Kenji Nakanishi , Wilhelm Schlag

Invariant Manifolds
and Dispersive Hamiltonian
Evolution Equations

不变流形和色散型哈密顿发展方程

世界图书出版公司
www.wpcbj.com.cn

Kenji Nakanishi
Wilhelm Schlag

Invariant Manifolds
and Dispersive Hamiltonian
Evolution Equations

€uropean $\mathcal{M}$athematical $\mathcal{S}$ociety

Authors:

Prof. Kenji Nakanishi
Department of Mathematics
Kyoto University
606-8502 Kyoto
Japan

Prof. Wilhelm Schlag
Department of Mathematics
University of Chicago
5734 S. University Avenue
Chicago, IL 60637-1514
USA

Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics

Edited by

Erwin Bolthausen (Managing Editor), Freddy Delbaen, Thomas Kappeler (Managing Editor), Christoph Schwab, Michael Struwe, Gisbert Wüstholz

Mathematics in Zurich has a long and distinguished tradition, in which the writing of lecture notes volumes and research monographs plays a prominent part. The *Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics* series aims to make some of these publications better known to a wider audience. The series has three main constituents: lecture notes on advanced topics given by internationally renowned experts, graduate text books designed for the joint graduate program in Mathematics of the ETH and the University of Zurich, as well as contributions from researchers in residence at the mathematics research institute, FIM-ETH. Moderately priced, concise and lively in style, the volumes of this series will appeal to researchers and students alike, who seek an informed introduction to important areas of current research.

Previously published in this series:

Contents

1 Introduction

This research monograph is intended as an introduction to, and exposition of, some of the phenomena that solutions of nonlinear dispersive focusing equations exhibit at energy levels strictly above that of the ground state soliton. It grew out of lectures that the authors have given on various aspects of their work on focusing wave equations. In particular, it is a much expanded version of the second author's postgraduate course (Nachdiplomvorlesung), which he taught in the fall of 2010 at ETH Zürich, Switzerland.

The equations which we consider in these lectures are Hamiltonian, but not completely integrable, and they all exhibit soliton-like (i.e., stationary or periodic) solutions which are unstable. Amongst those the ground state is singled out as the one of smallest energy. The aforementioned phenomena concern the *transition* from a region of phase space in which solutions exist globally in forward time and scatter to a free wave, to one where they blow up in finite positive time. We can describe this transition in some detail provided the energy is only slightly larger than that of the ground state. In fact, the boundary along which these open regions meet can be identified as a *center-stable manifold* associated with the ground state.

To be more specific, consider an energy subcritical Klein–Gordon equation

$$\ddot{u} - \Delta u + u = f(u) \tag{1.1}$$

in $\mathbb{R}_t \times \mathbb{R}_x^d$ with real-valued solutions. More generally, the *mass term* should be $m^2 u$ with $m > 0$, but we can set $m = 1$ without loss of generality. This equation should be thought of as perhaps the simplest model equation which exhibits the phenomena which we wish to describe here, but it should not be mistaken as the central object of our investigations. We begin with a fairly general discussion of (1.1). It is invariant under the full Poincaré group, i.e., under the group generated by spatial as well as temporal translations, Euclidean rotations, and Lorentz transforms. The latter are defined as the group that leave the quadratic form $\tau^2 - |\xi|^2$ in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ invariant (the Minkowski metric).

Moreover, (1.1) is both Lagrangian as well as Hamiltonian in the following sense: at least formally, solutions to this equation are characterized as critical point of the Lagrangian, with $F' = f$,

$$\mathcal{L}(u, \dot{u}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_{t,x}^{d+1}} \left[-\frac{1}{2}\dot{u}^2 + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla u|^2 + \frac{1}{2}u^2 - F(u) \right](t, x)\, dt\, dx .$$

This can be seen by integrating by parts in the integral representing $\mathcal{L}'(\vec{u}) = 0$. The Lagrangian point of view is important with respect to conservation laws generated by one-parameter subgroups of symmetries of $\mathcal{L}$ (Noether's theorem). For example, time translation invariance leads to the conservation of the energy

$$E(u, \dot{u}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[\frac{1}{2}\dot{u}^2 + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla u|^2 + \frac{1}{2}u^2 - F(u)\right](t, x)\, dx$$

invariance under spatial translations yields the conservation of the momentum $P(u) = \langle \dot{u}|\nabla u \rangle$. Euclidean rotations are associated with the conservation of the angular momentum.

The aforementioned energy subcriticality assumption which we made on (1.1) now means the following: the nonlinear term $F(u(t))$ is strictly weaker than the H^1 part of the energy, as expressed by the Sobolev estimate. To be more specific, consider $f(u) = \lambda |u|^{p-1}u$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Then $p < 5$ is subcritical, whereas $p = 5$ is critical and $p > 5$ is supercritical due to the Sobolev embedding $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \subset L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)$. We shall not touch the supercritical case here at all. Even though it may seem most desirable to restrict one's attention to classical, i.e., smooth, solutions of (1.1) this is not the case; the best notion of solution for many different reasons turns out to be that of an *energy solution* which is a solution which belongs to $H^1 \times L^2$ for all times.

To express (1.1) in Hamiltonian form, we write it as a first order system, with dependent variable $U := \binom{u}{\dot{u}}$:

$$\dot{U} = JHU + N(U)$$

where

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad H = \begin{pmatrix} -\Delta + 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad N(U) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ f(u) \end{pmatrix}.$$

For simplicity, let $f = 0$. Then energy conservation simply means that $\frac{d}{dt}\langle HU|U \rangle = 0$. The symplectic form associated with (1.1) can be now seen to be

$$\omega(U, V) = \langle JU|V \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (U_2 V_1 - U_1 V_2)(x)\, dx.$$

There are two main classes dividing equations of the form (1.1): the *defocusing* equations on the one hand, and the *focusing* ones on the other hand.

Loosely speaking, this division can be expressed along the lines of the global-in-time existence problem for (1.1) for smooth, compactly supported data, say. Defocusing equations admit smooth solutions for all data and all times, whereas the

focusing ones may exhibit finite time blowup for certain data (such as those of negative energies). To be more specific, consider monic nonlinearities $f(u) = \lambda|u|^{p-1}u$ in arbitrary dimensions. Then $\lambda > 0$ represents the focusing case, and $\lambda < 0$ the defocusing one. Note that this corresponds exactly to the distinction of the energy $E(\vec{u})$ being indefinite vs. positive definite, respectively.

Only the focusing case will be relevant to this monograph. Of central importance to the theory of the focusing nonlinear Klein–Gordon (NLKG) equation (1.1) is the fact that they admit nonzero time-independent solutions φ. Any weak H^1 solution of the semilinear elliptic PDE

$$-\Delta\varphi + \varphi = f(\varphi) \tag{1.2}$$

is such a solution. Letting the Poincaré symmetries act on φ generates a manifold of moving solutions of the following form: first, define for any $(p,q) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$

$$Q(p,q)(x) = Q(x - q + p(\langle p \rangle - 1)|p|^{-2} p \cdot (x - q)),$$

where $\langle p \rangle := \sqrt{1 + |p|^2}$. The traveling waves generated from φ are defined as

$$u(t) = \pm\varphi(p, q(t)), \quad p \in \mathbb{R}^d, \ \dot{q}(t) = \frac{p}{\langle p \rangle},$$

with fixed momentum p and velocity $\frac{p}{\langle p \rangle}$. They are solutions of (1.1). Note that $|\dot{q}(t)| < 1$ in agreement with the fact that the speed of light which is normalized to equal 1, acts as a barrier.

Amongst all solutions of (1.2) one singles out a positive decaying one, called the *ground state* which we denote by Q. It is known to be unique up to translations for many different nonlinearities $f(u)$, and it is radial. Q is characterized as the minimizer of the stationary energy (or action)

$$J(\varphi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left[\frac{1}{2}|\nabla\varphi|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\varphi^2 - F(\varphi) \right] dx$$

subject to the constraint, with $\varphi \neq 0$,

$$K_0(\varphi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left[|\nabla\varphi|^2 + \varphi^2 - f(\varphi)\varphi \right] dx = 0 \tag{1.3}$$

It follows that the regions

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{PS}_+ &= \{(u, \dot{u}) \mid E(u, \dot{u}) < J(Q), \ K_0(u) \geq 0\}, \\
\mathcal{PS}_- &= \{(u, \dot{u}) \mid E(u, \dot{u}) < J(Q), \ K_0(u) < 0\}
\end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

are invariant under the nonlinear flow in the phase space $H^1 \times L^2$ where $E(u, \dot{u})$ is the conserved energy for (1.1). It is a classical result of Payne and Sattinger [114] that solutions in $\mathcal{PS}_+$ are global, whereas those in $\mathcal{PS}_-$ blow up in finite time; these results apply to *both time directions*, i.e., blowup occurs for both positive and negative times simultaneously, and the same is true of global existence. In particular, the stationary solution Q is unstable, see also Shatah [125] and Berestycki, Cazenave [11]. Scattering in $\mathcal{PS}_+$ was only recently shown by Ibrahim, Masmoudi, and the first author [77] using the concentration-compactness proof method of Kenig and Merle [84]. We present these results below the energy threshold $J(Q)$ in Chapter 2.

Starting with Chapter 3 we study solutions whose energies satisfy

$$J(Q) \leq E(u, \dot{u}) < J(Q) + \varepsilon^2 \tag{1.5}$$

for some small $\varepsilon > 0$ and the special nonlinearity $f(u) = u^3$ (although this is out of convenience rather than necessity). It is here that one encounters the aforementioned center-stable manifolds that appear as boundaries of open blowup/global existence regions.

Center/stable/unstable manifolds are well-established objects which arise in the study of the asymptotic behavior of ODEs in $\mathbb{R}^n$, see for example Carr [25], Hirsch, Pugh, Shub [72], as well as Guckenheimer, Holmes [68], and Vanderbauwhede [138].

Let us recall the meaning of these manifolds: given an ODE in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\dot{x} = f(x)$ with $f(0) = 0$, and f smooth, let $A = Df(0)$. Then split $\mathbb{R}^n = X_u + X_s + X_c$ as a direct sum into A-invariant subspaces such that all eigenvalues of $A \upharpoonright X_u$ lie in the right half-plane, those of $A \upharpoonright X_s$ lie in the left half-plane, and the eigenvalues of $A \upharpoonright X_c$ are all purely imaginary. An example of such a situation is given by the 7×7 matrix

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{1.6}$$

The eigenvalues are $\{0, 1, -1, i, -i\}$, and X_u is spanned by the first two coordinate directions, X_s by the third, and the center subspace by the final four. Note that X_c splits into a rotation in the fourth and fifth variables, but has linear growth on

the subspace spanned by variables six and seven. By the *center-manifold* theorem, see [25], [68], [138], there exist smooth manifolds M_u, M_s, M_c locally around zero which are tangent to X_u, X_s, X_c, respectively, at $x = 0$, and which are transverse to each other. Moreover, M_u, M_s, M_c are each locally invariant under the flow (meaning that a trajectory starting on any of these, say M_c, remains on M_c as long as the trajectory itself remains in a small neighborhood of the equilibrium point). A manifold M_{cs} which is tangent to $X_s + X_c$ at $x = 0$, of the same dimension as this tangent space, and is locally invariant under the flow is referred to as *center-stable*. On M_s, M_u the solution to $\dot{x} = f(x)$ decreases exponentially fast as $t \rightarrow \infty$ or $t \rightarrow -\infty$, respectively (in fact, they are characterized by this property). But on M_c the behavior can be quite complicated and that manifold is not characterized by growth conditions.

Such a decomposition is relevant for several reasons. On the one hand, it reduces the dynamics in the state space to lower-dimensional subspaces which is often the only way to obtain any understanding of the flow. On the other hand, it is most relevant for bifurcation theory of ODEs which refers to situations where the vector field $f(x)$ depends on a parameter μ, see Guckenheimer, Holmes [68].

In the context of (1.1) and related Hamiltonian PDEs such as the cubic focusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation (NLS), a center-stable manifold arose in [122] from the attempt of obtaining a *conditional asymptotic stability* result for an unstable equation. More precisely, the second author obtained – for the cubic focusing NLS in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and in a small neighborhood of the ground state soliton – a codimension one manifold with the property that any solution starting from that manifold exists globally and scatters to a (modulated) ground state soliton. The drawback of [122] lay with the topology which is not invariant under the NLS flow. But Beceanu [9] later carried out the construction in the optimal topology introducing several novel ideas, such as Strichartz estimates for linear evolution equations with small time-dependent but space-independent lower order terms. This allowed him not only to obtain a similar conditional asymptotic stability result as the one in [122] (but of course without any pointwise control on the rate of convergence of various parameters, which requires a stronger topology), but also to verify the properties usually associated with the center-stable manifold such as invariance locally in time (in fact, globally in forward time, and locally in backward time).

The method of proof in [122], [9] is perturbative, and is restricted to a small neighborhood of the ground states. This work left open the question as to what happens near the ground state soliton, but off the center-stable manifold. This is one of the problems we wish to address in this monograph. While there has been some heuristic and numerical work in the physics literature, see Bizoń et al. [15], [16] and Choptuik [30], the first rigorous results on this problem were obtained in

[87], [88], [109]–[111]. As an example, consider the one-dimensional Klein–Gordon equation

$$u_{tt} - u_{xx} + u = |u|^{p-1}u \tag{1.7}$$

with $p > 5$. It is well-known that for this equation the solitons are given by the explicit expressions

$$Q(x) = \alpha \cosh^{-\frac{1}{\beta}}(\beta x), \quad \alpha = \left(\frac{p+1}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}, \quad \beta = \frac{p-1}{2}.$$

In contrast to the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, one of the advantages of (1.7) lies with the fact that under an *even perturbation* Q does not change; in other words, it is not modulated. In fact, the following result was obtained in [88].

Theorem 1.1. *Let $p > 5$. There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that any even real-valued data $(u_0, u_1) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with energy*

$$E(u, \dot{u}) < E(Q, 0) + \varepsilon^2 \tag{1.8}$$

have the property that the solutions $u(t)$ of (1.7) associated with these data exhibit exactly one scenario of the following trichotomy:
○ *u blows up in finite positive time*
○ *u exists globally and scatters to zero as $t \to \infty$*
○ *u exists globally and scatters to Q, i.e., there exists a free Klein–Gordon wave $(v(t), \dot{v}(t)) \in H^1 \times L^2$ with the property that*

$$\big(u(t), \dot{u}(t)\big) = (Q, 0) + \big(v(t), \dot{v}(t)\big) + o_{\mathcal{H}}(1), \quad t \to \infty.$$

In addition, the set of even data as above splits into nine nonempty disjoint sets corresponding to all possible combinations of this trichotomy in both forward and negative times.

All solutions which fall under the third alternative form the center-stable manifold. One can show that this is a C^1 (or better) manifold of codimension 1 which passes through $(Q, 0)$ and lies in the set described by (1.8). Figure 1.1 illustrates Theorem 1.1 for data that start off near the ground-state solution $(Q, 0)$. The third region is the *center-stable* manifold. The figure on the cover illustrates the nine sets alluded to in the final statement of the theorem.

Moreover, we obtain the following characterization of the threshold solutions, i.e., those with energies $E(\vec{u}) = E(Q, 0)$. Results of this type originate with the seminal work of Duyckaerts and Merle [48].

Figure 1.1. The forward trichotomy near $(Q, 0)$

Corollary 1.2. *The even solutions to (1.7) with energy $E(\vec{u}) = E(Q, 0)$ are characterized by exactly one of the following scenarios, each of which can occur:*

○ *they blow up in both the positive and negative time directions*
○ *they exist globally on $\mathbb{R}$ and scatter as $t \to \pm\infty$*
○ *they are constant and equal $\pm Q$*
○ *they equal one of the following solutions, for some $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$:*

$$\sigma W_+(t + t_0, x), \quad \sigma W_-(t + t_0, x), \quad \sigma W_+(-t + t_0, x), \quad \sigma W_-(-t + t_0, x)$$

where $(W_\pm(t, \cdot), \partial_t W_\pm(t, \cdot))$ approach $(Q, 0)$ exponentially fast in $\mathcal{H}$ as $t \to \infty$, and $\sigma = \pm 1$. In backward time, W_+ scatters to zero, whereas W_- blows up in finite time.

As usual, the images of $W_\pm$ and Q form the one-dimensional *stable manifold* associated with $(Q, 0)$. The *unstable manifold* is obtained by time-reversal. The goal of these lectures is to prove results such as Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2. More precisely, in Chapters 2–5 we restrict ourselves to the radial cubic NLKG equation in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and systematically develop the machinery leading to results analogous to Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2 above.

Loosely speaking, the argument relies on an interplay between the hyperbolic dynamics near the ground states on the one hand, and a variational analysis away

from them on the other hand. While the former here means linearizing around the ground states and then performing the necessary perturbative analysis locally around the ground states, the latter refers to a type of global argument that is not at all based on linearization. More precisely, we shall use the virial identity valid for any energy solution of (1.1),

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left\langle w\dot{u} \mid \frac{1}{2}(x\cdot\nabla + \nabla\cdot x)u\right\rangle = -K_2(u) + \text{error} \qquad (1.9)$$

where $K_2(u) = \|\nabla u\|_2^2 - \frac{3}{4}\|u\|_4^4$. The cut-off function w here is chosen in such a way that the error remains small, cf. Figure 4.6 on page 165. From variational considerations we shall be able to conclude that $K_2(u)$ has a definite sign away from a neighborhood of $\pm Q$, and by integration of (1.9) we will obtain the important no-return (or "one-pass") theorem, see Chapter 4. This guarantees that solutions which are not trapped by $\pm Q$ can only make one pass near the ground states which then implies that the signs of $K_0(u), K_2(u)$ stabilize. The latter then allows one to conclude finite time blowup or global existence in the same way as Payne and Sattinger [114], at least for those solutions which are not trapped by the ground states. Those that are trapped are then shown to lie on the center-stable manifold whence the third alternative in Theorem 1.1.

Since very little is known about solutions in the regime $E(u, \dot{u}) > J(Q) + \varepsilon^2$, it seems natural to turn to numerical investigations in order to obtain some idea of the nature of the blowup/global existence dichotomy. Roland Donninger and the second author have conducted such computer experiments at the University of Chicago, see [45]. This work consists of numerical computations of radial solutions to (1.1) with $f(u) = u^3$ whose data belong to a two-dimensional surface (such as a planar rectangle) in the infinite dimensional phase space $\mathcal{H} := H^1 \times L^2$ (of course the data are chosen to belong to a fine rectangular grid on that surface). Each solution is then evaluated with regard to blowup/global existence and a dot is placed on the data rectangle if global existence is observed, whereas the dot is left blank otherwise. Figure 1.2 below shows the outcome of such a computation for the data choice

$$\bigl(u(0), \dot{u}(0)\bigr)(r) = \bigl(Q(r) + Ae^{-r^2}, Be^{-r^2}\bigr)$$

with the horizontal axis being A, and the vertical being B. The central region, from which thin spikes emanate, is the set of data leading to global existence. The drop-shaped region contained inside of it is the set $\mathcal{PS}_+$, see (1.4), whereas both the region to the far right (which meets $\mathcal{PS}_+$ at a cusp centered at $(Q, 0)$ which corresponds to $A = B = 0$) as well as the region on the far left are $\mathcal{PS}_-$. The region which appears blank is the one giving finite time blowup (at least numerically), and it contains $\mathcal{PS}_-$ as a subset.

We refer the reader to [45] for a discussion of the numerical methods, as well as more results and figures. The appearance of the two Payne–Sattinger regions near the point $(0,0)$ is reminiscent of the set $\xi^2 - \eta^2 \leq 0$. This is due to the fact that the energy near Q takes the form of a saddle surface, which in turn follows from the existence of negative spectrum of the linearized operator $L_+ = -\Delta + 1 - 3Q^2$, see Section 3.1. In fact, there is a codimension-1 plane around $(Q,0)$ in $\mathcal{H}$ such that locally around that point the energy is positive definite on this plane, whereas it is indefinite on the whole space. An important feature of the central global existence region in Figure 1.2 is the appearance of the boundary: it seems to be a smooth curve. In fact, we will prove in Chapter 3 that *near* $(Q,0)$ in $\mathcal{H}$ the boundary is indeed a smooth codimension 1 manifold $\mathfrak{M}$ with the property that solutions with data on that manifold are global and scatter to Q as $t \to \infty$. In dynamical terms this manifold is precisely the *center-stable* one, which contains the 1-dimensional stable manifold. Furthermore, $\mathfrak{M}$ is transverse to the 1-dimensional unstable manifold. The latter manifold is characterized by the property that all solutions starting on it converge to $(Q,0)$ as $t \to -\infty$; in fact, this convergence is exponential. Moreover, in positive times solutions on the unique unstable manifold grow exponentially up until the time at which they leave a small neighborhood of the equilibrium $(Q,0)$.


Figure 1.2. Numerically computed planar section through $(Q,0)$