

A Generic Framework of Adiabatic Approximation for Nonlinear Evolutions

Jingxuan Zhang

March 9, 2022

Abstract

In the study of evolution equations, the method of adiabatic approximation is an essential tool to reduce an infinite-dimensional dynamical system to a simpler, possibly finite-dimensional one. In this paper, we formulate a generic scheme of adiabatic approximation that is valid for an abstract nonlinear evolution under mild regularity assumptions. The key prerequisite for the scheme is the existence of what we call approximate solitons. These are some low energy but not necessarily stationary configurations. The approximate solitons are characterized by a number of parameters (possibly infinitely many), and have a manifold structure. The adiabatic scheme reduces the given abstract evolution equation to an effective equation on the manifold of approximate solitons. We give sufficient conditions for the approximate solitons so that the reduction scheme is valid up to a large time. The validity is determined by the energy property of the original evolution as well as the adiabaticity of the approximate solitons.

1 Introduction

Consider an abstract evolution equation

$$\partial_t u = JE'(u). \quad (1)$$

Here $u = u_t \in U$, $t \geq 0$ is a C^1 path of vectors in some open set U in a real Hilbert space X . The map $E : U \subset X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is some energy functional which is C^2 on U . The vector $E'(u) \in X$ is the X -gradient of E at u .

We assume the operator $J : X \rightarrow X$ in (1) is a bounded invertible linear operator, satisfying

$$\text{either } J = -1, \quad \text{or } J^* = J^{-1} = -J.$$

In the first case, J is the negative of the identical map. In the second case, J is a symplectic operator. This symplectic condition holds, for example, if J can be represented by the standard symplectic matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

These two cases respectively turn (1) into either a first-order energy dissipative dynamics or a Hamiltonian system.

We assume the following global well-posedness result for (1):

For every $u_0 \in U$, there exists a path $u \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, U)$ s.th. $u|_{t=0} = u_0$ and $\partial_t u_t = JE'(u_t)$ for $t > 0$.

In this case we say u_t is the flow generated by u_0 under (1). Then we consider the following problem:

Suppose a configuration $u_0 \in X$ can be parametrized up to a small error by a point σ_0 in a manifold Σ . Let $u_t, t \geq 0$ be the flow generated by u_0 under (1). Can one reduce the full flow $u_t \in U$ to an approximate flow $\sigma_t \in \Sigma$ generated by σ_0 under some suitable effective dynamics?

Here are some examples when this problem arises:

1. Let $n, k \geq 1$. Let X be a suitable space of functions from $\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$, where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ is a domain. Suppose the initial configuration u_0 is *localized* in the sense that outside a neighbourhood of some k -dimensional concentration set $\sigma_0 \subset \Omega$, all derivatives of u_0 vanish rapidly. Then one is interested in whether the evolution u_t remains localized near some concentration set σ_t for $t > 0$, and if so, what kind of geometric flow governs the motion of σ_t . This problem arises from the study of phase transition, see e.g. [7, 15, 16, 37].
2. Let X and u_0 be as before. Suppose σ_0 is given by a collection of distinct points in Ω (i.e. $k = 0$). Heuristically, one would expect the evolution of σ_0 to be the motion law of interaction among the points of localization. One is interested in to what extent the full dynamics can be reduced to this “renormalized” dynamics of points. This is the setting for various soliton scattering problems in high energy physics [14, 39, 43, 44].
3. Let X be a suitable space of geometric objects (e.g. curves, surfaces, etc.). Suppose $u_0 \in X$ is determined by a number of parameters, for instance center, radius, axial direction, etc.. Then one is interested in whether u_t can still be described faithfully by these parameters at time $t > 0$. This problem is essential to the study of rigidity under various geometric flows [12, 19–21, 50].

1.1 Outline of the main result

In this study we propose an abstract scheme to answer the questions above, known in the physics literature as the method of *adiabatic approximation*. The precise statements of the main results are in Theorems 1-2. Below we give an outline.

Our main assumption is the existence of a parametrized family of configurations $v_\sigma \in X, \sigma \in \Sigma$, where Σ is a manifold. We call Σ the *moduli space*,

in the sense that Σ contains various modulation parameters. The space Σ can be finite-dimensional if, for instance, it represents finitely many concentration points in a domain. In general, Σ can be infinite-dimensional, e.g. as a space of geometric objects or local gauge symmetries. We call this family v_σ the *approximate solitons*. In Section 2, we further explain the terminology, and list the precise requirements (C1)-(C3) for v_σ . These requirements specify certain approximate energy-critical and linear stability properties. We give a justification in Section 2 for the generality of these requirements.

Suppose there exists a family of approximate solitons $v_\sigma \in X$, $\sigma \in \Sigma$ satisfying the main assumptions (C1)-(C3). Then the adiabatic approximation scheme goes as follows: First, we find an evolution equation $\partial_t \sigma = F(\sigma)$ for a path $\sigma_t \in \Sigma$ with the following property: Let u_t , $t \geq 0$ be a solution to (1). Assuming u_t remains close to a path $v_\sigma \equiv v_{\sigma_t}$, then σ_t evolves according to this equation in the leading order. We calculate the velocity $F(\sigma)$ explicitly (see (24)). This equation for σ is the effective (or adiabatic) dynamics for (1). In this step we use the approximate critical point property (C1) of v_σ .

At this point there is a caveat: In the first step, we have assumed that u_t remains close to some approximate soliton for all t . But, a priori, even u_0 lies in a neighbourhood of the approximate solitons, the path u_t may soon exit this neighbourhood (for instance, due to acceleration). Thus we need to justify the validity of the effective dynamics derived in the first step.

In the second step, we show that so long as the initial configuration u_0 is close to an approximate soliton v_{σ_0} , then the flow u_t generated by u_0 stays uniformly close to a path of approximate solitons v_{σ_t} , at least up to a large time. In this step we use the stability properties (C2)-(C3). This step is analogous to proving orbital stability for ground states [47, 48].

As a corollary of the main result, we derive a converse that allows us to find a flow evolving by (1) that agrees with a given adiabatic flow in Σ in the leading order up to a large time. The precise statements are given in Corollaries 1-2.

1.2 Historical Remarks

The idea in this paper dates back at least to Manton's moduli space approximation scheme for monopole dynamics [32]. In addition to the cited works above, rigorous results using similar methods include [9, 13, 17, 18, 22, 24, 26–28, 30, 34, 35, 46], with diverse applications to superfluidity, superconductivity, particle physics, and geometric flows. The point in common in these applications is that solitonic configurations (i.e. coherent states) arise naturally due to focusing nonlinearity or other types of constraints. The structure of the present paper can be compared to [18, 28].

We refer the readers to an excellent review on the applications of adiabatic approximation to classical field theory [45]. The review contains several examples of effective dynamics describing interacting point solitons, and discusses a different approach through compactness arguments. The latter finds applications to a large class of problems, which, among others, include the now-classical geometric theory of phase transitions [15, 16, 33, 37], relating the flow of a real

order parameter under the Allen-Cahn equation to the mean curvature flow of its nodal set.

Mathematically, one can compare the results in this paper to the classical invariant manifold theory developed in [2–6, 10]. In this regard, our main assumptions (C1)-(C3) can be compared to the normal hyperbolicity condition in those references. However, we note that here our focus is different, since we are less interested in the properties of the invariant manifold *per se*, but rather to reduce (1) to an explicit effective dynamics and make sure the reduction is both tractable and valid at least for a long time.

1.3 Arrangement

The arrangement of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we describe the manifold M of approximate solitons. We list two groups of assumptions on this manifold and discuss the generality of these assumptions for applications.

In Section 3, we prove two key lemmas. By these lemmas, we find a heuristic candidate (24) as the effective dynamics of (1).

In Sections 4-5, we prove the main results of this paper. We show that for both dissipative and Hamiltonian (1), the heuristic effective dynamics (24) is indeed valid as the adiabatic approximation for (1) for a long time (global in the dissipative case).

In Section 6, we give some concrete example to illustrate the application of our abstract framework to the study of the motion of mesoscopic interfaces, a central problem in statistical physics. In Appendix, we list the basic concepts of variational calculus that are used repeatedly.

Notations

Throughout this paper, when no confusion arises, we shall drop the time dependence t in subscripts. An estimate $A \lesssim B$ means there is some $C > 0$ independent of time and all the parameters in question, s.th. $A \leq CB$. The expression $A \sim B$ means that $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$ hold simultaneously.

2 The Manifold of Approximate Solitons

The central object of this paper is the manifold M defined below.

Definition 1 (manifold of approximate solitons). Let X be a real Hilbert space. Let Σ be a closed Riemannian manifold sitting in some (possibly infinite-dimensional) Banach space. Let $f : \Sigma \rightarrow U \subset X$ be a C^2 map, where $U \subset X$ is an open set on which the energy functional E in (1) is C^2 .

Then the subset

$$M := f(\Sigma)$$

forms a manifold in X . The tangent space $T_{f(\sigma)}M$, $\sigma \in \Sigma$ can be trivialized as a subspace of X , as

$$T_{f(\sigma)}M = \{df(\sigma)\xi \in X : \xi \in T_\sigma\Sigma\}.$$

By assumption, the tangent space $T_\sigma\Sigma$ can also be trivialized as a subspace Y of the ambient Banach space.

Fix some bases for the tangent spaces $T_{f(\sigma)}M$ and $T_\sigma\Sigma$ w.r.t. the trivializations above. Denote by

$$g_\sigma : Y \rightarrow X$$

the action of $df(\sigma) : T_\sigma\Sigma \rightarrow T_{f(\sigma)}M$ on a given fiber. In other words, g_σ is the Fréchet derivative $df(\sigma)$ in local coordinates. Denote by

$$g_\sigma^* : X \rightarrow Y$$

the adjoint to g_σ .

We call M a *manifold of approximate solitons* if the following holds:

1. (Solitonic assumptions) There exist

$$0 < \epsilon \ll 1, \quad \beta > 0$$

such that every element $f(\sigma) \in M$ with $\sigma \in \Sigma$ satisfies the following conditions:

$$\|E'(f(\sigma))\|_X \leq \epsilon, \tag{C1}$$

$$L_\sigma := E''(f(\sigma)) : X \rightarrow X \text{ is self-adjoint, and } L_\sigma|_{(JT_{f(\sigma)}M)^\perp} \geq \beta > 0, \tag{C2}$$

$$L_\sigma|_{T_{f(\sigma)}M} \leq \epsilon. \tag{C3}$$

In (C2), the the bounded invertible operator $J : X \rightarrow X$ is as in (1).

2. (Geometric assumptions) There exist

$$0 < c \leq C < \infty, \quad 0 \leq \alpha < 1$$

such that the parametrization f satisfies the following conditions:

$$df(\sigma) : T_\sigma\Sigma \rightarrow X \text{ is injective at every } \sigma \in \Sigma, \tag{G1}$$

$$c\epsilon^{-\alpha} \|\xi\|_Y \leq \|g_\sigma\xi\|_{Y \rightarrow X} \leq C\epsilon^{-\alpha} \|\xi\|_Y \quad (\xi \in Y). \tag{G2}$$

Remark 1. Condition (G1) implies that f is an immersion of the given manifold Σ . Hence, M forms a non-degenerate manifold in X .

Conditions (C1)-(G2) play central roles for the validity of adiabatic theory for the full evolution (1). In the remaining of this section, we discuss these conditions in two groups. The first group, (C1)-(C3), concerns with the qualitative properties of the approximate solitons related to the energy functional E in (1). The second group, (G1)-(G2), concerns with the geometric properties of the manifold M from in Definition 1. In Section 6, we give some examples of approximate solitons that arise naturally as models of mesoscopic interfaces.

2.1 Solitonic Assumptions

In this subsections, we discuss the solitonic assumptions (C1)-(C3).

Let M be a manifold of approximate solitons as in Definition 1. Then there exist two constants

$$0 < \epsilon \ll 1, \quad \beta > 0$$

s.t. every element $f(\sigma) \in M$ with $\sigma \in \Sigma$ satisfies

$$\|E'(f(\sigma))\|_X \leq \epsilon, \quad (\text{C1})$$

$$L_\sigma := E''(f(\sigma)) : X \rightarrow X \text{ is self-adjoint, and } L_\sigma|_{(JT_{f(\sigma)}M)^\perp} \geq \beta > 0, \quad (\text{C2})$$

$$L_\sigma|_{T_{f(\sigma)}M} \leq \epsilon. \quad (\text{C3})$$

Through out the remaining sections, ϵ is taken to be a sufficiently small parameter. In practice, this parameter usually comes with the equation (1).

Condition (C1) says that elements in M are approximate critical points of E . Conditions (C2)-(C3) assert certain stability properties regarding the linearized operator L_σ . (See Appendix for the definition of the Hessian E'' .)

Remark 2. If E is a C^2 map on an open set $U \subset X$, and X lies in a larger Hilbert space Z with a possibly weaker topology, then the Z -gradient $E'(u)$, $u \in U$ is an element in Z . In this situation, the (possibly nonlinear) map $u \mapsto E'(u)$ is C^1 from $X \rightarrow Z$, and for fixed $u \in U$, the linearized operator $E''(u)$ is bounded from $X \rightarrow Z$. This would result in a number of changes in the conditions (C1)-(C3). For example, we would need estimates on $\|E'(f(\sigma))\|_Z$ in (C1) and $\|L_\sigma\|_{X \rightarrow Z}$ in (C2).

However, in most applications where this situation arises, it is possible to show that on the class of configurations of interest, the formally weaker topology induced by the Z -norm is equivalent to that induced by the X -norm (e.g. all cited works in Section 1.2). For example, consider the typical situation where E' is an elliptic differential operator of second order with sufficiently regular coefficients (but not necessarily linear) mapping from some Sobolev space $H^k \rightarrow H^{k-2}$, $k \geq 2$. Then, so long as the initial configuration u_0 for (1) is sufficiently regular, by standard elliptic regularity theory we have $\|u_t\|_{H^k} \lesssim \|u_t\|_{H^{k-2}}$ for the flow u_t , $t \geq 0$ generated by u_0 under (1). Moreover, the Fréchet derivatives depend only on the topology but not the norm on the ambient space [1, Sect. 1]. Hence, the technicality mentioned above has little to no bearing for most applications of the adiabatic theory developed in the present paper, as it can be easily amended *ad hoc*. For this reason, in the sequel we choose not to pursue this point any further so as not to obscure our main results.

Now we explain some terminology. We call the space M in Definition 1 the manifold of *approximate solitons*, and Σ the *moduli space*, for the following reason: Consider the case for $J = -1$. Suppose M consists of exact critical points of E . Then (C1) holds with $\epsilon = 0$. If, moreover, Σ is the (continuous) symmetry group of E and f is the action of Σ on X , then (C2) holds if the elements in M are (linearly) stable, and (C3) holds with $\epsilon = 0$, since in this case

the tangent space $T_{f(\sigma)}M$ consists exactly of the zero-modes generated by the broken symmetries.

In the preceding situation, each element in M is an *exact soliton*, and Σ consists of the *modulation parameters* of the continuous symmetries. Conditions (C1)-(C3) relax this limiting case, while retaining the key qualitative features. This explains our terminology as well as the motivations for (C1)-(C3).

We note that the idea of approximating a flow near M by a flow on the moduli space dates back to Manton's classical work [32], and such approximating scheme was first rigorously implemented in [43, 44].

Remark 3. Among the three main conditions above, the most restrictive one is (C2). This condition asserts that there is a spectral gap at 0 for the linearized operator L_σ . When the operator L_σ does not have compact resolvent, for instance due to the non-compactness of domain on which L_σ acts, verifying this spectral gap condition is a non-trivial issue. This affects the applicability of our framework to problems arising from e.g. nonlinear optics, where the linearized operators at exponentially decaying ground states on \mathbb{R}^d in general possess delicate spectral properties.

Nonetheless, we remark that linearly stable exact solitons defined on non-compact domains are readily available in various important models. For applications to classical field theory, due to the Higgs mechanism, one can obtain coercivity estimates of the form (C2) for the linearized operator at ground states *even in the presence of essential spectrum*. See [25, 36, 43, 44] for some examples in gauge field theory of this kind. For applications in geometric analysis, due to the topological properties of the underlying domain, (C2) can also be achieved by the linearized operators at key solutions defined on non-compact manifolds. See [11, 12] for some examples arising from the analysis of the mean curvature flow.

Now we proceed to give some further justifications of the generality of the conditions (C1)-(C3). Indeed, these conditions are generic, first and foremost, because if one has a single approximate soliton u_0 satisfying these conditions to begin with, then one can find other approximate solitons by perturbing this u_0 . These perturbations can be rather arbitrary, because (C1)-(C3) do not impose any quantitative constraints other than that the perturbations have to be small.

For simplicity, suppose $J = -1$ and $u_0 = 0 \in X$ is a given approximate soliton, satisfying

$$\|E'(0)\|_X \leq \epsilon, \quad L_0 P^+ \geq \beta, \quad L_0(1 - P^+) \leq \epsilon \quad (L_0 := E''(0)),$$

where P^+ denotes the Riesz projection onto the intersection of $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ with the spectrum of L_0 . Consider an arbitrary perturbation $v \in X$ around $u_0 = 0$ with $\|v\|_X \ll 1$. For (C1), the size of $\|E'(v)\|_X$ is still small by the continuity of E' . For (C2), if the energy functional E is sufficiently regular, say at least C^4 , then the path $v \mapsto L_v := E''(v)$ is C^2 , and it follows from [29, Thm. (D)] that the second lowest positive eigenvalue of L_v is at least $\beta/2$ for every v along this path, provided $\|v\|_X \ll 1$ and the linearized operators L_v have compact

resolvents (which, of course, excludes the problem due to essential spectrum mentioned in Remark 3). A similar statement holds for (C3).

Hence, if $u_0 = 0$ is an approximate soliton, and the linearized operators have compact resolvents, then any element in an immersed manifold $M \subset B_\delta(0) \subset X$ with $0 < \delta \ll 1$ and tangent space $T_v M$ close to $\text{ran}(1 - P^+)$ satisfies (C1)-(C3). The condition on the tangent space determines the geometry of M (c.f. the normal hyperbolicity condition for infinite-dimensional invariant manifolds in [2-6]).

Note that even if the linearized operators do not have compact resolvents, it is still possible to construct such a manifold, see e.g. [26, 43, 44]. Note also that in the above discussion, u_0 needs not to be an exact soliton to begin with, see e.g. [26, 39].

To summarize, our emphasis here is the freedom in constructing M , since we do not require (C1) with $\epsilon = 0$, and (C2)-(C3) are persistent under sufficiently regular perturbations (in some cases even in the presence of essential spectrum).

2.2 Geometric Assumptions

The secondary assumptions are about the parametrization f of the manifold of approximate solitons given in Definition 1.

Recall that we have defined $g_\sigma : Y \rightarrow X$ as the Fréchet derivative $df(\sigma)$ in local coordinates, and $g_\sigma^* : X \rightarrow Y$ as its adjoint. Now we assume there exist

$$0 < c \leq C < \infty, \quad 0 \leq \alpha < 1$$

s.th. the following holds:

$$df(\sigma) : T_\sigma \Sigma \rightarrow X \text{ is injective at every } \sigma \in \Sigma, \quad (\text{G1})$$

$$c\epsilon^{-\alpha} \|\xi\|_Y \leq \|g_\sigma \xi\|_{Y \rightarrow X} \leq C\epsilon^{-\alpha} \|\xi\|_Y \quad (\xi \in Y). \quad (\text{G2})$$

Condition (G1) says that the parametrization f in Definition 1 is an immersion, and therefore the manifold $M = f(\Sigma)$ is non-degenerate. Condition (G2) is to emphasize that this $\|g_\sigma\|_{Y \rightarrow X}$ is allowed to be large, though not as large as ϵ^{-1} . It is important to allow g_σ to be large, for the following reason: In applications to interface dynamics, g_σ is often a multiplication operator by the gradient of a function that has steep transition layers (e.g. (83), (87)). As such, (G2) arises naturally with $\alpha \geq 0$. See some concrete examples in Section 6.

In the remaining of this subsection, we explain the implication of (G1)-(G2) in relation to the geometric structure induced by the evolution (1).

Define a bilinear form

$$\omega : (u, v) \mapsto \langle -J^{-1}u, v \rangle_X, \quad (2)$$

where either $J = -1$ or J is a symplectic operator satisfying

$$J^{-1} = J^* = -J. \quad (3)$$

If (1) is a gradient flow, then ω is just the inner product on X . This turns M into a Riemannian manifold. If (1) is Hamiltonian, then ω is a non-degenerate symplectic form on X and therefore turns M into a symplectic manifold.

Recall that the tangent space $T_\sigma\Sigma$ to the Riemannian manifold Σ can be trivialized as a Hilbert space Y . Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_\sigma &: Y \longrightarrow Y \\ \xi &\longmapsto g_\sigma^* J^{-1} g_\sigma \xi \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

If J is a symplectic operator, then \mathcal{J}_σ induces a symplectic form on the tangent bundle $T\Sigma$, since

$$\langle \mathcal{J}_\sigma \xi, \xi \rangle = \langle g_\sigma^* J^{-1} g_\sigma \xi, \xi \rangle = \langle J^{-1} g_\sigma \xi, g_\sigma \xi \rangle = 0 \quad (\xi \in Y).$$

Moreover, \mathcal{J}_σ is invertible precisely because of the assumption (G1) that g_σ is injective (or, equivalently, that f is an immersion).

Hence, in both gradient and Hamiltonian cases, the operator \mathcal{J}_σ induces a non-degenerate bilinear form on Σ through

$$T_\sigma\Sigma \times T_\sigma\Sigma \ni (\xi, \eta) \mapsto \langle \mathcal{J}_\sigma \xi, \eta \rangle_Y.$$

This map is the pull back of (2) by the parametrization f (up to a sign). The non-degeneracy of \mathcal{J}_σ is essential in the subsequent sections, and this is the most important implication of (G1). This importance was already noted in [26].

Next, we summarize the key implications of (G2) into the following lemma:

Lemma 1 (estimates on \mathcal{J}_σ). *There hold the following estimates:*

$$\|\mathcal{J}_\sigma\|_{Y \rightarrow Y} \lesssim \epsilon^{-2\alpha}, \quad (5)$$

$$\|\mathcal{J}_\sigma^{-1}\|_{Y \rightarrow Y} \lesssim \epsilon^{2\alpha}, \quad (6)$$

$$\|\mathcal{E}'(\sigma)\|_Y \lesssim \epsilon^{1-\alpha}. \quad (7)$$

Here $\mathcal{E} : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the pull-back of E by f .

Proof. Estimate (5) is straight forward. For (7), we use the identity

$$g_\sigma^* E'(f(\sigma)) = \mathcal{E}'(\sigma).$$

This follows from the chain rule.

For (6), we note that the assumption (G2) means the bounded self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{J}_\sigma^* \mathcal{J}_\sigma : Y \rightarrow Y$ has a spectral gap at 0 of size $O(\epsilon^{-4\alpha})$. To see this, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{J}_\sigma^* \mathcal{J}_\sigma \xi, \xi \rangle &= \langle (g_\sigma^* J g_\sigma)(g_\sigma^* J^{-1} g_\sigma) \xi, \xi \rangle \\ &= \langle (g_\sigma g_\sigma^*) J^{-1} g_\sigma \xi, J^{-1} g_\sigma \xi \rangle \\ &\geq c_1 \epsilon^{-2\alpha} \|J^{-1} g_\sigma \xi\|_Y^2 \\ &\geq c_2 \epsilon^{-4\alpha} \|\xi\|_Y^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here $c_1, c_2 > 0$ depend only on the constant c in (G2). In the last two inequalities, we use the lower bound from (G2) twice, together with the fact that $\|J(\cdot)\|_X = \|J^{-1}(\cdot)\|_X = \|\cdot\|_X$ if $J = -1$ or J is a symplectic operator satisfying (3). By the spectral theorem, we conclude (6) from the lower bound above. \square

Remark 4. Lastly, we remark that in Definition 1, the closedness assumption on Σ naturally arises when Σ represents finitely many small perturbation parameters. However, this assumption is not essential. For all results in this paper, one can replace this assumption by

$$\|L_\sigma\|_{X \rightarrow X} \lesssim 1, \quad \sup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \left(\|f(\sigma)\|_X + \|d_\sigma g_\sigma\|_{Y \rightarrow L(Y, X)} \right) \lesssim 1.$$

In applications where Σ is unbounded (e.g. when the moduli represent points in \mathbb{R}^d), or when Σ is not compact (e.g. when the moduli represent local gauge symmetries), such uniform $O(1)$ estimates as above can often be derived *ad hoc*. See e.g. [18, 28, 39] for the first case, and [26] for both cases.

3 Two Key Lemmas

In this section we prove two key lemmas for the adiabatic theory developed in Sections 4-5.

Recall that the tangent space $T_{f(\sigma)}M$ can be trivialized as a subspace of X (see Definition 1). Define the linear projection Q_σ onto $T_{f(\sigma)}M$ by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\sigma &: X \longrightarrow T_{f(\sigma)}M \subset X \\ \phi &\longmapsto g_\sigma \mathcal{J}_\sigma^{-1} g_\sigma^* J^{-1} \phi \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Then $Q_\sigma^2 = Q_\sigma$ and

$$\text{ran } Q_\sigma = T_{f(\sigma)}M, \quad \ker Q_\sigma = (JT_{f(\sigma)}M)^\perp.$$

Compare this to the requirements in (C2)-(C3).

Either $J = -1$, or J is a symplectic operator satisfying (3), the operator Q_σ satisfies the identity

$$Q_\sigma^* = J^* Q_\sigma J. \quad (9)$$

If $J = -1$, then this implies the projection Q_σ is orthogonal, i.e. $Q_\sigma^* = Q_\sigma$. If J is symplectic, then Q is skew orthogonal with $Q_\sigma^* = -JQ_\sigma J$.

Recall

$$\omega : (u, v) \mapsto \langle -J^{-1}u, v \rangle_X \quad (u, v \in X)$$

is the bilinear map defined in (2). Recall also that if $V \subset X$ is a non-empty subset, and u is an element in X , then

$$\text{dist}(u, V) = \inf \{ \|u - v\|_X : v \in V \}. \quad (10)$$

With these definitions at hand, we first construct a nonlinear projection from a tubular neighbourhood around the manifold M of approximate solitons

into the moduli space Σ . If $u \in X$ lies in this tubular neighbourhood, then we call the projection $\sigma \in \Sigma$ of u the *moduli* of u . Indeed, as far as the effective dynamics is concerned, one can think of the vector σ as a (possibly infinite) tuple of modulation parameters.

Lemma 2 (existence of moduli). *Fix two constants $\gamma, C > 0$. There exists $0 < \epsilon_0 \ll 1$ depending on γ, C only s.th. the following holds:*

1. (Existence of projection) *There exists an open neighbourhood $M' \subset X$ around M , together with a C^1 map*

$$S : M' \rightarrow \Sigma,$$

s.th. for every $u \in M'$ and $\sigma = S(u)$, there holds

$$\omega(u - f(\sigma), \phi) = 0 \quad (\phi \in T_{f(\sigma)}M). \quad (11)$$

2. (Definite size of M') *For every $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ and $\delta = C\epsilon^\gamma$, the set M' can be taken to be the tubular neighbourhood*

$$M' = \{u \in X : \text{dist}(u, M) < \delta\}.$$

3. (A priori estimate) *If $u \in M'$ and $u = f(\sigma_1) + w_1$ for some $\sigma_1 \in \Sigma$, then there holds*

$$\|u - S(u)\|_X \lesssim \|w_1\|. \quad (12)$$

Remark 5. The map S is a projection in the sense that $S(f(\sigma)) = \sigma$ for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$, and $S(f(S(u))) = S(u)$ for every $u \in M'$.

For fixed $\gamma > 0$, the threshold $\epsilon_0 \rightarrow 0$ as $C \rightarrow \infty$. Hence it is not possible to extend the size of M' indefinitely. For fixed C , the threshold $\epsilon_0 \rightarrow 0$ as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ from above.

Notice that for this lemma, we only need the geometric assumptions from Section 2.2.

Proof of the lemma. 1. First, note that $Q_\sigma \phi = \phi$ if $\phi \in T_{f(\sigma)}M$. (One can check this by writing $\phi = g_\sigma \xi$ for some $\xi \in Y$.) By this fact, together with the identity (9), which holds for both gradient and Hamiltonian case, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(u - f(\sigma), \phi) &= \langle -J^{-1}(u - f(\sigma)), Q_\sigma \phi \rangle \\ &= -\langle Q^* J^{-1}(u - f(\sigma)), \phi \rangle \\ &= -\langle J^* Q_\sigma(u - f(\sigma)), \phi \rangle \quad (\phi \in T_{f(\sigma)}M). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, condition (11) is satisfied if $Q_\sigma(u - f(\sigma)) = 0$, and for the existence part, it suffices to find a map $S : u \mapsto \sigma$ s.th.

$$Q_\sigma(u - S(u)) = 0.$$

Consider the map

$$F : X \times \Sigma \longrightarrow Y \\ (u, \sigma) \longmapsto g_\sigma^* J^{-1}(u - f(\sigma)) .$$

It is clear that if $F(u, \sigma) = 0$, then $Q_\sigma(u - f(\sigma)) = 0$. Moreover, if the parametrization map f is C^2 , then F is C^1 . Thus, we proceed to solve the equation

$$F(u, \sigma) = 0 \tag{13}$$

by Implicit Function Theorem.

Fix a point $\sigma \in \Sigma$. The equation (13) has the trivial solution $(f(\sigma), \sigma)$. The partial Fréchet derivative $\partial_\sigma F|_{(f(\sigma), \sigma)}$ equals to $-\mathcal{J}_\sigma$, which is invertible as we discussed in Section 2.2. Hence, we conclude from Implicit Function Theorem that there exists $\delta = \delta(\sigma, \epsilon) > 0$ and a C^1 map $S_\sigma : B_\delta(f(\sigma)) \rightarrow \Sigma$ s.th. $F(u, S_\sigma(u)) = 0$ for $u \in B_\delta(f(\sigma))$.

Since σ is arbitrary in the above construction, we can patch together all these S_σ to get an open set $M' \subset X$ containing M , together with a C^1 map $S : M' \rightarrow X$, s.th. $(u, S(u))$ solves (13) for every $u \in M'$.

2. At this point the open set $M' = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} B_{\delta(\sigma, \epsilon)}(f(\sigma))$. Now we claim in fact δ can be made independent of σ . This is essential for our purpose, because we would like M' to contain a definite volume for a flow to fluctuate.

Fix a point $\sigma \in \Sigma$. Write

$$A_w := d_\sigma F|_{(w+f(\sigma), \sigma)}, \quad V_w := A_w - A_0.$$

Then

$$A_0 = -\mathcal{J}_\sigma, \quad V_w = (d_\sigma g_\sigma^*)(\cdot)|_{J^{-1}w}.$$

We recall from the proof of Implicit Function Theorem (e.g. [1, Sec. 2]) that the size of $\delta > 0$ from the above construction is determined by the following condition: For every $w \in B_\delta(f(\sigma))$, there hold

$$A_w \text{ is invertible,} \tag{14}$$

$$\|A_w^{-1}\|_{Y \rightarrow Y} \leq 2 \|A_0^{-1}\|_{Y \rightarrow Y}, \tag{15}$$

$$\|F(w + f(\sigma), \sigma)\|_Y \leq \frac{\delta_0}{4 \|A_0^{-1}\|_{Y \rightarrow Y}}, \tag{16}$$

where $\delta_0 > 0$ is chosen so that for the remainder

$$R(w, \xi) := F(w + f(\sigma), \sigma + \xi) - F(w + f(\sigma), \sigma) - \partial_\sigma F(w + f(\sigma), \sigma)\xi,$$

the following conditions hold for every $\xi \in B_{\delta_0}(\sigma)$ and $u \in B_\delta(f(\sigma))$:

$$\|R(w, \xi)\|_Y \leq \frac{\delta_0}{4 \|A_0^{-1}\|_{Y \rightarrow Y}}, \tag{17}$$

$$\|\mathcal{J}_{\sigma+\xi} - \mathcal{J}_\sigma\|_{Y \rightarrow Y} \leq \frac{1}{4 \|A_0^{-1}\|_{Y \rightarrow Y}}. \tag{18}$$

Note that the r.h.s. of (15)-(18) are independent of σ by the uniform estimates for $\mathcal{J}_\sigma^{-1} = -A_0^{-1}$ from (6).

Fix any $c_0 > 0$, and recall $\gamma > 0$ is given. We claim conditions (17)-(18) are satisfied for $\delta_0 = c_0\epsilon^\gamma$ and all sufficiently small ϵ .

To get (17), one uses the fact that $\|R(w, \xi)\|_Y = o(\|\xi\|_Y) = o(\delta_0)$, since R is the super-linear remainder of the expansion of the C^1 map F in σ . At this point we need a constraint $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ depending on γ . This constraint $\epsilon_0 \rightarrow 0$ as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ from above.

To get (18), one uses the continuity of the map $\sigma \mapsto \mathcal{J}_\sigma \in L(Y, Y)$ and the estimate (6), which imply that (18) holds so long as $\delta_0 = o(1)$. At this point we need another constraint $\epsilon_0 = o(c_0^{-1})$ as $c_0 \rightarrow \infty$. Importantly, this constraint implies the size of δ cannot be made indefinite.

Next, we claim (14)-(16) are satisfied for $\delta = c_1\delta_0$ with some fixed c_1 independent of c_0 and all $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0(c_0)$. This, together with the choice of δ_0 above, confirms the claim about the size of δ .

Indeed, with the choice $\delta_0 = c_0\epsilon^\gamma$, condition (16) is satisfied if and only if

$$\|A_0^{-1}\|_{Y \rightarrow Y} \|F(w + f(\sigma), \sigma)\|_Y \leq \frac{c_0\epsilon^\gamma}{4}. \quad (19)$$

By the uniform estimate for g_σ^* and \mathcal{J}_σ^{-1} , we find that l.h.s. of this expression can be bounded from above by $c_2\epsilon^\alpha \|w\|_X$ for some $c_2 > 0$ depending only on the constants c, C in (G2). Thus, (19) holds with the choice $\delta = c_0\epsilon^\gamma/(4c_2)^{-1}$.

Next, by elementary perturbation theory, since A_0 is invertible, it follows that condition (14) is satisfied so long as

$$\|V_w\|_{Y \rightarrow Y} \leq \frac{1}{2} \|A_0^{-1}\|_{Y \rightarrow Y}^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{J}_\sigma^{-1}\|_{Y \rightarrow Y}^{-1}. \quad (20)$$

By (6), we have $\|\mathcal{J}_\sigma^{-1}\|_{Y \rightarrow Y}^{-1} \geq c_3$ for some $c_3 > 0$ depending on the implicit constant in (6) only. By the condition that f is C^2 and Σ is closed (see Definition 1 as well as Remark 4), we have a uniform $O(1)$ bound on the linear map $\xi \mapsto d_\sigma g_\sigma^*(\xi) \in L(X, Y)$. By this, together with the definition of V_w , we conclude $\|V_w\|_{Y \rightarrow Y} \leq c_4 \|J^{-1}w\|_X = c_4 \|w\|_X$ for some $c_4 > 0$ depending on f only. Thus, (20) is satisfied if $\delta = c_3/(2c_4)$.

Lastly, referring to the Neumann series for the inverse

$$A_w^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_0^{-1} (-V_w A_0^{-1})^n,$$

we find

$$\|A_w^{-1}\|_{Y \rightarrow Y} \leq \frac{\|A_0^{-1}\|_{Y \rightarrow Y}}{1 - \|V_w\|_{Y \rightarrow Y} \|A_0^{-1}\|_{Y \rightarrow Y}}.$$

With the previous choice $\delta = c_3/(2c_4)$, we conclude (15) from this and (20).

This proves the claim about the size of M' , with the choice

$$\delta = \epsilon^\gamma \min \left\{ \frac{c_3}{2c_4}, \frac{c_0}{4c_2} \right\},$$

which is valid for arbitrary fixed $\gamma, c_0 > 0$ and all $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0(\gamma, c_0)$.

3. Lastly, we establish the estimate (12).

Suppose $u \in M'$ and $u = f(\sigma_1) + w_1$ for some $\sigma_1 \in \Sigma$. Let S be the nonlinear projection constructed above, and let $w := u - f(S(u))$. Then

$$w = f(\sigma_1) + w_1 - f(S(u)). \quad (21)$$

Estimate (12) is equivalent to the bound $\|w\|_X \lesssim \|w_1\|_X$, which we prove below.

Consider the expansion

$$\begin{aligned} f(S(u)) &= f(S(f(\sigma_1) + w_1)) \\ &= f(\sigma_1 + dS(f(\sigma_1))w_1 + o_{\|\cdot\|_X}(w_1)) \\ &= f(\sigma_1) + g_{\sigma_1}(dS(f(\sigma_1))w_1 + o_{\|\cdot\|_X}(w_1)) \\ &\quad + o_{\|\cdot\|_Y}(dS(f(\sigma_1))w_1). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The second line is valid since S is C^1 and $S(f(\sigma_1)) = \sigma_1$. The third line is valid since f is C^2 . In view of (21) and (G2), it remains to find a uniform $O(\epsilon^\alpha)$ estimate on the linear operator $dS(u) : X \rightarrow Y$.

Differentiating the equation $F(u, S(u)) = 0$, we find

$$0 = d_u F(u, S(u)) = \partial_u F(u, S(u)) + \partial_\sigma F(u, S(u))dS(u).$$

This implies $dS(u) = -(\partial_\sigma F(u, S(u)))^{-1} \partial_u F(u, S(u)) = -\mathcal{J}_{S(u)}^{-1} g_{S(u)}^* J^{-1}$. By (G2) and (6), we conclude $\|dS(u)\|_{X \rightarrow Y} \lesssim \epsilon^\alpha$. Plugging this into (22), and using (G2), we find $f(S(u)) = f(\sigma_1) + O_{\|\cdot\|_X}(w_1)$. Hence, the desired estimate (12) follows from (21).

This completes the proof. \square

By Lemma 2, if u_t is a path in X with $\text{dist}(u_t, M) \lesssim \epsilon^\gamma$ for some $\gamma > 0$ and sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, then there holds the unique decomposition

$$u_t = f(\sigma_t) + w_t \quad \text{s.th.} \quad \sigma_t \in \Sigma, \quad Q_{\sigma_t} w = 0. \quad (23)$$

Moreover, the choice σ_t is optimal in the sense that the (skew) orthogonality condition (11) is satisfied. To see (11) is a natural condition for optimality, we note that if $J = -1$, then (11) means $w \perp T_{f(\sigma)}M$ and this guarantees $f(\sigma_t)$ is the closest path in M to u_t . In the Hamiltonian case, in the presence of continuous symmetry, the skew orthogonality condition is also customarily used to derive the modulation equations for solitary wave dynamics, see e.g. [18, 23, 28, 40, 41].

Remark 6. In the sequel we will use the a priori estimate (12) as follows: Suppose $u \in X$ satisfies $\text{dist}(u, M) \leq C\epsilon^\gamma$ for some $\gamma, C > 0$ and sufficiently small ϵ . Then there is $\sigma_* \in \Sigma$ s.th. $\|u - f(\sigma_*)\|_X \leq 2C\epsilon^\gamma$ by definition (10). Now, if $\sigma = S(u)$ is the moduli associated to u and $w := u - f(\sigma)$, then applying the a priori estimate (12) yields $\|w\|_X \lesssim \|u - f(\sigma_*)\|_X \leq C'\epsilon^\gamma$ for some $C' \geq 2C$. This fact allows us to keep track only the leading order term in w in the derivation of various remainder estimates below, knowing only that u_t is close to some point in M .

Recall $\mathcal{E} : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the pull-back of the energy functional E by f . If σ is the moduli of u , then $\mathcal{E}(\sigma)$ is the effective energy of the latter. Hence, if u_t can be decomposed as (23), then heuristically, one expects the effective dynamics governing the motion of the moduli $\sigma = \sigma_t$ to be

$$\partial_t \sigma = \mathcal{J}_\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{E}'(\sigma). \quad (24)$$

In particular, the energy property of (24) (i.e. dissipative or conservative) agrees with that of (1).

In the next lemma, we justify the heuristic choice of (24) as the effective dynamics for a full flow u_t solving (1), *assuming* u_t stays uniformly close to M . We drop this assumption in the next two sections, and we will show it suffices to have u_t near M only at $t = 0$ for the approximation (24) to be valid globally in the gradient flow case, and up to some large time in the Hamiltonian case.

Lemma 3. *Let $0 < T \leq \infty$. Let u_t , $0 \leq t < T$ be a solution to (1). Suppose $\text{dist}(u_t, M) \lesssim \epsilon^\gamma$ for all $t \leq T$ and some $\gamma > 0$. Write $u_t = f(\sigma_t) + w_t$ as in (23). Then there holds the following uniform estimate for all $t \leq T$:*

$$\|\partial_t \sigma - \mathcal{J}_\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{E}'(\sigma)\|_Y \lesssim \epsilon^{1+\alpha} \|w\|_X. \quad (25)$$

Proof. 1. Expand (1) as

$$\partial_t v + \partial_t w = J(E'(v) + L_\sigma w + N_\sigma(w)), \quad (26)$$

where L_σ is the linearized operator at $v_t := f(\sigma_t)$, and $N_\sigma(w)$ defined by this equation. This expansion holds by the C^2 regularity of E .

Recall Q_σ is the projection onto $T_v M$ defined in (8). Applying Q_σ to both sides of (26), we have

$$\partial_t v - Q_\sigma J E'(v) = Q_\sigma (J L_\sigma w - \partial_t w + J N_\sigma(w)). \quad (27)$$

Consider the identity

$$\mathcal{J}_\sigma^{-1} g_\sigma^* J^{-1} (\partial_t v - Q_\sigma J E'(v)) = \partial_t \sigma - \mathcal{J}_\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{E}'(\sigma).$$

To verify this, one uses two facts that follow readily from the chain rule:

$$\partial_t v = g_\sigma \partial_t \sigma, \quad g_\sigma^* E'(f(\sigma)) = \mathcal{E}'(\sigma).$$

Thus by the uniform estimates for g_σ^* and \mathcal{J}_σ^{-1} , we have

$$\|\partial_t \sigma - \mathcal{J}_\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{E}'(\sigma)\|_Y \lesssim \epsilon^\alpha \|\partial_t v - Q_\sigma J E'(v)\|_X. \quad (28)$$

2. Consider now the r.h.s. of (27). These three terms can be bounded respectively as follows:

$$\|Q_\sigma J L_\sigma w\|_X \lesssim \epsilon \|w\|_X, \quad (29)$$

$$\|Q_\sigma \partial_t w\|_X \lesssim \epsilon^{-\alpha} \|\partial_t \sigma\|_Y \|w\|_X, \quad (30)$$

$$\|Q_\sigma J N_\sigma(w)\|_X \lesssim \|w\|_X^2. \quad (31)$$

In all these three inequalities we use the uniform bound $\|Q_\sigma\|_{X \rightarrow X} \lesssim 1$.

For (29) we need the identity

$$|\langle Q_\sigma J L_\sigma w, w' \rangle| = |\langle w, L_\sigma Q_\sigma J w' \rangle|. \quad (32)$$

In both gradient and Hamiltonian case, we have $Q_\sigma J = J Q_\sigma^*$ by (9), and (32) follows from here.

By (32), we find

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle Q_\sigma J L_\sigma w, w' \rangle| &= |\langle w, L_\sigma Q_\sigma J w' \rangle| \\ &\leq \|L_\sigma Q_\sigma\|_{X \rightarrow X} \|w\|_{X^1} \|w'\|_X \quad (w, w' \in X). \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Plugging $w' = Q_\sigma J_\sigma L w$ into (33), we get

$$\|Q_\sigma J L_\sigma w\|_X \leq \|L_\sigma Q_\sigma\|_{X \rightarrow X} \|w\|_X \lesssim \epsilon \|w\|_X.$$

The last inequality follows from the approximate zero mode property (C3).

Next, for (30), we use the construction from Lemma 2, which ensures the remainder $w = u - v$ satisfies $Q_\sigma w = 0$. We note that precisely at this point we use this optimal construction in an essential way. See a discussion in Remark 7 below.

Indeed, differentiating $Q_\sigma w = 0$ w.r.t. t , we find

$$0 = \partial_t(Q_\sigma w) = (\partial_t Q_\sigma)w + Q_\sigma \partial_t w = (d_\sigma Q_\sigma \partial_t \sigma)w + Q_\sigma \partial_t w. \quad (34)$$

Here $d_\sigma Q_\sigma$ is an operator from Y to the space of linear operators $L(X, X)$. Geometrically, since Q_σ is the projection onto the tangent space $T_{f(\sigma)}M$, the operator $d_\sigma Q_\sigma$ is the Weingarten map (or shape operator), and therefore the bound on $d_\sigma Q_\sigma$ depends only on the curvature on M . Since the map $f : \Sigma \rightarrow M \subset X$ is a C^2 immersion of a closed manifold Σ (see also Remark 4), we find the uniform estimate

$$\|d_\sigma Q_\sigma\|_{Y \rightarrow L(X, X)} \lesssim \sup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \left(\|g_\sigma\|_{Y \rightarrow X} + \|d_\sigma g_\sigma\|_{Y \rightarrow L(Y, X)} \right) \lesssim \epsilon^{-\alpha}.$$

Plugging this into (34) gives (30).

Lastly, (31) follows from the remainder estimate $N_\sigma(w) = o(\|w\|_X^2)$, since E is C^2 .

3. Plugging (29)-(31) to (27)-(28) gives

$$\|\partial_t \sigma - \mathcal{J}_\sigma^{-1} d_\sigma E(f(\sigma))\|_Y \lesssim (\|\partial_t \sigma\|_Y + \epsilon^{1+\alpha}) \|w\|_X. \quad (35)$$

Here note that as we discussed in Remark 6, we can absorb higher order terms in w into the first order ones.

Now we want to estimate $\|\partial_t \sigma\|_Y$ in the r.h.s. of (35) at the order of $O(\epsilon^{1+\alpha})$, whence the claim (25) follows.

Applying the reverse triangle inequality to the l.h.s. of (35), we find two cases. If $\|\partial_t \sigma\|_Y < \|\mathcal{J}_\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{E}'(\sigma)\|_Y$, then $\|\partial_t \sigma\|_Y \lesssim \epsilon^{1+\alpha}$ by (6)-(7). Otherwise, if $\|\partial_t \sigma\|_Y \geq \|\mathcal{J}_\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{E}'(\sigma)\|_Y$, then (35) implies

$$\|\partial_t \sigma\|_Y \leq \|\mathcal{J}_\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{E}'(\sigma)\|_Y + C (\|\partial_t \sigma\|_Y \|w\|_X + \epsilon^{1+\alpha} \|w\|_X), \quad (36)$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of ϵ and time. So long as

$$\|w\|_X = o(1), \quad 0 < \epsilon \ll 1, \quad (37)$$

we can transpose the second term in the r.h.s. of (36) to obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\partial_t \sigma\|_Y \leq \|\mathcal{J}_\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{E}'(\sigma)\|_Y + C\epsilon^{1+\alpha} \|w\|_X. \quad (38)$$

The Ansatz (37) holds since by assumption $\text{dist}(u_t, M) \lesssim \epsilon^\gamma$ for some $\gamma > 0$ and $\epsilon \ll 1$. This implies $\|w\|_X = O(\epsilon^\gamma) = o(1)$ as we explained in Remark 6.

From (38) we conclude

$$\|\partial_t \sigma\|_Y \lesssim \epsilon^{1+\alpha} + \epsilon^{1+\alpha} \|w\|_X \lesssim \epsilon^{1+\alpha}. \quad (39)$$

Hence, in both cases we have shown the r.h.s. of (35) is of the order $O(\epsilon^{1+\alpha} \|w\|_X)$. Thus (25) is proved. \square

Remark 7. Here we would like to remark on the estimate (30). Indeed, it is not in general possible to estimate the full velocity $\partial_t w$, because this fluctuation field, however small, may vary rapidly, especially in the Hamiltonian space due to acceleration. However, an estimate on the projection $Q_\sigma \partial_t w$ is possible because of the identity (34). This identity is an important consequence of the (skew) orthogonality condition (11), as (34) relates the tangential velocity $Q_\sigma \partial_t w$ to the velocity of moduli, $\partial_t \sigma$. The latter is small up to a large time, so long as initially $\text{dist}(u_0, M) \ll \epsilon$, as we show in the next sections.

4 Effective Dynamics for Gradient Flow

In this section we consider (1) with $J = -1$ on the tangent bundle TU . In this case the evolution reads

$$\partial_t u = -E'(u). \quad (40)$$

This turns (1) into the gradient flow of E . We show any flow starting near the manifold of approximate soliton M can be approximated uniformly for all time by a gradient flow of the effective energy \mathcal{E} on the moduli space Σ . Then we derive a converse of this as a corollary.

Theorem 1. *Fix any $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$. There exists $0 < \delta \ll \epsilon$ s.th. the following holds: Let M be the manifold of approximate solitons as in Definition 1. Let $u_0 \in X$ be an initial configuration s.th. $\text{dist}(u_0, M) \leq \delta$. Let u_t be the flow generated by u_0 under (40).*

1. (A priori estimate) For all $t \geq 0$, there holds

$$\text{dist}(u_t, M) \lesssim \epsilon. \quad (41)$$

2. (Effective dynamics) Moreover, the decomposition (23) for u_t is valid for all time, and the moduli $\sigma \equiv \sigma_t := S(u_t)$ satisfies the following effective dynamics:

$$\partial_t \sigma = -(g_\sigma^* g_\sigma)^{-1} \mathcal{E}'(\sigma) + O_{\|\cdot\|_Y}(\epsilon^{2+\alpha}). \quad (42)$$

Remark 8. The remainder in (42) is of lower order by (7).

Proof of Theorem 1. 1. To begin with, note that by the continuity of the flow (40), if $\delta \ll \epsilon$, then there exists some (possibly small) $0 < T_1 \leq \infty$ s.th. (41) holds for $t < T_1$. This gives the decomposition

$$u_t = v_t + w_t, \quad v_t := f(\sigma_t), \quad \sigma_t := S(u_t) \quad (43)$$

as in (23), which is valid for $0 \leq t < T_1$. Here w_t is defined by the relation (43), i.e. $w_t := u_t - v_t = u_t - f(S(\sigma_t))$.

The claim now is that we have the a priori estimate

$$\|w_t\|_X \leq C(1 + e^{-\gamma t})\epsilon \quad (t \leq T_1) \quad (44)$$

for some $\gamma, C > 0$ independent of t and T_1 . If this holds, then since the constant C is independent of time, a standard blow-up argument yields $T_1 = \infty$, and (41) follows since by definition (10), we have $\text{dist}(u_t, M) \leq \|w_t\|_X$. Lemma 2 then guarantees the validity of the decomposition (43) for all time, and the remainder estimate in (42) follows from (25) and (44).

Hence, the theorem is proved once we establish (44).

To this end, we derive a differential inequality for the function

$$t \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \langle L_{\sigma(t)} w(t), w(t) \rangle, \quad (45)$$

which accounts for most of the energy dissipation. We will show this quadratic form is approximately a Lyapunov functional along (40). Then by the coercivity condition (C2), this approximately monotone quantity controls $\|w\|_X$, since by the orthogonality condition (11), the fluctuation field $w \in \ker Q_\sigma = (T_{f(\sigma)} M)^\perp$.

2. We now study the quantity $\frac{1}{2} \langle L_\sigma w, w \rangle$. Compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d \langle L_\sigma w, w \rangle}{dt} &= \langle \partial_t w, L_\sigma w \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle (\partial_t L_\sigma) w, w \rangle \\ &= \langle -\partial_t v - (E'(v) + L_\sigma w + N_\sigma(w)), L_\sigma w \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle (\partial_t L_\sigma) w, w \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Here we have used the expansion (26). We bound the two inner products in the last line of (46).

To bound the second one, we note two things: First, there holds the identity $\partial_t L_\sigma = (d_\sigma L_\sigma) \partial_t \sigma$ by the chain rule. Second, we have a uniform bound on $d_\sigma L_\sigma : Y \rightarrow L(X, X)$ of the order $O(\epsilon^{1-\alpha})$. To see this, we compute $d_\sigma L_\sigma = d_\sigma E''(f(\sigma)) = d_v|_{v=f(\sigma)} E''(v) df(\sigma) = L_\sigma g_\sigma$. For the last equality, we note that for a linear map, the Fréchet derivative is itself. Since g_σ maps into (the trivialization of) $T_{f(\sigma)} M$, the claimed uniform bound on $d_\sigma L_\sigma$ follows from the assumptions (C3) and (G2).

From the preceding discussion, we conclude the following estimate for the second term in the last line of (46):

$$|\langle (\partial_t L_\sigma) w, w \rangle| \lesssim \epsilon^{1-\alpha} \|\partial_t \sigma\|_Y \|w\|_X^2. \quad (47)$$

We note that the approximate zero-mode property (C3) is used here in a crucial way to derive this estimate.

Now we claim the following three estimates hold:

$$\langle -\partial_t v - E'(v), L_\sigma w \rangle \lesssim (\epsilon + \|w\|_X) \|w\|_X^2 + \epsilon \|w\|_X, \quad (48)$$

$$-\langle N_\sigma(w), L_\sigma w \rangle \lesssim \|w\|_X^3, \quad (49)$$

$$-\langle L_\sigma w, L_\sigma w \rangle \leq -\beta' \|w\|_X^2 \text{ for some fixed } \beta' > 0. \quad (50)$$

For all these estimates we need a uniform bound on $\|L_\sigma\|_{X \rightarrow X}$. Recall in Definition 1 we assume the moduli space Σ to be closed. Moreover, we assume the map f and the energy functional E are both C^2 . These facts imply that the map $\sigma \mapsto L_\sigma$ is continuous and bounded on Σ . Consequently, there exists some fixed $C > 0$ s.th.

$$\|L_\sigma\|_{X \rightarrow X} \leq C. \quad (51)$$

See also Remark 4.

For (48), we recall equation (27) and the estimates (29)-(31), (39) derived in Lemma 3. Rearranging (27), we conclude from these estimates and condition (C1) that there holds the velocity bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t v\|_X &\lesssim \epsilon + (\epsilon + \epsilon^{-\alpha} \|\partial_t \sigma\|_X + \|w\|_X) \|w\|_X \quad \text{by (C1) and (29)-(31)} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon + (\epsilon + \|w\|_X) \|w\|_X \quad \text{by (39)}. \end{aligned}$$

This and another application of (C1) gives (48).

For (49), we use the nonlinear estimate $\|N_\sigma(w)\|_X \lesssim \|w\|_X^2$, which follows from the C^2 regularity of the energy functional E .

For (50), we recall that the orthogonality condition from Lemma 2 in the gradient case ensures $w \in (T_v M)^\perp$. By this fact, (50) follows from the stability condition (C2), and the constant β' depends on the gap size β in (C2) only. (In general we have $\beta' \leq \beta^2$.) This spectral gap condition is precisely used here to get the bound (50), which is the central estimate in what follows.

3. Combining (48)-(49), we get an estimate

$$\langle -\partial_t v - (E'(v) + L_\sigma w + N_\sigma(w)), L_\sigma w \rangle \lesssim (\|w\|_X + \epsilon - \beta') \|w\|_X^2. \quad (52)$$

Plugging (47) and (52) into (46), we find

$$\frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{d \langle L_\sigma w, w \rangle}{dt} \right| \lesssim (\|w\|_X + \epsilon - \beta') \|w\|_X^2 + \epsilon \|w\|_X. \quad (53)$$

Now, by (53), so long as $\epsilon \leq \beta/4$, we can find $\gamma > 0$ depending on the constant C in (51) and β' in (50) only s.th.

$$\left(\frac{d}{dt} + \gamma \right) \langle L_\sigma w, w \rangle \lesssim (\|w\|_X - \beta'/2) \|w\|_X^2 + \epsilon \|w\|_X. \quad (54)$$

At this point we make the Ansatz

$$\|w\|_X \leq \beta'/2. \quad (55)$$

Shrinking ϵ if necessary, we can ensure that this Ansatz holds at least locally for $t \leq T_1$.

So long as (55) holds, we can drop the first term in the r.h.s. of (54), and then multiply both side by $e^{\gamma t}$ to get

$$\frac{d}{dt} (e^{\gamma t} \langle L_\sigma w, w \rangle) \lesssim \epsilon e^{\gamma t} \|w\|_X. \quad (56)$$

Integrating (56), and then dividing the integration factor, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \langle L_\sigma w, w \rangle &\lesssim e^{-\gamma t} \langle L_{\sigma_0} w_0, w_0 \rangle + \epsilon M(t) \\ &\lesssim e^{-\gamma t} \|w_0\|_X^2 + \epsilon M(t) \quad \left(M(t) := \sup_{t' \leq t} \|w_{t'}\|_X \right). \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Together with the coercivity condition (C2), we find

$$M(t) \leq C_1 (e^{-\gamma t} \|w_0\|_X + \epsilon), \quad (58)$$

where $C_1 > 0$ depends on the spectral gap from (C2) and is independent of t and T_1 .

As we discussed in Remark 6, if we now choose $\delta \ll \epsilon$, then $\|w_0\|_X \leq \epsilon$. This, together with (58) above, implies the key a priori estimate (44). We also conclude from here that Ansatz (55) holds so long as ϵ is sufficiently small. This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 1 (Converse of Theorem 1). *Fix any large $T \gg 1$ and $0 < \gamma < 1$. There exist $c > 0$ independent of T , and $0 < \epsilon_0 \ll 1$ depending on γ, T only, s.th. the following holds: Let $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$. Let $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma$. Let $\sigma_t \in \Sigma$ be the flow generated by σ_0 under the effective dynamics (24). Then there exists a solution u_t to (40) s.th. for all $\epsilon^\gamma t \leq T$, there holds*

$$\|u_t - f(\sigma_t)\|_X \leq c\epsilon^{(1-\gamma)/2}. \quad (59)$$

Remark 9. Note that this result holds only on a long finite interval, and the remainder in (59) tends to 0 as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

For fixed $\gamma > 0$, the threshold $\epsilon_0 \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. For fixed T , the threshold $\epsilon_0 \rightarrow 0$ as $\gamma \rightarrow 1$ from below.

Proof of the Corollary. Let $u_0 = f(\sigma_0)$. Let u_t be the flow generated by u_0 under (1). We claim this flow u_t satisfies (59) for $\epsilon^\gamma t \leq T$.

Indeed, by Theorem 1, there exists a flow $\tilde{\sigma}_t \in \Sigma$ s.th.

$$\|u_t - f(\tilde{\sigma}_t)\|_X \leq c_1 \epsilon, \quad (60)$$

$$\|\partial_t \tilde{\sigma} - \mathcal{J}_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{-1} \mathcal{E}'(\tilde{\sigma})\|_Y \leq c_2 \epsilon^{2+\alpha}. \quad (61)$$

Here $c_1, c_2 > 0$ are some constants independent of ϵ, T , and c .

By the uniqueness of moduli (see Lemma 2), at the initial time we have $\sigma_0 = \tilde{\sigma}|_{t=0}$. Using this, and integrating (61), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\sigma}_t - \sigma_t\|_Y &\leq \epsilon^{-\gamma} T \sup_{\epsilon^\gamma \tau \leq T} (\|\partial_t \tilde{\sigma}_\tau - \mathcal{J}_{\tilde{\sigma}_\tau}^{-1} \mathcal{E}'(\tilde{\sigma}_\tau)\|_Y + \|\mathcal{J}_{\tilde{\sigma}_\tau}^{-1} \mathcal{E}'(\tilde{\sigma}_\tau) - \mathcal{J}_{\sigma_\tau}^{-1} \mathcal{E}'(\sigma_\tau)\|_Y) \\ &\leq T(c_2 \epsilon^{2+\alpha-\gamma} + c_3 \epsilon^{1+\alpha-\gamma}), \end{aligned}$$

so long as $\epsilon^\gamma t \leq T$. In the last line we have used (61), and the constant c_3 depends on the implicit constants in (6) and (7) only.

By the uniform estimate (G2), it follows that

$$\|f(\tilde{\sigma}_t) - f(\sigma_t)\|_X \leq C \epsilon^{-\alpha} \|\tilde{\sigma}_t - \sigma_t\|_Y \leq CT(c_3 \epsilon^{1-\gamma} + c_2 \epsilon^{2-\gamma}) \quad (\epsilon^\gamma t \leq T).$$

Here $C > 0$ is the constant from (G2).

Applying triangle inequality to (60), we find

$$\|u_t - f(\sigma_t)\|_X \leq CT(c_3 \epsilon^{1-\gamma} + c_2 \epsilon^{2-\gamma}) + c_1 \epsilon \quad (\epsilon^\gamma t \leq T). \quad (62)$$

Recall that $T \gg 1$ is fixed, the exponent $0 < \gamma < 1$, and these c_1, c_2, c_3, C are all absolute constants. Hence, the leading term in (62) is of the order $O(\epsilon^{1-\gamma})$, and from (62) we can choose ϵ_0 depending on T only to conclude (59) for every $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$. \square

5 Effective Dynamics for Hamiltonian System

In this section we consider the Hamiltonian system

$$\partial_t u = JE'(u), \quad J^{-1} = J^* = -J. \quad (63)$$

One essential difference in the analysis of (63) from that of the gradient flow (40) is the following: For (63), we do not have a natural Lyapunov-type functional that bounds the fluctuation field, such as the quadratic form (45). Indeed, the decay property of (45) is ultimately due to the energy dissipation for gradient flows.

There are two important classes of evolutions of the form (63) that arise from physics:

1. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a domain. The configuration space $X \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$ is taken to be a suitable space of wave functions, and we equip X with the real inner product $\langle \psi, \phi \rangle = \int \Re \bar{\psi} \phi$. Then the map $\psi \mapsto (\Re \psi, \Im \psi)$ is an isometric isomorphism between X and a subspace of $L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$, if the latter is equipped with inner product $\langle u, v \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \int (u_1 v_1 + u_2 v_2)$. Hence, we can identify X as a subspace of $L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$.

Under this identification, the operator $J : \psi \mapsto -i\psi$ can be represented by the symplectic matrix

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (64)$$

Consider now a Schrödinger type equation

$$i\partial_t u = E'(u), \quad (65)$$

where, for consistency of notation, E is a suitable Hamiltonian. Using the identification described above, we can cast (65) into (63). This is the typical setting for evolutions from quantum mechanics.

2. Let $X_1 \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^k)$ be a suitable space of density functions or order parameters, equipped with the usual inner product.

Consider a second-order dynamics

$$\partial_{tt} v = -\tilde{E}'(v), \quad (66)$$

where $v \in X_1$ and \tilde{E} is some Hamiltonian. We can reduce this to a first-order system by setting $u = (u_1, u_2) = (v, \partial_t v)$, and choosing some E s.th. $E'(u) = (\tilde{E}'(u_1), u_2)$. The configuration space for u is $X = X_1 \times X_2$, for some suitable $X_2 \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^k)$. X is equipped with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{X_1} + \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{X_2}$. This way we can cast (66) into (63), with J given by (64).

The main result of this section is the next theorem, analogous to Theorem 1 in the gradient case, but only valid on a long finite time interval.

Theorem 2. *Fix any $T \gg 1$ and $0 < \gamma < 1$. There exists $0 < \epsilon_0 \ll 1$ depending on γ, T only, s.th. the following holds: For every $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, there exists $0 < \delta \ll \epsilon$ s.th. the following holds: Let M be the manifold of approximate solitons as in Definition 1. Let $u_0 \in X$ be an initial configuration s.th. $\text{dist}(u_0, M) \leq \delta$. Let u_t be the flow generated by u_0 under (63).*

1. (A priori estimate) For all $\epsilon^\gamma t \leq T$, there holds

$$\text{dist}(u_t, M) \leq \epsilon^\gamma. \quad (67)$$

2. (Effective dynamics) Moreover, for $\epsilon^\gamma t \leq T$, there exists a unique decomposition for u_t as in (23), and the moduli $\sigma \equiv \sigma_t := S(u_t)$ satisfies the following effective dynamics:

$$\partial_t \sigma = \mathcal{J}_\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{E}'(\sigma) + O_{\|\cdot\|_Y}(\epsilon^{1+\alpha+\gamma}). \quad (68)$$

Remark 10. As in the gradient case, the remainder in (68) is of lower order by (7), but here we have a weaker error estimate. Note importantly that the implicit constant in the remainder of (68) is independent of T and γ .

Proof of Theorem 2. 1. The initial setup is identical to the first step in Theorem 1. In particular, we write $u_t = v_t + w_t$ as in (43).

The claim now is that for every $t \leq \epsilon^{-\gamma} T$, there holds

$$\|w_t\|_X \leq \epsilon^\gamma, \quad (69)$$

provided $0 < \delta \ll \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0(T, \gamma)$.

Notice that by the continuity of (63), there exists some (possibly small) $T_1 > 0$ s.th. (69) holds for all $t \leq T_1$, provided $\|w_0\|_X \ll \epsilon^\gamma$. The latter is the case because $0 < \gamma < 1$, and for $\delta \ll \epsilon$, we have $\|w_0\|_X = O(\epsilon)$ by Remark 6. Hence, the decomposition $u_t = v_t + w_t$ is valid at least locally.

As in Step 1 of Theorem 1, if (69) holds, then (67) follows from definition (10). By Lemma 2, (67) implies the validity of the decomposition (23) for u_t . By Lemma 3, (69) implies the effective dynamics (68) and the remainder estimate therein.

Hence, the theorem is proved once we establish (69) for all $t \leq \epsilon^{-\gamma}T$.

2. Consider the expansion

$$E(u) = E(v + w) = E(v) + \langle E'(v), w \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle L_\sigma w, w \rangle + R_\sigma(w), \quad (70)$$

where $R_\sigma(w)$ is the super-quadratic remainder. By the construction from Lemma 2, the fluctuation field w satisfies (11). Thus $w \in (JT_v M)^\perp$, and by condition (C2), we can rearrange (70) to obtain

$$\|w\|_X^2 \lesssim E(v + w) - E(v) - \langle E'(v), w \rangle - R_\sigma(w). \quad (71)$$

Since $E(u)$ is conserved along (63), we have

$$E(v + w) = E(v_0 + w_0) = E(v_0) + \langle E'(v_0), w_0 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle L_{\sigma_0} w_0, w_0 \rangle + R_{\sigma_0}(w_0).$$

Plugging this into (71), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_X^2 &\lesssim E(v_0) - E(v) \\ &+ \langle E'(v_0), w_0 \rangle - \langle E'(v), w \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle L_{\sigma_0} w_0, w_0 \rangle + R_{\sigma_0}(w_0) - R_\sigma(w). \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

The last five terms in (72) can be controlled as follows: By the approximate critical point property (C1), we have

$$\langle E'(v_0), w_0 \rangle - \langle E'(v), w \rangle \lesssim \epsilon(\|w_0\|_X + \|w\|_X) \lesssim \epsilon M(t).$$

Here recall that we have defined the function

$$M(t) := \sup_{t' \leq t} \|w_{t'}\|_X.$$

Next, since L_{σ_0} is bounded, we have

$$\langle L_{\sigma_0} w_0, w_0 \rangle \lesssim \|w_0\|_X^2.$$

Note that this bound does not depend on σ_0 (see the discussion about (51)).

Lastly, since the remainder $R_\sigma(w)$ is of the order $o(\|w\|_X^2)$ for C^2 functional E , it follows that

$$R_\sigma(w) - R_{\sigma_0}(w_0) = o(M(t)^2).$$

By the preceding estimates, (72) becomes

$$\|w\|_X^2 \lesssim E(v_0) - E(v) + \epsilon M(t) + o(M(t)^2) + \|w_0\|_X^2. \quad (73)$$

3. It remains to control the first two terms in the r.h.s. of (73). This difference is the energy fluctuation of the approximate solitons, and it can be controlled as follows. Differentiating the energy $E(t) = E(f(\sigma_t))$ and using (27), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dE}{dt} &= \langle E'(v), \partial_t v \rangle \\ &= \langle E'(v), Q_\sigma J E'(v) \rangle + \langle E'(v), Q_\sigma (J L_\sigma w - \partial_t w) \rangle + \langle E'(v), Q_\sigma J N_\sigma(w) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

We now bound the three inner products in the last line.

Recall the definition of Q_σ in (8) as the skew projection, which gives the relations $Q_\sigma^2 = Q_\sigma$ and $Q_\sigma J = J Q_\sigma^*$ (the latter follows from (3) and (9)). Using these and the fact that J is symplectic, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \phi, Q_\sigma J \phi \rangle &= \langle \phi, Q_\sigma^2 J \phi \rangle \\ &= \langle Q_\sigma^* \phi, Q_\sigma J \phi \rangle \\ &= \langle (J^{-1} J) Q_\sigma^* \phi, Q_\sigma J \phi \rangle \\ &= - \langle J(Q_\sigma J \phi), Q_\sigma J \phi \rangle = 0 \quad (\phi \in X). \end{aligned}$$

Applying this with $\phi = E'(v)$, we see that the first term in (74) vanishes.

For the two estimates below, we need to use the approximate critical point property (C1). Recall also that as discussed in Remark 6, we can drop higher order terms in w on the interval $\epsilon^\gamma t \leq T'$, so long as (69) holds.

Using (29)-(30) and (39), the second inner product in the last line of (74) can be bounded as

$$|\langle E'(v), Q_\sigma (J L_\sigma w - \partial_t w) \rangle| \lesssim \epsilon^2 \|w\|_X. \quad (75)$$

By the uniform nonlinear estimate (31), the third inner product can be bounded as

$$|\langle E'(v), Q_\sigma J N_\sigma(w) \rangle| \lesssim \epsilon \|w\|_X^2. \quad (76)$$

Combining (74)-(76) and integrating from 0 to t , we find

$$|E(v(t)) - E(v(0))| \lesssim t (\epsilon^2 M(t) + \epsilon M(t)^2). \quad (77)$$

4. Plugging (77) into (73), and then dividing both side by $M(t)$, we have

$$M(t) \lesssim t (\epsilon^2 + \epsilon M(t)) + \epsilon + o(M(t)) + \|w_0\|_X. \quad (78)$$

For $\delta \ll \epsilon$, the last term is $O(\epsilon)$ by Remark 6. Hence, there exist two constants $C_0 > 0$ and $0 < \delta_0 \ll 1$, both independent of t, T, γ , such that

$$M(t) \leq C_0 (t(\epsilon^2 + \epsilon M(t)) + \epsilon + \delta_0 M(t) + \epsilon). \quad (79)$$

Now, choose a sufficiently small $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(\gamma, T) > 0$ from here, so that

$$1 - C_0(t\epsilon + \delta_0 t) > 1/2 \quad (t \leq \epsilon^{-\gamma} T).$$

Then it follows from (79) that

$$M(t) \leq 2C_0 T(\epsilon^{2-\gamma} + \epsilon) + 2C_0 \epsilon \quad (t \leq \epsilon^{-\gamma} T). \quad (80)$$

At this point, the leading order term in the r.h.s. of (80) is of the order ϵ . Since $0 < \gamma < 1$, and C_0 is an absolute constant, we conclude from (80) that we can further shrink $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(\gamma, T) > 0$ so that (69) holds for every $\epsilon^\gamma t \leq T$ with $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$. This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 2 (Converse of Theorem 2). *Fix any large $T \gg 1$ and $0 < \gamma < 1$. There exists $c > 0$ independent of T and $0 < \epsilon_0 \ll 1$ depending on γ, T only with the following properties: Let $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$. Let $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma$. Let $\sigma_t \in \Sigma$ be the flow generated by σ_0 under the effective dynamics (63). Then there exists a solution u_t to (40) s.th. for all $\epsilon^\gamma t \leq T$, there holds*

$$\|u_t - f(\sigma_t)\|_X \leq c \max(\epsilon^{(1-\gamma)/2}, \epsilon^\gamma). \quad (81)$$

Proof. Choose $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(\gamma, T) > 0$ s.th. Theorem 2 holds with γ, T and all $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$. Following the proof of Corollary 1, *mutatis mutandis*, we find

$$\|u_t - f(\sigma_t)\|_X \leq c_1 T(\epsilon^{1-\gamma} + c_2 \epsilon) + c_3 \epsilon^\gamma \quad (\epsilon^\gamma t \leq T). \quad (82)$$

Here $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$ are all absolute constants. Since $\gamma < 1$, we can choose $0 < \epsilon_0(\gamma, T) \leq \epsilon_1$ from (82) to conclude (81). \square

6 Application to Interface dynamics

In this section we consider a typical situation arising from the study of phase transition. Following [49], we give some concrete examples of approximate solitons that fully utilize the generality of the adiabatic framework developed in the preceding sections.

Consider a suitable function space X consisting of vector-valued order parameters

$$\psi : \mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_z^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k \quad (n \geq 1, k \geq 0).$$

Suppose there is a k -dimensional interface at $\{x = 0, z \in \mathbb{R}^k\}$ separating two homogeneous phases with a steep transition layer. Here $k = 0$ is allowed, because one can be interested in some soliton concentrated at a single point in \mathbb{R}^n (e.g. one-dimensional kinks, planar Ginzburg-Landau vortices, spherical droplets around some point in the space, etc.).

Suppose we are given a stable equilibrium ψ of (1), s.th. for some $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ and small $\epsilon \ll 1$,

$$\|\nabla_x \psi\|_X \sim \epsilon^{-\alpha} \text{ due to the steep phase transition at the interface,} \quad (83)$$

$$E'(\psi) = 0, \quad L_\psi := E''(\psi) \geq 0, \quad (84)$$

0 is isolated from the rest of the spectrum of L_ψ .

Note that we do not require $L_\psi > 0$, because if there are continuous symmetries broken by ψ , then L_ψ in general have zero modes due to symmetry breaking.

Consider another space Y consisting of smooth perturbations of the form

$$\sigma : \mathbb{R}_z^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \|\sigma\|_Y \ll 1. \quad (85)$$

Geometrically, such σ can be thought of as some “wiggling” within the n -dimensional horizontal cross sections around the k -dimensional interface $\{x = 0\}$.

Define a map

$$f : \sigma \mapsto \psi_\sigma := \psi(x - \sigma(z), z). \quad (86)$$

This map is smooth if ψ is smooth. Below we consider the two groups of assumptions from Section 2 in connection with this particular parametrization (86).

For the first group of assumptions, we note that by (84), for $\sigma = 0$, the configuration $f(0) = \psi$ is an exact soliton satisfying conditions (C1)-(C3) with $\epsilon = 0$. As we discussed in Section 2.1, these conditions are persistent for small perturbations of a given approximate soliton, and it follows that (C1)-(C3) hold on an appropriately chosen manifold Σ around $\sigma = 0$ consisting of perturbations of the form (85). The choice of Σ depends only on $\ker L_\psi$ for the linearized operator at the given exact soliton in (84). See e.g. [49] in the exactly same setting, and [26, 39, 43, 44] in closely related settings.

For the second group of geometric assumptions, we note that the Fréchet derivative of f is given by

$$df(\sigma) : \xi \mapsto -\nabla_x \psi_\sigma \cdot \xi \quad (\xi \in Y). \quad (87)$$

This map is clearly injective, so f is an immersion and (G1) holds. Using the formula (87), depending on the particular choice of spaces X and Y , one can deduce (G2) from the condition (83).

To illustrate this fact, consider the situation $n = 1$, $k \geq 1$. Fix the configuration spaces

$$X := L^2(\mathbb{R}_x \times \mathbb{R}_z^k, \mathbb{R}^k), \quad Y := L^2(\mathbb{R}_z^k, \mathbb{R}).$$

Suppose we are given a function $\tilde{\psi} : \mathbb{R}_x \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ satisfying

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\nabla_x \tilde{\psi}(x)|^2 dx = A^2, \quad (88)$$

e.g. a certain curve of geometric interest. Then we define the lift $\psi : \mathbb{R}_x \times \mathbb{R}_z^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ by setting $\psi(x, z) = \tilde{\psi}(x)$ for every z . In principle, the solitonic properties of $\tilde{\psi}$ is not affected by such a lift, see e.g. [49].

Suppose the parametrization f and its derivative is given by (86)-(87), and recall $g_\sigma : Y \rightarrow X$ is defined as the Fréchet derivative $df(\sigma)$ in local coordinate. For $\xi \in Y$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\|g_\sigma \xi\|_X^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} |\xi(z) \cdot \nabla_x \psi_\sigma(x, z)|^2 dx dz \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} |\xi(z)|^2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\nabla_x \psi(x - \sigma(z), z)|^2 dx \right) dz \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} |\xi(z)|^2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\nabla_x \tilde{\psi}(x - \sigma(z))|^2 dx \right) dz \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} |\xi(z)|^2 A^2 dz = \|\xi\|_Y^2 A^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

In the second equality we use Fubini's theorem, and in the fourth equality we use the fact that Lebesgue measure is translation invariant.

Now, if $A \sim \epsilon^{-\alpha}$ in (88), then we can conclude (G2) from (89). Thus, with this example, we have demonstrated the typical implication from (83) to (G2).

Remark 11. This kind of geometric implication was already noted and played a crucial role in [26] (see Sect. 3.1 of that paper), as well as [43, 44], where the authors studied some situations with $n = 2$, $k = 0$.

The conclusion from the above discussion is that the framework we laid out in the previous sections applies to the study of interface dynamics via parametrization of the form (86), provided there is some known exact soliton to begin with. We proceed to demonstrate in the next subsection an application with $n = 2$, $k = 1$.

6.1 Example: Ginzburg-Landau Vortex Filaments

In this subsection, we discuss some of the results obtained in [49] in the adiabatic framework developed in the present paper.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d = 2, 3$ be a domain. Consider the Ginzburg-Landau energy functional

$$E(\psi) \equiv E_\Omega^\epsilon(\psi) := \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \psi|^2 + \frac{1}{4\epsilon^2} (|\psi|^2 - 1)^2. \tag{90}$$

Here $\psi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a complex order parameter representing, for instance, the Bose-Einstein condensate in superfluidity. The energy (90) has translation, rotation, and global $U(1)$ -gauge symmetries.

It is well-known that there exist non-trivial stable critical points $\tilde{\psi} : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ satisfying

$$\left\| \nabla_x \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{L^2} \sim |\log \epsilon|^{1/2}, \tag{91}$$

$$E'(\tilde{\psi}) = 0, \quad L_{\tilde{\psi}} \geq 0, \quad L_{\tilde{\psi}}|_{Z^\perp} \geq \beta > 0. \tag{92}$$

See for instance [8, 38]. Here Z denotes the space of symmetry zero modes, in this case generated by the broken translation and global gauge symmetry. Such $\tilde{\psi}$ are known as the (planar) *vortex* solutions.

The characteristic feature of a vortex $\tilde{\psi}$ is its concentration property. This is due to the structure of nonlinearity in (90). The quartic, hat-shaped potential term forces the modulus $|\tilde{\psi}|$ of the non-homogeneous equilibrium to rapidly increase from 0 to 1 in all directions away from the vortex center.

The planar vortex configuration $\tilde{\psi}$ obviously lifts to a steady state in \mathbb{R}^3 through $\tilde{\psi}(x) \mapsto \psi(x, z) \equiv \tilde{\psi}(x)$, where $z \in \mathbb{R}$ parametrizes the vertical direction. This lift $\psi(x, z)$ concentrates near the vertical axis $\{x = 0\}$.

Now, consider perturbations of the form (up to a global gauge)

$$f(\sigma) = \psi(x - \sigma(z), z), \quad \sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (93)$$

Since each planar vortex $\tilde{\psi}(x)$ concentrates around $x = 0$, the function $f(\sigma)$ describes a vortex filament that “curves around” a concentration set near the vertical axis $\{(0, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3\}$. In general, (93) is not a critical point of (90), and do not arise from any symmetry reduction procedure. Moreover, the space of σ can be infinite-dimensional.

In [49], we show that under some small curvature assumption on the perturbation parameter σ (which lifts to a three-dimensional curve through $\sigma(z) \mapsto (\sigma(z), z)$ that winds around the axis $\{(0, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3\}$), the parametrization (93) (up to a global gauge) gives a manifold of approximate solitons sitting in the energy space for (90), satisfying all the assumptions in Section 2.

Using the method developed in Section 5 for Hamiltonian system, we obtain an adiabatic approximation for the three-dimensional Gross-Pitaevskii equation

$$i \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = -\Delta \psi + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} (|\psi|^2 - 1) \psi \quad (\psi : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}). \quad (94)$$

Evolution (94) can be cast into a Hamiltonian system of the form (65), with E given by the Ginzburg-Landau energy (90). The effective dynamics for (94) is an evolution of the concentration sets σ (i.e. the moduli, using the terminology in Section 2), namely the binormal curvature flow

$$\partial_t \vec{\sigma} = \partial_s \vec{\sigma} \times \partial_{ss} \vec{\sigma}, \quad (95)$$

where $\vec{\sigma}(z) := (\sigma(z), z)$ is the lift of σ to a spatial curve, and $s = s(z)$ is the arclength parameter, satisfying $\frac{ds}{dz} = |\vec{\sigma}|$. The flow (95) is a Hamiltonian system in the moduli space (in this case consists of functions $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$), and it appears in place of the abstract effective dynamics (24), (68).

Let us remark that most results relating the geometry of k -dimensional interfaces with $k \geq 1$ to the full configurations on \mathbb{R}^{n+k} rely on rather involved measure theoretic arguments. See for instance the important contributions [7, 31]. Moreover, these results do not retain the structure of the interface, as they take the limit as the length scale $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. On the other hand, results using adiabatic approximations are mostly for rather simple geometry of interfaces (e.g. finite collection of points, in which case $k = 0$), see the cited works in Introduction.

Acknowledgment

The Author is supported by Danish National Research Foundation grant CPH-GEOTOP-DNRF151.

Declarations

- Conflict of interest: The Author has no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.
- Data availability: Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

A Basic Variational Calculus

Here we recall some basic elements of variational calculus that have been used repeatedly. For details, see for instance [42, Appendix C], [1, Chapt. 1].

A.1 Fréchet Derivative

Let X, Y be two Banach spaces. Let U be an open set in X . For a map $g : U \subset X \rightarrow Y$ and a vector $u \in U$, the Fréchet derivative $dg(u)$ is a linear map from $X \rightarrow Y$ s.th. $g(u + v) - g(u) - dg(u)v = o(\|v\|_X)$ for every $v \in X$ with $\|v\|_X \ll 1$. If $dg(u)$ exists at u , then it is unique. If $dg(u)$ exists for every $u \in U$, and the map $u \mapsto dg(u)$ is continuous from U to the space of linear operators $L(X, Y)$, then we say g is C^1 on U . In this case, $dg(u)$ is uniquely given by

$$v \mapsto \left. \frac{dg(u + tv)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \quad (v \in X).$$

Iteratively, we can define higher order derivatives this way.

A.2 Gradient and Hessian

If X is a Hilbert space over a scalar field Y , then by Riesz representation, we can identify $dg(u)$ as an element in X , denoted by $g'(u)$. The vector $g'(u)$ is called the X -gradient of g . Similarly, we denote $g''(u)$ the second-order Fréchet derivative $d^2g(u)$. If g is C^2 , then g'' can be identified as a symmetric linear operator uniquely determined by the relation

$$\langle g''(u)v, w \rangle = \left. \frac{\partial^2 g(u + tv + sw)}{\partial t \partial s} \right|_{s=t=0} \quad (v, w \in X).$$

A.3 Remainder and Composition

Let X be a Hilbert space over a scalar field Y . Suppose g is C^2 on $U \subset X$. Define a scalar function $\phi(t) := g(v + tw)$ for vectors v, w s.th. $v + tw \in U$ for every $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Then the elementary Taylor expansion at $\phi(1)$ gives

$$g(v + w) = g(v) + \langle g'(v), w \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle g''(v)w, w \rangle + o(\|w\|_X^2).$$

Here we have used the definition of g' and g'' from the last subsection.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Fix $r > d/2$, $f \in C^{r+1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, define a map $g : u \mapsto f \circ u$. Then $g : H^r(\Omega) \rightarrow H^r(\Omega)$ is C^1 , and the Fréchet derivative is given by $v \mapsto \nabla f \cdot v$.

References

- [1] Antonio Ambrosetti and Giovanni Prodi, *A primer of nonlinear analysis*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 34, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995. Corrected reprint of the 1993 original. MR1336591
- [2] Peter W. Bates and Christopher K. R. T. Jones, *Invariant manifolds for semilinear partial differential equations*, Dynamics reported, Vol. 2, 1989, pp. 1–38. MR1000974
- [3] Peter W. Bates, Kening Lu, and Chongchun Zeng, *Existence and persistence of invariant manifolds for semiflows in Banach space*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **135** (1998), no. 645, viii+129. MR1445489
- [4] ———, *Invariant foliations near normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds for semiflows*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **352** (2000), no. 10, 4641–4676. MR1675237
- [5] ———, *Approximately invariant manifolds and global dynamics of spike states*, Invent. Math. **174** (2008), no. 2, 355–433. MR2439610
- [6] Peter W. Bates and Song Mu Zheng, *Inertial manifolds and inertial sets for the phase-field equations*, J. Dynam. Differential Equations **4** (1992), no. 2, 375–398. MR1160925
- [7] F. Bethuel, G. Orlandi, and D. Smets, *Convergence of the parabolic Ginzburg-Landau equation to motion by mean curvature*, Ann. of Math. (2) **163** (2006), no. 1, 37–163. MR2195132
- [8] Fabrice Bethuel, Haïm Brezis, and Frédéric Hélein, *Ginzburg-Landau vortices*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, vol. 13, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1994. MR1269538
- [9] Rémi Carles and Clotilde Fermanian Kammerer, *A nonlinear adiabatic theorem for coherent states*, Nonlinearity **24** (2011), no. 8, 2143–2164. MR2813581
- [10] Jack Carr, *Applications of centre manifold theory*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 35, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1981. MR635782
- [11] Tobias H. Colding and William P. Minicozzi II, *Generic mean curvature flow I: generic singularities*, Ann. of Math. (2) **175** (2012), no. 2, 755–833. MR2993752
- [12] Tobias Holck Colding and William P. Minicozzi II, *Uniqueness of blowups and Łojasiewicz inequalities*, Ann. of Math. (2) **182** (2015), no. 1, 221–285. MR3374960
- [13] Monique Combescure and Didier Robert, *Coherent states and applications in mathematical physics*, Theoretical and Mathematical Physics, Springer, Dordrecht, 2012. MR2952171
- [14] Sophia Demoulini and David Stuart, *Adiabatic limit and the slow motion of vortices in a Chern-Simons-Schrödinger system*, Comm. Math. Phys. **290** (2009), no. 2, 597–632. MR2525632

- [15] L. C. Evans, H. M. Soner, and P. E. Souganidis, *Phase transitions and generalized motion by mean curvature*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **45** (1992), no. 9, 1097–1123. MR1177477
- [16] L. C. Evans and J. Spruck, *Motion of level sets by mean curvature. I*, J. Differential Geom. **33** (1991), no. 3, 635–681. MR1100206
- [17] Clotilde Fermanian-Kammerer and Alain Joye, *A nonlinear quantum adiabatic approximation*, Nonlinearity **33** (2020), no. 9, 4715–4751. MR4135093
- [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. MR2094474
- [19] Zhou Gang, *On the dynamics of formation of generic singularities of mean curvature flow*, 2017.
- [20] ———, *On the mean convexity of a space-and-time neighborhood of generic singularities formed by mean curvature flow*, J. Geom. Anal. **31** (2021), no. 10, 9819–9890. MR4303943
- [21] Zhou Gang and Dan Knopf, *Universality in mean curvature flow neckpinches*, Duke Math. J. **164** (2015), no. 12, 2341–2406. MR3397388
- [22] Zhou Gang, Dan Knopf, and Israel Michael Sigal, *Neckpinch dynamics for asymmetric surfaces evolving by mean curvature flow*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **253** (2018), no. 1210, v+78. MR3803553
- [23] Zhou Gang and I. M. Sigal, *Relaxation of solitons in nonlinear Schrödinger equations with potential*, Adv. Math. **216** (2007), no. 2, 443–490. MR2351368
- [24] Zhou Gang and Israel Michael Sigal, *Neck pinching dynamics under mean curvature flow*, J. Geom. Anal. **19** (2009), no. 1, 36–80. MR2465296
- [25] S. Gustafson and I. M. Sigal, *The stability of magnetic vortices*, Comm. Math. Phys. **212** (2000), no. 2, 257–275. MR1772246
- [26] ———, *Effective dynamics of magnetic vortices*, Adv. Math. **199** (2006), no. 2, 448–498. MR2189216
- [27] Justin Holmer, Galina Perelman, and Maciej Zworski, *Effective dynamics of double solitons for perturbed $mKdV$* , Comm. Math. Phys. **305** (2011), no. 2, 363–425. MR2805465
- [28] 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. MR2232367
- [29] Andreas Kriegl and Peter W. Michor, *Differentiable perturbation of unbounded operators*, Math. Ann. **327** (2003), no. 1, 191–201. MR2006008
- [30] Caroline Lasser and Christian Lubich, *Computing quantum dynamics in the semiclassical regime*, Acta Numerica **29** (2020), 229–401.
- [31] Fang Hua Lin, *Complex Ginzburg-Landau equations and dynamics of vortices, filaments, and codimension-2 submanifolds*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **51** (1998), no. 4, 385–441. MR1491752
- [32] N. S. Manton, *A remark on the scattering of BPS monopoles*, Phys. Lett. B **110** (1982), no. 1, 54–56. MR647883
- [33] Luciano Modica, *The gradient theory of phase transitions and the minimal interface criterion*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **98** (1987), no. 2, 123–142. MR866718
- [34] Yu. N. Ovchinnikov and I. M. Sigal, *The Ginzburg-Landau equation. III. Vortex dynamics*, Nonlinearity **11** (1998), no. 5, 1277–1294. MR1644389
- [35] ———, *Long-time behaviour of Ginzburg-Landau vortices*, Nonlinearity **11** (1998), no. 5, 1295–1309. MR1644393
- [36] Yuri N. Ovchinnikov and Israel M. Sigal, *Ginzburg-Landau equation. I. Static vortices*, Partial differential equations and their applications (Toronto, ON, 1995), 1997, pp. 199–220. MR1479248

- [37] Frank Pacard and Manuel Ritoré, *From constant mean curvature hypersurfaces to the gradient theory of phase transitions*, J. Differential Geom. **64** (2003), no. 3, 359–423. MR2032110
- [38] Frank Pacard and Tristan Rivière, *Linear and nonlinear aspects of vortices*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, vol. 39, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2000. The Ginzburg-Landau model. MR1763040
- [39] Galina Perelman, *Asymptotic stability of multi-soliton solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **29** (2004), no. 7-8, 1051–1095. MR2097576
- [40] A. Soffer and M. I. Weinstein, *Multichannel nonlinear scattering for nonintegrable equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **133** (1990), no. 1, 119–146. MR1071238
- [41] ———, *Multichannel nonlinear scattering for nonintegrable equations. II. The case of anisotropic potentials and data*, J. Differential Equations **98** (1992), no. 2, 376–390. MR1170476
- [42] Michael Struwe, *Variational methods*, Fourth, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics], vol. 34, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008. Applications to nonlinear partial differential equations and Hamiltonian systems. MR2431434
- [43] D. Stuart, *Dynamics of abelian Higgs vortices in the near Bogomolny regime*, Comm. Math. Phys. **159** (1994), no. 1, 51–91. MR1257242
- [44] ———, *The geodesic approximation for the Yang-Mills-Higgs equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **166** (1994), no. 1, 149–190. MR1309545
- [45] David M. A. Stuart, *Analysis of the adiabatic limit for solitons in classical field theory*, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci. **463** (2007), no. 2087, 2753–2781. MR2360179
- [46] F. Ting, *Effective dynamics of multi-vortices in an external potential for the Ginzburg-Landau gradient flow*, Nonlinearity **23** (2010), no. 1, 179–210. MR2576380
- [47] Michael I. Weinstein, *Modulational stability of ground states of nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **16** (1985), no. 3, 472–491. MR783974
- [48] ———, *Lyapunov stability of ground states of nonlinear dispersive evolution equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **39** (1986), no. 1, 51–67. MR820338
- [49] Jingxuan Zhang, *Adiabatic Approximation for the Motion of Ginzburg-Landau Vortex Filaments*, Comm. Math. Phys. **389** (2022), no. 2, 1061–1085. MR4369726
- [50] Gang Zhou, *On the non-degenerate and degenerate generic singularities formed by mean curvature flow*, 2021.