

LOCAL WELL-POSEDNESS OF THE INITIAL VALUE PROBLEM FOR A FOURTH-ORDER NONLINEAR DISPERSIVE SYSTEM ON THE REAL LINE

EIJI ONODERA

ABSTRACT. This paper investigates the initial value problem for a system of one-dimensional fourth-order dispersive partial differential-integral equations with nonlinearity involving derivatives up to second order. Examples of the system arise in relation with nonlinear science and geometric analysis. Applying the energy method based on the idea of a gauge transformation and Bona-Smith approximation technique, we prove that the initial value problem is time-locally well-posed on the real line for initial data in a Sobolev space with high regularity.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper investigates the initial value problem for an n -component system of fourth-order nonlinear dispersive partial differential-integral equations on the real line:

$$(\partial_t - iM_a\partial_x^4 - M_b\partial_x^3 - iM_\lambda\partial_x^2)Q = F(Q, \partial_x Q, \partial_x^2 Q) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (1.1)$$

$$Q(0, x) = Q_0(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \quad (1.2)$$

where n is a positive integer, $Q = {}^t(Q_1, \dots, Q_n)(t, x) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ is an unknown function, $Q_0 = {}^t(Q_{01}, \dots, Q_{0n})(x) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ is a given initial function, $i = \sqrt{-1}$, $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in (\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^n$, $M_a = \text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $M_b = \text{diag}(b_1, \dots, b_n)$, $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $M_\lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$, and

$$F(Q, \partial_x Q, \partial_x^2 Q) = {}^t(F_1(Q, \partial_x Q, \partial_x^2 Q), \dots, F_n(Q, \partial_x Q, \partial_x^2 Q))$$

is a nonlinear expression of Q , $\partial_x Q$, $\partial_x^2 Q$ and their complex conjugates \overline{Q} , $\overline{\partial_x Q}$, $\overline{\partial_x^2 Q}$. It is supposed that each of $F_j(Q, \partial_x Q, \partial_x^2 Q)$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ takes the form

$$F_j(Q, \partial_x Q, \partial_x^2 Q) = F_j^1(Q, \partial_x^2 Q) + F_j^2(Q, \partial_x Q) + F_j^3(Q, \partial_x Q),$$

$$F_j^3(Q, \partial_x Q)(t, x) = \sum_{r=1}^n \left(\int_{-\infty}^x F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q, \partial_x Q)(t, y) dy \right) F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q)(t, x),$$

and all of the following conditions (F1)-(F3) are satisfied:

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35E15, 35G55, 35Q99, 58J99.

Key words and phrases. System of nonlinear fourth-order dispersive partial differential equations; Local well-posedness; Generalized bi-Schrödinger flow; Gauge transformation; Bona-Smith approximation .

(F1) $F_j^1(u, w)$ for each $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ is a complex-valued polynomial in $u, \bar{u}, w, \bar{w} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfying

$$|F_j^1(u, w)| \leq c_j^1 |u|^2 |w| \quad \text{for any } u, w \in \mathbb{C}^n, \quad (1.3)$$

where $c_j^1 > 0$ is a constant which may depend on j but not on u, w .

(F2) There exist integers $d_1, d_2 \geq 0$ such that $F_j^2(u, v)$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ is a complex-valued polynomial in $u, \bar{u}, v, \bar{v} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfying

$$|F_j^2(u, v)| \leq c_j^2 \sum_{p_1=0}^{d_1} \sum_{p_2=0}^{d_2} |u|^{1+p_1} |v|^{p_2} \quad \text{for any } u, v \in \mathbb{C}^n, \quad (1.4)$$

where $c_j^2 > 0$ is a positive constant which may depend on j but not on u, v .

(F3) There exist integers $d_3, d_4, d_5 \geq 0$ such that $F_{j,r}^{3,A}(u, v)$ and $F_{j,r}^{3,B}(u)$ for all $j, r \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ are respectively complex-valued polynomials in $u, \bar{u}, v, \bar{v} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and in $u, \bar{u} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfying

$$|F_{j,r}^{3,A}(u, v)| \leq c_{j,r} \left(\sum_{p_3=0}^{d_3} |u|^{2+p_3} + \sum_{p_4=0}^{d_4} |v|^{2+p_4} \right) \quad \text{for any } u, v \in \mathbb{C}^n, \quad (1.5)$$

$$|F_{j,r}^{3,B}(u)| \leq c_{j,r} \sum_{p_5=0}^{d_5} |u|^{1+p_5} \quad \text{for any } u \in \mathbb{C}^n, \quad (1.6)$$

where $c_{j,r} > 0$ is a positive constants which may depend on j, r but not on u, v .

Examples of (1.1) satisfying (F1)-(F3) with nonlinearity involving derivatives up to second order arise in some fields of nonlinear science, in which the nonlocal terms satisfying (F3) are not involved, that is, $F_j^3(Q, \partial_x Q) \equiv 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. They include single equations (in the case of $n = 1$) which are related to the vortex filament ([11, 12]), continuum models of Heisenberg spin chain systems ([6, 24, 34]) and alpha-helical proteins ([7]). (See (2.1) in Section 2.) They also include an n -component system to study the wave propagation of n distinct ultrashort optical fields in a fiber ([43]). (See (2.2) in Section 2.)

Examples of (1.1) satisfying (F1)-(F2) and (F3) with non-vanishing nonlocal terms have their origin in geometric dispersive partial differential equations (PDEs) having been investigated in [8, 9, 32]. The geometric equations describe the evolution of a map $u(t, \cdot) : M \rightarrow N$, where M is a Riemannian manifold and N is a Kähler (or para-Kähler) manifold. It can be also said that they describe a curve flow on N if $M = \mathbb{R}$. Roughly speaking, each of them can be transformed to a system of nonlinear fourth-order dispersive PDEs for complex-valued functions (including the case of a single equation) if $M = \mathbb{R}$ with Euclidean metric, and the derived system satisfies the structure of (1.1) with (F1)-(F3) under some geometric assumptions on the Kähler manifold N . The component n of (1.1) in this context is equivalent to the complex dimension of N . The transformation can be comprehensively regarded as a kind of the so-called generalized Hasimoto transformation. (See (2.3), (2.4), and (2.6) in Section 2.)

Our goal of this paper is to show (1.1)-(1.2) is time-locally well-posed for initial data in a Sobolev space with high regularity. This is an attempt to present a framework that can solve the initial value problem for the examples mentioned above comprehensively. This is also an attempt to interpret the solvable structure of the above geometric dispersive PDEs for curve flows with values into N of complex-dimension $n \geq 2$, in the level of the system (1.1) for \mathbb{C}^n -valued functions. Applying the energy method based on the idea of a gauge transformation and Bona-Smith approximation technique, we prove (1.1)-(1.2) is time-locally well-posed in Sobolev space $H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ for integer $m \geq 4$ (Theorem 3.1). Time local well-posedness for systems (except for the case of a single equation) of fourth-order dispersive PDEs for complex-valued functions with nonlinearity involving derivatives up to second order seems to be established for the first time in this paper, with or without nonlocal terms. See Section 3 for other contributions of our results and for related known results.

The strategy and the idea to prove our main results (Theorem 3.1) are outlined in Section 4. The idea of the gauge transformation is to bring out the local smoothing effect of dispersive equations on \mathbb{R} and overcomes the difficulty of the loss of derivatives occurred from the nonlinear terms $F_j^1(Q, \partial_x^2 Q)$ and $F_j^2(Q, \partial_x Q)$ with the conditions (F2) and (F3). The idea is motivated from [4] which investigated a fourth-order geometric dispersive PDE for curve flows on a compact Kähler manifold. For better readability of the idea and our proof, we additionally illustrate the idea with the initial value problem for a linear dispersive PDE for complex-valued functions, showing Proposition 4.1. On the other hand, the Bona-Smith approximation technique is often useful to derive the continuous dependence of the solution with respect to the initial data, which is also the case for our problem. Not only that, we adopt the technique to construct a time-local solution, the difficulty of which comes from the presence of nonlocal terms in $F_j^3(Q, \partial_x Q)$ with the condition (F3). See Section 4 and Remark 5.2 in Section 5 for the detail.

The framework presented in this paper is certainly applicable to all the examples mentioned above comprehensively, whereas Theorems 3.1 may still has a room for improvement from the viewpoint of mathematical analysis of nonlinear PDEs. Our proof heavily relies on the idea of the gauge transformation in [4] and the local smoothing effect for dispersive PDEs brought out via it is not sharp as is pointed out in [4]. If we can make full use of the smoothing effect via another method and avoid any obstructions due to the presence of nonlocal terms, then the assumption on the regularity of the data will be improved or the conditions on the nonlinearity will be relaxed. Moreover, it seems that our proof of Theorem 3.1 handles (1.1) as if it is close to n -pieces of single equations for complex-valued functions which can be investigated separately, and does not make use of the structure of (1.1) as a system. For example, if we can provide a classification of (1.1) in terms of the regularity of the Sobolev space based on the dispersion coefficients and other coefficients of nonlinear terms, it will be more interesting. These directions are not pursued in this paper, although they seem to be worth investigating.

The organization of the present paper is as follows: In Section 2, we review the background of (1.1) satisfying (F1)-(F3) in more detail. In Section 3, we state Theorem 3.1 and the contribution. In Section 4 and Appendix, we illustrate the strategy and the idea of the proof of Theorem 3.1. In Sections 5-7, we complete the proof of Theorem 3.1.

NOTATION USED THROUGHOUT THIS PAPER

Different positive constants are sometimes denoted by the same C for simplicity, if there seems to be no confusion. Expressions such as $C = C(\cdot, \dots, \cdot)$, $C_k = C_k(\cdot, \dots, \cdot)$, and $D_k = D_k(\cdot, \dots, \cdot)$ are used to show the dependency on quantities appearing in parenthesis. Other symbols to denote a constant are explained on each occasion. For nonnegative integers j and k , the set of integers ℓ with $j \leq \ell \leq j + k$ is denoted by $\{j, \dots, j + k\}$. The partial differentiation for functions is written by ∂ or the subscript, e.g., $\partial_x f$, f_x .

For any $z = {}^t(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ and $w = {}^t(w_1, \dots, w_n)$ in \mathbb{C}^n , their inner product is defined by $z \cdot w = \sum_{j=1}^n z_j \overline{w_j}$, and the norm of z is by $|z| = (z \cdot z)^{1/2}$. (Although the same $|\cdot|$ is often used to denote the absolute value of a complex number in \mathbb{C} , the author expects it does not cause great confusion.) Moreover, we set

$$g(z) = |z|^2 \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{C}^n, \quad (1.7)$$

which will be used for readability of the role of (F1) and our gauge transformation.

The L^2 -space of \mathbb{C}^n -valued functions on \mathbb{R} is denoted by $L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ being the set of all measurable functions $f = {}^t(f_1, \dots, f_n) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ such that

$$\|f\|_{L^2} := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(x)|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_j(x) \overline{f_j(x)} dx \right)^{1/2} < \infty.$$

The L^2 -type Sobolev space for a nonnegative integer k is denoted by $H^k(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ being the set of all measurable functions $f = {}^t(f_1, \dots, f_n) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $\partial_x^\ell f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ for all $\ell \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. The norm $\|f\|_{H^k}$ of $f \in H^k(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ is defined by

$$\|f\|_{H^k} := \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^k \|\partial_x^\ell f\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Moreover, $H^\infty(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ denotes the intersection of all $H^k(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ for nonnegative integers k . Furthermore, $C([t_1, t_2]; H^k(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$ denotes the Banach space of $H^k(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ -valued continuous functions on the interval $[t_1, t_2]$ with the norm $\|Q\|_{C([t_1, t_2]; H^k)} :=$

$$\sup_{t \in [t_1, t_2]} \|Q(t, \cdot)\|_{H^k}.$$

2. BACKGROUND OF (1.1)

This section aims at reviewing the background of (1.1) satisfying (F1)-(F3) more concretely.

First, (1.1) is a multi-component extension of the single nonlinear dispersive partial differential equation (PDE):

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t - i\nu\partial_x^4 - i\partial_x^2)\psi &= \mu_1|\psi|^2\psi + \mu_2|\psi|^4\psi + \mu_3(\partial_x\psi)^2\bar{\psi} + \mu_4|\partial_x\psi|^2\psi \\ &+ \mu_5\psi^2\bar{\partial_x^2\psi} + \mu_6|\psi|^2\partial_x^2\psi \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

for $\psi = \psi(t, x) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, where μ_j for $j \in \{1, \dots, 6\}$ and $\nu \neq 0$ are real constants. The equation arises in relation with the continuum limit of a one-dimensional isotropic Heisenberg ferromagnetic spin chain systems with nearest neighbor bilinear and bi-quadratic exchange interaction ([24, 34]), the continuum limit of a one-dimensional anisotropic Heisenberg ferromagnetic spin chain systems with octupole-dipole interaction ([6]), the three-dimensional motion of a vortex filament with elliptical deformation effect of the core in an incompressible viscous fluid ([11, 12]), and the molecular excitations along the hydrogen bonding spine in an alpha-helical protein with higher-order molecular interactions([7]).

Second, (1.1) is a fourth-order extension of the system of nonlinear Schrödinger equations which has had much attention to study the interactions of many bodies. The following is the example of (1.1) in this context:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q}_t &= i\alpha \left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{q}_{xx} + \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^*\mathbf{q} \right) - \varepsilon \left[\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{q}_{xxx} + \frac{3}{2}(\mathbf{q}_x\mathbf{q}^*\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^*\mathbf{q}_x) \right] \\ &+ i\gamma \left[\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{q}_{xxxx} + \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{q}_x^*\mathbf{q})_x + \mathbf{q}_x\mathbf{q}_x^*\mathbf{q} \right. \\ &\left. + 2(\mathbf{q}_{xx}\mathbf{q}^*\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^*\mathbf{q}_{xx}) + 3\{\mathbf{q}_x\mathbf{q}^*\mathbf{q}_x + \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{q}^*\mathbf{q})^2\} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

for $\mathbf{q}(t, x) = {}^t(q_1(t, x), \dots, q_n(t, x)) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$, where $\gamma \neq 0$, α and ε are real constants, “*” denotes the Hermitian transpose. It is pointed out in [43] that (2.2) investigates the wave propagation of n distinct ultrashort optical fields in a fiber, and models the broadband, ultrashort pulses propagation.

Third, examples of (1.1) satisfying (F1)-(F2) and (F3) with non-vanishing nonlocal terms have their origin in geometric dispersive PDEs: The equation for the so-called generalized bi-Schrödinger flow(GBSF) was introduced by Ding and Wang in [8], which is formulated for $u = u(t, x) : (-T, T) \times M \rightarrow N$, where M is a Riemannian manifold and N is a Kähler (or para-Kähler) manifold.

- When $M = \mathbb{R}$ (with Euclidean metric) and N is either of G_{n_0, k_0} or $G_{n_0}^{k_0}$, it is revealed in [8] that the equation for GBSF can be equivalently reduced to a fourth-order matrix nonlinear dispersive partial differential-integral equation for $q = q(t, x) : (-T, T) \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{k_0 \times (n_0 - k_0)}$, where G_{n_0, k_0} (resp. $G_{n_0}^{k_0}$)

denotes the complex Grassmannian of compact (resp. noncompact) type as a Hermitian symmetric space and $\mathcal{M}_{k_0 \times (n_0 - k_0)}$ stands for the space of $k_0 \times (n_0 - k_0)$ complex-matrices. For example, when $N = G_{n_0, k_0}$ for integers n_0, k_0 with $1 \leq k_0 < n_0$ being a Kähler manifold of complex dimension $n = k_0(n_0 - k_0)$, the results in [8] tell that the equation for q can be formulated by

$$\begin{aligned} q_t = & -i\alpha \left\{ q_{xx} + 2qq^*q \right\} + i\beta \left\{ q_{xxxx} + 4q_{xx}q^*q + 2qq_{xx}^*q + 4qq^*q_{xx} \right. \\ & \left. + 2q_xq_x^*q + 6q_xq^*q_x + 2qq_x^*q_x + 6qq^*qq^*q \right\} \\ & - 2i(\beta + 8\gamma) \left\{ (qq^*q)_{xx} + 2qq^*qq^*q \right. \\ & \left. + q \left(\int_{-\infty}^x q^*(qq^*)_s q ds \right) + \left(\int_{-\infty}^x q(q^*q)_s q^* ds \right) q \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

for $q = q(t, x) : (-T, T) \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{k_0 \times (n_0 - k_0)}$, where $\beta \neq 0$ and α are real constants. In this setting, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, there exists a unique pair of integers $j_1 \in \{1, \dots, k_0\}$ and $j_2 \in \{1, \dots, n_0 - k_0\}$ such that $j = (j_2 - 1)k_0 + j_1$. Hence, if we set Q_j to be the (j_1, j_2) -component of q for $j = (j_2 - 1)k_0 + j_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then the equation for $Q = {}^t(Q_1, \dots, Q_n)$ turns out to be a specialization of (1.1) with (F1)-(F3).

- When $M = \mathbb{R}$ and N is a Riemann surface, the equation for GBSF can be reduced to a single partial differential-integral equation for $q = q(t, x) : (-T, T) \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, which is proved in [9] by using the generalized Hasimoto transformation. The explicit expression is available in [9, Theorem 5.1]. Looking at the relation between u and q explained in the proof, we see that, if N is compact, then the partial derivative of the Gaussian curvature at $u(t, x)$ with respect to x is bounded by $|q(t, x)|$ multiplied by a positive constant, and thus the equation for q satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t - i\beta\partial_x^4 + i\alpha\partial_x^2)q = & O(|\partial_x^2 q||q|^2 + |\partial_x q|^2|q| + |\partial_x q||q|^3 + |q|^3 + |q|^5) \\ & + \left(\int_{-\infty}^x f_1(q, \partial_x q)(t, y) dy \right) q, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

where $f_1(q, \partial_x q) = O(|\partial_x q|^2|q| + |\partial_x q||q|^2 + |q|^3 + |q|^5)$. The equation (2.4) satisfies the structure of (1.1) with (F1)-(F3) for $n = 1$. Additionally, the explicit expression stated in [9, Theorem 5.1] tells that the nonlocal term remains in (2.4) unless N has a constant Gaussian curvature.

In recent study [32] by the present author, a similar fourth-order geometric dispersive PDE has been investigated, which reads

$$u_t = a J_u \nabla_x^3 u_x + \lambda J_u \nabla_x u_x + b R(\nabla_x u_x, u_x) J_u u_x + c R(J_u u_x, u_x) \nabla_x u_x \quad (2.5)$$

for $u = u(t, x) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow N$, where $a \neq 0$, b, c, λ are real constants, N is a general compact Kähler manifold of complex dimension n with complex structure J , Kähler metric h , and with the Levi-Civita connection ∇ and the Riemann curvature tensor R associated to h . (See e.g., [31, 32], for the details on the geometric setting of terms in (2.5).) Developing the generalized Hasimoto transformation, the author in [32] has shown that (2.5) can be transformed to a system for complex-valued functions Q_1, \dots, Q_n . If $n \geq 2$, then the equation for each Q_j satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t - ia\partial_x^4 - i\lambda\partial_x^2)Q_j &= O(|\partial_x^2 Q||Q|^2 + |\partial_x Q|^2|Q| + |\partial_x Q||Q|^3 + |Q|^3) \\ &+ \sum_{r=1}^n \left(\int_{-\infty}^x f_{j,r}(Q, \partial_x Q)(t, y) dy \right) Q_r, \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$f_{j,r}(Q, \partial_x Q) = O(|\partial_x Q|^2|Q| + |\partial_x Q||Q|^2 + |\partial_x Q||Q|^3 + |Q|^3). \quad (2.7)$$

The system of (2.6) for $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ satisfies the structure of (1.1) with (F1)-(F3).

Remark 2.1. When N is imposed to be locally Hermitian symmetric, (2.5) coincides with the equation for GBSF under an assumption on coefficients of the equation, which is proved in [31]. Note that the expression of the right hand side of (2.6) with (2.7) can change depending on additional assumptions on N , where the nonlocal terms are rewritten by the fundamental theorem of calculus. One may notice that the structure of (2.6) with (2.7) is slightly different from (2.4), even though G_{n_0, k_0} is also locally Hermitian symmetric. However, it is not inconsistent by the above reason, which has been discussed in [32].

3. MAIN THEOREM

Our main results is now stated as follows:

Theorem 3.1. *Let m be an integer satisfying $m \geq 4$. Then the initial value problem (1.1)-(1.2) is time-locally well-posed in $H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$, that is, the following assertions hold:*

- (i) *(Existence and uniqueness.) For any $Q_0 \in H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$, there exists a time $T = T(\|Q_0\|_{H^4}) > 0$ and a unique solution $Q \in C([-T, T]; H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$ to (1.1)-(1.2).*
- (ii) *(Continuous dependence with respect to the initial data.) Suppose that $T > 0$ and $Q \in C([-T, T]; H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$ are respectively the time and the unique solution to (1.1) with initial data Q_0 obtained in the above part (i). Fix $T' \in (0, T)$. Then for any $\eta > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $\tilde{Q}_0 \in H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ satisfying $\|Q_0 - \tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^m} < \delta$, the unique solution \tilde{Q} to (1.1) with initial data \tilde{Q}_0 exists on $[-T', T'] \times \mathbb{R}$ and satisfies $\|Q - \tilde{Q}\|_{C([-T, T']; H^m)} < \eta$.*

We state the contribution of Theorem 3.1 and related results.

First, to the best of the author's knowledge, no previous results which established well-posedness of (1.1)-(1.2) for $n \geq 2$ are available with or without nonlocal terms. It might be better to mention that the recent study by Malham [26] has succeeded to construct a time-local solution to the following matrix nonlinear fourth-order dispersive PDE:

$$\begin{aligned} q_t = & \mu_2 q_{xx} + \mu_3 q_{xxx} + \mu_4 q_{xxxx} + 2\mu_2 q q^* q + 3\mu_3 (q_x q^* q + q q^* q_x) \\ & + \mu_4 (4q_{xx} q^* q + 2q q_{xx}^* q + 4q q^* q_{xx} + 2q_x q_x^* q \\ & + 6q_x q^* q_x + 2q q_x^* q_x + 6q q^* q q^* q), \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where $q = q(t, x)$ is a $k_0 \times m_0$ complex-matrix-valued function of $t, x \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\mu_4 \neq 0, \mu_2, \mu_3 \in \mathbb{C}$ are constants such that $\mu_2, \mu_4 \in i\mathbb{R}$ and $\mu_3 \in \mathbb{R}$. By the same identification as that for (2.3), the equation (3.1) can be identified with the example of (1.1) where $n = k_0 m_0$. Meanwhile, it does not seem that the initial value problem for (3.1) has been investigated in [26].

Second, it seems that time-local existence results have been expected by the authors in [8] concerning (2.3). Indeed, it is commented in [8, p.190] as follows:

When $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = \gamma = 0$, one sees that Eqs. (62), (63) and (64) return to the standard matrix NLS and matrix NLH respectively. We believe that for the matrix nonlinear Schrödinger-like equation (62) on $u(n)$, a similar property to the standard matrix NLS that one may obtain by using the geometric energy method (refer to [29, 43]) is the short time existence of solutions.

The equation (62) in the above quotation corresponds to (2.3). The part of the time-local existence of a solution in Theorem 3.1 is not inconsistent with their belief. Further, Theorem 3.1 also presents the uniqueness and the continuous dependence with respect to the initial data.

Remark 3.2. The previous study in [4] investigated another but similar fourth-order geometric dispersive PDE for curve flows on a compact Kähler manifold N , showing that the initial value problem possesses a time-local solution $u : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow N$ for initial data $u_0 \in C(\mathbb{R}; N)$ with $\partial_x u_0 \in H^m(\mathbb{R}; TN)$ and $m \geq 4$, where $H^m(\mathbb{R}; TN)$ is a kind of geometric Sobolev space on \mathbb{R} with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^m(\mathbb{R}; TN)}$ and $T > 0$ depends on $\|\partial_x u_0\|_{H^4(\mathbb{R}; TN)}$. The proof in [4] was based on the geometric energy method, and the method seemed to be valid also for (2.5). In view of the claim and the relation $\|\partial_x u(t)\|_{H^m(\mathbb{R}; TN)} = \|Q(t)\|_{H^m}$ via the generalized Hasimoto transformation, the author expected that a solvable structure of (2.5) is inherited in some sense to the systems (2.3) and (2.6) with initial data $Q_0 \in H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$. Theorem 3.1 is not inconsistent with the expectation.

Remark 3.3. We should comment that Theorem 3.1 still does not immediately contribute to solve the initial value problem for (2.5). To be exact, the generalized Hasimoto transformation does not ensure the equivalence of the initial value problem for (2.5) and that for the system derived after transformation in general, since constructing

the inverse of the transformation seems to be a nontrivial task and since the transformations to derive (2.3), (2.4), (2.6) impose the existence of a fixed edge point $u(t, \infty) \in N$ or $u(t, -\infty) \in N$. However, the author expects that future work as a continuation of this paper on (1.1) will present an important insight on some unsolved problems for (2.5), such as finding conditions for time-global existence of a solution.

Third, well-posedness for single fourth-order dispersive PDEs for complex-valued functions with nonlinearity involving derivatives up to second order but without nonlocal terms has already been extensively studied by several authors ([15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 36, 37, 38, 39]). In this direction, the contribution of Theorem 3.1 seems to be rather limited. To see it, we review some known results related to Theorem 3.1: A series of studies by Segata ([37, 38]) and Huo and Jia ([20, 21]) established local well-posedness for (2.1) in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ with $s > 1/2$ (and in $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})$ under an additional condition on coefficients of the equation), which was proved by applying the smoothing effect via the Fourier restriction norm method. Theorem 3.1 presents local well-posedness for (1.1) with more general nonlinearities than (2.1), but imposes higher regularity on the solution. Segata in [39] also showed local well-posedness of (2.1) in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$ with $s \geq 4$ by analyzing the structure of the nonlinearity in more detail via the so-called modified energy method, where \mathbb{T} is the one-dimensional flat torus and thus the above smoothing effect on \mathbb{R} is absent. Hirayama et al. in [19, Theorem 1.3] established local well-posedness in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ with $s \geq 1/2$ for a one-dimensional fourth-order dispersive PDE with first- and second-derivative nonlinearities, by developing the method to apply the local smoothing effect, which improved the class of the solution and generalizes the nonlinearities handled in [37, 38, 20, 21] (see [19, Remark 1.5.]). We note that their generalization of the nonlinearities is partly different from that given by (F1)-(F3) in our paper. For example, restricting to the case $n = 1$ where (1.1) is a single equation, the nonzero nonlinear term of $O(|\partial_x^2 Q|^3)$ satisfies the assumption in [19, Theorem 1.1] but does not satisfy (F1) in our paper. On the other hand, the quadratic type nonlinear term of $O(|Q||\partial_x Q|)$ is not considered in [19] but satisfies (F1)-(F3) where $n = j = 1$, $F_j^2(u, v) = O(|u||v|)$ and $F_j^1 \equiv F_j^3 \equiv 0$.

Apart from the contribution of Theorem 3.1, it might be better to state the following related results:

- (i) Some multi-component systems of fourth-order nonlinear dispersive PDEs for complex-valued functions have been considered in [13, 42], and local and global existence of a unique solution, and scattering properties have been investigated, where neither nonlinear terms involving derivatives nor nonlocal terms are included in their systems.
- (ii) Similar nonlocal nonlinearities have already appeared in the study of well-posedness for one- or two-dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equations with physical background (e.g., [5, 17, 29, 33]) and the Davey-Stewartson system (e.g., [3, 14, 18, 25]). Moreover, similar nonlinearities also appear in the study of geometric dispersive PDEs for the so-called Schrödinger flow and for

the third-order analogues via the generalized Hasimoto transformation (e.g., [2, 30, 35, 40]).

- (iii) Some single fourth-order dispersive PDEs for complex-valued functions with nonlinearities involving derivatives up to third order have been investigated by [19, 22, 36], and local well-posedness in Sobolev spaces ([19, 22]) and global well-posedness in Sobolev spaces and in modulation spaces ([36]) were established. Moreover, multi-dimensional case has been also investigated in [16, 22, 36]. Meanwhile, all of these results impose the smallness of the initial data, if a third-order derivative is involved in their nonlinearities.

4. IDEA OF THE PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1

Our proof of Theorem 3.1 is based on the parabolic regularization and the energy method combined with a gauge transformation. The assumption $m \geq 4$ on the regularity of the solution comes from the requirement for the above method to work. More concretely, a loss of derivative of order one occurs from the nonlinear terms $F_j^1(Q, \partial_x^2 Q)$ and $F_j^2(Q, \partial_x Q)$ (not from $F_j^3(Q, \partial_x Q)$) in general, which prevents the classical L^2 -based energy method from working. We overcome the difficulty by introducing a gauge transformation of the form (5.7)-(5.8) (and analogically (6.7)-(6.8) and (7.2)-(7.3)), which is a method to bring out the local smoothing effect for dispersive PDEs on \mathbb{R} . Roughly speaking, the gauge transformation behaves as a summation of the identity and a pseudodifferential operator of order -1 , and the commutator with the fourth-order principal part of (1.1) generates a second-order elliptic operator which absorbs the loss of derivative. Additionally, in the actual proof of Theorem 3.1, the gauge transformation we call here acts on images of the partial differentiation ∂_x , and thus explicit pseudodifferential calculus is not required. We choose the strategy by following the idea in [4] to solve a fourth-order geometric dispersive PDE for curve flows on a compact Kähler manifold. Indeed, the form of (5.7)-(5.8) looks extremely similar to that in [4, Eqn.(40)].

Notably, using the above energy method finds another difficulty to show Theorem 3.1, which is due to the presence of nonlocal terms in $F_j^3(Q, \partial_x Q)$. More concretely, the energy method with our gauge transformation actually leads to an estimate for the solution to the initial value problem for the parabolic regularized equation uniformly with respect to the coefficient of the added parabolic fourth-order term. This ensures that the family of the parabolic regularized solutions subconverges to a limit weak-star in $L^\infty H^m$ and (strongly) in CH_{loc}^{m-1} . However, the convergence seems to be insufficient to show that the nonlocal terms for the regularized solution converges to those for the limit in the sense of distribution. Hence, an additional argument is required to conclude that the limit is actually a solution to the original problem. (See Remark 5.2 also.) To avoid the delicate argument, following mainly [1, 10, 23, 27, 39], we adopt the Bona-Smith type approximation of the original equation to construct parabolic regularized solutions, which then ensures a strong convergence to a solution

in CH^m . The use of it also leads to the continuous dependence of the solution with respect to the initial data.

Additionally, we point out that the well-posedness theory for single linear dispersive PDEs for complex-valued functions is helpful in understanding the idea of our proof and the conditions (F1)-(F3). To state it, consider the initial value problem of the form

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t - ia\partial_x^4 - b\partial_x^3)u &= i\partial_x\{\beta_1(t, x)\partial_x u\} + i\partial_x\{\beta_2(t, x)\overline{\partial_x u}\} \\ &\quad + \gamma_1(t, x)\partial_x u + \gamma_2(t, x)\overline{\partial_x u} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

$$u(0, x) = u_0(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \quad (4.2)$$

where $u(t, x)$ is a complex-valued unknown function of $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, $a \neq 0$ and b are real constants, $\beta_1(t, x)$, $\beta_2(t, x)$, $\gamma_1(t, x)$, $\gamma_2(t, x) \in C(\mathbb{R}; \mathcal{B}^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$ are complex-valued, $\mathcal{B}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is the set of all bounded smooth functions on \mathbb{R} whose derivatives of any order are all bounded, and $u_0(x)$ is an initial data in L^2 . Under the setting where $\beta_2(t, x) \equiv \gamma_2(t, x) \equiv 0$ and both $\beta_1(t, x)$ and $\gamma_1(t, x)$ are independent of t , the necessary and sufficient condition for L^2 -well-posedness of (4.1)-(4.2) was established by Mizuhara ([28]) and Tarama ([41]), where more general higher-order linear dispersive PDEs were also investigated. Restricting our concern to the application to our problem, we recall the fact that (4.1)-(4.2) is L^2 -well-posed if $\beta_1(t, x)$ is real-valued, $\beta_2(t, x) \equiv \gamma_2(t, x) \equiv 0$, and there exists a function $\phi(x) \in \mathcal{B}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$|\operatorname{Im} \gamma_1(t, x)| \leq \phi(x) \text{ for any } (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(x) dx < \infty. \quad (4.3)$$

The proof was presented in [4, Section 2] for the purpose of illustrating the idea of the gauge transformation in [4, Eqn.(40)] to solve the fourth-order geometric dispersive PDE for curve flows on a compact Kähler manifold. We note that the idea also works for (4.1)-(4.2) with $\beta_2(t, x) \not\equiv 0$ or $\gamma_2(t, x) \not\equiv 0$ under the following assumption:

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that there exist functions $\phi_A(x)$, $\phi_B(x) \in \mathcal{B}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that*

$$|\operatorname{Im} \beta_1(t, x)| + |\beta_2(t, x)| \leq \phi_A(x) \text{ for any } (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi_A(x) dx < \infty, \quad (4.4)$$

$$|\operatorname{Im} \gamma_1(t, x)| \leq \phi_B(x) \text{ for any } (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\phi_B(x)|^2 dx < \infty. \quad (4.5)$$

Then (4.1)-(4.2) is L^2 -well-posed, that is, for any $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C})$, (4.1)-(4.2) has a unique solution $u \in C(\mathbb{R}; L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}))$.

The proof is stated in Appendix. Although the assumptions (4.4)-(4.5) are still loose from the viewpoint of the theory for linear dispersive PDEs, they are informative enough to find the way to solve the initial value problem for (1.1) including (2.1), (2.2), (2.3), (3.1). In fact, we arrived at the conditions (F1) and (F2) by observing the above fact and the equation in [4]((Eqn.(41) with $\varepsilon = 0$) satisfied by higher-order covariant derivatives of the curve flow, and our choice of the gauge transformation to prove Theorem 3.1 is also motivated from that of Proposition 4.1 where $|Q|^2$ and $|Q|$ play roles as ϕ_A and ϕ_B respectively.

5. UNIFORM ESTIMATE FOR BONA-SMITH REGULARIZED SOLUTIONS IN $L^\infty H^m$.

This section aims to obtain uniform estimates for solutions to an initial value problem regularized by the Bona-Smith approximation. Throughout this section, m is supposed to be an integer satisfying $m \geq 4$.

To begin with, following mainly [1, 10, 23, 27, 39], we recall the setting of the Bona-Smith approximation: Let $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Schwartz function satisfying $0 \leq \phi(x) \leq 1$ on \mathbb{R} and $\phi(x) = 1$ on a neighborhood of the origin $x = 0$ so that $\partial_x^k \phi(0) = 0$ for all positive integers k . For any $Q_0 = {}^t(Q_{01}, \dots, Q_{0n}) \in H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, define $Q_0^\varepsilon : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ by

$$\widehat{Q_0^\varepsilon}(\xi) = \phi(\varepsilon\xi)\widehat{Q_0}(\xi) \quad (\xi \in \mathbb{R}),$$

where $\widehat{Q_0^\varepsilon}$ and $\widehat{Q_0}$ denote the Fourier transform of Q_0^ε and Q_0 respectively. It follows that $Q_0^\varepsilon \in H^\infty(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ and $Q_0^\varepsilon \rightarrow Q_0$ in $H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. Moreover,

$$\|Q_0^\varepsilon\|_{H^m} \leq \|Q_0\|_{H^m}, \quad (5.1)$$

$$\|Q_0^\varepsilon\|_{H^{m+\ell}} \leq C\varepsilon^{-\ell}\|Q_0\|_{H^m} \quad (\ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots), \quad (5.2)$$

$$\|Q_0^\varepsilon - Q_0\|_{H^{m-\ell}} \leq C\varepsilon^\ell\|Q_0\|_{H^m} \quad (\ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots), \quad (5.3)$$

where C is a positive constant which depends on m, k, ϕ , but not on ε . The set $\{Q_0^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ is called a Bona-Smith approximation of Q_0 .

For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $Q_0 \in H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$, we consider the initial value problem for the fourth-order parabolic regularized system:

$$(\partial_t + \varepsilon^5 \partial_x^4 - iM_a \partial_x^4 - M_b \partial_x^3 - iM_\lambda \partial_x^2) Q = F(Q, \partial_x Q, \partial_x^2 Q), \quad (5.4)$$

$$Q(0, x) = Q_0^\varepsilon(x) \quad (5.5)$$

for $Q = {}^t(Q_1, \dots, Q_n) : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$, where $Q_0^\varepsilon \in H^\infty(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ is given by the Bona-Smith approximation of Q_0 . It is not difficult to show that there exists a time $T_\varepsilon = T(\varepsilon, \|Q_0^\varepsilon\|_{H^m}) > 0$ and a unique solution $Q^\varepsilon = {}^t(Q_1^\varepsilon, \dots, Q_n^\varepsilon) \in C([0, T_\varepsilon]; H^\infty(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$ to (5.4)-(5.5) by the standard contraction mapping argument. We omit the detail.

The goal of this section is to show the following:

Proposition 5.1. *Let m be an integer with $m \geq 4$. For any $Q_0 \in H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$, let $\{Q^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ be the family of solutions to (5.4)-(5.5). Then, there exists a time $T = T(\|Q_0\|_{H^4}) > 0$ which is independent of $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that $\{Q^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ is bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$.*

Proof of Proposition 5.1. For the integer $m \geq 4$ and fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we consider the estimate for $\mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon) = \mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(t)) : [0, T_\varepsilon] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, the square of which is defined by

$$\mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(t))^2 := \|V^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^{m-1}}^2. \quad (5.6)$$

Here, $V^\varepsilon = {}^t(V_1^\varepsilon, \dots, V_n^\varepsilon)$ is a \mathbb{C}^n -valued function defined by

$$V_j^\varepsilon = V_j^\varepsilon(t, x) := \partial_x^m Q_j^\varepsilon(t, x) + \frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^\varepsilon(t, x) i \partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon(t, x) \quad (j \in \{1, \dots, n\}), \quad (5.7)$$

$$\Phi^\varepsilon = \Phi^\varepsilon(t, x) := \int_{-\infty}^x g(Q^\varepsilon(t, y)) dy \left(= \int_{-\infty}^x |Q^\varepsilon(t, y)|^2 dy \right), \quad (5.8)$$

where $L > 1$ is a sufficiently large constant which will be decided later independently of j and ε . Moreover, we set $\mathcal{E}_m(Q_0^\varepsilon) = \mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(0))$.

Equivalence of $\mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(t))$ and $\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}$ on a restricted time-interval:

By definition (5.6) with (5.7)-(5.8) and

$$|\Phi^\varepsilon(t, x)| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} |Q^\varepsilon(t, y)|^2 dy = \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

there exist constants $C_{1,L}, C_{2,L} > 0$ which depend on L and not on ε and m such that

$$\frac{\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}^2}{C_{1,L} (1 + \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^4)} \leq \mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(t))^2 \leq C_{2,L} (1 + \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^4) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}^2 \quad (5.9)$$

for all $t \in [0, T_\varepsilon]$. We set

$$T_\varepsilon^* = \sup \{T > 0 \mid \mathcal{E}_4(Q^\varepsilon(t)) \leq 2\mathcal{E}_4(Q_0^\varepsilon) \text{ for all } t \in [0, T]\}. \quad (5.10)$$

By (5.6) and (5.9) for $m = 4$ and (5.10),

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^4}^2 &\leq C_{1,L} (1 + \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^4) \mathcal{E}_4(Q^\varepsilon(t))^2 \quad (\because (5.9)) \\ &\leq C_{1,L} \{1 + \mathcal{E}_4(Q^\varepsilon(t))^4\} \mathcal{E}_4(Q^\varepsilon(t))^2 \quad (\because (5.6)) \\ &\leq 4C_{1,L} \{1 + 16 \mathcal{E}_4(Q_0^\varepsilon)^4\} \mathcal{E}_4(Q_0^\varepsilon)^2 \quad (\because (5.10)) \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

for $t \in [0, T_\varepsilon^*]$. In addition, (5.9) for $t = 0$ and (5.1) for $m = 4$ imply

$$\mathcal{E}_4(Q_0^\varepsilon)^2 \leq C_{2,L} (1 + \|Q_0^\varepsilon\|_{H^4}^4) \|Q_0^\varepsilon\|_{H^4}^2 \leq C_{2,L} \{1 + \|Q_0\|_{H^4}^4\} \|Q_0\|_{H^4}^2. \quad (5.12)$$

Combining (5.11) and (5.12), we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T_\varepsilon^*]} \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^4}^2 \leq P_L^0(\|Q_0\|_{H^4}) \quad (5.13)$$

and

$$\frac{\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}^2}{P_L^1(\|Q_0\|_{H^4})} \leq \mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(t))^2 \leq P_L^2(\|Q_0\|_{H^4}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}^2 \quad (5.14)$$

for any $t \in [0, T_\varepsilon^*]$. Here, each of $P_L^k(\cdot) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$ denotes a positive-valued increasing function on $[0, \infty)$ depending on L but not on m and ε .

The equation satisfied by V_j^ε and uniform estimate for $\{Q^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$:

We set $U^\varepsilon = \partial_x^m Q^\varepsilon$, i.e., $U^\varepsilon = {}^t(U_1^\varepsilon, \dots, U_n^\varepsilon)$ and $U_j^\varepsilon(t, x) = \partial_x^m Q_j^\varepsilon(t, x)$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. In this part, we investigate the equation satisfied by V_j^ε and then derive estimates for $\{Q^\varepsilon(t)\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ in $H^m(\mathbb{R})$ on a restricted time-interval. Hereafter in this

part, we use $A_m^k(\cdot) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and $A_{L,m}^k(\cdot) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ for some integer k to denote a positive-valued increasing function which depends on m but not on ε . We use the latter only if the increasing function depends also on L .

Applying ∂_x^m to the j -th component of (5.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\partial_t + (\varepsilon^5 - i a_j) \partial_x^4 - b_j \partial_x^3 - i \lambda_j \partial_x^2\} U_j^\varepsilon \\ &= \partial_x^m (F_j^1(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x^2 Q^\varepsilon)) + \partial_x^m (F_j^2(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)) + \partial_x^m (F_j^3(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)). \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

We compute the three terms of the right hand side of (5.15) separately.

First, recalling $F_j^1(u, w) = O(g(u)|w|)$ follows from (1.3) in (F1) and (1.7), we use the Leibniz rule, the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, and the Sobolev embedding to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_x^m (F_j^1(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x^2 Q^\varepsilon)) \\ &= O(g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x^2 U^\varepsilon|) + O(|\partial_x \{g(Q^\varepsilon)\}| |\partial_x U^\varepsilon|) + r_{\leq m}^1 \\ &= O(g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x^2 U^\varepsilon|) + O(|\partial_x Q^\varepsilon| |Q^\varepsilon| |\partial_x U^\varepsilon|) + r_{\leq m}^1 \\ &= O(g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x^2 U^\varepsilon|) + O(\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2} |Q^\varepsilon| |\partial_x U^\varepsilon|) + r_{\leq m}^1, \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

where

$$\|r_{\leq m}^1(t)\|_{L^2} \leq A_m^1(\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^3}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}. \quad (5.17)$$

More precisely, the first term of the right hand side of (5.16) satisfies

$$|O(g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x^2 U^\varepsilon|)| \leq \sum_{j=1}^n c_j^1 g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x^2 U^\varepsilon|, \quad (5.18)$$

where the constants c_j^1 for $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ come from (F1) and are independent of L .

Second, since

$$F_j^2(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon) = O\left(\sum_{p_1=0}^{d_1} \sum_{p_2=0}^{d_2} |Q^\varepsilon|^{1+p_1} |\partial_x Q^\varepsilon|^{p_2}\right)$$

follows from (1.4) in (F2), a similar computation using the Leibniz rule, the Sobolev embedding, and the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality shows the following: If $d_2 = 0$, then

$$\|\partial_x^m (F_j^2(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon))(t)\|_{L^2} \leq A_m^2(\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}. \quad (5.19)$$

If $d_2 \geq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_x^m (F_j^2(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)) \\ &= O\left(\sum_{p_1=0}^{d_1} \sum_{p_2=1}^{d_2} |Q^\varepsilon|^{1+p_1} |\partial_x Q^\varepsilon|^{p_2-1} |\partial_x^{m+1} Q^\varepsilon|\right) + r_{\leq m}^2 \\ &= O\left(\sum_{p_1=0}^{d_1} \sum_{p_2=1}^{d_2} \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}^{p_1+p_2-1} |Q^\varepsilon| |\partial_x^{m+1} Q^\varepsilon|\right) + r_{\leq m}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

where

$$\|r_{\leq m}^2(t)\|_{L^2} \leq A_m^3(\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^3})\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}. \quad (5.21)$$

Third, it follows that

$$\|\partial_x^m (F_j^3(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon))(t)\|_{L^2} \leq A_m^4(\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2})\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}. \quad (5.22)$$

Although it may not be difficult to see the fact, we confirm it here to share how to handle nonlocal terms. For this purpose, we begin with using the Leibniz rule to see

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_x^m (F_j^3(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)) \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^n \left(\int_{-\infty}^x F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)(t, y) dy \right) \partial_x^m (F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon)) \\ & \quad + \sum_{r=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{m!}{k!(m-k)!} \left(\partial_x^k \int_{-\infty}^x F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)(t, y) dy \right) \partial_x^{m-k} (F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon)) \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^n \left(\int_{-\infty}^x F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)(t, y) dy \right) \partial_x^m (F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon)) \\ & \quad + \sum_{r=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{m!}{k!(m-k)!} \partial_x^{k-1} (F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)) \partial_x^{m-k} (F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon)). \end{aligned}$$

Here, by the Hölder inequality and the Sobolev embedding,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left(\int_{-\infty}^x F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)(t, y) dy \right) \partial_x^m (F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon))(t) \right\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq \left\| \int_{-\infty}^x F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)(t, y) dy \right\|_{L^\infty} \left\| \partial_x^m (F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon))(t) \right\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq \left\| F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)(t) \right\|_{L^1} \left\| \partial_x^m (F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon))(t) \right\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

for $j, r \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left(\partial_x^{k-1} (F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)) \partial_x^{m-k} (F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon)) \right) (t) \right\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq \left\| \partial_x^{k-1} (F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon))(t) \right\|_{L^2} \left\| \partial_x^{m-k} (F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon))(t) \right\|_{L^\infty} \\ & \leq \left\| \partial_x^{k-1} (F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon))(t) \right\|_{L^2} \left\| \partial_x^{m-k} (F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon))(t) \right\|_{H^1} \end{aligned}$$

for $j, r \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Furthermore, recalling

$$\begin{aligned} F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon) &= O \left(\sum_{p_3=0}^{d_3} |Q^\varepsilon|^{2+p_3} + \sum_{p_4=0}^{d_4} |\partial_x Q^\varepsilon|^{2+p_4} \right), \\ F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon) &= O \left(\sum_{p_5=0}^{d_5} |Q^\varepsilon|^{1+p_5} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which follow from (1.5) and (1.6) in (F3), we estimate in the same way as above to deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)(t) \right\|_{L^1} \\
& \leq C \left(\sum_{p_3=0}^{d_3} \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{p_3} + \sum_{p_4=0}^{d_4} \|\partial_x Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{p_4} \right) (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2) \\
& \leq C \sum_{\ell=2}^{d_3+d_4+2} \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}^\ell, \tag{5.23}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\left\| \partial_x^m (F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon))(t) \right\|_{L^2} \leq A_m^5 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}, \tag{5.24}$$

$$\left\| \partial_x^{k-1} (F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon))(t) \right\|_{L^2} \leq A_m^6 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^k}, \tag{5.25}$$

$$\left\| \partial_x^{m-k} (F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon))(t) \right\|_{H^1} \leq A_m^7 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^{m-k+1}}. \tag{5.26}$$

It follows from (5.23) and (5.24)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\cdot} F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)(t, y) dy \right) \partial_x^m (F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon))(t) \right\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq A_m^8 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}. \tag{5.27}
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (5.25) and (5.26)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \left(\partial_x^{k-1} (F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)) \partial_x^{m-k} (F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon)) \right) (t) \right\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq A_m^9 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^k} \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^{m-k+1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, for each $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^k} \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^{m-k+1}} \\
& \leq C \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1}^{\frac{m-k}{m-1}} \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}^{\frac{k-1}{m-1}} \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1}^{\frac{k-1}{m-1}} \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}^{\frac{m-k}{m-1}} \\
& = C \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1} \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \left(\partial_x^{k-1} (F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)) \partial_x^{m-k} (F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon)) \right) (t) \right\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq A_m^{10} (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}. \tag{5.28}
\end{aligned}$$

The desired estimate (5.22) immediately follows from (5.27) and (5.28).

Combining (5.15), (5.16)(with (5.17)), (5.19) or (5.20) (with (5.21)), and (5.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \{ \partial_t + (\varepsilon^5 - i a_j) \partial_x^4 - b_j \partial_x^3 - i \lambda_j \partial_x^2 \} U_j^\varepsilon \\
& = O(g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x^2 U^\varepsilon|) + O(A_m^{11} (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}) |Q^\varepsilon| |\partial_x U^\varepsilon|) + r_{\leq m}^3, \tag{5.29}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\|r_{\leq m}^3(t)\|_{L^2} \leq A_m^{12} (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^3}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}. \quad (5.30)$$

We next compute

$$\partial_t \left(\frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^\varepsilon i \partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon \right) = \frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^\varepsilon i \partial_t \partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon + \frac{L}{4a_j} (\partial_t \Phi^\varepsilon) i \partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon. \quad (5.31)$$

By the almost same computation to obtain (5.15) with (5.16)-(5.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon &= \{(-\varepsilon^5 + ia_j) \partial_x^4 + b_j \partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j \partial_x^2\} \partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon \\ &\quad + O(g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x U^\varepsilon|) + r_{\leq m}^4 \\ &= \{(-\varepsilon^5 + ia_j) \partial_x^4 + b_j \partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j \partial_x^2\} \partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon \\ &\quad + O(\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1} |Q^\varepsilon| |\partial_x U^\varepsilon|) + r_{\leq m}^4, \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

where

$$\|r_{\leq m}^4(t)\|_{L^2} \leq A_m^{13} (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}.$$

Recalling $|\Phi^\varepsilon(t, x)| \leq \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2$, and substituting (5.32) into the first term of the right hand side of (5.31), we see

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^\varepsilon i \partial_t \partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon \\ &= \{(-\varepsilon^5 + ia_j) \partial_x^4 + b_j \partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j \partial_x^2\} \left(\frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^\varepsilon i \partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon \right) \\ &\quad - (-\varepsilon^5 + ia_j) \sum_{k=1}^4 \frac{4!}{k!(4-k)!} (\partial_x^k \Phi^\varepsilon) \frac{L}{4a_j} i \partial_x^{4-k+m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon \\ &\quad - b_j \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{3!}{k!(3-k)!} (\partial_x^k \Phi^\varepsilon) \frac{L}{4a_j} i \partial_x^{3-k+m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon \\ &\quad - i\lambda_j \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{2!}{k!(2-k)!} (\partial_x^k \Phi^\varepsilon) \frac{L}{4a_j} i \partial_x^{2-k+m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon \\ &\quad + \frac{L}{4a_j} O(A_m^{14} (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1}) |Q^\varepsilon| |\partial_x U^\varepsilon|) + r_{\leq m}^5, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\|r_{\leq m}^5(t)\|_{L^2} \leq A_{L,m}^1 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}.$$

Moreover, since $\partial_x \Phi^\varepsilon = g(Q^\varepsilon) = |Q^\varepsilon|^2$, it follows that

$$\sum_{k=1}^4 \frac{4!}{k!(4-k)!} (\partial_x^k \Phi^\varepsilon) \frac{L}{4a_j} i \partial_x^{4-k+m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{Li}{a_j} g(Q^\varepsilon) \partial_x^{m+2} Q_j^\varepsilon + \frac{4!}{2!2!} \frac{Li}{4a_j} \partial_x \{g(Q^\varepsilon)\} \partial_x^{m+1} Q_j^\varepsilon + \dots \\
&= \frac{Li}{a_j} \partial_x \{g(Q^\varepsilon) \partial_x U_j^\varepsilon\} + \frac{Li}{2a_j} \partial_x \{g(Q^\varepsilon)\} \partial_x U_j^\varepsilon + r_{\leq m}^6 \\
&= \frac{Li}{a_j} \partial_x \{g(Q^\varepsilon) \partial_x U_j^\varepsilon\} + \frac{Li}{a_j} O(A_m^{15} (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}) |Q^\varepsilon| |\partial_x U^\varepsilon|) + r_{\leq m}^6,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\|r_{\leq m}^6(t)\|_{L^2} \leq A_{L,m}^2 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^3}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}.$$

In the same way as above,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{3!}{k!(3-k)!} (\partial_x^k \Phi^\varepsilon) \frac{L}{4a_j} i \partial_x^{3-k+m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon \\
&= \frac{Li}{a_j} O(\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1} |Q^\varepsilon| |\partial_x U^\varepsilon|) + r_{\leq m}^7,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\|r_{\leq m}^7(t)\|_{L^2} \leq A_{L,m}^3 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^3}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}.$$

Noting them, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^\varepsilon i \partial_t \partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon \\
&= \{(-\varepsilon^5 + ia_j) \partial_x^4 + b_j \partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j \partial_x^2\} \left(\frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^\varepsilon i \partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon \right) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{\varepsilon^5 i}{a_j} + 1 \right) L \partial_x \{g(Q^\varepsilon) \partial_x U_j^\varepsilon\} + O(A_{L,m}^4 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}) |Q^\varepsilon| |\partial_x U^\varepsilon|) \\
&\quad + r_{\leq m}^8, \tag{5.33}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\|r_{\leq m}^8(t)\|_{L^2} \leq A_{L,m}^5 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^3}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}.$$

On the other hand, noting $Q^\varepsilon \in C([0, T_\varepsilon]; H^\infty(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we use (5.4) to deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{L}{4a_j} (\partial_t \Phi^\varepsilon) i \partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon \right| &= \left| \frac{L}{2a_j} \operatorname{Re} \left[\int_{-\infty}^x \partial_t Q^\varepsilon \cdot Q^\varepsilon dy \right] i \partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon \right| \\
&\leq \frac{L}{2|a_j|} \|\partial_t Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2} \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2} |\partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon| \\
&\leq A_{L,m}^6 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^4}) |\partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon|.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows

$$\left\| \left(\frac{L}{4a_j} (\partial_t \Phi^\varepsilon) i \partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon \right) (t) \right\|_{L^2} \leq A_{L,m}^6 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^4}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}. \quad (5.34)$$

Combining (5.33) and (5.34), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t \left(\frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^\varepsilon i \partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon \right) \\ &= \{ (-\varepsilon^5 + ia_j) \partial_x^4 + b_j \partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j \partial_x^2 \} \left(\frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^\varepsilon i \partial_x^{m-1} Q_j^\varepsilon \right) \\ &+ \left(\frac{\varepsilon^5 i}{a_j} + 1 \right) L \partial_x \{ g(Q^\varepsilon) \partial_x U_j^\varepsilon \} + O(A_{L,m}^4 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}) |Q^\varepsilon| |\partial_x U^\varepsilon|) \\ &+ r_{\leq m}^9, \end{aligned} \quad (5.35)$$

where

$$\|r_{\leq m}^9(t)\|_{L^2} \leq A_{L,m}^7 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^4}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}. \quad (5.36)$$

Consequently, combining (5.29) (with (5.30)) and (5.35) (with (5.36)), and then using (5.7), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t V_j^\varepsilon &= \{ (-\varepsilon^5 + ia_j) \partial_x^4 + b_j \partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j \partial_x^2 \} V_j^\varepsilon \\ &+ \left(\frac{\varepsilon^5 i}{a_j} + 1 \right) L \partial_x \{ g(Q^\varepsilon) \partial_x U_j^\varepsilon \} + O(g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x^2 U^\varepsilon|) \\ &+ O(A_{L,m}^8 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}) |Q^\varepsilon| |\partial_x U^\varepsilon|) + r_{\leq m}^3 + r_{\leq m}^9 \\ &= \{ (-\varepsilon^5 + ia_j) \partial_x^4 + b_j \partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j \partial_x^2 \} V_j^\varepsilon \\ &+ \left(\frac{\varepsilon^5 i}{a_j} + 1 \right) L \partial_x \{ g(Q^\varepsilon) \partial_x V_j^\varepsilon \} + O(g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x^2 V^\varepsilon|) \\ &+ O(A_{L,m}^9 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}) |Q^\varepsilon| |\partial_x V^\varepsilon|) + r_{\leq m}^{10}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.37)$$

where

$$\|r_{\leq m}^{10}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq A_{L,m}^{10} (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^4}) \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}. \quad (5.38)$$

In what follows, we estimate $\mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(t))^2$ for $t \in [0, T_\varepsilon^*]$ where T_ε^* is introduced by (5.10). Using (5.37) and the integration by parts, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|V^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^n \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial_t V_j^\varepsilon \overline{V_j^\varepsilon} dx \\ &\leq -\varepsilon^5 \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\partial_x^2 V^\varepsilon|^2 dx - L \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x V^\varepsilon|^2 dx \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^n \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} O(g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x^2 V^\varepsilon|) \overline{V_j^\varepsilon} dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + C A_{L,m}^9 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}) \int_{\mathbb{R}} |Q^\varepsilon| |\partial_x V^\varepsilon| |V^\varepsilon| dx \\
& + \|r_{\leq m}^{10}(t)\|_{L^2} \|V^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}. \tag{5.39}
\end{aligned}$$

The second term of the right hand side of (5.39) comes from the first term of the right hand side of (5.16) with (5.18). Therefore, by integration by parts, we see that there exists positive constants C_1^* and C_2^* which are independent of L such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=1}^n \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} O(g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x^2 V^\varepsilon|) \overline{V_j^\varepsilon} dx \\
& = \sum_{j,\ell=1}^n \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} O(g(Q^\varepsilon)) \left(\partial_x^2 V_\ell^\varepsilon + \overline{\partial_x^2 V_\ell^\varepsilon} \right) \overline{V_j^\varepsilon} dx \\
& = - \sum_{j,\ell=1}^n \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} O(g(Q^\varepsilon)) \left(\partial_x V_\ell^\varepsilon + \overline{\partial_x V_\ell^\varepsilon} \right) \overline{\partial_x V_j^\varepsilon} dx \\
& \quad - \sum_{j,\ell=1}^n \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial_x (O(g(Q^\varepsilon))) \left(\partial_x V_\ell^\varepsilon + \overline{\partial_x V_\ell^\varepsilon} \right) \overline{V_j^\varepsilon} dx \\
& \leq C_1^* \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x V^\varepsilon|^2 dx + C_2^* \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |Q^\varepsilon| |\partial_x V^\varepsilon| |V^\varepsilon| dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the Young inequality for products and (5.13) shows

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |Q^\varepsilon| |\partial_x V^\varepsilon| |V^\varepsilon| dx \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |Q^\varepsilon|^2 |\partial_x V^\varepsilon|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} |V^\varepsilon|^2 dx \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x V^\varepsilon|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} P_L^0(\|Q_0\|_{H^4}) \mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(t))^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=1}^n \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} O(g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x^2 V^\varepsilon|) \overline{V_j^\varepsilon} dx \\
& \leq \left(C_1^* + \frac{C_2^*}{2} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x V^\varepsilon|^2 dx + \frac{C_2^*}{2} P_L^0(\|Q_0\|_{H^4}) \mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(t))^2. \tag{5.40}
\end{aligned}$$

In the same way, we use the Young inequality and (5.13) to deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
& A_{L,m}^9 (\|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2}) \int_{\mathbb{R}} |Q^\varepsilon| |\partial_x V^\varepsilon| |V^\varepsilon| dx \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x V^\varepsilon|^2 dx + A_{L,m}^{11} (\|Q_0\|_{H^4}) \mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(t))^2. \tag{5.41}
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, in view of (5.38), (5.13), and (5.14), we obtain

$$\|r_{\leq m}^{10}(t)\|_{L^2}\|V^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2} \leq A_{L,m}^{12}(\|Q_0\|_{H^4})\mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(t))^2. \quad (5.42)$$

Therefore, combining (5.39)-(5.42), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|V^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon^5 \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\partial_x^2 V^\varepsilon|^2 dx \\ & \leq \left(-L + C_1^* + \frac{C_2^*}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(Q^\varepsilon) |\partial_x V^\varepsilon|^2 dx \\ & \quad + A_{L,m}^{13}(\|Q_0\|_{H^4})\mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(t))^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.43)$$

On the other hand, permitting loss of one derivative, we can easily obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^{m-1}}^2 + \varepsilon^5 \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\partial_x^{k+2} Q^\varepsilon|^2 dx \\ & \leq A_{L,m}^{14}(\|Q_0\|_{H^4})\mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(t))^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.44)$$

Noting again that C_1^* and C_2^* are independent of L , we can take $L = L_0$ to satisfy $-L_0 + C_1^* + (C_2^*/2) + (1/2) < 0$. By fixing $L = L_0$ and combining (5.43) and (5.44), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(t))^2 + 2\varepsilon^5 (\|\partial_x^2 V^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x^2 Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^{m-1}}^2) \\ & \leq A_{L_0,m}^{15}(\|Q_0\|_{H^4})\mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(t))^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.45)$$

Therefore, the Gronwall inequality shows

$$\mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(t))^2 \leq \mathcal{E}_m(Q_0^\varepsilon)^2 \exp(A_{L_0,m}^{15}(\|Q_0\|_{H^4})t) \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T_\varepsilon^*]. \quad (5.46)$$

This inequality (5.46) for $m = 4$ and the definition of T_ε^* implies

$$4 \leq \exp(A_{L_0,4}^{15}(\|Q_0\|_{H^4})T_\varepsilon^*).$$

From this, we obtain

$$T_\varepsilon^* \geq \frac{\log 4}{A_{L_0,4}^{15}(\|Q_0\|_{H^4})} =: T > 0, \quad (5.47)$$

and it follows that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathcal{E}_m(Q^\varepsilon(t))^2 \leq \mathcal{E}_m(Q_0^\varepsilon)^2 \exp(A_{L_0,m}^{15}(\|Q_0\|_{H^4})T).$$

Furthermore, by combining this, (5.14), (5.9) for $t = 0$, and (5.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|Q^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^m}^2 & \leq C(T, L_0, \|Q_0\|_{H^4})\mathcal{E}_m(Q_0^\varepsilon)^2 \\ & \leq C(T, L_0, \|Q_0\|_{H^4})\|Q_0^\varepsilon\|_{H^m}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (5.48)$$

$$\leq C(T, L_0, \|Q_0\|_{H^4})\|Q_0\|_{H^m}^2. \quad (5.49)$$

Since the right hand side of (5.49) is independent of t and ε , we conclude $\{Q^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ is bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$, which completes the proof of Proposition 5.1. \square

Remark 5.2. Once Proposition 5.1 is proved, the standard compactness argument shows there exists a subsequence of $\{Q^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ which converges to a limit Q^* weak* in $L^\infty(0, T; H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$ and (strongly) in $C([0, T]; H_{\text{loc}}^{m-1}(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$. However, it is still not straightforward to verify that Q^* is actually a solution to (1.1)-(1.2), in that the subconvergence of $\{Q^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ in $C([0, T]; H_{\text{loc}}^{m-1}(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$ seems to be insufficient to ensure the subconvergence of the nonlocal term $F_3(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)$ to $F_3(Q^*, \partial_x Q^*)$ even in the sense of distribution. To avoid the argument to justify the above, we choose to take an advantage of the Bona-Smith approximation $\{Q_0^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ satisfying (5.1)-(5.3), which will be demonstrated in Sections 6 and 7.

6. ESTIMATE FOR THE DIFFERENCE OF BONA-SMITH APPROXIMATED SOLUTIONS

Let m be an integer with $m \geq 4$. For $Q_0 = {}^t(Q_{01}, \dots, Q_{0n}) \in H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$, let $\{Q_0^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ be the Bona-Smith approximation of Q_0 . We denote Q^μ and Q^ν by corresponding solutions to (5.4)-(5.5) for $\varepsilon = \mu$ and $\varepsilon = \nu$ respectively, that is,

$$(\partial_t + \mu^5 \partial_x^4 - iM_a \partial_x^4 - M_b \partial_x^3 - iM_\lambda \partial_x^2) Q^\mu = F(Q^\mu, \partial_x Q^\mu, \partial_x^2 Q^\mu), \quad (6.1)$$

$$Q^\mu(0, x) = Q_0^\mu(x), \quad (6.2)$$

$$(\partial_t + \nu^5 \partial_x^4 - iM_a \partial_x^4 - M_b \partial_x^3 - iM_\lambda \partial_x^2) Q^\nu = F(Q^\nu, \partial_x Q^\nu, \partial_x^2 Q^\nu), \quad (6.3)$$

$$Q^\nu(0, x) = Q_0^\nu(x). \quad (6.4)$$

Proposition 5.1 which is proved in Section 5 ensures both $\{Q^\mu\}_{\mu \in (0,1)}$ and $\{Q^\nu\}_{\nu \in (0,1)}$ are uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$, where $T = T(\|Q_0\|_{H^4}) > 0$ is decided by (5.47) independently of μ and ν .

The goal of this section is to get the following:

Proposition 6.1. *There exists a constant $C = C(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) > 1$ such that for all μ and ν satisfying $0 < \mu \leq \nu < 1$,*

$$\|Q^\mu - Q^\nu\|_{C([0,T]; H^1)} \leq C(\nu^{m-1} + \nu^4), \quad (6.5)$$

$$\|Q^\mu - Q^\nu\|_{C([0,T]; H^m)} \leq C(\nu^{m-3} + \nu + \|Q_0^\mu - Q_0^\nu\|_{H^m}). \quad (6.6)$$

Proof of Proposition 6.1. For μ, ν satisfying $0 < \mu \leq \nu < 1$, we set $W := Q^\mu - Q^\nu$, that is, $W = {}^t(W_1, \dots, W_n)$ and $W_j = Q_j^\mu - Q_j^\nu$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. For $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, we introduce a \mathbb{C}^n -valued function $Z^k = {}^t(Z_1^k, \dots, Z_n^k)$, where

$$Z_j^k = Z_j^k(t, x) := \partial_x^k W_j(t, x) + \frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^\mu(t, x) i \partial_x^{k-1} W_j(t, x) \quad (j \in \{1, \dots, n\}), \quad (6.7)$$

$$\Phi^\mu = \Phi^\mu(t, x) := \int_{-\infty}^x g(Q^\mu(t, y)) dy \left(= \int_{-\infty}^x |Q^\mu(t, y)|^2 dy \right), \quad (6.8)$$

and $L > 1$ is a sufficiently large constant which will be taken later independently of j , μ , and ν . Furthermore we define $\mathcal{E}_k^{\mu, \nu}(W) = \mathcal{E}_k^{\mu, \nu}(W(t)) : [0, T] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ to satisfy

$$\mathcal{E}_k^{\mu, \nu}(W(t))^2 = \|Z^k(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|W(t)\|_{H^{k-1}}^2. \quad (6.9)$$

We shall estimate $\mathcal{E}_1^{\mu,\nu}(W(t))$ and $\mathcal{E}_m^{\mu,\nu}(W(t))$ for $t \in [0, T]$ to get (6.5) and (6.6). Roughly speaking, these estimates can be derived in the same way as we estimate (5.6) in the previous section. The main point we need to care is that the estimate for the time-derivative of $\|Z^m(t)\|_{L^2}^2$ involves some terms including $\|\partial_x^{m+j}Q^\nu(t)\|_{L^2}$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$ which grow as $\nu \downarrow 0$ in relation with (5.2). To compensate the growth, we apply the decay properties of (6.5) and the factor ν^5 in (6.3).

Before going to the detail, we here collect some estimates on $[0, T]$ and notation used later. First, since the estimates for the solution Q^ε to (5.4)-(5.5) in the previous section also hold for Q^μ (and Q^ν) on $[0, T]$, it follows from (5.48) and (5.49) for Q^μ and Q_0^μ ,

$$\|Q^\mu\|_{C([0,T]:H^m)} \leq C_1(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^4}) \|Q_0^\mu\|_{H^m} \quad (6.10)$$

$$\leq C_2(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}), \quad (6.11)$$

where $C_1(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^4})$ and $C_2(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})$ are positive constants depending also on L_0 (in the previous Section) but not on μ . Second, by a similar argument to obtain (5.9) and by (6.11), there exists a positive constant $C_3(L, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})$ depending also on L_0 but not on μ such that

$$\frac{\|W(t)\|_{H^k}^2}{C_3(L, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})} \leq \mathcal{E}_k^{\mu,\nu}(W(t))^2 \leq C_3(L, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) \|W(t)\|_{H^k}^2 \quad (6.12)$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$. (Although constants $C_k(\cdot, \dots, \cdot)$ appearing here and hereafter in this part may also depend on L_0 , we omit to write it for simplicity. By noting L_0 is a fixed constant to ensure Proposition 5.1, any confusion will not occur.) Moreover, in what follows in this part, we use $B_k(\cdot)$ and $B_{L,k}(\cdot)$ for an integer k to denote a positive-valued increasing function on $[0, \infty)$. We use the latter only if the increasing function depends also on L .

Proof of (6.5):

We estimate $\mathcal{E}_1^{\mu,\nu}(W(t))$ for $t \in [0, T]$. Since Q^μ and Q^ν satisfy (6.1) and (6.3) respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\partial_t + (\mu^5 - ia_j)\partial_x^4 - b_j\partial_x^3 - i\lambda_j\partial_x^2\} \partial_x W_j \\ & = (\nu^5 - \mu^5)\partial_x^4(\partial_x Q_j^\nu) + I^{(1)} + I^{(2)} + I^{(3)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(1)} & := \partial_x (F_j^1(Q^\mu, \partial_x^2 Q^\mu)) - \partial_x (F_j^1(Q^\nu, \partial_x^2 Q^\nu)), \\ I^{(2)} & := \partial_x (F_j^2(Q^\mu, \partial_x Q^\mu)) - \partial_x (F_j^2(Q^\nu, \partial_x Q^\nu)), \\ I^{(3)} & := \partial_x (F_j^3(Q^\mu, \partial_x Q^\mu)) - \partial_x (F_j^3(Q^\nu, \partial_x Q^\nu)). \end{aligned}$$

Since F_j^1 satisfies the condition (F1),

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x (F_j^1(Q^\mu, \partial_x^2 Q^\mu)) & = O(g(Q^\mu)|\partial_x^3 Q^\mu|) + O(|\partial_x \{g(Q^\mu)\}| |\partial_x^2 Q^\mu|), \\ \partial_x (F_j^1(Q^\nu, \partial_x^2 Q^\nu)) & = O(g(Q^\nu)|\partial_x^3 Q^\nu|) + O(|\partial_x \{g(Q^\nu)\}| |\partial_x^2 Q^\nu|). \end{aligned}$$

By taking the difference between both sides, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(1)} &= O(g(Q^\mu)|\partial_x^3 W|) + O(|\partial_x \{g(Q^\mu)\}| |\partial_x^2 W|) + r_1 + r_2 \\ &= O(g(Q^\mu)|\partial_x^3 W|) + O(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^2} |Q^\mu| |\partial_x^2 W|) + r_1 + r_2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 &= O((|Q^\mu| + |Q^\nu|)|Q^\mu - Q^\nu| |\partial_x^3 Q^\nu|), \\ r_2 &= O((|Q^\mu| + |Q^\nu|)|\partial_x Q^\mu - \partial_x Q^\nu| |\partial_x^2 Q^\nu|) \\ &\quad + O((|\partial_x Q^\mu| + |\partial_x Q^\nu|)|Q^\mu - Q^\nu| |\partial_x^2 Q^\nu|). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|r_1(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{L^\infty})\|(Q^\mu - Q^\nu)(t)\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x^3 Q^\nu(t)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq B_1(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^1} + \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{H^3})\|W(t)\|_{H^1}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|r_2(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{L^\infty})\|(\partial_x Q^\mu - \partial_x Q^\nu)(t)\|_{L^2} \|\partial_x^2 Q^\nu(t)\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\quad + C(\|\partial_x Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x Q^\nu(t)\|_{L^2})\|(Q^\mu - Q^\nu)(t)\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x^2 Q^\nu(t)\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq B_2(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^1} + \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{H^3})\|W(t)\|_{H^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since F_j^2 satisfies (F2), the following holds for both $\varepsilon = \mu$ and $\varepsilon = \nu$:

If $d_2 = 0$, then

$$\partial_x (F_j^2(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)) = O\left(\sum_{p_1=0}^{d_1} |Q^\varepsilon|^{p_1} |\partial_x Q^\varepsilon|\right).$$

If $d_2 \geq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x (F_j^2(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)) &= O\left(\sum_{p_1=0}^{d_1} \sum_{p_2=1}^{d_2} |Q^\varepsilon|^{1+p_1} |\partial_x Q^\varepsilon|^{p_2-1} |\partial_x^2 Q^\varepsilon|\right) \\ &\quad + O\left(\sum_{p_1=0}^{d_1} \sum_{p_2=0}^{d_2} |Q^\varepsilon|^{p_1} |\partial_x Q^\varepsilon|^{p_2+1}\right) \\ &\quad + O\left(\sum_{p_1=0}^{d_1} |Q^\varepsilon|^{p_1} |\partial_x Q^\varepsilon|\right). \end{aligned}$$

In both cases, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(2)} &= O(B_3(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_x Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^\infty})|Q^\mu| |\partial_x^2 W|) + r_3 \\ &= O(B_3(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^2})|Q^\mu| |\partial_x^2 W|) + r_3, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\|r_3(t)\|_{L^2} \leq B_4(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^2} + \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{H^3})\|W(t)\|_{H^1}.$$

Since $F_{j,r}^{3,A}$ and $F_{j,r}^{3,B}$ satisfy (F3), the following holds for both $\varepsilon = \mu$ and $\varepsilon = \nu$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_x (F_j^3(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)) \\
&= \sum_{r=1}^n F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon) F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon) \\
&+ \sum_{r=1}^n \left(\int_{-\infty}^x F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\varepsilon, \partial_x Q^\varepsilon)(t, y) dy \right) \partial_x (F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\varepsilon)) \\
&= O \left(\sum_{p_3=0}^{d_3} \sum_{p_5=0}^{d_5} |Q^\varepsilon|^{3+p_3+p_5} + \sum_{p_4=0}^{d_4} \sum_{p_5=0}^{d_5} |Q^\varepsilon|^{1+p_5} |\partial_x Q^\varepsilon|^{2+p_4} \right) \\
&+ \left(\int_{-\infty}^x O \left(\sum_{p_3=0}^{d_3} |Q^\varepsilon|^{2+p_3} + \sum_{p_4=0}^{d_4} |\partial_x Q^\varepsilon|^{2+p_4} \right) (t, y) dy \right) \\
&\quad \times O \left(\sum_{p_5=0}^{d_5} |Q^\varepsilon|^{p_5} |\partial_x Q^\varepsilon| \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it is now easy to obtain

$$\|I^{(3)}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq B_5(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^2} + \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{H^2})\|W(t)\|_{H^1}.$$

Gathering them, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \{\partial_t + (\mu^5 - ia_j)\partial_x^4 - b_j\partial_x^3 - i\lambda_j\partial_x^2\} \partial_x W_j \\
&= O(g(Q^\mu)|\partial_x^3 W|) + O(B_6(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^2})|Q^\mu||\partial_x^2 W|) \\
&\quad + (\nu^5 - \mu^5)\partial_x^4(\partial_x Q_j^\nu) + r_4,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

where

$$\|r_4(t)\|_{L^2} \leq B_7(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^2} + \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{H^3})\|W(t)\|_{H^1}.$$

We next compute the right hand side of

$$\partial_t \left(\frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^\mu i W_j \right) = \frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^\mu i \partial_t W_j + \frac{L}{4a_j} (\partial_t \Phi^\mu) i W_j. \tag{6.14}$$

The argument is almost the same as that to obtain (5.33)-(5.34) and (5.35)-(5.36). First, it is not difficult to show

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t W_j &= \{(-\mu^5 + ia_j)\partial_x^4 + b_j\partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j\partial_x^2\} W_j \\
&\quad + O(g(Q^\mu)|\partial_x^2 W|) + (\nu^5 - \mu^5)\partial_x^4 Q_j^\nu + r_5,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\|r_5(t)\|_{L^2} \leq B_8(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^2} + \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{H^3})\|W(t)\|_{H^1}.$$

Substituting this and using $\|\Phi^\mu(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^2}^2$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^\mu i \partial_t W_j &= \{(-\mu^5 + ia_j) \partial_x^4 + b_j \partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j \partial_x^2\} \left(\frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^\mu i W_j \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\mu^5 i}{a_j} + 1 \right) L \partial_x \{g(Q^\mu) \partial_x^2 W_j\} \\ &\quad + O(B_{L,1}(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^2}) |Q^\mu| |\partial_x^2 W|) \\ &\quad + (\nu^5 - \mu^5) \frac{L}{4a_j} O(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^2}^2) \partial_x^4 Q_j^\nu + r_6, \end{aligned} \quad (6.15)$$

where

$$\|r_6(t)\|_{L^2} \leq B_{L,2}(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^3} + \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{H^3}) \|W(t)\|_{H^1}.$$

Second, the same computation to obtain (5.34) shows

$$\left\| \left(\frac{L}{4a_j} (\partial_t \Phi^\mu) i W_j \right) (t) \right\|_{L^2} \leq B_{L,3}(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^4}) \|W(t)\|_{H^1}. \quad (6.16)$$

Applying (6.15) and (6.16) to (6.14), and combining this with (6.13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t Z_j^1 &= \{(-\mu^5 + ia_j) \partial_x^4 + b_j \partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j \partial_x^2\} Z_j^1 \\ &\quad + O(g(Q^\mu) |\partial_x^3 W|) + \left(\frac{\mu^5 i}{a_j} + 1 \right) L \partial_x \{g(Q^\mu) \partial_x^2 W_j\} \\ &\quad + O(B_{L,4}(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^2}) |Q^\mu| |\partial_x^2 W|) \\ &\quad + (\nu^5 - \mu^5) \left\{ \partial_x^4 (\partial_x Q_j^\nu) + \frac{L}{4a_j} O(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^2}^2) \partial_x^4 Q_j^\nu \right\} + r_7, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\|r_7(t)\|_{L^2} \leq B_{L,5}(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^4} + \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{H^3}) \|W(t)\|_{H^1}.$$

Furthermore, using $\partial_x W_j = Z_j^1 - L O(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^2}^2 |W_j|)$ which follows from (6.7) for $k = 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t Z_j^1 &= \{(-\mu^5 + ia_j) \partial_x^4 + b_j \partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j \partial_x^2\} Z_j^1 \\ &\quad + O(g(Q^\mu) |\partial_x^2 Z_j^1|) + \left(\frac{\mu^5 i}{a_j} + 1 \right) L \partial_x \{g(Q^\mu) \partial_x Z_j^1\} \\ &\quad + O(B_{L,6}(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^2}) |Q^\mu| |\partial_x Z_j^1|) \\ &\quad + (\nu^5 - \mu^5) \left\{ \partial_x^4 (\partial_x Q_j^\nu) + \frac{L}{4a_j} O(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^2}^2) \partial_x^4 Q_j^\nu \right\} + r_8, \end{aligned} \quad (6.17)$$

where

$$\|r_8(t)\|_{L^2} \leq B_{L,7}(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^4} + \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{H^3}) \|W(t)\|_{H^1}. \quad (6.18)$$

By the almost same way to obtain (5.43), we use (6.17) with (6.18) to derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|Z^1(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu^5 \|\partial_x^2 Z^1(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq (-L + C_\star) \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(Q^\mu) |\partial_x Z^1|^2 dx + J_1 + J_2, \end{aligned} \quad (6.19)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 & := (\nu^5 - \mu^5) \sum_{j=1}^n \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left\{ \partial_x^4 (\partial_x Q_j^\nu) + \frac{L}{4a_j} O(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^2}^2) \partial_x^4 Q_j^\nu \right\} \overline{Z_j^1} dx, \\ J_2 & := B_{L,7} (\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^4} + \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{H^3}) \|W(t)\|_{H^1} \|Z^1(t)\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and $C_\star > 0$ is a positive constant which is independent of L . Recall here that (6.11) ensures $\|Q^\mu\|_{C([0,T];H^4)}$ and $\|Q^\nu\|_{C([0,T];H^4)}$ are bounded by a positive constant depending on T and $\|Q_0\|_{H^m}$ but not on μ and ν . From this and (6.12), it is easy to have

$$J_2 \leq C_4(L, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) \mathcal{E}_1^{\mu,\nu}(W(t))^2. \quad (6.20)$$

In addition, it follows that

$$J_1 \leq C_5(L, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) (\nu^5 - \mu^5) \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{H^5} \|Z^1(t)\|_{L^2}.$$

Here, applying (6.10) for $m = 5$, we have

$$\|Q^\nu\|_{C([0,T];H^5)} \leq C_6(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^4}) \|Q_0^\nu\|_{H^5}.$$

Moreover, applying (5.2) for $\varepsilon = \nu$, $m = 4$ and $\ell = 1$, we have

$$\|Q_0^\nu\|_{H^5} \leq C\nu^{-1} \|Q_0\|_{H^4}.$$

Combining them, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 & \leq C_7(L, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) (\nu^5 - \mu^5) \nu^{-1} \|Z^1(t)\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C_7(L, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) \nu^4 \mathcal{E}_1^{\mu,\nu}(W(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, going back to (6.19) and taking $L = L_1 > 1$ so that $-L_1 + C_\star < 0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|Z^1(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_8(L_1, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) (\mathcal{E}_1^{\mu,\nu}(W(t))^2 + \nu^4 \mathcal{E}_1^{\mu,\nu}(W(t))).$$

On the other hand, it is now not difficult to show

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|W(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_9(L_1, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) (\mathcal{E}_1^{\mu,\nu}(W(t))^2 + \nu^5 \mathcal{E}_1^{\mu,\nu}(W(t))).$$

Combining them, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}_1^{\mu,\nu}(W(t))^2 \leq C_{10}(L_1, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) (\mathcal{E}_1^{\mu,\nu}(W(t))^2 + \nu^4 \mathcal{E}_1^{\mu,\nu}(W(t))). \quad (6.21)$$

The Gronwall inequality for (6.21) shows

$$\mathcal{E}_1^{\mu,\nu}(W(t)) \leq C_{11}(L_1, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) (\mathcal{E}_1^{\mu,\nu}(W(0)) + \nu^4),$$

and hence the equivalence (6.12) shows

$$\begin{aligned} \|W(t)\|_{H^1} &\leq C_{12}(L_1, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})(\|W(0)\|_{H^1} + \nu^4) \\ &= C_{12}(L_1, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})(\|Q_0^\mu - Q_0^\nu\|_{H^1} + \nu^4) \end{aligned} \quad (6.22)$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$. This combined with the triangle inequality $\|Q_0^\mu - Q_0^\nu\|_{H^1} \leq \|Q_0^\mu - Q_0\|_{H^1} + \|Q_0 - Q_0^\nu\|_{H^1}$ and (5.3) (where $\ell = m - 1$) for $0 < \mu \leq \nu < 1$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|W\|_{C([0,T];H^1)} &\leq C_{13}(L_1, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})(\mu^{m-1} + \nu^{m-1} + \nu^4) \\ &\leq 2C_{13}(L_1, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})(\nu^{m-1} + \nu^4), \end{aligned} \quad (6.23)$$

which is the desired (6.5).

Proof of (6.6):

We estimate $\mathcal{E}_m^{\mu,\nu}(W(t))$ for $t \in [0, T]$. Recall again that (6.11) shows the existence of a positive constant $D_1 = D_1(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})$ which is independent of μ and ν such that

$$\|Q^\mu\|_{C([0,T];H^m)} + \|Q^\nu\|_{C([0,T];H^m)} \leq D_1(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}). \quad (6.24)$$

The fact will be used hereafter to show (6.6) sometimes without any comments. Other constants which are independent of μ and ν will be denoted by $D_k = D_k(\cdot, \dots, \cdot)$ for some integer $k = 2, 3, \dots$. In addition, we use $s_{m,k}$ for an integer k to denote a function of (t, x) satisfying

$$\|s_{m,k}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq D_k(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})\|W(t)\|_{H^m} \quad \text{for any } t \in [0, T]. \quad (6.25)$$

We use $s_{m,L,k}$ instead of $s_{m,k}$ only when the above D_k depends also on L .

By taking the difference between (5.15) for Q^μ and that for Q^ν ,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \partial_x^m W_j &= \partial_t \partial_x^m Q_j^\mu - \partial_t \partial_x^m Q_j^\nu \\ &= \{(-\mu^5 + ia_j) \partial_x^4 + b_j \partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j \partial_x^2\} \partial_x^m W_j \\ &\quad + (\nu^5 - \mu^5) \partial_x^4 (\partial_x^m Q_j^\nu) + I_m^{(1)} + I_m^{(2)} + I_m^{(3)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_m^{(1)} &:= \partial_x^m (F_j^1(Q^\mu, \partial_x^2 Q^\mu)) - \partial_x^m (F_j^1(Q^\nu, \partial_x^2 Q^\nu)), \\ I_m^{(2)} &:= \partial_x^m (F_j^2(Q^\mu, \partial_x Q^\mu)) - \partial_x^m (F_j^2(Q^\nu, \partial_x Q^\nu)), \\ I_m^{(3)} &:= \partial_x^m (F_j^3(Q^\mu, \partial_x Q^\mu)) - \partial_x^m (F_j^3(Q^\nu, \partial_x Q^\nu)). \end{aligned}$$

Noting (5.16) with (5.17), and using (6.24), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} I_m^{(1)} &= O(g(Q^\mu) |\partial_x^2 (\partial_x^m W)|) + O(|Q^\mu| |\partial_x (\partial_x^m W)|) \\ &\quad + O(|W| |\partial_x^2 (\partial_x^m Q^\nu)|) + O((|\partial_x W| + |W|) |\partial_x (\partial_x^m Q^\nu)|) + s_{m,1}. \end{aligned}$$

In the same way as above, it is not difficult to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} I_m^{(2)} &= O(|Q^\mu| |\partial_x (\partial_x^m W)|) + O(|W| |\partial_x (\partial_x^m Q^\nu)|) + s_{m,2}, \\ I_m^{(3)} &= s_{m,3}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining them, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \partial_x^m W_j &= \{(-\mu^5 + ia_j) \partial_x^4 + b_j \partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j \partial_x^2\} \partial_x^m W_j \\
&\quad + (\nu^5 - \mu^5) \partial_x^{m+4} Q_j^\nu + O(g(Q^\mu) |\partial_x^{m+2} W|) \\
&\quad + O(|Q^\mu| |\partial_x^{m+1} W|) + O(|W| |\partial_x^{m+2} Q^\nu|) \\
&\quad + O((|\partial_x W| + |W|) |\partial_x^{m+1} Q^\nu|) + s_{m,1} + s_{m,2} + s_{m,3}. \tag{6.26}
\end{aligned}$$

In the same way as above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \partial_x^{m-1} W_j &= \{(-\mu^5 + ia_j) \partial_x^4 + b_j \partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j \partial_x^2\} \partial_x^{m-1} W_j \\
&\quad + (\nu^5 - \mu^5) \partial_x^{m+3} Q_j^\nu + O(|Q^\mu| |\partial_x^{m+1} W|) \\
&\quad + O(|W| |\partial_x^{m+1} Q^\nu|) + s_{m,4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the almost same computation to obtain (5.33) and (6.15), we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^\mu i \partial_t \partial_x^{m-1} W_j \\
&= \{(-\mu^5 + ia_j) \partial_x^4 + b_j \partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j \partial_x^2\} \left(\frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^\mu i \partial_x^{m-1} W_j \right) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{\mu^5 i}{a_j} + 1 \right) L \partial_x \{g(Q^\mu) \partial_x^{m+1} W_j\} \\
&\quad + L O(|Q^\mu| |\partial_x^{m+1} W|) + L O(|W| |\partial_x^{m+1} Q^\nu|) \\
&\quad + (\nu^5 - \mu^5) \frac{L}{4a_j} O(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^2}^2) \partial_x^{m+3} Q_j^\nu + s_{m,L,5}. \tag{6.27}
\end{aligned}$$

The same computation to obtain (5.34) and (6.16) shows

$$\left\| \left(\frac{L}{4a_j} (\partial_t \Phi^\mu) i \partial_x^{m-1} W_j \right) (t) \right\|_{L^2} \leq C L \|W(t)\|_{H^m}. \tag{6.28}$$

Combining (6.26), (6.27), and (6.28), and using (6.7) for $k = m$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t Z_j^m &= \{(-\mu^5 + ia_j) \partial_x^4 + b_j \partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j \partial_x^2\} Z_j^m + O(g(Q^\mu) |\partial_x^2 Z_j^m|) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{\mu^5 i}{a_j} + 1 \right) L \partial_x \{g(Q^\mu) \partial_x Z_j^m\} \\
&\quad + (1 + L) O(|Q^\mu| |\partial_x Z_j^m|) + O(|W| |\partial_x^{m+2} Q^\nu|) \\
&\quad + (1 + L) O((|\partial_x W| + |W|) |\partial_x^{m+1} Q^\nu|) \\
&\quad + (\nu^5 - \mu^5) \left\{ \partial_x^{m+4} Q_j^\nu + \frac{L}{4a_j} O(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^2}^2) \partial_x^{m+3} Q_j^\nu \right\} + s_{m,L,6}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, in the same way as we obtain (5.43), we use the integration by part, the Young inequality and (6.12) for $k = m$ to deduce

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|Z^m(t)\|_{L^2}^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq (C^* - L) \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(Q^\mu) |\partial_x Z^m|^2 dx + D_2(L, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) \mathcal{E}_m^{\mu, \nu}(W(t))^2 \\
&\quad + D_3(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) \|W(t)\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x^{m+2} Q^\nu(t)\|_{L^2} \|Z^m(t)\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + D_4(L, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) \|\partial_x W(t)\|_{L^2} \|\partial_x^{m+1} Q^\nu(t)\|_{L^\infty} \|Z^m(t)\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + D_5(L, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) \|W(t)\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x^{m+1} Q^\nu(t)\|_{L^2} \|Z^m(t)\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + (\nu^5 - \mu^5) \sum_{j=1}^n \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left\{ \partial_x^{m+4} Q_j^\nu + \frac{L}{4a_j} O(\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^2}^2) \partial_x^{m+3} Q_j^\nu \right\} \overline{Z_j^m} dx \\
&\leq (C^* - L) \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(Q^\mu) |\partial_x Z^m|^2 dx + D_2(L, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) \mathcal{E}_m^{\mu, \nu}(W(t))^2 \\
&\quad + D_6(L, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) \|W(t)\|_{H^1} \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{H^{m+2}} \|Z^m(t)\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + D_7(L, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) (\nu^5 - \mu^5) \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{H^{m+4}} \|Z^m(t)\|_{L^2}. \tag{6.29}
\end{aligned}$$

By the same reason as that we choose L_0 and L_1 , we can take the constant $C^* > 0$ independently of L and hence can take a positive constant $L = L_2$ so that $C^* - L_2 < 0$. Furthermore, as the estimate (6.10) holds even when m is replaced with $m + j$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$\|Q^\nu\|_{C([0, T]; H^{m+j})} \leq D_8(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^4}) \|Q_0^\nu\|_{H^{m+j}} \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots).$$

Noting (5.2), we see the left hand side of the above grows up as $\nu \downarrow 0$, that is,

$$\|Q^\nu\|_{C([0, T]; H^{m+j})} \leq D_9(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) \nu^{-j} \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots). \tag{6.30}$$

Combining (6.30) for $j = 2$ and (6.23), we deduce

$$\|W(t)\|_{H^1} \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{H^{m+2}} \leq D_{10}(L_1, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) (\nu^{(m-1)-2} + \nu^{4-2}). \tag{6.31}$$

In the same way, we apply (6.30) for $j = 4$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(\nu^5 - \mu^5) \|Q^\nu(t)\|_{H^{m+4}} &\leq D_{11}(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) (\nu^5 - \mu^5) \nu^{-4} \\
&\leq D_{11}(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) \nu. \tag{6.32}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (6.29) with the above choice of $L = L_2$, (6.31)-(6.32), (6.12) for $k = m$, and noting $0 < \nu < 1$, we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|Z^m(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq D_{12} \{ \mathcal{E}_m^{\mu, \nu}(W(t))^2 + (\nu^{m-3} + \nu) \mathcal{E}_m^{\mu, \nu}(W(t)) \}$$

where $D_2 = D_{12}(L_1, L_2, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})$. On the other hand, it is now easy to obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|W(t)\|_{H^{m-1}}^2 \leq D_{13} \{ \mathcal{E}_m^{\mu, \nu}(W(t))^2 + (\nu^{m-2} + \nu^2) \mathcal{E}_m^{\mu, \nu}(W(t)) \}$$

where $D_{13} = D_{13}(L_1, L_2, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})$. The above two inequalities and $0 < \nu < 1$ shows

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}_m^{\mu, \nu}(W(t))^2 \leq D_{14} \{ \mathcal{E}_m^{\mu, \nu}(W(t))^2 + (\nu^{m-3} + \nu) \mathcal{E}_m^{\mu, \nu}(W(t)) \}$$

where $D_{14} = D_{14}(L_1, L_2, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})$. The Gronwall inequality and (6.12) shows

$$\|W\|_{C([0,T];H^m)} \leq D_{15}(L_1, L_2, T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) (\nu^{m-3} + \nu + \|W(0)\|_{H^m}),$$

which is the desired (6.6). \square

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1

This section completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let m be an integer satisfying $m \geq 4$, and let $Q_0 \in H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$. From the time-reversibility of (1.1), it suffices to solve (1.1)-(1.2) in positive time-direction.

Local existence of a solution in CH^m :

Let $\{Q_0^\alpha\}_{\alpha \in (0,1)}$ be the Bona-Smith approximation of Q_0 introduced in Section 5. For μ and ν with $0 < \mu \leq \nu < 1$, let Q^μ and Q^ν satisfy (6.1)-(6.2) and (6.3)-(6.4) respectively. Let $T = T(\|Q_0\|_{H^4}) > 0$ be given by (5.47) independently of μ and ν . Combining (6.6) in Proposition 6.1 with the triangle inequality, the convergence $Q_0^\alpha \rightarrow Q_0$ in H^m as $\alpha \downarrow 0$, and $m \geq 4$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \|Q^\mu - Q^\nu\|_{C([0,T];H^m)} \\ & \leq C(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) (\nu^{m-3} + \nu + \|Q_0^\mu - Q_0\|_{H^m} + \|Q_0 - Q_0^\nu\|_{H^m}) \\ & \rightarrow 0 \quad (\mu, \nu \downarrow 0). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\{Q^\mu\}_{\mu \in (0,1)}$ is Cauchy in $C([0, T]; H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$, and thus there exists its limit $Q := \lim_{\mu \downarrow 0} Q^\mu$ in $C([0, T]; H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$. By the strong convergence, it is not difficult to prove that Q is actually a solution to (1.1)-(1.2). If we may add something, the proof of it is reduced to the justification of

$$F_j(Q^\mu, \partial_x Q^\mu, \partial_x^2 Q^\mu) \rightarrow F_j(Q, \partial_x Q, \partial_x^2 Q) \quad \text{as } \mu \downarrow 0$$

for each $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ in the sense of distribution on $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}$. We omit the detail but demonstrate only the proof of

$$F_j^3(Q^\mu, \partial_x Q^\mu) \rightarrow F_j^3(Q, \partial_x Q) \quad \text{as } \mu \downarrow 0 \tag{7.1}$$

for readers who are interested in how to handle the nonlocal terms. In fact, we can prove it in the sense of uniformly convergence on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$ as follows: By a simple calculation and the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & |F_j^3(Q^\mu, \partial_x Q^\mu) - F_j^3(Q, \partial_x Q)| (t, x) \\ & \leq \sum_{r=1}^n \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\mu, \partial_x Q^\mu) - F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q, \partial_x Q)| (t, y) dy \right) |F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\mu)(t, x)| \\ & \quad + \sum_{r=1}^n \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q, \partial_x Q)| (t, y) dy \right) |(F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\mu) - F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q))(t, x)|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $F_{j,r}^{3,A}$ and $F_{j,r}^{3,B}$ satisfy (F3) with (1.5) and (1.6), it follows from the Schwarz inequality and the Sobolev embedding

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q, \partial_x Q) \right| (t, y) dy \\ & \leq C \left(\sum_{p_3=0}^{d_3} \|Q(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{p_3} + \sum_{p_4=0}^{d_4} \|\partial_x Q(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{p_4} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}} (|Q|^2 + |\partial_x Q|^2) (t, y) dy \\ & \leq C \sum_{\ell=2}^{d_3+d_4+2} \|Q\|_{C([0,T];H^2)}^\ell, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q^\mu, \partial_x Q^\mu) - F_{j,r}^{3,A}(Q, \partial_x Q) \right| (t, y) dy \\ & \leq C \sum_{p_3=0}^{d_3} \int_{\mathbb{R}} ((|Q^\mu|^{1+p_3} + |Q|^{1+p_3}) |Q^\mu - Q|) (t, y) dy \\ & \quad + C \sum_{p_4=0}^{d_4} \int_{\mathbb{R}} ((|\partial_x Q^\mu|^{1+p_4} + |\partial_x Q|^{1+p_4}) |\partial_x Q^\mu - \partial_x Q|) (t, y) dy \\ & \leq C \sum_{p_3=0}^{d_3} (\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{p_3} + \|Q(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{p_3}) (\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^2} + \|Q(t)\|_{L^2}) \| (Q^\mu - Q)(t) \|_{L^2} \\ & \quad + C \sum_{p_4=0}^{d_4} (\|\partial_x Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{p_4} + \|\partial_x Q(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{p_4}) \\ & \quad \quad \times (\|\partial_x Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x Q(t)\|_{L^2}) \| (\partial_x Q^\mu - \partial_x Q)(t) \|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C \sum_{p_3=0}^{d_3} (\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^1}^{1+p_3} + \|Q(t)\|_{H^1}^{1+p_3}) \| (Q^\mu - Q)(t) \|_{L^2} \\ & \quad + C \sum_{p_4=0}^{d_4} (\|\partial_x Q^\mu(t)\|_{H^1}^{1+p_4} + \|\partial_x Q(t)\|_{H^1}^{1+p_4}) \| (\partial_x Q^\mu - \partial_x Q)(t) \|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C \sum_{\ell=1}^{d_3+d_4+1} \left(\sup_{\mu \in (0,1)} \|Q^\mu\|_{C([0,T];H^2)}^\ell + \|Q\|_{C([0,T];H^2)}^\ell \right) \|Q^\mu - Q\|_{C([0,T];H^1)}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\left| F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\mu)(t, x) \right| \leq C \sum_{p_5=0}^{d_5} \|Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{1+p_5} \leq C \sum_{p_5=0}^{d_5} \sup_{\mu \in (0,1)} \|Q^\mu\|_{C([0,T];H^1)}^{1+p_5},$$

$$\left| \left(F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q^\mu) - F_{j,r}^{3,B}(Q) \right) (t, x) \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \sum_{p_5=0}^{d_5} (\|Q^\mu(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{p_5} + \|Q(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{p_5}) \|(Q^\mu - Q)(t)\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\leq C \sum_{p_5=0}^{d_5} \left(\sup_{\mu \in (0,1)} \|Q^\mu\|_{C([0,T];H^1)}^{p_5} + \|Q\|_{C([0,T];H^1)}^{p_5} \right) \|Q^\mu - Q\|_{C([0,T];H^1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining them, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}} |F_j^3(Q^\mu, \partial_x Q^\mu) - F_j^3(Q, \partial_x Q)| (t, x) \\
&\leq C \sum_{\ell=1}^{d_3+d_4+1} \sum_{p_5=0}^{d_5} M_T^{1+p_5} \left(M_T^\ell + \|Q\|_{C([0,T];H^2)}^\ell \right) \|Q^\mu - Q\|_{C([0,T];H^1)} \\
&\quad + C \sum_{\ell=2}^{d_3+d_4+2} \sum_{p_5=0}^{d_5} \|Q\|_{C([0,T];H^2)}^\ell \left(M_T^{p_5} + \|Q\|_{C([0,T];H^1)}^{p_5} \right) \|Q^\mu - Q\|_{C([0,T];H^1)},
\end{aligned}$$

where $M_T := \sup_{\mu \in (0,1)} \|Q^\mu\|_{C([0,T];H^2)}$. Since $\{Q^\mu\}_{\mu \in (0,1)}$ converges to Q and is bounded in $C([0, T]; H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$, it follows that $\|Q^\mu - Q\|_{C([0,T];H^1)} \rightarrow 0$ as $\mu \downarrow 0$ and $M_T < \infty$. This implies the desired convergence

$$\sup_{(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}} |F_j^3(Q^\mu, \partial_x Q^\mu) - F_j^3(Q, \partial_x Q)| (t, x) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \mu \downarrow 0.$$

Uniqueness of the solution:

Let $Q^1, Q^2 \in C([0, T]; H^4(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$ be solutions to (1.1) with $Q^1(0, x) = Q^2(0, x)$. Then $Q^1, Q^2 \in C^1([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$. Set $\widetilde{W} = {}^t(\widetilde{W}_1, \dots, \widetilde{W}_n) := Q^1 - Q^2$. It suffices to show $\widetilde{W} = 0$. For this purpose, we introduce $\widetilde{Z}^1 = {}^t(\widetilde{Z}_1^1, \dots, \widetilde{Z}_n^1)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\widetilde{W}(t))$, where

$$\widetilde{Z}_j^1 = \widetilde{Z}_j^1(t, x) := \partial_x \widetilde{W}_j(t, x) + \frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^1(t, x) i \widetilde{W}_j(t, x) \quad (j \in \{1, \dots, n\}), \quad (7.2)$$

$$\Phi^1 = \Phi^1(t, x) := \int_{-\infty}^x g(Q^1(t, y)) dy \left(= \int_{-\infty}^x |Q^1(t, y)|^2 dy \right), \quad (7.3)$$

$$\mathcal{E}(\widetilde{W}(t))^2 := \|\widetilde{Z}^1(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\widetilde{W}(t)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and $L > 1$ is again a constant which will be taken later. The argument below is formally the same as that we obtain (6.17) and (6.21) under the setting $\mu = \nu = 0$ and the modification of (Q^μ, Q^ν) with (Q^1, Q^2) . We can make it rigorous by taking the regularity of Q^1 and Q^2 into account: Since

$$\widetilde{Z}^1 \in C([0, T]; H^3(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)) \cap C^1([0, T]; H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)), \quad (7.4)$$

the following holds in the sense of distribution on $(0, T)$:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\widetilde{Z}^1(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = 2 \operatorname{Re} \sum_{j=1}^n \left\langle \partial_t \widetilde{Z}_j^1(t), \widetilde{Z}_j^1(t) \right\rangle_{H^{-1}, H^1}, \quad (7.5)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H^{-1}, H^1}$ denotes the duality pairing for $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C})$ and $H^1(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C})$. Since $Q^1 \in C([0, T]; H^4(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)) \cap C^1([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$,

$$\partial_t \Phi^1(t, x) = 2 \operatorname{Re} \int_{-\infty}^x \frac{\partial Q^1}{\partial t}(t, y) \cdot Q^1(t, y) dy$$

holds for any $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, it follows that

$$\partial_t \left(\frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^1 i \widetilde{W}_j \right) = \frac{L}{4a_j} \Phi^1 i \partial_t \widetilde{W}_j + \frac{L}{4a_j} (\partial_t \Phi^1) i \widetilde{W}_j \quad \text{in } C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}))$$

for $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Noting them and (7.4), we deduce

$$\partial_t \widetilde{Z}_j^1 = (ia_j \partial_x^4 + b_j \partial_x^3 + i\lambda_j \partial_x^2) \widetilde{Z}_j^1 + R_j \quad \text{in } C([0, T]; H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C})) \quad (7.6)$$

for $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} R_j &= O\left(g(Q^1) |\partial_x^2 \widetilde{Z}^1|\right) + L \partial_x \left\{ g(Q^1) \partial_x \widetilde{Z}_j^1 \right\} + O\left(|Q^1| |\partial_x \widetilde{Z}^1|\right) + r_j, \\ \|r_j(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|Q^1\|_{C([0, T]; H^4)} + \|Q^2\|_{C([0, T]; H^3)}) \|\widetilde{W}(t)\|_{H^1}. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, (7.4) shows $R_j \in C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}))$, and thus $\langle R_j(t), \widetilde{Z}_j^1(t) \rangle_{H^{-1}, H^1}$ is just their L^2 -product. Noting them and using (7.5)-(7.6), we can take a sufficiently large L so that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\widetilde{Z}^1(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq A_L(\|Q^1(t)\|_{H^4} + \|Q^2(t)\|_{H^3}) \mathcal{E}(\widetilde{W}(t))^2,$$

where $A_L(\cdot)$ is a positive-valued increasing function on $[0, \infty)$ which depends on L . This estimate combined with that for the time-derivative of $\|\widetilde{W}(t)\|_{L^2}^2$ implies

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}(\widetilde{W}(t))^2 \leq C(L, \|Q^1\|_{C([0, T]; H^4)} + \|Q^2\|_{C([0, T]; H^3)}) \mathcal{E}(\widetilde{W}(t))^2.$$

Hence, the Gronwall inequality and $Q^1(0, x) = Q^2(0, x)$ shows $\mathcal{E}(\widetilde{W}(t)) = 0$ for any $t \in [0, T]$. This implies $\widetilde{W} = 0$ on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$, which is the desired result.

Continuous dependence:

Let $Q \in C([0, T(\|Q_0\|_{H^4})]; H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$ be the unique solution to (1.1) with $Q(0, \cdot) = Q_0 \in H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ constructed above. Fix $T' \in (0, T(\|Q_0\|_{H^4}))$. Let $\eta > 0$ be any given. We take $\delta > 0$ (which will be retaken sufficiently small later) and $\widetilde{Q}_0 \in H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ to satisfy $\|Q_0 - \widetilde{Q}_0\|_{H^m} < \delta$. We denote the solution to (1.1) with $\widetilde{Q}(0, \cdot) = \widetilde{Q}_0$ by $\widetilde{Q} \in C([0, T(\|\widetilde{Q}_0\|_{H^4})]; H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$. Moreover, let Q_0^α and \widetilde{Q}_0^α for each $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be defined to form Bona-Smith approximations of Q_0 and \widetilde{Q}_0 respectively, and let Q^α and \widetilde{Q}^α be regularized solutions to (5.4) (for $\varepsilon = \alpha$) with

$Q^\alpha(0, \cdot) = Q_0^\alpha$ and $\tilde{Q}^\alpha(0, \cdot) = \tilde{Q}_0^\alpha$ respectively. In view of the lower-semicontinuity for $T = T(\|Q_0\|_{H^4})$ given by (5.47) with respect to Q_0 , there exists a sufficiently small $0 < \delta_1 < 1$ such that $Q, \tilde{Q}, Q^\alpha, \tilde{Q}^\alpha$ exist commonly at least on $[0, T']$ if δ satisfies $0 < \delta < \delta_1$. In what follows, we fix such δ_1 and assume $0 < \delta < \delta_1 < 1$.

We estimate $\|Q - \tilde{Q}\|_{C([0, T']; H^m)}$. By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q - \tilde{Q}\|_{C([0, T']; H^m)} &\leq \|Q - Q^\alpha\|_{C([0, T']; H^m)} + \|Q^\alpha - \tilde{Q}^\alpha\|_{C([0, T']; H^m)} \\ &\quad + \|\tilde{Q}^\alpha - \tilde{Q}\|_{C([0, T']; H^m)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 7.1. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. There exists a constant $C = C(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) > 1$ which depends on T and $\|Q_0\|_{H^m}$ but is independent of α such that*

$$\|Q - Q^\alpha\|_{C([0, T']; H^m)} \leq C(\alpha^{m-3} + \alpha + \|Q_0 - Q_0^\alpha\|_{H^m}), \quad (7.7)$$

$$\|\tilde{Q}^\alpha - \tilde{Q}\|_{C([0, T']; H^m)} \leq C(\alpha^{m-3} + \alpha + \|\tilde{Q}_0^\alpha - \tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^m}), \quad (7.8)$$

$$\|Q^\alpha - \tilde{Q}^\alpha\|_{C([0, T']; H^m)} \leq C(\alpha^{m-3} + \alpha^{-2}\|Q_0 - \tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^1} + \|Q_0^\alpha - \tilde{Q}_0^\alpha\|_{H^m}). \quad (7.9)$$

Proof of Proposition 7.1. Let μ, ν be positive parameters satisfying $0 < \mu \leq \nu < 1$. By (6.6), the following holds:

$$\|Q^\mu - Q^\nu\|_{C([0, T']; H^m)} \leq C(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) (\nu^{m-3} + \nu + \|Q_0^\mu - Q_0^\nu\|_{H^m}). \quad (7.10)$$

The estimate (7.7) is obtained by fixing $\nu = \alpha$ and by passing the limit as $\mu \downarrow 0$ in (7.10), where we use $Q_0^\mu \rightarrow Q_0$ in $H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ and $Q^\mu \rightarrow Q$ in $C([0, T']; H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n))$ as $\mu \downarrow 0$.

The estimate (7.8) is obtained in the same manner: If we show (7.7) for $\tilde{Q}, \tilde{Q}^\alpha, \tilde{Q}_0, \tilde{Q}_0^\alpha$ in place for $Q, Q^\alpha, Q_0, Q_0^\alpha$ respectively, then it reads

$$\|\tilde{Q}^\alpha - \tilde{Q}\|_{C([0, T']; H^m)} \leq C(\alpha^{m-3} + \alpha + \|\tilde{Q}_0^\alpha - \tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^m}),$$

where $C = C(T, \|\tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^m}) > 1$. Recalling $\|Q_0 - \tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^m} < \delta \leq 1$, we can retake a larger constant C which depends on T and $\|Q_0\|_{H^m}$.

The estimate (7.9) follows from a similar argument to obtain (6.6) and (7.7) with slight modification. The difference of (7.7) and (7.9) in their right hand side comes from the estimate for $Q^\alpha - \tilde{Q}^\alpha$ in CH^1 : To be more precise, a similar argument to obtain (6.22) (but without handling the terms with coefficient $\nu^5 - \mu^5$) yields

$$\|Q^\alpha - \tilde{Q}^\alpha\|_{C([0, T']; H^1)} \leq C_1(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}, \|\tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^m}) \|Q_0^\alpha - \tilde{Q}_0^\alpha\|_{H^1}.$$

From the triangle inequality and (5.3) with $\ell = m - 1$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_0^\alpha - \tilde{Q}_0^\alpha\|_{H^1} &\leq \|Q_0^\alpha - Q_0\|_{H^1} + \|Q_0 - \tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^1} + \|\tilde{Q}_0 - \tilde{Q}_0^\alpha\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq C_2 \alpha^{m-1} (\|Q_0\|_{H^m} + \|\tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^m}) + \|Q_0 - \tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the constant $C_2 > 0$ is also independent of α . Combining them and $\|\tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^m} \leq \|Q_0\|_{H^m} + 1$, we see that there exists a positive constant $C_3 = C_3(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})$ which

is independent of α such that

$$\|Q^\alpha - \tilde{Q}^\alpha\|_{C([0,T'];H^1)} \leq C_3(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})(\alpha^{m-1} + \|Q_0 - \tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^1}). \quad (7.11)$$

It is then straightforward to derive (7.9) by using (7.11) in the same way as we obtain (6.6) by using (6.5) (or (6.23)), where the key procedure involves the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \| (Q^\alpha - \tilde{Q}^\alpha)(t) \|_{H^1} \| \tilde{Q}^\alpha(t) \|_{H^{m+2}} \\ & \leq C_4(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}, \| \tilde{Q}_0 \|_{H^m}) (\alpha^{m-1} + \|Q_0 - \tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^1}) \alpha^{-2} \\ & \leq C_5(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) (\alpha^{m-3} + \alpha^{-2} \|Q_0 - \tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^1}), \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to the part (6.31) to obtain (6.6). The difference between the above and (6.31) affects the right hand side of (7.9). We omit the detail for the other parts. \square

Furthermore, by the triangle inequality and (5.1),

$$\|Q_0^\alpha - \tilde{Q}_0^\alpha\|_{H^m} = \|(Q_0 - \tilde{Q}_0)^\alpha\|_{H^m} \leq \|Q_0 - \tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^m}, \quad (7.12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \| \tilde{Q}_0^\alpha - \tilde{Q}_0 \|_{H^m} & \leq \| \tilde{Q}_0^\alpha - Q_0^\alpha \|_{H^m} + \| Q_0^\alpha - Q_0 \|_{H^m} + \| Q_0 - \tilde{Q}_0 \|_{H^m} \\ & \leq \| Q_0^\alpha - Q_0 \|_{H^m} + 2 \| Q_0 - \tilde{Q}_0 \|_{H^m}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.13)$$

Gathering (7.7)-(7.9) and (7.12)-(7.13), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \|Q - \tilde{Q}\|_{C([0,T'];H^m)} \\ & \leq C(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) \\ & \quad \times \left\{ 3\alpha^{m-3} + 2\alpha + (3 + \alpha^{-2}) \|Q_0 - \tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^m} + 2 \|Q_0 - Q_0^\alpha\|_{H^m} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $m \geq 4$ and $Q_0^\alpha \rightarrow Q_0$ in $H^m(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$ as $\alpha \downarrow 0$, we can take a sufficiently small $0 < \alpha_0 < 1$ such that

$$C(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})(3\alpha^{m-3} + 2\alpha) < \eta, \quad 2C(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m}) \|Q_0 - Q_0^\alpha\|_{H^m} < \eta$$

for any $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$. By fixing $\alpha = \alpha_0$, we have

$$\|Q - \tilde{Q}\|_{C([0,T'];H^m)} < 2\eta + C(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})(3 + (\alpha_0)^{-2}) \|Q_0 - \tilde{Q}_0\|_{H^m}.$$

Then we take a $\delta_2 \in (0, \delta_1)$ so that

$$C(T, \|Q_0\|_{H^m})(3 + (\alpha_0)^{-2})\delta_2 < \eta.$$

This shows $\|Q - \tilde{Q}\|_{C([0,T'];H^m)} < 3\eta$ for any $\delta \in (0, \delta_2)$. Note that $\delta_2 > 0$ is decided to depend on η and Q_0 but not on \tilde{Q}_0 , since so is α_0 . This completes the proof of the continuous dependence. \square

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.1

We state the proof of Proposition 4.1. Our proof follows that of Proposition 2.1 in [4], and mostly use the same notation in [4, Section 2] for readability to see points to change.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. We give only the outline of the energy estimates.

We introduce a pseudodifferential operator $\Lambda = I + \tilde{\Lambda}$ of order zero. Here, I is the identity operator and the symbol of $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is given by

$$\tilde{\lambda}(x, \xi) = \Phi(x) \frac{\varphi(\xi)}{4a\xi},$$

where

$$\Phi(x) = L \int_0^x \phi(y) dy, \quad \phi = \phi_A + |\phi_B|^2,$$

$L > 3$ is a constant, $\varphi(\xi) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is taken to be a real-valued even function which satisfies

$$\varphi(\xi) = 1 \quad (|\xi| \geq r + 1), \quad \varphi(\xi) = 0 \quad (|\xi| \leq r),$$

and $r > 0$ is a sufficiently large constant so that Λ is an automorphism on $L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C})$. Compared with the setting of Λ used in [4, Section 2], the definition of $\Phi(x)$ is slightly changed by considering (4.4) and (4.5), and $\varphi(\xi)$ is explicitly mentioned to be a real-valued even function, which implies $\overline{\tilde{\lambda}(x, -\xi)} = -\tilde{\lambda}(x, \xi)$ and hence $\overline{\tilde{\Lambda}v} = -\tilde{\Lambda}\bar{v}$.

Let u be a solution to (4.1), and set $v = \Lambda u$. Moreover, set $D_x = -i\partial_x$. Here we denote by \mathcal{L} the set of all L^2 -bounded operators on \mathbb{R} . In what follows, different positive constants are denoted by the same C , and different operators in $C(\mathbb{R}; \mathcal{L})$ are denoted by the same $P(t)$. Then, we deduce

$$\Lambda \partial_t u = \partial_t v,$$

$$\Lambda ia \partial_x^4 u = ia \partial_x^4 v + ia \left[\tilde{\Lambda}, D_x^4 \right] v - ia \left[\tilde{\Lambda}, D_x^4 \right] \tilde{\Lambda} v + P(t)v, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\Lambda b \partial_x^3 u = b \partial_x^3 v - ib \left[\tilde{\Lambda}, D_x^3 \right] v + P(t)v, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\Lambda i \partial_x \{ \beta_1(t, x) \partial_x u \} = i \partial_x \{ \beta_1(t, x) \partial_x v \} + P(t)v,$$

$$\Lambda i \partial_x \{ \beta_2(t, x) \overline{\partial_x u} \} = i \partial_x \{ \beta_2(t, x) \overline{\partial_x v} \} - 2i \beta_2(t, x) D_x^2 \tilde{\Lambda} \bar{v} + P(t)\bar{v}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\Lambda \gamma_1(t, x) \partial_x u = \gamma_1(t, x) \partial_x v + P(t)v,$$

$$\Lambda \gamma_2(t, x) \overline{\partial_x u} = \gamma_2(t, x) \overline{\partial_x v} + P(t)\bar{v},$$

We here check only (A.2) and (A.3), because they are not handled in [4, Section 2] and because the effect of $\tilde{\Lambda}v \neq \tilde{\Lambda}\bar{v}$ appears in (A.3). The equality (A.1) is shown in [4, Section 2] and other relations are not difficult to be checked by the same argument. For (A.2), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda b \partial_x^3 u &= -ib(I + \tilde{\Lambda})D_x^3(I - \tilde{\Lambda} + \tilde{\Lambda}^2 - \tilde{\Lambda}^3 + \dots)v \\ &= -ibD_x^3(I - \tilde{\Lambda} + \tilde{\Lambda}^2 - \tilde{\Lambda}^3 + \dots)v \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -ib\tilde{\Lambda}D_x^3(I - \tilde{\Lambda} + \tilde{\Lambda}^2 - \tilde{\Lambda}^3 + \dots)v \\
&= -ibD_x^3v + ibD_x^3\tilde{\Lambda}(I - \tilde{\Lambda} + \tilde{\Lambda}^2 - \tilde{\Lambda}^3 + \dots)v \\
& \quad -ib\tilde{\Lambda}D_x^3(I - \tilde{\Lambda} + \tilde{\Lambda}^2 - \tilde{\Lambda}^3 + \dots)v \\
&= b\partial_x^3v - ib\left[\tilde{\Lambda}, D_x^3\right](I - \tilde{\Lambda} + \tilde{\Lambda}^2 - \tilde{\Lambda}^3 + \dots)v \\
&= b\partial_x^3v - ib\left[\tilde{\Lambda}, D_x^3\right]v + P(t)v.
\end{aligned}$$

For (A.3), noting $\overline{\tilde{\Lambda}v} = -\tilde{\Lambda}\bar{v}$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda i\beta_2(t, x)\partial_x^2\bar{u} &= -i(I + \tilde{\Lambda})\beta_2(t, x)D_x^2\overline{(I - \tilde{\Lambda} + \tilde{\Lambda}^2 - \tilde{\Lambda}^3 + \dots)v} \\
&= -i(I + \tilde{\Lambda})\beta_2(t, x)D_x^2(I + \tilde{\Lambda} + \tilde{\Lambda}^2 + \tilde{\Lambda}^3 + \dots)\bar{v} \\
&= -i\beta_2(t, x)D_x^2(I + \tilde{\Lambda} + \tilde{\Lambda}^2 + \tilde{\Lambda}^3 + \dots)\bar{v} \\
& \quad -i\tilde{\Lambda}\beta_2(t, x)D_x^2(I + \tilde{\Lambda} + \tilde{\Lambda}^2 + \tilde{\Lambda}^3 + \dots)\bar{v} \\
&= -i\beta_2(t, x)D_x^2\bar{v} - i\beta_2(t, x)D_x^2\tilde{\Lambda}(I + \tilde{\Lambda} + \tilde{\Lambda}^2 + \tilde{\Lambda}^3 + \dots)\bar{v} \\
& \quad -i\tilde{\Lambda}\beta_2(t, x)D_x^2(I + \tilde{\Lambda} + \tilde{\Lambda}^2 + \tilde{\Lambda}^3 + \dots)\bar{v} \\
&= i\beta_2(t, x)\partial_x^2\bar{v} - i\left[\tilde{\Lambda}, \beta_2(t, x)D_x^2\right](I + \tilde{\Lambda} + \tilde{\Lambda}^2 + \tilde{\Lambda}^3 + \dots)\bar{v} \\
& \quad - 2i\beta_2(t, x)D_x^2\tilde{\Lambda}(I + \tilde{\Lambda} + \tilde{\Lambda}^2 + \tilde{\Lambda}^3 + \dots)\bar{v} \\
&= i\beta_2(t, x)\partial_x^2\bar{v} - 2i\beta_2(t, x)D_x^2\tilde{\Lambda}\bar{v} + P(t)\bar{v}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Lambda i(\partial_x\beta_2)(t, x)\partial_x\bar{u} = i(\partial_x\beta_2)(t, x)\partial_x\bar{v} + P(t)\bar{v}.$$

Combining them, we have (A.3).

Furthermore, by elementary pseudodifferential calculus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
ia\left[\tilde{\Lambda}, D_x^4\right] &= -\Phi'(x)D_x^2 + \frac{3}{2}i\Phi''(x)D_x + P(t) \\
&= L\phi(x)\partial_x^2 + \frac{3L}{2}\phi'(x)\partial_x + P(t), \\
ia\left[\tilde{\Lambda}, D_x^4\right]\tilde{\Lambda} &= -\frac{\Phi'(x)}{4a}\Phi(x)D_x + P(t) = iL\frac{\phi(x)}{4a}\Phi(x)\partial_x + P(t), \\
ib\left[\tilde{\Lambda}, D_x^3\right] &= ib\frac{3i}{4a}\Phi'(x)D_x + P(t) = i\frac{3b}{4a}L\phi(x)\partial_x + P(t), \\
2i\beta_2(t, x)D_x^2\tilde{\Lambda} &= 2i\frac{1}{4a}\beta_2(t, x)\Phi(x)D_x + P(t) = \frac{1}{2a}\beta_2(t, x)\Phi(x)\partial_x + P(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining them, we obtain

$$\partial_tv = ia\partial_x^4v + b\partial_x^3v + L\partial_x\{\phi(x)\partial_xv\} + i\partial_x\{\beta_1(t, x)\partial_xv\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + i\partial_x\{\beta_2(t, x)\overline{\partial_x v}\} + \left\{\operatorname{Re}\gamma_1(t, x) + \frac{L}{2}\phi'(x)\right\}\partial_x v \\
& + i\left\{\operatorname{Im}\gamma_1(t, x) - L\frac{\phi(x)\Phi(x)}{4a} - \frac{3b}{4a}L\phi(x)\right\}\partial_x v \\
& + \left\{\gamma_2(t, x) - \frac{1}{2a}\beta_2(t, x)\Phi(x)\right\}\overline{\partial_x v} + P(t)v + P(t)\bar{v}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using this and the integration by parts leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{R}}|v|^2 dx & = -2L\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi(x)|\partial_x v|^2 dx - 2\operatorname{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}}i\beta_1(t, x)|\partial_x v|^2 dx \\
& - 2\operatorname{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}}i\beta_2(t, x)\overline{\partial_x v}^2 dx \\
& + 2\operatorname{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left\{\operatorname{Re}\gamma_1(t, x) + \frac{L}{2}\phi'(x)\right\}\partial_x v \bar{v} dx \\
& + 2\operatorname{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}}i\left\{\operatorname{Im}\gamma_1(t, x) - L\frac{\phi(x)\Phi(x)}{4a} - \frac{3b}{4a}L\phi(x)\right\}\partial_x v \bar{v} dx \\
& + 2\operatorname{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left\{\gamma_2(t, x) - \frac{1}{2a}\beta_2(t, x)\Phi(x)\right\}\overline{\partial_x v} \bar{v} dx \\
& + 2\operatorname{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\{P(t)v\}\bar{v} dx + 2\operatorname{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\{P(t)\bar{v}\}\bar{v} dx. \tag{A.4}
\end{aligned}$$

By assumption (4.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-2\operatorname{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}}i\beta_1(t, x)|\partial_x v|^2 dx & = 2\operatorname{Im}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\beta_1(t, x)|\partial_x v|^2 dx \leq 2\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi_A(x)|\partial_x v|^2 dx, \\
-2\operatorname{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}}i\beta_2(t, x)\overline{\partial_x v}^2 dx & \leq 2\int_{\mathbb{R}}|\beta_2(t, x)||\partial_x v|^2 dx \leq 2\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi_A(x)|\partial_x v|^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

By assumptions (4.4)-(4.5) and the definition of ϕ and Φ ,

$$\operatorname{Im}\gamma_1(t, x) - L\frac{\phi(x)\Phi(x)}{4a} - \frac{3b}{4a}L\phi(x) = O(\phi_B(x)) + O(\phi(x)).$$

This combined with the Young inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left|2\operatorname{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}}i\left\{\operatorname{Im}\gamma_1(t, x) - L\frac{\phi(x)\Phi(x)}{4a} - \frac{3b}{4a}L\phi(x)\right\}\partial_x v \bar{v} dx\right| \\
& \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}}|\phi_B(x)|^2|\partial_x v|^2 dx + C\int_{\mathbb{R}}|v|^2 dx \\
& \quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi(x)|\partial_x v|^2 dx + C\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi(x)|v|^2 dx \\
& \leq 2\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi(x)|\partial_x v|^2 dx + C\int_{\mathbb{R}}|v|^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, by using the integration by parts, the fourth and sixth terms of the right hand side of (A.4) are bounded by $C \int_{\mathbb{R}} |v|^2 dx$. Hence, for any $T > 0$ there exists a constant C_T such that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |v|^2 dx \leq -(2L - 6) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(x) |\partial_x v|^2 dx + C_T \int_{\mathbb{R}} |v|^2 dx \leq C_T \int_{\mathbb{R}} |v|^2 dx$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. This implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |v(t, x)|^2 dx \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |v(0, x)|^2 dx \right) \exp(C_T t)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. The same inequality holds for the negative direction of t . Using these energy estimates, we can prove Proposition 4.1. We omit the other parts. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) Grant Numbers JP20K03703 and JP24K06813. The author would like to express his sincere gratitude to Hiroyuki Chihara for conducting a collaborative research to publish [4], the valuable experience of which has helped the author to perform this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. L. Bona and R. Smith, The initial value problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., Ser. A*, **278** (1975), 555–601.
- [2] N.-H. Chang, J. Shatah and K. Uhlenbeck, Schrödinger maps, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **53** (2000), 590–602.
- [3] H. Chihara, The initial value problem for the elliptic-hyperbolic Davey-Stewartson equation, *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, **39** (1999), 41–66.
- [4] H. Chihara and E. Onodera, A fourth-order dispersive flow into Kähler manifolds, *Z. Anal. Anwend.*, **34** (2015), 221–249.
- [5] R. Cipolatti and O. Kaviani, On a nonlinear Schrödinger equation modelling ultra-short laser pulses with a large noncompact global attractor, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **17** (2007), 121–132.
- [6] M. Daniel, L. Kavitha and R. Amuda, Soliton spin excitations in an anisotropic Heisenberg ferromagnet with octupole-dipole interaction, *Phys. Rev. B*, **59** (1999), 13774.
- [7] M. Daniel and M. M. Latha, Soliton in discrete and continuum alpha helical proteins with higher-order excitations, *Phys. A*, **240** (1997), 526–546.
- [8] Q. Ding and Y.D. Wang, Vortex filament on symmetric Lie algebras and generalized bi-Schrödinger flows, *Math. Z.*, **290** (2018), 167–193.
- [9] Q. Ding and S. Zhong, On the vortex filament in 3-spaces and its generalizations, *Sci. China Math.*, **64** (2021), 1331–1348.
- [10] M. B. Erdogan and N. Tzirakis, *Dispersive Partial Differential Equations; Wellposed-ness and Applications*, Cambridge Student Texts, 86, Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [11] Y. Fukumoto, Three-dimensional motion of a vortex filament and its relation to the localized induction hierarchy, *Eur. Phys. J. B*, **29** (2002), 167–171.
- [12] Y. Fukumoto and T. K. Moffatt, Motion and expansion of a viscous vortex ring. Part 1. A higher-order asymptotic formula for the velocity, *J. Fluid. Mech.*, **417** (2000), 1–45.
- [13] R. Ghanmi and T. Saanouni, Defocusing fourth-order coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, No.96, (2016), 1–24.

- [14] J.-M. Ghidaglia and J.-C. Saut, On the initial value problem for Davey-Stewartson systems, *Nonlinearity*, **3** (1990), 475–506.
- [15] C. Hao, L. Hsiao and B. Wang, Well-posedness for the fourth order nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **320** (2006), 246–265.
- [16] C. Hao, L. Hsiao and B. Wang, Well-posedness of Cauchy problem for the fourth order nonlinear Schrödinger equations in multi-dimensional spaces, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **328** (2007), 58–83.
- [17] N. Hayashi and T. Ozawa, Schrödinger equations with nonlinearity of integral type, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **1** (1995), 475–484.
- [18] N. Hayashi, Local existence in time of solutions to the elliptic-hyperbolic Davey-Stewartson system without smallness condition on the data, *J. Anal. Math.*, **73** (1997), 133–164.
- [19] H. Hirayama, M. Ikeda and T. Tanaka, Well-posedness for the fourth-order Schrödinger equation with third order derivative nonlinearities, *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, **28** Paper No. 46 (2021), 72 pp.
- [20] Z. Huo and Y. Jia, The Cauchy problem for the fourth-order nonlinear Schrödinger equation related to the vortex filament, *J. Differential Equations*, **214** (2005), 1–35.
- [21] Z. Huo and Y. Jia, A refined well-posedness for the fourth-order nonlinear Schrödinger equation related to the vortex filament, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, **32** (2007), 1493–1510.
- [22] Z. Huo and Y. Jia, Well-posedness for the fourth-order nonlinear derivative Schrödinger equation in higher dimension, *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, **96** (2011), 190–206.
- [23] R. Iorio and V. M. Iorio, *Fourier Analysis and Partial Differential Equations*, Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math., 70, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [24] M. Lakshmanan, K. Porsezian and M. Daniel, Effect of discreteness on the continuum limit of the Heisenberg spin chain, *Phys. Lett. A*, **133** (1988), 483–488.
- [25] F. Linares and G. Ponce, *Introduction to nonlinear dispersive equations*, 2nd ed, Springer Verlag, New York, 2015.
- [26] S. J. A. Malham, Integrability of local and non-local non-commutative fourth-order quintic nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *IMA J. Appl. Math.*, **87** (2022), 231–259.
- [27] C. Mietka, On the well-posedness of a quasi-linear Korteweg-de Vries equation, *Ann. Math. Blaise Pascal*, **24** (2017), 83–114.
- [28] R. Mizuhara, The initial value problem for third and fourth order dispersive equations in one space dimension, *Funkcial. Ekvac.*, **49** (2006), 1–38.
- [29] K. Nakamura and T. Ozawa, Finite charge solutions to cubic Schrödinger equations with a nonlocal nonlinearity in one space dimension, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **33** (2013), 789–801.
- [30] E. Onodera, Generalized Hasimoto transform of one-dimensional dispersive flows into compact Riemann surfaces, *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.*, **4** article No. 044 (2008), 10 pp.
- [31] E. Onodera, Local existence of a fourth-order dispersive curve flow on locally Hermitian symmetric spaces and its application, *Differential Geom. Appl.*, **67** 101560 (2019), 26 pp.
- [32] E. Onodera, Structure of a fourth-order dispersive flow equation through the generalized Hasimoto transformation, preprint, 2024, arXiv: 2405.00412.
- [33] T. Ozawa, K. Yamauchi and Y. Yamazaki, Analytic smoothing effect for solutions to Schrödinger equations with nonlinearity of integral type, *Osaka J. Math.*, **42** (2005), 737–750.
- [34] K. Porsezian, M. Daniel and M. Lakshmanan, On the integrability aspects of the one-dimensional classical continuum isotropic biquadratic Heisenberg spin chain, *J. Math. Phys.*, **33** (1992), 1–10.
- [35] I. Rodnianski, Y. A. Rubinstein and G. Staffilani, On the global well-posedness of the one-dimensional Schrödinger map flow, *Analysis and PDE*, **2** (2009), 187–209.
- [36] M. Ruzhansky, B. Wang and H. Zhang, Global well-posedness and scattering for the fourth order nonlinear Schrödinger equations with small data in modulation and Sobolev spaces, *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, **105** (2016), 31–65.

- [37] J. Segata, Well-posedness for the fourth-order nonlinear Schrödinger-type equation related to the vortex filament, *Differential Integral Equations*, **16** (2003), 841–864.
- [38] J. Segata, Remark on well-posedness for the fourth order nonlinear Schrödinger type equation, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **132** (2004), 3559–3568.
- [39] J. Segata, Refined energy inequality with application to well-posedness for the fourth order nonlinear Schrödinger type equation on torus, *J. Differential Equations*, **252** (2012), 5994–6011.
- [40] X. W. Sun and Y. D. Wang, KdV geometric flows on Kähler manifolds, *Internat. J. Math.*, **22** (2011), 1439–1500.
- [41] S. Tarama, L^2 -well-posed Cauchy problem for fourth-order dispersive equations on the line, *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, No. 168 (2011), 11 pp.
- [42] M. Tarulli, H^2 -scattering for systems of weakly coupled fourth-order NLS equations in low space dimensions, *Potential Anal.*, **51** (2019), 291–313.
- [43] W. Weng, G. Zhang and Z. Yan, Strong and weak interactions of rational vector rogue waves and solitons to any n -component nonlinear Schrödinger system with higher-order effects, *Proc. A.*, **478** no. 2257, Paper No. 20210670 (2022), 23 pp.

(Eiji Onodera) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, KOCHI UNIVERSITY, KOCHI 780-8520, JAPAN

Email address: onodera@kochi-u.ac.jp