

NONLINEAR DISCRETE SCHRÖDINGER EQUATIONS WITH A POINT DEFECT

DIRK HENNIG

ABSTRACT. We study the d -dimensional discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation with general power nonlinearity and a delta potential. Our interest lies in the interplay between two localization mechanisms. On the one hand, the attractive (repulsive) delta potential acting as a point defect breaks the translational invariance of the lattice so that a linear staggering (non-staggering) bound state is formed with negative (positive) energy. On the other hand, focusing nonlinearity may lead to self-trapping of excitation energy. For focusing nonlinearity we prove the existence of a spatially exponentially localized and time-periodic ground state and investigate the impact of an attractive respectively repulsive delta potential on the existence of an excitation threshold, i.e. supercritical l^2 norm, for the creation of such a ground states. Explicit expressions for the lower excitation thresholds are given. Reciprocally, we discuss the influence of defocusing nonlinearity on the durability of the linear bound states and provide upper thresholds of the l^2 -norm for their preservation. Regarding the asymptotic behavior of the solutions we establish that for a l^2 -norm below the excitation threshold the solutions scatter to a solution of the linear problem in $l^{p>2}$.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation (DNLS) on the d -dimensional infinite lattice with a delta potential

$$i \frac{du_n}{dt} + \kappa(\Delta u)_n + \gamma |u_n|^{2\sigma} u_n + V_0 \delta_{n,0} u_n = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad (1.1)$$

where $u \in \mathbb{C}$, $V_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta_{m,n}$ denotes the Kronecker delta, i.e. $\delta_{m,n} = 1$ if $m = n$ and $\delta_{m,n} = 0$ if $m \neq n$. That is, the last term on the right-hand side of (1.1) represents a point defect on the lattice \mathbb{Z}^d . We will refer to (1.1) also as δ DNLS. The operator $(\Delta u)_n$ is the d -dimensional discrete Laplacian

$$(\Delta u)_n = \sum_j (u_{n+j} - 2u_n + u_{n-j}),$$

where j are the d unit vectors belonging to the d axes of \mathbb{Z}^d and the value of $\kappa > 0$ regulates the coupling strength. Without loss of generality we set $\kappa = 1$. The degree of nonlinearity is determined by $\sigma > 0$. For $\gamma > 0$ ($\gamma < 0$) the nonlinearity is of focusing (defocusing) type and for $V_0 > 0$ ($V_0 < 0$) the delta potential is attractive (repulsive).

Remark 1.1. The presence of the point defect breaks the (space) translational invariance. The system (1.1) still exhibits gauge invariance (i.e. multiplication by a complex phase), and possesses the time reversibility symmetry $t \leftrightarrow -t$, $u \leftrightarrow \bar{u}$ as well as time shift symmetry.

System (1.1) has two conserved quantities, namely the Hamiltonian (energy)

$$H = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_j |u_{n+j} - u_n|^2 - \frac{\gamma}{\sigma + 1} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |u_n|^{2(\sigma+1)} - V_0 \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \delta_{n,0} |u_n|^2 \quad (1.2)$$

and the mass

$$\nu = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |u_n|^2.$$

The equations of motion (1.1) are derived as

$$i\dot{u}_n = \frac{\partial H}{\partial \bar{u}_n}.$$

The DNLS with general power nonlinearity but without the delta potential,

$$i\frac{du_n}{dt} + (\Delta u)_n + |u_n|^{2\sigma}u_n = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad (1.3)$$

has served as a model with numerous applications including optical lattices in Bose-Einstein condensates [1], photonic crystals [2], arrays of optical fibers [3], plasmonic nanowires [4] and energy transport in biomolecules. For reviews see [5]-[41]. We emphasize that the DNLS (1.3) admits global solutions for all $\sigma > 0$ [32],[33],[34].

We express (1.1) in operator form

$$\frac{du}{dt} = i(\Delta_\delta u + F(u)), \quad (1.4)$$

where $\Delta_\delta = \Delta + V_\delta$ with $V_\delta : l^2 \mapsto l^2$, $(V_\delta u)_n = V_0 \delta_{n,0} u_n$ and $F(u) = \gamma |u|^{2\sigma} u$. The linear operator Δ_δ is self-adjoint on l^2 and $i\Delta_\delta : l^2 \mapsto l^2$ is \mathbb{C} -linear and skew-adjoint and generates a group $(\mathcal{S}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ of isometries on l^2 . (Note that the delta potential acts as a (local) multiplication operator.) For fixed $T > 0$ and initial data $u_0 \in l^2$, a function $u \in C([0, T], l^2)$ is a solution of (1.4) if and only if

$$u(t) = \mathcal{S}u_0 + i \int_0^t \mathcal{S}(t - \tau) F(u(\tau)) d\tau.$$

In a similar vein as in [32]-[34], exploiting the conservation of energy and mass one proves, by the energy methods, that for any initial data $u_0 \in l^2$ there exists a unique global solution $u \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, l^2)$ for any $\sigma > 0$.

It is illustrative to compare the global well-posedness of (1.1) with data $u_0 \in l^2$ for all powers of the nonlinear term $\sigma > 0$ with that of its continuous focusing counterpart given by

$$i\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial x^2} + |U|^{2\sigma}U + V_0 \delta U = 0, \quad U_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}), \quad (1.5)$$

where $0 \leq \sigma < \infty$ and δ is the Dirac measure at the origin. System (1.5) has attracted considerable interest [14]-[23] from a physical as well as mathematical view point.

Several studies have been conducted about the well-posedness of the Cauchy problem, the existence of standing waves, their orbital and strong stability, and their asymptotic behavior such as scattering, global existence and blow-up (see for example [16]-[21]). In more detail, for $d = 1$ global well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for (1.5) with data in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ was proven for $0 < \sigma < 2$ in [18]. The ground state solution (minimizing the associated action functional on $H^1(\mathbb{R})$) plays a crucial role as it provides a threshold for the scattering blow-up dichotomy result. For actions below and on that of the ground state solution the solutions are global and scatter in both time directions for negative virial functional. The solutions blow up in both time directions for positive virial functional.

With respect to nonlinear bound (solitary) states of (1.5), $U(x, t) = \Phi(x) \exp(i\omega t)$, from the comprehensive study in [18] we know that for $V_0 > 0$ the ground state is orbitally stable in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ for any $\omega > V_0^2/4$ if $0 < \sigma \leq 2$. For $\sigma > 2$ there exists a critical frequency $\omega_c > V_0^2/4$ such that the ground state is stable in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ for any $V_0^2/4 < \omega < \omega_c$ and unstable in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ for any $\omega > \omega_c$.

For $V_0 < 0$ and $\omega > V_0^2/4$ orbital stability in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ of standing solitary waves $\Phi(x) \exp(i\omega t)$ was proven in [17], if $0 < \sigma \leq 1$ while their instability occurs if $1 < \sigma \leq 2$ for any $\omega > V_0^2/4$.

Finally, let us comment also on the behavior of the solutions to the NLS in absence of the delta potential, i.e

$$i \frac{\partial U}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial x^2} + |U|^{2\sigma} U = 0, \quad (1.6)$$

for which the global existence of solutions for initial data in H^1 holds only for $\sigma < 2$ while for $\sigma \geq 2$ blow up in finite time may occur (see e.g. in [8]-[10]). Regarding the orbital stability of standing solitary wave solutions $\Phi(x) \exp(i\omega t)$ of (1.6), there are several studies [8],[9],[44]-[46]. In [8] it is shown that $\Phi(x) \exp(i\omega t)$ is stable in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ for any $\omega > 0$ if $1 < \sigma < 5$, and unstable in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ for any $\omega > 0$ if $\sigma \geq 5$. In contrast to its continuum counterpart (1.6), which is completely integrable for cubic nonlinearity, i.e. $\sigma = 1$, [35]-[38], the cubic DNLS is nonintegrable [36].

Similar to the dichotomy feature of the NLS with delta potential, for the L^2 -critical case $\sigma = 2$, the solutions exist globally in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ for subcritical mass $\|U\|_{L^2} < \|\Phi\|_{L^2}$ where Φ is the (radial) ground state and scatter to the linear solution $\exp(i\partial_x^2)U_0^\pm$ in both time directions [31]. For the critical mass $\|U\|_{L^2} = \|\Phi\|_{L^2}$, finite blow-up solutions occur [24]. For super-critical mass $\|U\|_{L^2} > \|\Phi\|_{L^2}$, we refer for blow-up results to [25]-[29].

Concerning bound states of the lattice system (1.1), we distinguish between linear and nonlinear bound ones, respectively. The first ones arise in the presence of an attractive delta potential acting as an (external) impurity (defect) breaking the translational invariance of the lattice. The origin of the latter is due to the focusing nonlinear term creating an intrinsic potential well on a part of the lattice in which excitation energy becomes trapped. In this paper we study also the interplay between these two localization mechanisms.

Our contributions in this paper are threefold.

First for focusing nonlinearity we study the existence of nonlinear ground state solutions as the minimizer of an associated action functional (see Section 3). Such ground states correspond to stationary solutions $u_n(t) = x_n \exp(-i\omega t)$ which are time-periodic and spatially (exponentially) localized; thus referred to also as *breathers*. In particular, we are interested in the effect of a delta potential on the existence of ground state solutions, both in the attractive and the repulsive case. To prove the existence of such solutions, we use a special variational method, consisting in minimizing the action functional under the Nehari manifold. In the first step we prove in Proposition 3.1 that the Nehari manifold \mathcal{N} is a nonempty closed C^1 manifold. The second step, proves that a minimizer exists on \mathcal{N} . Our main result is:

Theorem 1.1. *Let the assumptions of Proposition 3.1 hold. There exists a nontrivial solution to the stationary equation*

$$\omega x_n + (\Delta x)_n + \gamma x_n^{2\sigma} x_n + V_0 \delta_{n,0} x_n = 0. \quad (1.7)$$

which is the ground state.

In the last step, it is verified that such solutions are critical points of the associated action functional.

Our second result concerns the existence of excitation thresholds for the creation of ground states:

Theorem 1.2. *Consider equation (1.1) with general power nonlinearity $\sigma > 0$.*

1) For focusing nonlinearity $\gamma > 0$ and attractive delta potential $V_0 > 0$ and all $\sigma > 0$ there is no excitation threshold, i.e. $H < 0$ for all $\nu > 0$.

2) For focusing nonlinearity $\gamma > 0$ and repulsive delta potential $V_0 < 0$ and $\sigma < \min\{1, 2/d\}$ there is no excitation threshold, i.e. $H < 0$ for all $\nu > 0$.

Conversely, if $\sigma \geq \max\{1, 2/d\}$, then a ground state solution exists only if $\nu > \nu_{thresh} = ((\sigma + 1)/\gamma)(2 - V_0) > 0$.

Notably, from the perspective of the DNLS, the additional contribution of an attractive delta potential prevents the existence of an excitation threshold for the formation of breathers. In other words, for all $\nu > 0$ and all $\sigma > 0$ there exist ground state solutions. Indeed, in this case the two localization mechanisms conspire in the sense that the total energy, when considered separately for $\gamma = 0$ and $V_0 = 0$, respectively, gets lowered with the additional presence of the respective other term in the energy functional.

On the contrary, for focusing nonlinearity $\gamma > 0$ and repulsive delta potential $V_0 < 0$, in order to have a ground state solution one needs that the mass satisfies $\nu > \nu_{thresh} > 0$ and the value of the degree of nonlinearity is supercritical, i.e. $\sigma > \min\{1, 2/d\}$. If the degree of the nonlinearity is subcritical, i.e. $\sigma < \min\{1, 2/d\}$, ground state solutions are supported for any mass. Consequently, ground states of arbitrarily small l^2 -norm exist. Note that a repulsive delta potential counteracts the nonlinear localization mechanism. Remarkably, there exist a localized state with frequencies above respectively below the upper respectively lower edge of absolutely continuous spectrum of Δ . Interestingly, these localized states have the form of a staggering defect mode respectively breather simultaneously in the same system. This is a repercussion of the spatial discreteness of the system, and therefore not present in the continuum system.

Conversely, defocusing nonlinearity weakens the localization capability of an attractive delta potential. That is, an *upper* excitation threshold, confining the l^2 -size of the nonlinear term, ensues for the persistence of the linear bound state.

Our third main result contained in Section 5 concerns the asymptotic properties of the solutions to system (1.1).

Theorem 1.3. *Consider system (5.1) with focusing nonlinearity $\gamma > 0$.*

(1) *If $V_0 < 0$ then assume $\sigma \geq \max\{1, 2/d\}$.*

(2) *If $V_0 = 0$ then assume $\sigma \geq 2/d$.*

Let $2(\sigma + 1) \geq p \geq 4d\sigma/(2d\sigma - 3)$ and $u \in C([0, \infty), l^2)$ be a solution to (5.1) for initial data $u_0 \in l^2$ such that $\|u_0\|_{l^2} \leq P_{thresh}$. Then there exists $v^\pm \in l^{p>2}$ such that

$$\|\exp(-i\Delta_\delta t)u(t) - v^\pm\|_{l^p} \leq C \|u_0\|_{l^{p'}}^{2\sigma+1} |t|^{-\frac{d(p-2)}{3p}}, \quad \forall |t| > 0.$$

In detail, with the proof of the assertions in Theorem 1.3 we establish that the solutions for $\sigma \geq \max\{1, 2/d\}$ and l^2 -norm below ν_{thresh} scatter to a solution of the linear problem in l^p , $p > 2$. In other words, the solutions of the nonlinear problem exhibit asymptotically free behavior. Notably, if $V_0 = 0$, this proves also Weinstein's conjecture in [12] for $\sigma \geq 2$: If $\nu(u_0) = \|u_0\|_{l^2}^2 < \nu_{thresh}$, then for any $p \in (2, \infty]$ the solutions decay, that is, $\|u(t)\|_{l^p} \rightarrow 0$, as $|t| \rightarrow \infty$.

Moreover, if existent, the ground state represents a non-scattering global solution. We show that there is a scattering —non-scattering-ground-state dichotomy occurring, if $\gamma > 0$, for $V_0 < 0$, $\sigma \geq \max\{1, 2/d\}$ respectively $V_0 = 0$, $\sigma \geq 2/d$.

The paper is organized as follows: We begin with an analysis of the impact of weak nonlinearity on the persistence of linear defect modes. In section 3, using variational methods, we prove the existence of breathers as standing ground state solutions for focusing nonlinearity under the influence of an attractive respectively repulsive delta potential. Section 4 is concerned with the existence of lower respectively upper thresholds for the presence of ground states respectively

perseverance of defect modes. Subsequently, in section 5 we investigate the asymptotic behavior of the solutions and prove that they scatter for supercritical degree of nonlinearity and subcritical mass.

2. WEAK NONLINEARITY AND PERSISTENCE OF LINEAR DEFECT MODES

In the linear limiting case, arising for $\gamma = 0$ in (1.1), the system

$$i\frac{dv_n}{dt} + (\Delta v)_n + V_0\delta_{n,0}v_n = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \quad (2.1)$$

supports localized solutions (also called defect modes) generated by the presence of the point defect destroying the spatial translational invariance. These stationary solutions are of the form $v_n(t) = x_n \exp(-i\omega t)$, $x_n \in \mathbb{R}$ with a spectral parameter (eigenenergy) ω and fulfil the stationary system

$$\omega x_n + (\Delta x)_n + V_0\delta_{n,0}x_n = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \quad (2.2)$$

For $V_0 > 0$ there exist a non-staggering bound state

$$x_n = A\eta_+^{|n|}, \quad 0 < \eta < 1, \\ \eta_+ = \frac{1}{2d} \left(\sqrt{V_0^2 + 4d^2} - V_0 \right),$$

with $|n| = |n_1| + \dots + |n_d|$ and amplitude $A > 0$.

For $V_0 < 0$ there exist a staggering bound state

$$x_n = A(-1)^n \eta_-^{|n|}, \quad -1 < \eta < 0, \\ \eta_- = -\frac{1}{2d} \left(\sqrt{V_0^2 + 4d^2} + V_0 \right),$$

with $|n| = |n_1| + \dots + |n_d|$ and amplitude $A > 0$.

The amplitude A is related to the conserved l^2 -norm (mass)

$$P = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |x_n|^2 = \left(A^2 \frac{1 + \eta_{\pm}^2}{1 - \eta_{\pm}^2} \right)^d.$$

The associated eigenvalues are determined by

$$\omega_+ = 2d - \sqrt{V_0^2 + 4d^2}, \quad \left(\omega_- = 2d + \sqrt{V_0^2 + 4d^2} \right). \quad (2.3)$$

The eigenvalues $\omega_+ < 0$ ($\omega_- > 4d$) lie below (above) the lower edge of absolutely continuous spectrum of Δ . Notice that the defect modes are exponentially localized at the origin of the lattice (single-hump).

Next, we investigate the impact of a (small) nonlinear term on the impurity modes. To be precise, we consider the system

$$i\frac{dw}{dt} + (\Delta w)_n + \gamma ||^{2\sigma} + V_0\delta_{n,0} = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \quad (2.4)$$

Obviously, if $\gamma > 0$ and $V_0 > 0$ respectively $\gamma < 0$ and $V_0 < 0$, the linear and nonlinear localization mechanisms enhance each other opposed to the case if γ and V_0 are of opposite sign. In the latter case, if $V_0 > 0$ ($V_0 < 0$) an additional negative (positive) nonlinear term, i.e. $\gamma < 0$ ($\gamma > 0$), in the equation of motion leads to an increase (decrease) of the negative (positive) total energy (1.2) of the impurity mode going along with a reduction of its degree of localization. Nevertheless,

for sufficiently low amplitude (l^2 -norm), going along with weak nonlinearity, we expect sustained impurity modes even when V_0 and γ have different sign. Our statement reads:

Theorem 2.1. *Assume $\gamma \neq 0$ and $0 < \epsilon < 1$.*

Suppose that v_0 and w_0 are the initial data for (2.1) and (2.4) respectively and satisfy

$$\|v_0 - w_0\|_{l^2} \leq C_0 \epsilon, \quad (2.5)$$

$$\|w_0\|_{l^2} \leq C_{w,0} \epsilon, \quad (2.6)$$

for some constants $C_0 > 0$, $C_{w,0} > 0$. Then for any $T > 0$ satisfying

$$T \leq C_T \cdot \epsilon^{-2\sigma}, \quad C_T > 0, \quad (2.7)$$

the solutions v and w for (2.1) and (2.4) respectively satisfy

$$\|v(t) - w(t)\|_{l^2} \leq C \epsilon, \quad (2.8)$$

where C depends on v_0 and w_0 .

Proof. We set $z_n = v_n - w_n$ and obtain for z_n the equation

$$\frac{dz_n}{dt} = i \{ (\Delta z)_n + V_0 \delta_{n,0} z_n + \gamma |z_n|^{2\sigma} \}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \quad (2.9)$$

For fixed $T > 0$ and initial data $z_0 \in l^2$ the solution of (2.9) $z \in C([0, T], l^2)$ is given by

$$z(t) = \exp(i\Delta_\delta t) z_0 + i\gamma \int_0^T \exp(i\Delta_\delta(t-\tau)) |w(\tau)|^{2\sigma} w(\tau) d\tau. \quad (2.10)$$

Then we have for $t \in [0, T]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z(t)\|_{l^2} &= \left\| \exp(it\Delta_\delta) z_0 + i\gamma \int_0^T \exp(i(t-\tau)\Delta_\delta) |w(\tau)|^{2\sigma} w(\tau) d\tau \right\|_{l^2} \\ &\leq \|z_0 \exp(it\Delta_\delta)\|_{l^2} + \left\| \gamma \int_0^T \exp(i(t-\tau)\Delta_\delta) |w(\tau)|^{2\sigma} w(\tau) d\tau \right\|_{l^2} \\ &\leq \|z_0\|_{l^2} + \int_0^T \left\| |\gamma w(\tau)|^{2\sigma} w(\tau) \right\|_{l^2} d\tau \\ &= \|z_0\|_{l^2} + \int_0^T \left(\sum_n |\gamma|^{2\sigma} |w(\tau)|^{4\sigma+2} \right)^{1/2} d\tau \\ &\leq \|z_0\|_{l^2} + \int_0^T \left(\gamma^2 \sum_n |w(\tau)|^{4\sigma+2} \right)^{1/2} d\tau \leq \|z_0\|_{l^2} + |\gamma| \|w_0\|_{l^2}^{2\sigma+1} \cdot T, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the conservation law $\|w(t)\|_{l^2} = \|w_0\|_{l^2}$ and the continuous embeddings $l^p \subset l^q$, $\|u\|_{l^q} \leq \|u\|_{l^p}$, $1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty$. We stress that the size of the nonlinear term is indeed small because $(\|w(t)\|_{l^2})^{2\sigma+1} = \|w_0\|_{l^2}^{2\sigma+1} \leq (C_{w,0}\epsilon)^{2\sigma+1}$. Using assumptions (2.5) and (2.6) we obtain

$$\|z(t)\|_{l^2} \leq (C_0 + |\gamma| C_{w,0}^{2\sigma} T \cdot \epsilon^{2\sigma}) \cdot \epsilon \leq (C_0 + |\gamma| C_{w,0}^{2\sigma} C_T) \cdot \epsilon.$$

Setting $C = C_0 + |\gamma| C_{w,0}^{2\sigma} C_T$ we arrive at the claimed result (2.8) and the proof is complete. \square

At least for sufficiently small amplitudes (mass) the defect modes persist. More specifically, for an attractive delta potential, when the non-staggering defect mode has negative energy, an additional positive nonlinear term $\gamma|u|^{2\sigma+1} > 0$ in the equations of motion serves constructively to even lower the total energy whereas negative nonlinearity for $\gamma < 0$ leads to an increase of the total

energy. The energy remains negative though if the nonlinear term is sufficiently small. Similar arguments hold for the staggering defect mode. Therefore, we expect that there are critical values of the mass that the defect modes can sustain. In fact, in section 4 we further analyze the impact of nonlinearity on the existence of defect mode(s) where we also derive explicit formulae for upper and lower thresholds of the mass for which the defect modes survive in the presence of nonlinearity.

3. GROUND STATE SOLUTIONS

In this section we consider ground state solutions of system (1.1) given in the form of standing states $u_n(t) = x_n \exp(-i\omega t)$ with frequency $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega < 0$, and $x_n \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Existence of ground states, as nonlinear localized waves, necessitates $\gamma > 0$.

We consider the Hilbert space of square-summable sequences defined as:

$$X =: l^2 = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}; \|x\|_{l^2}^2 = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_n^2 < \infty \right\}. \quad (3.1)$$

The stationary system (1.7) is related to the action functional $J : X \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$J(x) = -\frac{1}{2} \langle \Delta x, x \rangle - \frac{\omega}{2} \|x\|_X^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2\sigma + 2} \|x\|_{l^{2\sigma+2}}^{2\sigma+2} - \frac{V_0}{2} x_0^2. \quad (3.2)$$

where \langle, \rangle in the first term denotes the duality bracket between X and X^* . Stationary state solutions correspond to the critical points of J . Clearly, $J(x) \in C^1(X, \mathbb{R})$ and

$$\langle J'(x), z \rangle = - \langle \Delta x, z \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_n z_n - \gamma (f(x), z)_X - V_0 \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \delta_{n,0} x_n z_n,$$

where $f_n(x) = x_n^{2\sigma+1}$, $z \in X$ and $(,)_X$ denotes the scalar product $(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})_X = \sum_n x_n^{(1)} x_n^{(2)}$ for all $x^{(1)}, x^{(2)} \in X$. Note that J is not necessarily bounded from below on X . It can be proved that J is bounded from below if restricted to a suitable subset of X , i.e. the so-called Nehari manifold.

3.1. Nehari manifold

We introduce the Nehari functional

$$I(x) = \langle J'(x), x \rangle = - \langle \Delta x, x \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_n^2 - \gamma (f(x), x)_X - V_0 \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \delta_{n,0} x_n^2,$$

and the Nehari manifold

$$\mathcal{N} = \{x \in X : I(x) = 0, x \neq 0\}.$$

$I(x) \in C^1(X, \mathbb{R})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle I'(x), z \rangle &= -2 \langle \Delta x, z \rangle - 2\omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_n z_n - 2(\sigma + 1)\gamma \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_n^{2\sigma+1} z_n \\ &\quad - 2V_0 \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \delta_{n,0} x_n z_n. \end{aligned}$$

We define the fibering map $\Gamma_x(s) = J(sx)$ for $s > 0$. Obviously, if x is a local minimizer of J then Γ_x possesses a local minimum at $s = 1$. Furthermore, for $x \in X \setminus \{0\}$, $sx \in \mathcal{N}$ if and only if $\Gamma'_x(s) = 0$, a result that follows readily from the fact that $\Gamma'_x(s) = \langle J'(sx), sx \rangle = (1/s) \langle J'(sx), sx \rangle$. Conclusively, stationary points of the map Γ_x correspond to points in \mathcal{N} .

In the forthcoming we make use of the following theorem relating minimizers on \mathcal{N} and critical points for J :

Theorem 3.1. *If x_0 is a local minimizer for J on \mathcal{N} and $\langle I'(x_0), x_0 \rangle \neq 0$, then $J'(x_0) = 0$.*

Proof. Let x_0 be a local minimizer of J on \mathcal{N} . Then by the method of Lagrange multipliers there exists a $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $J'(x_0) = \lambda I'(x_0)$. Hence,

$$\langle J'(x_0), z \rangle + \lambda \langle I'(x_0), z \rangle = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

for any $z \in X$, yielding for $z = x_0$

$$I(x_0) + \lambda \langle I'(x_0), x_0 \rangle = 0.$$

As $x_0 \in \mathcal{N}$, $I(x_0) = 0$. Furthermore, since $\langle I'(x_0), x_0 \rangle \neq 0$ it follows that $\lambda = 0$ and the proof is finished. \square

Remark 3.1. x_0 is a weak solution of (1.7) because from (3.3) we infer that $\langle J'(x_0), z \rangle = 0$ for any $z \in X$.

Remark 3.2. If $\gamma < 0$ and $V_0 < 0$, then $I(x) = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$. That is, $J(x)$ does not possess nontrivial critical points so that there is no nontrivial solution to the equation (1.7).

Proposition 3.1. *Assume $\gamma > 0$. Let*

$$\omega < \min\{0, -V_0\}. \quad (3.4)$$

Then the set \mathcal{N} is nonempty and closed in X .

Proof. We have

$$I(x) = -\langle \Delta x, x \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_n^2 - \gamma(f(x), x)_X - V_0 x_0^2.$$

We distinguish the following cases:

1) Focusing nonlinearity $\gamma > 0$ and attractive delta potential $V_0 > 0$.

As $\sigma(-\Delta) \in [0, 4d]$ we get

$$-\langle \Delta x, x \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_n^2 > 0. \quad (3.5)$$

Then, on the one hand, for sufficiently small $s > 0$ we obtain that assumption (3.4) is sufficient so that

$$I(sx) > -\omega \|sx\|_X^2 - \gamma(f(sx), sx)_X - V_0 (sx_0)^2 > 0. \quad (3.6)$$

On the other hand, we have

$$I(x) < (-\omega + 4d) \|x\|_X^2 - \gamma(f(x), x)_X - V_0 x_0^2. \quad (3.7)$$

Hence, $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} I(sx) = -\infty$ so that there must exist an $\tilde{s} > 0$ such that $I(\tilde{s}x) = 0$. Therefore $\tilde{s}x \in \mathcal{N}$.

Furthermore, $I(x) = 0$ implies $-\langle \Delta x, x \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_n^2 = \gamma(f(x), x)_X + V_0 x_0^2$ so that

$$\langle I'(x), x \rangle = -2\gamma\sigma \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_n^{2\sigma+2} < 0. \quad (3.8)$$

Thus, by the implicit function theorem we get that \mathcal{N} is closed in X .

2) Focusing nonlinearity $\gamma > 0$ and repulsive delta potential $V_0 < 0$.

One has

$$- \langle \Delta x, x \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_n^2 - V_0 x_0^2 > 0.$$

For $s > 0$ sufficiently small we get

$$I(sx) > -\omega \|sx\|_X^2 - \gamma(f(sx), sx)_X - V_0(sx_0)^2 > 0.$$

We also have

$$I(x) < (-\omega + 4d)\|x\|_X^2 - V_0 x_0^2 - \gamma(f(x), x)_X = (-\omega + 4d)\|x\|_X^2 - V_0 x_0^2 - \gamma \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_n^{2\sigma+2}.$$

As by assumption $\sigma > 0$ we observe $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} I(sx) = -\infty$ so that there must exist an $\tilde{s} > 0$ such that $I(\tilde{s}x) = 0$. Therefore $\tilde{s}x \in \mathcal{N}$.

Furthermore,

$$\langle I'(x), x \rangle = -2\gamma\sigma \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_n^{2\sigma+2} < 0.$$

Therefore, by the implicit function theorem we infer that \mathcal{N} is closed in X . \square

3.2. Existence of a ground state solution

Proposition 3.2. *If $\omega + V_0 < 0$, then for every $x \in \mathcal{N}$, one has*

$$J(x) > 0. \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. $I(x) = 0$ implies $-\langle \Delta x, x \rangle - \omega \|x\|_X^2 - V_0 x_0^2 = \gamma(f(x), x)_X$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} J(x) &= -\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sigma+2}\right) [\langle \Delta x, x \rangle + \omega \|x\|_X^2 + V_0 x_0^2] \\ &\geq -\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sigma+2}\right) [\omega \|x\|_X^2 + V_0 x_0^2] \\ &\geq -\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sigma+2}\right) (\omega + V_0) \|x\|_X^2 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Proof of Theorem 1.1

In order to prove the assertions of Theorem 1.1 we establish that there exists a minimizer for J on \mathcal{N} which is a critical point of $J(x)$ and thus a nontrivial solution of (1.7). Note that for all $x \in X$, there exists an $a > 0$ such that $-\langle \Delta x, x \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_n^2 \geq a \|x\|_X^2$.

1) Focusing nonlinearity $\gamma > 0$ and attractive delta potential $V_0 > 0$.

Let $\{x_k\} \in \mathcal{N}$ be a minimizing sequence. That is, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} J(x_k) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{N}} J(x)$. Since $x_k \in \mathcal{N}$ implies

$-\langle \Delta x_k, x_k \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_{k,n}^2 = \gamma \langle f(x_k), x_k \rangle + V_0 x_{k,0}^2$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we derive

$$J(x_k) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sigma+2}\right) \left[-\langle \Delta x_k, x_k \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_{k,n}^2 \right]$$

$$\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sigma + 2} \right) a \|x_k\|_X^2 > 0,$$

implying,

$$\|x_k\|_X^2 \leq \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sigma + 2} \right) a S \right)^{-1},$$

where $S = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{N}} J(x)$.

Hence, $\{x_k\}$ is bounded in X so that there exists a subsequence (not relabeled) that converges weakly in X , i.e. $x_k \rightharpoonup \tilde{x}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} J(x_k) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sigma + 2} \right) \gamma \langle f(x_k), x_k \rangle \right\} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sigma + 2} \right) \gamma \langle f(\tilde{x}), \tilde{x} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

and so $\tilde{x} \neq 0$. Next we show that $x_k \rightarrow \tilde{x}$ in X . By contradiction: Assume that $\|\tilde{x}\|_X < \underline{\lim}_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_k\|_X$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2} \langle \Delta \tilde{x}, \tilde{x} \rangle &< -\frac{\omega}{2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \tilde{x}_n^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma + 2} \gamma \langle f(\tilde{x}), \tilde{x} \rangle_X - \frac{V_0}{2} \tilde{x}_0^2 \\ &< \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \langle \Delta x_k, x_k \rangle - \frac{\omega}{2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_{k,n}^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma + 2} \gamma \langle f(x_k), x_k \rangle_X - \frac{V_0}{2} x_{k,0}^2 \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here it is useful to consider the map Γ_x . It holds $\Gamma_x(0) = 0$ and according to the proof of Proposition 3.1, $\Gamma_x(s) > 0$ for sufficiently small s and $\Gamma_x(s) \rightarrow -\infty$ for $s \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, $\Gamma_x(s)$ attains a unique maximum at $s(x)$ and $s(x)x \in \mathcal{N}$. We have

$$\Gamma'_{\tilde{x}}(1) = \langle J'(\tilde{x}), \tilde{x} \rangle = -\langle \Delta \tilde{x}, \tilde{x} \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \tilde{x}_n^2 - \gamma \langle f(\tilde{x}), \tilde{x} \rangle_X - V_0 \tilde{x}_0^2 < 0.$$

Hence, there exists an $s_0 < 1$ such that $\Gamma'_{\tilde{x}}(s_0) = 0$, that is, $s_0 \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{N}$. Also it holds $s_0 x_k \rightarrow s_0 \tilde{x}$ in X and since $x_k \in \mathcal{N}$, the map Γ_{x_k} attains its maximum at $s = s_0$. Therefore,

$$\Gamma_{\tilde{x}}(s_0) = J(s_0 \tilde{x}) < \underline{\lim}_{k \rightarrow \infty} J(s_0 x_k) \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} J(x_k) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{N}} J(x),$$

which leads to a contradiction. Thus, $x_k \rightarrow \tilde{x}$ in X .

It is readily concluded that $-\langle \Delta \tilde{x}, \tilde{x} \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \tilde{x}_n^2 - \gamma \langle f(\tilde{x}), \tilde{x} \rangle_X - V_0 \tilde{x}_0^2 = 0$ implying $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{N}$. Moreover, $J(\tilde{x}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} J(x_k) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{N}} J(x)$ so that \tilde{x} is a minimizer on \mathcal{N} . Finally, in accordance with Theorem 3.1, we rule out that the map Γ_x possesses inflection points requiring $\Gamma''(1) = 0$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma'_x(s) &= \langle J'(sx), x \rangle \\ &= -\langle \Delta(sx), x \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (sx_n)x_n - \gamma \langle f(sx), x \rangle_X - V_0(sx_0)x_0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma''_x(s) &= \langle J''(sx), x \rangle \\ &= \gamma(1 - (2\sigma + 1)s^{2\sigma}) \langle f(\tilde{x}), \tilde{x} \rangle_X + V_0(1 - s)x_0^2, \end{aligned}$$

yielding $\Gamma''_{\tilde{x}}(1) = -2\sigma\gamma(f(\tilde{x}), \tilde{x})_X < 0$. Hence, due to Theorem 3.1, \tilde{x} is a critical point of J and the proof for $V_0 > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ is complete.

2) Focusing nonlinearity $\gamma > 0$ and repulsive delta potential $V_0 < 0$.

Let $\{x_k\} \in \mathcal{N}$ be a minimizing sequence. That is, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} J(x_k) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{N}} J(x)$. From $x_k \in \mathcal{N}$ we infer

$-\langle \Delta x_k, x_k \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_{k,n}^2 - V_0 x_{k,0}^2 = \gamma(f(x_k), x_k)_X$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. One obtains

$$\begin{aligned} J(x_k) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\sigma + 2}\right) \left[-\langle \Delta x_k, x_k \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_{k,n}^2 \right] - V_0 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sigma + 2}\right) x_0^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\sigma + 2}\right) \left[-\langle \Delta x_k, x_k \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_{k,n}^2 \right] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\sigma + 2}\right) a \|x_k\|_X^2 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\{x_k\}$ is bounded in X . That is, there exists a subsequence (not relabeled) that converges weakly in X , i.e. $x_k \rightharpoonup \tilde{x}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} J(x_k) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sigma + 2}\right) \gamma \langle f(x_k), x_k \rangle \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sigma + 2}\right) \gamma(f(\tilde{x}), \tilde{x})_X \end{aligned}$$

and so $\tilde{x} \neq 0$.

The proof that x_k converges strongly to \tilde{x} in X proceeds analogously to the one in case 1) $\gamma > 0$ and $V_0 > 0$ above. From $-\langle \Delta \tilde{x}, \tilde{x} \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \tilde{x}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d}^2 - \gamma(f(\tilde{x}), \tilde{x})_X + V_0 \tilde{x}_0^2 = 0$ follows $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{N}$. In addition, $J(\tilde{x}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} J(x_k) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{N}} J(x)$. Hence, \tilde{x} is a minimizer on \mathcal{N} .

Finally, we show that $\Gamma''(1) = 0$ establishing that the map Γ_x does not have inflection points. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma'_x(s) &= \langle J'(sx), x \rangle \\ &= -\langle \Delta(sx), x \rangle - \omega \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (sx_n)x_n - \gamma(f(sx), x)_X - V_0(sx_0)x_0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma''_x(s) &= \langle J''(sx), x \rangle \\ &= \gamma(1 - (2\sigma + 1)s^{2\sigma})(f(x), x)_X + V_0(1 - s)x_0^2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

yielding $\Gamma''_{\tilde{x}}(1) = -2\sigma\gamma(f(\tilde{x}), \tilde{x})_X = -2\sigma\gamma \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \tilde{x}_n^{2\sigma+2} < 0$. That is, by Theorem 3.1, \tilde{x} is a critical point of J and the proof for $V_0 < 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ is finished.

□

4. EXCITATION THRESHOLDS

In this section we investigate the impact of nonlinearity on the durability of the (linear) defect modes and, reciprocally, how the delta potential affects the existence of (nonlinear) ground state solutions.

In the previous section we established the existence of a stable ground state solution as the critical point in l^2 of the action functional

$$J(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (x_n - x_{n-1})^2 - \frac{\omega}{2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_n^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma + 2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_n^{2\sigma+2} - \frac{1}{2} V_0 \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \delta_{n,0} x_n^2, \quad (4.1)$$

where ω is treated as a parameter. However, nothing can be stated about the value of the l^2 -norm of the solutions.

The influence of the l^2 -norm on the existence of ground state solutions was studied in [12] where the critical points (minimizers) of the energy functional $H(u)$ given in (1.2) with a prescribed l^2 -norm (mass), i.e. solutions constrained to l^2 -spheres

$$S_\nu = \{u \in C^1([0, \infty); l^2) : \|u\|_{l^2} = \nu\} \quad (4.2)$$

were determined. A solution $u_n(t) = x_n \exp(i\omega t)$ to the stationary equations $-\omega x_n + (\Delta x)_n + x_n^{2\sigma} x_n + \phi_n^{(x)} x_n = 0$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, is understood to be the pair $(x_\nu, \omega_\nu) \in l^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ with ω_ν being the Lagrange multiplier to the critical point x_ν on S_ν . That is, one looks for solutions with minimal energy constrained to the sphere S_ν , i.e. the minimization problem

$$H_\nu = \inf_{u \in S_\nu} H(u). \quad (4.3)$$

If

$$0 > H_\nu > -\infty \quad (4.4)$$

then for mass $\nu = \|u_\nu\|_{l^2}^2 = \|x_\nu\|_{l^2}^2$, the ground state is represented by $u_\nu(t) = x_\nu \exp(i\omega_\nu t)$. Problem (4.3) can be solved by application of concentrated compactness methods adopted to the discrete case [12],[48].

Regarding the equivalence between an action respectively energy minimizing ground state we have:

Proposition 4.1. *For every $\omega < 0$, a ground state, x , as the minimizer of the action functional (4.1) represents a ground state minimizing the energy functional*

$$E(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (x_n - x_{n-1})^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma + 2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} x_n^{2\sigma+2} - \frac{1}{2} V_0 \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \delta_{n,0} x_n^2, \quad (4.5)$$

too with $\|x\|_X^2 = \nu$.

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that there is $\tilde{x} \in X$ such that $\|\tilde{x}\|_X^2 = \nu$ and $E(\tilde{x}) < E(x)$. Then follows, $J(\tilde{x}) < J(x)$ and we arrive at a contradiction finishing the proof. \square

Furthermore, with concern to the localization of ground states we exploit that for a self-adjoint operator A on a Hilbert space X and a compact operator K on X , there holds $\sigma(A + K) \setminus \sigma(A)$ consists of isolated eigenvalues of finite multiplicity [50].

Since the defect modes are exponentially localized anyway, it is sufficient to prove exponential localization of breathers as solutions to

$$\omega x_n + (\Delta x)_n + \gamma x_n^{2\sigma} x_n = 0. \quad (4.6)$$

Here we present a concise proof as an alternative to the proof in [47].

Proposition 4.2. *Breather solutions to (4.6) satisfy*

$$|x_n| \leq C \exp(-\eta|n|), \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}^d,$$

with some constants $C, \eta > 0$.

Proof. We express (4.6) in the form

$$-(\Delta + M)x_n = \omega x_n, \quad (4.7)$$

where the multiplication operator $M : l^2 \mapsto l^2$ is determined by

$$(Mx)_n = (x_n^{2\sigma}) x_n.$$

Since $\lim_{|n| \rightarrow \infty} x_n^{2\sigma} = 0$, the multiplication operator M is compact on l^2 . As $\omega \notin \sigma(\Delta)$ implies $\omega \in \sigma(\Delta + M) \setminus \sigma(\Delta)$ so that ω is an eigenvalue of finite multiplicity of the operator $\Delta + M$. The associated eigenfunction exhibits exponential decay (see e.g. in [49]) and the proof is complete. \square

Following Weinstein [12] we say that if a ground state (as a minimizer of $\inf_{x \in S_\nu} H(u) < 0$) exists for any value of $\nu > 0$, there is no excitation threshold. Conversely, if there exists a positive ν_{thresh} such that $\inf[H_\nu] < 0$ if and only if $\nu > \nu_{thresh}$, then ν_{thresh} constitutes an excitation threshold.

With the proven exponential localization of ground states, $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \in l^2$ can be represented as $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} = (A \exp(-\alpha|n|))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ with $\alpha > \beta$.

Using $\alpha = -\log(\eta)$ with $0 < \eta < 1$, we express $x_n = A \exp(-\alpha|n|)$ as

$$x_n = A\eta^{|n|}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad (4.8)$$

with $|n| = |n_1| + \dots + |n_d|$ and amplitude $A > 0$ determined by

$$A = \left(\left(\frac{1 - \eta^2}{1 + \eta^2} \right)^d \nu \right)^{1/2}.$$

Note that $\eta \rightarrow 0^+$ leads to enhanced localization towards a single-site state while $\eta \rightarrow 1^-$ renders the profile wider (advancing towards a flat state of zero amplitude), i.e. varying η between zero and one interpolates between two nearly extreme states, namely a single site breather and a wide (yet localized) absolutely continuous spectrum near edge state.

The energy H is then expressed as

$$H = 2\nu \frac{(1 + \eta^2)^d - (2\eta)^d}{(1 + \eta^2)^d} - \frac{\gamma}{\sigma + 1} \left(\left(\frac{1 - \eta^2}{1 + \eta^2} \right)^d \nu \right)^{\sigma+1} \left(\frac{1 + \eta^{2\sigma+2}}{(1 - \eta)F(\eta, \sigma)} \right)^d - V_0 \left(\frac{1 - \eta^2}{1 + \eta^2} \right)^d \nu, \quad (4.9)$$

where $F(\eta, \sigma) = \sum_{l=1}^{2\sigma+1} \eta^l + 1$.

Subsequently we investigate for which value(s) of the mass $\nu = \|u\|_{l^2}^2$ a ground state solution exists at all using the criterion $H < 0$ where the energy $H = H(\nu; \eta, \gamma, \sigma, V_0)$ is determined by (4.9).

4.1. Ground states and lower excitation threshold

We begin with the effect of the point defect on the existence of excitation thresholds for the formation of ground state solutions. It is proved in [12] that, if $\sigma \geq 2$ the DNLS with general power nonlinearity

$$i \frac{du_n}{dt} + (\Delta u)_n + \gamma |u_n|^{2\sigma} u_n = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad (4.10)$$

exhibits ground state solutions if and only if the total mass ν is larger than some strictly positive threshold value ν_{thresh} .

Proof of Theorem 1.2

1) Focusing nonlinearity $\gamma > 0$ and attractive delta potential $V_0 > 0$.

As noted in section 2, for $V_0 > 0$ the linear lattice with delta potential possesses a bound state (defect mode) of negative energy generated by the presence of the point defect.

With the addition of a focusing nonlinear term to the linear equation, its associated contribution to the energy is negative so that the total energy remains negative for all $\nu > 0$. Hence, for focusing nonlinearity $\gamma > 0$ and attractive delta potential $V_0 > 0$ the existence of an excitation threshold for the creation of breathers is ruled out.

2) Focusing nonlinearity $\gamma > 0$ and repulsive delta potential $V_0 < 0$.

$H \geq 0$ if and only if

$$\frac{\sigma + 1}{\gamma} \left[2 \frac{(1 + \eta^2)^d - (2\eta)^d}{(1 + \eta^2)^d} - V_0 \left(\frac{1 - \eta^2}{1 + \eta^2} \right)^d \right] \left(\left(\frac{1 + \eta^2}{1 - \eta^2} \right)^d \right)^{\sigma+1} \left(\frac{F(\eta, \sigma)(1 - \eta)}{1 + \eta^{2\sigma+2}} \right)^d \geq \nu^\sigma,$$

implying the condition

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sigma + 1}{\gamma} \inf_{0 < \eta < 1} \left(\frac{1}{(1 + \eta^2)^d} \left[2 \left((1 + \eta^2)^d - (2\eta)^d \right) - V_0 (1 - \eta^2)^d \right] \frac{(1 + \eta^2)^{\sigma d}}{(1 - \eta^2)^{(\sigma+1)d}} \right. \\ & \times \left. \left(\frac{F(\eta, \sigma)(1 - \eta)}{1 + \eta^{2\sigma+2}} \right)^d \right) \geq \nu^\sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

The inequality (4.11) is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^\sigma & \leq \frac{\sigma + 1}{\gamma} \inf_{0 < \eta < 1} \left(\frac{1}{(1 + \eta^2)^d} \left[2F_1(\eta, d)(1 - \eta)^2 - V_0(1 + \eta)^d(1 - \eta)^d \right] \right. \\ & \times \left. \frac{(1 + \eta^2)^{\sigma d}}{(1 + \eta)^{(\sigma+1)d}(1 - \eta)^{(\sigma+1)d}} \left(\frac{F(\eta, \sigma)(1 - \eta)}{1 + \eta^{2\sigma+2}} \right)^d \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where $F_1(\eta, d)(1 - \eta)^2 = (1 + \eta^2)^d - (2\eta)^d$ is explicitly given for $d = 1, \dots, 4$ by $F_1(\eta, 1) = 1$, $F_1(\eta, 2) = 1$, $F_1(\eta, 3) = \eta^4 + 2\eta^3 + 6\eta^2 + 2\eta + 1$, $F_1(\eta, 4) = \eta^6 + 2\eta^5 + 7\eta^4 + 12\eta^3 + 7\eta^2 + 2\eta + 1$.

If $\sigma < \min\{1, 2/d\}$, then the infimum on the right-hand side of (4.12) is attained for $\eta \rightarrow 1^-$. Setting $1 - \eta = \epsilon$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^\sigma & \leq \frac{\sigma + 1}{\gamma} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \left(\frac{(1 + \eta^2)^{\sigma d}}{(1 + \eta)^{(\sigma+1)d}} \frac{1}{(1 + \eta^2)^d} \left(\frac{F(\eta, \sigma)}{1 + \eta^{2\sigma+2}} \right)^d \right) \\ & \times \left[2F_1(\eta, d)\epsilon^{2-\sigma d} - V_0(1 + \eta)^d \epsilon^{d(1-\sigma)} \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

That is, for $\sigma < \min\{1, 2/d\}$ one has $H < 0$ for all $\nu > 0$ so that there is no excitation threshold. Hence, ground states of arbitrarily small amplitude that bifurcate off the linear zero solution exist.

If $\sigma \geq \max\{1, 2/d\}$, then the infimum on the right-hand side of (4.12) is attained for $\eta \rightarrow 0^+$ yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^\sigma & \leq \frac{\sigma + 1}{\gamma} \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \left(\frac{1}{(1 + \eta^2)^d} \left[2F_1(\eta, d)(1 - \eta)^2 - V_0(1 + \eta)^d(1 - \eta)^d \right] \right. \\ & \times \left. \frac{(1 + \eta^2)^{\sigma d}}{(1 + \eta)^{(\sigma+1)d}(1 - \eta)^{(\sigma+1)d}} \left(\frac{F(\eta, \sigma)(1 - \eta)}{1 + \eta^{2\sigma+2}} \right)^d \right) = \frac{\sigma + 1}{\gamma} (2 - V_0). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $H < 0$ if and only if the mass exceeds the threshold value $\nu_{thresh} = ((\sigma+1)/\gamma)(2-V_0) > 0$.

3) Focusing nonlinearity $\gamma > 0$ and zero delta potential $V_0 = 0$.

In this special case, using $V_0 = 0$ in (4.11) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sigma+1}{\gamma} \inf_{0 < \eta < 1} \left(\frac{1}{(1+\eta^2)^d} [2F_1(\eta, d)(1-\eta)^2] \frac{(1+\eta^2)^{\sigma d}}{(1+\eta)^{(\sigma+1)d}(1-\eta)^{(\sigma+1)d}} \right. \\ & \times \left. \left(\frac{F(\eta, \sigma)(1-\eta)}{1+\eta^{2\sigma+2}} \right)^d \right) \geq \nu^\sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

If $\sigma < 2/d$ then the infimum on the left-hand side of (4.13) is attained for $\eta \rightarrow 1^-$. Setting $1-\eta = \epsilon$ we have

$$\nu^\sigma \leq \frac{\sigma+1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{(1+\eta^2)^{\sigma d}}{(1+\eta)^{(\sigma+1)d}} \frac{1}{(1+\eta^2)^d} \left(\frac{F(\eta, \sigma)}{1+\eta^{2\sigma+2}} \right)^d \right) 2F_1(\eta, d) \epsilon^{2-\sigma d} = 0.$$

Hence, for $V_0 = 0$, $\sigma < 2/d$ one has $H < 0$ for all $\nu > 0$, meaning that there is no excitation threshold. Thus ground states of arbitrarily small amplitude, bifurcating off the zero linear solution exist. We recover the result obtained in [12].

If $\sigma \geq 2/d$ then the infimum on the left-hand side of (4.13) is attained for $\eta \rightarrow 0^+$

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^\sigma \leq &= \frac{\sigma+1}{\gamma} \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \left(\frac{1}{(1+\eta^2)^d} 2F_1(\eta, d)(1-\eta)^2 \frac{(1+\eta^2)^{\sigma d}}{(1+\eta)^{(\sigma+1)d}(1-\eta)^{(\sigma+1)d}} \right. \\ & \times \left. \left(\frac{F(\eta, \sigma)(1-\eta)}{1+\eta^{2\sigma+2}} \right)^d \right) = 2 \frac{\sigma+1}{\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

so that we conclude that only if $\nu > \nu_{thresh} = 4(\sigma+1)/\gamma > 0$ the energy becomes negative.

To gain further insight into the localization features we note that when $\eta \rightarrow 0^+$ the excitation pattern approaches the single-site state and the gap between the energy of the linear system,

$$H_0 = \frac{(1-\eta)^2}{1+\eta^2} \nu,$$

and that of the nonlinear contribution (responsible for creating the potential well which makes possible at all localization),

$$H_1 = -\frac{\gamma}{2\sigma+2} \left(\frac{1-\eta^2}{1+\eta^2} P \right)^{\sigma+1} \frac{1+\eta^{2\sigma+2}}{1-\eta^{2\sigma+2}},$$

becomes maximal. In order to ease the illustration we treat here the case $d = 1$. We obtain

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} (H_0(\eta) + H_1(\eta)) = \nu \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{2\sigma+2} \nu^\sigma \right) \geq 0 \iff \nu \leq \left(\frac{2\sigma+2}{\gamma} \right)^{1/\sigma} \quad (4.14)$$

Substituting the threshold value $\nu_{thresh} = (2\sigma+2)/\gamma^{1/\sigma}$ into the expression for the energy $H = H_0 + H_1$, it is readily seen that for $\sigma \geq 2$

$$H = \left(1 - \frac{(1+\eta)^{\sigma+1}(1+\eta^{2\sigma+2})}{(1+\eta^2)^{\sigma+1}} (1-\eta)^{\sigma-1} \right) \frac{(1-\eta)^2}{1+\eta^2} \nu \geq 0, \quad \forall \eta \in (0, 1).$$

Conclusively, $H < 0$ only if $\nu > \nu_{thresh} = (2\sigma+2)/\gamma^{1/\sigma}$.

□

We also discuss the localization behavior if $\nu \rightarrow \infty$. From the relation

$$(1 + \eta^2)^d A^2 = (1 - \eta^2)^d \nu,$$

we deduce that if $\eta \rightarrow 1^-$ then $A \rightarrow 0^+$ complying with the fact that low amplitude breathers bifurcate off the linear trivial solution. Conversely, if $\eta \rightarrow 0^+$ then $A^2 \rightarrow \nu$, in accordance with the result in [12] proving that as ν increases, the ground states grow in amplitude and become increasingly concentrated about a single lattice site.

4.2. Defect modes and upper thresholds for the mass

We conclude this section with an investigation of the persistence of the linear impurity mode in the presence of defocusing nonlinearity, i.e. $\gamma < 0$ and $V_0 \neq 0$.

1) Defocusing nonlinearity $\gamma < 0$ and attractive delta potential $V_0 > 0$.

$$H = 2\nu \frac{(1 + \eta^2)^d - (2\eta)^d}{(1 + \eta^2)^d} - \frac{\gamma}{\sigma + 1} \left(\left(\frac{1 - \eta^2}{1 + \eta^2} \right)^d \nu \right)^{\sigma+1} \left(\frac{1 + \eta^{2\sigma+2}}{(1 - \eta)F(\eta, \sigma)} \right)^d - V_0 \left(\frac{1 - \eta^2}{1 + \eta^2} \right)^d \nu,$$

$H \leq 0$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^\sigma &\leq \frac{\sigma + 1}{\gamma} \inf_{0 < \eta < 1} \left(V_0 \left(\frac{1 + \eta}{1 + \eta^2} \right)^d (1 - \eta)^{d(1-\sigma)} - 2 \frac{F_1(\eta, d)}{1 + \eta^2} (1 - \eta)^{2-d\sigma} \right) \\ &\times (1 + \eta^2)^{d(\sigma+1)} \left(\frac{F(\eta, \sigma)}{1 + \eta^{2\sigma+2}} \right)^d. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

If $\sigma < \min\{1, 2/d\}$, then the infimum on the right-hand side of (4.8) is attained for $\eta \rightarrow 1^-$ yielding $\nu \leq 0$, so that we deduce $H > 0$ for all $\nu > 0$. That is, for $\sigma < 1$ a localized state cannot exist. However, if $\sigma \geq \max\{1, 2/d\}$, the infimum on the right-hand side of (4.8) is attained for $\eta \rightarrow 0^+$ yielding the *upper threshold*

$$0 < \nu < \bar{\nu}_{thresh} \leq \frac{\sigma + 1}{\gamma} (V_0 - 2), \quad V_0 > 2.$$

Hence, the (linear) impurity mode only sustains defocusing nonlinearity for subcritical mass $\nu < \bar{\nu}_{thresh}$.

2) Focusing nonlinearity $\gamma > 0$ and repulsive delta potential $V_0 < 0$.

The existence of the staggering defect mode requires $H > 4d$, which entails the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\sigma+1} &< \frac{\sigma + 1}{\gamma} \inf_{-1 < \eta < 0} \left(2 \frac{F_1(\eta, d)}{1 + \eta^2} (1 - \eta)^{2-d\sigma} \nu - V_0 \left(\frac{1 + \eta}{1 + \eta^2} \right)^d (1 - \eta)^{d(1-\sigma)} \nu \right. \\ &\left. - 4d(1 - \eta)^{-d\sigma} \right) (1 + \eta^2)^{d(\sigma+1)} \left(\frac{F(\eta, \sigma)}{1 + \eta^{2\sigma+2}} \right)^d \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

must be satisfied so the staggering defect mode survives under the impact of defocusing nonlinearity. For $\sigma \geq \max\{1, 2/d\}$ the infimum on the right-hand side of (4.9) is attained for $\eta \rightarrow 0^-$ resulting

in

$$0 < \nu^{\sigma+1} < \frac{\sigma+1}{\gamma} ((2-V_0)\nu - 4d).$$

In contrast, for $\sigma < \min\{1, 2/d\}$ one has $H \leq 4d$ for all $\nu^{\sigma+1} \geq ((2-V_0)\nu - 4d)(\sigma+1)/\gamma$. Thus, then no staggering defect mode exists.

Remark 4.1. For $\gamma > 0$ and $V_0 < 0$ the simultaneous existence of localized states below (breathers) as well as above (staggering defect mode) the absolutely continuous spectrum of Δ is possible. This is an effect of discreteness and it is not present in the continuum NLS with point defect because the operator $-\partial_x^2 + V_0\delta(x)$, $V_0 > 0$, possesses a purely absolutely continuous spectrum equal to $[0, \infty)$ and no eigenvalue (point spectrum).

5. ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOR

In this section we discuss the asymptotic features of the δ DNLS

$$i\frac{du}{dt} + (\Delta_\delta u) + \gamma|u|^{2\sigma}u = 0. \quad (5.1)$$

The operator $-\Delta_\delta = -\Delta - V_\delta$ possesses an absolutely continuous spectrum $[0, 4d]$. If $V_0 > 0$ ($V_0 < 0$) there is a single eigenvalue (eigenenergy) (cf. (2.3)) whose eigenfunction represents the single linear non-staggering (staggering) bound state.

With concern to the decay properties of the group $\exp(it\Delta_\delta)$ we have:

Proposition 5.1. *For the linear Schrödinger group $\exp(it\Delta_\delta)$ we have the dispersive estimate*

$$\|P_{ac}(\exp(it\Delta_\delta))\|_{\mathcal{L}(l^p, l^{p'})} \lesssim \frac{1}{|t|^{d/3}}, \quad (5.1)$$

where P_{ac} is the projection onto the continuous spectral subspace of Δ_δ .

Proof. Scattering features are governed by the absolutely continuous spectrum of the operator Δ_δ . We show that the absolutely continuous spectrum of Δ_δ coincides with those of the unperturbed discrete Laplace operator Δ .

Consider the multiplication operator $V_\delta : l^p \mapsto l^p$, $V = (V_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$, $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |V_n| < \infty$, $V_\delta x = (\dots, V_{-1}x_{-1}, V_0x_0, V_1x_1, \dots)$ for all $x = (\dots, x_{-1}, x_0, x_1, \dots) \in l^p$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Since $V_n \neq 0$ if and only if $n = 0$, the operator V_δ is a rank-one operator and hence, compact.

Then by Weyl's Theorem, the essential spectrum of Δ coincides with the essential spectrum of Δ_δ . (Since Δ is a bounded and self-adjoint operator its residual spectrum is empty.) From $\sigma_{ess}(\Delta_\delta) = \sigma_{ess}(\Delta)$ and $\sigma_{cont}(\Delta) \subset \sigma_{ess}(\Delta)$ follows $\sigma_{cont}(\Delta_\delta)$ equals $\sigma_{cont}(\Delta)$. Therefore, the two linear Schrödinger groups $\exp(it\Delta_\delta)$ and $\exp(it\Delta)$ exhibit the same scattering properties. For the latter the decay estimate

$$\|P_{ac}(\exp(it\Delta))\|_{\mathcal{L}(l^p, l^{p'})} \lesssim \frac{1}{|t|^{d/3}}, \quad (5.1)$$

holds [43] implying (5.1) and the proof is complete. \square

Corollary 5.1. *The linear discrete Schrödinger equation with and without delta potential exhibits equal decay features.*

Scattering: We establish that the solutions for $V_0 < 0$, $\sigma \geq \max\{1, 2/d\}$ and $V_0 = 0$, $\sigma \geq 2/d$, respectively, and l^2 -norm below ν_{thresh} scatter to a solution of the linear problem in l^p , $p > 2$. That is, the solutions of the nonlinear problem exhibit asymptotically free behavior. We say that a solution scatters in the positive (negative) time direction if there exists $v^\pm \in l^p$ such that

$$\|u(t) - \exp(i\Delta_\delta t)v^\pm\|_{l^p} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \pm\infty.$$

The solution scatters if it scatters in both time directions.

Proof of Theorem 1.3

We begin with the treatment of scattering in the positive time direction. For the Cauchy problem with initial datum $u_0 \in l^2$ we consider the global solution $u(t)$ and introduce the asymptotic state v^+

$$v^+ = u_0 + i\gamma \int_0^\infty \exp(-i\Delta_\delta s)|u(s)|^{2\sigma} u(s) ds. \quad (5.3)$$

Application of the operator $\exp(i\Delta_\delta t)$ on either side of (5.3) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(i\Delta_\delta t)v^+ &= \exp(i\Delta_\delta t)u_0 + i\gamma \int_0^\infty \exp(i\Delta_\delta(t-s))\gamma|u(s)|^{2\sigma} u(s) ds \\ &= u(t) + i\gamma \int_t^\infty \exp(i\Delta_\delta(t-s))|u(s)|^{2\sigma} u(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Using the estimate (5.2) we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \|\exp(i\Delta_\delta t)v^+ - u(t)\|_{l^p} &= \left\| \int_t^\infty \exp(i\Delta_\delta(t-s))\gamma|u(s)|^{2\sigma} u(s) ds \right\|_{l^p} \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty \|\exp(i\Delta_\delta(t-s))\gamma|u(s)|^{2\sigma} u(s)\|_{l^p} ds \\ &\leq C \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\langle t-s \rangle^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \gamma \| |u(s)|^{2\sigma+1} \|_{l^{(2\sigma+1)p'}} ds. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption $2(\sigma+1) \geq p$ one has $(2\sigma+1)p' \geq p$. Then due to the continuous embeddings $l^{(2\sigma+1)p'} \subseteq l^p$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\exp(i\Delta_\delta t)v^+ - u(t)\|_{l^p} &\leq C \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\langle t-s \rangle^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \gamma \| |u(s)|^{2\sigma+1} \|_{l^p} ds \\ &\leq C_1 \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\langle t-s \rangle^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \frac{\gamma \| |u(0)|^{2\sigma+1} \|_{l^{p'}}}{s^{d(p-2)(2\sigma+1)/(3p)}} ds \\ &\leq C_1 \gamma \| |u(0)|^{2\sigma+1} \|_{l^{p'}} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\langle t-s \rangle^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \frac{1}{\langle s \rangle^{d(p-2)(2\sigma+1)/(3p)}} ds. \end{aligned}$$

We evaluate the integral as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\langle t-s \rangle^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \frac{1}{\langle s \rangle^{d(p-2)(2\sigma+1)/(3p)}} ds \\ &= \int_0^t \frac{1}{\langle t-s \rangle^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \frac{1}{\langle s \rangle^{d(p-2)(2\sigma+1)/(3p)}} ds \\ &+ \int_t^\infty \frac{1}{\langle t-s \rangle^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \frac{1}{\langle s \rangle^{d(p-2)(2\sigma+1)/(3p)}} ds \\ &\equiv I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

Our assumption $p \geq 4d\sigma/(2d\sigma - 3)$ implies $d(p-2)(2\sigma+1)/(3p) > 1$. Therefore, for I_1 we estimate

$$I_1 = \int_0^t \frac{1}{\langle t-s \rangle^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \frac{1}{\langle s \rangle^{d(p-2)(2\sigma+1)/(3p)}} ds \leq C \frac{1}{\langle t \rangle^{d(p-2)/(3p)}}.$$

For I_2 we proceed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \int_t^\infty \frac{1}{\langle t-s \rangle^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \frac{1}{\langle s \rangle^{d(p-2)(2\sigma+1)/(3p)}} ds \\ &= \int_t^\infty \frac{1}{(1+s-t)^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \frac{1}{(1+s)^{d(p-2)(2\sigma+1)/(3p)}} ds. \end{aligned}$$

The change of variables $s = tz$ gives

$$I_2 = \int_1^\infty \frac{t}{(1+t(z-1))^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \frac{1}{(1+tz)^{d(p-2)(2\sigma+1)/(3p)}} dz.$$

A further change of variables $z = 1/s$ results in

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \int_0^1 \frac{t}{s^2} \frac{1}{(1+ts^{-1}(1-s))^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \frac{1}{(1+ts^{-1})^{d(p-2)(2\sigma+1)/(3p)}} ds \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t^{2(\sigma+1)d(p-2)/(3p)-1}} \int_0^1 (1-s)^{-d(p-2)/(3p)} s^{2(\sigma+1)d(p-2)/(3p)-2} ds \\ &= \frac{1}{t^{2(\sigma+1)d(p-2)/(3p)-1}} B(2(\sigma+1)d(p-2)/(3p) - 1, 1 - d(p-2)/(3p)), \end{aligned}$$

where $B(x, y) = \int_0^1 s^{x-1}(1-s)^{y-1} ds$ defines the beta-function. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\exp(i\Delta_\delta t)v^+ - u(t)\|_{l^p} &\leq C \left(\frac{1}{t^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{t^{2(\sigma+1)d(p-2)/(3p)-1}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times B(2(\sigma+1)d(p-2)/(3p) - 1, 1 - d(p-2)/(3p)) \right), \quad \forall t > 0, \end{aligned}$$

so that we deduce $v^+ \in l^p$.

Furthermore, applying the operator $\exp(-i\Delta_\delta t)$ on both sides of the integral equation

$$u(t) = \exp(i\Delta_\delta t)u_0 - i \int_0^t \exp(i\Delta_\delta(t-s))\gamma|u(s)|^{2\sigma}u(s)ds,$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(-i\Delta_\delta t)u(t) &= u_0 - i \int_0^t \exp(-i\Delta_\delta s)\gamma|u(s)|^{2\sigma}u(s)ds \\ &= v^+ + i \int_t^\infty \exp(-i\Delta_\delta s)\gamma|u(s)|^{2\sigma}u(s)ds. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\exp(-i\Delta_\delta t)u(t) - v^+ = i \int_t^\infty \exp(-i\Delta_\delta s)\gamma|u(s)|^{2\sigma}u(s)ds,$$

and we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\exp(-i\Delta_\delta t)u(t) - v^+\|_{l^p} &= \left\| \int_t^\infty \exp(-i\Delta_\delta s)\gamma|u(s)|^{2\sigma}u(s)ds \right\|_{l^p} \\ &= \left\| \int_t^\infty \exp(-i\Delta_\delta t)\exp(i\Delta_\delta(t-s))\gamma|u(s)|^{2\sigma}u(s)ds \right\|_{l^p} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \int_0^\infty \left\| \exp(-i\Delta_\delta t) \exp(i\Delta_\delta(t-s)) \gamma |u(s)|^{2\sigma} u(s) \right\|_{l^p} ds \\
&\leq C\gamma \int_0^\infty \frac{\|u(s)\|_{l^{(2\sigma+1)p'}}^{2\sigma+1}}{\langle t-s \rangle^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} ds \|\exp(-i\Delta_\delta t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(l^p, l^{p'})} \\
&\leq C_1\gamma \frac{\|u(0)\|_{l^{p'}}^{2\sigma+1}}{\langle t \rangle^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\langle t-s \rangle^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \frac{1}{\langle s \rangle^{d(p-2)(2\sigma+1)/(3p)}} ds \\
&\leq C_2\gamma \|u(0)\|_{l^{p'}}^{2\sigma+1} \frac{1}{\langle t \rangle^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \left(\frac{1}{\langle t \rangle^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{t^{2(\sigma+1)d(p-2)/(3p)-1}} B(2(\sigma+1)d(p-2)/(3p) - 1, 1 - d(p-2)/(3p)) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t > 0$. Since by assumption $2(\sigma+1)(p-2)/(3p) - 1 > d(p-2)/(3p) > 0$ it follows

$$\|\exp(-i\Delta_\delta t)u(t) - v^+\|_{l^p} \lesssim \frac{1}{t^{d(p-2)/(3p)}}, \quad t > 0. \quad (5.4)$$

Scattering in the negative time direction can be dealt with in the same way as above in the positive time direction. In fact, due to the time reversibility of system (1.1) it holds $v^- = \bar{v}^+$. Hence, we obtain

$$\|u(t) - \exp(i\Delta_\delta t)v^\pm\|_{l^p} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \pm\infty.$$

and the proof is complete. \square

The proof of Theorem 1.3 proves at the same time Weinstein's conjecture for the general power DNLS (4.10) with $\sigma \geq 2/d$ [12]: If $\nu(u_0) = \|u_0\|_{l^2}^2 < \nu_{thresh}$, then for any $p \in (2, \infty]$ the solutions decay, that is,

$$\|u(t)\|_{l^p} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } |t| \rightarrow \infty.$$

Using the triangle inequality we get for $p \geq 4d\sigma/(2d\sigma - 3)$ from (5.4)

$$\|u(t)\|_{l^p} \leq C \frac{1}{t^{d(p-2)/(3p)}} + \|\exp(i\Delta t)v^+\|_{l^p} \leq (C + C_1 \|v^+\|_{l^{p'}}) \frac{1}{t^{d(p-2)/(3p)}}, \quad t > 0.$$

Hence,

$$\|u(t)\|_{l^p} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Decay for $t \rightarrow -\infty$ is verified analogously.

In [43] the authors presented a proof that for *sufficiently small solutions*, their decay is like that of the free solutions in the corresponding l^p norms and this statement implies Weinstein's conjecture. However, our current result in Theorem 1.3 is valid for solutions with any l^2 norm below the threshold ν_{thresh} , as it is actually stated in Weinstein's conjecture, and thus not restricted to 'sufficiently small solutions' as in [43]. Take, for example, $d = 1$. Then $\nu_{thresh} = (2\sigma + 2)/\gamma^{1/\sigma}$. Since by a transformation $\tilde{u} = \sqrt{\gamma}u$ the parameter can be absorbed, it can be set equal to one in ν_{thresh} giving $\nu_{thresh} = (2(\sigma + 1))^{1/\sigma}$ which is not necessarily of small magnitude.

Remark 5.1. While for $V_0 < 0$, $\sigma < \min\{1, 2/d\}$ respectively $V_0 = 0$, $\sigma < 2/d$, the solutions do not scatter, for $V_0 < 0$, $\sigma \geq \max\{1, 2/d\}$ respectively $V_0 = 0$, $\sigma \geq 2/d$, we have the **dichotomy** result:

- (1) If $\|u_0\|_{l^2} < P_{thresh}$, then the solutions scatter in both time directions.
- (2) If $\|u_0\|_{l^2} \geq P_{thresh}$, the ground state is a global non-scattering solution.

REFERENCES

- [1] O. Morsch, M. Oberthaler, *Dynamics of Bose–Einstein condensates in optical lattice*. Rev. Mod. Phys. **78**, 179–215 (2006); M.A. Porter, R. Carretero-González, P.G. Kevrekidis, and B. Malomed, *Nonlinear lattice dynamics of Bose–Einstein condensates*, Chaos **15**, 015115 (2005).
- [2] M. Skorobogatiy and J. Yang, *Fundamentals of photonic crystal guiding* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, (2008).
- [3] D.N. Christodoulides and R.I. Joseph, *Discrete self-focusing in nonlinear arrays of coupled waveguides*, Opt. Lett. **13**, 794–796 (1988); H.S. Eisenberg, Y. Silberberg, R. Morandotti, A.R. Boyd, and J.S. Aitchison, *Discrete spatial optical solitons in waveguide arrays*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3383–3386 (1988); D.N. Christodoulides, F. Lederer, Y. Silberberg, *Discretizing light behaviour in linear and nonlinear waveguide lattices*, Nature **424**, 817–823 (2003); F. Lederer, G.I. Stegeman, D.N. Christodoulides, G. Assanto, M. Segev, M., and Y. Silberberg, *Discrete solitons in optics*, Phys. Rep. **463**, 1–126 (2008).
- [4] F. Ye, D. Mihalache, B. Hu, and N.C. Panou, *Subwavelength plasmonic lattice solitons in arrays of metallic nanowires*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 106802 (2010).
- [5] P. G. Kevrekidis, K. O. Rasmussen and A. R. Bishop, *The discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation: A survey of recent results*, Int. Journal of Modern Physics B **15**, 2833–2900 (2001).
- [6] J.C. Eilbeck and M. Johansson, The discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation-20 years on in: L. Vázquez, R.S. MacKay, M.P. Zorzano (Eds.), *Localization and Energy Transfer in Nonlinear Systems*. World Scientific, Singapore, pp. 44–67 (2003).
- [7] P.G. Kevrekidis, *The Nonlinear Discrete Schrödinger Equation: Mathematical Analysis, Numerical Computations, and Physical Perspectives* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009).
- [8] T. Cazenave and P.L. Lions, *Orbital stability of standing waves for some nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Comm. Math. Phys. **85**, 549-561 (1982).
- [9] T. Cazenave, *An introduction to nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, IM-UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro (1989).
- [10] T. Cazenave, *Semilinear Schrödinger equations*, vol. 10 Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics, AMS, Providence (2003).
- [11] E. Stein, *Harmonic analysis, real-variable methods, orthogonality and oscillatory integrals*, Princeton University Press, 1993.
- [12] M.I. Weinstein, *Excitation thresholds for nonlinear localized modes on lattices*, Nonlinearity **12**. 673–691 (1999).
- [13] M.I. Weinstein, *Lyapunov stability of ground states of nonlinear dispersive evolution equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **39**, 51 (1986).
- [14] V. Caudrelier, M. Mintchev, E. Ragoucy, *Solving the quantum nonlinear Schrödinger equation with δ -type impurity*, J. Math. Phys. **46** 1-24 (2005).
- [15] B. Bellazi, M. Mintchev, *Quantum field theory on star graphs*, J. Phys. A, Math. Theor. **39** 1101–1117 (2006).
- [16] S. Le Coz, R. Fukuizumi, G. Fibich, B. Ksherim, and Y. Sivan, *Instability of bound states of a nonlinear Schrödinger equation with a Dirac potential*, Physica D **237** 1103–1128 (2008).
- [17] R. Fukuizumi, and L. Jeanjean, *Stability of standing waves for a nonlinear Schrödinger equation with a repulsive Dirac delta potential*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **21** 121–136 (2008).
- [18] R. Fukuizumi, M. Ohta, T. Ozawa, *Nonlinear Schrödinger equation with a point defect*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Anal. Non Linéaire **25** 837–845 (2008).
- [19] P. Deift and J. Park, *Long-time asymptotic stability for solutions of the NLS equation with a delta potential and even initial data*, Int. Math. Res. Notices **24**, 5505–5624 (2011).
- [20] M. Belloni, R.W. Richard, *The infinite well and Dirac delta function potentials as pedagogical, mathematical and physical models in quantum mechanics*, Phys. Rep. **540** 25-122 (2014).
- [21] V. Banica and N. Visciglia, *Scattering for NLS with a delta potential*, J. Diff. Eqs. **260**, 4410–4439 (2016).
- [22] M. Ikeda and T. Inui, *Global dynamics below the standing waves for the focusing semilinear Schrödinger equation with a repulsive Dirac delta potential*, Anal. PDE **10** 481–512 (2017).
- [23] A.H. Ardila and T. Inui, *Threshold scattering for the focusing NLS with a repulsive Dirac delta potential*, J. Diff. Eqs. **313**, 54-84 (2022).

- [24] F. Merle, Determination of blow-up solutions with minimal mass for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with critical power, *Duke Math. J* **69** 427-454 (1993).
- [25] F. Merle and P. Raphael, *On universality of blow-up profile for L^2 critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, *Invent. Math.* **156** 565–672 (2004).
- [26] F. Merle and P. Raphael, *The blow-up dynamic and upper bound on the blow-up rate for critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, *Ann. of Math.* **161** 157–222 (2005).
- [27] G. Perelman, *On the blow up phenomenon for the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in 1D*, *Ann. Henri. Poincaré* **2** 605–673 (2001).
- [28] F. Planchon and P. Raphael, *Existence and stability of the log-log blow-up dynamics for the L^2 -critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in a domain*, *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, **8** 1177–1219 (2007).
- [29] P. Raphael, *Stability of the log-log bound for blow up solutions to the critical non linear Schrödinger equation*, *Math. Ann.* **331** 577–609 (2005).
- [30] R.H. Goodman, P.J. Holmes, and M.I. Weinstein, *Strong NLS soliton-defect interactions*, *Physica D* **192**, 215–248 (1987).
- [31] B. Dodson, *Global well-posedness and scattering for the mass critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation with mass below the mass of the ground state*, *Adv. Math.* **285** 1589-1618 (2015).
- [32] G.M. Guerekata and A. Pankov, *Global well-posedness for discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, *Appl. Anal.* **89** 1513-1521 (2010).
- [33] D. Hennig, N.I. Karachalios, and J. Cuevas-Maraver, *The closeness of the Ablowitz-Ladik lattice to the discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, *J. Diff. Eqs.* **316** 346-363 (2022).
- [34] J. Wang, *The well-posedness and scattering theory of nonlinear Schrödinger equations on lattice*, arXiv: 2408.01174v1.
- [35] V.E. Zakharov, S.V. Manakov, S.P. Novikov, and L.P. Pitaevskii, *Solitons: The Inverse Scattering Method* Nauka Publishers: Moscow, Russia, 1980; English Translation: Consultants Bureau: New York, NY, USA, 1984.
- [36] M.J. Ablowitz and H. Segur, *Solitons and Inverse Scattering Method* SIAM: Philadelphia, PA, USA, 1981.
- [37] F. Calogero and A. Degasperis, *Spectral Transform and Solitons: Tools to Solve and Investigate Nonlinear Evolution Equations* North-Holland: New York, NY, USA, 1982.
- [38] A.C. Newell, *Solitons in Mathematics and Physics* SIAM: Philadelphia, PA, USA, 1985.
- [39] M.J. Ablowitz and B.M. Herbst, *On homoclinic structure and numerically induced chaos for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation* *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **50**, 339–351 (1990).
- [40] D. Levi, M. Petrera, and C. Scimiterna, *On the integrability of the discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, *Europhys. Lett.* **84**, 10003 (2008).
- [41] P.G. Kevrekidis, *The Discrete Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation: Mathematical Analysis, Numerical Computations, and Physical Perspectives* (Springer, Berlin, 2009
- [42] A.I. Komech, E.A. Kopylova, and M. Kunze, *Dispersive estimates for the 1D discrete Schrödinger and Klein-Gordon equations*, *Appl. Anal.* **85**, 1487-1508 (2005).
- [43] A. Stefanov and P.G. Kevrekidis, *Asymptotic behaviour of small solutions for the discrete Schrödinger and Klein-Gordon equations*, *Nonlinearity* **18**, 1841–1857 (2005).
- [44] H. Berestycki and T. Cazenave, *Instabilité des états stationnaires dans les équations de Schrödinger et Klein-Gordon non linéaires*, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **293**, 489–492 (1981).
- [45] C. Sulem and P.L. Sulem, *The nonlinear Schrödinger equation, self-focusing and wave collapse*, *Applied Mathematical Sciences* 139, Springer-Verlag, New York (1999).
- [46] M.I. Weinstein, *Nonlinear Schrödinger equations and sharp interpolation estimates*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **87**, 567–576 (1983).
- [47] R. S. MacKay and S. Aubry, *Proof of existence of breathers for time-reversible or Hamiltonian networks of weakly coupled oscillators*, *Nonlinearity* **7** (1994), 1623–1643.
- [48] P.-L. Lions, *The concentration compactness principle in the calculus of variation: The locally compact case*, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Analysis Nonlinéaire* **1**, 223 (1984).
- [49] G. Teschl, *Jacobi operators and completely integrable lattices*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.
- [50] R.G. Douglas, *Banach algebra techniques in operator theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer New York (1998).

Email address, Email: dirkhennig@uth.gr

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF THESSALY, LAMIA GR35100, GREECE