

GLOBAL WELL-POSEDNESS OF THE ENERGY-CRITICAL NONLINEAR SCHRÖDINGER EQUATIONS ON \mathbb{T}^d

BEOMJONG KWAK

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we prove the global well-posedness of the energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equations on the torus \mathbb{T}^d for general dimensions. This result is new for dimensions $d \geq 5$, extending previous results for $d = 3, 4$ [10, 22]. Compared to the cases $d = 3, 4$, the regularity theory for higher d , developed in the underlying local well-posedness result [17], is less understood. In particular, stability theory and inverse inequalities, which are ingredients in [10, 22] and more generally in the widely used concentration compactness framework since [13], are too weak to be applied to higher dimensions.

Our proof introduces a new strategy for addressing global well-posedness problems. Without relying on perturbation theory, we develop tools to analyze the concentration dynamics of the nonlinear flow. On the way, we show the formation of a nontrivial concentration.

1. INTRODUCTION

The subject of this paper is the global well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for the energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation (NLS) on the periodic space

$$(NLS(\mathbb{T}^d)) \quad \begin{cases} iu_t + \Delta u = \pm |u|^{\frac{4}{d-2}} u =: \mathcal{N}(u) \\ u(0) = u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{T}^d) \end{cases},$$

where $u : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $d \geq 3$ and $\mathbb{T}^d = \mathbb{R}^d / (\theta_1 \mathbb{Z} \times \cdots \times \theta_d \mathbb{Z})$, $\theta_j > 0$ is any rectangular torus.

For $d \geq 3$, the following local well-posedness result for $(NLS(\mathbb{T}^d))$ was shown in [9, 14, 17]:¹

Proposition 1.1 ([9, 14, 17]). *For $d \geq 3$, $(NLS(\mathbb{T}^d))$ is locally well-posed in $C^0 H^1 \cap Y^1$. Here, Y^1 is the atomic-based space introduced in [9]; see Section 2.3. Nevertheless, the flow map fails to be Lipschitz for $d \geq 7$.*

Although the local well-posedness has been shown for every dimension, the local analysis is less understood and behaves worse for $d \geq 5$.

The local well-posedness result for $d \geq 5$ in [17] involved nonlinear estimates with limited rooms for adjustments, based on function spaces newly introduced there.

The large-data global well-posedness of $(NLS(\mathbb{T}^d))$ was shown for $d = 3, 4$ [10, 22] and previously unknown for $d \geq 5$. For $d \geq 5$, the nonlinearity is non-algebraic and so the nonlinear part is not sufficiently decomposable. The flow map is only known

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q55.

Key words and phrases. nonlinear Schrödinger equations, global well-posedness, energy-critical, periodic domains.

¹Indeed, the critical local well-posedness was shown over a larger regime of mass-supercritical power in [18, 17], though we focus on the energy-critical case.

to be continuous (and the failure of Hölder continuity was also shown in [17]). For dimensions $d = 3, 4$, the results [10, 22] were shown via the frameworks of [13] and [12], based on strong stability theory and decomposability of the nonlinearity. In this paper, we show the large-data global well-posedness of $(\text{NLS}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ for higher dimensions d . $(\text{NLS}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ enjoys the energy and mass conservation laws:

$$E(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla u|^2 \pm \frac{1}{\frac{4}{d-2} + 2} |u|^{\frac{4}{d-2} + 2} dx$$

and

$$M(u) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |u|^2 dx.$$

Considering scaling, $(\text{NLS}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ is energy-critical. Depending on the sign of \mathcal{N} , $(\text{NLS}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ is defocusing if $\mathcal{N}(u) = |u|^{\frac{4}{d-2}} u$ and focusing if $\mathcal{N}(u) = -|u|^{\frac{4}{d-2}} u$. We now state our main results. For the defocusing case, we show the following:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $d \geq 3$. $(\text{NLS}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ with the defocusing sign is globally well-posed.*

Theorem 1.2 is new for $d \geq 5$, as mentioned above.

For the focusing case, there is a threshold for global existence, analogous to that on \mathbb{R}^d (Proposition 2.8). We adopt a modified energy introduced in [22]:

$$(1.1) \quad E_{c_0}(u) := E(u) + \frac{c_0}{2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2,$$

where $c_0 = c_0(\mathbb{T}^d) > 0$ is the optimal constant from a Sobolev embedding on \mathbb{T}^d ; see Proposition 2.10.

Using the energy trapping lemma developed in [22], we obtain the analogous result for focusing equations.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $d \geq 4$. Consider $(\text{NLS}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ with the focusing sign. Let $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ be data such that*

$$\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + c_0 \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2$$

and

$$E_{c_0}(u_0) < E(W),$$

where W denotes the ground state of the energy-critical focusing NLS on \mathbb{R}^d

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

Then, there exists a unique global solution $u : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ to $(\text{NLS}(\mathbb{T}^d))$.

Remark 1.4. For $d = 3$, Theorem 1.3 remains open. This is an essential challenge; the analogous GWP on \mathbb{R}^3 is still open for general data.

The energy-critical GWP of NLS on \mathbb{R}^d has been extensively studied. For the radial defocusing case, Bourgain [2] and Grillakis [6] showed GWP for the defocusing NLS in dimension $d = 3$ under radial symmetry, where concentration of a solution was observed. Since then, the defocusing GWP for $d \geq 3$ has been shown for general nonradial data in [4, 19, 21].

Afterward, the concentration compactness method was introduced by Kenig and Merle [13]. They showed GWP of the energy-critical focusing NLS for $3 \leq d \leq 5$ under the radial symmetry, by reducing the GWP of a general solution to that of

an almost periodic solution modulo symmetries. This approach was extended to general nonradial data for $d \geq 4$ [15, 5].

At the level of regularity theory, a key ingredient for the concentration compactness roadmap is the profile decomposition, i.e., the approximation of a solution by a sum of rescaled solutions. For this, the following can be seen as conventional ingredients:

- (1) a strong (e.g., Lipschitz) stability theory,
- (2) an inverse inequality to capture concentration,
- (3) smallness of nonlinear interactions between profiles.

In [12], such profile decomposition analysis was extended to curved domains. Once (1)–(3) above are provided, the approach in [12] works robustly by approximating solutions on a domain as spatial cutoffs of solutions on \mathbb{R}^d . For dimensions $d = 3, 4$, where the nonlinearity $\mathcal{N}(u) = \pm|u|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}u$ is algebraic, (1)–(3) are fulfilled on \mathbb{T}^d by the previous achievements in Strichartz estimates [3, 14] and function spaces [9]. Consequently, the argument in [12] was successfully applied to showing the first large-data GWP results for the energy-critical defocusing NLS on periodic domains: the rational torus \mathbb{T}^3 [10] and cylinders $\mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{R}$ [11]. Later, Yue [22] suggested modified energies for the focusing nonlinearity and showed sub-threshold GWP results on \mathbb{T}^4 .

For $d \geq 5$, where the nonlinearity is not algebraic, the regularity behavior on \mathbb{T}^d is less understood:

- (i) LWP has barely been shown and Lipschitz well-posedness fails for $d \geq 7$ (see [17, Theorem 1.3]).
- (ii) On the solution space of LWP, the inverse property only partially holds (i.e., only within a frequency localization P_N ; see Proposition 4.6).
- (iii) Quantitative analysis of decompositions of the nonlinearity is less obvious due to the non-algebraic nonlinearity.

From (i)–(iii), what can be directly said about a blow-up solution is only the existence of a possibly unbounded number of concentrations of different scales whose sizes sum up to $\epsilon > 0$. In particular, the conventional profile decomposition is not obvious.

In proving Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3, we intend to present a robust argument for the global well-posedness. In the limited circumstances where (1)–(3) fail, we reconstruct the concentration compactness roadmap for $d \geq 5$ using an approach different from the profile decomposition method.

We outline the strategy for our proof. First, we capture spacetime concentrations and limit profiles of nonlinear solutions using weak limits. The effect of a weak limit profile on the dynamics of the original solution on \mathbb{T}^d is observed as scattering-like behavior in a distributional sense. More precisely, we show that a bounded sequence of solutions on either \mathbb{T}^d or \mathbb{R}^d converges uniformly to the sequence of their scattering limits as $t \rightarrow -\infty$ in the distributional sense.

Then, we upgrade the frequency-localized linear inverse theorem to concentration of the nonlinear flow (Proposition 5.4). This is a critical step in this work; we prove that the solution does not fully split into small-amplitude bubbles of multiple scales. We formalize the following heuristic: if a solution splits into small-amplitude bubbles distinguishable in a distributional sense, a maximum-amplitude bubble evolves in some sense like a free evolution.

With the aforementioned tools, we prove our main results, Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3. Here, the main difficulty is that we only know an ϵ -amount of concentration and have no information about the remainder. We do not use the conventionally used concept of orthogonalities between profiles. Instead, we view a certain triple weak limit in two different perspectives for a proof by contradiction. (For details, see the proof of Proposition 5.5).

Our proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 presume the global well-posedness results on \mathbb{R}^d , as these are well-known. Nevertheless, our method can also be applied to carry out the concentration compactness roadmap on \mathbb{R}^d itself, up to the reduction to almost periodic solutions modulo symmetries. This can be seen as a reproof of the global well-posedness on \mathbb{R}^d , alternative to the profile decomposition approach.²

This issue is briefly noted in Appendix A.

In Section 2, we provide preliminary materials. In Section 3, we provide primary concepts and basic facts on profiles and weak limits. In Section 4, we define a solution norm and prove preparatory facts related to it. In Section 5, we develop the main arguments and prove Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3.

Acknowledgements. The author appreciates Soonsik Kwon for helpful communications and encouragements. The author is partially supported by National Research Foundation of Korea, RS-2019-NR040050 and NRF-2022R1A2C1091499.

Also, a part of this work was done while the author was visiting Bielefeld University through International Research Training Group 2235. He appreciates their kind hospitality.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notations. We denote $A \lesssim B$ if $A \leq CB$ holds for some constant C .

Given an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, we denote by χ_I the sharp cutoff of I .

For simplicity, throughout this paper we assume our domain is the square torus $\mathbb{T}^d = \mathbb{R}^d / (2\pi\mathbb{Z})^d$. Since we do not rely on specific properties of the square torus, such as number-theoretic arguments on frequencies, the proof of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 in this paper stays valid on any rectangular torus.

We denote $a := \frac{4}{d-2}$ (i.e., $\mathcal{N}(u) = \pm|u|^a u$).

Fourier truncations. We handle functions of spacetime variables $f(t, x)$ and $f(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. We denote the Fourier series of f with the associated variable x by either $\mathcal{F}_x f$ or \hat{f} .

We use Littlewood-Paley projection operators. Denote the set of natural numbers by $\mathbb{N} = \{0\} \cup \mathbb{Z}_+$ and dyadic numbers by $2^{\mathbb{N}}$. Let $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a smooth even bump function such that $\psi|_{[-1, 1]} \equiv 1$ and $\text{supp}(\psi) \subset [-\frac{11}{10}, \frac{11}{10}]$. For a dyadic number $N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$, we denote by ψ_N the function $\psi_N(\xi) = \psi(\xi/N)$ and $P_{\leq N}$ the Fourier multiplier induced by $\psi_N(\xi_1) \cdots \psi_N(\xi_d)$. We denote $P_N := P_{\leq N} - P_{\leq N/2}$ with the convention $P_{\leq 2^{-k}} := 0$ for $k > 0$. For simplicity, we use abridged notations $u_N := P_N u$ and $u_{\leq N} := P_{\leq N} u$ for a function $u : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

²Note that the previous proof of GWP on \mathbb{R}^d for $d \geq 7$ was based on Hölder continuity of the solution map shown in [20]. [20] was a nontrivial result by itself; for instance, a nontrivial package of Strichartz estimates that holds on \mathbb{R}^d (called exotic Strichartz in [20]) was used.

We also use time Fourier projections, denoted with the superscript t . For each $N \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}$, we denote by $P_{\leq N}^t$ the Fourier projection for the time variable t with the multiplier $\psi_N(\cdot)$.

Analogous to \mathbb{T}^d , we use smooth Littlewood-Paley operators on \mathbb{R}^d . We use the same notation, except that we allow $N \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}$, i.e., we consider the homogeneous Littlewood-Paley cutoffs for \mathbb{R}^d .

2.2. Function spaces. In this subsection, we collect function space notations of functions of variables $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$ and $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d$. These spaces are either L^p -based or generated from atomic spaces. For a Banach space B , we denote its norm by $\|\cdot\|_B$. When B is defined on the domain $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d$, we denote by B' its dual space with respect to the inner product $\langle u, v \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d)} := \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d} \bar{u}v dt dx$.

We denote by $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the Schwartz space and the space of tempered distributions on \mathbb{R}^d .

For $q \in [1, \infty]$ and a Banach space E defined on \mathbb{T}^d , we denote by $L^q E = L_t^q E$ the mixed norm

$$\|u\|_{L^q E} := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \|u(t)\|_E^q dt \right)^{1/q}.$$

We use Besov-type norms for the time variable. Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p, q \in [1, \infty]$. For a Banach space E defined on either \mathbb{T}^d or \mathbb{R}^d , we denote by $B_{p,q}^s E = (B_{p,q}^s)_t E_x$ the (function-valued) Besov space defined as the dyadic summation on time frequency cutoffs

$$\|u\|_{B_{p,q}^s E} := \left(\sum_{N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}} N^{qs} \|P_N^t u\|_{L^p E}^q \right)^{1/q} + \|P_{\leq 1}^t u\|_{L^p E}.$$

We also use norms concerning ℓ^q -summations of spatial frequency-localized pieces. Let E be a function space defined on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d$. We denote

$$\|u\|_{\ell_s^q E} := \left(\sum_{N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}} N^{qs} \|u_N\|_E^q \right)^{1/q} + \|u_{\leq 1}\|_E.$$

When $s = 0$, the subscript s in ℓ_s^q is omitted and we simply write it as ℓ^q .

Lemma 2.1. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $p \in (1, \infty)$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$, and $s_0 \neq s_1$ be real numbers. Let $s_\theta = (1 - \theta)s_0 + \theta s_1$. For any function $f \in B_{p,\infty}^{s_0} L^p \cap B_{p,\infty}^{s_1} L^p$ on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d$, we have*

$$(2.1) \quad \|f\|_{B_{p,1}^{s_\theta} L^p} \lesssim_{s_0, s_1, \theta, p} \|f\|_{B_{p,\infty}^{s_0} L^p}^{1-\theta} \|f\|_{B_{p,\infty}^{s_1} L^p}^\theta.$$

Proof. Equivalently, it suffices to show for a positive function $g : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that

$$(2.2) \quad \sum_{N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}} N^{s_\theta} g(N) \lesssim_{s_0, s_1, \theta, p} \left(\sup_{N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}} N^{s_0} g(N) \right)^{1-\theta} \cdot \left(\sup_{N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}} N^{s_1} g(N) \right)^\theta =: A^{1-\theta} B^\theta.$$

(2.2) follows from a dyadic summation on the inequality $g(N) \leq \min\{AN^{-s_0}, BN^{-s_1}\}$. \square

Every weak limit we consider in this paper is in the distribution sense. Given a sequence of functions $\{f_n\}$, we denote by $\lim_n f_n$ the weak limit of f_n (if it exists). For two function norms $\|\cdot\|_{B_1}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{B_2}$, we denote by $B_1 \cap B_2$ and $B_1 + B_2$ the norms

$$\|f\|_{B_1 \cap B_2} := \|f\|_{B_1} + \|f\|_{B_2}$$

and

$$\|f\|_{B_1 + B_2} := \inf_{f_1 + f_2 = f} \|f_1\|_{B_1} + \|f_2\|_{B_2}.$$

2.3. Schrödinger operators, Strichartz estimates, and atomic spaces. In this subsection, we collect facts related to the Schrödinger operator. More specifically, we present Strichartz estimates for the linear Schrödinger operator on tori, the atomic spaces, and the Galilean transform.

We begin with notations related to the linear Schrödinger operator. For a function $\phi : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and time $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $e^{it\Delta}\phi(x)$ the linear evolution

$$e^{it\Delta}\phi = \mathcal{F}_x^{-1}(e^{-it|\xi|^2}\widehat{\phi}).$$

We denote by K^+ the retarded Schrödinger operator; for a function $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, K^+f is given as

$$(2.3) \quad K^+f(t) := -i \int_{-\infty}^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta} f(s) ds.$$

Strichartz estimates and atomic spaces. We state a kernel estimate for the Schrödinger operator on tori. This was first shown by Bourgain in [1].

Proposition 2.2 (Kernel bound, [1, 14]). *Consider a rectangular torus $\mathbb{T}^d = \mathbb{R}^d / (\theta_1\mathbb{Z} \times \cdots \times \theta_d\mathbb{Z})$ with $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d > 0$. Let (a_j, q_j) be a pair of coprime integers for $j = 1, \dots, d$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ be a dyadic number such that*

$$1 \leq q_j < N \text{ and } \left| \frac{2\pi t}{\theta_j^2} - \frac{a_j}{q_j} \right| \leq \frac{1}{q_j N}.$$

Then, we have

$$(2.4) \quad \|e^{it\Delta}\delta_N\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{N}{\sqrt{q_j} \left(1 + N \left| \frac{2\pi t}{\theta_j^2} - \frac{a_j}{q_j} \right|^{1/2}\right)}.$$

Proof. (2.4) is given in [14, Lemma 2.2] for $0 \leq a_j \leq q_j$. Due to the time-periodicity of $e^{it\partial_x^2}$, (2.4) holds for general $a_j \in \mathbb{Z}$. \square

Although (2.4) depends on the ratio of side lengths of \mathbb{T}^d , the dependence is irrelevant to our paper. Indeed, (2.4) is used only in the proof of the extinction lemma (5.4). In there, the side lengths θ_j are irrelevant. That is the only place where the rationality of side lengths is involved. For this reason, one can verify that the proof is valid for any torus. Hence, for simplicity of presentation, we assume that our domain \mathbb{T}^d is a square torus.

The next proposition is a scale-invariant Strichartz estimate for general tori. For the rational torus, this result follows from the ℓ^2 -decoupling theorem by Bourgain and Demeter [3]. For general tori, the subcritical version was first shown in [3], then was sharpened to the critical scale in [14].

Proposition 2.3 ([1, 3, 14]). *Let $p \in (\frac{2(d+2)}{d}, \infty)$ and $\sigma = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d+2}{p} > 0$. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a finite interval. Then, we have*

$$(2.5) \quad \sup_{N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}} \|P_N e^{it\Delta} f\|_{L_{t,x}^p(I \times \mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim_{p,I} \|f\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^d)}.$$

Next, we recall the definition of the function space Y^s first appeared in [9], which is the solution norm of LWP (Proposition 1.1). For a general theory, we refer to [16], [9], and [7].

Definition 2.4 ([9]). Let \mathcal{Z} be the collection of finite non-decreasing sequences $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^K$ in $(-\infty, \infty]$. Let V_{rc}^2 be the space of right-continuous functions $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ satisfying $\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} f(t) = 0$, equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_{V_{\text{rc}}^2} := \left(\sup_{\{t_k\}_{k=0}^K \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{k=1}^K |f(t_k) - f(t_{k-1})|^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

where the convention $f(\infty) = 0$ is used. For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we define Y^s as the space of $u : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\widehat{u}(\xi)$ lies in V_{rc}^2 for each $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and has a finite norm

$$\|u\|_{Y^s} := \left(\sum_{\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \langle \xi \rangle^{2s} \|e^{it|\xi|^2} \widehat{u}(t)(\xi)\|_{V_{\text{rc}}^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} < \infty.$$

While the space Y^s is defined on the full-time domain $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d$, since Strichartz estimates such as (2.5) depend on the size of the time interval, we often restrict the time interval to a finite interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, and denote this restriction by $Y^s(I)$.

Proposition 2.5 (Strichartz estimates, [9, 7, 8]). *Let $p \in (\frac{2(d+2)}{d}, \infty)$ and $\sigma = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d+2}{p}$. For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we have the following estimates:*

- (1) $Y^s = \ell^2 Y^s \hookrightarrow L^\infty H^s$.
- (2) For $f \in Y^s$, f is right-continuous in $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and for $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow t_0^-} f(t)$ exists in $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$.
- (3) Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a finite interval. For $N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$, we have the estimate

$$(2.6) \quad \|\chi_I P_{\leq N} u\|_{L_{t,x}^p} \lesssim_{p,I} N^\sigma \|P_{\leq N} u\|_{Y^0}.$$

- (4) For a function $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$(2.7) \quad \|K^+ f\|_{Y^s} \lesssim \|f\|_{(Y^{-s})'}.$$

(1) and (2) follow directly from the definition of Y^s . For (2), the right-continuity and the existence of a left limit follow from those of V_{rc}^2 ; see [7, Proposition 2.4] for the proof.

(2.6) is a consequence of (2.5), used for example in [14]. It is obtained using the atomic structure of Y^0 -norm.

(2.7) is a version of the $U^2 - V^2$ dual estimate used in [9].³

Galilean transforms. For $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we denote by $I_\xi : \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d)$ the Galilean transform mapping $u : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ to

$$(2.8) \quad I_\xi u(t, x) = e^{ix \cdot \xi - it|\xi|^2} u(t, x - 2t\xi).$$

³In other literature such as [9], [14], [18], (2.7) is obtained with the left-hand side replaced by the U^2 -based norm X^s , using the duality of atomic spaces. Since $X^s \hookrightarrow Y^s$, that implies (2.7).

2.4. Global well-posedness of NLS on \mathbb{R}^d . We recall the global well-posedness results and scattering norm bounds for NLS on \mathbb{R}^d , $d \geq 3$:

$$(NLS(\mathbb{R}^d)) \quad \begin{cases} iu_t + \Delta u = \pm |u|^{\frac{4}{d-2}} u =: \mathcal{N}(u) \\ u(0) = u_0 \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \end{cases}.$$

The following is a preparatory usual fact that is at the level of local theory.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $u \in L^\infty \dot{H}^1 \cap L^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}_{t,x}(I \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a Duhamel solution to $(NLS(\mathbb{R}^d))$, either focusing or defocusing. Then, $u \in C^0 \dot{H}^1 \cap L^2 \dot{W}^{1,2_1}(I \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ also holds and*

$$\|u\|_{L^2 \dot{W}^{1,2_1}(I \times \mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty \dot{H}^1 \cap L^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}_{t,x}} 1.$$

Here, we denoted $2_s = (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{s}{d})^{-1}$, with which $L^{2_s}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ have the same scaling. Furthermore, u scatters both forward and backward in time, i.e., there exist $\phi_\pm \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|u(t) - e^{it\Delta} \phi_\pm\|_{\dot{H}^1} = 0$.

Proof. This is a standard consequence of conventional Strichartz estimates; for a direct reference (which is fairly stronger), see [20, Theorem 1.3]. \square

For the defocusing case, the following global well-posedness and scattering result is known for arbitrary dimensions $d \geq 3$:

Proposition 2.7 ([4, 19, 21]). *Fix a number $E_0 > 0$. Let $u_0 \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $d \geq 3$ be initial data such that $E(u_0) \leq E_0$. There exists a unique Duhamel solution $u \in C^0 \dot{H}^1 \cap L^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}_{t,x}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ to $(NLS(\mathbb{R}^d))$ with the defocusing sign, which is global and scatters both forward and backward in time. Moreover, we have*

$$\|u\|_{L^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}_{t,x}} \lesssim_{E_0} 1.$$

Proof. This is shown in [4, 19, 21]. \square

A similar result for the focusing case is known for dimensions $d \geq 4$:

Proposition 2.8 ([15, 5]). *Let $u_0 \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $d \geq 4$ be initial data such that*

$$\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2} \leq K < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$$

and

$$E(u_0) < E(W).$$

Then, there exists a unique Duhamel solution $u \in C^0 \dot{H}^1 \cap L^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}_{t,x}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ to $(NLS(\mathbb{R}^d))$ with the focusing sign, which is global and scatters both forward and backward in time. Moreover, we have

$$\|u\|_{L^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}_{t,x}} \lesssim_K 1.$$

Here, we denote by W the ground state of $(NLS(\mathbb{R}^d))$ on \mathbb{R}^d , explicitly given in (1.2).

2.5. Energy trapping of energy-critical focusing NLS on \mathbb{T}^d . Yue [22] used a variational structure to introduce modified energies, which give sufficient conditions for energy trappings on \mathbb{T}^d . While [22] only dealt four-dimensional cases, the energy trapping works on general torus \mathbb{T}^d , $d \geq 3$, hence we state the result on general \mathbb{T}^d . We denote by c_* and C_d the constants given in [22, Lemma 2.1], which depend only on the domain \mathbb{T}^d . Explicitly, we define $C_d := \|W\|_{L^{2+a}}/\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$ and choose c_* as a positive constant such that for $u \in H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$,

$$\|u\|_{L^{2+a}(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 \leq C_d^2 \left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 + c_* \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 \right).$$

We define c_0 as the infimum of all such available c_* .

For $u \in H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $c > 0$, we define the modified energy $E_c(u)$ as

$$E_c(u) = E(u) + \frac{c}{2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2,$$

which is conserved by the mass and energy conservation laws.

Remark 2.9. Although the condition of Theorem 1.3 contains c_0 , the inequality conditions are strict and thus c_0 can be replaced by some $c_* > c_0$.

We recall the following energy trapping principle:

Proposition 2.10 (Energy trapping, [22, Theorem 2.5]). *Let $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$, $d \geq 3$ be such that for some $\delta_0 > 0$ and $c_* > c_0$,*

$$\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + c_* \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2$$

and

$$E_{c_*}(u_0) < (1 - \delta_0)E(W).$$

Let u be a maximum lifespan solution to (NLS(\mathbb{T}^d)) with the initial data u_0 and the lifespan $I \ni 0$. There exists $\bar{\delta} = \bar{\delta}(\delta_0) > 0$ such that for all $t \in I$,

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 < (1 - \bar{\delta})\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2.$$

3. FRAMES AND CUTOFF SOLUTIONS

3.1. Periodic extensions and frames. The proofs of the main results capture limit profiles from concentrating bubbles by taking weak limits of their rescales. The limit profiles lie on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$; hence, it is convenient to first extend a function on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d$ to that on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and then rescale the coordinates. How the function is extended is not essential to our roadmap; one could, e.g., use charts and bump functions for general domains. In our setting, we extend a function on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d$ to a spatially $2\pi\mathbb{Z}^d$ -periodic function on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and rescale it, as explained below.

We define the mappings of spacetime functions. We denote a triple $(N_*, t_*, x_*) \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d$ of scale, time, and space parameters. For $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d)$ and $(N_*, t_*, x_*) \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d$, we denote by $\iota_{(N_*, t_*, x_*)} f$ the $L^\infty \dot{H}^1$ -critically rescaled function

$$\iota_{(N_*, t_*, x_*)} f(t, x) := N_*^{1-\frac{d}{2}} f(N_*^{-2}t + t_*, N_*^{-1}x + x_* + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}^d) \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d).$$

We also use the $L^\infty \dot{H}^{-1}$ -critical rescale $\iota'_{(N_*, t_*, x_*)} = N_*^{-2} \iota_{(N_*, t_*, x_*)}$.

Definition 3.1. A sequence of triples of parameters $\{(N_n, t_n, x_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $2^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d$ is said to be a *frame* if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} N_n = \infty$.

We frequently work on distributional weak limits of $\iota_{\mathcal{O}_n} f_n$ for a sequence of functions $f_n : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

Definition 3.2. Let $q, r \in [1, \infty]$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. A sequence of functions $\{f_n\}$ in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ is said to be *uniformly locally bounded* in $L^q \dot{W}^{k,r}$ if

$$\sup_{R \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n\|_{L^q \dot{W}^{k,r}(\mathbb{R} \times B_R(0))} < \infty,$$

where $B_R(0) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| \leq R\}$.

For instance, for any frame $\{\mathcal{O}_n\}$ and any bounded sequence of functions $\{f_n\}$ in $L^q \dot{W}^{k,r}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d)$, if $L^q \dot{W}^{k,r}$ and $L^\infty \dot{H}^1$ have the same scaling, since the support of $\iota_{\mathcal{O}_n}(\chi_{\mathbb{R} \times [-\pi, \pi]^d})$ grows to $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ as $N_n \rightarrow \infty$, $\{\iota_{\mathcal{O}_n} f_n\}$ is uniformly locally bounded in $L^q \dot{W}^{k,r}$.

3.2. Cutoff solutions. In this work, to consider a solution u locally within a short time interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, it is often convenient to consider an extension of $u|_I$ by linear evolutions on $\mathbb{R} \setminus I$. For this, we introduce the concept of a cutoff solution.

A pair (u, I) , where $u \in C^0 \mathcal{S}' \cap L^{1+a}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an interval, is a *cutoff solution* to $(\text{NLS}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ if u is a Duhamel solution to

$$i u_t + \Delta u = \chi_I \cdot \mathcal{N}(u).$$

Here, I is possibly empty or \mathbb{R} itself (i.e., both linear evolutions and purely non-linear solutions are cutoff solutions). A cutoff solution on \mathbb{T}^d is defined similarly. Equivalently, u can be regarded as the continuous extension of $u|_I$ by linear evolutions.

The following lemma enables one to regard a weak limit of periodic extensions $\iota_{\mathcal{O}_n}$ of cutoff solutions on \mathbb{T}^d as a strong (cutoff) solution on \mathbb{R}^d .

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\{(v_n, I_n)\}$ be a sequence of cutoff solutions to $(\text{NLS}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ uniformly locally bounded in $C^0 \dot{H}^1 \cap L^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}_{t,x}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Passing to a subsequence, v_n converges weakly and almost everywhere to a cutoff solution (v_*, I_*) , $v_* \in C^0 \dot{H}^1 \cap L^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}_{t,x}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ to $(\text{NLS}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, which scatters both forward and backward in time. Furthermore, for every $T \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $v_n(T) \rightharpoonup v_*(T)$.*

Proof. Since $i \partial_t v_n = -\Delta v_n + \mathcal{N}(v_n)$ is bounded in $C^0 H_{\text{loc}}^{-1}$,

$$(3.1) \quad \{v_n\} \text{ is bounded in } C^0 H_{\text{loc}}^1 \cap \dot{W}^{1,\infty} H_{\text{loc}}^{-1} \hookrightarrow C^0 H_{\text{loc}}^1 \cap C^{0,1/2} L_{\text{loc}}^2.$$

Thus, passing to a subsequence, v_n converges almost everywhere; let v_* be the pointwise limit. By the uniform local boundedness of $\{v_n\}$ in $C^0 \dot{H}^1 \cap L^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}_{t,x}$ and (3.1), we have

$$(3.2) \quad v_n \rightharpoonup v_* \in L^\infty \dot{H}^1 \cap L^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}_{t,x} \cap C^{0,1/2} L_{\text{loc}}^2.$$

By (3.1), $\{v_n\}$ is equicontinuous in $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, thus $v_n(T) \rightharpoonup v_*(T)$ further holds for every $T \in \mathbb{R}$.

It remains to show that v_* is a cutoff solution. We proceed conventionally by first showing that v_* is a cutoff solution in the distributional sense, then using a mollification argument to show that such v_* is also a solution in the Duhamel sense. Firstly, we show that v_* is a distributional cutoff solution. Passing to a subsequence, there exists an interval I_* such that χ_{I_n} converges almost everywhere to χ_{I_*} . Since

v_n is bounded in $L_{\text{loc}}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and converges almost everywhere to v_* , $\mathcal{N}(v_n)$ is bounded in $L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and converges almost everywhere to $\mathcal{N}(v_*)$. Thus, taking weak limits of both sides of (NLS(\mathbb{R}^d)) gives

$$(3.3) \quad (i\partial_t + \Delta)v_* = \chi_{I_*} \cdot \mathcal{N}(v_*).$$

We check that v_* is a Duhamel cutoff solution. We use a mollification argument. Let $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a function such that $\int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi dx dt = 1$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\phi_n(t, x) := n^{d+1} \phi(nt, nx)$. Taking a convolution with ϕ_n to (3.3), we have

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta)v_* * \phi_n = (\chi_{I_*} \cdot \mathcal{N}(v_*)) * \phi_n,$$

which can be rewritten in the Duhamel form

$$(3.4) \quad (v_* * \phi_n)(t) = e^{it\Delta} (v_* * \phi_n)(0) - i \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta} ((\chi_I \cdot \mathcal{N}(v_*)) * \phi_n)(s) ds.$$

Since $v_* \in C^0 L_{\text{loc}}^2$, we have $(v_* * \phi_n)(0) \rightharpoonup v_*(0)$. Since $v_* \in L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, we have $\chi_{I_*} \cdot \mathcal{N}(v_*) \in L_{t,x}^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Thus, taking a weak limit by $n \rightarrow \infty$ of (3.4) yields

$$v_* = e^{it\Delta} v_*(0) - i \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta} (\chi_I \cdot \mathcal{N}(v_*))(s) ds,$$

which implies that (v_*, I_*) is a Duhamel cutoff solution. By Lemma 2.6, $v_* \in C^0 \dot{H}^1$ further holds, hence finishing the proof. \square

4. A SOLUTION SPACE AND AN INVERSE EMBEDDING PROPERTY

In this section, we define and investigate a solution space $Z^s = Z_\sigma^s$ modifying that of the local well-posedness result in [17]. We bring parameters σ and p given in [17], which depend only on d . As in [17, Section 3], we fix the parameters σ and p as follows:

$$(4.1) \quad \sigma = \sigma(d) \ll 1 \text{ and } p = \frac{d+2}{\frac{d}{2} - \sigma}.$$

Let $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a smooth even bump function such that $\psi|_{[-1,1]} \equiv 1$ and $\text{supp}(\psi) \subset [-\frac{11}{10}, \frac{11}{10}]$.

Definition 4.1. For $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\theta \in [0, \sigma]$, we define $Z_\theta^s = Z_\theta^s(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d)$ as a Banach space given by the norm

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u\|_{Z_\theta^s} &= \max_{q \in [p, \frac{1}{\sigma}]} \|N^{s-\sigma} \|\psi u_N\|_{L^q L^r} \|_{\ell^2(N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}})} \\ &+ \max_{\alpha \in [\sigma, \frac{1}{p} - \sigma]} \|N^s \max_{\substack{R \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \\ R \leq 8N}} (\langle N/R \rangle^{-\theta} + R^{-2\theta}) R^{-\beta} \| \|\psi P_{\leq 8R} I R_k u_N\|_{B_{p,1}^\alpha} \|_{\ell^2(k \in \mathbb{Z}^d)} \|_{\ell^2(N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}})}, \end{aligned}$$

where we denote $\langle x \rangle := \sqrt{|x|^2 + 1}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and the scaling conditions $\frac{d}{r} := \frac{d}{2} - \sigma - \frac{2}{q}$ and $\beta := \sigma + 2\alpha$ are imposed.

In [17], the Z_0^s space (originally denoted by Z^s in [17]) was first defined and used as a solution norm. The Z_0^s norm was initially introduced with sharp Littlewood-Paley cutoffs, but they work the same with smooth cutoffs, which is our setting.

In this paper, Z_σ^s is mainly used. Since Z_θ^s is weaker with higher θ , adopting Z_θ^s instead of Z_0^s means that we use a weaker solution norm for bootstrapping. This is beneficial for the inverse property of the embedding $Y^s \hookrightarrow Z_\theta^s$ (Proposition 4.6). Indeed, the factor $\theta > 0$ is crucial; for instance, a linear combination of Galilean packets $I_{Rk} P_{\leq R} e^{it\Delta} \delta$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ satisfies $\|u\|_{Y^s} \sim \|u\|_{Z_0^s}$. Although Z_σ^s is weaker than Z_0^s previously used in [17], all estimates given in [17] stay true with Z_σ^s . The second line of (4.2), where the decay exponent θ appears, was used in [17] only for the bilinear Strichartz estimate [17, (3.25)]. That estimate stays true, as explained in the proof of Lemma 4.4. We collect elementary properties of Z_θ^s spaces.

Proposition 4.2 ([17, Lemma 3.6]). *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\theta \in [0, \sigma]$. We have the following properties:*

- We have the embedding

$$(4.3) \quad \ell_s^2(Z_\theta^0)' = (Z_\theta^{-s})' \hookrightarrow (Y^{-s})' \xrightarrow{K^+} Y^s \hookrightarrow Z_\theta^s = \ell_s^2 Z_\theta^0.$$

- For a finite interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$(4.4) \quad \|u \cdot \chi_I\|_{Z_\theta^s} \lesssim \|u\|_{Z_\theta^s}.$$

This estimate is uniform on the choice of I .

- Let $\alpha \in [\sigma, \frac{1}{p} - \sigma]$ and $\beta = \sigma + 2\alpha$. We have

$$(4.5) \quad \|\psi u\|_{\ell_{s-\beta}^2 B_{p,1}^\alpha L^p} \lesssim \|u\|_{Z_\theta^s}.$$

Proof. These are shown in [17, Lemma 3.6] for the case $\theta = 0$. The proofs are identical for general $\theta \geq 0$. \square

Indeed, the σ -gap for the interval $\alpha \in [\sigma, \frac{1}{p} - \sigma]$ in (4.2) is artificial and can be relaxed to any compact subinterval of $(0, \frac{1}{p})$. In particular, we have the following:

Lemma 4.3 ([17, Lemma 3.6]). *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$. For $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{p})$, we have*

$$(4.6) \quad \|N^s \max_{\substack{R \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \\ R \leq 8N}} R^{-\beta} \|\psi P_{\leq 8R} I_{Rk} u_N\|_{B_{p,1}^\alpha L^p} \|\ell^2(k \in \mathbb{Z}^d)\|_{\ell^2(N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}})} \lesssim_\alpha \|u\|_{Y^s},$$

where the scaling condition $\beta = \sigma + 2\alpha$ is imposed.

Proof. This is just a part of (4.3), bringing the second line of (4.2) with α replaced by a member of $(0, \frac{1}{p})$. The proof in [17, Lemma 3.6] used only that $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{p}$ and works identically here. \square

Lemma 4.4 ([17, (4.8)]). *Let $\theta \in [0, \sigma]$. For $u \in Z_\theta^1$ such that $\text{supp}(u) \subset [-1, 1] \times \mathbb{T}^d$, we have*

$$(4.7) \quad \|\mathcal{N}(u)\|_{(Z_\theta^{-1})'} \lesssim \|u\|_{Z_\theta^1}^{1+a}.$$

Proof. (4.7) is [17, (4.8)] for the case $\theta = 0$. In [17], the key bilinear Strichartz estimate [17, (3.25)] is the only place that distinguishes Z_θ^1 and Z_0^1 . [17, (3.25)] contains a bilinear gain by $\langle N/R \rangle^{-\sigma_1} + R^{-2\sigma_1}$, which is the first-appearing place of the exponent $\sigma_1 \gg \sigma$ and allows a perturbation by $\widetilde{\sigma}_1 = \sigma_1 - \sigma$. Thus, the proof of [17, (4.8)] works identically on showing (4.7) for general $\theta \in [0, \sigma]$. \square

Just as commented after Definition 4.1, we mostly use Z_σ^s spaces in later proofs. For simplicity of notation, we denote $Z^s := Z_\sigma^s$.

We show an inverse property of the embedding $Y^1 \hookrightarrow Z^1 = Z_\sigma^1$ localized to one dyadic frequency support, which is the main reason why we adopted the space Z_σ^1 . This can be naturally expected since Y^1 is a space of regularity 1, while Z^1 is based on Besov spaces of regularities $1 - \sigma < 1$ (up to a fractional exchange of ∂_t and Δ).

Definition 4.5. A family of distributions $\{f_n\}$ on either \mathbb{R}^d or $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is said to be *weakly nonzero* if for any subsequence $\{n_k\}$, f_{n_k} does not converge weakly to zero.

Proposition 4.6. *Let $C < \infty$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Let $N_n \rightarrow \infty$ be a sequence of dyadic numbers. Let $I_n \subset [0, 1]$ be a sequence of intervals such that $|I_n| \rightarrow 0$. Let $\{u_n\}$ be a sequence in Y^1 such that $\text{supp}(u_n) \subset I_n \times \mathbb{T}^d$,*

$$(4.8) \quad \sup_n \|P_{N_n} u_n\|_{Y^1} \leq C,$$

and

$$(4.9) \quad \inf_n \|P_{N_n} u_n\|_{Z^1} \geq \epsilon.$$

Then, there exists a frame $\{\mathcal{O}_n\} = \{(N_n, t_n, x_n)\}$, where $t_n \in I_n$ and $x_n \in \mathbb{T}^d$, such that $\{\iota_{\mathcal{O}_n} u_n(0)\}$ is weakly nonzero.

Proof. Up to time-translations, we may assume $I_n = [0, T_n)$, $T_n \rightarrow 0$. Recalling (4.2), for each n , either of the following holds:

(1) There exists $q_n \in [p, \frac{1}{\sigma}]$ such that for $\frac{d}{r_n} := \frac{d}{2} - \sigma - \frac{2}{q_n}$,

$$(4.10) \quad \|\psi P_{N_n} u_n\|_{L^{q_n} L^{r_n}} \gtrsim N_n^{\sigma-1}.$$

(2) There exist $\alpha_n \in [\sigma, \frac{1}{p} - \sigma]$ and a dyadic number $R_n \leq 8N$ such that for $\beta_n := \sigma + 2\alpha_n$,

$$(4.11) \quad (\langle N_n/R_n \rangle^{-\sigma} + R_n^{-2\sigma}) R_n^{-\beta_n} \|\|\psi P_{\leq 8R_n} I_{R_n, k} P_{N_n} u_n\|_{B_{p,1}^{\alpha_n} L^p}\|_{\ell^2(k \in \mathbb{Z}^d)} \gtrsim N_n^{-1}.$$

Case 1. By interpolation, we assume $q_n \in \{p, \frac{1}{\sigma}\}$. Passing to a subsequence, we assume $q_n = q \in \{p, \frac{1}{\sigma}\}$. By (4.8), we have

$$(4.12) \quad \|\psi P_{N_n} u_n\|_{L^\infty L^{2\sigma}} \lesssim N_n^\sigma \|\psi P_{N_n} u_n\|_{L^\infty L^2} \lesssim N_n^{\sigma-1} \|P_{N_n} u_n\|_{Y^1} \lesssim N_n^{\sigma-1}.$$

Since $p \leq q < \infty$, extrapolating between (4.10) and (4.12) gives

$$(4.13) \quad \|\psi P_{N_n} u_n\|_{L_{t,x}^p} \gtrsim N_n^{\sigma-1}.$$

Let $\tilde{\sigma} \in (0, \sigma)$ and $\tilde{p} := \frac{d+2}{\frac{d}{2}-\tilde{\sigma}}$. By (2.6) and (4.8), we have

$$(4.14) \quad \|\psi P_{N_n} u_n\|_{L_{t,x}^{\tilde{p}}} \lesssim N_n^{\tilde{\sigma}} \|P_{N_n} u_n\|_{Y^0} \lesssim N_n^{\tilde{\sigma}-1}.$$

Since $\tilde{p} < p < \infty$, extrapolating between (4.13) and (4.14) yields

$$\|\psi P_{N_n} u_n\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \gtrsim N_n^{\frac{d}{2}-1}.$$

Thus, there exists a point $(t_n, x_n) \in I_n \times \mathbb{T}^d$ such that

$$|\langle u_n(t_n), \delta_{N_n}(\cdot - x_n) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}| = |P_{N_n} u_n(t_n, x_n)| \gtrsim N_n^{\frac{d}{2}-1}.$$

We choose the frame $\{\mathcal{O}_n\}$ as $\{\mathcal{O}_n\} = \{(N_n, t_n, x_n)\}$. The sequence $\langle \iota_{\mathcal{O}_n} u_n(0), \delta_1 \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \langle N_n^{1-\frac{d}{2}} u_n(t_n), \delta_{N_n}(\cdot - x_n) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}$ does not converge to zero on any subsequence, hence we are done for this case.

Case 2. By interpolation, we assume $\alpha_n \in \left\{ \sigma, \frac{1}{p} - \sigma \right\}$. Passing to a subsequence, we assume $\alpha_n = \alpha \in \left\{ \sigma, \frac{1}{p} - \sigma \right\}$. Fix $\tilde{\alpha} \in (\alpha, \frac{1}{p})$. Denote $\beta := \sigma + 2\alpha$ and $\tilde{\beta} := \sigma + 2\tilde{\alpha}$. By (4.6), we have

$$(4.15) \quad R_n^{-\tilde{\beta}} \|\|\psi P_{\leq 8R_n} I_{R_n k} P_{N_n} u_n\|_{B_{p,1}^{\tilde{\alpha}} L^p}\|_{\ell^2(k \in \mathbb{Z}^d)} \lesssim N_n^{-1} \|P_{N_n} u_n\|_{Y^1} \lesssim N_n^{-1}.$$

By (4.8) and (4.3), we have $\|u_n\|_{Z_0^1} \lesssim 1$, comparing which and (4.11), the decay part $(N_n/R_n)^{-\sigma} + R_n^{-2\sigma}$ of (4.11) cannot decrease to zero. Hence we may assume either $R_n \sim 1$ or $R_n \sim N_n$.

Case 2-1: $R_n \sim 1$. By (4.11) and (4.15), we have

$$\|\|\psi P_{\leq 8R_n} I_{R_n k} P_{N_n} u_n\|_{B_{p,1}^{\tilde{\alpha}} L^p}\|_{\ell^2(k \in \mathbb{Z}^d)} \lesssim \|\|\psi P_{\leq 8R_n} I_{R_n k} P_{N_n} u_n\|_{B_{p,1}^{\alpha} L^p}\|_{\ell^2(k \in \mathbb{Z}^d)},$$

which cannot happen since $\tilde{\alpha} > \alpha$ and $\text{supp}(\psi P_{\leq 8R_n} I_{R_n k} P_{N_n} u_n) \subset I_n \times \mathbb{T}^d$ holds with $|I_n| \rightarrow 0$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Thus, the subcase $R_n \sim 1$ is vacuous.

Case 2-2: $R_n \sim N_n$. Since $I_{R_n k}$ translates the spatial Fourier support by $R_n k$, $P_{\leq 8R_n} I_{R_n k} P_{N_n}$ is zero for $|k| \gg 1$. Thus, only $O(1)$ number of integer points $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ contribute to (4.11) and there exists $k_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that

$$(4.16) \quad R_n^{-\beta} \|\psi P_{\leq 8R_n} I_{R_n k_n} P_{N_n} u_n\|_{B_{p,1}^{\alpha} L^p} \gtrsim N_n^{-1}.$$

By (2.1), an extrapolation between (4.15) and (4.16) yields

$$(4.17) \quad R_n^{-\sigma} \|\psi P_{\leq 8R_n} I_{R_n k_n} P_{N_n} u_n\|_{B_{p,\infty}^0 L^p} \gtrsim N_n^{-1}.$$

By (4.17), the embedding $L_{t,x}^p \hookrightarrow B_{p,\infty}^0 L^p$, and the $L_{t,x}^p$ -norm conservation of the Galilean transform $I_{R_n k_n}$, we have

$$(4.18) \quad \|\psi P_{N_n} u_n\|_{L_{t,x}^p} \gtrsim R_n^{\sigma} N_n^{-1} \sim N_n^{\sigma-1},$$

which is just (4.13) we obtained in the proof for Case 1; proceeding as earlier finishes the proof. \square

Remark 4.7. Proposition 4.6 concerns only functions localized in one dyadic Fourier support. This is the best one can expect since $Z^1 = \ell^2 Z^1$ and $Y^1 = \ell^2 Y^1$. This is in contrast to previous results [10, 22] for $d = 3, 4$, where an inverse property for the inequality $\|e^{it\Delta} \phi\|_{L^\infty B_{\infty,\infty}^{-d/2}(I \times \mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}$ was enough.

Thus, the concentration of a solution to $(\text{NLS}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ is not directly obvious from Proposition 4.6. This is a major step of this work; we continue the discussion in Section 5.2.

5. GLOBAL WELL-POSEDNESS OF NLS ON \mathbb{T}^d

5.1. Weak scattering behaviors. In this subsection, we show uniform convergences of scattering limits over sequences of solutions.

For \mathbb{R}^d , we show that for a bounded sequence of solutions to $(\text{NLS}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, weak convergence to the scattering limit as $t \rightarrow -\infty$ uniformly occurs. A similar property is shown for \mathbb{T}^d with respect to any frame $\{\mathcal{O}_n\}$. This phenomenon is generic; the only ingredient is any decay of a linear Schrödinger propagation (from $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ or $P_N \delta_{\mathbb{T}^d}$) in a solution norm, which implies, in view of duality, that the inhomogeneous evolution from time t too far from 0 is almost negligible to the scattering limit in the weak sense.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $d \geq 3$. Let $\{(v_n, I_n)\}$ be a bounded sequence of cutoff solutions to (NLS(\mathbb{R}^d)) in $C^0 \dot{H}^1 \cap L^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}_{t,x}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Then,*

$$\{e^{iT\Delta} v_n(-T)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$

is uniformly convergent (in the weak sense) as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Explicitly, we show that for every $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$(5.1) \quad \limsup_{T_1, T_2 \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\langle \phi, e^{iT_1 \Delta} v_n(-T_1) - e^{iT_2 \Delta} v_n(-T_2) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}| = 0.$$

Applying Lemma 2.6 to $v_n|_{I_n}$ yields

$$(5.2) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|v_n\|_{L^2 \dot{W}^{1,2_1}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)} < \infty.$$

For $T_1, T_2 > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \phi, e^{iT_1 \Delta} v_n(-T_1) - e^{iT_2 \Delta} v_n(-T_2) \rangle_{L^2} &= \left| \langle \phi, \int_{[T_1, T_2] \cap I_n} e^{is\Delta} \mathcal{N}(v_n(-s)) ds \rangle_{L^2} \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{[T_1, T_2] \cap I_n} \langle e^{-is\Delta} \phi, \mathcal{N}(v_n(-s)) \rangle_{L^2} ds \right|, \end{aligned}$$

then by (5.2) we continue to estimate

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} &\lesssim \|\chi_{[-T_1, -T_2]} e^{it\Delta} \phi\|_{L^2 \dot{W}^{-1,2_1}} \|\mathcal{N}(v_n)\|_{L^2 \dot{W}^{1,2_1}} \\ &\lesssim \|\chi_{[-T_1, -T_2]} e^{it\Delta} \phi\|_{L^2 \dot{W}^{-1,2_1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit $T_1, T_2 \rightarrow \infty$ to (5.3) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_{T_1, T_2 \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\langle \phi, e^{iT_1 \Delta} v_n(-T_1) - e^{iT_2 \Delta} v_n(-T_2) \rangle_{L^2}| \\ &\lesssim \limsup_{T_1, T_2 \rightarrow \infty} \|\chi_{[-T_1, -T_2]} e^{it\Delta} \phi\|_{L^2 \dot{W}^{-1,2_1}}, \end{aligned}$$

which is 0 since $e^{it\Delta} \phi$ lies in the Strichartz space $L^2 \dot{W}^{-1,2_1}$, finishing the proof. \square

We show a similar uniform weak scattering property on \mathbb{T}^d . While we used only the boundedness of a Strichartz norm of $e^{it\Delta} \phi$ for \mathbb{R}^d , since the scaling size matters on \mathbb{T}^d , we employ a decay estimate of the kernel $e^{it\Delta} \delta_N = e^{it\Delta} P_N \delta$ uniform on N , explicitly the following preparatory fact known as the extinction lemma:

Lemma 5.2 (Extinction lemma, [10]). *Let $d \geq 3$. We have*

$$(5.4) \quad \limsup_{\substack{\epsilon \rightarrow 0 \\ T \rightarrow \infty}} \sup_{\substack{N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \\ TN^{-2} < \epsilon}} N^{1-\frac{d}{2}} \|\chi_{[TN^{-2}, \epsilon]} e^{it\Delta} \delta_N\|_{Z^{-1}} = 0.$$

Proof. By the definition of Z^s , (5.4) can be rewritten as

$$\limsup_{\substack{\epsilon \rightarrow 0 \\ T \rightarrow \infty}} \sup_{\substack{N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \\ TN^{-2} < \epsilon}} N^{-1-\frac{d}{2}} \|\chi_{[TN^{-2}, \epsilon]} e^{it\Delta} \delta_N\|_{Z^1} = 0.$$

Since the length of the interval $[TN^{-2}, \epsilon]$ vanishes to zero, by Proposition 4.6, it suffices to show

$$(5.5) \quad \limsup_{\substack{\epsilon \rightarrow 0 \\ T \rightarrow \infty}} \sup_{\substack{N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \\ TN^{-2} < \epsilon}} N^{-d} \|\chi_{[TN^{-2}, \epsilon]} e^{it\Delta} \delta_N\|_{L^{\infty}_{t,x}} = 0,$$

which can be shown similar to [10, (4.11)]; the only key ingredient is (2.4). \square

The next lemma states the weak scattering property on \mathbb{T}^d . For later use in Proposition 5.4, in this version, we consider general inhomogeneous evolutions, which are not necessarily solutions. Due to the periodic resonance, we assume the time-convergence $t_n \rightarrow 0$ of the frame and the negative-time linearity.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $d \geq 3$ and $C < \infty$. Let $\{u_n\}$ be a bounded sequence in $C^0 H^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d) \cap Y^1$. Let $\{\mathcal{O}_n\} = \{(N_n, t_n, x_n)\}$ be a frame such that $t_n \rightarrow 0$. If*

$$(5.6) \quad \sup_n \|(i\partial_t + \Delta)u_n\|_{(Z^{-1})'} \leq C$$

and

$$(5.7) \quad u_n(t) = e^{it\Delta}u_n(0) \text{ holds for } t \leq 0,$$

then

$$\{e^{iT\Delta}(\iota_{\mathcal{O}_n}u_n)(-T)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$

is uniformly convergent (in the weak sense) as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Explicitly, we show that for every $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$(5.8) \quad \{\langle \phi, e^{iT\Delta}(\iota_{\mathcal{O}_n}u_n)(-T) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$

is uniformly convergent as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Since the span of $\{\delta_{N_*}(\cdot - x_*) : N_* \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}} \text{ and } x_* \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is dense in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, one may assume further that

$$\phi = \delta_{N_*}(\cdot - x_*), \quad N_* \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}} \text{ and } x_* \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Up to a comparable choice of the frame $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_n = \{(N_n N_*^{-1}, t_n, x_n + x_*)\}$, we can further reduce to the case $(N_*, x_*) = (1, 0)$. Since $-T$ and $P_{1; \mathbb{R}^d}$ in the \mathcal{O}_n -coordinates correspond to $t_n - T N_n^{-2}$ and $P_{N_n; \mathbb{T}^d}$, respectively, in the original domain, it suffices to show the uniform convergence as $T \rightarrow \infty$ of

$$\left\{ \langle \delta_{N_n}(\cdot - x_n), N_n^{1-\frac{d}{2}} e^{iT N_n^{-2} \Delta} u_n(t_n - T N_n^{-2}) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}.$$

We show the uniform convergence. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $T_1, T_2 > 0$, denoting $f_n = (i\partial_t + \Delta)u_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \langle \delta_{N_n}(\cdot - x_n), e^{iT_1 N_n^{-2} \Delta} u_n(t_n - T_1 N_n^{-2}) - e^{iT_2 N_n^{-2} \Delta} u_n(t_n - T_2 N_n^{-2}) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} \right| \\ &= \left| \langle \delta_{N_n}(\cdot - x_n), \int_{t_n - T_1 N_n^{-2}}^{t_n - T_2 N_n^{-2}} e^{i(t_n - s) \Delta} f_n(s) ds \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{t_n - T_1 N_n^{-2}}^{t_n - T_2 N_n^{-2}} \langle \delta_{N_n}(\cdot - x_n), e^{i(t_n - s) \Delta} f_n(s) ds \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{t_n - T_1 N_n^{-2}}^{t_n - T_2 N_n^{-2}} \langle e^{i(s - t_n) \Delta} \delta_{N_n}(\cdot - x_n), f_n(s) ds \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} \right| \\ (5.9) \quad & \lesssim \|\chi_{[-T_1 N_n^{-2}, -T_2 N_n^{-2}] \cap [-t_n, \infty)} e^{it\Delta} \delta_{N_n}(\cdot - x_n)\|_{Z^{-1}} \|f_n\|_{(Z^{-1})'}, \end{aligned}$$

where the restriction $[-t_n, \infty)$ in (5.9) is obtained from the condition (5.7). Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| N_n^{1-\frac{d}{2}} \langle \delta_{N_n}(\cdot - x_n), e^{iT_1 N_n^{-2} \Delta} u_n(t_n - T_1 N_n^{-2}) - e^{iT_2 N_n^{-2} \Delta} u_n(t_n - T_2 N_n^{-2}) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} \right| \\ & \lesssim N_n^{1-\frac{d}{2}} \|\chi_{[-T_1 N_n^{-2}, -T_2 N_n^{-2}] \cap [-t_n, \infty)} e^{it\Delta} \delta_{N_n}(\cdot - x_n)\|_{Z^{-1}} \|f_n\|_{(Z^{-1})'}, \end{aligned}$$

which vanishes as $T_1, T_2 \rightarrow \infty$ by (5.4) and (5.6), finishing the proof. \square

5.2. A nonlinear inverse property. In this subsection, we show an inverse property of solutions to $(\text{NLS}(\mathbb{T}^d))$. The main difficulty is that the linear inverse property Proposition 4.6 is frequency-localized and does not rule out functions split into small-amplitude bubbles of different sizes. Although using strong multilinear estimates is a conventional approach, such estimates have not been shown for the nonlinearity when $d \geq 5$.

Without a multilinear estimate, the following key proposition upgrades Proposition 4.6 to the concentration of a nonlinear flow:

Proposition 5.4. *Let $d \geq 3$. Let $T_n \rightarrow 0$ be a positive sequence. Denote $I_n = [0, T_n)$. Let $C < \infty$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Let $\{u_n\}$ be a sequence of Duhamel solutions to $(\text{NLS}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ in $C^0 H^1([0, T_n] \times \mathbb{T}^d) \cap Y^1(I_n)$. Assume that*

$$(5.10) \quad \sup_n \|u_n\|_{Y^1(I_n)} \leq C$$

and

$$(5.11) \quad \inf_n \|\chi_{I_n} (u_n - e^{it\Delta} u_n(0))\|_{Z^1} \geq \epsilon.$$

Then, there exists a frame $\{\mathcal{O}_n\} = \{(N_n, t_n, x_n)\}$ such that $t_n \in I_n$ and both

$$\left\{ \chi_{\tilde{I}_n} \right\} \text{ and } \left\{ \iota_{\mathcal{O}_n} (u_n - e^{it\Delta} u_n(0)) (0) \right\}$$

are weakly nonzero, where $\tilde{I}_n = \{N_n^2(t - t_n) \mid t \in I_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is the time interval mapped from I_n by \mathcal{O}_n .

Proof. Since the statement concerns only the time interval I_n , one can equivalently regard u_n as the cutoff solution (u_n, I_n) to $(\text{NLS}(\mathbb{T}^d))$. Let $v_n := u_n - e^{it\Delta} u_n(0)$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, (5.11) can be rewritten as

$$(5.12) \quad \sum_N \|\chi_{I_n} P_N v_n\|_{Z^1}^2 = \|\chi_{I_n} v_n\|_{Z^1}^2 \gtrsim 1.$$

By (5.10), we have

$$(5.13) \quad \sum_N \|P_N v_n\|_{Y^1}^2 \lesssim_C 1.$$

By using (2.6) and $\|\mathcal{N}(u_n)\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \lesssim \|u_n\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2}{1+a}}}^{1+a} = \|u_n\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}}^{1+a}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (5.14) \quad \sum_N \|\chi_{[-1,1]} P_N \partial_t v_n\|_{L^\infty H^{-1} + L_{t,x}^2}^2 &= \|\chi_{[-1,1]} i \partial_t v_n\|_{\ell^2(L^\infty H^{-1} + L_{t,x}^2)}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|\Delta v_n\|_{\ell^2(L^\infty H^{-1})}^2 + \|\chi_{[-1,1]} \mathcal{N}(u_n)\|_{L_{t,x}^2}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|v_n\|_{\ell^2 L^\infty H^1}^2 + \|\chi_{[-1,1]} u_n\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}}^{2(1+a)} \\ &\lesssim \|v_n\|_{Y^1}^2 + \|u_n\|_{Y^1}^{2(1+a)} \lesssim_C 1. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.7) and (5.10), we have

$$(5.15) \quad \sum_N \|\chi_{I_n} P_N \mathcal{N}(u_n)\|_{(Z^{-1})'}^2 = \|\chi_{I_n} \mathcal{N}(u_n)\|_{(Z^{-1})'}^2 \lesssim \|u_n\|_{Y^1}^{2(1+a)} \lesssim_C 1.$$

Let δ be a small number, e.g., $\delta = 1/10$. We have

$$(5.16) \quad \sum_N N^{2\delta} \|P_{\geq N} u_n\|_{Y^{1-\delta}}^2 \lesssim \sum_{\substack{N, K \\ K \geq N}} (N/K)^{2\delta} \|P_K u_n\|_{Y^1}^2 \lesssim \sum_K \|P_K u_n\|_{Y^1}^2 \lesssim \|u_n\|_{Y^1}^2 \lesssim_C 1$$

and similarly

$$(5.17) \quad \sum_N N^{-2\delta} \|P_{\leq N} u_n\|_{Y^{1+\delta}}^2 \lesssim_C 1.$$

Taking a sum of all the inequalities (5.13), (5.14), (5.15), (5.16), (5.17), and (5.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_N \|\chi_{I_n} P_N v_n\|_{Z^1}^2 \gtrsim 1 \\ & \gtrsim \sum_N \|P_N v_n\|_{Y^1}^2 + \|\chi_{[-1,1]} P_N \partial_t v_n\|_{L^\infty H^{-1+L^2_{t,x}}}^2 + \|\chi_{I_n} P_N \mathcal{N}(u_n)\|_{(Z^{-1})'}^2 \\ & + N^{2\delta} \|P_{\geq N} u_n\|_{Y^{1-\delta}}^2 + N^{-2\delta} \|P_{\leq N} u_n\|_{Y^{1+\delta}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

thus there exists $N_n \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$(5.18) \quad \|\chi_{I_n} P_{N_n} v_n\|_{Z^1} \gtrsim \|P_{N_n} v_n\|_{Y^1}$$

$$(5.19) \quad + \|\chi_{[-1,1]} P_{N_n} \partial_t v_n\|_{L^\infty H^{-1+L^2_{t,x}}}$$

$$(5.20) \quad + \|\chi_{I_n} P_{N_n} \mathcal{N}(u_n)\|_{(Z^{-1})'}$$

$$(5.21) \quad + N_n^\delta \|P_{\geq N_n} u_n\|_{Y^{1-\delta}} + N_n^{-\delta} \|P_{\leq N_n} u_n\|_{Y^{1+\delta}}.$$

Denote $\alpha_n := \|\chi_{I_n} P_{N_n} v_n\|_{Z^1}$. By (5.18), we have $\|\chi_{I_n} \alpha_n^{-1} P_{N_n} v_n\|_{Z^1} = 1 \gtrsim \|\alpha_n^{-1} P_{N_n} v_n\|_{Y^1}$, thus by Proposition 4.6, there exists a frame $\{\mathcal{O}_n\} = \{(N_n, t_n, x_n)\}$ with $t_n \in I_n$ such that $\{\iota_{\mathcal{O}_n}(\alpha_n^{-1} P_{N_n} v_n)(0)\}$ is weakly nonzero. Passing to a subsequence, assume that

$$(5.22) \quad \iota_{\mathcal{O}_n}(\alpha_n^{-1} P_{N_n} v_n) \rightharpoonup v_*.$$

By (5.19), $\{\iota_{\mathcal{O}_n}(\alpha_n^{-1} P_{N_n} v_n)\}$ is equicontinuous in $H_{\text{loc}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, thus we may assume further that for every $T \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\iota_{\mathcal{O}_n}(\alpha_n^{-1} P_{N_n} v_n)(T) \rightharpoonup v_*(T).$$

In particular, since $\{\iota_{\mathcal{O}_n}(\alpha_n^{-1} P_{N_n} v_n)(0)\}$ is weakly nonzero, we have $v_*(0) \neq 0$.

If $\inf \alpha_n > 0$ and $\{\chi_{I_n}^{\leftarrow}\}$ is weakly nonzero, then

$$P_1(\iota_{\mathcal{O}_n} v_n)(0) = \alpha_n \cdot \iota_{\mathcal{O}_n}(\alpha_n^{-1} P_{N_n} v_n)(0)$$

is also weakly nonzero thus there is nothing to prove. Thus, passing to a subsequence, we assume either $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ or $\chi_{I_n}^{\leftarrow} \rightharpoonup 0$. In the rest of this proof, we show a contradiction. By (5.21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_n &= \|\chi_{I_n} P_{N_n} v_n\|_{Z^1} \gtrsim N_n^\delta \|P_{\geq N_n} u_n\|_{Y^{1-\delta}} + N_n^{-\delta} \|P_{\leq N_n} u_n\|_{Y^{1+\delta}} \\ &\gtrsim N_n^\delta \|P_{\geq N_n} u_n\|_{L^\infty L^{2_{1-\delta}}} + N_n^{-\delta} \|P_{\leq N_n} u_n\|_{L^\infty L^{2_{1+\delta}}} \end{aligned}$$

hence $\alpha_n^{-1} \iota_{\mathcal{O}_n} u_n$ is bounded in $L^\infty(L^{2_{1-\delta}} + L^{2_{1+\delta}})_{\text{loc}} \hookrightarrow L^\infty L_{\text{loc}}^{1+a}$, where we used $2_{1+\delta} > 2_{1-\delta} > \frac{d+2}{d-2} = 1+a$. Thus,

$$\alpha_n^{-1-a} \iota'_{\mathcal{O}_n} (P_{N_n} \mathcal{N}(u_n)) = \alpha_n^{-1-a} P_1 \mathcal{N}(\iota_{\mathcal{O}_n} u_n)$$

is bounded in $L^\infty L_{\text{loc}}^1$, then since we assumed either $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ or $\chi_{I_n}^- \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (i\partial_t + \Delta) \iota_{\mathcal{O}_n} (\alpha_n^{-1} P_{N_n} v_n) &= \iota'_{\mathcal{O}_n} (\alpha_n^{-1} \chi_{I_n} P_{N_n} \mathcal{N}(u_n)) \\ &= \alpha_n^a \chi_{I_n}^- \cdot \alpha_n^{-1-a} \iota'_{\mathcal{O}_n} (P_{N_n} \mathcal{N}(u_n)) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, v_* , which is the weak limit of $\iota_{\mathcal{O}_n} (\alpha_n^{-1} P_{N_n} v_n)$, is a distributional solution to $(i\partial_t + \Delta)v_* = 0$. By (5.18) and the embedding $Y^1 \hookrightarrow L^\infty H^1$, we have $v_* \in L^\infty \dot{H}^1$. Thus, the spatial Fourier transform can be applied to v_* , from which we obtain that v_* is a (Duhamel) free evolution almost everywhere. By Lemma 5.3 and (5.20), we have

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{iT\Delta} \iota_{\mathcal{O}_n} (\alpha_n^{-1} P_{N_n} v_n) (-T) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} e^{iT\Delta} \iota_{\mathcal{O}_n} (\alpha_n^{-1} P_{N_n} v_n) (-T),$$

the left-hand side of which equals to $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} e^{iT\Delta} v_* (-T)$, while the right-hand side of which equals to 0 since $v_n(t) = 0$ holds for $t < 0$. This contradicts that v_* is a free evolution and finishes the proof. \square

5.3. Proof of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3. In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3. Indeed, the proofs are identical; for simplicity, we prove only the defocusing case, Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 5.5. *Let $d \geq 3$ and $E_0 < \infty$. There is no sequence $u_n \in C^0 H^1 \cap Y^1([0, T_{n,\max}))$ of solutions to (NLS(\mathbb{T}^d)) with the defocusing sign and maximal positive lifespans $T_{n,\max} \rightarrow 0$ such that $E(u_n(0)) \leq E_0$ and $\|u_n\|_{Z^1} = \infty$.*

Proposition 5.5 is actually stronger than Theorem 1.2. Once we show Proposition 5.5, Theorem 1.2 will follow as shown below.

Proof of Theorem 1.2 assuming Proposition 5.5. Let $u \in C^0 H^1 \cap Y^1$ be a Duhamel solution to (NLS(\mathbb{T}^d)) with initial data $u(0) = u_0$ and the positive lifespan $[0, T_{\max})$. If $T_{\max} = \infty$, there is nothing to prove. Assume $T_{\max} < \infty$. Let $E_0 := E(u_0)$. By $T_{\max} < \infty$ and Proposition 2.5, we have $\|u\|_{Y^1} = \infty$. By (4.7), we have

$$\|u\|_{Y^1} = \|e^{it\Delta} u_0 + K^+ \mathcal{N}(u)\|_{Y^1} \lesssim \|e^{it\Delta} u_0\|_{H^1} + \|\mathcal{N}(u)\|_{(Z^{-1})'} \lesssim_{E_0} 1 + \|u\|_{Z^1}^{1+a},$$

which implies $\|u\|_{Z^1} = \infty$. Applying Proposition 5.5 to the sequence $u_n(t) := u(t + T_{\max} - 1/n)$, we obtain a contradiction, finishing the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.5. Assume $\{u_n\}$ is such a sequence. Since $\|u_n\|_{Z^1([0, T_{n,\max}))} = \infty$, there exist $0 = T_{n,0} < T_{n,1} < T_{n,2} < \dots < T_{n,\max}$ such that

$$(5.23) \quad \|\chi_{I_{n,j}} \left(u_n - e^{i(t-T_{n,j-1})\Delta} u(T_{n,j-1}) \right)\|_{Z^1} = 1,$$

where we denoted $I_{n,j} = [T_{n,j-1}, T_{n,j})$. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, by (4.7), we have

$$(5.24) \quad \|\chi_{I_{n,j}} u_n\|_{Y^1} \lesssim \|u_n(T_{n,j-1})\|_{H^1} + \|\chi_{I_{n,j}} \mathcal{N}(u_n)\|_{(Z^{-1})'} \lesssim_{E_0} 1 + \|\chi_{I_{n,j}} u_n\|_{Z^1}^{1+a} \lesssim_j 1.$$

For $j, n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $u_{n,j}, u_{n,\leq j} \in C^0 H^1 \cap Y^1$ be the cutoff solutions to (NLS(\mathbb{T}^d)) extending $u|_{[T_{n,j-1}, T_{n,j})}$ and $u|_{[0, T_{n,j})}$, respectively. By (5.24), (5.23), and the

condition $T_{n,\max} \rightarrow 0$, applying Proposition 5.4 to $\{u_{n,j}(\cdot - T_{n,j-1})\}_{n,j \in \mathbb{N}}$ yields the existence of a frame $\{\mathcal{O}_{n,j}\} = \{(N_{n,j}, t_{n,j}, x_{n,j})\}$ such that $t_{n,j} \in I_{n,j}$ and both

$$\left\{ \chi_{\widetilde{I_{n,j}}} \right\}_{n,j \in \mathbb{N}}$$

and

$$(5.25) \quad \left\{ \iota_{\mathcal{O}_{n,j}} \left(u_{n,j} - e^{i(t-T_{n,j-1})\Delta} u_n(T_{n,j-1}) \right) (0) \right\}_{n,j \in \mathbb{N}} = \left\{ \iota_{\mathcal{O}_{n,j}} (u_{n,\leq j} - u_{n,\leq j-1}) (0) \right\}_{n,j \in \mathbb{N}}$$

are weakly nonzero, where $\widetilde{I_{n,j}} = \{N_{n,j}^2(t - t_{n,j}) \mid t \in I_{n,j}\}$ denotes the time interval mapped from $I_{n,j}$ by $\mathcal{O}_{n,j}$. Thus, passing to a subsequence of n , either

$$\left\{ \iota_{\mathcal{O}_{n,j}} u_{n,\leq j}(0) \right\}_{n,j \in \mathbb{N}} \quad \text{or} \quad \left\{ \iota_{\mathcal{O}_{n,j}} u_{n,\leq j-1}(0) \right\}_{n,j \in \mathbb{N}}$$

is weakly nonzero. The proof is identical for either case; we assume the former for simplicity.

Passing to a subsequence of n , by Lemma 3.3, we have the weak convergence for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$: there exists a cutoff solution $(v_{\leq j}, I_{\leq j})$, $v_{\leq j} \in C^0 \dot{H}^1 \cap L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ to (NLS(\mathbb{R}^d)) such that for each $T \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(5.26) \quad (\iota_{\mathcal{O}_{n,j}} u_{n,\leq j})(T) \rightharpoonup v_{\leq j}(T).$$

By Proposition 2.7 on $v_{\leq j} \mid_{I_{\leq j}}$ and the Strichartz estimate on $v_{\leq j} \mid_{\mathbb{R} \setminus I_{\leq j}}$, we have an a priori bound

$$(5.27) \quad \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \|v_{\leq j}\|_{C^0 \dot{H}^1 \cap L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}} \lesssim_{E_0} 1.$$

By (5.27) and Lemma 3.3, there exists a cutoff solution (v_*, I_*) , $v_* \in C^0 \dot{H}^1 \cap L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ to (NLS(\mathbb{R}^d)) that scatters and a subsequence $\{j_k\}$ such that for $T \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$v_{\leq j_k}(T) \rightharpoonup v_*(T)$$

holds. Since $\left\{ \iota_{\mathcal{O}_{n,j}} u_{n,\leq j}(0) \right\}_{n,j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is weakly nonzero, so is $\{v_{\leq j}(0)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, thus $v_*(0) \neq 0$.

We evaluate the following limit in two ways:

$$(5.28) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} e^{iT\Delta} \left(\iota_{\mathcal{O}_{n,j_k}} u_{n,\leq j_k} \right) (-T).$$

Since $\{u_{n,\leq j}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in Y^1 for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{v_{\leq j}\}$ is bounded in $C^0 \dot{H}^1 \cap L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}$, by Lemma 5.3 and Lemma 5.1, (5.28) equals

$$(5.29) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} e^{iT\Delta} v_{\leq j_k}(-T) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} e^{iT\Delta} v_*(-T),$$

which exists and is nonzero since $v_* \neq 0$ scatters.

Since $u_{n,\leq j} = e^{it\Delta} u_n(0)$ holds for $t < 0$ and $\iota_{\mathcal{O}_{n,j_k}} (e^{it\Delta} u_n(0))$ is a free evolution, (5.28) can also be rewritten as

$$(5.30) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} e^{iT\Delta} \iota_{\mathcal{O}_{n,j_k}} (e^{it\Delta} u_{n,\leq j_k}(0)) (-T) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \iota_{\mathcal{O}_{n,j_k}} (e^{it\Delta} u_n(0)) (0).$$

Thus, we have

$$(5.31) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \iota_{\mathcal{O}_{n,j_k}} (e^{it\Delta} u_n(0)) (0) \neq 0.$$

By (5.31) and the weak nonzeroness of $\left\{ \chi_{I_{n,j_k}} \right\}_{n,k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \left\{ \chi_{I_{n,j}} \right\}_{n,j \in \mathbb{N}}$, the family of time-cutoffs of linear evolutions

$$\left\{ \iota_{\mathcal{O}_{n,j_k}} \left(\chi_{I_{n,j_k}} e^{it\Delta} u_n(0) \right) \right\}_{n,k \in \mathbb{N}} = \left\{ \chi_{I_{n,j_k}} \iota_{\mathcal{O}_{n,j_k}} \left(e^{it\Delta} u_n(0) \right) \right\}_{n,k \in \mathbb{N}}$$

is also weakly nonzero. Thus, we have the critical norm bound

$$(5.32) \quad \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \chi_{I_{n,j_k}} e^{it\Delta} u_n(0) \right\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}} > 0,$$

By (5.32) and the Fatou's lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| e^{it\Delta} u_n(0) \right\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}((0,1) \times \mathbb{T}^d)} \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \left\| \chi_{I_{n,j}} e^{it\Delta} u_n(0) \right\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}((0,1) \times \mathbb{T}^d)} \right\|_{\ell_j^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}} \\ &\geq \left\| \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \chi_{I_{n,j_k}} e^{it\Delta} u_n(0) \right\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}((0,1) \times \mathbb{T}^d)} \right\|_{\ell_k^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}} = \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (2.5). Thus, the assumption of this proposition cannot hold, and we finish the proof. \square

APPENDIX A. REDUCTION TO ALMOST PERIODIC SOLUTIONS

So far we have focused only on showing the global well-posedness of NLS on \mathbb{T}^d presuming that on \mathbb{R}^d . However, the argument in Proposition 5.5 can also be used to reduce the GWP problem on \mathbb{R}^d , Proposition 2.7, to the nonexistence of $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ solution that is almost periodic modulo scaling. This is conventionally reduced to showing the following Palais-Smale criterion:

Claim A.1 (Palais-Smale criterion, [15, Proposition 3.1]). Let $d \geq 3$. Assume Proposition 2.7 fails. Let E_{inf} be the infimum of E_0 for which Proposition 2.7 fails. Let $\{u_n\}$ be a sequence of solutions $u_n \in C^0 \dot{H}^1 \cap L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}((T_n^-, T_n^+) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, $T_n^- < 0 < T_n^+$ to (NLS(\mathbb{R}^d)) such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(u_n) = E_{\text{inf}}$$

and

$$(A.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| u_n \right\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}((0, T_n^+) \times \mathbb{R}^d)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| u_n \right\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}((T_n^-, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^d)} = \infty.$$

Then, there exist sequences $\{N_n\} \subset 2^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $\{x_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\left\{ N_n^{1-\frac{d}{2}} u_n(0, N_n^{-1} \cdot + x_n) \right\}$ converges in $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ along a subsequence.

The original proof of Claim A.1 in [15, Proposition 3.1] used a linear profile decomposition and stability theory.⁴ In particular, a nontrivial Hölder continuity of the flow map [20] was employed.

We provide an alternative proof of Claim A.1, which mainly follows the argument of Proposition 5.5. For the proof, we note that all the analysis we did on \mathbb{T}^d work the same on \mathbb{R}^d . On \mathbb{R}^d , there is no short-time restriction (since we no longer have resonance), frequency sizes are $N_n \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}$, and $\iota_{\mathcal{O}_{n,j}}$ is simply a scaling operator.

⁴In [15, Proposition 3.1], the kinetic energy (i.e., $\|\nabla u_n\|_{C^0 L^2}^2$) replaced the role of the energy in Claim A.1. Either choice leads to the reduction of GWP to the almost periodic case by the same convergence argument.

Although we show only the defocusing case, note that the same works for the focusing case due to the lower semicontinuity of the energy functional E , based on a Fatou property below the threshold energy.

Proof. Let $\{\mathcal{O}_{n,j}\} = \{(N_{n,j}, t_{n,j}, x_{n,j})\}$ (defined for $n \gg_j 1$) and $v_{\leq j}$ be as in the proof of Proposition 5.5. Since (5.27) is the only place where Proposition 2.7 is used, we have $\limsup_j E(v_{\leq j}) \geq E_{\text{inf}}$. Thus, for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $E(v_{\leq j}) \geq E_{\text{inf}} - \epsilon$. Assume $\epsilon \ll 1$. Up to scaling, we may assume $N_{n,j} = 1$ and $x_{n,j} = 0$. (5.26) can be rewritten as $u_{n,\leq j}(t_{n,j} + T) \rightharpoonup v_{\leq j}(T)$ for $T \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, we have

$$(A.2) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_{n,\leq j}(t_{n,j} + T) - v_{\leq j}(T)\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 \lesssim E_{\text{inf}} - E(v_{\leq j}) \lesssim \epsilon.$$

If $t_{n,j} \rightarrow \infty$ and $v_{\leq j}$ scatters backward in time, there exists $T > -\infty$ such that $\|e^{it\Delta} v_{\leq j}(T)\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}((-\infty, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^d)} \ll 1$, then by (A.2) and standard small-data theory, u_n scatters backward in time with $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}((-\infty, t_{n,j} + T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)} \ll 1$, contradicting (A.1).

If $t_{n,j} \rightarrow \infty$ and $v_{\leq j}$ does not scatter backward in time, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_{n,\leq j}\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)} \geq \|v_{\leq j}\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}((-\infty, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^d)} = \infty,$$

contradicting the norm bound (5.24) and the embedding $Y^1 \hookrightarrow L_{t,x}^{\frac{2d+4}{d-2}}$.

Thus, passing to a subsequence, we may assume $t_{n,j} \rightarrow T_* < \infty$. By (5.26), we have $u_{n,\leq j}(t_{n,j} - T_*) \rightharpoonup v_{\leq j}(-T_*)$. Since $\partial_t u_{n,\leq j}$ is a time-cutoff of $\partial_t u_n$, which is bounded in $L^\infty H_{\text{loc}}^{-1}$, $\{u_{n,\leq j}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is equicontinuous in $H_{\text{loc}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and thus $u_n(0) = u_{n,\leq j}(0) \rightharpoonup v_{\leq j}(-T_*)$ also holds true.

Now removing our simplification $N_{n,j} = 1$ and $x_{n,j} = 0$ above, what we obtained is that $\left\{ N_{n,j}^{1-\frac{d}{2}} u_n(0, N_{n,j}^{-1} \cdot + x_{n,j}) \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, which is a sequence of $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -critical rescales of $\{u_n(0)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, converges weakly to $v_{\leq j}(-T_*)$, which has the energy $E(v_{\leq j}(-T_*)) \geq E_{\text{inf}} - \epsilon$. Taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ finishes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bourgain. Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations. I. Schrödinger equations. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 3(2):107–156, 1993.
- [2] J. Bourgain. Global wellposedness of defocusing critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in the radial case. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 12(1):145–171, 1999.
- [3] Jean Bourgain and Ciprian Demeter. The proof of the l^2 decoupling conjecture. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 182(1):351–389, 2015.
- [4] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao. Global well-posedness and scattering for the energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in \mathbb{R}^3 . *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 167(3):767–865, 2008.
- [5] Benjamin Dodson. Global well-posedness and scattering for the focusing, cubic Schrödinger equation in dimension $d = 4$. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 52(1):139–180, 2019.
- [6] Manoussos G. Grillakis. On nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 25(9-10):1827–1844, 2000.
- [7] Martin Hadac, Sebastian Herr, and Herbert Koch. Well-posedness and scattering for the KP-II equation in a critical space. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 26(3):917–941, 2009.

- [8] Martin Hadac, Sebastian Herr, and Herbert Koch. Erratum to “Well-posedness and scattering for the KP-II equation in a critical space” [Ann. I. H. Poincaré—AN 26 (3) (2009) 917–941] [mr2526409]. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 27(3):971–972, 2010.
- [9] Sebastian Herr, Daniel Tataru, and Nikolay Tzvetkov. Global well-posedness of the energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation with small initial data in $H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)$. *Duke Math. J.*, 159(2):329–349, 2011.
- [10] Alexandru D. Ionescu and Benoit Pausader. The energy-critical defocusing NLS on \mathbb{T}^3 . *Duke Math. J.*, 161(8):1581–1612, 2012.
- [11] Alexandru D. Ionescu and Benoit Pausader. Global well-posedness of the energy-critical defocusing NLS on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^3$. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 312(3):781–831, 2012.
- [12] Alexandru D. Ionescu, Benoit Pausader, and Gigliola Staffilani. On the global well-posedness of energy-critical Schrödinger equations in curved spaces. *Anal. PDE*, 5(4):705–746, 2012.
- [13] Carlos E. Kenig and Frank 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.
- [14] Rowan Killip and Monica Vişan. Scale invariant Strichartz estimates on tori and applications. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 23(2):445–472, 2016.
- [15] Rowan Killip and Monica Visan. The focusing energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in dimensions five and higher. *Amer. J. Math.*, 132(2):361–424, 2010.
- [16] Herbert Koch, Daniel Tataru, and Monica Vişan. *Dispersive equations and nonlinear waves*, volume 45 of *Oberwolfach Seminars*. Birkhäuser/Springer, Basel, 2014. Generalized Korteweg-de Vries, nonlinear Schrödinger, wave and Schrödinger maps.
- [17] Beomjong Kwak and Soonsik Kwon. Critical local well-posedness of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on torus \mathbb{T}^d . *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 2024.
- [18] Gyu Eun Lee. Local wellposedness for the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation on \mathbb{T}^3 . *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 39(5):2763–2783, 2019.
- [19] E. Ryckman and M. Visan. Global well-posedness and scattering for the defocusing energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in \mathbb{R}^{1+4} . *Amer. J. Math.*, 129(1):1–60, 2007.
- [20] Terence Tao and Monica Visan. Stability of energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equations in high dimensions. *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, pages No. 118, 28, 2005.
- [21] Monica Visan. The defocusing energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in higher dimensions. *Duke Math. J.*, 138(2):281–374, 2007.
- [22] Haitian Yue. Global well-posedness for the energy-critical focusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation on \mathbb{T}^4 . *J. Differential Equations*, 280:754–804, 2021.

Email address: beomjong@kaist.ac.kr

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, KOREA ADVANCED INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, 291 DAEHAK-RO, YUSEONG-GU, DAEJEON 34141, KOREA