

LOCAL EXISTENCE FOR THE NON-RESISTIVE HALL-MAGNETO-HYDRODYNAMICS SYSTEM

MIMI DAI

ABSTRACT. Local in time existence of smooth solution is established for the incompressible inviscid (and viscous) non-resistive Hall-magneto-hydrodynamics system in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $s > 2 + \frac{n}{2}$, $n = 2, 3$. As a consequence, it removes a major assumption on the local existence of solutions in the work of Chae and Weng [7], where the authors constructed smooth initial data such that the solution, if exists, blows up at finite time in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for $s > \frac{7}{2}$.

KEY WORDS: Hall-magneto-hydrodynamics; local well-posedness; Littlewood-Paley theory.

CLASSIFICATION CODE: 76D03, 76W05, 35Q35, 35D35.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the incompressible non-resistive Hall-magneto-hydrodynamics (Hall-MHD) system:

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} u_t + u \cdot \nabla u - b \cdot \nabla b + \nabla p - \nu \Delta u &= 0, \\ b_t + u \cdot \nabla b - b \cdot \nabla u + \nabla \times ((\nabla \times b) \times b) &= 0, \\ \nabla \cdot u &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, \infty)$, $n \geq 2$, with the initial conditions

$$(1.2) \quad u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad b(x, 0) = b_0(x), \quad \nabla \cdot u_0 = \nabla \cdot b_0 = 0,$$

where u, p and b represent the fluid velocity, pressure and the magnetic field, respectively. One can observe that, if initially $\nabla \cdot b_0 = 0$, the magnetic field b will remain divergence free, see [4]. The Hall term $\nabla \times ((\nabla \times b) \times b)$ characterizes the feature of magnetic reconnection when the magnetic shear is large, which is the major cause of the investigation here. For physical background of the magnetic reconnection and the Hall-MHD model, we refer the readers to [13, 16, 18] and references therein. Mathematical aspects of this model can be found in, just to name a few, [1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11].

This paper concerns the local in time existence of strong solutions to (1.1) with $\nu \geq 0$ in Sobolev spaces. Below is the main result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\nu \geq 0$. Assume $(u_0, b_0) \in (H^s(\mathbb{R}^n))^2$ with $s > 2 + \frac{n}{2}$ and $\nabla \cdot u_0 = \nabla \cdot b_0 = 0$. There exists a time $T = T(\|u_0\|_{H^s}, \|b_0\|_{H^s}) > 0$ and a unique solution (u, b) of (1.1) on $[0, T]$ such that*

$$(u, b) \in (C([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)))^2.$$

Remark 1.2. Notice that standard bootstrap arguments imply that any solution of (1.1) in space $(C([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)))^2$ with $s > 2 + \frac{n}{2}$ is indeed smooth.

The principal contribution is that our result removes a major assumption of the conditional singularity formation result by Chae and Weng [7]. In [7], the authors constructed smooth initial data in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $s > \frac{7}{2}$, such that if there is a local in time smooth solution (u, b) to the 3D Hall-MHD system (1.1) emanating from this data, then the $H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ norm of the solution blows up in finite time. The authors specified that it seems difficult to show the local in time existence of smooth solution to (1.1) due to the Hall term. Thus, they could not rule out the possibility that (1.1) is locally ill-posed. Nevertheless, Theorem 1.1 here provides an affirmative answer that there exists a strong solution in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $s > \frac{7}{2}$ for a short time starting from initial data in the same space. In view of Remark 1.2 the strong solution obtained in Theorem 1.1 is actually smooth.

In addition, our result advances on the study of the local well-posedness problem for the Hall-MHD system. In particular, in [6], the authors considered the inviscid Hall-MHD system with fractional magnetic diffusion:

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{aligned} u_t + u \cdot \nabla u - b \cdot \nabla b + \nabla p &= 0, \\ b_t + u \cdot \nabla b - b \cdot \nabla u + \nabla \times ((\nabla \times b) \times b) + (-\Delta)^\alpha b &= 0, \\ \nabla \cdot u &= 0, \quad \nabla \cdot b = 0, \end{aligned}$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$. They showed that if $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$ and the initial data (u_0, b_0) is in $(H^s(\mathbb{R}^n))^2$ with $s > 1 + \frac{n}{2}$, there exists a unique solution (u, b) of (1.3) in $(L^\infty([0, T]; H^s))^2 \cap (C([0, T]; H^{s'}))^2$ for any $s' < s$ and some time $T > 0$. This result improved earlier work in [3, 4], where local existence of strong solutions was obtained only for $\alpha \geq 1$. In spite of that fact, the magnetic field diffusion cannot be taken weaker than $(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} b$ in [6]. Accordingly, by means of this, Theorem 1.1 improves all the aforementioned results since there is no diffusion in the magnetic field equation and the fluid viscosity ν is allowed to be zero in (1.1).

Finally, we explain briefly the strategy adopted to establish Theorem 1.1. As indicated above, the main difficulty lies in handling the Hall term in the absence of magnetic diffusion. Notice that, formally, (1.1) admits the basic energy law,

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|u(t)\|_2^2 + \|b(t)\|_2^2) + \nu \|\nabla u(t)\|_2^2 = 0,$$

which is the same as for the magneto-hydrodynamics system, i.e., (1.1) without the Hall term. Thus, for smooth solutions the Hall effect does not dissipate energy. Inspired by this fact, to overcome the obstacles caused by the Hall term, we need to fully exploit cancellations as a result of the special topological arrangement of the magnetic field lines. To take advantage of harmonic analysis techniques, we will use Littlewood-Paley decomposition. The task is to uncover cancellations in certain frequency shells after ‘‘chopping’’ the system into many sub-systems. Roughly speaking, Bony’s paraproduct will be employed to decompose the flux integrals; various commutators will be introduced to estimate the troublesome terms; and cancellations will be discovered on the level of decomposed shells. Indeed, the commutator estimates and cancellations discussed in Section 2 are the cornerstone to achieve a priori estimate in Section 3, which is a fundamental step in the proof of local existence of strong solutions to (1.1) in Section 4.

We conclude this section by remarking that our analysis gives an alternative proof of the local existence of the non-resistive MHD system by Fefferman et al.

in [12], that is, (1.1) without the Hall term has a unique local strong solution in $(H^s(\mathbb{R}^n))^2$ with $s > \frac{n}{2}$, see Remark 3.2 in Section 3.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation. It is convenient to denote by $A \lesssim B$ an estimate of the form $A \leq CB$ with some absolute constant C , and by $A \sim B$ an estimate of the form $C_1B \leq A \leq C_2B$ with some absolute constants C_1, C_2 . The norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^p}$ in space L^p is simplified to $\|\cdot\|_p$; and (\cdot, \cdot) stands for the L^2 -inner product.

2.2. Littlewood-Paley decomposition. The core techniques adopted in this paper are based on the Littlewood-Paley decomposition theory, which is recalled briefly in the following. For more detailed descriptions on this theory we refer the readers to the books [2] and [14].

A nonnegative radial function $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is chosen such that

$$\chi(\xi) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } |\xi| \leq \frac{3}{4} \\ 0, & \text{for } |\xi| \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Let $\lambda_q = 2^q$ for integers q . Next we define a sequence of bump functions,

$$\varphi(\xi) = \chi\left(\frac{\xi}{2}\right) - \chi(\xi), \quad \varphi_q(\xi) = \begin{cases} \varphi(\lambda_q^{-1}\xi) & \text{for } q \geq 0, \\ \chi(\xi) & \text{for } q = -1. \end{cases}$$

The Fourier transform and inverse Fourier transform are denoted by \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}^{-1} , respectively. For a tempered distribution vector field u we define the Littlewood-Paley projection

$$h = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi, \quad \tilde{h} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\chi,$$

$$u_q := \Delta_q u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\varphi(\lambda_q^{-1}\xi)\mathcal{F}u) = \lambda_q^n \int h(\lambda_q y)u(x-y)dy, \quad \text{for } q \geq 0,$$

$$u_{-1} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\chi(\xi)\mathcal{F}u) = \int \tilde{h}(y)u(x-y)dy.$$

By the Littlewood-Paley theory, the identity

$$u = \sum_{q=-1}^{\infty} u_q$$

holds in the sense of distribution, which indicates that the sequence of the smooth functions φ_q forms a dyadic partition of the unit. It is handy to denote the various summation terms by short symbols,

$$u_{\leq Q} = \sum_{q=-1}^Q u_q, \quad u_{(Q,N]} = \sum_{p=Q+1}^N u_p, \quad \tilde{u}_q = \sum_{|p-q| \leq 1} u_p.$$

Note that we can identify the norm of Sobolev space \dot{H}^s by

$$\|u\|_{\dot{H}^s} \sim \left(\sum_{q=-1}^{\infty} \lambda_q^{2s} \|u_q\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We recall Bernstein's inequality satisfied by the dyadic blocks u_q .

Lemma 2.1. (See [15].) *Let n be the space dimension and $r \geq s \geq 1$. Then for all tempered distributions u , we have*

$$(2.4) \quad \|u_q\|_r \lesssim \lambda_q^{n(\frac{1}{s}-\frac{1}{r})} \|u_q\|_s.$$

2.3. Bony's paraproduct and commutators. We choose the following version of Bony's paraproduct out of many flexible formulations,

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_q(u \cdot \nabla v) &= \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \Delta_q(u_{\leq p-2} \cdot \nabla v_p) + \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \Delta_q(u_p \cdot \nabla v_{\leq p-2}) \\ &+ \sum_{p \geq q-2} \Delta_q(\tilde{u}_p \cdot \nabla v_p), \end{aligned}$$

which will be used constantly to decompose the nonlinear terms in energy estimate. In order to have the flexibility to move derivatives, we introduce a commutator as

$$(2.6) \quad [\Delta_q, u_{\leq p-2} \cdot \nabla]v_p = \Delta_q(u_{\leq p-2} \cdot \nabla v_p) - u_{\leq p-2} \cdot \nabla \Delta_q v_p.$$

Lemma 2.2. *The following estimate holds, for any $1 < r < \infty$*

$$\|[\Delta_q, u_{\leq p-2} \cdot \nabla]v_p\|_r \lesssim \|\nabla u_{\leq p-2}\|_\infty \|v_p\|_r.$$

To treat the Hall term, two more commutators are defined for vector valued functions F and G ,

$$(2.7) \quad [\Delta_q, F \times \nabla \times]G = \Delta_q(F \times (\nabla \times G)) - F \times (\nabla \times G_q),$$

$$(2.8) \quad [\Delta_q, \nabla \times F \times]G = \Delta_q(\nabla \times F \times G) - \nabla \times F \times G_q,$$

which are crucial to reveal certain cancellations as well as move derivatives. They satisfy the estimates below.

Lemma 2.3. *Assume $\nabla \cdot F = 0$ and F, G vanish at large $|x| \in \mathbb{R}^3$. For any $1 < r < \infty$, we have*

$$\|[\Delta_q, F \times \nabla \times]G\|_r \lesssim \|\nabla F\|_\infty \|G\|_r;$$

$$\|[\Delta_q, \nabla \times F \times]G\|_r \lesssim \|\nabla F\|_\infty \|G\|_r.$$

Proof: The first inequality was obtained in [9]. We only prove the second one here. It follows from the definition of Δ_q and (2.8) that

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta_q, \nabla \times F \times]G &= \Delta_q(\nabla \times F \times G) - \nabla \times F \times G_q \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} h(\lambda_q(x-y)) \nabla \times (F(y) - F(x)) \times G(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Young's inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\Delta_q, \nabla \times F \times]G\|_r &\lesssim \|\nabla F\|_\infty \|G\|_r \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |h(\lambda_q(x-y))| dy \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla F\|_\infty \|G\|_r. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 2.4. *Assume the vector valued functions F , G and H vanish at large $|x| \in \mathbb{R}^3$. For any $1 < r_1, r_2 < \infty$ with $\frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2} = 1$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [\Delta_q, F \times \nabla \times] G \cdot \nabla \times H \, dx \right| &\lesssim \|\nabla^2 F\|_\infty \|G\|_{r_1} \|H\|_{r_2}; \\ \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [\Delta_q, \nabla \times F \times] G \cdot \nabla \times H \, dx \right| &\lesssim \|\nabla^2 F\|_\infty \|G\|_{r_1} \|H\|_{r_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof: Again, we only need to show the second inequality, for the first one was proved in [9]. The definition of Δ_q along with (2.8) indicates that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [\Delta_q, \nabla \times F \times] G \cdot \nabla \times H \, dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} h(\lambda_q(x-y)) \nabla_x \times (F(y) - F(x)) \times G(y) \cdot \nabla_x \times H(x) \, dy \, dx \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \lambda_q^3 \nabla_x h(\lambda_q(x-y)) \nabla_x \times (F(y) - F(x)) \times G(y) \cdot H(x) \, dy \, dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} h(\lambda_q(x-y)) \nabla_x \times \nabla_x \times (F(y) - F(x)) \times G(y) \cdot H(x) \, dy \, dx \\ &\equiv J_1 + J_2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, Young's inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned} |J_1| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \lambda_q^3 |\nabla_x h(\lambda_q(x-y)) \nabla_x \times (F(y) - F(x)) \times G(y)| \, dy |H(x)| \, dx \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \lambda_q^3 |x-y| |\nabla_x h(\lambda_q(x-y))| |G(y)| \frac{|\nabla_x \times (F(y) - F(x))|}{|x-y|} \, dy |H(x)| \, dx \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla^2 F\|_\infty \|G\|_{r_1} \|H\|_{r_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \lambda_q^3 |x-y| |\nabla_x h(\lambda_q(x-y))| \, dy \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla^2 F\|_\infty \|G\|_{r_1} \|H\|_{r_2} \end{aligned}$$

with $\frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2} = 1$, and also

$$\begin{aligned} |J_2| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |h(\lambda_q(x-y)) \nabla_x \times \nabla_x \times (F(y) - F(x)) \times G(y)| \, dy |H(x)| \, dx \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla^2 F\|_\infty \|G\|_{r_1} \|H\|_{r_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |h(\lambda_q(x-y))| \, dy \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla^2 F\|_\infty \|G\|_{r_1} \|H\|_{r_2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

3. A PRIORI ESTIMATE

The intuitive idea in regard to the local existence of (1.1) in H^s with $s > 2 + \frac{n}{2}$ comes from a priori estimate satisfied by smooth solutions in this space. Indeed, we prove

Theorem 3.1. *Let $(u_0, b_0) \in (H^s(\mathbb{R}^n))^2$ with $s > 2 + \frac{n}{2}$ and (u, b) be a smooth solution of (1.1) starting from the data (u_0, b_0) . There exists a time $T = T(\|u_0\|_{H^s}, \|b_0\|_{H^s}) > 0$, such that, for every $t \in [0, T]$ we have*

$$\|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b(t)\|_{H^s}^2 \leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b_0\|_{H^s}^2),$$

where the constant C depends on T , $\|u_0\|_{H^s}$, and $\|b_0\|_{H^s}$, but not on ν .

Proof: Multiplying the first equation of (1.1) by $\lambda_q^{2s} \Delta_q^2 u$ and the second one by $\lambda_q^{2s} \Delta_q^2 b$, and adding up for all $q \geq -1$ gives us

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{q \geq -1} (\lambda_q^{2s} \|u_q\|_2^2 + \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2) + \nu \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s+2} \|u_q\|_2^2 \\ & \leq I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 + I_5, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= - \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (u \cdot \nabla u) \cdot u_q \, dx, & I_2 &= \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (b \cdot \nabla b) \cdot u_q \, dx, \\ I_3 &= - \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (u \cdot \nabla b) \cdot b_q \, dx, & I_4 &= \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (b \cdot \nabla u) \cdot b_q \, dx, \\ I_5 &= \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q ((\nabla \times b) \times b) \cdot \nabla \times b_q \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

As known for smooth solutions, the energy flux $\int (u \cdot \nabla u) \cdot u \, dx$, $\int (u \cdot \nabla b) \cdot b \, dx$ and $\int ((\nabla \times b) \times b) \cdot \nabla \times b \, dx$ all vanish; while the combination $\int (b \cdot \nabla b) \cdot u \, dx + \int (b \cdot \nabla u) \cdot b \, dx$ is zero. Accordingly, we expect to see cancellations within each of the three terms, I_1 , I_3 and I_5 ; in contrast, we have to combine I_2 and I_4 to explore cancellations. With the tool of commutators and motivation of cancellations, estimates of I_1 , I_3 and $I_2 + I_4$ are rather straightforward; however, estimate of I_5 is more subtle and requires more effort.

In view of Bony's paraproduct (2.5), I_1 can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= - \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (u_{\leq p-2} \cdot \nabla u_p) \cdot u_q \, dx \\ &\quad - \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (u_p \cdot \nabla u_{\leq p-2}) \cdot u_q \, dx \\ &\quad - \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{p \geq q-2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (u_p \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_p) \cdot u_q \, dx \\ &= I_{11} + I_{12} + I_{13}; \end{aligned}$$

and then by commutator (2.6), I_{11} can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} I_{11} &= - \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [\Delta_q, u_{\leq p-2} \cdot \nabla] u_p \cdot u_q \, dx \\ &\quad - \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (u_{\leq q-2} \cdot \nabla \Delta_q u_p) \cdot u_q \, dx \\ &\quad - \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((u_{\leq p-2} - u_{\leq q-2}) \cdot \nabla \Delta_q u_p) \cdot u_q \, dx \\ &= I_{111} + I_{112} + I_{113}. \end{aligned}$$

The fact $\sum_{|p-q| \leq 2} \Delta_q u_p = u_q$ and $\nabla \cdot u_{\leq q-2} = 0$ asserts $I_{112} = 0$ after taking the action of integration by parts on the integral.

It follows from Hölder's inequality and the commutator estimate in Lemma 2.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{111}| &\leq \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|p-q| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \|\nabla u_{\leq p-2}\|_\infty \|u_p\|_2 \|u_q\|_2 \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla u\|_\infty \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|u_q\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

While I_{113} is simple,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{113}| &\leq \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|p-q| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \|u_{\leq p-2} - u_{\leq q-2}\|_2 \|\nabla u_p\|_\infty \|u_q\|_2 \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla u\|_\infty \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|u_q\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise I_{12} and I_{13} can be dealt with as I_{111} and I_{113} , respectively. Combining the estimates and analysis above yields

$$(3.10) \quad |I_1| \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_\infty \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|u_q\|_2^2.$$

We treat I_3 in the same spirit. Thus, without getting into details, it comes to

$$(3.11) \quad |I_3| \lesssim \|\nabla b\|_\infty \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} (\|u_q\|_2^2 + \|b_q\|_2^2).$$

We pause to mention that there is alternative way to estimate I_{111} and other non-zero terms in I_1 provided that $\nu > 0$. For instance, we utilize the diffusion of velocity to handle I_{111} ,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{111}| &\leq \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|p-q| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \|\nabla u_{\leq p-2}\|_\infty \|u_p\|_2 \|u_q\|_2 \\ &\leq \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|p-q| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \|u_p\|_2 \|u_q\|_2 \sum_{p' \leq p-2} \lambda_{p'} \|u_{p'}\|_\infty \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_\infty \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|p-q| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \lambda_p \|u_p\|_2 \|u_q\|_2 \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_\infty \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|p-q| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s+1} \|u_q\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{8} \nu \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s+2} \|u_q\|_2^2 + \frac{C}{\nu} \|u\|_\infty^2 \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|u_q\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

for an absolute constant C , where we observed that $\sum_{p' \leq p-2} \lambda_{p'} \sim \lambda_p$. Thus, in the case $\nu > 0$, we have

$$(3.12) \quad |I_1| \leq \frac{1}{8} \nu \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s+2} \|u_q\|_2^2 + \frac{C}{\nu} \|u\|_\infty^2 \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|u_q\|_2^2.$$

In analogy with the decomposition for I_1 , we reformulate I_2 and I_4 as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (b_{\leq p-2} \cdot \nabla b_p) \cdot u_q \, dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (b_p \cdot \nabla b_{\leq p-2}) \cdot u_q \, dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{p \geq q-2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (b_p \cdot \nabla \tilde{b}_p) \cdot u_q \, dx \\
&= I_{21} + I_{22} + I_{23},
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{21} &= \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [\Delta_q, b_{\leq p-2} \cdot \nabla] b_p \cdot u_q \, dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (b_{\leq q-2} \cdot \nabla \Delta_q b_p) \cdot u_q \, dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((b_{\leq p-2} - b_{\leq q-2}) \cdot \nabla \Delta_q b_p) \cdot u_q \, dx \\
&= I_{211} + I_{212} + I_{213};
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
I_4 &= \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (b_{\leq p-2} \cdot \nabla u_p) \cdot b_q \, dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (b_p \cdot \nabla u_{\leq p-2}) \cdot b_q \, dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{p \geq q-2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (\tilde{b}_p \cdot \nabla u_p) \cdot b_q \, dx \\
&= I_{41} + I_{42} + I_{43},
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{41} &= \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [\Delta_q, b_{\leq p-2} \cdot \nabla] u_p \cdot b_q \, dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (b_{\leq q-2} \cdot \nabla \Delta_q u_p) \cdot b_q \, dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} ((b_{\leq p-2} - b_{\leq q-2}) \cdot \nabla \Delta_q u_p) \cdot b_q \, dx \\
&= I_{411} + I_{412} + I_{413}.
\end{aligned}$$

Before estimating the sub-terms, we extract I_{212} and I_{412} , and add them up, which leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{212} + I_{412} &= \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (b_{\leq q-2} \cdot \nabla \Delta_q b_p) \cdot u_q \, dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (b_{\leq q-2} \cdot \nabla \Delta_q u_p) \cdot b_q \, dx \\
&= \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (b_{\leq q-2} \cdot \nabla b_q) \cdot u_q \, dx + \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (b_{\leq q-2} \cdot \nabla u_q) \cdot b_q \, dx \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, the second equality above is justified by the fact $\sum_{|p-q| \leq 2} \Delta_q b_p = b_q$ and $\sum_{|p-q| \leq 2} \Delta_q u_p = u_q$; the last equality follows from $\nabla \cdot (b_{\leq q-2}) = 0$ and integration by parts.

It is effortless to handle the rest terms in $I_2 + I_4$. We only show the estimate of one term, for instance I_{211} , by a routine use of Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_{211}| &\leq \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \|\nabla b_{\leq p-2}\|_{\infty} \|b_p\|_2 \|u_q\|_2 \\
&\lesssim \|\nabla b\|_{\infty} \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2 \|u_q\|_2 \\
&\lesssim \|\nabla b\|_{\infty} \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} (\|u_q\|_2^2 + \|b_q\|_2^2).
\end{aligned}$$

It then follows from the previous discussion that

$$(3.13) \quad |I_2 + I_4| \lesssim (\|\nabla b\|_{\infty} + \|\nabla u\|_{\infty}) \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} (\|u_q\|_2^2 + \|b_q\|_2^2).$$

It remains to estimate I_5 . The same strategy allows us to first decompose it to, by Bony's paraproduct

$$\begin{aligned}
I_5 &= \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (b_{\leq p-2} \times (\nabla \times b_p)) \cdot \nabla \times b_q \, dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (b_p \times (\nabla \times b_{\leq p-2})) \cdot \nabla \times b_q \, dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{p \geq q-2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (b_p \times (\nabla \times \tilde{b}_p)) \cdot \nabla \times b_q \, dx \\
&= I_{51} + I_{52} + I_{53};
\end{aligned}$$

and then rewrite I_{51} as, by adopting commutator (2.7),

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{51} &= \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [\Delta_q, b_{\leq p-2} \times \nabla \times] b_p \cdot \nabla \times b_q \, dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} b_{\leq q-2} \times (\nabla \times b_q) \cdot \nabla \times b_q \, dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|p-q| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (b_{\leq p-2} - b_{\leq q-2}) \times (\nabla \times (b_p)_q) \cdot \nabla \times b_q \, dx \\
&= I_{511} + I_{512} + I_{513},
\end{aligned}$$

where the fact $\sum_{|p-q| \leq 2} \Delta_q b_p = b_q$ is used again.

One can see $I_{512} = 0$ by the obvious cross product property. Another two terms in I_{51} are simple. By the commutator estimate in Lemma 2.4, we infer

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_{511}| &\lesssim \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|p-q| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \|\nabla^2 b_{\leq p-2}\|_\infty \|b_p\|_2 \|b_q\|_2 \\
&\lesssim \|\nabla^2 b\|_\infty \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2;
\end{aligned}$$

and by Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_{513}| &\leq \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|p-q| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |(b_{\leq p-2} - b_{\leq q-2}) \times (\nabla \times (b_p)_q) \cdot \nabla \times b_q| \, dx \\
&\lesssim \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|p-q| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \|\nabla b_q\|_\infty \|b_{\leq p-2} - b_{\leq q-2}\|_2 \|\nabla b_p\|_2 \\
&\lesssim \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|\nabla^2 b_q\|_\infty \|b_q\|_2 \|b_q\|_2 \\
&\lesssim \|\nabla^2 b\|_\infty \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We illustrate that I_{52} is a bad term by a heuristic comparison with other simple terms. As a matter of fact, in I_{52} one derivative is on high frequency quantity, i.e. $\nabla \times b_q$; and one derivative is on a sum of low frequency quantities, i.e. $\nabla \times b_{\leq p-2}$; as a contrast, say in I_{511} , two derivatives are moved to low frequency part $b_{\leq p-2}$ by virtue of the commutator. To break the barrier, we need to exploit a cancellation which is not obvious based on the current formulation. Therefore, we deconstruct

I_{52} by applying commutator (2.8),

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{52} &= \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Delta_q (\nabla \times b_{\leq p-2} \times b_p) \cdot \nabla \times b_q \, dx \\
&= \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|q-p| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [\Delta_q, \nabla \times b_{\leq p-2} \times] b_p \cdot \nabla \times b_q \, dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla \times b_{\leq q-2} \times b_q \cdot \nabla \times b_q \, dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{|p-q| \leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla \times (b_{\leq p-2} - b_{\leq q-2}) \times (b_p)_q \cdot \nabla \times b_q \, dx \\
&= I_{521} + I_{522} + I_{523}.
\end{aligned}$$

Among the three terms, I_{522} is the worst one; applying the second commutator estimate in Lemma 2.4, I_{521} can be estimated as I_{511} ; while I_{523} share the same estimate as I_{513} .

We focus on I_{522} . Applying integration by parts, the identity

$$(3.14) \quad \nabla \times (A \times B) = [(B \cdot \nabla)A - (\nabla \cdot A)B] - [(A \cdot \nabla)B - (\nabla \cdot B)A],$$

and the fact that $\nabla \cdot b_q = 0$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{522} &= \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla \times (\nabla \times b_{\leq q-2} \times b_q) \cdot b_q \, dx \\
&= \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [(b_q \cdot \nabla) \nabla \times b_{\leq q-2} - (\nabla \cdot \nabla \times b_{\leq q-2}) b_q] \cdot b_q \, dx \\
&\quad - \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\nabla \times b_{\leq q-2} \cdot \nabla) b_q \cdot b_q \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\nabla \cdot (\nabla \times b_{\leq q-2}) = 0$, integration by parts in the last integral gives

$$\sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\nabla \times b_{\leq q-2} \cdot \nabla) b_q \cdot b_q \, dx = 0.$$

Therefore, I_{522} turns out to be simple now, and can be estimated as (see the estimate for I_{511})

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_{522}| &\leq \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |[(b_q \cdot \nabla) \nabla \times b_{\leq q-2} - (\nabla \cdot \nabla \times b_{\leq q-2}) b_q] \cdot b_q| \, dx \\
&\lesssim \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|\nabla^2 b_{\leq q-2}\|_{\infty} \|b_q\|_2^2 \\
&\lesssim \|\nabla^2 b\|_{\infty} \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate I_{53} , we use Hölder's and Bernstein's inequalities to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_{53}| &\leq \sum_{q \geq -1} \sum_{p \geq q-2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\Delta_q(b_p \times \nabla \times \tilde{b}_p) \cdot \nabla \times b_q| dx \\
&\lesssim \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|\nabla b_q\|_\infty \sum_{p \geq q-3} \|b_p\|_2 \|\nabla \tilde{b}_p\|_2 \\
&\lesssim \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s+1+\frac{n}{2}} \|b_q\|_2 \sum_{p \geq q-3} \lambda_p \|b_p\|_2^2 \\
&\lesssim \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^s \|b_q\|_2 \lambda_q^{2+\frac{n}{2}-s} \sum_{p \geq q-3} \lambda_p^{2s} \|b_p\|_2^2 \lambda_{q-p}^{2s-1},
\end{aligned}$$

and then continue with Young's and Jensen's inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_{53}| &\lesssim \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2 + \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2(2+\frac{n}{2}-s)} \left(\sum_{p \geq q-3} \lambda_p^{2s} \|b_p\|_2^2 \lambda_{q-p}^{2s-1} \right)^2 \\
&\lesssim \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2 + \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2(2+\frac{n}{2}-s)} \sum_{p \geq q-3} \lambda_p^{4s} \|b_p\|_2^4 \\
&\lesssim \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2 + \sum_{p \geq -1} \lambda_p^{4s} \|b_p\|_2^4 \sum_{-1 \leq q \leq p+3} \lambda_q^{2(2+\frac{n}{2}-s)} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2 + \left(\sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2 \right)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

provided that $s > 2 + \frac{n}{2}$.

Collecting all the estimates for sub-items of I_5 leads to

$$(3.15) \quad |I_5| \lesssim (\|\nabla^2 b\|_\infty + 1) \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2 + \left(\sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2 \right)^2.$$

Combining (3.9)–(3.11), (3.13), and (3.15), there exist absolute constants C_1 , C_2 and C_3 such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt} (\|u\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2 + \|b\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2) + 2\nu \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s+2} \|u_q\|_2^2 \\
(3.16) \quad &\leq C_1 (\|\nabla u\|_\infty + \|\nabla b\|_\infty) \left(\sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|u_q\|_2^2 + \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2 \right) \\
&\quad + C_2 (\|\nabla^2 b\|_\infty + 1) \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2 + C_3 \left(\sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2 \right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

which holds for all $\nu \geq 0$; and by (3.12) and similar strategy for I_2, I_3, I_4 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} (\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b\|_{H^s}^2) + \nu \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s+2} \|u_q\|_2^2 \\
(3.17) \quad & \leq C_1 (\|u\|_\infty^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2) \left(\sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|u_q\|_2^2 + \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2 \right) \\
& \quad + C_2 (\|\nabla^2 b\|_\infty + 1) \sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2 + C_3 \left(\sum_{q \geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \|b_q\|_2^2 \right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

only for $\nu > 0$.

To continue, the following embeddings are recalled

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.18) \quad & \|u\|_\infty \lesssim \|u\|_{H^s}, \quad \|b\|_\infty \lesssim \|b\|_{H^s} \quad \text{for } s > \frac{n}{2}; \\
& \|\nabla u\|_\infty \lesssim \|u\|_{H^s}, \quad \|\nabla b\|_\infty \lesssim \|b\|_{H^s} \quad \text{for } s > 1 + \frac{n}{2}; \\
& \|\nabla^2 b\|_\infty \lesssim \|b\|_{H^s} \quad \text{for } s > 2 + \frac{n}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

We focus on the more general case $\nu \geq 0$. Inserting (3.18) into (3.16) yields, for some absolute constants C'_1, C'_2 and C

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.19) \quad & \frac{d}{dt} (\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b\|_{H^s}^2) + 2\nu \|u\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 \\
& \leq C'_1 (\|u\|_{H^s} + \|b\|_{H^s} + 1) (\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b\|_{H^s}^2) + C'_2 \|b\|_{H^s}^4 \\
& \leq C (\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b\|_{H^s}^2) + C (\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b\|_{H^s}^2)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Solving the ordinary differential inequality (3.19), it is not hard to obtain that for an absolute constant C

$$(3.20) \quad \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b(t)\|_{H^s}^2 \leq \frac{(\|u_0\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b_0\|_{H^s}^2) e^{Ct}}{1 + \|u_0\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b_0\|_{H^s}^2 - (\|u_0\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b_0\|_{H^s}^2) e^{Ct}},$$

for $0 \leq t < \frac{1}{C} \log \frac{1 + \|u_0\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b_0\|_{H^s}^2}{\|u_0\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b_0\|_{H^s}^2}$, which completes the proof. \square

We end this section with a discussion on the assumption of the index s .

Remark 3.2. The condition $s > 2 + \frac{n}{2}$ is only required to deal with I_5 ; instead, in the case $\nu = 0$, condition $s > 1 + \frac{n}{2}$ is sufficient to guarantee that the estimates for all of I_k with $k = 1, \dots, 4$ go through, by virtue of (3.16) and (3.18); while in the case of $\nu > 0$, a weaker condition $s > \frac{n}{2}$ is enough to deal with the rest four terms, in view of (3.17) and (3.18).

4. LOCAL-IN-TIME EXISTENCE OF SOLUTIONS

Now we turn our attention to the proof of Theorem 1.1 which will be divided into several steps. Having obtained suitable a priori estimates, the strategy to show the local existence of solutions to (1.1) with $\nu \geq 0$ is rather standard (see e.g., Chap. 3.2 of [17]). More precisely, we first consider a regularized system of equations for which we can apply the Picard theorem to, and establish global

existence of solutions. Second, we justify that the family of regularized solutions forms a Cauchy sequence in $C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))^2$ and converges to a pair of functions (u, b) which is indeed a solution to (1.1).

4.1. Existence of solutions to the regularized equations. We start with introducing a mollifier \mathcal{J}_ϵ which will be used to regularize the equations. For any radial function ρ satisfying

$$\rho(|x|) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad \rho \geq 0, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho dx = 1,$$

we define the operator \mathcal{J}_ϵ for any $\epsilon > 0$ on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$,

$$(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon v)(x) = \epsilon^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{x-y}{\epsilon}\right) v(y) dy.$$

Lemma 4.1. [17] *Let \mathcal{J}_ϵ be the mollifier defined above. Then $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon v \in C^\infty$ and (i) for all $v \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon v$ converges to v uniformly on any compact set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, and*

$$\|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon v\|_\infty \leq \|v\|_\infty;$$

(ii) \mathcal{J}_ϵ commutes with distribution derivatives,

$$D^\beta \mathcal{J}_\epsilon v = \mathcal{J}_\epsilon D^\beta v;$$

(iii) for all $u \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $v \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u)v dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon v) dx;$$

(iv) for all $v \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon v$ converges to v in H^s as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, and

$$\|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon v - v\|_{H^{s-1}} \leq C\epsilon \|v\|_{H^s};$$

(v) for all $v \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$, and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon v\|_{H^{s+k}} \leq C_{s,k} \epsilon^{-k} \|v\|_{H^s}, \quad \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon D^k v\|_\infty \leq C_k \epsilon^{-n/2-k} \|v\|_2.$$

Denote the Leray projection operator by P which projects functions to divergence-free functions and commutes with derivatives and \mathcal{J}_ϵ . System (1.1) can be approximated by the following regularized system

$$(4.21) \quad \begin{aligned} u_t &= -P\mathcal{J}_\epsilon[(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u) \cdot \nabla(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u)] + P\mathcal{J}_\epsilon[(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b) \cdot \nabla(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b)] + \nu \mathcal{J}_\epsilon^2 \Delta u \\ b_t &= -P\mathcal{J}_\epsilon[(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u) \cdot \nabla(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b)] + P\mathcal{J}_\epsilon[(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b) \cdot \nabla(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u)] \\ &\quad - P\mathcal{J}_\epsilon[\nabla \times (\nabla \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b)], \end{aligned}$$

for which we denote the right hand side by

$$\begin{aligned} F_\epsilon(u, b) &= -P\mathcal{J}_\epsilon[(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u) \cdot \nabla(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u)] + P\mathcal{J}_\epsilon[(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b) \cdot \nabla(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b)] + \nu \mathcal{J}_\epsilon^2 \Delta u \\ G_\epsilon(u, b) &= -P\mathcal{J}_\epsilon[(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u) \cdot \nabla(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b)] + P\mathcal{J}_\epsilon[(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b) \cdot \nabla(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u)] \\ &\quad - P\mathcal{J}_\epsilon[\nabla \times (\nabla \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b)]. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4.2. *For any given initial data $(u_0, b_0) \in (H^m)^2$, $m \geq 0$, with $\nabla \cdot u_0 = 0$ and $\nabla \cdot b_0 = 0$, and for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a unique solution $(u^\epsilon, b^\epsilon) \in (C^1([0, \infty); H^m))^2$ to (4.21), which satisfies*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t < \infty} (\|u^\epsilon(t)\|_2^2 + \|b^\epsilon(t)\|_2^2) \leq \|u_0\|_2^2 + \|b_0\|_2^2.$$

Proof: The two equations in (4.21) can be treated as autonomous ODEs. By Picard theorem, if F_ϵ and G_ϵ are (locally) Lipschitz continuous on $H^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$, there exists a unique solution to (4.21) in $C^1([0, \infty); H^m)$. We only verify that the Hall term is Lipschitz continuous, since for the other terms it is rather standard. Assume $b_1, b_2 \in H^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon[\nabla \times (\nabla \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b_1 \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b_1)] - \mathcal{J}_\epsilon[\nabla \times (\nabla \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b_2 \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b_2)]\|_{H^m} \\ & \leq \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon[\nabla \times (\nabla \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b_1 \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon (b_1 - b_2))]\|_{H^m} + \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon[\nabla \times (\nabla \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon (b_1 - b_2) \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b_2)]\|_{H^m} \\ & \lesssim \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b_1\|_\infty \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon (b_1 - b_2)\|_{H^{m+2}} + \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b_1\|_{H^{m+2}} \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon (b_1 - b_2)\|_\infty \\ & \quad + \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b_2\|_\infty \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon (b_1 - b_2)\|_{H^{m+2}} + \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b_2\|_{H^{m+2}} \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon (b_1 - b_2)\|_\infty \\ & \lesssim \epsilon^{-n/2-2} (\|b_1\|_2 + \|b_2\|_2) \|b_1 - b_2\|_{H^m} \\ & \leq C(\|b_1\|_2, \|b_2\|_2, \epsilon, n) \|b_1 - b_2\|_{H^m} \end{aligned}$$

where estimates (i) and (v) in Lemma 4.1 were used.

To show that (4.21) admits the basic energy law, multiplying the first equation in (4.21) by u and the second one by b , integrating and applying (iii) in Lemma 4.1 yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u|^2 + |b|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nu |\mathcal{J}_\epsilon \nabla u|^2 dx \\ & = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u \cdot \nabla) \mathcal{J}_\epsilon u \cdot \mathcal{J}_\epsilon u dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \cdot \nabla) \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \cdot \mathcal{J}_\epsilon u dx \\ & \quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u \cdot \nabla) \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \cdot \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \cdot \nabla) \mathcal{J}_\epsilon u \cdot \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b dx \\ & \quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla \times (\nabla \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b) \cdot \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\nabla \cdot \mathcal{J}_\epsilon u = \mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\nabla \cdot u) = 0$, and $\nabla \cdot \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b = 0$, applying integration by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u \cdot \nabla) \mathcal{J}_\epsilon u \cdot \mathcal{J}_\epsilon u dx = 0, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u \cdot \nabla) \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \cdot \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b dx = 0, \\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \cdot \nabla) \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \cdot \mathcal{J}_\epsilon u dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \cdot \nabla) \mathcal{J}_\epsilon u \cdot \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b dx \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \cdot \nabla) \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \cdot \mathcal{J}_\epsilon u dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \cdot \nabla) \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \cdot \mathcal{J}_\epsilon u dx \\ & = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Also, integrating by parts on the last term yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla \times (\nabla \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b) \cdot \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b \cdot \nabla \times \mathcal{J}_\epsilon b dx = 0.$$

Thus, we obtain the energy identity

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u|^2 + |b|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nu |\mathcal{J}_\epsilon \nabla u|^2 dx = 0.$$

Therefore, for any solution (u^ϵ, b^ϵ) of (4.21) with $\nu \geq 0$, the basic energy law holds

$$\sup_{0 \leq t < \infty} (\|u^\epsilon(t)\|_2^2 + \|b^\epsilon(t)\|_2^2) \leq \|u_0\|_2^2 + \|b_0\|_2^2.$$

□

4.2. Convergence of the regularized solutions.

Theorem 4.3. *Given any initial data $(u_0, b_0) \in (H^s)^2$ with $s > 2 + n/2$, $\nabla \cdot u_0 = 0$ and $\nabla \cdot b_0 = 0$, the following statements hold:*

(i) *There exists a time $T = T(\|u_0\|_{H^s}, \|b_0\|_{H^s})$ such that for any $\nu \geq 0$ a subsequence of the approximating solutions (u^ϵ, b^ϵ) of (4.21) converges to a limit $(u, b) \in (L^\infty([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap C_w([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)))^2$.*

(ii) *The approximating solutions (u^ϵ, b^ϵ) and the limit (u, b) satisfy the higher-order energy estimates*

$$(4.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\|u^\epsilon\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b^\epsilon\|_{H^s}^2) &\leq C(s, T, \|u_0\|_{H^s}, \|b_0\|_{H^s}) (\|u_0\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b_0\|_{H^s}^2), \\ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b\|_{H^s}^2) &\leq C(s, T, \|u_0\|_{H^s}, \|b_0\|_{H^s}) (\|u_0\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b_0\|_{H^s}^2). \end{aligned}$$

(iii) *The limit (u, b) is a classical solution to (1.1) on $[0, T]$.*

Proof: We consider (ii) first. Indeed, applying the analysis in Section 3 to the regularized system (4.21), we obtain that the first estimate in (4.22) holds for $s > 2 + n/2$ and a certain time $T > 0$. Notice that the estimate is independent of ϵ , and thus the second estimate in (4.22) holds as well after taking the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, by virtue of (3.19), one can infer $u^\epsilon \in L^2(0, T; H^{s+1})$ and $u \in L^2(0, T; H^{s+1})$. It then follows from the first equation of (4.21) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_t^\epsilon\|_{H^{s-1}} &\leq \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon[(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u) \cdot \nabla(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u)]\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon[(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b) \cdot \nabla(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b)]\|_{H^{s-1}} \\ &\quad + \nu \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon^2 \Delta u^\epsilon\|_{H^{s-1}} \\ &\leq C \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u^\epsilon\|_{H^s}^2 + C \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon b^\epsilon\|_{H^s}^2 + C \nu \|\mathcal{J}_\epsilon u^\epsilon\|_{H^{s+1}} \\ &\leq C \|u^\epsilon\|_{H^s}^2 + C \|b^\epsilon\|_{H^s}^2 + C \nu \|u^\epsilon\|_{H^{s+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining with $u^\epsilon \in L^\infty(0, T; H^s)$, $b^\epsilon \in L^\infty(0, T; H^s)$ and $u^\epsilon \in L^2(0, T; H^{s+1})$, we deduce that $u_t^\epsilon \in L^2(0, T; H^{s-1})$ and hence $u_t \in L^2(0, T; H^{s-1})$. Then the fact of $u \in L^2(0, T; H^{s+1})$ and $u_t \in L^2(0, T; H^{s-1})$ indicates

$$(4.23) \quad u \in C([0, T]; H^s).$$

To show the convergence in (i), we first justify that the sequence of approximating solutions $\{(u^\epsilon, b^\epsilon)\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2 \times L^2$. That is,

$$\|(u^\epsilon, b^\epsilon) - (u^{\epsilon'}, b^{\epsilon'})\|_2 \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon, \epsilon' \rightarrow 0.$$

The flux from the four nonlinear terms $u^\epsilon \cdot \nabla u^\epsilon$, $b^\epsilon \cdot \nabla b^\epsilon$, $u^\epsilon \cdot \nabla b^\epsilon$, and $b^\epsilon \cdot \nabla u^\epsilon$ can be handled in an analogous way as for the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations, see Chapter 3 of [17]. Whence, we only show the estimate for the Hall term in the

following

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.24) \quad & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [(\nabla \times ((\nabla \times b^\epsilon) \times b^\epsilon)) - (\nabla \times ((\nabla \times b^{\epsilon'}) \times b^{\epsilon'}))] \cdot (b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}) dx \\
& = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [\nabla \times ((\nabla \times (b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'})) \times b^\epsilon)] \cdot (b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}) dx \\
& \quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [\nabla \times ((\nabla \times b^\epsilon) \times (b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}))] \cdot (b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

The first integral on the right hand side vanishes. By identity (3.14), the second one can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [\nabla \times ((\nabla \times b^\epsilon) \times (b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}))] \cdot (b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}) dx \\
& = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [(b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}) \cdot \nabla(\nabla \times b^\epsilon)] \cdot (b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}) dx \\
& \quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [\nabla \times b^\epsilon \cdot \nabla(b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'})] \cdot (b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\nabla \cdot (\nabla \times b^\epsilon) = 0$, the second integral on the right hand side of the equation above vanishes as well. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [(\nabla \times ((\nabla \times b^\epsilon) \times b^\epsilon)) - (\nabla \times ((\nabla \times b^{\epsilon'}) \times b^{\epsilon'}))] \cdot (b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}) dx \right| \\
& = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [(b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}) \cdot \nabla(\nabla \times b^\epsilon)] \cdot (b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}) dx \right| \\
& \lesssim \|\nabla^2 b^\epsilon\|_\infty \|b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}\|_2^2 \\
& \lesssim \|b^\epsilon\|_{H^s} \|b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}\|_2^2,
\end{aligned}$$

for $s > 2 + \frac{n}{2}$. As a consequence, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.25) \quad & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\|u^\epsilon - u^{\epsilon'}\|_2^2 + \|b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}\|_2^2 \right) + \nu \|\nabla(u^\epsilon - u^{\epsilon'})\|_2^2 \\
& \leq C (\|u^\epsilon\|_{H^s} + \|b^\epsilon\|_{H^s}) \left(\|u^\epsilon - u^{\epsilon'}\|_2^2 + \|b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}\|_2^2 \right) \\
& \leq C(T, s, \|u_0^\epsilon\|_{H^s}, \|b_0^\epsilon\|_{H^s}) \left(\|u^\epsilon - u^{\epsilon'}\|_2^2 + \|b^\epsilon - b^{\epsilon'}\|_2^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that, for the sake of brevity, we omitted the mollifiers \mathcal{J}_ϵ and $\mathcal{J}_{\epsilon'}$ in (4.24); otherwise, there would be small terms of the order of ϵ and ϵ' on the right hand side of (4.25).

Recall that $u^\epsilon(0) = u^{\epsilon'}(0)$ and $b^\epsilon(0) = b^{\epsilon'}(0)$, by means of Grönwall's inequality applied to (4.25), we deduce $\{(u^\epsilon, b^\epsilon)\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $(C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)))^2$. Therefore, we have the strong convergence

$$(4.26) \quad u^\epsilon \rightarrow u, \quad b^\epsilon \rightarrow b, \quad \text{in } C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)).$$

Next we show the strong convergence in the high norm $C([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{R}^n))$. By Sobolev's inequality we have that for all $v \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $0 < s' < s$, there exists a constant C_s such that

$$\|u\|_{H^{s'}} \leq C_s \|v\|_2^{1 - \frac{s'}{s}} \|u\|_{H^s}^{\frac{s'}{s}}.$$

Thus, for $s > s' > 2 + \frac{n}{2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|b^\epsilon - b\|_{H^{s'}} &\leq C_s \|b^\epsilon - b\|_2^{1 - \frac{s'}{s}} \|b^\epsilon - b\|_{H^s}^{\frac{s'}{s}} \\ &\leq C_s \|b^\epsilon - b\|_2^{1 - \frac{s'}{s}} \left(\|b^\epsilon\|_{H^s}^{\frac{s'}{s}} + \|b\|_{H^s}^{\frac{s'}{s}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|b^\epsilon\|_{H^s}$ and $\|b\|_{H^s}$ are bounded for $s > 2 + \frac{n}{2}$, the last inequality combining (4.26) yields that

$$(4.27) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|b^\epsilon(t) - b(t)\|_{H^{s'}} = 0, \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad s > s' > 2 + \frac{n}{2}.$$

That is, $\{b^\epsilon\}$ converges strongly to b in $C([0, T]; H^{s'})$ for $s' > 2 + \frac{n}{2}$. It then follows that for any $\varphi \in H^{-s'}$,

$$(4.28) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} b^\epsilon(x, t) \varphi(x) dx \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} b(x, t) \varphi(x) dx \quad \text{uniformly on } [0, T].$$

Since $H^{-s'}$ is dense in H^{-s} for $s' < s$, the convergence (4.28) actually holds for any $\varphi \in H^{-s}$. Thus, we have $b \in C_w([0, T]; H^s)$.

The strong convergence in (4.27) is sufficient to justify that the limit (u, b) is a classical solution to system (1.1) as stated in (iii). \square

4.3. Uniqueness and Continuity.

Theorem 4.4. *The limit solution (u, b) obtained in Theorem 4.3 belongs to $(C([0, T]; H^s))^2$ with $s > 2 + \frac{n}{2}$. Moreover, if (u^*, b^*) and (u', b') are two solutions in $(C([0, T]; H^s))^2$ with the same initial data (u_0, b_0) , then $(u^*, b^*) \equiv (u', b')$.*

Proof: We start with uniqueness. Take the difference of the two solutions $u = u^* - u'$ and $b = b^* - b'$, which satisfy the equations

$$(4.29) \quad \begin{aligned} u_t + u^* \cdot \nabla u - b^* \cdot \nabla b + \nabla \tilde{p} - \nu \Delta u &= -u \cdot \nabla u' + b \cdot \nabla b' \\ b_t + u^* \cdot \nabla b - b^* \cdot \nabla u + \nabla \times (\nabla \times b^* \times b) &= b \cdot \nabla u' - u \cdot \nabla b' - \nabla \times (\nabla \times b \times b') \\ \nabla \cdot u &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying the first equation in (4.29) by u and the second one by b , integrating them over space \mathbb{R}^n and time $[0, t]$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} (\|u(t)\|_2^2 + \|b(t)\|_2^2) + \nu \int_0^t \|\nabla u\|_2^2 d\tau \\ &= - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u \cdot \nabla) u' \cdot u dx d\tau + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (b \cdot \nabla) b' \cdot u dx d\tau + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (b \cdot \nabla) u' \cdot b dx d\tau \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u \cdot \nabla) b' \cdot b dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla \times (\nabla \times b^* \times b) \cdot b dx d\tau \\ &\equiv K_1 + K_2 + K_3 + K_4 + K_5, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u^* \cdot \nabla) u \cdot u dx = 0$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u^* \cdot \nabla) b \cdot b dx = 0$, and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (b^* \cdot \nabla) b \cdot u dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (b^* \cdot \nabla) u \cdot b dx = 0$ hold for $(u^*, b^*), (u', b')$ in $(C([0, T]; H^s))^2$

with $s > 2 + \frac{n}{2}$. We first observe that

$$|K_1 + K_2 + K_3 + K_4| \leq C \int_0^t (\|\nabla u'\|_\infty + \|\nabla b'\|_\infty) (\|u(\tau)\|_2^2 + \|b(\tau)\|_2^2) d\tau.$$

Applying identity (3.14) to K_5 , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla \times (\nabla \times b^* \times b) \cdot b dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [b \cdot \nabla(\nabla \times b^*)] \cdot b dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [\nabla \times b^* \cdot \nabla b] \cdot b dx. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the second term vanishes due to the fact of $\nabla \cdot (\nabla \times b^*) = 0$. Thus,

$$|K_5| = \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [b \cdot \nabla(\nabla \times b^*)] \cdot b dx d\tau \right| \leq \int_0^t \|\nabla^2 b^*(\tau)\|_\infty \|b(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau.$$

Combining the above estimates, we obtain

$$\|u(t)\|_2^2 + \|b(t)\|_2^2 \leq C \int_0^t (\|\nabla u'\|_\infty + \|\nabla b'\|_\infty + \|\nabla^2 b^*\|_\infty) (\|u(\tau)\|_2^2 + \|b(\tau)\|_2^2) d\tau.$$

It follows from the integral form of Grönwall's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u(t)\|_2^2 + \|b(t)\|_2^2 \\ & \leq C(\|u(0)\|_2^2 + \|b(0)\|_2^2) \exp \left(\int_0^t (\|\nabla u'(\tau)\|_\infty + \|\nabla b'(\tau)\|_\infty + \|\nabla^2 b^*(\tau)\|_\infty) d\tau \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $u(0) = u^*(0) - u'(0) = 0$ and $b(0) = b^*(0) - b'(0) = 0$, it implies $u(t) \equiv 0$ and $b(t) \equiv 0$, which shows the uniqueness.

To prove $(u, b) \in (C([0, T]; H^s))^2$, we only need to show that the norm $\|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b(t)\|_{H^s}^2$ is continuous in time, by the virtue of $(u, b) \in (C_w([0, T]; H^s))^2$. Denote $\phi(t) = \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b(t)\|_{H^s}^2$, and $\phi^\epsilon(t) = \|u^\epsilon(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b^\epsilon(t)\|_{H^s}^2$. Notice that inequality (3.20) is valid for the approximating solutions (u^ϵ, b^ϵ) . Due to the fact that ϕ^ϵ converge weakly to ϕ and hence $\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \phi^\epsilon(t) \geq \phi(t)$ for every fixed t , it follows that (3.20) is valid for the limit solution (u, b) as well, that is

$$\phi(t) \leq \frac{\phi(0)e^{Ct}}{1 + \phi(0) - \phi(0)e^{Ct}}, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t < \frac{1}{C} \log \frac{1 + \phi(0)}{\phi(0)},$$

which implies

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \phi(t) \leq \phi(0).$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \phi(t) \geq \phi(0)$$

since $(u, b) \in (C_w([0, T]; H^s))^2$. It then follows that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \phi(t) = \phi(0)$, which indicates the strong right continuity at $t = 0$.

To prove the continuity of $\phi(t)$ at time other than the initial time, we divide it into two cases depending on the value of ν .

Case $\nu = 0$: At an arbitrary time $t_0 \in (0, T]$, applying the aforementioned argument gives that $\phi(t)$ is continuous from the right at time t_0 . By the virtue of the fact that the inviscid non-resistive Hall-MHD system is time-reversible, $\phi(t)$ is also continuous from the left at time t_0 . Therefore, $\phi(t)$ is continuous on $[0, T]$.

Case $\nu > 0$: By the same argument above, $\phi(t)$ is still continuous from the right at an arbitrary time $t_0 \in (0, T]$. In conjunction of $(u, b) \in (C_w([0, T]; H^s))^2$, the solution (u, b) is also continuous from the right at t_0 . Since the magnetic equation is non-resistive and hence reversible, b is continuous from the left at t_0 as well. Regarding the velocity field u , the estimates $u \in L^2([0, T]; H^{s+1})$ and $u_t \in L^2([0, T]; H^{s-1})$ holds. It follows that $u \in C([0, T]; H^s)$, see Evans' book, Chap. 5.9, Theorem 4.

Finally, in view of Theorems 4.3 and 4.4, the proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Acheritogaray, P. Degond, A. Frouvelle and J-G. Liu. *Kinetic formulation and global existence for the Hall-Magnetohydrodynamic system*. Kinetic and Related Models, 4: 901–918, 2011.
- [2] H. Bahouri, J. Chemin, and R. Danchin. *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations*. Grundlehrender Mathematischen Wissenschaften, 343. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [3] D. Chae, P. Degond and J-G. Liu. *Well-posedness for Hall-magnetohydrodynamics*. arXiv:1212.3919, 2012.
- [4] D. Chae and J. Lee. *On the blow-up criterion and small data global existence for the Hall-magneto-hydrodynamics*. J. Differential Equations, 256: 3835–3858, 2014.
- [5] D. Chae, and M. Schonbek. *On the temporal decay for the Hall-magnetohydrodynamic equations*. arXiv:1302.4601, 2013.
- [6] D. Chae, R. Wan and J. Wu. *Local well-posedness for the Hall–MHD equations with fractional magnetic diffusion*. arXiv:1404.0486v2, 2014.
- [7] D. Chae and S. weng. *Singularity formation for the incompressible Hall-MHD equations without resistivity*. Ann. I. H. Poincaré-AN, Vol. 33: 1009–1022, 2016.
- [8] D. Chae and J. Wolf. *On partial regularity for the 3D non-stationary Hall magnetohydrodynamics equations on the plane*. arXiv:1502.0347, 2015.
- [9] M. Dai. *Regularity criterion and energy conservation for the supercritical Quasi-Geostrophic equation*. Journal of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics. To appear. arXiv:1505.02293, 2015.
- [10] M. Dai and H. Liu. *Long time behavior of solutions to the 3D Hall-magneto-hydrodynamics system with one diffusion*. arXiv:1705.02647, 2017.
- [11] E. Dumas and F. Sueur. *On the weak solutions to the Maxwell-Landau-Lifshitz equations and to the Hall-magnetohydrodynamic equations*. Comm. Math. Phys., 330: 1179–1225, 2014.
- [12] C. L. Fefferman, D. S. McCormick, J. C. Robinson and J. L. Rodrigo. *Higher order commutator estimates and local existence for the non-resistive MHD equations and related models*. Journal of Functional Analysis, Vol. 267: 1035–1056, 2014.
- [13] T. G. Forbes. *Magnetic reconnection in solar flares*. Geophys. astrophys. fluid dynamics, 62: 15–36, 1991.
- [14] L. Grafakos. *Modern Fourier analysis*. Second edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 250. Springer, New York, 2009.
- [15] P. G. Lemarié-Rieusset. *Recent developments in the Navier-Stokes problem*. Chapman and Hall/CRC Research Notes in Mathematics, 431. Chapman and Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2002.
- [16] M. J. Lighthill. *Studies on magnetohydrodynamic waves and other anisotropic wave motions*. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., Ser. A : 397–430, 1960.
- [17] A. J. Majda and A. L. Bertozzi. *Vorticity and incompressible flow*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2001.
- [18] A. N. Simakov and L. Chacon. *Quantitative, analytical model for magnetic reconnection in Hall magnetohydrodynamics*. Phys. Rev. Lett, 101, 105003, 2008.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STAT. AND COMP.SCI., UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS CHICAGO,
CHICAGO, IL 60607, USA

E-mail address: mdai@uic.edu