

# SCATTERING FOR THE GENERALIZED HARTREE EQUATION WITH A POTENTIAL

CARLOS M. GUZMÁN, CRISTIAN LOLI, AND LUIS P. YAPU

ABSTRACT. We consider the focusing generalized Hartree equation in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  with a potential,

$$iu_t + \Delta u - V(x)u + (I_\gamma * |u|^p)|u|^{p-2}u = 0,$$

where  $I_\gamma = \frac{1}{|x|^{3-\gamma}}$ ,  $p \geq 2$  and  $\gamma < 3$ . In this paper, we prove scattering for the generalized Hartree equation with a potential in the intercritical case assuming radial initial data. The novelty of our approach lies in the use of a general mass-potential condition, incorporating the potential  $V$ , which extends the standard mass-energy framework. To this end, we employ a simplified method inspired by Dodson and Murphy [4], based on Tao's scattering criteria and Morawetz estimates. This approach provides a more straightforward proof of scattering compared to the traditional concentration-compactness/rigidity method of Kenig and Merle [9].

Mathematics Subject Classification. 35A01, 35QA55, 35P25.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we investigate the Cauchy problem for the focusing generalized Hartree equation with a potential (GHPV for short). Let  $u = u(x, t)$  be a complex-valued function. We consider

$$\begin{cases} iu_t + \Delta u - V(x)u + (I_\gamma * |u|^p)|u|^{p-2}u = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, T) \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3), \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $I_\gamma = \frac{1}{|x|^{3-\gamma}}$ ,  $p \geq 2$  and  $0 < \gamma < 3$ . The potential  $V : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies the following conditions:

$$V \in K_0 \cap L^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (1.2)$$

$$\|V_-\|_{K_0} < 4\pi, \quad \text{where } V_- = \min\{V, 0\}. \quad (1.3)$$

Here,  $K_0$  represents the closure of the set of functions with compact support concerning the Kato norm:

$$\|V\|_{K_0} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|V(y)|}{|x-y|} dy.$$

Under the assumptions of (1.2)-(1.3), it is established that the operator  $H := -\Delta + V$  possesses no eigenvalues, and the Sobolev norms  $\|\Lambda f\|_{L^2}$  and  $\|\nabla f\|_{L^2}$  are equivalent, where

$$\|\Lambda f\|_{L^2}^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla f|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} V|f|^2 dx.$$

The solutions to equation (1.1) conserve both mass and energy throughout their lifespan, given by the expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} M(u) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u(x, t)|^2 dx = M(u_0), \\ E(u) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{1}{2p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (I_\gamma * |u|^p)|u|^p dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} V(x)|u|^2 dx = E(u_0). \end{aligned}$$

---

*Key words and phrases.* Generalized Hartree equation; Radial Scattering.

The energy  $E_0$  without the potential  $V$ , is defined by

$$E_0(u) = \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{1}{2p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (I_\gamma * |u|^p) |u|^p dx,$$

and we denote the potential energy by

$$P(u(t)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (I_\gamma * |u|^p) |u|^p dx.$$

The main purpose of this paper is to study the energy scattering for (1.1) in the intercritical case, that is,  $0 < s_c < 1$ . The critical exponent  $s_c$ , which defines a scale-invariant Sobolev norm in  $\dot{H}^{s_c}$ , is given by

$$s_c = \frac{3}{2} - \frac{\gamma + 2}{2(p-1)}.$$

**Definition 1.1.** *We say that a solution to (1.1) scatters in  $H^1$  if there exist  $u_\pm \in H^1$  such that*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|u(t) - e^{-itH} u_\pm\|_{H^1} = 0,$$

where  $e^{-itH}$  is the free Schrödinger propagator.

To characterize the threshold for scattering, we require a ground state. The equation (1.1) admits wave solutions of the form  $u(x, t) = e^{it} Q(x)$ , where  $Q$  solves the nonlinear elliptic equation

$$-Q + \Delta Q + (I_\gamma * |Q|^p) |Q|^{p-2} Q = 0.$$

The first result of the existence and uniqueness for  $p = 2$  and  $\gamma = 2$  was proved by Lieb [10]. This solution is smooth, radial, decreasing in the radial coordinate and exponentially decaying at infinity. In the general case, the existence of positive solutions for  $\frac{N+\gamma}{N} < p < \frac{N+\gamma}{N-2}$  was shown by Moroz and van Schaftingen [11]. While the uniqueness of these solutions remains an open question, we utilize the minimizer of the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and its computed value from [2] for our purposes.

Before stating our results, we review previous findings on the model (1.1). The well-posedness of the Hartree equation without a potential ( $V = 0$  and  $p = 2$  in (1.1)) has been extensively studied, starting with the works of Cazenave [3] and Ginibre & Velo [6]. The local and global well-posedness in  $H^1$  for the generalized Hartree equation without potential was further investigated in [2]. Scattering results have generally been derived using the compactness and rigidity framework of Kenig and Merle [9]. A simplified proof of scattering for the cubic NLS equation, employing a scattering criterion introduced by Tao [13], was provided by Dodson and Murphy [4]. For the generalized Hartree equation with  $N \geq 3$  and without potential, scattering was proved by Arora and Roudenko following the Kenig-Merle roadmap [2], and by Arora [1] using a simplified proof similar to the method of [4]. Here, we study the generalized Hartree equation with a potential, as given by equation (1.1), in the inter-critical case, utilizing ideas from [4] (see also [5]). Initially, we establish a global existence result for small data in  $H^1$  across the entire inter-critical regime.

**Proposition 1.2.** *Let  $p \geq 2$  satisfy  $\frac{5+\gamma}{3} < p < 3 + \gamma$  with  $0 < \gamma < 3$ . Let  $V$  satisfy (1.2) and (1.3). Suppose that  $\|u_0\|_{H^1} \leq E$  and take  $\bar{r} = \frac{12(p-1)}{3+2\gamma-2\epsilon}$ ,  $\bar{a} = \frac{8(p-1)}{1+2\epsilon}$ . Then there exists  $\delta = \delta(E)$  such that if*

$$\|e^{-itH} u_0\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} < \delta,$$

then there exist a unique solution  $u$  to (1.1) with initial condition  $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  which is globally defined on  $[0, \infty)$  such that

$$\|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} < 2\delta \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{S(L^2)} + \|\Lambda u\|_{S(L^2)} \leq 2C \|u_0\|_{H^1}.$$

**Remark 1.3.** *It is important to note that, due to the presence of the potential  $V$ , we must use admissible pairs  $(q, r)$  with  $r < 3$ , rather than  $r \leq 6$  as in the case without a potential. In this work, we use the pair  $(q, r) = (4^+, 3^-)$ ; see Section 2. Additionally, the pair  $(\bar{a}, \bar{r})$  used here represents the scattering norm and is not  $H^{s_c}$ -admissible because  $\bar{r}$  does not satisfy  $\bar{r} < 6$ . Consequently, proving the results with a potential differs from the model without a potential. If we do not consider the appropriate pairs and carefully estimate, we would need to restrict the range of the parameter  $p$ . This is one of the main contributions of this work.*

We now present the main result of this paper. It is stated as follows.

**Theorem 1.4.** *(Scattering) Consider the generalized Hartree equation (1.1) with  $p \geq 2$ ,  $\gamma < 3$  and  $\frac{5+\gamma}{3} < p < \gamma + 3$ , with potential  $V : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying (1.2),  $V \geq 0$ ,  $x \cdot \nabla V \leq 0$ , and  $x \cdot \nabla V \in L^r$  with  $r \in [\frac{3}{2}, \infty)$ . Let  $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  be radial and  $u(t)$  be the corresponding solution of (1.1) such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T^*]} P(u(t))M(u(t))^{\sigma_c} < P(Q)M(Q)^{\sigma_c}, \quad \text{where } \sigma_c = \frac{1 - s_c}{s_c}, \quad (1.4)$$

then<sup>1</sup>  $u$  is global solution ( $T^* = \infty$ ) and scatters in  $H^1$ .

**Remark 1.5.** *Note that, by mass and energy conservation, the hypothesis (1.4) implies that the solution of (1.1) is global and the norm  $\|u\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^1}$  is bounded.*

The hypothesis (1.4) is more general than the standard mass-energy threshold conditions (1.5)-(1.6) typically used to prove scattering. This is formalized in the following result.

**Corollary 1.6.** *Let  $u$  be a solution of (1.1) with maximal lifespan. If*

$$M(u_0)^{\sigma_c} E(u_0) < M(Q)^{\sigma_c} E_0(Q) \quad (1.5)$$

and

$$\|u_0\|_2^{\sigma_c} \|\Lambda u_0\|_2 < \|Q\|_2^{\sigma_c} \|\nabla Q\|_2. \quad (1.6)$$

Then

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} \|u(t)\|_2^{\sigma_c} \|\Lambda u(t)\|_2 < \|Q\|_2^{\sigma_c} \|\nabla Q\|_2. \quad (1.7)$$

That is,  $u$  is a global. Moreover,  $u$  scatters in  $H^1$ .

The proof of Theorem 1.4 consists of two main steps: First, we establish the scattering criterion for the Hartree model with potential. This criterion, initially proven by Tao [13] for the radial 3D cubic NLS equation, is adapted to our context. Specifically, we show scattering under the conditions specified in Theorem 1.4 and the assumption

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B(0, R)} |u(x, t)|^2 dx \leq \varepsilon^2.$$

The second step is to verify that this inequality holds, which is ensured by satisfying the assumption stated in (1.4). To do that, we employ Virial-Morawetz-type estimates.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we study the results of global well-posedness and scattering for small data. In Section 3 we prove the Scattering criterion following the method of Dodson and Murphy [4] based on arguments of Tao [13]. Section 4 is devoted to the variational analysis using the hypothesis (1.4), and we prove Corollary 1.6. Finally, in Section 5 we prove Theorem 1.4 using Virial/Morawetz estimates.

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that we do not require the condition (1.3) for  $V$ , as we assume  $V \geq 0$ .

## 2. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

Let us start this section by introducing the notation used throughout the paper. We write  $a \lesssim b$  to denote  $a \leq cb$  for some constant  $c > 0$ . If  $a \lesssim b \lesssim a$ , we write  $a \sim b$ .

We make use of the standard Lebesgue spaces  $L^p$ , the mixed Lebesgue spaces  $L_t^q L_x^r$ , as well as the homogeneous and inhomogeneous Sobolev spaces  $\dot{H}^{s,r}$  and  $H^{s,r}$ . When  $r = 2$ , we write  $\dot{H}^{s,2} = \dot{H}^s$  and  $H^{s,2} = H^s$ . If necessary, we use subscripts to specify which variable we are concerned with. We use  $'$  to denote the Hölder dual of an index.

Consider the operator  $\mathcal{H} := -\Delta + V$  and  $\Lambda := (-\Delta + V)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Under the conditions (1.2) on  $V$ , the operator  $\mathcal{H}$  has no eigenvalues,  $\Lambda$  is well-defined and the operator  $e^{-it\mathcal{H}}$  enjoys dispersive estimates (2.3) and Strichartz estimates (2.4)-(2.5), see Hong [8].

Let us consider the norms,

$$\|u\|_{\dot{W}_V^{s,r}} := \|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^r} \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{W_V^{s,r}} := \|\langle \Lambda \rangle^s u\|_{L^r} \sim \|u\|_{L^r} + \|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^r}.$$

**Lemma 2.1** ([8]). *If  $1 < r < \frac{3}{s}$ , where  $0 \leq s \leq 1$ , then we have the following equivalence of the norms,*

$$\|u\|_{\dot{W}_V^{s,r}} \sim \|u\|_{\dot{W}^{s,r}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{W_V^{s,r}} \sim \|u\|_{W^{s,r}}.$$

In the particular case when  $V \geq 0$ , we have

$$\|\Lambda u\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} V(x)|u|^2 dx \geq \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2.$$

**Lemma 2.2.** *(Sobolev inequality) Let  $V : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfy (1.2). Then it holds that*

$$\|f\|_{L^q} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{W}_V^{s,r}} \quad \|f\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|f\|_{W_V^{s,r}(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

where  $1 < p < q < \infty$ ,  $1 < p < 3$ ,  $0 \leq s \leq 2$ , and  $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{s}{3}$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *(Radial Sobolev) For a radial function  $f \in H^1$  and  $\frac{1}{2} \leq s \leq 1$ , it follows that*

$$\||x|^s f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^1}.$$

We also have the following version:

**Lemma 2.4** ([7]). *(Radial Sobolev in  $L^p$ ). For  $p \geq 1$  and a radial function  $f \in H^1$ , it follows that*

$$\|f\|_{L^{p+1}(|x| \geq R)}^{p+1} \lesssim \frac{1}{R^{p-1}} \|f\|_{L^2(|x| \geq R)}^{\frac{p+3}{2}} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2(|x| \geq R)}^{\frac{p-1}{2}},$$

for any  $R > 0$ .

Now we recall the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev estimate, which allows us to handle the convolution term in the generalized Hartree equation.

**Lemma 2.5.** *For  $0 < \gamma < N$  and  $r > 1$ , there exists a constant  $C = C(r, \gamma)$  such that*

$$\left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(y)}{|x-y|^{N-\gamma}} dy \right\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \|u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^N)},$$

where  $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{r} - \frac{\gamma}{N}$  and  $r < \frac{N}{\gamma}$ .

**2.1. Well-posedness theory.** To discuss the well-posedness theory for (1.1), we first recall the Strichartz estimates for the generalized Hartree equation without potential from [2] for  $N = 3$ . We say the pair  $(q, r)$  is  $L^2$ -admissible if it satisfies

$$\frac{2}{q} + \frac{3}{r} = \frac{3}{2},$$

where

$$q \geq 2, \quad 2 \leq r \leq 6.$$

Here,  $n^+$  denotes a number (slightly) greater than  $n$  such that  $\frac{1}{n} = \frac{1}{n^+} + \frac{1}{(n^+)^7}$ . Analogously,  $n^-$  denotes a number (slightly) less than  $n$ .

Given a real number  $s > 0$ , we also say that the pair  $(q, r)$  is  $S(\dot{H}^s)$ -admissible if

$$\frac{2}{q} + \frac{3}{r} = \frac{3}{2} - s, \quad (2.1)$$

with

$$\left(\frac{2}{1-s}\right)^+ \leq q \leq \infty, \quad \frac{6}{3-2s} \leq r < 6^-. \quad (2.2)$$

Define

$$\|u\|_{S(L^2, I)} = \sup_{(q, r) \in \mathcal{A}_0} \|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r}$$

and

$$\|u\|_{S'(L^2, I)} = \inf_{(q, r) \in \mathcal{A}_0} \|u\|_{L_t^{q'} L_x^{r'}},$$

where  $\mathcal{A}_0$  denotes the set of  $L^2$ -admissible pairs. We also define the following norm

$$\|\langle \nabla \rangle u\|_{S(L^2, I)} = \|u\|_{S(L^2, I)} + \|\nabla u\|_{S(L^2, I)}.$$

If  $I = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $I$  is omitted usually.

**Lemma 2.6** (Dispersive estimate and Strichartz estimate, [8]). *Let  $V : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies (1.2). Then, the following statements hold:*

$$\|e^{-itH}\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty} \lesssim |t|^{-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\|e^{-itH} f\|_{L_t^q L_x^r} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2}, \quad (2.4)$$

$$\left\| \int_0^t e^{-i(t-s)H} g(s) ds \right\|_{L_t^q L_x^r} \lesssim \|g\|_{L_t^{m'} L_x^{n'}}, \quad (2.5)$$

for any  $L^2$ -admissible pairs  $(q, r)$  and  $(m, n)$ .

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let*

$$\frac{1}{r} + \frac{\gamma}{3} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q}. \quad (2.6)$$

Then,

$$\|(I_\gamma * f)g\|_{L_x^r} \leq \|f\|_{L_x^p} \|g\|_{L_x^q}.$$

*Proof.* Using Hölder and Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev (Lemma 2.5) inequalities,

$$\|(I_\gamma * f)g\|_{L_x^r} \leq \|I_\gamma * f\|_{L_x^{p_1}} \|g\|_{L_x^q} \leq \|f\|_{L_x^p} \|g\|_{L_x^q},$$

where

$$\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{q}, \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma = \frac{3}{p} - \frac{3}{p_1}.$$

Substituting  $p_1$  from the second equation in the first equation we get (2.6).  $\square$

**2.2. Local and Global well-posedness.** We start with the local well-posedness. Because of, the equivalence of norms  $\|\Lambda u\|_{L^r} \sim \|\nabla u\|_{L^r}$ , we need  $1 < r < 3$ .

**Proposition 2.8.** *Let  $N = 3$  and  $p$  such that  $2 \leq p < 1 + \frac{\gamma+2}{N-2}$ . Suppose  $V$  satisfies conditions (1.2)-(1.3) and  $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . Then there exists  $T > 0$ ,  $T = T(\|u_0\|_{H^1}, N, p, \gamma)$  and there is a unique solution  $u$  of (1.1) in  $[0, T]$  such that*

$$u \in C([0, T], H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)) \cap L^q([0, T], W_V^{1,r}(\mathbb{R}^N)),$$

where  $(q, r)$  is  $L^2$ -admissible.

*Proof.* See [2]. They showed the same result without potential (for  $N \geq 3$ ), using the pair  $(q, r)$  such that  $2 \leq r < N$ . The proof here is similar.  $\square$

Showing the global existence of solutions in  $H^1$ , we need to be more careful. Specifically, for the equivalence of norms  $\|\Lambda u\|_{L^r} \sim \|\nabla u\|_{L^r}$ , it is necessary to choose appropriate pairs  $(q, r)$ . Before stating the global result, we establish the nonlinearity estimate.

**Lemma 2.9** (Nonlinear estimates). *Let  $p \geq 2$ ,  $\gamma < 3$  and  $\frac{5+\gamma}{3} < p < \gamma + 3$ . Then, for any  $\epsilon > 0$  small*

- (i)  $\|(I_\gamma * |u|^p)|u|^{p-2}v\|_{L_t^{2'}L_x^{6'}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}}L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{2p-2} \|v\|_{L_t^{4^+}L_x^{3^-}},$
- (ii)  $\|\nabla((I_\gamma * |u|^p)|u|^{p-2}u)\|_{L_t^{2'}L_x^{6'}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}}L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{2p-2} \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^{4^+}L_x^{3^-}},$

where

$$\bar{r} = \frac{12(p-1)}{3+2\gamma-2\epsilon}, \quad \bar{a} = \frac{8(p-1)}{1+2\epsilon}, \quad 3^- = \frac{3}{1+\epsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad 4^+ = \frac{4}{1-2\epsilon}.$$

*Proof.* We start with (i). Note that,  $\frac{1}{6'} + \frac{\gamma}{3} = \frac{p}{\bar{r}} + \frac{p-2}{\bar{r}} + \frac{1}{3^-}$ . Applying Lemma 2.7 and the Hölder inequality. It follows that

$$\|(I_\gamma * |u|^p)|u|^{p-2}v\|_{L_x^{6'}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L_x^{\bar{r}}}^p \|u\|_{L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{p-2} \|v\|_{L_x^{3^-}} = \|u\|_{L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{2p-2} \|v\|_{L_x^{3^-}}.$$

Now, because of  $\frac{1}{2'} = \frac{2p-2}{\bar{a}} + \frac{1}{3^-}$  and by Hölder inequality in the time variable, we have

$$\|(I_\gamma * |u|^p)|u|^{p-2}v\|_{L_t^{2'}L_x^{6'}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}}L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{2p-2} \|v\|_{L_t^{4^+}L_x^{3^-}}.$$

We now estimate (ii). Observe that

$$\nabla((I_\gamma * |u|^p)|u|^{p-2}u) \sim (I_\gamma * |u|^{p-1}\nabla u)|u|^{p-2}u + (I_\gamma * |u|^p)|u|^{p-2}\nabla u = I + II.$$

As before, by replacing  $v$  by  $\nabla u$ , we obtain II. On the other hand, since

$$\|(I_\gamma * |u|^{p-1}\nabla u)|u|^{p-2}u\|_{L_x^{6'}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{p-1} \|\nabla u\|_{L_x^{3^-}} \|u\|_{L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{p-2} \|u\|_{L_x^{\bar{r}}} = \|u\|_{L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{2p-2} \|\nabla u\|_{L_x^{3^-}},$$

and by arguing as (i), we complete the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 2.10.** *Note that, the pair  $(\bar{a}, \bar{r})$  which satisfies (2.1) but not necessarily (2.2), i.e., it is not  $\dot{H}^{sc}$ -admissible.*

**Proposition 2.11.** (Global well-posedness) *Let  $p \geq 2$  satisfy  $\frac{5+\gamma}{3} < p < 3 + \gamma$  with  $0 < \gamma < 3$ . Let  $V$  satisfy (1.2) and (1.3). Suppose that  $\|u_0\|_{H^1} \leq E$  and take  $\bar{r} = \frac{12(p-1)}{3+2\gamma-2\epsilon}$ ,  $\bar{a} = \frac{8(p-1)}{1+2\epsilon}$ . Then there exists  $\delta = \delta(E)$  such that if*

$$\|e^{-itH}u_0\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}}L_x^{\bar{r}}} < \delta,$$

then there exist a unique solution  $u$  to (1.1) with initial condition  $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  which is globally defined on  $[0, \infty)$  such that

$$\|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}}L_x^{\bar{r}}} < 2\delta \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{S(L^2)} + \|\Lambda u\|_{S(L^2)} \leq 2C\|u_0\|_{H^1}.$$

*Proof.* For  $\rho$  and  $M$  to be defined later, define

$$B = \{u : \|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} < \rho \text{ and } \|u\|_{S(L^2)} + \|\Lambda u\|_{S(L^2)} \leq M\}.$$

We show that the operator  $G$  defined by

$$G(u) = e^{-itH} u_0 + i \int_0^t e^{-i(t-s)H} N(u(s)) ds,$$

where  $N(u) = (I_\gamma * |u|^p)|u|^{p-2}u$  is a contraction on  $B$ , with the metric  $d(u, v) = \|u - v\|_{S(L^2)}$ . Indeed,

$$\|G(u)\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} \leq \|e^{-itH} u_0\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} + \left\| \int_0^t e^{-i(t-s)H} N(u(s)) ds \right\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}},$$

and using Sobolev inequality,

$$\|G(u)\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} \leq \|e^{-itH} u_0\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} + \|\Lambda^{s_c} \int_0^t e^{-i(t-s)H} N(u(s)) ds\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{p}}},$$

where  $s_c = \frac{3}{p} - \frac{3}{\bar{r}}$  and  $\bar{p} = \frac{12(p-1)}{6p-7-2\epsilon}$ . We observe the pair  $(\bar{a}, \bar{p})$  is  $L^2$ -admissible. The Strichartz estimate, equivalence of norms, and interpolation yield

$$\begin{aligned} \|G(u)\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} &\leq \|e^{-itH} u_0\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} + c \|D^{s_c} N(u)\|_{L_t^{2'} L_x^{6'}}, \\ &\leq \|e^{-itH} u_0\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} + c \|N(u)\|_{L_t^{2'} L_x^{6'}}^{1-s_c} \|\nabla N(u)\|_{L_t^{2'} L_x^{6'}}^{s_c}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, Lemma 2.9 and taking  $u \in B$  imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|G(u)\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} &\leq \|e^{-itH} u_0\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} + c \|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{(2p-2)(1-s_c)} \|u\|_{L_t^{4^+} L_x^{3^-}}^{1-s_c} \|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{(2p-2)s_c} \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^{4^+} L_x^{3^-}}^{s_c} \\ &< \delta + c\rho^{(2p-2)(1-s_c)} M^{1-s_c} \rho^{(2p-2)s_c} M^{s_c} = \delta + c\rho^{2p-2} M. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by applying the Strichartz estimates and Lemma 2.9 once again, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|G(u)\|_{S(L^2)} &\leq \|e^{-itH} u_0\|_{S(L^2)} + c \|N(u)\|_{S'(L^2)} \leq c \|u_0\|_{L^2} + c \|N(u)\|_{S'(L^2)} \\ &\leq c \|u_0\|_{L^2} + c \|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{2p-2} \|u\|_{L_t^{4^+} L_x^{3^-}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly (by equivalence of norms)

$$\|\Lambda G(u)\|_{S(L^2)} \leq c \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} + c \|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{2p-2} \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^{4^+} L_x^{3^-}}.$$

Hence,

$$\|G(u)\|_{S(L^2)} + \|\Lambda G(u)\|_{S(L^2)} \leq c \|u_0\|_{H^1} + c \|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{2p-2} \left( \|u\|_{L_t^{4^+} L_x^{3^-}} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^{4^+} L_x^{3^-}} \right) \leq E + c\rho^{2p-2} M. \quad (2.7)$$

From (2.2) and (2.7), we take  $M = 2E$  and

$$\rho = \min \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{2M} \right)^{\frac{1}{2p-3}}, \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2p-2}} \right\},$$

we have that  $G(u) \in B$ . Now we show that  $G$  is a contraction on  $B$ . for  $u, v \in B$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d(G(u), G(v)) &\lesssim \|G(u(t)) - G(v(t))\|_{S(L^2)} \\ &\lesssim \|(I_\gamma * |u|^p)|u|^{p-2}u - (I_\gamma * |v|^p)|v|^{p-2}v\|_{S'(L^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Rewriting,

$$d(G(u), G(v)) \lesssim \|(I_\gamma * |u|^p) (|u|^{p-2}u - |v|^{p-2}v)\|_{S'(L^2)} + \|(I_\gamma * (|u|^p - |v|^p)) |v|^{p-2}v\|_{S'(L^2)} := A_1 + A_2.$$

Thus,

$$A_1 \lesssim \|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}}^p \left( \|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{p-2} + \|v\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{p-2} \right) \|u - v\|_{S(L^2)} \leq 2M^{2p-2} \|u - v\|_{S(L^2)}.$$

$$A_2 \lesssim \left( \|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{p-1} + \|v\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{p-1} \right) \|v\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{p-1} \|u - v\|_{S(L^2)} \leq 2M^{2p-2} \|u - v\|_{S(L^2)}.$$

For  $u, v \in B$  we deduce

$$d(G(u(t)), G(v(t))) \leq 4cM^{2p-2}d(u, v),$$

so,  $G$  is a contraction.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.12** (Space-time bounds imply scattering). *Let  $p \geq 2$  satisfy  $\frac{5+\gamma}{3} < p < 3 + \gamma$  with  $0 < \gamma < 3$ . Suppose  $V$  satisfies conditions (1.2)-(1.3) and  $u$  be a global solution to (1.1) satisfying  $\|u\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^1} \leq E$ . If*

$$\|u\|_{L_{[T,+\infty)}^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} < +\infty,$$

for some  $T > 0$ , then  $u$  scatters forward in time in  $H^1$ .

*Proof.* The proof is standard; here are the main steps. For  $\eta > 0$ , let  $[T, +\infty) = \bigcup_{j=1}^N I_j$ , where the intervals  $I_j$  are chosen such that  $\|u\|_{L_{I_j}^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} < \eta$  for all  $j$ . By Strichartz, Lemma 2.9 and a continuity argument we get

$$\|\langle \nabla \rangle u\|_{S(L^2, [T, +\infty))} < +\infty.$$

Defining

$$\phi^+ = e^{-itH}u(T) + i \int_T^{+\infty} e^{-itH}N(u)(s)ds,$$

we conclude that  $\|u(t) - e^{-itH}\phi^+\|_{H^1} \lesssim \|u\|_{L_{[t,+\infty)}^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{2p-2} \|\langle \nabla \rangle u\|_{L_{[t,+\infty)}^{4+} L_x^{3-}} \rightarrow 0$ , as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ .  $\square$

### 3. SCATTERING CRITERION

In this section, we study the scattering criterion for the generalized Hartree equation with a potential.

**Proposition 3.1** (Scattering criterion). *Assume the same hypotheses as in Theorem 1.4. Consider an  $H^1$ -solution  $u$  to (1.1) defined on  $[0, +\infty)$  and assume*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, +\infty)} \|u(t)\|_{H_x^1} := E < +\infty. \quad (3.1)$$

There exist constants  $R > 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  depending only on  $E, p$  (but never on  $u$  or  $t$ ) such that if

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{B(0, R)} |u(x, t)|^2 dx \leq \varepsilon^2, \quad (3.2)$$

then  $u$  scatters forward in time in  $H^1$ .

To this end, we begin with the following lemma, which is fundamental to the proof. Since the pair  $(\bar{a}, \bar{r})$  is not  $\dot{H}^{sc}$ -admissible, careful attention is required when estimating the recent past  $F_1$  and distant past  $F_2$  (see the proof).

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $p \geq 2$ ,  $0 < \gamma < 3$  such that  $\frac{5+\gamma}{3} < p < \gamma + 3$ . Suppose  $V$  satisfies conditions (1.2)-(1.3) and  $u$  be a radial  $H^1$ -solution to (1.1) satisfying (3.1). If  $u$  satisfies (3.2) for some  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ , then there exist  $\gamma, T > 0$  such that*

$$\left\| e^{-i(\cdot-T)H}u(T) \right\|_{L_{[T,+\infty)}^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} \lesssim \varepsilon^\gamma. \quad (3.3)$$



*Proof.* Fix the parameters  $\mu, \gamma > 0$  (to be chosen later). Applying Strichartz estimate (2.4), there exists  $T_0 > \varepsilon^{-\mu}$  such that

$$\|e^{-itH}u_0\|_{L_{[T,+\infty)}^{\bar{a}}L_x^{\bar{r}}} \leq \varepsilon^\gamma. \quad (3.4)$$

For  $T \geq T_0$ , define  $I_1 := [T - \varepsilon^{-\mu}, T]$  and  $I_2 := [0, T - \varepsilon^{-\mu}]$ . Duhamel's formula

$$u(T) = e^{-itH}u_0 - i \int_0^T e^{-i(t-s)H}N(u)(s) ds,$$

implies that

$$e^{-i(t-T)H}u(T) = e^{-itH}u_0 - iF_1 - iF_2,$$

where, for  $i = 1, 2$ ,

$$F_i = \int_{I_i} e^{-i(t-s)H}N(u)(s) ds.$$

We refer to  $F_1$  as the ‘‘recent past’’ and to  $F_2$  as the ‘‘distant past’’. By (3.4), it remains to estimate  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ .

### Step 1. Estimate on recent past.

Let  $\eta$  denote a smooth, spherically symmetric function which equals 1 on  $B(0, 1/2)$  and 0 outside  $B(0, 1)$ . For any  $R > 0$  we use  $\eta_R$  to denote the rescaling  $\eta_R(x) := \eta(x/R)$ .

By hypothesis (3.2), we can fix  $T \geq T_0$  such that

$$\int \eta_R(x) |u(T, x)|^2 dx \lesssim \varepsilon^2. \quad (3.5)$$

The following relation is obtained by multiplying (1.1) by  $\eta_R \bar{u}$ , taking the imaginary part and integrating by parts (see Tao [13, Section 4] for the NLS version),

$$\partial_t \int \eta_R |u|^2 dx = 2 \operatorname{Im} \left( \int \nabla \eta_R \cdot \nabla u \bar{u} \right).$$

Thus, using (3.1),

$$\left| \partial_t \int \eta_R(x) |u(t, x)|^2 dx \right| \lesssim \frac{1}{R},$$

so that, by (3.5), for  $t \in I_1$ ,

$$\int \eta_R(x) |u(t, x)|^2 dx \lesssim \varepsilon^2 + \frac{\varepsilon^{-\mu}}{R}.$$

If  $R > \varepsilon^{-(\mu+2)}$ , then we have

$$\|\eta_R u\|_{L_{I_1}^\infty L_x^2} \lesssim \varepsilon. \quad (3.6)$$

Recall the pairs used in Section 2.  $(\bar{a}, \bar{r})$  satisfies (2.1),  $(\bar{a}, \bar{p})$ , (2, 6) and  $(4^+, 3^-)$  are  $L^2$ -admissible.

$$\|F_1(u)\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} \lesssim \|D^{s_c} F_1(u)\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{p}}} \lesssim \|D^{s_c} N(u)\|_{L_t^{2'} L_x^{6'}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}}^{2p-2} \|D^{s_c} u\|_{L_t^{4^+} L_x^{3^-}}.$$

Using interpolation,

$$\|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} \leq \|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r}^{1-s_c} \|u\|_{L_t^m L_x^n}^{s_c}, \quad (3.7)$$

where  $(q, r)$  which is  $L^2$ -admissible,  $(m, n)$  is  $S(\dot{H}^1)$ -admissible and

$$\frac{1}{\bar{a}} = \frac{1-s_c}{q} + \frac{s_c}{m} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\bar{r}} = \frac{1-s_c}{r} + \frac{s_c}{n}.$$

Defining the numbers

$$q = \frac{8(\gamma + 2)}{3(1 + 2\epsilon)}, \quad r = \frac{4(\gamma + 2)}{3 + 2\gamma - 2\epsilon}, \quad m = 3q, \quad \text{and} \quad n = 3r,$$

we obtain (3.7) (using the value of  $\bar{a}$ ). By Sobolev embedding, with  $\frac{1}{n} = \frac{1}{s} - \frac{1}{3}$ , we have

$$\|u\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} \leq \|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r}^{1-s_c} \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^m L_x^s}^{s_c}. \quad (3.8)$$

Thus  $n = \frac{3s}{3-s}$ , or equivalently  $s = \frac{3n}{3+n}$ . Observe that  $(m, s)$  is  $L^2$ -admissible and  $2 \leq s < 3$ . Combining the relation (3.7), (3.8) and interpolation, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_1(u)\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} &\lesssim \|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r}^{(1-s_c)(2p-2)} \|u\|_{L_t^m L_x^n}^{s_c(2p-2)} \|D^{s_c} u\|_{L_t^{4+} L_x^{3-}} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r}^{(1-s_c)(2p-2)} \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^m L_x^s}^{s_c(2p-2)} \|D^{s_c} u\|_{L_t^{4+} L_x^{3-}} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r}^{(1-s_c)(2p-2)} \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^m L_x^s}^{s_c(2p-2)} \|u\|_{L_t^{4+} L_x^{3-}}^{1-s_c} \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^{4+} L_x^{3-}}^{s_c}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Lemma 3.3 gives

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L_t^m L_x^s}^{s_c(2p-2)} \|u\|_{L_t^{4+} L_x^{3-}}^{1-s_c} \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^{4+} L_x^{3-}}^{s_c} \lesssim (\varepsilon^{-\mu})^{\frac{s_c(2p-2)}{m}} (\varepsilon^{-\mu})^{\frac{1-s_c}{4+}} E^{1-s_c} (\varepsilon^{-\mu})^{\frac{s_c}{4+}}. \quad (3.10)$$

It remains to study  $\|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r}$ . The Hölder inequality and interpolation imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r} &\leq \|1\|_{L_t^{\frac{q}{1-\theta}}} \|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^r} \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\mu}{q}} \|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^r} \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\mu}{q}} (\|\eta_R u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^r} + \|(1-\eta_R)u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^r}) \\ &\leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\mu}{q}} \|\eta_R u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{1-\theta} \|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^6}^\theta + \varepsilon^{-\frac{\mu}{q}} \|(1-\eta_R)u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty}^{1-\bar{\theta}} \|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{\bar{\theta}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1-\theta}{2} + \frac{\theta}{6} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{r} = \frac{1-\bar{\theta}}{\infty} + \frac{\bar{\theta}}{2},$$

thus

$$\theta = \frac{3(r-2)}{2r} = \frac{3(1+2\epsilon)}{4(\gamma+2)} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\theta} = \frac{2}{r} = \frac{2\gamma+3-2\epsilon}{2(\gamma+2)}.$$

The hypothesis (3.1) leads to,

$$\|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{\mu}{q}} \left( \|\eta_R u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{1-\theta} + \|(1-\eta_R)u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty}^{1-\bar{\theta}} \right),$$

which, using (3.6) and Lemma 2.3, give

$$\|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{\mu}{q}} (\varepsilon^{1-\theta} + R^{-\frac{1-\bar{\theta}}{2}}).$$

Since  $R > \varepsilon^{-2-\mu}$ ,

$$\|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{\mu}{q}} (\varepsilon^{1-\theta} + \varepsilon^{(1-\bar{\theta})\frac{2+\mu}{2}}).$$

Note that  $\theta < \bar{\theta}$  and choosing  $\mu$  sufficiently small, one has  $1-\theta > (1-\bar{\theta})\frac{2+\mu}{2}$ , so

$$\|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{\mu}{q}} \varepsilon^{(1-\bar{\theta})\frac{2+\mu}{2}} = \varepsilon^{(1-\bar{\theta})\frac{2+\mu}{2} - \frac{\mu}{q}}. \quad (3.11)$$

Finally, applying (3.10) and (3.11) we deduce that

$$\|F_1(u)\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} \lesssim (\varepsilon^{(1-\bar{\theta})\frac{2+\mu}{2} - \frac{\mu}{q}})^{(1-s_c)(2p-2)} \varepsilon^{-\mu \frac{s_c(2p-2)}{m}} \varepsilon^{-\mu \frac{1-s_c}{4+}} \varepsilon^{-\mu \frac{s_c}{4+}}.$$

Since  $\mu$  can be chosen very small, the exponent of  $\varepsilon$  is positive, that is

$$\|F_1(u)\|_{L_t^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{\nu_1}.$$

## Step 2. Estimate on distant past.

<sup>2</sup>that,  $(q, r)$  is  $L^2$ -admissible and  $(m, n)$  is  $S(\dot{H}^1)$ -admissible. Moreover,  $2 \leq r \leq 6$  and  $m \geq 2$ .

We have

$$\|F_2\|_{L_{[T,+\infty)}^{\bar{a}}L_x^{\bar{r}}} \leq \|F_2\|_{L_{[T,+\infty)}^kL_x^l}^{1-\theta} \|F_2\|_{L_{[T,+\infty)}^{\bar{p}}L_x^\infty}^\theta, \quad (3.12)$$

where  $0 < \theta < 1$  and

$$\frac{1}{\bar{r}} = \frac{\theta}{l} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\bar{a}} = \frac{\theta}{k} + \frac{1-\theta}{\bar{p}}, \quad (3.13)$$

such that  $(k, l)$  is  $L^2$ -admissible and  $\bar{p} > 2$ .

We can rewrite  $F_2$  applying Duhamel's principle as

$$F_2 = e^{-itH} \left[ e^{-i(-T+\epsilon^{-\mu})H} U(-T + \epsilon^{-\mu})u(T - \epsilon^{-\mu}) - u(0) \right].$$

Using Strichartz estimate (2.4) in (3.12) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_2\|_{L_{[T,+\infty)}^{\bar{a}}L_x^{\bar{r}}} &\leq \|e^{-itH} [U(-T + \epsilon^{-\mu})u(T - \epsilon^{-\mu}) - u(0)]\|_{L_{[T,+\infty)}^kL_x^l}^{1-\theta} \|F_2\|_{L_{[T,+\infty)}^{\bar{p}}L_x^\infty}^\theta \\ &\lesssim \left( \|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \right)^{1-\theta} \|F_2\|_{L_{[T,+\infty)}^{\bar{p}}L_x^\infty}^\theta \lesssim \|F_2\|_{L_{[T,+\infty)}^{\bar{p}}L_x^\infty}^\theta. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

For  $t > T$  and using the dispersive estimate (2.3), we have

$$\|F_2(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \leq \int_0^{T-\epsilon^{-\mu}} \|e^{-i(t-s)H} N(u(s))\|_{L_x^\infty} ds \lesssim \int_0^{T-\epsilon^{-\mu}} (t-s)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|N(u(s))\|_{L_x^1} ds.$$

Using Lemma 2.7,

$$\|N(u(s))\|_{L^1} \leq \|u(s)\|_{L_x^{p_1}}^p \|u(s)\|_{L_x^{p_1}}^{p-1},$$

where  $1 + \frac{\gamma}{3} = \frac{p}{p_1} + \frac{p-1}{p_1}$ . That is,  $p_1 = \frac{3(2p-1)}{3+\gamma}$ . Since  $\frac{5+\gamma}{3} < p < 3 + \gamma$ , it is easy to see that  $2 < p_1 < 6$ . Thus, by the Sobolev inequality and the hypothesis (3.1),

$$\|F_2(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lesssim \int_0^{T-\epsilon^{-\mu}} (t-s)^{-\frac{3}{2}} ds \lesssim (t-T + \epsilon^{-\mu})^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Moreover,

$$\|F_2\|_{L_{[T,+\infty)}^{\bar{p}}L_x^\infty} \lesssim \left( \int_T^\infty (t-T + \epsilon^{-\mu})^{-\frac{1}{2}} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{\bar{p}}} \lesssim \epsilon^{\mu(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{\bar{p}})},$$

provided that  $\bar{p} > 2$ . Thus, from (3.14) we get

$$\|F_2\|_{L_{[T,+\infty)}^{\bar{a}}L_x^{\bar{r}}} \lesssim \epsilon^{\mu(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{\bar{p}})\theta} =: \epsilon^{\nu_2}.$$

Now, we choose  $\theta \in (0, 1)$  and  $k, l, \bar{p}$  satisfying (3.13), such that  $(k, l)$  is  $L^2$ -admissible and  $\bar{p} > 2$ .

Since  $(k, l)$  is  $L^2$ -admissible and  $(\bar{a}, \bar{r})$  verifies (2.1) we get (using (3.13))

$$\bar{p} = \frac{4(1-\theta)(p-1)}{2+\gamma-3\theta(p-1)}.$$

The condition  $\bar{p} > 2$  implies  $\theta > \frac{\gamma+4-2p}{p-1}$ , so  $p < \frac{\gamma+4}{2}$ . Note that,  $l = \bar{r}\theta \in [2, 6]$ , or

$$\frac{2}{\bar{r}} \leq \theta < \frac{6}{\bar{r}},$$

and  $k = \frac{4l}{3l-6} \geq 2$ . Thus, if  $\frac{5+\gamma}{3} < p < \frac{\gamma+4}{2}$ , we take  $\theta = \left( \frac{\gamma+4-2p}{p-1} \right)^+$ . If  $\frac{\gamma+4}{2} \leq p < \gamma + 3$ , we take  $\theta = \frac{2}{\bar{r}}$ , which implies that  $l = 2$  and  $k = \infty$ .

Finally, defining  $\gamma := \min\{\nu_1, \nu_2\}$ , recalling (3.4) and  $e^{-i(t-T)H}u(T) = e^{-itH}u_0 + iF_1 + iF_2$ , we obtain (3.3). □

We now show the following lemma which was used in Step 1, Eq. (3.10), of the previous result.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $u$  be a solution of (1.1) satisfying*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} \|u(t)\|_{H^1} \leq E,$$

and  $(q, r)$ ,  $(m, s)$  be the  $L^2$ -admissible pairs used in Lemma 3.2. Then for any  $T \geq 0$  and  $\tau > 0$

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r([T, T+\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \langle \tau \rangle.$$

*Proof.* The proof follows a standard argument, which can be found in [1] and [3]. We take the value  $u(T)$  as the initial data, with the solution being well-defined on the interval  $I_\tau = [T, T + \tau]$ .

For any  $T > 0$  and  $\tau > 0$ , define

$$X_\tau = \{u \in L_{I_\tau}^\infty H_x^1 : \nabla u \in L_{I_\tau}^m L_x^s \cap L_{I_\tau}^{4^+} L_x^{3^-}, u \in L_{I_\tau}^q L_x^r \cap L_{I_\tau}^{4^+} L_x^{3^-}\}.$$

First suppose  $\tau$  sufficiently small so that  $\|u\|_{X_\tau} < \beta < 1$ . By the computation performed in (3.9),

$$\|u\|_{X_\tau} \lesssim \|u(T)\|_{H^1} + \|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r}^{(1-s_c)(2p-2)} \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^m L_x^s}^{s_c(2p-2)} \|u\|_{L_t^{4^+} L_x^{3^-}}^{1-s_c} \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^{4^+} L_x^{3^-}}^{s_c},$$

and using the definition of  $X_\tau$ ,

$$\|u\|_{X_\tau} \lesssim \|u(T)\|_{H^1} + \|u\|_{X_\tau}^{(1-s_c)(2p-1)} \|u\|_{X_\tau}^{s_c(2p-1)} = \|u(T)\|_{H^1} + \|u\|_{X_\tau}^{2p-1}.$$

Using the smallness of  $\|u\|_{X_\tau}$ , we have that  $\|u\|_{X_\tau} \leq c_{N,p} \|u(T)\|_{H^1}$ . Subdividing the interval  $[T, T + \tau]$  into intervals  $I_j$  of length  $\tau_0$  such that  $\|u\|_{X_{I_j}} \lesssim \beta$ , where  $\beta = \beta(E)$ . Let  $k = \left\lceil \frac{\tau}{\tau_0} \right\rceil$ . We use the above argument on each  $I_j$ , obtaining  $\|u\|_{X_{I_j}} \lesssim \|u(T + j\tau_0)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}$ . Adding all the pieces, we obtain

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L_{I_\tau}^q L_x^r} \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{k+1} \int_{T+j\tau_0}^{T+(j+1)\tau_0} \|\nabla u\|_{L_x^r}^q d\tau \lesssim \tau_0(1+k) \lesssim \langle \tau \rangle.$$

□

**Proof of Proposition 3.1.** Choose  $\varepsilon$  is small enough so that, by Lemma 3.2,

$$\|e^{-i \cdot H} u(T)\|_{L_{[0, +\infty)}^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} = \left\| e^{-i(\cdot - T)H} u(T) \right\|_{L_{[T, +\infty)}^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}} \lesssim \varepsilon^\gamma \leq \delta_{sd},$$

which implies that the norm  $\|u\|_{L_{[T, +\infty)}^{\bar{a}} L_x^{\bar{r}}}$  is bounded, by Theorem (global well-posedness). Thus, using Lemma 2.12 we conclude that  $u$  scatters forward in time in  $H^1$ .

□

#### 4. VARIATIONAL ANALYSIS

We recall a Gagliardo-Nirenberg type inequality (when  $N = 3$ ), see [2]. Define  $A$  and  $B$  such that  $A + B = 2p$  by

$$A = 3 + \gamma - p \quad B = 3p - (3 + \gamma).$$

A direct computation shows that

$$A + 2\sigma_c = B\sigma_c, \quad \text{with} \quad \sigma_c = \frac{1 - s_c}{s_c}. \quad (4.1)$$

**Lemma 4.1** ([1], [2]). *If  $p \geq 2$  and  $0 < \gamma < N$ , then the potential  $P(u)$  verifies*

$$P(u) \leq C_{op} \|u\|_2^A \|\nabla u\|_2^B.$$

Moreover, the equality is attained on ground state solutions  $Q$ , which solve

$$-Q + \Delta Q + (I_\gamma * |Q|^p) |Q|^{p-2} Q = 0,$$

where

$$C_{op} = \frac{2p}{B} \left( \frac{A}{B} \right)^{\frac{B-2}{2}} \frac{P(Q)}{\|Q\|_2^{-2(p-1)}}.$$

Moreover, the Pohozaev identities are used

$$E_0(Q) = \frac{B-2}{2B} \|\nabla Q\|_2^2 = \frac{B-2}{2A} \|Q\|_2^2, \quad P(Q) = \frac{2p}{B} \|\nabla Q\|_2^2, \quad C_{op} = \frac{P(Q)}{\|Q\|_2^A \|\nabla Q\|_2^{\frac{B}{2}}}. \quad (4.2)$$

**Proposition 4.2.** (Coercivity) *Let  $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . If there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that*

$$P(u)M(u)^{\sigma_c} < (1-\delta)P(Q)M(Q)^{\sigma_c}, \quad (4.3)$$

*then there is constant  $\delta' > 0$  (depending on  $\delta$ ) such that*

$$\|\nabla u\|_2^2 - \frac{B}{2p}P(u) \geq \delta'P(u).$$

*Proof.* By the definition of the Sobolev optimal constant  $P(u) \leq C_{op}\|u\|_2^A \|\nabla u\|_2^{\frac{B}{2}}$ . Thus (by (4.1))

$$\begin{aligned} P(u)^{\frac{B}{2}} &\leq C_{op}P(u)^{\frac{B}{2}-1}M(u)^{\frac{A}{2}}\|\nabla u\|_2^{\frac{B}{2}} \\ &\leq C_{op}(P(u)M(u)^{\sigma_c})^{\frac{B}{2}-1}\|\nabla u\|_2^{\frac{B}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

On the other hand, since  $C_{op} = \frac{P(Q)}{\|Q\|_2^A \|\nabla Q\|_2^{\frac{B}{2}}}$ , we have

$$C_{op} = \frac{P(Q)}{M(Q)^{\frac{A}{2}} \left( \frac{B}{2p}P(Q) \right)^{\frac{B}{2}}} = \left( \frac{2p}{B} \right)^{\frac{B}{2}} \frac{1}{M(Q)^{\frac{A}{2}} P(Q)^{\frac{B}{2}-1}}.$$

Using (4.1) again, we get  $C_{op} = \left( \frac{2p}{B} \right)^{\frac{B}{2}} \frac{1}{(M(Q)^{\sigma_c} P(Q))^{\frac{B}{2}-1}}$ . Substituting this in (4.4),

$$P(u)^{\frac{B}{2}} \leq \left( \frac{P(u)M(u)^{\sigma_c}}{P(Q)M(Q)^{\sigma_c}} \right)^{\frac{B}{2}-1} \left( \frac{2p}{B} \|\nabla u\|_2^2 \right)^{\frac{B}{2}},$$

which implies (by (4.3)),  $P(u) \leq \frac{2p}{B}(1-\delta)^{\frac{B-2}{B}} \|\nabla u\|_2^2$ . Hence,

$$\|\nabla u\|_2^2 \geq \frac{B}{2p} \frac{1}{(1-\delta)^{\frac{B-2}{B}}} P(u).$$

Therefore,

$$\|\nabla u\|_2^2 - \frac{B}{2p}P(u) \geq \frac{B}{2p} \left( \frac{1}{(1-\delta)^{\frac{B-2}{B}}} - 1 \right) P(u) = \delta'P(u).$$

□

We also obtain the localized version of Proposition 4.2. Let  $\chi(x)$  denote a radial function with support on the ball  $|x| \leq 1$ , with value identically 1 on the ball  $|x| \leq \frac{1}{2}$  and smoothly decreasing on  $\frac{1}{2} \leq |x| \leq 1$ . For  $R > 0$  define the function  $\chi_R$  such that  $\chi_R(x) = \chi(\frac{x}{R})$ .

**Proposition 4.3.** (Coercivity on balls) *Let  $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . If there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $P(u)M(u)^{\sigma_c} < (1-\delta)P(Q)M(Q)^{\sigma_c}$ , then there is constant  $\delta' > 0$  (depending on  $\delta$ ) such that*

$$\int |\nabla(\chi_R u)|^2 dx - \frac{B}{2p}P(\chi_R u) \geq \delta'P(\chi_R u).$$

*Proof.* Observe that  $\|\chi_{Ru}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|u\|_{L^2}^2$  and  $P(\chi_{Ru}) \leq P(u)$ , using the hypothesis we have that

$$P(\chi_{Ru})M(\chi_{Ru})^{\sigma_c} < (1 - \delta)P(Q)M(Q)^{\sigma_c}.$$

Applying Proposition 4.2, we obtain  $\int |\nabla(\chi_{Ru})|^2 dx - \frac{B}{2p}P(\chi_{Ru}) \geq \delta'P(\chi_{Ru})$ .  $\square$

Now, we show Corollary 1.6. It is a consequence of our theorem. To this end, we use the scattering conditions below the threshold to imply the unique condition (1.4). Thus, by Theorem 1.4, we obtain the desired result.

**Proof of Corollary 1.6.** The optimal Sobolev constant is  $C_{op} = \frac{P(Q)}{\|Q\|_2^A \|\nabla Q\|_2^B}$ , where  $P(Q) = \frac{2p}{B} \|\nabla Q\|_2^2$ . Thus, using Pohozaev inequalities,

$$C_{op} = \frac{2p}{B} \frac{\|\nabla Q\|_2^2}{\|Q\|_2^A \|\nabla Q\|_2^B} = \frac{2p}{B \|Q\|_2^A \|\nabla Q\|_2^{B-2}}. \quad (4.5)$$

By condition (1.5), there is a  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$M(u)^{\sigma_c} E(u) < (1 - \delta)M(Q)^{\sigma_c} E_0(Q). \quad (4.6)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} M(u)^{\sigma_c} E(u) &= \|u\|_2^{2\sigma_c} \frac{1}{2} \|\Lambda u\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2p} P(u) \|u\|_2^{2\sigma_c} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} (\|\Lambda u\|_2 \|u\|_2^{\sigma_c})^2 - \frac{C_{op}}{2p} \|\nabla u\|_2^B \|u\|_2^{A+2\sigma_c}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $V \geq 0$ ,  $\|\nabla u\|_2^2 \leq \|\Lambda u\|_2^2$  and applying (4.1), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} M(u)^{\sigma_c} E(u) &\geq \frac{1}{2} (\|\Lambda u\|_2 \|u\|_2^{\sigma_c})^2 - \frac{C_{op}}{2p} \|\Lambda u\|_2^B \|u\|_2^{A+2\sigma_c} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\|\Lambda u\|_2 \|u\|_2^{\sigma_c})^2 - \frac{C_{op}}{2p} (\|\Lambda u\|_2 \|u\|_2^{\sigma_c})^B. \end{aligned}$$

If we define the function  $g(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{C_{op}}{2p}x^B$ , then the relation (4.6) implies

$$(1 - \delta)M(Q)^{\sigma_c} E_0(Q) > g(\|\Lambda u\|_2 \|u\|_2^{\sigma_c}). \quad (4.7)$$

The function  $g$  has critical points in 0 and  $x_0 = \|Q\|_2^{\sigma_c} \|\nabla Q\|_2$  and  $g(x_0) = M(Q)^{\sigma_c} E_0(Q)$ . Therefore,

$$(1 - \delta)g(\|Q\|_2^{\sigma_c} \|\nabla Q\|_2) > g(\|\Lambda u\|_2 \|u\|_2^{\sigma_c}).$$

Since  $g$  is strictly increasing in  $(0, x_0)$  and by (1.6), one has

$$\|Q\|_2^{\sigma_c} \|\nabla Q\|_2 > \|\Lambda u\|_2 \|u\|_2^{\sigma_c},$$

which implies (1.7), that is, the solution  $u$  is global.

On the other hand, by Pohozaev inequalities (4.2), we have  $E_0(Q)M(Q)^{\sigma_c} = \frac{B-2}{2B} (\|\nabla Q\|_2 \|Q\|_2^{\sigma_c})^2$ . Thus (4.7) gives

$$1 - \delta > \frac{B}{B-2} \left( \frac{\|\Lambda u\|_2 \|u\|_2^{\sigma_c}}{\|\nabla Q\|_2 \|Q\|_2^{\sigma_c}} \right)^2 - C_{op} \frac{B}{p(B-2)} \frac{1}{(\|\nabla Q\|_2 \|Q\|_2^{\sigma_c})^2} (\|\Lambda u\|_2 \|u\|_2^{\sigma_c})^B,$$

and using the expression of  $C_{op}$  in (4.5) and the identity (4.1),

$$\frac{C_{op} B}{p(B-2)} \frac{1}{(\|\nabla Q\|_2 \|Q\|_2^{\sigma_c})^2} = \frac{2}{B-2} \frac{1}{\|\nabla Q\|_2^B \|Q\|_2^{A+2\sigma_c}} = \frac{2}{B-2} \frac{1}{(\|\nabla Q\|_2 \|Q\|_2^{\sigma_c})^B}.$$

Thus,

$$1 - \delta > \frac{B}{B-2} \left( \frac{\|\Lambda u\|_2 \|u\|_2^{\sigma_c}}{\|\nabla Q\|_2 \|Q\|_2^{\sigma_c}} \right)^2 - \frac{2}{B-2} \left( \frac{\|\Lambda u\|_2 \|u\|_2^{\sigma_c}}{\|\nabla Q\|_2 \|Q\|_2^{\sigma_c}} \right)^B.$$

Denoting  $y(t) = \frac{\|\Lambda u\|_2 \|u\|_2^{\sigma_c}}{\|\nabla Q\|_2 \|Q\|_2^{\sigma_c}}$ . We have  $y(t) < 1$  by the first part. Observe that,

$$1 - \delta > \frac{B}{B-2} y(t)^2 - \frac{2}{B-2} y(t)^B.$$

The function  $f(y) = \frac{B}{B-2} y^2 - \frac{2}{B-2} y^B$ , verifies  $f'(y) = \frac{2B}{B-2} y(1 - y^{B-2})$ , and thus is strictly increasing in  $(0, 1)$  and  $f(0) = 0$  is a local minimum and  $f(1) = 1$  is a local maximum.

The condition  $\frac{B}{B-2} y^2 - \frac{2}{B-2} y^B < 1 - \delta$  for some  $\delta > 0$ , implies by continuity that there exists  $\delta' > 0$  such that  $y(t) < 1 - \delta'$ . That is,

$$\|\Lambda u\|_2 \|u\|_2^{\sigma_c} < (1 - \delta') \|\nabla Q\|_2 \|Q\|_2^{\sigma_c}.$$

Note that

$$P(u)M(u)^{\sigma_c} \leq C_{op} \|u\|_2^{A+2\sigma_c} \|\nabla u\|_2^B,$$

where  $C_{op} = \frac{P(Q)}{\|Q\|_2^A \|\nabla Q\|_2^B} = \frac{P(Q)M(Q)^{\sigma_c}}{\|Q\|_2^{A+2\sigma_c} \|\nabla Q\|_2^B}$ . The relation (4.1) yields

$$P(u)M(u)^{\sigma_c} \leq \frac{P(Q)M(Q)^{\sigma_c}}{\|Q\|_2^{B\sigma_c} \|\nabla Q\|_2^B} (\|u\|_2^{\sigma_c} \|\nabla u\|_2)^B.$$

Thus  $\frac{P(u)M(u)^{\sigma_c}}{P(Q)M(Q)^{\sigma_c}} \leq \left( \frac{\|u\|_2^{\sigma_c} \|\nabla u\|_2}{\|Q\|_2^{\sigma_c} \|\nabla Q\|_2} \right)^B < (1 - \delta')^B$ , so

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} P(u)M(u)^{\sigma_c} < (1 - \delta')^B P(Q)M(Q)^{\sigma_c}.$$

Therefore, the solution  $u$  scatters in  $H^1$ . □

## 5. SCATTERING: PROOF OF THEOREM

In this section, we prove a Virial-Morawetz-type estimate to gain control over a suitable norm on large balls. The proof is concluded using the scattering criterion (Proposition 3.1).

Consider the radial function

$$a(x) = \begin{cases} |x|^2, & |x| \leq \frac{R}{2} \\ R|x|, & |x| > R, \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

and which in the region  $\frac{R}{2} \leq |x| \leq R$  verifies

$$\partial_r a > 0, \quad \partial_r^2 a \geq 0, \quad |\partial^\alpha a| \lesssim_\alpha R|x|^{-\alpha+1} \quad \text{for } |\alpha| \geq 1. \quad (5.2)$$

We denote by  $\partial_r$  the radial derivative, i.e.  $\partial_r a = \nabla a \cdot \frac{x}{|x|}$ .

**Remark 5.1.** • The angular derivative is denoted by  $\hat{\nabla}$  and defined by  $\hat{\nabla} u = \nabla u - \frac{x}{|x|} \left( \frac{x}{|x|} \cdot \nabla u \right)$ . It verifies that

$$|\nabla u|^2 = |\partial_r u|^2 + |\hat{\nabla} u|^2.$$

In fact,  $|\hat{\nabla} u|^2 = \left| \nabla u - \frac{x}{|x|} \left( \frac{x}{|x|} \cdot \nabla u \right) \right|^2 = |\nabla u|^2 + \left| \frac{x}{|x|} \cdot \nabla u \right|^2 + 2\text{Re} \langle \nabla u, -\frac{x}{|x|} \left( \frac{x}{|x|} \cdot \nabla u \right) \rangle = |\nabla u|^2 + |\partial_r u|^2 - 2 \left| \frac{x}{|x|} \nabla u \right|^2 = |\nabla u|^2 - |\partial_r u|^2.$

• For  $|x| \leq \frac{R}{2}$ , denoting  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$  and using sub-indexes to denote derivatives, we have

$$a_j := \partial_{x_j} a = 2x_j, \quad \text{thus} \quad \nabla a = 2x.$$

$$a_{jk} := \partial_{x_k} \partial_{x_j} a = 2\delta_{jk}, \quad \Delta a = 2N, \quad \Delta^2 a := \Delta(\Delta a) = 0.$$

- For  $|x| > R$ ,

$$a_j = R \frac{x_j}{|x|}, \quad \text{thus} \quad \nabla a = R \frac{x}{|x|}.$$

$$a_{jk} = \frac{R}{|x|} \left( \delta_{jk} - \frac{x_j x_k}{|x|^2} \right), \quad \Delta a = \frac{R}{|x|} (N-1), \quad \Delta^2 a = 0.$$

**Lemma 5.2.** (Morawetz identity) Let  $a : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the smooth weight defined in (5.1). Define

$$z(t) = \int a(x) |u(x, t)|^2 dx,$$

where  $u$  is a solution of (1.1). Then

$$z'(t) = 2 \operatorname{Im} \int (\nabla a \cdot \nabla u) \bar{u} dx,$$

$$z''(t) = \int -4 \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p} \right) (I_\gamma * |v|^p) |u|^p \Delta a dx - \int \Delta^2 a |u|^2 dx + 4 \int \operatorname{Re}(a_{jk} \bar{u}_j u_k) dx$$

$$- \frac{4(N-\gamma)}{p} \int \int \nabla a(x) \cdot \frac{(x-y)}{|x-y|^{N-\gamma+2}} |u(y)|^p |u(x)|^p dy dx \quad (5.3)$$

$$- 2 \int \nabla V \cdot \nabla a |u|^2 dx.$$

**Remark 5.3.** The second line of (5.3) can be written as

$$\frac{2(N-\gamma)}{p} \int \int (\nabla a(x) - \nabla a(y)) \cdot \frac{(x-y)}{|x-y|^{N-\gamma+2}} |u(y)|^p |u(x)|^p dy dx.$$

In particular if  $a(x) = |x|^2$ , it becomes

$$\frac{2(N-\gamma)}{p} \int \int 2(x-y) \cdot \frac{(x-y)}{|x-y|^{N-\gamma+2}} |u(y)|^p |u(x)|^p dx = \frac{4(N-\gamma)}{p} \int (I_\gamma * |u|^p) |u(x)|^p dx.$$

**Proposition 5.4.** (Morawetz estimate) Let  $T > 0$  and let  $V : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a radially symmetric potential satisfying (1.2) (i),  $V \geq 0$ ,  $x \cdot \nabla V \leq 0$  and  $\partial_r V \in L^q$ , for  $\frac{3}{2} \leq q \leq \infty$ . Let  $u$  be a  $H^1$ -solution of (1.1) satisfying the hypothesis (1.4). For  $R = R(\delta, M(u), Q) > 0$  sufficiently large we have

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T P(\chi_R u(t)) dt \lesssim_\delta \begin{cases} \frac{R}{T} + \frac{1}{R^{\frac{(N-1)B}{N}}} + o_R(1) & \text{if } (N-1)B < 2N \\ \frac{R}{T} + \frac{1}{R^2} + o_R(1) & \text{if } (N-1)B \geq 2N. \end{cases} \quad (5.4)$$

*Proof.* Consider  $\mathcal{M}(t) = z'(t)$ . By Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathcal{M}(t)| \leq 2 \int |u| |\nabla u| |\nabla a| dx \lesssim \|\nabla a\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_2 \|\nabla u\|_2 \lesssim R. \quad (5.5)$$

From Lemma 5.2,

$$\mathcal{M}'(t) = \int |u|^2 (-\Delta^2 a) + 4 \operatorname{Re}(a_{jk} \bar{u}_j u_k) dx$$

$$- 4 \int \Delta a \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p} \right) (I_\gamma * |u|^p) |u|^p$$

$$- \frac{4(N-\gamma)}{p} \int \int \nabla a \cdot \frac{x-y}{|x-y|^{N-\gamma+2}} |v(y)|^p |v(x)|^p dx$$

$$- 2 \int \nabla V \cdot \nabla a |u|^2 dx.$$



Except for the last term, the estimates are the same as in [1]. One gets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}'(t) &\geq 8 \int_{|x| \leq \frac{R}{2}} |\chi_R \nabla u|^2 - \frac{4B}{p} \int_{|x| \leq \frac{R}{2}} (I_\gamma * |\chi_R u|^p) |\chi_R u|^p \\ &\quad + C_1 \iint_{\Omega} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{R}{|x|}\right) x - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{R}{|y|}\right) y \right] \frac{x-y}{|x-y|^{N-\gamma+2}} |u(x)|^p |v(y)|^p dx dy \\ &\quad - C_2 \int_{|x| > \frac{R}{2}} (I_\gamma * |u|^p) |u|^p dx - \frac{1}{R^2} M[u] - 2 \int \nabla V \cdot \nabla a |u|^2 dx, \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

where  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  are constants and  $\Omega$  is the region

$$\Omega = \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N : |x| > \frac{R}{2} \right\} \cup \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N : |y| > \frac{R}{2} \right\}.$$

Following [1] (see also [12]), we estimate the integral on  $\Omega$  subdividing it into three regions. We denote  $A := \left[ \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{R}{|x|}\right) x - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{R}{|y|}\right) y \right]$ .

- Region I: we consider  $x > \frac{R}{2}$  and  $y > \frac{R}{2}$ . We observe that  $A \lesssim |x - y|$ , then

$$\iint_{\substack{|x| > R/2 \\ |y| > R/2}} |A| \frac{|x-y|}{|x-y|^{N-\gamma+2}} |u(y)|^p |u(x)|^p dx dy \lesssim \int_{|x| > R/2} \left( |x|^{-(N-\gamma)} * |u|^p \right) |u|^p dx.$$

By Hölder inequality, Hardy inequality, and Radial Sobolev inequality (Proposition 2.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|x| > R/2} \left( |x|^{-(N-\gamma)} * |u|^p \right) |u|^p dx &\lesssim \| |x|^{N-\gamma} * |u|^p \|_{L^{\frac{2N}{N-\gamma}}} \|u\|_{L^{\frac{2Np}{N+\gamma}}}^p \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{L^{\frac{2Np}{N+\gamma}}}^{2p} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{R^{\frac{(N-1)B}{N}}} \|u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{B+2(N+\gamma)}{N}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{B}{N}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{R^{\frac{(N-1)B}{N}}}. \end{aligned}$$

- Region II: we consider  $x < \frac{R}{2}$  and  $y > \frac{R}{2}$ . Following [1] we also have  $A \lesssim |y| \sim |x - y|$ , then

$$\iint_{\substack{|x| < R/2 \\ |y| > R/2}} |A| \frac{|x-y|}{|x-y|^{N-\gamma+2}} |u(y)|^p |u(x)|^p dx dy \lesssim \int_{|y| > R/2} \int \frac{1}{|y-x|^{N-\gamma}} |u(x)|^p dx |u(y)|^p dy.$$

Proceeding as in Region I,

$$\int_{|y| > R/2} \left( |y|^{-(N-\gamma)} * |u|^p \right) |u|^p dy \lesssim \frac{1}{R^{\frac{(N-1)B}{N}}}.$$

- Region III: we consider symmetric region  $x > \frac{R}{2}$  and  $y < \frac{R}{2}$ . The estimation is analogous:

$$\iint_{\substack{|x| > R/2 \\ |y| < R/2}} |A| \frac{|x-y|}{|x-y|^{N-\gamma+2}} |u(y)|^p |u(x)|^p dx dy \lesssim \int_{|x| > R/2} \left( |x|^{-(N-\gamma)} * |u|^p \right) |u|^p dy \lesssim \frac{1}{R^{\frac{(N-1)B}{N}}}.$$

Continuing the computation in (5.6), using Proposition 4.3 we have

$$\mathcal{M}'(t) \geq 8\delta P(\chi_R u) + C_1 \frac{1}{R^{\frac{(N-1)B}{N}}} - C_2 \int_{|x| > \frac{R}{2}} (I_\gamma * |u|^p) |u|^p dx - \frac{1}{R^2} M(u) - 2 \int \nabla V \cdot \nabla a |u|^2 dx.$$

Proceeding as the integrals on  $\Omega$  we also have

$$\int_{|x| > R/2} \left( |x|^{-(N-\gamma)} * |u|^p \right) |u|^p dy \lesssim \frac{1}{R^{\frac{(N-1)B}{N}}},$$

thus

$$P(\chi_R u) \lesssim \mathcal{M}'(t) - C_1 \frac{1}{R^{\frac{(N-1)B}{N}}} + C_2 \frac{1}{R^{\frac{(N-1)B}{N}}} + \frac{1}{R^2} M(u) + 2 \int \nabla V \cdot \nabla a |u|^2 dx. \quad (5.7)$$

We estimate the term with the potential  $V$  and show that it can be made arbitrarily small for  $R$  big enough. By the definition of the function  $a$  we have

$$\int \nabla V \cdot \nabla a |u|^2 dx = \int_{|x| < \frac{R}{2}} 2x \cdot \nabla V |u|^2 dx + \int_{\frac{R}{2} \leq |x| \leq R} \nabla a \cdot \nabla V |u|^2 dx + \int_{|x| > R} R \frac{x}{|x|} \cdot \nabla V |u|^2 dx.$$

By the hypothesis  $x \cdot \nabla V \leq 0$ , we get

$$\int \nabla V \cdot \nabla a |u|^2 dx \leq \int_{\frac{R}{2} \leq |x| \leq R} \nabla a \cdot \nabla V |u|^2 dx.$$

Since  $a$  and  $V$  are radial,  $\nabla a$  and  $\nabla V$  are colinear and since  $\partial_r a > 0$  and  $\frac{x}{|x|} \cdot \nabla V = \partial_r V < 0$ , we have  $\nabla a \cdot \nabla V = -|\nabla a| |\nabla V| = -|\partial_r a| |\partial_r V|$ . Using (5.2) on  $\frac{R}{2} \leq |x| \leq R$ ,

$$-|\partial_r a| |\partial_r V| \lesssim -R \frac{x}{|x|} \cdot \nabla V \lesssim -R \frac{1}{R} |x \cdot \nabla V|.$$

Thus

$$\int \nabla V \cdot \nabla a |u|^2 dx \lesssim - \int_{\frac{R}{2} \leq |x| \leq R} |x \cdot \nabla V| |u|^2 dx.$$

On the other hand, the condition  $x \cdot \nabla V \in L^q$  for  $\frac{3}{2} \leq q \leq \infty$ , implies

$$\int x \cdot \nabla V |u|^2 dx \leq \|x \cdot \nabla V\|_{L^q} \|u(t)\|_{L^{\frac{2q}{q-1}}}^2 \lesssim \|u\|_{H^1}^2 \lesssim 1,$$

where we used the Sobolev embedding  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \subset L^{\frac{2q}{q-1}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for any  $\frac{3}{2} \leq q \leq \infty$ . Thus,

$$\int \nabla V \cdot \nabla a |u|^2 dx \leq o_R(1).$$

Integrating (5.7) on  $[0, T]$  we obtain

$$\int_0^T P(\chi_R u) dt \lesssim \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\mathcal{M}(t)| + C_3 \frac{T}{R^{\frac{(N-1)B}{N}}} + \frac{T}{R^2} M(u) + T o_R(1).$$

Therefore, using (5.5),

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T P(\chi_R u(t)) dt \lesssim \frac{R}{T} + \frac{1}{R^{\frac{(N-1)B}{N}}} + \frac{1}{R^2} + o_R(1).$$

If  $(N-1)B < 2N$  then  $\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T P(\chi_R u(t)) dt \lesssim \frac{R}{T} + \frac{1}{R^{\frac{(N-1)B}{N}}} + o_R(1)$ , otherwise  $\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T P(\chi_R u(t)) dt \lesssim \frac{R}{T} + \frac{1}{R^2} + o_R(1)$ .  $\square$

We now show an energy evacuation result.

**Proposition 5.5.** *There exist a sequence of times  $t_n \rightarrow \infty$  and a sequence of radii  $R_n \rightarrow \infty$  such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\chi_{R_n} u(x, t_n)) = 0.$$

*Proof.* Taking  $T = R^3$  in Proposition 5.4, in any of the two cases in (5.4) we have for  $R$  sufficiently large that

$$\frac{1}{R^3} \int_0^{R^3} P(\chi_R u(t)) dt \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} + \frac{1}{R^{\frac{(N-1)E}{N}}} + o_R(1).$$

Since  $u$  is global and  $P(u(t)) \leq E(u(t)) = E(u_0)$  is bounded, by the mean value theorem there are sequences  $t_n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $R_n \rightarrow \infty$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\chi_{R_n} u(t_n)) = 0.$$

□

We finally prove the main theorem.

**Proof of Theorem 1.4** The hypothesis (1.4) implies that  $P(u)$  is uniformly bounded in time. Since the energy  $E(u)$  is preserved we have that  $\|\nabla u\|^2 + \int V(x)|u|^2 dx = \|\Lambda u\|^2$  is bounded and then since  $V > 0$ , the solution  $u$  is global and uniformly bounded in  $H^1$ .

Choose  $\epsilon$  and  $R$  as in the scattering criterion (Proposition 3.1) with  $t_n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $R_n \rightarrow \infty$  as in Proposition 5.5. Taking  $n$  large so that  $R_n \geq R$ , using Hölder we have

$$\int_{|x| \leq R} |u(x, t_n)|^2 dx \lesssim R^{\frac{N(p-2)}{p}} \left( \int_{|x| < R_n} |u(x, t_n)|^p \right)^{2/p}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \int_{|x| < R} |u(x, t_n)|^p \right)^2 &= \int_{|x| < R} \int_{|y| < R} \frac{|u(x, t_n)|^p |u(y, t_n)|^p}{|x - y|^{N-\gamma}} |x - y|^{N-\gamma} dx dy \\ &\leq (2R)^{N-\gamma} \int_{|x| < R_n} \int_{|y| < R_n} \frac{|u(x, t_n)|^p |u(y, t_n)|^p}{|x - y|^{N-\gamma}} dx dy \\ &\leq (2R)^{N-\gamma} \int_{|x| < R_n} \int_{|y| < R_n} \frac{1}{|x - y|^{N-\gamma}} |u(y, t_n)|^p dy |u(x, t_n)|^p dx \\ &= (2R)^{N-\gamma} P(\chi_{R_n} u(t_n)). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 5.5 implies that

$$\int_{|x| \leq R} |u(x, t_n)|^2 dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

and thus Proposition 3.1 implies that  $u$  scatters in  $H^1$  forward in time.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. K. Arora. Scattering of radial data in the focusing NLS and generalized Hartree equations. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, 39(11):6643–6668, 2019.
- [2] A. K. Arora and S. Roudenko. Global Behavior of Solutions to the Focusing Generalized Hartree Equation. *Michigan Mathematical Journal*, 71(3):619 – 672, 2022.
- [3] T. Cazenave. *Semilinear Schrödinger equations*, volume 10 of *Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. New York University, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York; American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [4] B. Dodson and J. Murphy. A new proof of scattering below the ground state for the 3D radial focusing cubic NLS. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 145(11):4859–4867, 2017.
- [5] Y. Gao and Z. Wang. Below and beyond the mass–energy threshold: scattering for the hartree equation with radial data in  $\mathbf{d} \geq 5$ . *Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik*, 71(52), 2020.
- [6] J. Ginibre and G. Velo. On a class of nonlinear Schrödinger equations. I. The Cauchy problem, general case. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 32(1):1–32, 1979.
- [7] M. Hamano and M. Ikeda. Global dynamics below the ground state for the focusing schrödinger equation with a potential. *Journal of Evolution Equations*, 20(3):1131–1172, 2020.
- [8] Y. Hong. Scattering for a nonlinear Schrödinger equation with a potential. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 15(5):1571–1601, 2016.

- [9] C. E. Kenig and 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(3):645–675, 2006.
- [10] E. H. Lieb. Existence and uniqueness of the minimizing solution of choquard’s nonlinear equation. *Studies in Applied Mathematics*, 57(2):93–105, 1977.
- [11] V. Moroz and J. Van Schaftingen. Groundstates of nonlinear choquard equations: Existence, qualitative properties and decay asymptotics. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 265(2):153–184, 2013.
- [12] T. Saanouni. Scattering theory for a class of radial focusing inhomogeneous hartree equations. *Potential Analysis*, 58(4):617–643, 2023.
- [13] T. Tao. On the asymptotic behavior of large radial data for a focusing non-linear Schrödinger equation. *Dyn. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 1(1):1–48, 2004.

CARLOS M. GUZMAN

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL FLUMINENSE, INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA E ESTATÍSTICA, BRAZIL.

*Email address:* carlos.guz.j@gmail.com

CRISTIAN LOLI

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL FLUMINENSE, INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA E ESTATÍSTICA, BRAZIL.

*Email address:* cristianloli@id.uff.br

LUIS P. YAPU

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL FLUMINENSE, INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA E ESTATÍSTICA, BRAZIL.

*Email address:* luis.yapu@gmail.com