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#### Abstract

We consider the three-dimensional parabolic-parabolic Patlak-Keller-Segel equations (PKS) subject to ambient flows. Without the ambient fluid flow, the equation is super-critical in three-dimension and has finite-time blow-up solutions with arbitrarily small $L^{1}$-mass. In this study, we show that a family of time-dependent alternating shear flows, inspired by the clever ideas of Tarek Elgindi 39, can suppress the chemotactic blow-up in these systems.
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## 1. Introduction

In this paper, we consider the parabolic-parabolic Patlak-Keller-Segel systems (PKS) on the threedimensional torus, which model the chemotaxis phenomena in fluid flows:

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\partial_{t} n+U_{A}(t) \cdot \nabla n+\nabla \cdot(n \nabla \mathfrak{C})=\Delta n  \tag{1.1}\\
\partial_{t} \mathfrak{C}+U_{A}(t) \cdot \nabla \mathfrak{C}=\Delta \mathfrak{C}+n-\bar{n} \\
n(t=0)=n_{\mathrm{in}}, \quad \mathfrak{C}(t=0)=\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}}
\end{array}\right.
$$

Here $n, \mathfrak{C}$ denote the cell density and the chemical density, respectively. The first equation describes the time evolution of the cell density, incorporating processes such as the chemical-triggered aggregation, diffusion, and fluid transportation. The second equation describes the dynamics of the chemical density. We subtract the spatial average of cell density $(\bar{n})$ to normalize the chemical density equation. This adjustment has no impact on the cell density dynamics, as only the chemical gradient influences the $n$-equation. Additionally, we assume that the initial chemical density possesses a zero spatial average, denoted as $\overline{\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}}}=0$. Both equations involve strong fluid advection, characterized by time-dependent fluid vector field $U_{A}(t)$ that is divergencefree, with an amplitude denoted as $A:=\left\|U_{A}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}$. Throughout the paper, we employ the notation $(x, y, z)$ to represent points on the domain $\mathbb{T}^{3}=(-\pi, \pi]^{3}$.

It is worth mentioning that if the chemical reaches equilibrium in a much faster time scale than the fluid transportation and nonlinear aggregation, one can derive the following important variants of the equations (1.1), which are called the advective parabolic-elliptic PKS equations:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{t} n+U_{A}(t) \cdot \nabla n+\nabla \cdot(n \nabla \mathfrak{C})=\Delta n, \quad-\Delta \mathfrak{C}=n, \quad n(t=0)=n_{\mathrm{in}} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is also worth mentioning that another way to model the chemotaxis phenomena in the fluid flow is to couple the PKS equation with the Navier-Stokes equation, the Stokes equation, or other types of fluid
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equations. The literature on this topic is vast, we refer the interested readers to the following papers, 25, $37,42,60,64,66,73,74,79$ and the references therein.

If there is no ambient fluid flows, i.e., $U_{A}(t) \equiv 0$, the equation is the classical parabolic-parabolic PKS equation. The PKS equations were first derived by C. Patlak [70], E. Keller, and L. Segel [57]. The literature on the analysis of the classical parabolic-parabolic PKS equations and their variants is large, and we refer the interested readers to the papers $[15,17,18,23,24,31,38,71,80$ and the references within. We summarize the results on the blow-up and global regularity result of the classical parabolic-parabolic PKS equations here. In two-dimension, the total mass of cells $\mathfrak{M}:=\|n\|_{L^{1}}$ characterizes the long time behavior of the solution. If the total mass is strictly less than $8 \pi, \mathrm{~V}$. Calvez and L. Corrias showed that the solutions are globally regular, 23 . On the other hand, if the total mass is large enough, singularities form in a finite time, see, R. Schweyer [71]. In dimension three, the parabolic-parabolic PKS equations become supercritical. The total conserved mass $\mathfrak{M}$ becomes a supercritical quantity and is not enough to derive sufficient regularity control over the solutions. In the classical paper [80], M. Winkler showed that there exist solutions, which have arbitrary small masses, blow up in a finite time.

If the ambient fluid flow is present, the long time dynamics of the PKS systems change. In a series of work initiated by [58, it was shown that by introducing passive fluid flow into the system, mixing and fast-spreading effects of the fluid flow regularize the long time dynamics of the PKS equations. These works are mainly focusing on the parabolic-elliptic PKS equations (1.2). In the paper [58] A. Kiselev and X . Xu showed that if the ambient fluid flow is relaxation enhancing, which is introduced in the seminal paper [30], and the magnitude $A$ of the flow is large enough, then potential chemotactic blow-up ceases to exist. Their argument was simplified and generalized in recent work by G. Iyer, X. Xu, and A. Zlatoš [52]. In the paper $[10$, J. Bedrossian and the author proved that the suppression of the blow-up effect persists if the ambient fluid flow is the simple shear flow. The above works dwell on the mixing induced enhanced dissipation properties of the passive scalar equations (advection-diffusion equations). On the other hand, in the paper [49], E. Tadmor and the author showed that fast-spreading effect of the hyperbolic flow $(-x, y)$ also has the potential to suppress the blow-up of the parabolic-elliptic PKS systems (1.2). More interestingly, in a forthcoming paper, we also observe that shear flows in the infinite long channel $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ have the fast-spreading effect. In the advective-reaction-diffusion equation literature, it is referred to as the quenching effect, which is closely related to L. Hörmander's hypoellipticity 50]. For further references, see, e.g., P. Constantin, A. Kiselev and L. Ryzhik [29] and A. Kiselev and Zlatoš [59].

On the contrary, the study of the fluid flow-induced regularization effect in the parabolic-parabolic system (1.1) is limited. In the work [46], the author showed that the strictly monotone shear flows could suppress the chemotactic blow-up in two-dimension. Later, L. Zeng, Z. Zhang, and R. Zi extended this result to coupled Patlak-Keller-Segel-Navier-Stokes systems ( 82$]$ ). In both of these works, an additional smallness assumption on the initial chemical gradient $\nabla \mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}$ is employed. In a recent work [36], the authors are able to prove the suppression of blow-up through Couette flow on $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. To understand the new challenges, we highlight the differences between the parabolic-elliptic regime 1.2 and the parabolic-parabolic regime 1.1). It is enough to focus on the dynamics of the chemical gradient $\nabla \mathfrak{C}$, which determines the aggregation nonlinearity. In the parabolic-elliptic regime, since the chemical gradient is determined through an elliptic type relation $\nabla c=\nabla(-\Delta)^{-1} n$, the strong fluid advection has little impact on the aggregation nonlinearity. As a result, it is easy to invoke various regularization mechanisms from fluid mechanics to stabilize the system. On the other hand, the chemical density $\mathfrak{C}$ in the parabolic-parabolic regime is governed by an advection-diffusion type equation. A strong fluid advection can destabilize the dynamics by creating fast transient growth in the chemical gradient. This destabilizing effect rules out most of the regularization mechanisms applicable in the parabolic-elliptic regime. In the papers [46 82], the smallness in the initial chemical gradient is needed to compensate for this destabilizing effect.

In this work, we prove the suppression of chemotactic blow-up for the 3-dimensional parabolic-parabolic PKS equations.

Theorem 1.1. Consider the solutions $(n, \mathfrak{C})$ to the equation (1.1) subject to smooth initial data $n_{\text {in }} \in$ $C^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right)$, $\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }} \in C^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right)$. There exists a family of time-dependent flows $U_{A} \in L_{t}^{\infty} C_{x, y, z}^{\infty}$ such that the solutions are globally smooth on the time horizon $[0, \infty)$.

Our basic building blocks for the flow $U_{A}$ are a family of time-dependent alternating shear flows. We extend this result to the time-dependent shear flow case in a companion paper.
1.1. Sketch of the Proof. To motivate the idea and highlight the challenges, we first present the blow-up mechanism of the Patlak-Keller-Segel type equations (1.1), 1.2). Then we introduce the regularization effects induced by fluid advection. Finally, we highlight the obstacles in applying these regularization mechanisms in the parabolic-parabolic case 1.1 and our ideas to address them.

In the PKS type systems $(1.1)-(1.2)$, there are two competing forces - the nonlinear aggregation $(\nabla \cdot(n \nabla c))$ and the diffusion $(\Delta n)$. On the one hand, the cells aggregate to form Dirac singularities, while on the other hand, cell diffusion regularizes the dynamics. The solutions remain smooth when diffusion prevails over nonlinear aggregation ( $[18,22,23,76$ ). However, if the aggregation dominates, singularities can develop ( $17,27,28,43,53,71,80]$ ). One natural approach to suppress the blow-up is to enhance the diffusion to counteract the nonlinear aggregation. This can be achieved by replacing the diffusion operator with porous media type diffusion, e.g., 12,16 . Alternatively, the presence of external fluid flow can also achieve the same goal. The primary mechanism here is that strong fluid transportation creates fast oscillations in the cell density, thereby improving diffusion. This regularization effect of fluid flows, commonly referred to as the "enhanced dissipation phenomena" in the literature, is applicable to various fluid-related problems. For instance, in the study of hydrodynamic stability, the enhanced dissipation effect is crucial in deriving the sharp stability threshold associated with various shear flows, see, e.g., $6,9,11,13,26|33,51,56| 61,63,67,68,78]$. Furthermore, the enhanced dissipation phenomena find applications in a wide range of areas, ranging from plasma physics to mathematical biology, see, e.g., $2,3,14,34,40,44,48,72,81$.

To relate the system (1.1) to the existing theory of enhanced dissipation, we first divide the equation (1.1) by the amplitude of the flow $A=\left\|U_{A}\right\|_{L_{t, x, y, z}^{\infty}}$, and rescale time properly to obtain

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\partial_{t} n+u_{A} \cdot \nabla n=\frac{1}{A} \Delta n-\frac{1}{A} \nabla \cdot(n \nabla \mathfrak{C})  \tag{1.3}\\
\partial_{t} \mathfrak{C}+u_{A} \cdot \nabla \mathfrak{C}=\frac{1}{A} \Delta \mathfrak{C}+\frac{1}{A}(n-\bar{n}), \quad u_{A}:=\frac{U_{A}}{\left\|U_{A}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}} \\
\quad n(t=0)=n_{\text {in }}, \quad \mathfrak{C}(t=0)=\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}
\end{array}\right.
$$

Here we still use $t$ to denote the new time variable. In the large amplitude $A$ regime, we can view the equation (1.3) as a perturbation to the passive scalar equation

$$
\partial_{t} f+u \cdot \nabla f=\frac{1}{A} \Delta f
$$

For our purpose, it is enough to focus on the passive scalar equations on $\mathbb{T}^{3}$ subject to shear flows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{t} f+u(t, y) \partial_{x} f=\frac{1}{A} \Delta f, \quad f(t=0)=f_{\mathrm{in}}, \quad 0<A^{-1} \ll 1 \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

To motivate the key regularizing mechanism, we decompose the solutions to 1.4 into the average in the shearing direction and the remainder:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle f\rangle(y, z)=\frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}|} \int f(x, y, z) d x, \quad f_{\neq}(x, y, z)=f(x, y, z)-\langle f\rangle(y, z) \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is easy to see that the $x$-average $\langle f\rangle$ solves a heat equation; hence the $x$-average dissipates on a time scale $\mathcal{O}(A)$. The time scale $\mathcal{O}(A)$ is long if the $A$ is large. On the other hand, under suitable assumptions, the remainder $f_{\neq}$dissipates on a time scale much faster than $\mathcal{O}(A)$. This deviation in dissipative time scales, caused by fluid advection, is called the enhanced dissipation, and it has attracted much attention in recent years. Most analyses on the enhanced dissipation phenomenon are carried out in a 2 -dimensional setting but can be easily extended to a 3 -dimensional one. We first consider the stationary shear flow, i.e., $u(t, y)=u(y)$. If the shear flow profile $u(y)$ has only finitely many nondegenerate critical points, then the flow is called nondegenerate shear flow. In the paper [5], J. Bedrossian and M. Coti Zelati showed that if the stationary shear flows are nondegenerate, then there exist positive constants $\delta, C$ such that the following estimate holds:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|f_{\neq}(t)\right\|_{L^{2}} \leq C \| f_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq \not \|_{L^{2}} e^{-\delta A^{-1 / 2}|\log A|^{-2} t}, \quad \forall t \geq 0 . . . ~}^{\text {. }} \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

If the parameter $A^{-1}$ is small, the dissipation time scale $\mathcal{O}\left(A^{1 / 2}|\log A|^{2}\right)$ is much shorter than the heat dissipation time scale $\mathcal{O}(A)$. In the paper, the authors constructed explicit hypocoercivity functionals in the spirit of C. Villani 75 , and showed that these functionals decay with enhanced rate $\mathcal{O}\left(A^{-1 / 2}\right)$. Similar
estimates are derived for other degenerate shear flows. The result was improved in the paper 77]. By applying resolvent estimates and a Gearhart-Prüss type theorem, D. Wei proved that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|f_{\neq}(t)\right\|_{L^{2}} \leq C \| f_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq \|_{L^{2}} e^{-\delta A^{-1 / 2} t}, \quad \forall t \geq 0 . . .} \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the paper 35, M. Coti-Zelati and D. Drivas applied stochastic methods to show that the $A^{-1 / 2}$-enhanced dissipation rate are sharp for non-degenerate stationary shear flows. We also refer the interested readers to the works by Tarek Elgindi, M. Coti-Zelati and M. G. Delgadino 32, Y. Feng and G. Iyer 41, which derive the explicit relationship between the mixing effect of fluid flow and their enhanced dissipation rate. Recently, D. Albritton, R. Beekie, and M. Novack proved the estimate (1.7) on bounded channel [1]. The enhanced dissipation phenomena also appear in fractional dissipative systems, see, e.g., 32, 47] and 62.

Note that the above enhance-dissipation estimate is sharp for stationary shear flows, which leaves open the question that whether one can improve the dissipation rate by relaxing the stationary constraint. The first step to prove Theorem 1.1 is to show that by introducing time dependency into the shear flow, the enhanced dissipation rate can be improved from $\mathcal{O}\left(A^{-1 / 2}\right)$ to $\mathcal{O}\left(A^{-1 / 3}\right)$.

Theorem 1.2. Consider the solutions $f_{\neq}$to the passive scalar equations 1.4 subject to shear flow $(u(t, y), 0,0)$. There exists a family of shear flows $u_{A} \in C_{t, y}^{\infty}$ such that the following enhanced dissipation estimate is satisfied

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|f_{\neq}(s+t)\right\|_{L^{2}} \leq C_{0}\left\|f_{\neq}(s)\right\|_{L^{2}} e^{-\delta_{0} A^{-1 / 3} t} \tag{1.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all positive time $s, t \geq 0$. The constants $\delta_{0}$ and $C_{0}$ depend on the shear $u_{A}$, and they are independent of $A$ and the solutions. Moreover, the spatial Sobolev norms of the velocity fields are bounded independent of A, i.e., $\left\|\partial_{y} u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W_{y}^{M, \infty}} \leq C_{M}, \forall M \in \mathbb{N}$.

Remark 1.1. This construction is based on Tarek Elgindi's logarithmic-shifted shear flows ( [39] ). We reproduce all the details of his construction in Section 3. Thanks to a "rewinding" procedure, the resulting shear flows $u_{A}$ have a mild dependence on the amplitude $A$. However, this dependence will not alter the spacial Sobolev norm of the shear. The construction is general in the sense that for most shear profile functions, we can design time-dependent flows that achieve the enhanced dissipation 1.8.

Compared to existing enhanced dissipation flows in the literature, Theorem 1.2 provides time-dependent shear flows on $\mathbb{T}^{3}$ that balance the enhanced dissipation and the transient growth of the passive scalar solutions. We first recall that there are many freedoms in choosing fluid flows to suppress the blow-ups in the parabolic-elliptic PKS system $\sqrt[1.2]{ }$. For example, one can choose shear flows with an enhanced dissipation estimate $\sqrt[1.6]{ }$ ( 10 ) or flows with sufficiently short dissipation time ( $4,52,58])$. However, the story changes drastically for coupled systems. Here, we provide a heuristic argument to show that the flows constructed in Theorem 1.2 are optimal in a certain sense. Motivated by the parabolic-parabolic PKS systems (1.1), we introduce a toy model,

$$
\partial_{t} \rho+u \cdot \nabla \rho=\frac{1}{A} \Delta \rho-\frac{1}{A} \Delta g, \quad \partial_{t} g+u \cdot \nabla g=\frac{1}{A} \Delta g
$$

Here $\rho$ plays the role of the cell density, and $g$ is the chemical density, respectively. The linear forcing term $-\frac{1}{A} \Delta g$ in the $\rho$-equation mimics the aggregation nonlinearity. We assume suitable average-free conditions on the data and focus on the growth of the solution $\rho$. It is enough to estimate the net contribution from the forcing $-\frac{1}{A} \Delta g$. We expect the higher derivatives of the solution $g$ to undergo transient growth, and enhanced dissipation, which can be summarized as follows

$$
\|\Delta g(t)\|_{\infty} \leq \mathfrak{G}(t) \exp \{-\mathfrak{R} t\}
$$

We start by considering the stationary nondegenerate shear flows, which have enhanced dissipation rate $\mathfrak{R}=\mathcal{O}\left(A^{-1 / 2}\right) 1.7$ and transient growth $\mathfrak{G}(t)=\mathcal{O}\left(t^{2}\right)$. If we employ this type of flow, the contribution from the chemical might not be negligible, i.e.,

$$
\frac{1}{A} \int_{0}^{\infty}\|\Delta g(t)\|_{\infty} d t \leq \frac{C}{A} \int_{0}^{\infty} t^{2} \exp \left\{-\frac{t}{C A^{1 / 2}}\right\} d t=C A^{1 / 2}
$$

Similarly, we can consider the stochastic enhanced dissipation flows constructed in 4,19 . Here, the growth rate of the gradients and the enhanced dissipation rate are $\mathfrak{G}(t)=e^{C_{1} t}, \quad \mathfrak{R}=|\log A|^{-1} / C_{2}$. Hence the net contribution of the chemicals to the system can be large for $A \gg 1$,

$$
\frac{1}{A} \int_{0}^{\infty}\|\Delta g(t)\|_{\infty} d t \leq \frac{1}{A} \int_{0}^{\infty} \exp \left\{C_{1} t-\frac{t}{C_{2}|\log A|}\right\} d t=\infty
$$

For the time-dependent shear flows $u$ constructed in Theorem 1.2 the growth factor is $\mathfrak{G}(t)=\mathcal{O}\left(t^{2}\right)$ and the enhanced dissipation rate $\mathfrak{R}=\mathcal{O}\left(A^{-1 / 3}\right)$. In this case, the gradient of $g$ has bounded contribution to the $\rho$-dynamics, i.e.,

$$
\frac{1}{A} \int_{0}^{\infty}\|\Delta g(t)\|_{\infty} d t \leq \frac{C}{A} \int_{0}^{\infty} t^{2} \exp \left\{-\frac{t}{C A^{1 / 3}}\right\} d t \leq C
$$

In conclusion, constructing a smooth flow that balances the transient growth of gradients and enhanced dissipation is crucial for our analysis. Theorem 1.2 achieves this goal.

As a result of Theorem 1.2, if we introduce the strong shear flow $A\left(u_{A}(t, y), 0,0\right)$ to the system, the remainder $n_{\neq}, \nabla \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}$decay fast. Hence it is reasonable to expect that after a short amount of time, the remainders become small and the solutions become quasi-two-dimensional.

This is the content of the next main theorem.
Theorem 1.3. Consider the solutions $(n, \mathfrak{C})$ to the equation (1.3) initiated from the data $n_{\text {in }} \in H^{\mathbb{M}}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right)$, $\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }} \in H^{\mathbb{M}+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right), \mathbb{M} \geq 5$. Define a parameter

$$
\begin{equation*}
\zeta(\mathbb{M})=\frac{1}{108(2+\mathbb{M})} \tag{1.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Further assume that the shear flows $u_{A}$ in the equation 1.3) are the ones constructed in Theorem 1.2. There exists a threshold $A_{0}=A_{0}\left(\left\|n_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}}},\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\mathfrak{i n}}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+1}},\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{\mathbb{M}+3, \infty}}, \mathbb{M}\right)$ such that if $A \geq A_{0}$, then there exists a universal constant $C$ such that the following estimate holds at time instance $A^{1 / 3+\zeta(\mathbb{M})}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|n_{\neq}\left(A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}-1}}^{2}+\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}}}^{2} \leq C \exp \left\{-\frac{A^{\zeta}}{C}\right\} . \tag{1.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, the $x$-average is bounded as follows

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\langle n\rangle\left(A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}-1}}^{2}+\left\|\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\left(A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}}}^{2} \leq \mathfrak{B}\left(\left\|n_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}}},\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}+1}},\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{\mathrm{M}+3, \infty},}, \mathbb{M}\right) . \tag{1.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 1.2. We highlight that we obtain a fast decay of the remainder in a rougher Sobolev space. On the other hand, obtaining enhanced dissipation for the top-order Sobolev norm is challenging.

The final step to prove Theorem 1.1 is understanding the long-time dynamics. If we continue to use the shear flows constructed in Theorem 1.2 the nonlinear aggregation will eventually kick in through the $x$-averages $\langle n\rangle,\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle$-dynamics after the time-scale $\mathcal{O}(A)$. To get control over the solutions, one has to assume the subcritical mass constraint $\mathfrak{M}=\|n\|_{1}<8 \pi|\mathbb{T}|$. We address this case in a companion paper (45]. In Theorem 1.1, the total mass $\mathfrak{M}$ is arbitrary, and one cannot expect that the $x$-averages $\langle n\rangle,\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle$ stay bounded for all time. To overcome the nonlinearity effect, we introduce the last ingredient of the proof. It is an alternating construction of time-dependent flows from the paper [48]. If one alternates the shear direction of the flow in a particular time scale, the enhanced dissipation can dampen all the information fast. By carefully implementing this idea, we can complete the proof. It is worth mentioning that alternating shear flows have found applications in various field of fluid mechanics, see, e.g., 20, 21, 48, 54, 55.

In Section 2, we lay down the structure of the proof.
1.2. Notation. Throughout the paper, the constants $C$ can change from line to line. Moreover, to avoid cumbersome notation, we allow the implicit constant $C$ to depend on the $L_{t}^{\infty} W_{x, y, z}^{M, \infty}$-norm of the velocity and regularity level $M$. We recall that the velocity field $u_{A}$ we construct has the property that $\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W_{x, y, z}^{M, \infty}} \leq$ $C_{M}, \forall M \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence this notation convention will not cause confusion.

To avoid complicated notation, we will reuse the notion $T_{i}$. For the proof of each individual lemma, we are going to define different "local" quantities $T_{i}$ 's. Once the proof is finished, the current $T_{i}$ 's will no longer be in use.

For $\iota \in\{x, y, z\}$, we use $\langle f\rangle^{\iota}, f_{\neq}^{\iota}$ to denote the $\iota$-average and $\iota$-remainder:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle f\rangle^{\iota}:=\frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}|} \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(x, y, z) d \iota, \quad f_{\neq}^{\iota}(x, y, z):=f(x, y, z)-\langle f\rangle^{\iota} \tag{1.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

The following double average notation (and its natural analogues) is also applied in the text:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle\langle f\rangle\rangle^{x, y}(z):=\left\langle\langle f\rangle^{x}\right\rangle^{y}(z)=\frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}|^{2}} \iint f(x, y, z) d x d y \tag{1.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

The following vector field (and its natural analogues) and multi-index notation are used:

$$
\Gamma_{y ; t}=\partial_{y}+\int_{0}^{t} \partial_{y} u(T+s, y) d s \partial_{x}, \quad \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k}:=\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}, \quad|i, j, k|:=i+j+k
$$

The choice of the reference time $T$ will be specified in a case-by-case scenario. If the $t$ is clear from the text, we will also drop the ' $; t$ ' in the subscript, i.e., $\Gamma_{y}, \Gamma_{y}^{i j k}$.

In Section 3 of the paper, we apply Fourier transformation in the $x$-variable or in the $(x, z)$ variables. The frequency variables corresponding $x$ and $z$ are denoted by $k$ and $\ell$, respectively. The notation $\widehat{(\cdot)}$ is used to denote the Fourier transform and the $(\cdot)^{\vee}$ is used to denote the inverse transform. If we consider the transformation only in the $x$-variable, the Fourier transform and its inverse has the following form

$$
\widehat{f}_{\alpha}(y, z):=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{-\sqrt{-1} \alpha x} f(x, y, z) d x, \quad \check{g}(x, y, z)=\sum_{\alpha=-\infty}^{\infty} g_{\alpha}(y, z) e^{\sqrt{-1} \alpha x}
$$

The Fourier variables corresponding to $x, y, z$ are $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$, respectively. Recall the classical $L^{p}$ norms and Sobolev $H^{m}$ norms:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|f\|_{L^{p}} & =\|f\|_{p}=\left(\int|f|^{p} d V\right)^{1 / p} ; \quad\|f\|_{L_{t}^{q}\left([0, T] ; L^{p}\right)}=\left(\int_{0}^{T}\|f(t)\|_{L^{p}}^{q} d t\right)^{1 / q} \\
\|f\|_{H^{m}} & =\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} ; \quad\|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m}}=\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=m}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Throughout the paper, we use the notation $S_{t_{r}}^{t_{r}+\tau}$ to denote the semigroup corresponding to the passive scalar equation initiating from time $t_{r}$

$$
\partial_{\tau} \rho+u\left(t_{r}+\tau, y\right) \partial_{x} \rho=\frac{1}{A} \Delta \rho
$$

Adopting this notation, $S_{t_{r}}^{t_{r}+\tau} \rho_{\neq}$is the solution to the passive scalar subject to the initial data $\rho_{\neq}\left(t_{r}\right)$ at time $t_{r}$. We will also use the notation $S_{t_{r}, t_{r}+\tau}^{\alpha}$ to denote the solution semigroup corresponding to the $\alpha$-by- $\alpha$ equation

$$
\partial_{\tau} \widehat{\rho}_{\alpha}+u\left(t_{r}+\tau, y\right) i \alpha \widehat{\rho}_{\alpha}=\frac{1}{A}\left(-|\alpha|^{2}+\partial_{y y}+\partial_{z z}\right) \widehat{\rho}_{\alpha}, \quad \forall(y, z) \in \mathbb{T}^{2}
$$

which is initiating from $t=t_{r}$.
The notation $t_{r}$ is the reference time and is defined in 2.12a.

## 2. Road Map

To present the main ideas involved in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we need several preparations. First, we prove the linear enhanced dissipation estimate for a special family of time-dependent shear flows. These time-dependent shear flows have optimized the balance between enhanced dissipation and gradient creation. Moreover, we can upgrade the linear estimates to include higher-order gliding regularity norms based on this balance. These preparations will be accomplished in subsection 2.1. Secondly, we develop the nonlinear theory for the system (1.3) in subsection 2.2. A functional is introduced to characterize various components of the system in higher order gliding regularity norms. We can show that if the initial chemical gradient is moderately small, then nonlinear enhanced dissipation holds. On the other hand, if the initial chemical gradient is large, the function is still bounded for a sufficiently long time. After these preparations, we introduce an alternating construction in subsection 2.3 to show that the solutions to equation 1.3 are globally regular if the flow is strong enough.
2.1. Linear Theory of Time-dependent Shear Flows. The starting point of the analysis is the enhanced dissipation phenomena induced by a special family of time dependent shear flows. We consider the passive scalar equations subject to small viscosity:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{t} f_{\neq}+u_{A}(t, y) \partial_{x} f_{\neq}=\frac{1}{A} \Delta f_{\neq}, \quad f_{\neq}(t=0)=f_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq \neq}, \quad \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}|} \int_{\mathbb{T}} f_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq}(x, y, z) d x \equiv 0 \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we do the Fourier transform in the $(x, z)$-variables, we obtain that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{t} \widehat{f}_{\alpha, \gamma}(t, y)+u_{A}(t, y) i \alpha \widehat{f}_{\alpha, \gamma}(t, y)=\frac{1}{A}\left(-|\alpha|^{2}+\partial_{y y}-|\gamma|^{2}\right) \widehat{f}_{\alpha, \gamma}(t, y), \quad \alpha \neq 0 \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since the passive scalar equations (2.1) is linear, we can consider each Fourier mode independently. Hence the theorem below directly implies Theorem 1.2 .

Theorem 2.1. Consider solution $f_{\alpha, \gamma}$ to the equation $(2.2)$. Given any shear profile $\mathcal{U} \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{T})$, such that $\mathcal{U}^{\prime}$ is not identically zero. There exist time dependent shear flows $u_{A}(t, y)=\Psi_{A}(t) \mathcal{U}\left(y+\Phi_{A}(t)\right) \in C_{t, y}^{\infty}$ such that the following enhanced dissipation estimate holds

$$
\left\|\widehat{f}_{\alpha, \gamma}(s+t)\right\|_{2} \leq C\left\|\widehat{f}_{\alpha, \gamma}(s)\right\|_{2} e^{-\delta_{0} \frac{1}{A^{1 / 3}} t}
$$

Here $\delta_{0} \in(0,1), C \geq 1$ are constants that depend only on the shear profile $\mathcal{U}$. Moreover, the Sobolev norms of the velocity fields is bounded independent of $A$, i.e., $\left\|\partial_{y} u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W_{y}^{M, \infty}} \leq C_{M}, \forall M \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let us present the main idea of the construction.
The main obstacle for a smooth stationary shear flow $(u(y), 0,0)$ on the torus to achieve the enhanced dissipation rate $A^{-1 / 3}$ is that its profile function $u$ always contains critical points. Near the critical points, the enhanced dissipation effect will slow down ( 35$]$ ). By introducing time dependence, we can ensure that the critical point of the profile moves around and will not occupy a specific region for a long time. As a result, the flow can induce a faster dissipation in the time-average sense.

Let us start by considering time-dependent shears taking the form $(u(y+\log (1+t)), 0,0)$, which are logarithmic-in-time shifts of general smooth functions $u \in C_{y}^{\infty}$. We first show that the $L^{2}$-norm of the solution to 2.2 decays by a fixed amount on the time interval $\left[0, A^{1 / 3}\right]$, see, e.g., Lemma 3.1. Hence, it is tempting to believe that the solutions decay exponentially. However, the logarithmic shifts of the shear flow profiles slow down as time progresses. Hence we will smoothly truncate the flows and restart them after an appropriately chosen time interval. This smooth rewinding procedure will not alter the Sobolev norm $\left\|\partial_{y} u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+3, \infty}}$. After the rewinding process, our proof is complete.

The next object of study the higher $L^{2}$-based Sobolev norms. The starting point is the following observation. There exists a vector field that commute with the transport part of (2.1), i.e.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Gamma_{y ; t}:=\partial_{y}+\int_{0}^{t} \partial_{y} u(s, y) d s \partial_{x}, \quad\left[\Gamma_{y ; t}, \partial_{t}+u \partial_{x}\right]=0 \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

As a result, the advection term $\left(u \partial_{x}\right)$ in the equation (2.1) does not drive a transient growth of the $H^{1}$ norm induced by the $\Gamma_{y ; t}$-vector field, $\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t} f_{\neq}\right\|_{2}$. On the contrary, direct energy estimates yields that the canonical $H^{1}$-norm $\left\|f_{\neq}\right\|_{H^{1}}$ undergoes a transient linear growth $(\sim \mathcal{O}(t))$ thanks to the advection in 2.1). In conclusion, Sobolev norms induced by the vector fields $\partial_{x}, \Gamma_{y ; t}, \partial_{z}$ are well-adapted to the passive scalar equations 2.1 . From now on, we call these norms "gliding regularity norms" as in the celebrated work 69]. To simplify the notation, we also use the following variants throughout the text

$$
\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k}=\Gamma_{y}^{i j k}=\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}
$$

An obstacle in analyzing these gliding regularity norms comes from the diffusion operator $\frac{1}{A} \Delta$. When one applies $\Gamma_{y ; t}$-derivative to the equation (2.1], the commutator term $\frac{1}{A}\left[\Gamma_{y}, \Delta\right]$ arises. This term involves growth of the form $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{t^{2}}{A}\right)$. Nevertheless, we can use the following time weight to control the commutator terms,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi(t)=\frac{1}{1+\frac{t^{3}}{A}} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining all these considerations, we obtain the norm

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|f_{\neq}(t, \cdot)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}}^{2}:=\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i} \Phi(t)^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} f_{\neq}(t, \cdot)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}:=\sum_{i+j+k=0}^{M} G^{2 i} \Phi(t)^{2 j}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq}(t, \cdot)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

We apply the notations $\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k}:=\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}$, and $|i, j, k|:=i+j+k$. Moreover, the argument of the time weight $\Phi(t)$ is always the time variable of the target function $f_{\neq}(t, \cdot)$ throughout the paper. Here $G$ is a constant depending only on the norm $\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+2, \infty}}$ and the regularity level $M$, but independent of $A$. We note that the higher gliding regularity norm will slowly deplete over time. However, an enhanced dissipation estimate is enough to compensate for the decay. Later, we simplify the notation to $\mathcal{Z}^{M}$. The enhanced dissipation estimates of the gliding regularity norms are summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.2. Consider solutions to the equation 2.1). There exists a threshold $G_{M}:=G_{M}\left(\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+2, \infty}}\right)$ such that for any parameter $G$ that is above the threshold $G_{M}$, the following enhanced dissipation estimate holds

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\|f_{\neq}(s+t)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}}^{2} & \leq 2 e^{2}\left\|f_{\neq}(s)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}}^{2} \exp \left\{-2 \delta_{\mathcal{Z}} \frac{t}{A^{1 / 3}}\right\}, \quad \forall s, t \in[0, \infty)  \tag{2.6}\\
\delta_{\mathcal{Z}} & :=\delta_{0}\left(\log \left(8 C_{0}\right)\right)^{-1} \tag{2.7}
\end{align*}
$$

Here the parameters $\delta_{0}, C_{0}$ are defined in the estimate (1.8). Moreover, there exists a constant $C$, which depends only on the $M, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1}$ such that the following estimate holds

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} f_{\neq}(t)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \leq C \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq}(0)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \exp \left\{-\delta \mathcal{Z} \frac{t}{A^{1 / 3}}\right\}, \quad \forall t \geq 0 \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 2.1. We observe that even though the $\mathcal{Z}$-norm depletes over time, it still grants us enough enhanced dissipation as specified in 2.8). Another comment is that the parameter $\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}$ can be chosen independent of the regularity level $M$.

This concludes the linear theory.
2.2. Nonlinear Theory for the Time-dependent Shear Flows. In this subsection, we discuss the nonlinear theory associated with the parabolic-parabolic PKS system $\sqrt{1.3}$ subject to time dependent shear flows. The goal is to prove Theorem 1.3 .

First of all, we specify the main set of equations and their local existence theory. We rewrite the equation 1.3) as follows

$$
\begin{align*}
& \partial_{t} n+u_{A} \partial_{x} n+\frac{1}{A} \nabla \cdot(n \nabla \mathfrak{C})=\frac{1}{A} \Delta n  \tag{2.9a}\\
& \partial_{t} \mathfrak{C}+u_{A} \partial_{x} \mathfrak{C}=\frac{1}{A} \Delta \mathfrak{C}+\frac{1}{A} n-\frac{1}{A} \bar{n}  \tag{2.9b}\\
& n(t=0)=n_{\text {in }}, \quad \mathfrak{C}(t=0)=\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}}, \quad(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{T}^{3}
\end{align*}
$$

The fluid velocity drift is normalized, i.e., $\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t, x, y, z}^{\infty}}=1$. To prove Theorem 1.3 , it is enough to consider the time horizon $t \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]$, where $\zeta=\zeta(M)$ is defined in 1.9 . To rigorous capture the transient growth of the chemical gradient, we decompose the time horizon into two parts:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]=\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta / 2}\right) \cup\left[A^{1 / 3+\zeta / 2}, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]=:\left[0, T_{h}\right) \cup\left[T_{h}, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]=: \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{gr}} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{dc}} \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{gr}}$ is the transient growth phase, and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{dc}}$ represents the decaying phase.
Next, to characterize the enhanced dissipation, we decompose the solution $n$, $\mathfrak{C}$ into the $x$-average part $\langle n\rangle,\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle$ and the remainder part $n_{\neq}, \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}(1.5)$. Taking the $x$-average of 2.9a, 2.9b) yields the $(\langle n\rangle,\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle)$ equations, i.e.,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \partial_{t}\langle n\rangle+\frac{1}{A} \nabla_{y, z} \cdot\left(\langle n\rangle \nabla_{y, z}\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\right)+\frac{1}{A}\left\langle\nabla_{y, z} \cdot\left(n_{\neq} \nabla_{y, z} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right)\right\rangle=\frac{1}{A} \Delta_{y, z}\langle n\rangle,  \tag{2.11a}\\
& \partial_{t}\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle=\frac{1}{A} \Delta_{y, z}\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle+\frac{1}{A}\langle n\rangle-\frac{1}{A} \bar{n},  \tag{2.11b}\\
& \langle n\rangle(t=0)=\left\langle n_{\text {in }}\right\rangle, \quad\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle(t=0)=\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\rangle, \quad(y, z) \in \mathbb{T}^{2} .
\end{align*}
$$

Then we observe that since the chemical equation is linear, it is possible to decompose the remainder $\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}$as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)=c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}(\tau)+d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}(\tau),  \tag{2.12a}\\
& \partial_{\tau} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}+u_{A}\left(t_{r}+\tau, y\right) \partial_{x} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}=\frac{1}{A} \Delta c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}+\frac{1}{A} n_{\neq}, \quad c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}(\tau=0)=0,  \tag{2.12b}\\
& \partial_{\tau} d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}+u_{A}\left(t_{r}+\tau, y\right) \partial_{x} d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}=\frac{1}{A} \Delta d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}, \quad d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}(\tau=0)=\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t=t_{r}\right) . \tag{2.12c}
\end{align*}
$$

Here $t_{r}$ is a reference time taking values in $\left\{0, T_{h}\right\}$ 2.10. If $t_{r}=0$, then the initial data for $d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}$ is $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq \boldsymbol{*}}$. In the text, we also use the notation $S_{t_{r}}^{t_{r}+\tau} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}$to represent the passive scalar solution $d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}(\tau)$ that initiated from $\left(t_{r}, \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}\right)\right) 2.12 \mathrm{C}$. We view $d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}(\tau)$ as the main part of the chemical remainder and $c_{\neq 1}^{t_{r}}(\tau)$ as the deviation. Both of these components undergo transient growth. However, thanks to the zero initial condition, the deviation $c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}$ is small. Here we emphasize that the definition of $c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}$ and $d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}$ is sensitive to the reference time $t_{r}$, and we only choose $t_{r} \in\left\{0, T_{h}\right\}$ 2.10). Finally, the equation for the remainders $n_{\neq}$reads as follows
$\partial_{t} n_{\neq}+u_{A} \partial_{x} n_{\neq}+\frac{1}{A} \nabla_{y, z} \cdot\left(n_{\neq} \nabla_{y, z}\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\right)+\frac{1}{A} \nabla \cdot\left(\langle n\rangle \nabla \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right)+\frac{1}{A} \nabla \cdot\left(n_{\neq} \nabla \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right)_{\neq}=\frac{1}{A} \Delta n_{\neq}, \quad n_{\neq}(t=0)=n_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq}$.
First of all, we present the following local well-posedness result, which can be proven through standard argument.
Theorem 2.3. Consider solutions ( $n, \mathfrak{C}$ ) to the equation 2.9 subject to initial data $n_{\text {in }} \in H^{M}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right), \mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }} \in$ $H^{M+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right), M \geq 3$ and regular flow $u \in L_{t}^{\infty} W_{x, y, z}^{M+3, \infty}$. There exists a small constant $T_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\|n_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{M}},\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{M+1}}\right)$ such that the unique solution exists on the time interval $\left[0, T_{\varepsilon}\right]$.

Next, we specify the norms that we use to measure the solutions. Motivated by the functional introduced in the linear setting, we consider the following coupled functional for the nonlinear system $\underline{2.12}$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{r}+\tau, n_{\neq}, \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right]  \tag{2.13}\\
& =\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \Phi^{2 j} G^{4+2 i}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t_{r}+\tau}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} n_{\neq}\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \\
& \quad+\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} \Phi^{2 j+2} G^{2 i}\left(A^{2 / 3} \mathbb{1}_{j<M+1}+\mathbb{1}_{j=M+1}\right)\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t_{r}+\tau}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\left[\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)-S_{t_{r}}^{t_{r}+\tau}\left(\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}\right)\right)\right]\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \\
& \quad+Q^{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t_{r}}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{\left.2 A^{1 / 3} \tau\right\}, \quad \Phi=\Phi\left(t_{r}+\tau\right) .}\right.
\end{align*}
$$

Here we make several comments concerning the functional. The reference time is $t_{r}$, which takes values at two time instances, i.e., $t_{r}=0$ and $t_{r}=T_{h}(2.10)$. The parameter $\tau \geq 0$ is the time increment. If the reference time $t_{r}$ is zero, $\tau$ is nothing but the current time $t$. Here the parameter $G \geq 1$ will be chosen depending on $\left\{\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W_{y}^{M+3, \infty}}, M\right\}$ and the parameter $Q \geq 1$ depends on the initial conditions $\left\|n_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{M}},\left\|\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\rangle\right\|_{H^{M+1}}$, i.e., $Q=Q\left(\left\|n_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{M}},\left\|\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\rangle\right\|_{H^{M+1}}\right)$. The parameter $\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}$ is defined in Theorem 2.2 , Similar to the $\mathcal{Z}$-norm, a fast decay of the functional $\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}$ corresponds to the enhanced dissipation 2.8 . Moreover, thanks to the extra $A^{2 / 3}$-weight in the chemical component, boundedness of the functional can be translated to smallness of the chemical deviation $c_{\neq}^{t r}=\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}-S_{t_{r}}^{t_{r}+\tau} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}$in lower order gliding regularity spaces.

Finally, we specify the scheme to prove Theorem 1.3 . We consider two variants of the prototype functional $\mathbb{F}$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{H}_{G}^{\mathbb{M}+1}\left[t, n_{\neq}, \mathfrak{C}_{\neq 1}\right] & :=\mathbb{F}_{G, 1}^{t_{r}=0 ; \mathbb{M}+1}\left[t, n_{\neq}, \mathfrak{C}_{\neq 1}\right], \quad t \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{gr}}=\left[0, T_{h}=A^{1 / 3+\zeta / 2}\right]  \tag{2.14}\\
\mathbb{L}_{G}^{\mathbb{M}}\left[t, n_{\neq}, \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right] & :=\mathbb{F}_{G, A^{1 / 4}}^{t_{r}=T_{h} ; \mathbb{M}}\left[t, n_{\neq}, \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right], \quad t \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{dc}}=\left[A^{1 / 3+\zeta / 2}, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]
\end{align*}
$$

The transient growth phase $\mathcal{P}_{\text {gr }}$ and the decaying phase $\mathcal{P}_{\text {dc }}$ are defined in 2.10. In the transient growth phase, we propagate the functional $\mathbb{H}$. The boundedness of $\mathbb{H}$ is translated to smallness of the chemical deviation $c_{\neq}^{t_{r}=0}=\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}-S_{0}^{t} \mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq 2} 2.12 \mathrm{a}$ in a lower order regularity space. This smallness, when combined
with the linear enhanced dissipation 2.8 of the passive scalar solution $S_{0}^{t} \mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq}$, yields that the chemical gradient $\nabla \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}$is small at the transition time $T_{h}$. In the decaying phase $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{dc}}$, we capitalize the smallness of $\nabla \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(T_{h}\right)$ into the enhanced dissipation of the lower norm $\mathbb{L}$. We explicitly spell out these heurisitics in the following two propositions.
Growth Phase $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{gr}}$ : Propagation of the higher regularity norm $\mathbb{H}$. In the growth phase, we apply energy method to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 2.1. Consider the solutions to the equation 2.9 initiated from initial data $n_{\mathrm{in}} \in H^{M}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right), \mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}} \in$ $H^{M+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right), M \geq 5$. Assume that the ambient shear flow $u_{A}$ is the one defined in Theorem 1.2. Recall the definition of $\zeta \sqrt{1.9}$, $T_{h}=A^{1 / 3+\zeta / 2}(2.10)$, and consider the functional $\mathbb{H}(2.14)$. There exist thresholds $G_{\mathbb{H}}, A_{\mathbb{H}}$ such that if the following constraints are satisfied,

$$
G \geq G_{\mathbb{H}}\left(\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W_{y}^{M+3}}, M\right), \quad A \geq A_{\mathbb{H}}\left(M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W_{y}^{M+3}}, G, n_{\mathrm{in}}, \mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}}\right)
$$

the following estimate holds for all $t \in\left[0, T_{h}\right]$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{H}_{G}^{M}[t]+\|\langle n\rangle(t)\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+\|\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle(t)\|_{H^{M+1}}^{2} \leq \mathfrak{B}\left(M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+3, \infty}}, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1},\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}}\right\|_{H^{M+1}},\left\|n_{\mathrm{in}}\right\|_{H^{M}}\right) . \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 2.2. Throughout the paper, the regularity index $M$ will be changing. But they will be smaller than the $\mathbb{M}$ in Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 2.4.

## Decaying Phase $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{dc}}$ : Enhanced dissipation of the lower regularity norm $\mathbb{L}$.

To prove the enhanced dissipation of $\mathbb{L}$, we use a bootstrap argument, see, e.g., 10 , 46 . We set the reference time $t_{r}=T_{h}=A^{1 / 3+\zeta / 2} 2.10$. Assume that $\left[t_{r}, T_{\star}\right]$ is the largest interval on which the following hypotheses hold:

1) Remainders' enhanced dissipation estimates:

$$
\mathbb{L}_{G}^{M}\left[t_{r}+\tau, n_{\neq}, \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right] \leq 2 C_{E D} \mathbb{L}_{G}^{M}\left[t_{r}, n_{\neq}, \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right] \exp \left\{-\frac{2 \delta \tau}{A^{1 / 3}}\right\}, \quad \forall t_{r}+\tau \in\left[t_{r}, T_{\star}\right]
$$

2) Uniform-in-time estimates of the $x$-averages:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\langle n\rangle\|_{L_{t}^{\infty}\left(\left[t_{r}, T_{\star}\right] ; H_{y, z}^{M}\right)} & \leq 2 \mathcal{B}_{\langle n\rangle ; H^{M}} ; \\
\|\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\|_{L_{t}^{\infty}\left(\left[t_{r}, T_{\star}\right] ; H_{y, z}^{M+1}\right)} & \leq 2 \mathcal{B}_{\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle ; H^{M+1}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The parameter $\delta$ is chosen depending only on the constants $\delta_{0}, C_{0} 1.8$ and $\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}$ (2.7),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta=\delta\left(\delta_{0}, C_{0}, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}\right) \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the local well-posedness of the equation $\sqrt{2.9}$ ) in $H^{M}, M \geq 3$ (Theorem 2.3), we have that the interval $\left[t_{r}, T_{\star}\right]$ is non-empty.

The nonlinear enhanced dissipation is the consequence of the following proposition. We recall that $\mathbb{M}$ is the regularity level specified in Theorem 1.3

Proposition 2.2. Consider the solutions to the equation 2.9 initiated from the initial data $n_{\text {in }} \in H^{M}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right), \mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }} \in$ $H^{M+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right), 3 \leq M \leq \mathbb{M}$. Assume that the ambient shear flow $u_{A}$ is the one defined in Theorem 1.2, and the following "gluing" constraint is satisfied at time $t_{r}=T_{h}=A^{1 / 3+\zeta / 2}$ 1.9, 2.10,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \Phi\left(T_{h}\right)^{2 j}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; T_{h}}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} n_{\neq}\left(T_{h}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} A^{2 / 3} \Phi\left(T_{h}\right)^{2 j+2}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; T_{h}}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(T_{h}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right)}^{2} \leq \mathcal{B}_{1}^{2} \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here the bound $\mathcal{B}_{1}$ is independent of $A$ and $\Gamma_{y ; T_{h}}=\partial_{y}+\int_{0}^{T_{h}} \partial_{y} u_{A}(s, y) d s \partial_{x}$.
Let $\left[t_{r}, T_{\star}\right]$ be the maximal time interval on which the hypotheses 2.16) hold. There exist thresholds $G_{\mathbb{L}}, A_{\mathbb{L}}, Q_{\mathbb{L}}$ such that if the following constraints are satisfied,

$$
\begin{aligned}
G & \geq G_{\mathbb{L}}\left(C_{0}, \delta_{0}, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1},\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W_{y}^{M+3}}, M\right) \\
A & \geq A_{\mathbb{L}}\left(C_{0}, \delta_{0}, M, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1},\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W_{y}^{M+3}}, G, \mathcal{B}_{1},\left\|\langle n\rangle\left(T_{h}\right)\right\|_{H^{M}},\left\|\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\left(T_{h}\right)\right\|_{H^{M+1}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

then the following stronger estimates can be developed:

1) Remainders' enhanced dissipation estimates:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{L}_{G}^{M}\left[T_{h}+\tau\right] \leq C_{E D} \mathbb{L}_{G}^{M}\left[T_{h}\right] \exp \left\{-2 \frac{\delta \tau}{A^{1 / 3}}\right\}, \quad \forall T_{h}+\tau \in\left[T_{h}, T_{\star}\right] \tag{2.19a}
\end{equation*}
$$

2) Uniform-in-time estimates of the $x$-averages:

$$
\begin{align*}
&\|\langle n\rangle\|_{L_{t}^{\infty}\left(\left[T_{h}, T_{\star}\right] ; H_{y, z}^{M}\right)} \leq \mathcal{B}_{\langle n\rangle ; H^{M}}:=2\left\|\langle n\rangle\left(T_{h}\right)\right\|_{H^{M}}+2  \tag{2.19b}\\
&\|\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\|_{L_{t}^{\infty}\left(\left[T_{h}, T_{\star}\right] ; H_{y, z}^{M+1}\right)} \leq \mathcal{B}_{\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle ; H^{M+1}}:=\frac{1}{A^{1 / 5}}+\left\|\left\langle\mathfrak{C}\left(T_{h}\right)\right\rangle\right\|_{H^{M+1}} \tag{2.19c}
\end{align*}
$$

As a consequence of the bootstrap argument, the estimates 2.19a, 2.19b, 2.19c hold on the time horizon $\left[T_{h}, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]$.

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is completed once we combine the two propositions above:
Proof of Theorem 1.3. We decompose the time horizon as in 2.10 . On the time interval $\left[0, T_{h}\right]$, we apply Proposition 2.1 and obtain that

$$
\sum_{|i, j, k| \leq \mathbb{M}} \Phi\left(T_{h}\right)^{2 j+2}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; T_{h}}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(T_{h}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right)}^{2} \leq \frac{C}{A^{2 / 3}} \mathfrak{B}\left(\mathbb{M},\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{\mathbb{M}+3, \infty}}, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1},\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+1}},\left\|n_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}}}\right)
$$

This is the gluing condition $\sqrt{2.18}$ in Proposition 2.2 with regularity level $M=\mathbb{M}-1$. Now an application of Proposition 2.2 yields 1.10 and 1.11 . This concludes the proof.

To prepare ourselves for the alternating shear construction, we present the following proposition, which is in the same vein as Proposition 2.2

Proposition 2.3. Consider the solutions to the equation 2.9 initiated from initial data $n_{\mathrm{in}} \in H^{M}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right), \mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}} \in$ $H^{M+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right), M \geq 3$. Assume that the ambient shear flow $u_{A}$ is the one defined in Theorem 1.2, and the initial chemical remainder is small in the sense that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq \neq}\right\|_{H^{M+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right)} \leq \epsilon \tag{2.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

There exist thresholds $G_{0}, \epsilon_{0}, A_{0}, Q_{0}$ such that if the following constraints are satisfied,

$$
\begin{align*}
& G \geq G_{0}\left(\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W_{y}^{M+3}}, M\right), \quad \epsilon^{-1} \geq \epsilon_{0}^{-1}\left(n_{\mathrm{in}}, \mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}}\right)  \tag{2.21}\\
& A \geq A_{0}\left(M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W_{y}^{M+3}}, G, \epsilon^{-1}, n_{\mathrm{in}}, \mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}}\right), \quad Q \geq Q_{0}\left(M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W_{y}^{M+3}}, G, \epsilon^{-1}, n_{\mathrm{in}}, \mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

the following set of conclusions hold

1) Remainders' enhanced dissipation estimates:

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r}=0 ; M}\left[t, n_{\neq}, \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right] & \leq C_{E D} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r}=0 ; M}\left[0, n_{\neq}, \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right] \exp \left\{-\frac{2 \delta t}{A^{1 / 3}}\right\}  \tag{2.22a}\\
& \leq C\left(\left\|n_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq}\right\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq \neq}\right\|_{H^{M+1}}^{2}+1\right) \exp \left\{-\frac{2 \delta t}{A^{1 / 3}}\right\}
\end{align*}
$$

2) Uniform-in-time estimates of the $x$-averages:

$$
\begin{align*}
\|\langle n\rangle\|_{L_{t}^{\infty}\left(\left[0, T_{\star}\right] ; H_{y, z}^{M}\right)} & \leq 2\left\|\left\langle n_{\text {in }}\right\rangle\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}}+2  \tag{2.22b}\\
\|\nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\|_{L_{t}^{\infty}\left(\left[0, T_{\star}\right] ; H_{y, z}^{M}\right)} & \leq A^{-1 / 5}+2\left\|\nabla\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\rangle\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}} \tag{2.22c}
\end{align*}
$$

Remark 2.3. We highlight that the derivation of the enhanced dissipation estimate 2.22a) requires smallness of the chemical gradient $\nabla \mathfrak{C}$ 2.20). This is the main obstacle to overcome in the alternating construction.

This concludes Section 2.2 .
2.3. Suppression of Blow-up with Alternating Shear Flows. In this section, we sketch the idea of suppression of chemotactic blow-up through alternating shear flows. Several lemmas will be presented along with the argument. The proof of these technical lemmas will be postponed to Section 5. We consider the following time-dependent alternating shear flows acting on the system:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Phase } \mathfrak{a}: \widetilde{u}_{A}:=\left(u_{A}(t, y), 0,0\right)^{\top}, & \forall t \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right] \\
\text { Phase } \mathfrak{b}: \widetilde{u}_{A}:=\left(0,0, u_{A}(t, x)\right)^{\top}, & \forall t \in\left(A^{1 / 3+\zeta}, 2 A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right] \\
\text { Phase } \mathfrak{c}: \widetilde{u}_{A}:=\left(0, u_{A}(t, z), 0\right)^{\top}, & \forall t \in\left(2 A^{1 / 3+\zeta}, 3 A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right] .
\end{array}
$$

Here $u_{A}$ is the flow defined in Theorem 1.2. The explicit form of $\widetilde{u}_{A}$ can be found in Figure 1. We define
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Figure 1. The alternating shear flows
the following switching time instances:

$$
T_{I \mathfrak{a}}=3 I A^{1 / 3+\zeta}, \quad T_{I \mathfrak{b}}=(1+3 I) A^{1 / 3+\zeta}, \quad T_{I \mathfrak{c}}=(2+3 I) A^{1 / 3+\zeta}, \quad I \in\{0,1,2, \ldots\}=\mathbb{N}
$$

The subscripts $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}$ indicate the phase of the shear flows and the subscript $I$ indicates which period the system is in. Since the shearing direction changes over time, we consider three distinct gliding regularity norms induced by the following vector fields:

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { Phase } \mathfrak{a}: & \partial_{x}, \Gamma_{y ; t}, \partial_{z}, \quad \Gamma_{y ; t}:=\partial_{y}+\int_{0}^{t} \partial_{y} u\left(T_{I \mathfrak{a}}+s, y\right) d s \partial_{x}, \quad \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k}:=\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}, \quad t \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right] ; \\
\text { Phase } \mathfrak{b}: & \Gamma_{x ; t}, \partial_{y}, \partial_{z}, \quad \Gamma_{x ; t}:=\partial_{x}+\int_{0}^{t} \partial_{x} u\left(T_{I \mathfrak{b}}+s, x\right) d s \partial_{z}, \quad \Gamma_{x ; t}^{i j k}:=\Gamma_{x ; t}^{i} \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}, \quad t \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right] ; \\
\text { Phase } \mathfrak{c}: & \partial_{x}, \partial_{y}, \Gamma_{z ; t}, \quad \Gamma_{z ; t}:=\partial_{z}+\int_{0}^{t} \partial_{z} u\left(T_{I \mathfrak{c}}+s, z\right) d s \partial_{y}, \quad \Gamma_{z ; t}^{i j k}:=\partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{y}^{j} \Gamma_{z ; t}^{k}, \quad t \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]
\end{array}
$$

With all the notation introduced, we are ready to present the main theorems in the alternating construction. As it turns out, there are two distinct time phases in the system, i.e.,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { Phase \# 1: } I=0, \quad t \in\left[T_{0 \mathfrak{a}}, T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}\right]=\left[0,3 A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right)  \tag{2.24}\\
& \text { Phase \# 2: } I \geq 1, \quad t \in \cup_{I=1}^{\infty}\left[T_{I \mathfrak{a}}, T_{(I+1) \mathfrak{a}}\right]=\left[3 A^{1 / 3+\zeta}, \infty\right)
\end{align*}
$$

In Phase \# 1, the solutions undergo transient growth. However, by paying three derivatives, one can show that the chemical gradient $\nabla \mathfrak{C}$ decays to a low level. The following theorem summarized the state of the system at the end of Phase \# 1:
Theorem 2.4. Consider solutions to (1.3) subject to the initial data $\left(n_{\mathrm{in}}, \mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right) \in H^{\mathbb{M}+3} \times H^{\mathbb{M}+4}, \mathbb{M} \geq 5$. There exists a threshold $A_{0}=A_{0}\left(\mathbb{M},\left\|\nabla \widetilde{u}_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{\mathbb{M}+4, \infty}},\left\|n_{\mathrm{in}}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+3}},\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+4}}\right)$ such that if the parameter $A \geq A_{0}$, then the following bounds hold at the time instance $t=T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|n\left(T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}}}^{2} \leq \mathfrak{B}\left(\left\|n_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+3}},\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+4}}\right), \quad\left\|\mathfrak{C}\left(T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+1}}^{2} \leq \frac{\mathfrak{B}\left(\left\|n_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+3}},\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}+4}}\right)}{A^{1 / 3}} \tag{2.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, $\|n(t)\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}}}+\|\mathfrak{C}(t)\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+1}}<\infty$ for all $t \in\left[0,3 A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]$.
As a result, we observe that at the end of Phase \# 1, the chemical gradient becomes small. Hence, Proposition 2.3 becomes applicable. By repeatedly applying Proposition 2.3 in Phase $\# 2$, we expect the following conclusion:

Theorem 2.5. Consider solution to the equation 1.3 in Phase \# 2, i.e., $t \in \cup_{I=1}^{\infty}\left[T_{I \mathfrak{a}}, T_{(I+1) \mathfrak{a}}\right]=$ $\left[3 A^{1 / 3+\zeta}, \infty\right)$. Further assume that the condition 2.25 holds at time $T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}$. Then there exists a threshold

$$
A_{0}=A_{0}\left(\mathbb{M},\left\|\nabla \widetilde{u}_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{\mathbb{M}+1, \infty}},\left\|n\left(T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}}},\left\|\mathfrak{C}\left(T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+1}}\right)
$$

such that if $A \geq A_{0}$, then the following enhanced dissipation holds

$$
\left\|(n-\bar{n})\left(T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}+t\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}}}^{2}+\left\|\mathfrak{C}\left(T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}+t\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+1}}^{2} \leq C\left(\left\|n\left(T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}}}^{2}+\left\|\mathfrak{C}\left(T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+1}}^{2}\right) e^{-\delta t / A^{1 / 3+\zeta}}, \quad \forall t \geq 3 A^{1 / 3+\zeta}
$$

Here $C, \delta$ are constants that depends on $\mathbb{M},\left\|\nabla \widetilde{u}_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{\mathbb{M}+1, \infty}}$.
With these two theorems, we are ready to prove Theorem 1.1 .
Proof of Theorem 1.1. Combining Theorem 2.4 and Theorem 2.5, we observe that the Sobolev norms of the solution is bounded globally in time and the well-posedness follows from Theorem 2.3 .

The remaining part of the paper is organized as follows: in Section 3, we prove the Theorem 1.2 , in Section 44, we prove the enhanced dissipation of the remainder $n_{\neq}^{\iota}, \nabla c_{\neq}^{\iota} ;$ in Section 5, we prove the theorems and lemmas in subsection 2.3.

## 3. Linear Theory

In this section, we present the proof of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 2.2 .
3.1. Time-dependent Shear Flows with Logarithmic Shift. In this section, we recall the equations (2.1), (2.2) subject to diffusion coefficient $\frac{1}{A}$. Before proving Theorem 1.2 , we present a lemma which captures the decay of the $L^{2}$ norm.

Lemma 3.1. Consider the equation (2.2) subject to the shear flow $u(t, y)=\mathcal{U}(y+\log (t+1))$. Assume that the profile $\mathcal{U} \in C^{\infty}$ is not constant, i.e., there exists $y_{*} \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $\mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{*}\right) \neq 0$. Then the solutions to 2.2 satisfy the estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\widehat{f}_{\alpha, \gamma}\left(|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}} \leq(1-\kappa)\left\|\widehat{f}_{\alpha, \gamma}(0)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}, \quad \forall \alpha \neq 0 \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a constant $0<\kappa<1$ that depends only on $\mathcal{U}$.
Proof. We organize the proof in several steps.
Step \#1: General setup. First of all, we identify the range of the wave number $|\alpha|$ on which we focus. If $|\alpha| \geq A^{1 / 2} / K$ for some universal constant $K$, direct application of the non-expansive property of the $L^{2}$ norm of solutions to (2.2) yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\widehat{f}_{\alpha, \gamma}(t)\right\|_{2} \leq\left\|\widehat{f}_{\alpha, \gamma}(0)\right\|_{2} e^{-\frac{|\alpha|^{2 / 3}}{K^{4 / 3} A^{1 / 3}} t}, \quad|\alpha| \geq A^{1 / 2} / K . \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence at time instance $|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}$, the $L^{2}$ norm decays as in (3.1) with $\kappa=1-e^{-1 / K^{4 / 3}}$. Hence in the remaining proof, we always assume that $|\alpha| \leq A^{1 / 2} / K$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\alpha \geq 1$. We choose the constant $K$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} \geq K^{2 / 3} \geq e^{100 \pi} \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

We are going to refine the choice of $K$ in $(3.24)$ and (3.27).
Rearranging the terms in $(2.2)$ yields that

$$
\partial_{t}\left(\widehat{f}_{\alpha, \gamma}(t, y) e^{\frac{1}{A}\left(|\alpha|^{2}+|\gamma|^{2}\right) t}\right)+i u(t, y) \alpha\left(\widehat{f}_{\alpha, \gamma}(t, y) e^{\frac{1}{A}\left(|\alpha|^{2}+|\gamma|^{2}\right) t}\right)=\frac{1}{A} \partial_{y y}\left(\widehat{f}_{\alpha, \gamma}(t, y) e^{\frac{1}{A}\left(|\alpha|^{2}+|\gamma|^{2}\right) t}\right) .
$$

As a result, we define $F=\widehat{f}_{\alpha, \gamma}(t, y) e^{\frac{1}{A}\left(|\alpha|^{2}+|\gamma|^{2}\right) t}$ and consider the following equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{t} F(t, y)+i u \alpha F(t, y)=\frac{1}{A} \partial_{y y} F(t, y) \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We show that for $t=|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}$, the solutions to (3.4) must decrease in $L^{2}$ by a fixed amount. Assume without loss of generality that $\|F(0)\|_{L_{y}^{2}}=1$. Observe that we have the following energy identities:

$$
\begin{gather*}
\|F(t)\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}=1-\frac{2}{A} \int_{0}^{t}\left\|\partial_{y} F(s)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2} d s  \tag{3.5}\\
\left\|\partial_{y} F(t)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}+\frac{2}{A} \int_{0}^{t}\left\|\partial_{y y} F(s)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2} d s \leq 2\left\|\partial_{y} u\right\|_{L_{t, y}^{\infty}}|\alpha| \int_{0}^{t}\left\|\partial_{y} F(s)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}} d s+\left\|\partial_{y} F(0)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2} \tag{3.6}
\end{gather*}
$$

To derive the second inequality, we also use the fact that $\|F(s)\|_{L^{2}} \leq\|F(0)\|_{L^{2}}=1$. Assume then, that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{2}{A} \int_{0}^{|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}}\left\|\partial_{y} F(s)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2} d s<\kappa \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $\kappa$ is a small constant to be chosen later in 3.28. Thanks to 3.5), we have

$$
\|F(t)\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2} \geq 1-\kappa, \quad \forall t \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}\right]
$$

Next, we identify a time instance $\tau_{0}$ with the property that:

$$
\begin{gathered}
(3.8) \partial_{y} F\left(\tau_{0}\right)\left\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}<\left(2\left\|\partial_{y} u\right\|_{L_{t, y}^{\infty}}+1\right) H \sqrt{\kappa}|\alpha|^{2 / 3} A^{2 / 3}, \quad\right\| \partial_{y y} F\left(\tau_{0}\right) \|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}<\left(2\left\|\partial_{y} u\right\|_{L_{t, y}^{\infty}}+1\right) H^{2} \sqrt{\kappa}|\alpha|^{4 / 3} A^{4 / 3} \\
\frac{2}{A} \int_{\tau_{0}}^{|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}}\left\|\partial_{y} F(s)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2} d s<\kappa, \quad \tau_{0} \in\left[0, \frac{4}{H}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}\right]
\end{gathered}
$$

Here $H \geq 4 e^{16 \pi}$ is a large constant to be chosen later in (3.24, 3.27). The last inequality is a direct consequence of 3.7 . The explicit argument involves an application of the Chebyshev inequality. First we note that by the assumption (3.7),

$$
\left|\left\{\left.t \in\left[0,|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}\right]\left|\left\|\partial_{y} F(t)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}>H \kappa\right| \alpha\right|^{2 / 3} A^{2 / 3}\right\}\right| \leq \frac{\kappa A}{H \kappa|\alpha|^{2 / 3} A^{2 / 3}}=\frac{A^{1 / 3}}{H|\alpha|^{2 / 3}}
$$

so on the time interval $\left[0,|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}\right]$, a fraction of $1-\frac{1}{H}$ points have the $\dot{H}^{1}$ bound $\left\|\partial_{y} F(t)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2} \leq$ $H \kappa|\alpha|^{2 / 3} A^{2 / 3}$. Now we choose $\tau_{0}^{\prime}$ as the minimum of all these points, i.e.

$$
\tau_{0}^{\prime}=\min \left\{\left.t\left|\left\|\partial_{y} F(t)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2} \leq H \kappa\right| \alpha\right|^{2 / 3} A^{2 / 3}\right\}
$$

We observe that $\tau_{0}^{\prime} \leq \frac{2}{H}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}$. Now on the interval $\left[\tau_{0}^{\prime},|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}\right)$, we apply the estimate (3.6) subject to initial time $\tau_{0}^{\prime}$ and the assumption (3.7) to obtain that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\|\partial_{y} F(t)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}+\frac{2}{A} \int_{\tau_{0}^{\prime}}^{t}\left\|\partial_{y y} F(s)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2} d s  \tag{3.9}\\
& \leq 2\left\|\partial_{y} u\right\|_{L_{t, y}^{\infty}}|\alpha| A^{1 / 2} \sqrt{t}\left(\frac{1}{A} \int_{\tau_{0}^{\prime}}^{t}\left\|\partial_{y} F(s)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2} d s\right)^{1 / 2}+H \kappa|\alpha|^{2 / 3} A^{2 / 3} \leq\left(2\left\|\partial_{y} u\right\|_{L_{t, y}^{\infty}}+1\right) H \sqrt{\kappa}|\alpha|^{2 / 3} A^{2 / 3} \\
& =: C_{1}\left(\left\|\partial_{y} u\right\|_{L_{t, y}^{\infty}}\right) H \sqrt{\kappa}|\alpha|^{2 / 3} A^{2 / 3}, \quad \forall t \in\left[\tau_{0}^{\prime},|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}\right]
\end{align*}
$$

Now the Chebyshev inequality yields that

$$
\left|\left\{\left.t \in\left[\tau_{0}^{\prime},|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}\right]\left|\left\|\partial_{y y} F(t)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}>H^{2} C_{1} \sqrt{\kappa}\right| \alpha\right|^{4 / 3} A^{4 / 3}\right\}\right| \leq \frac{C_{1} H \sqrt{\kappa}|\alpha|^{2 / 3} A^{5 / 3}}{H^{2} C_{1} \sqrt{\kappa}|\alpha|^{4 / 3} A^{4 / 3}} \leq \frac{1}{H}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}
$$

Therefore, by (3.9), we can find $\tau_{0} \in\left[\tau_{0}^{\prime}, \tau_{0}^{\prime}+\frac{2}{H} A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}\right] \subset\left[0, \frac{4}{H} A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}\right]$ such that

$$
\left\|\partial_{y} F\left(\tau_{0}\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}<C_{1}(u) H \sqrt{\kappa}|\alpha|^{2 / 3} A^{2 / 3}, \quad\left\|\partial_{y y} F\left(\tau_{0}\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}<C_{1}(u) H^{2} \sqrt{\kappa}|\alpha|^{4 / 3} A^{4 / 3}
$$

This is (3.8).
We denote the solution to the corresponding inviscid problem by $\eta$, i.e., $\eta$ solves

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{t} \eta(t, y)+i u \alpha \eta(t, y)=0, \quad \eta\left(\tau_{0}, y\right)=F\left(\tau_{0}, y\right) \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Step \# 2: Quantitative estimates. In the second step, we provide some necessary estimates.

First of all, we present some upper bounds for the viscous/inviscid solutions. The starting point is the following claim

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\|\partial_{y y} \eta\left(\tau_{0}+t, y\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}+\left\|\partial_{y y} F\left(\tau_{0}+t, y\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}  \tag{3.11}\\
& \quad \leq C|\alpha|^{2} t^{2}\left\|F\left(\tau_{0}, y\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}+C|\alpha| t\left(\left\|\partial_{y} F\left(\tau_{0}, y\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}+\left\|F\left(\tau_{0}, y\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}\right)+\left\|\partial_{y y} F\left(\tau_{0}, y\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}, \quad \forall t \geq 0
\end{align*}
$$

Here the constant $C$ depends on the $L_{t}^{\infty} W_{y}^{2, \infty}$-norm of the shear $u$. To prove this bound, we observe that a direct $L^{2}$-based energy estimate on the solutions to (3.4) and 3.10 yields that

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
\|F\|_{L^{2}} \leq\left\|F\left(\tau_{0}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}, & \frac{d}{d t}\left\|\partial_{y} F\right\|_{L^{2}} \leq C|\alpha|\|F\|_{L^{2}}, & \frac{d}{d t}\left\|\partial_{y y} F\right\|_{L^{2}} \leq C|\alpha|\left(\left\|\partial_{y} F\right\|_{L^{2}}+\|F\|_{L^{2}}\right)  \tag{3.12}\\
\|\eta\|_{L^{2}}=\left\|F\left(\tau_{0}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}, & \frac{d}{d t}\left\|\partial_{y} \eta\right\|_{L^{2}} \leq C|\alpha|\|\eta\|_{L^{2}}, & \frac{d}{d t}\left\|\partial_{y y} \eta\right\|_{L^{2}} \leq C|\alpha|\left(\left\|\partial_{y} \eta\right\|_{L^{2}}+\|\eta\|_{L^{2}}\right)
\end{array}\right.
$$

Now a direct integration in time yields the upper bound (3.11).
If we focus on the time interval $\left[\tau_{0},|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}\right]$, finer estimates can be obtained. The energy estimate (3.12), together with the initial configuration (3.8), yields that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\partial_{y} \eta(t)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}} \leq C\left(\left\|\partial_{y} u\right\|_{L_{t, y}^{\infty}}\right) \sqrt{H}|\alpha|^{1 / 3} A^{1 / 3}, \quad \forall t \in\left[\tau_{0},|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}\right] \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining the upper bounds of the $\dot{H}^{2}$-norms (3.11) and the fact that the solutions $F$ and $\eta$ are initiated from identical data at the initial time $\tau_{0}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\|\partial_{y y} \eta(t)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}+\left\|\partial_{y y} F(t)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}  \tag{3.14}\\
& \quad \leq C|\alpha|^{2} t^{2}\left\|F\left(\tau_{0}, y\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}+C|\alpha| t\left(\left\|\partial_{y} F\left(\tau_{0}, y\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}+\left\|F\left(\tau_{0}, y\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}\right)+\left\|\partial_{y y} F\left(\tau_{0}, y\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}} \\
& \quad \leq C H|\alpha|^{2 / 3} A^{2 / 3}+C H|\alpha|^{1 / 3} A^{1 / 3} \leq C H|\alpha|^{2 / 3} A^{2 / 3}, \quad \forall t \in\left[\tau_{0},|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}\right]
\end{align*}
$$

The remaining part of step $\# 2$ is devoted to the proof of the following lower bound for all smooth solutions to the inviscid equation (3.10):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\tau_{0}}^{A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}}\left\|\partial_{y} \eta(s)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2} d s \geq \delta A\left\|\eta\left(\tau_{0}\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}-C t\left\|\partial_{y} \eta\left(\tau_{0}\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}, \quad 0<|\alpha| \leq A^{1 / 2} / K \tag{3.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

To prove the lower bound 3.15 , we first rewrite the solution to 3.10 as

$$
\eta(t, y)=\exp \left\{-i \alpha \int_{\tau_{0}}^{t} u(s, y) d s\right\} \eta\left(\tau_{0}, y\right), \quad \forall t \geq \tau_{0}
$$

The $\partial_{y}$-derivative reads,

$$
\partial_{y} \eta(t, y)=\exp \left\{-i \alpha \int_{\tau_{0}}^{t} u(s, y) d s\right\} \partial_{y} \eta\left(\tau_{0}, y\right)-i \alpha\left(\int_{\tau_{0}}^{t} \partial_{y} u(s, y) d s\right) \exp \left\{-i \alpha \int_{\tau_{0}}^{t} u(s, y) d s\right\} \eta\left(\tau_{0}, y\right)
$$

Thus, there exists a universal constant $C$ so that the following estimate holds

$$
\left\|\partial_{y} \eta(t)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2} \geq \frac{1}{C}|\alpha|^{2}\left\|\int_{\tau_{0}}^{t} \partial_{y} u(s, \cdot) \eta\left(\tau_{0}, \cdot\right) d s\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}-C\left\|\partial_{y} \eta\left(\tau_{0}, \cdot\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}
$$

Integration in time yields that for all $t \geq \tau_{0}$,

$$
\int_{\tau_{0}}^{t}\left\|\partial_{y} \eta(s)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2} d s \geq \frac{1}{C}|\alpha|^{2} \int_{\tau_{0}}^{t}\left\|\int_{\tau_{0}}^{s} \partial_{y} u(\tau, \cdot) \eta\left(\tau_{0}, \cdot\right) d \tau\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2} d s-C t\left\|\partial_{y} \eta\left(\tau_{0}, \cdot\right)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}
$$

Recalling the explicit form of the flow $u(t, y)=\mathcal{U}(y+\log (1+t))$, we will establish 3.15) once we show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\tau_{0}}^{A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}}\left|\int_{\tau_{0}}^{s} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}(y+\log (1+\tau)) d \tau\right|^{2} d s \geq \frac{A}{C_{*}(\mathcal{U})|\alpha|^{2}}, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{T} \tag{3.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we use the change of variable $\mathfrak{h}:=\log (1+\tau)$ to rewrite the above inequality

$$
\int_{\tau_{0}}^{A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}}\left|\int_{\log \left(1+\tau_{0}\right)}^{\log (1+s)} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}(y+\mathfrak{h}) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|^{2} d s \geq \frac{A}{C_{*}(\mathcal{U})|\alpha|^{2}}, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{T}
$$

Here we assume that $\mathcal{U}^{\prime}(y)$ is not identically zero on the interval $[0,2 \pi]$. Then we prove the following claims:
a) There exists a point $y_{0}$ on $\mathbb{T}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{R}_{0}:=\left|\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|>0 \tag{3.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

b) there exist a point $a_{0} \in[0,2 \pi)$ such that for $\forall \mathfrak{h}_{0} \in\left[a_{0}, 2 \pi\right]$, the integral has the following lower bound

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\int_{0}^{\mathfrak{h}_{0}} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right| \geq \mathcal{R}_{0} / 2>0, \quad \forall \mathfrak{h}_{0} \in\left[a_{0}, 2 \pi\right] . \tag{3.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $a_{0}$ depends only on the profile $\mathcal{U}$. We further define

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau_{a ; 0}:=e^{a_{0}}-1<e^{2 \pi}-1 \tag{3.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

The proof of 3.17 is through contradiction argument. Assume that the claim 3.17 is false, then we have that

$$
\partial_{y} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}(y+\mathfrak{h}) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}=0 \Rightarrow \int_{0}^{2 \pi}-\mathcal{U}^{\prime \prime}(y+\mathfrak{h}) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}=0, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{T}
$$

Now we apply the integration by parts and the vanishing conditions above to derive that

$$
\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}(y+\mathfrak{h}) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}=\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}(y+\mathfrak{h}) \frac{d}{d \mathfrak{h}} e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}=\left.\mathcal{U}^{\prime}(y+\mathfrak{h}) e^{\mathfrak{h}}\right|_{\mathfrak{h}=0} ^{2 \pi}-\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime \prime}(y+\mathfrak{h}) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{T}
$$

Since $\mathcal{U}$ is smooth and periodic, $\mathcal{U}^{\prime}$ is periodic. Hence,

$$
\mathcal{U}^{\prime}(y)\left(e^{2 \pi}-1\right)=0, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{T}
$$

This is a contradiction to the assumption that $\mathcal{U}^{\prime}(y)$ is not identically zero and hence yields (3.17).
The claim (3.18) is a natural corollary of (3.17) through a continuity argument. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}=\mathcal{R}_{0}>0$. Since the function $\int_{0}^{z} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}$ is continuous with respect to $z$, there exists a small neighborhood of $z=2 \pi$ such that the function is above $\mathcal{R}_{0} / 2$. This concludes the proof of the claim.

Now we consider the following integral $(m \in \mathbb{N} \backslash\{0\})$ and apply the periodicity of $\mathcal{U}^{\prime}(\cdot)$ and the claim (3.17) to get

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\int_{2 m \pi}^{2(m+1) \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right| & =\left|\int_{2(m-1) \pi}^{2 m \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}+2 \pi} d \mathfrak{h}\right|  \tag{3.20}\\
& =e^{2 m \pi}\left|\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|=e^{2 m \pi} \mathcal{R}_{0}>0
\end{align*}
$$

Now we find the smallest $L \in \mathbb{N} \backslash\{0\}$ and largest $U \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
\bigcup_{m=L}^{U}\left[e^{2 m \pi}, e^{2(m+1) \pi}\right] \subset\left[\tau_{0}+1, A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}+1\right]
$$

The definition of $L, U$ yields that

$$
\begin{gather*}
L=\left\lceil\frac{\log \left(\tau_{0}+1\right)}{2 \pi}\right\rceil \quad \Rightarrow \quad \tau_{0}+1 \leq e^{2 L \pi} \leq e^{2 \pi}\left(\tau_{0}+1\right) \\
U=\left\lfloor\frac{\log \left(A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}+1\right)}{2 \pi}\right\rfloor-1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad e^{-4 \pi}\left(A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}+1\right) \leq e^{2 U \pi} \leq A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}+1 \tag{3.21}
\end{gather*}
$$

Since the time interval is long, i.e., (3.3), and the $H$ is large, i.e., $H \geq 4 e^{16 \pi}$ (3.8), we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
L & \leq \frac{\log \left(\tau_{0}+1\right)}{2 \pi}+1 \leq \frac{\log \left(e^{-16 \pi} A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}+1\right)}{2 \pi}+1 \\
& \leq-7+\frac{\log \left(A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}+e^{16 \pi}\right)}{2 \pi} \leq \frac{\log \left(A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}+1\right)}{2 \pi}-6 \leq U-4
\end{aligned}
$$

Further recall the quantity $H$ in $(3.8)$ and the constraint on $K(3.3)$. We have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{e^{2 L \pi}}{e^{2 U \pi}} \leq \frac{e^{2 \pi}\left(\tau_{0}+1\right)}{e^{-4 \pi}\left(A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}+1\right)} \leq e^{6 \pi}\left(\frac{4}{H}+\frac{1}{K^{2 / 3}+1}\right) \tag{3.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

We focus on the point $y_{0} \in \mathbb{T}$ and prove estimate 3.16 for $y_{0}$. On the interval $\left[a_{0}, 2 \pi\right]$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\int_{0}^{\mathfrak{h}_{0}} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right) \times\left(\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right) \geq 0, \quad \forall \mathfrak{h}_{0} \in\left[a_{0}, 2 \pi\right] \tag{3.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we use the sign property $(3.23)$ to derive the following estimate with $q \in\left[\log \left(\tau_{a ; 0}+1\right)+2 U \pi,(1+U) 2 \pi\right]$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\int_{\log \left(1+\tau_{0}\right)}^{q} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right| \\
& \quad \geq \sum_{m=L}^{U-1} e^{2 m \pi}\left|\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|-\left|\int_{\log \left(1+\tau_{0}\right)}^{2 L \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|+e^{2 U \pi}\left|\int_{0}^{q-2 U \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

Recall the quotient bound 3.22 . Now we implement a similar argument as in 3.20 and choose the $H$ in (3.8) and $K$ in (3.3) to be large compared to $\mathcal{R}_{0}$ and $\max _{z \in[0,2 \pi]}\left|\int_{z}^{2 \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|$ to derive that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\int_{\log \left(1+\tau_{0}\right)}^{q} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|  \tag{3.24}\\
& \quad \geq \frac{\mathcal{R}_{0} e^{2 U \pi}}{2\left(e^{2 \pi}-1\right)}-e^{2(L-1) \pi} \max _{z \in[0,2 \pi]}\left|\int_{z}^{2 \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right| \\
& \quad \geq e^{2 U \pi}\left(\frac{\mathcal{R}_{0}}{2\left(e^{2 \pi}-1\right)}-e^{6 \pi}\left(\frac{4}{H}+\frac{1}{K^{2 / 3}}\right) \max _{z \in[0,2 \pi]}\left|\int_{z}^{2 \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|\right) \\
& \quad \geq \frac{e^{2 U \pi} \mathcal{R}_{0}}{4\left(e^{2 \pi}-1\right)}, \quad \forall q:=\log (1+s) \in\left[\log \left(\tau_{a ; 0}+1\right)+2 U \pi,(1+U) 2 \pi\right] .
\end{align*}
$$

We note that $q \in\left[\log \left(\tau_{a ; 0}+1\right)+2 U \pi,(1+U) 2 \pi\right]$ corresponds to $s \in\left[\left(\tau_{a ; 0}+1\right) e^{2 U \pi}-1, e^{2(U+1) \pi}-1\right]$. Hence, we have that by (3.24),

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\tau_{0}}^{A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}}\left|\int_{\tau_{0}}^{s} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\log (1+\tau)\right) d \tau\right|^{2} d s \\
& \geq \geq \int_{\left(\tau_{a ; 0}+1\right) e^{2 U \pi}-1}^{e^{2(U+1) \pi}-1}\left|\int_{\tau_{0}}^{s} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\log (1+\tau)\right) d \tau\right|^{2} d s \geq\left(e^{2 \pi}-\tau_{a ; 0}-1\right) \frac{e^{6 U \pi}}{16\left(e^{2 \pi}-1\right)^{2}} \mathcal{R}_{0}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Now we recall the relations (3.19, 3.21, and obtain that

$$
\int_{\tau_{0}}^{A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}}\left|\int_{\tau_{0}}^{s} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\log (1+\tau)\right) d \tau\right|^{2} d s \geq \frac{A}{C_{*}(\mathcal{U})|\alpha|^{2}}
$$

This is $3.16{ }_{y=y_{0}}$.
To generalize the result to $\forall y \in \mathbb{T}$, we note that for any point $y \in \mathbb{T}$, there exists a $\delta_{y} \in[0,2 \pi]$ so that $y=y_{0}+\delta_{y}(\bmod 2 \pi)$. Hence

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{\tau_{0}}^{A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}} & \left|\int_{\log \left(1+\tau_{0}\right)}^{\log (1+s)} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}(y+\mathfrak{h}) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|^{2} d s=\int_{\tau_{0}}^{A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}}\left|\int_{\log \left(1+\tau_{0}\right)}^{\log (1+s)} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\delta_{y}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|^{2} d s  \tag{3.25}\\
= & \int_{\tau_{0}}^{A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}}\left|\int_{\log \left(1+\tau_{0}\right)+\delta_{y}}^{\log (1+s)+\delta_{y}} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}-\delta_{y}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|^{2} d s
\end{align*}
$$

Now we identify the smallest integer $L_{y} \in \mathbb{N}$ and largest integer $U_{y} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
\left[2 L_{y} \pi, 2\left(U_{y}+1\right) \pi\right] \subset\left[\log \left(1+\tau_{0}\right)+\delta_{y}, \log \left(1+A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}\right)+\delta_{y}\right]
$$

Thanks to the bound $0 \leq \delta_{y} \leq 2 \pi$, we have that,

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{y}=\left\lceil\frac{\log \left(1+\tau_{0}\right)+\delta_{y}}{2 \pi}\right\rceil \in[L, L+1], \quad U_{y}=\left\lfloor\frac{\log \left(1+A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}\right)+\delta_{y}}{2 \pi}\right\rfloor-1 \in[U, U+1] \tag{3.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we focus on specific points $q \in\left[\log \left(\tau_{a ; 0}+1\right)+2 U_{y} \pi,\left(1+U_{y}\right) 2 \pi\right]$, and carry out the estimate with (3.23),

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\int_{\log \left(1+\tau_{0}\right)+\delta_{y}}^{q} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right| e^{-\delta_{y}} \\
& \geq e^{-\delta_{y}}\left(\sum_{m=L_{y}}^{U_{y}-1} e^{2 m \pi}\left|\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|-\left|\int_{\log \left(1+\tau_{0}\right)+\delta_{y}}^{2 L_{y} \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|+e^{2 U_{y} \pi}\left|\int_{0}^{q-2 U_{y} \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Now we recall the definition (3.17), the estimate (3.22), the fact that $U \geq L+4$, and the relation (3.26) to obtain the estimate

$$
\begin{align*}
\mid \int_{\log \left(1+\tau_{0}\right)+\delta_{y}}^{q} & \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h} \mid e^{-\delta_{y}}  \tag{3.27}\\
& \geq \frac{\mathcal{R}_{0} e^{2 U_{y} \pi} e^{-\delta_{y}}}{2\left(e^{2 \pi}-1\right)}-e^{2\left(L_{y}-1\right) \pi} \max _{z \in[0,2 \pi]}\left|\int_{z}^{2 \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right| e^{-\delta_{y}} \\
& \geq e^{2 U \pi}\left(\frac{\mathcal{R}_{0}}{2 e^{2 \pi}\left(e^{2 \pi}-1\right)}-e^{6 \pi}\left(\frac{4}{H}+\frac{1}{K^{2 / 3}}\right) \max _{z \in[0,2 \pi]}\left|\int_{z}^{2 \pi} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|\right) \\
& \geq \frac{\mathcal{R}_{0}}{4 e^{2 \pi}\left(e^{2 \pi}-1\right)} e^{2 U \pi}, \quad \forall q:=\log (1+s)+\delta_{y} \in\left[\log \left(\tau_{a ; 0}+1\right)+2 U_{y} \pi,\left(1+U_{y}\right) 2 \pi\right] .
\end{align*}
$$

The remaining part of the proof is similar to the $y=y_{0}$ case. We have that by (3.25) and (3.26),

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\tau_{0}}^{A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}} & \left|\int_{\log \left(1+\tau_{0}\right)}^{\log (1+s)} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}(y+\mathfrak{h}) e^{\mathfrak{h}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|^{2} d s \\
& \geq \int_{\left(\tau_{a ; 0}+1\right) e^{2 U_{y} \pi-\delta_{y}}-1}^{e^{2\left(U_{y}+1\right) \pi-\delta_{y}}-1}\left|\int_{\log \left(1+\tau_{0}\right)+\delta_{y}}^{\log (1+s)+\delta_{y}} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\left(y_{0}+\mathfrak{h}\right) e^{\mathfrak{h}-\delta_{y}} d \mathfrak{h}\right|^{2} d s \\
& \geq\left(e^{2 \pi}-\tau_{a ; 0}-1\right) \frac{e^{6 U \pi}}{16 e^{6 \pi}\left(e^{2 \pi}-1\right)^{2}} \mathcal{R}_{0}^{2} \geq \frac{A}{C_{*}(\mathcal{U})|\alpha|^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

This is 3.16).
Step \# 3: Decay estimates. To prove the decay estimate, we consider the difference between the viscous solution and the inviscid solution, which solves the equation

$$
\partial_{t}(F-\eta)+i u \alpha(F-\eta)=\frac{1}{A} \partial_{y y} F
$$

Recalling the estimate of $\partial_{y} \eta(3.13)$, the hypothesis (3.7), and the time constraint $t \leq A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}$, we have that the $L^{2}$-difference is bounded as follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\eta-F\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}(t) & \leq \frac{1}{A} \int_{\tau_{0}}^{t}\left\|\partial_{y} \eta(s)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}\left\|\partial_{y} F(s)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}} d s \\
& \leq C\left(\left\|\partial_{y} u\right\|_{L_{t, y}^{\infty}}\right) A^{-2 / 3}|\alpha|^{1 / 3} \sqrt{H} \sqrt{t} \sqrt{\int_{\tau_{0}}^{t}\left\|\partial_{y} F(s)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2} d s}<C \sqrt{H \kappa}
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, by interpolation and the $H^{2}$-estimate (3.14), we obtain the bound

$$
\|\eta-F\|_{\dot{H}_{y}^{1}} \leq C\|\eta-F\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{1 / 2}\|\eta-F\|_{\dot{H}_{y}^{2}}^{1 / 2}<C \sqrt{H^{5 / 4} \kappa^{1 / 4}|\alpha|^{2 / 3} A^{2 / 3}}=C H^{5 / 8} \kappa^{1 / 8}|\alpha|^{1 / 3} A^{1 / 3}
$$

Thus, the triangular inequality yields that

$$
\|F\|_{\dot{H}_{y}^{1}} \geq\|\eta\|_{\dot{H}_{y}^{1}}-\|\eta-F\|_{\dot{H}_{y}^{1}} \geq\|\eta\|_{\dot{H}_{y}^{1}}-C H^{5 / 8} \kappa^{1 / 8}|\alpha|^{1 / 3} A^{1 / 3} .
$$

Hence,

$$
\|F(t)\|_{\dot{H}_{y}^{1}}^{2} \geq \frac{1}{2}\|\eta\|_{\dot{H}_{y}^{1}}^{2}-C H^{5 / 4} \kappa^{1 / 4}|\alpha|^{2 / 3} A^{2 / 3}, \quad \forall t \in\left[\tau_{0}, A^{1 / 3}|\alpha|^{-2 / 3}\right]
$$

Now we integrate from $\tau_{0}$ to $|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}$ and apply the lower bound 3.15 to obtain that

$$
\frac{1}{A} \int_{\tau_{0}}^{|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}}\|F(s)\|_{\dot{H}_{y}^{1}}^{2} d s \geq \frac{\delta}{16}-C \sqrt{\kappa} H-C H^{5 / 4} \kappa^{1 / 4}
$$

Combining it with (3.7), we then see that:

$$
C H^{5 / 4}\left(\kappa^{1 / 2}+\kappa^{1 / 4}\right) \geq \delta
$$

It follows that $1 \geq \kappa \geq \delta^{4} /\left(C H^{5}\right)$. By choosing the $\kappa$ to be

$$
\begin{equation*}
\kappa<\frac{\delta^{4}}{C H^{5}} \tag{3.28}
\end{equation*}
$$

we obtain a contradiction. As a result, there exists a constant $\kappa>0$ such that

$$
\frac{2}{A} \int_{0}^{|\alpha|^{-2 / 3} A^{1 / 3}}\left\|\partial_{y} F(s)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2} d s \geq \kappa, \quad|\alpha| \leq \frac{A^{1 / 2}}{K}
$$

By (3.5), we have the decay (3.1) for $|\alpha| \leq \frac{1}{K} A^{1 / 2}$. Combining it with the estimate in the high modes (3.2), we have completed the proof of the lemma.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We first make the observation that the shear flow $u(y+\log (t+1))$ is not uniformly enhanced dissipation in time. As time becomes larger and larger, the shear flow changes slower and slower. Hence the decay rate might deplete over time. To obtain the uniform-in-time version, we introduce the rewinding of the flow. Recall that $A^{1 / 3}$ is the time when significant decay $(1-\kappa)$ happens, then we define the following flow

$$
U(t, y)=u(y+\phi(t)), \quad \phi(t)=\sum_{J=0}^{\infty} \chi_{J}(t) \log \left(1+\left(t-J\left(A^{1 / 3}+1\right)\right)\right), \quad t \geq 0
$$

where the $\chi_{J}(t)$ is smooth cut-off function such that

$$
\chi_{J}(t)=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
1, & t \in\left[2 J A^{1 / 3},(2 J+1) A^{1 / 3}\right] \\
\text { monotone, } & t \in\left[(2 J-1) A^{1 / 3}, 2 J A^{1 / 3}\right) \cup\left((2 J+1) A^{1 / 3}, 2(J+1) A^{1 / 3}\right] \\
0, & \text { others }
\end{array}\right.
$$

For this time periodic flow with period $2 A^{1 / 3}$, we show the estimate (1.8). If $s, t \in 2 A^{1 / 3} \mathbb{N}$, then by Lemma 3.1, we have the estimate 1.8 . In the general case, we find the largest integer $N_{1} \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $2 A^{1 / 3} N_{1} \leq s+t$ and the smallest integer $N_{2} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2 A^{1 / 3} N_{2} \geq s$. Further note that if $t<4 A^{1 / 3}$, then the result (1.8) is direct, i.e.,

$$
\|f(s+t)\|_{2} \leq\|f(s)\|_{2} \leq(1-\kappa)^{-2}\|f(s)\|_{2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}|\log (1-\kappa)| \frac{t}{A^{1 / 3}}}, \quad \forall t \in\left[0,4 A^{1 / 3}\right)
$$

Hence we assume that $t \geq 4 A^{1 / 3}$. As a consequence, $t-\left(N_{1}-N_{2}\right) 2 A^{1 / 3} \leq 4 A^{1 / 3}$. Thanks to the dissipative nature of the $L^{2}$-norm and the enhanced dissipation estimate for $s, t \in 2 A^{1 / 3} \mathbb{N}$ obtained before, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|f(s+t)\|_{2} & \leq\left\|f\left(2 N_{1} A^{1 / 3}\right)\right\|_{2} \leq\left\|f\left(2 N_{2} A^{1 / 3}\right)\right\|_{2}(1-\kappa)^{\left(N_{2}-N_{1}\right)} \leq\left\|f\left(2 N_{2} A^{1 / 3}\right)\right\|_{2} e^{-\frac{1}{2} A^{-1 / 3}\left(t-4 A^{1 / 3}\right) \log (1-\kappa)^{-1}} \\
& \leq(1-\kappa)^{-2}\|f(s)\|_{2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}|\log (1-\kappa)| \frac{t}{A^{1 / 3}}}, \quad \forall s \in[0, \infty), t \in\left[4 A^{1 / 3}, \infty\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

This concludes the proof of 1.8 .
3.2. Enhanced Dissipation in the Gliding Regularity Spaces. In this subsection, we prove Theorem 2.2. The proof develops a general framework to upgrade the $L^{2}$ enhanced dissipation to the higher gliding regularity spaces. The main obstacle to derive the enhanced dissipation estimates stem from the commutator terms involving the $\Gamma$ vector field and the diffusion operator $\frac{1}{A} \Delta$. These challenges are addressed by the key Lemma 3.2

The remaining part of the subsection is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.2. We organize the proof in four main steps.
Step \# 1: General Setup. We fix an arbitrary starting time $t_{\star} \in[0, \infty)$, and observe that Theorem 1.2 , together with the choice of $\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}$ 2.7), yields that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3}} \mathbb{P}_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{2} \rightarrow L^{2}} \leq \frac{1}{8} \tag{3.29}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $\mathbb{P}_{\neq}$is the projection operator such that $\mathbb{P}_{\neq} f=f_{\neq}$. Next we observe that the following regularity and decay estimates guarantee the enhanced dissipation 2.6,

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\|f_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}}^{2} & \leq 2\left\|f_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}}^{2}, \quad \forall \tau \in\left[0, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right]  \tag{3.30}\\
\left\|f_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}+\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}}^{2} & \leq \frac{1}{e^{2}}\left\|f_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M},}^{2} \tag{3.31}
\end{align*}
$$

The explicit argument is a variant to the one applied in the proof of Theorem 1.2. Consider general $s, t \in$ $[0, \infty)$. If the time instance $t$ in 2.6 take values in the set $\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3} \mathbb{N}$, iterative application of the decay estimate (3.31) yields the result (2.6). In the general case, we find the largest integer $N_{1} \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3} N_{1} \leq t$. As a consequence, we obtain the relation $t-N_{1} \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3}<\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3} \Rightarrow \delta_{\mathcal{Z}} A^{-1 / 3}(t-$ $\left.\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right)<N_{1}$. Combining the regularity estimate 3.30) and the decay estimate (3.31) yields that,

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\|f_{\neq}(s+t)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi(s+t)}^{M}}^{2} & \leq 2\left\|f_{\neq}\left(s+N_{1} \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi\left(s+N_{1} \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right)}^{2}}^{2} \leq 2\left\|f_{\neq}(s)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi(s)}^{M}}^{2} e^{-2 N_{1}}  \tag{3.32}\\
\leq & \leq 2\left\|f_{\neq}(s)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi(s)}^{M}}^{2} \exp \left\{-2 \delta_{\mathcal{Z}} \frac{t-\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3}}{A^{1 / 3}}\right\} \leq 2 e^{2}\left\|f_{\neq}(s)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi(s)}^{M}}^{2} \exp \left\{-2 \delta_{\mathcal{Z}} \frac{t}{A^{1 / 3}}\right\}
\end{align*}
$$

This is the result (2.6). Hence, it is enough to prove the estimates (3.30) and (3.31).
Step \# 2: Proof of the Regularity Estimate 3.30. The Step \# 2 and Step \# 3 are mainly devoted to estimating commutator terms. The following key lemma plays a major role.

Lemma 3.2. Consider function $\mathfrak{H}_{i j k} \in H^{1}$ and the family $\left\{\mathfrak{G}_{i j k}\right\}_{|i, j, k|=m} \subset H^{1}$, where $0 \leq m \leq M$. Further assume that the family of functions $\left\{\mathfrak{G}_{i j k}\right\}$ satisfies the following relations

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{x} \mathfrak{G}_{i j k}=\mathfrak{G}_{(i+1) j k}, \quad \Gamma_{y} \mathfrak{G}_{i j k}=\mathfrak{G}_{i(j+1) k}, \quad \partial_{z} \mathfrak{G}_{i j k}=\mathfrak{G}_{i j(k+1)} \tag{3.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then there exists a constant $C$, which depends only on $M$ and $\|u\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+2, \infty}}$, such that the following estimate holds

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{A} \int \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\left[\partial_{y y}, \Gamma_{y}^{j}\right] \mathfrak{G}_{i 0 k} d V\right|  \tag{3.34}\\
& \quad \leq \frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{8 A}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\left(\frac{C \Phi}{A^{1 / 3} G^{2}}+\frac{C}{G\left(A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}\right)}\right)\left(G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\sum_{\substack{i^{\prime}+j^{\prime}+k^{\prime} \leq m \\
j^{\prime} \leq j-1}} G^{2 i^{\prime}} \Phi^{2 j^{\prime}} \| \mathfrak{G}_{i^{\prime} j^{\prime} k^{\prime} \|_{2}}^{2}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

Proof. The proof of the lemma is postponed to the end of the subsection.
To prove the regularity estimate 3.30 , we express the time evolution of $\left\|f_{\neq}\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}}^{2}$ as follows

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d}{d \tau} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2} \tag{3.35}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \leq-\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{A}\left\|\nabla\left(\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}+\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{2 i}}{A} \Phi^{2 j} \int \partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq}\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq} d V \\
& =:-\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{A}\left\|\nabla\left(\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}+T_{c m}^{L ; R}
\end{aligned}
$$

Here " $L$ " stands for "linear" and " $R$ " stands for "regularity".
By setting $\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}=\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq}$and $\mathfrak{G}_{i j k}=\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq}$in Lemma 3.2 and checking that the condition 3.33) holds, we reach the conclusion that the commutator term $T_{c m}^{L ; R}$ in (3.35) is bounded as follows

$$
\left|T_{c m}^{L ; R}\right| \leq \frac{1}{8 A} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\nabla\left(\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}+\left(\frac{C \Phi}{G^{2} A^{1 / 3}}+\frac{C}{G\left(A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}\right)}\right)\left\|f_{\neq F}\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}}^{2}
$$

Here $C$ 's are constants depending only on $M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+2, \infty}}$. Hence, for all $\tau \in\left[0, \delta_{M}^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right]$,

$$
\frac{d}{d \tau}\left\|f_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}}^{2} \leq C\left(\frac{1}{G\left(A^{2 / 3}+\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)^{2}\right)}+\frac{1}{A^{1 / 3} G^{2}\left(1+\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)^{3} / A\right)}\right)\left\|f_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M},}^{2}
$$

Now by solving the differential relation and choosing the threshold $G_{M}>0$ large enough compared to $M$, $\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1}$ (as defined in 3.29 ), and $\|u\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+2, \infty}}$, we reach the result 3.30 . This concludes the Step \# 2.
Step \# 3: Proof of the Decay Estimate (3.31). Next we prove the decay estimate (3.31). The handle we apply is the passive scalar solution $S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau}\left(\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}\right)\right)$, whose $\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}$-norm naturally decays to $1 / 8$ of its value at $t_{\star}$ after time $\delta_{M}^{-1} A^{1 / 3} 3.29$. To avoid lengthy notation, we use the simplified notions

$$
\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k}=\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}+\tau}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}, \quad S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} f_{\neq}=S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau}\left(\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}\right)\right)
$$

The remaining task is to show that the deviation between the solution $\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} f_{\neq}$and the passive solution $S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} f_{\neq}$is small. To this end, we express the time evolution of the $\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}$-norm of the difference as follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d \tau} & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} f_{\neq}-S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} f_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2} \\
= & -\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{2 i}}{A} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\nabla\left(\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} f_{\neq-}-S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} f_{\neq}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2} \\
& +\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i} j \Phi^{2 j-1} \Phi^{\prime}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} f_{\neq-}-S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} f_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2} \\
& +\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{A} \int\left(\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} f_{\neq}-S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} f_{\neq}\right)\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq} d V \\
=: & -\mathfrak{D}_{1}-\mathfrak{D}_{2}+T_{c m}^{L ; D} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Here " $L$ " stands for "linear" and " $D$ " stands for "decay". To estimate the commutator term, we set $\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}=\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} f_{\neq}-S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} f_{\neq}$and $\mathfrak{G}_{i j k}=\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} f_{\neq}$in Lemma 3.2. The condition (3.33) can be checked directly. Hence an application of Lemma 3.2 yields that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|T_{c m}^{L ; D}\right| \leq & \frac{1}{8} \mathfrak{D}_{1}+\left(\frac{C \Phi\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)}{A^{1 / 3} G^{2}}+\frac{C}{G\left(A^{2 / 3}+\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)^{2}\right)}\right) \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} f_{\neq}-S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} f_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2} \\
& +\left(\frac{C \Phi\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)}{A^{1 / 3} G^{2}}+\frac{C}{G\left(A^{2 / 3}+\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)^{2}\right)}\right) \sup _{\tau \in\left[0, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right]}\left\|f_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}}^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Here the constant $C$ depends only on the regularity level $M$ and the norm $\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+2, \infty}}$. Combining this bound with the regularity estimate 3.30 , and the decomposition 3.34 yields that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{d \tau} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} f_{\neq-}-S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} f_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \\
& \leq C\left(\frac{\Phi\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)}{A^{1 / 3} G^{2}}+\frac{1}{G\left(\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)^{2}+A^{2 / 3}\right)}\right) \\
& \quad \times\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} f_{\neq}-S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} f_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+\left\|f_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}}^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

By applying a Grönwall-type estimate, and choosing the threshold $G \geq G_{M}>1$ large enough compared to $\|u\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+2, \infty}}, M$ and $\delta_{M}^{-1}$ (as defined in 3.29), we achieve the following bound

$$
\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} f_{\neq-}-S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} f_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \leq \frac{1}{32}\left\|f_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}}^{2}, \quad \forall \tau \in\left[0, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right]
$$

Since the choice of $\delta_{\mathcal{Z}} \sqrt{3.29}$ yields that

$$
\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\delta_{M}^{-1} A^{1 / 3}} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} f_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2} \leq \frac{1}{64}\left\|f_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}}^{2}
$$

we have obtained that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|f_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}+\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}}^{2} \leq & 2 \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} f_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}+\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right)-S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3}} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} f_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2} \\
& +2 \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} A^{1 / 3}} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} f_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2} \\
\leq & \left(\frac{2}{32}+\frac{1}{32}\right)\left\|f_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}}^{2} \leq \frac{1}{e^{2}}\left\|f_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_{G, \Phi}^{M}}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

At this point, we have obtained (3.31). Hence, the enhanced dissipation 2.6 is achieved. This concludes the Step \# 3 .
Step \# 4: Proof of 2.8). Thanks to the definition of the $\mathcal{Z}$-norm (2.5) and the estimate 2.6), we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq}(t)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} & \leq C(M)\left(\Phi^{-2 M} e^{-\delta z \frac{t}{A^{1 / 3}}}\right) \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq \neq}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} e^{-\delta \mathcal{Z} \frac{t}{A^{1 / 3}}} \\
& \leq C\left(M, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1}\right) \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq \|}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} e^{-\delta \mathcal{Z} \frac{t}{A^{1 / 3}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.2. The only remaining task is to prove Lemma 3.2, We collect the proof below.

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Since the result $(3.34)$ is trivially true for $j=0$, we always assume that $j \geq 1$ throughout the proof. According to the commutator relation (B.2d) and the computation rule (3.33), we can rewrite the left hand side of 3.34 in the following fashion,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{A} \int \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y y}\right] \mathfrak{G}_{i 0 k} d V\right| \\
& \quad=\left|\frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{A} \int \mathfrak{H}_{i j k} \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1}\binom{j}{\ell}\left(-2 B^{(j-\ell+1)} \partial_{x} \Gamma_{y}+\partial_{y}^{(j-\ell)}\left(B^{(1)}\right)^{2} \partial_{x x}-B^{(j-\ell+2)} \partial_{x}\right) \mathfrak{G}_{i \ell k} d V\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
=:\left|T_{1}+T_{2}+T_{3}\right|
$$

Here the quantities $B^{(m)}$ are defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
B^{(m)}(t, y):=\int_{0}^{t} \partial_{y}^{m} u(s, y) d s \tag{3.36}
\end{equation*}
$$

With this notation, the $\Gamma$-derivative can be rewritten as $\partial_{y}+B^{(1)} \partial_{x}$.
Let us start by estimating the quantity $\left|T_{1}+T_{2}\right|$. Here we distinguish between the $\ell=j-1$ case and the $0 \leq \ell \leq j-2$ case. In the first case, we expand $\Gamma$ as $\partial_{y}+B^{(1)} \partial_{x}$ and observe the following relation

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(-2 B^{(2)} \partial_{x} \Gamma_{y}+\partial_{y}\left(B^{(1)}\right)^{2} \partial_{x x}\right) \mathfrak{G}_{i(j-1) k} & =-2 B^{(2)}\left(\partial_{x y}+B^{(1)} \partial_{x x}\right) \mathfrak{G}_{i(j-1) k}+2 B^{(2)} B^{(1)} \partial_{x x} \mathfrak{G}_{i(j-1) k} \\
& =-2 B^{(2)} \partial_{x y} \mathfrak{G}_{i(j-1) k}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence we can simplify the $T_{1}+T_{2}$ with the property $\partial_{x} \mathfrak{G}_{i j k}=\mathfrak{G}_{(i+1) j k}$ and integration by parts,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|T_{1}+T_{2}\right| \mathbb{1}_{\ell=j-1}=\left|\frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{A} j \int \mathfrak{H}_{i j k} 2 B^{(2)} \partial_{x} \partial_{y} \mathfrak{G}_{i(j-1) k} d V\right| \\
& =\left|\frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{A} j \int \partial_{y} \mathfrak{H}_{i j k} 2 B^{(2)} \mathfrak{G}_{(i+1)(j-1) k} d V+\frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{A} j \int \mathfrak{H}_{i j k} 2 B^{(3)} \mathfrak{G}_{(i+1)(j-1) k} d V\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

Now applications of the Hölder inequality, the Young's inequality and the definition $\Phi(t)=1+\frac{t^{3}}{A}$ 2.4 yield that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|T_{1}+T_{2}\right| \mathbb{1}_{\ell=j-1} \leq & \frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{12 A}\left\|\partial_{y} \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C G^{2 i+2} \Phi^{2 j-2}\left(\Phi^{2} t^{2}\right)}{A G^{2}}\left\|\mathfrak{G}_{(i+1)(j-1) k}\right\|_{2}^{2}  \tag{3.37}\\
& +\frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{G\left(A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}\right)}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C G^{2 i+2} \Phi^{2 j-2} \Phi^{2}}{G A^{2 / 3}} \frac{\left(A^{2 / 3} t^{2}+t^{4}\right)}{A^{4 / 3}}\left\|\mathfrak{G}_{(i+1)(j-1) k}\right\|_{2}^{2} \\
= & \frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{12 A}\left\|\partial_{y} \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C G^{2 i+2} \Phi^{2 j-2}}{A^{1 / 3} G^{2}} \frac{t^{2} / A^{2 / 3}}{\left(1+t^{3} / A\right)^{2}}\left\|\mathfrak{G}_{(i+1)(j-1) k}\right\|_{2}^{2} \\
& +\frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{G\left(A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}\right)}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C G^{2 i+2} \Phi^{2 j-2}}{G A^{2 / 3}} \frac{\left(t^{2} / A^{2 / 3}+t^{4} / A^{4 / 3}\right)}{\left(1+t^{3} / A\right)^{2}}\left\|\mathfrak{G}_{(i+1)(j-1) k}\right\|_{2}^{2} \\
\leq & \frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{12 A}\left\|\partial_{y} \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{G\left(A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}\right)}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2} \\
& +\left(\frac{C}{A^{1 / 3} G^{2}\left(1+t^{3} / A\right)}+\frac{C}{G\left(A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}\right)}\right) G^{2(i+1)} \Phi^{2(j-1)}\left\|\mathfrak{G}_{(i+1)(j-1) k}\right\|_{2}^{2}
\end{align*}
$$

For the $0 \leq \ell \leq j-2$ case, we estimate the two terms individually. For the $T_{1}$ term, we have that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|T_{1}\right| \mathbb{1}_{0 \leq \ell \leq j-2} & =\left|2 \frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{A} \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-2}\binom{j}{\ell} \int \mathfrak{H}_{i j k} B^{(j-\ell+1)} \partial_{x} \Gamma_{y} \mathfrak{G}_{i \ell k} d V\right|  \tag{3.38}\\
& \leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-2} \frac{C}{A^{2 / 3} G}\left(\frac{\Phi^{j-\ell-1} t}{A^{1 / 3}}\right)\left(G^{i} \Phi^{j}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}\right)\left(G^{i+1} \Phi^{\ell+1}\left\|\mathfrak{G}_{(i+1)(\ell+1) k}\right\|_{2}\right) \\
& \leq \frac{C}{\left(A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}\right) G} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C}{\left(A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}\right) G} \sum_{\substack{i^{\prime}+j^{\prime}+k^{\prime} \leq m \\
j^{\prime} \leq j-1}} G^{2 i^{\prime}} \Phi^{2 j^{\prime}}\left\|\mathfrak{G}_{i^{\prime} j^{\prime} k^{\prime}}\right\|_{2}^{2}
\end{align*}
$$

Next we estimate the $T_{2}$ term as follows

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|T_{2}\right| \mathbb{1}_{0 \leq \ell \leq j-2} & \leq \frac{C}{G^{2} A^{1 / 3}} \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-2}\binom{j}{\ell} \frac{\Phi^{j-\ell} t^{2}}{A^{2 / 3}}\left(G^{i} \Phi^{j}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}\right)\left(G^{i+2} \Phi^{\ell}\left\|\mathfrak{G}_{(i+2) \ell k}\right\|_{2}\right)  \tag{3.39}\\
& \leq \frac{C}{G^{2} A^{1 / 3}} \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-2} \frac{t^{2} / A^{2 / 3}}{\left(1+t^{3} / A\right)^{2}}\left(G^{i} \Phi^{j}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}\right)\left(G^{i+2} \Phi^{\ell}\left\|\mathfrak{G}_{(i+2) \ell k}\right\|_{2}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\leq \frac{C}{A^{1 / 3} G^{2}\left(1+t^{3} / A\right)}\left(G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\sum_{\substack{i^{\prime}+j^{\prime}+k^{\prime} \leq m \\ j^{\prime} \leq j-1}} G^{2 i^{\prime}} \Phi^{2 j^{\prime}}\left\|\mathfrak{G}_{i^{\prime} j^{\prime} k^{\prime}}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right)
$$

The estimate of the $T_{3}$ is as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|T_{3}\right| & \leq C \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1} \frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{A} \int\left|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right|\left|B^{(j-\ell+2)}\right|\left|\mathfrak{G}_{(i+1) \ell k}\right| d V  \tag{3.40}\\
& \leq \frac{C}{A^{2 / 3} G} \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1}\left(G^{i} \Phi^{j}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}\right)\left(\frac{\Phi^{j-\ell} t}{A^{1 / 3}}\right)\left(G^{i+1} \Phi^{\ell}\left\|\mathfrak{G}_{(i+1) \ell k}\right\|_{2}\right) \\
& \leq \frac{C}{\left(A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}\right) G}\left(G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\sum_{\substack{i^{\prime}+j^{\prime}+k^{\prime} \leq m \\
j^{\prime} \leq j^{\prime}-1}} G^{2 i^{\prime}} \Phi^{2 j^{\prime}}\left\|\mathfrak{G}_{i^{\prime} j^{\prime} k^{\prime}}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

Combining (3.37), 3.38, 3.39, and 3.40 yields 3.34.

## 4. Nonlinear Theory

In this section, we develop the nonlinear theory for the system (1.3). We will prove the propositions stated in Section 2.2.

First of all, we observe that to derive the estimates in Proposition 2.3 (or other propositions in Section 2.2), there are two types of quantities to consider, namely, the $x$-average of the unknowns $\langle n\rangle,\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle$, and the remainders of the solutions $n_{\neq}, c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}, d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}$. In Subsection 4.1, we collect the lemmas which provide bounds to the $x$-averages. In Subsections 4.2-4.3. we collect estimates of the remainder. The main goal is to prepare necessary bounds to derive the nonlinear enhanced dissipation. As in the linear case, our general scheme is to fix an arbitrary time $t_{\star}$ on the time horizon, and then derive the following regularity estimate and the decay estimate on the time intervals $\left[t_{\star}, t_{\star}+\delta^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right]$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}+\tau\right] & \leq 2 \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}\right], \quad \forall \tau \in\left[0, \delta^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right] ;  \tag{4.1}\\
\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}+\delta^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right] & \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}\right] . \tag{4.2}
\end{align*}
$$

We recall that the parameter $\delta$ is chosen as $\delta=\delta\left(\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}\right)$ 2.17), and $\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}$ is defined in 2.7. We collect theorems involving (4.1) in Subsection 4.2 and decay estimates associated with (4.2) in Subsection 4.3 . Finally, in Subsection 4.4 we combine results in previous sections to derive Propositions 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3
4.1. The $x$-average Estimates. In this section, we present two lemmas concerning the $x$-average $\langle n\rangle$, $\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle$.

Theorem 4.1. Consider solutions to the system (2.11a), 2.11b) subject to initial conditions $\left(\left\langle n_{\mathrm{in}}\right\rangle,\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}}\right\rangle\right) \in$ $H^{M} \times H^{M+1}, M \geq 3$. There exists a constant $C$ depending only on $M$ and $\left\|\partial_{y} u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M, \infty}}$ such that the following estimates hold for all $t \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{d}{d t}\left(\sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\langle n\rangle(t)\right\|_{L_{y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)  \tag{4.3}\\
& \leq \frac{C}{A}\|\langle n\rangle(t)\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}}^{2}\left(\sup _{\tau \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta]}\right.}\|\langle n\rangle(\tau)\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}}^{2}+\left\|\nabla\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\rangle\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}}^{2}\right) \\
& \quad+\frac{C}{A}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}+t^{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq \|}\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq l}\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

Proof. We recall the equation 2.11a and implement direct energy estimate of the Sobolev norm to derive that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { (4.4) } \frac{d}{d t} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\langle n\rangle\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}= & -\frac{1}{A} \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\nabla \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\langle n\rangle\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+\frac{1}{A} \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M} \int \nabla_{y, z} \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\langle n\rangle \cdot \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}(\langle n\rangle \nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle) d V \\
& +\frac{1}{A} \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M} \int \nabla_{y, z} \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\langle n\rangle \cdot \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\left\langle n_{\neq} \nabla_{y, z} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right\rangle d V \\
= & -\frac{1}{A} \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\nabla \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\langle n\rangle\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+T_{1}+T_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

To estimate $T_{1}$ term in 4.4, we apply the Sobolev product estimate ( $M \geq 2$ ) and the integral estimate (A.1) to obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|T_{1}\right| & \leq \frac{1}{4 A} \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\nabla \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\langle n\rangle\right\|_{L_{y, z}^{2}}^{2}+\frac{C}{A}\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}}^{2}\|\nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}}^{2}  \tag{4.5}\\
& \leq \frac{1}{4 A} \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\nabla \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\langle n\rangle\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C}{A}\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}}^{2}\left(\sup _{\tau \in[0, t]}\|\langle n\rangle(\tau)\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}}^{2}+\left\|\nabla\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\rangle\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}}^{2}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

To estimate the $T_{2}$ term in (4.4), we invoke the product estimate (B.6), and the fact that $\partial_{y}^{j}\langle f\rangle^{x}=\left\langle\Gamma_{y ; t}^{j} f\right\rangle^{x}$ to estimate

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|T_{2}\right| & =\left|\frac{1}{A} \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M} \int \nabla_{y, z} \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\langle n\rangle \cdot\left\langle\Gamma_{y ; t}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\left(n_{\neq} \nabla_{y, z} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right)\right\rangle d V\right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{8 A} \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\nabla \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\langle n\rangle\right\|_{L_{y, z}^{2}}^{2}+\frac{C}{A} \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\left(n_{\neq} \nabla_{y, z} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right)\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{8 A} \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\nabla \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\langle n\rangle\right\|_{L_{y, z}^{2}}^{2}+\frac{C}{A}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} \nabla_{y, z} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq \neq}\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq 1}\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Now we apply the estimate of the gradient B.7 to obtain that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|T_{2}\right| \leq & \frac{1}{4 A} \sum_{|j, k| \leq M}\left\|\nabla \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\langle n\rangle\right\|_{L_{y, z}^{2}}^{2}  \tag{4.6}\\
& +\frac{C}{A}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}+t^{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq \neq}\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

Now combining the decomposition (4.4), and the estimates 4.5, 4.6, we end up with the result 4.3).

To conclude this section, we present a technical lemma involving the double average of the cell density $n$, which will be applied in the alternating construction.

Theorem 4.2. Consider solutions to the system 2.11a, 2.11b) subject to initial conditions $\left(\left\langle n_{\mathrm{in}}\right\rangle,\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}}\right\rangle\right) \in$ $H^{M} \times H^{M+1}, M \geq 3$. Further recall the double average $\langle\langle f\rangle\rangle^{\circ},{ }^{\prime} 1.13$. There exists constant $C$ such that following estimates hold for all $t \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{d}{d t}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}(t)\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}\right)  \tag{4.7}\\
& \leq-\frac{1}{A} \sum_{j=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j+1}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}+\frac{C}{A}\left\|\langle n\rangle^{x}(t)\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}}^{2}\left(\sup _{s \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta]}\right.}\left\|\langle n\rangle^{x}(s)\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{M, z}}^{2}+\left\|\partial_{y}\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\rangle^{x}\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{M, z}}^{2}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

$$
+\frac{C}{A}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}+t^{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)
$$

Similarly,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{d t}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{z}^{k}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, y}(t)\right\|_{L_{z}^{2}}^{2}\right) \\
& \leq \\
& -\frac{1}{A} \sum_{k=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{z}^{k+1}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, y}\right\|_{L_{z}^{2}}^{2}+\frac{C}{A}\left\|\langle n\rangle^{x}(t)\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}}^{2}\left(\sup _{s \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta]}\right.}\left\|\langle n\rangle^{x}(s)\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}}^{2}+\left\|\partial_{z}\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\rangle^{x}\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}}^{2}\right) \\
& \quad+\frac{C}{A}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq 1}\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}+t^{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. We focus on the proof of estimate 4.7. The proof of the other inequality is similar. First, we decompose the solution $n, \mathfrak{C}$ into three parts:

$$
n=\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}+\left(\langle n\rangle^{x}\right)_{\neq}^{z}+n_{\neq}^{x}, \quad \mathfrak{C}=\langle\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\rangle^{x, z}+\left(\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle^{x}\right)_{\neq}^{z}+\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}^{x} .
$$

Next, we take the $x, z$-average of the nonlinearity in the equation 2.11a

$$
\begin{aligned}
\langle\langle\nabla \cdot(n \nabla \mathfrak{C})\rangle\rangle^{x, z} & =\left\langle\nabla_{y, z} \cdot\left\langle n \nabla_{y, z} \mathfrak{C}\right\rangle^{x}\right\rangle^{z}=\partial_{y}\left\langle\left\langle n \partial_{y} \mathfrak{C}\right\rangle\right\rangle^{x, z} \\
& =\partial_{y}\left\langle\left\langle\left[\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}+\left(\langle n\rangle^{x}\right)_{\neq}^{z}+n_{\neq}^{x}\right]\left[\partial_{y}\langle\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\rangle^{x, z}+\partial_{y}\left(\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle^{x}\right)_{\neq}^{z}+\partial_{y} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}^{x}\right]\right\rangle\right\rangle^{x, z} \\
& =\partial_{y}\left(\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z} \partial_{y}\langle\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\rangle^{x, z}\right)+\partial_{y}\left\langle\left(\langle n\rangle^{x}\right)_{\neq}^{z} \partial_{y}\left(\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle^{x}\right)_{\neq}^{z}\right\rangle^{z}+\partial_{y}\left\langle\left\langle n_{\neq}^{x} \partial_{y} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}^{x}\right\rangle\right\rangle^{x, z}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence we end up with the following $\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}$-equation:

$$
\partial_{t}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}=\frac{1}{A} \partial_{y y}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}-\frac{1}{A} \partial_{y}\left(\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z} \partial_{y}\langle\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\rangle^{x, z}\right)-\frac{1}{A} \partial_{y}\left\langle\left(\langle n\rangle^{x}\right)_{\neq}^{z} \partial_{y}\left(\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle^{x}\right)_{\neq}^{z}\right\rangle^{z}-\frac{1}{A} \partial_{y}\left\langle\left\langle n_{\neq}^{x} \partial_{y} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}^{x}\right\rangle\right\rangle^{x, z}
$$

We implement direct energy estimate of the Sobolev norm to derive that

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d}{d t} & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}  \tag{4.8}\\
= & -\frac{1}{A} \sum_{j=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j+1}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}+\frac{1}{A} \sum_{j=0}^{M} \int \partial_{y}^{j+1}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z} \partial_{y}^{j}\left(\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z} \partial_{y}\langle\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\rangle^{x, z}\right) d y \\
& +\frac{1}{A} \sum_{j=0}^{M} \int \partial_{y}^{j+1}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z} \partial_{y}^{j}\left\langle\left(\langle n\rangle^{x}\right)_{\neq}^{z} \partial_{y}\left(\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle^{x}\right)_{\neq}^{z}\right\rangle^{z} d y+\frac{1}{A} \sum_{j=0}^{M} \int \partial_{y}^{j+1}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}\left\langle\left\langle n_{\neq}^{x} \partial_{y} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}^{x}\right\rangle\right\rangle^{x, z} d y \\
= & -\frac{1}{A} \sum_{j=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j+1}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}+T_{1}+T_{2}+T_{3} .
\end{align*}
$$

The estimates for the $T_{1}$ term and $T_{2}$ term are similar to the estimate 4.5. We apply the Hölder inequality, Young's inequality, Sobolev product estimate $(M \geq 2)$, the integral estimate A. 1 and Lemma A. 1 to obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|T_{1}+T_{2}\right| & \leq \frac{1}{4 A} \sum_{j=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j+1}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}+\frac{C}{A}\left\|\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}\right\|_{H_{y}^{M}}^{2}\left\|\partial_{y}\langle\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\rangle^{x, z}\right\|_{H_{y}^{M}}^{2}+\frac{C}{A}\left\|\left(\langle n\rangle^{x}\right)_{\neq}^{z}\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{M, z}}^{2}\left\|\partial_{y}\left(\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle^{x}\right)_{\neq}^{z}\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{M, z}}^{2}  \tag{4.9}\\
& \leq \frac{1}{4 A} \sum_{j=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j+1}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}\right\|_{L_{y}^{2}}^{2}+\frac{C}{A}\left\|\langle n\rangle^{x}\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}}^{2}\left(\sup _{s \in[0, t]}\left\|\langle n\rangle^{x}(s)\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}}^{2}+\left\|\partial_{y}\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}}\right\rangle^{x}\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{M}}^{2}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

The estimate of the $T_{3}$ term in (4.8) is similar to 4.6). We invoke the product estimate B.6), the fact that $\partial_{y}^{j}\langle\langle f\rangle\rangle^{x, z}=\left\langle\left\langle\Gamma_{y ; t}^{j} f\right\rangle\right\rangle^{x, z}$, and the gradient estimate B.7) to estimate

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|T_{3}\right|= & \left|\frac{1}{A} \sum_{j=0}^{M} \int \partial_{y}^{j+1}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}\left\langle\left\langle\Gamma_{y ; t}^{j}\left(n_{\neq}^{x} \partial_{y} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}^{x}\right)\right\rangle\right\rangle^{x, z} d y\right| \leq \frac{1}{8 A} \sum_{j=0}^{M}\left(\left\|\partial_{y}^{j+1}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+C\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{j}\left(n_{\neq}^{x} \partial_{y} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}^{x}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right)  \tag{4.10}\\
& \leq \frac{1}{8 A} \sum_{j=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j+1}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+\frac{C}{A}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} \partial_{y} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right)\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right) \\
\leq & \frac{1}{8 A} \sum_{j=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j+1}\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{x, z}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+\frac{C}{A}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+t^{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right)\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq l}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

Now combining the decomposition (4.8), and the estimates 4.9, 4.10, we end up with the result (4.7).
4.2. The Regularity Estimates of the Remainder. The goal of this subsection is to derive the following theorem which provides the necessary regularity estimates.
Theorem 4.3. Consider the solutions $n_{\neq}\left(t_{r}+\tau\right), c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}(\tau)=\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)-S_{t_{r}}^{t_{r}+\tau} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}, d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}(\tau)=S_{t_{r}}^{t_{r}+\tau} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}$to the equations 2.12 initiated from the reference time $t_{r} \in\left\{0, T_{h}=A^{1 / 3+\zeta / 2}\right\}$. Then the following estimate holds for all $t=t_{r}+\tau \in\left[t_{r}, A^{\frac{1}{3}+\zeta}\right]$,
(4.11) $\frac{d}{d \tau} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{r}+\tau, n_{\neq}, c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}\right]$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\leq & \frac{C}{G A^{1 / 3}}\left(\frac{G}{A^{1 / 6}}+\frac{\Phi\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)}{G}+\frac{A^{1 / 3}}{A^{2 / 3}+\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)^{2}}+\exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{4 A^{1 / 3}} \tau\right\}\right) \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} \\
& +\frac{C_{G}}{A^{1 / 3}} \frac{\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}}{A^{1 / 2} \Phi\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)^{4 M+4}}\left(1+\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+\|\nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) \\
& +\frac{C_{G}}{A^{1 / 3} Q^{2}} \frac{\exp \left\{-\frac{\delta \mathcal{Z}}{A^{1 / 3}} \tau\right\}}{\Phi\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)^{4 M+4}}\left(Q^{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i} \Phi\left(t_{r}\right)^{2 j}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t_{r}}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right)\left(\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Here the constant $C$ only depends on $M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+3, \infty}}$ and $C_{G}$ only depends on $G, M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+3, \infty}}$.
Before presenting the proof of the theorem, we first decompose the time derivative $d \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{r}+\tau\right] / d \tau$ and identify the terms to be estimated. Then we provide several lemmas to provide necessary bounds on these terms. The proofs of these lemmas will be postponed to the end of this subsection. Finally, after all the preparations are ready, the proof of Theorem 4.3 is straightforward.

The time evolution of the functional $\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}(2.13)$ on $t=t_{r}+\tau \in\left[t_{r}, T_{\star}\right] \subset\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]$ has three components:

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d}{d \tau} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}= & \frac{d}{d \tau}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \Phi^{2 j} G^{4+2 i}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t_{r}+\tau}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right)  \tag{4.12}\\
& +\frac{d}{d \tau}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} \Phi^{2 j+2} G^{2 i}\left(A^{2 / 3} \mathbb{1}_{j<M+1}+\mathbb{1}_{j=M+1}\right)\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t_{r}+\tau}^{i j k}\left(\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)-S_{t_{r}}^{t_{r}+\tau} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right) \\
& -\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}} Q^{2}}{2 A^{1 / 3}} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t_{r}}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}} \tau}{2 A^{1 / 3}}\right\}=: \partial F_{1}+\partial F_{2}-\partial F_{3} .
\end{align*}
$$

For the sake of simplicity, we use the notation $\Gamma_{y}$ to represent $\Gamma_{y ; t_{r}+\tau}$ and $\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k}$ to represent $\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t_{r}+\tau}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}$. We begin by considering the $\partial F_{1}$ term in 4.12). The equation for the higher gliding derivatives of $n_{\neq}$can
be expressed as follows with the help of the equation (2.12d),

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \partial_{\tau} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}+u_{A}\left(t_{r}+\tau, y\right) \partial_{x}^{i+1} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} n_{\neq}-\frac{1}{A} \Delta \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq} \\
& \quad=\frac{1}{A}\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{j} n_{\neq}-\frac{1}{A} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k}\left(\nabla \cdot\left(n_{\neq} \nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\right)+\nabla \cdot\left(\langle n\rangle \nabla \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right)+\nabla \cdot\left(n_{\neq} \nabla \mathfrak{C}_{\neq \neq}\right), \quad t=t_{r}+\tau\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

Combining the equation and a direct $L^{2}$-energy estimate yields that

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{2} \partial F_{1} \leq & -\frac{1}{A} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\nabla\left(\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}+\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A} \Phi^{2 j} \int \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k} n_{\neq} d V  \tag{4.13}\\
& +\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A} \Phi^{2 j} \int \nabla \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq} \cdot \partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\left(n \nabla \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}+n_{\neq} \nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\right) d V \\
& -\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A} \Phi^{2 j} \int \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k}\left(n \nabla \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}+n_{\neq} \nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\right) d V \\
= & -\mathfrak{D}_{n}+T_{n ; 1}^{N L ; R}+T_{n ; 2}^{N L ; R}+T_{n ; 3}^{N L ; R}
\end{align*}
$$

Next we recall the definition $c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}(\tau)=\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)-S_{t_{r}}^{t_{r}+\tau} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}\right)$ together with 2.12b), and express the equation satisfied by $\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}$ as follows,

$$
\begin{gathered}
\partial_{\tau} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}+u_{A}\left(t_{r}+\tau, y\right) \Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}-\frac{1}{A} \Delta \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}=\frac{1}{A}\left[\Gamma_{y ; t}^{j}, \partial_{y y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}+\frac{1}{A} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq} \\
\partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{y ; t_{r}}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}(\tau=0)=0, \quad t=t_{r}+\tau
\end{gathered}
$$

Now a direct computation yields an expression for the $\partial F_{2}$ term in 4.12:

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{2} \partial F_{2} \leq & \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left(A^{2 / 3} \mathbb{1}_{j \leq M}+\mathbb{1}_{j=M+1}\right)\left(-\frac{\Phi^{2 j+2} G^{2 i}}{A}\left\|\nabla \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right.  \tag{4.14}\\
& \left.\quad+\frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}}{A} \int \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}} d V+\frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}}{A} \int \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq} d V\right) \\
= & :-\mathfrak{D}_{c}+T_{c ; 1}^{N L ; R}+T_{c ; 2}^{N L ; R}
\end{align*}
$$

We note that the proof of Theorem 4.3 is completed once suitable estimates are provided for the $T_{n ; 1}^{N L ; R}, T_{n ; 2}^{N L ; R}, T_{n ; 3}^{N L ; R}$ terms in 4.13, and the $T_{c ; 1}^{N L ; R}, T_{c ; 2}^{N L ; R}$ terms in 4.14. Next we collect two lemmas that provides bounds for these terms. The proof of these two lemmas will be postponed to the end of this subsection.
Lemma 4.1. [Lemma of $T_{i}^{N L ; R}$ and $T_{i}^{N L ; D}$.] Consider functions $\left\{\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\}_{|i, j, k| \leq M} \subset H^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right)$. The following estimates hold

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A} \Phi^{2 j} \int \nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k} \cdot \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k}\left(n \nabla \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}+n_{\neq} \nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\right) d V\right|  \tag{4.15}\\
& \leq \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{4 A}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C(G)}{A \Phi^{4 M+4}}\left(\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\right)^{2}+\frac{C(G)}{A \Phi^{2 M+4}}\left(\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+\|\nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} \\
& \\
& \quad+\frac{C}{A^{1 / 3} Q^{2}}\left(\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right)\left(Q^{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i} \Phi\left(t_{r}\right)^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t_{r}}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right) \frac{\exp \left\{-\frac{2 \delta_{\mathcal{Z} \tau} \tau}{A^{1 / 3}}\right\}}{\Phi^{4 M+3}} ;  \tag{4.16}\\
& \\
& \left.\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A} \Phi^{2 j} \int \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k}\left(n \nabla \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}+n_{\neq} \nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\right) d V \right\rvert\, \\
& \leq \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{C G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{A^{1 / 3}}\left(\frac{1}{A^{1 / 6}}+\frac{\exp \left\{-\frac{\delta \mathcal{Z}}{\left.A^{1 / 3} \tau\right\}}\right.}{G^{2}}\right)\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C(G)}{A^{5 / 6} \Phi^{4 M+4}}\left(\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\right)^{2}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +\frac{C(G)}{A^{5 / 6} \Phi^{2 M+4}}\left(\|n\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+\|\nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} \\
& +\frac{C(G) \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta z}{A^{1 / 3}} \tau\right\}}{A^{1 / 3} \Phi^{2 M+4}}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i} \Phi\left(t_{r}\right)^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t_{r}}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right)\left(\Phi^{-2 M} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Here $\Phi=\Phi(t)=\Phi\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)$.
Lemma 4.2. Consider functions $\left\{\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\}_{|i, j, k| \leq M+1} \subset H^{1}$. There exists a constant $C$, which depends only on $M,\left\|\partial_{y} u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+2, \infty}}$, such that the following estimates hold

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left(A^{2 / 3} \mathbb{1}_{j \leq M}+\mathbb{1}_{j=M+1}\right) \frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}}{A}\left|\int \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\left[\Gamma_{y ; t}^{j}, \partial_{y y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}} d V\right|  \tag{4.17}\\
& \leq \frac{1}{8 A} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left(A^{2 / 3} \mathbb{1}_{j \leq M}+\mathbb{1}_{j=M+1}\right) G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \\
& +\left(\frac{C \Phi}{G^{2} A^{1 / 3}}+\frac{C}{G\left(A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}\right)}\right) \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left(A^{2 / 3} \mathbb{1}_{j \leq M}+\mathbb{1}_{j=M+1}\right) G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}\left(\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right) ; \\
& \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left(A^{2 / 3} \mathbb{1}_{j \leq M}+\mathbb{1}_{j=M+1}\right) \frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}}{A}\left|\int \mathfrak{H}_{i j k} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq} d V\right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{4 A} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left(A^{2 / 3} \mathbb{1}_{j \leq M}+\mathbb{1}_{j=M+1}\right) G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C \Phi^{2}}{G^{2} A^{1 / 3}} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}
\end{align*}
$$

Here $\Phi=\Phi\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)$.
With these two lemma, we can complete the proof of Theorem 4.3.
Proof of Theorem 4.3. We estimate each term in 4.13 and 4.14. We note that the commutator term $T_{n ; 1}^{N L ; R}$ in 4.13) is estimated in Lemma 3.2 By setting $\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}=\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}$in (4.15), 4.16), we obtain the estimates for the $T_{n ; 2}^{N L ; R}$ and $T_{n ; 3}^{N L ; R}$ terms in 4.13. By setting $\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}=\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}$ in 4.17) and 4.18), we obtain the bounds for $T_{c ; 1}^{N L ; R}, T_{c ; 2}^{N L ; R}$ terms in (4.14. Combining the estimates stated above and recalling the decomposition 4.12, we obtain 4.11.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Proof of 4.15: We decompose the left hand side of 4.15 into four parts:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A} \Phi^{2 j} \int \nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k} \cdot \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k}\left(n \nabla c_{\neq}+n \nabla d_{\neq}+n_{\neq} \nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\right) d V=: T_{1}+T_{2}+T_{3} . \tag{4.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here we drop the $(\cdots)^{t_{r}}$ in the $c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}$ and $d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}$.
We first estimate the $T_{1}, T_{2}$ terms with the product estimate (B.6 as follows

$$
\left|T_{1}\right| \leq C \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{A}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} \nabla c_{\neq}\right\|_{2}\right)\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n\right\|_{2}\right)
$$

Next we recall the estimate (B.7), the fact that $\frac{t^{2}}{A^{2 / 3}} \leq C \Phi^{-2 / 3}\left(2.4\right.$, and the definition of $\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} 2.23$ to derive that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|T_{1}\right| \leq & \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{12 A}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}  \tag{4.20}\\
& +\frac{C(G)}{A \Phi^{4 M+4}}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} c_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\Phi^{-2 / 3} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} A^{2 / 3} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} c_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\times\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\Phi^{2 M}\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) \\
\leq \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{12 A}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C(G)}{A \Phi^{4 M+4}}\left(\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\right)^{2}+\frac{C(G)\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}}{A \Phi^{2 M+4}} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} .
\end{gathered}
$$

Next we consider the $T_{2}$ term in 4.19, which contains the $\nabla d_{\neq}=\nabla S_{t_{r}}^{t_{r}+\tau} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}$. We apply the linear estimate (2.6) (with $G$ chosen large enough), and the gradient estimate (B.7) to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(4.21 \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} \nabla S_{t_{r}}^{t_{r}+\tau} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right\|_{2} \leq\right. & \frac{C}{\left(\Phi\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)\right)^{M}}\left(\frac{1}{\Phi\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{i}\left(\Phi\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)\right)^{j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t_{r}+\tau}^{i j k} S_{t_{r}}^{t_{r}+\tau} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right\|_{2}\right. \\
& \left.+\left(t_{r}+\tau\right) \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{i+1}\left(\Phi\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)\right)^{j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t_{r}+\tau}^{(i+1) j k} S_{t_{r}}^{t_{r}+\tau} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right\|_{2}\right) \\
\leq & C \frac{1+t_{r}+\tau}{\left(\Phi\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)\right)^{M+1}} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{i} \Phi\left(t_{r}\right)^{j}\left\|\Gamma_{y, t_{r}}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}} \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta \mathcal{Z}}{\left.A^{1 / 3} \tau\right\}}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

Here the notation $\Phi(\cdots)$ represents the value of the function $\Phi$ at the given time. This estimate, when combined with the product estimate $(\overline{\mathrm{B} .6}$, and the Hölder, Young inequalities, yields that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|T_{2}\right| \leq & \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{12 A}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}  \tag{4.22}\\
& +\frac{C}{Q^{2} A^{1 / 3}}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) \\
& \times Q^{2}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i} \Phi\left(t_{r}\right)^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t_{r}}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right) \exp \left\{-\frac{2 \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{\left.A^{1 / 3} \tau\right\}} \frac{\left(1+t_{r}+\tau\right)^{2}}{A^{2 / 3}} \Phi^{-4 M-2}\right. \\
\leq & \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{12 A}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2} \\
& +\frac{C(G) \exp \left\{-\frac{2 \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{\left.A^{1 / 3} \tau\right\}}\right.}{A^{1 / 3} Q^{2} \Phi^{4 M+3}}\left(Q^{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i} \Phi\left(t_{r}\right)^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t_{r}}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right)\left(\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

Similar to the estimate of $T_{1}$, we estimate $T_{3}$ term with the product estimate as follows

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|T_{3}\right| & \leq \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}\|\nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\|_{H^{M}}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right\|_{2}\right)  \tag{4.23}\\
& \leq \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{12 A} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C(G)}{A \Phi^{2 M}}\|\nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right) \\
& \leq \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{12 A} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C(G)}{A \Phi^{2 M}}\|\nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} .
\end{align*}
$$

Combining (4.19) and 4.20, 4.22), 4.23), we obtain the estimate 4.15).
Proof of 4.16): Now we estimate the left hand side of 4.16. We decompose it as three terms

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A} \Phi^{2 j} \int \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k}\left(n \nabla c_{\neq}+n \nabla d_{\neq}+n_{\neq} \nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\right) d V=: \sum_{\ell=4}^{6} T_{\ell} . \tag{4.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

The $T_{4}$ term can be estimated with the commutator relation $(\overline{\mathrm{B} .2 \mathrm{c}}$, the regularity estimate $(\bar{B} .7$, and the product estimate B.6 as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|T_{4}\right| & =\left|\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A} \Phi^{2 j} \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1}\binom{j}{\ell} \int \mathfrak{H}_{i j k} B^{(j-\ell+1)} \partial_{x} \Gamma_{y}^{\ell} \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k}\left(n \nabla c_{\neq}\right) d V\right| \\
& \leq \frac{C(G)}{A} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}\left(t_{r}+\tau\right) \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) \ell k}\left(n \nabla c_{\neq}\right)\right\|_{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

To estimate the last factor, we apply the product estimate (B.6) and the fact that $\left\|f_{\neq}\right\|_{2} \leq\left\|\partial_{x} f_{\neq \|}\right\|_{2}$ to derive the following general estimate:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{1}_{|i, j, k| \leq M} \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) \ell k}\left(n \nabla f_{\neq}\right)\right\|_{2} \leq \mathbb{1}_{|i, j, k| \leq M} \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1}\left(\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i \ell k}\left(\partial_{x} n_{\neq} \nabla f_{\neq}\right)\right\|_{2}+\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i \ell k}\left(n \partial_{x} \nabla f_{\neq}\right)\right\|_{2}\right) \\
& \leq C\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M-1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} \partial_{x} n_{\neq}\right\|_{2}\right)\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M-1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} \nabla f_{\neq}\right\|_{2}\right)+C\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M-1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n\right\|_{2}\right)\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M-1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} \partial_{x} \nabla f_{\neq f}\right\|_{2}\right) \\
& \leq C\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right\|_{2}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M-1}}\right)\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M-1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} \nabla f_{\neq}\right\|_{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Now we invoke the gradient estimate $(\bar{B} .7)$ to derive the following

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{1}_{|i, j, k| \leq M} \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) \ell k}\left(n \nabla f_{\neq}\right)\right\|_{2} \leq C\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right\|_{2}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M-1}}\right)\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} f_{\neq}\right\|_{2}\right)(1+t) \tag{4.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining the estimate 4.25, the bound $\left(\frac{1+t}{A^{1 / 3}}\right)^{4} \leq C \Phi^{-2} \quad 2.4$, and the definition of $\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}$ 2.13 yields the bound

$$
\begin{align*}
&\left|T_{4}\right| \leq \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A^{1 / 2}} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+  \tag{4.26}\\
& \frac{C(G)(1+t)^{4}}{A^{3 / 2+2 / 3} \Phi^{4 M+2}}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2} A^{2 / 3}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} c_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right) \\
& \times\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\Phi^{2 M}\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) \\
& \leq \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A^{1 / 2}} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C(G)}{A^{5 / 6} \Phi^{4 M+4}}\left(\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\right)^{2}+\frac{C(G)}{A^{5 / 6} \Phi^{2 M+4}} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2} .
\end{align*}
$$

Now we recall the estimates $4.25 f_{\neq d_{\neq}}$, B.7, the enhanced dissipation 4.21, and obtain the bound

$$
\begin{aligned}
(4.27)\left|T_{5}\right| \leq & \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A^{1 / 3} G^{2}} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2} e^{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{A^{1 / 3}} \tau}+\frac{C(G)(1+t)^{4}}{A^{5 / 3} \Phi^{4 M+2}}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} S_{t_{r}}^{t_{r}+\tau} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right) e^{\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{A^{1 / 3}} \tau} \\
& \times\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\Phi^{2 M}\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) \\
\leq & \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{G^{2} A^{1 / 3}}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta \mathcal{Z}}{\left.A^{1 / 3} \tau\right\}}\right. \\
& +\frac{C(G) \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta \mathcal{Z}}{\left.A^{1 / 3} \tau\right\}}\right.}{Q^{2} A^{1 / 3} \Phi^{2 M+4}}\left(Q^{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i} \Phi\left(t_{r}\right)^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t_{r}}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right)\left(\Phi^{-2 M} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Similar to the estimate of $T_{4}$, we estimate the $T_{6}$ as follows

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|T_{6}\right| & \leq C \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2} \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1}\binom{j}{\ell}\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)\left\|\partial_{x}^{i+1} \Gamma_{y}^{\ell} \partial_{z}^{k}\left(n_{\neq} \nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\right)\right\|_{2}  \tag{4.28}\\
& \leq \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A^{1 / 2}} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C}{A^{3 / 2}}\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)^{2} \Phi^{-2 M}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right)\|\nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2} \\
& \leq \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A^{1 / 2}} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C(G)}{A^{5 / 6} \Phi^{2 M+2}}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right)\|\nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2} .
\end{align*}
$$

Combining (4.26), 4.27, 4.28) and the decomposition (4.24), we obtain the estimate 4.16). This concludes the proof.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Application of the estimates in Lemma 3.2 yield that,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left(A^{2 / 3} \mathbb{1}_{j \leq M}+\mathbb{1}_{j=M+1}\right) \frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}}{A}\left|\int \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\left[\Gamma_{y ; t}^{j}, \partial_{y y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}} d V\right| \\
\leq & \frac{A^{2 / 3}}{8 A} \sum_{\substack{|i, j, k| \leq M+1 \\
j \leq M}} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+\frac{1}{8 A} \Phi^{2 M+4}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{0(M+1) 0}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \\
& +\sum_{|i, j, k| \leq M+1}^{j \leq M} A^{2 / 3}\left(\frac{C \Phi}{G^{2} A^{1 / 3}}+\frac{C}{G\left(A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}\right)}\right) G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}\left(\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{p}}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right) \\
& +\left(\frac{C \Phi}{G^{2} A^{1 / 3}}+\frac{C}{G\left(A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}\right)}\right) \Phi^{2 M+4}\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{0(M+1) 0}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \\
& +\sum_{|i, j, k| \leq M \leq 1}^{j \leq M}\left(\frac{C \Phi}{G^{2} A^{1 / 3}}+\frac{C}{G\left(A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}\right)}\right) G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \\
\leq & \frac{1}{8 A} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left(A^{2 / 3} \mathbb{1}_{j \leq M}+\mathbb{1}_{j=M+1}\right) G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \\
& +\left(\frac{C \Phi}{G^{2} A^{1 / 3}}+\frac{C}{G\left(A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}\right)}\right) \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left(A^{2 / 3} \mathbb{1}_{j \leq M}+\mathbb{1}_{j=M+1}\right) G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}\left(\left\|\mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} c_{\neq \neq}^{t_{r}}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

This is consistent with (4.17).
Now we focus on 4.18). We distinguish between two cases, $j=M+1$ and $j \leq M$. In the first case, we recall the definitions of $\Phi\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)=\left(1+\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)^{3} / A\right)^{-1} \quad$ 2.4) and $\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}$ 2.13), and observe that no $\partial_{x}$ is present $(i=0)$. Hence, the left hand side of 4.18 can be estimated as follows

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\frac{\Phi^{2 M+4}}{A} \int \mathfrak{H}_{0(M+1) 0} \Gamma_{y}^{M+1} n_{\neq} d V\right|=\left|-\frac{\Phi^{2 M+4}}{A} \int\left(\partial_{y}+B^{(1)} \partial_{x}\right) \mathfrak{H}_{0(M+1) 0} \Gamma_{y}^{M} n_{\neq} d V\right|  \tag{4.29}\\
& \leq \frac{\Phi^{2 M+4}}{12 A}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{0(M+1) 0}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C \Phi^{4}}{G^{4} A^{1 / 3}} \frac{\left(t_{r}+\tau\right)^{2}}{A^{2 / 3}}\left(G^{4} \Phi^{2 M}\left\|\Gamma_{y}^{M} n_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right) \leq \frac{\Phi^{2 M+4}}{12 A}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{0(M+1) 0}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C \Phi^{3}}{G^{4} A^{1 / 3}} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}
\end{align*}
$$

In the $j \leq M$ case, we invoke the definitions of $\Phi \sqrt{2.4}, \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} 2.23$, and distinguish between the $i=0$ and $i \neq 0$ cases. As a result, the left hand side of 4.18 is bounded as follows

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} \mathbb{1}_{j<M+1} \frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}}{A^{1 / 3}} \int\left(\mathbb{1}_{i \neq 0} \partial_{x} \mathfrak{H}_{i j k} \partial_{x}^{i-1} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} n_{\neq}+\mathbb{1}_{i=0} \partial_{z} \mathfrak{H}_{i j k} \partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k-1} n_{\neq}\right) d V\right| \tag{4.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\leq & \sum_{\substack{|i, j, k| \leq M+1 \\
j<M+1}} \frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}}{12 A^{1 / 3}}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2} \\
& +\frac{C}{G^{2} A^{1 / 3}} \Phi^{2} \sum_{\substack{|i, j, k| \leq M+1 \\
j<M+1}}\left(G^{4+2(i-1)} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i-1} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} n_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2}+G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k-1} n_{\neq}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right) \\
\leq & \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} \frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}}{12 A} A^{2 / 3} \mathbb{1}_{j<M+1}\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{H}_{i j k}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{C \Phi^{2}}{G^{2} A^{1 / 3}} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Combining 4.29 and 4.30 yields 4.18).
4.3. The Decay Estimates of the Remainder. In this subsection, we fixed an arbitrary time $t_{\star} \in$ $\left[t_{r}, T_{\star}-\delta^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right]$ and estimate the deviation between the solutions to the system (2.12) and the passive scalar solutions $\left(S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau}\left(\Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right), S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau}\left(\Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}\right)\right)$ initiated from time $t_{\star}$ on the time interval $t_{\star}+\tau \in$ $\left[t_{\star}, t_{\star}+\delta^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right] \subset\left[t_{r}, T_{\star}\right]$. To this end, we define the variations and the functional that measures them

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{n}\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right) & :=\Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}+\tau}^{i j k} n_{\neq}-S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau}\left(\Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}\right)\right)  \tag{4.31}\\
\mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{c}\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right) & :=\Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}+\tau}^{i j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}-S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau}\left(\Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}\left(t_{\star}-t_{r}\right)\right) ;  \tag{4.32}\\
\mathbb{D}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}+\tau\right] & :=\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{n}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i}\left(A^{2 / 3} \mathbb{1}_{j \leq M}+\mathbb{1}_{j=M+1}\right) \Phi^{2 j+2}\left\|\mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{c}\right\|_{2}^{2} . \tag{4.33}
\end{align*}
$$

Here the parameter $\tau$ is the time increment from $t_{\star}\left(\right.$ instead of $\left.t_{r}\right)$. Since the argument in the function $c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}$ is the time increment from the reference time $t_{r}$, we have to write $c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}\left(t_{\star}-t_{r}\right)$ when invoking the function value at time $t_{\star}$. To estimate the quantity $\mathbb{D}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} 4.33$, we write down the equations of the variations $\mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{n}$ 4.31), $\mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{c}$ 4.32):

$$
\begin{align*}
& \partial_{\tau} \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{n}+u_{A}\left(t_{\star}+\tau, y\right) \partial_{x} \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{n}-\frac{1}{A} \Delta \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{n}=\frac{1}{A}\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k} n_{\neq}-\frac{1}{A} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k}(\nabla \cdot(n \nabla \mathfrak{C}))_{\neq},  \tag{4.34a}\\
& \partial_{\tau} \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{c}+u_{A}\left(t_{\star}+\tau, y\right) \partial_{x} \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{c}-\frac{1}{A} \Delta \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{c}=\frac{1}{A}\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k} c_{\neq}+\frac{1}{A} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}  \tag{4.34b}\\
& \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{n}(\tau=0)=\mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{c}(\tau=0)=0, \quad\left[t_{\star}, t_{\star}+\tau\right] \subset\left[t_{\star}, t_{\star}+\delta^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right]
\end{align*}
$$

Here $\delta$ is defined in 2.17) and the current time is $t=t_{\star}+\tau$. The estimate of the functional $\mathbb{D}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}$ is collected in the next theorem.

Theorem 4.4. There exist constants $C$ and $C_{G}$ such that the following estimate holds

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d}{d \tau} & \mathbb{D}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}+\tau, \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{n}, \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{c}\right]  \tag{4.35}\\
\leq & \frac{C}{G}\left(\frac{\Phi}{G A^{1 / 3}}+\frac{G}{A^{1 / 2}}+\frac{1}{A^{2 / 3}+\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)^{2}}+\frac{1}{A^{1 / 3}} \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{4 A^{1 / 3}}\left(t_{\star}+\tau-t_{r}\right)\right\}\right) \mathbb{D}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} \\
& +\frac{C}{G}\left(\frac{\Phi}{G A^{1 / 3}}+\frac{1}{A^{2 / 3}+\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)^{2}}\right) \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} \\
& +\frac{C_{G}}{A^{1 / 3}} \frac{\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}}{A^{1 / 2} \Phi^{4 M+4}}\left(1+\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+\|\nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) \\
& +\frac{C_{G}}{A^{1 / 3}} \frac{\exp \left\{-\frac{\delta \mathcal{Z}}{A^{1 / 3}}\left(t_{\star}+\tau-t_{r}\right)\right\}}{\Phi^{4 M+4}}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i} \Phi\left(t_{r}\right)^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t_{r}}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right)\left(\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

Here $\Phi=\Phi\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right), \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}=\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}+\tau\right], \mathbb{D}_{G, Q}^{t_{t} ; M}=\mathbb{D}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}+\tau\right]$. Here the constant $C$ only depends on $M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+3, \infty}}$ and $C_{G}$ only depends on $G, M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+3, \infty}}$.

Proof. We first decompose the time evolution as follows

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d}{d \tau} \mathbb{D}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} & =\frac{d}{d \tau}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \Phi^{2 j} G^{4+2 i}\left\|\mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{n}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} \Phi^{2 j+2} G^{2 i}\left(A^{2 / 3} \mathbb{1}_{j<M+1}+\mathbb{1}_{j=M+1}\right)\left\|\mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{c}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right)  \tag{4.36}\\
& =: \partial D_{1}+\partial D_{2}
\end{align*}
$$

Application of the $\mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{n}$-equation 4.34a yields that the $\partial D_{1}$ term in 4.36 can be decomposed as follows

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{2} \partial D_{1} \leq & -\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{A}\left\|\nabla \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{n}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A} \Phi^{2 j} \int \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{n}\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k} n_{\neq} d V  \tag{4.37}\\
& +\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A} \Phi^{2 j} \int \nabla \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{n} \cdot \partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\left(n \nabla \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}+n_{\neq} \nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\right) d V \\
& -\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i}}{A} \Phi^{2 j} \int \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{n}\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k}\left(n \nabla \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}+n_{\neq} \nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\right) d V \\
= & -\mathfrak{D}_{\mathbb{V}^{n}}+T_{n ; 1}^{N L ; D}+T_{n ; 2}^{N L ; D}+T_{n ; 3}^{N L ; D}
\end{align*}
$$

Similarly, the $\partial D_{2}$-term in 4.36 can be decomposed with the equation 4.34b as follows

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{2} \partial D_{2} \leq & \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left(A^{2 / 3} \mathbb{1}_{j<M+1}+\mathbb{1}_{j=M+1}\right)\left(-\frac{\Phi^{2 j+2} G^{2 i}}{A}\left\|\nabla \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{c}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right.  \tag{4.38}\\
& \left.+\frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}}{A} \int \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{c}\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k} c_{\neq} d V+\frac{G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}}{A} \int \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{c} \partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} n_{\neq} d V\right) \\
= & -\mathfrak{D}_{\mathbb{V}^{c}}+T_{c ; 1}^{N L ; D}+T_{c ; 2}^{N L ; D} .
\end{align*}
$$

First of all, we invoke Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 4.2 to show that the commutator terms $T_{n ; 1}^{N L ; D}$ in 4.37 and $T_{c ; 1}^{N L ; D}$ in 4.38) are bounded as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|T_{n ; 1}^{N L ; D}\right|+\left|T_{c ; 1}^{N L ; D}\right| \leq \frac{1}{8} \mathfrak{D}_{\mathbb{V}^{n}}+\frac{1}{8} \mathfrak{D}_{\mathbb{V}^{c}}+\left(\frac{\Phi}{G A^{1 / 3}}+\frac{1}{A^{2 / 3}+\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)^{2}}\right)\left(\mathbb{D}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}+\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\right) \tag{4.39}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now application of Lemma 4.1 yields that the $T_{n ; 2}^{N L ; D}+T_{n ; 3}^{N L ; D}$ terms are bounded as follows
(4.40) $\left|T_{n ; 2}^{N L ; D}+T_{n ; 3}^{N L ; D}\right|$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\leq & \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{4 A}\left\|\nabla \mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{n}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \frac{C G^{4+2 i} \Phi^{2 j}}{A^{1 / 3}}\left(\frac{1}{A^{1 / 6}}+\frac{\exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{z}}{A^{1 / 3}}\left(t_{\star}+\tau-t_{r}\right)\right\}}{G^{2}}\right)\left\|\mathbb{V}_{i j k}^{n}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \\
& +\frac{C(G)}{A^{5 / 6} \Phi^{4 M+4}}\left(\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\right)^{2}+\frac{C(G)}{A^{5 / 6} \Phi^{2 M+4}}\left(\|n\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+\|\nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} \\
& +\frac{C(G) \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta z}{A^{1 / 3}}\left(t_{\star}+\tau-t_{r}\right)\right\}}{A^{1 / 3} \Phi^{4 M+4}}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i} \Phi\left(t_{r}\right)^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t_{r}}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right)\left(\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

This is consistent with the estimate 4.35).
Application of Lemma 4.2 yields that the $\left|T_{c ; 2}^{N L ; D}\right|$ is bounded as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|T_{c ; 2}^{N L ; D}\right| \leq \frac{1}{4} \mathfrak{D}_{\mathbb{V} c}+\frac{C \Phi^{2}}{G^{2} A^{1 / 3}} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} \tag{4.41}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining the decomposition (4.37, (4.38) and the estimates 4.39, 4.40, 4.41, we obtain 4.35).
4.4. Conclusion. In this section, we prove Proposition 2.3. Proposition 2.2, and Proposition 2.1. We start with the proof of Proposition 2.3 .

Proof of Proposition 2.3. First of all, we specify the reference time $t_{r}=0$. To prove the proposition, we use a bootstrap argument. Assume that $\left[0, T_{\star}\right] \subset\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]$ is the largest interval on which the following hypotheses hold:

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{t} ; M}\left[t, n_{\neq}, \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right] & \leq 2 C_{E D} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{t} ; M}\left[0, n_{\neq}, \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right] \exp \left\{-\frac{2 \delta t}{A^{1 / 3}}\right\}, \quad \forall t \in\left[0, T_{\star}\right],  \tag{4.42a}\\
\|\langle n\rangle\|_{L_{t}^{\infty}\left(\left[0, T_{\star}\right] ; H_{y, z}^{M}\right)} & \leq 2 \mathcal{B}_{\langle n\rangle ; H^{M}}, \quad\|\nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\|_{L_{t}^{\infty}\left(\left[0, T_{\star}\right] ; H_{y, z}^{M}\right)} \leq 2 \mathcal{B}_{\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle ; H^{M+1}} . \tag{4.42b}
\end{align*}
$$

Here,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{B}_{\langle n\rangle ; H^{M}}:=2\left\|\left\langle n_{\text {in }}\right\rangle\right\|_{H^{M}}+2, \quad \mathcal{B}_{\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle ; H^{M+1}}:=A^{-1 / 5}+2\left\|\nabla\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\rangle\right\|_{H^{M}} \tag{4.43}
\end{equation*}
$$

The parameter $\delta$ is chosen in 2.17. By the local well-posedness of the equation 2.9) in $H^{M}, M \geq 3$ (Theorem 2.3), we have that the interval $\left[0, T_{\star}\right]$ is non-empty. The goal is to prove that given the assumption (2.21) and the hypotheses 4.42a, 4.42b, the following stronger estimates hold
$\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t, n_{\neq}, \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right] \leq C_{E D} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[0, n_{\neq}, \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right] \exp \left\{-\frac{2 \delta t}{A^{1 / 3}}\right\} \leq C\left(\| n_{\left.\mathrm{in} ; \neq \|_{H^{M}}+1\right) \exp \left\{-\frac{2 \delta t}{A^{1 / 3}}\right\}, \quad \forall t \in\left[0, T_{\star}\right], ~}^{\text {, }}\right.$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|\langle n\rangle\|_{L_{t}^{\infty}\left(\left[0, T_{\star}\right] ; H_{y, z}^{M}\right)} \leq \mathcal{B}_{\langle n\rangle ; H^{M}}, \quad\|\nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\|_{L_{t}^{\infty}\left(\left[0, T_{\star}\right] ; H_{y, z}^{M}\right)} \leq \mathcal{B}_{\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle ; H^{M+1}} \tag{4.44b}
\end{equation*}
$$

As a consequence of this bootstrap argument and Theorem 2.3 , the estimates 2.22a), 2.22b, 2.22c) hold on the time horizon $\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]$.

First we prove the enhanced dissipation estimate 4.44a. We choose an arbitrary starting time $t_{\star} \in$ $\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]$ and consider a time interval $t=t_{\star}+\tau \in\left[t_{\star}, t_{\star}+\delta^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right] \subset\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]$. It is enough to derive the regularity estimate 4.1 and the decay estimate 4.2.

To prove the regularity estimate 4.1), we invoke Theorem 4.3. Combining the bootstrap hypothesis (4.42a), 4.42b), we refine the estimate 4.11) as follows

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{d}{d t} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}[t]  \tag{4.45}\\
& \leq \frac{C}{G A^{1 / 3}}\left(\frac{\Phi(t)}{G}+\frac{G}{A^{1 / 6}}+\frac{A^{1 / 3}}{A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}}+\exp \left\{-\frac{\delta \mathcal{Z}}{4 A^{1 / 3}} t\right\}\right) \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{;} ; M} \\
& \quad+\frac{C_{G}}{A^{1 / 3}} \frac{\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}}{A^{1 / 2} \Phi^{4 M+4}}\left(1+C_{E D} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}[0]+\mathcal{B}_{\langle n\rangle ; H^{M}}^{2}+\mathcal{B}_{\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle ; H^{M+1}}^{2}\right) \\
& \quad+\frac{C_{G}}{Q^{2} A^{1 / 3}} \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta \mathcal{Z}}{4 A^{1 / 3}} t\right\} \underbrace{}_{\leq \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}[t],} \underbrace{\left(Q^{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; 0}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\text {in } ; \neq \neq}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{2 A^{1 / 3}} t\right\}\right)}\left(C_{E D} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{F} ; M}[0]+\mathcal{B}_{\langle n\rangle ; H^{M}}^{2}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

Note that the choice of $\zeta(1.9)$ guarantees that $\left.\frac{1}{A^{1 / 2} \Phi^{4 M+4}}\right|_{t \leq A^{1 / 3+\zeta}} \leq \frac{1}{A^{1 / 4}}$. We take the parameters $A$ and $Q$ large enough such that the following estimate holds

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d}{d t} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}[t] \leq \frac{C}{G A^{1 / 3}}\left(\Phi(t)+\frac{A^{1 / 3}}{A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}}+\exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{4 A^{1 / 3}} t\right\}+\frac{1}{A^{1 / 6}}\right) \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}[t] \tag{4.46}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we have that if $G$ is chosen larger than a constant depending only on $M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+3, \infty}}, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1}$, the following inequalities hold

$$
(4.47) \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}+\tau\right] \leq 2 \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}\right], \quad \forall \tau \in\left[0, \delta^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right] ; \quad \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}[t] \leq 2 \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}[0], \quad \forall t \in\left[0, T_{\star}\right) \subset\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]
$$

These are the regularity estimates that we are after.

Next we derive the decay estimate (4.2). To this end we apply Theorem 4.4. We observe that the functional $\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}$ can be decomposed as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}+\tau\right] \leq & 2 \mathbb{D}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}+\tau\right]+\left(2 \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i+4} \Phi\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)^{2 j}\left\|S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau}\left(\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} n_{\neq}\left(t_{\star}\right)\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}\right.  \tag{4.48}\\
& +2 \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left(A^{2 / 3} \mathbb{1}_{j<M+1}+\mathbb{1}_{j=M+1}\right) G^{2 i} \Phi\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)^{2 j+2}\left\|S_{t_{\star}}^{t_{\star}+\tau}\left(\Gamma_{y ; t_{\star}}^{i j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}\left(t_{\star}-t_{r}\right)\right)\right\|_{2}^{2} \\
& \left.+Q^{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t_{r}}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} \mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq \neq}\right\|_{2}^{2} \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{2 A^{1 / 3}} \tau\right\}\right)=: 2 \mathbb{D}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}+\tau\right]+\mathcal{R}\left[t_{\star}+\tau\right]
\end{align*}
$$

Here we recall that the reference time is $t_{r}=0$. We note that thanks to the $L^{2}$-enhanced dissipation estimate (1.8), as long as we set $\tau=\delta^{-1} A^{1 / 3}$, with $\delta \in\left(0, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}\right)$ chosen small enough 2.17), we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{R}\left[t_{\star}+\delta^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right] \leq \frac{1}{16} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}\right] \tag{4.49}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence it is enough to estimate the $\mathbb{D}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}+\tau\right]$-term in 4.48). To this end, we recall the estimate 4.35) from Theorem 4.4 Since the main portion of the terms in 4.35 and 4.45 are similar, we choose the parameters as in (4.46) and apply the regularity estimate 4.47) to refine the estimate as follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{d \tau} \mathbb{D}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}+\tau\right] \\
& \leq \frac{C}{G A^{1 / 3}}\left(\Phi+\frac{G}{A^{1 / 6}}+\frac{A^{1 / 3}}{A^{2 / 3}+\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)^{2}}+\exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{4 A^{1 / 3}}\left(t_{\star}+\tau-t_{r}\right)\right\}\right)\left(\mathbb{D}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}+\tau\right]+\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}\right]\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Now we observe that as long as $G=G\left(M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+3, \infty}}, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1}\right)$ and $A$ are chosen large enough, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathbb{D}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}+\delta^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right]  \tag{4.50}\\
& \leq \int_{0}^{\delta^{-1} A^{1 / 3}} \exp \left\{\frac{C}{G} \int_{s}^{\delta^{-1} A^{1 / 3}}\left(\frac{\Phi\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)}{A^{1 / 3}}+\frac{G}{A^{1 / 2}}+\frac{1}{A^{2 / 3}+\left(t_{\star}+\tau\right)^{2}}+\frac{1}{A^{1 / 3}} \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{4 A^{1 / 3}}\left(t_{\star}+\tau-t_{r}\right)\right\}\right) d \tau\right\} \\
& \quad \times \frac{C}{G A^{1 / 3}}\left(\Phi\left(t_{\star}+s\right)+\frac{G}{A^{1 / 6}}+\frac{A^{1 / 3}}{A^{2 / 3}+\left(t_{\star}+s\right)^{2}}+\exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{4 A^{1 / 3}}\left(t_{\star}+s-t_{r}\right)\right\}\right) d s \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}\right] \\
& \leq \frac{1}{16} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}\right] .
\end{align*}
$$

Combining 4.48, 4.49 and 4.50, we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}+\delta^{-1} A^{1 / 3}\right] \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\left[t_{\star}\right] \tag{4.51}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining 4.47) and 4.51, an argument as in (3.32) yields 4.44a).
To conclude the proof of 4.44a), we further choose the $\epsilon 2.20$ to be small enough compared to $Q$ and recall that $G=G\left(M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+3, \infty}}, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1}\right)$ to obtain

$$
\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}[0]=\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{4+2 i}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} n_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+Q^{2} \epsilon^{2} \leq C\left(M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M+3, \infty}}, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1}\right)\left(\left\|n_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq}\right\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+1\right)
$$

We conclude the proof by proving the estimates 4.44b. Recall the main conclusions from Theorem 4.1,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d t}\left(\sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\langle n\rangle(t)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right) \leq & \frac{C}{A}\|\langle n\rangle(t)\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\left(\sup _{s \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta]}\right.}\|\langle n\rangle(s)\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+\left\|\nabla\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}}\right\rangle\right\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) \\
& +\frac{C}{A}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+t^{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right)\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} n_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Now we decompose the chemical density into two parts, i.e., $\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}(t)=c_{\neq}(t)+d_{\neq}(t), \quad d_{\neq}(t)=S_{0}^{t} \mathfrak{C}_{\text {in } ; \neq}$. Then we recall the definition of the functional $\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} 2.13$ and estimate the above expression using the fact that $t^{2} \leq C \Phi^{-1} A^{2 / 3}$ as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{d}{d t}\left(\sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\langle n\rangle(t)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right)  \tag{4.52}\\
& \leq \frac{C}{A}\|\langle n\rangle(t)\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\left(\sup _{s \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta]}\right.}\|\langle n\rangle(s)\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+\left\|\nabla\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\rangle\right\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) \\
&+\frac{C}{A \Phi^{4 M+4}}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j+2}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} A^{2 / 3} G^{2 i+2} \Phi^{2 j+2}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right) \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} \\
&+\frac{C}{A \Phi^{4 M+2}}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} d_{\neq \neq}^{t_{r} r}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+t^{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} d_{\neq \neq}^{t_{r}}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right) \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} \\
& \leq \frac{C}{A}\|\langle n\rangle(t)\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\left(\sup _{s \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta]}\right.}\|\langle n\rangle(s)\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+\left\|\nabla\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\rangle\right\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right)+\frac{C}{A \Phi^{4 M+4}}\left(\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\right)^{2} \\
&+\frac{C}{A \Phi^{4 M+2}}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+t^{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right) \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}
\end{align*}
$$

Now we apply the linear enhanced dissipation estimate (2.6) (given that $G$ is large enough), the smallness assumption 2.20 and the bootstrap assumptions 4.42a, 4.42b to obtain that

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d}{d t}\left(\sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}\langle n\rangle(t)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right) \leq & \frac{C}{A} \mathcal{B}_{\langle n\rangle ; H^{M}}^{2}\left(\mathcal{B}_{\langle n\rangle ; H^{M}}^{2}+\left\|\nabla \mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq \neq}\right\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right)+\frac{C\left(\mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}\right)^{2}}{A \Phi^{4 M+4}}  \tag{4.53}\\
& +\frac{C}{A^{1 / 3} \Phi^{4 M+3}}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; 0}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq \neq}\right\|_{2}^{2} \exp \left\{-\delta_{\mathcal{Z}} \frac{t}{A^{1 / 3}}\right\}\right) \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M} \\
\leq & A^{-2 / 3}+\frac{C\left(G, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1}\right) C_{E D}}{A^{1 / 3}} \epsilon^{2} \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{2 A^{1 / 3}} t\right\} \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}[0]
\end{align*}
$$

Here in the last line, we have invoked the facts that $M \leq \mathbb{M},\left\|\Phi^{-1}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty}\left(0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta)}\right.} \leq C A^{3 \zeta}$, and $12 \zeta(M+2) \leq$ $\frac{1}{9}$ (1.9). Then we choose the $A$ to be large compared to the bootstrap bounds in 4.42a, 4.42b and $\| \nabla \mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq \|_{H^{M}}}$ to achieve the bound in 4.53). Next we take the $A^{-1}$ and $\epsilon$ small enough compared to the bootstrap bounds $C_{E D}, \mathbb{F}_{G, Q}^{t_{r} ; M}[0]$ and other constants appeared in 4.53 , and integrate this differential inequality directly to obtain that

$$
\sup _{t \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta]}\right.}\|\langle n(t)\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2} \leq 2\left\|\left\langle n_{\text {in }}\right\rangle\right\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+1
$$

Since we choose the $\mathcal{B}_{\langle n\rangle ; H^{M}}=2\left\|\left\langle n_{\text {in }}\right\rangle\right\|_{H^{M}}+2$ in 4.43), the first bootstrap conclusion in 4.44b) follows.

The second bootstrap conclusion in 4.44 b is a direct consequence of the bootstrap hypothesis 4.42b, the length of the time interval $\left(0 \leq t \leq T_{\star} \leq A^{1 / 3+\zeta} \leq A^{1 / 2}\right)$ and the estimate A.2)

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} \nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle(t)\right\|_{2}^{2}  \tag{4.54}\\
& \quad \leq 2 \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\exp \left\{\frac{t}{A} \Delta_{\mathbb{T}^{2}}\right\} \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} \nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle(0)\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{2}{A^{2}} \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\int_{0}^{t} \nabla \exp \left\{\frac{t-s}{A} \Delta_{\mathbb{T}^{2}}\right\} \partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}(\langle n\rangle(s)-\bar{n}) d s\right\|_{2}^{2} \\
& \quad \leq 2 \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} \nabla\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\rangle\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{2}{A^{2}} \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left(\int_{0}^{t}\left\|\nabla \exp \left\{\frac{t-s}{A} \Delta_{\mathbb{T}^{2}}\right\}\right\|_{L^{2} \rightarrow L^{2}} \sup _{s \in\left[0, T_{\star}\right)}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}(\langle n\rangle(s)-\bar{n})\right\|_{2} d s\right)^{2} \\
& \quad \leq 2 \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} \nabla\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\rangle\right\|_{2}^{2}+C \mathcal{B}_{\langle n\rangle ; H^{M}}^{2}\left(\frac{1}{A} \int_{0}^{t}\left(\frac{t-s}{A}\right)^{-1 / 2} d s\right)^{2} \\
& \quad \leq 2 \sum_{|j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} \nabla\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\rangle\right\|_{2}^{2}+C \mathcal{B}_{\langle n\rangle ; H^{M}}^{2}\left(\frac{t}{A}\right) \leq 2\left\|\nabla\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\rangle\right\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+\frac{C \mathcal{B}_{\langle n\rangle ; H^{M}}^{2}}{A^{1 / 2}} .
\end{align*}
$$

Hence by taking $A$ large enough, we have obtained the second bound in 4.44b).

Proof of Proposition 2.2. The proof of the proposition is similar to the proof of Proposition 2.3 . Hence we only highlight the main differences here.

First of all, we set the reference time $t_{r}=T_{h}=A^{1 / 3+\zeta / 2}$ and consider the functional $\mathbb{L}_{G}^{M}:=\mathbb{F}_{G, A^{1 / 4}}^{T_{h} ; M}$. Another adjustment in the proof is that the $c_{\neq}^{t_{r}}$ and $d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}$ are redefined with $t_{r}$ being $T_{h}=A^{1 / 3+\zeta / 2}$. Since we assume $M \leq \mathbb{M}$, the choice of $\zeta(1.9$ yields the following

$$
12 \zeta(2+M) \leq \frac{1}{9}
$$

This estimate, together with the "gluing" condition 2.18), yields that $\mathbb{L}_{G}^{M}\left[T_{h}\right] \leq C\left(\mathcal{B}_{1}\right)$. Now we apply the estimate 4.11 to obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d \tau} & \mathbb{L}_{G}^{M}\left[T_{h}+\tau\right] \\
\leq & \frac{C}{G A^{1 / 3}}\left(\frac{\Phi\left(T_{h}+\tau\right)}{G}+\frac{G}{A^{1 / 2}}+\frac{A^{1 / 3}}{A^{2 / 3}+\left(T_{h}+\tau\right)^{2}}+\exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{4 A^{1 / 3}} \tau\right\}\right) \mathbb{L}_{G}^{M} \\
& +\frac{C(G)}{A^{1 / 3}} \frac{\mathbb{L}_{G}^{M}}{A^{1 / 2} \Phi^{4 M+4}}\left(1+\mathbb{L}_{G}^{M}+\mathcal{B}_{\langle n\rangle^{x} ; H^{M}}^{2}+\mathcal{B}_{\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle^{x} ; H^{M+1}}^{2}\right) \\
& +\frac{C(G)}{A^{5 / 6}} \frac{\exp \left\{-\frac{\delta \mathcal{Z}}{A^{1 / 3}} \tau\right\}}{\Phi^{4 M+4}}\left(A^{1 / 2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; T_{h}}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(T_{h}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right)\left(\mathbb{L}_{G}^{M}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) \\
\leq & \frac{C}{G A^{1 / 3}}\left(\frac{\Phi\left(T_{h}+\tau\right)}{G}+\frac{G}{A^{1 / 6}}+\frac{A^{1 / 3}}{A^{2 / 3}+\left(T_{h}+\tau\right)^{2}}+\exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{\left.\left.4 A^{1 / 3} \tau\right\}\right) \mathbb{L}_{G}^{M}}\right.\right. \\
& +\frac{C(G)}{A^{1 / 2}} \mathbb{L}_{G}^{M}\left(1+\mathbb{L}_{G}^{M}+\mathcal{B}_{\langle n\rangle ; H^{M}}^{2}+\mathcal{B}_{\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle ; H^{M+1}}^{2}\right)+\frac{1}{A^{1 / 2}} \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{4 A^{1 / 3}} \tau\right\} \mathbb{L}_{G}^{M}\left(\mathbb{L}_{G}^{M}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Now a similar argument as the one in the previous proof of Proposition 2.3 yields the regularity bound. The estimate 4.51 can be derived in a similar fashion as before. When one derive the estimate for $\langle n\rangle$, the $d_{\neq}^{t_{r}=T_{h}}$ - contribution in 4.52 needs to be estimated differently. Combining the "gluing" condition 2.18),
the definition $d_{\neq}^{T_{h}}(\tau)=S_{T_{h}}^{T_{h}+\tau}\left[\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(T_{h}\right)\right]$, and the linear enhanced dissipation (2.6) yields that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{C}{A \Phi^{4 M+2}}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+t^{2} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} G^{2 i} \Phi^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right) \mathbb{L}_{G}^{M} \\
& \leq \frac{C A^{3 \zeta(4 M+2)}}{A^{1 / 3}} \frac{1+\left(T_{h}+\tau\right)^{2}}{A^{2 / 3}} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i} \Phi\left(T_{h}+\tau\right)^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; T_{h}+\tau}^{i j k} S_{T_{h}}^{T_{h}+\tau}\left[\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(T_{h}\right)\right]\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \mathbb{L}_{G}^{M} \\
& \leq C \frac{A^{3 \zeta(4 M+3)}}{A^{1 / 3}} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} G^{2 i} \Phi\left(T_{h}\right)^{2 j}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; T_{h}}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(T_{h}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{A^{1 / 3}} \tau\right\} \mathbb{L}_{G}^{M} \\
& \leq \frac{C(G) A^{3 \zeta(4 M+5)}}{A}\left(A^{2 / 3} \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1} \Phi\left(T_{h}\right)^{2 j+2}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; T_{h}}^{i j k} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(T_{h}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right) \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{A^{1 / 3}} \tau\right\} \mathbb{L}_{G}^{M} \\
& \quad \leq \frac{\mathcal{B}_{1}^{2}}{A^{2 / 3}} \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{A^{1 / 3}} \tau\right\} \mathbb{L}_{G}^{M} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Here in the last line, we have used the choice of $\zeta 1.9$ and $M \leq \mathbb{M}$. Hence, by picking $A$ large enough, we observe that the time integral contribution from the $d_{\neq}^{t_{r}}(\tau)=S_{t_{r}}^{t_{r}+\tau} \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}\left(t_{r}\right)$ is small. The other arguments are similar and we omit the details.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Here we observe that $t_{r}=0, t=0+\tau \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]$, and $\left\|\Phi^{-4 M-4}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty}\left(0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta)}\right.} \leq$ $C A^{12 \zeta(M+1)} \leq C A^{1 / 9} 1.9$. Combining the estimates 4.11, 4.52, and 4.53), we have that

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d}{d t}\left(\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+\mathbb{H}_{G}^{M}\right) \leq & \frac{C_{1}}{A}\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\left(\sup _{s \in[0, t]}\|\langle n\rangle(s)\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+\left\|\nabla\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}}\right\rangle\right\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right)  \tag{4.55}\\
& +\frac{C_{2}}{G A^{1 / 3}}\left(\frac{\Phi}{G}+\frac{G}{A^{1 / 6}}+\frac{A^{1 / 3}}{A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}}+\exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{4 A^{1 / 3}} t\right\}\right) \mathbb{H}_{G}^{M}+\frac{C_{3}(G)}{A^{5 / 6}} \frac{\left(\mathbb{H}_{G}^{M}\right)^{2}}{\Phi^{4 M+4}} \\
& +\frac{C_{4}(G)}{A^{1 / 3}} \frac{\mathbb{H}_{G}^{M}}{A^{1 / 2} \Phi^{4 M+4}}\left(1+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+\sup _{s \in[0, t]}\|\langle n\rangle(s)\|_{H^{M}}^{2}+\left\|\nabla\left\langle\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}}\right\rangle\right\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) \\
& +\frac{C_{5}\left(\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1}, G\right)}{A^{1 / 3}} \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta \mathcal{Z}}{2 A^{1 / 3}} t\right\}\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq \neq}\right\|_{H^{M+1}}^{2}\left(\mathbb{H}_{G}^{M}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

Here in the last estimate, we employ the chemical gradient $\nabla\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle$ estimate A.1). To prove the boundedness of the solution on $\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]$, we apply a bootstrap argument. Assume that $[0, T) \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]$ is the largest time interval such that the following estimate holds

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{H}_{G}^{M}[t]+\|\langle n\rangle(t)\|_{H^{M}}^{2} \leq 2\left(1+\mathbb{H}_{G}^{M}[0]+\left\|\left\langle n_{\mathrm{in}}\right\rangle\right\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) \exp \left\{1+\frac{2 C_{5}\left(\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1}, G\right)}{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}} \| \mathfrak{C}_{\left.\mathrm{in} ; \neq \neq \|_{H^{M+1}}^{2}\right\} . . . . .}\right. \tag{4.56}
\end{equation*}
$$

We first take $A$ large compared to the right hand side of 4.56 and various constants in 4.55 to obtain that

$$
\begin{gathered}
\frac{d}{d t}\left(\mathbb{H}_{G}^{M}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) \leq\left(\mathbb{H}_{G}^{M}+\|\langle n\rangle\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right)\left(\frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^{4} C_{\ell}}{A^{1 / 2}}+\frac{C_{2}}{G A^{1 / 3}}\left(\frac{\Phi(t)}{G}+\frac{A^{1 / 3}}{A^{2 / 3}+t^{2}}+\exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{4 A^{1 / 3}} t\right\}\right)\right. \\
\left.+\frac{C_{5}}{A^{1 / 3}} \exp \left\{-\frac{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}{2 A^{1 / 3}} t\right\}\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq \neq}\right\|_{H^{M+1}}^{2}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

By integrating on $[0, \widetilde{T}]$, and taking $G \geq G_{\mathbb{H}}\left(M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W_{y}^{M+3, \infty}}\right), A \geq A_{\mathbb{H}}\left(M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W_{y}^{M+3}}, G,\left\|n_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{M}},\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{M+1}}\right)$ large enough, we have that

$$
\mathbb{H}_{G}^{M}[t]+\|\langle n\rangle(t)\|_{H^{M}}^{2} \leq\left(\mathbb{H}_{G}^{M}[0]+\left\|\left\langle n_{\mathrm{in}}\right\rangle\right\|_{H^{M}}^{2}\right) \exp \left\{1+\frac{2 C_{5}}{\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}}\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in} ; \neq \neq}\right\|_{H^{M+1}}^{2}\right\} .
$$

Since this estimate is stronger than 4.56 and $G$ can be chosen depending only on $M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W_{y}^{M+3, \infty}, \delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1} \text {, }}$ standard bootstrap argument yields the following estimate on $\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]$

Combining this estimate with gradient estimate A.1) and the argument in 4.54 yields (2.15).

## 5. Alternating Construction

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.4 and Theorem 2.5. For the sake of notation simplicity, the implicit constants $C$ in this section can depend on $\delta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{-1}, \delta_{0}^{-1}, C_{0}, M,\left\|u_{A}\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{\mathbb{M}+6, \infty}}$.

To prove Theorem 2.4, we focus on Phase \# 12.24 , i.e., $t \in\left[0,3 A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]$. As explained in Section 2.3, the main achievement in Phase $\# 1$ is to guarantee that at time $T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}=3 A^{1 / 3+\zeta}$, the chemical gradient is small, i.e., $\left\|\mathfrak{C}\left(T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+1}} \ll 1$. Once the smallness is reached, application of Proposition 2.3 yields the enhanced dissipation of the solution in Phase $\# 2\left(t \geq 3 A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right)$. We decompose the chemical density in the following way

$$
\mathfrak{C}=\langle\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\rangle^{y, z}+\left(\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle^{y}\right)_{\neq}^{z}+\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}^{y}, \quad \overline{\mathfrak{C}} \equiv 0 .
$$

To visualize this decomposition, we can apply a Fourier transform and see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\rangle^{y}} z & =\mathbb{1}_{R_{1}} \widehat{\mathfrak{C}}, & & R_{1}:=\{\alpha \neq 0, \beta=0, \gamma=0\} ; \\
\left(\widehat{\left.\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle^{y}\right)^{z}}\right. & =\mathbb{1}_{R_{2}} \widehat{\mathfrak{C}}, & & R_{2}:=\{\beta=0, \gamma \neq 0\} ; \\
\widehat{\mathfrak{C}_{\neq y}^{y}} & =\mathbb{1}_{R_{3}} \widehat{\mathfrak{C}}, & & R_{3}:=\{\beta \neq 0\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The explicit positions of the three Fourier domains can be found in Figure 2 Now the plan is to show


Figure 2. Region $R_{1}, R_{2}, R_{3}$
significant decay of the chemical density information in the three Fourier domains $R_{1}, R_{2}, R_{3}$. We will show that heuristically, the information stored in Fourier domains $R_{1}, R_{2}$ and $R_{3}$ will undergo significant decay in phase $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}$ and $\mathfrak{c}$, respectively. In Phase $\mathfrak{a}\left(t \in\left[0, A^{1 / 3+\zeta}\right]\right)$, the shear flow is in the $x$-direction, and it will efficiently damp all the chemical information in Fourier domain $\{\alpha \neq 0\} \supset R_{1}$. As a result, we obtain the following lemma, which captures the main characteristics of the system at the end of Phase $\mathfrak{a}$, i.e., $t=T_{1 \mathfrak{b}}$.

Lemma 5.1. Consider the solution to the equation (2.9), initiated from data $n_{\text {in }} \in H^{\mathbb{M}+3}$, $\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }} \in H^{\mathbb{M}+4}$. Recall the definitions of $f_{\neq}^{x},\langle f\rangle^{x}$ 1.12). If the parameter $A$ is chosen large enough, then the following
estimates hold
$\left\|n_{\neq}^{x}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{b}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+2}}^{2}+\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}^{x}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{b}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+3}}^{2} \leq A^{-1}, \quad\left\|\langle n\rangle^{x}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{b}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+2}}^{2}+\left\|\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle^{x}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{b}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+3}}^{2} \leq \mathcal{B}\left(\left\|n_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+3}},\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+4}}\right)$.
As a consequence, the following estimate holds at $T_{0 \mathfrak{b}}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\left(\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{y, z}-\bar{n}\right)\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{b}}\right)\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{\mathbb{M}+2}}^{2}+\left\|\langle\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\rangle^{y, z}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{b}}\right)\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{\mathbb{M}+3}}^{2} \leq A^{-1} \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here we recall that $\langle\langle f\rangle\rangle^{y, z}(x)=\frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}|^{2}} \iint f(x, y, z) d y d z$.
Proof of Lemma 5.1. Combining Proposition 2.1. Proposition 2.2, we have that at time $T_{0 \mathfrak{b}}$, 5.1 holds. Moreover, we have that

$$
\left\|\left(\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{y, z}-\bar{n}\right)\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{b}}\right)\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{\mathbb{M}+2}}^{2}+\left\|\langle\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\rangle^{y, z}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{b}}\right)\right\|_{H_{y, z}^{\mathbb{M}+3}}^{2} \leq\left\|n_{\neq}^{x}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{b}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+2}}^{2}+\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}^{x}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{b}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+3}}^{2} \leq A^{-1}
$$

This is estimate 5.2 .
In phase $\mathfrak{b}$, we obtain similar estimates for $n_{\neq}^{z},\langle n\rangle^{z}, \mathfrak{C}_{\neq}^{z},\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle^{z}$ as in phase $\mathfrak{a}$. Moreover, we can propagate the smallness estimate on $\langle\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\rangle^{y, z}=\mathbb{P}_{R_{1}} \mathfrak{C}(5.2)$. These estimates are summarized in the following lemma:

Lemma 5.2. Consider the solution to the equation 2.9. If the parameter $A$ is chosen large enough, then the following estimates hold

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|n_{\neq}^{z}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{c}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}+1}}^{2}+\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}^{z}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{c}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}+2}}^{2} \leq A^{-1} ; \quad\left\|\langle n\rangle^{z}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{c}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}+1}}^{2}+\left\|\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle^{z}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{c}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}+2}}^{2} \leq \mathcal{B}\left(\left\|n_{\mathrm{in}}\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}+3}},\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\mathrm{in}}\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}+4}}\right) \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, the following estimates hold at $T_{0 \mathfrak{c}}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\langle\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\rangle^{y, z}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{c}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+2}}^{2} \leq\left\|\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle^{y}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{c}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}+2}}^{2} \leq \frac{\mathcal{B}}{A^{1 / 3}} \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof of Lemma 5.2. Combining Proposition 2.1. Proposition 2.2, we have that at time $T_{0 \mathrm{c}}$, 5.3 holds. Next we combine Proposition 2.1. Proposition 2.2, and Theorem 4.2. As a result of an ODE argument, we observe that if $A$ is chosen large enough,

$$
\left\|\langle\langle n\rangle\rangle^{y, z}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{c}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}+1}} \leq C\left(\left\|n_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}+3}},\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+4}}\right) .
$$

Now Lemma A. 2 yields the estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\langle\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\rangle^{y, z}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{c}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+2}}^{2} \leq C\left\|\langle\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\rangle^{y, z}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{b}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+2}}^{2}+A^{-1 / 3} \leq C A^{-1 / 3} \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since

$$
\left\|\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle^{y}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+2}} \leq\left\|\langle\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\rangle^{y, z}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+2}}+\left\|\left(\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle^{y}\right)_{\neq}^{z}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+2}} \leq\left\|\langle\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle\rangle^{y, z}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+2}}+\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\neq}^{z}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+2}}
$$

the estimates 5.3 and 5.5 imply that 5.4 holds.
The main achievement in the phases $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}$ is that we obtain smallness in the $y$-average component at the beginning of phase $\mathfrak{c}$, i.e., $\left\|\langle\mathfrak{C}\rangle^{y}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{c}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathrm{M}+2}}=\left\|\mathbb{P}_{R_{1} \cup R_{2}} \mathfrak{C}\left(T_{0 \mathfrak{c}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+2}} \ll 1$. Hence we have nice estimate at time instance $T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}$ :

Lemma 5.3. Consider the solution to the equation 2.9. If the parameter $A$ is chosen large enough, then the following estimates hold at time instance $T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|(n-\bar{n})\left(T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}}}^{2} \leq \mathcal{B}\left(\left\|n_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+3}},\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+4}}\right) ; \quad\left\|\mathfrak{C}\left(T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}\right)\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+1}}^{2} \leq \frac{\mathcal{B}\left(\left\|n_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+3}},\left\|\mathfrak{C}_{\text {in }}\right\|_{H^{\mathbb{M}+4}}\right)}{A^{1 / 3}} \tag{5.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof of Lemma 5.3. Combining Proposition 2.1. Proposition 2.2. Theorem 4.2 and Lemma A.2, we have that at time $T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}$, (5.6) holds.

At this point $\left(t=T_{1 \mathfrak{a}}\right)$, the norm of the chemical density is small, and we can derive Theorem 2.5 .
Proof of Theorem 2.5. Application of Proposition 2.3 and the argument 3.32 yields the result.

## Appendix A. General Lemmas

Lemma A.1. Let $F$ be in $C^{m}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right)$, and define $\langle F\rangle(y, z):=\frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}|} \int_{\mathbb{T}} F(x, y, z) d x,\langle\langle F\rangle\rangle(z):=\frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}|^{2}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2}} F(x, y, z) d x d y$. The following estimates hold:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|\langle\langle F\rangle\rangle\|_{L_{z}^{p}(\mathbb{T})} \leq\|\langle F\rangle\|_{L_{y, z}^{p}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)} \leq\|F\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{p}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right)}, \quad 1 \leq p \leq \infty \\
& \sum_{k=0}^{m}\left\|\partial_{z}^{k}\langle\langle F\rangle\rangle\right\|_{L_{z}^{2}(\mathbb{T})} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{m}\left\|\partial_{z}^{k}\langle F\rangle\right\|_{L_{y, z}^{2}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{m}\left\|\partial_{z}^{k} F\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. Applying the Hölder's inequality yields that for $p \in(1, \infty)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\langle\langle F\rangle\rangle\|_{L_{z}^{p}(\mathbb{T})} & =\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}}\left|\frac{1}{|2 \pi|} \int_{\mathbb{T}}\langle F\rangle d y\right|^{p} d z\right)^{1 / p} \leq\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}}\left(\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}}|\langle F\rangle|^{p} d y\right)^{1 / p}\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}}|2 \pi|^{-p^{\prime}} d y\right)^{1 / p^{\prime}}\right)^{p} d z\right)^{1 / p} \\
& \leq\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2}}|\langle F\rangle|^{p} d y d z\right)^{1 / p}=\|\langle F\rangle\|_{L_{y, z}^{p}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)}=\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2}}\left|\frac{1}{|2 \pi|} \int_{\mathbb{T}} F d x\right|^{p} d y d z\right)^{1 / p} \\
& \leq\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2}}\left(\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}}|F|^{p} d x\right)^{1 / p}\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}}|2 \pi|^{-p^{\prime}} d x\right)^{1 / p^{\prime}}\right)^{p} d y d z\right)^{1 / p} \leq\|F\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{p}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Here $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{p^{\prime}}=1$. The $p=1$ case is a simple variant of the argument above. The estimate in the $p=\infty$ case is a direct consequence of definition. We observe that $\partial_{z}^{k}\langle\langle F\rangle\rangle=\left\langle\partial_{z}^{k}\langle F\rangle\right\rangle=\left\langle\left\langle\partial_{z}^{k} F\right\rangle\right\rangle$. Hence, the estimate above yields that
$\sum_{k=0}^{m}\left\|\partial_{z}^{k}\langle\langle F\rangle\rangle\right\|_{L_{z}^{p}(\mathbb{T})}=\sum_{k=0}^{m}\left\|\left\langle\partial_{z}^{k}\langle F\rangle\right\rangle\right\|_{L_{z}^{p}(\mathbb{T})} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{m}\left\|\partial_{z}^{k}\langle F\rangle\right\|_{L_{y, z}^{p}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)}=\sum_{k=0}^{m}\left\|\left\langle\partial_{z}^{k} F\right\rangle\right\|_{L_{y, z}^{p}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{m}\left\|\partial_{z}^{k} F\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{p}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right)}$.
This finishes the proof of the lemma.
Lemma A.2. Consider solution to the heat equation on $\mathbb{T}^{d}, d=1,2$,

$$
\partial_{t} \mathfrak{c}=\frac{1}{A} \Delta \mathfrak{c}+\frac{1}{A}(\mathfrak{n}-\overline{\mathfrak{n}}), \quad \mathfrak{c}(t=0, X)=\mathfrak{c}_{\mathrm{in}}(X), \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \mathfrak{c}_{\mathrm{in}} d X=0
$$

Then the following estimate holds,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\nabla^{m+1} \mathfrak{c}(t)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{T}^{d}\right)} \leq C\left(\frac{t}{A}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sup _{0 \leq \tau \leq t}\left\|\nabla^{m}(\mathfrak{n}(\tau)-\overline{\mathfrak{n}})\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{T}^{d}\right)}+\left\|\nabla^{m+1} \mathfrak{c}_{\mathrm{in}}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{T}^{d}\right)} \tag{A.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. By applying the Fourier transform, and the Plancherel equality, we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\nabla e^{\frac{t}{A} \Delta_{\mathbb{T}^{d}}} f\right\|_{2} \leq C\left(\frac{t}{A}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|f\|_{2}, \quad \forall t>0 \tag{A.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\nabla^{m+1} \mathfrak{c}(t)\right\|_{2} & \leq\left\|\exp \left\{\frac{t}{A} \Delta_{\mathbb{T}^{d}}\right\} \nabla^{m+1} \mathfrak{c}(0)\right\|_{2}+\frac{1}{A}\left\|\int_{0}^{t} \nabla \exp \left\{\frac{t-s}{A} \Delta_{\mathbb{T}^{d}}\right\} \nabla^{m}(\mathfrak{n}(s)-\overline{\mathfrak{n}}) d s\right\|_{2} \\
& \leq\left\|\nabla^{m+1} \mathfrak{c}_{\text {in }}\right\|_{2}+\frac{1}{A} \int_{0}^{t}\left\|\nabla \exp \left\{\frac{t-s}{A} \Delta_{\mathbb{T}^{d}}\right\}\right\|_{L^{2} \rightarrow L^{2}} \sup _{s \in[0, t)}\left\|\nabla^{m}(\mathfrak{n}(s)-\overline{\mathfrak{n}})\right\|_{2} d s \\
& \leq\left\|\nabla^{m+1} \mathfrak{c}_{\text {in }}\right\|_{2}+C\left(\frac{t}{A}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sup _{0 \leq s \leq t}\left\|\nabla^{m}(\mathfrak{n}(s)-\overline{\mathfrak{n}})\right\|_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Appendix B. Technical Lemmas in Linear Theory

In this subsection, we collect some technical lemmas/corollaries applied in Section 3 .
Lemma B.1. Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be two linear operators. Define the operation

$$
\operatorname{ad}_{\mathcal{A}}^{n}(\mathcal{B}):=\underbrace{[\mathcal{A},[\mathcal{A},[\mathcal{A}, \ldots[\mathcal{A}}_{n}, \mathcal{B}]] \ldots], \quad n \in\{1,2,3, \ldots\} .
$$

Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\mathcal{A}^{n}, \mathcal{B}\right]=\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1}\binom{n}{\ell} \operatorname{ad}_{\mathcal{A}}^{n-\ell}(\mathcal{B}) \mathcal{A}^{\ell} \tag{B.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. ${ }^{1}$ To prove the lemma, we need two extra definitions, i.e., the left multiplication $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{A}}$

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{B}=\mathcal{A B}, \quad \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{B}=\mathcal{B} \mathcal{A}
$$

Standard computation yields the following three relations:

$$
\operatorname{ad}_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{B}=\left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}-\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{A}}\right)(\mathcal{B}), \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{B}=\mathcal{A B} \mathcal{A}=\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{B}, \quad \operatorname{ad}_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{B})=\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{A}} \operatorname{ad}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{B})
$$

Now we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
{\left[\mathcal{A}^{n}, \mathcal{B}\right] } & =\mathcal{A}^{n} \mathcal{B}-\mathcal{B} \mathcal{A}^{n}=\left(\operatorname{ad}_{\mathcal{A}}+\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{A}}\right)^{n}(\mathcal{B})-\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{A}}^{n}(\mathcal{B})=\sum_{\ell=0}^{n}\binom{n}{\ell} \operatorname{ad}_{\mathcal{A}}^{n-\ell} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\ell}(\mathcal{B})-\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{A}}^{n}(\mathcal{B}) \\
& =\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1}\binom{n}{\ell} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\ell} \operatorname{ad}_{\mathcal{A}}^{n-\ell}(\mathcal{B})=\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1}\binom{n}{\ell} \operatorname{ad}_{\mathcal{A}}^{n-\ell}(\mathcal{B}) \mathcal{A}^{\ell}
\end{aligned}
$$

The follow corollary of Lemma B. 1 is useful when we compute the commutators involving $\Gamma_{y}$ and $\Delta$.
Lemma B.2. Consider the vector field $\Gamma_{y}=\Gamma_{y ; t}$ (2.3), and recall the notation (3.36): $B^{(m)}(t, y):=$ $\int_{0}^{t} \partial_{y}^{m} u(s, y) d s$. The following commutator relations hold

$$
\begin{align*}
{\left[\Gamma_{y}, \partial_{y}\right] } & =-\int_{0}^{t} \partial_{y y} u(s, y) d s \partial_{x}=-B^{(2)} \partial_{x}  \tag{B.2a}\\
{\left[\Gamma_{y}, \partial_{y y}\right] } & =-2 B^{(2)} \partial_{x} \Gamma_{y}+\partial_{y}\left(B^{(1)}\right)^{2} \partial_{x x}-B^{(3)} \partial_{x}  \tag{B.2b}\\
{\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y}\right] } & =-\sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1}\binom{j}{\ell} B^{(j-\ell+1)} \partial_{x} \Gamma_{y}^{\ell}  \tag{B.2c}\\
{\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y y}\right] } & =\sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1}\binom{j}{\ell}\left(-2 B^{(j-\ell+1)} \partial_{x} \Gamma_{y}+\partial_{y}^{(j-\ell)}\left(B^{(1)}\right)^{2} \partial_{x x}-B^{(j-\ell+2)} \partial_{x}\right) \Gamma_{y}^{\ell} . \tag{B.2d}
\end{align*}
$$

Proof. The first two relations $(\mathrm{B} .2 \mathrm{a},(\mathrm{B} .2 \mathrm{~b})$ are direct consequences of computation. Next we use the general relation (B.1) to derive $\bar{B} .2 \mathrm{c}),(\mathrm{B} .2 \mathrm{~d})$. First, we observe that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{ad}_{\Gamma_{y}}\left(-B^{(m)} \partial_{x}\right)=\left[\partial_{y}+B^{(1)} \partial_{x},-B^{(m)} \partial_{x}\right]=-B^{(m+1)} \partial_{x} \tag{B.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

As a result, we have the general formula

$$
\operatorname{ad}_{\Gamma_{y}}^{m}\left(\partial_{y}\right)=-B^{(m+1)} \partial_{x}, \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}
$$

Hence by B.1,

$$
\left[\Gamma_{y}^{j}, \partial_{y}\right]=\sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1}\binom{j}{\ell} \operatorname{ad}_{\Gamma_{y}}^{j-\ell}\left(\partial_{y}\right) \Gamma_{y}^{\ell}=-\sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1}\binom{j}{\ell} B^{(j-\ell+1)} \partial_{x} \Gamma_{y}^{\ell}
$$

This concludes the proof of B .2 c .

[^0]Finally, we derive $\overline{B .2 d}$. By B.1 , it is enough to compute $\operatorname{ad}_{\Gamma_{y}}^{m}\left(\partial_{y y}\right)$. We apply the induction to prove that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{ad}_{\Gamma_{y}}^{m}\left(\partial_{y y}\right)=-2 B^{(m+1)} \partial_{x} \Gamma_{y}+\partial_{y}^{m}\left(B^{(1)}\right)^{2} \partial_{x x}-B^{(m+2)} \partial_{x}, \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{Z}_{+} \tag{B.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

This relation, when combined with (B.1), implies (B.2d). The relation (B.4) holds when $m=1$ ( B.2b). Assume that the relation holds on the $m-1(\geq 1)$ level, then

$$
\operatorname{ad}_{\Gamma_{y}}^{m}\left(\partial_{y y}\right)=\operatorname{ad}_{\Gamma_{y}}\left(\operatorname{ad}_{\Gamma_{y}}^{m-1}\left(\partial_{y y}\right)\right)=\operatorname{ad}_{\Gamma_{y}}\left(-B^{(m+1)} \partial_{x}-2 B^{(m)} \partial_{x} \Gamma_{y}+\partial_{y}^{m-1}\left(B^{(1)}\right)^{2} \partial_{x x}\right) .
$$

Recalling (B.3), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{ad}_{\Gamma_{y}}^{m}\left(\partial_{y y}\right) & =-B^{(m+2)} \partial_{x}-\Gamma_{y}\left(2 B^{(m)}\right) \partial_{x} \Gamma_{y}+\Gamma_{y}\left(\partial_{y}^{m-1}\left(B^{(1)}\right)^{2}\right) \partial_{x x} \\
& =-B^{(m+2)} \partial_{x}-2 B^{(m+1)} \partial_{x} \Gamma_{y}+\partial_{y}^{m}\left(B^{(1)}\right)^{2} \partial_{x x}
\end{aligned}
$$

This concludes the proof of $(\overline{\mathrm{B} .4})$. Hence the proof of the lemma is complete.
We also use the following lemma.
Lemma B.3. Consider the gliding vector fields $\Gamma_{y}=\partial_{y}+\int_{0}^{t} \partial_{y} u(s, y) d s \partial_{x}$, and functions $f, g \in H^{m}\left(\mathbb{T}^{3}\right)$. Then the following two estimate hold

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|f\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{\infty}} \leq C \sum_{|i, j, k| \leq 2}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}} \tag{B.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, we have that for $m \geq 3$,
(B.6) $\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}(f g)\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leq C\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} g\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}$.

Proof. Consider the following change of variables:

$$
X=x-\int_{0}^{t} u(s, y) d s, \quad Y=y, \quad Z=z
$$

The Jacobian of this change of coordinate is 1 . We also check that it is one-one and onto. Define

$$
F(X, Y, Z)=f(x, y, z), \quad G(X, Y, Z)=g(x, y, z)
$$

Now by classical Sobolev embedding, we have

$$
\|f\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{\infty}}=\|F\|_{L_{X, Y, Z}^{\infty}} \leq C \sum_{|i, j, k| \leq 2}\left\|\partial_{X}^{i} \partial_{Y}^{j} \partial_{Z}^{k} F\right\|_{L_{X, Y, Z}^{2}}
$$

It is direct to check that

$$
\partial_{X}=\partial_{x}, \partial_{Y}=\Gamma_{y}, \partial_{Z}=\partial_{z}
$$

Hence,

$$
\|f\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{\infty}} \leq C\left(\sum_{|i, j, k| \leq 2}\left\|\partial_{X}^{i} \partial_{Y}^{j} \partial_{Z}^{k} F\right\|_{L_{X, Y, Z}^{2}}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}=C\left(\sum_{|i, j, k| \leq 2}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

This is B.5). Next we recall the product estimate in the $(X, Y, Z)$-coordinate

$$
\|F G\|_{H_{X, Y, Z}^{m}} \leq C\|F\|_{H_{X, Y, Z}^{m}}\|G\|_{L_{X, Y, Z}^{\infty}}+C\|G\|_{H_{X, Y, Z}^{m}}\|F\|_{L_{X, Y, Z}^{\infty}} .
$$

As a result,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k}(f g)\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leq C\|F G\|_{H_{X, Y, Z}^{m}} \leq C\|F\|_{H_{X, Y, Z}^{m}}\|G\|_{L_{X, Y, Z}^{\infty}}+C\|G\|_{H_{X, Y, Z}^{m}}\|F\|_{L_{X, Y, Z}^{\infty}} \\
& \quad \leq C\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\|g\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{\infty}}+C\left(\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} g\right\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{2}}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\|f\|_{L_{x, y, z}^{\infty}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Combining this with B.5 yields B.6.

To conclude this section, we present a lemma.
Lemma B.4. Recall the vector field $\Gamma_{y}=\Gamma_{y ; t}$ 2.3. The gliding regularity norms of the gradient of functions $f \in H^{M+1}$ are bounded as follows,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} \nabla f\right\|_{L^{p}} \leq \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k} f\right\|_{L^{p}}+C t \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} f\right\|_{L^{p}}, \quad \Gamma_{y ; t}^{i j k}=\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} \tag{B.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here the constant $C$ depends only on $M,\left\|\partial_{y} u\right\|_{L_{t}^{\infty} W^{M, \infty}}$ and $p \in[1, \infty]$.
Proof. Recalling the definition of commutators, we have that

$$
\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} \nabla f_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{p}} \leq \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\nabla \partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{p}}+\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \mathbb{1}_{j \geq 1}\left\|\left[\Gamma_{y ; t}^{j}, \partial_{y}\right] \partial_{x}^{i} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{p}}
$$

Direct applications of B .2 c and the relation $\partial_{y}=\Gamma_{y ; t}-\int_{0}^{t} \partial_{y} u(s, y) d s \partial_{x}$ yield that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} \nabla f_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{p}} \leq & \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M+1}\left\|\partial_{x}^{i} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{j} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{p}}+C \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \int_{0}^{t}\left\|\partial_{y} u(s, \cdot)\right\|_{L_{y}^{\infty}} d s\left\|\Gamma_{y ; t}^{(i+1) j k} f_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{p}} \\
& +C \sum_{|i, j, k|=0}^{M} \mathbb{1}_{j \geq 1} \sum_{j^{\prime}=0}^{j-1}\binom{j}{j^{\prime}}\left(\int_{0}^{t}\left\|\partial_{y}^{j-j^{\prime}+1} u(s, \cdot)\right\|_{L_{y}^{\infty}} d s\right)\left\|\partial_{x}^{i+1} \Gamma_{y ; t}^{j^{\prime}} \partial_{z}^{k} f_{\neq}\right\|_{L^{p}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Now direct estimation yields the result.
Acknowledgment. SH was supported in part by NSF grants DMS 2006660, DMS 2304392, DMS 2006372. The author would like to thank Tarek Elgindi for providing the key construction for the time-dependent shear flows and many crucial suggestions, discussions and guidance. The author would also like to thank Yiyue Zhang for his suggestion of a clean proof of Lemma B.1 and Zhongtian Hu for finding out typos in the first version of the manuscript.

## References

[1] D. Albritton, R. Beekie, and M. Novack. Enhanced dissipation and Hörmander's hypoellipticity. J. Funct. Anal., 283(3):Paper No. 109522, 38, 2022.
[2] D. Albritton and L. Ohm. On the stabilizing effect of swimming in an active suspension. arXiv:2205.04922, 2022.
[3] J. Bedrossian. Suppression of plasma echoes and Landau damping in Sobolev spaces by weak collisions in a Vlasov-FokkerPlanck equation. Ann. PDE, 3(2):Paper No. 19, 66, 2017.
[4] J. Bedrossian, A. Blumenthal, and S. Punshon-Smith. The Batchelor spectrum of passive scalar turbulence in stochastic fluid mechanics. arXiv:1911.11014, 2019.
[5] J. Bedrossian and M. Coti Zelati. Enhanced dissipation, hypoellipticity, and anomalous small noise inviscid limits in shear flows. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 224(3):1161-1204, 2017.
[6] J. Bedrossian, P. Germain, and N. Masmoudi. Dynamics near the subcritical transition of the 3D Couette flow II: Above threshold. arXiv:1506.03721, 2015.
[7] J. Bedrossian, P. Germain, and N. Masmoudi. On the stability threshold for the 3D Couette flow in Sobolev regularity. Ann. of Math. (2), 185(2):541-608, 2017.
[8] J. Bedrossian, P. Germain, and N. Masmoudi. Dynamics near the subcritical transition of the 3D Couette flow I: Below threshold. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., 266(1294):v+158, 2020.
[9] J. Bedrossian and S. He. Inviscid damping and enhanced dissipation of the boundary layer for 2d Navier-Stokes linearized around couette flow in a channel. arXiv:1909.07230.
[10] J. Bedrossian and S. He. Suppression of blow-up in Patlak-Keller-Segel via shear flows. SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis, 50(6):6365-6372, 2018.
[11] J. Bedrossian, N. Masmoudi, and V. Vicol. Enhanced dissipation and inviscid damping in the inviscid limit of the NavierStokes equations near the 2D Couette flow. Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., 216(3):1087-1159, 2016.
[12] J. Bedrossian, N. Rodríguez, and A. Bertozzi. Local and global well-posedness for aggregation equations and Patlak-KellerSegel models with degenerate diffusion. Nonlinearity, 24(6):1683-1714, 2011.
[13] J. Bedrossian, V. Vicol, and F. Wang. The Sobolev stability threshold for 2D shear flows near Couette. J. Nonlinear Sci., 28(6):2051-2075, 2018.
[14] J. Bedrossian, M. C. Zelati, and M. Dolce. Taylor dispersion and phase mixing in the non-cutoff Boltzmann equation on the whole space. arXiv:2211.05079.
[15] P. Biler. The Cauchy problem and self-similar solutions for a nonlinear parabolic equation. Studia Math., 114(2):181-192, 1995.
[16] A. Blanchet, J. Carrillo, and P. Laurençot. Critical mass for a Patlak-Keller-Segel model with degenerate diffusion in higher dimensions. Calc. Var., 35:133-168, 2009.
[17] A. Blanchet, J. Carrillo, and N. Masmoudi. Infinite time aggregation for the critical Patlak-Keller-Segel model in $\mathbb{R}^{2}$. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 61:1449-1481, 2008.
[18] A. Blanchet, J. Dolbeault, and B. Perthame. Two-dimensional Keller-Segel model: Optimal critical mass and qualitative properties of the solutions. E. J. Diff. Eqn, 2006(44):1-32, 2006.
[19] A. Blumenthal, M. C. Zelati, and R. S. Gvalani. Exponential mixing for random dynamical systems and an example of Pierrehumbert. arXiv:2204.13651.
[20] E. Bruè, M. Colombo, G. Crippa, C. De Lellis, and M. Sorella. Onsager critical solutions of the forced navier-stokes equations. arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08413, 2022.
[21] E. Bruè and C. De Lellis. Anomalous dissipation for the forced 3d navier-stokes equations. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 400(3):1507-1533, 2023.
[22] V. Calvez and J. Carrillo. Volume effects in the Keller-Segel model: energy estimates preventing blow-up. J. Math. Pures Appl., 86:155-175, 2006.
[23] V. Calvez and L. Corrias. The parabolic-parabolic Keller-Segel model in $\mathbb{R}^{2}$. Commun. Math. Sci., 6(2):417-447, 2008.
[24] K. Carrapatoso and S. Mischler. Uniqueness and long time asymptotic for the parabolic-parabolic Keller-Segel equation. Comm. Partial Differential Equations 42 (2017), no. 2.
[25] M. Chae, K. Kang, and J. Lee. Existence of smooth solutions to coupled chemotaxis-fluid equations. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., 33(6):2271-2297, 2013.
[26] Q. Chen, T. Li, D. Wei, and Z. Zhang. Transition threshold for the 2-D Couette flow in a finite channel. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 238(1):125-183, 2020.
[27] C. Collot, T.-E. Ghoul, N. Masmoudi, and V. T. Nguyen. Spectral analysis for singularity formation of the two dimensional Keller-Segel system. arXiv:1911.10884, 2019.
[28] C. Collot, T.-E. Ghoul, N. Masmoudi, and V. T. Nguyen. Refined description and stability for singular solutions of the 2D Keller-Segel system. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 75(7):1419-1516, 2022.
[29] P. Constantin, A. Kiselev, and L. Ryzhik. Quenching of flames by fluid advection. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 54(11):13201342, 2001.
[30] P. Constantin, A. Kiselev, L. Ryzhik, and A. Zlatoš. Diffusion and mixing in fluid flow. Ann. of Math. (2), 168:643-674, 2008.
[31] L. Corrias, M. Escobedo, and J. Matos. Existence, uniqueness and asymptotic behavior of the solutions to the fully parabolic keller-segel system in the plane. Journal of Differential Equations, 257(6):1840-1878, 2014.
[32] M. Coti Zelati, M. G. Delgadino, and T. M. Elgindi. On the relation between enhanced dissipation timescales and mixing rates. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 73(6):1205-1244, 2020.
[33] M. Coti Zelati and M. Dolce. Separation of time-scales in drift-diffusion equations on $\mathbb{R}^{2}$. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9), 142:58-75, 2020.
[34] M. Coti-Zelati, M. Dolce, Y. Feng, and A. L. Mazzucato. Global existence for the two-dimensional Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation with a shear flow. arXiv:2103.02971, 2021.
[35] M. Coti-Zelati and T. D. Drivas. A stochastic approach to enhanced diffusion. arXiv:1911.09995v1, 2019.
[36] S. Deng, B. Shi, and W. Wang. Suppression of blow-up in 3-D Keller-Segel model via Couette flow in whole space. arXiv:2311.18590, 2024.
[37] R.-J. Duan, A. Lorz, and P. Markowich. Global solutions to the coupled chemotaxis-fluid equations. Comm. Partial Differential Equations, Vol. 35, pages 1635-1673, 2010.
[38] G. Egaña and S. Mischler. Uniqueness and long time asymptotic for the keller-segel equation: the parabolic-elliptic case. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 220 (2016), no. 3.
[39] T. Elgindi. Mixing, enhanced dissipation, and stationary euler states. 2000.
[40] Y. Feng, Y. Feng, G. Iyer, and J.-L. Thiffeault. Phase separation in the advective Cahn-Hilliard equation. J. Nonlinear Sci., 30(6):2821-2845, 2020.
[41] Y. Feng and G. Iyer. Dissipation enhancement by mixing. Nonlinearity, 32(5):1810-1851, 2019.
[42] M. D. Francesco, A. Lorz, and P. Markowich. Chemotaxis-fluid coupled model for swimming bacteria with nonlinear diffusion: global existence and asymptotic behavior. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. A, 28:1437-1453, 2010.
[43] T.-E. Ghoul and N. Masmoudi. Minimal mass blowup solutions for the Patlak-Keller-Segel equation. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 71(10):1957-2015, 2018.
[44] Y. Gong, S. He, and A. Kiselev. Random search in fluid flow aided by chemotaxis. arXiv:2107.02913, 2021.
[45] S. He.
[46] S. He. Suppression of blow-up in parabolic-parabolic Patlak-Keller-Segel via strictly monotone shear flows. Nonlinearity, 31(8):3651-3688, 2018.
[47] S. He. Enhanced dissipation, hypoellipticity for passive scalar equations with fractional dissipation. J. Funct. Anal., 282(3):Paper No. 109319, 28, 2022.
[48] S. He and A. Kiselev. Stirring speeds up chemical reaction. Nonlinearity, 35(8):4599, 2022.
[49] S. He and E. Tadmor. Suppressing chemotactic blow-up through a fast splitting scenario on the plane. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 232(2):951-986, 2019.
[50] L. Hörmander. Hypoelliptic second order differential equations. Acta Math., 119:147-171, 1967.
[51] S. Ibrahim, Y. Maekawa, and N. Masmoudi. On pseudospectral bound for non-selfadjoint operators and its application to stability of Kolmogorov flows. Ann. PDE, 5(2):Paper No. 14, 84, 2019.
[52] G. Iyer, X. Xu, and A. Zlatoš. Convection-induced singularity suppression in the Keller-Segel and other non-linear PDEs. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 374(9):6039-6058, 2021.
[53] W. Jäger and S. Luckhaus. On explosions of solutions to a system of partial differential equations modelling chemotaxis. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 329(2):819-824, 1992.
[54] I.-J. Jeong and T. Yoneda. Vortex stretching and enhanced dissipation for the incompressible 3d navier-stokes equations. Mathematische Annalen, 380(3-4):2041-2072, 2021.
[55] I.-J. Jeong and T. Yoneda. Quasi-streamwise vortices and enhanced dissipation for incompressible 3d navier-stokes equations. Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, 150(3):1279-1286, 2022.
[56] H. Jia. Uniform linear inviscid damping and enhanced dissipation near monotonic shear flows in high Reynolds number regime (I): the whole space case. arXiv:2207.10987, 2022.
[57] E. F. Keller and L. Segel. Model for chemotaxis. J. Theor. Biol., 30:225-234, 1971.
[58] A. Kiselev and X. Xu. Suppression of chemotactic explosion by mixing. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 222(2):1077-1112, 2016.
[59] A. Kiselev and A. Zlatos. Quenching of combustion by shear flows. Duke Math. J., 132(1):49-72, 2006.
[60] H. Kozono, M. Miura, and Y. Sugiyama. Time global existence and finite time blow-up criterion for solutions to the Keller-Segel system coupled with the Navier-Stokes fluid. J. Differential Equations, 267(9):5410-5492, 2019.
[61] H. Li, N. Masmoudi, and W. Zhao. Asymptotic stability of two-dimensional Couette flow in a viscous fluid. arXiv:2208.14898, 2022.
[62] H. Li and W. Zhao. Metastability for the dissipative quasi-geostrophic equation and the non-local enhancement. arXiv:2107.10594, 2021.
[63] T. Li, D. Wei, and Z. Zhang. Pseudospectral bound and transition threshold for the 3D Kolmogorov flow. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 73(3):465-557, 2020.
[64] J.-G. Liu and A. Lorz. A coupled chemotaxis-fluid model: global existence. Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré. Analyse Non Linéaire, Vol. 28, pages 643-652, 2011.
[65] A. Lorz. Coupled chemotaxis fluid model. Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., Vol. 20, 2010.
[66] A. Lorz. A coupled Keller-Segel-Stokes model: global existence for small initial data and blow-up delay. Communications in Mathematical Sciences, Vol. 10, pages 555-574, 2012.
[67] N. Masmoudi and W. Zhao. Enhanced dissipation for the 2D Couette flow in critical space. Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 45(12):1682-1701, 2020.
[68] N. Masmoudi and W. Zhao. Stability threshold of two-dimensional Couette flow in Sobolev spaces. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire, 39(2):245-325, 2022.
[69] C. Mouhot and C. Villani. On Landau damping. Acta Math., 207:29-201, 2011.
[70] C. S. Patlak. Random walk with persistence and external bias. Bull. Math. Biophys., 15:311-338, 1953.
[71] R. Schweyer. Stable blow-up dynamic for the parabolic-parabolic Patlak-Keller-Segel model. arXiv:1403.4975 [math.AP], 2014.
[72] R. Shvydkoy. Global hypocoercivity of kinetic Fokker-Planck-alignment equations. Kinet. Relat. Models, 15(2):213-237, 2022.
[73] Y. Tao and M. Winkler. Locally bounded global solutions in a three-dimensional chemotaxis-Stokes system with nonlinear diffusion. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 30(1):157-178, 2013.
[74] I. Tuval, L. Cisneros, C. Dombrowski, C. W. Wolgemuth, J. O. Kessler, and R. E. Goldstein. Bacterial swimming and oxygen transport near contact lines. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 102(7):2277-2282, 2005.
[75] C. Villani. Hypocoercivity. American Mathematical Soc., 2009.
[76] D. Wei. Global well-posedness and blow-up for the 2-D Patlak-Keller-Segel equation. J. Funct. Anal., 274(2):388-401, 2018.
[77] D. Wei. Diffusion and mixing in fluid flow via the resolvent estimate. Science China Mathematics, pages 1-12, 2019.
[78] D. Wei, Z. Zhang, and W. Zhao. Linear inviscid damping and enhanced dissipation for the Kolmogorov flow. Adv. Math., 362:106963, 103, 2020.
[79] M. Winkler. Global large-data solutions in a chemotaxis-(Navier-)Stokes system modeling cellular swimming in fluid drops. Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 37(2):319-351, 2012.
[80] M. Winkler. Finite-time blow-up in the higher-dimensional parabolic-parabolic Keller-Segel system. Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquees, 100 (5):748-767, 2013.
[81] M. C. Zelati, H. Dietert, and D. Gérard-Varet. Orientation mixing in active suspensions. arXiv:2207.08431.
[82] L. Zeng, Z. Zhang, and R. Zi. Suppression of blow-up in Patlak-Keller-Segel-Navier-Stokes system via the Couette flow. J. Funct. Anal., 280(10):Paper No. 108967, 40, 2021.

Department of Mathematics, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, 29208
Email address: siming@mailbox.sc.edu


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ This proof is kindly suggested to me by Yiyue Zhang.

