

Weak stability of the sum of K solitary waves for Half-wave equation

Yuan Li

Abstract

In this paper, we consider the subcritical half-wave equation in one dimension. Let $R_k(t, x)$ represent K solitary wave solutions of the half-wave equation, each with different translations x_1, x_2, \dots, x_K . We show that if the relative distances $x_k - x_{k-1}$ between the solitary waves are large enough, then the sum of $R_k(t)$ is weakly stable. Our proof employs an energy method and the local mass monotonicity property. However, in contrast to the single-solitary wave or NLS cases, the interactions between different waves are strongest. To establish the local mass monotonicity property necessary for estimating the remainder of the geometrical decomposition, as well as to estimate non-local effects on localization functions and non-local operator $|D|$, we utilize the Carlderón estimate and the integration representation formula of the half-wave operator.

Keywords: Half-wave equation; Stability; K -solitary waves

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 35Q55; Secondary 35B35

1 Introduction and Main Result

We consider the half-wave equation of the form

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u - Du + |u|^{p-1}u = 0, & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N, \\ u(0) = u_0 \in H^s, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where D is defined via the Fourier transform by $(\widehat{Df})(\xi) = |\xi|\hat{f}(\xi)$, denotes the first-order nonlocal fractional derivative. Evolution problems like (1.1) arise in a variety of physical contexts, such as turbulence phenomena [4, 31], wave propagation [35], continuum limits of lattice system [28] and models for gravitational collapse in astrophysics [11, 15, 26]. For further background on the fractional Schrödinger model in mathematics, numerics, and physics, one can see [8, 12, 17, 29] and the references therein.

Let us review some basic properties of the equation (1.1). The Cauchy problem (1.1) is an infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian system, which has the following three conservation quantities:

Energy:

$$E(u(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| D^{\frac{1}{2}} u(t, x) \right|^2 dx - \frac{1}{p+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u(t, x)|^{p+1} dx = E(u_0); \quad (1.2)$$

Mass:

$$M(u(t)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u(t, x)|^2 dx = M(u_0); \quad (1.3)$$

Momentum:

$$P(u(t)) = (i\nabla u(t, x), u(t, x))_{L^2} = P(u_0).$$

Here we regard L^2 as a real Hilbert space equipped with the inner product

$$(u, v)_{L^2} = \Re \int u \bar{v} dx.$$

Equation (1.1) also admits the following symmetries.

- Phase invariance: If $u(t, x)$ satisfies (1.1), then for any $\gamma_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $u(t, x)e^{i\gamma_0}$ also satisfies (1.1);
- Translation invariance: If $u(t, x)$ satisfies (1.1), then for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $u(t - t_0, x - x_0)$ also satisfies (1.1);
- Scaling invariance: If $u(t, x)$ satisfies (1.1), then for any $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{p-1}} u(\lambda_0 t, \lambda_0 x)$ also satisfies (1.1).

It leaves invariant the norm in the homogeneous Sobolev space \dot{H}^{s_c} , where $s_c = \frac{N}{2} - \frac{1}{p-1}$. If $s_c < 0$, the problem is mass-subcritical; if $s_c = 0$, it is mass-critical and if $0 < s_c < 1$, it is mass super-critical and energy subcritical or just intercritical.

It is well known that the Cauchy problem is locally well-posed in Sobolev space H^s , for $s > \frac{1}{2}$. Specifically, Krieger, Lenzmann and Raphaël [30] showed that equation (1.1) is locally well-posed in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$, $s > \frac{1}{2}$, and established local existence in $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R})$ with $p = 3$. For the higher dimensional case, Bellazzini, Georgiev and Visciglia [2] proved that equation (1.1) is locally well-posed in $H_{rad}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, with $s_c < 1$ and $N \geq 2$; Furthermore, Hidano and Wang [24] improved this result and established local existence in the space $H_{rad}^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $N \geq 2$, as well as in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $s \in (\max\{\frac{N-1}{2}, \frac{N+1}{4}\}, p)$ and $s \geq s_c$, where $p > \max\{s_c, \frac{N-1}{2}, \frac{N+1}{4}, 1\}$. For more details on the half-wave equation (1.1), one can see [10, 19] for local/global well-posedness, [18, 20, 21, 25] for finite-time blow up, [2] for stability/instability of ground states, [1, 14, 22] for non-scattering traveling waves with arbitrary small mass, [10] for ill-posedness for low-regularity data, and [19] for the proof of various prior estimates.

This paper is concerned with questions related to special solutions of equation (1.1), called the solitary wave solution, which are fundamental in the dynamics of the equation. For $\omega > 0$, let

$$u(t, x) = e^{i\omega t} Q_\omega(x) \tag{1.4}$$

be the $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ solution of (1.1) if $Q_\omega : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ solution of

$$DQ_\omega + \omega Q_\omega = Q_\omega^p. \tag{1.5}$$

The first question concerning the solitary wave solutions of (1.1) is whether they are stable by perturbation of the initial data in the energy space, that is, whether or not the following property is satisfied.

Definition 1. A solitary wave solution of the form (1.4) is weakly orbitally stable if for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if

$$\|u(0) - Q_{\omega_0}(\cdot - x_0)e^{i\gamma_0}\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \delta, \quad u(0) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N), \quad s \in \left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right),$$

then for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, there exist $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\gamma(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $u(t)$ satisfies

$$\|u(t) - Q_{\omega_0}(\cdot - x(t))e^{i\gamma(t)}\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \epsilon.$$

where $u(t)$ is the unique global solution of (1.1) associated with the initial data $u(0)$.

Due to the invariances of the half-wave equation, whether or not this property is satisfied does not depend on x_0 and γ_0 . To the best of our knowledge, Bellazzini, Georgiev and Visciglia [2] proved the stability or instability of the ground state to the half-wave equation (1.1) by the classical argument of Cazenave-Lions (see [7]). On the other hand, Cao, Su, and Zhang [6] constructed the multi-bubble blow-up solutions to the mass critical half-wave equation in one dimension; Meanwhile, Gérard, Lenzmann, Pocovnicu and Raphaël [22] constructed asymptotic global-in-time compact two-soliton solutions of (1.1) that have an arbitrarily small L^2 -norm, where $p = 3$ and $N = 1$.

In this paper, our aim is to study the stability of the sum of K -solitary waves of the equation (1.1) by using the expansion of the conservation laws around the solitary wave. Now we state our main result.

Theorem 1.1. *(Stability of the sum of K solitary waves in one dimension). Assume that $N = 1$, $1 < p < 3$, and $s > \frac{1}{2}$. For $K \in \mathbb{N}$, and for all $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, let $\omega_k^0 > 0$ be such that there exists $Q_{\omega_k^0} \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R})$, a positive solution of (1.5) satisfying*

$$\frac{d}{d\omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} Q_{\omega}^2(x) dx \Big|_{\omega=\omega_k^0} > 0. \quad (1.6)$$

For all $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, let $x_k^0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\gamma_k^0 \in \mathbb{R}$. There exist $\sigma_0 > 1$, $A_0 > 0$ and $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that for any $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\sigma > \sigma_0$ and $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$ if

$$\left\| u_0 - \sum_{k=1}^K Q_{\omega_k^0}(\cdot - x_k^0) e^{i\gamma_k^0} \right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \alpha,$$

and for all $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$,

$$\sigma_0 := 4K \min_{k \neq j} \{|x_k^0 - x_j^0|\} \geq 4 \max_{k \neq j} \{x_k^0 - x_j^0\} > 1. \quad (1.7)$$

Let $u(t)$ be a solution of (1.1) is globally defined in H^s for all $t \geq 0$, and there exist C^1 -functions $\gamma_1(t), \dots, \gamma_K(t) \in \mathbb{R}$, $x_1(t), \dots, x_K(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ that satisfy

$$\sigma(t) := 4K \min_{k \neq j} \{|x_k(t) - x_j(t)|\} \geq 4 \max_{k \neq j} \{x_k(t) - x_j(t)\} \geq 1. \quad (1.8)$$

and

$$\sigma(t) \sim t^{\frac{2}{1-2\delta}}, \quad \delta \in \left(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}\right) \quad \text{for } t \geq 1. \quad (1.9)$$

Then, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\left\| u(t) - \sum_{k=1}^K Q_{\omega_k^0}(\cdot - x_k(t)) e^{i\gamma_k(t)} \right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq A_0 \left(\alpha + \frac{1}{\langle \sigma \rangle^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}} \right), \quad (1.10)$$

where $A_0 > 0$ is a constant.

Comments:

(1) The well-posedness in H^s , $s > \frac{1}{2}$, can be found in Appendix, see Lemma A.1.

(2) Assumption (1.6). Notice that by equation (1.5), the function $S_{\omega} \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}$ defined by $S_{\omega} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} Q_{\omega}$ satisfies $L_{\omega}^+ S_{\omega} = -Q_{\omega}$, where

$$L_{\omega}^+ = D + \omega - pQ_{\omega}^{p-1}.$$

Therefore, condition (1.6) is equivalent to

$$(S_{\omega_k^0}, Q_{\omega_k^0}) > 0.$$

This implies that L_{ω}^+ is coercivity in $H^{\frac{1}{2}}$ (see Lemma 2.5).

(3) Assumption (1.9). The condition (1.9) is a technical assumption. This means that a certain relationship must exist between the maximum and minimum distances of any two waves. In addition, the behavior of this distance is as $t^{\frac{2}{1-2\delta}}$ when t is sufficiently large.

(4) The structure of the problem is similar to the following two types of equations:

1. Mass subcritical nonlinear Schrödinger (NLS) equation

$$iu_t + \Delta u + |u|^{p-1}u = 0.$$

Martel, Merle and Tsai [33] proved the stability of the sum of K -solitary waves of this equation.

2. For the equation

$$u_t + \partial_x |D|^{\alpha} u + (u^p)_x = 0, \quad \text{for } p = 2, 3, 4.$$

For $\alpha = 2$ in the former equation, which corresponds to the subcritical generalized Korteweg-de Vries (gKdV) equation, Martel, Merle and Tsai [32] obtained the stability of the sum of K solitons of gKdV equations; For $\alpha = 1$, which is the generalized Benjamin-Ono (BO) equation, Kenig and Martel [27] studied the asymptotic stability of the solitons, and Gustafson, Takaoka and Tsai [23] studied the stability of the sum of K -soliton solution for BO equation; For $\alpha \in (1, 2)$, which is the fractional modified Korteweg-de Vries equation, Eychenne and Valet [13] proved that the existence of solution behaving in large time as a sum of two strongly interacting solitary waves with different signs.

However, in the scenario of multi-solitary waves for the half-wave equation, different waves exhibit the strongest interaction. Therefore, we introduce a property of local monotonicity, related to mass, which is similar to the L^2 -monotonicity property for the KdV equation used in [32] (see Lemma 4.2). Additionally, to deal with the non-local term, we utilize the Carderón estimate and the integration representation formula of the half-wave operator (see Lemma 4.2 and 4.4).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give some fundamental properties and Lemmas. In Section 3, we study the weak stability of a single solitary wave. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.1 and obtain the weak stability of the sum of K -solitary waves.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we aim to introduce some fundamental properties and useful lemmas.

Lemma 2.1 ([9]). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$. Then, for any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$,*

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^s f(x) &= C(s) P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{f(x+y) - f(x)}{|y|^{1+2s}} dy \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} C(s) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{f(x+y) + f(x-y) - 2f(x)}{|y|^{1+2s}} dy, \end{aligned}$$

where the normalization constant is given by

$$C(s) = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1 - \cos x}{|x|^{1+2s}} dx \right)^{-1}. \quad (2.1)$$

The following lemma provides useful formulas for the fractional Laplacian of the product of two functions.

Lemma 2.2 ([3]). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$ and $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Then, we have*

$$(-\Delta)^s(fg) - (-\Delta)^s f g = C(s) \int \frac{f(x+y)(g(x+y) - g(x)) - f(x-y)(g(x) - g(x-y))}{|y|^{1+2s}} dy, \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$(-\Delta)^s(fg) - (-\Delta)^s f g - f(-\Delta)^s g = -C(s) \int \frac{(f(x+y) - f(x))(g(x+y) - g(x))}{|y|^{1+2s}} dy,$$

where $C(s)$ is defined as in (2.1).

We recall the following commutator estimate.

Lemma 2.3. ([5, Theorem 2]) *For $\nabla f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, we have*

$$\|D(fg) - fDg\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^2}.$$

Next we give the following existence and uniqueness results of (1.5).

Lemma 2.4. (see [15, 16]) *If $\omega > 0$ and $s_c < 1$. Then the following hold.*

- (i) *Problem (1.5) has a positive, radial symmetry ground state solution Q_ω ;*
- (ii) *The ground state solution Q_ω is unique up to translation;*
- (iii) *There exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$|Q_\omega(x)| \leq \frac{C}{\langle x \rangle^{N+1}} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (2.3)$$

(iv) *Now define the operator*

$$L_\omega = (L_\omega^+, L_\omega^-),$$

where

$$L_\omega^+ v = Dv + \omega v - pQ_\omega^{p-1}v, \quad L_\omega^- v = Dv + \omega v - Q_\omega^{p-1}v, \quad v \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Then we have

$$\ker L_\omega^+ = \text{span}\{\nabla Q\}, \quad \ker L_\omega^- = \text{span}\{Q\}.$$

The following lemma is the positive property of the operator L_ω .

Lemma 2.5. *Assuming that $\omega > 0$, we have the following.*

- (i) *There exists $\lambda_+ > 0$ such that for any real-valued function $v \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$,*

$$(L_\omega^+ v, v) \geq \lambda_+ \|v\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^N)}^2 \quad \text{for } (v, Q_\omega) = (v, \nabla Q_\omega) = 0.$$

- (ii) *There exists $\lambda_- > 0$ such that for any real-valued function $v \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$,*

$$(L_\omega^- v, v) \geq \lambda_- \|v\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^N)}^2 \quad \text{for } (v, Q_\omega) = 0.$$

Proof. The proof of this result was given by [30] for mass critical in one dimensional case. For higher dimensional, one can see our previous results [20, 21]. For general case, exactly the same arguments apply to prove this Lemma. \square

We also recall some variational properties of Q_{ω_0} . Define

$$G_{\omega}(u) = E(u) + \frac{\omega}{2} \int |u|^2. \quad (2.4)$$

Lemma 2.6. *For $\omega, \omega_0 > 0$. Let Q_{ω_0} be the ground state of equation (1.5) with $\omega = \omega_0$ and Q_{ω} be defined as (1.5). For $\eta = \eta_1 + i\eta_2 \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R})$ is small, we have*

$$G_{\omega_0}(Q_{\omega_0} + \eta) = G_{\omega_0}(Q_{\omega_0}) + (L_{\omega_0}^+ \eta_1, \eta_1) + (L_{\omega_0}^- \eta_2, \eta_2) + \|\eta\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \beta \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right),$$

with $\beta(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. In particular, for ω close to ω_0 ,

$$G_{\omega_0}(Q_{\omega}) = G_{\omega_0}(Q_{\omega_0}) + (\omega - \omega_0)^2 (L_{\omega_0}^+ S_{\omega_0}, S_{\omega_0}) + |\omega - \omega_0|^2 \beta(|\omega - \omega_0|),$$

where $S_{\omega} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} Q_{\omega}$ and $L_{\omega}^+ S_{\omega} = -Q_{\omega}$. Moreover,

$$|G_{\omega_0}(Q_{\omega_0}) - G_{\omega_0}(Q_{\omega})| \leq C|\omega - \omega_0|^2.$$

Remark 2.7. The assumption (1.6) implies that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d\omega} \int Q_{\omega}^2 dx \Big|_{\omega=\omega_0} = (S_{\omega_0}, -Q_{\omega_0}) = -(L_{\omega_0}^+ S_{\omega_0}, S_{\omega_0}) > 0.$$

Proof of Lemma 2.6. By a similar argument as the classical nonlinear Schrödinger equation (see [34, Section 2] or [33, Lemma 2.3]), one can obtain this result. Here we omit it. \square

2.1 Decomposition of a solution

Let $\omega_1^0, \dots, \omega_K^0 \in \mathbb{R}$. For $\alpha > 0$, $\gamma_k \in \mathbb{R}$ and σ_0 is defined as in (1.7), we consider the $H^{\frac{1}{2}}$ -neighborhood of size α of the sum of K solitary waves with parameter $\{\omega_k^0\}$, located at distances satisfies the assumption (1.7);

$$B(\alpha, \sigma_0) = \left\{ u \in H^s, \inf \left\| u(t, \cdot) - \sum_{k=1}^K Q_{\omega_k^0}(\cdot - y_k) e^{i\delta_k} \right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} < \alpha \right\}.$$

Now we give the following Lemma.

Lemma 2.8. *There exist $\alpha_1, \sigma_1, C_1 > 0$, and for any $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, there exist unique C^1 -functions $(\omega_k, x_k, \gamma_k) : B(\alpha_1, \sigma_1) \rightarrow (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}$ such that if $u \in B(\alpha_1, \sigma_1)$ and if one defines*

$$\epsilon(x) = u(x) - \sum_{k=1}^K Q_{\omega_k}(\cdot - x_k) e^{i\gamma_k},$$

then for all $k = 1, \dots, K$,

$$\Re \int Q_{\omega_k}(\cdot - x_k) e^{i\gamma_k} \bar{\epsilon}(x) dx = \Im \int Q_{\omega_k}(\cdot - x_k) e^{i\gamma_k} \bar{\epsilon}(x) dx = \Re \int \nabla Q_{\omega_k}(\cdot - x_k) e^{i\gamma_k} \bar{\epsilon}(x) dx = 0.$$

Moreover, if $u \in B(\alpha, \sigma_0)$ for $0 < \alpha < \alpha_1$, $\sigma_0 > \sigma_1$, then

$$\|\epsilon\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k - \omega_k^0| \leq C_1 \alpha. \quad (2.5)$$

Proof. The proof is a standard application of the Implicit function theorem. For the reader's convenience, we give the proof of it. Let $\alpha, \sigma > 0$ and x_1^0, \dots, x_K^0 be such that x_k satisfies (1.7) and $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_K^0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Denote by B_0 the $H^{\frac{1}{2}}$ -ball of the center $\sum_{k=1}^K Q_{\omega_k^0}(\cdot - x_k^0)e^{i\gamma_k^0}$ and of radius 10α . For any $u \in B_0$ and the parameters $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_K, x_1, \dots, x_K, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_K$, Let $\rho = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_K, x_1, \dots, x_K, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_K, u)$, and define

$$\epsilon_\rho(x) = u(x) - \sum_{k=1}^K Q_{\omega_k}(\cdot - x_k)e^{i\gamma_k}.$$

Now we define the functions of ρ , for $k = 1, \dots, K$,

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_k^1(\rho) &= \Re \int Q_{\omega_k}(x - x_k)e^{i\gamma_k} \bar{\epsilon}_\rho(x) dx, \\ \eta_k^2(\rho) &= \Re \int Q'_{\omega_k}(x - x_k)e^{i\gamma_k} \bar{\epsilon}_\rho(x) dx, \\ \eta_k^3(\rho) &= \Im \int Q_{\omega_k}(x - x_k)e^{i\gamma_k} \bar{\epsilon}_\rho(x) dx,\end{aligned}$$

for ρ close to

$$\rho_0 = \left(\omega_1^0, \dots, \omega_K^0, x_1^0, \dots, x_K^0, \gamma_1^0, \dots, \gamma_K^0, \sum_{k=1}^K Q_{\omega_k^0}(\cdot - x_k^0)e^{i\gamma_k^0} \right).$$

For $\rho = \rho_0$, we have $\epsilon_{\rho_0}(x) \equiv 0$, and thus $\eta_k^j(\rho_0) = 0$, for $j = 1, 2, 3$ and $k = 1, \dots, K$. We check by applying the implicit function theorem that for any $u \in B_0$, one can choose in a unique way the coefficients $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_K, x_1, \dots, x_K, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_K)$, so that ρ is close to ρ_0 and verifies $\eta_k^j(\rho) = 0$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$. We compute the derivatives of η_k^j for any k and j with respect to each $(\omega_k, x_k, \gamma_k)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \epsilon_\rho}{\partial \omega_k}(\rho_0) &= - \frac{\partial Q_\omega}{\partial \omega}(\cdot - x_k^0)e^{i\gamma_k^0} \Big|_{\omega=\omega_k^0}, \\ \frac{\partial \epsilon_\rho}{\partial x_k}(\rho_0) &= Q'_{\omega_k^0}(\cdot - x_k^0)e^{i\gamma_k^0}, \\ \frac{\partial \epsilon_\rho}{\partial \gamma_k}(\rho_0) &= -i Q_{\omega_k^0}(\cdot - x_k^0)e^{i\gamma_k^0}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \eta_{k'}^1}{\partial \omega_k}(\rho_0) &= - \Re \int Q_{\omega_{k'}^0}(x - x_{k'}^0)e^{i\gamma_{k'}^0} \frac{\partial Q_\omega}{\partial \omega}(\cdot - x_k^0) \Big|_{\omega=\omega_k^0} e^{-i\gamma_k^0} dx, \\ \frac{\partial \eta_{k'}^1}{\partial x_k}(\rho_0) &= \Re \int Q_{\omega_{k'}^0}(x - x_{k'}^0)e^{i\gamma_{k'}^0} Q'_{\omega_k^0}(\cdot - x_k^0)e^{-i\gamma_k^0} dx, \\ \frac{\partial \eta_{k'}^1}{\partial \gamma_k}(\rho_0) &= - \Im \int Q_{\omega_{k'}^0}(x - x_{k'}^0)e^{i\gamma_{k'}^0} Q_{\omega_k^0}(\cdot - x_k^0)e^{-i\gamma_k^0} dx,\end{aligned}$$

and similar formulas hold for $\frac{\partial \eta_{k'}^j}{\partial \omega_k}(\rho_0)$, $\frac{\partial \eta_{k'}^j}{\partial x_k}(\rho_0)$, $\frac{\partial \eta_{k'}^j}{\partial \gamma_k}(\rho_0)$, for $j = 2, 3$.

Now we finish the computations for $k' = k$. By the assumption (1.6), we have $\frac{\partial \eta_k^1}{\partial \omega_k}(\rho_0) < 0$; Since Q_{ω_k} is even, $\frac{\partial \eta_k^1}{\partial x_k}(\rho_0) = 0$; and finally, since Q_{ω_k} is real, $\frac{\partial \eta_k^1}{\partial \gamma_k}(\rho_0) = 0$. The same applies for η_k^j ,

$j = 2, 3$. Hence, we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \eta_k^1}{\partial \omega_k}(\rho_0) < 0, & \quad \frac{\partial \eta_k^1}{\partial x_k}(\rho_0) = 0, & \quad \frac{\partial \eta_k^1}{\partial \gamma_k}(\rho_0) = 0, \\ \frac{\partial \eta_k^2}{\partial \omega_k}(\rho_0) = 0, & \quad \frac{\partial \eta_k^2}{\partial x_k}(\rho_0) > 0, & \quad \frac{\partial \eta_k^2}{\partial \gamma_k}(\rho_0) = 0, \\ \frac{\partial \eta_k^3}{\partial \omega_k}(\rho_0) = 0, & \quad \frac{\partial \eta_k^3}{\partial x_k}(\rho_0) = 0, & \quad \frac{\partial \eta_k^3}{\partial \gamma_k}(\rho_0) > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

For $k' \neq k$, and $j = 1, 2, 3$, since the different Q_{ω_k} are algebraic decaying and located at centers distant at least of $\sigma/4K$, we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial \eta_{k'}^j}{\partial \omega_k}(\rho_0) \right| + \left| \frac{\partial \eta_{k'}^j}{\partial x_k}(\rho_0) \right| + \left| \frac{\partial \eta_{k'}^j}{\partial \gamma_k}(\rho_0) \right| \leq \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2}. \quad (2.7)$$

These terms are arbitrarily small by choosing σ large.

Therefore, by (2.6) and (2.7), the Jacobian of $\eta = (\eta_1^1, \dots, \eta_K^1, \eta_1^2, \dots, \eta_K^2, \eta_1^3, \dots, \eta_K^3)$ as a function of ρ at the point ρ_0 is not zero. Thus we can apply the implicit function theorem to prove that for α small and $u \in B_0$, the existence and uniqueness of parameters ρ such that $\eta(\rho) = 0$. We obtain an estimate (2.5) with constants that are independent of the ball B_0 . This proves the result for $u \in B_0$. If we now take $u \in B(\alpha, \sigma_0)$, then u belongs to such a ball B_0 , and the result follows. \square

As a consequence of this decomposition, we have the following result.

Corollary 2.9. *There exist $\sigma_1, \alpha_1, C_1 > 0$ such that the following is true. If for $\sigma > \sigma_1$, $0 < \alpha < \alpha_1$ and $t_0 > 0$,*

$$u(t) \in B(\alpha, \sigma) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, t_0],$$

then there exist unique C^1 -function $\omega_k : [0, t_0] \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$, $x_k, \gamma_k : [0, t_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that if we set

$$\epsilon(t, x) = u(t, x) - R(t, x),$$

where

$$R(t, x) = \sum_{k=1}^K R_k(t, x), \quad R_k(t, x) = Q_{\omega_k(t)}(x - x_k(t))e^{i\gamma_k(t)},$$

then $\epsilon(t)$ satisfies, for all $k = 1, \dots, K$ and all $t \in [0, t^]$,*

$$\Re \int R_k(t) \bar{\epsilon}(t) = \Im \int R_k(t) \bar{\epsilon}(t) = \Re \int \partial_x R_k(t) \bar{\epsilon}(t) = 0.$$

Moreover, for all $t \in [0, t^]$ and for all $k = 1, \dots, K$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega(t) - \omega_k^0| &\leq C_1 \alpha, \quad x_k \text{ satisfies the assumption (1.8),} \\ |\omega'_k(t)| + |x'_k|^2 + |\gamma'_k(t) - \omega_k(t)|^2 &\leq C \int \langle x - x_k \rangle^{-2} \epsilon^2(t, x) dx + C_1 \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

3 Weak stability of a single solitary wave

Let $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$, $s > \frac{1}{2}$, and for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma_0 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\|u_0 - Q_{\omega_0}(x - x_0)e^{i\gamma_0}\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \alpha,$$

for $\alpha > 0$ small enough. Let $u(t)$ be the corresponding solution of (1.1) with the initial data $u_0 \in H^s$.

Decomposition of the solution. We argue on a time interval $[0, t^*]$, so that for all $t \in [0, t^*]$, $u(t)$ is close to $Q_{\omega(t)}(x - x(t))e^{i\gamma(t)}$ for some $\omega(t)$, $x(t)$ and $\gamma(t)$ in $H^{\frac{1}{2}}$. We can modify the parameters $\omega(t)$, $x(t)$ and $\gamma(t)$ such that

$$\epsilon(t, x) = u(t, x) - R_0(t, x), \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$R_0(t, x) = Q_{\omega(t)}(x - x(t))e^{i\gamma(t)} \quad (3.2)$$

satisfies the orthogonal conditions

$$\Re(\epsilon(t), R_0(t)) = \Im(\epsilon(t), R_0(t)) = \Re(\epsilon(t), R_0'(t)) = 0. \quad (3.3)$$

This choice of orthogonality conditions are well adapted to the positivity properties on the operators L_ω^+ and L_ω^- (see Lemma 2.5), and thus it is suitable to apply an energy method.

Note that, as in Lemma 2.8, we have

$$\|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} + |\omega(0) - \omega_0| \leq C\alpha. \quad (3.4)$$

By expanding $u(t) = R_0(t) + \epsilon(t)$ in the definition of G_ω (see (2.4)), we obtain the following formula.

Lemma 3.1. *The following holds:*

$$G_{\omega(0)}(u(t)) = G_{\omega(0)}(Q_{\omega(0)}) + H_0(\epsilon, \epsilon) + \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \beta \left(\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) + \mathcal{O}(|\omega(t) - \omega(0)|^2),$$

with $\beta(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, where

$$H_0(\epsilon, \epsilon) = \frac{1}{2} \int |D^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon|^2 + \frac{\omega(t)}{2} \int |\epsilon|^2 - \int \left(\frac{1}{2}|R_0|^{p-1}|\epsilon|^2 + \frac{p-1}{2}|R_0|^{p-3}(\Re(R_0\epsilon))^2 \right). \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. First, we consider the term $\int |D^{\frac{1}{2}}u|^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int |D^{\frac{1}{2}}u|^2 &= \int (D(R_0 + \epsilon), R_0 + \epsilon) \\ &= \int |D^{\frac{1}{2}}R_0|^2 + 2\Re \int D\bar{R}_0\epsilon + \int |D^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon|^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the nonlinear term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int |u|^{p+1} &= \int (|R_0 + \epsilon|^2)^{\frac{p+1}{2}} = \int \left[|R_0|^{p+1} + (p+1)|R_0|^{p-1}\Re(R_0\epsilon) + \frac{p+1}{2}|R_0|^{p-1}|\epsilon|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{p^2-1}{2}|R_0|^{p-3}(\Re(R_0\epsilon))^2 \right] + \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \beta \left(\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the L^2 term, we have

$$\int |u|^2 = \int |R_0|^2 + 2\Re \int \bar{R}_0 \epsilon + \int |\epsilon|^2.$$

Combining above equalities, we get

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\omega(0)}(u(t)) &= G_{\omega(0)}(R_0(t)) + \Re \int D\bar{R}_0 \epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \int |D^{\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon|^2 + \frac{\omega(0)}{2} \left(2\Re \int \bar{R}_0 \epsilon + \int |\epsilon|^2 \right) \\ &\quad - \int \left(|R_0|^{p-1} \Re(R_0 \epsilon) + \frac{1}{2} |R_0|^{p-1} |\epsilon|^2 + \frac{p-1}{2} |R_0|^{p-3} (\Re(R_0 \epsilon))^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \beta \left(\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \\ &= G_{\omega(0)}(R_0(t)) + H_0(\epsilon, \epsilon) + \Re \int D\bar{R}_0 \epsilon + \omega(0) \Re \int \bar{R}_0 \epsilon - \int |R_0|^{p-1} \Re(R_0 \epsilon) \\ &\quad + \frac{\omega(0) - \omega(t)}{2} \int |\epsilon|^2 + \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \beta \left(\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \\ &= G_{\omega(0)}(R_0(t)) + H_0(\epsilon, \epsilon) + I + \frac{\omega(0) - \omega(t)}{2} \int |\epsilon|^2 + \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \beta \left(\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $H_0(\epsilon, \epsilon)$ is defined by (3.5) and

$$I := \Re \int D\bar{R}_0 \epsilon + \omega(0) \Re \int \bar{R}_0 \epsilon - \int |R_0|^{p-1} \Re(R_0 \epsilon).$$

By the definition of R_0 (see (3.2)) and the equality $DQ_\omega + \omega Q_\omega = |Q_\omega|^{p-1} Q_\omega$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I &:= \Re \int (D\bar{R}_0 \epsilon + \omega(t) \bar{R}_0 \epsilon - |R_0|^{p-1} R_0 \epsilon) + (\omega(0) - \omega(t)) \Re \int \bar{R}_0 \epsilon \\ &= \Re \int (DQ_{\omega(t)} + \omega(t) Q_{\omega(t)} - |Q_{\omega(t)}|^{p-1} Q_{\omega(t)}) e^{-i\gamma(t)} \epsilon + (\omega(0) - \omega(t)) \Re \int \bar{R}_0 \epsilon \\ &= (\omega(0) - \omega(t)) \Re \int \bar{R}_0 \epsilon \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used the fact that the orthogonality condition (3.3).

On the other hand, we have

$$\frac{|\omega(0) - \omega(t)|}{2} \int |\epsilon|^2 \leq \frac{1}{4} |\omega(0) - \omega(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{4} \left(\int |\epsilon|^2 \right)^2.$$

Combining the above estimates, we can obtain the desire result. □

Next, we give the following positivity of the quadratic form H_0 .

Lemma 3.2. *There exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that if $\epsilon(t) \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies*

$$\Re(\epsilon(t), R_0(t)) = \Im(\epsilon(t), R_0(t)) = \Re(\epsilon(t), R_0'(t)) = 0,$$

then

$$H_0(\epsilon(t), \epsilon(t)) \geq \lambda_0 \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2,$$

where H_0 is given by (3.5).

Proof. This lemma is a direct consequence of the following claim applied to $Q_{\omega(t)}$ and ϵ .

Claim: Let $\omega_0 > 0$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\gamma_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and Q_{ω_0} is the solution of (1.5). Now we consider the quadratic form

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_0(\eta, \eta) &= \frac{1}{2} \int |D^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta|^2 + \frac{\omega(0)}{2} \int |\eta|^2 \\ &\quad - \int \left(\frac{1}{2} |Q_{\omega_0}(\cdot - x_0)|^{p-1} |\eta|^2 + \frac{p-1}{2} |Q_{\omega_0}(\cdot - x_0)|^{p-3} (\Re(Q_{\omega_0}(\cdot - x_0)\eta))^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

There exists $\lambda_1 > 0$ such that if $\eta = \eta_1 + i\eta_2 \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies

$$\Re \int Q_{\omega_0}(\cdot - x_0) e^{-i\gamma_0} \eta = \Re \int Q'_{\omega_0}(\cdot - x_0) e^{-i\gamma_0} \eta = \Im \int Q_{\omega_0}(\cdot - x_0) e^{-i\gamma_0} \eta = 0.$$

Then

$$\tilde{H}_0(\eta, \eta) \geq \lambda_1 \|\eta\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2.$$

Indeed, we have

$$\tilde{H}_0(\eta, \eta) = (L_{\omega_0}^+ \eta_1, \eta_1) + (L_{\omega_0}^- \eta_2, \eta_2) \geq \lambda_1 \|\eta\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2,$$

where in the last step, we used the orthogonality conditions and Lemma 2.5. Then the claim is true and we complete the proof of this lemma. \square

The following lemma aims to control the $H^{\frac{1}{2}}$ norm of $\epsilon(t)$.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume that $\epsilon(t)$ is given by (3.1). Then we have the following estimate:*

$$\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \leq C|\omega(t) - \omega(0)|^2 + C\|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2. \quad (3.6)$$

if $\|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ is small enough.

Proof. Since $G_{\omega(0)}(u(t))$ is the sum of two conserved quantities, we have

$$G_{\omega(0)}(u(t)) = G_{\omega(0)}(u(0)).$$

Thus, from Lemma 3.1, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} H_0(\epsilon(t), \epsilon(t)) &\leq H_0(\epsilon(0), \epsilon(0)) + C|\omega(t) - \omega(0)|^2 \\ &\quad + C\|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \beta \left(\|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) + C\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \beta \left(\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.2 and since $H_0(\epsilon(0), \epsilon(0)) \leq C\|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2$, we obtain

$$\lambda_0 \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \leq H_0(\epsilon(t), \epsilon(t)) \leq C|\omega(t) - \omega(0)|^2 + C\|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + C\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \beta \left(\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right).$$

Using Lemma 3.1 again and above estimates, we have

$$\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \leq C|\omega(t) - \omega(0)|^2 + C\|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2,$$

for $\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ small enough. Now we complete the proof of this Lemma. \square

Finally, we need to control the parameter $|\omega(t) - \omega(0)|$.

Lemma 3.4. *Assume that $\omega(t)$ and $\omega(0)$ is given by above. Then the following holds.*

$$|\omega(t) - \omega(0)| \leq C (\|\epsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\epsilon(0)\|_{L^2}^2). \quad (3.7)$$

Proof. We prove that $|\omega(t) - \omega(0)|$ is quadratic in $\epsilon(t)$. Note that by the conservation of $\|u(t)\|_{L^2}$ and the orthogonality condition $\Re(R_0, \epsilon) = 0$, we have

$$\int Q_{\omega(t)}^2 - \int Q_{\omega(0)}^2 = - \int |\epsilon(t)|^2 + \int |\epsilon(0)|^2. \quad (3.8)$$

Recall that we assume $\frac{d}{d\omega} \int Q_{\omega}^2(x) dx|_{\omega=\omega_0} > 0$, and $\omega(t), \omega(0)$ are close to ω_0 . Thus,

$$(\omega(t) - \omega(0)) \left(\frac{d}{d\omega} \int Q_{\omega}^2(x) dx|_{\omega=\omega_0} \right) = \int Q_{\omega(t)}^2 - \int Q_{\omega(0)}^2 + \beta(\omega(t) - \omega(0))(\omega(t) - \omega(0))^2,$$

with $\beta(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. This implies that for some $C = C(\omega_0) > 0$,

$$|\omega(t) - \omega(0)| \leq C \left| \int Q_{\omega(t)}^2 - \int Q_{\omega(0)}^2 \right|.$$

Therefore, by (3.8), we can obtain the desired result. \square

Proof of the stability of a single solitary wave. Combining (3.4), (3.6) and (3.7), we have, for some constant $C > 0$,

$$\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + |\omega(t) - \omega(0)| \leq C \|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \leq C\alpha,$$

for $\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ and $|\omega(t) - \omega(0)|$ small enough. Thus, for α small enough,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| u(t) - Q_{\omega_0}(x - x(t))e^{i\gamma(t)} \right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \\ & \leq \|u(t) - R_0(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \left\| R_0(t) - Q_{\omega_0}(x - x(t))e^{i\gamma(t)} \right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \\ & \leq \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + C|\omega(t) - \omega_0| \\ & \leq \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + |\omega(t) - \omega(0)| + C|\omega(0) - \omega_0| \\ & \leq C\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

This complete the proof of stability of a single solitary wave. \square

4 Stability the sum of multi-solitary waves result

In this section, we aim to prove the stability of the multi-solitary waves.

For $A_0, \sigma, \alpha > 0$, we define

$$\Gamma_{A_0}(\alpha, \sigma) = \left\{ u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}); \inf_k \left\| u(t, \cdot) - \sum_{k=1}^K Q_{\omega_k^0}(\cdot - y_k) e^{i\gamma_k} \right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq A_0 \left(\alpha + \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2\delta + \frac{1}{4}} \right) \right\},$$

where σ is given by (1.8), y_k satisfies the assumption (1.8) and (1.9), where $\delta \in (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$.

Let $\omega_k^0, x_k^0, \gamma_k^0$ be defined as in the statement of Theorem 1.1. We claim that Theorem 1.1 is a consequence of the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. (*Reduction of the problem*) *There exists $A_0 > 2$, $\sigma_0 > 0$, and $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that for all $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$, if*

$$\left\| u_0 - \sum_{k=1}^K Q_{\omega_k^0}(\cdot - x_k^0) e^{i\gamma_k^0} \right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \alpha, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\sigma > \sigma_0$, $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$, and x_k^0 satisfy (1.7), and if for some $t^* > 1$,

$$u(t) \in \Gamma_{A_0}(\alpha, \sigma), \quad \text{for any } t \in [0, t^*].$$

Then, for any $t \in [0, t^*]$,

$$u(t) \in \Gamma_{A_0/2}(\alpha, \sigma).$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Assuming that Proposition 4.1 is true, we check that it implies Theorem 1.1. In fact, suppose that u_0 satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.1. Let $u(t) \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$, $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, be the solution of (1.1) with the initial data $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$, $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Then, by the continuity of $u(t)$ in H^s , there exists $\tau > 0$ such that for any $0 \leq t \leq \tau$, $u(t) \in \Gamma_{A_0}(\alpha, \sigma)$. Let

$$t^* = \sup\{t \geq 0, u(t') \in \Gamma_{A_0}(\alpha, \sigma), t' \in [0, t]\}.$$

Assume for the sake of contradiction that t^* is not $+\infty$, then by Proposition 4.1, for all $t \in [0, t^*]$, $u \in \Gamma_{A_0/2}(\alpha, \sigma)$. Since $u(t)$ is continuous in H^s , there exists $\tau' > 0$ such that for all $t \in [0, t^* + \tau']$, $u(t) \in \Gamma_{2A_0/3}(\alpha, \sigma)$, which contradicts the definition of t^* . Therefore, $t^* = +\infty$, and (1.10) in Theorem 1.1 holds. \square

The rest of this section is to prove the Proposition 4.1. We divided the proof into the following four steps.

Step 1. Decomposition of the solution around K solitary waves. First, since for all $t \in [0, t^*]$, $u \in \Gamma_{A_0}(\alpha, \sigma)$, by choosing $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0(A_0)$ and $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(A_0) > 0$ small enough, we can apply the corollary 2.9 to $u(t)$ in the time interval $[0, t^*]$. It follows that there exist unique C^1 -functions $\omega_k : [0, t^*] \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$, $x_k, \gamma_k : [0, t^*] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that if we set

$$\epsilon(t, x) = u(t, x) - R(t, x),$$

where

$$R(t, x) = \sum_{k=1}^K R_k(t, x), \quad R_k(t, x) = Q_{\omega_k(t)}(x - x_k(t)) e^{i\gamma_k(t)}. \quad (4.2)$$

Then $\epsilon(t)$ satisfies, for all $k = 1, \dots, K$ and all $t \in [0, t^*]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Re \int R_k(t) \bar{\epsilon}(t) &= \Im \int R_k(t) \bar{\epsilon}(t) = \Re \int \partial_x R_k(t) \bar{\epsilon}(t) = 0, \\ \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} &+ \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0| + |\omega_k'(t)| + |x_k'(t)| + |\gamma_k'(t) - \omega_k(t)| \leq C_1 A_0 \left(\alpha + \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2\delta + \frac{1}{4}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Moreover, for all $t \in [0, t^*]$ and for all $k = 1, \dots, K$, by the assumption (4.1) on u_0 and Lemma 2.8 applied to u_0 , we have

$$\|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega(0) - \omega_k^0| \leq C_1 \alpha, \quad (4.4)$$

where C_1 does not depend on A_0 .

Step 2. Local mass monotonicity property.

First, we introduce the localization functions which will be frequently used in the construction. Let $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^K$ be the K distinct points in Theorem 1.1 and satisfy the assumptions (1.8) and (1.9).

Let $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a smooth function such that $|\Phi'(x)| \leq C\sigma^{-1}$ for some $C > 0$, where σ is defined as (1.8), $\Phi(x) = 1$ for $x \leq 4\sigma$ and $\Phi(x) = 0$ for $x \geq 8\sigma$. The localization functions Φ_k , $1 \leq k \leq K$, are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_1(x) &:= \Phi(x - x_1), & \Phi_K(x) &:= 1 - \Phi(x - x_{K-1}), \\ \Phi_k(x) &:= \Phi(x - x_k) - \Phi(x - x_{k-1}), & 2 \leq k \leq K - 1.\end{aligned}$$

One has the partition of unity, that is, $1 \equiv \sum_{k=1}^K \Phi_k$.

We also introduce a functional adapted to the stability problem for K solitary waves. We define

$$G(t) = E(u(t)) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{J}(t), \quad (4.5)$$

where $E(u(t))$ is given by (1.2) and

$$\mathcal{J}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K \mathcal{J}_k(t),$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}_k(t) = \omega_k(0) \int |u(t, x)|^2 \Phi_k(x) dx. \quad (4.6)$$

Lemma 4.2. *Let \mathcal{J}_k be defined as (4.6), then we have*

$$|\mathcal{J}_k(t) - \mathcal{J}_k(0)| \leq C \left(\frac{t}{\sigma^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{t}{\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|\epsilon\|_{L^2} + \frac{t}{\sigma} \|\epsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \right), \quad (4.7)$$

where σ is defined as (1.8).

Proof. By the equation (1.1) and $u(t, x) = R(t, x) + \epsilon(t, x)$, where R is given by (4.2), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{J}_k(t) &= \omega_k(0) \frac{d}{dt} \int |u|^2 \Phi_k dx = 2\omega_k(0) \Im \int \bar{u} D u \Phi_k dx \\ &= 2\omega_k(0) \Im \int \bar{R} D R \Phi_k dx + 2\omega_k(0) \Im \int (\bar{R} D \epsilon + \bar{\epsilon} D R) \Phi_k dx + 2\omega_k(0) \Im \int \bar{\epsilon} D \epsilon \Phi_k dx \\ &=: I + II + III.\end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

We shall estimate the above three terms separately. Due to the non-local operator D , the estimates below are more delicate. In fact, the integration representation of the operator D and the point-wise decay property of the ground state are used to obtain the right decay orders. And the Calderón's estimate in [5] is also used below.

(i) *Estimate of I.* The first term on the right-hand side of (4.8) can be decomposed as

$$I = 2\omega_k(0) \Im \int \bar{R}_1 D R_1 \Phi_k dx + 2\omega_k(0) \sum_{k=2}^K \Im \int (\bar{R}_1 D R_k + \bar{R}_k D R_1) \Phi_k dx + 2\omega_k(0) \sum_{k,l=2}^K \Im \int \bar{R}_k D R_l \Phi_k dx$$

$$=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \quad (4.9)$$

Since D is self-adjoint, then integrating by parts and using the $\Im(\bar{u}v) = -\Im(u\bar{v})$, we have

$$2\Im \int \bar{u}Du\phi = \Im \int uD(\bar{u}\phi) - \Im \int uD\bar{u}\phi$$

From the above equality and the identity (2.2), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & |I_1| \\ & \leq \left| \Im \int R_1(D(\bar{R}_1\Phi_k) - D\bar{R}_1\Phi_k)dx \right| \\ & = C \left| \Im \int R_1(x)dx \int \frac{\bar{R}_1(x+y)(\Phi_k(x+y) - \Phi_k(x)) - \bar{R}_1(x-y)(\Phi_k(x) - \Phi_k(x-y))}{|y|^2} dy \right| \\ & = C \left| \Im \int R_1(x)dx \int \frac{\bar{R}_1(x+y)[\Phi(x-x_k+y) - \Phi(x-x_{k-1}+y) - \Phi(x-x_k) + \Phi(x-x_{k-1})] \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{\bar{R}_1(x-y)[\Phi(x-x_k) - \Phi(x-x_{k-1}) - \Phi(x-x_k-y) + \Phi(x-x_{k-1}-y)]}{|y|^2} dy \right| \\ & \leq C \sum_{j=1}^4 \left| \Im \iint_{\Omega_{1,j}} R_1(x) \frac{\bar{R}_1(x+y)[\Phi(x-x_k+y) - \Phi(x-x_k)]}{|y|^2} dx dy \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \Im \iint_{\Omega_{1,j}} R_1(x) \frac{\bar{R}_1(x-y)[\Phi(x-x_k) - \Phi(x-x_k-y)]}{|y|^2} dx dy \right| \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=4}^8 \left| \Im \iint_{\Omega_{1,j}} R_1(x) \frac{\bar{R}_1(x+y)[\Phi(x-x_{k-1}+y) - \Phi(x-x_{k-1})]}{|y|^2} dx dy \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \Im \iint_{\Omega_{1,j}} R_1(x) \frac{\bar{R}_1(x-y)[\Phi(x-x_{k-1}) - \Phi(x-x_{k-1}-y)]}{|y|^2} dx dy \right| \\ & = : C \sum_{j=1}^4 I_{1,j} + \sum_{j=4}^8 I_{1,j}, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbb{R}^2 is partitioned into four regimes

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{1,1} & := \{|x-x_k| \leq 3\sigma, |y| \leq \sigma\}, \\ \Omega_{1,2} & := \{|x-x_k| \geq 3\sigma, |y| \leq \sigma\}, \\ \Omega_{1,3} & := \left\{ |x-x_k| \leq \frac{\sigma}{2}, |y| \geq \sigma \right\}, \\ \Omega_{1,4} & := \left\{ |x-x_k| \geq \frac{\sigma}{2}, |y| \geq \sigma \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma > 0$ is defined as in (1.8) and $\Omega_{1,j}$, $j = 4, \dots, 8$ is similarly $\Omega_{1,j}$, $j = 1, \dots, 4$ except for using x_{k-1} instead of x_k .

Below, we only estimate the integral $I_{1,j}$, $1 \leq j \leq 4$. For $4 \leq j \leq 8$, these are the same as $1 \leq j \leq 4$.

Now we estimate $I_{1,j}$, $1 \leq j \leq 4$.

For the term $I_{1,1}$, by the definition of Φ , we deduce that $I_{1,1} = 0$.

For the term $I_{1,2}$. By Taylor's expansion, there exists some $|\theta| \leq 1$ such that for any differentiable function f , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |f(x+y)(\Phi_1(x+y) - \Phi_1(x)) - f(x-y)(\Phi_1(x) - \Phi_1(x-y))| \\ & \leq |y|^2(|\nabla f(x+\theta y)| \|\nabla \Phi_1\|_{L^\infty} + |f(x)| \|\nabla^2 \Phi_1\|_{L^\infty}) \\ & \leq C|y|^2(|\nabla f(x+\theta y)| + |f(x)|). \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Thus, from (4.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,2} & \leq C \iint_{\Omega_{1,2}} |R_1(x)| (|\nabla R_1(x+\theta y)| + |R_1(x)|) dy dx \\ & \leq C \iint_{\Omega_{1,2}} |Q_{\omega_1}(x-x_1(t))| [|\nabla Q_{\omega_1}(x+\theta y-x_1(t))| + |Q_{\omega_1}(x-x_1(t))|] dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for $(x, y) \in \Omega_{1,2}$, and the definition of σ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x + \theta y - x_1(t)| & = |x + \theta y - x_k(t) + x_k(t) - x_1(t)| \geq 2\sigma - |x_k(t) - x_1(t)| \geq \sigma, \\ |x - x_1(t)| & = |x - x_k(t) + x_k(t) - x_1(t)| \geq 3\sigma - \sigma = 2\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

So, applying the decay property (2.3) of Q_{ω_1} , we get

$$I_{1,2} \leq C\sigma \int_{|x-x_k| \geq 3\sigma} |Q_{\omega_1}|^2 \leq C\sigma^{-3}.$$

For the term $I_{1,3}$. From $(x, y) \in \Omega_{1,3}$, then by the definition of σ (see (1.8)), we have

$$|x + y - x_1(t)| = |x - x_k(t) + y + x_k(t) - x_1(t)| \geq \frac{\sigma}{2} - |x_k(t) - x_1(t)| \geq \frac{\sigma}{4}.$$

By the definition of Φ and the decay property (2.3), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,3} & \leq C \int_{|x-x_k| \leq \frac{\sigma}{2}} |R_1(x)| dx \int_{|y| \geq \sigma} \frac{|R_1(x+y)|}{|y|^2} dy \\ & = \int_{|x-x_k| \leq \frac{\sigma}{2}} |Q_{\omega_1}(x-x_1(t))| dx \int_{|y| \geq \sigma} |Q_{\omega_1}(x+y-x_1(t))| |y|^{-2} dy \\ & \leq C \int_{|x-x_k| \leq \frac{\sigma}{2}} |Q_{\omega_1}(x-x_1(t))| \int_{|y| \geq \sigma} |y|^{-2} \sigma^{-2} dx \\ & \leq C\sigma^{-3}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step, we used the fact that Q_{ω_1} is bounded.

For the term $I_{1,4}$. Since $(x, y) \in \Omega_{1,4}$, by the definition of (1.8), we have

$$|x + y - x_1(t)| = |x - x_k(t) + y + x_k(t) - x_1(t)| \geq \frac{\sigma}{2} - |x_k(t) - x_1(t)| \geq \frac{\sigma}{4}.$$

Hence, it follows that

$$I_{1,4} \leq C \int_{|x-x_k| \geq \frac{\sigma}{2}} |R_1(x)| dx \int_{|y| \geq \sigma} |\sigma|^{-2} |y|^{-2} dy \leq C\sigma^{-4}.$$

Thus, by similar argument as above, we can also obtain

$$|I_{1,j}| \leq C\sigma^{-3}, \quad j = 4, \dots, 8.$$

Hence, we conclude that

$$|I_1| \leq C\sigma^{-3}. \quad (4.11)$$

Estimate of I_2 . The second term I_2 in (4.9) can be estimated by the renormalization (4.2). In fact, by the definition of Φ_k , we get that for $1 \leq k \leq K$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Im \int (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \Phi_k dx \\ &= \Im \int (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) (\Phi(x - x_k) - \Phi(x - x_{k-1})) dx \\ &= \Im \int (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \Phi(x - x_k) - \Im \int (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \Phi(x - x_{k-1}) \\ &= \Im \int_{|x-x_k| < 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) + \Im \int_{|x-x_k| \geq 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \Phi(x - x_k) \\ &\quad - \Im \int_{|x-x_{k-1}| < 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) - \Im \int_{|x-x_{k-1}| \geq 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \Phi(x - x_{k-1}) \\ &= \Im \int (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) - \Im \int_{|x-x_k| > 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \\ &\quad + \Im \int_{|x-x_k| \geq 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \Phi(x - x_k) - \Im \int (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \\ &\quad + \Im \int_{|x-x_{k-1}| \geq 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) - \Im \int_{|x-x_{k-1}| \geq 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \Phi(x - x_{k-1}) \\ &= - \Im \int_{|x-x_k| > 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) + \Im \int_{|x-x_k| \geq 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \Phi(x - x_k) \\ &\quad + \Im \int_{|x-x_{k-1}| \geq 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) - \Im \int_{|x-x_{k-1}| \geq 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \Phi(x - x_{k-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the definition of Φ .

Notice that $|\Phi| \leq 1$. Hence, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \Im \int (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \Phi_k dx \right| \\ & \leq \left| \Im \int_{|x-x_k| > 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \right| + \left| \Im \int_{|x-x_k| \geq 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \Phi(x - x_k) \right| \\ & \quad + \left| \Im \int_{|x-x_{k-1}| \geq 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \right| + \left| \Im \int_{|x-x_{k-1}| \geq 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \Phi(x - x_{k-1}) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \Im \int_{|x-x_k| > 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \right| + \left| \Im \int_{|x-x_{k-1}| \geq 4\sigma} (\bar{R}_1 DR_k + \bar{R}_k DR_1) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_{|x-x_k| > 4\sigma} (\bar{Q}_{\omega_1}(x - x_1) DQ_{\omega_k}(x - x_k) + \bar{Q}_{\omega_k}(x - x_k) DQ_{\omega_1}(x - x_1)) \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left| \int_{|x-x_{k-1}| \geq 4\sigma} (\bar{Q}_{\omega_1}(x-x_1)DQ_{\omega_k}(x-x_k) + \bar{Q}_{\omega_k}(x-x_k)DQ_{\omega_1}(x-x_1)) \right| \\
& \leq C\sigma^{-3},
\end{aligned}$$

since $|x-x_1| \geq |x-x_k| - |x_k-x_1| \geq 4\sigma - \sigma = 3\sigma$ and $|x-x_1| \geq |x-x_{k-1}| - |x_{k-1}-x_1| \geq 4\sigma - \sigma = 3\sigma$. Here we also used the decay property of Q_{ω_k} and Q_{ω_1} . Using this estimate and the definition of I_2 , we get

$$|I_2| \leq C\sigma^{-3}. \quad (4.12)$$

Estimate of I_3 . From (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_3| & = \left| 2\omega_k(0) \sum_{k,l=2}^K \Im \int \bar{R}_k DR_l [\Phi(x-x_k(t)) - \Phi(x-x_{k-1}(t))] dx \right| \\
& \leq C \left| \sum_{k,l=2, k \neq l}^K \int |Q_k| |DR_l| \Phi_k dx \right| + C \left| \sum_{k=2}^K \Im \int \bar{R}_k DR_k \Phi_k dx \right| \\
& = I_{3,1} + I_{3,2}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the term $I_{3,1}$. First, we have

$$\int |Q_k| |DR_l| \Phi_k dx = \sum_{j=1}^4 \int_{\Omega_{3,1,j}} |Q_k| |DR_l| \Phi_k dx = \sum_{j=1}^4 I_{3,1,j},$$

where the regions

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_{3,1,1} & := \left\{ |x-x_k| \leq \frac{1}{4}\sigma, |x-x_l| \leq \frac{1}{4}\sigma \right\}, \\
\Omega_{3,1,2} & := \left\{ |x-x_k| \leq \frac{1}{4}\sigma, |x-x_l| \geq \frac{1}{4}\sigma \right\}, \\
\Omega_{3,1,3} & := \left\{ |x-x_k| \geq \frac{1}{4}\sigma, |x-x_l| \leq \frac{1}{4}\sigma \right\}, \\
\Omega_{3,1,4} & := \left\{ |x-x_k| \geq \frac{1}{4}\sigma, |x-x_l| \geq \frac{1}{4}\sigma \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of σ , we can easily obtain that $I_{3,1,1} = 0$. For $I_{3,1,2}$, by the decay property of Q_{ω_k} and $\Phi_k < 1$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{3,1,2} & \leq C \int_{\Omega_{3,1,2}} Q_{\omega_k}(x-x_k(t)) DQ_{\omega_l}(x-x_l(t)) dx \leq C|\sigma|^{-2} \int_{\Omega_{3,1,2}} Q_{\omega_k}(x-x_k(t)) \\
& \leq C|\sigma|^{-2} \left(\int_{|x-x_k| \leq \frac{1}{4}\sigma} Q_{\omega_k}^2(x-x_k(t)) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\sigma|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C|\sigma|^{-\frac{3}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that the L^2 -norm of Q_{ω_k} is bounded.

Similarly, for the term $I_{3,1,3}$, we have

$$I_{3,1,3} \leq C \int_{\Omega_{3,1,3}} Q_{\omega_k}(x-x_k(t)) DQ_{\omega_l}(x-x_l(t)) dx \leq C|\sigma|^{-2} \int_{\Omega_{3,1,3}} DQ_{\omega_l}(x-x_l(t))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C|\sigma|^{-2} \int_{\Omega_{3,1,3}} (|Q_{\omega_l}(x - x_l(t))| + |Q_{\omega_l}(x - x_l(t))|^p) dx \\
&\leq C|\sigma|^{-2} \left(\int_{|x-x_l|\leq\frac{1}{4}\sigma} |Q_{\omega_l}(x - x_l(t))|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\sigma|^{\frac{1}{2}} + C|\sigma|^{-2} \left(\int_{|x-x_l|\leq\frac{1}{4}\sigma} Q_{\omega_l}^{p+1}(x - x_l(t)) \right)^{\frac{p}{p+1}} |\sigma|^{\frac{1}{p+1}} \\
&\leq C\sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $DQ_{\omega_l} + \omega_l Q_{\omega_l} = Q_{\omega_l}^p$, and the L^2 -norm and L^{p+1} -norm of Q_{ω_k} are bounded.

For $I_{3,1,4}$, we have

$$I_{3,1,4} \leq C \int_{\Omega_{3,1,4}} Q_{\omega_k}(x - x_k(t)) DQ_{\omega_l}(x - x_l(t)) dx \leq C|\sigma|^{-4}.$$

For $I_{3,2}$, by the similar argument as $I_{3,1}$, we can obtain

$$I_{3,2} \leq C\sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}}.$$

Hence, combining the above estimates, we get

$$|I_3| \leq C\sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (4.13)$$

Thus, from (4.11), (4.12) and (4.13), we deduce

$$|I| \leq C\sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (4.14)$$

(ii) *Estimate of II.* Regarding the second term II on the right-hand side of (4.8), we first apply the integration by parts formula and $\Im(\bar{u}v) = -\Im(u\bar{v})$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\Im \int (\bar{R}D\epsilon + \bar{\epsilon}DR)\Phi_k dx &= \sum_{k=1}^K \Im \int (\bar{R}_k D\epsilon + \bar{\epsilon}DR_k)\Phi_k dx \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^K \Im \int \epsilon(D(\bar{R}_k\Phi_k) - D\bar{R}_k\Phi_k) dx =: \sum_{k=1}^K II_k.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by (2.2) in Lemma 2.2, for $1 \leq k \leq K$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|II_k| &= C \left| \Im \int \epsilon(x) dx \int \frac{\bar{R}_k(x+y)(\Phi_k(x+y) - \Phi_k(x)) - \bar{R}_k(x-y)(\Phi_k(x) - \Phi_k(x-y))}{|y|^2} dy \right| \\
&= C \left| \Im \int \epsilon(x) dx \left(\int \frac{\bar{R}_k(x+y)[\Phi(x+y-x_k) - \Phi(x+y-x_{k-1}) - \Phi(x-x_k) + \Phi(x-x_{k-1})]}{|y|^2} dy \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \int \frac{\bar{R}_k(x-y)[\Phi(x-x_k) - \Phi(x-x_{k-1}) - \Phi(x-y-x_k) - \Phi(x-y-x_{k-1})]}{|y|^2} dy \right) \right| \\
&\leq C \sum_{j=1}^3 \left| \Im \iint_{\Omega_{2,j}} \epsilon(x) \frac{\bar{R}_k(x+y)[\Phi(x+y-x_k) - \Phi(x-x_k)]}{|y|^2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \Im \iint_{\Omega_{2,j}} \epsilon(x) \frac{\bar{R}_k(x-y)[\Phi(x-x_k) - \Phi(x-y-x_k)]}{|y|^2} dx dy \right|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + C \sum_{j=4}^6 \left| \Im \iint_{\Omega_{2,j}} \epsilon(x) \frac{\bar{R}_k(x+y)[\Phi(x+y-x_{k-1}) - \Phi(x-x_{k-1})]}{|y|^2} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \Im \iint_{\Omega_{2,j}} \epsilon(x) \frac{\bar{R}_k(x-y)[\Phi(x-x_{k-1}) - \Phi(x-y-x_{k-1})]}{|y|^2} dx dy \right| \\
& = : C \sum_{j=1}^6 II_{k,j},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_{2,1} & := \{|x-x_k| \leq 3\sigma, |y| \leq \sigma\}, & \Omega_{2,2} & := \{|x-x_k| \geq 3\sigma, |y| \leq \sigma\}, & \Omega_{2,3} & := \{|y| \geq \sigma\}, \\
\Omega_{2,4} & := \{|x-x_{k-1}| \leq 3\sigma, |y| \leq \sigma\}, & \Omega_{2,5} & := \{|x-x_{k-1}| \geq 3\sigma, |y| \leq \sigma\}, & \Omega_{2,6} & := \{|y| \geq \sigma\}.
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $|x \pm y - x_l| \leq 4\sigma$, $l = k, k-1$, for $(x, y) \in \Omega_{2,1}$ and $(x, y) \in \Omega_{2,4}$, respectively. Thus, $II_{k,1} = II_{k,4} = 0$ due to the definition of Φ . Moreover, by (4.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
II_{k,2} & \leq \int_{|x-x_k| \geq 3\sigma} |\epsilon(x)| dx \int_{|y| \leq \sigma} (|\nabla R_k(x+\theta y)| + |R_k(x)|) dy \\
& \leq \int_{|x-x_k| \geq 3\sigma} |\epsilon(x)| dx \int_{|y| \leq \sigma} (|\nabla Q_{\omega_k}(x+\theta y-x_k)| + |Q_{\omega_k}(x-x_k)|) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $(x, y) \in \Omega_{2,2}$, then $|x+\theta y-x_k| \geq \frac{1}{2}|x-x_k|$. Hence, applying the decay property of Q_{ω_k} (see (2.3)), we get

$$II_{k,2} \leq C\sigma \int_{|x-x_k| \geq 3\sigma} |\epsilon(x)| |x-x_k|^{-2} dx \leq C\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\epsilon\|_{L^2}.$$

The term $II_{k,3}$ can be estimated by

$$II_{k,3} \leq C \int_{|y| \geq \sigma} |y|^{-2} dy \int |\epsilon(x)| (|R_k(x+y)| + |R_k(x-y)|) dx \leq C\sigma^{-1} \|\epsilon\|_{L^2}.$$

Thus, by the same argument as II_j , $j = 2, 3$, we can obtain II_j , $j = 5, 6$. Hence, we conclude that

$$|II| \leq C\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\epsilon\|_{L^2}. \quad (4.15)$$

(iii) *Estimate of III.* At last, we consider the third term on the right-hand side of (4.8). By using the integration by parts formula,

$$III = 2\text{Im} \int \bar{\epsilon} D\epsilon \Phi_k dx = \text{Im} \int \epsilon (D(\bar{\epsilon} \Phi_k) - D\bar{\epsilon} \Phi_k) dx.$$

In view of the definition of Φ_k , we apply the Calderón estimate in Lemma 2.3 to get

$$\|D(\bar{\epsilon} \Phi_k) - D\bar{\epsilon} \Phi_k\|_{L^2} \leq C\sigma^{-1} \|\epsilon\|_{L^2},$$

which yields

$$|III| \leq C\sigma^{-1} \|\epsilon\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (4.16)$$

Now, combining estimates (4.14), (4.15) and (4.16) altogether we get

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} \int |u|^2 \Phi_k dx \right| \leq C \left(\sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}} + \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\epsilon\|_{L^2} + \sigma^{-1} \|\epsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \right).$$

Then, integrating from 0 to t , we get

$$\left| \int |u(t)|^2 \Phi_k dx - \int |u(0)|^2 \Phi_k dx \right| \leq C \left(\frac{t}{\sigma^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{t}{\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|\epsilon\|_{L^2} + \frac{t}{\sigma} \|\epsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \right).$$

Hence, we obtain (4.7) and finish the proof of Lemma 4.2. \square

The analogue of Lemma 3.1 for the case of multi-solitary wave solutions is the following result.

Lemma 4.3. *Let G be defined as (4.5). For all $t \in [0, t^*]$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} G(u(t)) &= \sum_{k=1}^K G(Q_{\omega_k(0)}) + H_K(\epsilon, \epsilon) + \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \beta \left(\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^K \mathcal{O}(|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)|^2) + \mathcal{O}(\langle \sigma \rangle^{-2}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

with $\beta(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, where

$$H_K(\epsilon, \epsilon) = \frac{1}{2} \int |D^{\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\omega_k(0)}{2} \int |\epsilon|^2 \Phi_k(t) - \sum_{k=1}^K \int \left(\frac{1}{2} |R_k|^{p-1} |\epsilon|^2 + \frac{p-1}{2} |R_k|^{p-3} (\Re(R_k \epsilon))^2 \right).$$

Proof. The proof of this Lemma is similar to that of Lemma 3.1. Here we omit it. \square

The next lemma is the coercivity of H_K . In the multi-bubble case, it is important to derive the following localized version of the coercivity estimate in the construction of multi-solitary wave solutions and its stability.

Lemma 4.4. *There exists $\lambda_k > 0$ such that*

$$H_K(\epsilon(t), \epsilon(t)) \geq \lambda_k \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2.$$

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 3.2, the proof of Lemma 4.4 is based on Lemma 2.5. It also requires localization arguments. First, we give a localized version of Lemma 3.2. Let $0 < a < 1$ and $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^2 -even function such that $\phi' \leq 0$ with

$$\phi(x) = 1 \text{ on } [0, 1], \quad \phi(x) = |x|^{-a} \text{ on } [2, +\infty), \quad \text{and } 0 < \phi < 1.$$

Let $R > 0$ and $\phi_R(x) = \phi(x/R)$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\phi_R}(v, v) &= \frac{1}{2} \int \phi_R(\cdot - x_0) \left\{ \int |D^{\frac{1}{2}} v|^2 + \omega_0 \int |v|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad - \int \left(\frac{1}{2} |Q_{\omega_0}(\cdot - x_0)|^{p-1} |v|^2 + \frac{p-1}{2} |Q_{\omega_0}(\cdot - x_0)|^{p-3} (\Re(Q_{\omega_0}(\cdot - x_0) e^{-i\gamma_0 v}))^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Claim: Let $\omega_0 > 0$, $x_0, \gamma_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that there exists a solution Q_{ω_0} of (1.5), and ω_0 satisfies assumption (1.6). There exists $R_0 > 2$ such that for all $R > R_0$, if $v \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies

$$\Re \int Q_{\omega_0}(\cdot - x_0) e^{-i\gamma_0} v = \Re \int Q'_{\omega_0}(\cdot - x_0) e^{-i\gamma_0} v = \Im \int Q_{\omega_0}(\cdot - x_0) e^{-i\gamma_0} v = 0.$$

Then

$$H_{\phi_R}(v, v) \geq C \int \phi_R(\cdot - x_0) \left(\left| D^{\frac{1}{2}} v \right|^2 + |v|^2 \right).$$

Now we prove this **Claim**. For the sake of simplicity, we assume that $x_0 = 0$ and $\gamma_0 = 0$. Set

$$\tilde{v} := v \phi_R^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{v} = \tilde{v}_1 + i\tilde{v}_2.$$

Then, we have

$$D^{\frac{1}{2}} v \phi_R^{\frac{1}{2}} = D^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{v} + \left(D^{\frac{1}{2}} (\tilde{v} \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}) - D^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{v} \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \phi_R^{\frac{1}{2}} =: D^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{v} + h. \quad (4.18)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int (|D^{\frac{1}{2}} v|^2 + |v|^2) \phi_R - p Q_{\omega_0}^{p-1} v_1^2 - Q_{\omega_0}^2 v_2^2 dx \\ &= \int |D^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{v}|^2 + |\tilde{v}|^2 - p Q_{\omega_0}^{p-1} \tilde{v}_1^2 - Q_{\omega_0}^2 \tilde{v}_2^2 dx \\ & \quad + \int (1 - \phi_R^{-1}) (p Q_{\omega_0}^{p-1} \tilde{v}_1^2 + Q_{\omega_0}^2 \tilde{v}_2^2) dx + \|h\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\Re \langle D^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{v}, h \rangle \\ &=: K_1 + K_2 + K_3 + K_4. \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

In the sequel, let us estimate each term on the right-hand side of (4.19).

(i) **Estimate of K_1 .** We claim that there exists $C(R) > 0$ with $\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} C(R) = 0$ such that

$$\left| \int Q_{\omega_0} \tilde{v} \right| + \left| \int Q'_{\omega_0} \tilde{v} \right| \leq C(R) \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (4.20)$$

Thus, along with Lemma 3.2 and (4.20) yields that there exists $C > 0$ such that for R sufficiently large,

$$K_1 = \int |D^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{v}|^2 + |\tilde{v}|^2 - p Q_{\omega_0}^{p-1} \tilde{v}_1^2 - Q_{\omega_0}^2 \tilde{v}_2^2 dx \geq C \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2. \quad (4.21)$$

In order to prove (4.20), we rewrite

$$\int \tilde{v}_1 Q_{\omega_0} = \int v_1 Q_{\omega_0} + \int \tilde{v}_1 Q_{\omega_0} (\phi_R^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1) \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}} dx.$$

Notice that

$$\left| \int \tilde{v}_1 Q_{\omega_0} (\phi_R^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1) \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}} dx \right| \leq C \int_{|x| \geq R} \left| \tilde{v}_1 Q_{\omega_0} \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right| dx \leq C \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2} \left(\int_{|x| \geq R} Q_{\omega_0}^2 \phi_R^{-1} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

By the decay property that $Q_{\omega_0}(y) \sim \langle y \rangle^{-2}$ (see (2.3)),

$$\int_{|x| \geq R} Q_{\omega_0}^2 \phi_R^{-1} dx = \frac{1}{R} \int_{|y| \geq 1} Q_{\omega_0}^2(Ry) \phi^{-1}(y) dy \leq C \frac{1}{R^5} \int_{|y| \geq 1} |y|^{a-4} dy \leq \frac{C}{R^5}.$$

Thus, we get

$$\left| \int \tilde{v}_1 Q_{\omega_0} - \int v_1 Q_{\omega_0} \right| \leq CR^{-\frac{5}{2}} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2}.$$

Similar arguments also apply to the term $\int Q'_{\omega_0} \tilde{v}$, so we obtain (4.20), as claimed.

(ii) *Estimate of K_2 .* Using the decay property of Q_{ω_0} (see (2.3)) again, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |K_2| &= \left| \int (1 - \phi_R^{-1})(pQ_{\omega_0}^{p-1} \tilde{v}_1^2 + Q_{\omega_0}^{p-1} \tilde{v}_2^2) dx \right| \\ &\leq C \int_{|x| \geq R} \phi_R^{-1} Q_{\omega_0}^{p-1} |\tilde{v}|^2 dx \leq C \|\phi_R^{-1} Q_{\omega_0}^{p-1}\|_{L^\infty(|x| \geq R)} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq R^{-2(p-1)} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

(iii) *Estimate of K_3 and K_4 .* We claim that there exists $C(R) > 0$ with $\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} C(R) = 0$ such that

$$\|h\|_{L^2} \leq C(R) \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2}. \quad (4.23)$$

This yields that

$$|K_3| + |K_4| \leq C(R) \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2. \quad (4.24)$$

In order to prove (4.23), by Lemma 2.2 (see (2.2)) and the Minkowski inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|h\|_{L^2} &= C \left(\int \phi_R(x) \left| \int \frac{\tilde{v}(x+y) \left(\phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x+y) - \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) \right) - \tilde{v}(x-y) \left(\phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) - \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x-y) \right)}{|y|^{\frac{3}{2}}} dy \right|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \int |y|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left(\int \phi_R(x) \left(\tilde{v}(x+y) \left(\phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x+y) - \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) \right) \right)^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dy \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=1}^4 \int_{\Omega_{j,1}} |y|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega_{j,2}} \phi_R(x) \left(\tilde{v}(x+y) \left(\phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x+y) - \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) \right) \right)^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dy \\ &=: H_1 + H_2 + H_3 + H_4, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Omega_1 := \Omega_{1,1} \cup \Omega_{1,2} = \{|x| \leq \frac{R}{2}, |y| \leq \frac{R}{4}\}$. For the sake of simplicity, we write $\Omega_j := \Omega_{j,1} \cup \Omega_{j,2}$ for the remaining three regimes, $2 \leq j \leq 4$, and take $\Omega_2 := \{|x| \geq \frac{R}{2}, |y| \leq \frac{R}{4}\}$, $\Omega_3 := \{|x| \leq \frac{|y|}{2}, |y| \geq \frac{R}{4}\}$ and $\Omega_4 := \{|x| \geq \frac{|y|}{2}, |y| \geq \frac{R}{4}\}$. Then, the proof of (4.23) is reduced to estimating H_k , $1 \leq k \leq 4$.

First notice that $\phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x+y) - \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) = 0$ for $(x, y) \in \Omega_1$, and so $H_1 = 0$.

For H_2 . Using the mean valued theorem, we get that for some $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$,

$$\phi_R(x) \left| \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x+y) - \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) \right|^2 = \frac{1}{4} \frac{\phi_R(x)}{\phi_R^3(x+\theta y)} |\phi'_R(x+\theta y)|^2 |y|^2.$$

Since $\frac{R}{2} \leq |x| \leq 3R$ and $|y| \leq \frac{R}{4}$, we have $\frac{R}{4} \leq |x + \theta y| \leq 4R$, and thus

$$\phi_R(x) \left| \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x+y) - \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) \right|^2 = \frac{1}{4R^2} \frac{\phi_R(x)}{\phi_R^3(x+\theta y)} \left| \phi' \left(\frac{x+\theta y}{R} \right) \right|^2 |y|^2 \leq \frac{C}{R^2} |y|^2.$$

While for $|x| \geq 3R$ and $|y| \leq \frac{R}{4}$, we have $\frac{|x|}{2} \leq |x + \theta y| \leq \frac{3|x|}{2}$, and thus

$$\phi_R(x) \left| \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x+y) - \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) \right|^2 \leq C \frac{\phi_R(\frac{x}{2})}{\phi_A^3(\frac{3x}{2})} |\phi'_R(x+\theta y)|^2 |y|^2 \leq \frac{C}{R^2} |y|^2.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$H_2 \leq \frac{C}{R} \int_0^{\frac{R}{4}} y^{-\frac{1}{2}} dy \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2} \leq CR^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2}. \quad (4.25)$$

For H_3 , we shall use the fact that

$$\phi_R(x) \left| \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x+y) - \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) \right|^2 \leq C \phi_R(x) (\phi_R^{-1}(x+y) + \phi_R^{-1}(x)). \quad (4.26)$$

For $(x, y) \in \Omega_3$, we have $\frac{|y|}{2} \leq |x+y| \leq \frac{3|y|}{2}$, so

$$\phi_R(x) \phi_R^{-1}(x+y) \leq C \phi_R^{-1} \left(\frac{3|y|}{2} \right) \leq C |y|^a,$$

which implies

$$\phi_R(x) \left| \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x+y) - \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) \right|^2 \leq C(1 + |y|^a),$$

and thus

$$H_3 \leq C \int_{\frac{R}{4}}^{+\infty} y^{-\frac{3}{2}} (1 + y^{\frac{a}{2}}) dy \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2} \leq CR^{\frac{a-1}{2}} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2}. \quad (4.27)$$

The estimate of H_4 also relies on (4.26). In fact, for $(x, y) \in \Omega_4$, we have $|x+y| \leq 3|x|$, and thus

$$\phi_R(x) \phi_R^{-1}(x+y) \leq C \phi_R(x) \phi_R^{-1}(3x) \leq C,$$

and, by (4.26),

$$\phi_R(x) \left| \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x+y) - \phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) \right|^2 \leq C.$$

It follows that

$$H_4 \leq C \int_{\frac{R}{4}}^{+\infty} y^{-\frac{3}{2}} dy \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2} \leq CR^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2}. \quad (4.28)$$

Thus, combining (4.25), (4.27) and (4.28) together, we obtain (4.23), as claimed.

Now, plugging (4.21), (4.22) and (4.24) into (4.19) we get that for R large enough,

$$\int (|D^{\frac{1}{2}}v|^2 + |v|^2) \phi_R - pQ^{p-1}v_1^2 - Q^{p-1}v_2^2 dx \geq C_1 \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2.$$

Hence, in order to finish the proof, it remains to show that there exists $C > 0$ such that for R sufficiently large

$$\|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \geq C \int \left(|D^{\frac{1}{2}}v|^2 + |v|^2 \right) \phi_R dx. \quad (4.29)$$

Since $\|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2}^2 = \int |v|^2 \phi_R dx$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{v}\|_{L^2}^2 &= \int \left| D^{\frac{1}{2}}v\phi_R^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(D^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{v} - D^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\tilde{v}\phi_R^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)\phi_R^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right|^2 dx = \int \left| D^{\frac{1}{2}}v\phi_R^{\frac{1}{2}} - h \right|^2 dx \\ &= \int \left| D^{\frac{1}{2}}v \right|^2 \phi_R dx + \int |h|^2 dx - 2\Re \int D^{\frac{1}{2}}v\phi_R^{\frac{1}{2}}\bar{h} dx, \end{aligned}$$

where h is given by (4.18). Applying (4.23) to derive that for R large enough

$$\|D^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{v}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2}^2 \geq C \int \left(|D^{\frac{1}{2}}v|^2 + |v|^2 \right) \phi_R dx.$$

This yields (4.29) and finishes the proof of this Claim.

Now, we finish the proof of Lemma 4.4. Let $R > R_0$ and $\sigma > 0$. Since $\sum_{k=1}^K \Phi_k(t) = 1$, we decompose $H_K(\epsilon, \epsilon)$ as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} H_K(\epsilon, \epsilon) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \int \phi_R(\cdot - x_k) \left[|D^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon|^2 + \omega_k(0)|\epsilon|^2 \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \int \left(|R_k|^{p-1}|v|^2 + (p-1)|R_k|^{p-3}(\Re(\bar{R}_k v))^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \int (\Phi_k - \phi_R(\cdot - x_k)) \left[|D^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon|^2 + \omega_k(0)|\epsilon|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

From the claim, for any $k = 1, \dots, K$, we have, for R large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int \phi_R(\cdot - x_k) \left[|D^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon|^2 + \omega_k(0)|\epsilon|^2 \right] - \int \left(|R_k|^{p-1}|v|^2 + (p-1)|R_k|^{p-3}(\Re(\bar{R}_k v))^2 \right) \\ &\geq C_k \int \phi_R(\cdot - x_k(t)) \left[|D^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon|^2 + |\epsilon|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by the properties of ϕ_R and $\Phi_k(t)$, for σ large enough, where σ is given by (1.8), then we have

$$\Phi_k - \phi_R(\cdot - x_k) \geq -|\sigma|^{-a}.$$

and $\delta(k) = \delta(\omega_k) > 0$,

$$|D^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon|^2 + \omega_k(0)|\epsilon|^2 \geq \delta_k \left(|D^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon|^2 + |\epsilon|^2 \right) \geq 0.$$

Hence,

$$\int (\Phi_k - \phi_R(\cdot - x_k)) \left[|D^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon|^2 + \omega_k(t)|\epsilon|^2 \right]$$

$$\geq \delta_k \int (\Phi_k - \phi_R(\cdot - x_k)) \left(|D^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon|^2 + |\epsilon|^2 \right) - |\sigma|^{-a} \int \left(|D^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon|^2 + |\epsilon|^2 \right).$$

Combining the above estimates, we get

$$H_K(\epsilon, \epsilon) \geq \lambda_k \int \sum_{k=1}^K \Phi_k \left(|D^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon|^2 + |\epsilon|^2 \right) - |\sigma|^{-a} \int \left(|D^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon|^2 + |\epsilon|^2 \right),$$

where $\lambda_k = \min\{C_k, \delta_k\}$. Since $\sum_{k=1}^K \Phi_k = 1$, we obtain the desired result by taking σ large enough. Now we complete the proof of Lemma 4.4. \square

As in the proof of a single solitary waves stability result in section 3, we now proceed in last two steps: first, we control the size of $\epsilon(t)$ in $H^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and second, we check that for any k , $|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)|$ is quadratic in $|\epsilon(t)|$.

Step 3. Energetic control of $\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}$. We give the following lemma:

Lemma 4.5. *Assume that σ and δ satisfy (1.8) and (1.9), respectively. For all $t \in [0, t^*]$, the following holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K |\mathcal{J}_k(t) - \mathcal{J}_k(0)| &\leq \frac{C}{\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \\ &\quad + C \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)| + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

Proof. First, we write (4.17) at $t > 0$ and at $t = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} E(u(t)) + J(t) &= \sum_{k=1}^K J_{\omega_k(0)}(Q_{\omega_k(0)}) + H_K(\epsilon(t), \epsilon(t)) + \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \beta \left(\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^K \mathcal{O}(|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)|^2) + \mathcal{O}(\langle \sigma \rangle^{-2}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$E(u(0)) + J(0) = \sum_{k=1}^K J_{\omega_k(0)}(Q_{\omega_k(0)}) + H_K(\epsilon(0), \epsilon(0)) + \|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \beta \left(\|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\langle \sigma \rangle^{-2}).$$

Since $E(u(t)) = E(u(0))$ and $H_K(\epsilon(0), \epsilon(0)) \leq C \|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2$, then from above equalities, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} H_K(\epsilon(t), \epsilon(t)) &\leq (J(t) - J(0)) + C \|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + C \sum_{k=1}^K (|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)|^2) \\ &\quad + C \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \beta \left(\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) + C \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

From the conservation of mass and Lemma 4.4, we obtain

$$\lambda_K \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^K (\mathcal{J}_k(t) - \mathcal{J}_k(0)) + C \|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + C \sum_{k=1}^K (|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)|^2) + C \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2}, \quad (4.31)$$

where we assume that α is small enough (α is as in (4.1)).

By Lemma 4.2 and the assumption of σ and δ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_k(t) - \mathcal{J}_k(0) &\leq C \frac{t}{\sigma} \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{L^2}^2 + C \frac{t}{\sigma^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{t}{\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|\epsilon\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\sigma^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\sigma^{1 + \delta}} + \frac{C}{\sigma^\delta} \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\sigma^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\sigma^{1 + \delta}} + \frac{C}{\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}} \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

In particular, if $t \in (0, 1)$, (4.32) is still hold.

Injecting (4.32) into (4.31), we obtain

$$\lambda_K \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \leq \frac{C}{\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + C \sum_{k=1}^K (|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)|^2) + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}}.$$

Using this and (4.31) and (4.32) again, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^K |\mathcal{J}_k(t) - \mathcal{J}_k(0)| &\leq \frac{C}{\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \\
&\quad + C \sum_{k=1}^K (|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)|^2) + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, from above estimates, (4.30) holds. Now we have completed the proof of Lemma 4.5. \square

Step 4. Quadratic control of $|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)|$. We give the following result.

Let $\Phi^+ : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a smooth function such that $|(\Phi^+)'(x)| \leq C\sigma^{-1}$ for some $C > 0$, $\Phi^+(x) = 1$ for $x \leq 2\sigma$ and $\Phi^+(x) = 0$ for $x \geq 6\sigma$. The localization functions Φ_k^+ , $1 \leq k \leq K$, are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_1^+(x) &:= \Phi^+(x - x_1), \quad \Phi_K^+(x) := 1 - \Phi^+(x - x_{K-1}), \\
\Phi_k^+(x) &:= \Phi^+(x - x_k) - \Phi^+(x - x_{k-1}), \quad 2 \leq k \leq K - 1.
\end{aligned}$$

One has the partition of unity, that is, $1 \equiv \sum_{k=1}^K \Phi_k^+$.

In addition, we define $\Phi^- : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as a smooth function such that $|(\Phi^-)'(x)| \leq C\sigma^{-1}$ for some $C > 0$, $\Phi^-(x) = 1$ for $x \leq 6\sigma$ and $\Phi^-(x) = 0$ for $x \geq 10\sigma$. The localization functions Φ_k^- , $1 \leq k \leq K$, are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_1^-(x) &:= \Phi^-(x - x_1), \quad \Phi_K^-(x) := 1 - \Phi^-(x - x_{K-1}), \\
\Phi_k^-(x) &:= \Phi^-(x - x_k) - \Phi^-(x - x_{k-1}), \quad 2 \leq k \leq K - 1.
\end{aligned}$$

One has the partition of unity, that is, $1 \equiv \sum_{k=1}^K \Phi_k^-$.

Define

$$\mathcal{J}_k^\pm(t) = \omega_k(0) \int |u(t, x)|^2 \Phi_k^\pm(t, x) dx. \tag{4.33}$$

Hence, from Lemma 4.2, we have the following corollary:

Corollary 4.6. Let \mathcal{J}_k^\pm be defined as (4.33), then we have

$$|\mathcal{J}_k^\pm(t) - \mathcal{J}_k^\pm(0)| \leq C \left(\frac{t}{\sigma^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{t}{\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|\epsilon\|_{L^2} + \frac{t}{\sigma} \|\epsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \right).$$

Now we have the following estimates:

Lemma 4.7. Let \mathcal{J}_k and \mathcal{J}_k^\pm be defined as (4.6) and (4.33), respectively. Then we have

$$\left| \mathcal{J}_k^+(t) - \mathcal{J}_k(t) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k'=k}^K \int Q_{\omega_{k'}(t)}^2 \right| \leq C \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2}, \quad (4.34)$$

$$\left| \mathcal{J}_k(t) - \mathcal{J}_k^-(t) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k'=k}^K \int Q_{\omega_{k'}(t)}^2 \right| \leq C \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2}. \quad (4.35)$$

Proof. By the calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_k^+(t) - \mathcal{J}_k(t) &= \int |u(t, x)|^2 \Phi_k^+(t, x) dx - \frac{1}{2} \int |u(t, x)|^2 \Phi_k(t, x) dx \\ &= \int |u(t, x)|^2 (\Phi^+(x - x_k) - \Phi^+(x - x_{k-1})) dx \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int |u(t, x)|^2 (\Phi(x - x_k) - \Phi(x - x_{k-1})) dx \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} \int |u(t, x)|^2 \Phi^+(x - x_k) + \frac{1}{2} \int |u(t, x)|^2 (\Phi^+(x - x_k) - \Phi(x - x_k)) \right) \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{1}{2} \int |u(t, x)|^2 \Phi^+(x - x_{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2} \int |u(t, x)|^2 (\Phi^+(x - x_{k-1}) - \Phi(x - x_{k-1})) \right) \\ &= I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, we have

$$\int |R(t, x)|^2 (\Phi^+(x - x_k) - \Phi(x - x_k)) \leq C \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2},$$

since $\Phi^+(x - x_k) - \Phi(x - x_k) = 0$ for $x - x_k \leq 2\sigma$ and $x - x_k \geq 8\sigma$. Therefore,

$$\left| \int |R(t, x)|^2 (\Phi^+(x - x_k) - \Phi(x - x_k)) \right| \leq C \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + C \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2}.$$

On the other hand, by the orthogonality condition $\Re \int R_{k'}(t) \epsilon(t) = 0$ and the algebraic decay of the $Q_{\omega_{k'}}$ (see (2.3)), we have

$$\left| \int |u(t, x)|^2 \Phi^+(x - x_k) - \sum_{k'=k}^K \int Q_{\omega_{k'}(t)}^2 \right| \leq C \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + C \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2}.$$

By the same argument as I_1 , we also can estimate I_2 . Hence, by the above estimates, we get (4.34) holds. Using an argument similar to (4.34), we can easily obtain (4.35). \square

Lemma 4.8. Assume that σ and δ satisfy (1.8) and (1.9), respectively. For all $t \in [0, t^*]$, it holds,

$$\sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)| \leq C \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}}. \quad (4.36)$$

Proof. From Lemma 4.2 and Corollary 4.6, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^K |\mathcal{J}_k(t) - \mathcal{J}_k(0)| \leq C \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + C \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)|^2 + C \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2}, \quad (4.37)$$

and for all $k = 1, \dots, K$,

$$|\mathcal{J}_k^\pm(t) - \mathcal{J}_k^\pm(0)| \leq \frac{C}{\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}} \quad (4.38)$$

Combining (4.34), (4.37) and (4.38), we have, for all $K = 2, \dots, K$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k'=k}^K \left(\int Q_{\omega_k(t)}^2 - Q_{\omega_k(0)}^2 \right) &\leq 2 [(\mathcal{J}_k^+(t) - \mathcal{J}_k(t)) - (\mathcal{J}_k^+(0) - \mathcal{J}_k(0))] + C \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + C \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2} \\ &\leq 2 [(\mathcal{J}_k^+(t) - \mathcal{J}_k(t))] + 2[(\mathcal{J}_k^+(0) - \mathcal{J}_k(0))] + C \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + C \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2} \\ &\leq C \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)|^2 + C \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} - \sum_{k'=k}^K \left(\int Q_{\omega_k(t)}^2 - Q_{\omega_k(0)}^2 \right) &\leq 2 [(\mathcal{J}_k^-(t) - \mathcal{J}_k(t)) - (\mathcal{J}_k^-(0) - \mathcal{J}_k(0))] + C \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + C \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2} \\ &\leq 2 [(\mathcal{J}_k^-(t) - \mathcal{J}_k(t))] + 2[(\mathcal{J}_k^-(0) - \mathcal{J}_k(0))] + C \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + C \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2} \\ &\leq C \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)|^2 + C \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we deduce, for all $k = 2, \dots, K$,

$$\left| \sum_{k'=k}^K \left(\int Q_{\omega_k(t)}^2 - Q_{\omega_k(0)}^2 \right) \right| \leq C \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)|^2 + C \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}}. \quad (4.39)$$

On the other hand, by the mass conservation (1.3) and the orthogonality conditions on ϵ (see (3.3)), we have

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\int Q_{\omega_k(t)}^2 - Q_{\omega_k(0)}^2 \right) \right| \leq C \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + C \langle \sigma \rangle^{-2}.$$

This means that (4.39) is true for $k = 1$.

Recall that $\omega_k(t), \omega_k(0)$ are close to ω_k^0 (see (4.3)), then for any $k = 1, \dots, K$,

$$|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)| \leq C \left| \int Q_{\omega_k(t)}^2 - Q_{\omega_k(0)}^2 \right|. \quad (4.40)$$

From (4.39) and (4.40), we obtain, for $k = K$

$$|\omega_K(t) - \omega_K(0)| \leq C \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)|^2 + C \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}}.$$

Then, by a backward induction argument on k , using (4.39) and (4.40), we deduce, for any $k = K - 1, \dots, 1$,

$$|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)| \leq C \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)|^2 + C \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}}.$$

Thus, for any $k = 1, \dots, K$,

$$|\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)| \leq C \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}}.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 4.8. \square

Conclusion of the proof of Proposition 4.1. Combining the conclusions of the Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.8, we obtain, for all $t \in [0, t^*]$,

$$\|\epsilon\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \leq \frac{C}{\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{L^2}^2 + C \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \left[\beta \left(\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \right] + C \|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}}.$$

For σ large enough, we have for all $t \in [0, t^*]$,

$$\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\epsilon(t')\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}}.$$

and so, for all $t \in [0, t^*]$,

$$\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \leq C \|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}}.$$

Using (4.36), we obtain

$$\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)| \leq C \|\epsilon(0)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}}.$$

By (4.3) and (4.4), we obtain

$$\|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)| + \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k(0) - \omega_k^0| \leq C\alpha^2 + C\langle\sigma\rangle^{-2\delta + \frac{1}{4}}.$$

where C is independent of A_0 . To conclude the proof, we go back to $u(t)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| u(t) - \sum_{k=1}^K Q_{\omega_k^0}(x - x_k(t)) e^{i\gamma_k(t)} \right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ & \leq \left\| u(t) - \sum_{k=1}^K R_k(t) \right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \sum_{k=1}^K \left\| R_k(t) - Q_{\omega_k^0}(x - x_k(t)) e^{i\gamma_k(t)} \right\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ & \leq \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} + C \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k^0| \\ & \leq \|\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} + C \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k(t) - \omega_k(0)| + C \sum_{k=1}^K |\omega_k(0) - \omega_k^0| \\ & \leq C_1 \left(\alpha + \frac{C}{\sigma^{2\delta - \frac{1}{4}}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $C > 0$ does not depend on A_0 . Thus, we can choose $A_0 = 2C_1$, then $\alpha_0 > 0$ small enough and σ_0 large enough, and we obtain the conclusion of Proposition 4.1. \square

A Appendix

In this section, we give the following local well-posedness result concerning the Cauchy problem for half-wave equation (1.1).

Lemma A.1. *Let $s > \frac{1}{2}$ be given. For every initial datum $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$, there exists a unique solution $u \in C^0([t_0, T); H^s(\mathbb{R}))$ of problem (1.1). Here $t_0 < T(u_0) \leq +\infty$ denotes its maximal time of existence (in forward time). Moreover, we have the following properties.*

(i) *Conservation of L^2 -mass, energy and linear momentum: It holds that*

$$M(u) = \int |u|^2, \quad E(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int |D^{\frac{1}{2}}u|^2 - \frac{1}{p+1} \int |u|^{p+1}, \quad P(u) = \int \bar{u}(-i\partial_x u),$$

are conserved along the flow.

(ii) *Blowup alternative in H^s : Either $T(u_0) = +\infty$ or, if $T(u_0) < +\infty$, then $\|u(t)\|_{H^s} \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow T^-$.*

(iii) *Continuous dependence: The flow map $u_0 \mapsto u(t)$ is Lipschitz continuous on bounded subsets of $H^s(\mathbb{R})$.*

(iv) *Global Existence: If $1 < p < 3$, then $T(u_0) = +\infty$ holds true.*

Proof. By the similar argument as [30, Lemma D.1], we can obtain this lemma. Here we omit it. \square

Acknowledgments.

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (12301090).

Data Availability

We do not analyse or generate any datasets, because our work proceeds within a theoretical and mathematical approach.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no potential conflict of interest.

References

- [1] J. Bellazzini, V. Georgiev, E. Lenzmann, and N. Visciglia. On traveling solitary waves and absence of small data scattering for nonlinear half-wave equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 372(2):713–732, 2019.
- [2] J. Bellazzini, V. Georgiev, and N. Visciglia. Long time dynamics for semi-relativistic NLS and half wave in arbitrary dimension. *Math. Ann.*, 371(1-2):707–740, 2018.
- [3] U. Biccari, M. Warma, and E. Zuazua. Local elliptic regularity for the Dirichlet fractional Laplacian. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.*, 17(2):387–409, 2017.
- [4] D. Cai, A. J. Majda, D. W. McLaughlin, and E. G. Tabak. Dispersive wave turbulence in one dimension. *Phys. D*, 152/153:551–572, 2001. Advances in nonlinear mathematics and science.
- [5] A.-P. Calderón. Commutators of singular integral operators. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 53:1092–1099, 1965.

- [6] D. Cao, Y. Su, and D. Zhang. Construction of multi-bubble blow-up solutions to the L^2 -critical half-wave equation. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 110(3):Paper No. e12974, 2024.
- [7] T. Cazenave and P.-L. Lions. Orbital stability of standing waves for some nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 85(4):549–561, 1982.
- [8] Y. Cho, H. Hajaiej, G. Hwang, and T. Ozawa. On the Cauchy problem of fractional Schrödinger equation with Hartree type nonlinearity. *Funkcial. Ekvac.*, 56(2):193–224, 2013.
- [9] Eleonora Di Nezza, Giampiero Palatucci, and Enrico Valdinoci. Hitchhiker’s guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 136(5):521–573, 2012.
- [10] V. D. Dinh. On the Cauchy problem for the nonlinear semi-relativistic equation in Sobolev spaces. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 38(3):1127–1143, 2018.
- [11] W. Eckhaus and P. Schuur. The emergence of solitons of the Korteweg-de Vries equation from arbitrary initial conditions. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 5(1):97–116, 1983.
- [12] A. Elgart and B. Schlein. Mean field dynamics of boson stars. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 60(4):500–545, 2007.
- [13] A. Eycheenne and F. Valet. Strongly interacting solitary waves for the fractional modified Korteweg–de Vries equation. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 285(11):Paper No. 110145, 71, 2023.
- [14] Z. Feng and Y. Su. Traveling wave phenomena of inhomogeneous half-wave equation. *J. Differential Equations*, 400:248–277, 2024.
- [15] R. L. Frank and E. Lenzmann. Uniqueness of non-linear ground states for fractional Laplacians in \mathbb{R} . *Acta Math.*, 210(2):261–318, 2013.
- [16] R. L. Frank, E. Lenzmann, and L. Silvestre. Uniqueness of radial solutions for the fractional Laplacian. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 69(9):1671–1726, 2016.
- [17] J. Fröhlich, B. Lars G. Jonsson, and E. Lenzmann. Boson stars as solitary waves. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 274(1):1–30, 2007.
- [18] K. Fujiwara, V. Georgiev, and T. Ozawa. Blow-up for self-interacting fractional Ginzburg-Landau equation. *Dyn. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 15(3):175–182, 2018.
- [19] K. Fujiwara, V. Georgiev, and T. Ozawa. On global well-posedness for nonlinear semirelativistic equations in some scaling subcritical and critical cases. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 136:239–256, 2020.
- [20] V. Georgiev and Y. Li. Blowup dynamics for mass critical half-wave equation in 3D. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 281(7):Paper No. 109132, 34, 2021.
- [21] V. Georgiev and Y. Li. Nondispersive solutions to the mass critical half-wave equation in two dimensions. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 47(1):39–88, 2022.
- [22] P. Gérard, E. Lenzmann, O. Pocovnicu, and P. Raphaël. A two-soliton with transient turbulent regime for the cubic half-wave equation on the real line. *Ann. PDE*, 4(1):Paper No. 7, 166, 2018.

- [23] S. Gustafson, H. Takaoka, and T. Tsai. Stability in $H^{1/2}$ of the sum of K solitons for the Benjamin-Ono equation. *J. Math. Phys.*, 50(1):013101, 14, 2009.
- [24] K. Hidano and C. Wang. Fractional derivatives of composite functions and the Cauchy problem for the nonlinear half wave equation. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 25(1):Paper No. 2, 28, 2019.
- [25] T. Inui. Some nonexistence results for a semirelativistic Schrödinger equation with nongauge power type nonlinearity. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 144(7):2901–2909, 2016.
- [26] A. D. Ionescu and F. Pusateri. Nonlinear fractional Schrödinger equations in one dimension. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 266(1):139–176, 2014.
- [27] C. E. Kenig and Y. Martel. Asymptotic stability of solitons for the Benjamin-Ono equation. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 25(3):909–970, 2009.
- [28] K. Kirkpatrick, E. Lenzmann, and G. Staffilani. On the continuum limit for discrete NLS with long-range lattice interactions. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 317(3):563–591, 2013.
- [29] C. Klein, C. Sparber, and P. Markowich. Numerical study of fractional nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, 470(2172):20140364, 26, 2014.
- [30] J. Krieger, E. Lenzmann, and P. Raphaël. Nondispersive solutions to the L^2 -critical half-wave equation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 209(1):61–129, 2013.
- [31] A. J. Majda, D. W. McLaughlin, and E. G. Tabak. A one-dimensional model for dispersive wave turbulence. *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, 7(1):9–44, 1997.
- [32] Y. Martel, F. Merle, and T. P. Tsai. Stability and asymptotic stability in the energy space of the sum of N solitons for subcritical gKdV equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 231(2):347–373, 2002.
- [33] Y. Martel, F. Merle, and T.-P. Tsai. Stability in H^1 of the sum of K solitary waves for some nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Duke Math. J.*, 133(3):405–466, 2006.
- [34] M. I. Weinstein. Lyapunov stability of ground states of nonlinear dispersive evolution equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 39(1):51–67, 1986.
- [35] M. I. Weinstein. Existence and dynamic stability of solitary wave solutions of equations arising in long wave propagation. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 12(10):1133–1173, 1987.

Yuan Li,
 School of Mathematics and Statistics, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, 730000, Gansu, Peoples
 Republic of China, E-mail: li_yuan@lzu.edu.cn