

DYNAMICS OF THRESHOLD SOLUTIONS FOR THE ENERGY-CRITICAL INHOMOGENEOUS NLS

XUAN LIU, KAI YANG, AND TING ZHANG

ABSTRACT. In this article, we study the long-time dynamics of threshold solutions for the focusing energy-critical inhomogeneous Schrödinger equation and classify the corresponding threshold solutions in dimensions $d = 3, 4, 5$. We first show the existence of special threshold solutions W^\pm by constructing a sequence of approximate solutions in suitable Lorentz space, which exponentially approach the ground state W in one of the time directions. We then prove that solutions with threshold energy either behave as in the subthreshold case or agree with W, W^+ or W^- up to the symmetries of the equation. The proof relies on detailed spectral analysis of the linearized Schrödinger operator, the relevant modulation analysis, the global Virial analysis, and the concentration compactness argument in the Lorentz space.

Keywords: inhomogeneous NLS, energy-critical, ground state, scattering, blow-up.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the following focusing energy-critical inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \Delta u + |x|^{-b}|u|^\alpha u = 0, & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0 \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d), \end{cases}$$

where $d \geq 3, 0 < b < \min\{2, \frac{d}{2}\}$ and $\alpha = \frac{4-2b}{d-2}$.

This model arises in the setting of nonlinear optics, where the factor $|x|^{-b}$ represents some inhomogeneity in the medium (see, e.g., [22, 38]). As pointed out by Genoud and Stuart [20], the factor $|x|^{-b}$ appears naturally as a limiting case of potentials that decay polynomially at infinity.

On the interval of existence, the solution preserves its energy

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

Equation (1.1) is referred to as focusing as the potential energy is negative. Equation (1.1) is also referred to as energy-critical as the natural scaling of the equation $u(t, x) \rightarrow \lambda^{\frac{d-2}{2}} u(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x)$ keeps the energy invariant.

The \dot{H}^1 local well-posedness of (1.1) was noted as an open problem in [24, Remark 1.7, p.252] and [13, line 38, p. 171]. The main difficulty comes from the singularity of $|x|^{-b}$ at the origin. Using Strichartz estimates in some weighted Lebesgue spaces, the authors in [31, 32] established the \dot{H}^1 local existence of (1.1) under some restrictive hypotheses on d and b . Recently, by considering Strichartz estimates in Lorentz spaces, Aloui and Tayachi [1] ultimately established the \dot{H}^1 local well-posedness of the Cauchy problem (1.1) (see Theorem 2.11 below).

The local theory in [1, 31, 32] also proves scattering for sufficiently small initial data. Here scattering refers to the fact that

$$\exists u_\pm \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{such that} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|u(t) - e^{it\Delta} u_\pm\|_{\dot{H}^1} = 0,$$

where $e^{it\Delta}$ is the linear Schrödinger group. The existence of the non-scattering solution (the ground state solution)

$$(1.2) \quad W(x) := \left(1 + \frac{|x|^{2-b}}{(d-2)(d-b)}\right)^{-\frac{d-2}{2-b}}$$

shows that scattering does not hold for all initial data $u_0 \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Instead, the threshold between blowup and scattering is proved to be determined by the ground state:

Theorem 1.1 ([10, 11, 25, 39]). *Let $d \geq 3, 0 < b < \min\{2, \frac{d}{2}\}$. Suppose $u_0 \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies $E(u_0) < E(W)$.*

(a) *If $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}$, then the corresponding solution u to (1.1) is global and scatters as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$.*

(b) *If $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \geq \|\nabla W\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ and either $xu_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ or $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is radial, then the corresponding solution u to (1.1) blows up in finite time.*

Theorem 1.1 was first obtained by Cho-Hong-Lee [10] for the radial inhomogeneous NLS when $d = 3, 0 < b < \frac{4}{3}$, and then extended by Cho-Lee [11] to the radial inhomogeneous NLS with $d = 3, \frac{4}{3} \leq b < \frac{3}{2}$. In the paper [25], Guzmán-Murphy proved Theorem 1.1 for non-radial initial data in the case $d = 3, b = 1$. The results of [25] are shown by a concrete concentration compactness argument based on Hardy's inequality and the fact that, (1.1) is well-approximated by the linear equation in the regime $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. The restriction on indices b and d are due to the lack of local theory of (1.1). Recently, Aloui and Tayachi [1] established the \dot{H}^1 local well-posedness of (1.1) by considering the contraction argument in the Lorentz spaces, which are properly suited for handling the inhomogeneity $|x|^{-b}$. Based on the work of [1], Liu-Zhang [39] developed the concentration compactness argument in the Lorentz space and proved Theorem 1.1 for all $d \geq 3, 0 < b < \min\{2, \frac{d}{2}\}$.

Observe that the above characterization is obtained only in the subthreshold case, i.e. $E(u_0) < E(W)$. Our purpose of this paper is to continue the study in [10, 11, 25, 39] on what will happen if the solution has the threshold energy, i.e. $E(u_0) = E(W)$. We call these solutions "threshold solutions". The classification of threshold solutions was initiated by Duyckaerts–Merle for the focusing energy critical nonlinear Schrödinger and wave equation in their seminal works [16, 17] in dimensions $d = 3, 4, 5$. These results were later extended to higher dimensions in [9, 34, 35]. See also [43] on the same topic in the nonradial subcritical case. The study on the threshold scattering has been a topic of recent mathematical interest. See e.g. [2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 15, 26, 29, 33, 40, 41, 46, 47] and references therein for more related works on this topic.

To classify the threshold solutions to the focusing energy critical inhomogeneous NLS (1.1), we first establish the following theorem, which shows the existence of special threshold solutions converging exponentially to W .

Theorem 1.2. *Let $3 \leq d \leq 5$. There exist radial global solutions W^\pm to (1.1) with $E(W^\pm) = E(W)$, defined on $I^\pm \supset [0, \infty)$, which satisfy*

$$\|W^\pm(t) - W\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim e^{-ct},$$

for some $c > 0$ and all $t > 0$.

The solution W^- is global ($I^- = \mathbb{R}$), satisfies

$$\|\nabla W^-(t)\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R},$$

and scatters in $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as $t \rightarrow -\infty$.

The solution W^+ satisfies

$$\|\nabla W^+(t)\|_{L^2} > \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Moreover, if $d = 5$, W^+ blows up in finite negative time ($I^+ = (T_-, \infty)$ for some $T_- < \infty$).

Remark 1.3. *The proof of $T_- < \infty$ relies heavily on the L^2 regularity of W^+ . As W belongs to $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if and only if $d \geq 5$, there is no L^2 regularity for W^+ in dimensions $d = 3, 4$ from the construction in Proposition 3.2. We still expect $T_- < \infty$ for $d = 3, 4$.*

Remark 1.4. *The restriction $d \leq 5$ together with the restriction for b in Theorem 1.5 ensures that $\alpha = \frac{4-2b}{d-2} \geq 1$, which provides sufficient regularity to handle the non-smoothness issue of the nonlinearity. Using the method of [9], our results can be extended to $d \geq 6$ with certain restrictions on b . We will address the high dimension problem elsewhere.*

Using the special threshold solutions W^\pm constructed in Theorem 1.2 and the ground state W , we can classify all threshold solutions to (1.1).

Theorem 1.5. *Let $3 \leq d \leq 5, 0 < b < -\frac{(d-4)^2}{2} + 1$, $u_0 \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $E(u_0) = E(W)$. Let u be the corresponding maximal-lifespan solution of (1.1) on $I \times \mathbb{R}^d$. We have*

(a) *If $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$, then either $u = W^-$ up to symmetries or u scatters in both time directions.*

(b) *If $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} = \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$, then $u = W$ up to symmetries.*

(c) *If $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} > \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$ and $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is radial, then either $|I|$ is finite or $u = W^+$ up to symmetries.*

Remark 1.6. *The assertion that $u = v$ up to symmetries means that there exist $\lambda_0 > 0$, $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that either*

$$u(t, x) = e^{i\theta_0} \lambda_0^{\frac{d-2}{2}} v(\lambda_0^2 t - t_0, \lambda_0 x) \quad \text{or} \quad u(t, x) = e^{i\theta_0} \lambda_0^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \bar{v}(\lambda_0^2 t - t_0, \lambda_0 x).$$

Remark 1.7. *Case (b) follows directly from the variational characterization of the ground state (see Proposition 2.14). Furthermore, using assumption $E(u_0) = E(W)$, it follows that the assumptions $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$, $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} = \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$ do not depend on the choice of the initial time t_0 (see Lemma 2.17). We call $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$ "subcritical case" and $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} > \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$ "supercritical case".*

Remark 1.8. *In the subcritical case, Theorem 1.5 does not require a radial assumption about u_0 . Note that for focusing energy critical NLS, the corresponding results were proved in the radial case ([9, 17, 34]). Recently, Su-Zhao [43] removed the radial assumption in $d \geq 5$ by using the interaction Morawetz estimate.*

Remark 1.9. *Due to the singularity of $|x|^{-b}$ at the origin, the modulation analysis in Lemma 4.4 leads to the restriction $0 < b < -\frac{(d-4)^2}{2} + 1$. See Claim B.2 for the details.*

For focusing energy critical NLS, the ground state is given by the smooth bounded function

$$W_0(x) = \left(1 + \frac{|x|^2}{d(d-2)}\right)^{-\frac{d-2}{2}},$$

which was also proved to be the threshold of scattering in the earlier work [19, 28, 30], except for $d = 3$ within the class of radial data. They showed that for the Cauchy problem with the initial datum satisfies the a priori condition $E(u_0) < E(W_0)$: (i) if $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W_0\|_{L^2}$, then the solution exists globally in time and scatters; (ii) if $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} > \|\nabla W_0\|_{L^2}$ and u_0 is radial or u_0 has finite variance ($xu_0 \in L^2$), then finite time blowup occurs. Later, Duyckaerts-Merle [17] studied the case of $E(u_0) = E(W_0)$ in dimensions $d = 3, 4, 5$ for radial initial data. They demonstrated the existence of special threshold solutions W_0^\pm exponentially approach the ground state W_0 , and proved that solutions with threshold energy either behave as in the subthreshold case, or it agrees with W_0, W_0^+, W_0^- up to the symmetries of the equation.

Our aim of this paper is to extend the classification results of [17] for the classical Schrödinger equation ($b = 0$) to the inhomogeneous case ($b > 0$). For the inhomogeneous NLS (1.1), the presence of the inhomogeneity $|x|^{-b}$ makes substantial differences. It breaks the translation symmetry of the equation and, at the same time, creates nontrivial singularity at the origin. As a consequence of the singularity of $|x|^{-b}$, we see that the ground state (1.2), which is also a stationary solution of (1.1), becomes singular at the origin. This will make the spectral analysis of the linearized operator (Proposition 2.21) and the estimates of the modulation parameters (Lemma 4.4) more difficult. Similar situations also occur in the study of threshold solutions for the intercritical inhomogeneous NLS and the energy critical NLS with inverse square potential (see [8, 46]). To address this issue, we adapt the argument of [8, 17, 46] within the Lorentz framework and work with a restricted range of b throughout the paper to ensure better regularity of W at the origin.

Furthermore, the construction of special threshold solutions W^\pm in Theorem 1.2 relies heavily on the expansion of $J(W^{-1}v_k)$, where J is real-analytic for $\{|z| < 1\}$ (see (3.5)), and the function v_k is the difference between the approximate solution and the ground state (see (3.2)). Unlike [8, 9, 17, 34], where either v_k is a Schwartz function or the nonlinearity is polynomial, in our case, these conditions no longer hold. We therefore need to make additional efforts to expand $J(W^{-1}v_k)$. Specifically, we work in dimensions $3 \leq d \leq 5$ and use Sobolev embedding to prove that the eigenfunctions $\mathcal{Y}_\pm \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (see Lemma 2.23). Then, using the spectral properties of the linearized operator, we inductively construct v_k such that it belongs to L_x^∞ and also includes a time exponential decay factor. Consequently, utilizing the real analyticity of J for $|z| < 1$, $J(W^{-1}v_k)$ can be expanded when time is sufficiently large (see Lemma 3.1 and the last part of Appendix C for details).

On the other hand, although the inhomogeneity $|x|^{-b}$ breaks the translation symmetry (thus breaking conservation of momentum and Galilean invariance), it also brings some advantages. In fact, due to the decay of the inhomogeneous coefficient $|x|^{-b}$ at infinity, we are able to construct scattering solutions associated with initial data involving translation parameters x_n with $|x_n| \rightarrow \infty$ (Proposition 2.13). Therefore, in Section 6, when we apply profile decomposition to nonscattering subcritical threshold solutions, the resulting moving spatial center $x(t)$ must be bounded. Consequently, after a translation, we can choose $x(t) \equiv 0$ for the nonscattering compact solution. This effectively places us in the same situation as in the radial case. Hence, in Theorem 1.5, we do not need to assume radial symmetry for the initial data. Recall that for the classical Schrödinger equation in dimensions $d = 3, 4$, the initial data still needs to be radially symmetric ([9, 17, 34, 43]).

The argument for Theorems 1.2 and 1.5 proceeds as follows:

The first main step (carried out in Section 3) is to construct the special threshold solutions W^\pm in Theorem 1.2 and prove that they exponentially approach the ground state in the positive time direction. The analysis starts with linearizing (1.1) around the ground state W and obtaining the linearized equation (2.15) with the linearized Schrödinger operator \mathcal{L} . Based on the spectral properties of \mathcal{L} (Lemma 2.23), we construct approximate solutions W_k^a of (1.1) in suitable Lorentz spaces which is quite different from previous construction (Lemma 3.1). Finally, in Proposition 3.2, we upgrade the approximate solutions W_k^a to true solutions W^a via a fixed point argument. The solutions W^a are essentially the special threshold solutions W^\pm appearing in Theorem 1.2 (Corollary 8.4).

The second main step (carried out in Section 6 and Section 7) is to classify forward-global threshold solutions in certain scenarios. In Proposition 6.1, we first show that if a forward-global subcritical threshold solution u fails

to scatter, then there exist $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mu, c > 0$ such that for all $t \geq 0$

$$(1.3) \quad \|u(t, x) - W_{[\theta, \mu]}(x)\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim e^{-ct},$$

where $W_{[\theta, \mu]}(x) := e^{i\theta} \lambda^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} W(\lambda^{-1}x)$. The idea is first to use the concentration compactness arguments to show it satisfies a compactness property in \dot{H}^1 (Proposition 6.2). Then we combine the Virial estimates (Lemma 5.1) and modulation analysis (Lemma 4.4) to establish the desired convergence (1.3). In Proposition 7.1, we prove the exponential convergence similar to (1.3) for forward-global supercritical threshold solutions, relying once again on Virial estimates and modulation analysis. The Virial estimates and the modulation analysis are prerequisite for both arguments. When the solution is away from the orbit of the ground state, we use the monotonicity formula arising from Virial to control the solution. When the solution approaches the orbit of W , we use modulation analysis to obtain a suitable decomposition to control the solution. These estimates will eventually ensure that the distance between the solution and the ground state

$$\mathbf{d}(u(t)) := \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|\nabla u(t, x)|^2 - |\nabla W(x)|^2) dx \right|$$

converges to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$, thus the modulation decomposition (4.9) holds for sufficiently large t . Furthermore, combining the estimates in Lemma 4.4 with $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{d}(u(t)) = 0$, we see that the parameters in (4.9) converge as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Finally, by replacing the modulation parameters in (4.9) with their corresponding limit functions, we obtain (1.3).

The last step (carried out in Section 8) is to use the positivity of the quadratic form Q (Lemma 2.24) to analyze the property of the exponentially small solution of the linearized equation, then apply it to establish the uniqueness property for solutions converging exponentially to the ground state. The uniqueness property shows that for any threshold solution u that satisfies (1.3), there exists $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $u = (W^a)_{[\theta, \mu]}$. As a corollary of the uniqueness property (Corollary 8.4), all of the solutions W^a constructed in Lemma 3.1 are in fact equal to W^+ or W^- (up to the symmetries). Therefore, combining the first and second steps above, we can then obtain the desired classification results in Theorem 1.5.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we recall the Cauchy theory for (1.1) and the variational property of the ground state. We also analyze the linearized equation associated with (1.1) near the ground W , and perform the detailed spectral analysis of the linearized operator \mathcal{L} . In Section 3, we use the contraction argument to construct special threshold solutions W^\pm in Theorem 1.2. In Section 4, we perform the modulation analysis for solutions around the ground state. In Section 5, we establish Virial estimates by incorporating the modulation estimates developed in Section 4. In Section 6 and Section 7, we study the forward-global threshold solutions in the subcritical case and supercritical case, respectively. In Section 8, we establish the uniqueness of the special solutions and this will imply the classification results of threshold solutions in Theorem 1.5. In Appendix, we show the asymptotic behavior of $G(r)$ introduced in Proposition 2.21 and give the proof of Lemma 2.23 and Lemma 4.4.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout the paper, we fix $3 \leq d \leq 5$, $0 < b < -\frac{(d-4)^2}{2} + 1$ and $\alpha = \frac{4-2b}{d-2}$. We write $A \lesssim B$ to denote $A \leq CB$ for some $C > 0$. If $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$, then we write $A \approx B$. Moreover, we use $O(Y)$ to denote any quantity X such that $|X| \lesssim Y$. We use Japanese bracket $\langle x \rangle$ to denote $(1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. By $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we denote the usual Sobolev space of smoothness s in spatial variable. We write $L_t^q L_x^r$ to denote the Banach space with norm

$$\|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)} := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(t, x)|^r dx \right)^{q/r} dt \right)^{1/q},$$

with the usual modifications when q or r are equal to infinity, or when the domain $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is replaced by spacetime slab such as $I \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

2.1. Lorentz spaces and Strichartz estimates. Let f be a measurable function on \mathbb{R}^d . The distribution function of f is defined by

$$d_f(\lambda) := |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |f(x)| > \lambda\}|, \quad \lambda > 0,$$

where $|A|$ is the Lebesgue measure of a set A in \mathbb{R}^d . The decreasing rearrangement of f is defined by

$$f^*(s) := \inf \{\lambda > 0 : d_f(\lambda) \leq s\}, \quad s > 0.$$

Definition 2.1 (Lorentz spaces).

Let $0 < r < \infty$ and $0 < \rho \leq \infty$. The Lorentz space $L^{r, \rho}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is defined by

$$L^{r, \rho}(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{f \text{ is measurable on } \mathbb{R}^d : \|f\|_{L^{r, \rho}} < \infty\},$$

where

$$\|f\|_{L^{r,\rho}} := \begin{cases} (\frac{\rho}{r} \int_0^\infty (s^{1/r} f^*(s))^\rho \frac{1}{s} ds)^{1/\rho} & \text{if } \rho < \infty, \\ \sup_{s>0} s^{1/r} f^*(s) & \text{if } \rho = \infty. \end{cases}$$

We collect the following basic properties of $L^{r,\rho}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.2 (Properties of Lorentz spaces [23]).

- For $1 < r < \infty$, $L^{r,r}(\mathbb{R}^d) \equiv L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and by convention, $L^{\infty,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d) = L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$.
- For $1 < r < \infty$ and $0 < \rho_1 < \rho_2 \leq \infty$, $L^{r,\rho_1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset L^{r,\rho_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.
- For $1 < r < \infty$, $0 < \rho \leq \infty$, and $\theta > 0$, $\| |f|^\theta \|_{L^{r,\rho}} = \|f\|_{L^{\theta r, \theta \rho}}^\theta$.
- For $b > 0$, $|x|^{-b} \in L^{\frac{d}{b}, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\| |x|^{-b} \|_{L^{\frac{d}{b}, \infty}} = |B(0,1)|^{\frac{b}{d}}$, where $B(0,1)$ is the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^d .

Lemma 2.3 (Hölder's inequality [42]).

- Let $1 < r, r_1, r_2 < \infty$ and $1 \leq \rho, \rho_1, \rho_2 \leq \infty$ be such that

$$\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2}, \quad \frac{1}{\rho} \leq \frac{1}{\rho_1} + \frac{1}{\rho_2}.$$

Then for any $f \in L^{r_1, \rho_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $g \in L^{r_2, \rho_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\|fg\|_{L^{r,\rho}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{r_1, \rho_1}} \|g\|_{L^{r_2, \rho_2}}.$$

- Let $1 < r_1, r_2 < \infty$ and $1 \leq \rho_1, \rho_2 \leq \infty$ be such that

$$1 = \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2}, \quad 1 \leq \frac{1}{\rho_1} + \frac{1}{\rho_2}.$$

Then for any $f \in L^{r_1, \rho_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $g \in L^{r_2, \rho_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\|fg\|_{L^1} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{r_1, \rho_1}} \|g\|_{L^{r_2, \rho_2}}.$$

Lemma 2.4 (Interpolation [42]). Let $1 < p, p_1, p_2 < \infty$, $1 \leq q, q_1, q_2 \leq \infty$ and $0 < \theta < 1$ be such that

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{\theta}{p_1} + \frac{1-\theta}{p_2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{q} \leq \frac{\theta}{q_1} + \frac{1-\theta}{q_2}.$$

Then for any $f \in L^{p_1, q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{p_2, q_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,q}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p_1, q_1}}^\theta \|f\|_{L^{p_2, q_2}}^{1-\theta}.$$

Lemma 2.5 (Convolution inequality [42]). Let $1 < r, r_1, r_2 < \infty$ and $1 \leq \rho, \rho_1, \rho_2 \leq \infty$ be such that

$$1 + \frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2}, \quad \frac{1}{\rho} \leq \frac{1}{\rho_1} + \frac{1}{\rho_2}.$$

Then for any $f \in L^{r_1, \rho_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $g \in L^{r_2, \rho_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\|f * g\|_{L^{r,\rho}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{r_1, \rho_1}} \|g\|_{L^{r_2, \rho_2}}.$$

Next, in Lemma 2.6–Lemma 2.8, we recall the Sobolev embedding, product rule, and chain rule in Lorentz spaces. We start by introducing the following definition.

Let $s \geq 0$, $1 < r < \infty$ and $1 \leq \rho \leq \infty$. We define the Sobolev-Lorentz spaces

$$\begin{aligned} W^s L^{r,\rho}(\mathbb{R}^d) &= \left\{ f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d) : (1 - \Delta)^{s/2} f \in L^{r,\rho}(\mathbb{R}^d) \right\}, \\ \dot{W}^s L^{r,\rho}(\mathbb{R}^d) &= \left\{ f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d) : (-\Delta)^{s/2} f \in L^{r,\rho}(\mathbb{R}^d) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the space of tempered distributions on \mathbb{R}^d and

$$(1 - \Delta)^{s/2} f = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left((1 + |\xi|^2)^{s/2} \mathcal{F}(f) \right), \quad (-\Delta)^{s/2} f = \mathcal{F}^{-1} (|\xi|^s \mathcal{F}(f))$$

with \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}^{-1} the Fourier and its inverse Fourier transforms respectively. The spaces $W^s L^{r,\rho}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\dot{W}^s L^{r,\rho}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are endowed respectively with the norms

$$\|f\|_{W^s L^{r,\rho}} = \|f\|_{L^{r,\rho}} + \|(-\Delta)^{s/2} f\|_{L^{r,\rho}}, \quad \|f\|_{\dot{W}^s L^{r,\rho}} = \|(-\Delta)^{s/2} f\|_{L^{r,\rho}}.$$

For simplicity, when $s = 1$ we write $W L^{r,\rho} := W^1 L^{r,\rho}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\dot{W} L^{r,\rho} := \dot{W}^1 L^{r,\rho}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Lemma 2.6 (Sobolev embedding[14]). Let $1 < r < \infty$, $1 \leq \rho \leq \infty$ and $0 < s < \frac{d}{r}$. Then

$$\|f\|_{L^{\frac{dr}{d-sr}, \rho}} \lesssim \|(-\Delta)^{s/2} f\|_{L^{r,\rho}} \quad \text{for any } f \in \dot{W}^s L^{r,\rho}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Lemma 2.7 (Product rule[12]). *Let $s \geq 0, 1 < r, r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, < \infty$, and $1 \leq \rho, \rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3, \rho_4 \leq \infty$ be such that*

$$\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2} = \frac{1}{r_3} + \frac{1}{r_4}, \quad \frac{1}{\rho} = \frac{1}{\rho_1} + \frac{1}{\rho_2} = \frac{1}{\rho_3} + \frac{1}{\rho_4}.$$

Then for any $f \in \dot{W}^s L^{r_1, \rho_1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{r_3, \rho_3}$ and $g \in \dot{W}^s L^{r_4, \rho_4} \cap L^{r_2, \rho_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we have

$$\|(-\Delta)^{s/2}(fg)\|_{L^{r, \rho}} \lesssim \|(-\Delta)^{s/2}f\|_{L^{r_1, \rho_1}} \|g\|_{L^{r_2, \rho_2}} + \|f\|_{L^{r_3, \rho_3}} \|(-\Delta)^{s/2}g\|_{L^{r_4, \rho_4}}.$$

Lemma 2.8 (Chain rule[1]). *Let $s \in [0, 1], F \in C^1(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C})$ and $1 < p, p_1, p_2 < \infty, 1 \leq q, q_1, q_2 < \infty$ be such that*

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

Then

$$\|(-\Delta)^{s/2}F(f)\|_{L^{p, q}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|F'(f)\|_{L^{p_1, q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|(-\Delta)^{s/2}f\|_{L^{p_2, q_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

At the end of this subsection, we recall the Strichartz estimates in the Lorentz spcae.

Definition 2.9 (Admissibility). *A pair (p, n) is said to be Schrödinger admissible, for short $(p, n) \in \Lambda$, where*

$$\Lambda = \left\{ (p, n) : 2 \leq p, n \leq \infty, \frac{2}{p} + \frac{d}{n} = \frac{d}{2}, (p, n, d) \neq (2, \infty, 2) \right\}.$$

Proposition 2.10 (Strichartz estimates[27, 44]).

- *Let $(m, n) \in \Lambda$ with $r < \infty$. Then for any $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$*

$$\|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{L_t^m L_x^{n, 2}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L_x^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

- *Let $(q_1, r_1), (q_2, r_2) \in \Lambda$ with $r_1, r_2 < \infty, t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval containing t_0 . Then for any $F \in L_t^{q_2'} L_x^{r_2', 2}(I \times \mathbb{R}^d)$*

$$\left\| \int_{t_0}^t e^{i(t-\tau)\Delta} F(\tau) d\tau \right\|_{L_t^{q_1} L_x^{r_1, 2}(I \times \mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|F\|_{L_t^{q_2'} L_x^{r_2', 2}(I \times \mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

2.2. Preliminaries on the Cauchy problem. In this subsection, we recall some results on the Cauchy problem (1.1). Let I be an interval and denote

$$\|f\|_{S(I)} := \|f\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p, 2}(I \times \mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad \|f\|_{Z(I)} := \|\nabla f\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p, 2}(I \times \mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad \|f\|_{N(I)} := \|f\|_{L_t^2 L_x^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(I \times \mathbb{R}^d)},$$

where

$$\gamma := 2(\alpha + 1), \quad \rho := \frac{2d(\alpha + 1)}{d + 2 - 2b + 2\alpha}, \quad p := \frac{2d(\alpha + 1)}{d - 2b}$$

satisfy

$$(2.1) \quad \frac{d+2}{2d} = \frac{b}{d} + \frac{\alpha}{p} + \frac{1}{\rho} = \frac{b+1}{d} + \frac{\alpha+1}{p}, \quad \frac{1}{2} = \frac{\alpha+1}{\gamma}.$$

Theorem 2.11 ([1, 39]). *For any $u_0 \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a unique maximal solution $u : (-T_-(u_0), T_+(u_0)) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ to (1.1) with $u(t_0) = u_0$. This solution also has the following properties:*

- If $T_+ = T_+(u_0) < \infty$, then $\|u\|_{S(0, T_+)} = +\infty$. An analogous result holds for $T_-(u_0)$.*
- If $\|u\|_{S(0, T_+)} < +\infty$, then $T_+ = \infty$ and u scatters as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. An analogous result holds for $T_-(u_0)$.*
- For any $\psi \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there exist $T > 0$ and a solution $u : (T, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ to (1.1) obeying $e^{-it\Delta}u(t) \rightarrow \psi$ in \dot{H}^1 as $t \rightarrow \infty$. The analogous statement holds backward in time.*
- There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that if $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^1} < \eta_0$, then u is a global solution and scatters to 0 in $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Next, we record the following stability result of the Cauchy problem (1.1).

Proposition 2.12 ([39]). *Suppose $\tilde{u} : I \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ obeys*

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{L_t^\infty \dot{H}_x^1(I \times \mathbb{R}^d)} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{S(I)} \leq E < \infty.$$

There exists $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(E) > 0$ such that if

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \{ (i\partial_t + \Delta)\tilde{u} + |x|^{-b}|\tilde{u}|^\alpha \tilde{u} \}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(I \times \mathbb{R}^d)} &\leq \varepsilon < \varepsilon_1, \\ \|e^{i(t-t_0)\Delta}[u_0 - \tilde{u}|_{t=t_0}]\|_{S(I)} &\leq \varepsilon < \varepsilon_1, \end{aligned}$$

for some $t_0 \in I$ and $u_0 \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\|u_0 - \tilde{u}|_{t=t_0}\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim_E 1$, then there exists a unique solution $u : I \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ to (1.1) with $u|_{t=t_0} = u_0$, which satisfies

$$\|u - \tilde{u}\|_{S(I)} \lesssim \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{L_t^\infty \dot{H}_x^1(I \times \mathbb{R}^d)} + \|u\|_{S(I)} \lesssim_E 1.$$

Given $\phi \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and a diverging sequence $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, we can deduce from Proposition 2.12 that, for n sufficiently large, the solution v_n to the Cauchy problem (1.1) with initial data $\phi(x - x_n)$ exists globally and scatters. In fact, by approximating $e^{it\Delta}\phi(x)$ with a smooth, compactly supported function $\psi(t, x)$ and using the decay of $|x|^{-b}$ at infinity, we can directly verify that the scattering solutions $\tilde{u}_n(t, x) =: e^{it\Delta}\phi(x - x_n)$ are good approximate solutions of v_n when n is sufficiently large. Furthermore, performing a spatial rescaling, we can obtain the following result:

Proposition 2.13 ([39]). *Let $\lambda_n \in (0, \infty)$, $x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $t_n \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|x_n|}{\lambda_n} = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad t_n \equiv 0 \quad \text{or} \quad t_n \rightarrow \pm\infty.$$

Let $\phi \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and define

$$\phi_n(x) = \lambda_n^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} [e^{it_n \Delta} \phi] \left(\frac{x - x_n}{\lambda_n} \right).$$

Then for all n sufficiently large, there exists a global solution v_n to (1.1) satisfying

$$v_n(0) = \phi_n \quad \text{and} \quad \|v_n\|_{S(I)} \lesssim \|\nabla v_n\|_{Z(I)} \lesssim 1,$$

with implicit constant depending only on $\|\phi\|_{\dot{H}^1}$.

2.3. Variational property of the ground state W . The ground state (1.2) solves the nonlinear elliptic equation

$$(2.2) \quad \Delta W + |x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+1} = 0,$$

and is characterized as the optimizers in Sobolev embedding inequality (Proposition 2.14).

Multiplying (2.2) by W and integrating by parts yields the Pohozaev's identity

$$(2.3) \quad \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 = \||x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+2}\|_{L^1}.$$

Proposition 2.14. *Let $d \geq 3$. Then for any $f \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$*

$$(2.4) \quad \||x|^{-b} |f|^{\alpha+2}\|_{L^1} \leq \||x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+2}\|_{L^1} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^{-(\alpha+2)} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2}^{\alpha+2}.$$

Moreover, equality holds in (2.4) if and only if $f(x) = zW(\lambda x)$ for some $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and some $\lambda > 0$.

The main tool that we need to prove Proposition 2.14 is the following bubble decomposition of [21].

Lemma 2.15 ([21]). *For any bounded sequence $\{f_n\}$ in \dot{H}^1 , the following holds up to a subsequence. There exist $J^* \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$; profiles $\phi^j \in \dot{H}^1 \setminus \{0\}$; scaling parameters $\lambda_n^j \in (0, \infty)$; space translation parameters $x_n^j \in \mathbb{R}^d$; and remainders w_n^J so that the following decomposition holds for $1 \leq J \leq J^*$:*

$$(2.5) \quad f_n(x) = \sum_{j=1}^J (\lambda_n^j)^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} \phi^j \left(\frac{x - x_n^j}{\lambda_n^j} \right) + w_n^J,$$

satisfying

$$(2.6) \quad \limsup_{J \rightarrow J^*} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|w_n^J\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}} = 0,$$

$$(2.7) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|\nabla f_n\|_{L^2}^2 - \sum_{j=1}^J \|\nabla \phi^j\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\nabla w_n^J\|_{L^2}^2 \right\} = 0,$$

$$(2.8) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \int |x|^{-b} |f_n|^{\alpha+2} dx - \sum_{j=1}^J \int |x|^{-b} |\phi^j(x - \frac{x_n^j}{\lambda_n^j})|^{\alpha+2} dx - \int |x|^{-b} |w_n^J|^{\alpha+2} dx \right\} = 0.$$

In addition, we may assume that either $x_n^j \equiv 0$ or $\frac{|x_n^j|}{\lambda_n^j} \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 2.16. In [21], the potential energy decoupling in (2.8) is given in terms of the $L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}$ norm. However, the same arguments suffices to establish decoupling for the functional appearing in (2.8).

Proof of Proposition 2.14. By the standard rearrangement inequalities (c.f. [36, Ch. 3]), the optimal constant can be determined by the consideration of radial functions alone. Moreover, as $\int |x|^{-b}|f(x)|^{\alpha+2}$ is strictly monotone under rearrangement, any optimizer must be radial. Let f_n be an optimizing sequence of radial functions for the problem

$$\text{maximize } J(f) := \||x|^{-b}|f|^{\alpha+2}\|_{L^1} \div \|\nabla f\|_{L^2}^{\alpha+2} \quad \text{subject to the constraint } \|f\|_{\dot{H}^1} = 1.$$

Applying Lemma 2.15, and passing to the requisite subsequence yields

$$(2.9) \quad \sup_f J(f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} J(f_n) \leq \limsup_{J \rightarrow J^*} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^J \int |x|^{-b} |\phi^j(x - \frac{x_n^j}{\lambda_n^j})|^{\alpha+2} dx \leq \sup_f J(f) \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} \|\phi^j\|_{\dot{H}^1}^{\alpha+2},$$

where in the first inequality we used (2.8) and

$$(2.10) \quad \limsup_{J \rightarrow J^*} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int |x|^{-b} |w_n^J|^{\alpha+2} dx = 0.$$

In fact, using Hölder's inequality and the interpolation in Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\int |x|^{-b} |w_n^J|^{\alpha+2} dx \lesssim \||x|^{-b}\|_{L^{\frac{d}{b}, \infty}} \|w_n^J\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}, \alpha+2}}^{\alpha+2} \lesssim \|w_n^J\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}, 2}}^{\alpha+2 - \frac{d\alpha}{2}} \|w_n^J\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}, \frac{2d}{d-2}}}^{\frac{d\alpha}{2}},$$

where $\alpha + 2 - \frac{d\alpha}{2} > 0$ by the assumptions made at the beginning of section 2. This inequality together with (2.6) and the embedding $\|w_n^J\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}, 2}} \lesssim \|\nabla w_n^J\|_{L^2} \lesssim 1$ yields (2.10).

On the other hand, the kinetic decoupling (2.7) guarantees that

$$(2.11) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} \|\phi^j\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f_n\|_{L^2} = 1.$$

Combining (2.9) and (2.11), we see that $J^* = 1$ and $\|\phi^1\|_{\dot{H}^1} = 1$. Since f_n is an optimizing sequence, ϕ^1 must be an optimizer for J and hence for the embedding (2.4).

The existence of optimizers is known, we turn to their characterization. Let $0 \neq f \in \dot{H}^1$ denote such an optimizer. Replacing f by βf for some $\beta > 0$, if necessary, we may assume that

$$\|f\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^{-b} |f(x)|^{\alpha+2} dx.$$

By assumption, f maximizes $\int |x|^{-b} |f(x)|^{\alpha+2} dx$ among all functions that subject to the constraint $\|f\|_{\dot{H}^1} = 1$. Thus, it satisfies the Euler–Lagrange equation $\Delta f + |x|^{-b} |f|^\alpha f = 0$; here we exploited the normalization of f to determine the Lagrange multiplier. Let $\phi = r^{\frac{d-2}{2}} f$. Recalling that all optimizers must be radial, we obtain the equation for ϕ :

$$\partial_{rr} \phi = -\frac{\partial_r \phi}{r} + \left(\frac{d-2}{2}\right)^2 \frac{\phi}{r^2} - \frac{1}{r} |\phi|^\alpha \phi.$$

Multiplying the above equation by $2r^2 \partial_r \phi$ and then integrating, we get

$$(2.12) \quad r^2 (\partial_r \phi)^2 = \left(\frac{d-2}{2}\right)^2 \phi^2 - \frac{2}{\alpha+2} |\phi|^{\alpha+2} + c.$$

As $f \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there is a sequence $r_n \rightarrow \infty$ so that $|(\partial_r f_n)(r_n)| + |\frac{1}{r_n} f(r_n)| = o(r_n^{-d/2})$. Thus, the constant c in (2.12) is zero. The resulting first-order ODE is separable:

$$\int \frac{d\phi}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{d-2}{2}\right)^2 \phi^2 - \frac{2}{\alpha+2} |\phi|^{\alpha+2}}} = \pm \int \frac{dr}{r}.$$

Letting $g = \sqrt{1 - \frac{4}{(d-2)(d-b)} |\phi|^\alpha}$ and carrying out the requisite integrals, we then deduce that $f(x) = \lambda^{\frac{d-2}{2}} W(\lambda x)$ for some $\lambda > 0$. \square

Finally, we show the persistence of the Kinetic energy.

Lemma 2.17. *Let $u \in C(I, \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ be a solution of (1.1) with initial data u_0 , and $I = (-T_-, T_+)$ its maximal interval of existence. Assume that $E(u_0) = E(W)$*

- (a) if $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$, then $\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$ for $t \in I$;
- (b) if $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} = \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$, then $u = W$ up to the symmetry of the equation;
- (c) if $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} > \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$, then $\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} > \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$ for $t \in I$.

Proof. Case (b) is a direct consequence of the variational characterization of W given by Proposition 2.14. We now prove (a). If $\|\nabla u(t_0)\|_{L^2} = \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$ for some $t_0 \in I$, then (b) implies that $u = W$ up to the symmetry of the equation. This contradicts $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$. The proof of (c) is similar to (a), so we omit the details. \square

2.4. The linearized operator around the ground state W . Consider a solution u of (1.1) close to W and let $v(t, x) := u(t, x) - W(x)$, then $v = v_1 + iv_2$ satisfies the Schrödinger equation

$$i\partial_t v + \Delta v + \mathcal{V}(v) + iR(v) = 0,$$

where the linear operator

$$(2.13) \quad \mathcal{V}(v) := (\alpha + 1)|x|^{-b}W^\alpha v_1 + i|x|^{-b}W^\alpha v_2,$$

and the remainder

$$(2.14) \quad R(v) := -i|x|^{-b}|W + v|^\alpha(W + v) + i|x|^{-b}W^{\alpha+1} + i(\alpha + 1)|x|^{-b}W^\alpha v_1 - |x|^{-b}W^\alpha v_2.$$

We will always write equally $f = \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix}$ for a complex valued function f with real part f_1 and imaginary part f_2 . Then v is a solution of the equation

$$(2.15) \quad \partial_t v + \mathcal{L}(v) + R(v) = 0, \quad \mathcal{L} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Delta + |x|^{-b}W^\alpha \\ -\Delta - (\alpha + 1)|x|^{-b}W^\alpha & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

We will use the following linear and nonlinear estimates about the linearized equation (2.15). Recall that the function spaces $N(I)$, $Z(I)$ are introduced in subsection 2.2.

Lemma 2.18 (Linear estimates). *Let \mathcal{V} be defined by (2.13) and I be a finite time interval of length $|I|$. Then*

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{V}(f)\|_{N(I)} \lesssim |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{7}} \|f\|_{Z(I)}.$$

Proof. By $|\nabla W| \lesssim |x|^{-1}W$, we get the pointwise bound

$$|\nabla \mathcal{V}(f)| \lesssim |x|^{-b-1}W^\alpha |f| + |x|^{-b}W^\alpha |\nabla f|.$$

It then follows from (2.1), Hölder's inequality and the embedding $\dot{W}^{1,\rho}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow L^\rho(\mathbb{R}^d)$ that

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{V}(f)\|_{N(I)} \lesssim \|W\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}}^\alpha (\|f\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}} + \|\nabla f\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}}) \lesssim |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{7}} \|f\|_{Z(I)}.$$

Lemma 2.18 is proved. \square

Lemma 2.19 (Non-linear estimates). *Let R be defined by (2.14) and I be a finite time interval. Then*

$$(2.16) \quad \|R(f) - R(g)\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+2},2}} \lesssim \|f - g\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2},2}} \left[\|f\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2},2}} + \|g\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2},2}} + \|f\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2},2}}^\alpha + \|g\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2},2}}^\alpha \right]$$

and

$$\|\nabla R(f) - \nabla R(g)\|_{N(I)} \lesssim \|f - g\|_{Z(I)} \left[|I|^{\frac{\alpha-1}{7}} (\|f\|_{Z(I)} + \|g\|_{Z(I)}) + \|f\|_{Z(I)}^\alpha + \|g\|_{Z(I)}^\alpha \right].$$

Recall that $\alpha \geq 1$ by the assumptions made at the begining of section 2.

Proof. We have

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} R(f) &= -i|x|^{-b} \left[|W + v|^\alpha(W + v) - W^{\alpha+1} - \frac{\alpha+2}{2}W^\alpha f - \frac{\alpha}{2}W^\alpha \bar{f} \right] \\ &= -i|x|^{-b}W^{\alpha+1}J(W^{-1}f), \end{aligned}$$

where J is the function defined on \mathbb{C} by

$$(2.18) \quad J(z) = |1+z|^\alpha(1+z) - 1 - \frac{\alpha+2}{2}W^\alpha z - \frac{\alpha}{2}W^\alpha \bar{z}.$$

Since $\alpha \geq 1$, J is of class C^2 on \mathbb{C} and $J(0) = \partial_z J(0) = \partial_{\bar{z}} J(0) = 0$. Hence

$$(2.19) \quad |J'(z)| \lesssim |z| + |z|^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad |J''(z)| \lesssim 1 + |z|^{\alpha-1}.$$

By (2.19), we get the pointwise bound

$$|R(f) - R(g)| \lesssim |x|^{-b} [W^{\alpha-1}(|f| + |g|) + |f|^\alpha + |g|^\alpha] |f - g|,$$

which yields (2.16) using Hölder's inequality

$$\||x|^{-b}abc^{\alpha-1}\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+2},2}} \lesssim \||x|^{-b}\|_{L^{\frac{d}{b},\infty}} \|a\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2},2}} \|b\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2},2}} \|c\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2},2}}^{\alpha-1}.$$

On the other hand, by (2.19) and $|\nabla W| \lesssim |x|^{-1}W$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\nabla R(f) - \nabla R(g)| \\ & \lesssim |x|^{-b-1}[W^{\alpha-1}(|f| + |g|) + |f|^\alpha + |g|^\alpha]|f - g| \\ & \quad + |x|^{-b}[W^{\alpha-1}(|\nabla f| + |\nabla g|) + (|f|^{\alpha-1} + |g|^{\alpha-1})(|\nabla f| + |\nabla g|)]|f - g| \\ & \quad + |x|^{-b}[W^{\alpha-1}(|f| + |g|) + |f|^\alpha + |g|^\alpha]|\nabla(f - g)|. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from (2.1), Hölder's inequality and Sobolev's embedding that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla R(f) - \nabla R(g)\|_{N(I)} \\ & \lesssim \left[\|W\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}}^{\alpha-1} (\|f\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}} + \|g\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}}) + \|f\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}}^\alpha + \|g\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}}^\alpha \right] \|f - g\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}} \\ & \quad + \left[\|W\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}}^{\alpha-1} (\|\nabla f\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}} + \|\nabla g\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}}) + (\|f\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}}^{\alpha-1} + \|g\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}}^{\alpha-1}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times (\|\nabla f\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}} + \|\nabla g\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}}) \right] \|f - g\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}} \\ & \quad + [\|W\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}}^{\alpha-1} (\|f\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}} + \|g\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}}) + \|f\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}}^\alpha + \|g\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}}^\alpha] \|\nabla(f - g)\|_{L_t^\gamma L_x^{p,2}} \\ & \lesssim \|f - g\|_{Z(I)} \left[|I|^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\gamma}} (\|f\|_{Z(I)} + \|g\|_{Z(I)}) + \|f\|_{Z(I)}^\alpha + \|g\|_{Z(I)}^\alpha \right], \end{aligned}$$

which yields the second estimate in Lemma 2.19. \square

By the Strichartz estimate, Lemma 2.18 and Lemma 2.19, we have

Lemma 2.20. *Let v be a solution of (2.15). Assume for some $c_0 > 0$*

$$\|v(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim e^{-c_0 t}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Then for any Strichartz couple (p, q) ,

$$\|v\|_{Z(t,+\infty)} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^p(t,+\infty;L^{q,2})} \lesssim e^{-c_0 t}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Proof. For small τ_0 , by the Strichartz estimate and Lemmas 2.18-2.19, we have on $I_\tau = [\tau, \tau + \tau_0]$

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{Z(I_\tau)} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^p(I_\tau;L^{q,2})} & \lesssim e^{-c_0 \tau} + \|\nabla \mathcal{V}(v)\|_{N(I_\tau)} + \|\nabla R(v)\|_{N(I_\tau)} \\ & \lesssim e^{-c_0 \tau} + \tau_0^{\frac{\alpha}{\gamma}} \|v\|_{Z(I_\tau)} + \|v\|_{Z(I_\tau)}^2 + \|v\|_{Z(I_\tau)}^{\alpha+1}. \end{aligned}$$

By choosing sufficiently small τ_0 , the continuous argument gives that

$$(2.20) \quad \|v\|_{Z(I_\tau)} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^p(I_\tau;L^{q,2})} \lesssim e^{-c_0 \tau}.$$

Summing up (2.20) at time $\tau = t, \tau = t + \tau_0, \tau = t + 2\tau_0, \dots$, and using the triangle inequality, we get desired estimate in Lemma 2.20. \square

2.5. Spectral properties of the linearized operator. Since W is a critical point of the energy E , we have the following development of the energy near W : For any $g \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\|g\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ small,

$$(2.21) \quad E(W + g) = E(W) + Q(g) + O(\|g\|_{\dot{H}^1}^3),$$

where Q is the quadratic form on $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ defined by

$$(2.22) \quad Q(g) := \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla g|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \int |x|^{-b} W^\alpha ((\alpha + 1)(\text{Re}g)^2 + (\text{Im}g)^2) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Im} \int (\mathcal{L}g)\bar{g},$$

with the operator \mathcal{L} defined by (2.15).

Let us specify the important coercivity properties of Q , which will be used in the later Sections. Consider the three orthogonal directions W, iW and

$$(2.23) \quad W_1 := -\frac{d}{d\lambda} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^{\frac{d-2}{2}}} W\left(\frac{x}{\lambda}\right) \right) \Big|_{\lambda=1} = \frac{d-2}{2} W + x \cdot \nabla W$$

in the real Hilbert space $\dot{H}^1 = \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C})$. Let

$$H := \text{span} \{W, iW, W_1\}$$

and H^\perp its orthogonal subspace in \dot{H}^1 for the usual product. Inspired by [46], we can show that the three directions, W_1, iW, W are the only nonpositive directions of the quadratic form Q .

Proposition 2.21. *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for all function $f \in H^1$, we have*

$$Q(f) \geq c\|f\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2.$$

Proof. Let $f_1 := \operatorname{Re}f$, $f_2 = \operatorname{Im}f$. We have

$$Q(f) = \frac{1}{2}(L_+f_1, f_1)_{L^2} + \frac{1}{2}(L_-f_2, f_2)_{L^2},$$

where

$$L_+ := -\Delta - (\alpha + 1)|x|^{-b}W^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad L_- := -\Delta - |x|^{-b}W^\alpha.$$

We first consider the operator L_+ and show that there is only one negative direction in the sense that for any real scalar valued function $v \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and

$$(2.24) \quad (-\Delta v, W)_{L^2} = 0,$$

we have

$$(2.25) \quad (L_+v, v)_{L^2} \geq 0.$$

Indeed, we will see that this is an implication of the fact that W is the constrained maximizer. Define the trajectory

$$l(s) := \frac{\|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2}{(\|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 + s^2\|v\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2)^{1/2}}(W + sv) \quad \text{such that} \quad \|l(s)\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 = \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2.$$

It can be computed that

$$l(0) = W, \quad l_s(0) = v, \quad l_{ss}(0) = -\frac{\|v\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2}{\|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2}W.$$

From here and noting that by Proposition 2.14, W is the constrained maximizer:

$$\int |x|^{-b}W^{\alpha+2} = \sup_{\|g\|_{\dot{H}^1} = \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}} \int |x|^{-b}|g|^{\alpha+2}dx,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \frac{d^2}{ds^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^{-b}|l(s)|^{\alpha+2}dx \Big|_{s=0} \\ &= (\alpha + 2)(\alpha + 1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^{-b}l(0)^\alpha l_s^2(0) + (\alpha + 2) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^{-b}l(0)^{\alpha+1}l_{ss}(0)dx \\ &= (\alpha + 2)(\alpha + 1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^{-b}W^\alpha v^2 dx - (\alpha + 2) \frac{\|v\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2}{\|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^{-b}W^{\alpha+2} dx \\ &= -(\alpha + 2) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (-\Delta v - (\alpha + 1)|x|^{-b}W^\alpha v) \cdot v dx = -(\alpha + 2)(L_+v, v)_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

and (2.25) is proved.

Next we investigate the null direction of L_+ and it is more convenient to work in L^2 setting instead of \dot{H}^1 setting. The operator L_+ having only one negative direction in $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ implies $(-\Delta)^{-1/2}L_+(-\Delta)^{-1/2}$ has only one negative direction in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Easily we can write

$$(-\Delta)^{-1/2}L_+(-\Delta)^{-1/2} = I - (\alpha + 1)(-\Delta)^{-1/2}|x|^{-b}W^\alpha(-\Delta)^{-1/2} := I - K.$$

We have the following result for K :

Claim 2.22. $K : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a compact operator.

Postponing the proof for the moment, using this claim we know that $I - K$ has at most finitely many eigenvalues in $(-\infty, \frac{1}{2}]$ which can be ordered as

$$\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_N$$

counting multiplicity.

From the previous discussion and recall that

$$(I - K)(-\Delta)^{-1/2}W_1 = 0,$$

we know

$$\lambda_1 < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_2 = 0.$$

Our goal now is to show $\lambda_3 > 0$. Note as $I - K$ is symmetric we can choose eigenfunctions as the orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and evaluate the L^2 bilinear form $((I - K)u, u)_{L^2}$. Switching back to \dot{H}^1 setting, we immediately get the desired estimate for L_+ :

$$(L_+u, u)_{L^2} \geq \lambda_3 \|u\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2, \quad \forall u \perp_{\dot{H}^1} W, W_1.$$

Therefore it remains to show $\lambda_3 > 0$ or the kernel of $I - K$ is only one-dimensional in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. This is equivalent to showing the kernel of L_+ is one dimensional in $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The proof relies on the spherical harmonics expansion and careful study on the spatial asymptotics of the resulted ODEs.

Consider the equation

$$L_+u = 0,$$

we write u in the spherical harmonic expansion:

$$u(r, \theta) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} f_j(r) Y_j(\theta).$$

Here, $Y_j(\theta)$ is the j th spherical harmonics and $\{Y_j(\theta)\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$ form an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} Y_j(\theta) &= \mu_j Y_j(\theta), \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \dots \\ 0 &= \mu_0 < \mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \rightarrow \infty, \quad Y_0 = 1, \mu_1 = d - 1. \end{aligned}$$

In spherical harmonic expansion, we have

$$L_+u = - \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left((\partial_{rr} + \frac{d-1}{r} \partial_r - \frac{\mu_j}{r^2} + \frac{\alpha+1}{r^b} W^\alpha) f_j(r) \right) Y_j(\theta).$$

Therefore we can discuss the contribution to the kernel from each spherical harmonic starting from $j = 0$.

Case 1. $j = 0$.

As $Y_0 = 1$, the kernel function in this mode must be a spherically symmetric function $u(r)$ satisfying $L_+u = 0$, which in the radial coordinate, takes the form

$$u_{rr} + \frac{d-1}{r} u_r + \frac{\alpha+1}{r^b} W^\alpha u = 0.$$

Supposing u is a solution independent of the known radial solution W_1 , from Abel's theorem, we have

$$(2.26) \quad u_r W_1 - (W_1)_r u = \frac{C}{r^{d-1}}.$$

In the small neighborhood of $r = 0$, $W_1 \neq 0$, we can divide both sides of (2.26) by W_1^2 and obtain

$$\left(\frac{u}{W_1} \right)_r = \frac{C}{r^{d-1} W_1^2}, \quad 0 < r < \varepsilon.$$

Recalling that by (2.23) $W_1(r) = O(1)$ as $r \rightarrow 0^+$ and integrating the above equation from r to ε , we have

$$\partial_r u(r) = O\left(\frac{1}{r^{d-1}}\right) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0^+$$

and u is certainly not an \dot{H}^1 function. Therefore, W_1 is the unique radial kernel.

Case 2. $\{j \in \mathbb{N}, \mu_j = \mu_1 = d - 1\}$.

In this case, we claim that for any $G(r) \in \dot{H}_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$(2.27) \quad \text{if } L_+(G(r)Y_j(\theta)) = 0 \quad \text{then } G(r) = 0.$$

Assume by contradiction that there exists $0 \neq G(r) \in \dot{H}_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $L_+(G(r)Y_j(\theta)) = 0$. Writing the Laplacian operator in a spherical coordinate, we have

$$0 = L_+(G(r)Y_j(\theta)) = \left(-\partial_{rr} - \frac{d-1}{r} \partial_r + \frac{\mu_1}{r^2} - \frac{\alpha+1}{r^b} W^\alpha \right) G(r) \cdot Y_j(\theta),$$

which implies

$$(2.28) \quad G(r) \in \text{Ker} \left(-\Delta + \mu_1 |x|^{-2} - (\alpha+1) |x|^{-b} W^\alpha \right).$$

Our first goal toward getting a contradiction is to show the positivity of G . To this end, we take any $v \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in the spherical harmonic expansion

$$v := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} v_k(r) Y_k(\theta).$$

Since $v_k(r)Y_1(\theta) \perp_{\dot{H}^1} W = WY_0(\theta)$, it follows from (2.24) and (2.25) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & ((-\Delta + \mu_1|x|^{-2} - (\alpha + 1)|x|^{-b}W^\alpha)v_k(r), v_k(r))_{L^2} \\
 &= ((-\Delta + \mu_1|x|^{-2} - (\alpha + 1)|x|^{-b}W^\alpha)v_k(r) \cdot Y_1(\theta), v_k(r) \cdot Y_1(\theta))_{L^2} \\
 (2.29) \quad &= (L_+(v_k(r)Y_1(\theta)), v_k(r)Y_1(\theta))_{L^2} \geq 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Using (2.29), we can evaluate

$$\begin{aligned}
 & ((-\Delta + \mu_1|x|^{-2} - (\alpha + 1)|x|^{-b}W^\alpha)v, v)_{L^2} \\
 &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} ((-\Delta + \mu_1|x|^{-2} - (\alpha + 1)|x|^{-b}W^\alpha)v_k(r), v_k(r))_{L^2} \\
 &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|v_k(x)|^2}{|x|^2} dx \geq 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

This together with (2.28) implies that 0 is the first eigenvalue. Hence, $G(r) > 0$.

We now turn to looking at the equation of G and $-W'$,

$$(2.30) \quad -G'' - \frac{d-1}{r}G' + \frac{d-1}{r^2}G - \frac{\alpha+1}{r^b}W^\alpha G = 0,$$

$$(2.31) \quad -W'''' - \frac{d-1}{r}W''' + \frac{d-1}{r^2}W'' + \frac{b}{r^{b+1}}W^{\alpha+1} - \frac{\alpha+1}{r^b}W^\alpha W' = 0.$$

Computing [(2.30) $\cdot r^{d-1}W'$ - (2.31) $\cdot r^{d-1}G$], we obtain

$$r^{d-1}W''''G + (d-1)r^{d-2}W''''G - r^{d-1}W'G'' - (d-1)r^{d-2}W'G' - br^{d-b-2}W^{\alpha+1}G = 0,$$

which can be further written into

$$\frac{d}{dr}[r^{d-1}(W''G - W'G')] - br^{d-b-2}W^{\alpha+1}G = 0.$$

As $G > 0$, we obtain

$$(2.32) \quad \int_0^\infty \frac{d}{dr}[r^{d-1}(W''G - W'G')]dr = b \int_0^\infty r^{d-b-2}W^{\alpha+1}Gdr > 0.$$

Recalling the asymptotics of W and G from Appendix A

$$\begin{cases} \text{As } r \rightarrow 0^+, G(r) = O(r), G'(r) = O(1), -W'(r) = O(r^{1-b}), \\ \text{As } r \rightarrow \infty, G(r) = O(r^{-(d-1)}), G'(r) = O(r^{-d}), -W'(r) = O(r^{-(d-1)}), \end{cases}$$

we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} r^{d-1}(W''G - W'G') = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^{d-1}(W''G - W'G') = 0,$$

which contradicts (2.32). Claim (2.27) is proved.

Case 3. $\{j \in \mathbb{N}, \mu_j > \mu_1\}$.

In this case, we take any function in the form $G(r)Y_j(\theta)$, $G \neq 0$, and compute

$$L_+(G(r)Y_j(\theta)) = (-\Delta + \mu_1|x|^{-2} - (\alpha + 1)|x|^{-b}W^\alpha)G(r)Y_j(\theta) + \frac{\mu_j - \mu_1}{r^2}G(r)Y_j(\theta).$$

Using (2.29) we immediately get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (L_+(G(r)Y_j(\theta)), G(r)Y_j(\theta))_{L^2} \\
 &= ((-\Delta + \mu_1|x|^{-2} - (\alpha + 1)|x|^{-b}W^\alpha)G(r), G(r))_{L^2} + (\mu_j - \mu_1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|G(x)|^2}{|x|^2} dx > 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

This shows there is no kernel function of L_+ associated to j th spherical harmonics for those j such that $\mu_j > \mu_1$.

The positivity of λ_3 is finally proved, and we end the discussion on the operator L_+ .

On the other hand, we can get the results for L_- quickly. By Hölder inequality and Proposition 2.14, we have, for any real-valued $v \in \dot{H}^1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int |\nabla v|^2 dx - \int |x|^{-b}W^\alpha v^2 dx &\geq \int |\nabla v|^2 dx - \left(\int |x|^{-b}W^{\alpha+2} dx \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2}} \left(\int |x|^{-b}|v|^{\alpha+2} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{\alpha+2}} \\
 &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\int |x|^{-b}W^{\alpha+2} dx}{\|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2} \right) \int |\nabla v|^2 dx = 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

with equality if and only if $v \in \text{Span} \{W\}$. This shows that $\int |\nabla f_2|^2 - \int |x|^{-b} W^\alpha |f_2|^2 > 0$ for $f_2 \neq 0$, $f_2 \perp_{\dot{H}^1} W$. Note that the quadratic form $\int |\nabla \cdot|^2 - \int |x|^{-b} W^\alpha |\cdot|^2$ is a compact perturbation of $\int |\nabla \cdot|^2$. Therefore, there exists $c_2 > 0$ such that for any $f_2 \in \dot{H}^1$, $f_2 \perp_{\dot{H}^1} W$,

$$(L_- f_2, f_2) \geq c_2 \|f_2\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2.$$

Combining the two parts together, we proved the estimate for $Q(v)$.

Finally, we complete the proof by verifying Claim 2.22. Indeed, note that as $(-\Delta)^{-1/2} : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is an isometric operator and the embedding $L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow \dot{H}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is continuous, it suffices to show that $|x|^{-b} W^\alpha : \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is compact.

We first claim that

$$(2.33) \quad \left\| |x|^{-b} W^\alpha \right\|_{WL^{\frac{d}{2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d)} < +\infty.$$

In fact, using Lemma 2.7 and $W(x) = O(\langle x \rangle^{-(d-2)})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| |x|^{-b} W^\alpha \right\|_{WL^{\frac{d}{2}, 2}} \\ & \lesssim \left\| |x|^{-b} \right\|_{L^{\frac{d}{b}, \infty}} \left(\left\| W^{\alpha-1} \nabla W \right\|_{L^{\frac{d}{2-b}, 2}} + \left\| W^\alpha \right\|_{L^{\frac{d}{2-b}, 2}} \right) + \left\| |x|^{-b-1} \right\|_{L^{\frac{d}{b+1}, \infty}} \left\| W^\alpha \right\|_{L^{\frac{d}{1-b}, 2}} < +\infty, \end{aligned}$$

which yields (2.33).

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. Then for $v \in \dot{H}^1$, we have, by applying (2.33)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| |\nabla|^\varepsilon (|x|^{-b} W^\alpha v) \right\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}}} \\ & \lesssim \left\| |\nabla|^\varepsilon (|x|^{-b} W^\alpha) \right\|_{L^{\frac{d}{2}, 2}} \|v\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}, 2}} + \left\| |x|^{-b} W^\alpha \right\|_{L^{\frac{d}{2-\varepsilon}, 2}} \left\| |\nabla|^\varepsilon v \right\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2+2\varepsilon}, 2}} \\ & \lesssim \left\| |\nabla|^\varepsilon (|x|^{-b} W^\alpha) \right\|_{L^{\frac{d}{2}, 2}} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|v\|_{\dot{H}^1}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left\| \chi_R |x|^{-b} W^\alpha v \right\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}}} \lesssim R^{-b} \left\| W^\alpha \right\|_{L^{\frac{d}{2}, 2}} \|v\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}, 2}} \lesssim R^{-b} \|v\|_{\dot{H}^1}.$$

The desired compactness of $|x|^{-b} W^\alpha$ is proved, hence Claim 2.22. Proposition 2.21 is finally proved. \square

Following the arguments in [8, 17, 18, 34], we have the following spectral properties of \mathcal{L} that defined in (2.15). For the sake of completeness, we will give the proof in Appendix C.

Lemma 2.23. *Let $\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ denote the spectrum of the operator \mathcal{L} , defined on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with domain $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and let $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{L})$ its essential spectrum. Then we have*

(a) *The operator \mathcal{L} admits two eigenfunctions $\mathcal{Y}_+, \mathcal{Y}_- \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with real eigenvalues $\pm e_0$, $e_0 > 0$, i.e. $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Y}_\pm = \pm e_0 \mathcal{Y}_\pm$, $\mathcal{Y}_+ = \overline{\mathcal{Y}_-}$.*

(b) *If $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$, then*

$$(2.34) \quad \left\| \varphi\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) \mathcal{Y}_\pm \right\|_{H^k} \lesssim_{\phi, k, l} \frac{1}{R^l}, \quad \forall R \geq 1.$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{Y}_\pm \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap W^3 L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

(c) *If $\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(\mathcal{L})$ and $F \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is such that*

$$(2.35) \quad \left\| \psi\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) F \right\|_{H^k} \lesssim_{\psi, k, l} \frac{1}{R^l} \quad \forall R \geq 1,$$

for any $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$, then the solution $f \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to

$$\mathcal{L}f - \lambda f = F$$

also satisfies

$$(2.36) \quad \left\| \phi\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) f \right\|_{H^k} \lesssim_{\phi, k, l} \frac{1}{R^l}$$

for any $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$. Moreover, if for some $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, $F \in H^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap WL^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap W^3 L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

(d) $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{L}) = \{i\xi : \xi \in \mathbb{R}\}$, $\sigma(\mathcal{L}) \cap \mathbb{R} = \{-e_0, 0, e_0\}$.

At the end of this subsection, we utilize the spectral properties of \mathcal{L} from Lemma 2.23 to give a subspace G^\perp of \dot{H}^1 , in which Q is positive definite.

Consider the symmetric bilinear form B on \dot{H}^1 such that $Q(f) = B(f, f)$:

$$(2.37) \quad \begin{aligned} B(f, g) := \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im} \int (\mathcal{L}f) \bar{g} &= \frac{1}{2} \int \nabla f_1 \nabla g_1 - \frac{\alpha+1}{2} \int |x|^{-b} W^\alpha f_1 g_1 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int \nabla f_2 \nabla g_2 - \frac{1}{2} \int |x|^{-b} W^\alpha f_2 g_2. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence of the definition of B , we have

$$(2.38) \quad B(f, g) = B(g, f), \quad B(iW, f) = B(W_1, f) = 0, \quad \forall f, g \in \dot{H}^1,$$

$$(2.39) \quad B(\mathcal{L}f, g) = -B(f, \mathcal{L}g), \quad \forall f, g \in \dot{H}^1, \quad \mathcal{L}f, \mathcal{L}g \in \dot{H}^1$$

$$(2.40) \quad Q(\mathcal{Y}_+) = Q(\mathcal{Y}_-) = 0.$$

Based on Proposition 2.21 and (2.38)–(2.40), we have the following coercivity of Q on G^\perp :

Lemma 2.24. *Let $G^\perp = \{v \in \dot{H}^1 : (iW, v)_{\dot{H}^1} = (W_1, v)_{\dot{H}^1} = B(\mathcal{Y}_+, v) = B(\mathcal{Y}_-, v) = 0\}$. There exists $c > 0$ such that*

$$Q(f) \geq c \|f\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2, \quad \forall f \in G^\perp.$$

Proof. We first claim that $B(\mathcal{Y}_+, \mathcal{Y}_-) \neq 0$. In fact, if $B(\mathcal{Y}_+, \mathcal{Y}_-) = 0$, then Q would be identically 0 on $\operatorname{Span} \{iW, W_1, \mathcal{Y}_+, \mathcal{Y}_-\}$ which is of dimension 4. But Q is, by Proposition 2.21, positive definite on H^\perp , which is of codimension 3, yielding a contradiction.

We next claim that $Q(h) > 0$ on $G^\perp \setminus \{0\}$. Assume by contradiction that there exists $h \in G^\perp \setminus \{0\}$ such that $Q(h) \leq 0$. Then by (2.38)–(2.40)

$$Q|_{\operatorname{Span} \{iW, W_1, \mathcal{Y}_+, h\}} \leq 0.$$

If for some $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\alpha iW + \beta W_1 + \gamma \mathcal{Y}_+ + \delta h = 0,$$

then $\gamma B(\mathcal{Y}_+, \mathcal{Y}_-) = 0$, which implies $\gamma = 0$. Therefore the vectors $iW, W_1, \mathcal{Y}_+, h$ are independent, since iW, W_1 and h are orthogonal in the real Hilbert space \dot{H}^1 . The fact that Q is nonpositive on a subspace of dimension 4 contradicts Proposition 2.21.

Finally, we prove the coercivity by a compactness argument. Suppose, by contradiction that there exists $\{f_n\} \in G^\perp$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q(f_n) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|f_n\|_{\dot{H}^1} = 1.$$

Up to a subsequence, we may assume $f_n \rightharpoonup f^*$ weakly in \dot{H}^1 . This implies $f^* \in G^\perp$ and

$$(2.41) \quad Q(f^*) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q(f_n) = 0.$$

Using Hölder's inequality and the decay of $|x|^{-b}$ at infinity, it is easy to see that $\int |x|^{-b} W^\alpha |\cdot|^2$ is a compact operator. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^{-b} W^\alpha ((\alpha+1)(\operatorname{Re} f^*)^2 + (\operatorname{Im} f^*)^2) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^{-b} W^\alpha ((\alpha+1)(\operatorname{Re} f_n)^2 + (\operatorname{Im} f_n)^2) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f_n\|_{L^2}^2 - Q(f_n) = \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $f^* \neq 0$. However, this together with (2.41) contradicts the strict positivity of Q on $G^\perp \setminus \{0\}$. \square

3. EXISTENCE OF SPECIAL THRESHOLD SOLUTIONS W^\pm

In this section, we show the existence of the solutions W_\pm of Theorem 1.2. Following the arguments in [17], we first construct approximate solutions W_k^a of (1.1) by use of the spectral property of the linearized operator \mathcal{L} . Then we prove the existence of special threshold solutions W^a and W^\pm by a fixed point argument around approximate solutions.

3.1. A family of approximate solutions converging to W .

Lemma 3.1. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. There exist functions $(\Phi_j^a)_{j \geq 1}$ in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap H^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap W^3 L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, satisfying (2.35), such that $\Phi_1^a = a\mathcal{Y}_+$ and if*

$$W_k^a(t, x) := W(x) + \sum_{j=1}^k e^{-je_0 t} \Phi_j^a(x),$$

then as $t \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$(3.1) \quad i\partial_t W_k^a + \Delta W_k^a + |x|^{-b} |W_k^a|^\alpha W_k^a = O(e^{-(k+1)e_0 t}) \quad \text{in} \quad WL^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Proof. For simplicity, we omit the superscript a . We will construct the functions $\Phi_j = \Phi_j^a$ by induction on j . Assume that Φ_1, \dots, Φ_k are known, and let

$$(3.2) \quad v_k := W_k - W = \sum_{j=1}^k e^{-je_0 t} \Phi_j(x).$$

By (2.15), assertion (3.1) is equivalent to

$$(3.3) \quad \varepsilon_k := \partial_t v_k + \mathcal{L}(v_k) + R(v_k) = O(e^{-(k+1)e_0 t}) \quad \text{in} \quad WL^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Step 1: $k=1$. Let $\Phi_1 := a\mathcal{Y}_+$ and $v_1(t, x) := e^{-e_0 t} \Phi_1(x)$. We have $\partial_t v_1 + \mathcal{L}(v_1) = 0$ and thus

$$\partial_t v_1 + \mathcal{L}(v_1) + R(v_1) = R(v_1).$$

Since $v_1 = ae^{-e_0 t} \mathcal{Y}_+$ and $\mathcal{Y}_+ \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap W^3 L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, it follows from Lemma 2.19 that $R(v_1) = O(e^{-2e_0 t})$ in $WL^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Step 2: Induction. Let us assume that Φ_1, \dots, Φ_k are known and satisfy (3.3) for some $k \geq 1$. To construct Φ_{k+1} , we first claim that there exists $\Psi_k \in H^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap WL^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, satisfying (2.35), such that for large t

$$(3.4) \quad \varepsilon_k(t, x) = e^{-(k+1)e_0 t} \Psi_k(x) + O(e^{-(k+2)e_0 t}) \quad \text{in} \quad WL^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Indeed, substituting $v_k = \sum_{j=1}^k e^{-je_0 t} \Phi_j(x)$ into (3.3), we obtain

$$\varepsilon_k(t, x) = \sum_{j=1}^k e^{-je_0 t} (-je_0 \Phi_j(x) + \mathcal{L}\Phi_j(x)) + R(v_k(t, x)).$$

Note that $R(v_k) = -i|x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+1} J(W^{-1}v_k)$, where J defined in (2.18) is real-analytic for $\{|z| < 1\}$ and satisfies $J(0) = \partial_z J(0) = \partial_{\bar{z}} J(0) = 0$. For $|z| \leq 1/2$, we can expand

$$(3.5) \quad J(z) = \sum_{j_1+j_2 \geq 2} a_{j_1 j_2} z^{j_1} \bar{z}^{j_2},$$

with normal convergence of the series and all its derivatives. All the functions $\Phi_j \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, so that for large t , and all x , $|v_k(t, x)| \leq \frac{1}{2}W(x)$. Using (3.5) to expand $R(v_k)$, we found that there exist $F_j \in WL^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ($1 \leq j \leq k$) and $F_{k+1} \in H^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap WL^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, satisfying (2.35) such that

$$\varepsilon_k(t, x) = \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} e^{-je_0 t} F_j(x) + O(e^{-(k+2)e_0 t}) \quad \text{in} \quad WL^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

By (3.3) at rank k , $F_j = 0$ for $j \leq k$ which shows (3.4) with $\Psi_k = F_{k+1}$.

By Lemma 2.23, $(k+1)e_0$ is not in the spectrum of \mathcal{L} . Define

$$\Phi_{k+1} := -(\mathcal{L} - (k+1)e_0)^{-1} \Psi_k$$

which belongs to $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap H^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap W^3 L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and satisfies (2.36) by Lemma 2.23. By definition, $v_{k+1} = v_k + e^{-(k+1)e_0 t} \Phi_{k+1}$. Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{k+1} &:= \partial_t v_{k+1} + \mathcal{L}v_{k+1} + R(v_{k+1}) \\ &= \partial_t v_k + \mathcal{L}v_k + R(v_k) + (\mathcal{L} - (k+1)e_0) \Phi_{k+1} e^{-(k+1)e_0 t} + R(v_{k+1}) \\ &= \varepsilon_k - e^{-(k+1)e_0 t} \Psi_k + R(v_{k+1}) - R(v_k). \end{aligned}$$

By (3.4), $\varepsilon_k - e^{-(k+1)e_0 t} \Psi_k = O(e^{-(k+2)e_0 t})$ in $WL^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Writing as before,

$$R(\cdot) = -i|x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+1} J(W^{-1}\cdot)$$

and using the development (3.5) of J , we get that

$$R(v_{k+1}) - R(v_k) = O(e^{-(k+2)e_0 t}) \quad \text{in } WL^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

which yields (3.3) at rank $k+1$. The proof is complete. \square

3.2. Construction of special threshold solutions W^a . In this subsection, we apply the fixed point argument to show the existence of special threshold solutions W^a .

Proposition 3.2. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. There exists $k_0 > 0$ such that for any $k \geq k_0$, there exists $t_k \geq 0$ and a solution W^a of (1.1) such that for $t \geq t_k$,*

$$(3.6) \quad \|W^a - W_k^a\|_{Z(t, +\infty)} \leq e^{-(k+\frac{1}{2})e_0 t}.$$

Furthermore, W^a is the unique solution of (1.1) satisfying (3.6) for large t ; W^a is also independent of k and satisfies for large t ,

$$(3.7) \quad \|W^a(t) - W - ae^{-e_0 t} \mathcal{Y}_+\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim e^{-\frac{3}{2}e_0 t}.$$

Finally, $W^a \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if $d = 5$.

Sketch of the proof. The proof is exactly the same as [17, Proposition 6.3]. For the convenience of the readers, we briefly sketch the proof of the existence of W^a . Let $v_k := W_k^a - W$ and by (3.3) it satisfies

$$(3.8) \quad \varepsilon_k := \partial_t v_k + \mathcal{L}(v_k) + R(v_k) = O(e^{-(k+1)e_0 t}) \quad \text{in } WL^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Let $v^a := W^a - W$ and by (2.15), W^a is a solution of (1.1) if and only if v^a satisfies the equation

$$(3.9) \quad \partial_t v^a + \mathcal{L}(v^a) + R(v^a) = 0.$$

Let $h := W^a - W_k^a$, then $h = v^a - v_k$. Combining (3.8) and (3.9), we deduce that

$$i\partial_t h + \Delta h = -\mathcal{V}(h) - iR(v_k + h) + iR(v_k) + i\varepsilon_k,$$

where the linear operator \mathcal{V} is defined in (2.13). Thus the existence of a solution W^a of (1.1) satisfying (3.6) for $t \geq t_k$ may be written as the following fixed-point problem

$$\begin{aligned} \forall t \geq t_k, \quad h(t) &= \mathcal{M}_k(h)(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \|h\|_{Z(t, +\infty)} \leq e^{-(k+\frac{1}{2})e_0 t} \quad \text{where} \\ \mathcal{M}_k(h)(t) &:= - \int_t^{+\infty} e^{i(t-s)\Delta} [i\mathcal{V}(h(s)) - R(v_k(s) + h(s)) + R(v_k(s)) - \varepsilon_k(s)] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Let us fix k and t_k . Consider the Banach space

$$B_Z^k := \left\{ h \in Z(t_k, +\infty); \sup_{t \geq t_k} e^{(k+\frac{1}{2})e_0 t} \|h\|_{Z(t, +\infty)} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

By using the Strichartz estimate, (3.8) and Lemma 2.19, we can show that if t_k and k are large enough, the mapping \mathcal{M}_k is a contraction on B_Z^k . This proves the existence of a solution W^a of (1.1) satisfying (3.6) for $t \geq t_k$.

Finally, we show that $W^a \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if $d = 5$. Define a positive radial function ψ on \mathbb{R}^d such that $\psi = 1$ if $|x| \leq 1$ and $\psi = 0$ if $|x| \geq 2$. For $R > 0$ and large t , define

$$F_R(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |U^a(t, x)|^2 \psi\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) dx.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_R' &= \frac{2}{R} \text{Im} \int W^a \nabla \overline{W^a} \cdot (\nabla \psi)\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) dx = \frac{2}{R} \text{Im} \int W \nabla (\overline{W^a} - W) \cdot (\nabla \psi)\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) dx \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{R} \text{Im} \int (W^a - W) \nabla W \cdot (\nabla \psi)\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) dx + \frac{2}{R} \text{Im} \int (W^a - W) \nabla (\overline{W^a} - W) \cdot (\nabla \psi)\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Applying (3.7) and Hardy's inequality, we obtain

$$|F_R'(t)| \lesssim \|U^a(t) - W\|_{\dot{H}^1} (\|U^a(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}) \lesssim e^{-e_0 t}.$$

Integrating the above inequality from sufficiently large t to $+\infty$, we get

$$\left| F_R(t) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |W(x)|^2 \psi\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) dx \right| \lesssim e^{-e_0 t}.$$

Letting $R \rightarrow +\infty$, we get $\|W^a(t)\|_{L^2} = \|W\|_{L^2}$ and $W^a(t) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ when $d = 5$, which completes the proof by applying mass conservation law. \square

3.3. Construction of W^\pm .

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $\mathcal{Y}_1 := \operatorname{Re}\mathcal{Y}_+ = \operatorname{Re}\mathcal{Y}_-$. We first claim that $(W, \mathcal{Y}_1)_{\dot{H}^1} \neq 0$. In fact, if $(W, \mathcal{Y}_1)_{\dot{H}^1} = 0$, then by the equation (2.2) and the definition of $B(\cdot, \cdot)$ in (2.37), we have

$$B(W, \mathcal{Y}_\pm) = \frac{1}{2} \int \nabla W \nabla \mathcal{Y}_1 - \frac{\alpha+1}{2} \int |x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+1} \mathcal{Y}_1 = -\frac{\alpha}{2} \int \nabla W \nabla \mathcal{Y}_1 = 0,$$

so that $W \in G^\perp$ and thus $Q(W) > 0$ by Lemma 2.24. However, by Pohozaev's identity (2.3):

$$(3.10) \quad Q(W) = \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla W|^2 - \frac{\alpha+1}{2} \int |x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+2} = -\frac{\alpha}{2} \int |x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+2} < 0.$$

Replacing \mathcal{Y}_\pm by $-\mathcal{Y}_\pm$ if necessary, we may assume

$$(3.11) \quad (W, \mathcal{Y}_1)_{\dot{H}^1} > 0.$$

Let

$$W^\pm := W^{\pm 1},$$

which yields two solutions of (1.1) for large $t > 0$. Then all the conditions of Theorem 1.2 are satisfied. Indeed, the limits

$$\|W^\pm(t) - W\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim e^{-\varepsilon_0 t}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

are an immediate consequence of (3.7), while $E(W^\pm) = E(W)$ follows from the conservation of the energy and the fact that W^a tends to W in \dot{H}^1 . Furthermore, again by (3.7)

$$\|W^a\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 = \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 + 2ae^{-\varepsilon_0 t} (W, \mathcal{Y}_1)_{\dot{H}^1} + O(e^{-\frac{3}{2}\varepsilon_0 t}),$$

which together with (3.11) shows that for large $t > 0$,

$$\|\nabla W^+(t)\|_{L^2} > \|\nabla W\|_{L^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla W^-(t)\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}.$$

From Lemma 2.17, these inequalities remain valid for every t in the intervals of existence of W^\pm . Finally, $W^-(t)$ scatters in the negative time direction follows from (6.4), and $W^+(t)$ blows up in finite negative time when $d = 5$ follows from Corollary 7.2. \square

4. MODULATION ANALYSIS.

In this section, we perform the modulation analysis for solutions in the small neighborhood of the ground state. On energy surface of the ground state, the distance to this manifold is controlled by

$$\mathbf{d}(u) = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|\nabla u(x)|^2 - |\nabla W(x)|^2) dx \right|,$$

as shown in the following result. The same result in the case of pure-power NLS can be found in [6, 37, 45].

Notation. If v is a function defined on \mathbb{R}^d , as a convention, we write

$$v_{[\lambda_0]}(x) := \lambda_0^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} v\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_0}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad v_{[\theta_0, \lambda_0]}(x) := e^{i\theta_0} \lambda_0^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} v\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_0}\right).$$

Proposition 4.1. *There exists a function $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\mathbf{d})$, satisfying $\lim_{\mathbf{d} \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon(\mathbf{d}) = 0$, such that for any $u \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $E(u) = E(W)$, the following inequality holds*

$$\inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}, \mu > 0} \|u_{[\theta, \mu]} - W\|_{\dot{H}^1} \leq \varepsilon(\mathbf{d}(u)).$$

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that the claim does not hold; then there must exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and a sequence of \dot{H}^1 functions $\{f_n\}$ such that

$$(4.1) \quad E(f_n) = E(W) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{d}(f_n) \rightarrow 0,$$

but

$$(4.2) \quad \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}, \mu > 0} \|(f_n)_{[\theta, \mu]} - W\|_{\dot{H}^1} > \varepsilon_0.$$

Applying bubble decomposition (Lemma 2.15) to $\{f_n\}$, we obtain a subsequence in f_n , (which for the sake of convenience is still denoted by f_n) satisfying the decomposition (2.5) and the properties (2.6)–(2.8). Since

$$\|\nabla f_n\|_{L^2}^2 - \sum_{j=1}^J \|\nabla \phi^j\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\nabla w_n^J\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^J \|\nabla \phi^j\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\nabla f_n\|_{L^2}^2,$$

it follows from (2.7) and $\mathbf{d}(f_n) \rightarrow 0$ that

$$(4.3) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} \|\phi^j\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 \leq \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2.$$

We next claim that

$$(4.4) \quad \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^{\alpha+2} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} \|\phi^j\|_{\dot{H}^1}^{\alpha+2}.$$

In fact, noting that by (4.1)

$$\int |x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+2} dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int |x|^{-b} |f_n|^{\alpha+2} dx,$$

we deduce from (2.8), (2.10) and Proposition 2.14 that

$$\int |x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+2} dx \leq \limsup_{J \rightarrow J^*} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^J \int |x|^{-b} |\phi^j(x - \frac{x_n^j}{\lambda_n})|^{\alpha+2} dx \leq \sum_{j=1}^{J^*} \frac{\|\phi^j\|_{\dot{H}^1}^{\alpha+2}}{\|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^{\alpha+2}} \int |x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+2} dx.$$

This proves (4.4).

Combining (4.3) and (4.4), we obtain $J^* = 1$ and

$$(4.5) \quad f_n = (\lambda_n)^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} \varphi\left(\frac{x - x_n}{\lambda_n}\right) + w_n \quad \text{where} \quad \| |x|^{-b} |w_n|^{\alpha+2} \|_{L^1} + \|w_n\|_{\dot{H}^1} \rightarrow 0.$$

Furthermore, either $x_n \equiv 0$ or $\frac{|x_n|}{\lambda_n} \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\|\varphi\|_{\dot{H}^1} = \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}, \quad \int |x|^{-b} |\varphi|^{\alpha+2} dx = \int |x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+2} dx.$$

Therefore, by Proposition 2.14, there exist $\theta \in \mathbb{R}, \mu > 0$ such that

$$(4.6) \quad \varphi = W_{[\theta, \mu]}.$$

Claim 4.2. *The space parameter x_n in (4.5) must satisfy $x_n \equiv 0$.*

Proof. Assume by contradiction that $\frac{|x_n|}{\lambda_n} \rightarrow \infty$. We first prove

$$(4.7) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int |x|^{-b} |(\lambda_n)^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} \varphi\left(\frac{x - x_n}{\lambda_n}\right)|^{\alpha+2} dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int |x + \frac{x_n}{\lambda_n}|^{-b} |\varphi(x)|^{\alpha+2} dx = 0.$$

In fact, noting that for any $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int |x + \frac{x_n}{\lambda_n}|^{-b} |\phi(x)|^{\alpha+2} dx \\ & \lesssim \int_{|x + \frac{x_n}{\lambda_n}| < \frac{1}{2} \frac{|x_n|}{\lambda_n}} |x + \frac{x_n}{\lambda_n}|^{-b} |\phi(x)|^{\alpha+2} dx + \int_{|x + \frac{x_n}{\lambda_n}| > \frac{1}{2} \frac{|x_n|}{\lambda_n}} |x + \frac{x_n}{\lambda_n}|^{-b} |\phi(x)|^{\alpha+2} dx \\ & \lesssim \int_{|x| > \frac{1}{2} \frac{|x_n|}{\lambda_n}} |x + \frac{x_n}{\lambda_n}|^{-b} |\phi(x)|^{\alpha+2} dx + \left(\frac{|x_n|}{\lambda_n}\right)^{-b} \|\phi\|_{L^{\alpha+2}}^{\alpha+2} \end{aligned}$$

tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain (4.7) by a standard approximation argument.

Combining (4.5) and (4.7), we obtain the contradiction

$$\int |x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+2} dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int |x|^{-b} |f_n|^{\alpha+2} dx = 0. \quad \square$$

It then follows from (4.5), (4.6) and Claim 4.2 that

$$f_n(x) = \lambda_n^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} W_{[\theta, \mu]}\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right) + w_n \quad \text{with} \quad \|w_n\|_{\dot{H}^1} \rightarrow 0,$$

which contradicts (4.2). Proposition 4.1 is proved. □

Proposition 4.1 together with the implicit theorem gives the following orthogonal decomposition.

Lemma 4.3. *There exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for all $u \in \dot{H}^1$ with $E(u) = E(W)$, $\mathbf{d}(u) < \delta_0$, there exists a couple θ, μ in $\mathbb{R} \times (0, +\infty)$ with*

$$u_{[\theta, \mu]} \perp iW, \quad u_{[\theta, \mu]} \perp W_1.$$

The parameters $(\theta, \mu) \in \mathbb{R} \times (0, +\infty)$ are unique in $\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}$, and the mapping $u \rightarrow (\theta, \mu)$ is C^1 .

Proof. Consider the following functionals on $\mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty) \times \dot{H}^1$:

$$J_0 : (\theta, \mu, f) \mapsto (f_{[\theta, \mu]}, iW)_{\dot{H}^1} \quad \text{and} \quad J_1 : (\theta, \mu, f) \mapsto (f_{[\theta, \mu]}, W_1)_{\dot{H}^1}.$$

By simple calculation, we have $J_0(0, 1, W) = J_1(0, 1, W) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial J_0}{\partial \theta}(0, 1, W) &= \int |\nabla W|^2, & \frac{\partial J_0}{\partial \mu}(0, 1, W) &= 0 \\ \frac{\partial J_1}{\partial \theta}(0, 1, W) &= 0 & \frac{\partial J_1}{\partial \mu}(0, 1, W) &= - \int |\nabla W_1|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by the implicit function theorem there exist $\varepsilon_0, \eta_0 > 0$ such that for $h \in \dot{H}^1$ with $\|h - W\|_{\dot{H}^1} < \varepsilon_0$, there exists a unique $(\tilde{\theta}(h), \tilde{\mu}(h)) \in C^1$ such that $|\tilde{\theta}| + |\tilde{\mu} - 1| < \eta_0$ and

$$(4.8) \quad (h_{[\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\mu}]}, iW)_{\dot{H}^1} = (h_{[\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\mu}]}, W_1)_{\dot{H}^1} = 0.$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 4.1, there exist a function ε and θ_1, μ_1 such that

$$\|u_{[\theta_1, \mu_1]} - W\|_{\dot{H}^1} \leq \varepsilon(\mathbf{d}(u)).$$

Therefore, for $\mathbf{d}(u)$ sufficiently small, we deduce from (4.8) that there exists $(\tilde{\theta}_1(u), \tilde{\mu}_1(u))$ such that

$$((u_{[\theta_1, \mu_1]})_{[\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\mu}_1]}, iW)_{\dot{H}^1} = ((u_{[\theta_1, \mu_1]})_{[\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\mu}_1]}, W_1)_{\dot{H}^1} = 0,$$

This completes the proof by taking $\theta = \tilde{\theta}_1 + \theta_1$ and $\mu = \tilde{\mu}_1 \mu_1$. □

Let u be a solution of (1.1) on an interval I such that $E(u_0) = E(W)$ and write

$$\mathbf{d}(t) := \mathbf{d}(u(t)) = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|\nabla u(t, x)|^2 - |\nabla W(x)|^2) dx \right|.$$

According to Lemma 4.3, if $\mathbf{d}(t) < \delta_0$ for all $t \in I$, there exist real parameters $\theta(t), \mu(t) > 0$ such that

$$(4.9) \quad u_{[\theta(t), \mu(t)]}(t) = (1 + \beta(t))W + \tilde{u}(t),$$

where

$$1 + \beta(t) = \frac{1}{\|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2} (u_{[\theta(t), \mu(t)]}, W)_{\dot{H}^1} \quad \text{such that} \quad \tilde{u}(t) \in H^\perp.$$

Define $v(t)$ by

$$(4.10) \quad v(t) := \beta(t)W + \tilde{u}(t) = u_{[\theta(t), \mu(t)]} - W.$$

We can obtain the following estimates regarding the parameter functions in (4.9) and (4.10).

Lemma 4.4. *Taking a smaller δ_0 if necessary, we have the following estimates on I :*

$$(4.11) \quad |\beta(t)| \approx \|v(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} \approx \|\tilde{u}(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} \approx \mathbf{d}(u(t))$$

$$(4.12) \quad |\beta'(t)| + |\theta'(t)| + \left| \frac{\mu'(t)}{\mu(t)} \right| \lesssim \mu^2(t) \mathbf{d}(u(t)).$$

The proof of Lemma 4.4 is a consequence of Proposition 2.21 and of the equation satisfied by v , which will be discussed explicitly in the Appendix B.

5. GLOBAL ANALYSIS-VIRIAL.

In the previous section, we develop the modulation analysis which enables us to control the solution near the two dimensional manifold $\{W_{[\theta, \mu]}\}$. When the solution is away from the manifold, we use the monotonicity formula arising from Virial to control the solution. To this end, in this section we establish Virial estimates by incorporating the modulation estimates developed in Section 4.

Let $\varphi(x)$ be a smooth radial function such that

$$(5.1) \quad \varphi(r) = r^2, \quad r \leq 1, \quad \varphi(r) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d^2\varphi}{dr^2}(r) \leq 2, \quad r \geq 0.$$

Define the truncated Virial

$$(5.2) \quad V_R(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_R(x) |u(t, x)|^2 dx,$$

where $\varphi_R(x) = R^2 \varphi(\frac{x}{R})$. For a solution $u(t)$ of (1.1) with $E(u) = E(W)$, the time derivatives of $V_R(t)$ are computed as

$$\partial_t V_R(t, x) = 2\text{Im} \int \bar{u}(t, x) \nabla u(t, x) \cdot \nabla \varphi_R(x) dx, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

and

$$(5.3) \quad \partial_{tt} V_R(t) = \begin{cases} 4\alpha \mathbf{d}(u(t)) + A_R(u(t)) & \text{if } \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} < \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}, \\ -4\alpha \mathbf{d}(u(t)) + A_R(u(t)) & \text{if } \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} > \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}. \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_R(u(t)) &:= 4 \int_{|x| \geq R} \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial_r \varphi_R}{\partial r} - 2 \right) |\nabla u|^2 dx + 4 \int_{|x| \geq R} \left(\frac{\partial_{rr} \varphi_R}{r^2} - \frac{\partial_r \varphi_R}{r^3} \right) |x \cdot \nabla u|^2 dx \\ &\quad - \int \Delta^2 \varphi_R |u|^2 dx - \frac{2\alpha}{\alpha + 2} \int_{|x| \geq R} \left[\partial_{rr} \varphi_R + (d-1 + \frac{2b}{\alpha}) \frac{\partial_r \varphi_R}{r} - \frac{4(\alpha+2)}{\alpha} \right] |x|^{-b} |u|^{\alpha+2} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, an explicit calculation together with equation (1.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{tt} V_R(t) &= 4 \int \frac{\partial_r \varphi_R}{r} |\nabla u|^2 dx + 4 \int \left(\frac{\partial_{rr} \varphi_R}{r^2} - \frac{\partial_r \varphi_R}{r^3} \right) |x \cdot \nabla u|^2 dx - \int |u|^2 \Delta^2 \varphi_R \\ &\quad - \frac{2\alpha}{\alpha + 2} \int \left[\partial_{rr} \varphi_R + (d-1 + \frac{2b}{\alpha}) \frac{\partial_r \varphi_R}{r} \right] |x|^{-b} |u|^{\alpha+2} dx \\ &= 8 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u(t)|^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^{-b} |u(t)|^{\alpha+2} \right) + A_R(u(t)). \end{aligned}$$

By $E(u) = E(W)$ and the Pohozaev's identity (2.3), we have

$$\int |\nabla u(t)|^2 - \int |x|^{-b} |u|^{\alpha+2} dx = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbf{d}(u(t)) & \text{if } \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} < \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1} \\ -\frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbf{d}(u(t)) & \text{if } \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} > \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1} \end{cases}$$

which yields (5.3).

The rest of this Section is devoted to giving proper estimates on $\partial_t V_R(t)$ and $A_R(t)$.

Lemma 5.1 (Virial estimate). *Let $u(t)$ be an \dot{H}^1 solution of (1.1) with $E(u) = E(W)$. For those t satisfying $\mathbf{d}(u(t)) < \delta_0$, let*

$$(5.4) \quad u(t)_{[\theta(t), \mu(t)]} = W + v(t)$$

be the orthogonal decomposition of $u(t)$ given by (4.9) with the bounds (4.11) and (4.12). We have

$$(5.5) \quad |\partial_t V_R(t)| \lesssim R^2 \mathbf{d}(u(t)),$$

$$(5.6) \quad A_R(u(t)) \lesssim \int_{|x| \geq R} \left(\frac{|u(t, x)|^{\alpha+2}}{|x|^b} + \frac{|u(t, x)|^2}{|x|^2} \right) dx,$$

$$(5.7) \quad |A_R(u(t))| \lesssim \begin{cases} \int_{|x| \geq R} (|\nabla u(t)|^2 + |x|^{-b} |u(t, x)|^{\alpha+2} + |x|^{-2} |u(t, x)|^2) dx, \\ (\mu(t)R)^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} \mathbf{d}(u(t)) + \mathbf{d}(u(t))^2 & \text{if } \mathbf{d}(u(t)) < \delta_0 \quad \text{and} \quad |\mu(t)R| \gtrsim 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We first estimate $\partial_t V_R(t)$. By Hölder and Hardy's inequality, we obtain

$$|\partial_t V_R(t)| \lesssim \int_{|x| \leq 2R} R^2 \frac{|u(t, x)|}{|x|} |\nabla u(t, x)| dx \lesssim R^2 \|u\|_{L_t^\infty \dot{H}_x^1}^2 \lesssim R^2 (\mathbf{d}(u(t)) + \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2).$$

This proves (5.5) in the case of $\mathbf{d}(u(t)) \geq \delta_0$. To get the bound in the case $\mathbf{d}(u(t)) < \delta_0$, we make the change of variable $x = y/\mu(t)$ and then apply the decomposition (5.4) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t V_R(t) &= 2\text{Im} \frac{R}{\mu(t)} \int \mu(t)^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} \bar{u}(t, \frac{y}{\mu(t)}) \mu(t)^{-\frac{d}{2}} (\nabla u)(t, \frac{y}{\mu(t)}) \cdot (\nabla \varphi) (\frac{y}{R\mu(t)}) dy \\ &= 2R^2 \text{Im} \int \frac{1}{R\mu(t)} (W + \bar{v}) \nabla (W + v) \cdot (\nabla \varphi) (\frac{y}{R\mu(t)}) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Write $\text{Im}[(W + \bar{v})\nabla(W + v)] = \text{Im}(W\nabla v + \bar{v}\nabla W + \bar{v}\nabla v)$ and note that on the support of $\nabla \varphi(y/R\mu(t))$, $1/R\mu(t)$ is bounded by $2/|y|$. As a consequence of Cauchy-Schwarz and Hardy's inequality, we get the bound

$$|\partial_t V_R(t)| \lesssim R^2 (\|v(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|v(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2),$$

which together with (4.11) yields (5.5) for $\mathbf{d}(u(t)) \leq \delta_0$.

We now turn to estimating $A_R(u(t))$. Denote by $\Omega := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : r\partial_{rr}\varphi_R \geq \partial_r\varphi_R\}$. Noting that $\frac{\partial_r\varphi_R}{\partial r} \leq 2r$ by (5.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{|x| \geq R} \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial_r\varphi_R}{\partial r} - 2 \right) |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_{|x| \geq R} \left(\frac{\partial_{rr}\varphi_R}{r^2} - \frac{\partial_r\varphi_R}{r^3} \right) |x \cdot \nabla u|^2 dx \\ & \leq \int_{\{|x| \geq R\} \cap \Omega} \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial_r\varphi_R}{\partial r} - 2 \right) |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_{\{|x| \geq R\} \cap \Omega} \left(\frac{\partial_{rr}\varphi_R}{r^2} - \frac{\partial_r\varphi_R}{r^3} \right) r^2 |\nabla u|^2 dx \\ & = \int_{\{|x| \geq R\} \cap \Omega} (\partial_{rr}\varphi_R - 2) |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which gives immediately (5.6) and the first line in (5.7).

To get the second bound when $\mathbf{d}(u(t)) < \delta_0$ and $\mu(t)R \gtrsim 1$, we recall $W(x) \approx O(|x|^{-(d-2)})$ for $|x| \gtrsim 1$. This together with the decomposition (5.4) and Lemma 4.4 yields

$$\begin{aligned} |A_R(u(t))| &= |A_{\mu(t)R}((u(t))_{[\theta(t), \mu(t)]})| = |A_{\mu(t)R}(W + v(t)) - A_{\mu(t)R}(W)| \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla W\|_{L^2(|x| \geq \mu(t)R)} \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + \|v\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}, 2}} (\|W\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}, 2}(|x| \geq \mu(t)R)}^{\alpha+1} + \|v(t)\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}, 2}}^{\alpha+1}) + \|W/|x|\|_{L^2(|x| \geq \mu(t)R)} \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim (\mu(t)R)^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} \mathbf{d}(u(t)) + (\mathbf{d}(u(t)))^2. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.1 is proved. \square

6. CONVERGENCE TO W IN THE SUBCRITICAL CASE

In this section, we focus on characterizing the nonscattering threshold solutions when the kinetic energy is less than that of the ground state W . The main result is the following.

Proposition 6.1. *Let u be a solution of (1.1) satisfying*

$$(6.1) \quad E(u_0) = E(W) \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^1} < \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1},$$

and $I = (T_-, T_+)$ be its maximal interval of existence. Assume that u does not scatter for the positive time, i.e.

$$(6.2) \quad \|u\|_{S(0, T_+)} = +\infty,$$

then $T_+ = +\infty$ and there exists $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mu_0 > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that

$$(6.3) \quad \|u(t) - W_{[\theta_0, \mu_0]}\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim e^{-ct}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Moreover, in the negative time direction, u exists globally and obeys

$$(6.4) \quad \|u\|_{S(-\infty, 0)} < \infty.$$

We first establish some properties for the nonscattering threshold solutions in subsection 6.1, and then give the proof of Proposition 6.1 in subsection 6.2.

6.1. Properties for Nonlinear Subcritical Threshold Solutions.

Proposition 6.2. *Let u be a solution of (1.1) satisfying (6.1), and $I = (T_-, T_+)$ be its maximal interval of existence. If*

$$(6.5) \quad \|u\|_{S(0, T_+)} = +\infty,$$

then

(a) *There exists a function λ on $[0, T_+)$ such that the set*

$$(6.6) \quad K_+ := \{u_{[\lambda(t)]}(t), t \in [0, T_+)\}$$

is relatively compact in \dot{H}^1 .

(b) $T_+ = +\infty$.

(c) *The function λ in (a) satisfies*

$$(6.7) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sqrt{t} \lambda(t) = +\infty.$$

An analogous assertion holds on negative time direction.

Proof. (a) As the proof follows that of [39, Proposition 3.1], we will only sketch the main steps.

Step 1. For any sequence $\{\tau_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0, T_+)$, there exists λ_n such that

$$(6.8) \quad \lambda_n^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} u(\tau_n, \frac{x}{\lambda_n}) \text{ converges strongly in } \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ (up to a subsequence).}$$

By continuity of u it suffices to consider $\tau_n \rightarrow T_+$. Applying the profile decomposition (c.f. [39, Proposition 3.2]) to $\{u(\tau_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, we deduce that there exist $J^* \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$; profiles $\phi^j \in \dot{H}^1 \setminus \{0\}$; scales $\lambda_n^j \in (0, \infty)$; space translation parameters $x_n^j \in \mathbb{R}^d$; time translation parameters t_n^j ; and remainders w_n^J such that the following decomposition holds for $1 \leq J \leq J^*$:

$$(6.9) \quad u_n := u(\tau_n) = \sum_{j=1}^J (\lambda_n^j)^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} [e^{it_n^j \Delta} \phi^j] (\frac{x - x_n^j}{\lambda_n^j}) + w_n^J;$$

here $w_n^J \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ obeys

$$\limsup_{J \rightarrow J^*} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{it \Delta} w_n^J\|_{S(0, +\infty)} = 0.$$

Moreover, for any $J \geq 1$, the following energy decoupling properties hold

$$(6.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|\nabla u_n\|_{L^2}^2 - \sum_{j=1}^J \|\nabla \phi^j\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\nabla w_n^J\|_{L^2}^2 \right\} &= 0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ E(u_n) - \sum_{j=1}^J E(e^{it_n^j \Delta} \phi^j) - E(w_n^J) \right\} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, either $t_n^j \equiv 0$ or $t_n^j \rightarrow \pm\infty$, and that either $x_n^j \equiv 0$ or $\frac{|x_n^j|}{\lambda_n^j} \rightarrow \infty$.

We now show that $J^* = 1$. Suppose by contradiction that $J^* \geq 2$. It then follows from (6.1), (6.10) and Lemma 2.17 that

$$(6.11) \quad E(\phi^j) < E(W) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla \phi^j\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq j \leq J^*.$$

We now construct scattering solutions to (1.1) corresponding to each profile. First, if $t_n^j \equiv 0$, then we take v^j to be the solution to (1.1) with initial data ϕ^j . This solution scatters due to (6.11) and Theorem 1.1. If instead $t_n^j \rightarrow \pm\infty$, we let v^j be the solution that scatters to $e^{it \Delta} \phi^j$ as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$ (see Theorem 2.11). In either of these cases, we then define

$$v_n^j(t, x) = (\lambda_n^j)^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} v^j \left(\frac{t}{(\lambda_n^j)^2} + t_n^j, \frac{x}{\lambda_n^j} \right).$$

We then construct a corresponding nonlinear profile decomposition of the form

$$u_n^J(t, x) = \sum_{j=1}^J v_n^j(t, x) + e^{it \Delta} w_n^J(x).$$

By construction, we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n^J(0) - u_n\|_{\dot{H}^1} = 0.$$

Moreover, the arguments of [39, Lemma 3.8] imply

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{J \rightarrow J^*} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{ \|u_n^J\|_{L_t^\infty \dot{H}_x^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)} + \|u_n^J\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} \} &\lesssim 1, \\ \limsup_{J \rightarrow J^*} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla[(i\partial_t + \Delta)u_n^J + |x|^{-b}|u_n^J|^\alpha u_n^J]\|_{L_t^2 L_x^{\frac{2d}{d-2+2b}}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the stability result (Proposition 2.12), we derive bounds for the solutions u_n that contradict (6.5).

Having established $J^* = 1$, (6.9) simplifies to

$$(6.12) \quad u_n(x) = \lambda_n^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} [e^{it_n \Delta} \phi] \left(\frac{x - x_n}{\lambda_n} \right) + w_n(x),$$

where either $t_n \equiv 0$ or $t_n \rightarrow \pm\infty$ and either $x_n \equiv 0$ or $\frac{|x_n|}{\lambda_n} \rightarrow \infty$. We now observe that

$$(6.13) \quad \|\nabla w_n(x)\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Indeed, otherwise, by (6.10) and Lemma 2.17, we see that $E(\phi) < E(W)$ and $\|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$. By the same arguments used above, we deduce that $\|u\|_{S(0,+\infty)} < +\infty$, contradicting (6.5).

To see that the space shifts must obey $x_n \equiv 0$, we note that if $\frac{|x_n|}{\lambda_n} \rightarrow \infty$ then Proposition 2.13 yields global scattering solutions v_n to (1.1) with

$$v_n(0) = \lambda_n^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} [e^{it_n \Delta} \phi] \left(\frac{x - x_n}{\lambda_n} \right).$$

Applying the stability result (Proposition 2.12), this implies uniform space-time bounds for the solutions u_n , contradicting (6.5). To see that the time shifts must obey $t_n \equiv 0$, we note that if $|t_n| \rightarrow \infty$ then the functions $e^{it \Delta} u_n$ (which has asymptotically vanishing space-time norm) define good approximate solutions obeying global space-time bounds for n large. In particular, an application of Proposition 2.12 would again yield uniform space-time bounds for the u_n , contradicting (6.5).

Finally, by (6.12) and (6.13) we get

$$\|\lambda_n^{\frac{d-2}{2}} u(\tau_n, \lambda_n x) - \phi\|_{\dot{H}^1} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty,$$

which complete the proof of (6.8).

Step 2. We define $\lambda(t)$. Note that for any $t \in [0, T_+)$

$$(6.14) \quad 2E(W) = 2E(u(t)) \leq \|u(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 \leq \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2.$$

Fixing $t \in [0, T_+)$, define

$$\lambda(t) := \sup \left\{ \lambda > 0, \quad \text{such that} \quad \int_{|x| \leq 1/\lambda} |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 dx = E(W) \right\}.$$

By (6.14), $0 < \lambda(t) < \infty$. Let $(t_n)_n$ be a subsequence in $[0, T_+)$. As proven in Step 1, up to the extraction of a subsequence, there exists a sequence $(\lambda_n)_n$ such that $(u_{[\lambda_n]}(t_n))_n$ converges in \dot{H}^1 to some $v_0 \in \dot{H}^1$. One may check directly, using (6.14) and the definition of $\lambda(t)$ that

$$C^{-1} \lambda(t_n) \leq \lambda_n \leq C \lambda(t_n),$$

which shows (extracting again subsequences if necessary) the convergence of $(u_{[\lambda(t_n)]}(t_n))_n$ in \dot{H}^1 . The compactness of \overline{K}_+ is proven, which concludes the proof of (a).

The proofs of (b) and (c) are same as the proofs of [Lemma 2.8, Step 2] and [Lemma 3.3, Step 2] in [17], so we omit the details. \square

The next observation on $\lambda(t)$ is that $\lambda(t)$ is basically comparable to $\mu(t)$ given by (4.9) when the solution $u(t)$ close to the manifold $\{W_{[\theta, \mu]}\}$.

Lemma 6.3. *Let u be the solution of (1.1) on the time interval I satisfying (6.6). Suppose $\mathbf{d}(u(t)) < \delta_0$ on I , and hence the orthogonal decomposition (4.10) holds. Then there exist constants $0 < c < C < \infty$ such that*

$$c < \frac{\lambda(t)}{\mu(t)} < C \quad \forall t \in I.$$

Proof. We argue by contradiction. Supposing this is not true, there must exist a sequence of times $t_n \in I_n$ such that

$$\frac{\mu(t_n)}{\lambda(t_n)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\mu(t_n)}{\lambda(t_n)} \rightarrow \infty.$$

This implies directly that

$$(6.15) \quad W_{\left[\frac{\lambda(t_n)}{\mu(t_n)}\right]} \rightharpoonup 0 \quad \text{weakly in } \dot{H}^1.$$

From the compactness in (6.6), we can extract a subsequence and find $V \in \dot{H}^1$ such that

$$(6.16) \quad (u(t_n))_{[\lambda(t_n)]} \rightarrow V \quad \text{in } \dot{H}^1$$

which along with $\mathbf{d}(u(t)) < \delta_0$ implies

$$(6.17) \quad \|V\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t_n)\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 = \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{d}(u(t_n)) > \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 - \delta_0.$$

On the other hand, rewriting the decomposition (4.10) as

$$(u(t_n))_{\lambda(t_n)} = (W + v(t_n))_{[-\theta(t_n), \frac{\lambda(t_n)}{\mu(t_n)}]},$$

we deduce from (6.15) and (6.16) that

$$(v(t_n))_{[-\theta(t_n), \frac{\lambda(t_n)}{\mu(t_n)}]} \rightharpoonup V \quad \text{weakly in } \dot{H}^1.$$

Therefore, by the estimate $\|v(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim \mathbf{d}(u(t))$ in (4.11)

$$\|V\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(v(t_n))_{[-\theta(t_n), \frac{\lambda(t_n)}{\mu(t_n)}]}\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim \mathbf{d}(u(t_n)) < \delta_0,$$

which contradicts (6.17) by replacing δ_0 by a smaller one. Lemma 6.3 is proved. \square

The precompactness in Proposition 6.2 implies that $u(t)$ keeps getting closer to the manifold $\{W_{[\theta, \mu]}\}$.

Lemma 6.4. *Let u be a solution of (1.1), defined on $[0, +\infty)$, satisfying (6.1) and (6.2). Then there exists a sequence $t_n \rightarrow +\infty$ such that $\mathbf{d}(u(t_n))$ tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow +\infty$.*

Proof. The compactness in (6.6) implies directly that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\rho_\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently large so that

$$(6.18) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} \int_{|x| > \frac{\rho_\varepsilon}{\lambda(t)}} |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 + |x|^{-b} |u(t, x)|^{\alpha+2} + |x|^{-2} |u(t, x)|^2 dx < \varepsilon.$$

On the other hand, by (6.7), there exists t_0 such that

$$\lambda(t) \geq \frac{\rho_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon \sqrt{t}}, \quad \forall t \geq t_0.$$

Fix $T \geq t_0$ and let $R = \varepsilon \sqrt{T}$. Then $R \geq \frac{\rho_\varepsilon}{\lambda(t)}$ for $t \in [t_0, T]$. Applying Lemma 5.1 for $t \in [t_0, T]$ and using (6.18), we obtain

$$(6.19) \quad |\partial_t V_R(t)| \lesssim R^2 = \varepsilon^2 T,$$

$$(6.20) \quad |A_R(u(t))| \lesssim \int_{|x| > R} |\nabla u|^2 + |x|^{-b} |u|^{\alpha+2} + |x|^{-2} |u|^2 dx \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

Substituting (6.20) into the first line in (5.3), we obtain

$$\partial_{tt} V_R(t) \geq 4\alpha \mathbf{d}(u(t)) - C\varepsilon.$$

Integrating it over $[t_0, T]$ and using (6.19), we have

$$\int_{t_0}^T \mathbf{d}(u(t)) dt \lesssim \varepsilon(T - t_0) + \varepsilon^2 T.$$

As $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, this implies

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbf{d}(u(t)) dt = 0.$$

The convergence of $\mathbf{d}(u(t))$ along a sequence of time is proved. \square

Lemma 6.3 implies that we can replace $\lambda(t)$ by $\mu(t)$ on the interval where $\mathbf{d}(u(t)) < \delta_0$. From the derivative estimate of $\mu(t)$ in Lemma 4.4, it is reasonable to expect

$$\frac{|\lambda'(t)|}{\lambda^3(t)} \lesssim \mathbf{d}(u(t)) \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

In fact, by the argument in [46, Lemma A.3], we can modify $\lambda(t)$ such that it is differentiable almost everywhere and satisfies

$$(6.21) \quad \left| \frac{1}{\lambda^2(a)} - \frac{1}{\lambda^2(b)} \right| \lesssim \int_a^b \mathbf{d}(u(t)) dt, \quad \forall [a, b] \subset [0, \infty).$$

Moreover, the compactness property (6.6) still holds for the modified $\lambda(t)$.

We will revisit this estimate later when we prove the uniform lower bound for $\lambda(t)$. Now we turn to considering the distance function $\mathbf{d}(u(t))$ with the goal of proving the exponential decay of $\mathbf{d}(u(t))$. We start by showing the following.

Lemma 6.5. *Let u be the solution of (1.1) satisfying (6.6). Then for any $[a, b] \subset [0, \infty)$,*

$$(6.22) \quad \int_a^b \mathbf{d}(u(t)) dt \lesssim \sup_{t \in [a, b]} \frac{1}{\lambda^2(t)} [\mathbf{d}(u(a)) + \mathbf{d}(u(b))].$$

Proof. Estimate (6.22) is scaling invariant; by rescaling the solution, we only need to prove the estimate with addition assumption $\min_{t \in [a, b]} \lambda(t) = 1$.

Let $V_R(t)$ be defined by (5.2). Then $|\partial_t V_R(t)| \lesssim R^2 \mathbf{d}(u(t))$ and

$$\partial_{tt} V_R(t) = -4\alpha \mathbf{d}(u(t)) + A_R(u(t)).$$

If $\mathbf{d}(u(t)) < \delta_1 < \delta_0$, the second line of (5.7) and Lemma 6.3 imply

$$|A_R(u(t))| \lesssim (R^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} + \delta_1) \mathbf{d}(u(t)).$$

If $\mathbf{d}(u(t)) \geq \delta_1$, the first line of (5.7) and (6.18) give that for $R \geq \rho_\varepsilon$

$$|A_R(u(t))| \lesssim \varepsilon \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta_1} \mathbf{d}(u(t)).$$

Choosing R sufficiently large, δ_1 sufficiently small and then ε sufficiently small, we deduce that

$$|A_R(u(t))| \leq 2\alpha \mathbf{d}(u(t)).$$

Hence

$$\partial_{tt} V_R(t) \leq -2\alpha \mathbf{d}(u(t)) \quad \forall t \in [a, b].$$

Integrating the above inequality from a to b gives (6.22). \square

The major obstacle of translating the integration estimate to the pointwise decay of $\mathbf{d}(u(t))$ is the uniform lower bound of $\lambda(t)$. We will show this is indeed the case knowing $\mathbf{d}(u(t))$ converges to 0 along a sequence of time, a result that can be deduced again from Virial analysis. We prove these results in the following Lemma.

Lemma 6.6. *Let u be the solution of (1.1) satisfying (6.1) and (6.2). Then there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{t \in [0, \infty)} \lambda(t) \geq c.$$

Proof. Let the sequence t_n be determined by Lemma 6.4 such that $\mathbf{d}(u(t_n)) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$(6.23) \quad \mathbf{d}(u(t_{N_\varepsilon})) + \mathbf{d}(u(t_m)) \leq \varepsilon \quad \forall m \geq N_\varepsilon.$$

Take any $\tau \in [t_{N_\varepsilon}, \infty)$ and any $m \geq N_\varepsilon$ such that $\tau \in [t_{N_\varepsilon}, t_m]$. Applying (6.21) on $[t_{N_\varepsilon}, \tau]$ and then using Lemma 6.5, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda^2(\tau)} - \frac{1}{\lambda^2(t_{N_\varepsilon})} \right| &\lesssim \int_{t_{N_\varepsilon}}^\tau \mathbf{d}(u(t)) dt \lesssim \int_{t_{N_\varepsilon}}^{t_m} \mathbf{d}(u(t)) dt \\ &\lesssim \sup_{t \in [t_{N_\varepsilon}, t_m]} \frac{1}{\lambda^2(t)} \times (\mathbf{d}(u(t_{N_\varepsilon})) + \mathbf{d}(u(t_m))). \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from (6.23) and the triangle inequality that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda^2(\tau)} \leq C\varepsilon \sup_{t \in [t_{N_\varepsilon}, t_m]} \frac{1}{\lambda^2(t)} + \frac{1}{\lambda^2(t_{N_\varepsilon})} \quad \forall \tau \in [t_{N_\varepsilon}, t_m].$$

Taking $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small yields

$$\sup_{\tau \in [t_{N_\varepsilon}, t_m]} \frac{1}{\lambda^2(\tau)} \leq \frac{2}{\lambda^2(t_{N_\varepsilon})} \quad \text{and thus} \quad \sup_{\tau \in [t_{N_\varepsilon}, \infty)} \frac{1}{\lambda^2(\tau)} \leq \frac{2}{\lambda^2(t_{N_\varepsilon})}$$

by letting $m \rightarrow \infty$. The uniform bound for $\frac{1}{\lambda(\tau)}$ comes from this and the boundedness on the closed interval $[0, t_{N_\varepsilon}]$. Lemma 6.6 is proved. \square

6.2. The proof of Proposition 6.1.

Proof. The assertion $T_+ = +\infty$ follows directly from Proposition 6.2. To prove (6.3), the key is to show

$$(6.24) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{d}(u(t)) = 0.$$

We start by proving

$$(6.25) \quad \int_t^\infty \mathbf{d}(u(s)) \lesssim e^{-ct} \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

In fact, by Lemmas 6.5 and 6.6

$$\int_t^{t_n} \mathbf{d}(u(s)) ds \lesssim \mathbf{d}(u(t)) + \mathbf{d}(u(t_n)),$$

where $\{t_n\}$ is the sequence in Lemma 6.4 such that $\mathbf{d}(u(t_n)) \rightarrow 0$. Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ gives immediately

$$\int_t^\infty \mathbf{d}(u(s)) ds \lesssim \mathbf{d}(u(t)) \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

which together with Gronwall's inequality yields (6.25) for some $c > 0$.

We now prove (6.24). Assume that (6.24) does not hold. Then extracting a subsequence from (t_n) , there exist $0 < \delta_1 < \delta_0$ and $t'_n > t_n$ such that

$$(6.26) \quad \mathbf{d}(u(t'_n)) = \delta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < \mathbf{d}(u(t)) < \delta_1 \quad \forall t \in (t_n, t'_n),$$

where δ_0 is such that (4.9) and Lemma 4.4 hold. Let $\beta(t)$ be the parameter in the decomposition (4.9) on the interval (t_n, t'_n) . By Lemma 4.4, $|\beta'(t)| \lesssim \mathbf{d}(u(t))$ for $t \in (t_n, t'_n)$, thus (6.25) implies that $\beta(t_n) - \beta(t'_n)$ tends to 0. Furthermore, again by Lemma 4.4, $|\beta(t)| \approx \mathbf{d}(u(t))$, which shows that $\mathbf{d}(u(t'_n))$ tends to 0, contradicting (6.26). This proves (6.24).

As a consequence of (6.24), we may decompose u for large t

$$u_{[\theta(t), \mu(t)]} = (1 + \beta(t))W + \tilde{u}(t), \quad \tilde{u}(t) \in H^\perp.$$

Then (6.3) is equivalent to the existence of $\theta_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mu_\infty \in (0, \infty)$ and $c > 0$ such that

$$(6.27) \quad \mathbf{d}(u(t)) + |\beta(t)| + \|\tilde{u}\|_{\dot{H}^1} + |\theta(t) - \theta_\infty| + |\mu(t) - \mu_\infty| \lesssim e^{-ct}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

We start by proving that there exists $\mu_\infty \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$(6.28) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mu(t) = \mu_\infty.$$

Combining the estimates (4.12), (6.21) and (6.25) we immediately see that $\frac{1}{\mu^2(t)}$ and $\frac{1}{\lambda^2(t)}$ converge as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, by Lemma 6.3, the proof of (6.28) reduces to preclude the possibility that

$$(6.29) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda^2(t)} = 0.$$

Assume by contradiction that (6.29) holds. Recalling $\mathbf{d}(u(t_n)) \rightarrow 0$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there must exist $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda(t)} < \varepsilon \quad \forall t \geq t_{N_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{d}(u(t_n)) < \varepsilon \quad \forall n \geq N_0.$$

Taking any $t_* \geq t_{N_0}$ and applying (6.21), (6.22) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda^2(t_*)} - \frac{1}{\lambda^2(t_n)} \right| &\lesssim \left| \int_{t_*}^{t_n} \mathbf{d}(u(t)) dt \right| \lesssim \int_{t_{N_0}}^{t_n} \mathbf{d}(u(t)) dt \\ &\leq C \sup_{t \in [t_{N_0}, t_n]} \frac{1}{\lambda^2(t)} [\mathbf{d}(u(t_n)) + \mathbf{d}(u(t_{N_0}))]. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$\frac{1}{\lambda^2(t_*)} \leq C \sup_{t \in [t_{N_0}, \infty)} \frac{1}{\lambda^2(t)} \mathbf{d}(u(t_{N_0})) \leq C\varepsilon \sup_{t \in [t_{N_0}, \infty)} \frac{1}{\lambda^2(t)}.$$

Choosing $C\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and taking supremum in t_* over $[t_{N_0}, \infty)$, we obtain $\frac{1}{\lambda(t)} = 0$ for all $t \geq t_{N_0}$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, we obtain (6.28).

Estimate (6.27) is then a straightforward consequence of Lemma 4.4 and the boundedness of μ . The proof of (6.3) is complete.

Finally, we prove (6.4). Assume by contradiction that $\|u\|_{S(T_-,0)} = +\infty$. Then by Proposition 6.2 and Lemma 6.6, applied forward and backward, $T_- = -\infty$ and there exists a function $\lambda(t)$ defined on \mathbb{R} with uniform lower bound, such that the set $\{(u(t))_{[\lambda(t)]}, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is relatively compact in \dot{H}^1 . Furthermore

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{d}(u(t)) = \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \mathbf{d}(u(t)) = 0.$$

Then by Lemma 6.5, we have $\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \mathbf{d}(u(t)) dt = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{-n}^{+n} \mathbf{d}(u(t)) dt = 0$. Thus $\mathbf{d}(u_0) = 0$, which contradicts (6.1). This proves (6.4). \square

7. CONVERGENCE TO W IN THE SUPERCRITICAL CASE.

In this section, we characterize solutions to (1.1) if the kinetic energy is greater than that of the ground state. More precisely, we prove that if the threshold solution does not blow up in finite time, then it converges exponentially to the ground state.

Proposition 7.1. *Let u be a radial solution to (1.1) defined on $[0, +\infty)$ satisfying*

$$(7.1) \quad E(u_0) = E(W) \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^1} > \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}.$$

Assume furthermore that $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then there exist constants $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mu_0, c > 0$ such that

$$\|u(t) - W_{[\theta_0, \mu_0]}\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim e^{-ct}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

A similar result holds for negative times if u is defined on $(-\infty, 0]$.

Corollary 7.2. *Let u be a radial solution of (1.1) satisfying (7.1) and such that $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then u is not defined on \mathbb{R}^d .*

We start by proving the following Lemma.

Lemma 7.3. *Suppose u is the solution in Proposition 7.1. Then we have the following:*

(a) *On the interval I where $\mathbf{d}(u(t)) < \delta_0$, there exists $c > 0$ such that $\mu(t)$ appearing in the modulation decomposition (4.9) satisfies*

$$(7.2) \quad \mu(t) \geq c, \quad \forall t \in I.$$

(b) *There exists $R_0 = R_0(\delta_0, W, \|u_0\|_{L^2})$ such that for all $R \geq R_0$*

$$(7.3) \quad A_R(u(t)) \leq 2\alpha \mathbf{d}(u(t)), \quad \forall t \in I.$$

Proof. We first prove (7.2). Taking the L^2 norm on both sides of (4.9) and using $\|v(t)\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}} \lesssim \|v\|_{\dot{H}^1} \leq C\delta_0$ from Lemma 4.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(t)\|u(t)\|_{L^2} &\geq \|W + v(t)\|_{L^2(|x| \leq 1)} \\ &\geq \|W\|_{L^2(|x| \leq 1)} - C\|v(t)\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}} \geq \|W\|_{L^2(|x| \leq 1)} - C\delta_0. \end{aligned}$$

Inequality (7.2) then follows from the mass conservation.

We now turning to prove (7.3). By the radial Sobolev inequality

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |x|^{\frac{d-1}{2}} |u(x)| \lesssim \|u\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{1/2},$$

we have

$$\int_{|x| > R} \frac{|u(t, x)|^{\alpha+2}}{|x|^b} \lesssim R^{-b - \frac{d-1}{2}\alpha} \|u\|_{L^2}^{2 + \frac{\alpha}{2}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

This together with the bound in (5.6) and Young's inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} A_R(u(t)) &\lesssim \int_{|x| > R} \frac{|u(t, x)|^{\alpha+2}}{|x|^b} dx + \int_{|x| > R} \frac{|u(t, x)|^2}{|x|^2} dx \\ &\lesssim R^{-b - \frac{d-1}{2}\alpha} \mathbf{d}(u(t)) + \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 + R^{-2} \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

By taking R large enough depending on $\|u_0\|_{L^2}, \delta_0$ and W , we obtain (7.3) in the case of $\mathbf{d}(u(t)) \geq \delta_0$. In the remaining case when $\mathbf{d}(u(t)) < \delta_0$, (7.3) follows directly from (7.2) and the second bound of (5.7). \square

We are ready to prove Proposition 7.1.

Proof of Proposition 7.1. By (5.3) and (7.3), we have

$$(7.4) \quad \partial_{tt}V_R(t) \leq -2\alpha\mathbf{d}(u(t)), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Thus, since $\partial_{tt}V_R(t) < 0$ and $V_R(t) > 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, it follows that

$$(7.5) \quad \partial_t V_R(t) > 0 \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

Integrating (7.4) between t and T , and using (5.5) we get

$$2\alpha \int_t^T \mathbf{d}(u(s))ds \leq \partial_t V_R(t) - \partial_t V_R(T) \leq \partial_t V_R(t) \lesssim R^2 \mathbf{d}(u(t)).$$

Letting T tend to infinity yields $\int_t^\infty \mathbf{d}(u(s))ds \lesssim \mathbf{d}(u(t))$, and thus by the Gronwall's lemma,

$$\int_t^\infty \mathbf{d}(u(s))ds \lesssim e^{-ct}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

As a direct implication, there exists a sequence $\{t_n\} \subset (0, \infty)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{d}(u(t_n)) = 0$. Therefore, we can perform the decomposition (4.9) in the neighborhood of t_n for large n . We claim that

$$(7.6) \quad \mu(t_n) \lesssim 1.$$

Indeed, if this is not true, passing to a subsequence, we have $\mu(t_{n_k}) \rightarrow \infty$. Along this subsequence we use the Hölder's inequality and (4.10) to estimate (recall that $\varphi_R(x) = R^2 \varphi(\frac{x}{R})$)

$$\begin{aligned} V_R(t_{n_k}) &= \int_{|x| \leq \varepsilon} \varphi_R(x) |u(t_{n_k}, x)|^2 dx + \int_{|x| > \varepsilon} \varphi_R(x) |u(t_{n_k}, x)|^2 dx \\ &\lesssim R^2 \varepsilon^2 \|u(t_{n_k}, x)\|_{L_x^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}}^2 + R^4 \|u(t_{n_k}, x)\|_{L_x^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}(|x| > \varepsilon)}^2 \\ &\lesssim R^2 \varepsilon^2 (\mathbf{d}(u(t_{n_k})) + \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2) + R^4 \|(u(t_{n_k}))_{[\theta(t_{n_k}), \mu(t_{n_k})]}\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}(|x| \geq \varepsilon \mu(t_{n_k}))}^2 \\ &\lesssim R^2 \varepsilon^2 (\mathbf{d}(u(t_{n_k})) + \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2) + R^4 \|W\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}(|x| \geq \varepsilon \mu(t_{n_k}))}^2 + R^4 \|v(t_{n_k})\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\|v(t_{n_k})\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim \mathbf{d}(u(t_{n_k}))$ by (4.11) and $\mathbf{d}(u(t_{n_k})) \rightarrow 0$. Taking $n_k \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain $\lim_{n_k \rightarrow \infty} V_R(t_{n_k}) = 0$, which contradicts (7.5).

Next, we prove that

$$(7.7) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{d}(u(t)) = 0.$$

We argue by contradiction. If this is not true, there must exist $c \in (0, \delta_0)$, a subsequence in $\{t_n\}$ (for which we use the same notation) and another sequence τ_n such that

$$(7.8) \quad \tau_n \in (t_n, t_{n+1}], \quad \mathbf{d}(u(\tau_n)) = c, \quad \mathbf{d}(u(t)) \in (0, c] \quad \forall t \in [t_n, \tau_n].$$

Taking any $t \in [t_n, \tau_n]$, we use the derivative estimate from Lemma 4.4 and (7.2) to obtain

$$\left| \frac{1}{\mu(t_n)^2} - \frac{1}{\mu(t)^2} \right| \lesssim \int_{t_n}^t \left| \frac{\mu'(t)}{\mu(t)^3} \right| dt \lesssim \int_{t_n}^\infty \mathbf{d}(u(t)) dt \rightarrow 0.$$

This together with the control from (7.2) and (7.6) implies

$$\mu(t) \approx 1 \quad \forall t \in [t_n, \tau_n].$$

Inserting this into the estimate of $\beta(t)$ in (4.11) we have

$$|\beta(t_n) - \beta(\tau_n)| \leq \int_{t_n}^{\tau_n} |\beta'(t)| dt \lesssim \int_{t_n}^{\tau_n} \frac{|\beta'(t)|}{\mu^2(t)} dt \lesssim \int_{t_n}^\infty \mathbf{d}(u(t)) dt \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This is a contradiction since $\beta(t_n) \approx \mathbf{d}(u(t_n)) \rightarrow 0$ and $\beta(\tau_n) \approx \mathbf{d}(u(\tau_n)) = c$ from (7.8). The convergence of $\mathbf{d}(u(t))$ in (7.7) is proved.

Given (7.7), we can perform the decomposition for all $t \geq T_0$ and repeat the same argument as that used to derive (7.6) to show that $\mu(t) \approx 1$. Finally, the exponential convergence of all the parameters follows from the same argument in the Section 6. \square

Proof of Corollary 7.2. Let u be a solution of (1.1) satisfying the assumptions of the corollary and defined on \mathbb{R} . Applying the arguments in the proof of Proposition 7.1 to $\bar{u}(-t)$, we know that (7.4) and (7.5) also hold for the negative time. Moreover, we have

$$(7.9) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \mathbf{d}(u(t)) = 0.$$

By (5.5), (7.4) and (7.9), we have that $\partial_{tt}V_R(t) < 0$ and $\partial_t V_R(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$. This contradicts (7.5) and completes the proof of Corollary 7.2. \square

8. UNIQUENESS AND THE CLASSIFICATION RESULT

In this section, we first follows the arguments in [17] to establish a uniqueness result for threshold solutions converging to the ground state. Then we use the uniqueness results to classify all threshold solutions for the energy critical inhomogeneous NLS (1.1), which will imply the proof of Theorem 1.5.

8.1. Estimates on exponential solutions of the linearized equation. Let us consider the linearized equation with

$$(8.1) \quad \partial_t h + \mathcal{L}h = \varepsilon$$

where h and ε satisfy, for $t \geq 0$

$$(8.2) \quad \|\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}}, 2} + \|\nabla \varepsilon\|_{N(t, +\infty)} \lesssim e^{-c_1 t},$$

$$(8.3) \quad \|h(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim e^{-c_0 t},$$

with $0 < c_0 < c_1$. The following proposition asserts that h must decay almost as fast as ε , except in the direction \mathcal{Y}_+ where the decay is of order $e^{-e_0 t}$.

Proposition 8.1. *Consider h and ε satisfying (8.1), (8.2) and (8.3). Then for any Strichartz couple (p, q)*

- if $e_0 \notin [c_0, c_1)$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\|h(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|\nabla h\|_{L^p(t, +\infty; L^{q, 2})} \leq C_\eta e^{-(c_1 - \eta)t};$$

- if $e_0 \in [c_0, c_1)$, there exists $A_+ \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $\eta > 0$

$$\|h(t) - A_+ e^{-e_0 t} \mathcal{Y}_+\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|\nabla(h - A_+ e^{-e_0 t} \mathcal{Y}_+)\|_{L^p(t, +\infty; L^{q, 2})} \leq C_\eta e^{-(c_1 - \eta)t}.$$

Proof. As the proof follows that of [17, Proposition 5.9], we will only sketch the main steps. By Lemma 2.20, it suffices to show that if $e_0 \notin [c_0, c_1)$ then

$$(8.4) \quad \|h(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} \leq C_\eta e^{-(c_1 - \eta)t};$$

and if $e_0 \in [c_0, c_1)$ then

$$(8.5) \quad \|h(t) - A_+ e^{-e_0 t} \mathcal{Y}_+\|_{\dot{H}^1} \leq C_\eta e^{-(c_1 - \eta)t}.$$

In the sequel, we will assume without loss of generality that $c_1 \neq e_0$.

Step 1: Let us decompose $h(t)$ as

$$(8.6) \quad h(t) = \alpha_+(t)\mathcal{Y}_+ + \alpha_-(t)\mathcal{Y}_- + \tilde{\alpha}(t)iW + \gamma(t)W_1 + g(t),$$

where

$$(8.7) \quad \alpha_- := \frac{B(h, \mathcal{Y}_+)}{B(\mathcal{Y}_+, \mathcal{Y}_-)}, \quad \alpha_+ := \frac{B(h, \mathcal{Y}_-)}{B(\mathcal{Y}_+, \mathcal{Y}_-)},$$

$$\tilde{\alpha} := \frac{1}{\|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2} (h - \alpha_+ \mathcal{Y}_+ - \alpha_- \mathcal{Y}_-, iW)_{\dot{H}^1},$$

$$(8.8) \quad \gamma := \frac{1}{\|W_1\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2} (h - \alpha_+ \mathcal{Y}_+ - \alpha_- \mathcal{Y}_-, W_1)_{\dot{H}^1},$$

so that by (2.38) and (2.40) $g \in G^\perp$. Using equation (8.1) and (2.39), we obtain the differential equations on the coefficients in (8.7)–(8.8):

$$(8.9) \quad \frac{d}{dt}(e^{e_0 t} \alpha_+) = e^{e_0 t} \frac{B(\mathcal{Y}_-, \varepsilon)}{B(\mathcal{Y}_+, \mathcal{Y}_-)}, \quad \frac{d}{dt}(e^{-e_0 t} \alpha_-) = e^{-e_0 t} \frac{B(\mathcal{Y}_+, \varepsilon)}{B(\mathcal{Y}_+, \mathcal{Y}_-)},$$

$$(8.10) \quad \frac{dQ(h)}{dt} = 2B(h, \varepsilon), \quad \frac{d\tilde{\alpha}}{dt} = \frac{(iW, \tilde{\varepsilon})_{\dot{H}^1}}{\|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2}, \quad \frac{d\gamma}{dt} = \frac{(W_1, \tilde{\varepsilon})_{\dot{H}^1}}{\|W_1\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2},$$

where

$$(8.11) \quad \tilde{\varepsilon} := \varepsilon - \frac{B(\mathcal{Y}_-, \varepsilon)}{B(\mathcal{Y}_+, \mathcal{Y}_-)} \mathcal{Y}_+ - \frac{B(\mathcal{Y}_+, \varepsilon)}{B(\mathcal{Y}_+, \mathcal{Y}_-)} \mathcal{Y}_- - \mathcal{L}g.$$

Step 2: Bounds on α_- and α_+ . We now claim

$$(8.12) \quad |\alpha_-(t)| \lesssim e^{-c_1 t},$$

$$(8.13) \quad |\alpha_+(t)| \lesssim \begin{cases} e^{-c_1 t}, & \text{if } e_0 \notin [c_0, c_1], \\ e^{-c_1 t} + e^{-e_0 t}, & \text{if } e_0 \in [c_0, c_1]. \end{cases}$$

Let us first show the following general bound on B .

Claim 8.2. *For any finite time-interval I of length $|I| \leq 1$, we have*

$$(8.14) \quad \int_I |B(f, g)| dt \lesssim |I|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\|\nabla f\|_{N(I)} + \|f\|_{L^\infty(I, L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2})}) \|g\|_{L^\infty(I, H^2)}.$$

Proof. Recall the definition of the symmetric bilinear form B in (2.37). By Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \int_I |B(f, g)| dt &\lesssim \int_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|\nabla f| |\nabla g| + |x|^{-b} |f| |g|) dx dt \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla f\|_{N(I)} \|\nabla g\|_{L^2(I, L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}, 2})} + |I| \|f\|_{L^\infty(I, L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2})} \|g\|_{L^\infty(I, L^{\frac{2d}{d-2-2b}, 2})}, \end{aligned}$$

which together with the embedding $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{2d}{d-2-2b}, 2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ yields (8.14). \square

Assumption (8.2) on ε , together with (8.9) and Claim 8.2 yields

$$e^{-e_0 t} |\alpha_-(t)| = \int_t^\infty e^{-e_0 s} |B(\mathcal{Y}_+, \varepsilon(s))| ds \lesssim e^{-(e_0 + c_1)t}.$$

This proves (8.12).

Let us show (8.13). First assume that $e_0 < c_0$. Thus by assumption (8.3) and (8.7), $e^{e_0 t} \alpha_+(t)$ tends to 0 when t tends to infinity. Then using the same argument as that used to derive (8.12), we obtain $|\alpha_+(t)| \lesssim e^{-c_1 t}$.

Now assume that $e_0 \geq c_0$. By (8.9)

$$\alpha_+(t) = e^{-e_0 t} \alpha_+(0) + \frac{e^{-e_0 t}}{B(\mathcal{Y}_+, \mathcal{Y}_-)} \int_0^t e^{e_0 s} B(\mathcal{Y}_-, \varepsilon(s)) ds.$$

Assumption (8.2) on ε together with Claim 8.2 yields

$$|\alpha_+(t)| \lesssim e^{-e_0 t} + e^{-e_0 t} \int_0^t e^{e_0 s} e^{-c_1 s} ds \lesssim e^{-e_0 t} + e^{-c_1 t}.$$

Estimate (8.13) is proved.

Step 3: Bounds on $\|g\|_{\dot{H}^1}$, $\tilde{\alpha}$ and γ . We next prove

$$(8.15) \quad \|g(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} + |\tilde{\alpha}(t)| + |\gamma(t)| \lesssim e^{-\left(\frac{c_0 + c_1}{2}\right)t}.$$

Integrating the equation on Q in (8.10) between t and $+\infty$, and using Claim 8.2, assumptions (8.2) and (8.3), we get $|Q(h(t))| \lesssim e^{-(c_0 + c_1)t}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |Q(\alpha_+ \mathcal{Y}_+ + \alpha_- \mathcal{Y}_- + \tilde{\alpha} iW + \gamma W_1 + g)| &\lesssim e^{-(c_0 + c_1)t} \\ |2\alpha_+ \alpha_- B(\mathcal{Y}_+, \mathcal{Y}_-) + Q(g)| &\lesssim e^{-(c_0 + c_1)t}, \end{aligned}$$

which together with the bounds (8.12) and (8.13) implies $|Q(g)| \lesssim e^{-(c_0 + c_1)t}$. As a consequence of the coercivity of Q on G^\perp (Lemma 2.24), we get the estimate on $\|g\|_{\dot{H}^1}$ in (8.15). It remains to show the bounds on $\tilde{\alpha}$ and γ .

Consider the function $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ defined in (8.11). By assumption (8.2) and the equation (2.2)

$$|(iW, \tilde{\varepsilon}(s))_{\dot{H}^1}| \lesssim e^{-c_1 t} + |(W, \mathcal{L}g(s))_{\dot{H}^1}| \lesssim e^{-c_1 t} + \left| \int |x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+1} \mathcal{L}g \right|.$$

Since $|\nabla W| \lesssim |x|^{-1}W$ and $W = O(\langle x \rangle^{-(d-2)})$, it follows from Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int |x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+1} \mathcal{L}g \right| &\lesssim \int |x|^{-b-1} W^{\alpha+1} |\nabla g| + |x|^{-2b} W^{2\alpha+1} |g| \\ &\lesssim \int |x|^{-b-1} \langle x \rangle^{-(d+2-2b)} |\nabla g| + \int |x|^{-2b} \langle x \rangle^{-(d+6-4b)} |g| \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla g\|_{L^2} + \|g\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}} \lesssim \|g\|_{\dot{H}^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by the estimate of g in (8.15), we have $|(iW, \tilde{\varepsilon}(s))_{\dot{H}^1}| \lesssim e^{-\frac{c_0+c_1}{2}t}$. In view of the second equation in (8.10) and (8.11), we get the bound on $\tilde{\alpha}$ in (8.15). An analogous proof yields the bound on γ .

Step 4: Conclusion. Summing up estimates (8.12), (8.13) and (8.15), we get, in view of decomposition (8.6) of h :

$$(8.16) \quad \|h(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim \begin{cases} e^{-\frac{c_0+c_1}{2}t}, & \text{if } e_0 \notin [c_0, c_1] \\ e^{-e_0 t} + e^{-\frac{c_0+c_1}{2}t} & \text{if } e_0 \in [c_0, c_1]. \end{cases}$$

Proof of (8.4): If $e_0 \notin [c_0, c_1]$, then by the first line in (8.16), the estimate of h in (8.3) can be improved. Iterating the argument we obtain the bound $\|h(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} \leq C_\eta e^{-(c_1-\eta)t}$ if $e_0 \notin [c_0, c_1]$, which yields the desired estimate (8.4).

Proof of (8.5): Let us assume $e_0 \in [c_0, c_1]$. Then the equation on α_+ in (8.7) shows that $e^{e_0 t} \alpha_+(t)$ has a limit A_+ when $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Integrating the equation on α_+ between t and $+\infty$, we get (in view of Claim 8.2)

$$(8.17) \quad A_+ - e^{e_0 t} \alpha_+(t) = e^{e_0 t} \int_t^{+\infty} \frac{B(\mathcal{Y}_+, \varepsilon(s))}{B(\mathcal{Y}_+, \mathcal{Y}_-)} ds = O(e^{(e_0-c_1)t}).$$

Substituting (8.17) into the decomposition (8.6), and using the estimates (8.12) and (8.15), we get $\|h(t) - A_+ e^{-e_0 t} \mathcal{Y}_+\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim e^{-\frac{c_0+c_1}{2}t}$. Furthermore, $h_1(t) := h(t) - A_+ e^{-e_0 t} \mathcal{Y}_+$ satisfies, as h , equation (8.1). Thus the estimate (8.4) shown in the preceding step implies (8.5). The proof of Proposition 8.1 is complete. \square

8.2. Uniqueness.

Lemma 8.3. *If u is a solution of (1.1), defined on $[t_0, +\infty)$, satisfies $E(u) = E(W)$ and*

$$(8.18) \quad \|u(t) - W\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim e^{-ct}, \quad \forall t \geq t_0,$$

for some constant $c > 0$. Then there exists a unique $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $u = W^a$, where W^a is constructed in Proposition 3.2.

Proof. Let $v := u - W$. Then by (2.15) v satisfies the equation

$$(8.19) \quad \partial_t v + \mathcal{L}v + R(v) = 0, \quad \forall t \geq t_0.$$

Step 1: We show that there exists $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $\eta > 0$,

$$(8.20) \quad \|v(t) - a e^{-e_0 t} \mathcal{Y}_+\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|v(t) - a e^{-e_0 t} \mathcal{Y}_+\|_{Z(t, +\infty)} \leq C_\eta e^{-(2-\eta)e_0 t}.$$

Indeed, we will show

$$(8.21) \quad \|v(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim e^{-e_0 t}, \quad \|R(v(t))\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}} + \|\nabla(R(v))\|_{N(t, +\infty)} \lesssim e^{-2e_0 t},$$

which together with Proposition 8.1 gives (8.20). By Lemma 2.19, it suffices to show the first estimate.

By (8.18) and Lemma 2.19, we have

$$\|R(v(t))\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}} + \|\nabla R(v(t))\|_{N(t, +\infty)} \lesssim e^{-2ct}.$$

Then Proposition 8.1 gives that

$$\|v(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim e^{-e_0 t} + e^{-\frac{3}{2}ct}.$$

If $\frac{3}{2}c \geq e_0$, we obtain the first inequality in (8.21). If not, an iteration argument gives the first inequality in (8.21).

Step 2: Let us show, for any $m > 0$,

$$(8.22) \quad \|u(t) - W^a\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|u - W^a\|_{Z(t, +\infty)} \leq e^{-mt}.$$

This implies that $u = W^a$, by uniqueness in Proposition 3.2. Therefore, the proof of Lemma 8.3 reduces to show (8.22).

We now prove (8.22). According to Step 1, (8.22) holds for $m = \frac{3}{2}e_0$. Let us assume (8.22) holds for some $m = m_1 > e_0$. We will show that it holds for $m = m_1 + \frac{e_0}{2}$, which will yield (8.22) by iteration.

Let $v^a(t) := W^a(t) - W$. Then by (2.15) and (8.19)

$$\partial_t(v - v^a) + \mathcal{L}(v - v^a) = -R(v) + R(v^a).$$

We have assumed that (8.22) holds for $m = m_1$, i.e.

$$\|v(t) - v^a(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|v - v^a\|_{Z(t,+\infty)} \leq e^{-m_1 t},$$

which together with Lemma 2.19 implies

$$\|R(v(t)) - R(v^a(t))\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}, 2}} + \|\nabla(R(v) - R(v^a))\|_{N(t,+\infty)} \lesssim e^{-(m_1 + \varepsilon_0)t}.$$

It then follows from Proposition 8.1 that

$$\|v(t) - v^a(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|v - v^a\|_{Z(t,+\infty)} \lesssim e^{-(m_1 + \frac{3}{4}\varepsilon_0)t},$$

which yields (8.22) with $m = m_1 + \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}$. By iteration, (8.22) holds for any $m > 0$. \square

Corollary 8.4. *For any $a \neq 0$, there exists $T_a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$(8.23) \quad \begin{cases} W^a(t) = W^+(t + T_a) & \text{if } a > 0, \\ W^a(t) = W^-(t + T_a) & \text{if } a < 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $a > 0$ and then choose $T_a > 0$ such that $ae^{-\varepsilon_0 T_a} = 1$. By (3.7), for large t ,

$$(8.24) \quad \|W^a(t + T_a) - W - e^{-\varepsilon_0 t} \mathcal{Y}_+\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim e^{-\frac{3}{2}\varepsilon_0 t},$$

which implies $\|W^a(t + T_a) - W\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim e^{-\varepsilon_0 t}$. By Lemma 8.3, there exists $a' \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $W^a(t + T_a) = W^{a'}(t)$. Substituting it into (8.24), using (3.7) and the uniqueness result of W^a in Proposition 3.2, we see that $a' = 1$. Hence (8.23) holds when $a > 0$. The proof for $a < 0$ is similar and we omit the details. \square

8.3. Proof of the classification result. Let us turn to the proof of Theorem 1.5. Point (b) is an immediate consequence of the variational characterization of W (Proposition 2.14).

Let us show (a). Let u be a solution of (1.1) satisfying (6.1), and $I = (T_-, T_+)$ be its maximal interval of existence. If $\|u\|_{S(T_-, T_+)} < \infty$, then u exists globally and scatters in both time directions by Theorem 2.11. Assume now that $\|u\|_{S(T_-, T_+)} = \infty$. Replacing if necessary $u(t)$ by $\bar{u}(t)$, we may assume that $\|u\|_{S(0, T_+)} = \infty$. By Proposition 6.1, $T_+ = +\infty$ and there exist $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mu_0 > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that $\|u(t) - W_{[\theta_0, \mu_0]}\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim e^{-ct}$. It then follows from Lemma 8.3 that there exists $a < 0$ such that $u_{[-\theta_0, \mu_0^{-1}]} = W^a$. Thus by Corollary 8.4,

$$u(t) = W_{[\theta_0, \mu_0]}^-(t + T_a)$$

for some $T_a \in \mathbb{R}$, which shows (a).

The proof of (c) is similar. Let u be a solution of (1.1) defined on I such that $E(u_0) = E(W)$, $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^1} > \|\nabla W\|_{\dot{H}^1}$ and $u_0 \in L^2$ is radial. Assume that $|I|$ is infinity. Without loss of generality, we may assume that u is defined on $[0, +\infty)$. Then by Proposition 7.1, $\|u(t) - W_{[\theta_0, \mu_0]}\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim e^{-ct}$. Using Lemma 8.3 and the same argument as before, we have

$$u(t) = W_{[\theta_0, \mu_0]}^+(t + T_a)$$

for some $T_a \in \mathbb{R}$, which shows (c). The proof of Theorem 1.5 is complete.

APPENDIX A. ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOR OF $G(r)$.

Lemma A.1. *Let W be the ground state in (1.2) and $G(x) = G(|x|) \in \dot{H}_{rad}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ solving*

$$(A.1) \quad G'' + \frac{d-1}{r}G' - \frac{d-1}{r^2}G + \frac{\alpha+1}{r^b}W^\alpha G = 0.$$

Then

$$\begin{cases} \text{As } r \rightarrow 0^+, G(r) = O(r), G'(r) = O(1), \\ \text{As } r \rightarrow \infty, G(r) = O(r^{-(d-1)}), G'(r) = O(r^{-d}), \end{cases}$$

Proof. It is easy to see 0 is the regular-singular point of the ODE (A.1); therefore there must exist two linear independent solutions in the form of a power series:

$$G_1(r) = r \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n r^n, \quad a_0 = 1;$$

$$G_2(r) = CG_1(r) \ln r + r^{-(d-1)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n r^n, \quad b_0 = 1.$$

General solutions to (A.1) near 0 are

$$c_1 G_1(s) + c_2 G_2(s).$$

Since $G(x) = G(|x|) \in \dot{H}_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, clearly it must hold that $c_2 = 0$ and thus we obtain the desired asymptotics of G near 0.

For the asymptotic behavior near infinity, we can reduce the issue into a similar situation by introducing the change of variable $s = r^{-1}$. Equation (A.1) in variable s is

$$G_{ss} - \frac{d-3}{s}G_s - \frac{d-1}{s^2}G + (\alpha+1)s^{b-4}W^\alpha G = 0.$$

From a similar analysis, it has two linear independent solutions near $s = 0$. Going back to r variable and using $G(r) \in \dot{H}_{\text{rad}}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we are able to select the right asymptotics

$$G(r) = O(r^{-(d-1)})$$

as $r \rightarrow \infty$. The lemma is proved. \square

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF MODULATION RESULTS.

Proof of Lemma 4.4. We first prove (4.11). By $v(t) = \beta(t)W + \tilde{u}(t)$ and $\tilde{u} \perp W$ in \dot{H}^1 , we have

$$(B.1) \quad \|v\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 = \beta^2 \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 + \|\tilde{u}\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2.$$

Denote by \tilde{u}_1 and \tilde{u}_2 the real and imaginary parts of \tilde{u} . By the orthogonality of \tilde{u}_1 and \tilde{u}_2 with W in \dot{H}^1 and the equation (2.2), we have

$$\int \nabla W \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_1 = \int \nabla W \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_2 = \int |x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+1} \tilde{u}_1 = \int |x|^{-b} W^{\alpha+1} \tilde{u}_2 = 0.$$

Hence $B(W, \tilde{u}) = 0$ and

$$(B.2) \quad Q(v) = Q(\tilde{u} + \beta W) = Q(\tilde{u}) + \beta^2 Q(W).$$

From the scaling invariance of the energy, (4.10) and (2.21), we have

$$(B.3) \quad E(W) = E(u_{[\theta, \mu]}) = E(W + v) = E(W) + Q(v) + O(\|v\|_{\dot{H}^1}^3).$$

As $Q(W) < 0$ by (3.10), it follows from (B.2) and (B.3) that

$$|\beta^2|Q(W)| - Q(\tilde{u})| = Q(v) \lesssim \|v\|_{\dot{H}^1}^3.$$

This inequality together with the coercivity property of Q in Proposition 2.21 implies that

$$(B.4) \quad \|\tilde{u}\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 \lesssim \|v\|_{\dot{H}^1}^3 + \beta^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta^2 \lesssim \|\tilde{u}\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 + \|v\|_{\dot{H}^1}^3.$$

Since $\|v\|_{\dot{H}^1}$ is small when $\mathbf{d}(u)$ is small by the variational characterization of W , it follows from (B.1) and (B.4) that

$$|\beta| \approx \|v\|_{\dot{H}^1} \approx \|\tilde{u}\|_{\dot{H}^1},$$

for small $\mathbf{d}(u)$. This is the first part of (4.11). It remains to show the estimate on $\mathbf{d}(u)$. Developing the equation

$\left| \|W + v\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 - \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 \right| = \mathbf{d}(u)$, we get

$$\left| \|v\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 + 2(v, W)_{\dot{H}^1} \right| = \left| \|v\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 + 2\beta \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 \right| = \mathbf{d}(u),$$

which yields $|\beta(t)| \approx \mathbf{d}(u(t))$. Estimates (4.11) are proved.

We now prove (4.12). Let us consider the self-similar variables y and s defined by

$$\mu(t)y = x, \quad ds = \mu^2(t)dt.$$

Then (1.1) may be rewritten as (for simplicity we drop the t dependence in θ, μ):

$$i\partial_s u_{[\theta, \mu]} + \Delta_y u_{[\theta, \mu]} + |y|^{-b} |u_{[\theta, \mu]}|^\alpha u_{[\theta, \mu]} + \theta_s u_{[\theta, \mu]} + i \frac{\mu_s}{\mu} \left(\frac{d-2}{2} u_{[\theta, \mu]} + y \cdot \nabla u_{[\theta, \mu]} \right) = 0.$$

Inserting $u_{[\theta, \mu]} = W + v$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s v - i\Delta v - i(\alpha+1)|y|^{-b} W^\alpha v_1 + |y|^{-b} W^\alpha v_2 + R(v) \\ - i\theta_s(W+v) + \frac{\mu_s}{\mu} W_1 + \frac{\mu_s}{\mu} (y \cdot \nabla v + \frac{d-2}{2} v) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Writing $v = \beta(s)W + \tilde{u}$, we obtain the equation for $\tilde{u} = \tilde{u}_1 + i\tilde{u}_2$:

$$(B.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_s \tilde{u}_1 + i\partial_s \tilde{u}_2 + \beta_s W + (\Delta + |y|^{-b} W^\alpha) \tilde{u}_2 - i(\Delta + (\alpha+1)|y|^{-b} W^\alpha) \tilde{u}_1 - \alpha i \beta(s) |y|^{-b} W^{\alpha+1} \\ - \theta_s i W + \frac{\mu_s}{\mu} W_1 = -R(v) + \theta_s i v - \frac{\mu_s}{\mu} \left(\frac{d-2}{2} v + y \cdot \nabla v \right). \end{aligned}$$

Claim B.1. *The \dot{H}^1 -scalar products of the right-hand term by W , iW and W_1 are bounded up to a constant by $\mathcal{E}(s)$, where $\mathcal{E}(s)$ is defined by*

$$\mathcal{E}(s) := |\mathbf{d}(u(s))|(|\mathbf{d}(u(s))| + |\theta_s(s)| + |\frac{\mu_s}{\mu}(s)|).$$

Proof of Claim B.1. We only show how to bound the \dot{H}^1 -scalar products of $R(v)$ by W , since the others can be handled similarly. Note that by (2.17) and (2.19),

$$|R(v)| \lesssim |y|^{-b}(W^{\alpha-1}|v|^2 + |v|^{\alpha+1});$$

so that by the equation (2.2), $0 < b < \min\{1, \frac{d-2}{2}\}$ and the estimate (4.11) that proved before

$$\begin{aligned} |(R(v), W)_{\dot{H}^1}| &= |(R(v), \Delta W)_{L^2}| \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^{-2b}(W^{\alpha-1}|v|^2 + |v|^{\alpha+1})W^{\alpha+1} dy \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^{-2b} \langle y \rangle^{-(8-4b)} |v|^2 + |y|^{-2b} \langle y \rangle^{-(d+2-2b)} |v|^{\alpha+1} dy \\ &\lesssim \| |y|^{-2b} \langle y \rangle^{-(8-4b)} \|_{L_y^{\frac{d}{2}}} \|v\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}}^2 + \| |y|^{-2b} \|_{L_y^{\frac{2d}{d-2+2b}}} \|v\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}}^{\alpha+1} \\ &\lesssim \|v(s)\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 + \|v(s)\|_{\dot{H}^1}^{\alpha+1} \lesssim \mathbf{d}(u(s))^2 + \mathbf{d}(u(s))^{\alpha+1} \lesssim \mathbf{d}(u(s))^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Taking the inner product between (B.5) and W, iW and W_1 in \dot{H}^1 , we obtain

$$(B.6) \quad \beta_s \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 = -(\Delta \tilde{u}_2, W)_{\dot{H}^1} - (|y|^{-b} W^\alpha \tilde{u}_2, W)_{\dot{H}^1} + O(\mathcal{E}(s))$$

$$\begin{aligned} -\theta_s \|W\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 &= (\Delta \tilde{u}_1, W)_{\dot{H}^1} + ((\alpha+1)|y|^{-b} W^\alpha \tilde{u}_1, W)_{\dot{H}^1} \\ &\quad - \alpha \beta(s) (|y|^{-b} W^{\alpha+1}, W)_{\dot{H}^1} + O(\mathcal{E}(s)) \end{aligned}$$

$$(B.7) \quad \frac{\mu_s}{\mu} \|W_1\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 = -(\Delta \tilde{u}_2, W_1)_{\dot{H}^1} - (|y|^{-b} W^\alpha \tilde{u}_2, W_1)_{\dot{H}^1} + O(\mathcal{E}(s)).$$

Claim B.2. *We have the following bounds:*

$$|(\Delta \tilde{u}, W)_{\dot{H}^1}| + |(|y|^{-b} W^\alpha \tilde{u}, W)_{\dot{H}^1}| \lesssim \mathbf{d}(u(s)).$$

The same set of estimates also hold when W is replaced by W_1 .

Proof of Claim B.2. Since $0 < b < \min\{1, \frac{d-2}{2}\}$, it follows from the equation (2.2), Hölder's inequality and (4.11) that

$$\begin{aligned} |(\Delta \tilde{u}, W)_{\dot{H}^1}| &= |(\nabla \tilde{u}, \nabla(|y|^{-b} W^{\alpha+1}))_{L^2}| \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_{L^2} \| |y|^{-b-1} \langle y \rangle^{-(d+2-2b)} \|_{L_y^2} \lesssim \|\tilde{u}\|_{\dot{H}^1} \lesssim \mathbf{d}(u(s)), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |(|y|^{-b} W^\alpha \tilde{u}, W)_{\dot{H}^1}| &= |(|y|^{-b} W^\alpha \tilde{u}, |y|^{-b} W^{\alpha+1})_{L^2}| \\ &\lesssim \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}} \| |y|^{-2b} \langle y \rangle^{-(d+6-4b)} \|_{L_y^{\frac{2d}{d+2}}} \lesssim \|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_{L^2} \lesssim \mathbf{d}(u(s)). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, as $-\Delta W_1 = (\alpha+1)W^\alpha W_1$, W_1 is bounded as $|y| \rightarrow 0$ and decays faster than W as $|y| \rightarrow \infty$, we have the same set of estimates when W is replaced by W_1 . □

Consequently all the right-hand terms in the equations (B.6)–(B.7) are bounded up to a constant by $\mathbf{d}(u(s)) + \mathcal{E}(s)$. Taking δ_0 sufficiently small, we have

$$|\beta_s(s)| + |\theta_s(s)| + |\frac{\mu_s}{\mu}(s)| \lesssim |\mathbf{d}(u(s))|.$$

Changing back to t variable we proved (4.12). □

APPENDIX C. SPECTRAL PROPERTIES OF THE LINEARIZED OPERATOR.

In this Appendix, we follow the arguments in [8, 17, 18, 34] to give the proof of Lemma 2.23.

(a) Existence and symmetry of the eigenfunctions. Note that $\overline{\mathcal{L}(v)} = -\mathcal{L}(\overline{v})$, so that if $e_0 > 0$ is an eigenvalue for \mathcal{L} with eigenfunction \mathcal{Y}_+ , $-e_0$ is an eigenvalue of \mathcal{L} with eigenfunction $\overline{\mathcal{Y}_+}$. Let us show the existence of \mathcal{Y}_+ . Writing $\mathcal{Y}_1 = \text{Re}\mathcal{Y}_+$, $\mathcal{Y}_2 = \text{Im}\mathcal{Y}_+$, we must solve

$$(C.1) \quad \begin{cases} (\Delta + (\alpha + 1)V)\mathcal{Y}_1 = -e_0\mathcal{Y}_2, \\ (\Delta + V)\mathcal{Y}_2 = e_0\mathcal{Y}_1, \end{cases}$$

where $V := |x|^{-b}W^\alpha$. The operator $-\Delta - V$ on L^2 with domain H^2 is self-adjoint and nonnegative, thus it has a unique square root $(-\Delta - V)^{1/2}$ with domain H^1 . Assume that there exists $f \in H^4$ such that

$$Pf = -e_0^2 f, \quad \text{where } P := (-\Delta - V)^{1/2}(-\Delta - (\alpha + 1)V)(-\Delta - V)^{1/2}$$

Then taking

$$\mathcal{Y}_1 := (-\Delta - V)^{1/2}f, \quad \mathcal{Y}_2 := \frac{1}{e_0}(-\Delta - (\alpha + 1)V)(-\Delta - V)^{1/2}f$$

would yield a solution of system (C.1), showing the existence of \mathcal{Y}_+ and \mathcal{Y}_- .

It suffices to show that the operator P on L^2 with domain H^4 has a strictly negative eigenvalue. Note that $0 < b < \min\{\frac{d}{4}, d-2\}$ by the assumptions made at the beginning of section 2, it is straightforward to check that

$$P = (\Delta + V)^2 - \alpha(-\Delta - V)^{1/2}V(-\Delta - V)^{1/2}$$

is a relatively compact, self-adjoint perturbation of Δ^2 ; so that its essential spectrum is $[0, +\infty)$. Thus the proof reduces to show the following:

$$(C.2) \quad \exists f \in H^4 \quad \text{such that} \quad ((\Delta + (\alpha + 1)V)(-\Delta - V)^{1/2}f, (-\Delta - V)^{1/2}f)_{L^2} > 0.$$

We distinguish two cases. First assume that $d = 3, 4$, so that $W \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We will use the localization method to prove (C.2). Let $W_a(x) := \chi(x/a)W(x)$, where χ is a smooth, radial function such that $\chi(r) = 1$ for $r \leq 1$ and $\chi(r) = 0$ for $r \geq 2$. We first claim

$$(C.3) \quad \exists a > 0 \quad \text{such that} \quad E_a := \int (\Delta + (\alpha + 1)V)W_a W_a > 0.$$

Recall that $\Delta W = -|x|^{-b}W^{\alpha+1}$. Thus

$$(\Delta + (\alpha + 1)V)W_a = \alpha|x|^{-b}\chi(x/a)W^{\alpha+1} + \frac{2}{a}(\nabla\chi)(x/a) \cdot \nabla W + \frac{1}{a^2}(\Delta\chi)(x/a)W.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \int (\Delta + (\alpha + 1)V)W_a W_a \\ &= \alpha \int |x|^{-b}\chi^2(x/a)W^{\alpha+2} + \underbrace{\frac{2}{a} \int (\chi\nabla\chi)(x/a) \cdot \nabla W W}_{(A)} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{a^2} \int (\chi\Delta\chi)(x/a)W^2}_{(B)}. \end{aligned}$$

According to the explicit expression of W , $W \lesssim |x|^{-(d-2)}$ and $|\nabla W| \lesssim |x|^{-(d-1)}$ at infinity, which gives $|(A)| + |(B)| \lesssim \frac{1}{a}$. Hence (C.3).

Let us fix a such that (C.3) holds. Recall that W is not in L^2 . Thus $\Delta + V$ is a selfadjoint operator on L^2 , with domain H^2 , and without eigenfunction. In particular $\overline{R(\Delta + V)} = \text{Ker}\{\Delta + V\}^\perp = L^2$. Hence for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we can find $G_\varepsilon \in H^2$ such that

$$(C.4) \quad \|(\Delta + V)G_\varepsilon - (\Delta + V - 1)W_a\|_{L^2} \leq \varepsilon,$$

which together with $\|(\Delta + V - 1)^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^2} < +\infty$ implies

$$(C.5) \quad \|(\Delta + V - 1)^{-1}(\Delta + V)G_\varepsilon - W_a\|_{H^2} \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

Substituting (C.5) into (C.3), we obtain, for small $\varepsilon > 0$

$$(C.6) \quad ((\Delta + (\alpha + 1)V)(\Delta + V - 1)^{-1}(\Delta + V)G_\varepsilon, (\Delta + V - 1)^{-1}(\Delta + V)G_\varepsilon) > 0.$$

Since $(\Delta + V - 1)^{-1}(-\Delta - V)^{1/2}G_\varepsilon \in H^3$, there exists $f \in H^4$ such that

$$\|(\Delta + V - 1)^{-1}(-\Delta - V)^{1/2}G_\varepsilon + f\|_{H^3} < \varepsilon,$$

which implies

$$(C.7) \quad \|(\Delta + V - 1)^{-1}(\Delta + V)G_\varepsilon - (-\Delta - V)^{1/2}f\|_{H^2} \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

Substituting (C.7) into (C.6) and choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficient small, we obtain (C.2).

Assume now that $d = 5$, so that W is in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In this case $\mathbf{R}(\Delta + V)^\perp = \text{Ker}(\Delta + V) = \text{Span}\{W\}$, and thus

$$(C.8) \quad \overline{\mathbf{R}(\Delta + V)} = \{f \in L^2 : (f, W)_{L^2} = 0\}.$$

Furthermore, $\Delta + (\alpha + 1)V$ is a self-adjoint compact perturbation of Δ and

$$((\Delta + (\alpha + 1)V)W, W)_{L^2} = \alpha \int V W^2 dx > 0,$$

which shows that $\Delta + (\alpha + 1)V$ has a positive eigenvalue. Let Z be the eigenfunction for this eigenvalue. Recalling that $(\Delta + (\alpha + 1)V)W_1 = 0$ we get, for any real number γ

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\Delta + (\alpha + 1)V)(Z + \gamma W_1)(Z + \gamma W_1) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\Delta + (\alpha + 1)V)ZZ > 0.$$

By explicit calculation, $(W_1, W)_{L^2} \neq 0$, so that we can choose the real number γ to have $(Z + \gamma W_1, W)_{L^2} = 0$. Hence by $(\Delta + V)W = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} ((\Delta + V - 1)(Z + \gamma W_1), W)_{L^2} &= (Z + \gamma W_1, (\Delta + V - 1)W)_{L^2} \\ &= -(Z + \gamma W_1, W)_{L^2} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By (C.8), we can choose, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ a function G_ε in H^2 such that

$$\|(\Delta + V)G_\varepsilon - (\Delta + V - 1)(Z + \gamma W_1)\|_{L^2} < \varepsilon,$$

which is similar to (C.4). As in the preceding case, we can find $f \in H^4$ such that (C.2) holds. This completes the proof of (a).

(b) Decay of the eigenfunctions at infinty. Recall that the eigenfunctions \mathcal{Y}_+ and \mathcal{Y}_- are complex conjugates. According to system (C.1), it suffices to show the decay result on \mathcal{Y}_1 only. We first show the following property holds for all k and s

$$\forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}), \forall R \geq 1, \|\varphi(x/R)\mathcal{Y}_1\|_{H^s} \lesssim \frac{1}{R^k} \cdot (\mathcal{P}_{k,s})$$

Recall that $\mathcal{Y}_1 = \sqrt{-\Delta - V}f_1$ with $f_1 \in H^4$, so that $(\mathcal{P}_{0,3})$ is satisfied. We now show that for $k \geq 0, s \geq 3$, $(\mathcal{P}_{k,s})$ implies $(\mathcal{P}_{k+1,s+1})$. Assume $(\mathcal{P}_{k,s})$ and consider φ and $\tilde{\varphi}$ in $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$ such that $\tilde{\varphi}$ is 1 on the support of φ . Applying $\Delta + V$ to the first equation of (C.1) and combining the second equation, we obtain

$$(C.9) \quad (\Delta^2 + e_0^2)\mathcal{Y}_1 = -V\Delta\mathcal{Y}_1 - (\alpha + 1)V^2\mathcal{Y}_1 - (\alpha + 1)\Delta(V\mathcal{Y}_1).$$

By the explicit form of W , V and all its derivatives decay at least as $1/|x|^{4-b}$ at infinity. Thus (C.9) implies $\|\varphi(x/R)(\Delta^2 + e_0^2)\mathcal{Y}_1\|_{H^{s-3}} \lesssim \frac{1}{R^{4-b}}\|\tilde{\varphi}(x/R)\mathcal{Y}_1\|_{H^s}$. Hence

$$(C.10) \quad \|(\Delta^2 + e_0^2)(\varphi(\frac{x}{R})\mathcal{Y}_1)\|_{H^{s-3}} \lesssim \frac{1}{R}\|\tilde{\varphi}(x/R)\mathcal{Y}_1\|_{H^s}.$$

By $(\mathcal{P}_{k,s})$, the right-hand side of (C.10) is bounded by C/R^{k+1} for large R . Furthermore, $\Delta^2 + e_0^2$ is an isomorphism from H^{s+1} to H^{s-3} , so that (C.10) implies $\|\varphi(x/R)\mathcal{Y}_1\|_{H^{s+1}} \lesssim 1/R^{k+1}$, which yields exactly $(\mathcal{P}_{k+1,s+1})$. The proof of (2.34) is complete.

With the decay (2.34) at infinity, and recalling $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we have $\mathcal{Y}_\pm \in L^{\frac{2d}{d+2},2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. After differentiating (C.1), we obtain $\mathcal{Y}_\pm \in W^3 L^{\frac{2d}{d+2},2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, as desired.

Finally, we prove that $\mathcal{Y}_\pm \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In fact, by Lemma 2.7 and (2.33), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \| |x|^{-b} W^\alpha \mathcal{Y}_\pm \|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}} \\ & \lesssim \| |x|^{-b} W^\alpha \|_{W^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon, L^{\frac{d}{2-\varepsilon},2}}} \| \mathcal{Y}_\pm \|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-4+2\varepsilon},2}} + \| |x|^{-b} W^\alpha \|_{L^{d,2}} \| \mathcal{Y}_\pm \|_{W^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon, L^{\frac{2d}{d-2},2}}} \\ & \lesssim \| |x|^{-b} W^\alpha \|_{W^{\frac{1}{2}+2\varepsilon, L^{\frac{d}{2},2}}} \| \mathcal{Y}_\pm \|_{H^2} + \| |x|^{-b} W^\alpha \|_{W L^{\frac{d}{2},2}} \| \mathcal{Y}_\pm \|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}+\varepsilon}} \lesssim \| \mathcal{Y}_\pm \|_{H^2} < +\infty, \end{aligned}$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. This inequality together with the equation (C.1) and the embedding $H^{\frac{5}{2}+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ shows $\mathcal{Y}_\pm \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

(c) and (d). The proof of (c) is similar to (b), and (d) follows from [17, Corollary 5.3], so we omit the details.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

K. Yang was partially supported by the Jiangsu Shuang Chuang Doctoral Plan and the Jiangsu Provincial Scientific Research Center of Applied Mathematics under Grant BK20233002. T. Zhang was partially supported by NSFC of China under Grants 11931010 and the Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. LDQ23A010001.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Aloui, S. Tayachi, *Local well-posedness for the inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation*. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **48** (2021), no. 11, 5409–5437.
- [2] Alex H. Ardila, M. Hamano, M. Ikeda, *Mass-energy threshold dynamics for the focusing NLS with a repulsive inverse-power potential*. [arXiv:2202.11640](#).
- [3] Alex H. Ardila, T. Inui, *Threshold scattering for the focusing NLS with a repulsive Dirac delta potential*. J. Differential Equations **313** (2022), 54–84.
- [4] Alex H. Ardila, J. Murphy, *Threshold solutions for the 3d cubic-quintic NLS*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations **48** (2023), no. 5, 819–862.
- [5] Alex H. Ardila, J. Murphy, J. Zheng, *Threshold dynamics for the 3d radial NLS with combined Nonlinearity*. [arXiv:2305.13531](#).
- [6] T. Aubin, *Problèmes isopérimétriques et espaces de Sobolev*. J. Diff. Geom. **11** (1976), 573–598.
- [7] J. Belmonte-Beitia, V. M. Pérez-García, V. Vekslerchik, P. J. Torres, *Lie Symmetries and Solitons in Nonlinear Systems with Spatially Inhomogeneous Nonlinearities*. Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 064102.
- [8] L. Campos, J. Murphy, *Threshold solutions for the intercritical inhomogeneous NLS*. SIAM J. Math. Anal. (2023) **55**, 3807–3843.
- [9] L. Campos, L. G. Farah, S. Roudenko, *Threshold solutions for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **38** (2022), 1637–1708.
- [10] Y. Cho, S. Hong, K. Lee, *On the global well-posedness of focusing energy-critical inhomogeneous NLS*. J. Evol. Equ. **20** (2020), no. 4, 1349–1380.
- [11] Y. Cho, K. Lee, *On the focusing energy-critical inhomogeneous NLS: weighted space approach*. Nonlinear Anal. **205** (2021), Paper No. 112261, 21 pp.
- [12] D. Cruz-Uribe, V. Naibo, *Kato-Ponce inequalities on weighted and variable Lebesgue spaces*. Differential Integral Equations **29** (2016), 801–836.
- [13] V. D. Dinh, *Blowup of H^1 solutions for a class of the focusing inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation*. Nonlinear Anal. **174** (2018), 169–188.
- [14] V.D. Dinh, S. Keraani, *Energy scattering for a class of inhomogeneous biharmonic nonlinear Schrödinger equations in low dimensions*. [arXiv:2211.11824v2](#).
- [15] T. Duyckaerts, O. Landoulsi, S. Roudenko, *Threshold solutions in the focusing 3D cubic NLS equation outside a strictly convex obstacle*. J. Funct. Anal. **282** (2022), no. 5, Paper No. 109326, 55 pp.
- [16] T. Duyckaerts, F. Merle, *Dynamics of threshold solutions for energy-critical wave equation*. Int. Math. Res. Pap. IMRP 2008, Art ID rpn002, 67 pp.
- [17] T. Duyckaerts, F. Merle, *Dynamic of threshold solutions for the energy-critical NLS*. Geom. Funct. Anal. **18** (2009), no.6, 1787–1840.
- [18] T. Duyckaerts, S. Roudenko, *Threshold solutions for the focusing 3D cubic Schrödinger equation*. Revista. Math. Iber. **26**(2010), 1–56.
- [19] B. Dodson, *Global well-posedness and scattering for the focusing, cubic Schrödinger equation in dimension $d = 4$* . Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. **52** (2019), no. 1, 139–180.
- [20] F. Genoud, C. A. Stuart, *Schrödinger equations with a spatially decaying nonlinearity: Existence and stability of standing waves*. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **21** (2008), 137–186.
- [21] P. Gérard, *Description du défaut de compacité de l'injection de Sobolev*. ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **3** (1998), 213–233.
- [22] T. S. Gill, *Optical guiding of laser beam in nonuniform plasma*. Pramana **55** (2000), 835–842.
- [23] L. Grafakos, *Classical Fourier analysis, 3rd edition, Graduate texts in Mathematics*. vol. 249, Springer, New York, 2014.
- [24] C. M. Guzmán, *On well posedness for the inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation*. Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl. **37** (2017), 249–286.
- [25] C. M. Guzmán, J. Murphy, *Scattering for the non-radial energy-critical inhomogeneous NLS*, J. Differential Equations **295** (2021), 187–210.
- [26] M. Hamano, H. Kikuchi, M. Watanabe, *Threshold solutions for the 3D focusing cubic-quintic nonlinear Schrödinger equation at low frequencies*. Dyn. Partial Differ. Equ. **20** (2023), no. 4, 263–297.
- [27] M. Keel, T. Tao, *Endpoint Strichartz estimates*. Amer. J. Math. **120** (1998), 955–980.
- [28] C. E. Kenig, F. Merle, *Global well-posedness, scattering and blow-up for the energy-critical, focusing, non-linear Schrödinger equation in the radial case*. Invent. Math **166** (2006), no. 3, 645–675.
- [29] R. Killip, J. Murphy, M. Visan, *Scattering for the cubic-quintic NLS: crossing the virial threshold*. SIAM J. Math. Anal. **53** (2021), no. 5, 5803–5812.
- [30] R. Killip, M. Visan, *The focusing energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in dimensions five and higher*. Amer. J. Math. **132** (2010), no. 2, 361–424.
- [31] J. Kim, Y. Lee, I. Seo, *On well-posedness for the inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation in the critical case*, J. Differential Equations **280** (2021), 179–202.
- [32] Y. Lee, I. Seo. *The Cauchy problem for the energy-critical inhomogeneous nonlinear Schrödinger equation*. Arch. Math. (Basel) **117** (2021), no. 4, 441–453.

- [33] X. Li, C. Liu, X. Tang, and G. Xu, *Dynamics of radial threshold solutions for generalized energy-critical hartree equation*, [arXiv:2310.14664](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.14664).
- [34] D. Li, X. Zhang, *Dynamics for the energy critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in high dimensions*, *J.Funct. Anal.* **256** (2009), no. 6, 1928–1961.
- [35] D. Li, X. Zhang, *Dynamics for the energy critical nonlinear wave equation in high dimensions*. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **363** (2011), no. 3, 1137–1160.
- [36] E. Lieb and M. Loss, *Analysis*, Second edition. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 14, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.
- [37] P.-L. Lions, *The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The limit case. II*. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* **1** (1985), 45–121.
- [38] C. Liu, V. Tripathi, *Laser guiding in an axially nonuniform plasma channel*. *Phys. Plasmas* **1** (1994), 3100–3103.
- [39] X. Liu, T. Zhang, *Global existence, scattering and blow-up for the focusing energy-critical inhomogeneous NLS*. Submitted.
- [40] C. Miao, J. Murphy, J. Zheng, *Threshold scattering for the focusing NLS with a repulsive potential*. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **72** (2023), no. 2, 409–453.
- [41] C. Miao, Y. Wu, G. Xu, *Dynamics for the focusing, energy-critical nonlinear Hartree equation*. *Forum Math.* **27** (2015), 373–447.
- [42] R. O’Neil, *Convolution operators and $L(p, q)$ spaces*. *Duke Math. J.* **30** (1963), 129–142.
- [43] Q. Su, Z. Zhao, *Dynamics of subcritical threshold solutions for energy-critical NLS*. *Dyn. Partial Differ. Equ.* **20** (2023), no. 1, 37–72.
- [44] R. J. Taggart, *Inhomogeneous Strichartz estimates*. *Forum Math.* **22** (2010), 825–853.
- [45] G. Talenti, *Best constant in Sobolev inequality*. *Ann. Mat. Pura. Appl.* **110** (1976), 353–372.
- [46] K. Yang, C. Zeng, X. Zhang, *Dynamics of threshold solutions for energy critical NLS with inverse square potential*. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **54** (2022), 173–219.
- [47] K. Yang, X. Zhang, *Dynamics of threshold solutions for energy critical NLW with inverse square potential*. *Math. Z.* **302** (2022), no. 1, 353–389.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, HANGZHOU NORMAL UNIVERSITY, HANGZHOU 311121, CHINA
Email address: liuxuan95@hznu.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SOUTHEAST UNIVERSITY, NANJING, 211189, CHINA
Email address: kaiyang@seu.edu.cn, yangkai99sk@gmail.com

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY, HANGZHOU 310058, CHINA
Email address: zhangting79@zju.edu.cn