# Graphs, hybrids and something else

#### R. Carlone

Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II



Dipartimento di Matematica ed Applicazioni R.Caccioppoli

Research Team: A. Mercaldo, M.R. Posteraro

Naples - 20/10/2021

# Quantum graphs



▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲目▶ ▲目▶ 目 のへぐ

## Quantum graphs



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ○○ のへで

# Quantum hybrids



# Quantum hybrids



# Standard NLS

The standard nonlinear Schrödinger equation (a.k.a. NLS) is

$$\imath rac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = -\Delta \psi + eta |\psi|^{2\sigma} \psi,$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

with  $\psi(t, \mathbf{x}) : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\sigma > 0$ .

# Standard NLS

The standard nonlinear Schrödinger equation (a.k.a. NLS) is

$$\imath rac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = -\Delta \psi + eta |\psi|^{2\sigma} \psi,$$

with  $\psi(t, \mathbf{x}) : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\sigma > 0$ .

References: e.g. [Ginibre, Velo, ANIHPA '78&'85, JFA '79, ANIHPC '84], [Weinstein, CMP '83], [Kato, ANIHPA '87], [Sulem, Sulem, '99], [Cazenave, '03].

# Standard NLS

The standard nonlinear Schrödinger equation (a.k.a. NLS) is

$$\imath \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = -\Delta \psi + \beta |\psi|^{2\sigma} \psi,$$

with  $\psi(t, \mathbf{x}) : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\sigma > 0$ .

References: e.g. [Ginibre, Velo, ANIHPA '78&'85, JFA '79, ANIHPC '84], [Weinstein, CMP '83], [Kato, ANIHPA '87], [Sulem, Sulem, '99], [Cazenave, '03].

Applications:

- (i) laser beams: e.g. [Rasmussen, Rypdal, Phys. Scr. '86];
- (ii) Bose-Einstein condensates (a.k.a. BEC): e.g. [Dalfovo, Giorgini, Pitaevskii, Stringari, RevModPhys '99];
- (iii) other applications: e.g. [Malomed, '05]:
  - → nonlinear optics, plasma waves, FitzHugh-Nazumo model,...

A system of N quantum particles with positions  $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is described by a wave function  $\Psi(t, x_1, \ldots, x_N)$  that satisfies

$$i\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial t} = \left(-\Delta_{\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{x}_N} + a(N)\sum_{j>i}V(b(N)(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j))\right)\Psi.$$

・ロト・日本・ヨト・ヨト・日・ つへぐ

A system of N quantum particles with positions  $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is described by a wave function  $\Psi(t, x_1, \ldots, x_N)$  that satisfies

$$i\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial t} = \left(-\Delta_{\mathbf{x}_{1},...,\mathbf{x}_{N}} + a(N)\sum_{j>i}V(b(N)(\mathbf{x}_{i} - \mathbf{x}_{j}))\right)\Psi.$$

$$\uparrow$$
Kinetic energy
of the particles

A system of N quantum particles with positions  $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is described by a wave function  $\Psi(t, x_1, \ldots, x_N)$  that satisfies

$$i\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial t} = \left(-\Delta_{\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{x}_N} + a(N)\sum_{j>i} V(b(N)(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j))\right)\Psi.$$

Two-body interaction potential

A system of N quantum particles with positions  $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is described by a wave function  $\Psi(t, x_1, \ldots, x_N)$  that satisfies

$$i\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial t} = \left(-\Delta_{\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{x}_N} + \mathbf{a}(N)\sum_{j>i}V(\mathbf{b}(N)(\mathbf{x}_i-\mathbf{x}_j))\right)\Psi.$$

Scaling factors connected to the energy of the interactions

A system of N quantum particles with positions  $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is described by a wave function  $\Psi(t, x_1, \ldots, x_N)$  that satisfies

$$\imath \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} = \left( -\Delta_{\mathbf{x}_1,...,\mathbf{x}_N} + a(N) \sum_{j>i} V(b(N)(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)) \right) \Psi.$$

For a wide class of V and for suitable  $a(\cdot)$  and  $b(\cdot)$  and for large N,

$${}^{\prime\prime} \Psi(t, \mathsf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{x}_N) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \psi(t, \mathsf{x}_1) \ldots \psi(t, \mathsf{x}_N) \, {}^{\prime\prime}$$

with  $\psi$  satisfying the NLS (with  $\sigma = 1$ ):

A system of N quantum particles with positions  $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is described by a wave function  $\Psi(t, x_1, \ldots, x_N)$  that satisfies

$$\imath \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} = \left( -\Delta_{\mathbf{x}_1,...,\mathbf{x}_N} + a(N) \sum_{j>i} V(b(N)(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)) \right) \Psi.$$

For a wide class of V and for suitable  $a(\cdot)$  and  $b(\cdot)$  and for large N,

$${}^{\prime\prime} \Psi(t, \mathsf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{x}_N) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \psi(t, \mathsf{x}_1) \ldots \psi(t, \mathsf{x}_N) {}^{\prime\prime}$$

with  $\psi$  satisfying the NLS (with  $\sigma = 1$ ):

Gain: factorization and reduction of complexity.

Loss: from linear to nonlinear.

A system of N quantum particles with positions  $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is described by a wave function  $\Psi(t, x_1, \ldots, x_N)$  that satisfies

$$\imath \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} = \left( -\Delta_{\mathbf{x}_1,...,\mathbf{x}_N} + a(N) \sum_{j>i} V(b(N)(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)) \right) \Psi.$$

For a wide class of V and for suitable  $a(\cdot)$  and  $b(\cdot)$  and for large N,

$${}^{\prime\prime} \Psi(t, \mathsf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{x}_N) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \psi(t, \mathsf{x}_1) \ldots \psi(t, \mathsf{x}_N) \, {}^\prime$$

with  $\psi$  satisfying the NLS (with  $\sigma = 1$ ):

Gain: factorization and reduction of complexity.

Loss: from linear to nonlinear.

#### Hot topic in mathematical physics:

→ Adami, Bardos, Brennecke, Erdos, Frank Golse, Lewin, Lieb, Loss, Paul,
 Pickl, Rodnianski, Rougerie, Schlein, Seiringer, Solovej, Sphon, Teta, Teufel,
 Yau, Yngvason...

# Concentrated nonlinearity Question:

what if the particles are forced (e.g., by a confining potential) to concentrate in a region small with respect to the wavelength of the particles? Which is the best effective model?

# Concentrated nonlinearity Question:

- what if the particles are forced (e.g., by a confining potential) to concentrate in a region small with respect to the wavelength of the particles? Which is the best effective model?
- The NLS with concentrated nonlinearity (a.k.a. CNLS), i.e.

$$i\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = -\Delta\psi + \beta|\psi|^{2\sigma}\psi\,\delta_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{0}}, \qquad \beta \in \mathbb{R}, \ \sigma > \mathbf{0}$$

again with  $\psi(t, \mathbf{x}) : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ , but only for d=1,2,3.

# Concentrated nonlinearity Question:

- what if the particles are forced (e.g., by a confining potential) to concentrate in a region small with respect to the wavelength of the particles? Which is the best effective model?
- The NLS with concentrated nonlinearity (a.k.a. CNLS), i.e.

$$\imath \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = -\Delta \psi + \beta |\psi|^{2\sigma} \psi \, \delta_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{0}}, \qquad \beta \in \mathbb{R}, \ \sigma > \mathbf{0}$$

again with  $\psi(t, \mathbf{x}) : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ , but only for d=1,2,3.

Applications:

- Solid state physics: charge accumulation in semiconductors in presence of an impurity;
- (ii) Nonlinear optics: propagation in presence of localized defects.
- ✓→ [Jona-Lasinio et al., PRB '91], [Malomed, Azbel, PRB '93], [Jona-Lasinio et al., APHY '95], [Bulashenko et al., PRB '96], [Sukhorukov et al., PRE '99] ...

Nonlinear Dirac equation on graphs with localized nonlinearities: bound states and nonrelativistic limit

・ロト・4日ト・4日ト・4日・9000

Notation

A metric graph is a graph  $\mathcal{G} := (V, E)$  s.t.:

i)  $\mathcal{G}$  is a multigraph (i.e., self-loops, multiple edges, etc...);

ii) each edge  $e \in E$  is associated with  $I_e = [0, \ell_e]$ , if bounded, or with  $I_e = [0, \infty)$ , if unbounded (a half-line).

References: [Exner, Keating, Kuchment, Sunada, Teplyaev, '08], [Post, '12], [Berkolaiko, Kuchment, '13].



Note: for bounded edges the orientation of the parametrization  $\overline{x_e \in I_e}$  is free, while for half-lines vertices at infinity correspond to  $x_e = +\infty$ .

i) the cardinality of V and E is finite  $\rightarrow$  no periodic graphs!; ii)  $\mathcal{G}$  is connected (a path between each pair of vertices); iii)  $\mathcal{G}$  is noncompact  $\rightsquigarrow$  from i) this entails at least a half-line. As usual, a function  $u: \mathcal{G} \to \mathbb{C}$  is a family of functions  $u = (u_e)_{e \in E}$ , with  $u_e := u_{|_{I_e}} : I_e \to \mathbb{C}$ . As a consequence, Lebesgue:  $L^{p}(\mathcal{G}) := \bigoplus L^{p}(I_{e}) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \|u\|_{L^{p}(\mathcal{G})}^{p} := \|u_{e}\|_{L^{p}(I_{e})}^{p}$ e∈E Sobolev:  $H^1(\mathcal{G}) := \bigoplus H^1(I_e) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{G})}^2 := \|u_e\|_{H^1(I_e)}^2$ e∈E

i) the cardinality of V and E is finite  $\rightarrow$  no periodic graphs!; ii)  $\mathcal{G}$  is connected (a path between each pair of vertices); iii)  $\mathcal{G}$  is noncompact  $\rightsquigarrow$  from i) this entails at least a half-line. As usual, a function  $u: \mathcal{G} \to \mathbb{C}$  is a family of functions  $u = (u_e)_{e \in E}$ , with  $u_e := u_{|_{I_e}} : I_e \to \mathbb{C}$ . As a consequence, Lebesgue:  $L^{p}(\mathcal{G}) := \bigoplus L^{p}(I_{e}) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \|u\|_{L^{p}(\mathcal{G})}^{p} := \|u_{e}\|_{L^{p}(I_{e})}^{p}$ e∈E Sobolev:  $H^1(\mathcal{G}) := \bigoplus H^1(I_e) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{G})}^2 := \|u_e\|_{H^1(I_e)}^2$ e∈E

i) the cardinality of V and E is finite  $\rightarrow$  no periodic graphs!; ii)  $\mathcal{G}$  is connected (a path between each pair of vertices); iii)  $\mathcal{G}$  is noncompact  $\rightsquigarrow$  from i) this entails at least a half-line. As usual, a function  $u: \mathcal{G} \to \mathbb{C}$  is a family of functions  $u = (u_e)_{e \in E}$ , with  $u_e := u_{|_{I_e}} : I_e \to \mathbb{C}$ . As a consequence, Lebesgue:  $L^{p}(\mathcal{G}) := \bigoplus L^{p}(I_{e}) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \|u\|_{L^{p}(\mathcal{G})}^{p} := \|u_{e}\|_{L^{p}(I_{e})}^{p}$ e∈E Sobolev:  $H^1(\mathcal{G}) := \bigoplus H^1(I_e) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{G})}^2 := \|u_e\|_{H^1(I_e)}^2$ e∈E

i) the cardinality of V and E is finite  $\rightarrow$  no periodic graphs!; ii)  $\mathcal{G}$  is connected (a path between each pair of vertices); iii)  $\mathcal{G}$  is noncompact  $\rightsquigarrow$  from i) this entails at least a half-line. As usual, a function  $u: \mathcal{G} \to \mathbb{C}$  is a family of functions  $u = (u_e)_{e \in E}$ , with  $u_e := u_{|_{I_e}} : I_e \to \mathbb{C}$ . As a consequence, Lebesgue:  $L^{p}(\mathcal{G}) := \bigoplus L^{p}(I_{e}) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \|u\|_{L^{p}(\mathcal{G})}^{p} := \|u_{e}\|_{L^{p}(I_{e})}^{p}$ e∈E Sobolev:  $H^1(\mathcal{G}) := \bigoplus H^1(I_e) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{G})}^2 := \|u_e\|_{H^1(I_e)}^2$ e∈E

i) the cardinality of V and E is finite  $\rightarrow$  no periodic graphs!; ii)  $\mathcal{G}$  is connected (a path between each pair of vertices); iii)  $\mathcal{G}$  is noncompact  $\rightsquigarrow$  from i) this entails at least a half-line. As usual, a function  $u: \mathcal{G} \to \mathbb{C}$  is a family of functions  $u = (u_e)_{e \in E}$ , with  $u_e := u_{|_{I_e}} : I_e \to \mathbb{C}$ . As a consequence, Lebesgue:  $L^{p}(\mathcal{G}) := \bigoplus L^{p}(I_{e}) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \|u\|_{L^{p}(\mathcal{G})}^{p} := \|u_{e}\|_{L^{p}(I_{e})}^{p}$ e∈E Sobolev:  $H^1(\mathcal{G}) := \bigoplus H^1(I_e) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{G})}^2 := \|u_e\|_{H^1(I_e)}^2$ e∈E

# Notation

Further assumptions:

- i) the cardinality of V and E is finite  $\ \rightsquigarrow$  no periodic graphs!;
- ii)  $\mathcal{G}$  is connected (a path between each pair of vertices);
- iii)  ${\cal G}$  is noncompact  $~\rightsquigarrow~$  from i) this entails at least a half-line.

As usual, a function  $u : \mathcal{G} \to \mathbb{C}$  is a family of functions  $u = (u_e)_{e \in \mathbb{E}}$ , with  $u_e := u_{|_{I_e}} : I_e \to \mathbb{C}$ . As a consequence,

Lebesgue: 
$$L^p(\mathcal{G}) := \bigoplus_{e \in \mathbb{E}} L^p(I_e) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \|u\|_{L^p(\mathcal{G})}^p := \|u_e\|_{L^p(I_e)}^p$$

Sobolev: 
$$H^1(\mathcal{G}) := \bigoplus_{e \in E} H^1(I_e) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{G})}^2 := \|u_e\|_{H^1(I_e)}^2$$

Note: usually in the definition of  $H^1(\mathcal{G})$  there is also a global continuity condition; for our purposes it is better to keep this condition separated.

## Motivation

Supposed to be good approximations for constrained dynamics in which transversal dimensions are small with respect to longitudinal ones.



Topical example: NonLinear Schrödinger Equation (NLSE).

 $\rightsquigarrow$  Effective model for Bose-Einstein Condensates (BEC) in ramified

traps, for nonlinear optical fibers, etc...

Literature:

- → [Gnutzmann, Smilanski, AdvPhys '06]
- → [Noja, RSTA '14], [Adami, Serra, Tilli, RivMatUnivParma '17]

→ [Lorenzo et al., PHYSLETA '14]

The focusing (NLSE) on metric graphs with homogeneous Kirchhoff vertex conditions reads:

 $i\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = -\Delta\psi - |\psi|^{p-2}\psi$  on  $\mathcal{G}$   $(p \ge 2)$  (NLSE)

 $-\Delta v_{|_{l_e}} := -v''_e, \quad \forall e \in \mathbf{E}, \quad \forall v \in \operatorname{dom}(-\Delta),$ 

The focusing (NLSE) on metric graphs with homogeneous Kirchhoff vertex conditions reads:

 $i\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = -\Delta\psi - |\psi|^{p-2}\psi$  on  $\mathcal{G}$   $(p \ge 2)$  (NLSE)

 $-\Delta v_{|_{l_e}} := -v''_e, \quad \forall e \in \mathbf{E}, \quad \forall v \in \operatorname{dom}(-\Delta),$ 

The focusing (NLSE) on metric graphs with homogeneous Kirchhoff vertex conditions reads:

 $i\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = -\Delta\psi - |\psi|^{p-2}\psi$  on  $\mathcal{G}$   $(p \ge 2)$  (NLSE)

 $-\Delta v_{|_{I_e}} := -v''_e, \quad \forall e \in \mathbf{E}, \quad \forall v \in \operatorname{dom}(-\Delta),$ 

 $\operatorname{dom}(-\Delta) := \left\{ v_e \in H^2(I_e), \, \forall e \in \mathcal{E}, \, \text{ s.t. } v \text{ satisties (K1)-(K2)} \right\},$ 

The focusing (NLSE) on metric graphs with homogeneous Kirchhoff vertex conditions reads:

 $i\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = -\Delta\psi - |\psi|^{p-2}\psi$  on  $\mathcal{G}$   $(p \ge 2)$  (NLSE)

 $-\Delta v_{|_{l_e}} := -v''_e, \quad \forall e \in \mathbf{E}, \quad \forall v \in \operatorname{dom}(-\Delta),$ 

 $\operatorname{dom}(-\Delta) := \left\{ v_e \in H^2(I_e), \, \forall e \in \mathrm{E}, \, \text{ s.t. } v \text{ satisties (K1)-(K2)} \right\},$  with

$$v_{e_1}(v) = v_{e_2}(v), \quad \forall e_1, e_2 \succ v, \quad \forall v \in V \setminus V_{\infty}$$
(K1)

$$\sum_{e\succ v} \frac{dv_e}{dx_e}(v) = 0, \quad \forall v \in V \backslash V_{\infty}$$

(K2)

The focusing (NLSE) on metric graphs with homogeneous Kirchhoff vertex conditions reads:

 $i\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = -\Delta\psi - |\psi|^{p-2}\psi$  on  $\mathcal{G}$   $(p \ge 2)$  (NLSE)

 $-\Delta v_{|_{l_e}} := -v''_e, \quad \forall e \in \mathbf{E}, \quad \forall v \in \operatorname{dom}(-\Delta),$ 

 $\operatorname{dom}(-\Delta) := \left\{ v_e \in H^2(I_e), \, \forall e \in \mathrm{E}, \, \text{ s.t. } v \text{ satisties (K1)-(K2)} \right\},$  with

$$\label{eq:velocity} \begin{split} v_{e_1}(\mathrm{v}) &= v_{e_2}(\mathrm{v}), \quad \forall e_1, e_2 \succ \mathrm{v}, \quad \forall \mathrm{v} \in \mathrm{V} \backslash \mathrm{V}_\infty \quad \mbox{(glob. cont.)} \\ (\mathsf{K1}) \end{split}$$

$$\sum_{e \succ v} \frac{dv_e}{dx_e}(v) = 0, \quad \forall v \in V \setminus V_{\infty}$$
 (Kirchhoff)
(K2)

The focusing (NLSE) on metric graphs with homogeneous Kirchhoff vertex conditions reads:

 $\imath \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = -\Delta \psi - |\psi|^{p-2} \psi$  on  $\mathcal{G}$   $(p \ge 2)$  (NLSE)

 $-\Delta v_{|_{l_e}} := -v''_e, \quad \forall e \in \mathbf{E}, \quad \forall v \in \operatorname{dom}(-\Delta),$ 

 $\operatorname{dom}(-\Delta) := \left\{ v_e \in H^2(I_e), \, \forall e \in \mathrm{E}, \, \text{ s.t. } v \text{ satisties } (\mathsf{K1})\text{-}(\mathsf{K2}) \right\},$  with

$$\label{eq:velocity} \begin{split} v_{e_1}(\mathrm{v}) &= v_{e_2}(\mathrm{v}), \quad \forall e_1, e_2 \,\succ \mathrm{v}, \quad \forall \mathrm{v} \in \mathrm{V} \backslash \mathrm{V}_\infty \quad (\text{glob. cont.}) \\ (\mathsf{K1}) \end{split}$$

$$\sum_{e \succ v} \frac{dv_e}{dx_e}(v) = 0, \quad \forall v \in V \setminus V_{\infty}$$
 (Kirchhoff) (K2)

where " $e \succ v$ " means that e is incident at v

The focusing (NLSE) on metric graphs with homogeneous Kirchhoff vertex conditions reads:

 $\imath \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = -\Delta \psi - |\psi|^{p-2} \psi$  on  $\mathcal{G}$   $(p \ge 2)$  (NLSE)

 $-\Delta v_{|_{l_e}} := -v''_e, \quad \forall e \in \mathbf{E}, \quad \forall v \in \operatorname{dom}(-\Delta),$ 

 $\operatorname{dom}(-\Delta) := \left\{ v_e \in H^2(I_e), \, \forall e \in \mathrm{E}, \, \text{ s.t. } v \text{ satisties } (\mathsf{K1})\text{-}(\mathsf{K2}) \right\},$  with

$$\label{eq:velocity} \begin{split} v_{e_1}(\mathrm{v}) &= v_{e_2}(\mathrm{v}), \quad \forall e_1, e_2 \ \succ \mathrm{v}, \quad \forall \mathrm{v} \in \mathrm{V} \backslash \mathrm{V}_\infty \quad \mbox{(glob. cont.)} \\ (\mathsf{K1}) \end{split}$$

$$\sum_{e \succ v} \frac{dv_e}{dx_e}(v) = 0, \quad \forall v \in V \setminus V_{\infty}$$
 (Kirchhoff) (K2)

where " $e \succ v$ " means that e is incident at v and  $\frac{dv_e}{dx_e}(v)$  stands for  $v'_e(0)$  or  $-v'_e(\ell_e)$  depending on the orientation of  $I_{em} \rightarrow e = v = v = v = v = v = v$ 

## Bound states of the NLSE

<u>Problem</u>: existence of bound states (B.S.), i.e.  $L^2$ -solutions of the form

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

Definition – B.S. of the NLSE A bound state of the (NLSE) is a function  $u \neq 0$  s.t.  $u \in \text{dom}(-\Delta)$  and there exists  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  s.t.

$$-u''_e - |u_e|^{p-2} u_e = \lambda u_e, \qquad \forall e \in \mathbf{E}.$$

Literature:

- i) real line: e.g. [Zakharov, Shabat, JETP '72], [Cazenave, Lions, CMP '82];
- ii) infinite N-star: e.g. [Adami, Cacciapuoti, Finco, Noja, JPA '12 JDE '14 ANIHPC '14], [Kairzhan, Pelinovsky, JPA '18 JDE '18];
- ii) tadpole: e.g. [Cacciapuoti, Finco, Noja, PhysRevE '15], [Noja, Pelinovsky, Shaikhova, Nonlin '15];
- iv) general: e.g. [Adami, Serra, Tilli, CVPDE '15 JFA '16 CMP '17 arXiv '17].

Definition – Compact core

The compact core of  $\mathcal{G}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{K}$ , is the metric subgraph of  $\mathcal{G}$  consisting of all its bounded edges.

Examples:

Definition – Compact core

The compact core of  $\mathcal{G}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{K}$ , is the metric subgraph of  $\mathcal{G}$  consisting of all its bounded edges.

Examples:

Definition – Compact core

The compact core of  $\mathcal{G}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{K}$ , is the metric subgraph of  $\mathcal{G}$  consisting of all its bounded edges.

Examples:



Definition – Compact core

The compact core of  $\mathcal{G}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{K}$ , is the metric subgraph of  $\mathcal{G}$  consisting of all its bounded edges.

Examples:



Definition – Compact core

The compact core of  $\mathcal{G}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{K}$ , is the metric subgraph of  $\mathcal{G}$  consisting of all its bounded edges.

Examples:



Definition – Compact core

The compact core of  $\mathcal{G}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{K}$ , is the metric subgraph of  $\mathcal{G}$  consisting of all its bounded edges.

Examples:



▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● ○ ○ ○

<u>Problem:</u> what happens when the nonlinearity affects only  $\mathcal{K}$ ? ([Gnutzmann, Smilanski, Derevyanko, PhysRevA '11], [Noja, RSTA '14])

Definition – Compact core

The compact core of  $\mathcal{G}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{K}$ , is the metric subgraph of  $\mathcal{G}$  consisting of all its bounded edges.

Examples:



<u>Problem</u>: what happens when the nonlinearity affects only  $\mathcal{K}$ ? ([Gnutzmann, Smilanski, Derevyanko, PhysRevA '11], [Noja, RSTA '14])

Definition – B.S. of the NLSE with Localized Nonlinearity A bound state of the (NLSE) with Localized Nonlinearity (L.N.) is a function  $u \neq 0$  s.t.  $u \in \text{dom}(-\Delta)$  and there exists  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  s.t.

$$-u_e''-\chi_{\mathcal{K}}|u_e|^{p-2}u_e=\lambda u_e,\qquad \forall e\in \mathbb{E}.$$

# B.S. with Localized Nonlinearity

L. [Tentarelli, JMAA '16]:

→ Existence/nonexistence of constrained minimizers of

$$\mathcal{E}_{\kappa}(\mathbf{v}) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{G}} |\mathbf{v}'|^2 \, d\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathcal{K}} |\mathbf{v}|^p \, d\mathbf{x},$$

on  $\{\|v\|_L^2(\mathcal{G}) = \mu > 0\}$ , in the  $L^2$ -subcritical case  $p \in (2, 6)$ .

- 2. [Serra, Tentarelli, JDE '16], [Serra, Tentarelli, NA '16]:
  - Existence/nonexistence (respectively) of constrained critical

points of the functional  $\mathcal{E}_{\kappa}(\cdot)$  (in the  $L^2$ -subcritical case).

- 3. [Dovetta, Tentarelli, arXiv '18]:
  - → Existence/nonexistence of constrained minimizers of  $\mathcal{E}_{\kappa}(\cdot)$ in the  $L^2$ -critical case p = 6 (for a tadpole graph); → Ongoing project.

# B.S. with Localized Nonlinearity

	Exponents	Ground	Bound
NLSE	$p\in(2,4)$	- yes, $\forall \mu > 0$	(see box below)
	<i>p</i> ∈ [4, 6)	- yes if $\mu > \mu_1$ - no if $\mu < \mu_2$ - unknown if $\mu \in [\mu_2, \mu_1]$	- yes (and multiple) if $\mu$ is large enough - yes if $G$ has a loop or two terminal edges - no (with $\lambda \leq 0$ ) if $g$ - no (with $\lambda \geq 0$ ) if $G$ has (at most) one terminal edge and no loops - unknown otherwise
	<i>p</i> = 6	<ul> <li>yes if µ ∈ [µ<sub>K</sub>, µ<sub>R</sub>] and if no terminal edges and no cycle coverings*</li> <li>no otherwise</li> </ul>	- yes if $\mathcal{G}$ has a loop or two terminal edges - no (with $\lambda \ge 0$ ) if $\mathcal{G}$ has (at most) one termi- nal edge and no loops - unknown otherwise
	p > 6	- unknown	(see box above)

Recenly, [Sabirov, Babajanov, Matrasulov, Kevrekidis, arXiv '17] proposed the study of the NonLinear Dirac Equation (NLDE)

$$\imath \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} = \mathcal{D}\Psi - |\Psi|^{p-2}\Psi \quad \text{on } \mathcal{G} \quad (p \ge 2),$$
 (NLDE)

$$\sigma_1 := egin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \qquad ext{and} \qquad \sigma_3 := egin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \,,$$

Applications: take into account relativistic effects.

Recenly, [Sabirov, Babajanov, Matrasulov, Kevrekidis, arXiv '17] proposed the study of the NonLinear Dirac Equation (NLDE)

$$i\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial t} = \mathcal{D}\Psi - |\Psi|^{p-2}\Psi \quad \text{on } \mathcal{G} \quad (p \ge 2), \qquad (\text{NLDE})$$
$$\mathcal{D} := -ic\frac{d}{dx} \otimes \sigma_1 + mc^2 \otimes \sigma_3,$$
$$\sigma_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1\\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_3 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0\\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

Applications: take into account relativistic effects.

Recenly, [Sabirov, Babajanov, Matrasulov, Kevrekidis, arXiv '17] proposed the study of the NonLinear Dirac Equation (NLDE)

$$i\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial t} = \mathcal{D}\Psi - |\Psi|^{p-2}\Psi \quad \text{on } \mathcal{G} \quad (p \ge 2), \qquad (\text{NLDE})$$
$$\mathcal{D} := -ic\frac{d}{dx} \otimes \sigma_1 + mc^2 \otimes \sigma_3,$$
$$\sigma_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1\\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_3 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0\\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

Applications: take into account relativistic effects.

Recenly, [Sabirov, Babajanov, Matrasulov, Kevrekidis, arXiv '17] proposed the study of the NonLinear Dirac Equation (NLDE)

$$i\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial t} = \mathcal{D}\Psi - |\Psi|^{p-2}\Psi \quad \text{on } \mathcal{G} \quad (p \ge 2), \qquad (\text{NLDE})$$
$$\mathcal{D} := -ic\frac{d}{dx} \otimes \sigma_1 + mc^2 \otimes \sigma_3,$$
$$\sigma_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1\\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_3 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0\\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

Applications: take into account relativistic effects.

Recenly, [Sabirov, Babajanov, Matrasulov, Kevrekidis, arXiv '17] proposed the study of the NonLinear Dirac Equation (NLDE)

$$i\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial t} = \mathcal{D}\Psi - |\Psi|^{p-2}\Psi \quad \text{on } \mathcal{G} \quad (p \ge 2), \qquad (\text{NLDE})$$
$$\mathcal{D} := -ic\frac{d}{dx} \otimes \sigma_1 + mc^2 \otimes \sigma_3,$$
$$\sigma_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1\\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_3 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0\\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

Applications: take into account relativistic effects.

Recenly, [Sabirov, Babajanov, Matrasulov, Kevrekidis, arXiv '17] proposed the study of the NonLinear Dirac Equation (NLDE)

$$i\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial t} = \mathcal{D}\Psi - |\Psi|^{p-2}\Psi \quad \text{on } \mathcal{G} \quad (p \ge 2), \qquad (\text{NLDE})$$
$$\mathcal{D} := -ic\frac{d}{dx} \otimes \sigma_1 + mc^2 \otimes \sigma_3,$$
$$\sigma_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1\\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_3 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0\\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

Applications: take into account relativistic effects.

#### Spinors on metric graphs

Since D is a matricial operator, the first difference with (NLSE) is that (NLDE) has a spinorial nature; namely the unknown is a 2-spinor:

$$\psi = (\psi_e) = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$$

where  $\varphi = (\varphi_e)$ ,  $\eta = (\eta_e)$  are functions on graphs.

Lebesgue: 
$$L^{p}(\mathcal{G}, \mathbb{C}^{2}) := \{\varphi, \eta \in L^{p}(\mathcal{G})\}$$
  
 $\rightsquigarrow \quad \|\psi\|_{L^{p}(\mathcal{G}, \mathbb{C}^{2})}^{p} := \|\varphi\|_{L^{p}(\mathcal{G})}^{p} + \|\eta\|_{L^{p}(\mathcal{G})}^{p},$ 

Sobolev: 
$$H^1(\mathcal{G}, \mathbb{C}^2) := \{\varphi, \eta \in H^1(\mathcal{G})\}$$
  
 $\rightsquigarrow \quad \|\psi\|^2_{H^1(\mathcal{G}, \mathbb{C}^2)} := \|\varphi\|^2_{H^1(\mathcal{G})} + \|\eta\|^2_{H^1(\mathcal{G})}.$ 

However,  $\mathcal{D}$  is just formal since it is not defined at the vertices! ...

To find a suitable s.a. realization of  $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{D}}$ 

We choose the following:

 $\mathcal{D}\psi_{|_{l_e}} = \mathcal{D}_e\psi_e := -\imath c\sigma_1\psi'_e + mc^2\sigma_3\psi_e, \quad \forall e \in \mathbf{E}, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathcal{D}),$ 

To find a suitable s.a. realization of  $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{D}}$ 

We choose the following:

 $\mathcal{D}\psi_{|_{l_e}} = \mathcal{D}_e\psi_e := -\imath c\sigma_1\psi'_e + mc^2\sigma_3\psi_e, \quad \forall e \in \mathbf{E}, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathcal{D}),$ 

To find a suitable s.a. realization of  $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{D}}$ 

We choose the following:

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{D}\psi_{|_{l_e}} &= \mathcal{D}_e\psi_e := -\imath c\sigma_1\psi'_e + mc^2\sigma_3\psi_e, \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}, \quad \forall \psi \in \operatorname{dom}(\mathcal{D}), \\ \operatorname{dom}(\mathcal{D}) &:= \left\{\psi \in H^1(\mathcal{G}, \mathbb{C}^2) : \ \psi \text{ satisties } (\mathsf{KT1})\text{-}(\mathsf{KT2})\right\}, \end{split}$$

To find a suitable s.a. realization of  $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{D}}$ 

We choose the following:

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{D}\psi_{|_{I_e}} &= \mathcal{D}_e\psi_e := -\imath c\sigma_1\psi'_e + mc^2\sigma_3\psi_e, \quad \forall e\in \mathrm{E}, \quad \forall \psi\in \mathrm{dom}(\mathcal{D}),\\ \mathrm{dom}(\mathcal{D}) &:= \left\{\psi\in H^1(\mathcal{G},\mathbb{C}^2): \; \psi \text{ satisties } (\mathsf{KT1})\text{-}(\mathsf{KT2})\right\},\\ \end{split}$$
 with

$$\begin{split} \varphi_{e_1}(\mathbf{v}) &= \varphi_{e_2}(\mathbf{v}), \quad \forall e_1, e_2 \succ \mathbf{v}, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V} \backslash \mathbf{V}_{\infty} \end{split} \tag{KT1}$$
$$\sum_{e \succ \mathbf{v}} \eta_e(\mathbf{v})_{\pm} &= 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V} \backslash \mathbf{V}_{\infty} \end{aligned} \tag{KT2}$$

To find a suitable s.a. realization of  $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{D}}$ 

We choose the following:

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{D}\psi_{|_{I_e}} &= \mathcal{D}_e\psi_e := -\imath c\sigma_1\psi'_e + mc^2\sigma_3\psi_e, \quad \forall e\in \mathrm{E}, \quad \forall \psi\in \mathrm{dom}(\mathcal{D}),\\ \mathrm{dom}(\mathcal{D}) &:= \left\{\psi\in H^1(\mathcal{G},\mathbb{C}^2): \; \psi \text{ satisties } (\mathsf{KT1})\text{-}(\mathsf{KT2})\right\},\\ \end{split}$$
 with

$$\varphi_{e_1}(v) = \varphi_{e_2}(v), \quad \forall e_1, e_2 \succ v, \quad \forall v \in V \setminus V_{\infty}$$
 (KT1)

$$\sum_{e \succ v} \eta_e(v)_{\pm} = 0, \quad \forall v \in V \setminus V_{\infty}$$
 (KT2)

 $\eta_e(\mathbf{v})_{\pm}$  stands for  $\eta_e(0)$  or  $-\eta_e(\ell_e)$  depending on the orientation of  $I_e$ .

One can check (using [Bulla, Trenkler, JMP '90], [Bolte, Harrison, JPA '02] [Dect '02] [C. Malamud Beriliana, JDE '12]) that:

'03],[Post, '08], [C., Malamud, Posilicano, JDE '13]) that:

i)  $\mathcal{D}$  is self-adjoint;

ii) the spectrum is absolutely continuous and presents a gap, i.e.

$$\sigma(\mathcal{D}) = (-\infty, -mc^2] \cup [mc^2, +\infty).$$

We call (KT1)-(KT2) Kirchhoff-type vertex conditions.

#### Why?

- 1. They identify (as Kirchhoff for  $-\Delta$ ) the free case: no effect at the vertices (which are then mere junctions between the edges).
  - Introduced by [Sabirov, Babajanov, Matrasulov, Kevrekidis, arXiv '17]

(where are derived by some conservation laws).

2. They converge to the Kirchhoff ones in the nonrelativistic limit.

# Quadratic form

Formally, the quadratic form associated with  ${\cal D}$  should read

$$\mathcal{Q}(\psi) := (\psi, \mathcal{D}\psi)_{L^2(\mathcal{G}, \mathbb{C}^2)} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{G}} \psi \cdot \mathcal{D}\psi \, d\mathsf{x},$$

with domain  $H^{1/2}(\mathcal{G}, \mathbb{C}^2) := \{\varphi, \eta \in H^{1/2}(\mathcal{G})\}.$ 

- i) the derivative of a function in  $H^{1/2}(I_e)$  belongs to  $H^{-1/2}(I_e)$ , which is not the dual of  $H^{1/2}(I_e)$  if  $I_e$  is bounded;
- ii)  $H^{1/2}(I_e) \nleftrightarrow C^0(I_e) \Rightarrow$  cannot "just add" a boundary condition

 $\rightarrow$  as for −Δ, where the definitions of the quadratic form and its domain are immediate, i.e.  $\frac{1}{2} \|v'\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})}^2$ , with domain  $H^1(\mathcal{G})$ "+"(K1).

Problem: how to define Q and dom(Q)?

# Quadratic form

→ There exists U unitary that transforms D into a multiplication operator f on  $L^2(M, d\mu)$ .

 $\rightsquigarrow$  Hence,  $\mathcal{Q}(v) := \frac{1}{2}(Uv, f Uv)_{L^2(M, d\mu)}$  and

 $\operatorname{dom}(\mathcal{Q}) := \left\{ \|\sqrt{|f|} Uv\|_{L^2(M, d\mu)} < \infty \right\}.$ 

This could seem quite abstract, but, by standard Interpolation Theory,

$$\operatorname{dom}(\mathcal{Q}) = \left[L^2(\mathcal{G}), \operatorname{dom}(\mathcal{D})\right]_{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and

$$H^{1/2}(\mathcal{G},\mathbb{C}^2) = \left[L^2(\mathcal{G}),H^1(\mathcal{G},\mathbb{C}^2)\right]_{\frac{1}{2}},$$

 $\operatorname{dom}(\mathcal{Q}) \hookrightarrow H^{1/2}(\mathcal{G}, \mathbb{C}^2) \hookrightarrow L^p(\mathcal{G}, \mathbb{C}^2) \qquad (2 \le p < \infty).$ 

## Back to nonlinear

Now, we have a precise meaning for (NLDE)

$$\imath rac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} = \mathcal{D} \Psi - |\Psi|^{p-2} \Psi$$

where  $\mathcal{D}$  is the Dirac operator with Kirchhoff-type vertex conditions. Goal: bound states, that is solutions of the form

$$\Psi(t,x):=e^{-\imath\omega t}\psi(x),\qquad\omega\in\mathbb{R}.$$

Problem: we cannot search for costrained minimizers since, the associated

$$\mathcal{E}(\psi) := \mathcal{Q}(\psi) - rac{1}{p} \int_{\mathcal{G}} |\psi|^p \, dx$$

is unbounded below, even if one fixes the  $L^2$ -norm

 → due to the spectral properties of D, precisely to the presence of an infinite negative portion of the spectrum.

## Main results: B.S. with localized nonlinearities

In addition, we decided to first study the case of the localized nonlinearity; that is, to search for

Definition – B.S. of the NLDE with L.N. A B.S. of the (NLDE) with L.N. is a spinor  $\psi \neq 0$  s.t.:

- i)  $\psi \in \operatorname{dom}(\mathcal{D});$
- ii) there exists  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$  s.t.

$$\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{e}}\psi_{\boldsymbol{e}} - \chi_{\kappa}|\psi_{\boldsymbol{e}}|^{\boldsymbol{p}-2}\psi_{\boldsymbol{e}} = \omega\psi_{\boldsymbol{e}}, \qquad \forall \boldsymbol{e} \in \mathcal{E}.$$

Then, we proved:

Theorem 1 [T.B.C., SIMA '19] Let  $\mathcal{K} \neq \emptyset$  and let p > 2. Then, for every  $\omega \in (-mc^2, mc^2) = \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(\mathcal{D})$ , there exists infinitely many (distinct pairs of) B.S. of frequency  $\omega$  of the (NLDE) with L.N..

#### Main results: nonrelativistic limit

By the definition of  $\mathcal{D}$ , the B.S. obtained via Theorem 1 depend on the relativistic parameter c (the mass m) and the frequency  $\omega$ :

→ meant as B.S. at (a fixed value) speed of light c and frequency  $\omega$ .

Theorem 2 [T.B.C., SIMA'19] Let  $\mathcal{K} \neq \emptyset$ ,  $p \in (2, 6)$  and  $\lambda < 0$ . Let also  $(c_n)$  and  $(\omega_n)$  be two real sequences such that

$$0 < c_n, \omega_n \to \infty, \qquad \omega_n < mc_n^2, \qquad \omega_n - mc_n^2 \to \frac{\lambda}{m}.$$

If  $\{\psi_n = (\varphi_n, \eta_n)^T\}$  is a sequence of B.S. of frequency  $\omega_n$  of the (NLDE)

with L.N. at speed of light  $c_n$ ,

 $\varphi_n \to u$  and  $\eta_n \to 0$  in  $H^1(\mathcal{G})$ ,

where u is a B.S. of frequency  $\lambda$  of the (NLSE) with L.N.,  $\lambda = 0$ 

# Remarks

#### B.S. EXISTENCE

- 1. First variational result on the B.S. of the (NLDE) on metric graphs.
- 2. Differences with respect to the (NLSE) on graphs:
  - i) one cannot search for constrained minimizers of a proper energy functional, since the kinetic part Q is unbounded from below;
  - ii) one cannot use the adaptations of direct methods of calculus of variations introduced for the (NLSE);
  - iii) Q is strongly indefinite in sign:
    - → more refined tools of Critical Point Theory;
    - → more complex geometry of the functional (linking);
  - iv) the spinorial nature and the implicit definition of Q:
    - → one cannot use of the techniques of rearrangements and "graph surgery" developed for (NLSE).

# Remarks

3. It is necessary to adapt classical techniques for (NLDE) on standard domains (e.g. [Rabinowitz, '80], [Esteban, Séré, CMP '95], [Struwe, '08]).

#### NONRELATIVISTIC LIMIT

- 1. Actually, the B.S. converge to the (NLSE) with a pre-factor 2*m* in front of the nonlinearity.
- 2. Theorem 2 holds just in the  $L^2$ -subcritical case  $p \in (2, 6)$ .
- 3. As a byproduct, Theorem 2 is an existence result for the (NLSE) parametrized by  $\lambda$  and not by  $L^2$ -norm.
- 4. The meaning of the nonrelativistic limit is to investigate what occurs when the relativistic effects become negligible (i.e.  $c_n \rightarrow \infty$ ):
  - ↔ the convergence to (NLSE) is a rigorous justification of the physical intuition.