

On Liouville Theorems and Global Regularity to the 3-D Incompressible Axisymmetric Navier-Stokes Equations

Quansen JIU ¹

School of Mathematical Sciences,

Capital Normal University, Beijing 100048, P. R. China

Zhouping XIN ²

IMS and Department of Mathematics,

The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong

Abstract: In this paper, we will prove Liouville theorems and global regularity to the 3-D axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations with swirls under some suitable assumptions on u_θ and u_z or some weighted estimates of the solutions which are scaling invariant. As a by-product, we obtain the global regularity to the 3-D axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations with swirls for a class of initial data with large amplitudes. The proof is based on a blow-up approach.

Key Words: 3-D axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations, Liouville theorem, global regularity, blow-up approach

AMS(1991)Subject Classification: 35Q35.

1 Introduction

We consider the Cauchy problem for the three-dimensional (3-D) incompressible Navier-Stokes equations

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u + (u \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla p = 0, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, T), \\ \operatorname{div} u = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

with the initial conditions

$$u(x, t) |_{t=0} = u_0(x). \quad (1.2)$$

¹The research is partially supported by National Natural Sciences Foundation of China (No. 11171229, No.11231006 and No.11228102) and Project of Beijing Chang Cheng Xue Zhe. e-mail: jiuqs@mail.cnu.edu.cn

²The research is partially supported by Zheng Ge Ru Funds, Hong Kong RGC Earmarked Research Grants CUHK4041/11P and CUHK4048/13P, NSFC/RGC Joint Research Scheme Grant CUHK443/14, a Focus Area Grant at The Chinese University of Hong Kong, and a grant from the Croucher Foundation. e-mail: zpxin@ims.cuhk.edu.hk

Here the unknown functions are the velocity vector $u = (u_1(x, t), u_2(x, t), u_3(x, t))$ and the pressure $p(x, t)$ with $x \in \mathbb{R}^3, t \in [0, T]$, where $T > 0$ is a constant. In (1.1), $\operatorname{div} u = 0$ means that the fluid is incompressible.

The global existence of the Leray-Hopf weak solutions to the Cauchy problem or the initial-boundary problem of the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations has been proved long ago (see [20],[8]). However, the uniqueness and regularity of the weak solutions remain completely open. Up to now, the weak solutions will be regular and unique provided that the Serrin-type conditions $u \in L^p([0, T]; L^q(\mathbb{R}^3))$ hold, where $2/p + 3/q \leq 1$, $p \geq 2$ and $q \leq 3$ (see [27], [28], [7]). The strong (or smooth) solution of the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations was proved to be unique but local in time (see [13, 15, 17, 22, 29]). On the other hand, Scheffer [25] introduced and began to study the partial regularity of suitable weak solutions. The significant results, due to Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg [2] show that, for any suitable weak solutions, one-dimensional Hausdorff measure of the singular set is zero. The simplified proofs and further studies are referred to [21], [30].

For the three-dimensional axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations, if the angular component of the velocity $u_\theta = 0$, the global existence and uniqueness of the strong (or smooth) solution have been successfully obtained ([17], [32]). In the presence of swirls, that is, $u_\theta \not\equiv 0$, the global well-posedness of the solution is still open. Recently, using DeGeogi-Nash-Moser iterations and a blow-up approach respectively, Chen-Strain-Tsai-Yau [5, 6] and Koch-Nadirashvili-Seregin-Šverák [14] obtained an interesting and important development on this problem. Roughly speaking, they proved that if the solution satisfies (1) $|ru(x, t)| \leq C$ or (2) $|u(x, t)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{T^* - t}}$ for $0 < t < T^*$, where $C > 0$ is an absolute constant and $(0, T^*)$ is the maximal existence interval of the solution, then there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that $|u(x, t)| \leq M$ for $0 < t \leq T^*$ which implies that the solution is globally regular on time. It should be remarked that the condition (1) or (2) is scaling invariant and the singularity satisfying (2) is usually called type I singularity in the sense of [9]. Thus, if an axisymmetric solution develops a singularity, it can only be a singularity of type II (any singularity which is not type I). The other regularity criteria and recent studies can be seen in [4, 12, 16, 19, 24] and references therein.

The basic idea of the blow-up approach is that if the solution would blow up at some space-time point, then making scaling transformation of the solution and enlarging the region near the possibly singular point, one can look into the equations satisfied by some suitably scaled solutions. In particular, after taking the limit, if the solution of the limit equation is trivial, which is a Liouville type of theorem, then one will obtain a contradiction and the blow-up will not happen. To the three-dimensional axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations, the possible singularity of the solution may only appear on the symmetry axis due to the partial regularity theory in [2]. Therefore it suffices to study the possible singularity of the solution on the symmetry axis. In this paper, we are concerned with Liouville type of theorems and

the global regularity of the three-dimensional axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations.

In Section 2, we prove a Liouville type of theorem by assuming that

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \|ru_\theta(x, t)\|_{L^\infty(\{|x| \leq \delta\} \times (-1, 0))} = 0. \quad (1.3)$$

It is shown that, under the assumption (1.3), there exists a bounded and continuous function $s(T)$ defined on $(-\infty, 0]$ such that the ancient solution $\bar{u} = (0, 0, s(T))$. Furthermore, to prove $s(T) \equiv 0$ and rule out the possible singularity of the solution, we impose one of scaling invariant conditions on u_z (see Theorem 2.2). It should be remarked that the assumption of (1.3) is natural since ru_θ satisfies the maximum principle and if the initial data satisfies $|ru_{\theta 0}| \leq C$ then the solution will keep the bound $|ru_\theta| \leq C$ for some constant $C > 0$. This implies that the singularity of u_θ near the symmetry axis, if exists, may be of the rate $\frac{O(1)}{r}$ as $r \rightarrow 0$, where $O(1)$ means a finite constant. While the condition (1.3) implies that the singularity which we impose on u_θ near the symmetry axis is of the rate $\frac{o(1)}{r}$ with $o(1) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. Our approaches are based on [5, 6] and [14]. In particular, we will use the integral expression on $\frac{\omega_\theta^{(k)}}{R}$ which is the scaled quantity of $\frac{\omega_\theta}{r}$ to prove a Liouville type of theorem to the ancient solution, where $\omega_\theta = \partial_r u_3 - \partial_3 u_r$ is the angular component of the vorticity. This is different from [14] in which the authors established a Liouville theorem by making full use of the strong maximum principle of the scalar equation of $\Gamma = ru_\theta$, under the assumption that $|ru| \leq C$. Moreover, in comparison with the global regularity results in [5, 6] and [14], we need (1.3) but do not require the condition on the radial component of the velocity u_r . It should be noted that in the process of proving the Liouville type of theorem, we only need the condition (1.3). How to remove the condition (1.3) and the scaling invariant condition on u_z in Theorem 2.2 will be very interesting and challenging.

In Section 3, we prove a Liouville type of theorem and global regularity under weighted estimates of smooth solutions to the three-dimensional axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations. As a by-product, making use of the weighted estimates in [2], it is shown that the 3-D axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations has a unique and global strong solution if the initial data is regular and satisfies $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|u_0|^2}{r} dx \leq L$ for some $L > 0$. The constant $L > 0$ is small in general but it still allows that the initial data has large amplitudes and oscillations especially away from the symmetry axis.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we will present some preliminaries and establish a Liouville type of theorem under (1.3). Then we obtain the global regularity of the smooth solution under additional scaling invariant condition on u_z . In Section 3, we will show a Liouville type of theorem under assumptions of weighted estimates of the solution. Then we will prove the global regularity of the smooth solution under the assumption of some weighted initial data.

2 A Liouville Type of Theorem

By an axisymmetric solution (u, p) of (1.1), we mean that, in the cylindrical coordinate systems, the solution takes the form $p(x, t) = p(r, x_3, t)$ and

$$u(x, t) = u_r(r, x_3, t)e_r + u_\theta(r, x_3, t)e_\theta + u_3(r, x_3, t)e_3,$$

where

$$e_r = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 0), \quad e_\theta = (-\sin \theta, \cos \theta, 0), \quad e_3 = (0, 0, 1).$$

Here $u_\theta(r, x_3, t)$ and $u_r(r, x_3, t)$ are the angular and radial components of $u(x, t)$ respectively. For the axisymmetric velocity field u , the corresponding vorticity $\omega = \nabla \times u$ is

$$\omega = \omega_r e_r + \omega_\theta e_\theta + \omega_3 e_3,$$

where

$$\omega_r = \partial_3 u_\theta, \quad \omega_\theta = \partial_r u_3 - \partial_3 u_r, \quad \omega_3 = -\frac{1}{r} \partial_r (r u_\theta).$$

The 3-D axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations read as

$$\frac{\tilde{D}u_r}{Dt} - (\partial_r^2 + \partial_3^2 + \frac{1}{r}\partial_r)u_r + \frac{1}{r^2}u_r - \frac{1}{r}(u_\theta)^2 + \partial_r p = 0, \quad (2.1)$$

$$\frac{\tilde{D}u_\theta}{Dt} - (\partial_r^2 + \partial_3^2 + \frac{1}{r}\partial_r)u_\theta + \frac{1}{r^2}u_\theta + \frac{1}{r}u_\theta u_r = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\frac{\tilde{D}u_3}{Dt} - (\partial_r^2 + \partial_3^2 + \frac{1}{r}\partial_r)u_3 + \partial_3 p = 0, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\partial_r (r u_r) + \partial_3 (r u_3) = 0, \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$\frac{\tilde{D}}{Dt} = \partial_t + u_r \partial_r + u_3 \partial_3, \quad r = (x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{1/2}.$$

In the following, we set

$$\tilde{\nabla} = (\partial_r, \partial_3)$$

and use C to denote an absolute constant which may be different from line to line.

Without loss of generality, after translation on the time variable, $u(x, t)$ is assumed to be a smooth axisymmetric solution to (2.1)-(2.4), defined in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-1, 0)$ with $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-1, t'))$ for any $-1 < t' < 0$.

Let

$$h(t) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^3} |u(x, t)|, \quad H(t) = \sup_{-1 \leq s \leq t < 0} h(s). \quad (2.5)$$

Suppose that the first singularity time for the solution $u(x, t)$ is at time $t = 0$. Then it is clear that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^-} H(t) = \infty$. In fact, by a classical result of Leray [20], if u develops a singularity at $t = 0$, then

$$h(t) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^3} |u(x, t)| \geq \frac{\varepsilon_1}{\sqrt{-t}} \quad (2.6)$$

for some $\varepsilon_1 > 0$.

There exist $t_k \nearrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that $H(t_k) = h(t_k)$. Denote $N_k = H(t_k)$. Then there exists a sequence of numbers $\gamma_k \searrow 1$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $M_k = |u(x_k, t_k)| \geq N_k/\gamma_k$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, satisfying $M_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Define

$$u^{(k)}(X, T) = \frac{1}{M_k} u\left(\frac{X_1}{M_k}, \frac{X_2}{M_k}, x_{k3} + \frac{X_3}{M_k}, t_k + \frac{T}{M_k^2}\right), k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (2.7)$$

In the cylindrical coordinate system, set

$$u^{(k)}(X, T) = b^{(k)}(X, T) + u_\theta^{(k)} e_\theta,$$

where $b^{(k)}(X, T) = u_R^{(k)} e_R + u_Z^{(k)} e_Z$, $R = \sqrt{X_1^2 + X_2^2}$.

Then $u^{(k)}(X, T)$ are smooth solutions of the 3D Navier-Stokes equations, which are defined in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (A_k, B_k)$ with

$$A_k = -M_k^2 - M_k^2 t_k, \quad B_k = -M_k^2 t_k. \quad (2.8)$$

Note that $B_k = -M_k^2 t_k \geq \left(\frac{N_k}{\gamma_k}\right)^2 (-t_k) \geq \frac{\varepsilon_1}{\gamma_k^2}$. Moreover, it holds that

$$|u^{(k)}(X, T)| \leq \gamma_k, \quad X \in \mathbb{R}^3, T \in (A_k, 0), \quad (2.9)$$

and

$$|u^{(k)}(M_k x_{k1}, M_k x_{k2}, 0, 0)| = 1. \quad (2.10)$$

It follows from the regularity theorem of the Navier-Stokes equations that

$$|\partial_T u^{(k)}| + |D^l u^{(k)}| \leq C_l, \quad X \in \mathbb{R}^3, T \in (A_k, 0] \quad (2.11)$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ and $|l| = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, where $l = (l_1, l_2, l_3)$ is a multi-index satisfying $l_1 + l_2 + l_3 = |l|$ and $D^l = \frac{\partial^{|l|}}{\partial x_1^{l_1} \partial x_2^{l_2} \partial x_3^{l_3}}$. C_l is a constant depending on l but not on k .

Then there exists a smooth function $\bar{u}(X, T)$ defined in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-\infty, 0)$ such that, for any $|l| = 0, 1, 2, \dots$,

$$D^l u^{(k)} \longrightarrow D^l \bar{u}, \quad k \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.12)$$

uniformly in $C(\bar{Q})$ for any compact subset $Q \subset \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \times (-\infty, 0]$. Denote $\bar{\omega}(X, T) = \bar{\omega}_\theta e_\theta + \bar{\omega}_r e_r + \bar{\omega}_z e_z$ the vorticity of $\bar{u}(X, T)$.

Our first main result of this section is a Liouville type of theorem.

Theorem 2.1 Let $u(x, t)$ be an axisymmetric vector field defined in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-1, 0)$ which belongs to $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-1, t'))$ for each $-1 < t' < 0$. Assume that u satisfies

$$|ru_\theta(x, t)| \leq C, \quad (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times (-1, 0), \quad (2.13)$$

and

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \|ru_\theta(x, t)\|_{L^\infty(\{x|r \leq \delta\} \times (-1, 0))} = 0, \quad (2.14)$$

where $C > 0$ is any finite constant. Then either

$$|u(x, t)| \leq M, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad t \in [-1, 0], \quad (2.15)$$

where $M > 0$ is an absolute constant depending on C , or $\bar{\omega} = 0$ and $\bar{u} = (0, 0, s(T))$, where \bar{u} is same as in (2.12) and $s(T) : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded and continuous function.

Remark 2.1 The condition (2.13) can be removed if the initial data satisfies $\|ru_{0\theta}\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$ (see [4, 12]). The condition (2.14) means that the singularity of u_θ near the symmetry axis is of the rate $\frac{o(1)}{r}$ with $o(1) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Suppose that (2.15) is false. Then one can rescale the solution as in (2.7)-(2.12). It will be shown that $\bar{\omega}(X, T) = 0$ and $\bar{u}(X, T) = (0, 0, s(T))$ with $s(T) : (-\infty, 0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a bounded and continuous function.

Let $C_0 > 0$ be any fixed constant. For any $X \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $R \leq C_0$ and $T \in (A_k, 0]$, it follows from (2.14) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma^{(k)}(X, T)| &\equiv |Ru_\theta^{(k)}| = \left| \frac{R}{M_k} u_\theta \left(\frac{X_1}{M_k}, \frac{X_2}{M_k}, x_{k3} + \frac{X_3}{M_k}, t_k + \frac{T}{M_k^2} \right) \right| \\ &\leq \tilde{F}(k, C_0) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Set

$$F(k, C_0) = \max(\tilde{F}(k, C_0), \frac{1}{k}), \quad k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

It follows that

$$|u_\theta^{(k)}(X, T)| \leq R^{-1} F(k, C_0), \quad 0 < R \leq C_0, T \in (A_k, 0]. \quad (2.17)$$

It follows from (2.13) that

$$|u_\theta^{(k)}(X, T)| \leq \frac{C}{R}, \quad R > 0, T \in (A_k, 0]$$

Using (2.11) and the fact that $u_\theta^{(k)}|_{R=0} = 0$, one has

$$|u_\theta^{(k)}(X, T)| \leq C \min(R, R^{-1}), R > 0, T \in (A_k, 0], \quad (2.18)$$

$$|\partial_Z u_\theta^{(k)}(X, T)| \leq C \min(R, 1), R > 0, T \in (A_k, 0]. \quad (2.19)$$

Consequently, for any $T \in (A_k, 0]$,

$$|u_\theta^{(k)}(X, T)| \leq \begin{cases} CR, & R < \sqrt{F(k, C_0)}, \\ \frac{F(k, C_0)}{R}, & \sqrt{F(k, C_0)} \leq R \leq C_0, \\ \frac{C}{R}, & R > C_0. \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

$$\left| \frac{\partial_Z (u_\theta^{(k)})^2(R, Z, T)}{R^2} \right| \leq \begin{cases} C, & R < \sqrt{F(k, C_0)}, \\ C \frac{F(k, C_0)}{R^2}, & \sqrt{F(k, C_0)} \leq R < 1, \\ C \frac{F(k, C_0)}{R^3}, & 1 \leq R \leq C_0, \\ \frac{C}{R^3}, & R \geq C_0. \end{cases} \quad (2.21)$$

Let $\Omega = \frac{\omega_\theta(x, t)}{r}$ and $f^{(k)} = \Omega^{(k)}(X, T) = \frac{\omega_\theta^{(k)}(X, T)}{R}$. Then it holds that

$$|f^{(k)}(X, T)| \leq C(1 + R)^{-1}, \quad X \in \mathbb{R}^3, T \in (A_k, 0). \quad (2.22)$$

It follows from the equation of ω_θ that

$$(\partial_T - L)f^{(k)} = g^{(k)}, \quad L = \Delta + \frac{2}{R}\partial_R - b^{(k)} \cdot \nabla_X, \quad (2.23)$$

where $g^{(k)} = R^{-2}\partial_Z(u_\theta^{(k)})^2$ and $b^{(k)} = u_R^{(k)}e_R + u_Z^{(k)}e_Z$.

Regarding $f^{(k)}(X, T) = f^{(k)}(R, Z, T)$ as a 5-dimensional axisymmetric function by denoting $X = (\tilde{X}, X_5) = (X_1, \dots, X_4, X_5)$, $R = |\tilde{X}| = \sqrt{X_1^2 + X_2^2 + X_3^2 + X_4^2}$ and $Z = X_5$, we obtain

$$(\partial_T + \tilde{b}^{(k)} \cdot \tilde{\nabla}_X - \Delta_5)f^{(k)} = g^{(k)}, \quad (2.24)$$

where $\tilde{b}^{(k)} = u_R^{(k)}\tilde{e}_R + u_Z^{(k)}\tilde{e}_Z$ with $\tilde{e}_R = (\frac{X_1}{R}, \frac{X_2}{R}, \frac{X_3}{R}, \frac{X_4}{R}, 0)$ and $\tilde{e}_Z = (0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$. The scaling (2.7) can be rewritten as

$$u_\theta^{(k)}(Y, T) = \frac{1}{M_k} u\left(\frac{R}{M_k}, z_k + \frac{Y_5}{M_k}, t_k + \frac{T}{M_k}\right), \quad (2.25)$$

where $z_k = x_{3k}$.

Denote $P(T, X; S, Y)$ the kernel for $\partial_T + \tilde{b}^{(k)} \cdot \tilde{\nabla}_X - \Delta_5$ and $Y = (\tilde{Y}, Y_5) = (Y_1, \dots, Y_5)$. By the Duhamel's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(k)}(X, T) &= \int P(T, X; S, Y) f^{(k)}(Y, S) dY + \int_S^T \int P(T, X; \tau, Y) g^{(k)}(Y, \tau) dY d\tau \\ &=: I + II. \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

Due to Carlen-Loss [3] and Chen-Strain-Tsai-Yau [6], the kernel P satisfies $P \geq 0$, $\int P(T, X; S, Y) dY = 1$ and

$$P(T, X; S, Y) \leq C(T - S)^{-\frac{5}{2}} e^{-h(|X-Y|, T-S)}, \quad h(a, T) = C \frac{a^2}{T} \left[\left(1 - \frac{T}{a}\right)_+ \right]^2,$$

where $f_+ = \max\{0, f\}$ and we have used the fact that $\|\tilde{b}^{(k)}\|_\infty \leq \gamma_k \leq 2$ for $k \geq N$.

It can be verified that the function $e^{-h(a, T)}$, $a \geq 0, T \geq 0$, has the following properties:

When $T \geq T_0 > 0$ for any fixed (but may be small) $T_0 > 0$, one has

$$e^{-h(a, T)} \leq C e^{-Ca/T} \tag{2.27}$$

holds for some constant $C > 0$ which may depend on T_0 .

When $T \geq \frac{a}{2}$, one has

$$e^{-h(a, T)} \leq C e^{-Ca/T}. \tag{2.28}$$

When $0 \leq T \leq \frac{a}{2}$, it is easy to get

$$e^{-h(a, T)} = e^{-C \frac{a^2}{T} (1 - \frac{T}{a})^2} \leq e^{-Ca^2/T}. \tag{2.29}$$

In (2.28) and (2.29), $C > 0$ is some uniform constant.

It follows from (2.27) and Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} |I| &\leq \left[\int P(T, X; S, Y) |f^{(k)}(Y, S)|^5 dY \right]^{\frac{1}{5}} \\ &\leq [C(T - S)^{-\frac{5}{2}} \int e^{-C \frac{|X_5 - Y_5|}{T-S}} \frac{\mathbb{R}^3 dR}{(1 + R)^5} dY_5]^{\frac{1}{5}} \\ &\leq C(T - S)^{-\frac{3}{10}} \end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

for all $X \in \mathbb{R}^5, T, S \in (A_k, 0)$ satisfying $T - S > 0$.

Let $L = \{\tau \in [S, T] : T - \tau \geq \frac{|X-Y|}{2}\}$ and $L^c = \{\tau \in [S, T] : T - \tau \leq \frac{|X-Y|}{2}\}$. For any $C_0 > 0$, with help of (2.28) and (2.29), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|II| &\leq \int_L \int C(T-\tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} e^{-C\frac{|X-Y|}{T-\tau}} |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)| dY d\tau \\
&+ \int_{L^c} \int C(T-\tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} e^{-C\frac{|X-Y|^2}{T-\tau}} |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)| dY d\tau \\
&\leq C \int_S^T (T-\tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} d\tau \int e^{-C\frac{|X_5-Y_5|}{T-\tau}} dY_5 \left(\int_{\{R \leq C_0\}} e^{-C\frac{|\tilde{X}-\tilde{Y}|}{T-\tau}} d\tilde{Y} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\{R \leq C_0\}} |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)|^2 d\tilde{Y} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&+ C \int_S^T (T-\tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} d\tau \int e^{-C\frac{|X_5-Y_5|}{T-\tau}} dY_5 \left(\int_{\{R \geq C_0\}} e^{-C\frac{|\tilde{X}-\tilde{Y}|}{T-\tau}} d\tilde{Y} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\{R \geq C_0\}} |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)|^2 d\tilde{Y} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&+ C \int_S^T (T-\tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} d\tau \int e^{-C\frac{|X_5-Y_5|^2}{T-\tau}} dY_5 \left(\int_{\{R \leq C_0\}} e^{-C\frac{|\tilde{X}-\tilde{Y}|^2}{T-\tau}} d\tilde{Y} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \left(\int_{\{R \leq C_0\}} |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)|^3 d\tilde{Y} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \\
&+ C \int_S^T (T-\tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} d\tau \int e^{-C\frac{|X_5-Y_5|^2}{T-\tau}} dY_5 \left(\int_{\{R \geq C_0\}} e^{-C\frac{|\tilde{X}-\tilde{Y}|^2}{T-\tau}} d\tilde{Y} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \left(\int_{\{R \geq C_0\}} |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)|^3 d\tilde{Y} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (2.21) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\{R \leq C_0\}} |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)|^2 d\tilde{Y} \\
&= \left[\int_{\{R < \sqrt{F(k, C_0)}\}} + \int_{\{\sqrt{F(k, C_0)} \leq R < 1\}} + \int_{\{1 \leq R < C_0\}} \right] |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)|^2 d\tilde{Y} \\
&\leq C[(\sqrt{F(k, C_0)})^4 + F^2(k, C_0)(-\ln \sqrt{F(k, C_0)}) + F^2(k, C_0)].
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\{R \leq C_0\}} |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)|^3 d\tilde{Y} \\
&\leq C[(\sqrt{F(k, C_0)})^4 + F^3(k, C_0)(\sqrt{F(k, C_0)})^{-2} + F^3(k, C_0)].
\end{aligned}$$

It concludes that

$$\begin{aligned}
|II| &\leq C(T-S)^{\frac{3}{2}} [(\sqrt{F(k, C_0)})^4 + F^2(k, C_0)(-\ln \sqrt{F(k, C_0)}) + F^2(k, C_0) + C_0^{-1}] \\
&+ C(T-S)^{\frac{1}{3}} [(\sqrt{F(k, C_0)})^4 + F^3(k, C_0)(\sqrt{F(k, C_0)})^{-2} + F^3(k, C_0) + C_0^{-\frac{5}{3}}].
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $T - S = C_0^{\frac{1}{3}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |I| + |II| &\leq C(C_0^{-\frac{1}{10}} + C_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} + C_0^{-\frac{14}{9}}) \\ &+ C[(\sqrt{F(k, C_0)})^4 + F^2(k, C_0)(-\ln \sqrt{F(k, C_0)}) + F^2(k, C_0)]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &+ C[(\sqrt{F(k, C_0)})^4 + F^3(k, C_0)(\sqrt{F(k, C_0)})^{-2} + F^3(k, C_0)]^{\frac{1}{3}}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ first and then letting $C_0 \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$|f^{(k)}(X, T)| \rightarrow 0,$$

and hence

$$|\omega_\theta^{(k)}(X, T)| \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.31)$$

which implies that $\bar{\omega}_\theta(R, Z, T) = 0$. Consequently, we obtain that $\bar{\omega}_\theta(X, T) = 0$ for $X \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $T \in (-\infty, 0)$. Denote $\bar{b}(X, T) = \bar{u}_R e_R + \bar{u}_Z$. It follows from (2.12) that

$$u^{(k)}(X, T) \rightarrow \bar{u}(X, T), \quad b^{(k)}(X, T) \rightarrow \bar{b}(X, T), \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.32)$$

uniformly in $C(\bar{Q})$ with any compact subset $Q \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^3 \times (-\infty, 0]$.

As a consequence of $\text{curl}_X b^{(k)}(X, T) = \omega_\theta^{(k)} e_\theta$, $\text{div}_X b^{(k)}(X, T) = 0$ and (2.32), $\bar{b}(X, T)$ is a harmonic and bounded function. That is, $\Delta_X \bar{b} = 0$ and $\bar{b}(X, T)$ is bounded. Since $\bar{u}_R(0, Z, T) = 0$, there exists a continuous and bounded function $s(T) : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\bar{b}(X, T) = (0, s(T))$. Moreover, since $|Ru_\theta^{(k)}| \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for $0 < R \leq C_0$, where $C_0 > 0$ is arbitrary, it follows that $\bar{u}_\theta(X, T) = 0$ for all $X \in \mathbb{R}^3, T \in (-\infty, 0)$. Therefore we have proved that $\bar{u}(X, T) = (0, 0, s(T))$ and furthermore $\bar{\omega}(X, T) = 0$. The proof of the theorem is finished.

To rule out the possible singularity of the solution, one needs some scaling invariant properties of u_z . More precisely, we have

Theorem 2.2 Under assumptions of Theorem 2.1, if one of the following conditions holds:

- (1) $|ru_z(x, t)| \leq C, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad t \in [-1, 0],$
- (2) $u_z \in L^p((-1, 0); L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)), \quad \frac{2}{p} + \frac{3}{q} = 1, \quad 2 \leq p \leq \infty, \quad 3 \leq q < \infty,$
- (3) $\sup_{-1 < t < 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|u_z|^2}{r} dx \leq C,$

then $|u(x, t)| \leq M$ for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times (-1, 0]$, where $M > 0$ is an absolute constant depending on C .

Proof. Suppose that the result does not hold true. Then there exist $t_k \nearrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that $H(t_k) = h(t_k)$, where $h(t)$ and $H(t)$ are defined as (2.5). Denote $N_k = H(t_k)$. Then one can choose a sequence of numbers $\gamma_k \searrow 1$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $M_k = |u(x_k, t_k)| \geq N_k/\gamma_k$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, satisfying $M_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Denote $r_k = \sqrt{(x_{k1})^2 + (x_{k2})^2}$.

The proof is divided into two cases.

Case I. $\{r_k M_k\} (k = 1, 2, \dots)$ is uniformly bounded.

In this case, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$r_k M_k \leq C. \quad (2.33)$$

Rescale the solution as in (2.7). In view of (2.33), there exists a point $(x_{\infty 1}, x_{\infty 2}) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that, up to a subsequence, $(M_k x_{k1}, M_k x_{k2}) \rightarrow (x_{\infty 1}, x_{\infty 2})$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Here $\sqrt{(x_{\infty 1})^2 + (x_{\infty 2})^2} \leq C < \infty$. It follows from (2.10) and (2.32) that $\bar{u}(x_{\infty 1}, x_{\infty 2}, 0, 0) = 1$.

Moreover, Theorem 2.1 implies that $\bar{u}(X, T) = (0, 0, s(T))$, where $s(T)$ is a bounded and continuous function defined in $(-\infty, 0]$. Furthermore, under the assumption of Theorem 2.2, it holds that $\bar{u}(X, T) = 0$ for all $(X, T) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times (-\infty, 0]$. This is a contradiction to $\bar{u}(x_{\infty 1}, x_{\infty 2}, 0, 0) = 1$, which implies that the theorem holds true in this case.

Case II. $r_k M_k (k = 1, 2, \dots)$ is not uniformly bounded.

This case has been discussed by Lei and Zhang [19]. In this case, one can rescale the solution as

$$u^{(k)}(X, T) = \frac{1}{M_k} u\left(x_k + \frac{X}{M_k}, t_k + \frac{T}{M_k^2}\right). \quad (2.34)$$

Then, similar to Case I, $u^{(k)}(X, T) (k = 1, 2, \dots)$ are smooth solutions of the 3D Navier-Stokes equations, which are defined in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (A_k, B_k)$ with

$$A_k = -M_k^2 - M_k^2 t_k, \quad B_k = -M_k^2 t_k. \quad (2.35)$$

Note that $B_k = -M_k^2 t_k \geq (\frac{N_k}{\gamma_k})^2 (-t_k) \geq \frac{\varepsilon_1^2}{\gamma_k^2}$ for some $\varepsilon_1 > 0$. Moreover, it is clear that

$$|u^{(k)}(X, T)| \leq \gamma_k, \quad X \in \mathbb{R}^3, T \in (A_k, 0], \quad (2.36)$$

and

$$|u^{(k)}(0, 0)| = 1. \quad (2.37)$$

In this case, there exists a subsequence of $\{M_k\}$ (still denoted by itself) such that $r_k M_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Due to the axis symmetry of u , x_k can be chosen so that

$\theta(x_k) \rightarrow \theta_\infty$ for some $\theta_\infty \in [0, 2\pi]$. Then there exists a unit vector $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, 0)$ such that $e_r(x_k) \rightarrow \nu$ and $e_\theta(x_k) \rightarrow \nu^\perp = (-\nu_2, \nu_1, 0)$. Moreover, it holds that

$$x_k + \frac{X}{M_k} \in B(x_k, \frac{r_k}{\sqrt{r_k M_k}}) \text{ for } X \in B(0, \sqrt{r_k M_k}),$$

and

$$t_k - \left(\frac{r_k}{\sqrt{r_k M_k}}\right)^2 < t_k + \frac{T}{M_k^2} \leq t_k < 0 \text{ for } -M_k r_k < T \leq 0.$$

By (2.13),

$$|u_\theta(y, t)| \leq \frac{C}{r_k} \text{ for } y \in B(x_k, \frac{r_k}{2}), t < 0,$$

which implies that

$$|u^{(k)}(X, T)e_\theta(x_k + \frac{X}{M_k})| = \frac{1}{M_k} |u_\theta(x_k + \frac{X}{M_k}, t_k + \frac{T}{M_k^2})| \leq \frac{C}{M_k r_k} \quad (2.38)$$

for $(X, T) \in B(0, \sqrt{r_k M_k}) \times (-r_k M_k, 0]$.

Since the flow is axisymmetric, thus, on $B(0, \sqrt{r_k M_k}) \times (-r_k M_k, 0]$, $e_R(x_k + \frac{X}{M_k}) \rightarrow \nu$ and $e_\theta(x_k + \frac{X}{M_k}) \rightarrow \nu^\perp$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, for each k , $u^{(k)}$ is a bounded and smooth solution to the 3D Navier-Stokes equations. There exists a subsequence of $u^{(k)}$ (still denoted by itself) and a bounded ancient solution $\tilde{u}(X, T)$ to the 3D Navier-Stokes equations on $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-\infty, 0]$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} u^{(k)}(X, T) &= \frac{1}{M_k} u_R(x_k + \frac{X}{M_k}, t_k + \frac{T}{M_k^2}) e_R(x_k + \frac{X}{M_k}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{M_k} u_\theta(x_k + \frac{X}{M_k}, t_k + \frac{T}{M_k^2}) e_\theta(x_k + \frac{X}{M_k}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{M_k} u_Z(x_k + \frac{X}{M_k}, \frac{T}{M_k^2}) e_Z(x_k + \frac{X}{M_k}) \\ &\rightarrow \tilde{u}(X, T) = \tilde{u}_R \nu + \tilde{u}_\theta \nu^\perp + \tilde{u}_Z e_Z \end{aligned}$$

in $C(\bar{Q})$ for any compact subset Q of $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-\infty, 0]$. Note that (2.38) implies $\tilde{u}(X, T) \cdot \nu^\perp = 0$. Hence

$$\tilde{u}(X, T) = \tilde{u}_R(X, T) \nu + \tilde{u}_Z(X, T) e_Z, \quad (2.39)$$

and in view of (2.37), one has

$$|\tilde{u}(0, 0)| = 1. \quad (2.40)$$

On the other hand, for $(y, s) \in B(x_k, \frac{r_k}{\sqrt{r_k M_k}}) \times [t_k - (\frac{r_k}{\sqrt{r_k M_k}})^2, t_k]$, one has that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{M_k} [u_r(y, s)e_\theta(y) - u_\theta(y, s)e_r(y)] \\
&= \frac{1}{M_k} \partial_\theta [u_r(y, s)e_r(y) + u_\theta(y, s)e_\theta(y)] \\
&= \frac{1}{M_k} \partial_\theta [u_r(y, s)e_r(y) + u_\theta(y, s)e_\theta(y) + u_z(y, s)e_z(y)] \\
&= \partial_\theta [u^{(k)}(M_k(y - x_k), M_k^2(s - t_k))] \\
&= M_k(\partial_\theta y \cdot \nabla)u^{(k)}(M_k(y - x_k), M_k^2(s - t_k)) \\
&= M_k|y|(e_\theta(y) \cdot \nabla)u^{(k)}(M_k(y - x_k), M_k^2(s - t_k)),
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{M_k} [u_r(x_k + \frac{X}{M_k}, t_k + \frac{T}{M_k^2})e_\theta(x_k + \frac{X}{M_k}) \\
& \quad - u_\theta(x_k + \frac{X}{M_k}, t_k + \frac{T}{M_k^2})e_R(x_k + \frac{X}{M_k})] \\
&= M_k|x_k + \frac{X}{M_k}|(e_\theta(x_k + \frac{X}{M_k}) \cdot \nabla)u^{(k)}(X, T)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.41}$$

for $(X, T) \in B(0, \sqrt{r_k M_k}) \times (-r_k M_k, 0]$. Since $r_k M_k \rightarrow \infty$, so $M_k|x_k + \frac{X}{M_k}| \rightarrow \infty$ for any fixed $X \in B(0, \sqrt{r_k M_k})$. But the left hand side of (2.41) is bounded. Hence, letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, one gets that

$$(\nu^\perp \cdot \nabla)\tilde{u}(X, T) = 0. \tag{2.42}$$

Note that the Navier-Stokes equations are invariant under rotation. Without loss of generality, we set $\nu = e_1, \nu^\perp = e_2$. Consequently, the limit function

$$\tilde{u}(X, T) = \tilde{u}_R(X_1, Z, T)e_1 + \tilde{u}_Z(X_1, Z, T)e_2,$$

is a bounded ancient solution to the 2D Navier-Stokes equations. It follows from Theorem 5.1 and Remark 6.1 in [14] that $\nabla u_R = \nabla u_Z = 0$. Hence, u_R and u_Z are bounded and continuous functions depending only on time variable $T \in (-\infty, 0]$. Then the assumptions of the theorem implies that $u_Z = 0$. Using the divergence-free condition, $\frac{u_R}{R} + \partial_R u_R + \partial_Z u_Z = 0$, we obtain that $u_R = 0$. Thanks to (2.38), it yields that $u_\theta = 0$. Therefore $u(X, T) \equiv 0$. This is a contradiction to (2.40) and the theorem is true in this case.

The proof of the theorem is finished.

3 Weighted Initial Data

In [2], some weighted estimates were obtained for suitable weak solutions $(u(x, t), p(x, t))$ of the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations (1.1). More precisely, suppose that there exists a small number $L_0 > 0$ such that if

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|u_0|^2}{|x|} dx \leq L \quad (3.1)$$

with $0 < L < L_0$, then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|u|^2}{|x|} dx + (L_0 - L) \exp\left\{\frac{1}{L_0} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{|x|}\right\} dx dt \leq L_0, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.2)$$

For the three-dimensional axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations, if

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|u_0|^2}{r} dx \leq L, \quad (3.3)$$

where $L > 0$ is same as in (3.1), then it is clear that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|u_0|^2}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z - z_0)^2}} dx \leq L \quad (3.4)$$

for any $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. By the translation with respect to $z (= x_3)$, one can prove in a similar way as in [2] that if (3.4) holds, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|u|^2}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z - z_0)^2}} dx \\ & + (L_0 - L) \exp\left\{\frac{1}{L_0} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z - z_0)^2}}\right\} dx dt \leq L_0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

for any $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, where L and L_0 are same as in (3.2). Note that the quantities on the left hand side of (3.5) are scaling invariant.

Let $B_{\bar{R}} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid |x| < \bar{R}\}$ be a ball with radius $\bar{R} > 0$. Motivated by the weighted estimates (3.5), we have

Theorem 3.1 Let $u(x, t)$ be an axisymmetric vector field defined in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-1, 0)$ which belongs to $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-1, t'))$ for each $-1 < t' < 0$ and $L^\infty(B_{\bar{R}}^c \times (-1, 0))$ for some $\bar{R} > 0$, where $B_{\bar{R}}^c = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{\bar{R}}$. Moreover, assume that u satisfies

$$(1) \quad |ru_\theta(x, t)| \leq C, \quad (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times (-1, 0), \quad (3.6)$$

$$(2) \quad \int_{-1}^0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|\omega_r|^2}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z - z_0)^2}} r dr dz dt \leq C \quad (3.7)$$

for any $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then either

$$|u(x, t)| \leq M, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad t \in (-1, 0], \quad (3.8)$$

where $M > 0$ is an absolute constant depending on C , or $\bar{\omega}_\theta = 0$ and $\bar{u} = \bar{u}_\theta e_\theta + s(T)e_Z$, where $s(T) : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded and continuous function, \bar{u} is defined in (2.12) and $\bar{\omega} = \nabla \times \bar{u} = \bar{\omega}_r e_r + \bar{\omega}_\theta e_\theta + \bar{\omega}_z e_z$ is the vorticity of \bar{u} .

Remark 3.1 The assumption that $u(x, t) \in L^\infty(B_{\bar{R}}^c \times (-1, 0))$ for some $\bar{R} > 0$ can be easily satisfied if the solution decays at far fields for all $t \in (-1, 0)$. Moreover, the condition (3.7) can be replaced by

$$\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|\omega_r|^2}{r} dx dt \leq C. \quad (3.9)$$

Proof of Theorem 3.1 Suppose that the solution $u(x, t)$ has singularity at $t = 0$. Then similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1, there exist $t_k \nearrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that $H(t_k) = h(t_k)$, where $H(t)$ and $h(t)$ are same as in (2.5). Denote $N_k = H(t_k)$. Since $u(x, t) \in L^\infty(B_{\bar{R}}^c \times (-1, 0))$ for some $\bar{R} > 0$ by the assumption, we can choose a sequence of numbers $\gamma_k \searrow 1$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $x_k \in B_{\bar{R}}$ such that $M_k = |u(x_k, t_k)| \geq N_k / \gamma_k$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, satisfying $M_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Using the same scaling (2.7), one can prove the theorem as for Theorem 2.1.

To be more precise, we continue the proof based on (2.26). The first term I in (2.26) can be estimated as in (2.30). Thus, one needs to focus on the estimate of the second term II in (2.26).

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |II| &\leq \int_L \int C(T - \tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} e^{-C \frac{|X-Y|}{T-\tau}} |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)| dY d\tau \\ &+ \int_{L^c} \int C(T - \tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} e^{-C \frac{|X-Y|^2}{T-\tau}} |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)| dY d\tau \equiv II_1 + II_2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

where $L = \{\tau \in [S, T] : T - \tau \geq \frac{|X-Y|}{2}\}$ and $L^c = \{\tau \in [S, T] : T - \tau \leq \frac{|X-Y|}{2}\}$. Here we are estimating in 5-dimensional space, $X = (\tilde{X}, X_5) = (X_1, \dots, X_4, X_5)$, $Y = (\tilde{Y}, Y_5) = (Y_1, \dots, Y_4, Y_5)$ and $R = |\tilde{X}| = \sqrt{X_1^2 + \dots + X_4^2}$.

First, II_2 can be estimated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
|II_2| &\leq \int_S^T \int_{R^5} (T-\tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} e^{-C\frac{|X-Y|^2}{T-\tau}} |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)| dY d\tau \\
&= \int_S^T \left[\int_{\{\frac{|X_5-Y_5|^2}{T-\tau} \leq C_0, \frac{|\tilde{X}-\tilde{Y}|^2}{T-\tau} \leq C_0\}} + \int_{\{\frac{|X_5-Y_5|^2}{T-\tau} \geq C_0, \frac{|\tilde{X}-\tilde{Y}|^2}{T-\tau} \leq C_0\}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{\{\frac{|X_5-Y_5|^2}{T-\tau} \leq C_0, \frac{|\tilde{X}-\tilde{Y}|^2}{T-\tau} \geq C_0\}} + \int_{\{\frac{|X_5-Y_5|^2}{T-\tau} \geq C_0, \frac{|\tilde{X}-\tilde{Y}|^2}{T-\tau} \geq C_0\}} \right] (T-\tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} e^{-C\frac{|X-Y|^2}{T-\tau}} |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)| dY d\tau \\
&\equiv J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

For $0 < \alpha < 1$, direct estimates lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &\leq \int_S^T \int_{\{|Y| \leq 2\sqrt{C_0(T-S)} + 2|X|\}} (T-\tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} e^{-C\frac{|X-Y|^2}{T-\tau}} \frac{|u_\theta^{(k)} \partial_Z u_\theta^{(k)}|}{R^2} dY d\tau \\
&\leq \int_S^T \int_{\{|Y| \leq 2\sqrt{C_0(T-S)} + 2|X|\}} (T-\tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} e^{-C\frac{|X-Y|^2}{T-\tau}} \frac{|\partial_Z u_\theta^{(k)}|^\alpha}{R^\alpha} \frac{|\partial_Z u_\theta^{(k)}|^{1-\alpha}}{(R^2|Y|)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}} |Y|^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} \frac{|u_\theta^{(k)}|}{R} dY d\tau \\
&\leq (2\sqrt{C_0(T-S)} + 2|X|)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} \left(\int_S^T \int_{\{|Y| \leq 2\sqrt{C_0(T-S)} + 2|X|\}} \frac{|\partial_Z u_\theta^{(k)}|^2}{R^2|Y|} dY d\tau \right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} \\
&\quad \times \left(\int_S^T \int_{\{|Y| \leq 2\sqrt{C_0(T-S)} + 2|X|\}} (T-\tau)^{-\frac{5}{1+\alpha}} e^{-C\frac{|X-Y|^2}{T-\tau}} dY d\tau \right)^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} \\
&\leq F(C_0, T-S, |X|, \alpha, k) \left(\int_S^T (T-\tau)^{-\frac{5}{1+\alpha} + \frac{5}{2}} d\tau \right)^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} \\
&\leq F(C_0, T-S, |X|, \alpha, k),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where

$$F(C_0, T-S, |X|, \alpha, k) = F_1(C_0, T-S, |X|, \alpha) \left(\int_S^T \int_{\{|Y| \leq 2\sqrt{C_0(T-S)} + 2|X|\}} \frac{|\partial_Z u_\theta^{(k)}|^2}{R^2|Y|} dY d\tau \right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}$$

and $F_1(C_0, T-S, |X|, \alpha)$ is a constant depending on $C_0, T-S, |X|$ and α . Note that the angular component of the velocity in (2.25) is

$$u_\theta^{(k)}(Y, T) = \frac{1}{M_k} u_\theta \left(\frac{R}{M_k}, z_k + \frac{Y_5}{M_k}, t_k + \frac{T}{M_k^2} \right),$$

where $z_k = x_{3k}$. Letting

$$y_1 = \frac{Y_1}{M_k}, \dots, y_4 = \frac{Y_4}{M_k}, z = z_k + \frac{Y_5}{M_k}, t = t_k + \frac{\tau}{M_k^2}, r = \sqrt{y_1^2 + \dots + y_4^2},$$

one can get that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_S^T \int_{\{|Y| \leq 2\sqrt{C_0(T-S)+2|X|}\}} \frac{|\partial_z u_\theta^{(k)}|^2}{R^2|Y|} dY d\tau \\
&= \int_{t_k + \frac{S}{M_k}}^{t_k + \frac{T}{M_k}} \int_{\{\sqrt{r^2 + (z-z_k)^2} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{C_0(T-S)+2|X|}}{M_k}\}} \frac{|\partial_z u_\theta|^2}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z-z_k)^2}} r dr dz dt \quad (3.13)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $|z_k| = |x_{k3}| \leq \bar{R}$ is bounded. There exists a subsequence of $\{(z_k, t_k)\}$, still denoted by itself, and $\bar{z} \in [-\bar{R}, \bar{R}]$ such that $t_k \rightarrow 0, z_k \rightarrow \bar{z}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. By the assumption (3.7), for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\int_{-2\delta}^0 \int_0^{2\delta} \int_{\bar{z}-2\delta}^{\bar{z}+2\delta} \frac{|\partial_z u_\theta|^2}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z-\bar{z})^2}} r dr dz dt \leq \varepsilon. \quad (3.14)$$

Using (3.7) again leads to

$$\int_{-2\delta}^0 \int_0^{2\delta} \int_{\bar{z}-2\delta}^{\bar{z}+2\delta} \frac{|\partial_z u_\theta|^2}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z-\bar{z}_k)^2}} r dr dz dt \leq C. \quad (3.15)$$

Taking $k > K$ large enough such that $(t_k + \frac{S}{M_k}, t_k + \frac{T}{M_k}) \subset (-\delta, 0)$ and $\{(r, z) \in (0, \infty) \times (-\infty, \infty) | \sqrt{r^2 + (z-\bar{z})^2} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{C_0(T-S)+2|X|}}{M_k}\} \subset (0, \delta) \times (\bar{z} - \delta, \bar{z} + \delta)$. Let

$$h_k(r, z, t) = \frac{|\partial_z u_\theta|^2}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z-z_k)^2}}, h(r, z, t) = \frac{|\partial_z u_\theta|^2}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z-\bar{z})^2}},$$

where $(r, z) \in (0, 2\delta) \times (\bar{z} - 2\delta, \bar{z} + 2\delta)$.

For any fixed $0 < \delta_0 < \delta$, we choose $0 \leq \varphi(r, z, t) \leq 1$ to be a smooth function defined in $(0, \infty) \times (-\infty, \infty) \times (-1, 0)$ satisfying $\varphi(r, z, t) \equiv 1$ if $(r, z, t) \in (\delta_0, \delta) \times (\bar{z} - \delta, \bar{z} + \delta) \times (-\delta, -\delta_0)$ and $\varphi(r, z, t) \equiv 0$ if $(r, z, t) \notin Q_{\delta, \delta_0} \equiv (\frac{\delta_0}{2}, 2\delta) \times (\bar{z} - 2\delta, \bar{z} + 2\delta) \times (-2\delta, -\frac{\delta_0}{2})$.

Then, there exists a subsequence (still denoted by itself) such that

$$h_k \rightharpoonup \tilde{h} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}(Q_{\delta, \delta_0}) \quad (\text{by (3.15)})$$

$$h_k \rightarrow h \quad \text{a.e. on } Q_{\delta, \delta_0},$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$, where $\tilde{h} \in \mathcal{M}(Q_{\delta, \delta_0})$ which is the finite Radon measure space restricted on Q_{δ, δ_0} . In particular, it concludes that $\tilde{h} = h$ and

$$\int_{Q_{\delta, \delta_0}} h_k \varphi r dr dz dt \rightarrow \int_{Q_{\delta, \delta_0}} h \varphi r dr dz dt, \quad (3.16)$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. That is

$$\int_{-2\delta}^{-\frac{\delta_0}{2}} \int_{\frac{\delta_0}{2}}^{2\delta} \int_{\bar{z}-2\delta}^{\bar{z}+2\delta} h_k \varphi r dr dz dt \rightarrow \int_{-2\delta}^{-\frac{\delta_0}{2}} \int_{\frac{\delta_0}{2}}^{2\delta} \int_{\bar{z}-2\delta}^{\bar{z}+2\delta} h \varphi r dr dz dt, \quad (3.17)$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Using (3.14) and (3.17), one obtains, for any $0 < \delta_0 < \delta$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-\delta}^{-\delta_0} \int_{\delta_0}^{\delta} \int_{\bar{z}-\delta}^{\bar{z}+\delta} h_k r dr dz dt &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-2\delta}^{-\frac{\delta_0}{2}} \int_{\frac{\delta_0}{2}}^{2\delta} \int_{\bar{z}-2\delta}^{\bar{z}+2\delta} h_k \varphi r dr dz dt \\ &= \int_{-2\delta}^{-\frac{\delta_0}{2}} \int_{\frac{\delta_0}{2}}^{2\delta} \int_{\bar{z}-2\delta}^{\bar{z}+2\delta} h \varphi r dr dz dt \leq \int_{-2\delta}^0 \int_0^{2\delta} \int_{\bar{z}-2\delta}^{\bar{z}+2\delta} h r dr dz dt \leq \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Due to the arbitrariness of δ_0 and $\varepsilon > 0$, and thanks to (3.12) and (3.17), one obtains that

$$|J_1| \leq F_1(C_0, T - S, |X|, \alpha) \int_{-\delta}^0 \int_0^{\delta} \int_{\bar{z}-\delta}^{\bar{z}+\delta} h_k r dr dz dt \rightarrow 0, \quad k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.18)$$

Now we continue estimating $J_2 - J_4$.

$$\begin{aligned} J_2 &= \int_S^T \int_{\left\{ \frac{|X_5 - Y_5|^2}{T - \tau} \geq C_0, \frac{|\bar{X} - \bar{Y}|^2}{T - \tau} \leq C_0 \right\}} (T - \tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} e^{-C \frac{|X - Y|^2}{T - \tau}} |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)| dY d\tau \\ &\leq \int_S^T (T - \tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} d\tau \int_{\left\{ \frac{|X_5 - Y_5|^2}{T - \tau} \geq C_0 \right\}} e^{-C \frac{|X_5 - Y_5|^2}{T - \tau}} dY_5 \int_{\left\{ \frac{|\bar{X} - \bar{Y}|^2}{T - \tau} \leq C_0 \right\}} e^{-C \frac{|\bar{X} - \bar{Y}|^2}{T - \tau}} \frac{|u_\theta^{(k)} \partial_Z u_\theta^{(k)}|}{R^2} d\tilde{Y} \\ &\leq \int_S^T (T - \tau)^{-2} d\tau \int_{|\xi| \geq C_0} e^{-C|\xi|^2} d\xi \int_{\{|\tilde{Y}| \leq \sqrt{C_0(T-S)} + |\bar{X}|\}} e^{-C \frac{|\bar{X} - \bar{Y}|^2}{T - \tau}} \frac{|u_\theta^{(k)} \partial_Z u_\theta^{(k)}|}{R^2} d\tilde{Y} \\ &\leq C \int_{|\xi| \geq C_0} e^{-C|\xi|^2} d\xi (T - S), \end{aligned}$$

where one has used the transformation $\xi = \frac{X_5 - Y_5}{T - \tau}$.

$$\begin{aligned} J_3 &= \int_S^T \int_{\left\{ \frac{|X_5 - Y_5|^2}{T - \tau} \leq C_0, \frac{|\bar{X} - \bar{Y}|^2}{T - \tau} \geq C_0 \right\}} (T - \tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} e^{-C \frac{|X - Y|^2}{T - \tau}} |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)| dY d\tau \\ &\leq \int_S^T (T - \tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} d\tau \int_{\frac{|X_5 - Y_5|^2}{T - \tau} \leq C_0} e^{-C \frac{|X_5 - Y_5|^2}{T - \tau}} dY_5 \int_{\left\{ \frac{|\bar{X} - \bar{Y}|^2}{T - \tau} \geq C_0 \right\}} e^{-C \frac{|\bar{X} - \bar{Y}|^2}{T - \tau}} |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)| dY \\ &\leq C(T - S) \int_{|\tilde{\xi}| \geq C_0} e^{-C|\tilde{\xi}|^2} d\tilde{\xi}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\xi} = \frac{\bar{X} - \bar{Y}}{T - \tau}$. Similarly, one can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} J_4 &= \int_S^T \int_{\left\{ \frac{|X_5 - Y_5|^2}{T - \tau} \geq C_0, \frac{|\bar{X} - \bar{Y}|^2}{T - \tau} \geq C_0 \right\}} (T - \tau)^{-\frac{5}{2}} e^{-C \frac{|X - Y|^2}{T - \tau}} |g^{(k)}(Y, \tau)| dY d\tau \\ &\leq C(T - S) \int_{|\xi| \geq C_0} e^{-C|\xi|^2} d\xi \int_{|\tilde{\xi}| \geq C_0} e^{-C|\tilde{\xi}|^2} d\tilde{\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting estimates of $J_1 - J_4$ into (3.12) gives

$$\begin{aligned} |II_2| &\leq F(C_0, T - S, |X|, \alpha, k) \\ &\quad + C[(T - S) + 1] \left(\int_{|\xi| \geq C_0} e^{-C|\xi|^2} d\xi + \int_{|\tilde{\xi}| \geq C_0} e^{-C|\tilde{\xi}|^2} d\tilde{\xi} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

The term II_1 can be treated as for J_1 so that

$$|II_1| \leq F(C_0, T - S, |X|, \alpha, k) \rightarrow 0, k \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.20)$$

for $C_0 \geq 2$. Now taking $T - S = C_0 \geq 2$ and using (2.26), (2.30), (3.19) and (3.20), one gets

$$\begin{aligned} |f^{(k)}(X, T)| &\leq C[C_0^{-\frac{3}{10}} + F(C_0, C_0, |X|, \alpha, k) \\ &\quad + C_0 \left(\int_{|\xi| \geq C_0} e^{-C|\xi|^2} d\xi + \int_{|\tilde{\xi}| \geq C_0} e^{-C|\tilde{\xi}|^2} d\tilde{\xi} \right)]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Passing to the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ first and then letting $C_0 \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.21), one obtains that, for any $X \in \mathbb{R}^3, T \in (-\infty, 0)$,

$$|f^{(k)}(X, T)| \rightarrow 0, k \rightarrow \infty,$$

and hence

$$|\omega_\theta^{(k)}(X, T)| \rightarrow 0, k \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.22)$$

which implies that $\bar{\omega}_\theta(R, Z, T) = 0$. Since $\text{curl}_X b^{(k)}(X, T) = \omega_\theta^{(k)} e_\theta$ and $\text{div}_X b^{(k)}(X, T) = 0$ so $\bar{b}(X, T)$ is a harmonic and bounded function defined on $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-\infty, 0)$. Since $\bar{u}_R(0, Z, T) = 0$, thus there exists a continuous and bounded function $s(T) : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\bar{b}(X, T) = s(T)e_Z$. The proof of Theorem 3.1 is finished.

Applying the weighted estimates (3.5) and Theorem 3.1 leads to

Corollary 3.2 Suppose that the initial data $u_0(x) \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is axisymmetric and divergence-free, satisfying (3.3) and $\|ru_{0\theta}(x)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C$. Then, for any $T > 0$, there exists a unique global strong solution $u(x, t) \in L^\infty([0, T]; H^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^3(\mathbb{R}^3))$ to the Cauchy problem of the 3-D axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations. Moreover, (3.5) holds true and

$$\|ru_\theta(x, t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C. \quad (3.23)$$

Remark 3.2 Large data is permitted under assumptions of Theorem 3.2. In particular, the oscillations and the amplitudes of the initial data can be large in

the region away from the symmetry axis. The regularity of the initial data may be relaxed such as $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ or $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

To prove Corollary 3.2, one needs two lemmas as follows.

Lemma 3.3 Let $u(x, t)$ be a bounded weak solution of the Navier-Stokes equations in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-\infty, 0)$. Assume that $u(x, t)$ is axisymmetric and satisfies

$$|u(x, t)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \times (-\infty, 0).$$

Then $u = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-\infty, 0)$.

Proof. See [14] for the details.

Lemma 3.4 Given a suitable weak solution $u(x, t)$. Suppose that $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u_0|^2 dx < \infty.$$

Then $u(x, t)$ is regular in the region $B_{\bar{R}}^c$ for some $\bar{R} > 0$.

Proof. This has been proved in [2].

Now we are ready to prove Corollary 3.2.

Proof of Corollary 3.2 The local existence and uniqueness of the strong solution $u(x, t) \in L^\infty([0, T^*]; H^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2([0, T^*]; H^3(\mathbb{R}^3))$ to the Cauchy problem of the 3-D axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations have been proved (see [17] and [29]), where $(0, T^*)$ is the maximal existence interval of the solution. Without loss of generality, we assume that the solution $u(x, t)$ is defined in $(-1, 0)$ and $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-1, t'))$ for any $-1 < t' < 0$. Suppose that the solution appear singularity at $t = 0$. Then there exist $t_k \nearrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that $H(t_k) = h(t_k)$, where $h(t)$ and $H(t)$ are defined as (2.5). Denote $N_k = H(t_k)$. Then one can choose a sequence of numbers $\gamma_k \searrow 1$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $M_k = |u(x_k, t_k)| \geq N_k/\gamma_k$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, satisfying $M_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Denote $r_k = \sqrt{(x_{k1})^2 + (x_{k2})^2}$.

Similar to Theorem 2.2, the proof is divided into two cases.

Case I. $\{r_k M_k\} (k = 1, 2, \dots)$ is uniformly bounded.

In this case, one can rescale the solution as in (2.7). In view of (2.33), there exists a point $(x_{\infty 1}, x_{\infty 2}) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that, up to a subsequence, $(M_k x_{k1}, M_k x_{k2}) \rightarrow (x_{\infty 1}, x_{\infty 2})$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Here $\sqrt{(x_{\infty 1})^2 + (x_{\infty 2})^2} \leq C < \infty$. By (2.10) and (2.32), $\bar{u}(x_{\infty 1}, x_{\infty 2}, 0, 0) = 1$.

Under the assumptions in the Corollary, the weighted estimates (3.5) hold true. Moreover, by Lemma 3.4, $u(x, t) \in L^\infty(B_{\bar{R}}^c \times (-1, 0))$ for some $\bar{R} > 0$. Therefore, Theorem 3.1 implies that $\bar{u} = \bar{u}_\theta e_\theta + s(T) e_Z$, where $s(T) : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded and continuous function. Then (3.5) yields that $s(T) = 0$ and hence

$\bar{u}_R(X, T) = \bar{u}_Z(X, T) = 0$. Using the condition $|ru_{\theta 0}| \leq C$, one can prove that $|ru_{\theta}| \leq C$ (see Remark 2.1) and hence $|R\bar{u}_{\theta}(X, T)| \leq C$. It follows from Lemma 3.3 that $\bar{u}(X, T) = 0$. However, this is a contradiction to $u(x_{\infty_1}, x_{\infty_2}, 0, 0) = 1$, which implies that the theorem holds true in this case.

Case II. $\{r_k M_k\} (k = 1, 2, \dots)$ is not uniformly bounded. Then similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2.2 work here.

The proof of the corollary is finished.

References

- [1] L. Brandolese, Space-time decay of Navier-Stokes flows invariant under rotations, *Math. Ann.* 329 (4), 685-706, 2004.
- [2] L. Caffarelli, R. Kohn, L. Nirenberg, Partial regularity of suitable weak solution of the Navier-Stokes equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 35, 771-837, 1982.
- [3] E. A. Carlen, M. Loss, Optimal smoothing and decay estimates for viscously damped conservation laws, with applications to 2-D Navier-Stokes equations, *A celebration of John F. Nash Jr.*, *Duke Math. J.* 81, 135-157, 1995.
- [4] D. Chae, J. Lee, On the Regularity of Axisymmetric solutions of the Navier-Stokes Equations, *Math. Z.*, 239 (4), 645-671, 2002.
- [5] C. C. Chen, R. M. Strain, H. T. Yau, T. P. Tsai, Lower bound on the blow-up rate of the axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations, *International Mathematics Research Notices*, Vol. 2008: rnn016.
- [6] C. C. Chen, R. M. Strain, T. P. Tsai, H. T. Yau, Lower bound on the blow-up rate of the axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations II, *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 34, 203-232, 2009.
- [7] L. Escauriaza, G. Seregin, V. Šverák, $L_{3,\infty}$ -solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations and backward uniqueness, *Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk*, 58(2), 3-44. English translation in *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 58(2), 211-250, 2003.
- [8] E. Hopf, Über die Anfangswertaufgabe für die hydrodynamischen Grundgleichungen, *Math. Nachr.*, 4, 213-231, 1954.
- [9] R. S. Hamilton, The formation of singularities in the Ricci flow, *Surveys in Differential Geometry*, Vol II, PP. 7-136, Int. Press, Cambridge, MA, 1995.

- [10] T. Y. Hou, Z. Lei, C. M. Li, Global regularity of the 3D axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations with anisotropic data, *Comm. Partial Diff. Eqns.*, 33, 1622-1637, 2008.
- [11] T. Y. Hou, C. M. Li, Dynamic stability of the 3D axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations with swirl, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 61(5), 661-697, 2008.
- [12] Q. S. Jiu, Z. P. Xin, Some regularity criteria on suitable weak solutions of the 3-D incompressible axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations, 119-139, *New Studies in Advanced Mathematics*, 2, International Press, Somerville, MA 2003.
- [13] T. Kato, Strong L^p -solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations in R^m , with applications to weak solutions, *Math. Z.*, 187(4), 471-480, 1984.
- [14] G. Koch, N. Nadirashvili, G. Seregin, V. Šverák, Liouville theorems for the Navier-Stokes equations and applications, *Acta Math.*, 203, 83-106, 2009.
- [15] H. Koch, D. Tataru, Well-posedness for the Navier-Stokes equations, *Adv. math.*, 157(1), 22-35, 2001.
- [16] A. Kubica, M. Pokorný, W. Zajaczkowski, Remarks on regularity criteria for axially symmetric weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 35, 360-371, 2012.
- [17] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya, *The mathematical theory of viscous incompressible flow*, Gordon and Breach, 2nd. ed., 1969.
- [18] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya, Unique global solvability of the three-dimensional Cauchy problem for the Navier-Stokes equations in the presence of axial symmetry, *Zap. Nauch. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Math. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)* 7, 155-177, 1968 (Russian).
- [19] Z. Lei, Q. S. Zhang, A Liouville theorem for the axially-symmetric Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 261(8), 2323-2345, 2011.
- [20] J. Leray, Sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace, *Acta Math.*, 63, 193-248, 1934.
- [21] F. H. Lin, A New Proof of the Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg Theorem, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, Vol. LI, 0241-0257, 1998.
- [22] A. J. Majda, A. L. Bertozzi, *Vorticity and incompressible flow*, Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics, 27, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

- [23] J. Nečas, M. Ružička, V. Šverák, On Leray's self-similar solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, *Acta Math.* 176 (2), 283-294, 1996.
- [24] X. H. Pan, Regularity of solution to axi-symmetric Navier-Stokes equations with a slightly supercritical condition, arXiv:1410.6260v1, 2014.
- [25] V. Scheffer, Partial regularity of solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations, *Pacific J. Math.*, 66, 535-552, 1976.
- [26] G. Seregin, V. Šverák, On type I singularities of the local axisymmetric solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, *Comm. Partial Diff. Eqns.*, 34, 171-201, 2009.
- [27] J. Serrin, On the interior regularity of weak solutions of the time-dependent Navier-Stokes equations, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.*, 9, 187-195, 1962.
- [28] M. Struwe, On partial regularity results for the Navier-Stokes equations, *Comm. on Pure and Appl. Math.*, 41, 437-458, 1988.
- [29] R. Temam, *Navier-Stokes equations*, North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York-Oxford, 1977.
- [30] G. Tian, Z.P. Xin, Gradient Estimation on Navier-Stokes Equations, *Communications in Analysis and Geometry*, 7(2), 221-257, 1999.
- [31] T. P. Tsai, On Leray's self-similar solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations satisfying local energy estimates, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.*, 143, 29-51, 1998.
- [32] M. R. Uchovskii, B. I. Yudovich, Axially Symmetric Flows of an Ideal and Viscous Fluid, *J. Appl. Math. Mech.* 32, 52-61, 1968.