{x_j} V_\lambda(x) \right| = \lambda^3 \left| \sum \lambda x_j \partial_{\lambda x_j} V(\lambda x) \right| \leq \lambda^3 \cdot \frac{C}{|\lambda x|^3} = \frac{C}{|x|^3},$$

under the assumption (1.10) which is a universal upper bound independent of λ . Besides, we only use L^1 norm for the potential function $V(x)$ which is also a scaling invariant norm under the renormalization, i.e. $\|V_\lambda(x)\|_{L^1} = \|V(x)\|_{L^1}$.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we will prove Theorem 1.5. More specifically, we will give a uniform control of the ρ norm, which is a suitable scaling invariant Morrey-Campanato norm, and a lower bound on a weight local L^2 norm, then we use a blackbox by applying Proposition 2.2 and 2.4 to finish the proof for Theorem 1.5. In section 3, we supply the connection between Schrödinger equation and Hartree equation. In Appendix A, for readers' convenience, we give some examples of blow up solutions and some direct observations for the blow up rate for $V(x)$ with higher integrability conditions. However, we can not give any special examples $V(x)$ which lead to this kind of blow up solutions. Appendix B is devoted to give some standard result of stability theory needed in Section 3.

2. BLOW-UP RATE FOR THE BLOW-UP SOLUTION

In this section, we focus on the proof of Theorem 1.5, i.e. we consider the equation

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \Delta u = -(V * |u|^2)u. & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0 \in \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1. \end{cases}$$

with $V(x)$ satisfies the conditions in Theorem 1.5. We will give a lower bound for the blow-up rate.

First, we prove the main propositions at the heart of the proof of Theorem 1.5. Let $u_0 \in \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1$ with radial symmetry and assume that the corresponding solution $u(t)$ to (2.1) blows up in finite time $0 < T < +\infty$. We can pick t close enough to T . Let

$$(2.2) \quad \lambda_u(t) = \left(\frac{1}{\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}} \right)^2,$$

then from the local theory,

$$(2.3) \quad \lambda_u(t) \lesssim \sqrt{T-t}.$$

We define the renormalization of $u(t)$ by

$$(2.4) \quad v^{(t)}(\tau, x) = \lambda_u(t)\bar{u}(t - \lambda_u^2(t)\tau, \lambda_u(t)x).$$

In this subsection, to clarify the notations, we omit the dependence of λ on $u(t)$ and define $v^\lambda := v^{(t)}(\tau, x)$. Then it is not hard to check that v^λ satisfies the following equation

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_\tau v^\lambda + \Delta v^\lambda = -(V_\lambda * |v^\lambda|^2)v^\lambda. & (\tau, x) \in [0, \frac{t}{\lambda^2}] \times \mathbb{R}^3, \quad V_\lambda(x) = \lambda^3 V(\lambda x), \\ v^\lambda|_{\tau=0} = \lambda\bar{u}(t, \lambda x) \in \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1. \end{cases}$$

Because of the no-scaling property of the potential function $V(x)$, the renormalization v^λ satisfies different equation at different time t . So we need some universal properties for these v^λ which are independent of λ .

We first give needed definitions in our following propositions and recall some elementary inequalities. Define a smooth radially symmetric cut-off function,

$$(2.6) \quad \psi(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{|x|^2}{2}, & |x| \leq 2, \\ 0, & |x| \geq 3, \end{cases}$$

with $\psi_R(x) := R^2\psi(\frac{x}{R})$ and we state the following lemma in [33]:

Lemma 2.1. (*Radial Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality*)

(i) *There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that for all $u \in L^3$,*

$$(2.7) \quad \forall R > 0, \quad \frac{1}{R} \int_{|y| \leq R} |u|^2 dy \leq C \|u\|_{L^3}^2.$$

(ii) *For all $\eta > 0$, there exists a constant $C_\eta > 0$ such that for all $u \in \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1$ with radial symmetry, for all $R > 0$,*

$$(2.8) \quad \int_{|x| \geq R} |u|^4 \leq \eta \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(|x| \geq R)}^2 + \frac{C_\eta}{R} [\rho(u, R)^2 + \rho(u, R)^3].$$

And from the definition of energy, we know

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} E^\lambda(v^\lambda) &:= \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla v^\lambda|^2 dx - \frac{1}{4} \int (V_\lambda * |v^\lambda|^2) |v^\lambda|^2 dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\|v^\lambda\|_{L^3}}{c_V}\right)^2\right) \int |\nabla v^\lambda|^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

for some $c_V > 0$ which is independent of λ .

With these prepared knowledge, we prove the following,

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\tau_* > 0$ and $v^\lambda(\tau) \in C([0, \tau_*], \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1)$ be a radially symmetric solution to (2.5) and assume*

$$(2.10) \quad \tau_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \max(E^\lambda(v_0^\lambda), 0) < 1,$$

and

$$(2.11) \quad M_0^\lambda := \frac{4\|v_0^\lambda\|_{L^3}}{c_V} \geq 2,$$

then there exist $C_1, \alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$ which are independent of λ such that

$$(2.12) \quad \rho(v^\lambda(\tau_*), (M_0^\lambda)^{\alpha_1} \sqrt{\tau_*}) \leq C_1 (M_0^\lambda)^2,$$

and

$$(2.13) \quad \int_0^{\tau_*} (\tau_* - \tau) \|\nabla v^\lambda(\tau)\|_{L_x^2}^2 d\tau \leq (M_0^\lambda)^{\alpha_2} \tau_*^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

Proof. Step 1. Local radial virial estimate.

We define

$$(2.14) \quad V_a(\tau) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} a(x) |v^\lambda(\tau, x)|^2 dx,$$

and

$$(2.15) \quad P_a(\tau) := \frac{d}{d\tau} V_a(\tau) = 2Im \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla a(x) \nabla v^\lambda(\tau, x) \bar{v}^\lambda(\tau, x) dx.$$

The a direct computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} \frac{d}{d\tau} P_a(\tau) &\leq \alpha E^\lambda(v^\lambda(\tau)) - \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1\right) \int |\nabla v^\lambda|^2 dx + \frac{C}{R^2} \int_{2R \leq |x| \leq 3R} |v^\lambda|^2 dx \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \int \int [(\partial_{x_j} \psi_R(x) - \partial_{y_j} \psi_R(y)) - (x_j - y_j)] \partial_{x_j} V_\lambda(x - y) |v^\lambda(\tau, y)|^2 |v^\lambda(\tau, x)|^2 dy dx \\ &= \alpha E^\lambda(v^\lambda(\tau)) - \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1\right) \int |\nabla v^\lambda|^2 dx + \frac{C}{R^2} \int_{2R \leq |x| \leq 3R} |v^\lambda|^2 dx + \Phi(\tau), \end{aligned}$$

where we substitute $a(x)$ with $\psi_R(x)$ and use the condition (1.8) with

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Phi(\tau)| &= \frac{1}{4} \left| \int \int [(\partial_{x_j} \psi_R(x) - \partial_{y_j} \psi_R(y)) - (x_j - y_j)] \partial_{x_j} V_\lambda(x-y) |v^\lambda(\tau, y)|^2 |v^\lambda(\tau, x)|^2 dy dx \right| \\
&\lesssim \iint_{|x| \geq R, |y| \geq R} |[(\partial_{x_j} \psi_R(x) - \partial_{y_j} \psi_R(y)) - (x_j - y_j)] \partial_{x_j} V_\lambda(x-y)| |v^\lambda(\tau, y)|^2 |v^\lambda(\tau, x)|^2 dx dy \\
&+ \iint_{|x| \leq R, |y| \geq 2R} |[(\partial_{x_j} \psi_R(x) - \partial_{y_j} \psi_R(y)) - (x_j - y_j)] \partial_{x_j} V_\lambda(x-y)| |v^\lambda(\tau, y)|^2 |v^\lambda(\tau, x)|^2 dx dy \\
&+ \iint_{|y| \leq R, |x| \geq 2R} |[(\partial_{x_j} \psi_R(x) - \partial_{y_j} \psi_R(y)) - (x_j - y_j)] \partial_{x_j} V_\lambda(x-y)| |v^\lambda(\tau, y)|^2 |v^\lambda(\tau, x)|^2 dx dy \\
&:= (I) + (II) + (III).
\end{aligned}$$

We should point out, the term $\Phi(\tau)$ is different from the error term in Schrödinger-equation setting and this is the reason to assume the additional condition (1.10). We summarize the estimate of $\Phi(\tau)$ as follows,

Lemma 2.3. *Assume (1.9), (1.10) in Theorem 1.5 hold, then $\forall \eta > 0$, $0 < R_1 < R$, there exists $C(\eta) > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.16) \quad |\Phi(\tau)| &\leq \eta \|\nabla v^\lambda(\tau)\|_{L_x^2}^2 + C(\eta) R^{-1} [\rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R) + \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)^3 + \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R_1) \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)] \\
&+ \|\nabla v^\lambda\|_{L^2}^2 \cdot \frac{R_1^2}{R^2} \cdot \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R).
\end{aligned}$$

If we assume Lemma 2.3 holds, then we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.17) \quad \frac{1}{4} \frac{d}{dt} P_a(\tau) &\leq \alpha E^\lambda(v^\lambda(\tau)) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1 \right) \int |\nabla v^\lambda|^2 dx \\
&+ C(\eta) R^{-1} [\rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R) + \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)^3 + \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R_1) \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)] + \|\nabla v^\lambda\|_{L^2}^2 \cdot \frac{R_1^2}{R^2} \cdot \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we return to the proof of Lemma 2.3,

Proof. For (I),

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.18) \quad (I) &\leq \|x \cdot \nabla_x V(\lambda x)\|_{L^1} \|v^\lambda(\tau, x) \cdot \chi_{\{|x| \geq R\}}\|_{L^4}^2 \|v^\lambda(\tau, y) \cdot \chi_{\{|y| \geq R\}}\|_{L^4}^2 \\
&\leq \|v^\lambda(\tau, x) \cdot \chi_{\{|x| \geq R\}}\|_{L^4}^4 \\
&\lesssim \eta \|\nabla v^\lambda\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C_\eta}{R} [\rho(v^\lambda, R)^2 + \rho(v^\lambda, R)^3]
\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 2.1.

Since (II) and (III) are symmetric, we only estimate (II). In fact, this term does not appear in the Schrödinger equation. We should divide the area $\{|x| \leq R, |y| \geq 2R\}$ into $\{|x| \leq R_1, |y| \geq 2R\}$ and $\{R_1 \leq |x| \leq R, |y| \geq 2R\}$ and choose R_1 carefully in next step. The term in the area $\{|x| \leq R_1, |y| \geq 2R\}$ can be controlled by $\frac{R_1^2}{R^2} \|\nabla v^\lambda\|_{L^2}^2 \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)$ and the other is controlled by $\frac{1}{R} \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R_1) \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)$. The details are the followings.

In the area $\{|x| \leq R, |y| \geq 2R\}$, using the property (1.10), we conclude

$$(2.19) \quad |[(\partial_{x_j} \psi_R(x) - \partial_{y_j} \psi_R(y)) - (x_j - y_j)] \partial_{x_j} V_\lambda(x-y)| \lesssim \lambda^3 \cdot \frac{1}{(\lambda|x-y|)^3} = \frac{1}{|x-y|^3} \lesssim \frac{1}{|y|^3},$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.20) \quad (II) &\lesssim \left| \iint_{|x| \leq R, |y| \geq 2R} \frac{1}{|y|^3} |v^\lambda(\tau, y)|^2 |v^\lambda(\tau, x)|^2 dx dy \right| \\
&\lesssim \int_{|x| \leq R} |v^\lambda(\tau, x)|^2 dx \left[\sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{(2^j R)^3} \int_{2^j R \leq |y| \leq 2^{j+1} R} |v^\lambda(\tau, y)|^2 dy \right] \\
&\lesssim \left[\int_{|x| \leq R_1} |v^\lambda(\tau, x)|^2 dx + \int_{R_1 \leq |x| \leq R} |v^\lambda(\tau, x)|^2 dx \right] \cdot \frac{1}{R^2} \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R) \\
&\lesssim [R_1^2 \|\nabla v^\lambda\|_{L^2}^2 + R \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R_1)] \cdot \frac{1}{R^2} \cdot \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R).
\end{aligned}$$

From (2.18) and (2.20), we finish the proof of Lemma 2.3. \square

Step 2. A priori control of the ρ norm on parabolic space time interval.

In this step, we need to choose R_1 appropriately. On the one hand, we should choose R_1 small enough so that $\frac{R_1^2}{R^2} \cdot \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R) \ll \frac{1}{2}$. On the other hand, we can not choose R_1 too small otherwise we can not control $R^{-1} \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R_1) \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)$. However, the above analysis is not self-contradictory. A natural idea is, we choose R_1 with $\frac{R_1^2}{R^2} \lesssim \varepsilon^{c_1}$ such that $\frac{R_1^2}{R^2} \cdot \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R) \ll \frac{1}{2}$. At the same time, let $R \geq R_1 \gg (M_0^\lambda)^{\frac{1}{2\varepsilon}}$ so that $R^{-1} \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R_1) \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)$ still can be treated as an error term. Once this difficulty is overcome, the rest of the analysis is similar to the one in [33].

Let $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ be a small enough constant to be chosen later. Let

$$(2.21) \quad G_\varepsilon = (M_0^\lambda)^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}}, \quad A_{\varepsilon_1} = \left(\frac{\varepsilon G_\varepsilon}{(M_0^\lambda)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad A_{\varepsilon_2} = \left(\frac{\varepsilon G_\varepsilon}{(M_0^\lambda)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \cdot \left(\frac{\delta}{M_0^\lambda} \right).$$

Recall from Lemma 2.1, there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\forall R > 0, \forall u \in L^3, \rho(u, R) \leq C \|u\|_{L^3}^3.$$

From the regularity of the flow $v^\lambda \in C([0, \tau^*], \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1)$ and the definition of M_0^λ , we may consider the largest time $\tau_1 \in [0, \tau_*]$ such that

$$(2.22) \quad \forall \tau_0 \in [0, \tau_1], [M_1^\lambda(A_{\varepsilon_1}, \tau_1)]^2 = \max_{\tau \in [0, \tau_1]} \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), A_{\varepsilon_1} \sqrt{\tau}) \leq 2 \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^2}{\varepsilon},$$

$$(2.23) \quad [M_2^\lambda(A_{\varepsilon_2}, \tau_1)]^2 = \max_{\tau \in [0, \tau_1]} \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), A_{\varepsilon_2} \sqrt{\tau}) \leq 2 \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^5}{\varepsilon^{10}}$$

and

$$(2.24) \quad \int_0^{\tau_0} (\tau_0 - \tau) \|\nabla v^\lambda(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \leq G_\varepsilon \tau_0^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

We claim that :

$$(2.25) \quad \forall \tau_0 \in [0, \tau_1], [M_1^\lambda(A_{\varepsilon_1}, \tau_1)]^2 = \max_{\tau \in [0, \tau_1]} \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), A_{\varepsilon_1} \sqrt{\tau}) \leq \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^2}{\varepsilon},$$

$$(2.26) \quad [M_2^\lambda(A_{\varepsilon_2}, \tau_1)]^2 = \max_{\tau \in [0, \tau_1]} \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), A_{\varepsilon_2} \sqrt{\tau}) \leq \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^5}{\varepsilon^{10}},$$

and

$$(2.27) \quad \int_0^{\tau_0} (\tau_0 - \tau) \|\nabla v^\lambda(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \leq \frac{G_\varepsilon}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{3}{2}}$$

provided $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ has been chosen small enough, and (2.12), (2.13) follow.

Proof of (2.25) and (2.26). $\forall \tau_0 \in [0, \tau_1]$, we integrate twice in time between 0 and τ_0 from (2.17) and get :

$$(2.28) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int \psi_R |v^\lambda(\tau_0)|^2 + C'_1 \int_0^{\tau_0} (\tau_0 - \tau) \|\nabla v^\lambda(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \\ & \lesssim \int \psi_R |v^\lambda(0)|^2 + \tau_0 [Im(\int \nabla \psi_R(x) \nabla v^\lambda(0) \bar{v}^\lambda(0) dx) + E(v_0^\lambda) \tau_0] \\ & + \frac{1}{R} \int_0^{\tau_0} (\tau_0 - \tau) [\rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R) + \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)^3 + \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R_1) \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)] d\tau \\ & + \frac{R_1^2}{R^2} \int_0^{\tau_0} (\tau_0 - \tau) \|\nabla v^\lambda\|_{L^2}^2 \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

We let $R \geq A_{\varepsilon_1} \sqrt{\tau_0}$ for $\forall \tau_0 \in [0, \tau_1]$ and choose R_1 as $R_1 := \frac{\delta}{M_0^\lambda} R$, then a direct computation yields

$$(2.29) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{R_1^2}{R^2} \int_0^{\tau_0} (\tau_0 - \tau) \|\nabla v^\lambda\|_{L^2}^2 \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R) d\tau \\ & \leq 2 \left(\frac{\delta}{M_0^\lambda} \right)^2 \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^2}{\varepsilon} \int_0^{\tau_0} (\tau_0 - \tau) \|\nabla v^\lambda\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \\ & \leq 2 \frac{\delta^2}{\varepsilon} \int_0^{\tau_0} (\tau_0 - \tau) \|\nabla v^\lambda\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can choose δ small enough such that $2 \frac{\delta^2}{\varepsilon} \ll \frac{C'_1}{2}$. For the sake of simplicity, if we define $\delta(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$ and ε small enough, substitute (2.29) into (2.28) and we get

$$(2.30) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int \psi_R |v^\lambda(\tau_0)|^2 + \frac{C'_1}{2} \int_0^{\tau_0} (\tau_0 - \tau) \|\nabla v^\lambda(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \\ & \lesssim \int \psi_R |v^\lambda(0)|^2 + \tau_0 [Im(\int \nabla \psi_R(x) \nabla v^\lambda(0) \bar{v}^\lambda(0) dx) + E^\lambda(v_0^\lambda) \tau_0] \\ & + \frac{1}{R} \int_0^{\tau_0} (\tau_0 - \tau) [\rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R) + \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)^3 + \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R_1) \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)] d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

We directly estimate the right hand side of (2.30) except the second term:

$$(2.31) \quad \int \psi_R |v^\lambda(\tau_0)|^2 \leq \left(\int (\psi_R)^3 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left(\int |v_0^\lambda|^3 dx \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \lesssim R^3 (M_0^\lambda)^2,$$

$$(2.32) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{R} \int_0^{\tau_0} (\tau_0 - \tau) [\rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R) + \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)^3 + \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R_1) \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)] d\tau \\ & \leq \frac{\tau_0^2}{R} \left(\frac{(M_0^\lambda)^6}{\varepsilon^3} + \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^7}{\varepsilon^{11}} \right) \\ & \leq 2 \frac{\tau_0^2}{R} \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^7}{\varepsilon^{11}}. \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, we claim the key estimate: $\forall \tau_0 \in [0, \tau_1], \forall A \geq A_{\varepsilon_1}$, let $R = A\sqrt{\tau_0}$, then

$$(2.33) \quad \text{Im} \int \nabla \psi_R \cdot \nabla v^\lambda(0) \overline{v^\lambda(0)} + E^\lambda(v_0^\lambda) \tau_0 \leq C \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^2 A^3}{\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In step 2 and step 3, we assume (2.33) holds and derive the desired upper bounds (2.25), (2.26) and (2.27). In step 4, we give the proof of (2.33) and thus finish the whole proof.

Since $R \geq A_{\varepsilon_1} \sqrt{\tau_0}$ and the definition, $R_1 = \frac{\varepsilon}{M_0^\lambda} R$, we deduce $R_1 \geq A_{\varepsilon_2} \sqrt{\tau_0}$.

We divide (2.30) by R^3 , and get

$$(2.34) \quad \frac{1}{R} \int_{R \leq |x| \leq 2R} |v^\lambda(\tau_0)|^2 dx \lesssim (M_0^\lambda)^2 + \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^2}{\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}} + \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^7}{\varepsilon^{11}} \frac{1}{A_{\varepsilon_1}^4} \leq \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^2}{\varepsilon},$$

by the definition of G_ε and A_{ε_1} .

Similarly, we divide (2.30) by R_1^3 , and get

$$(2.35) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{R_1} \int_{R_1 \leq |x| \leq 2R_1} |v^\lambda(\tau_0)|^2 dx &\leq \left(\frac{R}{R_1}\right)^3 (M_0^\lambda)^2 + \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^5}{\varepsilon^{3+\frac{2}{3}}} + \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^7}{\varepsilon^{11}} \frac{1}{A_{\varepsilon_1} A_{\varepsilon_2}^3} \\ &\leq \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^5}{\varepsilon^3} + \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^5}{\varepsilon^{3+\frac{2}{3}}} + \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^7}{\varepsilon^{11}} \frac{1}{A_{\varepsilon_1} A_{\varepsilon_2}^3} \\ &\leq \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^5}{\varepsilon^{10}}. \end{aligned}$$

By standard continuity argument, we conclude (2.12) holds. We should note that the choice of C_1 and α_1 is independent of λ from (2.22) and the definition of A_{ε_1} .

Step 3. Self similar decay of the gradient.

We substitute (2.25), (2.26) and (2.33) at $A = A_{\varepsilon_1}$ into (2.30), then we derive

$$(2.36) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_0^{\tau_0} (\tau_0 - \tau) \|\nabla v^\lambda(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \\ &\lesssim R^3 (M_0^\lambda)^2 + C \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^2 A_{\varepsilon_1}^3}{\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}} \tau_0^{\frac{3}{2}} + \frac{\tau_0^2 (M_0^\lambda)^7}{R \varepsilon^{11}} \\ &\leq \frac{\tau_0^{\frac{3}{2}} (M_0^\lambda)^2 A_{\varepsilon_1}^3}{\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}} \leq \frac{G_\varepsilon}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{3}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof of (2.13). From (2.21), we know the choice of α_2 in (2.13) is also independent of λ .

Step 4. Proof of the momentum estimate (2.33).

We can not directly use the interpolation estimate,

$$(2.37) \quad |\text{Im}(\int \nabla \psi_R(x) \nabla v^\lambda(0) \overline{v^\lambda(0)} dx)| \lesssim \|v_0^\lambda\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 R,$$

since we only know the information about $\|v_0^\lambda\|_{L^3}$ rather than $\|v_0^\lambda\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}}$. On the other hand, if we use Hölder inequality to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Im}(\int \nabla \psi_R(x) \nabla v^\lambda(0) \overline{v^\lambda(0)} dx)| &\leq R^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla v_0^\lambda\|_{L^2} \left(\frac{1}{R^3} \int \psi_R |v_0^\lambda|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq R^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla v_0^\lambda\|_{L^2} M_0^\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Although we have used the information of $\|v_0^\lambda\|_{L^3}$, we can not take full advantage of the information from (2.13) at the initial time $\tau = 0$. It is because that we hope $\|\nabla v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau})\|_{L^2}$ has the asymptotic behaviour with

$$(2.38) \quad \|\nabla v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau})\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{C}{\tilde{\tau}^{\frac{1}{4}}},$$

for some special large enough time $\tilde{\tau}$ from (2.13). With the above analysis, a natural idea is to choose a time $\tilde{\tau}$ carefully to obtain the decay estimate (2.38) at $\tilde{\tau}$. Then we use (2.15) to conclude the difference between $Im(\int \nabla \psi_R(x) \nabla v^\lambda(0) \bar{v}^\lambda(0) dx)$ and $Im(\int \nabla \psi_R(x) \nabla v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}) \bar{v}^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}) dx)$ is suitably small, which helps us to finish the proof (2.33). In order to explain the above content more clearly, we have divided the proof into three parts.

Part I: Choose a suitable time to obtain the decay estimate (2.38).

Let $\tau_0 \in [0, \tau_1]$, $A \geq A_{\varepsilon_1}$ and $R = A\sqrt{\tau_0}$. First, we should choose the proper $\tilde{\tau}$ as above. To be more specific, we claim the following fact: there exists a universal constant $K > 0$ which is independent of λ and $\tilde{\tau}_0$ such that

$$(2.39) \quad \tilde{\tau}_0 \in \left[\frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}}{4}\tau_0, \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}}{2}\tau_0\right] \text{ with } \|\nabla v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}_0)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{KG_\varepsilon}{\tilde{\tau}_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Proof of (2.39). By contradiction, let $\tilde{\tau} = \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}\tau_0$, then

$$(2.40) \quad \int_{\frac{\tilde{\tau}}{4}}^{\frac{\tilde{\tau}}{2}} \|\nabla v^\lambda(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^2 d\sigma \geq KG_\varepsilon \int_{\frac{\tilde{\tau}}{4}}^{\frac{\tilde{\tau}}{2}} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}} \geq CKG_\varepsilon \tilde{\tau}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Moreover, $\tilde{\tau} = \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}\tau_0 \leq \tau_0 \leq \tau_1$ and (2.24) implies:

$$(2.41) \quad G_\varepsilon \tilde{\tau}^{\frac{3}{2}} \geq \int_0^{\tilde{\tau}} (\tilde{\tau} - \sigma) \|\nabla v^\lambda(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^2 d\sigma \geq \frac{\tilde{\tau}}{2} \int_{\frac{\tilde{\tau}}{4}}^{\frac{\tilde{\tau}}{2}} \|\nabla v^\lambda(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^2 d\sigma \geq CKG_\varepsilon \tilde{\tau}^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

From (2.41), we conclude a contradiction for $K > 0$ large enough.

Part II: Derive the desired upper bound for the quantity $Im(\int \nabla \psi_R(x) \nabla v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}_0) \bar{v}^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}_0) dx)$.

Define $R = A\sqrt{\tau_0} = A_1\sqrt{\tilde{\tau}_0}$ and thus

$$(2.42) \quad \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}{16} \leq \frac{A}{A_1} \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

We claim:

$$(2.43) \quad |Im \int \nabla \psi_R \cdot \nabla v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}_0) \overline{v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}_0)}| \leq C \frac{(M_0^\lambda)^2 A^3}{\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof of (2.43). Before we derive (2.43), we show the following inequality

$$(2.44) \quad \frac{1}{R^3} \int \psi_R |v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}_0)|^2 \leq C[(M_0^\lambda)^2 + \frac{G_\varepsilon}{A_1^3}].$$

In fact, from (2.15) and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$|\frac{d}{d\tau} \int \psi_R |v^\lambda|^2| = 2|Im(\int \nabla \psi_R \cdot \nabla v^\lambda \bar{v}^\lambda)| \leq C \|\nabla v^\lambda\|_{L^2} (\int \psi_R |v^\lambda|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Therefore, we integrate this differential inequality from 0 to $\tilde{\tau}_0$ and get:

$$(2.45) \quad \begin{aligned} \int \psi_R |v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}_0)|^2 &\leq C[\int \psi_R |v^\lambda(0)|^2 + (\int_0^{\tilde{\tau}_0} \|\nabla v^\lambda(\sigma)\|_{L^2} d\sigma)^2] \\ &\leq C[R^3(M_0^\lambda)^2 + \tilde{\tau}_0 \int_0^{\tilde{\tau}_0} \|\nabla v^\lambda(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^2 d\sigma]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $2\tilde{\tau}_0 \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}\tau_0 \leq \tau_0 \leq \tau_1$ and using (2.24), we obtain

$$(2.46) \quad \int_0^{\tilde{\tau}_0} \|\nabla v^\lambda(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^2 d\sigma \leq \frac{1}{\tilde{\tau}_0} \int_0^{2\tilde{\tau}_0} (2\tilde{\tau}_0 - \sigma) \|\nabla v^\lambda(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^2 d\sigma \leq CG_\varepsilon \tilde{\tau}_0^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Thus, recalling that $R = A_1\sqrt{\tilde{\tau}_0}$, we combine (2.45) and (2.46) to get

$$\int \psi_R |v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}_0)|^2 \leq C[R^3(M_0^\lambda)^2 + G_\varepsilon \tilde{\tau}_0^{\frac{3}{2}}] = CR^3[(M_0^\lambda)^2 + \frac{G_\varepsilon}{A_1^3}]$$

and concludes the proof of (2.44).

Now we control the virial quantity (2.43) at time $\tilde{\tau}_0$:

$$\begin{aligned} |Im \int \nabla \psi_R \cdot \nabla v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}_0) \overline{v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}_0)}| &\leq R^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}_0)\|_{L^2} \left(\frac{1}{R^3} \int |v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}_0)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq CR^{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{G_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\tilde{\tau}_0^{\frac{1}{4}}} [(M_0^\lambda)^2 + \frac{G_\varepsilon}{A_1^3}]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq CAA_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} G_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} [M_0^\lambda + \frac{G_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}{A_1^{\frac{3}{2}}}] \end{aligned}$$

from $A \geq A_{\varepsilon_1}$ and the choice of $\tilde{\tau}_0$. From the definition of G_ε , A_{ε_1} and A_1 in (2.21) and (2.42), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} &|Im \int \nabla \psi_R \cdot \nabla v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}_0) \overline{v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}_0)}| \\ &\leq C(M_0^\lambda)^2 A^3 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{6}}} = \frac{C(M_0^\lambda)^2 A^3}{\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof of (2.43).

Part III: Prove the initial control on the virial quantity (2.33).

Using (2.17), we derive the crude estimate which connects $\tau = 0$ with $\tau = \tilde{\tau}_0$:

$$(2.47) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d}{d\tau} Im \left(\int \nabla \psi_R \cdot \nabla v^\lambda \overline{v^\lambda} \right) \right| &\leq C\{|E^\lambda(v_0^\lambda)| + \int |\nabla v^\lambda|^2 dx \\ &\quad + R^{-1}[\rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R) + \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)^3 + \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R_1)\rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} &R^{-1}[\rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R) + \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)^3 + \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R_1)\rho(v^\lambda(\tau), R)] \\ &\leq \frac{C(M_0^\lambda)^7}{R \varepsilon^{11}} \leq \frac{1}{\tilde{\tau}_0^{\frac{1}{2}}} \end{aligned}$$

for ε small enough, we conclude from (2.47)

$$(2.48) \quad \left| \frac{d}{d\tau} Im \left(\int \nabla \psi_R \cdot \nabla v^\lambda \overline{v^\lambda} \right) \right| \leq C\{|E^\lambda(v_0^\lambda)| + \int |\nabla v^\lambda|^2 dx + \frac{1}{\tilde{\tau}_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}\}.$$

We integrate (2.48) in time from 0 to $\tilde{\tau}_0$ and get

$$(2.49) \quad \begin{aligned} |Im \int \nabla \psi_R \cdot \nabla v^\lambda(0) \overline{v^\lambda(0)}| &\leq |Im \int \nabla \psi_R \cdot \nabla v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}_0) \overline{v^\lambda(\tilde{\tau}_0)}| \\ &\quad + C\left[\int_0^{\tilde{\tau}_0} \|\nabla v^\lambda(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^2 d\sigma + |E^\lambda(v_0^\lambda)|\tilde{\tau}_0 + \tilde{\tau}_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to (2.43) and (2.46), we conclude

$$(2.50) \quad \operatorname{Im} \int \nabla \psi_R \cdot \nabla v^\lambda(0) \overline{v^\lambda(0)} + E^\lambda(v_0^\lambda) \tau_0 \leq \frac{C(M_0^\lambda)^2 A^3}{\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} + C G_\varepsilon \tilde{\tau}_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ + E^\lambda(v_0) \tau_0 + C |E^\lambda(v_0)| \tilde{\tau}_0.$$

Our main task is to estimate the right-hand side in (2.50) term by term. Since the first term has been controlled, we estimate the second term

$$(2.51) \quad G_\varepsilon \tilde{\tau}_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C A_{\varepsilon_1}^3 (M_0^\lambda)^2 \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}{\varepsilon} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{C(M_0^\lambda)^2 A^3}{\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where we use the definition of $G_\varepsilon, A_{\varepsilon_1}$ in (2.21) and the choice of $\tilde{\tau}_0$ in (2.39). Lastly, to control the remaining two terms in (2.50), we observe that

$$E^\lambda(v_0^\lambda) \tau_0 + C |E^\lambda(v_0^\lambda)| \tilde{\tau}_0 \leq [E^\lambda(v_0^\lambda) + C \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}} |E^\lambda(v_0^\lambda)|] \tau_0 \\ \leq C \max[E^\lambda(v_0^\lambda), 0] \tau_0 \leq C \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough and we have used the condition (2.10). Summing up the above estimates, we finish the desired proof (2.33). \square

The following proposition implies a nontrivial repartition of the L^2 mass of the initial data. This repartition helps us to get uniform lower bound on sufficient disjoint annuli.

Proposition 2.4. *(Lower bound on a weighted local L^2 norm of $v^\lambda(0)$)*

Let $\tau_* > 0$ and $v^\lambda(\tau) \in C([0, \tau_*], \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1)$ be a radially symmetric solution to (2.5) and assume (2.10) and (2.11) in Prop 2.2 hold. Then there exist universal constants $\alpha_3, c_3 > 0$ which are independent of λ such that the following holds true. Let

$$(2.52) \quad \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau) = \left(\frac{1}{\|\nabla v^\lambda(\tau)\|_{L^2}} \right)^2,$$

and let

$$(2.53) \quad \tau_0 \in \left[0, \frac{\tau_*}{2} \right],$$

$$(2.54) \quad \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0) E^\lambda(v_0^\lambda) \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Let

$$(2.55) \quad F_* = \frac{\sqrt{\tau_0}}{\tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)},$$

and

$$(2.56) \quad D_* = (M_0^\lambda)^{\alpha_3} \max[1, F_*^3],$$

then

$$(2.57) \quad \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)} \int_{|x| \leq D_* \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)} |v^\lambda(0)|^2 \geq c_3.$$

Proof. Step 1. Energy constraint and lower bound on $v^\lambda(\tau_0)$.

We claim that there exist universal constants $C_3, c_3 > 0$ which are independent of λ such that:

$$(2.58) \quad \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)} \int_{|x| \leq A_* \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)} |v^\lambda(\tau_0)|^2 \geq c_3$$

with

$$(2.59) \quad A_* = C_3 \max[(M_0^\lambda)^{\alpha_1} F_*, (M_0^\lambda)^6].$$

Now we prove the claim (2.58). Consider a renormalization of $v^\lambda(\tau_0)$:

$$(2.60) \quad w(x) = \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0) v^\lambda(\tau_0, \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0) x),$$

then from (2.52), (2.54) and the conservation of the energy:

$$(2.61) \quad \|\nabla w\|_{L^2} = 1$$

and

$$(2.62) \quad \begin{aligned} E^{\lambda \cdot \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)}(w) &= \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla w|^2 dx - \frac{1}{4} \int (V_{\lambda \cdot \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)} * |w|^2)(x) |w(x)|^2 dx \\ &= \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0) \left[\frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla v^\lambda|^2 dx - \frac{1}{4} \int (V_\lambda * |v^\lambda|^2)(x) |v^\lambda(x)|^2 dx \right] \\ &= \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0) E^\lambda(v^\lambda(\tau_0)) = \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0) E^\lambda(v_0^\lambda) \leq \frac{1}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\iint_{R^3 \times R^3} V_{\lambda \cdot \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)}(x-y) |w(x)|^2 |w(y)|^2 dx dy = 4 \left(\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla w\|_{L_x^2}^2 - E^{\lambda \cdot \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)}(w) \right) \geq 1.$$

Pick now $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough and let

$$(2.63) \quad A_\varepsilon = C_\varepsilon \max[(M_0^\lambda)^{\alpha_1} F_*, (M_0^\lambda)^6]$$

for C_ε large enough to be chosen. First we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(w, A_\varepsilon) &\leq \rho(w, (M_0^\lambda)^{\alpha_1} F_*) = \rho(v^\lambda(\tau_0), (M_0^\lambda)^{\alpha_1} \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0) F_*) \\ &= \rho(v^\lambda(\tau_0), (M_0^\lambda)^{\alpha_1} \sqrt{\tau_0}) \leq C_1 (M_0^\lambda)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, from (1.9), (2.8)

$$(2.64) \quad \begin{aligned} \iint_{|x| \geq A_\varepsilon, |y| \geq A_\varepsilon} V_{\lambda \cdot \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)}(x-y) |w(x)|^2 |w(y)|^2 dx dy &\leq \|w(x) \cdot \chi_{\{|x| \geq A_\varepsilon\}}\|_{L^4}^2 \|w(y) \cdot \chi_{\{|y| \geq A_\varepsilon\}}\|_{L^4}^2 \\ &\leq \|w(x) \cdot \chi_{\{|x| \geq A_\varepsilon\}}\|_{L^4}^4 \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|\nabla w\|_{L_x^2}^2 + \frac{C(\varepsilon)}{A_\varepsilon} [\rho(w, A_\varepsilon) + \rho(w, A_\varepsilon)^3] \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

for C_ε large enough and

$$(2.65) \quad \iint_{|x| \leq A_\varepsilon, |y| \leq A_\varepsilon} + \iint_{|x| \geq A_\varepsilon, |y| \leq A_\varepsilon} + \iint_{|x| \leq A_\varepsilon, |y| \geq A_\varepsilon} V_{\lambda \cdot \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)}(x-y) |w(x)|^2 |w(y)|^2 dx dy \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

By the Pigeon house principle, there must exist at least one term that is bigger than $\frac{1}{6}$. Without loss of generality, we assume

$$\iint_{|x| \leq A_\varepsilon, |y| \geq A_\varepsilon} V_{\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)}(x-y) |w(x)|^2 |w(y)|^2 dx dy \geq \frac{1}{6}.$$

Then by the Hölder inequality, Young inequality and Sobolev embedding theory,

$$\frac{1}{6} \leq C \|\chi_{\{|x| \leq A_\varepsilon\}} w\|_{L_x^2} \|\nabla w\|_{L_y^2}^3,$$

which implies that

$$\int_{|x| \leq A_\varepsilon} |w(x)|^2 dx \geq c_3 > 0$$

for some constant $c_3 > 0$ which is independent of λ . By (2.60), this is

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)} \int_{|x| \leq A_* \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)} |v^\lambda(\tau_0)|^2 \geq c_3$$

which finishes the claim (2.58).

Step 2. Backwards integration of the L^2 fluxes.

We claim: $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\tilde{C}_\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\forall D \geq D_\varepsilon$ with

$$(2.66) \quad D_\varepsilon = \tilde{C}_\varepsilon \max[F_*, F_*^3] \cdot \max[(M_0^\lambda)^{\alpha_1}, (M_0^\lambda)^{2+\alpha_2}],$$

let

$$(2.67) \quad \tilde{R} = \tilde{R}(D, \tau_0) = D \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0),$$

and $\chi_{\tilde{R}}(r) = \chi(\frac{r}{\tilde{R}})$ for some smooth radially symmetric cut-off function $\chi(r) = 1$ for $r \leq 1$, $\chi(r) = 0$ for $r \geq 2$, then :

$$(2.68) \quad \left| \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)} \int \chi_{\tilde{R}} |v^\lambda(\tau_0)|^2 - \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)} \int \chi_{\tilde{R}} |v^\lambda(0)|^2 \right| < \varepsilon.$$

(2.58) and (2.68) now imply (2.57).

Proof of (2.68). Pick $\varepsilon > 0$. We compute the L^2 fluxes from (2.15) with $\chi_{\tilde{R}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d}{d\tau} \int \chi_{\tilde{R}} |v^\lambda|^2 \right| &= 2 |\operatorname{Im} \left(\int \nabla \chi_{\tilde{R}} \cdot \nabla v^\lambda \bar{v}^\lambda \right)| \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\tilde{R}} \|\nabla v^\lambda(\tau)\|_{L^2} \left(\int_{\tilde{R} \leq |x| \leq 2\tilde{R}} |v^\lambda(\tau)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\tilde{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|\nabla v^\lambda(\tau)\|_{L^2} (\rho(v^\lambda(\tau), \tilde{R}))^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now observe from (2.55), (2.66) and (2.67) that :

$$\forall \tau \in [0, \tau_0], \tilde{R} = D \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0) \geq D_\varepsilon \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)}{\sqrt{\tau_0}} \sqrt{\tau_0} \geq \frac{D_\varepsilon}{F_*} \sqrt{\tau} \geq (M_0^\lambda)^{\alpha_1} \sqrt{\tau},$$

and thus (2.12) and the monotonicity of ρ ensure :

$$(2.69) \quad \forall \tau \in [0, \tau_0], \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), \tilde{R}) \leq \rho(v^\lambda(\tau), (M_0^\lambda)^{\alpha_1} \sqrt{\tau}) < C_1 (M_0^\lambda)^2.$$

Now we derive that

$$\forall \tau \in [0, \tau_0], \left| \frac{d}{d\tau} \int \chi_{\tilde{R}} |v^\lambda(\tau)|^2 \right| \leq \frac{C M_0^\lambda}{\tilde{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|\nabla v^\lambda(\tau)\|_{L^2}.$$

We integrate this between 0 and τ_0 , divide by \tilde{R} and use (2.13) to get :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)} \int \chi_{\tilde{R}} |v^\lambda(\tau_0)|^2 - \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)} \int \chi_{\tilde{R}} |v^\lambda(0)|^2 \right| \\
& \leq \frac{CM_0^\lambda \cdot D}{\tilde{R}^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int_0^{\tau_0} \|\nabla v^\lambda(\tau)\|_{L^2} d\tau \leq \frac{CM_0^\lambda \cdot D}{D^{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)^{\frac{3}{2}}} (\tau_0 \int_0^{\tau_0} \|\nabla v^\lambda(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq \frac{CM_0^\lambda}{D^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left(\int_0^{2\tau_0} (2\tau_0 - \tau) \|\nabla v(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{CM_0^\lambda}{D^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \tilde{\lambda}_v(\tau_0)^{\frac{3}{2}}} (M_0^\lambda)^{\frac{\alpha_2}{2}} \cdot \tau_0^{\frac{3}{4}} \\
& \leq \frac{C(M_0^\lambda)^{1+\frac{\alpha_2}{2}} F_*^{\frac{3}{2}}}{D_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \varepsilon
\end{aligned}$$

for \tilde{C}_ε large enough which ends the proof. \square

In the end of this section, we state a proposition as a blackbox to finish the proof of Theorem 1.5,

Proposition 2.5. *Let $v_\varepsilon(\tau, x) \in C([0, e^N], \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1)^{10}$ be a radial solution to (2.1) with the potential function*

$$V_\varepsilon(x) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} V\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right), \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0,$$

where $V(x)$ is a fixed potential function satisfying the conditions in Theorem 1.5 and initial data satisfies

$$(2.70) \quad \|v_\varepsilon(0, x)\|_{\dot{H}^1} = 1,$$

Besides, we assume the following conditions¹¹

$$(2.71) \quad e^{\frac{N}{2}} \cdot \max(E^V(v_\varepsilon(0)), 0) < 1,$$

$$(2.72) \quad M_0 := \frac{4\|v_\varepsilon(0)\|_{L^3}}{c_V} \geq 2,$$

and

$$(2.73) \quad \forall \tau_0 \in [0, e^N], \quad \frac{E^{V_\varepsilon}(v_\varepsilon(0))}{\|v_\varepsilon(\tau_0)\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2} \leq \frac{1}{4},$$

then there exists a universal constant $\gamma_1 > 0$ which is independent of ε such that

$$\|v_\varepsilon(0)\|_{L^3} \geq N^{\gamma_1}.$$

Using this proposition to equation (2.5) with $\tau = 0$, it is direct to see

$$\|u(t, x)\|_{L^3} = \|v^\lambda(0, x)\|_{L^3} \geq |\log(T - t)|^\gamma,$$

and we finish the proof of Theorem 1.5.

¹⁰ N is a large enough fixed number.

¹¹ $E^{V_\varepsilon}(v_0) := \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla v_\varepsilon(0)|^2 - \frac{1}{4} \int (V_\varepsilon * |v_\varepsilon(0)|^2) |v_\varepsilon(0)|^2.$

3. THE CONNECTION BETWEEN SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION AND HARTREE EQUATION

In section 2, we have proved Theorem 1.5. In this section, we aim to show the our result also implies Theorem 1.1 as said in section 1.2. Before our analysis, we state a stronger version proved by Merle and Raphaël in [33], which is also claimed in Remark 1.17,

Proposition 3.1. *Let $v(\tau, x) \in C([0, e^N], \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1)$ be a radial solution to equation (1.5) with the initial data satisfying*

$$(3.1) \quad \|v(0, x)\|_{\dot{H}^1} = 1,$$

and satisfies the following conditions¹²

$$(3.2) \quad e^{\frac{N}{2}} \cdot \max(E(v_0), 0) < 1,$$

$$(3.3) \quad M_0 := \frac{4\|v_0\|_{L^3}}{C_{GN}} \geq 2,$$

and

$$(3.4) \quad \forall \tau_0 \in [0, e^N], \frac{E(v_0)}{\|v(\tau_0)\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2} \leq \frac{1}{4},$$

then there exists a universal constant $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$(3.5) \quad \|v_0\|_{L^3} \geq N^\gamma.$$

Now we want to derive proposition 3.1 by applying our conclusion, proposition 2.5. First we state a result of standard stability theory, and supply the proof in Appendix B,

Lemma 3.2. *We consider the nonlinear Schrödinger equation (1.5) and Hartree equation (2.1) with the same radial initial data $v_0 \in \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1$, and assume the normalization condition*

$$(3.6) \quad \|V(x)\|_{L^1} = \|V_\varepsilon(x)\|_{L^1} = 1.$$

We define T_{max} as the lifetime of $v(\tau)$ and claim the following holds true, $\forall \delta > 0, \forall T \in [0, T_{max}), \exists \varepsilon^* = \varepsilon^*(\delta, T) > 0$, such that $\forall 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon^*$,

$$(3.7) \quad \|v_\varepsilon(\tau) - v(\tau)\|_{L^\infty([0, T], \dot{H}^1)} \leq \delta.$$

Combining Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 2.5, we will prove Proposition 3.1. The main task is to verify the above conditions in Proposition 3.1 hold true item by item.

Proof. From the standard analysis knowledge and the definition of $E(v_0), E^{V_\varepsilon}(v_0), \forall m_1 > 0, \exists m_2 > 0$, such that $\forall 0 < \varepsilon < m_2$,

$$(3.8) \quad |E(v_0) - E^{V_\varepsilon}(v_0)| < m_1.$$

Since τ_* is a fixed number, condition (2.71) is naturally established. The assumption (2.73) is verified by condition (3.4). Lastly, combining Lemma 3.2 and (3.8), we conclude (2.73) holds. The conclusion of the Proposition 2.5 then leads directly to the conclusion (3.5) as we want. \square

Acknowledgement: The author is very grateful to his advisers, Ping Zhang and Chenjie Fan for their constant encouragements, guidance and very helpful discussions during preparing this work. The author thanks Ning Liu and Hequn Zhang, for some helpful comments and discussions. The author is supported by National Key R&D Program of China under grant 2021YFA1000800.

¹² $E(v_0) := \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla v_0|^2 - \frac{1}{4} \int |v_0|^4.$

APPENDIX A. A VIRIAL ARGUMENT AND THE APPLICATIONS OF LOCAL THEORY

In this section, we give complete analysis claimed in Remark 1.8 and some applications of local theory. First, through a classical virial argument, we prove the existence of the blow up solutions, and state it as follows,

Proposition A.1. *Let $v(t, x) \in C([0, T], \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1)$ be a solution to equation (1.1) where $V(x)$ satisfies the condition (1.8), if the initial data v_0 satisfies*

$$(A.1) \quad E^V(v_0) = \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla v_0|^2 - \frac{1}{4} \int (V * |v_0|^2) |v_0|^2 < 0,$$

then $v(t, x)$ blows up in finite time, i.e. $T < +\infty$.

Proof. Since $V(x)$ is a radial function, then

$$2 \int x_j |v(t, x)|^2 \partial_{x_j} \int V(x-y) |v(t, y)|^2 dy dx = \int \int (x_j - y_j) \partial_{x_j} V(x-y) |v(t, x)|^2 |v(t, y)|^2 dy dx.$$

So we can rewrite the virial identity (1.13) as the follows

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \int |x|^2 |v|^2 &= 8 \int |\nabla v|^2 + 4 \int x_j |v|^2 \partial_j (V * |v|^2) dx \\ &= 8 \int |\nabla v|^2 + 2 \int \int (x_j - y_j) \partial_{x_j} V(x-y) |v(t, x)|^2 |v(t, y)|^2 dy dx \\ &= 16 \left(\frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla v|^2 + \frac{1}{8} \int \int (x_j - y_j) \partial_{x_j} V(x-y) |v(t, x)|^2 |v(t, y)|^2 dy dx \right) \\ &:= 16K^V(v(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Using the condition (1.8), we conclude

$$K^V(v(t)) \leq E^V(v(t)) = E^V(v_0) < 0,$$

and we finish the proof. \square

Proposition A.2. *Assume $u(t)$ is a solution in $C([0, T], \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1)$ to equation (1.1) with*

$$\begin{cases} u_0 \in \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1, \\ \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^1} \leq M, \end{cases}$$

and $V(x) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap L^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, then, if $u(t)$ blows up in finite time $T < \infty$, there holds

$$(A.2) \quad \lim_{t \nearrow T} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} = +\infty.$$

Proof. step 1. The energy is well-defined.

From the energy conservation law,

$$E^V(u(t)) = E^V(u_0) = \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 dx - \frac{1}{4} \int (V * |u|^2)(t, x) |u(t, x)|^2 dx.$$

Also, with the aid of Sobolev embedding theorem in \mathbb{R}^3 , $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hookrightarrow L^3$ and $\dot{H}^1 \hookrightarrow L^6$,

$$(A.3) \quad \int (V * |u|^2)(t, x) |u(t, x)|^2 dx \lesssim \|(V * |u|^2)\|_{L_x^3} \|u\|_{L_x^3}^2 \lesssim \|V\|_{L_x^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|u\|_{L_x^3}^4 \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}}^4.$$

So $E^V(u(t))$ is well defined.

step 2 . Proof by contradiction.

From step 1,

$$(A.4) \quad E^V(u(t)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 dx - C \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}}^4.$$

If $u(t)$ blows up at T , then

$$\lim_{t \nearrow T} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} = +\infty.$$

(Otherwise we can continue the solution to $[t, t + C(M)]$ with $t + C(M) > T$, which is a contradiction.)
The fact $E^V(u(t)) = E^V(u_0) < +\infty$ shows that

$$\lim_{t \nearrow T} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} = +\infty.$$

□

Proposition A.3. *Assume the assumptions in Proposition A.2 hold, and $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $V(x) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Then $u(t)$ can not blow up in finite time $T < \infty$.*

Proof. Recall

$$(A.5) \quad E^V(u(t)) = E^V(u_0) = \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 dx - \frac{1}{4} \int (V * |u|^2)(t, x) |u(t, x)|^2 dx < +\infty$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int (V * |u|^2)(t, x) |u(t, x)|^2 dx &\lesssim \|(V * |u|^2)\|_{L_x^\infty} \| |u|^2 \|_{L_x^1} \\ &\lesssim \|V\|_{L_x^\infty} \|u\|_{L_x^2}^4 \\ &\lesssim \|u_0\|_{L_x^2}^4 \\ &\lesssim C(u_0), \end{aligned}$$

where we also use mass conservation.

The above gives

$$(A.6) \quad \int |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \int (V * |u|^2)(t, x) |u(t, x)|^2 dx + 2E^V(u_0) \leq C(u_0),$$

which is a contradiction to $\lim_{t \nearrow T} \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} = +\infty$. □

In fact, we also have a stronger characterization about the blow-up rate of critical norm, and state it as follows:

Proposition A.4. *Under the assumptions in proposition A.2 and assume $u(t)$ blows up in finite time $T < +\infty$, then $\exists C = C(u_0)$ s.t.*

$$(A.7) \quad \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} \geq \frac{C}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{4}}},$$

and

$$(A.8) \quad \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \geq \frac{C}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{8}}}$$

for t close enough to T .

Proof. If not, $\exists \{t_n\}$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} t_n = T$ such that $\|u(t_n)\|_{\dot{H}^1} \leq \frac{1}{n(T-t_n)^{\frac{1}{4}}} := M_n$.

At the time t_n ,

$$(A.9) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \Delta u = -(V * |u|^2)u, & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3, \\ u|_{t=t_n} = u(t_n, x) \in \dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{cases}$$

From local theory, $u(t) \in C([t_n, t_n + T_n], \dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \dot{H}^1)$ with $T_n \geq \frac{C}{M_n^4} \gtrsim n^4(T - t_n)$.

However, $t_n + n^4(T - t_n) > T$ for n large enough, which is a contradiction.

From the energy conservation law,

$$\begin{aligned} E^V(u(t)) &= E^V(u_0) = \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 dx - \frac{1}{4} \int (V * |u|^2)(t, x) |u(t, x)|^2 dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L_x^2}^2 - C \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}}^4. \end{aligned}$$

From the (A.9), $\|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} \geq \frac{C}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{4}}}$, so $\|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \geq \frac{C}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{8}}}$. □

Remark A.5. In proposition A.4, we have used the fact $V(x) \in L^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

Remark A.6. Although we can give some characterizations about the blow-up rate, we can not give a concrete example of the blow-up solution. This is a weakness for proposition A.2-A.4.

APPENDIX B. THE PROOF OF LEMMA 3.2

Proof. We define $u_\varepsilon := v_\varepsilon - v$, i.e. $v_\varepsilon(\tau, x) = u_\varepsilon(\tau, x) + v(\tau, x)$, then $u_\varepsilon(\tau, x)$ satisfies

$$(B.1) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u_\varepsilon(\tau, x) + \Delta u_\varepsilon(\tau, x) = -(V_\varepsilon * |v_\varepsilon(\tau, x)|^2)v_\varepsilon(\tau, x) + |v|^2v, & (\tau, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3, \\ u_\varepsilon(\tau, x)|_{\tau=0} = 0. \end{cases}$$

From the integral equation,

$$(B.2) \quad u_\varepsilon(\tau, x) = i \int_0^\tau e^{i(\tau-s)\Delta} [(V_\varepsilon * |v_\varepsilon|^2)v_\varepsilon - |v|^2v](s) ds,$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\varepsilon(\tau, x)\|_{L_\tau^\infty([0, T], \dot{H}^1)} &= \left\| \int_0^\tau e^{i(\tau-s)\Delta} [(V_\varepsilon * |v_\varepsilon|^2)v_\varepsilon - |v|^2v](s) ds \right\|_{L_\tau^\infty([0, T], \dot{H}^1)} \\ &\leq \left\| \int_0^\tau e^{i(\tau-s)\Delta} \nabla [(V_\varepsilon * |v_\varepsilon|^2)v_\varepsilon - (V_\varepsilon * |v_\varepsilon|^2)v](s) ds \right\|_{L_\tau^\infty([0, T], L^2)} \\ &\quad + \left\| \int_0^\tau e^{i(\tau-s)\Delta} \nabla [(V_\varepsilon * |v_\varepsilon|^2) - |v|^2]v(s) ds \right\|_{L_\tau^\infty([0, T], L^2)} \\ &:= (I) + (II). \end{aligned}$$

Next we will estimate these two terms.

$$\begin{aligned}
(I) &\lesssim \|\nabla[(V_\varepsilon * |v_\varepsilon|^2)v_\varepsilon - (V_\varepsilon * |v_\varepsilon|^2)v]\|_{L^2_\tau([0,T],L^{\frac{6}{5}}_x)} \\
&\leq \|V_\varepsilon * (\nabla|v_\varepsilon|^2)(v_\varepsilon(s) - v(s))\|_{L^2_\tau([0,T],L^{\frac{6}{5}}_x)} + \|V_\varepsilon * (|v_\varepsilon|^2)\nabla(v_\varepsilon(s) - v(s))\|_{L^2_\tau([0,T],L^{\frac{6}{5}}_x)} \\
&\leq \|V_\varepsilon * (\nabla|v_\varepsilon|^2)\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],L^{\frac{3}{2}}_x)} \|v_\varepsilon(s) - v(s)\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],L^6_x)} \cdot T^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + \|V_\varepsilon * (|v_\varepsilon|^2)\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],L^{\frac{3}{2}}_x)} \|\nabla(v_\varepsilon(s) - v(s))\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],L^2_x)} \cdot T^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],L^2_x)}^2 \|u_\varepsilon(\tau, x)\|_{L^\infty([0,T],\dot{H}^1)} T^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq (\|u_\varepsilon(\tau, x)\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],\dot{H}^1)}^2 + \|v(\tau, x)\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],\dot{H}^1)}^2) \|u_\varepsilon(\tau, x)\|_{L^\infty([0,T],\dot{H}^1)} \cdot T^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Before we estimate part (II), let us recall some elementary knowledge,

$$(B.3) \quad \forall f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^3), p \in (1, +\infty), \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0^+} \|V_\varepsilon * f - f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)} = 0.$$

From the local theory, $v(\tau, x) \in C([0, T], \dot{H}^1)$, so $\forall \tilde{\delta} > 0, \exists \delta_1 > 0$, s.t. $\forall \tau_1, \tau_2 \in [0, T]$ with $|\tau_2 - \tau_1| < \delta_1$, $\|v(\tau_1, x) - v(\tau_2, x)\|_{\dot{H}^1} < \tilde{\delta}$. Similarly, we have $\|v(\tau_1, x) - v(\tau_2, x)\|_{L^6} < \tilde{\delta}$ and $\|v(\tau_1, x) \cdot \nabla v(\tau_1, x) - v(\tau_2, x) \cdot \nabla v(\tau_2, x)\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}} < \tilde{\delta}$.

Now we estimate the part (II):

$$\begin{aligned}
(II) &= \left\| \int_0^\tau e^{i(\tau-s)\Delta} \nabla[(V_\varepsilon * |v_\varepsilon|^2) - |v|^2]v(s) ds \right\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],L^2)} \\
&\leq \|\nabla[(V_\varepsilon * |v|^2) - |v|^2]v(s)\|_{L^2_\tau([0,T],L^{\frac{6}{5}}_x)} \\
&\quad + \|\nabla[(V_\varepsilon * (\bar{v}u_\varepsilon + v\bar{u}_\varepsilon))v(s)]\|_{L^2_\tau([0,T],L^{\frac{6}{5}}_x)} \\
&\quad + \|\nabla[(V_\varepsilon * |u_\varepsilon|^2)v(s)]\|_{L^2_\tau([0,T],L^{\frac{6}{5}}_x)} \\
&:= (i) + (ii) + (iii).
\end{aligned}$$

For the term (ii),

$$(B.4) \quad (ii) \leq \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],\dot{H}^1)} \|v\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],\dot{H}^1)}^2 T^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and the computation is also direct for (iii),

$$(B.5) \quad (iii) \leq \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],\dot{H}^1)}^2 \|v\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],\dot{H}^1)} T^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Finally, we estimate term (i):

$$\begin{aligned}
(i) &\leq \|[(V_\varepsilon * |v|^2) - |v|^2]\nabla v(s)\|_{L^2_\tau([0,T],L^{\frac{6}{5}}_x)} + \|[(V_\varepsilon * \nabla|v|^2) - \nabla|v|^2]v(s)\|_{L^2_\tau([0,T],L^{\frac{6}{5}}_x)} \\
&\leq \|[(V_\varepsilon * |v|^2) - |v|^2]\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],L^{\frac{3}{2}}_x)} \|\nabla v(s)\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],L^2_x)} T^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + \|[(V_\varepsilon * \nabla|v|^2) - \nabla|v|^2]\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],L^{\frac{3}{2}}_x)} \|v(s)\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],L^6_x)} T^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \delta_2 \|\nabla v(s)\|_{L^\infty_\tau([0,T],L^2_x)} T^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the prepared knowledge in the last inequality and δ_2 is a small enough constant to be defined later. Summing up the above three estimations, we conclude,

\forall fixed $T \in [0, T_{max})$, $\forall \delta_2 > 0$, $\exists \varepsilon_1 > 0$, such that $\forall \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$,

$$(B.6) \quad \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_{\tau'}([0, T], \dot{H}^1)} \leq C\{\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_{\tau'}([0, T], \dot{H}^1)}^3 T^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_{\tau'}([0, T], \dot{H}^1)}^2 \|v\|_{L^\infty_{\tau'}([0, T], \dot{H}^1)} T^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ + \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_{\tau'}([0, T], \dot{H}^1)} \|v\|_{L^\infty_{\tau'}([0, T], \dot{H}^1)}^2 T^{\frac{1}{2}} + \delta_2 \|v\|_{L^\infty_{\tau'}([0, T], \dot{H}^1)}^2 T^{\frac{1}{2}}\}.$$

Dual to the fact $v(t) \in C([0, T], \dot{H}^1)$, there exists $M = M(T)$ such that $\|\nabla v(\tau)\|_{L^\infty_{\tau'}([0, T], L^2_x)} < M$. We can also choose δ_2 small enough such that δ_3 small and $\delta_3 := \delta_2 M^2$. Then (B.6) can be rewrote as

$$(B.7) \quad \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_{\tau'}([0, T], \dot{H}^1)} \leq C\{\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_{\tau'}([0, T], \dot{H}^1)}^3 T^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_{\tau'}([0, T], \dot{H}^1)}^2 M T^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_{\tau'}([0, T], \dot{H}^1)} M^2 T^{\frac{1}{2}} + \delta_3 T^{\frac{1}{2}}\}.$$

We can divide T into $N(T)$ intervals and the length of each interval is T_1 such that $CT_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \ll 1$, $CMT_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \ll \frac{1}{100}$ and $CM^2 T_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \ll \frac{1}{100}$.

From each interval, (B.7) leads to

$$(B.8) \quad \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_{\tau'}([\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}], \dot{H}^1)} \leq \|u_\varepsilon(\tau_i)\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \frac{1}{100} \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_{\tau'}([\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}], \dot{H}^1)}^3 + \frac{1}{100} \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_{\tau'}([\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}], \dot{H}^1)}^2 + \delta_3.$$

On the one hand, we choose δ_3 such that $2^{N(T)} \delta_3 \ll 1$. On the other hand, with the aid of standard continuity argument, we adjust δ_3 such that

$$(B.9) \quad \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_{\tau'}([0, T], \dot{H}^1)} \leq 2^{N(T)} \delta_3 \leq \delta,$$

which ends the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bourgain, W. Wang, Construction of blowup solutions for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with critical nonlinearity. Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa, Cl. Sci., IV. Ser. 25, No. 1-2, 197-215 (1997).
- [2] M. Cardoso, L.G. Farah, Blow-up of radial solutions for the intercritical inhomogeneous NLS equation. J. Funct. Anal. 281, No. 8, Article ID 109134, 38 p. (2021).
- [3] C. Collot, F. Merle, P. Raphaël Dynamics near the ground state for the energy critical nonlinear heat equation in large dimensions. Commun. Math. Phys. 352, No. 1, 215-285 (2017).
- [4] B. Dodson, Global well-posedness and scattering for the mass critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation with mass below the mass of the ground state. Adv. Math. 285, 1589-1618 (2015).
- [5] B. Dodson, Global well-posedness and scattering for the focusing, cubic Schrödinger equation in dimension $d = 4$. Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) 52, No. 1, 139-180 (2019).
- [6] B. Dodson, A determination of the blowup solutions to the focusing, quintic NLS with mass equal to the mass of the soliton. arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.11690, 2021.
- [7] B. Dodson, A determination of the blowup solutions to the focusing NLS with mass equal to the mass of the soliton. arXiv:2106.02723, 2021.
- [8] T. Duyckaerts, J. Holmer, S. Roudenko, Scattering for the non-radial 3D cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Math. Res. Lett., 15 (2008), no. 5-6, 1233-1250.
- [9] T. Duyckaerts, S. Roudenko, Threshold solutions for the focusing 3d cubic Schrödinger equation, Revista Mat. Iber., 26 (2010), no. 1, 1-56.
- [10] T. Duyckaerts, S. Roudenko, Going beyond the threshold: scattering and blow-up in the focusing NLS equation. Commun. Math. Phys. 334, No. 3, 1573-1615 (2015).
- [11] C. Fan, log-log blow up solutions blow up at exactly m points. Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Anal. Non Linéaire 34, No. 6, 1429-1482 (2017).
- [12] J. Froehlich, E. Lenzmann, Mean-field limit of quantum bose gases and nonlinear Hartree equation, in Seminaire EDP, Ecole Polytechnique, (2004), 2003-2004.
- [13] Y. Gao, Blow-up for the focusing $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ -critical Hartree equation with radial data. J. Differ. Equations 255, No. 9, 2801-2825 (2013).
- [14] R.T. Glassey, On the blown up solutions to the cauchy problem for nonlinear Schrödinger equations. J. Math. Phys. 18(1977) 1794-1797
- [15] R. Harrison, I. Moroz, K.P. Tod, A numerical study of the Schrödinger-Newton equations, Nonlinearity 16 (2003), 101-122.

- [16] J. Holmer, S. Roudenko, A sharp condition for scattering of the radial 3d cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 282 (2008), no. 2, pp. 435–467.
- [17] J. Holmer, S. Roudenko, Divergence of infinite-variance nonradial solutions to the 3d cubic NLS equation, *Comm. PDE*, 35 (2010), no. 5, pp. 878–905.
- [18] C.E. Kenig, F. Merle, Global well-posedness, scattering and blow-up for the energy-critical, focusing, nonlinear Schrödinger equation in the radial case. *Invent. Math.* 166, No. 3, 645-675 (2006).
- [19] R. Killip, M. Visan, The focusing energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in dimensions five and higher. *Am. J. Math.* 132, No. 2, 361-424 (2010).
- [20] R. Killip, B. Stovall, M. Visan, Blowup behaviour for the nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation. *Math. Ann.* 358, No. 1-2, 289-350 (2014).
- [21] M. Landman, G. Papanicolaou, C. Sulem, P. Sulem. Rate of blowup for solutions of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation at critical dimension. *Physical Review A*, 38(8):3837, 1988.
- [22] D. Li, C. Miao, X. Zhang, The focusing energy-critical Hartree equation. *J. Differ. Equations* 246, No. 3, 1139-1163 (2009).
- [23] D. Li, X. Zhang, On the classification of minimal mass blowup solutions of the focusing mass-critical Hartree equation. *Adv. Math.* 220, No. 4, 1171-1192 (2009).
- [24] E.H. Lieb, Existence and uniqueness of the minimizing solution of Choquard’s nonlinear equation, *Stud. Appl. Math.* 57 (1977), 93–105.
- [25] Y. Martel, P. Raphaël, Strongly interacting blow up bubbles for the mass critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.* (4) 51, No. 3, 701-737 (2018).
- [26] F. Merle, Construction of solutions with exactly k blow-up points for the Schrödinger equation with critical nonlinearity, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 129 (1990), 223–240.
- [27] F. Merle, Determination of blow-up solutions with minimal mass for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with critical power. *Duke Math. J.* 69, No. 2, 427-454 (1993).
- [28] F. Merle, P. Raphaël, Sharp upper bound on the blow-up rate for the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA*, 13(3) :591–642, 2003.
- [29] F. Merle, P. Raphaël, On universality of blow up profile for L^2 critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Invent. Math.* 156, No. 3, 565-672 (2004).
- [30] F. Merle, P. Raphaël, Profiles and quantization of the blow up mass for critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 253(3) :675–704, 2005.
- [31] F. Merle, P. Raphaël, The blow-up dynamic and upper bound on the blow-up rate for critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Ann. Math.* (2) 161, No. 1, 157-222 (2005).
- [32] F. Merle, P. Raphaël, On a sharp lower bound on the blow-up rate for the L^2 critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *J. Am. Math. Soc.* 19, No. 1, 37-90 (2006).
- [33] F. Merle, P. Raphaël, Blow up of the critical norm for some radial L^2 super critical nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Am. J. Math.* 130(4), 945–978 (2008)
- [34] C. Miao, G. Xu, L. Zhao, Global well-posedness and scattering for the mass-critical Hartree equation for radial data, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 91 (2009) 49–79.
- [35] C. Miao, G. Xu, L. Zhao, On the blow-up phenomenon for the mass-critical focusing Hartree equation in \mathbb{R}^4 . *Colloq. Math.* 119, No. 1, 23-50 (2010).
- [36] K. Nakanishi, W. Schlag, Global dynamics above the ground state energy for the cubic NLS equation in 3D, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 44 (2012), no. 1-2, 1-45.
- [37] G. Perelman, On the blow up phenomenon for the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in $1d$. *Nonlinear dynamics and renormalization group (Montreal, QC, 1999)*, 27 :147–164, 2001.
- [38] F. Planchon, P. Raphaël, Existence and stability of the log-log blow-up dynamics for the L^2 -critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in a domain, *Ann. Henri Poincaré* 8 (2007), 1177–1219.
- [39] P. Raphaël. Stability of the log-log bound for blow up solutions to the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Mathematische Annalen*, 331(3) :577–609, 2005.
- [40] T. Tao, Quantitative bounds for critically bounded solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations. [arXiv:1908.04958](https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.04958).
- [41] M. Weinstein, Nonlinear Schrödinger equations and sharp interpolation estimates, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 87 (4) (1982/83) 567–576.
- [42] J. Zheng, On blow-up for the Hartree equation. *Colloq. Math.* 126, No. 1, 111-124 (2012).

ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, THE CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100190, CHINA.
Email address: wangshumao@amss.ac.cn