

A construction of two different solutions to an elliptic system

Jacek Cyranka^{*,‡}, Piotr Bogusław Mucha^{*}

^{*} Institute of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics, University of Warsaw
Banacha 2, 02-097 Warszawa, Poland

[‡] Department of Mathematics, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
110 Frelinghusen Rd, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019, USA

cyranka@mimuw.edu.pl, p.mucha@mimuw.edu.pl

July 7, 2021

Abstract. The paper aims at constructing two different solutions to an elliptic system

$$u \cdot \nabla u + (-\Delta)^m u = \lambda F$$

defined on the two dimensional torus. It can be viewed as an elliptic regularization of the stationary Burgers 2D system. A motivation to consider the above system comes from an examination of unusual properties of the linear operator $\lambda \sin y \partial_x w + (-\Delta)^m w$ arising from a linearization of the equation about the dominant part of F . We argue that the skew-symmetric part of the operator provides in some sense a smallness of norms of the linear operator inverse. Our analytical proof is valid for a particular force F and for $\lambda > \lambda_0$, $m > m_0$ sufficiently large. The main steps of the proof concern finite dimension approximation of the system and concentrate on analysis of features of large matrices, which resembles standard numerical analysis. Our analytical results are illustrated by numerical simulations.

Keywords: nonlinear elliptic problem, 2D stationary Burgers equation, nonuniqueness, construction of two solutions, large matrices

AMS classification: Primary: 35J60, 35A02. Secondary: 35Q99, 15B99.

1 Introduction

Analysis of sets of solutions to elliptic systems/equations is of particular interest in the current research on partial differential equations (PDEs). On the one hand, the question is challenging from the viewpoint of mathematical techniques. On the other hand, the precise information about this set is crucial for understanding the dynamics of evolutionary problems behind the elliptic one. In general, existing theory provides us with two answers: either there exists a single solution or the system admits at least one solution.

Existing methods of the PDEs analysis provide only few examples for quite simple problems. Starting with the classical example using the Mountain Pass Theorem for a semilinear elliptic equation [Eva10]. Nonuniqueness example for the stationary Navier-Stokes equations [Gal11], important geometric examples related to the mean curvature problems [BC83], or nonuniqueness for the one-dimensional viscous Burgers' equation [BP12], (in the case of evolutionary system we refer to [Dix96], [AA10]). Derivation of asymptotic lower bound for the multiplicity of solutions for a semilinear problem can be found in [DY05], [LM14], and for a class of elliptic equations with jumping nonlinearities in [MP10]. The work on numerical multiplicity proofs for systems/higher dimensional PDEs has also been an active topic of research. There exist several computer assisted proofs of existence of at least several solutions of certain parabolic PDEs. Let us stress

that contrary to our approach, all results obtained using a direct computer assistance are true essentially for some isolated parameter values or a compact set of parameter values, because all of the computations performed by a computer are finite. Representative results include a proof of existence of four solutions to a semilinear boundary value problem for particular choice of parameters [BMP03], an outlook for the multiplicity of solutions for some multidimensional PDEs is provided by a proof of existence of nonsymmetric solutions for a symmetric boundary value problem [AK12], validated bifurcation diagrams constructed in [BLV13], [GL11], structure of the global attractor [MPMW07], numerical existence proofs for a fluid flow, and convection problems [WN09], [HNX99].

The subject of the present paper is the following elliptic system, which can be viewed as an elliptic regularization of the *stationary Burgers system* [Bur48], [Hop50], [Col51] *in 2D*

$$\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} + (-\Delta)^m \mathbf{u} = \lambda \mathbf{F} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{T}^2. \quad (1)$$

eq:ma

Here \mathbf{u} is sought as a vector function $\mathbf{u} : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$. The vector \mathbf{F} is a particular external force, and in this paper we define it as

$$\mathbf{F}(x, y) = \begin{pmatrix} \sin y \\ \sin x \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

eq:F

The magnitude of the external force is controlled by the parameter λ and it is assumed to be greater than some positive number λ_0 . We shall note that the system has *no a-priori estimate*. The issue of the existence of a solution to the system (1) is still open for a general form of $\lambda \mathbf{F}$. To the best of our knowledge even the basic case of $m = 1$ is unclear.

Let us discuss what motivated the presented research. Our numerical investigations of (1) revealed a solution possessing a curious structure: one of solution's Fourier modes being of λ magnitude, and the remainder being bounded uniformly with respect to λ . We further noticed that the natural symmetry embedded in this equation implies the existence of a second solution, as the reflection by the symmetry of dominant part produces an essentially different solution. Further on, to convince ourselves that this structure is in fact conserved for λ large values after a bifurcation, we performed a numerical bifurcation analysis, which showed that the graph of solution's norm is approximately linear, and in fact there is a pitchfork bifurcation in the system for a particular λ .

We emphasize, that our situation is not as simple as it would be, when a symmetry embedded in the problem implies immediately existence of a different second solution. For sufficiently small λ 's solutions are symmetric, and for a large λ the symmetry is broken, which allows us to establish existence of two different solutions for large λ 's. For small λ 's we claim only existence of a solution, as the two solutions from our main result merge into a single one. The symmetry is seen as elementary, simply enough, we can exchange x with y , and the first component with the second component (denoted $x \leftrightarrow y$ in the sequel). Apparently, a stronger regularization effect is needed, than the one provided by the Laplacian operator. This is why we state our main result (Theorem 1.1) for m sufficiently large. Our analytical results are supported by a numerical bifurcation analysis (Section 3).

The main tool of our technique is to exploit unusual features of a linearization of the system. Let $\|w\|_{l^\infty}$ denote the supremum norm of elements of the Fourier series w . Apparently, for the solutions to the following scalar problem

$$\lambda \sin y \partial_x w + (-\Delta)^m w = \lambda \sin x \quad \text{on } \mathbb{T}^2, \quad (3)$$

eq:sc

we obtain

$$\|w\|_{l^\infty} \lesssim 1, \quad (4)$$

in other words, this quantity is free from λ dependence (for large λ), although other norms are growing with λ . We see an interplay between the growth of the right-hand side and an increase of influence of the term $\lambda \sin \partial_x$, which represents (in some sense) a rotation effects. In particular, it causes that the amplitudes of modes to be uniformly bounded. Such effect can be compared with general phenomenon of

hypocoercivity explained in [Vil09]. We shall note, however, we do not apply the general theory for operators of type $A^*A + B$, since we want to avoid considerations in Hilbertian spaces. We work instead in the l^1, l^∞ framework, which is the most optimal for our analysis. The technique is elementary, in order to obtain a constructive bounds for linear operators inverses we perform a *large matrices analysis*. The features of the linear operator are first found for its finite dimensional truncation – a Galerkin approximation, then the properties of the full infinite dimensional operator are obtained using a limit passage. The key result concerning (3) is described by Theorem 4.11 and its proof is the main part of this paper.

Our analysis of the system (1) allows to prove the following theorem being the main result of the present paper.

n:main

Theorem 1.1. *Let $m > 9/2$ and $\lambda > \lambda_0$ be sufficiently large. Then there exists at least two solutions to the system (1) with F given by (2) such that*

$$\mathbf{u}_1 = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} \sin y \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + L^1(x, y) + R^1(x, y), \quad (5) \quad \boxed{\text{i5}}$$

and

$$\mathbf{u}_2 = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \sin x \end{pmatrix} + L^2(x, y) + R^2(x, y), \quad (6) \quad \boxed{\text{i6}}$$

where L^1, L^2 are solutions to the linearization and they are of order $\lambda^{2/m}$ in l^∞ norm and R^1, R^2 are of order $\lambda^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha > 0$.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is based on a subtle analysis of the system (3). We impose the form of solutions and then we construct them via approximation on finite dimensional subspaces. The natural symmetry $x \leftrightarrow y$ implies that we obtain at least two different solutions, provided λ is sufficiently large.

Indeed, the properties of the system (3) established in Theorem 1.1 are the main impact of the present paper. We are ensured that this type of properties will allow to study precise dynamics of systems with the transport term $u \cdot \nabla u$. The most natural example is the Navier-Stokes equations. However, the current box of tools is not sufficient to attack this problem. We present here a brand new technique to study quasilinear elliptic systems. Hence one can look at the system (1) as a toy model for which we demonstrate our new method.

We are highly convinced that the explicit bounds for norms of tridiagonal differential operators obtained in this work, which are independent of the dimension, can be applied to study other problems, including bounds for solutions of some linear PDEs, computer assisted proofs for nonlinear PDEs, numerical analysis of discretizations of certain PDEs, and slow-fast systems. There are existing research efforts in understanding structure of the tridiagonal operators arising in PDEs, see e.g. [BDL15]. Let us also note that methods based on Fourier series may be applied for systems in pipe-like domains. An example is [Muc03], where analysis of the Oseen operator gave very precise space asymptotics of solutions in front and behind an obstacle.

Literature concerning the issue of existence of solutions to the stationary Burgers equations is not rich. Most of the results concern only the mono-dimensional case model [BGS01, BP12, BDG⁺11]. It motivates us to perform numerical analysis for various cases of the model. We observe that for the system (1) there exist a threshold value $\hat{m} > 1$, such that the main result is valid for all $m > \hat{m}$ – the two distinct solutions can be still constructed. For the case $m < \hat{m}$, especially, in case of the stationary forced 2D Burgers equations ($m = 1$) the global picture is significantly different, and for $m = 1$ certainly the two solutions cannot anymore be isolated as in the other cases.

We note that since finishing of the first version of this paper the first author significantly improved the bounds for the norm of the inverse tridiagonal operators [CL17]. The motivation has been to develop a validated numerical scheme for forward integration of a class of parabolic PDEs. We are now convinced that a proof along the lines presented in this paper is possible for the stationary Burgers system with smaller

exponents m defining the linear operator in (3). Moreover, we are convinced that a similar proof is also possible for other problems, including the stationary 2D viscous Navier-Stokes equations. We will investigate this possibilities in future research.

The paper is organized as follows. We present in Section 2 the subject of this paper written in coordinates, in Section 3 bifurcation diagrams, and a brief technical explanation. In Section 4, the relevant symmetries of the problem, which are crucial in our analysis. In Section 4.1, the matrix form of the linearized operator, along with some important inverse operators bounds. In Section 5, a-priori bounds for the solutions of finite dimensional truncations, and in Section 6, an existence argument for the infinite dimensional system. Finally, in Section 7, some technical lemmas necessary to prove crucial inverse operators bounds from Section 4.1.

Acknowledgments

The presented work has been done while the first author held a post-doctoral position at Warsaw Center of Mathematics and Computer Science, his research has been partly supported by Polish National Science Centre grant 2011/03B/ST1/04780. The second author (PBM) has been partly supported by National Science Centre grant 2014/14/M/ST1/00108 (Harmonia).

2 Preliminaries

We start our analysis with the preparation of our system

$$\begin{aligned} u \cdot \nabla u^1 + (-\Delta)^m u^1 &= \lambda \sin y, \\ u \cdot \nabla u^2 + (-\Delta)^m u^2 &= \lambda \sin x. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

We fix the notation

$$u = \bar{v} + V, \quad \text{where} \quad \bar{v} = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} \sin y \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{8}$$

We focus just on construction of solution (5), the symmetry will imply existence of the second one – see Section 4 (Definition 4.4). The above relations restate the system (7) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \sin y \partial_x V^1 + (-\Delta)^m V^1 &= -\lambda \cos y V^2 - V \cdot \nabla V^1, \\ \lambda \sin y \partial_x V^2 + (-\Delta)^m V^2 &= \lambda \sin x - V \cdot \nabla V^2. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Observe that the term $\lambda \sin y$ is not present in (9), as it disappears due to the ansatz (8). In order to split the solution into two parts, the first with small amplitudes and the second with higher ones. We introduce a linearization of (9)

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \sin y \partial_x A + (-\Delta)^m A &= -\lambda \cos y B, \\ \lambda \sin y \partial_x B + (-\Delta)^m B &= \lambda \sin x, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

and define V as the following pair

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

Vector $(A, B)^T$ defines L^1 appearing in (5). This step of prescription of constructing solutions to (1) is important, since (10) implies a constraint on A and B . This relation turns out to be satisfied also by a and b . By differentiating (10)₁ with respect to x and (10)₂ with respect to y , the system (10) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \sin y \partial_x A_x + (-\Delta)^m A_x &= -\lambda \cos y B_x, \\ \lambda \sin y \partial_x B_y + (-\Delta)^m B_y &= -\lambda \cos y B_x, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

So we obtain

$$\lambda \sin y \partial_x (A_x - B_y) + (-\Delta)^m (A_x - B_y) = 0. \quad (13)$$

Testing it by $(A_x - B_y)$ we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} |\nabla (-\Delta)^{m/2-1} (A_x - B_y)|^2 dx dy = 0, \quad \text{and of course} \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} (A_x - B_y) dx dy = 0. \quad (14)$$

Hence we get the desired constraint

$$A_x = B_y. \quad (15) \quad \boxed{\text{AB-con}}$$

Returning to V we find equations for a and b

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \sin y \partial_x a + (-\Delta)^m a &= -\lambda \cos y b - \begin{pmatrix} a + A \\ b + B \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla (a + A), \\ \lambda \sin y \partial_x b + (-\Delta)^m b &= - \begin{pmatrix} a + A \\ b + B \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla (b + B). \end{aligned} \quad (16) \quad \boxed{\text{p2}}$$

Here again one can check constraint (15) for a and b . Taking suitable differentiation of system (16) we find

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \sin y \partial_x a_x + (-\Delta)^m a_x &= -\lambda \cos y b_x - \begin{pmatrix} a_x + A_x \\ b_x + B_x \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla (a + A) - \begin{pmatrix} a + A \\ b + B \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla (a_x + A_x), \\ \lambda \sin y \partial_x b_y + (-\Delta)^m b_y &= -\lambda \cos y b_x - \begin{pmatrix} a_y + A_y \\ b_y + B_y \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla (b + B) - \begin{pmatrix} a + A \\ b + B \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla (b_y + B_y). \end{aligned} \quad (17) \quad \boxed{\text{p2a}}$$

So then we find, keeping in mind (15)

$$\lambda \sin y \partial_x (a_x - b_y) + (-\Delta)^m (a_x - b_y) = -[(a_x + A_x + B_y + b_y)(a_x - b_y)] - \begin{pmatrix} a + A \\ b + B \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla (a_x - b_y). \quad (18) \quad \boxed{\text{p2b}}$$

Observe that as the rhs of (18) would be zero than we find the desired constraint

$$a_x = b_y. \quad (19) \quad \boxed{\text{ab-con}}$$

This relation will be guaranteed by the construction presented at the beginning of Section 6. In few words, the construction is performed via an iteration scheme, so vanishing of the rhs will be guaranteed by the previous step, see (56).

Looking at the above problems we see that the analysis depends on the properties of the following operator

$$L_\lambda(w) = \lambda \sin y \partial_x w + (-\Delta)^m w. \quad (20)$$

The key element of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is a result concerning norm estimates for the L_λ inverse operator. The precise statement of the result we find in Section 4.2, it is Theorem 1.1.

Notation In bold we denote complex coefficients, e.g. $\mathbf{a}_k = (a_k^1, a_k^2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$, where a_k^1 , and a_k^2 denote the first, and the second component of \mathbf{a}_k respectively. Let $k, k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ denote pairs of integers. By k^1, k_1^1, k_2^1 , and k^2, k_1^2, k_2^2 we denote the first, and the second components respectively.

Fourier

We rewrite the problem (1) using Fourier's coordinates, being the most natural way to consider problems on a torus.

$$\mathbf{u}(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \mathbf{a}_k e^{ik \cdot (x,y)}, \quad \mathbf{a}_k = (a_k^1, a_k^2) \in \mathbb{C}^2, \quad (21a)$$

$$\mathbf{F}(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \mathbf{F}_k e^{ik \cdot (x,y)}, \quad \mathbf{F}_k = (F_k^1, F_k^2) \in \mathbb{C}^2. \quad (21b)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2=k \\ k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^2}} a_{k_1}^1 i k_2^1 a_{k_2}^j + \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2=k \\ k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^2}} a_{k_1}^2 i k_2^2 a_{k_2}^j + \left((k^1)^{2m} + (k^2)^{2m} \right) a_k^j - \lambda F_k^j = G(\mathbf{a}, \lambda)_k^j = 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^2. \quad (21c)$$

eq:inf

The operator $(-\Delta)^m$ is diagonal in Fourier's basis, having $((k^1)^2 + (k^2)^2)^m$ as the eigenvalues. In order to simplify the arguments in the remainder of the paper as the operator $(-\Delta)^m$ we will consider an operator having $(k^1)^{2m} + (k^2)^{2m}$ as the eigenvalues. Of course, all of the presented arguments are also valid for the original case, as $((k^1)^2 + (k^2)^2)^m$ clearly bounds $(k^1)^{2m} + (k^2)^{2m}$ from above.

For the particular choice of the external forcing, \mathbf{F} is given by

$$F_{(0,1)}^1 = F_{(1,0)}^2 = -\frac{i}{2}, \quad F_{(0,-1)}^1 = F_{(-1,0)}^2 = \frac{i}{2}, \quad F_k^j = 0 \text{ for all the other cases.} \quad (1d)$$

Definition 2.1. *In the space of complex sequences $\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$, we will say that the sequence $\{a_k\}$ satisfies the reality condition iff*

$$a_k = \overline{a_{-k}}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \quad (22)$$

eq:rea

In the considered problem we impose odd periodic boundary conditions, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} u^j(x, y) &= -u^j(-x, -y) \\ u^j(x, y) &= u^j(x + 2\pi, y) = u^j(x, y + 2\pi) \end{aligned} \quad j = 1, 2, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (23)$$

odd

which on the level of the Fourier series means that we restrict the basis to odd functions, or equivalently the coefficients are purely imaginary numbers satisfying

$$\operatorname{Re}(a_k^j) = 0, \quad a_k^j = -a_{-k}^j \quad j = 1, 2, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^2. \quad (24)$$

eq:fou

It is immediately verified that the space of coefficients satisfying (24) is invariant under the equation (21), and we skip the formal calculations. Observe that (24) together with the reality condition implies automatically the following 'zero mass' constraint

$$a_0^j = 0, \quad j = 1, 2. \quad (25)$$

Immediately, also we recognize that symmetry (23) implies that our solutions will be constructed as series in sinus only.

From now on we are going to consider the following finite dimensional approximation of the system (21)

Definition 2.2. *Let $N > 0$. We call the N -th Galerkin approximation of (21) the following system*

$$\sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2=k \\ |k_1|, |k_2| \leq N}} a_{k_1}^1 i k_2^1 a_{k_2}^j + \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2=k \\ |k_1|, |k_2| \leq N}} a_{k_1}^2 i k_2^2 a_{k_2}^j + \left((k^1)^{2m} + (k^2)^{2m} \right) a_k^j - \lambda F_k^j = G_N(\mathbf{a}, \lambda)_k^j = 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \quad |k| \leq N. \quad (1P)$$

eq:pro

Banach

Definition 2.3. *We introduce the following Banach spaces for sequences $\{a_k\}$ equipped with the following norms*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\{a_k\}\|_{l^\infty} &= \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} |a_k|, & \|\{a_k\}\|_{l_p^\infty} &= \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} (|k_1| + |k_2|)^p |a_k|, \\ \|\{a_k\}\|_{l^1} &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} |a_k|, & \|\{a_k\}\|_{l_1^1} &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} (|k_1| + |k_2|) |a_k|. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

The norm used for multi-indices is taken to be the ∞ norm, i.e.

$$|k| := \max \{|k^1|, |k^2|\}.$$

Definition 2.4. *Let us define the following space*

$$H = H_{(N)} = \left\{ \{a_k\} \in \mathbb{C}^{(2N+1)^2-1} : a_k = \overline{a_{-k}}, \operatorname{Re}(a_k) = 0, \text{ for } 0 < |k| \leq N \right\}.$$

we are going to look for solutions \mathbf{a} of (1P), such that $\mathbf{a} \in H \times H$. In the sequel, whenever H appears, N will either be fixed or clear from context.

3 Numerical bifurcation analysis

We analyze the bifurcation structure of the problem (1P), and we present the results on Figure 2. Starting from the zero solution at $\lambda = 0$ we follow the branch of solutions. We detected a pitchfork bifurcation at a value of λ , which depends on the parameter m appearing in (1P). From the point of the pitchfork bifurcation we follow both the stable (one of two) and unstable branch (it is unique).

For a given λ we solve for $a(\lambda)$ such that $G_N(a(\lambda), \lambda) = 0$. We implemented a path following procedure in order to track $a(\lambda)$. To make any path following procedure work the partial derivative $\frac{\partial a(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda}$ is required, as bifurcation points are detected by monitoring for its eigenvalues crossing zero. We implemented our path following procedure on the top of the existing C++ software [Cyr14] in which the partial derivative is calculated by means of automatic differentiation and fast Fourier transforms, refer to [Cyr14] for details.

We computed bifurcation diagrams for two specific cases

- Figure 1, $m = 1$ is fixed, and the truncation dimension N is varied. This case is excluded from our theory.
- Figure 2, $m = 6$ is fixed, and the truncation dimension N is varied. This case is excluded from our theory.

There are some apparent differences between those two cases. In Figure 1 and 2 in blue we marked the unstable branch of index 1, and in black the stable solution(s) – this branch represents in fact two solutions having the same norm related with a symmetry. The symmetry is denoted by S in Section 4. Apparently, the considered pitchfork bifurcation is the point where the symmetry S breaks. Let us relate the presented diagrams with our theoretical results presented in the sequel. We prove that on the stable branch in Figure 2 there are two distinct solutions, and this branch is approximately linear with respect to λ for sufficiently large λ .

The diagrams were generated using the approximation with $N = 8$, corresponding to $17^2/2$ degrees of freedom.

We approximate the solution using a fixed number of Fourier's functions. On Figure 1 we present a few bifurcation diagrams obtained using Fourier's approximation with varying approximation dimensions (limited by our computational resources). To construct the diagrams, we start from the zero solution at $\lambda = 0$, the branch of solutions ($u(\lambda)$) is followed until a bifurcating solution is found. In case a bifurcating solution is found, both of the branches: the original, and the new bifurcating branch are followed.

Observe that those diagrams significantly differ. For instance the value of λ for which the numerical pitchfork bifurcation occurs is proportional to the approximation dimension, we mean that λ is significantly larger, when a larger approximation dimension is used. This leads us to the conjecture that the apparent bifurcation is only a numerical artifact. It appears that in the case of stationary forced 2D Burgers equations ($m = 1$) the dynamics is either not finite dimensional, or the dimension of the attractor is really high. This is in contrary to the cases included in our theory (e.g. $m = 6$), in which the dynamics is essentially finite dimensional (the bifurcation diagrams computed using different approximation dimensions does not differ much). One possible explanation is that in case $m = 1$ the Laplacian operator does not provide strong enough smoothing effect compared to the higher order elliptic operators.




Figure 1: Bifurcation diagram for $u \cdot \nabla u + (-\Delta)u = \lambda F$. Each diagram was computed with different approximation dimension N (given in the title). For this problem, the linear structure is not anymore evident, the question of the existence of two distinct solutions is left open in this case. The bifurcation point depends heavily on the dimension.

lacian




Figure 2: Bifurcation diagram for $u \cdot \nabla u + (-\Delta)^6 u = \lambda F$. Clearly, the stable (black) solutions curve is almost $\|u(\lambda)\| = \lambda$, as there is only one mode of λ magnitude. Single pitchfork bifurcation was detected at $\lambda_0 = 8.0629$.

ig:bif

4 Definition of a subspace of symmetric solutions

In this section we define the symmetry exhibited by the studied problem, and which we will use in the sequel. We make a standing assumption that the external forces that we consider are also symmetric. Later on it will become evident that the second solution is obtained through the reflection by the symmetry $S^{x \leftrightarrow y}$ (Definition 4.4).

Recall our working space of sequences of complex Fourier modes satisfying the reality condition

$$H = H_{(N)} = \left\{ \{a_k\} \in \mathbb{C}^{(2N)^2+1} : \operatorname{Re}(a_k) = 0, a_k = -a_{-k} \right\}.$$

Instead of working directly with the space H , we will work with the following product space of sequences of complex Fourier modes satisfying certain symmetry exhibited by the solutions of the system (21).

Definition 4.1. Let H' be the following space

$$H'_{(N)} = \left\{ \mathbf{a} \in H_{(N)} \times H_{(N)} : \mathbf{a} \text{ satisfies } S \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a} \right\}.$$

The symmetry $S: H \times H \rightarrow H \times H$ is the following symmetry. We define the symmetry directly on the level of Fourier modes

$$\begin{aligned} S \left(a_{(k^1, k^2)}^1, a_{(k^1, k^2)}^2 \right) &= \left(-a_{(-k^1, k^2)}^1, a_{(-k^1, k^2)}^2 \right) && \text{for } k^1, k^2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\text{even}}, \text{ or } k^1, k^2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\text{odd}}, \\ S \left(a_{(k^1, k^2)}^1, a_{(k^1, k^2)}^2 \right) &= \left(a_{(-k^1, k^2)}^1, -a_{(-k^1, k^2)}^2 \right) && \text{for } k^1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\text{even}}, k^2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\text{odd}}, \text{ or } k^1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\text{odd}}, k^2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\text{even}}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

In Lemma 4.3 we show that the nonlinearity appearing in the system (21) is symmetric with respect to S , i.e. $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{a}) = 0 \iff \mathbf{G}(S\mathbf{a}) = 0$ as long as \mathbf{F} is symmetric.

Observation 4.2. Using the isomorphism of the space of sequences of Fourier modes with the space of functions spanned by the trigonometric basis, space $H_{(N)}$ is isomorphic to a space of functions spanned by sines, i.e.

$$H_{(N)} \sim \left\{ \sum_{\substack{-N \leq l \leq N \\ 0 \leq k \leq N}} v_{lk} \sin(lx + ky) \right\}. \quad (28)$$

Lemma 4.3. Let \mathbf{Nonl} be the nonlinear part of (21c) modulo the imaginary unit factor. \mathbf{Nonl} satisfies

$$\mathbf{Nonl}(S\mathbf{a}) = S \mathbf{Nonl}(\mathbf{a}).$$

Proof

$$\mathbf{Nonl}(\mathbf{a}) = \left(\mathbf{Nonl}^1(\mathbf{a}), \mathbf{Nonl}^2(\mathbf{a}) \right).$$

Below, we check that the first component \mathbf{Nonl}^1 satisfies the symmetry, by the same arguments the symmetry of the second component \mathbf{Nonl}^2 follows. To verify the claim let us consider two subcases

Case 1 $k = (k^1, k^2)$, k^1, k^2 even or k^1, k^2 odd.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Nonl}^1(\mathbf{a})_{(-k^1, k^2)} &= \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} a_{(-k_1^1, k_1^2)}^1 (-k_2^1) a_{(-k_2^1, k_2^2)}^1 + \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} a_{(-k_1^1, k_1^2)}^2 k_2^2 a_{(-k_2^1, k_2^2)}^1 = \\ &- \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} (S\mathbf{a})_{(k_1^1, k_1^2)}^1 k_2^1 (S\mathbf{a})_{(k_2^1, k_2^2)}^1 - \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} (S\mathbf{a})_{(k_1^1, k_1^2)}^2 k_2^2 (S\mathbf{a})_{(k_2^1, k_2^2)}^1 = \\ &- \mathbf{Nonl}^1(S\mathbf{a})_{(k^1, k^2)} = \mathbf{Nonl}^1(S\mathbf{a})_{(-k^1, k^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

If we consider indices k_1, k_2 such that $k = k_1 + k_2$, it holds that either k_j^1, k_j^2 are even (odd) (k^1, k^2 even case) or one of k_j^1, k_j^2 is even and the second one is odd (k^1, k^2 odd case), $j = 1, 2$. This implies the second equality above, where in the first term the symmetry generates either none or two minuses, as both of the modes come from the same component, hence, the only minus appears in front of the index $-k_2^1$. Whereas in the second term there is single minus generated, as the modes come from different components, this is seen clearly from (27).

Case 2 $k = (k^1, k^2)$, k^1 even, and k^2 odd or k^1 odd, and k^2 even.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Nonl}^1(\mathbf{a})_{(-k^1, k^2)} &= \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} a_{(-k_1^1, k_1^2)}^1(-k_2^1) a_{(-k_2^1, k_2^2)}^1 + \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} a_{(-k_1^1, k_1^2)}^2 k_2^2 a_{(-k_2^1, k_2^2)}^1 = \\ &+ \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} -(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{a})_{(k_1^1, k_1^2)}^1(-k_2^1)(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{a})_{(k_2^1, k_2^2)}^1 + \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} (\mathbf{S}\mathbf{a})_{(k_1^1, k_1^2)}^2 k_2^2 (\mathbf{S}\mathbf{a})_{(k_2^1, k_2^2)}^1 = \\ &\text{Nonl}^1(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{a})_{(k^1, k^2)} = \text{Nonl}^1(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{a})_{(-k^1, k^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

If we consider indices k_1, k_2 such that $k = k_1 + k_2$, it holds that both of the indices in one of the pairs k_j^1, k_j^2 are even (odd), and in the second pair indices are of different parity (one even, and the other odd). This implies that in the last equality, in the first term the symmetry generates single minus, as both of the modes come from the same component, the second minus appears in front of the index $-k_2^1$. Whereas in the second term, as the modes come from different components, the symmetry generates either two minuses (k_1^1 even, k_1^2 odd or vice-versa, and k_2^1, k_2^2 even (odd)), or none minuses (k_1^1, k_1^2 even (odd), and k_2^1 even, k_2^2 odd or vice-versa). Finally, we obtain the claim. \square

We remark that there is another symmetry exhibited by the solutions of (21c), which we denote by $S^{x \leftrightarrow y}$. Existence of the second solution in Theorem 1.1 follows from the bounds we establish in Section 4.2 and the symmetry defined below.

Definition 4.4. Symmetry $S^{x \leftrightarrow y}$ by reflection by this symmetry we will obtain the existence of the second solution from Theorem 1.1. Let $S^{x \leftrightarrow y}: H \times H \rightarrow H \times H$ be the following symmetry (denoted $x \leftrightarrow y$ in the prequel)

$$\begin{aligned} S^{x \leftrightarrow y}(\mathbf{a})_{(k^1, k^2)}^1 &= \mathbf{a}_{(k^2, k^1)}^2, \\ S^{x \leftrightarrow y}(\mathbf{a})_{(k^1, k^2)}^2 &= \mathbf{a}_{(k^2, k^1)}^1, \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

It is immediately verified that the solutions of the system (21) and all its Galerkin approximations are invariant under this symmetry, i.e. $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{a}) = 0 \iff \mathbf{G}(S^{x \leftrightarrow y}\mathbf{a}) = 0$ as long as \mathbf{F} is symmetric.

4.1 Structure of the linear operator

Now, let us present the linear operator

$$L_\lambda(w) = \lambda \sin y \partial_x w + (-\Delta)^m w \tag{29}$$

in Fourier's coordinates introduced previously. Here we argue how to reduce the problem of deriving dimension independent bounds for L_λ^{-1} to the problem of bounding particular matrix norms. Recall that the operator $(-\Delta)^m$ in Fourier's coordinates is diagonal

$$(-\Delta)^m = \text{diag}(\dots, l^{2m} + k^{2m}, \dots).$$

In order to show the action of the $\lambda \sin y \partial_x w$ component, we introduce the following subspaces

Definition 4.5. Let $l \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$. We denote the following subspace of $H_{(N)}$

$$H_{(N)} \supset H_{(N)}^l = \left\{ w : w = \sum_{k=0}^N w_k^\pm \sin(\pm lx + ky) = \sum_{k=0}^N -\frac{1}{2} a_{(\pm l, k)} \left(e^{i(\pm l, k) \cdot (x, y)} - e^{-i(\pm l, k) \cdot (x, y)} \right), w_0^\pm = w_0 \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that H^l subspaces are invariant for the operator $L_\lambda(w)$ in the following sense $L_\lambda H_{(N)}^l \subset H_{(N+1)}^l$.

Definition 4.6. Let us denote the projection of L_λ onto $H_{(N)}^l$ by

$$L_\lambda^l := P_{H_{(N)}^l} \circ L_\lambda \circ P_{H_{(N)}^l} : H_{(N)}^l \rightarrow H_{(N)}^l.$$

Let

$$H'_{(N)} = H_{(N)}^0 \oplus H_{(N)}^1 \oplus \dots \oplus H_{(N)}^N.$$

Define the projection of L_λ onto the following space

Definition 4.7. Let $R \subset H_{(N)}$ denote the following space

$$R := H^1 \oplus \dots \oplus H^N. \quad (30)$$

subspa

The projection of L_λ onto R will be denoted by

$$L_\lambda^R := P_R(L_\lambda)P_R : R \rightarrow R.$$

In order to present action of the operator L_λ on a vector in $H_{(N)}^l$ we take

$$H_{(N)}^l \ni w = w_0 \sin(lx) + \sum_{j=1}^N w_j^\pm \sin(\pm lx + jy)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \sin y w_x &= \lambda \sin y \left(w_0 \cos lx + \sum_{j=1}^N w_j^+ \cos(lx + jy) - w_j^- \cos(-lx + jy) \right) \\ &= \frac{l}{2} \lambda \left[w_0 \sin(lx + y) + w_0 \sin(-lx + y) + \sum_{j=1}^N w_j^+ [\sin(lx + (j+1)y) - \sin(lx + (j-1)y)] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{j=1}^N w_j^- [\sin(-lx + (j+1)y) - \sin(-lx + (j-1)y)] \right], \end{aligned}$$

System

Therefore

$$\left(L_\lambda^l w \right)_{l,0} = -\frac{\lambda l}{2} w_1^+ - \frac{\lambda l}{2} w_1^- + l^{2m} w_0, \quad (31a)$$

eq: sin

$$\left(L_\lambda^l w \right)_{\pm l, j} = \pm \frac{\lambda l}{2} w_{j-1}^\pm \mp \frac{\lambda l}{2} w_{j+1}^\pm + (l^{2m} + j^{2m}) w_j^\pm \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, N-1, \quad (31b)$$

$$\left(L_\lambda^l w \right)_{\pm N, j} = \pm \frac{\lambda l}{2} w_{j-1}^\pm + (N^{2m} + j^{2m}) w_j^\pm, \quad (31c)$$

arized

where we used the convention $w_0^\pm = w_0$.

We will study the structure of the linear operator L_λ^l acting on the subspace $G_{(N)}^l$

$$H_{(N)}^l \supset G_{(N)}^l = \{w : w \in \text{span} \{\sin(lx), \sin(lx + ky) \text{ for } k = 1, 2, \dots, N\}\}. \quad (32)$$

The subspace $G_{(N)}^l$ does not include in its span the part of the basis functions $\{\sin(-lx + ky), k = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$, which are present in the span of $H_{(N)}^l$. As we always work with vector solutions satisfying symmetry S (Definition 4.1), for a given $(w_1, w_2) \in G_{(N)}^l \times G_{(N)}^l$ there is a unique $(v_1, v_2) \in H_{(N)}^l \times H_{(N)}^l$. In other words, the coefficients $(w_1^-, \dots, w_j^-, \dots, w_N^-)$ are determined by the corresponding coefficients with '+', i.e. $(w_1^+, \dots, w_j^+, \dots, w_N^+)$ through symmetry S (Definition 4.1).

In the sequel we will study the operator

$$L_\lambda^l := P_{G_{(N)}^l} \circ L_\lambda \circ P_{G_{(N)}^l} : G_{(N)}^l \rightarrow G_{(N)}^l,$$

which has the following tridiagonal form

$$L_\lambda^l = \begin{bmatrix} l^{2m} & -\frac{l\lambda}{2} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \frac{l\lambda}{2} & l^{2m} + 1 & -\frac{l\lambda}{2} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & \frac{l\lambda}{2} & l^{2m} + (N-1)^{2m} & -\frac{l\lambda}{2} \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \frac{l\lambda}{2} & l^{2m} + N^{2m} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

We will study the following full (projected) linear operator

$$P_{\oplus_{l=0}^N G_{(N)}^l} \circ L_\lambda \circ P_{\oplus_{l=0}^N G_{(N)}^l} : \oplus_{l=0}^N G_{(N)}^l \rightarrow \oplus_{l=0}^N G_{(N)}^l.$$

In the sequel, we will use simply L_λ to denote the full linear operator, which has the following block diagonal form

$$L_\lambda = \begin{bmatrix} L_\lambda^0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & L_\lambda^1 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & L_\lambda^{N-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & L_\lambda^N \end{bmatrix}. \quad (34)$$

4.2 Bounds for matrices inverse to L_λ^l, L_λ

In this part we provide results on bounds of the particular norms of inverse tridiagonal matrices. Some technical lemmas used to prove the presented bounds are provided in Section 7.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $N > 0, m > 1, l = 1, \dots, N$. The following uniform bound holds*

$$\left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{j,k} \right| \leq 2^{2m} \left(\frac{l\lambda}{2} \right)^{-1}, \quad \text{for } k, j = 1, \dots, N.$$

Lemma 4.9. *Let $N > 0, m > 1, l = 1, \dots, N$. There exist $C(m) > 0$ (independent of λ and N), such that for $\lambda > 2$ the following bounds hold*

$$\sum_{j=1, \dots, N} \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{ij} \right| \leq C(m) \left(\frac{l\lambda}{2} \right)^{-1+1/2m}, \quad \sum_{j=1, \dots, N} \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{ji} \right| \leq C(m) \left(\frac{l\lambda}{2} \right)^{-1+1/2m},$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, N$.

In the next theorem we present the main result of this section, which is composed of bounds for the following norms $\|L_\lambda^{R^{-1}}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l^1}$, $\|L_\lambda^{R^{-1}}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l^\infty}$, $\|L_\lambda^{R^{-1}}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l_1^1}$, see Definition 2.3. Where first two are standard norms, and the third (which we call the *gradient norm*) is defined

Definition 4.10. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N^2 \times N^2}$ be a block-diagonal matrix

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & A_{N-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & A_N \end{bmatrix},$$

where A_1, \dots, A_{N-1}, A_N are N dimensional square matrices.

We call the gradient norm of A the following matrix norm

$$\|A\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l_1^1} = \max_{j=1, \dots, N^2} \|A(j)\|_{l_1^1} = \max_{\substack{l=1, \dots, N \\ j=1, \dots, N}} \|A_l(j)\|_{l_1^1} = \max_{\substack{l=1, \dots, N \\ j=1, \dots, N}} \sum_{k=1}^N (l+k) |(A_l)_{k,j}|, \quad (35) \quad \text{eq:gra}$$

where $A(j)$ denotes the j -th column of A .

Theorem 4.11. Let $l = 1, \dots, N$. Let L_λ^l be the matrix given by (33), L_λ^R be the truncated matrix $P_R L_\lambda$ (projection of L_λ onto the space R (30)).

The following estimates hold for the matrices L_λ^{l-1} (diagonal submatrices of $L_\lambda^{R^{-1}}$).

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_\lambda^{l-1}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l^1} &\leq C_1(m) \left(\frac{l\lambda}{2}\right)^{-1+1/2m}, \\ \|L_\lambda^{l-1}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l^\infty} &\leq 2^{2m} \left(\frac{l\lambda}{2}\right)^{-1}, \\ \|L_\lambda^{l-1}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l_1^1} &\leq C_2(m) \left(\frac{l\lambda}{2}\right)^{-1+1/m}. \end{aligned}$$

The following estimates hold for the matrix $L_\lambda^{R^{-1}}$

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_\lambda^{R^{-1}}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l^1} &\leq C_1(m) \left(\frac{\lambda}{2}\right)^{-1+1/2m}, \\ \|L_\lambda^{R^{-1}}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l^\infty} &\leq 2^{2m} \left(\frac{\lambda}{2}\right)^{-1}, \\ \|L_\lambda^{R^{-1}}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l_1^1} &\leq C_2(m) \left(\frac{\lambda}{2}\right)^{-1+1/m}. \end{aligned}$$

We present a proof of this theorem in Section 7.

5 Fixed point argument

Having the estimate for the operator $(L_\lambda^R)^{-1}$ we are prepared to prove the main result of the paper. We assume that the considered solutions to (16) are finite dimensional. This assumption allows to use the results about the matrices norms presented in Section 4.2. Let us define two projections of the space H

$$P_R \text{ projection onto } H^1 \oplus \cdots \oplus H^N \text{ (the rotation like part) ,} \quad (36) \quad \text{f4}$$

$$P_D = I - P_R \text{ (the diagonal part) ,} \quad (37)$$

where P_D is the projection onto the subspace free of y dependence. We proceed as follows. First, we construct an a-priori estimate for the solution of (10). Let us display basic features of $(A, B) \in H'$ – the solutions to (10), which follows directly from the bounds presented in Theorem 4.11 (where we absorb the $\frac{1}{2}$ factor into the constant), namely

$$\begin{aligned}\|L_\lambda^{R^{-1}}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l^1} &\lesssim \lambda^{-1+1/2m}, \\ \|L_\lambda^{R^{-1}}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l^\infty} &\lesssim \lambda^{-1}, \\ \|L_\lambda^{R^{-1}}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l^1_1} &\lesssim \lambda^{-1+1/m}.\end{aligned}$$

Observe that due to the identities $P_D A, P_D B = 0$ it is enough to use the bound for $(L_\lambda^D)^{-1}$, and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|B\|_{l^1} &\lesssim \lambda^{1/2m} & \|A\|_{l^1} &\lesssim \lambda^{1/m}, \\ \|B\|_{l^1_1} &\lesssim \lambda^{1/m} & \|A\|_{l^1_1} &\lesssim \lambda^{3/2m}, \\ \|B\|_{l^\infty} &\lesssim 1 & \|A\|_{l^\infty} &\lesssim \lambda^{1/2m}.\end{aligned}\tag{38} \quad \boxed{\text{f1}}$$

Consequently

$$\|(A, B)^T \cdot \nabla A\|_{l^1} \lesssim \|(A, B)^T\|_{l^1} \|A\|_{l^1_1} \lesssim \lambda^{1/m} \lambda^{3/2m} \lesssim \lambda^{5/2m},\tag{39} \quad \boxed{\text{f2}}$$

$$\|(A, B)^T \cdot \nabla B\|_{l^1} \lesssim \|(A, B)^T\|_{l^1} \|B\|_{l^1_1} \lesssim \lambda^{1/m} \lambda^{1/m} \lesssim \lambda^{2/m},\tag{40}$$

$$\|(A, B)^T \cdot \nabla A\|_{l^\infty} \lesssim \|(A, B)^T\|_{l^\infty} \|A\|_{l^1_1} \lesssim \lambda^{1/2m} \lambda^{3/2m} \lesssim \lambda^{2/m}.\tag{41}$$

In the estimations above, and generally in the estimates derived in this section we use often Young's inequality for products, i.e.

$$\|f * g\|_1 \leq \|f\|_1 \|g\|_1, \text{ and } \|f * g\|_\infty \leq \|f\|_\infty \|g\|_1.$$

Now we split V – the solution to the system (9) in the following way

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix},\tag{42} \quad \boxed{\text{f3}}$$

where $(A, B)^T$ is the solution of the linearized system (10).

In order to obtain the desired a priori estimate we are required to find a special property of function b . Namely, we prove that

$$P_D b = 0,\tag{43} \quad \boxed{\text{Pb}}$$

i.e. in b there is no element depending only on y . To show (43) we look at the rhs of (16) on the equation on b . We see that by (15) and (19)

$$(a + A)(b_x + B_x) + (b + B)(b_y + B_y) = (a + A)(b_x + B_x) + (b + B)(a_x + A_x) = \partial_x((a + A)(b + B)).\tag{44}$$

Hence

$$P_D((a + A)(b_x + B_x) + (b + B)(b_y + B_y)) = 0, \quad \text{i.e. } P_D b = 0.\tag{45}$$

Standing assumptions. At the formal level of the a-priori estimate we assume that solutions to (16) fulfill

$$\|(a, b)^T\|_{l^1_1} \leq \lambda^{1-1/m},\tag{46a} \quad \boxed{\text{eq:ass}}$$

$$\|P_R a\|_{l^1} \leq 1,\tag{46b} \quad \boxed{\text{eq:ass}}$$

$$m > 9/2.\tag{46c} \quad \boxed{\text{eq:ass}}$$

Recall (16)

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda \sin y \partial_x a + (-\Delta)^m a &= -\lambda \cos y b - \begin{pmatrix} a + A \\ b + B \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla(a + A), \\ \lambda \sin y \partial_x b + (-\Delta)^m b &= - \begin{pmatrix} a + A \\ b + B \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla(b + B).\end{aligned}\tag{47} \quad \boxed{\text{f6}}$$

In order to find the bound we apply the estimates for L_λ^R formally, assuming that the solutions are finite dimensional. Treating the right hand side of (47) we have the following bounds

Bound for $\|b\|_{l_1^1} = \|P_R b\|_{l_1^1}$.

$$\begin{aligned}\|b\|_{l_1^1} &\lesssim \|L_\lambda^{R^{-1}}\|_{l_1^1 \rightarrow l_1^1} \left(\|(A, B)^T \cdot \nabla B\|_{l^1} + \|ab_x\|_{l^1} + \|bb_y\|_{l^1} + \|aB_x\|_{l^1} + \|bB_y\|_{l^1} + \|(A, B)^T \cdot \nabla b\|_{l^1} \right) \\ &\lesssim \lambda^{-1+1/m} \left(\lambda^{2/m} + \|a\|_{l^1} \|b\|_{l_1^1} + \|b\|_{l^1} \|b\|_{l_1^1} + \|a\|_{l^1} \lambda^{1/m} + \|b\|_{l^1} \lambda^{1/m} + \lambda^{1/m} \|b\|_{l_1^1} \right) \\ &\lesssim \lambda^{-1+3/m} + \|a\|_{l^1} \lambda^{-1+2/m},\end{aligned}\tag{48} \quad \boxed{\text{eq: bou}}$$

where the last inequality is obtained after cleaning the absorbed terms, which is due to the assumptions (46a), and (46c). We will also need the following estimate for $\|b\|_{l^1}$, derived analogously as above

$$\|b\|_{l^1} \lesssim \lambda^{-1+5/2m} + \|a\|_{l^1} \lambda^{-1+3/2m}.\tag{49} \quad \boxed{\text{eq: b1}}$$

Let us define

$$\|P_D a\|_{l_{2m}^\infty} = \sup_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{Z} \\ |k| \leq N}} k^{2m} |a_{(0,k)}|.\tag{50} \quad \boxed{\text{f8}}$$

Bound for $\|P_D a\|_{l_{2m}^\infty}$. In this case the operator $P_D L_\lambda$ is diagonal, therefore we bound the particular norm $\|P_D a\|_{l_{2m}^\infty}$, it is trivially bounded by the l^∞ norm of the right hand side. Moreover, observe that l_{2m}^∞ norm bounds l_1^1 , i.e. we have $\|P_D a\|_{l_1^1} \lesssim \|P_D a\|_{l_{2m}^\infty}$ for $m > 3/2$, remembering that the dimension is two.

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_D a\|_{l_{2m}^\infty} &\lesssim \|(A, B)^T \cdot \nabla A\|_{l^\infty} + \|P_D(aa_x)\|_{l^\infty} + \|P_D(ba_y)\|_{l^\infty} + \|P_D(aA_x)\|_{l^\infty} + \|P_D(bA_y)\|_{l^\infty} \\ &\quad + \|P_D((A, B)^T \cdot \nabla a)\|_{l^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \lambda^{2/m} + \|P_R a\|_{l^1} \|P_R a\|_{l_1^1} + \|b\|_{l^1} \|P_R a\|_{l_1^1} + \|P_R a\|_{l^1} \lambda^{3/2m} + \|b\|_{l^1} \lambda^{3/2m} + \lambda^{1/m} \|P_R a\|_{l_1^1}.\end{aligned}\tag{51} \quad \boxed{\text{eq: bbo}}$$

We removed all terms, which do not generate P_D , i.e. any product of terms, one of them being in P_D , and the other one in P_R . When the bound (51) is used (potentially the worst term $\|P_D a P_D a_x\|$ is not present as $P_D a_x = 0$) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_D a\|_{l_{2m}^\infty} &\lesssim \lambda^{2/m} + \|P_R a\|_{l_1^1}^2 + \lambda^{-1+3/m} \|P_R a\|_{l_1^1} + \|a\|_{l^1} \|P_R a\|_{l_1^1} \lambda^{-1+2/m} \\ &\quad + \|P_R a\|_{l^1} \lambda^{3/2m} + \lambda^{-1+9/2m} + \|a\|_{l^1} \lambda^{-1+7/2m} + \lambda^{1/m} \|P_R a\|_{l_1^1} \\ &\lesssim \lambda^{2/m}.\end{aligned}$$

To get last inequality we used the assumption (46b) and (46c), the term $\lambda^{2/m}$ is clearly of the highest order from the terms that are left. Here we use that $m > 9/2$.

Bound for $\|P_{Ra}\|_{l_1^1}$. Observe that we have $\|P_{Da}\|_{l_1^1} \lesssim \|P_{Da}\|_{l_{2m}^\infty} \lesssim \lambda^{2/m}$

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{Ra}\|_{l_1^1} &\lesssim \lambda^{-1+1/m} \left(\lambda \|b\|_{l^1} + \|(A, B)^T \cdot \nabla A\|_{l^1} + \|a\|_{l^1} \|a\|_{l_1^1} + \|b\|_{l^1} \|a\|_{l_1^1} + \|a\|_{l^1} \|A\|_{l_1^1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|b\|_{l^1} \|A\|_{l_1^1} + \|(A, B)^T\|_{l^1} \|a\|_{l_1^1} \right) \\ &\lesssim \lambda^{-1+1/m} \left(\lambda \|b\|_{l^1} + \lambda^{5/2m} + \|P_{Ra}\|_{l_1^1}^2 + \|P_{Ra}\|_{l_1^1} \lambda^{2/m} + \|b\|_{l^1} \|P_{Ra}\|_{l_1^1} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \lambda^{2/m} \lambda^{3/2m} + \|P_{Ra}\|_{l_1^1} \lambda^{3/2m} + \|b\|_{l^1} \lambda^{3/2m} + \lambda^{1/m} \lambda^{2/m} \right) \\ &\lesssim \lambda^{-1+1/m} \left(\lambda \|b\|_{l^1} + \|P_{Ra}\|_{l_1^1}^2 + \|P_{Ra}\|_{l_1^1} \lambda^{2/m} + \|b\|_{l^1} \lambda^{3/2m} + \|b\|_{l^1} \|P_{Ra}\|_{l_1^1} + \lambda^{7/2m} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that after the second inequality the term $\|b\|_{l^1} \|a\|_{l_1^1}$ is not present as $P_{Da} = 0$, clearly the highest order term is $\|P_{Da}\|_{l^1} \|A\|_{l_1^1} = \lambda^{2/m} \lambda^{3/2m} = \lambda^{7/2m}$.

Now we use the bound (51), and remove some of the terms that were absorbed by using the assumptions (46a), (46b), and (46c), observe in the inequality above the bad looking term $\lambda \|b\|_{l^1}$, we estimate it using (49)

$$\lambda \|b\|_{l^1} \lesssim \lambda^{5/2m} + \lambda^{3/2m} (\|P_{Da}\|_{l^1} + \|P_{Ra}\|_{l^1}),$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{Ra}\|_{l_1^1} &\lesssim \lambda^{-1+1/m} \left(\lambda^{5/2m} + \lambda^{2/m} \lambda^{3/2m} + \|P_{Ra}\|_{l_1^1}^2 + \|P_{Ra}\|_{l_1^1} \lambda^{2/m} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\lambda^{-1+5/2m} + \|a\|_{l^1} \lambda^{-1+3/2m}) (\lambda^{3/2m} + \|P_{Ra}\|_{l_1^1}) + \lambda^{7/2m} \right). \end{aligned}$$

After using the assumption (46b) all terms with $\|P_{Ra}\|_{l_1^1}$ are being absorbed, and clearly the highest order term in the parenthesis is $\lambda^{7/2m}$, so finally we end up with

$$\|P_{Ra}\|_{l_1^1} \lesssim \lambda^{-1+9/2m}. \quad (52) \quad \boxed{\text{f10}}$$

Observe that P_{Ra} is mapped into itself by the operator L_λ^{-1} , due to the assumption (46c), namely $m > 9/2$.

Going back to (48) we get that

$$\|b\|_{l_1^1} \leq \lambda^{-1+4/m}. \quad (53) \quad \boxed{\text{f11}}$$

Summing up the considerations from this part we obtain the following result

Lemma 5.1. *Let a, b be a small solution to problem (47), then it obeys the following dimension independent a-priori estimate*

$$\|b\|_{l_1^1} \leq C \lambda^{-1+4/m}, \quad \|P_{Ra}\|_{l_1^1} \leq C \lambda^{-1+9/2m}, \quad \|P_{Da}\|_{l_1^1} \leq C \lambda^{2/m}. \quad (54) \quad \boxed{\text{f12}}$$

6 Proof of main theorem

Using the so far presented results, we may now proceed to proving our main result – Theorem 1.1. Here we want to construct the solutions, using the system (47) and the a-priori estimates (Lemma 5.1).

We start with the construction of the sequence of solution's approximations. We define the solution (a_{n+1}, b_{n+1}) as the solution to the following problem

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \sin y \partial_x a_{n+1} + (-\Delta)^m a_{n+1} &= -\lambda \cos y b_{n+1} - \begin{pmatrix} a_n + A_n \\ b_n + B_n \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla (a_n + A_n), \\ \lambda \sin y \partial_x b_{n+1} + (-\Delta)^m b_{n+1} &= - \begin{pmatrix} a_n + A_n \\ b_n + B_n \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla (b_n + B_n). \end{aligned} \quad (55) \quad \boxed{\text{f13}}$$

We take $(a_0, b_0) = (0, 0)$ and define A_n, B_n as the projection onto the spaces $H_{(N+2)}$, where N determines the number of active modes. If $(a_n, b_n) \in H_{(N)}$, then $(a_{n+1}, b_{n+1}) \in H_{(2N+2)}$.

Note, in addition, that (55) guarantees the constraint (19). It is clear that from $\partial_x a_n = \partial_y b_n$ it follows

$$\partial_x \left[\begin{pmatrix} a_n + A_n \\ b_n + B_n \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla(a_n + A_n) \right] - \partial_y \left[\begin{pmatrix} a_n + A_n \\ b_n + B_n \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla(b_n + B_n) \right] \equiv 0. \quad (56) \quad \boxed{\text{f13a}}$$

And this implies $\partial_x a_{n+1} = \partial_y b_{n+1}$. Thus constraint (19) is guaranteed, refer (18).

Repeating the estimates for the system (47) we find that if

$$\|b_n\|_{l_1^1} \leq C\lambda^{-1+4/m}, \quad \|P_R a_n\|_{l_1^1} \leq C\lambda^{-1+9/2m}, \quad \|P_D a_n\|_{l_1^1} \leq C\lambda^{2/m}. \quad (57) \quad \boxed{\text{f14}}$$

then

$$\|b_{n+1}\|_{l_1^1} \leq C\lambda^{-1+4/m}, \quad \|P_R a_{n+1}\|_{l_1^1} \leq C\lambda^{-1+9/2m}, \quad \|P_D a_{n+1}\|_{l_1^1} \leq C\lambda^{2/m}. \quad (58) \quad \boxed{\text{f15}}$$

with the same constants C , provided λ sufficiently large.

We shall underline that for a fixed n we are allowed to apply results for the finite dimensional approximation of L_λ . We emphasize that all constants in Theorem 4.11 are independent on N .

We want to prove that $\{a_n, b_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. We consider the following system

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \sin y \partial_x (a_{n+1} - a_n) + (-\Delta)^m (a_{n+1} - a_n) &= -\lambda \cos y (b_{n+1} - b_n) \\ &\quad - \begin{pmatrix} a_n + A_n \\ b_n + B_n \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla(a_n + A_n) + \begin{pmatrix} a_{n-1} + A_{n-1} \\ b_{n-1} + B_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla(a_{n-1} + A_{n-1}), \\ \lambda \sin y \partial_x (b_{n+1} - b_n) + (-\Delta)^m (b_{n+1} - b_n) &= \\ &\quad - \begin{pmatrix} a_n + A_n \\ b_n + B_n \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla(b_n + B_n) + \begin{pmatrix} a_{n-1} + A_{n-1} \\ b_{n-1} + B_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla(b_{n-1} + B_{n-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (59) \quad \boxed{\text{f16}}$$

Taking a large n we want to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_R(a_{n+1} - a_n), b_{n+1} - b_n\|_{l_1^1} + \lambda^{-2/m} \|P_D(a_{n+1} - a_n)\|_{l_1^1} \leq \\ \frac{1}{2} \left(\|P_R(a_n - a_{n-1}), b_n - b_{n-1}\|_{l_1^1} + \lambda^{-2/m} \|P_D(a_n - a_{n-1})\|_{l_1^1} \right) + \epsilon_n, \end{aligned} \quad (60) \quad \boxed{\text{f17}}$$

where $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the quantity ϵ_n is related by norms of terms like $(A_n - A_{n-1})$ and $(B_n - B_{n-1})$.

In order to justify (60) we point out few estimates which provides the inequality. Here we use the same tools as in the proof of Lemma 5.1. Hence we estimate the right hand side of (59). We have to estimate the following terms.

For $\|b_{n+1} - b_n\|_{l_1^1}$ we have

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} a_n + A_n \\ b_n + B_n \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla(B_n - B_{n-1}) \right\|_{l^1} \leq \epsilon_n. \quad (61)$$

For n sufficiently large it is clear that $\|B_n - B_{n-1}\|_{l_1^1} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Next,

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} a_n + A_n \\ b_n + B_n \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla(b_n - b_{n-1}) \right\|_{l^1} \lesssim \lambda^{2/m} \|b_n - b_{n-1}\|_{l_1^1} \quad (62)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} a_n - a_{n-1} + A_n - A_{n-1} \\ b_n - b_{n-1} + B_n - B_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla(b_{n-1} + B_{n-1}) \right\|_{l^1} \\ \lesssim \epsilon_n + (\lambda^{-1+4/m} + \lambda^{1/m}) \|(a_n - a_{n-1}), b_n - b_{n-1}\|_{l_1^1} \\ \lesssim \epsilon_n + (\lambda^{-1+4/m} + \lambda^{1/m}) \|P_R(a_n - a_{n-1}), b_n - b_{n-1}\|_{l_1^1} \\ \quad + (\lambda^{-1+4/m} + \lambda^{1/m}) \lambda^{2/m} \lambda^{-2/m} \|P_D(a_n - a_{n-1})\|_{l_1^1}. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

Hence

$$\|b_{n+1} - b_n\|_{l_1^1} \lesssim \lambda^{-1+3/m} \|P_1(a_n - a_{n-1}), b_n - b_{n-1}\|_{l_1^1} + (\lambda^{-2+7/m} + \lambda^{-1+4/m}) \lambda^{-2/m} \|P_D(a_n - a_{n-1})\|_{l_1^1} + \epsilon_n. \quad (64) \quad \boxed{\text{x1}}$$

For $\|P_D(a_{n+1} - a_n)\|_{l_1^1}$ we have

$$\|P_D \left(\begin{pmatrix} a_n + A_n \\ b_n + B_n \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla(a_n - a_{n-1}) \right)\|_{l^1} \lesssim \lambda^{1/m} \|P_R(a_n - a_{n-1})\|_{l_1^1}, \quad (65)$$

$$\|P_D \left(\begin{pmatrix} a_n - a_{n-1} \\ b_n - b_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \nabla A_n \right)\|_{l^1} \lesssim \lambda^{3/2m} \|P_R(a_n - a_{n-1}), b_n - b_{n-1}\|_{l_1^1}. \quad (66)$$

The remaining terms here are simpler. So

$$\|P_D(a_{n+1} - a_n)\|_{l_1^1} \lesssim \lambda^{3/2m} \|P_R(a_n - a_{n-1}), b_n - b_{n-1}\|_{l_1^1} + \text{better terms}. \quad (67) \quad \boxed{\text{x2}}$$

For $\|P_R(a_{n+1} - a_n)\|_{l_1^1}$ we have

$$\|P_R \left(\begin{pmatrix} a_n + A_n \\ b_n + B_n \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla(a_n - a_{n-1}) \right)\|_{l^1} \lesssim \lambda^{2/m} \|P_R(a_n - a_{n-1})\|_{l_1^1} + (\lambda^{-1+4/m} + \lambda^{1/m}) \lambda^{2/m} \lambda^{-2/m} \|P_D(a_n - a_{n-1})\|_{l_1^1} \quad (68)$$

and

$$\|P_R \left(\begin{pmatrix} a_n - a_{n-1} \\ b_n - b_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \nabla A_n \right)\|_{l^1} \lesssim \lambda^{3/2m} \|P_R(a_n - a_{n-1}), b_n - b_{n-1}\|_{l^1} + \lambda^{7/2m} \lambda^{-2/m} \|P_D(a_n - a_{n-1})\|_{l^1}. \quad (69)$$

The last term is $\|\lambda \cos y(b_{n+1} - b_n)\|_{l^1}$, and using the estimates for $\|L_\lambda^B\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l^1}$ from Theorem 4.11 we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|\lambda \cos y(b_{n+1} - b_n)\|_{l^1} &\lesssim \lambda^{1/2m} \|RHS(59)_2\|_{l^1} \\ &\lesssim \lambda^{1/2m} \left(\lambda^{2/m} \|P_R(a_n - a_{n-1}), b_n - b_{n-1}\|_{l_1^1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda^{3/m} \lambda^{-2/m} \|P_D(a_n - a_{n-1})\|_{l_1^1} + \epsilon_n \right). \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Hence

$$\|P_R(a_{n+1} - a_n)\|_{l_1^1} \quad (71) \quad \boxed{\text{x3}}$$

$$\lesssim \lambda^{-1+1/m} \left(\lambda^{5/2m} \|P_R(a_n - a_{n-1}), b_n - b_{n-1}\|_{l_1^1} + \lambda^{7/2m} \lambda^{-2/m} \|P_D(a_n - a_{n-1})\|_{l_1^1} + \epsilon_n \right) \quad (72)$$

$$\lesssim \lambda^{-1+7/2m} \|P_R(a_n - a_{n-1}), b_n - b_{n-1}\|_{l_1^1} + \lambda^{-1+9/2m} \lambda^{-2/m} \|P_D(a_n - a_{n-1})\|_{l_1^1} + \epsilon_n. \quad (73)$$

Summing up (64),(67) and (71) we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_R(a_{n+1} - a_n), b_{n+1} - b_n\|_{l_1^1} + \lambda^{-2/m} \|P_D(a_n - a_{n-1})\|_{l_1^1} &\lesssim \\ \lambda^{-1+7/2m} \|P_R(a_n - a_{n-1}), b_n - b_{n-1}\|_{l_1^1} + \lambda^{-1+9/2m} \lambda^{-2/m} \|P_D(a_n - a_{n-1})\|_{l_1^1} &+ \epsilon_n \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

For $m > 9/2$ and large λ we got (60).

The condition (60) implies that the sequence $\{P_{R}a_n, b_n, P_{D}a_n\}$ has a limit in the space l_1^1 . It means that there exists a solution to problem (47) obeying estimates from Lemma 5.1. In other words we have constructed the solution (5). We shall underline that the limit in l_1^1 implies that the derivative is uniformly bounded, thus the nonlinear term is described pointwisely. A bootstrap method implies that the solutions constructed in the above way are indeed smooth.

Existence of the solution (6) follows from the symmetry $x \leftrightarrow y$ from Definition 4.4 that we recall here for completeness

$$\begin{aligned} S^{x \leftrightarrow y} ((a, b))_{(k^1, k^2)}^1 &= b_{(k^2, k^1)}, \\ S^{x \leftrightarrow y} ((a, b))_{(k^1, k^2)}^2 &= a_{(k^2, k^1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where it should be understood on the level of the Fourier modes of (a, b) . Largeness of λ implies there are two different solutions. Theorem 1.1 is proved.

7 Analysis of large matrices and proof of Theorem 4.11

Notation Let $N > 0$ be an even number, $m > 1$, $l > 0$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let us denote

$$\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} \ni T^l(a, b) = \begin{bmatrix} a & -\frac{l\lambda}{2} \\ \frac{l\lambda}{2} & b \end{bmatrix}.$$

We denote a tridiagonal matrix with elements $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^N$ on the diagonal, $-l\lambda$ over diagonal, and $l\lambda$ under diagonal by

$$\mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \ni T^l(a_1, \dots, a_N) = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & -\frac{l\lambda}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \frac{l\lambda}{2} & a_2 & -\frac{l\lambda}{2} & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ & & \ddots & & \ddots & \\ & & & 0 & \frac{l\lambda}{2} & a_N \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let the increasing sequence $\{d_j^l\}_{j=1}^N$ be given by

$$d_1^l = l^{2m}, \quad d_2^l = l^{2m} + 1, \dots, \quad d_N^l = l^{2m} + (N-1)^{2m} \quad \text{for } l > 0.$$

We denote the tridiagonal matrix with the increasing sequence $\{d_j^l\}_{j=1}^N$ on the diagonal by

$$L_\lambda^l := T^l(d_1^l, \dots, d_N^l) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}.$$

Definition 7.1. In the sequel we will use the following notation to denote the off diagonal term of the tridiagonal matrices T^l

$$\hat{\lambda} = \hat{\lambda}(l) = \frac{l\lambda}{2}.$$

Lemma 7.2. Let $l > 1$. Let the sequences $\{a_j^l\}$, $\{b_j^l\}$ be given by the following recursive formulas

$$\begin{aligned} a_0^l &= 0, & b_0^l &= 0, \\ a_1^l &= \frac{d_N^l}{d_{N-1}^l d_N^l + \hat{\lambda}^2}, & b_1^l &= \frac{d_1^l}{d_1^l d_2^l + \hat{\lambda}^2}, \\ a_2^l &= \frac{d_{N-2}^l + a_1^l \hat{\lambda}^2}{d_{N-3}^l d_{N-2}^l + a_1^l d_{N-3}^l \hat{\lambda}^2 + \hat{\lambda}^2}, & b_2^l &= \frac{d_3^l + b_1^l \hat{\lambda}^2}{d_3^l d_4^l + b_1^l d_4^l \hat{\lambda}^2 + \hat{\lambda}^2}, \\ a_j^l &= \frac{d_{N-2j+2}^l + a_{j-1}^l \hat{\lambda}^2}{d_{N-2j+1}^l d_{N-2j+2}^l + a_{j-1}^l d_{N-2j+1}^l \hat{\lambda}^2 + \hat{\lambda}^2}, & b_j^l &= \frac{d_{2j-1}^l + b_{j-1}^l \hat{\lambda}^2}{d_{2j}^l d_{2j-1}^l + b_{j-1}^l d_{2j}^l \hat{\lambda}^2 + \hat{\lambda}^2}, \end{aligned}$$

for $j \geq 1$. Then the following bounds hold for all $j \geq 0$

$$0 \leq a_j^l \leq 2^{2m} / \hat{\lambda}, \quad 0 \leq b_j^l \leq 1 / \hat{\lambda}.$$




Figure 3: Graph showing numerically calculated recursive series $\{a_j^1\}, \{b_j^1\}$ for $\lambda = 1000$, and for $m = 2$ (top figures), $m = 4$ (bottom figures). Apparent upper bound for the series is also shown ($1/\lambda$).

Proof The $a_j^l, b_j^l \geq 0$ part of the bound is trivial.

Now we prove $2^{2m} \hat{\lambda}^{-1} \geq a_j^l$. We proceed by induction, first we prove that $2^{2m} \hat{\lambda}^{-1} \geq a_1^l$ holds. Observe that for all $N > 1$, and $l \geq 1$ we have

$$\frac{l^{2m} + (N-1)^{2m}}{(l^{2m} + (N-1)^{2m})(l^{2m} + (N-2)^{2m}) + \hat{\lambda}^2} < \frac{l^{2m} + 2^{2m-1} [(N-2)^{2m} + 1]}{(l^{2m} + (N-2)^{2m})^2 + \hat{\lambda}^2} < \frac{2^{2m} [l^{2m} + (N-2)^{2m}]}{(l^{2m} + (N-2)^{2m})^2 + \hat{\lambda}^2} < \frac{2^{2m} a}{a^2 + \hat{\lambda}^2} = \frac{2^{2m}}{a + \frac{\hat{\lambda}^2}{a}} < \frac{2^{2m}}{\hat{\lambda}}, \quad (75)$$

where $a = l^{2m} + (N-2)^{2m}$, we used the estimate due to convexity $(N-1)^{2m} < 2^{2m} \left(\frac{(N-2)+1}{2}\right)^{2m} < 2^{2m-1} ((N-2)^{2m} + 1)$, the last inequality follows from $a^2 + \hat{\lambda}^2 > a\hat{\lambda}$.

Assuming $2^{2m} \hat{\lambda}^{-1} \geq a_{j-1}$ we verify that $2^{2m} \hat{\lambda}^{-1} \geq a_j$ holds.

First, observe that $f(a) := \frac{d_{N-2j+2}^l + a\hat{\lambda}^2}{d_{N-2j+2}^l d_{N-2j+1}^l + a\hat{\lambda}^2 d_{N-2j+1}^l + \hat{\lambda}^2}$ is a strictly increasing function for all $a \geq 0$ (denominator is positive), as

$$f'(a) = \frac{\hat{\lambda}^4}{(d_{N-2j+2}^l d_{N-2j+1}^l + a\hat{\lambda}^2 d_{N-2j+1}^l + \hat{\lambda}^2)^2} \geq 0, \quad (76)$$

so we have

$$\frac{d_{k+2}^l + a_{j-1} \hat{\lambda}^2}{d_{k+2}^l d_{k+1}^l + a_{j-1} d_{k+1}^l \hat{\lambda}^2 + \hat{\lambda}^2} \leq \frac{l^{2m} + (k+1)^{2m} + 2^{2m} \hat{\lambda}}{(l^{2m} + (k+1)^{2m})(l^{2m} + k^{2m}) + 2^{2m} \hat{\lambda} (l^{2m} + k^{2m}) + \hat{\lambda}^2} \leq \frac{2^{2m}}{\hat{\lambda}}, \quad (77)$$

where $k = N - 2j$. The last inequality reduces to

$$\frac{l^{2m} + 2^{2m-1} (k^{2m} + 1) + 2^{2m} \hat{\lambda}}{(l^{2m} + k^{2m})^2 + 2^{2m} \hat{\lambda} (l^{2m} + k^{2m}) + \hat{\lambda}^2} \leq \frac{2^{2m}}{\hat{\lambda}},$$

after grouping the terms in this inequality it is easy to see that it is satisfied for all $l \geq 1$, and $k \geq 0$.

Obviously $\hat{\lambda}^{-1} \geq b_1$ holds. Analogically as above, assuming $\hat{\lambda}^{-1} \geq b_j$ we verify that $\hat{\lambda}^{-1} \geq b_{j+1}$ holds (it can also be verified that $f'(b)$ is strictly positive, and it is enough to verify the inequality setting $b_j = \hat{\lambda}^{-1}$).

$$\frac{d_{2j+1} + b_{j-1} \hat{\lambda}^2}{d_{2j+2} d_{2j+1} + b_{j-1} d_{2j+2} \hat{\lambda}^2 + \hat{\lambda}^2} \leq \frac{l^{2m} + (2j)^{2m} + \hat{\lambda}}{(l^{2m} + (2j+1)^{2m})(l^{2m} + (2j)^{2m}) + \hat{\lambda} (l^{2m} + (2j+1)^{2m}) + \hat{\lambda}^2} \leq \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}}, \quad (78)$$

The last inequality holds due to following inequality, which is clearly satisfied

$$\frac{a + \hat{\lambda}}{a^2 + a\hat{\lambda} + \hat{\lambda}^2} \leq \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}},$$

where $a = l^{2m} + (2j)^{2m}$. □

Lemma 7.3. *Let $l > 1$. All elements in 2×2 diagonal blocks of L_λ^{l-1} are estimated uniformly. Precisely, the following inequalities hold for $j = 0, \dots, N/2 - 1$*

$$\begin{aligned} |(L_\lambda^{l-1})_{2j+1,2j+1}| &\leq 2^{2m} / \hat{\lambda}, & |(L_\lambda^{l-1})_{2j+1,2j+2}| &\leq 1 / \hat{\lambda}, \\ |(L_\lambda^{l-1})_{2j+2,2j+1}| &\leq 1 / \hat{\lambda}, & |(L_\lambda^{l-1})_{2j+2,2j+2}| &\leq 1 / \hat{\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof Here we assume that l is fixed, and we drop the superscript in the notation of T^l , a_k^l , b_k^l , and d_k^l , we use simply T , a_k , b_k , and d_k respectively. First, all matrices considered are invertible, which is obvious by calculating the determinant of tridiagonal matrices.

We use the notation $\text{Inv}^{(D)}$ to denote the $D \times D$ dimensional upper-left corner block of L_λ^{l-1} . Analogously we use the notation $\overline{\text{Inv}}^{(D)}$ to denote the $D \times D$ dimensional lower-right corner block of L_λ^{l-1} . We are going to use the following convention for block decomposition of $L_\lambda^{l-1} = \text{Inv}^{(N)}$.

$$L_\lambda^{l-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Inv}_{11}^{(N)} & \text{Inv}_{12}^{(N)} \\ \text{Inv}_{21}^{(N)} & \text{Inv}_{22}^{(N)} \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} T(d_1, \dots, d_{N-2}) & -A \\ A^T & T(d_{N-1}, d_N) \end{bmatrix}^{-1}, \quad (79a) \quad \text{eq:Vde}$$

$$L_\lambda^{l-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{\text{Inv}}_{11}^{(N)} & \overline{\text{Inv}}_{12}^{(N)} \\ \overline{\text{Inv}}_{21}^{(N)} & \overline{\text{Inv}}_{22}^{(N)} \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} T(d_1, d_2) & -A'^T \\ A' & T(d_3, \dots, d_{N-1}, d_N) \end{bmatrix}^{-1}, \quad (79b) \quad \text{eq:Vde}$$

where

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 \\ \hat{\lambda} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A' = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \hat{\lambda} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We will call $\text{Inv}_{j,k}^{(N)}$, $\overline{\text{Inv}}_{j,k}^{(N)}$ the inverse blocks. In the remainder of the proof we will compute recursively $\text{Inv}^{(N-2)}$, $\overline{\text{Inv}}^{(N-2)}$... $\text{Inv}^{(2)}$, $\overline{\text{Inv}}^{(2)}$.

The explicit formulas for the inverse blocks are obtained from the following system of equations (simplifying the notation by dropping the brackets with parameters, i.e. $T_I = T(d_1, \dots, d_{N-2})$, $T_{II} = T(d_{N-1}, d_N)$ etc.)

$$T_I \text{Inv}_{11}^{(N)} - A \text{Inv}_{21}^{(N)} = I, \quad T_I \text{Inv}_{12}^{(N)} - A \text{Inv}_{22}^{(N)} = 0, \quad (80a)$$

$$A^T \text{Inv}_{11}^{(N)} + T_{II} \text{Inv}_{21}^{(N)} = 0, \quad A^T \text{Inv}_{12}^{(N)} + T_{II} \text{Inv}_{22}^{(N)} = I. \quad (80b)$$

When the equations for diagonal blocks are decoupled we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Inv}_{11}^{(N)} &= [T(d_1, \dots, d_{N-2}) + AT(d_{N-1}, d_N)^{-1}A^T]^{-1}, \\ \text{Inv}_{22}^{(N)} &= [T(d_{N-1}, d_N) + A^T T(d_1, \dots, d_{N-2})^{-1}A]^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} AT(d_{N-1}, d_N)^{-1}A^T &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & \hat{\lambda}^2 T(d_{N-1}, d_N)_{11}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}, \\ A^T T(d_1, \dots, d_{N-2})^{-1}A &= \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\lambda}^2 T(d_1, \dots, d_{N-2})_{NN}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we state the crucial observation – the inverse diagonal blocks W_{11} and W_{22} are inverses of tridiagonal matrices, i.e.

$$\text{Inv}_{11}^{(N)} = T(d_1, \dots, d_{N-3}, d_{N-2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_1)^{-1} = \text{Inv}^{(N-2)}, \quad (81a)$$

$$\text{Inv}_{22}^{(N)} = T(d_{N-1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 T(d_1, \dots, d_{N-2})_{NN}^{-1}, d_N)^{-1}, \quad (81b)$$

where $a_1 = T(d_{N-1}, d_N)_{11}^{-1} = \frac{d_N}{d_{N-1}d_N + \hat{\lambda}^2}$. The same holds for the diagonal inverse blocks $\overline{\text{Inv}}_{11}^{(N)}$ and $\overline{\text{Inv}}_{22}^{(N)}$ by symmetric calculations, i.e.

$$\overline{\text{Inv}}_{11}^{(N)} = \left[T(d_1, d_2) + A'^T T(d_3, \dots, d_N)^{-1} A' \right]^{-1} = T \left(d_1, d_2 + \hat{\lambda}^2 T(d_3, \dots, d_N)_{11}^{-1} \right)^{-1}, \quad (82a)$$

$$\overline{\text{Inv}}_{22}^{(N)} = \left[T(d_3, \dots, d_N) + A' T(d_1, d_2)^{-1} A'^T \right]^{-1} = T(d_3 + \hat{\lambda}^2 b_1, d_4, \dots, d_N)^{-1}, \quad (82b)$$

where $b_1 = T(d_1, d_2)_{22}^{-1} = \frac{d_1}{d_1 d_2 + \hat{\lambda}^2}$.

Observe that the decoupling of the diagonal blocks described above can be iterated, and the matrix $\text{Inv}^{(N-2)} = T(d_1, \dots, d_{N-3}, d_{N-2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_1)^{-1}$ is further decomposed

$$\text{Inv}^{(N-2)} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Inv}_{11}^{(N-2)} & \text{Inv}_{12}^{(N-2)} \\ \text{Inv}_{21}^{(N-2)} & \text{Inv}_{22}^{(N-2)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T(d_1, \dots, d_{N-4}) & -A \\ A^T & T(d_{N-3}, d_{N-2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_1) \end{bmatrix}^{-1},$$

thus we write the formula for the inverse diagonal block $\text{Inv}_{11}^{(N-2)} = \text{Inv}^{(N-4)}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Inv}_{11}^{(N-2)} = \text{Inv}^{(N-4)} &= \left[T(d_1, \dots, d_{N-4}) + AT(d_{N-3}, d_{N-2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_1)^{-1} A^T \right]^{-1} \\ &= T(d_1, \dots, d_{N-5}, d_{N-4} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_2)^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$a_2 = T(d_{N-3}, d_{N-2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_1)_{11}^{-1} = \frac{d_{N-2} + a_1 \hat{\lambda}^2}{d_{N-3} d_{N-2} + a_1 d_{N-3} \hat{\lambda}^2 + \hat{\lambda}^2}.$$

From repeating j times the procedure of taking the upper-left inverse diagonal block and decompose it further like in (79a), we obtain the explicit formula for the $N - 2j$ dimensional upper-left diagonal block of L_λ^{l-1}

$$\text{Inv}^{(N-2j)} = \left[T(d_1, \dots, d_{N-2j}) + AT(d_{N-2j+1}, d_{N-2j+2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{j-1})^{-1} A^T \right]^{-1} \quad (83)$$

$$= T(d_1, \dots, d_{N-2j-1}, d_{N-2j} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_j)^{-1}, \quad (84)$$

eq:upp

where

$$a_j = T(d_{N-2j+1}, d_{N-2j+2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{j-1})_{11}^{-1} = \frac{d_{N-2j+2} + a_{j-1} \hat{\lambda}^2}{d_{N-2j+1} d_{N-2j+2} + a_{j-1} d_{N-2j+1} \hat{\lambda}^2 + \hat{\lambda}^2}.$$

Performing iteratively j times the symmetric procedure to the one described above (performing decomposition like in (79b)), we obtain the explicit formula for $N - 2j$ dimensional lower right diagonal inverse block

$$\overline{\text{Inv}}^{N-2j} = \left[T(d_{2j+1}, \dots, d_N) + A' T(d_{2j-1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 b_{j-1}, d_{2j})^{-1} A'^T \right]^{-1} \quad (85)$$

$$= T(d_{2j+1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 b_j, d_{2j+2}, \dots, d_N)^{-1}, \quad (86)$$

where

$$b_j = T(d_{2j-1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 b_{j-1}, d_{2j})_{22}^{-1} = \frac{d_{2j-1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 b_{j-1}}{d_{2j-1} d_{2j} + b_{j-1} d_{2j} \hat{\lambda}^2 + \hat{\lambda}^2}.$$

Note that the recursive series $\{a_j\}$, $\{b_j\}$ are generated from the procedures described above. Using above results, we may now derive an explicit formulas for the 2×2 diagonal blocks of L_λ^{l-1} . Let us present an example how it is done. Observe that from (83) we have that the $N - 2j$ dimensional upper-left block of L_λ^{l-1} is $\text{Inv}^{(N-2j)} = T(d_1, \dots, d_{N-2j-1}, d_{N-2j} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_j)^{-1}$.

Then, for $j = (N - 2)/2$ we are left with $\text{Inv}^{(2)}$, whereas if $j < (N - 2)/2$ we apply j times to $\text{Inv}^{(N-2j)}$ the procedure of taking the lower right diagonal block, and decomposing like in (79b), and we get that the j -th (counting from the bottom) 2×2 diagonal block of L_λ^{l-1} equals to

$$T(d_{N-2j-1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 b_k, d_{N-2j} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_j)^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} d_{N-2j-1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 b_k & -\hat{\lambda} \\ \hat{\lambda} & d_{N-2j} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_j \end{bmatrix}^{-1}, \text{ where } k = (N - 2j - 2)/2.$$

Let us denote $D = \hat{\lambda}^2 + d_{N-2j-1}d_{N-2j} + d_{N-2j}b_k\hat{\lambda}^2 + d_{N-2j-1}a_j\hat{\lambda}^2 + \hat{\lambda}^4 a_j b_k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(d_{N-2j-1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 b_k, d_{N-2j} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_j)_{11}^{-1} &= \frac{d_{N-2j} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_j}{D}, \\ T(d_{N-2j-1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 b_k, d_{N-2j} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_j)_{22}^{-1} &= \frac{d_{N-2j-1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 b_k}{D}, \\ T(d_{N-2j-1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 b_k, d_{N-2j} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_j)_{12}^{-1} &= \pm \hat{\lambda}, \\ T(d_{N-2j-1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 b_k, d_{N-2j} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_j)_{21}^{-1} &= \frac{\pm \hat{\lambda}}{D}. \end{aligned}$$

We have that for $f(a_j, b_k) = \frac{d_{N-2j} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_j}{D} = \frac{N}{D}$ the partial derivatives equal to

$$\frac{\partial f(a_j, b_k)}{\partial a_j} = \frac{\hat{\lambda}^4}{D^2} > 0, \quad \frac{\partial f(a_j, b_k)}{\partial b_k} = \frac{-\hat{\lambda}^2 N^2}{D^2} < 0.$$

Hence, to bound $T(d_{N-2j-1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 b_k, d_{N-2j} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_j)_{11}^{-1}$ we use the upper end of the bound for a_j from Lemma 7.2, i.e. we set $a_j = 2^{2m}\hat{\lambda}^{-1}$, and we use the lower end of the bound for b_k , i.e. we set $b_k = 0$. We are left with bounding $\frac{d_{N-2j} + 2^{2m}\hat{\lambda}}{\hat{\lambda}^2 + d_{N-2j-1}d_{N-2j} + d_{N-2j-1}2^{2m}\hat{\lambda}}$, which was already showed in (77) to be bounded by $2^{2m}\hat{\lambda}^{-1}$.

To bound $T(d_{N-2j-1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 b_k, d_{N-2j} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_j)_{22}^{-1}$, analogously as above, we set $a_j = 0$, and $b_k = \hat{\lambda}^{-1}$, and we are left with bounding $\frac{d_{N-2j-1} + \hat{\lambda}}{\hat{\lambda}^2 + d_{N-2j-1}d_{N-2j} + d_{N-2j}\hat{\lambda}}$, which was already showed in (78) to be bounded by $\hat{\lambda}^{-1}$. To bound the remaining two elements, i.e. $T(d_{N-2j-1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 b_k, d_{N-2j} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_j)_{12}^{-1}$, $T(d_{N-2j-1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 b_k, d_{N-2j} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_j)_{21}^{-1}$ we set $a_j = 0$, $b_k = 0$, and we obtain the claimed bounds immediately. \square

Lemma 7.4. *Let $l > 0$. The following uniform bound hold*

$$\begin{aligned} |(L_\lambda^{l-1})_{2j+1, 2k+1}| &\leq 2^{2m}/\hat{\lambda} & |(L_\lambda^{l-1})_{2j+1, 2k+2}| &\leq 1/\hat{\lambda} \\ |(L_\lambda^{l-1})_{2j+2, 2k+1}| &\leq 1/\hat{\lambda} & |(L_\lambda^{l-1})_{2j+2, 2k+2}| &\leq 1/\hat{\lambda} \end{aligned}, \text{ for } k, j = 0, \dots, [(N-1)/2]. \quad (87a)$$

Proof Here we assume that l is fixed, and we drop the superscript in the notation of T^l , a_k^l , b_k^l , and d_k^l , we use simply T , a_k , b_k , and d_k respectively. We use the same notation as in Lemma 7.3, i.e. we use $\text{Inv}^{(D)}$ to denote the $D \times D$ dimensional upper-left corner block of L_λ^{l-1} . Analogously we use the notation $\overline{\text{Inv}}^{(D)}$ to denote the $D \times D$ dimensional lower-right corner block of L_λ^{l-1} .

First, for the sake of presentation, let us prove that the claimed bounds are true for the 4×4 upper left corner submatrix of L_λ^{l-1} , i.e. $\text{Inv}^{(4)}$, the general result will follow

$$\text{Inv}^{(4)} = T(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4 + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{N/2-2})^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Inv}_{11}^{(4)} & \text{Inv}_{12}^{(4)} \\ \text{Inv}_{21}^{(4)} & \text{Inv}_{22}^{(4)} \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} T(d_1, d_2) & -A \\ A^T & T(d_3, d_4 + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{N/2-2}) \end{bmatrix}^{-1}. \quad (88) \quad \text{eqw4}$$

From the equations for inverse blocks (80) it follows that the block beyond diagonal satisfies

$$\text{Inv}_{21}^{(4)} = T(d_3, d_4 + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{N/2-2})^{-1} A^T \text{Inv}_{11}^{(4)}.$$

From Lemma 7.2 follows that $2^{2m}\hat{\lambda}^{-1} \geq a_{N/2-2} \geq 0$, hence the bounds for all elements of $T(d_3, d_4 + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{N/2-2})^{-1}$ are the same as those derived in Lemma 7.3. Observe that

$$\text{Inv}_{21}^{(4)} = T(d_3, d_4 + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{N/2-2})^{-1} A^T \text{Inv}_{11}^{(4)} = \begin{bmatrix} T(d_3, d_4 + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{N/2-2})_{11}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} (\text{Inv}_{11}^{(4)})_{21} & T(d_3, d_4 + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{N/2-2})_{11}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} (\text{Inv}_{11}^{(4)})_{22} \\ T(d_3, d_4 + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{N/2-2})_{21}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} (\text{Inv}_{11}^{(4)})_{21} & T(d_3, d_4 + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{N/2-2})_{21}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} (\text{Inv}_{11}^{(4)})_{22} \end{bmatrix},$$

as we have from Lemma 7.3 the bounds $|\hat{\lambda} (\text{Inv}_{11}^{(4)})_{21}|, |\hat{\lambda} (\text{Inv}_{11}^{(4)})_{22}| \leq 1$, and $|T(d_3, d_4 + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{N/2-2})_{11}^{-1}| \leq 2^{2m}\hat{\lambda}^{-1}$, $|T(d_3, d_4 + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{N/2-2})_{21}^{-1}| \leq \hat{\lambda}^{-1}$. Elements from the block $\text{Inv}_{21}^{(4)}$ clearly satisfy the following bounds

$$|(\text{Inv}_{21}^{(4)})_{11}|, |(\text{Inv}_{21}^{(4)})_{12}| \leq 2^{2m}\hat{\lambda}^{-1}, \quad |(\text{Inv}_{21}^{(4)})_{21}|, |(\text{Inv}_{21}^{(4)})_{22}| \leq \hat{\lambda}^{-1}.$$

The block $\text{Inv}_{12}^{(4)}$ satisfies symmetric bounds by a symmetric argument. Observe that the bounds for the diagonal blocks $\text{Inv}_{11}^{(4)}, \text{Inv}_{22}^{(4)}$ were derived in the previous lemma, hence at this point we have bounded uniformly all elements in $\text{Inv}^{(4)} = T(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4 + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{N/2-2})^{-1}$. Observe that in order to derive the bounds for the off-diagonal blocks, we used only the bound for the last row of $\text{Inv}^{(4)}$ ($(\text{Inv}_{11}^{(4)})_{21} = \text{Inv}_{41}^{(4)}$, $(\text{Inv}_{11}^{(4)})_{22} = \text{Inv}_{42}^{(4)}$, $(\text{Inv}_{22}^{(4)})_{21} = \text{Inv}_{43}^{(4)}$, $(\text{Inv}_{22}^{(4)})_{22} = \text{Inv}_{44}^{(4)}$ see (88)). From the bounds established so far all elements in the last row of $\text{Inv}^{(4)}$ satisfy $|\text{Inv}_{4j}^{(4)}| \leq \hat{\lambda}^{-1}$. It is easy to see that, if we now consider $\text{Inv}^{(6)} = T(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4, d_5, d_6 + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{N/2-3})^{-1}$, by a similar argument for $j = 1, \dots, 6$ we obtain the bounds

$$\begin{cases} |\text{Inv}_{6j}^{(6)}| \leq \hat{\lambda}^{-1}, \\ |\text{Inv}_{5j}^{(6)}| \leq 2^{2m}\hat{\lambda}^{-1}. \end{cases}$$

Finally, from the presentation above follows that assuming that absolute value of all of the elements in the last row of the inverse block $\text{Inv}^{(2k)} = T(d_1, \dots, d_{2k-1}, d_{2k} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{N/2-k})^{-1}$ are bounded by $\hat{\lambda}^{-1}$, and the rest by $2^{2m}\hat{\lambda}^{-1}$, the same bounds for the larger inverse block $\text{Inv}^{(2k+2)} = T(d_1, \dots, d_{2k+1}, d_{2k+2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{N/2-(k+1)})^{-1}$ will follow, thus, we showed that the bounds (87) are propagated for the whole $L_\lambda^{l-1} = \text{Inv}^{(N)}$. \square

Lemma 7.5. *Let $N > 0$, $m > 1$, $l = 1, \dots, N$. There exist $C(m) > 0$ (independent of λ and N), such that for $\lambda > 1$ the following bounds hold*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1, \dots, N} \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{ij} \right| &\leq C(m) \cdot \hat{\lambda}^{-1+1/2m}, \\ \sum_{j=1, \dots, N} \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{ji} \right| &\leq C(m) \cdot \hat{\lambda}^{-1+1/2m}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, N$.

Proof Here we assume that l is fixed, and we drop the superscript in the notation of T^l , a_k^l , b_k^l , and d_k^l , we use simply T , a_k , b_k , and d_k respectively.

For the sake of clarification let us restrict our attention to the first column of L_λ^{l-1} .

From Lemma 7.3 it follows that $n = \lceil c\hat{\lambda}^{1/2m} \rceil$ dimensional upper left corner submatrix of L_λ^{l-1} is equal to $\text{Inv}^{(n)} = T(d_1, \dots, d_{n-1}, d_n + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{(N-n)/2})^{-1}$, and the absolute values of elements in this matrix are uniformly bounded by $2^{2m}\hat{\lambda}^{-1}$, thus the straightforward estimate for the first part of the sum is

$$\sum_{i=1, \dots, n} \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{i1} \right| \leq n 2^{2m}\hat{\lambda}^{-1} = c\hat{\lambda}^{1/2m} \cdot 2^{2m}\hat{\lambda}^{-1} = 2^{2m} c \hat{\lambda}^{-1+1/2m}.$$

Next, we are going to show that the terms in remainder

$$\sum_{i=n+1, \dots, N} |(L_\lambda^{l-1})_{i1}| = \sum_{i=n+1, \dots, N} |\text{Inv}_{i1}^{(N)}|$$

obey a geometric decay rate, and can be bounded uniformly with respect to the dimension.

As in the previous lemmas we take the block decomposition of

$$L_\lambda^{l-1} = \text{Inv}^{(N)}, \text{ i.e.}$$

$$\text{Inv}^{(N)} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Inv}_{11}^{(N)} & \text{Inv}_{12}^{(N)} \\ \text{Inv}_{21}^{(N)} & \text{Inv}_{22}^{(N)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T(d_1, \dots, d_{N-2}) & -A \\ A^T & T(d_{N-1}, d_N) \end{bmatrix}^{-1}.$$

From (80) it follows that $\text{Inv}_{21}^{(N)}$ can be expressed in terms of $\text{Inv}_{11}^{(N)}$, namely, for the first column of $\text{Inv}_{21}^{(N)}$ the identities are

$$\text{Inv}_{N-1,1}^{(N)} = T(d_{N-1}, d_N)_{11}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} \text{Inv}_{N-2,1}^{(N)}, \quad \text{Inv}_{N,1}^{(N)} = T(d_{N-1}, d_N)_{21}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} \text{Inv}_{N-2,1}^{(N)}.$$

Analogously, for $\text{Inv}_{N-3,1}^{(N)}$, $\text{Inv}_{N-2,1}^{(N)}$ we have

$$\text{Inv}_{N-3,1}^{(N)} = T(d_{N-3}, d_{N-2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_1)_{11}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} \text{Inv}_{N-4,1}^{(N)}, \quad \text{Inv}_{N-2,1}^{(N)} = T(d_{N-3}, d_{N-2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_1)_{21}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} \text{Inv}_{N-4,1}^{(N)}.$$

From repeating this argument we obtain

$$\text{Inv}_{N-5,1}^{(N)} = T(d_{N-5}, d_{N-4} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_2)_{11}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} \text{Inv}_{N-6,1}^{(N)}, \quad \text{Inv}_{N-4,1}^{(N)} = T(d_{N-5}, d_{N-4} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_2)_{21}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} \text{Inv}_{N-6,1}^{(N)},$$

...

$$\text{Inv}_{n+1,1}^{(N)} = T(d_{n+1}, d_{n+2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{(N-n)/2-1})_{11}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} \text{Inv}_{n1}^{(N)}, \quad \text{Inv}_{n+2,1}^{(N)} = T(d_{n+1}, d_{n+2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{(N-n)/2-1})_{21}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} \text{Inv}_{n1}^{(N)}.$$

This is a recursive series, all elements can be expressed in terms of $\text{Inv}^{(N)}$. Therefore

$$\sum_{i=n+1, \dots, N} |\text{Inv}_{i1}^{(N)}| \leq |\text{Inv}_{n1}^{(N)}| \sum_{j=n+1}^N |c_j|,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} c_{n+1} &:= T(d_{n+1}, d_{n+2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{(N-n)/2-1})_{11}^{-1} \hat{\lambda}, \\ c_{n+2} &:= T(d_{n+1}, d_{n+2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{(N-n)/2-1})_{21}^{-1} \hat{\lambda}, \\ c_{n+3} &:= T(d_{n+3}, d_{n+4} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{(N-n)/2-2})_{11}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} \cdot T(d_{n+1}, d_{n+2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{(N-n)/2-1})_{21}^{-1} \hat{\lambda}, \\ c_{n+4} &:= T(d_{n+3}, d_{n+4} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{(N-n)/2-2})_{21}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} \cdot T(d_{n+1}, d_{n+2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{(N-n)/2-1})_{21}^{-1} \hat{\lambda}, \\ &\dots, \\ c_{N-1} &:= T(d_{N-1}, d_N)_{11}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} \cdot T(d_{N-3}, d_{N-2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_1)_{21}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} \cdots T(d_{n+1}, d_{n+2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{(N-n)/2-1})_{21}^{-1} \hat{\lambda}, \\ c_N &:= T(d_{N-1}, d_N)_{21}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} \cdot T(d_{N-3}, d_{N-2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_1)_{21}^{-1} \hat{\lambda} \cdots T(d_{n+1}, d_{n+2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{(N-n)/2-1})_{21}^{-1} \hat{\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 7.2 it follows that $2^{2m} \hat{\lambda}^{-1} \geq a_j \geq 0$, and $f(a) = \frac{d_{j+1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a}{\hat{\lambda}^2 + d_j d_{j+1} + d_j \hat{\lambda}^2 a}$ is strictly positive for all $j \geq 1$ (as the derivative is positive, compare (76)). Recall that $d_j = l^{2m} + (j-1)^{2m}$, and we have the obvious

inequality $\hat{\lambda}^2 + d_j d_{j+1} + d_j \hat{\lambda}^2 a < \hat{\lambda}^2 + d_{j+1} d_{j+2} + d_{j+1} \hat{\lambda}^2 a$ for $a > 0$. Therefore the following inequalities are satisfied

$$\begin{aligned} \left| T(d_{n+j}, d_{n+j+1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{(N-(n+j+1))/2})_{11}^{-1} \right| &\leq \left| T(d_{n+1}, d_{n+2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{(N-n)/2-1})_{11}^{-1} \right| \leq \frac{d_{n+2} + 2^{2m} \hat{\lambda}}{\hat{\lambda}^2 + d_{n+1} d_{n+2} + 2^{2m} \hat{\lambda} d_{n+1}}, \\ \left| T(d_{n+j}, d_{n+j+1} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{(N-(n+j+1))/2})_{21}^{-1} \right| &\leq \left| T(d_{n+1}, d_{n+2} + \hat{\lambda}^2 a_{(N-n)/2-1})_{21}^{-1} \right| \leq \frac{\hat{\lambda}}{\hat{\lambda}^2 + d_{n+1} d_{n+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now to show the claim about the geometric decay, we take $n > \lceil 2^{(2m+1)/2m} \hat{\lambda}^{1/2m} \rceil$

$$\frac{\hat{\lambda}}{\hat{\lambda}^2 + d_{n+1} d_{n+2}} \leq \frac{d_{n+2} + 2^{2m} \hat{\lambda}}{\hat{\lambda}^2 + d_{n+1} d_{n+2} + 2^{2m} \hat{\lambda} d_{n+1}} = \frac{l^{2m} + (n+1)^{2m} + 2^{2m} \hat{\lambda}}{\hat{\lambda}^2 + (l^{2m} + n^{2m})(l^{2m} + (n+1)^{2m}) + 2^{2m} \hat{\lambda} (l^{2m} + n^{2m})}$$

Similar argument to the one used in (75) shows that

$$\frac{l^{2m} + (n+1)^{2m} + 2^{2m} \hat{\lambda}}{\hat{\lambda}^2 + (l^{2m} + n^{2m})(l^{2m} + (n+1)^{2m}) + 2^{2m} \hat{\lambda} (l^{2m} + n^{2m})} \leq \frac{2^{2m} a + 2^{2m} \hat{\lambda}}{a^2 + 2^{2m} a \hat{\lambda} + \hat{\lambda}^2} \leq \frac{2^{4m+1} \hat{\lambda} + 2^{2m} \hat{\lambda}}{2^{4m+2} \hat{\lambda}^2 + 2^{4m+1} \hat{\lambda}^2 + \hat{\lambda}^2} < \frac{1}{2\hat{\lambda}}.$$

We thus demonstrated that for any N we have

$$\sum_{i=n+1, \dots, N} \left| (L_\lambda^{l^{-1}})_{i1} \right| = \sum_{i=n+1, \dots, N} \left| \text{Inv}_{i1}^{(N)} \right| < \left| \text{Inv}_{n1}^{(N)} \right| 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^i = 2 \left| \text{Inv}_{n1}^{(N)} \right| \leq \frac{2^{2m+1}}{\hat{\lambda}}. \quad (89) \quad \boxed{\text{eq:geo}}$$

Now taking $C(m) > 2^{(2m+1)/2m} + 2^{2m+1}$ we obtain the claim.

To conclude, observe that the bound holds for the first row, as the matrices L_λ^l and $L_\lambda^{l^{-1}}$ commute ($L_\lambda^l = D + A$, where D is a diagonal, A is a skew-symmetric matrix). The bound is true for any other column/row, to see this note that for each column there are at most $n = \lceil c \hat{\lambda}^{1/2m} \rceil$ elements beyond the geometric decay regime, therefore the bound is true for any column of $L_\lambda^{l^{-1}}$. \square

7.1 Proof of Theorem 4.11

Using lemmas presented in this section we prove the main result with inverse matrix bounds

Theorem 4.11. *Let $l = 1, \dots, N$. Let L_λ^l be the matrix given by (33), L_λ^B be the matrix $(P_B L_\lambda)^{-1}$.*

The following estimates hold for the matrices $L_\lambda^{l^{-1}}$ (diagonal submatrices of $L_\lambda^{B^{-1}}$).

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_\lambda^{l^{-1}}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l^1} &\leq C_1(m) \left(\frac{l\lambda}{2} \right)^{-1+1/2m}, \\ \|L_\lambda^{l^{-1}}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l^\infty} &\leq 2^{2m} \left(\frac{l\lambda}{2} \right)^{-1}, \\ \|L_\lambda^{l^{-1}}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l_1^1} &\leq C_2(m) \left(\frac{l\lambda}{2} \right)^{-1+1/m}. \end{aligned}$$

The following estimates hold for the matrix $L_\lambda^{B^{-1}}$

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_\lambda^{B^{-1}}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l^1} &\leq C_1(m) \left(\frac{\lambda}{2} \right)^{-1+1/2m}, \\ \|L_\lambda^{B^{-1}}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l^\infty} &\leq 2^{2m} \left(\frac{\lambda}{2} \right)^{-1}, \\ \|L_\lambda^{B^{-1}}\|_{l^1 \rightarrow l_1^1} &\leq C_2(m) \left(\frac{\lambda}{2} \right)^{-1+1/m}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof The uniform l^1 estimate for each column of $L_\lambda^{B^{-1}}$ follows directly from Lemma 7.5. The uniform l^∞ estimate for each column of $L_\lambda^{B^{-1}}$ follows directly from Lemma 7.4.

In order to estimate uniformly the gradient norm of $L_\lambda^{B^{-1}}$ we are going to consider two cases separately.

Let $c > 2^{(2m+1)/2m}$, $\alpha = \left\lceil c \left(\frac{\lambda}{2}\right)^{1/(2m-1)} \right\rceil$, where $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is the integer part. Let us demonstrate the result for the first column of $L_\lambda^{B^{-1}}$.

Case I For $l \leq \alpha$ we split the sum

$$\sum_{k=1}^N (l+k) \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{k,1} \right| = \sum_{k=1}^n (l+k) \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{k,1} \right| + \sum_{k=n+1}^N (l+k) \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{k,1} \right|,$$

where $n = l^{1/2m} \left(\frac{\lambda}{2}\right)^{-1/[2m(2m-1)]}$ $\alpha = \left\lceil c \left(\frac{\lambda}{2}\right)^{1/2m} \right\rceil$ (this particular choice is due to technical reasons). The finite part of the sum above can be estimated

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{k,1} \right| \leq \max_{k=1, \dots, N} \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{k,1} \right| \sum_{k=1}^n l+k \leq 2^{2m} \left(\frac{l\lambda}{2}\right)^{-1} (ln + n^2) \leq c_1 \left(\frac{l\lambda}{2}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{l\lambda}{2}\right)^{1/m} = c_1 \left(\frac{l\lambda}{2}\right)^{-1+1/m},$$

where we estimated $ln = l^{(2m-1)/2m} l^{1/m} \left(\frac{\lambda}{2}\right)^{1/2m} \leq \alpha^{(2m-1)/2m} l^{1/m} \left(\frac{\lambda}{2}\right)^{1/2m} \leq \tilde{c} \left(\frac{l\lambda}{2}\right)^{1/m}$. As $d_n^l > 2^{2m+1} \frac{l\lambda}{2}$ from the proof of Lemma 7.5 it follows that the remaining part of the sum is within the geometric decay regime, therefore we can estimate like in (89)

$$\sum_{k=n+1}^N (l+k) \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{k,1} \right| \leq \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{n,1} \right| 2 \left(l \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k}{2^k} \right) \leq c_2 \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{n,1} \right| (l+1) \leq C_2 \left(\frac{\lambda}{2}\right)^{-1},$$

in the last inequality we used the estimate from Lemma 7.4, i.e. $\left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{n,1} \right| \leq 2^{2m} \left(\frac{\lambda}{2}\right)^{-1}$.

The final uniform bound for this case is

$$\sum_{k=1}^N (l+k) \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{k,1} \right| \leq C_2 \left(\frac{\lambda}{2}\right)^{-1+1/m}.$$

Case II For $l > \alpha$.

For this case we have $d_1^l > 2^{2m+1} \frac{l\lambda}{2}$, and therefore from the proof of Lemma 7.5 it follows that the whole column is within the geometric decay regime, therefore the whole column can be estimated like in (89)

$$\sum_{k=1}^N (l+k) \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{k,1} \right| \leq \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{1,1} \right| 2 \left(l \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k}{2^k} \right) \leq c_3 \left| (L_\lambda^{l-1})_{1,1} \right| l \leq C_3 \left(\frac{\lambda}{2}\right)^{-1}.$$

Final bound The bound in Case I is clearly of higher order, hence it is the final uniform bound. The bound is true for other than the first columns, as there are at most $n = \left\lceil c \left(\frac{l\lambda}{2}\right)^{1/2m} \right\rceil$ elements beyond the geometric decay regime. □

References

- [AA10] Nathaël Alibaud and Boris Andreianov. Non-uniqueness of weak solutions for the fractal Burgers equation. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré (C) Non Linear Analysis*, 27(4):997 – 1016, 2010.
- [AK12] Gianni Arioli and Hans Koch. Non-symmetric low-index solutions for a symmetric boundary value problem. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 252(1):448 – 458, 2012.
- [BC83] Haïm Brezis and Jean-Michel Coron. Large solutions for harmonic maps in two dimensions. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 92(2):203–215, 1983.
- [BDG⁺11] Lorenzo Bertini, Alberto De Sole, Davide Gabrielli, Giovanni Jona-Lasinio, and Claudio Landim. Action functional and quasi-potential for the burgers equation in a bounded interval. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 64(5):649–696, 5 2011.
- [BDL15] Maxime Breden, Laurent Desvillettes, and Jean-Philippe Lessard. Rigorous numerics for non-linear operators with tridiagonal dominant linear part. *to appear in Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, 2015.
- [BGS01] A. Balogh, D.S. Gilliam, and V.I. Shubov. Stationary solutions for a boundary controlled burgers' equation. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 33(1–3):21 – 37, 2001. Computation and control {VI} proceedings of the sixth Bozeman conference.
- [BLV13] Maxime Breden, Jean-Philippe Lessard, and Matthieu Vanicat. Global bifurcation diagrams of steady states of systems of PDEs via rigorous numerics: a 3-component reaction-diffusion system. *Acta Applicandae Mathematicae*, 128(1):113–152, 2013.
- [BMP03] B. Breuer, P.J. McKenna, and M. Plum. Multiple solutions for a semilinear boundary value problem: a computational multiplicity proof. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 195(1):243 – 269, 2003.
- [BP12] Lorenzo Bertini and Marcello Ponsiglione. A variational approach to the stationary solutions of the burgers equation. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 44(2):682–698, 2012.
- [Bur48] J. M. Burgers. A mathematical model illustrating the theory of turbulence. *Adv. Appl. Mech.*, 1:171–199, 1948.
- [CL17] Jacek Cyranka and Jean-Philippe Lessard. Validated forward integration scheme for a class fo parabolic pdes based on chebyshev expansion in time. 2017. in preparation.
- [Col51] J.D. Cole. On a quasi-linear parabolic equation occurring in aerodynamics. *Quart. Appl. Math.*, 9:225–236, 1951.
- [Cyr14] Jacek Cyranka. Efficient and Generic Algorithm for Rigorous Integration Forward in Time of dPDEs: Part I. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 59(1):28–52, 2014.
- [CZ15] Jacek Cyranka and Piotr Zgliczyński. Existence of Globally Attracting Solutions for One-Dimensional Viscous Burgers Equation with Nonautonomous Forcing—A Computer Assisted Proof. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 14(2):787–821, 2015.
- [Dix96] Daniel B. Dix. Nonuniqueness And Uniqueness In The Initial-Value Problem For Burgers' Equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal*, 27:708–724, 1996.

- [DY05] E.N. Dancer and Shusen Yan. On the superlinear Lazer–McKenna conjecture. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 210(2):317 – 351, 2005.
- [Eva10] Lawrence C. Evans. *Partial differential equations*, volume 19 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2010.
- [Gal11] G. P. Galdi. *An introduction to the mathematical theory of the Navier-Stokes equations*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, second edition, 2011. Steady-state problems.
- [GL11] Marcio Gameiro and Jean-Philippe Lessard. Rigorous computation of smooth branches of equilibria for the three dimensional Cahn–Hilliard equation. *Numerische Mathematik*, 117(4):753–778, 2011.
- [HNX99] John G. Heywood, Wayne Nagata, and Wenzheng Xie. A Numerically Based Existence Theorem for the Navier-Stokes Equations. *Journal of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics*, 1(1):5–23, 1999.
- [Hop50] E. Hopf. The partial differential equation $u_t + uu_x = \mu u_{xx}$. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 3:201–230, 1950.
- [LM14] A.C. Lazer and P.J. McKenna. An abstract theorem in nonlinear analysis. In Djairo G de Figueiredo, João Marcos do Ó, and Carlos Tomei, editors, *Analysis and Topology in Nonlinear Differential Equations*, volume 85 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications*, pages 301–307. Springer International Publishing, 2014.
- [MP10] Riccardo Molle and Donato Passaseo. Multiple solutions for a class of elliptic equations with jumping nonlinearities. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (C) Non Linear Analysis*, 27(2):529 – 553, 2010.
- [MPMW07] Stanislaus Maier-Paape, Konstantin Mischaikow, and Thomas Wanner. Structure of the attractor of the Cahn–Hilliard equation on a square. *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos*, 17(04):1221–1263, 2007.
- [Muc03] Piotr Bogusław Mucha. Asymptotic behavior of a steady flow in a two-dimensional pipe. *Studia Math.*, 158(1):39–58, 2003.
- [Vil09] C. Villani. Hypocoercivity. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 202(950), 2009.
- [WN09] Yoshitaka Watanabe and Mitsuhiro T. Nakao. Numerical Verification Method of Solutions for Elliptic Equations and Its Application to the Rayleigh–Bénard Problem. *Japan J. Indust. Appl. Math.*, 26(2-3):443–463, 10 2009.