

Existence and (in)stability of standing waves for the nonlinear Schrödinger Equations on looping-edge graphs with δ' -type interactions

Jaime Angulo Pava and Alexander Muñoz

Department of Mathematics, IME-USP
Rua do Matão 1010, Cidade Universitária, CEP 05508-090, São Paulo, SP, Brazil.
angulo@ime.usp.br, alexd@usp.br

Abstract

In this work, we investigate the existence and orbital (in)stability of several branches of standing-wave solutions for the cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation (NLS) posed on a looping-edge graph \mathcal{G} , consisting of a circle and a finite number N of infinite half-lines attached to a common vertex. The model is endowed with δ' -type interaction boundary conditions at the vertex, which enforce continuity of the derivatives of the wave functions, while continuity of the wave function itself is not required. By means of the Implicit Function Theorem, we establish the existence of families of standing-wave profiles that converge, on the circular component of the graph, to Jacobi elliptic solutions of dnoidal type, coupled with soliton-type tail profiles on the half-lines. Tools from perturbation theory and Kreĭn-von Neumann extension theory for symmetric operators play a central role in the (in)stability analysis of such standing wave solutions. Our approach may be extended to other bound states for the NLS on looping graphs or more general non-compact metric graphs.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020). Primary 35Q51, 35Q55, 81Q35, 35R02; Secondary 47E05.

Key words. Schrödinger equation, quantum graphs, extension theory of symmetric operators, perturbation theory.

1 Introduction

In recent years, the nonlinear Schrödinger equation (NLS)

$$i\mathbf{U}_t + \Delta \mathbf{U} + |\mathbf{U}|^{p-1} \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{0}, \quad p > 1, \quad (1.1)$$

has been extensively studied on various classes of metric graphs \mathcal{G} , including star graphs, tadpole graphs, flower graphs, dumbbell graphs, double-bridge graphs, and periodic ring graphs; see the review paper [40]. For a vector-valued function $\mathbf{U}(x_e, t) = (u_e(x_e, t))_{e \in E}$, the nonlinearity acts componentwise, namely

$$(|\mathbf{U}|^{p-1} \mathbf{U})_e = |u_e|^{p-1} u_e,$$

and the Laplacian Δ is realized as a self-adjoint operator on $L^2(\mathcal{G})$, whose domain encodes the coupling conditions at the graph vertices. Formally, its action is given by

$$-\Delta : (u_e)_{e \in E} \mapsto (-u_e'')_{e \in E}. \quad (1.2)$$

The existence of standing waves, their orbital stability properties, and the well-posedness of (1.1) have been the subject of intense research for a wide range of graph geometries; see, for instance, [1, 2, 13, 14, 26, 39–41, 46, 51–54] and the references therein.

The aim of the present paper is to shed new light on the dynamics of standing wave solutions of (1.1) posed on looping-edge graphs \mathcal{G}_N , consisting of a ring with N half-lines attached at a single vertex (see Figure 1). Identifying the ring with the interval $[-L, L]$ and each half-line with $[L, +\infty)$, we obtain a metric graph \mathcal{G}_N whose edge set is $E = \{e_j\}$, where $e_0 = [-L, L]$ and $e_j = [L, +\infty)$ for $j = 1, \dots, N$, all connected at the vertex $\nu = L$. A wave function on \mathcal{G}_N is written as

$$\mathbf{U} = (\phi, (\psi_j)_{j=1}^N),$$

with $\phi : [-L, L] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and $\psi_j : [L, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

The operator $-\Delta$ on \mathcal{G}_N is considered with the two-parameter family of domains

$$D_{Z_1, Z_2, N} := \left\{ \mathbf{U} \in H^2(\mathcal{G}_N) \mid \begin{aligned} &\phi(L) = \phi(-L), \quad \phi'(L) = \psi'_1(L) = \dots = \psi'_N(L), \\ &\phi'(L) - \phi'(-L) = Z_2\phi(-L), \quad \sum_{j=1}^N \psi_j(L) = Z_1\psi'_1(L) \end{aligned} \right\}, \quad (1.3)$$

where $Z_1, Z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$H^n(\mathcal{G}_N) = H^n(-L, L) \oplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^N H^n(L, +\infty).$$

The boundary conditions in (1.3) are of δ' -type and enforce continuity of the derivatives at the vertex, without requiring continuity of the wave function itself. The operator $(-\Delta, D_{Z_1, Z_2, N})$ is self-adjoint for all $Z_1, Z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. The identification of such self-adjoint extensions was obtained based on boundary system techniques and Krein space methods [59], rather than on the classical von Neumann deficiency index theory [7, 11, 57] or Nevanlinna pairs [23, 44]. This approach has previously been applied successfully to KdV-type equations on similar graphs in [17]. Domains of the form (1.3) also arise in models of electron transport in thin metallic networks, known as quantum wire networks [32, 35].

The NLS with domains $D_{Z_1, Z_2, N}$ was recently investigated by Angulo and Muñoz [16] in the case $Z_2 = 0$ and $Z_1 < 0$, corresponding to periodic profiles on the ring. In the present work, we focus on the regime $Z_2 \neq 0$.

Our main interest lies in the existence and stability of standing wave solutions of (1.1) on \mathcal{G}_N , namely solutions of the form

$$\mathbf{U}(x, t) = e^{i\omega t} \Theta(x), \quad \omega > 0, \quad (1.4)$$

where $\Theta = (\Phi, \Psi) \in D_{Z_1, Z_2, N}$ satisfies the stationary equation

$$-\Delta\Theta + \omega\Theta - |\Theta|^{p-1}\Theta = 0. \quad (1.5)$$

Equivalently, Φ and $\Psi = (\psi_j)_{j=1}^N$ solve the system

$$\begin{cases} -\Phi''(x) + \omega\Phi(x) - |\Phi(x)|^{p-1}\Phi(x) = 0, & x \in (-L, L), \\ -\psi_j''(x) + \omega\psi_j(x) - |\psi_j(x)|^{p-1}\psi_j(x) = 0, & x \in (L, +\infty), \\ \Phi(L) = \Phi(-L), \quad \Phi'(L) = \psi'_1(L) = \dots = \psi'_N(L), \\ \Phi'(L) - \Phi'(-L) = Z_2\Phi(L), \quad \sum_{j=1}^N \psi_j(L) = Z_1\psi'_1(L), \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

with $Z_1, Z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Positive solutions on the half-lines necessarily have soliton profiles of the form

$$\psi_j(x) = \left(\frac{(p+1)\omega}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \operatorname{sech}^{\frac{2}{p-1}} \left(\frac{(p-1)\sqrt{\omega}}{2}(x - L) + a_j \right), \quad x \geq L, \quad (1.7)$$

where the shifts a_j depend on the boundary conditions. A complete classification of solutions to (1.6) for $Z_2 \neq 0$ is currently unknown. In the case $Z_2 = 0$, $Z_1 < 0$, and $\psi_1 = \dots = \psi_N$, Angulo and Muñoz [16] constructed solutions with Φ given by a positive dnoidal Jacobi elliptic function and ψ_j given by translated soliton tails for $p = 3$, with explicit shifts

$$a_j(\omega) = \tanh^{-1} \left(-\frac{N}{Z_1 \sqrt{\omega}} \right), \quad \omega > \frac{N^2}{Z_1^2}.$$

In this manuscript, we extend the analysis in [16] by considering the case $Z_2 < 0$ and $Z_1 < 0$. Our main results address both the existence and the orbital stability properties of standing wave solutions for the NLS (1.1) posed on the looping-edge graph \mathcal{G}_N . The first result establishes the persistence, under δ' -type perturbations at the vertex, of the dnoidal-type standing waves constructed in the periodic case $Z_2 = 0$, giving rise to smooth local branches of solutions with $Z_2 \neq 0$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $L > 0$, $Z_1 < 0$, and $N \geq 1$. Consider $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ the open set defined in Theorem 3.2 below (see also [16, Theorem 4.9]). For every fixed $\omega_0 \in I$, there exist $\delta, \gamma > 0$ and a unique smooth map*

$$\omega \in (\omega_0 - \delta, \omega_0 + \delta) \subset I \longmapsto (\mathbf{U}(\omega), Z_2(\omega)) \in D_{Z_1, Z_2(\omega), N} \times (-\gamma, \gamma)$$

of solutions to system (1.6), such that $\mathbf{U}(\omega_0) = \mathbf{U}_0$ and $Z_2(\omega_0) = 0$, where \mathbf{U}_0 is the dnoidal-translated plus tail profile Θ_{ω_0} defined in Theorem 3.2 with $\omega = \omega_0$. Moreover,

$$\mathbf{U}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{U}_0 \text{ in } H^2(\mathcal{G}) \quad \text{and} \quad Z_2(\omega) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \omega \rightarrow \omega_0.$$

In Theorem 4.2 (below) we complement Theorem 1.1 by showing that, when N is even, the bifurcating branch of standing waves persists within certain symmetric invariant subspaces

$$D_{Z_1, Z_2(\omega), N} \cap (L^2([-L, L]) \times L^2_{\frac{N}{2}}(\Gamma)) \quad (1.8)$$

(see (3.12) for a precise definition) yielding solutions with additional symmetry on the half-lines.

The second part of this work provides a complete orbital stability and instability characterization for the standing waves obtained in Theorem 1.1, depending on the frequency regime and the geometry of the graph. Namely, we prove in Section 7 the following result.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $L > 0$, $Z_1 < 0$, and $N \geq 1$. For every fixed $\omega_0 \in I$, consider the C^1 map*

$$\omega \in (\omega_0 - \delta, \omega_0 + \delta) \subset I \longmapsto (\mathbf{U}(\omega), Z_2(\omega)) \in D_{Z_1, Z_2(\omega), N} \times (-\gamma, \gamma)$$

of solutions to system (1.6) established in Theorem 1.1, for some $\delta, \gamma > 0$. Then:

- (i) *If $\omega_0 + \delta < \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2}$, then $e^{i\omega t} \mathbf{U}(\omega)$ is orbitally stable in $H^1(\mathcal{G})$ for all $\omega \in (\omega_0 - \delta, \omega_0 + \delta) \subset I$.*
- (ii) *If $\omega_0 - \delta > \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2}$ and N is even, then $e^{i\omega t} \mathbf{U}(\omega)$ is orbitally unstable in $H^1(\mathcal{G})$ for all $\omega \in (\omega_0 - \delta_1, \omega_0 + \delta_1) \subset I$, where $0 < \delta_1 \leq \delta$.*

The proof of part (ii) of Theorem 1.2 rely on the orbital instability of the partially symmetric standing waves obtained in Theorem 4.2 for the invariant subspace (1.8). We describe such results in Theorem 7.1 below.

Organization of the paper. Section 2 introduces notation and preliminary material. In Section 3, we review the pure periodic case $Z_2 = 0$, $Z_1 < 0$, including the existence and stability of standing waves. Section 4 is devoted to the existence theory for $Z_2, Z_1 < 0$ while in Section 5 we perform the associated spectral analysis. Section 6 addresses the Cauchy problem, and Section 7 is devoted to the stability theory.

2 Notation

Let $-\infty \leq a < b \leq \infty$. We denote by $L^2(a, b)$ the Hilbert space equipped with the inner product $(u, v) = \int_a^b u(x) \overline{v(x)} dx$. By $H^n(\Omega)$ we denote the classical Sobolev spaces on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$ with the usual norm. For a metric looping-edge graph \mathcal{G} , we define the $L^p(\mathcal{G})$ -spaces by $L^p(\mathcal{G}) = L^p(-L, L) \oplus \bigoplus_j L^p(L, +\infty)$, $p > 1$, with the natural norms. For $\mathbf{U} = (f, \{g_j\})$, $\mathbf{V} = (\tilde{f}, \{\tilde{g}_j\}) \in L^2(\mathcal{G})$, the natural inner product in $L^2(\mathcal{G})$ is defined by $[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}] = \int_{-L}^L f(x) \overline{\tilde{f}(x)} dx + \sum_{j=1}^N \int_L^\infty g_j(x) \overline{\tilde{g}_j(x)} dx$. For any $n \geq 0$, we have the $H^n(\mathcal{G})$ -Sobolev spaces, $H^n(\mathcal{G}) = H^n(-L, L) \oplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^N H^n(L, +\infty)$.

Let A be a closed densely defined symmetric operator in the Hilbert space H . The domain of A is denoted by $D(A)$. The deficiency indices of A are denoted by $n_\pm(A) := \dim \ker(A^* \mp iI)$, with A^* denoting the adjoint operator of A . The number of negative eigenvalues counting multiplicities (or Morse index) of A is denoted by $n(A)$.

3 Review of the pure periodic case $Z_2 = 0$ and $Z_1 < 0$.

In this section, we present several preliminary results that provide the analytical foundation for the existence and orbital (in)stability analysis of standing waves constructed via bifurcation arguments based on the Implicit Function Theorem and subsequently studied through perturbation theory in the forthcoming sections.

3.1 Existence theory of standing waves

For sake of completeness, we begin with a rough overview of the existence results associated to shifted dnoidal profiles on the circle together with tail solitons on the half-lines.

In the case of a compact interval $[-L, L]$ it was shown in [10] the existence of dnoidal solutions to the stationary equation (1.5) with $p = 3$ in the following sense:

Proposition 3.1. *Let $L > 0$ arbitrary but fixed. Then, there exists a smooth mapping of periodic functions $\omega \in (\frac{\pi^2}{2L^2}, +\infty) \rightarrow \Phi_\omega \in H_{per}^1([-L, L])$ such that the periodic profile Φ_ω satisfies*

$$-\Phi_\omega''(x) + \omega \Phi_\omega(x) - \Phi_\omega^3(x) = 0, \quad x \in [-L, L], \quad (3.1)$$

and with a profile of dnoidal type, namely,

$$\Phi_\omega(x) = \eta_1 dn\left(\frac{\eta_1}{\sqrt{2}}x; k\right) \quad (3.2)$$

with the elliptic modulus $k \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$k^2(\eta, \omega) = \frac{2\omega - 2\eta_2^2}{2\omega - \eta_2^2}, \quad \eta_1^2 + \eta_2^2 = 2\omega, \quad 0 < \eta_2 < \eta_1. \quad (3.3)$$

Moreover, $k = k(\omega)$, $\eta_i = \eta_i(\omega)$ are smooth functions for $\omega \in (\frac{\pi^2}{2L^2}, +\infty)$, with the map $\omega \rightarrow k(\omega)$ being strictly increasing.

Proof. See Theorem 2.1 in [10]. □

In [16], standing-wave solutions of (1.1) of the form (1.4) with $\Theta = (\Phi, \Psi_1, \Psi_2, \dots, \Psi_N) \in D_{Z_1, 0, N}$ and $Z_1 < 0$, were constructed. Based on Proposition 3.1, the profile Φ is given by a translation of a dnoidal solution, while each Ψ_j corresponds to a tail-soliton profile (see also Figure 1). Each Ψ_j is explicitly given by (1.7), and the symmetry condition

$$\Psi_1 = \Psi_2 = \dots = \Psi_N \equiv \Psi$$




Figure 1: Orange: homoclinic orbit for the standing NLS equation for positive solutions. Green: Soliton tail to be considered. Red: the line $v = \frac{N}{Z_1} u$. Blue: intersection points of the periodic orbit at the derivative level of q . Purple: inner periodic orbit starting and ending at the same q_i . Purple + Green: a feasible profile $\Theta \in D_{Z_1,0,N}$.

holds. Consequently, the translation parameters satisfy $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_N \equiv \gamma_*$, and the common tail profile $\Psi = \Psi_{\omega, Z_1, N}$ is given by

$$\Psi_{\omega, Z_1, N}(x) = \sqrt{2\omega} \operatorname{sech} \left(\sqrt{\omega}(x - L) + \tanh^{-1} \left(\frac{-N}{Z_1 \sqrt{\omega}} \right) \right), \quad x \geq L, \quad (3.4)$$

for $\omega > \frac{N^2}{Z_1^2}$ and $Z_1 < 0$. In this case, the boundary condition

$$N\Psi_{\omega, Z_1, N}(L) = Z_1\Psi'_{\omega, Z_1, N}(L)$$

is satisfied (see Figure 3).

Remark 1. The condition $\omega > \frac{N^2}{Z_1^2}$ in the definition of $\Psi_{\omega, Z_1, N}$ is sharp, in the sense that no positive solution decaying at infinity can solve the second equation in (1.6) when $\omega \leq \frac{N^2}{Z_1^2}$. This can be understood geometrically as the requirement that the homoclinic orbit associated with the stationary cubic NLS equation intersects nontrivially the line $\Psi'(L) = \frac{N}{Z_1}\Psi(L)$ in the phase plane; see Figure 1.

We now specify the existence result for the periodic case. Recall from Proposition 3.1 that the mapping $\omega \mapsto k(\omega)$ is strictly increasing. For $Z_1 < 0$ and $N \geq 1$, we define

$$k_0 := k \left(\frac{N^2}{Z_1^2} \right),$$

which represents the infimum of $k(\omega)$ over the interval $(\frac{N^2}{Z_1^2}, \infty)$. Let $r_1 > r_2 > 0$ denote the roots of the quadratic polynomial

$$P(x) := \frac{Z_1^2 k_0^4}{16N^2} x^2 - x + \frac{N^2}{Z_1^2}.$$

A direct application of the quadratic formula shows that

$$\frac{N^2}{Z_1^2} < r_2 < \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2} < r_1.$$

We then define the admissible frequency set

$$I = I(N, Z_1, L) := \left(\frac{\pi}{2L^2}, \infty \right) \cap \left(\left(\frac{N^2}{Z_1^2}, r_2 \right) \cup (r_1, \infty) \right). \quad (3.5)$$

Theorem 3.2. *Let $L > 0$, $Z_1 < 0$, and $N \geq 1$. There exists a smooth mapping*

$$\omega \in I(N, Z_1, L) \mapsto e^{i\omega t} \Theta_\omega$$

of standing-wave solutions for the cubic NLS model posed on a looping-edge graph, where

$$\Theta_\omega = (\Phi_{\omega,a}, (\Psi_{\omega,Z_1,N})_{i=1}^N) \in D_{Z_1,0,N}.$$

Here, $\Phi_{\omega,a}(x) = \Phi_\omega(x - a)$ for $x \in [-L, L]$, with $a = a(\omega) \in (0, L)$, Φ_ω denotes the dnoidal profile given in (3.2), and $\Psi_{\omega,Z_1,N}$ is defined by (3.4). Moreover, L is not an inflection point of $\Phi_{\omega,a}$.

In addition, the slope condition

$$\frac{d}{d\omega} \|\Theta_\omega\|^2 > 0$$

holds for every $\omega \in I(N, Z_1, L)$.

Proof. See Theorems 4.9 and 4.13 in Angulo and Muñoz [16]. □

3.2 Spectral theory

We begin by observing that the fundamental symmetry of the NLS model (1.1) on a looping graph is *phase invariance*. Indeed, if \mathbf{U} is a solution of (1.1), then $e^{i\theta} \mathbf{U}$ is also a solution for any $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$. This invariance naturally motivates the following notion of orbital stability for (1.1); see [37, 38].

Definition 3.1. *The standing wave $\mathbf{U}(x, t) = e^{i\omega t} \Theta(x)$ is said to be orbitally stable in a Banach space X if, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that the following holds: whenever $\mathbf{U}_0 \in X$ satisfies*

$$\|\mathbf{U}_0 - \Theta\|_X < \eta,$$

the corresponding solution $\mathbf{U}(t)$ of (1.1) with initial condition $\mathbf{U}(0) = \mathbf{U}_0$ exists for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \|\mathbf{U}(t) - e^{i\theta} \Theta\|_X < \varepsilon.$$

Otherwise, the standing wave $\mathbf{U}(x, t) = e^{i\omega t} \Theta$ is said to be orbitally unstable in X .

The energy space X in Definition 3.1 for the model (1.1) is determined by the realization of the operator $-\Delta$ on the domain $D_{Z_1, Z_2, N}$. More precisely, we set

$$X = \begin{cases} H_{\text{per}}^1([-L, L]) \times H^1(\Gamma), & \text{if } Z_2 = 0, \\ \{f \in H^1([-L, L]) : f(L) = f(-L)\} \times H^1(\Gamma), & \text{if } Z_2 \neq 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

where Γ denotes the metric star graph consisting of N infinite half-lines $[L, +\infty)$ attached to the common vertex.

In this part of the exposition, we consider Z_1 , Z_2 , and N to be arbitrary. For a fixed $\omega > 0$, let

$$\mathbf{U}(x, t) = e^{i\omega t} \Theta(x),$$

with $\Theta = (\Phi, \Psi_1, \Psi_2, \dots, \Psi_N)$ be a standing-wave solution of (1.1) such that $\Theta \in D_{Z_1, Z_2, N}$ and satisfies (1.6). For $\mathbf{U} = (\phi, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_N)$ belonging to the energy space X defined in (3.6), we consider the following conserved quantities associated with (1.1):

$$E_{Z_1, Z_2}(\mathbf{U}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \mathbf{U}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})}^2 - \frac{1}{p+1} \|\mathbf{U}\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G})}^{p+1} + \frac{Z_2}{2} |\phi(L)|^2 + \frac{1}{2Z_1} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_i(L) \right|^2, \quad Z_1 \neq 0, \quad (3.7)$$

which represents the energy, and

$$Q(\mathbf{U}) = \|\mathbf{U}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})}^2, \quad (3.8)$$

which corresponds to the mass.

We then introduce the action functional

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{U}) = E_{Z_1, Z_2}(\mathbf{U}) + \omega Q(\mathbf{U}), \quad \mathbf{U} \in X. \quad (3.9)$$

Since Θ is a standing-wave profile, it follows that $\mathcal{S}'(\Theta) = \mathbf{0}$. Writing $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}_1 + i\mathbf{U}_2$ and $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}_1 + i\mathbf{W}_2$, where \mathbf{U}_j and \mathbf{W}_j ($j = 1, 2$) have real components, a direct computation shows that the second variation of \mathcal{S} at Θ is given by

$$\mathcal{S}''(\Theta)(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}) = \langle \mathcal{L}_{+, Z_1, Z_2} \mathbf{U}_1, \mathbf{W}_1 \rangle + \langle \mathcal{L}_{-, Z_1, Z_2} \mathbf{U}_2, \mathbf{W}_2 \rangle, \quad (3.10)$$

where the two diagonal operators $\mathcal{L}_{\pm, Z_1, Z_2}$ of size $(N+1) \times (N+1)$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{+, Z_1, Z_2} &= \text{diag} \left(-\partial_x^2 + \omega - p|\Phi|^{p-1}, -\partial_x^2 + \omega - p|\Psi_1|^{p-1}, \dots, -\partial_x^2 + \omega - p|\Psi_N|^{p-1} \right), \\ \mathcal{L}_{-, Z_1, Z_2} &= \text{diag} \left(-\partial_x^2 + \omega - |\Phi|^{p-1}, -\partial_x^2 + \omega - |\Psi_1|^{p-1}, \dots, -\partial_x^2 + \omega - |\Psi_N|^{p-1} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

The operators $\mathcal{L}_{\pm, Z_1, Z_2}$ are self-adjoint with common domain $D(\mathcal{L}_{\pm, Z_1, Z_2}) \equiv D_{Z_1, Z_2, N}$. Moreover, since $\Theta \in D_{Z_1, Z_2, N}$ satisfies system (1.6), we have $\mathcal{L}_{-, Z_1, Z_2} \Theta = \mathbf{0}$, and hence the kernel of $\mathcal{L}_{-, Z_1, Z_2}$ is nontrivial. We also note that both functionals E_{Z_1, Z_2} and Q belong to $C^2(X)$, since $p > 0$.

Lastly, for the standing-wave profile $\Theta_\omega \in D_{Z_1, 0, N}$, constructed in Theorem 3.2 with $Z_2 = 0$, we obtain the following spectral properties for the associated operators $\mathcal{L}_{\pm, Z_1, 0}$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $L > 0$, $Z_1 < 0$, and $N \geq 1$. Consider the self-adjoint operators $(\mathcal{L}_{\pm, Z_1, 0}, D_{Z_1, 0, N})$ defined in (3.11) for $p = 3$, and associated with the dnoidal-plus-tail soliton profiles Θ_ω given in Theorem 3.2, where $\omega \in I(N, Z_1, L)$ and $a = a(\omega) \in (0, L)$, with $\Phi''_{\omega, a}(L) \neq 0$. Then,*

1. *The kernel of $\mathcal{L}_{+, Z_1, 0}$ is trivial for $\omega \neq \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2}$.*
2. *The Morse index of $\mathcal{L}_{+, Z_1, 0}$ is given in the following form:*
 - 2.1. *If $\omega < \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2}$, then $n(\mathcal{L}_{+, Z_1, 0}) = 1$ on $D_{Z_1, 0, N}$.*
 - 2.2. *If $\omega > \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2}$, then $n(\mathcal{L}_{+, Z_1, 0, N}) = 2$ if we consider N even and the domain of $\mathcal{L}_{+, Z_1, 0, N}$ to be the set $D_{Z_1, 0, N} \cap (L^2_{\text{per}}([-L, L]) \times L^2_{\frac{N}{2}}(\Gamma))$ where*

$$L^2_{\frac{N}{2}}(\Gamma) = \left\{ (v_j)_{j=1}^N \in L^2(\Gamma) \mid v_1(x) = \dots = v_{\frac{N}{2}}(x), v_{\frac{N}{2}+1}(x) = \dots = v_N(x), x > L \right\} \quad (3.12)$$

and Γ represents the metric star graph obtained by removing the circular edge e_0 .

3. The rest of the spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_{+,Z_1,0}$ is positive and bounded away from zero.

4. $\ker(\mathcal{L}_{-,Z_1,0}) = \text{span}\{(\Phi_{\omega,a}, (\Psi_{\omega,Z_1,N})_{i=1}^N)\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{-,Z_1,0} \geq 0$.

Proof. See Theorems 4.11 and 4.12 in [16]. \square

Remark 2. In addition to Theorem 3.3, we record the following observations.

(1) In the critical case $\omega = \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2}$ appearing in Theorem 3.3, one can show that the Morse index of $\mathcal{L}_{+,Z_1,0}$ is exactly one. This follows from a combination of Floquet theory and extension theory; see Corollary 4.7 and Proposition A.2 in the appendix of [16]. Moreover, the kernel of $\mathcal{L}_{+,Z_1,0}$ has dimension at least $N - 1$. Indeed, using (4.3), one verifies that the vectors

$$\mathbf{V}_i = (0, \mathbf{g}_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, N - 1,$$

where

$$\mathbf{g}_i = (0, \dots, 0, \underset{i\text{th}}{\Psi'}, \underset{(i+1)\text{th}}{-\Psi'}, 0, \dots, 0) \in D_{Z_1,0,N},$$

belong to $\ker(\mathcal{L}_{+,Z_1,0})$.

(2) If L is an inflection point of the profile $\Phi_{\omega,a}$, then an additional eigenfunction

$$\mathbf{V}_0 = (\Phi'_{\omega,a}, \mathbf{0}) \in D_{Z_1,0,N}$$

belongs to the kernel of $\mathcal{L}_{+,Z_1,0}$.

(3) In the regime $\omega > \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2}$ considered in Theorem 3.3, extension theory implies that the operator

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M} = \text{diag}(\mathcal{L}, \dots, \mathcal{L}), \\ D(\mathcal{M}) = \{(g_j)_{j=1}^N \in H^2(\Gamma) : g'_1(L) = \dots = g'_N(L), \sum_{j=1}^N g_j(L) = Z_1 g'_1(L)\}, \end{cases} \quad (3.13)$$

where $\mathcal{L} = -\partial_x^2 + \omega - 3\Psi_{\omega,Z_1,N}^2$, satisfies the bound $n(\mathcal{M}) \leq N$; see [11, 14]. Furthermore, one readily checks that the quadratic form $\mathcal{F}_{Z_1,p+s}$ associated with $\mathcal{L}_{+,Z_1,0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{Z_1,p+s}(f, \mathbf{W}) &= Q_{\text{per}}(f) + H_{Z_1,\text{sol}}(\mathbf{W}) \\ &= \int_{-L}^L (|f'|^2 + \omega|f|^2 - 3\Phi_{\omega,a}^2|f|^2) dx \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^N \int_L^\infty (|w'_j|^2 + \omega|w_j|^2 - 3\Psi_{\omega,Z_1,N}^2|w_j|^2) dx + \frac{1}{Z_1} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N w_j(L) \right|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

defined on $D(\mathcal{F}_{Z_1,p+s}) = H_{\text{per}}^1([-L, L]) \times H^1(\Gamma)$, is negative definite on an orthogonal subspace of dimension $n(\mathcal{M}) + 1$. Consequently,

$$n(\mathcal{L}_{+,Z_1,0}) \geq n(\mathcal{M}) + 1 \quad \text{on} \quad D_{Z_1,0,N}.$$

The resulting lack of a precise characterization of the Morse index for $(\mathcal{L}_{+,Z_1,0}, D_{Z_1,0,N})$ motivates our restriction to the subspace

$$D_{Z_1,0,N} \cap (L_{\text{per}}^2([-L, L]) \times L_{\frac{N}{2}}^2(\Gamma)).$$

4 Existence of standing wave solutions for $Z_2 \neq 0$

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.1 and 4.2, which establish the existence of branches of standing-wave solutions for system (1.6) in the regime $Z_2 \neq 0$. Our approach is based on an application of the Implicit Function Theorem to construct smooth local branches of solutions for sufficiently small values of Z_2 . These branches bifurcate from the periodic case $Z_2 = 0$, and their associated standing-wave profiles converge, in suitable Sobolev norms, to the periodic solutions as Z_2 tends to zero.

We begin by addressing the general case described in Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Fix $Z_1 < 0$ and define the following subspace of $H^2(\mathcal{G})$:

$$V_{Z_1} := \left\{ \mathbf{U} = (\phi, (\psi_j)) \in H^2(\mathcal{G}) \mid \phi(L) = \phi(-L), \sum_{j=1}^N \psi_j(L) = Z_1 \phi'(L) \right. \\ \left. \text{and } \psi_j'(L) = \phi'(L) \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, N \right\}. \quad (4.1)$$

Let $\omega_0 \in I(N, Z_1, L)$ (see (3.5)) be fixed but arbitrary. Let $J_1(\omega_0) \equiv J_1 \subset I(N, Z_1, L)$ and $J_0 \subset \mathbb{R}$ be open neighborhoods of ω_0 and 0, respectively. We define the mapping

$$F : V_{Z_1} \times J_1 \times J_0 \longrightarrow L^2(\mathcal{G}) \times \mathbb{R}$$

by

$$F(\mathbf{U}, \omega, Z_2) = \left(-\mathbf{U}'' + \omega \mathbf{U} - \mathbf{U}^3, \phi'(L) - \phi'(-L) - Z_2 \phi(L) \right),$$

where the cubic nonlinearity \mathbf{U}^3 is understood componentwise on the loop and on the half-lines.

Note that, for $(\mathbf{U}, \omega, Z_2) \in V_{Z_1} \times J_1 \times J_0$, the condition

$$F(\mathbf{U}, \omega, Z_2) = (0, 0)$$

is equivalent to requiring that $\mathbf{U} \in D_{Z_1, Z_2, N}$ and that \mathbf{U} solves system (1.6) with $p = 3$. In particular, note the standing-wave profile

$$\mathbf{U}_0 \equiv \Theta_{\omega_0} = (\Phi_{\omega_0, a(\omega_0)}, (\Psi_{\omega_0, Z_1, N})_{i=1}^N) \equiv (\Phi_0, (\Psi_0)_{i=1}^N),$$

constructed in Theorem 3.2 as a stationary solution of (1.6) with $Z_2 = 0$ satisfies

$$F(\mathbf{U}_0, \omega_0, 0) = (0, 0).$$

We now compute the derivative $D_{(\mathbf{U}, Z_2)} F$ at the point $(\mathbf{U}_0, \omega_0, 0)$. More precisely, for

$$(\mathbf{V}, \eta) = ((\varphi, (\psi_j)), \eta) \in V_{Z_1} \times \mathbb{R},$$

we have

$$D_{(\mathbf{U}, Z_2)} F(\mathbf{U}_0, \omega_0, 0)[\mathbf{V}, \eta] = \left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} F(\mathbf{U}_0 + \varepsilon \mathbf{V}, \omega_0, \varepsilon \eta) \right|_{\varepsilon=0} = \left(\mathcal{L}_+ \mathbf{V}, \varphi'(L) - \varphi'(-L) - \eta \Phi_0(L) \right),$$

where the linear operator \mathcal{L}_+ is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_+ = \text{diag}(-\partial_x^2 + \omega_0 - 3\Phi_0^2, -\partial_x^2 + \omega_0 - 3\Psi_0^2, \dots, -\partial_x^2 + \omega_0 - 3\Psi_0^2).$$

This operator coincides with the diagonal operator $\mathcal{L}_{+, Z_1, 0}$ defined in (3.11), evaluated at $\Theta = \Theta_{\omega_0}$, with $\omega = \omega_0$ and $p = 3$, and is considered here with domain V_{Z_1} .

We claim that the operator $D_{(\mathbf{U}, Z_2)} F(\mathbf{U}_0, \omega_0, 0)$ is a bounded isomorphism.

To verify injectivity, assume that

$$D_{(\mathbf{U}, Z_2)} F(\mathbf{U}_0, \omega_0, 0)[\mathbf{V}, \eta] = (0, 0).$$

Then it follows that

$$\mathcal{L}_+ \mathbf{V} = 0, \quad \varphi'(L) - \varphi'(-L) = \eta \Phi_0(L). \quad (4.2)$$

On the loop, the function φ satisfies

$$-\varphi'' + (\omega_0 - 3\Phi_0^2)\varphi = 0,$$

and it is immediate that Φ'_0 is a nontrivial solution of the same equation. Define the Wronskian

$$W(x) = \Phi'_0(x)\varphi'(x) - \Phi''_0(x)\varphi(x)$$

associated with Φ'_0 and φ . Since both functions solve the same second-order linear ordinary differential equation, W is constant on the interval $[-L, L]$.

Using the condition $\varphi(L) = \varphi(-L)$ (which holds because $\mathbf{V} \in V_{Z_1}$) together with the periodicity of Φ_0 , we obtain from $W(L) - W(-L) = 0$ that

$$\Phi'_0(L)(\varphi'(L) - \varphi'(-L)) = 0.$$

Since $\Phi'_0(L) \neq 0$, it follows that

$$\varphi'(L) - \varphi'(-L) = 0.$$

Returning to (4.2) and using the fact that $\Phi_0(L) \neq 0$, we conclude that $\eta = 0$.

We now show that $\mathbf{V} = (\varphi, (\psi_j)) = \mathbf{0}$. Observe that each component ψ_j satisfies

$$(-\partial_x^2 + \omega_0 - 3\Psi_0^2)\psi_j = 0, \quad \text{on } [L, \infty).$$

It is known that the space of $L^2(L, \infty)$ solutions to this equation is one-dimensional and spanned by Ψ'_0 . Therefore, there exist constants $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $j = 1, \dots, N$, such that

$$\psi_j = \alpha_j \Psi'_{\omega_0}.$$

Since $\psi'_j(L) = \alpha_j \Psi''_{\omega_0}(L)$, the vertex conditions defining V_{Z_1} yield

$$(\alpha_j - \alpha_1) \Psi''_{\omega_0}(L) = 0.$$

Recalling that

$$\Psi''_{\omega_0}(L) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \omega_0 = \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2}, \quad (4.3)$$

from the definition of the interval $I(N, Z_1, L)$ in (3.5), we conclude that

$$\alpha_j = \alpha_1 \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, N.$$

Suppose, by contradiction, that $\alpha_1 \neq 0$. Then the boundary condition

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \psi_j(L) = Z_1 \psi'_j(L)$$

implies

$$\alpha_1 N \Psi'_{\omega_0}(L) = \alpha_1 Z_1 \Psi''_{\omega_0}(L),$$

or equivalently,

$$N\Psi'_{\omega_0}(L) = Z_1\Psi''_{\omega_0}(L).$$

This identity forces $Z_1^2\omega_0 = N^2$, which contradicts the existence condition in (3.4). Therefore, $\alpha_1 = 0$, and consequently,

$$\psi_j \equiv 0 \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, N.$$

Next, since $\eta = 0$, the vertex conditions in V_{Z_1} reduce to periodic conditions for φ , namely,

$$\varphi(L) = \varphi(-L), \quad \varphi'(L) = \varphi'(-L) = 0.$$

Let $\mathcal{L}_0 = -\partial_x^2 + \omega_0 - 3\Phi_0^2$ denote the first component of the diagonal operator \mathcal{L}_+ . Since $\mathcal{L}_0\varphi = 0$ and, by Floquet theory (see Corollary 4.7 in [16]), the kernel of \mathcal{L}_0 is spanned by Φ'_0 , it follows that

$$\varphi = \alpha \Phi'_{\omega_0}$$

for some constant α . Using the fact that $\Phi''_0(L) \neq 0$ (see Theorem 3.2), the condition $\varphi'(L) = 0$ implies

$$0 = \alpha \Phi''_{\omega_0}(L),$$

and hence $\alpha = 0$. Therefore, $\varphi \equiv 0$.

We conclude that $(\mathbf{V}, \eta) = (\mathbf{0}, 0)$, which proves that $D_{(\mathbf{U}, Z_2)}F(\mathbf{U}_0, \omega_0, 0)$ is injective.

We now show that the operator $D_{(\mathbf{U}, Z_2)}F(\mathbf{U}_0, \omega_0, 0)$ is surjective. Consider the self-adjoint operator $(\mathcal{L}_+, D_{Z_1, 0, N})$. By Theorem 3.3, we have

$$\ker(\mathcal{L}_+) = \{\mathbf{0}\},$$

and since $0 \notin \sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{L}_+)$, it follows that $(\mathcal{L}_+, D_{Z_1, 0, N})$ is invertible. In particular, we note that

$$D_{Z_1, 0, N} \subset V_{Z_1}.$$

Let $(\mathbf{W}, r) \in L^2(\mathcal{G}) \times \mathbb{R}$ be arbitrary. By invertibility, there exists $\mathbf{V} \in D_{Z_1, 0, N}$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}_+\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{W}.$$

Since $\Phi_0(L) \neq 0$, we define

$$\eta := -\frac{r}{\Phi_0(L)}.$$

Then it follows directly that

$$D_{(\mathbf{U}, Z_2)}F(\mathbf{U}_0, \omega_0, 0)[\mathbf{V}, \eta] = (\mathbf{W}, r).$$

This establishes the surjectivity of $D_{(\mathbf{U}, Z_2)}F(\mathbf{U}_0, \omega_0, 0)$.

By the Banach inverse mapping theorem, the inverse of the linear operator $D_{(\mathbf{U}, Z_2)}F(\mathbf{U}_0, \omega_0, 0)$ is bounded. Since $F(\mathbf{U}_0, \omega_0, 0) = (0, 0)$, the Implicit Function Theorem applied with unknowns (\mathbf{U}, Z_2) and parameter ω yields the existence of $\delta, \gamma > 0$, a neighborhood \mathcal{U} of \mathbf{U}_0 in V_{Z_1} , and a unique C^1 mapping

$$I \supset (\omega_0 - \delta, \omega_0 + \delta) \ni \omega \mapsto (\mathbf{U}(\omega), Z_2(\omega)) \in \mathcal{U} \times (-\gamma, \gamma), \quad (4.4)$$

such that

$$F(\mathbf{U}(\omega), \omega, Z_2(\omega)) = (0, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathbf{U}(\omega_0), Z_2(\omega_0)) = (\mathbf{U}_0, 0).$$

In this way, we obtain a C^1 family of solutions to system (1.6) that are small perturbations of the dnoidal-plus-tail soliton profile \mathbf{U}_0 . The convergence

$$\mathbf{U}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{U}_0 \text{ in } H^2(\mathcal{G}) \quad \text{and} \quad Z_2(\omega) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \omega \rightarrow \omega_0,$$

follows directly from the continuity of the mapping (4.4). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. \square

Remark 3. Since ω_0 was arbitrary on I it follows from the uniqueness of the map in (4.4) that we can take the domain of the map to be the whole interval I .

As consequences of the proof of Theorem 1.1, we obtain the following proposition that will be useful in our stability theory.

Proposition 4.1. Let $L > 0$, $Z_1 < 0$, and $N \geq 1$. Consider $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ the open set defined in (3.5). For every $\omega_0 \in I$ fixed we consider the C^1 map

$$\omega \in (\omega_0 - \delta, \omega_0 + \delta) \subset I \mapsto \mathbf{U}(\omega) \in D_{Z_1, Z_2(\omega), N}$$

of solutions for system in (1.6) determined by Theorem 1.1, such that $\mathbf{U}(\omega_0) = \mathbf{U}_0$ and $Z_2(\omega_0) = 0$. Here, \mathbf{U}_0 is the dnoidal-translated plus tail profiles defined in Theorem 3.2 determined by the phase-velocity ω_0 . Then,

$$\frac{d}{d\omega} \|\mathbf{U}(\omega)\|^2 > 0,$$

for every $\omega \in (\omega_0 - \delta_1, \omega_0 + \delta_1)$ with δ_1 positive and $\delta_1 \leq \delta$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.2, we know that

$$\frac{d}{d\omega} \|\Theta_\omega\|^2 \Big|_{\omega=\omega_0} > 0.$$

Thus, it suffices to show that

$$\frac{d}{d\omega} \|\mathbf{U}(\omega)\|^2 \Big|_{\omega=\omega_0} = \frac{d}{d\omega} \|\Theta_\omega\|^2 \Big|_{\omega=\omega_0},$$

since continuity then implies $\frac{d}{d\omega} \|\mathbf{U}(\omega)\|^2 > 0$ in a neighborhood of ω_0 .

We differentiate the identity

$$F(\mathbf{U}(\omega), \omega, Z_2(\omega)) = (\mathbf{0}, 0)$$

with respect to ω at $\omega = \omega_0$. By the chain rule, this yields

$$D_{(\mathbf{U}, Z_2)} F(\mathbf{U}_0, \omega_0, 0) [\partial_\omega \mathbf{U}(\omega)|_{\omega=\omega_0}, \partial_\omega Z_2(\omega)|_{\omega=\omega_0}] + \partial_\omega F(\mathbf{U}_0, \omega_0, 0) = (\mathbf{0}, 0).$$

Since $\partial_\omega F(\mathbf{U}, \omega, Z_2) = (\mathbf{U}, 0)$, setting

$$\dot{\mathbf{U}} = \partial_\omega \mathbf{U}(\omega)|_{\omega=\omega_0}, \quad \dot{Z}_2 = \partial_\omega Z_2(\omega)|_{\omega=\omega_0},$$

we obtain

$$D_{(\mathbf{U}, Z_2)} F(\mathbf{U}_0, \omega_0, 0) [\dot{\mathbf{U}}, \dot{Z}_2] = -(\mathbf{U}_0, 0). \quad (4.5)$$

Equivalently,

$$\mathcal{L}_+ \dot{\mathbf{U}} = -\mathbf{U}_0, \quad [\partial_\omega \phi_\omega|_{\omega=\omega_0}]'(L) - [\partial_\omega \phi_\omega|_{\omega=\omega_0}]'(-L) = \dot{Z}_2 \Phi_0(L), \quad (4.6)$$

where we write $\mathbf{U}(\omega) = (\phi_\omega, (\psi_{\omega, j})_{j=1}^N)$.

On the other hand, differentiating the first two equations in (1.6) with respect to ω and evaluating at $\omega = \omega_0$ (with $p = 3$) yields

$$\mathcal{L}_+ (\partial_\omega \Theta_\omega|_{\omega=\omega_0}) = -\Theta_{\omega_0} \equiv -\mathbf{U}_0.$$

Since $\partial_\omega \Theta_\omega|_{\omega=\omega_0} \in V_{Z_1}$ (because $D_{Z_1,0,N} \subset V_{Z_1}$) and \mathcal{L}_+ is injective, comparison with (4.6) implies

$$\dot{\mathbf{U}} = \partial_\omega \mathbf{U}(\omega)|_{\omega=\omega_0} = \partial_\omega \Theta_\omega|_{\omega=\omega_0}. \quad (4.7)$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{d}{d\omega} \|\mathbf{U}(\omega)\|^2 \Big|_{\omega=\omega_0} = 2\langle \dot{\mathbf{U}}, \mathbf{U}_0 \rangle = 2\langle \partial_\omega \Theta_\omega|_{\omega=\omega_0}, \Theta_{\omega_0} \rangle = \frac{d}{d\omega} \|\Theta_\omega\|^2 \Big|_{\omega=\omega_0} > 0.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Remark 4. From (4.6) and (4.7), together with the periodicity of $\partial_\omega \Theta_\omega|_{\omega=\omega_0}$ and the fact that $\Phi_0(L) \neq 0$, it follows immediately

$$\partial_\omega Z_2(\omega)|_{\omega=\omega_0} = 0.$$

Theorem 4.2. Let $L > 0$, $Z_1 < 0$, and $N \geq 2$ be even. Consider $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ the open set defined in Theorem 3.2 below (see also [16, Theorem 4.9]). For every fixed $\omega_0 \in I$, there exist $\delta, \gamma > 0$ and a unique smooth map

$$\omega \in (\omega_0 - \delta, \omega_0 + \delta) \subset I \longmapsto (\mathbf{P}(\omega), Z_2(\omega)) \in \mathcal{D}_\omega \times (-\gamma, \gamma)$$

of solutions to system (1.6), such that $\mathbf{P}(\omega_0) = \mathbf{U}_0$ and $Z_2(\omega_0) = 0$, where \mathbf{U}_0 is the dnoidal-translated plus tail profile defined in Theorem 3.2 with $\omega = \omega_0$ and

$$\mathcal{D}_\omega = D_{Z_1, Z_2(\omega), N} \cap (L^2([-L, L]) \times L_{\frac{N}{2}}^2(\Gamma)),$$

with $L_{\frac{N}{2}}^2(\Gamma)$ defined in (3.12). Moreover,

$$\mathbf{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{U}_0 \text{ in } H^2(\mathcal{G}) \quad \text{and} \quad Z_2(\omega) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \omega \rightarrow \omega_0.$$

Proof of Theorem 4.2. The argument follows closely the proof of Theorem 1.1, and we only indicate the modifications required in the present setting.

Fix $Z_1 < 0$ and assume that N is even. Instead of working in the space V_{Z_1} defined in (4.1), we restrict the analysis to the closed subspace

$$\mathcal{V}_{Z_1, N} = V_{Z_1} \cap (L^2([-L, L]) \times L_{\frac{N}{2}}^2(\Gamma)),$$

where $L_{\frac{N}{2}}^2(\Gamma)$ is defined in (3.12). For a fixed $\omega_0 \in I(N, Z_1, L)$, we define the mapping $\mathcal{F}_{Z_1, N}$ exactly as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, but with domain $\mathcal{V}_{Z_1, N} \times J_1 \times J_0$ and codomain $(L^2([-L, L]) \times L_{\frac{N}{2}}^2(\Gamma)) \times \mathbb{R}$. As before, the dnoidal-plus-tail profile \mathbf{U}_0 satisfies

$$\mathcal{F}_{Z_1, N}(\mathbf{U}_0, \omega_0, 0) = (0, 0).$$

The derivative of $\mathcal{F}_{Z_1, N}$ with respect to (\mathbf{U}, Z_2) at $(\mathbf{U}_0, \omega_0, 0)$ coincides with the linear operator

$$(\mathbf{V}, \eta) \longmapsto (\mathcal{L}_+ \mathbf{V}, \varphi'(L) - \varphi'(-L) - \eta \Phi_0(L)),$$

where $\mathcal{L}_+ = \mathcal{L}_{+, Z_1, 0}$ is the same diagonal operator appearing in the proof of Theorem 1.1, now acting on $\mathcal{V}_{Z_1, N}$. The injectivity and surjectivity of this derivative are obtained by the same arguments as before, so that the operator remains a bounded isomorphism between the reduced spaces.

Therefore, the Implicit Function Theorem applies and yields $\delta, \gamma > 0$ and a unique smooth mapping

$$\omega \in (\omega_0 - \delta, \omega_0 + \delta) \longmapsto (\mathbf{P}(\omega), Z_2(\omega)) \in \mathcal{D}_\omega \times (-\gamma, \gamma),$$

where $\mathbf{P}(\omega_0) = \mathbf{U}_0$ and $Z_2(\omega_0) = 0$. This concludes the proof. \square

As consequence of the proof of Theorem 4.2, we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $L > 0$, $Z_1 < 0$, and $N \geq 2$ be even. Consider $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ the open set defined in (3.5). For every $\omega_0 \in I$ fixed we consider the C^1 map*

$$\omega \in (\omega_0 - \delta, \omega_0 + \delta) \subset I \mapsto \mathbf{P}(\omega) \in \mathcal{D}_\omega$$

of solutions for system in (1.6) determined by Theorem 4.2, such that $\mathbf{P}(\omega_0) = \mathbf{U}_0$ and $Z_2(\omega_0) = 0$. Here, \mathbf{U}_0 is the dnoidal-translated plus tail profiles defined in Theorem 3.2 determined by the phase-velocity ω_0 . Then,

$$\frac{d}{d\omega} \|\mathbf{P}(\omega)\|^2 > 0,$$

for every $\omega \in (\omega_0 - \delta_1, \omega_0 + \delta_1)$ with δ_1 positive and $\delta_1 \leq \delta$.

5 Spectral analysis for the case $Z_2 \neq 0$ and $Z_1 < 0$

In this section, we study the Morse index and the nullity of the diagonal operators

$$\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega} = -\Delta + \omega - 3\Theta^2(\omega), \quad \mathcal{L}_{-,\omega} = -\Delta + \omega - \Theta^2(\omega), \quad (5.1)$$

defined in (3.11), where $\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega} \equiv \mathcal{L}_{+,Z_1,Z_2,N}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{-,\omega} \equiv \mathcal{L}_{-,Z_1,Z_2,N}$. Here,

$$\omega \in (\omega_0 - \delta, \omega_0 + \delta) \mapsto \Theta(\omega) \in H^1(\mathcal{G})$$

denotes the smooth family of standing-wave profiles obtained in either Theorem 1.1 or Theorem 4.2, with $\omega_0 \in I$ fixed. Accordingly, we consider either $\Theta(\omega) = \mathbf{U}(\omega)$ from Theorem 1.1 or $\Theta(\omega) = \mathbf{P}(\omega)$ from Theorem 4.2.

We begin our analysis with the former case.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $L > 0$, $Z_1 < 0$, and $N \geq 1$. Let us consider the self-adjoint operators $(\mathcal{L}_\pm, D_{Z_1,Z_2,N})$ in (5.1) with $\Theta(\omega) = \mathbf{U}(\omega)$. Then, for $\omega \in (\omega_0 - \delta, \omega_0 + \delta)$ with $\omega_0 + \delta < \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2}$ it follows*

1. *The kernel of $\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega}$ is trivial.*
2. *The Morse index of $\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega}$ is given by $n(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega}) = 1$ on $D_{Z_1,Z_2(\omega),N}$.*
3. *The rest of the spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega}$ is positive and bounded away from zero.*
4. *$\ker(\mathcal{L}_{-,\omega}) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{U}(\omega)\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{-,\omega} \geq 0$.*
5. *The essential spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_{-,\omega}$, $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{L}_{-,\omega})$, satisfies $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{L}_{-,\omega}) \subset (\eta, +\infty)$ for some $\eta > 0$.*

Proof. By Theorem 1.1, the family of standing-wave profiles $\mathbf{U}(\omega)$ satisfies

$$\mathbf{U}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{U}_0 \quad \text{in } H^1(\mathcal{G}) \quad \text{as } \omega \rightarrow \omega_0,$$

where $\mathbf{U}_0 \equiv \Theta_{\omega_0}$ is the stationary solution of (1.6) with $Z_2 = 0$ constructed in Theorem 3.2. As a consequence, the operator $\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega}$ defined in (5.1) converges to

$$\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega_0} = -\Delta + \omega_0 - 3\mathbf{U}_0^2$$

in the generalized sense.

Indeed, define

$$W_\omega := \omega - 3\mathbf{U}^2(\omega),$$

which acts as a bounded multiplication operator on $L^2(\mathcal{G})$ via

$$W_\omega \mathbf{V} = \omega \mathbf{V} - 3\mathbf{U}^2(\omega) \mathbf{V}.$$

Then we may write

$$\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega} = \mathcal{L}_{+,\omega_0} + (W_\omega - W_{\omega_0}),$$

and hence

$$\widehat{\delta}(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega}, \mathcal{L}_{+,\omega_0}) = \widehat{\delta}(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega_0} + (W_\omega - W_{\omega_0}), \mathcal{L}_{+,\omega_0}) \leq \|W_\omega - W_{\omega_0}\|_{B(L^2(\mathcal{G}))} \longrightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \omega \rightarrow \omega_0, \quad (5.2)$$

where $\widehat{\delta}$ denotes the gap metric (see Theorem A.2). As consequence of (5.2) we have the following analysis.

1. The kernel of $\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega}$ is trivial for ω sufficiently close to ω_0 (in particular, for $\omega \neq \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2}$). Indeed, by Theorem 3.3 the inverse operator $\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega_0}^{-1}$ exists and is bounded on $L^2(\mathcal{G})$. It then follows from [42, Theorem IV-2.23] that, for ω close to ω_0 , the inverse $\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega}^{-1}$ also exists and is bounded on $L^2(\mathcal{G})$. In particular,

$$\ker(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega}) = \{\mathbf{0}\},$$

which proves the claim.

2. The Morse index satisfies $n(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega}) = 1$ on $D_{Z_1, Z_2(\omega), N}$ for ω sufficiently close to ω_0 . Indeed, by Theorem 3.3 we have $n(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega_0}) = 1$ on $D_{Z_1, 0, N}$, and we denote by λ_{ω_0} its unique negative eigenvalue. Moreover, there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$\sigma(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega}) \cap (-\infty, -M] = \emptyset \quad \text{for all } \omega \in [\omega_0 - \delta, \omega_0 + \delta].$$

Consequently, the spectrum $\sigma(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega_0})$ can be decomposed into two disjoint parts,

$$\sigma_0 = \{\gamma < 0 : \gamma \in \sigma(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega_0})\} = \{\lambda_{\omega_0}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_1 = \sigma(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega_0}) \setminus \sigma_0,$$

which are separated by a closed contour Γ contained in the resolvent set $\rho(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega_0})$. The contour Γ can be chosen so that $0 \in \Gamma$, σ_0 lies in the interior of Γ , and σ_1 lies in its exterior. For instance, Γ may be taken as a rectangle with vertical sides passing through $-M$ and 0 , noting that $\sigma_1 \subset [\theta_0, +\infty)$ with

$$\theta_0 = \inf\{\theta > 0 : \theta \in \sigma(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega_0})\} > 0,$$

and recalling that $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega_0}) = [\omega_0, +\infty)$.

By standard perturbation theory (see [42, Theorem IV-3.16]), there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that $\Gamma \subset \rho(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega})$ for all $\omega \in [\omega_0 - \delta_1, \omega_0 + \delta_1]$. Moreover, $\sigma(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega})$ is likewise separated by Γ , and the portion of the spectrum enclosed by Γ consists of exactly one negative eigenvalue, counted with algebraic multiplicity one. This proves the claim.

3. From standard analysis relying on Weyl's theorem we get that the rest of the spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_{\pm,\omega}$ is positive and bounded away from zero.

4. We have $\ker(\mathcal{L}_{-, \omega}) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{U}(\omega)\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{-, \omega} \geq 0$. Indeed, it is immediate that

$$\mathcal{L}_{-, \omega} \mathbf{U}(\omega) = -\Delta \mathbf{U}(\omega) + \omega \mathbf{U}(\omega) - \mathbf{U}^3(\omega) = 0.$$

Write $\mathbf{U}(\omega) = (\phi_\omega, (\varphi_{\omega, j})_{j=1}^N)$ and $\mathbf{U}(\omega_0) = (\Phi_{\omega_0}, (\Psi_{\omega_0, Z_1, N})_{j=1}^N)$. Since $\mathbf{U}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{U}(\omega_0)$ in $H^2(\mathcal{G})$ as $\omega \rightarrow \omega_0$, we have

$$\|\phi_\omega - \Phi_{\omega_0}\|_{L^\infty([-L, L])} \rightarrow 0.$$

Because $\min_{x \in [-L, L]} \Phi_{\omega_0}(x) > 0$, it follows that $\min_{x \in [-L, L]} \phi_\omega(x) > 0$ for ω sufficiently close to ω_0 .

Define the operator

$$\mathcal{F}_\omega = -\partial_x^2 + \omega - \phi_\omega^2 \quad \text{on } [-L, L].$$

Then for any $f \in H^2(-L, L)$ we have the identity

$$\mathcal{F}_\omega f = -\frac{1}{\phi_\omega} \frac{d}{dx} \left[\phi_\omega^2 \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{f}{\phi_\omega} \right) \right], \quad x \in [-L, L]. \quad (5.3)$$

Using integration by parts and the boundary conditions $f(L) = f(-L)$ and $f'(L) - f'(-L) = Z_2(\omega)f(L)$, we obtain

$$\langle \mathcal{F}_\omega f, f \rangle = \int_{-L}^L \phi_\omega^2 \left[\frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{f}{\phi_\omega} \right) \right]^2 dx \geq 0.$$

Next, each component $\varphi_{\omega, j}$ satisfies the equation

$$-\frac{1}{2}(\varphi'_{\omega, j})^2 + \frac{\omega}{2}\varphi_{\omega, j}^2 - \frac{1}{4}\varphi_{\omega, j}^4 = 0, \quad x \geq L.$$

If there existed $x_0 > L$ such that $\varphi_{\omega, j}(x_0) = 0$, then $\varphi'_{\omega, j}(x_0) = 0$. However, since

$$\|\varphi'_{\omega, j} - \Psi'_{\omega_0, Z_1, N}\|_{L^\infty(L, \infty)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \omega \rightarrow \omega_0,$$

and $\Psi'_{\omega_0, Z_1, N}(x) < 0$ for all $x > L$, this is impossible. Therefore, $\varphi_{\omega, j} > 0$ on $[L, \infty)$ for every j .

Define

$$\mathcal{L}_{\omega, j} = -\partial_x^2 + \omega - \varphi_{\omega, j}^2 \quad \text{on } [L, \infty).$$

Then for $g_j \in H^2(L, \infty)$ we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\omega, j} g_j = -\frac{1}{\varphi_{\omega, j}} \frac{d}{dx} \left[\varphi_{\omega, j}^2 \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{g_j}{\varphi_{\omega, j}} \right) \right], \quad x > L. \quad (5.4)$$

Let $\mathcal{M}_\omega = \text{diag}(\mathcal{L}_{\omega, 1}, \dots, \mathcal{L}_{\omega, N})$ and $\mathbf{g} = (g_j)_{j=1}^N$ satisfy the vertex conditions $g'_1(L) = \dots = g'_N(L)$ and $\sum_{j=1}^N g_j(L) = Z_1 g'_1(L)$. An integration by parts yields

$$\langle \mathcal{M}_\omega \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g} \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^N \int_L^\infty \varphi_{\omega, j}^2 \left[\frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{g_j}{\varphi_{\omega, j}} \right) \right]^2 dx + R_{Z_1, N},$$

where

$$R_{Z_1, N} = \frac{1}{Z_1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N g_j(L) \right)^2 - \frac{1}{Z_1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{g_j^2(L)}{\varphi_{\omega, j}(L)} \right) \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi_{\omega, j}(L).$$

Note $R_{Z_1, N} \geq 0$ by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and the fact that $Z_1 < 0$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{L}_{-, \omega} = \text{diag}(\mathcal{F}_\omega, \mathcal{M}_\omega) \geq 0.$$

Finally, suppose $\mathcal{L}_{-, \omega} \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{0}$ for $\mathbf{V} = (f, (g_j)_{j=1}^N) \in D_{Z_1, Z_2(\omega), N}$. Then

$$\langle \mathcal{L}_{-, \omega} \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{V} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{F}_\omega f, f \rangle + \langle \mathcal{M}_\omega \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g} \rangle = 0,$$

which implies $f = c_0 \phi_\omega$ on $[-L, L]$ and $g_j = c_j \varphi_{\omega, j}$ on $[L, \infty)$. The vertex conditions yield $c_j = c_1$ for all j , and from $f'(L) = g'_1(L)$ we obtain $c_0 = c_1$. Therefore,

$$\mathbf{V} = c_1 \mathbf{U}(\omega),$$

and the proof is complete. □

A spectral analysis of the operators $\mathcal{L}_{\pm, \omega}$ analogous to that carried out in Theorem 5.1 becomes inconclusive in the regime $\omega > \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2}$. This is due to the fact that, *a priori*, no information is available on the relations among the components $(\varphi_{\omega, j})_{j=1}^N$ for general N , which would be required in order to apply item 2.2 of Theorem 3.3. Addressing precisely this lack of structural information was the motivation for establishing Theorem 4.2. In this restricted setting, a conclusive spectral analysis can be carried out, as described below.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $L > 0$, $Z_1 < 0$, and $N \geq 2$ be even. Let us consider the self-adjoint operators $(\mathcal{L}_{\pm, \omega}, \mathcal{D}_\omega)$ in (5.1) with $\Theta(\omega) = \mathbf{P}(\omega)$ in Theorem 4.2 and*

$$\mathcal{D}_\omega = D_{Z_1, Z_2(\omega), N} \cap (L^2([-L, L]) \times L^2_{\frac{N}{2}}(\Gamma)).$$

Then, for $\omega \in (\omega_0 - \delta, \omega_0 + \delta)$ one has:

1. The kernel of $\mathcal{L}_{+, \omega}$ is trivial when $\omega_0 + \delta < \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2}$.
2. The Morse index of $\mathcal{L}_{+, \omega}$ is given in the following form:
 - 2.1. If $\omega_0 + \delta < \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2}$, then $n(\mathcal{L}_{+, \omega}) = 1$ on \mathcal{D}_ω .
 - 2.2. If $\omega_0 - \delta > \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2}$, then $n(\mathcal{L}_{+, \omega}) = 2$ on \mathcal{D}_ω .
3. The rest of the spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_{+, \omega}$ is positive and bounded away from zero.
4. $\ker(\mathcal{L}_{-, \omega}) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{P}(\omega)\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{-, \omega} \geq 0$.
5. The essential spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_{-, \omega}$, $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{L}_{-, \omega})$, satisfies $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{L}_{-, \omega}) \subset (\eta, +\infty)$ for some $\eta > 0$.

Proof. The proofs of items 1 and 3–5 follow the same arguments as those used in the proof of Theorem 5.1. We therefore focus on item 2, which relies on perturbation theory applied to the operators

$$\mathcal{L}_{+, \omega} = -\Delta + \omega - 3\mathbf{P}^2(\omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_{+, \omega_0} = -\Delta + \omega_0 - 3\mathbf{U}_0^2.$$

Define

$$W_\omega := \omega - 3\mathbf{P}^2(\omega),$$

which acts as a bounded multiplication operator on $L^2([-L, L]) \times L^2_{\frac{N}{2}}(\Gamma)$. Then we may write

$$\mathcal{L}_{+, \omega} = \mathcal{L}_{+, \omega_0} + (W_\omega - W_{\omega_0}),$$

and consequently

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\delta}(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega}, \mathcal{L}_{+,\omega_0}) &= \widehat{\delta}(\mathcal{L}_{+,\omega_0} + (W_\omega - W_{\omega_0}), \mathcal{L}_{+,\omega_0}) \\ &\leq \|W_\omega - W_{\omega_0}\|_{B(L^2([-L,L]) \times L^2_{\frac{N}{2}}(\Gamma))} \longrightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \omega \rightarrow \omega_0.\end{aligned}\tag{5.5}$$

Using item 2 of Theorem 3.3 we completes the proof. \square

6 Local and global well-posedness

For simplicity in the exposition let us first recall the spectral description in the periodic case $Z_2 = 0$.

Consider $(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}, D(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2})) = (-\Delta, D_{Z_1, Z_2, N})$ on the looping-edge graph \mathcal{G} .

Proposition 6.1. *Let $Z_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. Then:*

1) *For $Z_1 \geq 0$, the spectrum of $\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, 0}$ in $L^2(\mathcal{G})$ is given by*

$$\sigma(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, 0}) = [0, +\infty) = \sigma_c(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, 0}) \cup \sigma_p(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, 0}),$$

where $\sigma_p(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, 0}) = \left\{ \frac{n^2}{\pi^2 L^2} \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}}$ is a sequence of simple eigenvalues.

2) *For $Z_1 < 0$, the spectrum of $\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, 0}$ in $L^2(\mathcal{G})$ is given by*

$$\sigma(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, 0}) = \{\lambda_0\} \cup [0, +\infty), \quad \lambda_0 = -\frac{N^2}{Z_1^2},$$

with

$$\sigma_c(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, 0}) = [0, +\infty) \setminus \left\{ \frac{n^2}{\pi^2 L^2} \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}}.$$

Proof. See Proposition 4.3 in [16]. \square

Let us now focus in the non-periodic case $Z_2 \neq 0$. We anticipate that the negative eigen-value count structure is preserved up to an extra compatibility condition when $Z_1 < 0$. More precisely, we have the following description of the spectra.

Proposition 6.2. *Let $Z_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $Z_2 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Then:*

(1) *For $Z_1 \geq 0$ the spectrum of \mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2} in $L^2(\mathcal{G})$ is given by*

$$\sigma(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}) = [0, +\infty) = \sigma_c(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}).$$

(2) *For $Z_1 < 0$, the spectrum of \mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2} in $L^2(\mathcal{G})$ is given by*

$$\sigma(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}) = \Sigma \cup [0, +\infty) = \Sigma \cup \sigma_c(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2})$$

where

$$\Sigma := \begin{cases} \left\{ -\frac{N^2}{Z_1^2} \right\}, & \text{if } Z_2 = 2\mu_0 \tanh(\mu_0 L), \quad \mu_0 := -\frac{N}{Z_1} > 0. \\ \emptyset, & \text{in other cases.} \end{cases}\tag{6.1}$$

Proof. We analyze the spectral problem

$$\begin{cases} -f''(x) = \lambda f(x), & x \in (-L, L), \\ -g_j''(x) = \lambda g_j(x), & x \in (L, \infty), \quad j = 1, \dots, N, \\ f(-L) = f(L), \\ f'(L) = g_1'(L) = \dots = g_N'(L), \\ f'(L) - f'(-L) = Z_2 f(L), \\ \sum_{j=1}^N g_j(L) = Z_1 g_1'(L). \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

where $\mathbf{U} = (f, g_1, \dots, g_N)$ by separating the three possible forms of eigenfunctions.

We first note that no L^2 -eigenfunctions for $\lambda \geq 0$ can be produced on the half-lines only. If $\lambda \geq 0$, every solution of $-g_j'' = \lambda g_j$ on (L, ∞) is a linear combination of oscillatory (or affine, if $\lambda = 0$) functions and does not belong to $L^2(L, \infty)$ unless it is identically zero. Hence, for an eigenfunction in $L^2(\mathcal{G})$ we must have $g_j \equiv 0$ for all j , whenever $\lambda \geq 0$.

Case I: eigenfunctions of the form $(f, \mathbf{0})$. Here $g_j \equiv 0$, so the coupling condition yields $f'(L) = g_j'(L) = 0$ for all j . Thus f solves

$$-f'' = \lambda f \text{ on } (-L, L), \quad f(-L) = f(L), \quad f'(L) = 0, \quad f'(L) - f'(-L) = Z_2 f(L).$$

We show that this forces $f \equiv 0$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

If $\lambda = k^2 > 0$, write $f(x) = A \cos(kx) + B \sin(kx)$. The condition $f(-L) = f(L)$ gives $B \sin(kL) = 0$. The condition $f'(L) = 0$ gives $-A \sin(kL) + B \cos(kL) = 0$. If $\sin(kL) = 0$, then $B \cos(kL) = 0$, so $B = 0$ and $f(x) = A \cos(kx)$ with $kL = n\pi$. The boundary condition becomes $-f'(-L) = Z_2 f(L)$, i.e. $0 = Z_2 A \cos(n\pi)$, which implies $A = 0$ since $Z_2 \neq 0$. If instead $\sin(kL) \neq 0$, then $B = 0$ from $B \sin(kL) = 0$, and $-A \sin(kL) = 0$ forces $A = 0$. Hence no positive eigenvalues arise in this case.

If $\lambda = 0$, then $f(x) = Ax + B$ and $f(-L) = f(L)$ implies $A = 0$. Then $f'(L) = 0$ is automatic, and the jump condition gives $0 = Z_2 B$, hence $B = 0$.

If $\lambda = -\mu^2 < 0$, then $f(x) = A \cosh(\mu x) + B \sinh(\mu x)$. From $f(-L) = f(L)$ we get $B \sinh(\mu L) = 0$, hence $B = 0$. Then $f'(L) = A\mu \sinh(\mu L) = 0$ implies $A = 0$. Therefore $\mathbf{U} = (f, \mathbf{0})$ yields no eigenvalues.

Case II: eigenfunctions of the form $(0, \mathbf{g})$. Then $f \equiv 0$, so $f'(L) = 0$ and the coupling condition gives $g_j'(L) = 0$ for all j . For $\lambda \geq 0$ there are no L^2 half-line solutions except $\mathbf{g} \equiv 0$. For $\lambda = -\mu^2 < 0$, the L^2 solutions are $g_j(x) = a_j e^{-\mu(x-L)}$, hence $g_j'(L) = -\mu a_j = 0$, so $a_j = 0$ for all j . Thus no eigenvalues arise in this case either.

Case III: eigenfunctions of the form (f, \mathbf{g}) with $\mathbf{g} \neq \mathbf{0}$. We must have $\lambda = -\mu^2 < 0$ with $\mu > 0$. Then each g_j is of the form

$$g_j(x) = a_j e^{-\mu(x-L)}, \quad x \geq L,$$

and thus $g_j'(L) = -\mu a_j$. The coupling condition $f'(L) = g_1'(L) = \dots = g_N'(L)$ implies that all a_j coincide: $a_1 = \dots = a_N =: a$, and $f'(L) = -\mu a$.

The δ' -condition $\sum_{j=1}^N g_j(L) = Z_1 g_1'(L)$ becomes

$$Na = Z_1(-\mu a).$$

If $a \neq 0$ this forces $\mu = -\frac{N}{Z_1}$, hence necessarily $Z_1 < 0$ and

$$\lambda = \lambda_0 := -\mu^2 = -\frac{N^2}{Z_1^2}.$$

(If $a = 0$ then $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{0}$, reducing to Case I, which has no eigenvalues.)

It remains to determine when the loop component can be chosen to match this μ and the boundary conditions. Since $\lambda = -\mu^2$, on the loop we have

$$f(x) = A \cosh(\mu x) + B \sinh(\mu x).$$

The condition $f(-L) = f(L)$ yields $B \sinh(\mu L) = 0$, hence $B = 0$ and $f(x) = A \cosh(\mu x)$. Then $f'(L) = A\mu \sinh(\mu L)$ must equal $-\mu a$, so $A = -a/\sinh(\mu L)$ (and in particular $A \neq 0$ if $a \neq 0$).

Finally the jump condition on the loop gives

$$f'(L) - f'(-L) = Z_2 f(L).$$

For $f(x) = A \cosh(\mu x)$ we compute $f'(L) - f'(-L) = 2A\mu \sinh(\mu L)$ and $f(L) = A \cosh(\mu L)$, so (since $A \neq 0$)

$$2\mu \sinh(\mu L) = Z_2 \cosh(\mu L) \iff Z_2 = 2\mu \tanh(\mu L).$$

Thus λ_0 is an eigenvalue of the full coupled system if and only if $Z_1 < 0$ and the compatibility condition

$$Z_2 = 2\mu_0 \tanh(\mu_0 L) \tag{6.3}$$

holds with $\mu = \mu_0 = -N/Z_1$. In that case an eigenfunction is given (up to a nonzero scalar factor) by

$$g_1(x) = \cdots = g_N(x) = e^{-\mu_0(x-L)} \quad (x \geq L), \quad f(x) = \frac{\cosh(\mu_0 x)}{\sinh(\mu_0 L)} \quad (x \in [-L, L]).$$

The latter is obtained by fixing $a \neq 0$ and the corresponding $A = -a/\sinh(\mu_0 L)$. Note λ_0 must be simple because μ is uniquely determined by Z_1 (hence λ_0 fixed) and the boundary conditions determine the solution up to a scalar multiple.

We claim that for every $\lambda < 0$ (with $\lambda \neq \lambda_0$ when $Z_1 < 0$ and (6.3) holds) it follows $\lambda \in \rho(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2})$.

Indeed, fix such $\lambda < 0$ and suppose by contradiction that $\lambda \in \sigma(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2})$. From the case analysis above, λ cannot be an eigenvalue and therefore λ must belong to the continuous spectrum. In particular, $(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2} - \lambda)^{-1}$ is unbounded.

Thus, there exists a sequence $\{T_n\} \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2} - \lambda)$ such that

$$\|T_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2} - \lambda)^{-1} T_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})} \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let $\mathbf{U}_n := (f_n, \mathbf{g}_n) = (\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2} - \lambda)^{-1} T_n$. Then \mathbf{U}_n solves

$$(-\partial_x^2 - \lambda)f_n = t_n^{(0)} \text{ on } (-L, L), \quad (-\partial_x^2 - \lambda)g_{n,j} = t_{n,j} \text{ on } (L, \infty),$$

together with the vertex/coupling conditions in $D(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2})$. Since $\lambda < 0$, the operator $-\partial_x^2 - \lambda$ is coercive on each edge. More precisely, using integration by parts on $(-L, L)$ and on each (L, ∞) and the boundary conditions at $x = L$, one obtains an estimate of the form

$$\|\mathbf{U}_n\|_{H^1(\mathcal{G})} \leq C \|T_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})}$$

with a constant $C > 0$ independent of n (because λ is fixed and $\lambda \neq \lambda_0$ excludes the unique nontrivial kernel element). In particular, $\|\mathbf{U}_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})} \leq C$ for all n , contradicting $\|\mathbf{U}_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})} \rightarrow \infty$.

Therefore $\lambda \notin \sigma(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2})$, and hence $\lambda \in \rho(\mathcal{H}_{Z, Z_2})$.

This completes the proof. \square

In the following we pursue to clarify how is the action of the unitary group. To do so we first precise the action of the resolvent operator. Let $\lambda \in \rho(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2})$ and suppose $(f, \mathbf{g}) \in L^2(\mathcal{G})$ is such that $R(\lambda : \mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2})(f, \mathbf{g}) = (\phi, \psi)$. It follows from Proposition 6.2 that $(\lambda I_{N+1} - \mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2})(\phi, \psi) = (f, \mathbf{g})$. The latter implies $(\lambda - \mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}^{loop})f = \phi$ and $(\lambda - \mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}^{\delta'})\mathbf{g} = \psi$ where $\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}^{loop}$ acts on

$$D(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}^{loop}) := \left\{ f \in H^2([-L, L]) \mid f(-L) = f(L) \text{ and } f'(L) - f'(-L) = Z_2 f(L) \right\}$$

and $\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}^{\delta'}$ acts on

$$D(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}^{\delta'}) = \left\{ \mathbf{g} \in H^2(\Gamma) \mid g'_1(L) = \dots = g'_N(L) \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^N g_j(L) = Z_1 g'_1(L) \right\}, \quad (6.4)$$

where Γ denotes the star graph obtained by removing the circular edge e_0 from the looping-edge graph. In summary we have seen that

$$R(\lambda : \mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}) = \text{diag}(R(\lambda : \mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}^{loop}), R(\lambda : \mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}^{\delta'})). \quad (6.5)$$

Expression (6.5) is the main ingredient to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 6.3. *Let $Z_1, Z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $N \geq 1$. The unitary group associated with $(-\Delta, D_{Z_1, Z_2, N})$ acts as*

$$e^{-it\mathcal{H}_Z}(f, \mathbf{g}) = (W_1(t)f, W_2(t)\mathbf{g}),$$

where $W_1(t)f = e^{-it\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}^{loop}}f$ is the unitary group generated by $\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}^{loop}$ on $L^2([-L, L])$ and $W_2(t)\mathbf{g} = e^{-itH_Z^{\delta'}}\mathbf{g}$ is the unitary group generated by $H_Z^{\delta'}$ on the star graph Γ .

Proof. The proof follows from (6.5) and the fact that the resolvent of the infinitesimal generator can be seen as the Laplace transform of the group (see [55, Section 1.7]). In fact, one can express $e^{-it\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-it\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}}(f, \mathbf{g}) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma-i\infty}^{\gamma+i\infty} e^{\lambda t} R(\lambda : \mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2})(f, \mathbf{g}) d\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left(\int_{\gamma-i\infty}^{\gamma+i\infty} e^{\lambda t} R(\lambda : \mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}^{loop})f d\lambda, \int_{\gamma-i\infty}^{\gamma+i\infty} e^{\lambda t} R(\lambda : \mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}^{\delta'})\mathbf{g} d\lambda \right) \\ &= (W_1(t)f, W_2(t)\mathbf{g}), \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

where $\gamma > \beta + 1$ with $\beta \geq 0$ given by $\beta = 0$ except when $Z_1 < 0$ and (6.3) holds, in such case $\beta = \frac{N^2}{Z_1^2}$. Moreover, $\lambda \in \rho(\mathcal{H}_Z)$ with $\text{Re } \lambda = \gamma$, and for every $\delta > 0$, the integral converges uniformly in t for every $t \in [\delta, 1/\delta]$. \square

Remark 5. *It is important to note that from Theorem 6.3 and (6.6) one easily see that the set X for $Z_2 \neq 0$ defined on (3.6) is preserved under the action of the group $e^{it\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}}$.*

We are now in position to enunciate the main result of this section.

Theorem 6.4 (Local and global well-posedness). *Let $Z_1, Z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{U}_0 \in X$, where X is defined in (3.6), and $p > 1$. Then the integral equation associated with (1.1),*

$$\mathbf{U}(t) = e^{it\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}}\mathbf{U}_0 - i \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}} |\mathbf{U}(s)|^{p-1} \mathbf{U}(s) ds, \quad (6.7)$$

has a unique solution $\mathbf{U} \in C((-T, T); X)$ for some $T = T(\|\mathbf{U}_0\|_{H^1}) > 0$ with initial condition $\mathbf{U}(0) = \mathbf{U}_0$. Moreover, for any $T_0 < T$, the mapping

$$\mathbf{U}_0 \in X \longmapsto \mathbf{U} \in C([-T_0, T_0]; X)$$

is continuous. In particular, for $p > 2$ this mapping is of class C^2 . For $1 < p < 5$, the solution can be extended globally in time, i.e., T can be taken arbitrarily large.

Proof. The case $Z_2 = 0$ was proved in [16, Theorem 1.3] so we focus only in the case $Z_0 \neq 0$. Based in Theorem 6.3 the local well-posedness result in X follows from standard arguments of the Banach fixed point theorem on metric graphs (splitting in our case the energy space in the spaces $\{f \in L^2([-L, L]) \mid f(L) = f(-L)\}$ and $H^1(\Gamma)$ where Γ represents the metric star graph determined by the number N of infinite half-lines $[L, +\infty)$ attached to the common vertex). We will give the sketch of the proof for convenience of the reader. Consider the mapping $J_{\mathbf{U}_0} : C([-T, T] : X) \longrightarrow C([-T, T]; X)$ given by

$$J_{\mathbf{U}_0}[\mathbf{U}](t) = e^{it\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}} \mathbf{U}_0 + \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}} F(\mathbf{U}(s)) ds,$$

where $e^{it\mathcal{H}_Z}$ is the unitary group given by Theorem 6.3 and $F(\mathbf{U}) = |\mathbf{U}|^{p-1}\mathbf{U}$. By following [2, Proposition 2.1 and Corollary 2.1] based in Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality on graphs

$$\|\mathbf{U}\|_{L^q(\mathcal{G})} \leq C \|\nabla \mathbf{U}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})}^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{q}} \|\mathbf{U}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q}}, \quad q > 2, \quad C > 0,$$

we get that the mapping $J_{\mathbf{U}_0}$ is well-defined, the continuity and contraction property of $J_{\mathbf{U}_0}$. Then, the Banach fixed point theorem implies that the integral equation associated with (1.1) has a unique solution $\mathbf{U} \in C([-T, T] : X)$ for some $T = T(\|\mathbf{U}_0\|_{H^1(\mathcal{G})}) > 0$ with initial condition $\mathbf{U}(0) = \mathbf{U}_0$. Moreover, the mapping data-solution is at least continuous.

Next, we recall that the argument based on the contraction mapping principle above has the advantage that if $F(\mathbf{U})$ has a specific regularity, then it is inherited by the mapping data-solution, this general fact follows from the Implicit function theorem (see [45, Corollary 5.6]). By completeness in our exposition, we will give some highlight of this property that will be use in our stability theory below. We consider for $(\mathbf{W}_0, \mathbf{W}) \in B(\mathbf{U}_0; \epsilon) \times C([-T, T], X)$, with $\epsilon > 0$ and T given in the former local well-posedness analysis, the mapping

$$\Upsilon(\mathbf{W}_0, \mathbf{W})(t) = W(t) - J_{\mathbf{W}_0}[\mathbf{W}](t), \quad t \in [-T, T].$$

Then, by the analysis above $\Upsilon(\mathbf{U}_0, \mathbf{U})(t) = 0$ for all $t \in [-T, T]$, and since $F(\mathbf{W})$ is smooth we obtain that Υ is smooth. Hence, using the arguments applied for obtaining the local well-posedness in X above, we can show that the operator $\partial_{\mathbf{W}} \Upsilon(\mathbf{U}_0, \mathbf{U})$ is one-to-one and onto. Thus, by the Implicit function theorem there exists a smooth mapping $\mathbf{A} : B(\mathbf{U}_0; \delta) \rightarrow C([-T, T], X)$ such that $\Upsilon(\mathbf{W}_0, \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{W}_0)) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{W}_0 \in B(\mathbf{U}_0; \delta)$. This argument establishes the smoothness property of the mapping data-solution associated to the NLS equation.

By using (3.7)–(3.8) and ideas in Section 2 of [2], we obtain that the local solution extend to a global one. This finishes the proof. \square

7 Stability theory

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2 based on the Grillakis-Shatah-Strauss approach [37, 38] (see also Appendix A).

We divide the proof into two parts.

Proof of Theorem 1.2, part (i). Note from Theorem 6.4 that (1.1) is globally well-posed for $p = 3$ with a datum-solution map at least C^2 . For any $\omega_0 \in I$, from Theorem 1.1 we have the existence of a smooth curve of bound states $\omega \mapsto \mathbf{U}(\omega)$ in the energy space X defined on (3.6). From (3.9), (3.11) and Theorem 5.1 we have the spectral structure required to apply the criterion in Theorem A.1 to the profiles $\mathbf{U}(\omega)$. Moreover, Proposition 4.1 provides the slope condition $\rho(\omega) = 1$ (see (A.1)). We conclude the proof of Theorem 1.2, part (i), by applying Theorem A.1, item 1. \square

The proof of item (ii) of Theorem 1.2 require a little bit more work. In fact, we will apply Theorem A.1, item 2, in a subspace of the energy set X which preserve some symmetry. More precisely, we can establish the following result

Theorem 7.1. *Let $L > 0$, $Z_1 < 0$, and $N \geq 2$ be even. For every fixed $\omega_0 \in I$, consider the smooth map*

$$\omega \in (\omega_0 - \delta, \omega_0 + \delta) \subset I \mapsto (\mathbf{P}(\omega), Z_2(\omega)) \in \mathcal{D}_\omega \times (-\gamma, \gamma)$$

of solutions to system (1.6) established in Theorem 4.2, for some $\delta, \gamma > 0$. Then:

- (i) *If $\omega_0 + \delta < \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2}$, then $e^{i\omega t}\mathbf{P}(\omega)$ is orbitally stable in $H^1(\mathcal{G})$ for all $\omega \in (\omega_0 - \delta, \omega_0 + \delta) \subset I$.*
- (ii) *If $\omega_0 - \delta > \frac{2N^2}{Z_1^2}$, then $e^{i\omega t}\mathbf{P}(\omega)$ is orbitally unstable in $H^1(\mathcal{G})$ for all $\omega \in (\omega_0 - \delta, \omega_0 + \delta) \subset I$.*

Proof. The proof of item (i) follows along the lines of the proof of part (i) of Theorem 1.2 by considering the map $\omega \mapsto \mathbf{P}(\omega)$ provided by Theorem 4.2. The spectral structure is provided by Theorem 5.2 items 1, 2.1 and 3 to 5. The slope condition $\rho(\omega) = 1$ is given in Proposition 4.3.

On the other hand, to prove item (ii), we need to note in addition that from Theorem 5.2, item 2.2, the Morse index $n(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}) = 2$. Therefore the slope condition $\rho(\omega) = 1$ lead to the count $n(\mathcal{H}_{Z_1, Z_2}) - \rho(\omega) = 1$. The result follows from Theorem A.1, item 2 (see also Remark 6). \square

We finish this section with the proof of part (ii) of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2, part (ii). Let $\omega_0 \in I$ be fixed but arbitrary. Since the map

$$(\omega_0 - \delta, \omega_0 + \delta) \ni \omega \mapsto \mathbf{U}(\omega) \in D_{Z_1, Z_2, N}$$

provided by Theorem 1.1 is such that $\mathbf{U}(\omega) \big|_{\omega=\omega_0} = \mathbf{U}_0 \in \mathcal{D}_{\omega_0}$ (see (3.4)), by uniqueness of the map

$$(\omega_0 - \tilde{\delta}, \omega_0 + \tilde{\delta}) \ni \omega \mapsto \mathbf{P}(\omega) \in \mathcal{D}_\omega$$

provided by Theorem 4.2, there exists a small neighborhood of ω_0 , say $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}(\omega_0)$, in which $\mathbf{P}(\omega) = \mathbf{U}(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \mathcal{O}$. By item (ii) of Theorem 7.1 the result follows. \square

Acknowledgments

This study is financed, in part, by the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP), Brazil. Process number 2024/20623-7.

J. Angulo was partially funded by CNPq/Brazil Grant.

Data availability statement. Data supporting this study are included within the article and/or supporting materials.

A Orbital (in)stability criterion

In the Grillakis-Shatah-Straus (GSS, [37, 38]) setting we assume the existence of C^2 -conserved functionals $E_{Z_1, Z_2} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (energy) with $E_{Z_1, Z_2}(\mathbf{U}(t)) = E_{Z_1, Z_2}(\mathbf{U}(0))$, and $Q : L^2(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (mass) with $Q(\mathbf{U}(t)) = Q(\mathbf{U}(0)) = \|\mathbf{U}(0)\|_2^2$. Note E_{Z_1, Z_2} is invariant by the phase symmetry $T(\theta) = e^{i\theta}$ for any $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$. Note also the standing waves are written in the form $T(\omega t)\Theta(x)$.

Suppose that the Cauchy problem associated to (1.1) is globally well-posed in the energy space X , more precisely, it is guaranteed existence and uniqueness of solutions with continuous datum-solution map.

We suppose the existence of a C^1 map on $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathcal{O} \ni \omega \mapsto \Theta_\omega \in X$$

of stationary solutions that are critical points of the action functional $S = E_{Z_1, Z_2} + \omega Q$.

Define on \mathcal{O} the function

$$\rho(\omega_0) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \partial_\omega \|\Theta_\omega\|^2 > 0 \text{ at } \omega = \omega_0. \\ 0, & \text{if } \partial_\omega \|\Theta_\omega\|^2 < 0 \text{ at } \omega = \omega_0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

For the (in)stability study of Θ_ω the main information will be given by the second variation

$$S''(\Theta_\omega)(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) = [\mathcal{L}_{+, Z_1, Z_2} \mathbf{U}_1, \mathbf{V}_1] + [\mathcal{L}_{-, Z_1, Z_2} \mathbf{U}_2, \mathbf{V}_2], \quad \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}_1 + i\mathbf{U}_2, \quad \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_1 + i\mathbf{V}_2,$$

in the following sense:

Theorem A.1. *Suppose $\text{Ker}(\mathcal{L}_{-, Z_1, Z_2}) = \text{span}\{\Theta_\omega\}$ and $\text{Ker}(\mathcal{L}_{+, Z_1, Z_2}) = \{0\}$. Assume also the Morse indices of $n(\mathcal{L}_{\pm, Z})$ are finite while the rest of the spectra is bounded away from 0. Then the following hold for $\mathcal{H} := \text{diag}(\mathcal{L}_{+, Z_1, Z_2}, \mathcal{L}_{-, Z_1, Z_2})$:*

1. *If $n(\mathcal{H}) = \rho(\omega) = 1$, then the standing wave $e^{i\omega t}\Theta_\omega$ is orbitally stable in the energy space X .*
2. *If $n(\mathcal{H}) - \rho(\omega)$ is odd, then the standing wave $e^{i\omega t}\Theta_\omega$ is orbitally unstable in the energy space X .*

Remark 6. *The second item above deserve further discussion. From [37] when $n(\mathcal{H}) - \rho(\omega)$ is odd it is obtained that $e^{i\omega t}\Theta_\omega$ is spectrally unstable via the existence of nonzero eigenvalues for the linearized operator*

$$J\mathcal{H} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_{N+1} \\ -I_{N+1} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{L}_{+, Z_1, Z_2} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{L}_{-, Z_1, Z_2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathcal{L}_{-, Z_1, Z_2} \\ -\mathcal{L}_{+, Z_1, Z_2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

(see [37, Theorem 5.1]). In order to get nonlinear instability via [37, Theorem 6.1] one need the semigroup estimate

$$\|e^{tJ\mathcal{H}}\| \leq be^{\mu t} \text{ for some } \mu < 2\text{Re}\lambda,$$

being λ an eigenvalue of $J\mathcal{H}$ with positive real part. In the case of Schrödinger operators posed on metric graphs we don't know a "standardized" way to obtain such a result. One may obtain nonlinear instability using the approach of [56, Theorem 2] provided the datum-solution map is at least of class C^2 , which is the case of this manuscript (see the details on [21, Theorem 3.5]. See also applications of such ideas, for instance, in [15, 18]).

A.1 Perturbation theory

In this Appendix, we state some facts from perturbation theory of closed linear operator on Hilbert spaces that we have used in section 5 (see Kato [?] for details). We consider $\mathcal{X} = L^2(\mathcal{G}) \times L^2(\mathcal{G})$ on the metric looping-edge graph \mathcal{G} with norm defined by $\|(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})\|^2 = \|\mathbf{U}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})}^2 + \|\mathbf{V}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})}^2$, and for any closed operator T on $L^2(\mathcal{G})$ with domain $D(T)$, its graph, $G(T) = \{(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) \in \mathcal{X} : \mathbf{U} \in D(T), T(\mathbf{U}) = \mathbf{V}\}$. Then a metric on $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})$, the space of closed operators on $L^2(\mathcal{G})$, may be defined as follows: for any $S, T \in \mathcal{C}$

$$\widehat{\delta}(S, T) = \|P_S - P_T\|_{B(\mathcal{X})}$$

where P_S and P_T are the orthogonal projections on $G(S)$ and $G(T)$, respectively, and $\|\cdot\|_{B(\mathcal{X})}$ denotes the operator norm on the space of bounded operators on \mathcal{X} . The results of section IV-4 of Kato [27] imply the following,

Theorem A.2. *Let $T \in \mathcal{C}$, and suppose A is a bounded operator on $L^2(\mathcal{G})$ with operator norm $\|A\|_{B(L^2(\mathcal{G}))}$. Then $\widehat{\delta}(T + A, T) \leq \|A\|_{B(L^2(\mathcal{G}))}$.*

References

- [1] R. Adami, C. Cacciapuoti, D. Finco, and D. Noja, *Stable standing waves for a NLS on star graphs as local minimizers of the constrained energy*, J. Differential Equations, 260 (2016), 7397–7415.
- [2] R. Adami, C. Cacciapuoti, D. Finco, and D. Noja, *Variational properties and orbital stability of standing waves for NLS equation on a star graph*, J. Differential Equations, 257 (2014), 3738–3777.
- [3] R. Adami, E. Serra, and P. Tilli, *NLS ground states on graphs*, Calc. Var., 54 (2015), no. 1, 743–761.
- [4] R. Adami, E. Serra, and P. Tilli, *Threshold phenomena and existence results for NLS ground states on graphs*, J. Funct. Anal., 271 (2016), 201–223.
- [5] R. Adami, E. Serra, and P. Tilli, *Negative energy ground states for the L^2 -critical NLSE on metric graphs*, Comm. Math. Phys. 352 (2017), 387–406.
- [6] R. Adami, E. Serra, and P. Tilli, *Multiple positive bound states for the subcritical NLS equation on metric graphs*, Calc. Var., 58 (2019), no. 1, 5, 16pp.
- [7] S. Albeverio, F. Gesztesy, R. Hoegh-Krohn, and H. Holden, *Solvable models in quantum mechanics*, 2nd edition, AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, 2005.
- [8] J. P. Albert, J.L. Bona, and D. Henry, *Sufficient conditions for stability of solitary-wave solutions of model equations for long waves*, Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 24 (1987), 343–366.
- [9] J. Angulo, *Stability theory for two-lobe states on the tadpole graph for the NLS equation*, Nonlinearity, 37, (2024), no. 4, 045015.
- [10] J. Angulo. *Nonlinear stability of periodic traveling wave solutions to the Schrödinger and the modified Korteweg-de Vries equations*, JDE, 235, 1–30. 2007.
- [11] J. Angulo and M. Cavalcante, *Nonlinear Dispersive Equations on Star Graphs*, 32º Colóquio Brasileiro de Matemática, IMPA, 2019.

- [12] J. Angulo and M. Cavalcante, *Linear instability of stationary solitons for the Korteweg-de Vries equation on a star graph*, Nonlinearity, 34, (2021), 3373–3410.
- [13] J. Angulo and N. Goloshchapova, *On the orbital instability of excited states for the NLS equation with the δ -interaction on a star graph*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. A., 38(10), (2018), 5039–5066.
- [14] J. Angulo and N. Goloshchapova, *Extension theory approach in the stability of the standing waves for the NLS equation with point interactions on a star graph*, Adv. Differential Equations 23 (11-12), (2018), 793–846.
- [15] J. Angulo, O. Lopes, and A. Neves, *Instability of travelling waves for weakly coupled KdV systems*, Nonlinear Anal. 69 (2008), no. 5-6, pp. 1870–1887.
- [16] J. Angulo and A. Muñoz, *Nonlinear Schrödinger equations on looping-edge graphs with δ' -type interactions*, To appear in J. Evol. Equ. (2026).
- [17] J. Angulo and A. Muñoz, *Airy and Schrödinger-type equations on looping-edge graphs*, arXiv:2410.11729. (2024).
- [18] J. Angulo and F. Natali, *On the instability of periodic waves for dispersive equations*, Differ. Integral Equ. 29 (2016), no. 9-10, pp. 837–874.
- [19] J. Angulo and R. Plaza, *Instability of static solutions of the sine-Gordon equation on a Y-junction graph with δ interaction*, J. Nonlinear Science, 31, 50, (2021).
- [20] J. Angulo and R. Plaza, *Instability theory of kink and anti-kink profiles for the sine-Gordon on Josephson tricrystal boundaries*, Physica D, 427, (2021), 133020.
- [21] J. Angulo and R. Plaza, *Unstable kink and anti-kink profiles for the sine-Gordon on a Y-junction graph with δ interaction at the vertex*, Mathematische Zeitschrift, 300, (2022), 2885–2915.
- [22] A. H. Ardila, *Orbital stability of standing waves for supercritical NLS with potential on graphs*, Applicable Analysis, 99, (2020), no. 8, 1359–1372.
- [23] G. Berkolaiko and P. Kuchment, *Introduction to Quantum Graphs*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 186, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013.
- [24] F. A. Berezin and M. A. Shubin, *The Schrödinger Equation*, Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series), 66, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1991.
- [25] R. Burioni, D. Cassi, M. Rasetti, P. Sodano, and A. Vezzani, *Bose-Einstein condensation on inhomogeneous complex networks*, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys., 34 (2001), 4697–4710.
- [26] C. Cacciapuoti, D. Finco, and D. Noja, *Topology induced bifurcations for the NLS on the tadpole graph*, Phys. Rev. E 91 (2015), 013206.
- [27] C. Cacciapuoti, D. Finco, and D. Noja, *Ground state and orbital stability for the NLS equation on a general starlike graph with potentials*, Nonlinearity 30, (2017), no. 8, 3271–3303.
- [28] C. Cacciapuoti, *Existence of the ground state for the NLS with potential on graphs*, Contemporary Mathematics, Mathematical Problems in Quantum Physics, 717, (2018), 155–172.
- [29] T. Cazenave, *Semilinear Schrödinger Equations*, American Mathematical Society, AMS. Lecture Notes, v. 10, 2003.

- [30] G. P. Chuiko, O. V. Dvornik, S.I. Shyian, and Y.A. Baganov, *A new age-related model for blood stroke volume*. Computers in Biology and Medicine, 79 (2016), 144–148.
- [31] E. Crépeau and M. Sorine, *A reduced model of pulsatile flow in an arterial compartment*. Chaos Solitons Fractals, 34 (2) (2007), 594–605.
- [32] P. Exner, *Magnetoresonance on a lasso graph*, Foundations of Physics, 27, 171 (1997).
- [33] P. Exner and M. Jex, *On the ground state of quantum graphs with attractive δ -coupling*, Phys. Lett. A 376, (2012), 713–717.
- [34] P. Exner, J. Keating, P. Kuchment, T. Sunada, and A. Teplyaev, *Analysis on graphs and its applications*, xiii, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 77, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008.
- [35] P. Exner and P. Šeba. *Free quantum motion on a branching graph*, Rep. Math. Phys., 28, 7–26. 1989.
- [36] F. Fidaleo, *Harmonic analysis on inhomogeneous amenable networks and the Bose-Einstein condensation*, J. Stat. Phys., 160 (2015), 715–759.
- [37] M. Grillakis, J. Shatah and W. Strauss. *Stability theory of solitary waves in the presence of symmetry, II*, J. Funct. Anal., 94, 308–348. 1990.
- [38] M. Grillakis, J. Shatah and W. Strauss. *Stability theory of solitary waves in the presence of symmetry, I*, J. Funct. Anal., 74(1), 160–197. 1987.
- [39] A. Kairzhan, R. Marangell, D. E. Pelinovsky, and K. Xiao, *Existence of standing waves on a flower graph*, J. Differential Equations, 271, (2021), 719–763.
- [40] A. Kairzhan, D. Noja, and D. E. Pelinovsky, *Standing waves on quantum graphs*, J. Phys. A; Math. Theor. 55, (2022), 243001 (51pp).
- [41] A. Kairzhan, D. E. Pelinovsky, and R. Goodman, *drift of spectrally stable shifted states on star graphs*, SIAM, Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems, 18, (2019), 1723–1755.
- [42] T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Second ed., 1980.
- [43] Q. Kong, H. Wu, and A. Zettl, *Dependence of the n -th Sturm-Liouville eigenvalue problem*, J. Differential Equations, 156, (1999), 328–354.
- [44] P. Kuchment, *Quantum graphs, I. Some basic structures*, Waves Random Media, 14 (2004), 107–128.
- [45] F. Linares and G. Ponce, *Introduction to Nonlinear Dispersive Equations*, 2nd edition, Universitext, Springer, New York, (2015).
- [46] J.L. Marzuola and D. E. Pelinovsky, *Ground state on the dumbbell graph*, Appl. Math. Res. Express, (2016), 98–145.
- [47] D. Mugnolo, *Mathematical Technology of Networks*, Bielefeld, December 2013, Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics 128, 2015.
- [48] M.A. Naimark, *Linear Differential Operators*, (Russian), 2nd edition, revised and augmented., Izdat. “Nauka”, Moscow, 1969.

- [49] K. Nakajima and Y. Onodera, *Logic design of Josephson network. II*, J. Appl. Phys. 49 (1978), no. 5, 2958–2963.
- [50] K. Nakajima and Y. Onodera, *Logic design of Josephson network*, J. Appl. Phys. 47 (1976), no. 4, 1620–1627.
- [51] D. Noja, *Nonlinear Schrödinger equation on graphs: recent results and open problems*, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci., 372 (2014), 20130002, 20 pp.
- [52] D. Noja and D. E. Pelinovsky, *Standing waves of the quintic NLS equation on the tadpole graph*, Calc. Var. 59, 173 (2020).
- [53] D. Noja, D. E. Pelinovsky, and G. Shaikhova, *Bifurcations and stability of standing waves in the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the tadpole graph*, Nonlinearity 28, (2015), 2343–2378.
- [54] A. Pankov, *Nonlinear Schrödinger equations on periodic metric graphs*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems-A, 38 (2018), no. 4, 697–714.
- [55] A. Pazy. *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations*, Vol. 44. Applied Mathematical Sciences, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.
- [56] D. Henry, J. Perez, and W. Wreszinski, *Stability theory for solitary-wave solutions of scalar field equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. 85 (1982), no. 3, pp. 351–361.
- [57] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics, II, Fourier Analysis and Self-Adjointness*, Academic Press, New York, 1978.
- [58] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics, IV, Analysis of operators*, Academic Press, New York, 1975.
- [59] C. Schubert, C. Seifert, J. Voigt and M. Waurick. *Boundary systems and (skew-) self-adjoint operators on infinite metric graphs*, Math. Nachr., 288, 1776–1785. 2015.
- [60] A. Zettl, *Sturm-Liouville Theory*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs (SURV), 121, AMS, 2005.