

**ON THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE BLOW-UP  
FOR CRITICAL NLS**

**FRANK MERLE, PIERRE RAPHAEL**

**Université de Cergy–Pontoise, Institut Universitaire  
de France, I.A.S.**

We study blow up dynamics of solutions to the  $L^2$  critical non linear Schrödinger equation

$$\begin{cases} iu_t = -\Delta u - |u|^{\frac{4}{N}}u, & (t, x) \in [0, T) \times \mathbf{R}^N \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), & u_0 : \mathbf{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbf{C} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

with  $u_0 \in H^1 = \{u, \nabla u \in L^2\}$ . Dimension  $N = 2$  is physically relevant.

(NLS) is an infinite dimensional Hamiltonian system with energy space  $H^1$  without any space localization property.

It is, together with the critical GKdV Equ. the only example where blow up is known to occur. (suspected for many equations: Zakharov, Yang-mills, Wave maps, Euler,...)

For (NLS), the proof of existence of blow up solutions is based on energy constraints and the existence of a “conformal” invariance. In particular, *It is not constructive. No qualitative information of any type on the blow up dynamics.*

The natural questions regarding blow up dynamics (related to how? why?) are

-Does there exist a universal blow up speed, or are there several possible regimes? Among these regimes, which ones are stable, generic?

-Does there exist a universal space time structure for the formation of singularities?

-What are the related mathematical problems?

# 1 HAMILTONIAN STRUCTURE, CRITICALITY

## Local well posedness and Hamiltonian structure in the energy space

Local well posedness in time in energy space  $H^1$ : 80's Ginibre, Velo. (Kenig Ponce Vega and of J. Bourgain in the periodic setting). THEORY OF OSCILLATORY INTEGRALS.

For  $u_0 \in H^1$ , there exists  $0 < T \leq +\infty$  such that  $u(t) \in \mathcal{C}([0, T], H^1)$  and either  $T = +\infty$ , we say the solution is global, or  $T < +\infty$  and then  $\limsup_{t \uparrow T} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} = +\infty$ , then we say the solution blows up in finite time (concentration in  $L^2$ ).

Symmetries in the energy space  $H^1$ : If  $u(t, x)$  solution, then are sol.

- Space-time translation invariance:  $u(t + t_0, x + x_0)$ .
- Phase invariance:  $u(t, x)e^{i\gamma}$ .
- Scaling invariance:  $\lambda^{\frac{N}{2}}u(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x)$ .
- Galilean invariance:  $u(t, x - \beta t)e^{i\frac{\beta}{2}(x - \frac{\beta}{2}t)}$ .

The pseudo-conformal symmetry holds in  $\Sigma = H^1 \cap \{xu \in L^2\}$  (not  $H^1$ ):

$$v(t, x) = \frac{1}{|t|^{\frac{N}{2}}} \bar{u}\left(\frac{1}{t}, \frac{x}{t}\right) e^{i\frac{|x|^2}{4t}}.$$

$L^2$  appears to be critical space.

Invariants in the energy space  $H^1$ :

- $L^2$ -norm:

$$\int |u(t, x)|^2 = \int |u_0(x)|^2; \quad (2)$$

- Energy:

$$\frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 - \frac{1}{2 + \frac{4}{N}} \int |u(t, x)|^{2 + \frac{4}{N}} = E(u_0); \quad (3)$$

- Momentum:

$$\text{Im} \left( \int \nabla u \bar{u}(t, x) \right) = \text{Im} \left( \int \nabla u_0 \bar{u}_0(x) \right). \quad (4)$$

In virial space  $\Sigma$ , the pseudo conformal symmetry, energy conservation for  $v$  imply the so called virial identity (monotonicity of quantity not in  $H^1$ ):

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \int |x|^2 |u(t, x)|^2 = 16E(u_0). \quad (5)$$

## Variational characterization of the ground state and global solutions

Sharp criterion of smallness for global existence of solutions related periodic solutions (variational tools M. Weinstein 80's).

There exists a unique non zero radial positive solution to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta Q - Q + Q^{1+\frac{4}{N}} = 0 \\ Q(r) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } r \rightarrow +\infty. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Variational characterization of  $Q$  gives the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality with sharp constant:

$$\forall v \in H^1, \quad E(v) \geq \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla v|^2 \left( 1 - \left( \frac{|v|_{L^2}}{|Q|_{L^2}} \right)^{\frac{4}{N}} \right). \quad (7)$$

**Cor:** If  $|u_0|_{L^2} < |Q|_{L^2}$  then the solution  $u(t)$  to (1) is global and bounded in  $H^1$ .

$H^1$  symmetries of (1) yield a three parameter family of global solutions:

$$W_{\lambda_0, x_0, \gamma_0}(t, x) = \lambda_0^{\frac{N}{2}} Q(\lambda_0 x + x_0) e^{i(\gamma_0 + \lambda_0^2 t)} \quad (8)$$

which satisfy:  $E(W) = 0$ ,  $Im(\int \nabla W \overline{W}) = 0$ ,  $\int |W|^2 = \int Q^2$ .

*The  $L^2$  criticality implies that the Hamiltonian invariants do not see the size of the different solitary waves.*

## Blow up for large data: the virial identity

We now turn to the super critical case in mass  $|u_0|_{L^2} > |Q|_{L^2}$ .

Let then  $u_0 \in \Sigma$  with  $E(u_0) < 0$ , the corresponding solution  $u(t)$  to (1) satisfies the virial identity (5):

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \int |x|^2 |u(t, x)|^2 dx = 16E(u_0),$$

and force the solution to blows up in finite time.

- No description of the blow up dynamic.
- Argument instable by  $H^1$  perturbation.

**The case of critical mass,**  $|u_0|_{L^2} = |Q|_{L^2}$ .

Weinstein's criterion for global solutions is sharp. Applying the pseudo-conformal transformation to  $W(t, x) = Q(x)e^{it}$ ,

$$S(t, x) = \frac{1}{|t|^{\frac{N}{2}}} Q\left(\frac{x}{t}\right) e^{i\frac{|x|^2}{4t} - \frac{i}{t}} \quad (9)$$

is a solution to (1) with the following properties:

- $S(t)$  has critical mass:  $|S(t)|_{L^2} = |Q|_{L^2}$ .
- $S(t)$  blow up at  $t = 0$  with rate  $|\nabla S(t)|_{L^2} \sim \frac{1}{|t|}$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ .
- The singularity corresponds to formation of a Dirac mass:

$$|S(t)|^2 \rightharpoonup \left(\int Q^2\right) \delta_{x=0} \text{ as } t \rightarrow 0. \quad (10)$$

Dynamical characterization of  $S(t)$

**Theorem:** (F.Merle) Let  $u_0 \in H^1$  with  $|u_0|_{L^2} = |Q|_{L^2}$  and assume  $u(t)$  blows up in finite time, then up to the set of  $H^1$  symmetries of (1)  $u(t) = S(t)$ .

Energy constraints imply Dirac Mass blow-up (no dispersion). A set of elliptic estimates on none dispersive solution implies regularity and expo decay). Successful for KdV...

## Explicit construction of blow up solutions

Remark first that the following lower bound on blow up rate always holds from scaling considerations:

$$|\nabla u(t)|_{L^2} \geq \frac{C}{\sqrt{T-t}}. \quad (11)$$

There are two results of construction of blow up solutions with a prescribed dynamic:

- Bourgain and Wang ( $N = 1, 2$ ) solutions  $u(t)$  which blow up in finite time  $T$  and behave locally like explicit blow up solution  $S(t)$ .

$$|\nabla u(t)|_{L^2} \sim \frac{1}{T-t} \text{ as } t \rightarrow T. \quad (12)$$

(Stability up to codimension  $G$  perturbation in  $H^G$ ).

- Numerical simulations, Formal picture in the past thirty years, Sinai  $|\nabla u(t)|_{L^2} \sim \frac{1}{(T-t)^{2/3}}$ , Zakharov  $|\nabla u(t)|_{L^2} \sim \sqrt{\frac{|\log T-t|}{T-t}}$ , finally Landman, Papanicolaou, Sulem, Sulem suggest solutions (stable by perturbation of the initial data) which blows up as

$$|\nabla u(t)|_{L^2} \sim \sqrt{\frac{\log(|\log T-t|)}{T-t}}. \quad (13)$$

Anomalous rate of blow up (13) is to be seen as a double log correction to the scaling estimate. For  $N = 1$ , G. Perelman proves the existence of one solution which blows up according to (13) and its stability in some space strictly included in  $H^1$ .

In conclusion, one expects that (1) admits at least two blow up dynamics: the log-log dynamic as an almost self similar blow up which is expected to be stable; the  $S(t)$  dynamic which is suspected to be unstable with respect to perturbation of the initial data.

However, the log-log rate is known to be structurally unstable in the following sense (Merle): consider in dimension  $N = 2$  the Zakharov system:

$$\begin{cases} iu_t = -\Delta u + nu \\ \frac{1}{c_0^2}n_{tt} = \Delta n + \Delta|u|^2 \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

from which in the limit  $c_0 \rightarrow +\infty$  we formally recover (1), then for all  $c_0 > 0$ , finite time blow-up solutions to (14) satisfy

$$|\nabla u(t)|_{L^2} \geq \frac{C}{T-t}. \quad (15)$$

## 2 STATEMENTS OF THE RESULTS

From now on, we consider :

$$\int Q^2 \leq \int |u_0|^2 \leq \int Q^2 + \alpha^* \quad \text{for } \alpha^* > 0 \text{ small.}$$

Assume  $u(t)$  blows up in finite time, then

$$u(t, x) = \frac{1}{\lambda(t)^{\frac{N}{2}}} (Q + \epsilon)(t, \frac{x - x(t)}{\lambda(t)}) e^{i\gamma(t)}. \quad (16)$$

where  $|\epsilon(t)|_{H^1} \leq \delta(\alpha^*)$ .

Description of the blow up dynamics: estimating  $\lambda(t) \sim \frac{1}{|\nabla u(t)|_{L^2}}$  and the behavior of  $\epsilon(t)$ .

*The aim of our analysis is to understand how to extract from the infinite dimensional dynamic of (1) a finite dimensional and possibly universal dynamic for the evolution of the geometrical parameters  $(\lambda(t), x(t), \gamma(t))$  which is coupled to the dispersive dynamic of  $\epsilon(t)$ .*

Nothing for large mass... Conjectured to locally describe the generic blow-up.

In addition, we assume

$$N = 1, 2, 3, 4$$

assuming *Spectral Property* which amounts counting the number of negative eigenvalues of an operator of the form  $-\Delta + V$  where  $V = V(x)$  is related to  $Q$ .

Construction of example of the blow up solutions are based on fixed point arguments. Prescribe the finite dimensional dynamic of  $(\lambda(t), x(t), \gamma(t))$  according to the expected rate of blow up, and then to build  $\varepsilon(t)$  thanks to suitable decay estimates on the propagator of the linearized operator  $L$  close to ground state  $Q$ .

Problem : the number of degeneracies for the linearized operator

$L$  are strictly bigger than the ones induced by  $H^1$  symmetries and the pseudo conformal transformation, which in fact make interaction of the two dynamics preponderant.

expect existence of cancellations between finite and infinite dimension dynamics: Sinai (no), Zakharov (at the first order), Papanicolaou (at all polynomial order).

Our approach: Classification results. Looking at general constraints or properties of the equation which will lead to rigidity (i.e. valid for all blow-up solution).

- *monotonicity results for  $\lambda(t)$  (related to a strong maximum principle type of argument),*
- *or existence of a Lyapounov functional defined in  $L^2_{loc}$  which contains dispersive informations.*
- *Dynamic characterization the solitary wave, or  $S(t)$  which are at the heart of the description of blow up dynamics.*

## Blow up for strictly negative energy solutions.

Let

$$E_G(u) = E(u) - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\text{Im}(\int \nabla u \bar{u})}{|u|_{L^2}} \right)^2. \quad (17)$$

**Theorem 1** *Assume*

$$E_G(u_0) < 0.$$

*Then  $u(t)$  blows up in finite time  $0 < T < +\infty$  and for  $t$  close to  $T$ :*

$$|\nabla u(t)|_{L^2} \leq C^* \left( \frac{\log |\log(T - t)|}{T - t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (18)$$

*Comments on the result*

1.  *$H^1$  theory for blow-up:* The blow up criterion is in  $H^1$  and thus improves the virial result ( $\Sigma$  only). For  $E_G(u_0) < 0$ , blow up is a stable phenomenon.

(18) removes the possibility of  $S(t)$  type of blow up for strictly negative energy solutions (also the ones predicted by Sinai, Zakharov...). First bound of the blow-up rate.

2. *Instability of  $S(t)$ :* Any neighborhood of  $S(t)$  in  $H^1$  contains a solution which blows up with the log-log upper bound, and thus not with rate  $\frac{1}{t}$ . Still open for solutions build by BW.

3. *Structural instability of the log-log rate:* From our proof, we can exhibit the algebraic cancellation which is responsible for existence of a blow up rate *below* the one of explicit solution  $S(t)$ .

See Zakharov equation.

4. *Sharpness of the result:* The bound is optimal. see later.

5.  $\dot{H}^1$  *theory:* Theorem 1 is in fact a consequence of purely local estimates in  $\dot{H}^1$  and  $L^2_{loc}$ . Proof is based on some monotonicity formula, or a special direction where the equa have the “maximum principle property”. Give estimates on bounded region decoupled from the behavior of the radiative field at infinity. This is a “miracle” (since from the critically, the blow-up is not a local but a global problem.)

The result is sharp (for lower bound) as it also includes blow up description for self similar solutions which are in  $\dot{H}^1$  but never in  $L^2$ . Indeed, let:

$$U_{b_0}(t, x) = \frac{1}{(2b_0(T-t))^{\frac{N}{4}}} Q_{b_0} \left( \frac{x}{\sqrt{2b_0(T-t)}} \right) e^{-i \frac{\ln(T-t)}{2b_0}}$$

for  $b_0 > 0$  and  $Q_{b_0}$  solving the ODE:

$$\Delta Q_b - Q_{b_0} + ib_0 \left( \frac{N}{2} Q_{b_0} + y \cdot \nabla Q_{b_0} \right) + Q_{b_0} |Q_{b_0}|^{\frac{4}{N}} = 0. \quad (19)$$

Such solutions are called *self similar* solutions as :

$$|\nabla U_{b_0}(t)|_{L^2} \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{T-t}}.$$

$Q_{b_0}$  never belong to  $L^2$  as  $|Q_{b_0}(y)| \sim \frac{C(b_0)}{|y|^{\frac{N}{2}}}$  as  $|y| \rightarrow +\infty$

## Lower bound on blow up rate and Asymptotic stability of the blow up profile.

We now turn to the question of lower bounds on blow up rate. (In  $H^1$ , better estimates than  $|\nabla u(t)|_{L^2} \geq \frac{C}{\sqrt{T-t}}$ ?)

Even though self similar blow up indeed describes the dynamics in other settings, from the criticality, we expect for any blow up solution in  $H^1$ :

$$\sqrt{T-t}|\nabla u(t)|_{L^2} \rightarrow +\infty \text{ as } t \rightarrow T. \quad (20)$$

*First approach:*

The problem is in fact implied by existence of a universal blow up profile which attracts blow up solutions as  $t \rightarrow T$  (First result of Asymptotic stability of  $Q$  for power nonlinearity).

**Theorem 2** *Let  $u(t)$  which blows up in finite time  $0 < T < +\infty$ . Then there exist parameters  $\lambda_0(t) = \frac{|\nabla Q|_{L^2}}{|\nabla u(t)|_{L^2}}$ ,  $x_0(t)$  and  $\gamma_0(t)$  such that*

$$e^{i\gamma_0(t)} \lambda_0^{\frac{N}{2}}(t) u(t, \lambda_0(t)x + x_0(t)) \rightarrow Q \text{ in } \dot{H}^1 \text{ as } t \rightarrow T. \quad (21)$$

*This implies the lower bound on blow up rate:*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \sqrt{T-t} |\nabla u(t)|_{L^2} = +\infty. \quad (22)$$

**Remark 1** :  $\varepsilon(t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow T$  in  $\dot{H}^1$ , and the profile of the solution in space is asymptotically  $Q$ . This result is optimal as strong  $L^2$  convergence to zero is forbidden from  $L^2$  invariance.

*To prove the non existence of self similar solutions, we need to obtain global dispersive informations in the scaling critical space  $L^2$ . The proof is based on some geometrical characterization of solitons and different notions of dispersion in  $L^2$ .*

*Part A: Characterization of soliton in the energy zero set.*

**Theorem 3** *Let*

$$E_G^0 = 0.$$

*Assume that  $u(t)$  is not a soliton up to the symmetries in  $H^1$ . Then  $u(t)$  blows up in finite time on the left and on the right in time and upper bound (18) holds.*

Characterization of the solitary wave:  $Q(x)e^{it}$  is up to the  $H^1$  symmetries the only zero energy solution to (1) which lives on an infinite time interval.

As a corollary, no KAM closed to  $Q$ .

*Part B:*  $L^2$  dispersive characterization of explicit blow up solution  $S(t)$ :

**Theorem 4** *Let  $v(t)$  a solution to (1) which blows up at  $0 < T < +\infty$  and*

$$|v|^2(t) \rightharpoonup \left( \int |v(0)|^2 \right) \delta_{x=0} \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow T, \quad (23)$$

*then*

$$v(t) = S(t)$$

*up to the set of  $H^1$  symmetries of (1).*

Proof of this result involves new type of dispersive estimates in  $L^2$ .

If  $v$  different from  $S(t)$ , then one show that  $v$  has a self similar behavior in norm ( $|\nabla v(t)|_{L^2} \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{T-t}}$ ). Then, it has to be closed in a strong sense to a stationary self similar profile, and we get a contradiction from the fact that these are not in  $L^2$ .

*Second approach:*

After estimates on asymptotic objects, we have able to give a direct proof. In the loglog regime in  $H^1$ , we have a sharp lower bound on blow up rate. From the complete understanding on the behavior of the solution, we are able to construct a Liouponov functional in time which yields the result.

**Theorem 5 (log-log lower bound)** *Let  $u(t)$  blows up in finite time  $0 < T < +\infty$ , then one has the following lower bound on blow up rate:*

$$|\nabla u(t)|_{L^2} \geq C_3^* \left( \frac{\log |\log(T-t)|}{T-t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (24)$$

Coupled with Theorems 1 and 6, this result gives a complete description of the log-log regime

$$|\nabla u(t)|_{L^2} \sim C(N) \left( \frac{\log |\log(T-t)|}{T-t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

## Blow up for strictly positive energy solutions.

In the positive energy case, one may have

- global solution,
- blow-up solutions (here one expect to have the 2 blow-up rate at least).

**Theorem 6** *(i) Rigidity of blow up rate: Let  $E_G(u_0) > 0$ , and assume that  $u(t)$  blows up in finite time  $T < +\infty$ , then for  $t$  close to  $T$  either*

$$|\nabla u(t)|_{L^2} \sim C^*(N) \left( \frac{\ln|\ln(T-t)|}{T-t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

or

$$|\nabla u(t)|_{L^2} \geq \frac{C_2^*}{(T-t)\sqrt{E_G(u_0)}}. \quad (25)$$

*(ii) Stability of log-log law: Moreover, the set of initial data  $u_0$  such that  $u(t)$  blows up in finite time with the loglog upper bound is open in  $H^1$ .*

From this theorem, one can construct loglog blow-up solutions with negative energy (using  $E = 0$ ).

STILL OPEN  $S(t)$  blow-up solution are at the boundary of the set of blow-up solutions.

## Mass quantization Property, Profile in the original variable

Question: Assume  $u(t) \in H^1$  blows up in finite time. Is the solution concentrates a finite number Dirac mass for *a universal and quantized amount of mass*, and the excess of mass is then purely dispersed in  $L^2$  outside the blow-up points.

**Theorem 7 (Mass quantization)** *Let  $u(t)$  blows up in finite time  $0 < T < +\infty$ , then there exists a function  $x(t) : [0, T) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^N$  such that:*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow T} |u(t, x + x(t))|^2 \rightharpoonup \left( \int Q^2 \right) \delta_{x=0} + f \quad \text{with } f \in L^1.$$

*Moreover,  $x(t) \rightarrow x(T)$  finite as  $t \rightarrow T$ .*

We have a much stronger property: For a  $u^* \in L^2$ ,

$$u(t) - \frac{1}{\lambda(t)^{\frac{N}{2}}} Q \left( \frac{x - x(t)}{\lambda(t)} \right) e^{i\gamma(t)} \rightarrow u^* \quad \text{in } L^2 \quad \text{when } t \rightarrow T.$$

One can recover the blow-up regime from  $u^*$ .

**Theorem 8** (i) *In the loglog regime,*

$$\int_{|x-x(T)| \leq R} |u^*(x)|^2 \sim \frac{C}{(\log |\log(R)|)^2} \quad \text{when } R \rightarrow 0$$

*In particular,*

$$u^* \notin H^1 \quad \text{and} \quad u^* \notin L^p, \quad p > 2.$$

(ii) *In the  $S(t)$  regime,*

$$\int_{|x-x(T)| \leq R} |u^*(x)|^2 \leq C E_0^G R^2 \quad \text{and} \quad u^* \in H^1.$$

Explosion loglog: The blow-up is related to radiation of mass and energy conservation, with very strong coupling between singularity and regular part of the solution.

Explosion  $S(t)$ : Decoupling between singularity and regular part of the solution.