

TIME-AVERAGES OF FAST OSCILLATORY SYSTEMS IN THREE-DIMENSIONAL GEOPHYSICAL FLUID DYNAMICS AND ELECTROMAGNETIC EFFECTS

BIN CHENG AND ALEX MAHALOV

ABSTRACT. Time-averages are common observables in analysis of experimental data and numerical simulations of physical systems. We will investigate, from the angle of PDE (partial differential equation) analysis, some oscillatory geophysical fluid dynamics in three dimensions: Navier-Stokes equations in a fast rotating, spherical shell, and Magnetohydrodynamics subject to strong Coriolis and Lorentz forces. Upon averaging their oscillatory solutions in time, interesting patterns such as zonal flows can emerge. More rigorously, we will prove that, when the restoring forces are strong enough, time-averaged solutions stay close to the null spaces of the wave operators, whereas the solutions themselves can be arbitrarily far away from these subspaces.

Keywords: Rotating fluids, Navier-Stokes equations, Magnetohydrodynamics, time-averages, spherical shell domain.

Date: August, 2015.

BIN CHENG
 Department of Mathematics
 University of Surrey
 Guildford, GU2 7XH, United Kingdom
 b.cheng@surrey.ac.uk

ALEX MAHALOV
 School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences
 Arizona State University, Wexler Hall (PSA)
 Tempe, Arizona 85287-1804 USA
 mahalov@asu.edu

1. INTRODUCTION

In many geophysical fluid dynamical systems, solutions exhibit fast oscillatory behaviors due to strong energy-preserving, restoring mechanisms — a typical example being the Coriolis force in fast rotating planets and stars. Time integration averages out the oscillatory part of the solution, which leads to emerging of interesting patterns that are relevant in a longer time scale.

A straightforward framework is introduced in [7] for proving that the time-average of the solution stays close to the null space of the large, skew-self-adjoint operator in the PDE system. A particular application of this framework can be found in [6] for 2D Euler equations on a fast rotating sphere.

In this article, we study two fast oscillatory, geophysical fluid dynamical systems in 3D.

The first one, (2) – (3), governs viscous, barotropic fluids confined within a fast rotating, spherical shell that models the global atmospheric circulation on Earth and other planets. On the boundary, the velocity field either satisfies conditions in terms of shear stress or is simply fixed. We prove in Theorem 1 that, with additional spatial-averaging in the radial direction, time-averages of the solution are $O(\varepsilon)$ close to zonal flows (i.e. motions in the east-west direction). Here, ε denotes the Rossby number, a dimensionless parameter measures the ratio between typical magnitudes of inertia and Coriolis force. This theoretical result is consistent with many numerical studies and observations. For a partial list of computational results, we mention [13, 23] for 3D models, [33, 8, 25, 15, 30, 12] for 2D models, and references therein. Note that many of these computations attempt to simulate turbulent flows with sufficiently high resolutions. Zonal structures in these numerical results are either directly noticeable by naked eyes or after some time-averaging procedures.

On the other hand, we have observed zonal flow patterns (e.g. bands and jets) on giant planets for hundreds of years, which has attracted considerable interests recently thanks to spacecraft missions and the launch of the Hubble Space Telescope (e.g. [14], [27]). In [24], the banded structure is directly observable in a composite view of the Jovian atmosphere captured by the Cassini spacecraft. There are also observational data in the oceans on Earth showing persistent zonal flow patterns (e.g. [28, 29, 22]).

It is worth mentioning that time-averaging and the more general time-filtering are commonly used for denoising of observational and computational data. Indeed, such post-processing is necessary for the emergence of zonal flow patterns in some of the above literature, e.g. [23, Fig 4,6 and 9]. We also point out that the zonal flow pattern would not arise in a model without the meridional variation of the Coriolis parameter. Such variation is due to the non-flat geometry of the spatial domain, which is why we use the *entire* spherical shell as the domain in this article. Most analytical work in literature adopts the β -plane approximation, focusing on a narrow strip near a fixed latitude, which essentially is a linear approximation of the spherical case. Fourier series then become applicable in the β -plane approximation but is not so in the whole sphere.

Mathematical studies of deterministic and stochastic 3D rotating Navier-Stokes equations including resonances were done in [2, 3, 4, 11] with uniformly large rotation. Recently, [17] proves some interesting β -plane effects using the randomly forced quasi-geostrophic equation.

The second system (12) governs rotating Magnetohydrodynamics (MHD) in \mathbb{R}^3 with two strong restoring forces: Coriolis force and Lorentz force. They induce the magnetostrophic waves, also known as rotating Alfen waves ([10]). We refer to [21] for ionospheric applications. We prove in Theorem 3 that time-averages of the solution vanish at order of fractional powers of ε when measured in L^s norms ($s > 6$). This result suggests there is dispersion in the time-averages, although we do not impose any spatial decay on the initial data like in the classical dispersive wave theory.

The rest of this article is organized as following. The formulations and main results are introduced in Sections 2, 3. Then, in Section 4, we apply the barotropic averaging (5) on the 3D Navier-Stokes equations (2) and reveal the close connection to the 2D Navier-Stokes equations on a sphere. In Section 5, we prove the main Theorem 1 using the time-averaging tools developed in [6, 7]. In Section 6, we study the MHD system (12) and prove Theorem 3 by using Sobolev-type inequalities. Finally, in Section 7 the Appendices, we give a geometric proof of Proposition 1 regarding the Navier boundary conditions and also prove energy and enstrophy estimates for the Navier-Stokes equations in a shell subject to Navier boundary conditions with $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{g} \equiv \mathbf{0}$.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Boris Galperin for stimulating and insightful discussion in the geophysical context.

AM is supported, in part, by the AFOSR, grant number: FA9550-15-1-0096.

2. NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS IN A ROTATING SHELL: FORMULATION AND MAIN RESULTS

Let (x, y, z) denote the usual Cartesian coordinates and let spherical coordinates (r, θ, ϕ) denote the radius, *colatitude* (i.e. inclination from the positive half of the z axis) and longitude respectively. The spatial domain is a thin, spherical shell

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} \Omega &:= \{(x, y, z) \mid \sqrt{x^2 + y^2 + z^2} \in [1, 1 + \delta]\} \\ &= \{(r, \theta, \phi) \mid r \in [1, 1 + \delta], \theta \in [0, \pi], \phi \in [0, 2\pi]\}. \end{aligned}$$

In short, we can write $\Omega = (1, 1 + \delta) \times \mathbb{S}^2$ with \mathbb{S}^2 denoting the unit sphere.

Let $\mathbf{e}_r, \mathbf{e}_\theta, \mathbf{e}_\phi$ denote the locally orthogonal unit vectors along the increasing directions of r, θ, ϕ respectively — and they are orientated according to the right hand rule, i.e. $(\mathbf{e}_r \times \mathbf{e}_\theta) \cdot \mathbf{e}_\phi = 1$. Similarly define $\mathbf{e}_x, \mathbf{e}_y, \mathbf{e}_z$ in terms of the Cartesian coordinate system. The unknown is velocity field \mathbf{u} . The Coriolis

force is given by

$$\mathbf{F}_{\text{Coriolis}} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{e}_r \cos \theta = \frac{z}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{e}_r$$

where ε , called the Rossby number, equals the ratio of the spatial domain's rotating period over the inertial time scale (usually $0.01 \sim 0.1$ for the Earth). Note we have adopted such geophysical version of the Coriolis force that differs from the laboratory version, $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{e}_z$. In other words, we neglect the radial component of the velocity and also neglect the radial component of the Coriolis force. See [35] for detailed justification.

Let q denote the pressure and constant μ the viscosity. The sum of other external forces is denoted by \mathbf{F}_{ext} . Then, the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations under the Coriolis force reads ([1, 9, 26])

$$(2) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{u} + \nabla_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u} + \nabla q = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{e}_r \cos \theta + \mu \Delta \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{F}_{\text{ext}}, \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0, \end{cases}$$

subject to the Navier boundary conditions,

$$(3a) \quad \mathbf{u} \cdot \vec{n} \Big|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad \text{solid-wall,}$$

$$(3b) \quad \left[\mathbf{S} \vec{n} + \lambda \mathbf{u} \right]_{\tan} \Big|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{g}, \quad \text{shear stress,}$$

with scalar $\lambda = \lambda(t, \mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ and vector $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{g}(t, \mathbf{x})$ given. (The physical significance of having positive λ is shown in Proposition 2 and its proof.) Here, \vec{n} denotes the outward normal at $\partial\Omega$ and subscript tan indicates the tangential component, e.g. $\mathbf{v}_{\tan} := \mathbf{v} - (\mathbf{v} \cdot \vec{n}) \vec{n}$. The stress tensor \mathbf{S} is defined as

$$\mathbf{S} := \nabla \mathbf{u} + (\nabla \mathbf{u})^\top$$

where $\nabla \mathbf{u} := \begin{pmatrix} \partial_x u_1 & \partial_y u_1 & \partial_z u_1 \\ \partial_x u_2 & \partial_y u_2 & \partial_z u_2 \\ \partial_x u_3 & \partial_y u_3 & \partial_z u_3 \end{pmatrix}.$

Throughout this article, vectors are treated as 3×1 matrices so that for vector fields $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{u}''$,

$$(4a) \quad (\nabla \mathbf{u}) \mathbf{u}' = \mathbf{u}' \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u},$$

$$(4b) \quad ((\nabla \mathbf{u})^\top \mathbf{u}') \cdot \mathbf{u}'' = (\mathbf{u}'' \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{u}'.$$

One can also impose the Dirichlet boundary conditions, $\mathbf{u} \Big|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{g}'$ with \mathbf{g}' given. This apparently includes the non-slip boundary condition $\mathbf{u} \Big|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$.

Discussion on external forcing \mathbf{F}_{ext} and nonhomogenous boundary condition $\mathbf{g} \neq 0$ in a more physical context is given in Subsection 2.2.

Before stating the main result, we need some definitions. The Sobolev L^2 norm for a scalar or vector function f is defined as

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} := \sqrt{\int_{\Omega} |f|^2}.$$

Also, we use the so-called barotropic averaging to reduce the 3D velocity field to 2D by averaging it in the vertical (i.e. radial) direction. It turns out that certain weight in the integral is convenient. From a physical perspective, we effectively take the barotropic average of the momentum flux through the relevant cross-section of the volume element $r^2 \sin \theta d\theta d\phi dr$. To this end, for velocity field $\mathbf{u} \in L^2(\Omega)$, define

$$\mathbf{u}_h := \mathbf{u} - (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{e}_r) \mathbf{e}_r$$

and

$$(5) \quad \bar{\mathbf{u}} := \frac{1}{\delta} \int_1^{1+\delta} r \mathbf{u}_h dr.$$

Next, define $\Pi_{\text{zonal}} : L^2(\mathbb{S}^2) \mapsto L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$ as the zonal-mean projector that projects horizontal velocity fields onto the subspace of zonal flows,

$$\Pi_{\text{zonal}} \bar{\mathbf{u}}(\theta, \phi) := \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \bar{\mathbf{u}}(\theta, \phi) \cdot \mathbf{e}_\phi d\phi \right) \mathbf{e}_\phi.$$

Lastly, let C denote some universal constant and we add subscript(s) to it, e.g. C_k , to emphasize its dependence on another parameter.

Theorem 1 (Homogeneous boundary conditions). *Consider 3D Navier-Stokes equations (2) in a spherical shell Ω defined in (1), subject to the Navier boundary condition (3) with $\mathbf{g} \equiv \mathbf{0}$. Let $\mu < 1/2$ and $\delta < 1/2$. Define M_0 as the normalized L^2 norm of the initial data \mathbf{u}_0 , i.e.,*

$$M_0 := \frac{\|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}}{\|1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}} \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Then, for any weak solution $\mathbf{u} \in L^\infty([0, \infty); L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2([0, \infty); H^1(\Omega))$, its barotropic average $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ as defined in (5) satisfies, for $\alpha < -4$,

$$(6) \quad \left\| (1 - \Pi_{\text{zonal}}) \int_0^T \bar{\mathbf{u}} dt \right\|_{H^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^2)} \leq C_\alpha [M_0(1 + M_0 T + \mu T + \sqrt{\mu T}) + M_{\text{ext}}] \varepsilon,$$

where $M_{\text{ext}} := \left\| (1 - \Pi_{\text{zonal}}) \int_0^T \bar{\mathbf{F}}_{\text{ext}} \right\|_{H^{\alpha+2}(\mathbb{S}^2)}$ and the $H^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^2)$ norm can be defined using spherical harmonics (c.f. Definition 1 and relation (38)). Note for negative α , the H^α norm dampens high wave number modes). The constant C_α depends solely on α and is otherwise independent of ε , δ , μ , M_0 , T .

Since operator $(1 - \Pi_{\text{zonal}})$ effectively extracts the non-zonal component of a velocity field, estimate (6) confirms that $\int_0^T \bar{\mathbf{u}}$ is $O(\varepsilon)$ close to zonal flows.

Combining this theorem with the energy estimate (58), we can obtain via interpolation that, for $\alpha \in [-4, 1)$,

$$\left\| (1 - \Pi_{\text{zonal}}) \int_0^T \bar{\mathbf{u}} dt \right\|_{H^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^2)} \leq C_\alpha [M_0(1 + M_0 T + \mu T + \sqrt{\mu T}) + M_{\text{ext}}] \varepsilon^a \mu^{-b},$$

where a, b are positive numbers depending on α .

The above results in 3D are nontrivial extension from the 2D case studied in [6] which is centered around the Euler equations on a fast rotating unit sphere \mathbb{S}^2 ,

$$(7) \quad \partial_t \mathbf{u} + \nabla_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u} + \nabla q = \frac{z}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{u}^\perp, \quad \text{div } \mathbf{u} = 0,$$

where $^\perp$ denotes the $\pi/2$ counterclockwise rotation of the associated vector on \mathbb{S}^2 .

For comparison, the main theorem for the 2D system (7) is stated as following with some minor notational changes.

Theorem 2 ([6]). *Consider the incompressible Euler equation (7) on \mathbb{S}^2 with initial data $\mathbf{u}_0 \in H^k(\mathbb{S}^2)$ for $k \geq 3$. Let $M_0 := \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{H^k}$. Then, there exists a function $f(\cdot) : [-1, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ depending on \mathbf{u} , so that*

$$(8) \quad \left\| \int_0^T (\mathbf{u} - \nabla^\perp f(z)) dt \right\|_{H^{k-3}(\mathbb{S}^2)} \leq CM_0(1 + M_0 T) \varepsilon,$$

for any given $T \in [0, T^*/M_0]$ where constant T^* depends on k but is independent of ε and \mathbf{u}_0 .

In spherical coordinates,

$$\nabla^\perp f(z) = -f'(\sin \theta) \sin \theta \mathbf{e}_\phi,$$

which represents longitude-independent zonal flows.

We finally remark that analysis of 3D Navier-Stokes equations and its variations in the geophysical context, including the existence of solutions and the low Rossby number limit, has seen substantial progress in recent years, e.g. [19, 18, 20, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11], just to name a few. There are also results regarding Navier-Stokes equations on thin 3D domains, e.g. [32, 16], without the Coriolis effect. The boundary conditions in the literature are either periodic, whole space, non-slip $\mathbf{u}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ or some variations of the Navier type (3). In the next two subsections, we further discuss (3) and its variations as seen in literature.

2.1. Geometry of the Navier boundary condition. The following proposition is regarding a general domain Ω and velocity field subject to the solid-wall condition.

Proposition 1. *For general smooth domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, let \vec{n} be the outward normal at a point of $\partial\Omega$. Suppose*

$$\mathbf{u} \cdot \vec{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$$

is always true. Then, the $\mathcal{S}\vec{n}$ term in the Navier boundary condition (3) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{S}\vec{n}]_{\text{tan}}|_{\partial\Omega} &= \left[\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \vec{n}} \right]_{\text{tan}} + \sum_{i=1}^2 \kappa_i (\mathbf{u} \cdot \vec{e}_i) \vec{e}_i \\ (9) \quad &= (\text{curl } \mathbf{u}) \times \vec{n} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^2 \kappa_i (\mathbf{u} \cdot \vec{e}_i) \vec{e}_i, \end{aligned}$$

where \vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2 form a pair of orthonormal, principal directions of the surface $\partial\Omega$ and $\kappa_i = -((\nabla \vec{n}) \vec{e}_i) \cdot \vec{e}_i$ denotes the corresponding principal curvature.

As a consequence, for the case of spherical shell domain defined in (1),

$$\begin{aligned} (10) \quad [\mathcal{S}\vec{n}]_{\text{tan}}|_{\partial\Omega} &= \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_h}{\partial \vec{n}} \pm \frac{\mathbf{u}_h}{r} \\ &= (\text{curl } \mathbf{u}) \times \vec{n} \pm \frac{2\mathbf{u}_h}{r}, \end{aligned}$$

where the \pm is set to be plus at the inner boundary and to be minus at the outer boundary.

The proof is postponed to the Appendices. Also, consult [34] for more details.

In literature, the Navier boundary condition is also referred to as “stree-free” or “slip” boundary condition. It should be however distinguished from the so-called “free” boundary condition (which is confusingly referred to as “slip” boundary condition in some cases),

$$\mathbf{u} \cdot \vec{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad (\text{curl } \mathbf{u}) \times \vec{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

By (10) of Proposition 1, the above condition does **not** satisfy the shear stress part of the Navier boundary condition (3b) on the inner boundary because of the constraint $\lambda \geq 0$. Similarly, the Neumann type boundary condition,

$$\mathbf{u} \cdot \vec{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \mathbf{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$$

as seen e.g. [18] does **not** satisfy (3b) either. Note that by Proposition 2 and its proof, $\lambda \geq 0$ plays a key role in the dissipation of energy. Also note that by (9) of Proposition 1, the deviation of the above two boundary conditions from the physically relevant condition (3b) is proportional to the (positive) principal curvatures of $\partial\Omega$. We can not, however, neglect these curvatures especially in global circulation models for which the radius of Earth is rescaled to 1.

Interested reader can further consult [16], in particular the top part of page 1085, and references therein.

2.2. Physical considerations of external forcing and non-homogeneous boundary conditions.

In the main Theorem 1, the external force \mathbf{F}_{ext} affects the estimate only via $(1 - \Pi_{\text{zonal}}) \int_0^T \overline{\mathbf{F}_{\text{ext}}}$ which is its non-zonal component averaged in time and r . This external force is intimately connected to non-homogeneous boundary conditions which are studied in e.g. the context of planetary boundary layer (PBL). Mathematically speaking, if $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ satisfies the Navier-Stokes equations (2) with nonhomogeneous boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{n}}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \\ \left[\mathbf{S}_{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}} \tilde{\mathbf{n}} + \lambda \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \right]_{\text{tan}}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{g} \neq \mathbf{0}, \end{cases}$$

and if one can find *some* velocity field \mathbf{v} , regardless of the dynamics, that is only subject to the boundary conditions

$$(11) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{v} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{n}}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \\ \left[\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{v}} \tilde{\mathbf{n}} + \lambda \mathbf{v} \right]_{\text{tan}}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{g}, \end{cases}$$

Then, the new unknown $\mathbf{u} := \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{v}$ will satisfy (2) with homogeneous boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{u} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{n}}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \\ \left[\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}} \tilde{\mathbf{n}} + \lambda \mathbf{u} \right]_{\text{tan}}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}, \end{cases}$$

which is then covered by the main Theorem 1. The new external force term in the \mathbf{u} system apparently contains information of the original boundary data \mathbf{g} .

There are indeed infinitely many ways to construct \mathbf{v} satisfying (11). For example, let $\mathbf{g}_{\text{out}}(\theta, \phi) = \mathbf{g}$ at the outer boundary $r = 1 + \delta$ and $\mathbf{g}_{\text{in}}(\theta, \phi) = \mathbf{g}$ at the inner boundary $r = 1$, both of which are tangent to \mathbb{S}^2 . Then, we seek vector fields $\mathbf{a}(\theta, \phi)$, $\mathbf{b}(\theta, \phi)$ both tangent to \mathbb{S}^2 so that $\mathbf{v} = r^2 \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}$ satisfies (11). The $\mathbf{v} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{n}}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ part is apparently. For the second condition of (11), we rewrite it using the first equation of (10) and the fact that $\tilde{\mathbf{n}} = \pm \mathbf{e}_r$ at the outer/inner boundary,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial r} - \frac{\mathbf{v}}{r} + \lambda \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{g}_{\text{out}} & \text{at } r = 1 + \delta, \\ -\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial r} + \frac{\mathbf{v}}{r} + \lambda \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{g}_{\text{in}} & \text{at } r = 1. \end{cases}$$

Plug in $\mathbf{v} = r^2 \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}$ and rearrange

$$\begin{cases} (1 + \delta + (1 + \delta)^2 \lambda) \mathbf{a} + \left(\frac{-1}{1 + \delta} + \lambda \right) \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{g}_{\text{out}}, \\ (-1 + \lambda) \mathbf{a} + (1 + \lambda) \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{g}_{\text{in}}. \end{cases}$$

The coefficient matrix has positive determinant for $\lambda \geq 0$, and thus one can perform Gaussian elimination to solve for \mathbf{a} , \mathbf{b} as linear combinations of \mathbf{g}_{out} , \mathbf{g}_{in} .

3. MAGNETOHYDRODYNAMICS IN \mathbb{R}^3 : FORMULATION AND MAIN RESULTS

Consider the domain to be \mathbb{R}^3 in which a uniform, imposed magnetic field \mathbf{e}_z resides and a fast rotating (about \mathbf{e}_z), conducting fluid moves subject to the predominantly large Coriolis force and Lorentz force. The fluid is homogeneous, incompressible and un-magnetizable. Then, upon some scaling arguments, one can reduce the full Navier-Stokes and Maxwell's equations to the following MHD system [10, §3.8] for the unknowns: velocity field \mathbf{u} and induced magnetic field \mathbf{b} (so that the total magnetic field is given by

$\mathbf{e}_z + \varepsilon \mathbf{b}$),

$$(12a) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla q \\ \quad = \frac{\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{e}_z}{\varepsilon} + \frac{(\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{b}) \times (\mathbf{e}_z + \varepsilon \mathbf{b})}{\varepsilon}, \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0; \end{cases}$$

$$(12b) \quad \partial_t \mathbf{b} = \frac{\operatorname{curl} [\mathbf{u} \times (\mathbf{e}_z + \varepsilon \mathbf{b})]}{\varepsilon}, \quad \operatorname{div} \mathbf{b} = 0.$$

Here, ε denotes the MHD Rossby number as well as the ratio of the induced magnetic field over imposed magnetic field; q denotes the pressure. Note in (12a) the Coriolis force and Lorentz force are of the same scale which is $O(1/\varepsilon)$ times the inertia. This is a reasonable scaling since the ratio of these two forces is often close to 1 in many geophysical and astrophysical applications ([10]). For simplicity, we have set both the kinetic viscosity and magnetic viscosity to be zero.

Let $M_0 := \|(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{b}_0)\|_{H^k(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ for $k > 5/2$. By the standard energy method, we know

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} \|(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b})\|_{H^k(\mathbb{R}^3)} &\leq C_k M_0 \\ \text{for positive times } t &\leq C_k/M_0. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3. *Consider any classical solution to (12) satisfying (13). Then, for any positive $T \leq C_k/M_0$,*

$$(14) \quad \left\| \int_0^T \mathbf{u} dt \right\|_{W^{k-3, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_k M_0 [(T + M_0 T^2) \varepsilon]^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and

$$(15) \quad \left\| \int_0^T \mathbf{b} dt \right\|_{W^{k-4, s}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_{k, s} M_0 [(T + M_0 T^2) \varepsilon]^{\frac{1}{6} - \frac{1}{s}},$$

with $6 < s < \infty$.

Therefore, time-averages of the solution vanish at order of fractional powers of ε when measured in L^s norms ($s > 6$). This result suggests there is dispersion in the time-averages, although we do not impose any spatial decay on the initial data like in the classical dispersive wave theory.

4. BAROTROPIC AVERAGING OF THE NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS

Recall the definition of barotropic averaging (5) and also define the baroclinic deviation from average,

$$(16) \quad \bar{\mathbf{u}} := \frac{1}{\delta} \int_1^{1+\delta} r \mathbf{u}_h dr, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{u}} := \mathbf{u} - \bar{\mathbf{u}}$$

where $\mathbf{u}_h := \mathbf{u} - (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{e}_r) \mathbf{e}_r$. For convenience, also define the barotropic average and baroclinic deviation for a scalar f ,

$$(17) \quad \bar{f} := \frac{1}{\delta} \int_1^{1+\delta} f dr, \quad \tilde{f} := f - \bar{f}.$$

We first remove the pressure term ∇q in (2) using the Helmholtz-Leray decomposition. Define \mathbb{X} to be the space of incompressible velocity fields subject to solid-wall boundary condition,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{X} &:= L^2 \text{ closure of} \\ &\left\{ \mathbf{u}^{\text{inc}} \in \mathcal{C}^1(\bar{\Omega}) \mid \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}^{\text{inc}} = 0, \mathbf{u}^{\text{inc}} \cdot \vec{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

By using testing functions, we see that

$$(18) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathsf{X} &= L^2 \text{ closure of} \\ &\left\{ \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{C}^1(\bar{\Omega}) \mid \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla f = 0 \text{ for any } f \in H^1(\Omega) \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \mathbf{u} \in L^2(\Omega) \mid \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla f = 0 \text{ for any } f \in H^1(\Omega) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Define \mathcal{P} as the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto X so that, for any $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}' \in L^2(\Omega)$,

$$(19a) \quad \mathcal{P}^2 \mathbf{u} = \mathcal{P} \mathbf{u} \in \mathsf{X},$$

$$(19b) \quad \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{u} - \mathcal{P} \mathbf{u}) \cdot (\mathcal{P} \mathbf{u}') = 0.$$

In fact, \mathcal{P} is the classical Leray projection subject to solid-wall boundary condition. Then, define

$$\mathcal{Q} := I - \mathcal{P}.$$

Now pick any scalar $f \in H^1(\Omega)$. By orthogonality of \mathcal{P} , \mathcal{Q} in (19b), we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{P}(\nabla f) \cdot \mathcal{P}(\nabla f) = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{P}(\nabla f) \cdot \nabla f$$

which is zero due to $\mathcal{P}(\nabla f) \in \mathsf{X}$ satisfying (18). In other words,

$$\mathcal{P}(\nabla f) \equiv 0.$$

By this property, we apply \mathcal{P} on the first equation of (2), cancel the ∇q term and reformulate it into,

$$(20) \quad \partial_t \mathbf{u} + \mathcal{P}(\nabla_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{e}_r \cos \theta) + \mu \mathcal{P} \Delta \mathbf{u}.$$

Note that, for generic div-free velocity field \mathbf{u} satisfying the Navier boundary condition (3), the term $\Delta \mathbf{u}$ is no longer subject to the solid-wall boundary condition part (3a) whereas the image of \mathcal{P} always satisfies solid-wall boundary condition. Thus, $\mathcal{P} \Delta \mathbf{u}$ and $\Delta \mathbf{u}$ differ by a div-free, potential flow — the gradient of the so-called Stokes pressure.

4.1. Barotropic averaging of Helmholtz-Leray projections. Similar to (18), we define

$$\mathsf{X}_h = \left\{ \mathbf{u}_h \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^2) \mid \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{u}_h \cdot \nabla g = 0 \text{ for any } g \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^2) \right\}$$

and then define projections \mathcal{P}_h and $\mathcal{Q}_h := I - \mathcal{P}_h$ for “horizontal” velocity field $\mathbf{u}_h \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$ so that, analogous to (19)

$$(21a) \quad \mathcal{P}_h^2 \mathbf{u}_h = \mathcal{P}_h \mathbf{u}_h \in \mathsf{X}_h,$$

$$(21b) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \mathcal{Q}_h \mathbf{u}_h \cdot (\mathcal{P}_h \mathbf{u}_h') = 0.$$

Here and below, subscript h following an operator indicates the operator acts on scalar or vector fields defined on \mathbb{S}^2 .

Now, we give the relation between \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}_h .

Lemma 1. *For any vector field $\mathbf{u} = \mathcal{P} \mathbf{u} + \mathcal{Q} \mathbf{u} \in L^2(\Omega)$,*

$$\overline{\mathcal{P} \mathbf{u}} = \mathcal{P}_h \overline{\mathbf{u}}, \quad \overline{\mathcal{Q} \mathbf{u}} = \mathcal{Q}_h \overline{\mathbf{u}}.$$

In the proof, we will repeatedly use the following basic facts that relate the differential operators in Ω to those in \mathbb{S}^2 .

For vector $\mathbf{u} = w\mathbf{e}_r + \mathbf{u}_h$,

$$(22a) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} &= r^{-2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r^2 w) + r^{-1} \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{u}_h, \\ \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u} &= r^{-1} (\operatorname{curl}_h \mathbf{u}_h) \mathbf{e}_r \\ &\quad + r^{-1} (\nabla_h w - \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r \mathbf{u}_h)) \times \mathbf{e}_r; \end{aligned}$$

for scalar f ,

$$(22b) \quad \begin{aligned} \nabla f &= \frac{\partial}{\partial r} f \mathbf{e}_r + r^{-1} \nabla_h f, \\ \Delta f &= r^{-2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial r} f) + r^{-2} \Delta_h f. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the relation of curl and curl_h in polar coordinates (with θ being the colatitude) is due to the following formulations that roughly resemble the Cartesian-coordinate form,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for } \mathbf{u} &= w\mathbf{e}_r + u_\theta \mathbf{e}_\theta + u_\phi \mathbf{e}_\phi, \\ \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u} &= \frac{1}{r \sin \theta} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} (u_\phi \sin \theta) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} u_\theta \right) \mathbf{e}_r \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{r} \left(\frac{1}{\sin \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} w - \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r u_\phi) \right) \mathbf{e}_\theta \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{r} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r u_\theta) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} (w) \right) \mathbf{e}_\phi, \\ \operatorname{curl}_h \mathbf{u}_h &= \frac{1}{\sin \theta} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} (u_\phi \sin \theta) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} u_\theta \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 1. Apply barotropic averaging (16) to $\mathbf{u} = \mathcal{P}\mathbf{u} + \mathcal{Q}\mathbf{u}$ and get $\bar{\mathbf{u}} = \overline{\mathcal{P}\mathbf{u}} + \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathbf{u}}$. Since by definition we also have $\bar{\mathbf{u}} = \mathcal{P}_h \bar{\mathbf{u}} + \mathcal{Q}_h \bar{\mathbf{u}}$, it suffices to prove

$$(23) \quad \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathbf{u}} = \mathcal{Q}_h \bar{\mathbf{u}}.$$

Also, since $H^1(\Omega)$ is dense in $L^2(\Omega)$ and barotropic averaging is apparently bounded from $L^2(\Omega)$ to $L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$, we only consider $\mathbf{u} \in H^1(\Omega)$ so that $\mathbf{u} \cdot \vec{n}$ is defined on $\partial\Omega$.

By elliptic PDE theory, we have

$$(24) \quad \mathcal{Q}\mathbf{u} = \nabla f \text{ with } f \text{ solving } \begin{cases} \Delta f = \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} & \text{in } \Omega \\ \nabla f \cdot \vec{n} = \mathbf{u} \cdot \vec{n} & \text{in } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

Similar equations hold for \mathcal{Q}_h ,

$$(25) \quad \mathcal{Q}_h \mathbf{u}_h = \nabla_h \Delta_h^{-1} \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{u}_h$$

Here, Δ_h^{-1} is defined using spherical harmonics, and maps between scalar functions of zero mean — note $\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{u}_h = 0$ by Stokes' lemma and $\partial\mathbb{S}^2 = \emptyset$.

Let $\mathbf{u} = w\mathbf{e}_r + \mathbf{u}_h$. Use (22) to reformulate (24) as,

$$(26) \quad \begin{cases} r^{-2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial r} f) + r^{-2} \Delta_h f \\ = r^{-2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r^2 w) + r^{-1} \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{u}_h, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial r} f = w, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Multiply the first equation with r^2 and integrate it in r ,

$$r^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial r} f \Big|_1^{1+\delta} + \int_1^{1+\delta} \Delta_h f \, dr = r^2 w \Big|_1^{1+\delta} + \int_1^{1+\delta} r \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{u}_h \, dr.$$

Then, apply the second equation of (26) to cancel out the boundary terms,

$$\int_1^{1+\delta} \Delta_h f \, dr = \int_1^{1+\delta} r \operatorname{div}_h \mathbf{u}_h \, dr.$$

Since $\mathbf{u} \in H^1(\Omega)$, we can exchange integrals and derivatives above, and invoke definitions of barotropic averaging in (16), (17) to obtain

$$(27) \quad \Delta_h \bar{f} = \operatorname{div}_h \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \nabla_h \bar{f} = \mathcal{Q}_h \bar{\mathbf{u}},$$

where \mathcal{Q}_h follows (25).

On the other hand, apply barotropic averaging (16) on the 3rd equation of (22) with the same f as in (24) to obtain

$$\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathbf{u}} = \overline{\nabla f} = \frac{1}{\delta} \int_1^{1+\delta} \nabla_h f = \nabla_h \bar{f}.$$

Combine it with (27) on \mathbb{S}^2 , we prove Lemma 1. \square

4.2. Dynamics of barotropic averages on \mathbb{S}^2 . We now apply barotropic averaging (5) on the 3D Navier-Stokes equations (20) with the help of Lemma 1 and identities (22).

Lemma 2. *The solution to (20) satisfies*

$$(28) \quad \partial_t \bar{\mathbf{u}} + \mathcal{P}_h \overline{\nabla_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{P}_h (\bar{\mathbf{u}} \times \mathbf{e}_r \cos \theta) + \mu \mathcal{P}_h \overline{\Delta \mathbf{u}} + \overline{\mathbf{F}_{\text{ext}}}$$

subject to $\operatorname{div}_h \bar{\mathbf{u}} = 0$. Here, $\mathbf{u} = w \mathbf{e}_r + \mathbf{u}_h$ so that $\bar{\mathbf{u}} = \overline{\mathbf{u}_h}$.

Furthermore, if the Navier boundary condition (3) is imposed, then the viscosity term above amounts to

$$(29) \quad \mathcal{P}_h \overline{\Delta \mathbf{u}} = \mathcal{P}_h \Delta_h \overline{r^{-2} \mathbf{u}} - 2 \mathcal{P}_h r^{-1} \overline{\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \mathbf{u}}.$$

Proof. First, integrate $r^2 \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0$ in r and invoke the first identity of (22)

$$r^2 (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{e}_r) \Big|_1^{1+\delta} + \int_1^{1+\delta} r \operatorname{div}_h (\mathbf{u}_h) = 0.$$

By the zero-flux boundary condition, the first term vanishes, and therefore we prove the incompressibility condition

$$(30) \quad \operatorname{div}_h \bar{\mathbf{u}} = 0.$$

For the Coriolis term, $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{e}_r \cos \theta)$, Lemma 1 implies

$$\overline{\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{e}_r \cos \theta)} = \mathcal{P}_h (\overline{\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{e}_r \cos \theta}) = \mathcal{P}_h (\bar{\mathbf{u}} \times \mathbf{e}_r \cos \theta).$$

Then, upon barotropic averaging and invoking Lemma 1, the 3D Navier-Stokes (20) is transformed into (28) subject to $\operatorname{div}_h \bar{\mathbf{u}} = 0$.

Now we show (29). By $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0$, we have,

$$(31) \quad \overline{\Delta \mathbf{u}} = -\overline{\operatorname{curl} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}}.$$

For the RHS, first apply the second identity of (22) to get

$$\begin{aligned} -\overline{\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}} &= -\frac{1}{\delta} \int_1^{1+\delta} (\nabla_h w - \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r \mathbf{u}_h)) \times \mathbf{e}_r \, dr \\ &= -\frac{1}{\delta} \left(\int_1^{1+\delta} \nabla_h w \, dr - r \mathbf{u}_h \Big|_1^{1+\delta} \right) \times \mathbf{e}_r. \end{aligned}$$

Then, make substitution $\mathbf{u} = \text{curl } \mathbf{u}$ and correspondingly $w = (\text{curl } \mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{e}_r = r^{-1} \text{curl}_h \mathbf{u}_h$,

$$\begin{aligned} & - \overline{\text{curl } \text{curl } \mathbf{u}} \\ &= -\frac{1}{\delta} \left(\int_1^{1+\delta} \nabla_h r^{-1} \text{curl}_h \mathbf{u}_h \, dr - r \text{Proj}_h(\text{curl } \mathbf{u}) \Big|_1^{1+\delta} \right) \times \mathbf{e}_r \\ &= \mathbf{e}_r \times \nabla_h \overline{\text{curl}_h r^{-2} \mathbf{u}} + \frac{r}{\delta} \text{Proj}_h(\text{curl } \mathbf{u}) \Big|_1^{1+\delta} \times \mathbf{e}_r \\ &=: I + II. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we transform the viscous term in (28) into

$$(32) \quad \mathcal{P}_h \overline{\Delta \mathbf{u}} = -\mathcal{P}_h \overline{\text{curl } \text{curl } \mathbf{u}} = \mathcal{P}_h I + \mathcal{P}_h II.$$

For the I term, apply identities $\Delta_h \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{e}_r \times \nabla_h \text{curl}_h \mathbf{u} + \nabla_h \text{div}_h \mathbf{u}$ and $\mathcal{P} \nabla_h \text{div}_h \mathbf{u} = 0$ to rewrite

$$(33) \quad \mathcal{P}_h I = \mathcal{P}_h \Delta_h \overline{r^{-2} \mathbf{u}}.$$

For the II term, invoke the second identity of (22) and the boundary condition $\mathbf{u} \cdot \vec{n} \Big|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ to obtain

$$\text{Proj}_h(\text{curl } \mathbf{u}) \Big|_1^{1+\delta} = r^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r \mathbf{u}_h) \times \mathbf{e}_r \Big|_1^{1+\delta}$$

namely,

$$II = -\frac{1}{\delta} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r \mathbf{u}_h) \Big|_1^{1+\delta}.$$

By (10), the Navier boundary condition (3) implies $\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \mathbf{u}_h \Big|_{\partial\Omega} = r^{-1} \mathbf{u}_h$. Therefore,

$$II = -\frac{2}{\delta} \mathbf{u}_h \Big|_1^{1+\delta} = -2r^{-1} \overline{\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \mathbf{u}}.$$

Combine this with (32), (33) to prove (29). \square

5. PROOF OF MAIN THEOREM FOR NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS

In this section, we following the framework in [7] to prove Theorem 1.

First, define

$$(34) \quad \mathcal{L}_h \bar{\mathbf{u}} := \mathcal{P}_h (\bar{\mathbf{u}} \times \mathbf{e}_r \cos \theta)$$

and rewrite (28) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_h \bar{\mathbf{u}} &= \varepsilon \left[\partial_t \bar{\mathbf{u}} + \mathcal{P}_h \overline{\nabla_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}} + \right. \\ & \quad \left. 2\mu \mathcal{P}_h r^{-1} \overline{\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \mathbf{u}} - \mu \mathcal{P}_h \Delta_h \overline{r^{-2} \mathbf{u}} - \overline{\mathbf{F}_{\text{ext}}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, take the time-averages of each term and exchange time integration and \mathcal{L}_h ,

$$(35) \quad \mathcal{L}_h \int_0^T \bar{\mathbf{u}} = \varepsilon \left[\overline{\bar{\mathbf{u}}(T)} - \bar{\mathbf{u}}_0 + A_1 + A_2 + A_3 - \overline{\mathbf{F}_{\text{ext}}} \right]$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &:= \int_0^T \mathcal{P}_h \overline{\nabla_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}} \, dt \\ A_2 &:= \mu \int_0^T \mathcal{P}_h r^{-1} \overline{\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \mathbf{u}} \, dt \\ A_3 &:= -\mu \int_0^T \mathcal{P}_h \Delta_h \overline{r^{-2} \mathbf{u}} \, dt \end{aligned}$$

We will then estimate every term in the RHS of (35) in terms of $H^k(\mathbb{S}^2)$ norms. Note that there are many equivalent definitions of Sobolev norms on a manifold through the literature (e.g. [31]), all of which

are independent of coordinate systems. One definition of $\|f\|_{H^k(\mathbb{S}^2)}$ is $\sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} [f \sum_{j=0}^k (-\Delta)^j f]}$ for $k \geq 0$.

Then, by the Poincaré's inequality, this definition is equivalent to $\sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} [f^2 + f(-\Delta)^k f]}$. In this article, all relevant scalar fields are of zero-mean, so that we adopt the following definition

$$(36) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{for scalar } f \text{ with } \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f = 0, \\ & \text{define } \|f\|_{H^k(\mathbb{S}^2)} := \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} [f(-\Delta)^k f]} \end{aligned}$$

with integer $k \geq 0$.

Consequently, for a vector field \mathbf{u} on \mathbb{S}^2 with Hodge Decomposition

$$\mathbf{u} = \nabla_h \Phi + \nabla_h^\perp \Psi \quad \text{with } \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \Phi = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \Psi = 0,$$

we define its H^k norm, among other equivalent versions, as

$$(37) \quad \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^k(\mathbb{S}^2)} := \sqrt{\|\Phi\|_{H^{k+1}(\mathbb{S}^2)}^2 + \|\Psi\|_{H^{k+1}(\mathbb{S}^2)}^2}.$$

Note that, here and below, we always impose zero-mean on Φ and Ψ .

With the help of spherical harmonics, we extend (36) and (37) to H^α for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 1. Let $\{Y_l^m\}$ be the set of spherical harmonics forming an orthonormal basis of L^2 . Let $\mathbf{u} = \nabla^\perp \Psi$ be any *div*-free velocity field in $L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$ with

$$\Psi = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-l}^l \psi_l^m Y_l^m, \quad \text{where } \psi_l^m = \langle \Psi, Y_l^m \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)}.$$

Then, for any real number α ,

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^2)} = \|\Psi\|_{H^{\alpha+1}(\mathbb{S}^2)} := \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-l}^l (l^2 + l)^{\alpha+1} |\psi_l^m|^2}.$$

This definition allows us to easily extend the proof of Theorem of [6] and reach the next lemma.

Lemma 3. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. For any horizontal vector field \mathbf{u}_h on \mathbb{S}^2 subject to $\text{div}_h \mathbf{u}_h = 0$,

$$\|(1 - \Pi_{\text{zonal}}) \mathbf{u}_h\|_{H^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^2)} \leq C \|\mathcal{L}_h \mathbf{u}_h\|_{H^{\alpha+2}(\mathbb{S}^2)}.$$

Note that $(1 - \Pi_{\text{zonal}})$ effectively extracts the non-zonal component of a velocity field.

Proof of Theorem 1. Let Ω stand for the three-dimensional shell domain defined in (1) for the rest of the proof.

Under Definition 1, it is straightforward to verify that $H^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^2)$ and $H^{-\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2)$ are dual spaces with respect to the $L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$ inner product, namely,

$$(38) \quad \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^{-\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^2)} = \max_{\mathbf{u}' \neq 0} \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}' \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)}}{\|\mathbf{u}'\|_{H^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^2)}}.$$

Then, by Lemma 3 and (30), it suffices to estimate

$$\left\langle \mathbf{u}_h', \mathcal{L}_h \int_0^T \bar{\mathbf{u}} \right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)}$$

for smooth, testing vector field \mathbf{u}_h' defined on \mathbb{S}^2 . Since the definition (34) implies $\text{div}_h \mathcal{L}_h = 0$, we can further impose $\text{div}_h \mathbf{u}' = 0$ so that $\langle \mathbf{u}_h', \mathcal{P}_h \mathbf{u}_h'' \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)} = \langle \mathbf{u}_h', \mathbf{u}_h'' \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)}$.

By (35), it suffices to make the following estimates. (Recall $M_0 := \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}/\sqrt{\delta}$.)

- Estimate of $\overline{\mathbf{u}}(T)$ and $\overline{\mathbf{u}}_0$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta \left\langle \overline{\mathbf{u}}(T), \mathbf{u}_h' \right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)} \\
&= \int_1^{1+\delta} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} r \mathbf{u}(T) \cdot \mathbf{u}_h' \\
&= \left\langle \mathbf{u}(T), r^{-1} \mathbf{u}_h' \right\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{u}(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|r^{-1} \mathbf{u}_h'\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= \|\mathbf{u}(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{u}_h'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)} \sqrt{\delta}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\mathbf{u}(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, we obtain

$$\|\overline{\mathbf{u}}(T)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)} \leq M_0, \quad \text{and similarly} \quad \|\overline{\mathbf{u}}_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)} \leq M_0$$

- Estimate of A_1 .

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta \left\langle \mathcal{P}_h \overline{\nabla_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{u}_h' \right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)} \\
&= \int_1^{1+\delta} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} r [\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u})] \cdot \mathbf{u}_h' \\
&= \left\langle \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}), r^{-1} \mathbf{u}_h' \right\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= \left\langle \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}, \nabla(r^{-1} \mathbf{u}_h') \right\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \dots \text{ by } \mathbf{u} \cdot \vec{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 |\nabla(r^{-1} \mathbf{u}_h')|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\
&\leq C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \|\mathbf{u}_h'\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{S}^2)} \\
&\leq C_\beta \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \|\mathbf{u}_h'\|_{H^{2+\beta}(\mathbb{S}^2)} \quad \text{for } \beta > 0 \\
&\quad \dots \text{ by Sobolev imbedding.}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\mathbf{u}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ due to Proposition 2, we use the duality relation (38) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathcal{P}_h \overline{\nabla_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{u}}\|_{H^{-2-\beta}(\mathbb{S}^2)} \leq C_\beta M_0^2, \\
\text{so } & \|A_1\|_{H^{-2-\beta}(\mathbb{S}^2)} \leq C_\beta M_0^2 T.
\end{aligned}$$

for $\beta > 0$.

- Estimate of A_2 .

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta \left\langle \overline{\mathcal{P}_h r^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{u}_h' \right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)} \\
&= \int_1^{1+\delta} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}_h' \\
&= \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \mathbf{u}, r^{-2} \mathbf{u}_h' \right\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|r^{-2} \mathbf{u}_h'\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{u}_h'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)} \sqrt{1 - (1 + \delta)^{-1}} \\
&< \sqrt{\delta} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{u}_h'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, integrate in time to get,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\langle A_2, \mathbf{u}_h' \right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)} \\
& < \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{\delta}} \|\mathbf{u}_h'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)} \int_0^T \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
& \leq \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{\delta}} \|\mathbf{u}_h'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)} \sqrt{\int_0^T \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \int_0^T 1} \\
& = \frac{\mu\sqrt{T}}{\sqrt{\delta}} \|\mathbf{u}_h'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)} \sqrt{\int_0^T \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2}
\end{aligned}$$

Since by the enstrophy estimate (58), $\int_0^T \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \mu^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}_0\|^2 (1 + C\mu T)$, we obtain

$$\|A_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)} \leq \sqrt{\mu} M_0 \sqrt{T + C\mu T^2}$$

• Estimate of A_3 .

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta \left\langle \mathcal{P}_h \Delta_h \overline{r^{-2} \mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{u}_h' \right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)} \\
& = \delta \left\langle \overline{r^{-2} \mathbf{u}}, \Delta_h \mathbf{u}_h' \right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)} \\
& \quad \dots \text{ by Green's identities on } \mathbb{S}^2 \\
& = \int_1^{1+\delta} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} r^{-1} \mathbf{u}_h \cdot \Delta_h \mathbf{u}_h' \\
& = \left\langle r^{-2} \mathbf{u}_h, r^{-1} \Delta_h \mathbf{u}_h' \right\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
& \leq \|r^{-2} \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|r^{-1} \Delta_h \mathbf{u}_h'\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
& < \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\Delta_h \mathbf{u}_h'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)} \sqrt{\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\mathbf{u}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ due to Proposition 2, we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{P}_h \Delta_h \overline{r^{-2} \mathbf{u}}\|_{H^{-2}(\mathbb{S}^2)} \leq M_0, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \|A_3\|_{H^{-2}(\mathbb{S}^2)} \leq \mu M_0 T$$

□

6. FAST ROTATING MHD MODEL

Let \mathcal{P} once again denote the Leray-Helmholtz projection. In other words, for any vector field $\mathbf{u} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$,

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathcal{P}\mathbf{u} + \nabla \mathcal{Q}\mathbf{u}$$

where

$$(39) \quad \mathcal{P}\mathbf{u} = -\text{curl} \Delta^{-1} \text{curl} \mathbf{u}, \quad \mathcal{Q}\mathbf{u} = \Delta^{-1} \text{div} \mathbf{u}.$$

By Fourier transform, we also have

$$(40) \quad \widehat{\mathcal{P}\mathbf{u}}(\xi) = -\frac{i\xi \times (i\xi \times \widehat{\mathbf{u}})}{|\xi|^2}, \quad \widehat{\mathcal{Q}\mathbf{u}}(\xi) = \frac{i\xi \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{u}}}{|\xi|^2}.$$

Define a skew-self-adjoint operator acting on the velocity field \mathbf{u} and magnetic field \mathbf{b} ,

$$(41) \quad \mathcal{L} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{b} \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{e}_z + (\text{curl} \mathbf{b}) \times \mathbf{e}_z) \\ \text{curl}(\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{e}_z) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, the system (12) can be reformulated as

$$(42) \quad \partial_t \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{b} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b}) \\ \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{L} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{b} \end{pmatrix}$$

where we used identity $2(\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{b}) \times \mathbf{b} - 2\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b} = \nabla |\mathbf{b}|^2$ to transform (12a) and identity $\operatorname{curl}(\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{u}(\operatorname{div} \mathbf{b}) - \mathbf{b}(\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}) + \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b}$ to transform (12b).

6.1. Kernel of the large operator \mathcal{L} . It is an elementary calculation to verify that

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0 \implies \operatorname{curl}(\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{e}_z) = \partial_z \mathbf{u}.$$

Combine it with (39) and the fact $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = \operatorname{div} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{b} = 0$ to transform (41) into

$$\mathcal{L} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{b} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\operatorname{curl} \Delta^{-1} \partial_z (\mathbf{u} + \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{b}) \\ \partial_z \mathbf{u} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, by $\mathbf{b} = \mathcal{P}\mathbf{b} = -\operatorname{curl} \Delta^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{b}$, this implies

$$(43) \quad \mathcal{L} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{b} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\operatorname{curl} \Delta^{-1} \partial_z \mathbf{u} + \partial_z \mathbf{b} \\ \partial_z \mathbf{u} \end{pmatrix}$$

Therefore,

$$(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}) \in \ker \mathcal{L} \iff \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(x, y) \text{ and } \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}(x, y)$$

When restricted to L^2 space, $\ker \mathcal{L} = \{(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})\}$.

6.2. Control L^∞ norm using ∂_z derivatives. Given H^k initial data ($k > 5/2$), we can apply the standard energy method to obtain $O(1)$ estimates for the L^p norms ($2 \leq p \leq \infty$) of the solution and its first spatial derivatives in a finite time interval. Upon time-averaging, such $O(1)$ estimates give rise to $O(\varepsilon)$ estimates for the L^p norms ($2 \leq p \leq \infty$) of $\int_0^T \mathcal{L} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{b} \end{pmatrix}$. By (43), the $O(\varepsilon)$ estimates also work for $\int_0^T (\partial_z \mathbf{u}, \partial_z \mathbf{b})$ in terms of L^p norms¹.

What estimates can be obtained for $\int_0^T (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b})$, the time-average of the solution itself? Because of the special role of ∂_z derivatives, we state and prove the following inequality regarding function f defined in \mathbb{R}^1 .

$$(44) \quad \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^1)}^2 \leq C \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^1)} \|f'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^1)}$$

Note that once the L^∞ norm is estimated, standard interpolation techniques can help control the rest of the L^p norms ($2 < p < \infty$).

Proof of (44). For any positive ρ , we estimate the L^1 norms of $\widehat{f}(\xi)$ over frequencies lower and higher than ρ respectively. The Holder's inequality is applied in both cases.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\rho}^{\rho} |\widehat{f}(\xi)| d\xi &\leq \left[\int_{-\rho}^{\rho} |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\int_{-\rho}^{\rho} 1 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^1)} \rho^{\frac{1}{2}}. \\ \int_{|\xi| > \rho} |\widehat{f}(\xi)| d\xi &\leq \left[\int_{|\xi| > \rho} |\xi \widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\int_{|\xi| > \rho} \xi^{-2} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \|f'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^1)} \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^1)} &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^1} |\widehat{f}(\xi)| d\xi \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^1)} \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} + C \|f'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^1)} \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Optimizing the RHS over $\rho \in (0, \infty)$, we prove (44). □

We are ready to state and prove the following lemma

¹For $\partial_z \mathbf{b}$, the range of p is reduced to $6 \leq p \leq \infty$ due to the negative derivative in the first line of (43)

Lemma 4. *Given function $g(x, y, z)$,*

$$\|g\|_{L^\infty_z(H_{xy}^m(\mathbb{R}^2))} \leq C \|g\|_{H^m(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_z g\|_{H^m(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Consequently, for and $m' \geq 0$ and $k > 1$,

$$\|g\|_{W^{m', \infty}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|g\|_{H^{m'+k}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_z g\|_{H^{m'+k}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. Consider $\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta g(x, y, z)$ with $\alpha + \beta \leq m$. For any numbers $a < b$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b \|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta g\|_{L_{xy}^2}^2 dz \\ &= \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} [\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta g(x, y, z)]^2 dx dy dz \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta g(x, y, z)\|_{L_z^\infty(\mathbb{R}^1)}^2 dx dy \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^1} (\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta g)^2 dz \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^1} (\partial_z \partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta g)^2 dz \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} dx dy \\ &\quad \dots \text{by (44)} \\ &\leq C \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta g)^2 dz dx dy \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_z \partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta g)^2 dz dx dy \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \dots \text{by Hölder's inequality in } \mathbb{R}^2 \\ &\leq C \|g\|_{H^m(\mathbb{R}^3)} \|\partial_z g\|_{H^m(\mathbb{R}^3)} \end{aligned}$$

Because a, b are arbitrary, this implies

$$\|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta g\|_{L_z^\infty(L_{xy}^2)}^2 \leq C \|g\|_{H^m(\mathbb{R}^3)} \|\partial_z g\|_{H^m(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

Summing up over all derivatives with $0 \leq \alpha + \beta \leq m$, we complete the proof of the first inequality and the second one follows from the Sobolev inequalities. \square

6.3. Estimates on time-averages of (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}) .

Proof of Theorem 3. By taking \int_0^T on (42) and then taking the $H^{k-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ norms, we have the estimate

$$(45) \quad \left\| \int_0^T \mathcal{L} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{b} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{H^{k-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq CM_0 \left(\frac{1}{T} + M_0 \right) \varepsilon.$$

Using the second component of (43), we obtain from above that

$$\left\| \int_0^T \partial_z \mathbf{u} \right\|_{H^{k-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq CM_0 \left(\frac{1}{T} + M_0 \right) \varepsilon,$$

and together with Lemma 4, we prove (14)

Similarly, substracting the second component of (43) from the curl of the first component of (43), we obtain from (45) that

$$\left\| \int_0^T \partial_z \text{curl} \mathbf{b} \right\|_{H^{k-2}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq CM_0 \left(\frac{1}{T} + M_0 \right) \varepsilon$$

and consequently, by Lemma 4,

$$(46) \quad \|\text{curl} \int_0^T \mathbf{b}\|_{W^{k-4, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq CM_0 \left(\frac{1}{T} + M_0 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

To “remove” the curl operator from (46), we use $\mathbf{b} = \mathcal{P}\mathbf{b} = -\text{curl}\Delta^{-1}\text{curl}\mathbf{b} \implies (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{b} = \text{curl}(-\Delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\text{curl}\mathbf{b}$ and the fact that $\text{curl}(-\Delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is a bounded mapping on any $W^{m,p}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ space with $1 < p < \infty$ (by properties of Fourier multipliers) to obtain

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^T \mathbf{b}\|_{W^{m,p}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|\text{curl} \int_0^T \mathbf{b}\|_{W^{m,p}(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

Then, apply the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev fractional integration theorem $\|g\|_{L^{\frac{3p}{3-p}}} \leq C\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}g\|_{L^p}$ to the LHS and the interpolative Hölder’s inequality $\|g\|_{L^p} \leq \|g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2}{p}}\|g\|_{L^\infty}^{1-\frac{2}{p}}$ to the RHS to arrive at, with $2 < p < 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int_0^T \mathbf{b} \right\|_{W^{m, \frac{3p}{3-p}}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ & \leq C \|\text{curl} \int_0^T \mathbf{b}\|_{W^{m,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{\frac{2}{p}} \|\text{curl} \int_0^T \mathbf{b}\|_{W^{m,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{1-\frac{2}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, plug in (13) and (46), we complete the proof of (15) by setting $m = k - 4$, $1/p = 1/3 + 1/s$. \square

7. APPENDICES

7.1. Geometric proof of Proposition 1.

Proof. Throughout this proof, let \vec{n} denote the outward normal at $\partial\Omega$ and let $\vec{\tau}$ denote a typical tangent vector at $\partial\Omega$.

By identities (4), we have,

$$(47) \quad \begin{cases} ((\nabla\mathbf{u})\vec{n}) \cdot \vec{\tau} = (\vec{n} \cdot \nabla\mathbf{u}) \cdot \vec{\tau}, \\ ((\nabla\mathbf{u})^\top\vec{n}) \cdot \vec{\tau} = (\vec{\tau} \cdot \nabla\mathbf{u}) \cdot \vec{n}. \end{cases}$$

Next, the assumption $\mathbf{u} \cdot \vec{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ implies $\vec{\tau} \cdot \nabla(\mathbf{u} \cdot \vec{n})|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ so that by treating $\vec{\tau} \cdot \nabla$ as a directional derivative and using the product rule, we have at $\partial\Omega$,

$$(\vec{\tau} \cdot \nabla\mathbf{u}) \cdot \vec{n} = -(\vec{\tau} \cdot \nabla\vec{n}) \cdot \mathbf{u}.$$

Combine it with (47) to obtain, at a general smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ with $\mathbf{u} \cdot \vec{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$

$$(48) \quad \begin{cases} ((\nabla\mathbf{u})\vec{n}) \cdot \vec{\tau} = \left[\frac{\partial\mathbf{u}}{\partial\vec{n}} \right] \cdot \vec{\tau}, \\ ((\nabla\mathbf{u})^\top\vec{n}) \cdot \vec{\tau} = -(\vec{\tau} \cdot \nabla\vec{n}) \cdot \mathbf{u}. \end{cases}$$

Recall the definition $\mathbf{S} = \nabla\mathbf{u} + (\nabla\mathbf{u})^\top$ and apply the above identities to obtain,

$$(49) \quad (\mathbf{S}\vec{n}) \cdot \vec{\tau} = \left[\frac{\partial\mathbf{u}}{\partial\vec{n}} \right] \cdot \vec{\tau} - (\vec{\tau} \cdot \nabla\vec{n}) \cdot \mathbf{u}.$$

One can also write the above identity using the vorticity. In fact, combine identities (48) with $(\text{curl}\mathbf{u}) \times \vec{n} = (\nabla\mathbf{u} - (\nabla\mathbf{u})^\top)\vec{n}$ to have

$$((\text{curl}\mathbf{u}) \times \vec{n}) \cdot \vec{\tau} = \left[\frac{\partial\mathbf{u}}{\partial\vec{n}} \right] \cdot \vec{\tau} + (\vec{\tau} \cdot \nabla\vec{n}) \cdot \mathbf{u}.$$

Subtract it from (49) to arrive at

$$(50) \quad (\mathbf{S}\vec{n}) \cdot \vec{\tau} = ((\text{curl}\mathbf{u}) \times \vec{n}) \cdot \vec{\tau} - 2(\vec{\tau} \cdot \nabla\vec{n}) \cdot \mathbf{u}$$

Now, we calculate the $\vec{\tau} \cdot \nabla \vec{n}$ term using surface geometry. First, by choosing the surface as a level set of scalar function g , so that $\vec{n} = \frac{\nabla g}{|\nabla g|}$, we use the product to obtain, for any two tangent vectors $\vec{\tau}_1, \vec{\tau}_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\vec{\tau}_1 \cdot \nabla \vec{n}) \cdot \vec{\tau}_2 &= \left(\vec{\tau}_1 \cdot \nabla \frac{\nabla g}{|\nabla g|} \right) \cdot \vec{\tau}_2 \\ &= \frac{1}{|\nabla g|} \left((\vec{\tau}_1 \cdot \nabla (\nabla g)) \cdot \vec{\tau}_2 \right) + \left(\vec{\tau}_1 \cdot \nabla \frac{1}{|\nabla g|} \right) (\nabla g \cdot \vec{\tau}_2). \end{aligned}$$

In the right side, since the first term is symmetric regarding $\vec{\tau}_1, \vec{\tau}_2$ and also in the second term, $\nabla g \cdot \vec{\tau}_2 = |\nabla g| \vec{n} \cdot \vec{\tau}_2 = 0$, we have

$$(51) \quad (\vec{\tau}_1 \cdot \nabla \vec{n}) \cdot \vec{\tau}_2 \text{ is a symmetric bilinear form.}$$

On the other hand, since $\vec{n}, \vec{\tau}, (\vec{n} \times \vec{\tau})$ form a Darboux frame of any surface curve going in the direction $\vec{\tau}$, we have

$$\vec{\tau} \cdot \nabla \vec{n} = -\kappa \vec{\tau} - g \vec{n} \times \vec{\tau}$$

where scalar κ denotes the normal curvature and scalar g the geodesic (relative) torsion. Thus,

$$(52) \quad -(\vec{\tau} \cdot \nabla \vec{n}) \cdot \vec{\tau} = \kappa = \mathbf{X}(\vec{\tau}, \vec{\tau}),$$

where $\mathbf{X}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the second fundamental form of $\partial\Omega$. Now, by (51), (52), we obtain that $-(\vec{\tau}_1 \cdot \nabla \vec{n}) \cdot \vec{\tau}_2$ is indeed *the* symmetric bilinear form associated with \mathbf{X} , namely, for any two tangent vectors $\vec{\tau}_1, \vec{\tau}_2$,

$$(53) \quad -(\vec{\tau}_1 \cdot \nabla \vec{n}) \cdot \vec{\tau}_2 = \mathbf{X}(\vec{\tau}_1, \vec{\tau}_2).$$

Then, the principal directions \vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2 are defined as the two orthonormal eigenvectors that diagonalize \mathbf{X} , i.e.

$$\mathbf{X}(\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2) = 0, \quad \mathbf{X}(\vec{e}_i, \vec{e}_i) = \kappa_i, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where κ_i denotes the principal curvature associated with \vec{e}_i . Combine it with (53) to obtain,

$$-\vec{e}_i \cdot \nabla \vec{n} = \kappa_i \vec{e}_i \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Finally, set $\vec{\tau} = \vec{e}_i$ with $i = 1, 2$ in (49) and apply the above identity to prove the first part of (9). Similarly, set $\vec{\tau} = \vec{e}_i$ with $i = 1, 2$ in (50) and apply the above identity to prove the second part of (9). For the special case with Ω being a spherical shell, (10) easily follows from the definition $\kappa_i = -((\nabla \vec{n}) \vec{e}_i) \cdot \vec{e}_i$ so that $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = -r^{-1}$ at the outer boundary and $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = r^{-1}$ at the inner boundary (also note $\vec{n} = \pm \mathbf{e}_r$ at the outer/inner boundary). \square

7.2. Energy and enstrophy estimates in a thin shell with Navier boundary condition. Let norm $\|\cdot\|$ stand for the $L^2(\Omega)$ norm and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ for the $L^2(\Omega)$ inner product.

Proposition 2. *Consider (2) subject to the Navier boundary condition (3) with $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{g} \equiv \mathbf{0}$. Then, the energy $\|\mathbf{u}\|(t)$ is decreasing with time.*

Proof. Take the $L^2(\Omega)$ inner product of \mathbf{u} and the first equation of (2), noting the Coriolis term is perpendicular to \mathbf{u} ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu \langle \Delta \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle \\ &= \langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle + \langle \nabla q, \mathbf{u} \rangle \\ (54) \quad &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_t \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 + \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla |\mathbf{u}|^2 + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla q \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_t \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the last step is due to the Divergence Theorem, solid-wall boundary condition and $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0$.

Now, it is useful to derive a version of the Green's formula adapted to the Navier boundary condition. First, use $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0$ to rewrite $\Delta \mathbf{u} = \operatorname{div} \mathbf{S}$ so that

$$\langle \Delta \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \langle \operatorname{div} \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{u} \rangle = -\langle \mathbf{S}, \nabla \mathbf{u} \rangle + \int_{\partial \Omega} (\mathbf{S} \vec{n}) \cdot \mathbf{u}.$$

The second term is non-positive. In fact, at $\partial \Omega$, the Navier boundary condition (3) implies that \mathbf{u} is perpendicular to \vec{n} while $(\mathbf{S} \vec{n} + \lambda \mathbf{u})$ is parallel to \vec{n} . Therefore, with $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{g} \equiv 0$,

$$(55) \quad \int_{\partial \Omega} (\mathbf{S} \vec{n} + \lambda \mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0 \quad \text{so} \quad \int_{\partial \Omega} (\mathbf{S} \vec{n}) \cdot \mathbf{u} \leq 0.$$

For the $\langle \mathbf{S}, \nabla \mathbf{u} \rangle$ term, use the definition of inner-products between matrices and the fact $\mathbf{S}^\top = \mathbf{S}$ to obtain, $\langle \mathbf{S}, \nabla \mathbf{u} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{S}^\top, (\nabla \mathbf{u})^\top \rangle = \langle \mathbf{S}, (\nabla \mathbf{u})^\top \rangle$. Therefore,

$$\langle \mathbf{S}, \nabla \mathbf{u} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{S}, \nabla \mathbf{u} + (\nabla \mathbf{u})^\top \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{S}\|^2.$$

So, combine the above 3 equations to arrive at

$$\langle \Delta \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle \leq -\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{S}\|^2.$$

Together with (54), it implies

$$(56) \quad \partial_t \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq -\mu \|\mathbf{S}\|^2.$$

The proof is complete. \square

To obtain some estimates on the total enstrophy $\|\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}\|$, it suffices to estimate $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|^2$. Simply taking the time integral of the above inequality (56) will however not yield estimate on $\int_0^T \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|^2 dt$ because \mathbf{S} lacks the information on the anti-symmetric part of $\nabla \mathbf{u}$ (which actually coincides with $\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}$). The remedy is to employ another version of Green's formula

$$(57) \quad \langle \Delta \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle = -\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|^2 + \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \vec{n}} \cdot \mathbf{u}.$$

For the boundary term above, apply the first equation of (10) and the fact that $\vec{n} \cdot \mathbf{e}_r = \pm 1$ at the outer/inner boundary to obtain, at $\partial \Omega$,

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_h}{\partial \vec{n}} = [\mathbf{S} \vec{n}]_{\tan} + (\vec{n} \cdot \mathbf{e}_r) \frac{\mathbf{u}_h}{r}.$$

Then, by $\mathbf{u} \cdot \vec{n}|_{\partial \Omega} = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \vec{n}} \cdot \mathbf{u} &= \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_h}{\partial \vec{n}} \cdot \mathbf{u} \\ &= \int_{\partial \Omega} \left([\mathbf{S} \vec{n}]_{\tan} + (\vec{n} \cdot \mathbf{e}_r) \frac{\mathbf{u}_h}{r} \right) \cdot \mathbf{u} \\ &= \int_{\partial \Omega} \left([\mathbf{S} \vec{n}] + (\vec{n} \cdot \mathbf{e}_r) \frac{\mathbf{u}}{r} \right) \cdot \mathbf{u} \\ &\leq \int_{\partial \Omega} (\vec{n} \cdot \mathbf{e}_r) \frac{\mathbf{u}}{r} \cdot \mathbf{u} \quad \dots \text{ by (55)}. \end{aligned}$$

Effectively, there are no more derivatives of \mathbf{u} in the boundary integral (indeed this formula works for general domain). Thus, by applying the divergence theorem to the right side above to obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \vec{n}} \cdot \mathbf{u} &\leq \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div} (\mathbf{e}_r |\mathbf{u}|^2 r^{-1}) \\ &\leq C (\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\| \|\mathbf{u}\| + \|\mathbf{u}\|^2) \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line, we also used the Holder's inequality.

Plug it into (54), (57) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \partial_t \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 &\leq \mu \left(-\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|^2 + C(\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\| \|\mathbf{u}\| + \|\mathbf{u}\|^2) \right) \\ &\leq \mu \left(-\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|^2 + C \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

with a different constant C . Together with the decrease of energy $\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{u}_0\|^2$ due to (56), it implies

$$(58) \quad \int_0^T \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|^2 dt \leq \|\mathbf{u}_0\|^2 \left(\frac{1}{\mu} + CT \right).$$

REFERENCES

- [1] Vladimir I. Arnold and Boris A. Khesin. *Topological methods in hydrodynamics*, volume 125 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [2] A Babin, A Mahalov, and B Nicolaenko. Regularity and integrability of 3d euler and navier–stokes equations for rotating fluids. *Asymptotic Analysis*, 15(2):103–150, 1997.
- [3] Anatoli Babin, Alex Mahalov, and Basil Nicolaenko. Global regularity of 3d rotating navier-stokes equations for resonant domains. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 48(3):1133, 1999.
- [4] Anatoli Babin, Alex Mahalov, and Basil Nicolaenko. 3d navier-stokes and euler equations with initial data characterized by uniformly large vorticity. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 50(1):1–35, 2001.
- [5] Chongsheng Cao and Edriss S Titi. Global well–posedness of the 3d primitive equations with partial vertical turbulence mixing heat diffusion. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 310(2):537–568, 2012.
- [6] Bin Cheng and Alex Mahalov. Euler equation on a fast rotating sphere—time-averages and zonal flows. *Eur. J. Mech. B Fluids*, 37:48–58, 2013.
- [7] Bin Cheng and Alex Mahalov. Time-averages of fast oscillatory systems. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S*, 6(5):1151–1162, 2013.
- [8] James Y-K Cho and Lorenzo M Polvani. The emergence of jets and vortices in freely evolving, shallow-water turbulence on a sphere. *Physics of Fluids*, 8(6):1531–1552, 1996.
- [9] Alexandre J. Chorin and Jerrold E. Marsden. *A mathematical introduction to fluid mechanics*, volume 4 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, third edition, 1993.
- [10] P. A. Davidson. *An introduction to magnetohydrodynamics*. Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [11] Franco Flandoli and Alex Mahalov. Stochastic three-dimensional rotating navier–stokes equations: Averaging, convergence and regularity. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 205(1):195–237, 2012.
- [12] B. Galperin, S. Sukoriansky, N. Dikovskaya, P. L. Read, Y. H. Yamazaki, and R. Wordsworth. Anisotropic turbulence and zonal jets in rotating flows with a β effect. *Nonlinear Processes Geophys.*, 13:83–98, 2006.
- [13] Boris Galperin, Hideyuki Nakano, Huei-Ping Huang, and Semion Sukoriansky. The ubiquitous zonal jets in the atmospheres of giant planets and earths oceans. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 31:L13303, 2004.
- [14] E Garcia-Melendo and A Sánchez-Lavega. A study of the stability of jovian zonal winds from hst images: 1995–2000. *Icarus*, 152(2):316–330, 2001.
- [15] H.-P. Huang, B. Galperin, and S. Sukoriansky. Anisotropic spectra in two-dimensional turbulence on the surface of a rotating sphere. *Phys Fluids*, 13:225–240, 2001.
- [16] Dragoş Iftimie, Geneviève Raugel, and George R. Sell. Navier-Stokes equations in thin 3D domains with Navier boundary conditions. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 56(3):1083–1156, 2007.
- [17] Sergei Kuksin and Alberto Maiocchi. The limit of small rossby numbers for randomly forced quasi-geostrophic equation on β -plane. *ArXiv*, 2014.
- [18] Jacques-Louis Lions, Roger Temam, and Shou Hong Wang. Mathematical theory for the coupled atmosphere-ocean models. (CAO III). *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 74(2):105–163, 1995.
- [19] Jacques-Louis Lions, Roger Temam, and Shouhong Wang. New formulations of the primitive equations of atmosphere and applications. *Nonlinearity*, 5(2):237, 1992.
- [20] Jacques-Louis Lions, Roger Temam, and Shouhong Wang. A simple global model for the general circulation of the atmosphere. *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, 50(8):707–752, 1997.
- [21] Alex Mahalov. Multiscale modeling and nested simulations of three-dimensional ionospheric plasmas: Rayleigh-taylor turbulence and non-equilibrium layer dynamics at fine scales. *Physica Scripta, Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences*, 89:098001(22p), 2014.
- [22] Nikolai A. Maximenko, Bohyun Bang, and Hideharu Sasaki. Observational evidence of alternating zonal jets in the world ocean. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32(12), 2005.
- [23] Hideyuki Nakano and Hiroyasu Hasumi. A series of zonal jets embedded in the broad zonal flows in the pacific obtained in eddy-permitting ocean general circulation models. *Journal of physical oceanography*, 35(4):474–488, 2005.

- [24] NASA, JPL, and University of Arizona. <http://photojournal.jpl.nasa.gov/catalog/PIA02873>, high resolution globe of jupiter. 2001.
- [25] Toru Nozawa and Shigeo Yoden. Formation of zonal band structure in forced two-dimensional turbulence on a rotating sphere. *Phys. Fluids*, 9(7):2081–2093, 1997.
- [26] J. Pedlosky. *Geophysical Fluid Dynamics*. Springer, New York+625 pp, 1987.
- [27] Carolyn C. Porco, Robert A. West, Alfred McEwen, Anthony D. Del Genio, Andrew P. Ingersoll, Peter Thomas, Steve Squyres, Luke Dones, Carl D. Murray, Torrence V. Johnson, Joseph A. Burns, Andre Brahic, Gerhard Neukum, Joseph Veverka, John M. Barbara, Tilmann Denk, Michael Evans, Joseph J. Ferrier, Paul Geissler, Paul Helfenstein, Thomas Roatsch, Henry Throop, Matthew Tiscareno, and Ashwin R. Vasavada. Cassini Imaging of Jupiter’s Atmosphere, Satellites, and Rings. *Science*, 299:1541–1547, 2003.
- [28] Gunnar I Roden. Upper ocean thermohaline, oxygen, nutrient, and flow structure near the date line in the summer of 1993. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 103(C6):12919–12939, 1998.
- [29] Gunnar I Roden. Flow and water property structures between the bering sea and fiji in the summer of 1993. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 105(C12):28595–28612, 2000.
- [30] Semion Sukoriansky, Boris Galperin, and Nadejda Dikovskaya. Universal spectrum of two-dimensional turbulence on a rotating sphere and some basic features of atmospheric circulation on giant planets. *Physical review letters*, 89(12):124501, 2002.
- [31] Michael E. Taylor. *Partial differential equations I. Basic theory*, volume 115 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, New York, second edition, 2011.
- [32] Roger Temam and Mohammed Ziane. Navier-stokes equations in thin spherical domains. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 209:281–314, 1997.
- [33] G. K. Vallis and M. E. Maltrud. Generation of mean flows and jets on a beta-plane and over topography. *J. Phys. Oceanog.*, 23:1346–1362, 1993.
- [34] Jiro Watanabe. On incompressible viscous fluid flows with slip boundary conditions. In *Proceedings of the 6th Japan-China Joint Seminar on Numerical Mathematics (Tsukuba, 2002)*, volume 159, pages 161–172, 2003.
- [35] Andy A White, Brian J Hoskins, Ian Roulstone, and Andrew Staniforth. Consistent approximate models of the global atmosphere: shallow, deep, hydrostatic, quasi-hydrostatic and non-hydrostatic. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 131(609):2081–2107, 2005.