

Non existence of the BV regularizing effect for scalar conservation laws in several space dimension

Shyam Sundar Ghoshal^a, Animesh Jana^a

^aCentre for Applicable Mathematics, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Post Bag No 6503, Sharadanagar, Bangalore - 560065, India.

Abstract

This article deals with the regularity aspects of entropy solutions to scalar conservation laws. We show that for each C^2 flux in multi-D, there exists an entropy solution which does not belong to $BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all time. For this purpose, we construct a non- BV_{loc} solution in 1-D for a special class of C^2 fluxes whose second derivative has a zero. It covers all the C^2 functions for which Lax-Oleĭnik's BV regularizing result is not applicable and provides a classification of one dimensional C^2 fluxes based on L^∞ - BV_{loc} regularizing of entropy solution. In the later part of this article, we extend our result to fractional Sobolev spaces for a class of non-degenerate fluxes.

Keywords: conservation laws, characteristics, non-degenerate flux, entropy solution.

2010 MSC: 35B65, 35L65, 35L67.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Main results	3
2.1	Comparison with previously constructed examples	4
3	Function spaces, some basic results and notations	5
4	Some basics from Kruřkov theory	7
5	Non-existence of BV-solution	8
5.1	One dimensional results	8
5.1.1	Proof of Theorem 2.2	15
5.2	Construction of multi-D non-BV solution	17
6	Non-existence of $W^{s,p}$-regularizing	19
6.1	One dimensional results	19
6.2	Proof of Theorem 2.4	29
6.3	Proof of Proposition 2.7	29
6.4	Proof of Remark 2.5	29
6.5	Proof of Proposition 2.6	29
	Appendix A	30

1. Introduction

We consider the following multi-dimensional scalar conservation laws

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u + \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} F_i(u) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad t > 0, \quad (1.1)$$

Email addresses: ghoshal@tifrbng.res.in (Shyam Sundar Ghoshal), animesh@tifrbng.res.in (Animesh Jana)

$$u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $F = (F_1, \dots, F_d) \in C^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Henceforth we use F as flux function for $d \geq 1$ and f as a flux for $d = 1$. Existence and uniqueness of solutions to (1.1) is well known due to Kruřkov [30]. Throughout the article, we deal with entropy solution that is a weak solution $u \in C([0, \infty); L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ satisfying Kruřkov entropy criteria [30].

Our main focus is to study L^∞ - BV_{loc} regularizing effect for entropy solutions to (1.1). By L^∞ - BV_{loc} regularizing we mean that the entropy solution gains BV_{loc} regularity for $t > 0$ when initial data $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In one dimension, L^∞ - BV_{loc} regularizing of the entropy solution is known for uniformly convex fluxes due to Lax and Oleřnik [31, 36]. This L^∞ - BV_{loc} regularizing fails for some special choice of non uniformly convex fluxes in 1-D [3, 8, 13, 15, 17, 21] and for C^∞ fluxes in multi-D [9]. In one dimension, near a vanishing point of f'' , these fluxes locally behave like u^p with $u > 0$. For some interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, we consider a class of $C^2(I, \mathbb{R})$ functions such that $\{f'' = 0\}$ is non-empty. For each flux in this class, we prove the existence of an entropy solution not belonging to $BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$. This class contains fluxes considered in [3, 8, 13, 15, 17, 21]. It is the optimal set of C^2 fluxes for obtaining a non- BV propagation because the complement of this class in C^2 is the set of uniformly convex or concave functions. For higher dimension i.e. for $d > 1$ we extend this result to whole $C^2(I, \mathbb{R}^d)$ that is, for each C^2 function F we construct an entropy solution which is not in $BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Note that previously it was known [9] only for C^∞ fluxes whereas our result is valid for each C^2 flux. Most of the previously constructed examples are non- BV_{loc} up to a finite time. In this article, we prove that the constructed examples are non- BV_{loc} for all time $t > 0$.

Since L^∞ - BV_{loc} regularizing is not possible one can ask a natural question whether the L^∞ entropy solution lies in a space larger than BV_{loc} . Lions, Perthame and Tadmor [34] first obtained regularity of entropy solution in fractional Sobolev space $W^{s,1}$ (see section 3 for the definition) when flux satisfies the following non-degeneracy condition,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{there exists } \alpha \in (0, 1] \text{ and } C \geq 0 \text{ such that} \\ & \mathcal{L}^1(\{|v| < R_0, |\tau + F'(v) \cdot \xi| < \delta\}) < C\delta^\alpha, \\ & \text{for all } \delta \in (0, 1), (\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \text{ with } \tau^2 + |\xi|^2 = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

Here \mathcal{L}^1 denotes the one dimensional Lebesgue measure. Authors showed that if F satisfies condition (1.2) with $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ then the entropy solution belongs to $W^{s,1}_{loc}$ with $s \in (0, \alpha/(\alpha + 2))$ by using averaging lemma [19]. For sufficiently smooth flux, it can be shown [27, 29, 37] that (1.2) means the following: $\{F''(u), \dots, F^{(m+1)}(u)\}$ spans \mathbb{R}^d for every $u \in I$ where m is the largest integer less than or equal to $1/\alpha$. For a survey and comparison between various flux conditions, we refer to [29]. Regularizing in fractional Sobolev space has been studied by several authors [16, 20, 26]. By introducing a new velocity-averaging lemma, Tadmor and Tao [38] proved the regularity of entropy solutions in $W^{s,1}$ for $s < \alpha/(2\alpha + 1)$ with an extra condition on flux. Jabin [27] showed that $u \in W^{s,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $s < \alpha$ when flux satisfying (1.2) and entropy solution satisfies an Oleřnik type inequality

$$\|t \nabla_x \cdot (F'(u(\cdot, t)))\|_{\mathcal{M}^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C(\|u_0\|_{L^\infty} + \|u_0\|_{L^1}). \tag{1.3}$$

In this context, we would like to mention that for uniformly convex flux entropy solutions of (1.1) with $d = 1$ additionally satisfy the following inequality

$$u(x + h, t) - u(x) \leq \frac{Ch}{t} \text{ for all } h, t > 0 \text{ and some constant } C > 0. \tag{1.4}$$

The inequality (1.4) is known as Oleřnik's inequality in literature. If an L^∞ entropy solution satisfies (1.4) then it belongs to $BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$ for all $t > 0$ [32]. Hoff introduced a criteria $\text{div } F'(u) \leq 1/t$ to characterize multi-D fluxes in the context of uniqueness of solutions [25]. In one dimension, it has been proved [14, 35] that $f'(u) \in BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$ indeed (1.3) with $d = 1$ for the fluxes with polynomial degeneracy. Note that inequality (1.3) can be seen as generalized version of Oleřnik inequality, Cheng [14] and Hoff [25] in multi-dimension. Combining [14, 35] with Jabin's result [27] it can be checked that in 1-D the entropy solution belongs to $W^{s,1}$ for any $s < \alpha$ where α is obtained from flux condition (1.2). This result is

optimal due to Theorem 2.4 of present article (see section 2). We show that for L^∞ data and C^2 flux with non-degeneracy condition (1.2), one cannot expect better than $W^{\alpha,1}$ regularity of the entropy solution to (1.1). The optimal regularity of the entropy solution in multi-D is still an open question. We refer [2, 7, 10, 11, 24] for more results on regularizing effects of entropy solution to (1.1). For finer properties of L^∞ entropy solutions in one dimension we refer an interested reader to [5, 6, 12].

Rest of the article is organized as follows. Section 2 presents main results of this article. We compare our results with known literature in subsection 2.1. We recall some definitions and some known facts from theory of conservation laws in section 3 and 4 respectively. We first construct non-BV examples in section 5. In section 6 we prove some facts on flux non-degeneracy and construct non- $W^{s,p}$ examples.

2. Main results

Primary goal of this article is to show the non-existence of BV regularizing effect in multi-dimension. We wish to find an initial data defined on \mathbb{R}^d with $d > 1$ such that the associated entropy solution to (1.1) does not belong to BV_{loc} for all $t > 0$. When $d = 1$, we construct non- BV_{loc} solutions for a class of C^2 fluxes. More precisely, we prove the following,

Theorem 2.1. *Let $d > 1$ and $F \in C^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Then there exists an entropy solution $u(\cdot, t) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of (1.1) such that $u(\cdot, t) \notin BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all time $t > 0$.*

Theorem 2.2. *Let $I = [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$ for some $a < b$. Let $f \in C^2(I, \mathbb{R})$ be a one dimensional flux function. Suppose there is a point $a_0 \in I$ such that $f''(a_0) = 0$. Then there exists an initial data u_0 such that the corresponding entropy solution $u(\cdot, t) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ of (1.1) does not belong to $BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$ for all time $t > 0$.*

Main difference between Theorem 2.1 and 2.2 is the following: for $d > 1$ case we can always find a unit vector ξ on sphere $\mathcal{S}^{d-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ to confirm $F''(a_0) \cdot \xi = 0$. Therefore, Theorem 2.1 is true for each $F \in C^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$. But for $d = 1$, we need to assume that there is a point where the second derivative of f vanishes. We observe that for a flux $f \in C^2(I, \mathbb{R})$ with $f'' \neq 0$ on I , Theorem 2.2 is not applicable. From works of Lax [31] and Oleinik [36] we know that the L^∞ - BV_{loc} regularizing is true when $f'' \neq 0$ on I and $u_0(x) \in I$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, we get a complete classification of C^2 fluxes based on L^∞ - BV_{loc} regularizing of entropy solution to (1.1).

Our next aim is to investigate the regularizing in fractional Sobolev space $W^{s,p}$ when flux is satisfying a non-degeneracy condition (1.2). It should be noted that for a C^2 flux F the condition (1.2) hardly tells about the optimality of α . For an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ we define $\alpha_{sup}(F, I)$ as follows:

$$\alpha_{sup}(F, I) := \sup\{\alpha \in (0, 1]; F \text{ satisfies (1.2) on } I \text{ for } \alpha \text{ and some } C > 0\}. \quad (2.1)$$

Similar notion of α_{sup} has been previously introduced in [29, section 1.1]. For a C^∞ flux F , it can be shown [29] that $\alpha_{sup}(F, I) = (d_F[I])^{-1}$ where d_F is defined as follows

$$d_F[I] := \sup_{u \in I} \inf\{k \geq 1; \text{span}\{F''(u), \dots, F^{(k+1)}(u)\} = \mathbb{R}^d\}. \quad (2.2)$$

For non-degenerate fluxes satisfying (2.1) with $\alpha_{sup} \in (0, 1)$ we want to show that if it has an L^∞ - $W_{loc}^{s,p}$ regularizing effect then fractional exponent s is bounded above by $\alpha_{sup}(F, I)$. For this purpose, we introduce the following ‘mild regularity assumption’.

Definition 2.3. *Let $F \in C^2(I, \mathbb{R}^d)$ for $d \geq 1$. Let $A_\xi = \{x \in I; \xi \cdot F''(x) = 0\}$ be the zero set of $F'' \cdot \xi$ for $\xi \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$ and $I \setminus A_\xi$ can be written as union of mutually disjoint open intervals $\{I_k^\xi\}$, that is,*

$$I \setminus A_\xi = \bigcup_{k \in \mathcal{I}_\xi} I_k^\xi \text{ with } \xi \cdot F'' \neq 0 \text{ in } I_k^\xi \quad (2.3)$$

for some index set $\mathcal{I}_\xi \subset \mathbb{N}$. We say F satisfies ‘mild regularity assumption’, if the following holds

$$\inf_{\xi \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}} \inf\{\alpha_{sup}(\xi \cdot F, I_k^\xi); k \in \mathcal{I}_\xi\} = \alpha_{sup}(F, I). \quad (2.4)$$

Observe that for 1-D C^2 fluxes with $\#\{f'' = 0\} < \infty$, the condition (2.4) holds. We note that any C^∞ flux with $\alpha_{sup}(F, I) > 0$ satisfies (2.4) (see Remark 6.8). In 1-D there are many C^2 fluxes with $\#\{f'' = 0\} = \infty$ for which (2.4) is true (see example 6.9). The condition (2.4) guarantees that considering all directional non-degeneracy on intervals I_k^ε is enough to conclude the non-degeneracy $\alpha_{sup}(F, I)$. It is an open question whether the condition (2.4) remains true for all C^2 fluxes. We leave this for future works. For fluxes satisfying $\alpha_{sup}(I, R) > 0$ along with (2.4) we have the following result.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $d \geq 1$ and $I = [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$ for some $a < b$. Let $F \in C^2(I, \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a flux satisfying the non-degeneracy condition (2.1) with $\alpha_{sup}(F, I) \in (0, 1)$. Let F be satisfying (2.4) as in Definition 2.3. Then, there exists an entropy solution $u(\cdot, t) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of (1.1) such that $u(\cdot, t) \notin W_{loc}^{s,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $t > 0$ with $s > \alpha_{sup}(F, I)$.*

Note that in Theorem 2.4 we assume that $\alpha_{sup}(F, I) < 1$. In one dimension there exists a flux function $f \in C^2(I)$ for some $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $\alpha_{sup}(f, I) = 1$. We make a remark on L^∞ - BV_{loc} regularizing of entropy solution to (1.1) for such fluxes.

Remark 2.5. *Let $I = [a, b]$ for some $a < b$. There exists a flux $f \in C^2(I, \mathbb{R})$ and an initial data $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\alpha_{sup}(f, I) = 1$ and if u is the entropy solution to (1.1) with flux f and data u_0 then we have $u(\cdot, t) \notin BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$ for all $t > 0$.*

Proof of Remark 2.5 can be found in section 6.4.

To prove Theorem 2.4 we calculate Besov norm of entropy solution and utilize the fact $W^{s,1} \subset B^{s,p,\theta}$ with suitable choice of p, θ where $B^{s,p,\theta}$ is Besov space (see section 3 for definition). Therefore, the result on failure of regularizing effect is actually true in more general space than $W^{s,p}$. In the Besov space set up the non-existence of regularizing from L^∞ data with fluxes satisfying (2.1) and (2.4), reads as follows,

Proposition 2.6. *Let $d \geq 1$ and $R_0 > 0$. Let $F \in C^2([-R_0, R_0], \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a flux satisfying the non-degeneracy condition (2.1) with $\alpha_{sup}(F, [-R_0, R_0]) \in (0, 1)$ and additionally (2.4). Then there exists an entropy solution $u(\cdot, t) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of (1.1) such that $u(\cdot, t) \notin B_{loc}^{s,p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $t > 0$ with $s > \alpha_{sup}(F, [-R_0, R_0])$, $p \geq 1, \theta \geq 1$.*

Till now the discussion has been restricted for fluxes having only C^2 regularity. For fluxes satisfying non-degeneracy condition (2.1) from Theorem 2.4 we get an upper bound for regularizing in fractional Sobolev space, more precisely, there exists a data such that if the associated entropy solution $u \in W^{s,p}$ then s must satisfy $s \leq \alpha_{sup}$. In [29] it has been shown for C^∞ fluxes that $\alpha_{sup} \leq d^{-1}$. By applying Theorem 2.4 we can conclude that there is an entropy solution, u to (1.1) for C^∞ flux such that $u \notin W^{s,p}$ for $s > d^{-1}$. Therefore, for C^∞ flux we recover an explicit upper bound on fractional exponent s . In our next proposition, we obtain an explicit bound of s for $C^{2,\beta}$ fluxes. By $C^{2,\beta}$ function we mean a C^2 function whose second derivative belongs to Holder space C^β when $0 < \beta \leq 1$.

Proposition 2.7. *Let $d > 1$ and $F \in C^{2,\beta}([a, b], \mathbb{R}^d)$ for some $0 < \beta \leq 1$. Then there exists an entropy solution $u(\cdot, t) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of (1.1) such that $u(\cdot, t) \notin W_{loc}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $t > 0$ with $s > 1/(1 + \beta)$, $p \geq 1$. Moreover, we have $u(\cdot, t) \notin B_{loc}^{s,p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $s > 1/(1 + \beta)$, $p \geq 1, \theta \geq 1$.*

2.1. Comparison with previously constructed examples

In a short note [13], Cheng first showed that L^∞ - BV regularizing fails for fluxes like $u^3/3, u^4/4$. With an explicit estimation of Besov semi-norm of entropy solution, De Lellis and Westdickenberg [17] proved that in one dimension there exists an entropy solution which does not belong to $W^{\alpha,1}$ for flux $f(u) = (p+1)^{-1}|u|^{p+1}$ and $\alpha > p^{-1}$. Cheverry [15] constructed an entropy solution, u for flux $u^3/3$ with piece-wise constant data to show that $u(\cdot, t) \notin BV_{loc}$ for $t \in [0, 1/6]$. In reference [3], authors built an entropy solution $u(\cdot, t) \notin BV_{loc}$ for non-uniform convex flux satisfying a certain condition. They used the method of backward construction from control theory [4].

In one dimension, Castelli and Junca [8] constructed an example, u for C^∞ flux, f such that $u(\cdot, t) \notin BV^{s+\epsilon}(\mathbb{R}) \cap W^{s+\epsilon,1}(\mathbb{R})$ for all $\epsilon > 0$, $t \in [0, T]$ with some $T > 0$ and $s = d_f^{-1}$ where d_f is determined as follows,

$$d_f = \sup_{u \in [-R, R]} \inf \left\{ j \geq 1; f^{(j+1)}(u) \neq 0 \right\} < +\infty, \quad R > 0,$$

where $f^{(k)}$ denotes the k -th derivative of f . The index d_f determines non-linearity of flux function f and if f is analytic functions d_f^{-1} coincides with α_{sup} defined as in (2.1) [29]. One can see that d_f is achieved at some point \tilde{u} and in a neighbourhood of \tilde{u} , f behaves like power law type flux $|u|^{1+d_f}$ (for more details see [8, Theorem 6] and [9, Example 14]). Then authors built the required solution following the method similar to [13]. By using the one-dimensional example, they [9] constructed a ‘mono-phase’ entropy solution in multi dimension such that it does not belong to $W_{loc}^{s,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $s > \alpha$ where α measures the non-degeneracy of smooth flux F .

On a slightly different note, we mention the counterexamples obtained in [1, 22] to show the non existence of BV solution with BV data for discontinuous flux. Unlike the situation for continuous case in the set up of discontinuous flux, the BV regularizing is possible [23] near the interface even for non uniformly convex fluxes.

From the above discussion, we observe that all the non-BV solutions obtained in the previous works are done either for fluxes of type $|u|^{p+1}$ or for C^∞ fluxes which behave like u^{p+1} with $u > 0$. The key difference between these examples and the solution constructed in Theorem 2.1 and 2.2 is the difficulty to find an initial data which gives a non-BV entropy solution for time $t \in [0, t_0]$. Due to the explicit structure of flux $f(u) = |u|^{1+p}$ one natural choice of data is an arrangement of sequences like $\{n^{-\epsilon-p^{-1}}\}$ with suitable spatial distance [3, 9, 15, 17]. One can also use $x \sin(1/x)$ as initial data to get a non- BV_{loc} entropy solution for power law type flux [8, 13]. Now consider the situation when f is a C^2 function such that f'' vanishes at some point. To construct a non-BV entropy solution for a such flux, we need a sequence like $\{n^{-\epsilon-p^{-1}}\}$. In this case, explicit structure of flux is not known and naturally, no such explicit sequence works. To resolve this matter we extract an implicit sequence $\{a_k\}$ around a vanishing point a_0 of f'' such that it verifies a certain estimate. Once we get $\{a_k\}$ one may think about constructing a data by arranging $\{a_0, a_1, a_0, a_2, a_0, \dots\}$ with suitable spatial distance. This works if we have

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} |a_k - a_0| = \infty. \quad (2.5)$$

Unfortunately, this may not hold in general. Since our choice of $\{a_k\}$ is implicit we can not conclude whether (2.5) is satisfied or not. We get rid of this hurdle by repeating a similar oscillation sufficiently many times.

Finally we would like to point out the fact that examples given in [8, 9, 13, 15, 17] are non-BV up to a finite time t_0 whereas in this article we construct examples such that they are not in $BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$ for all time $t > 0$. Although examples in [3, 21] are non BV_{loc} for all time, we can not rely on their construction because they used convexity of f on both side of the point where f'' vanishes. In our situation we have information about f only on one side of a zero of f'' . To give more clarity on this matter, let us consider flux $f(u) = u^3$. Since f is convex for $u > 0$ and concave for $u < 0$ we can not invoke results of [3] whereas we can still find an all time non- BV_{loc} entropy solution for u^3 by Theorem 2.2.

3. Function spaces, some basic results and notations

Here we recall some basic definitions and notations which will be used later on.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open set and $u \in L^1(\Omega)$. Suppose $\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ denotes the Borel σ -algebra. We say $u \in BV(\Omega)$ if for each $i = 1, \dots, d$ there exists a finite signed measure $\mu_i : \mathcal{B}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} u \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} dx = - \int_{\Omega} \varphi d\mu_i, \quad (3.1)$$

holds for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$. For $u \in BV(\Omega)$, we denote total variation of u by $TV(u, \Omega)$ defined as follows:

$$TV(u, \Omega) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial \Phi_i}{\partial x_i}; \Phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d), \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

When $d = 1$, for $\Omega = [a, b]$ with $a < b$, the semi-norm $TV(u, \Omega)$ is equivalent to following point-wise definition (for instance see [33]),

$$TV(u, [a, b]) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n |u(x_k) - u(x_{k+1})|; a \leq x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_{n+1} \leq b \right\}.$$

For $d \geq 1$, BV functions can be characterize in the point-wise variant on lines. More precisely, we can have

Theorem 3.1 ([33]). *Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be open and $d \geq 1$. For each $j = 1, \dots, d$ and $h > 0$ we define $Q_{h,j} := \{x \in Q; x + he_j \in Q\}$ where $\{e_j; 1 \leq j \leq d\}$ is the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^d . Let $u \in BV(Q)$ and derivatives of u are finite signed measures $\mu_j, j = 1, \dots, d$ determined by (3.1). Then for each $j = 1, \dots, d$ and $h > 0$ we have*

$$\int_{Q_{h,j}} |u(y + he_j) - u(y)| dy \leq h |\mu_j|(Q) \text{ and } \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{Q_{h,j}} \frac{|u(y + he_j) - u(y)|}{h} dy = |\mu_j|.$$

Conversely, if $u \in L^1(Q)$ is such that

$$\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{Q_{h,j}} \frac{|u(y + he_j) - u(y)|}{h} dy < \infty, \text{ for each } j = 1, \dots, d.$$

Then $u \in BV(Q)$.

Note that if some function has unbounded point-wise variation on a line then by virtue of Theorem 3.1 it can not belong to $BV(\mathbb{R})$. This fact will be use in proof of Theorem 3.1. We say a function $v \in BV_{loc}(\Omega)$ if $v \in BV(\Omega_1)$ for all $\Omega_1 \subset\subset \Omega$.

Let Ω be a smooth domain in \mathbb{R}^d . For a vector $h \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in L^p(\Omega)$ with $1 < p < \infty$ let $\Delta_h(u, x)$ be the difference operator defined as follows, $\Delta_h(u, x) := u(x + h) - u(x)$. We also use the following notation

$$\Delta_h(u, x, \Omega) := \begin{cases} \Delta_h(u, x) & \text{if } x, x + h \in \Omega, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The modulus of smoothness of order 1 of the L^p function u can be measured as

$$\omega(u, t, \Omega)_p := \sup\{\|\Delta_h(u, \cdot, \Omega)\|_{L^p(\Omega)}; |h| \leq t\}.$$

For $s \in (0, 1), p \in [1, \infty), \theta \in [1, \infty)$ the Besov space $B^{s,p,\theta}$ consists of $u \in L^p(\Omega)$ such that

$$|u|_{B^{s,p,\theta}(\Omega)} := \left(\int_0^1 \frac{\omega(u, t, \Omega)^\theta}{t^{1+s\theta}} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} < \infty.$$

We say $v \in B_{loc}^{s,p,\theta}(\Omega)$ if $v \in B^{s,p,\theta}(\Omega_1)$ for each open set $\Omega_1 \subset\subset \Omega$. Above definition of Besov space is adapted from [18]. For various properties of $B^{s,p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we refer [33].

For $s \in (0, 1)$ and $p \in [1, \infty)$ we define fractional Sobolev space $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ as follows,

$$W^{s,p}(\Omega) = \left\{ g \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d); |u|_{W^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p = \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|g(x) - g(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{d+sp}} dx dy < \infty \right\}.$$

The space $W_{loc}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ consists of functions u such that $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ for each bounded open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. When $\theta = p$ we have $W^{s,p}(\Omega) = B^{s,p,p}(\Omega)$ for $1 \leq p < \infty$ [33, 39].

Throughout the paper we use following definitions of convex function, box function and \mathcal{S}^{d-1} .

- Let $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a real valued function. We say f is “strictly convex” if the following holds: $f(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) < \lambda f(x) + (1 - \lambda)f(y)$ for any $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$.
- Suppose $x \in \mathbb{R}$ then by $[x]$ we denote the greatest integer which is less than or equal to x . This we refer later as “box function”.
- The notation \mathcal{S}^{d-1} stands for unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^d , i.e., $\mathcal{S}^{d-1} = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d; |\xi| = 1\}$.
- In this article, $\{e_j; 1 \leq j \leq d\}$ denotes the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^d .
- For $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, by ‘ $a \rightarrow a_0^\pm$ ’ we mean limits from right and left respectively.

Finally, we prove an elementary lemma. This is helpful in the proof of Theorem 2.4.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\{\delta_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a real number sequence such that $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then there exists an increasing sequence $\{q_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ and a subsequence $\{\delta_{n_k}\}_{k \geq 1}$ such that $|\delta_{n_k}| = k^{-q_k}$ and $q_{k+1} \geq q_k + 1$ for all $k \geq 1$.*

Proof. We take $q_1 := 1$ and $n_1 := \max\{n; |\delta_n| < 1\}$. Having defined q_1, \dots, q_k and n_1, \dots, n_k we define n_{k+1} as follows $n_{k+1} := \max\{n; |\delta_n| \leq (k+1)^{-q_k-1}\}$. Set $q_{k+1} := -(\log |\delta_{n_{k+1}}|)/\log(k+1)$. From the choice of n_{k+1} we get $|\delta_{n_{k+1}}| \leq \frac{1}{(k+1)^{q_k+1}}$. Therefore, we have $q_{k+1} \geq q_k + 1$. This completes the proof. \square

4. Some basics from Kruřkov theory

In this section, we recall some basic results on scalar conservation laws based on finite speed of propagation for L^∞ data and Kruřkov’s uniqueness proof for (1.1). These will be used heavily in section 5 and 6. Let us first recall the result from [30] in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1 (Kruřkov, [30]). *Let $d \geq 1$. Let $u, v \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+) \cap C([0, \infty); L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ be two entropy solution to (1.1) associated with initial data u_0 and v_0 respectively. Let M be defined as follows*

$$M = \max \left\{ |F'(w)|; |w| \leq \max\{\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+)}, \|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+)}\} \right\}.$$

Then we have for all $R > 0$ and $t > 0$

$$\int_{|x| \leq R} |u(x, t) - v(x, t)| dx \leq \int_{|x| \leq R+Mt} |u_0(x) - v_0(x)| dx.$$

In next lemma we consider a planar data (i.e. function of one variable and independent of other variables) in multi dimension then we show that the associated entropy solution is also planar. This is classical and elementary and based on a change of variable and right choice of test function [28]. We give a short proof in the Appendix to make the presentation self contained.

Lemma 4.2. *Let w is entropy solution of the following one dimensional conservation law*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t w + \partial_{x_1} f_1(w) &= 0 & \text{for } t > 0 \text{ and } x_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \\ w(x_1, 0) &= w_0(x_1) & \text{for } x_1 \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Let $v : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $v_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} v(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d, t) &= w(x_1, t) & \text{for } (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ v_0(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) &= w_0(x_1) & \text{for } (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Then v is the entropy solution to (1.1) with initial data v_0 and flux $F = (f_1, \dots, f_d)$.

Next lemma is also elementary but has important role in proofs of our main results. It establishes the relation between entropy solutions of (1.1) corresponding to two fluxes related by an isomorphism. This is also a corollary to Proposition 4.1 and we postpone the proof till Appendix.

Lemma 4.3. *Let v be the entropy solution to (1.1) with flux $F = (f_1, \dots, f_d)$ and initial data v_0 . Let \bar{v} be the entropy solution to (1.1) with flux $\bar{F} = (\bar{f}_1, \dots, \bar{f}_d)$ and initial data \bar{v}_0 . Suppose $L : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is an invertible linear map and $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a vector. Assume that $v_0(x) = \bar{v}_0(L(x) + \mathbf{c})$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\bar{F} = L(F)$. Then we have $v(x, t) = \bar{v}(L(x) + \mathbf{c}, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty)$.*

5. Non-existence of BV-solution

5.1. One dimensional results

In this section, we wish to show the existence of non- BV_{loc} entropy solutions in 1-D when second derivative of flux has a zero, say a_0 . For this purpose we construct an initial data by using a special sequence $\{a_k\}$ converging to the point a_0 . In general, for a C^2 -flux the choice of such sequence is tricky. Here is our next lemma precisely stating the properties of a sequence required to construct a non- BV_{loc} entropy solution.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^2 function for $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $a_0 \in (a, b)$ be a point such that $f''(a_0) = 0$ and $f'' \neq 0$ in $I = (a_0, a_0 + r) \subset [a, b]$ for some $r > 0$. Then there are sequences $\{p_k\}_{k \geq 1} \subset (1, \infty)$ and $\{a_k\}_{k \geq 1} \subset (a_0, a_0 + r)$ such that*

$$\frac{|f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)|}{|a_k - a_0|^{p_k}} = \frac{1}{k}, \quad |a_k - a_0| \leq \frac{1}{k} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)|}{|a_k - a_0|} \leq \frac{1}{k^2} \quad \text{for all } k \geq k_0 \quad (5.1)$$

for some $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k_0 \geq 2$.

Before we go to proof of Lemma 5.1 we put some remarks and observation on the $\{p_k\}$ sequence which is related to the degeneracy of f'' near a_0 .

Remark 5.2. (i) For $f(u) = (p+1)^{-1}|u|^{p+1}$ with $p > 1$, (5.1) implies that p_k must lie between $\max\{(p-1)/2, p-1\}$ and p . For instance we can choose

$$\begin{aligned} p_k &= (p+1)/2 \quad \text{and} \quad a_k = k^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} \quad \text{for } 1 < p \leq 3, \\ p_k &= p-1 \quad \quad \quad \text{and} \quad a_k = k^{-1} \quad \quad \quad \text{for } p > 3. \end{aligned}$$

It is possible to give a choice of a_k such that the associated p_k converges to p as $k \rightarrow \infty$. For example we can take $p_k = p - k^{-1}$ and $a_k = k^{-k}$ for $k \geq (p-1)/2$.

Proof. Note that $f'(u) = u|u|^{p-1}$ and $a_0 = 0$. From (5.1) we get

$$|a_k|^{p-p_k} = k^{-1}, \quad |a_k| \leq k^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad |a_k|^{p-1} \leq k^{-2}. \quad (5.2)$$

We observe $\log |a_k| \leq 0$ and subsequently, for $k > 1$ we have $(p-p_k) \log |a_k| = -\log k < 0$ which implies $p-p_k > 0$. Hence we obtain $p_k < p$. Now from (5.2) we get $k^{\frac{1}{p-p_k}} \geq k$ and $k^{\frac{1}{p-p_k}} \geq k^{\frac{2}{p-1}}$. This implies $1 \geq p-p_k$ and $\frac{p-1}{2} \geq p-p_k$. Hence $p_k \geq \max\{(p+1)/2, p-1\}$. A simple calculation proves rest of the statements in (i) of Remark 5.2. \square

(ii) Let $f \in C^2[0, e^{-1}]$ such that $f''(u) = (\log |u|)^{-1}$, then for $a_k = e^{-k^2}$ we have $p_k > 1$ and $p_k \rightarrow 1+$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Define $g : [0, e^{-1}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $g(x) := \int_0^x f''(y) dy$. Fix a $k \geq 1$. We observe that for $x \in [0, a_k]$

we have

$$|\log |x||^{-1} \geq x^{\frac{1}{k}}. \quad (5.3)$$

To see (5.3) consider $z = 1/x$ for $x > 0$ and we need to show $(\log z)^{-1} > z^{-k^{-1}}$, equivalently, $z^{\frac{1}{k}} > \log z$ for $z \geq e^{k^2}$. Define $h(z) = z^{\frac{1}{k}} - \log z$. By a simple calculation we have $h'(z) = z^{-1} \left[k^{-1} z^{\frac{1}{k}} - 1 \right] \geq 0$ for $z \geq e^{k^2}$. Hence h is increasing on $[e^{k^2}, \infty)$. Therefore, we have $h(z) \geq h(e^{k^2}) = e^k - k^2 \geq 0$ for $k \geq 1$. This establishes (5.3). By using the inequality (5.3) for $x \in [0, a_k]$ we obtain

$$g(a_k) \geq \int_0^{a_k} y^{\frac{1}{k}} dy \geq \frac{k}{k+1} e^{-k-k^2}. \quad (5.4)$$

Note that $|\log |x||^{-1} \leq |\log |a_k||^{-1} = k^{-2}$ for $x \in [0, a_k]$. Therefore, we infer

$$g(a_k) \leq k^{-2} e^{-k^2}. \quad (5.5)$$

Hence we have $a_k^{-1} |g(a_k)| \leq k^{-2}$. The first identity in (5.1) enforces $p_k = -k^{-2} \log |kg(a_k)|$. By (5.5) we have $k |g(a_k)| \leq k^{-1} e^{-k^2}$. Subsequently, we obtain $\log |kg(a_k)| \leq -k^2 - \log k$. This implies $-\log |kg(a_k)| \geq k^2 + \log k$. Hence $p_k \geq 1 + k^{-2} \log k > 1$. By (5.4) we have $\log(kg(a_k)) \geq -k - k^2 + 2 \log k - \log(k+1)$. Therefore, we get

$$p_k = -k^{-2} \log(kg(a_k)) \leq k^{-1} + 1 - 2k^{-2} \log k + k^{-2} \log(k+1). \quad (5.6)$$

Since $k^{-1} - 2k^{-2} \log k + k^{-2} \log(k+1) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $p_k > 1$ for all k , from (5.6) we conclude that $p_k \rightarrow 1$. \square

(iii) For fluxes $f \in C^2[0, 1]$ such that $f'(u) = \exp\{-u^{-2}\}$, we have $p_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for any choice of $\{a_k\}$ verifying (5.1). One example of $\{a_k\}$ satisfying (5.1) is $a_k = k^{-1}$.

Proof. Suppose $\{a_k\}$ satisfies (5.1). Then we have $p_k = \frac{\log(ke^{-1/a_k^2})}{\log(a_k)}$. This implies

$$p_k = \frac{1}{\log(a_k)} [\log k - a_k^{-2}]. \quad (5.7)$$

Since $a_k \leq k^{-1}$, we have $\log a_k \leq -\log k$ or equivalently, $\log k / \log a_k \geq -1$. Therefore, (5.7) becomes $p_k \geq -1 + a_k^{-2} (-\log a_k)^{-1}$. Let $b_k = a_k^{-1}$. Hence we get $p_k \geq b_k^2 / \log b_k - 1$. Since $a_k \rightarrow 0$ we have $b_k \rightarrow \infty$ and subsequently, $b_k^2 / \log b_k \rightarrow \infty$. This shows $p_k \rightarrow \infty$. Note that if we consider $a_k = k^{-1}$ it follows that $f'(a_k) a_k^{-1} = ke^{-k^2} \leq k^{-2}$ for $k \geq 2$. Therefore, $\{a_k\}$ verifies (5.1) with $p_k = -1 + k^2 / \log k$. \square

From above three examples of fluxes we see three different behaviour of p_k sequence. We also observe in these examples that p_k depends on the choice of a_k . To give more insight on this matter let us consider nonlinearity exponent p for convex flux f determined as follows

$$p = \inf \left\{ q; \frac{|f'(u) - f'(v)|}{|u - v|^q} > 0 \text{ for } u, v \in [\underline{u}, \bar{u}], u \neq v \right\}. \quad (5.8)$$

In general the exponent p as in (5.8) may not be achieved and it can be 1. From (i) of Remark 5.2 we observe that p_k (as in (5.1)) may not converge to the non-degeneracy exponent p . For a fixed $f \in C^2(I, \mathbb{R})$ and $a_0 \in I$ there are many choices for pairs (p_k, a_k) and in the proof of Lemma 5.1 we get an implicit choice of (p_k, a_k) .

Proof of Lemma 5.1. We define a function $Q : (a_0, a_0 + r) \times [1, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ as follows $Q(a, p) := |f'(a) - f'(a_0)| |a - a_0|^{-p}$. Since $f''(a_0) = 0$ we have

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow a_0^+} Q(a, 1) = \lim_{a \rightarrow a_0^+} \frac{|f'(a) - f'(a_0)|}{|a - a_0|} = |f''(a_0)| = 0.$$

Hence for each $k \geq 2$ we can choose

$$a_k \in (a_0, a_0 + k^{-1}) \text{ such that } Q(a_k, 1) \leq k^{-2}. \quad (5.9)$$

Since $f'' \neq 0$ in $(a_0, a_0 + r)$, we have $C_k := Q(a_k, 1) > 0$. Therefore, as $|a_k - a_0| < k^{-1}$, we have

$$Q(a_k, p) = |a_k - a_0|^{1-p} Q(a_k, 1) \geq k^{p-1} C_k \text{ for any } p > 1. \quad (5.10)$$

Note that for fixed $a_k \in (a_0, a_0 + r)$, $p \mapsto Q(a_k, p)$ is a continuous function. For a fixed $k \geq 2$, by (5.10) we have $Q(a_k, p) \rightarrow \infty$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$. From (5.9) we get $Q(a_k, 1) < k^{-1}$. Therefore, by Intermediate Value Theorem we can choose p_k such that $Q(a_k, p_k) = k^{-1}$. Hence the proof is completed. \square

Remark 5.3. Note that Lemma 5.1 is also valid if $f'' \neq 0$ in $(a_0 - r, a_0)$ instead of $(a_0, a_0 + r)$.

Existence of sequence a_k sets the ground to construct an initial data to have a non-BV solution for (1.1) with $d = 1$. For fixed $T > 0$, we first focus on constructing an entropy solution which is not in BV space up to the time T . Later we extend this for all time and in multi dimension.

Proposition 5.4. Let $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$. Suppose there is a point $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f''(a_0) = 0$. Then there exist constants $\lambda > 0$ and $u^* > 0$ such that the following holds: for every $T > 0$ there exists an initial data v_0^T verifying the following properties:

1. $\|v_0^T\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq u^*$ and $\text{supp}(v_0^T) \subset [-\lambda T, \lambda(T+1)]$.
2. if v^T is the entropy solution to (1.1) with initial data v_0^T , then we have $TV(v^T(\cdot, t), [-\lambda T, \lambda(T+1)]) = \infty$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

Note that in Proposition 5.4, since the construction depends on the parameter T , we use the notation v_0^T, v^T but the constants λ, u^* do not depend on T , they depend only on flux f .

Proof of Proposition 5.4. Based on the possible linearity of flux f in some interval, we divide the proof into two cases. First one is the case when there is a non-trivial interval where $f'' = 0$. Second case is considered when f is non-linear everywhere in the sense that there is no non-trivial interval such that f'' vanishes identically in it.

Case(1): Suppose $f'' = 0$ on $[\underline{a}, \bar{a}]$ for some $\underline{a} < \bar{a}$. Let $\{y_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ be an increasing positive real number sequence such that $y_k \rightarrow y_\infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for some $y_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$. Fix $a, b \in (\underline{a}, \bar{a})$ such that $a \neq b$. Consider w_0^{lin} defined as follows

$$w_0^{lin}(x) := \begin{cases} a & \text{if } x < y_1, \\ b & \text{if } y_{2m-1} < x < y_{2m} \text{ for } m \geq 1, \\ a & \text{if } y_{2m} < x < y_{2m+1} \text{ for } m \geq 1, \\ b & \text{if } x > y_\infty. \end{cases} \quad (5.11)$$

Since $f'' = 0$ on $[\underline{a}, \bar{a}]$ we have $f'(u) = c_1$ and $f(u) = c_1 u + c_2$ when $u \in [\underline{a}, \bar{a}]$ for some constants c_1, c_2 . Hence, for initial data w_0^{lin} , the entropy solution to (1.1) coincides with the weak solution of the transport equation $\partial_t w^{lin} + c_1 \partial_x w^{lin} = 0$. Let w^{lin} be the weak solution to the transport equation $\partial_t w^{lin} + c_1 \partial_x w^{lin} = 0$ with initial data w_0^{lin} . Then w^{lin} can be written as $w^{lin}(x, t) = w_0^{lin}(x - c_1 t)$. Hence we have for $t > 0$

$$w^{lin}(x, t) := \begin{cases} a & \text{if } x < y_1 + c_1 t, \\ b & \text{if } y_{2m-1} + c_1 t < x < y_{2m} + c_1 t \text{ for } m \geq 1, \\ a & \text{if } y_{2m} + c_1 t < x < y_{2m+1} + c_1 t \text{ for } m \geq 1, \\ b & \text{if } x > y_\infty + c_1 t. \end{cases} \quad (5.12)$$

Since $w^{lin}(\cdot, t)$ oscillates infinitely many times with oscillation strength $|a - b|$, it has unbounded variation for each $t \geq 0$. Fix a $t \geq 0$. We can choose $z_k = c_1 t + (y_k + y_{k+1})/2$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} TV(w^{lin}(\cdot, t), [y_1 + c_1 t, y_\infty + c_1 t]) &\geq \sum_{k \geq 1} \left| w^{lin}(z_k, t) - w^{lin}(z_{k+1}, t) \right| \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 1} |a - b| = \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$




Figure 1: The initial data is constructed by positioning a and b in between points y_k alternatively where $\{y_k\}$ is an increasing sequence converging to y_∞ and its support lies in $[A, B]$ for some $A < y_1 < y_\infty < B$. a and b are connected by linear waves starting from y_k for $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. Nonlinear waves are formed at A and B . Entropy solution consists of infinitely many oscillations of strength $|a - b|$ up to time T .

Now we wish to construct an initial data v_0 which is supported in a compact set of \mathbb{R} and the associated entropy solution to (1.1), $v(\cdot, t)$ has unbounded variation for $t \in [0, T]$. To construct v_0 we multiply previously constructed data w_0^{lin} by a characteristic function χ_I for some well-chosen interval I . Note that 0 may lie outside the interval $[\underline{a}, \bar{a}]$ and in that case characteristics can have non-linear propagation and it can cancel the oscillations. To avoid such situation, it is enough to choose I sufficiently large because the equation (1.1) has ‘finite speed of propagation’ property for L^∞ data. Set M_1 as follows

$$M_1 := \max\{|f'(u)|; |u| \leq r\} \text{ where } r := \max\{|a|, |b|\}. \quad (5.14)$$

We consider $R_1 := 3M_1T$. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ an interval defined as $I := [y_1 - R_1, y_\infty + R_1]$. We define initial data $v_{0,T}^{lin}$ as follows

$$v_{0,T}^{lin} := w_0^{lin} \chi_I \quad (5.15)$$

where w_0^{lin} is defined as in (5.11). Recall that $y_1 \geq 0$. Hence we have

$$\text{supp}(v_{0,T}^{lin}) \subset [-3M_1T, y_\infty + 3M_1T]. \quad (5.16)$$

Let v_{lin}^T be the entropy solution to (1.1) with initial data v_0 . Now by Proposition 4.1 we have

$$\int_{[x_1, x_2]} |w^{lin}(x, t) - v_{lin}^T(x, t)| dx \leq \int_{[x_1 - M_1T, x_2 + M_1T]} |w_0^{lin}(x) - v_{0,T}^{lin}(x)| dx \quad (5.17)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. Take $x_1 = y_1 - M_1T$ and $x_2 = y_\infty + M_1T$. Then from our choice of I , we have $[x_1 - M_1T, x_2 + M_1T] = [y_1 - 2M_1T, y_\infty + 2M_1T] \subset I$. As $v_{0,T}^{lin}(x) = w_0^{lin}(x)$ for all $x \in I$, from (5.17) we have (see Figure 1 for a clear illustration) $v_{lin}^T(x, t) = w^{lin}(x, t)$ for $(x, t) \in [y_1 - M_1T, y_\infty + M_1T] \times [0, T]$. From (5.13) we know that $w^{lin}(\cdot, t)$ has unbounded variation in the interval $[y_1 + c_1t, y_\infty + c_1t]$. Since $[y_1 + c_1t, y_\infty + c_1t] \subset [y_1 - M_1T, y_\infty + M_1T]$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, we conclude that $TV(v^T(\cdot, t), [y_1 - M_1T, y_\infty + M_1T]) = \infty$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Due to $y_1 \geq 0$, we have $[y_1 - M_1T, y_\infty + M_1T] \subset [-3M_1T, y_\infty + 3M_1T]$. Hence we have

$$TV(v^T(\cdot, t), [-3M_1T, y_\infty + 3M_1T]) = \infty \text{ for all } t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.18)$$

Case(2): Now we discuss the case when $\mathcal{Z} := \{f'' = 0\}$ has empty interior. Since $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$, the set $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Z}$ is open. If $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Z}$ is empty then it reduces to the **Case(1)**. Therefore, we assume $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Z}$ is non-empty. Hence, it can be written as union of at most countably many disjoint open intervals. We choose one of such open intervals, say (a_0, b_0) . Since intervals are disjoint and $(a_0, b_0) \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Z}$ we have $f''(a_0) = 0$ and $f''(y) \neq 0$ for $-\infty < a_0 < y < b_0 \leq \infty$. Without loss of generality we may assume $b_0 < \infty$ and $f'' > 0$ in (a_0, b_0) . To set the ground for the construction in multi-D here we build an initial data in one dimension with following parameters: $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k \geq 1}, \{a_k\}_{k \geq 1} \cup \{a_0\}, \{A_k\}_{k \geq 1}$

satisfying

$$|f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)| \leq \epsilon_k \leq A_k \text{ and } C := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k + 2\epsilon_1 < +\infty. \quad (5.19)$$

We invoke Lemma 5.1 to get sequences $\{p_k\}$ and $\{a_k\}$ verifying (5.1). From (5.1), observe that $\epsilon_k = |a_k - a_0|^{p_k}$ and $A_k = |f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)| / |a_k - a_0|$ satisfy (5.19). Note that from (5.1) we have $\epsilon_k^{-1} |f'(a_0) - f'(a_k)| = k^{-1} \leq 1$, $A_k \leq k^{-2}$ and $|a_k - a_0|^{-1} \geq k$. By using (5.1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_k &= |f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)| |a_k - a_0|^{-1} = (|f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)| |a_k - a_0|^{-p_k}) |a_k - a_0|^{p_k-1} \\ &= k^{-1} |a_k - a_0|^{-1} \epsilon_k \geq \epsilon_k. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\{\epsilon_k\}$, $\{a_k\}$ and $\{A_k\}$ satisfies (5.19). One may not be able to construct an appropriate initial data by arranging $\{a_1, a_0, a_2, a_0, \dots\}$ with suitable spatial distance because this may not give a non-BV data if $\sum_{k \geq 1} |a_k - a_0| < \infty$. To give more oscillation in data and to ensure $TV(u_0) = \infty$ we repeat each pair (a_k, a_0) sufficiently many times. For this purpose we define

$$N_l := \left\lfloor \frac{A_l}{\epsilon_l} \right\rfloor \text{ for } l \geq 1 \text{ and } J_k := \sum_{l=1}^k N_l \text{ for } k \geq 1 \quad (5.20)$$

where $[\cdot]$ is the standard ‘box function’. Let $J_0 = 0$. Since $A_l \geq \epsilon_l$ as in (5.19) we have $N_l \geq 1$. The quantity N_k denotes the number of times the oscillation of strength $|a_k - a_0|$ appears in initial data. Next we consider the following real number sequences $(\sigma_m)_{m \geq 1}$ and $(\delta_m)_{m \geq 1}$ defined as

$$\sigma_m := \begin{cases} a_0 & \text{if } m = 1, \\ a_k & \text{if } m = 2i \quad \text{with } J_{k-1} + 1 \leq i \leq J_k, k \geq 1, \\ a_0 & \text{if } m = 2i + 1 \quad \text{with } J_{k-1} + 1 \leq i \leq J_k, k \geq 1, \end{cases} \quad (5.21)$$

and

$$\delta_m := \begin{cases} T\epsilon_1 & \text{if } m = 1, 2, \\ T\epsilon_k & \text{if } 2J_{k-1} + 3 \leq m \leq 2J_k + 2, k \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.22)$$

We henceforth write

$$x_m := \sum_{j=1}^m \delta_j \text{ for } m \geq 1 \text{ and } x_\infty := \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} x_m = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \delta_j. \quad (5.23)$$

Consequently, by using (5.19), $J_k - J_{k-1} = N_k$ and $N_k \epsilon_k \leq 2A_k$ we have

$$x_\infty = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \delta_j \leq 2T \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (J_k - J_{k-1}) \epsilon_k + 2T\epsilon_1 \leq 4T \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k + 2T\epsilon_1 < \infty. \quad (5.24)$$

We consider an initial data w_0 defined as follows

$$w_0(x) := \begin{cases} a_0 & \text{if } x < x_1, \\ \sigma_m & \text{if } x_m < x < x_{m+1}, \\ a_0 & \text{if } x > x_\infty. \end{cases} \quad (5.25)$$

By our assumption $f'' > 0$ on (a_0, b_0) . We observe the following facts:

- (a) Since f is convex on (a_0, b_0) and $a_k > a_0$, *shock wave* is formed at $(x_{2m+1}, 0)$ with speed $(f(a_k) - f(a_0))/(a_k - a_0)$ for $J_{k-1} < m \leq J_k$ when $k \geq 1$.
- (b) Since f is convex on (a_0, b_0) and $a_k > a_0$ *rarefaction fan* is generated from $(x_{2m}, 0)$. At small time $t > 0$ it covers the interval $\{(x, t); x \in (f'(a_0)t, f'(a_k)t)\}$ for $J_{k-1} < m \leq J_k$ when $k \geq 1$.

We wish to check that no two Riemann problem solutions interact with each other in time interval $[0, T]$.

- (a) *No interaction between shock wave from $(x_{2m+1}, 0)$ with extreme right characteristic from point*




Figure 2: The initial data is constructed by repeating the pair (a_0, a_k) N_k times and two consecutive pair are connected by a_0 . At the (a_0, a_k) jump, rarefaction arises in structure of the associated entropy solution. Shocks are formed at each jump point (a_k, a_0) . Waves do not interact till time T .

$(x_{2m}, 0)$ for $J_{k-1} < m < J_k$: Suppose at time t_1 shock line, $x = x_{2m+1} + t(f(a_k) - f(a_0))/(a_k - a_0)$ meets with the extreme right characteristic line from $(x_{2m}, 0)$ i.e. $x = x_{2m} + tf'(a_k)$. Then we have $x_{2m+1} + t_1(f(a_k) - f(a_0))/(a_k - a_0) = x_{2m} + t_1f'(a_k)$. By the Mean Value Theorem we get $t_1 = \frac{x_{2m+1} - x_{2m}}{f'(a_k) - \frac{f(a_k) - f(a_0)}{a_k - a_0}} = \frac{x_{2m+1} - x_{2m}}{f'(a_k) - f'(c_k)}$ for some $c_k \in (a_0, a_k)$. By the choice of x_j in

(5.23) we have $x_{2m+1} - x_{2m} = \epsilon_k$ for $J_{k-1} < m < J_k$. Since $f'' > 0$ on (a_0, b_0) and $a_0 < c_k < a_k$ we have $f'(a_0) < f'(c_k) < f'(a_k)$. Hence $|f'(c_k) - f'(a_k)| = f'(a_k) - f'(c_k) < f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)$. With the help of (5.19) we obtain

$$t_1 = \frac{x_{2m+1} - x_{2m}}{f'(a_k) - f'(c_k)} \geq \frac{T\epsilon_k}{f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)} \geq T. \quad (5.26)$$

- (b) *No interaction between shock wave from $(x_{2m+1}, 0)$ with extreme left characteristic from point $(x_{2m+2}, 0)$ for $J_{k-1} < m < J_k$* : Suppose at time t_2 the shock line $x = x_{2m+1} + t(f(a_k) - f(a_0))/(a_k - a_0)$ meet the extreme left characteristic line from $(x_{2m+2}, 0)$, i.e. $x = x_{2m+2} + tf'(a_0)$. Then we have $x_{2m+1} + t_2 \frac{f(a_k) - f(a_0)}{a_k - a_0} = x_{2m+2} + t_2f'(a_0)$. After a rearrangement and by the Mean Value Theorem we have $t_2 = \frac{x_{2m+2} - x_{2m+1}}{\frac{f(a_k) - f(a_0)}{a_k - a_0} - f'(a_0)} = \frac{x_{2m+2} - x_{2m+1}}{f'(c_k) - f'(a_0)}$ for some $c_k \in (a_0, a_k)$. Since $f'' > 0$ on (a_0, b_0) we have $f'(a_k) > f'(c_k) > f'(a_0)$. Therefore, we obtain $|f'(c_k) - f'(a_0)| = f'(c_k) - f'(a_0) < f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)$. Since $x_{2m+2} - x_{2m+1} = \epsilon_k$ for $J_{k-1} < m < J_k$, by applying (5.19), we have

$$t_2 = \frac{x_{2m+2} - x_{2m+1}}{f'(c_k) - f'(a_0)} \geq \frac{T\epsilon_k}{f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)} \geq T. \quad (5.27)$$

- (c) *No interaction between shock wave from $(x_{2m+1}, 0)$ with extreme right characteristic from point $(x_{2m}, 0)$ for $m = J_k$* : Suppose $x = x_{2m+1} + t(f(a_k) - f(a_0))/(a_k - a_0)$ meets with the line $x = x_{2m} + tf'(a_k)$ at time t_3 . By similar argument as in (5.26), we have $t_3 \geq T$.
- (d) *No interaction between shock wave from $(x_{2m+1}, 0)$ with extreme left characteristic from point $(x_{2m+2}, 0)$ for $m = J_k$* : Suppose $x = x_{2m+1} + t(f(a_k) - f(a_0))/(a_k - a_0)$ meets with the line $x = x_{2m+2} + tf'(a_0)$ at time t_4 . By our choice of x_{2m+2} for $m = J_k$ we have $x_{2m+2} - x_{2m+1} = \epsilon_k$. Now by using (5.19) with a similar argument as in (5.27) we infer that $t_4 \geq T$.

Above observation confirms that no two Riemann problem solutions interact with each other before time T (see Figure 2 for clear illustration). Let w be the entropy solution to (1.1) with initial data

w_0 . Then we have

$$w(x, t) = \begin{cases} a_0 & \text{if } x < x_2 + f'(a_0)t, \\ a_k & \text{if } x_{2i} + f'(a_k)t < x < x_{2i+1} + P_k t, \\ & \text{for } J_{k-1} + 1 \leq i \leq J_k, k \geq 1, \\ a_0 & \text{if } x_{2i+1} + P_k t < x < x_{2i+2} + f'(a_0)t, \\ & \text{for } J_{k-1} + 1 \leq i \leq J_k, k \geq 1, \\ (f')^{-1}\left(\frac{x - x_{2i}}{t}\right) & \text{if } x_{2i} + f'(a_0)t < x \leq x_{2i} + f'(a_k)t, \\ & \text{for } J_{k-1} + 1 \leq i \leq J_k, k \geq 1, \\ a_0 & \text{if } x > x_\infty + f'(a_0)t, \end{cases} \quad (5.28)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$, where $P_k = (f(a_k) - f(a_0))/(a_k - a_0)$. Now we wish to show that $TV(w(\cdot, t), [(x_1 + f'(a_0)t, x_\infty + f'(a_0)t)]) = \infty$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. To do this, fix a time $t \in [0, T]$. Consider a sequence $\{z_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that

$$z_n \in \begin{cases} (x_{2i} + f'(a_k)t, x_{2i+1} + P_k t) & \text{if } n = 2i + 1 \text{ with } J_{k-1} < i \leq J_k, \\ & \text{for } k \geq 1, \\ (x_{2i+1} + P_k t, x_{2i+2} + f'(a_0)t) & \text{if } n = 2i + 2 \text{ with } J_{k-1} < i \leq J_k, \\ & \text{for } k \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that $\{z_n\} \subset [x_1 + f'(a_0)t, x_\infty + f'(a_0)t]$. From (5.28) we have

$$w(z_n, t) \in \begin{cases} a_k & \text{if } n = 2i + 1 \text{ with } J_{k-1} < i \leq J_k, \\ a_0 & \text{if } n = 2i + 2 \text{ with } J_{k-1} < i \leq J_k, \end{cases} \quad \text{for } k \geq 1, \quad (5.29)$$

therefore, from (5.29) we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=3}^{\infty} |w(z_j, t) - w(z_{j+1}, t)| &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=J_{k-1}+1}^{J_k} |w(z_{2i+2}, t) - w(z_{2i+1}, t)| \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=J_{k-1}+1}^{J_k} |a_k - a_0| = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (J_k - J_{k-1}) |a_k - a_0|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.30)$$

Recall from (5.20) that $J_k - J_{k-1} = N_k$ and N_k is the largest integer smaller than or equal to $\epsilon_k^{-1} |f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)| / |a_k - a_0|$. Therefore, $N_k \geq \frac{|f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)|}{2\epsilon_k |a_k - a_0|}$. By using the above observation we can estimate (5.30) as follows

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |w(z_j, t) - w(z_{j+1}, t)| \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{|f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)|}{2\epsilon_k |a_k - a_0|} |a_k - a_0| \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{|f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)|}{2\epsilon_k}. \quad (5.31)$$

Since $\epsilon_k = |a_k - a_0|^{p_k}$ we get

$$(2\epsilon_k)^{-1} |f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)| = (2|a_k - a_0|^{p_k})^{-1} |f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)|.$$

From (5.1) we obtain $(|a_k - a_0|^{p_k})^{-1} |f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)| = k^{-1}$. Therefore, from (5.31) we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |w(z_j, t) - w(z_{j+1}, t)| \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{|f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)|}{2|a_k - a_0|^{p_k}} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2k} = \infty.$$

This shows that

$$TV(w(\cdot, t), [(x_1 + f'(a_0)t, x_\infty + f'(a_0)t)]) = \infty \text{ for } t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.32)$$

To conclude Proposition 5.4 we need a compactly supported initial data. Note that w_0 as in (5.25) could be such candidate if $a_0 = 0$. In general, a_0 may not be 0. To obtain a compactly supported data, we apply similar technique as we have done in **Case(1)**. Let M_2 be defined as follows

$$M_2 := \max\{|f'(u)|; |u| \leq r_2\} \text{ where } r_2 := \|w_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}. \quad (5.33)$$

From (5.25) observe that $\|w_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} = \max\{|a_0|, |a_k|; \text{ for } k \geq 1\}$. Therefore r_2 does not depend

on T . Hence M_2 is independent of T . Let $R_2 = 3M_2T$ and $I_1 = [x_1 - R_2, x_\infty + R_2]$. We define

$$v_0^T := w_0 \chi_{I_1} \quad (5.34)$$

where w_0 is defined as in (5.25). Note that by choice of x_k in (5.23) we have $x_1 \geq 0$. Recall the constant C defined as in (5.19). From (5.24) we have $x_\infty \leq 4TC$. Hence we have

$$\text{supp}(v_0^T) \subset [-3M_2T, (C_1 + 3M_2)T] \text{ where } C_1 := 4C. \quad (5.35)$$

Let v^T be the entropy solution to (1.1) with initial data v_0^T . Applying Proposition 4.1 we have for $t \in [0, T]$ and $z_1 < z_2$

$$\int_{[z_1, z_2]} |w(x, t) - v^T(x, t)| dx \leq \int_{[z_1 - M_2T, z_2 + M_2T]} |w_0(x) - v_0^T(x)| dx. \quad (5.36)$$

Set $z_1 = x_1 - M_2T$ and $z_2 = x_\infty + M_2T$. With this choice of z_1 and z_2 we observe that $[z_1 - M_2T, z_2 + M_2T] \subset I_1$. Since $v_0^T = w_0$ in I_1 . From (5.36) we have

$$w(x, t) = v^T(x, t) \text{ for all } (x, t) \in [x_1 - M_2T, x_\infty + M_2T] \times [0, T]. \quad (5.37)$$

From (5.33) we have $M_2 \geq |f'(a_0)|$. Therefore, we have

$$[x_1 + f'(a_0)t, x_\infty + f'(a_0)t] \subset [x_1 - M_2T, x_\infty + M_2T] \text{ for all } t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.38)$$

By (5.32), (5.37) and (5.38) we have $TV(v^T(\cdot, t), [x_1 - M_2T, x_\infty + M_2T]) = \infty$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Recall the definition of C_1 in (5.35) and $x_\infty \leq 2CT$. Hence $x_\infty + M_2T \leq (C_1 + M_2)T$. Since $x_1 > 0$ we have $[x_1 - M_2T, x_\infty + M_2T] \subset [-3M_2T, (C_1 + 3M_2)T]$. Therefore, we obtain

$$TV(v^T(\cdot, t), [-3M_2T, (C_1 + 3M_2)T]) = \infty \text{ for all } t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.39)$$

Set $r = \max\{r_1, r_2\}$ where r_1, r_2 are defined as in (5.14) and (5.33) respectively. Let $v_{0,T}^{lin}, v_0^T$ as in (5.15) and (5.34) respectively. Subsequently, $\|v_{0,T}^{lin}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}, \|v_0^T\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq r$. Recall that v_{in}^T is the entropy solution to (1.1) with initial data $v_{0,T}^{lin}$ as in Case(1) and v^T is the entropy solution to (1.1) with initial data v_0^T as in Case(2). By maximum principle $\|v_{in}^T\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}, \|v^T\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq r$. As in Case(1) and Case(2) note that r_1 and r_2 are independent of T and so is r . Let us define $M := \max\{|f'(u)|; |u| \leq r\}$. Since $r \geq r_1, r_2$ we have $M \geq M_1, M_2$. Observe that M is independent of T because r does not depend on T . Note that y_∞ in Case(1) and C_1 in (5.35) are independent of T . Consider $\lambda := y_\infty + 3M + C_1$ which is independent of T . Note that $[-3M_1T, y_\infty + 3M_1T] \subset [-\lambda T, \lambda(T+1)]$ and $[-3M_2T, (C_1 + 3M_2)T] \subset [-\lambda T, \lambda(T+1)]$. Combining (5.16) and (5.35) we can write $\text{supp}(v_{0,T}^{lin}), \text{supp}(v_0^T) \subset [-\lambda T, \lambda(T+1)]$. From (5.18) and (5.39) we infer $TV(v_{in}^T(\cdot, t), [-\lambda T, \lambda(T+1)]), TV(v^T(\cdot, t), [-\lambda T, \lambda(T+1)]) = \infty$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. This concludes Proposition 5.4. \square

5.1.1. Proof of Theorem 2.2

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 2.2. From Proposition 5.4 there exists an entropy solution such that $TV(v^T(\cdot, t)) = \infty$ for $0 \leq t < T$. By using finite speed of propagation we construct a solution v which does not belong to $BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$ for all time $t > 0$.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Since there exists an $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f''(a_0) = 0$ we can invoke Proposition 5.4. Consider a positive increasing sequence $\{T_n\}$ such that $T_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By using Proposition 5.4 there exists $\lambda > 0$ and u^* such that for each T_n we have an initial data $v_0^{T_n}$ such that it satisfies the following:

1. $\|v_0^{T_n}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq u^*$ and $\text{supp}(v_0^{T_n}) \subset [-\lambda T_n, \lambda(T_n + 1)]$.

2. if v^{T_n} is the entropy solution to (1.1) with initial data $v_0^{T_n}$, then

$$TV(v^{T_n}(\cdot, t), [-\lambda T_n, \lambda(T_n + 1)]) = \infty \text{ for all } t \in [0, T_n]. \quad (5.40)$$

We want to build an entropy solution so that it remains non- $BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$ for all time. To do this, we use the sequence of data $v_0^{T_n}$ and with the help of finite speed of propagation, we arrange them such a way that

up to time T_n the entropy solution v^{T_n} does not interact with v^{T_m} if $m \neq n$. To this end, let us define M as follows $M := \max\{|f'(w)|; |w| \leq u^*\}$. Now define ν_n as follows

$$\nu_n = \sum_{k=1}^n 4(T_k + 1)(\lambda + M) + 2(T_{n+1} + 1)(\lambda + M). \quad (5.41)$$

Consider the following initial data v_0 and V_0^m

$$v_0(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} v_0^{T_n}(x - \nu_n) \text{ and } V_0^m(x) = \sum_{n=1}^m v_0^{T_n}(x - \nu_n). \quad (5.42)$$

Let v and V^m be the entropy solutions to (1.1) corresponding to v_0 and V_0^m respectively. To prove $v(\cdot, t) \notin BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$ for all $t > 0$, we first show that for $t \in [0, T_{m+1}]$ $\text{supp}(v^{T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+1}, t))$ is disjoint from $\text{supp}(V^m(\cdot, t))$ and $\text{supp}(v^{T_{m+k}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+k}, t))$ with $k \geq 2$. Then we prove that $v(\cdot, t)$ matches with $v^{T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+1}, t)$ on some interval for $t \in [0, T_{m+1}]$ and finally by (5.40) we conclude the result. Our next aim is to show that $v^{T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+1}, t)$ and $V^m(\cdot, t)$ have disjoint support up to time T_{m+1} . From (5.41),

$$\nu_n - \nu_{n-1} = 2(T_n + 1)(\lambda + M) + 2(T_{n+1} + 1)(\lambda + M). \quad (5.43)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{n-1} + \lambda(T_{n-1} + 1) &\leq \nu_{n-1} + \lambda(T_n + 1) \\ &= -(\nu_n - \nu_{n-1}) + \lambda(T_n + 1) + \nu_n \\ &= -2(T_n + 1)(\lambda + M) - 2(T_{n+1} + 1)(\lambda + M) + \lambda(T_n + 1) + \nu_n \\ &= -\lambda T_n + \nu_n - 2(\lambda + M)(T_n + 1) + 2(T_{n+1} + 1)(\lambda + M) \\ &\leq -\lambda T_n + \nu_n. \end{aligned} \quad (5.44)$$

Since $\text{supp}(v_0^{T_n})$ lies in $[-\lambda T_n, \lambda(T_n + 1)]$ we have

$$\text{supp}(v_0^{T_n}(\cdot - \nu_n)) \subset [-\lambda T_n + \nu_n, \lambda(T_n + 1) + \nu_n]. \quad (5.45)$$

From (5.42), (5.44) and (5.45) we infer

$$\text{supp}(V_0^m) \subset \bigcup_{n=1}^m [-\lambda T_n + \nu_n, \lambda(T_n + 1) + \nu_n] \subset [-\lambda_1 T_1 + \nu_1, \lambda(T_m + 1) + \nu_m].$$

By (5.44) and (5.45), we get $\text{supp}(v_0^{T_n})$ and $\text{supp}(v_0^{T_m})$ are disjoint if $n \neq m$. By using the previous observation, from (5.42) we observe that $\|v_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}, \|V_0^m\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq u^*$ for all $m \geq 1$ since $\|v_0^{T_n}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq u^*$ for all $n \geq 1$. Therefore, by Proposition 4.1 the entropy solution V^m to (1.1) with data V_0^m satisfies

$$\text{supp}(V^m(\cdot, t)) \subset [-\lambda T_1 + \nu_1 - MT_{m+1}, \lambda(T_m + 1) + \nu_m + MT_{m+1}], \quad (5.46)$$

for all $t \in [0, T_{m+1}]$. Recall that $v^{T_{m+1}}$ is the entropy solution to (1.1) with initial data $v_0^{T_{m+1}}$. By Lemma 4.3, we infer that $v^{T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+1}, t)$ is the entropy solution to (1.1) associated with initial data $v_0^{T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+1})$. As we observed in (5.45) $v_0^{T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+1})$ has support in $[-\lambda T_{m+1} + \nu_{m+1}, \lambda(T_{m+1} + 1) + \nu_{m+1}]$. Again by Lemma 4.3 we have

$$\text{supp}(v^{T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+1}, t)) \subset [A_{m+1}, B_{m+1}] \text{ for all } t \in [0, T_{m+1}] \quad (5.47)$$

where A_{m+1}, B_{m+1} are defined as follows

$$A_{m+1} = -\lambda T_{m+1} + \nu_{m+1} - MT_{m+1}, \quad B_{m+1} = \lambda(T_{m+1} + 1) + \nu_{m+1} + MT_{m+1}. \quad (5.48)$$

From definition (5.41) of ν_n and (5.43),

$$\begin{aligned} -\lambda T_{m+1} + \nu_{m+1} - MT_{m+1} &= -(\lambda + M)T_{m+1} + \nu_{m+1} - \nu_m + \nu_m \\ &= -(\lambda + M)T_{m+1} + 2(T_{m+1} + 1)(\lambda + M) \\ &\quad + (T_{m+2} + 1)(\lambda + M) + \nu_m \\ &= (T_{m+1} + 2)(\lambda + M) + (T_{m+2} + 1)(\lambda + M) + \nu_m \\ &= \nu_m + MT_{m+1} + \lambda(T_{m+2} + 1) + \lambda(T_{m+1} + 2) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ M(T_{m+2} + 3).$$

Since $\{T_m\}$ is increasing and $\lambda, M > 0$,

$$-\lambda T_{m+1} + \nu_{m+1} - MT_{m+1} > \lambda(T_m + 1) + \nu_m + MT_{m+1}. \quad (5.49)$$

Combining (5.46), (5.47) and (5.49) we obtain

$$\text{supp}(V^m(\cdot, t)) \cap \text{supp}(v^{T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+1}, t)) = \emptyset \text{ for all } t \in [0, T_{m+1}]. \quad (5.50)$$

Next we show that $v^{T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+1}, t)$ and $v^{T_{m+k}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+k}, t)$ have disjoint support for $t \in [0, T_{m+1}]$ and $k \geq 2$. To this end we consider $m+k$ instead of m in (5.50) to conclude that $\text{supp}(V^{m+k}(\cdot, t))$ and $\text{supp}(v^{T_{m+k+1}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+k+1}, t))$ are disjoint for $t \in [0, T_{m+k+1}]$. Since $\{T_n\}$ is increasing sequence, we have $T_{m+k+1} \geq T_{m+1}$ for all $k \geq 1$. By previous observation we have $\text{supp}(v^{T_{m+k+1}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+k+1}, t))$ and $\text{supp}(V^{m+k}(\cdot, t))$ are disjoint for $t \in [0, T_{m+1}]$ and $k \geq 1$. We also know that support of $v^{T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+1}, t)$ is contained in support of $V^{m+k}(\cdot, t)$ for $k \geq 1$. Hence

$$\text{supp}(v^{T_{m+k}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+k}, t)) \cap \text{supp}(v^{T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+1}, t)) = \emptyset \quad (5.51)$$

for all $t \in [0, T_{m+1}]$ and $k \geq 2$. From (5.50) and (5.51) we conclude that $v^{T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+1}, t)$ does not interact with V^m and $v^{T_{m+k}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+k}, t)$ for $t \in [0, T_{m+1}]$ and $k \geq 2$. Recall that v is the entropy solution to (1.1) with initial data v_0 where v_0 is defined as in (5.42). Therefore, $v(x, t) = v^{T_{m+1}}(x - \nu_{m+1}, t)$ for $(x, t) \in [A_{m+1}, B_{m+1}] \times [0, T_{m+1}]$. By using (5.40) and (5.48) we have for $t \in [0, T_{m+1}]$,

$$TV(v(\cdot, t), [A_{m+1}, B_{m+1}]) \geq TV(v^{T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \nu_{m+1}, t), [-\lambda T_{m+1}, \lambda(T_{m+1} + 1)]) = \infty.$$

This concludes Theorem 2.2. \square

5.2. Construction of multi-D non-BV solution

In this section, we focus on proof of Theorem 2.1. It follows in the same way as proof of Theorem 2.2. In the proof of Theorem 2.2, we have used a compact support data v_0^T as a building block which is guaranteed by Proposition 5.4. Similarly, in multi dimension we first construct a compact support data $U_{\xi, T}^0$ such that the associated entropy solution $U_{\xi, T}$ does not belong to $BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $t \in [0, T]$. By using $U_{\xi, T}^0$ as a building block, we prove Theorem 2.1 in the same manner as Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Fix $\hat{b} \in \mathbb{R}$. Now we wish to find a direction $\xi \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$ such that $F''(\hat{b}) \cdot \xi = 0$. If $F''(\hat{b}) = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ then we can take ξ to be any vector in \mathcal{S}^{d-1} . If $F''(\hat{b}) \neq \mathbf{0}$ then there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $F''_i(\hat{b}) \neq 0$. Therefore, in this case we choose $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d) \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$ as follows:

$$\xi_j := \begin{cases} -\vartheta^{-1/2} F''_i(\hat{b}) & \text{for } j \neq i, \\ \vartheta^{-1/2} \sum_{j \neq i} F''_j(\hat{b}) & \text{for } j = i, \end{cases} \quad \text{with } \vartheta = (d-1) \left| F''_i(\hat{b}) \right|^2 + \left| \sum_{j \neq i} F''_j(\hat{b}) \right|^2.$$

Consider $f = F \cdot \xi$. Then $f''(\hat{b}) = 0$. Since $F \in C^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ we have $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$. Similar to Theorem 2.2 consider a positive increasing real number sequence $\{T_n\}$ such that $T_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Now invoke Proposition 5.4 to get generic constant $\lambda, u^* > 0$ such that for each T_n we get an initial data $v_0^{T_n}$ satisfying the following properties:

1. $\|v_0^{T_n}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq u^*$ and $\text{supp}(v_0^{T_n}) \subset [-\lambda T_n, \lambda(T_n + 1)]$.
2. if v^{T_n} is the entropy solution to (1.1) with initial data $v_0^{T_n}$, then

$$TV(v^{T_n}(\cdot, t), [-\lambda T_n, \lambda(T_n + 1)]) = \infty \text{ for all } t \in [0, T_n]. \quad (5.52)$$

We use the sequence of data $\{v_0^{T_n}\}$ to define a planar data in multi-D which can be constructed as follows: Let $\{\xi, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{d-1}\}$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{R}^d . Now we define V_{ξ, T_n}^0 as follows

$$V_{\xi, T_n}^0(x) := v_0^{T_n}(x \cdot \xi) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (5.53)$$

In other words, if $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ where $x_1 = x \cdot \xi, x_j = x \cdot \zeta_{j-1}$ for $2 \leq j \leq d$, then (5.53) can be seen as a function which is constant with respect to x_i variable for $i \geq 2$ and it only varies in the first variable,

that is x_1 . It is clear that the function is no more a compact support data. To proceed in a similar way as we have done in Theorem 2.2, we need a compactly supported initial data. For this purpose let us consider the cube \mathcal{Q}_r in \mathbb{R}^d with each side length $2r$ and centred at origin, that is $\mathcal{Q}_r = [-r, r]^d$ for $r > 0$. Define U_{ξ, T_n}^0 as follows

$$U_{\xi, T_n}^0(x) = V_{\xi, T_n}^0(x) \chi_{\mathcal{Q}_{r_n}}(x) \text{ where } \chi_{\mathcal{Q}_{r_n}} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{Q}_{r_n}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (5.54)$$

and $r_n = 2(\lambda + M)(T_n + 1)$. Let U_{ξ, T_n} be the entropy solution to (1.1) for initial data U_{ξ, T_n}^0 as in (5.54). Recall that v^{T_n} is the entropy solution to (1.1) corresponding to initial data $v_0^{T_n}$. Define

$$V_{\xi, T_n}(x, t) = v^{T_n}(x \cdot \xi, t) \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (5.55)$$

Combining Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3, V_{ξ, T_n} is the entropy solution to (1.1) for initial data V_{ξ, T_n}^0 . By Proposition 4.1,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{|x| \leq \lambda(T_n+1) + MT_n} |V_{\xi, T_n}(x, t) - U_{\xi, T_n}(x, t)| dx \\ & \leq \int_{|x| \leq \lambda(T_n+1) + M(T_n+t)} |V_{\xi, T_n}^0(x) - U_{\xi, T_n}^0(x)| dx \end{aligned} \quad (5.56)$$

for $t \in [0, T_n]$. Since $r_n = 2(\lambda + M)(T_n + 1)$, $R_n := \lambda(T_n + 1) + 2MT_n < r_n$. Subsequently, we get $B(\mathbf{0}, R_n) \subset \mathcal{Q}_{r_n}$. By (5.54),

$$\int_{|x| \leq \lambda(T_n+1) + M(T_n+t)} |V_{\xi, T_n}^0(x) - U_{\xi, T_n}^0(x)| dx \leq \int_{|x| \leq R_n} |V_{\xi, T_n}^0(x) - U_{\xi, T_n}^0(x)| dx = 0$$

for all $t \in [0, T_n]$. Therefore, from (5.56) it yields $V_{\xi, T_n}(x, t) = U_{\xi, T_n}(x, t)$ for all $(x, t) \in B(\mathbf{0}, \lambda(T_n + 1) + MT_n) \times [0, T_n]$. From (5.55) we have $U_{\xi, T_n}(x, t) = v^{T_n}(x \cdot \xi, t)$ for $(x, t) \in B(\mathbf{0}, \lambda(T_n + 1) + MT_n) \times [0, T_n]$. By Theorem 3.1 and (5.52),

$$TV(U_{\xi, T_n}(\cdot, t), B(\mathbf{0}, \lambda(T_n + 1) + MT_n)) = \infty \text{ for } t \in [0, T_n]. \quad (5.57)$$

By arranging the sequence of data $\{U_{\xi, T_n}\}$ we want to build a data U_0 such that the associated entropy solution $U(\cdot, t)$ does not belong to $BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all time $t > 0$. For this purpose we use a similar procedure like Theorem 2.2 and arrange them such a way that U_{ξ, T_n} does not interact with U_{ξ, T_m} if $m \neq n$. To this

end, define ρ_n as follows $\rho_n = \sum_{k=1}^n 4(T_k + 1)(\lambda + M) + 2(T_{n+1} + 1)(\lambda + M)$. Now consider initial data U_0 and W_0^m defined as follows

$$U_0(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} U_{\xi, T_n}^0(x - \rho_n \xi) \text{ and } W_0^m(x) = \sum_{n=1}^m U_{\xi, T_n}^0(x - \rho_n \xi). \quad (5.58)$$

Let U and W^m be the entropy solutions to (1.1) corresponding to U_0 and W_0^m respectively. We want to show $U(\cdot, t) \notin BV_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all time $t > 0$. To do this we prove that $U(\cdot, t)$ agrees with $U_{\xi, T_n}(\cdot - \rho_n \xi, t)$ on some ball around the point $\rho \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for $t \in [0, T_n]$ for all $n \geq 1$. For this purpose let us first show that $\text{supp}(U_{\xi, T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \rho_{m+1} \xi, t))$ is disjoint from $\text{supp}(W^m(\cdot, t))$ and $\text{supp}(U_{\xi, T_{m+k}}(\cdot - \rho_{m+k} \xi, t))$ for $t \in [0, T_{m+1}]$ and $k \geq 2$. By a similar argument as in (5.44), from Lemma 4.3,

$$\rho_{n-1} + \lambda(T_{n-1} + 1) \leq -\lambda(T_n + 1) + \rho_n. \quad (5.59)$$

Since $\text{supp}(U_{\xi, T_n}^0)$ lies in $B(\mathbf{0}, \lambda(T_n + 1))$,

$$\text{supp}(U_{\xi, T_n}^0(\cdot - \rho_n \xi)) \subset B(\rho_n \xi, \lambda(T_n + 1)). \quad (5.60)$$

As $|\xi| = 1$, from (5.58), (5.59) and (5.60) we obtain

$$\text{supp}(W_0^m) \subset \bigcup_{n=1}^m B(\rho_n \xi, \lambda(T_n + 1)) \subset B(\mathbf{0}, \lambda(T_n + 1) + \rho_n).$$

From (5.58), we get $\|U_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}, \|W_0^m\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq u^*$ for all $m \geq 1$ due to the fact that $\|U_{\xi, T_n}^0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq u^*$ and U_{ξ, T_n}^0 's have disjoint support for all $n \geq 1$. Therefore, W^m , the entropy solution to (1.1) with data W_0^m satisfies

$$\text{supp}(W^m(\cdot, t)) \subset B(\mathbf{0}, \lambda(T_n + 1) + \rho_n + MT_{m+1}) \text{ for all } t \in [0, T_{m+1}]. \quad (5.61)$$

Recall that $U_{\xi, T_{m+1}}$ is the entropy solution to (1.1) with initial data $U_{\xi, T_{m+1}}^0$. By Lemma 4.3, $U_{\xi, T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \rho_{m+1}\xi, t)$ is the entropy solution to (1.1) associated with initial data $U_{\xi, T_{m+1}}^0(\cdot - \rho_{m+1})$. As we observed before $U_{\xi, T_{m+1}}^0(\cdot - \rho_{m+1}\xi)$ has support in $B(\rho_{m+1}\xi, \lambda(T_{m+1} + 1))$. Hence,

$$\text{supp}(U_{\xi, T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \rho_{m+1}\xi, t)) \subset B(\rho_{m+1}\xi, \lambda(T_{m+1} + 1) + MT_{m+1}) \quad (5.62)$$

for all $t \in [0, T_{m+1}]$. By a similar argument as in (5.49),

$$-\lambda(T_{m+1} + 1) + \rho_{m+1} - MT_{m+1} > \lambda(T_m + 1) + \rho_m + MT_{m+1}. \quad (5.63)$$

Next we wish to show that $B(\rho_{m+1}\xi, \lambda(T_{m+1} + 1) + MT_{m+1})$ and $B(\mathbf{0}, \lambda(T_n + 1) + \rho_n + MT_{m+1})$ are disjoint. Let $y \in B(\rho_{m+1}\xi, \lambda(T_{m+1} + 1) + MT_{m+1})$. Then $|y - \rho_{m+1}\xi| \leq \lambda(T_{m+1} + 1) + MT_{m+1}$. From the previous observation, $|y| \geq |\rho_{m+1}\xi| - |y - \rho_{m+1}\xi| \geq \rho_{m+1} - \lambda(T_{m+1} + 1) - MT_{m+1}$. Using (5.63) we get $|y| > \lambda(T_m + 1) + \rho_m + MT_{m+1}$. Hence $B(\rho_{m+1}\xi, \lambda(T_{m+1} + 1) + MT_{m+1})$ and $B(\mathbf{0}, \lambda(T_n + 1) + \rho_n + MT_{m+1})$ are disjoint. From (5.61) and (5.62),

$$\text{supp}(W^m(\cdot, t)) \cap \text{supp}(U_{\xi, T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \rho_{m+1}\xi, t)) = \emptyset \text{ for all } t \in [0, T_{m+1}]. \quad (5.64)$$

Considering $m + k$ instead of m in (5.64) we conclude that $\text{supp}(W^{m+k}(\cdot, t))$ and $\text{supp}(U_{\xi, T_{m+k+1}}(\cdot - \rho_{m+k+1}\xi, t))$ are disjoint for $t \in [0, T_{m+k+1}]$. Since $\{T_n\}$ is increasing sequence, $T_{m+k+1} \geq T_{m+1}$ for all $k \geq 1$. By previous observation, $\text{supp}(U_{\xi, T_{m+k+1}}(\cdot - \rho_{m+k}\xi, t))$ and $\text{supp}(W^{m+k}(\cdot, t))$ are disjoint for $t \in [0, T_{m+1}]$ and $k \geq 1$. We also know that $\text{supp}(U_{\xi, T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \rho_{m+1}\xi, t))$ is contained in $\text{supp}(W^{m+k}(\cdot, t))$ for all $k \geq 1$. Hence

$$\text{supp}(U_{\xi, T_{m+k}}(\cdot - \rho_{m+k}\xi, t)) \cap \text{supp}(U_{\xi, T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \rho_{m+1}\xi, t)) = \emptyset \quad (5.65)$$

for all $t \in [0, T_{m+1}]$ and $k \geq 2$. From (5.64) and (5.65) we conclude that $U_{\xi, T_{m+1}}(\cdot - \rho_{m+1}\xi, t)$ does not interact with W^m and $U_{\xi, T_{m+k}}(\cdot - \rho_{m+k}\xi, t)$ for $t \in [0, T_{m+1}]$ and $k \geq 2$. Recall that U is the entropy solution to (1.1) with initial data U where U_0 is defined as in (5.58). Therefore, $U(x, t) = U_{\xi, T_{m+1}}(x - \rho_{m+1}\xi, t)$ for $(x, t) \in B(\rho_{m+1}\xi, \lambda(T_{m+1} + 1) + MT_{m+1}) \times [0, T_{m+1}]$. Recall (5.57) to conclude

$$TV(U(\cdot, t), B(\rho_{m+1}\xi, \lambda(T_{m+1} + 1) + MT_{m+1})) = \infty \text{ for all } t \in [0, T_{m+1}] \text{ and } m \geq 1.$$

This completes proof of Theorem 2.1. \square

6. Non-existence of $W^{s,p}$ -regularizing

With the method of section 5, we want to investigate the situation in terms of regularizing in fractional Sobolev space. In this section our main goal is to prove Theorem 2.4 that is to give an upper bound of s for L^∞ - $W^{s,p}$ regularizing of entropy solutions to (1.1). Likewise section 5 we first show the result for one dimension and then extend it for multi dimension in a similar manner.

6.1. One dimensional results

As we observe in section 5 that to build a desired entropy solution first and fore most we need a real number sequence $\{a_k\}$ with some properties. Recall that in order to build a non- BV_{loc} entropy solution we were looking for a sequence satisfying (5.1) near a point where f'' vanishes. Since in this section we are mostly interested in non-degenerate fluxes, we wish to measure the flatness of a flux f near zeros of f'' by looking at the ratio $|f'(a) - f'(b)|/|a - b|$. In purpose of that let us first observe the following.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $p \geq 1$. Let $g : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^1 function for $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$. Fix $y_0 \in [a, b]$. Then **exactly one** of the following occurs:*

1. *there is a constant $C > 0$ and a sequence $\{y_m\}_{m \geq 1} \subset [a, b]$ with $y_m \rightarrow y_0$ such that*

$$|g(y_m) - g(y_0)| \leq C|y_m - y_0|^p \text{ for all } m \geq 1. \quad (6.1)$$

2. *for each $\varrho > 0$ there exists an $\eta_\varrho > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{x \in [a, b], 0 < |x - y_0| < \eta_\varrho} \frac{|g(x) - g(y_0)|}{|x - y_0|^p} \geq \varrho. \quad (6.2)$$

Note that for fixed y_0 and p , both of (6.1), (6.2) can not occur simultaneously. Before we see the proof of Lemma 6.1, we want to remark that if $g = f'$ for some C^2 flux f , then the exponent p measures the flatness of f near the point y_0 . Obviously, p and y_0 decide which one of (6.1) and (6.2) is true. For example consider $g(u) = u^3$. Note that for $p = 2$ and $y_0 = 0$, (6.1) holds whereas for $p = 4$ and $y_0 = 0$ (6.2) is true. Observe that for $p = 4$ and $y_0 = 0$, possible choice of η_ϱ is $\eta_\varrho = 2^{-1}\varrho^{-1}$ when $\varrho \geq 2$ and $\eta_\varrho = 4^{-1}$ for $\varrho \in (0, 2]$. Similarly, it can be checked that for $p = 2$ and $y_0 = 1$, (6.2) holds with $\eta_\varrho = \varrho^{-1}$ for $\varrho \geq 3$ and $\eta_\varrho = 3^{-1}$ for $\varrho \in (0, 3]$. It is interesting to note that for $p = 3$, $y_0 = 0$ the inequality (6.1) is satisfied with $C = 1$ and any sequence $\{y_n\}$ such that $y_n \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. It is clear that for $p = 3$, $y_0 = 0$, we have $|g(x) - g(y_0)|/|x - y_0|^p = 1$, hence it fails to satisfy (6.2) for all $\varrho > 1$.

Proof. Note that there are two possibilities:

Possibility(a): for each $\varrho > 0$ there exists $\eta_\varrho > 0$ such that (6.2) holds.

Possibility(b): **Possibility(a)** does not hold for some $\varrho_0 > 0$, i.e. for each $\eta > 0$ the inequality (6.2) fails to hold for ϱ_0 .

Note that if the **Possibility(a)** holds then there is nothing to prove because it gives (6.2). In the **Possibility(b)**, for each $\eta > 0$ we have some $x_\eta \in [a, b]$ with $0 < |x_\eta - y_0| < \eta$ such that $|g(x_\eta) - g(y_0)|/|x_\eta - y_0|^p < \varrho_0$. For a sequence η_m such that $\eta_m \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ we denote $x_m := x_{\eta_m}$ satisfying $|g(x_m) - g(y_0)| < \varrho_0|x_m - y_0|^p$ for all $m \geq 1$. This gives (6.1) with $C = \varrho_0$. \square

Our interest lies on behaviour of f near a point where f'' vanishes. In the next lemma, we consider a flux f such that it is satisfying (2.1) in an interval on \mathbb{R} and second derivative of f vanishes only at endpoints of the interval then we investigate flatness of f near endpoints of the interval. This lemma plays a key role in proving Theorem 2.4.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $a < b$ be two real numbers. Let $f \in C^2([a, b], \mathbb{R})$ such that $f''(a) = f''(b) = 0$ and $f'' \neq 0$ in (a, b) . Suppose f satisfies (2.1) with $\alpha_{sup}(f, [a, b]) < 1$. Let p be a real number such that $1 > p^{-1} > \alpha_{sup}(f, [a, b])$. Then there exist sequences $\{x_k\}_{k \geq 1}$, $\{y_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ and $M_0 > 0$ such that **at least one** of the following holds:*

(a) $x_k \rightarrow a$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ with

$$|f'(x_k) - f'(a)| \leq M_0|x_k - a|^p. \quad (6.3)$$

(b) $y_k \rightarrow b$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ with

$$|f'(y_k) - f'(b)| \leq M_0|y_k - b|^p. \quad (6.4)$$

Proof. We invoke Lemma 6.1 for $g = f'$ separately with $y_0 = a$ and $y_0 = b$. Then we have the following four possibilities:

(i) (6.1) holds for both $y_0 = a$ and $y_0 = b$.

(ii) (6.1) holds for $y_0 = a$ and (6.2) holds for $y_0 = b$.

(iii) (6.2) holds for $y_0 = a$ and (6.1) holds for $y_0 = b$.

(iv) (6.2) holds for both $y_0 = a$ and $y_0 = b$.

Note that if any of the above possibilities (i)-(iii) holds then we have nothing to prove because each of possibilities (i)-(iii) ensures at least one of the inequalities (6.3) and (6.4). Next we show that if (iv) holds then it gives a contradiction to the definition of $\alpha_{sup}(f, [a, b])$. Suppose (iv) holds. Then for $\varrho = 2$ there exist $\eta_1, \eta_2 > 0$ such that the following holds

$$\inf_{x \in (a, a + \eta_1]} \frac{|f'(x) - f'(a)|}{|x - a|^p} \geq 2 \text{ and } \inf_{x \in [b - \eta_2, b)} \frac{|f'(x) - f'(b)|}{|x - b|^p} \geq 2. \quad (6.5)$$

Now we claim that there exist $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in (0, b - a)$ such that

$$\inf_{x, y \in [a, a + \delta_1], x \neq y} \frac{|f'(x) - f'(y)|}{|x - y|^p} \geq 1 \quad (6.6)$$

$$\text{and } \inf_{x, y \in [b - \delta_2, b], x \neq y} \frac{|f'(x) - f'(y)|}{|x - y|^p} \geq 1. \quad (6.7)$$

We prove only (6.6). The other estimate (6.7) follows by a similar argument. If (6.6) does not hold for any $\delta > 0$ then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $x_n, y_n \in [a, a + n^{-1}]$ such that $x_n \neq y_n$ and $|f'(x_n) - f'(y_n)| < |x_n - y_n|^p$. We observe that $x_n, y_n \rightarrow a$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Without loss of generality suppose $y_n \neq a$ for all $n \geq 1$ otherwise we can work with a subsequence of either x_n or y_n . As $x_n \rightarrow a$, by using continuity of f' we get $|f'(a) - f'(y_n)| \leq |a - y_n|^p$. Since $y_n \rightarrow a$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $|y_n - a| < \eta_1$ for sufficiently large n . This contradicts the first estimate in (6.5). Therefore, we have (6.6). Next we show that f satisfies (1.2) with $\alpha = p^{-1}$. Since $f'' \neq 0$ in (a, b) we have

$$B := \min\{|f''(x)|; x \in [a + \delta_1, b - \delta_2]\} > 0. \quad (6.8)$$

Set $\bar{\delta} = \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$. Fix $\delta \in (0, \min\{\bar{\delta}, B|a - b + 2\bar{\delta}|\})$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. Define

$$A(\delta, \tau) := \{x \in [a, b]; |f'(x) - \tau| < \delta\}.$$

Our next goal is to prove that $\mathcal{L}^1(A(\delta, \tau)) \leq C\delta^{\frac{1}{p}}$ for $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and some constant $C > 0$. To show this we consider two cases based on the position of τ .

Case(1): We first consider the case when $\tau \notin f'([a, b])$. Since f'' does not change its sign in (a, b) , f' is monotone on $[a, b]$. Hence, in this case we have $\min\{|f'(x) - \tau|; x \in [a, b]\}$ is either $|f'(a) - \tau|$ or $|f'(b) - \tau|$. We deal these two situations separately,

Subcase(1a): Suppose $\min\{|f'(x) - \tau|; x \in [a, b]\} = |f'(a) - \tau|$. Then we wish to show

$$A(\delta, \tau) \subset \{x \in [a, b]; |f'(x) - f'(a)| < \delta\} \subset \{x; |x - a|^p < \delta\}. \quad (6.9)$$

To this end we first observe the following inequality from (6.6)

$$|f'(x) - f'(a)| \geq |x - a|^p \text{ when } x \in [a, a + \bar{\delta}]. \quad (6.10)$$

Since f' is monotone in $[a, b]$, we can write

$$|f'(x) - f'(a)| = |f'(x) - f'(a + \bar{\delta})| + |f'(a + \bar{\delta}) - f'(a)|$$

when $x \in [a + \bar{\delta}, b - \bar{\delta}]$. From (6.10) we have

$$|f'(a + \bar{\delta}) - f'(a)| \geq \bar{\delta}^p. \quad (6.11)$$

By using (6.8) and Mean Value Theorem for some $c \in (a + \bar{\delta}, x)$ we have

$$|f'(x) - f'(a + \bar{\delta})| = |x - a - \bar{\delta}| |f''(c)| \geq B|x - a - \bar{\delta}|. \quad (6.12)$$

Combining (6.11) and (6.12) we have

$$|f'(x) - f'(a)| \geq \begin{cases} |x - a|^p & \text{if } x \in [a, a + \bar{\delta}], \\ |\bar{\delta}|^p + B|a + \bar{\delta} - x| & \text{if } x \in [a + \bar{\delta}, b - \bar{\delta}]. \end{cases}$$

Note that f' is monotone. Since $|f'(a) - f'(x)| \geq |\delta|^p$ holds for $x \in [a + \bar{\delta}, b - \bar{\delta}]$ we have $|f'(a) - f'(x)| \geq \bar{\delta}^p$ for $x \in [a + \bar{\delta}, b]$. Recall that by our choice of δ , we have $\delta < \bar{\delta}^p$. Therefore, if $|f'(a) - f'(x)| < \delta$ then we obtain $x \in [a, a + \bar{\delta}]$. This shows the second inclusion in (6.9). To show the first inclusion of (6.9) we do the following: fix an $x \in (a, b)$. Suppose $f'(x) > f'(a)$. Since f' is monotone we have $f'(b) > f'(a)$. By our assumption we have $\min\{|f'(x) - \tau|; x \in [a, b]\} = |f'(a) - \tau|$ and $\tau \notin [f'(a), f'(b)]$. This implies that $f'(a) > \tau$. Hence we obtain

$$|f'(a) - f'(x)| \leq |f'(x) - \tau|. \quad (6.13)$$

If $f'(a) > f'(x)$ then by a similar argument we can show that (6.13) holds.

Now if $y \in A(\delta, \tau)$ Then we have $|f'(y) - \tau| < \delta$. From (6.13) we have $|f'(y) - f'(a)| < \delta$. This shows the first inclusion in (6.9). Hence (6.9) is proved.

Subcase(1b): Now we consider the case when $\min\{|f'(x) - \tau|; x \in [a, b]\} = |f'(b) - \tau|$. We wish to show

$$A(\delta, \tau) \subset \{x \in [a, b]; |f'(x) - f'(b)| < \delta\} \subset \{x; |x - b|^p < \delta\}. \quad (6.14)$$

This can be proved in a similar way as we have done for (6.9) in **Subcase(1a)**.

Combining (6.9) and (6.14) we get

$$\mathcal{L}^1(A(\delta, \tau)) \leq 2\delta^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (6.15)$$

Case(2): Now we consider the case when $\tau \in f'([a, b])$. Since f'' does not change its sign in (a, b) , f' is monotone on $[a, b]$. Therefore, in this case we have unique $x_0 \in [a, b]$ such that $\tau = f'(x_0)$. By a similar argument as in **Case(1)** we observe the following:

Subcase(2a): If $x_0 \in [a, a + \bar{\delta}]$ then we have

$$|f'(x) - f'(x_0)| \geq \begin{cases} |x - x_0|^p & \text{if } x \in [a, a + \bar{\delta}], \\ |a + \bar{\delta} - x_0|^p + B|a + \bar{\delta} - x| & \text{if } x \in [a + \bar{\delta}, b - \bar{\delta}], \\ (|a + \bar{\delta} - x_0|^p + B|a - b + 2\bar{\delta}| + |b - \bar{\delta} - x|^p) & \text{if } x \in [b - \bar{\delta}, b]. \end{cases}$$

Subsequently, by choice of δ we have

$$A(\delta, \tau) \subset \begin{cases} (x_0 - \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}, x_0 + \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}) & \text{if } \delta < |x_0 - a - \bar{\delta}|^p, \\ (x_0 - \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}, a + \bar{\delta} + \delta B^{-1}) & \text{if } \delta \geq |x_0 - a - \bar{\delta}|^p. \end{cases}$$

This yields

$$\mathcal{L}^1(A(\delta, \tau)) \leq \begin{cases} 2\delta^{\frac{1}{p}} & \text{if } \delta < |x_0 - a - \bar{\delta}|^p, \\ 2\delta^{\frac{1}{p}} + \delta B^{-1} & \text{if } \delta \geq |x_0 - a - \bar{\delta}|^p. \end{cases} \quad (6.16)$$

Subcase(2b): If $x_0 \in [b - \bar{\delta}, b]$ then we have

$$|f'(x) - f'(x_0)| \geq \begin{cases} |x - x_0|^p & \text{if } x \in [b - \bar{\delta}, b], \\ |b - \bar{\delta} - x_0|^p + B|b - \bar{\delta} - x| & \text{if } x \in [a + \bar{\delta}, b - \bar{\delta}], \\ (|a + \bar{\delta} - x|^p + B|a - b + \bar{\delta}| + |b - \bar{\delta} - x_0|^p) & \text{if } x \in [b - \bar{\delta}, b]. \end{cases}$$

By a similar argument as in **Subcase(2a)** we have

$$\mathcal{L}^1(A(\delta, \tau)) \leq \begin{cases} 2\delta^{\frac{1}{p}} & \text{if } \delta < |b - \bar{\delta} - x_0|^p, \\ 2\delta^{\frac{1}{p}} + \delta B^{-1} & \text{if } \delta \geq |b - \bar{\delta} - x_0|^p. \end{cases} \quad (6.17)$$

Subcase(2c): If $x_0 \in [a + \bar{\delta}, b - \bar{\delta}]$ we have

$$|f'(x) - f'(x_0)| \geq \begin{cases} B|x_0 - x| & \text{if } x \in [a + \bar{\delta}, b - \bar{\delta}], \\ B|a + \bar{\delta} - x_0| + |a + \bar{\delta} - x|^p & \text{if } x \in [a, a + \bar{\delta}], \\ B|b - \bar{\delta} - x_0| + |b - \bar{\delta} - x|^p & \text{if } x \in [b - \bar{\delta}, b]. \end{cases}$$

Subsequently, we have

$$A(\delta, \tau) \subset \begin{cases} \left(x_0 - \frac{\delta}{B}, x_0 + \frac{\delta}{B}\right) & \text{if } |a + \bar{\delta} - x_0|, |b - \bar{\delta} - x_0| \geq \frac{\delta}{B}, \\ \left(a + \bar{\delta} - \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}, x_0 + \frac{\delta}{B}\right) & \text{if } |a + \bar{\delta} - x_0| < \frac{\delta}{B} \leq |b - \bar{\delta} - x_0|, \\ \left(x_0 - \frac{\delta}{B}, b - \bar{\delta} + \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}\right) & \text{if } |b - \bar{\delta} - x_0| < \frac{\delta}{B} \leq |a + \bar{\delta} - x_0|, \\ \left(a + \bar{\delta} - \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}, b - \bar{\delta} + \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}\right) & \text{if } |a + \bar{\delta} - x_0|, |b - \bar{\delta} - x_0| < \frac{\delta}{B}. \end{cases}$$

This yields

$$\mathcal{L}^1(A(\delta, \tau)) \leq \begin{cases} 2\delta B^{-1} & \text{if } |a + \bar{\delta} - x_0|, |b - \bar{\delta} - x_0| \geq \frac{\delta}{B}, \\ \delta^{\frac{1}{p}} + 2\delta B^{-1} & \text{if } |a + \bar{\delta} - x_0| < \frac{\delta}{B} \leq |b - \bar{\delta} - x_0|, \\ \delta^{\frac{1}{p}} + 2\delta B^{-1} & \text{if } |b - \bar{\delta} - x_0| < \frac{\delta}{B} \leq |a + \bar{\delta} - x_0|, \\ 2\delta^{\frac{1}{p}} + 2\delta B^{-1} & \text{if } |a + \bar{\delta} - x_0|, |b - \bar{\delta} - x_0| < \frac{\delta}{B}. \end{cases} \quad (6.18)$$

Combining (6.16), (6.17) and (6.18) we have

$$\mathcal{L}^1(A(\delta, \tau)) \leq 2\delta^{\frac{1}{p}} + 2B^{-1}\delta. \quad (6.19)$$

From (6.19) and (6.15) we have $\mathcal{L}^1(A(\delta, \tau)) \leq 2\delta^{\frac{1}{p}} + 2B^{-1}\delta \leq (2 + 2B^{-1})\delta^{\frac{1}{p}}$. Define

$$C_1 := \max \left\{ (b - a)(\min\{\bar{\delta}^p, B|a - b + 2\bar{\delta}|\})^{-\frac{1}{p}}, (2 + 2B^{-1}) \right\}.$$

Note that C_1 does not depend on δ and τ . Now observe that for $\delta > \min\{\bar{\delta}^p, B|a - b + 2\bar{\delta}|\}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $\mathcal{L}^1(\{x \in [a, b]; |f'(x) - \tau| < \delta\}) \leq b - a \leq C_1\delta^{\frac{1}{p}}$. Therefore, we have $\mathcal{L}^1(A(\delta, \tau)) \leq C_1\delta^{\frac{1}{p}}$ for all $\delta > 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. This shows that f satisfies (1.2) for $\alpha = 1/p$. This contradicts the definition of $\alpha_{sup}(f, [a, b])$ since $1/p > \alpha_{sup}(f, [a, b])$. \square

Next we want to remark few things about fluxes satisfying (1.2) for some $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $C > 0$. First we recall the following fact implicitly mentioned in [34].

Remark 6.3. *If $f \in C^2(I, \mathbb{R})$ be a 1-D flux satisfying (1.2) for some $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ then f'' can not vanish in a non-trivial sub-interval of I . Note that if f'' vanishes on some $I_1 \subset I$ then f' is constant on I_1 . Hence if we choose $\tau = f'(a_0)$ for some $a_0 \in I_1$ then we get $I_1 \subset \{a \in I; |f'(a) - \tau| < \delta\}$ for any $\delta > 0$. This violates (1.2).*

To give more insight on α_{sup} we make a simple observation on non-degeneracy of uniformly convex flux in the following remark.

Remark 6.4. *Let $I = [a, b]$ for some $a < b$ and $f \in C^2(I, \mathbb{R})$. Then f satisfies (1.2) with $\alpha = 1$ if and only if $f'' \neq 0$ on I .*

Proof. Suppose f satisfies (1.2) with $\alpha = 1$. Suppose there exists a point $a_0 \in I$ such that $f''(a_0) = 0$. By Remark 6.3 there f'' can not vanish identically on I . Therefore, we can find a point \bar{a} such that $f'' \neq 0$ either on $(\bar{a}, \bar{a} + \epsilon)$ or on $(\bar{a} - \epsilon, \bar{a})$ but $f''(\bar{a}) = 0$. Without loss of generality we assume that $f'' \neq 0$ on $(\bar{a}, \bar{a} + \epsilon)$. Consider a sequence $\{b_n\} \subset (\bar{a}, \bar{a} + \epsilon)$ such that $b_n \rightarrow \bar{a}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Choose $\tau_n = f'(b_n)$ and

$\delta_n = 2|f'(\bar{a}) - f'(b_n)|$. Since $f'' \neq 0$ on $(\bar{a}, \bar{a} + \epsilon)$ we have f' is monotone on $(\bar{a}, \bar{a} + \epsilon)$. Hence we have $[\bar{a}, b_n] \subset \{u \in I; |f'(u) - \tau| < \delta_n\}$. From (1.2) we obtain $\frac{f'(\bar{a}) - f'(b_n)}{|\bar{a} - b_n|} \geq \frac{1}{2C}$. Passing to the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we have $f''(\bar{a}) \neq 0$. This is a contradiction. Hence $f'' \neq 0$ on I . Conversely, suppose $f'' \neq 0$ on I . Let $m = \min\{|f''(u)|; u \in I\}$. Then we have $|f'(u) - f'(v)| \geq m|u - v|$. By using a similar technique as in Lemma 6.2 we can show that f satisfies (1.2) with $\alpha = 1$. \square

By Remark 6.4 we can conclude that for uniformly convex flux $\alpha_{sup} = 1$. It is crucial to note that converse is not true, i.e. there are fluxes in one dimension which are not uniformly convex but still satisfies (2.1) with $\alpha_{sup} = 1$. Next we give an example of such flux.

Example 6.5. Let $f : [0, e^{-1}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as follows $f(u) := \int_0^u \int_0^y \frac{1}{|\log x|} dx dy$.

Now we claim:

Lemma 6.6. Let f be defined as in Example 6.5. Then $\alpha_{sup}(f, [0, e^{-1}]) = 1$.

Proof. It is clear that $f \in C^2([0, e^{-1}])$. To show $\alpha_{sup}(f, [0, e^{-1}])$, we first prove that f satisfies (1.2) with $\alpha = k/(k+1)$ for each $k \geq 2$. From definition of f , we observe that $f'(u) = \int_0^u \frac{1}{|\log x|} dx$. Fix

a $k \geq 2$. From (5.3) we have for $u \in [0, e^{-k^2}]$ $f'(u) \geq \int_0^u |x|^{\frac{1}{k}} dx = \frac{k}{k+1} u^{1+k^{-1}} \geq 2^{-1} u^{1+k^{-1}}$. Since

$f'' = |\log x|^{-1} \geq 0$, we have f' is increasing and $f'(0) = 0$. Hence we have $|f'| \geq 2^{-1} u^{1+k^{-1}}$. Note that for $u \in [e^{-k^2}, e^{-1}]$, $|f''| \geq k^{-2}$. By a similar technique as in proof of Lemma 6.2 we show that f satisfies (1.2) with $\alpha = k/(k+1)$ and some constant C (depends on k). Recall the definition of α_{sup} as in (2.1) and observe that $\sup\{k/(k+1); k \geq 1\} = 1$. Therefore, we conclude that the function f as in Example 6.5 satisfies $\alpha_{sup}(f, [0, e^{-1}]) = 1$. \square

In Lemma 6.6 we have seen that in one dimension α_{sup} can be 1 for certain C^2 fluxes. In the next lemma we show that for a slightly regular flux in multi-D i.e. $F \in C^{2,\beta}(I, \mathbb{R}^d)$ the non-degeneracy exponent α_{sup} is strictly smaller than 1. This plays a key role to prove Proposition 2.7.

Lemma 6.7. Let $d > 1$ and $F \in C^{2,\beta}([a, b], \mathbb{R}^d)$ for some $0 < \beta \leq 1$, $a < b$. Let $\alpha_{sup}(F, [a, b])$ be determined by (2.1). Then $\alpha_{sup}(F, [a, b]) \leq (1 + \beta)^{-1}$. Moreover, there exist $x_0 \in I$, $\xi_0 \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$, $r > 0$, $C_0 > 0$ and $\{x_k\}_{k \geq 1} \subset (x_0, x_0 + r) \subset I$ such that $F'' \cdot \xi_0 \neq 0$ on $(x_0, x_0 + r)$, $x_k \rightarrow x_0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$|\xi_0 \cdot F'(x_k) - \xi_0 \cdot F'(x_0)| \leq C_0 |x_k - x_0|^{1+\beta} \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (6.20)$$

Proof. Since $F \in C^{2,\beta}([a, b])$, there exists a constant C such that $|F''(x) - F''(y)| \leq C|x - y|^\beta$ for all $x, y \in [a, b]$. Fix a $x_0 \in [a, b]$. We choose a direction $\xi_0 \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$ such that $\xi_0 \cdot F''(x_0) = 0$. Therefore, by Mean Value Theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi_0 \cdot F'(x) - \xi_0 \cdot F'(x_0)| &= |\xi_0 \cdot F''(y)(x - x_0)|, \text{ for some } y \text{ between } x \text{ and } x_0 \\ &= |\xi_0 \cdot F''(y) - \xi_0 \cdot F''(x_0)||x - x_0| \\ &\leq C|y - x_0|^\beta |x - x_0| \\ &\leq C|x - x_0|^{1+\beta} \quad \text{since, } |y - x_0| \leq |x - x_0|. \end{aligned} \quad (6.21)$$

If $\alpha_{sup}(F, [a, b]) > 1/(1 + \beta)$ then there exists an $\alpha_0 \in (1/(1 + \beta), \alpha_{sup})$ such that F satisfies (1.2) with α_0 and some $C_1 > 0$. Consider $\tau = -\xi_0 \cdot F'(x_0)$. Define $\tau_1 := C_0^{-1}\tau$ and $\xi_1 := C_0^{-1}\xi_0$ with

$C_0 = (\tau^2 + |\xi_0|^2)^{1/2}$. This yields $\tau_1^2 + |\xi_1|^2 = 1$. Since F satisfies (1.2) with exponent α_0 we have $\mathcal{L}^1(\{x \in [a, b]; |\tau_1 + \xi_1 \cdot F'(x)| < \delta C_0^{-1}\}) \leq C_1 (\delta C_0^{-1})^{\alpha_0}$ for $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Therefore, we get

$$\mathcal{L}^1(\{x \in [a, b]; |\xi_0 \cdot F'(x_0) - \xi_0 \cdot F'(x)| < \delta\}) \leq \frac{C_1}{C_2} \delta^{\alpha_0} \quad (6.22)$$

where $C_2 = C_0^{\alpha_0}$. On the other hand estimate (6.21) gives

$$\mathcal{L}^1(\{x \in [a, b]; |\tau + \xi_0 \cdot F'(x)| < \delta\}) \geq \frac{1}{C_1^{1/(1+\beta)}} \delta^{1/(1+\beta)}.$$

By (6.22) we have

$$\frac{C_1}{C_2} \delta^{\alpha_0} \geq \frac{1}{C_1^{1/(1+\beta)}} \delta^{1/(1+\beta)} \text{ which implies, } \delta^{\alpha_0 - 1/(1+\beta)} \geq \frac{C_2}{C_1 C_1^{1/(1+\beta)}}. \quad (6.23)$$

Since $\alpha_0 > 1/(1+\beta)$ and (6.23) is true for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$ this gives a contradiction. Note that (6.20) is guaranteed by (6.21). This completes the proof of Lemma 6.7. \square

Now we are almost ready to prove Theorem 2.4. Before that we wish to discuss more on the regularity assumption (2.4). In one dimension, if f satisfies (2.1) and f'' vanishes finitely many times in an interval $[a, b]$ then it satisfies (2.4). We have the following remark for C^∞ fluxes.

Remark 6.8. *Let $I = [a, b]$ for $-\infty < a < b < \infty$ and $F \in C^\infty(I, \mathbb{R}^d)$ be satisfying (2.1) with $\alpha_{sup}(F, I) > 0$. Then F satisfies (2.4).*

Proof. First we observe that for $d = 1$, if $f \in C^\infty(I, \mathbb{R})$ satisfies (2.1) with $\alpha_{sup} > 0$ then f'' has finitely many zeros in I (for instance see [29]). Since I is compact, if f'' has infinitely many zeros then there exists a point $\bar{a} \in I$ such that $f^{(n)}(\bar{a}) = 0$ for all $n \geq 2$. This shows that f can not satisfy (2.2) with $d_f < \infty$. This violates the assumption $\alpha_{sup}(f, I) = d_f^{-1} > 0$. Hence f'' has finitely many zeros in I . Therefore, by previous observation, we conclude that f satisfies (2.4). Consequently, $u \mapsto F''(u) \cdot \xi$ satisfies (2.4) for each $\xi \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$. Hence to show that F satisfies (2.4) it is enough to prove the following

$$\alpha_{sup}(F, I) = \inf\{\alpha_{sup}(F \cdot \xi, I), \xi \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}\}. \quad (6.24)$$

Since $F, F \cdot \xi$ are smooth functions, $d_F[I], d_{F \cdot \xi}[I]$ are positive integers (for more detail see [29]). By previous observation we know that (6.24) with $\alpha_{sup} > 0$ is equivalent to $d_F[I] = \sup\{d_{F \cdot \xi}[I], \xi \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}\} < \infty$. Note that $d_F[I] \geq d_{F \cdot \xi}[I]$ for each $\xi \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$. To show this fix a $k \geq d_F[I]$. From (2.2) we have $\text{span}\{F''(u), \dots, F^{(k+1)}(u)\} = \mathbb{R}^d$ for all $u \in I$. For a $\xi \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$ we have $\text{span}\{F''(u) \cdot \xi, \dots, F^{(k+1)}(u) \cdot \xi\} = \mathbb{R}$ for all $u \in I$. Hence we have $d_{F \cdot \xi}[I] \leq k$ for each $\xi \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$. Taking infimum over all $k \geq d_F[I]$ we have $d_{F \cdot \xi} \leq d_F[I]$. Therefore, we obtain $d_F[I] \geq \sup\{d_{F \cdot \xi}[I], \xi \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}\}$. Now we show that $d_F[I] \leq \sup\{d_{F \cdot \xi}[I], \xi \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}\}$. Suppose $d_{F \cdot \xi}[I] \leq d_F[I] - 1$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$. Then $\{F''(u) \cdot \xi, \dots, F^{(d_F[I])}(u) \cdot \xi\}$ spans \mathbb{R} for all $u \in I$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$. Hence $\{F''(u), \dots, F^{(d_F[I])}(u)\}$ spans whole \mathbb{R}^d for all $u \in I$. This gives a contradiction with definition (2.2) of $d_F[I]$. \square

In the following example we construct a C^2 flux in 1-D such that f'' vanishes at infinitely many points in a finite interval and it also satisfies (2.4).

Example 6.9. *Here we provide a non-trivial example of flux in 1-D satisfying (2.4) and zero set of second derivative is not locally finite. Define $g_n : [1/(n+1), 1/n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $n \geq 2$, as follows:*

$$g_n(x) := \begin{cases} a_n (x - (n+1)^{-1})^{1-n-1} & \text{if } x \in \left[\frac{1}{n+1}, \frac{1}{n+1} + \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2} \right], \\ n^{-1} & \text{if } x \in \left[\frac{1}{n+1} + \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2}, \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2} \right], \\ a_n (n^{-1} - x)^{1-n-1} & \text{if } x \in \left[\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2}, \frac{1}{n} \right] \end{cases}$$

where $a_n := 2^{1-\frac{1}{n}} \frac{(n+1)^{2-\frac{2}{n}}}{n}$. Suppose $g : [0, \frac{1}{2}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as $g := \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \chi_{[\frac{1}{n+1}, \frac{1}{n}]} g_n$. Note that g is a continuous function vanishing on $\{1/n\}_{n \geq 2} \cup \{0\}$. We define a flux $f : [0, 1/2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $f(x) = \int_0^x \int_0^y g(z) dz dy$.

Then we claim:

Lemma 6.10. *Let f be defined as in Example 6.9. Then the following holds*

1. $\alpha_{sup}(f, [0, 1/2]) = 1/2$ and for each $n \geq 1$ we have $\alpha_{sup}(f, [1/(n+1), 1/n]) = \frac{n}{2n-1} > \frac{1}{2}$.

2. f satisfies the mild regularity assumption (2.4), i.e.,

$$\alpha_{sup}(f, [0, 1/2]) = \inf \{ \alpha_{sup}(f, [1/(n+1), 1/n]), n \geq 2 \}. \quad (6.25)$$

Proof. Since $g \geq 0$ we have f' is non-decreasing. Observe that

$$\frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{n(n+1)^2} + \frac{1}{n^2(n+1)^2} \leq f'(n^{-1}) - f'((n+1)^{-1}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{n(n+1)^2} + \frac{1}{n^2(n+1)^2}.$$

Let $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k < l$. We consider $x \in (1/(l+1), 1/l)$ and $y \in (1/(k+1), 1/k)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} f'(y) - f'(x) &\geq \frac{1}{6} \sum_{n=k+1}^{l-1} \left[\frac{2}{n(n+1)^2} + \frac{1}{n^2(n+1)^2} \right] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{6} \sum_{n=k+1}^{l-1} \left[\frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{(n+1)^2} \right] \geq \frac{1}{6} \left[\frac{1}{(k+1)^2} - \frac{1}{l^2} \right] \geq \frac{1}{6} \left(\frac{l-k-1}{(k+1)l} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that if $[(l+1)^{-1}, k^{-1}] \subset \{x \in [0, 1]; |f'(x) - f'(x_0)| < \delta\} \subset \left[\frac{1}{l+2}, \frac{1}{k-1} \right]$ for $l-k \geq 2$, then we have $\frac{l-k-1}{(k+1)l} \leq (12\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Therefore

$$\frac{1}{k-1} - \frac{1}{l+2} = \left(\frac{k+1}{k-1} \right) \left(\frac{l}{l+2} \right) \left(\frac{l+3-k}{l-1-k} \right) \left(\frac{l-k-1}{(k+1)l} \right) \leq 15(12\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Fix $x_0 \in \left[\frac{1}{n+1}, \frac{1}{n+1} + \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2} \right]$. Then observe the following cases:

1. if $x \in \left[\frac{1}{n+1}, \frac{1}{n+1} + \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2} \right]$ then we have $f'(x) - f'(x_0) \geq \frac{a_n}{3} (x - x_0)^{2-\frac{1}{n}}$.

2. if $x \in [(n+1)^{-1} + 2^{-1}(n+1)^{-2}, n^{-1} - 2^{-1}(n+1)^{-2}]$ then we have

$$f'(x) - f'(x_0) \geq \frac{a_n}{3} \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2} - x_0 \right)^{2-\frac{1}{n}} + \left(x - \frac{1}{n+1} - \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}}.$$

3. if $x \in \left[\frac{1}{n} - \frac{2(n+1)^2}{n}, \frac{1}{n} \right]$ then we have

$$\begin{aligned} f'(x) - f'(x_0) &\geq \frac{a_n}{3} \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2} - x_0 \right)^{2-\frac{1}{n}} + (n(n+1)^2)^{-\frac{4}{3}} \\ &\quad + \frac{a_n}{3} \left(x - \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2} \right)^{2-\frac{1}{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

By a similar argument as in proof of Lemma 6.2 we can show that

$$\mathcal{L}^1(\{x \in [0, 1/2]; |f'(x) - f'(x_0)| < \delta\}) \leq C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (6.26)$$

For other positions of x_0 we can show (6.26) by a similar manner. Therefore, it shows that f satisfies (1.2) with $\alpha = 1/2$ on the interval $[0, 1/2]$. Also note that in a neighbourhood of $1/(n+1)$, f'' is Holder continuous with exponent $\frac{n-1}{n}$. By Lemma 6.7 we have $\alpha_{sup}(f, [0, 1]) \leq \frac{n}{2n-1}$. Therefore, we have $\alpha_{sup}(f, [0, 1/2]) = \frac{1}{2}$. By a similar argument as in proof of Lemma 6.2 we can show that $\alpha_{sup}(f, [(n+1)^{-1}, n^{-1}]) = \frac{n}{2n-1}$. Hence we prove (6.25) \square

Now we are ready to proceed for proof of Theorem 2.4. Similar to section 5 here we first construct an entropy solution u such that $u \notin W_{loc}^{s,1}$ up to a finite time t_0 . This is one of the key tools to prove Theorem 2.4.

Proposition 6.11. *Let $R_0 > 0$. Let $f \in C^2([-R_0, R_0], \mathbb{R})$ be a flux satisfying the non-degeneracy condition (2.1) with $\alpha_{sup}(f, [-R_0, R_0]) \in (0, 1)$ and additionally (2.4). Then there exist constants $\lambda > 0$ and $u^* > 0$ such that the following holds: for every $T > 0$ and $s > \alpha_{sup}(f, [-R_0, R_0])$ there exists an initial data v_0^T verifying the following properties:*

1. $\|v_0^T\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq u^*$ and $\text{supp}(v_0^T) \subset [-\lambda T, \lambda(T+1)]$.
2. if v^T is the entropy solution to (1.1) with initial data v_0^T , then $v^T(\cdot, t) \notin W^{s,1}([-\lambda T, \lambda(T+1)])$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

Proof. Fix an $s \in (\alpha_{sup}(f, [-R_0, R_0]), 1)$. Now we choose a p_0 such that $\alpha_{sup}(f, [-R_0, R_0]) < p_0^{-1} < s$. Since $\alpha_{sup}(f, [-R_0, R_0]) < 1$ the zero set of f'' , $\mathcal{Z}(f, [-R_0, R_0])$ is non-empty due to Remark 6.4. As $\alpha_{sup} > 0$ $\mathcal{Z}(f, [-R_0, R_0])$ has empty interior by Remark 6.3. Therefore, $[-R_0, R_0] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(f, [-R_0, R_0])$ is non-empty open set and it can be written as at most countable union of disjoint open intervals, that is, $[-R_0, R_0] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(f, [-R_0, R_0]) = \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} I_j$ for some index set $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathbb{N}$. Since f satisfies (2.4), we have $\alpha_{sup}(f, [-R_0, R_0]) = \inf_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \alpha_{sup}(f, I_j)$. Hence there exists an interval $I_{j_0} = [a_0, b_0] \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $\alpha_{sup}(f, [a_0, b_0]) < p_0^{-1}$. Since I_j are disjoint interval and subset of $[-R_0, R_0] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(f, [-R_0, R_0])$ we have $f'' \neq 0$ in (a_0, b_0) and $f''(a_0) = f''(b_0) = 0$. Now we invoke Lemma 6.2 for interval $[a_0, b_0]$ and show that at least one of (6.3) and (6.4) holds. Without loss of generality we assume that (6.3) holds. Hence there exists a sequence $\{a_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ such that

$$|f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)| \leq C|a_k - a_0|^{p_0} \text{ for all } k \geq 1. \quad (6.27)$$

Without loss of generality we assume that $C = 1$. Fix a time $T > 0$. We wish to construct an initial data in a similar way as we have done in Proposition 5.4. Note that **Case(1)** of Proposition 5.4 does not appear here because of Remark 6.3. Therefore, to construct a data we only need to mimic the construction in **Case(2)** of Proposition 5.4. To set the ground we first invoke Lemma 3.2, to get a subsequence of $\{a_k\}$ (still labelled as $\{a_k\}$) verifying the following properties:

$$|a_k - a_0| = k^{-q_k} \text{ for some sequence } q_k \text{ satisfying } q_{k+1} \geq q_k + 1 \text{ for all } k \geq 1. \quad (6.28)$$

We define ϵ_k, A_k as follows

$$\epsilon_k = |a_k - a_0|^{p_0} \text{ and } A_k = \frac{1}{k^{1+\epsilon}} \text{ for some } \epsilon \in (0, 1). \quad (6.29)$$

Since $q_k \geq 1$ and $p_0 > 1$ we can choose $\epsilon > 0$ small enough such that $p_0 q_k - 1 - \epsilon > 0$. By using (6.28) and (6.29) we get $A_k \epsilon_k^{-1} = k^{-1-\epsilon} |a_k - a_0|^{-1} = k^{-1-\epsilon} k^{q_k p_0} \geq 1$ since $p_0 q_k - 1 - \epsilon > 0$. By employing (6.27), (6.29) we have $|f'(a_k) - f'(a_0)| \leq \epsilon_k \leq A_k$ and $\sum_{k \geq 1} A_k + 2\epsilon_1 < \infty$. This ensures (5.19). Recall

the definitions of $N_k, J_k, \sigma_m, \delta_n, x_n$ as in (5.20), (5.21), (5.22) and (5.23) respectively. Consider the initial data w_0 defined as in (5.25) with ϵ_k, A_k are as in (6.29). Similar to Proposition 5.4, there exists a constant u^* such that $\|w_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq u^*$. Let M be defined as

$$M := \max\{|f'(u)|; |u| \leq u^*\}. \quad (6.30)$$

Let w be the entropy solution to (1.1) with initial data w_0 . As we have seen in proof of Proposition 5.4, w enjoys the structure (5.28) with $t \in [0, T]$. Recall the definition of x_∞ as in (5.24) and x_1 as in (5.23). Let \underline{x}, \bar{x} be defined as follows: $\underline{x} = x_0 - MT$ and $\bar{x} = x_\infty + MT$. Now we want to show that $|w|_{W^{s,p}([\underline{x}, \bar{x}])} = \infty$. In order to do so we define

$$h_n := \epsilon_n(T - t) \text{ for } n \geq 1, \quad (6.31)$$

$$\Omega_i[h, t] := \{z \in \mathbb{R}; x_{2i+1} + P_k t - h < z < x_{2i+1} + P_k t\} \text{ for } J_{k-1} < i \leq J_k.$$

Note that if $h \in (h_{n+1}, h_n]$ then for $J_{m-1} < i < J_m$ we have $x_{2i} + f'(a_k)t < x_{2i+1} + P_k t - h$ and $x_{2i+1} + P_k t + h < x_{2i+2} + P_k t$. Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta^h w(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p(\underline{x}, \bar{x})}^p &\geq \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=J_{k-1}+1}^{J_k} \int_{\Omega_i[h, t]} |a_k - a_0|^p dx \geq C_1 \sum_{k=1}^n h N_k |a_k - a_0|^p \\ &\geq h n^{-p q_n + p_0 q_n - 1 - \epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} |w(\cdot, t)|_{B^{s,p,\theta}([\underline{x}, \bar{x}])}^\theta &\geq \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \int_{h_{n+1}}^{h_n} \|\Delta_{\nu_0}^h w(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p(\underline{x}, \bar{x})}^\theta \frac{1}{h^{1+s\theta}} dh \\ &\geq C_1 \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} n^{-q_n \theta - \frac{\theta}{p} - \frac{\theta}{p} \epsilon + \frac{p_0 q_n \theta}{p}} h_n^{-s\theta} \int_{h_{n+1}}^{h_n} h^{\frac{\theta}{p} - 1} dh. \end{aligned}$$

By fundamental theorem of calculus we have

$$|w(\cdot, t)|_{B^{s,p,\theta}([\underline{x}, \bar{x}])}^\theta \geq C_1 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-q_n \theta - \frac{\theta}{p} - \frac{\theta}{p} \epsilon + \frac{p_0 q_n \theta}{p}} h_n^{-s\theta + \frac{\theta}{p}} \left[1 - \left(\frac{h_{n+1}}{h_n} \right)^{\frac{\theta}{p}} \right]. \quad (6.32)$$

Recall definition of ϵ_n as in (6.27). From (6.31) we have $h_n = (T - t) |a_k - a_0|^{p_0}$. From (6.29) we infer $h_n = (T - t) n^{-p_0 q_n}$. Hence we have

$$\frac{h_{n+1}}{h_n} = (n+1)^{-p_0 q_{n+1}} n^{p_0 q_n} = \left(\frac{n}{n+1} \right)^{p_0 q_n} (n+1)^{p_0 (q_n - q_{n+1})}. \quad (6.33)$$

Recall from (6.28) that $q_n \geq 0$ and $q_{n+1} \geq q_n + 1$, equivalently, $q_n - q_{n+1} \leq -1$. From (6.33) we get $\frac{h_{n+1}}{h_n} \leq (n+1)^{p_0 (q_n - q_{n+1})} \leq (n+1)^{-p_0} \leq \frac{1}{2^{p_0}}$ for $n \geq 1$. Hence, from (6.32) we obtain

$$|w(\cdot, t)|_{B^{s,p,\theta}([\underline{x}, \bar{x}])}^\theta \geq C_1 2^{-p} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-q_n \theta - \frac{\theta}{p} - \frac{\theta}{p} \epsilon + \frac{p_0 q_n \theta}{p}} h_n^{-s\theta + \frac{\theta}{p}}. \quad (6.34)$$

Using $h_n = (T - t) n^{-p_0 q_n}$ in (6.34), we infer

$$|w(\cdot, t)|_{B^{s,p,\theta}([\underline{x}, \bar{x}])}^\theta \geq C_1 2^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-q_n \theta - \frac{\theta}{p} - \frac{\theta}{p} \epsilon + \frac{p_0 q_n \theta}{p}} n^{s p_0 \theta q_n - \frac{\theta p_0 q_n}{p}}. \quad (6.35)$$

To simplify the exponent in (6.35) we observe the following

$$-q_n \theta - \frac{\theta}{p} - \frac{\theta}{p} \epsilon + \frac{p_0 q_n \theta}{p} + s p_0 \theta q_n - \frac{\theta p_0 q_n}{p} = q_n \theta (s p_0 - 1) - \theta/p - \epsilon \theta/p.$$

By choice of p_0 we have $s p_0 > 1$. Note that $q_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then there exists an n_0 such that

$q_n \geq (sp_0 - 1)^{-1} [\theta/p + \epsilon\theta/p - 1]$. Hence we have $-q_n\theta - \frac{\theta}{p} - \frac{\theta}{p}\epsilon + \frac{p_0q_n\theta}{p} + sp_0\theta q_n - \frac{\theta p_0q_n}{p} \geq -1$ for $n \geq n_0$. From (6.35) we infer

$$|w(\cdot, t)|_{B^{s,p,\theta}(\underline{x}, \bar{x})}^\theta \geq C_1 2^{-1} \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} n^{-1} = \infty. \quad (6.36)$$

As we observe in proof of Proposition 5.4 that w_0 is not a compactly supported data when $a_0 \neq 0$. We wish to find a data v_0^T such that it has compact support and the corresponding entropy solution v^T does not belong to $B^{s,p,\theta}$. Here we take the similar strategy as we have done in the proof of Proposition 5.4. Let M be defined as in (6.30). We consider $R_2 = 3MT$ and $I = [x_1 - R_2, x_\infty + R_2]$. We define v_0^T as $v_0^T = w_0\chi_I$. By a similar analysis as we have done in proof of Proposition 5.4 we can show that

$$w(x, t) = v^T(x, t) \text{ for all } (x, t) \in [x_1 - MT, x_\infty + MT] \times [0, T]. \quad (6.37)$$

From (6.30) we have $M \geq |f'(a_0)|$. Therefore, we have

$$[\underline{x}, \bar{x}] = [x_1 - f'(a_0)T, x_\infty + f'(a_0)T] \subset [x_1 - MT, x_\infty + MT]. \quad (6.38)$$

By (6.36), (6.37) and (6.38) we have $|v^T(\cdot, t)|_{B^{s,p,\theta}(\underline{x}, \bar{x})} = \infty$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. By a similar argument as in proof of Proposition 5.4 we find a $\lambda > 0$ independent of T such that $\text{supp}(v_0^T) \subset [-\lambda T, \lambda(T+1)]$ and $|v^T(\cdot, t)|_{B^{s,p,\theta}([-\lambda T, \lambda(T+1)])} = \infty$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. This concludes Proposition 6.11. \square

6.2. Proof of Theorem 2.4

Now we are ready to show Theorem 2.4. Proof is similar to Theorem 2.1. Here we use regularity property (2.4) of flux and Proposition 6.11 from section 6.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. By our assumption $F \in C^2(I, \mathbb{R}^d)$ and satisfies (2.1) for $\alpha_{sup}(F, I) < 1$ along with mild regularity assumption (2.4). Fix an s such that $\alpha_{sup}(F, I) < s < 1$. Since F satisfies (2.4), there exists a $\xi_0 \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$ and $k_0 \in \mathcal{I}_{\xi_0}$ such that $\alpha_{sup}(\xi_0 \cdot F, I_{k_0}^{\xi_0}) < s$ where $I_{k_0}^{\xi_0}$ is defined in (2.3). We define $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ as $f = \xi_0 \cdot F$. Observe that f satisfies all the assumptions of Proposition 6.11. By a similar method as in proof of Theorem 2.1 we can construct an entropy solution U_{ξ_0} such that $U_{\xi_0}(x, t) = v^T(x \cdot \xi_0, t)$ for $t \in [0, T]$. Note that $\|\Delta_i^h U_{\xi_0}(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p(B(\mathbf{0}, \lambda(T+1)))} = c_0 \|\Delta^h v^T(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p(B(\mathbf{0}, \lambda(T+1)))}$. Hence we show that $|U_{\xi_0}(\cdot, t)|_{B^{s,p,\theta}(B(\mathbf{0}, \lambda(T+1)))} = \infty$ for $t \in [0, T]$. By a similar method as in Theorem 2.1 we construct an entropy solution U such that $U(\cdot, t) \notin B_{loc}^{s,p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $t > 0$. This finishes the proof. \square

6.3. Proof of Proposition 2.7

Now we can prove Proposition 2.7 in a similar manner as we did for Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Proposition 2.7. Proof is similar to Theorem 2.4. In proof of Theorem 2.4, we use condition 2.4 satisfied by flux F to get direction ξ and sequence $\{a_k\}$. Here flux need not satisfy (2.4) but existence of direction ξ and $\{a_k\}$ are guaranteed by Lemma 6.7. \square

6.4. Proof of Remark 2.5

Combining Lemma 6.6 and Theorem 2.2 we conclude Remark 2.5.

6.5. Proof of Proposition 2.6

Proposition 2.6 can be proved in a similar way as Theorem 2.4.

Appendix A.

Now we prove Lemma 4.2. It is an application of Proposition 4.1.

Proof of Lemma 4.2: Fix a $\bar{\varphi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty))$. Let v, v_0 be defined as in (4.2). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[v(x, t) \frac{\partial \bar{\varphi}}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^d f_i(v) \frac{\partial \bar{\varphi}}{\partial x_i} \right] dx dt + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_0(x) \bar{\varphi}(x, 0) dx \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[w(x_1, t) \frac{\partial \bar{\varphi}}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^d f_i(w(x_1, t)) \frac{\partial \bar{\varphi}}{\partial x_i} \right] dx dt + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} w_0(x_1) \bar{\varphi}(x, 0) dx. \end{aligned}$$

As $f_i(w(x_1, t))$ is independent of x_i for $i \neq 1$, we have $\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_i(w(x_1, t)) \frac{\partial \bar{\varphi}}{\partial x_i} dx dt = 0$ for $i \neq 1$. Since w is a weak solution to Cauchy problem (4.1), by using Fubini's Theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[v(x, t) \frac{\partial \bar{\varphi}}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^d f_i(v) \frac{\partial \bar{\varphi}}{\partial x_i} \right] dx dt + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_0(x) \bar{\varphi}(x, 0) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \left[\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(w \frac{\partial \bar{\varphi}}{\partial t} + f_1(w) \frac{\partial \bar{\varphi}}{\partial x_1} \right) dx_1 dt + \int_{\mathbb{R}} w_0(x_1) \bar{\varphi}(x, 0) dx_1 \right] dx_2 \cdots dx_d = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since w is a weak solution to Cauchy problem (4.1), we obtain

$$\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[v(x, t) \frac{\partial \bar{\varphi}}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^d f_i(v) \frac{\partial \bar{\varphi}}{\partial x_i} \right] dx dt + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_0(x) \bar{\varphi}(x, 0) dx = 0.$$

By a similar argument, we can show that v satisfies Kruzkov entropy inequality. This proves Lemma 4.2. \square

Now we prove Lemma 4.3. It follows from Proposition 4.1 after a suitable change of variable.

Proof of Lemma 4.3: Fix a $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty))$. Since \bar{v} is entropy solution to (1.1) with initial data \bar{v}_0 and flux \bar{f} , then we put $\bar{\varphi}(x) = \varphi(L^{-1}(x - \mathbf{c})) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty))$ in weak formulation of v and use $y = L^{-1}(x - \mathbf{c})$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |\det L| \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \bar{v}(L(y) + \mathbf{c}, t) \frac{\partial \bar{\varphi}}{\partial t}(L(y) + \mathbf{c}, t) + \sum_{i=1}^d \bar{f}_i(\bar{v}(L(y) + \mathbf{c}, t)) \frac{\partial \bar{\varphi}}{\partial x_i}(L(y) + \mathbf{c}, t) dy dt \\ &+ |\det L| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \bar{v}_0(L(y) + \mathbf{c}) \bar{\varphi}(L(y) + \mathbf{c}, 0) dy = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

By definition of $\bar{\varphi}$ and \bar{F} we have $\frac{\partial \bar{\varphi}}{\partial x_i}(L(y) + \mathbf{c}, t) = \sum_{j=1}^d (L^{-1})_{ij} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_j}(y, t)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^d (L^{-1})_{ij} \bar{f}_i(\bar{v}(L(y) + \mathbf{c}, t)) = f_j(\bar{v}(L(y) + \mathbf{c}, t))$. Hence, from (A.1) and definition of \bar{v}_0 , we infer

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \bar{v}(L(y) + \mathbf{c}, t) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}(y, t) + \sum_{j=1}^d f_j(\bar{v}(L(y) + \mathbf{c}, t)) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_j}(y, t) dy dt + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_0(y) \varphi(y, 0) dy \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since \bar{v} satisfies the Kruřkov entropy inequality it is immediate that $\bar{v}(L(x) + \mathbf{c}, t)$ also satisfies the Kruřkov entropy inequality. Hence, $\bar{v}(L(x) + \mathbf{c}, t)$ is an entropy solution to (1.1) with the initial data v_0 . Hence from Proposition 4.1 we conclude that $v(x, t) = \bar{v}(L(x) + \mathbf{c}, t)$. This completes proof of Lemma 4.3. \square

Acknowledgement. Authors acknowledge the support of the Department of Atomic Energy, Government of India, under project no. 12-R&D-TFR-5.01-0520. The first author would like to thank Inspire faculty-research grant DST/INSPIRE/04/2016/00-0237. Authors thank IFCAM project ‘‘Conservation laws: BV^s , interface and control’’. Authors are very thankful to Pierre-Emmanuel Jabin for his valuable comments and suggestions.

References

- [1] Adimurthi, R. Dutta, S. S. Ghoshal and G. D. Veerappa Gowda, Existence and nonexistence of TV bounds for scalar conservation laws with discontinuous flux, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 64, (1), 84–115, 2011.
- [2] Adimurthi, S. S. Ghoshal and G. D. Veerappa Gowda, Structure of entropy solutions to scalar conservation laws with strictly convex flux, *J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ.* 9 (4), 571–611, 2012.
- [3] Adimurthi, S. S. Ghoshal and G. D. Veerappa Gowda, Finer regularity of an entropy solution for $1 - d$ scalar conservation laws with non uniform convex flux, *Rend. Semin. Mat. Univ. Padova*, 132, 1–24, 2014.
- [4] Adimurthi, S. S. Ghoshal and G. D. Veerappa Gowda, Exact controllability of scalar conservation laws with strict convex flux, *Math. Control Relat. Fields*, 4, (4), 401–449, 2014.
- [5] S. Bianchini and E. Marconi, On the concentration of entropy for scalar conservation laws, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S*, 9 (1), 73–88, 2016.
- [6] S. Bianchini and E. Marconi, On the structure of L^∞ entropy solutions to scalar conservation laws in one-space dimension, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 226 (1), 441–493, 2017.
- [7] C. Bourdarias, M. Gisclon and S. Junca, Fractional BV spaces and applications to scalar conservation laws, *J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ.* 11 (4), 655–677, 2014.
- [8] P. Castelli and S. Junca, Oscillating waves and the maximal smoothing effect for one dimensional nonlinear conservation laws, *AIMS*, 8, 709–716, 2014.
- [9] P. Castelli and S. Junca, On the maximal smoothing effect for multidimensional scalar conservation laws, *Nonlinear Anal.* 155, 207–218, 2017.
- [10] P. Castelli and S. Junca, Smoothing effect in $BV - \Phi$ for entropy solutions of scalar conservation laws, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 451 (2), 712–735, 2017.
- [11] P. Castelli, P.-E. Jabin and S. Junca, Fractional spaces and conservation laws, *Theory, Numerics and Applications of Hyperbolic Problems I. HYP 2016. Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics*, 236, 2018.
- [12] G.-Q. Chen, S. Junca and M. Rascle, Validity of nonlinear geometric optics for entropy solutions of multidimensional scalar conservation laws. *J. Differential Equations* 222, 2, 439–475, 2006.
- [13] K. S. Cheng, The space BV is not enough for hyperbolic conservation laws, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 91 (2), 559–561, 1983.
- [14] K. S. Cheng, A regularity theorem for a nonconvex scalar conservation law, *J. Differential Equations* 61 (1), 79–127, 1986.
- [15] C. Cheverry, Regularizing effects for multidimensional scalar conservation laws, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 17, 413–472, 2000.
- [16] G. Crippa, F. Otto and M. Westdickenberg, Regularizing effect of nonlinearity in multidimensional scalar conservation laws. Transport equations and multi-D hyperbolic conservation laws, *Lect. Notes Unione Mat. Ital.*, 5, Springer, Berlin, 77–128, 2008.
- [17] C. De Lellis and M. Westdickenberg, On the optimality of velocity averaging lemmas, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 20 (6), 1075–1085, 2003.

- [18] R. A. DeVore and R. C. Sharpley, Besov spaces on domains in \mathbb{R}^d . *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 335 (1993), no. 2, 843–864.
- [19] R. J. DiPerna, P.L. Lions and Y. Meyer, L^p regularity of velocity averages, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 8 , 271–287, 1991.
- [20] B. Gess and X. Lamy, Regularity of solution to scalar conservation laws with force, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 36 (2), 505–521, 2019.
- [21] S.S. Ghoshal, B. Guelmame, A. Jana and S. Junca, Optimal regularity for all time for entropy solutions of conservation laws in BV^s . *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.* 27, 5, 46, 2020.
- [22] S. S. Ghoshal, Optimal results on TV bounds for scalar conservation laws with discontinuous flux, *J. Differential Equations* 3, 980–1014, 2015.
- [23] S. S. Ghoshal, BV regularity near the interface for nonuniform convex discontinuous flux, *Networks and Heterogeneous Media*, 11 (2), 331–348, 2016.
- [24] F. Golse and B. Perthame, Optimal regularizing effect for scalar conservation laws, *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 29 (4), 1477–1504, 2013.
- [25] D. Hoff, The sharp form of Oleĭnik’s entropy condition in several space variables, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 276 (2), 707–714, 1983.
- [26] P.-E. Jabin and B. Perthame, Regularity in kinetic formulations via averaging lemmas. A tribute to J.-L. Lions, *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* 8 , 761–774, 2002.
- [27] P.-E. Jabin, Some regularizing methods for transport equations and the regularity of solutions to scalar conservation laws, *Exp. No. XVI, Smin. Equ. Driv. Partielles, Ecole Polytech., Palaiseau*, 2008–2009, 2010.
- [28] S. Junca, A two-scale convergence result for a nonlinear scalar conservation law in one space variable. *Asymptot. Anal.* 17, 3, 221–238, 1998.
- [29] S. Junca, High frequency waves and the maximal smoothing effect for nonlinear scalar conservation laws, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 46 (3), 2160–2184, 2014.
- [30] S. N. Kružkov, First-order quasilinear equations with several space variables, *Mat. Sbornik*, 123 (1970), 228–255; *Math. USSR Sbornik*, 10, 217–273, 1970(in English).
- [31] P. D. Lax, Hyperbolic systems of conservation laws II, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 10, 537–566, 1957.
- [32] P. D. Lax. Hyperbolic partial differential equations. With an appendix by Cathleen S. Morawetz, *Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 14. New York University, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York; American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006.
- [33] G. Leoni, A first course in Sobolev spaces, *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*, 105. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2009.
- [34] P.-L. Lions, B. Perthame and E. Tadmor, A kinetic formulation of multidimensional scalar conservation laws and related equations, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 7, 169–192, 1994.
- [35] E. Marconi, Regularity estimates for scalar conservation laws in one space dimension, *J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ.* 15 (4), pp. 623–691, 2018.
- [36] O. Oleĭnik, Discontinuous solutions of nonlinear differential equations, *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* 12 3–73, 1957. [Transl. Am. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, 26, 95–172, 1963].
- [37] L. Silvestre, Oscillation properties of scalar conservation laws, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 72 (6), 1321–1348, 2019.
- [38] E. Tadmor and T. Tao, Velocity averaging, kinetic formulations and regularizing effects in quasi-linear PDEs, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 60 (10), 1488–1521, 2007.
- [39] H. Triebel, Fractals and Spectra Related to Fourier Analysis and Function Spaces, *Monographs Math., Vol. 91, Birkhauser, Basel*, 1997.