

Radial blow-up standing solutions for the semilinear wave equation

Maissâ Boughrara and Hatem Zaag

Université Sorbonne Paris Nord, LAGA, CNRS (UMR 7539), F-93430 Villetaneuse, France.

Abstract

We consider the semilinear wave equation with a power nonlinearity in the radial case. Given $r_0 > 0$, we construct a blow-up solution such that the solution near $(r_0, T(r_0))$ converges exponentially to a soliton. Moreover, we show that r_0 is a non-characteristic point. For that, we translate the question in self-similar variables and use a modulation technique. We will also use energy estimates from the one dimensional case treated in [MZ07]. Of course because of the radial setting, we have an additional gradient term which is delicate to handle. That's precisely the purpose of our paper.

1 Introduction

We are concerned with blow-up phenomena for the following semilinear wave equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 U = \Delta U + |U|^{p-1}U, \\ U(\cdot, 0) = U_0, \\ U_t(\cdot, 0) = U_1, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $1 < p$, if $N \geq 2$ then $p \leq 1 + \frac{4}{N-1}$, and $(U_0, U_1) \in H_{loc,u}^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \times L_{loc,u}^2$. The space $L_{loc,u}^2$ is the set of all v in L_{loc}^2 such that

$$\|v\|_{L_{loc,u}^2} := \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left(\int_{|x-a|<1} |v(x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < +\infty,$$

and the space $H_{loc,u}^1 = \{v \in L_{loc,u}^2 \mid \nabla v \in L_{loc,u}^2\}$. The Cauchy problem of (1.1) can be solved locally in time in the space $H_{loc,u}^1 \times L_{loc,u}^2$ (see [GSV92] and [LS95]). For the existence of blow-up solutions, it follows from ODE techniques or the energy-based blow-up criterion of Levine in [Lev74].

Concerning the blow-up behavior for general solutions (i.e. with no symmetry assumptions), we first mention the result of Merle and Zaag in [MZ03], [MZ05a] and [MZ05b] who showed that the blow-up rate is given by $C(T-t)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}$, i.e. the solution of the associated ODE $u'' = u^p$, where T is the (local) blow-up time.

As for the derivation of the asymptotic behavior of the blow-up, it depends on the dimension. Indeed, if $N = 1$, all has been described by Merle and Zaag in a series of papers ([MZ07], [MZ08], [MZ12b], [MZ12a]...etc). In higher dimension $N \geq 2$, some partial results are available in [MZ15], [MZ16]... etc.

The main obstruction in the generalization of the one-dimensional case to higher dimension stems from the lack of a classification of all self-similar solutions of (1.1) in the energy spaces. For that reason, Merle and Zaag addressed in [MZ11] the radial case, which reduces to a perturbed one dimensional case, if we focus on the blow-up behavior outside the origin. In particular, they showed that the solution in similarity variables converges to the one-dimensional soliton. However, they gave no example of initial data which behaves like that. This is precisely our aim in this paper. Therefore, we assume here that U is a radial solution. Introducing

$$u(r, t) = U(x, t) \text{ where } r = |x|, \quad (1.2)$$

we rewrite (1.1) as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 u = \partial_r^2 u + \frac{(N-1)}{r} \partial_r u + |u|^{p-1} u, \\ \partial_r u(0, \cdot) = 0, \\ u(\cdot, 0) = u_0, \\ u_t(\cdot, 0) = u_1. \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

If u blows up then we define a 1-Lipschitz curve $\Gamma = \{(r, T(r)), r \geq 0\}$ such that the domain of definition D called the maximum influence domain of u is written as the following

$$D = \{(r, t) | t < T(r)\}.$$

Γ is called the blow-up graph of u . A point r_0 is a non-characteristic point if there are

$$\delta_0 \in (0, 1) \text{ and } t_0 < T(r_0) \text{ such that } u \text{ is defined on } \mathcal{C}_{r_0, T(r_0), \delta_0} \cap \{t \geq t_0\} \cap \{r \geq 0\}, \quad (1.4)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{\bar{r}, \bar{t}, \bar{\delta}} = \{(r, t) | t < \bar{t} - \bar{\delta}|r - \bar{r}|\}$. We denote by $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ (resp. $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$) the set of non characteristic (resp. characteristic) points.

1.1 Explicit solutions

Given $r_0 > 0$, $T > 0$, we define for all $|r - r_0| < T - t$, $|d| < 1$ and $\nu > -1 + |d|$ the following family of functions

$$\hat{u}(d, \nu, r_0, T, r, t) = \kappa_0 \frac{(1 - d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{((1 + \nu)(T - t) + d(r - r_0))^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}. \quad (1.5)$$

One may see that $\hat{u}(d, 0, r_0, T)$ is a blow-up solution of (1.3) in one dimension. Given $r_0 > 0$ and $T_0 \leq T(r_0)$, we introduce the following similarity variables

$$\begin{aligned} y &= \frac{r - r_0}{T_0 - t}, \quad s = -\log(T_0 - t). \\ w_{r_0, T_0}(y, s) &= (T_0 - t)^{\frac{2}{p-1}} u(r, t). \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

The function $w = w_{r_0, T_0}$ satisfies the following equation for $|y| < 1$ and $s > -\log T(r_0)$:

$$\partial_s^2 w = \mathcal{L}w - \frac{2(p+1)}{(p-1)^2}w + |w|^{p-1}w - \frac{p+3}{p-1}\partial_s w - 2y\partial_{y,s}^2 w + e^{-s} \frac{(N-1)}{r_0 + ye^{-s}} \partial_y w, \quad (1.7)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}w = \frac{1}{\rho} \partial_y (\rho(1-y^2) \partial_y w) \text{ and } \rho(y) = (1-y^2)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}. \quad (1.8)$$

We have for all $|d| < 1$ the following solitons defined by

$$\kappa(d, y) = \kappa_0 \left(\frac{1-d^2}{(1+dy)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \text{ where } \kappa_0 = \left(\frac{2(p+1)}{(p-1)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \text{ and } |y| < 1. \quad (1.9)$$

Note that $\kappa(d)$ is a stationary solution of (1.7) in one space dimension. We introduce the "generalized solitons" or solitons for short defined for all $|y| < 1$, $|d| < 1$ and $\nu > -1 + |d|$, by $\kappa^*(d, \nu, y) = (\kappa_1^*, \kappa_2^*)(d, \nu, y)$ where

$$\kappa_1^*(d, \nu, y) = \kappa_0 \frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{(1+dy+\nu)^{\frac{2}{p-1}}}, \quad (1.10)$$

$$\kappa_2^*(d, \nu, y) = \nu \partial_\nu \kappa_1^*(d, \nu, y) = -\frac{2\kappa_0 \nu}{p-1} \frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{(1+dy+\nu)^{\frac{p+1}{p-1}}}. \quad (1.11)$$

Notice also that for all $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $\overline{\kappa^*}(d, \mu, y, s) = \kappa^*(d, \mu e^s, y)$ is a solution of the first order vector-valued formulation of (1.7) in dimension one.

1.2 Main results

We first introduce the following spaces:

$$\mathcal{H} = \{(q_1, q_2) \in H_{loc}^1 \times L_{loc}^2 \mid \|(q_1, q_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \int_{-1}^1 (q_1^2 + (q_1')^2(1-y^2) + q_2^2) \rho dy < +\infty\}, \quad (1.12)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \{q_1 \in H_{loc}^1 \mid \|q_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_0}^2 = \int_{-1}^1 (q_1^2 + (q_1')^2(1-y^2)) \rho dy < +\infty\}, \quad (1.13)$$

where ρ is given in (1.8). Note that the norm of the \mathcal{H} space can be defined by the inner product

$$\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \sqrt{\phi(q, q)},$$

where

$$\phi(q, r) = \int_{-1}^1 (q_1 r_1 + q_1' r_1' (1-y^2) + q_2 r_2) \rho dy. \quad (1.14)$$

Using integration by parts and the definition of \mathcal{L} in (1.8), we have the following identity

$$\phi(q, r) = \int_{-1}^1 (q_1(-\mathcal{L}r_1 + r_1) + q_2 r_2) \rho dy.$$

The following is our main result giving us the existence of blow-up solutions converging to solitons, for well-chosen initial data.

Theorem 1 (A solution converging to a soliton in similarity variables). *There exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$, such that for all $r_0 > 0$ and $\hat{d}_0 \in (-1, 1)$, there exist $s_0 > -\log r_0$, $\nu_0, d_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that equation (1.3) with the initial data given by*

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_0(r) \\ u_1(r) \end{pmatrix} = \chi(r) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{u}(d_0, \nu_0, r_0, T_0, r, 0) \\ \frac{1}{1+\nu_0} \partial_t \hat{u}(d_0, \nu_0, r_0, T_0, r, 0) \end{pmatrix}, \text{ for all } r \geq r_0, \quad (1.15)$$

with $T_0 = e^{-s_0}$, has a solution $u(r, t)$ defined for all $(r, t) \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^2$ such that $0 \leq t < T(r)$ for some 1-Lipschitz curve $r \mapsto T(r)$. Moreover, r_0 is a non-characteristic point, $T(r_0) = T_0$ and for $w = w_{r_0, T(r_0)}$, we have $(w(s), \partial_s w(s)) \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfies

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w(s) \\ \partial_s w(s) \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \kappa(\hat{d}_0) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C e^{-\delta(s-s_0)-s_0}. \quad (1.16)$$

where \hat{u} and κ are given in (1.5), (1.9), and $\chi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty$, with $\chi \equiv 1$ on $[r_0 - T_0 - \varepsilon_0, r_0 + T_0 + \varepsilon_0]$, $\chi_0 \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R} \setminus [r_0 - T_0 - 2\varepsilon_0, r_0 + T_0 + 2\varepsilon_0]$.

Remark 1.1. *For the case of $N = 1$ or of $\hat{d}_0 = 0$, we have an explicit solution. Indeed:*

- if $\hat{d}_0 = 0$, then $u(r, t) = \kappa(T_0 - t)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}$,
- if $N = 1$, then $u(r, t) = \hat{u}(\hat{d}_0, 0, T_0, r, t)$ defined in (1.5),

for all for $T_0 > 0$. Therefore, the result is meaningful when $N \geq 2$ and $\hat{d}_0 \neq 0$.

Remark 1.2. *Our proof relies on the use of similiary variables (1.6). In that setting, we will linearize equation (1.7) around the soliton $\kappa(\hat{d}_0)$, and use a modulation technique together with energy methods from the one dimensional case treated in [MZ07]. Accordingly our focus will be on the term $e^{-s} \frac{(N-1)}{r_0 + ye^{-s}} \partial_y w$ which need a delicate treatment that is precisely the goal of our paper.*

Using the converging technique of [MZ05b] and proceeding as in [MZ07] for $N = 1$ and [MZ11] for $N \geq 2$ in the radial case, we derive the following stronger convergence:

Corollary 1.3 (Convergence in $H^1 \times L^2(-1, 1)$). *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1, it holds that:*

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w(s) \\ \partial_s w(s) \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \kappa(\hat{d}_0) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{H^1(-1,1) \times L^2(-1,1)} \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

We can restate this corollary in the initial variables, but let us first give the following definition of the equivalence of functions in the normalized $L^2_{\{|r-r_0|<T_0-t\}}$.

Definition 1.4 (Equivalence of functions in the normalized $L^2_{\{|r-r_0|<T_0-t\}}$ norm). *Let $g = g(r, t)$ and $f = f(r, t)$ be two functions defined on $(\mathbb{R}^+)^2$, such that $|r - r_0| < T_0 - t$. We say that f and g are equivalent ($f \sim g$) if*

$$\int_{|r-r_0|<T_0-t} (f(r, t) - g(r, t))^2 dr = o\left(\int_{|r-r_0|<T_0-t} f(r, t)^2 dr\right) \text{ as } t \mapsto T.$$

Therefore, using (1.6), we obtain the following equivalences in the initial set of variables $u(r, t)$:

Corollary 1.5 (Profile in the $u(x, t)$ variables). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, we have the following equivalences as $t \rightarrow T_0$:*

$$u \sim \hat{u}(\hat{d}_0, 0, r_0, T_0), \quad \partial_r u \sim \partial_r \hat{u}(\hat{d}_0, 0, r_0, T_0), \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_t u \sim \partial_t \hat{u}(\hat{d}_0, 0, r_0, T_0).$$

From the classification of the blow-up behavior outside the origin for radial solutions given in [MZ11], we have the following corollary:

Corollary 1.6 (Differentiability and stability with respect to the blow-up point). *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1, the following holds:*

- **(Differentiability of $r \mapsto T(r)$)** *There exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that the curve T is of class C^1 in $[r_0 - \varepsilon, r_0 + \varepsilon]$. Moreover, $\hat{d}_0 = T'(r_0)$.*
- **(Blow-up behavior near r_0)** *For all $r_1 \in [r_0 - \varepsilon, r_0 + \varepsilon]$, we have that*

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_{r_1, T(r_1)}(s) \\ \partial_s w_{r_1, T(r_1)}(s) \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \kappa(T'(r_1)) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{H^1(-1,1) \times L^2(-1,1)} \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

Merle and Zaag in [MZ11] proved the stability of the profile (1.16) in the radial setting with respect to the initial data. This gives us the stability of the solution constructed in Theorem 1. indeed:

Corollary 1.7 (Stability with respect to the initial data in the radial setting). *Let us denote by \bar{u} , the solution constructed in Theorem 1 and a bar on all the items associated with \bar{u} . Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1, there exist $\eta > 0$, $K_0 > 0$ such that for all (U_0, U_1) radial initial data such that $\|(U_0, U_1) - (\bar{U}_0, \bar{U}_1)\|_{H^1 \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq \varepsilon_0$, the solution $u(r, t)$ of (1.3) with initial data (u_0, u_1) blows up in finite time with a blow-up curve $r \rightarrow T(r)$, and*

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w_{r_0, T(r_0)}(s) \\ \partial_s w_{r_0, T(r_0)}(s) \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \kappa(T'(r_0)) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{H^1 \times L^2(-1,1)} \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow +\infty} 0$$

and

$$|\arg \tanh |T'(r_0)| - \arg \tanh |\bar{T}'(r_0)|| + \frac{|T'(r_0) - \bar{T}'(r_0)|}{\sqrt{1 + |T'(r_0)|}} \leq K_0 \eta.$$

Remark 1.8. Here $U_0(x) = u_0(|x|)$ as in (1.2) and the same for U, \bar{U}_0 and \bar{U} .

Remark 1.9. In fact, Merle and Zaag in [MZ15] proved the stability in the general case, even in the non-radial setting. This implies that the constructed solution is stable with respect to non-radial perturbation in initial data. In order to avoid introduction of more notations, we invite the reader to guess the non-radial case of corollary 1.7, simply by checking [MZ15].

This paper is organized as the following:

Section 2: We reformulate the goal of this work in similarity variables and introduce some useful tools for the proof.

Section 3: We obtain an exponential bound of the difference between the solution of the vector-valued version of (1.7) and the generalized soliton thanks to some modulation technique and energy estimates.

Section 4: We prove estimate (1.16) by trapping the parameter d, ν and the difference between the solution and the generalized soliton in some shrinking set.

Section 5: We conclude the proof of Theorem 1 by obtaining the initial data (1.15) in the initial variables. Note that we don't give the proof of corollaries 1.3, 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7, as they follow in a straightforward way from earlier literature.

2 Setting of the problem

Given $r_0 > 0$ and $\hat{d}_0 \in (-1, 1)$, we aim at constructing a solution w to the Cauchy problem of equation (1.7), such that

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w(s) \\ \partial_s w(s) \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \kappa(\hat{d}_0) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } s \rightarrow +\infty.$$

For that aim, we will take initial data

$$\begin{pmatrix} w(y, s_0) \\ \partial_s w(y, s_0) \end{pmatrix} = \kappa^*(d_0, \nu_0, y), \quad (2.1)$$

where $s_0 > -\log r_0$ will be fixed large enough later, $|\hat{d}_0 - d_0| \leq Ae^{-s_0}$, and $|\nu_0| \leq Ae^{-s_0}$, and the constant $A > 0$ will be fixed later. This is the aim of this section:

Proposition 2.1 (Solution converging to a soliton in the $w(y, s)$ setting). *There exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$, for all $r_0 > 0$ and $\hat{d}_0 \in (-1, 1)$, there exist $s_0 > -\log r_0$, $\nu_0, d_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that equation (1.7) with the initial data given by (2.1) is defined for all $(y, s) \in (-1, 1) \times [s_0, \infty)$ and satisfies $(w(s), \partial_s w(s)) \in \mathcal{H}$, and there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} w(s) \\ \partial_s w(s) \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \kappa(\hat{d}_0) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq Ce^{-\delta(s-s_0)-s_0}. \quad (2.2)$$

A solution of equation (1.7) with initial data (2.1) will be denoted by $w(s_0, d_0, \nu_0, y, s)$, or, when there is no ambiguity, by $w(y, s)$ or $w(s)$ for short. We define the vector-valued function $q = (q_1, q_2)$ as the following

$$\begin{pmatrix} w(y, s) \\ \partial_s w(y, s) \end{pmatrix} = \kappa^*(d(s), \nu(s), y) + q(y, s), \quad (2.3)$$

where d and ν will be chosen later through a modulation technique.

We define as in [MZ07, Lemma 4.4] and [MZ16, Lemma 2.4], for all $|d| < 1$ and $\lambda \in \{0, 1\}$, $W_\lambda^d \in \mathcal{H}$ continuous in terms of d by

$$W_{1,2}^d(y) = c_1(d) \frac{1 - y^2}{(1 + dy)^{\frac{2}{p-1} + 1}}, \quad W_{0,2}^d(y) = c_0(d) \frac{y + d}{(1 + dy)^{\frac{2}{p-1} + 1}}. \quad (2.4)$$

$W_{\lambda,1}^d$ is uniquely determined by the solution r of the following equation

$$-\mathcal{L}r + r = \left(\lambda - \frac{p+3}{p-1} \right) r_2 - 2yr'_2 + \frac{8}{p-1} \frac{r_2}{1-y^2},$$

with $r_2 = W_{\lambda,2}^d$ and the C^1 function $c_\lambda(d) > 0$ are given by the following

$$c_\lambda(d) = c_\lambda(1 - d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}, \quad \text{with } \frac{1}{c_\lambda} = 2\left(\lambda + \frac{2}{p-1}\right) \int_{-1}^1 \left(\frac{y^2}{1-y^2} \right)^{1-\lambda} \rho(y) dy.$$

We also introduce for $\lambda = 0, 1$ and for any $v \in \mathcal{H}$.

$$\pi_\lambda^d(v) = \phi(W_\lambda^d, v), \quad (2.5)$$

where ϕ is defined (1.14).

3 Dynamics in similarity variables

The aim of this section is to obtain an exponential bound of q . This will be achieved in two steps, given in two separate subsections:

We first kill nonnegative modes of the linear operator, given in (3.15), around the soliton. To do such a thing, we need to choose the correct parameters in (2.3), using a modulation technique.

Then, we project the equation satisfied by q on the nonnegative directions and use energy estimates to derive the exponential bound on q .

3.1 Modulation theory

Here, we impose some orthogonality conditions related to nonnegative direction of the linearized operator of equation (3.6) satisfied by q . The following modulation technique from Merle and Zaag in [MZ12b] allows us to do such a thing.

Proposition 3.1 (Modulation technique). *For all $B \geq 1$, there exists $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(B) > 0$, such that for all $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, if $v \in \mathcal{H}$ and for $(\hat{d}, \hat{\nu}) \in (-1, 1) \times \mathbb{R}$, such that*

$$-1 + \frac{1}{B} \leq \frac{\hat{\nu}}{1 - |\hat{d}|} \leq B, \quad \|\hat{q}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \varepsilon,$$

where

$$\hat{q} = v - \kappa^*(\hat{d}, \hat{\nu}) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{d}^* = \frac{\hat{d}}{1 + \hat{\nu}} = -\tanh \hat{\xi}^*.$$

Then, there exists $(d, \nu) \in (-1, 1) \times \mathbb{R}$ such that

(i) for $l = 0, 1$, $\pi_l^{d^*}(q) = 0$, where $q = v - \kappa^*(d, \nu)$.

(ii) $\left| \frac{\nu}{1-|d|} - \frac{\hat{\nu}}{1-|\hat{d}|} \right| + |\xi^* - \hat{\xi}^*| \leq C(B)\|\hat{q}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C(B)\varepsilon$.

(iii) $-1 + \frac{1}{2B} \leq \frac{\nu}{1-|d|} \leq B + 1$ and $\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \varepsilon$.

where $d^* = \frac{d}{1+\nu} = -\tanh \xi^*$.

Proof. In [MZ12b, Proposition 3.1], the proof is given for functions near multisolitons. A careful reading allows to see that our present case, with only one soliton follows from the same proof. \square

Taking $B = 2$ and s_0 large enough, we can apply Proposition 3.1 to $v = \begin{pmatrix} w(s_0) \\ \partial_s w(s_0) \end{pmatrix}$, $\hat{d} = d_0$ and $\hat{\nu} = \nu_0$, introduced in (2.1). Therefore, $\hat{q} = 0$. From the continuity of the flow associated with equation (1.7) in \mathcal{H} , we have a maximal $\bar{s} = \bar{s}(s_0, d_0, \nu_0)$ such that the solution w exists for all times $s \in [s_0, \bar{s})$ and can be modulated in the sense that there exist $d = d(s)$ and $\nu = \nu(s)$, such that for all $s \in [s_0, \bar{s})$

$$\begin{pmatrix} w(s, y) \\ \partial_s w(s, y) \end{pmatrix} = \kappa^*(d(s), \nu(s), y) + q(s, y) \quad \text{with} \quad \pi_l^{d^*(s)}(q(s)) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad l = 0, 1, \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$d^* = \frac{d}{1 + \nu}, \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$\frac{|\nu|}{1 - |d|} \leq s_0^{-1/4}, \quad \|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq s_0^{-1/2}. \quad (3.3)$$

which lead us to the following

$$|d^*| < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{1 - d^{*2}}{1 - d^2} \leq 2, \quad \text{provided that } s_0 \text{ is large enough.} \quad (3.4)$$

Then, two cases arise:

- Either $\bar{s} = +\infty$.
- Or, $\bar{s} < +\infty$ and one of the symbols in (3.3) is an $=$ at \bar{s} .

We see that controlling the solution $w \in \mathcal{H}$ is equivalent to controlling $q \in \mathcal{H}$, $d(s) \in (-1, 1)$ and $\nu(s) \in \mathbb{R}$.

3.2 Energy estimates

Here we derive an exponential bound on q , using energy estimates.

Proposition 3.2 (An exponential bound). *There exist $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $C^* > 0$ such that for s_0 large enough and for all $s \in [s_0, \bar{s})$, we have*

$$\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \leq C^* e^{-\delta(s-s_0)-s_0}.$$

Before starting the proof of Proposition 3.2, let us first derive an equation on q . Using the remark below (1.11) and the first order vector-valued formulation of (1.7) in dimension one, we have

$$\nu \partial_\nu \kappa^* = \partial_s \overline{\kappa^*} = \begin{pmatrix} \kappa_2^* \\ \mathcal{L}\kappa_1^* - \frac{2(p+1)}{(p-1)^2} \kappa_1^* + \kappa_1^{*p} - \frac{p+3}{p-1} \kappa_2^* - 2y \partial_y \kappa_2^* \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.5)$$

From (1.7), (2.3) and (3.5), the equation of q is given by the following

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s \begin{pmatrix} q_1 \\ q_2 \end{pmatrix} = & L_{d,\nu} \begin{pmatrix} q_1 \\ q_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ f_{d,\nu}(q_1) \end{pmatrix} - d' \partial_d \kappa^*(d, \nu) - (\nu' - \nu) \partial_\nu \kappa^*(d, \nu) \\ & + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ e^{-s} \frac{(N-1)}{r_0 + y e^{-s}} \partial_y (\kappa_1^*(d, \nu) + q_1) \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where

$$L_{d,\nu} \begin{pmatrix} q_1 \\ q_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} q_2 \\ \mathcal{L}q_1 + \psi_{d,\nu} q_1 - \frac{p+3}{p-1} q_2 - 2y \partial_y q_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.7)$$

with

$$\psi_{d,\nu} = p \kappa_1^*(d, \nu)^{p-1} - \frac{2(p+1)}{(p-1)^2}, \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$f_{d,\nu}(q_1) = |\kappa_1^*(d, \nu) + q_1|^{p-1} (\kappa_1^*(d, \nu) + q_1) - \kappa_1^*(d, \nu)^p - p \kappa_1^*(d, \nu)^{p-1} q_1. \quad (3.9)$$

We introduce

$$\varphi(q, r) = \int_{-1}^1 (q_1' r_1' (1 - y^2) - \psi_{d,\nu} q_1 r_1 + q_2 r_2) \rho dy, \quad (3.10)$$

where $\psi_{d,\nu}$ is defined in (3.8). We have the following useful results:

Lemma 3.3. (i) *(Dynamics of the parameters) There exists $\bar{C} > 0$ such that for s_0 large enough and for all $s \in [s_0, \bar{s})$, we have*

$$\frac{|d'| + |\nu' - \nu|}{1 - d^{*2}} \leq \bar{C} \left(\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}} \frac{|\nu|}{1 - d^{*2}} + e^{-s} \right). \quad (3.11)$$

(ii) We have the following estimate of $\varphi(q, q)$

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\varphi(q, q) + R\right)' \leq \frac{C}{s_0^{1/4}}\varphi(q, q) + \left(Ce^{-s} - \frac{4}{p-1}\right) \int_{-1}^1 q_2^2 \frac{\rho}{1-y^2} dy + Ce^{-s},$$

where

$$R = - \int_{-1}^1 \mathcal{F}_{\nu, d}(q_1) dy, \quad \text{with } \mathcal{F}_{\nu, d}(q_1) = \int_0^{q_1} f_{\nu, d}(\xi) d\xi, \quad (3.12)$$

and $f_{\nu, d}$ is defined in (3.9).

(iii) We have an additional estimate

$$\frac{d}{ds} \int_{-1}^1 q_1 q_2 \rho = -\frac{9}{10}\varphi(q, q) + C \int_{-1}^1 q_2^2 \frac{\rho}{1-y^2} + Ce^{-s}.$$

Proof. Proof of (i): We project equation (3.6) with the projector π_λ^d (2.5) for $\lambda = 0$ and $\lambda = 1$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\lambda^{d^*}(\partial_s q) &= \pi_\lambda^{d^*}(L_{d, \nu} q) + \pi_\lambda^{d^*} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ f_{d, \nu}(q_1) \end{pmatrix} - d' \pi_\lambda^{d^*}(\partial_d \kappa^*) + (\nu' - \nu) \pi_\lambda^{d^*}(\partial_\nu \kappa^*) \\ &+ \pi_\lambda^{d^*} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ e^{-s} \frac{(N-1)}{r_0 + ye^{-s}} \partial_y(\kappa_1^* + q_1) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Defining $\alpha_\lambda = \pi_\lambda^{d^*}(q)$ for $\lambda = 0, 1$, where $\pi_\lambda^{d^*}$ is defined in (2.5), we know from (3.1) that for all $s \in [s_0, \bar{s})$, $\alpha_\lambda(s) = 0$, hence $\alpha'_\lambda(s) = 0$. Together with [MZ07, (194)], we have

$$|\pi_\lambda^{d^*}(\partial_s q) - \alpha'_\lambda(s)| = |\pi_\lambda^{d^*}(\partial_s q)| \leq \frac{C}{1-d^{*2}} |d^{*'}| \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (3.14)$$

Next, we write (3.7) as

$$\begin{aligned} L_{d, \nu} q &= \begin{pmatrix} q_2 \\ \mathcal{L}q_1 + \psi_{d^*} q_1 - \frac{p+3}{p-1} q_2 - 2y \partial_y q_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ p(\kappa_1^*(d, \nu)^{p-1} - \kappa(d^*)^{p-1}) q_1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &=: L_{d^*} q + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ V q_1 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

where

$$\psi_{d^*} = p\kappa(d^*)^{p-1} - \frac{2(p+1)}{(p-1)^2}.$$

From [MZ07, (195)] and [MZ12b, (i) of Claim 3.2], we have

$$\pi_\lambda^{d^*}(L_{d^*} q) = \lambda \alpha_\lambda = 0, \quad (3.16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0^{d^*}(\partial_\nu \kappa^*) &= 0, & -\frac{C}{1-d^{*2}} &\leq \pi_1^{d^*}(\partial_\nu \kappa^*) \leq -\frac{1}{C(1-d^{*2})}, \\ -\frac{C}{1-d^{*2}} &\leq \pi_0^{d^*}(\partial_d \kappa^*) \leq -\frac{1}{C(1-d^{*2})}, & |\pi_1^{d^*}(\partial_d \kappa^*)| &\leq \frac{C}{1-d^{*2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

From similar analysis as in [MZ12b, Proof of Lemma C.2, page 2900] and [MZ12a, (C.7)], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \pi_\lambda^{d^*} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ Vq_1 \end{pmatrix} \right| &\leq \frac{C|\nu|}{1-d^{*2}} \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}, \\ \left| \pi_\lambda^d \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ f(q_1) \end{pmatrix} \right| &\leq C \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Therefore, we see from definitions (1.9) and (2.4) of $\kappa(d^*)$ and $W_{\lambda,2}^{d^*}$ that $W_{\lambda,2}^{d^*} \leq C\kappa(d^*)$, Together with definition (2.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \pi_\lambda^{d^*} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ e^{-s} \frac{(N-1)}{r_0 + ye^{-s}} \partial_y (\kappa_1^*(d, \nu) + q_1) \end{pmatrix} \right| &= \left| (N-1)e^{-s} \int_{-1}^1 W_{\lambda,2}^{d^*} \frac{1}{r_0 + ye^{-s}} \partial_y (\kappa_1^*(d, \nu) + q_1) \rho \right| \\ &\leq \frac{Ce^{-s}}{r_0 - e^{-s}} \left| \int_{-1}^1 \kappa(d^*) \partial_y (\kappa_1^*(d, \nu) + q_1) \rho \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

Using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, Lemma A.1 and (1.12), we have for the second term

$$\left| \int_{-1}^1 \kappa(d^*) \partial_y q_1(d, \nu) \rho \right| \leq \left(\int_{-1}^1 \kappa^2(d^*) \frac{\rho}{1-y^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{-1}^1 \partial_y q_1(d, \nu) (1-y^2) \rho \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (3.20)$$

For the first term, with the same computations, we obtain

$$\left| \int_{-1}^1 \kappa(d^*) \partial_y \kappa_1^*(d, \nu) \rho \right| \leq C \|\kappa^*(d, \nu)\|_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (3.21)$$

Using (A.3) and (A.4), we obtain the following bound on $\kappa^*(d, \nu)$ for s_0 is large enough

$$\|\kappa^*(d, \nu)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C. \quad (3.22)$$

Combining this with (3.3), (3.19), (3.20) and (3.21) we obtain for all $s \in [s_0, \bar{s})$,

$$\left| \pi_\lambda^{d^*} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ e^{-s} \frac{(N-1)}{r_0 + ye^{-s}} \partial_y (\kappa_1^*(d, \nu) + q_1) \end{pmatrix} \right| \leq Ce^{-s} (1 + \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq Ce^{-s}. \quad (3.23)$$

Combining (3.13), (3.14), (3.15) (3.16), (3.17), (3.18) and (3.23), we have for $\lambda = 0$

$$\frac{|d'|}{1-d^{*2}} \leq C \left(\frac{|d^{*'}| + |\nu|}{1-d^{*2}} \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + e^{-s} \right). \quad (3.24)$$

With the same computations but for $\lambda = 1$ and with (3.24), we have

$$\frac{|\nu' - \nu|}{1-d^{*2}} \leq C \left(\frac{|d^{*'}| + |\nu|}{1-d^{*2}} \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + e^{-s} \right). \quad (3.25)$$

Using (3.2) and (3.4), for s_0 large enough, we have the following

$$\frac{|d^{*'}|}{1-d^{*2}} \leq C^* \frac{|d'| + |\nu - \nu'| + |\nu|}{1-d^{*2}}. \quad (3.26)$$

Therefore combining (3.24), (3.25), (3.4), (3.26), with the (3.3) for s_0 , we obtain (3.11), and concludes the proof of item (i).

Proof of (ii): One may see that with similar computation as in [MZ12b, (C.25), (C.26) and (C.27)] that we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{2} \partial_s \varphi(q, q) - \varphi(\partial_s q, q) \right| \leq C \frac{|d'| + |\nu'|}{1-d^{*2}} \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

With (3.11), we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{2} \partial_s \varphi(q, q) - \varphi(\partial_s q, q) \right| \leq C \left(\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}} \frac{|\nu|}{1-d^{*2}} + e^{-s} \right) \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

Together with (3.3) and (3.4), taking s_0 large enough, we obtain

$$\left| \frac{1}{2} \partial_s \varphi(q, q) - \varphi(\partial_s q, q) \right| \leq \frac{C}{s_0^{3/4}} \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \quad (3.27)$$

Using (3.6), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\partial_s q, q) &= \varphi(L_{d,\nu} q, q) + \varphi \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ f_{d,\nu}(q_1) \end{pmatrix}, q \right) - d' \varphi(\partial_d \kappa^*, q) - (\nu' - \nu) \varphi(\partial_\nu \kappa^*, q) \\ &\quad + \varphi \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ e^{-s} \frac{(N-1)}{r_0 + y e^{-s}} \partial_y (\kappa_1^* + q_1) \end{pmatrix}, q \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

where φ is defined in (3.10). We have from [MZ07, (208)], the following estimate

$$\varphi(L_{d,\nu} q, q) = -\frac{4}{p-1} \int_{-1}^1 q_2^2 \frac{\rho}{1-y^2} dy, \quad (3.29)$$

With similar computations as in [MZ12b, (C.29) and (C.31)], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |d' \varphi(\partial_d \kappa^*, q) + (\nu' - \nu) \varphi(\partial_\nu \kappa^*, q)| &\leq C \frac{|d'| + |\nu' - \nu|}{1-d^{*2}} \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}, \\ \left| R' + \varphi \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ f_{d,\nu}(q_1) \end{pmatrix}, q \right) \right| &\leq C \frac{|d'| + |\nu'| + |\nu|}{1-d^*} \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

With (3.11) and (3.3), we obtain by taking s_0 large enough

$$\begin{aligned} |d' \varphi(\partial_d \kappa^*, q) + (\nu' - \nu) \varphi(\partial_\nu \kappa^*, q)| &\leq \frac{C}{s_0^{1/4}} (\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + e^{-s}), \\ \left| R' + \varphi \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ f_{d,\nu}(q_1) \end{pmatrix}, q \right) \right| &\leq \frac{C}{s_0^{1/4}} \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

For the last term, from the definition of φ in (3.10) and using (A.1) (3.22) and (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \varphi \left(\left(e^{-s} \frac{(N-1)}{r_0 + ye^{-s}} \partial_y (\kappa_1^* + q_1) \right), q \right) \right| &= (N-1)e^{-s} \left| \int_{-1}^1 \frac{1}{r_0 + ye^{-s}} \partial_y (\kappa_1^* + q_1) q_2 \rho \right| \\
&\leq e^{-s} \frac{(N-1)}{r_0 - e^{-s}} \left(\left| \int_{-1}^1 \partial_y \kappa_1^* q_2 \rho \right| + \left| \int_{-1}^1 \partial_y q_1 q_2 \rho \right| \right) \\
&\leq Ce^{-s} (\|\kappa_1^*\|_{\mathcal{H}_0} + \|q_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_0}) \left(\int_{-1}^1 q_2^2 \frac{\rho}{1-y^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq Ce^{-s} (1 + \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \left(1 + \int_{-1}^1 q_2^2 \frac{\rho}{1-y^2} \right). \\
&\leq Ce^{-s} \left(1 + \int_{-1}^1 q_2^2 \frac{\rho}{1-y^2} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

Gathering the estimates (3.27), (3.28), (3.29), (3.30), and (3.31), we have for s_0 sufficiently large that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{1}{2} \varphi(q, q) + R \right)' &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_s \varphi(q, q) - \varphi(\partial_s q, q) + \varphi(\partial_s q, q) + R' \\
&\leq \frac{C}{s_0^{1/4}} \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \left(Ce^{-s} - \frac{4}{p-1} \right) \int_{-1}^1 q_2^2 \frac{\rho}{1-y^2} dy + Ce^{-s}.
\end{aligned}$$

with (A.5), we obtain (ii).

Proof of (iii): From (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{ds} \int_{-1}^1 q_1 q_2 \rho &= \int_{-1}^1 \partial_s q_1 q_2 \rho + \int_{-1}^1 q_1 \partial_s q_2 \rho \\
&= \int_{-1}^1 q_2^2 \rho - d' \int_{-1}^1 \partial_d \kappa^*(d, \nu) \cdot (q_2, q_1) \rho - (\nu' - \nu) \int_{-1}^1 \partial_\nu \kappa^*(d, \nu) \cdot (q_2, q_1) \rho \\
&\quad + \int_{-1}^1 q_1 (\mathcal{L}q_1 + \psi_{d,\nu} q_1 - \frac{p+3}{p-1} q_2 - 2y \partial_y q_2) \rho + \int_{-1}^1 q_1 f_{d,\nu}(q_1) \rho \\
&\quad + e^{-s} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{(N-1)}{r_0 + ye^{-s}} q_1 \partial_y (\kappa_1^*(d, \nu) + q_1) \rho,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

where the dot “ \cdot ” stands for the inner product coordinate by coordinate. As in [MZ12b,

page 2904], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-1}^1 q_2^2 \rho &\leq \int_{-1}^1 q_2^2 \frac{\rho}{1-y^2}, \\
\int_{-1}^1 q_1 (\mathcal{L}q_1 + \psi_{d,\nu} q_1) \rho &\leq -\varphi(q, q) + \int_{-1}^1 q_2^2 \frac{\rho}{1-y^2}, \\
\left| \int_{-1}^1 -\frac{p+3}{p-1} q_1 q_2 - 2y q_1 \partial_y q_2 \rho \right| &\leq \frac{1}{100} \varphi(q, q) + C \int_{-1}^1 q_2^2 \frac{\rho}{1-y^2}, \\
\left| \int_{-1}^1 q_1 f_{d,\nu}(q_1) \right| &\leq \frac{1}{100} \varphi(q, q).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

With similar computation as in [MZ12b, page 2904], we have

$$\left| d' \int_{-1}^1 \partial_d \kappa^*(d, \nu) \cdot (q_2, q_1) \rho + (\nu' - \nu) \int_{-1}^1 \partial_\nu \kappa^*(d, \nu) \cdot (q_2, q_1) \rho \right| \leq C \frac{\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}}{1-d^{*2}} (|d'| + |\nu' - \nu|).$$

Together with (3.11), (3.3), (3.4) and (A.5), we obtain for s_0 sufficiently large

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| d' \int_{-1}^1 \partial_d \kappa^*(d, \nu) \cdot (q_2, q_1) \rho + (\nu' - \nu) \int_{-1}^1 \partial_\nu \kappa^*(d, \nu) \cdot (q_2, q_1) \rho \right| \\
\leq C \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \left(\|q\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \frac{|\nu|}{1-d^{*2}} + e^{-s} (1 + \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \right) \\
\leq C \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \\
\leq \frac{1}{100} \varphi(q, q).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

For the last term, we proceed as the following

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| e^{-s} \frac{(N-1)}{r_0 + ye^{-s}} \int_{-1}^1 q_1 \partial_y (\kappa_1^*(d, \nu) + q_1) \rho \right| \\
\leq \frac{Ce^{-s}}{r_0 - e^{-s}} \left(\left| \int_{-1}^1 q_1 \partial_y \kappa_1^*(d, \nu) \rho \right| + \left| \int_{-1}^1 q_1 \partial_y q_1 \right| \right) =: \frac{Ce^{-s}}{r_0 - e^{-s}} (I_1 + I_2).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.35}$$

Using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, Lemma A.1 and (3.22), we obtain

$$I_1 = \left| \int_{-1}^1 q_1 \partial_y \kappa_1^*(d, \nu) \rho \right| \leq \|q_1\|_{L^2 \frac{\rho}{1-y^2}} \|\kappa_1^*(d, \nu)\|_{\mathcal{H}_0} \leq C \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

With the same computations, we obtain for the second integral

$$I_2 \leq C \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

Therefore for s_0 large enough with (3.35) and (3.3) becomes

$$\left| e^{-s} \frac{(N-1)}{r_0 + ye^{-s}} \int_{-1}^1 q_1 \partial_y (\kappa_1^*(d, \nu) + q_1) \rho \right| \leq Ce^{-s} \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}} (1 + \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq Ce^{-s}. \tag{3.36}$$

Combining (3.32), (3.33), (3.34) and (3.36), we obtain (iii). This concludes the proof of Lemma 3.3. \square

From the differential inequalities in lemma 3.3, we can derive some energy functional for equation (3.6) which is easily controllable and equivalent to the norm squared. More precisely, we claim the following:

Corollary 3.4 (Some energy functional). *There exist constants $C^* > 0$ and $\delta \in [0, 1)$ such that for all $s \in [s_0, \bar{s})$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{C^*} \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \leq h \leq C^* \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \text{ and } h' \leq -\delta h + Ce^{-s}, \quad (3.37)$$

where

$$h = \frac{1}{2} \varphi(q, q) - \int_{-1}^1 \mathcal{F}(q_1) \rho + \eta \int_{-1}^1 q_1 q_2 \rho,$$

with $\mathcal{F}(q_1)$ is defined in (3.12).

Proof. For the first inequality, with similar computation as [MZ12b, (C.21)], we have

$$\left| h - \frac{1}{2} \varphi(q, q) \right| \leq \frac{1}{100} \varphi(q, q).$$

Combining this with (A.5), we obtain the first inequality.

For the second inequality, we have from definition of φ that

$$h' \leq Ch \left(\frac{1}{s_0^{1/4}} - \eta \frac{9}{10} \right) + \left(C^*(e^{-s} + \eta) - \frac{4}{p-1} \right) \int_{-1}^1 q_2^2 \frac{\rho}{1-y^2} dy + C(1+\eta)e^{-s}.$$

By taking s_0 sufficiently large, $\eta = \frac{3}{C^*(p-1)}$, and s_0 large enough, there exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$h' \leq -\delta h + Ce^{-s}.$$

Obtaining the second inequality, we conclude the proof. \square

We are now in a position to prove Proposition 3.2:

Proof of Proposition 3.2. We have from the second inequality of (3.37) that

$$\left(e^{\delta s} h \right)' \leq Ce^{(\delta-1)s}.$$

Therefore for all $s \in [s_0, \bar{s})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(s) &\leq \frac{Ce^{-s_0}}{1-\delta} \left[e^{-\delta(s-s_0)} - e^{-(s-s_0)} \right] + e^{-\delta(s-s_0)} h(s_0). \\ &\leq Ce^{-\delta(s-s_0)-s_0} + e^{-\delta(s-s_0)} h(s_0), \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof of Proposition 3.2. \square

4 Trapping in some shrinking set

In this section, we prove Proposition 2.1 by trapping ν, d and q , defined in (3.1) and right before and in (2.3), in a set shrinking to zero. We proceed in two steps: We use the differential equality and inequalities obtained earlier combined with a topological argument. Then, we conclude the proof of Proposition 2.1 using a result obtained in [MZ12b].

4.1 Reduction thanks to some shrinking set

We introduce the following set $V_{A, \hat{d}_0}(s)$:

Definition 4.1 (A set shrinking to zero). *For $\hat{d}_0 \in (-1, 1)$, $A > 0$, $s_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s \geq s_0$, we define $V_{A, \hat{d}_0}(s)$ as the set of $(\nu(s), d(s), q(s)) \in (-1, 1)^2 \times \mathcal{H}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} |\nu(s)| &\leq Ae^{-\delta(s-s_0)-s_0}, \\ |d(s) - \hat{d}_0| &\leq Ae^{-\delta(s-s_0)-s_0}, \\ \|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &\leq Ae^{-\delta(s-s_0)-s_0}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta \in (0, 1)$ has already been fixed in Proposition 3.2.

We have the following proposition giving us, for well-chosen initial data, the existence of a solution in the shrinking set:

Proposition 4.2 (Existence of a solution in $V_{A, \hat{d}_0}(s)$). *For all $r_0 > 0$ and $\hat{d}_0 \in (-1, 1)$, there exists $A_0 > 0$, such that for all $A \geq A_0$, there exists $s_0 = s_0(r_0, \hat{d}_0, A) > -\log r_0$, such that there exist $d_0 \in (-1, 1), \nu_0 > -1 + |d_0|$ with*

$$|d_0 - \hat{d}_0| \leq Ae^{-s_0} \text{ and } |\nu_0| \leq Ae^{-s_0},$$

so that $(\nu(s), d(s), q(s)) \in V_{A, \hat{d}_0}(s)$, for all $s \geq s_0$, where q, d and ν are defined in (3.1) and right before, and w is the solution of equation (1.7) with initial data (2.1).

Proof. Consider $r_0 > 0, \hat{d}_0 \in (-1, 1), A \geq A_0$ and $s_0 \geq -\log r_0$, where A_0 and s_0 will be chosen later. For any $(d_0, \nu_0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that

$$|d_0 - \hat{d}_0| \leq Ae^{-s_0} \text{ and } |\nu_0| \leq Ae^{-s_0}, \tag{4.1}$$

it holds that $d_0 \in (-1, 1)$, and $\nu_0 > -1 + |d_0|$ for s_0 large enough. Hence, initial data in (2.1) are well-defined and belong to \mathcal{H} . From the paragraph before (3.3), one may see that

$$(\nu(s_0), d(s_0), q(s_0)) = (\nu_0, d_0, 0) \in V_{A, \hat{d}_0}(s_0).$$

We assume $(\nu(s), d(s), q(s))$ does not belong to $V_{A, \hat{d}_0}(s)$ for some $s \in [s_0, \bar{s}]$, where \bar{s} is defined above (3.1). By continuity, there exists a maximal $s^* = s^*(d_0, \nu_0) \in [s_0, \bar{s}]$ such that for all $s \in [s_0, s^*]$, we have $(\nu(s), d(s), q(s)) \in V_{A, \hat{d}_0}(s)$.

If $s^* = +\infty$ for some (d_0, ν_0) such that (4.1) holds, then we get to the conclusion of Proposition 4.2.

If $s^* < +\infty$ for all (d_0, ν_0) such that (4.1), we will find a contradiction below. Two cases may happen if $s^* < +\infty$:

Case 1: If $s^* = \bar{s}$, then $\bar{s} < +\infty$. As said in the statement after (3.4), one of the inequalities of (3.3) becomes an equality, i.e.

$$\text{either } \frac{|\nu(\bar{s})|}{1 - |d(\bar{s})|} = s_0^{-1/4}, \text{ or } \|q(\bar{s})\|_{\mathcal{H}} = s_0^{-1/2}, \quad (4.2)$$

From the fact of $(\nu, d, q)(\bar{s}) \in V_{A, \hat{d}_0}(\bar{s})$, we have

$$\|q(\bar{s})\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq Ae^{-\delta(\bar{s}-s_0)-s_0}, \quad (4.3)$$

$$|d(\bar{s}) - \hat{d}_0| \leq Ae^{-\delta(\bar{s}-s_0)-s_0},$$

$$|\nu(\bar{s})| \leq Ae^{-\delta(\bar{s}-s_0)-s_0}. \quad (4.4)$$

Hence, for s_0 large enough, we have

$$|d(\bar{s}) - \hat{d}_0| \leq \frac{1 - |\hat{d}_0|}{2}.$$

In particular, we have

$$|d(\bar{s})| \leq \frac{1 + |\hat{d}_0|}{2}.$$

Hence

$$1 - |d(\bar{s})| \geq \frac{1 - |\hat{d}_0|}{2}.$$

Using (4.4), for s_0 large enough, we obtain

$$\frac{|\nu(\bar{s})|}{1 - |d(\bar{s})|} \leq \frac{2A}{1 - |\hat{d}_0|} e^{-\delta(\bar{s}-s_0)-s_0} < s_0^{-1/4}. \quad (4.5)$$

Together with (4.3), for s_0 large enough, we have a contradiction with (4.2).

Case 2: If $s^* < \bar{s}$, then by continuity and by definition of s^* , we have either

$$|\nu(s^*)| = Ae^{-\delta(s^*-s_0)-s_0}, \text{ or } |d(s^*) - \hat{d}_0| = Ae^{-\delta(s^*-s_0)-s_0}, \text{ or } \|q(s^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = Ae^{-\delta(s^*-s_0)-s_0}.$$

Together with Proposition 3.2, taking $A > C^*$, we exclude the third equality. Therefore, we have only two possibilities:

$$\text{either } |d(s^*) - \hat{d}_0| = Ae^{-\delta(s^*-s_0)-s_0}, \quad (4.6)$$

$$\text{or } |\nu(s^*)| = Ae^{-\delta(s^*-s_0)-s_0}. \quad (4.7)$$

Case 2.1: We assume that (4.6) holds. From (3.11), Proposition 3.2, (3.4), together with the fact that $0 < \delta < 1$, we have for all $s \in [s_0, s^*]$

$$|d'(s)| \leq \bar{C} \left((C^* + 1)e^{-\delta(s-s_0)-s_0} + \sqrt{C^*} Ae^{-\frac{\delta}{2}(s-s_0) - \frac{s_0}{2}} e^{-\delta(s^*-s_0)-s_0} \right).$$

For s_0 large enough, we have

$$|d'(s^*)| \leq \bar{C}(C^* + 2)e^{-\delta(s^* - s_0) - s_0}.$$

From (4.6), if

$$d(s^*) = \hat{d}_0 + Ae^{-\delta(s^* - s_0) - s_0},$$

taking $A > \max(C^*, \frac{\bar{C}(C^* + 2)}{\delta})$, we have

$$\frac{d}{ds}[\hat{d}_0 + Ae^{-\delta(s^* - s_0) - s_0}]_{s=s^*} = -\delta Ae^{-\delta(s^* - s_0) - s_0} < d'(s^*).$$

Therefore, the curve $s \mapsto d(s)$ transversely crosses the curve $s \mapsto d_0 + Ae^{-\delta(s - s_0) - s_0}$ at $s = s^*$. The same arguments can be used for the opposite case, when $d(s^*) = \hat{d}_0 - Ae^{-\delta(s^* - s_0) - s_0}$.

Case 2.2: We assume that (4.7) holds. Again, from (3.11), Proposition 3.2 and the fact that $|d^*| < 1$, we have for all $s \in [s_0, s^*]$

$$|\nu'(s) - \nu(s)| \leq \bar{C} \left((C^* + 1)e^{-\delta(s - s_0) - s_0} + \sqrt{C^*} Ae^{-\frac{\delta}{2}(s - s_0) - \frac{s_0}{2}} e^{-\delta(s^* - s_0) - s_0} \right).$$

For s_0 large enough, we have that

$$|\nu'(s^*) - \nu(s^*)| \leq \bar{C}(C^* + 2)e^{-\delta(s^* - s_0) - s_0}.$$

From (4.6), if

$$\nu(s^*) = Ae^{-\delta(s^* - s_0) - s_0},$$

then

$$\nu'(s^*) \geq \nu(s^*) - \bar{C}(C^* + 2)e^{-\delta(s^* - s_0) - s_0} = (A - \bar{C}(C^* + 2))e^{-\delta(s^* - s_0) - s_0}.$$

Since $\delta < 1$, taking again $A > \max(C^*, \frac{\bar{C}(C^* + 2)}{\delta})$, we have

$$\frac{d}{ds}[Ae^{-\delta(s^* - s_0) - s_0}]_{s=s^*} < \nu'(s^*).$$

Therefore, the curve $s \mapsto \nu(s)$ transversely crosses the curve $s \mapsto Ae^{-\delta(s - s_0) - s_0}$ at $s = s^*$. The same arguments can be used for the opposite case, when $\nu(s^*) = -Ae^{-\delta(s^* - s_0) - s_0}$.

Conclusion: Take $A_0 = \max(C^*, \frac{\bar{C}(C^* + 2)}{\delta}) + 1$. Whether Case 2.1 or Case 2.2 holds, we have just proved that the flow $s \mapsto (d(s), \nu(s))$ is transverse outgoing on the surface $s \mapsto (\hat{d}_0 \pm Ae^{-\delta(s - s_0) - s_0}, \pm Ae^{-\delta(s - s_0) - s_0})$ at the crossing point $s = s^*(d_0, \nu_0)$. In particular, $(d_0, \nu_0) \mapsto s^*(d_0, \nu_0)$ is continuous. Let us introduce the following function

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : \quad \Omega &\rightarrow \partial[-1, 1]^2 \\ (\nu_0, d_0) &\mapsto \left(\frac{\nu(s^*)}{Ae^{-\delta(s^* - s_0) - s_0}}, \frac{d(s^*) - \hat{d}_0}{Ae^{-\delta(s^* - s_0) - s_0}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Omega = [-Ae^{-s_0}, Ae^{-s_0}] \times [\hat{d}_0 - Ae^{-s_0}, \hat{d}_0 + Ae^{-s_0}]$. We claim the following properties for Φ :

- (i) It is well-defined from (4.6) and (4.7).
- (ii) It is continuous from the outgoing transverse property.
- (iii) It holds that $\Phi|_{\partial\Omega} = Id|_{\partial\Omega}$. Indeed, if $(\nu_0, d_0) \in \partial\Omega$, then $s^*(\nu_0, d_0) = s_0$ from the outgoing transverse property.

We know that such a function with the previous properties does not exist, and we have our contradiction, which concludes the proof of Proposition 4.2. \square

4.2 Proof of Proposition 2.1

Before concluding the proof of Proposition 2.1, let us first recall from [MZ12b, Lemma A.2] the following continuity result for the solitons κ^* :

Lemma 4.3 (Continuity of κ^*). *For all $B \geq 2$, there exists $C(B) > 0$ such that if (d_1, ν_1) and (d_2, ν_2) satisfy*

$$\frac{\nu_1}{1 - |d_1|}, \frac{\nu_2}{1 - |d_2|} \in \left[-1 + \frac{1}{B}, B \right],$$

then

$$\|\kappa^*(d_1, \nu_1) - \kappa^*(d_2, \nu_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C(B) \left(\left| \frac{\nu_1}{1 - |d_1|} - \frac{\nu_2}{1 - |d_2|} \right| + |\arg \tanh d_1 - \arg \tanh d_2| \right).$$

Let us now give the proof of Proposition 2.1.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Consider $\delta \in (0, 1)$ defined in Proposition 3.2. Then consider arbitrary r_0 and $\hat{d}_0 \in (-1, 1)$. Note that $\kappa^*(\hat{d}_0, 0) = (\kappa_0^{\hat{d}_0})$. Then, from Proposition 4.2, there exists $A > 0$, $s_0(r_0, \hat{d}_0, A) \geq -\log r_0$, d_0, ν_0 , such that the solution $w(y, s)$ of (1.7) with initial data given in (2.1) satisfies $(\nu(s), d(s), q(s)) \in V_{A, \hat{d}_0}(s)$ for all $s \geq s_0$, where q, d and ν are defined in (3.1) and right before. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} w(s) \\ \partial_s w(s) \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \kappa_0^{\hat{d}_0} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} &\leq \|q(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|\kappa^*(d, \nu) - \kappa^*(\hat{d}_0, 0)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{A} e^{-\frac{\delta}{2}(s-s_0)-s_0} + \|\kappa^*(d, \nu) - \kappa^*(\hat{d}_0, 0)\|_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Moreover, we have from Proposition 4.2 that

$$|\nu(s)| \leq A e^{-\delta(s-s_0)-s_0}, |d(s) - \hat{d}_0| \leq A e^{-\delta(s-s_0)-s_0}$$

With the same computations as for (4.5), for s_0 large enough, we have for all $s \geq s_0$,

$$\frac{\nu(s)}{1 - |d(s)|} \leq \frac{2A}{1 - |\hat{d}_0|} e^{-\delta(s-s_0)-s_0}.$$

Thus, for s_0 large enough, it holds that

$$\frac{|\nu(s)|}{1 - |d(s)|} \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}, 2 \right].$$

Using the fact that $\arg \tanh(x) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{1+x}{1-x} \right)$, for all $x \in (-1, 1)$, then applying Lemma 4.3 with $B = 2$, for s_0 large enough, we write from (4.8), for all $s \geq s_0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} w(s) \\ \partial_s w(s) \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \kappa(\hat{d}_0) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} &\leq \sqrt{A} e^{-\frac{\delta}{2}(s-s_0)-s_0} + C \frac{|\nu(s)|}{1 - |d(s)|} + C |\arg \tanh d(s) - \arg \tanh \hat{d}_0| \\ &\leq \sqrt{A} e^{-\frac{\delta}{2}(s-s_0)-s_0} + C \frac{2A}{1 - |\hat{d}_0|} e^{-\delta(s-s_0)-s_0} + C(\hat{d}_0) A e^{-\delta(s-s_0)-s_0} \\ &\leq C(A, \hat{d}_0) e^{-\delta(s-s_0)-s_0}, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof of Proposition 2.1. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 1

Now, we have first found our initial data for (1.7). The aim of this section is to obtain the initial data for (1.3) and conclude the proof of Theorem 1. Consider $\delta \in (0, 1)$ given in Proposition 2.1, $r_0 > 0$ and $\hat{d}_0 \in (-1, 1)$. From Proposition 2.1, we have $s_0 \geq -\log r_0$ and $d_0, \nu_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that equation (1.7), with initial data (2.1) has a solution that behaves as in (2.2). We introduce $T_0 = e^{-s_0}$. Using (1.6) in a reverse way, we define u as the following

$$u(r, t) = (T_0 - t)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} w(y, s), \quad \text{where } y = \frac{r - r_0}{T_0 - t}, s = \log(T_0 - t). \quad (5.1)$$

Since w is well-defined for $(y, s) \in (-1, 1) \times [s_0, +\infty)$, this formula allows us to define a function $u = u(r, t)$ in the backward light cone

$$\Gamma(r_0) = \mathcal{C}_{r_0, T_0, 1} \cap \{t \geq 0\}, \quad (5.2)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{r_0, T_0, \delta_0}$ is defined right after (1.4). Naturally, u is a solution of equation (1.3) in that cone for some initial data, which will be determined shortly afterwards. Note that our cone is included in $\{r > 0\}$ since $s_0 > -\log r_0$.

In the next step of the proof, we will define the solution u outside the cone $\Gamma(r_0)$. In order to do so, we will first determine the value of the initial data for $(u, \partial_t u)$ at the basis of the cone. Then, extend it to \mathbb{R}^+ .

Let us then write the value of $(u, \partial_t u)$ at $t = 0$ in the basis of the cone $\Gamma(r_0)$. Using

(1.3), and the definition of κ_1^* and κ_2^* in (1.10) and (1.11), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} u(r, 0) &= T_0^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} w(y, s_0) = T_0^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} \kappa_1^*(d_0, \nu_0, \frac{r-r_0}{T_0}), \\ \partial_t u(r, 0) &= T_0^{-\frac{p+1}{p-1}} \left(\frac{2}{p-1} w(y, s_0) + y \cdot \partial_y w(y, s_0) + \partial_s w(y, s_0) \right) \\ &= T_0^{-\frac{p+1}{p-1}} \left(\frac{2}{p-1} \kappa_1^*(d_0, \nu_0, y) + y \cdot \partial_y \kappa_1^*(d_0, \nu_0, y) + \kappa_2^*(d_0, \nu_0, y) \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{p-1} T_0^{-\frac{p+1}{p-1}} \frac{\kappa_1^*(d_0, \nu_0, y)}{1 + d_0 y + \nu_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Together with (5.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u(r, 0) &= T_0^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} \kappa_1^* \left(d_0, \nu_0, \frac{r-r_0}{T_0} \right) = \hat{u}(d_0, \nu_0, r_0, T_0, r, 0), \\ \partial_t u(r, 0) &= T_0^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} \frac{2}{p-1} \frac{\kappa_1^* \left(d_0, \nu_0, \frac{r-r_0}{T_0} \right)}{T_0(1 + \nu_0) + d_0(r-r_0)} = \frac{1}{1 + \nu_0} \partial_t \hat{u}(d_0, \nu_0, r_0, T_0, r, 0), \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

using (1.10) and \hat{u} is given in (1.5). Let us now define u outside the cone $\Gamma(r_0)$. For that, we will first extend the definition of the initial data outside the basis of the cone, namely $[r_0 - T_0, r_0 + T_0]$, thanks to some cutoff function. Note first from (2.1) that $\kappa^*(d_0, \nu_0, y)$ has no singularity for $y \in (-1, 1)$, if s_0 is large enough. Accordingly, $u(r, 0)$ has no singularity for $r \in [r_0 - T_0, r_0 + T_0]$. Therefore, by continuity, we may consider $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ small enough such that on $[r_0 - T_0 - 2\varepsilon_0, r_0 + T_0 + 2\varepsilon_0]$, $\hat{u}(d_0, \nu_0, r_0, T_0, r, 0)$ has no singularity (see (1.5)). Let us then consider the cut-off function $\chi \in C_0^\infty$, such that $\chi \equiv 1$ on $[r_0 - T_0 - \varepsilon_0, r_0 + T_0 + \varepsilon_0]$, $\chi_0 \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R} \setminus [r_0 - T_0 - 2\varepsilon_0, r_0 + T_0 + 2\varepsilon_0]$. Multiplying (5.3) with χ and denoting the result by (u_0, u_1) , we obtain (1.15). Clearly, $(U_0, U_1) \in H_{loc}^1 \times L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$, where $U_i(x) = u_i(|x|)$.

From the Cauchy theory applied to (1.1), there is a unique solution to the equation (1.3) which is radial. From the uniqueness and finite time speed of propagation, the value of that solution in $\Gamma(r_0)$ defined in (5.2) is already known. It is given in (5.1). For simplicity, we will use the same notation for the solution, we have just got from the application of the Cauchy problem.

Note that, we have two cases for the domain D of definition of u :

Case 1: $D = \{t \geq 0\}$.

Case 2: D is included in $\{0 \leq t < T(r)\}$ for some 1-Lipschitz curve $r \mapsto T(r)$.

Let us show that Case 2 occurs with $T(r_0) = T_0$. We assume, by contradiction, that u is global (Case 1) or that u blows up with $T(r_0) > T_0$. We already know that u is defined in $\Gamma(r_0)$. Hence, $T(r_0) \geq T_0$. In both cases, u is defined on the cone $\mathcal{C}_{r_0, T_0 + \eta_0, 1} \cap \{t \geq 0\}$. In particular, the L^2 average of u on slices of $\Gamma(r_0)$ should be bounded, at one hand. On the other hand, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{T_0 - t} \int_{|r-r_0| < T_0 - t} u^2 dr &\geq \frac{1}{T_0 - t} \int_{|r-r_0| < \frac{T_0 - t}{2}} u^2 dr \\
&= (T_0 - t)^{-\frac{4}{p-1}} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} w^2 dy \\
&\geq (T_0 - t)^{-\frac{4}{p-1}} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} w^2 \rho(y) dy.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

From Proposition 2.1, we have that

$$\int_{-1/2}^{1/2} w^2 \rho(y) dy \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow T_0} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \kappa(\hat{d}_0)^2 > 0.$$

Together with (5.4), we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{T_0 - t} \int_{|r-r_0| < T_0 - t} u^2 dr \longrightarrow +\infty \text{ as } t \rightarrow +\infty,$$

and a contradiction follows.

Therefore, we have that case 2 occurs, and u is defined below the graph of some 1-Lipschitz function $r \mapsto T(r)$ with $T(r_0) = T_0$. Since we have a convergence of $(w(s), \partial_s w(s))$ to one soliton in \mathcal{H} in Proposition 2.1, one may see from Theorem 6 in [MZ11] that r_0 is a non-characteristic point. Since (1.16) follows from Proposition 2.1, we concludes the proof of Theorem 1.

A Toolbox

In this section, we give some useful tools required in this work. We will not give the proof since they are easy or already given in the cited references. We have first the following Hardy-Sobolev inequalities from [MZ12b].

Lemma A.1 (Hardy-Sobolev inequality). *For $h \in \mathcal{H}_0$, we have*

$$\|h\|_{L^2_{\frac{\rho}{1-y^2}}(-1,1)} + \|h\|_{L^{\rho+1}(-1,1)} + \|h(1-y^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\|_{L^\infty(-1,1)} \leq C \|h\|_{\mathcal{H}_0}, \tag{A.1}$$

where ρ and \mathcal{H}_0 are given in (1.8) and (1.13).

Proof. See proof of Claim A.1 in [MZ12b] □

We also have the follwonig estimates on the solitons from [MZ12b]:

Lemma A.2 (estimates on solitons).

(i) *For all $d \in (-1, 1)$, it holds that*

$$\|\kappa(d)\|_{\mathcal{H}_0} \leq CE(\kappa_0), \tag{A.2}$$

(ii) For all $|d| < 1$ and $\nu > -1 + |d|$, then we have

$$\|\kappa^*(d, \nu)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C\lambda(d, \nu) + C\mathbb{1}_{\{\nu < 0\}} \frac{|\nu|}{\sqrt{1-d^2}} \lambda^{\frac{p+1}{2}}(d, \nu), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\text{where } \lambda = \lambda(d, \nu) = \frac{(1-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{((1+\nu)^2-d^2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}.$$

(iii) For $|d| < 1$ and $\frac{|\nu|}{1-|d|} \leq \varepsilon$, for some $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, we have

$$|\lambda(d^*, \nu)^{1-p} - 1| = \left| \left(1 + \frac{\nu}{1-|d|}\right) \left(1 + \frac{\nu}{1+|d|}\right) - 1 \right| \leq C \frac{|\nu|}{1-|d|}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Proof. See [MZ12b, Claim A.1, (A.1) and (i) of Claim A.2] for (A.1), (A.2), (A.3). The (A.4) is easy to obtain. \square

In following lemma, we give a bound φ using the norm of q .

Lemma A.3 (Estimate on φ). *We have the following estimate on φ , defined in (3.10), given by the following*

$$\frac{1}{C^*} \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \leq \varphi(q, q) \leq C^* \|q\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Proof. The reader may see that the proof in [MZ12b, Lemma C.1, (ii)] combined with (3.3) and (A.4) for s_0 large enough holds as well for our case. \square

References

- [GSV92] J. Ginibre, A. Soffer, and G. Velo. “The global Cauchy problem for the critical nonlinear wave equation”. English. *J. Funct. Anal.* 110.1 (1992), pp. 96–130. ISSN: 0022-1236.
- [Lev74] Howard A. Levine. “Instability and nonexistence of global solutions to nonlinear wave equations of the form $Pu_{tt} = -Au + \mathfrak{F}(u)$ ”. English. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 192 (1974), pp. 1–21. ISSN: 0002-9947.
- [LS95] Hans Lindblad and Christopher D. Sogge. “On existence and scattering with minimal regularity for semilinear wave equations”. English. *J. Funct. Anal.* 130.2 (1995), pp. 357–426. ISSN: 0022-1236.
- [MZ03] Frank Merle and Hatem Zaag. “Determination of the blow-up rate for the semilinear wave equation”. English. *Am. J. Math.* 125.5 (2003), pp. 1147–1164. ISSN: 0002-9327.
- [MZ05a] Frank Merle and Hatem Zaag. “Determination of the blow-up rate for a critical semilinear wave equation”. English. *Math. Ann.* 331.2 (2005), pp. 395–416. ISSN: 0025-5831.

- [MZ05b] Frank Merle and Hatem Zaag. “On growth rate near the blowup surface for semilinear wave equations”. English. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 2005.19 (2005), pp. 1127–1155. ISSN: 1073-7928.
- [MZ07] Frank Merle and Hatem Zaag. “Existence and universality of the blow-up profile for the semilinear wave equation in one space dimension”. English. *J. Funct. Anal.* 253.1 (2007), pp. 43–121. ISSN: 0022-1236.
- [MZ08] Frank Merle and Hatem Zaag. “Openness of the set of non-characteristic points and regularity of the blow-up curve for the 1 D semilinear wave equation”. English. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 282.1 (2008), pp. 55–86. ISSN: 0010-3616.
- [MZ11] Frank Merle and Hatem Zaag. “Blow-up behavior outside the origin for a semilinear wave equation in the radial case”. English. *Bull. Sci. Math.* 135.4 (2011), pp. 353–373. ISSN: 0007-4497.
- [MZ12a] Frank Merle and Hatem Zaag. “Existence and classification of characteristic points at blow-up for a semilinear wave equation in one space dimension”. English. *Am. J. Math.* 134.3 (2012), pp. 581–648. ISSN: 0002-9327.
- [MZ12b] Frank Merle and Hatem Zaag. “Isolatedness of characteristic points at blowup for a 1-dimensional semilinear wave equation”. English. *Duke Math. J.* 161.15 (2012), pp. 2837–2908. ISSN: 0012-7094.
- [MZ15] Frank Merle and Hatem Zaag. “On the stability of the notion of non-characteristic point and blow-up profile for semilinear wave equations”. English. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 333.3 (2015), pp. 1529–1562. ISSN: 0010-3616.
- [MZ16] Frank Merle and Hatem Zaag. “Dynamics near explicit stationary solutions in similarity variables for solutions of a semilinear wave equation in higher dimensions”. English. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 368.1 (2016), pp. 27–87. ISSN: 0002-9947.