JEMS

Thomas Duyckaerts · Carlos Kenig · Frank Merle

Universality of blow-up profile for small radial type II blow-up solutions of the energy-critical wave equation

Abstract. Consider the energy-critical focusing wave equation on the Euclidian space. A blow-up type II solution of this equation is a solution which has finite time of existence but stays bounded in the energy space. The aim of this work is to exhibit universal properties of such solutions.

Let W be the unique radial positive stationary solution of the equation. Our main result is that in dimension 3, under an appropriate smallness assumption, any type II blow-up radial solution is essentially the sum of a rescaled W concentrating at the origin and a small remainder which is continuous with respect to the time variable in the energy space. This is coherent with the solutions constructed by Krieger, Schlag and Tataru. One ingredient of our proof is that the unique radial solution which is compact up to scaling is equal to W up to symmetries.

Contents

1. Introduction

Consider the focusing energy-critical wave equation on an interval I ($0 \in I$),

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 u - \Delta u - |u|^{\frac{4}{N-2}} u = 0, & (t, x) \in I \times \mathbb{R}^N, \\ u_{\upharpoonright t=0} = u_0 \in \dot{H}^1, & \partial_t u_{\upharpoonright t=0} = u_1 \in L^2, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

T. Duyckaerts, F. Merle: Département de mathématiques, Université de Cergy-Pontoise,
Site de Saint Martin, 2, avenue Adolphe Chauvin, 95302 Cergy-Pontoise Cedex, France;
e-mail: tduyckae@u-cergy.fr, frank.merle@u-cergy.fr

C. Kenig: Department of Mathematics, University of Chicago, 5734 University Avenue,
Chicago, IL 60637-1514, USA; e-mail: cek@math.uchicago.edu

where u is real-valued, $N \in \{3, 4, 5\}$, and $\dot{H}^1 := \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. We set $S(I) := L^{\frac{2(N+1)}{N-2}}(I \times \mathbb{R}^N)$. We will often restrict ourselves to the case of radial solutions in space dimension $N = 3$.

The Cauchy problem (1.1) is locally well-posed in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$. This space is invariant under the scaling of the equation: if u is a solution to (1.1), $\lambda > 0$ and

$$u_\lambda = \frac{1}{\lambda^{(N-2)/2}} u\left(\frac{t}{\lambda}, \frac{x}{\lambda}\right),$$

then u_λ is also a solution and $\|u_\lambda(0)\|_{\dot{H}^1} = \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^1}$, $\|\partial_t u_\lambda(0)\|_{L^2} = \|u_1\|_{L^2}$.

Let $T_+ \in (0, +\infty]$ be the maximal positive time of definition for the solution u. It satisfies the following finite time blow-up criterion:

$$T_+ < \infty \implies \|u\|_{S(0, T_+)} = \infty. \tag{1.2}$$

Note that this criterion does not rule out *type II blow-up*, i.e. solutions such that $T_+ < \infty$ and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T_+)} [\|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2] < \infty. \tag{1.3}$$

This is different from the case of lower order nonlinearity (of the form $|u|^{p-1}u$ with $p < (N+2)/(N-2)$), where the finite time blow-up implies the blow-up of the energy norm.

Energy arguments of Levine type [Lev74] are not expected to give directly type II blow-up. Examples of radial type II blow-up solutions of (1.1) were constructed in space dimension $N = 3$ by Krieger, Schlag and Tataru [KST09]. The aim of this article is to exhibit universal properties of this type of solutions.

Let

$$W := \frac{1}{\left(1 + \frac{|x|^2}{N(N-2)}\right)^{(N-2)/2}}, \tag{1.4}$$

which is a stationary solution of (1.1). The construction of [KST09] relies on an elaborate fixed point argument which yields the following description of the solution:

$$u(t) = \frac{1}{\lambda(t)^{1/2}} W\left(\frac{x}{\lambda(t)}\right) + \varepsilon(t), \tag{1.5}$$

where $\lambda(t) = (T_+ - t)^{1+\nu}$, $\nu > 0$ and

$$\lim_{t \to T_+} \int_{|x| \le T_+ - t} |\nabla \varepsilon(t)|^2 \, dx + \int_{|x| \le T_+ - t} |\partial_t \varepsilon(t)|^2 \, dx + \int_{|x| \le T_+ - t} |\varepsilon(t)|^6 \, dx = 0. \tag{1.6}$$

In this work, we investigate the converse problem: if we consider an arbitrary type II radial blow-up solution, does such a decomposition hold?

We will obtain this result under an appropriate smallness assumption. From [KM08] (see also [DKM]) if $N = 3, 4$ or u is radial, and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T_+)} [\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2] < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2,$$

then $T_+ = \infty$ and the solution scatters forward in time, and in particular does not blow up. In this work, the authors introduce a general road map to tackle such critical problems in focusing and defocusing situations. From a concentration-compactness result (in this case [BG99]), one reduces the proof to some rigidity property of solutions of (1.1) that are compact in the energy space up to the invariances of the equation. This rigidity property has to be shown by independent arguments.

The threshold $\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2$ is sharp. Indeed, from [KST09], for all $\eta_0 > 0$ there exists a type II blow-up solution such that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T_+)} [\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2] \leq \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta_0. \tag{1.7}$$

In the present article, we consider type II blow-up solutions such that (1.7) holds. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1. *Assume that $N = 3$. There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for any* radial *solution u of (1.1) such that $T_+(u) = T_+ < \infty$ that satisfies (1.7), there exist a solution $v(t)$ of (1.1) defined in a neighborhood of $t = T_+$, a sign $\iota_0 \in \{\pm 1\}$, and a positive C^0 function $\lambda(t)$ on $(0, T_+)$ such that, as $t \overset{<}{\to} T_+$,*

$$u(t) = v(t) + \frac{\iota_0}{\lambda(t)^{1/2}} W\left(\frac{x}{\lambda(t)}\right) + o(1) \quad \text{in } \dot{H}^1, \tag{1.8}$$

$$\partial_t u(t) = \partial_t v(t) + o(1) \quad \text{in } L^2, \tag{1.9}$$

$$\lambda(t) = o(T_+ - t). \tag{1.10}$$

Note that (1.8), (1.9) imply that u is of the form (1.5) with ε satisfying (1.6): any radial blow-up solution satisfying (1.7) is of the type of the solutions constructed by Krieger, Schlag and Tataru.

As is now well-known from previous works on similar problems (see remarks below), the result is based on classification of solutions of (1.1) that are compact up to the symmetry of the equation. We state this result for its own interest.

Theorem 2. *Let u be a nonzero radial solution of (1.1) in space dimension $N = \{3, 4, 5\}$. Assume that there exists a function $\lambda(t)$ of $t \in (T_-(u), T_+(u))$ such that*

$$K = \left\{ \left(\lambda(t)^{N/2-1} u(t, \lambda(t) \cdot), \lambda(t)^{N/2} \partial_t u(t, \lambda(t) \cdot)\right) : t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$$

has compact closure in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$. Then there exist $\lambda_0 > 0$ and a sign $\iota_0 \in \{\pm 1\}$ such that

$$u(t, x) = \frac{\iota_0}{\lambda_0^{N/2-1}} W\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_0}\right).$$

Remark 1.1. The proof of Theorem 2 (see Section 6) uses the material of [DM08], where a first classification result of this type was obtained. Namely, at the energy threshold $E(u_0, u_1) = E(W, 0)$, all solutions such that $\int |\nabla u_0|^2 + \int |u_1|^2 \leq \int |\nabla W|^2$ are globally defined, and the only ones that do not scatter are (up to the transformations of the equation) W and a solution W^-, which scatters backward in time and tends to W exponentially as t goes to ∞.

Remark 1.2. These results are essential to understand type II blow-up. After one has exhibited a universal profile for blow-up, one can hope using local dynamics near W, or linearization around W (see e.g. [KS07]) to understand the possible blow-up speeds, which will complete the program to understand type II blow-up. Moreover, this is the first step to prove that the boundary of the set of initial data that lead to blow-up is given by type II blow-up solutions.

The proof of Theorem 1 highlights, through the mechanism of profile decomposition and the finite speed of propagation, why the only candidates to be type II blow-up profiles are compact solutions. The only case where such a striking fact was established was for GKdV by Martel and Merle [MM00, MM01].

Remark 1.3. In the case of nonlinear wave maps, all blow-up solutions are of type II: the equation is defocusing, in the sense that the energy provides a bound on the energy norm. An analogue of Theorem 1 is known locally in space for a sequence of times (without size condition due to the defocusing nature of the equation). Namely, if u is a blow-up solution, there exist a sequence of times $t_n \to T_+$ and a sequence $\lambda_n \to 0^+$ such that $u(t_n, x/\lambda_n)$ tends to a nonlinear object. This follows from a remarkable paper of Christodoulou and Tahvildar-Zadeh [CTZ93]. See also the article of Shatah and Tahvildar-Zadeh [STZ97] which established a result similar to Theorem 2 in this context, the articles of Struwe [Str02, Str03], and the recent article of Sterbenz and Tataru [ST10] for the general case of solutions without any special invariant properties. We also refer to the works of Rodnianski and Sterbenz [RS], Krieger, Schlag and Tataru [KST08] and Raphaël and Rodnianski [RR] for the construction of blow-up solutions.

Remark 1.4. Universality of blow-up profiles for a critical equation, as t goes to the blow-up time T_+ (without restriction to a sequence of times), was established, also under a smallness condition, in two cases:

- for the critical KdV equation

$$u_t = (u_{xx} + u^5)_x, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

  by classification of compact solutions of the GKdV equation: see Martel and Merle [MM00, MM01, MM02];
- for the mass-critical NLS equation

$$iu_t = \Delta u + |u|^{4/N}u, \quad 1 \le N \le 5,$$

  by Merle and Raphaël, by classification of solutions that are nondispersive (in a weak sense) [MR04].

See also the subcritical wave equation in dimension one where all blow-up profiles were found by Merle and Zaag [MZ07, MZ08] for general data (see the work of Caffarelli and Friedman for specific data [CF86]).

We next sketch the proof of Theorem 1.

Consider a radial, blow-up solution u of (1.1) in space dimension $N = 3$ that satisfies (1.7) and assume for simplicity that the blow-up time $T_+(u)$ is 1. As is shown in Section 3,

u may be decomposed as the sum of a solution to (1.1) which is well-defined around the blow-up time, and a singular part $a(t, x)$ which is supported in the light cone $|x| \leq 1 - t$. Choose a sequence $t_n \to 1^-$ and a Bahouri–Gérard [BG99] profile decomposition associated to the sequence $\{(a(t_n), \partial_t a(t_n))_n\}$. According to the result of [KM08], the bound (1.7) implies that there is one large profile and that the other profiles are small (see Remark 3.10). This contrasts with [KM08] where the minimality of the solution imposes automatically that there is only one profile (the large one). In our case, we must show by another mechanism that the small profiles do not exist, which would imply by Theorem 2 that the large profile is W, yielding Theorem 1.

The main idea to exclude the small profiles is that any small block of energy norm decoupled from the main profile would yield, for each time t_n, a nonnegligible amount of energy norm localized on a light cone.[1] By finite speed of propagation one can show that these small energy blocks, localized in disjoint light cones, sum up, implying the blow-up of the energy norm, which contradicts the bound (1.7). A similar phenomenon is highlighted in the context of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation in [MR05, MR08]. Unfortunately, this strategy can be implemented only for a class of profiles that are very small and exterior in a certain sense (see Proposition 4.4), and we must exclude the other small profiles by indirect means (see Sections 5, 7 and 8).

By Proposition 5.1, the existence of a sequence $\tau_n \to 1^-$ such that $a(\tau_n)$ concentrates at a speed faster than self-similar implies, at least for another sequence of times $t_n \to 1^-$, that all profiles are equal to the stationary solution W. This property follows from rigidity arguments involving virial type identities. In particular, there cannot be small profiles, and the bound (1.7) implies that W is the only profile for this particular sequence t_n. This yields the strong condition that the energy of the singular part $E(a, \partial_t a)$ tends to $E(W, 0)$ as $t \to 1^-$ (see Corollary 8.3), which can be combined with the results of [KM08] to complete the proof (see §8.3 and §8.4).

It remains to exclude the case of self-similar concentration, which is the object of Proposition 8.2. Towards a contradiction, we show (as a consequence of the nonexistence of small exterior profiles) that this self-similar concentration, if it exists, must concern the large profile. The solution of (1.1) corresponding to this profile is globally defined and nonscattering backward in time, satisfies a global bound similar to (1.7) for negative times, and is partially located around the light cone $|t| = |x|$ as $t \to -\infty$. This type of solution is excluded by Proposition 7.1, using the nonexistence, shown in [KM08], of self-similar blow-up solutions of (1.1) which are compact up to scaling.

The outline of the paper is as follows.

After some preliminaries (Section 2), we give in Section 3 general results on type II blow-up solutions of (1.1) in space dimensions $N = 3, 4, 5$. In the next two sections we restrict ourselves to radial solutions in space dimension 3. In Section 4 we show the nonexistence of small exterior profiles for a radial type II blow-up solution. In Section 5, we assume that the solution does not concentrate at a self-similar rate, and show that

---

[1] This follows from a property of the radial three-dimensional linear wave equation that does not hold in the nonradial setting or in higher dimensions (see Lemma 4.2), which is the main reason why we restricted ourselves to radial solutions in space dimension $N = 3$.

in this case, there exists a sequence $t_n \to T_+$ such that $u(t_n)$ decomposes as a sum of rescaled stationary solutions.

In the following two sections, we consider solutions of (1.1) that do not blow up in finite time. Section 6 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2, which is a consequence of the classification result of [DM08]. Section 7 is concerned with the localization of the energy for globally defined, bounded, nonscattering solutions of (1.1).

Section 8 gathers the results of all previous sections to prove Theorem 1. In Appendix A we prove some technical properties of profile decompositions. Appendix B shows a simple result on a family of sequences of positive numbers which is needed in some parts of the proof.

In all the article, for sequences of positive numbers $\{\alpha_n\}_n$ and $\{\beta_n\}_n$, we will write $\alpha_n \ll \beta_n$ when $\alpha_n/\beta_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, and $\alpha_n \approx \beta_n$ when $C^{-1}\alpha_n \le \beta_n \le C\alpha_n$ for some large constant n. We will denote by $o_n(1)$ a sequence that goes to 0 as n goes to ∞.

Let us mention that the nonradial case will be the object of a subsequent paper to appear in JEMS [DKM].

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Cauchy problem

The Cauchy problem for equation (1.1) was developed in [Pec84, GSV92, LS95, SS94, SS98, Sog95, Kap94]. If I is an interval, we define

$$S(I) = L^{\frac{2(N+1)}{N-2}}(I \times \mathbb{R}^N), \quad W(I) = L^{\frac{2(N+1)}{N-1}}(I \times \mathbb{R}^N), \quad N(I) = L^{\frac{2(N+1)}{N+3}}(I \times \mathbb{R}^N).$$

Let $\mathsf{S}_L(t)$ be the one-parameter group associated to the linear wave equation. By definition, if $(v_0, v_1) \in \dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $v(t) = \mathsf{S}_L(t)(v_0, v_1)$ is the solution of

$$\partial_t^2 v - \Delta v = 0, \tag{2.1}$$

$$v_{\restriction t=0} = v_0, \quad \partial_t v_{\restriction t=0} = v_1. \tag{2.2}$$

We have

$$\mathsf{S}_L(t)(v_0, v_1) = \cos(t\sqrt{-\Delta})v_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\Delta}}\sin(t\sqrt{-\Delta})v_1.$$

By the Strichartz and Sobolev estimates,

$$\|v\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} + \|D_x^{1/2}v\|_{W(\mathbb{R})} \le C_S(\|v_0\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|v_1\|_{L^2}). \tag{2.3}$$

A solution of (1.1) on an interval I, where $0 \in I$, is a function $u \in C^0(I, \dot{H}^1)$ such that $\partial_t u \in C^0(I, L^2)$,

$$J \Subset I \implies \|D_x^{1/2}u\|_{W(J)} + \|u\|_{S(J)} < \infty \tag{2.4}$$

satisfying the Duhamel formulation

$$u(t) = \mathsf{S}(t)u_0 + \int_0^t \frac{\sin((t-s)\sqrt{-\Delta})}{\sqrt{-\Delta}}|u(s)|^{\frac{4}{N-2}}u(s)\,ds. \tag{2.5}$$

We recall there exists a small $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for any interval I containing 0 and any $(u_0, u_1) \in \dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ such that

$$\|\mathrm{S_L}(t)(u_0, u_1)\|_{S(I)} < \delta_0, \tag{2.6}$$

there exists a unique solution u of (1.1) on I. Furthermore if δ_0 is chosen small enough, this solution satisfies

$$\|u\|_{S(I))} \leq 2\|\mathrm{S_L}(t)(u_0, u_1)\|_{S(I)}. \tag{2.7}$$

Sticking together these local solutions, we see that for any initial condition (u_0, u_1) in the energy space, there exists a unique solution u of (1.1), which is defined on a maximal interval of definition

$$I_{\max} = I_{\max}(u_0, u_1) = (T_-(u_0, u_1), T_+(u_0, u_1)).$$

We will often write $I_{\max}(u)$, $T_\pm(u)$, instead of $I_{\max}(u_0, u_1)$, $T_\pm(u_0, u_1)$.

If $\|\mathrm{S_L}(t)(u_0, u_1)\|_{S(I)} = \delta < \delta_0$, then u is close to the linear solution with initial condition (u_0, u_1) in the following sense: if $A = \|D_x^{1/2}\mathrm{S_L}(t)(u_0, u_1)\|_{W(I)}$, we have

$$\|u(\cdot) - \mathrm{S_L}(\cdot)(u_0, u_1)\|_{S(I)} + \sup_{t \in I}[\|u(t) - \mathrm{S_L}(t)(u_0, u_1)\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|\partial_t u(t) - \partial_t(\mathrm{S_L}(t)(u_0, u_1))\|_{L^2}]$$

$$\leq C A \delta^{\frac{4}{N-2}} \tag{2.8}$$

(see for example [KM06, proof of Theorem 2.7]).

Any solution u of (1.1) satisfies the blow-up criterion (1.2), and the analogue for negative time. As a consequence, if $\|u\|_{S(0, T_+)} < \infty$, then $T_+ = \infty$. Furthermore in this case, the solution scatters forward in time in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$: there exists a solution v of the linear equation (2.1) such that

$$\lim_{t \to \infty}[\|u(t) - v(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_t u(t) - \partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}] = 0.$$

Of course an analogous statement holds backward in time also.

We next recall a long-time perturbation theory result for (1.1) (see Theorem 2.20 of [KM08]).

Theorem 2.1. *Let $M > 0$. There exists $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(M)$ with the following property. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a time interval such that $0 \in I$, and $\tilde{u}$ be defined on $I \times \mathbb{R}^N$ such that*

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{S(I)} + \sup_{t \in I}[\|\tilde{u}(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|\partial_t \tilde{u}(t)\|_{L^2}] \leq M, \quad J \Subset I \Rightarrow \|D_x^{1/2}\tilde{u}\|_{W(J)} < \infty.$$

Denote $(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{u}_1) = (\tilde{u}(0), \partial_t \tilde{u}(0))$. Let $(u_0, u_1) \in \dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. Assume

$$\partial_t^2 \tilde{u} - \Delta \tilde{u} - |\tilde{u}|^{\frac{4}{N-2}}\tilde{u} = e, \quad (t, x) \in I \times \mathbb{R}^N,$$

$$\|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|u_1 - \tilde{u}_1\|_{L^2} + \|D_x^{1/2}e\|_{N(I)} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Then the solution u of (1.1) with initial condition (u_0, u_1) satisfies $I_{\max}(u) \subset I$ and for a $\beta_0 > 0$,

$$\|u\|_{S(I)} \leq C(M), \quad \sup_{t \in I}[\|u(t) - \tilde{u}(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|\partial_t u(t) - \partial_t \tilde{u}(t)\|_{L^2}] \leq C(M)\varepsilon^{\beta_0}.$$

2.2. Remarks on stationary solutions of (1.1)

Recall from (1.4) the definition of the stationary solution W. It is known from the works of T. Aubin [Aub76] and G. Talenti [Tal76] that W is the unique minimizer, up to translation, scaling and multiplication by a scalar constant, for the Sobolev inequality on $\mathbb{R}^N$,

$$\|f\|_{L^{2N/(N-2)}} \leq C_N \|\nabla f\|_{L^2}.$$

By a classical ODE argument, we also have the following uniqueness result:

Claim 2.2. *Let U be a (real) $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ radial solution of*

$$\Delta U + |U|^{\frac{4}{N-2}} U = 0.$$

Then

$$U = 0 \quad or \quad \exists \lambda_0 > 0, \ U = \pm \frac{1}{\lambda_0^{(N-2)/2}} W\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_0}\right).$$

Note that the equation $\Delta W + W^{(N+2)/(N-2)} = 0$ implies $E(W, 0) = N^{-1} \int |\nabla W|^2 > 0$. This fact is used to prove the following variational properties of W which will be needed throughout the paper.

Claim 2.3. *Let $v \in \dot{H}^1$. Then*

$$\|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 \text{ and } E(v, 0) \leq E(W, 0)$$

$$\Rightarrow \ \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2}{E(W, 0)} E(v, 0) = N E(v, 0). \quad (2.9)$$

Furthermore, if $\|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \left(\frac{N}{N-2}\right)^{(N-2)/2} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2$, then $E(v, 0) \geq 0$.

Proof. The first part of the claim is shown in [DM08, proof of Claim 2.4]. For the second part, write

$$E(v, 0) = \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla v|^2 - \frac{N-2}{2N} \int |v|^{\frac{2N}{N-2}} \geq \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla v|^2 - \frac{N-2}{2N} C_N^{\frac{2N}{N-2}} \left(\int |\nabla v|^2\right)^{\frac{N}{N-2}},$$

where C_N is the best constant in the Sobolev inequality $\|v\|_{2N/(N-2)} \leq C_N \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}$. Let $y = \int |\nabla v|^2$ and assume that $E(v, 0)$ is negative. Then

$$0 > \frac{1}{2} y - \frac{N-2}{2N} C_N^{\frac{2N}{N-2}} y^{\frac{N}{N-2}}.$$

This shows that $y \geq y_*$, where y_* is the unique positive solution of $\frac{1}{2} y - \frac{N-2}{2N} C_N^{\frac{2N}{N-2}} y^{\frac{N}{N-2}} = 0$. Using that $C_N^{-N} = \int |\nabla W|^2$, we obtain $y_* = \left(\frac{N}{N-2}\right)^{(N-2)/2} \int |\nabla W|^2$, which concludes the proof. $\qquad\square$

2.3. Profile decomposition

We recall here the profile decomposition of H. Bahouri and P. Gérard [BG99]. This paper is written in space dimension $N = 3$ but the results stated below hold in all dimensions $N \geq 3$. See also [BC85] and [Lio85] for the elliptic case and [MV98] for the Schrödinger equation.

Choose a sequence $\{(v_{0,n}, v_{1,n})\}_n$ which is bounded in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$. Let $\{U_L^j\}_{j \geq 0}$ be a sequence of solutions of the linear equation (2.1), with initial data $(U_0^j, U_1^j) \in \dot{H}^1 \times L^2$, and $(\lambda_{j,n}, x_{j,n}, t_{j,n}) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}$, $j, n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a family of parameters satisfying the pseudo-orthogonality relation

$$j \neq k \implies \lim_{n \to \infty} \left[\frac{\lambda_{j,n}}{\lambda_{k,n}} + \frac{\lambda_{k,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} + \frac{|t_{j,n} - t_{k,n}|}{\lambda_{j,n}} + \frac{|x_{j,n} - x_{k,n}|}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right] = \infty. \tag{2.10}$$

We say that $\{(v_{0,n}, v_{1,n})\}_n$ *admits a profile decomposition* $\{U_L^j\}_j$, $\{\lambda_{j,n}, x_{j,n}, t_{j,n}\}_{j,n}$ when

$$\begin{cases} v_{0,n} = \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^J \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{(N-2)/2}} U_L^j \left(\frac{-t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x - x_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) + w_{0,n}^J(x), \\[3mm] v_{1,n} = \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^J \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{N/2}} \partial_t U_L^j \left(\frac{-t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x - x_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) + w_{1,n}^J(x), \end{cases} \tag{2.11}$$

with

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \limsup_{J \to \infty} \|w_n^J\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} = 0, \tag{2.12}$$

where w_n^J is the solution of (2.1) with initial conditions $(w_{0,n}^J, w_{1,n}^J)$. Then:

Theorem 2.4 ([BG99]). *If the sequence $\{(v_{0,n}, v_{1,n})\}_n$ is bounded in the energy space $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$, there always exists a subsequence of $\{(v_{0,n}, v_{1,n})\}_n$ which admits a profile decomposition. Furthermore,*

$$j \leq J \implies \left(\lambda_{j,n}^{(N-2)/2} w_n^J(t_{j,n}, x_{j,n} + \lambda_{j,n} y), \lambda_{j,n}^{N/2} \partial_t w_n^J(t_{j,n}, x_{j,n} + \lambda_{j,n} y) \right) \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} 0, \tag{2.13}$$

weakly in $\dot{H}_y^1 \times L_y^2$, and the following Pythagorean expansions hold for all $J \geq 1$:

$$\|v_{0,n}\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^J \left\| U_L^j \left(\frac{-t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) \right\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 + \|w_{0,n}^J\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 + o_n(1), \tag{2.14}$$

$$\|v_{1,n}\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^J \left\| \partial_t U_1^j \left(\frac{-t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \|w_{1,n}^J\|_{L^2}^2 + o_n(1), \tag{2.15}$$

$$E(v_{0,n}, v_{1,n}) = \sum_{j=1}^J E\left(U_L^j \left(-\frac{t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right), \partial_t U_L^j \left(-\frac{t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) \right) + E(w_{0,n}^J, w_{1,n}^J) + o_n(1). \tag{2.16}$$

Replacing $U_{\mathrm{L}}^j(t,x)$ by $V_{\mathrm{L}}^j(t,x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_j^{(N-2)/2}} U_{\mathrm{L}}^j\left(\frac{t-t_j}{\lambda_j}, \frac{x-x_j}{\lambda_j}\right)$ for some good choice of the parameters λ_j, t_j, x_j, and extracting subsequences, we can always assume that one of the following two cases occurs:

$$\forall n, \ t_{j,n} = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \in \{-\infty, \infty\}. \tag{2.17}$$

We will need the following bound on the parameters:

Lemma 2.5. *Let v_n be as above and $\{\mu_n\}_n$ be a sequence of positive numbers. Assume*

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{|x|\geq R\mu_n} [|\nabla v_{0,n}|^2 + v_{1,n}^2]\, dx = 0. \tag{2.18}$$

Then for all j, the sequences $\{\lambda_{j,n}/\mu_n\}_n$, $\{t_{j,n}/\mu_n\}_n$ and $\{x_{j,n}/\mu_n\}_n$ are bounded. Furthermore, there is at most one j such that $\{\lambda_{j,n}/\mu_n\}_n$ does not converge to 0.

Proof. The case $\mu_n = 1$ follows from [BG99, pp. 154–155]. For the general case, apply the result of the case $\mu_n = 1$ to the rescaled sequence $\{(\tilde v_{0,n}, \tilde v_{1,n})\}_n$ defined by

$$\tilde v_{0,n}(t,x) = \mu_n^{N/2-1} v_{0,n}(\mu_n x), \quad \tilde v_{1,n}(t,x) = \mu_n^{N/2} v_{1,n}(\mu_n x). \qquad \square$$

Notation 2.6. For any profile decomposition with profiles $\{U_{\mathrm{L}}^j\}$ and parameters $\{\lambda_{j,n}, t_{j,n}, x_{j,n}\}$, we will denote by $\{U^j\}$ the nonlinear profiles associated with $\{U_{\mathrm{L}}^j(-t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n}), \partial_t U_{\mathrm{L}}^j(-t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n})\}$, which are the unique solutions of (1.1) such that for all n, $-t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n} \in I_{\max}(U^j)$ and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\left[\left\|U^j\left(\frac{-t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right) - U_{\mathrm{L}}^j\left(\frac{-t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right)\right\|_{\dot H^1} + \left\|\partial_t U^j\left(\frac{-t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right) - \partial_t U_{\mathrm{L}}^j\left(\frac{-t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right)\right\|_{L^2}\right] = 0.$$

Assuming (2.17), the proof of the existence of U^j follows from the local existence for (1.1) if $t_{j,n} = 0$ and from the existence of wave operators for equation (1.1) if $t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n}$ tends to $\pm\infty$. By the Strichartz inequalities for the linear problem, and the small data Cauchy theory (see (2.7)), if $\lim_{n\to\infty} -t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n} = \infty$, then $T_+(U^j) = \infty$ and

$$s_0 > T_-(U^j) \implies \|U^j\|_{S(s_0,\infty)} < \infty; \tag{2.19}$$

an analogous statement holds in the case $\lim_{n\to\infty} t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n} = \infty$.

Notation 2.7. We will often write, for the sake of simplicity,

$$U_n^j(t,x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{N/2-1}} U^j\left(\frac{t-t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x-x_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right),$$

$$U_{\mathrm{L},n}^j(t,x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{N/2-1}} U_{\mathrm{L}}^j\left(\frac{t-t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x-x_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right).$$

We will need the following approximation result, which follows from Theorem 2.1 and is an adaptation to the focusing case of the result of Bahouri–Gérard (see the Main Theorem, p. 135 in [BG99]).

Proposition 2.8. *Let $\{(v_{0,n}, v_{1,n})\}_n$ be a bounded sequence in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ which admits the profile decomposition* (2.11). *Let $\theta_n \in (0, \infty)$. Assume that for all j, n,*

$$\frac{\theta_n - t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} < T_+(U^j) \quad and \quad \limsup_{n \to \infty} \|U^j\|_{S(-t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n}, (\theta_n - t_{j,n})/\lambda_{j,n})} < \infty. \tag{2.20}$$

Let u_n be the solution of (1.1) *with initial data $(v_{0,n}, v_{1,n})$. Then for large n, u_n is defined on $[0, \theta_n)$,*

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \|u_n\|_{S(0, \theta_n)} < \infty, \tag{2.21}$$

and

$$\forall t \in [0, \theta_n), \quad u_n(t, x) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} U_n^j(t, x) + w_n^J(t, x) + r_n^J(t, x), \tag{2.22}$$

where

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \limsup_{J \to \infty} \left[\|r_n^J\|_{S(0, \theta_n)} + \sup_{t \in (0, \theta_n)} (\|\nabla r_n^J(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_t r_n^J(t)\|_{L^2}) \right] = 0. \tag{2.23}$$

An analogous statement holds if $\theta_n < 0$.

Remark 2.9. Assume that for all j, at least one of the following occurs:

(a) $\|U_0^j\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|U_1^j\|_{L^2} < \delta_0/C_S$, where the constant C_S is given by the Strichartz estimate (2.3) and δ_0 by the small data theory;

(b) $\displaystyle\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{-t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} = \infty$,

(c) $\displaystyle\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{\theta_n - t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} < T_+(U^j)$.

Then (2.8) holds. Indeed in case (a), this follows from (2.3) and the small data theory. In case (b), it follows directly from the small data theory: see (2.19). It remains to treat case (c), when $t_{j,n} = 0$ or $-t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n} \to -\infty$. If $t_{j,n} = 0$, then by definition $T_-(U^j) < 0$ and (2.8) is a consequence of (2.4) and (c). If $-t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n} \to -\infty$, then the analogue of (2.19) for negative times and (c) imply (2.8).

Remark 2.10. When N is odd, under the assumptions of Proposition 2.8, we have localized pseudo-orthogonality properties for all time of the interval $(0, \theta_n)$ as follows: let $\tau_n \in (0, \theta_n)$ for all n, $\{\mu_n\}$ be any sequence of positive numbers, and $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be

radial and such that $\chi = 1$ in a neighborhood of 0. Then, if $\varphi = 1$, $\varphi = \chi$ or $\varphi = 1 - \chi$, one can show after extraction the following Pythagorean expansion:

$$
\int \varphi\left(\frac{x}{\mu_n}\right)|\nabla_{t,x} u(\tau_n)|^2 \, dx
$$
$$
= \sum_{j=1}^{J} \int \varphi\left(\frac{x}{\mu_n}\right)|\nabla_{t,x} U_n^j(\tau_n)|^2 \, dx + \int \varphi\left(\frac{x}{\mu_n}\right)|\nabla_{t,x} w_n^J(\tau_n)|^2 \, dx + o_n(1),
$$

where $|\nabla_{t,x} u|^2 = (\partial_t u)^2 + |\nabla_x u|^2$. This follows easily from Claim A.1 in the appendix and we omit the proof.

Sketch of proof of Proposition 2.8. Denote the nonlinearity by $F(u) = |u|^{4/(N-2)}u$. Let

$$
\tilde{u}_n^J(t,x) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{(N-2)/2}} U^j\left(\frac{t - t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x - x_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right) + w_n^J(t,x).
$$

We will apply Theorem 2.1 to $\tilde{u}_n$ and u_n for large n.

We notice that there exists $J_0 > 0$ such that

$$
\forall j \geq J_0 + 1, \qquad \|U_L^j\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} < \delta_0, \tag{2.24}
$$

where δ_0 is given by the small data theory for (1.1). Indeed, this is an immediate consequence of the Pythagorean expansions (2.14), (2.15) and Strichartz estimates. Thus we can use the small data theory which implies, by (2.7),

$$
\forall j \geq J_0 + 1, \qquad \|U^j\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} \leq C(\|U_0^j\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|U_1^j\|_{L^2}). \tag{2.25}
$$

Fixing a large J, one can show, as a consequence of the orthogonality (2.10) of the parameters,

$$
\left\|\sum_{j=1}^{J} \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{(N-2)/2}} U^j\left(\frac{t - t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x - x_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right)\right\|_{S(0,\theta_n)}^{\frac{2(N+1)}{N-2}}
$$
$$
= \sum_{j=1}^{J} \left\|\frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{(N-2)/2}} U^j\left(\frac{t - t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x - x_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right)\right\|_{S(0,\theta_n)}^{\frac{2(N+1)}{N-2}} + o_n(1).
$$

Combining this with (2.25) and the Pythagorean expansions (2.14), (2.15), we get

$$
\limsup_{J \to \infty} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \|\tilde{u}_n^J\|_{S(0,\theta_n)} < \infty.
$$

Let $J \geq J_0$ and $e_n^J = (\partial_t^2 - \Delta)\tilde{u}_n^J - F(\tilde{u}_n^J)$. Then

$$
e_n^J(t,x) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} F\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{(N-2)/2}} U^j\left(\frac{t - t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right)\right) - F\left(\sum_{j=1}^{J} \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{(N-2)/2}} U^j\left(\frac{t - t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right) + w_n^J\right).
$$

From (2.8) and again the orthogonality (2.10) of the parameters, we can deduce

$$\lim_{J \to \infty} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \|D_x^{1/2} e_n^J\|_{N(0,\tau_n)} = 0.$$

Furthermore

$$\tilde{u}_n^J(0) = u_n^J(0), \qquad \partial_t \tilde{u}_n^J(0) = \partial_t u_n^J(0),$$

which yields by Theorem 2.1 the conclusion of the proposition. $\square$

We will also need the following technical claim. The proof is postponed to Appendix A.

Claim 2.11. *Assume that N is odd. Let $\{w_n\}$ be a sequence of radial solutions to the linear wave equation (2.1) with bounded energy and such that*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \|w_n\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} = 0. \tag{2.26}$$

Let $(w_{0,n}, w_{1,n})$ be the initial data of w_n, $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be radial and such that $\chi = 1$ around the origin, and $\{\tilde{\lambda}_n\}$ be a sequence of positive numbers. Consider the solution $\tilde{w}_n$ to (2.1) with initial data $(\tilde{w}_{0,n}, \tilde{w}_{1,n}) = (\varphi(|x|/\tilde{\lambda}_n)w_{0,n}, \varphi(|x|/\tilde{\lambda}_n)w_{1,n})$, where $\varphi = \chi$ or $\varphi = 1 - \chi$. Then

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \|\tilde{w}_n\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} = 0. \tag{2.27}$$

3. Description of general type II blow-up solutions

In this section we consider a general type II blow-up solution of (1.1) in space dimension $N \in \{3, 4, 5\}$, that is, a solution u bounded in the energy space and such that $T_+(u) < \infty$. We do not assume that u is spherically symetric.

Definition 3.1. Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$. We will say that the point x_0 is *regular* if

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \ \exists R, \ \forall t \in [0, T_+(u)), \quad \int_{|x-x_0| \leq R} \left[|\nabla u|^2 + \frac{u^2}{|x - x_0|^2} + (\partial_t u)^2 \right] \leq \varepsilon. \tag{3.1}$$

If x_0 is not regular, we will say that it is *singular*. We will denote by S the set of singular points.

Theorem 3.2. *Let u be a solution of (1.1) with type II blow-up forward in time, and $T_+ = T_+(u)$ the blow-up time. Then there exists $K \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and K distinct points $m_1, \ldots, m_K$ of $\mathbb{R}^N$ such that $S = \{m_1, \ldots, m_K\}$. Furthermore there exists $(v_0, v_1) \in \dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ such that*

$$(u(t), \partial_t u(t)) \xrightarrow[t \to T_+]{} (v_0, v_1) \quad \text{weakly in } \dot{H}^1 \times L^2. \tag{3.2}$$

If $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is equal to 1 around each singular point, we have

$$\lim_{t \to T_+} \left[\|(1 - \varphi)(u(t) - v_0)\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|(1 - \varphi)(\partial_t u(t) - v_1)\|_{L^2} \right] = 0. \tag{3.3}$$

Furthermore, if $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$, assuming moreover $N = 3, 4$ for (3.4),

$$\limsup_{t \to T_+} \int_{|x - m_k| \le |t - T_+|} [|\nabla u(t, x)|^2 + |\partial_t u(t, x)|^2] \ge \int |\nabla W|^2, \qquad (3.4)$$

$$\liminf_{t \to T_+} \int_{|x - m_k| \le |t - T_+|} [|\nabla u(t, x)|^2 + |\partial_t u(t, x)|^2] \ge \frac{2}{N} \int |\nabla W|^2. \qquad (3.5)$$

Definition 3.3. Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.2, le v be the solutions of (1.1) such that $(v(T_+), \partial_t v(T_+)) = (v_0, v_1)$. We will call v the *regular part* of u at the blow-up time T_+, and $a = u - v$ the *singular part* of u. Note that (3.3) implies, together with the finite speed of propagation, that

$$\operatorname{supp} a \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{K} \{(t, x) : |x - m_k| \le |t - T_+|\}.$$

This section is divided into two parts. In §3.1, we perform a first analysis of the behavior of u around each singular point, showing (3.2) and (3.3). In §3.2, we write a profile decomposition of the solution around each singular point to show (3.4) and (3.5).

We will assume throughout without loss of generality that the blow-up time is $T_+(u) = 1$.

3.1. Generalities on regular and singular points

Lemma 3.4. *There exists a constant $\delta_1 > 0$ with the following properties:*

(a) *for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $t_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $R > 0$, if*

$$\int_{|x - x_0| \le |t_0 - 1| + R} \left[|\nabla u(t_0)|^2 + |\partial_t u(t_0)|^2 + \frac{1}{|x - x_0|^2} |u(t_0)|^2 \right] \le \delta_1,$$

and $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ has compact support in $\{|x - x_0| \le R\}$, then $(\varphi u(t), \varphi \partial_t u(t))$ has a limit in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ as $t \xrightarrow{<} 1$;

(b) *for all $t_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $R > 0$, if*

$$\int_{|x| \ge R} \left[|\nabla u(t_0)|^2 + |\partial_t u(t_0)|^2 + \frac{1}{|x|^2} |u(t_0)|^2 \right] \le \delta_1,$$

and $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is equal to 1 at infinity and is supported in the set $|x| \ge R + |1 - t_0|$, then $(\varphi u(t), \varphi \partial_t u(t))$ has a limit in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ as $t \xrightarrow{<} 1$.

Proof. Let us prove (a). Assume that for some parameter $\eta_0 > 0$ to be determined later,

$$\int_{|x - x_0| \le |t_0 - 1| + R} \left[|\nabla u(t_0)|^2 + |\partial_t u(t_0)|^2 + \frac{1}{|x - x_0|^2} |u(t_0)|^2 \right] \le \eta_0 E(W, 0).$$

If η_0 is chosen small enough, then, by a standard extension theorem, there exist $\tilde{u}_0 \in \dot{H}^1$ and $\tilde{u}_1 \in L^2$ compactly supported on $\mathbb{R}^N$ and such that

$$\tilde{u}_0(x) = u(t_0, x) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{u}_1 = \partial_t u(t_0, x) \quad \text{if } |x - x_0| \leq |t_0 - 1| + R, \qquad (3.6)$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[|\nabla \tilde{u}_0|^2 + |\tilde{u}_1|^2 + \frac{1}{|x - x_0|^2} |\tilde{u}_0|^2 \right] \leq C \eta_0 E(W, 0) < E(W, 0). \qquad (3.7)$$

Consider the solution $\tilde{u}$ of (1.1) with initial condition $(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{u}_1)$ at $t = t_0$. By (3.7), we have

$$E(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{u}_1) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla \tilde{u}_0|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\tilde{u}_1|^2 - \frac{N-2}{2N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\tilde{u}_0|^{\frac{2N}{N-2}} < E(W, 0),$$

$$\|\nabla \tilde{u}_0\|_{L^2}^2 \leq E(W, 0) < \int |\nabla W|^2.$$

By the result of Kenig–Merle [KM08], $\tilde{u}$ is globally defined. The mapping $t \mapsto (\tilde{u}(t), \partial_t \tilde{u}(t))$ is continuous from $\mathbb{R}$ to $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$. By finite speed of propagation and (3.6),

$$\forall t \in [t_0, 1], \ \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \ |x - x_0| \leq |t - 1| + R \ \Rightarrow \ u(t, x) = \tilde{u}(t, x), \ \partial_t u(t, x) = \partial_t \tilde{u}(t, x).$$

In particular, $(\varphi u(t), \varphi \partial_t u(t)) = (\varphi \tilde{u}(t), \varphi \partial_t \tilde{u}(t))$ has a limit as $t \to 1$, which concludes the proof of case (a).

Case (b) is similar. Indeed, in this case, if δ_1 is small enough, there exist $\tilde{u}_0$ and $\tilde{u}_1$ such that

$$\tilde{u}_0(x) = u(t_0, x) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{u}_1 = \partial_t u(t_0, x) \text{ if } |x| \geq R,$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[|\nabla \tilde{u}_0|^2 + |\tilde{u}_1|^2 + \frac{1}{|x|^2} |\tilde{u}_0|^2 \right] < E(W, 0).$$

Consider the solution $\tilde{u}$ with initial data $(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{u}_1)$ at $t = t_0$. By finite speed of propagation, u and $\tilde{u}$ coincide if $|x| > |t_0 - t| + R$, and the result follows again by the global existence of $\tilde{u}$. □

Corollary 3.5. *For any singular point m, and all $t \in I_{\max} = I_{\max}(u)$,*

$$\delta_1 \leq \int_{|x - m| \leq |t - 1|} \left[|\nabla u(t)|^2 + |\partial_t u(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{|x - m|^2} |u(t)|^2 \right], \qquad (3.8)$$

where δ_1 is given by Lemma 3.4. Furthermore, the set S of singular points is finite.

Proof. The finiteness of S follows immediately from (3.8) and the fact that the blow-up is of type II.

Let us show (3.8). Towards a contradiction, consider a singular point m, and assume that for some $t_0 \in I_{\max}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\int_{|x - m| \leq |t_0 - 1| + \varepsilon} \left[|\nabla u(t_0)|^2 + |\partial_t u(t_0)|^2 + \frac{1}{|x - m|^2} |u(t_0)|^2 \right] < \delta_1.$$

Let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be such that $\varphi(x) = 0$ if $|x - m| \geq \varepsilon$ and $\varphi(x) = 1$ if $|x - m| \leq \varepsilon/2$. By Lemma 3.4, $(\varphi u, \varphi \partial_t u)$ converges in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ as t tends to 1, contradicting, in view of the continuous embedding of $\dot{H}^1$ into $L^2(|x - m|^{-2}\,dx)$, the assumption that m is a singular blow-up point.

We have proven that for all $t \in I_{\max}$ and all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\delta_1 \leq \int_{|x-m| \leq |t-1|+\varepsilon} \left[|\nabla u(t)|^2 + |\partial_t u(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{|x - m|^2}|u(t)|^2 \right],$$

concluding the proof of (3.8).   □

We are now ready to prove (3.2) and (3.3) of Theorem 3.2. Let us first show that $(u(t), \partial_t u(t))$ has a weak limit in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ as $t \overset{<}{\to} 1$. It is equivalent to show that all weak limits of sequences $\{(u(t_n), \partial_t u(t_n))\}_n$, where $t_n \overset{<}{\to} 1$, coincide. For this, notice that the definition of a regular point and Lemma 3.4 show that if (v_0, v_1) and $(\tilde{v}_0, \tilde{v}_1)$ are such limits, then they must coincide around any regular point. As the set of singular points is finite, this shows as desired that $(v_0, v_1) = (\tilde{v}_0, \tilde{v}_1)$. Denote

$$(v_0, v_1) = \underset{t \to 1}{w\text{-}\lim}\,(u(t), \partial_t u(t)).$$

By Lemma 3.4(a), $(u, \partial_t u)$ has a limit in $\dot{H}^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus S) \times L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus S)$ as t goes to 1. The uniqueness of limits shows that this limit must be (v_0, v_1). Using Lemma 3.4(b), we conclude that the convergence to v is also global, hence (3.3).

We finish this part by noting that there is at least one singular point. If not, (3.3) shows that $(u(t), \partial_t u(t))$ has a limit as $t \to 1$, which shows that 1 is not the maximal positive time of existence, a contradiction.

3.2. Bounds from below on the norm of the main profile

In this subsection we will complete the proof of Theorem 3.2 by studying the behavior of u in the neighborhood of singular points by using a profile decomposition. We assume that

$$0 \in S.$$

Choose an increasing sequence $\{\tau_n\} \in (t_0, 1)^{\mathbb{N}}$ that tends to 1 and a function $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $\psi = 1$ close to 0 and $\text{supp}\,\psi \cap S = \{0\}$. After extracting a subsequence, we can assume that there exists a profile decomposition

$$\begin{cases} \psi u(\tau_n) - \psi v(\tau_n) = \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{J} \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{N/2-1}} U_{\text{L}}^j\left(\frac{-t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x - x_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) + w_{0,n}(x), \\[4mm] \psi \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t}(\tau_n) - \psi \dfrac{\partial v}{\partial t}(\tau_n) = \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{J} \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{N/2}} \frac{\partial U_{\text{L}}^j}{\partial t}\left(\frac{-t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x - x_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) + w_{1,n}(x), \end{cases} \tag{3.9}$$

where U_{L}^j is a solution of the linear wave equation (2.1) with initial conditions (U_0^j, U_1^j).

As $\psi(u - v)$ is supported in $\{|x| \leq 1 - t\}$ when t is close to 1, Lemma 2.5 implies

$$\forall j \geq 1, \ \exists C_j, \ \forall n, \quad |\lambda_{j,n}| + |t_{j,n}| + |x_{j,n}| \leq C_j(1 - \tau_n). \tag{3.10}$$

Let us first show:

Lemma 3.6. *Reorder the decomposition* (3.9) *so that*

$$\|\nabla U_0^1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_1^1\|_{L^2}^2 = \sup_{j \geq 1} [\|\nabla U_0^j\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_1^j\|_{L^2}^2]. \tag{3.11}$$

Then

$$\|\nabla U_0^1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_1^1\|_{L^2}^2 \geq \frac{2}{N} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{3.12}$$

Lemma 3.6, together with the Pythagorean expansions (2.14) and (2.15), implies (3.5) immediately.

Remark 3.7. In space dimension $N = 3$, we have the following immediate corollary of Lemma 3.6. If

$$\liminf_{t \to 1^-} [\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2] < \frac{4}{3} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2,$$

then there is only one singular point. See Remark 3.10 below for an improvement.

Proof of Lemma 3.6. Assume that

$$\|\nabla U_0^1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_1^1\|_{L^2}^2 < \frac{2}{N} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and thus for all $j \geq 1$,

$$\|\nabla U_0^j\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_1^j\|_{L^2}^2 < \frac{2}{N} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Using that $2E(f, g) \leq \|\nabla f\|_{L^2}^2 + \|g\|_{L^2}^2$ and that $E(W, 0) = \frac{1}{N} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2$, we find that there exists an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all j, n,

$$E(U_{\mathrm{L}}^j(-t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n}), \partial_t U_{\mathrm{L}}^j(-t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n})) \leq E(W, 0) - \varepsilon_0, \quad \|\nabla U_0^j\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 - \varepsilon_0.$$

Then according to [KM08], for all j, U^j is globally defined and scatters. By Proposition 2.8 the solution with initial condition $(\psi u(\tau_n), \psi \partial_t u(\tau_n))$ is globally defined and scatters for large n. Using the finite speed of propagation, we get a contradiction with the fact that 0 is singular. Hence (3.12) follows. □

It remains to show (3.4). We first recall the following scattering result (see [KM08, Corollary 7.4]) and [DKM]:

Proposition 3.8. *Assume $N = 3, 4$. Let u be a solution of* (1.1) *such that*

$$\limsup_{t \to T_+(u)} [\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2] < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Then u is globally defined and scatters.

The following proposition implies (3.4) by the Pythagorean expansions (2.14), (2.15):

Proposition 3.9. *Assume $N = 3, 4$. Let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. There exists a sequence $\{\tilde{\tau}_n\} \in (t_0, 1)^{\mathbb{N}}$ that tends to 1 such that $(\psi a(\tilde{\tau}_n), \psi \partial_t a(\tilde{\tau}_n))$ admits a profile decomposition $\{\widetilde{U}_L^j\}_j$, $\{\tilde{\lambda}_{j,n}, \tilde{x}_{j,n}, \tilde{t}_{j,n}\}_{j,n}$ such that $\tilde{t}_{1,n} = 0$ and*

$$\|\nabla \widetilde{U}_0^1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\widetilde{U}_1^1\|_{L^2}^2 \geq \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 - \varepsilon_0. \tag{3.13}$$

Proof. We follow the proof of [KM08, Corollary 7.5]. In all the proof, we will always work up to extraction of a subsequence for sequences indexed by n. In particular, any real sequence indexed by n will be assumed to have a limit in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$.

Select an increasing sequence $\{\tau_n\} \in (t_0, 1)^{\mathbb{N}}$ that tends to 1. Let $\tilde{u}_n$ and $\tilde{v}_n$ be the solutions of (1.1) such that

$$(\tilde{u}_n, \partial_t \tilde{u}_n)_{\restriction t = \tau_n} = (\psi u(\tau_n), \psi \partial_t u(\tau_n)), \quad (\tilde{v}_n, \partial_t \tilde{v}_n)_{\restriction t = \tau_n} = (\psi v(\tau_n), \psi \partial_t v(\tau_n)).$$

By finite speed of propagation and the fact that $x = 0$ is a singular point for u, $T_+(\tilde{u}_n) \leq 1$. Furthermore, $(\psi v(\tau_n), \psi \partial_t v(\tau_n))$ has a limit in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ as $n \to \infty$, which implies that there exists a small $t_0 > 0$ such that $\tilde{v}_n(\tau_n + t)$ is well-defined for large n and $|t| \leq t_0$.

After extracting a subsequence, there exists a profile decomposition with profiles $\{U_L^j\}$ and parameters $\{\lambda_{j,n}, x_{j,n}, t_{j,n}\}$ associated to the sequence $\{((\tilde{u}_n(\tau_n) - \tilde{v}_n(\tau_n), \partial_t \tilde{u}_n(\tau_n) - \partial_t \tilde{v}_n(\tau_n))\}_n$. The fact that $\tilde{\psi}(u - v)$ is supported in $\{|x| \leq 1 - t\}$ and Lemma 2.5 imply

$$\forall j \geq 1, \exists C_j, \forall n, \quad |\lambda_{j,n}| + |t_{j,n}| + |x_{j,n}| \leq C_j(1 - \tau_n). \tag{3.14}$$

Let us consider the associated nonlinear profiles U^j (see Notation 2.6). Reordering the profiles, we get a J_0 such that

$$\forall j \leq J_0, \quad \|U^j\|_{S(0, T_+(U^j))} = \infty, \quad \forall j \geq J_0 + 1, \quad \|U^j\|_{S(0, T_+(U^j))} < \infty.$$

By the finite blow-up criterion, $T_+(U^j) = \infty$ if $j \geq J_0 + 1$. By Proposition 2.8 there is at least one solution U^j that does not scatter forward in time (otherwise we would have $T_+(u) > 1$), and thus $J_0 \geq 1$.

For $1 \leq j \leq J_0$, $\lim_n -t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n} = \ell_j \in \{-\infty\} \cup \mathbb{R}$ (the case $\ell_j = \infty$ is excluded as the nonlinear profile does not scatter forward in time). If ℓ_j is finite, the corresponding profile is compact up to scaling and translation, and we may assume $t_{j,n} = 0$. Thus

$$\forall j \in \{1, \ldots, J_0\}, \quad t_{j,n} = 0 \text{ or } \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{-t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} = -\infty. \tag{3.15}$$

By Proposition 3.8, for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, J_0\}$, there exists a time T_j such that

$$T_-(U^j) < T_j < T_+(U^j) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla u(T_j)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t u(T_j)\|_{L^2}^2 \geq \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 - \varepsilon_0, \tag{3.16}$$

furthermore, using that $T_+(U^j) > 0$ if $t_{j,n} = 0$, we may choose T_j such that

$$(\forall n, \ t_{j,n} = 0) \implies T_j > 0.$$

Extracting subsequences and reordering the profiles, we may assume

$$\forall n, \quad t_{1,n} + \lambda_{1,n} T_1 = \min_{1 \le j \le J_0} (t_{j,n} + \lambda_{j,n} T_j). \tag{3.17}$$

Denote $\theta_n = t_{1,n} + \lambda_{1,n} T_1$. Note that $\theta_n \ge 0$ for large n and, by (3.14),

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \theta_n = 0. \tag{3.18}$$

For all j, we have, by definition of θ_n, $(\theta_n - t_{j,n})/\lambda_{j,n} \le T_j < T_+(U^j)$. According to Remark 2.9 we can use Proposition 2.8 which shows that $\tau_n + \theta_n < T_+(\tilde{u}_n) \le 1$, that $\{\|\tilde{u}_n\|_{S(\tau_n, \tau_n + \theta_n)}\}_n$ is bounded and

$$\tilde{u}_n(\tau_n + t) = \tilde{v}_n(\tau_n + t) + \sum_{j=1}^{J} \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{(N-2)/2}} U^j \left(\frac{t - t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x - x_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right)$$
$$+ w_n^J(t,x) + r_n^J(t,x), \quad t \in (0, \theta_n), \tag{3.19}$$

where r_n^J satisfies (2.23). If $j \ge 1$, there exists (extracting a subsequence if necessary) a linear wave $\widetilde{U}_L^j$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \left[\left\| U^j \left(\frac{\theta_n - t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) - \widetilde{U}_L^j \left(\frac{\theta_n - t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) \right\|_{\dot{H}^1} \right.$$
$$\left. + \left\| \partial_t U^j \left(\frac{\theta_n - t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) - \partial_t \widetilde{U}_L^j \left(\frac{\theta_n - t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) \right\|_{L^2} \right] = 0.$$

Indeed, if $\{(\theta_n - t_{j,n})/\lambda_{j,n}\}_n$ converges this is obvious, and if it goes to $-\infty$, then also $\{(\theta_n - t_{j,n})/\lambda_{j,n}\}_n$ goes to $-\infty$, and we can take $\widetilde{U}_L^j = U_L^j$. Writing $\tilde{\tau}_n = \tau_n + \theta_n$ and $\tilde{t}_{j,n} = t_{j,n} - \theta_n$ we get by (3.19),

$$\begin{cases} (\tilde{u}_n - \tilde{v}_n)(\tilde{\tau}_n) = \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{J} \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{N/2-1}} \widetilde{U}_L^j \left(\frac{-\tilde{t}_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x - x_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) + w_n^J(\theta_n) + r_n^J(\theta_n) + o_n(1), \\[4mm] \partial_t(\tilde{u}_n - \tilde{v}_n)(\tilde{\tau}_n) = \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{J} \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{N/2}} \partial_t \widetilde{U}_L^j \left(\frac{-\tilde{t}_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x - x_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) + \partial_t w_n^J(\theta_n) + \partial_t r_n^J(\theta_n) + o_n(1), \end{cases} \tag{3.20}$$

This is a profile decomposition for the sequence $\{(\tilde{u}_n(\tilde{\tau}_n) - \tilde{v}_n(\tilde{\tau}_n), \partial_t \tilde{u}_n(\tilde{\tau}_n) - \partial_t \tilde{v}_n(\tilde{\tau}_n))\}$, with profiles $\{\widetilde{U}_L^j\}$ and parameters $\{\lambda_{j,n}, x_{j,n}, \tilde{t}_{j,n}\}$. Note that the orthogonality of the parameters follows directly from the equality $\tilde{t}_{j,n} - \tilde{t}_{k,n} = t_{j,n} - t_{k,n}$.

Next notice that by finite speed of propagation and the definitions of $\tilde{u}_n$ and $\tilde{v}_n$, there exists an $r_0 > 0$ such that if n is large and $|x| < r_0$ then $\tilde{u}_n(\tilde{\tau}_n) = u(\tilde{\tau}_n)$, $\partial_t \tilde{u}_n(\tilde{\tau}_n) = \partial_t u(\tilde{\tau}_n)$, $\tilde{v}_n(\tilde{\tau}_n) = v(\tilde{\tau}_n)$ and $\partial_t \tilde{v}_n(\tilde{\tau}_n) = \partial_t v(\tilde{\tau}_n)$. Using that $u(\tilde{\tau}_n) - v(\tilde{\tau}_n)$ and $\partial_t u(\tilde{\tau}_n) - \partial_t v(\tilde{\tau}_n)$ are supported in the set $\{|x| \le 1 - \tilde{\tau}_n\}$, one can replace, in the decomposition (3.20), $\tilde{u}_n$ and $\tilde{v}_n$ by ψu and ψv.

Finally, $(\theta_n - t_{1,n})/\lambda_{1,n} = T_1$. Thus the first profile $\widetilde{U}^1$ in the decomposition (3.20) is compact up to modulation, and we may assume $\tilde{t}_{1,n} = 0$ as announced. The inequality (3.13) follows from the choice of T_1. □

Remark 3.10. In space dimension $N = 3, 4$, we can improve Remark 3.7 as follows. If for some $t_0 \in (0, 1)$,

$$\sup_{t \in (t_0, 1)} [\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2] < \left(1 + \frac{2}{N}\right) \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2,$$

then there is only one singular point. This is a direct consequence of (3.4) and (3.5).

4. Finite speed of propagation and exclusion of small exterior profiles

In the next two sections, we assume that $N = 3$ and that u is spherically symmetric, blows up at time $T = 1$ and satisfies

$$\sup_{\tau_0 \le t < 1} \sqrt{\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2} \le C_0. \tag{4.1}$$

In these two sections we will not make any further assumption on $C_0 > 0$. By spherical symmetry, 0 is the only singular point. We denote by

$$a(t, x) = u(t, x) - v(t, x)$$

the singular part of u at the blow-up time $t = 1$ (see Definition 3.3).

   The main result of this section (Proposition 4.4), shown in §4.2, is that the norm of the most exterior profile of any profile decomposition of a sequence $\{(a(t_n), \partial_t a(t_n))\}$ is bounded from below by a universal constant independent of the solution.

4.1. Linear behavior

We start by two preliminary results on the linear problem, valid in odd dimension only, that will be needed later. The first one follows from the Huyghens principle:

Lemma 4.1. *Assume that N is odd. Let v be a solution of the linear wave equation* (2.1) *with initial conditions* (v_0, v_1), *let* $\{\lambda_n\}_n$, $\{t_n\}_n$ *be two real sequences with λ_n positive, set*

$$v_n(t, x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2-1}} v\left(\frac{t}{\lambda_n}, \frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right),$$

and assume $\lim_{n \to \infty} t_n/\lambda_n = \ell \in [-\infty, \infty]$. *Then, if $\ell = \pm\infty$,*

$$\lim_{R \to \infty} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \int_{||x| - |t_n|| \ge R\lambda_n} \left[|\nabla v_n(t_n)|^2 + \frac{1}{|x|^2} |v_n(t_n)|^2 + (\partial_t v_n(t_n))^2 \right] dx = 0,$$

and if $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{R \to \infty} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \int_{\substack{\{|x| \ge R\lambda_n\} \\ \cup \{|x| \le \lambda_n/R\}}} \left[|\nabla v_n(t_n)|^2 + \frac{1}{|x|^2} |v_n(t_n)|^2 + (\partial_t v_n(t_n))^2 \right] dx = 0.$$

Proof. This is a classical property. In the case $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$, just notice that

$$v_n(t_n, x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2-1}} v\left(\ell, \frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right) + o_n(1) \quad \text{in } \dot{H}^1,$$

$$\partial_t v_n(t_n, x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2}} \partial_t v\left(\ell, \frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right) + o_n(1) \quad \text{in } L^2,$$

which implies the announced estimate (in this case we do not need any assumption on the parity of N).

Let us treat the case $\ell = \pm\infty$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, and let $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be such that $\chi(x) = 1$ for $|x| \leq 1/2$ and $\chi(x) = 0$ for $|x| \geq 1$. Then

$$\lim_{R \to \infty} [\|\nabla(v_0^R - v_0)\|_{L^2} + \|v_1^R - v_1\|_{L^2}] = 0,$$

where

$$v_0^R(x) = \chi(x/R)v_0(x), \quad v_1^R(x) = \chi(x/R)v_1(x).$$

Choose R_ε such that for $R \geq R_\varepsilon$, $\sqrt{\|\nabla(v_0^R - v_0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|v_1^R - v_1\|_{L^2}^2} \leq \varepsilon$. Let $R \geq R_\varepsilon$ and denote by v_n^R the solution with initial condition $v_{0,n}^R = \lambda_n^{1-N/2} v_0^R(x/\lambda_n)$, $v_{1,n}^R = \lambda_n^{-N/2} v_1^R(x/\lambda_n)$. By conservation of energy and the scaling of the equation,

$$\forall n, \quad \sqrt{\|\nabla v_n^R(t_n) - \nabla v_n(t_n)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t v_n^R(t_n) - \partial_t v_n(t_n)\|_{L^2}^2} \leq \varepsilon.$$

By the strong Huyghens principle, $(v_n^R(t_n), \partial_t v_n^R(t_n))$ is supported in the ring $\{|t_n| - R\lambda_n \leq |x| \leq |t_n| + R\lambda_n\}$. Hence for large n (using Hardy's inequality),

$$\left(\int_{||t_n|-|x||\geq R\lambda_n} \left[|\nabla v_n(t_n)|^2 + \frac{1}{|x|^2}|v_n(t_n)|^2 + (\partial_t v_n(t_n))^2\right] dx\right)^{1/2}$$

$$\leq \left(\int_{||t_n|-|x||\geq R\lambda_n} \left[|\nabla v_n^R(t_n)|^2 + \frac{1}{|x|^2}|v_n^R(t_n)|^2 + (\partial_t v_n^R(t_n))^2\right] dx\right)^{1/2} + C\varepsilon = C\varepsilon,$$

which concludes the proof of the lemma. $\qquad\square$

We next give, in Lemma 4.2, a property of the energy of radial solutions to the linear equation in space dimension $N = 3$. In Corollary 4.3 we deduce a similar property for solutions of the nonlinear equation which are sums of small profiles.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that $N = 3$. Let v be a **radial** solution of (2.1), $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 < r_0 < r_1$. Then the following property holds for all $t \geq t_0$ or for all $t \leq t_0$:*

$$\int_{r_0+|t-t_0|<r<r_1+|t-t_0|} [(\partial_r(rv(t,x)))^2 + r^2(\partial_t v(t,x))^2] \, dr$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{r_0<r<r_1} [(\partial_r(rv(t_0,x)))^2 + r^2(\partial_t v(t_0,x))^2] \, dr. \quad (4.2)$$

Proof. We can assume that $t_0 = 0$. Let $f = rv$, $f_0 = f_{\restriction t=0}$, $f_1 = \partial_t f_{\restriction t=0}$. Then

$$\partial_t^2 f = \partial_r^2 f, \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}, \, r > 0. \tag{4.3}$$

Furthermore, as $v(t)$ is in $\dot{H}^1$ for all t, by Hardy's inequality in dimension 3,

$$\int \frac{1}{r^2}(f(t,r))^2 \, dr + \int (\partial_r f(t,r))^2 \, dr < \infty.$$

By Sobolev embeddings in dimension 1, for all t, $f(t, \cdot)$ is continuous and satisfies the condition $f(t,0) = 0$. By explicit computation we get

$$f(t,r) = F(t+r) - F(t-r), \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}, \, r > 0,$$

where F is defined by

$$F(s) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{2} f_0(s) + \dfrac{1}{2} \displaystyle\int_0^s f_1(\sigma) \, d\sigma, & s > 0, \\[4mm] -\dfrac{1}{2} f_0(-s) + \dfrac{1}{2} \displaystyle\int_0^{-s} f_1(\sigma) \, d\sigma, & s < 0. \end{cases}$$

Thus, if $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_{r_0+|t|}^{r_1+|t|} [(\partial_t f(t,r))^2 + (\partial_r f(t,r))^2] \, dr = 2 \int_{r_0+|t|}^{r_1+|t|} [(F'(t+r))^2 + (F'(t-r))^2] \, dr. \tag{4.4}$$

Consequently, if $t > 0$,

$$\int_{r_0+|t|}^{r_1+|t|} [(\partial_t f)^2 + (\partial_r f)^2] \, dr \geq 2 \int_{r_0}^{r_1} (F'(-r))^2 \, dr,$$

and if $t < 0$,

$$\int_{r_0+|t|}^{r_1+|t|} [(\partial_t f)^2 + (\partial_r f)^2] \, dr \geq 2 \int_{r_0}^{r_1} (F'(r))^2 \, dr.$$

By (4.4) at $t = 0$ we see that

$$\int_{r_0+|t|}^{r_1+|t|} [(\partial_t f(t,r))^2 + (\partial_r f(t,r))^2] \, dr \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{r_0}^{r_1} [(f_1(r))^2 + (\partial_r f_0(r))^2] \, dr$$

for all $t > 0$ or for all $t < 0$, hence (4.2) follows. $\square$

Corollary 4.3. *Assume that $N = 3$. Let $C_0 > 0$. Then there exists a constant $\delta_1 = \delta_1(C_0) > 0$ with the following property. Let $J > 0$, and let $\{\lambda_{1,n}\}_n, \ldots, \{\lambda_{J,n}\}_n$ be sequences of positive numbers such that*

$$\lambda_{1,n} \ll \cdots \ll \lambda_{J,n} \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

*Pick J **radial** solutions $U^1, \ldots, U^J$ of (1.1) with initial conditions (U_0^j, U_1^j), $j = 1, \ldots, J$, such that*

$$\forall j \in \{1, \ldots, J\}, \quad \sqrt{\|\nabla U_0^j\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_1^j\|_{L^2}^2} = \eta_j \leq \delta_1.$$

Select a sequence $\{w_n\}$ of solutions of the linear wave equation (2.1) such that

$$\forall j \in \{1, \ldots, J\}, \quad (\lambda_j^{N/2-1} w_{0,n}(\lambda_j x), \lambda_j^{N/2} w_{1,n}(\lambda_j x)) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \text{ weakly in } \dot{H}^1 \times L^2,$$

Let $\eta = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^J \eta_j^2}$ and assume that $\eta \leq C_0$. Let

$$U_n(t, x) = \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{N/2-1}} U^j\left(\frac{t}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right) + w_n(t, x).$$

Then there exists $r_1 > 0$ such that for large n, the inequality

$$\sqrt{\int_{r_1\lambda_{1,n}+|t|<|x|} [|\nabla U_n(t, x)|^2 + (\partial_t U_n(t, x))^2]\, dx} \geq \frac{\eta}{4} \tag{4.5}$$

holds for all $t > 0$ or for all $t < 0$.

Proof. Denote
$$U_{0,n}(x) = U_n(0, x), \quad U_{1,n}(x) = \partial_t U_n(0, x).$$

Let U_{L}^j be the solution of (2.1) with initial conditions (U_0^j, U_1^j), $j = 1, \ldots, J$, and

$$U_{\mathrm{L},n}(t, x) = \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{N/2-1}} U_{\mathrm{L}}^j\left(\frac{t}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right) + w_n(t, x).$$

Step 1. We first show that if $\delta_1 = \delta_1(C_0)$ is chosen small enough, then

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \sqrt{\|U_n(t) - U_{\mathrm{L},n}(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 + \|\partial_t U_n(t) - \partial_t U_{\mathrm{L},n}(t)\|_{L^2}^2} \leq \frac{\eta}{4}. \tag{4.6}$$

Indeed by (2.8), if $\delta_1^3 \leq 1/(CC_0)$ for some large constant C, then $\sqrt{\|\nabla U_0^j\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_1^j\|_{L^2}^2} = \eta_j \leq \delta_1$ implies

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \sqrt{\|U^j(t) - U_{\mathrm{L}}^j(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 + \|\partial_t U^j(t) - \partial_t U_{\mathrm{L}}^j(t)\|_{L^2}^2} \leq C\eta_j^5 \leq \frac{\eta_j^2}{4C_0}.$$

By the triangle inequality and the fact that $\eta \leq C_0$,

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \sqrt{\|U_n(t) - U_{\mathrm{L},n}(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 + \|\partial_t U_n(t) - \partial_t U_{\mathrm{L},n}(t)\|_{L^2}^2} \leq \frac{\eta^2}{4C_0} \leq \frac{\eta}{4}.$$

Hence (4.6) follows.

Step 2. We next show that there exists $r_1 > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \int_{r_1 \lambda_{1,n}}^{\infty} [(\partial_r (r U_{0,n}(r)))^2 + (r U_{1,n}(r))^2] \, dr \geq \frac{\eta^2}{2}. \tag{4.7}$$

Indeed, if $f \in \dot{H}^1$ is a radial function and $0 < R_0 < R_1$,

$$\int_{R_0}^{R_1} (\partial_r (r f(r)))^2 \, dr = \int_{R_0}^{R_1} [f^2 + r^2 (\partial_r f)^2 + 2 r f \partial_r f] \, dr$$

$$= \int_{R_0}^{R_1} [f^2 + r^2 (\partial_r f)^2 + r \partial_r (f^2)] \, dr$$

$$= \int_{R_0}^{R_1} r^2 (\partial_r f)^2 \, dr + R_1 f^2(R_1) - R_0 f^2(R_0).$$

By Hardy's inequality, $\int f(t, r)^2 \, dr < \infty$, which implies that there exist sequences $R_n \to \infty$ and $\tilde{R}_n \to 0$ such that $R_n f(R_n)^2 \to 0$ and $\tilde{R}_n f(\tilde{R}_n)^2 \to 0$. Letting $R_1 = R_n$ and $n \to \infty$, we get

$$\int_{R_0}^{\infty} (\partial_r (r f(r)))^2 \, dr = \int_{|x| \geq R_0} |\nabla f|^2 \, dx - R_0 f(R_0)^2 \leq \int_{|x| \geq R_0} |\nabla f|^2 \, dx. \tag{4.8}$$

Letting $R_0 = \tilde{R}_n$ and $n \to \infty$ we get

$$\int_0^{\infty} (\partial_r (r f(r)))^2 \, dr = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla f|^2 \, dx. \tag{4.9}$$

By (4.9), there exists $r_1 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{r_1}^{\infty} [(\partial_r (r U_0^1(r)))^2 + (r U_1^1(r))^2] \, dr \geq \frac{\eta_1^2}{2}. \tag{4.10}$$

Let $g^j = \partial_r (r U_0^j(r)) \in L^2(dr)$. Then

$$A_n^{j,k} := \left| \int_{r_1 \lambda_{1,n}}^{\infty} \partial_r \left(\frac{r}{\lambda_{j,n}^{1/2}} U_0^j \left(\frac{r}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) \right) \partial_r \left(\frac{r}{\lambda_{k,n}^{1/2}} U_0^k \left(\frac{r}{\lambda_{k,n}} \right) \right) dr \right|$$

$$= \left| \int_{r_1 \lambda_{1,n}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{1/2}} g_j \left(\frac{r}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) \frac{1}{\lambda_{k,n}^{1/2}} g_k \left(\frac{r}{\lambda_{k,n}} \right) dr \right|$$

$$= \left| \int_{r_1 \lambda_{1,n}/\lambda_{j,n}}^{\infty} g_j(\rho) \frac{\lambda_{j,n}^{1/2}}{\lambda_{k,n}^{1/2}} g_k \left(\frac{\lambda_{j,n}}{\lambda_{k,n}} \rho \right) d\rho \right|. \tag{4.11}$$

Letting $j = k$ in (4.11) we deduce that if $j > 1$, then $A_n^{j,j} \to \int_0^{\infty} g_j(\rho)^2 \, d\rho$ as $n \to \infty$. Furthermore if $1 \leq j < k$, using that $\lambda_{k,n}/\lambda_{j,n} \to \infty$, we find that for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$|A_n^{j,k}| \leq C_j \sqrt{\int_0^{R_\varepsilon} \frac{\lambda_{j,n}}{\lambda_{k,n}} \left(g_k \left(\frac{\lambda_{j,n}}{\lambda_{k,n}} \rho \right) \right)^2 d\rho} + C_k \sqrt{\int_{R_\varepsilon}^{\infty} g_j(\rho)^2 \, d\rho} \leq o_n(1) + \varepsilon.$$

and hence $A_n^{j,k} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Similarly, noting that $h_n = \partial_r (r w_{0,n}) = w_{0,n} + r \partial_r w_{0,n}$ is such that $\lambda_{j,n}^{1/2} h_n(\lambda_{j,n} \cdot)$ converges weakly to 0 in $L^2(dr)$ we get

$$\int_{r_1 \lambda_{1,n}}^{\infty} \partial_r \left(\frac{r}{\lambda_{j,n}^{1/2}} U_0^j \left(\frac{r}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) \right) \partial_r (r w_{0,n}) \, dr = \int_{r_1 \lambda_{1,n}/\lambda_{j,n}}^{\infty} g_j(\rho) \lambda_{j,n}^{1/2} h_n(\lambda_{j,n} \rho) \, d\rho$$

$$= \begin{cases} \int_{r_1}^{\infty} g_1(\rho) \lambda_{1,n}^{1/2} h_n(\lambda_{1,n} \rho) \, d\rho + o_n(1) & \text{if } j = 1, \\ \int_0^{\infty} g_j(\rho) \lambda_{j,n}^{1/2} h_n(\lambda_{j,n} \rho) \, d\rho + o_n(1) & \text{if } j > 1, \end{cases}$$

which tends to 0 as $n \to \infty$. Using similar estimates on $U_{1,n}$ and $w_{1,n}$ and combining with (4.10) we get (4.7).

Step 3: End of the proof. In view of Step 2 and Lemma 4.2, if n is large, then the following holds for all $t > 0$ or for all $t < 0$:

$$\int_{r_1 \lambda_{1,n} + |t|}^{\infty} [(\partial_r (r U_{n,\mathrm{L}}))^2 + (\partial_t (r U_{n,\mathrm{L}}))^2] \, dr \geq \frac{\eta^2}{4}.$$

By (4.8), for all $t > 0$ or for all $t < 0$,

$$\int_{|x| \geq r_1 \lambda_{1,n} + |t|} [|\nabla U_{n,\mathrm{L}}|^2 + |\partial_t U_{n,\mathrm{L}}|^2] \, dx \geq \frac{\eta^2}{4}.$$

By Step 1 and the triangle inequality,

$$\sqrt{\int_{|x| \geq r_1 \lambda_{1,n} + |t|} [|\nabla U_n|^2 + |\partial_t U_n|^2] \, dx} \geq \frac{\eta}{2} - \frac{\eta}{4} = \frac{\eta}{4},$$

which concludes the proof. $\square$

4.2. No small exterior profile

Before stating the main result of this section, we introduce some notation. Throughout the following, we assume $N = 3$. Let $\tau_n \to 1^-$ and consider a profile decomposition of $\{(a(\tau_n), \partial_t a(\tau_n))\}$ with profiles $\{U_{\mathrm{L}}^j\}$ and parameters $\{\lambda_{j,n}, t_{j,n}\}$. We will consider as usual the nonlinear profiles $\{U^j\}$ associated to $\{U_{\mathrm{L}}^j\}$, $-t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n}$, and will write, for the sake of simplicity,

$$U_{\mathrm{L},n}^j(t, x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{1/2}} U_{\mathrm{L}}^j \left(\frac{t - t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right), \qquad U_n^j(t, x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{3/2}} U^j \left(\frac{t - t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right).$$

The second expression is defined as long as $(t - t_{j,n})/\lambda_{j,n}$ is in $(T_-(U^j), T_+(U^j))$. We will also write

$$U_{0,n}^j = U_{\mathrm{L},n}^j(0, x), \qquad U_{1,n}^j = (\partial_t U_{\mathrm{L},n}^j)(0, x).$$

Let $j \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Extracting subsequences and time-translating the profiles if necessary we can assume that

$$\forall n, \; t_{j,n} = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \in \{-\infty, \infty\}. \tag{4.12}$$

We define

$$\rho_{j,n} = \begin{cases} |t_{j,n}| & \text{if } |t_{j,n}|/\lambda_{j,n} \to \infty, \\ \lambda_{j,n} & \text{if } t_{j,n} = 0. \end{cases}$$

According to Lemma 4.1 the sequence $\{(U_{0,n}^j, U_{1,n}^j)\}_n$ is localized, for large n, around $|x| \approx \rho_{j,n}$.

Reordering the profiles and extracting subsequences, we can find a $J_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that (here $\delta_1(C_0)$ is given by Corollary 4.3, and C_0 is the constant in assumption (4.1))

$$j > J_0 \;\Leftrightarrow\; (E(U_0^j, U_1^j) \le (\delta_1(C_0))^2/N, \text{ and } \|\nabla U_0^j\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2})$$
$$\text{or } (\lim_{n\to\infty} -t_{j,n}/\lambda_j^j \in \{\pm\infty\} \text{ and } E(U_0^j, U_1^j) < E(W, 0)), \tag{4.13}$$

$$\rho_{J_0,n} \lesssim \rho_{J_0-1,n} \lesssim \cdots \lesssim \rho_{1,n}. \tag{4.14}$$

In particular if $j > J_0$ and $t_{j,n} = 0$ for all n, by Claim 2.3 we have $\|\nabla U_0^j\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_1^j\|_{L^2}^2 \le (\delta_1(C_0))^2$.

In this section we show:

Proposition 4.4. *Under the above assumptions,*

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{|x|\ge R\rho_{1,n}} [|\nabla a(\tau_n)|^2 + (\partial_t a(\tau_n))^2]\, dx = 0. \tag{4.15}$$

Proof. If (4.15) does not hold, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and a sequence $\{\overline{\rho}\}_n$ such that

$$\int_{|x|\ge\overline{\rho}_n} [|\nabla a(\tau_n)|^2 + (\partial_t a(\tau_n))^2]\, dx \ge \varepsilon_0, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\overline{\rho}_n}{\rho_{1,n}} = \infty. \tag{4.16}$$

Since $\operatorname{supp} a(\tau_n) \subset \{|x| \le 1 - \tau_n\}$, we have $\overline{\rho}_n \le 1 - \tau_n$. Moreover, by Claim B.1, we get, extracting subsequences in n, a sequence $\{\tilde{\rho}_n\}_n$ such that

$$\rho_{1,n} \ll \tilde{\rho}_n \ll \overline{\rho}_n \tag{4.17}$$

and

$$\forall j, \quad \tilde{\rho}_n \ll \rho_{j,n} \text{ or } \rho_{j,n} \ll \tilde{\rho}_n. \tag{4.18}$$

Let $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be such that $\chi(x) = 1$ if $|x| \ge 2$ and $\chi(x) = 0$ if $|x| \le 1$. Then

$$\chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)u(\tau_n, x) = \chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)v(\tau_n, x) + \sum_{j=1}^J \chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)U_{0,n}^j + \chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)w_{0,n}^J, \tag{4.19}$$

$$\chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)\partial_t u(\tau_n, x) = \chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)\partial_t v(\tau_n, x) + \sum_{j=1}^J \chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)U_{1,n}^j + \chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)w_{1,n}^J. \tag{4.20}$$

Claim 4.5. *If $\rho_{j,n} \ll \tilde{\rho}_n$ then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} [\|\chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)U_{0,n}^j\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|\chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)U_{1,n}^j\|_{L^2}] = 0.$$

If $\tilde{\rho}_n \ll \rho_{j,n}$ then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} [\|\chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)U_{0,n}^j - U_{0,n}^j\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|\chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)U_{1,n}^j - U_{1,n}^j\|_{L^2}] = 0.$$

Proof. Indeed by Lemma 4.1,

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_{\rho_{j,n}/R \le |x| \le R\rho_{j,n}} [|\nabla U_{0,n}^j|^2 + |U_{1,n}^j|^2] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla U_{0,n}^j|^2 + |U_{1,n}^j|^2].$$

In the case $\rho_{j,n} \ll \tilde{\rho}_n$, choose $\varepsilon > 0$ and $R = R(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{R\rho_{j,n} \le |x|} [|\nabla U_{0,n}^j|^2 + |U_{1,n}^j|^2] \le \varepsilon.$$

As $R\rho_{j,n} \ll \tilde{\rho}_n$, we see that for large n,

$$\|\chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)U_{0,n}^j\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 + \|\chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)U_{1,n}^j\|_{L^2}^2 \le \int_{R\rho_{j,n} \le |x|} [|\nabla U_{0,n}^j|^2 + |U_{1,n}^j|^2] \le \varepsilon,$$

which shows the first estimate of the claim. The proof of the second one is similar and we skip it. □

Let us denote by $\mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}$ the set of indices j such that $\tilde{\rho}_n \ll \rho_{j,n}$. Note that for $j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}$ we have $j > J_0$ and thus

$$j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}} \Rightarrow (E(U_0^j, U_1^j) \le (\delta_1(C_0))^2/N \text{ and } \|\nabla U_0^j\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2})$$
$$\text{or } (\lim_{n\to\infty} -t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n} = \pm\infty \text{ and } E(U_0^j, U_1^j) < E(W, 0)),$$

so the corresponding nonlinear profile U^j is globally defined and scatters in both time directions. In view of Claim 4.5, we rewrite (4.19), (4.20) as

$$\chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)u(\tau_n, x) = v(\tau_n, x) + \sum_{\substack{j\in\mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}} \\ j \le J}} U_{0,n}^j(x) + \tilde{w}_{0,n}^J(x), \qquad (4.21)$$

$$\chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)\partial_t u(\tau_n, x) = \partial_t v(\tau_n, x) + \sum_{\substack{j\in\mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}} \\ j \le J}} U_{1,n}^j(x) + \tilde{w}_{1,n}^J(x), \qquad (4.22)$$

where

$$\tilde{w}_{0,n}^J = \chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)w_{0,n}^J + o_n(1) \text{ in } \dot{H}^1, \qquad \tilde{w}_{1,n}^J = \chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)w_{1,n}^J + o_n(1) \text{ in } L^2.$$

By Claim 2.11,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \limsup_{J\to\infty} \|\tilde{w}_n^J\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} = 0. \qquad (4.23)$$

Indeed, if (4.23) does not hold, one can find, in view of (2.12), sequences $\{n_k\}_k$, $\{J_k\}_k$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\forall k, \ \|\tilde{w}_{n_k}^{J_k}\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} \geq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \to \infty} \|w_{n_k}^{J_k}\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} = 0,$$

a contradiction with Claim 2.11.

By (4.23), the decomposition (4.21), (4.22) is a profile decomposition of the sequence

$$\chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)(u(\tau_n, x), \partial_t u(\tau_n, x)).$$

Denote by $\tilde{u}_n$ the solution of (1.1) such that

$$\tilde{u}_{n \restriction t=\tau_n} = \chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)u(\tau_n, x), \qquad \partial_t \tilde{u}_{n \restriction t=\tau_n} = \chi(x/\tilde{\rho}_n)\partial_t u(\tau_n, x).$$

Using that all the nonlinear solutions U^j, $j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}$, are globally defined and scatter, we deduce by Proposition 2.8 that $\tilde{u}_n$ is globally defined for large n and

$$\tilde{u}_n(\tau_n + t, x) = v(\tau_n + t, x) + \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}} \\ j \leq J}} U_n^j(t, x) + \tilde{w}_n^J(t, x) + r_n^J(t, x), \qquad (4.24)$$

where r_n^J satisfies (2.23). By the definition of $\tilde{u}_n$,

$$\tilde{u}_n(\tau_n, x) = u(\tau_n, x), \qquad \partial_t \tilde{u}_n(\tau_n, x) = \partial_t u(\tau_n, x) \quad \text{if } |x| \geq 2\tilde{\rho}_n. \qquad (4.25)$$

By finite speed of propagation, as long as $0 \leq \tau_n + t < 1$, we have

$$\tilde{u}_n(\tau_n + t, x) = u(\tau_n + t, x), \qquad \partial_t \tilde{u}_n(\tau_n + t, x) = \partial_t u(\tau_n + t, x) \quad \text{if } |x| \geq 2\tilde{\rho}_n + |t|.$$
$$(4.26)$$

The key point of the proof is the following claim:

Claim 4.6. *The set $\mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}$ is empty.*

Proof. The proof takes several steps.

Step 1: No profile dispersing backward in time. Let $k \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}$. We first show that we cannot have $-t_{k,n}/\lambda_{k,n} \to -\infty$. Let us assume that $-t_{k,n}/\lambda_{k,n} \to -\infty$. Then $\rho_{k,n} = |t_{k,n}|$. Furthermore U^k scatters backward in time. As a consequence, by Lemma 4.1, if M is large enough, there exists $\varepsilon_k > 0$ such that for all large n,

$$\int_{|x| \geq t_{k,n} + \tau_n - M\lambda_{k,n}} [|\nabla U_n^k(-\tau_n, x)|^2 + |\partial_t U_n^k(-\tau_n, x)|^2] \, dx \geq \varepsilon_k.$$

As $k \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}$, we know that $t_{k,n} = \rho_{k,n} \gg \tilde{\rho}_n$. Furthermore $\lambda_{k,n} = o(|t_{k,n}|)$. Thus for large n, $t_{k,n} + \tau_n - M\lambda_{k,n} \gg 2\tilde{\rho}_n + \tau_n$, and the preceding inequality implies

$$\int_{|x| \geq 2\tilde{\rho}_n + \tau_n} [|\nabla U_n^k(-\tau_n, x)|^2 + |\partial_t U_n^k(-\tau_n, x)|^2] \, dx \geq \varepsilon_k. \qquad (4.27)$$

Using again that U^k scatters backward in time and that $\tilde{\rho}_n \ll t_{k,n}$, by Lemma 4.1 we get

$$\int_{|x| \le 2\tilde{\rho}_n + \tau_n} [|\nabla U_n^k(-\tau_n, x)|^2 + |\partial_t U_n^k(-\tau_n, x)|^2] \, dx = o_n(1). \tag{4.28}$$

Let $j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}} \setminus \{k\}$. Then U^j scatters in both time directions, and there exists a solution V_L^j of the linear wave equation such that

$$\lim_{t \to -\infty} [\|V_L^j(t) - U^j(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|\partial_t V_L^j(t) - \partial_t U^j(t)\|_{L^2}] = 0.$$

Noting $V_{L,n}^j(t, x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{1/2}} V_L^j\left(\frac{t - t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right)$, we get, by conservation of energy for the linear wave equation and (4.28),

$$\int_{|x| \ge \tau_n + 2\tilde{\rho}_n} \nabla_{t,x} U_n^j(-\tau_n) \cdot \nabla_{t,x} U_n^k(-\tau_n) \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla_{t,x} U_n^j(-\tau_n) \cdot \nabla_{t,x} U_n^k(-\tau_n) \, dx + o_n(1)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla_{t,x} V_{L,n}^j(0) \cdot \nabla_{t,x} U_{L,n}^k(0) \, dx + o_n(1) = o_n(1), \tag{4.29}$$

where we have used the orthogonality of the parameters $(\lambda_{j,n}, t_{j,n})$ and $(\lambda_{k,n}, t_{k,n})$. Similarly, if $J > k$,

$$\int_{|x| \ge \tau_n + 2\tilde{\rho}_n} \nabla_{t,x} U_n^k(-\tau_n, x) \cdot \nabla_{t,x} \tilde{w}_n^J(-\tau_n, x) \, dx$$

$$= \int \nabla_{t,x} U_n^k(-\tau_n, x) \cdot \nabla_{t,x} \tilde{w}_n^J(-\tau_n, x) \, dx + o_n(1)$$

$$= \int \nabla_{t,x} V_{L,n}^k(-\tau_n, x) \cdot \nabla_{t,x} \tilde{w}_n^J(-\tau_n, x) \, dx + o_n(1)$$

$$= \int \nabla_{t,x} V_{L,n}^k(-t_{k,n}, x) \cdot \nabla_{t,x} \tilde{w}_n^J(0, x) \, dx + o_n(1) = o_n(1). \tag{4.30}$$

At the last line, we used the conservation of energy, and the fact that by (4.23), the $\tilde{w}_n^J$ are the remainders of the profile decomposition (4.21), (4.22) and thus by (2.13),

$$\lambda_{k,n}^{N/2} \nabla_{t,x} \tilde{w}_n^J(t_{k,n}, \lambda_{k,n} x) \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} 0 \quad \text{in } (L^2)^{N+1}.$$

Combining (4.24) with $t = -\tau_n$, (4.25), (4.27), (4.29) and (4.30) we get, if n is large enough,

$$\int_{|x| \ge \tau_n + 2\tilde{\rho}_n} [|\nabla_{t,x} u(0, x)|^2 - |\nabla_{t,x} v(0, x)|^2] \ge \frac{\varepsilon_k}{2}.$$

As the function $x \mapsto |\nabla_{t,x} u(0, x)|^2 - |\nabla_{t,x} v(0, x)|^2$ is supported in $\{|x| \le 1\}$, we get

$$\int_{2\tilde{\rho}_n + |\tau_n| \le |x| \le 1} \left||\nabla_{t,x} u(0, x)|^2 - |\nabla_{t,x} v(0, x)|^2\right| \ge \frac{\varepsilon_k}{2}.$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ we have $2\tilde{\rho}_n + |\tau_n| \to 1$, which yields a contradiction.

Step 2: No profile dispersing forward in time. We next show by contradiction that if $k \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}$ we cannot have $\lim_{n \to \infty} -t_{k,n}/\lambda_{k,n} = \infty$. Let $\sigma_n = (1 - \tau_n)/2$. Using that U^k scatters forward in time, Lemma 4.1 implies that if M is large enough, there exists $\varepsilon_k > 0$ such that for all large n,

$$\int_{|x| \geq |t_{k,n}| + \sigma_n - M\lambda_{k,n}} |\nabla_{t,x} U_n^k(\sigma_n, x)|^2 \, dx \geq \varepsilon_k. \tag{4.31}$$

By Lemma 4.1, we also have (using that $\lambda_{k,n} \ll |t_{k,n}|$)

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{|x| \leq \sigma_n} |\nabla_{t,x} U_n^k(\sigma_n, x)|^2 \, dx = 0,$$

from which we can deduce the analogues of the ortogonality conditions (4.29) and (4.30) with $\tau_n + 2\tilde{\rho}_n$ replaced by σ_n. As in the preceding case, using (4.24) with $t = \sigma_n$ we deduce from (4.31) that for large n,

$$\int_{|x| \geq \sigma_n} \left[\left| \nabla_{t,x} u \left(\frac{1 + \tau_n}{2}, x \right) \right|^2 - \left| \nabla_{t,x} v \left(\frac{1 + \tau_n}{2}, x \right) \right|^2 \right] \geq \frac{\varepsilon_k}{2}.$$

As $1 - (1 + \tau_n)/2 = \sigma_n$, this contradicts the fact that $|x| \leq 1 - t$ on the support of $u - v$.

Step 3: No compact profile. In this step we conclude the proof, showing that $\mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}$ is empty. According to Steps 1 and 2, for all $j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}$ and all n, $t_{j,n} = 0$, and we can rewrite (4.24) as

$$\tilde{u}_n(\tau_n + t) = v(\tau_n + t, x) + \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}} \\ j \leq J}} \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{1/2}} U^j \left(\frac{t}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) + \tilde{w}_n^J(t, x) + r_n^J(t, x), \tag{4.32}$$

Furthermore, we know that $j > J_0$ for $j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}$, and thus by the definition of J_0 we have

$$\sqrt{\|\nabla U_0^j\|^2 + \|U_1^j\|^2} \leq \delta_1(C_0). \tag{4.33}$$

Assume that $\mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}$ is not empty. Then by assumption (4.1) for large J,

$$0 < \eta^2 = \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}} \\ j \leq J}} [\|\nabla U_0^j\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_1^j\|_{L^2}^2] \leq C_0^2.$$

Choose J such that

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \sqrt{\|\nabla r_n^J(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t r_n^J(t)\|_{L^2}} \leq \frac{\eta}{8}. \tag{4.34}$$

Let $k \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}$ be such that $k \leq J$ and

$$\lambda_k = \inf_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}} \\ j = 1, \ldots, J}} \lambda_j.$$

By (4.33), we can use Corollary 4.3, which implies that there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that the following occurs for all $t \in [-\tau_n, 0)$ or for all $t \in (0, 1 - \tau_n)$:

$$\int_{|x| \geq \lambda_{k,n} r_0 + |t|} [|\nabla U_n(t, x)|^2 + |\partial_t U_n(t, x)|^2] \, dx \geq \frac{\eta^2}{16},$$

where

$$U_n = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}} \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{1/2}} U^j \left(\frac{t}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) + \tilde{w}_n^J(t, x).$$

And thus by (4.34), for all $t \in [-\tau_n, 0)$ or for all $t \in (0, 1 - \tau_n)$,

$$\int_{|x| \geq \lambda_{k,n} r_0 + |t|} [|\nabla(\tilde{u}_n(\tau_n + t) - v(\tau_n + t))|^2 + |\partial_t \tilde{u}_n(\tau_n + t) - \partial_t v(\tau_n + t)|^2] \geq \frac{\eta^2}{64}. \quad (4.35)$$

First assume that this holds for all $t \in (0, 1 - \tau_n)$. Letting $t_n = (1 - \tau_n - r_0 \lambda_{k,n})/2$ in (4.35), we obtain, for large n,

$$\int_{|x| \geq 1 - \tau_n - t_n} [|\nabla(\tilde{u}_n(\tau_n + t_n) - v(\tau_n + t_n))|^2 + |\partial_t \tilde{u}_n(\tau_n + t_n) - \partial_t v(\tau_n + t_n)|^2] \geq \frac{\eta^2}{64}.$$

Furthermore, as $k \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}}$, we have $2\tilde{\rho}_n + t_n \leq 1 - \tau_n - t_n$, and thus by (4.26), $|x| \leq 1 - \tau_n - t_n$ on the support of $u(\tau_n + t_n, \cdot) - v(\tau_n + t_n, \cdot)$, a contradiction.

It remains to treat the case when (4.35) holds for all $t \in [-\tau_n, 0)$. Then (4.35) with $t = -\tau_n$ yields

$$\int_{|x| \geq \lambda_{k,n} r_0 + \tau_n} [|\nabla(\tilde{u}_n(0) - v(0))|^2 + |\partial_t \tilde{u}_n(0) - \partial_t v(0)|^2] \geq \frac{\eta^2}{64},$$

which is again a contradiction, recalling that $(\tilde{u}_n(0, x), \partial_t \tilde{u}_n(0, x))$ and $(u(0, x), \partial_t u(0, x))$ coincide for $|x| \geq \tau_n + 2\tilde{\rho}_n$, and thus for $|x| \geq \tau_n + \lambda_{k,n} r_0$ for large n. The proof of Claim 4.6 is complete. □

To finish the proof of Proposition 4.4, we must show that if $\overline{\rho}_n$ is as in (4.16), and J is large, then

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{|x| \geq \overline{\rho}_n} [|\nabla w_{0,n}^J|^2 + (w_{1,n}^J)^2] \, dx = 0. \quad (4.36)$$

We will use that w_n^J is a radial solution of the linear wave equation (2.1). By (4.8),

$$\int_{\overline{\rho}_n}^{\infty} (\partial_r (r w_{0,n}^J))^2 \, dr = \int_{|x| \geq \overline{\rho}_n} |\nabla w_n^J|^2 \, dx - \overline{\rho}_n w_{0,n}^J(\overline{\rho}_n)^2. \quad (4.37)$$

By the construction of the profile decomposition (see (2.13)), we can choose J so large that

$$\overline{\rho}_n^{1/2} w_{0,n}^J(\overline{\rho}_n \cdot) \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} 0 \quad \text{in } \dot{H}^1. \quad (4.38)$$

The map $u \mapsto u(1)$ is a continuous linear form on the vector space of radial functions in $\dot{H}^1$. Thus (4.38) implies

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \overline{\rho}_n^{1/2} w_{0,n}^J(\overline{\rho}_n) = 0. \tag{4.39}$$

To show (4.36), assume for contradiction that after extraction (in n), for large n,

$$\int_{|x| \geq \overline{\rho}_n} [|\nabla w_{0,n}^J|^2 + (w_{1,n}^J)^2]\,dx \geq \varepsilon_0.$$

Then by (4.37) and (4.39), for large n,

$$\int_{\overline{\rho}_n}^{\infty} [(\partial_r (r w_{0,n}^J))^2 + (r w_{1,n}^J)^2]\,dr \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}. \tag{4.40}$$

By Lemma 4.2, and still extracting subsequences, the following holds for all $t > 0$ or all $t < 0$, and for all large n:

$$\int_{\overline{\rho}_n + |t|}^{\infty} [(\partial_r (r w_n^J(t)))^2 + (r \partial_t w_n^J(t))^2]\,dr \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4}.$$

By (4.8), this implies that for all $t > 0$ or for all $t < 0$,

$$\int_{|x| \geq \overline{\rho}_n + |t|} [|\nabla w_n^J(t)|^2 + (\partial_t w_n^J(t))^2]\,dx \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4}.$$

By finite speed of propagation, we have

$$\tilde{w}_n^J(t, x) = w_n^J(t, x), \qquad |x| \geq 2\tilde{\rho}_n + |t|.$$

As $\tilde{\rho}_n \ll \overline{\rho}_n$, we obtain for large n,

$$\int_{|x| \geq \overline{\rho}_n + |t|} [|\nabla \tilde{w}_n^J(t)|^2 + (\partial_t \tilde{w}_n^J(t))^2]\,dx \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4}, \tag{4.41}$$

for all $t \geq 0$ or for all $t \leq 0$. In view of Claim 4.6, the equality (4.32) can be rewritten

$$\tilde{u}_n(\tau_n + t) = v(\tau_n + t, x) + \tilde{w}_n^J(t, x) + r_n^J(t, x), \qquad 0 \leq \tau_n + t < 1. \tag{4.42}$$

Taking $t = -\tau_n$ if (4.41) holds for all $t < 0$, and $t = (1 - \tau_n)/2$ if (4.41) holds for all $t > 0$, we get a contradiction as in the proof of Claim 4.6, concluding the proof of Proposition 4.4. $\qquad \square$

5. Rigidity argument for non-self-similar blow-up

In the section we consider, as in the preceding one, a radial solution in space dimension $N = 3$ that blows up at time $T = 1$ and satisfies (4.1). We assume in addition that there exist sequences $\{\tau_n\}$, $\{\lambda_n\}$ such that $\tau_n \in (0, 1)$, $\tau_n \to 1$ and

$$\lambda_n \ll 1 - \tau_n, \tag{5.1}$$

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{|x| \geq \lambda_n} \left[|\nabla a(\tau_n)|^2 + (\partial_t a(\tau_n))^2 + \frac{1}{|x|^2} (a(\tau_n))^2 \right] = 0, \tag{5.2}$$

where $a = u - v$ is as usual the singular part of u. The main result of this section is the following

Proposition 5.1. *Assume that u is radial and that (4.1), (5.1) and (5.2) hold. Then there exist a sequence $\{t_n\}$, $J_0 > 0$, $\{\iota_j\}_{j=1}^{J_0} \in \{\pm 1\}^{J_0}$, and, for $j = 1, \ldots, J_0$, sequences $\{\lambda_{j,n}\}_n$ of positive numbers, such that*

$$u(t_n, x) = v(t_n, x) + \sum_{j=1}^{J_0} \frac{\iota_j}{\lambda_{j,n}^{1/2}} W\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right) + w_{0,n} \quad \text{in } \dot{H}^1, \tag{5.3}$$

$$\partial_t u(t_n, x) = \partial_t v(t_n, x) + o_n(1) \qquad \text{in } L^2, \tag{5.4}$$

where, denoting by w_n the solution of (2.1) with initial data $(w_{0,n}, 0)$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \|w_n\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} = 0.$$

Let us mention that the assumption $N = 3$ is not essential for the arguments of this section. In §5.1 we show that assumptions (5.1), (5.2) imply that $\partial_t a$ is small in L^2 for a sequence of times. Proposition 5.1 is proven in §5.2.

5.1. Smallness of the time derivative of the solution

Lemma 5.2. *Assume* (5.2). *Then*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{1 - \tau_n} \int_{\tau_n}^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_t a)^2 \, dx \, dt = 0.$$

Corollary 5.3. *Under the assumption of Lemma* 5.2, *there exists an increasing sequence $t_n \to 1$ with $t_n \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$\forall n, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\partial_t a(t_n, x)|^2 \, dx \leq \frac{1}{n}, \tag{5.5}$$

$$\forall n, \forall \sigma \in (0, 1 - t_n), \quad \frac{1}{\sigma} \int_{t_n}^{t_n + \sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\partial_t a(t, x)|^2 \, dx \, dt \leq \frac{1}{n}. \tag{5.6}$$

Let us first assume Lemma 5.2 and prove Corollary 5.3.

Proof of Corollary 5.3. Using that the map $t \mapsto \partial_t a(t, \cdot)$ is continuous from $(0, 1)$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ we get (5.5) from (5.6) by letting $\sigma \to 0$.

The existence of a sequence $\{t_n\}$ satisfying (5.6) is equivalent to

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \ \forall t_* \in (0, 1), \ \exists t_0 \in (t_*, 1), \ \forall \sigma \in (0, 1 - t_0), \quad \frac{1}{\sigma} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_t a)^2 \, dx \, dt \leq \varepsilon.$$

Assume for contradiction that

$$\exists \varepsilon > 0, \ \exists t_* \in (0, 1), \ \forall t_0 \in (t_*, 1), \ \exists \sigma \in (0, 1 - t_0), \quad \frac{1}{\sigma} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_t a)^2 \, dx \, dt > \varepsilon. \tag{5.7}$$

By Lemma 5.2 we can fix a large n such that $\tau_n > t_*$ and

$$\frac{1}{1 - \tau_n} \int_{\tau_n}^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_t a)^2 \, dx \, dt \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Let

$$A = \left\{ \sigma \in (0, 1 - \tau_n) : \frac{1}{\sigma} \int_{\tau_n}^{\tau_n+\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_t a)^2 \, dx \, dt \geq \varepsilon \right\}.$$

By (5.7), A is not empty. Furthermore, it is closed in $(0, 1 - \tau_n)$. Let $\theta_0 = \sup A$. By the choice of n, $\theta_0 \neq 1 - \tau_n$. Furthermore,

$$\int_{\tau_n}^{\tau_n+\theta_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_t a)^2 \, dx \, dt \geq \varepsilon \theta_0.$$

By (5.7), using that $t_* < \tau_n + \theta_0 < 1$, there exists $\sigma \in (0, 1 - \tau_n - \theta_0)$ such that

$$\int_{\tau_n+\theta_0}^{\tau_n+\theta_0+\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_t a)^2 \, dx \, dt > \varepsilon \sigma.$$

Summing up the preceding two inequalities, we get

$$\int_{\tau_n}^{\tau_n+\theta_0+\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_t a)^2 \, dx \, dt > \varepsilon (\theta_0 + \sigma)$$

with $\theta_0 + \sigma \in (\theta_0, 1 - \tau_n)$. Thus $\theta_0 + \sigma \in A$ and $\theta_0 + \sigma > \theta_0$, contradicting the fact that $\theta_0 = \sup A$. ☐

It remains to prove Lemma 5.2.

Proof of Lemma 5.2. Let

$$z_1(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [(u \partial_t u) - (v \partial_t v)] \, dx, \quad z_2(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [x \cdot \nabla u \, \partial_t u - x \cdot \nabla v \, \partial_t v] \, dx.$$

As $u - v$ and $\partial_t(u - v)$ are compactly supported in the space variable, both integrals are well-defined. We first show

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{|z_1(\tau_n)| + |z_2(\tau_n)|}{1 - \tau_n} = 0. \tag{5.8}$$

Indeed, write

$$z_1(\tau_n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} a(\tau_n) \partial_t u(\tau_n) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v(\tau_n) \partial_t a(\tau_n).$$

Then, using the fact that $|x| \leq 1 - \tau_n$ on the supports of $a(\tau_n)$ and $\partial_t a(\tau_n)$,

$$\left| \int a(\tau_n) \partial_t u(\tau_n) \right| \leq \int_{|x| \leq \lambda_n} |a(\tau_n) \partial_t u(\tau_n)| + \int_{|x| \geq \lambda_n} |a(\tau_n) \partial_t u(\tau_n)|$$

$$\leq \lambda_n \int_{|x| \leq \lambda_n} \frac{1}{|x|} |a(\tau_n) \partial_t u(\tau_n)| + (1 - \tau_n) \int_{|x| \geq \lambda_n} \frac{1}{|x|} |a(\tau_n) \partial_t u(\tau_n)|.$$

By (5.1) and (5.2),

$$\left| \int a(\tau_n) \partial_t u(\tau_n) \right| = o(1 - \tau_n) \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

Estimating the other terms in the same way we get (5.8).

Differentiating the definitions of z_1 and z_2 and using that both u and v are solutions of (1.1), we get

$$z_1'(t) = \int (\partial_t u)^2 - \int |\nabla u|^2 + \int u^6 - \left[\int (\partial_t v)^2 \, dx - \int |\nabla v|^2 \, dx + \int v^6 \right],$$

$$z_2'(t) = -\frac{3}{2} \int (\partial_t u)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\int |\nabla u|^2 - \int u^6 \right)$$
$$- \left[-\frac{3}{2} \int (\partial_t v)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\int |\nabla v|^2 - \int v^6 \right) \right].$$

Noting that $|x| \leq 1 - t$ on the support of a, that v converges in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ as $t \to 1$, and that u is bounded in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$, we get, as $t \to 1^-$,

$$z_1'(t) = \int (\partial_t a)^2 \, dx - \int |\nabla a|^2 \, dx + \int a^6 \, dx + o(1),$$

$$z_2'(t) = -\frac{3}{2} \int (\partial_t a)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\int |\nabla a|^2 - \int a^6 \right) + o(1).$$

Let

$$Z(t) = \frac{1}{2} z_1(t) + z_2(t).$$

Then

$$Z'(t) = -\int (\partial_t a)^2 + o(1) \quad \text{as } t \to 1.$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$, and m, n be two large integers with $n < m$. Integrating the preceding inequality we get

$$\int_{\tau_n}^{\tau_m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_t a)^2 \leq |Z(\tau_m) - Z(\tau_n)| + \varepsilon |\tau_n - \tau_m|.$$

Letting m tend to infinity we obtain

$$\int_{\tau_n}^{1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_t a)^2 \leq |Z(\tau_n)| + o(1 - \tau_n) \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

From (5.8) we deduce

$$\int_{\tau_n}^{1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_t a)^2 = o(1 - \tau_n) \quad \text{as } n \to \infty. \qquad \square$$

5.2. Decomposition into a sum of rescaled stationary solutions

The proof of Proposition 5.1 is divided into four steps.

Step 1: Extraction of a sequence and profile decomposition. Extracting a subsequence from $\{t_n\}$, we assume that $\{(a(t_n), \partial_t a(t_n))\}_n$ admits a profile decomposition with profiles $\{U^j\}$ and parameters $\{\lambda_{j,n}, t_{j,n}\}$. By the Pythagorean expansion

$$\|\partial_t a(t_n)\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \|\partial_t U^j(-t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n})\|_{L^2}^2 + \|w_n^J\|_{L^2}^2 + o(1) \quad \text{as } n \to \infty$$

and using (5.5), we find that for all j (here U_n^j is the rescaled profiled, defined in Notation 2.7),

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \|\partial_t U_n^j(0)\|_{L^2} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \|\partial_t U^j(-t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n})\|_{L^2} = 0. \tag{5.9}$$

We deduce that for all j such that $U^j \neq 0$, $\{-t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n}\}_n$ is bounded. Indeed, assume that there exists a subsequence in n such that $-t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n} \to \pm\infty$. Then by definition of U^j and the equipartition of energy for solutions of the linear equation (2.1) as $t \to \pm\infty$,

$$\frac{1}{2} \|U_L^j(0)\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\partial_t U_L^j(0)\|_{L^2}^2 = \lim_{n \to \infty} \|\partial_t U_L^j(-t_{j,n}/\lambda_{j,n})\|_{L^2}^2 = 0,$$

showing that $U^j = 0$, a contradiction.

Translating in time the profiles, we may assume

$$\forall j, \forall n, \quad t_{j,n} = 0. \tag{5.10}$$

As a consequence of (5.9), $U_1^j := \partial_t U^j(0) = 0$ for all j. Let $\delta_0 > 0$ be a small parameter (given by the small data theory for (1.1)). There exists a finite number J_0 of profiles U^j such that $\|U_0^j\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|U_1^j\|_{L^2} = \|U_0^j\|_{\dot{H}^1} \geq \delta_0$. Reordering the profiles, we may assume

$$\|U_0^j\|_{\dot{H}^1} \geq \delta_0 \Leftrightarrow 1 \leq j \leq J_0.$$

In view of (5.10) and the orthogonality of the profiles, we obtain, after a new extraction in n,

$$\forall j, k, \quad j \neq k \implies \lambda_{j,n} \ll \lambda_{k,n} \text{ or } \lambda_{k,n} \ll \lambda_{j,n}.$$

Thus we may reorder the first profiles so that

$$\lambda_{J_0,n} \ll \lambda_{J_0-1,n} \ll \cdots \ll \lambda_{1,n}.$$

We show that $U^j \in \{W, -W\}$ if $1 \leq j \leq J_0$ and $U^j = 0$ if $j > J_0$. This is equivalent to the fact that the set of indices j such that $U^j \notin \{0, W, -W\}$ is empty. Assume that this set is not empty and let

$$k_0 = \min\{j \geq 1 : U^j \notin \{0, W, -W\}\}.$$

Let $k_1 = \min\{1 \leq j \leq J_0 : \lambda_{j,n} \ll \lambda_{k_0,n}\}$. If this set is empty, k_1 is not defined, and we will make the convention $\lambda_{k_1,n} = 0$. By Claim B.1, there exists a sequence $\tilde{\lambda}_n \to 0$ such that

$$\lambda_{k_1,n} \ll \tilde{\lambda}_n \ll \lambda_{k_0,n}, \tag{5.11}$$

$$\forall j, \quad \tilde{\lambda}_n \ll \lambda_{j,n} \text{ or } \lambda_{j,n} \ll \tilde{\lambda}_n. \tag{5.12}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}} = \{j \geq 1 : \tilde{\lambda}_n \ll \lambda_{j,n}\}.$$

Note that by the first inequality in (5.11),

$$\forall j, \quad (j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}} \text{ and } \lambda_{j,n} \ll \lambda_{k_0,n}) \implies j > J_0. \tag{5.13}$$

Step 2. Let $T > 0$ be in the domain of existence of U^{k_0}. Using that $\lambda_{k_0,n} \lesssim 1 - \tau_n$, we can choose T small enough so that $\lambda_{k_0,n} T < 1 - t_n$ for large n. In this step we show

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_{k_0,n} T} \int_0^{\lambda_{k_0,n} T} \int_{|x| \geq \lambda_{k_0,n}\varepsilon + |t|} |\partial_t U_n^{k_0}(t, x) + \partial_t w_n^J(t, x)|^2 \, dx \, dt = o_n^J, \tag{5.14}$$

where by definition $\lim_{J \to \infty} \limsup_{n \to \infty} o_n^J = 0$. More precisely, we will show the following two estimates which directly imply (5.14):

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_{k_0,n} T} \int_0^{\lambda_{k_0,n} T} \int_{|x| \geq \lambda_{k_0,n}\varepsilon + |t|} \left| \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}} \\ j \leq J}} \partial_t U_n^j(t, x) + \partial_t w_n^J(t, x) \right|^2 \, dx \, dt = o_n^J, \tag{5.15}$$

$$j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}} \text{ and } j \neq k_0 \implies \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_{k_0,n} T} \int_0^{\lambda_{k_0,n} T} \int_{|x| \geq \varepsilon \lambda_{k_0,n} + |t|} |\partial_t U_n^j(t, x)|^2 \, dx \, dt = 0. \tag{5.16}$$

Proof of (5.15). Choose a radial function $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $\chi(x) = 1$ for $|x| \geq 2$ and $\chi(x) = 0$ for $|x| \leq 1$. Let $\tilde{u}_n$ be the solution of (1.1) with initial data

$$\tilde{u}_{n \restriction t=t_n} = \chi(x/\tilde{\lambda}_n) u(t_n, x), \quad \partial_t \tilde{u}_{n \restriction t=t_n} = \chi(x/\tilde{\lambda}_n) \partial_t u(t_n, x).$$

Then, by finite speed of propagation, as long as $t_n + s$ is in the domain of existence of u and $\tilde{u}_n$,

$$\tilde{u}_n(t_n + s, x) = u(t_n + s, x), \qquad |x| \geq |s| + 2\tilde{\lambda}_n.$$

Furthermore, letting

$$\tilde{w}_{0,n}^J(x) = \chi(x/\tilde{\lambda}_n) w_{0,n}^J(x), \qquad \tilde{w}_{1,n}^J(x) = \chi(x/\tilde{\lambda}_n) w_{1,n}^J(x),$$

we obtain (recall that $U_{1,n}^j = 0$ for all j)

$$\tilde{u}_n(t_n, x) - v(t_n, x) = \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}} \\ j \leq J}} U_{0,n}^j(x) + \tilde{w}_{0,n}^J(x) + o_n(1) \quad \text{in } \dot{H}^1, \tag{5.17}$$

$$\partial_t \tilde{u}_n(t_n, x) - \partial_t v(t_n, x) = \tilde{w}_{1,n}^J(x) + o_n(1) \quad \text{in } L^2. \tag{5.18}$$

By Claim 2.11 together with the argument that we used to show (4.23),

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \limsup_{J \to \infty} \|\tilde{w}_n^J\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} = 0. \tag{5.19}$$

By (5.19), the two equations (5.17), (5.18) yield a profile decomposition of the sequence

$$\{(\tilde{u}(t_n, x) - v(t_n, x), \partial_t \tilde{u}(t_n, x) - \partial_t v(t_n, x))\}_n.$$

The development (5.17), (5.18) satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 2.8 with $\theta_n = \lambda_{k_0,n} T$. Indeed, for $j > J_0$ the solution U^j scatters both forward and backward in time. Furthermore by (5.13),

$$(j \in \{1, \ldots, J_0\} \cap \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}} \text{ and } j \neq k_0) \implies \lambda_{k_0,n} T \ll \lambda_{j,n}.$$

Thus by Proposition 2.8, for $s \in [0, \lambda_{k_0,n} T]$,

$$\tilde{u}_n(t_n + s, x) = v(t_n + s, x) + \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}} \\ j \leq J}} U_n^j(s, x) + \tilde{w}_n^J(s, x) + r_n^J(s, x), \tag{5.20}$$

where r_n^J satisfies (2.23) with $\theta_n = \lambda_{k_0,n} T$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. We have, for large n (so that $\varepsilon \lambda_{k_0,n} \geq 2\tilde{\lambda}_n$),

$$
\begin{aligned}
o_n(1) &= \frac{1}{\lambda_{k_0,n} T} \int_{t_n}^{t_n + \lambda_{k_0,n} T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\partial_t a(t, x)|^2 \, dx \, dt \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\lambda_{k_0,n} T} \int_{t_n}^{t_n + \lambda_{k_0,n} T} \int_{|x| \geq \lambda_{k_0,n} \varepsilon + |t|} |\partial_t a(t, x)|^2 \, dx \, dt \\
&= \frac{1}{\lambda_{k_0,n} T} \int_{t_n}^{t_n + \lambda_{k_0,n} T} \int_{|x| \geq \lambda_{k_0,n} \varepsilon + |t|} |(\partial_t u_n - \partial_t v)(t, x)|^2 \, dx \, dt,
\end{aligned}
$$

which yields (5.15) in view of (5.20).

Proof of (5.16). Let $R_{j,n} = \lambda_{k_0,n}/\lambda_{j,n}$. We have

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_{k_0,n}T} \int_0^{\lambda_{k_0,n}T} \int_{|x|\geq\varepsilon\lambda_{k_0,n}+|t|} |\partial_t U_n^j(t,x)|^2 \, dx \, dt$$

$$= \frac{1}{TR_{j,n}} \int_0^{TR_{j,n}} \int_{|y|\geq\varepsilon R_{j,n}+|s|} |\partial_t U^j(s,y)|^2 \, dy \, ds. \qquad (5.21)$$

If $\lambda_{j,n} \ll \lambda_{k_0,n}$ (and thus $j > J_0$), we have $R_{j,n} \to \infty$. By finite speed of propagation, for all $\eta > 0$, there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$\forall s \in \mathbb{R}, \qquad \int_{|y|\geq M+|s|} |\partial_t U^j(s,y)|^2 \, dy \leq \eta,$$

which implies that the right-hand member of (5.21) tends to 0 as $n \to \infty$.

If $\lambda_{k_0,n} \ll \lambda_{j,n}$, then $R_{j,n} \to 0$, and thus

$$\frac{1}{TR_{j,n}} \int_0^{TR_{j,n}} \int_{|y|\geq R_{j,n}\varepsilon+|s|} |\partial_t U^j(s,y)|^2 \, dy \, ds \leq \frac{1}{TR_{j,n}} \int_0^{TR_{j,n}} \int |\partial_t U^j(s,y)|^2 \, dy \, ds$$

$$\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \int |\partial_t U^j(0,y)|^2 \, dy = 0,$$

concluding the proof of (5.16).

Step 3: Uniqueness argument and conclusion of the proof. By (5.14),

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \int_{|x|\geq\varepsilon+|t|} |\partial_t U^{k_0}(t,x) + \lambda_{k_0,n}^{3/2} \partial_t w_n^J(\lambda_{k_0,n}t, \lambda_{k_0,n}x)|^2 \, dx \, dt = o_n^J.$$

Consider the mapping $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2 \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$(f_0, f_1) \mapsto \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \int_{|x|\geq\varepsilon+|t|} \partial_t U^{k_0}(t,x) \partial_t f(t,x) \, dx \, dt,$$

where $f(t,x)$ is the solution of the linear wave equation with initial conditions (f_0, f_1). This is a continuous linear form on $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$. By (2.13),

$$(\lambda_{k_0,n}^{1/2} w_{0,n}^J(\lambda_{k_0,n}\cdot), \lambda_{k_0,n}^{3/2} w_{1,n}^J(\lambda_{k_0,n}\cdot)) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \quad \text{weakly in } \dot{H}^1 \times L^2.$$

Hence

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \int_{|x|\geq\varepsilon+|t|} \partial_t U^{k_0}(t,x) \lambda_{k_0,n}^{3/2} \partial_t w_n^J(\lambda_{k_0,n}t, \lambda_{k_0,n}x) \, dx \, dt = 0,$$

and we conclude that for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \int_{|x|\geq\varepsilon+|t|} |\partial_t U^{k_0}(t,x)|^2 \, dx \, dt = 0.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \to 0$ we get

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \int_{|x| \geq |t|} |\partial_t U^{k_0}(t,x)|^2 \, dx \, dt = 0.$$

This shows that $\partial_t U^{k_0}(t,x) = 0$ if $t \leq |x|$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$. Let

$$\Omega = \{(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3 : |x| \geq t\}.$$

Then

$$(t,x) \in \Omega \;\Rightarrow\; U^{k_0}(t,x) = U_0^{k_0}(x).$$

In Ω, the nonlinear wave equation $\partial_t^2 U^{k_0} - \Delta U^{k_0} - (U^{k_0})^5 = 0$ becomes $\Delta U^{k_0} = -(U^{k_0})^5$. Thus U^{k_0} satisfies in the sense of distributions the elliptic equation

$$\Delta U_0^{k_0} = -(U_0^{k_0})^5 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}.$$

This shows that U^{k_0} is smooth in $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$ and satisfies the preceding equation in the classical sense in $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$. As a consequence $\Delta U_0^{k_0} + (U_0^{k_0})^5$ is a distribution in $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, supported at the origin. The only distribution with these properties in dimension 3 is 0 and we deduce

$$\Delta U_0^{k_0} + (U_0^{k_0})^5 = 0$$

in the sense of distributions on $\mathbb{R}^3$ and thus by Claim 2.2, as U^{k_0} is radial,

$$U^{k_0}(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_0^{1/2}} W\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_0}\right) \quad \text{or} \quad U^{k_0}(x) = -\frac{1}{\lambda_0^{1/2}} W\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_0}\right) \quad \text{or} \quad U^{k_0} = 0,$$

for some $\lambda_0 > 0$, which yields the desired contradiction. The proof is complete. $\qquad\square$

6. All radial compact solutions are stationary

In this section we show Theorem 2.

We will assume without loss of generality that λ is continuous on $(T_-(u), T_+(u))$ (see [KM06, Remark 5.4]).

Step 1. We show in this step that the solution is globally defined. Assume that $T_+(u) < \infty$. For the sake of simplicity, we will assume that $T_+(u) = 1$. By a standard argument (see Section 3), $\lambda(t) \leq C(1-t)$. By [KM08, Section 6], self-similar, compact blow-up is excluded, which implies that there exists a sequence $\{\tau_n\}_n$ such that

$$\tau_n \in (0,1), \qquad \lim_{n \to \infty} \tau_n = 1, \qquad \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\lambda(\tau_n)}{1 - \tau_n} = 0.$$

Using that the regular part of v at the blow-up point $t = 1$ is 0, we find, arguing as in Corollary 5.3, that there exists a sequence $\{t_n\}_n$ such that

$$\forall n, \ \forall \sigma \in (0, 1 - t_n), \qquad \frac{1}{\sigma} \int_{t_n}^{t_n + \sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\partial_t u(t,x)|^2 \, dx \, dt \leq \frac{1}{n}. \tag{6.1}$$

Consider $(U_0, U_1) \in \dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ such that for a subsequence,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \left(\lambda(t_n)^{(N-2)/2} u(t_n, \lambda(t_n)x), \lambda(t_n)^{N/2} u(t_n, \lambda(t_n)x) \right) = (U_0, U_1).$$

Let U be the solution of (1.1) with initial condition (U_0, U_1) and $\tau_0 \in (0, T_+(U))$. Then by Theorem 2.1,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_0^{\tau_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \lambda(t_n)^N (\partial_t u(t_n + \lambda(t_n)s, \lambda(t_n)x))^2 \, dx \, ds = \int_0^{\tau_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\partial_t U(t))^2 \, dt.$$

By (6.1), we obtain

$$\int_0^{\tau_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \lambda(t_n)^N (\partial_t u(t_n + \lambda(t_n)s, \lambda(t_n)x))^2 \, dx \, ds$$
$$= \frac{1}{\lambda(t_n)} \int_0^{\tau_0 \lambda(t_n)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\partial_t u(t_n + t, x))^2 \, dx \, dt \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} 0.$$

As a consequence, $\partial_t U = 0$ for $t \in [0, \tau_0]$. By Claim 2.2, $U = 0$ or $U = W$ up to the invariances of the equation. If $U = 0$, then $E(u_0, u_1) = 0$, and as $\|u(t_n)\|_{\dot{H}^1}$ tends to 0, this implies by Claim 2.3 that $u = 0$, contradicting our assumption. Thus $U = W$ up to the invariances, and by conservation of energy we deduce that $E(u_0, u_1) = E(W, 0)$.

The solution u of (1.1) has threshold energy $E(W, 0)$, is not globally defined and satisfies $u_0 \in L^2$. By Theorem 2 of [DM08], $N = 5$ and u has to be the special solution W^+ constructed in this paper, which satisfies $\|u(t) - W\|_{\dot{H}^1} \leq e^{ct}$ as $t \to -\infty$. This contradicts the fact that u has compact support in space, concluding Step 1.

Step 2. We assume in this step that λ is bounded on $[0, \infty)$ or on $(-\infty, 0]$, and show that $E(u_0, u_1) = E(W, 0)$. By time symmetry we can assume that λ is bounded on $[0, \infty)$. By the preceding step,

$$T_+(u) = \infty.$$

Let us fix $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $\phi \equiv 1$ for $|x| \leq 1$, and $\phi \equiv 0$ for $|x| \geq 2$. For $R > 1$, write $\phi_R = \phi(x/R)$, $\psi_R = x\phi(x/R)$ and

$$\rho(R) = \sup_{t \in (T_-(u), T_+(u))} \int_{|x| \geq R} \left[\frac{|u|^2}{|x|^2} + |\nabla u|^2 + |\partial_t u|^2 + |u|^6 \right] dx. \tag{6.2}$$

The compactness of $\overline{K}$ and the boundedness of λ imply that $\rho(R)$ is finite, and tends to 0 as R goes to infinity. Let

$$y_R(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \psi_R \cdot \nabla u \, \partial_t u \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \varphi_R u \partial_t u \, dx.$$

Then (see [KM08, Lemma 5.3])

$$y_R'(t) = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_t u)^2 \, dx + \mathcal{O}(\rho(R)). \tag{6.3}$$

Integrating with respect to time, we find that there exists a constant $C > 0$, independent of R, such that for all $T > 0$,

$$\int_0^T \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \, dt \leq |y_R(T) - y_R(0)| + CT\rho(R).$$

Using that, for any fixed $R > 0$, $y_R(t)$ is bounded independently of t, we get

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \, dt = 0. \tag{6.4}$$

We next show that there exists a sequence $t_n \to \infty$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda(t_n)} \int_{t_n}^{t_n + \lambda(t_n)} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \, dt = 0. \tag{6.5}$$

Indeed, define

$$\tau_0 = 0, \qquad \tau_{n+1} = \tau_n + \lambda(\tau_n).$$

We first show that $\tau_n \to \infty$. If not, τ_n has a finite limit $\tau_\infty = \sum_{n \geq 0} \lambda(\tau_n)$, which shows by continuity of λ that $\lambda(\tau_\infty) = 0$, a contradiction with the assumption that λ takes strictly positive values.

Assuming, towards a contradiction, that no subsequence $\{t_n\}$ of $\{\tau_n\}$ satisfies (6.5), we see that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\forall n, \qquad \int_{\tau_n}^{\tau_{n+1}} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \, dt \geq \varepsilon \lambda(\tau_n).$$

Summing up, and using that $\tau_{n+1} = \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda(\tau_k)$, we get

$$\forall n, \qquad \frac{1}{\tau_{n+1}} \int_0^{\tau_{n+1}} |\partial_t u(t)|_{L^2}^2 \, dt \geq \varepsilon,$$

contradicting (6.4). Hence (6.5).

Extracting subsequences, we get $(U_0, U_1) \in \dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ such that

$$\left(\lambda_n^{N/2-1} u(t_n, \lambda(t_n)x), \lambda_n^{N/2} \partial_t u(t_n, \lambda(t_n)x) \right) \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} (U_0, U_1).$$

Let U be the solution of (1.1) with initial conditions (U_0, U_1). Let $\theta_0 \in (0, T_+(U))$ with $\theta_0 \leq 1$. Then by Theorem 2.1,

$$\frac{1}{\theta_0 \lambda(t_n)} \int_{t_n}^{t_n + \lambda(t_n)} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \, dt \geq \frac{1}{\theta_0 \lambda(t_n)} \int_{t_n}^{t_n + \theta_0 \lambda(t_n)} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \, dt$$

$$= \frac{1}{\theta_0 \lambda(t_n)} \int_0^{\theta_0 \lambda(t_n)} \|\partial_t U(t/\lambda(t_n))\|_{L^2}^2 \, dt + o_n(1) = \int_0^{\theta_0} \|\partial_t U(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds + o_n(1).$$

By (6.5), we see that $\partial_t U = 0$ on $[0, \theta_0]$. By Claim 2.2, $U = W$, which shows that $E(U_0, U_1) = E(u_0, u_1) = E(W, 0)$. This concludes Step 2.

Step 3. We next show that $E(u_0, u_1) = E(W, 0)$ also if λ is unbounded on both intervals $[0, \infty)$ and $(-\infty, 0]$. We will use an argument of [KM06] to reduce to the previous case. We sketch the argument for the sake of completeness. Consider the sequence $\{t_n\}_n$,

$$t_n = \inf\{t \in [0, \infty) : \lambda(t_n) = n\}.$$

By continuity of λ and the fact that $\lambda(t)$ tends to ∞ as t tends to ∞, we see that t_n is well-defined for large n and

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} t_n = \infty, \quad \forall t \in [0, t_n], \ \lambda(t) \leq \lambda(t_n). \tag{6.6}$$

Extracting subsequences, consider (U_0, U_1) such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \left(\lambda(t_n)^{N/2-1} u(t_n, \lambda(t_n)x), \lambda(t_n)^{N/2} \partial_t u(t_n, \lambda(t_n)x)\right) = (U_0, U_1).$$

Note that we cannot have $(U_0, U_1) = (0, 0)$ (this would imply, by Claim 2.3, that $u = 0$). Let U be the solution of (1.1) with initial conditions (U_0, U_1). By the arguments of [KM06, proof of Theorem 7.1], we can show, as a consequence of the compactness of $\overline{K}$ and (6.6), that there exists a continuous function $\tilde{\lambda}$ on $(T_-(U), T_+(U))$, bounded on $(T_-(U), 0]$ and such that

$$\widetilde{K} = \left\{\left(\tilde{\lambda}(t)^{N/2-1} U(t, \tilde{\lambda}(t)x), \tilde{\lambda}(t)^{N/2} \partial_t U(t, \tilde{\lambda}(t)x)\right) : t \in (T_-(U), T_+(U))\right\}$$

has compact closure in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$. By Step 1, U is globally defined. By Step 2, as $\tilde{\lambda}$ is bounded on $(-\infty, 0]$, we find that $E(U_0, U_1) = E(W, 0)$. Thus by conservation of the energy of u, $E(u_0, u_1) = E(W, 0)$, which concludes this step.

Step 4: Convergence in mean to W. By [DM08, Theorem 2], $\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \geq \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2$ for all t: if not, u would scatter at least in one time direction, contradicting the compactness of K.

To show that $u = W$, we will use the arguments of [DM08, Section 3].[2] In that section, it is shown in particular that a globally defined solution u of (1.1) of energy $E(W, 0)$, satisfying $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2$ and such that there exists $\lambda(t)$ with K compact, must be equal to W up to the symmetries of (1.1). We will quickly check here that the same proof works with a slight modification in the case $\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \geq \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2$. As usual, we may assume that $\lambda(t)$ is a continuous function of t. Let

$$\mathsf{d}(t) = 8 \int (\partial_t u)^2 + 4\left(\int |\nabla u|^2 - \int |\nabla W|^2\right) \geq 0.$$

By the characterization of W ([Aub76], [Tal76]), for any t_0, $\mathsf{d}(t_0) = 0$ if and only if $u(t_0) \equiv W$ up to the symmetries of the equation. In this case, by uniqueness of the Cauchy problem, $u(t)$ is a stationary solution identically equal to W up to the symmetries.

In this step we show that

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{-T}^{T} \mathsf{d}(t) \, dt = 0. \tag{6.7}$$

---

[2] In the cited paper, the notation $\lambda(t)$ stands for the function $1/\lambda(t)$ of the present paper.

Choose a function $\varphi \in C_0^\infty$ such that $\varphi = 1$ if $|x| \leq 1$, and write $\varphi_R(x) = \varphi(x/R)$. Let $g_R(t) = 2 \int u \partial_t u \varphi_R$ and note that $|g_R(t)| \leq C_0 R$ for a constant $C_0 > 0$ depending only on $\sup_t [\|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}]$. Using that u is solution of (1.1), we get

$$g_R'(t) = \mathsf{d}(t) + A_R(t), \tag{6.8}$$

where

$$|A_R(t)| \leq \int_{|x| \geq R} \left[\frac{1}{|x|^2} u^2 + u^6 + |\nabla u|^2 + (\partial_t u)^2 \right]. \tag{6.9}$$

As in the case $\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}$ we will use that g_R and g_R' vanish for $u = W$, and that $|g_R'|$ is larger than $\mathsf{d}(t)$ up to the remainder term A_R. In our case, the definition of g_R is slightly different but it will not affect the proof.

Fix a small $\varepsilon > 0$. As in the proof of Lemma 3.3 of [DM08], using that $\lambda(t)/t \to 0$ as $t \to \pm\infty$, we deduce that there exists a constant C_1, independent of ε, and a time $t_1 = t_1(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$\forall T > 2t_1(\varepsilon), \ \forall t \in [t_1(\varepsilon), T], \qquad g_{\varepsilon T}'(t) \geq \mathsf{d}(t) - C_1 \varepsilon;$$

integrating between t_1 and T we find that $T^{-1} \int_0^T \mathsf{d}(t) \, dt$ tends to 0. The same proof works for negative time, yielding (6.7).

Step 5. In view of (6.8), and refining the bound on $g_R(t)$ and the estimate (6.9) on $A_R(t)$ by modulating the solution around W for small $\mathsf{d}(t)$, we conclude that there is a constant $C > 0$ (depending only on the set K) such that

$$\forall \sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \sigma < \tau \implies \int_\sigma^\tau \mathsf{d}(t) \, dt \leq C \Big(\sup_{\sigma \leq t \leq \tau} \lambda(t) \Big) (\mathsf{d}(\sigma) + \mathsf{d}(\tau)) \tag{6.10}$$

(see the proof of Lemma 3.8 in [DM08]). Using compactness and modulation arguments, we get the following control on $\lambda(t)$ (see Lemma 3.10 in [DM08] and its proof):

$$\sigma + \lambda(\sigma) \leq \tau \implies |\lambda(\sigma) - \lambda(\tau)| \leq \int_\sigma^\tau \mathsf{d}(t) \, dt. \tag{6.11}$$

Pick two sequences $\sigma_n \to -\infty$ and $\tau_n \to \infty$ such that $\mathsf{d}(\sigma_n) \to 0$ and $\mathsf{d}(\tau_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. The existence of $\{\sigma_n\}_n$ and $\{\tau_n\}_n$ is given by (6.7) in Step 4. Let n_0 be such that $\mathsf{d}(\tau_{n_0}) \leq 1/2$. Let us prove that λ is bounded. For large n, let $t_n \in [\tau_{n_0}, \tau_n]$ be such that

$$\lambda(t_n) = \max_{\tau_{n_0} \leq t \leq \tau_n} \lambda(t).$$

If $\lambda(t_n) \to \infty$, then by continuity of λ, $t_n \to \infty$. In particular for large n, $\tau_{n_0} + \lambda(\tau_{n_0}) \leq t_n$, and we can deduce from (6.10) and (6.11) that

$$\lambda(t_n) \leq \lambda(\tau_{n_0}) + \lambda(t_n)(1/2 + \mathsf{d}(\tau_n)),$$

a contradiction if $\lambda(t_n) \to \infty$. Thus λ is bounded on $[0, \infty)$ and a similar proof yields the boundedness of λ on $(-\infty, 0]$. As a consequence of (6.10), we get

$$\int_{\sigma_n}^{\tau_n} \mathsf{d}(t) \, dt \leq C(\mathsf{d}(\sigma_n) + \mathsf{d}(\tau_n)),$$

which implies that $\mathsf{d}(t) = 0$ for all t, concluding the sketch of the proof. $\qquad\square$

7. Bounded globally defined solutions are not self-similar

This section is dedicated to the proof of the following proposition, which will be needed in Section 8 and uses some of the material of Section 3:

Proposition 7.1. *Assume that $N = 3$. There exists a constant $\eta_1 > 0$ with the following property. Let u be a spherically symmetric solution of (1.1) such that $T_+(u) = \infty$, which does not scatter for positive time and such that*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} [\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2] \leq \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta_1. \tag{7.1}$$

Define

$$v(t) = \inf\left\{\mu : \int_{|x| \geq \mu} [|\partial_t u(t)|^2 + |\nabla u(t)|^2] \leq \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla W|^2\right\}. \tag{7.2}$$

Then there exists a sequence $t_n \to \infty$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} v(t_n)/t_n = 0. \tag{7.3}$$

Proof. Assume that (7.3) does not hold. Taking into account the finite speed of propagation, we deduce that there exist c_0, C_0 such that

$$\forall t \geq 1, \quad c_0 t \leq v(t) \leq C_0 t. \tag{7.4}$$

Step 1. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the set of $\binom{U_0}{U_1}$ such that there exists $t_n \to \infty$ with

$$\begin{pmatrix} t_n^{1/2} u(t_n, t_n x) \\ t_n^{3/2} \partial_t u(t_n, t_n x) \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} \begin{pmatrix} U_0 \\ U_1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{weakly in } \dot{H}^1 \times L^2.$$

In this step we show that there is an $(A_0, A_1) \in \mathcal{A}$ with minimal energy, that is, such that

$$\forall (U_0, U_1) \in \mathcal{A}, \quad E(A_0, A_1) \leq E(U_0, U_1). \tag{7.5}$$

We first show that $\mathcal{A}$ is sequentially closed in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ for the weak topology. Indeed, let $(U_{0,n}, U_{1,n}) \rightharpoonup (U_0, U_1)$ with $(U_{0,n}, U_{1,n}) \in \mathcal{A}$. Select a countable family of smooth compactly supported functions $\{(\varphi_j, \psi_j)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ which is dense in $\dot{H}^{-1} \times L^2$. Then for all k, there exists n_k such that

$$\left|\int (U_{0,n_k} - U_0)\varphi_j\right| + \left|\int (U_{1,n_k} - U_1)\psi_j\right| \leq \frac{1}{k}, \quad j = 0, \ldots, k.$$

Thus there exists $t_k \geq k$ such that

$$\left|\int (t_k^{1/2} u(t_k, t_k x) - U_0)\varphi_j\right| + \left|\int (t_k^{3/2} \partial_t u(t_k, t_k x) - U_1)\psi_j\right| \leq \frac{2}{k}, \quad j = 0, \ldots, k.$$

This shows that $(t_k^{1/2} u(t_k, t_k x), t_k^{3/2} \partial_t u(t_k, t_k x))$ converges weakly to (U_0, U_1) and thus $(U_0, U_1) \in \mathcal{A}$.

We next construct the minimizing element (A_0, A_1) of $\mathcal{A}$. Let $\{(U_{0,n}, U_{1,n})\}_n$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{A}$ minimizing the energy. As $\{(U_{0,n}, U_{1,n})\}_n$ is bounded in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$, we can extract from it a subsequence such that

$$(U_{0,n}, U_{1,n}) \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} (A_0, A_1) \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Define $\tilde{w}_{0,n} = U_{0,n} - A_0$, $\tilde{w}_{1,n} = U_{1,n} - A_1$. Writing after extraction of a subsequence the profile decomposition of the sequence $\{(U_{0,n}, U_{1,n})\}$ and using the Pythagorean expansions (2.14)–(2.16), we get

$$\|\nabla U_{0,n}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_{1,n}\|_{L^2}^2 = \|\nabla A_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \|A_1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \tilde{w}_{0,n}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\tilde{w}_{1,n}\|_{L^2}^2 + o_n(1),$$
$$(7.6)$$

$$E(U_{0,n}, U_{1,n}) = E(A_0, A_1) + E(\tilde{w}_{0,n}, \tilde{w}_{1,n}) + o_n(1). \tag{7.7}$$

By (7.6) and assumption (7.1), we obtain, for large n,

$$\|\nabla A_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \|A_1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \tilde{w}_{0,n}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \tilde{w}_{1,n}\|_{L^2}^2 \le \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\eta_1,$$

which shows by Claim 2.3 that in (7.7), all the energies are positive. Thus

$$\inf_{(V_0, V_1) \in \mathcal{A}} E(V_0, V_1) = \lim_{n \to \infty} E(U_{0,n}, U_{1,n}) \ge E(A_0, A_1),$$

implying that (A_0, A_1) satisfies (7.5).

Step 2: Profile decomposition. Choose an arbitrary positive sequence $\{\tau_n\}_n$ that tends to ∞ and such that

$$\left(\tau_n^{1/2} u(\tau_n, \tau_n x), \tau_n^{3/2} \partial_t u(\tau_n, \tau_n x)\right) \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} (A_0, A_1) \quad \text{weakly in } \dot{H}^1 \times L^2, \tag{7.8}$$

where (A_0, A_1) is the minimal element of $\mathcal{A}$ defined in Step 1.

Extracting a subsequence from $\{\tau_n\}_n$, we can assume that their exists a profile decomposition $\{U_L^j\}$, $\{\lambda_{j,n}, t_{j,n}\}$ associated to the sequence $\{(u(\tau_n), \partial_t u(\tau_n))\}_n$.

Reordering the profiles, we may assume

$$\|\nabla U_0^1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_1^1\|_{L^2}^2 = \sup_{j \ge 1} [\|\nabla U_0^j\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_1^j\|_{L^2}^2]. \tag{7.9}$$

We remark that

$$\|\nabla U_0^1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_1^1\|_{L^2}^2 \ge \frac{2}{3} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{7.10}$$

If not, the result of [KM08] would imply that all nonlinear profiles U^j scatter, showing by Proposition 2.8 that u scatters for both positive and negative times, which contradicts our assumption.

As a consequence, we deduce from (7.1) and again the result of [KM08] that for all $j \ge 2$, the nonlinear profile U^j scatters both for positive and for negative time.

Extracting subsequences and time-translating U_L^1 if necessary, we may distinguish three cases:

(a) $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \dfrac{-t_{1,n}}{\lambda_{1,n}} = \infty.$

(b) $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \dfrac{-t_{1,n}}{\lambda_{1,n}} = -\infty.$

(c) $\forall n,\ t_{1,n} = 0.$

Case (a) is clearly excluded, as it would imply by Proposition 2.8 that u scatters for positive time, contradicting our assumptions.

Assume that (b) holds. Then the nonlinear solution U^1 scatters for negative time. Precisely, by definition of U^1,

$$\lim_{t\to-\infty}[\|U_{\mathrm{L}}^1(t) - U^1(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|\partial_t U_{\mathrm{L}}^1(t) - \partial_t U^1(t)\|_{L^2}] = 0.$$

Furthermore, by Proposition 2.8, denoting as usual by U_n^j the rescaled profiles (see Notation 2.6),

$$u(0) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{1,n}^{1/2}} U_{\mathrm{L}}^1\left(\frac{-t_{1,n} - \tau_n}{\lambda_{1,n}}, \frac{x}{\lambda_{1,n}}\right) + \sum_{j=2}^{J} U_n^j(-\tau_n, x) + w_n^J(-\tau_n) + r_n^J(-\tau_n),$$

(7.11)

$$\partial_t u(0) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{1,n}^{3/2}} \partial_t U_{\mathrm{L}}^1\left(\frac{-t_{1,n} - \tau_n}{\lambda_{1,n}}, \frac{x}{\lambda_{1,n}}\right)$$

$$+ \sum_{j=2}^{J} \partial_t U_n^j(-\tau_n, x) + \partial_t w_n^J(-\tau_n) + \partial_t r_n^J(-\tau_n).$$

(7.12)

Let $v_n(t) = S_{\mathrm{L}}(t)(\lambda_{1,n}^{1/2} u(0, \lambda_{1,n} x), \lambda_{1,n}^{3/2} u(0, \lambda_{1,n} x))$. By orthogonality of the parameters $\{\lambda_{j,n}, t_{j,n}\}$, the developments (7.11), (7.12) imply

$$\left(v_n\left(\frac{t_{1,n} + \tau_n}{\lambda_{1,n}}\right), \partial_t v_n\left(\frac{t_{1,n} + \tau_n}{\lambda_{1,n}}\right)\right) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} (U_0^1, U_1^1) \quad \text{in } \dot{H}^1 \times L^2;$$

since $(t_{1,n} + \tau_n)/\lambda_{1,n} \to \infty$ this would imply $(U_0^1, U_1^1) = (0, 0)$, a contradiction.

Step 3: Compact main profile. It remains to consider case (c). By (7.4),

$$\int_{C_0 \tau_n \leq |x|} [|\nabla u(\tau_n, x)|^2 + |\partial_t u(\tau_n, x)|^2]\, dx$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla W|^2 \leq \int_{c_0 \tau_n \leq |x|} [|\nabla u(\tau_n, x)|^2 + |\partial_t u(\tau_n, x)|^2]\, dx. \quad (7.13)$$

This shows by assumption (7.1),

$$\int_{|x| \leq c_0 \tau_n} [|\nabla u(\tau_n, x)|^2 + |\partial_t u(\tau_n, x)|^2]\, dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla W|^2 + \eta_1,$$

and thus by (7.10) (using that $t_{1,n} = 0$), $\lambda_{1,n} \approx \tau_n$. Extracting subsequences and rescaling U^1 we may assume that $\lambda_{1,n} = \tau_n$. Then by (7.8),

$$U_0^1 = A_0, \qquad U_1^1 = A_1. \tag{7.14}$$

We will show that $T_-(U^1) = -1$ and that

$$K = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} (1+t)^{1/2} U^1(t, (1+t)x) \\ (1+t)^{3/2} \partial_t U^1(t, (1+t)x) \end{pmatrix} : t \in (-1, 0] \right\} \tag{7.15}$$

has compact closure in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$. This type of self-similar solution is excluded by [KM08, Section 6]. Let $\sigma \in (T_-(U_1), 0)$. Then by Proposition 2.8,

$$u(\tau_n + \sigma \tau_n) = \frac{1}{\tau_n^{1/2}} U^1\left(\sigma, \frac{x}{\tau_n}\right) + \sum_{j=2}^J U_n^j(\sigma \tau_n) + w_n^J(\sigma \tau_n) + r_n^J(\sigma \tau_n), \tag{7.16}$$

$$\partial_t u(\tau_n + \sigma \tau_n) = \frac{1}{\tau_n^{3/2}} \partial_t U^1\left(\sigma, \frac{x}{\tau_n}\right) + \sum_{j=2}^J \partial_t U_n^j(\sigma \tau_n) + \partial_t w_n^J(\sigma \tau_n) + \partial_t r_n^J(\sigma \tau_n). \tag{7.17}$$

Let

$$Z_n^J(t) = \sum_{j=2}^J U_n^j(t) + w_n^J(t).$$

By Remark 2.10, for large J and n we have

$$\|\nabla_{t,x} U^1(\sigma)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_{t,x} Z_n^J(\sigma \tau_n)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\nabla_{t,x} u(\tau_n + \sigma \tau_n)\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta_1.$$

By assumption (7.1) and using (7.10), we get

$$\|\nabla_{t,x} Z_n^J(\sigma \tau_n)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{1}{3} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\eta_1. \tag{7.18}$$

By (7.4) and the triangle inequality, we deduce that for large J and n,

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla W|^2} \leq \sqrt{\int_{c_0(1+\sigma)\tau_n \leq |x|} |\nabla_{t,x} u((1+\sigma)\tau_n, x)|^2 \, dx}$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\int_{c_0(1+\sigma)\tau_n \leq |x|} \frac{1}{\tau_n^3} \left|\nabla_{t,x} U^1\left(\sigma, \frac{x}{\tau_n}\right)\right|^2 dx} + \sqrt{\int_{c_0(1+\sigma)\tau_n \leq |x|} |\nabla_{t,x} Z_n^J(\sigma \tau_n, x)|^2 \, dx} + \eta_1.$$

Thus by (7.18), and if η_1 is chosen small enough so that the left hand side inequality holds,

$$(2\eta_1)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla W|^2} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3} \int |\nabla W|^2 + 2\eta_1} - \eta_1 \leq \sqrt{\int_{c_0(1+\sigma)\leq |x|} |\nabla_{t,x} U^1(\sigma)|^2}. \tag{7.19}$$

Using again assumption (7.1), we obtain

$$\forall \sigma \in (-1, 0), \quad \int_{|x| \leq c_0(1+\sigma)} |\nabla_{t,x} U^1(\sigma)|^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla W|^2 - \eta_1.$$

In view of (3.4) in Theorem 3.2, we must have $T_-(U^1) \leq -1$. We cannot have $T_-(U^1) < -1$ because (7.16), (7.17) with $\sigma = -1$ would give a nontrivial profile decomposition for $(u(0), \partial_t u(0))$, a contradiction. Thus $T_-(U^1) = -1$.

Next, note that by the developments (7.16), (7.17), we have

$$\left(\tau_n^{1/2} u((1+\sigma)\tau_n, \tau_n \cdot), \tau_n^{3/2} u((1+\sigma)\tau_n, \tau_n \cdot)\right) \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} (U^1(\sigma), \partial_t U^1(\sigma)).$$

This shows that

$$\forall \sigma \in (-1, T_+(U^1)), \quad ((1+\sigma)^{1/2} U^1(\sigma, (1+\sigma)\cdot), (1+\sigma)^{3/2}\partial_t U^1(\sigma, (1+\sigma)\cdot)) \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{7.20}$$

We next show that K defined by (7.15) has compact closure in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$. Indeed, let t_n be a sequence that goes to -1 and assume after extraction that (weakly in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$)

$$\left((1+t_n)^{1/2} U^1(t_n, (1+t_n)\cdot), (1+t_n)^{3/2}\partial_t U^1(t_n, (1+t_n)\cdot)\right) \xrightarrow[]{n \to \infty} (\widetilde{U}_0, \widetilde{U}_1). \tag{7.21}$$

Then by (7.20) and the fact that $\mathcal{A}$ is closed for the weak topology, $(\widetilde{U}_0, \widetilde{U}_1) \in \mathcal{A}$. In particular, using that $(U_0^1, U_1^1) = (A_0, A_1)$ has minimal energy in $\mathcal{A}$,

$$0 < E(U_0^1, U_1^1) \leq E(\widetilde{U}_0, \widetilde{U}_1). \tag{7.22}$$

We must show that (7.21) is (at least for a subsequence) a strong convergence. For this, consider, after extraction, a profile decomposition for the sequence

$$\left(U^1(t_n, x) - \frac{1}{(1+t_n)^{1/2}} \widetilde{U}_0\left(\frac{x}{1+t_n}\right), \partial_t U^1(t_n, x) - \frac{1}{(1+t_n)^{3/2}} \widetilde{U}_1\left(\frac{x}{1+t_n}\right)\right).$$

Denote the profiles by V_L^j, the parameters by $s_{j,n}$, and $\nu_{j,n}$ and the remainders by $\tilde{w}_n^J$. By the Pythagorean expansion of the energy

$$E(U_0^1, U_1^1) = E(\widetilde{U}_0, \widetilde{U}_1) + \sum_{j=1}^{J} E\left(V_L^j\left(\frac{-s_{j,n}}{\nu_{j,n}}\right), \partial_t V_L^j\left(\frac{-s_{j,n}}{\nu_{j,n}}\right)\right) + E(\tilde{w}_{0,n}^J, \tilde{w}_{1,n}^J) + o_n(1).$$

By Claim 2.3, all the energies are positive in this expansion. By (7.22), $E(\widetilde{U}_0, \widetilde{U}_1) = E(U_0^1, U_1^1)$, and thus using Claim 2.3 again, $V_L^j = 0$ for all $j \geq 1$ and $\|\nabla \tilde{w}_{0,n}^J\|_{L^2} + \|\tilde{w}_{1,n}^J\|_{L^2}$ tends to 0 as n tends to infinity, concluding the proof of the compactness of $\overline{K}$ in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ and yielding the desired contradiction. Note that in this last argument, we only needed the profile decomposition, for a fixed J, to show that the weak convergence (7.21) and the inequality (7.22) imply the strong convergence. The proof of Proposition 7.1 is complete. $\qquad \square$

8. Proof of the main result

In this section we prove Theorem 1.

Assume that $N = 3$ and that u is a spherically symmetric type II blow-up solution such that

$$\sup_{\tau_0 \leq t < 1} [\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2] \leq \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta_0. \tag{8.1}$$

The proof of Theorem 1 takes several steps. Consider the singular part a of u given by Definition 3.3. In §8.1, we show that a profile decomposition of a sequence $\{(a(\tau_n), \partial_t a(\tau_n))\}$ with $\tau_n \to 1^-$ admits a large profile which is compact up to scaling. In §8.2, we show that, at least for a time sequence, the concentration is not self-similar, i.e. u satisfies the assumptions of Section 5. In §8.3, we show that $a(t)$ is compact in the energy space up to a scaling parameter. In §8.4 it is proven that the only limit, as t tends to 1, of $a(t)$ up to scaling is W. We then conclude the proof of the theorem.

8.1. Compactness of the main profile

Lemma 8.1. *Assume that $N = 3$ and that (8.1) holds. Choose a sequence $\tau_n \to 1^-$, a profile decomposition $\{U^j\}$, $\{\lambda_{j,n}, t_{j,n}\}$ associated to $\{(a(\tau_n), \partial_t a(\tau_n))\}$ and reorder the profiles (after extraction) so that (3.11) holds. Then all the profiles U^j, $j \geq 2$, scatter. Furthermore U^1 does not scatter for positive or negative time,*

$$\|U_0^1\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 + \|U_1^1\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 \geq \frac{2}{3} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2, \tag{8.2}$$

and the sequence $\{-t_{1,n}/\lambda_{1,n}\}_n$ is bounded.

In other words, the largest profile is compact up to modulation and we may assume that $t_{1,n} = 0$ for all n.

Proof. The inequality (8.2) follows from Lemma 3.6. The assumption (8.1) implies that for all $j \geq 2$, $\|U_1^j\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla U_0^j\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{1}{3} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta_0$. Thus all nonlinear profiles U^j, $j \geq 2$, scatter both forward and backward in time. To conclude the proof, it is sufficient to show that U^1 does not scatter forward or backward in time, which would imply that $\{-t_{1,n}/\lambda_{1,n}\}_n$ is bounded. Assume that U^1 is globally defined and scatters forward in time. Then, by Proposition 2.8, u is globally defined and scatters forward in time, a contradiction. It remains to exclude the case when U^1 is globally defined and scatters backward in time. By Proposition 2.8 again, we find that for $t < 0$,

$$u(\tau_n + t, x) = v(\tau_n + t, x) + \sum_{j=1}^J U_n^j(t, x) + w_n^J(t, x) + r_n^J(t, x),$$

where

$$\lim_{J \to \infty} \limsup_{n \to \infty} [\|r_n^J\|_{S(-\infty,0)} + \sup_{t \in (-\infty,0)} (\|\nabla r_n^J(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_t r_n^J(t)\|_{L^2})] = 0.$$

The solution U^1 scatters backward, but not forward in time. By [KM08], this implies that $E(U^1_0, U^1_1) \geq E(W, 0)$. As a consequence, for all t in the domain of existence of U^1,

$$\|\nabla U^1(t)\|^2_{L^2} + \|\partial_t U^1(t)\|^2_{L^2} \geq 2E(U^1_0, U^1_1) \geq 2E(W, 0) = \frac{2}{3}\|\nabla W\|^2_{L^2}. \tag{8.3}$$

Let $t_0 \in (\tau_0, 1)$, where τ_0 is defined in (8.1). Taking $t = t_0 - \tau_n < 0$ in the preceding decomposition, we obtain, for large n,

$$u(t_0, x) = \frac{1}{\lambda^{1/2}_{1,n}} U^1\left(\frac{t_0 - \tau_n - t_{1,n}}{\lambda_{1,n}}, \frac{x - x_{1,n}}{\lambda_{1,n}}\right) + R_{0,n}(x),$$

$$\partial_t u(t_0, x) = \frac{1}{\lambda^{3/2}_{1,n}} \partial_t U^1\left(\frac{t_0 - \tau_n - t_{1,n}}{\lambda_{1,n}}, \frac{x - x_{1,n}}{\lambda_{1,n}}\right) + R_{1,n}(x),$$

where by Pythagorean expansion, $\|\nabla R_{0,n}\|^2_{L^2} + \|R_{1,n}\|^2_{L^2} \leq \frac{1}{3}\|\nabla W\|^2_{L^2} + \eta_0$. By (8.3), we conclude that $\{(u(t_0), \partial_t u(t_0))\}_n$, considered as a sequence in n, admits a nontrivial profile decomposition (recall that $\lambda_{1,n} \to 0$), a contradiction. The proof is complete. □

8.2. Existence of a sequence avoiding self-similar blow-up

Proposition 8.2. *Assume $N = 3$ and let u be a radial solution satisfying* (8.1). *Then there exist* $\{\tau_n\}_n$, $\{\mu_n\}_n$ *with*

$$\tau_n \to 1^-, \quad 0 < \mu_n \ll 1 - \tau_n \quad as\ n \to \infty$$

such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{|x| \geq \mu_n} \left[(\partial_t a(\tau_n, x))^2 + |\nabla a(\tau_n, x)|^2 + \frac{1}{|x|^2}(a(\tau_n, x))^2\right] dx = 0.$$

Corollary 8.3.
$$\lim_{t \to 1^-} E(a(t), \partial_t a(t)) = E(W, 0).$$

Proof of Corollary 8.3. By Propositions 8.2 and 5.1 (replacing u by $-u$ if necessary), there exists a sequence $\tau_n \to 1^-$ a sequence $\lambda_n \to 0$ such that

$$a(\tau_n, x) = \frac{1}{\lambda^{1/2}_n} W\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right) + w_{0,n}, \tag{8.4}$$

$$\partial_t a(\tau_n, x) = o(1) \quad \text{in } L^2 \text{ as } n \to \infty, \tag{8.5}$$

where, denoting by w_n the solution of (2.1) with initial condition $(w_{0,n}, 0)$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \|w_n\|_{S(-\infty, \infty)} = 0.$$

Step 1. We first show

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \|w_{0,n}\|_{\dot{H}^1} = 0. \tag{8.6}$$

Let us mention that this step still works, with a small refinement, after replacing the assumption (8.1) by the more general (4.1).

Assume that (8.6) does not hold. Extracting a subsequence in n, we can assume that there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and, for all n, $r_n > 0$ such that

$$\int_{|x| \geq r_n} |\nabla w_{0,n}(x)|^2 \, dx \geq \varepsilon_0.$$

Then, arguing as in the proof of Proposition 4.4 (see (4.40)), we find that for large n,

$$\int_{r_n}^{\infty} |\partial_r (r w_{0,n})(r)|^2 \, dr \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}.$$

Next, the fact that $w_n(t) = w_n(-t)$ and Lemma 4.2 imply that for large n, for all $T > 0$,

$$\int_{|x| \geq r_n + T\lambda_n} |\nabla_{t,x} w_n(-T\lambda_n, x)|^2 \, dx \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4}. \tag{8.7}$$

By Proposition 2.8, we have

$$\begin{cases} a(\tau_n - T\lambda_n) = \dfrac{1}{\lambda_n^{1/2}} W\left(\dfrac{x}{\lambda_n}\right) + w_n(-T\lambda_n) + o_n(1) & \text{in } \dot{H}^1, \\[2mm] \partial_t a(\tau_n - T\lambda_n) = \partial_t w_n(-T\lambda_n) + o_n(1) & \text{in } L^2. \end{cases} \tag{8.8}$$

Combining this with (8.7) we see that there exists an increasing sequence $\{n_k\}$ such that $\tau_{n_k} - k\lambda_{n_k} \geq 0$ and

$$\int_{|x| \geq r_{n_k} + k\lambda_{n_k}} |\nabla_{t,x} a(\tau_{n_k} - k\lambda_{n_k}, x)|^2 \, dx \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{8}.$$

In view of (8.8), this contradicts Proposition 4.4 (here $\rho_{1,n} = \lambda_n$). Step 1 is complete.

Step 2. By Step 1,
$$\lim_{n \to \infty} E(a(\tau_n), \partial_t a(\tau_n)) = E(W, 0).$$

Note that

$$E(u(t), \partial_t u(t)) = E(v(t), \partial_t v(t)) + E(a(t), \partial_t a(t)) + o(1) \quad \text{as } t \to 1^-,$$

which shows by conservation of energy for u and v that $E(a(t), \partial_t a(t))$ has a limit as $t \to 1^-$, concluding the proof of Corollary 8.3. $\qquad\square$

Proof of Proposition 8.2. By Hardy's inequality

$$\int_{|x| \geq R} \frac{1}{|x|^2} (a(t, x))^2 \, dx \leq C \int_{|x| \geq R} |\nabla a(t, x)|^2 \, dx,$$

so that we only need to show that there exist sequences $\{\mu_n\}$ and $\{\tau_n\}$ as in the proposition such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{|x| \geq \mu_n} [(\partial_t a(\tau_n, x))^2 + |\nabla a(\tau_n, x)|^2] \, dx = 0.$$

If this does not hold, there exist $\alpha > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$\forall t \in (0, 1), \quad \int_{|x| \geq \alpha(1-t)} [|\partial_t a(t, x)|^2 + |\nabla a(t, x)|^2] \, dx \geq \varepsilon_0. \tag{8.9}$$

Step 1. We first show that there exists $\beta > 0$ such that[3]

$$\liminf_{t \to 1^-} \int_{|x| \geq \beta(1-t)} [|\partial_t a(t, x)|^2 + |\nabla a(t, x)|^2] \, dx \geq \frac{2}{3} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{8.10}$$

Indeed, assume that (8.10) does not hold, i.e. that there exist sequences $\tau_n \to 1^-$ and $\beta_n \to 0^+$ such that

$$\int_{|x| \geq \beta_n(1-\tau_n)} [|\partial_t a(\tau_n, x)|^2 + |\nabla a(\tau_n, x)|^2] \, dx \leq \frac{2}{3} \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 - \varepsilon_1. \tag{8.11}$$

After extraction, pick a profile decomposition $\{U^j\}$, $\{t_{j,n}, \lambda_{j,n}\}$ for $\{(a(\tau_n), \partial_t a(\tau_n))\}_n$. Reordering the profiles, we assume (3.11), i.e. that U^1 is the largest profile in the energy space. By Lemma 8.1, we may assume that $t_{1,n} = 0$, and the norm of (U_0^1, U_1^1) in the energy space is bounded from below (see (8.2)).

Let $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ to be specified later. By Proposition 3.8, there exists $T \in (0, T_+(U^1))$ such that

$$\|\nabla U^1(T)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t U^1(T)\|_{L^2}^2 \geq \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 - \varepsilon_2.$$

Then by Proposition 2.8,

$$a(\tau_n + \lambda_{1,n} T) = \sum_{j=1}^J U_n^j(\lambda_{1,n} T) + w_n^J(\lambda_{1,n} T) + r_n^J(\lambda_{1,n} T), \tag{8.12}$$

$$\partial_t a(\tau_n + \lambda_{1,n} T) = \sum_{j=1}^J \partial_t U_n^j(\lambda_{1,n} T) + \partial_t w_n^J(\lambda_{1,n} T) + \partial_t r_n^J(\lambda_{1,n} T). \tag{8.13}$$

The rescaled profiles U_n^j are defined as usual (see Notation 2.6). Note that

$$\|\nabla U^1(\lambda_{1,n} T)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t U^1(\lambda_{1,n} T)\|_{L^2}^2 = \|\nabla U_n^1(T)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t U_n^1(T)\|_{L^2}^2 \geq \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 - \varepsilon_2.$$

Combining this with (8.1), (8.12), (8.13) and the orthogonality of the parameters, we get

$$\sum_{j=2}^J \left\| \nabla_{t,x} U^j \left(\frac{\lambda_{1,n} T - t_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_{t,x} w_n^J(\lambda_{1,n} T)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \eta_0 + \varepsilon_2.$$

And thus using the conservation of energy,

$$\sum_{j=2}^J E(U_0^j, U_j^1) \leq \frac{1}{2}(\eta_0 + \varepsilon_2).$$

---

[3] We could replace $\frac{2}{3}\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2$ by $\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 - C\eta_0$ for some large positive constant C, where η_0 is given by (8.1).

Take η_0 and ε_2 so small that $\frac{1}{2}(\eta_0 + \varepsilon_2) \leq \frac{1}{3}\delta_1^2$, where $\delta_1 = \delta_1(2\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2)$ is given by Corollary 4.3. Then U^1 is the unique large profile, i.e., with the notations of §4.2, $J_0 = 1$. Assume that $\lambda_{1,n} = o_n(1 - \tau_n)$. Then by Proposition 4.4 we would obtain

$$\lim_{R \to \infty} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \int_{|x| \geq R\lambda_{1,n}} [|\nabla a(\tau_n)|^2 + (\partial_t a(\tau_n))^2]\, dx = 0,$$

a contradiction with (8.9). Thus $1 - \tau_n \approx \lambda_{1,n}$. Choose a sequence $\{\tilde{\beta}_n\}$ such that $\beta_n \ll \tilde{\beta}_n \ll 1$. Let $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be such that $\chi(x) = 1$ if $|x| \geq 2$ and $\chi(x) = 0$ is $|x| \leq 1$. By Remark 2.10,

$$\int_{|x| \geq \beta_n(1-\tau_n)} [|\nabla a(\tau_n, x)|^2 + |\partial_t a(\tau_n, x)|^2]$$

$$\geq \int \chi\left(\frac{x}{\tilde{\beta}_n(1-\tau_n)}\right)[|\nabla a(\tau_n, x)|^2 + |\partial_t a(\tau_n, x)|^2]$$

$$\geq \int \chi\left(\frac{\lambda_{1,n} y}{\tilde{\beta}_n(1-\tau_n)}\right)[|\nabla U_0^1(y)|^2 + |U_1^1(y)|^2]\, dy$$

$$\xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} \int [|\nabla U_0^1(y)|^2 + |U_1^1(y)|^2]\, dy \geq \frac{2}{3}\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2.$$

This contradicts (8.11) and concludes Step 1.

Step 2: End of the argument. Let, for $t \in [0, 1)$,

$$\mu(t) = \inf\left\{\mu : \int_{|x| \leq \mu} [|\partial_t a(t)|^2 + |\nabla a(t)|^2] \geq \frac{2}{5} \int |\nabla W|^2\right\}. \tag{8.14}$$

By Step 1 and assumption (8.1),

$$\beta(1 - t) \leq \mu(t) \leq 1 - t. \tag{8.15}$$

Take any sequence $\tau_n \to 1^-$ such that $(a(\tau_n), \partial_t a(\tau_n))$ admits a profile decomposition. By Lemma 8.1 and Step 1, we may assume, after extraction,

$$\|\nabla U_0^1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_0^1\|_{L^2}^2 \geq \frac{2}{3}\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2, \quad t_{1,n} = 0, \quad \lambda_{1,n} = \mu(\tau_n) \approx 1 - \tau_n.$$

Furthermore, the solution U^1 does not scatter forward or backward in time. Let $\varepsilon_3 = \beta^2/2$, where β is given by (8.15). By Proposition 7.1 (if $T_-(U^1) = -\infty$) or Section 3 (if $T_-(U^1) \in (-\infty, 0)$), there exists $-\theta \in (T_-(U^1), 0)$ such that

$$\int_{|x| \leq \varepsilon_3\theta} [|\partial_t U^1(-\theta)|^2 + |\nabla U^1(-\theta)|^2] \geq \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla W|^2. \tag{8.16}$$

Let us show that for large n,

$$\mu(\tau_n - \theta\mu(\tau_n)) \leq \varepsilon_3\theta\mu(\tau_n). \tag{8.17}$$

If this holds, by (8.15) we would get

$$\beta^2 \theta(1 - \tau_n) \leq \beta\theta\mu(\tau_n) \leq \beta(1 - \tau_n + \theta\mu(\tau_n)) \leq \mu(\tau_n - \theta\mu(\tau_n)) \leq \varepsilon_3\theta\mu(\tau_n)$$
$$\leq \frac{\beta^2}{2}\theta(1 - \tau_n),$$

a contradiction. The inequality (8.17) is equivalent to

$$\int_{|x| \leq \varepsilon_3\theta\mu(\tau_n)} |\nabla_{t,x} a(\tau_n - \theta\mu(\tau_n))|^2 \geq \frac{2}{5}\int|\nabla W|^2. \qquad (8.18)$$

We have, writing $\theta_{j,n} = -\theta\mu(\tau_n) - t_{j,n}$,

$$u(\tau_n - \theta\mu(\tau_n)) = v(\tau_n - \theta\mu(\tau_n)) + \frac{1}{\mu(\tau_n)^{1/2}} U^1\left(-\theta, \frac{x}{\mu(\tau_n)}\right)$$
$$+ \sum_{j=2}^{J} \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{1/2}} U^j\left(\frac{\theta_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right) + w_n^J(-\theta\mu(\tau_n)) + r_n^J(-\theta\mu(\tau_n)),$$

$$\partial_t u(\tau_n - \theta\mu(\tau_n)) = \partial_t v(\tau_n - \theta\mu(\tau_n)) + \frac{1}{\mu(\tau_n)^{3/2}} \partial_t U^1\left(-\theta, \frac{x}{\mu(\tau_n)}\right)$$
$$+ \sum_{j=2}^{J} \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{3/2}} \partial_t U^j\left(\frac{\theta_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}, \frac{x}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right) + \partial_t w_n^J(-\theta\mu(\tau_n)) + \partial_t r_n^J(-\theta\mu(\tau_n)),$$

where r_n^J satisfies

$$\lim_{J \to \infty} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \left[\|\nabla r_n^J(\theta\mu(\tau_n))\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_t r_n^J(\theta\mu(\tau_n))\|_{L^2}\right] = 0.$$

Let J_0 be such that for all $J \geq J_0$, and for large n, $\|\partial_{t,x} r_n^J\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{40}\int|\nabla W|^2$. Let $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\psi(x) = 1$ for $|x| \leq 1$ and $\psi(x) = 0$ for $|x| \geq 2$. Then by Remark 2.10,

$$\int \psi\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon_3\theta\mu(\tau_n)}\right)|\nabla_{t,x} a(\tau_n - \theta\mu(\tau_n))|^2 \geq \int \psi\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon_3\theta}\right)|\nabla_{t,x} U^1(-\theta)|^2 \geq \frac{2}{5}\int|\nabla W|^2,$$

hence (8.17) holds. The proof is complete. $\qquad\square$

8.3. Compactness of the singular part

Proposition 8.4. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1 (in particular $N = 3$ and u is spherically symmetric), a is compact in the energy space up to a scaling parameter: there exists a continuous function $\lambda(t)$, $t \in (0, 1)$, such that the closure of*

$$K = \left\{\left(\lambda(t)^{1/2} a(t, \lambda(t)x), \lambda(t)^{3/2}\partial_t a(t, \lambda(t)x)\right) : t \in (0, 1)\right\}$$

is compact in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$.

Proof. It is sufficient to show that for any time sequence $\tau_n \overset{<}{\to} 1$, there exists a subsequence of $\{\tau_n\}$ and a sequence $\{\lambda_n\}$ such that $(\lambda_n^{1/2} a(\tau_n, \lambda_n x), \lambda_n^{3/2} \partial_t a(\tau_n, \lambda_n x))$ converges in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$.

Let $\tau_n \overset{<}{\to} 1$. After extraction of a subsequence (in n), assume that $\{(a(\tau_n), \partial_t a(\tau_n))\}$ has a profile decomposition with profiles $\{U_L^j\}$ and parameters $\{\lambda_{j,n}, t_{j,n}\}$. Let U^1 be the largest profile. By Lemma 8.1, $\|\nabla U_0^1\|_{L^2} + \|U_1^1\|_{L^2} \geq \frac{2}{3}\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2$. By (8.1) and the Pythagorean expansions (2.14) and (2.15), we get

$$\|\nabla w_n^J(\tau_n)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{1}{3}\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta_0$$

and

$$\forall j \geq 2, \quad \|\nabla U_0^j\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_1^j\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{1}{3}\|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2 + \eta_0.$$

This implies that the energies of U^j, $j \geq 2$, and of w_n^J are all positive (see Claim 2.3). We distinguish three cases:

- If $E(U^1, \partial_t U^1) \geq E(W, 0)$, then by Corollary 8.3 and the Pythagorean expansion of the energy (using that all energies are positive), we see immediately that $E(U^1, \partial_t U^1) = E(W, 0)$, that there are no other nonzero profiles and that $(w_{0,n}^J, w_{1,n}^J)$ tends to 0 as $n \to \infty$, giving the compactness property.
- If $E(U^1, \partial_t U^1) < E(W, 0)$, and $\|\nabla U_0^1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_1^1\|_{L^2}^2 < \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2$, the profile U^1 scatters, yielding immediately a contradiction.
- If $E(U^1, \partial_t U^1) < E(W, 0)$, and $\|\nabla U_0^1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|U_1^1\|_{L^2}^2 > \|\nabla W\|_{L^2}^2$, then the nonlinear solution U^1 blows up in both time directions. By Proposition 2.8, U^1 is a type II blow-up solution of (1.1) such that $E(U^1, \partial_t U^1) < E(W, 0)$. Furthermore, as $(a, \partial_t a)$ converges weakly to 0 and $(v, \partial_t v)$ converges strongly in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ as $t \to 1$, we have

$$\int |\nabla_{t,x} u(t, x)|^2 = \int |\nabla_{t,x} a(t, x)|^2 + \int |\nabla_{t,x} v(t, x)|^2 + o(1) \quad \text{as } t \to 1^-.$$

Thus U^1 also satisfies (8.1), which shows that U^1 contradicts Corollary 8.3.

The proof is complete. ☐

8.4. Convergence to the stationary solution up to scaling

In this section we conclude the proof of Theorem 1. Consider a solution u of (1.1) satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1. By Corollary 8.3,

$$\lim_{t \to 1^-} E(a(t), \partial_t a(t)) = E(W, 0). \tag{8.19}$$

By Proposition 8.4, there exists $\lambda(t)$ such that the closure of

$$K = \left\{ \left(\lambda(t)^{1/2} a(t, \lambda(t)x), \lambda(t)^{3/2} \partial_t a(t, \lambda(t)x) \right) : t \in (0, 1) \right\}$$

is compact in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$. The following result is classical in this setting.

Lemma 8.5. *Let τ_n be a sequence that tends to 1, and such that*

$$\left(\lambda(\tau_n)^{1/2}a(\tau_n, \lambda(\tau_n)x), \lambda(\tau_n)^{3/2}\partial_t a(\tau_n, \lambda(\tau_n)x)\right) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} (U_0, U_1)$$

in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$. Consider the solution U of (1.1) such that

$$U_{|t=0} = U_0, \qquad \partial_t U_{|t=0} = U_1.$$

Then there exists a continuous function $\tilde{\lambda}$ defined on $(T_-(U), T_+(U))$ such that

$$\widetilde{K} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\lambda}(t)^{1/2}U(t, \tilde{\lambda}(t)x) \\ \tilde{\lambda}(t)^{3/2}\partial_t U(t, \tilde{\lambda}(t)x) \end{pmatrix} : t \in (T_-(U), T_+(U)) \right\}$$

has compact closure in $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$.

Sketch of proof. We have

$$u(\tau_n, x) = v(\tau_n, x) + \frac{1}{\lambda(\tau_n)^{1/2}}U_0\left(\frac{x}{\lambda(\tau_n)}\right) + o_n(1) \qquad \text{in } \dot{H}^1,$$

$$\partial_t u(\tau_n, x) = \partial_t v(\tau_n, x) + \frac{1}{\lambda(\tau_n)^{3/2}}U_1\left(\frac{x}{\lambda(\tau_n)}\right) + o_n(1) \quad \text{in } L^2.$$

Let $T \in (T_-(U), T_+(U))$. By Proposition 2.8,

$$u(\tau_n + \lambda(\tau_n)T, x) = v(\tau_n + \lambda(\tau_n)T, x) + \frac{1}{\lambda(\tau_n)^{1/2}}U\left(T, \frac{x}{\lambda(\tau_n)}\right) + o_n(1) \qquad \text{in } \dot{H}^1,$$

$$\partial_t u(\tau_n + \lambda(\tau_n)T, x) = \partial_t v(\tau_n + \lambda(\tau_n)T, x) + \frac{1}{\lambda(\tau_n)^{3/2}}\partial_t U\left(T, \frac{x}{\lambda(\tau_n)}\right) + o_n(1) \text{ in } L^2.$$

Letting $\sigma_n = \tau_n + \lambda(\tau_n)T$, we get

$$(\sigma_n)^{1/2}a(\sigma_n, \lambda(\sigma_n)x) = \left(\frac{\lambda(\sigma_n)}{\lambda(\tau_n)}\right)^{1/2}U\left(T, \frac{\lambda(\sigma_n)}{\lambda(\tau_n)}x\right) + o_n(1) \qquad \text{in } \dot{H}^1,$$

$$\lambda(\sigma_n)^{3/2}\partial_t a(\sigma_n, x) = \left(\frac{\lambda(\sigma_n)}{\lambda(\tau_n)}\right)^{3/2}\partial_t U\left(T, \frac{\lambda(\sigma_n)}{\lambda(\tau_n)}x\right) + o_n(1) \quad \text{in } L^2.$$

Extracting subsequences, we deduce from the compactness of $\overline{K}$ that there exists $(V_0, V_1) \in \overline{K}$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(\left(\frac{\lambda(\sigma_n)}{\lambda(\tau_n)}\right)^{1/2}U\left(T, \frac{\lambda(\sigma_n)}{\lambda(\tau_n)}x\right), \left(\frac{\lambda(\sigma_n)}{\lambda(\tau_n)}\right)^{3/2}\partial_t U\left(T, \frac{\lambda(\sigma_n)}{\lambda(\tau_n)}x\right)\right) = (V_0, V_1)$$

$$\text{in } \dot{H}^1 \times L^2.$$

This shows that $\lambda(\sigma_n)/\lambda(\tau_n)$ has a limit $\tilde{\lambda}(T) \in (0, \infty)$ (by conservation of energy $(0, 0) \notin \overline{K}$) and that

$$\left(\tilde{\lambda}(T)^{1/2}U(T, \tilde{\lambda}(T)x), \tilde{\lambda}(T)^{3/2}\partial_t U(T, \tilde{\lambda}(T)x)\right) \in \overline{K}.$$

The proof is complete, up to the proof of the known fact that the function $T \mapsto \tilde{\lambda}(T)$ may be taken continuous, for which we refer to [KM06, Remark 5.4]. $\qquad\square$

We next prove Theorem 1.

Step 1: Convergence to W for sequences. Let $\{t_n\}_n$ be a sequence in $(0, 1)$ such that $t_n \to 1$ and

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \left(\lambda(t_n)^{1/2} a(t_n, \lambda(t_n)x), \lambda(t_n)^{3/2} \partial_t a(t_n, \lambda(t_n)x) \right) = (U_0, U_1) \quad \text{in } \dot{H}^1 \times L^2.$$

In this step we show that for some $\lambda_0 > 0$ and some sign $+$ or $-$, $(U_0, U_1) = \pm(\lambda_0^{1/2} W(\lambda_0 \cdot), 0)$.

Let U be the solution of (1.1) with initial condition (U_0, U_1). By Lemma 8.5, U is compact up to scaling. By Theorem 2, $U = W$ up to the symmetries, concluding Step 1.

Step 2: Estimate on the scaling parameter. Let

$$\lambda_1(t) = \inf \left\{ \mu > 0 : \int_{|x| \leq \mu} |\nabla u(t, x) - \nabla v(t, x)|^2 \, dx \geq \int_{|x| \geq 1} |\nabla W|^2 \, dx \right\}.$$

By Step 1, $\int |\nabla a(t, x)|^2 \, dx \to \int |\nabla W|^2$ as $t \to 1$, which shows that $\lambda_1(t)$ is well-defined for $t < 1$, close to 1. Consider a sequence $t_n \overset{<}{\to} 1$. By Step 1, for $\iota_0 = -1$ or $+1$ and some sequence $\{\lambda_n\}_n$ of positive numbers,

$$a(t_n, x) = \iota_0 \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{1/2}} W\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_n} \right) + o_n(1) \quad \text{in } \dot{H}^1.$$

Thus if $\mu > 0$,

$$\int_{|x| \leq \mu} |\nabla a(t_n, x)|^2 \, dx = \int_{|x| \leq \mu} \frac{1}{\lambda_n^3} \left| \nabla W\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_n} \right) \right|^2 + o_n(1)$$

$$= \int_{|y| \leq \mu/\lambda_n} |\nabla W(y)|^2 \, dy + o_n(1),$$

which shows that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_1(t_n)} = 1.$$

Thus

$$a(t_n, x) = \iota_0 \frac{1}{\lambda_1(t_n)^{1/2}} W\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_1(t_n)} \right) + o_n(1) \quad \text{in } \dot{H}^1. \tag{8.20}$$

Step 3: Choice of the sign. Let

$$f(t) = \int \nabla a(t, x) \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda_1(t)^{1/2}} \nabla W\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_1(t)} \right) dx.$$

Then by Step 2, for each sequence $t_n \overset{<}{\to} 1$, there exists a subsequence such that $f(t_n) \to \pm \int |\nabla W|^2$. As f is a continuous function, the intermediate value theorem implies that

the value must be the same for all the sequences $\{t_n\}$. Changing u into $-u$ if necessary, we can assume

$$\lim_{t \to 1^-} f(t) = \int |\nabla W|^2.$$

By Step 2, for all sequences $\{t_n\}$,

$$u(t_n, x) = v(t_n, x) + \frac{1}{\lambda_1(t_n)^{1/2}} W\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_1(t_n)}\right) + o_n(1),$$

which concludes the proof of the development (1.8).

Step 4: Estimate on λ_1. Recalling that $u - v$ is supported in the cone $\{|x| \le 1 - t\}$, we get, for t close to 1,

$$0 = \int_{|x| \ge 1-t} |\nabla u(t) - \nabla v(t)|^2 \, dx = \int_{|x| \ge 1-t} \frac{1}{\lambda_1^3(t)} \left|\nabla W\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_1(t)}\right)\right|^2 dx + o(1)$$

$$= \int_{|y| \ge \frac{1-t}{\lambda_1(t)}} |\nabla W(y)|^2 \, dy + o(1),$$

as $t \to 1^-$, which shows that $(1 - t)/\lambda_1(t) \to \infty$, concluding the proof of Theorem 1. $\qquad\square$

Appendix A. Properties of profiles

In this appendix we prove a pseudo-orthogonality property (Claim A.1) and Claim 2.11.

Claim A.1. *Assume that $N \ge 3$ is odd. Let $\{w_n\}$ be a sequence of finite energy solutions of the linear wave equation (2.1), bounded in the energy space, and U be a finite energy solution of (2.1). Consider real sequences $\{\lambda_n\}$, $\{\mu_n\}$, $\{t_n\}$, $\{\theta_n\}$ with $\lambda_n, \mu_n > 0$. Assume that*

$$\lambda_n^{N/2} \nabla_{t,x} w_n(t_n, \lambda_n \cdot) \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} 0 \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}). \tag{A.1}$$

Then, if $\varphi = 1$, or if φ is a radial, continuous, compactly supported function on $\mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\varphi(r) = 1$ if r is small, there exist subsequences such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int \varphi\left(\frac{|x|}{\mu_n}\right) \nabla_{t,x} w_n(\theta_n, x) \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2}} \nabla_{t,x} U\left(\frac{\theta_n - t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right) dx = 0 \tag{A.2}$$

and

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int \left(1 - \varphi\left(\frac{|x|}{\mu_n}\right)\right) \nabla_{t,x} w_n(\theta_n, x) \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2}} \nabla_{t,x} U\left(\frac{\theta_n - t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right) dx = 0. \tag{A.3}$$

Proof. We start by showing (A.2) when $\varphi = 1$. By conservation of energy for solutions of (2.1),

$$\int \nabla_{t,x} w_n(\theta_n, x) \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2}} \nabla_{t,x} U\left(\frac{\theta_n - t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right) dx$$
$$= \int \nabla_{t,x} w_n(t_n, x) \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2}} \nabla_{t,x} U\left(0, \frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right) dx.$$

By the change of variable $\lambda_n y = x$, we see that (A.1) implies (A.2) for $\varphi = 1$.

We next consider the case when $\varphi \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is compactly supported and satisfies $\varphi = 1$ around 0. Because of the case $\varphi = 1$, one of the estimates (A.2) or (A.3) implies the other. By the change of variable $\mu_n y = x$,

$$\int \varphi\left(\frac{|x|}{\mu_n}\right) \nabla_{t,x} w_n(\theta_n, x) \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2}} \nabla_{t,x} U\left(\frac{\theta_n - t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right) dx$$
$$= \int \varphi(|y|) \mu_n^{N/2} \nabla_{t,x} w_n(\mu_n \theta_n, \mu_n y) \cdot \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_n^{N/2}} \nabla_{t,x} U\left(\frac{\tilde{\theta}_n - \tilde{t}_n}{\tilde{\lambda}_n}, \frac{y}{\tilde{\lambda}_n}\right) dy,$$

where $\tilde{\theta}_n = \theta_n/\mu_n$, $\tilde{\lambda}_n = \lambda_n/\mu_n$, $\tilde{t}_n = t_n/\mu_n$. Replacing w_n by the solution $(t, y) \mapsto \mu_n^{N/2} w_n(\mu_n t, \mu_n y)$ of (2.1), θ_n by $\tilde{\theta}_n$, t_n by $\tilde{t}_n$ and λ_n by $\tilde{\lambda}_n$, we will assume, in addition to (A.1), that $\mu_n = 1$ for all n.

Extracting subsequences, we distinguish two cases.

Case 1. Assume
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\theta_n - t_n}{\lambda_n} = \pm\infty. \tag{A.4}$$

Then, by Lemma 4.1, the energy of $\frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2}} U\left(\frac{\theta_n - t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right)$ concentrates in sets of the form

$$\{|\theta_n - t_n| - C\lambda_n \leq |x| \leq |\theta_n - t_n| + C\lambda_n\}.$$

Recalling that $\mu_n = 1$, we deduce that if $|\theta_n - t_n| \to \infty$, then (A.2) holds, and if $|\theta_n - t_n| \to 0$, then (A.3) holds. In both cases, the proof is complete.

We next assume, after extraction, that
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} (\theta_n - t_n) = T \in \mathbb{R}^*. \tag{A.5}$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$, and let R (given by Lemma 4.1) be such that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{\complement \mathcal{C}_n(R)} \frac{1}{\lambda_n^N} \left|\nabla_{t,x} U\left(\frac{\theta_n - t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right)\right|^2 dx \leq \varepsilon^2,$$

where $\mathcal{C}_n(R) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : |\theta_n - t_n| - R\lambda_n \leq |x| \leq |\theta_n - t_n| + R\lambda_n\}$ and $\complement\mathcal{C}_n(R)$ is its complement in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Using the boundedness of $\nabla_{t,x} w_n$ in $(L^2)^{N+1}$, we get, for large n,

$$\left| \int (\varphi(x) - \varphi(|\theta_n - t_n|)) \nabla_{t,x} w_n(\theta_n, x) \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2}} \nabla_{t,x} U\left(\frac{\theta_n - t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right) dx \right|$$

$$\leq C \max_{x \in \mathcal{C}_n(R)} |\varphi(x) - \varphi(|\theta_n - t_n|)| + C\varepsilon,$$

where the constant C depends only on the energy of U and the bound of $\nabla_{t,x} w_n$ in $(L^2)^{N+1}$. As φ is uniformly continuous, and $\lambda_n \to 0$, by (A.4) and (A.5) we get

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \left| \int (\varphi(x) - \varphi(|\theta_n - t_n|)) \nabla_{t,x} w_n(\theta_n, x) \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2}} \nabla_{t,x} U\left(\frac{\theta_n - t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right) dx \right| \leq C\varepsilon,$$

and hence (using the case $n = 1$),

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \left| \int \varphi(x) \nabla_{t,x} w_n(\theta_n, x) \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2}} \nabla_{t,x} U\left(\frac{\theta_n - t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right) dx \right| \leq C\varepsilon.$$

The proof is complete if (A.4) holds.

Case 2. Assume

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\theta_n - t_n}{\lambda_n} = t_0 \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{A.6}$$

Then by Lemma 4.1 the L^2 norm of $\frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2}} \nabla_{t,x} U\left(\frac{\theta_n - t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right)$ is localized in sets of the form

$$\{C^{-1}\lambda_n \leq |x| \leq C\lambda_n\}.$$

If $\lambda_n \to \infty$ or $\lambda_n \to 0$, the argument of Case 1 yields (A.2) and (A.3). Let us assume

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \lambda_n = \lambda_\infty \in (0, \infty).$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2}} \nabla_{t,x} U\left(\frac{\theta_n - t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{x}{\lambda_n}\right) = \frac{1}{\lambda_\infty^{N/2}} \nabla_{t,x} U\left(t_0, \frac{x}{\lambda_\infty}\right) + o_n(1) \quad \text{in } (L^2(\mathbb{R}^N))^{N+1}.$$

Thus we must show

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int \varphi(x) \nabla_{t,x} w_n(\theta_n, x) \frac{1}{\lambda_\infty^{N/2}} \nabla_{t,x} U\left(t_0, \frac{x}{\lambda_\infty}\right) dx = 0. \tag{A.7}$$

First notice that if $\Phi \in (L^2)^{N+1}$,

$$\int \nabla_{t,x} w_n(t_n, x) \cdot \Phi(x) \, dx = \int \lambda_n^{N/2} \nabla_{t,x} w_n(t_n, \lambda_n y) \cdot \lambda_n^{N/2} \Phi(\lambda_n y) \, dy$$

$$= \int \lambda_n^{N/2} \nabla_{t,x} w_n(t_n, \lambda_n y) \cdot \lambda_\infty^{N/2} \Phi(\lambda_\infty y) \, dy + o_n(1).$$

At the last line we used that $\lambda_n^{N/2}\Phi(\lambda_n y)$ converges strongly to $\lambda_\infty^{N/2}\Phi(\lambda_\infty y)$ in $(L^2)^{N+1}$. Thus by (A.1),

$$\nabla_{t,x} w_n(t_n, x) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \quad \text{in } (L^2)^{N+1}. \tag{A.8}$$

Next, consider the solution v of (2.1) with initial data $(v_0, v_1) \in \dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ such that

$$\Delta v_0(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_\infty^{N/2}} \operatorname{div}\left(\varphi(x)\nabla_x U\left(t_0, \frac{x}{\lambda_\infty}\right)\right), \quad v_1(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_\infty^{N/2}}\varphi(x)\partial_t U\left(t_0, \frac{x}{\lambda_\infty}\right).$$

Write $\theta_n = \lambda_\infty t_0 + t_n + \varepsilon_n$ with $\varepsilon_n \to 0^+$. Then by conservation of energy,

$$\int \varphi(x)\nabla_{t,x} w_n(\theta_n, x)\frac{1}{\lambda_\infty^{N/2}}\nabla_{t,x} U\left(t_0, \frac{x}{\lambda_\infty}\right) dx = \int \nabla_{t,x} w_n(\theta_n, x)\nabla_{t,x} v(0, x)\, dx$$

$$= \int \nabla_{t,x} w_n(t_n, x)\nabla_{t,x} v(-\lambda_\infty t_0 - \varepsilon_n, x)\, dx$$

$$= \int \nabla_{t,x} w_n(t_n, x)\nabla_{t,x} v(-\lambda_\infty t_0, x)\, dx + o_n(1),$$

which shows (A.7) in view of (A.8).   □

We next prove Claim 2.11.

Proof of Claim 2.11. We prove the result when N is odd, although it should also hold when N is even. Rescaling if necessary, we will assume

$$\forall n, \quad \tilde{\lambda}_n = 1. \tag{A.9}$$

Note that the assumption (2.26) implies that for any sequences $\{\lambda_n\}, \{t_n\}$,

$$\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_n^{(N-2)/2}} w_n\left(\frac{-t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n}\right), \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2}}\partial_t w_n\left(\frac{-t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n}\right)\right) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} (0, 0) \quad \text{weakly in } \dot{H}^1 \times L^2. \tag{A.10}$$

Indeed, if (A.10) does not hold, the sequence $\{w_n\}$ would have a nontrivial profile decomposition, contradicting (2.26).

Conversely, we claim that (2.27) holds as soon as for all sequences $\{\lambda_n\}, \{t_n\}$,

$$\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_n^{(N-2)/2}} \tilde{w}_n\left(\frac{-t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n}\right), \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2}}\partial_t \tilde{w}_n\left(\frac{-t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{\cdot}{\lambda_n}\right)\right) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} (0, 0) \quad \text{weakly in } \dot{H}^1 \times L^2. \tag{A.11}$$

Again, if (2.27) does not hold, then the sequence $(\tilde{w}_n(0), \partial_t \tilde{w}_n(0))$ has a profile decomposition with at least one nonzero profile, which contradicts (A.11).

Let us show (A.11). Let $(Z_0, V_1) \in \dot{H}^{-1} \times L^2$ and let $V_0 \in \dot{H}^1$ be such that $\Delta V_0 = Z_0$. Let V be the solution of (2.1) with initial conditions (V_0, V_1). We have

$$\int \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{(N-2)/2}} \tilde{w}_n \left(\frac{-t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{x}{\lambda_n} \right) Z_0(x) \, dx + \int \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{N/2}} \partial_t \tilde{w}_n \left(\frac{-t_n}{\lambda_n}, \frac{x}{\lambda_n} \right) V_1(x) \, dx$$

$$= \int \nabla_x \tilde{w}_n(0, x) \cdot \lambda_n^{N/2} \nabla_x V(t_n, \lambda_n x) \, dx + \int \partial_t \tilde{w}_n(0, x) \lambda_n^{N/2} \partial_t V(t_n, \lambda_n x)$$

$$= \int \nabla_x (\varphi(|x|) w_{0,n}(x)) \cdot \lambda_n^{N/2} \nabla_x V(t_n, \lambda_n x) \, dx + \int \varphi(|x|) w_{1,n}(x) \lambda_n^{N/2} \partial_t V(t_n, \lambda_n x).$$
(A.12)

Thus it suffices to show

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int \varphi(|x|) \nabla_x w_{0,n}(x) \cdot \lambda_n^{N/2} \nabla_x V(t_n, \lambda_n x) \, dx$$

$$+ \int \varphi(|x|) w_{1,n}(x) \lambda_n^{N/2} \partial_t V(t_n, \lambda_n x) = 0, \qquad \text{(A.13)}$$

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int (\nabla_x \varphi(|x|)) w_{0,n}(x) \cdot \lambda_n^{N/2} \nabla_x V(t_n, \lambda_n x) \, dx = 0. \qquad \text{(A.14)}$$

The first limit, (A.13), follows immediately from Claim A.1. To show (A), we use that there exists $C > 0$ such that $\nabla \varphi$ is supported in $\{1/C \leq |x| \leq C\}$, and distinguish several cases.

If t_n is bounded, then one can assume after extraction that t_n has a limit $T \in [0, \infty)$. If $\lambda_n \to 0$ or $\lambda_n \to \infty$ then by Lemma 4.1,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{1/C \leq |x| \leq C} \lambda_n^N |\nabla V(t_n, \lambda_n x)|^2 \, dx = 0, \qquad \text{(A.15)}$$

and (A) follows. If λ_n has a limit $\lambda_\infty \in (0, \infty)$, then $\lambda_n^{N/2} \nabla V(t_n, \lambda_n x)$ converges strongly to $\lambda_\infty^{N/2} \nabla V(T, \lambda_\infty x)$, and we are reduced to showing

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{1/C \leq |x| \leq C} (\nabla_x \varphi(|x|)) w_{0,n}(x) \cdot \lambda_\infty^{N/2} \nabla V(T, \lambda_\infty x) \, dx = 0,$$

which follows from the fact that by (A.10), $w_{0,n}$ tends to 0 weakly in $\dot{H}^1$ (and thus, by Hardy's inequality, $|x|^{-1} w_{0,n}$ tends to 0 weakly in L^2).

We next treat the case when t_n is not bounded. Extracting, we assume that $t_n \to \infty$ (the case $t_n \to -\infty$ is analogous). If $t_n/\lambda_n \to 0$ or $t_n/\lambda_n \to \infty$, Lemma 4.1 implies again (A.15), and (A) follows. It remains to consider the case when (after extraction) $t_n/\lambda_n \to \ell \in (0, \infty)$. By Lemma 4.1, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists R_ε such that for all $R \geq R_\varepsilon$,

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \int_{||x| - \ell| \geq R/\lambda_n} \lambda_n^N |\nabla V(t_n, \lambda_n x)|^2 \, dx \leq \varepsilon$$

As a consequence,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{||x|-\ell|\geq 1/\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \lambda_n^N |\nabla V(t_n, \lambda_n x)|^2 \, dx = 0. \tag{A.16}$$

It remains to show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left| \int_{||x|-\ell|\leq 1/\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \partial_r \varphi(|x|) w_{0,n}(x) \lambda_n^{N/2} \partial_r V(t_n, \lambda_n x) \, dx \right| = 0. \tag{A.17}$$

We have

$$\int_{||x|-\ell|\leq 1/\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \partial_r \varphi(|x|) w_{0,n}(x) \lambda_n^{N/2} \partial_r V(t_n, \lambda_n x) \, dx$$

$$= \int_{||x|-\ell|\leq 1/\sqrt{\lambda_n}} |x| \partial_r \varphi(|x|) \frac{1}{|x|} w_{0,n}(x) \lambda_n^{N/2} \partial_r V(t_n, \lambda_n x) \, dx$$

$$= \int_{||x|-\ell|\leq 1/\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \ell \partial_r \varphi(\ell) \frac{1}{|x|} w_{0,n}(x) \lambda_n^{N/2} \partial_r V(t_n, \lambda_n x) \, dx + o_n(1)$$

$$= \ell \partial_r \varphi(\ell) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|x|} w_{0,n}(x) \lambda_n^{N/2} \partial_r V(t_n, \lambda_n x) \, dx + o_n(1). \tag{A.18}$$

At the third line, we have used that $r\partial_r \varphi$ is continuous and thus

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{|r-\ell|\leq 1/\sqrt{\lambda_n}} |r\partial_r \varphi(r) - \ell\partial_r \varphi(\ell)| = 0.$$

At the last line we have used (A.16). By Hardy's inequality and assumption (A.10), $|x|^{-1} w_{0,n}$ converges weakly to 0 in L^2, and thus (A.18) implies (A.17), which concludes the proof of Claim 2.11. □

Appendix B. Family of sequences of positive numbers

Claim B.1. *Let $\{\lambda_n\}_n$, $\{\nu_n\}_n$ and for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{\rho_{j,n}\}_n$, be sequences of positive numbers and assume*

$$\lambda_n \ll \nu_n. \tag{B.1}$$

Then, after extraction of subsequences, there exists a sequence $\{\mu_n\}_n$ such that

$$\lambda_n \ll \mu_n \ll \nu_n, \tag{B.2}$$

$$\forall k, \quad \mu_n \ll \rho_{k,n} \text{ or } \rho_{k,n} \ll \mu_n. \tag{B.3}$$

Proof. Let, for $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mu_n(s) = \lambda_n^{1-s} \nu_n^s.$$

Note that for any $s \in (0, 1)$, $\lambda_n \ll \mu_n(s) \ll \nu_n$. Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, extracting subsequences in n if necessary, we are in one of the following three cases:

$$\begin{cases} \forall s \in (0, 1), \quad \mu_n(s) \ll \rho_{j,n} \text{ or} \\ \forall s \in (0, 1), \quad \rho_{j,n} \ll \mu_n(s) \text{ or} \\ \exists s_j \in (0, 1), \ \forall s \in (0, s_j), \ \mu_n(s) \ll \rho_{j,n} \text{ and } \forall s \in (s_j, 1), \ \rho_{j,n} \ll \mu_n(s). \end{cases} \tag{B.4}$$

Indeed, let

$$s_j = \inf\{s \in [0, 1] : \{\rho_{j,n}/\mu_n(s)\}_n \text{ is bounded.}\}.$$

Note that $\mu_n(s) \ll \mu_n(s')$ is $s < s'$. As a consequence, if $s_j = 0$, then $\rho_{j,n}/\mu_n(s) \to 0$ for all $s \in (0, 1)$. Similarly if $s_j = 1$, then $\{\rho_{j,n}/\mu_n(s)\}_n$ is never bounded for $s \in (0, 1)$ and by diagonal extraction we can find a subsequence such that $\rho_{j,n}/\mu_n(s) \to \infty$ for any $s \in (0, 1)$. Finally if $s_j \in (0, 1)$, then $\rho_{j,n}/\mu_n(s) \to 0$ for all $s \in (s_j, 1)$, and $\{\rho_{j,n}/\mu_n(s)\}_n$ is not bounded for $s \in (0, s_j)$. Using diagonal extraction again we can assume that $\rho_{j,n}/\mu_n(s) \to \infty$ for all $s \in (0, s_j)$. Hence (B.4) follows.

After another diagonal extraction, we can assume that (B.4) holds for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Choosing $s \in (0, 1)$ distinct from all s_j, and letting $\mu_n = \mu_n(s)$, we get the desired properties (B.2) and (B.3). $\qquad\square$

References

[Aub76] Aubin, T.: Équations différentielles non linéaires et problème de Yamabe concernant la courbure scalaire. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **55**, 269–296 (1976)   Zbl 0336.53033   MR 0431287

[BG99] Bahouri, H., Gérard, P.: High frequency approximation of solutions to critical nonlinear wave equations. Amer. J. Math. **121**, 131–175 (1999)   Zbl 0919.35089   MR 1705001

[BC85] Brezis, H., Coron, J.-M.: Convergence of solutions of H-systems or how to blow bubbles. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **89**, 21–56 (1985)   Zbl 0584.49024   MR 0784102

[CF86] Caffarelli, L. A., Friedman, A.: The blow-up boundary for nonlinear wave equations. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **297**, 223–241 (1986)   Zbl 0638.35053   MR 0849476

[CTZ93] Christodoulou, D., Tahvildar-Zadeh, A. S.: On the asymptotic behavior of spherically symmetric wave maps. Duke Math. J. **71**, 31–69 (1993)   Zbl 0791.58105   MR 1230285

[DKM] Duyckaerts, T., Kenig, C., Merle, F.: Universality of the blow-up profile for small type II blow-up solutions of the energy-critical wave equation: the non-radial case. J. Eur. Math. Soc., to appear; arXiv:1003.0625 (2010)

[DM08] Duyckaerts, T., Merle, F.: Dynamics of threshold solutions for energy-critical wave equation. Int. Math. Res. Pap. **2008**, art. ID rpn002, 67 pp.   Zbl 1159.35043   MR 2470571

[GSV92] Ginibre, J., Soffer, A., Velo, G.: The global Cauchy problem for the critical nonlinear wave equation. J. Funct. Anal. **110**, 96–130 (1992)   Zbl 0813.35054   MR 1190421

[Kap94] Kapitanski, L.: Global and unique weak solutions of nonlinear wave equations. Math. Res. Lett. **1**, 211–223 (1994)   Zbl 0841.35067   MR 1266760

[KM06] Kenig, C. E., Merle, F.: Global well-posedness, scattering and blow-up for the energy-critical, focusing, non-linear Schrödinger equation in the radial case. Invent. Math. **166**, 645–675 (2006) Zbl 1115.35125 MR 2257393

[KM08] Kenig, C. E., Merle, F.: Global well-posedness, scattering and blow-up for the energy-critical focusing non-linear wave equation. Acta Math. **201**, 147–212 (2008) Zbl 1183.35202 MR 2461508

[KS07] Krieger, J., Schlag, W.: On the focusing critical semi-linear wave equation. Amer. J. Math. **129**, 843–913 (2007) Zbl pre05170329 MR 2325106

[KST08] Krieger, J., Schlag, W., Tataru, D.: Renormalization and blow up for charge one equivariant critical wave maps. Invent. Math. **171**, 543–615 (2008) Zbl 1139.35021 MR 2372807

[KST09] Krieger, J., Schlag, W., Tataru, D.: Slow blow-up solutions for the $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ critical focusing semilinear wave equation. Duke Math. J. **147**, 1–53 (2009) Zbl 1170.35066 MR 2494455

[Lev74] Levine, H. A.: Instability and nonexistence of global solutions to nonlinear wave equations of the form $Pu_{tt} = -Au + \mathcal{F}(u)$. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **192**, 1–21 (1974) Zbl 0288.35003 MR 0344697

[LS95] Lindblad, H., Sogge, C. D.: On existence and scattering with minimal regularity for semilinear wave equations. J. Funct. Anal. **130**, 357–426 (1995) Zbl 0846.35085 MR 1335386

[Lio85] Lions, P.-L.: The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The limit case. II. Rev. Mat. Iberoamer. **1**, no. 2, 45–121 (1985) Zbl 0704.49006 MR 0850686

[MM00] Martel, Y., Merle, F.: A Liouville theorem for the critical generalized Korteweg–de Vries equation. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **79**, 339–425 (2000) Zbl 0963.37058 MR 1753061

[MM01] Martel, Y., Merle, F.: Asymptotic stability of solitons for subcritical generalized KdV equations. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **157**, 219–254 (2001) Zbl 0981.35073 MR 1826966

[MM02] Martel, Y., Merle, F.: Stability of blow-up profile and lower bounds for blow-up rate for the critical generalized KdV equation. Ann. of Math. (2) **155**, 235–280 (2002) Zbl 1005.35081 MR 1888800

[MR04] Merle, F., Raphaël, P.: On universality of blow-up profile for L^2 critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Invent. Math. **156**, 565–672 (2004) Zbl 1067.35110 MR 2061329

[MR05] Merle, F., Raphaël, P.: Profiles and quantization of the blow up mass for critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Comm. Math. Phys. **253**, 675–704 (2005) Zbl 1062.35137 MR 2116733

[MR08] Merle, F., Raphaël, P.: Blow up of the critical norm for some radial L^2 super critical nonlinear Schrödinger equations. Amer. J. Math. **130**, 945–978 (2008) Zbl 1188.35182 MR 2427005

[MV98] Merle, F., Vega, L.: Compactness at blow-up time for L^2 solutions of the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in 2D. Int. Math. Res. Notices **1998**, no. 8, 399–425 Zbl 0913.35126 MR 1628235

[MZ07] Merle, F., Zaag, H.: Existence and universality of the blow-up profile for the semilinear wave equation in one space dimension. J. Funct. Anal. **253**, 43–121 (2007) Zbl 1133.35070 MR 2362418

[MZ08] Merle, F., Zaag, H.: Existence and characterization of characteristic points for a semilinear wave equation in one space dimension. http://arxiv.org/abs/0811.4068 (2008)

[Pec84] Pecher, H.: Nonlinear small data scattering for the wave and Klein–Gordon equation. Math. Z. **185**, 261–270 (1984) Zbl 0538.35063 MR 0731347

[RR]   Raphaël, P., Rodnianski, I.: Personal communication

[RS]   Rodnianski, I., Sterbenz, J.: On the formation of singularities in the critical O(3)σ-model. Ann. of Math. **172**, 187–242 (2010)   Zbl pre05779357   MR 2680419

[SS94]   Shatah, J., Struwe, M.: Well-posedness in the energy space for semilinear wave equations with critical growth. Int. Math. Res. Notices **1994**, no. 7, 303ff., approx. 7 pp. Zbl 0830.35086   MR 1283026

[SS98]   Shatah, J., Struwe, M.: Geometric Wave Equations. Courant Lecture Notes Math. 2, New York Univ. Courant Inst. of Math. Sci., New York (1998)   Zbl 0993.35001   MR 1674843

[STZ97]   Shatah, J., Tahvildar-Zadeh, A. S.: On the stability of stationary wave maps. Comm. Math. Phys. **185**, 231–256 (1997)   Zbl 0877.58054   MR 1463041

[Sog95]   Sogge, C. D.: Lectures on Nonlinear Wave Equations. Monogr. Anal. 2, Int. Press, Boston, MA (1995)   Zbl 1089.35500   MR 1715192

[ST10]   Sterbenz, J., Tataru, D.: Regularity of wave-maps in dimension 2+1. Comm. Math. Phys. **298**, 231–264 (2010)   Zbl pre05764635   MR 2657818

[Str02]   Struwe, M.: Radially symmetric wave maps from $(1 + 2)$-dimensional Minkowski space to the sphere. Math. Z. **242**, 407–414 (2002)   Zbl 1052.58034   MR 1985457

[Str03]   Struwe, M.: Radially symmetric wave maps from $(1 + 2)$-dimensional Minkowski space to general targets. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **16**, 431–437 (2003) Zbl 1039.58033   MR 1971037

[Tal76]   Talenti, G.: Best constant in Sobolev inequality. Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **110**, 353–372 (1976)   Zbl 0353.46018   MR 0463908