

Derivation of the Chern–Simons–Schrödinger equation from the dynamics of an almost-bosonic-anyon gas

Théotime Girardot* Jinyeop Lee†

January 15, 2025

Abstract

We study the time evolution of an initial product state in a system of almost-bosonic-extended-anyons in the large-particle limit. We show that the dynamics of this system can be well approximated, in finite time, by a product state evolving under the effective Chern–Simons–Schrödinger equation. Furthermore, we provide a convergence rate for the approximation in terms of the radius $R = (\log N)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}$ of the extended anyons. These results establish a rigorous connection between the microscopic dynamics of almost-bosonic-anyon gases and the emergent macroscopic behavior described by the Chern–Simons–Schrödinger equation.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	General Introduction	2
1.2	The Anyon Gas	3
1.2.1	Point-Like Anyons	3
1.2.2	Extended Anyons	3
1.2.3	The Mean-Field Limit of Almost-Bosonic Anyons	4
1.3	The Dynamics	5
1.3.1	The Hartree Dynamics	5
1.3.2	The Chern–Simons–Schrödinger Equation	5
1.4	Main Theorem	7
1.5	Strategy of the Proof	8
1.5.1	Structure of the Paper	8
1.5.2	Notations and Basic Inequalities	9
2	Useful Properties	10
2.1	Operator Bounds for the Interaction Terms	10
2.2	A Priori Bounds for Mean-Field Terms	14

*GSSI, Via comunale, L’Aquila, Italy theotime.girardot@gssi.it

†Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland jinyeop.lee@unibas.ch

3 Chern–Simons–Schrödinger Equation	16
3.1 Well-posedness	16
3.2 Convergence of Solutions	20
4 Countdown of the number of particles in the state φ_t	22
4.1 Bound on the time derivative of $E_N^{(1)}(t)$	22
4.2 Properties of the Projectors	23
4.3 The Two-Body term V	25
4.4 The W term	27
4.5 The Term X	30
5 Evolution of the Kinetic Energy	31
5.1 Bound on the Kinetic Energy	31
5.2 Control of $M_N(t)$	36
5.3 The Two-Body Term V	37
5.4 The Three-Body Term W	40
6 Conclusion	42
A Useful Estimates	43
B BBGKY Hierarchy	44
C Remark on the Dynamics with Two-Body Interaction	46
D Global Wellposedness of $CSS(R, \varphi_0)$	46

1 Introduction

1.1 General Introduction

Anyons are two-dimensional quasi-particles interacting through an Aharonov–Bohm magnetic flux. By gauging this interaction directly into the wave function, they can be regarded as free particles with a new symmetry that differs from the bosonic or fermionic cases. Anyons possess a statistical parameter, a real number denoted by $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, which interpolates between bosons ($\alpha = 0$) and fermions ($\alpha = 1$). We refer to the survey [32] for a larger view on various mathematical developments about anyon gases.

This paper focuses on the dynamics of an almost-bosonic anyon gas, where the statistical parameter α tends to zero as the number of particles becomes large. The ground state energy per particle for such systems has been previously studied in [12, 13, 19, 33]. It has been shown that it can be approximated by the energy of a one-body functional. The associated ground state of the N -body system then converges to a product state based on the minimizer of the one-body functional. The aim of the present paper is to show that, for a sufficiently large number of particles, such a product state will remain in a product form over time, and to present an effective governing equation for this behavior.

The dynamical properties of a product state can be analyzed using various methods, including the BBGKY hierarchy [14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 43] and the coherent state approach [4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 42]. In

this paper, neither of these two strategies will be followed. We will apply a third strategy consisting in counting the number of particles in the condensate state, which has been developed in [24, 34, 38]. This approach will allow us to demonstrate the convergence of a product state $\varphi_0^{\otimes N}$ to a product state $\varphi_t^{\otimes N}$, where the evolution of φ_t is governed by the Chern–Simons–Schrödinger (CSS) equation with initial data φ_0 . This is in agreement with what has been shown by physicists in the early 1990s, i.e., that many-particle anyon systems can be described using the CSS [21, 22, 23]. In the following sections, we introduce the Hamiltonian describing the anyon gas, we define the dynamical CSS equation and we present the main result followed by discussions of its limitations and implications.

1.2 The Anyon Gas

1.2.1 Point-Like Anyons

To describe anyons, the wave function of the system has to formally behave as

$$\tilde{\Psi}(x_1, \dots, x_j, \dots, x_k, \dots, x_N) = e^{i\alpha\pi} \tilde{\Psi}(x_1, \dots, x_k, \dots, x_j, \dots, x_N) \quad (1.1)$$

when we exchange particles x_j and x_k . The above definition is only formal. If we apply the same exchange twice, following the rule of (1.1), we observe that $\tilde{\Psi}$ is multi-valued. To overcome this issue, we obtain this symmetry by writing

$$\tilde{\Psi}(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \prod_{j < k} e^{i\alpha\phi_{jk}} \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_N) \quad \text{where} \quad \phi_{jk} = \arg \frac{x_j - x_k}{|x_j - x_k|}$$

with Ψ a bosonic wave function, i.e., symmetric under particle exchange. In that way, we can encode the symmetry (1.1) into a product playing the role of the phase of a bosonic wave function. Acting on $\tilde{\Psi}$ with the Laplacian is then equivalent to acting on Ψ with a magnetic Laplacian in which an α dependent gauge appeared. This is called the gauge picture of the anyonic problem and consists in working with the Hamiltonian

$$H_N = \sum_{j=1}^N (-i\nabla_j + \alpha \mathbf{A}_j)^2 \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{A}_j = \sum_{j \neq k} \frac{(x_j - x_k)^\perp}{|x_j - x_k|^2} \quad (1.2)$$

acting on $L_{\text{sym}}^2(\mathbb{R}^{2N})$. Here, we have denoted $(x, y)^\perp = (-y, x)$.

The operator $\mathbf{A}_j(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) := \mathbf{A}_j$ is the statistical gauge vector potential felt by the particle j due to an influence of all the other particles. In this picture, anyons are described as bosons, each of them carrying an Aharonov-Bohm magnetic flux of strength α .

1.2.2 Extended Anyons

The Hamiltonian defined in (1.2) is too singular to be an operator acting on a pure tensor product $u^{\otimes N} \in \bigotimes_{\text{sym}}^N L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. In order to circumvent this problem, we introduce a length R over which the equivalent magnetic charge is smeared. In our approach, $R = f(N)$ for some function $f(N) \rightarrow 0$ when $N \rightarrow \infty$. In that limit, we will recover the point-like anyon system. We consider the 2D Coulomb potential generated by a unit charge smeared over the disc of radius R

$$w_R(x) = \log |\cdot| * \frac{\mathbb{1}_{B(0,R)}(\cdot)}{\pi R^2}(x), \quad \text{with the convention} \quad w_0(x) = \log |x|. \quad (1.3)$$

Remark that

$$\nabla^\perp w_0(x) = \frac{x^\perp}{|x|^2}, \text{ with } B_0(x) = \nabla^\perp \cdot \nabla^\perp w_0 = \Delta w_0 = 2\pi\delta_0.$$

We can then define the regularized Hamiltonian

$$H_{N,R} = \sum_{j=1}^N (-i\nabla_j + \alpha \mathbf{A}_j^R)^2 \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{A}^R(x_j) := \sum_{k \neq j} \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_k) \quad (1.4)$$

acting on $L^2_{\text{sym}}(\mathbb{R}^{2N})$ as a self adjoint operator with the same form domain as the non-interacting bosonic Hamiltonian where $\mathbf{A}^R = 0$ due to the boundness of the interaction \mathbf{A}^R for $R > 0$ see [3, 40]. We may also use the formulation

$$\nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_k) = \frac{(x_j - x_k)^\perp}{|x_j - x_k|_R^2} \quad \text{where} \quad |x|_R^2 = \max(R, |x|). \quad (1.5)$$

Notice that in this picture, R can be interpreted as the radius of the particles. In the limit $R = f(N) \rightarrow 0$, any specific choice of f defines a specific type of extended anyons. Those different gases may have, a priori, different mean-field limits. An interesting threshold is $R = N^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ which corresponds to the average distance between anyons in the plane. In the present paper, we consider a slower convergences $R = (\log N)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}$. See Remark 1.6 for more details on that point.

1.2.3 The Mean-Field Limit of Almost-Bosonic Anyons

By expanding (1.4), we interpret our anyons as an interacting boson system, described by the following Hamiltonian, which includes a two-body and a three-body term:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{N,R} &= \sum_{j=1}^N -\Delta_j && \text{(Kinetic term)} \\ &+ \alpha \sum_{j \neq k} \left(-i\nabla_j \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_k) + \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_k) \cdot -i\nabla_j \right) && \text{(Mixed two-body term)} \\ &+ \alpha^2 \sum_{j \neq k \neq l} \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_k) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_l) && \text{(Three-body term)} \\ &+ \alpha^2 \sum_{j \neq k} \left| \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_k) \right|^2. && \text{(Singular two-body term)} \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

Notice here that our gauge formulation of the anyon gas presents a two-body term mixing momentum and position. The mean-field limit is defined by taking

$$\alpha := \frac{\beta}{N-1} \quad (1.7)$$

where β is a real number. As shown in [19, Theorem 1.1], for some trapping potential $V := \sum_{j=1}^N v(x_j)$ and for all $0 < \eta < 1/4$ such that $R = N^{-\eta}$, the minimizer of $H_{N,R} + V$ is well approximated by the state $u_{\text{af}}^{\otimes N}$, where the function $u_{\text{af}} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ minimizes the average-field energy

$$\mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[u] := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |(-i\nabla + \beta \mathbf{A}^R[|u|^2])u|^2 + v|u|^2 \quad (1.8)$$

under the constraint $\|u_{\text{af}}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} = 1$ and where $\mathbf{A}^R[|u|^2] := \nabla^\perp w_R * |u|^2$. Moreover, it holds that

$$N^{-1} \inf_{L^2_{\text{sym}}(\mathbb{R}^{2N})} (H_{N,R} + V) \rightarrow \inf_{\|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}=1} \mathcal{E}_0^{\text{af}}[u] \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow +\infty.$$

This is comparable to Hartree theory but with a self-generated magnetic field $\mathbf{A}^R[|u|^2]$ instead of a smeared two-body electric field $V_e * |u|^2$.

1.3 The Dynamics

1.3.1 The Hartree Dynamics

If the potential V is removed at $t = 0$, letting the system to evolve, the dynamics of the N almost-bosonic-extended anyons is governed by the Schrödinger equation

$$i\partial_t \Psi_N(t) = H_{N,R} \Psi_N(t). \quad (1.9)$$

If $\Psi_N(0) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2N})$ is the initial state of the system at time $t = 0$, we can write

$$\Psi_N(t) = e^{-itH_{N,R}} \Psi_N(0).$$

Let $|f\rangle\langle f|$ be the bra-ket representation of the orthogonal projection onto $\text{span}\{f\}$, the Schrödinger equation can also be written in terms of the density matrix and takes the form

$$i\partial_t \gamma_N(t) = [H_{N,R}, \gamma_N(t)] \quad \text{where } \gamma_N(t) = |\Psi_N(t)\rangle\langle\Psi_N(t)| \quad (1.10)$$

with the associated k -particle reduced density matrices defined as

$$\gamma_N^{(k)}(t) := \text{Tr}_{k+1, \dots, N} [\gamma_N(t)].$$

Our aim is to show that if the initial data of (1.9) is a product state $\Psi_N(0) = \varphi_0^{\otimes N}$ for a given $\varphi_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, in later time, the state $\Psi_N(t) = e^{-iH_{N,R}t} \Psi_N(0)$ can be approximated by a uncorrelated state $\varphi_t^{\otimes N}$ where φ_t is driven by a one-body non-linear equation with initial data φ_0 .

To infer what could be the one-body pilot equation, we can write the BBGKY hierarchy of the non-linear system, i.e., expand (1.10) in terms of $\gamma_N^{(k)}(t)$ and formally take the limit

$$N \rightarrow \infty, \quad \alpha = \beta(N-1)^{-1} \rightarrow 0, \quad R \rightarrow 0.$$

With the assumption that, in this limit, $\gamma_N^{(k)}(t) \rightarrow |\varphi(t)\rangle\langle\varphi(t)|^{\otimes k}$ we obtain that φ_t is driven by the Chern–Simons–Schrödinger equation defined in Definition 1. A detailed formal calculation of the BBGKY hierarchy is presented in Appendix B. In our case, showing the existence of $\gamma_\infty(t) \simeq \varphi_t^{\otimes(N=\infty)}$ without an explicit convergence rate to control the inverse powers of R is a challenging task that we do not manage to fulfill only using the general BBGKY approach.

1.3.2 The Chern–Simons–Schrödinger Equation

Another way to guess what should be the correct pilot equation is to compute

$$i\partial_t u = \left. \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[v, \bar{v}]}{\delta \bar{v}} \right|_u.$$

In the case of the electric Hartree equation, the calculation gives

$$i\partial_t u = \frac{\delta(f|\nabla v|^2 + (V_e * |v|^2)|v|^2)}{\delta\bar{v}} \Big|_u = -\Delta u + 2(V_e * |u|^2)u.$$

In the present magnetic case, the non linearity of $\mathbf{A}^R[|u|^2]$ in (1.8) is squared. This provides new terms that can be interpreted as a time curvature, see (3.1). If we proceed to the calculation, we derive the following equation.

Definition 1 (Chern–Simons–Schrödinger equation). We denote by $\text{CSS}(R, u_0)$ the differential problem whose the unknown is $u : (\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^2) \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} i\partial_t u &= (-i\nabla + \beta\mathbf{A}^R[|u|^2])^2 u \\ &\quad - \beta \left[\nabla^\perp w_R * (2\beta\mathbf{A}^R[|u|^2]|u|^2 + i(u\nabla\bar{u} - \bar{u}\nabla u)) \right] u \end{aligned} \quad (1.11)$$

with initial condition $u(0, x) = u_0(x) \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. We define $\text{CSS}(u_0) := \text{CSS}(R = 0, u_0)^1$.

The well-posedness of $\text{CSS}(R, u_0)$ is discussed in Section 3. General references on this topic can be found in [5, 30, 31, 37], with particular attention given to its connection with the fractional quantum Hall effect in [16]. For later convenience, we denote $J[u] := i(u\nabla\bar{u} - \bar{u}\nabla u)$.

Remark 1.1. Note that $\text{CSS}(u_0)$ is sometimes written in a gauge covariant form:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{D}_t u = i\mathbf{D}_\ell \mathbf{D}_\ell u + ig|u|^2 u, \\ F_{12} = -\frac{1}{2}|u|^2, \\ F_{01} = -\frac{i}{2}(u\overline{\mathbf{D}_2 u} - (\mathbf{D}_2 u)\bar{u}), \\ F_{02} = \frac{i}{2}(u\overline{\mathbf{D}_1 u} - (\mathbf{D}_1 u)\bar{u}) \end{cases} \quad (1.12)$$

except that in our case $g = 0$. Here, $A = A_0 dx^0 + A_1 dx^1 + A_2 dx^2$ is a real-valued 1-form (gauge potential), $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$ (curvature 2-form), $\mathbf{D}_\mu = \partial_\mu + iA_\mu$ (covariant derivative), and $g \in \mathbb{C}$. Here, by choosing the Coulomb gauge, $\partial_1 A_1 + \partial_2 A_2 = 0$, Eq. (1.12) can be reformulated as

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u = -\Delta u + A_0 u - 2i \sum_{\ell=1}^2 A_\ell \partial_\ell u + \sum_{\ell=1}^2 A_\ell A_\ell u - g|u|^2 u, \\ \Delta A_1 = \frac{1}{2}\partial_2 |u|^2, \\ \Delta A_2 = -\frac{1}{2}\partial_1 |u|^2, \\ \Delta A_0 = \frac{i}{2}\partial_1 (u\overline{\mathbf{D}_2 u} - (\mathbf{D}_2 u)\bar{u}) - \frac{i}{2}\partial_2 (u\overline{\mathbf{D}_1 u} - (\mathbf{D}_1 u)\bar{u}). \end{cases} \quad (1.13)$$

By noting that the fundamental solution of the Laplacian in \mathbb{R}^2 is the Coulomb potential, we see that (1.13) is equivalent to (1.11) with $\beta = 1$, $R = 0$, and the extra non-linear term $-g|u|^2 u$. We refer to [1, 29] for recent results considering $g \neq 0$. We can also notice that the Lagrangian formulation of this equation corresponds to a usual Chern–Simons equation coupled to the density $|u|^2$, see for instance, [22, Eq. (1.4)].

¹Note that the above equation can also be written as in (3.1). This other formulation makes the behavior of the equation under gauge changes clearer.

1.4 Main Theorem

Before stating the main theorem of the paper, we explicitly outline the following important assumption.

Assumption 1.2. *Throughout the paper, we assume that the initial data satisfies $\varphi_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and that the parameter $|\beta|$ is bounded by a small constant $c > 0$, which depends on $\|\varphi_0\|_{H^1}$.*

Theorem 1.3. *Let φ_t be the solution of CSS(φ_0) defined in (1.11) with initial data $\varphi_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Let $\Psi_N(t)$ denote the solution of the Schrödinger equation (1.9) with Hamiltonian $H_{N,R}$, where $R = (\log N)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}$ and $\Psi_N(0) = \varphi_0^{\otimes N}$. Choose any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\gamma_N^{(k)}$ denote the k -particle reduced density matrix associated with $\Psi_N(t)$. Then, there exist constants $T, C, c > 0$ depending on $\|\varphi_0\|_{H^2}$ such that for any $|\beta| \leq c$ and for all time $0 \leq t \leq T$, we have, for sufficiently large N ,*

$$\mathrm{Tr} \left| \gamma_N^{(k)}(t) - |\varphi_t^{\otimes k}\rangle\langle\varphi_t^{\otimes k}| \right| \leq C(\log N)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}. \quad (1.14)$$

for any choice of $\varepsilon > 0$.

The result is new in several aspects. This is, as far as we know, the first time that the CSS equation is derived from a many-body problem and more generally, that the dynamics of anyonic particles is studied. Although similar results already exist for bosons with three-body interaction, like for instance in [10, 11, 27, 35], our treatment of the non-positive mixed two-body term is entirely new. We also bring a modest improvement to well-known bounds for anyonic terms as, for instance, in Corollary 2.3 and Lemma 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6. We discuss more specific points in the following remarks.

Remark 1.4. In [5, Theorem 2.1], the well-posedness of the CSS equation is established in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for times up to some T' due to the existence of blow-up, [5, Theorem 3.1]. In our case, $g = 0$, and blow-up might not occur. Nevertheless, in our approach, we need to control $\|\varphi_t\|_{H^2}$ and only manage to bound it uniformly in R on finite times intervals or allow it to diverge in R on unbounded time intervals; see also the next Remark 1.5. The CSS equation is also known to be globally well-posed for small $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ initial data, [5, Theorem 2.3] or for zero energy initial data as shown in [1, Theorem 1.2]. However, even with global well-posedness in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ uniformly in R , our proof could not provide a global in time result.

Remark 1.5. The assumption on β is necessary to obtain the uniform control $\|\varphi_t^R\|_{H^2} \leq C$ in Theorem 3.2 for all R . It is important to note that this uniform control in R only holds for finite times $0 \leq t < T$. Without this assumption, when considering all $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, the best control we can achieve is $\|\varphi_t^R\|_{H^2} \leq R^{-Ct}$, as shown in Lemma D.1, which is valid for all $t \geq 0$. However, this bound diverges (as $R \rightarrow 0$) too rapidly for our proof to apply. The proof could still work with a control of the form $\|\varphi_t^R\|_{H^2} \leq C|\log R|$. It is worth mentioning that, although Lemmas 4.4, 5.5, and 5.1 are stated with the constraint $|\beta| \leq c$, their proofs could be adapted to avoid any dependence on $\|\varphi_t^R\|_{H^2}$ and remain valid for all β . The only additional effort would come from the estimate (2.21), where $\|\varphi_t^R\|_{H^2}$ could be replaced by $|\log R|$. The crucial obstacle to relax the assumption on β is located in the proof of Lemma 3.4.

Remark 1.6. The radius R can be interpreted as a regularizing cut-off for a singular potential, similar to the Coulomb case considered in [15]. However, a major difference in this paper is that the parameter R represents a physical quantity—the radius of the anyons. Each specific choice of

R corresponds to a distinct model of anyons. We expect our results to hold true up to $R = N^{-1/2}$, which corresponds to the typical interparticle distance in 2D systems. With the current method, however, we are far from achieving even a polynomial rate such as $R = N^{-\eta}$. To attain this, it would be necessary to reduce the power of $|\log R|$ in the estimates of Lemma 2.5 and 2.6 used to control the different operators constituting the Hamiltonian so that the final Grönwall inequality yields $N^{-\delta} e^{Ct|\log R|}$ for some $\delta > 0$. See also Remark 1.7. A stronger rate than $R = N^{-1/2}$ would lead to different effective equations for both the ground state and the pilot equation. While the result would likely still hold, the proof would need to include the two-body correlation effects, for instance, by incorporating a Jastrow factor, making a non-linear term (with g) appear as in (1.12).

Remark 1.7. In our proof, the main obstacle to cover faster R convergences is located in Lemma 5.1 when we are trying to show the negativity of (5.13). In [24], the equivalent of (5.15) was holding by assumption on two-body interaction potential, which is not guaranteed in our case. While the rest of the proof only deals with powers of $|\log R|$ divergences, at this specific step we cannot avoid a R^{-2} which limits us to deal with $R \geq (\log N)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}$ and makes the final result to be as in (1.14). See more details about this technical issue in Remarks 5.2 and 5.3.

Remark 1.8. The initial data constraint $\Psi_N(0) = \varphi_0^{\otimes N}$ could be enlarged to a class of almost condensed state $\Psi_N(0) \rightarrow \varphi_0^{\otimes N}$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Our choice was to simplify the exposition.

Remark 1.9. We could certainly include a repulsive two-body interaction. This potential extension is discussed in Appendix C.

Remark 1.10. It is likely that we could also include an external magnetic interaction by deriving bounds similar to those in [19, Lemma 2.3] to replace the estimates in Lemma 2.6. The key challenge would then be located in Lemma 5.1, where it would be necessary to control the evolution of the projection of the magnetic gradient operator, rather than the non-magnetic gradient.

1.5 Strategy of the Proof

1.5.1 Structure of the Paper

The idea of the proof follows the techniques developed in [24, 38]. We will stick to the notation introduced in [24], where the indicators of the particles outside the condensate are measured using the quantities

$$E_N^{(k)}(t) := 1 - \left\langle \varphi_t^{\otimes k}, \gamma_N^{(k)}(t) \varphi_t^{\otimes k} \right\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad R_N^{(k)}(t) := \text{Tr} \left| \gamma_N^{(k)}(t) - |\varphi_t^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle \varphi_t^{\otimes k}| \right|. \quad (1.15)$$

The method relies on controlling $E_N^{(1)}(t)^2$ through

$$\partial_t E_N^{(1)}(t) \leq a(E_N^{(1)}(t) + b), \quad (1.16)$$

where a and b will a priori depend on t , N , R and $\|\varphi_t\|_{H^2}$. Applying Grönwall's lemma 1.14 will then provide

$$E_N^{(1)}(t) \leq e^{\int_0^t a(\tau) d\tau} (E_N^{(1)}(0) + b). \quad (1.17)$$

²Note that we can also write $E_N^{(1)}(t) = N^{-1}(N - \langle a_{\varphi_t}^* a_{\varphi_t} \rangle_{\Psi_N(t)})$ with a^* and a the usual creation and annihilation operators.

With the specific assumptions of Theorem 1.3 we have $E_N^{(1)}(0) = 0$. To make the one-body time evolution meaningful, the time t will be bounded by a given T until which $\text{CSS}(\varphi_0)$ stays well-posed as shown in Theorem 3.2. We will then obtain

$$E_N^{(1)}(t) \leq b(R, N, \varphi_0) e^{a(T, R, \varphi_0)t} \quad (1.18)$$

with $b \rightarrow 0$ when $N \rightarrow \infty$. The final step will be to choose $R = f(N)$ such that $be^{at} \rightarrow 0$ when N gets large. A difficult part of the calculation consists in controlling the divergences in the parameter R appearing in the functions a and b . In Section 2, we derive a bunch of estimates to control the different operators of $H_{N,R}$ defined in (1.6). The bounds are Hardy type inequalities and provide a control in term of $|\log R|(1 - \Delta)$, i.e., a slightly diverging kinetic energy plus constant. This section also contains bounds of several quantities appearing later in the calculation. In Section 3, we establish the well-posedness of $\text{CSS}(R, \varphi_0)$ as well as the conservation of the energy. This allows us to control $\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}$ in term of $\|\varphi_0\|_{H^1}$ and to control $\|\varphi_t\|_{H^2}$ in two different manners, see Lemma 3.2 and Theorem D.1. The derivation of (1.16) is carried out in Section 4. In that calculation, most of the $-\Delta$ of the bounds of Section 2 hit a φ_t and provide an $\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1} \leq C$. Some don't and imply to be able to estimate the time growth of the kinetic energy of the non-condensated part of $\Psi_N(t)$. This is the content of Section 5 and is achieved via the second Grönwall type lemma. In the last section, Section 6, we gather all the intermediate results and conclude by proving Theorem 1.3.

1.5.2 Notations and Basic Inequalities

The main Hilbert space in our paper is $L_{\text{sym}}^2(\mathbb{R}^{2N})$. For that reason, we will always mean $\|\Psi\|_{L_{\text{sym}}^2(\mathbb{R}^{2N})}$ when writing $\|\Psi\|$ and the different $L_{\text{sym}}^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ norms will be denoted $\|\varphi\|_p$ with the p subscript. For the Sobolev norms $H_{\text{sym}}^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we write H^p in the subscript. The symbol C will denote any strictly positive constant possibly depending on fixed parameters as β , $\|\varphi_0\|_{H^1}$ or $\|\varphi_0\|_{H^2}$ but never depending on R or N and related quantities. It can be different from a line to the other. We will also use the convention

$$\langle \Psi_N, A\Psi_N \rangle := \langle A \rangle_{\Psi_N} \quad (1.19)$$

for self-adjoint operators A . As in the above, we often drop the t variable in $\Psi_N(t)$ and $\gamma_N^{(k)}(t)$ or even φ_t . As we have already used to describe (1.10) and the main theorem, we use the bra-ket representation of projection operator onto a function f , $|f\rangle\langle f|$.

For an operator A , we denote $\|A\|_{\text{op}}$ and $\|A\|_{\text{HS}}$ to denote the operator norm and the Hilbert-Schmidt norm, respectively.

All along the paper, we will make use of well-known inequalities that can be respectively found in literature, e.g. [28, Section 8.1, Eq. (3)] and [28, Theorem 4.3].

Lemma 1.11 (Sobolev's inequality). *Let $f \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we have for any $2 \leq q < \infty$ that*

$$C_q^{-1} \|f\|_q^2 \leq \|f\|_2^2 + \|\nabla f\|_2^2. \quad (\text{S})$$

where

$$C_q^{-1} \leq \left(q^{1-\frac{2}{q}} (q-1)^{\frac{1}{q}-1} \left(\frac{q-2}{8\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}} \right)^2.$$

Note that, for large q , we have

$$C_q \leq 2\pi q^{1-\frac{2}{q}}. \quad (1.20)$$

This inequality will be used systematically to control $\|\varphi_t\|_q$ and $\|\nabla\varphi_t\|_q$, when $2 < q < \infty$. We will sometimes consider $q \simeq |\log R|$ and will then have to keep track of C_q .

Lemma 1.12 (Sobolev inequality for $q = \infty$). *Let $f \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $s > 1$, then there exist C depending on s but not f such that*

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq C \|f\|_{H^s}^{\frac{1}{s}} \|f\|_2^{1-\frac{1}{s}} \leq C \|f\|_{H^s}. \quad (1.21)$$

The proof can be found in [41, Theorem 5.8, 5.9]. We also need to define the weak L^p norms denoted $L_w^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ as

$$\|f\|_{p,w} := \sup_{t>0} t (\mu\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |f(x)| > t\})^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad (1.22)$$

where $\mu\{X\}$ is the Lebesgue measure of the measurable $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$.

Lemma 1.13 (Weak-Young inequality). *Let $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $g \in L_w^r(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we have for any $1 < p, q, r < \infty$ that*

$$\|g * f\|_q \leq C_{p,q,r} \|g\|_{r,w} \|f\|_2 \quad (\text{WY})$$

provided that

$$1 + \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{r}.$$

Note that Young's convolution inequality is identical to (WY) except that the first one allows more values $1 \leq p, q, r \leq \infty$. Also note that

$$\|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w} \leq \|\nabla^\perp w_0\|_{2,w} \leq C. \quad (1.23)$$

For that reason, all along the paper, $\|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w}$ will be considered as a constant. As already mentioned, we will make use of Grönwall's lemma.

Lemma 1.14 (Grönwall Lemma). *Let a function $f(t)$ be such that $|\partial_t f(t)| \leq C(t)f(t) + \varepsilon(t)$ then*

$$f(t) \leq f(0) e^{\int_0^t C(\tau) d\tau} + \int_0^t \varepsilon(s) e^{\int_s^t C(\tau) d\tau} ds. \quad (1.24)$$

Now we are ready to enter into Section 2 to establish the main basic estimates of the proof.

2 Useful Properties

2.1 Operator Bounds for the Interaction Terms

We gather some intermediate estimates in the following lemmas. The key aspects of this section are the $|\log R|$ divergences appearing in Lemmas 2.5, 2.6 and Corollary 2.3. These results provide modest improvements of [33, Lemmas 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3]. Additional results, such as Lemmas 2.1 and 2.4, will be needed when discussing the well-posedness of the CSS equation in Section 3. In the later part of this section, we bound several quantities appearing in the core of the proof in Section 4 and 5.

Lemma 2.1. For any $u, v \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $s \geq 0$ and any $R \geq 0$, the following bounds hold

$$\|\partial^s \mathbf{A}^R [|u|^2]\|_p \leq C \|u\|_{H^{s+1}} \quad (2.1)$$

as well as

$$\|\partial^s (\mathbf{A} [|u|^2] - \mathbf{A}^R [|v|^2])\|_p \leq CR + C \|u - v\|_2 \quad (2.2)$$

for any $2 < p < \infty$.

We note that throughout this paper, Lemma 2.1 is used exclusively in the case $s = 0$. However, for the benefit of future work, we present the lemma in a more general form than is strictly required here.

Proof. We first have via weak Young's inequality (WY), that for $p > 2$:

$$\|\partial^s \mathbf{A}^R [|u|^2]\|_p = \left\| \nabla^\perp w_R * \partial^s |u|^2 \right\|_p \leq C \left\| \nabla^\perp w_0 \right\|_{2,w} \left\| \partial^s |u|^2 \right\|_{\frac{2p}{p+2}} \leq C \|u\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^2)} \quad (2.3)$$

using Sobolev's inequality (S). For the second norm we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A} [|u|^2] - \mathbf{A}^R [|v|^2] &= (\nabla^\perp w_0 - \nabla^\perp w_R) * |v|^2 + \nabla^\perp w_0 * (|u|^2 - |v|^2) \\ &= (\nabla^\perp w_0 - \nabla^\perp w_R) * |v|^2 + \nabla^\perp w_0 * ((u - v)\bar{u} + (\bar{u} - \bar{v})v). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

We apply the triangle inequality and Young's inequality (WY) for the convolution to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\partial^s (\mathbf{A} [|u|^2] - \mathbf{A}^R [|v|^2])\|_p \\ &\leq \left\| \partial^s [(\nabla^\perp w_0 - \nabla^\perp w_R) * |v|^2] \right\|_p \\ &\quad + \left\| (\nabla^\perp w_0 * \partial^s (u - v)\bar{u}) \right\|_p + \left\| (\nabla^\perp w_0 * \partial^s (\bar{u} - \bar{v})v) \right\|_p \\ &\leq \left\| \nabla^\perp w_0 - \nabla^\perp w_R \right\|_1 \left\| \partial^s |v|^2 \right\|_p \\ &\quad + \left\| \nabla^\perp w_0 \right\|_{2,w} \left(\left\| \partial^s (\bar{u} - \bar{v})v \right\|_{\frac{2p}{p+2}} + \left\| \partial^s (u - v)\bar{u} \right\|_{\frac{2p}{p+2}} \right) \\ &\leq \left\| \partial^s |v|^2 \right\|_p \int_{B(0,R)} |x|^{-1} dx + \left\| \nabla^\perp w_0 \right\|_{2,w} \|u - v\|_{H^s} (\|\partial^s v\|_p + \|\partial^s u\|_p) \\ &= C\sqrt{p} \|u\|_{H^{s+1}} R + C\sqrt{p} (\|u\|_{H^{s+1}} + \|v\|_{H^{s+1}}) \|u - v\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

This gives the desired lemma. \square

Lemma 2.2 (The smeared Coulomb potential). Let w_R be defined as in (1.3). There is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla w_R| \leq \frac{C}{R}. \quad (2.7)$$

Moreover, for any $2 < p < \infty$,

$$\|\nabla w_R\|_p \leq \left(\frac{4\pi p}{p^2 - 4} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} R^{\frac{2}{p} - 1}. \quad (2.8)$$

Proof. Eq. (2.7) follows from Newton's theorem as established in [33, Lemma 2.1]. To obtain (2.8), we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla w_R\|_p^p &= 2\pi \int_0^R \frac{r^p}{R^{2p}} r \, dr + 2\pi \int_R^\infty r^{-p} r \, dr \\ &= 2\pi \left(\frac{1}{R^{2p}} \frac{1}{2+p} R^{2+p} + \frac{1}{p-2} R^{2-p} \right) = \frac{4\pi p}{p^2-4} R^{2-p}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 2.3. For $p = 2 + |\log R|^{-1}$ with $0 < R < e^{-1}$, we have

$$\|\nabla w_R\|_p \leq C\sqrt{|\log R|}. \quad (2.9)$$

Proof. The proof follows by substituting $p = 2 + |\log R|^{-1}$ into (2.8), using the monotonicity of the logarithmic function, and noting that $x^{(\log x)^{-1}} = e$ for all $x > 0$. Additionally, the monotonically increasing property of a^x with respect to x for all $a > 1$ is applied. □

Lemma 2.4. For any $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and any $0 < R < e^{-1}$, the following holds

$$\|\mathbf{A}^R[|u|^2]\|_\infty \leq C\sqrt{|\log R|}\|u\|_{H^1}^2. \quad (2.10)$$

Proof. By using Young's inequality with $\varepsilon = |\log R|^{-1}$, combined with the bound (1.20) for the constant of Sobolev embedding, and Corollary (2.3), one gets

$$\|\mathbf{A}^R[|u|^2]\|_\infty = \left\| \nabla^\perp w_R * |u|^2 \right\|_\infty \leq \left\| \nabla^\perp w_R \right\|_{2+\varepsilon} \| |u|^2 \|_{\frac{2+\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}} \leq C\sqrt{|\log R|}\|u\|_{H^1}^2. \quad (2.11)$$

□

Lemma 2.5 (Singular two-body term). We have that, as operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ or $L^2_{\text{sym}}(\mathbb{R}^4)$,

$$|\nabla w_R(x-y)|^2 \leq C|\log R|^2(1-\Delta_x) \quad (2.12)$$

for any $0 < R < e^{-1}$.

Proof. Here we repeat the proof of [33, Lemma 2.2] and only modify the last step. We start with an application of Hölder's and Sobolev's inequalities. For any $W : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$

$$\begin{aligned}\langle f, W(x-y)f \rangle &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} \overline{f(x,y)} W(x-y) f(x,y) \, dx dy \\ &\leq \|W\|_p \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |f(x,y)|^{2q} \, dx \right)^{1/q} \, dy \\ &\leq C_q \|W\|_p \int \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} (|f(x,y)|^2 + |\nabla_x f(x,y)|^2) \, dx dy \\ &= C_q \|W\|_p \langle f | (1 - \Delta_x) \otimes \mathbf{1} | f \rangle\end{aligned}$$

where we take any $p > 1$, $q = \frac{p}{p-1} \in (1, +\infty)$. Finally, we plug $W = |\nabla w_R|^2$, $p = 1 + \varepsilon$, $q = \frac{p}{p-1} = \frac{1+\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}$ with $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}|\log R|^{-1}$, and we use (1.20) for C_q and (2.9) for $\|W\|_p$ to obtain

$$C_q \|W\|_p \leq C_q \|\nabla w_R\|_{2p}^2 \leq C|\log R|^2. \quad (2.13)$$

□

Lemma 2.6 (Mixed two-body term). *For any $0 < R < e^{-1}$, we have that*

$$\left(\nabla_x \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) + \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) \cdot \nabla_x \right)^2 \leq \begin{cases} C |\log R|^2 (1 - \Delta_x)^2 \\ C |\log R|^2 (1 - \Delta_x)(1 - \Delta_y) \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

as operators on $L^2_{\text{sym}}(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2)$.

Proof. Note that the first inequality of the lemma can be found in [33, Lemma 2.5]. We use the same approach to derive the second one. We start by noticing that

$$\nabla_x \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) = \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) \cdot \nabla_x \quad (2.15)$$

because $\nabla_x \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) = 0$. We can then square the expression we want to estimate, obtaining

$$\left(\nabla_x \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) + \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) \cdot \nabla_x \right)^2 = 4 \nabla_x \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) \cdot \nabla_x.$$

Consequently, for any $f = f(x, y) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left\langle f \left| \left(\nabla_x \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) + \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) \cdot \nabla_x \right)^2 \right| f \right\rangle \right| \\ &= 4 \left| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} \left(\nabla_x \bar{f}(x, y) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) \right) \left(\nabla_x f(x, y) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) \right) dx dy \right| \\ &\leq 4 \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla_x f(x, y)|^2 \left| \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) \right|^2 dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting (2.12) with $|\nabla^\perp w_R(x-y)| = |\nabla^\perp w_R(y-x)|$, we get

$$\left| \left\langle f \left| \left(\nabla_x \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) + \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) \cdot \nabla_x \right)^2 \right| f \right\rangle \right| \leq C |\log R|^2 \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} (|\nabla_x f|^2 + |\nabla_y \nabla_x f|^2) dx dy$$

and thus

$$\left(\nabla_x \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) + \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) \cdot \nabla_x \right)^2 \leq C |\log R|^2 (1 - \Delta_x)(1 - \Delta_y)$$

concluding the proof. \square

We will also need the operator bound from [33, Lemma 2.4] based on Hardy's inequality.

Lemma 2.7 (Three-body term). *We have that, as operators on $L^2_{\text{sym}}(\mathbb{R}^6)$,*

$$0 \leq \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x-z) \leq C (1 - \Delta_x). \quad (2.16)$$

This lemma concludes the derivation of the main bounds of the operators contained in the Hamiltonian $H_{N,R}$ defined in (1.6). We now proceed to the analysis of the various quantities that play an important role in the proofs of Sections 4 and 5.

2.2 A Priori Bounds for Mean-Field Terms

Definition 2. For any function $\varphi_t \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we define the operators:

$$v'(x) := -i\nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t|^2](x) + \text{h.c.} - (\nabla^\perp w_R * J[\varphi_t])(x), \quad (2.17)$$

$$w'(x) := \mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t|^2]^2(x) + 2(\nabla^\perp w_R * \mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t|^2] |\varphi_t|^2)(x), \quad (2.18)$$

$$v(x-y) := -i\nabla_x \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) + \text{h.c.}, \quad (2.19)$$

$$w(x-y, x-z) := \nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x-z) \quad (2.20)$$

as well as the projectors $p(x) := |\varphi_t(x)\rangle\langle\varphi_t(x)|$ and $q(x) := \mathbb{1}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} - p(x)$.

Lemma 2.8. *We then have the following estimates:*

$$\|v'\varphi_t\|_2 \leq C\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}^3 + C\|\varphi_t\|_{H^2}\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}, \quad (2.21)$$

$$\|v(x-y)\varphi_t(x)\varphi_t(y)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}^2 \leq C|\log R|^2(\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\varphi_t\|_{H^1} + 1), \quad (2.22)$$

$$\|w'\varphi_t\|_2 \leq C\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}^3(\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1} + 1), \quad (2.23)$$

$$\|w(x-y, x-z)\varphi_t(x)\varphi_t(y)\varphi_t(z)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^6)} \leq C|\log R|\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}^3. \quad (2.24)$$

Proof. We start with the first estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|v'\varphi_t\|_2 &\leq 2\|\mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t|^2] \cdot \nabla\varphi_t\|_2 + \|\nabla^\perp w_R * J[\varphi_t]\varphi_t\|_2 \\ &\leq 2\|\nabla\varphi_t\|_4\|\mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t|^2]\|_4 + \|\nabla^\perp w_R * J[\varphi_t]\|_4\|\varphi_t\|_4 \\ &\leq C\|\nabla\varphi_t\|_4\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1} + 2\|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w}\|\varphi_t\nabla\varphi_t\|_{\frac{4}{3}}\|\varphi_t\|_4 \end{aligned}$$

where we used (2.1) as well as (WY) and Hölder inequality to treat the convolution product. For the second estimate of the lemma we write

$$\begin{aligned} \|v(x_1-x_2)\varphi_t(x_1)\varphi_t(x_2)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}^2 &= \langle\varphi_t(x_1)\varphi_t(x_2), (v(x_1-x_2))^2\varphi_t(x_1)\varphi_t(x_2)\rangle \\ &\leq C|\log R|^2\langle\varphi_t(x_1)\varphi_t(x_2), (1-\Delta_x)(1-\Delta_y)\varphi_t(x_1)\varphi_t(x_2)\rangle \\ &\leq C|\log R|^2(\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\varphi_t\|_{H^1} + 1) \end{aligned} \quad (2.25)$$

by Lemma 2.6, using the operator bound of (2.14). The next term to treat is

$$\begin{aligned} \|w'\varphi_t\|_2 &\leq \|\mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t|^2]^2\varphi_t\|_2 + 2\|(\nabla^\perp w_R * \mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t|^2] |\varphi_t|^2)\varphi_t\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t|^2]\|_8^2\|\varphi_t\|_4 + C\|\nabla^\perp w_R * \mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t|^2] |\varphi_t|^2\|_4\|\varphi_t\|_4 \\ &\leq C\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}^3 + C\|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w}\|\mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t|^2] |\varphi_t|^2\|_{\frac{4}{3}}\|\varphi_t\|_4 \\ &\leq C\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}^3 + C\|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w}\|\mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t|^2]\|_4\|\varphi_t^2\|_2\|\varphi_t\|_4 \\ &\leq C\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}^3 + C\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}^4 \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

where we used (2.1) twice with $s = 0$. Once with $p = 8$ and once with $p = 4$ combined with (WY).

The last estimate is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|w(x-y, x-z)\varphi_t(x)\varphi_t(y)\varphi_t(z)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^6)}^2 & (2.27) \\
& \leq \left\langle \varphi_t(x)\varphi_t(y)\varphi_t(z), |\nabla^\perp w_R(x-y)|^2 |\nabla^\perp w_R(x-z)|^2 \varphi_t(x)\varphi_t(y)\varphi_t(z) \right\rangle \\
& = \left\| (|\nabla^\perp w_R|^2 * |\varphi_t|^2)^2 |\varphi_t|^2 \right\|_1 \\
& \leq \|\varphi_t\|_4^2 \|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2+2\varepsilon}^4 \|\varphi_t\|_{\frac{8(1+\varepsilon)}{1+5\varepsilon}}^4 \\
& \leq C |\log R|^2 \|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}^6. & (2.28)
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we chose $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2|\log R|}$ in the last inequality to apply Corollary 2.3. \square

The next two lemmas involve the projectors $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ and show what happens in the cases when $-\Delta$ will hit a φ_t or won't.

Lemma 2.9. *For any function $\Psi_N \in L_{\text{sym}}^2(\mathbb{R}^{2N})$, we have*

$$\|v(x-y)p(x)q(y)\Psi_N\| \leq C |\log R| (\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1} + 1) (\|\nabla_y q(y)\Psi_N\| + \|q(y)\Psi_N\|). \quad (2.29)$$

Proof. The main ingredient is (2.14) of Lemma 2.6 that we use to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v(x-y)p(x)q(y)\Psi_N\|^2 &= \langle p(x)q(y)\Psi_N, (v(x-y))^2 p(x)q(y)\Psi_N \rangle \\
&\leq C |\log R|^2 \langle p(x)q(y)\Psi_N, (1-\Delta_x)(1-\Delta_y)p(x)q(y)\Psi_N \rangle \\
&\leq C |\log R|^2 (\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}^2 + 1) \langle p(x)q(y)\Psi_N, (1-\Delta_y)p(x)q(y)\Psi_N \rangle \\
&\leq C |\log R|^2 (\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}^2 + 1) (\|\nabla_y q(y)\Psi_N\|^2 + \|q(y)\Psi_N\|^2). & (2.30)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the above holds the same for $v(y-x)$ even if $v(x-y) \neq v(y-x)$. \square

Lemma 2.10. *For any function $\Psi_N \in L_{\text{sym}}^2(\mathbb{R}^{2N})$, we have for $u(x) \in \{p(x), q(x)\}$ that*

$$\left\| \sqrt{w(x-y, x-z)} u(x)u(y)u(z)\Psi_N \right\| = \begin{cases} C(\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1} + 1) \|u(x)u(y)u(z)\Psi_N\| & \text{if } u(x) = p(x) \\ C(\|u(x)u(y)u(z)\Psi_N\| + \|\nabla_x u(x)\Psi_N\|) & \text{if } u(x) = q(x) \end{cases}$$

This also holds true for any circular permutation of (x, y, z) .

Proof. We have by Lemma 2.7

$$\langle u(x)u(y)u(z), w(x-y, x-z)u(x)u(y)u(z) \rangle_{\Psi_N} \leq C \langle u(x)u(y)u(z), (1-\Delta_x)u(x)u(y)u(z) \rangle_{\Psi_N}$$

such that if $u(x) = p(x) = |\varphi_t(x)\rangle\langle\varphi_t(x)|$

$$\langle u(x)u(y)u(z), w(x-y, x-z)u(x)u(y)u(z) \rangle_{\Psi_N} \leq C(\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}^2 + 1) \|u(x)u(y)u(z)\Psi_N\|^2$$

and if $u(x) = q(x)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle u(x)u(y)u(z), w(x-y, x-z)u(x)u(y)u(z) \rangle_{\Psi_N} &\leq C \|u(x)u(y)u(z)\Psi_N\|^2 + C \|\nabla_x u(x)u(y)u(z)\Psi_N\|^2 \\
&\leq C \|u(x)u(y)u(z)\Psi_N\|^2 + C \|\nabla_x u(x)\Psi_N\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

using that $u \leq \mathbb{1}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}$. \square

3 Chern–Simons–Schrödinger Equation

In this section, we establish the well-posedness of the Chern–Simons–Schrödinger equation $\text{CSS}(R, \varphi_0)$ for an initial data $\varphi_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. We then demonstrate the convergence of the solution of $\text{CSS}(R, \varphi_0)$ to the solution of $\text{CSS}(\varphi_0)$ when $R \rightarrow 0$.

3.1 Well-posedness

We base our approach on results for $\text{CSS}(\varphi_0)$ derived in [5] to prove, among other things, the local well-posedness in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and the conservation of the energy. To make use of the existing results more effectively, we rewrite $\text{CSS}(R, \varphi_0)$ using the notation system introduced in [5].

The equation can be expressed in the covariant derivative form by setting the parameters g and κ in [5] as $\kappa^{-1} = -2\pi\beta$, $g = 0$, and by rewriting (1.11) as follows:

$$(i\partial_t - \mathcal{A}_R^0)u = -(\nabla - i\mathcal{A}_R)^2 u \quad (3.1)$$

where we defined

$$\mathcal{A}_R = -\beta \mathbf{A}^R [|u|^2]$$

as well as

$$\mathcal{A}_R^0 := -2\beta \nabla^\perp w_R * \text{Im}[\bar{u}(\nabla - i\mathcal{A}_R)u] = -2\beta \nabla^\perp w_R * \mathbf{j}_R$$

where $\mathbf{j}_R := (\beta \mathbf{A}^R [|u|^2] |u|^2 + \frac{1}{2} J[u])$. Note that, in this translation, a factor 2 has been lost compared to [5, Equation 2.6] due to their choice of kinetic energy $-\frac{1}{2}\Delta$. With that notation, we have the property

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbf{j}_R \cdot \partial_t \mathcal{A}_R = -\beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbf{j}_R \cdot (\nabla^\perp w_R * \partial_t |u_t|^2) = \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (\mathbf{j}_R * \nabla^\perp w_R) \partial_t |u_t|^2 = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathcal{A}_R^0 \partial_t |u_t|^2. \quad (3.2)$$

Theorem 3.1 (Conservation of the energy). *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for any $0 \leq R \leq c$ and any u_t solution of $\text{CSS}(R, u_0)$, the energy is conserved along time*

$$\mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[u_t] = \mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[u_0] \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \quad (3.3)$$

Moreover, we deduce that

$$\|u_t\|_{H^1} \leq C \quad (3.4)$$

where the constant C only depends on the fixed parameters β and $\|u_0\|_{H^1}$ and not on R .

Proof. We start by computing

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |(\nabla - i\mathcal{A}_R)u_t|^2 &= 2 \text{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} ((\nabla - i\mathcal{A}_R)u_t)^* (\nabla - i\mathcal{A}_R) \partial_t u_t - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbf{j}_R \cdot \partial_t \mathcal{A}_R \\ &= 2 \text{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} ((\nabla - i\mathcal{A}_R)u_t)^* (\nabla - i\mathcal{A}_R) \partial_t u_t + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathcal{A}_R^0 \partial_t |u_t|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Next, we multiply (3.1) by $\partial_t \bar{u}_t$ and take the real part, obtaining

$$0 = \text{Re} i |\partial_t u_t|^2 = \text{Re} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} ((\nabla - i\mathcal{A}_R)u_t)^* (\nabla - i\mathcal{A}_R) \partial_t u_t + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathcal{A}_R^0 \partial_t |u_t|^2,$$

which concludes the proof of (3.3). The H^1 -norm of u_t can then be estimated using the following argument:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla u_t\|_2 &= \|\nabla u_t - i\mathcal{A}_R u_t + i\mathcal{A}_R u_t\|_2 \\
&\leq \mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[u_0]^{1/2} + |\beta| \|\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2]u_t\|_2 \\
&\leq \mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[u_0]^{1/2} + C|\beta| \|u_t\|_2 \|\nabla |u_t|\|_2 \\
&\leq (1 + C|\beta|) \mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[u_0]^{1/2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Here, we used Hardy's inequality A.1 and the diamagnetic inequality A.2 to reconstruct $\mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[u_t]$ and applied the conservation of energy (3.3). Using Proposition A.3, we replace $\mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[u_0]$ with $\mathcal{E}^{\text{af}}[u_0]$ in the above. For R small enough, we then obtain

$$\|u_t\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C(1 + \mathcal{E}^{\text{af}}[u_0]). \tag{3.7}$$

Here, $\mathcal{E}^{\text{af}}[u_0]$ is also a fixed parameter, and we have

$$\mathcal{E}^{\text{af}}[u_0] \leq 2\|\nabla u_0\|_2^2 + 2\beta^2 \|\mathbf{A}[|u_0|^2]u_0\|_2^2 \leq C\|u_0\|_{H^1}^2, \tag{3.8}$$

where we used the triangle inequality and (2.1). This concludes the proof. \square

Theorem 3.2 (Local well-posedness in H^2). *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for any $R < c$ and any initial data $u_0 \in H^2$ there exists a time $T > 0$ not depending on R but only on $\|u_0\|_{H^2}$ and β such that $\text{CSS}(R, u_0)$ has a unique solution*

$$u_t \in C([0, T], H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)). \tag{3.9}$$

Moreover, there exist two constants $C, c' > 0$ not depending on R such that for any $|\beta| < c'$ and any $0 \leq t \leq T$, we have the control

$$\|-\Delta u_t\|_2 \leq C. \tag{3.10}$$

Remark 3.3. We can, in fact, prove (3.9) with $T(R) = +\infty$ for any $R > 0$, as demonstrated in Theorem D.1. However, Theorem D.1 also provides a bound for $\|-\Delta u_t\|_2$ global in time but which diverges as R approaches zero.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Abstract well-posedness. The proof for $R = 0$ can be found in [5, Theorem 2.1] and provides a $T_1 > 0$ for which the well-posedness of $\text{CSS}(0, u_0)$ holds for time $0 \leq t \leq T_1$. When $0 < R < 1$ the well-posedness holds by the same argument of [5, Theorem 2.1] and provides a $T(R) > 0$. However with so few information, we could have $T(R) < T_1$ and $\inf_{R \geq 0} T(R)$ might, a priori, be zero. To make our proof meaningful for any $0 < R \leq c$, we need to show that $T(R) > C$ for some $C > 0$ independent of R . This is the aim of the next paragraph.

Control of the R -dependent H^1 -norm. Let u_t be the solution of $\text{CSS}(R, u_0)$. By Theorem 3.1, $\|u_t\|_{H^1} \leq C$ where C does not depend on R .

Control of the R -dependent H^2 -norm. We will prove $T(R) > C > 0$ via the control of $\|-\Delta u_t\|_2$. We first express it in term of $\|\partial_t u_t\|_2$ and bound this last norm via Grönwall's lemma 1.14. To make the calculation lighter we introduce the notation $\mathcal{A} := (\nabla - i\mathcal{A}_R)^2 + \mathcal{A}_R^0$ such that

$$i\partial_t u_t = \mathcal{A}u_t. \tag{3.11}$$

Note that \mathcal{A} is self-adjoint due to the realness of \mathcal{A}_R^0 . Before starting we prove a useful inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(-i\nabla + \beta\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2])^2 u_t\|_2 &= \|(i\partial_t - \mathcal{A}_R^0)u_t\|_2 \\
&\leq \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 + \|\mathcal{A}_R^0 u_t\|_2 \\
&\leq \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 + C|\beta| \|u_t\|_4 \|\mathcal{A}_R^0\|_4 \\
&\leq \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 + C|\beta| \|u_t\|_4 \|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w} \|\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2]u_t\|_2 + J[u_t]\|_{\frac{4}{3}} \\
&\leq \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 + C|\beta| \|u_t\|_{H^1}^3.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Using (S) to get $\|\nabla u_t\|_4^2 \leq \|\nabla u_t\|_2^2 + \|\Delta u_t\|_2^2$ and (2.1) of Lemma 2.1 we now express

$$\begin{aligned}
\|-\Delta u_t\|_2 &= \|(\nabla - i\mathcal{A}_R + i\mathcal{A}_R)^2 u_t\|_2 \\
&\leq \|(\nabla - i\mathcal{A}_R)^2 u_t\|_2 + \|2\beta\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2](-i\nabla + \beta\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2])u_t\|_2 + |\beta|^2 \|\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2]\|^2 u_t\|_2 \\
&\leq \|(i\partial_t - \mathcal{A}_R^0)u_t\|_2 + |2\beta| \|\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2]\|_4 \|(-i\nabla + \beta\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2])u_t\|_4 + |\beta| \|\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2]\|_8^2 \|u_t\|_4 \\
&\leq \|(i\partial_t - \mathcal{A}_R^0)u_t\|_2 + C|\beta| \|u_t\|_{H^1} (\|\nabla u_t\|_4 + \|(\beta\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2])u_t\|_4 + C|\beta| \|u_t\|_{H^1}^2) \\
&\leq \|(i\partial_t - \mathcal{A}_R^0)u_t\|_2 + C|\beta| \|u_t\|_{H^1} (\|\Delta u_t\|_2 + |\beta| \|(\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2])\|_8 \|u_t\|_8 + |\beta| \|u_t\|_{H^1}^2 + C\|u_t\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)}) \\
&\leq \|(i\partial_t - \mathcal{A}_R^0)u_t\|_2 + C|\beta| \|u_t\|_{H^1} (\|\Delta u_t\|_2 + C|\beta| \|u_t\|_{H^1}^2 + C\|u_t\|_{H^1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Then we use the estimate (3.12) to have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 + C|\beta| \|u_t\|_{H^1} \|\Delta u_t\|_2 + \|\mathcal{A}_R^0 u_t\|_2 + C|\beta|^2 \|u_t\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)}^3 + C|\beta| \|u_t\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \\
&\leq \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 + C|\beta| \|u_t\|_{H^1} \|\Delta u_t\|_2 + C|\beta|^2 \|u_t\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)}^3 + C|\beta| \|u_t\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

We can observe in (3.13) that if $C|\beta| \|u_t\|_{H^1} < 1$, then

$$\|-\Delta u_t\|_2 \leq C (\|\partial_t u_t\|_2 + \|u_t\|_{H^1}). \tag{3.14}$$

This justifies the Assumption 1.2 that $|\beta| < c$ for some $c > 0$.³ Next step consists in computing

$$\partial_t \|\partial_t u_t\|_2^2 = \partial_t \|\mathcal{A}u_t\|_2^2 = 2i \operatorname{Im} \langle (i\partial_t \mathcal{A})u_t, \mathcal{A}u_t \rangle + 2i \operatorname{Im} \langle \mathcal{A}^2 u_t, \mathcal{A}u_t \rangle$$

in order to bound $\|\partial_t u_t\|_2$. The second term in the above is the imaginary part of a real number and cancels. This cancellation is the main reason why we compute a Grönwall on $\|\partial_t u_t\|_2$ and not directly on the magnetic term $\|(\nabla - i\mathcal{A}_R)^2 u_t\|_2$. We are then left with

$$2i \operatorname{Im} \langle (i\partial_t \mathcal{A})u_t, \mathcal{A}u_t \rangle = 2i \operatorname{Im} \langle i\partial_t (-i\nabla + \beta\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2])^2 u_t + (i\partial_t \mathcal{A}_R^0)u_t, \mathcal{A}u_t \rangle := E^{(1)} + E^{(2)}.$$

To treat $E^{(1)}$, we first calculate

$$i\partial_t \mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2] = 2\nabla^\perp w_R * \operatorname{Re}[\bar{u}_t i\partial_t u_t]$$

and get

$$|E^{(1)}| = 8 \left| \operatorname{Im} \left\langle \beta \nabla^\perp w_R * \operatorname{Re}[\bar{u}_t i\partial_t u_t] \cdot (-i\nabla + \beta\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2])u_t, \partial_t u_t \right\rangle \right|$$

³It possible to avoid this constraint to the price of divergences in R , see Theorem D.1.

with

$$\begin{aligned}
|E^{(1)}| &\leq C \|\nabla^\perp w_R * \operatorname{Re}[\bar{u}_t i \partial_t u_t]\|_4 \|(-i\nabla + \beta \mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2])u_t\|_4 \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \\
&\leq C \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_t\|_{H^1} \|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w} \|\bar{u}_t i \partial_t u_t\|_{\frac{4}{3}} \\
&\leq C \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_t\|_{H^1} \|u_t\|_{H^2} \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_t\|_4 \\
&\leq C \left(\|\partial_t u_t\|_2^3 + \|\partial_t u_t\|_2^2 \right) \|u_t\|_{H^1}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Here we used the inequality (3.12) to get the last line but also Young's inequality for the convolution, the conservation of energy (3.3) and the estimate (3.4). We now treat

$$\begin{aligned}
|E^{(2)}| &= 2|\operatorname{Im} \langle (i\partial_t \mathcal{A}_R^0)u_t, \mathcal{A}u_t \rangle| \\
&\leq C \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_t\|_4 \|\partial_t \mathcal{A}_R^0\|_4 \\
&\leq C \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_t\|_4 \|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w} \|4\beta \mathbf{A}^R[\operatorname{Re}(\bar{u}_t i \partial_t u_t)]|u_t|^2 + 4\beta \mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2] \operatorname{Re}(\bar{u}_t i \partial_t u_t)\|_{\frac{4}{3}} \\
&\quad + C \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_t\|_4 \|\nabla^\perp w_R * J[i\partial_t u_t]\|_4
\end{aligned}$$

here we have two $\frac{4}{3}$ -norms to treat and the last term. The first gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\|4\beta \mathbf{A}^R[\operatorname{Re}(\bar{u}_t i \partial_t u_t)]|u_t|^2\|_{\frac{4}{3}} &\leq C \| |u_t|^2 \|_2 \left\| \nabla^\perp w_R * \operatorname{Re}(\bar{u}_t i \partial_t u_t) \right\|_4 \\
&\leq C \| |u_t|^2 \|_2 \|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w} \|\bar{u}_t i \partial_t u_t\|_{\frac{4}{3}} \\
&\leq C \| |u_t|^2 \|_2 \|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w} \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_t\|_4.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Here we used (WY). The second provides

$$\|4\beta \mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2] \operatorname{Re}(\bar{u}_t i \partial_t u_t)\|_{\frac{4}{3}} \leq C \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2]\|_8 \|u_t\|_8 \leq C \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_t\|_{H^1}^2. \tag{3.17}$$

The last term to treat is

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \nabla^\perp w_R * J[i\partial_t u_t] \right\|_4 &= \left\| \nabla^\perp w_R * i[(i\partial_t u_t)\nabla \bar{u}_t + u_t \nabla(i\partial_t \bar{u}_t) - (i\partial_t \bar{u}_t)\nabla u_t - \bar{u}_t \nabla(i\partial_t u_t)] \right\|_4 \\
&\leq 4 \left\| \nabla^\perp w_R * (i\partial_t u_t)\nabla \bar{u}_t \right\|_4 \\
&\leq C \|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w} \|(i\partial_t u_t)\nabla \bar{u}_t\|_{\frac{4}{3}} \\
&\leq C \|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w} \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_t\|_4
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

where we first used that $\nabla^\perp \cdot \nabla = 0$ to integrate by part in the convolution product the two $u_t \nabla(i\partial_t \bar{u}_t)$ terms. We then used (WY). We conclude that

$$|E^{(2)}| \leq C \|\partial_t u_t\|_2^2 (\|u_t\|_{H^1}^4 + \|u_t\|_{H^1}^3 + \|u_t\|_{H^1}^2). \tag{3.19}$$

If we gather the estimates (3.15) and (3.19) for $E^{(1)}$ and $E^{(2)}$ we get

$$\partial_t \|\partial_t u_t\|_2^2 \leq C \left(\|\partial_t u_t\|_2^2 + \|\partial_t u_t\|_2^3 \right). \tag{3.20}$$

We can apply Grönwall's lemma 1.14 to the function $f_t := \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 + 1$ and obtain

$$\|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{C_1 - C_2 t} \tag{3.21}$$

for some $C_2, C_1 > 0$. We bounded $\|\mathcal{A}u_0\|_2$ using the same techniques as earlier in the proof. Substituting this last inequality into (3.13), and choosing $T := \min(T_1, 0.99 \frac{C_1}{C_2})$, allows us to conclude the proof. \square

3.2 Convergence of Solutions

Lemma 3.4 (Convergence of the pilot equation). *Let $\varphi_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, define φ_t^R to be the solution of $\text{CSS}(R, \varphi_0)$ and φ_t to be the solution of $\text{CSS}(\varphi_0)$. We then have that there exist $C, c, c' > 0$ such that for any $0 < R \leq c$, $|\beta| \leq c'$ and $t < T$ (with the T given in Theorem 3.2):*

$$\partial_t \|\varphi_t - \varphi_t^R\|_2^2 \leq CR^2 + C\|\varphi_t - \varphi_t^R\|_2^2 \quad (3.22)$$

which implies

$$\|\varphi_t - \varphi_t^R\|_2^2 \leq CR^2 e^{Ct} \quad (3.23)$$

by Grönwall's lemma 1.14.

Proof. Let us denote $\mathcal{E}_R = (-i\nabla + \beta \mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t^R|^2])^2$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \|\varphi_t - \varphi_t^R\|_2^2 &= 2 \operatorname{Im} [\langle (\mathcal{E}_0 + \mathcal{A}_0^0) \varphi_t, \varphi_t^R \rangle - \langle \varphi_t, (\mathcal{E}_R + \mathcal{A}_R^0) \varphi_t^R \rangle] \\ &= 2 \operatorname{Im} [\langle (\mathcal{E}_0 + \mathcal{A}_0^0) \varphi_t, (\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t) \rangle - \langle \varphi_t, (\mathcal{E}_R + \mathcal{A}_R^0) (\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t) \rangle], \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

where we used the fact that $\langle (\mathcal{E}_R + \mathcal{A}_R^0) \varphi_t, \varphi_t \rangle$ is real. We calculate separately the \mathcal{E} part and the \mathcal{A}^0 part.

We begin with **the \mathcal{E} part** and compute

$$\begin{aligned} E &:= \langle \mathcal{E}_0 \varphi_t, (\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t) \rangle - \langle \varphi_t, \mathcal{E}_R (\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t) \rangle \\ &= 2\beta \langle -i\nabla \varphi_t, (\mathbf{A} [|\varphi_t|^2] - \mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t^R|^2]) (\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t) \rangle + \beta^2 \langle (\mathbf{A} [|\varphi_t|^2]^2 - \mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t^R|^2]^2) \varphi_t^R, (\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t) \rangle \\ &\leq C \|\nabla \varphi_t\|_4 \|\mathbf{A} [|\varphi_t|^2] - \mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t^R|^2]\|_4 \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2 \\ &\quad + C \|\varphi_t^R\|_8 \|\mathbf{A} [|\varphi_t|^2] - \mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t^R|^2]\|_4 \|\mathbf{A} [|\varphi_t|^2] + \mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t^R|^2]\|_8 \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2 \\ &\leq C \|\nabla \varphi_t\|_4 \|\mathbf{A} [|\varphi_t|^2] - \mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t^R|^2]\|_4 \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2 \\ &\quad + C \|\varphi_t^R\|_8 \|\mathbf{A} [|\varphi_t|^2] - \mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t^R|^2]\|_4 \|\nabla^\perp w_0\|_{2,w} \| |u|^2 \|_{\frac{8}{5}} \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

Here, we used that $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A}^R [|u|^2] = \nabla \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R * |u|^2 = 0$, that $a^2 - b^2 = (a+b)(a-b)$ and the triangle inequality combined (WY). We apply (2.1) and (2.2) of Lemma 2.1 combined with the estimates S on $\|\varphi_t^R\|_8$ and $\|\nabla \varphi_t\|_4$ to get

$$E \leq C(\|\varphi_t\|_{H^2} + 1)(R^2 + \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2^2). \quad (3.26)$$

For **the \mathcal{A}^0 part**, we have to compute

$$\begin{aligned} M &:= \langle (\mathcal{A}_0^0 - \mathcal{A}_R^0) \varphi_t, (\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t) \rangle \\ &= \beta \left\langle (\nabla^\perp w_0 - \nabla^\perp w_R) * (2\beta \mathbf{A} [|\varphi_t|^2] |\varphi_t|^2 + J[\varphi_t]), \overline{\varphi_t} (\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t) \right\rangle \\ &\quad - \beta \left\langle \nabla^\perp w_R * 2\beta (\mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t^R|^2] |\varphi_t^R|^2 - \mathbf{A} [|\varphi_t|^2] |\varphi_t|^2), \overline{\varphi_t} (\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t) \right\rangle \\ &\quad - \beta \left\langle \nabla^\perp w_R * [J[\varphi_t^R] - J[\varphi_t]], \overline{\varphi_t} (\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t) \right\rangle \\ &:= \beta(M_1 + M_2 + M_3). \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

We treat M_1 , M_2 and M_3 separately.

$$\begin{aligned}
M_1 &\leq C \left\| (\nabla^\perp w_0 - \nabla^\perp w_R) * J[\varphi_t] \right\|_2 \left\| \overline{\varphi_t}(\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t) \right\|_2 \\
&\quad + \left\| (\nabla^\perp w_0 - \nabla^\perp w_R) * 2\beta \mathbf{A}[|\varphi_t|^2] |\varphi_t|^2 \right\|_2 \left\| \overline{\varphi_t}(\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t) \right\|_2 \\
&\leq C \|\varphi_t\|_\infty \|\varphi_t - \varphi_t^R\|_2 \left\| \nabla^\perp w_0 - \nabla^\perp w_R \right\|_1 \left(\|\nabla \varphi_t\|_4 \|\varphi_t^R\|_4^2 + \|\mathbf{A}[|\varphi_t|^2] |\varphi_t|^2\|_2 \right) \\
&\leq CR \|\varphi_t\|_{H^2}^2 \|\varphi_t - \varphi_t^R\|_2 \left(C + \|\mathbf{A}[|\varphi_t|^2]\|_4 \|\varphi_t\|_8^2 \|\varphi_t^R\|_4 \right) \\
&\leq CR^2 + C \|\varphi_t - \varphi_t^R\|_2^2
\end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

where we used Young's inequality for the convolution, Sobolev inequality (S), the embedding $\|\varphi_t\|_\infty \leq \|\varphi_t\|_{H^2}$ and (2.1) for the last inequality.

We continue by bounding M_2

$$\begin{aligned}
M_2 &\leq C \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2 \|\varphi_t\|_4 \left\| \nabla^\perp w_R * 2\beta(\mathbf{A}^R[|\varphi_t^R|^2] |\varphi_t^R|^2 - \mathbf{A}[|\varphi_t|^2] |\varphi_t|^2) \right\|_4 \\
&\leq C \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2 (\|\varphi_t^R\|_8 \|\mathbf{A}^R[|\varphi_t^R|^2]\|_8 \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2 + \|\varphi_t\|_2 \|\mathbf{A}^R[|\varphi_t^R|^2] - \mathbf{A}[|\varphi_t|^2]\|_4) \\
&\leq CR \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2 + C \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2^2 \\
&\leq CR^2 + C \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2^2
\end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

where we used (WY), (2.1) and (2.2) of Lemma 2.1. We finish with M_3 and to do so, we write

$$J[\varphi_t^R] - J[\varphi_t] = (\varphi_t - \varphi_t^R) \nabla \overline{\varphi_t} + \varphi_t^R \nabla (\overline{\varphi_t} - \overline{\varphi_t^R}) + (\overline{\varphi_t^R} - \overline{\varphi_t}) \nabla \varphi_t^R + \overline{\varphi_t} \nabla (\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t)$$

to get

$$\begin{aligned}
M_3 &\leq C \left| \left\langle \nabla^\perp w_R * [J[\varphi_t^R] - J[\varphi_t]], \overline{\varphi_t}(\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t) \right\rangle \right| \\
&= C \left| \left\langle J[\varphi_t^R] - J[\varphi_t], \nabla^\perp w_R * \overline{\varphi_t}(\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t) \right\rangle \right| \\
&\leq 2C \left| \left\langle (\varphi_t - \varphi_t^R) \nabla \overline{\varphi_t} + (\overline{\varphi_t^R} - \overline{\varphi_t}) \nabla \varphi_t^R, \nabla^\perp w_R * \overline{\varphi_t}(\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t) \right\rangle \right|
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\nabla \cdot \nabla^\perp w_0 = 0$ to integrate by part the two terms $\varphi_t^R \nabla (\overline{\varphi_t} - \overline{\varphi_t^R}) + \overline{\varphi_t} \nabla (\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t)$.

We can conclude with

$$\begin{aligned}
M_3 &\leq C \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2 (\|\nabla \varphi_t\|_4 + \|\nabla \varphi_t^R\|_4) \|\nabla^\perp w_R * \overline{\varphi_t}(\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t)\|_4 \\
&\leq C \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2 \|\varphi_t^R\|_{H^2} \|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w} \|\overline{\varphi_t}(\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t)\|_{\frac{4}{3}} \\
&\leq C \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2 \|\varphi_t^R\|_{H^2} \|\varphi_t\|_4 \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2 \\
&\leq C \|\varphi_t^R\|_{H^2} \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

where we used Young's inequality for the convolution and the estimate (3.4).

Combining (3.28), (3.29), and (3.30) with (3.27), we obtain that

$$M \leq CR^2 + C \|\varphi_t^R\|_{H^2} \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2^2. \tag{3.31}$$

Noting that for $t < T$, we have $\|\varphi_t\|_{H^2} \leq C$ by Theorem 3.2. Then, gathering (3.24), (3.26), and (3.31), we conclude the proof. \square

4 Countdown of the number of particles in the state φ_t

4.1 Bound on the time derivative of $E_N^{(1)}(t)$

As mentioned in the proof strategy outlined in Section 1.5.1, our aim is to follow the method in [24, 38] and apply Grönwall's lemma to the quantity

$$E_N^{(1)}(t) = 1 - \left\langle \varphi_t, \gamma_N^{(1)} \varphi_t \right\rangle \quad (4.1)$$

where $\gamma_N^{(1)}(t) = \text{Tr}_{2, \dots, N} |\Psi_N(t)\rangle \langle \Psi_N(t)|$ with $\Psi_N(t)$ is the solution of the Schrödinger equation (1.9) with initial data $\Psi_N(0) = \varphi_0^{\otimes N}$ and where φ_t is the solution of CSS(R, φ_0) defined in (1.11). We can rewrite

$$\left\langle \varphi_t, \gamma_N^{(1)} \varphi_t \right\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2(N-1)}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi_t(x_1) \Psi_N(x_1, \dots, x_N) dx_1 \right|^2 dx_2 \dots dx_N = \langle \Psi_N, p_1(t) \Psi_N \rangle \quad (4.2)$$

where we defined the projectors

$$p_1(t) := |\varphi_t(x_1)\rangle \langle \varphi_t(x_1)| \quad \text{and} \quad q_1(t) := \mathbb{1}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} - p_1(t). \quad (4.3)$$

In the following, the notations p_j and q_j will refer to the same time-dependent projectors, acting on the variable j . Using (4.2), we express

$$E_N^{(1)}(t) = \langle \Psi_N, q_1(t) \Psi_N \rangle \quad (4.4)$$

and using the symmetry of Ψ_N , we equivalently have $E_N^{(1)}(t) = \langle \Psi_N, q_j(t) \Psi_N \rangle$ for any $j \in [1, N]$. Using these properties, we can compute

$$\partial_t E_N^{(1)}(t) = -i \left\langle \Psi_N(t), \left[(H_{N,R} - H_{N,R}^H), \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \right] \Psi_N(t) \right\rangle \quad (4.5)$$

where $[A, B]$ denotes the commutator of operators A and B and where the Hartree Hamiltonian is

$$H_{N,R}^H := \sum_{j=1}^N \left(-i \nabla_j + \beta \mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t|^2](x_j) \right)^2 - \beta \left[\nabla^\perp w_R * (2\beta \mathbf{A}^R [|\varphi_t|^2] |\varphi_t|^2 + i(\varphi_t \nabla \bar{\varphi}_t - \bar{\varphi}_t \nabla \varphi_t)) \right] (x_j). \quad (4.6)$$

The goal is now to bound the right-hand-side of (4.5) in term of $E_N^{(1)}(t)$ to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\Psi_N(t)$ denote the solution of the Schrödinger equation (1.9) with the initial data $\Psi_N(0) = \varphi_0^{\otimes N}$, where $\varphi_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Let φ_t solves CSS(R, φ_0). There exist three constants $C, c, c' > 0$ such that for any $|\beta| \leq c'$, $0 < R \leq c$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$, we have that*

$$\partial_t E_N^{(1)}(t) \leq C |\log R| (E_N^{(1)} + \|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N\|^2) + N^{-1} R^{-2}. \quad (4.7)$$

Proof. The prove is provided by a direct combination of Lemma 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6. \square

In the above lemma, the quantity $\|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N\|$ appears. In Section 5, we will focus on bounding this quantity, using the idea from [24] that if most of the particles condense into p_1 with a conserved H^1 -norm, then this quantity is small.

In order to prove Theorem 4.1, we split the work into three parts that we will treat in the Lemmas 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6. To this end we define

$$H_N^R - H_{N,R}^H := V + W + X \quad (4.8)$$

where V and W are respectively the two-body and three-body terms given by

$$V := \beta \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k \neq j} v(x_j - x_k) - v'(x_j) \right) \quad (4.9)$$

$$W := \beta^2 \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\substack{k \neq j \\ l \neq k \neq j}} w(x_j - x_k, x_j - x_l) - w'(x_j) \right) \quad (4.10)$$

$$X := \frac{\beta^2}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k \neq j} \left| \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_k) \right|^2 \quad (4.11)$$

and X an error term. Recall that v , v' , w and w' have been defined in Definition 2. We will treat V , W and X in the next dedicated sections but we first need to introduce some tools to deal with the projections q and p .

4.2 Properties of the Projectors

Following [24, Section 3.3], we write

$$\mathbb{1}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2N})} = \prod_{j=1}^N (p_j + q_j), \quad (4.12)$$

and define P_k as the term obtained by expanding (4.12) and collecting all summands containing exactly k factors of q operators. This yields

$$P_k := \sum_{\substack{a \in \{0,1\}^N \\ \sum_j a_j = k}} \prod_{j=1}^N p_j^{1-a_j} q_j^{a_j}. \quad (4.13)$$

We use the convention that $P_k := 0$ whenever $k \notin \{0, \dots, N\}$. Note that P_k is an orthogonal projector, that $P_k P_l = \delta_{kl} P_k$, that $\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} P_k = \mathbb{1}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2N})}$ and that P_0 only contains projectors onto φ_t . For any weight function $f : \{0, \dots, N\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ we define the operator

$$\hat{f} := \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} f(k) P_k. \quad (4.14)$$

It follows that \hat{f} commutes with any q_j and P_k . That way we can define the operator \hat{m} with the real parameter $\xi \geq 0$ as

$$\hat{m}(\xi) := \sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{k}{N}\right)^\xi P_k \quad (4.15)$$

associated to the weight $m^\xi(k) := \left(\frac{k}{N}\right)^\xi$. Those will be used extensively in the proof. Let us first note that we have the relations

$$\hat{m}(1) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^N q_j P_k = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \quad (4.16)$$

that allows to recover the term in the right-hand-side of the commutator in the expression (4.5).

Lemma 4.2. *The operator $\hat{m}(\xi)$ has the following properties. For any positive ξ_1 and ξ_2 we have*

$$\hat{m}(\xi_1)\hat{m}(\xi_2) = \hat{m}(\xi_1 + \xi_2) \quad (4.17)$$

and in particular

$$\hat{m}(\xi_1)\hat{m}(-\xi_1) = \mathbb{1}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2N})} - P_0. \quad (4.18)$$

Moreover, for any operator \hat{f} defined as in (4.14) and any $n \in \{0, \dots, N\}$

$$N(N-1)\dots(N-n+1) \left\langle \Psi, \hat{f} q_1 q_2 \dots q_n \Psi \right\rangle \leq N^n \left\langle \Psi, \hat{f} \hat{m}(n) \Psi \right\rangle. \quad (4.19)$$

Proof. We can directly compute

$$\hat{m}(\xi_1)\hat{m}(\xi_2) = \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\frac{k}{N}\right)^{\xi_1} \left(\frac{j}{N}\right)^{\xi_2} P_k P_j = \sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{k}{N}\right)^{\xi_1 + \xi_2} P_k$$

where we used that $P_k P_j = \delta_{kj}$. It proves (4.17) and (4.18). The third identity follows using the symmetry of Ψ and (4.16). We have

$$\begin{aligned} N(N-1)\dots(N-n+1) \left\langle \Psi, \hat{f} q_1 q_2 \dots q_n \Psi \right\rangle &= \sum_{\substack{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n=1 \\ j_k \neq j_l}}^N \left\langle \Psi, \hat{f} q_{j_1} q_{j_2} \dots q_{j_n} \Psi \right\rangle \\ &\leq N^n \left\langle \Psi, \hat{f} \hat{m}^n(1) \Psi \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

and we conclude using (4.17). \square

The last tool we need is the shift τ_n defined as $(\tau_n f) := f(k+n)$ with the property of [24, Lemma 3.10] that we repeat here.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $r \geq 1$, A be a r -particles operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2r})$ and \hat{f} an operator defined as in (4.14). Let Q_i , $i = 1, 2$, be two projectors of the form $Q_i = u_1 \dots u_r$ where each u stands for either p or q . Then*

$$Q_1 A \hat{f} Q_2 = Q_1 \widehat{\tau_n f} A Q_2, \quad (4.20)$$

where $n = n_1 - n_2$ and n_i is the number of factors q in Q_i .

In the following, we will make use of the two relations

$$(\hat{m}(1) - \widehat{\tau_{-n}m}(1))q_j = \frac{n}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N P_k q_j = \frac{n}{N} q_j \quad (4.21)$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ as well as

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{m}(\tfrac{1}{2}) - \widehat{\tau_{-n}m}(\tfrac{1}{2})) &= \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \sqrt{\frac{k}{N}} P_k + \frac{n}{N} \sum_{k=n}^N \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{k} + \sqrt{k-n}} P_k \\ &\leq \frac{n}{N} \hat{m}(-\tfrac{1}{2}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

We are now equipped to compute each part of (4.5). We start with the two-body term V .

4.3 The Two-Body term V

This section is dedicated to the computation of the V term of (4.5) defined in (4.9).

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\Psi_N(t)$ denote the solution of the Schrödinger equation (1.9) with the initial data $\Psi_N(0) = \varphi_0^{\otimes N}$, where $\varphi_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Let V be as defined in (4.9), and let $\hat{m}(1)$ be as defined in (4.16). Then there exist three constants $C, c, c' > 0$ such that for any $|\beta| \leq c'$, $0 < R \leq c$ and any $0 \leq t \leq T$ we have*

$$|\langle \Psi_N(t), [V, \hat{m}(1)] \Psi_N(t) \rangle| \leq C |\log R| (E_N^{(1)} + \|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N\|^2 + N^{-1}) \quad (4.23)$$

where q_1 is defined in (4.3) with φ_t a solution of CSS(R, φ_0).

Proof. We start by expanding

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{E}_V &:= -i \langle \Psi_N(t), [V, \hat{m}(1)] \Psi_N(t) \rangle \\ &= -i \left\langle \Psi_N(t), \left[\frac{\beta}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{m>k} (v(x_k - x_m) + v(x_m - x_k)) - \sum_{j=1}^N v'(x_j), \hat{m}(1) \right] \Psi_N(t) \right\rangle \\ &= -\frac{i\beta}{2} \left\langle \Psi_N(t), \left[(N-1)(v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) - Nv'(x_1) - Nv'(x_2), \hat{m}(1) \right] \Psi_N(t) \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

where we used the bosonic symmetry of $\Psi_N(t)$ and the symmetry of $\hat{m}(1)$ and of the operator $v(x_k - x_m) + v(x_m - x_k)$. Note that, as we defined it in (2.19), we have $v(x_j - x_k) \neq v(x_k - x_j)$. We now use that $(p_1 + q_1)(p_2 + q_2) = \mathbb{1}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{E}_V &= -i\beta \left\langle p_1 p_2 \Psi_N(t), \left[(N-1)(v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) - Nv'(x_1) - Nv'(x_2), \hat{m}(1) \right] q_1 p_2 \Psi_N(t) \right\rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{i\beta}{2} \left\langle p_1 p_2 \Psi_N(t), \left[(N-1)(v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) - Nv'(x_1) - Nv'(x_2), \hat{m}(1) \right] q_1 q_2 \Psi_N(t) \right\rangle \\ &\quad - i\beta \left\langle q_1 p_2 \Psi_N(t), \left[(N-1)(v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) - Nv'(x_1) - Nv'(x_2), \hat{m}(1) \right] q_1 q_2 \Psi_N(t) \right\rangle + \text{h.c.} \\ &:= \dot{E}_V^{(1)} + \dot{E}_V^{(2)} + \dot{E}_V^{(3)} + \text{h.c.} \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Here we applied Lemma 4.3. It implies that the terms with the same number of factors q on both sides of the bracket vanished. We obtain three terms to treat and proceed one by one.

We start with $\dot{E}_V^{(1)}$ which is the most important term of the three because it displays the mean-field cancelation, i.e., the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
& p_2(v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1))p_2 \\
&= p_2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\varphi_t(x_2)|^2 (-i\nabla_1 \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_2) + \text{h.c.}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \overline{\varphi_t}(x_2) (-i\nabla_2 \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_2 - x_1) + \text{h.c.}) \varphi_t(x_2) dx_2 \right) p_2 \\
&= p_2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (-i\nabla_1 \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R * |\varphi_t|^2 + \text{h.c.}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \nabla^\perp w_R(x_2 - x_1) \cdot (\overline{\varphi_t}(x_2) (-i\nabla_2) \varphi_t(x_2) + \text{h.c.}) dx_2 \right) p_2 \\
&= p_2 v'(x_1) p_2. \tag{4.25}
\end{aligned}$$

We can plug the above into

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{E}_V^{(1)} &= -i\beta \left\langle p_2 p_1, \left[(N-1)(v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) - Nv'(x_1), \hat{m}(1) \right] q_1 p_2 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\
&= -i\beta \left\langle p_2 p_1, \left[v'(x_1), \hat{m}(1) \right] q_1 p_2 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\
&= -i\beta \left\langle p_2 p_1, v'(x_1) (\hat{m}(1) - \widehat{\tau_{-1}m}) q_1 p_2 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\
&= -\frac{i\beta}{N} \left\langle p_2 p_1, v'(x_1) q_1 p_2 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \tag{4.26}
\end{aligned}$$

using that $p_1 q_1 v'(x_2) = 0$, Lemma 4.3 to compute the commutator and (4.21) to treat $(\hat{m}(1) - \widehat{\tau_{-2}m}) q_1$. We now use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to obtain

$$|\dot{E}_V^{(1)}| \leq \frac{2|\beta|}{N} \|v'(x_1) p_2 p_1 \Psi_N\| \leq \frac{C}{N} \|v' \varphi_t\|_2 \leq \frac{C}{N} (\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}^3 + \|\varphi_t\|_{H^1} \|\varphi_t\|_{H^2}) \tag{4.27}$$

using the estimate (2.21) to bound $\|v' \varphi_t\|_2$.

For the $\dot{E}_V^{(2)}$ term we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{E}_V^{(2)} &= -i\frac{\beta}{2} \left\langle p_2 p_1, ((N-1)(v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) - Nv'(x_1) - Nv'(x_2)) (\hat{m}(1) - \widehat{\tau_{-2}m}) q_1 q_2 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\
&= -i\beta \frac{N-1}{N} \left\langle p_2 p_1, (v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) q_1 q_2 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \tag{4.28}
\end{aligned}$$

in which we used Lemma 4.3, the relation (4.21) and the fact that $p_2 v'(x_1) q_2 = 0 = p_1 v'(x_2) q_1$. We have that on the range of q_1 , the operator $\hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2})$ is well-defined and bounded. We then introduce the function $\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})$ defined in (4.15) and use the property (4.18) $\hat{m}(\xi) \hat{m}(-\xi) = \mathbb{1} - P_0$ with $P_0 q_j = 0$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{E}_V^{(2)} &= -i\beta \frac{N-1}{N} \left\langle p_2 p_1, (v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2}) q_1 q_2 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\
&= -i\beta \frac{N-1}{N} \left\langle p_2 p_1, \widehat{\tau_2 m}(\frac{1}{2}) (v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) \hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2}) q_1 q_2 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)}. \tag{4.29}
\end{aligned}$$

By a Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\dot{E}_V^{(2)}|^2 &\leq C \|v(x_1 - x_2) \widehat{\tau_2 m}(\frac{1}{2}) p_2 p_1 \Psi_N\|^2 \|\hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2}) q_2 q_1 \Psi_N\|^2 \\
&= C \langle p_2 p_1, \widehat{\tau_2 m}(\frac{1}{2}) v^2(x_1 - x_2) \widehat{\tau_2 m}(\frac{1}{2}) p_2 p_1 \rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \langle q_2 q_1, \hat{m}(-1) q_2 q_1 \rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\
&\leq C \|v(x_1 - x_2) \varphi_t(x_1) \varphi_t(x_2)\|_2^2 \|\widehat{\tau_2 m}(\frac{1}{2}) \Psi_N\|_2^2 \langle \Psi_N, \hat{m}(1) \Psi_N \rangle \left(1 + \frac{1}{N}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

where we applied the formula (4.19) to bound $\langle q_2 q_1, \hat{m}(-1) q_2 q_1 \rangle_{\Psi_N(t)}$. We now use that

$$\langle \Psi_N, \widehat{\tau_2 m}(1) \Psi_N \rangle = \langle \Psi_N, \hat{m}(1) \Psi_N \rangle + \frac{2}{N} = E_N^{(1)} + \frac{2}{N}$$

to get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\dot{E}_V^{(2)}| &\leq C \sqrt{E_N^{(1)}} \sqrt{(E_N^{(1)} + N^{-1})} \|v(x_1 - x_2) \varphi_t(x_1) \varphi_t(x_2)\|_2 \\
&\leq C |\log R| \left(E_N^{(1)} + \frac{1}{N}\right) (\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1} + \|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}^{1/2} + 1)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

by using (2.22) and $2|ab| \leq a^2 + b^2$ to get the last inequality.

The last term $\dot{E}_V^{(3)}$ provides

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{E}_V^{(3)} &= -i\beta \left\langle p_1 q_2, \left[(N-1)(v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) - Nv'(x_1), \hat{m}(1) \right] q_1 q_2 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\
&= -i\beta \left\langle p_1 q_2, \left((N-1)(v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) - Nv'(x_1) \right) (\hat{m}(1) - \widehat{\tau_{-1} m}) q_1 q_2 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\
&= -i\beta \left\langle p_1 q_2, \left(\frac{N-1}{N} (v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) - v'(x_1) \right) q_1 q_2 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

by the Lemma 4.3 and the relation (4.21). Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
|\dot{E}_V^{(3)}| &\leq C \|q_1 q_2 \Psi_N\|_2 (\|v(x_1 - x_2) p_1 q_2 \Psi_N\|_2 + \|v(x_2 - x_1) p_1 q_2 \Psi_N\|_2 + \|v'(x_1) p_1 q_2 \Psi_N\|_2) \\
&\leq C \sqrt{E_N^{(1)}} \left(\sqrt{E_N^{(1)}} \|v' \varphi_t\|_2 + |\log R| (\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1} + 1) (\|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N\| + \sqrt{E_N^{(1)}}) \right) \\
&\leq C |\log R| (E_N^{(1)} + \|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N\|^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.33}$$

where we applied Lemma 2.9 for the terms containing a v , the estimate (2.21) for the term with v' and where we have treated all $H^{1,2}$ -norm as constants. We gather (4.33), (4.31) and (4.27) to get

$$|\dot{E}_V| \leq C |\log R| (E_N^{(1)} + \|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N\|^2) + N^{-1} \tag{4.34}$$

and conclude the proof of the lemma. \square

4.4 The W term

Here we estimate the W term of (4.5).

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\Psi_N(t)$ denote the solution of the Schrödinger equation (1.9) with the initial data $\Psi_N(0) = \varphi_0^{\otimes N}$, where $\varphi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Let W be as defined in (4.10), and let $\hat{m}(1)$ be as defined in (4.16). Then there exist two constants $C, c > 0$ such that for any β , $0 < R \leq c$ and any $0 \leq t \leq T$ we have*

$$|\langle \Psi_N(t), [W, \hat{m}(1)] \Psi_N(t) \rangle| \leq C |\log R| (E_N^{(1)} + \|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N(t)\|^2) + N^{-1} \tag{4.35}$$

where q_1 is defined in (4.3) with φ_t a solution of CSS(R, φ_0).

Proof. We denote

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{E}_W &:= -i \left\langle \Psi_N, \left[\frac{\beta^2}{N^2} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{\substack{m \neq k \\ n \neq m \neq k}} w(x_k - x_m, x_k - x_n) - \sum_{j=1}^N w'(x_j), \hat{m}(1) \right] \Psi_N \right\rangle \\ &= -i \frac{\beta^2}{3} \left\langle \left[\frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N} \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) - N(w'(x_1) + w'(x_2) + w'(x_3)), \hat{m}(1) \right] \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)}\end{aligned}$$

where we denoted $\tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) := w(x_1 - x_2, x_1 - x_3) + w(x_2 - x_1, x_2 - x_3) + w(x_2 - x_3, x_2 - x_1)$. Note that \tilde{W} is symmetric under pairwise exchange of particles and positive by Lemma 2.7. We introduce

$$\mathbb{1}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^6)} = (p_1 + q_1)(p_2 + q_2)(p_3 + q_3)$$

on each side of the scalar product and obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{E}_W &= -i\beta^2 \left\langle p_3 p_2 p_1, \left[\frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N} \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) - N(w'(x_1) + w'(x_2) + w'(x_3)), \hat{m}(1) \right] q_1 p_2 p_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\ &\quad - i\beta^2 \left\langle p_3 p_2 q_1, \left[\frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N} \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) - N(w'(x_1) + w'(x_2) + w'(x_3)), \hat{m}(1) \right] q_1 q_2 q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\ &\quad - i \frac{\beta^2}{3} \left\langle p_3 p_2 p_1, \left[\frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N} \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) - N(w'(x_1) + w'(x_2) + w'(x_3)), \hat{m}(1) \right] q_1 q_2 q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\ &\quad - i\beta^2 \left\langle p_3 p_2 p_1, \left[\frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N} \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) - N(w'(x_1) + w'(x_2) + w'(x_3)), \hat{m}(1) \right] p_1 q_2 q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\ &\quad - i\beta^2 \left\langle q_3 q_2 p_1, \left[\frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N} \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) - N(w'(x_1) + w'(x_2) + w'(x_3)), \hat{m}(1) \right] q_1 q_2 q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\ &\quad - 3i\beta^2 \left\langle q_3 p_2 p_1, \left[\frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N} \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) - N(w'(x_1) + w'(x_2) + w'(x_3)), \hat{m}(1) \right] p_1 q_2 q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\ &\quad \text{h.c.}\end{aligned}\tag{4.36}$$

where we used Lemma 4.3 to discard all the term containing the same number of q factors on the left and on the right side of the scalar product and the fact that Ψ_N as well as the commutator are symmetric. It provides us six terms $\dot{E}_W := \sum_{i=1}^6 \dot{E}_W^{(i)}$ that we treat one by one.

We start by noting that we have the mean-field cancellation

$$\begin{aligned}p_3 p_2 \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) p_2 p_3 &= p_2 p_3 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\varphi_t(x_2)|^2 |\varphi_t(x_3)|^2 \left(\nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_2) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_3) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 2 \nabla^\perp w_R(x_2 - x_1) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_2 - x_3) \right) dx_1 dx_2 \right) p_2 p_3 \\ &= p_3 p_2 w'(x_1) p_2 p_3\end{aligned}\tag{4.37}$$

which implies that

$$|\dot{E}_W^{(1)}| \leq \left| \left\langle p_3 p_2 p_1, w'(x_1) (\hat{m}(1) - \widehat{\tau_{-1} m}(1)) q_1 p_2 p_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \right| \leq \frac{C}{N} \|w'(x_1) \varphi_t(x_1)\|_2 \leq \frac{C}{N}\tag{4.38}$$

where we used the bound (2.23). To treat $\dot{E}_W^{(4)}$ we use that $\hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2})\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})q_1 = q_1$ to get,

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{E}_W^{(4)} &= -i\beta^2 \frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N} \left\langle p_3 p_2 p_1, \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) (\hat{m}(1) - \widehat{\tau_{-2}m}(1)) p_1 q_2 q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\ &= -2i\beta^2 \frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N^2} \left\langle p_3 p_2 p_1, \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) p_1 q_2 q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\ &= -2i\beta^2 \frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N^2} \left\langle p_3 p_2 p_1, \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2}) p_1 q_2 q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)}\end{aligned}$$

via a Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}|\dot{E}_W^{(4)}| &\leq C \|\hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2})q_1 p_2 q_3 \Psi_N\| \left\| \tilde{W} \widehat{\tau_{-2}m}(\frac{1}{2}) p_3 p_2 p_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2N})} \\ &\leq C \sqrt{E_N^{(1)}} \left\| \tilde{W} \widehat{\tau_{-2}m}(\frac{1}{2}) p_3 p_2 p_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2N})} \\ &\leq C \sqrt{E_N^{(1)}} \left\| \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) \varphi_t(x_1) \varphi_t(x_2) \varphi_t(x_3) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^6)} \left(\sqrt{E_N^{(1)}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \right) \\ &\leq C |\log R| (E_N^{(1)} + N^{-1})\end{aligned}\tag{4.39}$$

using (4.19) and (4.18) on $\|\hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2})q_1 q_3 \Psi_N\|$ and where we used the estimate (2.24) to bound the last norm containing \tilde{W} . The next term is

$$\begin{aligned}|\dot{E}_W^{(6)}| &\leq C \left| \left\langle q_3 p_2 p_1, \left(\frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N^2} \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) - w'(x_1) \right) q_1 p_2 q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \right| \\ &\leq C E_N^{(1)} \|w' \varphi_t\|_2 + \left\| \sqrt{\tilde{W}} q_3 p_2 p_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \left\| \sqrt{\tilde{W}} q_3 p_2 q_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \\ &\leq C E_N^{(1)} + \|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N\|^2.\end{aligned}\tag{4.40}$$

To obtain the last inequality of above, we used (2.23) for the first term, and for the second, we split $\tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = w(x_1 - x_2, x_1 - x_3) + w(x_2 - x_1, x_2 - x_3) + w(x_3 - x_2, x_3 - x_1)$, and estimate each term using Lemma 2.10. We then transform all the $\nabla_i q_i$, $i = 2, 3$ into $\nabla_1 q_1$ using the symmetry of Ψ_N . Next we treat

$$\begin{aligned}|\dot{E}_W^{(3)}| &\leq C \left| \left\langle p_3 p_2 p_1, \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) q_1 q_2 q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \right| \\ &\leq C \|\hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2})q_3 q_2 q_1 \Psi_N\| \left\| \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \tilde{W} p_3 p_2 p_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \\ &\leq C \sqrt{E_N^{(1)}} \left\| \tilde{W} \widehat{\tau_3 m}(\frac{1}{2}) p_3 p_2 p_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \\ &\leq C \sqrt{E_N^{(1)}} \left\| \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) \varphi_t(x_1) \varphi_t(x_2) \varphi_t(x_3) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^6)} \left\| \widehat{\tau_3 m}(\frac{1}{2}) p_3 p_2 p_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \\ &\leq C \sqrt{E_N^{(1)}} \left\| \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) \varphi_t(x_1) \varphi_t(x_2) \varphi_t(x_3) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^6)} \sqrt{E_N^{(1)} + \frac{3}{N}} \\ &\leq C |\log R| (E_N^{(1)} + N^{-1})\end{aligned}\tag{4.41}$$

by (2.24). We continue with

$$\begin{aligned}
|\dot{E}_W^{(2)}| &\leq C \left| \left\langle q_3 p_2 p_1, \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) q_1 q_2 q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \right| \\
&\leq C \left\| \sqrt{\tilde{W}} q_3 p_2 p_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \left\| \sqrt{\tilde{W}} q_3 q_2 q_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \\
&\leq C (E_N^{(1)} + \|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N(t)\|^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.42}$$

where we proceeded as in (4.40) with the help of Lemma 2.10. There is left to estimate

$$\dot{E}_W^{(5)} = -2i\beta^2 \operatorname{Im} \left\langle q_3 q_2 p_1, \left(\frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N^2} \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) - w'(x_1) \right) q_1 q_2 q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)}. \tag{4.43}$$

As previously we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\dot{E}_W^{(5)}| &\leq C E_N^{(1)} \|w' \varphi_t\|_2 + C \left| \left\langle q_3 q_2 p_1, \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) q_1 q_2 q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \right| \\
&= C E_N^{(1)} \|w' \varphi_t\|_2 + C \left\| \sqrt{\tilde{W}} q_3 q_2 p_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \left\| \sqrt{\tilde{W}} q_3 q_2 q_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \\
&\leq C (E_N^{(1)} + \|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N(t)\|^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.44}$$

where we used Lemma 2.10 and (2.23) to conclude. If we gather (4.38), (4.42), (4.41), (4.39), (4.44) and (4.40), we obtain the result. \square

4.5 The Term X

Here we estimate the term X to finish proving Theorem 4.1.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\Psi_N(t)$ denote the solution of the Schrödinger equation (1.9) with the initial data $\Psi_N(0) = \varphi_0^{\otimes N}$, where $\varphi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Let X be as defined in (4.11), and let $\hat{m}(\xi)$ be as defined in (4.15). Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $\beta, R, \xi \geq 1/2$ and any $0 \leq t \leq T$ we have*

$$|\langle \Psi_N(t), [X, \hat{m}(\xi)] \Psi_N(t) \rangle| \leq C \frac{1}{N^\xi R^2}. \tag{4.45}$$

Proof. Recall that

$$X := \beta^2 N^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k \neq j} \left| \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_k) \right|^2,$$

and using that $\hat{m}(\xi) = \sum_k \left(\frac{k}{N}\right)^\xi P_k \leq \frac{1}{N^\xi} \sum_k k P_k = \frac{1}{N^\xi} \sum_{j=1}^N q_j$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle \Psi_N(t), [X, \hat{m}(\xi)] \Psi_N(t) \rangle| &\leq \frac{CN}{N^2 N^\xi} \sum_{j=2}^N \left\langle \Psi_N(t), \left[\left| \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_1) \right|^2, q_1 \right] \Psi_N(t) \right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2N})} \\
&\leq CN^{-\xi} R^{-2}
\end{aligned}$$

using the bosonic symmetry of $\Psi_N(t)$ and the bound $\sup_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla w_R| \leq C/R$ of (2.7). \square

5 Evolution of the Kinetic Energy

5.1 Bound on the Kinetic Energy

Our aim in this section is to control the $\|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N(t)\|$ term appearing in Theorem 4.1. We will do it through the conservation of the energies

$$E_N(t) := \frac{1}{N} \langle \Psi_N(t), H_{N,R} \Psi_N(t) \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[u] := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |(-i\nabla + \beta \mathbf{A}^R[|u|^2])u|^2$$

combined with the fact that $E_N(0) \simeq \mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[\varphi_0] + O(N^{-1}R^{-2})$. We define $M_N(t) := \langle \Psi_N(t), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \Psi_N(t) \rangle$ and the lemma is given as follows:

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\Psi_N(t)$ denote the solution of the Schrödinger equation (1.9) with the initial data $\Psi_N(0) = \varphi_0^{\otimes N}$, where $\varphi_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Let $\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})$ be as defined in (4.15). Then there exist two constants $C, c, c' > 0$ such that for any $|\beta| \leq c'$, $0 < R \leq c$ and any $0 \leq t \leq T$ we have*

$$\|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N\|^2 \leq \left| E_N(t) - \mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[\varphi_t] \right| + CR^{-2} M_N(t) + C \frac{|\log R|}{\sqrt{N}} \quad (5.1)$$

where q_1 is defined as in (4.3) with φ_t solving CSS(R, φ_0). Moreover we have that

$$\left| E_N(t) - \mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[\varphi_t] \right| \leq C |\log R|^2 N^{-1} \quad (5.2)$$

as a consequence of energy conservation.

In this Lemma appears the quantity $\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})$. We will obtain a control on it later in Theorem 5.4 through a Grönwall type estimate similar to the one used in Section 4.

Proof. Recalling definitions (2.19) and (2.20), we introduce the notation

$$\tilde{v}(x) := -i\nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{A}^R[|\varphi|^2](x) + \text{h.c} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{w}(x) := (\mathbf{A}^R[|\varphi|^2](x))^2$$

to write

$$\mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[\varphi] = \langle \varphi, -\Delta \varphi \rangle + \beta \langle \varphi, \tilde{v} \varphi \rangle + \beta^2 \langle \varphi, \tilde{w} \varphi \rangle \quad (5.3)$$

$$E[\Psi] := \langle \Psi, -\Delta_{x_1} \Psi \rangle + \beta \langle \Psi, v(x_1, x_2) \Psi \rangle + \frac{(N-2)}{(N-1)} \beta^2 \langle \Psi, w(x_1 - x_2, x_1 - x_3) \Psi \rangle. \quad (5.4)$$

Note that by symmetry of $\Psi_N(t)$ and Lemma 2.2 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} E[\Psi_N(t)] &= E_N(t) + \frac{\beta^2}{N-1} \langle \Psi_N | \nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_2) |^2 \Psi_N \rangle \\ &= E_N(t) + O(R^{-2} N^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Using that $p_j, q_j \leq \mathbb{1}(x_j)_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}$ are projections, applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the symmetry of Ψ_N , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N(t)\| &= \|\nabla_1 (1 - p_1(p_2 + q_2)(p_3 + q_3)) \Psi_N(t)\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla_1 (1 - p_1 p_2 p_3) \Psi_N(t)\| + 3 \|\nabla_1 p_1\| \|q_2 \Psi_N(t)\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla_1 (1 - p_1 p_2 p_3) \Psi_N(t)\| + 3 \|\nabla_1 p_1\| \|q_2 \Psi_N(t)\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla_1 (1 - p_1 p_2 p_3) \Psi_N(t)\| + 3 \|\nabla \varphi_t\| \langle \Psi_N(t), q_2 \Psi_N(t) \rangle^{1/2} \\ &\leq \|\nabla_1 (1 - p_1 p_2 p_3) \Psi_N(t)\| + 3 \|\nabla \varphi_t\| \langle \Psi_N(t), \hat{m}(1) \Psi_N(t) \rangle^{1/2} \\ &\leq \|\nabla_1 (1 - p_1 p_2 p_3) \Psi_N(t)\| + 3 \|\nabla \varphi_t\| \langle \Psi_N(t), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \Psi_N(t) \rangle^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof uses the same techniques as Section 4 in order to bound $\|\nabla_1(1-p_1p_2p_3)\Psi_N(t)\|$. As we assumed $|\beta| \leq c$, we will systematically treat $\|\varphi_t\|_{H^1}$ and $\|\varphi_t\|_{H^2}$ as constants for a better readability. For the rest of the proof, we write the Ψ for $\Psi_N(t)$ to have a shorter notation. Inserting

$$\mathbb{1}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^6)} = p_1p_2p_3 + (\mathbb{1}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^6)} - p_1p_2p_3),$$

into (5.4), and denoting $\Psi' := (\mathbb{1}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^6)} - p_1p_2p_3)\Psi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E[\Psi] &= \langle \Psi, p_1p_2p_3h_1p_1p_2p_3\Psi \rangle + \langle \Psi, p_1p_2p_3h_1\Psi' \rangle + \langle \Psi', h_1p_1p_2p_3\Psi \rangle + \langle \Psi' h_1\Psi' \rangle \\ &+ \beta \left(\langle \Psi_N, p_1p_2p_3v(x_1, x_2)p_1p_2p_3\Psi \rangle + \langle \Psi, p_1p_2p_3v(x_1, x_2)\Psi' \rangle + \langle \Psi'_N, v(x_1, x_2)p_1p_2p_3\Psi \rangle \right. \\ &\left. + \langle \Psi', v(x_1, x_2)\Psi' \rangle \right) \\ &+ \beta^2 \frac{N-2}{N-1} \left(\langle \Psi, p_1p_2p_3w(x_1-x_2, x_1-x_3)p_1p_2p_3\Psi \rangle \right. \\ &+ \langle \Psi, p_1p_2p_3w(x_1-x_2, x_1-x_3)\Psi' \rangle + \langle \Psi', w(x_1-x_2, x_1-x_3)p_1p_2p_3\Psi \rangle \\ &\left. + \langle \Psi', w(x_1-x_2, x_1-x_3)\Psi' \rangle \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, using some further short-hand notation, $v := v(x_1, x_2)$ and $w := w(x_1-x_2, x_1-x_3)$ as well as $h = -\Delta$ and $h_1 = -\Delta_{x_1}$, we obtain for any $0 < \kappa < 1$ that

$$\begin{aligned} &\kappa \langle \Psi, (1-p_1p_2p_3)h_1(1-p_1p_2p_3)\Psi \rangle \\ &= E[\Psi] - \mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[\varphi_t] \\ &\quad - \langle \Psi, p_1p_2p_3h_1p_1p_2p_3\Psi \rangle + \langle \varphi_t, h\varphi_t \rangle \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

$$- \langle \Psi, p_1p_2p_3h_1(1-p_1p_2p_3)\Psi \rangle - \langle \Psi, p_1p_2p_3h_1(1-p_1p_2p_3)\Psi \rangle \tag{5.7}$$

$$- \beta \left(\langle \Psi, p_1p_2p_3vp_1p_2p_3\Psi \rangle - \langle \varphi_t, \tilde{v}\varphi_t \rangle \right) \tag{5.8}$$

$$- \beta \left(\langle \Psi, p_1p_2p_3v(1-p_1p_2p_3)\Psi \rangle + \langle \Psi, (1-p_1p_2p_3)vp_1p_2p_3\Psi \rangle \right) \tag{5.9}$$

$$- \beta^2 \left(\langle \Psi, p_1p_2p_3wp_1p_2p_3\Psi \rangle - \langle \varphi_t, \tilde{w}\varphi_t \rangle \right) \tag{5.10}$$

$$- \beta^2 \left(\langle \Psi, p_1p_2p_3w(1-p_1p_2p_3)\Psi \rangle + \langle \Psi, (1-p_1p_2p_3)wp_1p_2p_3\Psi \rangle \right) \tag{5.11}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \frac{\beta^2}{N-1} \left(\langle \Psi, p_1p_2p_3wp_1p_2p_3\Psi \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \langle \Psi, p_1p_2p_3w(1-p_1p_2p_3)\Psi \rangle + \langle \Psi, (1-p_1p_2p_3)wp_1p_2p_3\Psi \rangle \right) \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &- \left(\beta \langle \Psi, (1-p_1p_2p_3)v(1-p_1p_2p_3)\Psi \rangle \right. \\ &\quad + \beta^2 \frac{N-2}{N-1} \langle \Psi, (1-p_1p_2p_3)w(1-p_1p_2p_3)\Psi \rangle \\ &\quad \left. + (1-\kappa) \langle \Psi, (1-p_1p_2p_3)h_1(1-p_1p_2p_3)\Psi \rangle \right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

We now bound the above line by line making the same use of the properties of Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 as previously.

Line of expression (5.6) is

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 h_1 p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle - \langle \varphi, h\varphi \rangle| \\
&= \langle \varphi, h\varphi \rangle |\langle \Psi, (1 - p_1 p_2 p_3) \Psi \rangle| \\
&= \langle \varphi, h\varphi \rangle |\langle \Psi, (q_1 p_2 p_3 + p_1 q_2 p_3 + p_1 p_2 q_3 + p_1 q_2 q_3 + q_1 p_2 q_3 + q_1 q_2 p_3 + q_1 q_2 q_3) \Psi \rangle| \\
&\leq 7 \langle \varphi, h\varphi \rangle \langle \Psi, \hat{m}(1) \Psi \rangle \\
&\leq C \langle \Psi, \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \Psi \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Line of expression (5.7) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 h_1 (1 - p_1 p_2 p_3) \Psi \rangle \\
&= \langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 h_1 (q_1 p_2 p_3 + p_1 q_2 p_3 + p_1 p_2 q_3 + p_1 q_2 q_3 + q_1 p_2 q_3 + q_1 q_2 p_3 + q_1 q_2 q_3) \Psi \rangle \\
&= \langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 h_1 q_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle \\
&= \langle \Psi, q_1 h_1 p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle \\
&= \langle \Psi, q_1 \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{-1/2} \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{1/2} h_1 p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle \\
&= \langle \Psi, q_1 \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{-1/2} h_1 \widehat{\tau_1 m}(\frac{1}{2})^{1/2} h_1 p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 h_1 (1 - p_1 p_2 p_3) \Psi \rangle| \\
&\leq \sqrt{\langle \Psi, q_1 \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{-1} \Psi \rangle} \sqrt{\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 \widehat{\tau_1 m}(\frac{1}{2})^{1/2} h_1^2 \widehat{\tau_1 m}(\frac{1}{2})^{1/2} p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle} \\
&= \sqrt{\langle \Psi, \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \Psi \rangle} \sqrt{\langle \varphi, h^2 \varphi \rangle} \sqrt{\langle \Psi, \widehat{\tau_1 m}(\frac{1}{2}) p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle} \\
&\leq C \sqrt{M_N(t)} \left(\sqrt{M_N(t)} + \frac{1}{N^{1/4}} \right) \\
&\leq C \left(M_N(t) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Line of expression (5.8) provides

$$|\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 v p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle - \langle \varphi, \tilde{v}\varphi \rangle| \leq \langle \varphi, \tilde{v}\varphi \rangle |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle - 1| \leq C |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle - 1| \leq C M_N(t)$$

where we used the estimate (2.1) to get

$$\langle \varphi, \tilde{v}\varphi \rangle = \|\varphi(-i\nabla\varphi) \cdot \mathbf{A}^R[|\varphi|^2]\|_1 \leq \|\nabla\varphi\|_2 \|\varphi\|_4 \|\mathbf{A}^R[|\varphi|^2]\|_4 \leq C.$$

Line of expression (5.9) is

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 v (1 - p_1 p_2 p_3) \Psi \rangle| \\
&= |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 v (q_1 p_2 p_3 + p_1 q_2 p_3 + p_1 p_2 q_3 + p_1 q_2 q_3 + q_1 p_2 q_3 + q_1 q_2 p_3 + q_1 q_2 q_3) \Psi \rangle| \\
&\leq |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 v q_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle| + |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 v p_1 q_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle| + |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 v p_1 p_2 q_3 \Psi \rangle| \\
&\quad + |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 v p_1 q_2 q_3 \Psi \rangle| + |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 v q_1 q_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle| + |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 v q_1 p_2 q_3 \Psi \rangle| \\
&\quad + |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 v q_1 q_2 q_3 \Psi \rangle| \\
&=: (a) + (b) + (b') + (c) + (d) + (d') + (e).
\end{aligned}$$

We have (c) = (e) = 0 because $p_3q_3 = 0$.

Now, for (a), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 v q_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle| \\
&= |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 \tilde{v}(x_1) q_1 \Psi \rangle| \\
&= \left| \langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 \tilde{v}(x_1) \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{1/2} \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{-1/2} q_1 \Psi \rangle \right| \\
&= \left| \langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 \widehat{\tau_1 \hat{m}}(\frac{1}{2})^{1/2} \tilde{v}(x_1) \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{-1/2} q_1 \Psi \rangle \right| \\
&\leq \sqrt{\langle \varphi, \tilde{v}^2(x_1) \varphi \rangle} \sqrt{\langle \Psi, \widehat{\tau_1 \hat{m}}(\frac{1}{2}) p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle} \sqrt{\langle \Psi, \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{-1} q_1 \Psi \rangle} \\
&\leq C \left(M_N(t) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

by the estimate $\|\tilde{v}\varphi_t\|_2 \leq C \|\nabla\varphi \cdot \mathbf{A}^R[|\varphi|^2]\|_2 \leq C$ as in the proof of the estimate (2.17). For (b) and (b'), similarly we obtain

$$|\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 v p_1 q_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle| + |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 v p_1 p_2 q_3 \Psi \rangle| \leq C \left(M_N(t) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \right).$$

For (d),

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 v q_1 q_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle| \\
&= |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 v \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{-1} q_1 q_2 \Psi \rangle| \\
&= |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 \widehat{\tau_1 \hat{m}}(\frac{1}{2}) v \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{-1} q_1 q_2 \Psi \rangle| \\
&\leq \|v(x-y)\varphi(x)\varphi(y)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)} \sqrt{\langle \Psi, \widehat{\tau_1 \hat{m}}(\frac{1}{2}) p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle} \sqrt{\langle \Psi, \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{-1} q_1 q_2 \Psi \rangle} \\
&\leq C |\log R| \left(\langle \Psi, \hat{m}(1) \Psi \rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \right) \\
&\leq C |\log R| \left(\langle \Psi, \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \Psi \rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the estimate (2.22). The same holds true for (d').

Line of expression (5.10)

$$|\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 w p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle - \langle \varphi, \tilde{w}\varphi \rangle| \leq \langle \varphi, \tilde{w}\varphi \rangle |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle - 1| \leq C \|\varphi\|_2 \|\mathbf{A}^R[|\varphi|^2]\|_4^2 M_N(t) \leq C M_N(t)$$

using the estimate (2.1). *Line of expression (5.11)*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 w(1 - p_1 p_2 p_3) \Psi \rangle \\
&= \langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 w(q_1 p_2 p_3 + p_1 q_2 p_3 + p_1 p_2 q_3 + p_1 q_2 q_3 + q_1 p_2 q_3 + q_1 q_2 p_3 + q_1 q_2 q_3) \Psi \rangle \\
&\leq |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 w q_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle| + 2 |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 w p_1 p_2 q_3 \Psi \rangle| + |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 w p_1 q_2 q_3 \Psi \rangle| \\
&\quad + 2 |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 w q_1 q_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle| + |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 w q_1 q_2 q_3 \Psi \rangle| \\
&=: (a) + 2(a)' + (b) + 2(b)' + (c).
\end{aligned}$$

For (a),

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 w q_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle| \\
&= |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 \tilde{w}(x_1) q_1 \Psi \rangle| \\
&= \left| \langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 \tilde{w}(x_1) \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{1/2} \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{-1/2} q_1 \Psi \rangle \right| \\
&= \left| \langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 \widehat{\tau_1 m}(\frac{1}{2})^{1/2} \tilde{w}(x_1) \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{-1/2} q_1 \Psi \rangle \right| \\
&\leq \sqrt{\langle \varphi, \tilde{w}^2 \varphi \rangle} \sqrt{\langle \Psi, \widehat{\tau_1 m}(\frac{1}{2}) p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle} \sqrt{\langle \Psi, \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{-1} q_1 \Psi \rangle} \\
&\leq C \left(M_N(t) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

using that $\langle \varphi, \tilde{w}^2 \varphi \rangle \leq \|\varphi\|_2 \|\mathbf{A}^R[|\varphi|^2]\|_8^4 \leq C$ by estimate (2.1). We bound (a') the same way using that by (WY) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| (\nabla^\perp w_R * \mathbf{A}^R[|\varphi|^2] |\varphi|^2) \right\|_1 &\leq \|\varphi\|_2 \left\| \nabla^\perp w_R * \mathbf{A}^R[|\varphi|^2] |\varphi|^2 \right\|_4^2 \\
&\leq \|\varphi\|_2 \left\| \nabla^\perp w_R \right\|_{2,w} \left\| \mathbf{A}^R[|\varphi|^2] |\varphi|^2 \right\|_{\frac{4}{3}}^2 \leq C.
\end{aligned}$$

For (b) and (b'),

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 w q_1 q_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle| + |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 w p_1 q_2 q_3 \Psi \rangle| \\
&= |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 \widehat{\tau_1 m}(\frac{1}{2}) w \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{-1} q_1 q_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle| + |\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 \widehat{\tau_1 m}(\frac{1}{2}) w \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{-1} p_1 q_2 q_3 \Psi \rangle| \\
&\leq \sqrt{\langle \varphi^{\otimes 3}, w^2 \varphi^{\otimes 3} \rangle} \sqrt{\langle \Psi, \widehat{\tau_1 m}(\frac{1}{2}) p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi \rangle} \left(\sqrt{\langle \Psi, \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{-1} q_1 q_2 \Psi \rangle} + \sqrt{\langle \Psi, \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})^{-1} q_2 q_3 \Psi \rangle} \right) \\
&\leq C |\log R| \left(\langle \Psi, \hat{m}(1) \Psi \rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \right) \\
&\leq C |\log R| \left(\langle \Psi, \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \Psi \rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where we concluded using (2.24).

For (c'), the same calculation provides

$$|\langle \Psi, p_1 p_2 p_3 w q_1 q_2 q_3 \Psi \rangle| \leq C |\log R| \left(M_N(t) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \right).$$

Line of expression (5.12) is bounded, using (2.24) and that

$$\|\Psi'_N\| \leq \|\Psi_N\| + \|p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi_N\| \leq 2.$$

We obtain via the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality on $\langle w p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi_N, \Psi'_N \rangle$ that (5.12) is controlled by

$$C \frac{\beta^2}{N} \|w p_1 p_2 p_3 \Psi_N\| \leq C \frac{\beta^2}{N} \langle \varphi^{\otimes 3}, w^2 \varphi^{\otimes 3} \rangle^{1/2} \leq C \frac{|\log R|}{N}. \quad (5.14)$$

Line of expression (5.13). Here is one of the main technical point of the paper. Following [24, Proof of Theorem 4.1], we would like to prove that

$$0 \leq (1 - \kappa)(-\Delta_{x_1}) + \beta v(x_1, x_2) + \frac{(N-2)}{(N-1)} \beta^2 w(x_1 - x_2, x_1 - x_3) \quad (5.15)$$

using that our β is small.

Remark 5.2. Note that the above operator acts on $\Psi'_N = (\mathbb{1}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^6)} - p_1 p_2 p_3) \Psi$ which is symmetric in the particles (x_1, x_2, x_3) and in (x_4, \dots, x_N) but not in (x_1, \dots, x_N) . Because this lack of symmetry we do not manage to prove the above inequality using the completion of the square and are forced to use the rough bound (2.7) providing a R^{-2} instead of, ideally, a $|\log R|$. This strongly deteriorates the rate of the final Theorem 1.3 as explained in Remark 1.7.

More precisely, we drop the w term of above which is positive, see Lemma 2.7, and use a weighted Cauchy-Schwarz for operators to get

$$\beta v(x_1, x_2) \geq -\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta_{x_1} + 2\beta^2 |\nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_2)|^2\right) \quad (5.16)$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta \langle \Psi'_N, v(x_1, x_2) \Psi'_N \rangle &\geq -\frac{1}{2} \langle \Psi'_N, -\Delta_{x_1} \Psi'_N \rangle - CR^{-2} \langle \Psi'_N, \Psi'_N \rangle \\ &\geq -\frac{1}{2} \langle \Psi'_N, -\Delta_{x_1} \Psi'_N \rangle - CR^{-2} M_N(t). \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

Remark 5.3. Note that a naive completion of the square in (5.15), only using the symmetry of Ψ'_N in the variables (x_1, x_2, x_3) provides the same $|\nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_2)|^2$ type of term as in (5.16). We would need to use the symmetry in all the particles to complete the square and be left with the usual $N^{-1} |\nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_2)|^2$.

We now choose $\kappa = \frac{1}{2}$ such that $1 - \kappa - \frac{1}{2} \geq 0$ and include the $CR^{-2} \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})$ in the final bound. All in all, we have proven that

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \Psi, (1 - p_1 p_2 p_3) h_1 (1 - p_1 p_2 p_3) \Psi \rangle \\ &\leq |E[\Psi] - \mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[\varphi]| + R^{-2} M_N(t) + \frac{|\log R|}{\sqrt{N}} \\ &\leq |E_N(t) - \mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[\varphi]| + CR^{-2} N^{-1} + R^{-2} M_N(t) + \frac{|\log R|}{\sqrt{N}} \end{aligned}$$

by (5.5). We conclude the proof by showing that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| E_N(t) - \mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[\varphi_t] \right| &= \left| E_N(0) - \mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[\varphi_0] \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\beta^2}{N-1} \left\langle \varphi_0^{\otimes 3}, (|\nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_2)|^2 + \nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_2) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_3)) \varphi_0^{\otimes 3} \right\rangle \\ &\leq CN^{-1} |\log R|^2 \langle \varphi_0, (1 - \Delta) \varphi_0 \rangle \\ &\leq C |\log R|^2 N^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

where we used the conservation of energy Theorem 3.1 together with the bounds (2.12) and (2.16). \square

5.2 Control of $M_N(t)$

The strategy to bound $\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})$ is the same as the one used to control $E_N^{(1)}(t) = 1 - \langle \Psi_N(t), \hat{m}(1) \Psi_N(t) \rangle$ in Section 4. We define $M_N(t) := \langle \Psi_N(t), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \Psi_N(t) \rangle$ and prove the following theorem.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $\Psi_N(t)$ denote the solution of the Schrödinger equation (1.9) with the initial data $\Psi_N(0) = \varphi_0^{\otimes N}$, where $\varphi_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then there exist four constants $C, C', c, c' > 0$ such that for any $|\beta| \leq c'$, $0 < R \leq c$ and any $0 \leq t \leq T$ we have*

$$\partial_t M_N(t) \leq C |\log R| R^{-2} M_N(t) + C N^{-1/2} R^{-2}. \quad (5.19)$$

Moreover, one deduces that

$$M_N(t) \leq C' N^{-1/2} R^{-2} e^{C' T \frac{|\log R|}{R^2}} \quad (5.20)$$

via Grönwall's lemma 1.14.

Proof. We apply Lemma 5.5 and 5.6 and Lemma 4.6 with $\xi = 1/2$ to get

$$\partial_t M_N \leq C |\log R|^4 M_N + C |\log R| \|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N(t)\|^2 + C N^{-1/2} R^{-2}$$

and conclude using Lemma 5.1 to control $\|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N(t)\|^2$. \square

As we can see in the above proof, we follow exactly the same strategy as for proving Theorem 4.1. We start by writing

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t M_N &= -i \langle \Psi_N(t), [(H_{N,R} - H_{N,R}^H), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})] \Psi_N(t) \rangle \\ &= -i \langle \Psi_N(t), [(V + W + X), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})] \Psi_N(t) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

where the Hartree Hamiltonian is defined in (4.6) and V, W, X in (4.9), (4.10) and (4.11). We will treat each of them one by one except the term X whose estimate follows directly from Lemma 4.6.

5.3 The Two-Body Term V

This section is dedicated to the computation of the V term of (5.21) defined in (4.9). Recall that $E_N^{(1)}(t) \leq M_N(t)$.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\Psi_N(t)$ denote the solution of the Schrödinger equation (1.9) with the initial data $\Psi_N(0) = \varphi_0^{\otimes N}$, where $\varphi_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Let V be as defined in (4.9), and let $\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})$ be as defined in (4.15). Then there exist two constants $C, c, c' > 0$ such that for any $|\beta| \leq c'$, $0 \leq R \leq c$ and any $0 \leq t \leq T$ we have*

$$|\langle \Psi_N(t), [V, \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})] \Psi_N(t) \rangle| \leq C |\log R| (M_N + \|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N(t)\|^2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}) \quad (5.22)$$

where q_1 is defined in (4.3) with φ_t a solution of CSS(R, φ_0).

Proof. The proof closely follows that of Lemma 4.4. For this reason, we will emphasize only the new aspects arising from the presence of $\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})$ instead of $\hat{m}(1)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{M}_V &:= -i \langle \Psi_N(t), [V, \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})] \Psi_N(t) \rangle \\ &= -i \left\langle \Psi_N(t), \left[\frac{\beta}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{m>k} (v(x_k - x_m) + v(x_m - x_k)) - \sum_{j=1}^N v'(x_j), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \right] \Psi_N(t) \right\rangle \\ &= -\frac{i\beta}{2} \left\langle \Psi_N(t), \left[(N-1)(v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) - Nv'(x_1) - Nv'(x_2), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \right] \Psi_N(t) \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

where we used the bosonic symmetry of $\Psi_N(t)$ and the symmetry of $\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})$. We use again that

$$(p_1 + q_1)(p_2 + q_2) = \mathbb{1}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}$$

to get

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{M}_V &= -i\beta \left\langle p_1 p_2 \Psi_N(t), \left[(N-1)(v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) - Nv'(x_1) - Nv'(x_2), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \right] q_1 p_2 \Psi_N(t) \right\rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{i\beta}{2} \left\langle p_1 p_2 \Psi_N(t), \left[(N-1)(v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) - Nv'(x_1) - Nv'(x_2), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \right] q_1 q_2 \Psi_N(t) \right\rangle \\ &\quad - i\beta \left\langle q_1 p_2 \Psi_N(t), \left[(N-1)(v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) - Nv'(x_1) - Nv'(x_2), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \right] q_1 q_2 \Psi_N(t) \right\rangle + \text{h.c.} \\ &:= \dot{M}_V^{(1)} + \dot{M}_V^{(2)} + \dot{M}_V^{(3)} + \text{h.c.} \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

Lemma 4.3 implied that the terms with the same number of factors q on both sides of the bracket vanished. We obtain three terms to treat and proceed one by one. We start with $\dot{M}_V^{(1)}$ which is the most important term of the three because it uses the mean-field cancelation, i.e., the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} &p_2(v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1))p_2 \\ &= p_2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\varphi_t(x_2)|^2 (-i\nabla_1 \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_2) + \text{h.c.}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \overline{\varphi_t}(x_2) (-i\nabla_2 \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_2 - x_1) + \text{h.c.}) \varphi_t(x_2) dx_2 \right) p_2 \\ &= p_2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (-i\nabla_1 \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R * |\varphi_t|^2 + \text{h.c.}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \nabla^\perp w_R(x_2 - x_1) \cdot (\overline{\varphi_t}(x_2) (-i\nabla_2) \varphi_t(x_2) + \text{h.c.}) dx_2 \right) p_2 \\ &= p_2 v'(x_1) p_2 \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

We can apply the above in

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{M}_V^{(1)} &= -i\beta \left\langle p_2 p_1, \left[(N-1)(v(x_1 - x_2) + v(x_2 - x_1)) - Nv'(x_1), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \right] q_1 p_2 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\ &= -i\beta \left\langle p_2 p_1, \left[v'(x_1), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \right] q_1 p_2 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\ &= -i\beta \left\langle p_2 p_1, v'(x_1) (\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) - \widehat{\tau_{-1} m}(\frac{1}{2})) q_1 p_2 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\ &= -\frac{i\beta}{N} \left\langle p_2 p_1, v'(x_1)^2 p_1 p_2 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)}^{1/2} \left\langle p_2 q_1, \hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2}) \hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2}) q_1 p_2 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)}^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

using that $p_1 q_1 v'(x_2) = 0$ in the first line of above and the inequality (4.22) to bound

$$\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) - \widehat{\tau_{-1} m}(\frac{1}{2}) \leq \frac{1}{N} \hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2}).$$

We obtain

$$|\dot{M}_V^{(1)}| \leq \frac{2|\beta|}{N} \|v'(x_1) p_2 p_1 \Psi_N(t)\| \|\hat{m}(-1) q_1 \Psi_N(t)\| \leq \frac{C}{N} \|v' \varphi_t\|_2 \leq CN^{-1} \quad (5.26)$$

using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (2.21) to bound $\|v'\varphi_t\|_2$. For the $\dot{M}_V^{(2)}$ term,

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{M}_V^{(2)} &= -i\frac{\beta}{2}\langle p_2p_1, ((N-1)(v(x_1-x_2)+v(x_2-x_1))-Nv'(x_1)-Nv'(x_2))(\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})-\widehat{\tau_{-2}m}(\frac{1}{2}))q_1q_2\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\ &= -i\frac{\beta(N-1)}{2}\langle p_2p_1, (v(x_1-x_2)+v(x_2-x_1))\hat{m}(\frac{1}{4})\hat{m}(-\frac{1}{4})(\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})-\widehat{\tau_{-2}m}(\frac{1}{2}))q_1q_2\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)}\end{aligned}$$

in which we used Lemma 4.3, the relation (4.21) and the fact that $p_2v'(x_1)q_2 = 0 = p_1v'(x_2)q_1$. We used the property (4.18) $\hat{m}(\xi)\hat{m}(-\xi) = \mathbb{1} - P_0$ with $P_0q_j = 0$.

By Cauchy-Schwarz we get

$$\begin{aligned}|\dot{M}_V^{(2)}|^2 &\leq CN^2\|v(x_1-x_2)\widehat{\tau_2m}(\frac{1}{4})p_2p_1\Psi_N(t)\|^2\|\hat{m}(-\frac{1}{4})(\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})-\widehat{\tau_{-2}m}(\frac{1}{2}))q_2q_1\Psi_N(t)\|^2 \\ &= C\langle p_2p_1, \widehat{\tau_2m}(\frac{1}{4})v^2(x_1-x_2)\widehat{\tau_2m}(\frac{1}{4})p_2p_1\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)}\langle q_2q_1, \hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2})\hat{m}^2(-1/2)q_2q_1\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\ &\leq C\|v(x_1-x_2)\varphi_t(x_1)\varphi_t(x_2)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}^2\|\widehat{\tau_2m}(\frac{1}{4})\Psi_N(t)\|^2\langle\Psi_N(t), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})\Psi_N(t)\rangle(1+\frac{1}{N})\end{aligned}$$

where we used the formula (4.19) to bound $\langle q_2q_1, \hat{m}(-\frac{3}{2})q_2q_1\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)}$ and formula (4.22) to bound $\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})-\widehat{\tau_{-2}m}(\frac{1}{2})$. We now use that

$$\langle\Psi_N(t), \widehat{\tau_2m}(\frac{1}{2})\Psi_N(t)\rangle \leq \langle\Psi_N(t), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})\Psi_N(t)\rangle + \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}} = M_N(t) + \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}$$

to get

$$|\dot{M}_V^{(2)}|^2 \leq C\|v(x_1-x_2)\varphi_t(x_1)\varphi_t(x_2)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}^2(M_N^2(t) + \frac{1}{N}) \leq C|\log R|^2(M_N^2(t) + \frac{1}{N})$$

where we concluded with (2.22).

The last term $\dot{M}_V^{(3)}$

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{M}_V^{(3)} &= -i\beta\left\langle p_1q_2, \left[(N-1)(v(x_1-x_2)+v(x_2-x_1))-Nv'(x_1), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})\right]q_1q_2\right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \quad (5.27) \\ &= -i\beta\langle p_1q_2, ((N-1)(v(x_1-x_2)+v(x_2-x_1))-Nv'(x_1))(\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})-\widehat{\tau_{-1}m}(\frac{1}{2}))q_1q_2\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)}\end{aligned}$$

by the Lemma 4.3. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned}|\dot{M}_V^{(3)}| &\leq CN\|(\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})-\widehat{\tau_{-1}m}(\frac{1}{2}))q_1q_2\Psi_N(t)\|_2 \\ &\quad \times \left(\|v(x_1-x_2)p_1q_2\Psi_N(t)\|_2 + \|v(x_2-x_1)p_1q_2\Psi_N(t)\|_2 + \|v'(x_1)p_1q_2\Psi_N(t)\|_2\right) \\ &\leq C|\log R|\|\hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2})q_1q_2\Psi_N(t)\|_2(\|\nabla_1q_1\Psi_N(t)\| + \|v'(x_1)\varphi_t(x_1)\|_2) \\ &\leq C|\log R|\sqrt{E_N^{(1)}}(\|\nabla_1q_1\Psi_N(t)\| + \|v'(x_1)\varphi_t(x_1)\|_2) \\ &\leq C|\log R|(E_N^{(1)} + \|\nabla_1q_1\Psi_N(t)\|^2)\end{aligned}$$

where we used (2.21) and Lemma 2.29 to conclude. This ends the proof of the lemma. \square

5.4 The Three-Body Term W

Here, we estimate the W term of (5.21).

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\Psi_N(t)$ denote the solution of the Schrödinger equation (1.9) with the initial data $\Psi_N(0) = \varphi_0^{\otimes N}$, where $\varphi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Let W be as defined in (4.10), and let $\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})$ be as defined in (4.15). Then there exist two constants $C, c > 0$ such that for any β , $0 < R \leq c$ and any $0 \leq t \leq T$ we have*

$$|\langle \Psi_N(t), [W, \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})] \Psi_N(t) \rangle| \leq C |\log R|^4 M_N(t) + C |\log R| \|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N(t)\|^2 + \frac{C |\log R|}{\sqrt{N}} \quad (5.28)$$

for q_1 as in (4.3) with φ_t solving CSS(R, φ_0).

Proof. We denote

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{M}_W &:= -i \left\langle \Psi_N(t), \left[\frac{\beta^2}{N^2} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{\substack{m \neq k \\ n \neq m \neq k}} w(x_k - x_m, x_k - x_n) - \sum_{j=1}^N w'(x_j), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \right] \Psi_N(t) \right\rangle \\ &= -i \frac{\beta^2}{3} \left\langle \left[\frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N} \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) - N(w'(x_1) + w'(x_2) + w'(x_3)), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \right] \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \end{aligned}$$

As in (4.36), we introduce $\mathbb{1}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^6)} = (p_1 + q_1)(p_2 + q_2)(p_3 + q_3)$ on each side of the scalar product and obtain six terms $\dot{M}_W := \sum_{i=1}^6 \dot{M}_W^{(i)}$ which are the same as in (4.36) but with $\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2})$ instead of $\hat{m}(1)$. We treat them one by one. We start by noting that we have the mean-field cancelation

$$\begin{aligned} p_3 p_2 \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) p_2 p_3 &= p_2 p_3 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |\varphi_t(x_2)|^2 |\varphi_t(x_3)|^2 \left(\nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_2) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_3) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 2 \nabla^\perp w_R(x_2 - x_1) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_2 - x_3) \right) dx_1 dx_2 \right) p_2 p_3 \\ &= p_3 p_2 w'(x_1) p_2 p_3 \end{aligned} \quad (5.29)$$

implying that

$$|\dot{M}_W^{(1)}| \leq C \left| \langle p_3 p_2 p_1, w'(x_1) (\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) - \widehat{\tau_{-1} m}(\frac{1}{2})) q_1 p_2 p_3 \rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \right| \leq \frac{C}{N} \|w'(x_1) \varphi_t(x_1)\|_2 \leq C N^{-1} \quad (5.30)$$

where we used the bound (4.22) and (2.23). To treat $\dot{M}_W^{(4)}$, we use that $\hat{m}(-\frac{1}{4}) \hat{m}(\frac{1}{4}) q_1 = q_1$ to get,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{M}_W^{(4)} &= -i \beta^2 \frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N} \left\langle p_3 p_2 p_1, \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) \hat{m}(\frac{1}{4}) \hat{m}(-\frac{1}{4}) (\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) - \widehat{\tau_{-2} m}(\frac{1}{2})) p_1 q_2 q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \\ &\leq C \left\langle p_3 p_2 p_1, \widehat{\tau_2 m}(\frac{1}{4}) \tilde{W}^2(x_1, x_2, x_3) \widehat{\tau_2 m}(\frac{1}{4}) p_1 p_2 p_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)}^{1/2} \|\hat{m}(-\frac{1}{4}) \hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2}) q_2 q_3 \Psi_N\| \\ &\leq C \left\| \tilde{W} \varphi_t(x_1) \varphi_t(x_2) \varphi_t(x_3) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^6)} \left\| \widehat{\tau_2 m}(\frac{1}{2}) \Psi_N \right\| \left\| \hat{m}(\frac{1}{4}) \Psi_N \right\| \\ &\leq C |\log R| M_N(t) \end{aligned} \quad (5.31)$$

via a Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, using (4.19) and (4.18) on $\|\hat{m}(-\frac{3}{4})q_1q_3\Psi_N\|$ and where we applied (2.24) to bound the last norm. The next term is

$$\begin{aligned}
|\dot{M}_W^{(6)}| &\leq C \left| \left\langle q_3p_2p_1, \left(\frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N} \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) - Nw'(x_1) \right) (\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) - \widehat{\tau_{-1}m}(\frac{1}{2})) q_1p_2q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \right| \\
&\leq CN \left\| (\tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) - w'(x_1)) q_3p_2p_1 \Psi_N \right\| \left\| (\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) - \widehat{\tau_{-1}m}(\frac{1}{2})) q_1p_2q_3 \Psi_N \right\| \\
&\leq C \left\| (\tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) - w'(x_1)) q_3p_2p_1 \Psi_N \right\| \sqrt{E_N^{(1)}} \\
&\leq C \sqrt{E_N^{(1)}} \left(\|w'\varphi_t\|_2 \sqrt{E_N^{(1)}} + \left\| \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) q_3p_2p_1 \Psi_N \right\| \right). \tag{5.32}
\end{aligned}$$

The term $\|w'\varphi_t\|_2$ has been calculated in (2.23). For the last norm of above, we expand \tilde{W}^2 and use for each of the terms

$$|\nabla^\perp w_R(x-y) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x-z)|^2 \leq |\nabla^\perp w_R(x-y)|^2 |\nabla^\perp w_R(x-z)|^2$$

in order to apply (2.12) in the variable x_1 and x_2 for all of the terms using that

$$|\nabla^\perp w_R(x-y)|^2 = |\nabla^\perp w_R(y-x)|^2.$$

We get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\dot{M}_W^{(6)}| &\leq CE_N^{(1)} + C |\log R|^2 \sqrt{E_N^{(1)}} \langle q_3p_1p_2, (1-\Delta_1)(1-\Delta_2)q_3p_1p_2 \rangle_{\Psi_N}^{1/2} \\
&\leq C |\log R|^2 E_N^{(1)}. \tag{5.33}
\end{aligned}$$

We now treat

$$\begin{aligned}
|\dot{M}_W^{(3)}| &\leq CN \left| \left\langle p_3p_2p_1, \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) \hat{m}(\frac{1}{4}) \hat{m}(-\frac{1}{4}) (\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) - \widehat{\tau_{-3}m}(\frac{1}{2})) q_1q_2q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \right| \\
&\leq CN \left\| \hat{m}(-\frac{1}{4}) (\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) - \widehat{\tau_{-3}m}(\frac{1}{2})) q_3q_2q_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \left\| \tilde{W} \widehat{\tau_3 m}(\frac{1}{4}) p_3p_2p_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \\
&\leq C \left\| \hat{m}(-\frac{1}{4}) \hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2}) q_3q_2q_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \left\| \tilde{W} \widehat{\tau_3 m}(\frac{1}{2}) p_3p_2p_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \\
&\leq C \sqrt{M_N} \left\| \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) \varphi_t(x_1) \varphi_t(x_2) \varphi_t(x_3) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^6)} \left\| \widehat{\tau_3 m}(\frac{1}{4}) p_3p_2p_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \\
&\leq C \sqrt{M_N} \left\| \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) \varphi_t(x_1) \varphi_t(x_2) \varphi_t(x_3) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^6)} \left(\sqrt{M_N} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}} \right) \\
&\leq C |\log R| (M_N(t) + N^{-1}) \tag{5.34}
\end{aligned}$$

by (2.24). We continue with

$$\begin{aligned}
|\dot{M}_W^{(2)}| &\leq CN \left| \left\langle q_3p_2p_1, \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) (\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) - \widehat{\tau_{-2}m}(\frac{1}{2})) q_1q_2q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)} \right| \\
&\leq C \left\| \tilde{W} q_3p_2p_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \left\| \hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2}) q_3q_2q_1 \Psi_N \right\| \\
&\leq C \left\| \tilde{W} q_3p_2p_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \sqrt{E_N^{(1)}} \\
&\leq C |\log R|^2 E_N^{(1)} \tag{5.35}
\end{aligned}$$

where we concluded using the previous calculation (5.32). There is left to estimate

$$\dot{M}_W^{(5)} = -2i\beta^2 \operatorname{Im} \left\langle q_3 q_2 p_1, \left(\frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N} \tilde{W}(x_1, x_2, x_3) - N w'(x_1) \right) (\hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) - \widehat{\tau_{-1} m}(\frac{1}{2})) q_1 q_2 q_3 \right\rangle_{\Psi_N(t)}.$$

With the help of Lemma 2.5 to bound the following $\left\| \tilde{W} q_3 q_2 p_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\|$ term as previously, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\dot{M}_W^{(5)}| &\leq C \|w' \varphi_t\|_2 \|\hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2}) q_3 q_2 q_1 \Psi_N\| + C \left\| \tilde{W} q_3 q_2 p_1 \Psi_N(t) \right\| \|\hat{m}(-\frac{1}{2}) q_3 q_2 q_1 \Psi_N\| \\ &\leq C \sqrt{E_N^{(1)}} (\|w' \varphi_t\|_2 + |\log R|^2 \|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N(t)\|) \\ &\leq C |\log R|^4 (E_N^{(1)} + \|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N(t)\|^2) \end{aligned} \quad (5.36)$$

where we used (2.23) to conclude. Gathering all the previous estimates provides the proof. \square

6 Conclusion

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We can now prove Theorem 1.3. We work as usual under the assumption that $\varphi_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $|\beta| \leq c$, $R \leq c'$ and that $0 \leq t \leq T$ to make use of Theorem 4.1 combined with Lemma 5.1 in which we plug the result of Theorem 5.4 to bound $M_N = \langle \Psi_N(t), \hat{m}(\frac{1}{2}) \Psi_N(t) \rangle$. We get

$$\|\nabla_1 q_1 \Psi_N(t)\|^2 \leq C \frac{1}{\sqrt{N} R^4} e^{CT \frac{|\log R|}{R^2}}.$$

Then Theorem 4.1 implies that

$$\partial_t E_N^{(1)}(t) \leq C |\log R| E_N^{(1)} + C \frac{|\log R|}{\sqrt{N} R^4} e^{CT \frac{|\log R|}{R^2}}$$

and we get, via Grönwall's Lemma 1.14, the estimate

$$E_N^{(1)}(t) \leq C \frac{|\log R|}{\sqrt{N} R^4} e^{CT \frac{|\log R|}{R^2}}.$$

We finally use it in

$$\operatorname{Tr} \left| \gamma_N^{(k)}(t) - |\varphi_t^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle \varphi_t^{\otimes k}| \right| \leq \operatorname{Tr} \left| |\varphi_t^R\rangle \langle \varphi_t^R|^{\otimes k} - |\varphi_t^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle \varphi_t^{\otimes k}| \right| + \operatorname{Tr} \left| \gamma_N^{(k)}(t) - |\varphi_t^R\rangle \langle \varphi_t^R|^{\otimes k} \right|. \quad (6.1)$$

To bound the first term of above, we apply Lemma 3.4, which gives

$$\operatorname{Tr} \left| |\varphi_t^R\rangle \langle \varphi_t^R|^{\otimes k} - |\varphi_t^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle \varphi_t^{\otimes k}| \right| \leq 2k \|\varphi_t^R - \varphi_t\|_2 \leq CR. \quad (6.2)$$

For the second, we use [25, Eq. (2.3b)] to have

$$\operatorname{Tr} \left| |\varphi_t^R\rangle \langle \varphi_t^R|^{\otimes k} - |\varphi_t^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle \varphi_t^{\otimes k}| \right| = R_N^{(k)}(t) \leq \sqrt{8E_N^{(k)}(t)} \leq C \frac{|\log R|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{RN^{\frac{1}{4}}} e^{CT \frac{|\log R|}{R^2}}.$$

We then get the final result by choosing $R = (\log N)^{-\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. We then have

$$\operatorname{Tr} \left| \gamma_N^{(k)}(t) - |\varphi_t^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle \varphi_t^{\otimes k}| \right| \leq \frac{C e^{CT}}{(\log N)^{\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon}} + C \frac{(\log N)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{N^{\frac{1}{4}}} N^{\frac{CT \log \log N}{(\log N)^\varepsilon}} \rightarrow 0 \quad (6.3)$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$. \square

A Useful Estimates

Here we repeat some useful generic bounds well-known in the literature.

Lemma A.1 (Bound on the magnetic term). *We have for any $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $R \geq 0$, that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\mathbf{A}^R[|u|^2]|^2 |u|^2 \leq \frac{3}{2} \|u\|_2^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla|u||^2 \leq \frac{3}{2} \|u\|_2^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla|u||^2.$$

Proof. The proof follows the one of [33, Lemma A.1] but with $\nabla^\perp w_R$ instead of $\nabla^\perp w_0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\mathbf{A}^R[|u|^2](x)|^2 |u(x)|^2 dx &= \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^6} \frac{x-y}{|x-y|_R^2} \cdot \frac{x-z}{|x-z|_R^2} |u(x)|^2 |u(y)|^2 |u(z)|^2 dx dy dz \\ &\leq \frac{1}{6} \int_{\mathbb{R}^6} \frac{1}{\rho(X)^2} ||u|^{\otimes 3}|^2 dX \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^6} |\nabla_X |u|^{\otimes 3}|^2 dX = \frac{3}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla|u(x)||^2 dx \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u(x)|^2 dx \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we used the symmetry and that

$$0 \leq \frac{x-y}{|x-y|_R^2} \cdot \frac{x-z}{|x-z|_R^2} + \frac{y-x}{|y-x|_R^2} \cdot \frac{y-z}{|y-z|_R^2} + \frac{z-y}{|z-y|_R^2} \cdot \frac{z-x}{|z-x|_R^2} \leq \frac{C}{\rho^2(x, y, z)} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

as shown in [33, Proof of Lemma 2.4, inequality (2.13)] with $\rho^2(x, y, z) = |x-y|^2 + |y-z|^2 + |z-x|^2$ and where we concluded applying Hardy' inequality [33, Lemma 2.5]. \square

Lemma A.2 (Basic magnetic inequality). *We have for $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $R \geq 0$, that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |(\nabla + i\beta \mathbf{A}^R[|u|^2])u|^2 \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla|u||^2. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

This is the usual diamagnetic inequality, the proof can be founded in [26, Lemma 1.4].

Proposition A.3. *The functional $\mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[u_0]$ converges pointwise to $\mathcal{E}^{\text{af}}[u_0]$ as $R \rightarrow 0$*

$$\left| \mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[u_0] - \mathcal{E}^{\text{af}}[u_0] \right| \leq C(1 + \mathcal{E}^{\text{af}}[u_0]^{\frac{3}{2}})R. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

This proposition can be found in [33, Proposition A.6].

B BBGKY Hierarchy

Here we show how the pilot equation (1.11) can be formally inferred from the BBGKY hierarchy. We start from (1.6) and express each term of (1.10) in term of the reduced density matrices to get

$$\begin{aligned}
i\partial_t \gamma_N^{(k)} &= \sum_{j=1}^k \left[-\Delta_j, \gamma_N^{(k)} \right] \\
&+ \alpha \sum_{\substack{j,l=1 \\ j \neq l}}^k \left[\left(-i\nabla_j \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_l) + \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_l) \cdot -i\nabla_j \right), \gamma_N^{(k)} \right] \\
&+ \alpha(N-k) \sum_{j=1}^k \text{Tr}_{k+1} \left[\left(-i\nabla_j \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_{k+1}) + \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_{k+1}) \cdot -i\nabla_j \right), \gamma_N^{(k+1)} \right] \\
&+ \alpha(N-k) \sum_{l=1}^k \text{Tr}_{k+1} \left[\left(-i\nabla_{k+1} \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_{k+1} - x_l) + \nabla^\perp w_R(x_{k+1} - x_l) \cdot -i\nabla_{k+1} \right), \gamma_N^{(k+1)} \right] \\
&+ 2\alpha^2 \sum_{\substack{j,l=1 \\ j < l}}^k \left[\left| \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_l) \right|^2, \gamma_N^{(k)} \right] \\
&+ 2(N-k)\alpha^2 \sum_{j=1}^k \text{Tr}_{k+1} \left[\left| \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_{k+1}) \right|^2, \gamma_N^{(k+1)} \right] \\
&+ \alpha^2 \sum_{\substack{j,l,m=1 \\ j \neq l \neq m}}^k \left[\nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_l) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_m), \gamma_N^{(k)} \right] \\
&+ 2(N-k)\alpha^2 \sum_{\substack{j,m=1 \\ j \neq m}}^k \text{Tr}_{k+1} \left[\nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_{k+1}) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_m), \gamma_N^{(k+1)} \right] \\
&+ (N-k)\alpha^2 \sum_{\substack{l,m=1 \\ l \neq m}}^k \text{Tr}_{k+1} \left[\nabla^\perp w_R(x_{k+1} - x_l) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_{k+1} - x_m), \gamma_N^{(k+1)} \right] \\
&+ 2(N-k)(N-k-1)\alpha^2 \sum_{m=1}^k \text{Tr}_{k+1,k+2} \left[\nabla^\perp w_R(x_{k+1} - x_{k+2}) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_{k+1} - x_m), \gamma_N^{(k+2)} \right] \\
&+ 2(N-k)(N-k-1)\alpha^2 \sum_{j=1}^k \text{Tr}_{k+1,k+2} \left[\nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_{k+1}) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_{k+2}), \gamma_N^{(k+2)} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

The limit can be taken formally with $\alpha = \beta/(N - 1)$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
i\partial_t \gamma_\infty^{(k)} &= \sum_{j=1}^k \left[-\Delta_j, \gamma_\infty^{(k)} \right] \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^k \text{Tr}_{k+1} \left[\left(-i\nabla_j \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_{k+1}) + \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_{k+1}) \cdot -i\nabla_j \right), \gamma_\infty^{(k+1)} \right] \\
&+ \sum_{l=1}^k \text{Tr}_{k+1} \left[\left(-i\nabla_{k+1} \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_{k+1} - x_l) + \nabla^\perp w_R(x_{k+1} - x_l) \cdot -i\nabla_{k+1} \right), \gamma_\infty^{(k+1)} \right] \\
&+ 2 \sum_{m=1}^k \text{Tr}_{k+1, k+2} \left[\nabla^\perp w_R(x_{k+1} - x_{k+2}) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_{k+1} - x_m), \gamma_\infty^{(k+2)} \right] \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^k \text{Tr}_{k+1, k+2} \left[\nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_{k+1}) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_j - x_{k+2}), \gamma_\infty^{(k+2)} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

under the formal assumption that $\gamma_\infty^{(k)}$ exists. If we also assume that it takes the form of a product state $\gamma^{(k)} = |\varphi^{\otimes k}\rangle\langle\varphi^{\otimes k}|$ in the limit, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
i\partial_t \gamma^{(1)} &= \left[-\Delta_1, \gamma^{(1)} \right] \\
&+ \beta \text{Tr}_2 \left[\left(-i\nabla_1 \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_2) + \nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_2) \cdot -i\nabla_1 \right), \gamma^{(2)} \right] \\
&+ \beta \text{Tr}_2 \left[\left(-i\nabla_2 \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_2 - x_1) + \nabla^\perp w_R(x_2 - x_1) \cdot -i\nabla_2 \right), \gamma^{(2)} \right] \\
&+ 2\beta^2 \text{Tr}_{2,3} \left[\nabla^\perp w_R(x_2 - x_3) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_2 - x_1), \gamma^{(3)} \right] \\
&+ \beta^2 \text{Tr}_{2,3} \left[\nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_2) \cdot \nabla^\perp w_R(x_1 - x_3), \gamma^{(3)} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

By taking the limit $R \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
i\partial_t \gamma^{(1)} &= \left[(-i\nabla + \beta \mathbf{A} [|\varphi_t|^2])^2, \gamma^{(1)} \right] \\
&- \beta \left[\nabla^\perp w_R * (2\beta \mathbf{A} [|\varphi_t|^2] |\varphi_t|^2 + i(\varphi_t \nabla \bar{\varphi}_t - \bar{\varphi}_t \nabla \varphi_t)), \gamma^{(1)} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

The above is equivalent to the CSS pilot equation

$$\begin{aligned}
i\partial_t \varphi_t &= (-i\nabla + \beta \mathbf{A} [|\varphi_t|^2])^2 \varphi_t \\
&- \beta \left[\nabla^\perp w_0 * (2\beta \mathbf{A} [|\varphi_t|^2] |\varphi_t|^2 + i(\varphi_t \nabla \bar{\varphi}_t - \bar{\varphi}_t \nabla \varphi_t)) \right] \varphi_t
\end{aligned} \tag{B.4}$$

in which

$$\mathbf{A} [|\varphi_t|^2] := \mathbf{A}^{R=0} [|\varphi_t|^2] = \nabla^\perp w_0 * |\varphi_t|^2. \tag{B.5}$$

C Remark on the Dynamics with Two-Body Interaction

By following [39], adding a two-body interaction $W_{N,\delta}$ to the energy should be strait-forward. The new Hamiltonian would be

$$H_N = \sum_{j=1}^N (-i\nabla_j + \alpha \mathbf{A}_j^R)^2 - \frac{g}{N-1} \sum_{i \neq j=1}^N W_{N,\nu}(x_i - x_j), \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where $\alpha = \beta/(N-1)$ and

$$W_{N,\nu}(x) = N^{2\nu} \mathbf{w}(N^\nu x) \quad \text{for some } \mathbf{w} \in C_c^\infty \text{ with } \|\mathbf{w}\|_1 = 1 \text{ and } \nu > 0.$$

Note that the ground state of such a Hamiltonian is studied in detail in [36, 2] for many interesting regimes of R and ν .

The new CSS equation would include a non-linear interaction with coupling constant g

$$\begin{aligned} i\partial_t u &= (-i\nabla + \beta \mathbf{A} [|u|^2])^2 u - g|u|^2 u \\ &\quad - \beta \left[\nabla^\perp w_R * (2\beta \mathbf{A} [|u|^2] |u|^2 + i(u\nabla \bar{u} - \bar{u}\nabla u)) \right] u. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

It is clear from [39] that the derivation of this new pilot equation holds with the interacting H_N . We would then have, for $R = N^{-\eta}$, $0 < \eta < c$ and some restricted $\nu > 0$, that

$$\text{Tr} \left| \gamma_N^{(k)}(t) - |\varphi_t^{\otimes k}\rangle \langle \varphi_t^{\otimes k}| \right| \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{C.3})$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$. The only point that would need to be checked is the R -dependent well-posedness and the control of $\|u\|_{H^2}$ of Theorem 3.2. Some work would be needed to show that similar results still hold when adding the term $g|u|^2 u$ to the pilot equation. We refer to [36, Theorem 2] for detail about the specific possible interesting regimes.

D Global Wellposedness of $\text{CSS}(R, \varphi_0)$

We give here an other version of Theorem 3.2 in which we allow some divergence in the parameter R . It provides the global well-posedness for any $R > 0$, $T(R) = +\infty$, and does not require the constraint $|\beta| \leq c$. The price to pay to relax this constraint on β is the diverging control we obtain in (D.1) compared to (3.4).

Theorem D.1 (Global well-posedness in H^2). *For any $0 \leq R < 1$ and any initial data $u_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ there exists a time $T(R) > 0$ only depending on R and on $\|u_0\|_{H^2}$ such that $\text{CSS}(R, u_0)$ has a unique solution*

$$u \in C([0, T(R)], H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)).$$

Moreover, when $R > 0$ we have the control

$$\|-\Delta u_t\|_2 \leq CR^{-Ct} \quad (\text{D.1})$$

implying that $T(R) = +\infty$.

Proof. Note that the abstract well-posedness is provided in the proof of Theorem 3.2. Thus, it is enough to bound $\|-\Delta u_t\|_2$ globally in time.

$$\begin{aligned}
\|-\Delta u_t\|_2 &= \|(\nabla - \mathbf{i}\mathcal{A}_R + \mathbf{i}\mathcal{A}_R)^2 u_t\|_2 \\
&\leq \|(\nabla - \mathbf{i}\mathcal{A}_R)^2 u_t\|_2 + \|\beta \mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2](-\mathbf{i}\nabla + \beta \mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2])u_t\|_2 + |\beta|^2 \|\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2]^2 u_t\|_2 \\
&\leq \|(\mathbf{i}\partial_t - \mathcal{A}_R^0)u_t\|_2 + |\beta| \|\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2]\|_\infty (\mathcal{E}_R^{\text{af}}[u_0] + |\beta| \|\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2]u_t\|_2) \\
&\leq \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 + \|\mathcal{A}_R^0 u_t\|_2 + C\sqrt{|\log R|} \|u_0\|_{H^1}^3 \\
&\leq \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 + C\sqrt{|\log R|} \|u_t\|_{H^1}^3.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.2}$$

Here we replaced the constraint on β of Theorem 3.2 by a $|\log R|$ divergence. We now use (3.12) to compute

$$\partial_t \|\partial_t u_t\|_2^2 = \partial_t \|\mathcal{A}u_t\|_2^2 = 2i \operatorname{Im} \langle (\mathbf{i}\partial_t \mathcal{A})u_t, \mathcal{A}u_t \rangle + 2i \operatorname{Im} \langle \mathcal{A}^2 u_t, \mathcal{A}u_t \rangle.$$

The second term in the above is the imaginary part of a real number and cancels. We then have to bound

$$2i \operatorname{Im} \langle (\mathbf{i}\partial_t \mathcal{A})u_t, \mathcal{A}u_t \rangle = 2i \operatorname{Im} \langle \mathbf{i}\partial_t (-\mathbf{i}\nabla + \beta \mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2])^2 u_t + (\mathbf{i}\partial_t \mathcal{A}_R^0)u_t, \mathcal{A}u_t \rangle := E^{(1)} + E^{(2)}. \tag{D.3}$$

To treat $E^{(1)}$, we first calculate

$$\mathbf{i}\partial_t \mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2] = 2\nabla^\perp w_R * \operatorname{Re}[\bar{u}_t \mathbf{i}\partial_t u_t] \tag{D.4}$$

and get

$$|E^{(1)}| = 8 \left| \operatorname{Im} \left\langle \beta \nabla^\perp w_R * \operatorname{Re}[\bar{u}_t \mathbf{i}\partial_t u_t] \cdot (-\mathbf{i}\nabla + \beta \mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2])u_t, \partial_t u_t \right\rangle \right| \tag{D.5}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
|E^{(1)}| &\leq C \|\nabla^\perp w_R * \operatorname{Re}[\bar{u}_t \mathbf{i}\partial_t u_t]\|_\infty \|(-\mathbf{i}\nabla + \beta \mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2])u_t\|_2 \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \\
&\leq C \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_0\|_{H^1} \|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2+\varepsilon} \|\bar{u}_t \mathbf{i}\partial_t u_t\|_{\frac{2+\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}} \\
&\leq C \sqrt{|\log R|} \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_0\|_{H^1} \|\mathbf{i}\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_t\|_{\frac{2+2\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}} \\
&\leq C |\log R| \|\partial_t u_t\|_2^2 \|u_0\|_{H^1}^2
\end{aligned} \tag{D.6}$$

where we used the inequality (3.12) to get the last line but also Young's inequality for the convolution, the conservation of energy (3.3) and the estimates (3.4) with $\varepsilon = |\log R|^{-1}$. We now treat

$$\begin{aligned}
|E^{(2)}| &= 2|\operatorname{Im} \langle (\mathbf{i}\partial_t \mathcal{A}_R^0)u_t, \mathcal{A}u_t \rangle| \\
&\leq C \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_t\|_4 \|\mathbf{i}\partial_t \mathcal{A}_R^0\|_4 \\
&\leq C \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_t\|_4 \|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w} \|4\beta \mathbf{A}^R[\operatorname{Re}(\bar{u}_t \mathbf{i}\partial_t u_t)]|u_t|^2 + 4\beta \mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2] \operatorname{Re}(\bar{u}_t \mathbf{i}\partial_t u_t)\|_{\frac{4}{3}} \\
&\quad + C \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_t\|_4 \|\nabla^\perp w_R * J[\mathbf{i}\partial_t u_t]\|_4.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have two $\frac{4}{3}$ -norms to treat and the last term. The first gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|4\beta\mathbf{A}^R[\operatorname{Re}(\bar{u}_t i \partial_t u_t)]|u_t|^2\|_{\frac{4}{3}} &\leq C\| |u_t|^2 \|_2 \|\nabla^\perp w_R * \operatorname{Re}(\bar{u}_t i \partial_t u_t)\|_4 \\ &\leq C\| |u_t|^2 \|_2 \|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w} \|\bar{u}_t i \partial_t u_t\|_{\frac{4}{3}} \\ &\leq Cs\| |u_t|^2 \|_2 \|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w} \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_t\|_4. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.7})$$

Here we used (WY). The second provides

$$\|4\beta\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2] \operatorname{Re}(\bar{u}_t i \partial_t u_t)\|_{\frac{4}{3}} \leq C\|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|\mathbf{A}^R[|u_t|^2]\|_8 \|u_t\|_8 \leq C\|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_0\|_{H^1}^2. \quad (\text{D.8})$$

The last term to treat is

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \nabla^\perp w_R * J[i\partial_t u_t] \right\|_4 &= \left\| \nabla^\perp w_R * i[(i\partial_t u_t)\nabla\bar{u}_t + u_t\nabla(i\partial_t\bar{u}_t) - (i\partial_t\bar{u}_t)\nabla u_t - \bar{u}_t\nabla(i\partial_t u_t)] \right\|_4 \\ &\leq 4 \left\| \nabla^\perp w_R * (i\partial_t u_t)\nabla\bar{u}_t \right\|_4 \\ &\leq C\|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w} \|(i\partial_t u_t)\nabla\bar{u}_t\|_{\frac{4}{3}} \\ &\leq C\|\nabla^\perp w_R\|_{2,w} \|\partial_t u_t\|_2 \|u_t\|_4 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.9})$$

where we first used that $\nabla^\perp \cdot \nabla = 0$ to integrate by part in the convolution product the two $u_t\nabla(i\partial_t\bar{u}_t)$ terms and then (WY). We then conclude that

$$|E^{(2)}| \leq C\|\partial_t u_t\|_2^2 (\|u_t\|_{H^1}^4 + \|u_t\|_{H^1}^3 + \|u_t\|_{H^1}^2). \quad (\text{D.10})$$

If we gather (D.6) and (D.10) we get

$$\partial_t \|\partial_t u_t\|_2^2 \leq C|\log R| \|\partial_t u_t\|_2^2. \quad (\text{D.11})$$

We can apply Grönwall's lemma 1.14 to the above line and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t u_t\|_2^2 &\leq C\|\mathcal{A}u_0\|_2^2 e^{C|\log R|t} \\ &\leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^2}^2 + \|u_0\|_{H^1}^6) e^{C|\log R|t} \leq CR^{-Ct}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.12})$$

This last inequality plugged into (D.2) allows us to state that $T(R) = +\infty$ and concludes the proof. \square

Acknowledgment

We thank Paolo Antonelli, Kihyun Kim, and Sung-Jin Oh for helpful discussion about Chern–Simons–Schrödinger equation. We also appreciate Serena Cenatiempo, Younghun Hong, Peter Pickl, and Nicolas Rougerie for insightful discussion. T.G. is supported by the mathematics area of GSSI, L'Aquila, Italy. J.L. is supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation through the NCCR SwissMAP, the SNSF Eccellenza project PCEFP2_181153, by the Swiss State Secretariat for Research and Innovation through the project P.530.1016 (AEQUA), and Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Ministry of Education (RS-2024-00411072). Part of this work was carried out during a visit to GSSI. We would like to express our gratitude to GSSI for hosting and funding J.L.'s visit to L'Aquila.

References

- [1] A. ATAEI, *A sharp condition on global wellposedness of Chern–Simons–Schrödinger equation*, 2024. arXiv:2405.07315.
- [2] A. ATAEI, D. LUNDHOLM, AND D.-T. NGUYEN, *A generalized liouville equation and magnetic stability*, 2024. arXiv:2404.09332.
- [3] I. AVRON, J. HERBST AND B. SIMON, *Schrödinger operators with magnetic fields. 1. general interactions*, Duke Math. J., 45 N 4 (1978).
- [4] N. BENEDIKTER, G. DE OLIVEIRA, AND B. SCHLEIN, *Quantitative derivation of the Gross–Pitaevskii equation*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 68 (2015), pp. 1399–1482.
- [5] L. BERGE, A. DE BOUARD, AND J. C. SAUT, *Blowing up time-dependent solutions of the planar, Chern–Simons gauged nonlinear schrodinger equation*, Nonlinearity, 8 (1995), p. 235.
- [6] C. BOCCATO, C. BRENNER, S. CENATIEMPO, AND B. SCHLEIN, *Complete Bose–Einstein condensation in the Gross–Pitaevskii regime*, Comm. Math. Phys., 359 (2018), pp. 975–1026.
- [7] C. BOCCATO, S. CENATIEMPO, AND B. SCHLEIN, *Quantum many-body fluctuations around nonlinear Schrödinger dynamics*, 18 (2017), pp. 113–191.
- [8] L. CHEN, J. O. LEE, AND J. LEE, *Rate of convergence toward Hartree dynamics with singular interaction potential*, J. Math. Phys., 59 (2018), pp. 031902, 20.
- [9] L. CHEN, J. O. LEE, AND B. SCHLEIN, *Rate of convergence towards Hartree dynamics*, J. Stat. Phys., 144 (2011), pp. 872–903.
- [10] T. CHEN AND N. PAVLOVIĆ, *The quintic NLS as the mean field limit of a boson gas with three-body interactions*, J. Funct. Anal., 260 (2011), pp. 959–997.
- [11] X. CHEN, *Second order corrections to mean field evolution for weakly interacting bosons in the case of three-body interactions*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 203 (2012), pp. 455–497.
- [12] M. CORREGGI, R. DUBOSCQ, D. LUNDHOLM, AND N. ROUGERIE, *Vortex patterns in the almost-bosonic anyon gas*, Europhysics Letters, 126 (2019), p. 20005.
- [13] M. CORREGGI, D. LUNDHOLM, AND N. ROUGERIE, *Local density approximation for the almost-bosonic anyon gas*, Anal. PDE., 10 (2017), pp. 1169–1200.
- [14] L. ERDŐS, B. SCHLEIN, AND H.-T. YAU, *Derivation of the Gross–Pitaevskii equation for the dynamics of Bose–Einstein condensate*, Ann. of Math. (2), 172 (2010), pp. 291–370.
- [15] L. ERDŐS AND H.-T. YAU, *Derivation of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation from a many body Coulomb system*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys., 5 (2001), pp. 1169–1205.
- [16] J. ESPOSITO, *An indefinite system of equations governing the fractional quantum Hall effect*, 2018. arXiv:1810.07723.
- [17] J. GINIBRE AND G. VELO, *The classical field limit of scattering theory for nonrelativistic many-boson systems. I*, Commun. Math. Phys., 66 (1979), pp. 37–76.

- [18] ———, *The classical field limit of scattering theory for nonrelativistic many-boson systems. II*, Commun. Math. Phys., 68 (1979), pp. 45–68.
- [19] T. GIRARDOT, *Average field approximation for almost bosonic anyons in a magnetic field*, J. Math. Phys., 61 (2020), p. 071901.
- [20] K. HEPP, *The classical limit for quantum mechanical correlation functions*, Comm. Math. Phys., 35 (1974), pp. 265–277.
- [21] R. IENGO AND K. LECHNE, *Anyon quantum mechanics and Chern–Simons theory*, Phys. Rep., 213 (1992), pp. 179–269.
- [22] R. JACKIW AND S.-Y. PI, *Classical and quantal nonrelativistic Chern–Simons theory*, Phys. Rev. D, 42 (1990), p. 3500.
- [23] ———, *Soliton solutions to the gauged nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the plane*, Phys. Rev. Lett., 64 (1990), p. 2969.
- [24] A. KNOWLES AND P. PICKL, *Mean-field dynamics: singular potentials and rate of convergence*, Commun. Math. Phys., 298 (2010), pp. 101–138.
- [25] ———, *Mean-field dynamics: singular potentials and rate of convergence*, Comm. Math. Phys., 298 (2010), pp. 101–138.
- [26] S. LARSON AND D. LUNDHOLM, *Exclusion bounds for extended anyons*, 2018.
- [27] J. LEE, *Rate of convergence towards mean-field evolution for weakly interacting bosons with singular three-body interactions*, 2021. arXiv:2006.13040.
- [28] E. H. LIEB AND M. LOSS, *Analysis*, vol. 14 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2nd ed., 2001.
- [29] Z. M. LIM, *Well-posedness and scattering of the Chern-Simons-Schrödinger system*, PhD thesis, 2017.
- [30] B. LIU AND P. SMITH, *Global wellposedness of the equivariant Chern–Simons–Schrödinger equation*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam., 32 (2016), pp. 751–794.
- [31] B. LIU, P. SMITH, AND D. TATARU, *Local Wellposedness of Chern–Simons–Schrödinger*, Int. Math. Res. Not., 2014 (2013), pp. 6341–6398.
- [32] D. LUNDHOLM, *Properties of 2D anyon gas*, Elsevier, 2024, p. 450–484.
- [33] D. LUNDHOLM AND N. ROUGERIE, *The average field approximation for almost bosonic extended anyons*, J. Stat. Phys., 161 (2015), pp. 1236–1267.
- [34] D. MITROUSKAS, S. PETRAT, AND P. PICKL, *Bogoliubov corrections and trace norm convergence for the Hartree dynamics*, Rev. Math. Phys., 31 (2019), pp. 1950024, 36.
- [35] P. T. NAM AND R. SALZMANN, *Derivation of 3d energy-critical nonlinear schrödinger equation and bogoliubov excitations for bose gases*, Commun. Math. Phys., 375 (2020), pp. 495–571.

- [36] D.-T. NGUYEN, *2d attractive almost-bosonic anyon gases*, 2024. arXiv:2409.00409.
- [37] S.-J. OH AND F. PUSATERI, *Decay and scattering for the Chern–Simons–Schrödinger equations*, Int. Math. Res. Not., 2015 (2015), pp. 13122–13147.
- [38] P. PICKL, *A simple derivation of mean field limits for quantum systems*, Lett. Math. Phys., 97 (2011), pp. 151–164.
- [39] —, *Derivation of the time dependent Gross–Pitaevskii equation with external fields*, Rev. Math. Phys., 27 (2015), p. 1550003.
- [40] M. REED AND B. SIMON, *Methods of modern mathematical physics. II. Fourier analysis, self-adjointness*, Academic Press, New York-London, 1975.
- [41] J. J. F. ROBERT A. ADAMS, *Sobolev spaces*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, Academic Press, 2 ed., 2003.
- [42] I. RODNIANSKI AND B. SCHLEIN, *Quantum fluctuations and rate of convergence towards mean field dynamics*, Comm. Math. Phys., 291 (2009), pp. 31–61.
- [43] H. SPOHN, *Kinetic equations from Hamiltonian dynamics: Markovian limits*, Rev. Modern Phys., 52 (1980), pp. 569–615.