Nonlinear Schrodinger equation and frequency saturation

Rémi Carles

NONLINEAR SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION AND FREQUENCY SATURATION

RÉMI CARLES

ABSTRACT. We propose an approach that permits to avoid instability phenomena for the nonlinear Schrödinger equations. We show that by approximating the solution in a suitable way, relying on a frequency cut-off, global well-posedness is obtained in any Sobolev space with nonnegative regularity. The error between the exact solution and its approximation can be measured according to the regularity of the exact solution, with different accuracy according to the cases considered.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$i\partial_t u + \Delta u = \epsilon|u|^{2\sigma}u, \quad (t,x) \in I \times \mathbf{R}^d; \quad u_{|t=0} = u_0, \tag{1.1}$$

for some time interval $I \ni 0$, with $\epsilon = 1$ (defocusing case) or $\epsilon = -1$ (focusing case). The aim of this paper is to propose an approach to overcome the lack of local well-posedness in Sobolev spaces with nonnegative regularity.

Recall two important invariances associated to (1.1):

- Scaling: if u solves (1.1), then for $\lambda > 0$, so does $u_\lambda(t,x) := \lambda^{1/\sigma}u\left(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x\right)$. This scaling leaves the $\dot{H}^{s_c}_x$-norm invariant, with $s_c = d/2 - 1/\sigma$.
- Galilean: if u solves (1.1), then for $v \in \mathbf{R}^d$, so does $e^{iv\cdot x - i|v|^2 t/2}u(t, x - vt)$. This transform leaves the L^2_x-norm invariant.

These two arguments suggest that the critical Sobolev regularity to solve (1.1) is $\min(s_c, 0)$. Indeed, if $s_c \geqslant 0$, local well-posedness from $H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$ to $H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for $s \geqslant s_c$ has been established in [13], and if $s_c < 0$, local well-posedness from $H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$ to $H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for $s \geqslant 0$ has been established in [25].

If $s_c > 0$, pathological phenomena have been exhibited for initial data in $H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$ with $0 < s < s_c$: Gilles Lebeau has proved a "norm inflation" phenomenon for the wave equation $\partial_t^2 u - \Delta u + u^p = 0$, $x \in \mathbf{R}^3$, $p \in 2\mathbf{N}+1$, $p \geqslant 7$ ([21]; see also [23]). The analogous result for (1.1) has been established in [14] and [4].

Theorem 1.1 (From [4, 14])**.** *Let $\sigma \geqslant 1$. Assume that $s_c = d/2 - 1/\sigma > 0$, and let $0 < s < s_c$. There exists a family $(u_0^h)_{0<h\leqslant 1}$ in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with*

$$\|u_0^h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0 \text{ as } h \to 0,$$

a solution u^h to (1.1) *and $0 < t^h \to 0$, such that:*

$$\|u^h(t^h)\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to +\infty \text{ as } h \to 0.$$

Key words and phrases. Nonlinear Schrödinger equation; well-posedness; approximation.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35Q55; Secondary 35A01, 35B30, 35B45, 35B65.
This work was supported by the French ANR project R.A.S. (ANR-08-JCJC-0124-01).

The argument of the proof consists in considering concentrated initial data,

$$u_0(x) = h^{s-d/2}(\log 1/h)^{-\alpha} a_0\left(\frac{x}{h}\right) \quad \text{with } h \to 0,$$

and showing that for very short time, the Laplacian can be neglected in (1.1). The above result then stems from its (easy) counterpart in the ODE case, by choosing a suitable $\alpha > 0$. In the spirit of [22], the above result has been strengthened to a "loss of regularity" in [1, 8, 24]; the assumptions and conclusion are similar to that in Theorem 1.1, the only difference is that $u^h(t^h, \cdot)$ is measured in $H^k(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for any $k > s/(1 + \sigma(s_c - s))$, thus allowed to be smaller than s. In all the cases mentioned here, the lack of uniform continuity of the nonlinear flow map near the origin is due to the appearance of higher and higher frequencies on a very short time scale. If $s_c < 0$, similar pathological phenomena have been established in $H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$ with $s < 0$, where on the contrary, low frequencies are ignited; see e.g. [2, 10, 14, 20]. In the rest of this paper, we focus on nonnegative regularity, $s \geqslant 0$.

The goal of this paper is twofold. First, we want to investigate a method to remove the pathology mentioned above, causing a lack of well-posedness for (1.1), in a deterministic way, as opposed to the probabilisitc approach initiated in [6, 7] for the wave equation. The other motivation is related to numerical simulations for (1.1), where high frequencies may be a source of important errors; see for instance [18], a reference which will be discussed further into details in Sections 3 and 4.

We show that with a suitable cut-off on the high frequencies of the nonlinearity, the obstructions to local well-posedness vanish, and the problem becomes globally well-posed: the nonlinear evolution of any initial datum in $L^2(\mathbf{R}^d)$ can be controlled *a priori*, an information which may be useful for numerics, since we do not have to decide if the initial datum belongs to a full measure set or not. This strategy is validated inasmuch as this procedure yields a good approximation of the solution to (1.1) as the cut-off tends to the identity. Note that this approach can be viewed as a deterministic counterpart of the one presented in [5] (see also [3]), where by the construction of a probability measure, the authors prove that the pathological phenomenon described in Theorem 1.1 occurs for a set of initial data whose probability is zero.

Notations. We define the Fourier transform by the formula

$$\widehat{f}(\xi) = \mathcal{F}(f)(\xi) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} e^{-ix\cdot\xi} f(x)dx, \quad f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^d).$$

We write $a \lesssim b$ if there exists C such that $a \leqslant Cb$. In the presence of a small parameter h, the notation indicates that C is independent of $h \in (0, 1]$.

2. From instability to global well-posedness

Let $\chi : \mathbf{R}^d \to [0, 1]$ be a smooth function, equal to one on the unit ball, and even: $\chi(-x) = \chi(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$. It may be compactly supported, in the Schwartz class $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^d)$, or with a slower decay at infinity. For simplicity, we will not discuss sharp assumptions on χ. We define the frequency "cut-off" Π as the Fourier multiplier

$$\widehat{\Pi(f)}(\xi) = \chi(\xi)\widehat{f}(\xi).$$

As pointed out in the introduction, in the examples constructed to prove the lack of local well-posedness, the mechanism of high frequencies amplification occurs at the level of the ordinary differential equation. We discuss some strategies to saturate high frequencies at the ODE level first, with $\epsilon = 1$ for simplicity.

2.1. **Candidates at the ODE level.** The first possibility to prevent the appearance of high frequencies by nonlinear self-interaction consists in saturating the whole nonlinearity:

$$i\partial_t v = \Pi\left(|v|^{2\sigma}v\right). \tag{2.1}$$

This can be viewed as an extremely simplified version of the I-method (see e.g. [15]). Another choice consists in saturating the high frequencies in the "nonlinear multiplicative potential" only, that is $|v|^{2\sigma}$: for $\sigma \in \mathbf{N}$, we propose two possibilities,

$$i\partial_t v = \Pi\left(|v|^{2\sigma}\right)v, \tag{2.2}$$

$$i\partial_t v = \left(\Pi\left(|v|^{2}\right)\right)^{\sigma} v. \tag{2.3}$$

In the cubic case $\sigma = 1$, the last two approaches obviously coincide. These two approaches have two advantages over (2.1):

- They preserve the gauge invariance. If v solves the equation, then so does $ve^{i\theta}$ for any constant $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$.
- They preserve the conservation of mass.

To see the second point, rewrite $\Pi(f) = K * f$, with $K(x) = (2\pi)^{-d/2}\widehat{\chi}(-x)$. Since χ is even and real-valued, so is K, and therefore $\partial_t|v|^2 = 0$ in (2.2) and (2.3). This identity leads to the conservation of the L^2-norm at the PDE level.

Before passing to the PDE case, we conclude this section by showing that even at the ODE level, cutting off high frequencies in the initial data does not suffice to prevent the appearance of higher frequencies in the solution for positive time. For $a \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and $s > 0$, consider v^h the solution to

$$i\partial_t v^h = |v^h|^{2\sigma}v^h; \quad v^h(0,x) = h^{s-d/2}a\left(\frac{x}{h}\right).$$

Then $v^h_{|t=0}$ is bounded in $H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$, uniformly in $h \in (0,1]$, and if $\widehat{a}$ is compactly supported (in $B(0,R)$), then $\widehat{v^h}_{|t=0}$ is compactly supported (in $B(0,R/h)$). Since $\partial_t|v^h|^2 = 0$, we have the explicit formula

$$v^h(t,x) = h^{s-d/2}a\left(\frac{x}{h}\right)\exp\left(-ith^{2\sigma(s-d/2)}\left|a\left(\frac{x}{h}\right)\right|^{2\sigma}\right).$$

We check that for $t > 0$, as $h \to 0$, the homogeneous Sobolev norms behave like

$$\|v^h(t)\|_{\dot{H}^k} \approx h^{s-2k\sigma(s-d/2)-k}t^k,$$

at least for $k \in \mathbf{N}$. The above quantity is unbounded as $h \to 0$ if

$$k > \frac{s}{1+2\sigma(s-d/2)}.$$

Therefore, if $s < d/2$, $v^h(t,\cdot)$ is unbounded in $H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for $t > 0$, as $h \to 0$: cutting off the high frequencies in the initial data does not suffice to control the frequency support of the solution. On the other hand, the models (2.2) and (2.3) prevent the appearance of high frequencies by nonlinear self-interaction. The above mechanism is essentially the one that leads to the norm inflation phenomenon in [4, 14, 21], except that in those papers, the approximation by an ODE is used only on a time interval where the H^s-norm becomes unbounded, but not the H^k-norm for any $k < s$. The above mechanism at the PDE level leads to the loss of regularity [1, 8, 22, 24], where indeed k is allowed to be smaller than s, as recalled in the introduction. Roughly speaking, the appearance of oscillations is quite similar to the above ODE example; in the PDE case, the numerology is different, and the proof is more intricate.

2.2. **Choice at the PDE level.** We consider now the equations

$$i\partial_t u + P(D)u = \epsilon \Pi\left(|u|^{2\sigma}\right) u, \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$i\partial_t u + P(D)u = \epsilon \left(\Pi\left(|u|^2\right)\right)^{\sigma} u, \tag{2.5}$$

where $P(D)$ is a Fourier multiplier with a real-valued symbol $P : \mathbf{R}^d \to \mathbf{R}$,

$$\widehat{P(D)f} = P(\xi)\widehat{f}(\xi).$$

The L^2-norm of u is formally independent of time:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} |u(t,x)|^2 dx = 0. \tag{2.6}$$

In view of this conservation and of Young inequality

$$\|\Pi(f)\|_{L^\infty} \leqslant \|K\|_{L^\infty}\|f\|_{L^1}, \tag{2.7}$$

the option (2.5) seems more interesting than (2.4), and we have the following result.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\sigma \in \mathbf{N}$, $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$, $P : \mathbf{R}^d \to \mathbf{R}$ and $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ even and real-valued.*

- *For any $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbf{R}^d)$, (2.5) has a unique solution $u \in C(\mathbf{R}; L^2(\mathbf{R}^d))$ such that $u_{|t=0} = u_0$. Its L^2-norm is independent of time: (2.6) holds.*
- *If in addition $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$, $s \in \mathbf{N}$, then $u \in C(\mathbf{R}; H^s(\mathbf{R}^d))$.*
- *The flow map $u_0 \mapsto u$ is uniformly continuous from the balls in $L^2(\mathbf{R}^d)$ to $C(\mathbf{R}; L^2(\mathbf{R}^d))$. More precisely, for all $u_0, v_0 \in L^2(\mathbf{R}^d)$, there exists C depending on σ, $\|K\|_{L^\infty}$, $\|u_0\|_{L^2}$ and $\|v_0\|_{L^2}$ such that for all $T > 0$,*

$$\|u - v\|_{L^\infty([-T,T];L^2(\mathbf{R}^d))} \leqslant \|u_0 - v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^d)} e^{CT}, \tag{2.8}$$

  where u and v denote the solutions to (2.5) with initial data u_0 and v_0, respectively.
- *More generally, let $s \in \mathbf{N}$. For all $u_0, v_0 \in H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$, there exists C depending on σ, $\|K\|_{W^{s,\infty}}$, $\|u_0\|_{H^s}$ and $\|v_0\|_{H^s}$ such that for all $T > 0$,*

$$\|u - v\|_{L^\infty([-T,T];H^s(\mathbf{R}^d))} \leqslant \|u_0 - v_0\|_{H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)} e^{CT}. \tag{2.9}$$

Remark 2.2. As pointed out in [12], even if the solution is constructed by a fixed point argument, the continuity of the flow map is not trivial in general. In the case of Schrödinger equations (1.1), continuity of the flow map in $H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is known only in a limited number of cases: see [25] for $s = 0$, [19] for $s = 1$ and $s = 2$, and [12] for $0 < s < 1$.

Proof. First, recall that $S(t) = e^{-itP(D)}$ is a unitary group on $\dot{H}^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$, $s \in \mathbf{R}$. Duhamel's formula associated to (2.5) reads

$$u(t) = S(t)u_0 - i\epsilon \int_0^t S(t-\tau)\left(\left(K * |u|^2\right)^{\sigma} u\right)(\tau) d\tau. \tag{2.10}$$

The local existence in L^2 stems from a standard fixed point argument in

$$X(T) = \{u \in C([-T,T]; L^2(\mathbf{R}^d)); \quad \|u\|_{L^\infty([-T,T];L^2)} \leqslant 2\|u_0\|_{L^2}\}.$$

Denote by $\Phi(u)(t)$ the right hand side of (2.10). In view of (2.7), for $t \in [-T, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Phi(u)(t)\|_{L^2} &\leqslant \|u_0\|_{L^2} + \int_{-T}^{T} \left\| \left(\left(K * |u|^2\right)^\sigma u \right)(\tau) \right\|_{L^2} d\tau \\ &\leqslant \|u_0\|_{L^2} + \int_{-T}^{T} \left\| K * |u(\tau)|^2 \right\|_{L^\infty}^\sigma \|u(\tau)\|_{L^2} d\tau \\ &\leqslant \|u_0\|_{L^2} + \|K\|_{L^\infty}^\sigma \int_{-T}^{T} \|u(\tau)\|_{L^2}^{2\sigma+1} d\tau.\end{aligned}$$

By choosing $T > 0$ sufficiently small, we see that $X(T)$ is stable under the action of Φ. Note that in the case of the model (2.4), the above estimate would have to be adapted, forcing us to work in a space smaller than $X(T)$ (L^2 regularity in space would no longer be sufficient in general). Contraction is established in the same way:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Phi(u)(t) - \Phi(v)(t)\|_{L^2} &\leqslant \int_{-T}^{T} \left\| \left(\left(K * |u|^2\right)^\sigma u \right)(\tau) - \left(\left(K * |v|^2\right)^\sigma v \right)(\tau) \right\|_{L^2} d\tau \\ &\leqslant \int_{-T}^{T} \left\| \left(\left(K * |u|^2\right)^\sigma - \left(K * |v|^2\right)^\sigma \right) u \right\|_{L^2} d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_{-T}^{T} \left\| \left(\left(K * |v|^2\right)^\sigma \right)(u - v) \right\|_{L^2} d\tau.\end{aligned}$$

Using the estimate $|a^\sigma - b^\sigma| \lesssim (|a|^{\sigma-1} + |b|^{\sigma-1})|a - b|$, and (2.7) again, we infer

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Phi(u)(t) - \Phi(v)(t)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|K\|_{L^\infty}^\sigma \int_{-T}^{T} \left(\|u\|_{L^2}^{2\sigma-1} + \|v\|_{L^2}^{2\sigma-1} \right) \|u - v\|_{L^2} \|u\|_{L^2} d\tau \\ &\quad + \|K\|_{L^\infty}^\sigma \int_{-T}^{T} \|v\|_{L^2}^{2\sigma} \|u - v\|_{L^2} d\tau,\end{aligned}$$

where all the functions inside the integrals are implicitly evaluated at time τ. Choosing $T > 0$ possibly smaller, Φ is a contraction on $X(T)$. Note that this small time T depends only on σ, $\|K\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\|u_0\|_{L^2}$. Since the L^2-norm of u is preserved (see e.g. [11] for the rigorous justification), the construction of a local solution can be repeated indefinitely, hence global existence and uniqueness at the L^2 level.

Global existence in $H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for $s \in \mathbf{N}$ then follows easily, thanks to the estimate

$$\left\| \left(K * |u|^2\right)^\sigma u \right\|_{H^s} \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|=s} \left\| \partial^\alpha \left(K * |u|^2\right)^\sigma \partial^\beta u \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|K\|_{W^{s,\infty}}^\sigma \|u\|_{L^2}^\sigma \|u\|_{H^s}.$$

The continuity of the flow map in L^2 is obtained by resuming the estimate written to establish the contraction of Φ: for $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|u(t) - v(t)\|_{L^2} &\leqslant \|u_0 - v_0\|_{L^2} + \|K\|_{L^\infty}^\sigma \int_0^t \left(\|u\|_{L^2}^{2\sigma} + \|v\|_{L^2}^{2\sigma} \right) \|u - v\|_{L^2} d\tau \\ &\leqslant \|u_0 - v_0\|_{L^2} + \|K\|_{L^\infty}^\sigma \left(\|u_0\|_{L^2}^{2\sigma} + \|v_0\|_{L^2}^{2\sigma} \right) \int_0^t \|u - v\|_{L^2} d\tau,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the conservation of the L^2-norm. Proceeding similarly for $t < 0$, Gronwall lemma then yields (2.8) for C depending only of σ, $\|K\|_{L^\infty}$, $\|u_0\|_{L^2}$ and $\|v_0\|_{L^2}$. Finally, (2.9) is obtained in a similar fashion. □

Remark 2.3. The proof of continuity of the flow map is extremely easy. This is in sharp constrast with the case of the equation without frequency cut-off. In the case of Schrödinger equations ($P(\xi) = -|\xi|^2$), continuity is more intricate to establish (see [25]), and is true only for L^2-subcritical nonlinearities, $\sigma \leqslant 2/d$, from [14].

We note that even for large σ, global well-posedness in L^2 is available, in sharp contrast with the nonlinear Schrödinger equation (1.1). Even in the focusing case $\epsilon = -1$, the high frequency cut-off prevents finite time blow-up. In (2.9), consider $v_0 = v = 0$ and $s = 1$ for instance: by comparison with the case of (1.1), we see that the constant C necessarily depends on K (or equivalently on χ), and is unbounded as χ converges to the Dirac mass. The frequency cut-off Π removes the instabilities, and prevents finite time blow-up.

Remark 2.4 (Hamiltonian structure in the cubic case). If $\sigma = 1$, (2.4) and (2.5) coincide. We have the equivalence

$$\chi \text{ even and real-valued } \iff K \text{ even and real-valued.}$$

This implies that under the assumption of Theorem 2.1, (2.5) has an Hamiltonian structure, and the conserved energy is

$$H(u) = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \overline{u}(x) P(D) u(x) dx + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \iint K(x-y)|u(y)|^2 |u(x)|^2 dxdy.$$

3. Convergence in the smooth case

Suppose that $P(D)$ converges to Δ and that Π converges to Id: does the solution to (2.5) converge to the solution of NLS? We show that this is the case under suitable assumptions on these convergences, at least in the case where the solution to the limiting equation (1.1) is very smooth. In the sequel, the convergence is indexed by $h \in (0,1]$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\sigma \in \mathbf{N}$. We assume that P and Π verify the following properties:*

- *There exist $\alpha, \beta \geqslant 0$ such that $P_h(\xi) = -|\xi|^2 + \mathcal{O}\left(h^\alpha \langle \xi \rangle^\beta\right)$.*
- *$\chi_h(\xi) = \chi(h\xi)$, with $\chi : \mathbf{R}^d \to [0,1]$ even, real-valued, $\chi = 1$ on the unit ball.*

Denote by u^h the solution to (2.5) *with P_h and χ_h, such that $u^h_{|t=0} = u_{|t=0}$. Suppose that the solution to* (1.1) *satisfies $u \in L^\infty([0,T]; H^{s+\beta})$, for some $s > d/2$. Then*

$$\|u - u^h\|_{L^\infty([0,T];H^s)} \lesssim h^{\min(\alpha,\beta)}.$$

Example 3.2. The above assumption on P_h is satisfied with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 2$ in the following cases:

- $P_h(\xi) = \dfrac{-|\xi|^2}{1 + h|\xi|^2}$.
- $P_h(\xi) = -\dfrac{1}{h} \arctan\left(h|\xi|^2\right)$.

The second example is borrowed from [16], where this truncated operator appears naturally when discretizing the Laplacian for numerical schemes.

Remark 3.3. In this result, no assumption is needed on the possible decay of χ at infinity.

Proof. Let $w^h = u - u^h$: it satisfies $w^h_{|t=0} = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} i\partial_t w^h + P_h(D) w^h = {} & \epsilon \left(\Pi_h\left(|u|^2\right)\right)^\sigma u - \epsilon \left(\Pi_h\left(|u^h|^2\right)\right)^\sigma u^h \\ & + \left(P_h(D) - \Delta\right) u + \epsilon \left(|u|^{2\sigma} - \left(\Pi_h\left(|u|^2\right)\right)^\sigma\right) u. \end{aligned}$$

Denote by $R^h(u)$ the second line, which corresponds to a source term. In view of the assumption on P_h, there exists C independent of $h \in (0,1]$ such that

$$\|P_h(D)f - \Delta f\|_{H^s} \leqslant Ch^\alpha \|f\|_{H^{s+\beta}} \quad \forall f \in H^{s+\beta}(\mathbf{R}^d).$$

We also have, by Plancherel formula,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\left(1-\Pi_h\right)f\|_{H^s}^2 &= \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \left(1-\chi(h\xi)\right)^2 \langle\xi\rangle^{2s} |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &\leqslant \int_{|\xi|>1/h} \langle\xi\rangle^{2s} |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &\leqslant h^{2\beta} \int_{|\xi|>1/h} \langle\xi\rangle^{2s+2\beta} |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \leqslant h^{2\beta}\|f\|_{H^{s+\beta}}^2.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\|R^h(u)\|_{L^\infty([0,T];H^s)} \lesssim h^{\min(\alpha,\beta)} \|u\|_{L^\infty([0,T];H^{s+\beta})}.$$

Now since $s > d/2$, $H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is an algebra, and there exists C independent of h such that

$$\left\| \left(\Pi_h\left(|u|^2\right)\right)^\sigma u - \left(\Pi_h\left(|u^h|^2\right)\right)^\sigma u^h \right\|_{H^s} \leqslant C\|\widehat{\chi}\|_{L^1}^\sigma \left(\|u\|_{H^s}^{2\sigma} + \|u^h\|_{H^s}^{2\sigma}\right) \|u-u^h\|_{H^s},$$

where the Young inequality that we have used is not the same as in Section 2:

$$\|K * f\|_{L^2} \leqslant \|K\|_{L^1}\|f\|_{L^2}.$$

This is essentially the only way to obtain an estimate independent of $h \in (0,1]$. Indeed, $\Pi_h(f) = K_h * f$, with

$$K_h(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}h^d}\widehat{\chi}\left(\frac{-x}{h}\right).$$

The result then stems from a bootstrap argument: so long as

$$\|u^h\|_{L^\infty([0,t];H^s)} \leqslant 1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty([0,T];H^s)},$$

Gronwall lemma yields

$$\|u-u^h\|_{L^\infty([0,t];H^s)} \lesssim h^{\min(\alpha,\beta)} \|u\|_{L^\infty([0,T];H^{s+\beta})}.$$

Therefore, up to choosing h sufficiently small, this estimate is valid up to $t = T$. □

Such a convergence result can be compared to the one proved in [18] to prove the convergence of numerical approximations. The approach there is a bit different though, inasmuch as the frequency cut-off does not affect the nonlinearity (as in (2.5)), but the initial data: consider v^h solution to

$$i\partial_t v^h + P_h(D)v^h = \epsilon|v^h|^{2\sigma}v^h; \quad v^h_{|t=0} = \Pi_h u_0.$$

Then in [18], the discrete analogue to $\Pi_h u - v_h$ is proven to be small. Proposition 3.1 differs from the results in [18] on several aspects:

- The context in [18] is discrete.
- Only the low frequency part of u, $\Pi_h u$, is shown to be well approximated.
- The regularity assumption on u may be much weaker.

As mentioned above, the second point is due to the choice of the model. However, as discussed in Section 2.1, controlling the high frequencies of the initial data must not be expected to ensure a control of high frequencies of the solution v^h for positive time.

The third point is due to the use of Strichartz estimates in [18]. In the next section, we show that in the presence of dispersion (with $P_h(\xi) = -|\xi|^2$), Proposition 3.1 can be adapted to rougher data.

4. Convergence using dispersive estimates

We first recall the standard definition.

Definition 4.1. *A pair $(p,q)\neq(2,\infty)$ is admissible if $p\geqslant 2$, $q\geqslant 2$, and*

$$\frac{2}{p}=d\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}\right).$$

We shall consider (2.5) when $P(D)$ is exactly the Laplacian, and not an approximation as in Proposition 3.1. The reason is that when P is bounded, then no Strichartz estimate is available, as we now recall. Let $S(\cdot)$ be bounded on H^s for all $s\geqslant 0$. By Sobolev embedding, for all (p,q) (not necessarily admissible) with $2\leqslant q<\infty$, there exists $C>0$ such that for all $u_0\in H^{d/2-d/q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$, and all finite time interval I,

$$\begin{aligned}\|S(\cdot)u_0\|_{L^p(I;L^q(\mathbf{R}^d))}&\leqslant C\|S(\cdot)u_0\|_{L^p(I;H^{d/2-d/q}(\mathbf{R}^d))}\\&\leqslant C\|u_0\|_{L^p(I;H^{d/2-d/q}(\mathbf{R}^d))}=C|I|^{1/p}\|u_0\|_{H^{d/2-d/q}(\mathbf{R}^d)}.\end{aligned}$$

If the Fourier multiplier P is bounded, the above estimate cannot be improved, in sharp contrast with the result provided by Strichartz estimates.

Proposition 4.2 (From [9])**.** *Let $d\geqslant 1$, and $P\in L^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d;\mathbf{R})$. Denote $S(t)=e^{-itP(D)}$. Suppose that there exist an admissible pair (p,q), an index $k\in\mathbf{R}$, a time interval $I\ni 0$, $|I|>0$, and a constant $C>0$ such that*

$$\|S(\cdot)u_0\|_{L^p(I;L^q(\mathbf{R}^d))}\leqslant C\|u_0\|_{H^k(\mathbf{R}^d)},\quad \forall u_0\in H^k(\mathbf{R}^d).$$

Then necessarily, $k\geqslant 2/p=d/2-d/q$.

We now state the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\sigma\in\mathbf{N}$ and $T>0$. We assume that $\chi_h(\xi)=\chi(h\xi)$, with $\chi\in\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ even, real-valued, $\chi=1$ on $B(0,1)$. Let u solve* (1.1)*, and consider the solution u^h to*

$$i\partial_t u^h+\Delta u^h=\epsilon\left(\Pi_h\left(|u^h|^2\right)\right)^\sigma u^h;\quad u^h_{|t=0}=u_0.$$

1. *Suppose that $\sigma=1$ and $d\leqslant 2$. If $u\in L^\infty([0,T];L^2)\cap L^{8/d}([0,T];L^4)$, then*

$$\|u-u^h\|_{L^\infty([0,T];L^2)}\underset{h\to 0}{\longrightarrow}0.$$

2. *Suppose that $\sigma=1$ and $d=3$.*
   - *If $u,\nabla u\in L^\infty([0,T];L^2)\cap L^{8/d}([0,T];L^4)$, then*

$$\|u-u^h\|_{L^\infty([0,T];H^1)}\underset{h\to 0}{\longrightarrow}0.$$

   - *If $u\in L^\infty([0,T];H^s)$, with $s>3/2$, then*

$$\|u-u^h\|_{L^\infty([0,T];L^2)}\lesssim h^s\quad\text{and}\quad\|u-u^h\|_{L^\infty([0,T];H^1)}\lesssim h^{s-1}.$$

3. *Suppose that $\sigma\geqslant 1$ and $d\leqslant 2$. If $u\in L^\infty([0,T];H^s)$, with $s\geqslant 1$ and $s>d/2$, then*

$$\|u-u^h\|_{L^\infty([0,T];L^2)}\lesssim h^s\quad\text{and}\quad\|u-u^h\|_{L^\infty([0,T];H^1)}\underset{h\to 0}{\longrightarrow}0.$$

If in addition $s>1$, then

$$\|u-u^h\|_{L^\infty([0,T];H^1)}\lesssim h^{s-1}.$$

Remark 4.4. Suppose u_0 sufficiently smooth. If $\epsilon = +1$ (defocusing case), the bounds for u are known in several cases, with $T > 0$ arbitrarily large. On the contrary, if $\epsilon = -1$ (focusing case), T may have to be finite, bounded by a blow-up time. See e.g. [11, 17]. Typically, if $\sigma = d = 1$, then the assumption of the first point is fulfilled for all $T > 0$ as soon as $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbf{R})$, for $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$, from [25], and if $\sigma \geqslant 1$, $d \leqslant 2$, the assumption of the third point is fulfilled for all $T > 0$ as soon as $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$, for $\epsilon = +1$, from [17].

Proof. For fixed $h > 0$, Theorem 2.1 shows that $u^h \in C(\mathbf{R}; H^k)$, with $k = 0, 1$ or s according to the cases considered in the assumptions of the theorem. Of course, the bounds provided by Theorem 2.1 blow up as $h \to 0$ if $k > 0$.

As in the proof of Proposition 3.1, let $w^h = u - u^h$. The equation satisfied by w^h is simpler than in the proof of Proposition 3.1, since $P_h(D) = \Delta$:

$$i\partial_t w^h + \Delta w^h = \epsilon \left(\Pi_h \left(|u|^2\right)\right)^\sigma u - \epsilon \left(\Pi_h \left(|u^h|^2\right)\right)^\sigma u^h + \epsilon \left(|u|^{2\sigma} - \left(\Pi_h \left(|u|^2\right)\right)^\sigma\right) u.$$

Resume the notations $R_h(u) = \epsilon \left(|u|^{2\sigma} - \left(\Pi_h \left(|u|^2\right)\right)^\sigma\right) u$ and $\Pi_h(f) = K_h * f$, with $K_h(x) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} h^{-d} \widehat{\chi}(-x/h)$. From young inequality, we have, for all $q \in [1, \infty]$,

$$\|\Pi_h(f)\|_{L^q} \leqslant \|K_h\|_{L^1} \|f\|_{L^q} \leqslant \|\widehat{\chi}\|_{L^1} \|f\|_{L^q}, \tag{4.1}$$

an estimate which is uniform in $h > 0$. Introduce the Lebesgue exponents

$$q = 2\sigma + 2 \quad ; \quad p = \frac{4\sigma + 4}{d\sigma} \quad ; \quad \theta = \frac{2\sigma(2\sigma + 2)}{2 - (d-2)\sigma}.$$

The pair (p, q) is admissible, and

$$\frac{1}{q'} = \frac{2\sigma}{q} + \frac{1}{q} \quad ; \quad \frac{1}{p'} = \frac{2\sigma}{\theta} + \frac{1}{p}. \tag{4.2}$$

For $t > 0$, denote $L^j_t L^k = L^j([0,t]; L^k(\mathbf{R}^d))$. From Strichartz estimates (see e.g. [11]),

$$\begin{aligned} \|w^h\|_{L^p_t L^q \cap L^\infty_t L^2} &\lesssim \left\| \left(\Pi_h \left(|u|^2\right)\right)^\sigma u - \left(\Pi_h \left(|u^h|^2\right)\right)^\sigma u^h \right\|_{L^{p'}_t L^{q'}} + \|R_h(u)\|_{L^{p'_1}_t L^{q'_1}} \\ &\lesssim \left(\|u\|^{2\sigma}_{L^\theta_t L^q} + \|u^h\|^{2\sigma}_{L^\theta_t L^q} \right) \|w^h\|_{L^p_t L^q} + \|R_h(u)\|_{L^{p'_1}_t L^{q'_1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Hölder inequality and (4.1), and where (p_1, q_1) is an admissible pair whose value will be given later.

If $\sigma = 1$ and $d \leqslant 2$, then $\theta \leqslant p$, and we infer

$$\|w^h\|_{L^p_t L^q \cap L^\infty_t L^2} \lesssim t^{1/\theta - 1/p} \left(\|u\|^{2\sigma}_{L^p_t L^q} + \|u^h\|^{2\sigma}_{L^p_t L^q} \right) \|w^h\|_{L^p_t L^q} + \|R_h(u)\|_{L^{p'_1}_t L^{q'_1}}.$$

In the first case of the theorem, we assume $u \in L^p([0,T]; L^q)$, since $p = 8/d$ and $q = 4$ for $\sigma = 1$. We use again a bootstrap argument: so long as $\|u^h\|_{L^p_t L^q} \leqslant 2\|u\|_{L^p_t L^q}$, we divide the interval $[0,T]$ into finitely many small intervals so the first term of the right hand side is absorbed by the left hand side (recall that p is finite), and we have

$$\|w^h\|_{L^p_t L^q \cap L^\infty_t L^2} \lesssim \|R_h(u)\|_{L^{p'_1}_t L^{q'_1}}.$$

The bootstrap argument is validated provided that $\|R_h(u)\|_{L^{p'_1}_T L^{q'_1}} \to 0$ as $h \to 0$.

If we have only $\sigma < \frac{2}{d-2}$, then by Sobolev embedding,

$$\|u\|_{L^\theta_t L^q} \leqslant t^{1/\theta} \|u\|_{L^\infty_t H^1}.$$

In the same way as above,

$$\|\nabla w^h\|_{L_t^p L^q \cap L_t^\infty L^2} \lesssim \left\|\nabla\left(\left(\Pi_h\left(|u|^2\right)\right)^\sigma u - \left(\Pi_h\left(|u^h|^2\right)\right)^\sigma u^h\right)\right\|_{L_t^{p'} L^{q'}} + \|\nabla R_h(u)\|_{L_t^{p_1'} L^{q_1'}}$$

The first term of the right hand side is controlled by

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\left(\Pi_h\left(|u|^2\right)\right)^\sigma \nabla u - \left(\Pi_h\left(|u^h|^2\right)\right)^\sigma \nabla u^h\right\|_{L_t^{p'} L^{q'}}\\ &+\left\|u\nabla\left(\Pi_h\left(|u|^2\right)\right)^\sigma - u^h\nabla\left(\Pi_h\left(|u^h|^2\right)\right)^\sigma\right\|_{L_t^{p'} L^{q'}}\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Introducing the factor $\left(\Pi_h\left(|u|^2\right)\right)^\sigma \nabla u^h$, the first term is estimated by

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\left(\Pi_h\left(|u|^2\right)\right)^\sigma \nabla w^h\right\|_{L_t^{p'} L^{q'}} + \left\|\left(\left(\Pi_h\left(|u|^2\right)\right)^\sigma - \left(\Pi_h\left(|u^h|^2\right)\right)^\sigma\right)\nabla u^h\right\|_{L_t^{p'} L^{q'}}\\
&\lesssim \left\|\Pi_h\left(|u|^2\right)\right\|_{L_t^{\theta/2} L^{q/2}}^\sigma \|\nabla w^h\|_{L_t^p L^q}\\
&\quad + \left(\|u\|_{L_t^\theta L^q}^{2\sigma-2} + \|u^h\|_{L_t^\theta L^q}^{2\sigma-2}\right)\left\||u|^2 - |u^h|^2\right\|_{L_t^{\theta/2} L^{q/2}} \|\nabla u^h\|_{L_t^p L^q}\\
&\lesssim \|u\|_{L_t^\theta L^q}^{2\sigma} \|\nabla w^h\|_{L_t^p L^q} + \left(\|u\|_{L_t^\theta L^q}^{2\sigma-1} + \|u^h\|_{L_t^\theta L^q}^{2\sigma-1}\right)\left\|w^h\right\|_{L_t^\theta L^q} \|\nabla u^h\|_{L_t^p L^q}\\
&\lesssim t^{2\sigma/\theta}\|u\|_{L_t^\infty H^1}^{2\sigma} \|\nabla w^h\|_{L_t^p L^q}\\
&\quad + t^{2\sigma/\theta}\left(\|u\|_{L_t^\infty H^1}^{2\sigma-1} + \|u^h\|_{L_t^\infty H^1}^{2\sigma-1}\right)\left\|w^h\right\|_{L_t^\infty H^1} \|\nabla u^h\|_{L_t^p L^q}\end{aligned}$$

Proceeding similarly for the other term in (4.3), splitting $[0,T]$ into finitely many time intervals where the terms containing w^h on the right hand side can be absorbed by the left hand side, and using a bootstrap argument, we end up with

$$\|w^h\|_{L_t^p W^{1,q}\cap L_t^\infty H^1} \lesssim \|R_h(u)\|_{L_t^{p_1'} W^{1,q_1'}}.$$

Therefore, it suffices to show that for some admissible pair (p_1,q_1), the source term converges to 0 in $L^{p_1'}([0,T];L^{q_1'})$ (if $\sigma=1$ and $d\leqslant 2$) or in $L^{p_1'}([0,T];W^{1,q_1'})$ (in the other cases), so the bootstrap argument is completed. In addition, the rate of converge of the source term, if any, yields a rate of convergence for w^h. The theorem then stems from the following lemma, in which (p,q) is given by (4.2).

Lemma 4.5. *Let $T>0$. The source term $R_h(u)$ can be controlled as follows.*
1. *Suppose that $\sigma=1$ and $d\leqslant 2$. If $u\in L^\infty([0,T];L^2)\cap L^{8/d}([0,T];L^4)$, then*

$$\|R_h(u)\|_{L^{p'}([0,T];L^{q'})} \underset{h\to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

2. *Suppose that $\sigma=1$ and $d=3$.*
   - *If $u,\nabla u\in L^\infty([0,T];L^2)\cap L^{8/d}([0,T];L^4)$, then*

$$\|R_h(u)\|_{L^{p'}([0,T];W^{1,q'})} \underset{h\to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

   - *If $u\in L^\infty([0,T];H^s)$, with $s>3/2$, then*

$$\|R_h(u)\|_{L^1([0,T];L^2)} \lesssim h^s \quad \text{and} \quad \|R_h(u)\|_{L^1([0,T];H^1)} \lesssim h^{s-1}.$$

3. *Suppose that $\sigma\geqslant 1$ and $d\leqslant 2$. If $u\in L^\infty([0,T];H^s)$, with $s\geqslant 1$ and $s>d/2$, then*

$$\|R_h(u)\|_{L^1([0,T];L^2)} \lesssim h^s \quad \text{and} \quad \|R_h(u)\|_{L^1([0,T];H^1)} \underset{h\to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

If in addition $s > 1$, then

$$\|R_h(u)\|_{L^1([0,T];H^1)} \lesssim h^{s-1}.$$

Proof of Lemma 4.5. For the first case, we use Hölder inequality, in view of (4.2):

$$\|R_h(u)\|_{L_T^{p'}L^{q'}} = \left\|(1-\Pi_h)\left(|u|^2\right)u\right\|_{L_T^{p'}L^{q'}} \leqslant \left\|(1-\Pi_h)\left(|u|^2\right)\right\|_{L_T^{\theta/2}L^{q/2}} \|u\|_{L_T^pL^q}.$$

We note that for $\sigma = 1$, $q = 4$, so by Plancherel Theorem,

$$\|\left(1-\Pi_h\right)(|u|^2)\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \left(1-\chi(h\xi)\right)^2 |\mathcal{F}(|u|^2)(\xi)|^2 d\xi \leqslant \int_{|\xi|>1/h} |\mathcal{F}(|u|^2)(\xi)|^2 d\xi.$$

By assumption, $u \in L^p([0,T];L^4) \subset L^\theta([0,T];L^4)$, thus $|u|^2 \in L^{\theta/2}([0,T];L^2)$, and by Plancherel Theorem, $\mathcal{F}(|u|^2) \in L^{\theta/2}([0,T];L^2)$. The first point of the lemma then stems from the Dominated Convergence Theorem.

For the first case of the second point, we note that now $\theta > p$, so the above argument must be adapted, and we have to estimate the gradient of $R_h(u)$ in the same space as above. Since $L^\infty([0,T];H^1(\mathbf{R}^3)) \subset L^\theta([0,T];L^4(\mathbf{R}^3))$, the Dominated Convergence Theorem yields

$$\|R_h(u)\|_{L_T^{p'}L^{q'}} \underset{h\to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

We now estimate $\nabla R_h(u)$. Write

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla R_h(u)\|_{L_T^{p'}L^{q'}} &\leqslant \left\|(1-\Pi_h)\left(|u|^2\right)\right\|_{L_T^{\theta/2}L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^pL^2} \\
&\quad + \left\|(1-\Pi_h)\nabla\left(|u|^2\right)\right\|_{L_T^{(1/\theta+1/p)^{-1}}L^2} \|u\|_{L_T^\theta L^2} \\
&\lesssim \left\|(1-\Pi_h)\left(|u|^2\right)\right\|_{L_T^\infty L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^pL^2} \\
&\quad + \left\|(1-\Pi_h)\nabla\left(|u|^2\right)\right\|_{L_T^{(1/\theta+1/p)^{-1}}L^2} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty L^2}
\end{aligned}$$

By the same argument as above,

$$\left\|(1-\Pi_h)\left(|u|^2\right)\right\|_{L_T^\infty L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L_T^pL^2} \underset{h\to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

We note that u bounded in $L^\infty([0,T];H^1(\mathbf{R}^3)) \subset L^\theta([0,T];L^4(\mathbf{R}^3))$, and ∇u bounded in $L_T^pL^4$, so $\nabla|u|^2$ is bounded in $L_T^{(1/\theta+1/p)^{-1}}L^2$. Invoking Plancherel Theorem and the Dominated Convergence Theorem like above, we infer

$$\left\|(1-\Pi_h)\nabla\left(|u|^2\right)\right\|_{L_T^{(1/\theta+1/p)^{-1}}L^2} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty L^2} \underset{h\to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

This completes the proof for the first case of the second point.

For the remaining cases, we use that $H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is embedded into $L^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d)$: for fixed t,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|R_h(u)(t)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \left(\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma-2} + \|\Pi_h(|u(t)|^2)\|_{L^\infty}^{\sigma-1}\right)\|(1-\Pi_h)(|u(t)|^2)\|_{L^2}\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\lesssim \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma-1}\|(1-\Pi_h)(|u(t)|^2)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^{2\sigma-1}\|(1-\Pi_h)(|u(t)|^2)\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Like in the proof of Proposition 3.1, we use the estimate

$$\|\left(1-\Pi_h\right)f\|_{L^2} \leqslant h^s\|f\|_{H^s}, \tag{4.4}$$

and since $H^s(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is an algebra,

$$\|R_h(u)\|_{L^\infty([0,T];L^2)} \lesssim h^s\|u\|_{L^\infty([0,T];H^s)}^{2\sigma+1}.$$

To conclude the proof, we estimate $\nabla R_h(u)$ in $L^2(\mathbf{R}^d)$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla R_h(u) = \sigma|u|^{2\sigma-2}\left((1-\Pi_h)\left(\nabla\left(|u|^2\right)\right)\right)u \\ + \sigma\left(|u|^{2\sigma-2} - \left(\Pi_h(|u|^2)\right)^{\sigma-1}\right)\Pi_h\left(\nabla\left(|u|^2\right)\right)u \\ + \left(|u|^{2\sigma} - \left(\Pi_h\left(|u|^2\right)\right)^{\sigma}\right)\nabla u,\end{aligned}$$

where the second line is zero is $\sigma = 1$. We estimate successively, thaks to (4.1),

$$\begin{aligned}\left\||u|^{2\sigma-2}\left((1-\Pi_h)\left(\nabla\left(|u|^2\right)\right)\right)u\right\|_{L^2} &\leqslant \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma-1}\left\|(1-\Pi_h)\left(|u|^2\right)\right\|_{H^1}, \\ \left\|\left(|u|^{2\sigma} - \left(\Pi_h\left(|u|^2\right)\right)^{\sigma}\right)\nabla u\right\|_{L^2} &\leqslant \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma-2}\left\|(1-\Pi_h)\left(|u|^2\right)\right\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

and, if $\sigma \geqslant 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\left(|u|^{2\sigma-2} - \left(\Pi_h(|u|^2)\right)^{\sigma-1}\right)\Pi_h\left(\nabla\left(|u|^2\right)\right)u\right\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma-4}\left\|(1-\Pi_h)\left(|u|^2\right)\right\|_{L^2}\left\|\nabla\left(|u|^2\right)\right\|_{L^2}\|u\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma-2}\left\|(1-\Pi_h)\left(|u|^2\right)\right\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Since we have $H^s(\mathbf{R}^d) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d)$, we end up with

$$\|\nabla R_h(u)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\sigma-2}\left\|(1-\Pi_h)\left(|u|^2\right)\right\|_{H^1}.$$

If $s > 1$, (4.4) yields, since in addition $s > d/2$,

$$\left\|(1-\Pi_h)\left(|u|^2\right)\right\|_{H^1} \lesssim h^{s-1}\left\||u|^2\right\|_{H^s} \lesssim h^{s-1}\|u\|_{H^s}^2.$$

If $s = 1$ (a case which may occur only if $d = 1$, since $s > d/2$), we write

$$\left\|\nabla\left(1-\Pi_h\right)\left(|u|^2\right)\right\|_{L^2}^2 \leqslant \int_{|\xi|>1/h}\left|\mathcal{F}\left(\nabla\left(|u|^2\right)\right)(\xi)\right|^2 d\xi.$$

Now since $\nabla\left(|u|^2\right) = 2\,\mathrm{Re}\,\bar{u}\nabla u$ and $u \in H^1(\mathbf{R}) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbf{R})$, $\nabla u \in L^2(\mathbf{R})$, we conclude thanks to the Dominated Convergence Theorem. □

This completes the proof of Theorem 4.3, by choosing $(p_1, q_1) = (p, q)$ or $(\infty, 2)$. □

REFERENCES

[1] T. ALAZARD AND R. CARLES, *Loss of regularity for super-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Math. Ann., 343 (2009), pp. 397–420.

[2] I. BEJENARU AND T. TAO, *Sharp well-posedness and ill-posedness results for a quadratic nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, J. Funct. Anal., 233 (2005), pp. 228–259.

[3] N. BURQ, *Large-time dynamics for the one-dimensional Schrödinger equation*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A, 141 (2011), pp. 227–251.

[4] N. BURQ, P. GÉRARD, AND N. TZVETKOV, *Multilinear eigenfunction estimates and global existence for the three dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4), 38 (2005), pp. 255–301.

[5] N. BURQ, L. THOMANN, AND N. TZVETKOV, *Long time dynamics for the one dimensional non linear Schrödinger equation*. Preprint, archived as `arXiv:1002.4054`, 2010.

[6] N. BURQ AND N. TZVETKOV, *Random data Cauchy theory for supercritical wave equations. I. Local theory*, Invent. Math., 173 (2008), pp. 449–475.

[7] ———, *Random data Cauchy theory for supercritical wave equations. II. A global existence result*, Invent. Math., 173 (2008), pp. 477–496.

[8] R. CARLES, *Geometric optics and instability for semi-classical Schrödinger equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 183 (2007), pp. 525–553.

[9] ———, *On Schrödinger equations with modified dispersion*, Dyn. Partial Differ. Equ., 8 (2011), pp. 173–184.

[10] R. CARLES, E. DUMAS, AND C. SPARBER, *Geometric optics and instability for NLS and Davey-Stewartson models*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), (2012).
[11] T. CAZENAVE, *Semilinear Schrödinger equations*, vol. 10 of Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics, New York University Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York, 2003.
[12] T. CAZENAVE, D. FANG, AND Z. HAN, *Continuous dependence for NLS in fractional order spaces*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 28 (2011), pp. 135–147.
[13] T. CAZENAVE AND F. WEISSLER, *The Cauchy problem for the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in H^s*, Nonlinear Anal. TMA, 14 (1990), pp. 807–836.
[14] M. CHRIST, J. COLLIANDER, AND T. TAO, *Ill-posedness for nonlinear Schrödinger and wave equations*. `http://arxiv.org/abs/math.AP/0311048`.
[15] J. COLLIANDER, M. KEEL, G. STAFFILANI, H. TAKAOKA, AND T. TAO, *Almost conservation laws and global rough solutions to a nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Math. Res. Lett., 9 (2002), pp. 659–682.
[16] A. DEBUSSCHE AND E. FAOU, *Modified energy for split-step methods applied to the linear Schrödinger equation*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 47 (2009), pp. 3705–3719.
[17] J. GINIBRE AND G. VELO, *On the global Cauchy problem for some nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 1 (1984), pp. 309–323.
[18] L. I. IGNAT AND E. ZUAZUA, *Convergence rates for dispersive approximation schemes to nonlinear Schrödinger equations*. Preprint, archived as `arXiv:1109.0377`, 2011.
[19] T. KATO, *On nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Ann. IHP (Phys. Théor.), 46 (1987), pp. 113–129.
[20] C. KENIG, G. PONCE, AND L. VEGA, *On the ill-posedness of some canonical dispersive equations*, Duke Math. J., 106 (2001), pp. 617–633.
[21] G. LEBEAU, *Non linear optic and supercritical wave equation*, Bull. Soc. Roy. Sci. Liège, 70 (2001), pp. 267–306 (2002). Hommage à Pascal Laubin.
[22] ———, *Perte de régularité pour les équations d'ondes sur-critiques*, Bull. Soc. Math. France, 133 (2005), pp. 145–157.
[23] G. MÉTIVIER, *Exemples d'instabilités pour des équations d'ondes non linéaires (d'après G. Lebeau)*, Astérisque, (2004), pp. vii, 63–75.
[24] L. THOMANN, *Instabilities for supercritical Schrödinger equations in analytic manifolds*, J. Differential Equations, 245 (2008), pp. 249–280.
[25] Y. TSUTSUMI, *L^2–solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger equations and nonlinear groups*, Funkcial. Ekvac., 30 (1987), pp. 115–125.

CNRS & UNIV. MONTPELLIER 2, MATHÉMATIQUES, CC 051, 34095 MONTPELLIER, FRANCE
E-mail address: `Remi.Carles@math.cnrs.fr`