

Applications of variational methods to nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Lyapunov functionals and orbital stability.

Recall: Lyapunov method and stability of solutions of systems of ordinary differential equations

Consider the system of ODE's:

$$(1) \quad \dot{x}(t) = F(t, x(t)) \quad x: I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n.$$

where

1° $F: \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is continuous in first variable and locally Lipschitz in the second variable

2° $F(t, 0) = 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$

consequently $x(t) \equiv 0$ is a solution.

Def (stability) $x(t) \equiv 0$ is a stable solution of (1) if for any $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$ $\exists \delta(t_0, \varepsilon)$ such that any ^{continuous} solution of (1) with $|x(t_0)| < \delta$ can be extended to $+\infty$ and $|x(t)| < \varepsilon$ for $t_0 \leq t < +\infty$

Theorem (Lyapunov functional method)

Assume $\exists \delta > 0$ and

$$V: B(0, \delta) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

such that

(i) V is continuous.

(ii) $V(x) \geq 0$ and $V(x) = 0$ iff $x = 0$

(iii) For any solution $x(t)$, $a < t < b$, of (1) with $|x(t)| < \delta$ for $a < t < b$ we have:

$V(x(t)) : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is nonincreasing.

Then $x(t) \equiv 0$ is a stable sol of (1).

Remark 3° is sometimes replaced by the stronger condition: V is differentiable on $B(0, \delta)$ and

$$F(t, x) \cdot \nabla V(x) \leq 0 \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, |x| < \delta.$$

Proof of Theorem (sketch) Fix $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ assume

$\exists \varepsilon > 0$ and sequences

$$x_n^0 \rightarrow 0, \quad t_n > t_0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}$$

such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a continuous solution of (1) with initial condition $x(t_0) = x_n^0$ satisfies

$$|x(t_n)| \geq \varepsilon.$$

Pick $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \min\{\varepsilon, \delta\}$. Then $\exists n_1 > 0$ such

Next $|x_n^0| < \varepsilon$, $\forall n \geq n_1$. For each $n \geq n_1$, let a solution $x_n(t)$ of (1) such that $x_n(t_0) = x_n^0$ and $x_n(t_n) \geq \varepsilon$. Choose

$$\tilde{t}_n = \inf \{ t \mid |x_n(t)| > \varepsilon, y \}.$$

By continuity of $x_n(t)$ we have

$$\begin{cases} x_n(\tilde{t}_n) = \varepsilon, \\ |x_n(t)| < \varepsilon, \quad t_0 \leq t < \tilde{t}_n \end{cases}$$

Hence $V(x_n(t)) : [t_0, \tilde{t}_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is well defined and nonincreasing. Moreover

$$0 \leq V(x_n(\tilde{t}_n)) \leq V(x_n(t_0)) = V(x_n^0)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \swarrow \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \\ & \searrow \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty & \\ & & 0 \end{array}$$

Since $|x_n(\tilde{t}_n)| = \varepsilon$, is bounded $\exists y \in \mathbb{R}^M$, $|y| = \varepsilon$, and $x_{n_k}(\tilde{t}_{n_k}) \rightarrow y$, as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

By continuity of V and the above, we have:

$0 = V(y)$, $|y| = \varepsilon > 0$ contradiction with (ii)
So $x(t) \equiv 0$ is stable QED.

Back to nonlinear Schrödinger equations:

Consider

$$(2) \quad i \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} = -\Delta \varphi - |\varphi|^\alpha \varphi \quad 0 < \alpha < \frac{4}{N}$$

$$\varphi \in C(\mathbb{R}, H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}, H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^N)).$$

We saw in lecture 9 that

$$\mathcal{H}(U) = \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla U|^2 dx - \frac{1}{\alpha+2} \int |U|^{\alpha+2} dx, \quad U \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$$

subject to constraint $\|U\|_{L^2}^2 = \mu > 0$ has a unique minimizer $U_\mu \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ up to translation and rotation.

In addition U_μ satisfies

$$(3) \quad -\Delta U_\mu - |U_\mu|^\alpha U_\mu = \lambda U_\mu \text{ for some } \lambda < 0$$

hence $\varphi_\mu = e^{-i\lambda t} U_\mu(x)$ is a solution of (2) which is called "ground state".

Theorem $\Psi_n(t)$ is a "stable" solution of (2) in the sense that:

$\forall t_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \delta(t_0, \varepsilon)$ such that for any solution $\Psi(t)$ of (2) satisfying

$$\|\Psi(t_0) - \Psi_n(t_0)\|_{H^1} < \delta$$

we have

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^M} \|\Psi(t) - e^{i\theta} \Psi_n(t, \cdot - y)\|_{H^1} < \varepsilon$$

in other words $\exists \theta(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^M$ such that:

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Psi(t) - e^{i\theta(t)} \Psi_n(t, \cdot - y(t))\|_{H^1} < \varepsilon$$

Remark The theorem implies that solutions of (2) starting close to a groundstate remain close to the orbit of the groundstate modulo space translations (orbital stability modulo space translation)

Space translations are necessary:

$$\text{Consider } U^\varepsilon(x) = e^{i\varepsilon x \cdot v} U_\mu(x), \quad v \in \mathbb{R}^M, |v|=1$$

and

$$\varphi^\varepsilon(t) = e^{i\varepsilon(x \cdot v - \varepsilon t)} e^{-i\lambda t} U_\mu(x - 2\varepsilon t v)$$

then $\varphi^\varepsilon(t)$ are sol's of (2) satisfying.

$$\varphi^\varepsilon(0) = U^\varepsilon(x) \xrightarrow{H^1} U_\mu(x) \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$$

but

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \|\varphi^\varepsilon(t) - \underbrace{e^{i\theta} e^{-i\lambda t} U_\mu(x)}_{\varphi_\lambda(t)}\|_{H^1} = 2 \|U_\mu\|_{H^1}$$

Rotations are necessary:

$$\text{Consider } U^\varepsilon(x) = (1+\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}} U_\mu((1+\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}} x)$$

and

$$\varphi^\varepsilon(t) = e^{-i\lambda(1+\varepsilon)t} (1+\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}} U_\mu((1+\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}} x)$$

then $\varphi^\varepsilon(t)$ are sol's of (2) satisfying.

$$\varphi^\varepsilon(0) = U^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{H^1} U_\mu \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$$

but

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^M} \|\varphi^\varepsilon(t) - \varphi_\lambda(t, -y)\|_{H^1} \geq \|U_\mu\|_{H^1}$$

Before we can prove the theorem we need to prove the following conservation laws:

Lemma (conservation of mass and energy)

Along any $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{R}, H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}, H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^N))$ solution of (2) the following are conserved

$$a) \quad W(\varphi(t)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\varphi(t)|^2 dx \equiv \text{const}$$

$$b) \quad \mathcal{H}(\varphi(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla \varphi(t)|^2 - \frac{1}{2+2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\varphi(t)|^{2+2} dx$$

Proof In what follows $\langle u, v \rangle$ denotes the pairing $u \in H^{-1}, v \in H^1$ which coincides with the (complex) scalar product in L^2 if $u, v \in L^2$.

a) From (2) we have

$$\left\langle i \frac{d\varphi}{dt}(t), \varphi(t) \right\rangle = \langle -\Delta \varphi, \varphi \rangle - \langle |\varphi|^{2+2} \varphi, \varphi \rangle$$

$$-i \left\langle \frac{d\varphi}{dt}, \varphi \right\rangle = \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\varphi\|_{L^{2+2}}^{2+2}$$

Taking the complex conjugate:

$$i \langle \varphi, \frac{d\varphi}{dt} \rangle = \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\varphi\|_{L^{2+2}}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{But } \frac{d}{dt} W(\varphi(t)) &= \frac{d}{dt} \langle \varphi(t), \varphi(t) \rangle = \\ &= \langle \frac{d\varphi}{dt}, \varphi \rangle + \langle \varphi, \frac{d\varphi}{dt} \rangle = 0 \end{aligned}$$

↑
see above calculation

$\Rightarrow W(t) = \text{const.}$

b) Formally

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 &= \frac{d}{dt} \langle \nabla\varphi, \nabla\varphi \rangle = \langle \frac{d\varphi}{dt}, -\Delta\varphi \rangle \\ &+ \langle -\Delta\varphi, \frac{d\varphi}{dt} \rangle \quad (*) \end{aligned}$$

Problem In (*), $\frac{d\varphi}{dt} \in H^{-1}$ and $-\Delta\varphi \in H^{-1}$ so the duality pairing might not exist.

$$\begin{aligned} (*) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|\varphi\|_{L^{2+2}}^{2+2} &= \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\varphi(t,x)|^{2+2} dx = \frac{2+2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\varphi|^{2+1} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\varphi|^2 dx \\ &= \frac{2+2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\varphi|^{2+1} \left(\frac{d\varphi}{dt} \varphi + \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t} \bar{\varphi} \right) dx \\ &= \frac{2+2}{2} \left(\langle \frac{d\varphi}{dt}, |\varphi|^{2+1} \varphi \rangle + \langle |\varphi|^{2+1} \varphi, \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t} \rangle \right) \end{aligned}$$

Even (*) is formal since $|\varphi|^{2+1} \varphi \notin H^1$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}(\varphi(t)) = \frac{1}{2} (\dot{\ast}) - \frac{1}{2} (\dot{\ast\ast})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left(\left\langle \frac{d\varphi}{dt}, -\Delta\varphi - |\varphi|^2\varphi \right\rangle + \left\langle -\Delta\varphi - |\varphi|^2\varphi, \frac{d\varphi}{dt} \right\rangle \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left(i \left\| \frac{d\varphi}{dt} \right\|_{L^2}^2 - i \left\| \frac{d\varphi}{dt} \right\|_{L^2}^2 \right) = 0$$

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{H}(t)$ constant provided (\ast) and $(\ast\ast)$ become rigorous:

$$\text{Consider } \mathbb{T}_\varepsilon = (\text{Id} - \varepsilon \Delta)^{-2} : H^s \rightarrow H^{s-2} \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}$$

and $\varphi^\varepsilon(t)$ the (unique) solution of:

$$\begin{cases} i \frac{d\varphi^\varepsilon}{dt} = -\Delta\varphi^\varepsilon - \mathbb{T}_\varepsilon \left[|\mathbb{T}_\varepsilon \varphi^\varepsilon|^2 \mathbb{T}_\varepsilon \varphi^\varepsilon \right] \\ \varphi^\varepsilon(0) \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \varphi^\varepsilon(0) \xrightarrow{H^1} \varphi(0) \end{cases}$$

Then $\varphi_\varepsilon \in C(\mathbb{R}, H^2) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}, L^2)$ and
 $\varphi_\varepsilon(t) \xrightarrow{H^1} \varphi(t)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$
 (\ast) and $(\ast\ast)$ are rigorous for φ_ε

$$\text{So } \mathcal{H}(\varphi_\varepsilon(t)) \equiv \text{const}$$

$$\Rightarrow \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}(\varphi_\varepsilon(t)) \equiv \text{const}$$

$$\Rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\varphi(t)) \equiv \text{const. } \underline{\text{Q.E.D.}}$$

Proof of Theorem: Fix t_0 , assume
 $\exists \varepsilon > 0$, $\varphi_n \xrightarrow{H^1} \varphi_n(t_0)$ and $t_n \geq t_0$ such

that the solutions $\varphi_n(t)$ of (2) and $\varphi_n(t_0) = \varphi_n$ satisfy,

$$(\ast\ast) \inf_{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}^1} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^M} \|\varphi_n(t_n) - e^{i\theta} \varphi_n(t_n, \cdot - y)\| \geq \varepsilon$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{But } \mathcal{H}(\varphi_n(t_n)) &= \mathcal{H}(\varphi_n(t_0)) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\varphi_n(t_0)) \\ &= \min_{\substack{\|U\|_{L^2}^2 = \mu \\ U \in H^1}} \mathcal{H}(U) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{and } \|\varphi_n(t_n)\|_{L^2}^2 \rightarrow \|\varphi_n(t_0)\|_{L^2}^2 = \mu.$$

So $v_n = \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{\|\varphi_n(t_n)\|_{L^2}} \varphi_n(t_n)$ is a minimizing sequence for

$\mathcal{H}(U)$ subject to $\|U\|_{L^2}^2 = \mu$. By concentration

Compactness $\exists v_{n_k}$ and y_k such that

$$v_{n_k}(\cdot - y_{n_k}) \rightarrow U_0 \text{ a minimizer}$$

and $v_{n_k} \xrightarrow{L^p} U_0 \quad 2 \leq p < \frac{2N}{N-2}$.

Since the minimizer is unique up to translations and rotations $\Rightarrow \exists \theta, y$ such that

$$U_0 = e^{i\theta} U_\mu(\cdot - y)$$

So $v_{n_k} \xrightarrow{L^2} e^{i\theta} U_\mu(\cdot - y)$

and since $\mathcal{H}(v_{n_k}) \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_\mu$ $\left\{ \Rightarrow \right.$

$$\|v_{n_k}\|_{L^{d+2}}^{2+2} \rightarrow \|U_0\|_{L^{d+2}}^{2+2}$$

$$\Rightarrow \|\nabla v_{n_k}\|_{L^2} \rightarrow \|\nabla U_0\|_{L^2} \left\{ \Rightarrow \nabla v_{n_k} \xrightarrow{L^2} \nabla U_0 \right.$$

and since $v_{n_k} \xrightarrow{L^2} \nabla U_0$

All in all $v_{n_k} \xrightarrow{H^1} U_0 = e^{i\theta} U_\mu(\cdot - y)$

in contradiction with $(*)$. QED.

Essential in the ^{above} proof of stability was the fact that minimizing sequences are precompact. This can be avoided sometimes like in the following general argument:

Another look at the Lyapunov method

Consider

$$(4) \quad \frac{dx}{dt} = F(t, x(t))$$

$$x \in C(\mathbb{R}, X_1) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}, X_2)$$

$F: \mathbb{R} \times X_1 \rightarrow X_2$, X_1, X_2 real Banach spaces

Example Problem (2) can be cast in this form with $X_1 = H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $X_2 = H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^N)$

Assume there exist a Lyapunov functional:

$$E: X_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

such that

(i) E is continuous

(ii) $x_0 \in X_1$ is a local minimum for E and
 $\exists \delta > 0, c > 0$ such that

$$E(x) - E(x_0) \geq c \|x - x_0\|_{X_1}^2 \quad \text{for } \|x - x_0\| \leq \delta$$

(iii) $E(x(t))$ is nonincreasing along any solution of (4)

Then, provided eq (4) has solutions on $[0, \infty)$ whenever $\|x(0) - x_0\| < \delta$, for some $\delta_1 > 0$,
 $x(t) \equiv x_0$ is a stable equilibrium for (4).

Sketch of proof: $x(t) \equiv x_0$ is a solution of (4).

Indeed consider (4) with initial data $x(0) = x_0$ and $x: [0, \infty) \rightarrow X_1$ a solution of it.

Assume $x(t) \neq x_0$ for some $t_1 > 0$

Choose

$$t_2 = \inf \left\{ t > 0 : \|x(t) - x_0\|_{X_1} \geq \min \left[\frac{\delta}{2}, \|x(t_1) - x_0\|_{X_1} \right] \right\}$$

then $x(t_2) \neq x_0$ and

$$E(x(t_2)) - E(x_0) \geq c \|x(t_2) - x_0\|_{X_1}^2 > 0$$

contradicts (iii).

For $\varepsilon > 0$, then by continuity of E at x_0
 $\exists \delta(\varepsilon) < \delta$

$$|E(x) - E(x_0)| < C\varepsilon \text{ for } \|x - x_0\|_{x_1} < \delta(\varepsilon)$$

where $C > 0$ is given by (ii).

We now consider a soln $x(t)$ of (4) such that

$$\|x(0) - x_0\|_{x_1} < \delta(\varepsilon)$$

We have.

$$\begin{aligned} E(x(0)) - E(x_0) &\stackrel{(iii)}{\geq} E(x(t)) - E(x_0) \stackrel{\text{by (ii)}}{\geq} \\ &\geq C \|x(t) - x_0\|_{x_1} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Hence } \|x(t) - x_0\|_{x_1} \leq \frac{E(x(0)) - E(x_0)}{C} < \varepsilon$$

So x_0 is stable.

There is one glitch! (ii) cannot be applied
if $\|x(t) - x_0\| > \delta$. This however can be fixed:

— if $\|x(t_1) - x_0\| > \delta$ for some $t_1 > 0$ choose

$$t_2 = \inf \{ t > 0 : \|x(t) - x_0\|_{x_1} > \delta \}$$

— then for $\varepsilon < \delta$ we get by above argument

$$\|x(t) - x_0\|_{x_1} < \varepsilon < \delta \quad \forall t \in [0, t_2]$$

with the choice of t_2 ! QED

Remarks

1° (ii) is usually verified via

$F(t, x) = F(x) = D\mathcal{E}|_x$ in which case $x_2 = x_1^*$, and

$DF|_{x_0} = D^2\mathcal{E}|_{x_0}$ positive definite.

2° (ii) apparently excludes situations in which the local minima are not separated:

$\exists x_n \rightarrow x_0$, $x_n \neq x_0$ and x_n local minima for \mathcal{E} . However if the other local minima are due solely to the invariance of \mathcal{E} under a group of symmetries $x \rightarrow Sx$ one can "mod out" the equivalence classes induced by the symmetry group and still be able to apply the above technique.

An example is the case of problem (2)

see:

M.I. Weinstein: Lyapunov stability of ground states of nonlinear dispersive evolution equations, Commun Pure Appl Math, Vol 39 (1986) p 51-68