

ANALYSIS OF GRADIENT FLOW FOR COMPUTING DEFOCUSING ACTION GROUND STATES OF ROTATING NONLINEAR SCHRÖDINGER EQUATIONS

WEI LIU, TINGFENG WANG, YONGJUN YUAN, AND XIAOFEI ZHAO

ABSTRACT. This work focuses on the numerical computation of defocusing action ground states for rotating nonlinear Schrödinger equations (RNLS) using a direct gradient flow (DGF) method. We address theoretical gaps in the existing literature concerning the stability and convergence of this DGF scheme. Firstly, we prove the unconditional stability of the DGF scheme, demonstrating that the action functional is monotonically non-increasing along the discrete flow for arbitrary time step sizes. Secondly, we establish a rigorous convergence analysis, proving global convergence under minor assumptions and local exponential convergence to the action ground state under a reasonable non-degeneracy condition. The analysis relies on the uniform boundedness of sublevel sets of the action functional and introduces a tailored H^1 -distance between phase-shift equivalence classes to handle complex-valued ground states with quantized vortices. A novel analytical framework is also developed to establish the exponential convergence rate. Numerical experiments are presented to validate the theoretical findings, demonstrating both the global migration towards a neighborhood of the ground state and subsequent exponential convergence.

Keywords. Rotating nonlinear Schrödinger equation; Action ground state; Gradient flow; Unconditional stability; Global convergence; Exponential convergence rate.

AMS(2010) subject classifications. 65M12, 35K20, 35K35, 35K55, 65Z05

1. INTRODUCTION

The nonlinear Schrödinger equation is a fundamentally important model in mathematical physics, widely applied in quantum physics [5, 25], nonlinear optics [11, 31] and wave dynamics in general [36, 39]. To describe matters in a rotating frame, e.g., the rotating BEC [18], a rotating force term has been further added leading to the following rotating nonlinear Schrödinger equation (RNLS) [1, 5] in d dimensions ($\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}^+$):

$$i\partial_t \psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = -\frac{1}{2}\Delta \psi(\mathbf{x}, t) + V(\mathbf{x})\psi(\mathbf{x}, t) + \beta|\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)|^{p-1}\psi(\mathbf{x}, t) - \Omega L_z \psi(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad t > 0,$$

where ψ is a complex-valued wave function, $\Omega \geq 0$ denotes the rotating speed with L_z the angular momentum operator

$$L_z = \begin{cases} i(x_2\partial_{x_1} - x_1\partial_{x_2}), & d \geq 2, \\ 0, & d = 1, \end{cases}$$

and $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an external trapping potential typically taken as a harmonic oscillator $V(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^d \gamma_i^2 x_i^2$ with γ_i the trapping frequency in applications. Moreover, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ is a given parameter denoting the strength of nonlinear self-interaction with $\beta > 0$ and $\beta < 0$ corresponding to the defocusing and focusing cases, and $p > 1$ is a given exponent. For $d \geq 3$, one usually assumes $1 < p < (d+2)/(d-2)$ for well-posedness of the model [7, 32].

Among all possible solutions of RNLS, the standing wave or soliton solution $\psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = e^{i\omega t}\phi(\mathbf{x})$ ($\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ often referred as the chemical potential) that maintains its shape during dynamics, finds special importance in applications, where $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ solves the stationary RNLS:

$$-\frac{1}{2}\Delta \phi(\mathbf{x}) + V(\mathbf{x})\phi(\mathbf{x}) + \beta|\phi(\mathbf{x})|^{p-1}\phi(\mathbf{x}) - \Omega L_z \phi(\mathbf{x}) + \omega \phi(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (1.1)$$

It has been known from elliptic theory that (1.1) possesses infinitely many nontrivial solutions [8, 35]. Identifying the most stable and physically relevant standing waves corresponds to the study of ground

state (GS), where two types of GS have been defined in the literature [5, 7, 16]. The first is the *energy GS* that is a minimizer of the energy functional [5]

$$E_{\Omega}(\phi) := \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V|\phi|^2 \, d\mathbf{x} + \frac{2\beta}{p+1} \|\phi\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1} + L_{\Omega}(\phi), \quad L_{\Omega}(\phi) := -\Omega \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \bar{\phi} L_z \phi \, d\mathbf{x},$$

subject to a prescribed mass $m_0 > 0$, i.e., $\min\{E_{\Omega}(\phi) : \phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d), \|\phi\|_{L^2} = m_0\}$. The second kind is the *action GS* defined as a nontrivial minimizer of the *action functional*

$$S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) := \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V|\phi|^2 \, d\mathbf{x} + \frac{2\beta}{p+1} \|\phi\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1} + L_{\Omega}(\phi) + \omega \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 = E_{\Omega}(\phi) + \omega \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (1.2)$$

under the natural constraint of (1.1), receiving considerable attention ever since the work of Berestycki and Lions [7], and it is later found equivalently to be defined on the Nehari manifold [4, 19, 30], i.e.,

$$\phi_g \in \arg \min\{S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) : \phi \in \mathcal{M}\}, \quad \mathcal{M} := \{\phi \in X \setminus \{0\} : K_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) = 0\}, \quad (1.3)$$

where

$$K_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V|\phi|^2 \, d\mathbf{x} + \beta \|\phi\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1} + L_{\Omega}(\phi) + \omega \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The energy GS has been extensively studied both theoretically and numerically, e.g., [2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 22, 24, 25, 26, 33, 41]. For action GS, the seminal work [7] initiated a vast literature on theoretical studies, e.g., [4, 7, 16, 19, 20, 34]. Some recent efforts have been made to understand the mathematical relation between the two kinds of GS. The results [16, 24, 27] have revealed the in-equivalence between the energy GS and the action GS, underscoring the necessity of studying them independently.

On the computational side of the action GS, for the focusing case ($\beta < 0$), [37] employed a projected gradient flow approach to solve the Nehari-constrained minimization problem (1.3). Our previous work [30] proposed an L^{p+1} -constrained minimization formulation equivalent to but simpler than (1.3), based on which a normalized gradient flow method was proposed. In a parallel recent work [28], we established the convergence of the method. On the other hand, for the defocusing case ($\beta > 0$), we have shown in [30] that the constraint in (1.3) can be completely removed, leading to an equivalent unconstrained minimization formulation for the action GS:

$$\phi_g \in \arg \min\{S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) : \phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)\}. \quad (1.4)$$

Based on (1.4), an efficient direct gradient flow (DGF) method has been proposed. Despite its practical effectiveness demonstrated in [29, 30], the DGF scheme still lacks theoretical support in two major aspects: (i) only a *modified* action is shown [30] to decay without a guaranty for stability of the original action $S_{\Omega, \omega}$; (ii) no convergence analysis has been done so far.

This work focuses on the defocusing action GS of RNLS and is targeted to fill the aforementioned theoretical gaps for the DGF scheme. More precisely, we shall first establish for the DGF scheme an **unconditional stability in the original action**. That is, $S_{\Omega, \omega}$ is monotonically non-increasing along the discrete flow for arbitrary time step. Then, we shall carry out a rigorous convergence analysis for the DGF scheme and obtain two main results: (i) under minor assumptions, a **global convergence**; (ii) under a reasonable non-degeneracy assumption, a local convergence with the **optimal exponential rate** toward the action GS. The global and local behavior of DGF will be numerically justified: the numerical solution first migrates into a neighborhood of the GS, and subsequently exhibits exponential convergence. The novelty of our analysis includes:

- The uniform boundedness of sublevel set $S_{\leq m} = \{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d) : S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) \leq m\}$ in H^1 for any $m > 0$, which gives stability of the discrete trajectory in DGF and is crucial for establishing the monotonic decay of $S_{\Omega, \omega}$.
- A tailored H^1 -distance between phase-shift equivalence classes, which is introduced to handle the invariance of $S_{\Omega, \omega}$ for complex-valued GS under constant phase changes, enabling measurement of the distance from the GS in the presence of quantized vortices.
- A new analytical framework for establishing exponential convergence rate of time-discrete gradient flow toward the steady state.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly reviews the DGF method and establishes the stability of its action functional. In Section 3, we in a sequel establish the global convergence result and the local exponential convergence rate of DGF. Section 4 presents numerical experiments that confirm our theoretical findings. Finally, Section 5 provides some concluding remarks. For later use, we clarify some notation and conventions: $a \lesssim b$ means $|a| \leq Cb$ and $a \gtrsim b$ means $|a| \geq Cb$, for some constant $C > 0$ independent of temporal discretization parameters (such as the time step τ and the time level n); $a \asymp b$ means both $a \lesssim b$ and $b \lesssim a$. Throughout the work, we assume that $\beta > 0$ in (1.1) or (1.2).

2. DGF METHOD AND ITS STABILITY

This section begins with a brief review of the DGF scheme proposed in [30] for computing the action GS in the defocusing case, and then establishes in detail its stability in terms of the unconditional decay of the action functional $S_{\Omega,\omega}$.

2.1. Preliminaries. Let us first give some notations. For numerical computation and theoretical analysis, we will consider the problem (1.3) or (1.4) on a truncated bounded domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with appropriate boundary conditions (e.g., homogeneous Dirichlet or periodic boundary conditions). Such a truncation is justified as the GS exhibits a fast decay in the far field at the presence of the confinement potential $V(\mathbf{x})$, where by choosing D sufficiently large, the truncation error is negligible. The real inner products of the functional spaces $L^2(D)$ and $H^1(D)$ are denoted as

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle_{L^2(D)} := \operatorname{Re} \left(\int_D \phi \bar{\psi} \, d\mathbf{x} \right), \quad \langle \phi, \psi \rangle_{H^1(D)} := \operatorname{Re} \left(\int_D \phi \bar{\psi} \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_D \nabla \phi \cdot \nabla \bar{\psi} \, d\mathbf{x} \right),$$

where \bar{z} means the complex conjugate of $z \in \mathbb{C}$, and their induced norms are denoted as $\|\cdot\|_{L^2}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{H^1}$. We will write $X = H^1(D)$ for short and also denote

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle := \int_D \phi \bar{\psi} \, d\mathbf{x} \quad \phi \in H^{-1}(D), \quad \psi \in X,$$

where $H^{-1}(D)$ is the dual space of X with the norm

$$\|\phi\|_{H^{-1}} = \sup_{\psi \in X, \psi \neq 0} \frac{|\langle \phi, \psi \rangle|}{\|\psi\|_{H^1}}.$$

Hereafter, we change the domain of integration in functionals $S_{\Omega,\omega}$, $K_{\Omega,\omega}$, L_{Ω} , E_{Ω} and in some relevant norms from \mathbb{R}^d to D . To provide the existence of GS, we are under the following basic setup.

Assumption (A). Let $1 < p < \frac{d+2}{d-2}$ for $d \geq 3$ and $1 < p < \infty$ for $d = 1, 2$. Assume that $V \in L^\infty(D)$, and one of the following holds:

- (a) $d = 1$ (or $\Omega = 0$) and $V(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in D$.
- (b) $d \geq 2$, $V(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^d \gamma_i^2 x_i^2$ with $\gamma_i > 0$ and $\Omega < \min \{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$.

Under Assumption (A), X is (compactly) embedded into $L^{p+1}(D)$, and the functionals $S_{\Omega,\omega}$ and $K_{\Omega,\omega}$ are well-defined in X . Next, we recall several standard inequalities and fix the notation for the involved generic constants that will be used throughout.

Lemma 2.1. *For any $u \in X$, the following inequalities hold:*

- (i) (Embedding inequality) *There exists a constant $C_E := C_E(d, p, D)$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{L^{p+1}} \leq C_E \|u\|_{H^1}.$$

- (ii) (Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality) *There exists a constant $C_G := C_G(d, p, D)$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{L^{p+1}} \leq C_G \|u\|_{L^2}^{1-\theta} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^\theta,$$

where $\theta = d \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p+1} \right) \in (0, 1)$.

(iii) If $d \geq 2$, then for any constant $c > 0$,

$$\left| \Omega \int_D \bar{u} L_z u \, d\mathbf{x} \right| \leq \int_D \left(\frac{c}{2} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{|\Omega|^2}{2c} (x_1^2 + x_2^2) |u|^2 \right) d\mathbf{x}.$$

When V satisfies Assumption (A), the linear operator $-\frac{1}{2}\Delta + V - \Omega L_z$ has a countably infinite discrete set of eigenvalues with the smallest eigenvalue λ_0 being simple [21]:

$$\lambda_0 := \inf_{u \in X, \|u\|_{L^2} = 1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_D V |u|^2 \, d\mathbf{x} + L_\Omega(u) \right). \quad (2.1)$$

When the given chemical potential in (1.2) satisfies $\omega < -\lambda_0$, we have established in [30] the existence of a global minimizer and shown that the Nehari constraint can be removed. Define the sublevel set $S_{\leq m} := \{\phi \in X : S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) \leq m\}$ for any $m \geq 0$.

Proposition 2.2 (Unconstrained formulation [30]). *Let Assumption (A) hold and $\omega < -\lambda_0$. Then, the following properties hold:*

- (i) The action functional $S_{\Omega, \omega}$ is bounded from below, i.e., $\inf_{\phi \in X} S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) > -\infty$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{M} \subset S_{\leq 0}$ and $\inf_{\phi \in \mathcal{M}} S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) < 0$.
- (iii) There exists a $\phi_g \in X$ such that

$$S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g) = \inf_{\phi \in X} S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) = \inf_{\phi \in \mathcal{M}} S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi). \quad (2.2)$$

The statements above are stated in [30] for the whole space \mathbb{R}^d , which hold here also for the case of bounded domain D under subtle modifications. Moreover, we can have a boundedness result in X .

Lemma 2.3 (Boundedness of sublevel set $S_{\leq m}$ in H^1). *Let Assumption (A) hold and $\omega < -\lambda_0$. Then for any $m \geq 0$, there exists some $M > 0$ such that for all $\phi \in S_{\leq m}$, we have $\|\phi\|_{H^1} \leq M$.*

Proof. First, we consider case (a) of Assumption (A). For any $\phi \in S_{\leq m}$, by using Hölder's inequality, we have for some constant $C > 0$,

$$m \geq S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) \geq (\lambda_0 + \omega) \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{2\beta}{p+1} \|\phi\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1} \geq (\lambda_0 + \omega) \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + C\beta \|\phi\|_{L^2}^{p+1},$$

which implies straightforwardly the uniform boundedness of $\|\phi\|_{L^2}$ due to $p > 1$ and $C\beta > 0$. Then, using the fact that $S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) \leq m$ with $\Omega = 0$ and $\beta > 0$ gives the uniform bound for $\|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2}$ and $\|\phi\|_{H^1}$.

We now consider case (b) of Assumption (A). From the result of Lemma 2.1 (iii), we find

$$\begin{aligned} m \geq S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) &\geq \frac{1-\delta}{2} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_D \left((V + \omega) |\phi|^2 + \frac{2\beta}{p+1} |\phi|^{p+1} - \frac{|\Omega|^2}{2\delta} (x_1^2 + x_2^2) |\phi|^2 \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ &\geq \frac{1-\delta}{2} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_D \left((V_{\Omega, \delta} + \omega) |\phi|^2 + \frac{2\beta}{p+1} |\phi|^{p+1} \right) d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned}$$

with $V_{\Omega, \delta} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d \gamma_i^2 x_i^2 - \frac{|\Omega|^2}{2\delta} (x_1^2 + x_2^2)$. Choosing $(|\Omega| / \min\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\})^2 < \delta < 1$, we have $V_{\Omega, \delta}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ and then the assertion can be proved in the same manner for case (a). \square

Proposition 2.2 indicates that the defocusing action GS can be obtained by minimizing the action functional $S_{\Omega, \omega}$ directly over the entire space X , without resorting to the Nehari manifold constraint (1.3). Consequently, the problem reduces to an unconstrained minimization of (1.2), which can be approached via a direct gradient flow (DGF):

$$\partial_t \phi = -\frac{\delta S_{\Omega, \omega}}{\delta \phi} = -\left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta + V + \beta |\phi|^{p-1} - \Omega L_z + \omega \right) \phi := -H_\phi \phi, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (2.3)$$

starting with an initial guess $\phi(\cdot, 0) = \phi_0 \in X \setminus \{0\}$. In such a way, it is straightforward to deduce from (2.3) that

$$\frac{d}{dt} S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi(\cdot, t)) = -2 \|\partial_t \phi(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Various discretization techniques can be applied to the gradient flow (2.3), and [30] suggests the following backward-forward Euler scheme: with the initial guess $\phi^0 \in X$,

$$\frac{1}{\tau}(\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n) = -\mu^{n+1}, \quad n \geq 0, \quad (2.4a)$$

$$\mu^{n+1} = \left(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta + \alpha\right) \phi^{n+1} + (V + \omega + \beta|\phi^n|^{p-1} - \Omega L_z - \alpha) \phi^n, \quad (2.4b)$$

where $\tau > 0$ is the time step and $\alpha \geq 0$ is a stabilization parameter chosen to enhance stability performance.

In [30], by choosing α properly, the monotone decay of the action functional was numerically observed but not rigorously established, where only a modified action was proved to decay during time stepping. We will fill the gap in the following.

2.2. Stability in action functional. In order to study the stability of $S_{\Omega, \omega}$ associated with the DGF scheme (2.4), we first derive several a priori bounds for ϕ^{n+1} . Rearranging (2.4), we obtain

$$\mathcal{A}\phi^{n+1} = (1 + \tau\alpha) \phi^n - \tau g(\phi^n), \quad (2.5)$$

where $\mathcal{A} := (1 + \tau\alpha)I - \frac{\tau}{2}\Delta$ and $g(\phi^n) := (V + \omega + \beta|\phi^n|^{p-1} - \Omega L_z) \phi^n$.

Throughout this paper, under a given ϕ^0 , we set $S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^0) \leq m$ for a constant $m \geq 0$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let Assumption (A) hold. If $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{8}$ and $\phi^n \in X$, then for some $C_1, C_2 > 0$,*

$$\|\phi^{n+1}\|_{H^1} \leq C_1 \|\phi^n\|_{H^1} + C_2 \|\phi^n\|_{H^1}^p. \quad (2.6)$$

Proof. By (2.5), we can write $\phi^{n+1} = \phi_1 - \tau\phi_2$, where ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are determined, respectively, by the elliptic equations $\mathcal{A}\phi_1 = (1 + \tau\alpha) \phi^n$ and $\mathcal{A}\phi_2 = g(\phi^n)$ (with the same boundary conditions as in (2.4)). On the one hand, noting that $\phi^n = (1 + \tau\alpha)^{-1} \mathcal{A}\phi_1 = \phi_1 - c\Delta\phi_1$ with $c := \frac{\tau}{2(1+\tau\alpha)} > 0$, one has

$$\|\phi^n\|_{H^1}^2 = \|\phi_1 - c\Delta\phi_1\|_{H^1}^2 = \|\phi_1\|_{H^1}^2 + 2c \left(\|\nabla\phi_1\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta\phi_1\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + c^2 \|\Delta\phi_1\|_{H^1}^2 \geq \|\phi_1\|_{H^1}^2.$$

On the other hand, taking the L^2 inner product of $\mathcal{A}\phi_2 = g(\phi^n)$ with ϕ_2 gives

$$(1 + \tau\alpha) \|\phi_2\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\tau}{2} \|\nabla\phi_2\|_{L^2}^2 = \langle \mathcal{A}\phi_2, \phi_2 \rangle = \langle g(\phi^n), \phi_2 \rangle \lesssim (\|\phi^n\|_{L^2} + \beta \|\phi^n\|_{L^{p+1}}^p) \|\phi_2\|_{H^1}.$$

Since $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{8}$, one gets $\tau \|\phi_2\|_{H^1} \lesssim \|\phi^n\|_{L^2} + \beta \|\phi^n\|_{L^{p+1}}^p \lesssim \|\phi^n\|_{H^1} + \beta \|\phi^n\|_{H^1}^p$. Consequently,

$$\|\phi^{n+1}\|_{H^1} \leq \|\phi_1\|_{H^1} + \tau \|\phi_2\|_{H^1} \lesssim \|\phi^n\|_{H^1} + \|\phi^n\|_{H^1}^p.$$

This completes the proof. \square

According to Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4, if $\phi^n \in S_{\leq m}$, then $\|\phi^n\|_{H^1} \leq M$ and

$$\|\phi^{n+1}\|_{H^1} \leq C_1 M + C_2 M^p =: C_M. \quad (2.7)$$

Now, we define for $d = 1$ or $\Omega = 0$,

$$\alpha_M = \frac{1}{2} \max \left\{ 0, \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\mathbf{x} \in D} (V(\mathbf{x}) + \omega) \right\} + \frac{1}{2} (1 - \theta) (8\theta)^{\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}} \left(\beta p C_E^{p-1} C_M^{p-1} C_G^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}},$$

otherwise,

$$\alpha_M = \frac{1}{2} \max \left\{ 0, \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\mathbf{x} \in D} (V(\mathbf{x}) + \omega + 2|\Omega|^2(x_1^2 + x_2^2)) \right\} + \frac{1}{2} (1 - \theta) (8\theta)^{\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}} \left(\beta p C_E^{p-1} C_M^{p-1} C_G^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}}.$$

The action-functional stability result then reads as follows.

Theorem 2.5 (Unconditional decay of action). *Let Assumption (A) hold. For a given $\phi^0 \in S_{\leq m}$, suppose that $\phi^n \in X$ and choose $\alpha \geq \alpha_M + \frac{1}{8}$. Then, the DGF scheme (2.4) possesses the unconditional decaying property for the action functional $S_{\Omega, \omega}$: $\forall \tau > 0$,*

$$S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^{n+1}) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) \leq -2\tau \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{\tau^2}{4} \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{H^1}^2. \quad (2.8)$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, we have $\|\phi^0\|_{H^1} \leq M$. We move on in an induction manner. Suppose that

$$S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^k) \leq m, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n, \quad (2.9)$$

which implies $\|\phi^k\|_{H^1} \leq M$ for all $0 \leq k \leq n$, and by (2.7) we have $\|\phi^{n+1}\|_{H^1} \leq C_M$. Taking the real L^2 inner products of (2.4a) and (2.4b) with $\tau\mu^{n+1}$ and $\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n$, respectively, yields

$$\begin{aligned} -2(\tau + \alpha\tau^2) \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla\phi^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla\phi^n\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla(\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + \left\langle V + \omega, |\phi^{n+1}|^2 - |\phi^n|^2 - |\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n|^2 \right\rangle_{L^2(D)} \\ &\quad + L_{\Omega}(\phi^{n+1}) - L_{\Omega}(\phi^n) - L_{\Omega}(\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n) \\ &\quad + 2\beta \left\langle |\phi^n|^{p-1} \phi^n, \phi^{n+1} - \phi^n \right\rangle_{L^2(D)}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^{n+1}) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) = -2(\tau + \alpha\tau^2) \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{\tau^2}{2} \|\nabla\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + Q^{n+1} + R^{n+1}, \quad (2.10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{n+1} &:= \left\langle V + \omega, |\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n|^2 \right\rangle_{L^2(D)} + L_{\Omega}(\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n), \\ R^{n+1} &:= 2\beta \int_D \left[\frac{1}{p+1} |\phi^{n+1}|^{p+1} - \frac{1}{p+1} |\phi^n|^{p+1} - \operatorname{Re} \left(|\phi^n|^{p-1} \phi^n \overline{(\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n)} \right) \right] dx. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we estimate Q^{n+1} and R^{n+1} separately. For Q^{n+1} , from the statement (iii) of Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{n+1} &\leq \frac{\tau^2}{8} \|\nabla\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \tau^2 \int_D (V(\mathbf{x}) + \omega + 2|\Omega|^2 (x_1^2 + x_2^2)) |\mu^{n+1}|^2 dx \\ &\leq \frac{\tau^2}{8} \|\nabla\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \tau^2 \max_{\mathbf{x} \in D} \left\{ 0, \operatorname{ess\,sup} \left(V(\mathbf{x}) + \omega + 2|\Omega|^2 (x_1^2 + x_2^2) \right) \right\} \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

For R^{n+1} , denoting $f(\rho) = \frac{2\beta}{p+1} \int_D |\phi_{\rho}|^{p+1} dx$ with $\phi_{\rho} := (1 - \rho)\phi^n + \rho\phi^{n+1}$, $\rho \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R^{n+1} &= f(1) - f(0) - f'(0) = \int_0^1 (1 - \rho) f''(\rho) d\rho \\ &= \beta \int_0^1 (1 - \rho) \int_D \left[(p+1) |\phi_{\rho}|^{p-1} |\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n|^2 + (p-1) \operatorname{Re} \left(|\phi_{\rho}|^{p-3} \phi_{\rho}^2 \overline{(\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n)^2} \right) \right] dx d\rho \\ &\leq \tau^2 \beta p \max_{\rho \in [0, 1]} \|\phi_{\rho}\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p-1} \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^{p+1}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.4 and noting that $C_M \geq M$, one has the following uniform bound for all $\rho \in [0, 1]$:

$$\|\phi_{\rho}\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p-1} \leq \max \left\{ \|\phi^n\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p-1}, \|\phi^{n+1}\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p-1} \right\} \leq C_E^{p-1} \max \left\{ \|\phi^n\|_{H^1}^{p-1}, \|\phi^{n+1}\|_{H^1}^{p-1} \right\} \leq C_E^{p-1} C_M^{p-1}.$$

Applying the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and Young's inequality of the form $ab \leq \frac{\varepsilon a^{p_1}}{p_1} + \varepsilon^{-\frac{p_2}{p_1}} \frac{b^{p_2}}{p_2}$, $\forall a, b \geq 0$, with $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} R^{n+1} &\leq \tau^2 \beta p C_E^{p-1} C_M^{p-1} C_G^2 \|\nabla \mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^{2\theta} \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^{2-2\theta} \\ &\leq \tau^2 \beta p C_E^{p-1} C_M^{p-1} C_G^2 \left(\theta \varepsilon \|\nabla \mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + (1-\theta) \varepsilon^{-\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}} \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\varepsilon = \left(8\theta \beta p C_E^{p-1} C_M^{p-1} C_G^2 \right)^{-1}$, we have

$$R^{n+1} \leq \frac{\tau^2}{8} \|\nabla \mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \tau^2 (1-\theta) (8\theta)^{\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}} \left(\beta p C_E^{p-1} C_M^{p-1} C_G^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}} \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Substituting the estimates of Q^{n+1} and R^{n+1} into (2.10) and using the definition of α_M , we find

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^{n+1}) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) &= -2(\tau + \alpha\tau^2) \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{\tau^2}{2} \|\nabla \mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + Q^{n+1} + R^{n+1} \\ &\leq -2\tau \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{\tau^2}{4} \|\nabla \mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 - 2\tau^2(\alpha - \alpha_M) \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

With the condition $\alpha \geq \alpha_M + \frac{1}{8}$ given in Theorem 2.5, we can get

$$S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^{n+1}) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) \leq -2\tau \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{\tau^2}{4} \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{H^1}^2,$$

which shows (2.8). The hypothesis (2.9) further leads to $S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^{n+1}) \leq m$, closing the induction. \square

Remark 1. In practical computations, it might be difficult to precisely quantify the theoretical α_M in Theorem 2.5, and the constant $1/8$ in Theorem 2.5 is a technical factor required for the subsequent convergence-rate analysis. From the perspective of action descent alone, the condition $\alpha \geq \alpha_M + 1/8$ is not strictly necessary. Motivated by (2.10) and the facts

$$\begin{aligned} |Q^{n+1}| &\leq \frac{\tau^2}{2} \|\nabla \mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \tau^2 \int_D \left(V(\mathbf{x}) + \omega + \frac{|\Omega|^2}{2} (x_1^2 + x_2^2) \right) |\mu^{n+1}|^2 \, d\mathbf{x}, \\ |R^{n+1}| &\leq \tau^2 \beta p \int_D \max \left\{ |\phi^n|^{p-1}, |\phi^{n+1}|^{p-1} \right\} |\mu^{n+1}|^2 \, d\mathbf{x} \approx \tau^2 \beta p \int_D |\phi^n|^{p-1} |\mu^{n+1}|^2 \, d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned}$$

we consider adaptively selecting α at each iteration step as

$$\alpha^n := \frac{1}{2} \max \left\{ 0, \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\mathbf{x} \in D} \left(V(\mathbf{x}) + \omega + \frac{|\Omega|^2}{2} (x_1^2 + x_2^2) + \beta(p+2) |\phi^n|^{p-1} \right) \right\}. \quad (2.11)$$

In our numerical experiments, the value of α^n is typically much larger than $1/8$.

3. CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

This section analyzes the convergence of the DGF scheme (2.4), giving the main results of the work. We will first present a global convergence result and then establish a refined quantitative convergence rate of DGF toward the GS.

3.1. A global convergence result. Our first result on convergence reads as follows.

Theorem 3.1 (Accumulation point & unconditional convergent subsequence). *For a given $\phi^0 \in H^2(D)$, suppose that Assumption (A) holds, $\omega < -\lambda_0$ and $\alpha \geq \alpha_M + \frac{1}{8}$. Additionally, assume for $d \geq 3$ that $1 < p \leq d/(d-2)$. Then, for every fixed $\tau > 0$:*

- (i) *The solution $\{\phi^n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ of (2.4) has a strongly convergent subsequence $\{\phi^{n_j}\}_{j=0}^\infty$ in $H^1(D)$;*
- (ii) *Every accumulation point $\phi^* \in X$ of $\{\phi^n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ in $H^1(D)$ satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation of (1.3) in the weak sense, i.e.,*

$$\langle H_{\phi^*} \phi^*, v \rangle = 0, \quad \forall v \in H^1(D), \quad (3.1)$$

and all accumulation points possess the same action value $S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^) = \inf_{n \geq 0} S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n)$.*

Proof. Taking the L^2 inner product of (2.5) with $-\Delta\phi^{n+1}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \tau\alpha) \|\nabla\phi^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\tau}{2} \|\Delta\phi^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 &= \langle (1 + \tau\alpha)\phi^n - \tau g(\phi^n), -\Delta\phi^{n+1} \rangle_{L^2(D)} \\ &\leq \left((1 + \tau\alpha) \|\phi^n\|_{L^2} + \tau \|g(\phi^n)\|_{L^2} \right) \|\Delta\phi^{n+1}\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

From the definition of $g(\phi^n)$ and the Sobolev embedding $H^1(D) \hookrightarrow L^{2p}(D)$ (which holds under the assumption on p), we obtain

$$\|g(\phi^n)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\phi^n\|_{H^1} + \|\phi^n\|_{L^{2p}}^p \lesssim \|\phi^n\|_{H^1} + \|\phi^n\|_{H^1}^p. \quad (3.3)$$

Inserting (3.3) into (3.2), we get

$$\frac{\tau}{2} \|\Delta\phi^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \left((1 + \tau) \|\phi^n\|_{H^1} + \tau \|\phi^n\|_{H^1}^p \right) \|\Delta\phi^{n+1}\|_{L^2},$$

which leads to $\|\Delta\phi^{n+1}\|_{L^2} \lesssim (1 + \tau^{-1}) \|\phi^n\|_{H^1} + \|\phi^n\|_{H^1}^p$. This also means that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $\phi^n \in H^2(D)$ and $\|\phi^n\|_{H^2} \leq C(\tau, M)$, where $C(\tau, M)$ depends on τ and M . By the Banach-Alaoglu theorem, there exists a weakly convergent subsequence $\{\phi^{n_j}\}_{j=0}^\infty$ in $H^2(D)$, and the compact embedding of $H^2(D) \hookrightarrow H^1(D)$ implies the strong convergence of $\{\phi^{n_j}\}_{j=0}^\infty$ in the H^1 -norm. This establishes the first assertion of Theorem 3.1.

Now we turn to the second assertion of Theorem 3.1. Let $\phi^* \in X$ be an accumulation point of $\{\phi^n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ with $\{\phi^{n_j}\}_{j=0}^\infty$ a subsequence converging strongly to ϕ^* in the H^1 -norm. Denoting

$$a(\phi, \psi) := \langle H_\phi\phi, \psi \rangle = \int_D \left[\frac{1}{2} \nabla\phi \cdot \nabla\bar{\psi} + (V + \omega)\phi\bar{\psi} + \beta|\phi|^{p-1}\phi\bar{\psi} - \Omega\bar{\psi}L_z\phi \right] dx,$$

we can find that for all $\psi \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} a(\phi^{n_j}, \psi) - a(\phi^*, \psi) &= \int_D \left[\frac{1}{2} \nabla(\phi^{n_j} - \phi^*) \cdot \nabla\bar{\psi} + \bar{\psi}(V + \omega - \Omega L_z)(\phi^{n_j} - \phi^*) \right] dx \\ &\quad + \beta \int_D (|\phi^{n_j}|^{p-1}\phi^{n_j} - |\phi^*|^{p-1}\phi^*) \bar{\psi} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Note that

$$|\phi^{n_j}|^{p-1}\phi^{n_j} - |\phi^*|^{p-1}\phi^* = \int_0^1 \left(\frac{p+1}{2} |\phi_\rho|^{p-1}(\phi^{n_j} - \phi^*) + \frac{p-1}{2} |\phi_\rho|^{p-3} \phi_\rho^2 \overline{(\phi^{n_j} - \phi^*)} \right) d\rho,$$

where $\phi_\rho := \rho\phi^{n_j} + (1-\rho)\phi^*$. Thus, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_D (|\phi^{n_j}|^{p-1}\phi^{n_j} - |\phi^*|^{p-1}\phi^*) \bar{\psi} dx \right| &\lesssim p \max_{0 \leq \rho \leq 1} \|\phi_\rho\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p-1} \|\phi^{n_j} - \phi^*\|_{L^{p+1}} \|\psi\|_{L^{p+1}} \\ &\lesssim \|\phi^{n_j} - \phi^*\|_{H^1} \|\psi\|_{H^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this estimate into (3.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} |a(\phi^{n_j}, \psi) - a(\phi^*, \psi)| &\lesssim \|\phi^{n_j} - \phi^*\|_{H^1} \|\psi\|_{H^1} + \left| \int_D (|\phi^{n_j}|^{p-1}\phi^{n_j} - |\phi^*|^{p-1}\phi^*) \bar{\psi} dx \right| \\ &\lesssim \|\phi^{n_j} - \phi^*\|_{H^1} \|\psi\|_{H^1}. \end{aligned}$$

The H^1 -strong convergence of the subsequence $\{\phi^{n_j}\}_{j=0}^\infty$ implies that for all $\psi \in X$,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a(\phi^{n_j}, \psi) = a(\phi^*, \psi).$$

On the other hand, subtracting $H_{\phi^n}\phi^n$ from (2.4b) gives

$$\mu^{n+1} - H_{\phi^n}\phi^n = -\frac{1}{2}\Delta(\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n) + \alpha(\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n) = \frac{\tau}{2}\Delta\mu^{n+1} - \tau\alpha\mu^{n+1}.$$

Rearranging the terms above yields the following elliptic resolvent equation (with the same boundary conditions as in (2.4)):

$$(1 + \tau\alpha)\mu^{n+1} - \frac{\tau}{2}\Delta\mu^{n+1} = H_{\phi^n}\phi^n. \quad (3.5)$$

We find from (3.5) and the the action decay (2.8) that for any $\psi \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle H_{\phi^n}\phi^n, \psi \rangle &= (1 + \tau\alpha) \langle \mu^{n+1}, \psi \rangle + \frac{\tau}{2} \langle \nabla\mu^{n+1}, \nabla\psi \rangle \lesssim (1 + \tau) \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{H^1} \|\psi\|_{H^1} \\ &\lesssim (1 + \tau^{-1}) \sqrt{S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi^{n+1})} \|\psi\|_{H^1} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

This means $|a(\phi^{n_j}, \psi)| = |\langle H_{\phi^{n_j}}\phi^{n_j}, \psi \rangle| \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} 0$, and so

$$a(\phi^*, \psi) = \langle H_{\phi^*}\phi^*, \psi \rangle = 0, \quad \forall \psi \in X,$$

which confirms (3.1). Finally, since the action functional sequence $\{S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi^n)\}$ is non-increasing and bounded from below, it has a unique limit, i.e.,

$$S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi^*) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi^{n_j}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi^n) = \inf_{n \geq 0} S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi^n),$$

which completes the proof. \square

Remark 2. For the case of homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions with some regularity assumption on the boundary $\partial\Omega$, we could remove the additional assumption $p \leq d/(d-2)$ for $d \geq 3$ in Theorem 3.1 by employing the $W^{2,q}$ estimate (see, e.g., [21, Sect. 9.6]) for the elliptic equation (2.5):

$$\|\phi^{n+1}\|_{W^{2,q}} \leq C(\tau) (\|\phi^n\|_{L^q} + \tau \|g(\phi^n)\|_{L^q}), \quad (3.6)$$

where $q = \frac{2d}{p(d-2)} \in \left(\frac{2d}{d+2}, \frac{2d}{d-2}\right)$ and $C(\tau) > 0$ depends on τ but is independent of n . In fact, applying Hölder's inequality and the continuous embeddings $H^1(D) \hookrightarrow L^q(D)$ and $H^1(D) \hookrightarrow L^{pq}(D)$ gives

$$\|g(\phi^n)\|_{L^q} \lesssim \|\phi^n\|_{L^q} + \|\phi^n\|_{H^1}^q + \|\phi^n\|_{L^{pq}}^p \lesssim \|\phi^n\|_{H^1} + \|\phi^n\|_{H^1}^q + \|\phi^n\|_{H^1}^p \lesssim 1,$$

which, combining with (3.6), implies the boundedness of $\{\phi^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $W^{2,q}(D)$ for fixed $\tau > 0$, and the subsequential convergence in H^1 can be obtained by the compact embedding $W^{2,q}(D) \hookrightarrow H^1(D)$.

3.2. Local convergence rate. This subsection is devoted to rigorously establishing a practically observed exponential convergence rate of the DGF scheme (2.4). To achieve this goal, let us first discuss the uniqueness of GS.

3.2.1. Local uniqueness of GS. For any $\phi \in X$, we have $e^{i\theta}\phi \in X$ and $S_{\Omega,\omega}(e^{i\theta}\phi) = S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi)$. Consequently, the (local) uniqueness of the GS can only be expected up to a constant phase factor $e^{i\theta}$ with $\theta \in (-\pi, \pi]$. The action functional $S_{\Omega,\omega}$ may also be invariant under other symmetry transformations in special geometric settings, for instance, under rotations of the coordinate system when the domain D is a ball and the potential V is radially symmetric. Such additional symmetries are not considered in the present work, and let us focus on the phase invariance inherent to the complex-valued formulation.

Denote the phase orbit $[[\phi]] := \{e^{i\theta}\phi : \theta \in \mathbb{R}\}$ of $\phi \in X$, and define the phase-invariant H^1 -distance between two orbits by

$$\text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi_1, \phi_2] := \inf_{u_1 \in [[\phi_1]], u_2 \in [[\phi_2]]} \|u_1 - u_2\|_{H^1}, \quad \forall \phi_1, \phi_2 \in X.$$

We now show that this definition of the distance is well posed.

Lemma 3.2 (Orbit distance). *For any $\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3 \in X$, the following properties hold:*

(i) *Attainment of the infimum: there exists $\theta \in (-\pi, \pi]$ such that*

$$\text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi_1, \phi_2] = \inf_{u \in [[\phi_2]]} \|\phi_1 - u\|_{H^1} = \left\| \phi_1 - e^{i\theta}\phi_2 \right\|_{H^1}.$$

- (ii) *Non-negativity and separation:* $\text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi_1, \phi_2] \geq 0$, with equality if and only if $\phi_1 \in \llbracket \phi_2 \rrbracket$ (or, $\phi_2 \in \llbracket \phi_1 \rrbracket$).
- (iii) *Symmetry:* $\text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi_1, \phi_2] = \text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi_2, \phi_1]$.
- (iv) *Triangle inequality:* $\text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi_1, \phi_2] \leq \text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi_1, \phi_3] + \text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi_3, \phi_2]$.

Proof. First, by reducing the two phase parameters to one, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi_1, \phi_2] &= \inf_{\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}} \left\| e^{i\theta_1} \phi_1 - e^{i\theta_2} \phi_2 \right\|_{H^1} = \inf_{\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}} \left\| \phi_1 - e^{i(\theta_2 - \theta_1)} \phi_2 \right\|_{H^1} \\ &= \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \left\| \phi_1 - e^{i\theta} \phi_2 \right\|_{H^1} = \inf_{u \in \llbracket \phi_2 \rrbracket} \left\| \phi_1 - u \right\|_{H^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the function $\theta \mapsto \|\phi_1 - e^{i\theta} \phi_2\|_{L^2}^2$ is a smooth 2π -periodic function, it attains at least one minimum on $(-\pi, \pi]$, which proves (i). Assertions (ii)–(iii) are immediate. To prove (iv), let $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy

$$\text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi_1, \phi_3] = \left\| \phi_1 - e^{i\theta_1} \phi_3 \right\|_{H^1}, \quad \text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi_3, \phi_2] = \left\| \phi_3 - e^{i\theta_2} \phi_2 \right\|_{H^1},$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi_1, \phi_2] &\leq \left\| \phi_1 - e^{i(\theta_1 + \theta_2)} \phi_2 \right\|_{H^1} \leq \left\| \phi_1 - e^{i\theta_1} \phi_3 \right\|_{H^1} + \left\| e^{i\theta_1} \phi_3 - e^{i(\theta_1 + \theta_2)} \phi_2 \right\|_{H^1} \\ &= \left\| \phi_1 - e^{i\theta_1} \phi_3 \right\|_{H^1} + \left\| \phi_3 - e^{i\theta_2} \phi_2 \right\|_{H^1} = \text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi_1, \phi_3] + \text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi_3, \phi_2], \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

For any GS ϕ_g in (2.2), define the neighborhood $U_\delta(\phi_g) := \{\phi \in X : \text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi, \phi_g] \leq \delta\}$. Note that for every $u = e^{i\theta} \phi_g \in \llbracket \phi_g \rrbracket$, the vector iu is tangent to the phase orbit at u since $\frac{d}{d\theta} e^{i\theta} \phi_g = ie^{i\theta} \phi_g = iu$. Accordingly, we introduce the H^1 -orthogonal complement of iu :

$$\{iu\}_{H^1}^\perp := \{\eta \in X : \langle iu, \eta \rangle_{H^1(D)} = 0\}.$$

For any $\phi \in U_\delta(\phi_g)$, we define θ_ϕ by minimizing the distance on $(-\pi, \pi]$:

$$\theta_\phi \in \arg \min_{\theta \in (-\pi, \pi]} \left\| \phi - e^{i\theta} \phi_g \right\|_{H^1}.$$

Lemma 3.3. *If $\delta > 0$ is sufficiently small, then for any $\phi \in U_\delta(\phi_g)$, the minimizer*

$$\theta_\phi = \text{Arg}(\langle \phi, \phi_g \rangle + \langle \nabla \phi, \nabla \phi_g \rangle)$$

is unique, where Arg denotes the principal argument angle of a complex number. Moreover, setting $u_\phi = e^{i\theta_\phi} \phi_g \in \llbracket \phi_g \rrbracket$, we have $\phi - u_\phi \in \{iu_\phi\}_{H^1}^\perp$.

Proof. Denote $F(\theta) := \frac{1}{2} \|\phi - e^{i\theta} \phi_g\|_{H^1}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|\phi\|_{H^1}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\phi_g\|_{H^1}^2 - \langle \phi, e^{i\theta} \phi_g \rangle_{H^1(D)}$, and its derivative reads

$$F'(\theta) = -\langle \phi, ie^{i\theta} \phi_g \rangle_{H^1(D)} = -\text{Im} \left(\langle \phi, e^{i\theta} \phi_g \rangle + \langle \nabla \phi, e^{i\theta} \nabla \phi_g \rangle \right).$$

Denoting $\langle \phi, \phi_g \rangle + \langle \nabla \phi, \nabla \phi_g \rangle = r_\phi e^{i\theta_\phi}$ with

$$r_\phi := |\langle \phi, \phi_g \rangle + \langle \nabla \phi, \nabla \phi_g \rangle|, \quad \theta_\phi := \text{Arg}(\langle \phi, \phi_g \rangle + \langle \nabla \phi, \nabla \phi_g \rangle),$$

we have

$$\langle \phi, e^{i\theta} \phi_g \rangle + \langle \nabla \phi, e^{i\theta} \nabla \phi_g \rangle = r_\phi e^{i(\theta_\phi - \theta)}.$$

Hence,

$$F'(\theta) = -r_\phi \sin(\theta_\phi - \theta), \quad F''(\theta) = r_\phi \cos(\theta_\phi - \theta).$$

The stationary condition $F'(\theta) = 0$ yields $\theta = \theta_\phi - k\pi = \theta_k$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. At a stationary point θ_k , there is $F''(\theta_k) = (-1)^k r_\phi$. Hence, for even k and enough small δ , $F''(\theta_k) = r_\phi > 0$, showing a local

minimum. This also means that there is only one minimizer θ_ϕ in $(-\pi, \pi]$, giving the uniqueness. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle iu_\phi, \phi - u_\phi \rangle_{H^1(D)} &= \left\langle i e^{i\theta_\phi} \phi_g, \phi - e^{i\theta_\phi} \phi_g \right\rangle_{H^1(D)} = \left\langle i e^{i\theta_\phi} \phi_g, \phi \right\rangle_{H^1(D)} - \left\langle i e^{i\theta_\phi} \phi_g, e^{i\theta_\phi} \phi_g \right\rangle_{H^1(D)} \\ &= \left\langle i e^{i\theta_\phi} \phi_g, \phi \right\rangle_{H^1(D)} = -F'(\theta_\phi) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

so $\phi - u_\phi \in \{iu_\phi\}_{H^1}^\perp$. This completes the proof. \square

With Lemma 3.3, for a sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, we can have the decomposition

$$\phi = u_\phi + (\phi - u_\phi) = e^{i\theta_\phi} \left[\phi_g + \left(e^{-i\theta_\phi} \phi - \phi_g \right) \right],$$

and note that $e^{-i\theta_\phi} \phi - \phi_g \in \{i\phi_g\}_{H^1}^\perp$. Hence, we can introduce a local coordinate mapping

$$\chi : (-\pi, \pi] \times \{i\phi_g\}_{H^1}^\perp \mapsto U_\delta(\phi_g), \quad (\theta, v) \mapsto e^{i\theta} (\phi_g + v),$$

which is a bijection onto its image. Its inverse is given by

$$\chi^{-1} : \phi \in U_\delta(\phi_g) \mapsto (\theta(\phi), v(\phi)) = \left(\theta_\phi, e^{-i\theta_\phi} \phi - \phi_g \right) \in (-\pi, \pi] \times \{i\phi_g\}_{H^1}^\perp.$$

For convenience, set

$$v_\phi := e^{-i\theta_\phi} \phi - \phi_g, \quad w_\phi := \phi - u_\phi = e^{i\theta_\phi} v_\phi,$$

so that $\text{dist}_{H^1}[\phi, \phi_g] = \|w_\phi\|_{H^1} = \|v_\phi\|_{H^1}$. For any $u, \eta_1, \eta_2 \in X$, the first- and second-order Gâteaux derivatives of the action functional read

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}S_{\Omega, \omega}(u)[\eta_1] &= 2 \left\langle \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta + V + \beta |u|^{p-1} - \Omega L_z + \omega \right) \phi, \eta_1 \right\rangle_{L^2(D)}, \\ \mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega, \omega}(u)[\eta_2, \eta_1] &= 2 \left\langle \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta + V - \Omega L_z + \omega \right) \eta_2, \eta_1 \right\rangle_{L^2(D)} \\ &\quad + 2 \left\langle \frac{p-1}{2} \beta |u|^{p-3} u^2 \overline{\eta_2} + \frac{p+1}{2} \beta |u|^{p-1} \eta_2, \eta_1 \right\rangle_{L^2(D)}. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\mathcal{L}_1 := -\frac{1}{2} \Delta + V - \Omega L_z + \omega, \quad \mathcal{L}_{2,u} \eta := \frac{p-1}{2} \beta |u|^{p-3} u^2 \overline{\eta} + \frac{p+1}{2} \beta |u|^{p-1} \eta, \quad \mathcal{L}_u := \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_{2,u}.$$

Then $\mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega, \omega}(u)[\eta_2, \eta_1] = 2 \langle \mathcal{L}_u \eta_2, \eta_1 \rangle_{L^2(D)}$. Since only $p > 1$ is assumed, higher-order variations may not be available. Hence, we require continuity of the second-order Gâteaux derivative with respect to u . Recall the following result.

Lemma 3.4 (Theorem A.2 of [38]). *On a bounded domain D , for $1 < p < \infty$, the mappings $u \mapsto |u|^{p-1}$ and $u \mapsto |u|^{p-3} u^2$ from $L^{p+1}(D)$ to $L^{\frac{p+1}{p-1}}(D)$ are continuous.*

For any $\rho \in [0, 1]$, using Hölder's inequality and Sobolev's embeddings and Lemma 3.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle (\mathcal{L}_{2, u_\phi + \rho w_\phi} - \mathcal{L}_{2, u_\phi}) w_\phi, w_\phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} \\ &= \frac{(p-1)\beta}{2} \langle (|u_\phi + \rho w_\phi|^{p-3} (u_\phi + \rho w_\phi)^2 - |u_\phi|^{p-3} (u_\phi)^2) \overline{w_\phi}, w_\phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} \\ &\quad + \frac{(p+1)\beta}{2} \langle (|u_\phi + \rho w_\phi|^{p-1} - |u_\phi|^{p-1}) w_\phi, w_\phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} \\ &\lesssim \left(\| |u_\phi + \rho w_\phi|^{p-3} (u_\phi + \rho w_\phi)^2 - |u_\phi|^{p-3} (u_\phi)^2 \|_{L^{\frac{p+1}{p-1}}} + \| |u_\phi + \rho w_\phi|^{p-1} - |u_\phi|^{p-1} \|_{L^{\frac{p+1}{p-1}}} \right) \|w_\phi\|_{L^{p+1}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\langle (\mathcal{L}_{2, u_\phi + \rho w_\phi} - \mathcal{L}_{2, u_\phi}) w_\phi, w_\phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} = o\left(\|w_\phi\|_{L^{p+1}}^2\right) = o\left(\|w_\phi\|_{H^1}^2\right), \quad (3.7)$$

which will be used frequently below. For subsequent technical analysis, we require ϕ_g (and all its phase shifts) to be a **non-degenerate** minimizer of $S_{\Omega,\omega}$ on X by imposing a standard coercivity condition on the second variation of $S_{\Omega,\omega}$.

Proposition 3.5 (Local uniqueness). *Assume that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi_g)[\eta, \eta] \geq c \|\eta\|_{H^1}^2, \quad \forall \eta \in \{\mathrm{i}\phi_g\}_{H^1}^\perp. \quad (3.8)$$

Then, for a sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, we have

$$S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi) - S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi_g) \asymp (\mathrm{dist}_{H^1}[\phi, \phi_g])^2, \quad (3.9)$$

and the unconstrained minimization problem (2.2) has a minimizer in $U_\delta(\phi_g)$ if and only if it is ϕ_g or its phase shifts.

Proof. The condition (3.8) gives $\langle \mathcal{L}_{\phi_g} \eta, \eta \rangle_{L^2(D)} \geq \frac{c}{2} \|\eta\|_{H^1}^2$, and, moreover,

$$|\langle \mathcal{L}_{\phi_g} \eta, \eta \rangle| \lesssim \|\eta\|_{H^1}^2 + \beta p \|\phi_g\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p-1} \|\eta\|_{L^{p+1}}^2 \lesssim \|\eta\|_{H^1}^2,$$

hence $\langle \mathcal{L}_{\phi_g} \eta, \eta \rangle_{L^2(D)} \asymp \|\eta\|_{H^1}^2$ for all $\eta \in \{\mathrm{i}\phi_g\}_{H^1}^\perp$. According to the Taylor expansion, there is

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi) - S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi_g) &= S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi) - S_{\Omega,\omega}(u_\phi) \\ &= \mathcal{D}S_{\Omega,\omega}(u_\phi)[w_\phi] + \int_0^1 (1-\rho) \mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega,\omega}(u_\phi + \rho w_\phi)[w_\phi, w_\phi] \mathrm{d}\rho \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega,\omega}(u_\phi)[w_\phi, w_\phi] + \int_0^1 (1-\rho) (\mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega,\omega}(u_\phi + \rho w_\phi)[w_\phi, w_\phi] - \mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega,\omega}(u_\phi)[w_\phi, w_\phi]) \mathrm{d}\rho \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega,\omega}(u_\phi)[w_\phi, w_\phi] + \int_0^1 (1-\rho) \langle (\mathcal{L}_{2,u_\phi + \rho w_\phi} - \mathcal{L}_{2,u_\phi}) w_\phi, w_\phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} \mathrm{d}\rho \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega,\omega}(u_\phi)[w_\phi, w_\phi] + o(\|w_\phi\|_{H^1}^2), \end{aligned}$$

where we used (3.7) and the first-order critical condition $\mathcal{D}S_{\Omega,\omega}(u_\phi)[w_\phi] = 0$. Noting that

$$\mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega,\omega}(u_\phi)[w_\phi, w_\phi] = \mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega,\omega}(e^{\mathrm{i}\theta_\phi} \phi_g)[e^{\mathrm{i}\theta_\phi} v_\phi, e^{\mathrm{i}\theta_\phi} v_\phi] = \mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi_g)[v_\phi, v_\phi],$$

we conclude that for all $u \in U_\delta(\phi_g)$ with $\delta > 0$ small enough,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi) - S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi_g) &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi_g)[v_\phi, v_\phi] + o(\|v_\phi\|_{H^1}^2) \\ &= \langle \mathcal{L}_{\phi_g} v_\phi, v_\phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} + o(\|v_\phi\|_{H^1}^2) \\ &\asymp \|v_\phi\|_{H^1}^2 = (\mathrm{dist}_{H^1}[\phi, \phi_g])^2. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the proposition. \square

Remark 3. The non-degeneracy assumption can also be characterized via the L^2 -orthogonal complement (similar to, e.g., [23]):

$$\{\mathrm{i}\phi_g\}_{L^2}^\perp := \{\xi \in X : \langle \mathrm{i}\phi_g, \xi \rangle_{L^2(D)} = 0\}.$$

In that case, the condition (3.8) is replaced by

$$\mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi_g)[\xi, \xi] \geq c \|\xi\|_{H^1}^2, \quad \forall \xi \in \{\mathrm{i}\phi_g\}_{L^2}^\perp. \quad (3.10)$$

Here we show that (3.10) is the stronger requirement, as it implies (3.8). In fact, for any $\eta \in \{\mathrm{i}\phi_g\}_{H^1}^\perp$, we have L^2 -orthogonal decomposition as

$$\eta = \mathrm{i}\kappa\phi_g + \xi \quad \text{with } \kappa = \frac{\langle \mathrm{i}\phi_g, \eta \rangle_{L^2(D)}}{\|\phi_g\|_{L^2}^2} \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{and } \xi = \eta - \frac{\mathrm{i}\langle \mathrm{i}\phi_g, \eta \rangle_{L^2(D)} \phi_g}{\|\phi_g\|_{L^2}^2} \in \{\mathrm{i}\phi_g\}_{L^2}^\perp.$$

Substituting this decomposition into $\mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)[\eta, \eta]$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)[\eta, \eta] &= \kappa^2 \mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)[i\phi_g, i\phi_g] + 2\kappa \mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)[i\phi_g, \xi] + \mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)[\xi, \xi] \\ &= 2\kappa^2 \langle iH_{\phi_g} \phi_g, i\phi_g \rangle_{L^2(D)} + 4\kappa \langle iH_{\phi_g} \phi_g, \xi \rangle_{L^2(D)} + \mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)[\xi, \xi] \\ &= \mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)[\xi, \xi]. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\eta\|_{H^1}^2 &= \kappa^2 \|\phi_g\|_{H^1}^2 + 2\kappa \langle i\phi_g, \xi \rangle_{H^1(D)} + \|\xi\|_{H^1}^2 \\ &= \kappa^2 \|\phi_g\|_{H^1}^2 + 2\kappa \langle i\phi_g, \eta - i\kappa\phi_g \rangle_{H^1(D)} + \|\xi\|_{H^1}^2 \\ &= -\kappa^2 \|\phi_g\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\xi\|_{H^1}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which means $\|\eta\|_{H^1} \leq \|\xi\|_{H^1}$. Therefore, by (3.10),

$$\mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)[\eta, \eta] = \mathcal{D}^2 S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)[\xi, \xi] \geq c \|\xi\|_{H^1}^2 \geq c \|\eta\|_{H^1}^2, \quad \forall \eta \in \{i\phi_g\}_{H^1}^\perp,$$

which is precisely (3.8).

3.2.2. Exponential convergence. Now we are ready to present the convergence rate result for the DGF scheme (2.4). With the numerical solution ϕ^n , we denote $\theta_n = \theta_{\phi^n}$, $u^n = u_{\phi^n}$, $v^n = v_{\phi^n}$ and $w^n = w_{\phi^n}$ for simplicity of notation.

Theorem 3.6 (Exponential rate). *Suppose that Assumption (A) holds and $\omega < -\lambda_0$. Let ϕ_g be the GS defined by (2.2) and suppose that it satisfies the non-degeneracy condition in Proposition 3.5. Then, there exists a constant $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for any initial data $\phi^0 \in U_{\delta_0}(\phi_g)$, $\alpha \geq \alpha_M + \frac{1}{8}$ and $\tau > 0$, the DGF scheme (2.4) converges to the GS at the rate:*

$$\text{dist}_{H^1}[\phi^n, \phi_g] \leq C e^{-an\tau/(1+\tau)}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (3.11)$$

where $C, a > 0$ are constants independent of n and τ .

We then turn to the proof of Theorem 3.6. As a preparation, we give some estimations derived from the action decaying property. We can show that the numerical solution ϕ^n for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ can stay within a local range of $U_\delta(\phi_g)$, which is crucial.

Lemma 3.7 (Lyapunov stability). *Let the assumptions in Theorem 3.6 hold and let $\delta > 0$ be a sufficiently small constant that meets the requirements of Lemma 3.3 and Proposition 3.5. Then, there exists a $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\phi^0 \in U_{\delta_0}(\phi_g)$, $\alpha \geq \alpha_M + \frac{1}{8}$ and $\tau > 0$, the solution of (2.4) with initial guess ϕ^0 satisfies $\phi^n \in U_\delta(\phi_g)$.*

Proof. From (3.9), there exist constants $0 < c_1 \leq c_2$ such that

$$c_1 (\text{dist}_{H^1}[\phi, \phi_g])^2 \leq S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g) \leq c_2 (\text{dist}_{H^1}[\phi, \phi_g])^2. \quad (3.12)$$

From the decay of action functional (2.8), we have

$$\tau^2 \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{H^1}^2 \leq 4 (S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^{n+1})),$$

which means

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{H^1}[\phi^{n+1}, \phi^n] &= \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \|\phi^{n+1} - e^{i\theta} \phi^n\|_{H^1} \leq \|\phi^{n+1} - \phi^n\|_{H^1} = \tau \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{H^1} \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^{n+1})} \lesssim \sqrt{S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^0) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)} \lesssim \text{dist}_{H^1}[\phi^0, \phi_g], \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can say for a constant $c_3 > 0$ that

$$\text{dist}_{H^1}[\phi^{n+1}, \phi^n] \leq c_3 \text{dist}_{H^1}[\phi^0, \phi_g] \leq c_3 \delta_0. \quad (3.13)$$

Fix $\delta_0 > 0$ such that $\delta_0 < \frac{\delta}{2} \min \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{c_1}{c_2}}, \frac{1}{c_3} \right\}$. We now proceed to show that the assertion of the lemma holds for this δ_0 . We argue by contradiction, supposing that there exists $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ with $\text{dist}_{H^1}[\phi^{n_1}, \phi_g] > \delta$. By (3.13), $\text{dist}_{H^1}[\phi^{n+1}, \phi^n] \leq c_3 \delta_0 < \delta/2$. Combining with the triangle

inequality of dist_{H^1} in Lemma 3.2, there exists $0 \neq n_2 < n_1$ such that $\delta/2 < \text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi^{n_2}, \phi_g] \leq \delta$. Setting ϕ in (3.12) as ϕ^0 and ϕ^{n_2} , respectively, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^{n_2}) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g) &\geq c_1 (\text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi^{n_2}, \phi_g])^2 > c_1 \delta^2/4, \\ S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^0) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g) &\leq c_2 (\text{dist}_{H^1} [\phi^0, \phi_g])^2 \leq c_2 \delta_0^2. \end{aligned}$$

By choosing δ_0 , we can have $c_2 \delta_0^2 < c_1 \delta^2/4$ and so $S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^0) < S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^{n_2})$, which contradicts the decay of action in Lemma 2.5. \square

Under the non-degeneracy condition, we can establish the following Łojasiewicz-type gradient inequality near the GS as the last tool.

Lemma 3.8 (Łojasiewicz-type gradient inequality). *Suppose that $\omega < -\lambda_0$, and that Assumption (A) as well as the non-degeneracy condition in Proposition 3.5 hold for the ground state ϕ_g . Then, there exists a sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g) \lesssim \|H_\phi \phi\|_{H^{-1}}^2, \quad \forall \phi \in U_\delta(\phi_g). \quad (3.14)$$

Proof. For every $\phi \in U_\delta(\phi_g)$, we have

$$\langle H_\phi \phi, w_\phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} = \langle H_\phi \phi - H_{u_\phi} u_\phi, w_\phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} = \langle \mathcal{L}_1 w_\phi, w_\phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} + \beta \langle |\phi|^{p-1} \phi - |u_\phi|^{p-1} u_\phi, w_\phi \rangle_{L^2(D)}.$$

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle |\phi|^{p-1} \phi - |u_\phi|^{p-1} u_\phi, w_\phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} &= \int_0^1 \langle \mathcal{L}_{2, u_\phi + \rho w_\phi} w_\phi, w_\phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} d\rho \\ &= \left\langle \frac{p-1}{2} |u_\phi|^{p-3} u_\phi^2 \overline{w_\phi} + \frac{p+1}{2} |u_\phi|^{p-1} w_\phi, w_\phi \right\rangle_{L^2(D)} + \int_0^1 \langle (\mathcal{L}_{2, u_\phi + \rho w_\phi} - \mathcal{L}_{2, u_\phi}) w_\phi, w_\phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} d\rho \\ &= \left\langle \frac{p-1}{2} |\phi_g|^{p-3} \phi_g^2 \overline{v_\phi} + \frac{p+1}{2} |\phi_g|^{p-1} v_\phi, v_\phi \right\rangle_{L^2(D)} + o\left(\|w_\phi\|_{H^1}^2\right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

we obtain

$$\langle H_\phi \phi, w_\phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} = \langle \mathcal{L}_{\phi_g} v_\phi, v_\phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} + o\left(\|w_\phi\|_{H^1}^2\right).$$

From the definition of H^{-1} -norm, we have

$$\|H_\phi \phi\|_{H^{-1}} \geq \frac{\langle \mathcal{L}_{\phi_g} v_\phi, v_\phi \rangle}{\|w_\phi\|_{H^1}} + o\left(\|w_\phi\|_{H^1}\right) \geq \frac{c}{2} \|v_\phi\|_{H^1} + o\left(\|v_\phi\|_{H^1}\right).$$

Using the local equivalence between $\|v_\phi\|_{H^1}^2$ and $S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)$, we find when $\delta > 0$ is small enough,

$$\|H_\phi \phi\|_{H^{-1}} \geq \frac{c}{4} \|v_\phi\|_{H^1} \gtrsim \sqrt{S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)},$$

which proves the assertion. \square

The following result is a direct application of Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.8:

Corollary 3.9. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.6, there exists some $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\phi^0 \in U_{\delta_0}(\phi_g)$, $\alpha \geq \alpha_M + \frac{1}{8}$ and $\tau > 0$,*

$$S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g) \leq C_{Lo} \|H_{\phi^n} \phi^n\|_{H^{-1}}^2, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (3.16)$$

with $C_{Lo} > 0$ a constant independent of n, τ .

Now we can present the proof of Theorem 3.6 below.

Proof of Theorem 3.6. From the elliptic equation (3.5), we can derive that

$$\langle H_{\phi^n} \phi^n, v \rangle = (1 + \tau\alpha) \langle \mu^{n+1}, v \rangle + \frac{\tau}{2} \langle \nabla \mu^{n+1}, \nabla v \rangle \lesssim (\|\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2} + \tau \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{H^1}) \|v\|_{H^1},$$

which by noting the definition of H^{-1} -norm can give $\|H_{\phi^n} \phi^n\|_{H^{-1}} \lesssim \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2} + \tau \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{H^1}$. By Lemma 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau \|H_{\phi^n} \phi^n\|_{H^{-1}}^2 &\lesssim \tau \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \tau^3 \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{H^1}^2 \\ &\lesssim (1 + \tau) \left(\tau \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \tau^2 \|\mu^{n+1}\|_{H^1}^2 \right) \\ &\lesssim (1 + \tau) (S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^{n+1})). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for some constant $c_D > 0$ satisfying $c_D \leq C_{Lo}$,

$$S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^{n+1}) \geq c_D \frac{\tau}{1 + \tau} \|H_{\phi^n} \phi^n\|_{H^{-1}}^2,$$

which combining with (3.16) gives

$$S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^{n+1}) \geq \frac{c_D}{C_{Lo}} \frac{\tau}{1 + \tau} (S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)).$$

Denoting $a_0 = c_D/C_{Lo} \in (0, 1]$, we then have

$$S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^{n+1}) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g) \leq \left(1 - \frac{a_0 \tau}{1 + \tau}\right) (S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.17)$$

Using (3.17) recursively, we find that for every $\tau > 0$,

$$S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g) \leq \left(1 - \frac{a_0 \tau}{1 + \tau}\right)^n (S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^0) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)) \leq e^{-na_0 \tau / (1 + \tau)} (S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^0) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)).$$

Using the local equivalence $S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g) \asymp (\text{dist}_{H^1}[\phi^n, \phi_g])^2$ from Proposition 3.5, we complete the proof of Theorem 3.6 by setting $a = a_0/2$. \square

Remark 4. The semi-discrete DGF scheme (2.4) can be coupled with a variety of spatial discretization methods, e.g., finite element and pseudospectral approaches, depending on the user's preference. The proposed theoretical analysis framework remains applicable to the fully discrete setting, provided that (i) a quantitative consistency estimate between the continuous optimization problem (1.4) and its discrete counterpart can be established (see similar efforts e.g., [9, 40]), and (ii) the relevant inequalities, including the embedding and the Gagliardo–Nirenberg interpolation inequalities in Lemma 2.1, continue to hold under the spatial discretization. These issues will be addressed in another work.

4. NUMERICAL VERIFICATION

In this section, we give numerical examples to demonstrate the practical convergence behavior of the DGF scheme (2.4). We begin with a one-dimensional example in which analytical GS is available.

Example 4.1 (Soliton in 1D). Letting $d = 1$, $\mathbf{x} = x$, $V(x) = 0$, $\beta = 1$, $p = 3$ and $D = [0, L]$ for a given $L > 0$ in (1.1) yields

$$-\frac{1}{2} \partial_{xx} \phi(x) + |\phi(x)|^2 \phi(x) = -\omega \phi(x), \quad x \in (0, L),$$

with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. Its action GS (unique positive solution) is the Jacobi elliptic function $\text{sn}(\cdot, \cdot)$ (see [10] for more details):

$$\phi_g(x) = \frac{2k K(k)}{L} \text{sn} \left(\frac{2K(k)x}{L}, k \right), \quad x \in [0, L],$$

where $K(k) = \int_0^{\pi/2} (1 - k^2 \sin^2 \theta)^{-1/2} d\theta$ is the complete elliptic integral of the first kind and the modulus $k \in [0, 1]$ is determined by the equation $2(1 + k^2)K(k)^2 + \omega L^2 = 0$. We take $L = 1$, and

use the sine pseudospectral discretization with N discrete sine modes. The stabilization factor can be chosen adaptively as

$$\alpha^n = \frac{1}{2} \max \left\{ 0, \max_{1 \leq j \leq N-1} (V(x_j) + \omega + \beta(p+2)|\phi^n(x_j)|^{p-1}) \right\},$$

referring to (2.11), where $x_j = jL/N$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, N$. The initial data is chosen as $\phi_0(x) = \sin(\pi x)$. We stop the iteration if the maximal residual is less than 10^{-13} . i.e.,

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq N-1} \left| -\frac{1}{2} \partial_{xx} \phi^n(x_j) + \omega \phi^n(x_j) + |\phi^n(x_j)|^2 \phi^n(x_j) \right| < 10^{-13},$$




FIGURE 1. The change of $S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)$ (left) and H^1 -norm error $\|\phi^n - \phi_g\|_{H^1}$ (right) of DGF (2.4) along iteration (on logarithmic scale) under different τ with $\omega = -10$ fixed in Example 4.1.




FIGURE 2. The profiles of GS ϕ_g (left), the change of $S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)$ (middle) and H^1 -norm error $\|\phi^n - \phi_g\|_{H^1}$ (right) of DGF (2.4) along iteration (on logarithmic scale) under different ω with $\tau = 0.1$ fixed in Example 4.1.

In Figure 2, the left subplot shows the profiles of GS ϕ_g for different values of $\omega = -10, -15, -20$. Subsequently, the two plots in Figure 1 together with the middle and right subplots in Figure 2 illustrate the evolution of the quantity $S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega, \omega}(\phi_g)$ and the error $\|\phi^n - \phi_g\|_{H^1}$ with respect to the iteration index n , for different time step sizes ($\tau = 1, 0.5, 0.2, 0.1$) or different ω values ($\omega = -10, -15, -20$). It can be observed that all curves exhibit a distinct exponential decay in n .

Example 4.2 (Vortex states in 2D). Letting $d = 2$, $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2)$, $p = 3$, $\beta = 100$, and $V(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_1^2 x_1^2 + \gamma_2^2 x_2^2)$ with $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$ in (2.4). The computation domain is fixed as $D = [-10, 10]^2$ with mesh size $h = 1/8$, and the time step is fixed as $\tau = 0.1$, and use the Fourier pseudospectral discretization.

The stabilization factor is chosen adaptively according to (2.11), and stopping criterion is set as

$$|S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi^{n+1})| < 10^{-12}.$$

We introduce the functions $\phi_a = \sqrt{\gamma_1\gamma_2/\pi} e^{-(\gamma_1 x_1^2 + \gamma_2 x_2^2)/2}$, and define the following initial data under different Ω (as considered in [30]):

$$\phi^0 = \begin{cases} (x_1 + ix_2) \psi_a, & \Omega = 0.3, \\ (x_1 + ix_2)^4 \psi_a, & \Omega = 0.5, \\ \frac{1}{2} \left((x_1 + ix_2) + (x_1 + ix_2)^4 \right) \psi_a, & \Omega = 0.7. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

Under these initial values, the final steady state exhibits quantized vortices, as shown in Figure 3.




FIGURE 3. Contour plots of $|\phi_g|^2$ for different Ω and ω with ϕ^0 of (4.1) in Example 4.2.




FIGURE 4. $S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi^n)$ for different Ω and ω with ϕ^0 of (4.1) in Example 4.2.

Figure 4 illustrates the evolution of the action functional $S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi^n)$ along iteration under different angular velocities Ω and ω with initial conditions (specified in (4.1)). A key observation is the




FIGURE 5. The change of $S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi_g)$ and $\|\phi^n - \phi_g\|_{H^1}^2$ of DGF (2.4) along iteration (on logarithmic scale) under different Ω and ω with ϕ^0 of (4.1) in Example 4.2.

monotonic decrease of $S_{\Omega,\omega}$ in all cases. Figure 5 illustrates the decay of two key quantities: the energy difference $S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi^n) - S_{\Omega,\omega}(\phi_g)$ and the squared H^1 -error $\|\phi^n - \phi_g\|_{H^1}^2$, plotted against the time step index n . Here, ϕ_g denotes the numerical GS obtained by the DGF method upon satisfying the stopping criterion. In all cases, both curves eventually exhibit a clear linear decay on the log-log scale, which corresponds to an exponential decay in the original variables. Notably, during this exponential decay phase, the two curves are parallel. This parallelism aligns with our theoretical result on the equivalence between the deviation of $S_{\Omega,\omega}$ and the square of the H^1 distance to the GS. Notably, for $\Omega = 0.5$ and 0.7 , the curves do not exhibit exponential decay during the initial phase of the iteration; instead, they remain relatively flat over a significant interval. This behavior aligns perfectly with our theoretical analysis of local convergence: the exponential decay rate is only guaranteed once the numerical solution enters a sufficiently small neighborhood of the GS ϕ_g .

5. CONCLUSION

This work has analyzed the direct gradient flow (DGF) method for computing defocusing action ground states of rotating nonlinear Schrödinger equations (RNLS). We have rigorously established the unconditional stability of the DGF scheme, demonstrating that the action functional is monotonically non-increasing along the discrete flow for any time step size. Furthermore, we have provided a comprehensive convergence analysis, proving both global convergence under mild assumptions and, crucially, local convergence with an optimal exponential rate toward the action ground state under a reasonable non-degeneracy condition. Numerical experiments have validated our theoretical findings, demonstrating that the DGF scheme exhibits a clear exponential convergence behavior after the solution enters a neighborhood of the ground state. The close agreement between the theoretical predictions and the numerical results confirms the effectiveness and robustness of the DGF method for computing defocusing action ground states. Future work will focus on extending this analysis to the fully discrete setting, incorporating spatial discretization methods such as finite element or pseudospectral approaches.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

W. Liu is supported by the NSFC grant 12571448 and the Innovation Research Foundation of NUDT (202402-YJRC-XX-002). T. Wang and X. Zhao are supported by National Key Research and Development Program of China, National MCF Energy R&D Program (No. 2024YFE03240400), NSFC 42450275, 12271413. Y. Yuan is supported by the NSFC grant 12471375.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. AFTALION AND Q. DU, *Vortices in a rotating Bose–Einstein condensate: Critical angular velocities and energy diagrams in the Thomas–Fermi regime*, Phys. Rev. A, 64 (2001), p. 063603.
- [2] R. ALTMANN, P. HENNING, AND D. PETERSEIM, *The J-method for the Gross–Pitaevskii eigenvalue problem*, Numer. Math., 148 (2021), pp. 575–610.
- [3] X. ANTOINE, A. LEVITT, AND Q. TANG, *Efficient spectral computation of the stationary states of rotating Bose–Einstein condensates by preconditioned nonlinear conjugate gradient methods*, J. Comput. Phys., 343 (2017), pp. 92–109.
- [4] A. H. ARDILA AND H. HAJAIEJ, *Global well-posedness, blow-up and stability of standing waves for supercritical NLS with rotation*, J. Dyn. Differ. Equ., 35 (2023), pp. 1643–1665.
- [5] W. BAO AND Y. CAI, *Mathematical theory and numerical methods for Bose–Einstein condensation*, Kinet. Relat. Models, 6 (2013), pp. 1–135.
- [6] W. BAO AND Q. DU, *Computing the ground state solution of Bose–Einstein condensates by a normalized gradient flow*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 25 (2004), pp. 1674–1697.
- [7] H. BERESTYCKI AND P.-L. LIONS, *Nonlinear scalar field equations, I. existence of a ground state*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 82 (1983), pp. 313–345.
- [8] ———, *Nonlinear scalar field equations, II. existence of infinitely many solutions*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 82 (1983), pp. 347–375.
- [9] E. CANCÈS, R. CHAKIR, AND Y. MADAY, *Numerical analysis of nonlinear eigenvalue problems*, J. Sci. Comput., 45 (2010), pp. 90–117.
- [10] L. D. CARR, C. W. CLARK, AND W. P. REINHARDT, *Stationary solutions of the one-dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equation. I. case of repulsive nonlinearity*, Phys. Rev. A, 62 (2000), p. 063610.
- [11] C.-L. CHEN, *Foundations for guided-wave optics*, John Wiley & Sons, 2006.
- [12] H. CHEN, G. DONG, W. LIU, AND Z. XIE, *Second-order flows for computing the ground states of rotating Bose–Einstein condensates*, J. Comput. Phys., 475 (2023), p. 111872.
- [13] I. DANAILA AND P. KAZEMI, *A new Sobolev gradient method for direct minimization of the Gross–Pitaevskii energy with rotation*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 32 (2010), pp. 2447–2467.
- [14] I. DANAILA AND B. PROTAS, *Computation of ground states of the Gross–Pitaevskii functional via Riemannian optimization*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 39 (2017), pp. B1102–B1129.
- [15] C. M. DION AND E. CANCÈS, *Ground state of the time-independent Gross–Pitaevskii equation*, Comput. Phys. Commun., 177 (2007), pp. 787–798.
- [16] S. DOVETTA, E. SERRA, AND P. TILLI, *Action versus energy ground states in nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Math. Ann., 385 (2023), pp. 1545–1576.
- [17] Z. FENG, Q. SHU, AND Q. TANG, *Mass-preserving and energy-diminishing semi-implicit schemes for computing ground states of rotating Bose–Einstein condensates*, J. Sci. Comput., 106 (2026), p. 30.
- [18] A. FETTER, *Rotating trapped bose-einstein condensates*, Rev. Mod. Phys., 81 (2009), p. 647–691.
- [19] R. FUKUIZUMI, *Stability and instability of standing waves for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with harmonic potential*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., 7 (2001), pp. 525–544.
- [20] R. FUKUIZUMI AND M. OHTA, *Instability of standing waves for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with potentials*, Differ. Integral Equ., 16 (2003), pp. 691–706.
- [21] D. GILBARG, N. S. TRUDINGER, D. GILBARG, AND N. TRUDINGER, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, vol. 2, Springer, 1998.

- [22] P. HENNING AND D. PETERSEIM, *Sobolev gradient flow for the Gross–Pitaevskii eigenvalue problem: Global convergence and computational efficiency*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 58 (2020), pp. 1744–1772.
- [23] P. HENNING AND M. YADAV, *On discrete ground states of rotating Bose–Einstein condensates*, Math. Comput., 94 (2025), pp. 1–32.
- [24] L. JEANJEAN AND S.-S. LU, *On global minimizers for a mass constrained problem*, Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ., 61 (2022), p. 214.
- [25] E. H. LIEB, R. SEIRINGER, AND J. YNGVASON, *A rigorous derivation of the Gross–Pitaevskii energy functional for a two-dimensional bose gas*, Comm. Math. Phys., 224 (2001), pp. 17–31.
- [26] W. LIU AND Y. CAI, *Normalized gradient flow with Lagrange multiplier for computing ground states of Bose–Einstein condensates*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 43 (2021), pp. B219–B242.
- [27] W. LIU, C. WANG, AND X. ZHAO, *On action ground states of defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 35 (2025), pp. 39–74.
- [28] W. LIU, T. WANG, AND X. ZHAO, *Convergence analysis of L^{p+1} -normalized gradient flow for action ground state of nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.20820, (2026).
- [29] W. LIU, Z. WEN, Y. YUAN, AND X. ZHAO, *Computing defocusing action ground state of rotating nonlinear Schrödinger equation: methods via various formulations and comparison*, J. Comput. Phys., 538 (2025), p. 114193.
- [30] W. LIU, Y. YUAN, AND X. ZHAO, *Computing the action ground state for the rotating nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 45 (2023), pp. A397–A426.
- [31] B. MALOMED, *Soliton Management in Periodic Systems*, Springer, New York, 2006.
- [32] S. I. POHOZAEV, *Eigenfunctions of the equation $\Delta u + \lambda f(u) = 0$* , Soviet Mathematics Doklady, 5 (1965), pp. 1408–1411.
- [33] R. SEIRINGER, *Gross-pitaevskii theory of the rotating bose gas*, Comm. Math. Phys., 229 (2002), p. 491–509.
- [34] J. SHATAH AND W. STRAUSS, *Instability of nonlinear bound states*, Commun. Math. Phys., 100 (1985), pp. 173–190.
- [35] W. A. STRAUSS, *Existence of solitary waves in higher dimensions*, Commun. Math. Phys., 55 (1977), pp. 149–162.
- [36] C. SULEM AND S. PIRRE-LOUIS, *The nonlinear Schrödinger equation: self-focusing and wave collapse*, Springer New York, NY, 2006.
- [37] C. WANG, *Computing the least action ground state of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation by a normalized gradient flow*, J. Comput. Phys., 471 (2022), p. 111675.
- [38] M. WILLEM, *Minimax theorems*, vol. 24, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [39] X. ZHAO, *Numerical integrators for continuous disordered nonlinear schrödinger equation*, J. Sci. Comput., 89 (2021), p. 40.
- [40] A. ZHOU, *An analysis of finite-dimensional approximations for the ground state solution of Bose–Einstein condensates*, Nonlinearity, 17 (2004), pp. 541–550.
- [41] Q. ZHUANG AND J. SHEN, *Efficient SAV approach for imaginary time gradient flows with applications to one-and multi-component Bose-Einstein condensates*, J. Comput. Phys., 396 (2019), pp. 72–88.

W. LIU: COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY, CHANGSHA, 410073, CHINA
 Email address: wl@nudt.edu.cn

T. WANG: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WUHAN UNIVERSITY, WUHAN, 430072, CHINA
 Email address: tingfengwang@whu.edu.cn

Y. YUAN: MOE-LCSM, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, HUNAN NORMAL UNIVERSITY, CHANGSHA, 410081, CHINA
 Email address: yyj1983@hunnu.edu.cn

X. ZHAO: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS & COMPUTATIONAL SCIENCES HUBEI KEY LABORATORY, WUHAN UNIVERSITY, WUHAN, 430072, CHINA
 Email address: matzhxf@whu.edu.cn