

# Math 567: Assignment 2 (Due: Tuesday, Feb. 28)

Choose 3 of the 4 to submit.

1. **‘Endpoint’ Strichartz estimates** In class we sketched a proof of the *Strichartz estimates* for the Schrödinger equation in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ :

$$(S1) \quad \|e^{it\Delta}u_0\|_{L_t^r L_x^p} \leq C\|u_0\|_{L^2} \quad (S2) \quad \left\| \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta} f(\cdot, s) ds \right\|_{L_t^r L_x^p} \leq C\|f\|_{L_t^{\tilde{r}'} L_x^{\tilde{p}'}},$$

$\frac{2}{r} + \frac{n}{p} = \frac{2}{\tilde{r}} + \frac{n}{\tilde{p}} = \frac{n}{2}$ , avoiding the ‘endpoint’ cases  $r = 2, p = \frac{2n}{n-2} = 2^*$ . It turns out that these endpoint estimates do hold for  $n \geq 3$ , but fail in dimension  $n = 2$ . Show that for  $n = 2$  the ‘double endpoint’ case  $r = \tilde{r} = 2, p = \tilde{p} = \infty$  (so  $\tilde{p}' = 1$ ) of (S2) fails. *Hint: first observe this failure ‘formally’ by trying  $f(x, t) = \chi_{[0,1]}(t)\delta(x)$ . Then argue rigorously by using an actual  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$  approximation of the delta function  $\delta(x)$ .*

2. **Linearized water waves:** linearize the water wave system

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \Delta\phi &= 0 & -h \leq x_1 \leq \eta(x', t), & x' \in \mathbb{R}^2 \\ \eta_t + \nabla_{x'}\phi \cdot \nabla_{x'}\eta - \phi_{x_1} &= 0 \\ \phi_t + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\phi|^2 + g\eta &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \quad x_1 = \eta(x', t), \quad x' \in \mathbb{R}^2$$

$$\phi_{x_1} = 0 \quad x_1 = -h, \quad x' \in \mathbb{R}^2$$

and obtain the dispersion relation  $\omega^2 = g|\xi| \tanh(h|\xi|)$  for the result.

*Hint: more precisely, suppose  $\phi, \eta$  (and their derivatives) are small perturbations of the flat, still solution  $\phi \equiv 0, \eta \equiv 0$ , drop all terms which are nonlinear in these small quantities (and in the upper boundary condition, evaluate at the unperturbed surface  $x_1 = 0$ ), and seek solutions of the form  $\eta(x', t) = e^{i(\xi \cdot x' - \omega t)}$  for  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$ .*

3. **Local existence for the Hartree equation:** a variant of the NLS arising in Quantum Mechanics (many-body theory) is the *Hartree equation*, which has a convolution-type nonlinearity:

$$iu_t + \Delta u = (V * |u|^2)u, \quad u(x, 0) = u_0(x),$$

where  $V : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the *potential* (describing the inter-particle interaction).

- (a) Use the Hölder and/or Young inequalities to show that if  $V$  is a bounded function, then the nonlinearity  $u \mapsto (V * |u|^2)u$  is locally Lipschitz in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  (and so it follows from the standard argument given in class that for  $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  we can construct a local solution  $u \in C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ ).
- (b) Physically important potentials such as the *Coulomb potential*  $V(x) = \pm 1/|x|$  are not bounded. Show that the Coulomb potential lies in the class  $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3) + L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  (that is, it can be written as a sum of two terms, one lying in the first space, the other in the second).
- (c) Use the Hölder and/or Young and/or Sobolev inequalities (more precisely for the latter,  $\|u\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq c\|u\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ ) to show that if  $V \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3) + L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , then the Hartree nonlinearity is locally Lipschitz in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$  (and so for  $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , the standard argument gives a local solution  $u \in C([0, T], H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))$  for this class of potentials, which includes the Coulomb).

4. **Persistence of regularity:** consider a nonlinear Schrödinger equation with pure power nonlinearity

$$iu_t + \Delta u = \pm u^p \quad u(x, 0) = u_0(x),$$

with  $p$  a positive integer. Recall that if  $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$  where  $s > n/2$  is (for simplicity) an integer, we constructed a ‘classical solution’  $u \in C([0, T^{max}); H^s)$  with  $\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{H^s} \rightarrow \infty$  if  $T^{max} < \infty$ . Prove that if  $T^{max} < \infty$ , then in fact  $\|u\|_{L_t^{p-1}L_x^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T^{max}])} = \infty$ .

*Hint: one (but not the only) way to do this is to argue by contradiction, assuming that  $T^{max} < \infty$  but  $\|u\|_{L_t^{p-1}L_x^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T^{max}])} < \infty$ , and apply the Strichartz estimates (together with Hölder’s inequality) successively on subintervals  $I$  of  $[0, T^{max})$  chosen so that  $\|u\|_{L_t^{p-1}L_x^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)}$  is sufficiently small on each.*

*Remark: one implication of an estimate like this one, is ‘persistence of regularity’ – namely that the constructed  $H^s$  solutions for different  $s$  will all have the same lifespan. More precisely, an  $H^{s_2}$  solution is also an  $H^{s_1}$  solution if  $n/2 < s_1 < s_2$ , but the  $H^{s_2}$  norm cannot blow up before the  $H^{s_1}$  norm does: clearly  $T^{max}(H^{s_1}) \geq T^{max}(H^{s_2})$ , but in fact we cannot have  $T^{max}(H^{s_1}) > T^{max}(H^{s_2})$ . For if so, the boundedness of  $\|u\|_{H^{s_1}}$  on  $[0, T^{max}(H^{s_2})]$  implies (by Sobolev imbedding)  $\|u\|_{L_t^{p-1}L_x^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T^{max}(H^{s_2})])} < \infty$ , contradicting what was proved in this exercise.*