

WELL-POSEDNESS OF THE HIGHER-ORDER NONLINEAR SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION ON A FINITE INTERVAL

CHRIS MAYO[†], DIONYSSIOS MANTZAVINOS[†], TÜRKER ÖZSARI^{*}

[†]Department of Mathematics, University of Kansas

^{*}Department of Mathematics, Bilkent University

ABSTRACT. We establish the local Hadamard well-posedness of a certain third-order nonlinear Schrödinger equation with a multi-term linear part and a general power nonlinearity known as the higher-order nonlinear Schrödinger equation, formulated on a finite interval with a combination of nonzero Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions. Specifically, for initial and boundary data in suitable Sobolev spaces that are related to one another through the time regularity induced by the equation, we prove the existence of a unique solution as well as the continuous dependence of that solution on the data. The precise choice of solution space depends on the value of the Sobolev exponent and is dictated both by the linear estimates associated with the forced linear counterpart of the nonlinear initial-boundary value problem and, in the low-regularity setting below the Sobolev algebra property threshold, by certain nonlinear estimates that control the Sobolev norm of the power nonlinearity. In particular, as usual in Schrödinger-type equations, in the case of low regularity it is necessary to derive Strichartz estimates in suitable Lebesgue/Bessel potential spaces. The proof of well-posedness is based on a contraction mapping argument combined with the aforementioned linear estimates, which are established by employing the explicit solution formula for the forced linear problem derived via the unified transform of Fokas. Due to the nature of the finite interval problem, this formula involves contour integrals in the complex Fourier plane with corresponding integrands that contain differences of exponentials in their denominators, thus requiring delicate handling through appropriate contour deformations. It is worth noting that, in addition to the various linear and nonlinear results obtained for the finite interval problem, novel time regularity results are established here also for the relevant half-line problem.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the higher-order nonlinear Schrödinger (HNLS) equation with a power nonlinearity, formulated on the finite interval $(0, \ell)$ with nonzero boundary conditions, namely

$$\begin{aligned} iu_t + i\beta u_{xxx} + \alpha u_{xx} + i\delta u_x &= \kappa |u|^{\lambda-1} u, \quad 0 < x < \ell, \quad 0 < t < T, \\ u(x, 0) &= u_0(x) \in H^s(0, \ell), \\ u(0, t) = g_0(t) \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T), \quad u(\ell, t) &= h_0(t) \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T), \quad u_x(\ell, t) = h_1(t) \in H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T), \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\beta > 0$, $\alpha, \delta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\kappa \in \mathbb{C}$, $\lambda > 1$, $\ell > 0$, and $T > 0$ is an appropriate lifespan to be determined. In the above initial-boundary value problem, the initial data is taken from the L^2 -based Sobolev space $H^s(0, \ell)$, which is defined as the restriction on the finite interval $(0, \ell)$ of the usual Fourier-based Sobolev space on the whole line

$$H^s(\mathbb{R}) := \left\{ \phi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) : (1 + k^2)^{\frac{s}{2}} \mathcal{F}\{\phi\} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \right\}, \quad s \geq 0, \tag{1.2}$$

where $\mathcal{F}\{\cdot\}$ denotes the Fourier transform. The equivalent characterization of $H^s(0, \ell)$ as the space $W^{s,2}(0, \ell)$ of functions in $L^2(0, \ell)$ whose first s derivatives belong in $L^2(0, \ell)$ will also prove useful for our purposes. The Sobolev spaces $H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)$ and $H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)$ for the three pieces of boundary data are defined similarly. It should be noted that the two Sobolev exponents $\frac{s+1}{3}$ and $\frac{s}{3}$ for the boundary data are determined in terms of the Sobolev exponent s for the initial data through the study of both the spatial and the temporal regularity of the solution of problem (1.1)

E-mail address: cmayo@ku.edu, mantzavinos@ku.edu (corresponding author), turker.ozsari@bilkent.edu.tr.

Date: June 21, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35Q55, 35G31, 35G16.

Key words and phrases. higher-order nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Korteweg-de Vries equation, initial-boundary value problem, finite interval, nonzero boundary conditions, unified transform of Fokas, well-posedness in Sobolev spaces, Strichartz estimates, low regularity solutions, power nonlinearity.

Acknowledgements. DM's and CM's research is partially supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF-DMS #2206270). TÖ's research is supported by BAGEP 2020 Young Scientist Award.

(see Theorem 2.1 and Section 3 for more details). In other words, the (time) regularity of the boundary data is fully dictated by the (space) regularity of the initial data.

The HNLS equation is a higher-order analogue of the renowned NLS equation $iu_t + u_{xx} = \kappa|u|^{\lambda-1}u$, which is a ubiquitous model in mathematical physics with applications ranging from nonlinear optics to water waves to plasmas to Bose-Einstein condensates. In the context of nonlinear optics, the HNLS equation has been derived as an improved approximation (in comparison to NLS) to the three-dimensional Maxwell equations, as it additionally involves a third-order dispersive term that serves as a necessary correction for modeling pulses in the femtosecond regime [Kod85, KH87]. In its original form, the HNLS equation appeared with a *cubic* power nonlinearity ($\lambda = 3$) as well as additional cubic nonlinearities involving derivatives. Here, we consider the case of a *general* power nonlinearity ($\lambda > 1$) but without the terms involving the derivative cubic nonlinearities, so that the HNLS equation in (1.1) is a direct higher-dispersion analogue of the NLS equation. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the third-order dispersion of the HNLS equation induces a time regularity (through the relevant time estimates established in Section 3) of the same type with the Korteweg-de Vries (KdV) equation. In this light and from a purely mathematical viewpoint, the HNLS equation can be seen as an interesting hybrid between the NLS and KdV equations — the two most celebrated nonlinear dispersive equations in one spatial dimension.

The well-posedness of the initial value problem (also known as the Cauchy problem) for the HNLS equation on the whole line has been studied extensively, e.g. see the works [Lau97, Sta97, Tak00, CL03, Car04, Car06, Fam23]. On the other hand, following the general trend in the well-posedness theory of nonlinear dispersive equations, the analysis of *nonhomogeneous initial-boundary value problems* for HNLS is much more limited. An important challenge associated with such problems has to do with the presence of a boundary in the spatial domain, which in turn introduces the need for prescribing appropriate boundary conditions. In one space dimension, such domains are the half-line $(0, \infty)$ and the finite interval $(0, \ell)$. While in the case of the initial value problem one can prove local well-posedness by first using the Fourier transform on the whole line to solve the forced linear counterpart of the nonlinear equation and then obtaining the solution to the nonlinear problem as a fixed point (in a suitable function space) through a contraction mapping argument, the situation for initial-boundary value problems is less straightforward. Now, the Fourier transform method is not available and, therefore, an important challenge arises right away concerning the solution of the forced linear problem which is needed for defining the iteration map. Importantly, even when this obstacle is overcome, working outside the standard Fourier transform framework means that several tools from harmonic analysis that play a key role in the derivation of linear estimates for the initial value problem (which are then used in order to establish the contraction) are either no longer available or must be adapted in nontrivial ways.

A general method for proving the (local) well-posedness of initial-boundary value problems for nonlinear dispersive equations has been developed systematically over the last decade or so. This method, which first appeared in the context of the NLS and KdV equations on the half-line [FHM17, FHM16], relies on the solution of the forced linear problem via the unified transform, also known as the Fokas method [Fok97, Fok08]. The unified transform was introduced by Fokas in 1997 for solving initial-boundary value problems of (i) linear and (ii) integrable nonlinear evolution equations. In the former setting, the unified transform provides the direct analogue of the Fourier transform in domains with a boundary. In the latter setting, it provides the counterpart of the inverse scattering transform used for solving the initial value problem of integrable equations (including NLS and KdV) via the spectral analysis of their Lax pair. As most physical nonlinear dispersive models — including HNLS — are not integrable and hence do not possess a Lax pair, it is not possible to employ the inverse scattering transform (for the initial value problem) and the unified transform (for initial-boundary value problems) in order to study these equations directly at the nonlinear level. As noted above, in the case of the initial value problem, one uses the Fourier transform/contraction mapping approach that leads to well-posedness through a fixed point theorem. In the case of initial-boundary value problems, an analogue of this approach is the method of [FHM17, FHM16], where the Fourier transform is replaced by the unified transform.

In the present work, the unified transform is combined with the basic ideas of [FHM17, FHM16] as well as with new techniques needed specifically due to the finite interval setting (as opposed to the half-line) and the multi-term nature of the HNLS equation (as opposed to the simpler linear parts of NLS and KdV) in order to establish the

Hadamard well-posedness (namely, the existence and uniqueness of solution, as well as the continuity of the data-to-solution map) of the HNLS finite interval problem (1.1). More precisely, in the high-regularity setting of $s > \frac{1}{2}$ (“smooth” data), our result reads as follows:

Theorem 1.1 (High-regularity Hadamard well-posedness). *Suppose $\frac{1}{2} < s \leq 2$, $s \neq \frac{3}{2}$, and $\lambda > 1$, where if $\lambda \notin 2\mathbb{N} + 1$ then the following conditions are satisfied:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{if } s \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ then } \lambda \geq s + 1 \text{ if } \lambda \in 2\mathbb{N}; [\lambda] \geq s \text{ if } \lambda \notin \mathbb{N}, \\ & \text{if } s \notin \mathbb{N}, \text{ then } \lambda > s + 1 \text{ if } \lambda \in 2\mathbb{N}; [\lambda] \geq [s] + 1 \text{ if } \lambda \notin \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

Furthermore, let $T > 0$ be such that

$$|\kappa| \max\{c_s, c(s, \lambda)\} [2c(s, T)]^\lambda \sqrt{T} \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \right)^{\lambda-1} < 1, \quad (1.4)$$

where $c(s, T) = \max\{c_1(s, T), c_2(s, T), c_2(s, T)\sqrt{T}\}$ with $c_1(s, T)$ and $c_2(s, T)$ being the constants in the Sobolev estimates (1.10) and (1.11), $c(s, \lambda)$ is the constant in Lemma 4.1, and c_s is the constant of the algebra property inequality in $H^s(0, \ell)$. Then, under the compatibility conditions

$$g_0(0) = u_0(0), \quad h_0(0) = u_0(\ell), \quad s > \frac{1}{2}, \quad h_1(0) = u'_0(\ell), \quad s > \frac{3}{2}, \quad (1.5)$$

the initial-boundary value problem (1.1) for the HNLS equation on a finite interval is locally well-posed in the sense of Hadamard. More specifically, (1.1) possesses a unique solution $u \in C_t([0, T]; H_x^s(0, \ell)) \cap L_t^2((0, T); H_x^{s+1}(0, \ell))$ which satisfies the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \left\{ \|u\|_{C_t([0, T]; H_x^s(0, \ell))}, \|u\|_{L_t^2((0, T); H_x^{s+1}(0, \ell))} \right\} \\ & \leq 2c(s, T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

Furthermore, the data-to-solution map is locally Lipschitz continuous. In addition, uniqueness holds in the whole of $C_t([0, T]; H_x^s(0, \ell))$.

In the setting of low regularity $s < \frac{1}{2}$ (“rough” data), the well-posedness of the finite interval problem (1.1) is more challenging, as it requires the derivation of suitable Strichartz estimates. The precise statement of our result is the following:

Theorem 1.2 (Low-regularity Hadamard well-posedness). *Suppose $0 \leq s < \frac{1}{2}$ and $2 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{7-2s}{1-2s}$, and let $T > 0$ be such that*

$$|\kappa| c(s, \lambda) [2c(s, \lambda, T)]^\lambda T^{\frac{7-\lambda+2s(\lambda-1)}{6}} \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \right)^{\lambda-1} < 1, \quad (1.7)$$

where $c(s, \lambda, T) := \max\{c_2(s, T), c_3(s, 2, T), c_3(s, \frac{2\lambda}{1+2(\lambda-1)s}, T)\}$ with the three constants involved coming from the Sobolev estimate (1.11) and the Strichartz estimate (1.12), and $c(s, \lambda)$ is the constant in Lemma 4.3. Then, the initial-boundary value problem (1.1) for the HNLS equation on a finite interval is locally well-posed in the sense of Hadamard. More specifically, (1.1) possesses a unique solution

$$u \in C_t([0, T]; H_x^s(0, \ell)) \cap L_t^2((0, T); H_x^{s+1}(0, \ell)) \cap L_t^{\frac{6\lambda}{(1-2s)(\lambda-1)}}((0, T); H_x^{s, \frac{2\lambda}{1+2(\lambda-1)s}}(0, \ell))$$

which satisfies the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \left\{ \|u\|_{C_t([0, T]; H_x^s(0, \ell))}, \|u\|_{L_t^2((0, T); H_x^{s+1}(0, \ell))}, \|u\|_{L_t^{\frac{6\lambda}{(1-2s)(\lambda-1)}}((0, T); H_x^{s, \frac{2\lambda}{1+2(\lambda-1)s}}(0, \ell))} \right\} \\ & \leq 2c(s, \lambda, T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (1.8)$$

Furthermore, the data-to-solution map is locally Lipschitz continuous. In addition, uniqueness holds in the whole of $C_t([0, T]; H_x^s(0, \ell)) \cap L_t^{\frac{6\lambda}{(1-2s)(\lambda-1)}}((0, T); H_x^{s, \frac{2\lambda}{1+2(\lambda-1)s}}(0, \ell))$.

The proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 combine a contraction mapping argument (in the relevant solution spaces) with appropriate linear estimates for the forced linear counterpart of the nonlinear problem (1.1), namely for the problem

$$\begin{aligned} iu_t + i\beta u_{xxx} + \alpha u_{xx} + i\delta u_x &= f(x, t), \quad 0 < x < \ell, \quad 0 < t < T, \\ u(x, 0) &= u_0(x), \\ u(0, t) = g_0(t), \quad u(\ell, t) = h_0(t), \quad u_x(\ell, t) &= h_1(t), \end{aligned} \tag{1.9}$$

where $f(x, t)$ is a given forcing. In particular, we establish the following crucial linear estimates:

Theorem 1.3 (Linear estimates). *For initial data $u_0 \in H^s(0, \ell)$, Dirichlet boundary data $g_0, h_0 \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)$, Neumann boundary data $h_1 \in H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)$, and forcing $f \in L_t^2((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))$ when $s > \frac{1}{2}$ and $f \in L_t^1((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))$ when $s < \frac{1}{2}$, the solution to the initial-boundary value problem (1.9) for the linear higher-order Schrödinger equation on a finite interval satisfies the Sobolev estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L_t^\infty((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))} &\leq c_1(s, T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|f\|_{L_t^2((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))} \right), \quad \frac{1}{2} < s \leq 2, \quad s \neq \frac{3}{2}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.10}$$

the additional smoothing estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L_t^2((0, T); H_x^{s+1}(0, \ell))} &\leq c_2(s, T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|f\|_{L_t^1((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))} \right), \quad 0 \leq s \leq 2, \quad s \neq \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.11}$$

and the family of Strichartz-type estimates (which contains the analogue of estimate (1.10) as a special case)

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(0, \ell))} &\leq c_3(s, p, T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|f\|_{L_t^1((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))} \right), \quad 0 \leq s < \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.12}$$

where the positive constants $c_1(s, T)$, $c_2(s, T)$ and $c_3(s, p, T)$ remain bounded as $T \rightarrow 0^+$ and (q, p) is any pair satisfy the admissibility condition

$$q, p \geq 2, \quad \frac{3}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{2}. \tag{1.13}$$

The Sobolev estimate (1.10) provides the basis for the proof of the high-regularity Theorem 1.1, while the Strichartz estimate (1.12) used both for $(q, p) = (\infty, 2)$ (in which case it corresponds to the analogue of the Sobolev estimate (1.10) in the low-regularity setting) and for $(q, p) = \left(\frac{6\lambda}{(1-2s)(\lambda-1)}, \frac{2\lambda}{1+2(\lambda-1)s}\right)$ plays an instrumental role in the proof of the low-regularity Theorem 1.2. The proof of Theorem 1.3 relies on the following novel solution formula for the forced linear problem (1.9), which is derived in Appendix A via the unified transform:

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, t) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ikx+i\omega t} \left[\widehat{u}_0(k) - i \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(k, t') dt' \right] dk \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial \widetilde{D}_0} \frac{e^{ikx+i\omega t}}{\Delta(k)} \left[(\nu_- - k) e^{-i\nu_+ \ell} - (\nu_+ - k) e^{-i\nu_- \ell} \right] \left[\widehat{u}_0(k) - i \int_0^T e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(k, t') dt' \right] dk \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial \widetilde{D}_+ \cup \partial \widetilde{D}_-} \frac{e^{-ik(\ell-x)+i\omega t}}{\Delta(k)} (\nu_+ - \nu_-) \left[\widehat{u}_0(k) - i \int_0^T e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(k, t') dt' \right] dk \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial \widetilde{D}_0 \cup \partial \widetilde{D}_+ \cup \partial \widetilde{D}_-} \frac{e^{-ik(\ell-x)+i\omega t}}{\Delta(k)} \left\{ (\nu_- - k) \left[\widehat{u}_0(\nu_+) - i \int_0^T e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(\nu_+, t') dt' \right] \right. \\ &\quad \quad - (\nu_+ - k) \left[\widehat{u}_0(\nu_-) - i \int_0^T e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(\nu_-, t') dt' \right] \\ &\quad \quad - (\nu_+ - \nu_-) \omega' \widetilde{g}_0(\omega, T) - (\nu_- e^{-i\nu_+ \ell} - \nu_+ e^{-i\nu_- \ell}) \omega' \widetilde{h}_0(\omega, T) \\ &\quad \quad \left. - i (e^{-i\nu_+ \ell} - e^{-i\nu_- \ell}) \omega' \widetilde{h}_1(\omega, T) \right\} dk. \end{aligned} \tag{1.14}$$

In the above formula, ω and Δ are given by (2.4) and (2.5), $\widehat{u}_0, \widehat{f}$ denote the finite interval Fourier transforms of u_0, f defined by (A.1), $\widetilde{g}_0, \widetilde{h}_0, \widetilde{h}_1$ are certain time transforms defined by (A.3), ν_{\pm} are given by (2.6), and the contours of integration $\partial\widetilde{D}_0, \partial\widetilde{D}_{\pm}$ are the positively oriented boundaries of the regions $\widetilde{D}_0, \widetilde{D}_{\pm}$ defined by (2.8) and depicted in Figure 2.1.

It should be noted that the well-posedness of the HNLS equation with a Dirichlet boundary condition on the half-line was established in the recent work [AMO24]. However, the finite interval problem (1.1) considered here involves several new and important challenges, which can be summarized as follows:

- (i) The unified transform solution formula (1.14) for the forced linear problem (1.9) is significantly more complicated than the one for the corresponding half-line problem. In particular, formula (1.14) involves a certain combination of exponentials in the denominator of the relevant integrands through the quantity $\Delta(k)$, which requires special care while proving the linear estimates of Theorem 1.3 (e.g. see Lemma A.4).
- (ii) Formula (1.14) involves integrals over three different complex contours (as opposed to just one in the case of the half-line) — a byproduct of the two additional boundary conditions $u(\ell, t) = h_0(t)$ and $u_x(\ell, t) = h_1(t)$ that were not present in the half-line problem. The simultaneous presence of all three contours in the linear solution formula imposes a different choice of branch cut for the multivalued functions ν_{\pm} , which in turn requires a different approach in the derivation of the relevant estimates.
- (iii) The boundary datum $h_1(t)$ is of Neumann type, while the half-line problem considered in [AMO24] involved a Dirichlet datum. In particular, the new type of datum introduces the need for new estimates at the stage of the linear decomposition of Section 3.
- (iv) Indeed, the proof of Theorem 1.3 motivates the derivation of linear time estimates both for the finite interval problem and, importantly, for the half-line problem. Such time estimates were not necessary in [AMO24] and so they constitute novel results even at the level of the half-line.

As noted earlier, the literature on the well-posedness of nonlinear dispersive initial-boundary value problems is much more limited than the one on their initial value problem counterparts. Nevertheless, over the course of the past two decades or so, important works have appeared on the rigorous analysis of initial-boundary value problems, starting from those on the well-posedness of the KdV equation on the half-line by Bona, Sun and Zhang [BSZ02] as well as Colliander and Kenig [CK02] (the latter work being on the generalized KdV equation) and continuing with the works of Holmer on both the NLS and the KdV half-line problems [Hol05, Hol06]. In the first of these works, the forced linear problem is solved via a temporal Laplace transform, while in the rest of them it is handled through a clever decomposition into appropriate initial value problems that relies on the construction of a certain boundary forcing operator. The temporal Laplace transform approach of [BSZ02] has been employed in several other works; indicatively, we mention [BSZ06, BSZ08, Kai13, Ö15, BO16, ET16, BSZ18]. The approach of [FHM17, FHM16], which relies on the unified transform (as the analogue of the Fourier transform in domains with a boundary) and is the one used in the present work, has also been further developed in recent years, e.g. see [HM15, HMY19, OY19, BFO20, HM20, HM21, HMY21, HM22, KO22, HY22b, HY22a, MO24]. Other works on the well-posedness of initial-boundary value problems for the classical NLS equation also include [CB91, SB01].

Concerning the HNLS equation in the initial-boundary value problem setting, we note that, in addition to the local well-posedness established in [AMO24] for the half-line problem, Faminskii has recently obtained results on global solutions on the half-line [Fam24] as well as on the well-posedness of inverse problems with integral overdetermination on a bounded interval [FM23]. We also note that the analysis of the HNLS equation on a finite interval in the case of $\beta < 0$ can be carried out in an *entirely analogous way* as the case of $\beta > 0$ presented in this work, the only difference being the prescription of two boundary data at $x = 0$ and one at $x = \ell$ (as opposed to the one datum at $x = 0$ and two data at $x = \ell$ in problem (1.1)). On the other hand, the case of $\beta < 0$ on the half-line is more interesting, as it requires the prescription of *two* boundary data at $x = 0$ (as opposed to the *single* boundary condition present in [AMO24]) and will be considered in the upcoming work [AMO].

Finally, there are also numerical results [CCSVA19] as well as works on the controllability of HNLS [CPVV05, BBVV07, Che18, BOY21, OY22] — a direction of research that directly involves the well-posedness of initial-boundary value problems. In fact, the representation formulas for solutions of initial-boundary value problems obtained through the unified transform play an important role from control theoretical perspectives. For instance, boundary or interior controllability problems can be recast or characterized as integral equations that involve given

data (i.e. the initial state and a target state) and also sought-after control(s), e.g. one or more nonhomogeneous boundary inputs or a locally supported interior source function, respectively. Then, an analysis on the solvability of these integral equations can determine whether a given evolution is controllable or not. For instance, [KO20] used unified transform formulas to revisit the classical lack of null controllability problem for the heat equation on the half line [MZ01] via boundary controls and established failure of the controllability feature in a quite elementary fashion. Using unified transform formulas, the authors also extended their result of lack of controllability to partial differential equations of different nature such as the Schrödinger and biharmonic Schrödinger equations in [OK23], a question that had not been answered with the classical tools of control theory previously. It is well known that, in the framework of a bounded domain (e.g., a finite interval), the heat equation has the feature of (null) controllability via boundary controls in contrast with the case of an unbounded domain. Although, this is a well-known result, its applicability to real-life problems was limited because most approaches in the literature are abstract, leading to existence of a control input without providing an explicit formula for a physically reasonable control in terms of the given initial and target states. It was shown recently in [KOD24] that such a control in the form of a nonhomogeneous boundary input can be constructed explicitly by utilizing the representation formula established through the unified transform. The unified transform formulas can also be used for establishing Hadamard well-posedness for linear and nonlinear feedback control problems. For instance, for a boundary feedback problem, one can simply replace the boundary terms in the unified transform formula with the given (possibly nonlinear) feedback terms and take the right-hand side of the resulting formula as the definition of a solution operator whose fixed point becomes the sought-after local solution, e.g. see the preprint [MOY].

Structure. The crucial Sobolev and Strichartz linear estimates of Theorem 1.3 are established in Section 2 for the so-called reduced initial-boundary value problem, namely for problem (1.9) in the special case of zero initial data, zero forcing, zero Dirichlet data at $x = 0$, and boundary data at $x = \ell$ that are supported inside a compact set. Once this reduced problem is estimated, the full version of Theorem 1.3 is established for the original forced linear problem (1.9) in Section 3 through a delicate linear decomposition. This part of the analysis is quite involved and motivates the derivation of novel time estimates for the higher-order Schrödinger equation on the half-line. The nonlinear analysis leading to the proof of Theorem 1.1 in the high-regularity setting is presented in the first part of Section 4 via the combination of the Sobolev estimate (1.10) with the algebra property in $H_x^s(0, \ell)$ and a contraction mapping argument. The second part of that section contains the proof of the low-regularity Theorem 1.2, which relies on the Strichartz estimates of Theorem 1.3 and suitable nonlinear estimates that fix the pair of exponents (q, p) in (1.12) to the values appearing in the solution space $Y_T^{s, \lambda}$. Finally, the unified transform solution formula (1.14) for the forced linear problem (1.9) is derived in Appendix A.

2. LINEAR ESTIMATES ON A FINITE INTERVAL

We begin our analysis from the most essential part of the forced linear finite interval problem (1.9), namely the following *reduced* initial-boundary value problem:

$$\begin{aligned} iv_t + i\beta v_{xxx} + \alpha v_{xx} + i\delta v_x &= 0, & 0 < x < \ell, & 0 < t < T', \\ v(x, 0) &= 0, \\ v(0, t) &= 0, & v(\ell, t) = \psi_0(t), & v_x(\ell, t) = \psi_1(t), \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where the boundary data ψ_0, ψ_1 are globally defined on \mathbb{R} but only supported in the compact set $[0, T']$, i.e.

$$\text{supp}(\psi_0) \subseteq [0, T'], \quad \text{supp}(\psi_1) \subseteq [0, T']. \tag{2.2}$$

The analysis of the reduced problem (2.1) will allow us to determine the role played by the boundary conditions at $x = \ell$, which were not present in the half-line problem of [AMO24]. Notably, in addition to the Dirichlet condition, we now also have a Neumann condition. Once we have estimated the solution to the reduced interval problem (2.1), we will be able to deduce linear estimates for the full interval problem (1.9) by a careful use of the linear superposition principle (see Section 3). Importantly, as noted in the introduction, in that process it will become necessary to establish new time regularity results for the half-line problem (which were not obtained in [AMO24]).

In the case of the reduced problem (2.1), the unified transform solution formula (1.14) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} v(x, t) = & -\frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{\partial\tilde{D}} \frac{e^{-ik(\ell-x)+i\omega t}}{\Delta(k)} (e^{-i\nu_+\ell} - e^{-i\nu_-\ell}) \omega' \mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega) dk \\ & - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial\tilde{D}} \frac{e^{-ik(\ell-x)+i\omega t}}{\Delta(k)} (\nu_- e^{-i\nu_+\ell} - \nu_+ e^{-i\nu_-\ell}) \omega' \mathcal{F}\{\psi_0\}(\omega) dk, \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

where $\mathcal{F}\{\cdot\}$ denotes the regular Fourier transform on the whole line, the dispersion relation ω is given by

$$\omega := \beta k^3 - \alpha k^2 - \delta k, \quad (2.4)$$

the denominator Δ involved in the two integrands is

$$\Delta(k) := (\nu_+ - \nu_-) e^{-ik\ell} + (\nu_- - k) e^{-i\nu_+\ell} + (k - \nu_+) e^{-i\nu_-\ell} \quad (2.5)$$

with the quantities ν_{\pm} defined by

$$\nu_{\pm} := -\frac{1}{2} \left(k - \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \right) \pm \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} i \left[\left(k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right)^2 - \frac{4}{9\beta^2} (\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (2.6)$$

and the complex contour of integration $\partial\tilde{D}$ is defined as follows. Letting $D := D_0 \cup D_+ \cup D_-$, where the individual regions are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} D_0 &:= \{k \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Im}(\omega) < 0, \text{Im}(k) > 0\}, \\ D_+ &:= \left\{ k \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Im}(\omega) < 0, \text{Im}(k) < 0, \text{Re} \left(k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right) > 0 \right\}, \\ D_- &:= \left\{ k \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Im}(\omega) < 0, \text{Im}(k) < 0, \text{Re} \left(k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right) < 0 \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

we define the ‘‘punctured’’ regions

$$\tilde{D}_n := D_n \setminus \left\{ k \in \mathbb{C} : \left| k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right| \leq R_{\Delta} \right\}, \quad n \in \{0, +, -\}, \quad (2.8)$$

where the radius R_{Δ} (motivated by Lemma A.4) is given by

$$R_{\Delta} := \max \left\{ \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3}\beta} \sqrt{|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}, \frac{9}{\ell} \right\}, \quad (2.9)$$

and then let $\partial\tilde{D}$ be the positively oriented boundary of the union

$$\tilde{D} := \tilde{D}_0 \cup \tilde{D}_+ \cup \tilde{D}_- = D \setminus \left\{ k \in \mathbb{C} : \left| k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right| \leq R_{\Delta} \right\}, \quad (2.10)$$

as shown in Figure 2.1.

Remark 2.1. The presence of the regular Fourier transform of the data ψ_0, ψ_1 in formula (2.1), instead of the time transform (A.3) that normally appears in the general formula (1.14), is possible thanks to the support condition (2.2) and will turn out useful in the derivation of estimates given below.

We will use the unified transform formula (2.3) in order to derive estimates for the solution $v(x, t)$ of the reduced interval problem (2.1) in both Sobolev and Strichartz-type spaces. We begin with the Sobolev estimate and then proceed to the Strichartz estimate, which is necessary in the low-regularity setting.

2.1. Sobolev estimate

Requiring that the solution of problem (2.1) belongs to the Sobolev space $H^s(0, \ell)$ as a function of x and for each $t \in [0, T']$, we are led to the following result.

Theorem 2.1 (Sobolev estimate). *Let $s \geq 0$ and $\psi_0 \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$, $\psi_1 \in H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfy the support condition (2.2). Then, the solution to the reduced finite interval problem (2.1), as given by formula (2.3), admits the estimate*

$$\|v(t)\|_{H_x^s(0, \ell)} \leq c_s \sqrt{T'} e^{M_{\Delta} T'} \left(\|\psi_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} + \|\psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \right), \quad t \in [0, T'], \quad (2.11)$$

where $c_s > 0$ is a constant depending only on s, α, β, δ , and the constant $M_{\Delta} > 0$ is given by (2.32).




FIGURE 2.1. The open set \tilde{D} is defined by (2.10) through the curve $\text{Im}(\omega) = 0$ (which, in addition to the real axis, takes the form of a pair of intersecting lines in the case of $\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta = 0$ and a hyperbola otherwise), as well as the circle of radius R_Δ (given by (2.9)) centered at $\frac{\alpha}{3\beta}$. The positively oriented boundary of \tilde{D} consists of the nine distinct curves Γ_m , $m = 1, 2, \dots, 9$ (labeled only in the second figure for clarity). Additionally, \tilde{D} is comprised of three connected subsets, \tilde{D}_0 , \tilde{D}_\pm , where the subscript refers to the symmetry of ω (out of $\nu_0 = k$ and ν_\pm given by (2.6)) that has positive imaginary part within that subset. Also, in all three cases, the angle ϕ_0 is equal to half the measure of the arc Γ_2 . Finally, when they exist, the branch points of the square root in the expression (2.6) for ν_\pm are associated with a branch cut taken so that it is entirely contained within the circle $\left|k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}\right| = R_\Delta$ and hence lies outside \tilde{D} .

Remark 2.2. The fact that $\psi_0 \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$ must satisfy the support condition (2.2) imposes certain trace conditions on ψ_0 at the points $t = 0, T'$. Specifically, according to Theorems 11.4 and 11.5 of [LM72], it must be that $\partial^j \psi_0(0) = \partial^j \psi_0(T') = 0$ for all integers $0 \leq j < \frac{s+1}{3} - \frac{1}{2}$. Similarly, ψ_1 must satisfy $\partial^j \psi_1(0) = \partial^j \psi_1(T') = 0$ for all integers $0 \leq j < \frac{s}{3} - \frac{1}{2}$. These conditions will be verified in Section 3 for the specific forms of ψ_0, ψ_1 that arise when employing Theorem 2.1 in the decomposition of the full interval problem (1.9).

Proof. Let $t \in [0, T']$. For any $s \in \mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, by the physical space characterization of the $H^s(0, \ell)$ norm (namely, the fact that, thanks to Plancherel's theorem, the spaces $H^s(0, \ell)$ and $W^{s,2}(0, \ell)$ are equivalent for $s \geq 0$),

$$\|v(t)\|_{H_x^s(0, \ell)} = \sum_{j=0}^s \|\partial_x^j v(t)\|_{L_x^2(0, \ell)}, \quad s \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (2.12)$$

For $m = 1, \dots, 9$, let $v_m(x, t)$ be the portion of $v(x, t)$ which is integrated over the contour Γ_m (see Figure 2.1). Then, the solution (2.3) can be written as

$$v(x, t) = \sum_{m=1}^9 v_m(x, t) \quad (2.13)$$

and, fixing $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$, for each $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, s\}$ we have

$$\partial_x^j v_m(x, t) = -iI_{j, \Gamma_m}^1(x, t) - I_{j, \Gamma_m}^0(x, t) \quad (2.14)$$

where

$$I_{j, \Gamma_m}^1(x, t) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma_m} \frac{(ik)^j e^{-ik(\ell-x)+i\omega t}}{\Delta(k)} (e^{-i\nu^+ \ell} - e^{-i\nu^- \ell}) \omega' \mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega) dk, \quad (2.15)$$

$$I_{j, \Gamma_m}^0(x, t) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma_m} \frac{(ik)^j e^{-ik(\ell-x)+i\omega t}}{\Delta(k)} (\nu_- e^{-i\nu^+ \ell} - \nu_+ e^{-i\nu^- \ell}) \omega' \mathcal{F}\{\psi_0\}(\omega) dk. \quad (2.16)$$

Hence, it suffices to estimate I_{j, Γ_m}^1 and I_{j, Γ_m}^0 for $m = 1, 2, 9$, since the remaining contours can be handled similarly thanks to symmetry. Each of the contours $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_9$ requires a different parametrization. Recalling

the definition (2.8) and computing

$$\operatorname{Im}(\omega) = \beta \operatorname{Im}(k) \left\{ 3 \left[\operatorname{Re}(k) - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right]^2 - [\operatorname{Im}(k)]^2 - \frac{\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta}{3\beta^2} \right\}, \quad (2.17)$$

we parametrize $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_9$ respectively as follows:

$$\gamma_1(r) = \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} - \frac{\sqrt{3\beta^2 r^2 + \alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta}}{3\beta} + ir, \quad r \geq R_\Delta \cos \phi_0 =: r_0 > 0, \quad (2.18a)$$

$$\gamma_2(\theta) = \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} + R_\Delta e^{i\theta}, \quad \frac{\pi}{2} - \phi_0 \leq \theta \leq \frac{\pi}{2} + \phi_0, \quad (2.18b)$$

$$\gamma_9(r) = r, \quad r \leq \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} - R_\Delta, \quad (2.18c)$$

where, as shown in Figure 2.1, ϕ_0 is the measure of the angle between the upward vertical and the ray emanating from $\frac{\alpha}{3\beta}$ and passing through the intersection of Γ_2 and Γ_3 . Note that the square root in γ_1 is always real.

Estimation of v_1 . This term consists of the integrals I_{j,Γ_1}^1 and I_{j,Γ_1}^0 , which are similar to each other and hence can be estimated in the same way. We begin with I_{j,Γ_1}^1 . By the parametrization (2.18a) of Γ_1 ,

$$I_{j,\Gamma_1}^1(x, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_\infty^{r_0} \frac{(i\gamma_1)^j e^{i\operatorname{Re}(\gamma_1)x - rx + i\omega t}}{e^{i\gamma_1 \ell} \Delta(\gamma_1)} (e^{-i\nu+\ell} - e^{-i\nu-\ell}) \omega'(\gamma_1) \mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega) \gamma_1'(r) dr. \quad (2.19)$$

Note that ω is strictly real on Γ_1 by the definition (2.8). Therefore, when taking the $L^2(0, \ell)$ norm of the above expression, we can use the triangle inequality to eliminate the exponential factor containing both $i\operatorname{Re}(\gamma_1)$ and $i\omega t$. This leads to the estimate

$$\|I_{j,\Gamma_1}^1(t)\|_{L_x^2(0, \ell)} \lesssim \left\| \int_{r_0}^\infty \frac{|\gamma_1|^j e^{-rx}}{|e^{i\gamma_1 \ell} \Delta(\gamma_1)|} |(e^{-i\nu+\ell} - e^{-i\nu-\ell}) \omega'(\gamma_1) \mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega) \gamma_1'(r)| dr \right\|_{L_x^2(0, \ell)}. \quad (2.20)$$

At this point, we invoke Lemma A.4 to note that the denominator within the integral is bounded below by a multiple of $|\gamma_1 - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|$, as well as Lemma A.3 to note that $\operatorname{Im}(\nu_\pm) \leq 0$ for $k \in \Gamma_1 \subseteq \overline{D}_0$ and hence the difference of exponentials in (2.20) has a magnitude bounded above by 2. Thus, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_{j,\Gamma_1}^1(t)\|_{L_x^2(0, \ell)} &\lesssim \left\| \int_{r_0}^\infty e^{-rx} \frac{|\gamma_1|^j}{|\gamma_1 - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|} |\mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega)| |\omega'(\gamma_1) \gamma_1'(r)| dr \right\|_{L_x^2(0, \ell)} \\ &\leq \left\| \mathcal{L} \left\{ \frac{|\gamma_1|^j}{|\gamma_1 - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|} |\mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega)| |\omega'(\gamma_1) \gamma_1'(r)| \chi_{[r_0, \infty)} \right\} \right\|_{L_x^2(0, \infty)}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

where $\mathcal{L}\{\phi\}(x) := \int_0^\infty e^{-rx} \phi(r) dr$, $x > 0$, is the usual Laplace transform and $\chi_{[r_0, \infty)}$ is the characteristic function of the interval $[r_0, \infty)$. At this point, we use the fact that the Laplace transform is bounded in $L^2(0, \infty)$:

Lemma 2.1 (Hardy [Har29]). *The Laplace transform is bounded from $L^2(0, \infty)$ to $L^2(0, \infty)$ with*

$$\|\mathcal{L}\{\phi\}\|_{L^2(0, \infty)} \leq \sqrt{\pi} \|\phi\|_{L^2(0, \infty)}.$$

Lemma 2.1, whose proof can be found in [FHM17], implies

$$\|I_{j,\Gamma_1}^1(t)\|_{L_x^2(0, \ell)}^2 \lesssim \int_{r_0}^\infty \frac{|\gamma_1|^{2j}}{|\gamma_1 - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|^2} |\mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega)|^2 \left| \frac{d\omega}{dr} \right|^2 dr,$$

where $\omega'(\gamma_1)$ and $\gamma_1'(r)$ have been combined into $\frac{d\omega}{dr}$ via the chain rule. At this point, we make the a change of variable from r to ω , as one can see by direct calculation that

$$\frac{d\omega}{dr} = \frac{d\omega}{dk} \gamma_1' = \frac{2r}{\sqrt{3\beta^2 r^2 + \alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta}} \left(\frac{\beta^2 r^2}{3\beta^2 r^2 + \alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta} + 1 \right) > 0. \quad (2.22)$$

Hence, letting $\omega_0 := \omega(r_0)$, we have

$$\|I_{j,\Gamma_1}^1(t)\|_{L_x^2(0, \ell)}^2 \lesssim \int_{\omega_0}^\infty \frac{|\gamma_1|^{2j}}{|\gamma_1 - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|^2} |\mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega)|^2 \frac{d\omega}{dr} d\omega. \quad (2.23)$$

For large γ_1 , and hence for large ω , $|\gamma_1 - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}| \simeq |\gamma_1|$. More precisely, there is an $\omega_1 > \omega_0$ such that $|\gamma_1 - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\gamma_1|$. In view of this observation, we consider the cases of large ω and small ω separately to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_{j,\Gamma_1}^1(t)\|_{L_x^2(0,\ell)}^2 &\lesssim \int_{\omega_0}^{\omega_1} \frac{|\gamma_1|^{2j}}{|\gamma_1 - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|^2} |\mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega)|^2 \frac{d\omega}{dr} d\omega + \int_{\omega_1}^{\infty} \frac{|\gamma_1|^{2j}}{|\gamma_1 - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|^2} |\mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega)|^2 \frac{d\omega}{dr} d\omega \\ &\lesssim \max_{\omega \in [\omega_0, \omega_1]} \left(\frac{|\gamma_1|^{2j}}{|\gamma_1 - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|^2} \frac{d\omega}{dr} \right) \|\mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}\|_{L_\omega^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 + \int_{\omega_1}^{\infty} |\gamma_1|^{2(j-1)} |\mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega)|^2 \frac{d\omega}{dr} d\omega. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term, we use Plancherel's theorem. For the second term, we employ Lemma 2 of [AMO24] to infer

$$|\gamma_1|^{2(j-1)} \frac{d\omega}{dr} \leq c(1 + \omega^2)^{\frac{j}{3}}$$

for some $c > 0$ depending only on α, β, δ . Hence, we deduce the estimate

$$\|I_{j,\Gamma_1}^1(t)\|_{L_x^2(0,\ell)}^2 \lesssim \|\psi_1\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 + \int_{\omega_1}^{\infty} (1 + \omega^2)^{\frac{j}{3}} |\mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega)|^2 d\omega \lesssim \|\psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}^2, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (2.24)$$

Moving on to the term I_{j,Γ_1}^0 , we note that it involves the extra factors of ν_- and ν_+ within the sum of exponentials. This has the effect of introducing a factor of $(|\nu_-| + |\nu_+|)^2$ in the right-hand side of the analogue of (2.23) for I_{j,Γ_1}^0 , resulting in

$$\|I_{j,\Gamma_1}^0(t)\|_{L_x^2(0,\ell)}^2 \lesssim \int_{\omega_0}^{\infty} \frac{|\gamma_1|^{2j}}{|\gamma_1 - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|^2} (|\nu_-| + |\nu_+|)^2 |\mathcal{F}\{\psi_0\}(\omega)|^2 \frac{d\omega}{dr} d\omega. \quad (2.25)$$

From here, we observe that

$$|\nu_{\pm}| \leq |k| \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{|\alpha|}{2\beta|k|} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \sqrt{1 + \frac{2|\alpha|}{3\beta|k|} + \frac{|\alpha^2 + 4\beta\delta|}{3\beta^2|k|^2}} \right) \quad (2.26)$$

and so, for $|k|$ large enough, $|\nu_{\pm}|$ is bounded by $2|k|$. Similarly to the estimation of I_{j,Γ_1}^1 , we choose ω_1 large enough so that $|\gamma_1 - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\gamma_1|$ but now, we also ensure that ω_1 is large enough so that $|\nu_{\pm}| \leq 2|\gamma_1|$ for $\omega \geq \omega_1$. Then, (2.25) becomes

$$\|I_{j,\Gamma_1}^0(t)\|_{L_x^2(0,\ell)}^2 \lesssim \int_{\omega_0}^{\omega_1} \frac{|\gamma_1|^{2j}}{|\gamma_1 - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|^2} (|\nu_+| + |\nu_-|)^2 |\mathcal{F}\{\psi_0\}(\omega)|^2 \frac{d\omega}{dr} d\omega + \int_{\omega_1}^{\infty} |\gamma_1|^{2j} |\mathcal{F}\{\psi_0\}(\omega)|^2 \frac{d\omega}{dr} d\omega. \quad (2.27)$$

After this adjustment, we follow the same argument as for I_{j,Γ_1}^1 to conclude that

$$\|I_{j,\Gamma_1}^0(t)\|_{L_x^2(0,\ell)} \lesssim \|\psi_0\|_{H^{\frac{j+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}. \quad (2.28)$$

Overall, for each $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, s\}$, we have the estimate

$$\|\partial_x^j v_1(t)\|_{L_x^2(0,\ell)} \lesssim \|\psi_0\|_{H^{\frac{j+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} + \|\psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \quad (2.29)$$

and, therefore, in view of the definition (2.12) of the Sobolev norm,

$$\|v_1(t)\|_{H_x^s(0,\ell)} \lesssim \|\psi_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} + \|\psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}, \quad s \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad t \in [0, T']. \quad (2.30)$$

Estimation of v_2 . The second contour to consider is the circular arc Γ_2 . Contrary to Γ_1 , ω is not purely real on Γ_2 and so the method used for v_1 no longer applies. Instead, we will exploit the fact that Γ_2 is finite. For this, in view of Remark 2.1 and the parametrization (2.18b), we express I_{j,Γ_2}^1 in the form

$$I_{j,\Gamma_2}^1(x, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\frac{\pi}{2} + \phi_0}^{\frac{\pi}{2} - \phi_0} \frac{(i\gamma_2)^j e^{i\gamma_2 x + i\omega t}}{e^{i\gamma_2 \ell} \Delta(\gamma_2)} (e^{-i\nu_+ \ell} - e^{-i\nu_- \ell}) \omega'(\gamma_2) \tilde{\psi}_1(\omega, T') \cdot iR_{\Delta} e^{i\theta} d\theta.$$

Taking the $L^2(0, \ell)$ norm and applying the triangle inequality yields

$$\|I_{j,\Gamma_2}^1(t)\|_{L_x^2(0,\ell)} \lesssim \left\| \int_{\frac{\pi}{2} - \phi_0}^{\frac{\pi}{2} + \phi_0} \frac{|\gamma_2|^j e^{-R_{\Delta} \sin(\theta)x - \text{Im}(\omega)t}}{|e^{i\gamma_2 \ell} \Delta(\gamma_2)|} (e^{\text{Im}(\nu_+) \ell} + e^{\text{Im}(\nu_-) \ell}) |\omega'(\gamma_2)| |\tilde{\psi}_1(\omega, T')| R_{\Delta} d\theta \right\|_{L_x^2(0,\ell)}.$$

We can reuse some previous ideas to simplify. Lemma A.4 addresses the denominator and Lemma A.3 allows us to boost the sum of exponentials to 2. Furthermore, because Γ_2 is part of $\partial\bar{D}_0$ (see Figure 2.1), we have $\sin(\theta) > 0$. Thus, we can eliminate the dependence on x and obtain the bound

$$\|I_{j,\Gamma_2}^1(t)\|_{L_x^2(0,\ell)} \lesssim \sqrt{\ell} \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}-\phi_0}^{\frac{\pi}{2}+\phi_0} |\gamma_2|^j e^{-\text{Im}(\omega)t} |\omega'(\gamma_2)| \left| \tilde{\psi}_1(\omega, T') \right| d\theta.$$

The derivative can be absorbed as a constant since

$$|\omega'(\gamma_2)| = |3\beta\gamma_2^2 - 2\alpha\gamma_2 - \delta| \leq 3\beta \left(\frac{|\alpha|}{3\beta} + R_\Delta \right)^2 + 2|\alpha| \left(\frac{|\alpha|}{3\beta} + R_\Delta \right) + |\delta|. \quad (2.31)$$

Therefore, noting also that $|\gamma_2| \leq \frac{|\alpha|}{3\beta} + R_\Delta$ and recalling the definition (A.3), we find

$$\|I_{j,\Gamma_2}^1(t)\|_{L_x^2(0,\ell)} \lesssim \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}-\phi_0}^{\frac{\pi}{2}+\phi_0} \int_0^{T'} e^{\text{Im}(\omega)(t'-t)} |\psi_1(t')| dt' d\theta.$$

Since $\text{Im}(\omega) \leq 0$ on Γ_2 , for any fixed $T' \geq t$ we have $e^{\text{Im}(\omega)(t'-t)} \leq e^{-\text{Im}(\omega)t} \leq e^{|\omega|T'} \leq e^{M_\Delta T'}$ after observing that, along Γ_2 ,

$$|\omega| \leq M_\Delta := \beta \left(\frac{|\alpha|}{3\beta} + R_\Delta \right)^3 + |\alpha| \left(\frac{|\alpha|}{3\beta} + R_\Delta \right)^2 + |\delta| \left(\frac{|\alpha|}{3\beta} + R_\Delta \right). \quad (2.32)$$

Hence,

$$\|I_{j,\Gamma_2}^1(t)\|_{L_x^2(0,\ell)} \lesssim e^{M_\Delta T'} \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}-\phi_0}^{\frac{\pi}{2}+\phi_0} \int_0^{T'} |\psi_1(t')| dt' d\theta \simeq e^{M_\Delta T'} \int_0^{T'} |\psi_1(t')| dt'$$

and by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\|I_{j,\Gamma_2}^1(t)\|_{L_x^2(0,\ell)} \lesssim \sqrt{T'} e^{M_\Delta T'} \|\psi_1\|_{L^2(0,T')} \quad (2.33)$$

for all $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, s\}$ and each $t \in [0, T']$. The integral $I_{j,\Gamma_2}^0(t)$ can be addressed in much the same way to establish the bound

$$\|I_{j,\Gamma_2}^0(t)\|_{L_x^2(0,\ell)} \lesssim \sqrt{T'} e^{M_\Delta T'} \|\psi_0\|_{L^2(0,T')}. \quad (2.34)$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\|\partial_x^j v_2(t)\|_{L_x^2(0,\ell)} \lesssim \sqrt{T'} e^{M_\Delta T'} \left(\|\psi_0\|_{L^2(0,T')} + \|\psi_1\|_{L^2(0,T')} \right)$$

and, in turn,

$$\|v_2(t)\|_{H_x^s(0,\ell)} \lesssim \sqrt{T'} e^{M_\Delta T'} \left(\|\psi_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} + \|\psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \right), \quad s \in \mathbb{N}_0, t \in [0, T']. \quad (2.35)$$

Estimation of v_9 . Because Γ_9 is a real contour (contrary to Γ_1 which is complex), a different approach than the one used for the estimation of v_1 will be followed. Specifically, instead of the L^2 characterization of the $H^s(0, \ell)$ norm (2.12), we will exploit the fact that the expression for v_9 actually makes sense for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and not just for $x \in (0, \ell)$ in order to estimate the $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ norm of this term via the usual Fourier transform characterization which is available for L^2 -based Sobolev spaces on the infinite line, namely

$$\|v_9(t)\|_{H_x^s(\mathbb{R})}^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (1+k^2)^s |\mathcal{F}_x\{v_9\}(k, t)|^2 dk. \quad (2.36)$$

From (2.14), we have $v_9 = -iI_{0,\Gamma_9}^1 - I_{0,\Gamma_9}^0$. We begin with the former term, which contains

$$I_{0,\Gamma_9}^1(x, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\frac{\alpha}{3\beta} - R_\Delta} e^{irx} \frac{-e^{-ir\ell + i\omega t}}{e^{i\nu_- \ell} \Delta(r)} \left(e^{i(\nu_- - \nu_+) \ell} - 1 \right) \omega'(r) \mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega) dr. \quad (2.37)$$

Observe that this is an inverse Fourier transform and hence, by injectivity,

$$\mathcal{F}\{I_{0,\Gamma_9}^1\}(r, t) = \frac{-e^{-ir\ell + i\omega t}}{e^{i\nu_- \ell} \Delta(r)} \left(e^{i(\nu_- - \nu_+) \ell} - 1 \right) \omega'(r) \mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega) \chi_{(-\infty, \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} - R_\Delta]} \cdot \quad (2.38)$$

Taking the magnitude of this quantity and using previous techniques to simplify (i.e. that the numerator has unit magnitude, the magnitude of the denominator is bounded below by a multiple of $|r - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|$, and the difference of exponentials in (2.38) can be bounded by 2), we are left with

$$|\mathcal{F}\{I_{0,\Gamma_9}^1\}(r,t)| \lesssim \frac{1}{|r - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|} |\omega'(r)| |\mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega)| \chi_{(-\infty, \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} - R_\Delta)}. \quad (2.39)$$

Now, a direct calculation yields $\omega'(r) = 3\beta(r - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta})^2 - \frac{\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta}{3\beta}$. Since Γ_9 lies beyond the branch points, i.e. $|r - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}| > \frac{2}{3\beta}\sqrt{|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}$, it follows that $\omega'(r)$ must be positive. Hence,

$$|\mathcal{F}\{I_{0,\Gamma_9}^1\}(r,t)| \lesssim \sqrt{3\beta - \frac{\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta}{3\beta(r - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta})^2}} \sqrt{\omega'(r)} |\mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega)| \chi_{(-\infty, \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} - R_\Delta)}.$$

If $\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta \geq 0$, the first square root may be increased to $\sqrt{3\beta}$. Otherwise, $|r - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}| \geq R_\Delta \geq \frac{2}{3\beta}\sqrt{|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}$ so

$$\sqrt{3\beta - \frac{\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta}{3\beta(r - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta})^2}} \leq \sqrt{3\beta + \frac{|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}{\frac{4}{3\beta}|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}} = \frac{\sqrt{15\beta}}{2}.$$

In any case, we find

$$|\mathcal{F}\{I_{0,\Gamma_9}^1\}(r,t)| \lesssim \sqrt{\omega'(r)} |\mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega)| \chi_{(-\infty, r_0]} \quad (2.40)$$

which can be used to directly calculate the $H^s(0, \ell)$ norm of I_{0,Γ_9}^1 as follows:

$$\|I_{0,\Gamma_9}^1(t)\|_{H_x^s(0,\ell)}^2 \leq \|I_{0,\Gamma_9}^1(t)\|_{H_x^s(\mathbb{R})}^2 \lesssim \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (1+r^2)^s \omega'(r) |\mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega)|^2 \chi_{(-\infty, \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} - R_\Delta)} dr \quad (2.41)$$

since $\omega'(r)$ is positive and $\omega \rightarrow \pm\infty$ as $r \rightarrow \pm\infty$. Next, changing variables from r to ω and using Lemma 2.2 below, we deduce

$$\|I_{0,\Gamma_9}^1(t)\|_{H_x^s(0,\ell)} \lesssim \|\psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}, \quad t \in [0, T']. \quad (2.42)$$

Lemma 2.2. *There exists some $c > 0$ such that $(1+r^2)^3 \leq c[1+\omega(r)^2]$ for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof of Lemma 2.2. Since $\omega = \beta r^3 - \alpha r^2 - \delta r$, we can write $1 + \omega^2 = \beta^2(1+r^2)^3 + P(r)$ where P is some polynomial of degree at most five. Since $1 + \omega^2$ and $(1+r^2)^3$ are positive, $1 + \omega^2 = |1 + \omega^2| \geq \beta^2(1+r^2)^3 - |P(r)|$. Since P has degree less than six, there exists some $r_1 > 0$ such that, for all $|r| > r_1$, $|P(r)| < \frac{1}{2}\beta^2(1+r^2)^3$ i.e. $1 + \omega^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\beta^2(1+r^2)^3$. Moreover, if $|r| \leq r_1$, then $1 + \omega^2 \geq (1+r^2)^3 \min_{|r| \leq r_1} \frac{1+\omega^2}{(1+r^2)^3} \geq \frac{(1+r^2)^3}{(1+r_1^2)^3}$. Overall, the claimed result holds with $c = \max\{\frac{2}{\beta^2}, (1+r_1^2)^3\}$. \blacksquare

Finally, concerning I_{0,Γ_9}^0 , the only change needed in comparison with the estimation of I_{0,Γ_9}^1 is the additional factors of ν_+, ν_- . Tracing these factors throughout the estimation, we see that they appear in the form of $(|\nu_+| + |\nu_-|)^2$ in the analogue of (2.41). In this regard, we note that

$$|\nu_\pm| \leq \frac{1}{2} \left| r - \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \right| + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \sqrt{\left(r - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right)^2 + \frac{4}{9\beta^2} |\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}$$

so that, by the triangle inequality and the fact that $r - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \leq -R_\delta < 0$ on Γ_9 ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nu_+| + |\nu_-| &\leq \left| r - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right| + \frac{2|\alpha|}{3\beta} + \sqrt{3} \sqrt{\left(r - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right)^2 + \frac{4}{9\beta^2} |\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|} \\ &= \sqrt{\left(\frac{\alpha}{3\beta} - r + \frac{2|\alpha|}{3\beta} \right)^2} + \sqrt{3 \left(r - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right)^2 + \frac{4}{3\beta^2} |\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} \sqrt{\left(\frac{\alpha}{3\beta} - r + \frac{2|\alpha|}{3\beta} \right)^2 + 3 \left(r - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right)^2 + \frac{4}{3\beta^2} |\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|} \end{aligned}$$

with the last step due to the inequality $\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b} \leq \sqrt{2}\sqrt{a+b}$, $a, b \geq 0$. From here, we can see that $(|\nu_+| + |\nu_-|)^2$ is bounded by a polynomial in r which has a leading term of $8r^2$. Using the same techniques as in the proof of Lemma 2.2, it follows that $(|\nu_+| + |\nu_-|)^2 \lesssim 1 + r^2$. This has the effect of increasing the exponent of s in (2.41) to $s + 1$, thereby resulting in the estimate

$$\|I_{0,\Gamma_9}^0(t)\|_{H_x^s(0,\ell)} \lesssim \|\psi_0\|_{H_x^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}. \quad (2.43)$$

Overall, we have established that

$$\|v_9(t)\|_{H_x^s(0,\ell)} \lesssim \|\psi_0\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} + \|\psi_1\|_{H_t^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}, \quad s \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (2.44)$$

Finally, we note that estimates (2.30), (2.35) and (2.44) can be extended to all $s \geq 0$ via interpolation. Furthermore, as noted earlier, similar estimates can be derived for the remaining terms in (2.13). Therefore, Theorem 2.1 has been established. \blacksquare

We conclude this section with a smoothing effect which is characteristic of KdV-type equations like HNLS when these are considered on a bounded domain like the finite interval $(0, \ell)$ in this work. First, we prove the following time regularity result:

Theorem 2.2 (Time estimates for the reduced interval problem). *Suppose $\psi_0 \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$, $\psi_1 \in H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$ and $s \geq -1$. For any $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $\sigma \leq s + 1$, the σ th spatial derivative of the solution $v(x, t)$ to the reduced interval problem (2.1) belongs to $H^{\frac{s+1-\sigma}{3}}(0, T')$ as a function of t . In particular, we have the estimate*

$$\|\partial_x^\sigma v\|_{L_x^\infty((0,\ell); H_t^{\frac{s+1-\sigma}{3}}(0, T'))} \leq c \max\{T' e^{M_\Delta T'}, 1\} \left(\|\psi_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} + \|\psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \right), \quad (2.45)$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant that depends only on s, α, β, δ , and the constant M_Δ is given by (2.32).

Proof. As before, it is sufficient to estimate I_{σ,Γ_1}^1 , I_{σ,Γ_2}^1 , and I_{σ,Γ_9}^1 of (2.15) because of the symmetry of the contours along with the fact that, for I_{σ,Γ_1}^0 , I_{σ,Γ_2}^0 , and I_{σ,Γ_9}^0 , the extra factors of ν_\pm behave like factors of k in magnitude, essentially increasing the value of σ by 1. Actually, due to the fact that $\text{Im}(\omega) = 0$ along Γ_1 and Γ_9 , and since we are estimating in t rather than in x , the terms I_{σ,Γ_1}^1 and I_{σ,Γ_9}^1 can be handled in an identical way. Thus, we only provide the details for I_{σ,Γ_1}^1 and I_{σ,Γ_2}^1 .

Let $m = \frac{s+1-\sigma}{3}$. In view of the parametrization (2.18a), the expression (2.15) for I_{σ,Γ_1}^1 becomes

$$I_{\sigma,\Gamma_1}^1(x, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\omega t} \frac{(i\gamma_1)^\sigma e^{i\gamma_1 x}}{e^{i\gamma_1 \ell} \Delta(\gamma_1)} (e^{-i\nu_+ \ell} - e^{-i\nu_- \ell}) \mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega) \chi_{[\omega_0, \infty)} d\omega.$$

Hence, by the Fourier inversion theorem,

$$\mathcal{F}\{I_{\sigma,\Gamma_1}^1\}(x, \omega) = \frac{(i\gamma_1)^\sigma e^{i\gamma_1 x}}{e^{i\gamma_1 \ell} \Delta(\gamma_1)} (e^{-i\nu_+ \ell} - e^{-i\nu_- \ell}) \mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega) \chi_{[\omega_0, \infty)}$$

and we infer

$$\|I_{\sigma,\Gamma_1}^1(x)\|_{H_t^m(0, T')} = \left\| (1 + \omega^2)^{\frac{m}{2}} \frac{(i\gamma_1)^\sigma e^{i\gamma_1 x}}{e^{i\gamma_1 \ell} \Delta(\gamma_1)} (e^{-i\nu_+ \ell} - e^{-i\nu_- \ell}) \mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega) \chi_{[\omega_0, \infty)} \right\|_{L_\omega^2(\mathbb{R})}.$$

To handle γ_1^σ in the above norm, we note that, for r sufficiently large, $|\omega(\gamma_1(r))| \geq \beta |\gamma_1|^3 - |\alpha| |\gamma_1|^2 - |\delta| |\gamma_1| \geq \frac{1}{2} \beta |\gamma_1|^3$ or, equivalently, $|\gamma_1| \leq \left(\frac{2}{\beta} |\omega|\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}$. Thus, since $|\gamma_1|$ is continuous in r , we have

$$|\gamma_1| \leq c |\omega|^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad r \geq r_0, \quad (2.46)$$

for some constant $c > 0$. Thus, using also Lemma A.4 for $e^{i\gamma_1 \ell} \Delta(\gamma_1)$ and the fact that $|e^{i\gamma_1 x}| = e^{-rx} \leq 1$, we find

$$\|I_{\sigma,\Gamma_1}^1(x)\|_{H_t^m(0, T')} \lesssim \left\| (1 + \omega^2)^{\frac{m}{2}} \omega^{\frac{\sigma-1}{3}} \mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega) \right\|_{L_\omega^2(\omega_0, \infty)} \leq \|\psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \quad (2.47)$$

Next, for I_{σ,Γ_2}^1 , we take j derivatives in time for $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, parametrize according to (2.18b), take magnitudes, and use Lemmas A.3 and A.4 to get

$$\left| \partial_t^j I_{\sigma,\Gamma_2}^1(x, t) \right| \lesssim \int_{\frac{\pi}{2} - \phi_0}^{\frac{\pi}{2} + \phi_0} \frac{|\gamma_2|^\sigma |\omega|^j e^{-\text{Im}(\omega)t}}{\left| \gamma_2 - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right|} \left| \frac{d\omega}{d\gamma_2} \right| |\mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega)| d\theta.$$

Noting that $\left| \frac{d\omega}{d\gamma_2} \right| \simeq |\gamma_2|^2$, recalling that $\text{supp}(\psi_1) \subseteq [0, T']$, and using the analogue of the bound (2.46), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \partial_t^j I_{\sigma, \Gamma_2}^1(x, t) \right| &\lesssim \int_{\frac{\pi}{2} - \phi_0}^{\frac{\pi}{2} + \phi_0} |\gamma_2|^{\sigma+1} |\omega|^j e^{-\text{Im}(\omega)t} \left| \int_0^{T'} e^{-i\omega t'} \psi_1(t') dt' \right| d\theta \\ &\lesssim \int_{\frac{\pi}{2} - \phi_0}^{\frac{\pi}{2} + \phi_0} |\omega|^{\frac{\sigma+1}{3} + j} \int_0^{T'} e^{\text{Im}(\omega)(t'-t)} |\psi_1(t')| dt' d\theta \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{T'} M_\Delta^{\frac{\sigma+1}{3} + j} e^{M_\Delta T'} \|\psi_1\|_{L^2(0, T')}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have also used (2.32) and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Based on this bound, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_{\sigma, \Gamma_2}^1(x)\|_{H_t^m(0, T')}^2 &\leq \|I_{\sigma, \Gamma_2}^1(x)\|_{H_t^{[m]}(0, T')}^2 \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{[m]} T'^2 M_\Delta^{2(\frac{\sigma+1}{3} + 2j)} e^{2M_\Delta T'} \|\psi_1\|_{L^2(0, T')}^2 \\ &\leq T'^2 M_\Delta^{\frac{2(\sigma+1)}{3}} \frac{M_\Delta^{2([m]+1)} - 1}{M_\Delta^2 - 1} e^{2M_\Delta T'} \|\psi_1\|_{H^m(0, T')}^2, \end{aligned}$$

concluding the proof. \blacksquare

As an immediate corollary of Theorem 2.2, we have the following smoothing estimate for the finite interval problem (2.1):

Corollary 2.1 (Smoothing effect). *The solution $v(x, t)$ to the reduced finite interval problem (2.1) satisfies the estimate*

$$\|v\|_{L_t^2((0, T'); H_x^{s+1}(0, \ell))} \leq c \max\{T' e^{M_\Delta T'}, 1\} \sqrt{\ell(s+2)} \left(\|\psi_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} + \|\psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \right), \quad s \geq -1, \quad (2.48)$$

where c is the constant of estimate (2.45).

Proof. For $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $s \geq -1$, we have

$$\|v\|_{L_t^2((0, T'); H_x^{s+1}(0, \ell))}^2 = \sum_{\sigma=0}^{s+1} \int_0^\ell \|\partial_x^\sigma v(x, t)\|_{L_t^2(0, T')}^2 dx \leq \sum_{\sigma=0}^{s+1} \int_0^\ell \|\partial_x^\sigma v(x, t)\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-\sigma}{3}}(0, T')}^2 dx$$

so (2.48) follows in light of the time estimate (2.45). The case of general $s > -1$ is deduced via interpolation. \blacksquare

2.2. Strichartz estimate

In the low-regularity setting, in addition to the Sobolev estimate of Theorem 2.1 it is necessary to also estimate the linear initial-boundary value problem in the Strichartz-type space $L_t^q((0, T'); H_x^{s,p}(0, \ell))$, where $H^{s,p}(0, \ell)$ is the restriction on the interval $(0, \ell)$ of the Bessel potential space $H^{s,p}(\mathbb{R})$ defined via the norm

$$\|\phi\|_{H^{s,p}(\mathbb{R})} := \left\| \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left\{ (1+k^2)^{\frac{s}{2}} \mathcal{F}\{\phi\}(k) \right\} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}. \quad (2.49)$$

Using once again the unified transform solution formula (2.3), we will establish the following result:

Theorem 2.3 (Strichartz estimate). *Suppose $s \geq 0$ and $\psi_0 \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$, $\psi_1 \in H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfy the support condition (2.2). Then, for any admissible pair (q, p) in the sense of (1.13), the solution to the reduced finite interval problem (2.1), as given by formula (2.3), satisfies*

$$\|v\|_{L_t^q((0, T'); H_x^{s,p}(0, \ell))} \lesssim \left[1 + (T')^{\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{2}} \right] \left(\|\psi_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} + \|\psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \right). \quad (2.50)$$

Proof. As before, we express our solution in the form (2.13) and focus on the terms v_1 , v_2 and v_9 since the rest of the terms can be handled similarly to these three. Instead of the parametrizations (2.18), it turns out convenient to parametrize Γ_1 , Γ_2 and Γ_9 as

$$\gamma_1(r) = r + i\sqrt{3\left(r - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}\right)^2 - \frac{\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta}{3\beta^2}}, \quad r \leq \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} - R_\Delta \sin \phi_0 =: r_0, \quad (2.51a)$$

$$\gamma_2(\theta) = \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} + R_\Delta e^{i\theta}, \quad \frac{\pi}{2} - \phi_0 \leq \theta \leq \frac{\pi}{2} + \phi_0, \quad (2.51b)$$

$$\gamma_9(r) = r, \quad r \leq \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} - R_\Delta, \quad (2.51c)$$

with R_Δ given by (2.9) and the angle ϕ_0 as shown in Figure 2.1.

Estimation of v_1 . Using our new parametrization for Γ_1 , we have

$$v_1(x, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{r_0} e^{i\gamma_1 x + i\omega t} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ir_1 y} \Psi_1(y) dy dr \quad (2.52)$$

where the function Ψ_1 is defined through its Fourier transform by

$$\mathcal{F}\{\Psi_1\}(r) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{e^{i\gamma_1 \ell} \Delta(\gamma_1)} \left[-i(e^{-i\nu_+ \ell} - e^{-i\nu_- \ell}) \mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega) \right. \\ \quad \left. - (\nu_- e^{-i\nu_+ \ell} - \nu_+ e^{-i\nu_- \ell}) \mathcal{F}\{\psi_0\}(\omega) \right] \omega'(\gamma_1) \gamma_1', & r < r_0, \\ 0, & r > r_0. \end{cases} \quad (2.53)$$

Along the lines of [AMO24], we introduce the kernel

$$\mathcal{K}(y; x, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{r_0} e^{i\vartheta(r; x, y, t)} \hat{k}(r; x) dr \quad (2.54)$$

where

$$\hat{k}(r; x) = e^{-\sqrt{3\left(r - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}\right)^2 - \frac{\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta}{3\beta^2}} x}, \quad \vartheta(r; x, y, t) = r(x - y) + \omega t, \quad (2.55)$$

so that (2.52) can be expressed in the form

$$v_1(x, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{K}(y; x, t) \Psi_1(y) dy =: [K_1(t) \Psi_1](x). \quad (2.56)$$

Via a duality argument, for any $\eta \in C_c([0, T']; C_x^\infty(0, \ell))$,

$$\left| \int_0^{T'} \langle K_1(t) \Psi_1, \eta(\cdot, t) \rangle_{L_x^2(0, \ell)} dt \right| \lesssim \|\Psi_1\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \|K_2\|_{L_y^2(\mathbb{R})} \quad (2.57)$$

where $K_2(y) := \int_0^{T'} \int_0^\ell \overline{\mathcal{K}(y; x, t)} \eta(x, t) dx dt$. In fact, we can write the second norm on the right-hand side as

$$\|K_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 = \int_0^{T'} \int_0^\ell \eta(x, t) \left(\int_0^{T'} \int_0^\ell \overline{\eta(x', t')} K_3(x, x'; t, t') dx' dt' \right) dx dt$$

with $K_3(x, x'; t, t') := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \overline{\mathcal{K}(y; x, t)} \mathcal{K}(y; x', t') dy$, so that by Hölder's inequality in (x, t) and then Minkowski's integral inequality between x and t' ,

$$\|K_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \leq \|\eta\|_{L_t^q((0, T'); L_x^{p'}(0, \ell))} \left\| \int_0^{T'} \left\| \int_0^\ell \overline{\eta(x', t')} K_3(x, x'; t, t') dx' \right\|_{L_x^p(0, \ell)} dt' \right\|_{L_t^q(0, T')}. \quad (2.58)$$

By the Fourier inversion theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} K_3(x, x'; t, t') &= \int_{-\infty}^{r_0} \hat{k}(r; x) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-i\vartheta(r; x, y, t)} \int_{-\infty}^{r_0} e^{i\vartheta(r'; x', y, t')} \hat{k}(r'; x') dr' dy dr \\ &= 2\pi \int_{-\infty}^{r_0} e^{-i\vartheta(r; x, x', t-t')} \hat{k}(r; x + x') dr. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Lemma 3 of [AMO24] (whose proof relies on the classical van der Corput lemma), for $t \neq t'$ we infer that $|K_3(x, x', t, t')| \lesssim |t - t'|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ with inequality constant independent of x, x', t and t' . In turn,

$$\left\| \int_0^\ell \overline{\eta(x', t')} K_3(x, x'; t, t') dx' \right\|_{L_x^\infty(0, \ell)} \lesssim |t - t'|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \|\eta(t')\|_{L_x^1(0, \ell)}. \quad (2.59)$$

Furthermore, by the L^2 boundedness of the Laplace transform and, more precisely, by Lemma 4 in [AMO24],

$$\left\| \int_0^\ell \overline{\eta(x', t')} K_3(x, x'; t, t') dx' \right\|_{L_x^2(0, \ell)} \lesssim \|\eta(t')\|_{L_x^2(0, \ell)}. \quad (2.60)$$

Estimates (2.59) and (2.60) combined with the Riesz-Thorin interpolation theorem imply

$$\left\| \int_0^\infty \overline{\eta(x', t')} K_3(x, x'; t, t') dx' \right\|_{L_x^p(0, \ell)} \lesssim |t - t'|^{-\frac{2}{q}} \|\eta(t')\|_{L_x^{p'}(0, \ell)} \quad (2.61)$$

for any $p \geq 2$ where, importantly, the interpolation forces q to be given by the admissibility condition (1.13). Hence, for any $\eta \in L_t^{q'}((0, T'); L_x^{p'}(0, \ell))$,

$$\int_0^{T'} \left\| \int_0^\infty \overline{\eta(x', t')} K_3(x, x'; t, t') dx' \right\|_{L_x^p(0, \ell)} dt' \lesssim \int_0^{T'} |t - t'|^{-\frac{2}{q}} \|\eta(t')\|_{L_x^{p'}(0, \ell)} dt'.$$

Applying the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev fractional integration inequality (see Theorem 1 in [Ste70]) on the right-hand side and combining the resulting inequality with (2.58), we deduce $\|K_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \|\eta\|_{L_t^{q'}((0, T'); L_x^{p'}(0, \ell))}$ and so in view of (2.57) we conclude that

$$\|v_1\|_{L_t^q((0, T'); L_x^p(0, \ell))} \lesssim \|\Psi_1\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}. \quad (2.62)$$

Differentiating (2.52) j times with respect to x for any $j \leq s$ and repeating the above arguments, we find

$$\|\partial_x^j v_1\|_{L_t^q((0, T'); L_x^p(0, \ell))} \lesssim \|\partial_x^j \Psi_1\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = \|\mathcal{F}\{\partial_x^j \Psi_1\}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \quad (2.63)$$

after also using Plancherel's theorem. However, as can be seen by from the arguments presented in Section 2, we have already dealt with $\mathcal{F}\{\partial_x^j \Psi_1\}$. More specifically, $\mathcal{F}\{\partial_x^j \Psi_1\}$ is essentially the sum of I_{j, Γ_1}^1 and I_{j, Γ_1}^0 defined by (2.15) and (2.16) albeit with a slightly altered parametrization and without the factor of $e^{i\gamma_1 x}$, which was removed by Lemma 2.1 anyway. Combining this observation with estimates (2.24), (2.28) and (2.63), we obtain

$$\|\partial_x^j v_1\|_{L_t^q((0, T'); L_x^p(0, \ell))} \lesssim \|\psi_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} + \|\psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}. \quad (2.64)$$

This estimate combined with the fact that, for $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the Bessel potential space $H^{s,p}$ coincides with the Sobolev space $W^{s,p}$ (see [Cal61] and also discussion on page 22 of [Gra14]),

$$\|v_1\|_{L_t^q((0, T'); H_x^{s,p}(0, \ell))} \lesssim \|\psi_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} + \|\psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}, \quad s \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad (2.65)$$

which can be extended to all $s \geq 0$ via interpolation (Theorem 5.1 in [LM72]).

Estimation of v_2 . A straightforward adaptation of the argument that yields the bounds (2.33) and (2.34) gives

$$\|I_{j, \Gamma_2}^1(t)\|_{L_x^p(0, \ell)} \lesssim \sqrt{T'} \|\psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}, \quad \|I_{j, \Gamma_2}^0(t)\|_{L_x^p(0, \ell)} \lesssim \sqrt{T'} \|\psi_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}, \quad s \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Taking the $L^q(0, T')$ norm in t of these inequalities produces the desired estimate for $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$ while generating a factor of $(T')^{\frac{1}{q}}$. Finally, using interpolation we can cover the entire range $s \geq 0$ and hence conclude that

$$\|v_2\|_{L^q((0, T'); H^{s,p}(0, \ell))} \lesssim (T')^{\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{2}} \left(\|\psi_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} + \|\psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \right), \quad s \geq 0. \quad (2.66)$$

Estimation of v_9 . Since Γ_9 lies on the real axis, $I_{0, \Gamma_9}^1(x, t)$ makes sense for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, allowing us to employ the Fourier transform formulation of the $H^{s,p}(\mathbb{R})$ norm (which controls the $H^{s,p}(0, \ell)$ norm) instead of looking at individual derivatives:

$$\|I_{0, \Gamma_9}^1(t)\|_{H_x^{s,p}(0, \ell)} \leq \|I_{0, \Gamma_9}^1(t)\|_{H_x^{s,p}(\mathbb{R})} = \left\| \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left\{ (1+r^2)^{\frac{s}{2}} \mathcal{F}_x \{I_{0, \Gamma_9}^1\}(r, t) \right\} \right\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{R})}. \quad (2.67)$$

Substituting for the Fourier transform via (2.38) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_{0, \Gamma_9}^1(t)\|_{H_x^{s,p}(0, \ell)} &\leq \left\| \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left\{ (1+r^2)^{\frac{s}{2}} \frac{e^{-ir\ell + i\omega t}}{e^{i\nu-\ell}\Delta(r)} \left(e^{i(\nu-\nu_+)\ell} - 1 \right) \omega'(r) \mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega) \chi_{(-\infty, \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} - R_\Delta]}(r) \right\} \right\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{R})} \\ &= \left\| \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{irx + i\omega t} \mathcal{F}\{\phi\}(r) dr \right\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{R})}, \end{aligned}$$

where the function $\phi(x)$ is defined through its Fourier transform

$$\mathcal{F}\{\phi\}(r) := (1+r^2)^{\frac{s}{2}} \frac{e^{-ir\ell}}{e^{i\nu-\ell}\Delta(r)} \left(e^{i(\nu-\nu_+)\ell} - 1 \right) \omega'(r) \mathcal{F}\{\psi_1\}(\omega) \chi_{(-\infty, \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} - R_\Delta]}(r). \quad (2.68)$$

With this notation, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_{0,\Gamma_9}^1(t)\|_{H_x^{s,p}(0,\ell)} &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{irx+i\omega t} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-iry} \phi(y) dy dr \right\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{R})} \\ &= \left\| \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(y) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ir(x-y)+i\omega t} dr dy \right\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{R})} = \left\| \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} I(x,y,t) \phi(y) dy \right\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{R})}, \end{aligned}$$

where $I(x,y,t) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ir(x-y)+i\omega t} dr$. For $t \neq 0$, from the proof of Lemma 4.2 in [CL03] we have the dispersive estimate $|I(x,y,t)| \lesssim |\beta t|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$, where the inequality constant is independent of x, y and t . With this estimate at hand, proceeding along the lines of the proof of Theorem 4.1 in [CL03] and, importantly, imposing the admissibility condition (1.13) for the pair (q, p) , we obtain the bound

$$\left\| \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} I(x,y,t) \phi(y) dy \right\|_{L_x^q((0,T'); L_x^p(\mathbb{R}))} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{L_x^2(\mathbb{R})} \simeq \|\mathcal{F}\{\phi\}\|_{L_x^2(\mathbb{R})}.$$

As we have already seen from (2.37) onward how to handle $\|\phi\|_{L_x^2(\mathbb{R})}$, we are able to deduce the desired estimate for I_{0,Γ_9}^1 . In addition, the same proof can be adapted in a straightforward way for I_{0,Γ_1}^0 , thereby completing the proof of Theorem 2.3. \blacksquare

3. LINEAR DECOMPOSITION AND NEW ESTIMATES ON THE HALF-LINE

We will now use the Sobolev and Strichartz estimates derived in Section 2 for the reduced interval problem (2.1) in order to establish analogous estimates for the full forced linear interval problem (1.9). More specifically, we will decompose problem (1.9) in several components, which can be handled either via our results from Section 2 or through novel estimates obtained in the present section for linear half-line problem. It should be emphasized that these new half-line estimates were not necessary for the well-posedness of HNLS on the half-line proved in [AMO24], since they arise through the decomposition of the interval problem (1.9) below via the traces of the half-line solution that interact with the boundary data of problem (1.9).

3.1. Proof of Theorem 1.3 in the high-regularity setting

Let $s > \frac{1}{2}$. By linearity, the solution of the forced linear problem (1.9) can be written as

$$u = U|_{x \in (0,\ell)} + \check{u}, \quad (3.1)$$

where U denotes the solution to the half-line problem

$$\begin{aligned} iU_t + i\beta U_{xxx} + \alpha U_{xx} + i\delta U_x &= F(x,t), \quad 0 < x < \infty, \quad 0 < t < T, \\ U(x,0) &= U_0(x), \\ U(0,t) &= g_0(t), \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

and \check{u} satisfies the finite interval problem

$$\begin{aligned} i\check{u}_t + i\beta\check{u}_{xxx} + \alpha\check{u}_{xx} + i\delta\check{u}_x &= 0, \quad 0 < x < \ell, \quad 0 < t < T, \\ \check{u}(x,0) &= 0, \\ \check{u}(0,t) = 0, \quad \check{u}(\ell,t) &= h_0(t) - U(\ell,t), \quad \check{u}_x(\ell,t) = h_1(t) - U_x(\ell,t), \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where the initial datum U_0 and the forcing F of the half-line problem are given by

$$U_0 = \mathcal{U}_0|_{(0,\infty)}, \quad F = \mathfrak{F}|_{(0,\infty) \times [0,T]}$$

with $\mathcal{U}_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathfrak{F} \in C([0,T]; H_x^s(\mathbb{R}))$ being Sobolev extensions from $(0, \ell)$ to \mathbb{R} of the original initial datum $u_0 \in H^s(0, \ell)$ and forcing $f \in C([0,T]; H_x^s(0, \ell))$, respectively, such that

$$\|U_0\|_{H^s(0,\infty)} \leq \|\mathcal{U}_0\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{H^s(0,\ell)}, \quad (3.4)$$

$$\|F(t)\|_{H_x^s(0,\infty)} \leq \|\mathfrak{F}(t)\|_{H_x^s(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \|f(t)\|_{H_x^s(0,\ell)}, \quad t \in (0,T). \quad (3.5)$$

We note that the constant in inequalities (3.4) and (3.5) is the same, as it only depends on s due to the existence of a fixed bounded extension operator from $H^s(0, \ell)$ to $H^s(\mathbb{R})$.

Introducing the notation $u = S[u_0, g_0, h_0, h_1; f]$, $U = S[U_0, g_0; F]$ and $\mathcal{U} = S[\mathcal{U}_0; \mathfrak{F}]$ for the solution operators of the interval problem (1.9), the half-line problem (3.2) and the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{aligned} i\mathcal{U}_t + i\beta\mathcal{U}_{xxx} + \alpha\mathcal{U}_{xx} + i\delta\mathcal{U}_x &= \mathfrak{F}(x, t), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad 0 < t < T, \\ \mathcal{U}(x, 0) &= \mathcal{U}_0(x), \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

we further decompose (3.1) by expressing U and \check{u} as

$$U = \mathcal{W}|_{x \in (0, \infty)} + \mathcal{Z}|_{x \in (0, \infty)} + \check{U}_1 - \check{U}_2, \quad \check{u} = \check{u}_1 - \check{u}_2 + \check{u}_3, \quad (3.7)$$

where, using the solution operators notation above,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W} &= S[\mathcal{U}_0; 0], \quad \mathcal{Z} = S[0; \mathfrak{F}], \quad \check{U}_1 = S[0, g_0 - \mathcal{W}|_{x=0}; 0], \quad \check{U}_2 = S[0, \mathcal{Z}|_{x=0}; 0], \\ \check{u}_1 &= S[0, 0, h_0 - \mathcal{W}|_{x=\ell} - \check{U}_1|_{x=\ell}, h_1 - \partial_x \mathcal{W}|_{x=\ell} - \partial_x \check{U}_1|_{x=\ell}; 0], \\ \check{u}_2 &= S[0, 0, \mathcal{Z}|_{x=\ell}, \partial_x \mathcal{Z}|_{x=\ell}; 0], \quad \check{u}_3 = S[0, 0, \check{U}_2|_{x=\ell}, \partial_x \check{U}_2|_{x=\ell}; 0]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Hence, for each $t \in (0, T)$, the decomposition (3.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t)\|_{H_x^s(0, \ell)} &\leq \|\mathcal{W}(t)\|_{H_x^s(\mathbb{R})} + \|\mathcal{Z}(t)\|_{H_x^s(\mathbb{R})} + \|\check{U}_1(t)\|_{H_x^s(0, \infty)} + \|\check{U}_2(t)\|_{H_x^s(0, \infty)} \\ &\quad + \|\check{u}_1(t)\|_{H_x^s(0, \ell)} + \|\check{u}_2(t)\|_{H_x^s(0, \ell)} + \|\check{u}_3(t)\|_{H_x^s(0, \ell)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

and so estimating u in $C([0, T]; H_x^s(0, \ell))$ amounts to estimating each of the norms on the right-hand side of (3.9) and then taking the supremum over $t \in [0, T]$.

At this point, it is useful to state the following results from the analysis of the half-line problem in [AMO24]:

Theorem 3.1 ([AMO24]). *The following estimates are satisfied by the Cauchy problems in (3.8):*

$$\|\mathcal{W}(t)\|_{H_x^s(\mathbb{R})} = \|\mathcal{U}_0\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}, \quad s, t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (3.10)$$

$$\|\mathcal{W}(x)\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} \leq c_s(1 + \sqrt{T}) \|\mathcal{U}_0\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}, \quad s, x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (3.11)$$

$$\|\mathcal{Z}(t)\|_{H_x^s(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|\mathfrak{F}\|_{L_t^1((0, T); H_x^s(\mathbb{R}))}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad t \in [0, T] \quad (3.12)$$

$$\|\mathcal{Z}(x)\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} \leq c(s, T) \|\mathfrak{F}\|_{L_t^2((0, T); H_x^s(\mathbb{R}))}, \quad -1 \leq s \leq 2, \quad s \neq \frac{1}{2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (3.13)$$

where c_s is a constant that depends only upon α, β, δ, s and $c(s, T)$ remains bounded as $T \rightarrow 0^+$. Furthermore, the solution V to the reduced half-line problem

$$\begin{aligned} iV_t + i\beta V_{xxx} + \alpha V_{xx} + i\delta V_x &= 0, \quad x > 0, \quad 0 < t < T', \\ V(x, 0) &= 0, \\ V(0, t) = V_0(t) &\in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}), \quad \text{supp}(V_0) \subseteq [0, T'], \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

satisfies the estimate

$$\|V\|_{L_t^\infty((0, T'); H_x^s(0, \infty))} \leq c_s(1 + \sqrt{T'}e^{cT'}) \|V_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}, \quad s \geq 0. \quad (3.15)$$

Corollary 3.1 (Smoothing effect). *For any $s \geq -1$, the Cauchy problem estimates (3.11) and (3.13) readily imply*

$$\|\mathcal{W}\|_{L_t^2((0, T); H_x^{s+1}(0, \ell))} \leq c_s(1 + \sqrt{T}) \sqrt{\ell(s+2)} \|\mathcal{U}_0\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (3.16)$$

$$\|\mathcal{Z}\|_{L_t^2((0, T); H_x^{s+1}(0, \ell))} \leq c_s(1 + \sqrt{T}) \sqrt{\ell(s+2)} \|\mathfrak{F}\|_{L_t^1((0, T); H_x^s(\mathbb{R}))}. \quad (3.17)$$

Proof. For $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $s \geq -1$, using the time estimate (3.11) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{W}\|_{L_t^2((0, T); H_x^{s+1}(0, \ell))}^2 &= \sum_{j=0}^{s+1} \int_0^\ell \|S[\partial_x^j \mathcal{U}_0; 0](x)\|_{L_t^2(0, T)}^2 dx \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{s+1} \int_0^\ell c_s^2(1 + \sqrt{T})^2 \|\partial_x^j \mathcal{U}_0\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R})}^2 dx \leq c_s^2(1 + \sqrt{T})^2 \ell(s+2) \|\mathcal{U}_0\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}^2. \end{aligned}$$

By interpolation, we can extend the estimate to cover all $s \geq -1$. Similarly, for $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $s \geq -1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{Z}\|_{L_t^2((0,T);H_x^{s+1}(0,\ell))}^2 &= \sum_{j=0}^{s+1} \int_0^\ell \|S[0; \partial_x^j \mathfrak{F}](x, t)\|_{L_t^2(0,T)}^2 dx \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{s+1} \int_0^\ell \left\| \int_0^t S[\partial_x^j \mathfrak{F}(t'); 0](x, t-t') dt' \right\|_{L_t^2(0,T)}^2 dx \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{s+1} \int_0^\ell \left(\int_0^T \|S[\partial_x^j \mathfrak{F}(t'); 0](x, \cdot - t')\|_{L_t^2(0,T)} dt' \right)^2 dx \end{aligned}$$

so employing the time estimate (3.11) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{Z}\|_{L_t^2((0,T);H_x^{s+1}(0,\ell))}^2 &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{s+1} \int_0^\ell \left(\int_0^T c_s(1 + \sqrt{T}) \|\partial_x^j \mathfrak{F}(t')\|_{H_x^{-1}(\mathbb{R})} dt' \right)^2 dx \\ &= c_s^2(1 + \sqrt{T})^2 \ell \sum_{j=0}^{s+1} \|\mathfrak{F}(t')\|_{L_t^1((0,T);H_x^{j-1}(\mathbb{R}))}^2 \\ &\leq c_s^2(1 + \sqrt{T})^2 \ell (s+2) \|\mathfrak{F}(t')\|_{L_t^1((0,T);H_x^s(\mathbb{R}))}^2. \end{aligned}$$

As before, for general $s \geq -1$ we proceed via interpolation. ■

Note that the problems satisfied by \check{U}_1 and \check{U}_2 are essentially the same with the one satisfied by V , except for the important difference that the support condition of V_0 is not satisfied by the boundary data $g_0 - \mathcal{W}|_{x=0}$ and $\mathcal{Z}|_{x=0}$ of \check{U}_1 and \check{U}_2 . For this reason, in order to be able to employ estimate (3.15) for \check{U}_1 and \check{U}_2 , an additional step is first necessary, namely the construction of appropriate extensions for the boundary data of \check{U}_1 and \check{U}_2 .

Boundary data extension. We begin with \check{U}_1 . We are in the high-regularity setting of $s > \frac{1}{2}$ and, in particular, we will work with $\frac{1}{2} < s < \frac{7}{2}$. Since $u_0 \in H^s(0, \ell)$ and $g_0 \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)$, in our range of s we have continuity of both the initial and the boundary data, which is the reason why the first of the compatibility conditions (1.5) is required, namely $g_0(0) = u_0(0)$. This implies $g_0(0) = \mathcal{W}(0, 0)$ so the function

$$g(t) := g_0(t) - \mathcal{W}(0, t), \quad 0 < t < T, \quad (3.18)$$

satisfies $g(0) = 0$. Furthermore, thanks to the time estimate (3.11), $g \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)$ and, using also the extension inequality (3.4),

$$\|g\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0,T)} \leq \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0,T)} + c_s(1 + \sqrt{T}) \|u_0\|_{H^s(0,\ell)}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.19)$$

Next, let G be an extension of g such that

$$\|G\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq 2 \|g\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0,T)} \quad (3.20)$$

and, for $\theta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ a smooth cutoff function such that $0 \leq \theta(t) \leq 1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\theta(t) = 1$ on $[0, T]$ and $\text{supp}(\theta) \subseteq [-(T+1), T+1]$, define $G_\theta(t) = \theta(t)G(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that $\text{supp}(G_\theta) \subseteq [-(T+1), T+1]$ and, in particular, $G_\theta(T+1) = 0$. Furthermore, since $g(0) = 0$, it follows that $G_\theta(0) = 0$. Hence, the function

$$G_0(t) := \chi_{[0, T+1]}(t) G_\theta(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (3.21)$$

has $\text{supp}(G_0) \subseteq [0, T+1]$ and is continuous at $t = 0$ and $t = T+1$ with $G_0(0) = G_0(T+1) = 0$. Therefore, by Theorem 11.4 of [LM72], $G_0 \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$ with

$$\|G_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C(s, T) \|G_\theta\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T+1)}. \quad (3.22)$$

In addition, by the algebra property (which is valid since $s > \frac{1}{2}$) and the inequality (3.20),

$$\|G_\theta\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T+1)} \leq \|\theta\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T+1)} \|G\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq \tilde{C}(s, T) \|g\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)}, \quad (3.23)$$

where $\tilde{C}(s, T) := 2 \|\theta\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T+1)}$ depends on s and T and remains bounded as $T \rightarrow 0^+$. Therefore,

$$\|G_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq c(s, T) \|g\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} \quad (3.24)$$

where the constant $c(s, T)$ remains bounded as $T \rightarrow 0^+$.

With the above construction at hand, combining (3.19) and (3.24) with (3.15) in the case of $V_0 = G_0$ and $T' = T + 1$, for $\frac{1}{2} < s < \frac{7}{2}$ we obtain

$$\|\check{U}_1\|_{L_t^\infty((0, T); H_x^s(0, \infty))} \leq c(s, T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} \right), \quad (3.25)$$

where $c(s, T)$ is a constant (different from the one in (3.24)) that remains bounded as $T \rightarrow 0^+$. Estimate (3.25) will be used to bound the corresponding term in (3.9).

The norm of \check{U}_2 in (3.9) can be handled via the analogue of (3.25) obtained for $g(t) = \mathcal{Z}(0, t)$ (instead of (3.18)). Indeed, for $-1 \leq s \leq 2$ and $s \neq \frac{1}{2}$, thanks to the time estimate (3.13) we have $\mathcal{Z}|_{x=0} \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)$. Moreover, $\mathcal{Z}(0, 0) = 0$. Thus, $\mathcal{Z}(0, t)$ has the same properties with the function in (3.18) and so, proceeding as before and using successively (3.15), (3.13) and (3.5), for $0 \leq s \leq 2$ with $s \neq \frac{1}{2}$ we find

$$\|\check{U}_2\|_{L_t^\infty((0, T); H_x^s(0, \infty))} \leq c(s, T) \|f\|_{L_t^2((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))}. \quad (3.26)$$

The three remaining terms in (3.9), namely the norms of the interval solutions \check{u}_1 , \check{u}_2 , \check{u}_3 , can be handled similarly to each other. Starting with \check{u}_1 , we extend our Dirichlet boundary datum at $x = \ell$ from $H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)$ to $H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$ using the same methodology described above for the Dirichlet datum of \check{U}_1 . This step is possible thanks to the second of the compatibility conditions (1.5), namely $h_0(0) = u_0(\ell)$. In addition, for $s < \frac{3}{2}$, the Neumann datum of \check{u}_1 can simply be extended by zero from $H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)$ to $H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$. On the other hand, for $s > \frac{3}{2}$ continuity is required, leading to the third of the compatibility conditions (1.5), i.e. $h_1(0) = u_0'(\ell)$.¹ Then, we can employ Theorem 2.1 with $T' = T + 1$ and with ψ_0 and ψ_1 being the extensions of $h_0 - \mathcal{W}|_{x=\ell} - \check{U}_1|_{x=\ell}$ and $h_1 - \partial_x \mathcal{W}|_{x=\ell} - \partial_x \check{U}_1|_{x=\ell}$ constructed similarly to (3.21) and hence satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} &\leq c(s, T) \left\| h_0 - \mathcal{W}|_{x=\ell} - \check{U}_1|_{x=\ell} \right\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)}, & \frac{1}{2} < s < \frac{7}{2}, \quad s \neq \frac{3}{2}, \\ \|\psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} &\leq c(s, T) \left\| h_1 - \partial_x \mathcal{W}|_{x=\ell} - \partial_x \check{U}_1|_{x=\ell} \right\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

to deduce, for the above specified range of s ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{u}_1\|_{L_t^\infty((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))} &\leq c_s \sqrt{T+1} e^{M_\Delta(T+1)} \left(\|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|\mathcal{W}(\ell)\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|\check{U}_1(\ell)\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} + \|\partial_x \mathcal{W}(\ell)\|_{H_t^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} + \|\partial_x \check{U}_1(\ell)\|_{H_t^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

The norms of $\mathcal{W}(\ell, t)$ and $\partial_x \mathcal{W}(\ell, t)$ on the right-hand side of (3.28) can be handled via the time estimate (3.11), which as noted earlier was derived in [AMO24] for the well-posedness of HNLS on the half-line. On the other hand, the corresponding norms of $\check{U}_1(\ell, t)$ and $\partial_x \check{U}_1(\ell, t)$ were not estimated in [AMO24], as that was not necessary there. In our case, however, in order to use the bound (3.28) we must study the time regularity of the half-line solution \check{U}_1 and its spatial derivative $\partial_x \check{U}_1$. This is done in Theorem 3.3 below. Using the corresponding estimate (3.56) for $\sigma = 0, 1$, as well as inequality (3.24), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{u}_1\|_{L_t^\infty((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))} &\leq c_s \sqrt{T+1} e^{M_\Delta(T+1)} \left[c_s (1 + \sqrt{T}) \|u_0\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} + \|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + c_s \max \left\{ (T+1) e^{M_\Delta(T+1)}, 1 \right\} c(s, T) \|g\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

Then, in view of (3.4) and (3.19), for $\frac{1}{2} < s < \frac{7}{2}$ with $s \neq \frac{3}{2}$ we deduce

$$\|\check{u}_1\|_{L_t^\infty((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))} \leq c(s, T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H_x^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_0\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H_t^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \right), \quad (3.30)$$

where the constant $c(s, T)$ remains bounded as $T \rightarrow 0^+$.

For \check{u}_2 and \check{u}_3 , the procedure is identical except that we now use (3.13) and (3.5) to obtain

$$\|\check{u}_2\|_{L_t^\infty((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))} + \|\check{u}_3\|_{L_t^\infty((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))} \leq c(s, T) \|f\|_{L_t^2((0, T); H_x^s(\mathbb{R}))}, \quad (3.31)$$

¹Of course, additional compatibility conditions are needed as the value of s increases, the next one being on the Dirichlet datum when $s > \frac{7}{2}$. However, these conditions are not relevant in the range of $0 \leq s \leq 2$ considered in this work.

where now $\frac{1}{2} < s \leq 2$, $s \neq \frac{3}{2}$ (this restriction is the intersection of the restrictions $-1 \leq s \leq 2$, $s \neq \frac{1}{2}$ and $0 \leq s \leq 3$, $s \neq \frac{3}{2}$ that are needed for using (3.13) for \mathcal{Z} and $\partial_x \mathcal{Z}$ in the high-regularity setting $s > \frac{1}{2}$) and once again the constant $c(s, T)$ is bounded as $T \rightarrow 0^+$.

Overall, returning to the decomposition inequality (3.9) and combining the estimates (3.10), (3.12), (3.25), (3.26), (3.30) and (3.31) with the inequalities (3.4) and (3.5), for all $\frac{1}{2} < s \leq 2$ with $s \neq \frac{3}{2}$ we obtain the Sobolev linear estimate (1.10). In addition, starting from the analogue of the decomposition (3.9) for the space $L_t^2((0, T); H_x^{s+1}(0, \ell))$ and employing the smoothing estimates (3.16), (3.17), (3.65), (2.48), the extension inequalities (3.4) and (3.5) for the initial data and the forcing, inequality (3.19) and the extension inequality (3.24) for the boundary datum $g_0(t)$, the analogue of the latter inequality for $\mathcal{Z}(0, t)$ instead of $g_0(t)$, and the extension inequalities (3.27) together with the time estimates (3.11), (3.13) and (3.56), we obtain the smoothing estimate (1.11) in high-regularity setting of $\frac{1}{2} < s \leq 2$ with $s \neq \frac{3}{2}$. As the Strichartz estimate (1.12) is only valid in the low-regularity setting of $0 \leq s < \frac{1}{2}$, the proof of Theorem 1.3 in the high-regularity setting is complete.

3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.3 in the low-regularity setting

For $s < \frac{1}{2}$, in addition to the Sobolev estimate (1.10) we must establish the linear estimate (1.12) in the family of Strichartz spaces $L_t^q([0, T]; H_x^{s,p}(0, \ell))$ with (q, p) satisfying the admissibility condition (1.13). The decompositions (3.1) and (3.7) yield the following low-regularity counterpart of (3.9):

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(0, \ell))} &\leq \|W\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}))} + \|\mathcal{Z}\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}))} + \|\check{U}_1\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(0, \infty))} + \|\check{U}_2\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(0, \infty))} \\ &\quad + \|\check{u}_1\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(0, \ell))} + \|\check{u}_2\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(0, \ell))} + \|\check{u}_3\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(0, \ell))}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

As in the case of high regularity, it is useful to recall the following results from the analysis of the HNLS half-line problem in [AMO24].

Theorem 3.2 ([AMO24]). *For any admissible pair (q, p) in the sense of (1.13), the Cauchy problems in (3.8) admit the estimates*

$$\|W\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}))} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (3.33)$$

$$\|\mathcal{Z}\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}))} \lesssim \|\mathfrak{F}\|_{L_t^1((0, T); H_x^s(\mathbb{R}))}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.34)$$

Moreover, the solution to the reduced half-line problem (3.14) satisfies the estimate

$$\|V\|_{L_t^q((0, T'); H_x^{s,p}(0, \infty))} \lesssim [1 + (T')^{\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{2}}] \|V_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}, \quad s \geq 0. \quad (3.35)$$

Estimates (3.33) and (3.34) can be directly employed for handling the first two terms in (3.32). The remaining five terms are associated with the half-line solutions \check{U}_1, \check{U}_2 and the finite interval solutions $\check{u}_1, \check{u}_2, \check{u}_3$. We begin with the estimation of the half-line solutions and, in particular, with $\check{U}_1 = S[0, g; 0]$ where

$$g(t) = g_0(t) - W(0, t)$$

in line with (3.8). Recall that $g \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)$ with estimate (3.19) in place. Hence, for $-1 \leq s < \frac{1}{2}$ or, equivalently, $0 \leq \frac{s+1}{3} < \frac{1}{2}$, Theorem 11.4 of [LM72] implies that the extension G_0 of g by zero outside the interval $[0, T]$ belongs to $H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$ with the estimate

$$\|G_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq c(s, T) \|g\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)}. \quad (3.36)$$

This fact allows us to identify \check{U}_1 as the solution V of the reduced half-line problem (3.14) with $T' = T$ and $V_0 = G_0$. Hence, we can employ estimate (3.35) and then use successively inequalities (3.36) and (3.19) to infer

$$\|\check{U}_1\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(0, \infty))} \leq c(s, T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} \right), \quad 0 \leq s < \frac{1}{2}, \quad (3.37)$$

where (q, p) is any pair satisfying (1.13) and the constant $c(s, T)$ remains bounded as $T \rightarrow 0^+$.

We proceed to $\check{U}_2 = S[0, \mathcal{Z}(0, \cdot); 0]$. For this term, simply repeating the steps used for \check{U}_1 above would yield the forcing in the norm of the space $L_t^2((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))$. However, via Lemma 3.1 below (see also expression (6.11) in [HM20]), it is possible to make the forcing appear in the norm of the space $L_t^1((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))$ instead, thereby allowing us to establish the low-regularity well-posedness of Theorem 1.2 for a broader range of nonlinearities.

Lemma 3.1. *The solution $\check{U}_2 = S[0, \mathcal{Z}|_{x=0}; 0]$ can be expressed in the form*

$$\check{U}_2(x, t) = -i \int_{t'=0}^T S[0, S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](0, \cdot); 0](x, t - t') dt'. \quad (3.38)$$

Proof. The expression (65) in [AMO24] provides the unified transform solution to the reduced half-line problem (3.14). Combining the specific form of that solution with the Duhamel's principle and the homogeneous Cauchy problem solution, we arrive at the formula

$$\check{U}_2(x, t) = \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{\partial \tilde{D}_0} e^{ikx+i\omega t} \omega' \int_{t''=0}^T e^{-i\omega t''} \int_{t'=0}^{t''} S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](0, t'' - t') dt' dt'' dk, \quad (3.39)$$

where \tilde{D}_0 and ω are defined by (2.8) and (2.4), respectively. Interchanging the integrals with respect to t' and t'' and then making the change of variable $t'' \mapsto t'' + t'$ yields

$$\check{U}_2(x, t) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{t'=0}^T \int_{\partial \tilde{D}_0} e^{ikx+i\omega(t-t')} - i\omega' \int_{t''=0}^{T-t'} e^{-i\omega t''} S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](0, t'') dt'' dk dt'.$$

Recalling that $\text{Im}(k) > 0$ and $\text{Im}(\omega) \leq 0$ for $k \in \overline{\tilde{D}_0}$, we observe that for $t'' \geq T - t' \geq t - t'$ the exponential $e^{ikx+i\omega(t-t-t'')}$ decays as $|k| \rightarrow \infty$ within $\overline{\tilde{D}_0}$. Therefore, along the lines of the argument used in Appendix A, we can use analyticity and Cauchy's theorem to augment the integration range of the inner integral from $[0, T - t']$ to $[0, T]$, resulting in the desired representation (3.38). \blacksquare

Starting from formula (3.38) and applying Minkowski's integral inequality twice, we find

$$\|\check{U}_2\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(0, \infty))} \leq \int_{t'=0}^T \|S[0, S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](0, \cdot); 0](\cdot, \cdot - t')\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(0, \infty))} dt'. \quad (3.40)$$

Now, observe that the reduced half-line Strichartz estimate (3.35) with $T' = T$ allows us to readily estimate this Strichartz norm on the right-hand side. This is because, due to the fact that $0 \leq s < \frac{1}{2}$, the relevant boundary data $S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](0, \cdot)$ can readily be extended by zero outside $(0, T)$, thus fulfilling the compact support requirement of (3.14). Hence, using also the time estimate (3.11), we have

$$\|S[0, S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](0, \cdot); 0](\cdot, \cdot - t')\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(0, \infty))} \leq c_s (1 + \sqrt{T} e^{cT}) (1 + T^{\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{2}}) \|\mathfrak{F}(t')\|_{H_x^s(\mathbb{R})}. \quad (3.41)$$

In turn, for any $0 \leq s < \frac{1}{2}$ and any admissible pair (q, p) in the sense of (1.13), inequality (3.40) yields

$$\|\check{U}_2\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(0, \infty))} \leq c_s (1 + \sqrt{T} e^{cT}) (1 + T^{\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{2}}) \|\mathfrak{F}\|_{L_t^1((0, T); H_x^s(\mathbb{R}))}. \quad (3.42)$$

Back to (3.32), having completed the estimation of the half-line solutions \check{U}_1, \check{U}_2 , we turn our attention to the finite interval solutions $\check{u}_1, \check{u}_2, \check{u}_3$. The procedure for \check{u}_1 is identical to the one used for \check{U}_1 . Specifically, we let $\psi_0 = h_0 - \mathcal{W}|_{x=\ell} - \check{U}_1|_{x=\ell}$, $\psi_1 = h_1 - \partial_x \mathcal{W}|_{x=\ell} - \partial_x \check{U}_1|_{x=\ell}$ and then employ Theorem 11.4 of [LM72] to extend these functions by zero outside $(0, T)$ to produce the extensions Ψ_0, Ψ_1 supported in $[0, T]$ and satisfying the bounds

$$\|\Psi_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq c(s, T) \|\psi_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)}, \quad \|\Psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq c(s, T) \|\psi_1\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)}. \quad (3.43)$$

Next, we let $v(x, t)$ be the solution to the reduced finite interval problem (2.1) with $T' = T$ and the extensions Ψ_0, Ψ_1 as boundary conditions. Then, combining Theorem 2.3 with inequalities (3.43), the time estimate (3.11) (used twice, once for \mathcal{W} and once for $\partial_x \mathcal{W}$ after shifting s to $s - 1$ in the latter case) and inequality (3.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{u}_1\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(0, \ell))} &\leq (1 + T^{\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{2}}) c(s, T) \left(\|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} + \|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\check{U}_1(\ell)\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|\partial_x \check{U}_1(\ell)\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.44)$$

At this point, as in the high-regularity case, it becomes evident that novel time estimates are needed for the half-line solution $\check{U}_1 = S[0, g_0 - \mathcal{W}|_{x=0}; 0]$. These estimates are established in Theorem 3.3 below and can be readily employed after simply extending the boundary datum $g_0 - \mathcal{W}|_{x=0}$ by zero outside $(0, T)$ to yield

$$\|\check{U}_1(\ell)\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|\partial_x \check{U}_1(\ell)\|_{H_t^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \leq c_s \max\{T e^{M\Delta T}, 1\} \left(\|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|\mathcal{W}(0)\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} \right), \quad s \geq 0.$$

In view of this estimate, the time estimate (3.11), and inequality (3.4), we deduce via inequality (3.44) that

$$\|\check{u}_1\|_{L_t^q((0,T);H_x^{s,p}(0,\ell))} \leq (1 + T^{\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{2}})c(s, T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s(0,\ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0,T)} + \|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0,T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0,T)} \right) \quad (3.45)$$

for any $s \geq 0$ and any admissible pair (1.13).

Regarding the term $\check{u}_2 = S[0, 0, \mathcal{Z}|_{x=\ell}, \partial_x \mathcal{Z}|_{x=\ell}; 0]$, since its boundary data are traces of the forced Cauchy problem solution \mathcal{Z} , we face a similar issue as with \check{U}_2 earlier. Namely, following the method used for \check{u}_1 will eventually result in an $L_t^2(0, T)$ norm of the forcing (through the time estimate (3.13)), while it is actually possible to instead have an $L_t^2(0, T)$ norm instead, provided we can establish the following following finite interval analogue of Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 3.2. *The solution $\check{u}_2 = S[0, 0, \mathcal{Z}(\ell, \cdot), \partial_x \mathcal{Z}(\ell, \cdot); 0]$ can be expressed in the form*

$$\check{u}_2(x, t) = -i \int_{t'=0}^T S[0, 0, S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](\ell, \cdot), S[\partial_x \mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](\ell, \cdot); 0](x, t - t') dt'. \quad (3.46)$$

Proof. Starting from the unified transform formula (1.14) and recalling the definition (A.3) along with the representation for $\mathcal{Z}(x, t)$ obtained via Duhamel's principle and the homogeneous Cauchy problem solution, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \check{u}_2(x, t) = & \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{\partial \tilde{D}} \frac{e^{-ik(\ell-x)+i\omega t}}{\Delta(k)} \left[(e^{-i\nu_+\ell} - e^{-i\nu_-\ell}) \omega' \int_{t''=0}^T e^{-i\omega t''} \int_{t'=0}^{t''} \partial_x S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](x, t'' - t') dt' dt'' \right. \\ & \left. - i(\nu_- e^{-i\nu_+\ell} - \nu_+ e^{-i\nu_-\ell}) \omega' \int_{t''=0}^T e^{-i\omega t''} \int_{t'=0}^{t''} S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](\ell, t'' - t') dt' dt'' \right] dk. \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$

Interchanging the integrals with respect to t' and t'' and then making the substitution $t'' \mapsto t'' + t'$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \check{u}_2(x, t) = & \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{t'=0}^T \int_{\partial \tilde{D}} \frac{e^{-ik(\ell-x)+i\omega(t-t')}}{\Delta(k)} \left[(e^{-i\nu_+\ell} - e^{-i\nu_-\ell}) \omega' \int_{t''=0}^{T-t'} e^{-i\omega t''} \partial_x S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](x, t'') dt'' \right. \\ & \left. - i(\nu_- e^{-i\nu_+\ell} - \nu_+ e^{-i\nu_-\ell}) \omega' \int_{t''=0}^{T-t'} e^{-i\omega t''} S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](\ell, t'') dt'' \right] dk dt'. \end{aligned} \quad (3.48)$$

The exponentials involved in the first half of the above integrand combine to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\Delta(k)} e^{-ik(\ell-x) - i\omega(t''+t'-t)} (e^{-i\nu_+\ell} - e^{-i\nu_-\ell}) &= \frac{1}{e^{i\nu_0 \ell} \Delta(k)} e^{ikx + -i\omega(t''+t'-t)} (e^{-i\nu_+\ell} - e^{-i\nu_-\ell}) \\ &= \frac{1}{e^{i\nu_+\ell} \Delta(k)} e^{-i\nu_0(\ell-x) + -i\omega(t''+t'-t)} (1 - e^{i\mu_0 \ell}) \\ &= \frac{1}{e^{i\nu_-\ell} \Delta(k)} e^{-i\nu_0(\ell-x) + -i\omega(t''+t'-t)} (e^{-i\mu_0 \ell} - 1), \end{aligned} \quad (3.49)$$

where we recall that $\nu_0 = k$ and $\mu_0 = \nu_+ - \nu_-$. Each of the three forms on the right-hand side is suitable for working in each of the three regions $\tilde{D}_n \subseteq \tilde{D}$, $n \in \{0, +, -\}$. Importantly, by Lemma A.4, $\frac{1}{e^{i\nu_n \ell} \Delta(k)} \rightarrow 0$ as $|k| \rightarrow \infty$ with $k \in \tilde{D}_n$. For $k \in \tilde{D}_0$ we have $\text{Im}(\nu_0) > 0$, while for $k \in \tilde{D}_\pm$ we have $\text{Im}(\nu_0) < 0$, so the factor containing ν_0 also decays. Also, $\text{Im}(\omega) < 0$ inside \tilde{D} , so for $t'' \geq T - t'$ the exponential $e^{-i\omega(t''+t'-t)}$ decays as well. Finally, by the characterization of each \tilde{D}_n provided by Lemma A.3, the differences of exponentials are bounded. Therefore, the entire exponential factor given by (3.49) decays as $|k| \rightarrow \infty$ in \tilde{D} . A similar argument can be made for the exponential emerging from the second half of (3.48). Thus, by analyticity and Cauchy's theorem, the range of the integral in t'' can be augmented up to T , resulting in the desired representation (3.46). ■

Proceeding similarly to the derivation of the half-line estimate (3.40), we use the representation (3.46) to obtain

$$\|\check{u}_2\|_{L_t^q((0,T);H_x^{s,p}(0,\ell))} \leq \int_{t'=0}^T \|S[0, 0, S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](\ell, \cdot), S[\partial_x \mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](\ell, \cdot); 0](\cdot, \cdot - t')\|_{L_t^q((0,T);H_x^{s,p}(0,\ell))} dt'. \quad (3.50)$$

Following the same reasoning as below (3.40), we can estimate the Strichartz norm on the right-hand side of (3.50) by combining Theorem 2.3 for the reduced interval problem (with $T' = T$, $\psi_0 = S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](\ell, \cdot)$)

and $\psi_1 = S[\partial_x \mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](\ell, \cdot)$ with the time estimate (3.11) (for $\mathcal{W} = S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](\ell, \cdot)$ and s , as well as for $\mathcal{W} = S[\partial_x \mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](\ell, \cdot)$ and $s - 1$) to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{u}_2\|_{L_t^q((0,T); H_x^{s,p}(0,\ell))} &\lesssim \int_{t'=0}^T \left(\|S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](\ell, \cdot)\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0,T)} + \|S[\partial_x \mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](\ell, \cdot)\|_{H_t^{\frac{s}{3}}(0,T)} \right) dt' \\ &\lesssim \|\mathfrak{F}\|_{L_t^1((0,T); H_x^s(0,\ell))} \end{aligned} \quad (3.51)$$

for any $0 \leq s < \frac{1}{2}$ and any admissible pair (1.13). We remark that Theorem 2.3 does apply to (3.50) despite the time shift that the theorem does not consider. Indeed, the factor induced by the shift is purely oscillatory and so it disappears once norms are taken, leaving the proof of the theorem unaffected.

Our final task in regard to the decomposition inequality (3.32) is to estimate the Strichartz norm of the term $\check{u}_3 = S[0, 0, \check{U}_2|_{x=\ell}, \partial_x \check{U}_2|_{x=\ell}; 0]$. Recalling that $\check{U}_2 = S[0, \mathcal{Z}|_{x=0}; 0]$ and $\mathcal{Z} = S[0; \mathfrak{F}]$, we realize that we once again face the same issue as with \check{U}_2 and \check{u}_2 , except that now the forced Cauchy solution \mathcal{Z} is nested one level deeper within the finite interval solution (through the traces of the half-line solution \check{U}_2 , whose boundary datum is a trace of \mathcal{Z}). The remedy here is a simple application of Lemma 3.1. Specifically, extending the relevant boundary data by zero outside $(0, T)$ via the reasoning given below (3.40), we use Theorem 2.3 to infer

$$\|\check{u}_3\|_{L_t^q((0,T); H_x^{s,p}(0,\ell))} \leq c_s (1 + T^{\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{2}}) \left(\|\check{U}_2|_{x=\ell}\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0,T)} + \|\partial_x \check{U}_2|_{x=\ell}\|_{H_t^{\frac{s}{3}}(0,T)} \right). \quad (3.52)$$

We then apply Lemma 3.1 and Minkowski's inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{u}_3\|_{L_t^q((0,T); H_x^{s,p}(0,\ell))} &\leq c_s (1 + T^{\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{2}}) \left(\int_{t'=0}^T \|S[0, S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](0, \cdot); 0](\ell, \cdot - t')\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0,T)} dt' \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{t'=0}^T \|\partial_x S[0, S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](0, \cdot); 0](\ell, \cdot - t')\|_{H_t^{\frac{s}{3}}(0,T)} dt' \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.53)$$

At this point, Theorem 3.3 implies

$$\|\check{u}_3\|_{L_t^q((0,T); H_x^{s,p}(0,\ell))} \leq c_s (1 + T^{\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{2}}) \max\{Te^{M\Delta T}, 1\} \int_{t'=0}^T \|S[\mathfrak{F}(\cdot, t'); 0](0, \cdot)\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0,T)} dt', \quad s \geq 0, \quad (3.54)$$

again considering the fact that translations in time have no effect on the proof of the theorem. After this step, we invoke the time estimate (3.11) to deduce

$$\|\check{u}_3\|_{L_t^q((0,T); H_x^{s,p}(0,\ell))} \leq c_s (1 + T^{\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{2}}) \max\{Te^{M\Delta T}, 1\} \|\mathfrak{F}\|_{L_t^1((0,T); H_x^s(\mathbb{R}))} \quad (3.55)$$

for any $s \geq 0$ and any admissible pair (1.13).

We are now ready to finalize the estimation of the Strichartz norm of the forced linear interval problem (1.9). Indeed, the decomposition inequality (3.32) combined with the component estimates (3.33), (3.34), (3.37), (3.42), (3.45), (3.51), (3.55) and the extension inequalities (3.4), (3.5), readily yields the Strichartz estimate (1.12). Moreover, combining the analogue of the decomposition (3.9) for the space $L_t^2((0, T); H_x^{s+1}(0, \ell))$ with the smoothing estimates (3.16), (3.17), (3.65), (2.48), the extension inequalities (3.4), (3.5) for the initial data and the forcing, inequalities (3.19) and (3.36) for $g_0(t)$, the analogue of the latter inequality for $\mathcal{Z}(0, t)$ instead of $g_0(t)$, and the extension inequalities (3.43) together with the time estimates (3.11) and (3.56), we obtain the smoothing estimate (1.11) in the low-regularity range $0 \leq s < \frac{1}{2}$. This step completes the proof of Theorem 1.3 for the forced linear interval problem (1.9) in the low-regularity setting.

3.3. Time estimates for the half-line problem

As noted earlier, the decomposition inequalities (3.9) and (3.32) introduce the need for studying the time regularity of the solution to the reduced half-line problem (3.14). In particular, it is necessary to estimate the norms $\|V(x)\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T')}$ and $\|\partial_x V(x)\|_{H_t^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T')}$ for each $x \in (0, \infty)$. Furthermore, analogously to the finite interval, we wish to establish the analogue of the smoothing effect given in Corollary 2.1. This latter task will require us to estimate, for all $\sigma \leq s + 1$, the σ th spatial derivative of V in $H_t^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T')$. Our results can be combined into the following theorem:

Theorem 3.3 (Time estimates for the reduced half-line problem). *Suppose $V_0 \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$ and $s \geq -1$. For any $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $\sigma \leq s+1$, the σ th spatial derivative of the solution $V(x, t)$ to the reduced half-line problem (3.14) belongs to $H^{\frac{s+1-\sigma}{3}}(0, T')$ as a function of t . In particular, we have the estimate*

$$\|\partial_x^\sigma V\|_{L_x^\infty((0, \infty); H_t^{\frac{s+1-\sigma}{3}}(0, T'))} \leq c \max\{T' e^{M_\Delta T'}, 1\} \|V_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (3.56)$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant that depends only on s, α, β, δ , and the constant M_Δ is given by (2.32).

Proof. Let $m = \frac{s+1-\sigma}{3}$, and start by assuming $\sigma = 0$. By the expression (65) in [AMO24] and the support condition for V_0 , the solution to problem (3.14) is given by the unified transform formula

$$V(x, t) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial \tilde{D}_0} e^{ikx+i\omega t} \omega' \mathcal{F}\{V_0\}(\omega) dk, \quad (3.57)$$

where the contour $\partial \tilde{D}_0$ is defined by (2.8). Recalling that $\partial \tilde{D}_0 = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3$ (see Figure 2.1), we consider each contour separately and write

$$V(x, t) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{n=1}^3 I_{\Gamma_n}(x, t), \quad I_{\Gamma_n}(x, t) := \int_{\Gamma_n} e^{ikx+i\omega t} \omega' \mathcal{F}\{V_0\}(\omega) dk. \quad (3.58)$$

Since Γ_1 and Γ_3 are similar, we will only examine I_{Γ_1} , which when parametrized by (2.18a) becomes

$$I_{\Gamma_1}(x, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{r_0} e^{i\gamma_1 x + i\omega t} \mathcal{F}\{V_0\}(\omega) \frac{d\omega}{dr} dr. \quad (3.59)$$

Making the change of variables from r to ω , we have

$$I_{\Gamma_1}(x, t) = - \int_{\omega_0}^{\infty} e^{i\omega t} \cdot e^{i\gamma_1 x} \mathcal{F}\{V_0\}(\omega) d\omega \quad (3.60)$$

which implies $\mathcal{F}_t\{I_{\Gamma_1}\}(x, \omega) = -2\pi e^{i\gamma_1 x} \mathcal{F}\{V_0\}(\omega) \chi_{[\omega_0, \infty)}$. In turn, substituting for γ_1 via (2.18a) and using the fact that $r, x > 0$, we find

$$\|I_{\Gamma_1}(x)\|_{H_t^m(0, T')}^2 \leq \|I_{\Gamma_1}(x)\|_{H_t^m(\mathbb{R})}^2 \lesssim \int_{\omega_0}^{\infty} (1 + \omega^2)^m |\mathcal{F}\{V_0\}(\omega)|^2 d\omega \leq \|V_0\|_{H^m(\mathbb{R})}^2. \quad (3.61)$$

For I_{Γ_2} , the parametrization (2.18b) yields

$$I_{\Gamma_2}(x, t) = \int_{\frac{\pi}{2} + \phi_0}^{\frac{\pi}{2} - \phi_0} e^{i\gamma_2 x + i\omega t} \frac{d\omega}{d\gamma_2} \mathcal{F}\{V_0\}(\omega) i R_\Delta e^{i\theta} d\theta. \quad (3.62)$$

Differentiating in t , taking the magnitude and noting that $\sin(\theta) \geq 0$ and $\text{Im}(\omega) \leq 0$ on Γ_2 , we find

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_t^j I_{\Gamma_2}(x, t)| &\leq \int_{\frac{\pi}{2} - \phi_0}^{\frac{\pi}{2} + \phi_0} e^{-R_\Delta \sin(\theta)x - \text{Im}(\omega)t} |\omega|^j \left| \frac{d\omega}{d\gamma_2} \right| |\mathcal{F}\{V_0\}(\omega)| R_\Delta d\theta \\ &\leq \int_{\frac{\pi}{2} - \phi_0}^{\frac{\pi}{2} + \phi_0} e^{-\text{Im}(\omega)t} |\omega|^j \left| \frac{d\omega}{d\gamma_2} \right| |\mathcal{F}\{V_0\}(\omega)| R_\Delta d\theta \end{aligned}$$

for each $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Using the bound (2.32) for ω and the bound (2.31) for the derivative of ω (which allows us to absorb the derivative as a constant), we further obtain

$$|\partial_t^j I_{\Gamma_2}(x, t)| \lesssim M_\Delta^j \int_{\frac{\pi}{2} - \phi_0}^{\frac{\pi}{2} + \phi_0} e^{-\text{Im}(\omega)t} |\mathcal{F}\{V_0\}(\omega)| d\theta. \quad (3.63)$$

Next, thanks to the support condition for V_0 , we switch from $\mathcal{F}\{V_0\}(\omega)$ to $\tilde{V}_0(\omega, T')$ defined by (A.3), so that

$$|\partial_t^j I_{\Gamma_2}(x, t)| \lesssim M_\Delta^j \int_{\frac{\pi}{2} - \phi_0}^{\frac{\pi}{2} + \phi_0} e^{-\text{Im}(\omega)t} \left| \int_0^{T'} e^{-i\omega t'} V_0(t') dt' \right| d\theta \leq M_\Delta^j \int_{\frac{\pi}{2} - \phi_0}^{\frac{\pi}{2} + \phi_0} \int_0^{T'} e^{\text{Im}(\omega)(t'-t)} |V_0(t')| dt' d\theta.$$

Hence, using the bound $e^{\text{Im}(\omega)(t'-t)} \leq e^{M_\Delta T'}$ with M_Δ given by (2.32), we have

$$|\partial_t^j I_{\Gamma_2}(x, t)| \lesssim M_\Delta^j e^{M_\Delta T'} \int_{\frac{\pi}{2} - \phi_0}^{\frac{\pi}{2} + \phi_0} \int_0^{T'} |V_0(t')| dt' d\theta \lesssim \sqrt{T'} M_\Delta^j e^{M_\Delta T'} \|V_0\|_{L^2(0, T')}$$

with the last step due to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Since the right-hand side does not depend on t , for each $x \in (0, \infty)$ and any $m \geq 0$ (or, equivalently, $s \geq -1$) we have

$$\|I_{\Gamma_2}(x)\|_{H_t^m(0, T')} \leq \|I_{\Gamma_2}(x)\|_{H_t^{[m]}(0, T')} = \sum_{j=0}^{[m]} \|\partial_t^j I_{\Gamma_2}(x)\|_{L_t^2(0, T')} \lesssim T' e^{M_\Delta T'} \frac{M_\Delta^{[m]+1} - 1}{M_\Delta - 1} \|V_0\|_{L^2(0, T')}. \quad (3.64)$$

Also, as noted earlier, the estimation of I_{Γ_3} is similar to I_{Γ_1} and leads to the analogue of (3.61). Thus, (3.61) and (3.64) combined with the decomposition (3.58) yield the time estimate (3.56) for V when $\sigma = 0$.

The case where $\sigma \neq 0$ can be established in a similar fashion, since differentiating (3.58) σ times in x only results in additional factors of k inside the integrand. Along Γ_1 , these factors can be handled via (2.46). A similar argument can be employed along Γ_3 . Finally, on Γ_2 , the relevant integrand gains a factor of $(\frac{\alpha}{3\beta} + R_\Delta e^{i\theta})^\sigma$, which has a magnitude bounded by the constant $(\frac{|\alpha|}{3\beta} + R_\Delta)^\sigma$. Hence, the argument for I_{Γ_2} also follows through for $\partial_x^\sigma I_{\Gamma_2}$ provided that $m \geq 0$ i.e. $s \geq \sigma - 1$. ■

An immediate consequence of estimate (3.56) is the following corollary, which provides the half-line analogue of the smoothing effect of Corollary 2.1 and can be established in the same way.

Corollary 3.2 (Smoothing effect). *The solution $V(x, t)$ to the reduced half-line problem (3.14) satisfies the estimate*

$$\|V\|_{L_t^2((0, T'); H_x^{s+1}(0, \ell))} \leq c \max\{T' e^{M_\Delta T'}, 1\} \sqrt{\ell(s+2)} \|V_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}, \quad s \geq -1, \quad (3.65)$$

where c is the constant of estimate (3.56).

Finally, for completeness of presentation and since these were not derived in the half-line work [AMO24], below we provide time estimates for the full forced linear half-line problem (3.2). We emphasize that these are not needed for the proof of Theorem 1.3 given earlier. Indeed, the only half-line time estimates used in that proof are those of Theorem 3.3 for the reduced half-line problem (3.14).

Theorem 3.4 (Time estimates for the full half-line problem). *Suppose $0 \leq s \leq 2$ with $s \neq \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}$. Then, the solution $U(x, t)$ to the forced linear half-line problem (3.2) belongs to $H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)$ as a function of t , and the derivative $\partial_x U(x, t)$ belongs to $H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)$ as a function of t . In particular, we have the estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|U\|_{L_x^\infty((0, \infty); H_t^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T))} + \|\partial_x U\|_{L_x^\infty((0, \infty); H_t^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T))} \\ & \lesssim \max\{T e^{2M_\Delta T}, 1\} \max\left\{T^{\frac{(1-2s)}{6}}, \sqrt{T}, 1\right\} \left[(1 + \sqrt{T}) \|U_0\|_{H^s(0, \infty)} + \|g_0(x)\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \max\left\{\sqrt{T}(1 + \sqrt{T}), T^{a(s)}, T^{a(s-1)}\right\} \|F\|_{L_t^2((0, T); H_x^s(0, \infty))} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.66)$$

with the exponent $a(s)$ given by

$$a(s) = \begin{cases} \frac{1-2s}{6}, & -1 \leq s < \frac{1}{2}, \\ \frac{2-s}{3}, & \frac{1}{2} \leq s < 2, \\ \frac{1}{2}, & s = 2. \end{cases} \quad (3.67)$$

Proof. Theorem 3.4 follows by combining the linear decompositions (3.1) and (3.7) with Theorem 3.1 on the Cauchy problem estimates proved in [AMO24] and Theorem 3.3 on the new time estimates for the reduced half-line problem derived above. ■

4. NONLINEAR THEORY: PROOFS OF THEOREMS 1.1 AND 1.2

4.1. High-regularity well-posedness

Suppose $\frac{1}{2} < s \leq 2$ with $s \neq \frac{3}{2}$. For lifespan $T > 0$ yet to be determined, let

$$X_T^s := C_t([0, T]; H_x^s(0, \ell)) \cap L_t^2((0, T); H_x^{s+1}(0, \ell))$$

with norm equal to the maximum of the norms of the two spaces involved. Consider the iteration map $u \mapsto \Phi(u)$ on X_T^s , where

$$\Phi(u) := S[u_0, g_0, h_0, h_1; \kappa|u|^{\lambda-1}u] \quad (4.1)$$

and $S[u_0, g_0, h_0, h_1; f]$ is the solution to the forced linear problem (1.9). Then, the Sobolev estimates (1.10) and (1.11) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(u)\|_{X_T^s} \leq c(s, T) & \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \right. \\ & \left. + \sqrt{T} \|\kappa|u|^{\lambda-1}u\|_{L_t^\infty((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where $c(s, T) := \max\{c_1(s, T), c_2(s, T), c_2(s, T)\sqrt{T}\}$. In view of the algebra property in $H_x^s(0, \ell)$ (which applies since $s > \frac{1}{2}$), estimate (4.2) becomes

$$\|\Phi(u)\|_{X_T^s} \leq c(s, T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} + |\kappa|c_s\sqrt{T}\|u\|_{X_T^s}^\lambda \right). \quad (4.3)$$

Defining the radius

$$\varrho = \varrho(T) := 2c(s, T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \right) \quad (4.4)$$

and assuming $\varrho > 0$ (if not, the zero solution certainly exists and is unique as a result of the separate uniqueness argument below), we let $B_\varrho(0) \subseteq X_T^s$ be the ball of radius ϱ centered at the origin. Then, for any $u \in \overline{B_\varrho(0)}$,

$$\|\Phi(u)\|_{X_T^s} \leq \frac{\varrho}{2} + |\kappa|c_s c(s, T)\sqrt{T}\varrho^\lambda, \quad (4.5)$$

therefore, if $T > 0$ satisfies the condition

$$|\kappa|c_s c(s, T)\sqrt{T}\varrho^{\lambda-1} \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad (4.6)$$

it follows that $\Phi(u) \in \overline{B_\varrho(0)}$, i.e. $u \mapsto \Phi(u)$ maps $\overline{B_\varrho(0)}$ into $\overline{B_\varrho(0)}$.

Similarly, for any two $u_1, u_2 \in \overline{B_\varrho(0)}$, the Sobolev estimates (1.10) and (1.11) imply

$$\|\Phi(u_1) - \Phi(u_2)\|_{X_T^s} \leq |\kappa|c(s, T)\sqrt{T} \left\| |u_1|^{\lambda-1}u_1 - |u_2|^{\lambda-1}u_2 \right\|_{L_t^\infty((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))} \quad (4.7)$$

with $c(s, T)$ as above. The norm of the difference of nonlinearities on the right hand side will be handled via the following lemma, which is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.1 in [BO16].

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that $s > \frac{1}{2}$, $\lambda > 1$ satisfies the conditions (1.3) of Theorem 1.1, and $u_1, u_2 \in H^s(0, \ell)$. Then,*

$$\left\| |u_1|^{\lambda-1}u_1 - |u_2|^{\lambda-1}u_2 \right\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} \leq c(s, \lambda) \left(\|u_1\|^{\lambda-1} + \|u_2\|^{\lambda-1} \right) \|u_1 - u_2\|_{H^s(0, \ell)}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2$ be the usual global extensions of u_1, u_2 satisfying the analogue of (3.4) and note that, due to the existence of a fixed bounded extension operator from $H^s(0, \ell)$ to $H^s(\mathbb{R})$, their difference also satisfies the same inequality, namely

$$\|\mathcal{U}_j\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \|u_j\|_{H^s(0, \ell)}, \quad j = 1, 2, \quad \|\mathcal{U}_1 - \mathcal{U}_2\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \|u_1 - u_2\|_{H^s(0, \ell)}.$$

Then, by Lemma 3.1 in [BO16],

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| |u_1|^{\lambda-1}u_1 - |u_2|^{\lambda-1}u_2 \right\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} & \leq \left\| |\mathcal{U}_1|^{\lambda-1}\mathcal{U}_1 - |\mathcal{U}_2|^{\lambda-1}\mathcal{U}_2 \right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \\ & \lesssim \left(\|\mathcal{U}_1\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}^{\lambda-1} + \|\mathcal{U}_2\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}^{\lambda-1} \right) \|\mathcal{U}_1 - \mathcal{U}_2\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \end{aligned}$$

which in view of the above extension inequalities yields the desired inequality. \blacksquare

Combining (4.7) with Lemma 4.1 and the fact that $u_1, u_2 \in \overline{B_\varrho(0)}$ yields

$$\|\Phi(u_1) - \Phi(u_2)\|_{X_T^s} \leq |\kappa|c(s, \lambda, T)\sqrt{T} \left(\varrho^{\lambda-1} + \varrho^{\lambda-1} \right) \|u_1 - u_2\|_{X_T^s} \quad (4.8)$$

where $c(s, \lambda, T) := c(s, \lambda)c(s, T)$. Hence, for $T > 0$ satisfying the condition (4.6) as well as the condition (note that the two constants involved are not the same)

$$|\kappa|c(s, \lambda, T)\sqrt{T}\varrho^{\lambda-1} < \frac{1}{2} \quad (4.9)$$

we conclude that $u \mapsto \Phi(u)$ is a contraction on $\overline{B_\varrho(0)}$. Therefore, by the Banach fixed point theorem, the map $u \mapsto \Phi(u)$ has a unique fixed point in $\overline{B_\varrho(0)}$, implying the existence of a unique solution to the HNLS finite interval problem (1.1) in $\overline{B_\varrho(0)} \subseteq X_T^s$.

Extending uniqueness to the whole of $C_t([0, T]; H_x^s(0, \ell))$. Suppose $u_1, u_2 \in C_t([0, T]; H_x^s(0, \ell))$ are two solutions of (1.1) corresponding to the same set of initial and boundary data. Then, their difference $w = u_1 - u_2$ satisfies the problem

$$\begin{aligned} iw_t + i\beta w_{xxx} + \alpha w_{xx} + i\delta w_x &= \kappa (|u_1|^{\lambda-1}u_1 - |u_2|^{\lambda-1}u_2), \quad 0 < x < \ell, \quad 0 < t < T, \\ w(x, 0) &= 0, \\ w(0, t) = w(\ell, t) = w_x(\ell, t) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Multiplying the equation for w by \bar{w} and integrating in x , we have

$$i \int_0^\ell \bar{w} w_t dx + i\beta \int_0^\ell \bar{w} w_{xxx} dx + \alpha \int_0^\ell \bar{w} w_{xx} dx + i\delta \int_0^\ell \bar{w} w_x dx = \kappa \int_0^\ell \bar{w} (|u_1|^{\lambda-1}u_1 - |u_2|^{\lambda-1}u_2) dx$$

so integrating by parts on the left-hand side while employing the boundary conditions for w yields

$$i \int_0^\ell \bar{w} w_t dx - i\beta \int_0^\ell \bar{w}_x w_{xx} dx - \alpha \int_0^\ell |w_x|^2 dx + i\delta \int_0^\ell \bar{w} w_x dx = \kappa \int_0^\ell \bar{w} (|u_1|^{\lambda-1}u_1 - |u_2|^{\lambda-1}u_2) dx.$$

Taking imaginary parts, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^\ell |w|^2 dx + \frac{\beta}{2} |w_x(0, t)|^2 = \text{Im} \left[\kappa \int_0^\ell \bar{w} (|u_1|^{\lambda-1}u_1 - |u_2|^{\lambda-1}u_2) dx \right]. \tag{4.11}$$

Therefore, since $\beta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|w\|_{L_x^2(0, \ell)}^2 &\leq \text{Im} \left[\kappa \int_0^\ell \bar{w} (|u_1|^{\lambda-1}u_1 - |u_2|^{\lambda-1}u_2) dx \right] \\ &\leq |\kappa| \int_0^\ell |w| | |u_1|^{\lambda-1}u_1 - |u_2|^{\lambda-1}u_2 | dx. \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

At this point, we employ the following standard result (for a proof, see e.g. Lemma 3.3 in [HKM+24]):

Lemma 4.2. *For any pair of complex numbers u_1, u_2 ,*

$$|u_1|^{\lambda-1}u_1 - |u_2|^{\lambda-1}u_2 = \frac{\lambda+1}{2} \left(\int_0^1 |Z_\tau|^{\lambda-1} d\tau \right) (u_1 - u_2) + \frac{\lambda-1}{2} \left(\int_0^1 |Z_\tau|^{\lambda-3} Z_\tau^2 d\tau \right) \overline{(u_1 - u_2)}, \tag{4.13}$$

where $Z_\tau := \tau u_1 + (1 - \tau) u_2$, $\tau \in [0, 1]$.

Using Lemma 4.2 and the fact that $\lambda \geq 2$ and $w = u_1 - u_2$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} ||u_1|^{\lambda-1}u_1 - |u_2|^{\lambda-1}u_2| &\leq c \int_0^1 (|\tau u_1|^{\lambda-1} + |(1-\tau)u_2|^{\lambda-1}) d\tau |w| \\ &\leq c (|u_1|^{\lambda-1} + |u_2|^{\lambda-1}) |w|, \end{aligned}$$

where $c > 0$ depends on λ . Hence, (4.12) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|w(t)\|_{L_x^2(0, \ell)}^2 &\leq c |\kappa| \left(\|u_1(t)\|_{L_x^\infty(0, \ell)}^{\lambda-1} + \|u_2(t)\|_{L_x^\infty(0, \ell)}^{\lambda-1} \right) \|w(t)\|_{L_x^2(0, \ell)}^2 \\ &\leq c |\kappa| \left(\|u_1\|_{X_T^s}^{\lambda-1} + \|u_2\|_{X_T^s}^{\lambda-1} \right) \|w(t)\|_{L_x^2(0, \ell)}^2 \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

with the last inequality thanks to the embedding $H^s(0, \ell) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(0, \ell)$ (which applies since $s > \frac{1}{2}$). Since the constant on the right-hand side is positive, the differential inequality (4.14) can be solved via a simple application of Grönwall's inequality to yield

$$\|w(t)\|_{L_x^2(0, \ell)}^2 \leq \|w(0)\|_{L_x^2(0, \ell)}^2 e^{2c|\kappa| \left(\|u_1\|_{X_T^s} + \|u_2\|_{X_T^s} \right)^{\lambda-1} t}. \tag{4.15}$$

As the right-hand side is zero in view of the initial condition $w(x, 0) = 0$, we conclude that $u_1 \equiv u_2$ in all of $C_t([0, T]; H_x^s(0, \ell))$.

Continuous dependence on the data. The final task for showing Hadamard well-posedness is to prove that the solution depends continuously on the data. More precisely, we will show that the data-to-solution map is locally

Lipschitz. For some $T > 0$, let $d \in \mathcal{D} := H^s(0, \ell) \times H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T) \times H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T) \times H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)$ be an arbitrary data point with corresponding norm

$$\|d\|_{\mathcal{D}_T} := \|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)}. \quad (4.16)$$

Select $R > 0$ and define $B_R(d)$ to be the open ball of radius R centered at d . Given two data points $d_1 = (u_0^{(1)}, g_0^{(1)}, h_0^{(1)}, h_1^{(1)})$ and $d_2 = (u_0^{(2)}, g_0^{(2)}, h_0^{(2)}, h_1^{(2)})$ in $B_R(d)$, let u_1 and u_2 be the solutions obtained as fixed points of the maps $u \mapsto \Phi_1(u)$ and $u \mapsto \Phi_2(u)$ respectively, which are defined by (4.1) but with data d_1 and d_2 respectively. Note that these solutions exist somewhere within the balls $\overline{B_{\varrho_1}(0)}$ and $\overline{B_{\varrho_2}(0)}$, respectively, where

$$\varrho_j = 2c(s, T_j) \|d_j\|_{\mathcal{D}_{T_j}}, \quad j = 1, 2, \quad (4.17)$$

and the lifespans $T_j \in (0, T]$ satisfy the conditions (4.6) and (4.9). Since $d_j \in B_R(d)$,

$$\|d_j\|_{\mathcal{D}} := \|u_0^{(j)}\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0^{(j)}\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T_j)} + \|h_0^{(j)}\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T_j)} + \|h_1^{(j)}\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T_j)} < \|d\|_{\mathcal{D}_T} + R,$$

or, in other words, using the boundedness of $c(s, T_j)$ as $T_j \rightarrow 0^+$,

$$\varrho_j < 2 \sup_{t \in (0, T]} [c(s, t)] (\|d\|_{\mathcal{D}_T} + R) = 2c(s) (\|d\|_{\mathcal{D}_T} + R) =: \varrho_c. \quad (4.18)$$

Now, let $T_c \in (0, T]$ satisfy (referencing the constants in (4.6) and (4.9))

$$T_c < \frac{1}{4|\kappa|^2 C(s, \lambda)^2 \varrho_c^{2(\lambda-1)}}, \quad C(s, \lambda) := \sup_{t \in (0, T]} [c_s c(s, t) + c(s, \lambda, t)], \quad (4.19)$$

and possibly other restrictions determined below. Since $\varrho_c > \max\{\varrho_1, \varrho_2\}$ and $\lambda > 1$, it follows that $T_c \leq \min\{T_1, T_2\}$ so that u_1, u_2 exist for all $t \in [0, T_c]$ and, crucially, T_c is independent of $d_1, d_2 \in B_R(d)$. Consider the associated solution space $X_{T_c}^s := C_t([0, T_c]; H_x^s(0, \ell)) \cap L_t^2((0, T_c); H_x^{s+1}(0, \ell))$ and note that $X_{T_1}^s, X_{T_2}^s \subseteq X_{T_c}^s$. Then, since the solutions u_1 and u_2 have been obtained as fixed points of $u \mapsto \Phi_1(u)$ and $u \mapsto \Phi_2(u)$ in the balls $\overline{B_{\varrho_1}(0)} \subseteq X_{T_1}^s$ and $\overline{B_{\varrho_2}(0)} \subseteq X_{T_2}^s$, respectively, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_1 - u_2\|_{X_{T_c}^s} &= \|\Phi_1(u_1) - \Phi_2(u_2)\|_{X_{T_c}^s} \\ &= \left\| S[u_0^{(1)} - u_0^{(2)}, g_0^{(1)} - g_0^{(2)}, h_0^{(1)} - h_0^{(2)}, h_1^{(1)} - h_1^{(2)}; \kappa (|u_1|^{\lambda-1} u_1 - |u_2|^{\lambda-1} u_2)] \right\|_{X_{T_c}^s}. \end{aligned}$$

At this point, we employ the Sobolev estimates (1.10) and (1.11) together with Lemma 4.1 to infer

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_1 - u_2\|_{X_{T_c}^s} &\leq c(s, \lambda, T_c) \left[\|u_0^{(1)} - u_0^{(2)}\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0^{(1)} - g_0^{(2)}\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T_c)} + \|h_0^{(1)} - h_0^{(2)}\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T_c)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|h_1^{(1)} - h_1^{(2)}\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T_c)} + |\kappa| \sqrt{T_c} \left(\|u_1\|_{X_{T_c}^s}^{\lambda-1} + \|u_2\|_{X_{T_c}^s}^{\lambda-1} \right) \|u_1 - u_2\|_{X_{T_c}^s} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

By rearranging and considering the fact that $u_1, u_2 \in B_{\varrho_c}(0) \subseteq X_{T_c}^s$, we deduce (after recalling the definition (4.16))

$$\left[1 - 2|\kappa| c(s, \lambda, T_c) \sqrt{T_c} \varrho_c^{\lambda-1} \right] \|u_1 - u_2\|_{X_{T_c}^s} \leq c(s, \lambda, T_c) \|d_1 - d_2\|_{\mathcal{D}_{T_c}}. \quad (4.21)$$

Thus, if T_c is small enough such that it not only satisfies (4.19) but also

$$|\kappa| c(s, \lambda, T_c) \sqrt{T_c} \varrho_c^{\lambda-1} < \frac{1}{2}, \quad (4.22)$$

then we can rearrange inequality (4.21) to

$$\|u_1 - u_2\|_{X_{T_c}^s} \leq \frac{c(s, \lambda, T_c)}{1 - 2|\kappa| c(s, \lambda, T_c) \sqrt{T_c} \varrho_c^{\lambda-1}} \|d_1 - d_2\|_{\mathcal{D}_{T_c}}, \quad (4.23)$$

which shows that the unique solution u to (1.1) is locally Lipschitz and so, in particular, it depends continuously on the data. Hence, we conclude that the HNLS finite interval problem (1.1) is well-posed in the Hadamard sense, completing the proof of the high-regularity Theorem 1.1.

4.2. Low-regularity well-posedness

For $0 \leq s < \frac{1}{2}$ and lifespan $T > 0$ yet to be determined, define the solution space

$$Y_T^{s,\lambda} := C_t([0, T]; H_x^s(0, \ell)) \cap L_t^2((0, T); H_x^{s+1}(0, \ell)) \cap L_t^{\frac{6\lambda}{(1-2s)(\lambda-1)}}((0, T); H_x^{s, \frac{2\lambda}{1+2(\lambda-1)s}}(0, \ell)) \quad (4.24)$$

with norm equal to the maximum of the norms of the three spaces involved. Note that the particular choice of $(q, p) = (\frac{6\lambda}{(1-2s)(\lambda-1)}, \frac{2\lambda}{1+2(\lambda-1)s})$, which is indeed admissible in the sense of (1.13), is dictated by the nonlinear estimates of Lemma 4.3 below. Using the Sobolev estimate (1.11), as well as the Strichartz estimate (1.12) twice, once for $(q, p) = (\infty, 2)$ (this choice gives the analogue of the Sobolev estimate (1.10) for $0 \leq s < \frac{1}{2}$) and once more for $(q, p) = (\frac{6\lambda}{(1-2s)(\lambda-1)}, \frac{2\lambda}{1+2(\lambda-1)s})$, we infer that the iteration map (4.1) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(u)\|_{Y_T^{s,\lambda}} &\leq c(s, \lambda, T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\kappa| \| |u|^{\lambda-1} u \|_{L_t^1((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

where $c(s, \lambda, T) := \max \{c_2(s, T), c_3(s, 2, T), c_3(s, \frac{2\lambda}{1+2(\lambda-1)s}, T)\}$. At this point, we remark that the algebra property in $H_x^s(0, \ell)$, which was employed for simplifying the nonlinear term in the high-regularity case, is no longer available (since $s < \frac{1}{2}$). Instead, we resort to the following fundamental nonlinear estimates:

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose $0 \leq s < \frac{1}{2}$, $2 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{7-2s}{1-2s}$ and $(q, p) = (\frac{6\lambda}{(1-2s)(\lambda-1)}, \frac{2\lambda}{1+2(\lambda-1)s})$. Then,*

$$\| |\varphi|^{\lambda-1} \varphi \|_{L_t^1((0, T); H_x^s(\mathbb{R}))} \leq c(s, \lambda) T^{\frac{q-\lambda}{q}} \|\varphi\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}))}^\lambda, \quad (4.26)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \| |\varphi|^{\lambda-1} \varphi - |\psi|^{\lambda-1} \psi \|_{L_t^1((0, T); H_x^s(\mathbb{R}))} &\leq c(s, \lambda) T^{\frac{q-\lambda}{q}} \left(\|\varphi\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}))}^{\lambda-1} \|\psi\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}))} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot \|\varphi - \psi\|_{L_t^q((0, T); H_x^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}))} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

The techniques leading to the proof of Lemma 4.3 are standard in the literature related to the NLS Cauchy problem (see, for example, the proof of Proposition 3.1 in [MO24] for the two-dimensional analogue of this result). As noted above, the particular choice of exponents in the Strichartz space component of (4.24) is dictated precisely by Lemma 4.3.

Thanks to the nonlinear estimate (4.26), estimate (4.25) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(u)\|_{Y_T^{s,\lambda}} &\leq c(s, \lambda, T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\kappa| c(s, \lambda) T^{\frac{7-\lambda+2s(\lambda-1)}{6}} \|u\|_{Y_T^{s,\lambda}}^\lambda \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

Defining the radius

$$\varrho = \varrho(T) := 2c(s, \lambda, T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)} + \|g_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_0\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(0, T)} + \|h_1\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(0, T)} \right), \quad (4.29)$$

and assuming that $\varrho > 0$ (if $\varrho = 0$, then we have the zero solution), we consider the ball $B_\varrho(0) \subseteq Y_T^{s,\lambda}$ of radius ϱ centered at the origin. For any $u \in \overline{B_\varrho(0)}$, estimate (4.28) implies

$$\|\Phi(u)\|_{Y_T^{s,\lambda}} \leq \frac{\varrho}{2} + |\kappa| c(s, \lambda) c(s, \lambda, T) T^{\frac{7-\lambda+2s(\lambda-1)}{6}} \varrho^\lambda. \quad (4.30)$$

Thus, as long as $\lambda < \frac{7-2s}{1-2s}$, we can always choose $T > 0$ small enough such that

$$|\kappa| c(s, \lambda) c(s, \lambda, T) T^{\frac{7-\lambda+2s(\lambda-1)}{6}} \varrho^{\lambda-1} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (4.31)$$

a condition which guarantees that Φ maps $\overline{B_\varrho(0)}$ into itself. On the other hand, in the critical case $\lambda = \frac{7-2s}{1-2s}$ the power of T disappears from (4.31). In that case, in order to ensure that $\Phi(u)$ remains in $\overline{B_\varrho(0)}$, we make ϱ small enough by taking sufficiently small initial data norm $\|u_0\|_{H^s(0, \ell)}$ and also by choosing $T > 0$ small enough to control the norms of the boundary data in (4.29) so that (4.31) is satisfied.

Next, suppose that $u_1, u_2 \in \overline{B_\varrho(0)}$. Then, proceeding similarly to the path that resulted in (4.25), we have

$$\|\Phi(u_1) - \Phi(u_2)\|_{Y_T^{s,\lambda}} \leq |\kappa| c(s, \lambda, T) \| |u_1|^{\lambda-1} u_1 - |u_2|^{\lambda-1} u_2 \|_{L_t^1((0, T); H_x^s(0, \ell))}. \quad (4.32)$$

Thus, in view of the nonlinear estimate (4.27) and the fact that $u_1, u_2 \in \overline{B_\varrho(0)}$,

$$\|\Phi(u_1) - \Phi(u_2)\|_{Y_T^{s,\lambda}} \leq 2|\kappa|c(s,\lambda)c(s,\lambda,T)T^{\frac{7-\lambda+2s(\lambda-1)}{6}}\varrho^{\lambda-1}\|u_1 - u_2\|_{Y_T^{s,\lambda}} \quad (4.33)$$

so Φ is a contraction on $\overline{B_\varrho(0)}$ provided that

$$|\kappa|c(s,\lambda)c(s,\lambda,T)T^{\frac{7-\lambda+2s(\lambda-1)}{6}}\varrho^{\lambda-1} < \frac{1}{2}. \quad (4.34)$$

As before, for $2 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{7-2s}{1-2s}$ we can choose $T > 0$ sufficiently small so that (4.34) is satisfied, taking $\|u_0\|_{H^s(0,\ell)}$ to be small enough in the critical case $\lambda = \frac{7-2s}{1-2s}$. Note that the contraction condition (4.34) is stronger than the into condition (4.31) due to the fact that the constant involved is the same in both cases (in contrast to the high-regularity case where the constants are different).

By Banach's fixed point theorem, if $T > 0$ (and, in the critical case $\lambda = \frac{7-2s}{1-2s}$, the norm $\|u_0\|_{H^s(0,\ell)}$) is small enough such that (4.34) is satisfied, then there exists a unique fixed point of the map $u \mapsto \Phi(u)$ in $\overline{B_\varrho(0)}$, amounting to a unique solution of the HNLS finite interval problem (1.1) in $\overline{B_\varrho(0)}$.

The argument used in the high-regularity case to extend uniqueness to the entire solution space $C_t^s([0, T]; H_x^s(0, \ell))$ can be adapted to obtain the analogous result in the low-regularity setting and the space $C_t([0, T]; H_x^s(0, \ell)) \cap L_t^{\frac{6\lambda}{(1-2s)(\lambda-1)}}((0, T); H_x^{s, \frac{2\lambda}{1+2(\lambda-1)s}}(0, \ell))$ after appropriate mollification along the lines of Section 8 in [Hol05]. Moreover, the local Lipschitz continuity in the low-regularity setting can be proved in the same way as in the high-regularity case, with Lemma 4.3 replaced by Lemma 4.1. Hence, Theorem 1.2 on the Hadamard well-posedness of the HNLS finite interval problem (1.1) in the low-regularity setting has been established.

REFERENCES

- [AMO] A. Alkin, D. Mantzavinos, and T. Özşari, *Local well-posedness of the higher-order nonlinear schrödinger equation on the half-line: the case of two boundary conditions*, (preprint).
- [AMO24] ———, *Local well-posedness of the higher-order nonlinear schrödinger equation on the half-line: Single-boundary condition case*, *Studies in Applied Mathematics* **152** (2024), no. 1, 203–248.
- [BBVV07] E. Bisognin, V. Bisognin, and O. P. Vera Villagrán, *Stabilization of solutions to higher-order nonlinear Schrödinger equation with localized damping*, *Electron. J. Differential Equations* (2007), No. 06, 18.
- [BFO20] A. Batal, A. S. Fokas, and T. Özşari, *Fokas method for linear boundary value problems involving mixed spatial derivatives*, *Proc. A.* **476** (2020), no. 2239, 20200076, 15.
- [BO16] A. Batal and T. Özşari, *Nonlinear Schrödinger equations on the half-line with nonlinear boundary conditions*, *Electron. J. Differential Equations* (2016), Paper No. 222, 20.
- [BOY21] A. Batal, T. Özşari, and K. C. Yilmaz, *Stabilization of higher order Schrödinger equations on a finite interval: Part I*, *Evol. Equ. Control Theory* **10** (2021), no. 4, 861–919.
- [BSZ02] J. L. Bona, S. M. Sun, and B.-Y. Zhang, *A non-homogeneous boundary-value problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation in a quarter plane*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **354** (2002), no. 2, 427–490.
- [BSZ06] ———, *Boundary smoothing properties of the Korteweg-de Vries equation in a quarter plane and applications*, *Dyn. Partial Differ. Equ.* **3** (2006), no. 1, 1–69.
- [BSZ08] ———, *Non-homogeneous boundary value problems for the Korteweg-de Vries and the Korteweg-de Vries-Burgers equations in a quarter plane*, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire* **25** (2008), no. 6, 1145–1185.
- [BSZ18] J. L. Bona, S.-M. Sun, and B.-Y. Zhang, *Nonhomogeneous boundary-value problems for one-dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) **109** (2018), 1–66.
- [Cal61] A.-P. Calderón, *Lebesgue spaces of differentiable functions and distributions*, *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, Vol. IV, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1961, pp. 33–49.
- [Car04] X. Carvajal, *Local well-posedness for a higher order nonlinear Schrödinger equation in Sobolev spaces of negative indices*, *Electron. J. Differential Equations* (2004), No. 13, 10.
- [Car06] ———, *Sharp global well-posedness for a higher order Schrödinger equation*, *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* **12** (2006), no. 1, 53–70.
- [CB91] R. Carroll and Q. Bu, *Solution of the forced nonlinear Schrödinger (NLS) equation using PDE techniques*, *Appl. Anal.* **41** (1991), no. 1-4, 33–51.
- [CCSVA19] M. M. Cavalcanti, W. J. Corrêa, M. A. Sepúlveda, and R. Véjar-Asem, *Finite difference scheme for a higher order nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, *Calcolo* **56** (2019), no. 4, Paper No. 40, 32.
- [Che18] M. Chen, *Stabilization of the higher order nonlinear Schrödinger equation with constant coefficients*, *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci.* **128** (2018), no. 3, Art. 39, 15.
- [CK02] J. E. Colliander and C. E. Kenig, *The generalized Korteweg-de Vries equation on the half line*, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **27** (2002), no. 11-12, 2187–2266.

- [CL03] X. Carvajal and F. Linares, *A higher-order nonlinear Schrödinger equation with variable coefficients*, Differential Integral Equations **16** (2003), no. 9, 1111–1130.
- [CPVV05] J. C. Ceballos, R. Pavez, and O. P. Vera Villagrán, *Exact boundary controllability for higher order nonlinear Schrödinger equations with constant coefficients*, Electron. J. Differential Equations (2005), No. 122, 31.
- [ET16] M. B. Erdoğan and N. Tzirakis, *Regularity properties of the cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the half line*, J. Funct. Anal. **271** (2016), no. 9, 2539–2568.
- [Fam23] A. V. Faminskii, *The higher order nonlinear Schrödinger equation with quadratic nonlinearity on the real axis*, Adv. Differential Equations **28** (2023), no. 5-6, 413–466.
- [Fam24] ———, *Global weak solutions of an initial-boundary value problem on a half-line for the higher order nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **533** (2024), no. 2, Paper No. 128003, 22.
- [FHM16] A. S. Fokas, A. A. Himonas, and D. Mantzavinos, *The Korteweg–de Vries equation on the half-line*, Nonlinearity **29** (2016), no. 2, 489–527.
- [FHM17] ———, *The nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the half-line*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **369** (2017), no. 1, 681–709.
- [FM23] A. V. Faminskii and E. V. Martynov, *Inverse problems for the higher order nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, J. Math. Sci. (N.Y.) **274** (2023), no. 4, 475–492.
- [Fok97] A. S. Fokas, *A unified transform method for solving linear and certain nonlinear PDEs*, Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **453** (1997), no. 1962, 1411–1443.
- [Fok08] A. S. Fokas, *A unified approach to boundary value problems*, CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics, vol. 78, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2008.
- [Gra14] L. Grafakos, *Modern Fourier analysis*, third ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 250, Springer, New York, 2014.
- [Har29] G. H. Hardy, *Remarks in Addition to Dr. Widder’s Note on Inequalities*, J. London Math. Soc. **4** (1929), no. 3, 199–202.
- [HKM⁺24] D. Hennig, N. I. Karachalios, D. Mantzavinos, J. Cuevas-Maraver, and I. G. Stratis, *On the proximity between the wave dynamics of the integrable focusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation and its non-integrable generalizations*, J. Differential Equations **397** (2024), 106–165.
- [HM15] A. A. Himonas and D. Mantzavinos, *The “good” Boussinesq equation on the half-line*, J. Differential Equations **258** (2015), no. 9, 3107–3160.
- [HM20] ———, *Well-posedness of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the half-plane*, Nonlinearity **33** (2020), no. 10, 5567–5609.
- [HM21] ———, *The nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the half-line with a Robin boundary condition*, Anal. Math. Phys. **11** (2021), no. 4, Paper No. 157, 25.
- [HM22] ———, *The Robin and Neumann problems for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the half-plane*, Proc. A. **478** (2022), no. 2265, Paper No. 279, 20.
- [HMY19] A. A. Himonas, D. Mantzavinos, and F. Yan, *The Korteweg–de Vries equation on an interval*, J. Math. Phys. **60** (2019), no. 5, 051507, 26.
- [HMY21] A. A. Himonas, C. Madrid, and F. Yan, *The Neumann and Robin problems for the Korteweg–de Vries equation on the half-line*, J. Math. Phys. **62** (2021), no. 11, Paper No. 111503, 24.
- [Hol05] J. Holmer, *The initial-boundary-value problem for the 1D nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the half-line*, Differential Integral Equations **18** (2005), no. 6, 647–668.
- [Hol06] ———, *The initial-boundary value problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **31** (2006), no. 7-9, 1151–1190.
- [HY22a] A. A. Himonas and F. Yan, *A higher dispersion KdV equation on the half-line*, J. Differential Equations **333** (2022), 55–102.
- [HY22b] A. A. Himonas and F. Yan, *The Korteweg–de Vries equation on the half-line with Robin and Neumann data in low regularity spaces*, Nonlinear Anal. **222** (2022), Paper No. 113008, 31.
- [Kai13] E. I. Kaikina, *Inhomogeneous Neumann initial-boundary value problem for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, J. Differential Equations **255** (2013), no. 10, 3338–3356.
- [KH87] Y. Kodama and A. Hasegawa, *Nonlinear pulse propagation in a monomode dielectric guide*, IEEE Journal of Quantum Electronics **23** (1987), no. 5, 510–524.
- [KO20] K. Kalimeris and T. Özsari, *An elementary proof of the lack of null controllability for the heat equation on the half line*, Appl. Math. Lett. **104** (2020), 106241, 6.
- [KO22] B. Köksal and T. Özsari, *The interior-boundary strichartz estimate for the schrödinger equation on the half line revisited*, Turkish J. Math. **46** (2022), no. 8, 3323–3351.
- [Kod85] Y. Kodama, *Optical solitons in a monomode fiber*, vol. 39, 1985, Transport and propagation in nonlinear systems (Los Alamos, N.M., 1984), pp. 597–614.
- [KOD24] K. Kalimeris, T. Özsari, and N. Dikaios, *Numerical computation of Neumann controls for the heat equation on a finite interval*, IEEE Trans. Automat. Control **69** (2024), no. 1, 161–173.
- [Lau97] C. Laurey, *The Cauchy problem for a third order nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Nonlinear Anal. **29** (1997), no. 2, 121–158.
- [LM72] J.-L. Lions and E. Magenes, *Non-homogeneous boundary value problems and applications. Vol. I*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 181, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1972, Translated from the French by P. Kenneth.

- [MO24] D. Mantzavinos and T. Özarsarı, *Low-regularity solutions of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the spatial quarter-plane*, arXiv:2403.15350v1 (2024).
- [MOY] D. Mantzavinos, T. Özarsarı, and K. C. Yilmaz, *Ginzburg-landau equation on a finite interval and rapid chaos suppression via a finite dimensional backstepping controller*, (preprint).
- [MZ01] S. Micu and E. Zuazua, *On the lack of null-controllability of the heat equation on the half-line*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **353** (2001), no. 4, 1635–1659.
- [Ö15] T. Özarsarı, *Well-posedness for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with boundary forces in low dimensions by Strichartz estimates*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **424** (2015), no. 1, 487–508.
- [OK23] T. Özarsarı and K. Kalimeris, *Existence of unattainable states for Schrödinger type flows on the half-line*, IMA J. Math. Control Inform. **40** (2023), no. 4, 789–803.
- [OY19] T. Özarsarı and N. Yolcu, *The initial-boundary value problem for the biharmonic Schrödinger equation on the half-line*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. **18** (2019), no. 6, 3285–3316.
- [OY22] T. Özarsarı and K. C. Yilmaz, *Stabilization of higher order Schrödinger equations on a finite interval: Part II*, Evol. Equ. Control Theory **11** (2022), no. 4, 1087–1148.
- [SB01] W. Strauss and C. Bu, *An inhomogeneous boundary value problem for nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, J. Differential Equations **173** (2001), no. 1, 79–91.
- [Sta97] G. Staffilani, *On the generalized Korteweg-de Vries-type equations*, Differential Integral Equations **10** (1997), no. 4, 777–796.
- [Ste70] E. M. Stein, *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 30, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1970.
- [Str94] R. S. Strichartz, *A guide to distribution theory and Fourier transforms*, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1994.
- [Tak00] H. Takaoka, *Well-posedness for the higher order nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Adv. Math. Sci. Appl. **10** (2000), no. 1, 149–171.

APPENDIX A. LINEAR SOLUTION FORMULA VIA THE UNIFIED TRANSFORM

We employ the unified transform of Fokas to derive the solution formula (1.14) for the forced linear problem on a finite interval given by (1.9). Throughout our derivation, we work under the assumption of sufficient smoothness and decay. We begin by defining the finite interval Fourier transform pair

$$\widehat{\phi}(k) := \int_0^\ell e^{-ikx} \phi(x) dx, \quad k \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \phi(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ikx} \widehat{\phi}(k) dk, \quad 0 < x < \ell, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where we note that the inverse formula follows by applying the standard Fourier inversion theorem to a function defined on \mathbb{R} but with support on $(0, \ell)$ and equal to $\phi(x)$ there. We emphasize that, contrary to the usual Fourier transform on the whole line, which is only defined for $k \in \mathbb{R}$, the finite interval Fourier transform is entire with respect to $k \in \mathbb{C}$ thanks to the fact that the spatial variable x is bounded (see Section 7.2 in [Str94]).

Taking the finite interval Fourier transform (A.1) of the forced linear higher-order Schrödinger equation in (1.9) and then integrating in t , we obtain what is known in the unified transform terminology as the *global relation*:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-i\omega t} \widehat{u}(k, t) &= \widehat{u}_0(k) - i \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(k, t') dt' + \beta \widetilde{g}_2(\omega, t) + i(\beta k - \alpha) \widetilde{g}_1(\omega, t) - (\beta k^2 - \alpha k - \delta) \widetilde{g}_0(\omega, t) \\ &\quad - e^{-ik\ell} \left[\beta \widetilde{h}_2(\omega, t) + i(\beta k - \alpha) \widetilde{h}_1(\omega, t) - (\beta k^2 - \alpha k - \delta) \widetilde{h}_0(\omega, t) \right], \quad k \in \mathbb{C}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where ω is given by (2.4) and we have introduced the notation

$$g_2(t) = u_{xx}(0, t), \quad g_1(t) = u_x(0, t), \quad h_2(t) = u_{xx}(\ell, t), \quad \widetilde{\phi}(\omega, t) := \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \phi(t') dt'. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Inverting the global relation for $k \in \mathbb{R}$ via (A.1), we obtain the following integral representation for the solution:

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, t) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ikx+i\omega t} \left[\widehat{u}_0(k) - i \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(k, t') dt' \right] dk \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ikx+i\omega t} \left[\beta \widetilde{g}_2(\omega, t) + i(\beta k - \alpha) \widetilde{g}_1(\omega, t) - (\beta k^2 - \alpha k - \delta) \widetilde{g}_0(\omega, t) \right] dk \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ik(\ell-x)+i\omega t} \left[\beta \widetilde{h}_2(\omega, t) + i(\beta k - \alpha) \widetilde{h}_1(\omega, t) - (\beta k^2 - \alpha k - \delta) \widetilde{h}_0(\omega, t) \right] dk. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

This expression is not an explicit formula for the solution because it contains the unknown boundary values g_1, g_2, h_2 through their respective time transforms defined by (A.3). The key idea behind the unified transform is to combine

the fact that these transforms depend on k only through ω with appropriate symmetries of ω in the complex k -plane which, therefore, leave the transforms invariant.

The first step in the implementation of the above plan is to perform appropriate contour deformations by exploiting analyticity and exponential decay. Indeed, motivated by the decay of the exponentials involved in (A.4), and thanks to the fact that the relevant integrands are entire in k , we use Cauchy's theorem to deform the contours of integration of the second and third integrals in (A.4) from \mathbb{R} to the positively oriented boundaries $\partial\tilde{D}_0$ and $\partial\tilde{D}_+ \cup \partial\tilde{D}_-$, respectively, where the regions $\tilde{D}_0, \tilde{D}_+, \tilde{D}_-$ are defined by (2.8) and shown in Figure 2.1. We note that these regions are obtained by puncturing the regions D_0, D_+, D_- (given by (2.7) and shown in Figure A.1) by a disk of radius R_Δ (given by (2.9)) centered at $\frac{\alpha}{3\beta}$. This is done proactively, now that the integrands are still entire in k , in order to ensure that neither the branch cut introduced later for the symmetries of ω (see discussion below (A.6)) nor the zeros of the quantity Δ given by (2.5), which will eventually appear in the denominator of our integrands, are enclosed by the deformed contours of integration. Eventually, by Cauchy's theorem and use of the exponential decay, we arrive at the modified integral representation

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, t) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ikx+i\omega t} \left[\hat{u}_0(k) - i \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \hat{f}(k, t') dt' \right] dk \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial\tilde{D}_0} e^{ikx+i\omega t} \left[\beta \tilde{g}_2(\omega, t) + i(\beta k - \alpha) \tilde{g}_1(\omega, t) - (\beta k^2 - \alpha k - \delta) \tilde{g}_0(\omega, t) \right] dk \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial\tilde{D}_+ \cup \partial\tilde{D}_-} e^{-ik(\ell-x)+i\omega t} \left[\beta \tilde{h}_2(\omega, t) + i(\beta k - \alpha) \tilde{h}_1(\omega, t) - (\beta k^2 - \alpha k - \delta) \tilde{h}_0(\omega, t) \right] dk. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$




FIGURE A.1. The regions D_0, D_+, D_- depending on the sign of the quantity $\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta$.

The symmetries of ω can be identified by solving the equation $\omega(\nu) = \omega(k)$ for $\nu = \nu(k)$. There are three solutions to this polynomial equation: the trivial solution $\nu_0 = k$, and two nontrivial solutions given by ν_\pm in (2.6). The latter solutions involve the complex square root

$$\left[\left(k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right)^2 - \frac{4}{9\beta^2} (\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

which is made single-valued by introducing an appropriate branch cut in the complex k -plane as follows. When $\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta > 0$, (A.6) has two real branch points given by

$$b_\pm = \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \pm \frac{2}{3\beta} \sqrt{\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Then, taking a branch cut from b_- to b_+ along the real line, we define

$$\left[\left(k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right)^2 - \frac{4}{9\beta^2} (\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} = [(k - b_-)(k - b_+)]^{\frac{1}{2}} = \sqrt{r_- r_+} e^{i\frac{\theta_- + \theta_+}{2}}, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where the radii $r_\pm \geq 0$ and the counterclockwise angles $\theta_\pm \in [0, 2\pi)$ are shown in Figure 2.1. When $\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta < 0$, the branch points of (A.6) are complex and given by

$$b_\pm = \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \pm \frac{2}{3\beta} i \sqrt{|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Thus, we define r_{\pm} as before but measure the counterclockwise angles $\theta_{\pm} \in [0, 2\pi)$ from the rays emanating vertically from b_{\pm} , resulting in the following definition for (A.6):

$$\left[\left(k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right)^2 - \frac{4}{9\beta^2} (\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} = [(k - b_-)(k - b_+)]^{\frac{1}{2}} = \sqrt{r_- r_+} e^{i \frac{\theta_- + \theta_+ + \pi}{2}}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Finally, when $\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta = 0$, the zeros of the radicand in (A.6) coincide at $b_{\pm} = \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}$. Therefore, since both signs are already present in (2.6), we simply define (A.6) to be

$$\left[\left(k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right)^2 - \frac{4}{9\beta^2} (\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} = k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

At this point, we provide an alternative characterization of the regions \tilde{D}_0 , \tilde{D}_+ , \tilde{D}_- that will be useful when employing the symmetries of ω later. We begin with the following observation:

Lemma A.1. *Let $k \in \mathbb{C}$ off the branch cut of ν_{\pm} . Then, $\text{Im}(\omega) < 0$ if and only if $\text{Im}(\nu_0) \text{Im}(\nu_+) \text{Im}(\nu_-) > 0$. Moreover, the zeros of $\text{Im}(\nu_0) \text{Im}(\nu_+) \text{Im}(\nu_-)$ and of $\text{Im}(\omega)$, excluding those that may lie on the branch cut, are identical. In other words, off the branch cut, the sign of $\text{Im}(\nu_0) \text{Im}(\nu_+) \text{Im}(\nu_-)$ is the opposite of the sign of $\text{Im}(\omega)$.*

Proof. Letting $c = \frac{\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta}{3\beta^2}$ and $z = k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}$, we compute

$$\text{Im}(\nu_{\pm}) = -\frac{1}{2} \text{Im}(z) \pm \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \text{Re} \left[\left(z^2 - \frac{4}{3}c \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right], \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Applying the identities $[\text{Re}(\zeta^{\frac{1}{2}})]^2 = \frac{1}{2} (|\zeta| + \text{Re}(\zeta))$ and $[\text{Im}(\zeta^{\frac{1}{2}})]^2 = \frac{1}{2} (|\zeta| - \text{Re}(\zeta))$, which are valid for any $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$, and multiplying by conjugates, we eventually obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im}(\nu_+) \text{Im}(\nu_-) &= \frac{1}{8} \left(4c + 5 [\text{Im}(z)]^2 - 3 [\text{Re}(z)]^2 - 3 \left| z^2 - \frac{4}{3}c \right| \right) \\ &= \left(c + [\text{Im}(z)]^2 - 3 [\text{Re}(z)]^2 \right) \frac{[\text{Im}(z)]^2}{[\text{Im}(z)]^2 + \frac{3}{2} \left[\left| z^2 - \frac{4}{3}c \right| - \text{Re} \left(z^2 - \frac{4}{3}c \right) \right]} = H(k)Z(k), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where

$$H(k) := \frac{\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta}{3\beta^2} + [\text{Im}(k)]^2 - 3 \left[\text{Re} \left(k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right) \right]^2, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$$Z(k) := \frac{[\text{Im}(k)]^2}{[\text{Im}(k)]^2 + 3 \left[\text{Im} \left(\left[\left(k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right)^2 - \frac{4}{9\beta^2} (\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right]^2}. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Recall that the branch cut is excluded from the lemma. Furthermore, Z is undefined when $\text{Im}(k) = 0$ (which implies that the radicand must be real) and, at the same time, $\left(k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right)^2 - \frac{4}{9\beta^2} (\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta) \geq 0$. When k is real and not on the branch cut, the second condition will always hold. Hence, Z is undefined precisely on the real axis. However, it can be seen directly that these values of k behave consistently with the lemma, as $\text{Im}(\omega) = \text{Im}(\nu_0) \text{Im}(\nu_+) \text{Im}(\nu_-) = 0$ for $k \in \mathbb{R}$. Otherwise, for $k \notin \mathbb{R}$ and off the branch cut, Z is well-defined and positive. Since $\text{Im}(\omega) = -\beta \text{Im}(k)H(k)$ in view of (2.17), and $\text{Im}(\nu_0) \text{Im}(\nu_+) \text{Im}(\nu_-) = \text{Im}(k)H(k)Z(k)$, the lemma follows. \blacksquare

Lemma A.1 identifies D as the region where $\text{Im}(\nu_0) \text{Im}(\nu_+) \text{Im}(\nu_-) > 0$ (up to a portion of the branch cut that is missing in the case $\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta < 0$). However, it would be helpful if we could characterize the three regions D_0 , D_+ , D_- individually. This is accomplished by the next lemma.

Lemma A.2. *For each $n \in \{0, +, -\}$, the set D_n without the branch cut consists of precisely those values of k that do not lie on the branch cut and are such that $\text{Im}(\nu_n) > 0$ and the remaining two symmetries have negative imaginary parts.*

Proof. Let k be a point off the branch cut. Suppose first that $k \notin D = D_0 \cup D_+ \cup D_-$ so that $\text{Im}(\omega) \geq 0$. Then, by Lemma A.1, it must be that $\text{Im}(\nu_0) \text{Im}(\nu_+) \text{Im}(\nu_-) \leq 0$ and hence it is impossible to have one symmetry with a positive imaginary part and the other two with negative imaginary parts. This implies that the conditions on the imaginary parts of the symmetries described by the lemma will not be satisfied.

Now suppose that $k \in D$ and not on the branch cut so that, again by Lemma A.1, we have $\text{Im}(\nu_0) \text{Im}(\nu_+) \text{Im}(\nu_-) > 0$. For this inequality to hold, either exactly two factors must be negative or all three must

be positive. It turns out that the latter case can never happen. To see this, recall that the symmetries satisfy the equation $\beta\nu^3 - \alpha\nu^2 - \delta\nu - \beta k^3 + \alpha k^2 - \delta k = 0$. Thus, by Vieta's formula, $\nu_0 + \nu_+ + \nu_- = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}$, so

$$\text{Im}(\nu_0) + \text{Im}(\nu_+) + \text{Im}(\nu_-) = 0. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

As all three imaginary parts cannot be positive simultaneously, exactly one of $\text{Im}(\nu_0)$, $\text{Im}(\nu_+)$, and $\text{Im}(\nu_-)$ must be positive. By continuity of each symmetry (which, in D , is only lost when crossing the branch cut in the case that $\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta < 0$), we can check one point in each of D_0 , D_+ , and D_- to determine the signs of the symmetries in the entirety of the region. This process results in the characterization given by the lemma. ■

The following lemma expands the results of Lemma A.1 to include the boundary of D .

Lemma A.3 (Characterization of \overline{D}_n beyond the branch points). *Suppose $k \in \mathbb{C}$ is such that $|k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}| \geq \sqrt{6}|b_{\pm} - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}| = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3\beta}}\sqrt{|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}$ and let $n \in \{0, +, -\}$.*

- (i) *$k \in \overline{D}_n$ if and only if $\text{Im}(\nu_n) > 0$ and the other two symmetries have nonpositive imaginary parts. Moreover, if $k \in \overline{D}_n$, then these two remaining symmetries will simultaneously have zero imaginary parts if and only if $\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta = 0$ and $k = \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}$.*
- (ii) *If $k \in \overline{D}_n$, then $\text{Im}(\nu_n)$ is bounded below by a constant multiple of $|k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|$. Specifically,*

$$\text{Im}(\nu_0) \geq \frac{\sqrt{23}}{4\sqrt{2}} \left|k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}\right|, \quad k \in \overline{D}_0, \quad \text{Im}(\nu_{\pm}) \geq \frac{1}{4} \left|k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}\right|, \quad k \in \overline{D}_{\pm}. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Remark A.1. In the special case of $\beta = 1$, $\alpha = \delta = 0$, in which the linear higher-order Schrödinger equation in (1.9) reduces to the Airy equation, the results of Lemma A.3 are trivial. Indeed, the symmetries simplify to $\nu_0 = k$, $\nu_+ = e^{i\frac{2\pi}{3}}k$, $\nu_- = e^{i\frac{4\pi}{3}}k$ and the sets $\{k \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Im}(\nu_n) > 0\}$ for $n \in \{0, +, -\}$ are simply rotations of the upper half-plane. For each choice of n , asserting that $\text{Im}(\nu_n) > 0$ and the other two symmetries have nonpositive real part clearly corresponds to the region \overline{D}_n (refer to the case $\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta = 0$ in Figure A.1). Lemma A.3 establishes that the same basic behavior holds for all valid choices of parameters β, α, δ , even though the regions D_n are more complicated and the symmetries are no longer simple rotations of k .

Proof. (i) Suppose $k \in \overline{D}_n$ lies beyond the branch points in the sense implied by the statement of the lemma. If $k \in D_n$, then Lemma A.2 proves (i). Therefore, we will focus on the boundaries of D_n that are beyond the branch points. Suppose k is on the real axis. Obviously $\text{Im}(\nu_0) = 0$, and by (A.12) together with (A.8), (A.10), (A.11), and the fact that we are beyond the branch points, $\text{Im}(\nu_{\pm})$ are both nonzero with opposite signs. To maintain their continuity, their signs should be the same as if they were in D_n , so (i) is consistent on the real axis.

If k lies on the hyperbola (or, in the case of $\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta = 0$, the diagonal lines) defining part of ∂D_n , then by (A.13) at least one of $\text{Im}(\nu_{\pm})$ is zero. However, since we are not on the real axis, (A.16) requires that exactly one must be zero and the other has the opposite sign of $\text{Im}(\nu_0)$. This is sufficient to prove the case of $k \in \overline{D}_0$. For $k \in \overline{D}_+$ on the hyperbola, because the imaginary parts ν_0, ν_- must have matching signs within D_+ , we can use continuity to claim that $\text{Im}(\nu_-)$ cannot have the opposite sign of $\text{Im}(\nu_0)$ on the hyperbola. Hence, it must be the case that $\text{Im}(\nu_+) > 0$ to balance the negativity of $\text{Im}(\nu_0)$, while $\text{Im}(\nu_-)$ becomes zero. The argument is similar for \overline{D}_- .

Now suppose that, for some k beyond the branch points, $\text{Im}(\nu_n) > 0$ and the other two symmetries have nonpositive imaginary parts. If both of the latter two symmetries have negative imaginary parts, then $k \in D_n \subseteq \overline{D}_n$ by Lemma A.2. Note that the imaginary parts of these two symmetries cannot vanish simultaneously, because then (A.16) would be violated. Thus, assume that exactly one of them has zero imaginary part. Given an arbitrarily small neighborhood of k , we can always find a point in that neighborhood such that the imaginary part of this symmetry becomes negative, which implies that $k \in \overline{D}_n$. For example, if we have that $\text{Im}(\nu_0) > 0$, $\text{Im}(\nu_+) = 0$, and $\text{Im}(\nu_-) < 0$, then in light of (A.12), we can adjust k by an arbitrarily small amount in such a way that $\text{Re}\left(\left[\left(k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}\right)^2 - \frac{4}{9\beta^2}(\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)$ remains constant, $\text{Im}(k)$ increases, and $\text{Im}(\nu_0)$, $\text{Im}(\nu_-)$ maintain their signs. Since this new point satisfies $\text{Im}(\nu_0) > 0$ and the other symmetries have negative imaginary parts, this point belongs to D_0 , so $k \in \overline{D}_0$.

- (ii) Starting from $\text{Im}(\nu_0) = \text{Im}(k)$ in \overline{D}_0 , we write $\text{Im}(k) = |k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}| \sin \theta$, where $\theta = \arg(k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta})$. Taking into consideration the geometries shown in Figure A.1, the smallest possible value of $\sin \theta$ will occur in the case

$\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta > 0$ at the point where the hyperbola is closest to the real axis. This happens where the hyperbola is a distance of $\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3\beta}}\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta}$ away from $\frac{\alpha}{3\beta}$, as this is where we stop considering \overline{D}_0 . Here, (A.14) implies that if k is on the hyperbola in ∂D_0 and $|k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}| = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3\beta}}\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta}$, then $\sin^2 \theta \geq \frac{23}{32}$ so $\text{Im}(\nu_0) \geq \frac{\sqrt{23}}{4\sqrt{2}}|k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|$.

As for $k \in \overline{D}_\pm$, (A.12), (A.8), (A.10) and (A.11) imply

$$\text{Im}(\nu_\pm) \geq \pm \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \text{Re} \left(\left[\left(k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right)^2 - \frac{4}{9\beta^2} (\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \left| \text{Re} \left(\left[\left(k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right)^2 - \frac{4}{9\beta^2} (\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right|.$$

Using the identity $[\text{Re}(\zeta^{\frac{1}{2}})]^2 = \frac{1}{2} (|\zeta| + \text{Re}(\zeta))$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$, along with the half-angle formula, we eventually find

$$\text{Im}(\nu_\pm) \geq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \left| k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right| \sqrt{\cos^2(\theta) - \frac{2(|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta| + \alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta)}{9\beta^2 \left| k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right|^2}},$$

where again $\theta = \arg(k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta})$. If $\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta \leq 0$, then the above inequality becomes $\text{Im}(\nu_\pm) \geq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \left| k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right| |\cos \theta|$ and we need to find a lower bound for $|\cos \theta|$. According to (A.14), if $\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta \leq 0$, then the hyperbola is at a distance $\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3\beta}}\sqrt{|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}$ from $\frac{\alpha}{3\beta}$ when $(k_R - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta})^2 = \frac{7|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}{12\beta^2}$. Therefore, $\cos^2(\theta) \geq \frac{7}{32}$, which implies $\text{Im}(\nu_\pm) \geq \frac{\sqrt{7}}{4\sqrt{2}} \left| k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right|$. If instead $\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta > 0$, then using the fact that $|k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}| \geq \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3\beta}}\sqrt{|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}$ we have

$$\frac{2 \left[|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta| + (\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta) \right]}{9\beta^2 \left| k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right|^2} = \frac{4|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}{9\beta^2 \left| k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right|^2} \leq \frac{1}{6}$$

so, since in that case $\cos(\theta) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ due to the angle of the asymptotes of the hyperbola, we obtain

$$\text{Im}(\nu_\pm) \geq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \left| k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right| \sqrt{\cos^2(\theta) - \frac{1}{6}} \geq \frac{1}{4} \left| k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right|$$

concluding the proof of the lemma. ■

With a more thorough understanding of the region D , we are ready to employ the symmetries ν_\pm in order to remove the unknown terms from the integral representation (A.5). Returning to the global relation (A.2) and replacing k by ν_+ and ν_- gives rise to the two additional relations

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-i\omega t} \widehat{u}(\nu_+, t) &= \widehat{u}_0(\nu_+) - i \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(\nu_+, t') dt' + \beta \widetilde{g}_2(\omega, t) + i(\beta\nu_+ - \alpha) \widetilde{g}_1(\omega, t) - (\beta\nu_+^2 - \alpha\nu_+ - \delta) \widetilde{g}_0(\omega, t) \\ &\quad - e^{-i\nu_+ t} \left[\beta \widetilde{h}_2(\omega, t) + i(\beta\nu_+ - \alpha) \widetilde{h}_1(\omega, t) - (\beta\nu_+^2 - \alpha\nu_+ - \delta) \widetilde{h}_0(\omega, t) \right], \quad k \in \mathbb{C}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-i\omega t} \widehat{u}(\nu_-, t) &= \widehat{u}_0(\nu_-) - i \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(\nu_-, t') dt' + \beta \widetilde{g}_2(\omega, t) + i(\beta\nu_- - \alpha) \widetilde{g}_1(\omega, t) - (\beta\nu_-^2 - \alpha\nu_- - \delta) \widetilde{g}_0(\omega, t) \\ &\quad - e^{-i\nu_- t} \left[\beta \widetilde{h}_2(\omega, t) + i(\beta\nu_- - \alpha) \widetilde{h}_1(\omega, t) - (\beta\nu_-^2 - \alpha\nu_- - \delta) \widetilde{h}_0(\omega, t) \right], \quad k \in \mathbb{C}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

The two identities (A.18) and (A.19) together with the original global relation (A.2) are valid for all values of $k \in \widetilde{D}$ and can be treated as a 3×3 linear system for the unknown transforms $\beta \widetilde{g}_2(\omega, t)$, $\widetilde{g}_1(\omega, t)$, $\beta \widetilde{h}_2(\omega, t)$. Solving this system for these unknowns and substituting the resulting expressions into the integral representation (A.5) while simplifying using Vieta's formulas and the fact that $\omega' = -\beta\mu_+\mu_-$, we eventually obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, t) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ikx+i\omega t} \left[\widehat{u}_0(k) - i \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(k, t') dt' \right] dk \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial \widetilde{D}_0} \frac{e^{ikx+i\omega t}}{\Delta(k)} (\mu_+ e^{-i\nu_+ t} + \mu_- e^{-i\nu_- t}) \left[\widehat{u}_0(k) - i \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(k, t') dt' \right] dk \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial \widetilde{D}_+ \cup \partial \widetilde{D}_-} \frac{e^{-ik(\ell-x)+i\omega t}}{\Delta(k)} \mu_0 \left[\widehat{u}_0(k) - i \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(k, t') dt' \right] dk \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial \widetilde{D}_0 \cup \partial \widetilde{D}_+ \cup \partial \widetilde{D}_-} \frac{e^{-ik(\ell-x)+i\omega t}}{\Delta(k)} \left\{ \mu_+ \left[\widehat{u}_0(\nu_+) - i \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(\nu_+, t') dt' \right] \right. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \mu_- \left[\widehat{u}_0(\nu_-) - i \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(\nu_-, t') dt' \right] - \mu_0 \omega' \widetilde{g}_0(\omega, t) \\
& - (\nu_- e^{-i\nu_+ \ell} - \nu_+ e^{-i\nu_- \ell}) \omega' \widetilde{h}_0(\omega, t) - i (e^{-i\nu_+ \ell} - e^{-i\nu_- \ell}) \omega' \widetilde{h}_1(\omega, t) \Big\} dk \\
& - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial \widetilde{D}_0} \frac{e^{ikx}}{\Delta(k)} \left[-(\mu_+ e^{-i\nu_+ \ell} + \mu_- e^{-i\nu_- \ell}) \widehat{u}(\nu_0, t) + \mu_+ e^{-i\nu_0 \ell} \widehat{u}(\nu_+, t) + \mu_- e^{-i\nu_0 \ell} \widehat{u}(\nu_-, t) \right] dk \\
& - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial \widetilde{D}_+ \cup \partial \widetilde{D}_-} \frac{e^{-ik(\ell-x)}}{\Delta(k)} [\mu_0 \widehat{u}(\nu_0, t) + \mu_+ \widehat{u}(\nu_+, t) + \mu_- \widehat{u}(\nu_-, t)] dk, \tag{A.20}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta(k)$ is defined by (2.5) and we recall that $\nu_0 = k$.

The expression (A.20) still contains unknowns in the form of the transforms $\widehat{u}(\nu_n, t)$, $n \in \{0, +, -\}$. In addition, one needs to ensure that $\Delta(k)$ does not vanish on any of the contours of integration and, furthermore, in the neighborhoods surrounding the zeros of Δ our integrands may lose analyticity, preventing us from using Cauchy's theorem to eliminate the aforementioned unknowns (see relevant argument later). The following lemma guarantees that, if $\Delta(k)$ has any zeros, these do not lie in the closure of $\widetilde{D}_0 \cup \widetilde{D}_+ \cup \widetilde{D}_-$ and hence $\Delta(k)$ is bounded away from zero in that region.

Lemma A.4. *Let $R_\Delta > 0$ be given by (2.9) so that, in particular, R_Δ is greater than the distance $\frac{2}{3\beta} \sqrt{|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}$ of $\frac{\alpha}{3\beta}$ from the branch points, should these exist. Then, there is some number $c > 0$ such that, for any $n \in \{0, +, -\}$, if $|k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}| \geq R_\Delta$ and $k \in \overline{D}_n$ then $|e^{i\nu_n \ell} \Delta(k)| \geq c |k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|$.*

Proof. We begin by noting that the value of R_Δ provided by (2.9) is certainly not optimal as such a task is of no consequence for our purposes. Alongside the fact that $|k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}| > \frac{2}{3\beta} \sqrt{|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}$, repeated application of the triangle inequality yields the bounds

$$\sqrt{3} \left| k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right| \sqrt{1 - \frac{4|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}{9\beta^2 |k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|^2}} \leq |\mu_0| \leq \sqrt{3} \left| k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right| \sqrt{1 + \frac{4|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}{9\beta^2 |k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|^2}}, \tag{A.21}$$

$$\left| k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right| \left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \sqrt{1 + \frac{4|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}{9\beta^2 |k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|^2}} \right) \leq |\mu_\pm| \leq \left| k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right| \left(\frac{3}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \sqrt{1 + \frac{4|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}{9\beta^2 |k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|^2}} \right). \tag{A.22}$$

If $n = 0$, then by the characterization of \overline{D}_0 beyond the branch points given in Lemma A.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|e^{i\nu_0 \ell} \Delta(k)| & \geq |\mu_0| - (|\mu_+| + |\mu_-|) e^{-\text{Im}(\nu_0) \ell} \\
& \geq \left| k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} \right| \left[\sqrt{3} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}{9\beta^2 |k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|^2}} - \left(3 + \sqrt{3} \sqrt{1 + \frac{4|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}{9\beta^2 |k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|^2}} \right) e^{-\text{Im}(\nu_0) \ell} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since $|k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}| \geq \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3\beta}} \sqrt{|\alpha^2 + 3\beta\delta|}$, the two square root containing k on the right-hand side are bounded below by $\frac{\sqrt{5}}{\sqrt{6}}$ and $\frac{\sqrt{7}}{\sqrt{2}}$ respectively. Furthermore, by (A.17) and the fact that $|k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}| \geq \frac{9}{2}$, $\text{Im}(\nu_0) \ell \geq \frac{3\sqrt{23}}{\sqrt{2}}$. Altogether, these bounds combine to produce $|e^{i\nu_0 \ell} \Delta(k)| \geq |k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}| \left[\frac{\sqrt{5}}{\sqrt{2}} - (3 + \frac{\sqrt{7}}{\sqrt{2}}) e^{-\frac{9\sqrt{23}}{4\sqrt{2}}} \right]$ as claimed. For $n \in \{+, -\}$ similar steps result in the inequality $|e^{i\nu_\pm \ell} \Delta(k)| \geq |k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}| \left[\left(\frac{3\sqrt{2} - \sqrt{7}}{2\sqrt{2}} \right) - \left(\frac{3\sqrt{2} + 3\sqrt{7}}{2\sqrt{2}} \right) e^{-\frac{9}{4}} \right]$, concluding the proof. ■

We will now argue that the terms involving the unknowns $\widehat{u}(\nu_n, t)$, $n \in \{0, +, -\}$, on the right-hand side of (A.20) have zero contribution in that expression. This process involves the consideration of the integrals of each term taken over arcs of radius R centered at $\frac{\alpha}{3\beta}$ that subtend the respective \widetilde{D}_n . By Cauchy's theorem and analyticity of the relevant integrands, it suffices to show that the values of these integrals decay uniformly to zero as $R \rightarrow \infty$. For each term containing $\widehat{u}(\nu_n, t)$ within the final two integrals of (A.20) and for any fixed $R = |k - \frac{\alpha}{3\beta}|$, we parametrize the arc by $k = \frac{\alpha}{3\beta} + Re^{i\theta}$ for appropriate bounds on θ so that the arc subtends the associated region \widetilde{D}_n .

The significant factors appearing alongside $\widehat{u}(\nu_n, t)$ are the following. (i) Each term has a factor of $\frac{1}{\Delta(k)} = \frac{e^{i\nu_n \ell}}{e^{i\nu_n \ell} \Delta(k)}$. By Lemma A.4, the behavior of $\frac{1}{\Delta(k)}$ is like $\frac{1}{R} e^{i\nu_n \ell}$. (ii) There is always one factor of μ_0 , μ_+ , or μ_- , whose magnitudes according to (A.21) and (A.22) behave as factors of R . (iii) In view of the definition (A.1), the transform $\widehat{u}(\nu_n, t)$ contains the exponential $e^{-i\nu_n y}$ (here, n does not necessarily correspond with the region \widetilde{D}_n).

(iv) A factor of $iRe^{i\theta}$ appears due to the parametrization. (v) Finally, any other exponentials appearing explicitly within the term must also be considered. Overall, thanks to Lemma A.3, the aforementioned factors are guaranteed to combine to produce uniform exponential decay. Therefore, the final two integrals in (A.20) vanish, resulting in the explicit solution formula

$$\begin{aligned}
u(x, t) = & \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ikx+i\omega t} \left[\widehat{u}_0(k) - i \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(k, t') dt' \right] dk \\
& - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial \widetilde{D}_0} \frac{e^{ikx+i\omega t}}{\Delta(k)} (\mu_+ e^{-i\nu_+ \ell} + \mu_- e^{-i\nu_- \ell}) \left[\widehat{u}_0(k) - i \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(k, t') dt' \right] dk \\
& + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial \widetilde{D}_+ \cup \partial \widetilde{D}_-} \frac{e^{-ik(\ell-x)+i\omega t}}{\Delta(k)} \mu_0 \left[\widehat{u}_0(k) - i \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(k, t') dt' \right] dk \\
& + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial \widetilde{D}_0 \cup \partial \widetilde{D}_+ \cup \partial \widetilde{D}_-} \frac{e^{-ik(\ell-x)+i\omega t}}{\Delta(k)} \left\{ \mu_+ \left[\widehat{u}_0(\nu_+) - i \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(\nu_+, t') dt' \right] \right. \\
& \quad + \mu_- \left[\widehat{u}_0(\nu_-) - i \int_0^t e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(\nu_-, t') dt' \right] - \mu_0 \omega' \widetilde{g}_0(\omega, t) \\
& \quad \left. - (\nu_- e^{-i\nu_+ \ell} - \nu_+ e^{-i\nu_- \ell}) \omega' \widetilde{h}_0(\omega, t) - i (e^{-i\nu_+ \ell} - e^{-i\nu_- \ell}) \omega' \widetilde{h}_1(\omega, t) \right\} dk.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.23}$$

The final step in the derivation of the unified transform solution (1.14) consists in replacing the time transforms of the boundary data and the forcing in formula (A.23) by

$$\widetilde{g}_0(\omega, T), \quad \widetilde{h}_0(\omega, T), \quad \widetilde{h}_1(\omega, T), \quad \int_0^T e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(k, t') dt'$$

for any fixed $T > t$. We emphasize that this task is not necessary for obtaining the solution to problem (1.9), since (A.23) is indeed an explicit solution formula that contains only known terms. However, replacing the variable t by a fixed T in the above transforms facilitates significantly the analysis of Section 2 that leads to the proofs of Theorems 2.1 and 2.3 for the Sobolev and Strichartz estimates of the reduced initial-boundary value problem (2.1), which as already noted play the key role in establishing the general linear estimates of Theorem 1.3.

The replacement described above amounts to showing that the quantities

$$\int_t^T e^{-i\omega t'} g_0(t') dt', \quad \int_t^T e^{-i\omega t'} h_0(t') dt', \quad \int_t^T e^{-i\omega t'} h_1(t') dt', \quad \int_t^T e^{-i\omega t'} \widehat{f}(k, t') dt' \tag{A.24}$$

have zero contributions when replacing the relevant transforms in the last three k -integrals of (A.23). Therefore, replacing t with T inside these transforms does not alter (A.23) and results in the desired solution formula (1.14). We refer to (A.24) as the tilde transform augmentations of the associated functions.

We proceed as before with an argument relying on Cauchy's theorem similar to the one used for eliminating $\widehat{u}(\nu_n, t)$ from (A.20). The main difference is that the exponential $e^{-i\omega t'}$ appears from the tilde transform augmentation instead of the exponential $e^{-i\nu_n y}$, which is no longer present. We also have the occasional factor of ω' , which behaves like R^2 . As before, all terms in consideration can be shown to display uniform exponential decay, except for those terms corresponding to the boundary data h_0 and h_1 in the regions \widetilde{D}_{\pm} , which become oscillatory as we approach the real axis. For these terms, we first integrate by parts within the tilde transform augmentation. This produces an extra factor of $\frac{1}{\omega}$, which behaves like R^{-3} . Hence, while we lose uniform exponential decay, we have uniform algebraic decay of order R^{-1} in the case of h_0 and R^{-2} in the case of h_1 . Consequently, the integrals (A.24) vanish when substituted in place of their associated time transforms in (A.23), as claimed.