

# NOTE ON THE EULER EQUATIONS IN $C^k$ SPACES

TAREK M. ELGINDI AND NADER MASMOUDI

ABSTRACT. In this note, using the ideas from our recent article [2], we prove strong ill-posedness for the 2D Euler equations in  $C^k$  spaces. This note provides a significantly shorter proof of many of the main results in [1]. In the case  $k > 1$  we show the existence of initial data for which the  $k$ th derivative of the velocity field develops a logarithmic singularity immediately. The strong ill-posedness covers  $C^{k-1,1}$  spaces as well. The ill-posedness comes from the pressure term in the Euler equation. We formulate the equation for  $D^k u$  as:

$$\partial_t D^k u = D^{k+1} p + l.o.t.$$

and then use the non-locality of the map  $u \rightarrow p$  to get the ill-posedness. The real difficulty comes in how to deal with the "l.o.t." terms which can be handled by special commutator estimates.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this note we give a short proof of the strong ill-posedness of the Euler equations for incompressible flow in  $C^k$  spaces. Our proof works in the whole space case as well as the case of periodic boundary conditions and the bounded domain case. We use the non-locality of the map  $u \rightarrow p$  to get growth in  $C^k$  spaces (since Riesz transforms are unbounded on these spaces!). The proof uses classical commutator estimates which estimate the commutation of a Riesz transform (or a Calderón Zygmund operator) and composition by a bi-Lipschitz map.

We prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1.** *The Euler equations are strongly ill-posed in  $C^k$  spaces for  $k \geq 1$ . In other words, for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists initial data  $u_0 \in C^k$  such that the unique solution,  $u(t)$ , of the Euler equations with initial data  $u_0$  leaves  $C^k$  immediately.*

We note that very recently Bourgain and Li have proven the same result as above [1]. In their paper the authors cite our work [2] and note that it did not include ill-posedness  $C^k$  spaces for  $k > 1$ . In this note we show that the work in [2] can easily be extended to the case  $k > 1$ . Moreover we make clear the fact that strong ill-posedness in  $C^k$  can be proven quite easily only using commutator estimates without having to rely upon very intricate constructions.

## 2. THE PROOF

*Proof.* Note that it suffices to consider the two dimensional Euler equations. Now consider the equation for  $D^k u$  which means  $k$  spatial derivatives of  $u$ , which we take to be a vector of many components.

$\nabla D^{k-1}u$  satisfies the following equation:

$$\partial_t \nabla D^{k-1}u + u \cdot \nabla D^k u + \sum_{j,l}^k Q(D^j u, D^l u) + D^{k-1} D^2 p = 0$$

Recall that

$$\Delta p = \det(\nabla u)$$

so that

$$(D^2 p)_{ij} = (R_i R_j \det(\nabla u))_{ij}$$

We rely upon the following commutator estimate in  $L^p$ :

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\Phi$  be a bi-Lipschitz measure preserving map. Let  $K = \max\{|\Phi - Id|_{Lip}, |\Phi^{-1} - Id|_{Lip}\}$ . Let  $R$  be a composition of Riesz transforms. Define the following commutator:*

$$[R, \Phi]\omega = R(\omega \circ \Phi) - R(\omega) \circ \Phi,$$

for  $\omega \in L^p$ .

Then,

$$\|[R, \Phi]\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \leq c_p K.$$

Moreover,  $c_p \leq cp$  as  $p \rightarrow \infty$ .

Now we recall the Lagrangian flow

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Phi}(x, t) &= u(\Phi(t, x), t) \\ \Phi(x, 0) &= x. \end{aligned}$$

Because  $u$  is divergence free,  $\Phi$  is measure preserving. Furthermore,  $\Phi(x, -t) = \Phi^{-1}(x, t)$ .

Now, we may write

$$\Phi(x, t) = x + \int_0^t u(\Phi(x, \tau), \tau) d\tau.$$

Thus,

$$\Phi(\cdot, t) - I = \int_0^t u(\Phi(\cdot, \tau), \tau) d\tau.$$

Consequently,

$$|\Phi - I|_{Lip} \leq t|u|_{Lip} |\Phi|_{Lip}$$

and similarly for  $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot, t) = \Phi(\cdot, -t)$ .

Furthermore, by Gronwall's lemma,

$$|\Phi|_{Lip} \leq \exp(t|u|_{Lip}).$$

In particular,

$$(2.1) \quad |\Phi - I|_{Lip} \leq t|u|_{Lip} \exp(t|u|_{Lip}).$$

In particular, if  $u$  is Lipschitz then the Lagrangian flow-map is controlled. Now, assume that  $u$  remains Lipschitz (which in the case  $k > 0$  is trivial).

Then we have:

$$\partial_t(D^k u \circ \Phi) + \sum_{j,l}^k Q(D^j u, D^l u) \circ \Phi + \left( R_i R_j D^{k-1} \det(\nabla u) \right) \circ \Phi = 0$$

Now assume that the solution remains in  $C^k$ .

Now call  $R_i R_j := R$  for short.

$$\partial_t(D^k u \circ \Phi) + \sum_{j,l}^k Q(D^j u, D^l u) \circ \Phi + \left( R D^{k-1} \det(\nabla u) \right) \circ \Phi = 0$$

$$\partial_t(D^k u \circ \Phi) + \sum_{j,l}^k Q(D^j u, D^l u) \circ \Phi + R \left( D^{k-1} \det(\nabla u) \circ \Phi \right) = [R, \Phi] D^{k-1} \det(\nabla u)$$

We are going to take a special initial data  $u_0 \in C^k$ . Now, suppose that the solution remains in  $C^k$ . Note that we can always solve the 2D Euler equations in  $W^{k,p}$  and that the solution will be unique when  $k > 1$  (in the case  $k=1$  we will also get a unique solution the class of velocity fields with bounded curl). Assume that the solution stays in  $C^k$  with  $|u|_{C^k} \leq M$ .

Then we can solve the Euler equations formally using the Duhamel formula:

$$|D^k u \circ \Phi|_{L^p} \geq |D^k u_0 + t R (D^{k-1} \det(\nabla u_0))|_{L^p} - \left| \int_0^t e^{R(t-s)} [R, \Phi] D^{k-1} \det(\nabla u) - Q(D^j u, D^l u) \circ \Phi ds \right|_{L^p}$$

Now suppose that we construct compactly supported initial data  $u_0$  such that  $|R D^{k-1} \det(\nabla u_0)|_{L^p} \geq cp$  as  $p \rightarrow \infty$ .

Then we see that

$$|D^k u \circ \Phi|_{L^p} \geq tcp - C - t(1+tp) |[R, \Phi]|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} C(M) + tC(M).$$

This is because  $\|R\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \lesssim p$  as  $p \rightarrow \infty$ . Now using the commutator estimate in Lemma 2.1 we get:

$$|D^k u \circ \Phi|_{L^p} \geq tcp - C - t(1+tp) t p \tilde{C}(M) + tC(M)$$

Now take  $t$  very small depending upon  $M$  then we get:

$$|D^k u \circ \Phi|_{L^p} \geq t\tilde{c}p$$

for  $t$  small and all  $p$  large.

This contradicts the fact that  $|D^k u|_{L^\infty}$  remains bounded. □

Now, of course we relied upon the existence of an initial data  $u_0$  such that

$$|R D^{k-1} \det(\nabla u_0)|_{L^p} \geq cp.$$

Constructing such initial data is not too difficult. We will copy the construction from our work [2] below in the case  $k = 1$ . The higher order cases are similar.

We are interested in showing that for some  $i, j$  and for some divergence free  $u$ , with  $\nabla u \in L^\infty$ ,  $D^2p = R_i R_j \det(\nabla u)$  has a logarithmic singularity. Once that is shown, Lemma 8.2 will follow by a regularization argument.

Take a harmonic polynomial,  $Q$ , which is homogeneous of degree 4. In the two-dimensional case, we can take

$$Q(x, y) := x^4 + y^4 - 6x^2y^2, \\ \Delta P = 0.$$

Define

$$G(x, y) := Q(x, y) \text{Log}(x^2 + y^2).$$

Notice that

$$(2.2) \quad \partial_i \partial_j \Delta G \in L^\infty(B_1(0)), i, j \in \{1, 2\}.$$

Notice, on the other hand, that

$$(2.3) \quad \partial_{xxyy} G = -24 \text{Log}(x^2 + y^2) + H(x, y),$$

with  $H \in L^\infty(B_1(0))$ . In particular,  $\partial_{xxyy} G$  has a logarithmic singularity at the origin—and the same can be said about  $\partial_{xxxx} G$  and  $\partial_{yyyy} G$ .

Define  $\tilde{u} = \nabla^\perp \Delta G$ . Then, by 8.12,  $\nabla \tilde{u} \in L^\infty(B_1(0))$ . Moreover, by definition,

$$R_i R_j \nabla \tilde{u} = \nabla \nabla^\perp \partial_{ij} G.$$

Thus, for example,  $R_1 R_2 \nabla \tilde{u}_{1x} = \partial_{xxyy} G$  has a logarithmic singularity in  $B_1(0)$ . Unfortunately, we are interested in showing that  $R_i R_j \det(\nabla u)$  has a logarithmic singularity for some  $i, j$ , not  $R_i R_j \nabla u$ . To rectify this, we choose

$$u = \delta \nabla^\perp \Delta(\chi G) + \eta(2y\chi + y^2 \partial_y \chi, y \partial_x \chi),$$

where  $\eta, \delta$  are small parameters which will be determined and  $\chi$  is a smooth cut-off function with:

$$\chi = 1 \text{ on } B_1(0), \\ \chi = 0 \text{ on } B_2(0)^c.$$

Note that  $u$  is divergence free and

$$u \equiv \delta \nabla^\perp \Delta G + \eta(y, 0) \text{ on } B_1(0).$$

Therefore,

$$\nabla u = \delta \begin{bmatrix} -\partial_{xy} \Delta G & -\partial_{yy} \Delta G \\ \partial_{xx} \Delta G & \partial_{xy} \Delta G \end{bmatrix} + \eta \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In particular,

$$\det(\nabla u) = \eta \delta \partial_{xx} \Delta G + \delta^2 J(x, y),$$

where  $J$  is a bounded on  $B_1(0)$ .

Now consider  $R_2 R_2 \det(\nabla u)$ :

$$R_2 R_2 \det(\nabla u) = \eta \delta \partial_{xxyy} G + \delta^2 R_2 R_2 J.$$

Now, by (8.13), we have

$$R_2 R_2 \det(\nabla u) = \eta \delta (-24 \operatorname{Log}(x^2 + y^2) + H(x, y)) + \delta^2 R_2 R_2 J,$$

with  $H$  and  $J$  bounded. Now, recall that  $R_2 R_2$  maps  $L^\infty$  to BMO and that any BMO function can have at most a logarithmic singularity.

Thus,

$$|R_2 R_2 \det(\nabla u)| \geq 24\eta\delta \operatorname{Log}(x^2 + y^2) - C\delta^2 \operatorname{Log}(x^2 + y^2) - |H(x, y)|.$$

Choose  $\delta \ll \eta$  and we see that, near  $(0, 0)$

$$|R_2 R_2 \det(\nabla u)| \geq 12\delta^2 \operatorname{Log}(x^2 + y^2).$$

Taking  $\delta \leq C$  small enough, we see that  $|\nabla u| \leq 1$  but  $|R_2 R_2 \det(\nabla u)| \geq c \operatorname{Log}(x^2 + y^2)$ , for some small  $c$ .

This completes the construction.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bourgain and D. Li. Strong illposedness of the incompressible Euler equation in integer  $C^m$  spaces *preprint*, *arXiv:1405.2847*.
- [2] T.M. Elgindi and N. Masmoudi  $L^\infty$  ill-posedness for a class of equations arising in hydrodynamics. *preprint*, *arXiv:1405.2478*.