

On the Cauchy problem for the inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation with inverse-power potential

JinMyong An, JinMyong Kim* and OkByol Kim

Faculty of Mathematics, Kim Il Sung University, Pyongyang, Democratic People's Republic of Korea

* Corresponding Author: jm.kim0211@ryongnamsan.edu.kp.

Abstract

In this paper, we study the Cauchy problem for the inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation with inverse-power potential

$$iu_t + \Delta u - c|x|^{-a}u = \pm|x|^{-b}|u|^\sigma u, \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $a, b > 0$ and $\sigma > 0$. First, we establish the local well-posedness in the fractional Sobolev spaces $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $s \geq 0$ by using contraction mapping principle based on the Strichartz estimates in Sobolev-Lorentz spaces. Next, the global existence and blow-up of H^1 -solution are investigated. Our results extend the known results in several directions.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35Q55, 35A01, 35B44.

Key words and phrases. Inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Inverse-power potential, Local well-posedness, Continuous dependence, Global existence, Blow-up.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the Cauchy problem for inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation with inverse-power potential:

$$\begin{cases} iu_t + \Delta u - c|x|^{-a}u = \lambda|x|^{-b}|u|^\sigma u, & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $u : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $u_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 < a < 2$, $0 < b < 2$, $\sigma > 0$ and $\lambda = \pm 1$. The parameters $\lambda = 1$ and $\lambda = -1$ corresponds to the defocusing and focusing cases respectively.

The equation (1.1) appears in a variety of physical settings, for example, in nonlinear optical systems with spatially dependent interactions (see e.g. [13, 15, 40, 42] and the references therein). The case $c = b = 0$ is the classic nonlinear Schrödinger (NLS) equation which has been extensively studied over the last three decades (see e.g. [20, 21, 23, 46, 53] and the references therein).

When $b = 0$ and $c \neq 0$, we have the NLS equation with inverse-power potential, which has also been widely studied in the past decades. See e.g. [25, 44, 49, 56] for the inverse-square potential $a = 2$ and [10, 27, 30, 36, 47, 48] for the slowly decaying potentials $0 < a < 2$.

Moreover, the inhomogeneous NLS equation without potential (i.e. (1.1) with $b > 0$ and $c = 0$) has also attracted a lot of interest in recent years. We refer the reader to [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 33, 37] for the local well-posedness and small data global well-posedness in H^s with $s \geq 0$ and [5, 11, 16, 19, 24, 28, 29, 32, 38] for the global well-posedness and blow-up in the energy space H^1 .

Recently, the inhomogeneous NLS equation with inverse-square potential, i.e. (1.1) with $a = 2$ has also been investigated by [8, 9, 12, 14, 17, 18, 39, 51].

As in the study of the NLS equation with potential, in this paper, we mainly focus on the local and global well-posedness as well as blow-up for inhomogeneous NLS equation with slowly decaying potential, i.e. (1.1) with $0 < a, b < 2$.

1.1 Known results

In this subsection, we recall the known results for the inhomogeneous NLS equation (i.e. (1.1) with $c = 0$ and $b > 0$) and the NLS equation with inverse-power potential (i.e. (1.1) with $b = 0$ and $0 < a < 2$).

1.1.1 Known results for (1.1) with $c = 0$ and $b > 0$

Let us recall the known results for the inhomogeneous NLS equation without potential, namely,

$$\begin{cases} iu_t + \Delta u = \lambda|x|^{-b}|u|^\sigma u, & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < b < \min\{2, d\}$, $\sigma > 0$ and $\lambda = \pm 1$. The inhomogeneous NLS equation (1.2) is invariant under the scaling,

$$u_\mu(t, x) := \mu^{\frac{2-b}{\mu}} u(\mu^2 t, \mu x), \quad \mu > 0. \quad (1.3)$$

An direct computation shows that

$$\|u_\mu(0)\|_{\dot{H}^s} = \mu^{s - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{2-b}{\mu}} \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^s}.$$

We thus define the critical exponents

$$s_c := \frac{d}{2} - \frac{2-b}{\sigma} \quad (1.4)$$

and

$$\gamma_c := \frac{1 - s_c}{s_c} = \frac{4 - 2b - (d - 2)\sigma}{d\sigma - 4 + 2b}. \quad (1.5)$$

Putting

$$\sigma_c(s, b) := \begin{cases} \frac{4-2b}{d-2s}, & \text{if } s < \frac{d}{2}, \\ \infty, & \text{if } s \geq \frac{d}{2}, \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

we can easily see that $s > s_c$ is equivalent to $\sigma < \sigma_c(s, b)$. If $s < \frac{d}{2}$, then $s = s_c$ is equivalent to $\sigma = \sigma_c(s, b)$. For initial data $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we say that the Cauchy problem (1.2) is H^s -critical if $0 \leq s < \frac{d}{2}$ and $\sigma = \sigma_c(s, b)$. If $s \geq 0$ and $\sigma < \sigma_c(s, b)$, then the problem (1.2) is said to be H^s -subcritical. Especially, if $\sigma = \sigma_c(0, b)$, then the problem is also known as mass-critical. If $\sigma = \sigma_c(1, b)$ with $d \geq 3$, it is also called energy-critical. If $\sigma_c(0, b) < \sigma < \sigma_c(1, b)$, it is called mass-supercritical and energy-subcritical (or intercritical). The inhomogeneous NLS equation (1.2) has formally the conservation of mass and energy, which are defined respectively by

$$M(u(t)) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(t, x)|^2 dx = M(u_0), \quad (1.7)$$

$$E_b(u(t)) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{\sigma + 2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^{-b} |u(t, x)|^{\sigma+2} dx = E_b(u_0). \quad (1.8)$$

1) H^s -subcritical case

Using the energy method developed by [20], Genoud-Stuart [33] proved that (1.2) is locally well-posed in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < b < \min\{2, d\}$ and $0 < \sigma < \sigma_c(1, b)$. However, this energy method cannot be

applied to established the local well-posedness for (1.2) in the general Sobolev spaces H^s . Later, Guzmán [37] used the contraction mapping principle based on the Strichartz estimates in Sobolev spaces to prove that (1.2) is locally well-posedness in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $0 \leq s \leq \min\{1, \frac{d}{2}\}$ if $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < b < \min\{2, \frac{d}{3}\}$ and $0 < \sigma < \sigma_c(s, b)$. It was also proved that the above local H^s -solution is extended globally in time if $\sigma > \frac{4-2b}{d}$ and the initial data is sufficiently small. The well-posedness results of [37] were later extended by [2, 3, 6]. More precisely, the authors in [2] proved that (1.2) is locally well-posed in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, if $0 \leq s < \min\{d, \frac{d}{2} + 1\}$, $0 < b < \min\{2, d - s, 1 + \frac{d-2s}{2}\}$, $0 < \sigma < \sigma_c(s, b)$ and the following regularity assumption for the nonlinear term is further satisfied¹:

$$\sigma \text{ is an even integer, or } \sigma \geq [s] - 1. \quad (1.9)$$

It was also proved in [3] that the above local H^s -solution is extended globally in time if $\sigma > \frac{4-2b}{d}$ and the initial data is sufficiently small. Furthermore, the authors in [6] obtained some standard continuous dependence result for (1.2) in H^s -subcritical case.

On the other hand, the global existence as well as blow-up of H^1 -solution for the energy-subcritical problem (1.2) with $0 < \sigma < \sigma_c(1, b)$ have also been widely studied.

In the defocusing case $\lambda = 1$, it is easily proved that any local H^1 -solution to energy-subcritical problem (1.2) with $0 < \sigma < \sigma_c(1, b)$ is extended globally in time by using the conservation laws and the blow-up alternative.

The focusing problem (1.2) with $\lambda = -1$ were studied by [16, 19, 24, 28, 29, 32, 38]. In the mass-subcritical case $0 < \sigma < \sigma_c(0, b)$, it was proved in [33] that focusing problem (1.2) with $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < b < \min\{2, d\}$ is globally well-posed in H^1 . The mass-critical case $\sigma = \sigma_c(0, b)$ was studied in [32, 24, 19]. More precisely, Genoud [32] proved that the focusing, mass-critical problem (1.2) with $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < b < \min\{2, d\}$ is globally well-posed in H^1 if $\|u_0\|_{L^2} < \|Q\|_{L^2}$, where Q is the unique positive radial solution of the ground state equation

$$\Delta Q - Q + |x|^{-b}|Q|^{\frac{4-2b}{d}}Q = 0.$$

It was also proved in [24, 19] that any H^1 -solution for the focusing, mass-critical problem (1.2) with initial data $u_0 \in H^1$ satisfying $E_b(u_0) < 0$ blows up in finite time. The mass-supercritical and energy-subcritical case $\sigma_c(0, b) < \sigma < \sigma_c(1, b)$ was investigated in [16, 24, 28, 29, 38]. Farah [29] showed the global existence for (1.2) with $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < b < \min\{2, d\}$ by assuming $u_0 \in H^1$ and

$$E_b(u_0)[M(u_0)]^{\gamma_c} < E_b(Q)[M(Q)]^{\gamma_c}, \quad (1.10)$$

$$\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} \|u_0\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c} < \|\nabla Q\|_{L^2} \|Q\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c}, \quad (1.11)$$

where Q is the unique positive radial solution to the elliptic equation

$$\Delta Q - Q + |x|^{-b}|Q|^\sigma Q = 0. \quad (1.12)$$

He also proved the finite time blow-up for (1.2) with $u_0 \in \Sigma := H^1 \cap L^2(|x|^2 dx)$ satisfying (1.10) and

$$\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} \|u_0\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c} > \|\nabla Q\|_{L^2} \|Q\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c}. \quad (1.13)$$

The latter result was extended to the radial data in [24], and to the non-radial data in [11, 28]. Note that the uniqueness of positive radial solution to (1.12) was established in [55, 31, 52]. The long time dynamics for the focusing problem (1.2) with $\sigma_c(0, b) < \sigma < \sigma_c(1, b)$ and

$$E_b(u_0)[M(u_0)]^{\gamma_c} \geq E_b(Q)[M(Q)]^{\gamma_c},$$

were also investigated by [16, 28].

¹For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $[s]$ denotes the minimal integer which is larger than or equal to s .

2) H^s -critical case

Aloui-Tayachi [1] developed a local well-posedness theory for (1.2) in both of H^s -subcritical case and H^s -critical case. More precisely, they used the Sobolev-Lorentz spaces to prove that (1.2) is locally well-posed in H^s if $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq s \leq 1$, $s < \frac{d}{2}$, $0 < b < \min\{2, d - 2s\}$ and $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{4-2b}{d-2s}$. However, they didn't treat the case $1 < s < \frac{d}{2}$ with $d \geq 3$. This case was later investigated by [4]. More precisely, they used the fractional Hardy inequality to prove that the H^s -critical problem (1.2) with $d \geq 3$, $1 < s < \frac{d}{2}$, $0 < b < 1 + \frac{d-2s}{2}$ and $\sigma = \sigma_c(s, b)$ is locally well-posed in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if (1.9) and one of the conditions in the following system are further satisfied:

$$\begin{cases} s \in \mathbb{N}, d \geq 3 \text{ and } b < 4s/d, \\ s \notin \mathbb{N}, d \geq 4 \text{ and } b < 6s/d - 1, \\ s \notin \mathbb{N}, d = 3 \text{ and } b < 1. \end{cases} \quad (1.14)$$

However, one can easily see that the conditions on b in the H^s -critical case obtained by [1, 4] are not so good as in the H^s -subcritical case obtained by [2, 3, 6]. The local well-posedness results of [1, 4] for (1.2) in the H^s -critical case $\sigma = \sigma_c(s, b)$ were finally extended in [5] to the full range of $0 \leq s < \frac{d}{2}$ and $0 < b < \min\{2, d - s, 1 + \frac{d-2s}{2}\}$. The authors in [5] also showed the blow-up of the H^1 -solution for the focusing, energy-critical problem (1.2) with initial data $u_0 \in H^1$ satisfying

- $E_b(u_0) < 0$ or
- $E_b(u_0) \geq 0$, $E_b(u_0) \leq E_b(W_b)$ and $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} > \|\nabla W_b\|_{L^2}$,

where

$$W_b(x) := \frac{[\varepsilon(d-b)(d-2)]^{\frac{d-2}{4-2b}}}{(\varepsilon + |x|^{2-b})^{\frac{d-2}{2-b}}}. \quad (1.15)$$

with $\varepsilon > 0$. We also refer the reader to [38] and the references therein for the global well-posedness and scattering for the focusing, energy-critical problem (1.2).

1.1.2 Known results for (1.1) with $c \neq 0$ and $b = 0$

Let us recall the known results for the NLS equation with inverse-power potential:

$$\begin{cases} iu_t + \Delta u - c|x|^{-a}u = \lambda|u|^\sigma u, (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), \end{cases} \quad (1.16)$$

where $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $c \neq 0$, $0 < a < 2$, $\sigma > 0$ and $\lambda = \pm 1$.

The global-in-time Strichartz estimates for e^{-itH_c} with $H_c = -\Delta + c|x|^{-\sigma}$, $c > 0$ and $0 < a < 2$ were established in [48] in dimension $d \geq 3$. Miao-Zhang-Zheng [47] studied the global well-posedness, finite time blow-up and scattering in the energy space $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for the NLS equation with coulomb potential, i.e. (1.16) with $a = 1$. Later, Dinh [27] extend the results of [47] to the NLS equation with a general class of inverse-power potentials (i.e. (1.16) with $0 < a < 2$) and higher dimensions. More precisely, using the energy method developed by [20], he showed that (1.16) is locally well-posed in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < a < \min\{2, d\}$ and $0 < \sigma < \tilde{\sigma}_c(1)$, where

$$\tilde{\sigma}_c(s) := \sigma_c(s, 0) = \begin{cases} \frac{4}{d-2s}, & \text{if } s < \frac{d}{2}, \\ \infty, & \text{if } s \geq \frac{d}{2}. \end{cases} \quad (1.17)$$

Using Strichartz estimates in Lorentz spaces (see Lemma 2.13), he also gave the alternative proof of the local well-posedness for (1.16) with $d \geq 3$, $0 < \sigma < \frac{4}{d-2}$ and

$$\begin{cases} 0 < a < \frac{3}{2}, & \text{if } d = 3, \\ 0 < a < 2, & \text{if } d \geq 4. \end{cases} \quad (1.18)$$

Note that although the latter result is weaker than the former result on the validity of d and a , it gives more information on the solution, for instance, one knows that the solutions to (1.16) satisfy $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^p((-T_{\min}, T_{\max}), H_q^1)$ for any admissible pair (p, q) . He also proved that (1.16) with $d \geq 3$, $0 < a < 2$ and $\sigma = \frac{4}{d-2}$ is locally well-posed in H^1 by using the the global in time Strichartz estimates obtain by [48]. Furthermore, he obtained some global well-posedness, finite time blow-up and scattering results in the energy space H^1 for (1.2) with $0 < a < 2$. We also refer the reader to [13, 30, 36] for further results.

1.2 Main results

1.2.1 Local well-posedness in H^s

Using the energy method developed by [20], we have the following local well-posedness in H^1 for (1.1) with $\sigma < \sigma_c(1, b)$.

Proposition 1.1. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda = \pm 1$, $0 < a, b < \min\{2, d\}$ and $0 < \sigma < \sigma_c(1, b)$. Then for any $u_0 \in H^1$, there exist $T_*, T^* \in (0, \infty]$ and a unique maximal solution*

$$u \in C((-T_*, T^*), H^1) \cap C^1((-T_*, T^*), H^{-1}),$$

of (1.1). If $T^* < \infty$ (resp. if $T_* < \infty$), then $\|u_0\|_{H^1} \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \uparrow T^*$ (resp. as $t \downarrow -T_*$). Moreover, the following mass and energy of $u(t)$ are conserved:

$$M(u(t)) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(t, x)|^2 dx, \quad (1.19)$$

$$E_{b,c}(u(t)) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 + \frac{c}{2} |x|^{-a} |u(t, x)|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{\sigma+2} |x|^{-b} |u(t, x)|^{\sigma+2} \right) dx. \quad (1.20)$$

Proof. Noticing that $0 < a < \min\{2, d\}$, we can see that the potential $c|x|^{-a}$ belongs to $L^r(\mathbb{R}^d) + L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for some $r > \max\{1, \frac{d}{2}\}$. Hence, using Theorem 4.3.1, Example 3.2.11 of [20] and Appendix K of [33], we can get the desired result. \square

Using the contraction mapping principle based on Strichartz estimates in Lorentz spaces, we also have the following local well-posedness in H^s for (1.1).

Theorem 1.2. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 \leq s < \frac{d}{2}$, $0 \leq b < \min\{2, d-s, 1 + \frac{d}{2} - s\}$, $0 < a < \min\{2, d-s, 1 + \frac{d}{2} - s\}$ and $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{4-2b}{d-2s}$. If σ is not an even integer, assume further $\sigma > [s] - 1$. Then for any $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there exist $T_{\max} = T_{\max}(u_0) > 0$ and $T_{\min} = T_{\min}(u_0) > 0$ such that (1.1) has a unique, maximal solution u satisfying*

$$u \in C((-T_{\min}, T_{\max}), H^s) \cap L_{\text{loc}}^p((-T_{\min}, T_{\max}), H_{q,2}^s), \quad (1.21)$$

for any admissible pair (p, q) . Moreover, the above solution u depends continuously on the initial data u_0 in the following sense. There exists $0 < T < T_{\max}, T_{\min}$ such that if $u_{0,n} \rightarrow u_0$ in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and if u_n denotes the solution of (1.1) with the initial data $u_{0,n}$, then $0 < T < T_{\max}(u_{0,n}), T_{\min}(u_{0,n})$ for all sufficiently large n and $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $L^p([-T, T], L^{q,2}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any admissible pair (p, q) . Furthermore, if $s > 0$, then $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $L^p([-T, T], H_{q,2}^s(\mathbb{R}^d))$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all admissible pair (p, q) and all $\varepsilon > 0$. In particular, $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $C([-T, T], H^{s-\varepsilon})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

Remark 1.3. Theorem 1.2 extends the known results for (1.1) in the following directions.

- When $b > 0$, it extends the results of [1, 5] for (1.1) with $c = 0$ to (1.1) with $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

- When $b > 0$ and $c = 0$, it improves the results of [1] by extending the validity of s and b . It also extends the result of [5] by giving the unified proof for both of H^s -subcritical case $\sigma < \frac{4-2b}{d-2s}$ and H^s -critical case $\sigma = \frac{4-2b}{d-2s}$.
- When $b = 0$ and $c \neq 0$, it improves the result of [27] (see Proposition 3.3 of [27]) by extending the validity of s .

We also have the following standard continuous dependence result.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 \leq s < \frac{d}{2}$, $0 < a, b < \min\{2, d - s, 1 + \frac{d}{2} - s\}$ and $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{4-2b}{d-2s}$. If σ is not an even integer, assume that*

$$\begin{cases} \sigma > [s] - 1, & \text{for } \sigma < \frac{4-2b}{d-2s}, \\ \sigma \geq [s], & \text{for } \sigma = \frac{4-2b}{d-2s}. \end{cases}$$

If $s < 1$, in addition, suppose further that $\sigma > 1$. Then for any given $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the corresponding solution u of (1.1) in Theorem 1.2 depends continuously on the initial data u_0 in the following sense. For any interval $[-S, T] \subset (-T_{\min}(u_0), T_{\max}(u_0))$, and every admissible pair (p, q) , if $u_{0,n} \rightarrow u_0$ in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and if u_n denotes the solution of (1.1) with the initial data $u_{0,n}$, then $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $L^p([-S, T], H_{q,2}^s(\mathbb{R}^d))$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $C([-S, T], H^s)$.

Remark 1.5. Theorem 1.4 extends the standard continuous dependence results of [5, 6] for $c = 0$ to $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, when $c = 0$, it gives the unified proof for both of H^s -subcritical case $\sigma < \frac{4-2b}{d-2s}$ and H^s -critical case $\sigma = \frac{4-2b}{d-2s}$.

1.2.2 Global existence and blow-up of H^1 -solution

Concerning the global existence of H^1 -solution, we have the following result.

Theorem 1.6 (Global existence). *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda = \pm 1$, $0 < a, b < \min\{2, d\}$ and $0 < \sigma < \sigma_c(1)$. If one of the following conditions is satisfied, then the corresponding solution u of (1.1) with initial data $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in Proposition 1.1 is a global one.*

1. $\lambda = 1$.
2. $\lambda = -1$ and $\sigma < \frac{4-2b}{d}$.
3. $\lambda = -1$, $\sigma = \frac{4-2b}{d}$ and $\|u_0\|_{L^2} < \|Q\|_{L^2}$.
4. $\lambda = -1$, $\frac{4-2b}{d} < \sigma < \sigma_c(1, b)$, $c \geq 0$ and

$$E_{b,c}(u_0)[M(u_0)]^{\gamma_c} < E_b(Q)[M(Q)]^{\gamma_c}, \quad \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} \|u_0\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c} < \|\nabla Q\|_{L^2} \|Q\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c}, \quad (1.22)$$

where Q is the unique positive radial solution to the elliptic equation (1.12) and γ_c is as in (1.5).

In the focusing case $\lambda = -1$, we also have the following blow-up result.

Theorem 1.7 (Blow-up). *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $c \geq 0$, $\lambda = -1$, $0 < a, b < \min\{2, d\}$ and $\frac{4-2b}{d} \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_c(1, b)$ with $\sigma < \infty$. Let u be the solution to (1.1) defined on the maximal forward time interval of existence $[0, T^*)$.*

1. (Mass-critical case: $\sigma = \frac{4-2b}{d}$.) *If $E_{b,c}(u_0) < 0$, the corresponding solution u blows up in finite time, i.e. $T^* < \infty$.*

2. (Intercritical case: $\frac{4-2b}{d} < \sigma < \sigma_c(1, b)$.) If $E_{b,c}(u_0) < 0$ or if not, we assume that

$$E_{b,c}(u_0)[M(u_0)]^{\gamma_c} < E_b(Q)[M(Q)]^{\gamma_c}, \quad \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} \|u_0\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c} > \|\nabla Q\|_{L^2} \|Q\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c}. \quad (1.23)$$

Then the corresponding solution u blows up in finite or infinite time, i.e. either $T^* < \infty$ or $T^* = \infty$ and there exists a time sequence $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\|\nabla u(t_n)\|_{L^2} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, if we assume in addition that $\sigma < \frac{4}{d}$, then the corresponding solution u blows up in finite time, i.e. $T^* < \infty$.

3. (Energy-critical case: $\sigma = \frac{4-2b}{d-2}$ with $d \geq 3$.) If $E_{b,c}(u_0) < 0$ or if not, we assume that

$$E_{b,c}(u_0) < E_b(W_b), \quad \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} > \|\nabla W_b\|_{L^2}, \quad (1.24)$$

where W_b is as in (1.15). Then the corresponding solution u blows up in finite or infinite time. Moreover, if we assume in addition that $b > \frac{4}{d}$, then the corresponding solution u blows up in finite time.

Remark 1.8. Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 extend global existence and blow up results of [5, 11, 19, 28, 29] for (1.1) with $c = 0$ to $c \in \mathbb{R}$ or $c \geq 0$. Furthermore, when $c = 0$ and $\sigma = \frac{4-2b}{d-2}$, Item 3 of Theorem 1.7 improves the blow-up result of [5]. In fact, the authors in [5] only obtained the finite or infinite blow-up result for non-radial data (see Theorem 1.10 of [5]). However, in Item 3 of Theorem 1.7, we also obtained the finite time blow-up result for non-radial data and $b > \frac{4}{d}$.

In addition, we have the following blow-up result for mass-critical inhomogeneous NLS equation with inverse-square potential, i.e. (1.1) with $a = 2$.

Theorem 1.9. Let $d \geq 3$, $a = 2$, $0 < b < 2$, $\lambda = -1$, $\sigma = \frac{4-2b}{d}$ and $c > -(\frac{d-2}{2})^2$. Let u be the solution to (1.1) defined on the maximal forward time interval of existence $[0, T^*)$. If $E_{b,c}(u_0) < 0$, then the corresponding solution u blows up in finite time. A similar statement holds for negative times.

Remark 1.10. Theorem 1.9 improves the blow-up results of [9, 18] for mass-critical inhomogeneous NLS equation with inverse-square potential. In fact, when $E_{b,c}(u_0) < 0$, Campos-Guzmán [18] proved the finite time blow-up only for radial or finite variance data (see Theorem 1.2 of [18]). Later, the authors in [9] showed the finite or infinite time blow-up for non-radial data (see Proposition 1.5 of [9]).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some notation and give some preliminary results related to our problem. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.2. Theorem 1.4 is proved in Section 4. In Section 5, we prove Theorem 1.6. In Section 6, we prove Theorems 1.7 and 1.9.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notation

Let us introduce some notation used in this paper. Throughout the paper, \mathcal{F} denotes the Fourier transform, and the inverse Fourier transform is denoted by \mathcal{F}^{-1} . $C > 0$ stands for a positive universal constant, which may be different at different places. $a \lesssim b$ means $a \leq Cb$ for some constant $C > 0$. $a \sim b$ expresses $a \lesssim b$ and $b \lesssim a$. Given normed spaces X and Y , $X \hookrightarrow Y$ means that X is continuously embedded in Y . For $p \in [1, \infty]$, p' denotes the dual number of p , i.e. $1/p + 1/p' = 1$. For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $[s]$ the minimal integer which is larger than or equal to s . As in [53], for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 < p < \infty$, we denote by $H_p^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\dot{H}_p^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the nonhomogeneous Sobolev space and homogeneous Sobolev space, respectively. The norms of these spaces are given as

$$\|f\|_{H_p^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} := \left\| (I - \Delta)^{s/2} f \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad \|f\|_{\dot{H}_p^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} := \left\| (-\Delta)^{s/2} f \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

where $(I - \Delta)^{s/2} f = \mathcal{F}^{-1} (1 + |\xi|^2)^{s/2} \mathcal{F} f$ and $(-\Delta)^{s/2} f = \mathcal{F}^{-1} |\xi|^s \mathcal{F} f$. As usual, we abbreviate $H_2^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\dot{H}_2^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, respectively. For $0 < p, q \leq \infty$, we denote by $L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the Lorentz space (see e.g. [35]). The quasi-norms of these spaces are given by

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)} := \left(\int_0^\infty \left(t^{\frac{1}{p}} f^*(t) \right)^k \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}, \quad \text{when } 0 < q < \infty,$$

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)} := \sup_{t>0} t^{\frac{1}{p}} f^*(t), \quad \text{when } q = \infty,$$

where $f^*(t) = \inf \{ \tau : M^d(\{x : |f(x)| > \tau\}) \leq t \}$, with M^d being the Lebesgue measure in \mathbb{R}^d . Note that $L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a quasi-Banach space for $0 < p, q \leq \infty$. When $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, $L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ can be turned into a Banach space via an equivalent norm. In particular $L^{p,p}(\mathbb{R}^d) = L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, while $L^{p,\infty}$ corresponds to weak L^p space. These spaces are natural in the context of (1.1) since $|x|^{-b} \in L^{\frac{d}{b},\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In general, we have the embedding $L^{p,q} \hookrightarrow L^{p,r}$ for $q < r$. Note also that $\| |f|^r \|_{L^{p,q}} = \| f \|_{L^{pr,qr}}^r$ for $1 \leq p, r < \infty, 1 \leq q \leq \infty$. We also have the Hölder's inequality in Lorentz spaces (see e.g. [50]):

$$\|fg\|_{L^{p,q}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p_1,q_1}} \|g\|_{L^{p_2,q_2}}.$$

for $1 < p, p_1, p_2 < \infty$ and $1 \leq q, q_1, q_2 \leq \infty$ satisfying

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}, \quad \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}.$$

For $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma \in [1, \infty]$, we will use the space-time mixed space $L^\gamma(I, X(\mathbb{R}^d))$ whose norm is defined by

$$\|f\|_{L^\gamma(I, X(\mathbb{R}^d))} = \left(\int_I \|f\|_{X(\mathbb{R}^d)}^\gamma dt \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}},$$

with a usual modification when $\gamma = \infty$, where $X(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a normed space on \mathbb{R}^d . If there is no confusion, \mathbb{R}^d will be omitted in various function spaces.

2.2 Sobolev-Lorentz spaces

Throughout the paper, we mainly use the Sobolev-Lorentz spaces. In this subsection, we recall some useful facts about the Sobolev-Lorentz spaces. See [1, 5, 7, 45] for example.

For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, the (nonhomogeneous) Sobolev-Lorentz space $H_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is defined as the set of tempered distribution $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $(I - \Delta)^{s/2} f \in L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_{H_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} := \left\| (I - \Delta)^{s/2} f \right\|_{L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

The homogeneous Sobolev-Lorentz space $\dot{H}_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is defined as the set of equivalence classes of distribution $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $(-\Delta)^{s/2} f \in L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_{\dot{H}_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} := \left\| (-\Delta)^{s/2} f \right\|_{L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the set of polynomials with d variables.

Lemma 2.1 ([5]). *Let $s \geq 0$, $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q_1 \leq q_2 \leq \infty$. Then we have*

- (a) $\dot{H}_{p,1}^s \hookrightarrow \dot{H}_{p,q_1}^s \hookrightarrow \dot{H}_{p,q_2}^s \hookrightarrow \dot{H}_{p,\infty}^s$.
- (b) $\dot{H}_{p,p}^s = \dot{H}_p^s$.

Lemma 2.2 ([5]). *Let $s \geq 0$, $1 < p < \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ and $v = s - [s]$. Then we have*

$$\|f\|_{\dot{H}_{p,q}^s} \sim \sum_{|\alpha|=[s]} \|D^\alpha f\|_{\dot{H}_{p,q}^v}.$$

Lemma 2.3 ([7]). *Let $s \geq 0$, $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q \leq \infty$. Then we have $H_{p,q}^s = L^{p,q} \cap \dot{H}_{p,q}^s$ with*

$$\|f\|_{H_{p,q}^s} \sim \|f\|_{L^{p,q}} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}_{p,q}^s}.$$

Lemma 2.4 ([7]). *Let $-\infty < s_2 \leq s_1 < \infty$ and $1 < p_1 \leq p_2 < \infty$ with $s_1 - \frac{d}{p_1} = s_2 - \frac{d}{p_2}$. Then for any $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, there holds the embeddings:*

$$\dot{H}_{p_1,q}^{s_1} \hookrightarrow \dot{H}_{p_2,q}^{s_2}, \quad H_{p_1,q}^{s_1} \hookrightarrow H_{p_2,q}^{s_2}$$

Lemma 2.5 ([7]). *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q \leq \infty$. Then we have $H_{p,q}^{s+\varepsilon} \hookrightarrow H_{p,q}^s$.*

As an immediate consequence of Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, we have the following.

Corollary 2.6 ([7]). *Let $-\infty < s_2 \leq s_1 < \infty$ and $1 < p_1 \leq p_2 < \infty$ with $s_1 - \frac{d}{p_1} \geq s_2 - \frac{d}{p_2}$. Then for any $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, there holds the embedding: $H_{p_1,q}^{s_1} \hookrightarrow H_{p_2,q}^{s_2}$.*

Using Lemma 2.4 and the fact that $|x|^{-\gamma} \in L^{\frac{d}{\gamma},\infty}$, we also have the following Hardy inequality under Lorentz norms.

Corollary 2.7 (Hardy inequality under Lorentz norms, [45]). *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ with $0 < \gamma < \frac{d}{p}$. Then we have*

$$\||x|^{-\gamma} f\|_{L^{p,q}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{H}_{p,q}^\gamma}.$$

We also recall the fractional product rule and chain rule in Sobolev-Lorentz spaces.

Lemma 2.8 (Fractional product rule in Sobolev-Lorentz spaces, [22]). *Let $s \geq 0$, $1 < p, p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 < \infty$ and $1 \leq q, q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4 \leq \infty$. Assume that*

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = \frac{1}{p_3} + \frac{1}{p_4}, \quad \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2} = \frac{1}{q_3} + \frac{1}{q_4}.$$

Then we have

$$\|fg\|_{\dot{H}_{p,q}^s} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{H}_{p_1,q_1}^s} \|g\|_{L^{p_2,q_2}} + \|f\|_{L^{p_3,q_3}} \|g\|_{\dot{H}_{p_4,q_4}^s}.$$

Lemma 2.9 (Fractional chain rule in Sobolev-Lorentz spaces, [1]). *Suppose $F \in C^1(\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C})$ and $0 < s \leq 1$. Then for $1 < p, p_1, p_2 < \infty$ and $1 \leq q, q_1, q_2 < \infty$ satisfying*

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}, \quad \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2},$$

we have

$$\|F(u)\|_{\dot{H}_{p,q}^s} \lesssim \|F'(u)\|_{L^{p_1,q_1}} \|u\|_{\dot{H}_{p_2,q_2}^s}.$$

Lemma 2.9 which holds for $0 < s \leq 1$ was then extended to $s > 0$ by [7].

Lemma 2.10 ([7]). *Let $s > 0$ and $F \in C^{\lceil s \rceil}(\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C})$. Then for $1 < p, p_{1_k}, p_{2_k}, p_{3_k} < \infty$ and $1 \leq q, q_{1_k}, q_{2_k}, q_{3_k} < \infty$ satisfying*

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_{1_k}} + \frac{1}{p_{2_k}} + \frac{k-1}{p_{3_k}}, \quad \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_{1_k}} + \frac{1}{q_{2_k}} + \frac{k-1}{q_{3_k}}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, \lceil s \rceil,$$

we have

$$\|F(u)\|_{\dot{H}_{p,q}^s} \lesssim \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil s \rceil} \left\| F^{(k)}(u) \right\|_{L^{p_{1_k}, q_{1_k}}} \|u\|_{\dot{H}_{p_{2_k}, q_{2_k}}^s} \|u\|_{L^{p_{3_k}, q_{3_k}}^{k-1}}.$$

As an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.10, we have the following useful nonlinear estimates in Sobolev-Lorentz spaces $\dot{H}_{p,q}^s$ with $s \geq 0$.

Corollary 2.11 ([7]). *Let $s \geq 0$ and $\sigma > 0$. If σ is not an even integer, assume further $\sigma > [s] - 1$. Then for $1 < p, p_1, p_2 < \infty$ and $1 \leq q, q_1, q_2 < \infty$ satisfying*

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{\sigma}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}, \quad \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\sigma}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2},$$

we have

$$\| |u|^\sigma u \|_{\dot{H}_{p,q}^s} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^{p_1, q_1}}^\sigma \|u\|_{\dot{H}_{p_2, q_2}^s}.$$

Finally, we recall the interpolation inequality in Sobolev-Lorentz spaces.

Lemma 2.12 (Convexity Hölder's inequality in Sobolev-Lorentz spaces, [7]). *Let $1 < p, p_i < \infty$, $1 \leq q, q_i < \infty$, $0 \leq \theta_i \leq 1$, $s \geq 0$, $s_i \geq 0$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$), $\sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i = 1$, $s = \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i s_i$, $1/p = \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i/p_i$ and $1/q = \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i/q_i$. Then we have $\bigcap_{i=1}^N \dot{H}_{p_i, q_i}^{s_i} \subset \dot{H}_{p, q}^s$ and for any $f \in \bigcap_{i=1}^N \dot{H}_{p_i, q_i}^{s_i}$,*

$$\|f\|_{\dot{H}_{p, q}^s} \leq \prod_{i=1}^N \|f\|_{\dot{H}_{p_i, q_i}^{s_i}}^{\theta_i}.$$

2.3 Strichartz estimates

In this subsection, we recall the Strichartz estimates for the Schrödinger semi-group $e^{it\Delta}$ in Lorentz spaces, which are the fundamental tool to establish the local well-posedness of the Cauchy problem (1.1) in H^s . See, for example, [1, 27, 43]. Throughout the paper, a pair (p, q) is said to be admissible (for short $(p, q) \in S$) if

$$\begin{cases} 2 \leq q \leq \frac{2d}{d-2}, & \text{if } d \geq 3, \\ 2 \leq q < \infty, & \text{if } d \leq 2, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$\frac{2}{p} = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{q}. \quad (2.2)$$

Moreover, $(p, q) \in S_0$ means that $(p, q) \in S$ with

$$\begin{cases} 2 < q < \frac{2d}{d-2}, & \text{if } d \geq 3, \\ 2 < q < \infty, & \text{if } d \leq 2. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 2.13 (Strichartz estimates). *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $S(t) = e^{it\Delta}$. Then for any admissible pairs (p, q) and (a, b) , we have*

$$\|S(t)\phi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}, L^{q, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d))} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\left\| \int_0^t S(t-\tau)f(\tau)d\tau \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}, L^{q, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d))} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{a'}(\mathbb{R}, L^{b', 2}(\mathbb{R}^d))}. \quad (2.4)$$

2.4 Variational Analysis

In this subsection, we recall the sharp Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality and the sharp Hardy-Sobolev embedding which are useful to study the global existence and blow-up of H^1 -solution to (1.1).

Lemma 2.14 (Sharp Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, [29]). *Let $d \geq 1$, $0 < \sigma < \sigma_c(1, b)$, $0 < b < 2$. Then for $f \in H^1$, we have*

$$\int |x|^{-b} |f(x)|^{\sigma+2} dx \leq C_{\text{GN}} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2}^{\frac{d\sigma+2b}{2}} \|f\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4-2b-\sigma(d-2)}{2}}, \quad (2.5)$$

The equality in (2.5) is attained by a function $Q \in H^1$, which is the unique positive radial solution to the elliptic equation (1.12).

Remark 2.15. We also have the following Pohozaev identities:

$$\|Q\|_{L^2}^2 = \frac{4-2b-(d-2)\sigma}{d\sigma+2b} \|\nabla Q\|_{L^2}^2 = \frac{4-2b-(d-2)\sigma}{2(\sigma+2)} \int |x|^{-b} |f(x)|^{\sigma+2} dx. \quad (2.6)$$

In the mass-critical case $\sigma = \frac{4-2b}{d}$, we have

$$C_{\text{GN}} = \frac{2-b+d}{d} \|Q\|_{L^2}^{-\frac{4-2b}{d}}. \quad (2.7)$$

In the intercritical case $\frac{4-2b}{d} < \sigma < \sigma_c(1, b)$, we also have

$$C_{\text{GN}} = \frac{2(\sigma+2)}{d\sigma+2b} (\|\nabla Q\|_{L^2} \|Q\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c})^{-\frac{d\sigma-4+2b}{2}}, \quad (2.8)$$

where γ_c is as in (1.5).

Lemma 2.16 (Sharp Hardy-Sobolev embedding, [41]). *Let $d \geq 3$ and $0 < b < 2$. Then we have*

$$\left(\int |x|^{-b} |f|^{\sigma_c(1,b)+2} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{\sigma_c(1,b)+2}} \leq C_{\text{HS}} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2}, \quad (2.9)$$

for all $f \in \dot{H}^1$, where the sharp Hardy-Sobolev constant C_{HS} defined by

$$C_{\text{HS}} = \inf_{f \in \dot{H}^1 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|\nabla f\|_{L^2}}{\left(\int |x|^{-b} |f|^{\sigma_c(1,b)+2} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{\sigma_c(1,b)+2}}}. \quad (2.10)$$

is attained by function

$$W_b(x) := \frac{[\varepsilon(d-b)(d-2)]^{\frac{d-2}{4-2b}}}{(\varepsilon + |x|^{2-b})^{\frac{d-2}{2-b}}}, \quad (2.11)$$

for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

Lemma 2.2 in [41] also shows that W_b solves the equation

$$\Delta W_b + |x|^{-b} |W_b|^{\sigma_c(1,b)} W_b = 0,$$

and satisfies

$$\|\nabla W_b\|_{L^2}^2 = \int |x|^{-b} W_b^{\sigma_c(1,b)+2} dx. \quad (2.12)$$

Hence, we have

$$\|\nabla W_b\|_{L^2}^2 = \int |x|^{-b} W_b^{\sigma_c(1,b)+2} dx = [C_{\text{HS}}]^{-\frac{2(d-b)}{2-b}} \quad (2.13)$$

and

$$E_b(W_b) = \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla W_b\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{1}{\sigma_c(1,b)+2} \int |x|^{-b} |W_b|^{\sigma_c(1,b)+2} dx = \frac{2-b}{2(d-b)} [C_{\text{HS}}]^{-\frac{2(d-b)}{2-b}}. \quad (2.14)$$

3 Local well-posedness in H^s

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2. First, we recall the useful fact concerning to the term $|x|^{-b}$ with $b > 0$.

Remark 3.1 ([37]). Let $b > 0$, $s \geq 0$ and $b + s < d$. Then we have $(-\Delta)^{s/2}(|x|^{-b}) = C_{d,b}|x|^{-b-s}$.

Using Lemma 2.8, Corollary 2.11 and Remark 3.1, we have the following estimates of the term $|x|^{-b}|u|^\sigma u$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq s < \frac{d}{2}$, $0 \leq b < \min\{2, d - s, 1 + \frac{d}{2} - s\}$ and $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{4-2b}{d-2s}$. If σ is not an even integer, assume further $\sigma > \lceil s \rceil - 1$. Then, for any interval $I(\subset \mathbb{R})$, there exist $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) \in S_0$ and $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) \in S_0$ such that*

$$\| |x|^{-b}|u|^\sigma u \|_{L^{\tilde{\alpha}'}(I, \dot{H}_{\tilde{\beta}', 2}^s)} \lesssim |I|^\theta \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, \dot{H}_{\tilde{q}, 2}^s)}^{\sigma+1}, \quad (3.1)$$

$$\| |x|^{-b}|u|^\sigma v \|_{L^{\tilde{\alpha}'}(I, L^{\tilde{\beta}', 2})} \lesssim |I|^\theta \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, \dot{H}_{\tilde{q}, 2}^s)}^\sigma \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, L^{\tilde{q}, 2})}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\theta = \frac{(4-2b)-(d-2s)\sigma}{4}$.

Proof. We claim that there exist $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) \in S_0$ and $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) \in S_0$ satisfying

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{\beta}'} = \sigma \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{q}} - \frac{s}{d} \right) + \frac{1}{\tilde{q}} + \frac{b}{d}, \quad \frac{1}{\tilde{q}} - \frac{s}{d} > 0. \quad (3.3)$$

In fact, we can choose $(p, q) \in S_0$ satisfying

$$\max \left\{ \frac{d-2}{2d}, \frac{s}{d} \right\} < \frac{1}{\tilde{q}} < \frac{1}{2},$$

provided that

$$\max \left\{ \frac{s}{d} + \frac{b}{d}, \frac{(d-2)(\sigma+1)}{2d} - \frac{\sigma s}{d} + \frac{b}{d} \right\} < \frac{1}{\tilde{\beta}'} < \frac{\sigma+1}{2} - \frac{\sigma s}{d} + \frac{b}{d}. \quad (3.4)$$

And we can easily check that there exists $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) \in S_0$ satisfying (3.4) by using the fact $b < \min\{d - s, 1 + \frac{d}{2} - s\}$.

Let us consider the case $b > 0$. Using (3.3), Lemmas 2.1, 2.4, 2.8, Corollary 2.11 and Remark 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \| |x|^{-b}|u|^\sigma u \|_{\dot{H}_{\tilde{\beta}', 2}^s} &\lesssim \| |x|^{-b} \|_{L^{q_1, \infty}} \| |u|^\sigma u \|_{\dot{H}_{q_2, 2}^s} + \| |x|^{-b} \|_{\dot{H}_{q_3, \infty}^s} \| |u|^\sigma u \|_{L^{q_4, 2}} \\ &\lesssim \| |u|^\sigma u \|_{\dot{H}_{q_2, 2}^s} + \| |u|^\sigma u \|_{L^{q_4, 2}} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{L^{r, 2(\sigma+1)}}^\sigma \|u\|_{\dot{H}_{\tilde{q}, 2(\sigma+1)}^s} + \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{\alpha}, 2(\sigma+1)}}^{\sigma+1} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{L^{r, 2}}^\sigma \|u\|_{\dot{H}_{\tilde{q}, 2}^s} + \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{r}, 2}}^{\sigma+1} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{H}_{\tilde{q}, 2}^s}^{\sigma+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$\frac{1}{q_1} := \frac{b}{d}, \quad \frac{1}{q_2} := \frac{1}{\tilde{\beta}'} - \frac{b}{d}, \quad \frac{1}{q_3} := \frac{b+s}{d}, \quad \frac{1}{q_4} := \frac{1}{\tilde{\beta}'} - \frac{b+s}{d}, \quad \frac{1}{\tilde{r}} := \frac{1}{\tilde{q}} - \frac{s}{d}.$$

Similarly, we also have

$$\| |x|^{-b}|u|^\sigma v \|_{L^{\tilde{\beta}', 2}} \lesssim \| |x|^{-b} \|_{L^{q_1, \infty}} \| |u|^\sigma v \|_{L^{q_2, 2}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{r}, 2}}^\sigma \|v\|_{L^{\tilde{q}, 2}} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{H}_{\tilde{q}, 2}^s}^\sigma \|v\|_{L^{\tilde{q}, 2}}. \quad (3.6)$$

Let us consider the case $b = 0$. It follows from (3.3), Lemma 2.4 and Corollary 2.11 that

$$\| |u|^\sigma u \|_{\dot{H}_{\tilde{\beta}',2}^s} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{r},2(\sigma+1)}}^\sigma \|u\|_{\dot{H}_{\tilde{q},2(\sigma+1)}^s} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{r},2}}^\sigma \|u\|_{\dot{H}_{\tilde{q},2}^s} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{H}_{\tilde{q},2}^{s+1}} \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$\| |u|^\sigma u \|_{L^{\tilde{\beta}',2}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{r},2(\sigma+1)}}^\sigma \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{q},2(\sigma+1)}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{r},2}}^\sigma \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{q},2}} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{H}_{\tilde{q},2}^s}^\sigma \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{q},2}}. \quad (3.8)$$

On the other hand, (3.3) imply that

$$\theta := \frac{1}{\tilde{\alpha}'} - \frac{\sigma+1}{\tilde{p}} = \frac{(4-2b) - (d-2s)\sigma}{4}. \quad (3.9)$$

Using (3.5)–(3.9) and Hölder's inequality, we immediately get (3.1) and (3.2). \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq s < \frac{d}{2}$ and $0 < a < \min\{2, d-s, 1 + \frac{d}{2} - s\}$. Then, for any interval $I(\subset \mathbb{R})$, there exist $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) \in S_0$ and $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) \in S_0$ such that*

$$\| |x|^{-a} u \|_{L^{\tilde{\alpha}'(I, \dot{H}_{\tilde{\beta}',2}^s)} \lesssim |I|^{\frac{2-a}{2}} \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, \dot{H}_{\tilde{q},2}^s)}, \quad (3.10)$$

$$\| |x|^{-a} u \|_{L^{\tilde{\alpha}'(I, L^{\tilde{\beta}',2})} \lesssim |I|^{\frac{2-a}{2}} \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, L^{\tilde{q},2})}. \quad (3.11)$$

Proof. We claim that there exist $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) \in S_0$ and $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) \in S_0$ satisfying

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{\beta}'} = \frac{1}{\tilde{q}} + \frac{a}{d}, \quad \frac{1}{\tilde{q}} - \frac{s}{d} =: \frac{1}{\tilde{r}} > 0. \quad (3.12)$$

In fact, we can choose \tilde{q} satisfying

$$\max \left\{ \frac{d-2}{2d}, \frac{s}{d} \right\} < \frac{1}{\tilde{q}} < \frac{1}{2},$$

provided that we choose $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) \in S_0$ satisfying

$$\max \left\{ \frac{d-2}{2d} + \frac{a}{d}, \frac{s+a}{d} \right\} < \frac{1}{\tilde{\beta}'} < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{a}{d}. \quad (3.13)$$

Using the fact $0 < a < \min\{2, d-s, 1 + \frac{d}{2} - s\}$, we can easily check that there exists $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) \in S_0$ satisfying (3.13). Using (3.12), Lemma 2.4, Lemma 2.8, Remark 3.1 and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\| |x|^{-a} u \|_{\dot{H}_{\tilde{\beta}',2}^s} \lesssim \| |x|^{-a} \|_{L^{d/a,\infty}} \|u\|_{\dot{H}_{\tilde{q},2}^s} + \| |x|^{-a} \|_{\dot{H}_{d/(a+s),\infty}^s} \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{r},2}} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{H}_{\tilde{q},2}^s} \quad (3.14)$$

and

$$\| |x|^{-a} u \|_{L^{\tilde{\beta}',2}} \lesssim \| |x|^{-a} \|_{L^{d/a,\infty}} \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{q},2}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{q},2}}. \quad (3.15)$$

Hence, using (3.14), (3.15), Hölder's inequality and the fact that $\frac{1}{\tilde{\alpha}'} - \frac{1}{\tilde{p}} = \frac{2-a}{2}$, we immediately get (3.10) and (3.11). \square

We are ready to prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $T > 0$ and $M > 0$, which will be chosen later. Given $I = [-T, T]$, we define

$$D = \left\{ u \in L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s) : \|u\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s)} + \|u\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s)} \leq M \right\},$$

where $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) \in S_0$ and $(\bar{p}, \bar{q}) \in S_0$ are as in Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3. Putting

$$d(u, v) = \|u - v\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, L^{\bar{q},2})} + \|u - v\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, L^{\bar{q},2})},$$

(D, d) is a complete metric space (see e.g. [1]). Now we consider the mapping

$$G : u(t) \rightarrow S(t)u_0 - i \int_0^t S(t-\tau)(c|x|^{-a}u(\tau) + \lambda|x|^{-b}|u(\tau)|^\sigma u(\tau))d\tau. \quad (3.16)$$

Using Lemma 2.13 (Strichartz estimates) and Lemmas 3.2, 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Gu\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s)} &\lesssim \|S(t)u_0\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s)} + \||x|^{-b}|u|^\sigma u\|_{L^{\bar{\alpha}'}(I, H_{\bar{\beta}',2}^s)} + |c| \||x|^{-a}u\|_{L^{\bar{\alpha}'}(I, H_{\bar{\beta}',2}^s)} \\ &\lesssim \|S(t)u_0\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s)} + |I|^{\frac{(4-2b)-(d-2s)\sigma}{4}} \|u\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s)}^{\sigma+1} + |c||I|^{\frac{2-a}{2}} \|u\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s)} \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} d(Gu, Gv) &\lesssim \||x|^{-b}(|u|^\sigma u - |v|^\sigma v)\|_{L^{\bar{\alpha}'}(I, L^{\bar{\beta}',2})} + |c| \||x|^{-a}(u - v)\|_{L^{\bar{\alpha}'}(I, L^{\bar{\beta}',2})} \\ &\lesssim |I|^{\frac{(4-2b)-(d-2s)\sigma}{4}} \|u\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s)}^\sigma \|u - v\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, L^{\bar{q},2})} + |c||I|^{\frac{2-a}{2}} \|u - v\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, L^{\bar{q},2})} \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

First, we consider the H^s -subcritical case $\sigma < \frac{4-2b}{d-2s}$. Using (3.17), (3.18) and Lemma 2.13 (Strichartz estimates), we have

$$\|Gu\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s)} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{H^s} + |I|^{\frac{(4-2b)-(d-2s)\sigma}{4}} M^{\sigma+1} + |c||I|^{\frac{2-a}{2}} M \quad (3.19)$$

and

$$d(Gu, Gv) \lesssim (|I|^{\frac{(4-2b)-(d-2s)\sigma}{4}} M^\sigma + |c||I|^{\frac{2-a}{2}})d(u, v). \quad (3.20)$$

Taking $M = 2C\|u_0\|_{H^s}$ and choosing $T > 0$ small enough so that

$$C|I|^{\frac{(4-2b)-(d-2s)\sigma}{4}} M^\sigma + C|c||I|^{\frac{2-a}{2}} < \frac{1}{2}, \quad (3.21)$$

it follows from (3.19) and (3.20) that G is a contraction on (D, d) . The continuous dependence result follows from the above argument and Lemma 2.12, whose proof will be omitted.

Next, we consider the H^s -critical case $\sigma = \frac{4-2b}{d-2s}$. Using (3.17) and (3.18), we have

$$\|Gu\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s)} \lesssim \|S(t)u_0\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s)} + M^{\sigma+1} + |c||I|^{\frac{2-a}{2}} M \quad (3.22)$$

and

$$d(Gu, Gv) \lesssim (M^\sigma + |c||I|^{\frac{2-a}{2}})d(u, v). \quad (3.23)$$

By the Strichartz estimates (2.3), we can also see that

$$\|S(t)u_0\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s)} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } T \rightarrow 0$$

Hence, taking $M > 0$ such that $CM^\sigma \leq \frac{1}{4}$ and $T > 0$ such that

$$\|S(t)u_0\|_{L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\bar{p}}(I, H_{\bar{q},2}^s)} \leq \frac{M}{4} \text{ and } C|c||I|^{\frac{2-a}{2}} < \frac{1}{4}, \quad (3.24)$$

(3.21) and (3.22) imply that G is a contraction on (D, d) . This completes the proof. \square

4 Standard continuous dependence in H^s

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.4. To this end, we need the following estimates of the term $f(u) - f(v)$, where $f(u)$ is a nonlinear function that behaves like $|u|^\sigma u$.

Lemma 4.1 ([5]). *Let $p > 1$, $0 < s < 1$ and $\sigma > 1$. Assume that $f \in C^2(\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C})$ satisfies*

$$|f^{(k)}(u)| \lesssim |u|^{\sigma+1-k}, \quad (4.1)$$

for any $0 \leq k \leq 2$ and $u \in \mathbb{C}$. Suppose also that

$$\frac{1}{p} = \sigma \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{s}{d} \right) + \frac{1}{r}, \quad \frac{1}{r} - \frac{s}{d} > 0. \quad (4.2)$$

Then we have

$$\|f(u) - f(v)\|_{\dot{H}_{p,2}^s} \lesssim (\|u\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^\sigma + \|v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^\sigma) \|u - v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}. \quad (4.3)$$

Lemma 4.2. *Let $p > 1$, $s \geq 1$ and $\sigma > [s] - 1$. Assume that $f \in C^{[s]}(\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C})$ satisfies (4.1) for any $0 \leq k \leq [s]$ and $u \in \mathbb{C}$. Assume further that*

$$|f^{([s])}(u) - f^{([s])}(v)| \lesssim |u - v|^{\min\{\sigma - [s] + 1, 1\}} (|u| + |v|)^{\max\{0, \sigma - [s]\}}, \quad (4.4)$$

for any $u, v \in \mathbb{C}$. Suppose also that (4.2) holds. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(u) - f(v)\|_{\dot{H}_{p,2}^s} &\lesssim \|u - v\|_{L^{\gamma,2}}^{\min\{\sigma - [s] + 1, 1\}} (\|u\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^{\max\{[s], \sigma\}} + \|v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^{\max\{[s], \sigma\}}) \\ &\quad + (\|u\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^\sigma + \|v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^\sigma) \|u - v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where $\gamma = \frac{rd}{d - rs}$. Moreover, if $\sigma \geq [s]$, then we have

$$\|f(u) - f(v)\|_{\dot{H}_{p,2}^s} \lesssim (\|u\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^\sigma + \|v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^\sigma) \|u - v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. The case $\sigma \geq [s]$ was proved in [5]. However, we can easily extend this result to $\sigma > [s] - 1$ by combining the arguments of Lemma 4.2 in [5] and Lemma 3.2 in [6], whose proof will be omitted. \square

Similarly, we also have the following result.

Lemma 4.3 ([5]). *Let $s > 0$ and $f(z)$ be a polynomial in z and \bar{z} satisfying $\deg(f) = \sigma + 1$. Suppose also that (4.2) holds. Then we have (4.6).*

Remark 4.4. Let $s > 0$ and $\sigma > 0$. If σ is not an even integer, assume that $\sigma > [s] - 1$. If $s < 1$, in addition, suppose further that $\sigma \geq 1$. Then one can easily see that $f(u) = |u|^\sigma u$ satisfies the conditions of Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3. See [6, 21] for example.

Using Remark 3.1 and Lemmas 4.1–4.3, we have the following estimates of the term $|x|^{-b}(|u|^\sigma u - |v|^\sigma v)$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $1 < p$, $r < \infty$, $b > 0$, $s > 0$, $b + s < d$ and $\sigma > 0$. If σ is not an even integer, assume that $\sigma > [s] - 1$. If $s < 1$, in addition, suppose further that $\sigma > 1$. Suppose also that*

$$\frac{1}{p} = \sigma \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{s}{d} \right) + \frac{1}{r} + \frac{b}{d}, \quad \frac{1}{r} - \frac{s}{d} > 0. \quad (4.7)$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \||x|^{-b}(|u|^\sigma u - |v|^\sigma v)\|_{\dot{H}_{p,2}^s} &\lesssim \|u - v\|_{L^{\gamma,2}}^{\min\{\sigma - [s] + 1, 1\}} (\|u\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^{\max\{[s], \sigma\}} + \|v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^{\max\{[s], \sigma\}}) \\ &\quad + (\|u\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^\sigma + \|v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^\sigma) \|u - v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

where $\gamma = \frac{rd}{d-rs}$. Moreover, if $\sigma \geq [s]$, then we have

$$\| |x|^{-b} (|u|^\sigma u - |v|^\sigma v) \|_{\dot{H}_{p,2}^s} \lesssim (\|u\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^\sigma + \|v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^\sigma) \|u - v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}. \quad (4.9)$$

Proof. Using Lemma 2.8 (fractional product rule), Lemmas 2.4, 4.1–4.3, Remark 3.1 and Hölder's inequality in Lorentz spaces, we immediately get

$$\begin{aligned} & \| |x|^{-b} (|u|^\sigma u - |v|^\sigma v) \|_{\dot{H}_{p,2}^s} \\ & \lesssim \| |x|^{-b} \|_{L^{d/b, \infty}} \| |u|^\sigma u - |v|^\sigma v \|_{\dot{H}_{p_1,2}^s} + \| |x|^{-b} \|_{H_{d/(b+rs)}^s} \| |u|^\sigma u - |v|^\sigma v \|_{L^{p_2,2}} \\ & \lesssim \| |u|^\sigma u - |v|^\sigma v \|_{\dot{H}_{p_1,2}^s} + \| (|u|^\sigma + |v|^\sigma)(u - v) \|_{L^{p_2,2}} \\ & \lesssim \|u - v\|_{L^{\gamma,2}}^{\min\{\sigma-[s]+1,1\}} (\|u\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^{\max\{[s],\sigma\}} + \|v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^{\max\{[s],\sigma\}}) \\ & \quad + (\|u\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^\sigma + \|v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^\sigma) \|u - v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s} + (\|u\|_{L^{\gamma,2}}^\sigma + \|v\|_{L^{\gamma,2}}^\sigma) \|u - v\|_{L^{\gamma,2}} \\ & \lesssim \|u - v\|_{L^{\gamma,2}}^{\min\{\sigma-[s]+1,1\}} (\|u\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^{\max\{[s],\sigma\}} + \|v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^{\max\{[s],\sigma\}}) \\ & \quad + (\|u\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^\sigma + \|v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}^\sigma) \|u - v\|_{\dot{H}_{r,2}^s}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\frac{1}{p_1} := \sigma \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{s}{d} \right) + \frac{1}{r}, \quad \frac{1}{p_2} := (\sigma + 1) \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{s}{d} \right).$$

This completes the proof of (4.8). If $\sigma \geq [s]$, then (4.9) follows directly from (4.8) by using the embedding $\dot{H}_{r,2}^s \hookrightarrow L^{\gamma,2}$. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq s < \frac{d}{2}$, $0 \leq b < \min\{2, d - s, 1 + \frac{d}{2} - s\}$ and $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{4-2b}{d-2s}$. If σ is not an even integer, assume further $\sigma > [s] - 1$. If $s < 1$, in addition, suppose further that $\sigma > 1$. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval and $\theta = \frac{(4-2b)-(d-2s)\sigma}{4}$.*

1. *If either σ is an even integer or $\sigma \geq [s]$, then we have*

$$\| |x|^{-b} (|u|^\sigma u - |v|^\sigma v) \|_{L^{\tilde{\alpha}'}(I, \dot{H}_{\tilde{\beta}',2}^s)} \lesssim |I|^\theta (\|u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, \dot{H}_{\tilde{q},2}^s)}^\sigma + \|v\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, \dot{H}_{\tilde{q},2}^s)}^\sigma) \|u - v\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, \dot{H}_{\tilde{q},2}^s)}, \quad (4.10)$$

where $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) \in S_0$ and $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) \in S_0$ are as in Lemma 3.2.

2. *If σ is not an even integer and $[s] > \sigma > [s] - 1$, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \| |x|^{-b} (|u|^\sigma u - |v|^\sigma v) \|_{L^{\tilde{\alpha}'}(I, \dot{H}_{\tilde{\beta}',2}^s)} & \lesssim |I|^\theta (\|u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, \dot{H}_{\tilde{q},2}^s)}^\sigma + \|v\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, \dot{H}_{\tilde{q},2}^s)}^\sigma) \|u - v\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, \dot{H}_{\tilde{q},2}^s)} \\ & \quad + (\|u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, \dot{H}_{\tilde{q},2}^s)}^{[s]} + \|v\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, \dot{H}_{\tilde{q},2}^s)}^{[s]}) \|u - v\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, L^{\tilde{r},2})}^{\sigma+1-[s]}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

where $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) \in S_0$ and $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) \in S_0$ are as in Lemma 3.2 and

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{r}} = \frac{1}{\tilde{q}} - \frac{s}{d}, \quad \frac{1}{\tilde{p}} = \frac{1}{\tilde{p}} + \frac{\theta}{\sigma + 1 - [s]}. \quad (4.12)$$

Proof. Using (3.3), (3.9), (4.12), Lemma 4.5 and Hölder's inequality, we immediately get (4.10) and (4.11). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Since u, u_n satisfy the following integral equations:

$$\begin{aligned} u(t) &= S(t)u_0 - i \int_0^t S(t-\tau)(c|x|^{-a}u(\tau) + \lambda|x|^{-b}|u(\tau)|^\sigma u(\tau))d\tau, \\ u_n(t) &= S(t)u_{0,n} - i \int_0^t S(t-\tau)(c|x|^{-a}u_n(\tau) + \lambda|x|^{-b}|u_n(\tau)|^\sigma u_n(\tau))d\tau, \end{aligned}$$

respectively, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_n(t) - u(t) &= S(t)(u_{0,n} - u_0) - ic \int_0^t S(t-\tau)|x|^{-a}(|u_n(\tau)| - u(\tau))d\tau \\ &\quad - i\lambda \int_0^t S(t-\tau)|x|^{-b}(|u_n(\tau)|^\sigma u_n(\tau) - |u(\tau)|^\sigma u(\tau))d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

We are to prove that there exists $T > 0$ sufficiently small such that as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$u_n \rightarrow u \text{ in } L^p([-T, T], H_{q,2}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)), \quad (4.13)$$

for every admissible pair (p, q) . If this has been done, then the result follows by iterating this property to cover any compact subset of $(-T_{\min}, T_{\max})$ in the H^s -subcritical case (see e.g. Chapter 3 or 4 of [20]) or a standard compact argument in the H^s -critical case (see e.g. Subsection 3.2 of [23]). We divide the proof of (4.13) in two cases: H^s -subcritical case and H^s -critical case.

Case 1. We consider the H^s -subcritical case $\sigma < \frac{4-2b}{d-2s}$. Since $u_{0,n} \rightarrow u_0$ in H^s , we have

$$\|u_{0,n}\|_{H^s} \leq 2\|u_0\|_{H^s},$$

for n large enough. Using the argument in the proof of Theorem 1.2, we can construct solutions u and u_n (n sufficiently large) in the set (D, d) given in Theorem 1.2, which implies that there exist $T > 0$ such that $T < T_{\max}(u_0), T_{\min}(u_0)$ and $T < T_{\max}(u_{0,n}), T_{\min}(u_{0,n})$ for n large enough. Furthermore, for all sufficiently large n , we have

$$\|u_n\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s)} \leq M,$$

where $I = [-T, T]$ and $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) \in S_0, (\bar{p}, \bar{q}) \in S_0, M > 0$ are as in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Case 1.1. We consider the case $\sigma \geq \lceil s \rceil$ or the case that σ is an even integer. Using Lemmas 2.13, 3.2, 3.3, 4.6 and (3.21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_n - u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s)} &\lesssim \|u_{0,n} - u_0\|_{H^s} + \left\| |x|^{-b}(|u_n|^\sigma u_n - |u|^\sigma u) \right\|_{L^{\tilde{\alpha}'}(I, H_{\tilde{\beta}',2}^s)} \\ &\quad + |c| \left\| |x|^{-a}(u_n - u) \right\|_{L^{\tilde{\alpha}'}(I, H_{\tilde{\beta}',2}^s)} \\ &\lesssim |I|^{\frac{(4-2b)-(d-2s)\sigma}{4}} (\|u_n\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s)}^\sigma + \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s)}^\sigma) \|u_n - u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s)} \\ &\quad + |c| |I|^{\frac{2-a}{2}} \|u_n - u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s)} + \|u_{0,n} - u_0\|_{H^s} \\ &\leq (2C|I|^{\frac{(4-2b)-(d-2s)\sigma}{4}} M^\sigma + C|c| |I|^{\frac{2-a}{2}}) \|u_n - u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s)} \\ &\quad + \|u_{0,n} - u_0\|_{H^s} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|u_n - u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s)} + \|u_{0,n} - u_0\|_{H^s}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

which shows that

$$\|u_n - u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s)} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.15)$$

Using Lemma 2.13 (Strichartz estimates) and (4.15) and repeating the same argument, we have, for any admissible pair (p, q) ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_n - u\|_{L^p(I, H_{q,2}^s)} &\lesssim \|u_{0,n} - u_0\|_{H^s} + \left\| |x|^{-b} (|u_n|^\sigma u_n - |u|^\sigma u) \right\|_{L^{\tilde{\alpha}'}(I, H_{\tilde{\beta}',2}^s)} \\ &\quad + |c| \left\| |x|^{-a} (u_n - u) \right\|_{L^{\tilde{\alpha}'}(I, H_{\tilde{\beta}',2}^s)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|u_n - u\|_{L^{\hat{p}}(I, H_{\hat{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s)} + \|u_{0,n} - u_0\|_{H^s} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Case 1.2. We consider the case that σ is not an even integer and $\lceil s \rceil > \sigma > \lceil s \rceil - 1$. Repeating the same argument as in the proof of (4.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_n - u\|_{L^{\hat{p}}(I, H_{\hat{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s)} &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|u_n - u\|_{L^{\hat{p}}(I, H_{\hat{q},2}^s) \cap L^{\tilde{p}}(I, H_{\tilde{q},2}^s)} + \|u_{0,n} - u_0\|_{H^s} \\ &\quad + (\|u_n\|_{L^{\hat{p}}(I, \dot{H}_{\hat{q},2}^s)}^{\lceil s \rceil} + \|u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, \dot{H}_{\tilde{q},2}^s)}^{\lceil s \rceil}) \|u_n - u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(I, L^{\tilde{r},2})}^{\sigma+1-\lceil s \rceil}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

where \hat{p} and \tilde{r} are given in (4.12). Since $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) \in S_0$, we can take $\eta > 0$ sufficiently small such that

$$\tilde{q}_1 := \tilde{q} + \eta, \quad (\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{q}_1) \in S_0, \quad \hat{p} < \tilde{p}_1 < \tilde{p}, \quad s - \frac{\eta d}{\tilde{q}\tilde{q}_1} > 0. \quad (4.17)$$

By (4.17) and Lemma 2.4, there holds the embedding $\dot{H}_{\tilde{q}_1}^{s-\frac{\eta d}{\tilde{q}\tilde{q}_1}} \hookrightarrow L^{\tilde{r}}$. Hence, it follows from (4.17), Hölder's inequality and Theorem 1.2 that

$$\|u_n - u\|_{L^{\hat{p}}(I, L^{\tilde{r},2})} \leq (2T)^{\frac{1}{\hat{p}} - \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_1}} \|u_n - u\|_{L^{\tilde{p}_1}(I, H_{\tilde{q}_1,2}^{s-\frac{\eta d}{\tilde{q}\tilde{q}_1})} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.18)$$

Using (4.16), (4.18) and the same argument as in Case 1.1, we can get the desired result.

Case 2. Next, we consider the H^s -critical case $\sigma = \frac{4-2b}{d-2s}$. Since $u_{0,n} \rightarrow u_0$ in H^s , it follows from Lemma 2.13 (Strichartz estimates) that

$$\|S(t)u_{0,n}\|_{L^p([-T, T], H_{q,2}^s)} \leq 2 \|S(t)u_0\|_{L^p([-T, T], H_{q,2}^s)}. \quad (4.19)$$

for any admissible pair (p, q) and n large enough. Hence, by using the argument similar to that in Case 1.1, we can get the desired result. \square

5 Global existence of H^1 -solution

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Thanks to the local well-posedness in Proposition 1.1 and the conservation of mass, the global existence follows if we can show that there exists $C > 0$ independent of t such that

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C,$$

for any t in the existence time.

Proof of Item 1. We consider the defocusing case $\lambda = 1$. If $c \geq 0$, then it follows from the conservation of energy (see (1.20) for the definition of energy) that

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \leq \sqrt{2E_{b,c}(u_0)},$$

for any t in the existence time. Hence, it suffices to consider the case $c < 0$. By the definition of energy (1.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_{b,c}(u(t)) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{|c|}{2} \||x|^{-a}|u(t)|^2\|_{L^1} + \frac{1}{\sigma+2} \||x|^{-b}|u(t)|^{\sigma+2}\|_{L^1} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{|c|}{2} \||x|^{-a}|u(t)\|_{L^1}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

On the other hand, it follows from Corollary 2.7, Lemma 2.12 and Young's inequality²

$$\begin{aligned} \||x|^{-a}|u(t)\|_{L^1} &= \||x|^{-\frac{a}{2}}|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{a}{2}}}^2 \leq C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^a \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^{2-a} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2|c|} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C(a, |c|) \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

(5.1), (5.2) and the conservation of mass and energy imply that we have

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 4E_{b,c}(u_0) + C(a, |c|)M(u_0),$$

for any t in the existence time. This completes the proof of Item 1.

It remains to consider the focusing case $\lambda = -1$.

Proof of Item 2. We consider the mass-subcritical case $\sigma < \frac{4-2b}{d}$. If $c \geq 0$, then it follows from Lemma 2.14 (Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality) that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{b,c}(u(t)) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{c}{2} \||x|^{-a}|u(t)|^2\|_{L^1} - \frac{1}{\sigma+2} \||x|^{-b}|u(t)|^{\sigma+2}\|_{L^1} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{C_{\text{GN}}}{\sigma+2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{d\sigma+2b}{2}} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4-2b-\sigma(d-2)}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

Since $\sigma < \frac{4-2b}{d}$, we use Young's inequality and the conservation of mass to get that

$$\frac{C_{\text{GN}}}{\sigma+2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{d\sigma+2b}{2}} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4-2b-\sigma(d-2)}{2}} \leq \varepsilon \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\varepsilon, M(u_0)), \quad (5.4)$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. (5.3), (5.4) and the conservation of energy imply that

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon\right) \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq E_{b,c}(u_0) + C(\varepsilon, M(u_0)).$$

Taking $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$, we get the uniform bound on $\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}$.

If $c < 0$, then it follows from Lemma 2.14 (Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality), (5.4) and (5.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{b,c}(u(t)) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{|c|}{2} \||x|^{-a}|u(t)|^2\|_{L^1} - \frac{1}{\sigma+2} \||x|^{-b}|u(t)|^{\sigma+2}\|_{L^1} \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{4} - \varepsilon\right) \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - C(a, |c|)M(u_0) - C(\varepsilon, M(u_0)). \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Taking $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$, the desired result follows from (5.5) and the conservation of energy.

Proof of Item 3. We consider the case mass-critical case $\sigma = \frac{4-2b}{d}$.

² Let a, b be non-negative real numbers and p, q be positive real numbers satisfying $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Then for any ε , we have $ab \lesssim \varepsilon a^p + \varepsilon^{-\frac{a}{p}} b^q$.

Let us consider the case $c \geq 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.14 (Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality) with (2.7) and the conservation of mass that

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{b,c}(u(t)) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{c}{2} \||x|^{-a}|u(t)|^2\|_{L^1} - \frac{d}{2d+4-2b} \||x|^{-b}|u(t)|^{\frac{4-2b}{d}+2}\|_{L^1} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\|u(t)\|_{L^2}}{\|Q\|_{L^2}} \right)^{\frac{4-2b}{d}} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\|u(t)\|_{L^2}}{\|Q\|_{L^2}} \right) \right) \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Since $\|u_0\|_{L^2} < \|Q\|_{L^2}$, (5.6) and the conservation of energy show that the corresponding solution u exists globally in time.

Let us consider the case $c < 0$. Using the same argument as in the proof of (5.2), we also have

$$\||x|^{-a}|u(t)|\|_{L^1} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{|c|} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C(a, |c|, \varepsilon) \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Using this inequality, Lemma 2.14 (Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality) and the conservation of mass, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{b,c}(u(t)) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{|c|}{2} \||x|^{-a}|u(t)|^2\|_{L^1} - \frac{d}{2d+4-2b} \||x|^{-b}|u(t)|^{\frac{4-2b}{d}+2}\|_{L^1} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - C(a, |c|, \varepsilon) \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\|u(t)\|_{L^2}}{\|Q\|_{L^2}} \right)^{\frac{4-2b}{d}} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \varepsilon - \left(\frac{\|u(t)\|_{L^2}}{\|Q\|_{L^2}} \right) \right) \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - C(a, |c|, \varepsilon) M(u_0).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Since $\|u_0\|_{L^2} < \|Q\|_{L^2}$, we can get the desired result from (5.7) by taking $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small.

Proof of Item 4. Let us consider the intercritical case $\frac{4-2b}{d} < \sigma < \sigma_c(1, b)$. Since $c \geq 0$, it follows from Lemma 2.14 (Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&E_{b,c}(u(t))[M(u(t))]^{\gamma_c} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^{2\gamma_c} - \frac{|c|}{2} \||x|^{-a}|u(t)|^2\|_{L^1} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^{2\gamma_c} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\sigma+2} \||x|^{-b}|u(t)|^{\sigma+2}\|_{L^1} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^{2\gamma_c} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} (\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c})^2 - \frac{C_{\text{GN}}}{\sigma+2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{d\sigma+2b}{2}} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4-2b-\sigma(d-2)}{2}+2\gamma_c} \\
&= f(\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c}),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

where $f(x) := \frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{C_{\text{GN}}}{\sigma+2}x^{\frac{d\sigma+2b}{2}}$. On the other hand, (2.6) and (2.8) show that

$$f(\|\nabla Q\|_{L^2} \|Q\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c}) = E_b(Q)[M(Q)]^{\gamma_c}. \tag{5.9}$$

Using (5.8), (5.9), (1.22) and the conservation of mass and energy, we get

$$f(\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c}) < f(\|\nabla Q\|_{L^2} \|Q\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c}), \tag{5.10}$$

for any t in the existence time. (5.10), the second condition in (1.22) and the continuity argument imply that

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c} < \|\nabla Q\|_{L^2} \|Q\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c},$$

for any t in the existence time. The result follows from the above inequality and the conservation of mass. \square

6 Blow-up of H^1 -solution

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.7 and 1.9.

6.1 Virial estimates

In this subsection, we derive the virial estimates related to (1.1) in the focusing case which are useful to study the finite or infinite time blow-up of H^1 -solution. To this end, we recall the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality. See Corollary 1.3 of [53] for example.

Lemma 6.1 ([53]). *Let $1 < p, p_0, p_1 < \infty$, $s, s_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$. The the fractional GN inequality of the following type*

$$\|u\|_{\dot{H}_p^s} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^{p_0}}^{1-\theta} \|u\|_{\dot{H}_{p_1}^{s_1}}^\theta$$

holds if and only if

$$\frac{d}{p} - s = (1 - \theta) \frac{d}{p_0} + \theta \left(\frac{d}{p_1} - s_1 \right), \quad s \leq \theta s_1.$$

Given a real valued function ω , we define the virial potential by

$$V_\omega(t) := \int \omega(x) |u(t, x)|^2 dx.$$

A simple computation shows that the following result holds.

Lemma 6.2 ([27]). *Let $V, W : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. If u is a (sufficiently smooth and decaying) solution to $iu_t + \Delta u = Vu + W|u|^\sigma u$, then it holds that*

$$\frac{d(t)}{dt} V_\omega = 2 \int \nabla \omega \cdot \text{Im}(\bar{u}(t) \nabla u(t)) dx \quad (6.1)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} V_\omega(t) &= - \int \Delta^2 a(x) |u(t)|^2 dx + 4 \sum_{j,k=1}^d \int \partial_{jk}^2 a(x) \text{Re}(\partial_k u(t) \partial_j \bar{u}(t)) dx \\ &\quad - 2 \int \nabla \omega \cdot \nabla V |u(t)|^2 dx + \frac{2\sigma}{\sigma+2} \int \Delta \omega W |u(t)|^{\sigma+2} dx \\ &\quad - \frac{4}{\sigma+2} \int \nabla \omega \cdot \nabla W |u(t)|^{\sigma+2} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

Let us introduce a function $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfying

$$\varphi(r) = \begin{cases} r^2, & \text{if } 0 \leq r \leq 1, \\ 0, & \text{if } r \geq 2, \end{cases} \quad \text{and } \varphi''(r) \leq 2 \text{ for } r \geq 0. \quad (6.3)$$

Given $R > 0$, we define the radial function $\varphi_R : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$:

$$\varphi_R(x) = \varphi_R(r) := R^2 \varphi(r/R), \quad r = |x|. \quad (6.4)$$

One can easily see that

$$2 - \varphi_R''(r) \geq 0, \quad 2 - \frac{\varphi_R'(r)}{r} \geq 0, \quad 2d - \Delta \varphi_R(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall r \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (6.5)$$

We have the following localized virial estimate.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < a, b < 2$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 < \sigma < \infty$, $\sigma \leq \sigma_c(1, b)$, $R > 1$ and φ_R be as in (6.4). Let $u : I \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a solution to the focusing Cauchy problem (1.1) with $\lambda = -1$. Then for any $t \in I$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} V_{\varphi_R}(t) &\leq 8 \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 4ac \||x|^{-a} |u(t)|^2\|_{L^1} - \frac{4(d\sigma + 2b)}{\sigma + 2} \int |x|^{-b} |u(t)|^{\sigma+2} dx \\ &\quad + CR^{-2} + CR^{-a} + CR^{-b} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{\sigma d}{2}} \\ &= G(u(t)) - 2c(d\sigma + 2b - 2a) \||x|^{-a} |u(t)|^2\|_{L^1} + CR^{-2} + CR^{-a} + CR^{-b} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{\sigma d}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G(u) &:= 8 \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + 2c(d\sigma + 2b) \||x|^{-a} |u|^2\|_{L^1} - \frac{4(d\sigma + 2b)}{\sigma + 2} \int |x|^{-b} |u|^{\sigma+2} dx \\ &= 4(d\sigma + 2b) E_{b,c}(u) - 2(d\sigma + 2b - 4) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

Proof. Applying Lemma 6.2 with $V = c|x|^{-a}$ and $W = -|x|^{-b}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} V_{\varphi_R}(t) &= - \int \Delta^2 \varphi_R(x) |u(t, x)|^2 dx - 2c \int \nabla \varphi_R(x) \cdot \nabla (|x|^{-a}) |u(t, x)|^2 dx \\ &\quad + 4 \sum_{j,k=1}^d \int \partial_{jk}^2 \varphi_R(x) \operatorname{Re}(\partial_k u(t, x) \partial_j \bar{u}(t, x)) dx \\ &\quad - \frac{2\sigma}{\sigma + 2} \int \Delta \varphi_R(x) |x|^{-b} |u(t, x)|^{\sigma+2} dx \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{\sigma + 2} \int \nabla \varphi_R(x) \cdot \nabla (|x|^{-b}) |u(t, x)|^{\sigma+2} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

Noticing that

$$\partial_j = \frac{x_j}{r} \partial_r, \quad \partial_{jk}^2 = \left(\frac{\delta_{jk}}{r} - \frac{x_j x_k}{r^3} \right) \partial_r + \frac{x_j x_k}{r^2} \partial_r^2,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j,k=1}^d \int \partial_{jk}^2 \varphi_R(x) \operatorname{Re}(\partial_k u(t, x) \partial_j \bar{u}(t, x)) dx \\ &= \int \frac{\varphi_R'(r)}{r} |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 dx + \int \left(\frac{\varphi_R''(r)}{r^2} - \frac{\varphi_R'(r)}{r^3} \right) |x \cdot \nabla u(t, x)|^2 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

and

$$\nabla \varphi_R(x) \cdot \nabla (|x|^{-a}) = -a \frac{\varphi_R'}{r} |x|^{-a}, \quad \nabla \varphi_R(x) \cdot \nabla (|x|^{-b}) = -b \frac{\varphi_R'}{r} |x|^{-b}. \quad (6.10)$$

In view of (6.8)–(6.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d^2}{dt^2} V_{\varphi_R}(t) &= - \int \Delta^2 \varphi_R(x) |u(t, x)|^2 dx + 4 \int \frac{\varphi'_R(r)}{r} |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 dx \\
&+ 4 \int \left(\frac{\varphi''_R(r)}{r^2} - \frac{\varphi'_R(r)}{r^3} \right) |x \cdot \nabla u(t, x)|^2 dx \\
&- 2ac \int \left(2 - \frac{\varphi'_R}{r} \right) |x|^{-a} |u(t, x)|^2 dx + 4ac \| |x|^{-a} |u(t)|^2 \|_{L^1} \\
&- \frac{4b}{\sigma+2} \int |x|^{-b} \frac{\varphi'_R(r)}{r} |u(t, x)|^{\sigma+2} dx \\
&- \frac{2\sigma}{\sigma+2} \int \Delta \varphi_R(x) |x|^{-b} |u(t, x)|^{\sigma+2} dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

Since $\|\Delta^2 \varphi_R\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim R^{-2}$, the conservation of mass implies that

$$\left| \int \Delta^2 \varphi_R(x) |u(t, x)|^2 dx \right| \lesssim R^{-2} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim R^{-2}. \tag{6.12}$$

Using the conservation of mass and the facts that $|x \cdot \nabla u| \leq r |\nabla u|$, $\varphi''_R(r) \leq 2$, $\frac{\varphi'_R(r)}{r} \leq 2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&4 \int \frac{\varphi'_R(r)}{r} |\nabla u(t)|^2 dx + 4 \int \left(\frac{\varphi''_R(r)}{r^2} - \frac{\varphi'_R(r)}{r^3} \right) |x \cdot \nabla u(t)|^2 dx - 8 \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq 4 \int \left(2 - \frac{\varphi'_R(r)}{r} \right) \left(-|\nabla u(t)|^2 + \frac{|x \cdot \nabla u(t)|^2}{r^2} \right) dx \leq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

Using (6.5) and the conservation of mass, we also have

$$-2ac \int \left(2 - \frac{\varphi'_R}{r} \right) |x|^{-a} |u(t, x)|^2 dx \lesssim \max\{-2acS, 0\} \int_{|x|>R} R^{-a} |u(t)|^2 dx \lesssim R^{-a}, \tag{6.14}$$

where $S = \max_{r \geq 1} \{2 - \frac{\theta'(r)}{r}\}$. Furthermore, it follows from Lemma 6.1 and the conservation of mass that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{4(d\sigma+2b)}{\sigma+2} \int |x|^{-b} |u(t, x)|^{\sigma+2} dx - \frac{2\sigma}{\sigma+2} \int \Delta \varphi_R(x) |x|^{-b} |u(t, x)|^{\sigma+2} dx \\
&- \frac{4b}{\sigma+2} \int |x|^{-b} \frac{\varphi'_R(r)}{r} |u(t, x)|^{\sigma+2} dx \\
&= \frac{2\sigma}{\sigma+2} \int |x|^{-b} (2d - \Delta \varphi_R(x)) |u(t)|^{\sigma+2} dx \\
&+ \frac{4b}{\sigma+2} \int |x|^{-b} \left(2 - \frac{\varphi'_R(r)}{r} \right) |u(t)|^{\sigma+2} dx \\
&\lesssim \int_{|x| \geq R} |x|^{-b} |u(t)|^{\sigma+2} \leq R^{-b} \|u(t)\|_{L^{\sigma+2}}^{\sigma+2} \\
&\lesssim R^{-b} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{\sigma d}{2}} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\sigma+2 - \frac{\sigma d}{2}} \lesssim R^{-b} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{\sigma d}{2}},
\end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

where we use the fact $\sigma \leq \sigma_c(1, b)$. The desired result follows from (6.11)–(6.15). \square

In the mass-critical case $\sigma = \frac{4-2b}{d}$, we have the following refined version of Lemma 6.2. As in [19], we use the following function

$$v(r) = \begin{cases} 2r, & \text{if } 0 \leq r \leq 1, \\ 2r - 2(r-1)^k, & \text{if } 1 < r \leq 1 + \left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{k-1}}, \\ \text{smooth and } v' = 0, & \text{if } 1 + \left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} < r < 2, \\ 0, & \text{if } r \geq 2, \end{cases} \quad (6.16)$$

where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is chosen as in [19]. We then define the radial function

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(r) &= \int_0^r v(s) ds. \\ \phi_R(x) &= \phi_R(r) := R^2 \phi(r/R), \quad r = |x|. \end{aligned} \quad (6.17)$$

Lemma 6.4. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < a \leq 2$, $0 < b < 2$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma = \frac{4-2b}{d}$ and ϕ_R be as in (6.17). Let $u : I \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a solution to the focusing Cauchy problem (1.1) with $\lambda = -1$ and $E_{b,c}(u_0) < 0$. Then for any $t \in I$ and $R > 1$ large enough, we have*

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} V_{\phi_R}(t) \leq 8E_{b,c}(u_0) - 4c(2-a) \left\| |x|^{-a} |u(t)|^2 \right\|_{L^1}. \quad (6.18)$$

Proof. Using the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 6.2, we immediately get

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} V_{\phi_R}(t) = 16E_{b,c}(u_0) - 4c(2-a) \left\| |x|^{-a} |u(t)|^2 \right\|_{L^1} + K_1 + K_2 + K_3 + K_4, \quad (6.19)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= -4 \int \left(2 - \frac{\phi'_R(r)}{r} \right) |\nabla u(t)|^2 dx + 4 \int \left(\frac{\phi''_R(r)}{r^2} - \frac{\phi'_R(r)}{r^3} \right) |x \cdot \nabla u(t)|^2 dx, \\ K_2 &= \frac{2}{d+2-b} \int \left[(2-b)(2 - \phi''_R(r)) + (2d-2+b) \left(2 - \frac{\phi'_R(r)}{r} \right) \right] |x|^{-b} |u(t)|^{\sigma+2} dx, \\ K_3 &= - \int \Delta^2 \phi_R(x) |u(t, x)|^2 dx \end{aligned}$$

and

$$K_4 = -2ac \int \left(2 - \frac{\phi'_R}{r} \right) |x|^{-a} |u(t, x)|^2 dx.$$

Using the same argument as in (6.14), we get

$$K_4 \lesssim R^{-a}. \quad (6.20)$$

Using (6.19), (6.20) and the estimates of K_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) obtained in [19], we immediately get (6.18) for $R > 1$ large enough and we omitted the details. \square

6.2 Proofs of Theorems 1.7 and 1.9

We are ready to prove Theorems 1.7 and 1.9.

Proof of Item 1 of Theorem 1.7 and Theorem 1.9. Using Lemma 6.4 and the assumptions of Item 1 of Theorem 1.7 and Theorem 1.9, we immediately get

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} V_{\phi_R}(t) \leq 8E_{b,c}(u_0) < 0,$$

where ϕ_R is given in (6.17). Integrating this estimate, there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $V_{\phi_R}(t_0) < 0$ which is impossible. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Items 2 and 3 of Theorem 1.7. We prove the results in three steps.

Step 1. In this step, we prove that there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$G(u(t)) \leq -c_1, \quad (6.21)$$

for any t in the existence time, where $G(u)$ is given in (6.7). In fact, if $E_{b,c}(u_0) < 0$, we immediately get (6.21) by using (6.7), the conservation of energy and fact that $\sigma > \frac{4-2b}{d}$. Hence, it suffices to consider the case $E_{b,c}(u_0) \geq 0$.

First, we consider the intercritical case $\frac{4-2b}{d} < \sigma < \sigma_c(1, b)$. Using (5.10), the second condition in (1.23) and the continuity argument, we have

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c} > \|\nabla Q\|_{L^2} \|Q\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c}, \quad (6.22)$$

for any t in the existence time. And the first condition in (1.23) shows that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$E_{b,c}(u_0)[M(u_0)]^{\gamma_c} \leq (1 - \delta)E_b(Q)[M(Q)]^{\gamma_c}. \quad (6.23)$$

(6.22), (6.23), (2.6) and the conservation of mass and energy show that

$$\begin{aligned} G(u(t))[M(u(t))]^{\gamma_c} &= 4(d\sigma + 2b)E_{b,c}(u(t))[M(u(t))]^{\gamma_c} \\ &\quad - 2(d\sigma - 4 + 2b) (\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c})^2 \\ &\leq 4(d\sigma + 2b)(1 - \delta)E_b(Q)[M(Q)]^{\gamma_c} \\ &\quad - 2(d\sigma - 4 + 2b) (\|\nabla Q\|_{L^2} \|Q\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c})^2 \\ &= -2(d\sigma - 4 + 2b)\delta (\|\nabla Q\|_{L^2} \|Q\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c})^2, \end{aligned} \quad (6.24)$$

for any t in the existence time. Hence we have (6.21) with

$$c_1 = \frac{2(d\sigma - 4 + 2b)\delta (\|\nabla Q\|_{L^2} \|Q\|_{L^2}^{\gamma_c})^2}{[M(u_0)]^{\gamma_c}}.$$

Next, we consider the energy-critical case $\sigma = \frac{4-2b}{d-2}$ with $d \geq 3$. By definition of the energy and Lemma 2.16 (sharp Hardy-Sobolev inequality), we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_{b,c}(u(t)) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} + \frac{c}{2} \| |x|^{-a} |u(t)|^2 \|_{L^1} - \frac{1}{\sigma + 2} \int |x|^{-b} |u(t, x)|^{\sigma+2} dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} - \frac{[C_{HS}]^{\sigma+2}}{\sigma + 2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\sigma+2} =: g(\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$g(y) = \frac{1}{2}y^2 - \frac{[C_{HS}]^{\sigma+2}}{\sigma + 2}y^{\sigma+2}. \quad (6.25)$$

(2.14) shows that

$$g(\|\nabla W_b\|_{L^2}) = E_b(W_b).$$

By the conservation of energy and the first condition in (1.24), we can see that

$$g(\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}) \leq E_{b,c}(u(t)) = E_{b,c}(u_0) < E_b(W_b).$$

By the second condition in (1.24) and the continuity argument, we have

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} > \|\nabla W_b\|_{L^2}, \quad (6.26)$$

for any t in the existence time. By the second condition in (1.24), we can take $\delta > 0$ small enough such that

$$E_{b,c}(u_0) \leq (1 - \delta)E_b(W_b). \quad (6.27)$$

(2.13), (2.14), (6.7), (6.26) and (6.27) show that

$$\begin{aligned} G(u(t)) &= 4(d\sigma + 2b)E_{b,c}(u(t)) - 2(d\sigma + 2b - 4) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq 4(1 - \delta)(d\sigma + 2b)E_b(W_b) - 2(d\sigma + 2b - 4) \|\nabla W_b\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= -\frac{8\delta(2 - b)}{d - 2} \|\nabla W_b\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (6.21).

Step 2. In this step, we prove the first parts of Items 2 and 3 in Theorem 1.6. If $T^* < \infty$, then we are done. If $T^* = \infty$, then we have to show that there exists $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\|\nabla u(t_n)\|_{L^2} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Assume by contradiction that it doesn't hold, i.e.

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \leq M_0, \quad (6.28)$$

for some $M_0 > 0$. Using Lemma 6.3, (6.21), (6.28) and the fact $d\sigma + 2b > 4 > 2a$, we can take $R > 1$ large enough such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} V_{\varphi_R}(t) &\leq -c_1 - 2c(d\sigma + 2b - 2a) \||x|^{-a}|u(t)|^2\|_{L^1} + CR^{-2} + CR^{-a} + CR^{-b}M_0^{\frac{\sigma d}{2}} \\ &= -\frac{c_1}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.29)$$

for any t in the existence time, where φ_R is given in (6.4). This shows that there exists $t_1 > 0$ such that $V_{\varphi_R}(t_1) < 0$ which is impossible. This completes the proof of the first parts in Items 2 and 3 of Theorem 1.6.

Step 3. In this step, we prove the second parts of Items 2 and 3 in Theorem 1.6. By assumption, we have $\sigma < \frac{4}{d}$ in both of intercritical and energy-critical case.

We first claim that there exists $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \geq c_2, \quad (6.30)$$

for all $t \in [0, T_{\max})$. In fact, (6.7), (6.21) and the fact $c \geq 0$ imply that

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \int |x|^{-b}|u|^{\sigma+2} dx. \quad (6.31)$$

On the other hand, the conservation of mass, Lemmas 2.14 and 2.16 show that

$$\int |x|^{-b}|u|^{\sigma+2} dx \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{d\sigma+2b}{2}}. \quad (6.32)$$

(6.30) follows directly from (6.31), (6.32) and the fact $\sigma > \frac{4-2b}{d}$.

We next claim that there exists $c_3 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} V_{\varphi_R}(t) \leq -c_3 \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (6.33)$$

for all $t \in [0, T_{\max})$ and $R > 1$ large enough, where φ_R is as in (6.4). To prove (6.33), we denote

$$\gamma := \frac{4(d\sigma + 2b)|E_{b,c}(u_0)| + 4}{d\sigma + 2b - 4}. \quad (6.34)$$

Case 1. We consider the case

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \gamma. \quad (6.35)$$

Lemma 6.3, (6.21), (6.35) and the fact that $c \geq 0$, we immediately get

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} V_{\varphi_R}(t) \leq -c_1 + CR^{-2} + CR^{-a} + CR^{-b} \gamma^{\frac{\sigma d}{2}},$$

By choosing $R > 1$ large enough, it follows from (6.35) that

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} V_{\varphi_R}(t) \leq -\frac{c_1}{2} \leq -\frac{c_1}{2\gamma} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (6.36)$$

Case 2. We consider the case

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \geq \gamma. \quad (6.37)$$

In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G(u(t)) &= 4(d\sigma + 2b)E_{b,c}(u(t)) - 2(d\sigma + 2b - 4) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq 4(d\sigma + 2b)E_{b,c}(u(t)) - (d\sigma + 2b - 4)\gamma - (d\sigma + 2b - 4) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq -4 - (d\sigma + 2b - 4) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (6.38)$$

Since $c \geq 0$ and $\sigma < \frac{4}{d}$, it follows from Lemma 6.3, (6.30) and (6.38) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} V_{\varphi_R}(t) &\leq -4 - (d\sigma + 2b - 4) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + CR^{-2} + CR^{-a} + CR^{-b} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{\sigma d}{2}} \\ &\leq -4 - (d\sigma + 2b - 4 - CR^{-b} c_2^{\frac{\sigma d}{2} - 2}) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + CR^{-2} + CR^{-a}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.39)$$

Due to the fact that $\sigma > \frac{4-2b}{d}$, we can choose $R > 1$ large enough such that

$$CR^{-b} c_2^{\frac{\sigma d}{2} - 2} \leq \frac{d\sigma + 2b - 4}{2} \text{ and } CR^{-2} + CR^{-a} \leq 4. \quad (6.40)$$

(6.39) and (6.40) imply that

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} V_{\varphi_R}(t) \leq -\frac{d\sigma + 2b - 4}{2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (6.41)$$

for $R > 1$ large enough. In both of Case 1 and Case 2, the choice of $R > 1$ are independent of t . Hence, we get (6.33) with $c_3 := \min\{\frac{c_1}{2\gamma}, \frac{d\sigma + 2b - 4}{2}\} > 0$. This complete the proof of (6.33).

By time integration, (6.30) and (6.33) imply that

$$V'_{\varphi_R}(t) \lesssim -t < 0, \quad \forall t > T, \quad (6.42)$$

for $T > 0$ sufficiently large. By time integration again, (6.33) and (6.42) show that

$$V'_{\varphi_R}(t) \lesssim -\int_T^t \|\nabla u(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds, \quad \forall t > T. \quad (6.43)$$

On the other hand, (6.1) and Hölder's inequality imply that

$$|V'_{\varphi_R}(t)| = \left| 2\text{Im} \int \varphi'_R \frac{x \cdot \nabla u}{r} \bar{u} dx \right| \lesssim R \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \|u\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}. \quad (6.44)$$

(6.43) and (6.44) show that

$$\int_T^t \|\nabla u(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \lesssim |V'_{\varphi_R}(t)| \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}.$$

Hence, defining $h(t) := \int_T^t \|\nabla u(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds$, we have $h^2(t) \lesssim h'(t)$. And this ODI has no global solution. Indeed, taking $T' > T$ and integrating on $[T', t)$, we get

$$t - T' \lesssim \int_{T'}^t \frac{h'(s)}{h^2(s)} ds = \frac{1}{h(T')} - \frac{1}{h(t)} \leq \frac{1}{h(T')}.$$

This implies that $t < cT' + \frac{c}{h(T')}$. This completes the proof. \square

References

- [1] L. Aloui and S. Tayachi, Local well-posedness for the inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **41** (2021) 5409–5437.
- [2] J. An and J. Kim, Local well-posedness for the inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, **59** (2021) 103268.
- [3] J. An and J. Kim, Small data global well-posedness and scattering for the inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, *Z. Anal. Anwend.*, **40** (2021) 453–475.
- [4] J. An and J. Kim, The Cauchy problem for the critical inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, *Evol. Equ. Control Theory*, **12** (2023) 1039–1055.
- [5] J. An and J. Kim, A note on the H^s -critical inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *Z. Anal. Anwend.*, **42** (2023) 403–433.
- [6] J. An, J. Kim and K. Chae, Continuous dependence of the Cauchy problem for the inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, **27** (2022) 4143–4172.
- [7] J. An, J. Kim and P. Ryu, Sobolev-Lorentz spaces with an application to the inhomogeneous biharmonic NLS equation, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, **29** (2024) 3326–3345.
- [8] J. An, R. Jang and J. Kim, Global existence and blow-up for the focusing inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation with inverse-square potential, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, **28** (2023) 1046–1067.
- [9] J. An, H. Mun and J. Kim, On stability and instability of the ground states for the focusing inhomogeneous NLS with inverse-square potential, *Pure Appl. Math. Q.*, (2024) to appear.
- [10] A. H. Ardila, M. Hamano and M. Ikeda, Mass-energy threshold dynamics for the focusing NLS with a repulsive inverse-power potential, *Evol. Equ. Control Theory*, (2024) Doi:10.3934/eect.2024033.
- [11] R. Bai and B. Li, Finite time/Infinite time blow-up behaviors for the inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *Nonlinear Anal.*, **232** (2023) 113266.
- [12] R. Bai and T. Saanouni, Finite time blow-up of non-radial solutions for some inhomogeneous Schrödinger equations, arXiv:2306.15210
- [13] J. Belmonte-Beitia, V. M. Pérez-García, V. Vekslerchik and P. J. Torres, Lie symmetries and solitons in nonlinear systems with spatially inhomogeneous nonlinearities, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **98** (2007), 064102.
- [14] S. Boulaaras, R. Ghanmi and T. Saanouni, Scattering threshold for a focusing inhomogeneous non-linear Schrödinger equation with inverse-square potential, *Bound. Value Probl.*, (2023), 2023(1687–2770).

- [15] N. Burq, F. Planchon, J. Stalker and A. S. Tahvildar-Zadeh, Strichartz estimates for the wave and Schrödinger equations with the inverse-square potential, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **203** (2003), 519–549.
- [16] L. Campos and M. Cardoso, Blow up and scattering criteria above the threshold for the focusing inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl.*, **28** (2021), 69.
- [17] L. Campos, M. Cardoso and L. G. Farah, Blow-up for the 3D intercritical inhomogeneous NLS with inverse-square potential, arXiv:2305.06971.
- [18] L. Campos and C. M. Guzmán, On the inhomogeneous NLS with inverse-square potential, *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.*, **72** (2021), 143.
- [19] M. Cardoso and G. Farah, Blow-up of non-radial solutions for the L^2 critical inhomogeneous NLS equation, *Nonlinearity*, **35** (2022) 4426.
- [20] T. Cazenave, *Semilinear Schrödinger Equations*, Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics, New York University, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York; American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [21] T. Cazenave, D. Fang and Z. Han, Continuous dependence for NLS in fractional order spaces, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, **28** (2011), 135–147.
- [22] D. Cruz-Uribe and V. Naibo, Kato-Ponce inequalities on weighted and variable Lebesgue spaces, *Differential Integral Equations.*, **29** (2016) 801–836.
- [23] W. Dai, W. Yang and D. Cao, Continuous dependence of Cauchy problem for nonlinear Schrödinger equation in H^s , *J. Differential Equations*, **255** (2013), 2018–2064.
- [24] V. D. Dinh, Blowup of H^1 solutions for a class of the focusing inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *Nonlinear Anal.*, **174** (2018), 169–188.
- [25] V. D. Dinh, Global existence and blowup for a class of focusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation with inverse-square potential, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **468** (2018), 270–303.
- [26] V. D. Dinh, Global dynamics for a class of inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equations with potential. *Math. Nachr.* **294** (2021), 672–716.
- [27] V. D. Dinh, On nonlinear Schrödinger equations with repulsive inverse-power potentials, *Acta App. Math.* **174** (2021) 14.
- [28] V. D. Dinh and S. Keraani, Long time dynamics of non-radial solutions to inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **53** (2021), 4765–4811.
- [29] L. G. Farah, Global well-posedness and blow-up on the energy space for the inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *J. Evol. Equ.*, **16** (2016), 193–208.
- [30] N. Fukaya and M. Ohta, Strong instability of standing waves for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with attractive inverse power potential, *Osaka J. Math.*, **56** (2019), 713–726.
- [31] F. Genoud, A uniqueness result for $\Delta u - \lambda u + V(|x|)u^p = 0$ on \mathbb{R}^2 , *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.*, **11** (2011), 483–491.
- [32] F. Genoud, An inhomogeneous, L^2 -critical, nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *Z. Anal. Anwend.*, **31** (2012), 283–290.
- [33] F. Genoud and C. A. Stuart, Schrödinger equations with a spatially decaying nonlinearity: existence and stability of standing waves, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **21** (2008), 137–186.
- [34] R. T. Glassey, On the blowing up of solutions to the Cauchy problem for nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *J. Math. Phys.*, **18** (1977), 1794–1797.

- [35] L. Grafakos, *Classical Fourier Analysis*, third ed., Springer, New York, 2014.
- [36] Q. Guo, H. Wang and X. Yao, Dynamics of the focusing 3D cubic NLS with slowly decaying potential, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **56** (2022) 125653.
- [37] C. M. Guzmán, On well posedness for the inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, **37** (2017), 249–286.
- [38] C. M. Guzmán and J. Murphy, Scattering for the non-radial energy-critical inhomogeneous NLS, *J. Differential Equations*, **295** (2021), 187–210.
- [39] R. Jang, J. An and J. Kim, The Cauchy problem for the energy-critical inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation with inverse-square potential, Preprint arXiv:2107.09826.
- [40] H. Kalf, U. W. Schmincke, J. Walter and R. Wust, *On the spectral theory of Schrödinger and Dirac operators with strongly singular potentials*, in: *Spectral Theory and Differential Equations*, in: Lect. Notes in Math., vol. 448, Springer, Berlin, 1975, pp. 182–226.
- [41] D. S. Kang and S. J. Peng, Positive solutions for elliptic equations with critical Sobolev-Hardy exponents, *Appl. Math. Lett.*, **17** (2004), 411–416.
- [42] Y. V. Kartashov, B. A. Malomed, V. A. Vysloukh, M. R. Belic and L. Torner, Rotating vortex clusters in media with inhomogeneous defocusing nonlinearity. *Opt. Lett.*, **42** (2017), 446–449.
- [43] M. Keel and T. Tao, Endpoint Strichartz estimates, *Amer. J. Math.*, **120** (1998), 955–980.
- [44] R. Killip, C. Miao, M. Visan, J. Zhang and J. Zheng. Sobolev spaces adapted to the Schrödinger operator with inverse-square potential. *Math. Z.*, **288** (2018) 1273–1298.
- [45] H. Hajaiej, X. Yu and Z. Zhai, Fractional Gagliardo-Nirenberg and Hardy inequalities under Lorentz norms, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **396** (2012) 569–577.
- [46] F. Linares and G. Ponce, *Introduction to Nonlinear Dispersive Equations*, second edition, Universitext. Springer, New York, 2015.
- [47] C. Miao, J. Zhang and J. Zheng. Nonlinear Schrödinger equation with coulomb potential, *Acta Math. Sci. Ser. B (Engl. Ed.)*, **42** (2022) 2230–2256.
- [48] H. Mizutani, Strichartz estimates for Schrödinger equations with slowly decaying potential, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **279** (2020) 108789.
- [49] N. Okazawa, T. Suzuki and T. Yokota, Energy methods for abstract nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Evol. Equ. Control Theory*, **1** (2012) 337–354.
- [50] R. O’Neil, Convolution operators and $L(p, q)$ spaces, *Duke Math. J.*, **30** (1963) 129–142.
- [51] T. Suzuki. Solvability of nonlinear Schrödinger equations with some critical singular potential via generalized Hardy-Rellich inequalities, *Funkcial. Ekvac.*, **59** (2016), 1–34.
- [52] J. F. Toland, Uniqueness of positive solutions of some semilinear Sturm-Liouville problems on the half line, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, **97** (1984) 259–263.
- [53] B. X. Wang, Z. Huo, C. Hao and Z. Guo, *Harmonic Analysis Method for Nonlinear Evolution Equations, I*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2011.
- [54] M. I. Weinstein, Nonlinear Schrödinger equations and sharp interpolation estimates, *Commun. Math. Phys.*, **87** (1983), 567–576.
- [55] E. Yanagida, Uniqueness of positive radial solutions of $\Delta u + g(r)u + h(r)u^p = 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n , *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, **115** (1991) 257–274.
- [56] K. Yang, Scattering of the focusing energy-critical NLS with inverse-square potential in the radial case, *Comm. Pure Appl. Anal.*, **20** (2021), 77–99.