

Long time oscillation of solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations near minimal mass ground state

Scipio Cuccagna, Masaya Maeda

September 19, 2018

Abstract

In this paper, we consider the long time dynamics of radially symmetric solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations (NLS) having a minimal mass ground state. In particular, we show that there exist solutions with initial data near the minimal mass ground state that oscillate for long time. More precisely, we introduce a coordinate defined near the minimal mass ground state which consists of finite and infinite dimensional part associated to the discrete and continuous part of the linearized operator. Then, we show that the finite dimensional part, two dimensional, approximately obeys Newton's equation of motion for a particle in an anharmonic potential well. Showing that the infinite dimensional part is well separated from the finite dimensional part, we will have long time oscillation.

Keywords— Nonlinear Schrödinger equation; ground states; oscillation

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Set up and Main result	5
2.1	Notation	5
2.2	The linearized operator	7
2.3	Modulation coordinates	9
2.4	Symbol for errors	11
2.5	Hamilton structure of NLS and symplectic form	13
2.6	Main theorems	14
3	Normal form argument	18
3.1	Properties of symbols $\mathcal{S}_{i,j}^k$	18
3.2	Darboux coordinates	20
3.3	Energy expansion	23
3.4	Canonical transformations	26
4	Long time oscillation	33
4.1	Dynamics of finite dimensional system	33
4.2	Dispersive Estimates	35
4.3	Long time almost conservation of E_Q and the shadowing for several periods	39

A Appendix	42
A.1 Proof of Proposition 2.9	42
A.2 Proof of Lemma 3.11	45
A.3 Proof of Lemma 4.12	49

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider a nonlinear Schrödinger equation (NLS)

$$i\partial_t u = -\Delta u + g(|u|^2)u, \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3, \quad (1.1)$$

with $u(0) = u_0 \in H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}) := \{u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}) \mid u \text{ is radially symmetric}\}$ and $g \in C^\infty([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ with $g(0) = 0$ and $|g^{(n)}(s)| \leq C_n s^{p-n}$ in $s \geq 1$ for some $p < 2$ and $C_n > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

We assume the existence of a one parameter family of ground states, i.e. there exists an open interval $\mathcal{O} \subset (0, \infty)$ and a C^2 map

$$\mathcal{O} \ni \omega \mapsto \phi_\omega \in H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}), \quad (1.2)$$

s.t. ϕ_ω are positive and solve

$$0 = -\Delta \phi_\omega + \omega \phi_\omega + g(\phi_\omega^2) \phi_\omega. \quad (1.3)$$

Notice that $e^{i\omega t} \phi_\omega$ are solutions of (1.1), which are also called ground states. We further assume that the map $\omega \mapsto \|\phi_\omega\|_{L^2}$ has a nondegenerate local minimum, i.e.

$$\exists \omega_* \in \mathcal{O} \text{ s.t. } q'(\omega_*) = 0 \text{ and } q''(\omega_*) > 0, \text{ where } q(\omega) := \frac{1}{2} \|\phi_\omega\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C})}^2. \quad (1.4)$$

Remark 1.1. The above hypotheses have been numerically verified for various equations involving *saturated* nonlinearities such as $g(s) = \frac{s}{1+s}$, relevant in optics, see [38], or $g(s) = \frac{s^3}{1+s^2}$, discussed by Marzuola *et al.* [28]. Other examples are in Buslaev–Grikurov [5]. For an analytical result for double power nonlinearity in one dimension, see [26].

The above set up provides some interesting patterns. First of all, by (1.4), we have $q'(\omega) < 0$ for $\omega \in (\omega_* - \delta, \omega_*)$ and $q'(\omega) > 0$ for $\omega \in (\omega_*, \omega_* + \delta)$ for some $\delta > 0$. It is well known that under standard nondegeneracy assumption (1. of Assumption 2.6 below), the ground state $e^{i\omega t} \phi_\omega$ is orbitally stable (resp. unstable) if $q'(\omega) > 0$ ($q'(\omega) < 0$), see e.g. [20].

Therefore, ω_* is the critical frequency dividing the stable and unstable ground states. Comech–Pelinovsky [9] proved that this critical ground state $e^{i\omega_* t} \phi_{\omega_*}$ is orbitally instable (see also [31, 27]). The proof uses an appropriate system of coordinates, involving a mixture of three scalar coordinates (related to the discrete spectrum of an appropriate linearization of the NLS) and one infinite dimensional coordinate (related to the continuous spectrum of the linearization). By this coordinates, (1.1) is viewed as a perturbation of a finite dimensional Hamiltonian system involving the scalar coordinates, with $e^{i\omega_* t} \phi_{\omega_*}$ shown to be unstable for the finite dimensional system. Then, by controlling the continuous spectrum coordinate by means of classical methods involving the energy, like in [39, 40, 20], Comech–Pelinovsky [9] produces some solutions of (1.1) whose discrete coordinates *shadow* the unstable solutions of the finite dimensional system. More precisely, it is shown that for a sufficiently large period of time the discrete coordinates have motion similar to that of the finite dimensional system while the continuous coordinate of the NLS remains small. This yields the desired instability for the full NLS.

Marzuola *et al.* [28] considered the framework of Comech–Pelinovsky [9] and developed a systematic numerical exploration of solutions of both the finite dimensional approximation and of the full NLS. While observing the patterns of Comech–Pelinovsky [9], Marzuola *et al.* [28] identified another class of initial data near the minimal mass ground state $e^{i\omega_* t} \phi_{\omega_*}$. The corresponding solutions look like $e^{i\vartheta(t)} \phi_{\omega(t)}$ locally in space with $\omega(t)$ displaying an oscillating motion, which appears periodic. A similar pattern had previously been observed also by Buslaev–Grikurov [5, fig. 2 case $\alpha = 0.5$].

The aim of this paper is to rigorously justify the observation of Marzuola *et al.* [28] and provide a theoretical explanation of the oscillation phenomena. Very roughly, our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.2 (informal). *For any $M \in \mathbb{N}$, $M \geq 2$, there exists an open set $\mathcal{U}_M \subset H_{\text{rad}}^1$ near ϕ_{ω_*} contained in $\{u \in H_{\text{rad}}^1 \mid \|u\|_{L^2}^2/2 > q(\omega_*)\}$ s.t. the solutions of (1.1) with initial datum $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}_M$ can be expressed as $u(t) = e^{i\vartheta(t)} \phi_{\omega(t)} + \text{error}$ and $\omega(t)$ is oscillating for long time. In particular, if $u \in \mathcal{U}_M$, we have $\inf_{\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}} \|u_0 - e^{i\vartheta} \phi_{\omega_*}\|_{H_{\text{rad}}^1} \sim \epsilon$, the oscillations occur over a time period of length $T \sim \epsilon^{-M}$ and each oscillation occurs in a time approximately equal to $\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, where $\epsilon^2 := \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 - q(\omega_*)$.*

Remark 1.3. The open sets $\mathcal{U}_M \subset H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C})$ are not neighborhoods of ϕ_{ω_*} . As stated in Theorem 1.2, they belong to the region of $\frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 > q(\omega_*) = \frac{1}{2} \|\phi_{\omega_*}\|_{L^2}^2$. When $\frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 < q(\omega_*)$, then $\omega(t)$ does not oscillate and the solution escapes from the tubular neighborhood of $\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*} := \{e^{i\vartheta} \phi_{\omega_*} \mid \vartheta \in \mathbb{R}\}$. This is the instability proved by Comech–Pelinovsky [9]. Notice that the escape from ϕ_{ω_*} of the solutions $\frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 < q(\omega_*)$ is natural from the point of view of the Soliton Resolution conjecture because if the solution stayed near \mathcal{T}_{ω_*} for all time, then we would expect it to converge, modulo phase and a linear wave, to ϕ_{ω} for ω near ω_* . And since the linear wave would have nonnegative L^2 norm scattered to spatial infinity, we would get a contradiction with the L^2 -norm conservation of equation (1.1), because $\|\phi_{\omega}\|_{L^2} \geq \|\phi_{\omega_*}\|_{L^2} > \|u_0\|_{L^2}$. See the related discussion in the proof of Theorem 1.4 of [15]. See also, [23].

The precise statement of Theorem 1.2 will be given in Theorems 2.22, 2.29 and 2.32. In Theorem 2.22, we will make the meaning “the solution $u(t)$ can be expressed as $u(t) = e^{i\vartheta(t)} \phi_{\omega(t)} + \text{error}$ ” clear by introducing an appropriate coordinate system. In Theorem 2.29 and 2.32, we will make the meaning “long time” clear and deduce the effective equation which governs the motion of $\omega(t)$. This will provide the meaning of “ $\omega(t)$ is oscillating for long time”.

Similar results on persistence of oscillating patterns for long periods of time have been proved, for different but analogous problems, by Marzuola and Weinstein [29], see also [19, 32]. However here we are able to prove the persistence of the oscillations for much longer times. In fact, in [29] the number of oscillations is of the order of ϵ^{-a_0} for a fixed a_0 , while in this paper the number of oscillations can be arranged to be ϵ^{-N} for any N . A somewhat similar result to Theorem 1.2 is in [3], which deals with the effects that an arbitrarily small but classically trapping potential exerts on solitons of a translation invariant NLS. In [3] the time frame of the phenomena is as our’s, not coincidentally since in fact we use similar methods. However here we examine our oscillating patterns in more detail than what is done for possibly analogous patterns in [3]. For the trapping of a soliton in a well we refer also to [4, 17, 18, 22, 24] and to the references therein.

We now explain the strategy of the proof. As we mentioned above, for problems related to the dynamics near ground states, following the classical works such as [39, 34, 35], it is quite natural to introduce coordinates which are in part discrete and in part continuous coordinates and which are related to the spectral decomposition of the linearization of (1.1). For example, when we study the asymptotic stability of ground states (i.e. showing solutions near ground states decompose to ground state and linear wave) for the case $q'(\omega) > 0$, we can decompose the solution $u(t)$ as

$$u(t) = e^{i\vartheta(t)} (\phi_{\omega(t)} + r(t)).$$

Here, $r(t)$ is symplectic orthogonal to the kernel of the linearized operator. If we assume that there are no internal modes (non-zero discrete spectrum) for the linearized operator, then (ϑ, ω) can be viewed as the discrete coordinates and r as the continuous coordinate, with (ϑ, ω, r) a complete system of independent coordinates. Therefore, the dynamics of $u(t)$ reduces to the dynamics of $\vartheta(t)$, $\omega(t)$ and $r(t)$. As in [13, 2] it is natural to replace the coordinate system (ϑ, ω, r) with (ϑ, Q, r) , where $Q = \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{L^2}^2$ is a first integral of motion, and by an elementary application of Noether's principle, to decrease the number of coordinates, reducing to a NLS-like equation on r . Then the proof of asymptotic stability results from the proof of the scattering of r .

The above argument, is based on the fact that the generalized kernel of the linearized operator is 2 dimensional, which is a consequence of $q'(\omega) \neq 0$. In the case $q'(\omega) = 0$ the generalized kernel becomes 4 dimensional, and instead of the previous ansatz with coordinates (ϑ, ω, r) , we have

$$u(t) = e^{i\omega(t)} (\phi_{\omega(t)} + \lambda(t)\psi_3 + \mu(t)\psi_4 + r(t)),$$

where ψ_3 and ψ_4 are additional generalized eigenfunctions (see Proposition 2.9). Thus, under the assumption that there exist no internal modes, our problem reduces to the study of the dynamics of $(\vartheta, \omega, \lambda, \mu, r)$. Unlike in the case $q'(\omega) \neq 0$, we cannot replace ω by Q . But we can replace μ by Q . Then, by an elementary application of Noether's principle, we are left with (ω, λ, r) . The equations for modulation parameters (ω, λ) have already been studied in the literature, see (4.11) in [9] or (3.5) in [28], but are not well understood. Here we add to their understanding by following an approach initiated in [12]. That is, using the Hamilton structure of NLS (1.1), we move to a Darboux system of coordinates, see Proposition 3.7 in Subsection 3.2 (and we further simplify them by canonical transformations, see Sect. 3.4). In Darboux coordinates we have

$$\dot{\omega} = A^{-1}\partial_\lambda E, \quad \dot{\lambda} = -A^{-1}\partial_\omega E$$

where E is the energy (Hamiltonian) of the NLS and $A = A(\omega) > 0$ is a function that here we can assume constant. If we expand $E = E_f(Q, \omega, \lambda, 0) + \text{“terms with } r\text{”}$, where for E_f see (2.46), and think the second term as an error, we obtain

$$\dot{\omega} = A^{-1}\partial_\lambda E_f(Q, \omega, \lambda, 0) + \text{error}, \quad \dot{\lambda} = -A^{-1}\partial_\omega E_f(Q, \omega, \lambda, 0) + \text{error}.$$

Ignoring errors, this is a 2 dimensional Hamiltonian system with energy $\sim 2^{-1}A\lambda^2 + d(\omega) - \omega Q$, where $d(\omega) = E(\phi_\omega) + \omega q(\omega)$ satisfies $d'(\omega) = q(\omega)$. So, thinking $2^{-1}A\lambda^2$ as the kinetic energy and $V_Q(\omega) = d(\omega) - \omega Q$ as potential energy, we see that ω approximately Newton's equation in a potential well V_Q , with λ the momentum. If $Q > q(\omega_*)$, the well has a local minimum at a point $\omega = \omega_+ > \omega_*$. Thus, in this case, even starting from $\omega(0) = \omega_*$, ω will oscillate around ω_+ , consistently with the numerical observations by Marzuola *et al.* [28, Fig. 4–6]. Similarly, we see that if $Q < q(\omega_*)$, then $V(Q, \omega)$ is monotonically increasing and ω will fall to the unstable side ($\omega < \omega_*$) without oscillation.

As we mentioned, Marzuola and Weinstein [29], see also [19, 32], considered similar problems, proving long time shadowing of solutions of an appropriate finite dimensional systems by solutions of NLS's. However, as we mentioned above, we prove the persistence of the oscillating patterns for much longer than in [28], because we are more careful in the choice of the coordinates, as we now explain.

Because of the fact that the coordinates are derived from the linearization of (1.1), at a linear level the various coordinates evolve in time independently from each other, they interact at a non-linear level only. The reason why the oscillations last for a long time, but presumably not for ever, is that the continuous coordinate, if initially very small, remains small for a long time. However, because of nonlinear interactions, the continuous coordinate grows and after a sufficiently long time,

disrupts the motion of the discrete coordinates. The latter coordinates, for a long time and as long as the continuous coordinate is very small, evolve like solutions of the finite dimensional system, but, from a certain moment on, evolve quite differently. What we do in this paper, which is not done in related papers such as [29], is to choose the coordinates (i.e. a normal forms argument) in such a way that it is quite clear that the interaction between the continuous coordinate with the various discrete coordinates occurs at arbitrarily high order: the higher this order, the longer the time it takes for the continuous coordinate to disrupt the discrete coordinates. This is analogous to the approach by Bambusi and Maspero [3].

While we prove oscillations for very long times, the question on what happens asymptotically to these oscillating patterns remains open. In [28, Conjecture 1.1] it is suggested that asymptotically these oscillating solutions should scatter to a stable ground state. Reference is made to possible radiation damping phenomena and to the damped oscillations observed numerically in some cases for the mass critical saturated NLS by LeMesurier *et al.* [25, figures 7 and 16]. For further comments and references see also the discussion in [37, Sect. 9.3.2–9.3.3].

Damped oscillations similar to the ones in LeMesurier *et al.* [25] are observed in Buslaev–Grikurov [5, fig. 2]. However only the case $\alpha = 0.5$ in [5, fig. 3], which has an unknown asymptotic behavior, is in the same regime of Marzuola *et al.* The other cases in [5, fig. 3], all displaying damping and convergence, have $\alpha \ll 1$, which means that the initial value u_0 has large distance in $H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ from the orbit of ϕ_{ω_*} , with distance $\xrightarrow{\alpha \rightarrow 0^+} \infty$. Ultimately the regime $\alpha \ll 1$ in [5, fig. 3] seems to be very different from the regime considered in [28].

We think that it is plausible that a radiation damping phenomenon like in [36, 7, 12, 14] will prove Conjecture 1.1 in [28]. However, it is almost certain that the type of coordinates used in the present paper, which originate from the analysis in Comech and Pelinovsky [9], are inadequate to prove the conjecture. There should exist more "nonlinear" coordinates, possibly related to the ones used in the study of the blow up by Perelman [33] and Merle and Raphael [30]. For few more comments on the conjecture we refer to Remark 3.20.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we set up the framework and give the precise statement of the main results (Theorems 2.22, 2.29 and 2.32). Section 3 will be devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.22, which consists of Darboux theorem (Proposition 3.7) and Birkhoff normal forms in subsection 3.4. In section 4, we prove Theorems 2.29 and 2.32. In the appendix of this paper, we provide the proof of Proposition 2.9, Lemmas 3.11 and Lemma 4.12.

2 Set up and Main result

2.1 Notation

We collect notations which we use throughout this paper.

- By $f \lesssim g$, we mean there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $f \leq Cg$. Here, C only depends on parameters which are irrelevant to us. Further, by $f \lesssim_a g$, we mean that there exists a constant $C = C_a$ (depending on parameter a) such that $f \leq C_a g$. If $f \lesssim g$ and $g \lesssim f$, then we write $f \sim g$.
- We use Pauli matrices

$$\sigma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.1)$$

- For Banach spaces X, Y we denote by $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ the Banach space of all bounded operators from X to Y . If $X = Y$, we write $\mathcal{L}(X, X) = \mathcal{L}(X)$. Further, we define $\mathcal{L}^n(X, Y)$ by $\mathcal{L}^0(X, Y) = Y$, $\mathcal{L}^1(X, Y) = \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$, $\mathcal{L}^n(X, Y) = \mathcal{L}^{n-1}(X, \mathcal{L}(X, Y))$ and we set $\mathcal{L}^n(X) := \mathcal{L}^n(X, X)$.
- Given a Banach space X , $x_0 \in X$ and $r > 0$, we set $D_X(x_0, r) := \{x \in X : \|x - x_0\|_X < r\}$. Further, for $A \subset X$, we set

$$D_X(A, r) := \{x \in X \mid \text{dist}_X(x, A) < r\}, \quad \text{dist}_X(x, A) := \inf_{y \in A} \|x - y\|_X. \quad (2.2)$$

- We embed $\mathbb{C} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ using the natural identification

$$u \in \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \tilde{u} := {}^t(u \ \bar{u}) \in \tilde{\mathbb{C}} := \{{}^t(z \ \bar{z}) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : z \in \mathbb{C}\} \subset \mathbb{C}^2. \quad (2.3)$$

We set $\langle U, V \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} := 2^{-1}(u_1 v_1 + u_2 v_2)$ for $U = (u_1 \ u_2)^t$ and $V = (v_1 \ v_2)^t$ in \mathbb{C}^2 and

$$\langle U, V \rangle := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \langle U(x), V(x) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx \text{ for } U, V \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2). \quad (2.4)$$

We will also use $\langle U, V \rangle$ as the dual coupling between $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)$ and $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)$. By our definition we have $\langle \tilde{u}, \sigma_1 \tilde{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} = \text{Re } u \bar{v}$, and in particular $\langle \tilde{u}, \sigma_1 \tilde{u} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} = |u|^2$. For $\tilde{u} \in \tilde{\mathbb{C}}$, we define $|\tilde{u}|^2 := \langle \tilde{u}, \sigma_1 \tilde{u} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}$.

- We define the skew-symmetric form Ω by

$$\Omega(\cdot, \cdot) := \langle i\sigma_3 \cdot, \sigma_1 \cdot \rangle. \quad (2.5)$$

Notice that $\Omega(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = \text{Im} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u(x) \overline{v(x)} dx$.

- For $F \in C^1(H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}), \mathbb{R})$, we define the gradient $\nabla F(\tilde{u}) \in H_{\text{rad}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})$ by

$$dF(\tilde{u})\tilde{v} = \langle \nabla F(\tilde{u}), \sigma_1 \tilde{v} \rangle \text{ for all } \tilde{v} \in H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}) \quad (2.6)$$

where $dF(\tilde{u}) \in \mathcal{L}(H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}), \mathbb{R})$ is the Fréchet derivative of F . For $F \in C^1(L_{\text{rad}}^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}), \mathbb{R})$, the gradient $\nabla F(\tilde{u})$ will be similarly defined and it will belong in $L_{\text{rad}}^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})$. Further, for $F \in C^m(H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}), \mathbb{R})$ define

$$\nabla^m F \in C^{m-m}(H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}), \mathcal{L}^{m-1}(H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}), H_{\text{rad}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})))$$

inductively by $\nabla^m F = d\nabla^{m-1} F$ ($2 \leq m \leq n$).

- For $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and for $X = \tilde{\mathbb{C}}$ or \mathbb{C}^2 , we set

$$\Sigma^s(\mathbb{R}^3, X) := \{U \in \mathcal{S}'_{\text{rad}}(\mathbb{R}^3, X) : \|U\|_{\Sigma^s} < \infty\} \text{ where } \|U\|_{\Sigma^s} := \|(-\Delta + |x|^2 + 1)^{s/2} U\|_{L^2}. \quad (2.7)$$

We further set $\Sigma_c^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}) := P(\omega_*)\Sigma^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})$, where $P(\omega)$ is defined in (2.20).

- For an operator A , we set $\mathcal{N}(A)$ to be the kernel of A and $\mathcal{N}_g(A) = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{N}(A^n)$ to be the generalized kernel.

2.2 The linearized operator

It is a traditional approach to study the stability of solitons by appropriate choices of coordinates where the problem is reframed as the stability of 0 and where nonlinear stability is derived by some form of Lyapunov or linear stability argument, see for example [39, 20, 6]. In all these approaches a key role is played by the linearization of the NLS at the soliton $e^{it\omega}\phi_\omega$, related to the operator (2.14) below. Such operator is \mathbb{R} -linear but not \mathbb{C} -linear. Since it is very important to consider spectral decompositions of this operator, it is quite natural to “complexify”, which leads to viewing a \mathbb{C} -valued function u as a $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}(\hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^2)$ -valued function $\tilde{u} = {}^t(u \ \bar{u})$ (see (2.3)). The map $u \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ yields a natural identification of $H_{\text{rad}}^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C})$ with $H_{\text{rad}}^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}) \subset H_{\text{rad}}^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)$. By this identification, NLS (1.1) can be written as

$$i\sigma_3\partial_t\tilde{u} = -\Delta\tilde{u} + g(|\tilde{u}|^2)\tilde{u}. \quad (2.8)$$

We introduce the energy E and mass Q , which are the constant under the flow of (2.8).

Definition 2.1. We define $E \in C^6(H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}), \mathbb{R})$ and $Q \in C^\infty(L_{\text{rad}}^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}), \mathbb{R})$ by

$$E(\tilde{u}) := \frac{1}{2} \langle (-\Delta)\tilde{u}, \sigma_1\tilde{u} \rangle + E_P(\tilde{u}) \text{ with } E_P(\tilde{u}) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} G(|\tilde{u}(x)|^2) dx, \quad (2.9)$$

$$Q(\tilde{u}) := \frac{1}{2} \langle \tilde{u}, \sigma_1\tilde{u} \rangle. \quad (2.10)$$

where $G(s) = \int_0^s g(\tau) d\tau$. Recall that $|\tilde{u}(x)|^2 = \langle \tilde{u}(x), \sigma_1\tilde{u}(x) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}$.

Remark 2.2. The fact E is only C^6 comes from $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}) \hookrightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C})$ for $p = 6$ but not for $p > 6$. For example, $F(\tilde{u}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\tilde{u}(x)|^8 dx$ is not defined for all $\tilde{u} \in H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})$. However, E is C^∞ in for example H^s or Σ^s for $s > 3/2$.

We further set the action $S_\omega(u)$ by

$$S_\omega(\tilde{u}) := E(\tilde{u}) + \omega Q(\tilde{u}) \quad (2.11)$$

and for later use we introduce also

$$d(\omega) := S_\omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega). \quad (2.12)$$

Notice that (1.3) is equivalent to $\nabla S_\omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega) = 0$. The “linearized Hamiltonian” $\nabla^2 S_\omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega)$ will be an important operator in our analysis. However, it lies in $\mathcal{L}(H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}), H_{\text{rad}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}))$ which is not a vector space with scalar field \mathbb{C} . Therefore, we use another operator H_ω whose restriction in $H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})$ equals $\nabla^2 S_\omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega)$ but which extends to a \mathbb{C} -linear element in $\mathcal{L}(H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2); H_{\text{rad}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2))$ and furthermore is self-adjoint in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{C}^2)$.

Lemma 2.3. We have $\nabla^2 S_\omega|_{H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})} = H_\omega \in \mathcal{L}(H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}), H_{\text{rad}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}))$, where

$$H_\omega := -\Delta + \omega + g(\phi_\omega^2) + g'(\phi_\omega^2)\phi_\omega^2 + g'(\phi_\omega^2)\phi_\omega^2\sigma_1. \quad (2.13)$$

Proof. Differentiating (2.11), we have $\nabla^2 S_\omega(\tilde{u})(\cdot) = -\Delta + \omega + g(|\tilde{u}|^2) \cdot + 2g'(|\tilde{u}|^2) \langle \sigma_1\tilde{u}, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \tilde{u}$. Thus, substituting, $\tilde{u} = \tilde{\phi}_\omega$, we have

$$\nabla^2 S_\omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega)(\cdot) = (-\Delta + \omega + g(\phi_\omega^2)) + 2g'(\phi_\omega^2) \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_\omega, \cdot \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \tilde{\phi}_\omega. \quad (2.14)$$

Since for $\tilde{r} = {}^t(r \ \bar{r})$ we have

$$\left\langle \tilde{\phi}_\omega, \tilde{r} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \tilde{\phi}_\omega = \frac{1}{2} \phi_\omega \operatorname{Re}(\bar{r} + r) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_\omega \\ \phi_\omega \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \phi_\omega^2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} r \\ \bar{r} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \sigma_1) \phi_\omega^2 \tilde{r},$$

we obtain $\nabla^2 S_\omega|_{H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C})} = H_\omega$. \square

We now introduce the linearized operator \mathcal{H}_ω .

Definition 2.4. We set

$$\mathcal{H}_\omega := \sigma_3 H_\omega = \sigma_3(-\Delta + \omega) + \mathcal{V}(\omega) \text{ with } \mathcal{V}(\omega) := (g(\phi_\omega^2) + g'(\phi_\omega^2)\phi_\omega^2)\sigma_3 + g'(\phi_\omega^2)\phi_\omega^2 i\sigma_2. \quad (2.15)$$

Notice that \mathcal{H}_ω with domain $H_{\text{rad}}^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)$ defines a closed \mathbb{C} -linear operator in $L_{\text{rad}}^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)$.

Remark 2.5. When we substitute $\tilde{u} = e^{i\omega t \sigma_3} (\tilde{\phi}_\omega + \tilde{r})$, we obtain

$$i\partial_t \tilde{r} = \mathcal{H}_\omega \tilde{r} + \text{“higher order of } \tilde{r}\text{”}.$$

Thus, actually $-i\mathcal{H}_\omega$ is the linearized operator. However, we adopt this terminology because we would like to handle the linearized equation as a Schrödinger equation.

Since $\mathcal{V}(\omega)$ decreases rapidly at spatial infinity (see Lemma 2.8 below), we have $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{H}_\omega) = (-\infty, -\omega] \cup [\omega, \infty)$, where $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{H}_\omega) \subset \mathbb{C}$ is the set of essential spectrum of \mathcal{H}_ω . For the discrete spectrum $\sigma_{\text{d}}(\mathcal{H}_\omega)$, we know that $0 \in \sigma_{\text{d}}(\mathcal{H}_\omega)$ because we have

$$\mathcal{H}_\omega i\sigma_3 \tilde{\phi}_\omega = 0, \quad -i\mathcal{H}_\omega \partial_\omega \tilde{\phi}_\omega = i\sigma_3 \tilde{\phi}_\omega. \quad (2.16)$$

We make the following assumptions on the spectrum of \mathcal{H}_{ω_*} .

Assumption 2.6. We assume

1. $\sigma_{\text{d}}(\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}) = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}) = \operatorname{span}\{i\sigma_3 \tilde{\phi}_{\omega_*}\}$.
2. \mathcal{H}_{ω_*} has no edge resonance nor embedded eigenvalues.

Remark 2.7. The assumption $\dim \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}) = 1$ is equivalent to the standard assumption (see, e.g. [39, 40, 20]) $\mathcal{N}(L_+|_{L_{\text{rad}}^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C})}) = \{0\}$, where $L_+ := -\Delta + \omega_* + g(\phi_{\omega_*}^2) + 2g'(\phi_{\omega_*}^2)\phi_{\omega_*}^2$. Notice that $L_+ \partial_{x_j} \phi_{\omega_*} = 0$ but $\partial_{x_j} \phi_{\omega_*} \notin L_{\text{rad}}^2(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{C})$. The hypothesis $\sigma_{\text{d}}(\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}) = \{0\}$ is here assumed for simplicity, but we expect to be able to relax it, by allowing the existence of internal modes that we should be able to treat like in [12]. The 2nd assumption is technical and is needed to get dispersive estimates. The nonexistence of edge resonance is expected to hold generically and the nonexistence of embedded eigenvalue is conjectured to be true.

By Assumption 2.6, we can bootstrap the regularity of the map $\omega \mapsto \tilde{\phi}_\omega$. Specifically, we can show:

Lemma 2.8. *Under Assumption 2.6, there exists $\delta > 0$ s.t. the map $\omega \mapsto \phi_\omega$ is C^∞ in $\Sigma^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R})$ for all $s \geq 0$.*

Since the proof of Lemma 2.8 consists of standard elliptic regularity argument, we omit it.

We set

$$\Psi_1(\omega) := i\sigma_3 \tilde{\phi}_\omega, \quad \Psi_2(\omega) := \partial_\omega \tilde{\phi}_\omega. \quad (2.17)$$

The following proposition is due to Comech–Pelinovsky [9].

Proposition 2.9. For $s \geq 0$, there exists $\delta_s > 0$ s.t. for $\omega \in D_{\mathbb{R}}(\omega_*, \delta_s)$, there exist $\Psi_j(\omega) \in \Sigma^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})$ ($j = 3, 4$) satisfying the following properties.

1. For $1 \leq j \leq 4$, $\Psi_j \in C^\infty(D_{\mathbb{R}}(\omega_*, \delta_s), \Sigma^s)$.
2. We have $\mathcal{N}_g(\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}) = \text{span}\{\Psi_j(\omega_*) \mid j = 1, 2, 3, 4\}$.
3. We have $A(\omega) := \Omega(\Psi_2(\omega), \Psi_3(\omega)) > 0$.
4. There exists

$$P_d \in \cap_{s \geq 0} C^\infty(D_{\mathbb{R}}(\omega_*, \delta_s), \mathcal{L}(\Sigma^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2), \Sigma^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2))),$$

s.t. $P_d(\omega)$ is a projection symmetric w.r.t. Ω , i.e. $\Omega(P_d(\omega)\cdot, \cdot) = \Omega(\cdot, P_d(\omega)\cdot)$ (recall (2.5)).
The projection $P_d(\omega)$ commutes with π_0 and \mathcal{H}_ω and satisfies $\mathcal{N}_g(\mathcal{H}_\omega) = \text{Ran}P_d(\omega)$.

5. The operator $-i\mathcal{H}_\omega P_d(\omega)$ can be represented as

$$-i\mathcal{H}_\omega P_d(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & a(\omega) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.18)$$

in the frame $\{\Psi_j(\omega), j = 1, 2, 3, 4\}$, where $a(\omega) = -A(\omega)^{-1}q'(\omega)$.

6. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(\Psi_1(\omega), \Psi_2(\omega)) &= -q'(\omega), \Omega(\Psi_1(\omega), \Psi_3(\omega)) = 0, \quad \Omega(\Psi_1(\omega), \Psi_4(\omega)) = -A(\omega), \\ \Omega(\Psi_2(\omega), \Psi_4(\omega)) &= 0, \quad \Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, \Psi_2(\omega)) = \Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, \Psi_4(\omega)) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

Remark 2.10. The matrix in (2.18) has eigenvalues $0, \pm\sqrt{a(\omega)}$.

We will give the proof of Proposition 2.9 in the appendix of this paper.

2.3 Modulation coordinates

In this subsection, we give the first choice of the coordinates related to the linearized operator \mathcal{H}_ω . We set

$$P(\omega) := 1 - P_d(\omega). \quad (2.20)$$

We set $\mathcal{T}_\omega = \{e^{i\theta\sigma_3}\tilde{\phi}_\omega \mid \theta \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and recall (2.2).

Lemma 2.11. For any $s \geq 0$, there exists $\delta_s > 0$ s.t. there exist $\vartheta, \omega, \lambda, \mu \in C^\infty(D_{\Sigma^{-s}}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}, \delta_s), \mathbb{R})$ s.t. for $\tilde{u} \in D_{\Sigma^{-s}}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}, \delta_s)$,

$$R(\tilde{u}) := e^{-i\vartheta(\tilde{u})\sigma_3}\tilde{u} - \tilde{\phi}_{\omega(\tilde{u})} - \lambda(\tilde{u})\Psi_3(\omega(\tilde{u})) - \mu(\tilde{u})\Psi_4(\omega(\tilde{u})) \in P(\omega(\tilde{u}))\Sigma_{-s}. \quad (2.21)$$

Furthermore, Σ^s can be replaced by H_{rad}^s .

Proof. Set $R(\tilde{u}, \vartheta, \omega, \lambda, \mu) := e^{-i\vartheta\sigma_3}\tilde{u} - \tilde{\phi}_\omega - \lambda\Psi_3(\omega) - \mu\Psi_4(\omega)$ and

$$F_j(\tilde{u}, \vartheta, \omega, \lambda, \mu) = \Omega(R(\tilde{u}, \vartheta, \omega, \lambda, \mu), \Psi_j(\omega)). \quad (2.22)$$

Then, by (2.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial(F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4)}{\partial(\vartheta, \omega, \lambda, \mu)} \Big|_{(\tilde{u}, \vartheta, \omega, \lambda, \mu) = (e^{i\vartheta\sigma_3} \tilde{\phi}_{\omega_*}, \theta, \omega_*, 0, 0)} &= (\Omega(\Psi_i(\omega_*), \Psi_j(\omega_*)))_{1 \leq i, j \leq 4} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -A(\omega_*) \\ 0 & 0 & A(\omega_*) & 0 \\ 0 & -A(\omega_*) & 0 & B(\omega_*) \\ A(\omega_*) & 0 & -B(\omega_*) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

where $A(\omega)$ is given in 3. of Proposition 2.9 and

$$B(\omega) := \Omega(\Psi_3(\omega), \Psi_4(\omega)). \quad (2.24)$$

Since the determinant of the matrix given in (2.23) is $A(\omega_*)^4 > 0$, it is invertible. Therefore, since $F_j(e^{i\vartheta\sigma_3} \tilde{\phi}_{\omega_*}, \theta, \omega_*, 0, 0) = 0$, we have the claim by the implicit function theorem. \square

Proposition 2.12. *Let $\delta_1 > 0$ given in Lemma 2.11 for H_{rad}^1 . Set*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_1 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times D_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times P(\omega_*) H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})}((\omega_*, 0, 0, 0), \delta_1), H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})) : \\ (\vartheta, \omega, \lambda, \mu, \tilde{r}) \mapsto \mathcal{F}_1(\vartheta, \omega, \lambda, \mu, \tilde{r}) := e^{i\vartheta\sigma_3}(\tilde{\phi}_\omega + \lambda\Psi_3(\omega) + \mu\Psi_4(\omega) + P(\omega)\tilde{r}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, \mathcal{F}_1 is a C^∞ diffeomorphism onto a neighborhood of \mathcal{T}_{ω_*} in H_{rad}^1 .

Proof. It suffices to show \mathcal{F}_1^{-1} exists and it is C^∞ . To show it, since we already have the map $\tilde{u} \mapsto (\vartheta(\tilde{u}), \omega(\tilde{u}), \lambda(\tilde{u}), \mu(\tilde{u}), R(\tilde{u}))$, it suffices to replace $R(\tilde{u}) \in P(\omega(\tilde{u}))H_{\text{rad}}^1$ by $\tilde{r}(\tilde{u}) \in P(\omega_*)H_{\text{rad}}^1$ if the map

$$P(\omega(\tilde{u}))|_{P(\omega_*)H_{\text{rad}}^1} = (1 + P(\omega(\tilde{u})) - P(\omega_*))|_{P(\omega_*)H_{\text{rad}}^1} : P(\omega_*)H_{\text{rad}}^1 \rightarrow P(\omega)H_{\text{rad}}^1 \quad (2.25)$$

is an isomorphism. For \tilde{u} sufficiently close to \mathcal{T}_{ω_*} then $\|P(\omega(\tilde{u})) - P(\omega_*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(H_{\text{rad}}^1)} < 1$ and so the operator $1 + P(\omega(\tilde{u})) - P(\omega_*)$ is invertible in the whole of H_{rad}^1 , and in particular the map in (2.25) is invertible with

$$(1 + P(\omega(\tilde{u})) - P(\omega_*))^{-1}|_{P(\omega(\tilde{u}))H_{\text{rad}}^1} = (P(\omega(\tilde{u}))|_{P(\omega_*)H_{\text{rad}}^1})^{-1}.$$

Therefore, if we set $\tilde{r}(\tilde{u}) := (P(\omega(\tilde{u}))|_{P(\omega_*)H_{\text{rad}}^1})^{-1}R(\tilde{u})$, we will have the desired property. \square

If $q'(\omega)$ is bounded away from 0 it is natural to replace ω by Q , see [10], since by the conservation of Q this reduces the number of unknowns in the system. However, in a neighborhood of $\omega = \omega_*$ this is not possible and, instead, we replace μ by Q .

Lemma 2.13. *For any $s \geq 0$, there exists $\delta_s > 0$ s.t. there exists*

$$\mu \in \cap_{s \geq 0} C^\infty(D_{\mathbb{R}^4 \times \Sigma_c^{-s}}((q(\omega_*), \omega_*, 0, 0, 0), \delta_s), \mathbb{R})$$

s.t. $\mu = \mu(Q, \omega, \lambda, \rho, \tilde{r})$ satisfies

$$Q = Q(\mathcal{F}_1(\vartheta, \omega, \lambda, \mu, \tilde{r})) \text{ for } \rho = Q(\tilde{r}). \quad (2.26)$$

Remark 2.14. The additional variable ρ is introduced to define μ for Σ^s with $s < 0$. In the following, we will always substitute $\rho = Q(\tilde{r})$.

Proof. We define $\mu = \mu(Q, \omega, \lambda, \rho, \tilde{r})$ by the implicit function theorem to be the solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\mu, Q, \omega, \lambda, \rho, \tilde{r}) := & Q(\tilde{\phi}_\omega + \lambda\Psi_3(\omega) + \mu\Psi_4(\omega) - P_d(\omega)\tilde{r}) \\ & + \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_\omega + \lambda\Psi_3(\omega) + \mu\Psi_4(\omega) - P_d(\omega)\tilde{r}, \sigma_1\tilde{r} \right\rangle + \rho - Q = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

Since $\mathcal{G}(0, q(\omega_*), \omega_*, 0, 0, 0) = 0$ and

$$\partial_\mu \mathcal{G}|_{(\mu, Q, \omega, \lambda, \rho, \tilde{r})=(0, q(\omega_*), \omega_*, 0, 0, 0)} = \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_{\omega_*}, \sigma_1\Psi_4(\omega_*) \right\rangle = A(\omega_*) \neq 0,$$

we have the assumptions of implicit function theorem. From (2.27), it is clear that we have (2.26). \square

By using $\mu = \mu(Q, \omega, \lambda, Q(\tilde{r}), \tilde{r})$ we can move to coordinates $(\vartheta, Q, \omega, \lambda, \tilde{r})$ instead of the coordinates $(\vartheta, \omega, \lambda, \mu, \tilde{r})$.

Proposition 2.15. *Consider the $\delta_1 > 0$ in Lemma 2.11 for H_{rad}^1 . For \mathcal{F}_1 the function in Proposition 2.12, set*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_2 \in & C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times D_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times P(\omega_*)} H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}))((q(\omega_*), \omega_*, 0, 0), \delta_s), H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})) : \\ & (\vartheta, Q, \omega, \lambda, \tilde{r}) \mapsto \mathcal{F}_2(\vartheta, Q, \omega, \lambda, \tilde{r}) := \mathcal{F}_1(\vartheta, \omega, \lambda, \mu(Q, \omega, \lambda, Q(\tilde{r}), \tilde{r}), \tilde{r}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, \mathcal{F}_2 is a C^∞ diffeomorphism onto a neighborhood of \mathcal{T}_{ω_*} in H_{rad}^1 .

2.4 Symbol for errors

Even though we have replaced μ by Q , as a dependent variable μ will appear frequently. We define some classes of functions to handle various error terms.

Definition 2.16. For $n = 0, 1, 2$ and $s \geq 0$, we set,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_s^n(\delta) := C^\infty(D_{\mathbb{R}^5 \times P(\omega_*)} \Sigma^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}))((q(\omega_*), \omega_*, 0, 0, 0, 0), \delta), X_s^n),$$

where $X_s^0 := \mathbb{R}$, $X_s^1 := \Sigma^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})$ and $X_s^2 := \mathcal{L}(\Sigma^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}), \Sigma^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}))$. We define \mathcal{S}^n by

$$\begin{aligned} f \in \mathcal{S}^n & \Leftrightarrow \forall s \geq 0, \exists \delta_s > 0 \text{ s.t. } \exists \widehat{f} \in \cap_{s \geq 0} \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_s^n(\delta_s) \text{ s.t.} \\ f(Q, \omega, \lambda, \tilde{r}) & = \widehat{f}(Q, \omega, \lambda, \mu(Q, \omega, \lambda, Q(\tilde{r}), \tilde{r}), Q(\tilde{r}), \tilde{r}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we define $\mathcal{S}_{i,j}^n \subset \mathcal{S}^n$ by $f \in \mathcal{S}_{i,j}^n$ if and only if $\widehat{f}(Q, \omega, \lambda, \mu, \rho, \tilde{r})$ satisfies

$$\|\widehat{f}\|_{X_s^n} \lesssim_s (|Q - q(\omega_*)|^{1/2} + |\omega - \omega_*| + |\lambda| + |\mu| + \rho^{1/2} + \|\tilde{r}\|_{\Sigma^{-s}})^i (|\lambda| + |\mu| + \|\tilde{r}\|_{\Sigma^{-s}})^j.$$

We will always use $S_{i,j}^n$ to be a generic element of $\mathcal{S}_{i,j}^n$. We also write formulas like $S_{i,j}^n = S_{i,j}^n + S_{i+1,j}^n$ where $S_{i,j}^n$ in the l.h.s. and r.h.s. are different (so the equation does not imply $S_{i+1,j}^n = 0$).

We further define $s_{i,j}^1$ similarly to $S_{i,j}^1$ but replacing $\Sigma^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})$ in the definition of X_s^1 with $\Sigma^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R})$.

In the sequel, other error terms will appear in the energy expansion which are not of the form $S_{i,j}^0$. These terms are essentially like $\int V(s)r^n dx$, with r^n an n -linear form, for and $n \geq 2$, from $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}$ to \mathbb{C} and with $V \in \mathcal{S}$. Before introducing these class, we need some preliminary notation.

Definition 2.17. Let $\beta_{-1}(s) = 1$ and $\beta_n(s) = g^{(n)}(s)$ for $n \geq 0$. We will write $cg^{(n)}(s) = \beta_n(s)$, ignoring constants. With this convention we write $2g'(s) = \beta_1(s)$ and obviously this does not mean that $2\beta_1(s) = 2g'(s) = \beta_1(s)$ implies $\beta_1(s) = 0$, because here the β_1 's are not the same function. We extend further the use of the symbol β_n as follows. If we set

$$T_{S_{i,j}^1, k} \beta_n(S_{0,0}^1, \tilde{r}) := \int_0^1 t^k \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + t\tilde{r} + tS_{i,j}^1|^2) dt, \quad (2.28)$$

for $k \geq 0$ and $i, j \geq 0$, and if more generally we consider the composition

$$T_{S_{i_1, j_1}^1, k_1} T_{S_{i_2, j_2}^1, k_2} \cdots T_{S_{i_N, j_N}^1, k_N} \beta_n(S_{0,0}^1, \tilde{r}) \quad (2.29)$$

we will denote the expression (2.29) by $\beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2)$.

Remark 2.18. In Definition 2.17 we are committing an abuse of notation, which is however harmless in terms of the estimates or of qualitative properties like the smoothness and the decay/increasing property. Indeed the r.h.s. of (2.28), or a more general multiple integral representing (2.29), satisfies the same bounds of $\beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2)$. In particular, for $n \geq 0$ using our notation we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) &= \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1|^2) + \int_0^1 2\beta'_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + t\tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1 + t\tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle dt \\ &= S_{0,0}^0 + \beta_{n+1}(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} + \beta_{n+1}(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) |\tilde{r}|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

With the above notation we define the classes \mathbf{R}_k .

Definition 2.19. Let β_n given in definition (2.17).

- By \mathbf{R}_2 , we mean \mathbb{R} valued functions consisting of finite sums of $\langle S_{1,0}^2 \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle$ and terms in the form

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{1,0}^1 |\tilde{r}|^2 dx, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{1,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx, \quad (2.31)$$

with $n \geq -1$.

- By \mathbf{R}_k ($k = 3, 4, 5$), we mean \mathbb{R} valued functions consisting of finite sums of

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^i |\tilde{r}|^{2j} dx, \quad i + 2j = k, \quad (2.32)$$

with $n \geq k - 2$.

- By \mathbf{R}_6 , we mean \mathbb{R} valued functions consisting of finite sums of

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^1 (1-t)^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} g'''(|v(t,s)|^2) \langle v(t,s), \sigma_1 S_{0,0}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle v(t,s), \sigma_1 S_{1,1}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle v(t,s), \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2 dx ds dt, \quad (2.33)$$

with $v(t,s) = sS_{0,0}^1 + t(\tilde{r} + S_{0,0}^1)$.

- By \mathbf{R}_7 , we express an \mathbb{R} valued function consisting of finite sum of

$$\mathbf{R}_7 = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (1-t)^2 \langle \nabla^4 E_P(v(t,s))(S_{0,0}^1, \tilde{r}, \tilde{r}), \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle ds dt \quad (2.34)$$

with $v(t,s) = sS_{0,0}^1 + t(\tilde{r} + S_{0,0}^1)$.

2.5 Hamilton structure of NLS and symplectic form

We introduce the notion of symplectic form.

Definition 2.20. Let X be a Banach space on \mathbb{R} and let X' be its dual. A strong symplectic form is a 2-form $\tilde{\Omega}$ on X s.t. $d\tilde{\Omega} = 0$ (i.e. $\tilde{\Omega}$ is closed) and s.t. the map $X \ni x \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}(x, \cdot) \in X'$ is an isomorphism.

Setting $\Gamma(\tilde{u}) := \frac{1}{2}\Omega(\tilde{u}, \cdot)$, we have $d\Gamma = \Omega$ (recall that given two vector fields X and Y we have $d\Gamma(X, Y) := X\Gamma(Y) - Y\Gamma(X) - \Gamma([X, Y])$, see [1]). Therefore, the skew-symmetric form Ω defined in (2.5) is a strong symplectic form on $H_{\text{rad}}^j(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C})$ for $j = 0, 1$.

Notice that $\Omega(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = \text{Im} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u(x)\bar{v}(x)dx$ and that Ω extends naturally in a symplectic form on $H_{\text{rad}}^j(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)$ for $j = 0, 1$.

Definition 2.21. Let $\tilde{\Omega}$ be a strong symplectic form in $H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})$ and $F, G \in C^1(H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}), \mathbb{R})$. We define the Hamiltonian vector field $X_F(\tilde{u})$ with respect to $\tilde{\Omega}$ by

$$\tilde{\Omega}(\tilde{u})(X_F(\tilde{u}), \tilde{y}) := dF(\tilde{u})\tilde{y} = \langle \nabla F(\tilde{u}), \sigma_1 \tilde{y} \rangle \text{ for all } \tilde{y} \in H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}).$$

For the case $\tilde{\Omega} = \Omega$ defined in (2.5), we have $X_F(\tilde{u}) = -i\sigma_3 \nabla F(\tilde{u})$.

The Hamiltonian vector field of E with respect to Ω is

$$X_E(\tilde{u}) = -i\sigma_3 \nabla E = -i\sigma_3 (-\Delta \tilde{u} + g(|\tilde{u}|^2)\tilde{u}) \in H_{\text{rad}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}). \quad (2.35)$$

Thus, we see that (1.1) can be rewritten in the Hamiltonian formulation as

$$\partial_t \tilde{u} = X_E(\tilde{u}). \quad (2.36)$$

The symplectic form Ω looks simple. However, when expressed in terms of the modulation coordinates, Ω appears very complicated and full of cross terms (see (3.16) below). For this reason, we introduce a new symplectic form $\Omega_0 := d\Gamma_0$, where

$$\Gamma_0(\tilde{u}) := Qd\theta - \lambda A(\omega)d\omega + \lambda B(\omega)\partial_Q \mu dQ + \frac{1}{2}\Omega(\tilde{r}, d\tilde{r}), \quad (2.37)$$

For $A(\omega)$ defined in Prop. 2.9 and $B(\omega)$ defined in (2.24).

Using the notation in Definition 2.16, we have

$$\Omega_0 = dQ \wedge d\theta + A(\omega)d\omega \wedge d\lambda + \Omega(d\tilde{r}, d\tilde{r}) + (S_{0,0}^0 d\lambda + S_{0,1}^0 d\omega + \langle S_{0,1}^0 \tilde{r} + S_{0,1}^1, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle) \wedge dQ. \quad (2.38)$$

This representation of Ω_0 in (2.38) still may look complicated due to the 4th term. However, the fourth term affects only the dynamics of ϑ , which we will ignore. If $F = F(Q, \omega, \lambda, \tilde{r})$ is C^1 and does not depend on ϑ , like the Energy E , if we decompose its differential as

$$dF = \sum_{\tau=Q,\omega,\lambda} \partial_\tau F d\tau + \langle \nabla_{\tilde{r}} F, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle, \quad (2.39)$$

where $\nabla_{\tilde{r}} F \in \text{Ran}P(\omega_*)^*$ is defined by the above formula, then the Hamiltonian vector field of F associated to Ω_0 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_0(X_F, Y) &= \partial_Q F(Y)_Q + \partial_\omega F(Y)_\omega + \partial_\lambda F(Y)_\lambda + \langle \nabla_{\tilde{r}} F, \sigma_1(Y)\tilde{r} \rangle \\ &= (X_F)_Q(Y)_\vartheta - (X_F)_\vartheta(Y)_Q + A(\omega)(X_F)_\omega(Y)_\lambda - A(\omega)(X_F)_\lambda(Y)_\omega + \Omega((X_F)\tilde{r}, (Y)\tilde{r}) \\ &\quad + (S_{0,0}^0(X_F)_\lambda + S_{0,1}^0(X_F)_\omega + \langle S_{0,0}^0 \tilde{r} + S_{0,1}^1, (X_F)\tilde{r} \rangle)(Y)_Q \\ &\quad - (S_{0,0}^0(Y)_\lambda + S_{0,1}^0(Y)_\omega + \langle S_{0,0}^0 \tilde{r} + S_{0,1}^1, (Y)\tilde{r} \rangle)(X_F)_Q, \end{aligned}$$

where $(X)_\tau = d\tau X$ for $\tau = \vartheta, Q, \omega, \lambda, \tilde{r}$. Therefore, we have the following simple formulas for X_F

$$(X_F)_Q = 0, \quad (X_F)_\omega = A(\omega)^{-1}\partial_\lambda F, \quad (X_F)_\lambda = -A(\omega)^{-1}\partial_\omega F, \quad (X_F)_{\tilde{r}} = -iP(\omega_*)\sigma_3\nabla_{\tilde{r}}F, \quad (2.40)$$

and a more complicated formula only for the ϑ -th component

$$(X_F)_\vartheta = -\partial_Q F + S_{0,0}^0(X_F)_\lambda + S_{0,1}^0(X_F)_\omega + \langle S_{0,0}^0\tilde{r} + S_{0,1}^1, (X_F)_{\tilde{r}} \rangle. \quad (2.41)$$

Since a vector can be decomposed as

$$X = e^{i\vartheta\sigma_3} (i\sigma_3\underline{u}(X)_\vartheta + \partial_\omega\underline{u}(X)_\omega + \Psi_3(X)_\lambda + \Psi_4(X)_\mu + P(X)_{\tilde{r}}) \text{ where} \\ (X)_\tau := d\tau X \text{ for } \tau = \vartheta, \omega, \lambda, \mu, \tilde{r} \text{ and } \underline{u} := \tilde{\phi}_\omega + \lambda\Psi_3 + \mu\Psi_4 + P\tilde{r}, \quad (2.42)$$

we can recover X_F from $(X_F)_\tau$ for $\tau = \vartheta, Q, \omega, \lambda, \tilde{r}$ given in (2.40) and (2.41).

2.6 Main theorems

We are now in the position to state our main theorems precisely. First, we will give appropriate coordinates which will be a modification of the modulation coordinate given in Proposition 3.7. These coordinates will transform the symplectic form Ω into Ω_0 defined in (2.38) and will decouple the continuous and discrete coordinate to arbitrary high order. The proof will be given in Sect. 3.

Theorem 2.22. *For any $N \geq 2$, there exist $\delta_N > 0$ and a C^∞ -diffeomorphism onto a neighborhood of \mathcal{T}_{ω_*} in H_{rad}^1 (recall $\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*} = \{e^{i\theta\sigma_3}\tilde{\phi}_\omega \mid \theta \in \mathbb{R}\}$), $\mathfrak{F}_N \in C^\infty(D_{H_{\text{rad}}^1}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}, \delta_N), H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}))$, s.t.*

$$\mathfrak{F}_N^*Q = Q, \quad \mathfrak{F}_N^*\omega = \omega + S_{0,1}^0, \quad \mathfrak{F}_N^*\lambda = \lambda + S_{1,1}^0, \quad \mathfrak{F}_N^*\tilde{r} = e^{iS_{0,1}^0\sigma_3}(\tilde{r} + S_{1,1}^1) \quad (2.43)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{F}_N^*\Omega = \Omega_0, \quad (2.44)$$

where \mathfrak{F}_N^* is the pull-back operator. Further, for $E_N := \mathfrak{F}_N^*E (= E \circ \mathfrak{F}_N)$, we have

$$E_N = E_{f,N}(Q, \omega, \lambda, Q(\tilde{r})) + \frac{1}{2} \langle H_{\omega_*}\tilde{r}, \sigma_1\tilde{r} \rangle + E_P(\tilde{r}) + S_{0,N+1}^0 + \sum_{k=2}^7 \mathbf{R}_k, \quad (2.45)$$

where \mathbf{R}_k are terms defined in Definition 2.19 and

$$E_{f,N}(Q, \omega, \lambda, Q(\tilde{r})) = d(\omega) - \omega Q + (\omega - \omega_*)Q(\tilde{r}) + \frac{1}{2}A(\omega)\lambda^2 + \sum_{m=2}^N \lambda^m e_{m,0}^{(N)}(Q, \omega, Q(\tilde{r})) \quad (2.46)$$

with $e_{2,0}^{(N)} = S_{1,0}^0$ and $e_{m,0}^{(N)} = S_{0,0}^0$ for $m \geq 3$ and where $d(\omega)$ was defined in (2.12).

Remark 2.23. In (2.43), we can expand $\mathfrak{F}_N^*\omega = \omega + S_{0,1}^0$ as

$$\mathfrak{F}_N^*\omega = \omega + \frac{B(\omega)}{2A(\omega)}\mu + S_{1,1}^0 = \omega - \frac{B(\omega)}{2A(\omega)^2}(q(\omega) - Q + Q(\tilde{r})) + S_{1,1}^0, \quad (2.47)$$

see Lemma 3.15 for the 1st equality and Lemma 3.2 for the 2nd.

Remark 2.24. For (2.43), for example $\mathfrak{F}_N^* \omega = \omega + S_{0,1}^0$, we mean that $\mathcal{F}_2^*(\mathfrak{F}_N^* \omega - \omega)$, initially defined in the neighborhood of $\mathbb{R} \times (q(\omega_*), \omega_*, 0, 0)$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times P(\omega_*)H_{\text{rad}}^1$ will not depend on ϑ and can be extended to $D_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times P(\omega_*)\Sigma^{-s}}((q(\omega_*), \omega_*, 0, 0), \delta_s)$ for arbitrary $s \geq 0$ and some $\delta_s > 0$ to belong in $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}^0$. Actually, we will be constructing \mathfrak{F}_N by determining $\mathcal{F}_2^*(\mathfrak{F}_N^* \tau - \tau)$ ($\tau = \vartheta, Q, \omega, \lambda, \tilde{r}$) in $D_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times P(\omega_*)\Sigma^{-s}}((q(\omega_*), \omega_*, 0, 0), \delta_s)$ and then define \mathfrak{F}_N by them so there will be no ambiguity for the extension.

Remark 2.25. Let $v = \mathfrak{F}_N^{-1}(u)$. Then, by Theorem 2.22, in the v variable, the symplectic form Ω will be transformed to Ω_0 and the energy E will be transformed to E_N . Thus, our coordinate will be given by $\mathcal{F}_2^{-1} \circ \mathfrak{F}_N^{-1}(u) = (\vartheta(v), Q(u), \omega(v), \lambda(v), \tilde{r}(v))$.

Before proceeding, we prepare another notation.

Definition 2.26. For $F \in C^1(D_{H_{\text{rad}}^1}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}, \delta), \mathbb{R})$ written in the form $F(u) = f(Q, \omega, \lambda, Q(\tilde{r}), \tilde{r})$, we define

$$\partial_\rho F = \partial_\rho|_{\rho=Q(\tilde{r})} f(Q, \omega, \lambda, \rho, \tilde{r}), \quad (2.48)$$

and

$$\tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} F = \nabla_{\tilde{r}}|_{\rho=Q(\tilde{r})} f(Q, \omega, \lambda, \rho, \tilde{r}). \quad (2.49)$$

In particular, we have

$$\nabla_{\tilde{r}} F = \tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} F + \partial_\rho F \tilde{r}. \quad (2.50)$$

We set $\mathbf{R} = S_{0,N+1}^0 + \sum_{k=2}^7 \mathbf{R}_k$, where r.h.s. contains the terms in (2.45). In the coordinate system given in Theorem 2.22, NLS (1.1) is reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\omega} &= A(\omega)^{-1} \partial_\lambda E_{f,N} + \mathbf{R}_\omega, \\ \dot{\lambda} &= -A(\omega)^{-1} \partial_\omega E_{f,N} + \mathbf{R}_\lambda, \\ i \partial_t \tilde{r} &= (\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} + \partial_\rho E_N P(\omega_*) \sigma_3) \tilde{r} + P(\omega_*) \sigma_3 g(|\tilde{r}|^2) \tilde{r} + \mathbf{R}_{\tilde{r}}, \\ &\text{with initial data } \omega_0 = \omega(u_0), \lambda_0 = \lambda(u_0) \text{ and } \tilde{r}_0 = \tilde{r}(u_0), \end{aligned} \quad (2.51)$$

where we have ignored the motion of ϑ and

$$\mathbf{R}_\omega = A(\omega)^{-1} \partial_\lambda \mathbf{R}, \quad \mathbf{R}_\lambda = -A(\omega)^{-1} \partial_\omega \mathbf{R}, \quad \mathbf{R}_{\tilde{r}} = P(\omega_*) \sigma_3 \tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} \mathbf{R}. \quad (2.52)$$

Let us think of \tilde{r} as a perturbation and let us set (ω_f, λ_f) to be the solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\omega}_f &= A(\omega_f)^{-1} \partial_\lambda E_{f,N}(Q, \omega_f, \lambda_f, 0), \\ \dot{\lambda}_f &= -A(\omega_f)^{-1} \partial_\omega E_{f,N}(Q, \omega_f, \lambda_f, 0), \text{ with } (\omega_f(t), \lambda_f(t))|_{t=0} = (\omega_0, \lambda_0). \end{aligned} \quad (2.53)$$

We introduce the ‘‘kinetic energy’’ and the ‘‘potential energy’’ as

$$K_Q(\omega, \lambda) := \frac{1}{2} A(\omega) \lambda^2 + \sum_{m=2}^N \lambda^m e_{m,0}^{(N)}(Q, \omega, 0) \text{ and } V_Q(\omega) = d(\omega) - \omega Q.$$

Then, we have $K_Q(\omega, \lambda) + V_Q(\omega) = E_{f,N}(Q, \omega, \lambda, 0)$. Notice that in a neighborhood of \mathcal{T}_{ω_*} , $K_Q(\omega, \lambda) \sim 2^{-1} A(\omega_*) \lambda^2$, which is the reason we call K_Q the ‘‘kinetic energy’’. For ω_+ a value to be defined momentarily and omitting N we denote

$$E_Q(\omega, \lambda) := E_{f,N}(Q, \omega, \lambda, 0) - V_Q(\omega_+) = K_Q(\omega, \lambda) + V_Q(\omega) - V_Q(\omega_+). \quad (2.54)$$

Since $\partial_\omega V_Q(\omega) = q(\omega) - Q$, we see that if $Q < q(\omega_*)$ then $V_Q(\omega)$ becomes monotonic increasing, which implies that ω_f will fall to left monotonically until it will be ejected out of the region where we can use the coordinate (this was essentially what Comech–Pelinovsky [9] proved). If $0 < Q - q(\omega_*) \ll 1$, the equation $\partial_\omega V_Q = q(\omega) - Q = 0$ will have two solutions $\omega_\pm = \omega_{Q,\pm}$ s.t. $\omega_- < \omega_* < \omega_+$. Here, ω_- is a local maximum and ω_+ a local minimum of V_Q (see Lemma 4.1 for details). Therefore, if $0 < Q - q(\omega_*) \ll 1$, V_Q works as a trapping potential around $\omega = \omega_+$.

If (ω_f, λ_f) is trapped in the potential well V_Q , we have the oscillation in (2.53).

Proposition 2.27. *Fix $N \geq 2$. There exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ s.t. for Q satisfying $0 < Q - q(\omega_*) < \epsilon_0^2$ and $c \in (0, 1)$, if we take (ω_0, λ_0) s.t.*

$$\omega_0 > \omega_- \text{ and } 0 < E_Q(\omega_0, \lambda_0) < c(V_Q(\omega_-) - V_Q(\omega_+)), \quad (2.55)$$

then there exists $T_f > 0$ s.t. the solution $(\omega_f(t), \lambda_f(t))$ of (2.53) is T_f -periodic with $T_f \sim (Q - q(\omega_))^{-1/4}$.*

Remark 2.28. Condition (2.55) is given for ω_f to stay in the potential well. For energy trapping, $c = 1$ would work but we need for c to be a fraction of 1 to prove a uniform bound on the period T_f . Indeed, if we start from $(\omega_\epsilon, 0)$ with $\omega_\epsilon > \omega_+$ s.t. $E_{f,N}(Q, \omega_\epsilon, 0, \rho_0) = V_{Q,\rho_0}(\omega_-) - \epsilon$, then T_f diverges to $+\infty$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow +0$.

The proof of Proposition 2.27 is in Section 4.1. Here we remark that, since (2.53) is just a two dimensional Hamilton system, it is clear that $(\omega_f(t), \lambda_f(t))$ is periodic. So, what we only need to prove is the estimate of the period.

We now go back to the full system (2.51). The first observation is that since $(\omega, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the constraint of the finite part energy $E_Q = C$ gives us a 1 dimensional torus (a circle). Therefore, the position of (ω, λ) is determined by $E_Q(\omega, \lambda)$ modulo the phase of the circle. We will show that E_Q is almost conserved for a long time. For the proof of the following three results see Sect. 4.3.

Theorem 2.29. *For $N \geq 2$, $c \in (0, 1)$ and $C_0 > 0$ there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ s.t. for $Q \in (q(\omega_*), q(\omega_*) + \epsilon_0^2)$, if $(\omega_0, \lambda_0, \tilde{r}_0)$ satisfies (2.55) and $\|\tilde{r}_0\|_{H^1} \leq C_0(Q - q(\omega_*))^{3/4}$, for $T := (Q - q(\omega_*))^{-\frac{3}{2}(N-1) + \frac{1}{2}}$ then for the solution of (2.51) we have*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\tilde{r}(t)\|_{H^1} \lesssim (Q - q(\omega_*))^{3/4}, \quad (2.56)$$

and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |E_Q(\omega(t), \lambda(t)) - E_Q(\omega_0, \lambda_0)| \lesssim (Q - q(\omega_*))^2. \quad (2.57)$$

Remark 2.30. By elementary computation, we see $V_Q(\omega_-) - V_Q(\omega_+) \sim (Q - q(\omega_*))^{3/2}$ (see (4.5) below). Thus, for $Q - q(\omega_*) > 0$ small enough, the $(\omega(t), \lambda(t))$ Theorem 2.29 are still in the potential well of V_Q and satisfy (2.55) with $c < 1$ replaced by a slightly larger $c' < 1$. In particular, since

$$E_Q(\omega(t), \lambda(t)) \leq E_Q(\omega_0, \lambda_0) + C(Q - q(\omega_*))^2 < c(1 + C(Q - q(\omega_*))^{1/2})(Q - q(\omega_*))^{3/2},$$

taking $0 < Q - q(\omega_*) < (\frac{1-c}{2cC})^2$, we have $E_Q(\omega(t), \lambda(t)) < \frac{1+c}{2}(V_Q(\omega_-) - V_Q(\omega_+))$.

As a direct Corollary of Theorem 2.29, we see that $(\omega(t), \lambda(t))$ stays near the 1 dimensional torus $\{(\omega, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid E_Q(\omega, \lambda) = E_Q(\omega_0, \lambda_0), |\lambda| + |\omega - \omega_*| \ll 1, \omega > \omega_-\}$.

Corollary 2.31. *Let*

$$O_{\omega_0, \lambda_0} := \{(\omega, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid E_Q(\omega, \lambda) = E_Q(\omega_0, \lambda_0), |\lambda| + |\omega - \omega_*| \ll 1\}.$$

Assume $E_Q(\omega_0, \lambda_0) \sim (Q - q(\omega_*))^{3/2}$. Then under the assumption of Theorem 2.29 for the solution of (2.51) we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \inf_{(\omega, \lambda) \in O_{\omega_0, \lambda_0}} \left((Q - q(\omega_*))^{-3/2} |\omega(t) - \omega| + (Q - q(\omega_*))^{-5/4} |\lambda(t) - \lambda| \right) \lesssim 1,$$

where $T = (Q - q(\omega_*))^{-\frac{3}{2}(N-1) + \frac{1}{2}}$.

One may view Corollary 2.31 as a long (but not infinite) time orbital stability result. As with the usual orbital stability results on ground states, the control of the phase for (ω, λ) near O_{ω_0, λ_0} is more subtle. However, we can show that for fixed n , the difference of $(\omega(t), \lambda(t))$ between $(\omega_f(t), \lambda_f(t))$ is small for $t \in [0, nT_f]$, where T_f is given in Proposition 2.27.

Theorem 2.32. *Let $N \geq 2$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $c \in (0, 1)$ and $C_0 > 0$. Then, there exist $\epsilon_n > 0$ s.t. for $Q \in (q(\omega_*), q(\omega_*) + \epsilon_n^2)$, if $(\omega_0, \lambda_0, \tilde{r}_0)$ satisfies (2.55) and $\|\tilde{r}_0\|_{H^1} \leq C_0(Q - q(\omega_*))^{3/4}$, then comparing the solutions of (2.51) and of (2.53) we have*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, nT_f]} \left((Q - q(\omega_*))^{-3/2} |\omega(t) - \omega_f(t)| + (Q - q(\omega_*))^{-5/4} |\lambda(t) - \lambda_f(t)| \right) \lesssim_n 1, \quad (2.58)$$

where T_f is the period of (ω_f, λ_f) given in Proposition 2.27.

Theorem 2.32 works for much shorter time $nT_f \sim (Q - q(\omega_*))^{-1/4}$ than the time given by Theorem 2.29, which is $T = (Q - q(\omega_*))^{-\frac{3}{2}(N-1) + \frac{1}{2}}$. This is quite natural since the time evolution of the linear operator obtained linearizing system (2.53) at the solution (ω_f, λ_f) appears to be growing linearly. Hence, expressing (ω, λ) as a perturbation of (ω_f, λ_f) , their difference tends to grow in a way similar to the "secular modes" discussed in p.473 [39]. However, a combination of Theorems 2.29 and 2.32 shows that (ω, λ) oscillates for $0 < t < T = (Q - q(\omega_*))^{-\frac{3}{2}(N-1) + \frac{1}{2}}$ (and not just $0 < t < nT_f$) with an oscillation similar to that of (ω_f, λ_f) . This is because, fixing $n = 2$ (say), we can apply Theorem 2.32 for any time in $t \in [0, T]$. So, taking $t_m, m = 1, 2, \dots$ the time when $\omega(t_m)$ is (say) at a local maximum, then applying Theorem 2.32 we see that $\|(t_{m+1} - t_m) - T_f^{(m)}\| \ll T_f^{(m)}$, with $T_f^{(m)}$ the period of the solution $(\omega_{f,m}(t), \lambda_{f,m}(t))$ of (2.53) with $(\omega_{f,m}(t_m), \lambda_{f,m}(t_m)) = (\omega(t_m), \lambda(t_m))$, and in each time interval $(t_m, t_m + 2T_f^{(m)})$ the quantity $|\omega(t) - \omega_{f,m}(t)| + |\lambda(t) - \lambda_{f,m}(t)|$ satisfies (2.58).

Therefore, by the main Theorems 2.22, 2.29 and 2.32, we have proved the long time oscillation of $\omega(t)$ as informally stated in Theorem 1.2.

Remark 2.33. Notice that at the point $(\omega_+, 0)$ the linearization of (2.53) is, for $a(\omega) = -A(\omega)^{-1}q'(\omega)$,

$$B_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ a(\omega_+) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ with group } e^{tB_0} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\left(t\sqrt{-a(\omega_+)}\right) & \frac{\sin\left(t\sqrt{-a(\omega_+)}\right)}{\sqrt{-a(\omega_+)}} \\ -\sqrt{-a(\omega_+)}\sin\left(t\sqrt{-a(\omega_+)}\right) & \cos\left(t\sqrt{-a(\omega_+)}\right) \end{pmatrix},$$

with norm $\|e^{tB_0}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \sim (-a(\omega_+))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sim (Q - q(\omega_*))^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. In Lemma 4.2 we consider periodic orbits $(\omega_f(t), \lambda_f(t))$ for (2.53) where $|\omega_f(t) - \omega_*| \lesssim (Q - q(\omega_*))^{1/2}$. It is clear now that it is not obvious how to bound the norm of the group of the linearization of (2.53) at $(\omega_f(t), \lambda_f(t))$ in terms of the norm $\|e^{tB_0}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$ and that here it is not possible to use the continuity argument in [29, Proposition 3.3].

3 Normal form argument

In this section we prove Theorem 2.22. We will start summarizing the properties of the symbols $S_{i,j}^k$ and the dependent variable μ . Then we will construct a transform \mathfrak{F}_0 satisfying (2.43) and (2.44). After that, we will successively construct canonical change of coordinates $(\phi_N^* \Omega_0 = \Omega_0)$ so that we can erase the interaction term to achieve the expansion (2.45).

3.1 Properties of symbols $S_{i,j}^k$

In this subsection we summarize the properties of $S_{i,j}^k$.

Lemma 3.1. *We have $P_d(\omega)P(\omega_*) = S_{1,0}^2$, $q'(\omega) = S_{1,0}^0$ and $q(\omega) - Q + Q(\tilde{r}) = S_{2,0}^0$.*

Proof. $P_d(\omega)P(\omega_*) = (P_d(\omega) - P_d(\omega_*))P(\omega_*) = (\omega - \omega_*)\partial_\omega P_d(\omega_* + \theta(\omega - \omega_*))P(\omega_*)$. The 2nd and 3rd claim follow from $q'(\omega_*) = 0$ and $q(\omega) - Q = q(\omega) - q(\omega_*) + q(\omega_*) - Q$. \square

We next consider the expansion of the dependent variable μ .

Lemma 3.2. *We have*

$$\mu = -A(\omega)^{-1}(q(\omega) - Q + Q(\tilde{r})) + S_{0,2}^0. \quad (3.1)$$

and

$$\partial_Q \mu = S_{0,0}^0, \quad \partial_\omega \mu = -A^{-1}(\omega)q'(\omega) + S_{0,1}^0, \quad \partial_\lambda \mu = S_{0,1}^0, \quad \partial_\rho \mu = S_{0,0}^0 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} \mu = S_{0,1}^1. \quad (3.2)$$

Recall that $\tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}}$ is defined in (2.49) and we have $\nabla_{\tilde{r}} \mu = S_{0,1}^1 + S_{0,0}^0 \tilde{r}$.

Remark 3.3. In formula (3.2) the term $\nabla_{\tilde{r}} \mu$ is defined by $\langle \nabla_{\tilde{r}} \mu, \sigma_1 \tilde{v} \rangle = d_{\tilde{r}} F(\tilde{r}) \tilde{v}$ where $P(\omega) \tilde{v} = \tilde{v}$ and $F(\tilde{r}) = \mu(Q, \omega, \lambda, Q(\tilde{r}), \tilde{r})$ for fixed Q, ω and λ .

Proof. By (2.27), we have

$$Q(\tilde{\phi}_\omega) + \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_\omega, \sigma_1(\lambda \Psi_3(\omega) + \mu \Psi_4(\omega) - P_d(\omega) \tilde{r}) \right\rangle + \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_\omega, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \right\rangle + S_{0,2}^0 + Q(\tilde{r}) - Q = 0.$$

Therefore, since

$$\left\langle \tilde{\phi}_\omega, \sigma_1(\lambda \Psi_3 + P(\omega) \tilde{r}) \right\rangle = -\Omega(\Psi_1, \lambda \Psi_3 + P \tilde{r}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_\omega, \Psi_4(\omega) \right\rangle = -\Omega(\Psi_1(\omega), \Psi_4(\omega)) = A(\omega),$$

we have (3.1). Next, set $\underline{\mu} := \tilde{\phi}_\omega + \lambda \Psi_3(\omega) + \mu \Psi_4(\omega) + P(\omega) \tilde{r}$. Then differentiating (2.27) (with $\rho = Q(\tilde{r})$) with respect to Q, ω, λ and \tilde{r} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \underline{\mu}, \sigma_1 \Psi_4 \rangle \partial_Q \mu &= 1 \quad \text{where from (2.17) and (2.19) we have } \langle \underline{\mu}, \sigma_1 \Psi_4 \rangle = A + S_{0,1}^0, \\ \langle \underline{\mu}, \sigma_1 \Psi_4 \rangle \partial_\omega \mu &= -\langle \underline{\mu}, \sigma_1(\Psi_2 + \lambda \partial_\omega \Psi_3 + \mu \partial_\omega \Psi_4 + \partial_\omega P \tilde{r}) \rangle = -q'(\omega) + S_{0,1}^0, \\ \langle \underline{\mu}, \sigma_1 \Psi_4 \rangle \partial_\lambda \mu &= -\langle \underline{\mu}, \sigma_1 \Psi_3 \rangle = S_{0,1}^0, \\ \langle \underline{\mu}, \sigma_1 \Psi_4 \rangle \langle \nabla_{\tilde{r}} \mu, \sigma_1 \cdot \rangle &= \langle \underline{\mu}, \sigma_1 P \cdot \rangle = \langle S_{0,1}^1 + \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \cdot \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have the conclusion. \square

We next consider the relation of the indexes i, j of $S_{i,j}^k$ and the differentiation with respect to Q, ω, λ and \tilde{r} .

Lemma 3.4. *We set*

$$I(i) = \begin{cases} i & \text{for } i = 0, 1, \\ i - 2 & \text{for } i \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Let $i, j, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We have

$$\partial_Q S_{i,j}^k = S_{I(i),j}^k + S_{i,j-1}^k, \quad \partial_\rho S_{i,j}^k = S_{I(i),j}^k + S_{i,j-1}^k, \quad \partial_\omega S_{i,j}^k = S_{i-1,j}^k + S_{i+1,j-1}^k, \quad \partial_\lambda S_{i,j}^k = S_{i,j-1}^k,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} S_{i,j}^0 &= S_{i,j-1}^1, \\ d_{\tilde{r}} S_{i,j}^1 &= S_{i,j-1}^2 + \langle S_{0,1}^1, \sigma_1 \cdot \rangle S_{i,j-1}^1 + \left(S_{I(i),j}^1 + S_{i,j-1}^1 \right) \langle \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \cdot \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Here, for $i, j = 0$, the indexes $i - 1, j - 1$ are always understood as 0.

Proof. Let $S_{i,j}^0 = \hat{f}(Q, \omega, \lambda, \mu(Q, \omega, \lambda, Q(\tilde{r}), \tilde{r}), Q(\tilde{r}), \tilde{r})$. Then, by (3.2)

$$\partial_Q S_{i,j}^0 = \partial_Q \hat{f} + \partial_\mu \hat{f} \partial_Q \mu = S_{I(i),j}^0 + S_{i,j-1}^0 S_{0,0}^0.$$

Here, notice that $I(i)$ appears because of the regularity of \hat{f} . We obtain the others by similar manner. \square

We next consider a C^∞ -diffeomorphism $\mathfrak{F} \in C^\infty(D_{H_{\text{rad}}^1}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}, \delta), H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathcal{C}}))$ s.t.

$$\mathfrak{F}^* Q = Q, \quad \mathfrak{F}^* \omega = \omega + S_{0,l}^0, \quad \mathfrak{F}^* \lambda = \lambda + S_{1,l}^0, \quad \mathfrak{F}^* \tilde{r} = e^{iS_{0,l}^0 \sigma_3} (\tilde{r} + S_{\sigma(l),l}^1) \quad (3.3)$$

$$\text{for some } l \geq 1 \text{ and } \sigma(l) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } l = 1, 2, \\ 0 & \text{for } l \geq 3. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

We note that all the transforms we use in this paper satisfy (3.3) for some $l \geq 1$. In particular, \mathfrak{F}_0 in Proposition 3.7, ϕ_1 in Lemma 3.15 and ϕ_2 in Lemma 3.18 satisfy (3.3) with $l = 1$ and ϕ_{N+1} appearing in Lemma 3.19 satisfies (3.3) with $l = N$. It is obvious that we have

$$\mathfrak{F}^* S_{i,j}^k = S_{i,j}^k. \quad (3.5)$$

We study the expansion of $\mathfrak{F}^* Q(\tilde{r})$ and $\mathfrak{F}^* \mu$.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $l \geq 1, \delta > 0$ and let $\mathfrak{F} \in C^\infty(D_{H_{\text{rad}}^1}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}, \delta), H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathcal{C}}))$ be a C^∞ -diffeomorphism satisfying (3.3). Then, for the $\sigma(l)$ in (3.4) we have*

$$\mathfrak{F}^* Q(\tilde{r}) = Q(\tilde{r}) + S_{\sigma(l),l+1}^0, \quad \mathfrak{F}^* \mu = \mu + S_{1,l}^0.$$

Proof. First, since $e^{iS_{0,l}^0 \sigma_3} \sigma_1 e^{iS_{0,l}^0 \sigma_3} = \sigma_1$ by $\sigma_3 \sigma_1 = -\sigma_1 \sigma_3$, we have

$$\mathfrak{F}^* Q(\tilde{r}) = \left\langle \tilde{r} + S_{\sigma(l),l}^1, \sigma_1 \left(\tilde{r} + S_{\sigma(l),l}^1 \right) \right\rangle = Q(\tilde{r}) + S_{\sigma(l),l+1}^0 + S_{2\sigma(l),2l}^0 = Q(\tilde{r}) + S_{\sigma(l),l+1}^0.$$

Next, from Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F}^* \mu &= \mu \left(Q, \omega + S_{0,l}^0, \lambda + S_{1,l}^0, Q(\tilde{r}) + S_{\sigma(l),l+1}^0, \tilde{r} + (S_{0,l}^0 \sigma_3 + S_{0,2l}^0) \tilde{r} + S_{\sigma(l),l}^1 \right) \\ &= \mu(Q, \omega, \lambda, Q(\tilde{r}), \tilde{r}) + S_{1,0}^0 S_{0,l}^0 + S_{0,1}^0 S_{1,l}^0 + S_{0,0}^0 S_{\sigma(l),l+1}^0 + S_{0,l+1}^0 \\ &= S_{1,l}^0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have the conclusion. \square

3.2 Darboux coordinates

As usual in the proof of Darboux theorem, we start from studying the 1-form $\Gamma(\tilde{u}) = \frac{1}{2}\Omega(\tilde{u}, \cdot)$ introduced in Sect. 2.5.

Lemma 3.6. *We have*

$$\Gamma(\tilde{u}) = \Gamma_0(\tilde{u}) + \Omega(S_{0,1}^0 \tilde{r} + S_{1,1}^1, d\tilde{r}) + S_{1,1}^0 d\omega + S_{0,2}^0 d\lambda + (exact)_1 \quad (3.6)$$

where $(exact)_1 := d\left[\Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, P\tilde{r}) + \Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, \Psi_3)\lambda + B\lambda\mu\right]$ and Γ_0 is defined in (2.37).

Proof. It is a simple linear algebra argument. Recalling the definition of \underline{u} in (2.42), using the functions $(\vartheta, \omega, \lambda, \mu, \tilde{r})$ we have

$$2\Gamma(\tilde{u}) = 2Qd\vartheta + \Omega(\underline{u}, \partial_\omega \underline{u})d\omega + \Omega(\underline{u}, \Psi_3)d\lambda + \Omega(\underline{u}, \Psi_4)d\mu + \Omega(\underline{u}, Pd\tilde{r}).$$

Since $\partial_\omega \underline{u} = \Psi_2 + \lambda\partial_\omega \Psi_3 + \mu\partial_\omega \Psi_4 - \partial_\omega Pd\tilde{r}$, we have

$$\Omega(\underline{u}, \partial_\omega \underline{u}) = \lambda\Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, \partial_\omega \Psi_3) - \Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, \partial_\omega Pd\tilde{r}) - A\lambda + S_{0,2}^0$$

and

$$\Omega(\underline{u}, \Psi_3) = \Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, \Psi_3) - \mu\Omega(\Psi_3, \Psi_4) = \Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, \Psi_3) - B\mu,$$

$$\Omega(\underline{u}, \Psi_4) = \lambda\Omega(\Psi_3, \Psi_4) = B\lambda,$$

$$\Omega(\underline{u}, Pd\tilde{r}) = \Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, Pd\tilde{r}) + \Omega(P\tilde{r}, d\tilde{r}) = d[\Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, P\tilde{r})] + \Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, \partial_\omega Pd\tilde{r})d\omega + \Omega(P\tilde{r}, d\tilde{r}).$$

Here, recall $A = A(\omega)$ and $B = B(\omega)$ are given in Proposition 2.9 and (2.24) respectively. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\Gamma(\underline{u}) &= 2Qd\vartheta + \lambda\Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, \partial_\omega \Psi_3)d\omega - \lambda A(\omega)d\omega + S_{0,2}^0 d\omega \\ &\quad + \Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, \Psi_3)d\lambda - \mu B(\omega)d\lambda + \lambda B(\omega)d\mu + d\left[\Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, P\tilde{r})\right] + \Omega(P\tilde{r}, d\tilde{r}). \end{aligned}$$

We use the following identities:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda\Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, \partial_\omega \Psi_3)d\omega + \Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, \Psi_3)d\lambda &= d\left(\Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, \Psi_3)\lambda\right) - A\lambda d\omega, \\ -B\mu d\lambda &= -d(B\lambda\mu) + B\lambda d\mu + S_{0,2}^0 d\omega. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting we obtain by Lemma 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\Gamma(\underline{u}) &= 2Qd\vartheta - 2A\lambda d\omega + 2B\lambda d\mu + \Omega(\tilde{r}, d\tilde{r}) \\ &\quad + \Omega(S_{1,1}^1, d\tilde{r}) + S_{0,2}^0 d\omega + d\left[\Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, P\tilde{r}) + \Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, \Psi_3)\lambda - B\lambda\mu\right]. \end{aligned}$$

From (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} B\lambda d\mu &= B\lambda(\partial_Q \mu dQ + S_{1,0}^0 d\omega + S_{0,1}^0 d\lambda + S_{0,0}^0 \langle \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle + \langle S_{0,1}^1, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle) \\ &= B\lambda \partial_Q \mu dQ + S_{1,1}^0 d\omega + S_{0,2}^0 d\lambda + S_{0,1}^0 \langle \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle + \langle S_{0,2}^1, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have the following, which implies (3.6):

$$\begin{aligned} 2\Gamma(\underline{u}) &= 2Qd\vartheta - 2A\lambda d\omega + \Omega(\tilde{r}, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r}) + 2B\lambda \partial_Q \mu dQ \\ &\quad + \langle S_{0,1}^0 \tilde{r} + S_{1,1}^1, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle + S_{1,1}^0 d\omega + S_{0,2}^0 d\lambda + d(\Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, P\tilde{r}) + \Omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega, \Psi_3)\lambda - B\lambda\mu). \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

□

We now state the Darboux theorem, which corresponds to the first half of Theorem 2.22. Recall $\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*} = \{e^{i\theta\sigma_3}\tilde{\phi}_{\omega_*} \mid \theta \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

Proposition 3.7 (Darboux theorem). *There exists $\delta_0 > 0$ s.t. there exists a C^∞ -diffeomorphism $\mathfrak{F}_0 \in C^\infty(D_{H_{\text{rad}}^1}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}, \delta_0), H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathcal{C}}))$ onto a neighborhood of \mathcal{T}_{ω_*} in H_{rad}^1 s.t.*

$$\mathfrak{F}_0^*\omega = \omega + S_{0,2}^0, \quad \mathfrak{F}_0^*\lambda = \lambda + S_{1,1}^0, \quad \mathfrak{F}_0^*\tilde{r} = e^{iS_{0,1}^0\sigma_3}(\tilde{r} + S_{1,1}^0) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{F}_0^*Q = Q \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{F}_0^*\Omega = \Omega_0,$$

Furthermore, we have $\mathfrak{F}_0^*\mu = \mu + S_{1,1}^0$ and $\mathfrak{F}_0^*Q(\tilde{r}) = Q(\tilde{r}) + S_{1,2}^0$.

Remark 3.8. The coordinates $(\vartheta, Q, \omega, \lambda, \tilde{r}) = (\vartheta(u), Q(u), \omega(u), \lambda(u), \tilde{r}(u))$ in (3.8) are given by $(\vartheta(u), Q(u), \omega(u), \lambda(u), \tilde{r}(u)) = \mathcal{F}_2^{-1}(u)$, where \mathcal{F}_2 is the modulation coordinate given in Proposition 2.15. We make no care about $\mathfrak{F}_0^*\vartheta - \vartheta$, even though we can compute it by looking in to the proof.

For the proof of Proposition 3.7, we consider the following lemma.

Lemma 3.9. *There exists $\delta > 0$ s.t. there exists $\mathcal{X} \in C^\infty(D_{\mathbb{R}}(0, 2) \times D_{H_{\text{rad}}^1}(0, \delta), H_{\text{rad}}^1)$ s.t.*

$$\mathcal{X}(s)_Q = 0, \quad \mathcal{X}(s)_\omega = S_{0,2}^0, \quad \mathcal{X}(s)_\lambda = S_{1,1}^0, \quad \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} = S_{0,1}^0 i\sigma_3 \tilde{r} + S_{1,1}^1 \quad (3.9)$$

and if $\Omega_s := \Omega_0 + s(\Omega - \Omega_0)$, we have $i_{\mathcal{X}(s)}\Omega_s = -\tilde{\Gamma}$, where $\tilde{\Gamma} = \Gamma - \Gamma_0 - (\text{exact})_1$ and $i_X\Omega_s = \Omega_s(X, \cdot)$.

Proof. We will directly solve the equation

$$\Omega_0(\mathcal{X}(s), \cdot) + s(\Omega(\mathcal{X}(s), \cdot) - \Omega_0(\mathcal{X}(s), \cdot)) = -\tilde{\Gamma}. \quad (3.10)$$

By (2.42), it suffices to determine $\mathcal{X}(s)_\tau$ for $\tau = \vartheta, Q, \omega, \lambda, \tilde{r}$. By (3.7) in the proof of Lemma 3.6, we have

$$\tilde{\Gamma} = S_{1,1}^0 d\omega + S_{0,2}^0 d\lambda + \langle S_{0,1}^0 \tilde{r} + S_{1,1}^1, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle. \quad (3.11)$$

For the first term of the r.h.s. of (3.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_0(\mathcal{X}(s), \cdot) &= \mathcal{X}(s)_Q d\vartheta - \mathcal{X}(s)_\vartheta dQ + A(\omega)\mathcal{X}(s)_\omega d\lambda - A(\omega)\mathcal{X}(s)_\lambda d\omega + \langle i\sigma_3 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}}, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle \\ &\quad + (S_{0,0}^0 \mathcal{X}(s)_\lambda + S_{0,1}^0 \mathcal{X}(s)_\omega + \langle S_{0,1}^0 \tilde{r} + S_{1,1}^1, \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} \rangle) dQ \\ &\quad + \mathcal{X}(s)_Q (S_{0,0}^0 d\lambda + S_{0,1}^0 d\omega + \langle S_{0,1}^0 \tilde{r} + S_{1,1}^1, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

By (3.11) and Lemma 3.4, we have

$$d[S_{1,1}^0 d\omega] = S_{1,0}^0 dQ \wedge d\omega + S_{1,0}^0 d\omega \wedge d\lambda + d\omega \wedge \langle S_{1,0}^1 + S_{1,0}^0 \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle \quad (3.13)$$

$$d[S_{0,2}^0 d\lambda] = S_{0,1}^0 dQ \wedge d\lambda + S_{1,1}^0 d\omega \wedge d\lambda + d\lambda \wedge \langle S_{1,1}^1 + S_{0,1}^0 \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle, \quad (3.14)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} d\langle S_{0,1}^0 \tilde{r} + S_{1,1}^1, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle &= dQ \wedge \langle S_{0,0}^0 \tilde{r} + S_{1,0}^1, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle + d\omega \wedge \langle S_{1,0}^0 \tilde{r} + S_{1,0}^1, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle + \\ &\quad d\lambda \wedge \langle S_{0,0}^0 \tilde{r} + S_{1,0}^1, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle + \langle \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle \wedge \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle + \langle S_{0,1}^1, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle \wedge \langle S_{1,0}^1, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle + \langle S_{1,0}^2 d\tilde{r}, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Here, notice that terms such as $\langle S_{0,1}^0 d\tilde{r}, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle$ and $S_{0,0}^0 \langle \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle \wedge \langle \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle$ are symmetric and do not appear when we take the exterior derivative. By (3.11), (3.13)–(3.15) and $\Omega - \Omega_0 = d\tilde{\Gamma}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(\mathcal{X}(s), \cdot) - \Omega_0(\mathcal{X}(s), \cdot) &= (S_{1,0}^0 \mathcal{X}(s)_\omega + S_{1,0}^0 \mathcal{X}(s)_\lambda + \langle S_{1,0}^1 + S_{0,0}^0 \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} \rangle) dQ \\ &+ (S_{1,0}^0 \mathcal{X}(s)_Q + S_{1,0}^0 \mathcal{X}(s)_\lambda + \langle S_{1,0}^1 + S_{1,0}^0 \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} \rangle) d\omega \\ &+ (S_{1,0}^0 \mathcal{X}(s)_Q + S_{1,0}^0 \mathcal{X}(s)_\omega + \langle S_{1,0}^1 + S_{0,0}^0 \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} \rangle) d\lambda \\ &+ \mathcal{X}(s)_Q \langle S_{0,0}^1 + S_{1,0}^0 \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle + \mathcal{X}(s)_\omega \langle S_{1,0}^1 + S_{1,0}^0 \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle + \mathcal{X}(s)_\lambda \langle S_{1,0}^1 + S_{0,0}^0 \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle \\ &+ \langle S_{1,0}^2 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}}, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle + \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} \rangle \langle \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle + \langle \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} \rangle \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 d\tilde{r} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

where we have used $\langle S_{i,j}^1 \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} \rangle S_{j,i}^1 = S_{1,0}^2 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}}$ for $(i, j) = (1, 0)$ or $(0, 1)$.

We substitute (3.11), (3.12) and (3.16) into (3.10) and compare the coefficients of $d\vartheta$, dQ , $d\omega$, $d\lambda$ and $d\tilde{r}$. First, looking at the coefficients of $d\vartheta$, we have

$$\mathcal{X}(s)_Q = 0.$$

Next, the coefficients of $d\omega$, $d\lambda$, $d\tilde{r}$ have to satisfy

$$-A(\omega) \mathcal{X}(s)_\lambda + s (S_{1,0}^0 \mathcal{X}(s)_\lambda + \langle S_{1,0}^1 + S_{1,0}^0 \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} \rangle) = S_{1,1}^0, \quad (3.17)$$

$$A(\omega) \mathcal{X}(s)_\omega + s (S_{1,0}^0 \mathcal{X}(s)_Q + S_{1,0}^0 \mathcal{X}(s)_\omega + \langle S_{1,0}^1 + S_{0,0}^0 \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} \rangle) = S_{0,2}^0, \quad (3.18)$$

$$i\sigma_3 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} + s (\mathcal{X}(s)_\omega (S_{1,0}^1 + S_{1,0}^0 \tilde{r}) + \mathcal{X}(s)_\lambda (S_{1,0}^1 + S_{0,0}^0 \tilde{r}) + S_{1,0}^2 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}}) \quad (3.19)$$

$$+ s (\langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} \rangle \tilde{r} + \langle \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} \rangle S_{0,0}^1) = S_{0,1}^0 \tilde{r} + S_{1,1}^1.$$

We further decompose the third equation by setting $\mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} = x(s)i\sigma_3 \tilde{r} + \tilde{\mathcal{X}}(s)_{\tilde{r}}$. Then, we have

$$-x(s) + s (\mathcal{X}(s)_\omega S_{1,0}^0 + \mathcal{X}(s)_\lambda S_{0,0}^0 + \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} \rangle) = S_{0,1}^0, \quad (3.20)$$

$$i\sigma_3 \tilde{\mathcal{X}}(s)_{\tilde{r}} + s (\mathcal{X}(s)_\omega S_{1,0}^1 + \mathcal{X}(s)_\lambda S_{1,0}^1 + S_{1,0}^2 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} + \langle \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} \rangle S_{0,0}^1) = S_{1,1}^1. \quad (3.21)$$

We can solve the system (3.17), (3.18), (3.20) and (3.21) by Neumann series and obtain

$$\mathcal{X}(s)_\omega = S_{0,2}^0, \quad \mathcal{X}(s)_\lambda = S_{1,1}^0, \quad \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} = S_{0,1}^0 i\sigma_3 \tilde{r} + S_{1,1}^1.$$

Finally, we define $\mathcal{X}(s)_\omega$ by looking at the coefficients of dQ .

$$\begin{aligned} & -\mathcal{X}(s)_\vartheta + (S_{0,0}^0 \mathcal{X}(s)_\lambda + S_{0,1}^0 \mathcal{X}(s)_\omega + \langle S_{0,1}^0 \tilde{r} + S_{0,1}^1, \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} \rangle) \\ & + s (S_{1,0}^0 \mathcal{X}(s)_\omega + S_{1,0}^0 \mathcal{X}(s)_\lambda + \langle S_{1,0}^1 + S_{0,1}^0 \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \mathcal{X}(s)_{\tilde{r}} \rangle) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have constructed the desired vector field $\mathcal{X}(s)$ □

We now prove Proposition 3.7.

Proof of Proposition 3.7. The desired change of coordinate \mathfrak{F}_0 will given by the transform $\mathcal{Y}(s)|_{s=1}$, where $\mathcal{Y}(s)$ is the solution of

$$\frac{d}{ds} \mathcal{Y}(s) = \mathcal{X}(s)(\mathcal{Y}(s)), \quad \mathcal{Y}(0) = \text{Id}, \quad (3.22)$$

see [10]. The existence of such \mathcal{Y} follows from standard argument. If we set

$$\mathcal{Y}^*(s)\omega = \omega + y_\omega(s), \quad \mathcal{Y}^*(s)\lambda = \lambda + y_\lambda(s) \text{ and } \mathcal{Y}^*(s)\tilde{r} = e^{\tilde{y}_{\tilde{r}}(s)i\sigma_3} (\tilde{r} + y_{\tilde{r}}(s)),$$

(3.22) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{ds}y_\omega(s) &= S_{0,2}^0 \\ \frac{d}{ds}y_\lambda(s) &= S_{1,1}^0 \\ \frac{d}{ds}\left(e^{\tilde{y}_{\tilde{r}}(s)i\sigma_3}(\tilde{r} + y_{\tilde{r}}(s))\right) &= S_{0,1}^0 i\sigma_3 e^{\tilde{y}_{\tilde{r}}(s)i\sigma_3}(\tilde{r} + y_{\tilde{r}}(s)) + S_{1,1}^1.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$y_\omega = y_\omega(1) = S_{0,2}^0, \quad y_\lambda = y_\lambda(1) = S_{1,1}^0, \quad y_{\tilde{r}} = y_{\tilde{r}}(1) = S_{1,1}^1 \text{ and } \tilde{y}_{\tilde{r}} = \tilde{y}_{\tilde{r}}(1) = S_{0,1}^0,$$

by elementary argument. Further, since $\mathcal{X}(s)_Q = 0$, we have $\mathcal{Y}^*Q = Q$.

Finally, the last statement of Proposition 3.7 follows from Lemma 3.5. \square

3.3 Energy expansion

We have the following expansion.

Lemma 3.10. *In the coordinates $(\vartheta, Q, \omega, \lambda, \tilde{r})$ given in Proposition 2.15 we have the expansion*

$$\begin{aligned}E = & d(\omega) - \omega Q + \frac{\lambda^2}{2}A(\omega) + \frac{\mu^2}{2}B(\omega) + (\omega - \omega_*)Q(\tilde{r}) + \frac{1}{2}\langle H_{\omega_*}\tilde{r}, \sigma_1\tilde{r} \rangle + E_P(\tilde{r}) \\ & + S_{1,2}^0 + \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_7,\end{aligned}\quad (3.23)$$

where \mathbf{R}_k are terms given in Definition 2.19

Proof. Set $F(s, t) = S_\omega(s\Psi + t\tilde{r})$, where $S_\omega = E + \omega Q$ and $\Psi = \tilde{\phi}_\omega + \lambda\Psi_3(\omega) + \mu\Psi_4(\omega) - P_d\tilde{r} = S_{0,0}^1$. Then, by Taylor expansion, we have

$$F(1, 1) = F(0, 1) + F(1, 0) + \sum_{j=1}^2 \int_0^1 \frac{1}{j!} \partial_s \partial_t^j F(s, 0) ds + \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{(1-t)^2}{2} \partial_s \partial_t^3 F(s, t) dt ds. \quad (3.24)$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}S_\omega(\Psi + \tilde{r}) = & S_\omega(\Psi) + S_\omega(\tilde{r}) + \sum_{j=1}^2 \int_0^1 \frac{1}{j!} \partial_s \partial_t^j \Big|_{t=0} S_\omega(s\Psi + t\tilde{r}) ds \\ & + \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{(1-t)^2}{2} \langle \nabla^4 E_P(s\Psi + t\tilde{r})(\Psi, \tilde{r}, \tilde{r}), \sigma_1\tilde{r} \rangle dt ds.\end{aligned}\quad (3.25)$$

Notice that we can replace S_ω by E_P in the second line of (3.25) because the $S_\omega - E_P$ consist of quadratic terms.

We expand all terms of (3.25). For the first, we have

$$\begin{aligned}S_\omega(\Psi) &= S_\omega(\tilde{\phi}_\omega) + \frac{1}{2} \langle H_\omega(\lambda\Psi_3 + \mu\Psi_4 - P_d\tilde{r}), \sigma_1(\lambda\Psi_3 + \mu\Psi_4 - P_d\tilde{r}) \rangle + S_{0,3}^0 \\ &= d(\omega) + \frac{1}{2} \Omega(-i\mathcal{H}_\omega(\lambda\Psi_3 + \mu\Psi_4), \lambda\Psi_3 + \mu\Psi_4) + S_{1,2}^0 \\ &= d(\omega) + \frac{1}{2} A(\omega)\lambda^2 + \frac{1}{2} B(\omega)\mu^2 + S_{1,2}^0,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $P_d(\omega)\tilde{r} = S_{1,1}^1$ in the second line and (2.18) and $a(\omega) = S_{1,0}^0$ in the third line. For the third term with $j = 1$ in the r.h.s. of (3.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \partial_s \partial_t|_{t=0} S_\omega(s\Psi + t\tilde{r}) ds &= \int_0^1 \partial_s \langle \nabla S_\omega(s\Psi), \sigma_1 P\tilde{r} \rangle ds = \langle \nabla S_\omega(\Psi), \sigma_1 P\tilde{r} \rangle \\ &= \langle H_\omega(\lambda\Psi_3 + \mu\Psi_4 - P_d\tilde{r}), \sigma_1 P\tilde{r} \rangle + S_{0,3}^0 = S_{0,3}^0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $\nabla S_\omega(0) = 0$ in the second equality and orthogonality in the fourth equality. For the remaining terms of the 1st line of (3.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_\omega(\tilde{r}) + \int_0^1 \frac{1}{2} \partial_s \partial_t^2|_{t=0} S_\omega(s\Psi + t\tilde{r}) ds &= S_\omega(\tilde{r}) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \partial_s \langle \nabla^2 S_\omega(s\Psi)\tilde{r}, \sigma_1\tilde{r} \rangle ds \\ &= S_\omega(\tilde{r}) - \frac{1}{2} \langle \nabla^2 S_\omega(0)\tilde{r}, \sigma_1\tilde{r} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle H_\omega\tilde{r}, \sigma_1\tilde{r} \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \langle \nabla^3 E_P(\tilde{\phi}_\omega + t(\lambda\Psi_3 + \mu\Psi_4 - P_d\tilde{r}))(\lambda\Psi_3 + \mu\Psi_4 - P_d\tilde{r}, \tilde{r}), \sigma_1\tilde{r} \rangle dt \\ &= E_P(\tilde{r}) + \frac{1}{2} \langle H_{\omega_*}\tilde{r}, \sigma_1\tilde{r} \rangle + (\omega - \omega_*)Q(\tilde{r}) + \mathbf{R}_2. \end{aligned}$$

Here, since

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^3 E_P(u)(v_1, v_2) &= 2g'(|u|^2) (\langle u, \sigma_1 v_1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} v_2 + \langle u, \sigma_1 v_2 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} v_1 + \langle v_1, \sigma_1 v_2 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} u) \\ &\quad + 4g''(|u|^2) \langle u, \sigma_1 v_1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle u, \sigma_1 v_2 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} u, \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

with $\tilde{\phi}_\omega + t(\lambda\Psi_3 + \mu\Psi_4 - P_d\tilde{r}) = S_{0,0}^1$ and $\lambda\Psi_3 + \mu\Psi_4 - P_d\tilde{r} = S_{0,1}^1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \langle \nabla^3 E_P(\tilde{\phi}_\omega + t(\lambda\Psi_3 + \mu\Psi_4 - P_d\tilde{r}))(\lambda\Psi_3 + \mu\Psi_4 - P_d\tilde{r}, \tilde{r}), \sigma_1\tilde{r} \rangle dt \\ = \langle S_{0,1}^1\tilde{r}, \sigma_1\tilde{r} \rangle + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1\tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle S_{0,1}^1, \sigma_1\tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx = \mathbf{R}_2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the 2nd line of (3.25) is \mathbf{R}_7 by definition. \square

We next study the expansion of $\mathfrak{F}_0^* E$. However, before that we study what happens for $\mathfrak{F}^* \mathbf{R}_k$ as a preliminary.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $l \geq 1$, $\delta > 0$ and let $\mathfrak{F} \in C^\infty(D_{H_{\text{rad}}^1}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}, \delta), H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}))$ satisfy (3.3)–(3.4). Then, we have*

$$\mathfrak{F}^* \left(\sum_{k=2}^7 \mathbf{R}_k \right) = \sum_{k=2}^7 \mathbf{R}_k + S_{\sigma^{(l)+1, l+1}}^0 + S_{0, l+2}^0. \quad (3.27)$$

For the elementary but long proof, see Sect. A.2 in the Appendix.

We next study the expansion of $\mathfrak{F}^* E_P$.

Lemma 3.12. *Let $l \geq 1$, $\delta > 0$ and let $\mathfrak{F} \in C^\infty(D_{H_{\text{rad}}^1}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}, \delta), H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}))$ satisfy (3.3)–(3.4). Then, we have*

$$\mathfrak{F}^* E_P(\tilde{r}) = E_P(\tilde{r}) + \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_7 + S_{4\sigma^{(l), 4l}}^0. \quad (3.28)$$

Proof. By Taylor expansion as in (3.24) we have

$$\mathfrak{F}_0^* E_P(\tilde{r}) = E_P(\tilde{r} + S_{\sigma(l),l}^1) = E_P(\tilde{r}) + E_P(S_{\sigma(l),l}^1) + \sum_{j=1,2} \int_0^1 \partial_s \partial_t^j \Big|_{t=0} E_P(t\tilde{r} + sS_{\sigma(l),l}^1) ds + \mathbf{R}_7.$$

Further, we have $E_P(S_{\sigma(l),l}^1) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} G(s_{2\sigma(l),2l}^1) dx = S_{4\sigma(l),4l}^0$, and by (2.13) we have

$$\int_0^1 \partial_s \partial_t \Big|_{t=0} E_P(t\tilde{r} + sS_{1,1}^1) ds = \left\langle \nabla^2 E_P(sS_{\sigma(l),l}^1) S_{\sigma(l),l}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \right\rangle = S_{4\sigma(l),4l+1}^0$$

and by (3.26) we have

$$\int_0^1 \partial_s \partial_t^2 \Big|_{t=0} E_P(t\tilde{r} + sS_{1,1}^1) ds = \int_0^1 \left\langle \nabla^3 E_P(sS_{\sigma(l),l}^1) (S_{\sigma(l),l}^1, \tilde{r}), \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \right\rangle ds = \mathbf{R}_2.$$

Therefore, we obtain (3.28). \square

We next consider the expansion in the Darboux coordinates.

Lemma 3.13. *Let \mathfrak{F}_0 be the transformation in Proposition 3.7. Then $\mathfrak{F}_0^* E$ has the expansion*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F}_0^* E &= d(\omega) - \omega Q + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} A(\omega) + \frac{\mu^2}{2} B(\omega) + (\omega - \omega_*) Q(\tilde{r}) + \frac{1}{2} \langle H_{\omega_*} \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle + E_P(\tilde{r}) \\ &\quad + S_{1,2}^0 + \sum_{j=2}^7 \mathbf{R}_j \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

where \mathbf{R}_j are terms in the form given in Definition 2.19.

Proof. We consider the expansion of E in (3.23) and we apply the pull back \mathfrak{F}_0^* to each of the terms in the r.h.s. First, if we set $\omega' = \mathfrak{F}_0^* \omega = \omega + y_\omega$ where $y_\omega = S_{0,2}^0$, we have by $d'(\omega) = q(\omega)$

$$\begin{aligned} d(\omega') - \omega' Q &= d(\omega) - \omega Q + (q(\omega) - Q) y_\omega + O(y_\omega^2) = d(\omega) - \omega Q + S_{1,0}^0 S_{0,2}^0 + O((S_{0,2}^0)^2) \\ &= d(\omega) - \omega Q + S_{1,2}^0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F}_0^* \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{2} A(\omega) + \frac{\mu^2}{2} B(\omega) + (\omega - \omega_*) Q(\tilde{r}) \right) \\ &= \frac{(\lambda + S_{1,1}^0)^2}{2} A(\omega + S_{0,2}^0) + \frac{(\mu + S_{1,2}^0)^2}{2} B(\omega + S_{0,2}^0) + (\omega - \omega_* + S_{0,2}^0) (Q(\tilde{r}) + S_{1,2}^0) \\ &= \frac{\lambda^2}{2} A(\omega) + \frac{\mu^2}{2} B(\omega) + (\omega - \omega_*) Q(\tilde{r}) + S_{1,2}^0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

For $\mathfrak{F}_0^* \left(\frac{1}{2} \langle H_{\omega_*} \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle \right)$, recall by (2.13) that $H_{\omega_*} = -\Delta + \omega_* + g(\phi_{\omega_*}^2) + g'(\phi_{\omega_*}^2) \phi_{\omega_*}^2 + g'(\phi_{\omega_*}^2) \phi_{\omega_*}^2 \sigma_1$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F}_0^* \left(\frac{1}{2} \langle H_{\omega_*} \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle \right) &= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle H_{\omega_*} e^{\tilde{y}_{\tilde{r}} i \sigma_3} (\tilde{r} + S_{1,1}^1), \sigma_1 e^{\tilde{y}_{\tilde{r}} i \sigma_3} (\tilde{r} + S_{1,1}^1) \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left(e^{-\tilde{y}_{\tilde{r}} i \sigma_3} H_{\omega_*} e^{\tilde{y}_{\tilde{r}} i \sigma_3} - H_{\omega_*} \right) (\tilde{r} + S_{1,1}^1), \sigma_1 (\tilde{r} + S_{1,1}^1) \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \langle H_{\omega_*} \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle + S_{1,2}^0 + \left\langle g'(\phi_{\omega_*}^2) \phi_{\omega_*}^2 \sigma_1 \left(e^{2\tilde{y}_{\tilde{r}} i \sigma_3} - 1 \right) \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

Now, by $y_{\tilde{r}} = S_{0,1}^0$ and $e^{2\tilde{y}_{\tilde{r}}i\sigma_3} - 1 = S_{0,1}^0 i\sigma_3 + S_{0,2}^0$, we have $\sigma_1 (e^{2\tilde{y}_{\tilde{r}}i\sigma_3} - 1) = S_{0,1}^0 \sigma_2 + S_{0,2}^0 \sigma_1$. Thus, by

$$\sigma_1 = \frac{1}{2} (e \cdot {}^t e + f \cdot {}^t f), \quad \sigma_2 = \frac{1}{2} (e \cdot {}^t f - f \cdot {}^t e), \quad e = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad f = \begin{pmatrix} i \\ -i \end{pmatrix},$$

where ${}^t e, {}^t f$ are transpose of e, f , we have

$$g'(\phi_{\omega_*}^2) \phi_{\omega_*}^2 \sigma_1 (e^{2\tilde{y}_{\tilde{r}}i\sigma_3} - 1) = g'(\phi_{\omega_*}^2) \phi_{\omega_*}^2 \sum_{x,y=e,f} (S_{0,1}^0 x) \cdot {}^t (S_{0,0}^0 y) = S_{0,1}^1 \cdot {}^t (S_{0,0}^1),$$

where we have omitted the sum in the r.h.s. Now, since $\langle u, v \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} = {}^t u \cdot v$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle g'(\phi_{\omega_*}^2) \phi_{\omega_*}^2 \sigma_1 (e^{2\tilde{y}_{\tilde{r}}i\sigma_3} - 1) \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} &= {}^t (S_{0,1}^1 \cdot {}^t (S_{0,0}^1) \tilde{r}) \cdot (\sigma_1 \tilde{r}) = ({}^t \tilde{r}) \cdot S_{0,0}^1 ({}^t (S_{0,1}^1) \cdot (\sigma_1 \tilde{r})) \\ &= \langle \sigma_1 S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle S_{0,1}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sigma_1 S_{0,0}^1 = S_{0,0}^1$, we have

$$\langle g'(\phi_{\omega_*}^2) \phi_{\omega_*}^2 \sigma_1 (e^{2\tilde{y}_{\tilde{r}}i\sigma_3} - 1) \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle = \mathbf{R}_2. \quad (3.33)$$

Finally, from Lemmas 3.27 and 3.12, we have

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_0^* (S_{1,2}^0 + \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_7 + E_P(\tilde{r})) = S_{1,2}^0 + \sum_{k=2}^7 \mathbf{R}_k + E_P(\tilde{r}),$$

where, we note that $S_{1,2}^0$ and \mathbf{R}_k in the l.h.s. and r.h.s. are different.

Therefore, we have the conclusion. \square

3.4 Canonical transformations

We consider the coordinates of Proposition 3.7. In these coordinates the energy E has the expansion of formula (3.29). In the sequel we will consider real valued functions, for $l \in \mathbb{N}$, of the form

$$\chi = \sum_{m+n=l+1} c_{m,n}(Q, \omega, Q(\tilde{r})) \lambda^m \mu^n + \sum_{m+n=l} \lambda^m \mu^n \Omega(C_{m,n}(Q, \omega, Q(\tilde{r})), \tilde{r}). \quad (3.34)$$

The fact that χ is real valued is equivalent to

$$c_{m,n} = \bar{c}_{m,n} \text{ and } C_{m,n} = \sigma_1 \bar{C}_{m,n}. \quad (3.35)$$

We consider the flow ϕ^s obtained from the hamiltonian vector field X_χ associated to Ω_0 . Notice that for $\phi := \phi^1$, we have $\phi^* \Omega_0 = \Omega_0$. The first question is if ϕ exists.

Lemma 3.14. *Fix an arbitrary $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and, for $\epsilon > 0$, set*

$$\mathcal{U}_\epsilon := \mathcal{F}_2 \left(\mathbb{R} \times D_{\mathbb{R}^4 \times P(\omega_*)} H_{\text{rad}}^1 ((q(\omega_*), \omega_*, 0, 0, 0), \epsilon) \right) \subset H_{\text{rad}}^1. \quad (3.36)$$

For the case $l = 1$, we assume that $c_{m,n} = S_{1,0}^0$ and $C_{m,n} = S_{1,0}^1$. Then, there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ s.t. if $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$, we have

$$\phi^s \in C^\infty(D_{\mathbb{R}}(0, 2) \times \mathcal{U}_\epsilon, H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathcal{C}})) \quad (3.37)$$

and there exist $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that

$$\phi^s(\mathcal{U}_{\epsilon_1}) \subset \mathcal{U}_\epsilon \text{ for all } |s| < 2. \quad (3.38)$$

For every $|s| < 2$ and for $(Q^s, \omega^s, \lambda^s, \tilde{r}^s) := (\phi^{s,*}Q, \phi^{s,*}\omega, \phi^{s,*}\lambda, \phi^{s,*}\tilde{r})$ we have $Q^s = Q$ and

$$\omega^s = \omega + S_{0,l}^0, \quad \lambda^s = \lambda + S_{1,l}^0, \quad \tilde{r}^s = e^{i\sigma_3 S_{0,l}^0} \tilde{r} + S_{0,l}^1. \quad (3.39)$$

Proof. By (2.40) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (X_\chi)_\lambda &= -A(\omega)^{-1} \partial_\omega \chi = S_{1,l}^0 \\ (X_\chi)_\omega &= A(\omega)^{-1} \partial_\lambda \chi = S_{\delta_{1l},l}^0 \\ (X_\chi)_{\tilde{r}} &= -i\sigma_3 \nabla_{\tilde{r}} \chi = -i\sigma_3 (\partial_\rho \chi + \partial_\mu \chi \partial_\rho \mu) \tilde{r} + \sum_{m+n=l} \lambda^m \mu^n C_{m,n} + \partial_\mu \chi \nabla_{\tilde{r}} \mu \\ &= S_{\delta_{1l},l}^0 i\sigma_3 \tilde{r} + S_{\delta_{1l},l}^1, \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_{1l} = 1$ for $l = 1$ and $\delta_{1l} = 0$ otherwise. The proof of Lemma 3.14 is based on

$$\tau^s = \tau + \int_0^s \{\tau, \chi\} \circ \phi^{s'} ds' \text{ for } \tau = \omega, \lambda, \quad (3.40)$$

and

$$e^{-i\sigma_3 \int_0^s S_{0,l}^0 \circ \phi^{s'} ds'} \tilde{r}^s = \tilde{r} + \int_0^s e^{-i\sigma_3 \int_0^{s'} S_{0,l}^0 \circ \phi^{s''} ds''} S_{0,l}^1 \circ \phi^{s'} ds'.$$

In the case $l \geq 2$ the error term represented by the integral in the r.h.s. is of order l and this leads to the desired result by elementary ODE analysis, see Lemma 3.8 [10]. Even for the case $l = 1$, the error term is order 2 by hypothesis. The proof of (3.39) is similar to that in Lemma 3.8 [10]. \square

We now exploit Lemma 3.14 in order to eliminate the term $\frac{\mu^2}{2} B(\omega)$ from E using χ with $N = 1$ defined for some $c = S_{0,0}^0$ by

$$\chi = c(Q, \omega, Q(\tilde{r})) \lambda \mu. \quad (3.41)$$

Lemma 3.15. *There exists $c = S_{0,0}^0$ s.t. for the function χ in (3.41) and for ϕ_1 the map associated to χ , we have $\mathfrak{F}_1 = \mathfrak{F}_0 \circ \phi_1 \in C^\infty(D_{H_{\text{rad}}^1}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}, \delta), H_{\text{rad}}^1)$ for some $\delta > 0$ satisfying (2.43) and (2.44). Moreover, \mathfrak{F}_1 is a C^∞ -diffeomorphism onto the neighborhood of \mathcal{T}_{ω_*} and we have*

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &:= E \circ \mathfrak{F}_1 \\ &= d(\omega) - \omega Q + (\omega - \omega_*) Q(\tilde{r}) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} A(\omega) + \frac{1}{2} \langle H_{\omega_*} \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle + E_P(\tilde{r}) + S_{1,2}^0 + \sum_{j=2}^7 \mathbf{R}_j, \end{aligned} \quad (3.42)$$

where \mathbf{R}_j are terms in the form given in Definition 2.19. Moreover,

Remark 3.16. This case is not covered by Lemma 3.14. However, by the proof, it will be clear that ϕ^s satisfies (3.37) and (3.38).

Proof. We pick $c = \beta(Q, \omega, Q(\tilde{r})) \lambda \mu$ without initially specifying c . Let ϕ^s the flow obtained from the Hamilton vector field X_χ . We set $\tau^s = (\phi^s)^* \tau = \tau \circ \phi^s$ for $\tau = \omega, \lambda, \tilde{r}$. By Lemma 3.14

$$\omega^s = \omega + S_{0,1}^0, \quad \lambda^s = \lambda + S_{1,1}^0.$$

Further, since

$$(X_\chi)_{\tilde{r}} = -i\sigma_3(\partial_\rho\beta\mu\lambda + \beta\partial_\rho\mu\lambda)\tilde{r} - \sigma_3\beta\lambda\nabla_{\tilde{r}}\mu = -i\sigma_3S_{0,1}^0\tilde{r} + S_{0,2}^1,$$

following the proof of Lemma 3.14, we have

$$\tilde{r}^s = e^{i\sigma_3S_{0,1}^0}(\tilde{r} + S_{0,2}^1).$$

Notice that the change of coordinate made by ϕ^1 has almost the same property as the change of coordinate by \mathfrak{F}_0 given in Proposition 3.7. The only difference is that $(\phi^1)^*\omega = \omega + S_{0,1}^0$ whereas the change of coordinates by Darboux theorem we had $\mathfrak{F}_0^*\omega = \omega + S_{0,2}^0$.

Thus, we expand ω^s more carefully. Since $(X_\chi)_\omega = A^{-1}(\omega)c(\mu + \lambda\partial_\lambda\mu)$, and by (3.2) and (3.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\omega^s &= \omega + \int_0^s A^{-1}(\omega^\tau)c(Q, \omega^\tau, Q(\tilde{r}^\tau))(\mu^\tau + \lambda^\tau\partial_\lambda\mu^\tau) d\tau \\ &= \omega + A^{-1}(\omega)c(Q, \omega, Q(\tilde{r})) \int_0^s \mu(Q, \omega^\tau, \lambda, Q(\tilde{r}), \tilde{r}) d\tau + S_{0,2}^0 \\ &= \omega + A^{-1}(\omega)c\mu s + A^{-1}(\omega)c\partial_\omega\mu(Q, \omega, 0, Q(\tilde{r}), 0) \int_0^s (\omega^\tau - \omega) d\tau + S_{0,2}^0,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Taylor expansion in the third line. Notice that $S_{0,2}^0$ in the second and third line are different. We set $D(Q, \omega, Q(\tilde{r})) := A^{-1}(\omega)\partial_\omega\mu(Q, \omega, 0, Q(\tilde{r}), 0) = S_{1,0}^0$. Then, we have

$$\omega^1 = \omega + A^{-1}c\mu \left(\frac{e^{Dc} - 1}{Dc} \right) + S_{0,2}^0 = \omega + A^{-1}c\mu \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(Dc)^{n-1}}{n!} + S_{0,2}^0.$$

We now compute $E \circ \mathfrak{F}_0 \circ \phi^1$. First,

$$d(\omega^1) - \omega^1 Q + (\omega^1 - \omega_*)Q(\tilde{r}^1) = d(\omega) - \omega Q + (\omega - \omega_*)Q(\tilde{r}) + (q(\omega) - Q + Q(\tilde{r}))(\omega^1 - \omega) + S_{1,2}^0,$$

where we have used $d'(\omega) = q(\omega)$ and $q'(\omega) = S_{1,0}^0$. Now, since $q(\omega) - Q + Q(\tilde{r}) = -A(\omega)\mu + S_{0,2}^0$ by Lemma 3.2, we have

$$d(\omega^1) - \omega^1 Q + (\omega^1 - \omega_*)Q(\tilde{r}^1) = d(\omega) - \omega Q + (\omega - \omega_*)Q(\tilde{r}) - c\mu^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(Dc)^{n-1}}{n!} + S_{1,2}^0.$$

For the expansion of other parts, from Lemmas 3.27 and 3.12, we have

$$\phi_1^* \left(S_{1,2}^0 + \sum_{k=2}^7 \mathbf{R}_k + E_P(\tilde{r}) \right) = S_{1,2}^0 + \sum_{k=2}^7 \mathbf{R}_k + E_P(\tilde{r}).$$

However, we remark that $S_{1,2}^0$, \mathbf{R}_k and $S_{0,0}^0$ and \tilde{v} in the l.h.s. and r.h.s. are not the same. Thus, if we set c to be the solution of

$$-c \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(Dc)^{n-1}}{n!} + \frac{1}{2}B(\omega) = 0,$$

we are able to erase the term $\frac{\mu^2}{2}B(\omega)$ from the energy expansion. Recalling $D = D(Q, \omega, Q(\tilde{r})) = S_{1,0}^0$, we can easily solve the above equation by Neumann series. Therefore, we have the conclusion. \square

Before, proceeding to the next step, we remark the following.

Lemma 3.17. *For any $s \geq 0$, $-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}|_{\Sigma_c^s}$ is invertible. That is, $(-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}|_{\Sigma_c^s})^{-1} : \Sigma_c^s \rightarrow \Sigma_c^s$ exists.*

Proof. For $s = 0$, the lemma is a consequence of the fact that $-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}|_{P(\omega_*)L_{\text{rad}}^2}$ has no 0 spectrum. For $s > 0$, for $v \in \Sigma_c^s \subset P(\omega_*)L_{\text{rad}}^2$, we can find $u \in P(\omega_*)L_{\text{rad}}^2$ s.t. $-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}u = v$. Then, by elliptic regularity, we can show $u \in \Sigma_c^s$ (actually, we gain two more derivatives). \square

We will prove Theorem 2.22 by induction. We first prove the base case $N = 2$.

Lemma 3.18 (Theorem 2.22 for $N = 2$). *There exists χ of the form given in (3.34) with $l = 2$ s.t. for ϕ_2 the map associated to χ we have $\mathfrak{F}_2 = \mathfrak{F}_1 \circ \phi_2 \in C^\infty(D_{H_{\text{rad}}^1}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}, \delta), H_{\text{rad}}^1)$ for some $\delta > 0$ satisfying (2.43) and (2.44). Moreover, \mathfrak{F}_2 is a C^∞ -diffeomorphism onto the neighborhood of \mathcal{T}_{ω_*} and $E_2 := E_1 \circ \phi_2$ satisfies (2.46) with $N = 2$.*

Proof. We expand $S_{1,2}^0$ in (3.42). Then, we have

$$S_{1,2}^0 = \sum_{m+n=2} e_{m,n}(Q, \omega, Q(\tilde{r}))\lambda^m\mu^n + \sum_{m+n=1} \lambda^m\mu^n\Omega(E_{m,n}(Q, \omega, Q(\tilde{r})), \tilde{r}) + \mathbf{R}_2 + S_{0,3}^0, \quad (3.43)$$

where $e_{m,n}(Q, \omega, Q(\tilde{r})) = S_{1,0}^0$ and $E_{m,n}(Q, \omega, Q(\tilde{r})) = S_{1,0}^1$. Further, notice that we can assume $P(\omega_*)E_{m,n} = E_{m,n}$. We want to erase the terms

$$e_{1,1}\lambda\mu + e_{0,2}\mu^2 + \lambda\Omega(E_{1,0}, \tilde{r}) + \mu\Omega(E_{0,1}, \tilde{r}). \quad (3.44)$$

Set

$$\chi = c_{2,0}\lambda^2 + c_{1,1}\lambda\mu + \lambda\Omega(G_{1,0}, \tilde{r}) + \mu\Omega(G_{0,1}, \tilde{r}),$$

where $c_{m,n} = c_{m,n}(Q, \omega, Q(\tilde{r}))$ and $G_{m,n} = G_{m,n}(Q, \omega, Q(\tilde{r}))$ are to be determined. We can assume $P(\omega_*)G_{m,n} = G_{m,n}$. In the end, we will have $c_{m,n} = S_{1,0}^0$ and $G_{m,n} = S_{1,0}^1$.

We define symbols $\tilde{S}_{i,j}^k$ similar $S_{i,j}^k$ but which are also a function of $c_{m,n}$ and $G_{m,n}$. Specifically, we write $f = f(Q, \omega, \lambda, \tilde{r}) = \tilde{S}_{i,j}^k$ if there exists $\hat{f} = \hat{f}(Q, \omega, \lambda, \mu, \rho, \tilde{r}, c_{m,n}, G_{m,n})$ with

$$\|\hat{f}\|_{X_s^n} \lesssim_s (|Q - q(\omega_*)|^{1/2} + |\omega - \omega_*| + |\lambda| + |\mu| + \rho^{1/2} + \|\tilde{r}\|_{\Sigma_{-s}} + |c_{m,n}| + \|G_{m,n}\|_{\Sigma_{-s}})^i \times (|\lambda| + |\mu| + \|\tilde{r}\|_{\Sigma_{-s}})^j$$

and

$$f(Q, \omega, \lambda, \tilde{r}) = \hat{f}(Q, \omega, \lambda, \mu(Q, \omega, \lambda, Q(\tilde{r}), \tilde{r}), Q(\tilde{r}), \tilde{r}, c_{m,n}(Q, Q(\tilde{r}), \tilde{r}), G_{m,n}(Q, Q(\tilde{r}), \tilde{r})).$$

We now compute the pullbacks by ϕ_2 . First, since

$$(X_\chi)_\lambda = -A(\omega)^{-1}(\partial_\omega \mu c_{1,1}\lambda + \partial_\omega \mu \langle i\sigma_3 G_{0,1}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle) + S_{0,2}^0 = \tilde{S}_{2,1}^0 + S_{0,2}^0,$$

we have

$$\lambda^s := \lambda \circ \phi_2^s = \lambda + \tilde{S}_{2,1}^0 + S_{0,2}^0.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} (X_\chi)_\omega &= A(\omega)^{-1}(2c_{2,0}\lambda + c_{1,1}\mu + \Omega(G_{1,0}, \tilde{r})) + S_{0,2}^0 = \tilde{S}_{1,1}^0 + S_{0,2}^0, \\ (X_\chi)_{\tilde{r}} &= -i\sigma_3(c_{1,1}\lambda\partial_\rho\tilde{r} + \lambda i\sigma_3 G_{1,0} + \mu i\sigma_3 G_{0,1}) + S_{0,2}^0 = \tilde{S}_{1,1}^0 i\sigma_3 \tilde{r} + \lambda G_{1,0} + \mu G_{0,1} + S_{2,0}^1 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\omega^s &:= \omega \circ \phi_2^s = \omega + \tilde{S}_{1,1}^0 + S_{0,2}^0, \\ \tilde{r}^s &:= \tilde{r} \circ \phi_2^s = e^{\tilde{S}_{1,1}^0 i \sigma_3} \left(\tilde{r} + \tilde{S}_{1,1}^1 + S_{0,2}^1 \right)\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}Q(\tilde{r}^s) &= Q(\tilde{r}) + \tilde{S}_{1,2}^0 + S_{1,3}^0, \\ \mu^s &:= \mu \circ \phi_2^s = \mu + \partial_\omega \mu(\omega_1 - \omega) + S_{0,2}^0 = \mu + \tilde{S}_{2,1}^0 + S_{0,2}^0.\end{aligned}$$

Using the above, we can rewrite the expansion of ω^1 and \tilde{r}^1 as

$$\begin{aligned}\omega^1 &= \omega + A(\omega)^{-1} \left(2c_{2,0} \int_0^1 \lambda^s ds + c_{1,1} \int_0^1 \mu^s ds + \Omega(G_{1,0}, \int_0^1 \tilde{r}^s ds) \right) + S_{0,2}^0 \\ &= \omega + A(\omega)^{-1} (2c_{2,0}\lambda + c_{1,1}\mu + \Omega(G_{1,0}, \tilde{r})) + \tilde{S}_{2,1}^0 + S_{0,2}^0; \\ \tilde{r}^1 &= e^{i\sigma_1 \tilde{S}_{1,1}^0} \left(\tilde{r} + (\lambda + \tilde{S}_{2,1}^0)G_{1,0} + (\mu + \tilde{S}_{2,1}^0)G_{0,1} + S_{0,2}^1 \right).\end{aligned}$$

We now substitute this into the energy expansion (3.42). One of the contributions is

$$\begin{aligned}d(\omega^1) - \omega^1 Q + (\omega^1 - \omega_*)Q(\tilde{r}^1) &= d(\omega) - \omega Q + (\omega - \omega_*)Q(\tilde{r}) + (q'(\omega) - Q + Q(\tilde{r}))(\omega^1 - \omega) \\ &\quad + \tilde{S}_{2,2}^0 + S_{0,3}^0 \\ &= d(\omega) - \omega Q + (\omega - \omega_*)Q(\tilde{r}) - 2c_{2,0}\lambda\mu - c_{1,1}\mu^2 - \mu\Omega(G_{1,0}, \tilde{r}) + \tilde{S}_{2,2}^0 + S_{0,3}^0.\end{aligned}$$

The next term will not give a significant contribution:

$$\frac{1}{2}A(\omega)(\lambda^1)^2 = \frac{1}{2}A(\omega)\lambda^2 + \tilde{S}_{2,2}^0 + S_{0,3}^0.$$

For the main term in \tilde{r} , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2} \langle H_{\omega_*} \tilde{r}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r}^1 \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \langle H_{\omega_*} \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle + (\lambda + \tilde{S}_{2,1}^0)\Omega(-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} G_{1,0}, \tilde{r}) + (\mu + \tilde{S}_{2,1}^0)\Omega(-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} G_{0,1}, \tilde{r}) \\ &\quad + \tilde{S}_{2,2}^0 + S_{0,3}^0 + \mathbf{R}_2.\end{aligned}$$

There will be no significant contributions from the remaining terms. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}E^{(2)} &= d(\omega) - \omega Q + (\omega - \omega_*)Q(\tilde{r}) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2}A(\omega) + \frac{1}{2} \langle H_{\omega_*} \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle + E_P(\tilde{r}) \\ &\quad - 2c_{2,0}\lambda\mu - c_{1,1}\mu^2 - \mu\Omega(G_{1,0}, \tilde{r}) + (\lambda + \tilde{S}_{2,1}^0)\Omega(-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} G_{1,0}, \tilde{r}) + (\mu + \tilde{S}_{2,1}^0)\Omega(-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} G_{0,1}, \tilde{r}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m+n=2} e_{m,n}\lambda^m\mu^n + \sum_{m+n=1} \lambda^m\mu^n\Omega(E_{m,n}, \tilde{r}) + \tilde{S}_{2,2}^0 + S_{0,3}^0 + \sum_{j=2}^7 \mathbf{R}_j\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, to eliminate the terms (3.44), it suffices to solve the system

$$\begin{aligned}-2c_{2,0} + \tilde{S}_{2,0}^0 + e_{1,1} &= 0, \text{ where } e_{1,1} = e_{1,1}(Q, \omega, \rho) \\ -c_{1,1} + \tilde{S}_{2,0}^0 + e_{0,2} &= 0, \text{ where } e_{0,2} = e_{0,2}(Q, \omega, \rho) \\ G_{1,0} + (-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*})^{-1}\tilde{S}_{2,0}^1 + (-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*})^{-1}E_{1,0} &= 0, \text{ where } E_{1,0} = E_{1,0}(Q, \omega, \rho) \\ -G_{0,1} - (-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*})^{-1}G_{1,0} + (-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*})^{-1}\tilde{S}_{2,0}^1 + (-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*})^{-1}E_{0,1} &= 0 \text{ where } E_{0,1} = E_{0,1}(Q, \omega, \rho),\end{aligned}$$

where we exploited the invertibility of $-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}|_{\Sigma_c^s}$ and where the $\tilde{S}_{2,0}^i$ are C^∞ functions in the independent variables $(c_{2,0}, c_{1,1}, G_{1,0}, G_{0,1}, Q, \omega, \rho)$. Now, at

$$(c_{2,0}, c_{1,1}, G_{1,0}, G_{0,1}, Q, \omega, \rho) = (0, 0, 0, 0, q(\omega_*), \omega_*, 0)$$

all the terms in the above system are 0, because of $e_{m,n} = S_{1,0}^0$ and $E_{m,n} = S_{1,0}^1$ and of the properties of the $\tilde{S}_{2,0}^i$. The functions $c_{m,n}(Q, \omega, \rho) = S_{1,0}^0$ and $G_{m,n}(Q, \omega, \rho) = S_{1,0}^1$ remain determined by Implicit Function Theorem. \square

We now consider the inductive step for $N > 2$.

Lemma 3.19. *Suppose that for $N \geq 2$, there exists a C^∞ -diffeomorphism*

$$\mathfrak{F}_N \in C^\infty(D_{H_{\text{rad}}^1}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}, \delta), H_{\text{rad}}^1),$$

for some $\delta > 0$ satisfying (2.43), (2.44) and (2.45). Then, there exists χ of the form given in (3.34) with $l = N + 1$ s.t. for ϕ_{N+1} the canonical map associated to χ , we have $\mathfrak{F}_{N+1} = \mathfrak{F}_N \circ \phi_{N+1} \in C^\infty(D_{H_{\text{rad}}^1}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}), H_{\text{rad}}^1)$ satisfying (2.43)–(2.44). Moreover, \mathfrak{F}_{N+1} is a C^∞ -diffeomorphism onto the neighborhood of \mathcal{T}_{ω_*} and $E_{N+1} := E_N \circ \phi_{N+1}$ satisfies (2.45) with N replaced by $N + 1$.

Proof. We expand the $S_{0,N+1}^0$ term in E_N as

$$S_{N+1}^0 = \sum_{m+n=N+1} e_{m,n}(Q, \omega, Q(\tilde{r}))\lambda^m\mu^n + \sum_{m+n=N} \lambda^m\mu^n\Omega(E_{m,n}(Q, \omega, Q(\tilde{r})), \tilde{r}) + \mathbf{R}_2 + S_{0,N+2}^0.$$

Our aim is to erase the first two terms except the term $e_{N+1,0}\lambda^{N+1}$, which is absorbed into $E_{f,N+1}$. We consider a transformation ϕ_{N+1} like in Lemma 3.14 with $l = N + 1$. By (2.40), (3.2) and Lemma 3.14, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega^1 &= \omega + A^{-1} \left(\sum_{m+n=N+1} m c_{m,n} \lambda^{m-1} \mu^n + \sum_{m+n=N} m \lambda^{m-1} \mu^n \Omega(C_{m,n}, \tilde{r}) \right) + S_{0,N+1}^0, \\ \lambda^1 &= \lambda + A^{-2} q'(\omega) \left(\sum_{m+n=N+1} n c_{m,n} \lambda^m \mu^{n-1} + \sum_{m+n=N} n \lambda^m \mu^{n-1} \Omega(C_{m,n}, \tilde{r}) \right) + S_{0,N+1}^0, \\ \tilde{r} &= e^{i\sigma_3 S_{0,N}^0} \left(\tilde{r} + \sum_{m+n=N} \lambda^m \mu^n C_{m,n} + S_{0,N+1}^0 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain, for $A_2 = A + e_{2,0}^{(N)} = A + S_{1,0}^0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{N+1} = & d(\omega) - (\omega - \omega_*)Q(\tilde{r}) + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 A(\omega) + \sum_{m=2}^N \lambda^m e_{m,0}^{(N)} + e_{N+1,0}\lambda^{N+1} + \frac{1}{2}\Omega(-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}\tilde{r}, \tilde{r}) \\
& + \sum_{m+n=N+1} m c_{m,n} \lambda^{m-1} \mu^{n+1} + \sum_{m+n=N} m \lambda^{m-1} \mu^{n+1} \Omega(C_{m,n}, \tilde{r}) \\
& + A_2(\omega)A^{-2}(\omega)q'(\omega) \left(\sum_{m+n=N+1} n c_{m,n} \lambda^{m+1} \mu^{n-1} + \sum_{m+n=N} n \lambda^{m+1} \mu^{n-1} \Omega(C_{m,n}, \tilde{r}) \right) \\
& + \sum_{m+n=N} \lambda^m \mu^n \Omega(-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} C_{m,n}, \tilde{r}) + \sum_{m+n=N+1} e_{m,n} \lambda^m \mu^m + \sum_{m+n=N} \lambda^m \mu^m \Omega(E_{m,n}, \tilde{r}) \\
& + E_P(\tilde{r}) + S_{0,N+2}^0 + \sum_{k=2}^7 \mathbf{R}_k.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, it suffices choose $c_{m,n}$ and $C_{m,n}$ s.t.

$$(m+1)c_{m+1,n-1} + A_2 A^{-2} q'(n+1)c_{m-1,n+1} + e_{m,n} = 0, \quad 0 \leq m \leq N, \quad (3.45)$$

$$-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} C_{m,n} + (m+1)C_{m+1,n-1} + A_2 A^{-2} q'(n+1)C_{m-1,n+1} + E_{m,n} = 0, \quad 0 \leq m \leq N. \quad (3.46)$$

Here, we are setting $c_{-1,N+2} = 0$ and $C_{N+1,-1} = C_{-1,N+1} = 0$. One can easily solve (3.45) by Neumann series. For the second equation, we express it in a matrix form

$$(\mathbf{H}_N + A_2 A^{-2} q' \mathbf{A}_N) \mathbf{C}_N = -\mathbf{E}_N,$$

where

$$\mathbf{C}_N = {}^t(C_{0,N}, C_{1,N-1}, \dots, C_{N,0}), \quad \mathbf{E}_N = {}^t(E_{0,N}, E_{1,N-1}, \dots, E_{N,0})$$

and

$$\mathbf{H}_N := -i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} I_N + \mathbf{B}_N,$$

and I_N is a $(N+1) \times (N+1)$ unit matrix, $\mathbf{A}_N, \mathbf{B}_N$ are $(N+1) \times (N+1)$ matrices with

$$(\mathbf{A}_N)_{i,j} = (N+2-i)\delta_{i-1,j}, \quad (\mathbf{B}_N)_{i,j} = i\delta_{i+1,j}.$$

Now, \mathbf{H}_N is invertible in Σ^s for arbitrary s because \mathbf{H}_N is an upper triangular matrix and $-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}$ is invertible by Lemma 3.17. Next, for each $s \geq 0$, taking δ_s small s.t. $\|A_2 A^{-2} q' \mathbf{H}_N^{-1} \mathbf{A}_N\|_{\mathcal{L}((\Sigma^s)^{N+1})} < 1$, we can invert $\mathbf{H}_N + A_2 A^{-2} q' \mathbf{A}_N$. \square

By Lemmas 3.18 and 3.19, we have completed the proof of Theorem 2.22.

Remark 3.20. Prop. 2.9 tells us that the nonzero eigenvalues of $-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega}$ are given by $\pm i\lambda$ with $\lambda(\omega) = \pm \sqrt{A(\omega)^{-1}q'(\omega)}$. For any given N here we take ω sufficiently close to ω_* s.t. $N\lambda(\omega) \ll \omega$ when $\omega > \omega_*$, so that we do not see the dissipation by radiation phenomena detected in [2], [7]–[8], [11]–[16], [36] and other works referenced in these papers. Taking a really large number of iterates N , so that $N\lambda(\omega) \sim \omega$, would lead to a $A_2(\omega)A^{-2}(\omega)q'(\omega)\mathbf{H}_N^{-1}\mathbf{A}_N$ not small, obviously disrupting the above proof. Also, by the large number of coordinate changes, the size of the coefficients of the polynomials (3.34) could be not simple to control. Furthermore, ω is oscillating around ω_* and so

it is natural to ask which ω should be the ones used for the iterates. It would be natural to choose values of ω close to its limiting value, assuming Conjecture 1.1 [28] true. But, to the best of our knowledge, there is no information on this limit value, save for the fact that it should be strictly larger than ω_* . All this suggests that, as we mentioned in Sect.1, the framework in this paper is not the correct one to prove the conjecture and that a better choice of modulation coordinates is required.

4 Long time oscillation

In this section, we consider the dynamics of (2.51), which is equivalent (modulo ϑ) to NLS (1.1) in the coordinate system given by Theorem 2.22. We will consider only the situation $0 < Q - q(\omega_*) \ll 1$. Therefore, we set

$$\epsilon := (Q - q(\omega_*))^{1/2}, \quad (4.1)$$

and use ϵ to measure the smallness.

4.1 Dynamics of finite dimensional system

Fix $N \geq 2$. We start from studying the finite dimensional system (2.53):

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\omega}_f &= A(\omega_f)^{-1} \partial_\lambda E_Q(\omega_f, \lambda_f), \\ \dot{\lambda}_f &= -A(\omega_f)^{-1} \partial_\omega E_Q(\omega_f, \lambda_f), \end{aligned} \quad (2.53)$$

where $E_Q(\omega, \lambda) = E_{f,N}(Q, \omega, \lambda, 0)$, with $E_{f,N}$ defined in (2.46). As explained in Sect. 2.6, V_Q can be thought as the potential energy and the remaining terms, which sum up approximately to $2^{-1}A(\omega_*)\lambda^2$, can be thought as the kinetic energy.

We first study the critical points of V_Q . The following is elementary.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $0 < Q - q(\omega_*) \ll 1$. Then, near ω_* the potential V_Q has two critical points, ω_\pm with*

$$\omega_\pm = \omega_* \pm \epsilon \sqrt{\frac{2}{q''(\omega_*)}} + O(\epsilon^2), \quad (4.2)$$

with ω_- a local maximum and ω_+ a local minimum of V_Q , with ϵ defined in (4.1).

Proof. Since (recall $d(\omega) := E(\tilde{\phi}_\omega) + \omega q(\omega)$ and so $d'(\omega) = q(\omega)$, since (1.3) implies $\partial_\omega E(\tilde{\phi}_\omega) + \omega q'(\omega) = 0$)

$$V'_Q(\omega) = q(\omega) - Q = q(\omega_*) + \frac{1}{2}q''(\omega_*)(\omega - \omega_*)^2 + O((\omega - \omega_*)^3) - Q,$$

we only have to find the solutions of

$$\omega - \omega_* = \pm \sqrt{\frac{2}{q''(\omega_*)}} (\epsilon^2 + O((\omega - \omega_*)^3)).$$

We can solve this for example by fixed point argument and obtain the conclusion using $\text{sign} V''_Q(\omega_\pm) = \mp$. \square

Since E_Q is the Hamiltonian of (2.53), it is a constant of the motion. Notice also that $(\omega_+, 0)$ is an isolated local minimum $(\omega_-, 0)$ is a saddle for $(\omega, \lambda) \rightarrow E_Q(\omega, \lambda)$. Thus, if $E_Q(\omega_f, \lambda_f) < V_Q(\omega_-)$ and $\omega_f(0) > \omega_-$, then the solution $(\omega_f(t), \lambda_f(t))$ will be trapped in this potential well.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $0 < Q - q(\omega_*) \ll 1$ and*

$$\omega_f(0) > \omega_-, \quad E_Q(\omega_f(0), \lambda_f(0)) < V_Q(\omega_-). \quad (4.3)$$

Then, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$|\omega_f(t) - \omega_*| \lesssim \epsilon, \quad |\lambda_f(t)| \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2}, \quad (4.4)$$

where $(\omega_f(t), \lambda_f(t))$ are solutions of (2.53). Moreover, there exists $T_f \geq 0$ depending on Q and $E_{f,N}(Q, \omega(0), \lambda_f(0), 0)$ s.t. $(\omega_f(t), \lambda_f(t))$ is a periodic functions of t with period T_f .

Proof. By the energy conservation and the trapping condition, it is obvious that the solutions are periodic with some period T_f . Notice that if $(\omega_f(0), \lambda_f(0)) = (\omega_+, 0)$, then the solution is stationary. To prove (4.4), we estimate $V_Q(\omega_-) - V_Q(\omega_+)$. Since

$$V_Q(\omega) = V_Q(\omega_*) - (Q - q(\omega_*))(\omega - \omega_*) + \frac{1}{6}q''(\omega_*)(\omega - \omega_*)^3 + O((\omega - \omega_*)^4),$$

using (4.1) and (4.2) and elementary computations we get

$$\begin{aligned} V_Q(\omega_-) - V_Q(\omega_+) &= (Q - q(\omega_*))(\omega_+ - \omega_-) + \frac{1}{6}q''(\omega_*)((\omega_- - \omega_*)^3 - (\omega_+ - \omega_*)^3) + O(\epsilon^4) \\ &= \frac{4}{3}\epsilon^3 \sqrt{\frac{2}{q''(\omega_*)}} + O(\epsilon^4). \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

By a similar computation, we can show $\omega_{++} - \omega_* \sim \epsilon$, for $\omega_{++} > \omega_+$ the solution of $V_Q(\omega_{++}) = V_Q(\omega_-)$. Since $\omega(t) \in (\omega_-, \omega_{++})$ for all t , we obtain the first estimate of (4.4). Turning to the second estimate, since the kinetic energy is $\frac{1}{2}A(\omega)\lambda^2 + \sum_{m=2}^N \lambda^m e_{m,0}^{(N)}(Q, \omega, 0) \sim \lambda^2$, then $E_Q < V_Q(\omega_-)$ implies

$$\lambda^2 \lesssim V_Q(\omega_-) - V_Q(\omega_+) \lesssim \epsilon^3.$$

□

Remark 4.3. The estimates in (4.4) simply come from the trapping condition (4.3). Therefore, even if (ω, λ) is not the solution of (2.53), we can use the bound (4.4) if they satisfy (4.3).

From (4.4), it is natural to rescale the problem using (4.1). In particular, we set

$$\omega_f = \omega_+ + \epsilon\zeta_f, \quad \lambda_f = \epsilon^{3/2}\kappa_f, \quad t = \epsilon^{-1/2}\tau. \quad (4.6)$$

Then, setting

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_Q(\zeta_f, \kappa_f) &:= \epsilon^{-3}E_Q(\omega_f, \lambda_f) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{q''(\omega_*)}{2}}(1 + O(\epsilon))\zeta_f^2 + \frac{1}{6}q''(\omega_*)\zeta_f^3 + \frac{1}{2}A(\omega_*)\kappa_f^2(1 + O(\epsilon) + O(\epsilon\kappa_f) + O(\epsilon\zeta_f)), \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

the system (2.53) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\zeta}_f &= A(\omega_+ + \epsilon\zeta_f)^{-1} \partial_\kappa \tilde{E}_Q(\zeta_f, \kappa_f), \\ \dot{\kappa}_f &= -A(\omega_+ + \epsilon\zeta_f)^{-1} \partial_\zeta \tilde{E}_Q(\zeta_f, \kappa_f),\end{aligned}\tag{4.8}$$

where $\dot{\zeta}_f = \frac{d}{d\tau} \zeta_f$ and $\dot{\kappa}_f = \frac{d}{d\tau} \kappa_f$

We now prove Proposition 2.27. Because of (4.2), it suffices to estimate T_f . Notice that the condition (2.55) is excluding the case $(\omega_f(t), \lambda_f(t)) \equiv (\omega_+, 0)$.

Proof of Proposition 2.27. First, the rescaled equation can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\zeta}_f &= \kappa_f(1 + O(\epsilon)), \\ \dot{\kappa}_f &= -c_0(1 + O(\epsilon))\zeta_f + O(\zeta_f^2) + O(\epsilon)\kappa_f^2 \text{ with } c_0 = A(\omega_*)^{-1} \sqrt{2q''(\omega_*)}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.9}$$

If $0 < \tilde{E}_Q(\zeta_f, \kappa_f) \ll 1$, then $|\zeta_f| + |\kappa_f| \ll 1$. Thus, the ζ_f^2 term in (4.9) is negligible. Elementary plane phase analysis shows that ζ_f varies monotonically from its minimum $\zeta_{min} < 0$ to its maximum $\zeta_{max} > 0$ and then comes back. Let us see that it takes $\tau \sim 1$ time to vary from ζ_{min} to 0, and since for the other parts of the motion the time frame is similar, we can conclude that the rescaled period τ_f is approximately 1. We have

$$\frac{d\kappa}{dt} = \frac{d\kappa}{d\zeta} \frac{d\zeta}{dt} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d\kappa^2}{d\zeta} (1 + O(\epsilon)) = -c_0(1 + O(\epsilon))\zeta + O(\zeta^2) + O(\epsilon)\kappa^2.$$

An elementary integrating factor argument leads to

$$\frac{d\kappa^2}{d\zeta} = -2c_0(1 + O(\epsilon) + O(\zeta))\zeta$$

and since, as we mentioned above, here we assume $|\zeta| \ll 1$, we have

$$\kappa(\zeta) \approx \sqrt{c_0(\zeta_{min}^2 - \zeta^2)}$$

and so

$$\tau = \int_{\zeta_{min}}^0 \frac{d\zeta}{\kappa(\zeta)} \approx 1.$$

Therefore, the period τ_f in the rescaled time τ satisfies $\tau_f \sim 1$, which implies $T_f \sim \epsilon^{-1/2}$. \square

4.2 Dispersive Estimates

In this subsection, we consider several estimates based on dispersion for the proof of Theorem 2.29. We use the following standard Strichartz spaces.

Definition 4.4. For $s \geq 0$ and $I = [t_1, t_2]$, we set

$$\text{Stz}^s(I) := L^\infty H^s(I) \cap L^2 W^{s,6}(I), \quad \text{Stz}^{*,s}(I) := L^1 H^s(I) + L^2 W^{s,6/5}(I),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{u}\|_{\text{Stz}^s(I)} &:= \|\tilde{u}\|_{L_t^\infty(I, H^s)} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{L_t^2(I, W^{s,6})}, \\ \|\tilde{u}\|_{\text{Stz}^{*,s}(I)} &:= \inf_{\tilde{u}=\tilde{v}+\tilde{w}} \left(\|\tilde{v}\|_{L_t^1(I, H^s)} + \|\tilde{w}\|_{L_t^2(I, W^{s,6/5})} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Definition 4.5. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval and $F \in C(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$. For $t_1, t \in I$ and $\tilde{r}_0 \in P(\omega_*)H^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})$, we denote by $U_F(t_1, t)\tilde{r}_0 \in P(\omega_*)H^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})$ the solution of

$$i\partial_t \tilde{r} = (\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} + F(t)P(\omega_*)\sigma_3)\tilde{r}, \quad \tilde{r}(t_1) = \tilde{r}_0. \quad (4.10)$$

Lemma 4.6. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $t_0 \in I$. There exists $\delta > 0$ s.t. for $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $t_0 \in I$, if $\|F\|_{L^\infty(I)} < \delta$, then we have

$$\|U_F(\cdot, t_0)\tilde{r}\|_{\text{Stz}^1} \lesssim \|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1}, \quad (4.11)$$

$$\left\| \int_{t_0}^{\cdot} U_F(t, s)\tilde{f}(s) ds \right\|_{\text{Stz}^1} \lesssim \|\tilde{f}\|_{\text{Stz}^{*,1}} \quad (4.12)$$

Before the proof, we recall the following result from [11], which was inspired by an earlier statement in [7], see also [8].

Lemma 4.7. Consider the strong limits

$$W = s - \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} e^{it\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}} e^{-i\sigma_3(-\Delta + \omega_*)t} \text{ and } Z = s - \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} e^{i\sigma_3(-\Delta + \omega_*)t} e^{-it\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}} P(\omega_*) \quad (4.13)$$

and set

$$P_+ = W \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{C}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} Z, \quad P_- = W \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{C}} \end{pmatrix} Z. \quad (4.14)$$

Then, W initially defined on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})$ can be extended to an isomorphism $W : L^p(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}) \rightarrow P(\omega_*)L^p(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})$ for all $p \in [1, \infty]$ with $W^{-1} = Z$. Furthermore, for any l we have

$$\|P(\omega_*)\sigma_3 - (P_+ - P_-)\|_{\Sigma^{-l} \rightarrow \Sigma^l} \leq c_l < \infty. \quad (4.15)$$

Proof of Lemma 4.6. Set $\tilde{U}_F(t, t_0)\tilde{r}_0$ to be the solution of

$$i\tilde{r}_t = \mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}\tilde{r} + F(t)(P_+ - P_-)\tilde{r}, \quad \tilde{r}(t_0) = \tilde{r}_0.$$

Then, since

$$\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}P(\omega_*) = \mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}WZ = W\sigma_3(-\Delta + \omega_*)Z,$$

we have

$$\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} + F(t)(P_+ - P_-) = W\sigma_3(-\Delta + \omega_* + F(t))Z.$$

By the L^p boundedness of W and Z , we have (4.11) and (4.12) for \tilde{U}_F .

Now, since $U_F(t, t_0)\tilde{r}_0$ is the solution of

$$ir_t = (\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} + F(t)(P_+ - P_-))\tilde{r} + F(t)(P(\omega_*)\sigma_3 - (P_+ - P_-))\tilde{r}, \quad \tilde{r}(t_0) = \tilde{r}_0,$$

we have

$$\tilde{r}(t) = \tilde{U}_F(t, t_0)\tilde{r}_0 - i \int_{t_0}^t \tilde{U}_F(t, s)F(s)(P(\omega_*)\sigma_3 - (P_+ - P_-))\tilde{r}(s) ds,$$

where $r(t) = U_F(t, t_0)\tilde{r}_0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{r}\|_{\text{Stz}^s} &\lesssim \|\tilde{r}_0\|_{H^s} + \delta \|(P(\omega_*)\sigma_3 - (P_+ - P_-))\tilde{r}\|_{L^2W^{s,6/5}} \\ &\lesssim \|\tilde{r}_0\|_{H^s} + \delta\|\tilde{r}\|_{\text{Stz}^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for sufficiently small δ , we have (4.11).

Next, since $-\mathrm{i} \int_{t_0}^t U_F(t, s) f(s) ds$ is the solution of

$$\mathrm{i} r_t = (\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} + F(t)(P_+ - P_-)) \tilde{r} + F(t)(P(\omega_*)\sigma_3 - (P_+ - P_-)) \tilde{r} + f, \quad \tilde{r}(t_0) = 0,$$

we have

$$\tilde{r}(t) = -\mathrm{i} \int_{t_0}^t \tilde{U}_F(t, s) F(s) (P(\omega_*)\sigma_3 - (P_+ - P_-)) \tilde{r}(s) ds - \mathrm{i} \int_{t_0}^t \tilde{U}_F(t, s) f(s) ds,$$

where $\tilde{r}(t) = -\int_{t_0}^t U_F(t, s) f(s) ds$. Thus, as before

$$\|\tilde{r}\|_{\mathrm{Stz}^s} \lesssim \delta \|\tilde{r}\|_{\mathrm{Stz}^s} + \|\tilde{f}\|_{\mathrm{Stz}^{*,s}}.$$

Therefore, we have (4.12) for $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small. \square

The following estimate is standard.

Lemma 4.8. *We have*

$$\|g(|\tilde{r}|^2)\tilde{r}\|_{\mathrm{Stz}^{*,1}} \lesssim \|\tilde{r}\|_{\mathrm{Stz}^1}^3 + \|\tilde{r}\|_{\mathrm{Stz}^1}^{\max(3, 2p+1)}.$$

Proof. Since $g(0) = 0$, $|g^{(n)}(s)| \lesssim s^{p-n}$ for $s \geq 1$ and some $p < 2$, we have

$$|g(|\tilde{r}|^2)\tilde{r}| \lesssim |\tilde{r}|^3 + |\tilde{r}|^{\max(3, 2p+1)}, \quad |\nabla_x (g(|\tilde{r}|^2)\tilde{r})| \lesssim (|\tilde{r}|^2 + |\tilde{r}|^{\max(2, 2p)}) |\nabla_x \tilde{r}|.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|g(|\tilde{r}|^2)\tilde{r}\|_{\mathrm{Stz}^{*,1}} &\lesssim \| |\tilde{r}|^3 \|_{L^2 L^{6/5}} + \| |\tilde{r}|^2 \nabla_x \tilde{r} \|_{L^2 L^{6/5}} + \| |\tilde{r}|^{\max(3, 2p+1)} \|_{L^2 L^{6/5}} + \| |\tilde{r}|^{\max(2, 2p)} \nabla_x \tilde{r} \|_{L^2 L^{6/5}} \\ &\lesssim \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^\infty L^3}^2 \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^2 W^{1,6}} + \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^\infty L^{\max(3, 3p)}}^{\max(2, 2p)} \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^2 W^{1,6}} \lesssim \|\tilde{r}\|_{\mathrm{Stz}^1}^3 + \|\tilde{r}\|_{\mathrm{Stz}^1}^{\max(3, 2p+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the embedding $L^3 \hookrightarrow H^1$ and $L^{\max(3, 3p)} \hookrightarrow H^1$. \square

In the following, we consider the situation when (ω, λ) is trapped in the potential well (i.e. $(\omega(t), \lambda(t))$ satisfies (4.3) for all $t \in I$ for some $I \subset \mathbb{R}$). By Lemma 4.2, this condition guarantees $\|\omega - \omega_*\|_{L^\infty(I)} \lesssim \epsilon$ and $\|\lambda\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2}$.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval and assume $\|\omega - \omega_*\|_{L^\infty(I)} \lesssim \epsilon$ and $\|\lambda\|_{L^\infty} + \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^\infty H^1(I)} \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2}$. Then, the function μ in (3.2) satisfies*

$$\|\mu\|_{L^\infty(I)} \lesssim \epsilon^2.$$

Proof. Immediate from Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2. \square

We estimate $\mathbf{R} = S_{0, N+1}^0 + \sum_{k=2}^7 \mathbf{R}_k$.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $T > 0$ and set $I = [0, T]$ and assume $\|\omega - \omega_*\|_{L^\infty(I)} \lesssim \epsilon$ and $\|\lambda\|_{L^\infty} + \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^\infty H^1(I)} \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2}$. Then, we have*

$$\|\mathbf{R}\|_{L^\infty(I)} \lesssim \epsilon^{3(N+1)/2} + \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^2.$$

Proof. It suffices to estimate each term in the sum defining \mathbf{R} .

First, by Lemma 4.9, we have $|\mu| + |\lambda| + \|\tilde{r}\|_{\Sigma^0} \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2}$. Thus,

$$|S_{0,N+1}^0| \lesssim \epsilon^{3(N+1)/2}. \quad (4.16)$$

Next, we estimate \mathbf{R}_2 . The $\langle S_{1,0}^2 \tilde{r}, \tilde{r} \rangle$ term in \mathbf{R}_2 can be bounded by $\epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{\Sigma^{-2}}^2 \lesssim \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^2$. Next, recalling Definition 2.17, for $s \geq 0$ we have

$$\beta_n(s) \lesssim \begin{cases} s + s^{\max(1,p)} & n = 0, \\ 1 + s^{\max(0,p-1)} & n \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (4.17)$$

Thus, the terms in \mathbf{R}_2 of the form $\int \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{1,0}^1 |\tilde{r}|^2 dx$ ($n \geq -1$) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{1,0}^1 |\tilde{r}|^2 dx \right| &\lesssim \epsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \langle x \rangle^{-4} (|\tilde{r}|^2 + |\tilde{r}|^{\max(4,2+2p)}) \\ &\lesssim \epsilon \left(\|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^2 + \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^{\max(4,2+2p)} \right) \lesssim \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

The other term in (2.31) satisfies the same estimate.

For \mathbf{R}_k ($k = 3, 4, 5$), by (2.32) and (4.17), for $n \geq k - 3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle^i |\tilde{r}|^{2j} dx \right| &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \langle x \rangle^{-2} \left(|\tilde{r}|^k + |\tilde{r}|^{\max(k,k+2(p-1))} \right) dx \\ &\lesssim \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^k + \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^{\max(k,k+2(p-1))} \lesssim \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

for $k = 3, 4$ and

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle^i |\tilde{r}|^{2j} dx \right| \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \langle x \rangle^{-2} |\tilde{r}|^5 dx \lesssim \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^2, \quad (4.20)$$

where we used $\|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6} \lesssim \|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1} \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2} \leq \epsilon$.

For \mathbf{R}_6 , since $g'''(s) \lesssim s^{p-3}$ for $s \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (1-t)^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} g'''(|v(t,s)|^2) \langle v(t,s), \sigma_1 S_{0,0}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle v(t,s), \sigma_1 S_{1,1}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle v(t,s), \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2 dx ds dt \right| \\ &\lesssim \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_{|v(t,s)| \leq 1} |S_{1,1}^1| |\tilde{r}|^2 dx ds dt + \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_{|v(t,s)| > 1} |v(t,s)|^{2p-3} |S_{1,1}^1| |\tilde{r}|^2 dx ds dt \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^{5/2} \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^2 \leq \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

Finally, for \mathbf{R}_7 , by (2.34) and (A.16), we have

$$|\mathbf{R}_7| \lesssim \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^2. \quad (4.22)$$

Combining (4.16), (4.18), (4.19), (4.21) and (4.22), we have the conclusion. \square

We also have a similar estimate for \mathbf{R}_ω and \mathbf{R}_λ (see (2.52) for the definition).

Lemma 4.11. *Let $T > 0$ and set $I = [0, T]$ and assume $\|\omega - \omega_*\|_{L^\infty(I)} \lesssim \epsilon$ and $\|\lambda\|_{L^\infty} + \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^\infty H^1(I)} \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2}$. Then, we have*

$$\|\mathbf{R}_\omega\|_{L^\infty(I)} + \|\mathbf{R}_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(I)} \lesssim \epsilon^{3N/2} + \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^2.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 4.10. Therefore, we omit it. \square

We now estimate the $W^{s,6/5}$ norm for $s = 0, 1$ of $\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{r}}$, see (2.52).

Lemma 4.12. *Let $s = 0, 1$. Assume $|\omega - \omega_*| \lesssim \epsilon$ and $|\lambda| + \|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1(I)} \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2}$. Then, we have*

$$\|\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{r}}(t)\|_{W^{s,6/5}} \lesssim_{\sigma} \epsilon^{3N/2} + \epsilon \|\tilde{r}(t)\|_{W^{s,6}}, \quad \forall t \in I$$

The proof of Lemma 4.12 is elementary. However, it will be long simply because there are many terms in $\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{r}}$. Therefore, we give the proof in Sect. A.3 in the appendix of this paper.

Lemma 4.13. *Let $T > 0$ and set $I = [0, T]$ and assume $\|\omega - \omega_*\|_{L^\infty(I)} \lesssim \epsilon$ and $\|\lambda\|_{L^\infty} + \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^\infty H^1(I)} \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2}$. We have*

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} Q(\tilde{r}(t)) \right| \lesssim \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^2 + \epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}(N+1)}.$$

Proof. We directly compute the derivative.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} Q(\tilde{r}) &= \langle \partial_t \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle = -\Omega(i\sigma_3 \tilde{r}, \tilde{r}) \\ &= -\Omega((H_{\omega_*} + \partial_\rho E_N) \tilde{r} + g(|\tilde{r}|^2) \tilde{r} + \mathbf{R}_{\tilde{r}}, \tilde{r}) \\ &= -\Omega(g'(\phi_{\omega_*}^2) \phi_{\omega_*}^2 \sigma_1 \tilde{r}, \tilde{r}) - \Omega(\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{r}}, \tilde{r}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Lemma 4.12, we have the following, which yields the proof:

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} Q(\tilde{r}) \right| \lesssim \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^2 + \epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}N} \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}.$$

\square

4.3 Long time almost conservation of E_Q and the shadowing for several periods

We now prove Theorem 2.29.

Proof of Theorem 2.29. Take $C_1 > 0$ sufficiently large (chosen later) and take $\epsilon_0 > 0$ so that we have $C_1 \epsilon \ll 1$. We will fix $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$.

We first show that for $0 < \tilde{T} \leq \epsilon^{-\frac{3}{2}(N-1)+1} =: T$, if we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \tilde{T}]} |E_Q(\omega(t), \lambda(t)) - E_Q(\omega_0, \lambda_0)| \leq C_1 \epsilon^4, \quad (4.23)$$

then we have for $C = C(C_0)$, where C_0 the constant in the claim of Theorem 2.29,

$$\|\tilde{r}\|_{\text{Stz}^1(0, \tilde{T})} \leq C \epsilon^{3/2} \quad (4.24)$$

and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \tilde{T}]} |E_Q(\omega(t), \lambda(t)) - E_Q(\omega_0, \lambda_0)| \leq \frac{1}{2} C_1 \epsilon^4. \quad (4.25)$$

Since $\text{Stz}^1 \hookrightarrow L^\infty H^1$, by continuity argument this will give us the conclusion.

First, by (4.23) and the assumption (2.55), we see that $(\omega(t), \lambda(t))$ satisfies (4.3) for all $t \in [0, \tilde{T}]$. Therefore, by Lemma 4.1, we have (4.4) where the implicit constants do not depend on C_1 . Therefore, by Lemmas 4.6, 4.8 and 4.12, we have

$$\|\tilde{r}\|_{\text{Stz}^1(0,t)} \lesssim \|\tilde{r}_0\|_{H^1} + \|\tilde{r}\|_{\text{Stz}^1(0,t)}^4 + \|\tilde{r}\|_{\text{Stz}^1(0,t)}^{\max(3,2p+1)} + t^{1/2}\epsilon^{3N/2} + \epsilon\|\tilde{r}\|_{\text{Stz}^1(0,t)},$$

for any $t \in [0, \tilde{T}]$. Therefore, from an easy continuity argument, we have

$$\|\tilde{r}\|_{\text{Stz}^1(0,\tilde{T})} \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2},$$

where the implicit constant is independent of C_1 (but depends on C_0).

Next, we prove (4.25). We claim that

$$|E_{f,N}(Q, \omega, \lambda, Q(\tilde{r})) - E_Q(\omega, \lambda)| = \left| \int_0^1 \partial_\rho E_{f,N}(Q, \omega, \lambda, tQ(\tilde{r})) dt Q(\tilde{r}) \right| \lesssim \epsilon^4. \quad (4.26)$$

The equality follows from the definition $E_Q(\omega, \lambda) = E_{f,N}(Q, \omega, \lambda, 0)$, is a consequence of the assumption $|\omega - \omega_*| \lesssim \epsilon$ and $|\lambda| + \|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1} \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2}$ and $|\partial_\rho E_{f,N}| \lesssim \epsilon$ (the latter follows from the previous inequalities and from $\partial_\rho E_{f,N} = \omega - \omega_* + O(\lambda^2)$, see (2.46)).

In view of (4.26), it is enough to prove (4.25) with $E_Q(\omega, \lambda)$ replaced by $E_{f,N}(Q, \omega, \lambda, Q(\tilde{r}))$.

From

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} E_{f,N}(Q, \omega(t), \lambda(t), Q(\tilde{r}(t))) &= \partial_\omega E_{f,N} \dot{\omega} + \partial_\lambda E_{f,N} \dot{\lambda} + \partial_\rho E_{f,N} \frac{d}{dt} Q(\tilde{r}) \\ &= \partial_\omega E_{f,N} \mathbf{R}_\omega + \partial_\lambda E_{f,N} \mathbf{R}_\lambda + \partial_\rho E_{f,N} \frac{d}{dt} Q(\tilde{r}), \end{aligned}$$

by Lemmas 4.11, 4.12 and 4.13 we have

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} E_{f,N}(Q, \omega(t), \lambda(t), Q(\tilde{r}(t))) \right| \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2} \left(\epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}N} + \|\tilde{r}(t)\|_{L^6}^2 \right) + \epsilon \left(\|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^2 + \epsilon^{\frac{3N+1}{2}} \right),$$

where we have used $|\partial_\omega E_{f,N}| \lesssim \epsilon^2$, $|\partial_\lambda E_{f,N}| \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2}$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| E_{f,N}(Q, \omega(\tilde{T}), \lambda(\tilde{T}), Q(\tilde{r}(\tilde{T}))) - E_{f,N}(Q, \omega_0, \lambda_0, Q(\tilde{r}_0)) \right| &\lesssim \int_0^{\tilde{T}} \left| \frac{d}{dt} E_{f,N}(Q, \omega(t), \lambda(t), Q(\tilde{r}(t))) \right| dt \\ &\lesssim \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{\text{Stz}^1(0,\tilde{T})} + \tilde{T} \epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}(N+1)} \lesssim \epsilon^4, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant does not depend on C_1 . Therefore, we have the conclusion. \square

Corollary 2.31 is an easy consequence of Theorem 2.29.

Proof of Corollary 2.31. By Theorem 2.29, we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |E_Q(\omega(t), \lambda(t)) - E_Q(\omega_0, \lambda_0)| \lesssim \epsilon^4. \quad (4.27)$$

By Remark 2.30, for $c \in (0, 1)$ the constant in (2.55) we have

$$E_Q(\omega(t), \lambda(t)) < \frac{1+c}{2} (V_Q(\omega_-) - V_Q(\omega_+)) \sim \epsilon^3 \text{ for all } t \in [0, T]. \quad (4.28)$$

By Remark 4.3 we know that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} (|\omega(t) - \omega_*|^3 + |\lambda(t)|^2) \lesssim \epsilon^3.$$

This implies that, setting $\omega = \omega(t)$, $\lambda = \lambda(t)$, it suffices to prove that there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\alpha| \lesssim \epsilon$ s.t.

$$E_Q(\omega_+ + (1 + \alpha)(\omega - \omega_+), (1 + \alpha)\lambda) = E_Q(\omega_0, \lambda_0). \quad (4.29)$$

By the Taylor expansion

$$E_Q(\omega, \lambda) = \left(\sqrt{\frac{q''(\omega_*)}{2}} \epsilon + \frac{1}{6} q''(\omega_*)(\omega - \omega_+) \right) (\omega - \omega_+)^2 + \frac{1}{2} A(\omega_*) \lambda^2 + O(\epsilon^4)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_Q(\omega_+ + (1 + \alpha)(\omega - \omega_+), (1 + \alpha)\lambda) &= E_Q(\omega, \lambda) \\ &+ \alpha \left(\left(\sqrt{2q''(\omega_*)} \epsilon + \frac{1}{2} q''(\omega_*)(\omega - \omega_+) \right) (\omega - \omega_+)^2 + \frac{1}{2} A(\omega_*) \lambda^2 \right) + O(\alpha \epsilon^4 + \alpha^2 \epsilon^3). \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

Notice now that (4.27)–(4.28) and the hypothesis $E_Q(\omega_0, \lambda_0) \sim \epsilon^3$, imply $E_Q(\omega, \lambda) \sim \epsilon^3$ and that we have $\omega \in (\omega_+ - c'(\omega_+ - \omega_-), \omega_{++})$ for some $c' \in (0, 1)$, uniformly bounded away from 0 for all $t \in [0, T]$, where $\omega_{++} > \omega_+$ is the solution of $V_Q(\omega_{++}) = V_Q(\omega_-)$ with $\omega_{++} > \omega_+$. Thus by (4.2) we have

$$\omega - \omega_+ > -c'(\omega_+ - \omega_-) = -2c' \sqrt{\frac{2}{q''(\omega_*)}} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\left(\sqrt{2q''(\omega_*)} \epsilon + \frac{1}{2} q''(\omega_*)(\omega - \omega_+) \right) > (1 - c') \sqrt{2q''(\omega_*)} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (4.31)$$

By (4.30) and (4.31), it is clear that we can take $|\alpha| \lesssim \epsilon$ such that the 2nd line in (4.30) is 0 and (4.29) holds. Therefore, we have the conclusion. \square

We finally prove Theorem 2.32.

Proof of Theorem 2.32. To estimate the difference, we use the scaling

$$\omega = \omega_+ + \epsilon \zeta, \quad \lambda = \epsilon^{3/2} \kappa, \quad t = \epsilon^{-1/2} \tau. \quad (4.32)$$

For fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $nT_f \sim_n \epsilon^{-1/2}$ so it suffices to show that for fixed $\tau_0 > 0$,

$$\sup_{\tau \in [0, \tau_0]} (|\zeta(\tau) - \zeta_f(\tau)| + |\lambda(\tau) - \lambda_f(\tau)|) \lesssim_{\tau_0} \epsilon. \quad (4.33)$$

By the estimate (2.56), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\zeta} &= \kappa + O(\epsilon), \\ \dot{\kappa} &= -A(\omega_*)^{-1} \left(\sqrt{2q''(\omega_*)} \zeta + \frac{1}{2} q''(\omega_*) \zeta^2 \right) + O(\epsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (4.34)$$

where $\dot{\zeta} = \frac{d}{d\tau}\zeta$ and $\dot{\kappa} = \frac{d}{d\tau}\kappa$. Notice that this system looks completely the same as (4.35) although the $O(\epsilon)$ are of course different. Subtracting (4.8) from (4.35), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{d\tau}(\zeta - \zeta_f) &= \kappa - \kappa_f + O(\epsilon), \\ \frac{d}{d\tau}(\kappa - \kappa_f) &= -A(\omega_*)^{-1} \left(\sqrt{2q''(\omega_*)}(\zeta - \zeta_f) + \frac{1}{2}q''(\omega_*)(\zeta + \zeta_f)(\zeta - \zeta_f) \right) + O(\epsilon),\end{aligned}\tag{4.35}$$

Therefore, setting $f(\tau) := |\zeta(\tau) - \zeta_f(\tau)| + |\kappa(\tau) - \kappa_f(\tau)|$, we have

$$f(t) \lesssim \epsilon t + \int_0^t f(s) ds,\tag{4.36}$$

where we have used the bound $|\zeta(\tau)| + |\zeta_f(\tau)| \lesssim 1$ for $\tau \in [0, \tau_0]$. Therefore, by Gronwall inequality, we have

$$\sup_{\tau \in [0, \tau_0]} |f(\tau)| \lesssim_{\tau_0} \epsilon.\tag{4.37}$$

Since this is (4.33), we have the conclusion. \square

A Appendix

A.1 Proof of Proposition 2.9

In this section, we give the proof of Proposition 2.9. We note that Proposition 2.9 was proved by Comech–Pelinovsky [9].

First, we set

$$\Pi_R := \frac{1}{2}(1 + \sigma_1), \quad \Pi_I := \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sigma_1).\tag{A.1}$$

The operators Π_R and Π_I satisfies $\Pi_R \widetilde{u} = \widetilde{\operatorname{Re} u}$ and $\Pi_I \widetilde{u} = \widetilde{\operatorname{Im} u}$. So, it correspond taking real and imaginary parts respectively. Further, notice that Π_R and Π_I are orthogonal projections with respect to the innerproduct $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and satisfy $\Pi_R + \Pi_I = 1$ and commute with π_0 . Moreover, we have $[H_\omega, \Pi_X] = 0$ for $X = R, I$. We define

$$L_{+, \omega} := H_\omega \Pi_R, \quad L_{-, \omega} := H_\omega \Pi_I.$$

Then, we have

$$L_{+, \omega} = -\Delta + \omega + g(\phi_\omega^2) + 2g'(\phi_\omega^2), \quad L_{-, \omega} = -\Delta + \omega + g(\phi_\omega^2).\tag{A.2}$$

and

$$H_\omega = L_{+, \omega} \Pi_R + L_{-, \omega} \Pi_I.\tag{A.3}$$

Notice that $i\sigma_3 \widetilde{\phi}_\omega$ is purely imaginary valued and $\partial_\omega \widetilde{\phi}_\omega$ is real valued. This structure is important when we study the generalized kernel. The following lemma is elementary.

Lemma A.1. *We have*

- $\Pi_R i \sigma_3 \tilde{\phi}_\omega = 0$ and $\Pi_I \partial_\omega \tilde{\phi}_\omega = 0$.
- $\mathcal{H}_\omega \Pi_R = \Pi_I \mathcal{H}_\omega$ and $\mathcal{H}_\omega \Pi_I = \Pi_R \mathcal{H}_\omega$.

Following [9], we introduce the Riesz projection $P_d(\omega)$ for $\omega \in \mathcal{O}$.

Definition A.2. For a fixed sufficiently small $0 < r \ll 1$ we define in $L^2_{\text{rad}}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)$ the operator

$$P_d(\omega) := -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_\gamma (\mathcal{H}_\omega - z)^{-1} dz, \text{ where } \gamma = \{re^{i\theta} \mid \theta \in [0, 2\pi)\}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Remark A.3. By a simple change of coordinate we can express $P_d(\omega)$ as

$$P_d(\omega) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_\gamma (-i\mathcal{H}_\omega - z)^{-1} dz, \text{ with } \gamma \text{ as above.} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

The properties of P_d (which correspond to 4. of Proposition 2.9) are summarized as follows.

Lemma A.4. For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists $\delta_s > 0$ s.t. $P_d \in \cap_s C^\infty(D_{\mathbb{R}}(\omega_*, \delta_s), \mathcal{L}(\Sigma^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)))$. Moreover, we have

- $P_d(\omega)^2 = P_d(\omega)$.
- $\Omega(P_d(\omega)U, V) = \Omega(U, P_d(\omega)V)$.
- $[P_d(\omega), \mathcal{H}_\omega] = 0$ and $[P_d(\omega), \Pi_A] = [P_d(\omega), \pi_0] = 0$ for $A = R, I$.

Proof. We first expand $\mathcal{H}_\omega = \mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} + h_\omega$. From (2.15) and Lemma 2.8, for arbitrary $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\|h_\omega\|_{\Sigma^s \rightarrow \Sigma^s} \rightarrow 0$ as $\omega \rightarrow \omega_*$. We can rewrite (A.4) as

$$\begin{aligned} P_d(\omega) &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_\gamma (\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} - z)^{-1} (1 + (\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} - z)^{-1} h_\omega)^{-1} dz \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_\gamma (\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} - z)^{-1} (1 + \tilde{h}_\omega(z)) dz \\ &= P_d(\omega_*) - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_\gamma (\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} - z)^{-1} \tilde{h}_\omega(z) dz, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{h}_\omega(z)$ are determined by the relation

$$1 + \tilde{h}_\omega(z) = (1 + (\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} - z)^{-1} h_\omega)^{-1}.$$

Therefore, we see $P_d \in \cap_s C^\infty(D_{\mathbb{R}}(\omega_*, \delta_s), \mathcal{L}(\Sigma^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)))$ for some $\delta_s > 0$.

$P_d(\omega)^2 = P_d(\omega)$ is standard, see for example section 6 of [21]. The fact that P_d is symmetric w.r.t. Ω follows from simple change of variables.

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(P_d(\omega)U, V) &= \Omega\left(-\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_\gamma (\mathcal{H}_\omega - z)^{-1} dz U, V\right) = \Omega\left(-\frac{r}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} (\mathcal{H}_\omega - re^{i\theta})^{-1} e^{i\theta} d\theta U, V\right) \\ &= -\frac{r}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \Omega((\mathcal{H}_\omega - re^{i\theta})^{-1} e^{i\theta} U, V) d\theta = \frac{r}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \Omega(U, (\mathcal{H}_\omega + re^{-i\theta})^{-1} e^{-i\theta} V) d\theta \\ &= \Omega\left(U, -\frac{r}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} (\mathcal{H}_\omega - re^{i\theta})^{-1} e^{i\theta} d\theta V\right) = \Omega(U, P_d(\omega)V). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have the following, which implies $[P_d(\omega), \Pi_A] = 0$ for $A = R, I$:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_1 P_d(\omega) \sigma_1 &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \sigma_1 \oint_{\gamma} (\mathcal{H}_\omega - z)^{-1} dz \sigma_1 = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma} (\sigma_1 \mathcal{H}_\omega \sigma_1 - z)^{-1} dz \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma} (\mathcal{H}_\omega + z)^{-1} dz = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma} (\mathcal{H}_\omega - z)^{-1} dz = P_d(\omega).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, $[P_d(\omega), \mathcal{H}_\omega] = 0$ follows from the expression (A.4) and $[P_d(\omega), \pi_0]$ follows from the expression (A.5) and $[-i\mathcal{H}_\omega, \pi_0] = 0$. \square

Remark A.5. In Lemma A.4, we only proved $P_d \in \cap_s C^\infty(D_{\mathbb{R}}(\omega_*, \delta_s), \mathcal{L}(\Sigma^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)))$ and not $P_d \in \cap_{s>0} C^\infty(D_{\mathbb{R}}(\omega_*, \delta_s), \mathcal{L}(\Sigma^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2), \Sigma^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)))$. We will show the latter after we obtain another expression of P_d based on $\Psi_j(\omega)$ which we will define below.

We next study the structure of the generalized kernel of $-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}$.

Lemma A.6. *There exists $\Psi_j(\omega_*) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}^2)$ ($j = 3, 4$) s.t.*

$$-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} \Psi_j(\omega_*) = \Psi_{j-1}(\omega_*) \text{ and } \Pi_R \Psi_3(\omega_*) = \Pi_I \Psi_4(\omega_*) = 0.$$

Here, $\Psi_2(\omega_*)$ is defined in (2.17). Moreover, we have

$$A(\omega_*) = \Omega(\Psi_2(\omega_*), \Psi_3(\omega_*)) = -\Omega(\Psi_2(\omega_*), \Psi_3(\omega_*)) > 0. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Proof. First, it suffices to restrict everything in $\text{Ran} P_d(\omega_*)$. Set $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*, d} := \mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}|_{\text{Ran} P_d(\omega_*)}$. Recall the relation

$$\text{Ran} \mathcal{H}_{\omega_*, d} = \overline{\text{Ran} \mathcal{H}_{\omega_*, d}} = (\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}^*))^\perp = \left(\text{span}\{\sigma_1 \tilde{\phi}_{\omega_*}\} \right)^\perp,$$

with orthogonality in terms (2.4) and we have used $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}^* = \sigma_1 \sigma_3 \mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} \sigma_3 \sigma_1$ and Assumption 2.6 in the last equality. Now,

$$\left\langle \sigma_1 \tilde{\phi}_{\omega_*}, \Psi_2(\omega_*) \right\rangle = q'(\omega_*) = 0,$$

so we have $\Psi_2(\omega_*) \in \text{Ran} \mathcal{H}_{\omega_*}$. Therefore, there exists nontrivial $\hat{\Psi}_3(\omega_*)$ s.t. $i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*, d} \hat{\Psi}_3(\omega_*) = \Psi_3(\omega_*)$. By standard elliptic regularity argument, we have $\hat{\Psi}_3 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)$. Moreover, setting $\Psi_3(\omega_*) = \Pi_I(1 - \pi_0)P_d(\omega_*)\hat{\Psi}_3$, we see that $\Psi_3(\omega_*) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})$ satisfies $-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} \Psi_3(\omega_*) = \Psi_2(\omega_*)$ and $\Pi_R \Psi_3(\omega_*) = \pi_0 \Psi_3(\omega_*) = 0$.

In the case $q'(\omega_*) = 0$, we try also to find $\hat{\Psi}_4(\omega_*)$ s.t. $-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*, d} \hat{\Psi}_4(\omega_*) = \Psi_3(\omega_*)$. As before, it suffices to show $\left\langle \Psi_3(\omega_*), \sigma_1 \tilde{\phi}_{\omega_*} \right\rangle = 0$. However, this follows from

$$\left\langle \Psi_3(\omega_*), \sigma_1 \tilde{\phi}_{\omega_*} \right\rangle = \left\langle \Pi_I \Psi_3(\omega_*), \sigma_1 \tilde{\phi}_{\omega_*} \right\rangle = \left\langle \Psi_3(\omega_*), \Pi_I \sigma_1 \tilde{\phi}_{\omega_*} \right\rangle = 0.$$

Again, by standard elliptic regularity argument, we have $\hat{\Psi}_4(\omega_*) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)$. Setting $\Psi_4(\omega_*) = P_d(\omega_*)(1 - \pi_0)\Pi_R \hat{\Psi}_4(\omega_*) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}})$, we have $-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} \Psi_4(\omega_*) = \Psi_3(\omega_*)$, $\pi_0 \Psi_4(\omega_*) = \Pi_I \Psi_4(\omega_*) = 0$.

Finally, we show (A.6).

$$\begin{aligned}-\Omega(\Psi_1(\omega_*), \Psi_4(\omega_*)) &= -\Omega(-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} \Psi_2(\omega_*), \Psi_4(\omega_*)) = \Omega(\Psi_2(\omega_*), -i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} \Psi_4(\omega_*)) \\ &= \Omega(\Psi_2(\omega_*), \Psi_3(\omega_*)) = -\Omega(i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} \Psi_3(\omega_*), \Psi_3(\omega_*)) = \langle H_{\omega_*} \Psi_3(\omega_*), \sigma_1 \Psi_3(\omega_*) \rangle \\ &= \langle L_{-, \omega_*} \Psi_3(\omega_*), \sigma_1 \Psi_3(\omega_*) \rangle,\end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where $L_{-, \omega_*} = H_{\omega_*} \Pi_I$. We can express $L_{-, \omega_*} = -\Delta + \omega_* + g(\phi_{\omega_*}^2)$. Obviously $\Psi_1(\omega_*) = i\sigma_3 \tilde{\phi}_{\omega_*}$ satisfies $L_{-, \omega_*} \Psi_1(\omega_*)$ and since $\tilde{\phi}_{\omega_*}$ is positive valued, $L_{-, \omega_*} \geq 0$ and (A.7) will be 0 if and only if $u = c\Psi_1(\omega_*)$. If the last quantity in (A.7) were 0 it would mean that $\Psi_3(\omega_*) = c\Psi_1(\omega_*)$. This would imply $0 = -i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} \Psi_3(\omega_*) = \Psi_2(\omega_*)$, which is absurd.

We note that since $0 \neq A(\omega_*) = \langle \sigma_1 \tilde{\phi}_{\omega_*}, \Psi_4 \rangle$, there exists no Ψ_5 s.t. $-i\mathcal{H}_{\omega_*} \Psi_5 = \Psi_4(\omega_*)$. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.9. We set $\tilde{\Psi}_4(\omega) := P_d(\omega) \Psi_4(\omega_*)$. Notice that by Lemma A.4, $\Pi_I \tilde{\Psi}_4(\omega) = 0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_4 \in C^\infty(D_{\mathbb{R}}(\omega_*)(0, \delta_s), \Sigma^s)$. Similarly, by Lemma A.4 and by Lemma A.6 we have $\pi_0 \tilde{\Psi}_4(\omega) = P_d(\omega) \pi_0 \Psi_4(\omega_*) = 0$. Since $-i\mathcal{H}_\omega$ is invariant in $\text{Ran} P_d(\omega)$, we have

$$(-i\mathcal{H}_\omega)^2 \tilde{\Psi}_4(\omega) = b(\omega) \Psi_2(\omega) + a(\omega) \tilde{\Psi}_4(\omega),$$

with $a, b \in C^\infty(D_{\mathbb{R}}(0, \delta_0), \mathbb{R})$, $b(\omega_*) = 1$ and $a(\omega_*) = 0$. Thus, we set $\Psi_4(\omega) = b(\omega)^{-1} \tilde{\Psi}_4(\omega) \in C^\infty(D_{\mathbb{R}}(\omega_*)(0, \delta_s), \Sigma^s)$ making δ_s smaller to avoid the zero of b if necessary. Therefore, we have $(-i\mathcal{H}_\omega)^2 \Psi_4(\omega) = \Psi_2(\omega) + a(\omega) \Psi_4(\omega)$. We further set

$$\Psi_3(\omega) := -i\mathcal{H}_\omega \Psi_4(\omega) \in C^\infty(D_{\mathbb{R}}(\omega_*)(0, \delta_s), \Sigma^s),$$

with modifying δ_s to δ_{s+2} . Notice that we have $\Pi_R \Psi_3(\omega) = -i\mathcal{H}_\omega \Pi_I \Psi_4(\omega) = 0$ and $\pi_0 \Psi_3(\omega) = -i\mathcal{H}_\omega \pi_0 \Psi_4(\omega) = 0$.

By applying $\Omega(\Psi_1(\omega), \cdot)$ to the equality $-i\mathcal{H}_\omega \Psi_3 = \Psi_2(\omega) + a(\omega) \Psi_4(\omega)$, we obtain

$$0 = \Omega(\Psi_1(\omega), \Psi_2(\omega)) + a(\omega) \Omega(\Psi_1(\omega), \Psi_4(\omega)).$$

By $\Omega(\Psi_1(\omega), \Psi_2(\omega)) = -q'(\omega)$ and $\Omega(\Psi_1(\omega), \Psi_4(\omega)) = -\Omega(\Psi_2(\omega), \Psi_3(\omega)) = -A(\omega)$, we obtain 5. of Finally, we can express $P_d(\omega)$ by

$$P_d(\omega) = A(\omega)^{-1} (-\Omega(\cdot, \Psi_4(\omega)) \Psi_1(\omega) + \Omega(\cdot, \Psi_3(\omega)) \Psi_2(\omega) + \Omega(\Psi_2(\omega), \cdot) \Psi_3(\omega) - \Omega(\Psi_1(\omega), \cdot) \Psi_4(\omega))$$

By this expression, it is clear that we have $P_d \in \cap_s C^\infty(D_{\mathbb{R}}(\omega_*, \delta_s), \mathcal{L}(\Sigma^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2), \Sigma^s(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)))$ for some $\delta_s > 0$. \square

A.2 Proof of Lemma 3.11

In this section, we prove Lemma 3.11. We expand each $\mathfrak{F}^* \mathbf{R}_k$.

Lemma A.7. *Let $l \geq 1$, $\delta > 0$ and let $\mathfrak{F} \in C^\infty(D_{H_{\text{rad}}^1}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}, \delta), H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathcal{C}}))$ satisfy (3.3)–(3.4). Then, we have*

$$\mathfrak{F}^* \mathbf{R}_2 = \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_3 + S_{\sigma(l)+1, l+1}^0 + S_{0, l+2}^0. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Proof. We first consider the term $\langle S_{1,0}^2 \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle$. By $\mathfrak{F}^* S_{1,0}^2 = S_{1,0}^2$. Moreover, from (3.3), expanding $e^{S_{0,l}^0 i \sigma_3}$, we have $\mathfrak{F}^* \tilde{r} = (1 + S_{0,l}^0 i \sigma_3 + S_{0,2l}^0) \tilde{r} + S_{\sigma(l), l}^1$. Therefore, we have

$$\mathfrak{F}^* \langle S_{1,0}^2 \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle = \langle S_{1,0}^2 \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle + S_{0, l+2}^0 + S_{\sigma(l)+1, l+1}^0. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Next, we consider the term $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{1,0}^1 |\tilde{r}|^2 dx$ in \mathbf{R}_2 . We have $|e^{S_{0,l}^0 i \sigma_3} \tilde{r}|^2 = |\tilde{r}|^2$ and

$$|S_{0,0}^1 + e^{S_{0,l}^0 i \sigma_3} (\tilde{r} + S_{0,l}^1)|^2 = |S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r} + S_{0,l}^1|^2 = |S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2,$$

where we have used $e^{S_{0,l}^0 i \sigma_3} S_{0,0}^1 = S_{0,0}^1$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F}^* \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{1,0}^1 |\tilde{r}|^2 dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{1,0}^1 |\tilde{r} + S_{\sigma(l),l}^1|^2 dx \\ &= \mathbf{R}_2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{\sigma(l)+1,l}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{1+2\sigma(l),2l}^1 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

By (2.30), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{\sigma(l)+1,l}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1|^2) \langle S_{\sigma(l)+1,l}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_{n+1} (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle S_{\sigma(l)+1,l}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_{n+1} (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) |\tilde{r}|^2 \langle S_{\sigma(l)+1,l}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx \\ &= S_{\sigma(l)+1,l+1}^0 + \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_3. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

We remark that by using (2.30), we are using the convention in Definition (2.17). Notice that here, if $n = -1$ (which means that $\beta_n = \beta_{-1} = \text{constant}$) the terms in the third and fourth term do not appear. On the other hand, if $n \geq 0$, then $n + 1 \geq 1 = 3 - 2$ so it is compatible with the Definition of \mathbf{R}_3 in Definition 2.19.

Next, for the last term in the second line of (A.10),

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{1+2\sigma(l),2l}^1 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1|^2) s_{1+2\sigma(l),2l}^1 dx \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_{n+1} (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{1+2\sigma(l),2l}^1, \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_{n+1} (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) |\tilde{r}|^2 s_{1+2\sigma(l),2l}^1 dx \\ &= S_{1+2\sigma(l),2l}^0 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_{n+1} (|S_{0,0}^1|^2) \langle S_{1+2\sigma(l),2l}^1, \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_{n+2} (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle S_{1+2\sigma(l),2l}^1, \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_{n+2} (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) |\tilde{r}|^2 \langle S_{1+2\sigma(l),2l}^1, \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx + \mathbf{R}_2 \\ &= S_{1+2\sigma(l),2l}^0 + S_{1+2\sigma(l),2l+1}^0 + \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_3 + \mathbf{R}_2 \\ &= S_{1+2\sigma(l),2l}^0 + \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_3, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where we have used (2.30) in the first and second equality. Again, notice that $n + 2 \geq 1$ and this is compatible with the definition of \mathbf{R}_3 .

Finally, the term $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{1,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx$ can be handled as above repeatedly using (2.30).

Therefore, we have (A.8). \square

Lemma A.8. *Let $k = 3, 4, 5$. Let $l \geq 1$, $\delta > 0$ and let $\mathfrak{F} \in C^\infty(D_{H_{\text{rad}}^1}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}, \delta), H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}))$ satisfy (3.3)–(3.4). Then, we have*

$$\mathfrak{F}^* \mathbf{R}_k = \sum_{j=2}^k \mathbf{R}_j + S_{(k-1)\sigma(l), (k-1)l+1}^0. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Proof. We consider the expansion of the term $\mathfrak{F}^* \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle^i |\tilde{r}|^{2k} dx$. Recall that $n \geq k - 2$. By $e^{S_{0,i}^0 i \sigma_3} S_{0,0}^1 = S_{0,0}^1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathfrak{F}^* \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle^i |\tilde{r}|^{2k} dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1(\tilde{r} + S_{\sigma(l),l}^1) \rangle^i |\tilde{r} + S_{\sigma(l),l}^1|^{2k} dx \\ &= \sum_{j=2}^k \mathbf{R}_j + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{(k-1)\sigma(l), (k-1)l}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{k\sigma(l), kl}^1 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Using (2.30) as for (A.11) and (A.12), we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{(k-1)\sigma(l), (k-1)l}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx = S_{(k-1)\sigma(l), (k-1)l+1}^0 + \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_3,$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{k\sigma(l), kl}^1 dx = S_{k\sigma(l), kl}^0 + \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_3.$$

Therefore, we have (A.13). \square

Lemma A.9. *Let $l \geq 1$, $\delta > 0$ and let $\mathfrak{F} \in C^\infty(D_{H_{\text{rad}}^1}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}, \delta), H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}))$ satisfy (3.3)–(3.4). Then, we have*

$$\mathfrak{F}^* \mathbf{R}_6 = \sum_{j=2}^6 \mathbf{R}_j + S_{\sigma(l)+1, l+2}^0. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Proof. For $\mathfrak{F}^* \mathbf{R}_6$, we have, recalling $v(t, s) = sS_{0,0}^1 + t(\tilde{r} + S_{0,0}^1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathfrak{F}^* \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (1-t)^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} g'''(|v(t, s)|^2) \langle v(t, s), \sigma_1 S_{0,0}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle v(t, s), \sigma_1 S_{1,1}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle v(t, s), \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2 dx ds dt \\ &= \mathbf{R}_6 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_3(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle \tilde{r} + S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 S_{0,0}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle \tilde{r} + S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 S_{1,1}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle \tilde{r} + S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 S_{\sigma(l), l}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2 dx \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_3(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle \tilde{r} + S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 S_{0,0}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle \tilde{r} + S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 S_{1,1}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle \tilde{r} + S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 S_{\sigma(l), l}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \\ &\quad \times \langle \tilde{r} + S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx \\ &= \sum_{k=2}^6 \mathbf{R}_k + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_3(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{\sigma(l)+1, l+2}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_3(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{2\sigma(l)+1, 2l+1}^1 dx \\ &= \sum_{k=2}^6 \mathbf{R}_k + S_{\sigma(l)+1, l+2}^0, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the convention in Definition 2.17 in the first equality when we replace g''' with β_3 and erase the integral of t and s . Furthermore, in the last equality, we have used (2.30) as in (A.11) and (A.12). Here, since (2.30) is used, we are again using the convention in Definition 2.17.

By the above equality, we have (A.14). \square

Lemma A.10. *Let $l \geq 1$, $\delta > 0$ and let $\mathfrak{F} \in C^\infty(D_{H_{\text{rad}}^1}(\mathcal{T}_{\omega_*}, \delta), H_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \tilde{\mathbb{C}}))$ satisfy (3.3)–(3.4). Then, we have*

$$\mathfrak{F}^* \mathbf{R}_7 = \sum_{j=2}^7 \mathbf{R}_j + S_{\sigma(l)+1, l+2}^0. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Proof. Since we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^4 E_P(u)(v_1, v_2, v_3) &= g'(|u|^2) \sum_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_3} \langle v_{\tau(1)}, \sigma_1 v_{\tau(2)} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} v_{\tau(3)} \\ &+ 2g''(|u|^2) \sum_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_3} (\langle u, \sigma_1 v_{\tau(1)} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle u, \sigma_1 v_{\tau(2)} \rangle v_{\tau(3)} + \langle v_{\tau(1)}, \sigma_1 v_{\tau(2)} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle u, \sigma_1 v_{\tau(3)} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} u) \\ &+ 8g'''(|u|^2) \langle u, \sigma_1 v_1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle u, \sigma_1 v_2 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle u, \sigma_1 v_3 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} u, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

where \mathfrak{S}_3 is the permutation group of $\{1, 2, 3\}$, it suffices to consider the contribution of each terms of the r.h.s. of (A.16). For the first term of the r.h.s. of (A.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathfrak{F}^* \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (1-t)^2 g'(|v(t, s)|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle |\tilde{r}|^2 dx ds dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (1-t)^2 g'(|\mathfrak{F}^* v(t, s)|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 (\tilde{r} + S_{\sigma(l), l}^1) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} |\tilde{r} + S_{\sigma(l), l}^1|^2 dx ds dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (1-t)^2 g'(|\mathfrak{F}^* v(t, s)|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} |\tilde{r}|^2 dx ds dt + \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_3 \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_1(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{2\sigma(l), 2l}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_1(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{3\sigma(l), 3l}^1 \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (1-t)^2 g'(|\mathfrak{F}^* v(t, s)|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} |\tilde{r}|^2 dx ds dt + \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_3 + S_{2\sigma(l), 2l+1}^0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

where we have used the convention in Definition 2.17 in the second equality when we replace g' with β_1 and erase the integral of t and s . Furthermore, in the last equality, we have used (2.30) as in (A.11) and (A.12). Also, notice that $1 \geq k - 2$ for $k = 3$ so it is compatible with the definition of \mathbf{R}_k in Definition 2.19.

For the second term of the r.h.s. of (A.16), considering first term with $\tau = \text{id}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathfrak{F}^* \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (1-t)^2 g''(|v(t,s)|^2) \langle v(t,s), \sigma_1 S_{0,0}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle v(t,s), \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} |\tilde{r}|^2 dx ds dt \quad (\text{A.18}) \\
&= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (1-t)^2 g''(|\mathfrak{F}^* v(t,s)|^2) \langle \mathfrak{F}^* v(t,s), \sigma_1 S_{0,0}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \left\langle \mathfrak{F}^* v(t,s), \sigma_1 \left(\tilde{r} + S_{\sigma(l),l}^1 \right) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \\
&\quad \times |\tilde{r} + S_{\sigma(l),l}^1|^2 dx ds dt \\
&= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (1-t)^2 g''(|\mathfrak{F}^* v(t,s)|^2) \langle \mathfrak{F}^* v(t,s), \sigma_1 S_{0,0}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle \mathfrak{F}^* v(t,s), \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} |\tilde{r}|^2 dx ds dt + \sum_{k=2}^4 \mathbf{R}_k \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_2 (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{2\sigma(l),2l}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_2 (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{3\sigma(l),3l}^1 \\
&= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (1-t)^2 g''(|\mathfrak{F}^* v(t,s)|^2) \langle \mathfrak{F}^* v(t,s), \sigma_1 S_{0,0}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle \mathfrak{F}^* v(t,s), \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} |\tilde{r}|^2 dx ds dt \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=2}^4 \mathbf{R}_k + S_{2\sigma(l),2l+1}^0,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the convention in Definition 2.17 in the second equality when we replace g'' with β_2 and erase the integral of t and s . Furthermore, in the last equality, we have used (2.30) as in (A.11) and (A.12). Also, notice that $2 \geq k-2$ for $k=3,4$ so it is compatible with the definition of \mathbf{R}_k in Definition 2.19.

The other terms in the second term of the r.h.s. of (A.16) will have the same estimate. Finally, for the third term of the r.h.s. of (A.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathfrak{F}^* \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (1-t)^2 g'''(|v(t,s)|^2) \langle v(t,s), \sigma_1 S_{0,0}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle v(t,s), \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^3 dx ds dt \quad (\text{A.19}) \\
&= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (1-t)^2 g'''(|\mathfrak{F}^* v(t,s)|^2) \langle \mathfrak{F}^* v(t,s), \sigma_1 S_{0,0}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \left\langle \mathfrak{F}^* v(t,s), \sigma_1 \left(\tilde{r} + S_{\sigma(l),l}^1 \right) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^3 dx ds dt \\
&= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (1-t)^2 g'''(|\mathfrak{F}^* v(t,s)|^2) \langle \mathfrak{F}^* v(t,s), \sigma_1 S_{0,0}^1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle \mathfrak{F}^* v(t,s), \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^3 dx ds dt \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=2}^6 \mathbf{R}_k + S_{2\sigma(l),2l+1}^0,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the same argument as above. Adding the first terms of r.h.s. in (A.17), (A.18) and (A.19), we have \mathbf{R}_7 . Therefore, we have the conclusion. \square

Combining (A.8), (A.13), (A.14) and (A.15), we obtain Lemma 3.11.

A.3 Proof of Lemma 4.12

In this subsection we prove Lemma 4.12. Since $\mathbf{R} = S_{0,N+1}^0 + \sum_{k=2}^7 \mathbf{R}_k$, we estimate each term in Lemmas A.11, A.12, A.13 and A.14.

Lemma A.11. *Let $s = 0, 1$. Assume $|\omega - \omega_*| \lesssim \epsilon$ and $|\lambda| + \|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1} \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2}$. Then, we have*

$$\|\tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} S_{0,N+1}^0\|_{W^{s,6/5}} \lesssim \epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}N}. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Proof. By Lemma (3.4), we have $\sigma_3 \tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} S_{0,N+1}^0 = S_{0,N}^1$. Thus,

$$\|\sigma_3 \tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} S_{0,N+1}^0\|_{W^{1,6/5}} = \|S_{0,N}^1\|_{W^{1,6/5}} \lesssim \epsilon^{3N/2}. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

Therefore, we have (A.20). \square

Lemma A.12. *Let $s = 0, 1$. Assume $|\omega - \omega_*| \lesssim \epsilon$ and $|\lambda| + \|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1} \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2}$. Then, we have*

$$\|\tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} \mathbf{R}_2\|_{W^{s,6/5}} \lesssim \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{W^{s,6}}. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

Proof. Let $f = \langle S_{1,0}^2 \tilde{r}, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle$. Then, since

$$\langle \tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} f, \sigma_1 \tilde{\eta} \rangle = \langle S_{1,0}^2 \tilde{r}, \tilde{\eta} \rangle + \langle d_{\tilde{r}} S_{1,0}^2(\tilde{r}, \tilde{\eta}), \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle,$$

and $d_{\tilde{r}} S_{1,0}^2(\tilde{r}, \cdot) = S_{1,1}^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} f\|_{\Sigma^s} &\lesssim \sup_{\|\tilde{\eta}\|_{\Sigma^{-s}} \leq 1} \langle \tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} f, \sigma_1 \tilde{\eta} \rangle \leq \|S_{1,0}^2 \tilde{r}\|_{\Sigma^s} + \sup_{\|\tilde{\eta}\|_{\Sigma^{-s}} \leq 1} \|d_{\tilde{r}} S_{1,0}^2(\tilde{r}, \tilde{\eta})\|_{\Sigma^s} \|\tilde{r}\|_{\Sigma^{-s}} \\ &\lesssim_s \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{\Sigma^{-s}}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have

$$\|\tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} f\|_{W^{1,6/5}} \lesssim \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}. \quad (\text{A.23})$$

We next consider the term $\tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{1,0}^1 |\tilde{r}|^2 dx$ in $\tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} \mathbf{R}_2$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{1,0}^1 |\tilde{r}|^2 dx &= \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{1,0}^1 \tilde{r} + S_{0,0}^2 \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) |\tilde{r}|^2 \\ &\quad + (1 + S_{0,0}^2) \beta_{n+1} (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{1,0}^1 |\tilde{r}|^2 (S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}), \end{aligned}$$

where are using (2.30) and the convention of Definition 2.17, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) s_{1,0}^1 |\tilde{r}|^2 dx\|_{W^{s,6/5}} &\lesssim \epsilon \|\beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \tilde{r}\|_{W^{s,6/5}} \\ &\quad + \|\beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) |\tilde{r}|^2\|_{L^{6/(2\tilde{p}+2)}} + \epsilon \|\beta_{n+1} (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) |\tilde{r}|^2 (S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r})\|_{W^{s,6/5}} \lesssim \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{W^{s,6}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.24})$$

where $\tilde{p} = \max(p, 1)$ and we have used $L^{6/(2\tilde{p}+2)} \hookrightarrow \Sigma^{-2} \hookrightarrow \Sigma^2 \hookrightarrow L^2 \cap L^\infty$.

The contribution of the term $\sigma_3 \tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{1,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx$ also follows the same estimate as (A.24). Therefore, from (A.23) and (A.24), we have (A.22). \square

Lemma A.13. *Let $k = 3, 4, 5$. Let $s = 0, 1$. Assume $|\omega - \omega_*| \lesssim \epsilon$ and $|\lambda| + \|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1} \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2}$. Then, we have*

$$\|\tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} \mathbf{R}_k\|_{W^{s,6/5}} \lesssim \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{W^{s,6}}.$$

Proof. We consider the term $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^i |\tilde{r}|^{2j} dx$ in \mathbf{R}_k for $k = 3, 4, 5$. Here, recall that $n \geq k - 2$ (see Definition 2.19). Taking $\tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}}$ and using (2.30) with the convention of Definition 2.17, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^i |\tilde{r}|^{2j} dx &= \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^i |\tilde{r}|^{2(j-1)} \tilde{r} \\ &\quad + \beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^{i-1} |\tilde{r}|^{2j} S_{0,0}^1 + S_{0,0}^2 \left(\beta_n (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^i |\tilde{r}|^{2j} \tilde{r} \right) \\ &\quad + (1 + S_{0,0}^2) \beta_{n+1} (|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^i |\tilde{r}|^{2j} (S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.25})$$

where if $i = 0$ or $j = 0$, the terms with $i - 1$ or $j - 1$ do not exist.

For the first term of r.h.s. of (A.25), if $s = 0$,

$$\|\beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^i |\tilde{r}|^{2(j-1)} \tilde{r}\|_{L^{6/5}} \lesssim \|(1 + |S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^{\max(2(p-n), 0)}) s_{0,0}^1 |\tilde{r}|^{k-1}\|_{L^{6/5}}. \quad (\text{A.26})$$

If $k = 4, 5$ since $p < 2$ and $n \geq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^i |\tilde{r}|^{2(j-1)} \tilde{r}\|_{L^{6/5}} &\lesssim \|s_{0,0}^1 |\tilde{r}|^{k-1}\|_{L^{6/5}} \lesssim \|\tilde{r}\|^{k-1} \|L^{6/(k-1)}\| \\ &\leq \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^{k-1} \lesssim \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.27})$$

The same estimate holds for the case $k = 3$ with $n \geq 2$ or $n = 1$ and $p \leq 1$. For the remaining case $k = 3$, $n = 1$ and $1 < p < 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^i |\tilde{r}|^{2(j-1)} \tilde{r}\|_{L^{6/5}} &\lesssim \|(1 + |S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^{2p-2}) s_{0,0}^1 |\tilde{r}|^2\|_{L^{6/5}} \\ &\lesssim \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^3}^2 + \| |S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^{2p-2} |\tilde{r}|^2 \|_{L^{6/2p}} \lesssim \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

The case $s = 1$ for the first term of the r.h.s. of (A.25), since we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \nabla_x \left(\beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^i |\tilde{r}|^{2(j-1)} \tilde{r} \right) \right| &\lesssim |\beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2)| |S_{0,0}^1| |\tilde{r}|^{k-2} |\nabla_x \tilde{r}| \\ &+ |\beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2)| |S_{0,0}^1| |\tilde{r}|^{k-1} + |\beta_{n+1}(|v|^2)| |v| |S_{0,0}^1| |\tilde{r}|^{k-1} (S_{0,0}^1 + |\nabla_x \tilde{r}|), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.29})$$

where $v = S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}$, we can bound the $L^{6/5}$ norm of the first term in the r.h.s. of (A.29) by a similar manner to (A.26), (A.27) and (A.28), and we have

$$\|\beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) |S_{0,0}^1| |\tilde{r}|^{k-2} \nabla_x \tilde{r}\|_{L^{6/5}} \lesssim \epsilon \|\nabla_x \tilde{r}\|_{L^6}. \quad (\text{A.30})$$

The second term is the same as what appeared in (A.26), so we can bound it by $\epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}$. The $L^{6/5}$ norm of the third term of the r.h.s. of (A.29) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta_{n+1}(|v|^2)|v| |S_{0,0}^1| |\tilde{r}|^{k-1} (S_{0,0}^1 + |\nabla_x \tilde{r}|)\|_{L^{6/5}} &\lesssim \| |S_{0,0}^1| (1 + |\tilde{r}|^{\max(0, 2p-2n-1)}) |\tilde{r}|^{k-1} (1 + |\nabla_x \tilde{r}|) \|_{L^{6/5}} \\ &\lesssim \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^{k-1} (1 + \|\nabla_x \tilde{r}\|_{L^6}) + \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^6}^{k-1 + \max(0, 2p-2n-1)} (1 + \|\nabla_x \tilde{r}\|_{L^6}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last term is only needed in the case $k = 3$, $n = 1$ and $p > 1$. Thus, we have

$$\|\beta_n(|S_{0,0}^1 + \tilde{r}|^2) \langle S_{0,0}^1, \sigma_1 \tilde{r} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2}^i |\tilde{r}|^{2(j-1)} \tilde{r}\|_{W^{s, 6/5}} \lesssim \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{W^{s, 6}}. \quad (\text{A.31})$$

The second term of the r.h.s. of (A.25) can be handled by similar manner. The third term will be easier because we have a cutoff $S_{0,0}^2$ so we omit it. The fourth term also can be handled similarly as the first term taking care of the decay property of β_n . Therefore, we have the conclusion. \square

Lemma A.14. *Let $s = 0, 1$. Let $k = 6, 7$. Assume $|\omega - \omega_*| \lesssim \epsilon$ and $|\lambda| + \|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1} \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2}$. Then, we have*

$$\|\tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{r}} \mathbf{R}_k\|_{W^{s, 6/5}} \lesssim \epsilon \|\tilde{r}\|_{W^{s, 6}}.$$

Proof. Since the proof will be similar to the proof of Lemma A.13, we will omit it. \square

By Lemmas A.11, A.12, A.13 and A.14, we obtain Lemma 4.12.

Acknowledgments

M.M. was supported by the JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP15K17568, JP17H02851 and JP17H02853. ■

References

- [1] R. Abraham, J. E. Marsden, and T. Ratiu, Manifolds, tensor analysis, and applications, second ed., Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 75, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.
- [2] D. Bambusi, Asymptotic stability of ground states in some Hamiltonian PDEs with symmetry, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **320** (2013), no. 2, 499–542.
- [3] D. Bambusi and A. Maspero, Freezing of energy of a soliton in an external potential, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **344** (2016), no. 1, 155–191.
- [4] Claudio Bonanno, Long time dynamics of highly concentrated solitary waves for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *J. Differential Equations* **258** (2015), no. 3, 717–735.
- [5] V. S. Buslaev and V. E. Grikurov, Simulation of instability of bright solitons for NLS with saturating nonlinearity, *Math. Comput. Simulation* **56** (2001), no. 6, 539–546.
- [6] V. S. Buslaev and G. S. Perelman, Nonlinear scattering: states that are close to a soliton, *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)* **200** (1992), no. Kraev. Zadachi Mat. Fiz. Smezh. Voprosy Teor. Funktsii. 24, 38–50, 70, 187.
- [7] V. S. Buslaev and G. S. Perelman, On the stability of solitary waves for nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *Nonlinear evolution equations*, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, vol. 164, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1995, pp. 75–98.
- [8] V. S. Buslaev and C. Sulem, On asymptotic stability of solitary waves for nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **20** (2003), no. 3, 419–475.
- [9] A. Comech and D. Pelinovsky, Purely nonlinear instability of standing waves with minimal energy, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **56** (2003), no. 11, 1565–1607.
- [10] S. Cuccagna, On the Darboux and Birkhoff steps in the asymptotic stability of solitons, *Rend. Istit. Mat. Univ. Trieste* **44** (2012), 197–257.
- [11] S. Cuccagna, On asymptotic stability of ground states of NLS, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **15** (2003), no. 8, 877–903.
- [12] S. Cuccagna, The Hamiltonian structure of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation and the asymptotic stability of its ground states, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **305** (2011), no. 2, 279–331.
- [13] S. Cuccagna, On asymptotic stability of moving ground states of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **366** (2014), no. 6, 2827–2888.
- [14] S. Cuccagna and M. Maeda, On small energy stabilization in the NLS with a trapping potential, *Anal. PDE* **8** (2015), no. 6, 1289–1349.
- [15] S. Cuccagna and M. Maeda, On orbital instability of spectrally stable vortices of the NLS in the plane, *J. Nonlinear Sci.* **26** (2016), no. 6, 1851–1894.

- [16] S. Cuccagna, D. Pelinovsky, and V. Vougalter, Spectra of positive and negative energies in the linearized NLS problem, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **58** (2005), no. 1, 1–29.
- [17] V. Fleurov and A. Soffer, Soliton in a Well. Dynamics and Tunneling, arXiv:1305.4279v1.
- [18] J. Fröhlich, S. Gustafson, B. L. G. Jonsson, and I. M. Sigal, Solitary wave dynamics in an external potential, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **250** (2004), no. 3, 613–642.
- [19] R. H. Goodman, J. L. Marzuola, and M. I. Weinstein, Self-trapping and Josephson tunneling solutions to the nonlinear Schrödinger/Gross-Pitaevskii equation, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **35** (2015), no. 1, 225–246.
- [20] M. Grillakis, J. Shatah, and W. Strauss, Stability theory of solitary waves in the presence of symmetry. I, *J. Funct. Anal.* **74** (1987), no. 1, 160–197.
- [21] P. D. Hislop and I. M. Sigal, Introduction to spectral theory, Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 113, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996, With applications to Schrödinger operators.
- [22] Justin Holmer and Maciej Zworski, Soliton interaction with slowly varying potentials, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* (2008), no. 10, Art. ID rnn026, 36.
- [23] R. Killip, T. Oh, O. Pocovnicu, and M. Visan, Solitons and scattering for the cubic-quintic nonlinear Schrödinger equation on \mathbb{R}^3 , *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **225** (2017), no. 1, 469–548.
- [24] B. Lars G. Jonsson, Jürg Fröhlich, Stephen Gustafson, and Israel Michael Sigal, Long time motion of NLS solitary waves in a confining potential, *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **7** (2006), no. 4, 621–660.
- [25] B. J. LeMesurier, G. Papanicolaou, C. Sulem, and P.-L. Sulem, Focusing and multi-focusing solutions of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *Phys. D* **31** (1988), no. 1, 78–102.
- [26] M. Maeda, Stability and instability of standing waves for 1-dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equation with multiple-power nonlinearity, *Kodai Math. J.* **31** (2008), no. 2, 263–271.
- [27] M. Maeda, Stability of bound states of Hamiltonian PDEs in the degenerate cases, *J. Funct. Anal.* **263** (2012), no. 2, 511–528.
- [28] J. L. Marzuola, S. Raynor, and G. Simpson, A system of ODEs for a perturbation of a minimal mass soliton, *J. Nonlinear Sci.* **20** (2010), no. 4, 425–461.
- [29] J. L. Marzuola and M. I. Weinstein, Long time dynamics near the symmetry breaking bifurcation for nonlinear Schrödinger/Gross-Pitaevskii equations, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **28** (2010), no. 4, 1505–1554.
- [30] F. Merle and P. Raphael, On a sharp lower bound on the blow-up rate for the L2 critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **19** (2006), no. 1, 37–90.
- [31] M. Ohta, Instability of bound states for abstract nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *J. Funct. Anal.* **261** (2011), no. 1, 90–110.
- [32] D. E. Pelinovsky and T. V. Phan, Normal form for the symmetry-breaking bifurcation in the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *J. Differential Equations* **253** (2012), no. 10, 2796–2824.

- [33] G. Perelman On the Formation of Singularities in Solutions of the Critical Nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Ann. Henri Poincaré 2 (2001), 605–673.
- [34] A. Soffer and M. I. Weinstein, Multichannel nonlinear scattering for nonintegrable equations, Comm. Math. Phys. **133** (1990), no. 1, 119–146.
- [35] A. Soffer and M. I. Weinstein, Multichannel nonlinear scattering for nonintegrable equations. II. The case of anisotropic potentials and data, J. Differential Equations **98** (1992), no. 2, 376–390.
- [36] A. Soffer and M. I. Weinstein, Resonances, radiation damping and instability in Hamiltonian nonlinear wave equations, Invent. Math. **136** (1999), no. 1, 9–74.
- [37] C. Sulem and P.-L. Sulem, The nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 139, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999, Self-focusing and wave collapse.
- [38] V. Tikhonenko, J. Christou, and B. Luther-Davies, Three dimensional bright spatial soliton collision and fusion in a saturable nonlinear medium, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76** (1996), 2698–2701.
- [39] M. I. Weinstein, Modulational stability of ground states of nonlinear Schrödinger equations, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **16** (1985), no. 3, 472–491.
- [40] M. I. Weinstein, Lyapunov stability of ground states of nonlinear dispersive evolution equations, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **39** (1986), no. 1, 51–67.

Department of Mathematics and Geosciences, University of Trieste, via Valerio 12/1 Trieste, 34127 Italy. *E-mail Address:* `scuccagna@units.it`

Department of Mathematics and Informatics, Faculty of Science, Chiba University, Chiba 263-8522, Japan. *E-mail Address:* `maeda@math.s.chiba-u.ac.jp`