

Tunisian Journal of Mathematics

an international publication organized by the Tunisian Mathematical Society

A nonlinear estimate of the life span of solutions of the three dimensional Navier–Stokes equations

Jean-Yves Chemin and Isabelle Gallagher

2019 vol. 1 no. 2



A nonlinear estimate of the life span of solutions of the three dimensional Navier–Stokes equations

Jean-Yves Chemin and Isabelle Gallagher

The purpose of this article is to establish bounds from below for the life span of regular solutions to the incompressible Navier–Stokes system, which involve norms not only of the initial data, but also of nonlinear functions of the initial data. We provide examples showing that those bounds are significant improvements to the one provided by the classical fixed point argument. One of the important ingredients is the use of a scale-invariant energy estimate.

1. Introduction

In this article our aim is to give bounds from below for the life span of solutions to the incompressible Navier–Stokes system in the whole space \mathbb{R}^3 . We are not interested here in the regularity of the initial data: we focus on obtaining bounds from below for the life span associated with regular initial data. Here regular means that the initial data belongs to the intersection of all Sobolev spaces of nonnegative index. Thus all the solutions we consider are regular ones, as long as they exist.

Let us recall the incompressible Navier–Stokes system, together with some of its basic features. The incompressible Navier–Stokes system is the following:

$$(NS) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t u - \Delta u + u \cdot \nabla u &= -\nabla p, \\ \operatorname{div} u &= 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u|_{t=0} = u_0, \end{aligned}$$

where u is a three dimensional, time-dependent vector field and p is the pressure, determined by the incompressibility condition $\operatorname{div} u = 0$:

$$-\Delta p = \operatorname{div}(u \cdot \nabla u) = \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3} \partial_i \partial_j (u^i u^j).$$

This system has two fundamental properties related to its physical origin:

- scaling invariance,
- dissipation of kinetic energy.

MSC2010: 76D05.

Keywords: Navier–Stokes equations, blow-up.

The scaling property is the fact that if a function u satisfies (NS) on a time interval $[0, T]$ with the initial data u_0 , then the function u_λ defined by

$$u_\lambda(t, x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda u(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x)$$

satisfies (NS) on the time interval $[0, \lambda^{-2}T]$ with the initial data $\lambda u_0(\lambda \cdot)$. This property is far from being a characteristic property of the system (NS). It is indeed satisfied by all systems of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(GNS)} \quad \partial_t u - \Delta u + Q(u, u) = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad Q^i(u, u) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{1 \leq j, k \leq 3} A_{j,k}^i(D)(u^j u^k), \\ u|_{t=0} &= u_0, \end{aligned}$$

where the $A_{j,k}^i(D)$ are smooth homogeneous Fourier multipliers of order 1. Indeed denoting by \mathbb{P} the projection onto divergence free vector fields

$$\mathbb{P} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Id} - (\partial_i \partial_j \Delta^{-1})_{ij},$$

the Navier–Stokes system takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u - \Delta u + \mathbb{P} \operatorname{div}(u \otimes u) &= 0, \\ u|_{t=0} &= u_0, \end{aligned}$$

which is of the type (GNS). For this class of systems, the following result holds. The definition of homogeneous Sobolev spaces \dot{H}^s is recalled in the [Appendix](#).

Proposition 1.1. *Let u_0 be a regular three-dimensional vector field. A positive time T exists such that a unique regular solution to (GNS) exists on $[0, T]$. Let $T^*(u_0)$ be the maximal time of existence of this regular solution. Then, for any γ in the interval $]0, \frac{1}{2}[$, a constant c_γ exists such that*

$$T^*(u_0) \geq c_\gamma \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\gamma}}^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}. \quad (1)$$

In the case when $\gamma = \frac{1}{4}$ for the particular case of (NS), this type of result goes back to the seminal work of J. Leray [1934]. Let us point out that the same type of result can be proved for the $L^{3+6\gamma/(1-2\gamma)}$ norm.

Proof. This result is obtained by a scaling argument. Let us define the following function

$$\underline{T}_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\gamma}}(r) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf\{T^*(u_0) \mid \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\gamma}} = r\}.$$

We assume that at least one smooth initial data u_0 develops singularities, which means exactly that $T^*(u_0)$ is finite. Let us mention that this lower bound is in fact a minimum (see [Poulon 2015]). Actually the function $\underline{T}_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\gamma}}$ may be computed using a scaling argument. Observe that

$$\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\gamma}} = r \iff \|r^{-\frac{1}{2\gamma}} u_0(r^{-\frac{1}{2\gamma}} \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\gamma}} = 1.$$

As we have $T^*(u_0) = r^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}} T^*(r^{-\frac{1}{2\gamma}} u_0(r^{-\frac{1}{2\gamma}} \cdot))$, we infer that $\underline{T}_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\gamma}}(r) = r^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}} \underline{T}_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\gamma}}(1)$ and thus that

$$T^*(u_0) \geq c_\gamma \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\gamma}}^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}} \quad \text{with} \quad c_\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{T}_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}+2\gamma}}(1).$$

The proposition is proved. □

Now let us investigate the optimality of such a result, in particular concerning the norm appearing in the lower bound (1). Useful results and definitions concerning Besov spaces are recalled in the [Appendix](#); the Besov norms of particular interest in this text are the $\dot{B}_{\infty,2}^{-1}$ norm which is given by

$$\|a\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,2}^{-1}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\int_0^\infty \|e^{t\Delta} a\|_{L^\infty}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and the Besov norms $\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-\sigma}$ for $\sigma > 0$, which are

$$\|a\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-\sigma}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{t>0} t^{\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|e^{t\Delta} a\|_{L^\infty}.$$

It has been known since [\[Fujita and Kato 1964\]](#) that a smooth initial data in $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ (corresponding of course to the limit case $\gamma = 0$ in [Proposition 1.1](#)) generates a smooth solution for some time $T > 0$. Let us point out that in dimension 3, the following inequality holds

$$\|a\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,2}^{-1}} \lesssim \|a\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

The norms $\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-\sigma}$ are the smallest norms invariant by translation and having a given scaling. More precisely, we have the following result:

Proposition 1.2 [\[Meyer 1997, Lemma 9\]](#). *Let $d \geq 1$ and let $(E, \|\cdot\|_E)$ be a normed space continuously included in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the space of tempered distributions on \mathbb{R}^d . Assume that E is stable by translation and by dilation, and that a constant C_0 exists such that*

$$\forall (\lambda, e) \in]0, \infty[\times \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \forall a \in E, \quad \|a(\lambda \cdot - e)\|_E \leq C_0 \lambda^{-\sigma} \|a\|_E.$$

Then a constant C_1 exists such that

$$\forall a \in E, \quad \|a\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-\sigma}} \leq C_1 \|a\|_E.$$

Proof. Let us simply observe that, as E is continuously included in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$, a constant C exists such that for all a in E ,

$$|\langle a, e^{-|\cdot|^2} \rangle| \leq C \|a\|_E.$$

Then by invariance by translation and dilation of E , we infer immediately that

$$\|e^{t\Delta} a\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_1 t^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|a\|_E,$$

which proves the proposition. □

Now let us state a first improvement to [Proposition 1.1](#) where the life span is bounded from below in terms of the $\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-1+2\gamma}$ norm of the initial data.

Theorem 1.3. *With the notation of [Proposition 1.1](#), for any γ in the interval $]0, \frac{1}{2}[$, a constant c'_γ exists such that*

$$T^*(u_0) \geq T_{\text{FP}}(u_0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} c'_\gamma \|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-1+2\gamma}}^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}. \tag{2}$$

This theorem is proved in [Section 2](#); the proof relies on a fixed point theorem in a space included in the space of L^2 in time functions, with values in L^∞ .

Let us also recall that if a scaling 0 norm of a regular initial data is small, then the solution of (NS) associated with u_0 is global. This a consequence of the Koch and Tataru theorem [[2001](#)], which can be translated as follows in the context of smooth solutions.

Theorem 1.4. *A constant c_0 exists such that for any regular initial data u_0 satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_0\|_{\text{BMO}^{-1}} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{t>0} t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{t\Delta} u_0\|_{L^\infty} + \left(\sup_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \\ R>0}} \frac{1}{R^3} \int_0^{R^2} \int_{B(x,R)} |e^{t\Delta} u_0(y)|^2 dy dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq c_0, \end{aligned}$$

the associate solution of (GNS) is globally regular.

Let us remark that

$$\|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-1}} \leq \|u_0\|_{\text{BMO}^{-1}} \leq \|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,2}^{-1}}.$$

We shall explain in [Section 2](#) how to deduce [Theorem 1.4](#) from the Koch and Tataru theorem [[2001](#)].

The previous results are valid for the whole class of systems (GNS). Now let us present the second main feature of the incompressible Navier–Stokes system, which is not shared by all systems under the form (GNS) as it relies on a special structure of the nonlinear term (which must be skew-symmetric in L^2): the dissipation estimate for the kinetic energy. For regular solutions of (NS) it holds that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = 0,$$

which gives by integration in time

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \mathcal{E}(u(t)) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla u(t')\|_{L^2} dt' = \frac{1}{2} \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (3)$$

T. Tao [2016] pointed out that the energy estimate is not enough to prevent possible singularities from appearing. Our purpose here is to investigate if this energy estimate can improve the lower bound (2) on the life span for regular initial data. We recall indeed that for smooth initial data, all Leray solutions — meaning solutions in the sense of distributions satisfying the energy inequality

$$\mathcal{E}(u(t)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (4)$$

coincide with the smooth solution as long as the latter exists.

What we shall use here is a rescaled version of the energy dissipation inequality in the spirit of [Chemin and Planchon 2012], on the fluctuation $w \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u - u_L$ with $u_L(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e^{t\Delta} u_0$.

Proposition 1.5. *Let u be a regular solution of (NS) associated with some initial data u_0 . Then the fluctuation w satisfies, for any positive t*

$$\mathcal{E}\left(\frac{w(t)}{t^{\frac{1}{4}}}\right) + \int_0^t \frac{\|w(t')\|_{L^2}^2}{t'^{\frac{3}{2}}} dt' \lesssim Q_L^0 \exp \|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,2}^{-1}}^2$$

with $Q_L^0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^\infty t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbb{P}(u_L \cdot \nabla u_L)(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt$.

Our main result is then the following:

Theorem 1.6. *There is a constant $C > 0$ such that the following holds. For any regular initial data of (NS),*

$$T^*(u_0) > T_L(u_0), \quad (5)$$

where

$$T_L(u_0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C(Q_L^0)^{-2} (\|\partial_3 u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,3}^{-\frac{3}{2}}}^2 Q_L^0 + \sqrt{Q_L^0 Q_L^1})^{-2} \exp(-4\|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,2}^{-1}}^2),$$

with $Q_L^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^\infty t^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\partial_3^2(\mathbb{P}(u_L \cdot \nabla u_L))(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt$.

The main two features of this result are that:

- the statement involves nonlinear quantities associated with the initial data, namely norms of $\mathbb{P}(u_L \cdot \nabla u_L)$;
- one particular (arbitrary) direction plays a specific role.

This theorem is proved in Section 4.

The following theorem shows that the lower bound on $T^*(u_0)$ in [Theorem 1.6](#) is, for some classes of initial data, a significant improvement.

Theorem 1.7. *Let (γ, η) be in $]0, \frac{1}{2}[\times]0, 1[$. There is a constant C and a family $(u_{0,\varepsilon})_{\varepsilon \in]0,1[}$ of regular initial data such that, with the notation of [Theorems 1.3](#) and [1.6](#),*

$$T_{\text{FP}}(u_{0,\varepsilon}) = C\varepsilon^2 |\log \varepsilon|^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}} \quad \text{and} \quad T_L(u_{0,\varepsilon}) \geq C\varepsilon^{-2+\eta}.$$

This theorem is proved in [Section 5](#). The family $(u_{0,\varepsilon})_{\varepsilon \in]0,1[}$ is closely related to the family used in [\[Chemin and Gallagher 2009\]](#) to exhibit families of initial data which do not obey the hypothesis of the Koch and Tataru theorem and which nevertheless generate global smooth solutions. However it is too large to satisfy the assumptions of [Theorem 2](#) in [\[Chemin and Gallagher 2009\]](#) so it is not known if the associated solution is global.

In the following we shall denote by C a constant which may change from line to line, and we shall sometimes write $A \lesssim B$ for $A \leq CB$.

2. Proof of [Theorem 1.3](#)

Let u_0 be a smooth vector field and let us solve [\(GNS\)](#) by means of a fixed point method. We define the bilinear operator B by

$$\partial_t B(u, v) - \Delta B(u, v) = -\frac{1}{2}(Q(u, v) + Q(v, u)), \quad \text{and} \quad B(u, v)|_{t=0} = 0. \quad (6)$$

One can decompose the solution u to [\(GNS\)](#) into

$$u = u_L + B(u, u).$$

Resorting to the Littlewood–Paley decomposition defined in the [Appendix](#), let us define for any real number γ and any time $T > 0$, the quantity

$$\|f\|_{E_T^\gamma} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{-j(1-2\gamma)} (\|\Delta_j f\|_{L^\infty([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3)} + 2^{2j} \|\Delta_j f\|_{L^1([0,T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))).$$

Using [Lemma 2.1](#) of [\[Chemin 1999\]](#) it is easy to see that

$$\|u_L\|_{E_\infty^\gamma} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-1+2\gamma}},$$

so [Theorem 1.3](#) will follow from the fact that B maps $E_T^\gamma \times E_T^\gamma$ into E_T^γ with the following estimate:

$$\|B(u, v)\|_{E_T^\gamma} \leq C_\gamma T^\gamma \|u\|_{E_T^\gamma} \|v\|_{E_T^\gamma}. \quad (7)$$

So let us prove [\(7\)](#). Using again [Lemma 2.1](#) of [\[Chemin 1999\]](#) along with the fact that the $A_{k,\ell}^i(D)$ are smooth homogeneous Fourier multipliers of order 1, we have

$$\|\Delta_j B(u, v)(t)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \int_0^t e^{-c2^{2j(t-t')}} 2^j \|\Delta_j (u(t') \otimes v(t') + v(t') \otimes u(t'))\|_{L^\infty} dt'.$$

We then decompose (componentwise) the product $u \otimes v$ following Bony’s para-product algorithm: for all functions a and b the support of the Fourier transform of $S_{j'+1}a\Delta_j b$ and $S_j b\Delta_j a$ is included in a ball $2^{j'}B$ where B is a fixed ball of \mathbb{R}^3 , so one can write for some fixed constant $c > 0$

$$ab = \sum_{2^{j'} \geq c2^j} (S_{j'+1}a\Delta_j b + \Delta_j aS_j b),$$

so thanks to Young’s inequality in time one can write

$$2^{-j(1-2\gamma)} (\|\Delta_j B(u, v)\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3)} + 2^{2j} \|\Delta_j B(u, v)\|_{L^1([0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))}) \lesssim \mathcal{B}_j^1(u, v) + \mathcal{B}_j^2(u, v), \quad (8)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_j^1(u, v) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2^{2j\gamma} \sum_{2^{j'} \geq \max\{c2^j, T^{-\frac{1}{2}}\}} \|S_{j'+1}u\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3)} \|\Delta_{j'}v\|_{L^1([0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))} \\ &\quad + 2^{2j\gamma} \sum_{c2^j \leq 2^{j'} < T^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \|S_{j'+1}u\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3)} \|\Delta_{j'}v\|_{L^1([0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))}, \\ \mathcal{B}_j^2(u, v) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2^{2j\gamma} \sum_{2^{j'} \geq \max\{c2^j, T^{-\frac{1}{2}}\}} \|S_{j'}v\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3)} \|\Delta_{j'}u\|_{L^1([0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))} \\ &\quad + 2^{2j\gamma} \sum_{c2^j \leq 2^{j'} < T^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \|S_{j'}v\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3)} \|\Delta_{j'}u\|_{L^1([0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))}. \end{aligned}$$

In each of the sums over $c2^j \leq 2^{j'} < T^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ we write

$$\|f\|_{L^1([0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq T \|f\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3)}$$

and we can estimate the two terms $\mathcal{B}_j^1(u, v)$ and $\mathcal{B}_j^2(u, v)$ in the same way: for $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_j^\ell(u, v) &\leq \|u\|_{E_T^\gamma} \|v\|_{E_T^\gamma} \left(2^{2j\gamma} \sum_{2^{j'} \geq \max\{c2^j, T^{-\frac{1}{2}}\}} 2^{-4j'\gamma} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + T 2^{2j(1-\gamma)} \sum_{c \leq 2^{j'-j} < (2^{2j} T)^{-\frac{1}{2}}} 2^{2(j'-j)(1-2\gamma)} \right) \\ &\leq \|u\|_{E_T^\gamma} \|v\|_{E_T^\gamma} \left(T^\gamma + T 2^{2j(1-\gamma)} \sum_{c \leq 2^{j'-j} < (2^{2j} T)^{-\frac{1}{2}}} 2^{2(j'-j)(1-2\gamma)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Once it is noticed that

$$T2^{2j(1-\gamma)} \sum_{c \leq 2^{j'-j} < (2^{2j} T)^{-\frac{1}{2}}} 2^{2(j'-j)(1-2\gamma)} \leq \mathbf{1}_{\{2^{2j} T \leq C\}} (T2^{2j})^\gamma 2^{-2j\gamma} \lesssim T^\gamma,$$

the estimate (7) is proved and Theorem 1.3 follows. □

3. Proof of Theorem 1.4

As the solutions given by the Fujita and Kato theorem [1964] and the Koch and Tataru theorem [2001] are unique in their own class, they are unique in the intersection and thus coincide as long as the Fujita–Kato solution exists. Thus Theorem 1.4 is a question of propagation of regularity, which is provided by the following lemma (which proves the theorem).

Lemma 3.1. *A constant c_0 exists which satisfies the following. Let u be a regular solution of (GNS) on $[0, T[$ associated with a regular initial data u_0 such that*

$$\|u\|_K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{t \in [0, T[} t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq c_0.$$

Then $T^*(u_0) > T$.

Proof. The proof is based on a parilinearization argument (see [Chemin 1999]). Observe that for any T less than $T^*(u_0)$, u is a solution on $[0, T[$ of the linear equation

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(PGNS)} \quad & \partial_t v - \Delta v + \mathcal{Q}(u, v) = 0, \\ & v|_{t=0} = u_0, \\ \text{with } \mathcal{Q}(u, v) & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{Q}(S_{j+1}u, \Delta_j v) + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{Q}(\Delta_j v, S_j u). \end{aligned}$$

In the same spirit as (6), let us define $\text{PB}(u, v)$ by

$$\partial_t \text{PB}(u, v) - \Delta \text{PB}(u, v) = -\mathcal{Q}(u, v) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{PB}(u, v)|_{t=0} = 0. \tag{9}$$

A solution of (PGNS) is a solution of

$$v = u_L + \text{PB}(u, v).$$

Let us introduce the space F_T of continuous functions with values in $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}$, which are elements of $L^4([0, T]; \dot{H}^1)$, equipped with the norm

$$\|v\|_{F_T} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^j \|\Delta_j v\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; L^2)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|v\|_{L^4([0, T]; \dot{H}^1)}.$$

Notice that the first part of the norm was introduced in [Chemin and Lerner 1995] and is a larger norm than the supremum in time of the $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ norm. Moreover it holds that

$$\|u_L\|_{F_T} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Let us temporarily assume the following inequality:

$$\|\text{PB}(u, v)\|_{F_T} \lesssim \|u\|_{\mathbb{K}} \|v\|_{F_T}. \tag{10}$$

Then it is obvious that if $\|u\|_{\mathbb{K}}$ is small enough for some time $[0, T[$, the linear equation (PGNS) has a unique solution in F_T (in the distribution sense) which satisfies in particular, if c_0 is small enough,

$$\|v\|_{F_T} \leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{1}{2} \|v\|_{F_T}.$$

As u is a regular solution of (PGNS), it therefore satisfies

$$\forall t < T, \quad \|u\|_{L^4([0,t];\dot{H}^1)} \leq 2C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

which implies that $T^*(u_0) > T$, so the lemma is proved provided we prove inequality (10).

Let us observe that for any j in \mathbb{Z} ,

$$\partial_t \Delta_j \text{PB}(u, v) - \Delta \Delta_j \text{PB}(u, v) = -\Delta_j \mathcal{Q}(u, v). \tag{11}$$

By definition of \mathcal{Q} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\Delta_j \mathcal{Q}(u, v)(t)\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{1 \leq i, k, \ell \leq 3} (\|\Delta_j A_{k, \ell}^i(D)(S_{j'+1} u \Delta_{j'} v)\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta_j A_{k, \ell}^i(D)(\Delta_{j'} v S_{j'} u)\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

As the $A_{k, \ell}^i(D)$ are smooth homogeneous Fourier multipliers of order 1, we infer that for some fixed nonnegative integer N_0

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\Delta_j \mathcal{Q}(u, v)(t)\|_{L^2} \\ & \lesssim 2^j \sum_{j' \geq j - N_0} (\|S_{j'+1} u(t) \Delta_{j'} v(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta_{j'} v(t) S_{j'} u(t)\|_{L^2}) \\ & \lesssim 2^j \sum_{j' \geq j - N_0} (\|S_{j'+1} u(t)\|_{L^\infty} \|\Delta_{j'} v(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta_{j'} v(t)\|_{L^2} \|S_{j'} u(t)\|_{L^\infty}) \\ & \lesssim 2^j \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty} \sum_{j' \geq j - N_0} \|\Delta_{j'} v(t)\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using relation (11) and the definition of the norm on F_T , we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_j \text{PB}(u, v)(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq \int_0^t e^{-c2^{2j}(t-t')} \|\Delta_j \mathcal{Q}(u, v)(t')\|_{L^2} dt' \\ &\lesssim 2^j \int_0^t e^{-c2^{2j}(t-t')} \|u(t')\|_{L^\infty} \sum_{j' \geq j-N_0} \|\Delta_{j'} v(t')\|_{L^2} dt' \\ &\lesssim 2^j \|u\|_{\mathbb{K}} \|v\|_{F_T} \sum_{j' \geq j-N_0} c_{j'} 2^{-\frac{j'}{2}} \int_0^t e^{-c2^{2j}(t-t')} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t'}} dt', \end{aligned}$$

where $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ denotes a generic element of the sphere of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. Thus we have, for all t less than T ,

$$2^{\frac{j}{2}} \|\Delta_j \text{PB}(u, v)(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|u\|_{\mathbb{K}} \|v\|_{F_T} \sum_{j' \geq j-N_0} c_{j'} 2^{-\frac{j'-j}{2}} \int_0^t 2^j e^{-c2^{2j}(t-t')} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t'}} dt'.$$

Thanks to Young's inequality, we have $\sum_{j' \geq j-N_0} c_{j'} 2^{-\frac{j'-j}{2}} \lesssim c_j$ and we deduce that

$$2^{\frac{j}{2}} \|\Delta_j \text{PB}(u, v)(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim c_j \|u\|_{\mathbb{K}} \|v\|_{F_T} \int_0^t 2^j e^{-c2^{2j}(t-t')} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t'}} dt'. \quad (12)$$

As we have

$$\int_0^t 2^j e^{-c2^{2j}(t-t')} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t'}} dt' \lesssim \int_0^t \frac{1}{\sqrt{t-t'}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t'}} dt',$$

we infer finally that

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^j \|\Delta_j \text{PB}(u, v)\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; L^2)}^2 \lesssim \|u\|_{\mathbb{K}}^2 \|v\|_{F_T}^2. \quad (13)$$

Moreover returning to inequality (12), we have

$$2^j \|\Delta_j \text{PB}(u, v)\|_{L^4([0, T]; L^2)} \lesssim c_j \|u\|_{\mathbb{K}} \|v\|_{F_T} \left\| \int_0^t 2^{\frac{3j}{2}} e^{-c2^{2j}(t-t')} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t'}} dt' \right\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^+)}.$$

The Hardy–Littlewood–Sobolev inequality implies that

$$\left\| \int_0^t 2^{\frac{3j}{2}} e^{-c2^{2j}(t-t')} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t'}} dt' \right\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^+)} \lesssim 1.$$

Since thanks to the Minkowski inequality we have

$$\|\text{PB}(u, v)\|_{L^4([0, T]; \dot{H}^1)}^2 \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{2j} \|\Delta_j \text{PB}(u, v)\|_{L^4([0, T]; L^2)}^2,$$

and together with inequality (13) this concludes the proof of inequality (10) and thus the proof of Lemma 3.1. \square

4. Proof of Theorem 1.6

The plan of the proof of Theorem 1.6 is the following: as previously we look for the solution of (NS) in the form

$$u = u_L + w,$$

where we recall that $u_L(t) = e^{t\Delta}u_0$. Moreover we recall that the solution u satisfies the energy inequality (4). By construction, the fluctuation w satisfies

$$(NSF) \quad \partial_t w - \Delta w + (u_L + w) \cdot \nabla w + w \cdot \nabla u_L = -u_L \cdot \nabla u_L - \nabla p, \quad \operatorname{div} w = 0.$$

Let us prove that the life span of w satisfies the lower bound (5). The first step of the proof consists in proving Proposition 1.5, stated in the introduction. This is achieved in Section 4A. The next step is the proof of a similar energy estimate on $\partial_3 w$ — that contrary to the scaled energy estimate of Proposition 1.5, the next result is useful in general only locally in time. It is proved in Section 4B.

Proposition 4.1. *With the notation of Proposition 1.5 and Theorem 1.6, the fluctuation w satisfies the following estimate:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}(\partial_3 w)(t) \\ & \lesssim \left(Q_L^0 \left(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \sup_{t' \in (0, t)} \|\partial_3 w(t')\|_{L^2}^4 + \|\partial_3 u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{-\frac{3}{2}}}^2 \right) + \sqrt{Q_L^0 Q_L^1} \right) \exp(2\|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty, 2}^{-1}}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Combining both propositions, one can conclude the proof of Theorem 1.6. This is performed in Section 4C.

4A. The rescaled energy estimate on the fluctuation: proof of Proposition 1.5.

An L^2 energy estimate on (NSF) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & = - \sum_{1 \leq j, k \leq 3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w^j \partial_j u_L^k w^k(t, x) \, dx - (\mathbb{P}(u_L \cdot \nabla u_L)|w)(t). \end{aligned}$$

From this, after an integration by parts and using the fact that the divergence of w is zero, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\|w(t)\|_{L^2}^2}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) + \frac{\|w(t)\|_{L^2}^2}{2t^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{\|\nabla w(t)\|_{L^2}^2}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ & \leq \frac{\|w(t)\|_{L^2} \|u_L(t)\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla w(t)\|_{L^2}}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{\|\mathbb{P}(u_L \cdot \nabla u_L)(t)\|_{L^2} \|w(t)\|_{L^2}}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us observe that

$$\frac{\|\mathbb{P}(u_L \cdot \nabla u_L)(t)\|_{L^2} \|w(t)\|_{L^2}}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}} = t^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\mathbb{P}(u_L \cdot \nabla u_L)(t)\|_{L^2} \frac{\|w(t)\|_{L^2}}{t^{\frac{3}{4}}}.$$

Using a convexity inequality, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\|w(t)\|_{L^2}^2}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) + \frac{\|w(t)\|_{L^2}^2}{2t^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{\|\nabla w(t)\|_{L^2}^2}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ \leq \frac{\|w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \|u_L(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}} + t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u_L(t) \cdot \nabla u_L(t)\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\|w(t)\|_{L^2}^2}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}} \exp \left(- \int_0^t \|u_L(t')\|_{L^\infty}^2 dt' \right) \right) \\ + \exp \left(- \int_0^t \|u_L(t')\|_{L^\infty}^2 dt' \right) \left(\frac{\|w(t)\|_{L^2}^2}{2t^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{\|\nabla w(t)\|_{L^2}^2}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \\ \leq \exp \left(- \int_0^t \|u_L(t')\|_{L^\infty}^2 dt' \right) t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbb{P}(u_L \cdot \nabla u_L)(t)\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

from which we infer by the definition of the $\dot{B}_{\infty,2}^{-1}$ norm and of Q_L^0 that

$\forall t \geq 0,$

$$\frac{\|w(t)\|_{L^2}^2}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \int_0^t \left(\frac{\|w(t')\|_{L^2}^2}{2t'^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{\|\nabla w(t')\|_{L^2}^2}{t'^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) dt' \leq Q_L^0 \exp \|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,2}^{-1}}^2. \tag{14}$$

Proposition 1.5 follows. □

4B. Proof of Proposition 4.1. Now let us investigate the evolution of $\partial_3 w$ in L^2 . Applying the partial differentiation ∂_3 to (NSF), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \partial_3 w - \Delta \partial_3 w + (u_L + w) \cdot \nabla \partial_3 w + \partial_3 w \cdot \nabla u_L \\ = -\partial_3 u_L \cdot \nabla w - \partial_3 w \cdot \nabla w - w \cdot \nabla \partial_3 u_L - \partial_3 (u_L \cdot \nabla u_L) - \nabla \partial_3 p. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

The difficult terms to estimate are those which do not contain explicitly $\partial_3 w$. So let us define

$$\begin{aligned} (a) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -(\partial_3 u_L \cdot \nabla w)|_{\partial_3 w}_{L^2}, & (b) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -(w \cdot \nabla \partial_3 u_L)|_{\partial_3 w}_{L^2}, \\ (c) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -(\partial_3 (u_L \cdot \nabla u_L))|_{\partial_3 w}_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The third term is the easiest. By integration by parts and using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality along with (14) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^\infty (c)(t) dt \right| &= \left| \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \partial_3^2 (\mathbb{P}(u_L \cdot \nabla u_L)(t, x)) \cdot w(t, x) dx dt \right| \\ &\leq \left(\int_0^\infty t^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\partial_3^2 \mathbb{P}(u_L \cdot \nabla u_L)(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^\infty \frac{\|w(t)\|_{L^2}^2}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{Q_L^0 Q_L^1} \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,2}^{-1}}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now let us estimate the contribution of (a) and (b). By integration by parts, we get, thanks to the divergence free condition on u_L ,

$$(a) = (\partial_3 u_L \otimes w | \nabla \partial_3 w)_{L^2} \quad \text{and} \quad (b) = (w \otimes \partial_3 u_L | \nabla \partial_3 w)_{L^2}.$$

The two terms can be estimated exactly in the same way since they are both of the form

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w(t, x) \partial_3 u_L(t, x) \nabla \partial_3 w(t, x) \, dx.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w(t, x) \partial_3 u_L(t, x) \nabla \partial_3 w(t, x) \, dx \right| & \\ & \leq \|w(t)\|_{L^2} \|\partial_3 u_L(t)\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \partial_3 w\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{100} \|\nabla \partial_3 w\|_{L^2}^2 + 100 \|w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \|\partial_3 u_L(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The first term will be absorbed by the Laplacian. The second term can be understood as a source term. By time integration, we get indeed

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \|w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \|\partial_3 u_L(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2 \, dt & \leq \int_0^T \frac{\|w(t)\|_{L^2}^2}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}} (t^{\frac{3}{4}} \|\partial_3 u_L(t)\|_{L^\infty})^2 \, dt \\ & \leq \|\partial_3 u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-\frac{3}{2}}}^2 \int_0^\infty \frac{\|w(t)\|_{L^2}^2}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}} \, dt, \end{aligned}$$

so it follows, thanks to Proposition 1.5, that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w(t, x) \partial_3 u_L(t, x) \nabla \partial_3 w(t, x) \, dx \, dt & \\ & \leq \frac{1}{100} \int_0^T \|\nabla \partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \, dt + C \|\partial_3 u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-\frac{3}{2}}}^2 Q_L^0 \exp \|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,2}^{-1,2}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The contribution of the quadratic term in (15) is estimated as follows: Writing, for any function a ,

$$\|a\|_{L_h^p L_v^q} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\int \|a(x_1, x_2, \cdot)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R})}^p \, dx_1 \, dx_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

we have by Hölder’s inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \partial_3 w(t, x) \cdot \nabla w(t, x) \partial_3 w(t, x) \, dx \right| & \\ & \leq \|\partial_3 w(t)\|_{L_v^2 L_h^4}^2 \|\nabla w\|_{L_v^\infty L_h^2} \\ & \leq \|\partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla w(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the inequalities

$$\|a\|_{L^\infty_\nu L^2_h} \lesssim \|\partial_3 a\|_{L^2} \frac{1}{2} \|a\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|a\|_{L^2_\nu L^4_h} \lesssim \|a\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_h a\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (16)$$

with $\nabla_h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\partial_1, \partial_2)$. The first inequality comes from

$$\begin{aligned} \|a(\cdot, x_3)\|_{L^2_h}^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{x_3} (\partial_3 a(\cdot, z) |a(\cdot, z)|)_{L^2} dz \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\partial_3 a(\cdot, z)\|_{L^2_h} \|a(\cdot, z)\|_{L^2_h} dz \\ &\leq \|\partial_3 a\|_{L^2} \|a\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

while the second simply comes from the embedding $\dot{H}_h^{\frac{1}{2}} \subset L_h^4$ and an interpolation. By Young’s inequality it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \partial_3 w(t, x) \cdot \nabla w(t, x) \partial_3 w(t, x) dx \right| &\leq \frac{1}{100} \|\nabla \partial_3 w\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\nabla w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \|\partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^4 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{100} \|\nabla \partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \left(\sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\partial_3 w(t')\|_{L^2}^4 \right) t^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\|\nabla w(t)\|_{L^2}^2}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

from which we infer by [Proposition 1.5](#) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \partial_3 w(t, x) \cdot \nabla w(t, x) \partial_3 w(t, x) dx \right| &\leq \frac{1}{100} \|\nabla \partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \left(\sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\partial_3 w(t')\|_{L^2}^4 \right) t^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_L^0 \exp \|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,2}^{-1}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, after an integration by parts we find

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \partial_3 w(t, x) \cdot \nabla u_L(t, x) \partial_3 w(t, x) dx &\leq \|\partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2} \|u_L(t)\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{100} \|\nabla \partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \|u_L(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2, \end{aligned}$$

so plugging all these estimates together we infer thanks to Gronwall’s inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T \|\nabla \partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt &\lesssim \left(T^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_L^0 \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|\partial_3 w(t')\|_{L^2}^4 + \|\partial_3 u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,2}^{-3}}^2 Q_L^0 + \sqrt{Q_L^0 Q_L^1} \right) \exp(2 \|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,2}^{-1}}^2). \end{aligned}$$

[Proposition 4.1](#) is proved. □

4C. End of the proof of Theorem 1.6.

4C1. Control of the fluctuation. To make notation lighter let us set

$$M_L \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\|\partial_3 u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{-\frac{3}{2}}}^2 Q_L^0 + \sqrt{Q_L^0 Q_L^1} \right) \exp(2\|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty, 2}^{-1}}^2).$$

Proposition 4.1 provides the existence of a constant K such that the following a priori estimate holds

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T \|\nabla \partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt \\ \leq K T^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_L^0 \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^4 \exp(2\|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty, 2}^{-1}}^2) + K M_L. \end{aligned}$$

Let T^* be the maximal time of existence of u , hence of w , and recalling that $w(t=0) = 0$, set T_1 to be the maximal time T for which

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 2K M_L.$$

Then on $[0, T_1]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T \|\nabla \partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt &\leq 4K^3 T_1^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_L^0 M_L^2 + K M_L \\ &\leq K M_L (1 + 4K^2 T_1^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_L^0 M_L). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$T_1 \geq T_* \quad \text{with} \quad T_* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\frac{1}{8K^2 Q_L^0 M_L} \right)^2,$$

and on $[0, T_*]$ it holds that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T \|\nabla \partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq \frac{3}{2} K M_L. \quad (17)$$

4C2. End of the proof of the theorem. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.6 we know that there exists a unique solution u to (NS) on some time interval $[0, T^*]$, which satisfies the energy estimate. Let us prove that this time interval contains $[0, T_*]$. Since the initial data u_0 belongs to L^2 , we may assume that u is a global Leray solution, meaning that

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \mathcal{E}(u(t)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (18)$$

Moreover one clearly has

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\partial_3 u_L(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^\infty \|\nabla \partial_3 u_L(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq \|\partial_3 u_0\|_{L^2}^2,$$

so together with (17) this implies that on $[0, T_*]$,

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\partial_3 w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T \|\nabla \partial_3 u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt \lesssim \|\partial_3 u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + M_L. \tag{19}$$

Let us prove that these estimates provide a control on u in \dot{H}^1 on $[0, T_*]$. After differentiation of (NS) with respect to the horizontal variables and an energy estimate, we get for any ℓ in $\{1, 2\}$ and after an integration by parts

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\partial_\ell u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \partial_\ell u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \partial_\ell (u \cdot \nabla u) \cdot \partial_\ell u(t, x) dx \\ &\leq \|u\|_{L^\infty L^4_h} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2_v L^4_h} \|\partial_\ell^2 u(t)\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly to (16) we have

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty_v L^4_h}^2 \lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty \dot{H}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \lesssim \int_{-\infty}^{x_3} (\partial_3 u(\cdot, z) |u(\cdot, z)|)_{\dot{H}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}} dz \lesssim \|\partial_3 u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla_h u\|_{L^2},$$

so using (16) we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \partial_\ell (u \cdot \nabla u) \cdot \partial_\ell u(t, x) dx \right| \\ \leq C \|\partial_3 u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_h u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \nabla_h u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_\ell^2 u(t)\|_{L^2} \\ \leq \frac{1}{100} \|\nabla \nabla_h u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\partial_3 u\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla_h u\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla_h u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \nabla_h u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|\partial_3 u\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla_h u\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and Gronwall’s inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_h u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla \nabla_h u(t')\|_{L^2}^2 dt' \\ \leq \|\nabla_h u_0\|_{L^2}^2 \exp\left(\int_0^t \|\partial_3 u(t')\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla u(t')\|_{L^2}^2 dt'\right). \end{aligned}$$

The fact that we control $\|\nabla u\|_{L_t^2(L_x^2)}$ and $\|\partial_3 u\|_{L_t^\infty(L_x^2)}$ thanks to (18) and (19) implies that on $[0, T_*]$ we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T \|\nabla^2 u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2}^2 \exp(\|u_0\|_{L^2(KM_L)}^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

This means that there is a unique, smooth solution at least on $[0, T_*]$, completing the proof of Theorem 1.6. □

5. Comparison of both life spans: proof of Theorem 1.7

Let us introduce the notation

$$f_\varepsilon(x_1, x_2, x_3) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \cos\left(\frac{x_1}{\varepsilon}\right) f\left(x_1, \frac{x_2}{\varepsilon^\alpha}, x_3\right),$$

where ε is a given number, assumed to be small, and α is a fixed parameter in the open interval $]0, 1[$. We assume the initial data is given by the following expression

$$u_{0,\varepsilon}(x) = \frac{A_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} (0, \varepsilon^\alpha (-\partial_3 \phi)_\varepsilon, (\partial_2 \phi)_\varepsilon), \tag{20}$$

where ϕ is a smooth compactly supported function and the parameter $A_\varepsilon \gg 1$ will be tuned later.

Let us recall that Lemma 3.1 of [Chemin and Gallagher 2009] claims in particular that

$$\forall \sigma > 0, \quad \|f_\varepsilon\|_{\dot{B}_{p,1}^{-\sigma}} \leq C_\sigma \varepsilon^{\sigma + \frac{\alpha}{p}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|f_\varepsilon\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-\sigma}} \geq c_\sigma \varepsilon^\sigma. \tag{21}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{0,\varepsilon}\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-1+2\gamma}} &\lesssim A_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{-2\gamma}, \quad \|u_{0,\varepsilon}\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-1}} \sim \|u_{0,\varepsilon}\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,2}^{-1}} \sim A_\varepsilon, \\ \text{and} \quad \|\partial_3 u_{0,\varepsilon}\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-\frac{3}{2}}} &\lesssim A_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

With the notation of Theorem 1.3 it therefore holds that

$$T_{\text{FP}}(u_{0,\varepsilon}) \geq C \varepsilon^2 A_\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}.$$

Let us now compute $T_L(u_{0,\varepsilon})$. Recalling that $u_L(t) = e^{t\Delta} u_{0,\varepsilon}$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} u_L^1 \partial_1 u_L^1 + u_L^2 \partial_2 u_L^1 &= \left(\frac{A_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\right)^2 e^{t\Delta} f_\varepsilon e^{t\Delta} g_\varepsilon, \\ u_L^1 \partial_1 u_L^2 + u_L^2 \partial_2 u_L^2 &= \left(\frac{A_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\right)^2 e^{t\Delta} \tilde{f}_\varepsilon e^{t\Delta} \tilde{g}_\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

where $f, g, \tilde{f}, \tilde{g}$ are smooth compactly supported functions. Now let us estimate

$$\int_0^\infty t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{t\Delta} f_\varepsilon e^{t\Delta} g_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 dt.$$

for f and g given smooth compactly supported functions. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{t\Delta} f_\varepsilon e^{t\Delta} g_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 dt &= \int_0^\infty t^{\frac{3}{2}} \|e^{t\Delta} f_\varepsilon e^{t\Delta} g_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty (t^{\frac{3}{8}} \|e^{t\Delta} f_\varepsilon\|_{L^4})^2 (t^{\frac{3}{8}} \|e^{t\Delta} g_\varepsilon\|_{L^4})^2 \frac{dt}{t}, \end{aligned}$$

thanks to the Hölder inequality. The Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and the definition of Besov norms imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|e^{t\Delta} f_\varepsilon e^{t\Delta} g_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 dt \\ & \leq \left(\int_0^\infty (t^{\frac{3}{8}} \|e^{t\Delta} f_\varepsilon\|_{L^4})^4 \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^\infty (t^{\frac{3}{8}} \|e^{t\Delta} g_\varepsilon\|_{L^4})^4 \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \|f_\varepsilon\|_{\dot{B}_{4,4}^{-\frac{3}{4}}}^2 \|g_\varepsilon\|_{\dot{B}_{4,4}^{-\frac{3}{4}}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that

$$\|f_\varepsilon\|_{\dot{B}_{4,4}^{-\frac{3}{4}}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{3+\alpha}{4}},$$

so it follows (since \mathbb{P} is a homogeneous Fourier multiplier of order 0) that

$$Q_L^0 \lesssim A_\varepsilon^4 \varepsilon^{\alpha-1}. \quad (23)$$

For the initial data (20), differentiations with respect to the vertical variable ∂_3 have no real influence on the term $u_L(t) \cdot \nabla u_L(t)$. Indeed, we have

$$\partial_3^2(u_L(t) \cdot \nabla u_L(t)) = \partial_3^2 u_L(t) \cdot \nabla u_L(t) + 2\partial_3 u_L(t) \cdot \partial_3 \nabla u_L(t) + u_L(t) \cdot \partial_3^2 \nabla u_L(t),$$

and it is then obvious that $\partial_3^2(u_L(t) \cdot \nabla u_L(t))$ is a sum of term of the type

$$\left(\frac{A_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\right)^2 e^{t\Delta} f_\varepsilon e^{t\Delta} g_\varepsilon.$$

Then following the lines used to estimate the term Q_L^0 , we write

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty t^{\frac{3}{2}} \|e^{t\Delta} f_\varepsilon e^{t\Delta} g_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 dt \\ & \leq \left(\int_0^\infty (t^{\frac{5}{8}} \|e^{t\Delta} f_\varepsilon\|_{L^4})^4 \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^\infty (t^{\frac{5}{8}} \|e^{t\Delta} g_\varepsilon\|_{L^4})^4 \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \|f_\varepsilon\|_{\dot{B}_{4,4}^{-\frac{5}{4}}}^2 \|g_\varepsilon\|_{\dot{B}_{4,4}^{-\frac{5}{4}}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that

$$\|f_\varepsilon\|_{\dot{B}_{4,4}^{-\frac{5}{4}}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{5+\alpha}{4}},$$

so it follows that

$$Q_L^1 \lesssim A_\varepsilon^4 \varepsilon^{\alpha+1}.$$

Together with (22) and (23), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} Q_L^0(\|\partial_3 u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{-\frac{3}{2}}}^2 Q_L^0 + \sqrt{Q_L^0 Q_L^1}) \exp(4\|u_0\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,2}^{-1}}^2) \\ \lesssim A_\varepsilon^4 \varepsilon^{\alpha-1} (A_\varepsilon^6 \varepsilon^\alpha + A_\varepsilon^4 \varepsilon^\alpha) \exp(C_0 A_\varepsilon^2) \\ \lesssim A_\varepsilon^{10} \varepsilon^{2\alpha-1} \exp(C_0 A_\varepsilon^2) \end{aligned}$$

because A_ε is larger than 1. Let us choose some κ in $]0, \eta[$ and then

$$A_\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\frac{C_0}{-\kappa \log \varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then with the notation of Theorem 1.6 we have

$$T_L = C A_\varepsilon^{-20} \varepsilon^{2(1-2\alpha+\kappa)}.$$

Let us choose κ' in $]\kappa, \eta[$. By definition of A_ε we get that

$$T_L \geq C \varepsilon^{2(1-2\alpha+\kappa')}.$$

Choosing $\alpha = 1 - (\eta - \kappa')/4$ concludes the proof of Theorem 1.7. □

Appendix: A Littlewood–Paley toolbox

Let us recall some well-known results on Littlewood–Paley theory (see for instance [Bahouri et al. 2011] for more details).

Definition A.1. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be such that $\hat{\phi}(\xi) = 1$ for $|\xi| \leq 1$ and $\hat{\phi}(\xi) = 0$ for $|\xi| > 2$. We define, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, the function $\phi_j(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2^{3j} \phi(2^j x)$, and the Littlewood–Paley operators

$$S_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \phi_j * \cdot \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S_{j+1} - S_j.$$

Homogeneous Sobolev spaces are defined by the norm

$$\|a\|_{\dot{H}^s} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{2js} \|\Delta_j a\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

This norm is equivalent to

$$\|a\|_{\dot{H}^s} \sim \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\xi|^{2s} |\mathcal{F}a(\xi)|^2 d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where \mathcal{F} is the Fourier transform. Finally let us recall the definition of Besov norms of negative index.

Definition A.2. Let σ be a positive real number and (p, q) in $[1, \infty]^2$. Let us define the homogeneous Besov norm $\|\cdot\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^{-\sigma}}$ by

$$\|a\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^{-\sigma}} = \|t^{\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|e^{t\Delta} a\|_{L^p} \|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^+; \frac{dt}{t})}.$$

Let us mention that thanks to the properties of the heat flow, for $p_1 \leq p_2$ and $q_1 \leq q_2$, we have the following inequality, valid for any regular function a

$$\|a\|_{\dot{B}_{p_2,q}^{-\sigma-3(\frac{1}{p_1}-\frac{1}{p_2})}} \lesssim \|a\|_{\dot{B}_{p_1,q}^{-\sigma}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|a\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q_2}^{-\sigma}} \lesssim \|a\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q_1}^{-\sigma}}.$$

An equivalent definition using the Littlewood–Paley decomposition is

$$\|a\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^{-\sigma}} \sim \left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{-j\sigma q} \|\Delta_j a\|_{L^p}^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

References

- [Bahouri et al. 2011] H. Bahouri, J.-Y. Chemin, and R. Danchin, *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations*, Grundlehren der Math. Wissenschaften **343**, Springer, 2011. [MR](#)
- [Chemin 1999] J.-Y. Chemin, “Théorèmes d’unicité pour le système de Navier–Stokes tridimensionnel”, *J. Anal. Math.* **77** (1999), 27–50. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Chemin and Gallagher 2009] J.-Y. Chemin and I. Gallagher, “Wellposedness and stability results for the Navier–Stokes equations in \mathbb{R}^3 ”, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **26**:2 (2009), 599–624. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Chemin and Lerner 1995] J.-Y. Chemin and N. Lerner, “Flot de champs de vecteurs non lipschitziens et équations de Navier–Stokes”, *J. Differential Equations* **121**:2 (1995), 314–328. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Chemin and Planchon 2012] J.-Y. Chemin and F. Planchon, “Self-improving bounds for the Navier–Stokes equations”, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **140**:4 (2012), 583–597. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Fujita and Kato 1964] H. Fujita and T. Kato, “On the Navier–Stokes initial value problem, I”, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **16** (1964), 269–315. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Koch and Tataru 2001] H. Koch and D. Tataru, “Well-posedness for the Navier–Stokes equations”, *Adv. Math.* **157**:1 (2001), 22–35. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Leray 1934] J. Leray, “Sur le mouvement d’un liquide visqueux emplissant l’espace”, *Acta Math.* **63**:1 (1934), 193–248. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Meyer 1997] Y. Meyer, “Wavelets, paraproducts, and Navier–Stokes equations”, pp. 105–212 in *Current developments in mathematics* (Cambridge, MA, 1996), edited by R. Bott et al., International Press, Boston, 1997. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Poulon 2015] E. Poulon, “About the possibility of minimal blow up for Navier–Stokes solutions with data in $\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ ”, preprint, 2015. [arXiv](#)
- [Tao 2016] T. Tao, “Finite time blowup for an averaged three-dimensional Navier–Stokes equation”, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **29**:3 (2016), 601–674. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)

JEAN-YVES CHEMIN:

chemin@ann.jussieu.fr

Laboratoire J.-L. Lions, UMR 7598, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Sorbonne Université,
75230 Paris Cedex 05, France

ISABELLE GALLAGHER:

gallagher@math.ens.fr

Ecole Normale Supérieure, 75005 Paris, France

and

Université Paris-Diderot, Sorbonne Paris-Cité, 75013 Paris, France

Tunisian Journal of Mathematics

msp.org/tunis

EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

Ahmed Abbes CNRS & IHES, France
abbes@ihes.fr
Ali Baklouti Faculté des Sciences de Sfax, Tunisia
ali.baklouti@fss.usf.tn

EDITORIAL BOARD

Hajer Bahouri CNRS & LAMA, Université Paris-Est Créteil, France
hajer.bahouri@u-pec.fr
Arnaud Beauville Laboratoire J. A. Dieudonné, Université Côte d'Azur, France
beauville@unice.fr
Bassam Fayad CNRS & Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu-Paris Rive Gauche, Paris, France
bassam.fayad@imj-prg.fr
Benoit Fresse Université Lille 1, France
benoit.fresse@math.univ-lille1.fr
Dennis Gaitsgory Harvard University, United States
gaitsgde@gmail.com
Emmanuel Hebey Université de Cergy-Pontoise, France
emmanuel.hebey@math.u-cergy.fr
Mohamed Ali Jendoubi Université de Carthage, Tunisia
ma.jendoubi@gmail.com
Sadok Kallel Université de Lille 1, France & American University of Sharjah, UAE
sadok.kallel@math.univ-lille1.fr
Minhyong Kim Oxford University, UK & Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul, Korea
minhyong.kim@maths.ox.ac.uk
Toshiyuki Kobayashi The University of Tokyo & Kavli IPMU, Japan
toshi@kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp
Yanyan Li Rutgers University, United States
yyli@math.rutgers.edu
Nader Masmoudi Courant Institute, New York University, United States
masmoudi@cims.nyu.edu
Haynes R. Miller Massachusetts Institute of Technology, United States
hrm@math.mit.edu
Nordine Mir Texas A&M University at Qatar & Université de Rouen Normandie, France
nordine.mir@qatar.tamu.edu
Detlef Müller Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel, Germany
mueller@math.uni-kiel.de
Mohamed Sifi Université Tunis El Manar, Tunisia
mohamed.sifi@fst.utm.tn
Daniel Tataru University of California, Berkeley, United States
tataru@math.berkeley.edu
Sundaram Thangavelu Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India
veluma@math.iisc.ernet.in
Saïd Zarati Université Tunis El Manar, Tunisia
said.zarati@fst.utm.tn

PRODUCTION

Silvio Levy (Scientific Editor)
production@msp.org

The Tunisian Journal of Mathematics is an international publication organized by the Tunisian Mathematical Society (<http://www.tms.rnu.tn>) and published in electronic and print formats by MSP in Berkeley.


See inside back cover or msp.org/tunis for submission instructions.

The subscription price for 2019 is US \$/year for the electronic version, and \$/year (+\$, if shipping outside the US) for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues and changes of subscriber address should be sent to MSP.

Tunisian Journal of Mathematics (ISSN 2576-7666 electronic, 2576-7658 printed) at Mathematical Sciences Publishers, 798 Evans Hall #3840, c/o University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840 is published continuously online. Periodical rate postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices.

TJM peer review and production are managed by EditFlow[®] from MSP.

PUBLISHED BY

 **mathematical sciences publishers**

nonprofit scientific publishing

<http://msp.org/>

© 2019 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

Tunisian Journal of Mathematics

2019

vol. 1

no. 2

| | |
|--|-----|
| Nonlocal self-improving properties: a functional analytic approach Pascal Auscher, Simon Bortz, Moritz Egert and Olli Saari | 151 |
| Saturated morphisms of logarithmic schemes Takeshi Tsuji | 185 |
| Quantum mean-field asymptotics and multiscale analysis Zied Ammari, Sébastien Breteaux and Francis Nier | 221 |
| A nonlinear estimate of the life span of solutions of the three dimensional Navier–Stokes equations Jean-Yves Chemin and Isabelle Gallagher | 273 |