NONLINEAR DYNAMICS OF SEMICLASSICAL COHERENT STATES IN PERIODIC POTENTIALS
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Abstract. We consider nonlinear Schrödinger equations with either local or nonlocal nonlinearities. In addition, we include periodic potentials as used, for example, in matter wave experiments in optical lattices. By considering the corresponding semiclassical scaling regime, we construct asymptotic solutions, which are concentrated both in space and in frequency around the effective semiclassical phase-space flow induced by Bloch’s spectral problem. The dynamics of these generalized coherent states is governed by a nonlinear Schrödinger model with effective mass. In the case of nonlocal nonlinearities we establish a novel averaging type result in the critical case.

1. Introduction

Coherent states have been originally introduced in quantum mechanics to describe wave packets minimizing the uncertainty principle. This property makes coherent states highly attractive for the study of semiclassical asymptotics, see, e.g., [17, 15, 21]. Indeed, it can be shown that for Schrödinger equations with sub-quadratic potentials, coherent states retain their shape, providing minimum uncertainty at all time in the quadratic case [13], and up to Ehrenfest time in general [6]. Recently, extensions to weakly nonlinear situations have been studied in [8, 7]. In addition, the semiclassical dynamics of coherent states under the influence of (highly oscillatory) periodic potentials has been investigated by the authors in [10]. In the present work we combine the effects coming from periodic and nonlinear potentials.

To this end, we consider nonlinear Schrödinger equations which, after scaling into dimensionless coordinates, appear in the following semiclassical form:

\[ i\varepsilon \partial_t \psi^\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \Delta \psi^\varepsilon = V_{\text{per}} \left( \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) \psi^\varepsilon + \varepsilon^\alpha f(|\psi^\varepsilon|^2)\psi^\varepsilon, \quad \psi^\varepsilon|_{t=0} = \psi_0^\varepsilon, \]

where \( t \in \mathbb{R}, \ x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \) and \( d \in \mathbb{N} \) denotes the spatial dimension (usually \( d = 3 \)). Moreover, \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1] \) denotes a (small) semiclassical parameter, i.e. a dimensionless rescaled Planck’s constant. The factor \( \varepsilon^\alpha \) measures the (asymptotic) strength of the nonlinearity: the larger the \( \alpha > 0 \), the weaker the nonlinear effects. In the following, we shall allow for two different types of gauge invariant nonlinearities:

- Local nonlinearities: \( f(|\psi^\varepsilon|^2) = \lambda |\psi^\varepsilon|^{2\sigma} \), with \( \sigma \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \), allowing for focusing (attractive) and defocusing (repulsive) situations.
- Nonlocal nonlinearities of convolution type: \( f(|\psi^\varepsilon|^2) = K * |\psi^\varepsilon|^2 \), with \( K(x) \in \mathbb{R} \) a given interaction kernel.

Finally, the term \( V_{\text{per}}(x/\varepsilon) \) denotes a highly oscillatory periodic potential. More precisely, let \( \Gamma \simeq \mathbb{Z}^d \) be some regular lattice, then we assume that for all \( y \in \mathbb{R}^d \): \( V_{\text{per}}(y + \gamma) = \)
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\( V_{\text{per}}(y) \) with \( \gamma \in \Gamma \). In addition, we shall assume \( V_{\text{per}} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \). Equation (1.1) describes the propagation of waves on macroscopic length- and time-scales, i.e. over many periods of the periodic potential. The parameter \( \varepsilon \ll 1 \) consequently describes the ratio between microscopic (quantum mechanical) and the macroscopic scales.

Nonlinear Schrödinger equations with periodic potentials arise in various physical contexts: A by now classical example is the mean-field description of electrons propagating in a crystalline solid \[16, 26\] under the additional influence of a self-consistent electric field. The latter is usually modeled by means of a nonlocal Hartree nonlinearity \[ f(|\psi|^2) = |\psi|^2 + 1/1 \cdot | \cdot \], see, e.g., \[3\] for a semiclassical study via Wigner measures. Another situation in which (1.1) applies is the description of Bose-Einstein condensates in so-called optical lattices, cf. \[12\]. In the regime of dilute gases, such condensates can be modeled by the Gross-Pitaevskii equation with cubic nonlinearity \( \sigma \).

In this case, the underlying assumption in the derivation of (1.1) is the existence of a preferred direction of propagation, implying that the appropriate model is stated in dimension \( d = 1 \).

In all of these situations, the joint effects of nonlinearity, periodicity and dispersion (or, quantum pressure), can lead to the existence of stable localized states conserving the form upon propagation and collisions. Gap solitons, discrete breathers and compactons are examples of such states. Here we shall present another possibility, which will arise from the description of wave packets propagating within nonlinear photonic crystals \[24\] and where the nonlinear response of the media is modeled via a so-called optical lattices, cf. \[12\]. A third example for the appearances of (1.1) stems from the description of wave packets propagating within nonlinear photonic crystals [24] and where the nonlinear response of the media is modeled via a Kerr nonlinearity \( \sigma = 1 \).

In this case, the underlying assumption in the derivation of (1.1) in the existence of a preferred direction of propagation, implying that the appropriate model is stated in dimension \( d = 1 \).

To present our results, we recall the classical Bloch eigenvalue problem \[28\]:

\[
H(k)\chi_m(\cdot, k) = E_m(k)\chi_m(\cdot, k), \quad m \in \mathbb{N},
\]

Denoting by \( Y \) the centered fundamental domain of \( \Gamma \), \( E_m(k) \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( \chi_m(\cdot, k) \) denote, respectively, the \( m \)-th eigenvalue/eigenvector pair of

\[
H(k) = \frac{1}{2} (-i \nabla_y + k)^2 + V_{\text{per}}(y), \quad y \in Y,
\]

parametrized by the crystal momentum \( k \in Y^* \simeq \mathbb{T}^d \). We shall assume that at \( t = 0 \),

\[
\psi^{\varepsilon}(0, x) \sim \varepsilon^{-d/4} u_0 \left( \frac{x - q_0}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) \chi_m \left( \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, p_0 \right) e^{ip_0 \cdot (x - q_0)/\varepsilon},
\]

where \( u_0 \) denotes some smooth and rapidly decaying profile. In other words, the initial data \( \psi^{\varepsilon}_0 \) can be approximated by a highly oscillatory Bloch eigenfunction \( \chi_m \), modulated by a (generalized) coherent state, i.e. a wave function which is localized both in space and in frequency.

**Remark 1.1.** In particular, the choice \( u_0(z) = \exp(-|z|^2/2) \) yields a classical coherent state, i.e. ground state of the harmonic oscillator potential, as modulation. The states (1.4)
are more general, though, since we can allow for any $u_0 \in \mathcal{S} (\mathbb{R}^d)$, the Schwartz space of rapidly decaying smooth functions. We also remark that the same class of initial data have recently been considered in [10], where the situation of linear Schrödinger equations with combined periodic and slowly varying external potentials has been considered (see [8] for more details).

Provided such initial data, we shall show that the solution of (1.1) can be approximately (in a sense to be made precise) described by the following semiclassical wave packet:

\[
\psi_\varepsilon (t, x) \sim \varepsilon^{-d/4} u \left( t, \frac{x - q(t)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) \chi_m \left( \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, p_0 \right) e^{i \phi_m(t, x)/\varepsilon}
\]

where $q(t) = p_0 + t \nabla_k E_m (p_0)$ describes the macroscopic shift of the centre of mass and the highly oscillatory phase function $\phi_m$ is

\[
\phi_m (t, x) = p_0 \cdot (x - q_0) - t E_m (p_0).
\]

To this end, we need to give sense to the group velocity $\nabla_k E_m (k)$ and thus, we have to assume from now on, that:

\[
E_m (k) \text{ is a simple eigenvalue in the vicinity of } k = p_0.
\]

(Of course, $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ has to be understood modulo $\Gamma^*$ in this case.) In other words, we have to avoid that two Bloch bands cross at $p_0$, that is $E_m (p_0) = E_n (p_0)$, for $m \neq n$. It is known that at such crossing points $E_m (k)$ is no longer differentiable, causing the above asymptotic description (which is based on an adiabatic decoupling of the slow and fast degrees of freedom) to break down.

**Remark 1.2.** Clearly, the non-crossing condition given above restricts our choice for the initial wave vectors $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. It is known however that the set of band crossings has Lebesgue measure zero. For example, in the case $d = 1$, band crossings can only occur at $k = 0$ or at the boundary of the Brillouin zone.

So far, we have not said what determines the profile $u = u(t, z)$ appearing in (1.5). Its time-evolution depends on the strength of the nonlinearity, i.e. on the size of $\alpha > 0$ in the case of local nonlinearities (the situation for nonlocal ones will be described later on). We shall find that the critical size is $\alpha_c = 1 + d \sigma / 2$ and when $\alpha = \alpha_c$, $u$ solves the following homogenized nonlinear Schrödinger equation

\[
i \partial_t u + \frac{1}{2} \text{div}_z \left( (\nabla_k^2 E_m (p_0)) \cdot \nabla_z \right) u = \lambda_m |u|^{2 \sigma} u,
\]

with effective coupling constant

\[
\lambda_m = \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\chi_m (y, p_0)|^{2 \sigma + 2} dy.
\]

Note that the dispersive properties of (1.8) are determined by an effective mass matrix $\nabla_k^2 E_m (p_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, which itself depends on the choice of the initial wave vector (cf. [14] for a recent study).

In the next section, we derive this effective mass equation from multi-scale expansion. A rigorous stability result is then proved in Section 3. The case of nonlocal nonlinearities is treated in Section 4. As we shall see, in situations where the kernel $K$ is homogeneous, the critical value $\alpha_c$ depends on the degree of homogeneity (like in the case of a local nonlinearity), and the analogue of (1.8) is an envelope equation with a nonlocal nonlinearity. On the other hand, if the kernel $K$ is a smooth function, then $\alpha_c = 1$, and in sharp contrast with the other situations studied in this paper, the analogue of (1.8) for $\alpha = \alpha_c$ is found to be a linear equation, see Section 4.2.
2. Multi-scale expansion

2.1. The hierarchy of equations. Except for the treatment of the nonlinear term, we resume the strategy followed in [10]. We seek the solution \( \psi_\varepsilon \) of (1.1) in the form

\[
\psi_\varepsilon (t, x) = \varepsilon^{-d/4} U_\varepsilon \left( t, \frac{x - q(t)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) e^{i \phi_m (t, x)/\varepsilon},
\]

where the phase \( \phi_m (t, x) \) is given by (1.6) and the function \( U_\varepsilon = U_\varepsilon (t, z, y) \) admits an asymptotic expansion

\[
U_\varepsilon (t, z, y) \sim \varepsilon \to 0 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \varepsilon^{j/2} U_j (t, z, y)
\]

with smooth profiles \( U_j \) which, in addition, are assumed to be \( \Gamma \)-periodic with respect to \( y \). For \( \psi_\varepsilon \) given by the ansatz (2.1), we compute

\[
\left( i \varepsilon \partial_t \psi_\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \Delta \psi_\varepsilon - V_{\text{per}} \left( \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) \psi_\varepsilon \right) = \varepsilon^{-d/4} e^{i \phi_\varepsilon /\varepsilon} \sum_{j=0}^2 \varepsilon^{j/2} b_j (t, z, y) \bigg|_{(z, y) = \left( \frac{x - q(t)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right)}
\]

with

\[
\begin{align*}
  b_0^\varepsilon &= -\partial_t \phi_m U_\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_y U_\varepsilon - \frac{1}{2} |p_0|^2 U_\varepsilon + ip_0 \cdot \nabla_y U_\varepsilon - V_{\text{per}} (y) U_\varepsilon, \\
  b_1^\varepsilon &= -i \dot{q}(t) \cdot \nabla_z U_\varepsilon + (\nabla_y \cdot \nabla_z) U_\varepsilon + ip_0 \cdot \nabla_z U_\varepsilon, \\
  b_2^\varepsilon &= i \partial_t U_\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_z U_\varepsilon.
\end{align*}
\]

Using (1.6) and the fact that \( \dot{q}(t) = \nabla_k E_m (p_0) \), we can rewrite \( b_0^\varepsilon, b_1^\varepsilon \) as

\[
\begin{align*}
  b_0^\varepsilon &= (E_m (p_0) - H (p_0)) U_\varepsilon, \\
  b_1^\varepsilon &= i (p_0 - \nabla_k E_m (p_0)) \cdot \nabla_z U_\varepsilon + (\nabla_y \cdot \nabla_z) U_\varepsilon,
\end{align*}
\]

where \( H(p_0) \) is the Bloch Hamiltonian (1.3) evaluated at \( k = p_0 \) (again, this has to be understood modulo \( \Gamma^* \)). Introducing the following linear operators:

\[
L_0 = E_m (p_0) - H (p_0), \quad L_1 = i (p_0 - \nabla_k E_m (p_0)) \cdot \nabla_z + \nabla_y \cdot \nabla_z, \quad L_2 = i \partial_t + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_z,
\]

and expanding \( U_\varepsilon \) in powers of \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1] \), we consequently need to solve the following hierarchy of equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
  L_0 U_0 &= 0, \\
  L_0 U_1 + L_1 U_0 &= 0, \\
  L_0 U_2 + L_1 U_1 + L_2 U_0 &= F(U_0),
\end{align*}
\]

where, for \( \alpha_c = 1 + d\sigma/2 \), we find:

\[
F(U_0) = \begin{cases} 
  0 & \text{if } \alpha > \alpha_c, \\
  \lambda |U_0|^{2\sigma} U_0 & \text{if } \alpha = \alpha_c.
\end{cases}
\]

In the next subsection, we shall focus on the resolution of (2.3).
The effective mass equation. Given the form of $L_0$, the equation $L_0 U_0 = 0$ implies
\begin{equation}
U_0(t, z, y) = u(t, z) \chi_m(y, p_0).
\end{equation}
By Fredholm’s alternative, a necessary and sufficient condition to solve the equation $L_0 U_1 + L_1 U_0 = 0$, is that $L_1 U_0$ is orthogonal to ker $L_0$, that is:
\begin{equation}
\langle \chi_m, L_1 U_0 \rangle_{L^2(Y)} = 0.
\end{equation}
Given the expression of $L_1$ and the formula (2.4), we compute
\begin{equation}
L_1 U_0 = i (p_0 - \nabla_k E_m(p_0)) \cdot \nabla_z u(t, z) \chi_m(y, p_0) + \nabla_y \chi_m(y, p_0) \cdot \nabla_z u(t, z).
\end{equation}
Now, we make use of the algebraic identities derived in Section A. In view of (A.2), we infer that (2.5) is automatically fulfilled. We thus obtain
\begin{equation}
U_1(t, z, y) = u_1(t, z) \chi_m(y, p_0) + u_1^\perp(t, z, y),
\end{equation}
where $u_1^\perp$, the part of $U_1$ which is orthogonal to ker $L_0$, is obtained by inverting an elliptic operator: $u_1^\perp = -L_0^{-1} L_1 U_0$. Note that the formula for $L_1 U_0$ can also be written as
\begin{equation}
L_1 U_0 = -i \nabla_k (E_m(p_0) - H(p_0)) \chi_m(y, p_0) \cdot \nabla_z u(t, z).
\end{equation}
Taking into account (A.1), this yields: $u_1^\perp(t, z, y) = -i \nabla_k \chi_m(y, p_0) \cdot \nabla_z u(t, z)$. At this stage, we shall, for simplicity, choose $u_1 = 0$, in which case $U_1$ becomes simply a function of $u$:
\begin{equation}
U_1(t, z, y) = -i \nabla_k \chi_m(y, p_0) \cdot \nabla_z u(t, z).
\end{equation}
As a next step in the formal analysis, we must solve $L_0 U_2 + L_1 U_1 + L_2 U_0 = F(U_0)$. By the same argument as before, we require
\begin{equation}
\langle \chi_m, L_1 U_1 + L_2 U_0 - F(U_0) \rangle_{L^2(Y)} = 0.
\end{equation}
With the expression (2.6), we compute
\begin{equation}
L_1 U_1 = \sum_{j, \ell=1}^d \left( p_0 - \nabla_k E_m(p_0) \right)_j \partial_{k_j} \chi_m(y, p_0) - i \partial_{y_j k_i} \chi_m(y, p_0) \right) \partial_{y_j z_i}^2 u,
\end{equation}
and we also have
\begin{equation}
L_2 U_0 = \left( i \partial_t + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_z \right) u(t, z) \chi_m(y, p_0).
\end{equation}
We consequently infer
\begin{equation}
\langle \chi_m, L_1 U_1 + L_2 U_0 \rangle_{L^2(Y)} = i \partial_t u + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_z u
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
- \sum_{j, \ell=1}^d \left( \chi_m, \partial_{k_j} E_m(p_0) \partial_{k_i} \chi_m + i \partial_{y_j k_i} \chi_m \right)_{L^2(Y)} \partial_{y_j z_i}^2 u.
\end{equation}
In the case $\alpha = \alpha_c$, by making the last sum symmetric with respect to $j$ and $\ell$, and using (A.3), we finally obtain the nonlinear Schrödinger equation (1.8) with effective mass tensor $M = \nabla_k^2 E_m(p_0)$ and coupling constant
\begin{equation}
\lambda_m := \lambda \langle \chi_m, |\chi_m|^{2\sigma} \chi_m \rangle_{L^2(Y)} = \lambda \int_Y |\chi_m(y, p_0)|^{2\sigma+2} \, dy.
\end{equation}
In addition, we can write
\begin{equation}
U_2(t, z, y) = u_2(t, z) \chi_m(y, p_0) + u_2^\perp(t, z, y),
\end{equation}
where $u_2^\perp = -L_0^{-1} (L_1 U_1 + L_2 U_0)$. We shall also impose $u_2 \equiv 0$ and thus $U_2 = u_2^\perp$. 
Assume for the moment that we can solve (1.8). Then, we have the following result, which establishes some basic regularity properties of our multi-scale expansion (where we denote by $H^k$ the usual $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ based Sobolev space).

**Lemma 2.1.** Suppose (1.7) holds true and let $u \in C([0, T]; H^k)$, be a solution of (1.8) up to some $T > 0$. Then $U_j \in C([0, T]; H^{k-j}_x \times W^{\infty, \infty}(Y))$, for $j = 0, 1, 2$.

**Proof.** First note that $(y, k) \mapsto \chi_m(y, k)$ is smooth and bounded together with all its derivatives, provided (1.7) holds true. Having this in mind, the proof follows directly from the construction of $\{U_j\}_{j=0,1,2}$ as solutions to the system (2.3).

**Remark 2.2.** Note that in the case $\alpha > \alpha_c$ nonlinear effects are absent at leading order since we obtain, instead of (1.8), a linear effective mass equation:

$$i\partial_t u_{\text{lin}} + \frac{1}{2} \text{div}_z (\nabla_x^2 E_m(p_0) \cdot \nabla_z) u_{\text{lin}} = 0, \quad u_{|t=0} = u_0.$$  \hfill (2.9)

This type of equation has been derived in [2, 25], using a different asymptotic scaling.

## 3. Main Results

In this section we shall make the computations given above rigorous and prove a non-linear stability result. As a first step we need to guarantee the existence of a smooth solution to (1.8), at least locally in-time.

### 3.1. Construction of an approximate solution

The dispersion relation of (1.8) is given by a real-valued symmetric matrix. Standard techniques (see, e.g., [27]) yield the existence of a unique local solution, provided that the initial datum is sufficiently smooth:

**Lemma 3.1.** Let $u_0 \in H^k$ with $k > d/2$. There exists $T_c \in (0, +\infty]$ and a unique maximal solution $u \in C([0, T_c]; H^k)$ to (1.8), such that $\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} = \|u_0\|_{L^2}$. The solution is maximal in the sense that if $T_c < \infty$, then

$$\lim_{t \to T_c} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{H^k} = +\infty.$$  

The solution $u(t, \cdot)$ may not exist for all times, even if $\lambda \geq 0$, i.e. even if the nonlinearity in the original equation (1.1) is defocusing. However, we can claim $T_c = \infty$ in either of the following cases (see e.g. [11]):

- $\nabla_x^2 E_m(p_0)$ is positive definite and $\lambda_m \geq 0$, or
- $\nabla_x^2 E_m(p_0)$ is negative definite and $\lambda_m \leq 0$.

On the contrary, if for instance $\nabla_x^2 E_m(p_0)$ is positive definite and $\lambda_m < 0$ (focusing nonlinearity), finite time blow up (that is, $T_c < \infty$) may occur, see, e.g., [27, 11]. This is the case typically if the initial datum is “too large”: for any fixed profile $u_0 \in S(\mathbb{R}^d)$, if one considers $u_{|t=0} = \Lambda u_0$, there exists $\Lambda_0 > 0$ such that for all $\Lambda \geq \Lambda_0, T_c < \infty$. Note that in other situations, where the signature of $\nabla_x^2 E_m(p_0)$ is non-trivial (hence $d \geq 2$), the issue of global existence vs. finite time blow-up is an open question.

**Remark 3.2.** Clearly, for $\alpha > \alpha_c$ these issues do not occur, since the leading order profile $u_{\text{lin}}$ solves the linear equation (2.9) and hence exists for all times, $T_c = +\infty$.

**Lemma 3.1** provides the existence of a local-in-time solution $u$ of the effective mass equation. In view of the multi-scale expansion given in Section 2, we can thus define an approximate solution by

$$\psi_{\text{app}}^\varepsilon(t, x) := e^{-d/4} \left(U_0 + \sqrt{\varepsilon} U_1 + \varepsilon U_2\right) \left(t, \frac{x - q(t)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) e^{i\phi_m(t,x)/\varepsilon}, \quad \hfill (3.1)$$
which satisfies the original equation (1.1) up to some remainder terms:

\[
\left( i\varepsilon \partial_t + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \Delta - V_{\text{per}} \right) \psi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}} - \lambda \varepsilon^\alpha |\psi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}}|^{2\sigma} \psi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}} = \frac{e^{i\phi_m/\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon^{d/4}} \varepsilon^{3/2} \left( r_1^\varepsilon + r_2^\varepsilon \right) (t, z, y) \bigg|_{(z,y)= (\frac{x-q(t)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}, \frac{y}{\varepsilon})} - \lambda R^\varepsilon (t, x).
\]

The remainder terms are given by

\[
r_1^\varepsilon (t, z, y) = L_2 U_1 (t, z, y), \quad r_2^\varepsilon (t, z, y) = L_1 U_2 (t, z, y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} L_2 U_2 (t, z, y),
\]

and

\[
R^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\alpha |\psi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}}|^{2\sigma} \psi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}} \quad \text{if } \alpha > \alpha_c, \quad \text{while if } \alpha = \alpha_c = 1 + d\sigma/2,
\]

\[
R^\varepsilon = e^{-d\sigma/2} |\psi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}}|^{2\sigma} \psi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{d/4}} e^{i\phi_m/\varepsilon} \left( U_0 \left( t, \frac{x-q(t)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}, \frac{y}{\varepsilon} \right) \right)^{2\sigma} U_0 \left( t, \frac{x-q(t)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}, \frac{y}{\varepsilon} \right).
\]

This, together with the regularity result established in Lemma [2.1], then directly yields the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.3.** Assume (1.7) and let \( \alpha \geq \alpha_c = 1 + d\sigma/2 \). Then, we can find \( \psi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}} \) such that:

1. For all \( T \in [0, T_c) \), \( \psi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}} \) has a coherent state structure on \( [0, T] \), in the sense that there exists \( C \) independent of \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1] \) such that, with \( \phi^\varepsilon \) defined in (1.5),

   \[
   \begin{align*}
   &\text{for } \alpha = \alpha_c, \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \| \psi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}} (t, \cdot) - \phi^\varepsilon (t, \cdot) \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \varepsilon, \\
   &\text{for } \alpha > \alpha_c, \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \| \psi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}} (t, \cdot) - \phi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{lin}} (t, \cdot) \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \varepsilon,
   \end{align*}
   \]

   where \( \phi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{lin}} \) is the approximate solution constructed from \( u^{\varepsilon}_{\text{lin}} \) solving (2.9).

2. The function solves (1.1) up to a small error:

   \[
   i\varepsilon \partial_t \psi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \Delta \psi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}} = V_{\text{per}} \left( \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) \psi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}} + \lambda \varepsilon^\alpha |\psi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}}|^{2\sigma} \psi^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}} + \varepsilon w^\varepsilon,
   \]

where the remainder term \( w^\varepsilon \) satisfies: for all \( T > 0 \), with \( T < T_c \) in the case \( \alpha = \alpha_c \), there exists \( C > 0 \) independent of \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that

\[
\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \| w^\varepsilon (t, \cdot) \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\varepsilon^{\min(\alpha-\alpha_c, 1/2)} & \text{if } \alpha > \alpha_c, \\
\varepsilon & \text{if } \alpha = \alpha_c.
\end{array} \right.
\]

Note that because of the factor \( \varepsilon \) in front of the time derivative, it is natural to represent a small error term as \( \varepsilon \) times as small term.

**3.2. Nonlinear stability.** It remains to prove nonlinear stability of the approximate solution constructed above. For the sake of simplicity we shall do so only for \( \alpha = \alpha_c \) and \( d = 1 \). The (physically less interesting) case \( \alpha > \alpha_c \) can be proved analogously and a possible generalization to higher dimensions is indicated in Remark [3.6] below. For \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \), set

\[
\| f^\varepsilon \|_{H^1} := \sup_{0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0} (\| f^\varepsilon \|_{L^2} + \| \varepsilon \partial_x f^\varepsilon \|_{L^2}),
\]

which is equivalent to the usual \( H^1 \)-norm for every (fixed) \( \varepsilon > 0 \). The approach that we present is similar to the one followed in [2]: First, we need to construct a more accurate
approximate solution than the one stated in Proposition 3.3. Taking the asymptotic expansion presented in Section 2 one step further, we can gain a factor \( \sqrt{\varepsilon} \) in Proposition 3.3. More precisely, we can construct \( \tilde{\psi}_{\text{app}}^\varepsilon \) such that:

\[
\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \psi_{\text{app}}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot) - \tilde{\psi}_{\text{app}}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^1_x} \leq C \sqrt{\varepsilon},
\]

and

\[
i\varepsilon \partial_t \tilde{\psi}_{\text{app}}^\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \Delta \tilde{\psi}_{\text{app}}^\varepsilon = V_{\text{per}} \left( \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) \tilde{\psi}_{\text{app}}^\varepsilon + \lambda \varepsilon^{1+\sigma/2} |\tilde{\psi}_{\text{app}}^\varepsilon|^{2\sigma} \tilde{\psi}_{\text{app}}^\varepsilon + \varepsilon \bar{w}^\varepsilon,
\]

where the additional factor \( \sqrt{\varepsilon} \) is reflected in the error estimate

\[
\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \bar{w}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^1_x} \leq C \varepsilon.
\]

Note that in this case the corrector \( U_1 \) is not the same for \( \tilde{\psi}_{\text{app}}^\varepsilon \), since unlike what we have done in [2.7] we can no longer assume \( u_1 = 0 \). Rather, \( u_1 \) now solves an evolution equation, which is essentially (1.8) linearized about \( u \), with a non-trivial source term (see [9] for more details). Therefore, the estimate (3.2) must be expected to be sharp in general.

Having constructed such an improved approximation \( \tilde{\psi}_{\text{app}}^\varepsilon \), we can state the following nonlinear stability result:

**Theorem 3.4.** Let \( d = 1, \alpha = 1 + \sigma/2, \sigma \in \mathbb{N}, \) and Assumption (1.7) hold. In addition, suppose that the initial data satisfy:

\[
\left\| \psi^\varepsilon_0 - \tilde{\psi}_{\text{app}}^\varepsilon(t=0) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = O(\varepsilon), \quad \left\| \varepsilon \partial_x \left( \psi^\varepsilon_0 - \tilde{\psi}_{\text{app}}^\varepsilon(t=0) \right) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = O(1).
\]

Let \( T \in [0, T_c) \). Then, there exists \( \varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(T) \) such that for \( \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0] \), the solution of (1.1) exists on \([0, T]\). Moreover, there exists \( C \) independent of \( \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0] \) such that

\[
\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \psi^\varepsilon(t, \cdot) - \varphi^\varepsilon(t, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \sqrt{\varepsilon}.
\]

where \( \varphi^\varepsilon \) is defined in (1.5).

**Proof.** The scheme of the proof is the same as the proof of Theorem 4.5 in [9], so we shall only give the main steps. Fix \( T < T_c \) and let \( \eta^\varepsilon = \psi^\varepsilon - \tilde{\psi}_{\text{app}}^\varepsilon \) be the error between the exact and the approximate solution. It satisfies

\[
i\varepsilon \partial_t \eta^\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \Delta \eta^\varepsilon = V_{\text{per}} \left( \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) \eta^\varepsilon + \lambda \varepsilon^{1+\sigma/2} (|\psi^\varepsilon|^{2\sigma} \psi^\varepsilon - |\tilde{\psi}_{\text{app}}^\varepsilon|^{2\sigma} \tilde{\psi}_{\text{app}}^\varepsilon) - \varepsilon \bar{w}^\varepsilon,
\]

with \( \|\eta^\varepsilon_{t=0}\|_{L^2} = O(\varepsilon), \|\varepsilon \partial_x \eta^\varepsilon_{t=0}\|_{L^2} = O(1) \) by assumption. From [23], we have:

**Lemma 3.5** (Moser’s lemma). Let \( R > 0, s \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( F(z) = |z|^{2\sigma} z, \sigma \in \mathbb{N} \). Then there exists \( C = C(R, s, \sigma) \) such that if \( \psi^\varepsilon \) satisfies

\[
\left\| (\varepsilon \partial_x)^{\alpha} \psi^\varepsilon \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq R, \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq s,
\]

and \( \delta^\varepsilon \) satisfies \( \|\delta^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq R \), then

\[
\sum_{0 \leq \beta \leq s} \left\| (\varepsilon \partial_x)^{\beta} (F(\psi^\varepsilon + \delta^\varepsilon) - F(\psi^\varepsilon)) \right\|_{L^2} \leq C \sum_{0 \leq \beta \leq s} \left\| (\varepsilon \partial_x)^{\beta} \delta^\varepsilon \right\|_{L^2}.\]
We apply this lemma with \( v^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{1/4} \tilde{\psi}^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}} \), and \( s = 0, s = 1 \) successively: there exists \( R > 0 \) independent of \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \) such that
\[
\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sum_{\beta = 0, 1} \left\| (\varepsilon \partial_x)^\beta v^\varepsilon (t) \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq R.
\]
Set \( \delta^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{1/4} \eta^\varepsilon \). By assumption and the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality,
\[
(3.5) \quad \| \delta^\varepsilon \|_{L^\infty} = \varepsilon^{1/4} \| \eta^\varepsilon \|_{L^\infty} \leq \varepsilon^{1/2} \sqrt{2} \varepsilon^{-1/2} \| \eta^\varepsilon_t \|_{L^2} \| \varepsilon \partial_x \eta^\varepsilon \|_{L^2}^{1/2} \leq C \varepsilon^{1/4}.
\]
As long as \( \| \delta^\varepsilon (t) \|_{L^\infty} \leq R \), energy estimates and Moser’s lemma with \( s = 0 \) yield
\[
\| \eta^\varepsilon (t) \|_{L^2} \leq \| \eta^\varepsilon (0) \|_{L^2} + C \int_0^t \| \eta^\varepsilon (s) \|_{L^2} ds + \int_0^t \| \tilde{\varepsilon} (s) \|_{L^2} ds,
\]
where we have used the homogeneity of \( F \). By Gronwall’s Lemma, for \( t \leq T \):
\[
\| \eta^\varepsilon (t) \|_{L^2} \leq C(T) \left( \| \eta^\varepsilon (0) \|_{L^2} + \int_0^t \| \tilde{\varepsilon} (s) \|_{L^2} ds \right) \leq C \varepsilon.
\]
Applying the operator \( \varepsilon \partial_x \) to the equation satisfied by \( \eta^\varepsilon \), we infer similarly
\[
\| \varepsilon \partial_x \eta^\varepsilon (t) \|_{L^2} \leq \| \varepsilon \partial_x \eta^\varepsilon (0) \|_{L^2} + C \int_0^t \| \eta^\varepsilon (s) \|_{H^1} ds + \int_0^t \| \varepsilon \partial_x \tilde{\varepsilon} (s) \|_{L^2} ds + 
\]
\[
+ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \| \partial_y \bar{V}_{\text{per}} \|_{L^\infty} \int_0^t \| \eta^\varepsilon (s) \|_{L^2} ds,
\]
where the last term stems from the relation \( [\varepsilon \partial_x, V_{\text{per}}(x/\varepsilon)] = \partial_y V_{\text{per}}(x/\varepsilon) \in L^\infty \), since \( V_{\text{per}} \) is smooth and periodic. Thus,
\[
\| \varepsilon \partial_x \eta^\varepsilon (t) \|_{L^2} \leq C + C \int_0^t \| \varepsilon \partial_x \eta^\varepsilon (s) \|_{L^2} ds + C t.
\]
Gronwall’s lemma now yields \( \| \varepsilon \partial_x \eta^\varepsilon (t) \|_{L^2} \leq C(T) \). In view of the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality,
\[
\| \delta^\varepsilon (t) \|_{L^\infty} = \varepsilon^{1/4} \| \eta^\varepsilon (t) \|_{L^\infty} \leq \sqrt{2} \varepsilon^{-1/4} \| \eta^\varepsilon \|_{L^2}^{1/2} \| \varepsilon \partial_x \eta^\varepsilon \|_{L^2}^{1/2} \leq C(T) \varepsilon^{1/4}.
\]
For \( \varepsilon \) sufficiently small (depending of \( T \)), \( \| \delta^\varepsilon (t) \|_{L^\infty} \leq R \) for all \( t \in [0, T] \), and the result follows from a bootstrap argument. \( \square \)

The above theorem shows nonlinear stability of the approximate solution up to times of order \( \mathcal{O}(1) \), i.e. independent of \( \varepsilon \), provided that the initial data are well-prepared, in the sense given in \((3.4)\). Essentially this means that \( \psi^\varepsilon_0 \) contains not only \( U_0 \), but also \( U_1 \) associated to \( \tilde{\psi}^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}} \). We shall not insist further on this aspect, which is probably a technical artifact, and remark that in the linear case a stronger result is valid, see \([10]\) where stability is proved up to the so-called Ehrenfest time \( \mathcal{O}(\ln 1/\varepsilon) \), and no well-preparedness as in \((3.4)\) is needed (an initial error \( \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^r) \) for some \( r > 0 \) suffices).

**Remark 3.6.** If \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) with \( d \geq 2 \), the proof can be easily adapted, provided an even better approximate solution is constructed. The reason is that, instead of \((3.5)\), one needs to rely on the following Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality
\[
\| \delta^\varepsilon \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \varepsilon^{-d/2} \| \delta^\varepsilon \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^{1-d/(2s)} \| | \nabla |^s \delta^\varepsilon \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^{d/(2s)}, \quad \text{for } s > d/2.
\]
Thus, in order to account for the singular factor \( \varepsilon^{-d/2} \), one is forced to construct an approximate solution \( \tilde{\psi}^{\varepsilon}_{\text{app}} \) to a sufficiently high order in \( \varepsilon \) (see \([9]\) for more details).
4. The case of nonlocal nonlinearities

In this section we shall show how to perform the same asymptotic analysis as before in the case of nonlocal nonlinearities. In other words, we consider

\[ i\varepsilon \partial_t \psi^\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 \frac{\Delta}{2} \psi^\varepsilon = V_{\text{per}} \left( \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) \psi^\varepsilon + \varepsilon^\alpha (K * |\psi^\varepsilon|^2) \psi^\varepsilon \]

with \( K(x) \in \mathbb{R} \) some given interaction kernel. In the following we shall focus on two particular choices of interaction kernels \( K \) which are physically relevant.

4.1. Homogeneous kernels. In this subsection we shall consider functions of the form

\[ K(x) = \lambda |x|^{\mu}, \ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \ \text{with} \ \mu \in \mathbb{R} \ \text{such that} \ -\min(2, d) < \mu \leq 2. \]

For example, the choice \( \mu = -1 \) in \( d = 3 \) corresponds to the classical Hartree nonlinearity, modeling a self-consistent, repulsive \((\lambda > 0)\) Coulomb interaction. The case \( \mu > 0 \) has been recently studied in \([19]\).

Like in the case of local nonlinearities, the critical exponent \( \alpha_c \) depends on the homogeneity \( \mu \), namely \( \alpha_c = 1 - \mu/2 \). This can be seen as follows: We plug the ansatz

\[ \varphi^\varepsilon(t, x, \varepsilon) = e^{-d/4} \nu \left( t, \frac{x - q(t)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) \chi_m \left( \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, p_0 \right) e^{i \phi_{m}(t, x)/\varepsilon} \]

into the convolution term \( \varepsilon^{1-\mu/2} (|x|^{\mu} + |\varphi^\varepsilon|^2) \). This yields

\[ \varepsilon^{1-\mu/2-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x - \xi|^{\mu} \left| u \left( t, \frac{x - q(t)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) \right|^2 \left| \chi_m \left( \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, p_0 \right) \right|^2 d\xi. \]

We want this term to be of order \( O(\varepsilon) \) in our asymptotic expansion, to mimic the approach presented in \([2]\). In this case, it will consequently appear within \( b_5 \), leading to the effective mass equation. In order to show that this is indeed the case, we rewrite the initial convolution as

\[ \varepsilon^{1-\mu/2-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\xi|^{\mu} \left| u \left( t, \frac{x - \xi - q(t)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) \right|^2 \left| \chi_m \left( \frac{x - \xi}{\varepsilon}, p_0 \right) \right|^2 d\xi, \]

and use the substitution \( z = (x - q(t))/\sqrt{\varepsilon} \) in the envelope \( u \), and \( y = x/\varepsilon \) in \( \chi_m \):

\[ \varepsilon^{1-\mu/2-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\xi|^{\mu} \left| u \left( t, z - \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) \right|^2 \left| \chi_m \left( y - \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}, p_0 \right) \right|^2 d\xi. \]

Setting \( \zeta = \xi/\sqrt{\varepsilon} \), this can be written as

\[ \varepsilon \int |\xi|^{\mu} \left| u \left( t, z - \zeta \right) \right|^2 \left| \chi_m \left( y - \frac{\zeta}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}, p_0 \right) \right|^2 d\zeta. \]

Then, the following averaging result can be proved:

**Proposition 4.1.** Let \([1,7]\) hold true and assume that \( \zeta \mapsto |\zeta|^{\mu} |u(t, z - \zeta)|^2 \) is in \( L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \). Then, for all \( k \in Y^*, \) it holds

\[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\xi|^{\mu} \left| u \left( t, z - \zeta \right) \right|^2 \left| \chi_m \left( y - \frac{\zeta}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}, k \right) \right|^2 d\zeta \xrightarrow[\varepsilon \to 0]{} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\xi|^{\mu} \left| u \left( t, z - \zeta \right) \right|^2 d\zeta. \]

In addition, if \( \zeta \mapsto |\zeta|^{\mu} |u(t, z - \zeta)|^2 \) is in \( W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \), then the above convergence holds with an error of order \( O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \).

This result can be seen as a variant of the two-scale convergence results introduced in \([20,1]\), and used in \([2]\). The main difference here is the convolution structure.
Proof. We decompose \( y \mapsto |\chi_m(y, k)|^2 \) into its generalized Fourier series (recall that \( \Gamma \approx \mathbb{Z}^d \)) and write

\[
\int |\zeta|^\mu |u(t, z - \zeta)|^2 \left| \chi_m \left( y - \frac{\zeta}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) \right|^2 d\zeta = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \int |\zeta|^\mu |u(t, z - \zeta)|^2 c_\gamma e^{i\gamma \cdot (y - \zeta/\sqrt{\varepsilon})} d\zeta
\]

\[
= \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} c_\gamma e^{i\gamma \cdot y} \int |\zeta|^\mu |u(t, z - \zeta)|^2 e^{-i\gamma \cdot \zeta/\sqrt{\varepsilon}} d\zeta.
\]

By Riemann–Lebesgue lemma, for each term with \( \gamma \neq 0 \), the limit, as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \), is zero. Then only the term corresponding to \( \gamma = 0 \) remains, with

\[
c_0(k) = \int_Y \chi_m(y, k)^2 dy = 1,
\]

since the eigenfunctions \( \chi_m(\cdot, k) \) form an orthonormal basis of \( L^2(Y) \). By the Dominated Convergence Theorem, we can exchange the sum over \( \gamma \in \Gamma \) and the limit \( \varepsilon \to 0 \) in the above computation provided that \( \zeta \mapsto |\zeta|^\mu |u(t, z - \zeta)|^2 \) is in \( L^1 \) (with an error \( o(1) \)).

In the case where the function is in \( W^{1,1} \), we obtain an error \( O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \). The reason is that the coefficients \( (c_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \) decrease rapidly for large \( |\gamma| \), since \( y \mapsto |\chi_m(y, k)|^2 \) is smooth, provided Assumption (1.7) holds true and thus we can perform an integration by parts, and use dominated convergence again.

Assuming that \( u \) is sufficiently smooth and decaying, we can use the above averaging result and perform the same asymptotic expansion as given in Section 2 to arrive at the effective nonlinear Schrödinger equation

\[
i\partial_t u + \frac{1}{2} \text{div}_z \left((\nabla^2 E_m(p_0)) \cdot \nabla_x \right) u = \lambda(z|u|^2)u, \quad u|_{t=0} = u_0.
\]

For \( \mu < 0 \), existence of a smooth solution \( u \in C([0, T_c), H^k) \), locally in time, can be proved along the same lines as in [11] and hence, a result analogous to the one stated in Proposition 3.3 is straightforward. In the case \( \mu > 0 \) one can follow the arguments of [19], using a functional framework which is more intricate, however (the Sobolev spaces \( H^k \) are not sufficient but have to be intersected with weighted \( L^2 \) spaces), and we shall not do so here. In a similar spirit, stability in the sense of Theorem 3.4 follows from an adaptation of Lemma 3.5 which we leave out.

4.2. Smooth kernels. If in (4.1) the interaction kernel \( K(x) \) is a given smooth function, bounded as well as its derivative, then \( \alpha_c = 1 \) (corresponding formally to the case \( \mu = 0 \)). Such a situation appears for example in [5], where

\[
K(x) = (a_1 + a_2|x|^2 + a_3|x|^4) e^{-A^2|x|^2} + a_4 e^{-B^2|x|^2},
\]

with constants \( a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \in \mathbb{R} \), \( A, B > 0 \). Resuming the above computations in this context, we find:

\[
K * |\psi^\varepsilon|^2 = e^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(\xi) \left| u \left( t, \frac{x - \xi - q(t)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) \right|^2 \left| \chi_m \left( \frac{x - \xi}{\varepsilon}, p_0 \right) \right|^2 d\xi
\]

\[
= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(\xi \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \left| u \left( t, z - \xi \right) \right|^2 \left| \chi_m \left( y - \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}, p_0 \right) \right|^2 d\xi
\]

\[
\xrightarrow{\varepsilon \to 0} K(0) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(t, z - \xi)|^2 d\xi = K(0)\|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = K(0)\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2,
\]
To this end, we define the semi-classical band Hamiltonian
\[ \hat{H} = \sum_{\gamma} \lambda_\gamma \hat{H}_\gamma. \]
At least formally, this can be done by combining our analysis with the results given in [10]:
\[ \nabla^2 E_m (p_0) \cdot \nabla z = K(0) \| u_0 \|_{L^2 Z}^2, \quad u_{t=0} = u_0. \]
The right hand side involves a constant potential term, which can be gauged away via
\[ v(t, x) = u(t, x) e^{i t K(0)} \| u_0 \|_{L^2 Z}^2. \]
The remaining amplitude \( v(t, x) \) then solves a free Schrödinger equation with effective mass tensor \( \nabla^2 E_m (p_0) \).

**APPENDIX A. SOME USEFUL ALGEBRAIC IDENTITIES**

For the derivation of the effective mass equation (1.8) we shall rely on several algebraic identities, which can be derived from Bloch’s spectral problem (for more details see, e.g., [4]): First, taking the gradient w.r.t. to \( k \) of (1.2), we have
\[ \nabla_k E_m = \langle \chi_m, \nabla_k H(k) \chi_m \rangle_{L^2 (Y)} + \langle \chi_m, (H(k) - E_m) \nabla_k \chi_m \rangle_{L^2 (Y)}. \]
Since \( H(k) \) is self-adjoint, the last term is zero, thanks to (1.2). We infer
\[ \nabla_k E_m (k) = \langle \chi_m, (-i \nabla_y + k) \chi_m \rangle_{L^2 (Y)}. \]
Differentiating (A.1) again, we have, for all \( j, \ell \in \{1, \ldots, d\} \):
\[ \begin{align*}
\partial^2_{k_j k_\ell} \langle \chi_m, \nabla_k H(k) \chi_m \rangle_{L^2 (Y)} &= \partial_{k_j} \langle \chi_m, (H(k) - E_m) \partial_{k_\ell} \chi_m \rangle_{L^2 (Y)} + \langle \chi_m, (H(k) - E_m) \partial_{k_j} \chi_m \rangle_{L^2 (Y)} \\
&+ \langle \chi_m, (H(k) - E_m) \partial_{k_j} \chi_m \rangle_{L^2 (Y)} = 0.
\end{align*} \]
Taking the scalar product with \( \chi_m \), we have:
\[ \begin{align*}
\partial^2_{k_j k_\ell} E_m (k) &= \delta_{j \ell} + \langle -i \partial_{k_j} + k_j \rangle \partial_{k_\ell} \chi_m + \langle -i \partial_{k_\ell} + k_\ell \rangle \partial_{k_j} \chi_m, \chi_m \rangle_{L^2 (Y)} \\
&- \langle \partial_{k_j} E_m \partial_{k_\ell} \chi_m + \partial_{k_\ell} E_m \partial_{k_j} \chi_m, \chi_m \rangle_{L^2 (Y)}. \\
\end{align*} \]

**APPENDIX B. ADDING AN ADDITIONAL, SLOWLY VARYING POTENTIAL**

As a possible extension of our study, one might want to consider the case where the wave function is not only under the influence of the nonlinearity and the periodic potential, but also add an additional slowly varying external potential \( V(t, x) \), i.e.
\[ i \varepsilon \partial_t \psi^\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \psi^\varepsilon = V_{\text{per}} \left( \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) \psi^\varepsilon + V(t, x) \psi^\varepsilon + \varepsilon \alpha f(|\psi^\varepsilon|^2) \psi^\varepsilon. \]
At least formally, this can be done by combining our analysis with the results given in [10]:
To this end, we define the semi-classical band Hamiltonian
\[ h_m^\text{sc} (k, x) = E_m (k) + V(t, x), \quad (k, x) \in Y^* \times \mathbb{R}^d, \]
and denote the corresponding semiclassical phase space trajectories by
\[ \begin{align*}
\dot{q}(t) &= \nabla_k E_m (p(t)), \quad q(0) = q_0, \\
\dot{p}(t) &= -\nabla_x V (t, q(t)), \quad p(0) = p_0.
\end{align*} \]
This system is the analogue of the classical Hamiltonian phase space flow, in the presence of an additional periodic potential \( V_{\text{per}} \). In order to make sure that the system (B.1) is...
well-defined, it is sufficient to assume that $E_m(p(t))$ is a simple eigenvalue ($|E_n(p(t)) - E_m(p(t))| \neq 0$ for all $n \neq m$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $k \in Y^*$); see e.g. [10], where examples of such situations are given.

The approximate solution under the form of a coherent state within the $m$-th Bloch band is then given by:

$$
\varphi^\varepsilon(t, x) = \varepsilon^{-d/4} u \left( t, \frac{x - q(t)}{\varepsilon} \right) \chi_m \left( \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, p(t) \right) e^{i \Phi_m(t, x)/\varepsilon}
$$

with $q(t), p(t)$ obtained from (B.1). The highly oscillatory phase takes the form $\Phi_m(t, x) = S_m(t) + p(t) \cdot (x - q(t))$, where $S_m(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ is the (purely time-dependent) semi-classical action

$$
S_m(t) = \int_0^t p(s) \cdot \nabla E_m(p(s)) - h_m^{sc} (p(s), q(s)) \, ds.
$$

Note that $\Phi_m$ simplifies to (1.6) in the case where $V(t, x) = 0$. In this case, the governing equation for the leading profile $u(t, z)$ is found to be a nonlinear Schrödinger equation with time-dependent quadratic potential, time-dependent effective mass $\nabla_x^2 E_m(p(t))$ and coupling constant $\lambda_m(t)$, see [10] for more details. These features make it difficult to give sufficient conditions under which the solution $u(t, z)$ is global, i.e. $T_e = \infty$. Indeed, the signature of $\nabla_x^2 E_m(p(t))$ may change, and the existence of Strichartz estimates for the linear part is a non-trivial issue. Moreover, $\lambda_m(t)$ may also change sign, making the analysis even more delicate.
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