

# Ground states of the Schrödinger equation coupled with fourth-order gravitation – Part 1: the case $K_{a,b} \leq 0$

Gustavo de Paula Ramos\*

Instituto de Ciências Matemáticas e de Computação,  
Universidade de São Paulo, Avenida Trabalhador São-Carlense  
400, 13566-590, São Carlos - SP, Brazil

December 30, 2025

## Abstract

We are interested in the existence and asymptotic behavior of ground states of the following normalized nonlocal semilinear problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (V - \omega)u + (K_{a,b} * u^2)u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3, \\ \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \mu, \end{cases}$$

where

$$K_{a,b}(x) := \frac{1}{|x|} \left( \frac{4}{3}e^{-b|x|} - \frac{1}{3}e^{-a|x|} - 1 \right);$$

$0 \leq a, b \leq \infty$ ;  $V$  denotes a singular potential that vanishes at infinity and the unknowns are  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $u: \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . This problem is obtained by looking for standing waves of the Schrödinger equation coupled with the nonrelativistic gravitational potential prescribed by a family of fourth-order gravity theories. In this paper, (i) we obtain a complete picture of the existence/nonexistence of ground states of the

---

\*gpramos@icmc.usp.br

associated autonomous problem for every possible geometry of  $K_{a,b}$ ,  
(ii) we obtain conditions that ensure the existence of ground states of  
the nonautonomous problem when  $K_{a,b} \leq 0$  and (iii) we prove that as

$$(a, b) \rightarrow (A, B) \in \{(0, 0), (\infty, \infty), (0, \infty)\},$$

ground states of this problem respectively converge to a ground state  
of (1) the Schrödinger equation, (2) the Choquard equation and (3) a  
rescaling of the Choquard equation.

**Keywords.** Yukawa potential, prescribed norm, prescribed mass,  
mass constraint, constrained energy functional

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Ground states of the associated autonomous problem . . . . .	6
1.2	Ground states of the nonautonomous problem . . . . .	8
1.3	Asymptotic behavior of ground states . . . . .	11
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Ground states of the autonomous problem</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Ground states of the nonautonomous problem</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1	Proof of Proposition 1.2 . . . . .	18
4.2	Proof of Theorem 1.3 . . . . .	19
<b>5</b>	<b>Asymptotic behavior of ground states</b>	<b>21</b>
5.1	Case 1: $(a_n, b_n) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ . . . . .	21
5.2	Case 2: $(a_n, b_n) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ . . . . .	22
5.3	Case 3: $(a_n, b_n) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ . . . . .	23
<b>A</b>	<b>Physical motivation</b>	<b>24</b>
A.1	Electromagnetic self-force . . . . .	24
A.2	Gravitational self-force and a family of fourth-order gravity theories . . . . .	25
A.3	Coupling the Schrödinger equation with fourth-order gravity .	26
<b>B</b>	<b>A study of the function <math>K_{a,b}</math></b>	<b>27</b>

# 1 Introduction

This paper is concerned with ground states of the following nonautonomous normalized nonlocal semilinear equation:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (V - \omega)u + (K_{a,b} * u^2)u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3; \\ \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \mu, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where

$$K_{a,b}(x) := \frac{1}{|x|} \left( \frac{4}{3} e^{-b|x|} - \frac{1}{3} e^{-a|x|} - 1 \right);$$

$0 \leq a, b \leq \infty$ ;  $V$  denotes a singular potential and we want to solve for  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $u: \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . More precisely, we set  $e^{-0|\cdot|} \equiv 1$  and  $e^{-\infty|\cdot|} \equiv 0$ .

Problem (1.1) is obtained when looking for standing waves of the Schrödinger equation coupled with the nonrelativistic gravitational potential prescribed by a family of fourth-order modified gravity theories indexed by the parameters  $a, b$  (see Appendix A). As suggested in [1, Section 5], a motivation for considering such a family of theories is to obtain a manageable model for the Newtonian gravitational self-force over massive point particles (see [2, Section V]) without the need of renormalization procedures when  $0 \leq a, b < \infty$ .

More precisely, we obtain a manageable term for the self-force when  $\int |\nabla K_{a,b}|^2 dx$  does not diverge. In fact,  $K_{a,b}$  has significantly different geometries according to how  $a, b$  compare with each other (see Table 1 and Appendix B). In particular, we highlight the following asymptotic behaviors of  $K_{a,b}(x)$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ .

- If  $0 = a < b \leq \infty$ , then  $K_{a,b} = K_{0,b}$  models an attractive potential that is stronger than the Newtonian potential at long distances because

$$|x|K_{0,b}(x) \xrightarrow{|x| \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{4}{3}. \quad (1.2)$$

- If  $0 < a, b \leq \infty$ , then  $K_{a,b}$  is indistinguishable from the Newtonian potential at long distances in the sense that

$$|x|K_{a,b}(x) \xrightarrow{|x| \rightarrow \infty} -1. \quad (1.3)$$

We obtain various normalized problems of physical interest by replacing  $a, b$  with specific values.

Case	Sign	Radial monotonicity	$\int  \nabla K_{a,b}(x) ^2 dx$
$a = b = 0$	Identically zero	-	0
$0 \leq a \leq 2b = \infty$	Negative	Strictly increasing	$\infty$
$0 \leq a \leq 2b < \infty$	Negative	Strictly increasing	$< \infty$
$0 < 2b < a \leq 4b < \infty$	Negative	Not monotonous	$< \infty$
$0 < 4b < a < \infty$	Sign-changing	Not monotonous	$< \infty$
$0 < 4b < a = \infty$	Sign-changing	Not monotonous	$\infty$
$0 = 4b < a < \infty$	Positive	Strictly decreasing	$< \infty$
$0 = 4b < a = \infty$	Positive	Strictly decreasing	$\infty$

Table 1: Qualitative behavior of  $K_{a,b}$ .

- When  $a = b = 0$ , (1.1) becomes the normalized stationary *Schrödinger equation*,

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (V - \omega)u = 0; \\ \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \mu. \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

- When  $a = b = \infty$ , (1.1) becomes the normalized *Choquard equation*,

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (V - \omega)u - (|\cdot|^{-1} * u^2)u = 0; \\ \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \mu. \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

- When  $(a, b) = (0, \infty)$ , (1.1) becomes a rescaling of the previous problem,

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (V - \omega)u - \frac{4}{3}(|\cdot|^{-1} * u^2)u = 0; \\ \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \mu. \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

- When  $0 \leq a < 2b < \infty$ , (1.1) becomes a normalized stationary equation with a *Bopp–Podolsky-type self-attractive interaction* (see [3]).

- When  $0 = b < a = \infty$ , (1.1) becomes the normalized stationary equation obtained by reducing the *Schrödinger–Maxwell system* (see [4]),

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (V - \omega)u + \frac{1}{3}(| \cdot |^{-1} * u^2)u = 0; \\ \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \mu. \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

- When  $0 = b < a < \infty$ , (1.1) becomes the normalized stationary equation obtained by reducing the *Schrödinger–Bopp–Podolsky system* (see [5]),

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (V - \omega)u + (K_{a,0} * u^2)u = 0; \\ \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \mu, \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

The archetypical example of a nonlocal semilinear elliptic equation is the Choquard equation

$$-\Delta u + u - (I_\alpha * |u|^p)|u|^{p-2}u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (1.9)$$

where  $0 < \alpha < N$ ,  $\frac{N+\alpha}{N} \leq p \leq \frac{N+\alpha}{(N-2)_+}$  and  $I_\alpha(x) := |x|^{-(N-\alpha)}$ . The literature concerned with problems related with (1.9) is too vast to list here, so we restrict ourselves to cite the seminal papers [6, 7] and the relatively recent survey about related problems [8].

On the other hand, more general normalized nonlocal semilinear elliptic problems of the form

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (V - \omega)u + (W * |u|^p)|u|^{p-2}u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N; \\ \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \mu \end{cases}$$

have received much less attention, especially when  $W$  is sign-changing or not homogeneous. In the autonomous case  $V \equiv 0$ , the recent papers [9, 10] studied the case where  $W$  is of the form  $I_\alpha - I_\beta$  with  $\alpha \neq \beta$  in  $]0, N[$ . In the nonautonomous case  $V \not\equiv 0$ , the problem where  $W$  is a sum of Riesz potentials with a weakly attractive  $V \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^N, ]-\infty, 0])$  was considered in [11].<sup>1</sup> Similar nonautonomous problems were also studied in [12, 13].

In a similar direction, there has been an increasing interest about normalized elliptic problems with a local nonlinearity of the form

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (V - \omega)u = f(\cdot, u) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N; \\ \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \mu. \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>We say that  $V$  is *weakly attractive potential* when  $V(x) \leq \limsup_{|y| \rightarrow \infty} V(y)$  for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ .

First, let us consider mass-subcritical problems. The influential paper [14] addressed the existence of ground states of (1.10) with an autonomous nonlinearity  $f(x, u) = f(u)$  and under the hypothesis that  $V$  is a continuous weakly attractive negative potential that vanishes at infinity. In [15], the existence of ground states was later extended for the case of a nonautonomous nonlinearity  $f(x, u)$  with a continuous weakly attractive potential  $V$ . In [16], the authors studied the existence of ground states for the mass-subcritical power nonlinearity  $f(u) = |u|^{p-2}u$  under the hypothesis that  $V: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow [0, \infty[$  is continuous and bounded. Problems of the form (1.10) in the mass-supercritical case are also receiving increasing attention. Inspired by the pioneering paper [17] (see also [18]), the common approach employed in this case is to look for minimizers under the additional constraint given by a Pohožaev identity. In this context, the paper [19] furnished conditions for the existence of solutions to (1.10) under certain hypotheses on  $V$ , including  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V(x) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} V(x) = 0$ .

As exemplified by the cited articles, it is standard to suppose that  $V$  is a weakly attractive potential in order to obtain ground states for nonautonomous normalized problems. Influenced by the classical approach in Lions' [20, Section III], this paper considers a weaker condition (the *energy deficiency condition* ( $H_3$ )) that ensures the existence of ground states even for certain sign-changing potentials that vanish at infinity.

## 1.1 Ground states of the associated autonomous problem

The first goal of this paper is to study the conditions for existence/nonexistence of ground states of the following autonomous problem associated with (1.1):

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u - \omega u + (K_{a,b} * u^2)u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3; \\ \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \mu. \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

In order to recall the considered notion of ground states, we have to introduce the variational formulation of (1.11). Problem (1.11) is naturally associated with the *energy functional*  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0: \mathcal{H}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{A}(u) + \frac{1}{4}\mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u),$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}(u) := \int |\nabla u(x)|^2 dx \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u) := \int \int K_{a,b}(x-y) u(x)^2 u(y)^2 dx dy.$$

Standard arguments involving the Sobolev embeddings and the Hardy–Littlewood–Sobolev inequality show that these functionals are well defined, so we omit the details. Sometimes, it will also be useful to consider the functional  $\mathcal{D}_c: \mathcal{H}^1 \rightarrow [0, \infty[$  defined as

$$\mathcal{D}_c(u) = \int \int \frac{e^{-c|x-y|}}{|x-y|} u(x)^2 u(y)^2 dx dy,$$

so that  $\mathcal{K}_{a,b} = \frac{4}{3}\mathcal{D}_b - \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{D}_a - \mathcal{D}_0$ . In this context, we understand a *ground state* of (1.11) to be a solution to the following minimization problem:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u) = E_{a,b}^0(\mu) := \inf_{v \in \mathcal{S}(\mu)} \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(v); \\ u \in \mathcal{S}(\mu), \end{cases}$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}(\mu) := \left\{ u \in \mathcal{H}^1 : \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \mu \right\}.$$

In fact, our first result provides the complete picture about existence and nonexistence of ground states of (1.11).

**Theorem 1.1.** *1. If  $0 \leq a \leq \infty$ ,  $b = 0$  and  $\mu > 0$ , then  $E_{a,0}^0(\mu) = 0$  and (1.11) does not admit ground states.*

*2. Suppose that  $0 \leq a \leq \infty$ ,  $0 < b \leq \infty$  and  $\mu > 0$ .*

- (a) Problem (1.11) admits ground states;*
- (b) its associated ground state energy is negative:  $E_{a,b}^0(\mu) < 0$ ;*
- (c) if  $u$  denotes a ground state of (1.11), then its associated Lagrange multiplier is negative:  $\omega < 0$ .*

Let us sketch the main ideas involved in the proof. The nonexistence result follows from a usual scaling argument. As for the existence result, if  $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  denotes a minimizing sequence of  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0|_{\mathcal{S}(\mu)}$  and  $u_n \rightharpoonup u_\infty$  in  $\mathcal{H}^1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then two bad scenarios may occur:

- *Vanishing:*  $u_\infty \equiv 0$ ;

- *Dichotomy:*  $0 < \|u_\infty\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 < \mu$ .

On one hand, we can rule out vanishing with a standard argument involving concentration-compactness. On the other hand, the strategy to rule out dichotomy involves proving the *Strict Subadditivity Condition*

$$E_{a,b}^0(\mu) < E_{a,b}^0(\rho) + E_{a,b}^0(\mu - \rho) \text{ for every } \mu > 0 \text{ and } \rho \in ]0, \mu[. \quad (1.12)$$

In this context, we use the asymptotic behaviors (1.2), (1.3) together with rescalings to prove that, even if  $K_{a,b}$  is sign-changing, the ground state energy function  $\mu \mapsto E_{a,b}^0(\mu)$  takes negative values and we use this fact to prove (1.12).

## 1.2 Ground states of the nonautonomous problem

We begin by stating the first hypotheses on the external potential  $V$ .

$$(H_1) \quad V \in \mathcal{L}^{\frac{3}{2}} + \mathcal{L}^\infty.$$

$$(H_2) \quad V \text{ vanishes at infinity in the sense that}$$

$$\text{meas}\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |V(x)| > c\right\}\right) < \infty$$

for every  $c > 0$ .

On one hand,  $(H_1)$  is a classical condition used to ensure that

$$\mathcal{H}^1 \ni u \mapsto \mathcal{V}(u) := \int V(x)u(x)^2 \, dx \in \mathbb{R}$$

is a well-defined functional. On the other hand, it follows from  $(H_1)$ ,  $(H_2)$  that the functional  $\mathcal{V}$  is weakly continuous (see Lemma 2.6).

**Example.** Conditions  $(H_1)$  and  $(H_2)$  are satisfied for potentials of the form

$$V(x) := \sum_{1 \leq k \leq K} \frac{q_k}{|x - x_k|^{\alpha_k}}$$

with  $K \in \mathbb{N}$ ;  $0 < \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K < 2$ ;  $x_1, \dots, x_K \in \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $q_1, \dots, q_K \in \mathbb{R}$ .



Problem (1.1) is naturally associated with the energy functional  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^V: \mathcal{H}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^V(u) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{A}(u) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{V}(u) + \frac{1}{4}\mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u).$$

As in the case of the autonomous problem, we understand a *ground state* of (1.1) to be a solution to the following minimization problem:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^V(u) = E_{a,b}^V(\mu) := \inf_{v \in \mathcal{S}(\mu)} \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^V(v); \\ u \in \mathcal{S}(\mu). \end{cases}$$

Having introduced the variational formulation of (1.1), we proceed to the statement of the last hypothesis on  $V$ .

$$(H_3) \quad E_{a,b}^V(\mu) < E_{a,b}^0(\mu).$$

Notice that  $(H_1)$ – $(H_3)$  are similar to the conditions in [20, Section III.1]. In particular, the *energy deficiency condition*  $(H_3)$  rules out nonnegative potentials, including the trivial potential  $V \equiv 0$ . The motivation for this hypothesis is that it ensures the applicability of the usual argument used to rule out vanishing and dichotomy of minimizing sequences in nonautonomous normalized problems (see [21, Section 3.1] or [15, Lemma 4.5], for instance). We can also consider  $(H_3)$  a natural generalization of the condition on the Schrödinger operator  $-\Delta + V$  used to ensure that the normalized Schrödinger equation (1.4) admits ground states. Indeed, it follows from Theorem 1.1 in the case  $a = b = 0$  that  $E_{0,0}^0(\mu) = 0$  and (1.4) does not admit ground states if  $V \equiv 0$ . On the other hand, it is classical that this problem has ground states if  $(H_1)$ – $(H_3)$  are satisfied (see [22, Theorem 11.5]).<sup>2</sup>

The following result shows that  $(H_3)$  is stable by small perturbations of the considered potentials and, at least when (1.11) admits ground states,  $(H_3)$  is weaker than the condition “ $0 \not\equiv V \leq 0$  a.e.”.

**Proposition 1.2.** *Suppose that  $0 \leq a, b \leq \infty$  and  $\mu > 0$ .*

---

<sup>2</sup>In this context, it is instructive to echo [21, Remark 1.4]. Suppose that  $a = b = 0$ , i.e.,  $K_{a,b} \equiv 0$ . It is clear that  $(H_3)$  implies  $V < 0$  in a set of positive measure. On the other hand, it is not sufficient to suppose that  $V < 0$  a.e. to obtain  $(H_3)$ . Indeed, it follows from the Hardy inequality that if  $-\frac{1}{4|x|^2} \leq V(x) \leq 0$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , then  $(H_3)$  is not satisfied. For a sufficient quantitative condition on  $V$  that implies  $(H_3)$ , we refer the reader to [23, Theorem 11.4.19].

1. (Nontrivial nonpositive potentials) *Suppose that  $(H_1)$  is satisfied, (1.11) admits ground states and  $0 \not\equiv V \leq 0$  almost everywhere. Then  $(H_3)$  is satisfied.*
2. (Perturbations of energy-deficient potentials) *Suppose that  $V_1$  is a function defined a.e. in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $(H_1)$ – $(H_3)$  are satisfied in the case  $V = V_1$ . Then there exists  $K = K(V_1) > 0$  such that if  $V_2 \in \mathcal{L}^{\frac{3}{2}}$ ,  $V_3 \in \mathcal{L}^\infty$  are such that*

$$\text{meas}\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |V_2(x) + V_3(x)| > c\right\}\right) < \infty$$

*for every  $c > 0$  and*

$$K\|V_2\|_{\mathcal{L}^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{1}{2}\|V_3\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty}\mu < E_{a,b}^0(\mu) - E_{a,b}^{V_1}(\mu),$$

*then  $(H_1)$ – $(H_3)$  are satisfied in the case  $V = V_1 + V_2 + V_3$ . If we suppose further that  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^{V_1}|_{\mathcal{S}(\mu)}$  admits a ground state  $u \in \mathcal{S}(\mu)$ , then we can take  $K = \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^6}^2$ .*

We make no claim whatsoever that the proposition has considered the optimal class of permitted perturbations. For instance, it is expected that small perturbations by Hardy potentials preserve energy deficiency. In this context, our next result gives sufficient conditions under which the nonautonomous problem (1.1) admits ground states when  $K_{a,b} \leq 0$ .

**Theorem 1.3.** *Suppose that  $\mu > 0$  and either*

- *$a = b = 0$  (in which case  $K_{a,b} \equiv 0$ ) or*
- *$0 \leq a \leq 4b$  and  $0 < b \leq \infty$  (in which case  $K_{a,b} < 0$ ).*

*Suppose further that  $(H_1)$ – $(H_3)$  are satisfied.*

1. *Problem (1.1) admits ground states and*
2. *if  $u$  denotes a ground state of (1.1), then its associated Lagrange multiplier is negative:  $\omega < 0$ .*

At least when  $K_{a,b}$  models nonrepulsive potentials (i.e.,  $K_{a,b} \leq 0$ ), the theorem provides a unifying view for the existence of ground states of the aforementioned physical problems obtained for specific values of  $a, b$ , providing a natural generalization of the well-known criterions for the existence of ground states of the Schrödinger equation (see [22, Theorem 11.5]) and the Choquard equation (see [20, Theorem III.1]).

The theorem only covers the case  $K_{a,b} \leq 0$  due to the challenge of disproving the dichotomy of minimizing sequences when  $K_{a,b}$  is sign-changing, which we plan to treat in an upcoming paper. The employed method of proof does not clarify whether the considered conditions are, in a certain sense, sharp for the existence of ground states. As such, we invite the reader to reflect about the following question.

**Question 1.4.** What is the maximal region for the parameters  $a, b$  such that  $(H_1)$ – $(H_3)$  still ensure the existence of ground states? If these conditions do not ensure the existence of ground states for every  $a, b \in [0, \infty]$ , then are there extra conditions on  $V$  under which this holds?

### 1.3 Asymptotic behavior of ground states

Our last results are concerned with physically-relevant limit situations of  $(a, b)$ . The first asymptotic result shows that ground states of (1.1) tend to ground states of (1.4) as  $a, b \rightarrow 0$ .

**Theorem 1.5.** *Suppose that  $(H_1)$ ,  $(H_2)$  are satisfied,  $\mu > 0$  and consider sequences  $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, \{b_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0, \infty[$  such that  $a_n, b_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Suppose further that given  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $u_n$  denotes a ground state of (1.1) in the case  $(a, b) = (a_n, b_n)$ . If  $(H_3)$  is satisfied in the case  $a = b = 0$ , then (1.4) has a ground state  $u_\infty$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n - u_\infty\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} = 0$ .*

Next, we show that ground states of (1.1) tend to ground states of (1.5) as  $a, b \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Theorem 1.6.** *Suppose that  $(H_1)$ ,  $(H_2)$  are satisfied,  $\mu > 0$  and consider sequences  $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, \{b_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset ]0, \infty]$  such that  $a_n, b_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Suppose further that given  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $u_n$  denotes a ground state of (1.1) in the case  $(a, b) = (a_n, b_n)$ . Then the following implications hold.*

1. *If  $V \equiv 0$ , then (1.5) has a ground state  $u_\infty$  and there exists  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n(\cdot - x_n) - u_\infty\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} = 0$ .*

2. If  $(H_3)$  is satisfied in the case  $a = b = \infty$ , then (1.5) has a ground state  $u_\infty$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n - u_\infty\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} = 0$ .

We then prove that ground states of (1.1) tend to ground states of (1.6) as  $(a, b) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ .

**Theorem 1.7.** *Suppose that  $(H_1)$ ,  $(H_2)$  are satisfied,  $\mu > 0$  and consider sequences  $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0, \infty[$ ,  $\{b_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset ]0, \infty]$  such that  $(a_n, b_n) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Suppose further that given  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $u_n$  denotes a ground state of (1.1) in the case  $(a, b) = (a_n, b_n)$ . Then the following implications hold.*

1. *If  $V \equiv 0$ , then (1.6) has a ground state  $u_\infty$  and there exists  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n(\cdot - x_n) - u_\infty\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} = 0$ .*
2. *If  $(H_3)$  is satisfied in the case  $(a, b) = (0, \infty)$ , then (1.6) has a ground state  $u_\infty$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n - u_\infty\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} = 0$ .*

## Organization of the text

- Section 2 contains technical preliminaries.
- Section 3 is concerned with the proof of Theorem 1.1.
- Section 4 provides the proofs of Proposition 1.2 and Theorem 1.3.
- Section 5 covers Theorems 1.5–1.7.
- Appendix A explains the physical motivation for considering (1.1).
- Appendix B provides a detailed study of the geometry of  $K_{a,b}$  and the respective graphs in function of the considered parameters  $a, b$ .

## Acknowledgement

This study was financed, in part, by the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP), Brasil. Process Number #2024/20593-0.

## 2 Preliminaries

The following result is a corollary of the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality [24, Theorem 12.87].

**Lemma 2.1.** *If  $2 \leq s \leq 6$ , then there exists  $C = C(s) > 0$  such that*

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^s} \leq C \mathcal{A}(u)^{\frac{3(s-2)}{4s}} \left( \int u(x)^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{6-s}{4s}}$$

for every  $u \in \mathcal{H}^1$ .

We recall a particular case of the Hardy–Littlewood–Sobolev inequality [22, Theorem 4.3].

**Lemma 2.2.** *1. If  $1 < \theta_1, \theta_2 < \infty$  and  $\frac{1}{\theta_1} + \frac{1}{\theta_2} = \frac{5}{3}$ , then there exists  $C = C(\theta_1) > 0$  such that*

$$\left| \int \int \frac{f(x)g(y)}{|x-y|} \, dx dy \right| \leq C \|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^{\theta_1}} \|g\|_{\mathcal{L}^{\theta_2}}$$

for every  $f \in \mathcal{L}^{\theta_1}$  and  $g \in \mathcal{L}^{\theta_2}$ .

*2. Given  $t \in ]\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}[$ , there exists  $C = C(t) > 0$  such that*

$$\int \int \left( \frac{u(y)^2}{|x-y|} \right)^{\frac{3t}{3-2t}} \, dx dy \leq C \left( \int |u(x)|^{2t} \, dx \right)^{\frac{3}{3-2t}}$$

for every  $u \in \mathcal{L}^{2t}$ .

The next result follows directly from [21, Lemma 2.2].

**Lemma 2.3.** *If  $(H_1)$  and  $(H_2)$  are satisfied, then we can associate each  $\varepsilon > 0$  with a constant  $C = C(\varepsilon) > 0$  and functions  $V_{\frac{3}{2}} = V_{\frac{3}{2}}(\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{L}^{\frac{3}{2}}$ ,  $V_{\infty} = V_{\infty}(\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{L}^{\infty}$  such that  $V = V_{\frac{3}{2}} + V_{\infty}$ ,  $\|V_{\frac{3}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}^{\frac{3}{2}}} < \varepsilon$  and  $\|V_{\infty}\|_{\mathcal{L}^{\infty}} < C$ .*

In view of the previous results, we can obtain a coercivity estimate for  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}|_{\mathcal{S}(\mu)}$  that does not depend on  $a, b$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** *If  $(H_1)$  and  $(H_2)$  are satisfied, then there exists  $C_2 > 0$  and we can associate each  $\varepsilon \in ]0, 1[$  with a  $C_1 = C_1(\varepsilon) > 0$  such that*

$$\mathcal{E}_{a,b}(u) \geq \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2} \mathcal{A}(u) - C_1 \mu - C_2 \mathcal{A}(u)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{\frac{3}{2}}$$

*for every  $\mu > 0$ ,  $u \in \mathcal{S}(\mu)$  and  $a, b \in [0, \infty]$ . It follows that given  $\mu > 0$  and  $a, b \in [0, \infty]$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}|_{\mathcal{S}(\mu)}$  is coercive and  $E_{a,b}(\mu) > -\infty$ .*

*Proof.*

**Association of  $\varepsilon > 0$  with  $C_1 = C_1(\varepsilon) > 0$ .** Corollary of Lemma 2.3.

**Existence of the constant  $C_2 > 0$ .** It is clear that  $|K_{a,b}(x)| \leq \frac{4}{3|x|}$  for every  $a, b \in [0, \infty]$ . As such, it follows from Lemma 2.2 that there exists  $C'_2 > 0$  such that  $|\mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u)| \leq C'_2 \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^{\frac{12}{5}}}^4$  for every  $a, b \in [0, \infty]$  and  $u \in \mathcal{L}^{\frac{12}{5}}$ . In view of this inequality, the result follows from an application of Lemma 2.1.  $\square$

Given  $c \in ]0, \infty[$ , the function  $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\} \ni x \mapsto \frac{e^{-c|x|}}{|x|}$  is integrable. In particular, we obtain the estimate that follows.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Given  $c \in ]0, \infty[$  it holds that*

$$\mathcal{D}_c(v) = \int \int \frac{e^{-c|x-y|}}{|x-y|} v(x)^2 v(y)^2 \, dx dy \leq \frac{4\pi}{c^2} \|v\|_{\mathcal{L}^4}^4$$

*for every  $v \in \mathcal{L}^4$ . In view of Lemma 2.1, there exists  $K > 0$  such that*

$$\mathcal{D}_c(v) \leq \frac{K}{c^2} \mathcal{A}(v)^{\frac{3}{2}} \left( \int v(x)^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

*for every  $c \in ]0, \infty[$  and  $v \in \mathcal{H}^1$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Young's inequality that the function

$$\mathbb{R}^3 \ni x \mapsto \int \frac{e^{-c|x-y|}}{|x-y|} v(y)^2 \, dy \in \mathbb{R}$$

is square-integrable and

$$\left\| x \mapsto \int \frac{e^{-c|x-y|}}{|x-y|} v(y)^2 \, dy \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \leq \left( \int \frac{e^{-c|x|}}{|x|} \, dx \right) \|v\|_{\mathcal{L}^4}^2 = \frac{4\pi}{c^2} \|v\|_{\mathcal{L}^4}^2.$$

As such, it follows from Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \int \int \frac{e^{-c|x-y|}}{|x-y|} v(x)^2 v(y)^2 \, dx dy &\leq \left\| x \mapsto \int \frac{e^{-c|x-y|}}{|x-y|} v(y)^2 \, dy \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \|v^2\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\ &\leq \frac{4\pi}{c^2} \|v\|_{\mathcal{L}^4}^4. \end{aligned}$$

□

We recall the following well-known result.

**Lemma 2.6** ([22, Theorem 11.4]). *If  $(H_1)$ ,  $(H_2)$  hold, then given  $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}} \subset \mathcal{H}^1$  such that  $u_n \rightharpoonup u_\infty$  in  $\mathcal{H}^1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , it holds that  $\mathcal{V}(u_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(u_\infty)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

The following Brézis–Lieb splitting is proved by arguing as in the proof of [25, Lemma 2.2] or [26, Proposition 4.2].

**Lemma 2.7.** *Suppose that  $0 \leq m < \infty$ . Suppose further that  $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}} \subset \mathcal{H}^1$  are such that  $u_n \rightharpoonup u_\infty$  in  $\mathcal{H}^1$  and  $u_n \rightarrow u_\infty$  a.e. as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{D}_m(u_n, u_n) - \mathcal{D}_m(u_n - u_\infty, u_n - u_\infty) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{D}_m(u_\infty, u_\infty).$$

### 3 Ground states of the autonomous problem

We associate each  $u \in \mathcal{H}^1$  and  $\theta > 0$  with the rescaling

$$u_\theta(x) := \theta^3 u(\theta^2 x).$$

A change of variable shows that

$$\|u_\theta\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}, \quad \mathcal{A}(u_\theta) = \theta^4 \mathcal{A}(u) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u_\theta) = \theta^2 \mathcal{K}_{\theta^{-2}a, \theta^{-2}b}(u). \quad (3.1)$$

In view of these identities, the following result is a consequence of Lemma 2.5.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Suppose that  $0 < b \leq \infty$  and  $u \in \mathcal{H}^1 \setminus \{0\}$ .*

1. *If  $0 < a \leq \infty$ , then  $\frac{\mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u_\theta)}{\theta^2} \xrightarrow{\theta \rightarrow 0} - \int \int \frac{u(x)^2 u(y)^2}{|x-y|} \, dx dy < 0$ .*

2. If  $a = 0$ , then  $\frac{\mathcal{K}_{0,b}(u_\theta)}{\theta^2} \xrightarrow{\theta \rightarrow 0} -\frac{4}{3} \int \int \frac{u(x)^2 u(y)^2}{|x-y|} dx dy < 0$ .

Next, we prove that the ground state energy is negative when  $b > 0$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *If  $0 \leq a \leq \infty$ ,  $0 < b \leq \infty$  and  $\mu > 0$ , then  $E_{a,b}^0(\mu) < 0$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to prove that there exists  $w \in \mathcal{S}(\mu)$  such that  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(w) < 0$ . Consider a fixed  $u \in \mathcal{S}(\mu)$ . It follows from (3.1) and Lemma 3.1 that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u_\theta)}{\theta^2} = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\theta^2}{2} \mathcal{A}(u) + \frac{1}{4\theta^2} \mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u_\theta) < 0,$$

hence the result.  $\square$

Our next goal is to show that the Strict Subadditivity Condition is satisfied.

**Lemma 3.3.** *If  $0 \leq a \leq \infty$  and  $0 < b \leq \infty$ , then (1.12) is satisfied.*

*Proof.* In view of Lemmas 2.4 and 3.2, we have a well-defined function  $]0, \infty[ \ni \mu \mapsto \frac{E_{a,b}^0(\mu)}{\mu} \in ]-\infty, 0[$ . It is classical that it suffices to prove that this function is strictly decreasing. Suppose that  $\mu > 0$ ,  $0 < \rho < \mu$  and let  $t = \frac{\mu}{\rho} > 1$ . Let  $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  denote a minimizing sequence of  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0|_{\mathcal{S}(\rho)}$ . As  $E_{a,b}^0(\rho) < 0$ , we deduce that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u_n) < 0. \quad (3.2)$$

By definition,

$$E_{a,b}^0(\mu) \leq \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(\sqrt{t}u_n) - t\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u_n) + t\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u_n) = \frac{t^2 - t}{4} \mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u_n) + t\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u_n).$$

In view of (3.2), we obtain

$$E_{a,b}^0(\mu) \leq \frac{t^2 - t}{4} \left( \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{K}(u_m) \right) + tE_{a,b}^0(\rho) < tE_{a,b}^0(\rho).$$

$\square$

We proceed to the proof of the theorem.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.*



**Case  $0 \leq a \leq \infty$  and  $b = 0$ : nonexistence of ground states.** It is clear that  $\mathcal{E}_{a,0}^0(u) > 0$  for every  $u \in \mathcal{S}(\mu)$ . As such, it suffices to prove that  $E_{a,0}^0(\mu) = 0$ . Consider a fixed  $u \in \mathcal{S}(\mu)$ . It follows from (3.1) that

$$0 \leq \mathcal{E}_{a,0}^0(u_\theta) \leq \frac{\theta^4}{2} \mathcal{A}(u) + \frac{\theta^2}{4} \mathcal{K}_{\infty,0}(u) \xrightarrow{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} 0,$$

hence the result.

**Case  $0 \leq a \leq \infty$  and  $b > 0$ : existence of ground state.** Let  $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  denote a minimizing sequence of  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0|_{\mathcal{S}(\mu)}$ . It follows from Lemma 2.4 that  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0|_{\mathcal{S}(\mu)}$  is coercive, so  $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{H}^1$ . Due to Lemma 3.2,  $E_{a,b}^0(\mu) < 0$ . As such, a standard argument involving concentration-compactness shows that there exists  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  such that, up to subsequence,  $(u_n := v_n(\cdot - x_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  does not admit subsequences that converge weakly to zero in  $\mathcal{H}^1$  (for details, see [27, p. 275–6]).

In particular, there exists  $u_\infty \in \mathcal{H}^1 \setminus \{0\}$  such that, up to subsequence,  $u_n \rightharpoonup u_\infty$  in  $\mathcal{H}^1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . If there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $u_n = u_\infty$  for every  $n \geq n_0$ , then there is nothing to prove. As such, we suppose that, up to subsequence,  $u_n \neq u_\infty$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . In view of the Kondrakov theorem, it also holds that, up to subsequence,  $u_n \rightarrow u_\infty$  a.e. as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

The norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}$  is weakly lower semicontinuous and  $u_\infty \not\equiv 0$ , so  $0 < \rho := \|u_\infty\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \leq \mu$ . We want to show that

$$\rho = \mu. \quad (3.3)$$

By contradiction, suppose that  $\rho < \mu$ . Clearly,

$$\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u_n) = \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u_\infty) + \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u_n - u_\infty) + (3.5) + (3.6), \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$\frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{A}(u_n) - \mathcal{A}(u_\infty) - \mathcal{A}(u_n - u_\infty)) \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{4}(\mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u_n) - \mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u_\infty) - \mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u_n - u_\infty)). \quad (3.6)$$

On one hand, the term (3.5) tends to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  because  $u_n \rightharpoonup u_\infty$  in  $\mathcal{H}^1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . On the other hand, (3.6) tends to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  due to Lemma 2.7. We deduce that

$$\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u_n) - \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u_\infty) - \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u_n - u_\infty) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (3.7)$$

Due to the weak convergence  $u_n \rightharpoonup u_\infty$  in  $\mathcal{H}^1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we deduce that  $\|u_n - u_\infty\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \rightarrow \mu - \rho$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . It follows that

$$\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u_n - u_\infty) - \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mu - \rho}{\delta_n}}(u_n - u_\infty)\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad (3.8)$$

where  $\delta_n := \|u_n - u_\infty\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2$ . In view of (3.7) and (3.8), we obtain

$$E_{a,b}^0(\mu) \geq E_{a,b}^0(\rho) + E_{a,b}^0(\mu - \rho).$$

This inequality contradicts Lemma 3.3, so (3.3) is satisfied.

We just proved that  $u_\infty \in \mathcal{S}(\mu)$ , so we only have to show that  $u_\infty$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0|_{\mathcal{S}(\mu)}$ . As  $\rho = \mu$ , it follows from (3.8) that  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u_n - u_\infty) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Finally, the result is a consequence of (3.7).

**Sign of the Lagrange multiplier.** On one hand,  $\mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u) < 0$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u) < 0$  because  $E_{a,b}^0(\mu) = \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u) < 0$ . On the other hand, the Nehari identity shows that

$$\omega\mu = \mathcal{A}(u) + \mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u) = 2\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u),$$

hence the result.  $\square$

## 4 Ground states of the nonautonomous problem

### 4.1 Proof of Proposition 1.2

**Proof of the first conclusion.** Let  $u$  denote a ground state of (1.11). We suppose that  $0 \not\equiv V \leq 0$  a.e., so

$$E_{a,b}^V(\mu) \leq \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^V(u) = \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{V}(u) = E_{a,b}^0(\mu) + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{V}(u)}_{<0} < E_{a,b}^0(\mu),$$

hence the result.

**Proof of the second conclusion.** Let  $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  denote a minimizing sequence of  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^{V_1}|_{\mathcal{S}(\mu)}$ . Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{a,b}^{V_1+V_2+V_3}(\mu) &\leq \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^{V_1}(u_n) + \frac{1}{2} \int (V_2(x) + V_3(x)) u_n(x)^2 \, dx \\ &\leq \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^{V_1}(u_n) + \frac{1}{2} \|V_2\|_{\mathcal{L}^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|u_n\|_{\mathcal{L}^6}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|V_3\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty} \mu. \end{aligned}$$

On one hand, it follows from Lemma 2.4 that  $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{H}^1$ . On the other hand,  $\mathcal{H}^1 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{L}^6$ . As such, we deduce that  $K := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2} \|u_n\|_{\mathcal{L}^6}^2 < \infty$ . Therefore,

$$E_{a,b}^{V_1+V_2+V_3}(\mu) \leq \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^{V_1}(u_n) + K \|V_2\|_{\mathcal{L}^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{1}{2} \|V_3\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty} \mu.$$

In view of Lemma 2.4, it suffices to take limits to conclude. □

## 4.2 Proof of Theorem 1.3

The case  $a = b = 0$  follows from the classical result [22, Theorem 11.5].

**Existence of ground state.** Suppose that  $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a minimizing sequence of  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^V|_{\mathcal{S}(\mu)}$ . It suffices to argue as in the proof of Theorem 1.1 to show that there exists  $u_\infty \in \mathcal{H}^1$  such that, up to subsequence,  $u_n \rightharpoonup u_\infty$  in  $\mathcal{H}^1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}$  is weakly lower semicontinuous and  $u_n \rightharpoonup u_\infty$  in  $\mathcal{H}^1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , so  $\|u_\infty\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \leq \mu$ . Let us prove that vanishing does not occur, i.e.,

$$u_\infty \not\equiv 0. \tag{4.1}$$

By contradiction, suppose that  $u_\infty \equiv 0$ . It follows from Lemma 2.6 that

$$E_{a,b}^V(\mu) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^V(u_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u_n) \geq E_{a,b}^0(\mu).$$

This inequality contradicts (H<sub>3</sub>), so (4.1) holds.

We just proved that  $u_\infty \not\equiv 0$ , so  $0 < \rho := \|u_\infty\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \leq \mu$ . If there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $u_n = u_\infty$  for every  $n \geq n_0$ , then there is nothing to prove. As such, suppose that  $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  has a subsequence such that  $u_n \neq u_\infty$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . In view of the Kondrakov theorem, it also holds that, up to subsequence,  $u_n \rightarrow u_\infty$  a.e. as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

By definition,

$$\mathcal{E}_{a,b}(u_n) = \mathcal{E}_{a,b}(u_\infty) \quad (4.2)$$

$$+ \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u_n - u_\infty) \quad (4.3)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{A}(u_n) - \mathcal{A}(u_\infty) - \mathcal{A}(u_n - u_\infty)) \quad (4.4)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{V}(u_n) - \mathcal{V}(u_\infty)) \quad (4.5)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4}(\mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u_n) - \mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u_\infty) - \mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u_n - u_\infty)). \quad (4.6)$$

First, consider the term (4.2). As  $K_{a,b} < 0$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E_{a,b}(\mu) &\leq \mathcal{E}_{a,b}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{\rho}}u_\infty\right) = \frac{\mu}{2\rho}\mathcal{A}(u_\infty) + \frac{\mu}{2\rho}\mathcal{V}(u_\infty) + \frac{\mu^2}{4\rho^2}\mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u_\infty) \\ &\leq \frac{\mu}{\rho}\mathcal{E}_{a,b}(u_\infty). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Now, consider the term (4.3). Let  $\delta_n := \|u_n - u_\infty\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2$ , so that  $\delta_n \rightarrow \mu - \rho < \mu$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . As argued for the previous term,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{a,b}^0(\mu) &\leq \mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{\delta_n}}(u_n - u_\infty)\right) = \frac{\mu}{2\delta_n}\mathcal{A}(u_n - u_\infty) + \frac{\mu^2}{4\delta_n^2}\mathcal{K}_{a,b}(u_n - u_\infty) \\ &\leq \frac{\mu}{\delta_n}\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u_n - u_\infty) \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . That is,

$$\mathcal{E}_{a,b}^0(u_n - u_\infty) \geq \frac{\delta_n}{\mu}E_{a,b}^0(\mu). \quad (4.8)$$

Let us show that the terms (4.4)–(4.6) tend to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Indeed, (4.4) tends to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  because  $u_n \rightharpoonup u_\infty$  in  $\mathcal{H}^1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The term (4.5) tends to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  due to Lemma 2.6. The term (4.6) also tends to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  due to Lemma 2.7. In view of (4.7), (4.8) and this discussion, we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_{a,b}(u_n) \geq \mathcal{E}_{a,b}(u_\infty) + \frac{\delta_n}{\mu}E_{a,b}^0(\mu) + o_n(1) \geq \frac{\rho}{\mu}E_{a,b}(\mu) + \frac{\delta_n}{\mu}E_{a,b}^0(\mu) + o_n(1). \quad (4.9)$$

Our next goal is to prove that

$$\|u_\infty\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \mu. \quad (4.10)$$

By contradiction, suppose that  $\rho < \mu$ . It follows from (4.9) that  $E_{a,b}(\mu) \geq E_{a,b}^0(\mu)$ . This contradicts (H<sub>3</sub>), so (4.10) holds.

We just proved that  $u_\infty \in \mathcal{S}(\mu)$ , so we only have to show that  $u_\infty$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}|_{\mathcal{S}(\mu)}$ . As  $\rho = \mu$ , it follows that  $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, we have  $\mathcal{E}_{a,b}(u_\infty) \leq E_{a,b}(\mu)$  due to (4.9). Finally, the result follows from the definition of  $E_{a,b}(\mu)$ .

**Sign of the Lagrange multiplier.** It suffices to argue as in the proof of Theorem 1.1.  $\square$

## 5 Asymptotic behavior of ground states

### 5.1 Case 1: $(a_n, b_n) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$

Consider the function defined as  $f(t) = \frac{1-e^{-ct}}{t}$  for every  $t > 0$ , where  $c$  denotes a fixed positive number. The following estimate is a consequence of the fact that  $f$  is strictly decreasing and  $f(0^+) = c$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *It holds that*

$$\int \int \frac{1 - e^{-c|x-y|}}{|x-y|} u(x)^2 u(y)^2 \, dx dy \leq c \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^4$$

for every  $c \in ]0, \infty[$  and  $u \in \mathcal{L}^2$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.5.* For the sake of simplicity, we omit the dependence on  $V$ . It is worth introducing a decomposition of  $K_{a_n, b_n}$ . Consider the functions  $K_{a_n, b_n}^\pm : \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined as

$$K_{a_n, b_n}^+(x) = \frac{4e^{-b_n|x|} - 4}{3|x|} \quad \text{and} \quad K_{a_n, b_n}^-(x) = \frac{e^{-a_n|x|} - 1}{3|x|},$$

so that  $K_{a_n, b_n} = K_{a_n, b_n}^+ - K_{a_n, b_n}^-$ .

Let us prove that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{a_n, b_n}(\mu) \leq E_{0,0}(\mu). \quad (5.1)$$

In view of [22, Theorem 11.5] (or Theorem 1.3 in the case  $a = b = 0$ ), we can let  $v_0$  denote a ground state of (1.4). It follows from the definition of  $v_0$  that

$$E_{0,0}(\mu) = \mathcal{E}_{0,0}(v_0) = \mathcal{E}_{a_n,b_n}(v_0) - \frac{1}{4}\mathcal{K}_{a_n,b_n}(v_0) \geq E_{a_n,b_n}(\mu) - \frac{1}{4}\mathcal{K}_{a_n,b_n}(v_0).$$

In view of the decomposition of  $K_{a_n,b_n}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{a_n,b_n}(v_0) &= \frac{4}{3} \int \int \frac{e^{-b_n|x-y|} - 1}{|x-y|} v_0(x)^2 v_0(y)^2 \, dx dy \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{3} \int \int \frac{e^{-a_n|x-y|} - 1}{|x-y|} v_0(x)^2 v_0(y)^2 \, dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.1 implies  $|\mathcal{K}_{a_n,b_n}(v_0)| \leq \frac{(4b_n+a_n)\mu^2}{3} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , hence the result.

As  $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mu)$ , a similar argument shows that  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{a_n,b_n}(\mu) \geq E_{0,0}(\mu)$ . In view of (5.1), we deduce that  $E_{a_n,b_n}(\mu) \rightarrow E_{0,0}(\mu)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a minimizing sequence of  $\mathcal{E}_{0,0}|_{\mathcal{S}(\mu)}$ . At this point, it suffices to argue as in the proof of Theorem 1.3 to finish.  $\square$

## 5.2 Case 2: $(a_n, b_n) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$

*Proof of Theorem 1.6.* Once again, we omit the dependence on  $V$ . Let us prove that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{a_n,b_n}(\mu) \leq E_{\infty,\infty}(\mu). \quad (5.2)$$

In view of Theorems 1.1 and 1.3, we can let  $v_\infty$  denote a ground state of (1.5). It follows from the definition of  $v_\infty$  that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\infty,\infty}(\mu) &= \mathcal{E}_{\infty,\infty}(v_\infty) = \mathcal{E}_{a_n,b_n}(v_\infty) - \frac{1}{12}(4\mathcal{D}_{b_n}(v_\infty) - \mathcal{D}_{a_n}(v_\infty)) \\ &\geq E_{a_n,b_n}(\mu) - \frac{1}{12}(4\mathcal{D}_{b_n}(v_\infty) - \mathcal{D}_{a_n}(v_\infty)). \end{aligned}$$

In view of the Sobolev embedding  $\mathcal{H}^1 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{L}^4$ , the result follows from Lemma 2.5.

Now, we want to show that

$$(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ is bounded in } \mathcal{H}^1. \quad (5.3)$$

It follows from (5.2) that  $(E_{a_n, b_n}(\mu))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded. In view of this fact, the result is a consequence of Lemma 2.4.

We proceed to the proof that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{a_n, b_n}(\mu) \geq E_{\infty, \infty}(\mu). \quad (5.4)$$

It follows from the definition of  $u_n$  that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{a_n, b_n}(\mu) &= \mathcal{E}_{a_n, b_n}(u_n) = \mathcal{E}_{\infty, \infty}(u_n) + \frac{1}{12}(4\mathcal{D}_{b_n}(u_n) - \mathcal{D}_{a_n}(u_n)) \\ &\geq E_{\infty, \infty}(\mu) + \frac{1}{12}(4\mathcal{D}_{b_n}(u_n) - \mathcal{D}_{a_n}(u_n)). \end{aligned}$$

In view of the embedding  $\mathcal{H}^1 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{L}^4$ , it follows from (5.3) that  $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{L}^4$ . As such, (5.4) follows from Lemma 2.5.

In view of (5.2) and (5.4), we deduce that  $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a minimizing sequence of  $\mathcal{E}_{\infty, \infty}|_{\mathcal{S}(\mu)}$ . At this point, there are two possible cases.

**Case 1:**  $V \equiv 0$ . In this case, it suffices to argue as in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

**Case 2:**  $V \not\equiv 0$ . In this case, it suffices to argue as in the proof of Theorem 1.3.  $\square$

### 5.3 Case 3: $(a_n, b_n) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$

*Proof of Theorem 1.7.* We omit the dependence on  $V$ . In this case, it is obvious that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{a_n, b_n}(\mu) \geq E_{0, \infty}(\mu). \quad (5.5)$$

Let us prove that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{a_n, b_n}(\mu) \leq E_{0, \infty}(\mu). \quad (5.6)$$

In view of Theorems 1.1 and 1.3, we can let  $v_\infty$  denote a ground state of (1.6). It follows from the definition of  $v_\infty$  that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{0, \infty}(\mu) &= \mathcal{E}_{0, \infty}(v_\infty) = \mathcal{E}_{a_n, b_n}(v_\infty) - \frac{1}{12}(4\mathcal{D}_{b_n}(v_\infty) - \mathcal{D}_{a_n}(v_\infty) + \mathcal{D}_0(v_\infty)) \\ &\geq E_{a_n, b_n}(\mu) - \frac{1}{12}(4\mathcal{D}_{b_n}(v_\infty) - \mathcal{D}_{a_n}(v_\infty) + \mathcal{D}_0(v_\infty)). \end{aligned}$$

On one hand, it suffices to argue as in the proof of Theorem 1.5 to deduce that  $\mathcal{D}_0(v_\infty) - \mathcal{D}_{a_n}(v_\infty) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . On the other hand, it suffices to argue as in the proof of Theorem 1.6 to deduce that  $\mathcal{D}_{b_n}(u_n) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We conclude that (5.6) holds. In view of (5.5) and (5.6),  $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a minimizing sequence of  $\mathcal{E}_{0,\infty}|_{\mathcal{S}(\mu)}$ .

**Case 1:**  $V \equiv 0$ . In this case, it suffices to argue as in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

**Case 2:**  $V \not\equiv 0$ . In this case, it suffices to argue as in the proof of Theorem 1.3.  $\square$

## A Physical motivation

### A.1 Electromagnetic self-force

It is classical that an accelerating electrically charged body loses energy due to electromagnetic radiation (see [1, 28], for instance). This phenomenon is usually modeled by means of an *electromagnetic self-force* acting over the aforementioned body.

A naive application of the Maxwell theory predicts that an accelerating charged point particle suffers an infinite self-force. Indeed, a charged point particle at  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$  in vacuum has an associated electric potential  $\phi(x) = \frac{q}{4\pi\epsilon_0|x|}$ , where  $q \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  denotes the charge of the particle and  $\epsilon_0$  denotes the *vacuum permittivity*. In particular, the energy of the ensuing electric field is infinite,  $\frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \int |\nabla\phi(x)|^2 dx = \infty$ , and the divergence of this integral is intimately related with the divergence of the electromagnetic self-force (see [1, Section 4.1]).

The standard procedure to deal with these divergences involves renormalization arguments. In particular, the resulting equation of motion becomes a third order differential equation, called the *Abraham–Lorentz equation*. Nonetheless, there is no consensus that this approach is always the preferred one due to some inconvenient unphysical consequences of third order equations (see [1, Section 1]).

To avoid these problems, another possible approach is to consider alternative electromagnetic theories under which charged point particles do not induce electric fields with infinite energy. One of the simplest examples of



this kind of theories is the Bopp–Landé–Thomas–Podolsky (BLTP) theory (see [1, Section 2.3]).

## A.2 Gravitational self-force and a family of fourth-order gravity theories

In classical physics, the gravitational and electric potentials are described by very similar equations. Indeed, given an electric charge density  $\rho_{\text{Charge}}: \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and a mass density  $\rho_{\text{Mass}}: \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow [0, \infty[$ , the respectively generated potentials are described by the laws that follow:

$$-\Delta\phi_{\text{Maxwell}} = \varepsilon_0^{-1}\rho_{\text{Charge}} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta\phi_{\text{Newton}} = 4\pi G\rho_{\text{Mass}}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where  $G$  denotes the *Newtonian gravitational constant*.

Similar to the aforementioned electromagnetic radiation, it follows from general relativity that an accelerating massive point particle also loses energy due to gravitational radiation and thus suffers a reaction by means of a gravitational self-force. Due to the analogy (A.1), the energy of the gravitational field generated by a massive point particle is also infinite and we obtain a divergent self-force once again. In view of this problem, Perlick suggested the consideration of modified gravity theories inspired by BLTP electrodynamics in order to obtain a model where we can avoid these divergences (see [1, Section 5]).

Motivated by this suggestion, we consider a family of modified gravity theories described by Lagrangian densities of the form

$$L_g = \frac{1}{8\pi G} \left( \frac{R}{2} + \alpha R_{\mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu} + \beta R^2 \right), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where  $g$  denotes a Lorentzian metric;  $\alpha, \beta$  denote real-valued dimensionless constants;  $R_{\mu\nu}$  denotes the local expression of the entries of the Ricci tensor induced by  $g$  and  $R$  denotes the scalar curvature induced by  $g$ . In fact, this family of theories was studied in detail in Stelle’s seminal paper [29].

Let us recall a few facts about this theory as in [30, Section 3.5]. Physical considerations indicate that we should suppose that  $\alpha \geq 0$  and  $\alpha + 3\beta \leq 0$ . A comparison with the Proca equation suggests respectively defining the expected masses of the spin-0 and spin-2 graviton as  $a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-4(\alpha+3\beta)}}$  and  $b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\alpha}}$ . Finally, in the Newtonian limit of this theory, the gravitational potential generated by a point particle with mass  $m$  at the origin becomes given by  $\phi(x) = mK_{a,b}(x)$ .

### A.3 Coupling the Schrödinger equation with fourth-order gravity

The following *Schrödinger–Newton system* was originally proposed by Diósi in [31] as a model for the wave function of a quantum particle with mass  $m$  in a theory where only matter fields are quantized and the gravitational field remains classical at the fundamental level:

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\Delta\psi + m\phi\psi = i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t}; \\ \Delta\phi = 4\pi Gm|\psi|^2 \end{cases} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where  $\hbar$  denotes the *Planck constant*. It is easy to verify that  $|\cdot|^{-1}$  provides a distributional solution to the problem  $-\Delta v = 4\pi\delta_0$ , so the standard procedure to obtain solutions to (A.3) involves considering the following nonlocal semilinear problem:

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\Delta\psi - Gm^2\left(|\cdot|^{-1} * |\psi|^2\right)\psi = i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t}.^3 \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Motivated by the previous sections, this paper considers the analogous problem obtained by considering the gravitational potential of a point particle obtained in the Newtonian limit of the gravity theory with Lagrangian density (A.2), that is,

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\Delta\psi + Gm^2\left(K_{a,b} * |\psi|^2\right)\psi = i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Suppose that  $\psi$  is of the form  $\psi(x, t) = v(x) \exp(-\frac{i\tilde{\omega}t}{\hbar})$  for certain  $v: \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\tilde{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $\psi$  solves (A.5) if, and only if,

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\Delta v - \tilde{\omega}v + Gm^2(K_{a,b} * v^2)v = 0.$$

By setting  $\omega = \frac{2m\tilde{\omega}}{\hbar^2}$  and  $u = \frac{\sqrt{2Gm^3}}{\hbar}v$ , we obtain

$$-\Delta u - \omega u + (K_{a,b} * u^2)u = 0.$$

This equation inspired the study of the normalized problem (1.1).

---

<sup>3</sup>For a rigorous justification of this reduction procedure, we refer the reader to [4, Section 4] or [32, Section 3].

## B A study of the function $K_{a,b}$

Let  $k_{a,b}: ]0, \infty[ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be given by

$$k_{a,b}(r) = \frac{1}{r} \left( \frac{4}{3}e^{-br} - \frac{1}{3}e^{-ar} - 1 \right),$$

so that  $K_{a,b}(x) = k_{a,b}(|x|)$ .

**Singular case**  $\{a, b\} \cap \{0, \infty\} \neq \emptyset$ . The next table contains a list of the explicit expressions of  $k_{a,b}$  in the singular case  $\{a, b\} \cap \{0, \infty\} \neq \emptyset$ .

Case	$k_{a,b}(r)$	Graph
$a = b = 0$	$\equiv 0$	-
$a = 0, 0 < b < \infty$	$-\frac{4}{3r}(1 - e^{-br})$	Fig. 2
$0 = a < b = \infty$	$-\frac{4}{3r}$	Fig. 1
$0 < a < \infty, b = \infty$	$-\frac{1}{r}(1 + \frac{1}{3}e^{-ar})$	Fig. 1
$a = b = \infty$	$-\frac{1}{r}$	Fig. 1
$a = \infty, 0 < b < \infty$	$\frac{1}{r}(\frac{4}{3}e^{-br} - 1)$	Fig. 7
$0 = b < a = \infty$	$\frac{1}{3r}$	Fig. 9
$0 = b < a < \infty$	$\frac{1}{3r}(1 - e^{-ar})$	Fig. 8

Table 2: Singular cases of  $a, b$ .

**Case**  $0 < a \leq 2b < \infty$ . Let us prove analytically that the possible geometries of  $k_{a,b}$  are illustrated in Figures 2, 3. First, we show that  $k_{a,b}$  is nondecreasing. It is clear that  $k'_{a,b}(r) = \frac{f(r)}{3r^2}$ , where

$$f(r) := r \left( ae^{-ar} - 4be^{-br} \right) + 3 + e^{-ar} - 4e^{-br}.$$

As such, we only have to prove that  $f$  is nonnegative. It follows from calculus that

$$f'(r) = r(-a^2e^{-ar} + 4b^2e^{-br}).$$

We deduce that  $r_0 > 0$  is a critical point of  $f$  if, and only if,  $e^{(b-a)r_0} = \frac{4b^2}{a^2}$ . There are two possible cases.

1.  $a < b$ . In this case,  $f$  admits a unique critical point on  $]0, \infty[$ ,  $r_0 = \frac{1}{b-a} \log\left(\frac{4b^2}{a^2}\right)$ . As  $f''(0^+) > 0$  and  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} f(r) = 3$ , we deduce that  $f(r_0) > 0$ . In particular, it follows that  $f$  is positive.
2.  $b \leq a \leq 2b$ . As  $\frac{4b^2}{a^2} \geq 1$  and  $b - a \leq 0$ , we deduce that  $f$  has no critical points. As  $f''(0^+) \geq 0$ , it follows that  $f$  only takes positive values.

**Case**  $0 < 2b < a < \infty$ . It suffices to argue as before to verify that  $r_1 = \frac{1}{a-b} \log\left(\frac{a^2}{4b^2}\right) > 0$  is the unique critical point of  $k_{a,b}$  on  $]0, \infty[$ . A Taylor expansion shows that

$$k_{a,b}(r) = \frac{a-4b}{3} + \frac{4b^2-a^2}{6}r + O(r^2)$$

in a neighborhood of  $r = 0$ . As such, it is clear that  $k'_{a,b}(0^+) < 0$  and it suffices to consider the different cases  $a < 4b$ ,  $a = 4b$ ,  $4b < a$  to obtain the geometries illustrated in Figures 4–6.




Figure 1:  $0 \leq a \leq 2b = \infty$




Figure 2:  $0 \leq a < 2b < \infty$




Figure 3:  $0 < a = 2b < \infty$




Figure 4:  $0 < 2b < a < 4b < \infty$




Figure 5:  $0 < a = 4b < \infty$




Figure 6:  $0 < 4b < a < \infty$




Figure 7:  $0 < 4b < a = \infty$




Figure 8:  $0 = 4b < a < \infty$




Figure 9:  $0 = 4b < a = \infty$

## References

- [1] Volker Perlick. “On the Self-force in Electrodynamics and Implications for Gravity”. In: *Equations of Motion in Relativistic Gravity*. Ed. by Dirk Puetzfeld, Claus Lämmerzahl, and Bernard Schutz. Vol. 179. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2015, pp. 523–542. ISBN: 978-3-319-18334-3. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-18335-0\_15.
- [2] Eric Poisson. “The Gravitational Self-Force”. In: *General Relativity and Gravitation*. RDS Convention Centre, Dublin: World Scientific, Nov. 2005, pp. 119–141. ISBN: 978-981-256-424-5. DOI: 10.1142/9789812701688\_0012.
- [3] Qi Zhang and Ting Rong. “Normalized Solution to Schrödinger System with Bopp–Podolsky-type Self-Attraction”. In: *J. Math. Phys.* 66.12 (Dec. 2025), p. 121504. ISSN: 0022-2488, 1089-7658. DOI: 10.1063/5.0283840.
- [4] Vieri Benci and Donato Fortunato. “An Eigenvalue Problem for the Schrödinger-Maxwell Equations”. In: *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.* 11.2 (June 1998), p. 283. ISSN: 1230-3429. DOI: 10.12775/TMNA.1998.019.
- [5] Pietro d’Avenia and Gaetano Siciliano. “Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation in the Bopp–Podolsky Electrodynamics: Solutions in the Electrostatic Case”. In: *J. Differential Equations* 267.2 (July 2019), pp. 1025–1065. ISSN: 00220396. DOI: 10.1016/j.jde.2019.02.001.
- [6] Elliott H. Lieb. “Existence and Uniqueness of the Minimizing Solution of Choquard’s Nonlinear Equation”. In: *Stud. Appl. Math.* 57.2 (Oct. 1977), pp. 93–105. ISSN: 0022-2526, 1467-9590. DOI: 10.1002/sapm197757293.
- [7] P.L. Lions. “The Choquard Equation and Related Questions”. In: *Nonlinear Anal.* 4.6 (1980), pp. 1063–1072. ISSN: 0362-546X. DOI: 10.1016/0362-546X(80)90016-4.
- [8] Vitaly Moroz and Jean Van Schaftingen. “A Guide to the Choquard Equation”. In: *J. Fixed Point Theory Appl.* 19.1 (Mar. 2017), pp. 773–813. ISSN: 1661-7746. DOI: 10.1007/s11784-016-0373-1.

- [9] Divyang Bhimani, Tianxiang Gou, and Hichem Hajaiej. “Normalized Solutions to Nonlinear Schrödinger Equations with Competing Hartree-type Nonlinearities”. In: *Math. Nachr.* 297.7 (July 2024), pp. 2543–2580. ISSN: 0025-584X, 1522-2616. DOI: 10.1002/mana.202200443.
- [10] Daomin Cao, Huifang Jia, and Xiao Luo. “Variational Problem with Repulsive-Attractive Kernels and Its Application”. In: *J. Funct. Anal.* 289.12 (Dec. 2025), p. 111187. ISSN: 00221236. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfa.2025.111187.
- [11] Lei Long, Fuyi Li, and Ting Rong. “Normalized Solutions to the Critical Choquard-type Equations with Weakly Attractive Potential and Nonlocal Perturbation”. In: *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.* 74.5 (Oct. 2023), p. 193. ISSN: 0044-2275, 1420-9039. DOI: 10.1007/s00033-023-02090-x.
- [12] Xin Song and Li Wang. “Normalized Solutions of Planar Schrödinger-Poisson System Involving Moser-Trudinger Critical Growth and Potential”. In: *Results Math.* 80.5 (Aug. 2025), p. 158. ISSN: 1422-6383, 1420-9012. DOI: 10.1007/s00025-025-02470-x.
- [13] Liejun Shen and Marco Squassina. “Concentrating Normalized Solutions for 2D Nonlocal Schrödinger Equations with Critical Exponential Growth”. In: *Electron. J. Differential Equations* 2025 (Apr. 2025), p. 34. ISSN: 1072-6691. DOI: 10.58997/ejde.2025.34.
- [14] Norihisa Ikoma and Yasuhito Miyamoto. “Stable Standing Waves of Nonlinear Schrödinger Equations with Potentials and General Nonlinearities”. In: *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 59.2 (Apr. 2020), p. 48. ISSN: 0944-2669, 1432-0835. DOI: 10.1007/s00526-020-1703-0.
- [15] Zuo Yang, Shijie Qi, and Wenming Zou. “Normalized Solutions of Nonlinear Schrödinger Equations with Potentials and Non-autonomous Nonlinearities”. In: *J. Geom. Anal.* 32.5 (May 2022), p. 159. ISSN: 1050-6926, 1559-002X. DOI: 10.1007/s12220-022-00897-0.
- [16] Claudianor O. Alves and Chao Ji. “Normalized Solutions for the Schrödinger Equations with  $L^2$ -Subcritical Growth and Different Types of Potentials”. In: *J Geom. Anal.* 32.5 (May 2022), p. 165. ISSN: 1050-6926, 1559-002X. DOI: 10.1007/s12220-022-00908-0.



- [17] Louis Jeanjean. “Existence of Solutions with Prescribed Norm for Semilinear Elliptic Equations”. In: *Nonlinear Anal.* 28.10 (May 1997), pp. 1633–1659. ISSN: 0362546X. DOI: 10.1016/S0362-546X(96)00021-1.
- [18] Thomas Bartsch and Nicola Soave. “A Natural Constraint Approach to Normalized Solutions of Nonlinear Schrödinger Equations and Systems”. In: *J. Funct. Anal.* 272.12 (June 2017), pp. 4998–5037. ISSN: 00221236. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfa.2017.01.025.
- [19] Yanheng Ding and Xuexiu Zhong. “Normalized Solution to the Schrödinger Equation with Potential and General Nonlinear Term: Mass Super-Critical Case”. In: *J. Differential Equations* 334 (Oct. 2022), pp. 194–215. ISSN: 00220396. DOI: 10.1016/j.jde.2022.06.013.
- [20] P.L. Lions. “The Concentration-Compactness Principle in the Calculus of Variations. The Locally Compact Case, Part 1.” In: *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire* 1.2 (Apr. 1984), pp. 109–145. ISSN: 0294-1449, 1873-1430. DOI: 10.1016/s0294-1449(16)30428-0.
- [21] Van Duong Dinh. “Blow-up Behavior of Prescribed Mass Minimizers for Nonlinear Choquard Equations with Singular Potentials”. In: *Monatsh. Math.* 192.3 (July 2020), pp. 551–589. ISSN: 0026-9255, 1436-5081. DOI: 10.1007/s00605-020-01387-7.
- [22] Elliott Lieb and Michael Loss. *Analysis*. Second. Vol. 14. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. Providence, Rhode Island: American Mathematical Society, Mar. 2001. ISBN: 978-0-8218-2783-3. DOI: 10.1090/gsm/014.
- [23] César R. de Oliveira. *Intermediate Spectral Theory and Quantum Dynamics*. Basel: Birkhäuser Basel, 2009. ISBN: 978-3-7643-8794-5. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-7643-8795-2.
- [24] Giovanni Leoni. *A First Course in Sobolev Spaces*. 2nd ed. Vol. 181. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 2017, pp. xxii+734. ISBN: 978-1-4704-2921-8. DOI: 10.1090/gsm/181.

- [25] Leiga Zhao and Fukun Zhao. “On the Existence of Solutions for the Schrödinger–Poisson Equations”. In: *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 346.1 (Oct. 2008), pp. 155–169. ISSN: 0022247X. DOI: 10.1016/j.jmaa.2008.04.053.
- [26] Eduardo Böer and Ederson Moreira Dos Santos. “Standing Waves for Nonlinear Hartree Type Equations: Existence and Qualitative Properties”. In: *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 64.5 (June 2025), p. 164. ISSN: 0944-2669, 1432-0835. DOI: 10.1007/s00526-025-03025-2.
- [27] Jacopo Bellazzini and Gaetano Siciliano. “Stable Standing Waves for a Class of Nonlinear Schrödinger-Poisson Equations”. In: *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.* 62.2 (Apr. 2011), pp. 267–280. ISSN: 0044-2275, 1420-9039. DOI: 10.1007/s00033-010-0092-1.
- [28] Eric Poisson, Adam Pound, and Ian Vega. “The Motion of Point Particles in Curved Spacetime”. In: *Living Rev. Relativ.* 14.1 (Dec. 2011), p. 7. ISSN: 2367-3613, 1433-8351. DOI: 10.12942/lrr-2011-7.
- [29] K. S. Stelle. “Classical Gravity with Higher Derivatives”. In: *Gen. Relativ. Gravitation* 9.4 (Apr. 1978), pp. 353–371. ISSN: 0001-7701, 1572-9532. DOI: 10.1007/BF00760427.
- [30] Hans-Jürgen Schmidt. “Fourth Order Gravity: Equations, History, and Applications to Cosmology”. In: *Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys.* 04.02 (Mar. 2007), pp. 209–248. ISSN: 0219-8878, 1793-6977. DOI: 10.1142/S0219887807001977.
- [31] L. Diósi. “Gravitation and Quantum-Mechanical Localization of Macro-Objects”. In: *Physics Letters A* 105.4-5 (Oct. 1984), pp. 199–202. ISSN: 03759601. DOI: 10.1016/0375-9601(84)90397-9.
- [32] Vieri Benci and Donato Fortunato. “Solitary Waves of the Nonlinear Klein-Gordon Equation Coupled with the Maxwell Equations”. In: *Rev. Math. Phys.* 14.4 (2002), pp. 409–420. ISSN: 0129-055X. DOI: 10.1142/S0129055X02001168.