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# STABLE SOLITARY WAVES FOR ONE-DIMENSIONAL SCHRÖDINGER-POISSON SYSTEMS 

GUOQING ZHANG, WEIGUO ZHANG, SANYANG LIU


#### Abstract

Based on the concentration compactness principle, we shoe the existence of ground state solitary wave solutions for one-dimensional SchrödingerPoisson systems with large $L^{2}$-norm in the energy space. We also obtain orbital stability for ground state solitary waves.


## 1. Introduction

Consider the one-dimensional Schrödinger-Poisson system

$$
\begin{gather*}
i \partial_{t} \psi+\partial_{x x} \psi+W \psi+b|\psi|^{p-2} \psi=0, \quad(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{1+1} \\
-\partial_{x x} W=|\psi|^{2}, \quad(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{1+1}  \tag{1.1}\\
\psi(0, x)=\psi_{0}(x)
\end{gather*}
$$

where $p>3, b$ is a real constant. The self-consistent Poisson potential $W$ is explicitly given by

$$
W_{\psi}(t, x)=-\frac{1}{2}\left(|x| *|\psi(t, x)|^{2}\right)=-\frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x-y||\psi(t, y)|^{2} d y .
$$

Problem (1.1) can be reduced to the nonlinear nonlocal Schrödinger equation

$$
\begin{gather*}
i \partial_{t} \psi+\partial_{x x} \psi-\frac{1}{2}\left(|x| *|\psi(t, x)|^{2}\right) \psi+b|\psi|^{p-2} \psi=0, \quad(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{1+1}  \tag{1.2}\\
\psi(0, x)=\psi_{0}(x)
\end{gather*}
$$

The model equation (1.2) appears in various frameworks, such as wave propagation in fibre optics to biophysics [8], one-dimensional reduction of electron density in plasma physics [2].

Recently, one-dimensional (1D) Schrödinger-Poisson system have been studied extensively. In 2005, Stimming [14] obtained the global existence result for 1.2] by using the semi-group theory. In 2007, De Leo, Rial 7] studied the global wellposedness and smoothing effect of 1.2 . In 2011, Masaki [12] proved that 1.2 is globally well-posed in the energy space, by means of perturbation methods.

[^0]We are interested in the search of solitary wave solutions of 1.2 , i.e., solutions to 1.2 in the form

$$
\psi(t, x)=e^{-i \lambda t} u(x), \lambda \in \mathbb{R}
$$

and $u$ solving

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\partial_{x x} u+\frac{1}{2}\left(|x| *|u|^{2}\right) u-b|u|^{p-2} u=\lambda u, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

As $b=0$, based on the rearrangement inequality, Choquard, Stubble 6 proved the existence and uniqueness result of ground states for (1.3). Hartmann, Zakvzewski [9] obtained the analytic solitary wave solutions which is approximated by a Gaussian, and soloved (1.3) numerically.

In this article, we look for solutions $u$ with a priori prescribed large $L^{2}$-norm by using the concentration compactness principle and the constraint minimization method. Notice that the Schrödinger-Poisson system in three dimensional space, Catto, Dolbeault, Sanchez, Soler [3] reviewed some recent results and open problems concerning the existence of solitary wave solutions in the frame work of the concentration compactness principle.

This article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give some preliminary results and state our main theorems. In Section 3, we prove the existence of ground state solitary wave solutions with sufficiently large $L^{2}$-norm for 1.3 .

## 2. Preliminary Results and main theorems

For any $1 \leq q<+\infty, L^{q}(\mathbb{R})$ is the usual Lebesgue space endowed with the norm $|u|_{q}^{q}=\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|u|^{q} d x . H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$ is the usual Sobolev space with the norm $\|u\|_{H^{1}(\mathbb{R})}^{2}=$ $\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left(\left|\partial_{x} u\right|^{2}+|u|^{2}\right) d x$. Consider the natural functional space $X=\{u: u \in$ $\left.H^{1}(\mathbb{R}), \sqrt{|x|} u \in L^{2}(\mathbb{R})\right\}$. The energy space $X[12$ is a Hilbert space with norm given by

$$
\|u\|_{X}^{2}=\|u\|_{H^{1}(\mathbb{R})}^{2}+\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x| u^{2}(x) d x=\|u\|_{H^{1}(\mathbb{R})}^{2}+|u|_{*}^{2},
$$

where $|u|_{*}^{2}=\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x| u^{2}(x) d x$. By Rellich's criterion [13], we have the following result.

Lemma 2.1. $X$ is compactly embedded in $L^{q}(\mathbb{R})$ for all $q \in[2,+\infty)$.
Masaki [12] proved the following lemma in 2011.
Lemma 2.2. When $b>0,3 \leq p<6, \psi_{0}(x) \in X$, problem 1.1) is globally well-posed in the energy space $X$.

We consider the symmetric bilinear form

$$
(u, v) \mapsto B_{0}(u, v)=\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x-y| u(x) v(y) d x d y
$$

and define the functional $V: H^{1}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup\{+\infty\}$ as

$$
V(u)=B_{0}\left(u^{2}, u^{2}\right)=\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x-y| u^{2}(x) u^{2}(y) d x d y
$$

Lemma 2.3. Let $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ be a sequence in $L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $u_{n} \rightarrow u$ in $L^{2}(\mathbb{R}) \backslash\{0\}$, $\left\{v_{n}\right\}$ be a bounded sequence in $L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\sup _{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_{0}\left(u_{n}^{2}, v_{n}^{2}\right)<\infty$. Then there exist $n_{0} \in \mathbb{N}, C>0$ such that $\left|u_{n}\right|_{*}<C$ for $n \geq n_{0}$.

Proof. From the assumptions and Egorov's Theorem, that there exist $n_{0} \in \mathbb{N}, R$, $\delta>0$ and $A \subset B_{R}(0)$ such that $|A|>0$ and $u_{n}^{2}(x) \geq \delta$ for all $n \geq n_{0}$. Since

$$
|x-y| \geq \frac{|y|}{2} \geq \sqrt{|y|} \quad \text { for all } x \in B_{R}(0) \text { and } y \in \mathbb{R} \backslash B_{2 R}(0)
$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
B_{0}\left(u_{n}, v_{n}\right) & \geq \int_{\mathbb{R} \backslash B_{2 R}(0)} \int_{A}\left|x-y \| u_{n}(x)\right|^{2}\left|v_{n}(y)\right|^{2} d x d y \\
& \geq \frac{\delta|A|}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R} \backslash B_{2 R}(0)}\left|y \| v_{n}(y)\right|^{2} d y \\
& \geq \frac{\delta|A|}{2}\left(\left|v_{n}\right|_{*}^{2}-2 R\left|v_{n}\right|_{2}^{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, we have $\left|u_{n}\right|_{*}<C$ for all $n \geq n_{0}$ because $B_{0}\left(u_{n}, v_{n}\right)$ and $\left|v_{n}\right|_{2}^{2}$ are bounded.

Remark 2.4. (1) From Lemma 2.3, we obtain that if $B_{0}\left(u_{n}, v_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0$ and $\left|v_{n}\right|_{2} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\left|u_{n}\right|_{*} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
(2) From Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.3 it is easy to obtain that if $u_{n} \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $X$, then we have $\widehat{B_{0}}\left(u_{n}^{2},\left(u_{n}-u\right) u\right) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Now, for problem (1.3), we consider the functionals $I, N: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
I(u) & =\frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\partial_{x} u\right|^{2} d x+\frac{1}{4} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x-y| u^{2}(x) u^{2}(y) d x d y-\frac{b}{p} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|u|^{p} d x \\
& =\frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\partial_{x} u\right|^{2} d x+\frac{1}{4} V(u)-\frac{b}{p} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|u|^{p} d x
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
N(u)=\left(\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|u|^{2} d x\right)^{1 / 2}=|u|_{2}
$$

From [6, 13], we obtain that the functionals $I, N$ are well-defined on $X$.
Lemma 2.5. The functional $I$ is of class $C^{1}$ on $X$.
Proof. Let $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ be a sequence in $X$ converging to some $u \in X$, we obtain that $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ is bounded and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mid V & \left(u_{n}\right)-V(u) \mid \\
= & \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|x-y \| u_{n}(x)\right|^{2}\left|u_{n}^{2}(y)-u^{2}(y)\right| d x d y \\
& +\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x-y|\left|u_{n}^{2}(x)-u^{2}(x) \| u(y)\right|^{2} d x d y \\
\leq & \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}(|x|+|y|)\left|u_{n}(x)\right|^{2}\left|u_{n}(y)-u(y) \| u_{n}(y)+u(y)\right| d x d y \\
& +\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}(|x|+|y|)\left|u_{n}(x)-u(x)\right|\left|u_{n}(x)+u(x)\right||u(y)|^{2} d x d y \\
\leq & \left|u_{n}(x)\right|_{*}^{2}\left|u_{n}-u\right|_{2}^{2}\left|u_{n}+u\right|_{2}^{2}+\left|u_{n}\right|_{2}^{2}\left|u_{n}-u\right|_{*}\left|u_{n}+u\right|_{*} \\
& +\left|u_{n}\right|_{2}^{2}\left|u_{n}-u\right|_{*}\left|u_{n}+u\right|_{*}+|u|_{*}^{2}\left|u_{n}-u\right|_{2}\left|u_{n}+u\right|_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\leq C\left\|u_{n}-u\right\|_{X}^{2}
$$

for some $C>0$. So, we obtain that $V\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow V(u)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By a simple calculation, we have

$$
V^{\prime}(u) v=4 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x-y| u(x)^{2} u(y) v(y) d x d y, \quad \forall v \in X
$$

When $u_{n} \rightarrow u$ in $X$, we can argue as before and obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left|V^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) v-V^{\prime}(u) v\right| \\
&= 4 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x-y|\left(u_{n}^{2}(x) u_{n}(y)-u^{2}(x) u(y)\right) v(y) d x d y \\
& \leq 4\left[\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}(|x|+|y|)\left(u_{n}(x)-u(x)\right)\left(u_{n}(x)+u(x)\right)\left|u_{n}(y) \| v(y)\right| d x d y\right. \\
&\left.\quad+\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}(|x|+|y|)\left(u_{n}(y)-u(y)\right)|u(x)|^{2}|v(y)| d x d y\right] \\
& \leq 4\left(\left|u_{n}-u\right|_{*}\left|u_{n}+u\right|_{*}\left|u_{n}\right|_{2}^{2}|v|_{2}+\left|u_{n}-u\right|_{2}|u|_{*}^{2}|v|_{2}\right) \\
& \leq 4 C\left\|u_{n}-u\right\|_{X}\|v\|_{X}, \quad \forall v \in X
\end{aligned}
$$

In conclusion, we obtain that $V(u)$ is $C^{1}$ on $X$. Since $3 \leq p<6$, by Lemma 2.1, we obtain that $|u|_{p}^{p}$ is $C^{1}$ on $X$. Hence, the functional $I$ is of class $C^{1}$ on $X$.

On the other hand, it is easy to obtain that $N(u)$ is $C^{1}$ on $X$ by Lemma 2.1 .
Inspired by the papers [3, 8, we look for the solution of the problem 1.3 with a priori prescribed $L^{2}$-norm. The natural way is to consider the constrained critical points of the functional $I$ on the set

$$
B_{M}=\left\{u \in X:|u|_{2}=M\right\}
$$

So by a solution of 1.3 we mean a couple $\left(\lambda_{M}, u_{M}\right) \in \mathbb{R} \times X$, where $\lambda_{M}$ is the Lagrange multiplier associated with the critical point $u_{M}$ on $B_{M}$. From a physical point of view, the most interesting case is the existence of solutions for 1.3 with minimal energy (ground state solutions), that is the minimizers of

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{M}=\inf _{u \in B_{M}} I(u) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Functionals $I, N$ are translation invariant, i.e., for every $z \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$
I(u(\cdot+z))=I(u), \quad N(u(\cdot+z))=N(u)
$$

Therefore, the concentration compactness principle [10, 11] is the natural framework for the study of the existence of a minimizer, and for the analysis of the minimizing sequence of 2.1). It is known that, in this kind of problems, the main difficulty is the lack of compactness of the minimizing sequences $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ in $B_{M}$; indeed, two possible bad scenarios are possible: (1) (Vanishing)

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{n} \rightharpoonup 0 \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

(2) (Dichotomy)

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{n} \rightharpoonup \bar{u} \neq 0 \quad \text { and } \quad 0<|\bar{u}|_{2}<M \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the concentration compactness principle, we obtain the strict inequalities

$$
I_{M}<I_{M^{\prime}}+I_{\sqrt{M^{2}-M^{\prime 2}}} \quad \text { for all } M, M^{\prime}, \quad \text { and } \quad 0<M^{\prime}<M
$$

as necessary and sufficient conditions for the precompactness of the minimizing sequences $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ in the problem 2.1. Now, we state our main theorems in this paper.
Theorem 2.6. Let $b>0,3<p<6$. Then the minimizing sequences for (2.1) is precompact in $X$ up to translations with prescribed large $L^{2}$-norm. In particular, there exists a couple $\left(\lambda_{M}, u_{M}\right) \in \mathbb{R} \times X$ solution of 1.3 , i.e., problem 1.1 has a ground state solitary wave solution.

Theorem 2.7. Let $b>0,3<p<6$. Then the set

$$
S_{M}=\left\{e^{i \theta} u, \theta \in[0,2 \pi),|u|_{2}=M, I(u)=I_{M}\right\},
$$

is orbitally stable, i.e., the ground state solitary wave solution of (1.1) is orbitally stable.

The definition of orbital stability is recalled in Definition 3.3 below.

## 3. Existence and orbital stability

In this case, our aim is to discuss the applicability of concentration compactness principle to the minimizing problem (2.1) for proving the existence of ground state solutions of 1.3 . The next result is the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality in onedimensional space, see [4, p. 9].
Lemma 3.1. For all $u \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
|u|_{q} \leq C|u|_{2}^{(1-\delta)}\left|\partial_{x} u\right|_{2}^{\delta}, \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $2 \leq q<\infty, \delta=\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}$, the constant $C$ only depends on $q$ and $\delta$.
By Lemma 3.1, we obtain that for every $M>0$, the functional $I$ is bounded from below on $B_{M}$. Indeed, from (3.1) and positive property of $V(u)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
I(u) & \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\partial_{x} u\right|^{2} d x-\frac{b}{p} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|u|^{p} d x \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2}\left|\partial_{x} u\right|_{2}^{2}-\frac{b}{p} C M \frac{p(1-\delta)}{2}\left|\partial_{x} u\right|_{2}^{p \delta}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $3<p<6$, we have $p \delta=\frac{p}{2}-1<2$. Hence, we have

$$
I(u) \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\partial_{x} u\right|^{2} d x+o(1)
$$

which concludes the proof. Moreover, we also obtain that $I$ is coercive on $B_{M}$.
Notice that if we set $u_{\theta}(x)=\theta^{\left(1-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)} u\left(\frac{x}{\theta^{\alpha}}\right), \theta>0, \alpha$ is a real number, we have

$$
\begin{gather*}
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|u_{\theta}\right|^{2} d x=\left|u_{\theta}\right|_{2}^{2}=\theta^{2}|u|_{2}^{2} \\
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\partial_{x} u_{\theta}\right|^{2} d x=\theta^{(2-2 \alpha)} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\partial_{x} u\right|^{2} d x \\
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x-y|\left|u_{\theta}(x)\right|^{2}\left|u_{\theta}(y)\right|^{2} d x d y \\
=\theta^{(4+\alpha)} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x-y \| u(x)|^{2}|u(y)|^{2} d x d y \tag{3.2}
\end{gather*}
$$

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|u_{\theta}\right|^{p} d x=\theta^{\left(1-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) p+\alpha} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|u|^{p} d x
$$

Lemma 3.2. If $b>0,3<p<6$, then there exists $M_{1}>0$, such that

$$
\begin{gathered}
I_{M^{\prime}}<0, \quad \text { for all } M^{\prime} \in\left(M_{1},+\infty\right) \\
I_{M}<I_{M^{\prime}}+I_{\sqrt{M^{2}-M^{\prime 2}}}
\end{gathered}
$$

for all $M>M_{1}$ and $0<M^{\prime}<M$.
Proof. By (3.2), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
I\left(u_{\theta}\right)= & \frac{\theta^{(2-2 \alpha)}}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\partial_{x} u\right|^{2} d x+\frac{\theta^{(4+\alpha)}}{4} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x-y \| u(x)|^{2}|u(y)|^{2} d x d y \\
& -\frac{b}{p} \theta^{\left(1-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) p+\alpha} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|u|^{p} d x \\
= & \theta^{2}\left[I(u)+\frac{\theta^{(-2 \alpha)}-1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\partial_{x} u\right|^{2} d x\right. \\
& +\frac{\theta^{(2+\alpha)}-1}{4} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x-y||u(x)|^{2}|u(y)|^{2} d x d y \\
& \left.-\frac{b}{p}\left(\theta^{\left(1-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) p+\alpha-2}-1\right) \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|u|^{p} d x\right] \\
= & \theta^{2}(I(u)+g(\theta, u))
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
g(\theta, u)= & \frac{\theta^{(-2 \alpha)}-1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\partial_{x} u\right|^{2} d x \\
& +\frac{\theta^{(2+\alpha)}-1}{4} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x-y||u(x)|^{2}|u(y)|^{2} d x d y \\
& -\frac{b}{p}\left(\theta^{\left(1-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) p+\alpha-2}-1\right) \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|u|^{p} d x
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $\alpha=-2 / 3$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
I\left(u_{\theta}\right)= & \frac{1}{2} \theta^{\frac{10}{3}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\partial_{x} u\right|^{2} d x+\frac{1}{4} \theta^{\frac{10}{3}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x-y \| u(x)|^{2}|u(y)|^{2} d x d y \\
& -\frac{b}{p} \theta^{\left(\frac{4}{3} p-\frac{2}{3}\right)} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|u|^{p} d x, \quad \forall u_{\theta} \in X
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, we obtain that $I\left(u_{\theta}\right)<0$ for a sufficiently large $\theta$ which proves the first case because $\frac{4}{3} p-\frac{2}{3}>\frac{10}{3}$ for $3<p<6$.
Claim: $I_{\theta M^{\prime}}<\theta^{2} I_{M^{\prime}}$ for $\theta$ sufficiently large. Indeed, let $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ be a minimizing sequence in $B_{M^{\prime}}$ with $I_{M^{\prime}}<0$. Since $I_{M^{\prime}}\left(u_{n}\right)<0$, we have

$$
0<C_{1}<\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\partial_{x} u_{n}\right|^{2} d x<C_{2}, \quad 0<C_{3}<\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|u_{n}\right|^{p} d x<C_{4}
$$

When $\alpha=-2 / 3$, we have

$$
g\left(\theta, u_{n}\right)=\frac{\left(\theta^{\frac{4}{3}}-1\right)}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\partial_{x} u_{n}\right|^{2} d x
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +\frac{\left(\theta^{\frac{4}{3}}-1\right)}{4} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x-y|\left|u_{n}(x)\right|^{2}\left|u_{n}(y)\right|^{2} d x d y \\
& -\frac{b}{p}\left(\theta^{\left(\frac{4}{3} p-\frac{8}{3}\right)}-1\right) \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|u_{n}\right|^{p} d x
\end{aligned}
$$

with $\frac{4}{3} p-\frac{8}{3}>\frac{4}{3}$, as $3<p<6$. With a simple computation we obtain that

$$
\left.\frac{d}{d \theta} g\left(\theta, u_{n}\right)\right|_{\theta=1}<0 \text { and } \frac{d^{2}}{d \theta^{2}} g\left(\theta, u_{n}\right)<0, \quad \text { for all } \theta>1
$$

In conclusion, we obtain that $g\left(\theta, u_{n}\right)<0$ for all $\theta>1$ and $I_{\theta M^{\prime}}<\theta^{2} I\left(u_{n}\right)=\theta^{2} I_{M^{\prime}}$.
From the claim, we obtain that for $M^{\prime}$ sufficiently large,

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{M} & =I_{\frac{M}{M^{\prime}} M^{\prime}}<\frac{M^{2}}{M^{\prime 2}} I_{M^{\prime}} \\
& =\frac{\left(M^{2}-M^{\prime 2}+M^{2}\right)}{M^{\prime 2}} I_{M^{\prime}} \\
& =I_{M^{\prime}}+\frac{\left(M^{2}-M^{\prime 2}\right)}{M^{\prime 2}} I_{\frac{M^{\prime}}{\sqrt{M^{2}-M^{\prime 2}}} \sqrt{M^{2}-M^{\prime 2}}} \\
& <I_{M^{\prime}}+I_{\sqrt{M^{2}-M^{\prime 2}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, we complete the proof.
Proof of Theorem 2.6. Since the functional $I$ is bounded below and coercive on $B_{M}$, we obtain that the minimizing sequence $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ is bounded in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{2}\right)$. By Lemma 3.2, we obtain that $I_{M}<0$ on $B_{M}$ for sufficiently large $M$. Hence, we have that

$$
\sup _{x \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{B_{2}(x)}\left|u_{n}\right|^{2} d x>0 \quad \text { textand } \quad u_{n} \rightharpoonup u \neq 0 \text { in } H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{2}\right) .
$$

and the vanishing case does not hold. On the other hand, by Lemma 3.2, $I_{M}<$ $I_{M^{\prime}}+I_{\sqrt{M^{2}-M^{\prime 2}}}$ for all $M^{\prime}>M_{1}$ and $0<M^{\prime}<M$, and the dichotomy case does not hold. Hence, from concentration compactness principle, we obtain that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { there exists } x_{n} \in \mathbb{R} \text { such that } \tilde{u}_{n}=u_{n}\left(y-x_{n}\right) \in X, n \in \mathbb{N} \text {, } \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

is precompact in $H^{1}(\mathbb{R})$ and converges strongly to some function $u \in H^{1}(\mathbb{R}) \backslash\{0\}$. We may also assume that $\tilde{u}_{n} \rightarrow u$ pointwise almost everywhere in $\mathbb{R}$.
Claim 1: $\left|\tilde{u}_{n}\right|_{*}$ is bounded in $n$. Indeed, since $\left\{\tilde{u}_{n}\right\}$ is a minimizing sequence for $I_{M}$ on $B_{M}$, by the version of Ekeland Variational principle in [p.122]w1, we obtain that there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
I^{\prime}\left(\tilde{u}_{n}\right)-\lambda N^{\prime}\left(\tilde{u}_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0, \quad I\left(\tilde{u}_{n}\right)-\lambda N\left(\tilde{u}_{n}\right) \rightarrow I_{M}-\lambda M^{2} \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence, we have

$$
B_{0}\left(\tilde{u}_{n}^{2}, \tilde{u}_{n}^{2}\right)=V\left(\tilde{u}_{n}\right)=V\left(u_{n}\right)=o(1)+\lambda\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{L^{2}(\mathbb{R})}^{2}+b\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{L^{p}(\mathbb{R})}^{p}-\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{H^{1}(\mathbb{R})}^{2}
$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and the right-hand side of this equality remains bounded in $n$. So, we obtain that $B_{0}\left(\tilde{u}_{n}^{2}, \tilde{u}_{n}^{2}\right)$ is bounded in $n$. By Lemma 2.3 and Remark 2.4, we have $\left|\tilde{u}_{n}\right|_{*}$ is bounded in $n$. Hence, by the definition of the norm $\left\|\tilde{u}_{n}\right\|_{X}$, we obtain that $\left\|\tilde{u}_{n}\right\|_{X}<\infty$.
Claim 2: $\left\|\tilde{u}_{n}-u\right\|_{X} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Indeed, by (3.4), we have

$$
I^{\prime}\left(\tilde{u}_{n}\right)\left(\tilde{u}_{n}-u\right)-\lambda N^{\prime}\left(\tilde{u}_{n}\right)\left(\tilde{u}_{n}-u\right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty .
$$

By a simple calculation, we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|\tilde{u}_{n}\right\|_{H^{1}(\mathbb{R})}^{2}-\|u\|_{H^{1}(\mathbb{R})}^{2}+V\left(\tilde{u}_{n}\right)\left(\tilde{u}_{n}-u\right)-b \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\tilde{u}_{n}\right|^{p-2} \tilde{u}_{n}\left(\tilde{u}_{n}-u\right) d x \\
& -\lambda \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\tilde{u}_{n}\right|\left(\tilde{u}_{n}-u\right) d x=o(1)
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\left\|\tilde{u}_{n}\right\|_{X}$ is bounded in $X$, we obtain that $\tilde{u}_{n} \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $X$. By Lemma 2.1. we obtain that $\tilde{u}_{n} \rightarrow u$ strongly in $L^{s}(\mathbb{R})$ for $s \in[2, \infty)$. Hence, we have
$V^{\prime}\left(\tilde{u}_{n}\right)\left(\tilde{u}_{n}-u\right)=B_{0}\left(\tilde{u}_{n}^{2}, \tilde{u}_{n}\left(\tilde{u}_{n}-u\right)\right)=B_{0}\left(\tilde{u}_{n}^{2},\left(\tilde{u}_{n}-u\right)^{2}\right)+B_{0}\left(\tilde{u}_{n}^{2}, u\left(\tilde{u}_{n}-u\right)\right) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By Lemma 2.3, we obtain that $\left|\tilde{u}_{n}-u\right|_{*} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, we obtain that $\left\|\tilde{u}_{n}-u\right\|_{X} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

From Claim 2, we obtain that the minimizing sequence $\left\{\tilde{u}_{n}\right\}$ of 2.1p is precompact in $X$ with prescribed large $L^{2}$-norm. So there exists a couple $\left(\lambda_{M}, u_{M}\right) \in \mathbb{R} \times X$ solution of 1.3 , and 1.1 has a ground state solitary wave solution. Let

$$
S_{M}=\left\{e^{i \theta} u(x), \theta \in[0,2 \pi),|u|_{2}=M, I(u)=I_{M}\right\}
$$

Definition 3.3 (c3). We say $S_{M}$ is orbitally stable if for every $\varepsilon>0$, there exists $\delta(\varepsilon)>0$ such that if $\psi_{0} \in X$ satisfies $\inf _{v \in S_{M}}\left\|v-\psi_{0}\right\|_{X}<\delta(\varepsilon)$, then we have

$$
\sup _{t>0} \inf _{v \in S_{M}}\|\psi(t, x)-v(x)\|_{X}<\varepsilon
$$

where $\psi(t, \cdot)$ is the solution of 1.1 with initial datum $\psi_{0}$.
Proof of Theorem 2.7. By [Theorem 1.5]m1, we obtain the solution of (1.1) conserves $|\psi|_{L^{2}(\mathbb{R})}^{2}$ and the energy

$$
\begin{aligned}
E(t, \psi)= & \frac{1}{2}\left|\partial_{x} \psi\right|_{2}^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x-y \| \psi(t, x)|^{2}|\psi(t, y)|^{2} d x d y \\
& -\frac{b}{p} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|\psi(t, x)|^{p} d x
\end{aligned}
$$

i.e.,

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|\psi(t, x)|^{2} d x=\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\psi_{0}(x)\right|^{2} d x
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2}\left|\partial_{x} \psi\right|_{2}^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|x-y \| \psi(t, x)|^{2}|\psi(t, y)|^{2} d x d y-\frac{b}{p} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}|\psi|^{p} d x \\
& =\frac{1}{2}\left|\partial_{x} \psi_{0}\right|_{2}^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|x-y \| \psi_{0}(x)\right|^{2}\left|\psi_{0}(y)\right|^{2} d x d y-\frac{b}{p} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|\psi_{0}\right|^{p} d x
\end{aligned}
$$

Suppose by contradiction that there exists a $M$ such that $S_{M}$ is not orbitally stable. Hence, there exist a subsequence $\left\{\psi_{n}(0, x)\right\}$ and $\left\{t_{n}\right\} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\inf _{v \in S_{M}}\left\|\psi_{n}(0, x)-v(x)\right\|_{X} \rightarrow 0, \quad \inf _{v \in S_{M}}\left\|\psi_{n}\left(t_{n}, x\right)-v(x)\right\|_{X} \geq \varepsilon \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty
$$

Then, we obtain that there exists $u_{M} \in X$ minimizer of $I_{M}$ and $\theta \in[0,2 \pi]$ such that $v=e^{i \theta} u_{M}$,

$$
\left|\psi_{n}(0, x)\right|_{2} \rightarrow|v|_{2}=M, \quad I\left(\psi_{n}(0, x)\right) \rightarrow I(v)=I_{M} \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty
$$

Actually, we can assume that $\psi_{n}(0, x) \in B_{M}$ (there exists $\alpha_{n}=\frac{M}{\left|\psi_{n}(0, x)\right|_{2}} \rightarrow 1$ so that $\alpha_{n} \psi_{n}(0, x) \in B_{M}$ and $I\left(\alpha_{n} \psi_{n}(0, x)\right) \rightarrow I_{M}$, i.e., we can replace $\psi_{n}(0, x)$ with $\left.\alpha_{n} \psi_{n}(0, x)\right)$. So, we have $\left\{\psi_{n}(0, x)\right\}$ is a minimizing sequence for $I_{M}$ and

$$
I\left(\psi_{n}\left(t_{n}, x\right)\right)=I\left(\psi_{n}(0, x)\right)
$$

and $\left\{\psi_{n}\left(t_{n}, x\right)\right\}$ is a minimizing sequence for $I_{M}$. Since we obtain that every minimizing sequence has a subsequence converging in $X$-norm to a minimum on $B_{M}$, and it is a contradiction.
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