

Solutions of differential equations in Freud-weighted Sobolev spaces

Maxime Breden* Hugo Chu†

January 24, 2025

Abstract

We lay some mathematically rigorous foundations for the resolution of differential equations with respect to semi-classical bases and topologies, namely Freud–Sobolev polynomials and spaces. In this quest, we uncover an elegant theory melding various topics in Numerical and Functional Analysis: Poincaré inequalities, Sobolev orthogonal polynomials, Painlevé equations and more. Brought together, these ingredients allow us to quantify the compactness of Sobolev embeddings on Freud-weighted spaces and finally resolve some differential equations in this topology. As an application, we rigorously and tightly enclose solutions of the Gross–Pitaevskii equation with sextic potential.

Keywords

Sobolev orthogonal polynomials · Weighted Sobolev spaces · Painlevé equations · Freud weight
Compactness estimates · Freud’s conjecture · Computer-assisted proofs

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020)

35B45 · 42C05 · 46B50 · 46E20 · 46E35 · 47B36 · 41A81 · 35J61 · 65G20 · 65Q30 · 65N15

1 Introduction

Given a potential $V \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R})$, it is well-known that if the probability measure $\nu(dx) := e^{-V} dx/Z$ has finite moments of all orders, then one may construct a Hilbert basis of orthonormal polynomials $\mathcal{P} = \{p_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ on $(L^2(\nu), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$, that is

$$\langle p_n, p_m \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_n p_m d\nu = \delta_{mn}, \quad Z := \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-V(x)} dx.$$

Orthogonal polynomials [1, 35, 45, 67, 71] have been a topic of interest since the birth of Numerical Analysis and much is known about their construction, asymptotic behaviour, relation with special functions and random matrices, zeroes etc. However, disappointingly, almost all the resolutions of differential equations with orthogonal polynomials are achieved using the classical families (Fourier, Hermite, Jacobi and Laguerre) [38]. One of the reasons is that these classical families have the property that the derivative of a classical orthogonal polynomial is a polynomial in the same family. Therefore, these bases allow for simple representations of the differentiation operator ∂_x (typically diagonal, maybe up to a shift), which makes them very convenient for the study of differential equations.

However, some (non-quantitative) results in Functional Analysis [5, 6] (most notably in Probability Theory) show that the Sobolev embedding $H^1(\nu) \hookrightarrow L^2(\nu)$ is often compact, even beyond the classical weights. In principle, this allows for the approximation of compact operators on these spaces with finite-dimensional matrices on the computer, in order to solve equations of the type

$$\mathcal{L}u = f(u), \quad \mathcal{L} := V'(x)\partial_x - \partial_{xx}, \tag{1}$$

*CMAP, CNRS, École polytechnique, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, 91120 Palaiseau, France. maxime.breden@polytechnique.edu

†Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom. hugo.chu17@imperial.ac.uk

which are naturally posed in $H^1(\nu)$, where \mathcal{L} is a well-studied operator in Probability Theory. Note that this type of equations are equivalent to (possibly nonlinear) Fokker–Planck equations and Schrödinger type equations [69, §4.9]. Ideally, for both theoretical and practical purposes, we would like to have \mathcal{L} diagonal with respect to the associated orthogonal polynomial basis $\{p_n\}$. Unfortunately, it is established [6, 7, 8, 64] that this only occurs if the p_n 's belong to a classical family, suggesting that working with respect to non-classical weights is much more intricate.

Taking inspiration from this functional analytic theory, in this work, we overcome the apparent hurdles of working with non-classical orthogonal polynomials, and show that it is in fact possible to effectively solve some differential equations with respect to non-classical weights [61], numerically but also rigorously.

1.1 A natural Sobolev Hilbert structure

A first problem arising in the numerical treatment of differential equations on weighted Sobolev spaces is that it is not so immediate that there exists a natural complete inner product, i.e. a natural Hilbert structure on such spaces. For instance, on bounded domains with appropriate boundary conditions (say Dirichlet), the simple norm induced by $\langle \nabla \cdot, \nabla \cdot \rangle$ defines a natural Hilbert structure. This simplifies the tackling of problems with Finite Elements, Chebyshev or Fourier bases. However, on weighted Sobolev spaces on unbounded domains, this inner product does not define a complete topology, essentially because there does not hold a classical Poincaré inequality, i.e. there does not exist $C_P > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 d\nu \leq C_P \int_{\mathbb{R}} (u')^2 d\nu \quad \text{for all } u \in H^1(\nu).$$

However, a fundamental tool in the analysis of weighted Sobolev spaces [15] is that there often holds a modified Poincaré inequality on $H^1(\nu)$: there exists $C_P > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 d\nu - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u d\nu \right)^2 \leq C_P \int_{\mathbb{R}} (u')^2 d\nu \quad \text{for all } u \in H^1(\nu). \quad (2)$$

From now on, we will simply refer to (2) as the Poincaré inequality on $H^1(\nu)$. It allows us to immediately give a natural inner product on $H^1(\nu)$

$$(u, v) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} u'v' d\nu + \int_{\mathbb{R}} u d\nu \int_{\mathbb{R}} v d\nu, \quad (3)$$

whose induced norm (henceforth denoted $\|\cdot\|_{H^1(\nu)}$) can be shown to be Lipschitz equivalent to the standard norm on $H^1(\nu)$; demonstrating that $(H^1(\nu), (\cdot, \cdot))$ is indeed a Hilbert space.

While this new inner product may appear “unusual” at first sight, it is actually very natural; for instance, it reduces to the inner product $\langle \partial_x \cdot, \partial_x \cdot \rangle$ on the subspace of ν -mean zero functions of $H^1(\nu)$. Furthermore, it allows us to propose a natural solution to the problem of the construction of orthogonal polynomials $\mathcal{Q} = \{q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ on a non-classical Sobolev space $H^1(\nu)$.

Proposition 1. For all $n \geq 1$, the polynomials $\mathcal{Q} = \{q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ orthonormal with respect to (\cdot, \cdot) are uniquely defined by the properties

$$q'_n = p_{n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} q_n d\nu = 0.$$

Proof. It suffices to check that these are orthonormal with respect to (\cdot, \cdot) , the uniqueness (up to sign) follows from the Gram–Schmidt algorithm. \square

Note that the q_n 's do not *stricto sensu* fall under the usual construction of orthogonal polynomials on a Sobolev space [4, 59, 60, 62, 73] which should be induced by an inner product of the type

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} uv d\nu_0 + \int_{\mathbb{R}} u'v' d\nu_1 \quad \text{for some Borel measures } \nu_0, \nu_1. \quad (4)$$

However, from now on, we will refer to the basis $\mathcal{Q} = \{q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ associated to the scalar product (3) as *Sobolev orthogonal polynomials*. There is a vast literature on polynomials orthogonal with respect to an inner product of the form (4) (See [59, 60, 62, 73] and references therein). Particularly when considering non-classical weights, the construction from (4) encounters several difficulties:

- A serious issue is that many of the particular cases of (4) studied in the literature (e.g. taking ν_1 to be some discrete measure) do not necessarily induce a meaningful Sobolev topology.
- Barring some special cases, the construction of such orthogonal basis is typically very involved [60, 73].
- They are often not practical in the Numerical Analysis of differential equations, which should be their main purpose (See [60, §12] for a discussion).

In some sense, our approach is more topological and directly inspired from the Functional Analysis of weighted Sobolev spaces. Proposition 1 shows that the q_n 's can be indeed simply obtained by integrating the p_n 's which is a natural (maybe naive) first approach when considering this problem. For instance, in the semi-classical setting [61] of V being a even polynomial, we will see that the q_n 's can be inexpensively evaluated from the p_n 's via the resolution of a banded triangular linear system.

More than that, we will show that they are quite useful in the Numerical Analysis of differential equations on weighted Sobolev spaces.

Example 2. Consider the case of the Gaussian measure, i.e. $V(x) = x^2/2$ such that $\nu(dx) = e^{-x^2/2}dx/\sqrt{2\pi}$. Then ∂_x acts very simply on the basis $\{p_n\}$, namely $p'_n = \sqrt{n}p_{n-1}$ for all $n \geq 1$ and therefore $q_n = p_n/\sqrt{n}$ for $n \geq 1$: in that case, the Sobolev orthonormal polynomials are simply renormalized classical orthogonal polynomials. However, we emphasize that, in general, q_n need not be proportional to p_n , and indeed this will not be the case in the main example considered in this work, as we have to work with non-classical weights.

1.2 A Numerical-Functional Analysis of Freud-weighted Sobolev spaces

While our approach may agree on classical settings, as previously mentioned, we are mainly interested in problems outside of these families. A natural example to consider is the case of *Freud-weighted* spaces associated with a quartic (or double-well) potential

$$V(x) = \frac{x^4}{4} - \kappa \frac{x^2}{2}, \quad \kappa \in \mathbb{R},$$

as the first step departing from the classical paradigm. We will show that this already leads to a rich theory bringing together several ideas in Numerical and Functional Analysis.




Figure 1: Plots of orthonormal polynomials with respect to $\nu(dx) = e^{-V(x)}dx/Z$ with $V(x) = x^4/4 - \kappa x^2/2$ with $\kappa = 4$.

In this context, the operator $\mathcal{L} = -\partial_{xx} + V'\partial_x$ of Eq. (1) becomes

$$\mathcal{L} = (x^3 - \kappa x)\partial_x - \partial_{xx}.$$

Note that this operator or very closely related operators are of importance as they appear in the probabilistic treatment of several models of *noise-induced phenomena* in Random Dynamics such as:

- the stochastic resonance phenomenon for the noisy Duffing oscillator [29, 40, 69] (or Benzi–Parisi–Sutera–Vulpiani model [10] which we will treat in an upcoming version of this work),
- the Hopf bifurcation with additive noise [9, 19, 37, 28],
- the Desai–Zwanti model [36],
- the (non)-destruction of the pitchfork bifurcation by additive noise [26, 34]. See also [12] for a recent example where our methods could be applied.

Our approach relies on exploiting the structure of the bidiagonal differentiation operator with respect to the bases $\{p_n\}$ and $\{q_n\}$ to give a thorough and precise Numerical and Functional Analysis of the Sobolev space $H^1(\nu)$. Our techniques are to be put in perspective with the related work [20].

For instance, our method allows us to compute the optimal Poincaré inequality constant C_P on $H^1(\nu)$ [15]. Note that, in general, even giving a non-sharp upper bound on C_P is not trivial [6, 13, 15, 17, 51, 75] especially when V is not convex (which can be the case here depending on the value of κ). In contrast, in this particular case, we can give a very tight enclosure for C_P .

Theorem 3. Consider $V(x) = x^4/4 - \kappa x^2/2$ with $\kappa = 4$, the best Poincaré inequality constant C_P in (2) is given by

$$C_P = 33.58004242 \pm 2.3 \times 10^{-7}. \quad (5)$$

In fact, we can do much better by rigorously proving and quantifying the compactness of the embedding $H^1(\nu) \hookrightarrow L^2(\nu)$, a rare occurrence in Numerical Analysis.

Theorem 4. Consider $V(x) = x^4/4 - \kappa x^2/2$, then there exists $C > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m \geq N$ and $u \in \overline{\text{Span}\{q_j\}_{j>m}}^{H^1(\nu)}$

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\nu)} \leq \frac{C}{m^{3/4}} \|u\|_{H^1(\nu)}. \quad (6)$$

In particular, if $\kappa = 4$, the above holds for $C = 1.2233$ and $N = 2, 187$.

It is well-established [2, 22, 27, 31, 43, 65] that such kind of estimates are useful in the numerical resolution of partial differential equations (PDEs), as they constitute a key ingredient to show the convergence of spectral methods. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first derivation of such compactness estimate in a non-classical setting. Indeed, while in classical polynomial settings, these estimates can be obtained trivially from a diagonal differentiation operator (e.g. see Example 14) or a well-structured integration operator (e.g. in Chebyshev [54]), much work is needed to obtain Theorem 4.

Remark 5. Note that this embedding is “more compact” than the known Hermite/Gaussian embedding $H^1(e^{-x^2/2}/\sqrt{2\pi}) \hookrightarrow L^2(e^{-x^2/2}/\sqrt{2\pi})$ which only decays like $1/\sqrt{n}$ (See Example 14). This agrees with our expectation that the compactness of the embedding $H^1(\nu) \hookrightarrow L^2(\nu)$ should get better as the potential V is more confining (i.e. as V grows faster, see also Conjecture 11).

Brought together, these insights allow for the resolution of new differential equations in a natural and mathematically rigorous framework, using the topology of Freud-weighted spaces and using Sobolev orthogonal polynomials. To showcase that our approach does indeed provide an excellent numerical framework beyond numerical experiments, we incorporate our estimates into computer-assisted proofs (CAPs) to provide some *rigorous* bounds on our numerical approximations, proving the *existence* of a nearby solution.

We first consider the Gross–Pitaevskii equation with sextic potential

$$i\partial_t v = -\partial_{xx} v + W(x)v + |v|^2 v, \quad (7)$$

where $W(x) = x^6/4 - \kappa x^4/2 + cx^2 + d$. We look for standing wave solutions $v(t, x) = e^{i\omega t} \varphi(x)$ of Eq. (7) where φ satisfies the elliptic semilinear equation

$$-\partial_{xx} \varphi + W(x)\varphi + \varphi^3 = \omega \varphi \quad (8)$$

which can be reformulated as an equation of the form 1. Within our framework which makes use of Sobolev orthogonal polynomials and estimates such as (6), we not only obtain accurate approximate solutions to this

equation plotted in Figure 2, but also prove the existence of *true* solutions of Eq. (8) nearby. The very small error bounds obtained below showcase that using Sobolev orthogonal polynomials to numerically solve such equations leads to very efficient numerical methods.

Theorem 6. Let $c = 5/2$, $d = 2$, $\kappa = 4$, $\omega = 8$ and $\bar{\varphi} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function whose restriction to the interval $[-5, 5]$ is depicted in Figure 2(a), and whose precise description is available at [30] in the file GP_eq/ubar1. There exists an even *strictly positive* solution $\varphi_1^* \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ to Eq. (8) such that

$$\|\varphi_1^* - \bar{\varphi}_1\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq 3.6711 \times 10^{-101},$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$ is the standard H^1 -norm on \mathbb{R} equipped with the Lebesgue measure dx , i.e. $\|\varphi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} = (\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\varphi')^2 dx)^{1/2}$.

Theorem 7. Let $c = 5/2$, $d = 2$, $\kappa = 4$, $\omega = 8$ and $\bar{\varphi} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function whose restriction to the interval $[-5, 5]$ is depicted in Figure 2(b), and whose precise description is available at [30] in the file GP_eq/ubar2. There exists an even solution $\varphi_2^* \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ to Eq. (8) such that

$$\|\varphi_2^* - \bar{\varphi}_2\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq 8.1614 \times 10^{-141}.$$




Figure 2: Plots of the numerical approximations $\bar{\varphi}_1$ and $\bar{\varphi}_2$ in Theorems 6 and 7.

Computer-assisted proofs have become more and more common in the study of differential equations, and we refer to the expository article [74], the surveys [46, 52] the books [66, 72] and the references therein for an overview of the field. A the notable feature of the computer-assisted proofs performed in this work is that they deal with problems on unbounded domains, for which fewer techniques are available (See [66, Part II], and the more recent [16, 25, 18]). Our proofs belong to the family of CAPs based on spectral methods, but with the unusual twist that we work between two different bases $\{p_n\}$ and $\{q_n\}$. Moreover, the dominant operator \mathcal{L} is not going to be diagonal but merely bidiagonal or tridiagonal in these bases, which means we have to resort to some of the tools developed in [20] in order to control its inverse. Furthermore, contrary to usual computer-assisted proofs, the formulae for the representations of our differential operators are not known explicitly in closed form and their coefficients are actually challenging to control.

1.3 A differential counterpart to Freud's conjecture

We recall that any family of orthogonal polynomials associated to a positive weight function satisfies a three-term recurrence relation. When the weight function is even, this recurrence relation simplifies to

$$xp_n = a_{n+1}p_{n+1} + a_n p_{n-1}, \quad n \geq 1, \quad (9)$$

where the coefficients a_n are positive and $a_0 = 0$. To any even potential V , we can therefore associate a unique (positive) sequence $(a_n)_{n \geq 0}$ satisfying (9), with $a_0 = 0$. Under the hood, the proofs of Theorems 3

and 4 (and ultimately Theorems 6 and 7) rely crucially on quantifying *explicitly* the asymptotic growth of the positive sequence $(a_n)_{n \geq 0}$ satisfying (9). This can be accomplished by first deriving a recurrence relation satisfied by the coefficients a_n themselves. For instance, in the case, where V is polynomial, we have the following.

Lemma 8. There exists a *computable* set of homogeneous polynomials $\{R_j : \mathbb{R}^{2j-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ having positive integer coefficients and with $\deg R_j = j - 1$ such that, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and every even polynomial potential $V(x) = \sum_{j=1}^k c_j \frac{x^{2j}}{2^j}$, the positive sequence $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = (a_n^2)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the recurrence relation

$$\frac{n}{b_n} = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} c_j R_j(b_{n-j}, \dots, b_n, \dots, b_{n+j}), \quad (10)$$

where $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the sequence associated to V via (23).

Proof. See Remark 32. □

In our case of the quartic potential $V(x) = x^4/4 - \kappa x^2/2$, we have that $R_0 = 1$ and $R_1(x_{-1}, x_0, x_1) = x_{-1} + x_0 + x_1$ such that $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = (a_n^2)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the (unique) positive solution to the recurrence relation

$$\frac{n}{b_n} = b_{n-1} + b_n + b_{n+1} - \kappa, \quad n \geq 1, \quad (11)$$

which is known as the *discrete Painlevé I equation* (See also [14]). From (11), one expects that $b_n \sim \sqrt{n}/\sqrt{3}$. However, (11) has high sensitivity on initial conditions and we furthermore require a tight quantitative control on the b_n 's. We achieve this control via computer assistance which gives a substantial improvement on previous non-constructive approaches [3, 32, 42, 47, 55, 68] which could not in general produce rigorous estimates such as the one below. Our work establishes an important connection between the said Freud's conjecture and the compact embedding of weighted Sobolev spaces previously established (in a non-quantitative manner) by probability theorists [5, 6].

Proposition 9. Let $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the unique positive solution to the recurrence relation (11). For all $c^- < 1$ and $c^+ > 1$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N$

$$c^- \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{3}} \leq b_n \leq c^+ \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{3}}. \quad (12)$$

In particular, if $\kappa = 4$, $c^- = 0.987$ and $c^+ = 1.025$, the above holds for $N = 2, 187$.

More generally, the asymptotic behaviour in $n^{1/k}$ is expected for the positive solution of the recurrence relation (10), a case of a statement known as the celebrated Freud's conjecture [42] of which we give a version below.

Conjecture 10. Let $V(x) = x^{2k}/(2k) + O(x^{2k})$ be an even polynomial potential of degree $2k$, then we have the following growth for the positive sequence $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = (a_n^2)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by (9)

$$b_n \sim n^{1/k} \binom{2k-1}{k}^{-1/k}. \quad (13)$$

For instance, this conjecture is proved in the case $V(x) = x^{2k}$ [56]. This allows us in turn to speculate the following on the compactness of the embedding $H^1(\nu) \hookrightarrow L^2(\nu)$.

Conjecture 11. Let $V(x) = x^{2k}/(2k) + O(x^{2k})$ be an even polynomial potential of degree $2k$ and denote by $\{q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ the Sobolev orthogonal polynomials with respect to $d\nu = e^{-V} dx/Z$. Then there exists $C > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m \geq N$ and $u \in \overline{\text{Span}\{q_j\}_{j>m}}^{H^1(\nu)}$

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\nu)} \leq \frac{C}{m^{\frac{2k-1}{2k}}} \|u\|_{H^1(\nu)}. \quad (14)$$

Heuristics. On $H^1(\nu)$, taking a derivative is essentially equivalent to multiplying by V' in the sense that they induce the same loss of regularity (they both send $H^1(\nu)$ to $L^2(\nu)$). This will be discussed further and more precisely in the subsequent sections, see in particular Remark 30. Since V' is of degree $(2k - 1)$ and equivalent to x^{2k-1} at infinity, multiplying by V' essentially amounts to multiplying by x $(2k - 1)$ times, i.e. applying $(2k - 1)$ times the recurrence relation (9). Therefore, using (13) and ignoring multiplicative constants, we expect to have

$$\|p_n\|_{H^1(\nu)} = \|p'_n\|_{L^2(\nu)} \gtrsim \|V'p_n\|_{L^2(\nu)} \gtrsim \|x^{2k-1}p_n\|_{L^2(\nu)} \gtrsim \|a_n^{2k-1}p_n\|_{L^2(\nu)} \gtrsim n^{\frac{2k-1}{2k}} \|p_n\|_{L^2(\nu)}$$

This yields the proposed compactness estimate (14). \square

Remark 12. Note that (14) is known to hold for $k = 1$ (See example 14), and that we prove the case $k = 2$ with Theorem 4. On the other hand, as $k \rightarrow \infty$ then $\exp(-x^{2k}/(2k)) \rightarrow \mathbb{1}_{[-1,1]}$, such that the asymptotic of (14) as $k \rightarrow \infty$ agrees with the compactness on the embedding $H^1([-1,1]) \hookrightarrow L^2([-1,1])$ which decays like $1/m$.

Organisation of the paper

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we first recall some results about weighted Sobolev spaces and Poincaré inequalities, and then discuss our construction of Sobolev orthogonal polynomials and the structure of operators with respect to orthogonal polynomial bases. Building on these insights, we focus in Section 3 on the case of the quartic potential $V(x) = x^4/4 - \kappa x^2/2$, and prove embedding estimates for $H^1(\nu) \hookrightarrow L^2(\nu)$, i.e. Theorems 3 and 4, as well as Proposition 9 on which they rely crucially. In Section 4, we apply these estimates to solve the Gross–Pitaevskii equation with sextic potential and prove Theorems 6 and 7.

2 Weighted Sobolev spaces

2.1 The Functional Analytic point-of-view

The present work is motivated by the study of the overdamped Langevin (or Smoluchowski) dynamics

$$dX_t = -V'(X_t)dt + \sqrt{2}dW_t, \quad (15)$$

for a potential $V \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R})$ which induce a reversible diffusion process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with stationary probability measure

$$\nu(dx) = \frac{e^{-V(x)}}{Z} dx \quad Z = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-V} dx,$$

where V and ν will always be of this form unless stated otherwise. The Markov semi-group $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ of $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is generated by $-\mathcal{L}$, where

$$\mathcal{L} = V'(x)\partial_x - \partial_{xx}$$

is a positive self-adjoint operator with respect to the L^2 -inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Indeed, by parts, one has that

$$\langle u, \mathcal{L}v \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u(\mathcal{L}v) d\nu = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u'v' d\nu = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\mathcal{L}u)v d\nu = \langle \mathcal{L}u, v \rangle, \quad \text{for all } u, v \in H^1(\nu), \quad (16)$$

which can thus also be written as a Dirichlet form. An accessible introduction to this theory can be found in [69, §4] (See also [15] for a nice introduction to Poincaré inequalities) but we emphasize that various aspects of this theory can be generalised [5, 6], to higher dimensions and to various geometries.

Much of this theory relies on the following Poincaré inequality on $H^1(\nu)$, i.e. on the existence of a constant $C_P > 0$ such that for all $u \in H^1(\nu)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 d\nu - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u d\nu \right)^2 \leq C_P \int_{\mathbb{R}} (u')^2 d\nu. \quad (17)$$

For instance [69, Theorem 4.4], such Poincaré inequality immediately implies the exponential ergodicity of the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ evolving under (15). A criterion for the Poincaré inequality (17) to hold and which will be sufficient for our purposes is given by the following proposition. See [15] for various functional analytic aspects related to this Poincaré inequality.

Proposition 13. Suppose that the potential V is such that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{(V'(x))^2}{2} - V''(x) = +\infty,$$

then there holds a Poincaré inequality of the form (17) on $H^1(\nu) = H^1(e^{-V}/Z)$.

Proof. See [76, Theorem A.1]. □

This criterion essentially amounts to V having to grow faster than linearly at infinity. Note that a more sophisticated way to verify the Poincaré inequality is via the Muckenhoupt criterion [6, Theorem 4.5.1] which is actually an equivalent statement and gives (large) bounds on the optimal Poincaré constant C_P (See also [76, §A.19]).

Example 14. Consider the case of the Gaussian measure, i.e. $V(x) = x^2/2$ such that $\nu(dx) = e^{-x^2/2}dx/\sqrt{\pi}$. Then, we have the following Poincaré inequality, for all $u \in H^1(\nu)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 d\nu - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u d\nu \right)^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} (u')^2 d\nu.$$

This is easily shown by decomposing u in terms of the orthonormal Hermite polynomials $\mathcal{P} = \{p_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ [1, §22]. One can actually improve this further and obtain the compactness estimates

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\nu)} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|u\|_{H^1(\nu)},$$

for all $u \in \overline{\text{Span}\{p_m\}_{m \geq n}}^{H^1(\nu)}$.

The Hermite case is actually one of the few settings for which such constructive compactness estimates have so far been able to be proved. This stems from the diagonal nature of the operator ∂_x when represented with respect to \mathcal{P} (See [7, 8, 64]). This is a shame, as from the probability theoretic point of view, the Hermite case (associated to the so-called Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process) is a limiting in the classification of diffusion semi-groups generated by $-\mathcal{L}$ and associated to ν (See [6, §7.7] for a discussion, see also [5, 53]).

However, the embedding $H^1(\nu) \hookrightarrow L^2(\nu)$ is known to be compact (without quantitative estimates) in a much broader setting.

Theorem 15. Let $V(x) = x^{2k}/(2k) + O(x^{2k})$ be a polynomial potential such that $k \geq 1$, then $H^1(\nu) = H^1(e^{-V}/Z)$ is compactly embedded in $L^2(\nu)$.

Proof. The case $k = 1$ follows from Example 14. The case $k > 1$, it suffices to check that V satisfies the assumptions of [53, Theorem 1.4] which implies the embedding $H^1(\nu) \hookrightarrow L^2(\nu)$ by [6, Theorem 6.4.2]. This last theorem (which is non constructive) relies on the fact that if $k > 1$, the semi-group $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is “ultracontractive” (the property that T_t sends a function $u \in L^1(\nu)$ to $T_t u \in L^\infty$ for all $t > 0$ and in particular is associated to a L^∞ -kernel representation for $t > 0$). □

As stated in Conjecture 11, we expect that if $V(x) \sim |x|^p$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ for $p \in (1, \infty)$, then the embeddings should get quantitatively better as p increases. We note that in the limiting case $p = 1$, while the Poincaré inequality (17) holds, the embedding $H^1(\nu) \hookrightarrow L^2(\nu)$ does not (See [6, §4.4.1]).

Finally, we emphasize that, once the Poincaré inequality (17) is available, all the Functional Analysis on $H^1(\nu)$ is reduced to textbook analysis of elliptic PDEs on Hilbert spaces. For instance, concerning the well-posedness of

$$\mathcal{L}u = g, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} g d\nu = 0,$$

we have the following weak formulation.

Proposition 16. Suppose there is a Poincaré inequality of the form (17) on $H^1(\nu)$. Let $H^{-1}(\nu)$ be the dual of

$$H_0^1(\nu) := \left\{ u \in H^1(\nu) \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}} u d\nu = 0 \right\}.$$

Then for all $g \in H^{-1}(\nu)$, there exists a unique $u \in H_0^1(\nu)$ such that for all $v \in H_0^1(\nu)$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u'v' d\nu = \int_{\mathbb{R}} gv d\nu.$$

We denote $u = \mathcal{L}^{-1}g$. Furthermore, $\mathcal{L}^{-1} : H^{-1}(\nu) \rightarrow H_0^1(\nu)$ is a bounded linear operator.

Proof. Using the Poincaré inequality (17), this follows immediately from the Lax–Milgram Theorem [23, Corollary V.8]. \square

Similarly, \mathcal{L} has positive unbounded discrete spectrum, etc.

2.2 Sobolev orthogonal polynomials

A problem naturally arising in Numerical Analysis is the construction of *Sobolev orthonormal polynomials* on the Sobolev space $H^1(\nu)$ and their use in the resolution of partial differential equations [60]. A first approach could consist in using the standard inner product on $H^1(\nu)$:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u'v' d\nu + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}} uv d\nu \quad u, v \in H^1(\nu), \lambda > 0,$$

which is a specific instance of (4). However, orthogonal polynomials generated with such inner product have not been very successful in the Numerical Analysis of PDEs. In particular, these polynomials have not achieved the quantification of compactness between weighted Sobolev spaces, in non-classical settings. Furthermore, even the construction of such basis is not necessarily simple; showing that in some sense the above inner product is not the “correct” choice. In particular, it is unclear what value of λ should be chosen, as each one gives rise to a different basis of orthonormal polynomials (even up to rescaling).

To construct a natural basis of Sobolev orthonormal polynomials, we propose to instead use the Poincaré inequality on $H^1(\nu)$.

Theorem 17. Suppose that ν is a probability measure such that on $H^1(\nu)$, there holds a Poincaré inequality, i.e. there exists a constant $C_P > 0$ such that for all $u \in H^1(\nu)$

$$\text{Var}_{\nu}(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 d\nu - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u d\nu \right)^2 \leq C_P \int_{\mathbb{R}} (u')^2 d\nu. \quad (18)$$

Then the inner product (\cdot, \cdot) defined by

$$(u, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u'v' d\nu + \int_{\mathbb{R}} u d\nu \int_{\mathbb{R}} v d\nu \quad u, v \in H^1(\nu)$$

defines a Hilbert structure on $H^1(\nu)$ inducing its topology. In particular, $H^1(\nu)$ is complete under the induced norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^1(\nu)} := \sqrt{(\cdot, \cdot)}$.

Proof. Verifying that (\cdot, \cdot) is indeed an inner product is straightforward. In particular, if $(u, u) = 0$, then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} (u')^2 d\nu = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u d\nu \right)^2 = 0.$$

The first inequality implies that u' is identically zero such that u is constant. Then, the second equality in turn implies that u is identically zero, proving the positive-definiteness. Now, let us show that the induced norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^1(\nu)} := \sqrt{(\cdot, \cdot)}$ is Lipschitz-equivalent to the standard Sobolev $H^1(\nu)$ -norm defined by

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} (u')^2 d\nu + \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 d\nu \right)^{1/2} \quad u \in H^1(\nu).$$

The fact that $\|\cdot\|_{H^1(\nu)}$ is dominated by the standard Sobolev $H^1(\nu)$ -norm is a direct consequence of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality (or Jensen or that the variance is positive). Now for the other direction, the Poincaré inequality (18) shows that

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2 = \langle u, u \rangle = \int u^2 d\nu \leq \max(1, C_P) \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}} (u')^2 d\nu + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u d\nu \right)^2 \right\} = \max(1, C_P) \|u\|_{H^1(\nu)}^2.$$

Since, it is clear that for $u \in H^1(\nu)$, $\langle u', u' \rangle \leq \|u\|_{H^1(\nu)}^2$, this finishes the proof. \square

Remark 18. On the space of mean-zero functions

$$H_0^1(\nu) := \left\{ u \in H^1(\nu) \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}} u d\nu = 0 \right\},$$

the standard Poincaré inequality

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 d\nu \leq C_P \int_{\mathbb{R}} (u')^2 d\nu. \quad (19)$$

holds, it is actually equivalent to (18).

After identifying that $q_0 = p_0 = 1$, one can thus think of the construction of the mean-zero Sobolev orthonormal polynomials $\{q_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ as the orthogonalisation of the basis $\{p_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of $H_0^1(\nu)$ with respect to the inner product

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u'v' d\nu, \quad \text{for } u, v \in H_0^1(\nu),$$

which is another way to show Proposition 1, i.e.

$$q'_n = p_{n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} q_n d\nu = 0.$$

Remark 19. Note that, up to normalisation, the q_n 's do not depend on any possible additional weighting coefficients λ_1 and λ_2 that could be appended to form an inner product of the form

$$\lambda_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}} u'v' d\nu + \lambda_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} u d\nu \int_{\mathbb{R}} v d\nu \quad u, v \in H^1(\nu).$$

Remark 20. Note that in the case $V(x) = x^4/4$, our Freud–Sobolev orthogonal polynomials are different to the ones obtained in [44], which do not actually correspond to the $H^1(e^{-V}/Z)$ -topology.

2.2.1 Some examples outside of our setting

The main focus of this paper is on measures of the form $\nu(dx) = e^{-V} dx/Z$ supported on the whole real line. However, even for different measures, our construction of Sobolev orthogonal polynomials can be used as soon as a form of Poincaré inequality is at hand, and in some specific cases it produces back classical orthogonal polynomials.

Example 21 (The Legendre case). Consider $d\nu = dx/2$ on $[-1, 1]$, where the orthonormal polynomials are the Legendre polynomials [1, §22]. While this example does not sit within the general setting of this paper, it satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 17. Indeed on $H^1(\nu)$, we have the Poincaré–Wirtinger inequality [39, §5.8.1] (See also [6, §4.5.2])

$$\int_{-1}^1 u^2 d\nu - \left(\int_{-1}^1 u d\nu \right)^2 \leq C_P \int_{-1}^1 (u')^2 d\nu, \quad C_P = \frac{4}{\pi^2}.$$

The Sobolev orthogonal polynomials q_n associated to the scalar product (3) are then given by

$$q_0 = 1, \quad q_1 = \frac{p_1}{\sqrt{3}}, \quad q_2 = \frac{p_2}{\sqrt{15}}, \quad q_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n-1}} \left(\frac{p_n}{\sqrt{2n+1}} - \frac{p_{n-2}}{\sqrt{2n-3}} \right) \quad \text{for } n \geq 3.$$

Note that $q_n(-1) = q_n(1) = 0$ for all $n \geq 3$, which furthermore shows that the q_n 's cannot simply be some (even rescaled) Jacobi polynomials, as those have interlacing zeros in $(-1,1)$. For $n \geq 3$, the q_n 's in fact coincide with some so-called Legendre associated polynomials [1, §8], which are the natural extension of the Jacobi polynomials at the parameters $\alpha = \beta = -1$.

Note that it might sometimes be more natural to construct H^1 -Sobolev orthogonal polynomials $\{q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with respect to an inner product with two different measures ν and $\tilde{\nu}$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u'v' d\nu + \int_{\mathbb{R}} u d\tilde{\nu} \int_{\mathbb{R}} v d\tilde{\nu}, \quad (20)$$

which extends our construction of Sobolev orthogonal polynomials naturally. For instance, in the case of beta distributions we have the following.

Example 22 (The Jacobi family). Let $\alpha, \beta > 0$ and denote $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}(dx) = (1-x)^\alpha(1+x)^\beta dx / Z_{\alpha, \beta}$ on $[-1, 1]$, for which the p_n 's are Jacobi polynomials of parameter (α, β) [1, §22]. Then, on $H^1(\nu_{\alpha, \beta}) \cap L^2(\nu_{\alpha-1, \beta-1})$, there holds a Poincaré inequality

$$\int_{-1}^1 u^2 d\nu_{\alpha-1, \beta-1} - \left(\int_{-1}^1 u d\nu_{\alpha-1, \beta-1} \right)^2 \leq C_P \int_{-1}^1 (u')^2 d\nu_{\alpha, \beta}, \quad C_P = \alpha + \beta.$$

See [6, §2.7.4] for more details about the associated semi-group. Then the q_n 's associated to the inner product (20) (with $\nu = \nu_{\alpha, \beta}$ and $\tilde{\nu} = \nu_{\alpha-1, \beta-1}$) are nothing but the (rescaled) Jacobi polynomials associated to $\nu_{\alpha-1, \beta-1}$. Observe that the Legendre-Sobolev polynomials on $H^1(\nu_{0,0})$ (Example 21), cannot be constructed via this inner product as we require $\alpha, \beta > 0$.

Similarly, concerning the gamma distributions, we have the following.

Example 23 (The Laguerre family). For $\alpha > -1$, denote $\nu_\alpha = x^\alpha e^{-x} dx / Z_\alpha$ on $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$ such that the p_n 's are orthonormal Laguerre polynomials of parameter α [1, §22].

- If $\alpha > 0$, on $H^1(\nu_\alpha) \cap L^2(\nu_{\alpha-1})$, we have the Poincaré inequality [6, §4.4.1]

$$\int_0^\infty u^2 d\nu_{\alpha-1} - \left(\int_0^\infty u d\nu_{\alpha-1} \right)^2 \leq \int_0^\infty (u')^2 d\nu_\alpha,$$

such that the q_n 's associated to the inner product (20) (with $\nu = \nu_\alpha$ and $\tilde{\nu} = \nu_{\alpha-1}$) are (rescaled) Laguerre polynomials of parameter $\alpha - 1$.

- In the case $\alpha = 0$, we have the Poincaré inequality [6, §4.4.1]

$$\int_0^\infty u^2 d\nu_0 - \left(\int_0^\infty u d\nu_0 \right)^2 \leq 4 \int_0^\infty (u')^2 d\nu_0.$$

In a similar way as in the Legendre case, for $n \geq 2$, the q_n 's correspond to a natural extension of the Laguerre polynomials at the parameter $\alpha = -1$ (which are not orthogonal with respect to a probability measure). They are for instance obtained by generalising the closed form of the Laguerre polynomials.

2.3 The differentiation operator

Notation 24. In the rest of this paper, so that all our statements are precise, we denote the ℓ^2 -representation of an element u of a weighted Sobolev space

- by $[u]_{L^2}$ if we consider its representation with respect to the orthonormal basis $\mathcal{P} = \{p_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ of $L^2(\nu)$,
- by $[u]_{H^1}$ if we consider its representation with respect to the orthonormal basis $\mathcal{Q} = \{q_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ of $H^1(\nu)$.

That is, $[u]_{L^2} \in \ell^2$ is the infinite vector of coefficients $\langle p_n, u \rangle$, and $[u]_{H^1} \in \ell^2$ is the infinite vector of coefficients $\langle q_n, u \rangle$. Furthermore, for the sake of clarity, we may shorten some notations by omitting the ν . Henceforth, $\|\cdot\|_{H^1}$ (resp. $\|\cdot\|_{L^2}$) will always denote $\|\cdot\|_{H^1(\nu)}$ (resp. $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\nu)}$).

Given an operator \mathcal{A} acting between two weighted Sobolev spaces, for instance $\mathcal{A} : H^1 \rightarrow L^2$, we denote by $[\mathcal{A}]_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2} : \ell^2 \rightarrow \ell^2$ the operator such that $[\mathcal{A}u]_{L^2} = [\mathcal{A}]_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2} [u]_{H^1}$. In other words, $[\mathcal{A}]_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2}$ is the infinite matrix representing the operator \mathcal{A} with basis \mathcal{Q} for the domain and basis \mathcal{P} for the range. We use similar arrow notations for operator norms, i.e.,

$$\|\mathcal{A}\|_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2} = \sup_{\substack{u \in H^1 \\ u \neq 0}} \frac{\|\mathcal{A}u\|_{L^2(\nu)}}{\|u\|_{H^1(\nu)}},$$

and note that

$$\|\mathcal{A}\|_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2} = \|[\mathcal{A}]_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2}\|_{\ell^2 \rightarrow \ell^2}.$$

When the two spaces are the same, we sometimes write $[\mathcal{A}]_{L^2}$ instead of $[\mathcal{A}]_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2}$.

In order to eventually deal with \mathcal{L} , we first consider the (unbounded) differentiation operator ∂_x , which we write with respect to \mathcal{P} , i.e.,

$$[\partial_x]_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} = D = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \begin{array}{c} \hline \end{array} \\ \vdots & D_0 \\ \hline \end{pmatrix}.$$

As a differentiation operator acting on a polynomial basis, D is strictly upper triangular. The submatrix D_0 , which corresponds to ∂_x from the subspace of mean zero functions of $L^2(\nu)$ to $L^2(\nu)$, will play a central role in the analysis to come.

As made clear by Proposition 31, the operator ∂_x (or equivalently D) is closely related to the change of basis matrix $P = [\text{id}]_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1}$ from \mathcal{P} to \mathcal{Q} , i.e. the matrix such that $[u]_{H^1} = P[u]_{L^2}$.

Proposition 25. The change of basis matrix P from \mathcal{P} to \mathcal{Q} is given by

$$P = [\text{id}]_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & \begin{array}{c} \hline \end{array} \\ \vdots & D_0 \\ \hline \end{pmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

Proof. We normalized the p_n and q_m so that $p_0 = q_0 = 1$, which explains the first column of P . The first row of zeros is an immediate consequence of the fact that the p_n all have mean 0 for $n \geq 1$. Finally, using that the q_m also all have mean 0 for $m \geq 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle q_m, p_n \rangle &= \langle q'_m, p'_n \rangle + \langle q_m, 1 \rangle \langle p_n, 1 \rangle \\ &= \langle p_{m-1}, p'_n \rangle \\ &= D_{m-1, n}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

These observations are useful for the resolution of differential equations involving the operator \mathcal{L} such as (8).

Proposition 26. We have that

$$[\mathcal{L}]_{L^2} = D^T D \quad \text{and} \quad [\mathcal{L}]_{H^1_0} = D_0 D_0^T.$$

Proof. This follows from (16) such that for all $u, v \in H^1$

$$\langle u, \mathcal{L}v \rangle = \langle u', v' \rangle = [\partial_x u]_{L^2}^T [\partial_x v]_{L^2} = (D[u]_{L^2})^T (D[v]_{L^2}) = [u]_{L^2}^T D^T D [v]_{L^2}. \quad \square$$

Since D is upper triangular, $[\mathcal{L}]_{L^2} = D^T D$ gives a Cholesky factorisation (LU) of $[\mathcal{L}]_{L^2}$, whereas $[\mathcal{L}]_{H_0^1} = D_0 D_0^T$ gives a *reverse Cholesky* factorisation (UL) of $[\mathcal{L}]_{H_0^1}$. UL decompositions are rather uncommon as they are typically non-unique in infinite dimensions but it seems to be canonical in this case.

This allows for a simple inversion of the operator \mathcal{L} . This is particularly the case if the potential V is polynomial. Indeed, we have

Lemma 27. Let $V(x) = x^{2k}/(2k) + O(x^{2k})$ be a polynomial of degree $2k$, and $\nu(dx) = e^{-V} dx/Z$. Then, for all $m \leq n - 2k$

$$D_{m,n} = \langle p_m, p'_n \rangle = 0$$

such that D (and P) are upper triangular operators on ℓ^2 of upper bandwidth $(2k - 1)$.

Proof. Let $m < n$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle p_m, p'_n \rangle &= \frac{1}{Z} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p_m(x) p'_n(x) e^{-V(x)} dx \\ &= -\frac{1}{Z} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p_n(x) \left(p_m(x) e^{-V(x)} \right)' dx \quad \text{By parts} \\ &= \frac{1}{Z} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p_n(x) p_m(x) V'(x) e^{-V(x)} dx - \frac{1}{Z} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p_n(x) p'_m(x) e^{-V(x)} dx \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p_n(x) p_m(x) V'(x) \nu(dx) \quad \text{By orthogonality since } \deg(p'_m) = m - 1 < n. \end{aligned}$$

Since $p_m V'(x)$ is a polynomial of degree $m + 2k - 1$, the above term is zero by orthogonality if $m + 2k - 1 < n$, i.e. $m \leq n - 2k$. \square

Remark 28. In the case of a polynomial potential V , one can think of the basis $\{p_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ as semi-classical in the sense that $[\partial_x]_{L^2}$ is banded with upper bandwidth $(2k - 1)$, in contrast with the classical case of Hermite polynomial ($\nu(dx) = e^{-x^2} dx/Z$) where $[\partial_x]_{L^2}$ is diagonal. This, in turn, implies that $[\mathcal{L}]_{L^2}$ is banded with bandwidth $(4k - 3)$, extending the result of [64].

Remark 29. Of course, if V is an even polynomial then for all $m = n \pmod{2}$, $D_{m,n} = \langle p_m, p'_n \rangle = 0$.

Remark 30. Observe that

$$\mathcal{L} = -\mathcal{J} \circ \partial_x \quad \text{where } \mathcal{J} \cdot = -V' \cdot + \partial_x \cdot$$

is the so-called probability flux (or current) operator [69]. Now, for $u, v \in H^1(\nu)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u, \partial_x v \rangle &= \frac{1}{Z} \int_{\mathbb{R}} u(\partial_x v) e^{-V} dx \\ &= -\frac{1}{Z} \int_{\mathbb{R}} v \partial_x (u e^{-V}) dx \\ &= -\frac{1}{Z} \int_{\mathbb{R}} v (-V' u + \partial_x u) e^{-V} dx \\ &= \langle -\mathcal{J} u, v \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that $-\mathcal{J}$ is the $L^2(\nu)$ -adjoint of ∂_x , and provides another proof of the first identity of Proposition 26. Another consequence of this observation is that

$$D^T = [-\mathcal{J}]_{L^2} = [V' \cdot]_{L^2} - D, \quad \text{and thus} \quad [V' \cdot]_{L^2} = D + D^T,$$

where $[V' \cdot]_{L^2}$ is the multiplication operator by V' . This means that the coefficients of $[V' \cdot]_{L^2}$ grow at the same speed as the ones of D , which is consistent with the expectation that multiplying by V' loses as much regularity as differentiating once on a ν -weighted Sobolev space. Furthermore, when V is a polynomial, note that one can therefore deduce the differentiation matrix D , directly from the multiplication by V' operator, and thus from the multiplication by x (Jacobi) operator.

3 Functional and Numerical Analysis on Freud-weighted Sobolev spaces

We consider the double-well potential

$$V(x) = \frac{x^4}{4} - \kappa \frac{x^2}{2}, \quad (22)$$

so that

$$d\nu = \frac{e^{-V(x)}}{Z} dx, \quad \text{with } Z = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{x^4}{4} + \kappa \frac{x^2}{2}\right) dx,$$

where Z can be expressed and computed via the use of Bessel functions.

3.1 Freud-type orthogonal polynomials

The orthonormal polynomials with respect to ν are the so-called *Freud-type* orthonormal polynomials $\{p_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and constitute a family of *semi-classical* orthonormal polynomials. These p_n 's can be constructed recursively via a three-term recurrence formula of the form

$$\begin{cases} p_0 &= 1 \\ xp_n &= a_{n+1}p_{n+1} + a_n p_{n-1}, \end{cases} \quad \text{where } a_n > 0, \quad (23)$$

without any p_n term in the r.h.s. since V is even.

Furthermore, in the case of Freud-type polynomials, one can give an “explicit” recurrence formula for the positive sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Indeed, the sequence $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} := (a_n^2)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the so-called discrete Painlevé I equation

$$\frac{n}{b_n} = b_{n-1} + b_n + b_{n+1} - \kappa, \quad n \geq 1, \quad (24)$$

with $b_0 = 0$ and

$$b_1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} x^2 \nu(dx) = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} x^2 \exp\left(-\frac{x^4}{4} + \kappa \frac{x^2}{2}\right) dx}{\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{x^4}{4} + \kappa \frac{x^2}{2}\right) dx}, \quad (25)$$

which can also be computed via Bessel functions.

In view of Lemma 27 and Remark 29, p'_n should be a linear combination of p_{n-1} and p_{n-3} and we furthermore have the following:

Proposition 31. Let $\{p_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the basis of orthonormal polynomials of $L^2(\nu) = L^2(e^{-V}/Z)$ generated by (23) and (24), then

$$p'_n = \frac{n}{a_n} p_{n-1} + a_n a_{n-1} a_{n-2} p_{n-3}. \quad (26)$$

Proof. This can be obtained rather easily from Remark 30. Indeed, applying (23) three times to express $x^3 p_n$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} V'(x)p_n &= (x^3 - \kappa x)p_n \\ &= a_{n+1}a_{n+2}a_{n+3}p_{n+3} + a_{n+1}(a_{n+2}^2 + a_{n+1}^2 + a_n^2 - \kappa)p_{n+1} \\ &\quad + a_n a_{n-1} a_{n-2} p_{n-3} + a_n(a_{n+1}^2 + a_n^2 + a_{n-1}^2 - \kappa)p_{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $[V']_{L^2} = D + D^T$ and that D is upper triangular allows us to extract the formula for p'_n , namely

$$p'_n = a_n a_{n-1} a_{n-2} p_{n-3} + a_n(a_{n+1}^2 + a_n^2 + a_{n-1}^2 - \kappa)p_{n-1},$$

and using (24) (with $a_n = b_n^2$) gives (26). \square

Remark 32. Proposition 31 is exactly the implication (iv) \implies (ii) of the main Theorem of [14], but they instead directly observe that by looking at the leading coefficient of p_n (and thus of p'_n) in terms of monomials

$$\langle p_{n-1}, p_n \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_n p_{n-1} d\nu = \frac{n}{a_n}.$$

This calculation does not actually depend on the chosen polynomial $V(x) = x^{2k}/(2k) + O(x^{2k})$, and thus by computing

$$\langle p_{n-1}, V' p_n \rangle = \langle p_{n-1}, p_n \rangle$$

by applying $2k - 1$ times the recurrence formula (23), one can automatically deduce the relation on the a_n 's. Identifying the polynomial R_j such that

$$\langle x^{2j+1} p_n, p_{n-1} \rangle = a_n R_j(a_{n-j+1}^2, \dots, a_n^2, \dots, a_{n+j-1}^2)$$

shows Lemma 8. Similar formulations of these recurrence relations are for instance found in [33, 56].

Proposition 31 means that the differential operator D and change of basis operator P are bidiagonal and can be written as

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha_1 & 0 & \beta_1 & & \\ & 0 & \alpha_2 & 0 & \beta_2 & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & & & & \ddots \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad P = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & & & \\ & \alpha_1 & 0 & \beta_1 & & \\ & & \alpha_2 & 0 & \beta_2 & \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & & & & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\alpha_n = \frac{n}{a_n}, \quad \beta_n = a_n a_{n+1} a_{n+2}. \quad (27)$$

Remark 33. Bonan and Nevai [14] actually prove that $[\partial_x]_{L^2}$ is bidiagonal if and only if V is of the form (22), up to a translation and scaling (in x).

In order to justify the invertibility of P and to get explicit compactness estimates for its inverse, we need a precise control on the growths of the α_n 's and the β_n 's, and thus on the growth of the b_n 's. Indeed, using the triangular structure of P one can easily derive a formal inverse P^{-1} , but to prove that this yields a well defined and bounded operator, and to then get quantitative compactness estimates, we will need an estimate of the form

$$\frac{\beta_n}{\alpha_n} \leq \theta < 1 \quad \text{for all } n \geq N, \quad (28)$$

with an explicit threshold N and constant θ . This condition, which naturally appears in our proof of Theorem 4 in Section 3.3.1, was also already used in [20] in the slightly more general context of tridiagonal operators.

Looking at (24), a formal calculation suggests that $b_n \sim \sqrt{n}/\sqrt{3}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and this can in fact be established rigorously [3, §6]. From the formulas (27) and the fact that $a_n = \sqrt{b_n}$, we get $\beta_n/\alpha_n \rightarrow 1/3$, which shows the existence of a $\theta < 1$ and of an N large enough such that (28) holds. However, since we require explicit N and θ , we need more quantitative estimates on the a_n 's (or equivalently on the b_n 's), like the ones stated in Proposition 9, with explicit constants c^- and c^+ . In order to establish these bounds, we have to overcome the following difficulties. While the recurrence relation (24) might seem in appearance very innocent, it turns out that it is extremely unstable and sensitive to initial conditions. More is in fact true [3, 14]: the initial condition given by (25) is the unique one such that $b_n \geq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, this suggests that one cannot get estimates solely from (24), the positivity condition being crucial. This furthermore constitutes a computational challenge as even calculating a finite number of terms in double precision quickly diverges from the positive solution.

We point out the analysis of the recurrence relation (24) has been the topic of a vast literature [3, 11, 32, 41, 47, 55, 56, 57, 58, 68] including the celebrated Freud's conjecture and its proof in the case $\kappa = 0$ [42]

(See [3, §2] for a nice historical review of the problem). However, quantitative bounds like (29) with explicit constants do not seem to be already available, and we obtain those via a computer-assisted proof, which, although based on a fixed point argument, has some unorthodox features.

Finally, let us emphasize we do not have access to an explicit form of the p_n 's and q_n 's, and nor of the a_n 's, but we show in this work that these explicit descriptions are in fact not necessary (contrarily to what was suggested in [49]) in order to successfully use these bases in practice. This is demonstrated in an unequivocal manner via the establishment of Theorems 6 and 7, which use these bases both for the obtention of the approximate solutions, and for deriving the compactness estimates required for the proof.

3.2 A precise analysis of the discrete Painlevé I equation

Proof of Proposition 9. The qualitative statement, namely that for all $0 < c^- < 1 < c^+$, there exists N such that (12) holds for all $n \geq N$, follows directly from the fact that $b_n \sim \sqrt{n}/\sqrt{3}$, which is for instance proved nicely in [3, §6]. However, such asymptotic analysis does not provide quantitative bounds on the b_n 's. The quantitative statement follows from a computer-assisted proof and adapts a construction first proposed in [55] (which gives quantitative bounds in the case $\kappa = 0$) and greatly simplified in [47] in the case of this particular recurrence. We describe below a procedure where, for a given κ and fixed c^- and c^+ close enough to 1, we find the smallest possible N such that, for $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying (24) and (25), we get

$$c^- \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{3}} \leq b_n \leq c^+ \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{3}}, \quad (29)$$

for all $n \geq N$.

Step 1 (Set-up of a fixed-point problem). Adapting the strategy in [47], we introduce

$$f(x) = -x + \sqrt{1+x^2} \quad \text{and} \quad g_n(x, y) = \frac{x+y-\kappa}{2\sqrt{n}}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

and the map $S : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}^*} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}^*}$ such that, for $b \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}^*}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (Sb)_n &= \sqrt{n}f(g(b_{n-1}, b_{n+1})), & \text{for } n > 1, \\ (Sb)_1 &= f(g(0, b_2)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}^*}$ is endowed with the product topology. It is then straightforward to check that, if $Sb = b$, then, defining $b_0 = 0$, b satisfies the recurrence relation (24), and we thus seek a fixed point of S in $\mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{N}^*}$. Note that, by the aforementioned uniqueness of a positive solution of (24) (see [3, 14]), the solution to (24)-(25) is the unique fixed point of S in $\mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{N}^*}$.

Step 2 (Upper and lower bounds of a fixed point). We keep following the ideas from [47, Theorem 2.1.(a)], which relies on a Banach lattice theory argument, and state the following lemma.

Lemma 34. If there are sequences $b^-, b^+ \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{N}^*}$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$

$$0 \leq b_n^- \leq (Sb^+)_n \leq (Sb^-)_n \leq b_n^+, \quad (30)$$

then the unique positive solution b of (24) satisfies $b_n^- \leq b_n \leq b_n^+$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

Proof. The inequality $(Sb^+)_n \leq (Sb^-)_n$ is implied by $b_n^- \leq b_n^+$, as from its definition S is monotone decreasing with respect to the canonical partial order \leq on $\mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{N}^*}$. Now, for the same reason, we have that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$(S(K))_n \subset [b_n^-, b_n^+], \quad \text{where} \quad K = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} [b_n^-, b_n^+] \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}^*}.$$

Thus $S(K) \subset K$, which is convex and compact in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}^*}$ by Tychonoff's theorem. Since $S : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}^*} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}^*}$ is continuous and $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}^*}$ is locally convex, by Schauder–Tychonoff theorem, we have that there exists $b \in K$ such that $Sb = b$. Since $K \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{N}^*}$, this fixed point is the positive solution of (24), and the fact that b belongs to K finishes the proof. \square

We are now going to get explicit enclosures of b by constructing explicit sequences b^- and b^+ satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 34.

Step 3 (Criterion for very large n). We henceforth assume that $\kappa > 0$ (the same procedure, with slightly different conditions, can be used if $\kappa < 0$ or $\kappa = 0$). Let $c^+ > 1$ and $c^- < 1$ such that there exists $N_1 > 1$ satisfying

$$\sqrt{12 + \left(c^+ \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{N_1}} + c^+ \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{N_1}} - \frac{\sqrt{3\kappa}}{\sqrt{N_1}} \right)^2} - 2c^+ - 2c^- \geq 0, \quad (31)$$

and

$$\sqrt{12 + (2c^-)^2} + \frac{\sqrt{3\kappa}}{\sqrt{N_1}} - c^- \left(\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{N_1}} + \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{N_1}} \right) - 2c^+ \leq 0. \quad (32)$$

Note that, if c^- and c^+ are both close enough to 1, such an N_1 always exists. For all $n \geq N_1$, let

$$b_n^+ = c^+ \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{3}}, \quad b_n^- = c^- \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{3}}. \quad (33)$$

Then, for $n > N_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} (Sb^+)_n &= \sqrt{n} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\left(\frac{c^+ \sqrt{n-1}}{\sqrt{3}} + \frac{c^+ \sqrt{n+1}}{\sqrt{3}} - \kappa \right)^2}{4n} + 1} - \frac{\frac{c^+ \sqrt{n-1}}{\sqrt{3}} + \frac{c^+ \sqrt{n+1}}{\sqrt{3}} - \kappa}{2\sqrt{n}}} \right) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2\sqrt{3}} \left(\sqrt{12 \left(c^+ \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{n}} + c^+ \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n}} - \frac{\sqrt{3\kappa}}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^2} + \frac{\sqrt{3\kappa}}{\sqrt{n}} - c^+ \left(\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{n}} + \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n}} \right) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{n}{2\sqrt{3}} \left(\sqrt{12 + \left(c^+ \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{N_1}} + c^+ \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{N_1}} - \frac{\sqrt{3\kappa}}{\sqrt{N_1}} \right)^2} - 2c^+ \right), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} (Sb^-)_n &= \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2\sqrt{3}} \left(\sqrt{12 + \left(c^- \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{n}} + c^- \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n}} - \frac{\sqrt{3\kappa}}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^2} + \frac{\sqrt{3\kappa}}{\sqrt{n}} - c^- \left(\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{n}} + \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n}} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2\sqrt{3}} \left(\sqrt{12 + (2c^-)^2} + \frac{\sqrt{3\kappa}}{\sqrt{N_1}} - c^- \left(\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{N_1}} + \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{N_1}} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to (31)-(32), we do get that

$$0 \leq b_n^- \leq (Sb^+)_n \leq (Sb^-)_n \leq b_n^+,$$

for all $n > N_1$.

Step 4 (Construction of K). We start by defining b^+ and b^- as in as in (33), for all $n \geq 1$.

- Picking N_1 as in Step 3, i.e. satisfying (31)-(32), we already have proven that (30) holds for all $n > N_1$.
- However, we do not expect the threshold given by (31)-(32) to be sharp. We therefore look for the smallest $N_2 \leq N_1$ such that (30) holds for all $n > N_2$. In principle it could be that $N_2 = N_1$, but in practice we typically get $N_2 \ll N_1$.
- For $n \leq N_2$, we gradually decrease b_n^- and increase b_n^+ by ε -inflation [63], until (30) holds for all $n \geq 1$.

All the calculations are guaranteed via interval arithmetic. If this step succeeds, We have constructed $b^- = (b_n^-)_{n \geq 1}$ and $b^+ = (b_n^+)_{n \geq 1}$ such that (30) holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Thus, we can apply Lemma 34, which yields that $b_n^- \leq b_n \leq b_n^+$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. In particular the estimate (29) holds for all $n > N_2$.

Step 5 (Estimates for small n). Finally, we compute b_1 with extended precision using the formula

$$b_1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} x^2 \nu(dx) = \frac{\kappa^2 I_{-\frac{1}{4}}\left(\frac{\kappa^2}{8}\right) + \kappa^2 \left(I_{\frac{3}{4}}\left(\frac{\kappa^2}{8}\right) + I_{\frac{5}{4}}\left(\frac{\kappa^2}{8}\right) \right) + (\kappa^2 + 4) I_{\frac{1}{4}}\left(\frac{\kappa^2}{8}\right)}{2\kappa \left(I_{-\frac{1}{4}}\left(\frac{\kappa^2}{8}\right) + I_{\frac{1}{4}}\left(\frac{\kappa^2}{8}\right) \right)},$$

where I_γ denotes the modified Bessel function of the first kind with parameter γ (and can be evaluated rigorously with `Arb` [50]). Recall that we assumed $\kappa > 0$, otherwise a slightly different expression in terms of Bessel functions is obtained for b_1 . We can then compute the b_n 's by recursion, to find the smallest $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that the estimate (29) also holds for all $n \in \{N, \dots, N_2\}$.

With $\kappa = 4$, $c^- = 0.987$ and $c^+ = 1.025$, the entire procedure is successful with $N_1 = 9,000,000$, $N_2 = 9,215$ and $N = 2,187$; the proof is performed at [30] in the file `GP_eq/Painleve_bounds.ipynb`. \square




Figure 3: Bounds on b_n for $k = 4$, $c^- = 0.987$ and $c^+ = 1.025$.

3.3 Compactness estimates

We now show how estimates on the growth of the positive solution of the discrete Painlevé I equation can be leveraged to quantify the compactness of the Sobolev embedding $H^1(\nu) \hookrightarrow L^2(\nu)$ and the Poincaré inequality on $H^1(\nu)$, i.e. we give quantitative versions of Proposition 13 and Theorem 15 via Theorems 3 and 4 respectively. First, using the upper bound on $b_n = a_n^2$ from Proposition 9, we now obtain explicit bounds on the coefficients

$$\alpha_n = \frac{n}{a_n} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_m = a_n a_{n+1} a_{n+2}$$

of the (unbounded) ℓ^2 -operator P introduced in Section 2.3, which in particular allow us to satisfy (28).

Corollary 35. For all $c^+ > 1$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$b_n \leq c^+ \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{3}}, \tag{34}$$

for all $n \geq N$. Defining

$$C_\alpha = \frac{\sqrt[4]{3}}{\sqrt{c^+}}, \quad \theta = \frac{(c^+)^2}{3} \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{N}\right) \left(1 + \frac{2}{N}\right) \right)^{1/4},$$

we get, for all $n \geq N$,

$$\alpha_n \geq C_\alpha n^{3/4} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\beta_n}{\alpha_n} \leq \theta. \quad (35)$$

In the case $\kappa = 4$, one can take $c^+ = 1.025$ and $N = 2,187$, which yields

$$C_\alpha \approx 1.299925254 \quad \text{and} \quad \theta \approx 0.350328462$$

Remark 36. Recall that $b_n \sim \sqrt{n/3}$ yields $\alpha_n \sim \sqrt[4]{3}n^{3/4}$ and $\beta_n \sim (n/3)^{3/4}$, and therefore $\beta_n/\alpha_n \sim 1/3$. In particular, up to taking N large enough, one can always get $\theta < 1$. Moreover, if c^+ is arbitrarily close to 1, then θ can be brought arbitrarily close to $1/3$. The above explicit values show that, in practice, we can indeed rather close to the optimal value of θ .

Note that we only needed the upper-bounds on b_n from Proposition 9 here, but the lower-bounds will also be used, in the Appendix A.

Remark 37. Of course, these estimates become worse and harder to obtain as κ gets larger. Furthermore, if c^- and c^+ were chosen to be further from 1, then N would be smaller, though the quality of C_α and θ would be worse. However, the crucial feature is for θ be strictly less than 1.

Notation 38. Note that $\text{id} : L^2(\nu) \rightarrow H^1(\nu)$ obviously maps even functions to even functions and odd functions to odd functions, which is reflected in the fact that the action of P on even and odd modes is decoupled. In the sequel, we only consider the subspace of even functions (the case of odd functions is analogous), which amounts to considering

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & & & \\ & \alpha_2 & \beta_2 & & \\ & & \alpha_4 & \ddots & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

Furthermore, for a matrix or operator A , we use the computational notations for selection of indices, e.g. $A_{1:n,-1}$ denotes the vector made up of the first n indices (i.e. the first index is 1 and notations are inclusive) of the last column of A .

The computational parts of the subsequent subsections are given at [30] in the file `GP_eq/Poincare.ipynb`.

3.3.1 Proof of Theorem 4

Observe that P^{-1} is the ℓ^2 -representation of the embedding $\iota : H^1(\nu) \hookrightarrow L^2(\nu)$, that is

$$P^{-1} = [\iota]_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2}.$$

We thus aim to obtain compactness estimates via the analysis of the ℓ^2 -operator P^{-1} . We first pick an even integer n , $n \geq N$, with respect to which we carve up our problem. Let us carve P as follows

$$P := \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \bar{P} & \\ \hline & \beta_n \\ \hline & D_n \end{array} \right) := \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 1 & \\ \hline \bar{D}_0 & \beta_n \\ \hline & D_n \end{array} \right),$$

where

$$\bar{P} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & \hline & \bar{D}_0 & \\ \vdots & & & \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & & & & \\ & \alpha_2 & \beta_2 & & & \\ & & \alpha_4 & \ddots & & \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & & \ddots & \beta_{n-2} \\ & & & & & \alpha_n \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$D_n = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{n+2} & \beta_{n+2} & & & \\ & \alpha_{n+4} & \beta_{n+4} & & \\ & & \alpha_{n+6} & \ddots & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & \ddots \end{pmatrix}. \quad (36)$$

Computing the inverse of P seen as a two-by-two block matrix and using the Schur complement, one thus infer that

$$P^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{P}^{-1} & \beta_n(\bar{P}^{-1})_{:, -1}(D_n^{-1})_{1, :} \\ \hline & D_n^{-1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \hline \bar{D}_0^{-1} & \beta_n(\bar{D}_0^{-1})_{:, -1}(D_n^{-1})_{1, :} \\ \hline & D_n^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (37)$$

where we will show that $P^{-1} : \ell^2(\mathbb{N}^*) \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathbb{N}^*)$ is a bounded operator. Since

$$\|u\|_{L^2} = \|\iota u\|_{L^2} = \|P^{-1}[u]_{H^1}\|_{\ell^2},$$

and

$$\|u\|_{H^1} = \|[u]_{H^1}\|_{\ell^2},$$

in order to prove Theorem 4, we need to find a constant C such that, for all $u \in \overline{\text{Span}\{q_j\}_{j>m}^{H^1(\nu)}}$, $m \geq N$,

$$\|P^{-1}[u]_{H^1}\|_{\ell^2} \leq \frac{C}{m^{3/4}} \|[u]_{H^1}\|_{\ell^2}.$$

In the remainder of this proof, we take $n = N$, but some of the calculations will be reused in the proof of Theorem 3 with a different (larger) n .

Denoting $m = n + 2k$, $k \geq 0$, and recalling that we only work on even subspaces here, we therefore need to find C such that

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \beta_n(\bar{P}^{-1})_{:, -1}(D_n^{-1})_{1, k+1:} \\ \hline (D_n^{-1})_{:, k+1:} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\ell^2} \leq \frac{C}{(n+2k)^{3/4}}.$$

We are going to obtain two separate constants C_{12} and C_{22} such that

$$\|\beta_n(\bar{P}^{-1})_{:, -1}(D_n^{-1})_{1, k+1:}\|_{\ell^2} \leq C_{12}(n+2k)^{-3/4} \quad \text{and} \quad \|(D_n^{-1})_{:, k+1:}\|_{\ell^2} \leq C_{22}(n+2k)^{-3/4}, \quad (38)$$

and then take C defined by

$$C := \sqrt{C_{12}^2 + C_{22}^2} = \left\| \begin{pmatrix} C_{12} \\ C_{22} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\ell^2}.$$

Starting with C_{12} , note that by backward substitution, we get from (36) that

$$(D_n^{-1})_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{(-1)^{i-j}}{\alpha_{n+2j}} \prod_{l=i}^{j-1} \frac{\beta_{n+2l}}{\alpha_{n+2l}}, & \text{for } i \leq j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

Using Corollary (35), assuming N is taken largen enough so that $\theta < 1$ (see Remark 36), we can therefore estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|(D_n^{-1})_{1,k+1:\cdot}\|_{\ell^2} &= \left(\sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_{n+2j}^2} \prod_{l=1}^{j-1} \frac{\beta_{n+2l}^2}{\alpha_{n+2l}^2} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{C_\alpha(n+2k)^{3/4}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta^{2(j-1)} \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus,

$$\|(D_n^{-1})_{1,k+1:\cdot}\|_{\ell^2} \leq \frac{1}{C_\alpha \sqrt{1-\theta^2} (n+2k)^{3/4}}. \quad (40)$$

Since, by the extremal case of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\|\beta_n(\bar{P}^{-1})_{\cdot,-1}(D_n^{-1})_{1,k+1:\cdot}\|_{\ell^2} = \beta_n \|(\bar{P}^{-1})_{\cdot,-1}\|_{\ell^2} \|(D_n^{-1})_{1,k+1:\cdot}\|_{\ell^2},$$

we choose

$$C_{12} = \frac{\beta_n \|(\bar{P}^{-1})_{\cdot,-1}\|_{\ell^2}}{C_\alpha \sqrt{1-\theta^2}}. \quad (41)$$

Turning our attention to C_{22} , let us first recall that for an operator $A : \ell^2(\mathbb{N}^*) \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathbb{N}^*)$,

$$\|A\|_{\ell^2} \leq \|A\|_{\ell^1}^{1/2} \|A\|_{\ell^\infty}^{1/2},$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\ell^1}, \|\cdot\|_{\ell^\infty}$ can be evaluated easily via the formulae

$$\|A\|_{\ell^1} = \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \|A_{\cdot,j}\|_{\ell^1} \quad \text{and} \quad \|A\|_{\ell^\infty} = \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \|A_{i,\cdot}\|_{\ell^1}.$$

Using again (39) together with (35), we estimate, for all $i \geq 1$,

$$\|(D_n^{-1})_{i,k+1:\cdot}\|_{\ell^1} = \sum_{j=i \vee (k+1)}^{\infty} \left| \frac{(-1)^{i-j}}{\alpha_{n+2j}} \prod_{l=i}^{j-1} \frac{\beta_{n+2l}}{\alpha_{n+2l}} \right| \leq \frac{1}{C_\alpha(n+2k)^{3/4}} \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \theta^{j-i} \leq \frac{1}{C_\alpha(1-\theta)(n+2k)^{3/4}},$$

which yields

$$\|(D_n^{-1})_{\cdot,k+1:\cdot}\|_{\ell^\infty} \leq \frac{1}{C_\alpha(1-\theta)(n+2k)^{3/4}}.$$

Similarly, we estimate, for all $j \geq k+1$,

$$\|(D_n^{-1})_{\cdot,j}\|_{\ell^1} = \sum_{i=1}^j \left| \frac{(-1)^{i-j}}{\alpha_{n+2j}} \prod_{l=i}^{j-1} \frac{\beta_{n+2l}}{\alpha_{n+2l}} \right| \leq \frac{1}{C_\alpha(n+2k)^{3/4}} \sum_{i=1}^j \theta^{j-i} \leq \frac{1}{C_\alpha(1-\theta)(n+2k)^{3/4}},$$

which yields

$$\|(D_n^{-1})_{:,k+1}\|_{\ell^1} \leq \frac{1}{C_\alpha(1-\theta)(n+2k)^{3/4}}.$$

Combining the two above estimates, we get

$$\|(D_n^{-1})_{:,k+1}\|_{\ell^2} \leq \frac{1}{C_\alpha(1-\theta)} \frac{1}{(n+2k)^{3/4}},$$

such that we can choose

$$C_{22} = \frac{1}{C_\alpha(1-\theta)}. \quad (42)$$

When $\kappa = 4$, according to Proposition 9 we can pick $c^+ = 1.025$ and $N = 2,187$ in Corollary 35. Repeating the same analysis on the odd subspaces and taking the maximum of the two constants yields the announced value of the constant C , and finishes the proof of Theorem 4. \square

3.3.2 Proof of Theorem 3

Recalling Remark 18, the Poincaré constant is the smallest number C_P such that for all $u \in H_0^1(\nu)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 d\nu \leq C_P \int_{\mathbb{R}} (u')^2 d\nu,$$

i.e. such that

$$\|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_P \|u'\|_{L^2}^2 = C_P \|u\|_{H^1}^2,$$

which means

$$C_P = \sup_{\substack{u \in H_0^1 \\ u \neq 0}} \frac{\|u\|_{L^2}^2}{\|u\|_{H^1}^2}.$$

Rephrasing this in terms of our operators P and D_0 , we have that the Poincaré constant is the smallest number C_P such that for all $u \in H_0^1(\nu)$,

$$\| [u]_{L^2} \|_{\ell^2}^2 = \| P^{-1}[u]_{H^1} \|_{\ell^2}^2 \leq C_P \| [u]_{H^1} \|_{\ell^2}^2.$$

Since $u \in H_0^1(\nu)$, i.e. $(q_0, u) = \langle p_0, u \rangle = 0$, and recalling (21), we get

$$C_P = \| D_0^{-1} \|_{\ell^2}^2 = \sup_{\substack{v \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}^*) \\ v \neq 0}} \frac{\| D_0^{-1} v \|_{\ell^2}^2}{\| v \|_{\ell^2}^2}$$

and we therefore prove Theorem 3 by rigorously enclosing the norm of D_0^{-1} .

First, since D_0^{-1} is upper triangular, using the carving and notations from Section 3.3.1 we have that $\| \bar{D}_0^{-1} \|_{\ell^2} \leq \| D_0^{-1} \|_{\ell^2}$. A lower bound for the Poincaré constant is therefore given by

$$\bar{C}_P := \| \bar{D}_0^{-1} \|_{\ell^2}^2.$$

Since \bar{D}_0 is a finite matrix, \bar{C}_P can be enclosed, sharply and rigorously, via the Gershgorin circle theorem:

- First, compute rigorously $M = \bar{D}_0^{-1}(\bar{D}_0^{-1})^T$, so that $\| \bar{D}_0^{-1} \|_{\ell^2} = \| M \|_{\ell^2}^{1/2}$. Since M is symmetric, $\| M \|_{\ell^2}$ is simply the maximum of $|\lambda(M)|$ over all the eigenvalues $\lambda(M)$ of M .
- Secondly, diagonalise M numerically, i.e. find Q such that $Q^{-1}MQ$ is approximately diagonal.
- Then, rigorously (i.e. in interval arithmetic) compute Q^{-1} ; this can be achieved via the function `inv` in the Julia library `IntervalArithmetic.jl` [70].
- Rigorously compute $\bar{\Lambda} := Q^{-1}MQ$. Note that $\bar{\Lambda}$ and M have same spectrum.

- Enclose the spectrum of $\bar{\Lambda}$ (and thus M , which is a subset of \mathbb{R}_+) via the Gershgorin circle theorem. This gives an upper bound on $\|\bar{D}_0^{-1}\|_{\ell^2} = \|M\|_{\ell^2}^{1/2}$.
- Finally, take v the column of Q corresponding to the largest numerical eigenvalue of M in modulus, and rigorously compute $\|\bar{D}_0^{-1}v\|_{\ell^2}/\|v\|_{\ell^2}$, which gives a lower bound on $\|\bar{D}_0^{-1}\|_{\ell^2}$.

It thus remains to find an upper bound for C_P . We pick some $n \geq N$, extract D_0^{-1} from (37), and proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 4, to get

$$C_P = \|D_0^{-1}\|_{\ell^2} \leq \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|\bar{D}_0^{-1}\|_{\ell^2} & \beta_n \|(\bar{D}_0^{-1})_{:, -1} (D_n^{-1})_{1, :}\|_{\ell^2} \\ 0 & \|D_n^{-1}\|_{\ell^2} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\ell^2}^2 \leq \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \bar{C}_P^{1/2} & C_{12}n^{-3/4} \\ 0 & C_{22}n^{-3/4} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\ell^2}^2,$$

where C_{12} and C_{22} are as in (41) and (42). We again pick $c^+ = 1.025$, this time with $n = 3,500$, which yields the announced enclosure for C_P . \square

Remark 39. Note that

$$\bar{C}_P \leq C_P \leq \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \bar{C}_P^{1/2} & C_{12}n^{-3/4} \\ 0 & C_{22}n^{-3/4} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\ell^2}^2 = \bar{C}_P + \frac{C_{12}^2}{n^{3/2}} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^3}\right),$$

which explains the sharpness of the estimate (5) in Theorem 3.

3.3.3 Other embedding estimates

In the context of (nonlinear) PDEs, it is often useful to make use of Sobolev inequalities [23, Corollary IX.13] to deal with nonlinearities. In one dimension, this can be achieved via the derivation of L^∞ -bounds which are also useful in the proof of the positivity of solutions to elliptic equations in the fashion of [18, §4.3]. Such bounds can be obtained via the standard inequality [23, Theorem VIII.7]

$$\|\varphi\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{2} \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{1/2} \|\varphi'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{1/2}, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}).$$

By setting $\varphi = e^{-V/2}u$, we then obtain

$$\|e^{-V/2}u\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{2} \|e^{-V/2}u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{1/2} \|(e^{-V/2}u)'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{1/2}.$$

Now, observe that

$$e^{V/2}(ue^{-V/2})' = -\frac{1}{2}V'u + u' = \frac{1}{2}(-V'u + u') + \frac{1}{2}u' = \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{J}u + \partial_x u),$$

where $\mathcal{J} = -V'(x) + \partial_x$, such that

$$\|(e^{-V/2}u)'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = \sqrt{Z} \|e^{V/2}(e^{-V/2}u)'\|_{L^2(\nu)} \leq \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2} (\|\mathcal{J}u\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x u\|_{L^2}).$$

Note that this calculation does not depend on the choice of V . Since $-\mathcal{J}$ is the $L^2(\nu)$ -adjoint of ∂_x (cf. proof of Proposition 26, also Remark 30), it is expected that $\|\mathcal{J}\|_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2}$ is finite as

$$\|\mathcal{J}\|_{H^1(\nu) \rightarrow L^2(\nu)} = \|\mathcal{J}\|_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2} \|\ell^2\| = \|\mathcal{J}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} P^{-1} \|\ell^2\| = \|-D^T P^{-1}\|_{\ell^2} = \|D^T P^{-1}\|_{\ell^2}.$$

We furthermore need to quantify this bound and have the following lemma.

Lemma 40. For $V = x^4/4 - \kappa x^2/2$, if $\mathcal{J} = -V'(x) + \partial_x$, then there exist $c > 0$ such that for all $u \in H^1(\nu)$,

$$\|\mathcal{J}u\|_{L^2(\nu)} \leq c \|u\|_{H^1(\nu)}.$$

Furthermore, for all $u \in H^1(\nu)$,

$$\|e^{-V/2}u\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{Z(c+1)} \|u\|_{L^2(\nu)}^{1/2} \|u\|_{H^1(\nu)}^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{Z(c+1)} \max(1, C_P)^{1/4} \|u\|_{H^1(\nu)}, \quad (43)$$

and

$$\|e^{-V/2}u\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq \sqrt{Z} \left(\max(1, C_P) + \frac{(c+1)^2}{4} \right)^{1/2} \|u\|_{H^1(\nu)}. \quad (44)$$

Finally, if $\kappa = 4$, we can choose $c = 29.492$.

Proof. See Appendix A. \square

4 The Gross–Pitaevskii equation with sextic potential

Notation 41. From the rest of this section, we fix some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ greater than N in Theorem 4 and for some $u \in L^2(\nu)$ (resp. H^1) we denote by $\Pi_n^{L^2}$ (resp. $\Pi_n^{H^1}$) the projection onto $\text{Span}\{p_m\}_{m=0}^n$ (resp. $\text{Span}\{q_m\}_{m=0}^n$) and by $\Pi_\infty^{L^2}$ (resp. $\Pi_\infty^{H^1}$) the projection onto $\overline{\text{Span}\{p_m\}_{m>n}}^{L^2}$ (resp. $\overline{\text{Span}\{q_m\}_{m>n}}^{H^1}$). Furthermore, we treat the problem of this section only with respect to even subspaces and polynomials of $L^2(\nu)$ and $H^1(\nu)$, and all operators are restricted to these subspaces.

We look for solutions of the Gross–Pitaevskii equation

$$-\partial_{xx}\varphi + W(x)\varphi + \varphi^3 = \omega\varphi,$$

where $W(x) = x^6/4 - \kappa x^4/2 + cx^2 + d$ is a sextic polynomial potential. We look for real even solutions φ of the above equation such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi^2 W dx < \infty. \quad (45)$$

Then, still with $V(x) = x^4/4 - \kappa x^2/2$, writing $u = e^{-V/2}\varphi$ gives

$$\mathcal{L}u + e^{-V}u^3 - \omega u + r(x)u = 0$$

where $r(x) = (6 + 4c - \kappa^2)x^2/4 + (2d - \kappa)/2$. For simplicity, we choose parameters c and d such that $r(x) = 0$, though this term does not contain any additional difficulty. We are thus left with the equation

$$\mathcal{L}u + e^{-V}u^3 - \omega u = 0, \quad (46)$$

which is equivalent to the zero-finding problem

$$F(u) := u - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}f(u) = u - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}(\omega u + u_0 - e^{-V}u^3) = 0, \quad u_0 := \int_{\mathbb{R}} u d\nu, \quad (47)$$

where we introduced $\tilde{\mathcal{L}} := \mathcal{L} + \Pi_0^{L^2} = \mathcal{L} + \Pi_0^{H^1}$ in order to get rid of the one-dimensional kernel of \mathcal{L} and get an invertible operator.

Corollary 42. We have the following representations of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ on $L^2(\nu)$ and $H^1(\nu)$:

$$[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}]_{L^2} = P^T P, \quad [\tilde{\mathcal{L}}]_{H^1} = P P^T \quad \text{and} \quad [\tilde{\mathcal{L}}]_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2} = P^T. \quad (48)$$

Furthermore,

$$\|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_\infty^{L^2}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} \leq \frac{C_{22}}{n^{3/4}}, \quad \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} \leq \frac{C}{n^{3/4}}, \quad (49)$$

where C_{22} and C are as in Section 3.3.1 and

$$\Pi_n^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_\infty^{L^2} = 0 \quad \text{such that} \quad \Pi_n^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} = \Pi_n^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2}. \quad (50)$$

Proof. The identities in (48) follow from Proposition (26) by adding the action of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ on constants. Combining (48) with the estimates of Section 3.3.1, gives (49). The identities in (50) follow from the fact that P^T and thus $(P^{-1})^T$ is lower triangular. Note that we also have that for $u, v \in H^1(\nu)$,

$$\langle u, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}v \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u'v' d\nu + \int_{\mathbb{R}} u d\nu \int_{\mathbb{R}} v d\nu = (u, v). \quad \square$$

Since $[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}]_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} = (P^{-1})^T$ which is a bounded (actually compact from Theorem 4) ℓ^2 -operator, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}$ is bounded and compact as an operator from $L^2(\nu)$ to $H^1(\nu)$. Moreover, by the Sobolev embeddings (see Section 3.3.3), $u \in H^1(\nu)$ implies $e^{-V/2}u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and thus $e^{-V}u^3 \in L^2(\nu)$. Therefore, $F : H^1(\nu) \rightarrow H^1(\nu)$ is bounded and a compact perturbation of the identity. Given an approximate solution \bar{u} to Eq. (47), this motivates the introduction of an operator $A : H^1(\nu) \rightarrow H^1(\nu)$ defined as

$$A = A_n + \Pi_\infty^{H^1},$$

where $A_n \approx (\Pi_n^{H^1} DF(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{H^1})^{-1}$ (note that $\Pi_n^{H^1} DF(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{H^1}$ is finite-dimensional, hence this approximate inverse can be computed numerically), so that $\approx DF(\bar{u})^{-1}$. This approximate inverse A can then be used to introduce a quasi-Newton (fixed-point) operator

$$\begin{aligned} T : \mathcal{H} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{H} \\ u &\longmapsto u - AF(u), \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

where

$$\mathcal{H} = \{u \in H^1(\nu) \mid u \text{ is even}\}.$$

This is a common reformulation for computer-assisted proofs, and we will show that $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is a contraction around \bar{u} , such that there exists a true solution u to Eq. (46) in a tight and explicit neighbourhood around \bar{u} . Note that by Lemma 40, if we find a solution $u \in \mathcal{H} \subset H^1(\nu)$ to Eq. (46), then $\varphi = e^{-V}u$ satisfies the integrability condition (45). Finally, the positivity of a solution u may be checked using the criterion of Appendix B.

Remark 43. Any Schrödinger operator with sextic potential

$$-\Delta + \frac{1}{4}x^6 - \frac{\kappa^2}{2}x^4 + ax^2 + b,$$

is tridiagonal symmetric (i.e. Jacobi) with respect to the weighted basis $\{e^{-V/2}p_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$, where $V(x) = x^4/4 - \kappa x^2/2$.

4.1 The Newton–Kantorovitch theorem

In order to show that T is actually a contraction on a neighbourhood of \bar{u} , we make use of the following statement, which is used in many computer-assisted proofs, and can be interpreted as a kind of Newton–Kantorovich theorem when its assumptions are expressed in terms of F rather than T .

Theorem 44. Let T be as in (51) and suppose that for some Y, Z_1, Z_2, Z_3

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(\bar{u}) - \bar{u}\|_{H^1} &\leq Y, \\ \|D^k T(\bar{u})\|_{H^1} &\leq Z_k, \quad k = 1, 2, 3. \end{aligned}$$

Then assume that for the radii polynomials

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\delta) &= Y - \delta + \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{Z_k}{k!} \delta^k, \\ R(\delta) &= -1 + \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{Z_k}{(k-1)!} \delta^{k-1}, \end{aligned}$$

there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $Q(\delta) < 0$. Then, denoting $\underline{\delta}$ the smallest positive root of Q and $\bar{\delta}$ the unique positive root of R , for all $\delta \in (\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta})$, T has a unique fixed point $u^* \in \bar{B}(\bar{u}, \delta) \subset \mathcal{H}$.

Proof. See for instance [21, Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 4.4], where this version of the theorem is proved in a more general form, and where further historical references are given. \square

4.2 The bounds

We first compute an approximate solution $\bar{u} \in \Pi_n^{H^1}(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, for $n = 2500$ (such that $n > N = 2,187$ in the case $\kappa = 4$ of Theorem 4). Note that this implies that $\Pi_n^{L^2} \bar{u} = \Pi_n^{H^1} \bar{u} = \bar{u}$ and $\Pi_\infty^{L^2} \bar{u} = \Pi_\infty^{H^1} \bar{u} = 0$. We then derive below appropriate bounds Y, Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 to prove the existence of an actual solution u to Eq. (47) (and thus to Eq. (46)) close to \bar{u} via Theorem 44. Our estimates rely on a carving of the problem in the fashion of Section 3.3.1.

Finally, much of our proofs will rely on rigorously computing integrals of polynomials against Freud-weights. This is done using a quadrature rule given in Appendix C and implemented in the file `GP_eq/quadrature.jl` at [30].

The computation of the bounds Y, Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 and application of Theorem 44 can be found at [30] in the files `GP_eq/proof1.ipynb` and `GP_eq/proof2.ipynb` for Theorem 6 and 7 respectively.

4.2.1 The Y bound

We estimate the difference $T(\bar{u}) - \bar{u}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T(\bar{u}) - \bar{u}\|_{H^1}^2 &= \|AF(\bar{u})\|_{H^1}^2 \\
&= \|A(\bar{u} - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}f(\bar{u}))\|_{H^1}^2 \\
&= \|\Pi_n^{H^1} A(\bar{u} - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}f(\bar{u}))\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} A(\bar{u} - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}f(\bar{u}))\|_{H^1}^2 \quad \text{By Parseval's identity} \\
&= \|A_n(\bar{u} - \Pi_n^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}f(\bar{u}))\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} (\bar{u} - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}f(\bar{u}))\|_{H^1}^2 \\
&= \|A_n(\bar{u} - \Pi_n^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2} f(\bar{u}))\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} f(\bar{u})\|_{H^1}^2 \quad \text{using (50)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term requires a finite computation and can therefore be evaluated exactly, while the second term has to be decomposed as follows

$$\|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} f(\bar{u})\|_{H^1} \leq \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2} f(\bar{u})\|_{H^1} + \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_\infty^{L^2} f(\bar{u})\|_{H^1}.$$

Now, we have

$$\left[\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2} f(\bar{u}) \right]_{H^1} = \left[\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2} \right]_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} \left[\Pi_n^{L^2} f(\bar{u}) \right]_{L^2} = \beta_n (D_n^{-1})_{1, \cdot} (\bar{P}^{-1})_{\cdot, -1}^T \left[\Pi_n^{L^2} f(\bar{u}) \right]_{L^2},$$

so that

$$\|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2} f(\bar{u})\|_{H^1} = \beta_n \|(D_n^{-1})_{1, \cdot}\|_{\ell^2} \left| (\bar{P}^{-1})_{\cdot, -1}^T \left[\Pi_n^{L^2} f(\bar{u}) \right]_{L^2} \right|,$$

where we recall (40)

$$\|(D_n^{-1})_{1, \cdot}\|_{\ell^2} \leq \frac{1}{C_\alpha \sqrt{1 - \theta^2}} \frac{1}{n^{3/4}}. \quad (52)$$

We also have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_\infty^{L^2} f(\bar{u})\|_{H^1} &\leq \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_\infty^{L^2}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} \|\Pi_\infty^{L^2} f(\bar{u})\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_\infty^{L^2}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} \|\Pi_\infty^{L^2} (\omega \bar{u} + \bar{u}_0 - e^{-V} \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_\infty^{L^2}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} \|\Pi_\infty^{L^2} (e^{-V} \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_\infty^{L^2}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} \left(\|e^{-V} \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\Pi_n^{L^2} (e^{-V} \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{C_{22}}{n^{3/4}} \left(\|e^{-V} \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\Pi_n^{L^2} (e^{-V} \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{by (49)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We can thus take

$$\begin{aligned}
Y^2 &:= \|A_n(\bar{u} - \Pi_n^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2} f(\bar{u}))\|_{H^1}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \left\{ \frac{\beta_n}{C_\alpha \sqrt{1 - \theta^2}} \left| (\bar{P}^{-1})_{\cdot, -1}^T \left[\Pi_n^{L^2} f(\bar{u}) \right]_{L^2} \right| + C_{22} \left(\|e^{-V} \bar{u}^3\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\Pi_n^{L^2} (e^{-V} \bar{u}^3)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

4.2.2 The Z_1 bound

We choose to compute Z_1 by treating finite and infinite dimensional parts separately, and therefore take

$$Z_1 := \left\| \begin{pmatrix} Z^{11} & Z^{12} \\ Z^{21} & Z^{22} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2$$

where the Z^{ij} are real numbers satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \|\Pi_n^{H^1} DT(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{H^1}\|_{H^1} \leq Z^{11}, \\ \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} DT(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{H^1}\|_{H^1} \leq Z^{21}, \\ \|\Pi_n^{H^1} DT(\bar{u}) \Pi_\infty^{H^1}\|_{H^1} \leq Z^{12}, \\ \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} DT(\bar{u}) \Pi_\infty^{H^1}\|_{H^1} \leq Z^{22}. \end{cases} \quad (53)$$

Indeed, for $h \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\|h\|_{H^1} = 1$, write $h = h_n + h_\infty$ such that $h_n \in \Pi_n^{H^1}(\mathcal{H})$, $h_\infty \in \Pi_\infty^{H^1}(\mathcal{H})$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|DT(\bar{u})h\|_{H^1} &= \sqrt{\|\Pi_n^{H^1} DT(\bar{u})h\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} DT(\bar{u})h\|_{H^1}^2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{(\|\Pi_n^{H^1} DT(\bar{u})h_n\|_{H^1} + \|\Pi_n^{H^1} DT(\bar{u})h_\infty\|_{H^1})^2 + (\|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} DT(\bar{u})h_n\|_{H^1} + \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} DT(\bar{u})h_\infty\|_{H^1})^2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{(Z^{11}\|h_n\|_{H^1} + Z^{12}\|h_\infty\|_{H^1})^2 + (Z^{21}\|h_n\|_{H^1} + Z^{22}\|h_\infty\|_{H^1})^2} \\
&= \left\| \begin{pmatrix} Z^{11} & Z^{12} \\ Z^{21} & Z^{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \|h_n\|_{H^1} \\ \|h_\infty\|_{H^1} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2 \\
&\leq Z_1 \quad \text{since } \|h_n\|_{H^1}^2 + \|h_\infty\|_{H^1}^2 = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

In the following subsections, we derive computable bounds Z^{ij} satisfying (53).

4.2.3 The bound Z^{11}

For $h_n \in \Pi_n^{H^1}(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\Pi_n^{H^1} DT(\bar{u})h_n = \Pi_n^{H^1} (\text{id} - ADF(\bar{u}))h_n = (\Pi_n^{H^1} - A_n \Pi_n^{H^1} DF(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{H^1})h_n,$$

by construction of A . Then, we get the estimate

$$\|\Pi_n^{H^1} DT(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{H^1}\|_{H^1, H^1} = \|\Pi_n^{H^1} - A_n \Pi_n^{H^1} DF(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{H^1}\|_{H^1, H^1} = \|[\Pi_n^{H^1}]_{H^1} - [A_n]_{H^1} [\Pi_n^{H^1} DF(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{H^1}]_{H^1}\|_{\ell^2} =: Z^{11}.$$

This quantity is expected to be very small as A_n is constructed as a numerical inverse of $[\Pi_n^{H^1} DF(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{H^1}]_{H^1}$. This estimate is only the two-norm of a finite-dimensional matrix and we bound this quantity via the inequality $\|A\|_{\ell^2} \leq \|A\|_{\ell^1}^{1/2} \|A\|_{\ell^\infty}^{1/2}$.

4.2.4 The bound Z^{21}

For $h_n \in \Pi_n^{H^1}(\mathcal{H})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} DT(\bar{u})h_n\|_{H^1} &= \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} (h_n - ADF(\bar{u})h_n)\|_{H^1} \\
&= \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} DF(\bar{u})h_n\|_{H^1} \\
&= \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} (h_n - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} Df(\bar{u})h_n)\|_{H^1} \\
&= \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} Df(\bar{u})h_n\|_{H^1} \\
&\leq \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2} Df(\bar{u})h_n\|_{H^1} + \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_\infty^{L^2} Df(\bar{u})h_n\|_{H^1}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2} Df(\bar{u})h_n \right]_{H^1} &= \left[\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2} \right]_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} \left[\Pi_n^{L^2} Df(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{H^1} \right]_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2} [h_n]_{H^1} \\
&= \beta_n (D_n^{-1})_{1, \cdot} (\tilde{P}_{\cdot, n}^{-1})^T \left[\Pi_n^{L^2} Df(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{H^1} \right]_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2} [h_n]_{H^1},
\end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2} Df(\bar{u})h_n\|_{H^1} &\leq \beta_n \|(D_n^{-1})_{1, \cdot}\|_{\ell^2} \left\| (\tilde{P}_{\cdot, n}^{-1})^T \left[\Pi_n^{L^2} Df(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{H^1} \right]_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2} \right\|_{\ell^2} \|h_n\|_{H^1} \\
&\leq \frac{\beta_n}{C_\alpha \sqrt{1 - \theta^2}} \frac{1}{n^{3/4}} \left\| (\tilde{P}_{\cdot, n}^{-1})^T \left[\Pi_n^{L^2} Df(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{H^1} \right]_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2} \right\|_{\ell^2} \|h_n\|_{H^1} \quad \text{using (52)}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_\infty^{L^2} Df(\bar{u})h_n = \Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_\infty^{L^2} (\omega h_n + h_0 - 3e^{-V} \bar{u}^2 h_n) = -3\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_\infty^{L^2} (e^{-V} \bar{u}^2 h_n).$$

Now, writing h_n as

$$h_n = \sum_{m=0}^n a_m q_m,$$

we get by linearity

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi_\infty^{L^2}(e^{-V}\bar{u}^2 h_n)\|_{L^2}^2 &= \left\| \sum_{m=0}^n a_m \Pi_\infty^{L^2}(e^{-V}\bar{u}^2 q_m) \right\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{m=0}^n |a_m| \|\Pi_\infty^{L^2}(e^{-V}\bar{u}^2 q_m)\|_{L^2} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{m=0}^n a_m^2 \right) \left(\sum_{m=0}^n \|\Pi_\infty^{L^2}(e^{-V}\bar{u}^2 q_m)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \quad \text{By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality} \\ &\leq \sum_{m=0}^n \|\Pi_\infty^{L^2}(e^{-V}\bar{u}^2 q_m)\|_{L^2}^2 \quad \text{Since } \|h_n\|_{H^1} = 1 \\ &\leq \sum_{m=0}^n \|e^{-V}\bar{u}^2 q_m\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\Pi_n^{L^2}(e^{-V}\bar{u}^2 q_m)\|_{L^2}^2 \quad \text{By Parseval's identity.} \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_\infty^{L^2} Df(\bar{u}) h_n\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_\infty^{L^2}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} \|\Pi_\infty^{L^2} Df(\bar{u}) h_n\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \frac{3C_{22}}{n^{3/4}} \left(\sum_{m=0}^n \|e^{-V}\bar{u}^2 q_m\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\Pi_n^{L^2}(e^{-V}\bar{u}^2 q_m)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \|h_n\|_{H^1} \quad \text{using (49).} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can choose

$$Z^{21} := \frac{1}{n^{3/4}} \left\{ \frac{\beta_n}{C_\alpha \sqrt{1-\theta^2}} \left\| (\bar{P}_{:,n}^{-1})^T \left[\Pi_n^{L^2} Df(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{H^1} \right]_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2} \right\|_{\ell^2} + 3C_{22} \left(\sum_{m=0}^n \|e^{-V}\bar{u}^2 q_m\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\Pi_n^{L^2}(e^{-V}\bar{u}^2 q_m)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\}.$$

4.2.5 The bound Z^{12}

For $h_\infty \in \Pi_\infty^{H^1}(\mathcal{H})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi_n^{H^1} DT(\bar{u}) h_\infty\|_{H^1} &= \|\Pi_n^{H^1}(h_\infty - ADF(\bar{u})h_\infty)\|_{H^1} \\ &= \|A_n \Pi_n^{H^1} DF(\bar{u}) h_\infty\|_{H^1} \\ &= \|A_n \Pi_n^{H^1}(h_\infty - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} Df(\bar{u}) h_\infty)\|_{H^1} \\ &= \|A_n \Pi_n^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} Df(\bar{u}) h_\infty\|_{H^1} \\ &= \|A_n \Pi_n^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2} Df(\bar{u}) h_\infty\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq \|A_n \Pi_n^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2}(Df(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{L^2} h_\infty)\|_{H^1} + \|A_n \Pi_n^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2}(Df(\bar{u}) \Pi_\infty^{L^2} h_\infty)\|_{H^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $h_\infty = \Pi_\infty^{H^1} h$, where the projection is the H^1 one, therefore $\Pi_n^{L^2} h_\infty$ is not equal to 0. We start with the first term, for which we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left[A_n \Pi_n^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2}(Df(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{L^2} h_\infty) \right]_{H^1} &= [A_n]_{H^1} \left[\Pi_n^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2} \right]_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} \left[\Pi_n^{L^2} Df(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{L^2} \right]_{L^2} \left[\Pi_n^{L^2} \iota \Pi_\infty^{H^1} \right]_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2} [h_\infty]_{H^1} \\ &= [A_n]_{H^1} (\bar{P}^{-1})^T \left[\Pi_n^{L^2} Df(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{L^2} \right]_{L^2} \beta_n (\bar{P}^{-1})_{:, -1} (D_n^{-1})_{1, :} [h_\infty]_{H^1}. \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $[l]_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} = P^{-1}$ and its carving given by (37). We thus get

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_n \Pi_n^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2} (Df(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{L^2} h_\infty)\|_{H^1} &\leq \beta_n \left\| [A_n]_{H^1} (\bar{P}^{-1})^T \left[\Pi_n^{L^2} Df(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{L^2} \right]_{L^2} (\bar{P}^{-1})_{:, -1} \right\|_{\ell^2} \|(D_n^{-1})_{1, :}\|_{\ell^2} \|h_\infty\|_{H^1} \\ &= \frac{\beta_n}{C_\alpha \sqrt{1 - \theta^2}} \frac{1}{n^{3/4}} \left\| [A_n]_{H^1} (\bar{P}^{-1})^T \left[\Pi_n^{L^2} Df(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{L^2} \right]_{L^2} (\bar{P}^{-1})_{:, -1} \right\|_{\ell^2} \|h_\infty\|_{H^1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (52). For the second term, we have

$$\Pi_n^{L^2} Df(\bar{u}) \Pi_\infty^{L^2} h_\infty = \Pi_n^{L^2} ((\omega - 3e^{-V} \bar{u}^2) \Pi_\infty^{L^2} h_\infty) = -3 \Pi_n^{L^2} (e^{-V} \bar{u}^2 \Pi_\infty^{L^2} h_\infty),$$

and we now estimate each coefficient of the above term

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle p_m, e^{-V} \bar{u}^2 \Pi_\infty^{L^2} h_\infty \rangle| &= |\langle p_m e^{-V} \bar{u}^2, \Pi_\infty^{L^2} h_\infty \rangle| \\ &= |\langle \Pi_\infty^{L^2} (p_m e^{-V} \bar{u}^2), \Pi_\infty^{L^2} h_\infty \rangle| \\ &\leq \|\Pi_\infty^{L^2} (p_m e^{-V} \bar{u}^2)\|_{L^2} \|\Pi_\infty^{L^2} h_\infty\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \left(\|p_m e^{-V} \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\Pi_n^{L^2} (p_m e^{-V} \bar{u}^2)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \|D_n^{-1}\|_{\ell^2} \|h_\infty\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq \frac{C_{22}}{n^{3/4}} \left(\|p_m e^{-V} \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\Pi_n^{L^2} (p_m e^{-V} \bar{u}^2)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \|h_\infty\|_{H^1} \quad \text{using (38)}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, writing $w_m = [-1, 1] \left(\|p_m e^{-V} \bar{u}^2\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\Pi_n^{L^2} (p_m e^{-V} \bar{u}^2)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_n \Pi_n^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2} (Df(\bar{u}) \Pi_\infty^{L^2} h_\infty)\|_{H^1} &\leq \frac{3C_{22}}{n^{3/4}} \left\| [A_n]_{H^1} \left[\Pi_n^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \Pi_n^{L^2} \right]_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} w \right\|_{\ell^2} \\ &\leq \frac{3C_{22}}{n^{3/4}} \left\| [A_n]_{H^1} (\bar{P}^{-1})^T w \right\|_{\ell^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We can therefore choose

$$Z^{12} := \frac{1}{n^{3/4}} \left\{ \frac{\beta_n}{C_\alpha \sqrt{1 - \theta^2}} \left\| [A_n]_{H^1} (\bar{P}^{-1})^T \left[\Pi_n^{L^2} Df(\bar{u}) \Pi_n^{L^2} \right]_{L^2} (\bar{P}^{-1})_{:, -1} \right\|_{\ell^2} + 3C_{22} \left\| [A_n]_{H^1} (\bar{P}^{-1})^T w \right\|_{\ell^2} \right\}.$$

4.2.6 The bound Z^{22}

For $h_\infty \in \Pi_\infty^{H^1}(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} DT(\bar{u}) h_\infty\|_{H^1} &= \|h_\infty - \Pi_\infty^{H^1} ADF(\bar{u}) h_\infty\|_{H^1} \\ &= \|h_\infty - \Pi_\infty^{H^1} DF(\bar{u}) h_\infty\|_{H^1} \\ &= \|h_\infty - \Pi_\infty^{H^1} (h_\infty - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} Df(\bar{u}) h_\infty)\|_{H^1} \\ &= \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} Df(\bar{u}) h_\infty\|_{H^1} \\ &= \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} (\omega - 3e^{-V} \bar{u}^2) h_\infty\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq \|\Pi_\infty^{H^1} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} \|(\omega - 3e^{-V} \bar{u}^2) h_\infty\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{n^{3/4}} \|(\omega - 3e^{-V} \bar{u}^2)\|_\infty \|h_\infty\|_{L^2} \quad \text{by Hölder's inequality and (49)} \\ &\leq \frac{C^2}{n^{3/2}} \left\{ 3\|e^{-V/2} \bar{u}\|_\infty^2 + |\omega| \right\} \|h_\infty\|_{H^1} \quad \text{by Theorem 4.} \end{aligned}$$

We thus choose

$$Z^{22} := \frac{C^2}{n^{3/2}} \left\{ 3\|e^{-V/2} \bar{u}\|_\infty^2 + |\omega| \right\}.$$

While other methods are possible, in practice, we simply use the estimate (43) to bound $\|e^{-V/2} \bar{u}\|_\infty$.

Note that our estimates are sharp in the sense that they agree with the estimates of the diagonal case (See [18, Section 4.1]) and that we observe in practice that Z^{22} is the largest of the Z^{ij} 's.

4.2.7 The bound Z_2

We have that for $h \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|D^2T(\bar{u})h^2\|_{H^1} &= \|AD^2F(\bar{u})h^2\|_{H^1} \\
&\leq \|A\|_{H^1} \|D^2F(\bar{u})h^2\|_{H^1} \\
&\leq \|A\|_{H^1} \|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}(D^2(\bar{u})h^2)\|_{H^1} \\
&\leq \|A\|_{H^1} \|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} \|(D^2(\bar{u})h^2)\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq 6\|A\|_{H^1} \|(P^{-1})^T\|_{\ell^2} \|e^{-V}\bar{u}h^2\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq 6\|A\|_{H^1} \|P^{-1}\|_{\ell^2} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^2} \|e^{-V/2}h\|_{\infty}^2 \quad \text{By Hölder's inequality} \\
&\leq 6\max(1, C_P) \|A\|_{H^1} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^2} (\sqrt{Z(c+1)} \max(1, C_P)^{1/4} \|h\|_{H^1})^2 \quad \text{by (43)} \\
&\leq 6Z(c+1) \max(1, C_P)^{3/2} \|A\|_{H^1} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{H^1}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We can thus choose

$$Z_2 := 6Z(c+1) \max(1, C_P)^{3/2} \|A\|_{H^1} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^2}$$

where $\|A\|_{H^1} = \max\{\|A_n\|_{H^1}, 1\}$.

4.2.8 The bound Z_3

Directly from the above bound we obtain that $h \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|D^3T(\bar{u})h^3\|_{H^1} &\leq 6\|A\|_{H^1} \|(P^{-1})^T\|_{\ell^2} \|e^{-V}h^3\|_{L^2} \quad \text{by (43)} \\
&\leq 6Z(c+1) \max(1, C_P)^{3/2} \|A\|_{H^1} \|h\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{H^1}^2 \\
&\leq 6Z(c+1) \max(1, C_P)^{5/2} \|A\|_{H^1} \|h\|_{H^1}^3.
\end{aligned}$$

and thus choose

$$Z_3 := 6Z(c+1) \max(1, C_P)^{5/2} \|A\|_{H^1}.$$

Acknowledgments

HC thanks Pierre Faugère, Grigorios Pavliotis and Luca Ziviani for valuable discussions. HC is particularly grateful to Sheehan Olver for discussions at the early stage of this research and for his continued encouragements. HC thanks Olivier Hénot for discussions about the library `IntervalArithmetic.jl` [70]. MB and HC thank the *Centre de recherches mathématiques*, Montréal for its hospitality during the thematic program *Computational Dynamics: Analysis, Topology and Data*. HC is grateful to G-Research and the Doris Chen mobility fund for making this visit possible. The authors also thank Yanbo Tang for his hospitality during the write-up of the present paper. HC was supported by a scholarship from the Imperial College London EPSRC DTP in Mathematical Sciences (EP/W523872/1) and by the EPSRC Centre for Doctoral Training in Mathematics of Random Systems: Analysis, Modelling and Simulation (EP/S023925/1). MB was supported by the ANR project CAPPS: ANR-23-CE40-0004-01. MB and HC thank the CNRS–Imperial *Abraham de Moivre* IRL for supporting this research.

References

- [1] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun. *Handbook of Mathematical Functions: With Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables Applied mathematics series*. 1970.
- [2] G. Allaire. *Numerical Analysis And Optimization*. Oxford University PressOxford, May 2007.
- [3] S. M. Alsulami, P. Nevai, J. Szabados, and W. Van Assche. A family of nonlinear difference equations: Existence, uniqueness, and asymptotic behavior of positive solutions. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 193:39–55, 2015.

- [4] P. Althammer. Eine Erweiterung des Orthogonalitätsbegriffes bei Polynomen und deren Anwendung auf die beste Approximation. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 1962(211):192–204, 1962.
- [5] D. Bakry. L’hypercontractivité et son utilisation en théorie des semigroupes. In P. Bernard, editor, *Lectures on Probability Theory: Ecole d’Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXII-1992*, pages 1–114. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1994.
- [6] D. Bakry, I. Gentil, and M. Ledoux. *Analysis and Geometry of Markov Diffusion Operators*, volume 348 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2014.
- [7] D. Bakry and O. Mazet. Characterization of Markov semigroups on \mathbb{R} Associated to Some Families of Orthogonal Polynomials. In *Séminaire de Probabilités XXXVII*, pages 60–80. 2003.
- [8] D. Bakry, S. Orevkov, and M. Zani. Orthogonal polynomials and diffusion operators. *Annales de la Faculté des sciences de Toulouse : Mathématiques*, 30(5):985–1073, Mar. 2022.
- [9] P. H. Baxendale. Lyapunov exponents and shear-induced chaos for a Hopf bifurcation with additive noise. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, (1), July 2024.
- [10] R. Benzi, G. Parisi, A. Sutera, and A. Vulpiani. A Theory of Stochastic Resonance in Climatic Change. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 43(3):565–578, June 1983.
- [11] P. Bleher and A. Its. Semiclassical Asymptotics of Orthogonal Polynomials, Riemann-Hilbert Problem, and Universality in the Matrix Model. *The Annals of Mathematics*, 150(1):185, July 1999.
- [12] A. Blessing, A. Blumenthal, M. Breden, and M. Engel. Detecting random bifurcations via rigorous enclosures of large deviations rate functions:1–45, Aug. 2024.
- [13] S. G. Bobkov. Isoperimetric and Analytic Inequalities for Log-Concave Probability Measures. *The Annals of Probability*, 27(4):1903–1921, Oct. 1999.
- [14] S. Bonan and P. Nevai. Orthogonal polynomials and their derivatives, I. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 40(2):134–147, 1984.
- [15] M. Bonnefont. Poincaré inequality with explicit constant in dimension $d \geq 1$. In 2022. Available at https://www.math.u-bordeaux.fr/~mibonnef/Poincare__Toulouse.pdf.
- [16] J. Bouwe van den Berg, O. Hénot, and J.-P. Lessard. Constructive proofs for localised radial solutions of semilinear elliptic systems on \mathbb{R}^d . *Nonlinearity*, 36(12):6476–6512, Dec. 2023.
- [17] H. J. Brascamp and E. H. Lieb. On extensions of the Brunn-Minkowski and Prékopa-Leindler theorems, including inequalities for log concave functions, and with an application to the diffusion equation. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 22(4):366–389, Aug. 1976.
- [18] M. Breden and H. Chu. Constructive proofs for some semilinear PDEs on $H^2(e^{|x|^2/4}, \mathbb{R}^d)$. *arXiv*, Apr. 2024.
- [19] M. Breden, H. Chu, J. S. W. Lamb, and M. Rasmussen. Rigorous enclosure of Lyapunov exponents of stochastic flows. *arXiv*, Nov. 2024.
- [20] M. Breden, L. Desvillettes, and J.-P. Lessard. Rigorous numerics for nonlinear operators with tridiagonal dominant linear part. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems - A*, 35(10):4765–4789, 2015.
- [21] M. Breden and C. Kuehn. Rigorous validation of stochastic transition paths. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 131:88–129, Nov. 2019.
- [22] S. C. Brenner and L. R. Scott. *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*, volume 15 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2008.
- [23] H. Brezis. *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2011.
- [24] M. Cadiot, J. Jaquette, J.-P. Lessard, and A. Takayasu. Validated matrix multiplication transform for orthogonal polynomials with applications to computer-assisted proofs for pdes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.18361*, 2024.

- [25] M. Cadiot, J.-P. Lessard, and J.-C. Nave. Rigorous computation of solutions of semilinear pdes on unbounded domains via spectral methods. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 23(3):1966–2017, 2024.
- [26] M. Callaway, T. S. Doan, J. S. W. Lamb, and M. Rasmussen. The dichotomy spectrum for random dynamical systems and pitchfork bifurcations with additive noise. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 53(4):1548–1574, Nov. 2017.
- [27] C. Canuto and A. Quarteroni. Approximation Results for Orthogonal Polynomials in Sobolev Spaces. *Mathematics of Computation*, 38(157):67, Jan. 1982.
- [28] D. Chemnitz and M. Engel. Positive Lyapunov Exponent in the Hopf Normal Form with Additive Noise. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 402(2):1807–1843, Sept. 2023.
- [29] A. M. Cherubini, J. S. W. Lamb, M. Rasmussen, and Y. Sato. A random dynamical systems perspective on stochastic resonance. *Nonlinearity*, 30(7):2835–2853, July 2017.
- [30] H. Chu. Codes associated to “Solutions of differential equations in Freud-weighted Sobolev spaces”, 2025. Available at <https://github.com/Huggzz/Freud-Sobolev-proofs>.
- [31] P. G. Ciarlet. *The Finite Element Method for Elliptic Problems*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Jan. 2002.
- [32] P. A. Clarkson and K. Jordaan. Properties of generalized Freud polynomials. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 225:148–175, 2018.
- [33] P. A. Clarkson, K. Jordaan, and A. Loureiro. Generalized higher-order Freud weights. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 479(2272), Apr. 2023.
- [34] H. Crauel and F. Flandoli. Additive noise destroys a pitchfork bifurcation. *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations*, 10(2):259–274, 1998.
- [35] P. Deift. *Orthogonal Polynomials and Random Matrices: A Riemann-Hilbert Approach*, volume 3 of *Courant Lecture Notes*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, Oct. 2000.
- [36] R. C. Desai and R. Zwanzig. Statistical mechanics of a nonlinear stochastic model. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 19(1):1–24, July 1978.
- [37] R. E. L. DeVille, N. S. Namachchivaya, and Z. Rapti. Stability of a Stochastic Two-Dimensional Non-Hamiltonian System. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 71(4):1458–1475, Jan. 2011.
- [38] T. A. Driscoll, N. Hale, and L. N. Trefethen. *Chebfun Guide*. Pafnuty Publications, 2014.
- [39] L. Evans. *Partial Differential Equations*, volume 19 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, Mar. 2010.
- [40] C. Feng, H. Zhao, and J. Zhong. Existence of geometric ergodic periodic measures of stochastic differential equations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 359:67–106, June 2023.
- [41] A. S. Fokas, A. R. Its, and A. V. Kitaev. Discrete Painlevé equations and their appearance in quantum gravity. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 142(2):313–344, Dec. 1991.
- [42] G. Freud. On the Coefficients in the Recursion Formulae of Orthogonal Polynomials. *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. Section A: Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 76:1–6, Jan. 1976.
- [43] D. Funaro and O. Kavian. Approximation of Some Diffusion Evolution Equations in Unbounded Domains by Hermite Functions. *Mathematics of Computation*, 57(196):597, 1991.
- [44] L. E. Garza, E. J. Huertas, and F. Marcellán. On Freud–Sobolev type orthogonal polynomials. *Afrika Matematika*, 30(3-4):505–528, 2019.
- [45] W. Gautschi. *Orthogonal Polynomials*. Oxford University Press, Apr. 2004.
- [46] J. Gómez-Serrano. Computer-assisted proofs in PDE: a survey. *SeMA Journal*, 76(3):459–484, Sept. 2019.
- [47] D. Hajela. On solutions of some nonlinear recurrences. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 50(3):208–213, July 1987.

- [48] B. F. Hildebrand. *Introduction to Numerical Analysis: 2nd Edition*. Dover Publications, Inc., USA, 1987.
- [49] A. Iserles and M. Webb. A Differential Analogue of Favard’s Theorem. In F. Gesztesy and A. Martínez-Finkelshtein, editors, *From Operator Theory to Orthogonal Polynomials, Combinatorics, and Number Theory*, chapter 13, pages 239–263. Birkhäuser, Cham, 2021.
- [50] F. Johansson. Arb: Efficient Arbitrary-Precision Midpoint-Radius Interval Arithmetic. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 66(8):1281–1292, Aug. 2017.
- [51] R. Kannan, L. Lovász, and M. Simonovits. Isoperimetric problems for convex bodies and a localization lemma. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 13(3-4):541–559, June 1995.
- [52] T. Kapela, M. Mrozek, D. Wilczak, and P. Zgliczyński. CAPD:: DynSys: a flexible C++ toolbox for rigorous numerical analysis of dynamical systems. *Communications in nonlinear science and numerical simulation*, 101:105578, 2021.
- [53] O. Kavian, G. Kerkycharian, and B. Roynette. Some Remarks on Ultracontractivity. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 111(1):155–196, Jan. 1993.
- [54] J.-P. Lessard and C. Reinhardt. Rigorous numerics for nonlinear differential equations using chebyshev series. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 52(1):1–22, 2014.
- [55] J. S. Lew and D. A. Quarles. Nonnegative solutions of a nonlinear recurrence. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 38(4):357–379, Aug. 1983.
- [56] D. S. Lubinsky, H. N. Mhaskar, and E. B. Saff. Freud’s conjecture for exponential weights. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 15(2):217–221, 1986.
- [57] A. P. Magnus. Freud’s equations for orthogonal polynomials as discrete Painlevé equations. In P. A. Clarkson and F. W. Nijhoff, editors, *Symmetries and Integrability of Difference Equations*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, pages 228–244. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [58] A. P. Magnus. Painlevé-type differential equations for the recurrence coefficients of semi-classical orthogonal polynomials. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 57(1-2):215–237, Feb. 1995.
- [59] F. Marcellán and J. J. Moreno-Balcázar. WHAT IS... a Sobolev Orthogonal Polynomial? *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, 64(08):873–875, Sept. 2017.
- [60] F. Marcellán and Y. Xu. On Sobolev orthogonal polynomials. *Expositiones Mathematicae*, 33(3):308–352, 2015.
- [61] P. Maroni. Prolégomènes à l’étude des polynômes orthogonaux semi-classiques. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*, 149(1):165–184, Dec. 1987.
- [62] A. Martínez-Finkelshtein. Analytic aspects of Sobolev orthogonal polynomials revisited. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 127(1-2):255–266, Jan. 2001.
- [63] G. Mayer. Epsilon-inflation in verification algorithms. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 60(1-2):147–169, June 1995.
- [64] O. Mazet. Classification des Semi-Groupes de diffusion sur \mathbb{R} associés à une famille de polynômes orthogonaux. In J. Azéma, M. Yor, and M. Emery, editors, *Séminaire de Probabilités XXXI*, pages 40–53, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1997.
- [65] M. T. Nakao. A numerical approach to the proof of existence of solutions for elliptic problems. *Japan Journal of Applied Mathematics*, 5(2):313–332, June 1988.
- [66] M. T. Nakao, M. Plum, and Y. Watanabe. *Numerical Verification Methods and Computer-Assisted Proofs for Partial Differential Equations*, volume 53 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer Singapore, Singapore, 2019.
- [67] P. Nevai, editor. *Orthogonal Polynomials*. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 1990.
- [68] P. Nevai. Orthogonal polynomials associated with $\exp(-x^4)$. In *Second Edmonton Conference on Approximation Theory*, volume 3, pages 263–285. Proc. Canad. Math. Soc, 1983.
- [69] G. A. Pavliotis. *Stochastic Processes and Applications*, volume 60 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2014.

- [70] D. P. Sanders, B. Richard, O. Hénot, L. Benet, L. Ferranti, K. Agarwal, P. Vana, J. Grawitter, M. F. Herbst, M. Forets, E. Gupta, yashrajgupta, E. Hanson, V. Tjeng, T. Koolen, S. Olver, S. Micluța-Câmpeanu, R. Vasani, C. Rackauckas, B. van Dyk, spaette, C. Schilling, matsueushi, M. Kaluba, Z. Hurák, Venkateshprasad, T. Holy, R. Deits, Q. Zhang, and M. Giordano. *JuliaIntervals/IntervalArithmetic.jl: v0.22.5*, Jan. 2024.
- [71] G. Szegő. *Orthogonal Polynomials*, volume 23. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 4th edition, Dec. 1939.
- [72] W. Tucker. *Validated numerics: a short introduction to rigorous computations*. Princeton University Press, 2011.
- [73] N. Van Buggenhout. On generating Sobolev orthogonal polynomials. *Numerische Mathematik*, 155(3-4):415–443, Dec. 2023.
- [74] J. B. van den Berg and J.-P. Lessard. Rigorous Numerics in Dynamics. *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, 62(09):1057, Oct. 2015.
- [75] L. Veysseire. A harmonic mean bound for the spectral gap of the Laplacian on Riemannian manifolds. *Comptes Rendus. Mathématique*, 348(23-24):1319–1322, Nov. 2010.
- [76] C. Villani. *Hypocoercivity*, volume 202 of number 950. American Mathematical Society, 2009.

A Proof of Lemma 40

Again, without loss of generality, we work on the subspace of even functions. Recall that we want to find a constant c such that

$$\|\mathcal{J}\|_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2} = \|[\mathcal{J}]_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2}\|_{\ell^2} = \|D^T P^{-1}\|_{\ell^2} \leq c.$$

Note that

$$D^T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & & \\ \alpha_2 & 0 & & & \\ \beta_2 & \alpha_4 & \ddots & & \\ & \beta_4 & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & & \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus,

$$\|D^T P^{-1}\|_{\ell^2} \leq \|\text{Diag}(\alpha_{2:2:})P^{-1}\|_{\ell^2} + \|\text{Diag}(\beta_{2:2:})P^{-1}\|_{\ell^2}.$$

For instance, we have

$$\text{Diag}(\alpha_{2:2:})P^{-1} := \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \text{Diag}(\alpha_{2:2:n+2})\bar{P}^{-1} & \beta_n \text{Diag}(\alpha_{2:2:n+2})(\bar{P}^{-1})_{:, -1} (D_n^{-1})_{1, :} \\ \hline & \text{Diag}(\alpha_{n+4:2:})D_n^{-1} \end{array} \right).$$

Mimicking the calculations of Section 3.3, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\text{Diag}(\alpha_{n+4:2:})D_n^{-1})_{i,:}\|_{\ell^1} &= \alpha_{n+2i+2} \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \left| \frac{(-1)^{i-j}}{\alpha_{n+2j}} \prod_{k=i}^{j-1} \frac{\beta_{n+2k}}{\alpha_{n+2k}} \right| \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{c^+}{c^-}} \left(\frac{n+2i+2}{n+2i} \right)^{3/4} \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \theta^{j-i} \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{c^-}}{\sqrt{c^+}(1-\theta)} \left(\frac{n+4}{n+2} \right)^{3/4},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\text{Diag}(\alpha_{n+4:2:})(D_n^{-1})_{:,j}\|_{\ell^1} &= \sum_{i=1}^j \left| \alpha_{n+2i+2} \frac{(-1)^{i-j}}{\alpha_{n+2j}} \prod_{k=i}^{j-1} \frac{\beta_{n+2k}}{\alpha_{n+2k}} \right| \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{c^+}{c^-}} \left(\frac{n+2j+2}{n+2j} \right)^{3/4} \sum_{i=1}^j \theta^{j-i} \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{c^+}}{\sqrt{c^-}(1-\theta)} \left(\frac{n+4}{n+2} \right)^{3/4},
\end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\|\text{Diag}(\alpha_{n+4:2:})D_n^{-1}\|_{\ell^2} \leq \|\text{Diag}(\alpha_{n+4:2:})D_n^{-1}\|_{\ell^1} \|\text{Diag}(\alpha_{n+4:2:})D_n^{-1}\|_{\ell^\infty}^{1/2} \leq \frac{\sqrt{c^+}}{\sqrt{c^-}(1-\theta)}^{1/2} \left(\frac{n+4}{n+2} \right)^{3/4}.$$

This yields that

$$\|\text{Diag}(\alpha_{2:2:})P^{-1}\|_{\ell^2} \leq c_\alpha := \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|\text{Diag}(\alpha_{2:2:n+2})\bar{P}^{-1}\|_{\ell^2} & \beta_n \|\text{Diag}(\alpha_{2:2:n+2})(\bar{P}^{-1})_{:, -1}\|_{\ell^2} \|(D_n^{-1})_{1,:}\|_{\ell^2} \\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{c^+}}{\sqrt{c^-}(1-\theta)} \left(\frac{n+4}{n+2} \right)^{3/4} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\ell^2},$$

where

$$\|(D_n^{-1})_{1,:}\|_{\ell^2} \leq \frac{1}{C_\alpha \sqrt{1-\theta^2}} \frac{1}{n^{3/4}}.$$

Similarly, we find that

$$\|\text{Diag}(\beta_{n+4:2:})D_n^{-1}\|_{\ell^2} \leq \frac{(c^+)^2}{3(1-\theta)} \left(\frac{n+4}{n+2} \right)^{3/4},$$

such that

$$\|\text{Diag}(\beta_{2:2:})P^{-1}\|_{\ell^2} \leq c_\beta := \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \|\text{Diag}(\beta_{2:2:n+2})\bar{P}^{-1}\|_{\ell^2} & \beta_n \|\text{Diag}(\beta_{2:2:n+2})(\bar{P}^{-1})_{:, -1}\|_{\ell^2} \|(D_n^{-1})_{1,:}\|_{\ell^2} \\ 0 & \frac{(c^+)^2}{3(1-\theta)} \left(\frac{n+4}{n+2} \right)^{3/4} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\ell^2}.$$

We thus choose $c := c_\alpha + c_\beta$. Now, to finalize our estimates, first note that

$$\|e^{-V/2}u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 = Z \|u\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2 \leq \max(1, C_P) \|u\|_{H^1(\nu)}^2.$$

Then, for all $u \in H^1(\nu)$

$$\|(e^{-V/2}u)'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2} (\|\mathcal{J}u\|_{L^2(\nu)} + \|u\|_{H^1(\nu)}) \leq \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2} (\|\mathcal{J}u\|_{H^1 \rightarrow L^2} + 1) \|u\|_{H^1(\nu)} \leq \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2} (c+1) \|u\|_{H^1(\nu)}.$$

By [23, Theorem VIII.7],

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{-V/2}u\|_\infty &\leq \sqrt{2}\|e^{-V/2}u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{1/2}\|(e^{-V/2}u)'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^{1/2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{Z(c+1)}\|u\|_{L^2(\nu)}^{1/2}\|u\|_{H^1(\nu)}^{1/2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{Z(c+1)}\max(1, C_P)^{1/4}\|u\|_{H^1(\nu)}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields (43). Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{-V/2}u\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} &:= \left(\|e^{-V/2}u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 + \|(e^{-V/2}u)'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2\right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{Z}\left(\|e^{-V/2}u\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2 + \frac{(c+1)^2}{4}\|u\|_{H^1(\nu)}^2\right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{Z}\left(\max(1, C_P) + \frac{(c+1)^2}{4}\right)^{1/2}\|u\|_{H^1(\nu)}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields (44).

In the case $\kappa = 4$, the calculation leading to an explicit value of c is performed at [30] in the file GP_eq/embedding.ipynb.

B Positivity of solutions

In this appendix, we give a criterion to prove the positivity of solutions to Eq. (8) (in particular for Theorem 6). We use the criterion proposed in [18, §4.3] reformulated in the lemma below. It is based on the maximum principle.

Lemma 45. Let $c : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a \mathcal{C}^0 function and $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a \mathcal{C}^2 function such that

$$-\partial_{xx}\varphi + c\varphi = 0. \quad (54)$$

Assume there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that $c(x) > 0$ for all $|x| \geq r_0$. Assume further that $\varphi(x) > 0$ for all $|x| \leq r_0$, and that $\varphi(x) \xrightarrow{|x| \rightarrow \infty} 0$. Then, $\varphi(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. See the proof of [18, Lemma 31] □

Now, by a usual bootstrap argument, if $\varphi = e^{-V/2}u \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ is a solution to

$$-\partial_{xx}\varphi + W\varphi + \varphi^3 - \omega\varphi = 0,$$

then $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$. Furthermore, since $\varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$, by [23, Corollary VIII.8], $\lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \varphi(x) = 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. We choose $c = W + \varphi^2 - \omega \in \mathcal{C}^\infty$. Denoting $\bar{\varphi} = e^{-V/2}\bar{u}$, by Lemma 40, we have that

$$\|\varphi - \bar{\varphi}\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{Z(c+1)}\max(1, C_P)^{1/4}\delta, \quad \text{where } \|u - \bar{u}\|_{H^1(\nu)} \leq \delta \quad (55)$$

and

$$\|\varphi\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{Z(c+1)}\max(1, C_P)^{1/4}\|u\|_{H^1(\nu)} \leq \sqrt{Z(c+1)}\max(1, C_P)^{1/4}(\|\bar{u}\|_{H^1(\nu)} + \delta).$$

That allows us to find a positive real r_0 such that $c(x) = W(x) + \varphi^2(x) - \omega \geq W(x) - \omega > 0$ for all $|x| \geq r_0$. Then using the estimate (55) and rigorously evaluating $\bar{\varphi}$ on $[-r_0, r_0]$ finishes verifying the assumptions of Lemma 45.

C Quadrature

To obtain the bounds of Section 4.2, we need to compute rigorously many integrals of the form

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\prod_{k=1}^m f_k \right) e^{-\tilde{V}} dx,$$

where the f_k 's are polynomials, $m = 4$ or $m = 6$, \tilde{V} is a quartic potential of the form $\tilde{V} = mV/2$, and \tilde{Z} is the corresponding normalisation constant. Similarly, we denote the orthonormal polynomials with respect to $e^{-\tilde{V}}$ by $\{\tilde{p}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and the coefficients of their recurrence relation (9) by $\{\tilde{a}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. We achieve this integration by essentially following the method employed in [18, §3] (See also [24] in the case of unweighted polynomial nonlinearities). Given some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2N - 1 \geq \sum_{k=1}^m \deg f_k$, we denote by $(\tilde{x}_i)_{i=1}^N$ the roots of \tilde{p}_N . Then, given the weights [48, p. 390]

$$\tilde{W}_i = \frac{\tilde{a}_N}{\tilde{a}_{N-1}} \frac{\frac{1}{\tilde{Z}} \int \tilde{p}_{N-1}^2 e^{-\tilde{V}} dx}{\tilde{p}'_N(\tilde{x}_i) p_{N_1}(\tilde{x}_i)} = \frac{\tilde{a}_N}{\tilde{a}_{N-1}} \frac{1}{\left(\frac{N}{\tilde{a}_N} p_{N-1}(\tilde{x}_i) + \tilde{a}_N \tilde{a}_{N-1} \tilde{a}_{N-2} p_{N-3}(\tilde{x}_i) \right) p_{N_1}(\tilde{x}_i)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

we have that

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\prod_{k=1}^m f_k \right) e^{-\tilde{V}} dx = \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{W}_i \left(\prod_{k=1}^m f_k(\tilde{x}_i) \right).$$

The \tilde{x}_i 's are enclosed rigorously similarly to [18] by

- finding approximate roots of \tilde{p}_N by numerically finding eigenvalues of the N -dimensional (tridiagonal) Jacobi matrix constructed from $\{\tilde{a}_n\}_{n=1}^{N-1}$,
- refining these approximate roots using Newton's method in `BigFloat` arithmetic,
- and rigorously enclosing these roots via a combination of the Intermediate Value Theorem and the Fundamental Theorem of Algebra (recall that orthogonal polynomials always have simple real roots).

As in [18], in practice we will express a function u in $\Pi_n^{L^2}(L^2(\nu))$ with respect to the basis $\{p_n\}$ (orthogonal with respect to $d\nu = e^{-V} dx/Z$ now!), i.e.

$$u = \sum_{j=0}^n c_j p_j, \quad c := (c_0, \dots, c_n)^T,$$

such that it suffices to evaluate $p_j(\tilde{x}_i)$ via the recurrence relation

$$p_{j+1}(\tilde{x}_i) = \frac{\tilde{x}_i p_j(\tilde{x}_i) - a_j p_{j-1}(\tilde{x}_i)}{a_{j+1}} \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

This defines a pseudo-Vandermonde matrix $M = (p_j(\tilde{x}_i))$. As in [18], we regularise M by replacing it by $\bar{M} = \text{Diag}(W)^{1/m} M$ which can be stored in lower precision. For instance, we then have that the finite-dimensional projection of the a cubic nonlinearity can be handled by the matrix

$$G_{ij} = \langle p_i, e^{-V} u^2 p_j \rangle,$$

which can be written as $G = \bar{M}^T \text{Diag}(\bar{M}c)^2 \bar{M}$.