

# Asymptotic stability of travelling waves for general nonlinear Schrödinger equations with non-zero condition at infinity

Jordan Berthoumieu<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

In previous works [4, 5], existence and uniqueness of travelling waves for the nonlinear Schrödinger equations have been shown for speeds close to the speed of sound. Furthermore, it has been proved that a chain of dark solitons of well-ordered speeds near the sound speed, taken initially apart from each other, is orbitally stable. In this article, we complete this study by proving the asymptotic stability of these travelling waves, namely that a solution initially close to a travelling wave eventually converges towards a travelling wave of close speed. This relies on the methods used by F. Béthuel, P. Gravejat and D. Smets in [6] and first introduced by Y. Martel and F. Merle in [22].

## 1 Introduction

The equation of main interest reads

$$i\partial_t\Psi + \partial_x^2\Psi + \Psi f(|\Psi|^2) = 0 \text{ for } (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}. \quad (NLS)$$

This equation is a generalization of the well-known Gross-Pitaevskii equation in the sense that we impose that  $f(1) = 0$  and the natural condition at space infinity is then

$$|\Psi(t, x)| \xrightarrow{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} 1.$$

The Gross-Pitaevskii case corresponds to the nonlinearity  $f(s) = 1 - s$ . It is a relevant model in condensed matter physics and nonlinear optics. In particular, it arises in the context of the Bose-Einstein condensation or of superfluidity (see [1, 9]). In the context of nonlinear optics, the non-vanishing condition at space infinity expresses the presence of a nonzero background. Besides in the latter context, experiments highlight a notch in the density distribution. This density wave propagates in a bright background, which explains the denomination of "dark" soliton. We refer to [3] for a significant example and more details on these features. Our study relates to defocusing nonlinearities, namely functions satisfying

$$f'(1) < 0.$$

The Hamiltonian structure of (NLS) is given by the generalized Ginzburg-Landau energy,

$$E(\Psi) := E_k(\Psi) + E_p(\Psi) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\partial_x \Psi|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} F(|\Psi|^2),$$

---

<sup>1</sup>CY Cergy Paris Université, Laboratoire Analyse, Géométrie, Modélisation, F-95302 Cergy-Pontoise, France. Website: <https://berthoumiejordan.wordpress.com> E-mail: [jordan.berthoumieu@cyu.fr](mailto:jordan.berthoumieu@cyu.fr)

with

$$F(\rho) := \int_{\rho}^1 f(r) dr.$$

In [7], many different behaviors have been highlighted according to the characteristics of  $f$ . Then in [4], special examples are taken to investigate more precisely the existence and orbital stability of the special solutions that are analyzed in this article.

In the sequel, we shall rely on the hydrodynamical formulation which gives a more convenient way to study the Hamiltonian structure of the equation. This framework is related to new variables given by  $\eta = 1 - |\Psi|^2$  and  $v = -\partial_x \varphi$  for non-vanishing functions that we lift as  $\Psi = |\Psi|e^{i\varphi}$ . Plugging the new variables into  $(NLS)$ , we obtain the hydrodynamical form of  $(NLS)$ , that is

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \eta = -2\partial_x(v(1-\eta)), \\ \partial_t v = -\partial_x \left( f(1-\eta) - v^2 - \frac{\partial_x^2 \eta}{2(1-\eta)} - \frac{(\partial_x \eta)^2}{4(1-\eta)^2} \right). \end{cases} \quad (NLS_{hy})$$

The main difference with Schrödinger equations with solutions vanishing at space infinity is that the vacuum solution becomes  $\Psi \equiv 1$  instead of 0. When we linearize around the hydrodynamic vacuum solution  $(\eta, v) \equiv (0, 0)$ , we obtain, in the long wave approximation, the free wave equation with the sound speed

$$c_s = \sqrt{-2f'(1)}. \quad (1)$$

The linearized equation indeed differs from the case of null condition at infinity, in the sense that the resulting dispersion relation is not the same: the plane wave solutions of this linearized system satisfy the dispersion relation

$$\omega(\xi) = \pm \sqrt{\xi^4 + c_s^2 \xi^2}.$$

The main result of stability is stated in the classical variables, and since we deal with infinite dimensional dynamical systems, we need to find a suitable functional setting. We just recall that the natural setting for taking care of classical solutions is the energy set

$$\mathcal{X}(\mathbb{R}) := \{ \psi \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}) \mid \psi' \in L^2(\mathbb{R}), F(|\psi|^2) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \}$$

endowed with the distance

$$d(\psi_1, \psi_2) = \|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|_{L^\infty([-1,1])} + \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{L^2} + \|\psi_1' - \psi_2'\|_{L^2}. \quad (2)$$

In a dedicated appendix, we will see that the Cauchy problem is well-posed in  $\mathcal{X}(\mathbb{R})$  and that the energy is conserved along the flow. We shall also need to analyze the continuity of the flow, and the Cauchy problem for  $(NLS_{hy})$ . We refer to Appendix B for more details. For now, we just mention that the Cauchy problem for  $(NLS)$  has been handled under several conditions on  $f$  that are described below and which we shall assume throughout the article. Observing moreover that  $\mathcal{X}(\mathbb{R}) + H^1(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{R})$ , we can state the following result.

**Theorem 1.1** ([13]). *Let  $u_0 \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{R})$ . Take  $f$  in  $C^2(\mathbb{R})$  satisfying (H1) below. In addition, assume that there exist  $\alpha_1 \geq 1$  and  $C_0 > 0$  such that for all  $\rho \geq 1$ ,*

$$|f''(\rho)| \leq \frac{C_0}{\rho^{3-\alpha_1}}.$$

If  $\alpha_1 > \frac{3}{2}$ , assume moreover that there exists  $\alpha_2 \in [\alpha_1 - \frac{1}{2}, \alpha_1]$  such that for  $\rho \geq 2$ ,  $C_0 \rho^{\alpha_2} \leq F(\rho)$ . There exists a unique function  $w \in C^0(\mathbb{R}, H^1(\mathbb{R}))$  such that  $u := u_0 + w$  solves (NLS). Moreover, the solution continuously depends on the initial condition, and the energy  $E$  and the momentum  $p$  are conserved by the flow.

In this article, we aim at understanding the dynamics of special solutions of the form  $\Psi(t, x) = \mathbf{u}_c(x - ct)$ . These are called travelling waves and their profiles  $\mathbf{u}_c$  satisfy the ordinary differential equation

$$-icu'_c + \mathbf{u}_c'' + \mathbf{u}_c f(|\mathbf{u}_c|^2) = 0. \quad (TW_c)$$

In the Gross-Pitaevskii case, where  $c_s = \sqrt{2}$ , travelling waves exist with a one-to-one correspondence with the speed  $c$  in the entire range  $c \in (-c_s, c_s)$ . In the case of a generic nonlinearity  $f$ , it is a much more subtle problem. Nonetheless, there can only exist nontrivial finite energy travelling waves with speed in  $(-c_s, c_s)$  (see Theorem 5.1 and the remark just after in [18]). Under suitable conditions on the nonlinearity  $f \in C^3(\mathbb{R}_+)$ , we have existence and uniqueness of transonic speeds. We assume that these conditions hold true in the sequel. Namely

- For all  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\frac{c_s^2}{4}(1 - \rho)^2 \leq F(\rho). \quad (H1)$$

- There exist  $M \geq 0$  and  $q \in [2, +\infty)$  such that for all  $\rho \geq 2$ ,

$$F(\rho) \leq M|1 - \rho|^q. \quad (H2)$$

- 

$$k := 2f''(1) + 6f'(1) < 0. \quad (H3)$$

**Theorem 1.2** ([5]). *There exists a critical speed  $c_0 > 0$  such that for  $c \in (c_0, c_s)$ , there exists a non-constant and non-vanishing smooth solution  $\mathbf{u}_c$  of  $(TW_c)$ , that is unique up to translations and a constant phase shift. The hydrodynamical and classical variables  $(\eta_c, v_c)$  are related by the formula*

$$\mathbf{u}_c(x) = \sqrt{1 - \eta_c(x)} e^{-\int_0^x v_c(r) dr}. \quad (3)$$

Moreover the hydrodynamical variables are smooth and  $c \mapsto Q_c$  belongs to  $C^2((c_0, c_s), \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}^2(\mathbb{R}))$ , with

$$\frac{d}{dc}(p(Q_c)) < 0. \quad (4)$$

Finally there exist  $a_d, K_d > 0$  independent of  $c \in (c_0, c_s)$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that,

$$\sum_{\substack{0 \leq k_1 \leq 3 \\ 0 \leq k_2 \leq 2 \\ 0 \leq j \leq 2}} (c_s^2 - c^2)^{j-1} \left( |\partial_c^j \partial_x^{k_1} \eta_c(x)| + c^{1+2j+2k_2} |\partial_c^j \partial_x^{k_2} v_c(x)| \right) \leq K_d e^{-a_d \sqrt{c_s^2 - c^2} |x|}. \quad (5)$$

In a previous article, hypothesis (H3) (see the proof of Theorem 1.2 in [5]) actually reads  $k \neq 0$ . In this framework, we can then check that (H3) is equivalent to  $k < 0$ . This sign can be explained by the fact that<sup>1</sup> for  $(c, x) \in (c_0, c_s) \times \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$0 < \eta_c(x) \leq \xi_c < 1, \quad (6)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>See Proposition 2.2 in [5] for more details.

where

$$\xi_c = \eta_c(0) \underset{c \rightarrow c_s}{\sim} -\frac{3(c_s^2 - c^2)}{k}. \quad (7)$$

One can now wonder whether these solutions are stable or not, and precise the sense of "stable". Taking an arbitrary initial condition close to a travelling wave  $\mathbf{u}_c$ , then the solution associated with this initial condition will certainly not stay close to  $\mathbf{u}_c(\cdot - ct)$  uniformly in time. Indeed, consider another travelling wave as an initial condition, with different speed  $\tilde{c}$ . As close as these speeds are taken, the solutions associated with these initial conditions will separate into two different bubbles, which will be more and more apart the further they travel. To illustrate this claim, one can show that there exists a positive constant  $\varepsilon_{c,\tilde{c}}$  only depending on  $c$  and  $\tilde{c}$  such that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} d(\mathbf{u}_c(\cdot - ct), \mathbf{u}_{\tilde{c}}(\cdot - \tilde{c}t)) \geq \varepsilon_{c,\tilde{c}}, \quad (8)$$

thus the Lyapunov stability does not stand a fair chance of success. However, intermediate notions of stability exist for travelling waves, such as *orbital* and *asymptotic* stability. In this article, we will prove that these notions are well-suited and why a stronger notion could not be true. Recall that the asymptotic stability of travelling waves in the Gross-Pitaevskii case has been thoroughly investigated in [6], even for the speed  $c = 0$ , in [17]. Our study refrains from handling this speed for a significant reason, the black soliton (of speed  $c = 0$ ) vanishes and thus prevents us from considering any smooth lifting of  $\mathbf{u}_0$ . However, we have to restrict ourselves to speeds even closer to  $c_s$  and we assume in addition that the hypothesis of Theorem B.1, as well as (H1), (H2) and (H3), are satisfied to state our main result.

**Theorem 1.3.** *There exists an integer  $l_*$  and  $c_1 \in (0, c_s)$  such that if  $f \in C^{l_*}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ , then the travelling wave with a given speed in  $(c_1, c_s)$  is asymptotically stable in the following sense. Let  $c^* \in (c_1, c_s)$ . There exists  $\delta_* > 0$  such that for any  $\psi_0 \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{R})$  satisfying  $d(\psi_0, \mathbf{u}_{c^*}) \leq \delta_*$ , then  $\psi(t)$  the solution associated with the initial condition  $\psi_0$  is globally wellposed and there exist  $c_0^* \in (c_0, c_s)$  and two functions  $(b, \theta) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2)$  such that*

$$e^{-i\theta(t)}\psi(t, \cdot + b(t)) \underset{t \rightarrow +\infty}{\xrightarrow{d}} \mathbf{u}_{c_0^*}, \quad (9)$$

and

$$b'(t) \underset{t \rightarrow +\infty}{\longrightarrow} c_0^* \quad \text{and} \quad \theta'(t) \underset{t \rightarrow +\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

Here the notation  $\Psi(t) \underset{t \rightarrow +\infty}{\xrightarrow{d}} \Psi_\infty$  stands for the fact that all three following convergences hold

$$\begin{cases} 1 - |\Psi(t)|^2 \underset{t \rightarrow +\infty}{\xrightarrow{d}} 1 - |\Psi_\infty|^2 & \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}), \\ \partial_x \Psi(t) \underset{t \rightarrow +\infty}{\xrightarrow{d}} \partial_x \Psi_\infty & \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}), \\ \Psi(t) \underset{t \rightarrow +\infty}{\xrightarrow{d}} \Psi_\infty & \text{in } L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}). \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

The proof of this theorem makes crucial use of the hydrodynamical variables and relies on a method developed in [6] that itself is based on ideas introduced in [22] for the Korteweg-de Vries equation. This article follows the footsteps of the preceding articles [4, 5] regarding the same kind of general nonlinearities. Indeed, it is of interest to identify the conditions that the nonlinearity  $f$  needs to satisfy for the travelling wave to be asymptotically stable. More generally, this series of articles aim at understanding the behaviour of solutions for large times, while not using scattering methods, as it is possible in the integrable case of the Gross-Piteasvkii equation [15, 10]. Unlike the latter articles, the proof relies here on PDEs arguments, already highlighted in integrable cases as in [6] and then for non-integrable systems in [22, 23, 20, 21].

**Remark 1.4.** *Unlike the Gross-Pitaevskii case, we need to restrict ourselves to small travelling waves. This corresponds to travelling waves with speeds taken close to  $c_s$  (see (D.1)). The special choice of these travelling waves is consistent with the branch of solitons already exhibited in Theorem 1.2. A further restriction will provide positivity on crucial quantities, which are necessary for proving Proposition 1.16 below.*

**Remark 1.5.** *The modulation parameters in (9) are closely related to the invariances of (NLS). More precisely, the asymptotic stability takes into account the symmetries that prevent the solution from being stable in the Lyapunov sense, that are translations and constant phase shifts.*

**Remark 1.6.** *In contrast with the Korteweg-de Vries equation, negative speeds are allowed and the asymptotic stability of the corresponding travelling waves can be reached by the same method by simply taking the complex conjugate.*

**Remark 1.7.** *The value of  $l_*$  is fixed during the proof (see Subsection 1.3.3), so that (NLS) is sufficiently differentiable with respect to the space variable. This differentiability is used to obtain a sufficient decay for the solution  $\psi$  that is crucial for characterizing a travelling wave as the limit object in (9).*

The main ingredients in the proof of Theorem 1.3 stand in three main ideas. Orbital stability allows us to construct a compact profile with speed  $c_0^*$  towards which the solution  $\psi$  weakly tends as time goes to  $+\infty$ . Furthermore, as previously analyzed in works such as [11], the structure of  $(NLS_{hy})$  and the exponential decay of the hydrodynamical travelling waves imply a smoothing effect for this profile, as well as some uniform exponential decay. This property is crucial to prove a rigidity theorem for solutions taken close to a stable travelling wave, which eventually provides Theorem 1.3.

## 1.1 The hydrodynamic framework

We first recall that a travelling wave of speed  $c$  close to  $c_s$  neither vanishes nor does any perturbation of such a wave, as ensured by the Sobolev embedding theorem. Non-vanishing solutions can be lifted as  $\psi = |\psi|e^{i\varphi}$ , hence we can construct the hydrodynamical variables given by  $Q = (\eta, v) = (1 - |\Psi|^2, -\partial_x \varphi)$ . In this framework, the natural energy set appears to be the space  $\mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R}) := H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$ . This space corresponds to the particular case  $k = 0$  in the class of spaces  $\mathcal{X}_{hy}^k(\mathbb{R}) = H^{k+1}(\mathbb{R}) \times H^k(\mathbb{R})$  for  $k \geq 0$  endowed with the euclidean norms

$$\|Q\|_{\mathcal{X}^k}^2 = \|\eta\|_{H^{k+1}}^2 + \|v\|_{H^k}^2.$$

One major difference with respect to the original setting is that  $(NLS_{hy})$  is locally well-posed on a vector space (see Appendix B for more details on the Cauchy problem) instead of a complete metric subspace. We also define the  $\mathcal{X}$ -weak convergence as follows. For  $Q_n, Q \in \mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R})$ , we naturally write that

$$Q_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathcal{X}} Q,$$

when

$$\begin{cases} \eta_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} \eta & \text{in } H^1(\mathbb{R}), \\ v_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} v & \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}). \end{cases}$$

Note that the first convergence in (10) is a straightforward consequence of the weak convergence in  $\mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R})$ . We can now state the asymptotic stability in the hydrodynamic framework.

**Theorem 1.8.** *Let  $c^* \in (c_1, c_s)$ . There exists  $\beta_* > 0$  such that for any  $Q_0 \in \mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R})$  satisfying  $d(Q_0, Q_{c^*}) \leq \beta_*$ , then  $Q(t)$  the solution associated with the initial condition  $Q_0$  is globally well-posed and there exist  $c_0^* \in (c_1, c_s)$  and a function  $a \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$  such that*

$$Q(t, \cdot + a(t)) \underset{t \rightarrow +\infty}{\overset{\mathcal{X}}{\rightarrow}} Q_{c_0^*}.$$

We will eventually derive asymptotic stability in the original framework, that is Theorem 1.3, from Theorem 1.8.

## 1.2 Orbital stability of a travelling wave

We have seen that the notion of stability needs to be properly defined. Typically, to understand the instability phenomenon described by (8), one has to take the symmetries of the equation into account. In other words, one can view the invariances of (NLS) as degrees of freedom regarding the possible different types of evolution for a solution. Orbital stability is designed in that purpose. We refer to [4, 5] where this question is solved, for more details regarding the following statements. Under the previous conditions (H1), (H2) and (H3) on the nonlinearity  $f \in C^3(\mathbb{R}_+)$  and for given speed  $c^* \in (c_0, c_s)$ , the hydrodynamic travelling wave  $Q_{c^*}$  is orbitally stable in the following sense.

**Theorem 1.9** ([5]). *Let  $c^* \in (c_0, c_s)$ . There exists  $\alpha_*, A_* > 0$ , such that the following holds. If  $Q_0 = (\eta_0, v_0) \in \mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R})$  is such that for some  $a^0 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$\alpha_0 := \|Q_0 - Q_{c^*}(\cdot - a^0)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq \alpha_*, \quad (11)$$

*then, the unique solution  $Q(t) = (\eta(t), v(t))$  to (NLS)<sub>hy</sub> associated with the initial datum  $(\eta_0, v_0)$  is globally defined. Moreover there exists  $(a, c) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2)$  such that for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $Q(t)$  can be decomposed as*

$$Q(t, \cdot + a(t)) = Q_{c(t)} + \varepsilon(t), \quad (12)$$

where

$$\|\varepsilon(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} + |c(t) - c^*| + |a(t) - a^0| \leq A_* \alpha_0, \quad (13)$$

and

$$|a'(t) - c(t)|^2 + |c'(t)| \leq A_* \|\varepsilon(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2. \quad (14)$$

Furthermore, recall that we construct the functions  $a$  and  $c$  in Theorem 1.9 by an implicit function argument such that we have both the orthogonality conditions

$$\langle \varepsilon(t), \partial_x Q_{c(t)} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} = \nabla p(Q_{c(t)}) \cdot \varepsilon(t) = 0. \quad (15)$$

From a spectral analysis of the linearized operator  $\mathcal{H}_c$ , we also recall that under the orthogonality conditions, there exists a positive constant  $l_{c(t)}$  such that

$$\langle \mathcal{H}_{c(t)}(\varepsilon(t)), \varepsilon(t) \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \geq l_{c(t)} \|\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2. \quad (16)$$

**Remark 1.10.** *This result expresses the fact that we can modulate a perturbation of a travelling wave  $Q_c$  so that it stays close to this travelling wave as time evolves. The modulation consists of modifying the speed and translating the travelling wave along the evolution, and the so-called parameters are given by the functions  $a$  and  $c$  above. Moreover, (13) and (14) provide some control over these parameters. As a straightforward consequence of this result, a compact profile emerges and then appears to be a suitable candidate to feature the asymptotic behavior of the solution  $Q(t)$ .*

**Remark 1.11.** Taking the limit  $\alpha_0 \rightarrow 0$  in both (13) and (14) formally implies that the translation parameters behave like a linear function  $a(t) \sim mt$  and then  $Q(t) \sim Q_{c^*}(\cdot - mt)$ . It is of interest to know whether the translation parameter  $a(t)$  behaves as an actual linear function of  $t$ . However, this does not stand a fair chance of success since it was shown in [21] for the generalized Korteweg-de Vries equation, that the analogue translation parameters  $a(t)$  can behave, up to a renormalization, as  $mt + \sqrt{\ln(t)}$ .

**Remark 1.12.** The only difference with the original result in [5] lies in the quadratic control in (14). This further control is justified in Appendix C.

In the sequel, we introduce the main ideas of the proof of Theorem 1.3 and how they are articulated.

### 1.3 Sketch of the proof

#### 1.3.1 Construction of the profile in hydrodynamic variables

Using orbital stability, we can construct a limit profile, up to a subsequence, by using (13). Indeed, the functions  $\varepsilon$  and  $c$  are bounded respectively in  $\mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathbb{R}$ . Given a speed  $c^* \in (c_0, c_s)$ , an initial condition  $Q_0$  satisfying (11) and a sequence of time  $(t_n)$  tending to  $+\infty$ , we can suppose, up to a subsequence, that there exist  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_0 \in \mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $c_0^* \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\begin{cases} \varepsilon(t_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathcal{X}} \tilde{\varepsilon}_0, \\ c(t_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} c_0^*. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Now, by local well-posedness, we can also construct  $\tilde{Q}(t)$  the unique solution of  $(NLS_{hy})$  with initial condition  $\tilde{Q}_0 := Q_{c_0^*} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_0$ . Using both convergences (17), then the control (14) with a potentially smaller  $\alpha_*$ , and the Lipschitz continuity of  $c \mapsto Q_c$  as stated in Lemma A.1 in [5], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{Q}_0 - Q_{c^*} \right\|_{\mathcal{X}} &\leq \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_0\|_{\mathcal{X}} + K_{lip}|c^* - c_0^*| \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|\varepsilon(t_n)\|_{\mathcal{X}} + K_{lip} \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} |c^* - c(t_n)| \leq \alpha_*. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Therefore, by orbital stability,  $\tilde{Q}(t)$  is globally defined and there exist two functions  $\tilde{c}, \tilde{a}$  such that for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have the decomposition

$$\tilde{Q}(t, \cdot + \tilde{a}(t)) = Q_{\tilde{c}(t)} + \tilde{\varepsilon}(t), \quad (19)$$

with for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\|\tilde{\varepsilon}(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} + |\tilde{c}(t) - c_0^*| \leq A_* \left\| \tilde{Q}_0 - Q_{c^*} \right\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq A_* \alpha_*, \quad (20)$$

and

$$|\tilde{a}'(t) - \tilde{c}(t)|^2 + |\tilde{c}'(t)| \leq A_* \|\tilde{\varepsilon}(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2. \quad (21)$$

For  $c \in [0, c_s]$ , we define

$$\nu_c := \sqrt{c_s^2 - c^2}.$$

From both previous estimates (20) and (21), and up to taking a smaller  $\alpha_*$  in (18), we can deduce some uniform control in time for several crucial quantities, such as  $\nu_c$ . In this sense, we state the following result, and we refer to Corollary 1.12 in [5] for the proof.

**Proposition 1.13.** *There exists  $\iota_* > 0$  and  $I_* \in (0, \frac{3}{2})$  depending only on  $c^*$  such that for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$\min \left\{ \tilde{c}(t), \nu_{\tilde{c}(t)}, \inf_{\mathbb{R}}(1 - \eta_{\tilde{c}(t)}), \inf_{\mathbb{R}}(1 - \tilde{\eta}), l_{\tilde{c}(t)}, -\frac{d}{dc}(p(Q_{\tilde{c}(t)})), -\frac{d}{dc}(p(Q_{c(t)})) \right\} \geq \iota_*,$$

and

$$\max \left\{ \|\tilde{\eta}(t)\|_{L^\infty}, |\tilde{a}'(t) - c_0^*|, \|\tilde{\psi}(t)\|_{L^\infty} \right\} \leq I_*.$$

Moreover, we shall use the weak continuity of the flow in order to obtain some convergences similar to (17), but along the time evolution. That is the aim of the next proposition, the proof of which can be found at the end of Appendix B.

**Proposition 1.14.** *Let  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then we have*

$$Q(t_n + t, \cdot + a(t_n)) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathcal{X}} \tilde{Q}(t),$$

as well as

$$a(t_n + t) - a(t_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} \tilde{a}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad c(t_n + t) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} \tilde{c}(t).$$

**Remark 1.15.** *Proposition 1.14 implies that  $\tilde{a}(0) = 0$  and  $\tilde{c}(0) = c_0^*$ .*

### 1.3.2 Liouville property around a travelling wave

The following step of the proof is to establish a rigidity property for smooth decaying solutions close to travelling waves. In fact, we shall prove that such solutions have no other choice but to be exactly a travelling wave. In the sequel, the previous profile  $\tilde{Q}$  shall be shown to decay sufficiently fast, fulfilling the conditions (22) in the next proposition. Eventually, since  $\tilde{Q}$  meets the assumptions of this rigidity property, this will impose that it is equal to a travelling wave.

The rigidity result is stated in the frame of the decomposition with modulation parameters. In its proof, we make crucial use of the smallness of the considered travelling waves. This is related to the bound from below in Lemma 1.24 that we are only able to prove for  $c$  close enough to  $c_s$ .

**Proposition 1.16.** *There exist an integer  $l_0$  and a speed  $c_1 \in (0, c_s)$  such that if  $c_0^* \in (c_1, c_s)$ , then the following holds. If there exist  $r > 5/2$  and  $C > 0$  such that for any  $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and any integer  $l \in \{0, \dots, l_0\}$ , we have*

$$\left| \partial_x^{l+1} \tilde{\eta}(t, x + \tilde{a}(t)) \right| + \left| \partial_x^l \tilde{\eta}(t, x + \tilde{a}(t)) \right| + \left| \partial_x^l \tilde{v}(t, x + \tilde{a}(t)) \right| \leq \frac{C}{1 + |x|^r}, \quad (22)$$

then we obtain  $\tilde{a}(t) = c_0^* t$ ,  $\tilde{c}(t) = c_0^*$  and for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\tilde{Q}(t) = Q_{c_0^*}(\cdot - c_0^* t).$$

**Remark 1.17.** *In the sequel, we will show that it is sufficient to take  $l_0 = 12$ . Then in a second step and consistently with Remark 1.7, the choice of  $l_*$  for which the main result holds will depend on the value of  $l_0$ .*

**Remark 1.18.** *Combining both the exponential decay in (5) of the travelling waves, and the decay (22) implies that  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$  and its derivatives decay similarly to (22). Indeed, we infer that there exists  $C_* > 0$  such that for any  $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $l \in \{0, \dots, l_0\}$ ,*

$$|\partial_x^{l+1} \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta(t, x)| + |\partial_x^l \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta(t, x)| + |\partial_x^l \tilde{\varepsilon}_v(t, x)| \leq \frac{\tilde{C}}{1 + |x|^r} + K_d e^{-a_d \iota_* |x|} \leq \frac{C_*}{1 + |x|^r}.$$

**Remark 1.19.** Once  $c_1$  is exhibited (see the proof of Lemma 1.24), the condition  $c_0^* \in (c_1, c_s)$  can be imposed by taking  $c^* \in (c_1, c_s)$  and potentially reducing the value of  $\alpha_*$ .

**Remark 1.20.** This proposition provides a classification for solutions of  $(NLS_{hy})$  initially taken sufficiently close to a stable travelling wave and enjoying the decaying property (22). Furthermore, we think that this classification can be proved if the next less restrictive property is satisfied. Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $R > 0$  such that for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\int_{|x-\tilde{a}(t)| \geq R} \pi(\tilde{Q}(t, x)) dx \leq \epsilon,$$

where  $\pi$  is the momentum density defined in (27). This uniform compactness condition is set consistently with the assumptions of the analogous Liouville theorem stated in [19, 20]. Under this condition, Proposition 1.16 prescribes the structure of a solution taken close to a travelling wave and that does not disperse. There is no other choice for these solutions to be an exact travelling wave.

**Remark 1.21.** One contribution of this article lies in the fact that the rigidity property can be shown for solutions that have algebraic decay instead of exponential decay. Precisely, for higher dimensions, the travelling waves in the Gross-Pitaevskii case are known to decay with an algebraic rate [16].

The proof of Proposition 1.16 can be divided into several steps. We first focus on the equation satisfied by  $\tilde{\varepsilon}(t)$ . The Hamiltonian structure of  $(NLS_{hy})$  can be expressed for a generic non-vanishing solution  $Q$  as

$$\partial_t Q = J \nabla E(Q), \tag{23}$$

where

$$JQ = -2S\partial_x Q \quad \text{with} \quad S := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{24}$$

and where the expression of the hydrodynamic energy is

$$E(Q) = E(\eta, v) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} e(\eta, v) := \frac{1}{8} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(\partial_x \eta)^2}{1 - \eta} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 - \eta)v^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} F(1 - \eta). \tag{25}$$

Moreover, we recall that  $(TW_c)$  reads in the hydrodynamic framework as

$$\nabla(E - cp)(Q_c) = 0. \tag{26}$$

This equation can be viewed as the Euler-Lagrange equation associated with the minimization problem for constructing  $Q_c$  in [4] in which the hydrodynamic momentum is defined by

$$p(Q) = p(\eta, v) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \pi(\eta, v) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta v. \tag{27}$$

Using (26), we can linearize (23) around the travelling wave of speed  $c$  and this leads to

$$\partial_t \varepsilon = J \mathcal{H}_c(\varepsilon)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}_c = \nabla^2(E - cp)(Q_c)$  is the linearized operator around the travelling wave  $Q_c$ . Among the properties of the linearized operator that are analyzed in [5], we recall that  $\mathcal{H}_c$  is a self-adjoint operator with domain  $H^2(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$ . It owns a unique negative direction, a unique

vanishing direction, and  $\ker(\mathcal{H}_c) = \text{Span}(Q'_c)$ . Now, using (23),(26) and the decomposition (12) with  $c = \tilde{c}(t)$ , we obtain the equation satisfied by  $\tilde{\varepsilon}(t) = \tilde{Q}(t, \cdot + \tilde{a}(t)) - Q_{\tilde{c}(t)}$ , that is

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \tilde{\varepsilon} &= J \left( \nabla E(\tilde{Q}) - \nabla E(Q_{\tilde{c}(t)}) - \nabla^2 E(Q_{\tilde{c}(t)}) \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon} \right) + J \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}(t)}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \\ &\quad + \tilde{c}(t) J \left( \nabla p(Q_{\tilde{c}(t)}) + \nabla^2 p(Q_{\tilde{c}(t)}) \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon} \right) + \tilde{a}'(t) \partial_x \tilde{Q}(t, \cdot + \tilde{a}(t)) - \tilde{c}'(t) \partial_c Q_{\tilde{c}(t)} \end{aligned}$$

Due to the very generic identities for any  $Q, \varepsilon \in \mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$J \nabla p(Q) = -\partial_x Q \text{ and } J \nabla^2 p(Q) \cdot \varepsilon = -\partial_x \varepsilon,$$

we are led to

$$\partial_t \tilde{\varepsilon} = J \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}(t)}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) + J \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}(t)}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) + (\tilde{a}'(t) - \tilde{c}(t)) (\partial_x Q_{\tilde{c}(t)} + \partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}(t)) - \tilde{c}'(t) \partial_c Q_{\tilde{c}(t)}, \quad (28)$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}(t)}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) = \nabla E(Q_{\tilde{c}(t)} + \tilde{\varepsilon}) - \nabla E(Q_{\tilde{c}(t)}) - \nabla^2 E(Q_{\tilde{c}(t)}) \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon}. \quad (29)$$

Taking the first-order approximation  $\mathcal{O}(\|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2) = 0$  and imposing  $|\tilde{a}'(t) - \tilde{c}(t)|^2 + |\tilde{c}'(t)| = \mathcal{O}(\|\tilde{\varepsilon}(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2)$  consistently to the orbital stability, we obtain the approximate linearized equation

$$\partial_t \tilde{\varepsilon} \approx J \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}(t)}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) + (\tilde{a}'(t) - \tilde{c}(t)) \partial_x Q_{\tilde{c}(t)}. \quad (30)$$

In order to obtain suitable estimates for  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ , we introduce a dual problem. Formally applying  $\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}(t)}$  to (30) and using that the null-space of  $\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}(t)}$  is spanned by  $\partial_x Q_{\tilde{c}(t)}$ , we get  $\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}(t)}(\partial_t \tilde{\varepsilon}) \approx \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}(t)} J \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}(t)}(\tilde{\varepsilon})$ . This leads to the definition of the new variable  $\tilde{e}(t) := S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}(t)}(\tilde{\varepsilon}(t))$ , which we also denote  $\tilde{e} = (\tilde{e}_\eta, \tilde{e}_v)$ . The main properties of this formulation is stated below.

**Lemma 1.22.** *We assume that the hypothesis of Proposition 1.16 hold true. Then  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \in C^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N} \mathcal{X}_{hy}^4(\mathbb{R})) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N} \mathcal{X}_{hy}^2(\mathbb{R}))$  and  $\tilde{e} \in C^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N} \mathcal{X}_{hy}^2(\mathbb{R})) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N} \mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R}))$ . Furthermore, we have the equation*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \tilde{e} &= -2S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}(t)}(\partial_x \tilde{e}) + S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}(t)}(J \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}(t)} \tilde{e}) - \tilde{c}'(t) S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}(t)}(\partial_c Q_{\tilde{c}(t)}) \\ &\quad + \tilde{c}'(t) S \partial_c \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}(t)}(\tilde{e}) + ((\tilde{a}'(t) - \tilde{c}(t)) S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}(t)}(\partial_x \tilde{e})). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, there exists  $D_* > 0$  only depending on  $c^*$  such that for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\|\tilde{\varepsilon}(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq D_* \|\tilde{e}(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}. \quad (31)$$

Proposition 1.16 next relies on the introduction of a time-dependent virial argument related to a matrix-valued function taking the form

$$N(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x \\ x & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \gamma^* M_{\tilde{c}(t)}, \quad (32)$$

where

$$M_{\tilde{c}}(x) := \begin{pmatrix} m_{1,\tilde{c}} & m_{2,\tilde{c}} \\ m_{2,\tilde{c}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with } m_{1,\tilde{c}} := -\frac{\eta_{\tilde{c}}'}{\eta_{\tilde{c}}} \text{ and } m_{2,\tilde{c}} := -\frac{\tilde{c} \eta_{\tilde{c}}'}{2(1 - \eta_{\tilde{c}})^2}. \quad (33)$$

**Remark 1.23.** *The matrix  $M_c$  is set so that we have  $\langle M_{\tilde{c}} Q_{\tilde{c}}, \tilde{e}(t) \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} = 0$ . Indeed,  $M_{\tilde{c}} Q_{\tilde{c}} = -S \partial_x Q_{\tilde{c}}$  which is orthogonal to  $S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\varepsilon(t))$ .*

We claim that the matrix  $M_{\tilde{c}}$  is uniformly bounded with respect to  $c$  and  $x$ . Indeed, the function  $m_{2,\tilde{c}}$  is bounded using the exponential decay properties of the travelling waves (5) and the uniform lower bound in Proposition 1.13. As for  $m_{1,\tilde{c}}$ , possibly taking  $c_1$  even closer to  $c_s$  so that Proposition D.1 applies and using once again Proposition 1.13, we infer that there exists a bound  $M_*$ , only depending on  $c^*$  such that  $\|M_{\tilde{c}(t)}\|_{L^\infty} \leq M_*$ . The virial quantity is then defined as

$$n(t) := \langle N(t)\tilde{e}(t), \tilde{e}(t) \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2}.$$

The first matrix in (32) gives some coercivity at infinity for the time derivative  $n'(t)$ . The matrix  $M_{\tilde{c}(t)}$  is designed to get some local coercivity for  $n'(t)$ . The constant  $\gamma_*$  is eventually chosen to obtain the full coercivity in the next lemma. Remark that this argument relies significantly on the smallness of the travelling waves involved, which is why we must restrict to speeds close to  $c_s$ .

**Lemma 1.24.** *We assume that the hypothesis of Proposition 1.16 hold true. Then  $n$  is well-defined and differentiable on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Furthermore, there exists  $c_1 \in (0, c_s)$  such that the following holds. If  $c_0^* \in (c_1, c_s)$  then there exists a constant  $\Xi_* > 0$  only depending on  $c_0^*$  such that for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$n'(t) \geq \Xi_* \|\tilde{e}(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2.$$

We deduce the proof of Proposition 1.16 from both Lemmas 1.22 and 1.24.

*Proof of Proposition 1.16.* By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Proposition C.1 and then Remark 1.18, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle N(t)\tilde{e}(t), \tilde{e}(t) \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2}| &\leq 2 \left\| \sqrt{|x|}\tilde{e}(t) \right\|_{L^2 \times L^2}^2 + 2\gamma_* M_* \|\tilde{e}(t)\|_{L^2 \times L^2}^2 \\ &\leq 2K_*^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} ((\partial_x^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)^2 + (\partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)^2 + \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta^2 + (\partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}_v)^2 + \tilde{\varepsilon}_v^2) (1 + |x|) dx \\ &\leq 2C_*^2 K_*^2 \left\| \frac{1 + |x|}{(1 + |x|^r)^2} \right\|_{L^1}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Since  $r > 1$ , the upper bound in the previous estimate is finite. Combining both the bound (34) and Lemma 1.24 yields to the fact that the integral

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\tilde{e}(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 dt$$

is also finite. As a consequence of this, there exists a sequence of times  $(t_n)$  tending to  $+\infty$  such that

$$\|\tilde{e}(t_n)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0,$$

and as a consequence of (31),

$$\|\tilde{\varepsilon}(t_n)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

To conclude, we use the orbital stability reversely in time by considering  $Q_0^n := \tilde{Q}(t_n, \cdot + \tilde{a}(t_n))$  as initial data, writing  $Q^n(t) = \tilde{Q}(t_n + t, \cdot + \tilde{a}(t_n + t))$  the corresponding solution to  $(NLS_{hy})$  and  $\varepsilon^n(t) = \tilde{Q}(t + t_n, \cdot + \tilde{a}(t + t_n)) - Q_{\tilde{c}(t_n + t)}$ . We have  $\varepsilon^n(-t_n) = \tilde{\varepsilon}_0$  by Remark 1.15. Moreover, by (13), we have  $\|\varepsilon^n(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq \alpha_*$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Applying (13) once more, we can make  $\|\tilde{\varepsilon}_0\|_{\mathcal{X}}$  as small as  $\|\tilde{\varepsilon}(t_n)\|_{\mathcal{X}}$  can be. Thus,  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_0 = 0$  and in particular,  $\tilde{Q}_0 = Q_{c_0^*}$ . This necessarily leads to  $\tilde{Q}(t) = Q_{c_0^*}(\cdot - c_0^* t)$  and then for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\tilde{\varepsilon}(t) = 0$ . Finally, we derive from (21) and Remark 1.15 that  $\tilde{c}(t) = c_0^*$  and  $\tilde{a}(t) = c_0^* t$ .  $\square$

### 1.3.3 Algebraic decay of the solution $\tilde{Q}$

In this section, we verify that  $\tilde{Q}$  satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 1.16. Furthermore, we shall exhibit the suitable value of  $l_*$  for Theorem 1.3 and eventually conclude the proof of Theorem 1.8. To do this, we rely on two propositions stated below. The first one is an almost monotonicity formula for a localized version of the momentum. The second proposition states a remarkable smoothing property satisfied by the solutions of (NLS). Both Propositions 1.25 and 1.27 are proven in Section 2 and depend crucially on the smoothness of  $f$ .

Recall first that the momentum is conserved along the flow, and let us introduce the following localized version for  $\tilde{Q}$

$$\tilde{p}_R(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \pi(\tilde{Q}(t)) \chi_{R+\tilde{a}(t)} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{\eta}(t) \tilde{v}(t) \chi_{R+\tilde{a}(t)}, \quad (35)$$

where  $\chi_R(x) = \chi(x - R)$  and

$$\chi(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \tanh \left( \frac{\tau_*}{2} x \right) \right).$$

Here, the value  $\tau_*$  is to be determined in the proof of Proposition 1.25 and depends only on  $c^*$ . The quantity (35) measures the amount of momentum of  $\tilde{Q}(t, \cdot + \tilde{a}(t))$  on the right of a given real number  $R \in \mathbb{R}$ . The evolution of this quantity is prescribed according to the next proposition. This evolution also holds for the localized momentum associated with the original solution  $Q$  (see Section 2)<sup>2</sup>.

**Proposition 1.25.** *There exist positive constants  $\kappa_*, \tau_*, \sigma_*$  only depending on  $c_*$  such that for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\sigma \in [-\sigma_*, \sigma_*]$ ,*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left( \tilde{p}_{R+\sigma t}(t) \right) \geq \kappa_* \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( (\partial_x \tilde{\eta})^2 + \tilde{\eta}^2 + \tilde{v}^2 \right) (t, \cdot + \tilde{a}(t)) \chi'(\cdot - R - \sigma t) + \mathcal{O} \left( e^{-\tau_* |R+\sigma t|} \right).$$

Arguing exactly as in [6], we deduce the next corollary.

**Corollary 1.26.** *For any  $\rho \geq 0$ , there exists  $\kappa_\rho$  such that for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have*

$$\int_t^{t+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( (\partial_x \tilde{\eta})^2 + \tilde{\eta}^2 + \tilde{v}^2 \right) (s, x + \tilde{a}(s)) |x|^\rho ds \leq \kappa_\rho.$$

Corollary 1.26 holds for any  $\rho \geq 0$ , so that we can fix the value  $\rho = r > \frac{5}{2}$  and write  $\kappa := \kappa_r$ . Next, we deduce that the solution  $\tilde{\psi}$  of (NLS) associated with the variables  $(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{v})$  can be differentiated a certain number of times (depending on  $l_*$ ) and enjoys polynomial decay at infinity. This decay follows from some smoothing effect that was already involved in [6] (see also [11] for related results). Henceforth, we impose the condition

$$l_* \geq l_0 + 1,$$

and verify that the following proposition is sufficient for checking that the Liouville property applies to  $\tilde{Q}$ .

**Proposition 1.27.** *Let  $f \in C^{l_*}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ . For any  $l \in \{1, \dots, l_*\}$ , there exists  $C_l > 0$  only depending on  $c^*$  such that for any  $\Lambda \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$\int_t^{t+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \partial_s^\Lambda [\partial_x^l \tilde{\psi}(s, x + \tilde{a}(s))] \right|^2 |x|^r dx ds \leq C_l.$$

<sup>2</sup>Throughout the article, we shall write  $g(\cdot, c) = \mathcal{O}(f(\cdot, c))$  or  $g(\cdot, c) \lesssim f(\cdot, c)$  whenever there exists a constant  $K > 0$  only depending on  $c^*$  such that for any  $(x, c) \in \mathbb{R} \times (0, c_s)$ ,  $|f(x, c)| \leq K |g(x, c)|$ .

Having admitted that Proposition 1.27 holds, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.8. Set  $\tilde{\Psi}(t, x) = \tilde{\psi}(t, x + \tilde{a}(t))$ . Assuming the preceding proposition, we can show that  $\tilde{\psi}$  possesses the suitable decay. We first prove that for any  $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and any  $l \in \{1, \dots, l_*\}$ , and up to a larger constant  $C_l$ , we have

$$|\partial_x^l \tilde{\Psi}(t, x)| \leq \frac{C_l}{1 + |x|^r}. \quad (36)$$

Indeed, by Proposition 1.27 and the one-dimensional Sobolev embedding  $H^1(J) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(J)$  on any interval  $J \subset \mathbb{R}$ , we have for any  $l \in \{1, \dots, l_*\}$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$|x|^r \left| \partial_x^l \tilde{\Psi} \right|^2 \leq \left\| \partial_x^l \tilde{\Psi} \right\|_{L^\infty(I, L^\infty(|x|^r dx))}^2 \lesssim \left\| \partial_x^l \tilde{\Psi} \right\|_{H^1(I, H^1(|x|^r dx))}^2 \leq 2C_l,$$

where  $I = [t - 1, t + 1]$ . This implies (36). Next, we recall that we can recover  $v$  by the formula

$$\tilde{v} = \frac{\partial_x \tilde{\psi} \cdot i \tilde{\psi}}{|\tilde{\psi}|^2},$$

where  $\cdot$  denotes the usual real scalar product defined by  $z_1 \cdot z_2 = \operatorname{Re}(z_1 \bar{z}_2)$ ,  $\forall z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ . Hence by using (36) and Proposition 1.13 we show recursively that for any  $l \in \{0, \dots, l_*\}$ ,  $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and up to taking a larger constant  $C_l$ ,

$$|\partial_x^l \tilde{v}(t, x + \tilde{a}(t))| \leq \frac{C_l}{1 + |x|^r}. \quad (37)$$

On the other hand, from (36), we also derive

$$|\partial_x^l \tilde{\eta}(t, x + \tilde{a}(t))| \leq \frac{C_l}{1 + |x|^r}, \quad (38)$$

for any  $l \in \{0, \dots, l_*\}$ . Let us handle the cases  $l \in \{1, \dots, l_*\}$  first, writing  $\tilde{\eta} = 1 - \tilde{\psi} \cdot \tilde{\psi}$ , we show using (36) and Proposition 1.13 that

$$\left| \partial_x^l \tilde{\eta}(t, x + \tilde{a}(t)) \right| \leq \sum_{m=0}^l \binom{l}{m} |\partial_x^m \tilde{\Psi}(t, x)| |\partial_x^{l-m} \tilde{\Psi}(t, x)| \leq \frac{C_l}{(1 + |x|^r)^2}.$$

Then it remains to deal with the case  $l = 0$ . By the one-dimensional Sobolev embedding, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\left\| 1 - |\tilde{\Psi}|^2 \right\|_{H^1(I, L^\infty(|x|^r dx))} \leq C_l.$$

By Corollary 1.26, up to taking a larger constant  $\kappa$ , we derive

$$\left\| 1 - |\tilde{\Psi}|^2 \right\|_{L^2(I, L^\infty(|x|^r dx))} \leq \kappa,$$

and by  $(NLS_{hy})$  we have

$$\partial_t (1 - |\tilde{\Psi}|^2)(t, x) = \tilde{a}'(t) \partial_x \tilde{\eta}(t, x + \tilde{a}(t)) - 2\partial_x (\tilde{v}(1 - \tilde{\eta}))(t, x).$$

Therefore, by (37), (38) and once more Proposition 1.13, we obtain

$$\left\| \partial_t (1 - |\tilde{\Psi}|^2) \right\|_{L^2(I, L^\infty(|x|^r dx))} \leq \kappa.$$

Conclusion. Provided that both Propositions 1.25 and 1.27 hold and since  $l_* \geq l_0 + 1$ , we have proven that (22) is satisfied by the limit profile  $\tilde{Q}$ . Then the Liouville property in Proposition 1.16 applies and for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\tilde{Q}(t) = Q_{c_0^*}(\cdot - c_0^* t).$$

This yields, by (17), to

$$Q(t_n, \cdot + a(t_n)) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathcal{X}} Q_{c_0^*}.$$

It remains to see that the convergence does not depend on the choice of the subsequence. This also relies on the monotonicity property in Proposition 1.25 applied to  $Q$ . More precisely, it is a consequence of (2.4) in Section 2. In particular, it can be proved the same way as it was already done in Subsection 1.3.4 in [6], given that this part does not depend on the nonlinearity  $f$ . This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.8.

### 1.3.4 Proof of the asymptotic stability in the classical variables

We have just proved the asymptotic stability of a hydrodynamical soliton  $Q_c = (\eta_c, v_c)$  for  $c \in (c_0, c_s)$ . Let us finish the proof and show that the travelling wave  $\mathbf{u}_c$  is asymptotically stable in the original setting. Invoking Lemma A.1, we fix  $\delta_c$  small enough such that  $d(\psi_0, \mathbf{u}_c) \leq \delta_c$  and  $\|Q_0 - Q_c\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq \beta_c$ . Therefore Theorem 1.8 applies and there exist  $c^* \in (c_0, c_s)$  and a function  $a$  such that whenever  $t_n \rightarrow +\infty$ ,  $Q_{t_n} := Q(t_n, \cdot + a(t_n))$  satisfies

$$Q_{t_n} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathcal{X}} Q_{c^*}.$$

In view of the previous convergence, we claim that

$$\psi(t, \cdot + a(t)) \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow +\infty]{d} \mathbf{u}_{c^*}. \quad (39)$$

We now verify that all three convergences in (39) are true. Setting the notation  $\psi_t := \psi(\cdot + a(t), t)$ , we have that  $(\psi_{t_n})_n$  is bounded in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R})$ . Then up to a subsequence, we get that

$$\psi_{t_n} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} \psi_\infty \quad \text{in } H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}), \quad (40)$$

for some function  $\psi_\infty \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R})$ . By the Rellich theorem and up to taking a further subsequence, convergence (40) holds strongly in  $L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  as well, thus we have the pointwise equality of the functions  $|\psi_\infty|$  and  $|\mathbf{u}_{c^*}|$ . However, the hydrodynamic framework omits the phase of the classical variable  $\psi$ , so that we need to modulate while taking care of this degree of freedom. To take this into account, we shall construct a time-dependent phase shift  $\theta$  such that the underlying solution converges as desired. This modulates the evolution so that the phases of both  $\psi_\infty$  and  $\mathbf{u}_{c^*}$  eventually match for any time  $t$ .

**Claim 1.28.** *There exist a function  $\theta \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})$  such that  $\theta'$  is bounded and a bump function  $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  such that*

$$\mathfrak{d}_{c^*} := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \neq 0,$$

and for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$e^{-i\theta(t)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi(x) \psi(x + a(t), t) dx \in \mathfrak{d}_{c^*} \mathbb{R}_+^*.$$

Replacing (40) by  $e^{-i\theta(t_n)}\psi_{t_n}$  does not change the pointwise equality  $|\psi_\infty| = |\mathbf{u}_c|$  so that we can assume that

$$e^{-i\theta(t_n)}\psi_{t_n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \psi_\infty \quad \text{in } H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}).$$

On the other hand we have

$$v(t_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} v_{c^*} \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}),$$

while

$$v(t_n) = \frac{i\psi_{t_n} \cdot \partial_x \psi_{t_n}}{|\psi_{t_n}|^2} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{i\psi_\infty \cdot \partial_x \psi_\infty}{|\psi_\infty|^2} = \varphi'_\infty \quad \text{in } L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}).$$

Then by integrating between 0 and  $x$ , we obtain for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  that  $\varphi_{c^*}(x) - \varphi_{c^*}(0) = \varphi_\infty(x) - \varphi_\infty(0)$  and therefore the expression  $\psi_\infty = \mathbf{u}_{c^*} e^{i(\varphi_\infty(0) - \varphi_{c^*}(0))}$ . Hence, the convergence

$$e^{-i\theta(t_n)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi_{t_n} \chi \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} e^{i(\varphi_\infty(0) - \varphi_{c^*}(0))} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \chi.$$

Now Claim 1.28 forces the difference of phases to behave as follows,

$$\varphi_\infty(0) = \varphi_{c^*}(0) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}.$$

In summary, we have proved that

$$e^{-i\theta(t_n)}\psi(\cdot + a(t_n), t_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{u}_{c^*}.$$

In view of what has been done in the hydrodynamical variable, we can show that the convergence does not depend on the choice of the sequence  $(t_n)$  and thus the convergence holds as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  and one can write

$$e^{-i\theta(t)}\psi(\cdot + a(t), t) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{u}_{c^*}.$$

Furthermore, this convergence still holds along the variable  $t + T$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ . This gives

$$e^{-i\theta(t+T)}\psi(\cdot + a(t+T), t+T) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{u}_{c^*}. \quad (41)$$

From the weak continuity of the flow in standard variables in Proposition B.2, we deduce that for any  $T \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$e^{-i\theta(t)}\psi(\cdot + a(t), t+T) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{u}_{c^*}(\cdot - c^*T). \quad (42)$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 1.14, we infer that

$$a(t+T) - a(t) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow +\infty} c^*T.$$

Convolving  $t \mapsto a(t)$  with any fixed mollifier provides the suitable function  $b$  satisfying for any  $T \in \mathbb{R}$

$$b(t) - a(t) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow +\infty} 0, \quad b'(t) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow +\infty} c^* \quad \text{and} \quad b(t+T) - b(t) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow +\infty} c^*T. \quad (43)$$

Now, by the triangle inequality, we have

$$\left| \left( e^{i(\theta(t) - \theta(t+T))} - 1 \right) \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \right| \leq \left| \mathbf{u}_{c^*} - e^{-i\theta(t)}\psi(\cdot + b(t) + c^*T, t+T) \right| \quad (44)$$

$$+ \left| \psi(\cdot + b(t) + c^*T, t+T) - \psi(\cdot + b(t+T), t+T) \right| \quad (45)$$

$$+ \left| e^{-i\theta(t+T)}\psi(\cdot + b(t+T), t+T) - \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \right|. \quad (46)$$

By (42) resp. (41), we deduce that the right-hand terms in (44) resp. (46) converge towards 0 uniformly on any compact set of  $\mathbb{R}$  as  $t$  tends to  $+\infty$ . As for the term (45), it converges weakly to 0 in  $H^1(\mathbb{R})$  due to the right-hand side of (43). This yields

$$e^{i(\theta(t)-\theta(t+T))} \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \quad \text{in } L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}).$$

Now, take a representative of the equivalence class in the torus, still denoted by  $\theta$ . By the previous convergence, we necessarily have

$$\theta(t+T) - \theta(t) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow +\infty} 2\pi k_T,$$

for some  $k_T \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Let us verify that  $k_T = 0$ . By Claim 1.28, we can first write  $|\theta(t+T) - \theta(t)| \leq \|\theta'\|_{L^\infty} T$ . Provided that  $T$  is small enough so that  $\|\theta'\|_{L^\infty} T < 2\pi$ , we deduce by taking the limit  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  that  $k_T = 0$ . We can now adapt this argument for any  $T \in \mathbb{R}$ , by taking  $\tilde{T} = \frac{T}{n}$  with an integer  $n$  large enough, so that  $k_{\tilde{T}} = 0$ . We conclude by writing

$$|\theta(t+T) - \theta(t)| \leq \sum_{l=1}^n |\theta(t + (l-1)\tilde{T} + \tilde{T}) - \theta(t + (l-1)\tilde{T})|.$$

and by passing to the limit  $t + (l-1)\tilde{T} \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ . We can finally convolve such a representative  $\theta$  with a fixed mollifier as for constructing the function  $b$  above, and keeping the notation  $\theta$  for such a function, we therefore obtain a modified  $C^1$  function  $\theta$  satisfying

$$\theta'(t) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow +\infty} 0,$$

which concludes the proof of Theorem 1.3. It remains to prove Claim 1.28.

*Proof.* The function  $\mathbf{u}_{c^*}$  does not vanish on  $\mathbb{R}$ , so that in particular,  $\mathbf{u}_{c^*}(0) \neq 0$ . Given any smooth function  $\chi$ , compactly supported in  $[-1, 1]$  such that  $\chi(0) = 1$ , and up to shrinking the length of its support by taking  $\chi_n = \chi(\frac{\cdot}{n})$  and  $n$  large enough, we can assume that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \neq 0$ . To construct  $\theta$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , we first write that for any  $\tilde{\varphi} \in \mathbb{R}$  that does not depend on  $x$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi \psi_t \right| &\geq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\tilde{\varphi}} \chi \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \right| - \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi (\psi_t - e^{i\tilde{\varphi}} \mathbf{u}_{c^*}) \right| \\ &\geq |\mathfrak{d}_{c^*}| - \left\| \psi_t - e^{i\tilde{\varphi}} \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \right\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Lifting the non-vanishing solution  $\psi$  as  $\psi = |\psi|e^{i\varphi}$ , setting  $\varphi_t := \varphi(\cdot + b(t), t)$  and  $v_t := -\partial_x \varphi_t$ , and by the special choice of adding a phase shift  $\tilde{\varphi} = \varphi(b(t), t) - \varphi_{c^*}(0)$  (that only depends on  $t$ ), we then derive

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \psi_t - e^{i\tilde{\varphi}} \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \right\|_{L^\infty} &= \left\| |\psi_t| e^{i\varphi_t} - |\mathbf{u}_{c^*}| e^{i\varphi_t} \right\|_{L^\infty} + \left\| |\mathbf{u}_{c^*}| (e^{i\varphi_t} - e^{i(\varphi_{c^*} + \tilde{\varphi})}) \right\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq \left\| |\psi_t| - |\mathbf{u}_{c^*}| \right\|_{L^\infty} + \left\| \left( e^{i\varphi_t} - e^{i(\varphi_{c^*} - \varphi_{c^*}(0) + \varphi(b(t), t))} \right) |\mathbf{u}_{c^*}| \right\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{|\psi_t|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_{c^*}|^2}{|\psi_t| + |\mathbf{u}_{c^*}|} \right\|_{L^\infty} + \left\| (\varphi_t - (\varphi_{c^*} - \varphi_{c^*}(0) + \varphi(b(t), t))) |\mathbf{u}_{c^*}| \right\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\inf_{\mathbb{R}} |\mathbf{u}_{c^*}|} \|\eta_t - \eta_{c^*}\|_{L^\infty} + \|v_t - v_{c^*}\|_{L^2} \left\| \sqrt{|x|} |\mathbf{u}_{c^*}| \right\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

By orbital stability, provided that  $\beta_c$  is taken small enough, the norm  $\|Q_t - Q_c\|_{\mathcal{X}}$  can be taken as small as we wish, uniformly in time. Therefore, by both previous estimates, we can assume that for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi \psi_t \right| \geq \frac{|\mathfrak{d}_{c^*}|}{2} > 0. \quad (47)$$

Thus we can lift the previous quantity and there exists a unique function  $\theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$  such that for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$e^{-i\theta(t)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi \psi_t \in \mathfrak{d}_{c^*} \mathbb{R}_+^*. \quad (48)$$

Regarding the smoothness of  $\theta$ , we implement an implicit function type argument. Consider the map  $X$  defined for any  $(t, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  by

$$X(t, \theta) = \Im \left( e^{-i \arg(\mathfrak{d}_{c^*})} e^{-i\theta} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi \psi_t \right),$$

where  $\arg(\mathfrak{d}_{c^*})$  designates the principal argument of  $\mathfrak{d}_{c^*}$ . By construction,  $X(t, \theta(t)) = 0$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Moreover,  $\partial_2 X(t, \theta(t)) \neq 0$ , then by uniqueness, we derive that  $\theta$  is smooth and that  $\theta$  satisfies the ordinary differential equation

$$\theta'(t) = \frac{-\Im \left( i e^{-i \arg(\mathfrak{d}_{c^*})} e^{-i\theta(t)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\chi'' + i b'(t) \chi' + f(|\psi_t|^2) \chi) \psi_t \right)}{X(t, \theta(t) + \frac{\pi}{2})}.$$

Applying the Sobolev embedding theorem to  $\psi_t$ , and using (47) and the definition of  $\theta(t)$ , we observe that this derivative is uniformly bounded in time.  $\square$

## 2 Monotonicity and smoothing properties of (NLS)

First, we prove the monotonicity formula.

*Proof of Proposition 1.25.* We recall from [5] the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $(\eta, v) \in C^0([0, T], \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}(\mathbb{R}))$  be a solution of (NLS<sub>hy</sub>). For any function  $\tilde{\chi} \in C^0([0, T], C_b^3(\mathbb{R})) \cap C^1([0, T], C_b^0(\mathbb{R}))$ , then  $t \mapsto \langle \tilde{\chi}, \eta v \rangle_{L^2}$  is differentiable and its derivative is*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{\chi} \eta v \right) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial_t \tilde{\chi} \eta v + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial_x \tilde{\chi} \left( (1 - 2\eta) v^2 + \tilde{F}(\eta) + \frac{(3 - 2\eta)(\partial_x \eta)^2}{4(1 - \eta)^2} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial_x^3 \tilde{\chi} (\eta + \ln(1 - \eta)), \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$\tilde{F}(\rho) = \rho f(1 - \rho) - F(1 - \rho). \quad (2.2)$$

Applying this to  $\tilde{\chi}(t, x) = \chi_{R+\sigma t}(x)$  provides

$$\frac{d}{dt} (\tilde{p}_{R+\sigma t}(t)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \pi_{R+\sigma t}(\tilde{\eta}, v)(t, \cdot + \tilde{a}(t)),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{R+\sigma t}(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{v}) &= \frac{1}{2}\chi'_{R+\sigma t} \left( (1-2\tilde{\eta})\tilde{v}^2 + \tilde{F}(\tilde{\eta}) + \frac{(3-2\tilde{\eta})(\partial_x \tilde{\eta})^2}{4(1-\tilde{\eta})^2} - (\tilde{a}'(t) + \sigma)\tilde{\eta}\tilde{v} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4}\chi'''_{R+\sigma t}(\tilde{\eta} + \ln(1-\tilde{\eta})). \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, we have by (21)

$$|\tilde{a}(t) + \sigma| \leq |\tilde{a}(t) - c_0^*| + c_0^* + \sigma_* \leq \mu_*,$$

where  $\mu_* := A_*\alpha_* + c_0^* + \sigma_*$ , and where the values of  $\alpha_*$  and  $\sigma_*$  can be decreased so that  $\mu_* < c_s$ . In addition, we have  $|\chi'''_R| \leq \tau_*^2\chi'_R$  and by (2.2) and some standard real analysis, there exists a positive constant  $C_{\ln}$  such that

$$\frac{1}{2}\chi'_R\tilde{F}(\tilde{\eta}) + \frac{1}{4}\chi'''_R(\tilde{\eta} + \ln(1-\tilde{\eta})) \geq \frac{1}{2}\chi'_R \left( -\int_0^1 r f'(1-r\tilde{\eta})dr - \tau_*^2 C_{\ln} \right) \tilde{\eta}^2.$$

As a consequence of the previous work and Proposition 1.13, we obtain

$$\pi_R(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{v}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\chi'_R \left( \frac{(3-2I_*)(\partial_x \tilde{\eta})^2}{8(1+I_*)^2} + q(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{v}) \right),$$

where

$$q(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{v}) = (1-2\tilde{\eta})\tilde{v}^2 - \mu_*|\tilde{\eta}\tilde{v}| + \left( -\int_0^1 r f'(1-r\tilde{\eta})dr - \tau_*^2 C_{\ln} \right) \tilde{\eta}^2.$$

We now separate the real line into two disjoint parts that are an interval  $\mathcal{I} = [-R_0, R_0]$ , where the travelling wave is small, and its complement  $\mathcal{I}^c$  where  $\chi'$  is small. Regarding the region where  $x \in \mathcal{I}^c$ , we state the following claim.

**Claim 2.2.** *Up to taking  $R_0$  large enough, and possibly shrinking the value of  $\tau_*$ , there exists  $\kappa_2 > 0$  such that on  $\mathcal{I}^c$ ,*

$$q(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{v}) \geq \kappa_2(\tilde{\eta}^2 + \tilde{v}^2).$$

Assuming that the preceding claim holds true, we conclude that, up to shrinking the value of  $\kappa_2$ , that on  $\mathcal{I}^c$  and for  $\sigma \in [-\sigma_*, \sigma_*]$ ,

$$\pi_{R+\sigma t}(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{v}) \geq \kappa_2\chi'_{R+\sigma t} \left( (\partial_x \tilde{\eta})^2 + \tilde{\eta}^2 + \tilde{v}^2 \right).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(\tilde{p}_{R+\sigma t}(t)) &\geq \int_{\mathcal{I}} \pi_{R+\sigma t}(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{v}) + \kappa_2 \int_{\mathcal{I}^c} \left( (\partial_x \tilde{\eta})^2 + \tilde{\eta}^2 + \tilde{v}^2 \right) (t, \cdot + \tilde{a}(t)) \chi'_{R+\sigma t} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{I}} \left( \pi_{R+\sigma t}(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{v}) - \kappa_2 \left( (\partial_x \tilde{\eta})^2 + \tilde{\eta}^2 + \tilde{v}^2 \right) \chi'_{R+\sigma t}(x) \right) (t, x + \tilde{a}(t)) dx \\ &\quad + \kappa_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( (\partial_x \tilde{\eta})^2 + \tilde{\eta}^2 + \tilde{v}^2 \right) (t, \cdot + \tilde{a}(t)) \chi'_{R+\sigma t}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, and from the previous analysis and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$|\pi_{R+\sigma t}(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{v})| \leq \frac{1}{2}\chi'_R \left( \left(1 + 2I_* + \frac{\mu_*}{2}\right)\tilde{v}^2 + (\|f''\|_{L^\infty([0,2])} + C_{\ln} + \frac{\mu_*}{2})\tilde{\eta}^2 + \frac{3+2I_*}{4t_*^2}\tau_*^2(\partial_x \tilde{\eta})^2 \right).$$

Furthermore, using (H1) and Proposition 1.13, we have the useful bounds

$$(\partial_x \tilde{\eta})^2 \leq 8(1 + I_*) \frac{(\partial_x \tilde{\eta})^2}{8(1 - \tilde{\eta})}, \quad \tilde{\eta}^2 \leq \frac{4}{c_s^2} \frac{F(1 - \tilde{\eta})}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{v}^2 \leq \frac{(1 - \tilde{\eta})\tilde{v}^2}{\iota_*}, \quad (2.3)$$

so that there exists a positive constant  $\kappa_1$  such that on  $\mathbb{R}$  now,

$$|\pi_{R+\sigma t}(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{v}) - \kappa_2((\partial_x \tilde{\eta})^2 + \tilde{\eta}^2 + \tilde{v}^2)\chi'_{R+\sigma t}| \leq \kappa_1 e(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{v})|\chi'_{R+\sigma t}|,$$

where  $e(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{v})$  is the energy density defined in (25). Now, since we have for any  $x \in \mathcal{I}$ ,

$$\chi'_{R+\sigma t}(x) \leq \tau_* e^{-\tau_*|x-(R+\sigma t)|} \leq \tau_* e^{\tau_* R_0} e^{-\tau_*|R+\sigma t|} = \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\tau_*|R+\sigma t|}\right),$$

we obtain the control

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\tilde{p}_{R+\sigma t}(t)) \geq -\kappa_1 E(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{v})e^{-\tau_*|R+\sigma t|} + \kappa_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( (\partial_x \tilde{\eta})^2 + \tilde{\eta}^2 + \tilde{v}^2 \right) (t, \cdot + \tilde{a}(t)) \chi'_{R+\sigma t},$$

which concludes the proof by conservation of the energy.  $\square$

It remains to prove the claim.

*Proof of Claim 2.2.* We write

$$q(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{v}) = A_1 \tilde{\eta}^2 - A_2 |\tilde{\eta} \tilde{v}| + A_3 \tilde{v}^2,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= - \int_0^1 r f'(1 - r\tilde{\eta}) dr - \tau_*^2 C_{\text{ln}}, \\ A_2 &= \mu_*, \\ A_3 &= 1 - 2\tilde{\eta}, \end{aligned}$$

and obtain the expression

$$q(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{v}) = \tilde{A}_{1,1} \left( |\tilde{\eta}| - \frac{A_2}{2\tilde{A}_{1,1}} |\tilde{v}| \right)^2 + \tilde{A}_{1,2} \tilde{\eta}^2 + \left( A_3 - \frac{A_2^2}{4\tilde{A}_{1,1}} \right) \tilde{v}^2,$$

where we have set  $\tilde{A}_{1,1} = \frac{\mu_*^2 + c_s^2}{4}$ , and  $\tilde{A}_{1,2} := A_1 - \tilde{A}_{1,1}$ . We recall that  $\mu_* < c_s$ , so that  $\tilde{A}_{1,1} < \frac{c_s^2}{2}$ . In addition, we set  $\mathfrak{d} := \frac{c_s^2}{2(\mu_*^2 + c_s^2)}$ . As a consequence of the preceding choices, by the decomposition (19), then the exponential decay (5) and Proposition 1.13, we have for any  $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{I}^c$ ,

$$|\tilde{\eta}(t, x + \tilde{a}(t))| \leq |\eta_{\tilde{c}(t)}(x)| + |\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta(t, x)| \leq K_d e^{-a_d \nu_{\tilde{c}(t)} |x|} + \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta\|_{H^1} \leq K_d e^{-\iota_* R_0} + A_* \alpha_*.$$

Now, since  $-2f'(1 - \xi)$  tends to  $c_s$  as  $\xi$  tends to 0, there exists  $R_0$  large enough and  $\tau_*$  small enough such that, up to shrinking once again the value of  $\alpha_*$ ,

$$|\tilde{\eta}| \leq \frac{\mathfrak{d}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{A}_{1,1} < A_1 < \frac{c_s^2}{2}.$$

This implies that  $A_3 - \frac{A_2^2}{4\tilde{A}_{1,1}} \geq \mathfrak{d}$  and  $\tilde{A}_{1,2} > 0$  which provides the suitable constant  $\kappa_*$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.3.** *The articulation of the previous proof does not depend on the special solution  $\tilde{Q}$ , so that it still holds for a generic solution  $Q$  of  $(NLS_{hy})$  that is orbitally close to  $Q_{c^*}$ .*

Before passing to the proof of Corollary 1.26, we deduce from the monotonicity formula that

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\tilde{p}_R(t)| \xrightarrow{R \rightarrow +\infty} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\tilde{p}_R(t) - p(\tilde{Q}(t))| \xrightarrow{R \rightarrow +\infty} 0. \quad (2.4)$$

This can be proved exactly the same way than it is proved in [6] (see Proposition 3 in the latter article). The final contradiction in the proof of this proposition still holds for the general nonlinearity  $f$  since we can control  $\tilde{p}_R$  in terms of the energy similarly as in (2.3) so that we get

$$|\tilde{p}_R(t)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\tilde{\eta}\tilde{v}| \leq \frac{4}{c_s^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} F(1 - \tilde{\eta}) + \frac{1}{\iota_*} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 - \tilde{\eta})\tilde{v}^2 \lesssim E(\tilde{Q}).$$

*Proof of Corollary 1.26.* Arguing exactly the same way that it is done in the proof of Proposition 4 in [6], we deduce the existence of a constant such that

$$\int_t^{t+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( (\partial_x \tilde{\eta})^2 + \tilde{\eta}^2 + \tilde{v}^2 \right) (s, x + \tilde{a}(s)) \chi'(x - R) dx ds = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\tau_* R}).$$

Now by the special choice of  $\chi$  and Proposition 1.13, we derive

$$\int_t^{t+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( (\partial_x \tilde{\eta})^2 + \tilde{\eta}^2 + \tilde{v}^2 \right) (s, x + \tilde{a}(s)) e^{\tau_* |x|} dx ds = \mathcal{O}(1). \quad (2.5)$$

Since, for any  $\rho \geq 0$ , there exists a constant  $\kappa_\rho$  such that for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$|x|^\rho \leq \kappa_\rho e^{\tau_* |x|}, \quad (2.6)$$

this is enough to conclude the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 1.27.* Recall that  $\tilde{\Psi}(t, x) = \tilde{\psi}(t, x + \tilde{a}(t))$ . Using the equation  $(NLS)$ , we obtain at least formally

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \partial_s \partial_x^l \tilde{\Psi} \right\|_{L^2(I, L^2(|x|^r dx))}^2 &\leq 2 \int_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \left| \partial_x^l \partial_t \tilde{\psi}(s, x + \tilde{a}(s)) \right|^2 + |\tilde{a}'(s)|^2 \left| \partial_x^{l+1} \tilde{\psi}(s, x + \tilde{a}(s)) \right|^2 \right) |x|^r dx ds \\ &\leq 4 \left( \left\| \partial_x^{l+2} \tilde{\Psi} \right\|_{L^2(I, L^2(|x|^r dx))}^2 + \left\| \partial_x^l (\Psi f(|\Psi|^2)) \right\|_{L^2(I, L^2(|x|^r dx))}^2 + \left\| \tilde{a}' \partial_x^l \tilde{\Psi} \right\|_{L^2(I, L^2(|x|^r dx))}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

We are going to prove by induction that there exist positive constants  $C_{1,l}$  and  $C_{2,l}$  such that for any positive integer  $l \in \{1, \dots, l_*\}$  and any compact interval  $I$  of length 1,

$$\left\| \partial_x^l (\Psi f(|\Psi|^2)) \right\|_{L^2(I, L^2(e^{\tau_* |x|}))} \leq C_{1,l} \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\left\| \partial_x^l \tilde{\Psi} \right\|_{L^2(I, L^2(e^{\tau_* |x|}))} \leq C_{2,l}, \quad (2.8)$$

which, by (2.6), will complete the proof of both cases  $\Lambda \in \{0, 1\}$  simultaneously. The induction principle is to be proved rather for weights of the form  $e^{\tau_* |x|}$  since it relies drastically on a smoothing effect that is stated for exponential weights (see Lemma 2.4 below) and that can be iterated until the maximum regularity of  $f$  is reached.

For  $l = 1$ , we can control the first derivative of  $\psi$  by the suitable derivatives of the hydrodynamic variables. Indeed,

$$|\partial_x \tilde{\psi}|^2 = \frac{(\partial_x \tilde{\eta})^2}{4(1 - \tilde{\eta})} + (1 - \tilde{\eta})\tilde{v}^2.$$

Thus, by Proposition 1.13

$$|\partial_x \tilde{\Psi}(t, x)|^2 \leq \frac{(\partial_x \tilde{\eta}(t, x + \tilde{a}(t)))^2}{4\iota_*} + (1 + I_*)(\partial_x \tilde{v}(t, x + \tilde{a}(t)))^2. \quad (2.9)$$

Therefore, (2.5) provides the desired constant  $C_{2,1}$ . On the other hand, we compute

$$\left| \partial_x \left( \tilde{\psi} f(|\tilde{\psi}|^2) \right) \right| \leq |\partial_x \tilde{\psi}| |f(|\tilde{\psi}|^2)| + 2|\tilde{\psi}|^2 |\partial_x \tilde{\psi}| |f'(|\tilde{\psi}|^2)|.$$

Since  $f$  and  $f'$  are continuous, and  $\|\tilde{\psi}\|_{L^\infty} \leq I_*$ , we derive the existence of a constant  $\tilde{C}_{1,1}$  such that

$$\left| \partial_x \left( \tilde{\Psi} f(|\tilde{\Psi}|^2) \right) \right| \leq \tilde{C}_{1,1} |\partial_x \tilde{\Psi}|.$$

Combining the previous estimate with (2.8), we derive the desired constant  $C_{1,1}$ .

Now assume that there exist constants  $C_{1,l}$  and  $C_{2,l}$  such that estimates (2.7) and (2.8) hold true for  $1 \leq l \leq m$  with  $m \leq l_* - 1$ . To prove the statement for the next integer, we shall rely on a special smoothing property of  $(NLS)$  whose understanding dates back to pioneering articles such as [11]. We refer to Proposition 5 in [6] for its proof.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . Consider a solution  $w \in C^0(\mathbb{R}, L^2(\mathbb{R}))$  to*

$$i\partial_t w + \partial_x^2 w = F,$$

*with  $F \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, L^2(\mathbb{R}))$ . Then, there exists a positive constant  $K_\lambda$ , depending only on  $\lambda$ , such that for any  $T > 0$ ,*

$$\lambda^2 \int_{-T}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\partial_x u(t, x)|^2 e^{\lambda x} dx dt \leq K_\lambda \int_{-T-1}^{T+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (|u(t, x)|^2 + |F(t, x)|^2) e^{\lambda x} dx dt.$$

We now apply Lemma 2.4 with  $u(s, x) = \partial_x^m \tilde{\Psi}(s + t + \frac{1}{2}, x)$ ,  $T = \frac{1}{2}$  and successively  $\lambda = \pm\tau_*$ . There exists  $\tilde{K}_*$  depending only on both  $K_{\pm\tau_*}$  such that

$$\int_t^{t+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\partial_x^{m+1} \tilde{\Psi}(s, x)|^2 e^{\tau_* |x|} dx ds \leq \tilde{K}_* \int_{t-1}^{t+2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( |\partial_x^m \tilde{\Psi}|^2 + \left| \partial_x^m \left( \tilde{\Psi} f(|\tilde{\Psi}|^2) \right) \right|^2 \right) (s, x) e^{\tau_* |x|} dx ds.$$

Then

$$\int_t^{t+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\partial_x^{m+1} \tilde{\Psi}(s, x)|^2 e^{\tau_* |x|} dx ds \leq C_{2,m+1},$$

with  $C_{2,m+1} := 3\tilde{K}_*(C_{1,m} + C_{2,m})$ .

Regarding the other term, we deduce from  $(NLS)$  and the fact that  $C_{2,m+1}$  is independent of  $t$ , that for any  $l \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ ,  $\partial_x^l \tilde{\psi} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, H^2(\mathbb{R})) \cap H^1(\mathbb{R}, L^2(\mathbb{R}))$ . Thus, up to taking a larger constant  $C_{2,m+1}$ , we have

$$\left\| \partial_x^l \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C_{2,m+1}. \quad (2.10)$$

We shall use the following claim, the proof of which can be derived from the Faà di Bruno's formula.

**Claim 2.5.** For  $g \in C^L(\mathbb{R}_+)$  with  $L \geq 0$  and any generic function  $\Psi \in H^L(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\left| \partial_x^L (\Psi g(|\Psi|^2)) \right| \leq K \sum_{n=0}^L \left| g^{(n)}(|\Psi|^2) \right| \sum_{\substack{i_0+i_1+\dots+i_L=2n+1 \\ i_1+2i_2+\dots+Li_L=L}} |\Psi|^{i_0} |\partial_x \Psi|^{i_1} \dots |\partial_x^L \Psi|^{i_L}.$$

We shall use the previous claim with the nonlinearity  $f \in C^L(\mathbb{R})$  with  $L = m + 1 \leq l_*$ . We separate the argument into several cases. First, the case  $m = 1$  being solved already, we can assume  $m \geq 2$ . Let  $n \in \{0, \dots, m + 1\}$ , we have  $i_{m+1} \in \{0, 1\}$ . Assume that  $i_{m+1} = 0$  then either  $i_m = 1$  or  $i_m = 0$ . If  $i_m = 1$ , we use (2.10) so that

$$\left| f^{(n)}(|\tilde{\psi}|^2) \right| |\tilde{\psi}|^{i_0} |\partial_x \tilde{\psi}|^{i_1} \dots |\partial_x^{m+1} \tilde{\psi}|^{i_{m+1}} \leq \left\| f^{(n)}(|\tilde{\psi}|^2) \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \left\| \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}^{i_0} \dots \left\| \partial_x^{m-1} \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}^{i_{m-1}} \left| \partial_x^m \tilde{\psi} \right|,$$

hence, up to taking a larger  $K$ ,

$$\left\| \partial_x^{m+1} \left( \tilde{\psi} f(|\tilde{\psi}|^2) \right) \right\|_{L^2(I, L^2(e^{\tau_*|x|}))} \leq K C_{2,m+1}^{2m+2} \max_{0 \leq n \leq m+1} \left\| f^{(n)}(|\tilde{\psi}|^2) \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \left\| \partial_x^m \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{L^2(I, L^2(e^{\tau_*|x|}))},$$

which provides the desired constant  $C_{1,m+1}$ , depending on  $C_{2,m+1}, C_{2,m}$  and the derivatives of  $f$ . The case  $i_m = 0$  can be dealt with similarly to (2.9) by arguing on derivatives of lower order than  $i_m$ . Finally, if  $i_{m+1} = 1$ , there is no other choice than  $i_1 = \dots = i_m = 0$  and then  $i_0 = 2n$ . Therefore for any  $n$ , the suitable control in this case reads

$$\left| f^{(n)}(|\tilde{\psi}|^2) \right| |\tilde{\psi}|^{i_0} |\partial_x \tilde{\psi}|^{i_1} \dots |\partial_x^{m+1} \tilde{\psi}|^{i_{m+1}} \leq \left\| f^{(n)}(|\tilde{\psi}|^2) \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \left\| \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}^{2n} \left| \partial_x^{m+1} \tilde{\psi} \right|,$$

and then, up to taking a further  $C_{2,m+1}$ ,

$$\left\| \partial_x^{m+1} \left( \tilde{\psi} f(|\tilde{\psi}|^2) \right) \right\|_{L^2(I, L^2(e^{\tau_*|x|}))} \leq C_{2,m+1} \max_{0 \leq n \leq m+1} \left\| f^{(n)}(|\tilde{\psi}|^2) \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \left\| \partial_x^{m+1} \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{L^2(I, L^2(e^{\tau_*|x|}))}.$$

This implies (2.7) for  $l = m + 1$ . In conclusion, we have proved that (2.7) and (2.8) hold true for  $1 \leq l \leq l_*$ , which ends the proof.  $\square$

### 3 Proof of the Liouville property

Before handling the proof of both Lemmas 1.22 and 1.24, we assert a lemma taking care of potential  $L^2$ -norms of high derivatives of  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ . Since both these lemma rely on the assumptions of Proposition 1.16 we assume that these latter conditions are fulfilled, namely we suppose that (22) holds. According to what is done in the proof of Lemma 1.24, see (3.22), we set the value  $l_0 := 12$ . By Remark 1.18, we recall that there exists  $r > 5/2$  such that for any integer  $l \in \{0, \dots, l_0\}$  and any  $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , we have

$$\left| \partial_x^{l+1} \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta(t, x + \tilde{a}(t)) \right| + \left| \partial_x^l \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta(t, x + \tilde{a}(t)) \right| + \left| \partial_x^l \tilde{\varepsilon}_v(t, x + \tilde{a}(t)) \right| \leq \frac{C_*}{1 + |x|^r}. \quad (3.1)$$

To simplify the notations, we get rid of the time-dependence and write for instance  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$  instead of  $\tilde{\varepsilon}(t)$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *There exists a positive constant  $B_*$  such that for any given  $(l, d) \in \{0, \dots, \frac{l_0}{2}\} \times \mathbb{R}_+$  such that either  $d = 0$ , or  $d \neq 0$  and  $l \leq d < r - \frac{1}{2}$ , then*

$$\|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}^l(|x|^d dx)} \leq B_* \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}(|x|^d dx)}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

*Proof.* Consider first the case  $d = 0$ . The case  $l = 0$  is straightforward so we consider a positive integer  $l$ . By doing enough integrations by parts, and using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\left\| \partial_x^l \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta \right\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta\|_{L^2} \left\| \partial_x^{2l-1} \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta \right\|_{L^2}.$$

From (3.1) and the fact that  $2l - 1 \leq l_0 - 1 \leq l_0 + 1$  by hypothesis, there exists a constant  $B_*$  such that

$$\|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}^l} \leq B_* \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Now if  $d > 0$ , assume moreover that  $l \leq d < r - \frac{1}{2}$ . From standard arguments,  $x \mapsto |x|^d$  is  $l$  times differentiable in a distributional sense and

$$\left| \partial_x^l (|x|^d) \right| \leq d(d-1)\dots(d-l+1)|x|^{d-l}.$$

We wish to evaluate the quantity  $\|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}^l(|x|^d dx)}$ . The highest order of differentiation in the  $\mathcal{X}^l$ -norm holds on the first component of  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$  and the corresponding weighted  $L^2$ -norm reads

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} (\partial_x^{l+1} \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)^2 |x|^d dx \leq \|\partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta\|_{L^2} \left\| \partial_x^l (|x|^d \partial_x^{l+1} \tilde{\varepsilon}) \right\|_{L^2} \leq \|\partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta\|_{L^2} \sum_{m=0}^l \binom{l}{m} \left\| |x|^{d-m} \partial_x^{2l+1-m} \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta \right\|_{L^2}.$$

Using (3.1) and that  $2l + 1 - m \leq l_0 + 1$  for any  $m \in \{0, \dots, l\}$ , and up to enlarging the value of  $C_*$ , we infer

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} (\partial_x^{l+1} \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)^2 |x|^d dx \leq C_* \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{m=0}^l \left\| \frac{|x|^{d-m}}{1 + |x|^r} \right\|_{L^2}.$$

In view of the special choice of  $d$ , each of the  $L^2$ -norms in the sum above is finite. Thus, up to a larger  $B_*$ , we derive

$$\|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}^l(|x|^d dx)}^2 \leq B_*^2 \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}(|x|^d dx)}.$$

□

In the first place, let us prove Lemma 1.22.

*Proof of Lemma 1.22.* In view of (22),  $\tilde{Q}_0 \in \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}_{hy}^4(\mathbb{R})$ . By the local well-posedness result in Theorem B.3 and by orbital stability implying the global well-posedness of  $\tilde{Q}$ , we deduce  $\tilde{Q} \in C^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}_{hy}^4(\mathbb{R}))$ . By the equation  $(NLS_{hy})$ , this implies that  $\tilde{Q} \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}_{hy}^2(\mathbb{R}))$  and by the decomposition (19) and the smoothness of the modulation parameters, we obtain that  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \in C^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}_{hy}^4(\mathbb{R})) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}_{hy}^2(\mathbb{R}))$ . Now, by definition of  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$  and Proposition C.1, we deduce that  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \in C^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}_{hy}^2(\mathbb{R})) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R}))$  and we can use the equation on  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$  that is (28) and the fact that  $\partial_x Q_{\tilde{c}(t)} \in \ker(\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}(t)})$  so that we get the desired equation on  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ . Finally, we deduce (31) from using (16) and Proposition 1.13, as well as the estimate

$$\iota_* \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \leq \langle S\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon}), S\tilde{\varepsilon} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} = \langle \tilde{\varepsilon}, S\tilde{\varepsilon} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \leq \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}} \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

□

Now that all the quantities are smooth and well-defined, we can prove Lemma 1.24.

*Proof of Lemma 1.24.* Firstly, let us justify that  $n$  is properly defined and differentiable. We define the scalar function  $\mu(x) = x$  and we write  $\tilde{c}$  instead of  $\tilde{c}(t)$  throughout the section. Recall that

$$M_{\tilde{c}}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} m_{1,\tilde{c}} & m_{2,\tilde{c}} \\ m_{2,\tilde{c}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with } m_{1,\tilde{c}} := -\frac{\eta'_{\tilde{c}}}{\eta_{\tilde{c}}} \text{ and } m_{2,\tilde{c}} := -\frac{\tilde{c}\eta'_{\tilde{c}}}{2(1-\eta_{\tilde{c}})^2}.$$

Since  $M_{\tilde{c}(t)}$  is bounded,  $\partial_t \tilde{e} \in C^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R}))$ , by Lemma 1.22 and the fact that  $\tilde{c}$  is differentiable, we deduce that  $t \mapsto \langle M_{\tilde{c}(t)} \tilde{e}(t), \tilde{e}(t) \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2}$  is well-defined and even differentiable.

Now, let us deal with the part involving the multiplication by  $\mu S$ . The fact that the scalar product  $\langle \mu S \tilde{e}(t), \tilde{e}(t) \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2}$  is well-defined relies on previous estimates, independent of the articulation of the proof, that are given in (34). Now to differentiate, we need to verify that every term in the right-hand side of

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \tilde{e} = & -2S\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_x \tilde{e}) + S\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(J\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}\tilde{e}) - \tilde{c}'(t)S\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_c Q_{\tilde{c}}) \\ & + \tilde{c}'(t)S\partial_c \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{e}) + ((\tilde{a}'(t) - \tilde{c}))S\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_x \tilde{e}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

in Lemma 1.22 can be integrated against the function  $\mu S \tilde{e}(t)$ . By Corollary C.2, we obtain

$$|\langle -2S\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_x \tilde{e}), \mu S \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2}| \leq \left\| \sqrt{|x|} \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_x \tilde{e}) \right\|_{L^2 \times L^2} \left\| \sqrt{|x|} \tilde{e} \right\|_{L^2 \times L^2} \quad (3.3)$$

$$\leq K_*^2 \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}^3(|x|dx)} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}^1(|x|dx)}. \quad (3.4)$$

Using now the decay (3.1), we obtain that the right-hand term in the latter estimate is bounded uniformly in time. The other terms can be dealt similarly by using Proposition C.1 with different  $m$  and  $l$ . Therefore one can differentiate the function  $n$  and we get

$$n'(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \langle N(t) \tilde{e}(t), \tilde{e}(t) \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} = n_1(t) + \gamma_*(n_2(t) + n_3(t)),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} n_1(t) & := 2 \langle \mu S \partial_t \tilde{e}, \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2}, \\ n_2(t) & := 2 \langle M_{\tilde{c}} \partial_t \tilde{e}, \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2}, \\ n_3(t) & := \tilde{c}'(t) \langle \partial_c M_{\tilde{c}} \tilde{e}, \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

We compute

$$n_1(t) = -4 \langle \mu \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_x \tilde{e}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} + 2 \langle \mu \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} J\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{e}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \quad (3.6)$$

$$-2\tilde{c}'(t) \langle \mu \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_c Q_{\tilde{c}}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} + 2\tilde{c}'(t) \langle \mu \partial_c \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{e}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \quad (3.7)$$

$$+ 2(\tilde{a}'(t) - \tilde{c}) \langle \mu \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_x \tilde{e}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2}, \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$n_2(t) = 2(\tilde{a}'(t) - \tilde{c}) \langle M_{\tilde{c}} S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} \partial_x \tilde{e}, \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} + 2 \langle M_{\tilde{c}} S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} J\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{e}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \quad (3.9)$$

$$- 2\tilde{c}'(t) \langle M_{\tilde{c}} S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} \partial_c Q_{\tilde{c}}, \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} + 2\tilde{c}'(t) \langle \partial_c M_{\tilde{c}} S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} \tilde{e}, \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \quad (3.10)$$

$$- 4 \langle M_{\tilde{c}} S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} \partial_x \tilde{e}, \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2}. \quad (3.11)$$

We are going to deal with each part separately.

Step 1. Regarding the term (3.11). We prove that there exists  $\Xi_1 > 0$  such that

$$-4 \langle M_{\tilde{c}} S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} \partial_x \tilde{e}, \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \geq \Xi_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta_{\tilde{c}} ((\partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta)^2 + \tilde{e}_\eta^2 + \tilde{e}_v^2).$$

To prove Step 1, we rely on the following claim. This claim relies on tedious computations. We refer to the end of this section for its proof. From now on and until the end of Step 1, we write  $c$  instead of  $\tilde{c}$ .

**Claim 3.2.** *We have*

$$-4 \langle M_c S \mathcal{H}_c \partial_x \tilde{e}, \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( q_{1,c} \left( \tilde{e}_v + \frac{q_{2,c}}{2q_{1,c}} \tilde{e}_\eta + \frac{q_{3,c}}{2q_{1,c}} \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta \right)^2 + \tilde{q}_{1,c} \left( \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta + m_{1,c} \tilde{e}_\eta \right)^2 \right)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B_c &= 1 - \eta_c, \\ q_{1,c} &= 2(m_{1,c} B_c)', \\ q_{2,c} &= -2cm'_{1,c}, \\ q_{3,c} &= 4m_{2,c} B_c, \\ \tilde{q}_{1,c} &= -\frac{q_{3,c}^2}{4q_{1,c}} + \frac{m'_{1,c}}{B_c} + \left( \frac{m_{1,c}}{2B_c} \right)'. \end{aligned}$$

Once we have shown Claim 3.2, we use Proposition D.2 so that all the quantities in the following claim are well-defined and moreover  $q_{1,c} > 0$  and  $\tilde{q}_{1,c} > 0$ . In particular, the quadratic form in the integral is non-negative and we check that its null-space is given by  $\text{Span}(Q_c)$ . By (D.9), we notice that

$$\frac{q_{1,c}(x)}{\eta_c(x)} \xrightarrow{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} k_0 := 2\nu_c^2 - \frac{k}{3}, \quad (3.12)$$

so that it is natural to substitute the variable  $\tilde{e}$  by  $\tilde{f} := \sqrt{\eta_c} \tilde{e}$  in order to provide

$$\begin{aligned} -4 \langle M_c S \mathcal{H}_c \partial_x \tilde{e}, \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \frac{q_{1,c}}{\eta_c} \left( \tilde{f}_v + \left( \frac{q_{2,c}}{2q_{1,c}} + \frac{q_{3,c} m_{1,c}}{4q_{1,c}} \right) \tilde{f}_\eta + \frac{q_{3,c}}{2q_{1,c}} \partial_x \tilde{f}_\eta \right)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\tilde{q}_{1,c}}{\eta_c} \left( \partial_x \tilde{f}_\eta + \frac{3m_{1,c}}{2} \tilde{f}_\eta \right)^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the old variables once again by the new pair  $\tilde{h} = (\tilde{h}_\eta, \tilde{h}_v) := (\tilde{f}_\eta, \tilde{f}_v + \frac{q_{3,c}}{2q_{1,c}} \partial_x \tilde{f}_\eta)$ , so that

$$-4 \langle M_c S \mathcal{H}_c \partial_x \tilde{e}, \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} = \langle T_c(\tilde{h}), \tilde{h} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2},$$

with

$$T_c(\tilde{h}) := \begin{pmatrix} -\partial_x \left( \frac{\tilde{q}_{1,c} \partial_x \tilde{h}_\eta}{\eta_c} \right) + \left( \frac{\eta_c \tilde{q}_{3,c}^2}{q_{1,c}} - \frac{3}{2} \partial_x \left( \frac{\tilde{q}_{1,c} m_{1,c}}{\eta_c} \right) + \frac{9\tilde{q}_{1,c} m_{1,c}^2}{4\eta_c} \right) \tilde{h}_\eta + \tilde{q}_{3,c} \tilde{h}_v \\ \tilde{q}_{3,c} \tilde{h}_\eta + \frac{q_{1,c}}{\eta_c} \tilde{h}_v \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\tilde{q}_{3,c} := \frac{2q_{2,c} + q_{3,c} m_{1,c}}{4\eta_c}$ ,  $T_c$  is non-negative and we can introduce

$$\mathfrak{h}_c = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{3}{\eta_c^{\frac{3}{2}}}, -\frac{\tilde{q}_{3,c} \eta_c^{\frac{5}{2}}}{q_{1,c}} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R}),$$

such that  $\ker(T_c) = \text{Span}(\mathfrak{h}_c)$ . We then state the following claim, the proof of which is at the end of this section.

**Claim 3.3.** *Up to taking  $c_1$  closer to  $c_s$ , we have  $\sigma_{ess}(T_c) = [\tau_c, +\infty)$  where  $\inf_{c \in (c_1, c_s)} \tau_c > 0$ .*

Thus by the previous claim, there exists a constant  $\Lambda_1 > 0$  such that for any  $h$  orthogonal to  $\mathfrak{h}_c$ , we have

$$\langle T_c(h), h \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \geq \Lambda_1 \|h\|_{L^2 \times L^2}^2.$$

Moreover we have,

$$\left| \langle T_c(h), h \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\widetilde{q}_{1,c}}{\eta_c} |\partial_x h_\eta|^2 \right| \leq A_1 \|h\|_{L^2 \times L^2}^2,$$

so that taking  $\tau \in (0, 1)$  and using Proposition D.2, we have

$$\langle T_c(h), h \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \geq (1 - \tau) \langle T_c(h), h \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} + \tau \left\| \left( \frac{\widetilde{q}_{1,c}}{\eta_c} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_x h_\eta \right\|_{L^2}^2 - A_1 \tau \|h\|_{L^2 \times L^2}^2 \quad (3.13)$$

$$\geq (1 - \tau - A_1 \tau) \|h\|_{L^2 \times L^2}^2 + \inf_{(c,x) \in (c_1, c_s) \times \mathbb{R}} \left| \frac{\widetilde{q}_{1,c}(x)}{\eta_c(x)} \right| \|\partial_x h_\eta\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (3.14)$$

Reducing the value of  $\tau$  enough, we obtain a constant  $\Lambda_2 > 0$  such that for any  $h$  orthogonal to  $\mathfrak{h}_c$ , we have

$$\langle T_c(h), h \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \geq \Lambda_2 \|h\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2.$$

We express the previous estimate in terms of the original variable. First notice that  $\widetilde{h}$  is orthogonal to  $\mathfrak{h}_c$  if and only if  $\widetilde{e}$  is orthogonal to  $\mathfrak{e}_c$ , where

$$\mathfrak{e}_c = \left( \eta_c - \frac{q_{3,c} \widetilde{q}_{3,c} \eta_c \eta'_c}{4q_{1,c}^2} + \partial_x \left( \frac{q_{3,c} \widetilde{q}_{3,c} \eta_c^2}{2q_{1,c}^2} \right), -\frac{\widetilde{q}_{3,c} \eta_c^2}{q_{1,c}} \right).$$

Furthermore, we have

$$-4 \langle M_c S \mathcal{H}_c \partial_x \widetilde{e}, \widetilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \geq \Lambda_2 \left( \|\widetilde{h}_\eta\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\widetilde{h}_v\|_{L^2}^2 \right).$$

First observe that

$$\|\widetilde{h}_\eta\|_{H^1}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta_c \left( (\partial_x \widetilde{e}_\eta)^2 + \left( 1 + \frac{(\eta'_c)^2}{4\eta_c^2} - \frac{\eta''_c}{2\eta_c} \right) \widetilde{e}_\eta^2 \right).$$

Now restricting to speeds  $c \in (c_1, c_s)$ , with  $c_1$  even closer to  $c_s$ , which will be satisfied by  $\widetilde{c}$  up to shrinking the value of  $\alpha_*$ , we can assume that, uniformly in  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$1 + \frac{(\eta'_c)^2}{4\eta_c^2} - \frac{\eta''_c}{2\eta_c} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Proceeding similarly than for (3.13) but with the standard inequality for  $a, b \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\tau \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\|a - b\|_{L^2} \geq \tau \|a\|_{L^2} - \frac{\tau}{1 - \tau} \|b\|_{L^2},$$

we verify that, up to taking a smaller  $\Lambda_2$ , we have

$$-4 \langle M_c S \mathcal{H}_c \partial_x \widetilde{e}, \widetilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \geq \Lambda_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta_c \left( (\partial_x \widetilde{e}_\eta)^2 + \widetilde{e}_\eta^2 + \widetilde{e}_v^2 \right),$$

whenever  $\tilde{e}$  is orthogonal to  $\mathbf{e}_c$  and up to shrinking the value of  $\Lambda_2$ . The rest of the argument can be deduced like in the proof of Proposition 8 in [6], except for the part where it makes use of the explicit shape of the travelling wave, namely with the part involving the quantities  $\partial_c \eta_c$  and  $\partial_c v_c$ . In this sense, we need to bound the integral

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\eta_c} ((\partial_c \eta_c)^2 + (\partial_c v_c)^2) \quad (3.15)$$

by a constant that does not depend on  $c$ . Recall that by (3), we get  $v_c = \frac{c\eta_c}{2(1-\eta_c)}$  so that

$$\partial_c v_c = \frac{\eta_c}{2(1-\eta_c)} + \frac{c\partial_c \eta_c}{2(1-\eta_c)^2}. \quad (3.16)$$

Moreover, we invoke Lemma 2.9 in [5] with the same setting apart from the fact that we impose  $\sigma = \nu_c(\frac{1}{2} + \delta)$ . Taking  $\delta$  sufficiently small, we then obtain the decay  $(\partial_c \eta_c(x))^2 \lesssim e^{-\nu_c(1+2\delta)|x|}$ . Then by Proposition D.1, we obtain

$$(\partial_c \eta_c(x))^2 \lesssim \frac{\eta_c(x)}{m_c} e^{-2\delta\nu_c|x|},$$

and the same holds for  $\partial_c v_c$  by (3.16). Potentially taking  $\alpha_*$  smaller,  $c_1$  even closer to  $c_s$ , and since  $m_c$  depends continuously on  $c$ , there exists  $m_* > 0$  only depending on  $c^*$  such that

$$(\partial_c \eta_{\tilde{c}}(x))^2 \lesssim \frac{\eta_{\tilde{c}}(x)}{m_*} e^{-2\delta\nu_{\tilde{c}}|x|}.$$

These considerations combined with Proposition 1.13 then imply the finiteness of the integral in (3.15) uniformly with respect to  $c$ .

Step 2. We deal with the terms (3.5), (3.7), (3.9) and (3.10). We show that they can be expressed as  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_*^q \|\tilde{e}(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2)$  for some real number  $q > 0$ . Regarding (3.5), (3.7) and (3.10), we use (21), and the estimate (31) so that we obtain  $|\tilde{c}'(t)| \leq A_* \|\tilde{\varepsilon}(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 = \mathcal{O}(\alpha_* \|\tilde{e}(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2)$ . Thus

$$|n_3(t)| = \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_* \|\partial_c M_{\tilde{c}}\|_{L^\infty} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2\right) \quad (3.17)$$

$$| -2\tilde{c}'(t) \langle \mu \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_c Q_{\tilde{c}}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} | = \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_* \|\mu \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_c Q_{\tilde{c}})\|_{L^2 \times L^2} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2\right), \quad (3.18)$$

$$|2\tilde{c}'(t) \langle \mu \partial_c \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} | = \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_* \|\mu \partial_c \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon})\|_{L^2 \times L^2} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2\right), \quad (3.19)$$

$$| -2\tilde{c}'(t) \langle M_{\tilde{c}} S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_c Q_{\tilde{c}}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} | = \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_* \|M_{\tilde{c}}\|_{L^\infty} \|\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_c Q_{\tilde{c}})\|_{L^2 \times L^2} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2\right), \quad (3.20)$$

$$|2\tilde{c}'(t) \langle \partial_c M_{\tilde{c}} S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} | = \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_* \|\partial_c M_{\tilde{c}}\|_{L^\infty} \|\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon})\|_{L^2 \times L^2} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2\right). \quad (3.21)$$

Now, combining Proposition C.1, the exponential decay (5) and Proposition 1.13, we control (3.17), (3.18) and (3.20) as  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_* \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2)$ . We control (3.19) and (3.21) similarly by invoking in addition the estimate (3.1) and also the exponential decay (5) on the derivative of  $\eta_c$  and  $v_c$  with respect to  $c$ .

The first term of (3.9) can be dealt with similarly, using eventually Lemma 3.1 with  $d = 0$ , which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} |2(\tilde{a}'(t) - \tilde{c}) \langle M_{\tilde{c}} S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} \partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} | &\leq 2\sqrt{A_* M_*} \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}} \|\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon})\|_{L^2 \times L^2} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{A_* D_* M_* K_*} \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}^2} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 = \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to deal with the right-hand term of (3.9). We have by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\left| 2 \langle M_{\tilde{c}} S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} J \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \right| \leq 2M_* \|\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} J \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon})\|_{L^2 \times L^2} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

At this moment of the argument, we fix the value of  $l_0$ . Indeed, we now impose

$$l_0 = 12, \tag{3.22}$$

and as a consequence of Corollary C.3, we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} J \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon})\|_{\mathcal{X}^{-1}} \leq K_* \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^{\frac{5}{4}} \max_{\substack{p \in \{1, \dots, 3\} \\ l \in \{0, \dots, l_0\}}} \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{W^{l,p}}^{p+2}.$$

By (3.1), each of the previous  $W^{l,p}$ -norms are uniformly bounded and this implies that

$$\left| 2 \langle M_{\tilde{c}} S \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} J \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \right| \leq 2M_* K_* C_* \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^{\frac{5}{4}} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{O} \left( \alpha_*^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right).$$

Again, using (20) and Lemma 1.22 provides the suitable control and ends the proof of Step 2 with  $q = \frac{1}{4}$ .

Step 3. We prove that the terms (3.6) and (3.8) can be bounded from below by  $\Xi_3 \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + \mathcal{O} \left( \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{B}_R)}^2 \right)$  with  $\Xi_3$  and  $R$  positive constants depending only on  $c^*$ . We start by developing the first term in (3.6). Recall that  $B_{\tilde{c}} = 1 - \eta_{\tilde{c}}$ . Then in view of the expression of  $\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}$  in (C.1), we compute

$$-4 \langle \mu \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_x \tilde{e}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} i(x) dx,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} i &= \left( \frac{3}{2B_{\tilde{c}}} - \frac{\mu \eta'_{\tilde{c}}}{2B_{\tilde{c}}^2} \right) (\partial_x \tilde{e}_{\eta})^2 - \frac{2\tilde{c}(B_{\tilde{c}} - \mu \eta'_{\tilde{c}})}{B_{\tilde{c}}^2} \tilde{e}_{\eta} \tilde{e}_v + 2(B_{\tilde{c}} - \mu \eta'_{\tilde{c}}) \tilde{e}_v^2 \\ &- \left( \left( \frac{\eta''_{\tilde{c}}}{B_{\tilde{c}}^2} + \frac{3(\eta'_{\tilde{c}})^2}{2B_{\tilde{c}}^3} + f'(B_{\tilde{c}}) \right) + \mu \left( \frac{\eta'''_{\tilde{c}}}{2B_{\tilde{c}}^2} + \frac{2\eta'_{\tilde{c}} \eta''_{\tilde{c}}}{B_{\tilde{c}}^3} + \frac{3(\eta'_{\tilde{c}})^2}{2B_{\tilde{c}}^4} - \eta'_{\tilde{c}} f'(B_{\tilde{c}}) \right) \right) \tilde{e}_{\eta}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

We compute the following limits

$$\frac{3}{2B_{\tilde{c}}} - \frac{\mu \eta'_{\tilde{c}}}{2B_{\tilde{c}}^2} \xrightarrow{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{3}{2}, \quad -\frac{2\tilde{c}(B_{\tilde{c}} - \mu \eta'_{\tilde{c}})}{B_{\tilde{c}}^2} \xrightarrow{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} -2\tilde{c}, \quad 2(B_{\tilde{c}} - \mu \eta'_{\tilde{c}}) \xrightarrow{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} 2,$$

and

$$-\left( \frac{\eta''_{\tilde{c}}}{B_{\tilde{c}}^2} + \frac{3(\eta'_{\tilde{c}})^2}{2B_{\tilde{c}}^3} + f'(B_{\tilde{c}}) \right) + \mu \left( \frac{\eta'''_{\tilde{c}}}{2B_{\tilde{c}}^2} + \frac{2\eta'_{\tilde{c}} \eta''_{\tilde{c}}}{B_{\tilde{c}}^3} + \frac{3(\eta'_{\tilde{c}})^2}{2B_{\tilde{c}}^4} - \eta'_{\tilde{c}} f'(B_{\tilde{c}}) \right) \xrightarrow{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{c_s^2}{2}.$$

Set  $\tau > 0$ , we use the exponential decay (5) to exhibit  $R_1 > 0$  large enough such that for  $|x| \geq R_1$ , we have by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} i(x) &\geq \frac{3}{2} (\partial_x \tilde{e}_{\eta}(x))^2 - 2\tilde{c} \tilde{e}_{\eta}(x) \tilde{e}_v(x) + 2\tilde{e}_v(x)^2 + \frac{c_s^2}{2} \tilde{e}_{\eta}(x)^2 - \tau \left( (\partial_x \tilde{e}_{\eta}(x))^2 + \tilde{e}_{\eta}(x)^2 + \tilde{e}_v(x)^2 \right) \\ &\geq \frac{3}{2} (\partial_x \tilde{e}_{\eta}(x))^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left( c_s^2 - \frac{\tilde{c}^2}{1-\delta} \right) \tilde{e}_{\eta}(x)^2 + 2\delta \tilde{e}_v(x)^2 - \tau \left( (\partial_x \tilde{e}_{\eta}(x))^2 + \tilde{e}_{\eta}(x)^2 + \tilde{e}_v(x)^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

We now fix the value of  $\delta > 0$  such that  $c^* + A_*\alpha_* < c_s\sqrt{1-\delta}$ . Therefore, taking  $\tau$  small enough, we obtain according to (21), a constant  $\Xi_3$  depending only on  $c^*$  such that for  $|x| \geq R_1$ ,

$$i(x) \geq \Xi_3 \left( (\partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta(x))^2 + \tilde{e}_\eta(x)^2 + \tilde{e}_v(x)^2 \right),$$

hence

$$-4 \langle \mu \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_x \tilde{e}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} = \int_{(\mathcal{B}_{R_1})^c} i(x) dx + \int_{\mathcal{B}_{R_1}} i(x) dx \geq \Xi_3 \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + \mathcal{O} \left( \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{B}_{R_1})}^2 \right).$$

Next, we deal with the second term in (3.6) and (3.8). On the one hand, take  $\delta > 0$ , and since  $r > \frac{5}{2}$ , take

$$s \in \left[ \frac{3}{2}, \frac{r}{2} - \frac{1}{4} \right). \quad (3.24)$$

Take also  $R_2 > 0$  large enough such that  $|x| \leq \delta(1 + |x|^s)$  for any  $|x| \geq R_2$ . Then, decomposing the line into the part where  $|x| \leq R_2$  and its complement, we obtain the estimates

$$\left| 2 \langle \mu \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} \mathcal{J} \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \right| \leq R_2 \|\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} \mathcal{J} \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon})\|_{\mathcal{X}^{-1}} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{B}_{R_2})} + \delta \|\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} \mathcal{J} \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon})\|_{\mathcal{X}^{-1}((1+|x|^{2s})dx)} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

Using Young's inequality and then Corollary C.2, we deduce

$$\|\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} \mathcal{J} \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon})\|_{\mathcal{X}^{-1}((1+|x|^{2s})dx)} \leq 2K_* \left( \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}^3}^2 + \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}^3(|x|^{2s}dx)}^2 \right),$$

hence

$$\left| 2 \langle \mu \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} \mathcal{J} \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \right| \leq K_* \left( R_2 \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}^3}^2 \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{B}_{R_2})} + 2\delta \left( \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}^3}^2 + \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}^3(|x|^{2s}dx)}^2 \right) \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}} \right).$$

Therefore, by the choice of  $s$  given by (3.24), we can apply Lemma 3.1 with  $d \in \{0, 2s\}$  and  $l = 3$  and there comes finally

$$\left| 2 \langle \mu \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} \mathcal{J} \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \right| \leq K_* B_*^2 \left( R_2 \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{B}_{R_2})} + 4\delta \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}} \right) \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}. \quad (3.25)$$

Regarding (3.8), we can decompose the integral the same way than for the previous term and deduce that the control in (3.25) holds also for  $\left| 2(\tilde{a}'(t) - \tilde{c}) \langle \mu \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_x \tilde{e}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \right|$ . To conclude, we use the bound (31) so that

$$K_* B_*^2 \left( R_2 \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{B}_{R_2})} + 4\delta \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}} \right) \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq K_* B_*^2 D_* \left( \frac{R_2^2}{\delta} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{B}_{R_2})}^2 + 5\delta \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right).$$

Fixing the value of  $\delta$  in the previous estimate such that  $20\delta K_* B_*^2 D_* \leq \Xi_3$  and fixing also  $R := \max(R_1, R_2)$  that only depends on  $c^*$  as well, we finally conclude that

$$-4 \langle \mu \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_x \tilde{e}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} + 2 \langle \mu \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} \mathcal{J} \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} + 2(\tilde{a}'(t) - \tilde{c}) \langle \mu \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\partial_x \tilde{e}), \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \geq \frac{\Xi_3}{2} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + \mathcal{O} \left( \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{B}_R)}^2 \right)$$

Step 4. Conclusion. We deduce from Proposition D.1 and all three previous steps the existence of constants  $\Xi_2, \Xi_4$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} n'(t) &\geq \frac{\Xi_3}{2} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 - \Xi_4 \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{B}_R)}^2 + \gamma_* \left( \Xi_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta_c \left( (\partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta)^2 + \tilde{e}_\eta^2 + \tilde{e}_v^2 \right) - \Xi_2 \alpha_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right) \\ &\geq \frac{\Xi_3}{2} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + \int_{\mathcal{B}_R} \left( \Xi_1 \gamma_* m_1 e^{-\iota_* R} - \Xi_4 \right) \left( (\partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta)^2 + \tilde{e}_\eta^2 + \tilde{e}_v^2 \right) - \Xi_2 \gamma_* \alpha_*^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We set  $\gamma_*$  large enough so that  $2\Xi_1\gamma_*m_1e^{-\iota_*R} \geq \Xi_4$ , which yields to

$$n'(t) \geq \min\left(\frac{\Xi_3}{2}, \frac{\Xi_4}{2}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( (\partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta)^2 + \tilde{e}_\eta^2 + \tilde{e}_v^2 \right) - \Xi_2\gamma_*\alpha_*^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2.$$

Having fixed the value of  $\gamma_*$ , we can now assume, up to shrinking the value of  $\alpha_*$  given by Theorem 1.9, that  $2 \min\left(\frac{\Xi_3}{2}, \frac{\Xi_4}{2}\right) \geq \Xi_2\gamma_*\alpha_*^{\frac{1}{4}}$ . We deduce the existence of  $\Xi_* > 0$  such that

$$n'(t) \geq \Xi_* \|\tilde{e}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2.$$

□

We now deal with the proof of Claim 3.2.

*Proof of Claim 3.2.* We recall that the expressions of  $\mathcal{H}_c$  and  $\mathcal{M}_c$  are given in (C.1) and (C.2). Also, recall the notation  $B_c = 1 - \eta_c$ . Since  $M_c$  and  $S$  are symmetric, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -4 \langle M_c S \mathcal{H}_c \partial_x \tilde{e}, \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} &= -4 \langle \mathcal{H}_c \tilde{e}, S M_c \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} \\ &= 4 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( m_{1,c} \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \left( \frac{\partial_x^2 \tilde{e}_\eta}{4B_c} \right) - m_{1,c} \mathcal{M}_c \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta + \frac{cm_{1,c}}{2B_c} \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_v \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{c^2 m_{2,c}}{4B_c} \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta + \frac{m_{2,c} B_c}{2} \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_v + \frac{cm_{1,c}}{2B_c} \tilde{e}_v \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta + m_{1,c} B_c \tilde{e}_v \partial_x \tilde{e}_v \right). \end{aligned}$$

By doing integrations by parts, we can express the previous quantity as an integral of a quadratic form that is

$$\begin{aligned} -4 \langle M_c S \mathcal{H}_c \partial_x \tilde{e}, \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( q_{1,c} \tilde{e}_v^2 + q_{2,c} \tilde{e}_v \tilde{e}_\eta + q_{3,c} \tilde{e}_v \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta + \left( \frac{m'_{1,c}}{B_c} \right)' \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta + \frac{m'_{1,c}}{B_c} (\partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \frac{m_{1,c}}{2B_c} \right)' (\partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta)^2 - 4m_{1,c} \mathcal{M}_c \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta - 4m_{2,c} \tilde{B}_c \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta \right), \end{aligned}$$

where, by Proposition D.2,

$$q_{1,c} = -2(a_c B_c)' = \frac{2((\eta'_c)^2 - \eta_c(1 - \eta_c)\eta''_c)}{\eta_c^2} > 0, \quad (3.26)$$

$$q_{2,c} = 4(b_c \tilde{B}_c + a_c B_c)' = \frac{2c(\eta_c \eta''_c - (\eta'_c)^2)}{\eta_c^2},$$

$$q_{3,c} = 4b_c B_c = -\frac{2c\eta'_c}{1 - \eta_c}. \quad (3.27)$$

Now applying the Gauss reduction for this quadratic form, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -4 \langle M_c S \mathcal{H}_c \partial_x \tilde{e}, \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} q_{1,c} \left( \tilde{e}_v + \frac{q_{2,c}}{2q_{1,c}} \tilde{e}_\eta + \frac{q_{3,c}}{2q_{1,c}} \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( -\frac{q_{2,c}^2}{4q_{1,c}} \tilde{e}_\eta^2 - \frac{q_{2,c} q_{3,c}}{2q_{1,c}} \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta - \frac{q_{3,c}^2}{4q_{1,c}} (\partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \frac{m'_{1,c}}{B_c} \right)' \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta + \frac{m'_{1,c}}{B_c} (\partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta)^2 + \left( \frac{m_{1,c}}{2B_c} \right)' (\partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta)^2 - 4m_{1,c} \mathcal{M}_c \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta - 4m_{2,c} \tilde{B}_c \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta \right), \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}
-4 \langle M_c S \mathcal{H}_c \partial_x \tilde{e}, \tilde{e} \rangle_{L^2 \times L^2} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} q_{1,c} \left( \tilde{e}_v + \frac{q_{2,c}}{2q_{1,c}} \tilde{e}_\eta + \frac{q_{3,c}}{2q_{1,c}} \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta \right)^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{q}_{1,c} \left( \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta + m_{1,c} \tilde{e}_\eta \right)^2 \\
&+ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( -2m_{1,c} \tilde{q}_{1,c} \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta - m_{1,c}^2 \tilde{q}_{1,c} \tilde{e}_\eta^2 - \frac{q_{2,c}^2}{4q_{1,c}} \tilde{e}_\eta^2 - \frac{q_{2,c} q_{3,c}}{2q_{1,c}} \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta \right. \\
&\left. + \left( \frac{m'_{1,c}}{B_c} \right)' \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta - 4m_{1,c} \mathcal{M}_c \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta - 4m_{2,c} \tilde{B}_c \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{q}_{1,c} = -\frac{q_{3,c}^2}{4q_{1,c}} + \frac{m'_{1,c}}{B_c} + \left( \frac{m_{1,c}}{2B_c} \right)'.$$

To finish the proof, we show that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( q_{4,c} \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta + q_{5,c} \tilde{e}_\eta^2 \right) = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
q_{4,c} &= -2m_{1,c} \tilde{q}_{1,c} - \frac{q_{2,c} q_{3,c}}{2q_{1,c}} + \left( \frac{m'_{1,c}}{B_c} \right)' - 4m_{1,c} \mathcal{M}_c - 4m_{2,c} \tilde{B}_c, \\
q_{5,c} &= -m_{1,c}^2 \tilde{q}_{1,c} - \frac{q_{2,c}^2}{4q_{1,c}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We compute indeed on the one hand

$$q_{5,c} = \frac{3(\eta'_c)^2 \eta''_c}{2\eta_c^3 B_c} - \frac{3(\eta'_c)^4}{2\eta_c^4 B_c} + \frac{(\eta'_c)^4}{2\eta_c^3 B_c^2} + \frac{c^2 \eta''_c}{2\eta_c B_c} + \frac{c^2 (\eta'_c)^2}{2} \left( \frac{1}{B_c^2} - \frac{1}{\eta_c^2} \right).$$

On the other hand, in order to compute  $q_{4,c}$ , we first use the equation satisfied by  $\eta_c'''$  (obtained by differentiating equation (D.5)), and notice that

$$\left( \frac{m'_{1,c}}{B_c} \right)' - 4m_{1,c} \mathcal{M}_c - 4m_{2,c} \tilde{B}_c = \frac{c^2 \eta'_c}{\eta_c B_c^2} + \frac{3\eta'_c \eta''_c}{\eta_c^2 B_c} - \frac{2(\eta'_c)^2}{\eta_c^3 B_c} + \frac{(\eta'_c)^3}{\eta_c^2 B_c^2},$$

then

$$q_{4,c} = \frac{c^2}{q_{1,c}} \left( \frac{2\eta'_c \eta''_c}{\eta_c B_c} - \frac{2(\eta'_c)^3}{\eta_c^2 B_c^2} + \frac{\eta'_c q_{1,c}}{\eta_c B_c^2} \right) + \frac{(\eta'_c)^3}{\eta_c^3 B_c},$$

and using the expression of  $q_{1,c}$  in (3.26), we obtain

$$q_{4,c} = \frac{(\eta'_c)^3}{\eta_c^3 B_c} + \frac{c^2 \eta'_c}{\eta_c B_c}.$$

Finally, in view of the latter expressions of  $q_{4,c}$  and  $q_{5,c}$ , we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( q_{4,c} \tilde{e}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{e}_\eta + q_{5,c} \tilde{e}_\eta^2 \right) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( -\frac{q'_{4,c}}{2} + q_{5,c} \right) \tilde{e}_\eta^2 = 0,$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

Finally, we prove Claim 3.3.

*Proof of Claim 3.3.* Recall from (H3) that  $k < 0$  and from (3.12) that

$$k_0 = 2\nu_c^2 - \frac{k}{3} > 0.$$

From (D.10), we derive

$$\frac{\widetilde{q}_{1,c}(x)}{\eta_c(x)} \xrightarrow{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} k_1 := -\left(\frac{k}{4} + \frac{\nu_c^2}{2} + \frac{c^2\nu_c^2}{k_0}\right) \underset{c \rightarrow c_s}{\sim} -\frac{k}{4} > 0, \quad (3.28)$$

and from the expressions of  $q_{2,c}$  and  $q_{3,c}$  in Claim 3.2, we compute

$$\widetilde{q}_{3,c} \xrightarrow{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} k_3 := \frac{c}{2} \left( \nu_c^2 + \frac{k}{3} \right), \quad (3.29)$$

which leads to

$$\frac{\eta_c \widetilde{q}_{3,c}^2}{q_{1,c}} \xrightarrow{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{k_3^2}{k_0} = \frac{c^2}{4k_0} \left( \nu_c^4 + \frac{2\nu_c^2 k}{3} + \frac{k^2}{9} \right). \quad (3.30)$$

From the expression of  $\widetilde{q}_{1,c}$  in Claim 3.2, (3.28) and from

$$m_{1,c}'' \underset{|x| \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} -\frac{k\eta_c'}{6},$$

we infer

$$-\frac{3}{2} \partial_x \left( \frac{\widetilde{q}_{1,c} m_{1,c}}{\eta_c} \right) = \mathcal{O}(\eta_c) \xrightarrow{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} 0. \quad (3.31)$$

On the other hand, from the asymptotic behavior of  $\eta_c$  and  $\eta_c'$ , and from (3.28), we infer

$$\frac{9\widetilde{q}_{1,c} m_{1,c}^2}{4\eta_c} \xrightarrow{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{9k_1 \nu_c^2}{4}. \quad (3.32)$$

As a consequence of (3.30), (3.31), (3.32) and (3.28) once again, we derive

$$\frac{\eta_c \widetilde{q}_{3,c}^2}{q_{1,c}} - \frac{3}{2} \partial_x \left( \frac{\widetilde{q}_{1,c} m_{1,c}}{\eta_c} \right) + \frac{9\widetilde{q}_{1,c} m_{1,c}^2}{4\eta_c} \xrightarrow{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} k_2, \quad (3.33)$$

where the limit  $k_2$  can be shown to satisfy

$$k_2 = \frac{k_3^2}{k_0} + \frac{9k_1 \nu_c^2}{4} = -\frac{c^2 k}{12} - c^2 \nu_c^2 - \frac{9k \nu_c^2}{16} - \frac{9\nu_c^4}{8} \underset{c \rightarrow c_s}{\sim} -\frac{c_s^2 k}{12} > 0.$$

Combining (3.12), (3.28), (3.29) and (3.33), we can formally take the limit  $|x| \rightarrow +\infty$  in the operator  $T_c$  and obtain the self-adjoint operator

$$T_\infty(\tilde{h}) = \begin{pmatrix} -k_1 \partial_x^2 \tilde{h}_\eta + k_2 \tilde{h}_\eta + k_3 \tilde{h}_v \\ k_3 \tilde{h}_\eta + k_0 \tilde{h}_v \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since  $T_\infty$  is a perturbation of  $T_c$ , then by the Weyl criterion for self-adjoint operators, we have  $\sigma_{ess}(T_c) = \sigma_{ess}(T_\infty)$ . In the Fourier domain, we observe that  $\lambda \in \sigma(T_\infty)$  if and only if there

exists  $\xi \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $P(\lambda) = \lambda^2 - \lambda(k_1|\xi|^2 + k_2 + k_0) + (k_1|\xi|^2 + k_2)k_0 - k_3^2 = 0$ . The discriminant of the previous polynomial in  $\lambda$  is

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_\xi &= (k_1|\xi|^2 + k_2 + k_0)^2 - 4((k_1|\xi|^2 + k_2)k_0 - k_3^2) \\ &= (k_1|\xi|^2 + k_2 - k_0)^2 + 4k_3^2 \geq 0.\end{aligned}\tag{3.34}$$

We infer that the polynomial  $P$  owns two roots

$$\lambda_\pm(\xi) = \frac{k_1|\xi|^2 + k_2 + k_0 \pm \sqrt{\Delta_\xi}}{2}.$$

Moreover, we notice that

$$k_2k_0 - k_3^2 = -\frac{c^2\nu_c^2k}{2} - \frac{3\nu_c^2k}{16}(\nu_c^2 - k) - \frac{5c^2\nu_c^4}{4} - \frac{9\nu_c^6}{4} \underset{c \rightarrow c_s}{\sim} -\frac{c_s^2\nu_c^2k}{2} + \frac{3\nu_c^2k^2}{16} > 0.\tag{3.35}$$

Clearly,  $\lambda_-(\xi) < \lambda_+(\xi)$ , and we now check by some standard real analysis that the function  $\xi \mapsto \lambda_-(\xi)$  increases on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  and thus  $\lambda_-(0) \leq \lambda_-(\xi)$ . Indeed, making the change of variables  $y = k_1|\xi|^2 + k_2 + k_0$  leads us to study the variations of the function

$$h(y) := y^2 - \sqrt{(y - 2k_0)^2 + 4k_3^2}.$$

By shrinking the value of  $c_1$  so that both quantities  $k_2k_0 - k_3^2$  and  $k_1$  are positive for  $c \in (c_1, c_s)$  by (3.35) and (3.31). We then derive that  $h$  is well-defined and differentiable on  $[k_2 + k_0, +\infty)$ . In addition,  $h' \geq 0$ , so that  $h(y) \geq h(k_2 + k_0) = \lambda_-(0)$ . From (3.34), and the fact that  $k_2 > 0$  and  $k_0 > 0$ , we deduce that

$$\sigma_{\text{ess}}(T_\infty) \subset [\tau_c, +\infty) \subset \mathbb{R}_+^*,$$

where we have set

$$\tau_c = \frac{k_2 + k_0 - \sqrt{(k_2 - k_0)^2 + 4k_3^2}}{2},$$

and checked that this number is uniformly strictly positive with respect to  $c$ .  $\square$

## A Equivalence of the topologies in a neighborhood of the travelling wave

In this section, we show the correspondence between the topologies for the original and the hydrodynamical framework, at least in a neighborhood of the travelling wave of speed  $c^*$ . We recall that the metric  $d$  is given in (2).

**Lemma A.1.** *There exists a ball  $\mathcal{B}_*$  of radius  $r_*$  and centered in  $\mathbf{u}_{c^*}$  for the metric  $d$  and a positive constant  $\tilde{A}_*$  such that for any  $u \in \mathcal{B}_*$ ,  $\|Q - Q_{c^*}\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq \tilde{A}_*d(u, \mathbf{u}_{c^*})$ .*

*Proof.* First, we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \|1 - |u|\|_{H^1} + 1 \lesssim 1 + \|1 - |u|\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x |u|\|_{L^2} \leq 1 + \|1 - |u|^2\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x u\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq 1 + 2r_* + \|1 - |\mathbf{u}_{c^*}|^2\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x \mathbf{u}_{c^*}\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Now using this bound, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\|\eta - \eta_{c^*}\|_{H^1} &\lesssim \| |u|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_{c^*}|^2 \|_{L^2} + \|u \cdot \partial_x u - \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \cdot \partial_x \mathbf{u}_{c^*}\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim r_* + \|u\|_{L^\infty} r_* + \|\partial_x \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \cdot (u - \mathbf{u}_{c^*})\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}\tag{A.1}$$

By the Sobolev embedding theorem, we can define the pointwise value of functions lying in the energy set  $\mathcal{X}(\mathbb{R})$ , so that we can write

$$(u - \mathbf{u}_{c^*})(x) = \int_0^x \partial_x(u - \mathbf{u}_{c^*}) + (u - \mathbf{u}_{c^*})(0).$$

We then deduce that

$$\|\partial_x \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \cdot (u - \mathbf{u}_{c^*})\|_{L^2} \leq \left\| \partial_x \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \sqrt{|x|} \right\|_{L^2} \|\partial_x u - \partial_x \mathbf{u}_{c^*}\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x \mathbf{u}_{c^*}\|_{L^2} \|u - \mathbf{u}_{c^*}\|_{L^\infty([-1,1])},$$

and since we have exponential decay of  $\partial_x \mathbf{u}_{c^*}$ , we thus have

$$\|\eta - \eta_{c^*}\|_{H^1} \lesssim d(u, \mathbf{u}_{c^*}). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

We now turn to the norm  $\|v - v_{c^*}\|_{L^2}$ . Since  $\mathbf{u}_{c^*} \in \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}(\mathbb{R})$ , we have a bound from below for this function, and we have just controlled  $\|\eta - \eta_{c^*}\|_{L^\infty}$ . Up to shrinking the value of  $r_*$  we can therefore assume that there exists  $m_{c^*} > 0$  such that  $\inf_{\mathbb{R}} |u| \geq m_{c^*}$ .

We conclude by estimating the last norm as

$$\begin{aligned} \|v - v_{c^*}\|_{L^2} &\leq \left\| \frac{i u \cdot \partial_x u}{|u|^2} - \frac{i \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \cdot \partial_x \mathbf{u}_{c^*}}{|\mathbf{u}_{c^*}|^2} \right\|_{L^2} \leq \left\| \frac{u \cdot \partial_x u - \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \cdot \partial_x \mathbf{u}_{c^*}}{|u|^2} \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \cdot \partial_x \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \left( \frac{1}{|u|^2} - \frac{1}{|\mathbf{u}_{c^*}|^2} \right) \right\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m_{c^*}^2} \|u \cdot \partial_x u - \mathbf{u}_{c^*} \cdot \partial_x \mathbf{u}_{c^*}\|_{L^2} + \frac{1}{m_{c^*}^2 \inf_{\mathbb{R}} |\mathbf{u}_{c^*}|^2} \|\mathbf{u}_{c^*} \cdot \partial_x \mathbf{u}_{c^*}\|_{L^2} \|\eta - \eta_{c^*}\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

The first term in the second-hand side can be controlled similarly as in (A.1). As for the second one, we use the one-dimensional Sobolev embedding and (A.2), so that we eventually have

$$\|v - v_{c^*}\|_{L^2} \lesssim d(u, \mathbf{u}_{c^*}).$$

□

## B Weak-continuity of the classical and hydrodynamical flow

In this section, we give brief details regarding the Cauchy problem of the equations involved in this paper and how this can be combined to prove the weak continuity of the flow of  $(NLS)$  (resp.  $(NLS_{hy})$ ) for the topology given by  $d$  (resp.  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{X}}$ ). This section relies mainly on two articles concerning the Cauchy problem where, on the one hand [12] the global well-posedness of  $(NLS)$  is proved for dimensions  $N \leq 4$  (see also [14]), and another article [13] where the Cauchy problem is addressed on Zhidkov spaces of order  $l$  (see (B.2)) for all dimensions  $l > \frac{N}{2}$ . We also mention that in [2], the Cauchy problem for  $(NLS)$  has been handled for dimensions  $N \in \{2, 3\}$  under less restrictive Kato-type assumptions.

We recall that we have assumed both the following conditions throughout the article:

- For all  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\frac{c_s^2}{4}(1 - \rho)^2 \leq F(\rho). \quad (\text{H1})$$

- There exist  $M \geq 0$  and  $q \in [2, +\infty)$  such that for all  $\rho \geq 2$ ,

$$F(\rho) \leq M|1 - \rho|^q. \quad (\text{H2})$$

**Theorem B.1** (Theorem 1.2 in C. Gallo [13]). *Let  $u_0 \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{R})$ . Take  $f$  in  $C^2(\mathbb{R})$  satisfying (H1). In addition, assume that there exist  $\alpha_1 \geq 1$  and  $C_0 > 0$  such that for all  $\rho \geq 1$ ,*

$$|f''(\rho)| \leq \frac{C_0}{\rho^{3-\alpha_1}}.$$

*If  $\alpha_1 > \frac{3}{2}$ , assume moreover that there exists  $\alpha_2 \in [\alpha_1 - \frac{1}{2}, \alpha_1]$  such that for  $\rho \geq 2$ ,  $C_0 \rho^{\alpha_2} \leq F(\rho)$ . There exists a unique function  $w \in C^0(\mathbb{R}, H^1(\mathbb{R}))$  such that  $u := u_0 + w$  solves (NLS). Moreover, the solution depends continuously on the initial condition, and the energy  $E$  and the momentum  $p$  are conserved by the flow.*

From the previous global well-posedness result, we derive the weak-continuity for the metric  $d$ .

**Proposition B.2.** *Let  $(\Psi_{n,0})_n \in \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\Psi_0 \in \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R})$  such that*

$$\Psi_{n,0} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{d} \Psi_0. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

*Write  $\Psi_n$  and  $\Psi$  the associated solutions to (NLS) given by Theorem B.1. Then for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$\Psi_n(t) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{d} \Psi(t).$$

*Proof.* We can follow the main lines of the proof of Proposition A.3 in [6]. The only remaining details that are to be verified are the compactness argument exhibiting the limit profile satisfying (NLS) in the distributional sense and the fact that the limit profile is sufficiently smooth. The construction of the limit profile is based on the boundedness of the sequence of the energies  $(E(\Psi_{n,0}))_n$  in the classical setting. Combining all three convergences in (B.1) provides that  $(1 - |\Psi_{n,0}|^2)_n$  is bounded in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$  and  $(\partial_x(1 - |\Psi_{n,0}|^2))_n$  as well. The first one is straightforward and to prove the second one, we first write  $\partial_x(1 - |\Psi_{n,0}|^2) = -2\partial_x \Psi_{n,0} \cdot \Psi_{n,0}$ . Now, we set  $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  supported on a compact  $K$  and real valued. Using both the weak-convergence of  $(\partial_x \Psi_{n,0})_n$  and the convergence in  $L_{loc}^\infty$  yields to

$$\langle \partial_x \Psi_{n,0} \cdot \Psi_{n,0}, \chi \rangle_{L^2} = \int_K \partial_x \Psi_{n,0} \cdot (\Psi_{n,0} \chi) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} \int_K \partial_x \Psi_0 \cdot (\Psi_0 \chi) = \langle \partial_x \Psi_0 \cdot \Psi_0, \chi \rangle_{L^2}.$$

This proves that  $(1 - |\Psi_{n,0}|^2)_n$  is bounded in  $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ , by some bound denoted by  $M_3$ . We also know that the sequence of kinetic energies  $(E_k(\Psi_{n,0}))_n$  is bounded, and we still denote  $M_3$  such a bound. Regarding the potential energy, we deduce from hypothesis (H2) that there exist two positive constants  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  such that for any  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$

$$F(\rho) \leq M_1(1 - \rho)^2 + M_2|1 - \rho|^q.$$

Therefore, by the one-dimensional Sobolev embedding  $H^1(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow L^q(\mathbb{R})$ , up to taking a larger  $M_3$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} F(|\Psi_{n,0}|^2) \leq M_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 - |\Psi_{n,0}|^2)^2 + M_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 - |\Psi_{n,0}|^2)^q \leq M_3.$$

Then, following the path of the anterior proof, we deduce the existence of a profile  $\Phi$  characterized as the weak limit function in  $L^\infty([0, T], L^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$  satisfying for any  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\partial_x \Psi_n(t) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{L^2} \partial_x \Phi(t) \quad \text{and} \quad 1 - |\Psi_n(t)|^2 \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{L^2} 1 - |\Phi(t)|^2,$$

and satisfying also  $(NLS)$  with initial data  $\Psi_0$  in a distributional sense due again to the Sobolev embedding.

It remains to check that it lies in  $C^0([0, T], \mathcal{Z}^s(\mathbb{R}))$  where  $T$  is a given positive number and  $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  designates a smoothness parameter in the Zhidkov space defined by

$$\mathcal{Z}^s(\mathbb{R}) := \{\psi \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \mid \partial_x \psi \in H^{s-1}(\mathbb{R})\}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

First, the  $L^2$ -norms of  $\partial_x \Phi$  and  $1 - |\Phi|^2$  are uniformly bounded with respect to  $t \in [0, T]$  and in particular,  $(\partial_x \Phi, 1 - |\Phi|^2) \in L^\infty([0, T], L^2(\mathbb{R})) \times L^\infty([0, T], H^1(\mathbb{R}))$ . Now, since  $\Phi$  satisfies  $(NLS)$  in a distributional sense, we have

$$i\partial_t(\partial_x \Phi) = -\partial_x^3 \Phi - \partial_x(\Phi f(|\Phi|^2)). \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Since  $\Phi \in L^\infty([0, T], L^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$  and  $1 - |\Phi|^2 \in L^\infty([0, T], H^1(\mathbb{R}))$ , and since  $f$  and  $f'$  are continuous functions with  $f(1) = 0$ , we proceed to a first-order Taylor expansion between  $|\Phi|^2$  and 1, in order to provide

$$\Phi f(|\Phi|^2) = -\Phi(1 - |\Phi|^2) \int_0^1 (1 - s) f'(s|\Phi|^2) ds \in L^\infty([0, T], L^2(\mathbb{R})) \quad (\text{B.4})$$

so that from (B.3), we have  $\partial_x \Phi \in W^{1, \infty}([0, T], H^{-2}(\mathbb{R}))$ . Using the same argument than in [6], we identically infer that  $1 - |\Phi|^2 \in W^{1, \infty}([0, T], H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}))$  and that  $\Phi \in C^0([0, T], \mathcal{Z}^s(\mathbb{R}))$  as well.

In [12], it is proved that under the condition (H1), the Cauchy problem associated with  $(NLS)$  is shown to be locally well-posed in the Zhidkov spaces  $\mathcal{Z}^s(\mathbb{R})$  for any  $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$  but the proof generalizes to all  $s > \frac{1}{2}$  by the one-dimensional Sobolev embedding. The fact that  $\Phi$  lies in  $\mathcal{Z}^s(\mathbb{R})$  with  $\frac{1}{2} < s < 1$  and  $\Phi(0) = \Psi_0$  thus implies that  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  coincide, which concludes the proof.  $\square$

Now, we state a local well-posedness result in the hydrodynamical framework, proved in [12] and extendable to all integer  $l > \frac{1}{2}$  according to the remark above Theorem 5.1 in [12].

**Theorem B.3** (Gallo [12]). *We assume that  $f \in C^5(\mathbb{R}_+)$  is such that for all  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$\frac{c_s^2}{4}(1 - \rho)^2 \leq F(\rho). \quad (\text{H1})$$

*Let  $l \in \{0, \dots, 4\}$  be a natural integer and let  $(\eta_0, v_0) \in \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}_{hy}^l(\mathbb{R})$ . There exist  $T_{\max} > 0$  and a unique solution  $(\eta, v) \in C^0([0, T_{\max}], \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}_{hy}^l(\mathbb{R}))$  to  $(NLS_{hy})$  with initial datum  $(\eta_0, v_0)$ . The maximal time  $T_{\max}$  is continuous with respect to the initial datum and is characterized by*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow T_{\max}^-} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \eta(t, x) = 1.$$

*Moreover, the flow map is continuous on  $\mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}_{hy}^l(\mathbb{R})$  and the energy and the momentum are conserved along the flow.*

From the local well-posedness in Theorem B.3 and the weak continuity of the flow in the original setting in Proposition B.2, we derive the weak-continuity of the flow in the hydrodynamic framework. The proof of this statement can be found in [6].

**Proposition B.4.** *Let  $(Q_{n,0})_n \in \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $Q_0 \in \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R})$  such that*

$$Q_{n,0} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathcal{X}} Q_0.$$

*Assume in addition that there exists a constant  $M \in ]0, 1)$  such that the associated solutions  $Q_n \in C([0, T_{\max, n}], \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R}))$  and  $Q \in C([0, T_{\max}], \mathcal{N}\mathcal{X}_{hy}(\mathbb{R}))$  to  $(NLS_{hy})$  given by Theorem B.3 satisfy for some  $0 < T < T_{\max, n}$  and any  $(n, t, x) \in \mathbb{N} \times [-T, T] \times \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$\eta_n(t, x) \leq M.$$

*Then  $0 < T < T_{\max}$  and for any  $t \in [-T, T]$ ,*

$$Q_n(t) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathcal{X}} Q(t).$$

Finally, we conclude this section by observing that the proof of Proposition 1.14 that is made in Subsection A.1.1 of [6] does not depend on the nonlinearity considered but only on the weak-continuity of the hydrodynamic flow as stated in Proposition B.4. In particular, we refer to the latter article for the details of the proof of Proposition 1.14.

## C Estimates on the linearized operator $\mathcal{H}_c$

### C.1 Useful estimates

We recall the expression of the linearized operator, that is

$$\mathcal{H}_c = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{L}_c & -\frac{c}{2(1-\eta_c)} \\ -\frac{c}{2(1-\eta_c)} & 1-\eta_c \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

with

$$\mathcal{L}_c(\varepsilon_\eta) = -\left(\frac{\varepsilon'_\eta}{4(1-\eta_c)}\right)' + \mathcal{M}_c(\varepsilon_\eta),$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_c(\varepsilon_\eta) = -\left(\frac{\eta_c''}{4(1-\eta_c)^2} + \frac{(\eta_c')^2}{4(1-\eta_c)^3} + \frac{f'(1-\eta_c)}{2}\right)\varepsilon_\eta. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

We define some weighted norms that will be useful throughout the article. For  $\rho \geq 0$  and any integer  $l \geq -1$ , define

$$\mathcal{X}_\rho^l := \left\{ Q = (\eta, v) \in \mathcal{X}^l(\mathbb{R}) \mid \|Q\|_{\mathcal{X}^l(|x|^\rho dx)} < +\infty \right\}$$

where

$$\|Q\|_{\mathcal{X}^l(|x|^\rho dx)}^2 = \sum_{m=0}^{l+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\partial_x^m \eta(x))^2 |x|^\rho dx + \sum_{m=0}^l \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\partial_x^m v(x))^2 |x|^\rho dx,$$

with the convention  $\mathcal{X}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}) = L^2(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\|Q\|_{\mathcal{X}^{-1}(|x|^\rho dx)}$  the corresponding weighted  $(L^2(|x|^\rho dx))^2$ -norm. The following proposition states several crucial estimates satisfied by the

operator  $\mathcal{H}_c$ . Since we need to have sharp estimates, we also introduce for non-negative integers  $l$ , the set

$$\mathcal{Y}_\rho^l := \left\{ Q = (\eta, v) \in H^{l+2}(\mathbb{R}) \times H^l(\mathbb{R}) \mid \|Q\|_{\mathcal{Y}^l(|x|^\rho dx)} < +\infty \right\},$$

where

$$\|Q\|_{\mathcal{Y}^l(|x|^\rho dx)}^2 = \sum_{m=0}^{l+2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\partial_x^m \eta(x))^2 |x|^\rho dx + \sum_{m=0}^l \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\partial_x^m v(x))^2 |x|^\rho dx.$$

**Proposition C.1.** *There exists an interval  $J$  centered in  $c^*$  such that for any integer  $l \in \{-1, \dots, 2\}$  and  $m \in \{0, 1\}$ , there exists a constant  $K_* > 0$  only depending on  $c^*, l$  and  $m$  such that for any  $\rho \geq 0, c \in J$  and  $\varepsilon \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{H}_c) \cap \mathcal{Y}_\rho^{l+1}$  such that  $\partial_c \varepsilon \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{H}_c) \cap \mathcal{Y}_\rho^{l+1}$ ,*

$$\|\partial_c^m \mathcal{H}_c(\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{X}^l(|x|^\rho dx)} \leq K_* \left( \|\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{Y}^{l+1}(|x|^\rho dx)} + \|\partial_c^m \varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{Y}^{l+1}(|x|^\rho dx)} \right).$$

*Proof.* The previous estimates directly follows from the expression of  $\mathcal{H}_c$  and the exponential decay of the travelling wave and its derivative with respect to  $c$  in (5) combined with Proposition 1.13.  $\square$

In particular, we deduce the useful estimates stated in the following corollary.

**Corollary C.2.** *Up to taking a larger  $K_* > 0$  in the previous proposition, we have for any  $\rho \geq 0$ ,*

$$\|\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} J \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon})\|_{\mathcal{X}^{-1}(|x|^\rho dx)} \leq K_* \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}^3(|x|^\rho dx)}^2,$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon})\|_{\mathcal{X}^{-1}} \leq K_* \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}^3}$$

*Proof.* To simplify the notation and because the argument is similar otherwise, we only deal with the case  $\rho = 0$ . In view of the definition of (29), we can write

$$\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) = \int_0^1 (1-s) \nabla^3 E(Q_{\tilde{c}} + s\tilde{\varepsilon})(\tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \cdot) ds,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^3 E(Q_{\tilde{c}} + s\tilde{\varepsilon})(\tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \cdot) = \\ \left( \frac{3(\partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)^2}{4(1-\eta_{\tilde{c}} - s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)^2} + \frac{3\partial_x(\eta_{\tilde{c}} + s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)\partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta}{2(1-\eta_{\tilde{c}} - s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)^3} + \left( \frac{3(\partial_x(\eta_{\tilde{c}} + s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta))^2}{4(1-\eta_{\tilde{c}} - s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)^4} + \frac{f''(1-\eta_{\tilde{c}} - s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)}{2} \right) \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta^2 - \tilde{\varepsilon}_v^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

In view of the expression of the operator  $J$  in (24), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J \nabla^3 E(Q_{\tilde{c}} + s\tilde{\varepsilon})(\tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \cdot) = \\ 2\partial_x \left( \frac{-3(\partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)^2}{4(1-\eta_{\tilde{c}} - s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)^2} - \frac{3\partial_x(\eta_{\tilde{c}} + s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)\partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta}{2(1-\eta_{\tilde{c}} - s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)^3} - \left( \frac{3(\partial_x(\eta_{\tilde{c}} + s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta))^2}{4(1-\eta_{\tilde{c}} - s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)^4} + \frac{f''(1-\eta_{\tilde{c}} - s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)}{2} \right) \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta^2 + \tilde{\varepsilon}_v^2 \right). \end{aligned} \tag{C.3}$$

Using the one-dimensional Sobolev embedding, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the uniform bounds on  $Q_{\tilde{c}}$  and  $\|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}}$  provided by (20), we conclude that

$$\|\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} J \mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon})\|_{L^2 \times L^2} \leq K_* \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}^3}^2.$$

To finish, since  $\tilde{\varepsilon} = S\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon})$ , we can apply Proposition C.1 twice with  $m = 0$  and use the continuous embedding  $\mathcal{X}_\rho^{l+1} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Y}_\rho^l$  to eventually deduce the second desired estimate.  $\square$

**Corollary C.3.** *Up to taking a larger  $K_* > 0$  in the previous proposition, we have*

$$\|\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} J\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon})\|_{\mathcal{X}^{-1}} \leq K_* \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^{\frac{5}{4}} \left( \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{W^{12,1} \times W^{12,1}}^{\frac{3}{4}} + \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{W^{12,3} \times W^{12,3}}^{\frac{5}{4}} \right).$$

*Proof.* By Proposition C.1 and coming back to the expression (C.3), we compute

$$\|\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{c}} J\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon})\|_{\mathcal{X}^{-1}} \leq K_* \|\mathcal{J}\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon})\|_{\mathcal{Y}^0}.$$

This norm can be dealt with essentially the same way than in [6]. As a matter of example, we handle the term involving the nonlinearity  $f$ . In particular, by exponential decay (5), by Hölder's inequality, Proposition 1.13 and the fact that  $f''$  and  $f'''$  are continuous, we have for  $s \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \partial_x \left( f''(1 - \eta_{\tilde{c}} - s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta) \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta^2 \right) \right\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta^2 f'''(1 - \eta_{\tilde{c}} - s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta) \partial_x \eta_{\tilde{c}}\|_{L^2} + s \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta^2 \partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta f'''(1 - \eta_{\tilde{c}} - s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + 2 \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta f''(1 - \eta_{\tilde{c}} - s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq I_* \left( K_d \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta^2\|_{L^2} + \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta^2 \partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta\|_{L^2} + 2 \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta \partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta\|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\leq I_* \left( K_d \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta\|_{L^4}^2 + \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta\|_{L^6}^2 \|\partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta\|_{L^6} + 2 \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta\|_{L^4} \|\partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon}_\eta\|_{L^4} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Eventually, note that the maximum order of differentiation is smaller than 3 and that the number of factors in the  $L^2$ -norms never exceed 3, so that we obtain, up to a larger  $K_*$ ,

$$\|\mathcal{J}\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon})\|_{\mathcal{Y}^0} \leq K_* \left( \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{W^{3,4} \times W^{3,4}}^2 + \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{W^{3,6} \times W^{3,6}}^3 \right). \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Using the general estimate for  $g \in \bigcap_{\substack{m \in \{0, \dots, 12\} \\ p \in \{2, 3\}}} W^{m,p}(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\|g\|_{W^{m,p}}^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq \|g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|g\|_{W^{2m,2}}^{\frac{p-1}{2}},$$

and iterating this estimate read

$$\|g\|_{W^{m,p}}^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq \|g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{p+1}{4}} \|g\|_{W^{4m,2}}^{\frac{p-1}{4}}.$$

Using the latter control in (C.4) leads to

$$\|\mathcal{J}\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{c}}(\tilde{\varepsilon})\|_{\mathcal{Y}^0} \leq K_* \left( \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^{\frac{5}{4}} \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{W^{12,1} \times W^{12,1}}^{\frac{3}{4}} + \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^{\frac{7}{4}} \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{W^{12,3} \times W^{12,3}}^{\frac{5}{4}} \right).$$

Assuming without loss of generality that  $\|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq 1$ , we obtain the desired estimate.  $\square$

## C.2 Improvement of the orbital stability result

In this subsection, we refine the orbital stability result in [5] so that we obtain (14). We recall that in the previous article [5], we have a less restrictive control on the modulation parameters that is

$$|a'(t) - c(t)| + |c'(t)| = \mathcal{O}(\|\varepsilon(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}). \quad (\text{C.5})$$

From this control, we shall derive the quadratic control on  $c'(t)$  stated in (14). We differentiate the second equality in (15) with respect to the time. Using the equation satisfied by  $\varepsilon$  that is (28) and the facts that  $\nabla p(Q_c)(J\mathcal{H}_c \varepsilon) = \nabla p(Q_c)(\partial_x Q_c) = 0$ , provides

$$\begin{aligned} c'(t) \frac{d}{dc} \left( p(Q_{c(t)}) \right) &= (a'(t) - c(t)) \nabla p(Q_{c(t)}) \cdot \partial_x \varepsilon(t) + c'(t) \nabla^2 p(Q_{c(t)}) \cdot (\partial_c Q_{c(t)}, \varepsilon(t)) \\ &\quad + \nabla p(Q_{c(t)})(J\mathcal{R}_{c(t)} \varepsilon(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by (C.5), we can bound  $(a'(t) - c(t))\nabla p(Q_{c(t)}) \cdot \partial_x \varepsilon(t)$  and  $c'(t)\nabla^2 p(Q_c) \cdot (\partial_c Q_{c(t)}, \varepsilon(t))$  by  $\mathcal{O}\left(\|\varepsilon(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2\right)$ . Finally, coming back to the computations made in the proof of Corollary C.2, we can also bound  $\nabla p(Q_{c(t)})(J\mathcal{R}_{c(t)}\varepsilon(t))$  by  $\mathcal{O}\left(\|\varepsilon(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2\right)$ . Using Proposition 1.13 provides the desired quadratic control of  $|c'(t)|$ .

## D The transonic regime $c \rightarrow c_s$ .

In this section, we highlight the properties of the travelling waves in the transonic regime. We recall that one of the fundamental assumption that appears in [4, 5] is that

$$k := 2f''(1) + 6f'(1) \neq 0. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

Recall from (6) and (7) that for  $(x, c) \in \mathbb{R} \times (c_0, c_s)$ , we have

$$0 < \eta_c(x) \leq \xi_c < 1, \quad (\text{D.2})$$

where

$$\xi_c = \eta_c(0) \underset{c \rightarrow c_s}{\sim} -\frac{3\nu_c^2}{k}. \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Due to both last statements, we recover the condition

$$k := 2f''(1) + 6f'(1) < 0. \quad (\text{H3})$$

The number  $k$  plays a major role in the asymptotics of  $\eta_c$  when  $c \rightarrow c_s$ . Recall indeed that the function  $\eta_c$  solves the equation

$$-(\partial_x \eta_c)^2 = \mathcal{N}_c(\eta_c),$$

where

$$\mathcal{N}_c(x) = c^2 x^2 - 4(1-x)F(1-x), \quad (\text{D.4})$$

so that

$$-\partial_x^2 \eta_c = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{N}'_c(\eta_c). \quad (\text{D.5})$$

Since

$$\mathcal{N}_c(\xi) \underset{\xi \rightarrow 0}{=} -\xi^2(\nu_c^2 + \frac{k}{3}\xi + \mathcal{O}(\xi^2)), \quad (\text{D.6})$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}'_c(\xi) \underset{\xi \rightarrow 0}{=} -\xi(2\nu_c^2 + k\xi + \mathcal{O}(\xi^2)), \quad (\text{D.7})$$

we deduce the following control on  $\eta_c$ .

**Proposition D.1.** *We have*

$$\eta_c \underset{c \rightarrow c_s}{\longrightarrow} 0 \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\mathbb{R}).$$

Moreover, there exists  $c_1 \in (c_0, c_s)$  such that for  $c \in (c_1, c_s)$  and any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$|\eta'_c(x)| \underset{c \rightarrow c_s}{\sim} \eta_c(x)\nu_c,$$

and there exists  $m_c$  depending continuously on  $c$  and tending to 0 as  $c$  tends to  $c_s$  such that for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$|\eta_c(x)| \geq m_c e^{-\nu_c |x|}.$$

*Proof.* Both properties (D.1) and (D.1) can be derived from what is shown in Section 2 in [5]. However, in the latter, no control from below was provided for the function  $\eta_c$  that is only known to be positive by (D.2). Therefore, we need to come back to [8], from which we have

$$|\eta_c(x)| \Big|_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} \sim M_c e^{-\nu_c |x|},$$

where

$$M_c = \xi_c e^{\int_0^{\xi_c} \frac{\mathcal{N}_{c_s}(\xi)}{\sqrt{-\xi^2 \mathcal{N}_c(\xi)} (\sqrt{-\mathcal{N}_c(\xi)} + \sqrt{\nu_c^2 \xi^2})} d\xi}. \quad (\text{D.8})$$

Taking the limit  $c \rightarrow c_s$  in the previous integral<sup>3</sup> yields to

$$M_c \underset{c \rightarrow c_s}{\sim} \xi_c e^{\frac{\nu_c^2}{1+\nu_c}}.$$

By (D.3), this provides  $c_1 \in (c_0, c_s)$  such that  $M_c$  is positive for  $c \in (c_1, c_s)$ . Thus, by (D.2), we deduce the existence of a constant  $m_c$  continuously depending on  $c$  such that  $\eta_c(x) \geq m_c e^{-\nu_c |x|}$ .  $\square$

Going back to the quadratic form in the proof of Lemma 1.22 we recall the notations  $a_c = \frac{\eta'_c}{\eta_c}$  and  $\lambda_c = \frac{\eta'_c}{(1-\eta_c)^2}$ . We also develop the expressions of

$$q_{1,c} = \frac{2((\eta'_c)^2 - \eta_c(1-\eta_c)\eta''_c)}{\eta_c^2},$$

and of the next quantity that will be shown to be well-defined in the next proposition

$$\widetilde{q}_{1,c} = -\frac{3a'_c}{2(1-\eta_c)} - \frac{a_c \lambda_c}{2} - \frac{c^2 (\eta'_c)^2}{(1-\eta_c)q_{1,c}}.$$

**Proposition D.2.** *There exists  $c_1 \in (c_0, c_s)$  such that we have for any  $(c, x) \in (c_1, c_s) \times \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$\frac{q_{1,c}(x)}{\eta_c(x)} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\widetilde{q}_{1,c}(x)}{\eta_c(x)} > 0.$$

*Proof.* We make a Taylor expansion of  $\mathcal{N}_c(x)$  in (D.4) and we eventually compute

$$q_{1,c}(x) = \eta_c(x) \left( 2\nu_c^2 + \int_0^1 (1-t)(t - \eta_c(x)) \mathcal{N}_c'''(t\eta_c(x)) dt \right).$$

Since  $\mathcal{N}_c'''(0) = -2k > 0$ , we use the uniform convergence (D.1) to infer that for  $c$  close enough to  $c_s$  we have

$$q_{1,c} = \left( 2\nu_c^2 - \frac{k}{3} \right) \eta_c + \mathcal{O}(\eta_c^2). \quad (\text{D.9})$$

Since  $\nu_c$  tends to 0 as  $c$  tends to  $c_s$ , we infer that there exists  $c_1$  close enough to  $c_s$  such that for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$q_{1,c}(x) \geq \frac{-k\eta_c(x)}{6}.$$

We conclude that  $\frac{q_{1,c}(x)}{\eta_c(x)} > 0$  for any  $(x, c) \in \mathbb{R} \times (c_1, c_s)$ , using (D.2).

---

<sup>3</sup>The computations can be properly justified on the basis of those made in [5].

Now, we handle  $\widetilde{q}_{1,c}$ . From (D.6) and (D.7), we derive

$$a'_c = \frac{k}{6}\eta_c + \mathcal{O}(\eta_c^2),$$

hence

$$-\frac{3a'_c}{2(1-\eta_c)} = -\frac{k}{4}\eta_c + \mathcal{O}(\eta_c^2).$$

On the other hand, from (D.6) again, we compute

$$-\frac{a_c\lambda_c}{2} = -\frac{\nu_c^2}{2}\eta_c + \mathcal{O}(\eta_c^2),$$

and using (D.9),

$$-\frac{c^2(\eta'_c)^2}{(1-\eta_c)q_{1,c}} = -\frac{c^2\nu_c^2}{2\nu_c^2 - \frac{k}{3}}\eta_c + \mathcal{O}(\eta_c^2).$$

Using all three previous estimates, we derive

$$\widetilde{q}_{1,c} = -\left(\frac{k}{4} + \frac{\nu_c^2}{2} + \frac{c^2\nu_c^2}{2\nu_c^2 - \frac{k}{3}}\right)\eta_c + \mathcal{O}(\eta_c^2). \quad (\text{D.10})$$

In sum, we conclude that, up to taking  $c_1$  even closer to  $c_s$ , we have for any  $(x, c) \in \mathbb{R} \times (c_1, c_s)$ ,

$$\frac{\widetilde{q}_{1,c}(x)}{\eta_c(x)} \geq -\frac{k}{8} > 0.$$

□

**Acknowledgments.** *The author thanks Philippe Gravejat for his well-meaning eye and help in some tedious computations made in this article.*

## References

- [1] M. Abid, C. Huepe, S. Metens, C. Nore, C. T. Pham, L. S. Tuckerman, and M. E. Brachet. Gross-Pitaevskii dynamics of Bose-Einstein condensates and superfluid turbulence. *Fluid Dynamics Research*, 33(5-6):509–544, December 2003.
- [2] Paolo Antonelli, Lars Eric Hientzsch, and Pierangelo Marcati. Finite energy well-posedness for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with non-vanishing conditions at infinity, 2024.
- [3] Christoph Becker, Simon Stellmer, Parvis Soltan-Panahi, Sören Dörscher, Mathis Baumert, Eva-Maria Richter, Jochen Kronjäger, Kai Bongs, and Klaus Sengstock. Oscillations and interactions of dark and dark-bright solitons in Bose-Einstein condensates. *Nature Physics*, 4(6):496–501, May 2008.
- [4] J. Berthoumieu. Minimizing travelling waves for the one-dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equations with non-zero condition at infinity. *Topological Methods in Nonlinear Analysis*, in press, 2024.

- [5] J. Berthoumieu. Orbital stability of a chain of dark solitons for general nonintegrable Schrödinger equations with non-zero condition at infinity. *Pre-print ArXiv, arXiv:2409.04277*, 2024.
- [6] F. Bethuel, P. Gravejat, and D. Smets. Asymptotic stability in the energy space for dark solitons of the Gross-Pitaevskii equation. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Sup.*, 48(6):1327–1381, 2015.
- [7] D. Chiron. Travelling waves for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with general nonlinearity in dimension one. *Nonlinearity*, 25(3):813–850, 2012.
- [8] D. Chiron. Stability and instability for subsonic traveling waves of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation in dimension one. *Anal. PDE*, 6(6):1327–1420, 2013.
- [9] C. Coste. Nonlinear Schrödinger equation and superfluid hydrodynamics. *Eur. Phys. J. B*, 1(2):245–253, 1998.
- [10] S. Cuccagna and R. Jenkins. On the asymptotic stability of N-soliton solutions of the defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 343(3):921–969, 2016.
- [11] L. Escauriaza, C.E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega. Hardy’s uncertainty principle, convexity and Schrödinger evolutions. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 10(4):883–907, 2008.
- [12] C. Gallo. Schrödinger group on Zhidkov spaces. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 9(5-6):509–538, 2004.
- [13] C. Gallo. The Cauchy problem for defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equations with nonvanishing initial data at infinity. *Commun. Partial Differential Equations*, 33(5):729–771, 2008.
- [14] P. Gérard. The Cauchy problem for the Gross-Pitaevskii equation. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Analyse Non Linéaire*, 23(5):765–779, 2006.
- [15] P. Gérard and Z. Zhang. Orbital stability of traveling waves for the one-dimensional Gross-Pitaevskii equation. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 91(2):178–210, 2009.
- [16] P. Gravejat. Decay for travelling waves in the Gross-Pitaevskii equation. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Analyse Non Linéaire*, 21(5):591–637, 2004.
- [17] P. Gravejat and D. Smets. Asymptotic stability of the black soliton for the Gross-Pitaevskii equation. *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 111(2):305–353, 2015.
- [18] M. Maris. Nonexistence of supersonic traveling waves for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with non-zero conditions at infinity. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 40(3):1076–1103, 2008.
- [19] Y. Martel. Linear problems related to asymptotic stability of solitons of the generalized KdV equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 38(3):759–781, 2006.
- [20] Y. Martel and F. Merle. Asymptotic stability of solitons for subcritical generalized KdV equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 157(3):219–254, 2001.
- [21] Y. Martel and F. Merle. Asymptotic stability of solitons of the subcritical gKdV equations revisited. *Nonlinearity*, 18(1):55–80, 2005.
- [22] Y. Martel and F. Merle. Asymptotic stability of solitons of the gKdV equations with general nonlinearity. *Math. Ann.*, 341(2):391–427, 2008.
- [23] Y. Martel, F. Merle, and T.-P. Tsai. Stability in  $H^1$  of the sum of  $K$  solitary waves for some nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Duke Math. J.*, 133(3):405–466, 2006.