

Continuity and two dimensional Euler equation with L^1 vorticity

Camilla Nobili

Joint work with G.Crippa, C.Seis and S.Spirito

University of Hamburg, Germany

Waves in Flow - summer school and workshop, Prague 27-31 August
2018

Motivation

Consider the 2D-Euler equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \omega + u \cdot \nabla \omega = 0, \\ u = \mathcal{K} * \omega, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$



with the Biot-Savart kernel \mathcal{K}

$$\mathcal{K}(x) = \frac{x^\perp}{2\pi|x|^2}, \quad \text{where } (x_1, x_2)^\perp = (-x_2, x_1).$$

Remark: $\nabla \cdot u = 0$.

Question in Lopes-Mazzucato-Lopes 2006

Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 179 (2006) 353–387
Digital Object Identifier (DOI) 10.1007/s00205-005-0390-5

Weak Solutions, Renormalized Solutions and Enstrophy Defects in 2D Turbulence

MILTON C. LOPES FILHO, ANNA L. MAZZUCATO
& HELENA J. NUSSENZVEIG LOPES

Communicated by Y. BRENIER

Question in Lopes-Mazzucato-Lopes 2006

Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 179 (2006) 353–387
Digital Object Identifier (DOI) 10.1007/s00205-005-0390-5

Weak Solutions, Renormalized Solutions and Enstrophy Defects in 2D Turbulence

MILTON C. LOPES FILHO, ANNA L. MAZZUCATO
& HELENA J. NUSSENZVEIG LOPES

Communicated by Y. BRENIER

Are solutions $\omega \in L^\infty([0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{R}^2))$ with $1 \leq p < 2$ obtained as a vanishing viscosity limit renormalized?

Distributional solution

Definition (Weak solutions)

Let $\omega \in L^\infty([0; T]; L^p(\mathbb{R}^2))$ for some $p \geq \frac{4}{3}$ and $u = K * \omega$. We say ω is a *weak-solution* of (1) if $\forall \phi \in C_c^\infty([0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^2)$, we have

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \phi_t \omega + \nabla \phi \cdot u \omega \, dx \, dt + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \phi(x, 0) \omega_0(x) \, dx = 0.$$

In addition we require *mild growth conditions* for u .

Remark 1: When $\omega_0 \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for $p \geq \frac{4}{3}$ **distributional solution** are well defined: $u\omega \in L^1_{loc}$.

Remark 2: Uniqueness of weak solutions only for (nearly) *bounded* vorticity (Yudovich, Vishik)

Renormalized solutions

Definition (Renormalized solution for the linear transport equation)

A function $\omega \in L^\infty([0, T]; L^0)$ is a *renormalized solution* of $\omega_t + u \cdot \nabla \omega = 0$, if (in the sense of distribution)

$$\partial_t \beta(\omega) + u \cdot \nabla \beta(\omega) = 0,$$

for all $\beta \in C^1 \cap L^\infty$.

L^0 denotes the set of all measurable functions such that $\{|\omega| > \lambda\}$ is finite for all $\lambda > 0$

- Renormalized solution make sense even when one cannot define distributionally the product $u\omega$.
- DiPerna-Lions theory assures existence, uniqueness of renormalized solution in Sobolev class.
- Distributional and renormalized solutions coincide when $u \in L^1(W^{1,p})$ with $\nabla \cdot u \in L^1(L^\infty)$ and $\omega \in L^\infty L^q$ with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$.

Viscosity solutions

Definition (viscosity solutions)

We call ω a viscosity solution to the Euler equations if

$$\omega = \lim_{\nu \downarrow 0} \omega^\nu,$$

where ω^ν is the curl of some divergence-free velocity field and solve the Navier-Stokes vorticity equation with viscosity ν

$$\partial_t \omega^\nu + (u \cdot \nabla) \omega^\nu = \nu \Delta \omega^\nu$$

Remark 1: Physically meaningful approximation

Remark 2: Anomalous dissipation of enstrophy \rightarrow 2D Turbulence

Connection between weak, renormalized and viscosity solutions

Let $\omega_0 \in L^p_c(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

When $p \geq 2$ every **distributional solution** is **renormalized solutions** of the transport equation with velocity $u = K * \omega$. [Lopes, Lopes&Mazuccato, '06]

When $1 < p < 2$ **viscosity solutions** to the Euler vorticity are **renormalized solutions** [Crippa&Spirito, '15]

The arguments rely on Calderón-Zygmund estimate for the Biot-Savart kernel:

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^p} \leq \|\omega\|_{L^p} \quad \text{when } p \in (1, \infty)$$

What happens when $\omega_0 \in L^1$?

For $p = 1$ the Calderón-Zygmund estimate fails $\rightsquigarrow u$ does not have Sobolev regularity \rightsquigarrow DiPerna-Lions theory does not apply.

Theorem 1

For initial vorticities in L^1 , viscosity solutions to the Euler vorticity are renormalized solutions.

Crucial tool to prove Theorem 1: **uniqueness** for the linear continuity equation with velocity field $\nabla u = K * g$ with K singular kernel and $g \in L^1$.

Uniqueness for continuity equation with singular velocity

Let ρ be the solution

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (u\rho) = 0 & \text{in } [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \rho(0, \cdot) = \rho_0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

with

- $u \in L^{p, \infty}([0, T], \Omega)$
- $\nabla \cdot u \in L^1([0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))$
- $\nabla u = K * g$ where $g = g(x, t) \in L^1$
 K smooth in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, $|K| \lesssim \frac{1}{|x|^n}$, $|\nabla K| \lesssim \frac{1}{|x|^{n+1}}$
- $\rho_0 \in L^1([0, T]; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))$

Under these hypotheses on u and ρ_0 .

Theorem 2: Uniqueness

Then the Cauchy problem (2) has a unique distributional solution ρ in the class $L^\infty((0, T); L^\infty \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

Under these hypotheses on u and ρ_0 .

Theorem 2: Uniqueness

Then the Cauchy problem (2) has a unique distributional solution ρ in the class $L^\infty((0, T); L^\infty \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

In this setting the existence and uniqueness of Lagrangian solutions was established by Bouchut&Crippa in 2013.

Corollary 1

Distributional and renormalized solutions are equivalent.

Under these hypotheses on u and ρ_0 .

Theorem 2: Uniqueness

Then the Cauchy problem (2) has a unique distributional solution ρ in the class $L^\infty((0, T); L^\infty \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

In this setting the existence and uniqueness of Lagrangian solutions was established by Bouchut&Crippa in 2013.

Corollary 1

Distributional and renormalized solutions are equivalent.

Corollary 2

If $\nabla \cdot u = 0$ and ρ_0 be in L^0 . Then there exists a unique renormalized solution to the Cauchy problem (2).

Moreover, the notions of Lagrangian and renormalized solutions are equivalent.

Method: Combine

- Estimate for $\eta = \rho_1 - \rho_2$: $f \eta = 0$ in the *Kantorovich-Rubinstein distance*

(A' la [Brenier, Otto & Seis et.al. '11/'13]):

$$\mathcal{D}_c(\eta) := \mathcal{D}_c(\eta, 0) := \mathcal{D}_c(\eta_+, \eta_-) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi} \iint \underbrace{c(|x - y|)}_{\text{cost function}} d\pi_{\text{opt}}(x, y)$$

with $c(|x - y|) = \log \left(\frac{|x - y|}{\delta} + 1 \right)$.

- Harmonic analysis tool: estimate for difference quotient of the type
(A' la [Crippa & De Lellis '08], [Crippa & Bouchut '13]):

$$\frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|} \lesssim M \nabla u(x) + M \nabla u(y)$$

where M is the maximal function $Mf(x) = \sup_{r>0} \frac{1}{|B(x,r)|} \int_{B(x,r)} |f(y)| dy$.

Stability estimate

The main ingredient for uniqueness is the following stability estimate:

Let ρ_1 and ρ_2 be solutions of the continuity equation with velocity field u_1 and u_2 and initial data $\rho_{0,1}$ and $\rho_{0,2}$ respectively and set $\eta = \rho_1 - \rho_2$. Then there exists for every $\varepsilon > 0$ a finite constant C_ε such that for every $\delta > 0$ it holds

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathcal{D}_\delta(\eta_t) \lesssim \mathcal{D}_\delta(\eta_0) + \varepsilon \|\rho\|_{L^1} \left[1 + \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta \varepsilon} \left(\frac{\|\rho\|_{L^1}}{\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}} \right)^{1 - \frac{1}{p}} \|u\|_{L^{p,\infty}} \right) \right] + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty(L^2)} C_\varepsilon$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_\delta(\eta) := \mathcal{D}_\delta(\eta_+, \eta_-) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\eta_+, \eta_-)} \iint \log \left(\frac{|x - y|}{\delta} + 1 \right) d\pi_{\text{opt}}(x, y)$$

Stability \Rightarrow Uniqueness

Uniqueness proof: Let ρ_1 and ρ_2 be two solutions of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (u\rho) = 0 & \text{in } [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \rho(0, \cdot) = \rho_0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

By the stability estimate applied to $\eta := \rho_1 - \rho_2$ we have

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathcal{D}_\delta(\eta_t) \lesssim \varepsilon \left[1 + \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta \varepsilon} \right) \right] + C_\varepsilon$$

Then

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}_\delta(\eta)}{|\log \delta|} \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

Therefore

$$\eta = 0 \quad \forall t \quad \Rightarrow \quad \boxed{\rho_1 = \rho_2}$$

Argument for the stability estimate

Using the absolute continuity of the map $t \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_\delta(\rho)$ and the marginal conditions we can write

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{D}_\delta(\eta_t) \leq \iint (u(t, x) \cdot \nabla \phi_{\text{opt}}(x) - u(t, y) \cdot \nabla \phi_{\text{opt}}) d\pi_{\text{opt}}(x, y)$$

where

$$\nabla \phi_{\text{opt}}(x) = \nabla \phi_{\text{opt}}(y) = c'(|x - y|) \frac{x - y}{|x - y|} \quad \text{for } \pi_{\text{opt}} - \text{almost all } (x, y).$$

Then

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{D}_\delta(\eta_t) \leq \iint \frac{|u(t, x) - u(t, y)|}{\delta + |x - y|} d\pi_{\text{opt}}.$$

Observe that

$$\frac{|u(t, x) - u(t, y)|}{|x - y|} \leq M_\sigma \nabla u(t, x) + M_\sigma \nabla u(t, y)$$

where

$$M_\sigma \nabla u(t, x) = M_\sigma (K * g)(t, x) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sigma \left(\frac{x - y}{\varepsilon} \right) (K * g)(y) dy \right|$$

where σ smooth convolution kernel.

Then we can estimate the integrand as

$$\frac{|u(t, x) - u(t, y)|}{\delta + |x - y|} \lesssim \min \left\{ \frac{|u(t, x)| + |u(t, y)|}{\delta}, M_\sigma (K * g)(t, x) + M_\sigma (K * g)(t, y) \right\}.$$

Apply interpolation inequality

$$\|f\|_{L^1} \leq \|f\|_{L^{1,\infty}} \left[1 + \log \left(\frac{\|f\|_{L^{p,\infty}}}{\|f\|_{L^{1,\infty}}} \right) \right]$$

to

$$f = \min \left\{ \frac{|u(t,x)| + |u(t,y)|}{\delta}; M_\sigma(K * g)(t,x) + M_\sigma(K * g)(t,y) \right\}$$

On the one hand

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,\infty}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta} \|u\|_{L^{p,\infty}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta}$$

On the other hand

$$\|f\|_{L^{1,\infty}} \lesssim \|M_\sigma(K * g)\|_{L^{1,\infty}} \stackrel{!}{\lesssim} \|g\|_{L^1} \quad (\text{cancellations})$$

Obtain:

$$\int_0^T \iint \min \left\{ \frac{|u(t, x)| + |u(t, y)|}{\delta}; M_\sigma(K * g)(t, x) + M_\sigma(K * g)(t, y) \right\} d\pi_{\text{opt}} dt$$
$$\lesssim \|g\|_{L^{1, \infty}} \left[1 + \log \left(\frac{\|u\|_{L^{p, \infty}}}{\delta \|g\|_{L^{1, \infty}}} \right) \right]$$

Not enough! Decompose

$$g \in L^1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad g = g_1 + g_2$$

where

$$\|g_1\|_{L^1} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{supp } g_2 \subset A_\varepsilon, \quad \|g_2\|_{L^2} \leq C_\varepsilon$$

and finally deduce:

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathcal{D}_\delta(\eta_t) \lesssim \underbrace{\varepsilon \left[1 + \log \left(\frac{\|u\|_{L^{p, \infty}}}{\delta \varepsilon} \right) \right]}_{\text{from } g_1} + \underbrace{C_\varepsilon}_{\text{from } g_2} + \mathcal{D}_\delta(\eta_0).$$

Thank you for your attention!!!