

# NON-UNIQUENESS IN LAW OF TRANSPORT-DIFFUSION EQUATION FORCED BY RANDOM NOISE

UJJWAL KOLEY AND KAZUO YAMAZAKI

**ABSTRACT.** We consider a transport-diffusion equation forced by random noise of three types: additive, linear multiplicative in Itô's interpretation, and transport in Stratonovich's interpretation. Via convex integration modified to probabilistic setting, we prove existence of a divergence-free vector field with spatial regularity in Sobolev space and corresponding solution to a transport-diffusion equation with spatial regularity in Lebesgue space, and consequently non-uniqueness in law at the level of probabilistically strong solutions globally in time.

## CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction                                       | 1  |
| 1.1. Motivation from physics and mathematics          | 1  |
| 1.2. Previous works                                   | 2  |
| 2. Statement of main results                          | 4  |
| 3. Preliminaries                                      | 11 |
| 3.1. Notations and assumptions                        | 11 |
| 3.2. Convex integration                               | 11 |
| 4. Proof of Theorem 2.2                               | 14 |
| 4.1. Proof of Proposition 4.2                         | 17 |
| 5. Proof of Theorem 2.3                               | 31 |
| 6. Proof of Theorem 2.5                               | 31 |
| 7. Appendix A   | 48 |
| 7.1. Proof of Theorem 2.1                             | 48 |
| 7.2. Proof of Theorem 2.4                             | 50 |
| 7.3. Proof of Corollary 2.6                           | 53 |
| 8. Appendix B   | 54 |
| 8.1. Further preliminaries                            | 54 |
| 8.2. Proof of second inequality of (99c) in Lemma 4.3 | 55 |
| Acknowledgements                                      | 55 |
| References  | 55 |

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Motivation from physics and mathematics.** A transport equation, also known as a continuity equation, appears in various problems of mathematical physics such as fluid mechanics and kinetic theory. There are physical examples such as the vorticity formulation of two-dimensional Euler equations with solution that is only in  $L_t^\infty L_x^p$  for  $p \in (1, 2)$  and thus not even bounded (see [23]); hence, following the breakthrough work of DiPerna and Lions [30] to be described in detail subsequently, in the deterministic case there has been extensive effort to reduce the necessary regularity condition on a vector field and still retain the uniqueness of the equation transported by such a vector field. In contrast, Flandoli, Gubinelli, and Priola [33], and Beck, Flandoli, Gubinelli, and Maurelli [4] demonstrated that a transport noise can actually regularize its

---

*Date:* March 28, 2022.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35A02; 35R60.

*Key words and phrases.* Convex integration; Continuity equation; Transport-diffusion equation; Non-uniqueness; Random noise.

solution by proving uniqueness with a relatively rough vector field. Finally, the recent developments of convex integration technique led to various non-uniqueness results for a deterministic transport equation, even with an arbitrary strong diffusion, with a surprisingly smooth vector field (e.g., [47–49]). The purpose of this manuscript is to employ convex integration and prove non-uniqueness in law of the transport equation forced by random noise of various types: additive, linear multiplicative, and transport, with our most interest in the last case considering other works on the stochastic transport equation such as [33].

**1.2. Previous works.** Let us write “ $dD$ ” for “ $d$ -dimensional” for  $d \geq 2$ . With a spatial variable  $x \in \mathbb{T}^d = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{Z}^d$ , given  $\rho^{\text{in}} : \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  and a vector field  $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$ , density  $\rho : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is a solution to a Cauchy problem of a transport equation if

$$\partial_t \rho(t, x) + \text{div}(u(t, x)\rho(t, x)) = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad t > 0, \quad (1a)$$

$$\rho(0, x) = \rho^{\text{in}}(x), \quad (1b)$$

where  $\partial_t \triangleq \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ . We refer to (1) forced by certain random noise as a stochastic transport equation (see (8)). Hereafter, for any  $p \in [1, \infty]$  we denote by  $p'$  its Hölder dual; i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1. \quad (2)$$

For any space of functions  $X$ , we indicate by  $\overset{\circ}{X}$  an additional mean-zero condition imposed; only for  $C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ , we follow the convention and denote by  $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$  an additional mean-zero condition imposed on  $C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ .

Informally, the pioneering work of DiPerna and Lions (e.g., [30, Cor. II.1]) states that given initial data  $\rho^{\text{in}} \in L_x^p$  for any  $p \in [1, \infty]$ , not only existence but also uniqueness for the solution  $\rho \in L_t^\infty L_x^p$  to (1) holds provided

$$u \in L_t^1 W_x^{1,p'} \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla \cdot u \in L_t^1 L_x^\infty \quad (3)$$

(see [3] for a certain local version). Subsequently, Ambrosio [1] proved uniqueness of solution  $\rho \in L_{t,x}^\infty$  to (1) under the condition that  $u \in L_t^1 BV_x$  and  $\nabla \cdot u \in L_t^1 L_x^\infty$  (see also [19]). More recently, Bianchini and Bonicatto [6] proved the uniqueness in case  $u \in L_t^1 BV_x$  and  $u$  is nearly incompressible (see [6, Definition 1.1] for the definition of  $u$  being nearly incompressible). Moreover, Caravenna and Crippa [13] proved uniqueness of solution  $\rho \in L_t^1 L_x^1$  rather than  $L_t^\infty L_x^p$ , starting from  $\rho^{\text{in}} \in L_x^1$  under additional assumptions that  $u \in L_t^1 W_x^{1,q}$  for  $q > 1$ ,  $\nabla \cdot u \in L_t^1 L_x^\infty$ , and  $u(t, \cdot)$  is continuous for almost every  $t \in [0, T]$  with a modulus of continuity on compact sets that is uniform in time. We refer to [2] for an excellent survey of related results. In the stochastic case, Flandoli, Gubinelli, and Priola [33] demonstrated that a transport noise in Stratonovich’s interpretation can regularize the solution enough to prove uniqueness. Specifically, in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  rather than  $\mathbb{T}^d$ , the authors in [33] considered (1) forced on the right hand side (r.h.s.) by

$$- \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \rho(t, x) \circ dB_i(t) \quad (4)$$

where  $B = (B_1, \dots, B_d)$  is a standard Brownian motion in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $B|_{t=0} = 0$   $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely (a.s.), and they proved in [33, Theorem 20] that under a condition that  $u \in L_t^\infty C_b^\alpha$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and  $\nabla \cdot u \in L_{t,x}^p$  for some  $p \in (2, \infty)$ , given any  $\rho^{\text{in}} \in L_x^\infty$ , there exists a unique process  $\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  such that for all  $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , the process  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x)\rho(t, x)dx$  has a continuous modification which is a semi-martingale and satisfies (1) distributionally (see also [33, Theorem 21] for some variation). We refer to [14] for similar results. Moreover, the authors in [4] proved, under Ladyzhenskaya-Prodi-Serrin (LPS) condition on  $u$ , path-by-path uniqueness of weak solutions to (1) (see [4, Theorem 1.2]). Concerning non-uniqueness, DiPerna and Lions in [30, Section IV] provided a few examples via Lagrangian approach, specifically  $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for any  $p < \infty$  that is bounded, uniformly continuous and has unbounded divergence, as well as  $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{s,1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for all  $s \in [0, 1)$  such that  $u \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^2) + L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for all  $p \in [1, 2)$  and  $\nabla \cdot u = 0$ . Moreover, [20, Theorem 2] showed that in case  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , there exist  $u = u(x)$  that is uniformly bounded and divergence-free, as well as a corresponding non-trivial solution  $\rho \in L_{t,x}^\infty$  starting from  $\rho^{\text{in}} \equiv 0$  (see also [33, Section 6.1]). Such non-uniqueness results were relatively limited until the recent developments of convex integration which we describe next.

The breakthrough work of Nash [52] concerning isometric embeddings led to Gromov establishing convex integration in [35, Part 2.4]. Further important works by Müller and Šverák on convex integration for Lipschitz mappings and more in [50, 51] led to another breakthrough work [25] by De Lellis and Székelyhidi Jr. in which non-zero weak solutions  $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  to  $dD$  Euler equations with compact support for  $d \geq 2$  were constructed via convex integration technique. After various extensions and improvements (e.g., [8, 26, 27]), particularly making use of Mikado flows in convex integration, Isett [40] settled the negative direction of Onsager's conjecture [53]. By an additional ingredient of intermittency, Buckmaster and Vicol [10] proved the non-uniqueness of weak solutions to the 3D Navier-Stokes equations. Other recent applications of convex integration can be found in the following references: [9, 21, 28, 46] concerning fractional Laplacian; [12] on power-law flows; [5, 31] on magnetohydrodynamics (MHD) system; [45] on Boussinesq system (see [11] for an excellent review).

The far-reaching consequence of convex integration technique has recently made impact in the stochastic community as well. For convenience, let us first recall some definitions.

**Definition 1.1.** (e.g., [16, Definitions 1.2-1.4]) For (1) forced on the r.h.s. by noise involving Brownian motion  $B$ , we say that uniqueness in law holds if for any solutions  $(\rho, B)$  and  $(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{B})$  which may be defined on different filtered probability spaces,  $\mathcal{L}(\rho(t))_{t \geq 0} = \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\rho}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ ; i.e., they have same probability laws. Moreover, we say that path-wise uniqueness holds if for any solutions  $(\rho, B)$  and  $(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{B})$  defined on same filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\{\rho(t) = \tilde{\rho}(t) \forall t \geq 0\}) = 1$ . Finally, we say that a solution  $(\rho, B)$  is probabilistically strong if  $\rho$  is adapted to the completed natural filtration of  $B$ .

First, path-wise non-uniqueness of certain stochastic Euler system forced by linear multiplicative noise in Itô's interpretation was proven by Breit, Feireisl, and Hofmanová [7] and Chiodaroli, Feireisl, and Flandoli [18] with the noise in Stratonovich's interpretation. Subsequently, Hofmanová, Zhu, and Zhu [36] proved non-uniqueness in law of 3D stochastic Navier-Stokes equations forced by additive and linear multiplicative noise in Itô's interpretation (see also [38, 39]). For a subsequent comparison purpose, let us formally state this equation as follows: with  $u : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{T}^3 \mapsto \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $\pi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{T}^3 \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  respectively representing the velocity and pressure fields, given  $u^{\text{in}}(x) \triangleq u(0, x)$ ,

$$du(t, x) + (\text{div}(u(t, x) \otimes u(t, x)) + \nabla \pi(t, x) - \Delta u(t, x))dt = G(u)dB, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad t > 0, \quad (5)$$

where  $G(u)dB$  represents the stochastic force. More works followed concerning non-uniqueness in law: [37] on 3D stochastic Euler equations; [54, 56, 57, 59] in case of 2D and 3D stochastic Navier-Stokes equations with fractional Laplacian; [58] on 2D and 3D stochastic Boussinesq system; [60] on 3D stochastic MHD system. Let us emphasize that non-uniqueness in law implies non-uniqueness path-wise due to Yamada-Watanabe theorem while uniqueness in law, together with existence of a probabilistically strong solution, implies path-wise uniqueness due to Cherny's theorem (see [16, Theorem 3.2]). A remarkable property of solutions to the stochastic partial differential equations (PDEs) obtained via convex integration is that they are probabilistically strong, and the existence of a probabilistically strong solution to the 3D stochastic Navier-Stokes equations was a long-standing open problem (e.g., [32, p. 84]).

Convex integration technique was applied to transport equation first, to the best of our knowledge, by Crippa, Gusev, Spirito, and Wiedemann who demonstrated, with a proof inspired by [25], that in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $d \geq 2$  there exist infinitely many  $\rho$  and divergence-free vector field  $u$  which are both bounded and compactly supported in space and time that solves (1) distributionally and has prescribed energy (see [22, Theorem 3.1]). More recently, Modena and Székelyhidi Jr. extended such result significantly; in particular, [48, Corollary 1.3] states that on  $\mathbb{T}^d$  for  $d \geq 3$ , if  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $\tilde{p} \in [1, \infty)$  satisfy

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{\tilde{p}} > 1 + \frac{1}{d-1}, \quad (6)$$

and  $\tilde{\rho} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ , then there exist  $u \in C_t L_x^{p'} \cap C_t W_x^{1, \tilde{p}}$  that is divergence-free and a corresponding weak solution  $\rho \in C_t L_x^p$  such that  $\rho|_{t=0} \equiv 0$  but  $\rho|_{t=T} \equiv \tilde{\rho}$ , implying non-uniqueness. Subsequently, the same authors extended this result to the case  $p = 1$  so that  $\rho \in C_t L_x^1$  and surprisingly, not only  $u \in C_t W_x^{1, \tilde{p}} \cap C_t L_x^\infty$  but in fact  $u \in C_t W_x^{1, \tilde{p}} \cap C_{t,x}$ . These results of [48, 49] required  $d \geq 3$ ; this is related to the inherent nature of Mikado flows and it is not the first time that the case  $d = 2$  had to be excluded in its application (e.g., see [40, p. 877]). Nevertheless, Modena and Sattig in [47] significantly improved [48, 49]; specifically, [47,

Theorem 1.1] states that for any  $d \geq 2$ , if  $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $\bar{p} \in [1, \infty)$  satisfy

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{\bar{p}} > 1 + \frac{1}{d} \quad (7)$$

(cf. (6)), then there are infinitely many divergence-free vector fields  $u \in C_t L_x^{p'} \cap C_t W_x^{1, \bar{p}}$  if  $p \in (1, \infty)$  while  $u \in C_{t,x} \cap C_t W_x^{1, \bar{p}}$  if  $p = 1$ , such that the corresponding Cauchy problem with a weak solution  $\rho \in C_t L_x^p$  fails uniqueness. These results in [47–49] can be extended to the case of arbitrarily strong diffusion in the expense of a few additional constraints; e.g., [47, Theorem 1.3] considers a diffusive case with  $-\Delta\rho$  but only for  $d \geq 3$ . Finally, Cheskidov and Luo [17, Theorem 1.3] improved (7) to  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{\bar{p}} > 1$  although it additionally requires  $d \geq 3$ ,  $p > 1$ ,  $u \in L_t^\infty L_x^{p'} \cap L_t^1 W_x^{1, \bar{p}}$  rather than  $C_t L_x^{p'} \cap C_t W_x^{1, \bar{p}}$ , and  $\rho \in L_t^1 L_x^p$  rather than  $C_t L_x^p$ . The purpose of this manuscript is to employ, for the first time to the best of our knowledge, probabilistic convex integration to stochastic transport equation to prove non-uniqueness in law.

More precisely, the main contributions of this paper are listed below:

- (a) We prove that non-uniqueness in law holds for (1) with diffusion perturbed by an additive noise on an arbitrary time interval. This has been achieved by gluing a convex integration solution with a weak solution of stochastic transport equation.
- (b) We also consider the transport equation (1) with diffusion perturbed by a linear multiplicative noise in Itô's interpretation, and present its non-uniqueness (in law) results.
- (c) Finally, for the transport equation (1) with diffusion perturbed by a transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation, we exhibit two different proofs of non-uniqueness in law. In one situation, we are able to prescribe initial data and construct convex integration solutions.

## 2. STATEMENT OF MAIN RESULTS

Hereafter, we will consider the following stochastic transport-diffusion equation

$$d\rho(t, x) + (\operatorname{div}(u(t, x)\rho(t, x)) - \Delta\rho(t, x))dt = G(\rho)dB, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad (8a)$$

$$\rho(0, x) = \rho^{\text{in}}(x), \quad (8b)$$

where  $G(\rho)dB$  represents a stochastic force on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ . We chose to consider the case of diffusion via Laplacian in comparison to the Navier-Stokes equations; most of our discussions and results go through for the cases of zero diffusion and arbitrarily strong diffusion similarly to [47–49]. Let us consider three different types of noise:

- (1) additive noise; i.e.,  $G(\rho)dB = dB$  where  $B$  is a certain  $GG^*$ -Wiener process for a Hilbert-Schmidt operator  $G \in L_2(U, \dot{L}^2(\mathbb{T}^d))$  on some Hilbert space  $U$  (e.g., [24, Section 4.1]) (considered in [36–39, 54, 56–60]);
- (2) linear multiplicative noise in Itô's interpretation; i.e.,  $G(\rho)dB = \rho dB$  where  $B$  is a  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued Wiener process (considered in [7, 36, 56–60]);
- (3) transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation; i.e.,  $G(\rho)dB = -\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \rho \circ dB_i$  where  $B = (B_1, \dots, B_d)$  is a Brownian motion.

While the noise type (3) has never been considered in probabilistic convex integration, it was the type investigated in [33]. A common property that is shared by (8) with these types of noise is that they may all be informally transformed to random PDEs when these operations are allowed. In the first case of an additive noise, one may consider a heat equation forced by the same noise

$$dz(t, x) = \Delta z(t, x)dt + dB(t, x), \quad z(0, x) \equiv 0 \quad (9)$$

so that we may focus on the following random PDE solved by  $\theta(t, x) \triangleq \rho(t, x) - z(t, x)$ :

$$\partial_t \theta(t, x) + \operatorname{div}(u(t, x)\theta(t, x)) = \Delta\theta(t, x) - \operatorname{div}(u(t, x)z(t, x)), \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad \theta(0, x) = \rho^{\text{in}}(x). \quad (10)$$

In the second case of a linear multiplicative noise in Itô's interpretation, we may focus on the following random PDE solved by  $\theta(t, x) \triangleq \rho(t, x)e^{-B(t)}$ :

$$\partial_t \theta(t, x) + \operatorname{div}(u(t, x)\theta(t, x)) + \frac{1}{2}\theta(t, x) = \Delta\theta(t, x), \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad \theta(0, x) = \rho^{\text{in}}(x). \quad (11)$$

In the third case of a transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation, we may focus on the following random PDE solved by  $\theta(t, x) \triangleq \rho(t, x + B(t))$  (e.g., [44, Theorem 3.3.2 on p. 93], also [42, 43]):

$$\partial_t \theta(t, x) + \operatorname{div}(u(t, x + B(t))\theta(t, x)) = \Delta \theta(t, x), \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad \theta(0, x) = \rho^{\text{in}}(x). \quad (12)$$

**Remark 2.1.** *We may also consider a linear multiplicative noise in Stratonovich's interpretation; i.e.,  $G(\rho)dB = \rho \circ dB$  where  $B$  is a  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued Wiener process (considered in [18]). In this case we may focus on the following random PDE solved by  $\theta(t, x) \triangleq \rho(t, x)e^{-B(t)}$ :*

$$\partial_t \theta(t, x) + \operatorname{div}(u(t, x)\theta(t, x)) = \Delta \theta(t, x), \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad \theta(0, x) = \rho^{\text{in}}(x). \quad (13)$$

This equation (13) is equivalent to the deterministic transport-diffusion equation (cf. (1)) and hence non-uniqueness results from [47–49] directly apply to (13) and therefore to (8) in the case of linear multiplicative noise in Stratonovich's interpretation.

Let us now describe main results in the cases of additive noise, linear multiplicative noise in Itô's interpretation, and transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation; we describe the case of a linear multiplicative noise in Itô's interpretation first for convenience of explaining the difficulty of their proofs. Let us mention first that existence of solution is standard; e.g., Lemma 8.1, which is a straight-forward generalization of [30, Proposition II.1], proves the existence of a deterministic solution  $\theta \in L_t^\infty L_x^p$  to (11) with  $u \in L_t^1 L_x^{p'}$  for any  $p \in (1, \infty)$  starting from  $\theta^{\text{in}} \in L_x^p$  and therefore a solution process  $\rho = \theta e^B \in L_t^\infty L_x^p$  to (8) forced by linear multiplicative noise  $G(\rho)dB = \rho dB$  where  $B$  is a  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued Wiener process. The following result proves that uniqueness fails by construction via convex integration.

**Theorem 2.1.** *(Linear multiplicative noise in Itô's interpretation) Suppose that  $d \geq 3$  and  $B$  is a  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued Wiener process on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  with  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  being the normal filtration generated by  $B$ . Let  $T > 0$ ,  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $\tilde{p} \in [1, \infty)$  such that*

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{\tilde{p}} > 1 + \frac{1}{d} \quad \text{and} \quad p' < d. \quad (14)$$

Then there exist infinitely many pairs  $(\rho, u)$  where

$$u \in C([0, T]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C([0, T]; W^{1, \tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \quad (15)$$

is a deterministic divergence-free vector field and

$$\rho \in C([0, T]; L^p(\Omega; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))) \quad \forall r \in [1, \infty) \text{ that is } (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0} \text{-adapted, } \rho|_{t=0} \equiv 0, \rho|_{t=T} \neq 0 \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \quad (16)$$

that satisfy (8) forced by linear multiplicative noise in Itô's interpretation as follows: for every test function  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ , the process  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(t, x)\varphi(x)dx$  has a continuous modification which is a  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -semimartingale and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(t, x)\varphi(x)dx &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho^{\text{in}}(x)\varphi(x)dx + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(s, x)u(s, x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x)dx ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(s, x)\Delta \varphi(x)dx ds + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(s, x)\varphi(x)dx dB(s, x) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

$\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Consequently, non-uniqueness in law holds for (8) forced by the linear multiplicative noise in Itô's interpretation on  $[0, \infty)$ ; moreover, for all  $T > 0$ , non-uniqueness in law holds on  $[0, T]$ .

**Remark 2.2.** [36, Theorem 1.3] proves non-uniqueness in law for the 3D stochastic Navier-Stokes equations (5) forced by a linear multiplicative noise in Itô's interpretation defined on a random time interval using stopping time to control the noise, and then [36, Theorem 1.4] (which is same as the last sentence in Theorem 2.1) more generally proves non-uniqueness in law on an arbitrary deterministic time interval using techniques from martingale problem of [55] (see [36, Section 5]) and generalization of Cherny's theorem [16] (see [36, Theorem C.1]). Theorem 2.1 is interesting in a way that it implies non-uniqueness in law more immediately. The main reason for this difference is that analogous transformation to (11) for the 3D Navier-Stokes equations (5) forced by linear multiplicative noise in Itô's interpretation solved by  $u$  returns the following random PDE solved by  $v(t, x) = u(t, x)e^{-B(t)}$ :

$$\partial_t v(t, x) + e^{B(t)} \operatorname{div}(v(t, x) \otimes v(t, x)) + e^{-B(t)} \nabla \pi(t, x) + \frac{1}{2} v(t, x) = \Delta v(t, x), \quad \nabla \cdot v = 0. \quad (18)$$

The striking difference between (11) and (18) is that the noise appears in the latter but not the former. We shall elaborate on how the appearance of the noise in the transformed random PDE creates major difficulty in Remark 2.3. In short, we are able to essentially directly apply the deterministic convex integration technique from [47] to (11) with only a few necessary modifications and immediately deduce Theorem 2.1; for this reason, we leave the proof of Theorem 2.1 in Appendix A for completeness.

Our next theorem concerns the case of additive noise,  $G(\rho)dB = dB$  where  $B$  is a certain  $GG^*$ -Wiener process.

**Remark 2.3.** The first major difficulty is the appearance of  $z$  in (10) which is Hölder continuous in time of an exponent that is strictly less than  $\frac{1}{2}$ , inherently from the regularity of Brownian motion. Following the Nash-type convex integration schemes in [47–49], let us consider the following transport-diffusion-defect equation based on (10):

$$\partial_t \theta(t, x) + \operatorname{div}(u(t, x)\theta(t, x)) + \operatorname{div}(u(t, x)z(t, x)) - \Delta \theta(t, x) = -\operatorname{div}R(t, x), \quad (19a)$$

$$\nabla \cdot u = 0. \quad (19b)$$

E.g., in the key proposition, specifically [47, Proposition 2.1], the authors assume that there already exists “smooth solution  $(\rho_0, u_0, R_0)$ ” and construct another “smooth solution  $(\rho_1, u_1, R_1)$ ” with the desired properties. Unfortunately, such smoothness is not only in space but also in time. Specifically, the authors in [47] define  $R_0^j$  to be the  $j$ -th component of the vector  $R_0$ , define  $a_j, b_j$  in terms of  $R_0^j$  on [47, p. 1092] and assume an estimate of  $a_j$  and  $b_j$  in  $C_{t,x}^k$ -norm for an arbitrary  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  (see [47, Equation (4.16b)]); similarly, the proof in [48] consists of an estimate of “ $\|\partial_t \vartheta(t)\|_{L^1}$ ” on [48, p. 30] which involves a temporal derivative of  $R_0$ , and the proof of [49] also consists of “ $\partial_t R_{0,j}$ ” in the definitions of “ $A_1^j$ ” and “ $A_2^j$ ” on [49, p. 25]. These authors can do so because their assumption is that  $R_0$  is smooth in both space and time; however, if we follow the same approach, our  $R$ , defined by simply taking an anti-divergence operator (see Definition 3.1) in (19a), is only Hölder continuous in time with an exponent strictly smaller than  $\frac{1}{2}$ . This type of difficulty was already observed in previous attempts of probabilistic convex integration (e.g., [57, Remark 1.2]). We will overcome this difficulty by mollifying  $R_0$  and replacing  $R_0$  in the proof of [47] by the mollified  $R_0$  appropriately and carefully estimating our new  $a_j$  and  $b_j$  (see Lemma 4.4). While this has clear advantage in terms of differentiability, it has a major cost, that we will describe next.

Let us describe the second major difficulty, which involves the aforementioned “cost” of mollifying  $R_0$ . In short, the authors in [47] assume the existence of a smooth solution  $(\rho_0, u_0, R_0)$  and construct  $(\rho_1, u_1, R_1) = (\rho_0, u_0, R_0) + \text{perturbation}$ . The key idea is that  $R_0$  is strategically embedded in this perturbation so that for any  $t$  such that  $R_0(t) \equiv 0$ , it follows that  $R_1(t) \equiv 0$  and  $(\rho_1, u_1)(t) \equiv (\rho_0, u_0)(t)$  (see the last sentence of [47, Proposition 2.1]). This leads to the key fact in [47, Theorem 1.2 (iii)]; the authors can choose an arbitrary  $\bar{\rho} \in C_{t,x}^{\infty}$  with zero mean, divergence-free vector field  $\bar{u} \in C_{t,x}^{\infty}$  and construct a new solution  $(\rho, u)$  such that  $(\rho, u)(t) \equiv (\bar{\rho}, \bar{u})(t)$  for all  $t$  such that  $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u})(t)$  satisfies the transport equation. This immediately allows them to prove the existence of a non-zero solution starting from zero initial data “Therefore,  $\rho|_{t=0} \equiv 0$  and  $\rho|_{t=T} = \bar{\rho} \not\equiv 0$ ” on [47, p. 1079], and this is a common punchline in all the proofs of [47–49]. The cost of mollifying  $R_0$  and replacing  $R_0$  appropriately in the proof of [47], which seems unavoidable, is the following: clearly  $R_0(t) \equiv 0$  does not imply that the mollified  $R_0$  at time  $t$  is equivalently zero and therefore our perturbation would not vanish at such  $t$ . In fact, another unique difficulty in the case of an additive noise, in comparison to all other cases, is that a zero function is no longer a solution starting from zero initial data for either (8) or (10). Therefore, we cannot follow the approach of [47–49] anyway. Hence, we must find an alternative approach to prove non-uniqueness. The complexity is that the convex integration scheme on the transport equation constructs both  $\rho$  and  $u$  and hence we cannot “prescribe  $u$ ” or even “know  $u$  precisely even after the construction,” and because formally  $u$  is “given” and  $\rho$  is the “unknown,” to prove non-uniqueness, we need to contradict a classical fact that is valid for “any”  $u$ . With the approach of doing so by constructing a non-zero solution starting from zero initial data out of the picture, we turn to another classical fact that is valid for “any”  $u$ , namely the  $L^p$ -inequality which we will describe next.

In case  $p \in [2, \infty)$ , we first recall that  $dB(s, x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\eta_j} e_j(x) d\beta_j(s)$ , where  $\{\sqrt{\eta_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{e_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  respectively are eigenvalues and eigenvectors of  $G$  by the property of a  $GG^*$ -Wiener process (e.g., [24, Definition 4.2, Proposition 4.3]). Thus, because (8) has diffusion, we can employ a standard Galerkin

approximation in which we may rely on Itô's formula for  $L^p$ -norm (e.g., [41, Lemma 5.1]), that is valid for only  $p \in [2, \infty)$ , to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho(t)\|_{L_x^p}^p &= \|\rho(0)\|_{L_x^p}^p + \int_0^t [-p \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\rho(l)|^{p-2} \rho(l) (-\Delta \rho(l) + (u \cdot \nabla) \rho(l)) dx \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} p(p-1) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\rho(l)|^{p-2} \|\sqrt{\eta_j} e_j\|_{\rho(\mathbb{N})}^2 dx] dl + p \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\rho(l)|^{p-2} \rho(l) \sqrt{\eta_j} e_j dx d\beta_j(l). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

In case  $p = 2$ , this implies

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [\|\rho(t)\|_{L_x^2}^2] \leq \|\rho(0)\|_{L_x^2}^2 + t \text{Tr}(GG^*). \quad (21)$$

In case  $p \in (2, \infty)$ , we can use the well-known fact that  $-p \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\rho(l)|^{p-2} \rho(l) (-\Delta \rho(l) + (u \cdot \nabla) \rho(l)) dx \leq 0$  for all  $l \in [0, t]$ , apply Young's inequality and Gronwall's inequality on (20) to deduce

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [\|\rho(t)\|_{L_x^p}^p] \leq e^t [\|\rho(0)\|_{L_x^p}^p + C(p, \text{Tr}((-\Delta)^{\frac{d}{2}+2\zeta} GG^*))] \quad (22)$$

where

$$C(p, \text{Tr}((-\Delta)^{\frac{d}{2}+2\zeta} GG^*)) \triangleq \frac{2}{p} \left( \frac{p-2}{p} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \left[ \frac{1}{2} p(p-2) C_S^1 \text{Tr}((-\Delta)^{\frac{d}{2}+2\zeta} GG^*) \right]^{\frac{p}{2}} \quad (23)$$

with  $C_S^1$  being the Sobolev constant for  $\dot{H}^{\frac{d}{2}+2\zeta}(\mathbb{T}^d) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$  for mean-zero functions. Application of martingale representation theorem (e.g., [24, Theorem 8.2]) deduces the existence of an analytically weak solution  $\rho \in L_\omega^q L_t^\infty L_x^p$  for all  $q \in [1, \infty)$  that preserves the bounds (21) and (22) in case  $p = 2, p \in (2, \infty)$ , respectively. In case  $p \in (1, 2)$ , standard Itô's formula is not available (e.g., [41] which is only for  $p \geq 2$ ). Nonetheless, we can assume (26) so that  $z$  that solves (9) has regularity of  $L_\omega^\infty L_t^\infty W_x^{1,\infty}$  due to (75) up to a stopping time  $T_L$  in (74), we can apply Lemma 8.1 to obtain the existence of an analytically weak solution  $\theta \in L_\omega^\infty L_t^\infty L_x^p$  to (10) in case  $p \in (1, 2]$ . Here, we can apply Lemma 8.1 precisely only for  $p \in (1, 2]$  because we must consider  $-(u \cdot \nabla)z$  in (10) as the external force  $f$  in (311); even though  $\nabla z \in L_{\omega,t,x}^\infty$  by our assumption, (310) still requires  $u \in L_t^1 L_x^p$  so that  $-(u \cdot \nabla)z \in L_t^1 L_x^p$  and this is satisfied only if  $p \in (1, 2]$  so that  $p' \in [2, \infty)$ . Therefore, we can rely on the bounds (316) and (75) to deduce for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$  (see (74))

$$\|\rho(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \|\theta(t)\|_{L_x^p} + \|z(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \leq \|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} + L^{\frac{1}{4}} \left( \int_0^t \|u(s)\|_{L_x^p} ds + 1 \right). \quad (24)$$

It also follows that  $\rho = \theta + z$  is an analytically weak solution to (8) forced by the additive noise. Therefore, we aim to construct a solution  $\rho$  such that for a fixed  $T > 0$ , on a set  $\{T_L \geq T\}$

$$\|\rho(T)\|_{L_x^p} > \begin{cases} \|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} + L^{\frac{1}{4}} \left( \int_0^T \|u(s)\|_{L_x^p} ds + 1 \right) & \text{if } p \in (1, 2), \\ \|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^2} + \sqrt{T} \text{Tr}(GG^*) & \text{if } p = 2, \\ e^{\frac{T}{p}} [\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} + C(p, \text{Tr}((-\Delta)^{\frac{d}{2}+2\zeta} GG^*))^{\frac{1}{p}}] & \text{if } p \in (2, \infty) \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

(see (31)). Let us now present our main result in the case of an additive noise.

**Theorem 2.2.** (Additive noise) Suppose that  $d \geq 3$ ,  $B$  is a  $GG^*$ -Wiener process, and

$$\text{Tr}((-\Delta)^{\frac{d}{2}+2\zeta} GG^*) < \infty \text{ for some } \zeta > 0. \quad (26)$$

Given  $T > 0$ ,  $K > 1$ , and  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ , there exists a  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. strictly positive stopping time  $T_L$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\{T_L \geq T\}) > \kappa \quad (27)$$

and the following is additionally satisfied. Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $\tilde{p} \in [1, \infty)$  such that (14) holds. Then there exist an  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted process  $u$  that is divergence-free such that

$$u \in L^\infty(\Omega; C([0, T_L]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))) \cap L^\infty(\Omega; C([0, T_L]; W^{1,\tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d))), \quad (28)$$

an  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted process

$$\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega; C([0, T_L]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))), \quad (29)$$

and  $\rho^{\text{in}} \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)$  that is deterministic such that  $\rho$  solves the corresponding (8) forced by additive noise  $B$  as follows: for every test function  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ , the process  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(t, x) \varphi(x) dx$  has a continuous modification which is a  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -semimartingale and satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(t, x) \varphi(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho^{\text{in}}(x) \varphi(x) dx + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(s, x) u(s, x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x) dx ds$$

$$+ \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(s, x) \Delta \varphi(x) dx ds + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \int_0^t \varphi(x) dB(s, x) dx \quad (30)$$

$\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$ . Moreover, on the set  $\{T_L \geq T\}$ ,

$$\|\rho(T)\|_{L_x^p} > \begin{cases} K[\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} + L^{\frac{1}{4}}(\int_0^T \|u\|_{L_x^p} ds + 1)] & \text{if } p \in (1, 2), \\ K[\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^2} + \sqrt{T \text{Tr}(GG^*)}] & \text{if } p = 2, \\ K e^{\frac{T}{p}} [\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} + C(p, \text{Tr}((-\Delta)^{\frac{d}{2}+2\zeta} GG^*))^{\frac{1}{p}}] & \text{if } p \in (2, \infty). \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

**Remark 2.4.** *Theorem 2.2 is an analogue of [36, Theorem 1.1] and already represents non-uniqueness in law for solutions defined on the random time interval  $[0, T_L]$  (cf. (21), (22), (23), (24), and (31)). On the other hand, [36, Theorems 1.2] is an extension that shows non-uniqueness in law over a deterministic time interval similarly to the last sentence of our Theorems 2.1, 2.4-2.5. Such an extension from Theorem 2.2 following the proof of [36, Theorem 1.2] would require proving the existence of a solution to a martingale problem in the spirit of [55] (see [36, Definitions 3.1-3.2, Theorem 3.1]) and thereafter its various properties following [36, Section 3]. A systematic approach for the former task is given in [34, Theorem 4.6]; however, it seems to be only for initial data in a Hilbert space limiting this possibility only to the special case  $p = 2$ . Other differences from [36, Theorem 1.1] and Theorem 2.2 include the fact that the solution to the 3D Navier-Stokes equations constructed via convex integration actually has Sobolev regularity  $H^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^3)$ , although for  $\gamma > 0$  arbitrarily small, and it is part of the definition of a solution (see “(M3)” in [36, Definitions 3.1-3.2]) while  $\rho$  in Theorem 2.2 has no such higher regularity, unless we work with arbitrarily strong diffusion (see [47, Theorem 1.4]). This creates major obstacle in applying [34, Theorem 4.6].*

One last possible approach to obtain non-uniqueness over a deterministic time interval in the case of an additive noise may be to follow the approach of [48] in which [48, Proposition 3.1] is similar in spirit to [12, Proposition 16]; the advantage here is that the proof of non-uniqueness does not rely on the strategy of  $R_0(t) \equiv 0$  implying  $R_1(t) \equiv 0$  that we described in Remark 2.3 and thus will not be affected by the fact that we will have to mollify  $R_0$ . Hence, one idea will be to assign  $z|_{t=0} = \rho^{\text{in}}$  so that the solution to the convex integration scheme can have zero initial data similarly to [38], utilize Mikado density and Mikado field from [47] to obtain the desired Hölder relation (7) rather than (6), obtain key iteration estimates similarly to [48, Proposition 3.1] and [12, Proposition 16] up to a stopping time  $T_L$  in hope to take the final value at this stopping time and repeat following the approach of [38, Theorem 1.1, Corollary 1.2]. Alas, even if this works, as stated in [48, Theorem 1.2 (c)], for any prescribed function  $\bar{\rho}$ , we can deduce a pair  $(\rho, u)$  that satisfies the transport-diffusion equation forced by an additive noise such that  $\rho|_{t=0} = \bar{\rho}|_{t=0}$  and  $\rho|_{t=T_L} = \bar{\rho}|_{t=T_L}$ . In the deterministic case, Modena and Székelyhidi Jr. [48] can conclude now by taking  $\bar{\rho}|_{t=0} \equiv 0$  and  $\bar{\rho}|_{t=T} \not\equiv 0$  because for any  $u$ , starting from  $\rho|_{t=0} \equiv 0$ ,  $\rho \equiv 0$  is a solution for them; however, this is not the case when forced by an additive noise. At the time of writing this manuscript, it is not clear to us how to prove non-uniqueness in law of the stochastic transport-diffusion equation forced by additive noise over an arbitrary deterministic time interval unconditionally; nonetheless, our next result Theorem 2.3 actually shows that we have been able to overcome the aforementioned difficulty, although the temporal continuity and the  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adaptedness of the vector field  $u$  have been lost.

**Theorem 2.3.** *(Additive noise) Suppose that  $d \geq 3$ ,  $B$  is a  $GG^*$ -Wiener process, and (26) holds. For any  $T > 0, K > 1$ , and  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ , there exists a  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. strictly positive stopping time  $T_L$  such that (27) holds and the following is additionally satisfied. Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $\bar{p} \in [1, \infty)$  such that (14) holds. Then there exist a process  $u$  that is divergence-free such that*

$$u \in L^\infty(\Omega; L^\infty([0, T]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d))) \cap L^\infty(\Omega; L^\infty([0, T]; W^{1, \bar{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d))), \quad (32)$$

an  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted process

$$\rho \in C([0, T]; L^r(\Omega; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))) \quad (33)$$

for all  $r \in [1, \infty)$  such that  $\rho$  solves the corresponding (8) forced by the additive noise  $B$ ; i.e., for every test function  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ , the process  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(t, x) \varphi(x) dx$  has a continuous modification which is a  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -semimartingale and satisfies (30)  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Moreover, on the set  $\{T_L \geq T\}$  (31) holds. Consequently, non-uniqueness in law holds for (8) forced by the additive noise  $B$  on  $[0, \infty)$ ; moreover, for all  $T > 0$ , non-uniqueness in law holds on  $[0, T]$ .



At last, let us discuss the case of a transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation:  $G(\rho)dB = -\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \rho \circ dB_i$ .

**Remark 2.5.** *For this case of a transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation, there is an advantage that a zero function is a solution, in contrast to the case of additive noise. Nonetheless, there is a familiar difficulty and a new difficulty. A familiar difficulty, which is similar to the presence of  $z$  in (19) as described in Remark 2.3, is that due to the presence of  $B(t)$  in (12), upon employing a Nash-type convex integration scheme similarly to (19),  $R(t, x)$  will not be differentiable in time. Therefore, the same difficulty explained in Remark 2.3 applies and we must mollify  $R$ . A new difficulty is that while the case of transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation does not have an external force " $-\text{div}(u(t, x)z(t, x))$ " on the r.h.s. of (12), we now have a "mismatch" of variables within the nonlinear term, specifically  $u(t, x + B(t)) \cdot \nabla \theta(t, x)$ . As we will describe subsequently, this creates a new difficulty in the convex integration scheme (see Remark 6.4).*

Existence of an analytically weak solution to (8) forced by a transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation with  $u \in C_t L_x^{p'}$  such that  $\nabla \cdot u = 0$ , starting from  $\rho^{\text{in}} \in L_x^p$  for  $p \in (1, \infty)$ , has been proven in variations; e.g., [14, Lemma 2.2] in case of zero diffusion (also [33, Theorem 15] in case  $p = \infty$ ). In short, we can consider the random PDE (12) in which  $u(t, x + B(t)) \in L_t^1 L_x^{p'}$  due to  $u \in L_t^1 L_x^{p'}$ , apply Lemma 8.1 (or its slight variation by considering test functions  $\phi \in C_x^\infty$ ) and apply Itô-Wentzell-Kunita formula (e.g., [44, Theorem 3.3.2 on p. 93], also [42, 43]) to conclude (see the proofs of [14, Lemma 2.2] and [33, Theorem 15]). Concerning the  $L^p$ -inequality, we see from (316) that for all  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,

$$\left( \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\rho(t, x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \|\theta(t)\|_{L_x^p} \stackrel{(316)}{\leq} \|\theta^{\text{in}}\|_{L_x^p} = \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\rho(0, x + B(0))|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L_x^p}. \quad (34)$$

Therefore we aim to construct solutions such that  $\|\rho(T)\|_{L^p} > K\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p}$  for  $K > 1$ . Because  $B(t)$  only appears "within" the vector field  $u(t, x + B(t))$ , we are able to obtain the following result over any prescribed deterministic interval  $[0, T]$ .

**Theorem 2.4.** *(Transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation) Suppose that  $d \geq 3$  and  $B(t) = (B_1, \dots, B_d)(t)$  is a standard Brownian motion on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . Let  $T > 0$ ,  $K > 1$ ,  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $\tilde{p} \in [1, \infty)$  such that (14) holds. Then there exist an  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted process  $u$  that is divergence-free such that*

$$u \in L^\infty(\Omega; C([0, T]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d))) \cap L^\infty(\Omega; C([0, T]; W^{1, \tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d))), \quad (35)$$

an  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted process

$$\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega; C([0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))), \quad (36)$$

and  $\rho^{\text{in}} \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)$  that is deterministic such that  $\rho$  solves the corresponding (8) forced by the transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation as follows: for every test function  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ , the process  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(t, x) \varphi(x) dx$  has a continuous modification which is a  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -semimartingale and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(t, x) \varphi(x) dx &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho^{\text{in}}(x) \varphi(x) dx + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(s, x) u(s, x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x) dx ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(s, x) \Delta \varphi(x) dx ds - \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \varphi(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \rho(s, x) dx \circ dB_i(s, x) \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Moreover,  $\rho$  satisfies

$$\|\rho(T)\|_{L_x^p} > K\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p}. \quad (38)$$

Consequently, non-uniqueness in law holds for (8) forced by the transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation on  $[0, \infty)$ ; moreover, for all  $T > 0$ , non-uniqueness in law holds on  $[0, T]$ .

We can also prove non-uniqueness in law for the case of a transport noise as follows:

**Theorem 2.5.** *(Transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation) Suppose that  $d \geq 3$  and  $B(t) = (B_1, \dots, B_d)(t)$  is a standard Brownian motion on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . Let  $T > 0$ ,  $\xi \in (0, T)$ ,  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $\tilde{p} \in [1, \infty)$  such that (14) holds, and  $v \in (1, p)$ . Then there exist infinitely many pairs  $(\rho, u)$  such that  $u|_{t=0} \equiv 0$ ,  $\rho|_{t=0} \equiv 0$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.,*

$$u \in L^\infty(\Omega; C((0, T]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d))) \cap L^\infty(\Omega; C([0, T]; W^{1, \tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d))), \quad (39a)$$

$$\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega; C((0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))) \cap L^\infty(\Omega; C([0, T]; L^v(\mathbb{T}^d))), \quad (39b)$$

both  $\rho$  and  $u$  are  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted,  $\rho$  satisfies the corresponding (8) forced by transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation as follows: for every test function  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ , the process  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(t, x) \varphi(x) dx$  has a continuous modification which is a  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -semimartingale and satisfies (37)  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Moreover, for all the pairs  $(\rho, u)$  and all  $t \in (\xi, T]$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(t, x) u(t, x) dx \quad (40)$$

are distinct  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. Consequently, non-uniqueness in law holds for (8) forced by the transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation on  $[0, \infty)$ ; moreover, for all  $T > 0$ , non-uniqueness in law holds on  $[0, T]$ .

**Remark 2.6.** Theorems 2.4 and 2.5 are both concerned with the case of a transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation; nonetheless, they present interesting differences in terms of both results and proofs. Theorem 2.4 states that there exist some deterministic initial condition  $\rho^{\text{in}} \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)$  and a relatively smooth  $u$  such that solution  $\rho$  emanating from it violates the classical  $L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)$ -inequality. On the other hand, Theorem 2.5 shows that we may prescribe zero initial data  $\rho^{\text{in}}$  and construct  $\rho$  that is non-zero regardless of any information about  $u^{\text{in}} \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)$  except that initially it is zero. The proof of Theorem 2.5 follows the idea from [12] and [38] and this approach also presented multiple difficulties, which we will describe within its proof (see Remarks 6.1-6.5). We point out that the non-uniqueness is derived from the distinct values of (40); this is in sharp contrast from analogous choice of energy  $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ -norm of the solution in the case of the Navier-Stokes equations, that corresponds to  $L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)$ -norm of  $\rho$  in the case of the transport-diffusion equation. We discovered this difference due to the structure of the transport-diffusion equation and believe that it is inevitable.

Lastly, we point out that the proof of Theorem 2.5 also fails in the case of an additive noise because (40) implies non-uniqueness only by taking zero initial data and relying on the fact that  $\rho \equiv 0$  is a solution regardless of  $u$  in the case of transport noise, which is not valid in the case of additive noise.

Finally, as a corollary of our proofs of Theorems 2.2 and 2.4, we are able to also prove non-uniqueness for deterministic transport-diffusion equation forced by non-zero external force  $f \in L^1(0, T; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))$  that is mean-zero. To the best of our knowledge this is new because all previous works [47–49] ultimately proved non-uniqueness by taking advantage of the fact that starting from zero initial data  $\rho^{\text{in}}$ ,  $\rho \equiv 0$  is a solution regardless of  $u$  to conclude the proof of non-uniqueness, and that breaks down once we add a non-zero external force.

First, for all  $f \in L^1(0, T; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))$  that is mean-zero for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $u \in C([0, T]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d))$  such that  $\nabla \cdot u = 0$  where  $p \in (1, \infty)$ , and  $\rho^{\text{in}} \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)$ , by Lemma 8.1 there exists an analytically weak solution  $\rho \in L^\infty(0, T; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))$  to (1) with diffusion and the external force

$$\partial_t \rho(t, x) + \text{div}(u(t, x) \rho(t, x)) - \Delta \rho(t, x) = f(t, x), \quad t > 0, \quad (41a)$$

$$\rho(0, x) = \rho^{\text{in}}(x), \quad (41b)$$

and from (316) we see that it satisfies

$$\|\rho(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} + \int_0^t \|f(s)\|_{L_x^p} ds \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \quad (42)$$

**Corollary 2.6.** (Deterministic force) Suppose that  $d \geq 3$ . Let  $T > 0, K > 1, p \in (1, \infty), \tilde{p} \in [1, \infty)$  such that (14) holds, and  $f \in L^1(0, T; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))$  that is mean-zero for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Then there exist  $u \in C([0, T]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C([0, T]; W^{1, \tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d))$  that is divergence-free and  $\rho \in C([0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))$  that satisfy (41) analytically weakly and

$$\|\rho(T)\|_{L_x^p} > K[\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} + \int_0^T \|f(s)\|_{L_x^p} ds]. \quad (43)$$

Consequently, for all  $T > 0$ , non-uniqueness holds for (41) on  $[0, T]$ .

We leave this proof in the Appendix A for completeness.

**Remark 2.7.** Various extensions of our results may be possible. First, Theorems 2.1-2.5 may be extended to the cases of zero or arbitrarily strong diffusion by appropriate modifications described in [47, Theorems 1.2 and 1.4], respectively. In particular, the case of zero diffusion may include the case  $d = 2$  (see [47, Remark

on p. 1080]). Improving from  $u \in L_x^\infty$  to  $u \in C_x$  in case  $p = 1$  may also be possible (see [47, Section 7.1] and [49]). The method in our work may be applied to [17] to achieve its probabilistic analogue as well.

To the best of our knowledge, convex integration technique has never been employed on stochastic transport equation. Via convex integration, we have proved the negative direction when forced by random noise of additive and linear multiplicative types similarly to previous works (e.g., [36]); despite [33], transport noise is no exception here. We note that the condition that the authors in [33] had on the vector field  $u$  was stronger than ours. Our work also makes a contribution to the research direction of probabilistic convex integration by providing another equation, as well as another type of noise, specifically transport, on which we can apply such a technique.

In the following, we shall give some preliminaries and thereafter prove Theorems 2.2-2.3 and 2.5. The proof of Theorem 2.1 is similar to the deterministic case while that of Theorem 2.4 follows from similar computations in the proof of Theorem 2.2; hence, along with the proof of Corollary 2.6, they are left in the Appendix A.

### 3. PRELIMINARIES

**3.1. Notations and assumptions.** We write  $A \lesssim_{a,b} B$  and  $A \approx_{a,b} B$  to imply that  $A \leq C_{a,b}^1 B$  and  $C_{a,b}^1 B \leq A \leq C_{a,b}^2 B$  for some constants  $C_{a,b}^j = C^j(a, b) \geq 0$  for  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ , respectively. We also write  $A \stackrel{(\cdot)}{\lesssim} B$  to indicate that this inequality is due to an equation  $(\cdot)$ . We define  $\mathbb{N} \triangleq \{1, 2, \dots\}$  while  $\mathbb{N}_0 \triangleq \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ . We write  $\|f\|_{C_{t,x}^\alpha} \triangleq \sum_{0 \leq n+|\alpha| \leq N} \|\partial_t^n D^\alpha f\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty}$  and  $\partial_j \triangleq \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ . We denote a mathematical expectation with respect to (w.r.t.) any probability measure  $P$  by  $\mathbb{E}^P$ .

**3.2. Convex integration.** For any  $f : \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ , we denote its dilation

$$f_\lambda : \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \quad f_\lambda(x) \triangleq f(\lambda x) \quad \text{so that} \quad \|D^k f_\lambda\|_{L^p} = \lambda^k \|D^k f\|_{L^p} \quad (44)$$

where  $D^k$  represents some multi-index  $\alpha$  such that  $|\alpha| = k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $p \in [1, \infty]$  (e.g., [47, Equation (1.20)]).

**Lemma 3.1.** ([48, Lemma 2.1]) Let  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $f, g : \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  be smooth functions. Then, for every  $p \in [1, \infty]$ , there exists a constant  $C_p \geq 0$  such that

$$\| \|f g_\lambda\|_{L^p} - \|f\|_{L^p} \|g\|_{L^p} \| \leq C_p \lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}} \|f\|_{C^1} \|g\|_{L^p}. \quad (45)$$

**Lemma 3.2.** ([12, Proposition 2]) Let  $a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ ,  $v \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ . Then, for any  $p \in [1, \infty]$ , there exists a constant  $C_p \geq 0$  such that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} a v_\lambda dx \right| \leq \lambda^{-1} C_p \|\nabla a\|_{L^p} \|v\|_{L^{p'}}. \quad (46)$$

**Definition 3.1.** ([47, Definition on p. 1083]) For any  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , we define

$$\mathcal{D}^k f \triangleq \begin{cases} \Delta^{\frac{k}{2}} f & \text{if } k \text{ is even,} \\ \nabla \Delta^{\frac{k-1}{2}} f & \text{if } k \text{ is odd,} \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

with the convention that  $\mathcal{D}^0 = \Delta^0 = Id$ . For  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{<0}$  the definition is identical under an additional hypothesis that  $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ . We refer to  $\mathcal{D}^{-1}$  as the anti-divergence operator.

**Lemma 3.3.** ([47, p. 1084])  $\mathcal{D}^k$  defined in Definition 3.1 has the following properties.

- (1)  $\partial^\alpha \mathcal{D}^k f = \mathcal{D}^k \partial^\alpha f$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  and any multi-index  $\alpha$ .
- (2) For any  $k, n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $f, g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \mathcal{D}^k f \cdot \mathcal{D}^{m+n} g dx = (-1)^n \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \mathcal{D}^{k+n} f \cdot \mathcal{D}^m g dx. \quad (48)$$

- (3)  $\mathcal{D}^k u_\lambda = \lambda^k (\mathcal{D}^k u)_\lambda$  for any  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}_0$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** ([47, Lemma 3.2]) Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$ . Then there exists a constant  $C_{d,p} \geq 0$  such that for any  $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ ,

$$\|f\|_{W^{2,p}} \leq C_{d,p} \|\Delta f\|_{L^p}. \quad (49)$$

**Lemma 3.5.** ([47, Lemma 3.3]) Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Then there exists a constant  $C_{d,p,k} \geq 0$  such that for any  $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ ,

$$\|\mathcal{D}^{-k}f\|_{W^{k,p}} \leq C_{d,p,k}\|f\|_{L^p}. \quad (50)$$

**Lemma 3.6.** ([47, Lemma 3.4]) Let  $p \in [1, \infty]$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then there exists a constant  $C_{d,p,k} \geq 0$  such that for any  $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ ,

$$\|\mathcal{D}^{-k}f\|_{W^{k-1,p}} \leq C_{d,p,k}\|f\|_{L^p}. \quad (51)$$

**Definition 3.2.** ([47, Definition on p. 1086]) (Bilinear anti-divergence operator) Let  $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Define  $\mathcal{R}_N : C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d) \times C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d) \mapsto C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$  by

$$\mathcal{R}_N(f, g) \triangleq \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (-1)^k \mathcal{D}^k f \mathcal{D}^{-k-1} g + \mathcal{D}^{-1} \left( (-1)^N \mathcal{D}^N f \cdot \mathcal{D}^{-N} g - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f g dx \right). \quad (52)$$

**Lemma 3.7.** ([47, Lemma 3.5 and Remark on p. 1087])

(1) Let  $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ , and  $g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ . Then

$$\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{R}_N(f, g)) = fg - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f g dx. \quad (53)$$

(2) Let  $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ , and  $g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ . Then for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ ,

$$\partial_j(\mathcal{R}_N(f, g)) = \mathcal{R}_N(\partial_j f, g) + \mathcal{R}_N(f, \partial_j g). \quad (54)$$

(3) Let  $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Then, for any  $p, r, s \in [1, \infty]$  such that  $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{s}$ , there exists a constant  $C_{d,p} \geq 0$  such that for any  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$  and  $g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ ,

$$\|\mathcal{R}_N(f, g)\|_{L^p} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \|\mathcal{D}^k f\|_{L^r} \|\mathcal{D}^{-k-1} g\|_{L^s} + C_{d,p} \|\mathcal{D}^N f\|_{L^r} \|\mathcal{D}^{-N} g\|_{L^s}. \quad (55)$$

(4) Let  $p \in [1, \infty]$  and  $\lambda, N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Then there exists a constant  $C_{d,p,N} \geq 0$  such that for all  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$  and  $g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ ,

$$\|\mathcal{R}_N(f, g_\lambda)\|_{L^p} \leq C_{d,p,N} \|g\|_{L^p} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \lambda^{-k-1} \|\mathcal{D}^k f\|_{L^\infty} + \lambda^{-N} \|\mathcal{D}^N f\|_{L^\infty} \right), \quad (56a)$$

$$\|\mathcal{R}_N(f, g_\lambda)\|_{L^p} \leq C_{d,p,N} \|g\|_{L^\infty} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \lambda^{-k-1} \|\mathcal{D}^k f\|_{L^p} + \lambda^{-N} \|\mathcal{D}^N f\|_{L^p} \right). \quad (56b)$$

The following are preliminaries on space-time Mikado densities and fields from [47, Section 4.1]. Let  $e_j$  denote the  $j$ -th element in the standard basis of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . For given  $\zeta, \nu \in \mathbb{T}^d$ , we consider the line on  $\mathbb{T}^d : s \mapsto \zeta + s\nu \in \mathbb{T}^d$  for any  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Lemma 3.8.** (Space-time Mikado lines [47, Lemma 4.1]) Let  $d_{\mathbb{T}^d}$  denote the Euclidean distance on the torus. There exist  $r > 0$  and  $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_d \in \mathbb{T}^d$  such that the lines

$$\mathfrak{x}_j : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{T}^d, \mathfrak{x}_j(s) \triangleq \zeta_j + se_j \quad (57)$$

satisfy

$$d_{\mathbb{T}^d}(\mathfrak{x}_i(s), \mathfrak{x}_j(s)) > 2r \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}, \forall i \neq j. \quad (58)$$

For  $r > 0$  from Lemma 3.8, we let  $\varrho$  be a smooth function on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\operatorname{supp} \varrho \subset B(P, r) \subset (0, 1)^d \quad \text{where } P \triangleq \left(\frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2}\right) \in (0, 1)^d \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varrho^2 dx = 1. \quad (59)$$

For any  $p \in (1, \infty)$ , we define

$$a \triangleq \frac{d}{p} \quad \text{and} \quad b \triangleq \frac{d}{p'} \quad \text{so that } a + b = d \quad (60)$$

(recall (2)). Then we define the scaled functions

$$\varrho_\mu(x) \triangleq \mu^a \varrho(\mu x), \quad \tilde{\varrho}_\mu(x) \triangleq \mu^b \varrho(\mu x), \quad \mu \geq 1. \quad (61)$$

Concerning these scaled functions, we have the following result:

**Lemma 3.9.** ([47, Lemma 4.2 and p. 1088]) For every  $\mu \geq 1, k \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $r \in [1, \infty]$ ,

$$\|D^k \varrho_\mu\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \mu^{a-\frac{d}{r}+k} \|D^k \varrho\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad \|D^k \tilde{\varrho}_\mu\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \mu^{b-\frac{d}{r}+k} \|D^k \varrho\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad (62a)$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varrho_\mu \tilde{\varrho}_\mu dx = 1. \quad (62b)$$

Consequently,  $\|\varrho_\mu\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|\varrho\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \|\tilde{\varrho}_\mu\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|\tilde{\varrho}\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ . Moreover,  $\text{supp} \varrho_\mu = \text{supp} \tilde{\varrho}_\mu$  and both are contained in a ball with radius at most  $r$  from Lemma 3.8.

For any given  $y \in \mathbb{T}^d$ , we define  $\tau_y : \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \mathbb{T}^d$  by

$$\tau_y(x) \triangleq x - y \quad \text{so that} \quad \|D^k(g \circ \tau_y)\|_{L^r} = \|D^k g\|_{L^r} \quad (63)$$

for every smooth function  $g$  on  $\mathbb{T}^d$ , for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , and all  $r \in [1, \infty]$ .

**Lemma 3.10.** ([47, Lemma 4.3]) There exist functions  $\varrho_\mu^j : \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j : \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ , such that for any  $r \in [1, \infty]$ , and any  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$

$$\|D^k \varrho_\mu^j\|_{L^r} = \mu^{a-\frac{d}{r}+k} \|D^k \varrho\|_{L^r}, \quad \|D^k \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{L^r} = \mu^{b-\frac{d}{r}+k} \|D^k \varrho\|_{L^r}. \quad (64)$$

Moreover, for any  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  and  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\varrho_\mu^i \circ \tau_{se_i})(\tilde{\varrho}_\mu^i \circ \tau_{se_i}) dx = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad (\varrho_\mu^i \circ \tau_{se_i})(\tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j \circ \tau_{se_j}) = 0 \quad \forall i \neq j. \quad (65)$$

**Remark 3.1.** From the proof of [47, Lemma 4.3] we know that the precise forms of such  $\varrho_\mu^j$  and  $\tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j$  are

$$\varrho_\mu^j \triangleq \varrho_\mu \circ \tau_{\zeta_j}, \quad \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j \triangleq \tilde{\varrho}_\mu \circ \tau_{\zeta_j} \quad (66)$$

where  $\zeta_j$  are those from Lemma 3.8.

Next, we fix a smooth function  $\psi : \mathbb{T}^{d-1} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d-1}} \psi dx = 0 \quad \text{while} \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d-1}} \psi^2 dx = 1 \quad (67)$$

and define for every  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$

$$\psi^j : \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \quad \psi^j(x) \triangleq \psi^j(x_1, \dots, x_d) \triangleq \psi(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_d) \quad (68)$$

so that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \psi^j dx = 0 \quad \text{while} \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\psi^j)^2 dx = 1. \quad (69)$$

For the parameters

$$\text{fast oscillation} = \lambda \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \text{concentration} = \mu \gg \lambda, \quad (70a)$$

$$\text{phase speed} = \omega, \quad \text{very fast oscillation} = \nu \in \lambda \mathbb{N}, \nu \gg \lambda, \quad (70b)$$

we define for  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ , Mikado density, Mikado field, and quadratic corrector as

$$\Theta_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j(t, x) \triangleq \varrho_\mu^j(\lambda(x - \omega t e_j)) \psi^j(\nu x) = ((\varrho_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j})(x) \psi_\nu^j(x), \quad (71a)$$

$$W_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j(t, x) \triangleq \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j(\lambda(x - \omega t e_j)) \psi^j(\nu x) e_j = ((\tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j})(x) \psi_\nu^j(x) e_j, \quad (71b)$$

$$Q_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j(t, x) \triangleq \omega^{-1} (\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)(\lambda(x - \omega t e_j)) (\psi^j(\nu x))^2 = \omega^{-1} ((\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j})(x) (\psi_\nu^j(x))^2, \quad (71c)$$

to which we refer as  $\Theta^j, W^j$ , and  $Q^j$  when no confusion arises, respectively. They satisfy

$$\partial_t \Theta_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j = -\lambda \omega ((\partial_j \varrho_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j}) \psi_\nu^j \quad \text{and} \quad \text{div} W_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j = \lambda ((\partial_j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j}) \psi_\nu^j. \quad (72)$$

## 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2

**Proposition 4.1.** *Under the hypothesis of (26), the solution  $z$  to (9) where  $B$  is the  $GG^*$ -Wiener process satisfies for all  $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $T > 0$ , and  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [\|z\|_{C_T \dot{H}_x^{\frac{d+2+l\delta}{2}}}^l + \|z\|_{C_T^{\frac{1}{2}-\delta} \dot{H}_x^{\frac{d+l\delta}{2}}}^l] < \infty. \quad (73)$$

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* This result is discussed in detail in [58, Proposition 4.4] and follows from [36, Proposition 3.6] which in turn followed [29, Proposition 34].  $\square$

For the Sobolev constant  $C_S > 0$  such that  $\|f\|_{L_x^\infty} \leq C_S \|f\|_{\dot{H}_x^{\frac{d+l\delta}{2}}}$  for all  $f \in \dot{H}_x^{\frac{d+l\delta}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^d)$  that is mean-zero and  $\varpi \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ , we define

$$T_L \triangleq \inf\{t \geq 0 : C_S \|z(s)\|_{\dot{H}_x^{\frac{d+2+l\delta}{2}}} \geq L^{\frac{1}{4}}\} \wedge \inf\{t \geq 0 : C_S \|z\|_{C_t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\varpi} \dot{H}_x^{\frac{d+l\delta}{2}}} \geq L^{\frac{1}{2}}\} \wedge L. \quad (74)$$

We see that  $T_L > 0$  and  $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} T_L = \infty$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. due to Proposition 4.1 and for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$ ,

$$\|z(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \leq L^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad \|z(t)\|_{W_x^{1,\infty}} \leq L^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad \|z\|_{C_t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\varpi} L_x^\infty} \leq L^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (75)$$

We let

$$M_0(t) \triangleq L^4 e^{4Lt}. \quad (76)$$

Theorem 2.2 essentially follows from this key proposition concerning the transport-diffusion-defect equation (19).

**Proposition 4.2.** *There exists a constant  $M > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $\varpi \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ ,  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $\tilde{p} \in [1, \infty)$  such that (14) holds. Then for any  $\delta, \eta > 0$  and  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted  $(\theta_0, u_0, R_0)$  that satisfies (19) such that for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$   $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta_0(t, x) dx = 0$ ,*

$$\theta_0 \in C^\infty([0, T_L] \times \mathbb{T}^d), \quad u_0 \in C^\infty([0, T_L] \times \mathbb{T}^d), \quad (77a)$$

$$R_0 \in C([0, T_L]; C^1(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C^{\frac{1}{2}-2\varpi}([0, T_L]; C(\mathbb{T}^d)), \quad (77b)$$

and

$$\|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq 2\delta M_0(t), \quad (78)$$

there exists another  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted  $(\theta_1, u_1, R_1)$  that satisfies (19) in same corresponding regularity class (77) such that for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$   $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta_1(t, x) dx = 0$  and

$$\|(\theta_1 - \theta_0)(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq M\eta(2\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (79a)$$

$$\|(u_1 - u_0)(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \leq M\eta^{-1}(2\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}}, \quad (79b)$$

$$\|(u_1 - u_0)(t)\|_{W_x^{1,p}} \leq \delta M_0(t), \quad (79c)$$

$$\|R_1(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \delta M_0(t). \quad (79d)$$

Finally, if  $(\theta_0, u_0, R_0)(0, x)$  are deterministic, then so are  $(\theta_1, u_1, R_1)(0, x)$ .

**Remark 4.1.** *Proposition 4.2 is a kind of a probabilistic analogue of [47, Proposition 2.1]. One key difference is that “ $\|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{p}}$ ” to bound  $\|(\theta_1 - \theta_0)(t)\|_{L_x^p}$  and “ $\|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{p'}}$ ” to bound  $\|(u_1 - u_0)(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}}$  in [47, Equations (2.3a)-(2.3b)] are unreasonable for us. Such bounds work well in [47] because e.g., they construct  $\theta_1(t)$  as a sum of  $\theta_0(t)$  and certain perturbation (“ $\vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t) + q(t, x) + q_c(t)$ ” on [47, p. 1092]) that completely vanishes when  $R_0(t) \equiv 0$  and thus  $\theta_1(t) - \theta_0(t) \equiv 0$  so that an inductive bound of “ $\|\theta_1(t) - \theta_0(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq M\eta \|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{p}}$ ” is achievable. As we described in Remark 2.3, we will construct  $\theta_1$  as a sum of  $\theta_0$  and perturbations that does not vanish in general even if  $R_0(t) \equiv 0$ ; thus we cannot bound  $\|(\theta_1 - \theta_0)(t)\|_{L_x^p}$  by  $M\eta \|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{p}}$  which may be zero. Analogous comment applies for our choice of  $\|(u_1 - u_0)(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \leq M\eta^{-1}(2\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}}$  in (79b). This is precisely why we included a hypothesis (78) that is absent in [47, Proposition 2.1] to achieve bounds of  $M\eta(2\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}}$  and  $M\eta^{-1}(2\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}}$  in (79a)-(79b), respectively.*

Assuming Proposition 4.2, we can prove Theorem 2.2 as follows.

*Proof of Theorem 2.2 assuming Proposition 4.2.* For any  $L > 1$  we define

$$\theta_0(t, x) \triangleq M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{p}}(x_d - \frac{1}{2}), \quad u_0 \equiv 0, \quad R_0 \triangleq -\mathcal{D}^{-1} \partial_t \theta_0 \quad (80)$$

so that  $\theta_0$  has mean zero for all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $u_0$  is trivially divergence-free, and  $\mathcal{D}^{-1}$  from Definition 3.1 is well-defined because  $\theta_0$  is mean-zero. Because  $\Delta \theta_0 = 0$ , by construction  $(\theta_0, u_0, R_0)$  solves (19); moreover,  $\theta_0 \in C_{t,x}^\infty, u_0 \in C_{t,x}^\infty, R_0 \in C_t C_x^1 \cap C_t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\sigma} C_x$  and they are all  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted. We can also readily compute

$$\|\theta_0(t)\|_{L^p} = \frac{M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{2(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}}. \quad (81)$$

We note that a typical choice for such  $\theta_0$  in the case of the 3D Navier-Stokes equations would be  $\theta_0(t, x) = M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sin(2\pi x_3)$  for which it suffices to compute its  $L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$ -norm (see e.g., [56, Proposition 4.7]); however, we need to compute its  $L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)$ -norm for an arbitrary  $p \in (1, \infty)$  while making sure that it is mean-zero and thus we chose  $\theta_0 = M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{p}}(x_d - \frac{1}{2})$  in (80) for simplicity.

We set  $\delta = \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \frac{\|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1}}{M_0(t)}$  so that  $\|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq 2\delta M_0(t)$ . We choose

$$\delta_n = \delta 2^{-(n-1)}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \quad (82)$$

so that  $\delta_{n+1} = \delta_n 2^{-1}$ ,  $\delta_0 = 2\delta, \delta_1 = \delta$ , etc. Having fixed such  $\delta_n$ , we fix a sequence  $\eta_n \in (1, \infty)$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\delta_n^{\frac{1}{p}} \eta_n = \sigma \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (83)$$

for  $\sigma > 0$  that satisfies

$$\sigma 4(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}} M \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\delta} 2^{-\frac{n-1}{2}} < 1. \quad (84)$$

By repeated applications of Proposition 4.2 we obtain  $(\theta_n, u_n, R_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  that satisfies (19) and

$$\|(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)(t)\|_{L_x^p} \stackrel{(79a)}{\leq} M \eta_n (2\delta_{n+1} M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \stackrel{(82)(83)}{=} M \sigma \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (85a)$$

$$\|(u_{n+1} - u_n)(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \stackrel{(79b)}{\leq} M \eta_n^{-1} (2\delta_{n+1} M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \stackrel{(82)(83)}{=} M \sigma^{-1} \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{p'}}, \quad (85b)$$

$$\|(u_{n+1} - u_n)(t)\|_{W_x^{1, \tilde{p}}} \stackrel{(79c)}{\leq} \delta_{n+1} M_0(t), \quad (85c)$$

$$\|R_{n+1}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(79d)}{\leq} \delta_{n+1} M_0(t). \quad (85d)$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)(t)\|_{L_x^p} \stackrel{(85a)(82)}{\leq} M M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sigma \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\delta} 2^{-\frac{(n-1)}{2}} < \infty, \quad (86a)$$

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|(u_{n+1} - u_n)(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \stackrel{(85b)(82)}{\leq} M M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \sigma^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\delta} 2^{-\frac{(n-1)}{2}} < \infty, \quad (86b)$$

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|(u_{n+1} - u_n)(t)\|_{W_x^{1, \tilde{p}}} \stackrel{(85c)(82)}{\leq} M_0(t) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \delta 2^{-n} < \infty. \quad (86c)$$

Thus, for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$ ,  $\{\theta_n(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  and  $\{u_n(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  are Cauchy in  $C([0, T_L]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))$  and  $C([0, T_L]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C([0, T_L]; W^{1, \tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ , respectively. Therefore, there exist unique  $\theta \in C([0, T_L]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))$  and  $u \in C([0, T_L]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C([0, T_L]; W^{1, \tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d))$  such that

$$\theta_n \rightarrow \theta \text{ in } C([0, T_L]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)), \quad u_n \rightarrow u \text{ in } C([0, T_L]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C([0, T_L]; W^{1, \tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \quad (87)$$

and there exists a deterministic constant  $C_L > 0$  such that

$$\max\{ \sup_{t \in [0, T_L]} \|\theta(t)\|_{L_x^p}, \sup_{t \in [0, T_L]} \|u(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}}, \sup_{t \in [0, T_L]} \|u(t)\|_{W_x^{1, \tilde{p}}} \} \leq C_L. \quad (88)$$

Because  $(\theta_0, u_0, R_0)$  were all  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted, so are  $(\theta_n, u_n, R_n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  due to Proposition 4.2; consequently,  $(\theta, u)$  are both  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted. Moreover,  $\|R_n(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(85d)}{\leq} M_0(t)\delta_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and

$$\|\theta_n u_n - \theta u\|_{C_t L_x^1} \leq \sup_{t \in [0, T_L]} \|\theta_n(t)\|_{L_x^p} \|(u_n - u)(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} + \|(\theta_n - \theta)(t)\|_{L_x^p} \|u(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \rightarrow 0, \quad (89a)$$

$$\|u_n z - u z\|_{C_t L_x^1} \leq \sup_{t \in [0, T_L]} \|(u_n - u)(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} L^{\frac{1}{4}} \rightarrow 0 \quad (89b)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  due to (75). Thus,  $(\theta, u)$  satisfies (10) analytically weakly. Consequently, by defining  $\rho = u + z$ , we obtain  $(\rho, u)$  that satisfies (8) forced by the additive noise analytically weakly, i.e., (30). The regularity claimed in (28)-(29) follow from (75) and (88). Next, in order to prove (31) on  $\{T_L \geq T\}$  for the fixed  $T > 0$  from hypothesis, we fix such  $(\rho, u)$ , define  $\rho^{\text{in}} = \rho|_{t=0}$ , and then take  $L > 0$  larger if necessary so that

$$L^{\frac{1}{p}} e^{\frac{2LT}{p}} > (3L^{\frac{1}{p}} + L4(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}), \quad (90a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & (\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} + L)e^{\frac{2LT}{p}} \\ & \geq \begin{cases} L^{\frac{1}{4}} + K[\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} + L^{\frac{1}{4}}(\int_0^T \|u\|_{L_x^p} ds + 1)] & \text{if } p \in (1, 2), \\ L^{\frac{1}{4}} + K[\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^2} + \sqrt{TT\text{Tr}(GG^*)}] & \text{if } p = 2, \\ L^{\frac{1}{4}} + Ke^{\frac{T}{p}}[\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} + C(p, \text{Tr}((-\Delta)^{\frac{d}{2}+2\zeta}GG^*))^{\frac{1}{p}}] & \text{if } p \in (2, \infty) \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (90b)$$

where  $C(p, \text{Tr}((-\Delta)^{\frac{d}{2}+2\zeta}GG^*))$  was defined in (23). Now for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$ , we can compute

$$\|(\theta - \theta_0)(t)\|_{L_x^p} \stackrel{(82)(85a)}{\leq} M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{p}} M\sigma \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\delta} 2^{-\frac{n-1}{2}} \stackrel{(84)}{\leq} \frac{M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{4(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}}. \quad (91)$$

This leads us to an estimate of

$$\begin{aligned} & (\|\theta(0)\|_{L_x^p} + L)e^{\frac{2LT}{p}} \leq (\|(\theta - \theta_0)(0)\|_{L_x^p} + \|\theta_0(0)\|_{L_x^p} + L)e^{\frac{2LT}{p}} \quad (92) \\ & \stackrel{(91)(81)}{\leq} \left( \frac{M_0(0)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{4(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}} + \frac{M_0(0)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{2(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}} + L \right) e^{\frac{2LT}{p}} \\ & \stackrel{(76)(90a)}{<} \frac{M_0(T)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{2(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}} - \frac{M_0(T)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{4(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}} \stackrel{(91)(81)}{\leq} \|\theta_0(T)\|_{L_x^p} - \|(\theta - \theta_0)(T)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \|\theta(T)\|_{L_x^p}. \end{aligned}$$

Because  $\rho = \theta + z$ , this allows us to conclude via Hölder's inequality and the fact that  $z(0, x) \equiv 0$  from (9) so that  $\rho^{\text{in}}(x) = \theta(0, x)$ , that on the set  $\{T_L \geq T\}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\rho(T)\|_{L_x^p} \geq \|\theta(T)\|_{L_x^p} - \|z(T)\|_{L_x^p} \stackrel{(92)}{>} (\|\theta(0)\|_{L_x^p} + L)e^{\frac{2LT}{p}} - \|z(T)\|_{L_x^p} \\ & \stackrel{(9)(75)}{\geq} (\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} + L)e^{\frac{2LT}{p}} - L^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ & \stackrel{(90b)}{\geq} \begin{cases} K[\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} + L^{\frac{1}{4}}(\int_0^T \|u\|_{L_x^p} ds + 1)] & \text{if } p \in (1, 2), \\ K[\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^2} + \sqrt{TT\text{Tr}(GG^*)}] & \text{if } p = 2, \\ Ke^{\frac{T}{p}}[\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} + C(p, \text{Tr}((-\Delta)^{\frac{d}{2}+2\zeta}GG^*))^{\frac{1}{p}}] & \text{if } p \in (2, \infty). \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

This proves (31). We can take  $L > 0$  larger if necessary to achieve (27) due to  $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} T_L = \infty$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. from (74). Finally, because  $(\theta_0, u_0, R_0)(0, x)$  was deterministic, Proposition 4.2 implies that  $(\theta_n, u_n, R_n)(0, x)$  are deterministic for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and consequently so is  $\rho^{\text{in}}$  because  $z(0, x) \equiv 0$  due to (9). This completes the proof of Theorem 2.2.  $\square$

**Remark 4.2.** In [47, Theorem 1.2], the parameter  $\eta$  in Proposition 4.2 was crucially utilized to deduce a freedom to choose  $\sigma > 0$  in (83)-(84) and conclude that given any  $\epsilon > 0$ , any  $\bar{\rho} \in C^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d)$  with zero mean and  $\bar{u} \in C^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d)$  that is divergence-free, they can construct a solution via convex integration such that  $\|\rho - \bar{\rho}\|_{C_T L_x^p} < \epsilon$  by taking  $\sigma > 0$  sufficiently small or  $\|u(t) - \bar{u}(t)\|_{C_T L_x^{p'}} < \epsilon$  by taking  $\sigma > 0$  sufficiently large. Because we are not pursuing such a result, one may wonder why we need the parameter  $\eta$ . First,  $\eta$  leads to the freedom to choose  $\sigma$  defined in (83)-(84), namely  $\sigma 4(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}} M \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\delta} 2^{-\frac{n-1}{2}} < 1$ ,



and (84) is crucial to deduce the necessary estimate (91). If we were to simplify the claim in Proposition 4.2 with  $\eta = 1$  therein, we obtain

$$\|(\theta_1 - \theta_0)(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq M(2\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

instead of (79a); following the computations of (91) requires

$$\|(\theta - \theta_0)(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} M(2\delta_{n+1} M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \frac{M_0(t)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{4(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}},$$

which in turn requires  $\delta[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-\frac{n}{p}} 4M]^p 2(p+1) \leq 1$ . On the other hand, we pointed out in Remark 4.1 the convenience of the additional hypothesis (78), and this implies the necessity of  $\frac{\|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1}}{2M_0(t)} \leq \delta$  to satisfy the hypothesis (78) at initial step. Making sure that we can find such  $\delta$  with the lower and the upper bounds is not trivial; one idea in this case is to take  $L > 0$  sufficiently large so that  $M_0(t) \gg 1$ . Nonetheless, the same issue will arise in the proof of Theorem 2.4 assuming Proposition 7.3 in which the same strategy will not work due to the absence of stopping time therein. Therefore, for convenience and consistency, we chose to attain Propositions 4.2 and 7.3 with  $\eta$  therein.

The rest of the proof of Theorem 2.2 is devoted to the proof of Proposition 4.2.

**4.1. Proof of Proposition 4.2.** We define a parameter

$$l \triangleq \lambda^{-\iota} \ll 1 \quad (94)$$

for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\iota \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  to be chosen subsequently. Then we let

$$\{\phi_l\}_{l>0} \quad \text{and} \quad \{\varphi_l\}_{l>0} \quad (95)$$

respectively be families of standard mollifiers on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  with mass one where the latter is equipped with compact support on  $(0, l]$ . Then we extend  $R_0$  to  $t < 0$  with its value at  $t = 0$  and mollify it with  $\phi_l$  and  $\varphi_l$  to obtain

$$R_l \triangleq R_0 *_x \phi_l *_t \varphi_l. \quad (96)$$

**Remark 4.3.** We note that in all of the previous works that employed Nash-type convex integration schemes to stochastic case mollified not only  $R_0$  but analogues of  $\theta_0, u_0$ , and  $z$  (e.g., [36]). Mollifying only  $R_0$  simplifies our proof significantly; indeed, otherwise our next step would be to write down the mollified equation of (19) which produces a commutator term from the nonlinear term. Not mollifying  $\theta_0$  and  $u_0$  will also be a crucial ingredient in proof of Proposition 6.1, as we will describe in Remark 6.3.

For the fixed  $p \in (1, \infty)$  from the hypothesis of Proposition 4.2, we define  $a \triangleq \frac{d}{p}$  and  $b \triangleq \frac{d}{p'}$  so that  $a + b = d$  as in (60). We adhere to the setting of convex integration from Section 3.2. In particular, we define  $r$  from Lemma 3.8,  $\varrho$  from (59),  $\psi$  from (67), the key parameters  $\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu$  from (70), and  $\Theta_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j, W_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j$ , and  $Q_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  from (71). Now we define

$$0 < \epsilon < \min\left\{\frac{d}{\tilde{p}} - \frac{d}{p'} - 1, \frac{d}{p'} - 1\right\} \quad (97)$$

where the positivity is guaranteed by the hypothesis (14). We have the following result:

**Lemma 4.3.** ([47, Proposition 4.4]) Define a constant

$$M \triangleq 2d \max_{k, k' \in \{0, 1\}} \{\|D^k \varrho\|_{L^\infty} \|D^{k'} \psi\|_{L^\infty}, \|\varrho\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\psi\|_{L^\infty}^2\}. \quad (98)$$

Then for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  and  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\|\Theta_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \frac{M}{2d}, \quad \|W_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \leq \frac{M}{2d}, \quad \|Q_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \frac{M\mu^b}{\omega}, \quad (99a)$$

$$\|\Theta_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \frac{M}{\mu^b}, \quad \|W_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \frac{M}{\mu^a}, \quad \|Q_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \frac{M}{\omega}, \quad (99b)$$

$$\|W_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j(t)\|_{C_x} \leq M\mu^b, \quad \|W_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j(t)\|_{W_x^{1-\tilde{p}}} \leq M \frac{\lambda\mu + \nu}{\mu^{1+\epsilon}}. \quad (99c)$$

Finally, for every  $i \neq j$ ,

$$\Theta_{\lambda,\mu,\omega,\nu}^i W_{\lambda,\mu,\omega,\nu}^j = 0 \quad (100)$$

and

$$\partial_t Q_{\lambda,\mu,\omega,\nu}^j + \operatorname{div}(\Theta_{\lambda,\mu,\omega,\nu}^j W_{\lambda,\mu,\omega,\nu}^j) = 0. \quad (101)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.3.* This is essentially [47, Proposition 4.4]. The only difference is that because we have diffusion, we considered  $\epsilon$  in (97) differently from [47, Equation (4.11)] following [47, p. 1106]. Therefore, the only claim that requires verification is the second inequality of (99c) as it involves  $\epsilon$ . We prove it in the Appendix B for completeness.  $\square$

We now start the definition of perturbations which will differ from [47]. We denote by  $R_l^j$  the  $j$ -th component of  $R_l$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ ; i.e.,

$$R_l(t, x) = (R_0 *_x \phi_l *_x \varphi_l)(t, x) = \sum_{j=1}^d R_l^j(t, x) e_j. \quad (102)$$

We define

$$\theta_1(t, x) \triangleq \theta_0(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t) + q(t, x) + q_c(t), \quad (103a)$$

$$u_1(t, x) \triangleq u_0(t, x) + w(t, x) + w_c(t, x), \quad (103b)$$

where

$$\vartheta(t, x) \triangleq \eta \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j(t, x) \operatorname{sgn}(R_l^j(t, x)) |R_l^j(t, x)|^{\frac{1}{p}} \Theta_{\lambda,\mu,\omega,\nu}^j(t, x), \quad (104a)$$

$$w(t, x) \triangleq \eta^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j(t, x) |R_l^j(t, x)|^{\frac{1}{p'}} W_{\lambda,\mu,\omega,\nu}^j(t, x), \quad (104b)$$

$$q(t, x) \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j^2(t, x) R_l^j(t, x) Q_{\lambda,\mu,\omega,\nu}^j(t, x). \quad (104c)$$

Let us describe  $\chi_j$ ,  $\vartheta_c$ ,  $q_c$ , and  $w_c$ . First,  $\chi_j$  is a cut-off function such that

$$\chi_j : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto [0, 1] \text{ and } \chi_j(t, x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |R_l^j(t, x)| \leq \frac{\delta}{4d} M_0(t), \\ 1 & \text{if } |R_l^j(t, x)| \geq \frac{\delta}{2d} M_0(t). \end{cases} \quad (105)$$

Additionally, let us define

$$a_j(t, x) \triangleq \eta \chi_j(t, x) \operatorname{sgn}(R_l^j(t, x)) |R_l^j(t, x)|^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad b_j(t, x) \triangleq \eta^{-1} \chi_j(t, x) |R_l^j(t, x)|^{\frac{1}{p'}} \quad (106)$$

so that

$$a_j(t, x) b_j(t, x) = \chi_j^2(t, x) R_l^j(t, x) \quad (107)$$

and

$$\vartheta(t) = \sum_{j=1}^d a_j(t) \Theta^j(t), \quad w(t) = \sum_{j=1}^d b_j(t) W^j(t), \quad \text{and} \quad q(t) = \sum_{j=1}^d a_j(t) b_j(t) Q^j(t). \quad (108)$$

Moreover,  $a_j, b_j$  satisfy due to (105)

$$\|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \eta \|R_l^j(t)\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \leq \eta^{-1} \|R_l^j(t)\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{p'}}. \quad (109)$$

We note that because  $\theta_0$  is mean-zero by hypothesis, by defining

$$\vartheta_c(t) \triangleq - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \vartheta(t, x) dx \quad \text{and} \quad q_c(t) \triangleq - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} q(t, x) dx, \quad (110)$$

we see that  $\theta_1(t, x)$  in (103) is mean-zero for all  $t$ . Moreover, we can compute

$$\nabla \cdot w(t, x) \stackrel{(108)}{=} \nabla \cdot \left( \sum_{j=1}^d b_j(t, x) W^j(t, x) \right) \stackrel{(71)(68)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^d \nabla(b_j(t, x) (\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j}) \cdot \psi_\nu^j(x) e_j \quad (111)$$

because  $\nabla \cdot (\psi_v^j e_j) = 0$  due to (68). Thus, if we define

$$w_c(t, x) \triangleq - \sum_{j=1}^d \mathcal{R}_N(f_j(t, x), \psi_v^j(x) e_j), \quad f_j(t, x) \triangleq \nabla(b_j(t, x)(\tilde{Q}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j}(x)), \quad (112)$$

which is well-defined by Definition 3.2 because  $\psi_v^j$  is mean-zero by (67), then

$$\nabla \cdot w_c(t, x) \stackrel{(53)(111)}{=} -\nabla \cdot w(t, x) \quad (113)$$

and thus because  $u_0$  is divergence-free by hypothesis,

$$\nabla \cdot u_1 = 0 \quad (114)$$

as desired; we note that  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  in (112) will be chosen subsequently.

**Lemma 4.4.** *For all  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  and  $t \in [0, T_L]$ ,  $a_j, b_j$  in (106) satisfy*

$$\|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lesssim \eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lesssim \eta^{-1} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (115a)$$

$$\|a_j(t)\|_{C_x^s} \lesssim \eta l^{-(d+2)s} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \|b_j(t)\|_{C_x^s} \lesssim \eta^{-1} l^{-(d+2)s} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (115b)$$

$$\|\partial_t a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lesssim \eta l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \|\partial_t b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lesssim \eta^{-1} l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (115c)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.4.* First, Young's inequality for convolution gives for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$ ,

$$\|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \stackrel{(106)(105)}{\leq} \eta \|R_l^j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty}^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim \eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (116)$$

Similarly, we can estimate for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$ ,

$$\|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \stackrel{(106)(105)}{\leq} \eta^{-1} \|R_l^j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty}^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim \eta^{-1} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Next, we rely on  $W^{r+d+1,1}(\mathbb{T}^d) \hookrightarrow W^{r,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$  for all  $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , chain rule estimate in Hölder space (e.g., [8, Equation (130)]) and the lower bound of  $|R_l^j(t, x)| > \frac{\delta}{4d} M_0(t)$  in the support of  $\chi_j$  due to (105) to estimate for all  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ , all  $t \in [0, T_L]$ , and all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large

$$\begin{aligned} & \|a_j(t)\|_{C_x^s} \\ (105) & \lesssim \eta [ \|R_l^j(t)\|_{W_x^{d+1,1}}^{\frac{1}{p}} + [(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}-1} \|R_l^j(t)\|_{W_x^{s+d+1,1}} + (M_0(t)\delta)^{\frac{1}{p}-s} \|R_l^j(t)\|_{W_x^{d+2,1}}^s] ] \\ (78) & \lesssim \eta [ l^{-(d+1)\frac{1}{p}} (M_0(t)\delta)^{\frac{1}{p}} + [(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}-1} l^{-s-d-1} \delta M_0(t) + (M_0(t)\delta)^{\frac{1}{p}-s} l^{-(d+2)s} (\delta M_0(t))^s] ] \\ & \lesssim \eta (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} l^{-(d+2)s}. \end{aligned} \quad (117)$$

Similarly, for all  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ , all  $t \in [0, T_L]$ , and all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large

$$\begin{aligned} & \|b_j(t)\|_{C_x^s} \\ (105) & \lesssim \eta^{-1} [ \|R_l^j(t)\|_{W_x^{d+1,1}}^{\frac{1}{p}} + [(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}-1} \|R_l^j(t)\|_{W_x^{s+d+1,1}} + (M_0(t)\delta)^{\frac{1}{p}-s} \|R_l^j(t)\|_{W_x^{d+2,1}}^s] ] \\ (78) & \lesssim \eta^{-1} [ l^{-(d+1)\frac{1}{p}} (M_0(t)\delta)^{\frac{1}{p}} + [(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}-1} l^{-s-d-1} \delta M_0(t) + (M_0(t)\delta)^{\frac{1}{p}-s} l^{-(d+2)s} (\delta M_0(t))^s] ] \\ & \lesssim \eta^{-1} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} l^{-(d+2)s}. \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

Finally, for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$ , and all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} & \stackrel{(106)(105)}{\lesssim} \eta [ \|R_l^j(t)\|_{W_x^{d+1,1}}^{\frac{1}{p}} + \|\partial_t R_l^j(t)\|_{W_x^{d+1,1}} (\delta M_0(t))^{-1+\frac{1}{p}} ] \\ (78) & \lesssim \eta [ l^{-\frac{d+1}{p}} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} + l^{-(d+2)} \delta M_0(t) (\delta M_0(t))^{-1+\frac{1}{p}} ] \lesssim \eta l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\|\partial_t b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \stackrel{(106)(105)}{\lesssim} \eta^{-1} [ \|R_l^j(t)\|_{W_x^{d+1,1}}^{\frac{1}{p}} + \|\partial_t R_l^j(t)\|_{W_x^{d+1,1}} (\delta M_0(t))^{-1+\frac{1}{p}} ]$$

$$(78) \quad \lesssim \eta^{-1} [l^{-\frac{d+1}{p'}} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} + l^{-(d+2)} \delta M_0(t) (\delta M_0(t))^{-1+\frac{1}{p'}}] \lesssim \eta^{-1} l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}}.$$

□

With Lemma 4.4 in hand, we can now start various necessary estimates.

**Lemma 4.5.** *There exist constants  $C = C(p) \geq 0$  with which  $\vartheta, q, w$  in (104),  $\vartheta_c$  and  $q_c$  in (110) satisfy for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$*

$$\|\vartheta(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \frac{M\eta}{2} (2\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} + \frac{C}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}} \eta l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (119a)$$

$$\|q(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq C l^{-(d+1)} \delta M_0(t) \mu^b \omega^{-1}, \quad (119b)$$

$$|\vartheta_c(t)| \leq C\eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \mu^{-b} \quad \text{and} \quad |q_c(t)| \leq C \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}} \omega^{-1}, \quad (119c)$$

$$\|w(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \leq \frac{M}{2\eta} (2\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} + \frac{C}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p'}}} \eta^{-1} l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}}, \quad (119d)$$

$$\|w(t)\|_{W_x^{1,\tilde{p}}} \leq C \eta^{-1} l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \frac{\lambda\mu + \nu}{\mu^{1+\epsilon}}. \quad (119e)$$

Furthermore, for any  $k, h \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $r \in [1, \infty]$ , there exists a constant  $C \geq 0$  with which for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ ,  $f_j$  in (112) satisfies for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$

$$\|\mathcal{D}^k \mathcal{D}^h f_j(t)\|_{L_x^r} \leq C \eta^{-1} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} l^{-(d+2)(k+h+1)} (\lambda\mu)^{k+h+1} \mu^{b-\frac{d}{r}} \quad (120)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}^k$  is defined in Definition 3.1. Consequently, there exist constants  $C = C(p', \tilde{p}, N) \geq 0$  with which  $w_c$  in (112) satisfies for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$

$$\|w_c(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \leq C \eta^{-1} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{\lambda\mu l^{-(d+2)}}{\nu} \right)^k + \frac{(\lambda\mu l^{-(d+2)})^{N+1}}{\nu^N} \right], \quad (121a)$$

$$\|w_c(t)\|_{W_x^{1,\tilde{p}}} \leq C \eta^{-1} \frac{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} [\lambda\mu l^{-(d+2)} + \nu]}{\mu^{1+\epsilon}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{l^{-(d+2)} \lambda\mu}{\nu} \right)^k + \frac{(l^{-(d+2)} \lambda\mu)^{N+1}}{\nu^N} \right]. \quad (121b)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.5.* First, because  $\Theta^j(t, x) = \varrho_\mu^j(\lambda(x - \omega t e_j)) \psi^j(\nu x)$  due to (71) for  $\nu \in \lambda\mathbb{N}$  due to (70), (45) is applicable, allowing us to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\vartheta(t)\|_{L_x^p} &\stackrel{(108)(45)(44)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^p} \|\Theta^j(t)\|_{L_x^p} + \frac{C}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}} \|a_j(t)\|_{C_x^1} \|\Theta^j(t)\|_{L_x^p} \\ &\stackrel{(99a)(109)(115b)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d \eta \|R_l^j(t)\|_{L_x^p}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \frac{M}{2d} \right) + \frac{C}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}} \eta l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \frac{M}{2d} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{M\eta}{2} (2\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} + \frac{C}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}} \eta l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the Young's inequality as follows. Because  $M_0(t)$  is strictly increasing, the assumptions that  $\|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq 2\delta M_0(t)$  for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$  due to (78) and  $\phi_l$  and  $\varphi_l$  both have mass one imply

$$\|R_l(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(96)}{\leq} \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|R_0(s, x)\|_{L_x^1} \|\varphi_l\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(78)}{\leq} 2\delta M_0(t). \quad (122)$$

Second, we can directly estimate for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$

$$\|q(t)\|_{L_x^p} \stackrel{(104)(105)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d \|R_l^j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|Q^j(t)\|_{L_x^p} \stackrel{(99a)(78)}{\leq} C l^{-(d+1)} \delta M_0(t) \mu^b \omega^{-1}. \quad (123)$$

Third, for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$  we can compute using Hölder's inequality

$$|\vartheta_c(t)| \stackrel{(110)}{\leq} \|\vartheta(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(108)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|\Theta^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(115a)(99b)}{\leq} C \eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \mu^{-b}. \quad (124)$$

Similarly via (110), (108), (115a), and (99b), for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$ , by Hölder's inequality

$$|q_c(t)| \leq \|q(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \sum_{j=1}^d \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|Q^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq C \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}} \omega^{-1}. \quad (125)$$

Fourth, similarly to (119a), because  $W^j(t) = \tilde{\partial}_\mu^j(\lambda(x - \omega t e_j)) \psi^j(\nu x) e_j$  due to (71) for  $\nu \in \lambda\mathbb{N}$  due to (70), (45) is applicable, allowing us to estimate for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|w(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} &\stackrel{(108)(45)(44)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \|W^j(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} + \frac{C}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p'}}} \|b_j(t)\|_{C_x^1} \|W^j(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \\ &\stackrel{(109)(99a)(115b)}{\lesssim} \sum_{j=1}^d \eta^{-1} \|R_l^j(t)\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left(\frac{M}{2d}\right) + \frac{C}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p'}}} \eta^{-1} l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left(\frac{M}{2d}\right) \\ &\stackrel{(78)}{\leq} \frac{M}{2\eta} (2\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} + \frac{C}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p'}}} \eta^{-1} l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \end{aligned}$$

by Young's inequality for convolution similarly to (122). Fifth, we compute for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$

$$\|w(t)\|_{W_x^{1,\tilde{p}}} \stackrel{(108)}{\lesssim} \sum_{j=1}^d \|b_j(t)\|_{C_x^1} \|W^j(t)\|_{W_x^{1,\tilde{p}}} \stackrel{(115b)(99c)}{\leq} C \eta^{-1} l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \frac{\lambda\mu + \nu}{\mu^{1+\epsilon}}. \quad (126)$$

Sixth, we compute for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{D}^k \mathcal{D}^h f_j(t)\|_{L_x^r} &\stackrel{(47)(112)}{\lesssim} \|b_j(t)\|_{C_x^{k+h+1}} \|(\tilde{\partial}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j}\|_{W_x^{k+h+1,r}} \\ &\stackrel{(63)(44)(115b)}{\lesssim} [\eta^{-1} l^{-(d+2)(k+h+1)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}}] \lambda^{k+h+1} \|\tilde{\partial}_\mu^j\|_{W_x^{k+h+1,r}} \\ &\stackrel{(64)(59)}{=} C \eta^{-1} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} l^{-(d+2)(k+h+1)} (\lambda\mu)^{k+h+1} \mu^{b-\frac{d}{r}}. \end{aligned} \quad (127)$$

Seventh, we compute for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_c(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} &\stackrel{(112)(56b)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d C_{d,p',N} \|\psi\|_{L^\infty} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \nu^{-k-1} \|\mathcal{D}^k f_j(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} + \nu^{-N} \|\mathcal{D}^N f_j(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(120)}{\lesssim} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \nu^{-k-1} \eta^{-1} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} l^{-(d+2)(k+1)} (\lambda\mu)^{k+1} \mu^{b-\frac{d}{p'}} \\ &\quad + \nu^{-N} \eta^{-1} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} l^{-(d+2)(N+1)} (\lambda\mu)^{N+1} \mu^{b-\frac{d}{p'}} \\ &\stackrel{(60)}{\leq} C \eta^{-1} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{\lambda\mu l^{-(d+2)}}{\nu} \right)^k + \frac{(\lambda\mu l^{-(d+2)})^{N+1}}{\nu^N} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (128)$$

Eighth, by definition,  $\|w_c(t)\|_{W_x^{1,\tilde{p}}} = \|w_c(t)\|_{L_x^{\tilde{p}}} + \|Dw_c(t)\|_{L_x^{\tilde{p}}}$ . First,

$$b - \frac{d}{\tilde{p}} \stackrel{(60)}{=} \frac{d}{p'} - \frac{d}{\tilde{p}} = -\left(\frac{d}{\tilde{p}} - \frac{d}{p'} - 1\right) - 1 \stackrel{(97)}{<} -\epsilon - 1 \quad (129)$$

and  $\mu \gg \lambda$  due to (70) and therefore  $\mu^{b-\frac{d}{\tilde{p}}} \leq \mu^{-\epsilon-1}$ . Therefore, we can repeat the computation in (128) with  $p'$  replaced by  $\tilde{p}$  and use the fact that  $\lambda\mu l^{-(d+2)} + \nu \gg 1$  due to (70) and (94) to bound  $\|w_c(t)\|_{L_x^{\tilde{p}}}$  by the r.h.s. of (121b). On the other hand, for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$  we can compute using (54)

$$\begin{aligned} \|Dw_c(t)\|_{L_x^{\tilde{p}}} &\stackrel{(56b)}{\lesssim} \sum_{j=1}^d \|\psi^j\|_{L^\infty} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \nu^{-k-1} \|\mathcal{D}^k Df_j(t)\|_{L_x^{\tilde{p}}} + \nu^{-N} \|\mathcal{D}^N Df_j(t)\|_{L_x^{\tilde{p}}} \right) \\ &\quad + \nu \|\mathcal{D}\psi^j\|_{L^\infty} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \nu^{-k-1} \|\mathcal{D}^k f_j(t)\|_{L_x^{\tilde{p}}} + \nu^{-N} \|\mathcal{D}^N f_j(t)\|_{L_x^{\tilde{p}}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$(120)(129) \leq C\eta^{-1} \frac{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} [\lambda\mu l^{-(d+2)} + \nu]}{\mu^{1+\epsilon}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{l^{-(d+2)}\lambda\mu}{\nu} \right)^k + \frac{(l^{-(d+2)}\lambda\mu)^{N+1}}{\nu^N} \right]. \quad (130)$$

□

Next, we define the new defect  $R_1$  using (19) as follows:

$$(19)(103) \begin{aligned} & -\operatorname{div}R_1 \\ & \stackrel{(103)}{=} -\operatorname{div}R_0 \\ & + \partial_t[\vartheta + \vartheta_c + q + q_c] + \operatorname{div}(\theta_0(w + w_c)) + \operatorname{div}((\vartheta + q)u_0) + \operatorname{div}((\vartheta + q)(w + w_c)) \\ & + (\vartheta_c + q_c) \underbrace{\operatorname{div}(u_0 + w + w_c)}_{\stackrel{(103)}{=} \operatorname{div}u_1} + \operatorname{div}(z(w + w_c)) - \Delta(\vartheta + q) \\ & \stackrel{(114)}{=} \underbrace{\partial_t(q + q_c) + \operatorname{div}(\vartheta w - R_l)}_{\operatorname{div}R^{\text{time},1} + \operatorname{div}R^{\text{quadr}} + \operatorname{div}R^\chi} + \underbrace{\partial_t(\vartheta + \vartheta_c) + \operatorname{div}(\theta_0 w + \vartheta u_0) - \Delta(\vartheta + q)}_{\operatorname{div}R^{\text{time},2} + \operatorname{div}R^{\text{lin}}} \\ & + \underbrace{\operatorname{div}(q(u_0 + w))}_{\operatorname{div}R^q} + \underbrace{\operatorname{div}((\theta_0 + \vartheta + q + z)w_c)}_{\operatorname{div}R^{\text{corr},1}} + \underbrace{\operatorname{div}(zw)}_{\operatorname{div}R^{\text{corr},2}} + \underbrace{\operatorname{div}(R_l - R_0)}_{\operatorname{div}R^{\text{moll}}} \end{aligned} \quad (131)$$

for  $R^{\text{time},1}$ ,  $R^{\text{quadr}}$ ,  $R^\chi$ ,  $R^{\text{time},2}$ ,  $R^{\text{lin}}$ ,  $R^q$ ,  $R^{\text{corr},1}$ ,  $R^{\text{corr},2}$ , and  $R^{\text{moll}}$  to be defined subsequently. Thus, we have defined

$$-R_1 \triangleq R^{\text{time},1} + R^{\text{quadr}} + R^\chi + R^{\text{time},2} + R^{\text{lin}} + R^q + R^{\text{corr},1} + R^{\text{corr},2} + R^{\text{moll}}. \quad (132)$$

4.1.1. *Estimates on  $\partial_t(q + q_c) + \operatorname{div}(\vartheta w - R_l) = \operatorname{div}R^{\text{time},1} + \operatorname{div}R^{\text{quadr}} + \operatorname{div}R^\chi$  in (131).* We first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta(t, x)w(t, x) & \stackrel{(108)}{=} \left( \sum_{j=1}^d a_j(t, x)\Theta^j(t, x) \right) \left( \sum_{k=1}^d b_k(t, x)W^k(t, x) \right) \\ & \stackrel{(100)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^d a_j(t, x)b_j(t, x)\Theta^j(t, x)W^j(t, x). \end{aligned} \quad (133)$$

Relying on (133) gives us

$$\operatorname{div}(\vartheta w) = \sum_{j=1}^d a_j b_j \operatorname{div}(\Theta^j W^j) + \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot \Theta^j W^j. \quad (134)$$

On the other hand, by setting

$$R^\chi \triangleq - \sum_{j=1}^d (1 - \chi_j^2) R_l^j e_j, \quad (135)$$

we see that

$$-\operatorname{div}R_l \stackrel{(102)}{=} -\operatorname{div} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^d (1 - \chi_j^2) R_l^j e_j + \chi_j^2 R_l^j e_j \right] \stackrel{(135)(107)}{=} \operatorname{div}R^\chi - \sum_{j=1}^d \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot e_j. \quad (136)$$

These lead us to

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(\vartheta w - R_l) & \stackrel{(134)(136)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^d a_j b_j \operatorname{div}(\Theta^j W^j) + \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot \Theta^j W^j + \operatorname{div}R^\chi - \sum_{j=1}^d \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot e_j \\ & = \sum_{j=1}^d a_j b_j \operatorname{div}(\Theta^j W^j) \\ & \quad + \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] dx \\ & \quad + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] dx + \operatorname{div}R^\chi. \end{aligned} \quad (137)$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t(q + q_c) &\stackrel{(108)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^d a_j b_j \partial_t Q^j + \partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j dx + q'_c. \end{aligned} \quad (138)$$

Summing (137)-(138) gives us

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t(q + q_c) + \operatorname{div}(\vartheta w - R_l) \\ (137)(138) &\stackrel{=}{=} \sum_{j=1}^d a_j b_j [\partial_t Q^j + \operatorname{div}(\Theta^j W^j)] \end{aligned} \quad (139a)$$

$$+ [\partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j dx] \quad (139b)$$

$$+ \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] dx + \operatorname{div} R^X \quad (139c)$$

$$+ \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] dx + q'_c. \quad (139d)$$

Here, (139a) vanishes due to (101) while (139d) also vanishes due to

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] dx + q'_c \\ (110)(108) &\stackrel{=}{=} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot \Theta^j W^j dx - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} a_j b_j \partial_t Q^j dx \stackrel{(101)}{=} 0. \end{aligned} \quad (140)$$

Thus, we conclude from (139) that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t(q + q_c) + \operatorname{div}(\vartheta w - R_l) &= \sum_{j=1}^d [\partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j dx] \\ &\quad + \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] dx + \operatorname{div} R^X, \end{aligned} \quad (141)$$

where we can further compute

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] &\stackrel{(71)}{=} \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [(\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega e_j} (\psi^j)^2 - 1] e_j \\ &= \partial_j(a_j b_j) [(\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega e_j} ((\psi^j)^2 - 1)_\nu + (\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j - 1)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega e_j}]. \end{aligned} \quad (142)$$

Thus, we define

$$R^{\text{time},1} \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^d \mathcal{D}^{-1} (\partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j dx) \quad (143)$$

so that because  $\mathcal{D}^{-1} = \nabla \Delta^{-1}$  according to (47) we obtain

$$\operatorname{div} R^{\text{time},1} \stackrel{(143)(47)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^d \partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j dx. \quad (144)$$

Additionally, we define

$$R^{\text{quadr}} \triangleq R^{\text{quadr},1} + R^{\text{quadr},2}, \quad (145)$$

where

$$R^{\text{quadr},1} \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^d \mathcal{R}_1(\partial_j(a_j b_j) (\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega e_j}, ((\psi^j)^2 - 1)_\nu), \quad (146a)$$

$$R^{\text{quadr},2} \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^d \mathcal{R}_1(\partial_j(a_j b_j), (\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j - 1)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega e_j}); \quad (146b)$$

both  $R^{\text{quadr},1}$  and  $R^{\text{quadr},2}$  are well-defined by Definition 3.2 because  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} ((\psi^j)^2 - 1)_\nu dx = 0$  due to (67) and  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j - 1)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega e_j} dx = 0$  due to (65). We see that  $R^{\text{quadr}}$  defined in (145)-(146) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div} R^{\text{quadr}} &\stackrel{(145)(146)}{=} \operatorname{div} \left( \sum_{j=1}^d \mathcal{R}_1(\partial_j(a_j b_j)) (\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega e_j}, ((\psi^j)^2 - 1)_\nu \right) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{R}_1(\partial_j(a_j b_j), (\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j - 1)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega e_j}) \\ (53) &\stackrel{(142)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^d \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] dx. \end{aligned} \quad (147)$$

Therefore, by applying (144) and (147) to (141) we conclude that  $\partial_t(q + q_c) + \operatorname{div}(\vartheta w - R_l) = \operatorname{div} R^{\text{time},1} + \operatorname{div} R^{\text{quadr}} + \operatorname{div} R^\chi$  as claimed.

**Lemma 4.6.** *There exist constants  $C = C(d) \geq 0$  with which  $R^\chi$  in (135),  $R^{\text{time},1}$  in (143), and  $R^{\text{quadr}}$  in (145) satisfy for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$*

$$\|R^\chi(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \frac{\delta M_0(t)}{2}, \quad (148a)$$

$$\|R^{\text{time},1}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq C \omega^{-1} l^{-(d+2)} \max\{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}, (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}\}, \quad (148b)$$

$$\|R^{\text{quadr}}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq C \left( \frac{\lambda \mu}{\nu} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \right) l^{-(d+2)2} \max\{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}, (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}\}. \quad (148c)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.6.* First, we compute

$$\|R^\chi(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(135)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\operatorname{supp}(1-\chi^2)(t)} |R_l^j(t, x)| dx \stackrel{(105)}{\leq} \frac{\delta M_0(t)}{2}. \quad (149)$$

Second, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \|R^{\text{time},1}(t)\|_{L_x^1} &\stackrel{(143)(51)}{\lesssim} \sum_{j=1}^d (\|\partial_t a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|\partial_t b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty}) \|Q^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \\ (115a)(115c)(99b) &\lesssim [\eta l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \eta^{-1} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} + \eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \eta^{-1} l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}}] \left( \frac{M}{\omega} \right) \\ &\leq C \omega^{-1} l^{-(d+2)} \max\{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}, (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Third, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \|R^{\text{quadr},1}(t)\|_{L_x^1} &\stackrel{(146)(56b)}{\lesssim} \nu^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d \|\partial_j(a_j b_j)(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|(\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega e_j}\|_{L_x^1} + \|\partial_j(a_j b_j)(t)\|_{C_x^1} \|(\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega e_j}\|_{W_x^{1,1}} \\ (44)(63) &\lesssim \nu^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d (\|a_j(t)\|_{C_x^2} \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|b_j(t)\|_{C_x^2}) (\|\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{L_x^1} + \lambda \|\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{W_x^{1,1}}) \\ (115a)(115b) &\lesssim \nu^{-1} (\eta (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} l^{-(d+2)2} \eta^{-1} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} + \eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \eta^{-1} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} l^{-(d+2)2}) \\ &\quad \times [\|\varrho_\mu^j\|_{L^2} \|\tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{L^2} + \lambda (\|\varrho_\mu^j\|_{W^{1,2}} \|\tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{L^2} + \|\varrho_\mu^j\|_{L^2} \|\tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{W^{1,2}})] \\ (64)(60) &\lesssim \left( \frac{\lambda \mu}{\nu} \right) l^{-(d+2)2} \max\{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}, (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (150)$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \|R^{\text{quadr},2}(t)\|_{L_x^1} &\stackrel{(146)(56a)}{\lesssim} \sum_{j=1}^d \|(\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j - 1) \circ \tau_{\omega e_j}\|_{L_x^1} (\lambda^{-1} \|\partial_j(a_j b_j)(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \lambda^{-1} \|\mathcal{D} \partial_j(a_j b_j)(t)\|_{L_x^\infty}) \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{(63)}{\lesssim} \sum_{j=1}^d \|\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j - 1\|_{L^1} \lambda^{-1} (\|a_j(t)\|_{C_x^2} \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|b_j(t)\|_{C_x^2}) \\
(115a)(115b) \quad & \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^d (\|\varrho_\mu^j\|_{L^2} \|\tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{L^2} + 1) \lambda^{-1} l^{-(d+2)2} \max\{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}, (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}\} \\
(64)(60) \quad & \lesssim \lambda^{-1} l^{-(d+2)2} \max\{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}, (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}\}. \tag{151}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we conclude (148c) from (145), (150), and (151).  $\square$

4.1.2. *Estimates on  $\partial_t(\vartheta + \vartheta_c) + \operatorname{div}(\theta_0 w + \vartheta u_0) - \Delta(\vartheta + q) = \operatorname{div}R^{\text{time},2} + \operatorname{div}R^{\text{lin}}$  in (131).* We compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t(\vartheta + \vartheta_c) + \operatorname{div}(\theta_0 w + \vartheta u_0) - \Delta(\vartheta + q) & \stackrel{(108)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^d a_j \partial_t \Theta^j - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} a_j \partial_t \Theta^j dx \\
& + \partial_t a_j \Theta^j - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_t a_j \Theta^j dx + \operatorname{div}(\theta_0 w + \vartheta u_0) - \Delta(\vartheta + q) \tag{152}
\end{aligned}$$

due to

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} a_j \partial_t \Theta^j dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_t a_j \Theta^j dx + \vartheta'_c \stackrel{(110)}{=} \partial_t \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} a_j \Theta^j dx - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \vartheta' dx \stackrel{(108)}{=} 0.$$

Thus, we define

$$R^{\text{lin}} \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^d \mathcal{D}^{-1}((\partial_t a_j) \Theta^j - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\partial_t a_j) \Theta^j dx) + \theta_0 w + \vartheta u_0 - \nabla(\vartheta + q), \tag{153a}$$

$$R^{\text{time},2} \triangleq -\lambda \omega \sum_{j=1}^d \mathcal{R}_N(a_j (\partial_j \varrho_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j}, \psi_\nu^j) \tag{153b}$$

where (153b) is well-defined because  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \psi_\nu^j(x) dx = 0$  due to (67). It follows that

$$\operatorname{div}R^{\text{lin}} \stackrel{(153a)(47)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^d (\partial_t a_j) \Theta^j - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\partial_t a_j) \Theta^j dx + \operatorname{div}(\theta_0 w + \vartheta u_0) - \Delta(\vartheta + q), \tag{154a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{div}R^{\text{time},2} & \stackrel{(153b)(53)}{=} -\lambda \omega \sum_{j=1}^d [a_j (\partial_j \varrho_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j} \psi_\nu^j - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} a_j (\partial_j \varrho_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j} \psi_\nu^j dx] \\
& \stackrel{(72)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^d (a_j \partial_t \Theta^j - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} a_j \partial_t \Theta^j dx). \tag{154b}
\end{aligned}$$

Considering (154a)-(154b) in (152), we conclude that  $\partial_t(\vartheta + \vartheta_c) + \operatorname{div}(\theta_0 w + \vartheta u_0) - \Delta(\vartheta + q) = \operatorname{div}R^{\text{time},2} + \operatorname{div}R^{\text{lin}}$ .

**Lemma 4.7.** *There exist constants  $C \geq 0$  with which  $R^{\text{lin}}$  in (153a) and  $R^{\text{time},2}$  in (153b) satisfy for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|R^{\text{lin}}(t)\|_{L_x^1} & \leq C(\mu^{-a} \|\theta_0\|_{C_{t,x}} \eta^{-1} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} + \mu^{-b} \eta [\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \|u_0\|_{C_{t,x}} + (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} l^{-(d+2)}] \\
& + [\eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \mu^{-b} + \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}} \omega^{-1}] [\lambda \mu + \nu] \\
& + l^{-(d+2)} \max\{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}, (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}\} \omega^{-1}), \tag{155a}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\|R^{\text{time},2}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq C \left( \frac{\omega}{\mu^b} \right) \eta (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{\lambda \mu}{\nu} \right)^k l^{-(d+2)(k-1)} + \frac{(\lambda \mu)^{N+1}}{\nu^N} l^{-(d+2)N} \right). \tag{155b}$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.7.* First, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \sum_{j=1}^d \mathcal{D}^{-1}((\partial_t a_j)\Theta^j) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\partial_t a_j)\Theta^j dx(t) \right\|_{L_x^1} \\
(51) \quad & \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^d \left\| (\partial_t a_j(t))\Theta^j(t) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\partial_t a_j(t))\Theta^j(t) dx \right\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(115c)(99b)}{\lesssim} \eta l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \mu^{-b}. \quad (156)
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\theta_0 w + \vartheta u_0)(t)\|_{L_x^1} & \stackrel{(108)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d \|\theta_0(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|W^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} + \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|\Theta^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \|u_0(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \\
& \stackrel{(115a)(99b)}{\lesssim} \mu^{-a} \|\theta_0\|_{C_{t,x}} \eta^{-1} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} + \mu^{-b} \|u_0\|_{C_{t,x}} \eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (157)
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla(\vartheta + q)(t)\|_{L_x^1} \quad (158) \\
(108) \quad & \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^d \|\nabla a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|\Theta^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} + \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|\nabla \Theta^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \\
& + (\|\nabla a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|\nabla b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty}) \|Q^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} + \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|\nabla Q^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \\
(115a)(115b)(99b)(71) \quad & \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^d \eta l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \mu^{-b} \\
& + \eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} [\|\nabla((\varrho_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j})\|_{L_x^1} \|\psi_\nu^j\|_{L^\infty} + \|(\varrho_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j}\|_{L_x^1} \|\nabla \psi_\nu^j\|_{L^\infty}] \\
& + l^{-(d+2)} \max\{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}, (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}\} \omega^{-1} \\
& + \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}} \omega^{-1} [\|\nabla((\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j})\|_{L_x^1} \|\psi_\nu^j\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|(\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j}\|_{L_x^1} \|\nabla \psi_\nu^j\|_{L^\infty} \|\psi_\nu^j\|_{L^\infty}] \\
(44)(63)(64) \quad & \lesssim \eta l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \mu^{-b} + \eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} [\lambda \mu^{a-d+1} \|\nabla \varrho\|_{L_x^1} + \mu^{a-d} \|\varrho\|_{L_x^1} \nu] \\
& + l^{-(d+2)} \max\{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}, (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}\} \omega^{-1} \\
& + \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}} \omega^{-1} [\lambda \|\nabla \varrho_\mu^j\|_{L^2} \|\tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{L^2} + \lambda \|\varrho_\mu^j\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{L^2} + \|\varrho_\mu^j\|_{L^2} \|\tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{L^2} \nu] \\
(64)(60) \quad & \lesssim \eta l^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \mu^{-b} + [\eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \mu^{-b} + \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}} \omega^{-1}] [\lambda \mu + \nu] \\
& + l^{-(d+2)} \max\{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}, (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}\} \omega^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude (155a) from (153a), (156), (157), and (158). Second, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|R^{\text{time},2}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \\
(153b)(56b) \quad & \lesssim \lambda \omega \sum_{j=1}^d \left( \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \nu^{-k-1} \|a_j(t)(\partial_j \varrho_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j}\|_{W_x^{k,1}} + \nu^{-N} \|a_j(t)(\partial_j \varrho_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j}\|_{W_x^{N,1}} \right) \\
(63)(44)(115b) \quad & \lesssim \lambda \omega \sum_{j=1}^d \left( \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \nu^{-k-1} \eta (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} l^{-(d+2)k} \lambda^k \|\partial_j \varrho_\mu^j\|_{W^{k,1}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \nu^{-N} \eta (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} l^{-(d+2)N} \lambda^N \|\partial_j \varrho_\mu^j\|_{W^{N,1}} \right) \\
(64)(60) \quad & \leq C \left( \frac{\omega}{\mu^b} \right) \eta (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{\lambda \mu}{\nu} \right)^k l^{-(d+2)(k-1)} + \frac{(\lambda \mu)^{N+1}}{\nu^N} l^{-(d+2)N} \right). \quad (159)
\end{aligned}$$

□

4.1.3. *Estimates on  $\operatorname{div}(q(u_0 + w)) = \operatorname{div}R^q$  in (131).* We define

$$R^q \triangleq q(u_0 + w). \quad (160)$$

**Lemma 4.8.** *There exists a constant  $C \geq 0$  with which  $R^q$  defined in (160) satisfies for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$*

$$\|R^q(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq C\omega^{-1}\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}(\|u_0\|_{C_{t,x}} + \eta^{-1}\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}\mu^b). \quad (161)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.8.* We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \|R^q(t)\|_{L_x^1} &\stackrel{(160)}{\leq} \|q(t)\|_{L_x^1}(\|u_0(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \|w(t)\|_{L_x^\infty}) \\ &\stackrel{(108)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|Q^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} (\|u_0\|_{C_{t,x}} + \sum_{k=1}^d \|b_k(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|W^k(t)\|_{L_x^\infty}) \\ &\stackrel{(115a)(99b)(99c)}{\leq} C\omega^{-1}\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}(\|u_0\|_{C_{t,x}} + \eta^{-1}\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}\mu^b). \end{aligned} \quad (162)$$

□

4.1.4. *Estimates on  $\operatorname{div}((\theta_0 + \vartheta + q + z)w_c) = \operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{corr},1}$  in (131).* We define

$$R^{\operatorname{corr},1} \triangleq (\theta_0 + \vartheta + q + z)w_c. \quad (163)$$

**Lemma 4.9.** *There exists a constant  $C \geq 0$  with which  $R^{\operatorname{corr},1}$  defined in (163) satisfies for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|R^{\operatorname{corr},1}(t)\|_{L_x^1} &\leq C \left( \|\theta_0\|_{C_t L_x^p} + \eta(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} [1 + \lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}} t^{-(d+2)}] + t^{-(d+1)} \delta M_0(t) \left( \frac{\mu^b}{\omega} \right) + L^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) \\ &\quad \times \eta^{-1} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{\lambda \mu t^{-(d+2)}}{\nu} \right)^k + \frac{(\lambda \mu t^{-(d+2)})^{N+1}}{\nu^N} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (164)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.9.* We compute for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$

$$\begin{aligned} \|R^{\operatorname{corr},1}(t)\|_{L_x^1} &\stackrel{(163)}{\leq} (\|\theta_0(t)\|_{L_x^p} + \|\vartheta(t)\|_{L_x^p} + \|q(t)\|_{L_x^p} + \|z(t)\|_{L_x^p}) \|w_c(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \\ &\stackrel{(75)(119)(121a)}{\leq} C \left( \|\theta_0\|_{C_t L_x^p} + \eta(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} [1 + \lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}} t^{-(d+2)}] + t^{-(d+1)} \delta M_0(t) \mu^b \omega^{-1} + L^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) \\ &\quad \times \eta^{-1} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{\lambda \mu t^{-(d+2)}}{\nu} \right)^k + \frac{(\lambda \mu t^{-(d+2)})^{N+1}}{\nu^N} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (165)$$

□

4.1.5. *Estimates on  $\operatorname{div}(zw) = \operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{corr},2}$  in (131).* We define

$$R^{\operatorname{corr},2} \triangleq zw. \quad (166)$$

**Lemma 4.10.** *There exists a constant  $C \geq 0$  with which  $R^{\operatorname{corr},2}$  defined in (166) satisfies for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$*

$$\|R^{\operatorname{corr},2}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq C\mu^{-1}L^{\frac{1}{4}}\eta^{-1}\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (167)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.10.* We compute for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$

$$\|R^{\operatorname{corr},2}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(75)(108)}{\lesssim} L^{\frac{1}{4}} \sum_{j=1}^d \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|W^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(115a)(99b)}{\leq} C\mu^{-a}L^{\frac{1}{4}}\eta^{-1}\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (168)$$

□

4.1.6. *Estimates on  $\operatorname{div}(R_l - R_0) = \operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{moll}}$  in (131).* We define

$$R^{\operatorname{moll}} \triangleq R_l - R_0. \quad (169)$$

**Lemma 4.11.** *There exists a constant  $C \geq 0$  with which  $R^{\operatorname{moll}}$  defined in (169) satisfies for all  $t \in [0, T_L]$*

$$\|R^{\operatorname{moll}}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq Cl^{\frac{1}{2}-2\varpi} (\|R_0\|_{C_t C_x^1} + \|R_0\|_{C_t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\varpi} C_x}). \quad (170)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.11.* This follows from a standard property of mollifiers as  $l \ll 1$  and  $\varpi \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$  and taking  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large.  $\square$

We now choose the parameters in the order of

$$\mu = \lambda^\alpha \text{ such that } \alpha(\epsilon) > 2\epsilon^{-1}, \quad (171a)$$

$$\nu = \lambda^\gamma \text{ for } \gamma(\alpha, \epsilon) \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } \alpha + 1 < \gamma < \alpha(1 + \epsilon), \quad (171b)$$

$$\beta = \beta(b, \alpha, \gamma) \text{ such that } b\alpha < \beta < b\alpha + \gamma - (\alpha + 1), \quad (171c)$$

$$\omega = \lambda^\beta, \quad (171d)$$

$$N(\alpha, \gamma) \in \mathbb{N} \text{ sufficiently large such that } \frac{N}{N-1} < \frac{\gamma}{1+\alpha}. \quad (171e)$$

Lastly, we choose  $\iota$  in (94). Before we do so, we observe that (97) and (60) imply that

$$\epsilon + 1 < b \text{ and consequently } \gamma < b\alpha \text{ which in turn implies } \gamma < \beta. \quad (172)$$

With (171)-(172) in mind, we choose a positive real number  $\iota$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \iota < \min\left\{ \frac{\min\{\frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{p'}\}}{d+2}, \frac{\beta - \alpha b}{2d+3}, \frac{1}{d+2} \left( \frac{\gamma N}{N+1} - 1 - \alpha \right), \right. \\ \left. \frac{\alpha(1+\epsilon) - \gamma}{d+2}, \frac{\gamma - 1 - \alpha}{3d+5}, \frac{1}{3d+5}, \frac{b\alpha + \gamma - (\beta + 1 + \alpha)}{(d+2)N} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (173)$$

Now by construction  $(\theta_1, u_1, R_1)$  solves (19). Moreover, due to the cut-offs  $\chi_j$ ,  $\theta_1$  and  $u_1$  defined in (103) are in  $C_{t,x}^\infty$ . On the other hand,  $R_1$  defined in (132) is in  $C_t C_x^1 \cap C_t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\delta} C_x$ . Next, we need to verify (79a)-(79d). We estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\theta_1 - \theta_0)(t)\|_{L_x^p} &\stackrel{(103)}{\leq} \|\vartheta(t)\|_{L_x^p} + |\vartheta_c(t)| + \|q(t)\|_{L_x^p} + |q_c(t)| \\ &\stackrel{(119a)(119b)(119c)}{\leq} \frac{M\eta}{2} (2\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} + \frac{C}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}} \eta t^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\quad + C\eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \mu^{-b} + Cl^{-(d+1)} \delta M_0(t) \mu^b \omega^{-1} + C\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}} \lambda^{-\beta} \\ &\stackrel{(94)(171)}{\leq} \frac{M\eta}{2} (2\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} + C[\lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}+(d+2)\iota} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\quad + \eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda^{-ab} + \lambda^{(d+1)\iota} \delta M_0(t) \lambda^{\alpha b - \beta} + \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}} \lambda^{-\beta}]. \end{aligned} \quad (174)$$

Now we use the fact that

$$\iota \stackrel{(173)}{<} \frac{\min\{\frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{p'}\}}{d+2} \leq \frac{1}{p(d+2)}, \quad \iota \stackrel{(173)}{<} \frac{\beta - \alpha b}{2d+3} < \frac{\beta - \alpha b}{d+1} \quad (175)$$

so that taking  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large gives us (79a) as desired. Next, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|(u_1 - u_0)(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} &\stackrel{(103)}{\leq} \|w(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} + \|w_c(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \\ &\stackrel{(121a)(119d)}{\leq} \frac{M}{2\eta} (2\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} + \frac{C}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p'}}} \eta^{-1} t^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\ &\quad + C\eta^{-1} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{\lambda \mu t^{-(d+2)}}{\nu} \right)^k + \frac{(\lambda \mu t^{-(d+2)})^{N+1}}{\nu^N} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (176)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(94)(171) \frac{M}{2\eta} (2\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} & \\
& + C\eta^{-1} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} [\lambda^{-\frac{1}{p'}+(d+2)\iota} + (\sum_{k=1}^N \lambda^{[1+\alpha-\gamma+(d+2)\iota]k} + \lambda^{-\gamma N} \lambda^{[1+\alpha+(d+2)\iota](N+1)})].
\end{aligned}$$

We now observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
(173) \iota & < \frac{\min\{\frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{p'}\}}{d+2} \leq \frac{1}{p'(d+2)}, \\
(173) \iota & < \frac{\gamma-1-\alpha}{3d+5} < \frac{\gamma-1-\alpha}{d+2}, \quad \iota < \frac{1}{d+2} \left( \frac{\gamma N}{N+1} - 1 - \alpha \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{177}$$

and therefore taking  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large gives us (79b). Next, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
(103) \quad \|(u_1 - u_0)(t)\|_{W_x^{1,p}} & \leq \|w(t)\|_{W_x^{1,p}} + \|w_c(t)\|_{W_x^{1,p}} \\
(119e)(121b) & \lesssim C\eta^{-1} \iota^{-(d+2)} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \frac{\lambda\mu + \nu}{\mu^{1+\epsilon}} \\
& + \eta^{-1} \frac{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} [\lambda\mu \iota^{-(d+2)} + \gamma]}{\mu^{1+\epsilon}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{\iota^{-(d+2)} \lambda\mu}{\nu} \right)^k + \frac{(\iota^{-(d+2)} \lambda\mu)^{N+1}}{\nu^N} \right] \\
(94)(171) & \lesssim \eta^{-1} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \lambda^{(d+2)\iota} \frac{\lambda^{1+\alpha} + \lambda^\gamma}{\lambda^{\alpha(1+\epsilon)}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda^{[(d+2)\iota+1+\alpha-\gamma]k} + \lambda^{-\gamma N + [(d+2)\iota+1+\alpha](N+1)} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{178}$$

We observe that due to (173)

$$\iota < \frac{\alpha(1+\epsilon) - \gamma}{d+2}, \quad \iota < \frac{\gamma-1-\alpha}{3d+5} < \frac{\gamma-1-\alpha}{d+2}, \quad \iota < \frac{1}{d+2} \left( \frac{\gamma N}{N+1} - 1 - \alpha \right) \tag{179}$$

so that taking  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large gives us (79c). Next, to prove (79d), we realize that  $\|R^Y(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \frac{\delta M_0(t)}{2}$  due to (148a); thus, according to (132), it suffices to bound the  $L_x^1$ -norm of  $R^{\text{time},1} + R^{\text{quadr}} + R^{\text{time},2} + R^{\text{lin}} + R^q + R^{\text{corr},1} + R^{\text{corr},2} + R^{\text{moll}}$  by  $\frac{\delta M_0(t)}{2}$ . We start with

$$\begin{aligned}
(148b) \quad \|R^{\text{time},1}(t)\|_{L_x^1} & \lesssim \omega^{-1} \iota^{-(d+2)} \max\{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p'}}, (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}\} \\
(171d)(94) & \lesssim \lambda^{-\beta+(d+2)\iota} \max\{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p'}}, (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}\} \ll \delta M_0(t)
\end{aligned} \tag{180}$$

for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large due to

$$\iota < \frac{(173) \beta - \alpha b}{2d+3} < \frac{\beta}{d+2}. \tag{181}$$

Next, due to (171a), (171b), and (94)

$$\begin{aligned}
(148c) \quad \|R^{\text{quadr}}(t)\|_{L_x^1} & \lesssim \left( \frac{\lambda\mu}{\nu} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \right) \iota^{-(d+2)2} \max\{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p'}}, (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}\} \\
& \approx (\lambda^{1+\alpha-\gamma} + \lambda^{-1}) \lambda^{(d+2)2\iota} \max\{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p'}}, (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}\} \ll \delta M_0(t)
\end{aligned} \tag{182}$$

for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large due to

$$\iota < \frac{(173) \gamma - 1 - \alpha}{3d+5} < \frac{\gamma-1-\alpha}{(d+2)2}, \quad \iota < \frac{1}{3d+5} < \frac{1}{(d+2)2}.$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned}
(155b) \quad \|R^{\text{time},2}(t)\|_{L_x^1} & \lesssim \left( \frac{\omega}{\mu^b} \right) \eta (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{\lambda\mu}{\nu} \right)^k \iota^{-(d+2)(k-1)} + \frac{(\lambda\mu)^{N+1}}{\nu^N} \iota^{-(d+2)N} \right) \\
(171)(94) & \lesssim \lambda^{\beta+1+\alpha-(\beta+\alpha\gamma)+(d+2)N\iota} \eta (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda^{(1+\alpha-\gamma)(k-1)} + \lambda^{(1+\alpha)N-\gamma(N-1)} \right] \ll \delta M_0(t)
\end{aligned} \tag{183}$$

for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large due to

$$1 + \alpha - \gamma \stackrel{(171b)}{<} 0, \quad (1 + \alpha)N - \gamma(N - 1) \stackrel{(171e)}{<} 0, \quad \iota \stackrel{(173)}{<} \frac{b\alpha + \gamma - (\beta + 1 + \alpha)}{(d + 2)N}.$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \|R^{\text{lin}}(t)\|_{L_x^1} &\stackrel{(155a)}{\lesssim} \mu^{-a} \|\theta_0\|_{C_{t,x}} \eta^{-1} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} + \mu^{-b} \eta [\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \|u_0\|_{C_{t,x}} + (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} t^{-(d+2)}] \\ &\quad + [\eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \mu^{-b} + \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}} \omega^{-1}] [\lambda \mu + \nu] \\ &\quad + t^{-(d+2)} \max\{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}, (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \omega^{-1}\} \\ &\stackrel{(171)(94)}{\lesssim} \lambda^{-\alpha a} \|\theta_0\|_{C_{t,x}} \eta^{-1} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} + \lambda^{-ab} \eta [\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \|u_0\|_{C_{t,x}} + (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda^{(d+2)\iota}] \\ &\quad + [\eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda^{-ab} + \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}} \lambda^{-\beta}] [\lambda^{1+\alpha} + \lambda^\gamma] \\ &\quad + \lambda^{(d+2)\iota} \max\{(\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}}, (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda^{-\beta}\} \ll \delta M_0(t) \end{aligned} \quad (184)$$

for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large due to

$$\begin{aligned} \iota &\stackrel{(173)}{<} \frac{\beta - \alpha b}{2d + 3} \stackrel{(172)}{<} \frac{\beta - \gamma}{2d + 3} \stackrel{(171c)}{<} \frac{b\alpha - (\alpha + 1)}{2d + 3} < \frac{\alpha b}{d + 2}, \quad \iota \stackrel{(173)}{<} \frac{\beta - \alpha b}{2d + 3} < \frac{\beta}{d + 2}, \\ \max\{-\alpha b, -\beta\} + \max\{1 + \alpha, \gamma\} &\stackrel{(171c)(171b)}{\leq} -\alpha b + \gamma \stackrel{(172)}{<} 0. \end{aligned} \quad (185)$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \|R^q(t)\|_{L_x^1} &\stackrel{(161)}{\lesssim} \omega^{-1} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}} (\|u_0\|_{C_{t,x}} + \eta^{-1} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \mu^b) \\ &\stackrel{(171)}{\approx} \lambda^{-\beta} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}} (\|u_0\|_{C_{t,x}} + \eta^{-1} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda^{\alpha b}) \ll \delta M_0(t) \end{aligned} \quad (186)$$

for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large due to  $ab < \beta$  from (171c). Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \|R^{\text{corr},1}(t)\|_{L_x^1} &\stackrel{(164)}{\lesssim} \left( \|\theta_0\|_{C_{t,x}} + \eta (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} [1 + \lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}} t^{-(d+2)}] + t^{-(d+1)} \delta M_0(t) \left( \frac{\mu^b}{\omega} \right) + L^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) \\ &\quad \times \eta^{-1} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{\lambda \mu t^{-(d+2)}}{\nu} \right)^k + \frac{(\lambda \mu t^{-(d+2)})^{N+1}}{\nu^N} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(94)(171)}{\lesssim} (\|\theta_0\|_{C_{t,x}} + \eta (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} [1 + \lambda^{-\frac{1}{p} + (d+2)\iota}] + \lambda^{(d+1)\iota + \alpha b - \beta} \delta M_0(t) + L^{\frac{1}{4}}) \\ &\quad \times \eta^{-1} (\delta M_0(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda^{(1+\alpha-\gamma+(d+2)\iota)k} + \lambda^{-\gamma N + [1+\alpha+(d+2)\iota](N+1)} \right] \ll \delta M_0(t) \end{aligned} \quad (187)$$

for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large due to

$$\begin{aligned} \iota &\stackrel{(173)}{<} \frac{\min\{\frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{p'}\}}{d + 2} \leq \frac{1}{p(d + 2)}, \quad \iota \stackrel{(173)}{<} \frac{\beta - \alpha b}{2d + 3} < \frac{\beta - \alpha b}{d + 1}, \\ \iota &\stackrel{(173)}{<} \frac{\gamma - 1 - \alpha}{3d + 5} < \frac{\gamma - 1 - \alpha}{d + 2}, \quad \iota \stackrel{(173)}{<} \frac{1}{d + 2} \left( \frac{\gamma N}{N + 1} - 1 - \alpha \right). \end{aligned}$$

Next,

$$\|R^{\text{corr},2}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(167)}{\lesssim} \mu^{-1} L^{\frac{1}{4}} \eta^{-1} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \stackrel{(171a)}{\ll} \delta M_0(t) \quad (188)$$

for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large. Finally,

$$\|R^{\text{moll}}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(170)}{\lesssim} t^{\frac{1}{2} - 2\varpi} (\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}} + \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{2} - 2\varpi}) \stackrel{(94)}{\ll} \delta M_0(t) \quad (189)$$

for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large as  $\varpi \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ . Due to (180), (182) - (184), (186)-(189), we conclude, along with  $\|R^\chi(t)\|_{L^1_x} \leq \frac{\delta M_0(t)}{2}$  due to (148a), that (79d) has been proven.

Finally, the proof that  $(\theta_1, u_1, R_1)$  are  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted if  $(\theta_0, u_0, R_0)$  are  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted, and that  $(\theta_1, u_1, R_1)(0, x)$  are deterministic if  $(\theta_0, u_0, R_0)(0, x)$  are deterministic, is very similar to the previous works (e.g., [36]); in fact, it is simpler because we mollified only  $R_0$ , not  $\theta_0$  or  $u_0$ . First,  $z(t) = \int_0^t e^{(t-r)\Delta} dB(r)$  from (9) is  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted. Due to the compact support of  $\varphi_l$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $R_l$  is  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted. As  $\Theta^j, Q^j$ , and  $W^j$  from (71) are deterministic, we see that  $\vartheta, q$ , and  $w$  in (104) are  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted; consequently, so are  $\vartheta_c$  and  $q_c$  in (110). As  $M_0(t)$  from (76) is deterministic,  $\chi_j$  from (105) and hence  $a_j$  and  $b_j$  from (106) are  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted; because  $\psi_\nu^j$  and  $\tilde{c}_\mu^j$  are deterministic, it follows that  $w_c$  in (112) is  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted. Therefore,  $\theta_1$  and  $u_1$  in (103) are  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted. We see that  $R^{\text{time},1}$  in (143) is  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted,  $R^{\text{quadr},1}$  and  $R^{\text{quadr},2}$  in (146) are both  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted so that  $R^{\text{quadr}}$  in (145) is  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted.  $R^\chi$  in (135) is  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted because  $R_l$  is  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted. Similarly,  $R^{\text{lin}}$  in (153a),  $R^{\text{time},2}$  in (153b),  $R^q$  in (160),  $R^{\text{corr},1}$  in (163),  $R^{\text{moll}}$  in (169), and  $R^{\text{corr},2}$  in (166) are all  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted. Therefore,  $R_1$  from (132) is also  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted. Due to similarity, we omit the proof that  $(\theta_1, u_1, R_1)(0, x)$  are deterministic. This completes the proof of Proposition 4.2.

## 5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.3

We already have a convex integration solution  $(\rho, u)$  for (8) forced by additive noise up to a stopping time  $T_L$  due to Theorem 2.2. To extend this convex integration solution to the interval  $[0, T]$ , we follow the argument given in [38], and glue an appropriate weak solution of (8) to this convex integration solution. Note that here, due to technical reasons aforementioned, we are gluing a convex integration solution with a weak solution as opposed to gluing two convex integration solutions as in proof of [38, Theorem 1.1]. However, both ideas are similar in spirit and differs slightly in details. In what follows, our aim is to solve the equation (8) with initial data  $\rho(T_L) \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)$  (due to (29)) and  $u(t) \equiv 0$  for all  $t \in (T_L, T]$ . To that context, let  $\hat{\rho}$  solve the following equation on  $[0, T]$

$$d\hat{\rho}(t) = \Delta \hat{\rho}(t) dt + d\hat{B}(t) \quad \text{for } t > 0, \quad \hat{\rho}|_{t=0} = 0, \quad (190)$$

where  $\hat{B}(t) \triangleq B(t + T_L) - B(T_L)$ . Next, let  $\tilde{\rho}(t) \triangleq \hat{\rho}(t) + e^{t\Delta} \rho(T_L)$ . Then we observe that  $\tilde{\rho}$  solves

$$d\tilde{\rho}(t) = \Delta \tilde{\rho}(t) dt + d\hat{B}(t) \quad \text{for } t > 0, \quad \tilde{\rho}|_{t=0} = \rho(T_L) \quad (191)$$

and is adapted to the filtration  $(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  where  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_t \triangleq \sigma(\hat{B}(s), s \leq t) \vee \sigma(\rho(T_L))$ . Now it follows that  $(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{u})$  defined by

$$(\tilde{\rho}(t), \tilde{u}(t)) \triangleq \begin{cases} (\rho(t), u(t)) & \text{if } t < T_L, \\ (\tilde{\rho}(t - T_L), 0) & \text{if } t \geq T_L, \end{cases} \quad (192)$$

satisfies (8) forced by additive noise. Moreover, following the argument presented in [38, Proof of Theorem 1.1], we conclude that  $\tilde{\rho}$  is an  $(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted process; we notice that

$$\tilde{\rho} \in C([0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)) \quad \tilde{u} \in L^\infty([0, T]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap L^\infty([0, T]; W^{1, \tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (193)$$

and observe the loss of regularity in time for the vector field  $u$ .

## 6. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.5

As we mentioned, the proof of Theorem 2.4 follows from similar computations in the proof of Theorem 2.2 and thus is left to Appendix A; in this section we prove Theorem 2.5.

**Remark 6.1.** *As we mentioned in Remark 2.6, the proof of Theorem 2.5 follows the approach of [38, Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2] which in turn followed the proof of [12, Theorem C]; however, its modification to the transport equation seems new, even in the deterministic case. In order to describe difficulty, let us informally recall some details from [38], to which we refer for specific notations. On [38, p. 41] the authors define the new velocity field  $v_{q+1} = w_{q+1} + v_l$  where  $w_{q+1} = \tilde{w}_{q+1}^{(p)} + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^{(c)} + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^{(t)}$  represents the perturbation and  $v_l$  is  $v_q$  that was mollified in space-time. They estimate for  $\{\gamma_q\}_{q=0}^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}$*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|v_{q+1}\|_{L^2}^2 - \|v_q\|_{L^2}^2 - 3\gamma_{q+1} \right| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |\tilde{w}_{q+1}^{(p)}|^2 + 2\tilde{w}_{q+1}^{(p)}(\tilde{w}_{q+1}^{(c)} + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^{(t)}) + |\tilde{w}_{q+1}^{(c)} + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^{(t)}|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2\tilde{w}_{q+1}^{(p)}v_l + 2(\tilde{w}_{q+1}^{(c)} + \tilde{w}_{q+1}^{(t)})v_l dx + \|v_l\|_{L^2}^2 - \|v_q\|_{L^2}^2 - 3\gamma_{q+1} \right| \end{aligned} \quad (194)$$

(see [38, Equation (5.44)], also [12, Equation (130)]) where  $|\tilde{w}_{q+1}^{(p)}|^2$  represents the most difficult part of the nonlinear term, called oscillation term (see [38, Equation (3.57)]). By defining

$$\rho \triangleq 2\sqrt{l^2 + |\mathring{R}_l|^2} + \frac{\gamma_{q+1}}{(2\pi)^3} \quad (195)$$

(see [38, p. 39], also [12, Equation (43)]) where  $\mathring{R}_l$  is the mollified Reynolds stress, for certain  $t$ , the authors in [38] were able to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{w}_{q+1}^{(p)}|^2 - \frac{3\gamma_{q+1}}{(2\pi)^3} &= \text{Tr}[-\mathring{R}_l + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda} a_{(\xi)}^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} W_{(\xi)} \otimes W_{(\xi)} + \rho \text{Id}] - \frac{3\gamma_{q+1}}{(2\pi)^3} \\ &= 6\sqrt{l^2 + |\mathring{R}_l|^2} + \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda} a_{(\xi)}^2 \mathbb{P}_{\neq 0} |W_{(\xi)}|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (196)$$

(see [38, Equation (3.36) and p. 43], also [12, Equations (50), and (95)]) where  $W_{(\xi)}$  represents intermittent jets, and the orthogonality of  $W_{(\xi)} \otimes W_{(\xi')} \equiv 0$  for  $\xi \neq \xi'$  and a geometric lemma [38, Lemma B.1] were crucially used in (196).

Let us make three observations. First, only because it was  $L_x^2$ -norm, expansion in (194) was possible. Although we prefer to repeat the same argument with  $\|\theta_1\|_{L_x^p}^p - \|\theta_0\|_{L_x^p}^p$  for an arbitrary  $p \in (1, \infty)$ , this seems to have no chance; moreover, we cannot consider  $\|\theta_1\|_{L_x^2}^2 - \|\theta_0\|_{L_x^2}^2$  in case  $p \in (1, 2)$ . Second, it was crucial to utilize the special feature of intermittent jets such as orthogonality to handle the difficult oscillation term. These two observations lead us to the direction that we need to consider  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta_1(t, x) u_1(t, x + B(t)) dx$  because, as we will see in (197), the new nonlinear term will be  $\text{div}(\theta_1(t, x) u_1(t, x + B(t)))$ , and the orthogonality of Mikado density  $\Theta^j$  and Mikado field  $W^j$ , specifically (100), was used indeed when handling the most difficult term  $R^{\text{quadr}}$  in (133). The third observation from (196) is that the geometric lemma produces a term “ $\rho \text{Id}$ ” and by strategically including  $\frac{\gamma_{q+1}}{(2\pi)^3}$  in (195), the authors of [38] (and [12] similarly) were able to create a cancellation. Our situation is quite different; considering  $\vartheta, w$ , and  $q$  in (104) it is not clear at all how to somehow “embed” an analogous term to  $\frac{\gamma_{q+1}}{(2\pi)^3}$  to make a cancellation. We were able to come up with a suitable alternative (see (208), (210), and Remark 6.5).

We first describe a key proposition Proposition 6.1 which is inspired by [38, Proposition 5.1] and [12, Proposition 16] concerning the following transport-diffusion-defect equation

$$\partial_t \theta(t, x) + \text{div}(u(t, x + B(t))\theta(t, x)) - \Delta \theta(t, x) = -\text{div}R(t, x), \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0. \quad (197)$$

We prescribe an arbitrary initial values of both  $\rho$  and  $u$  by  $\rho^{\text{in}} \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)$  and  $u^{\text{in}} \in L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. which are independent of the given standard Brownian motion  $B$  and let  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be the augmented joint canonical filtration on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  generated by  $B, \rho^{\text{in}}$ , and  $u^{\text{in}}$  so that  $\rho^{\text{in}}$  is  $\mathcal{F}_0$ -measurable. For such  $\rho^{\text{in}}$  and  $u^{\text{in}}$ , we will construct  $(\theta, u)$  that satisfies (197) such that  $(\theta, u)|_{t=0} = (\theta^{\text{in}}, u^{\text{in}})$  where  $\theta^{\text{in}} = \rho^{\text{in}}$ . We define  $l \triangleq \lambda^{-\iota}$  identically to (94) where  $\iota$  satisfies (173) and it will be taken smaller as needed.

**Proposition 6.1.** *There exists a constant  $M > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $T > 0$ ,  $\varpi \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ ,  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $\tilde{p} \in [1, \infty)$  such that (14) holds,  $\nu \in (1, p)$ , and  $\theta^{\text{in}} \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)$  and  $u^{\text{in}} \in L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. independently of the given standard Brownian motion  $B$ . Suppose that there exists a  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted  $(\theta_0, u_0, R_0)$  that satisfies (197) such that  $\theta_0(0, x) = \theta^{\text{in}}(x)$ ,  $u_0(0, x) = u^{\text{in}}(x)$ ,  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta_0(t, x) dx = 0$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,*

$$\theta_0 \in C^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d), \quad u_0 \in C^{\frac{1}{2}-2\varpi}([0, T]; C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)), \quad R_0 \in C^{\frac{1}{2}-2\varpi}([0, T]; C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)). \quad (198)$$

Choose any  $\delta, \Sigma \in (0, 1]$  and  $\Gamma > 0$  such that  $\frac{\Gamma}{\delta} \leq \bar{C} < \infty$ . Assume that

$$\|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq 2\delta \quad \forall t \in [2\Sigma \wedge T, T]. \quad (199)$$

Extend  $R_0$  to  $t < 0$  with its value at  $t = 0$ , and mollify it with  $\phi_l$  and  $\varphi_l$  from (95) to obtain  $R_l$  identically to (96), denote its  $j$ -th component by  $R_l^j$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  identically to (102), and then define cut-off functions

$$\chi_j : [0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto [0, 1] \quad \text{such that} \quad \chi_j(t, x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |R_l^j(t, x) + \Gamma| \leq \frac{\delta}{4d}, \\ 1 & \text{if } |R_l^j(t, x) + \Gamma| \geq \frac{\delta}{2d}, \end{cases} \quad (200)$$



(cf. (105) and (296)). Then there exists another  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted  $(\theta_1, u_1, R_1)$  that satisfies (197) in same corresponding regularity class (198) such that  $\theta_1(0, x) = \theta^{in}(x)$ ,  $u_1(0, x) = u^{in}(x)$ ,  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta_1(t, x) dx = 0$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , and

$$\|(\theta_1 - \theta_0)(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \begin{cases} M[2\delta + \Gamma]^{\frac{1}{p}} & \forall t \in (4\Sigma \wedge T, T], \\ M(\sup_{\tau \in [t-L, t]} \|R_0(\tau)\|_{L_x^1} + \Gamma)^{\frac{1}{p}} & \forall t \in (\frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T, 4\Sigma \wedge T], \\ 0 & \forall t \in [0, \frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T], \end{cases} \quad (201)$$

$$\|(\theta_1 - \theta_0)(t)\|_{L_x^v} \leq \begin{cases} \delta & \forall t \in [0, T], \\ 0 & \forall t \in [0, \frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T], \end{cases} \quad (202)$$

$$\|(u_1 - u_0)(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \leq \begin{cases} M[2\delta + \Gamma]^{\frac{1}{p'}} & \forall t \in (4\Sigma \wedge T, T], \\ M(\sup_{\tau \in [t-L, t]} \|R_0(\tau)\|_{L_x^1} + \Gamma)^{\frac{1}{p'}} & \forall t \in (\frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T, 4\Sigma \wedge T], \\ 0 & \forall t \in [0, \frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T], \end{cases} \quad (203)$$

$$\|(u_1 - u_0)(t)\|_{W_x^{1,p}} \leq \begin{cases} \delta & \forall t \in [0, T], \\ 0 & \forall t \in [0, \frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T], \end{cases} \quad (204)$$

$$\|R_1(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \begin{cases} \delta & \forall t \in (\Sigma \wedge T, T], \\ \sup_{\tau \in [t-L, t]} \|R_0(\tau)\|_{L_x^1} + \delta & \forall t \in (\frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T, \Sigma \wedge T], \\ \|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1} & \forall t \in [0, \frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T], \end{cases} \quad (205)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta_1(t, x) u_1(t, x + B(t)) dx - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta_0(t, x) u_0(t, x + B(t)) dx \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \chi_j^2(t, x) dx \epsilon_j \Gamma \right| \leq \delta 3d \quad \forall t \in (4\Sigma \wedge T, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (206)$$

**Remark 6.2.** To prove Theorem 2.5 we only need to rely on Proposition 6.1 for  $\rho^{in} \equiv 0$ ,  $u^{in} \equiv 0$  and the iteration argument in the proof of [38, Theorem 1.1] is not needed because the case of transport noise does not require a stopping time  $T_L$ . Nonetheless, we proved such a slightly more general result in Proposition 6.1 allowing any  $\theta^{in} \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)$  and  $u^{in} \in L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)$  in hope that it may in future lead to improvement of Theorem 2.2 preserving the continuity in time and  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adaptedness of vector field  $u$ . We also mention that the estimate (202) in Proposition 6.1 is new, and we included it to guarantee that the initial data of each iteration of  $\theta$  remains the same.

*Proof of Proposition 6.1.* We adhere to some of the settings the proof of Proposition 4.2:  $a, b$  from (60),  $r$  from Lemma 3.8,  $\varrho$  from (59),  $\psi$  from (67),  $\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu$  from (70) and more specifically (171),  $\Theta_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j, W_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j, Q_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  from (71), and  $\epsilon$  from (97) so that Lemma 4.3 remains applicable. We now define

$$\theta_1(t, x) \triangleq \theta_0(t, x) + \tilde{\vartheta}(t, x) + \tilde{\vartheta}_c(t) + \tilde{q}(t, x) + \tilde{q}_c(t), \quad (207a)$$

$$u_1(t, x) \triangleq u_0(t, x) + \tilde{w}(t, x - B(t)) + \tilde{w}_c(t, x - B(t)), \quad (207b)$$

(cf. (103)) where

$$\tilde{\vartheta}(t, x) \triangleq \tilde{\chi}(t) \vartheta(t, x), \quad \tilde{\vartheta}_c(t) \triangleq \tilde{\chi}(t) \vartheta_c(t), \quad \tilde{q}(t, x) \triangleq \tilde{\chi}^2(t) q(t, x), \quad \tilde{q}_c(t) \triangleq \tilde{\chi}^2(t) q_c(t), \quad (208a)$$

$$\tilde{w}(t, x) \triangleq \tilde{\chi}(t) w(t, x), \quad \tilde{w}_c(t, x) \triangleq \tilde{\chi}(t) w_c(t, x), \quad (208b)$$

$$\vartheta(t, x) \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j(t, x) \operatorname{sgn}(R_l^j(t, x) + \Gamma) |R_l^j(t, x) + \Gamma|^{\frac{1}{p}} \Theta_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j(t, x), \quad (208c)$$

$$w(t, x) \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j(t, x) |R_l^j(t, x) + \Gamma|^{\frac{1}{p'}} W_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j(t, x), \quad (208d)$$

$$q(t, x) \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j^2(t, x) (R_l^j(t, x) + \Gamma) Q_{\lambda, \mu, w, v}^j(t, x), \quad (208e)$$

(cf. (104)) with  $\chi_j$  defined in (200) and

$$\tilde{\chi}(t) \begin{cases} = 0 & t \leq \frac{\Sigma}{2}, \\ \in [0, 1] & t \in (\frac{\Sigma}{2}, \Sigma), \\ = 1 & t \geq \Sigma, \end{cases} \quad (209)$$

is a smooth cut-off function. We note that  $\tilde{\chi}^2$  in the definition of  $\tilde{q}$  and  $\tilde{q}_c$  are needed for a cancellation upon defining  $R_1$ , as we will see in (239). Furthermore, we define  $\vartheta_c$  and  $q_c$  identically to (110) so that the mean-zero property of  $\theta_0$  from hypothesis implies that of  $\theta_1$  defined in (207). Additionally, we define

$$a_j(t, x) \triangleq \chi_j(t, x) \operatorname{sgn}(R_l^j(t, x) + \Gamma) |R_l^j(t, x) + \Gamma|^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (210a)$$

$$b_j(t, x) \triangleq \chi_j(t, x) |R_l^j(t, x) + \Gamma|^{\frac{1}{p'}}, \quad (210b)$$

so that

$$a_j(t, x) b_j(t, x) = \chi_j^2(t, x) (R_l^j(t, x) + \Gamma) \quad (211)$$

(cf. (106) and (107)) and

$$\vartheta(t) = \sum_{j=1}^d a_j(t) \Theta^j(t), \quad w(t) = \sum_{j=1}^d b_j(t) W^j(t), \quad q(t) = \sum_{j=1}^d a_j(t) b_j(t) Q^j(t). \quad (212)$$

Moreover, similarly to (109),  $a_j, b_j$  satisfy due to (200)

$$\|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \|R_l^j(t) + \Gamma\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \leq \|R_l^j(t) + \Gamma\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{p'}}. \quad (213)$$

With this definition of  $b_j$ , the identity (111) remains valid so that if we define  $f_j$  and  $w_c$  identically to (112) with  $b_j$  from (210), then (113) remains valid so that  $u_1$  defined in (207) satisfies (114).

**Remark 6.3.** *As we pointed out in Remark 4.3, the choice of not mollifying  $\theta_0$  and  $u_0$  is not only for the simplification of the proofs of Theorems 2.2-2.4 but necessary in the proof of Proposition 6.1. Suppose that we mollified both  $\theta_0$  and  $u_0$  to obtain  $\theta_l = \theta_0 *_{x,t} \varphi_l$  and  $u_l = u_0 *_{x,t} \varphi_l$  so that instead of (207) we define  $\theta_1 = \theta_l + \tilde{\vartheta} + \tilde{\vartheta}_c + \tilde{q} + \tilde{q}_c$  and  $u_1 = u_l + \tilde{w} + \tilde{w}_c$ . This will make it very difficult to prove  $\|(\theta_1 - \theta_0)(t)\|_{L_x^p} = 0$  and  $\|(u_1 - u_0)(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} = 0$  over  $[0, \frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T]$  in (201) and (203). The authors in [38] are able to handle this issue as follows. They work on an additive case, assign  $z(0, x)$  to be the initial data of the solution (see “ $z(0) = u_0$ ” on [38, p. 35]) so that the initial data of the solution within the actual convex integration have zero initial data (see “ $v_q(0) = 0$ ” in [38, Equation (5.1)]) which allows them to add an extra inductive hypothesis “ $\|v_q(t)\|_{L^2} = 0$  for all  $t \in [0, \frac{\sigma_q-1}{2} \wedge T_L]$ ” in [38, Equation (5.5)] so that by taking advantage of  $\operatorname{supp} \varphi_l \subset [0, l]$ , they are able to prove “ $\|v_{q+1}(t) - v_q(t)\|_{L^2} = 0$  for  $t \in [0, \frac{\sigma_q}{2} \wedge T_L]$ ” in [38, Equation (5.9)]. As we are working in the case of transport noise rather than additive, we have no place to hide  $\theta^{\text{in}}$  or  $u^{\text{in}}$  such as “ $z(0)$ ” in [38].*

**Remark 6.4.** *At first sight, our choice of  $u_1(t, x)$  in (207b) seems awkward and a more natural choice may be*

$$u_1(t, x) \triangleq u_0(t, x) + \tilde{w}(t, x) + \tilde{w}_c(t, x). \quad (214)$$

*identically to (103). To describe the problem with this choice simply, let us assume that  $t \geq \Sigma$  so that  $\tilde{\chi}(t) = 1$  by (209) and hence  $\tilde{\vartheta} = \vartheta$ ,  $\tilde{\vartheta}_c = \vartheta_c$ ,  $\tilde{q} = q$ ,  $\tilde{q}_c = q$ ,  $\tilde{w} = w$ , and  $\tilde{w}_c = w_c$  due to (208) (see (223) for this case). Then, upon defining the new defect  $R_1$ , we obtain from (197), (207a), and (214),*

$$\begin{aligned} & - \operatorname{div} R_1(t, x) \\ &= \underbrace{\partial_t(q(t, x) + q_c(t)) + \operatorname{div}(\vartheta(t, x)w(t, x + B(t)) - R_l(t, x))}_{(\operatorname{div} R^{\text{time},1} + \operatorname{div} R^{\text{quadr}} + \operatorname{div} R^x)(t, x)} \\ & \quad + \underbrace{\partial_t(\vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t)) + \operatorname{div}(\theta_0(t, x)w(t, x + B(t)) + \vartheta(t, x)u_0(t, x + B(t))) - \Delta(\vartheta(t, x) + q(t, x))}_{(\operatorname{div} R^{\text{time},2} + \operatorname{div} R^{\text{lin}})(t, x)} \end{aligned} \quad (215)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \underbrace{\operatorname{div}(q(t, x)(u_0(t, x + B(t)) + w(t, x + B(t))))}_{\operatorname{div}R^q(t, x)} + \underbrace{\operatorname{div}([\theta_0(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x) + q(t, x)]w_c(t, x + B(t)))}_{\operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{corr}, l}(t, x)} \\
& + \underbrace{\operatorname{div}(R_l(t, x) - R_0(t, x))}_{\operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{moll}}(t, x)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The main difficulty arises from the mismatch of variables in  $\operatorname{div}(\vartheta(t, x)w(t, x + B(t)))$  in (215). A glance at (133) shows that we need a certain cancellation due to orthogonality for this product; specifically,

$$\vartheta(t, x)w(t, x + B(t)) \stackrel{(108)}{=} \left( \sum_{j=1}^d a_j(t, x) \Theta^j(t, x) \right) \left( \sum_{k=1}^d b_k(t, x + B(t)) W^k(t, x + B(t)) \right) \quad (216)$$

where due to (71)

$$\Theta^j(t, x)W^k(t, x + B(t)) = \varrho_\mu^j(\lambda(x - \omega t e_j)) \psi^j(vx) \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^k(\lambda(x + B(t) - \omega t e_j)) \psi^k(v(x + B(t))) e_k \quad (217)$$

We used in (133) that fact that  $\varrho_\mu^j(\lambda(x - \omega t e_j)) \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^k(\lambda(x - \omega t e_j)) = 0$  unless  $j = k$ . In detail,

$$\begin{aligned}
\varrho_\mu^j(\lambda(x - \omega t e_j)) & \stackrel{(66)}{=} (\varrho_\mu \circ \tau_{\zeta_j})(\lambda(x - \omega t e_j)) \stackrel{(57)}{=} \varrho_\mu(\lambda x - \bar{x}_j(\lambda \omega t)), \\
\tilde{\varrho}_\mu^k(\lambda(x - \omega t e_k)) & \stackrel{(66)}{=} (\tilde{\varrho}_\mu \circ \tau_{\zeta_k})(\lambda(x - \omega t e_k)) \stackrel{(57)}{=} \tilde{\varrho}_\mu(\lambda x - \bar{x}_k(\lambda \omega t))
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$d_{\mathbb{T}^d}(\lambda x - \bar{x}_j(\lambda \omega t), \lambda x - \bar{x}_k(\lambda \omega t)) = d_{\mathbb{T}^d}(\bar{x}_j(\lambda \omega t), \bar{x}_k(\lambda \omega t)) \stackrel{(58)}{>} 2r$$

if  $j \neq k$  and because  $\operatorname{supp} \varrho_\mu = \operatorname{supp} \tilde{\varrho}_\mu$  and both are contained in a ball with radius at most  $r$  due to Lemma 3.9, we conclude that  $\varrho_\mu^j(\lambda(x - \omega t e_j)) \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^k(\lambda(x - \omega t e_j)) = 0$  unless  $j = k$ . However, an identical computation in the case of (217) leads only to

$$d_{\mathbb{T}^d}(\lambda x - \bar{x}_j(\lambda \omega t), \lambda x + \lambda B(t) - \bar{x}_k(\lambda \omega t)) = d_{\mathbb{T}^d}(\bar{x}_j(\lambda \omega t), -\lambda B(t) + \bar{x}_k(\lambda \omega t))$$

which is not deterministic and thus does not lead to the desired orthogonality. This lack of orthogonality, and lack of necessary cancellations, is quite significant. A naive attempt of adding  $\Theta^j(t, x)W^k(t, x)$  to obtain the necessary orthogonality, and then subtracting and thereafter trying to handle an estimate of  $\|\Theta^j(t, x)[W^k(t, x + B(t)) - W^k(t, x)]\|_{L_x^1}$  failed miserably. Therefore, the definition (214) really does not work and we need (207b). Lastly, we point out that within (207b), we need  $\tilde{w}(t, x - B(t))$  to deduce the necessary orthogonality and  $\tilde{w}_c(t, x - B(t))$  to secure the divergence-free property.

We first prove (201) and (203). Let us work in case  $t \in (4\Sigma \wedge T, T]$ . Clearly if  $T \leq 4\Sigma$ , then there is nothing to prove; thus, we assume  $4\Sigma < T$  so that  $(4\Sigma \wedge T, T] = (4\Sigma, T]$ .

**Lemma 6.2.** For all  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  and  $t \in (4\Sigma, T]$ ,  $a_j, b_j$  defined in (210) satisfy

$$\|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lesssim l^{-\frac{d+1}{p}} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lesssim l^{-\frac{d+1}{p}} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (218a)$$

$$\|a_j(t)\|_{C_x^s} \lesssim l^{-(d+2)s} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \|b_j(t)\|_{C_x^s} \lesssim l^{-(d+2)s} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (218b)$$

$$\|\partial_t a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lesssim l^{-(d+2)} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \|\partial_t b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lesssim l^{-(d+2)} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (218c)$$

*Proof of Lemma 6.2.* Because  $4\Sigma < T$  by assumption,  $2\Sigma < T$  so that  $[2\Sigma \wedge T, T] = [2\Sigma, T]$ . Hence, by taking  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large we can assure that  $l \ll 2\Sigma$  and hence for all  $s \in \operatorname{supp} \varphi_l \subset (0, l]$  from (95), for any  $t \in (4\Sigma \wedge T, T]$ , we can estimate  $\sup_{s \in \operatorname{supp} \varphi_l} \|R_0^j(t - s)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \sup_{\tau \in [2\Sigma \wedge T, T]} \|R_0^j(\tau)\|_{L_x^1}$  to which we can apply (199) to bound by  $2\delta$ . Thus, very similar computations to the proof of Lemma 4.4 using  $W^{d+1,1}(\mathbb{T}^d) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$  lead to (218a), e.g.,

$$\|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lesssim (\|R_l^j(t, x)\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{p}} + \Gamma^{\frac{1}{p}}) \stackrel{(199)}{\lesssim} (l^{-\frac{d+1}{p}} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}} + (\delta \bar{C})^{\frac{1}{p}}) \lesssim l^{-\frac{d+1}{p}} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large. For the estimates (218b)-(218c), following the proof of Lemma 4.4 and keeping in mind the lower bound of  $|R_l^j(t, x) + \Gamma| > \frac{\delta}{4d}$  in the support of  $\chi_j$  due to (200) give us the desired results.  $\square$

Analogously to the proof of Theorem 2.2, Lemma 6.2 leads to the following result.

**Lemma 6.3.** *There exist constants  $C = C(p) \geq 0$  with which  $\tilde{\vartheta}$ ,  $\tilde{q}$ ,  $\tilde{\vartheta}_c$ ,  $\tilde{q}_c$ , and  $\tilde{w}$  in (208) satisfy for all  $t \in (4\Sigma, T]$*

$$\|\tilde{\vartheta}(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \frac{M}{2} [2\delta + \Gamma]^{\frac{1}{p}} + C\lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}} l^{-d-2} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (219a)$$

$$\|\tilde{q}(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq Cl^{-d-1} \delta \mu^b \omega^{-1}, \quad (219b)$$

$$|\tilde{\vartheta}_c(t)| \leq Cl^{-\frac{d+1}{p}} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}} \mu^{-b}, \quad |\tilde{q}_c(t)| \leq Cl^{-d-1} \delta \omega^{-1}, \quad (219c)$$

$$\|\tilde{w}(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \leq \frac{M}{2} [2\delta + \Gamma]^{\frac{1}{p'}} + C\lambda^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} l^{-d-2}, \quad (219d)$$

$$\|\tilde{w}(t)\|_{W_x^{1,\tilde{p}}} \leq C\delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} l^{-d-2} \frac{\lambda\mu + \nu}{\mu^{1+\epsilon}} \quad (219e)$$

(cf. (119a), (119b), (119c), (119d), and (119e)). Furthermore, for any  $k, h \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $r \in [1, \infty]$ , there exists a constant  $C \geq 0$  with which for all  $j \in 1, \dots, d$ ,  $f_j$  defined in (112) with  $b_j$  from (210) satisfies for all  $t \in (4\Sigma, T]$

$$\|\mathcal{D}^k D^h f_j(t)\|_{L_x^r} \leq C\delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} l^{-(d+2)(k+h+1)} (\lambda\mu)^{k+h+1} \mu^{b-\frac{d}{r}} \quad (220)$$

(cf. (120)). Consequently, there exist constants  $C \geq 0$  with which  $\tilde{w}_c$  in (208) with  $w_c$  in (112) and  $b_j$  in (210) satisfies for all  $t \in (4\Sigma, T]$

$$\|\tilde{w}_c(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \leq C\delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{\lambda\mu l^{-(d+2)}}{\nu} \right)^k + \frac{(\lambda\mu l^{-(d+2)})^{N+1}}{\nu^N} \right], \quad (221a)$$

$$\|\tilde{w}_c(t)\|_{W_x^{1,\tilde{p}}} \leq C \frac{\delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} [\lambda\mu l^{-(d+2)} + \nu]}{\mu^{1+\epsilon}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{l^{-(d+2)} \lambda\mu}{\nu} \right)^k + \frac{(l^{-(d+2)} \lambda\mu)^{N+1}}{\nu^N} \right] \quad (221b)$$

(cf. (121a) and (121b)).

*Proof of Lemma 6.3.* Because  $t \in (4\Sigma \wedge T, T]$ , we have  $\tilde{\chi}(t) = 1$  by (209). Especially for (219a) and (219d), by taking  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large so that  $l \ll 2\Sigma$ , we can estimate for any  $t \in (4\Sigma \wedge T, T]$   $\sup_{s \in \text{supp}\varphi_l} \|R_0^j(t-s)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \sup_{\tau \in [2\Sigma \wedge T, T]} \|R_0^j(\tau)\|_{L_x^1}$  and bound this by  $2\delta$  due to (199). Besides this issue, the proof is similar to that of Lemma 4.5 and thus we only sketch their computations: via (208)-(209)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\vartheta}(t)\|_{L_x^p} &\stackrel{(45)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^p} \|\Theta^j(t)\|_{L_x^p} + \frac{C_p}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}} \|a_j(t)\|_{C_x^1} \|\Theta^j(t)\|_{L_x^p} \\ &\stackrel{(213)(99a)(218b)(199)}{\leq} \frac{M}{2} [2\delta + \Gamma]^{\frac{1}{p}} + C\lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}} l^{-d-2}, \\ \|\tilde{q}(t)\|_{L_x^p} &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^d (\|R_l^j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \Gamma) \|Q^j(t)\|_{L_x^p} \stackrel{(99a)(199)}{\lesssim} l^{-d-1} \delta \mu^b \omega^{-1}, \\ |\tilde{\vartheta}_c(t)| &\stackrel{(110)(212)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|\Theta^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(218a)(99b)}{\leq} Cl^{-\frac{d+1}{p}} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}} \mu^{-b}, \\ |\tilde{q}_c(t)| &\stackrel{(110)(212)(211)(99b)}{\lesssim} \sum_{j=1}^d (\|R_l^j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \Gamma) \left( \frac{M}{\omega} \right) \stackrel{(199)}{\lesssim} (l^{-d-1} \delta + \delta \bar{C}) \omega^{-1} \leq Cl^{-d-1} \delta \omega^{-1}, \\ \|\tilde{w}(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} &\stackrel{(45)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \|W^j(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} + C_{p'} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \|b_j(t)\|_{C_x^1} \|W^j(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \\ &\stackrel{(213)(99a)(218b)(199)}{\leq} \frac{M}{2} [2\delta + \Gamma]^{\frac{1}{p'}} + C\lambda^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} l^{-d-2}, \\ \|\tilde{w}(t)\|_{W_x^{1,\tilde{p}}} &\stackrel{(212)}{\lesssim} \sum_{j=1}^d \|b_j(t)\|_{C_x^1} \|W^j(t)\|_{W_x^{1,\tilde{p}}} \stackrel{(218b)(99c)}{\leq} C\delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} l^{-d-2} \frac{\lambda\mu + \nu}{\mu^{1+\epsilon}}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{D}^k \mathcal{D}^h f_j(t)\|_{L_x^p} &\stackrel{(47)(112)}{\lesssim} \|b_j(t)\|_{C_x^{k+h+1}} \|(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j}\|_{W_x^{k+h+1,r}} \\ &\stackrel{(63)(44)(218b)(64)}{\leq} C \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} l^{-(d+2)(k+h+1)} (\lambda \mu)^{k+h+1} \mu^{b-\frac{d}{r}}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{w}_c(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} &\stackrel{(56b)}{\lesssim} \sum_{j=1}^d C_{d,p',N} \|\psi\|_{L_x^\infty} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \nu^{-k-1} \|\mathcal{D}^k f_j(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} + \nu^{-N} \|\mathcal{D}^N f_j(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(220)(60)}{\leq} C \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{\lambda \mu l^{-(d+2)}}{\nu} \right)^k + \frac{(\lambda \mu l^{-(d+2)})^{N+1}}{\nu^N} \right], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|D\tilde{w}_c(t)\|_{L_x^p} &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^d \|\mathcal{R}_N(Df_j(t), \psi_\nu^j e_j)\|_{L_x^p} + \|\mathcal{R}_N(f_j(t), D\psi_\nu^j e_j)\|_{L_x^p} \\ &\stackrel{(44)(56b)(220)}{\leq} C \frac{\delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} [\lambda \mu l^{-(d+2)} + \nu]}{\mu^{1+\epsilon}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{l^{-(d+2)} \lambda \mu}{\nu} \right)^k + \frac{(l^{-(d+2)} \lambda \mu)^{N+1}}{\nu^N} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

We are now ready to verify (201) and (203) on  $(4\Sigma \wedge T, T]$  by taking  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large and  $\iota > 0$  sufficiently small:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\theta_1 - \theta_0)(t)\|_{L_x^p} &\stackrel{(207)(219)(171)}{\leq} \frac{M}{2} [2\delta + \Gamma]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\quad + C [\lambda^{-\frac{1}{p} + (d+2)\iota} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}} + \lambda^{\frac{d+1}{p}\iota - \alpha b} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}} + \lambda^{(d+1)\iota + \alpha b - \beta} \delta + \lambda^{(d+1)\iota - \beta} \delta] \stackrel{(175)}{\leq} M [2\delta + \Gamma]^{\frac{1}{p}}, \end{aligned} \tag{222a}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|(u_1 - u_0)(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} &\stackrel{(207)(219d)(221a)(171)}{\leq} \frac{M}{2} [2\delta + \Gamma]^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\ &\quad + C [\lambda^{-\frac{1}{p'} + (d+2)\iota} \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} + \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda^{[1+\alpha-\gamma+(d+2)\iota]k} + \lambda^{[1+\alpha+(d+2)\iota](N+1)-\gamma N} \right]] \stackrel{(177)}{\leq} M [2\delta + \Gamma]^{\frac{1}{p'}}, \end{aligned} \tag{222b}$$

where the last inequality in (222a) also used (175) and

$$\iota \stackrel{(185)}{<} \frac{\alpha b}{d+2} < \frac{p\alpha b}{d+1} \text{ and } \iota \stackrel{(185)}{<} \frac{\beta}{d+2} < \frac{\beta}{d+1}.$$

Next, concerning (201) and (203) in the case  $t \in (\frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T, 4\Sigma \wedge T]$ , we cannot make use of (199); nonetheless, due to  $\text{supp} \varphi_l \subset [0, l]$ , we can estimate  $\|R_l^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0^j(\tau)\|_{L_x^1}$ . Therefore, analogous computations in the case  $t \in (4\Sigma \wedge T, T]$  give us (201) and (203) in case  $t \in (\frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T, 4\Sigma \wedge T]$ . In short, we get  $\frac{M}{2} (\sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0(\tau)\|_{L_x^1} + \Gamma)^{\frac{1}{p}}$  from  $\|\tilde{\vartheta}(t)\|_{L_x^p}$  and  $\frac{M}{2} (\sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0(\tau)\|_{L_x^1} + \Gamma)^{\frac{1}{p'}}$  from  $\|\tilde{w}(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}}$  similarly to (219a) and (219d) and  $|\tilde{\vartheta}_c(t)| + \|\tilde{q}(t)\|_{L_x^p} + |\tilde{q}_c(t)|$  from  $\|\theta_1(t) - \theta_0(t)\|_{L_x^p}$  and  $\|\tilde{w}_c(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}}$  from  $\|u_1(t) - u_0(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}}$  can be made small by taking  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large.

Next, we consider  $t \in [0, \frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T] \subset [0, \frac{\Sigma}{2}]$  in which  $\tilde{\chi} \equiv 0$  by (209) so that  $\theta_1 \equiv \theta_0$  and  $u_1 \equiv u_0$  due to (207). As we elaborated in Remark 6.3, the fact that we did not mollify  $\theta_0$  or  $u_0$  makes it easy for us here. Therefore, (201) and (203) for  $t \in [0, \frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T]$  are proven.

Next, we consider (202). First, for  $t \in [0, \frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T] \subset [0, \frac{\Sigma}{2}]$  in which  $\tilde{\chi} \equiv 0$  due to (209), we again have  $\theta_1 \equiv \theta_0$  so that the claim in (202) on this time interval is clear. Moreover, for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , we see from (207) that

$$\|(\theta_1 - \theta_0)(t)\|_{L_x^p} = \|\tilde{\vartheta}(t, x) + \tilde{\vartheta}_c(t) + \tilde{q}(t, x) + \tilde{q}_c(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \|\tilde{\vartheta}(t)\|_{L_x^p} + |\tilde{\vartheta}_c(t)| + \|\tilde{q}(t)\|_{L_x^p} + |\tilde{q}_c(t)|$$

because  $\nu \in (1, p)$ , where we can make  $|\tilde{\vartheta}_c(t)| + \|\tilde{q}(t)\|_{L_x^p} + |\tilde{q}_c(t)| \ll \delta$  for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large. The only reason we could not estimate  $\|\theta_1(t) - \theta_0(t)\|_{L_x^p}$  by a constant multiple of  $\delta$  over  $(\frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T, 4\Sigma \wedge T]$  where

(199) is not available was due to  $\|\tilde{\vartheta}(t)\|_{L_x^p}$ . In detail, we can readily deduce the following estimates for all  $t \in [0, T]$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{\vartheta}(t)\|_{L_x^p} &\stackrel{(45)(213)}{\leq} \frac{M}{2} \left( \sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0(\tau)\|_{L_x^1} + \Gamma \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + C\lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}} \left[ (l^{d-1} \sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0(\tau)\|_{L_x^1} + \Gamma)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \delta^{\frac{1}{p}-1} (l^{d-2} \sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0(\tau)\|_{L_x^1} + \Gamma) \right], \\
|\tilde{\vartheta}_c(t)| &\stackrel{(212)(99b)}{\lesssim} (l^{d-1} \sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0(\tau)\|_{L_x^1} + \Gamma)^{\frac{1}{p}} \mu^{-b} \stackrel{(171)(185)}{\ll} \delta, \\
\|\tilde{q}(t)\|_{L_x^p} &\stackrel{(212)(99a)}{\lesssim} (l^{d-1} \sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0(\tau)\|_{L_x^1} + \Gamma) \mu^b \omega^{-1} \stackrel{(171)(175)}{\ll} \delta, \\
|\tilde{q}_c(t)| &\stackrel{(211)(99b)}{\lesssim} (l^{d-1} \sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0(\tau)\|_{L_x^1} + \Gamma) \omega^{-1} \stackrel{(171)(181)}{\ll} \delta.
\end{aligned}$$

However, because  $v \in (1, p)$  we can interpolate and use (99) to deduce for all  $t \in [0, T]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{\vartheta}(t)\|_{L_x^v} &\stackrel{(212)(45)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^p} \|\Theta^j(t)\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{p-v}{v(p-1)}} \|\Theta^j(t)\|_{L_x^p}^{\frac{vp-p}{v(p-1)}} + C_v \lambda^{-\frac{1}{v}} \|a_j(t)\|_{C_x^1} \|\Theta^j(t)\|_{L_x^p} \\
&\stackrel{(213)(99)}{\lesssim} \sum_{j=1}^d \|R_l^j(t) + \Gamma\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \frac{M}{\mu^b} \right)^{\frac{p-v}{v(p-1)}} \left( \frac{M}{2d} \right)^{\frac{vp-p}{v(p-1)}} + \frac{1}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{v}}} \left[ (l^{d-1} \sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0^j(\tau)\|_{L_x^1} + \Gamma)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \delta^{\frac{1}{p}-1} (l^{d-2} \sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0^j(\tau)\|_{L_x^1} + \Gamma) \right] \left( \frac{M}{2d} \right) \ll \delta
\end{aligned}$$

by taking  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large and  $\iota < \frac{1}{v(d+2)} < \frac{p}{v(d+1)}$ . Therefore, we have proven (202) in case  $t \in [0, T]$  and hence (202) completely.

Next, we work on (204). Again, on  $[0, \frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T] \subset [0, \frac{\Sigma}{2}]$ , we have  $\tilde{\chi} \equiv 0$  due to (209) so that  $u_1 \equiv u_0$  due to (207) and thus the claim is clear. For  $t \in [0, T]$ , we can just estimate  $\|R_l^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0^j(\tau)\|_{L_x^1}$  and analogous computations to (178) and taking  $\iota > 0$  sufficiently small while  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large gives the desired result.

Next, we prove (205). First, we consider  $t \in (\Sigma \wedge T, T]$ . If  $T \leq \Sigma$ , then there is nothing to prove. Thus, we assume that  $\Sigma < T$ ; i.e.,  $t \in (\Sigma, T]$ . Then by (209),  $\tilde{\chi}(t) = 1$ . With that in mind, the new defect  $R_1$  is defined by (197) and (207) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \operatorname{div} R_1(t, x) \\
&= \partial_t \theta_0(t, x) + \partial_t [\vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t) + q(t, x) + q_c(t)] \tag{223a}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \operatorname{div} [\theta_0(t, x) u_0(t, x + B(t))] \\
& + \operatorname{div} (\theta_0(t, x) (w(t, x) + w_c(t, x)) + (\vartheta(t, x) + q(t, x)) (u_0(t, x + B(t)) + w(t, x) + w_c(t, x)) \\
& \quad + (\vartheta_c(t) + q_c(t)) (u_0(t, x + B(t)) + w(t, x) + w_c(t, x))) \\
& - \Delta \theta_0(t, x) - \Delta (\vartheta(t, x) + q(t, x)) \\
&= \partial_t (q(t, x) + q_c(t, x)) + \operatorname{div} (\vartheta(t, x) w(t, x) - R_l(t, x)) \tag{223b}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \underbrace{(\operatorname{div} R^{\text{time},1} + \operatorname{div} R^{\text{quadr}} + \operatorname{div} R^\chi)_{(t,x)}}_{(\operatorname{div} R^{\text{time},2} + \operatorname{div} R^{\text{lin}})_{(t,x)}} \\
& + \partial_t (\vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t)) + \operatorname{div} (\theta_0(t, x) w(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x) u_0(t, x + B(t))) - \Delta (\vartheta(t, x) + q(t, x)) \\
& + \underbrace{\operatorname{div} (q(t, x) (u_0(t, x + B(t)) + w(t, x)))}_{\operatorname{div} R^q(t,x)} \\
& + \underbrace{\operatorname{div} ([\theta_0(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x) + q(t, x)] w_c(t, x))}_{\operatorname{div} R^{\text{corr}}(t,x)} + \underbrace{\operatorname{div} (R_l(t, x) - R_0(t, x))}_{\operatorname{div} R^{\text{moll}}(t,x)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we defined

$$- R_1 \triangleq R^{\text{time},1} + R^{\text{quadr}} + R^\chi + R^{\text{time},2} + R^{\text{lin}} + R^q + R^{\text{corr}} + R^{\text{moll}}. \tag{224}$$

Due to our strategic definition of  $u_1$  in (207) (recall Remark 6.4), the following computations have some similarity to those in the proof of Theorem 2.2. Nonetheless, we changed the definitions of  $\vartheta$ ,  $w$ , and  $q$  from (104) to (208) and hence we provide details.

First, similarly to Section 7.2.2 we work on the estimates on  $\partial_t(q + q_c)(t, x) + \operatorname{div}(\vartheta w - R_l)(t, x) = (\operatorname{div}R^{\text{time},1} + \operatorname{div}R^{\text{quadr}} + \operatorname{div}R^\chi)(t, x)$  of (223). We observe that

$$\vartheta(t, x)w(t, x) \stackrel{(212)}{=} \left( \sum_{j=1}^d a_j(t, x) \Theta^j(t, x) \right) \left( \sum_{k=1}^d b_k(t, x) W^k(t, x) \right) \stackrel{(100)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^d a_j(t) b_j(t) \Theta^j(t) W^j(t)$$

so that

$$\operatorname{div}(\vartheta w) = \sum_{j=1}^d a_j b_j \operatorname{div}(\Theta^j W^j) + \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot \Theta^j W^j. \quad (225)$$

We set, differently from (135),

$$R^\chi \triangleq - \sum_{j=1}^d (1 - \chi_j^2) (R_l^j + \Gamma) e_j \quad (226)$$

so that using that  $\operatorname{div} \sum_{j=1}^d \Gamma e_j = 0$ , we can compute

$$- \operatorname{div} R_l \stackrel{(102)}{=} - \operatorname{div} \sum_{j=1}^d (R_l^j + \Gamma) e_j \stackrel{(226)(211)}{=} \operatorname{div} R^\chi - \sum_{j=1}^d \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot e_j. \quad (227)$$

This leads us to, identically to (137)

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(\vartheta w - R_l) &\stackrel{(225)(227)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^d a_j b_j \operatorname{div}(\Theta^j W^j) \\ &\quad + \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] dx + \operatorname{div} R^\chi. \end{aligned} \quad (228)$$

On the other hand, identical computation to (138) give us

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t(q + q_c) &\stackrel{(212)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^d a_j b_j \partial_t Q^j + \partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j dx + q'_c. \end{aligned} \quad (229)$$

Summing (228)-(229) gives us identically to (139)

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t(q + q_c) + \operatorname{div}(\vartheta w - R_l) \\ &\stackrel{(228)(229)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^d a_j b_j [\partial_t Q^j + \operatorname{div}(\Theta^j W^j)] \end{aligned} \quad (230a)$$

$$+ [\partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j dx] \quad (230b)$$

$$+ [\nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] dx] + \operatorname{div} R^\chi \quad (230c)$$

$$+ \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_t(a_j b_j) Q^j dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla(a_j b_j) \cdot [\Theta^j W^j - e_j] dx + q'_c \quad (230d)$$

where (230a) vanishes due to (101) and (230d) also vanishes identically to (140) using (110), (212), and (101). Therefore, we are able to conclude the same identity as (141), and (142) also continues to hold from (71). Thus, we define  $R^{\text{time},1}$  identically to (143), although with  $a_j$  and  $b_j$  from (210) rather than (106), so that (144) continues to hold. Additionally, we define  $R^{\text{quadr}}$  with  $R^{\text{quadr},1}$  and  $R^{\text{quadr},2}$  identically to (145)-(146) with  $a_j, b_j$  replaced by those from (210) rather than (106) so that (147) continues to hold. Therefore, by applying (144) and (147) to (141), all of which we just proved to remain valid, we conclude

that  $\partial_t(q + q_c) + \operatorname{div}(\vartheta w - R_l) = \operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{time},1} + \operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{quadr}} + \operatorname{div}R^X$  as claimed. Analogous computations to the proofs of Lemma 4.6 lead to the following results. Considering the case  $t \in (\frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T, \Sigma \wedge T]$  we will work next, we prove this result for all  $t \in [0, T]$ .

**Lemma 6.4.** (Cf. Lemma 4.6)  $R^X$  defined in (226),  $R^{\operatorname{time},1}$  defined identically to (143) but with  $a_j$  and  $b_j$  from (210), and  $R^{\operatorname{quadr}}$  with  $R^{\operatorname{quadr},1}$  and  $R^{\operatorname{quadr},2}$  defined identically to (145)-(146) with  $a_j, b_j$  replaced by those from (210) satisfy for all  $t \in [0, T]$

$$\|R^X(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(226)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\operatorname{supp}(1-\chi_j^2)} |R_l^j(t, x) + \Gamma| dx \stackrel{(200)}{\leq} \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad (231a)$$

$$\|R^{\operatorname{time},1}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \ll \delta, \quad \|R^{\operatorname{quadr}}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \ll \delta. \quad (231b)$$

*Proof of Lemma 6.4.* First, (231a) is clear. Second, for the first claim in (231b), similarly to (148b) we have for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large

$$\|R^{\operatorname{time},1}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(51)}{\lesssim} \sum_{j=1}^d (\|\partial_t a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|\partial_t b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty}) \|Q^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(99b)(173)}{\ll} \delta.$$

Third, the second claim in (231b) is a consequence of

$$\|R^{\operatorname{quadr},1}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(56)(64)(60)}{\lesssim} \nu^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d (\|a_j(t)\|_{C_x^2} \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|b_j(t)\|_{C_x^2}) \lambda \mu \stackrel{(171)}{\ll} \delta,$$

$$\|R^{\operatorname{quadr},2}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(56)(63)(64)(60)}{\lesssim} \lambda^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d (\|a_j(t)\|_{C_x^2} \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|b_j(t)\|_{C_x^2}) \stackrel{(171)}{\ll} \delta,$$

which can be verified by taking  $\iota > 0$  sufficiently small and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large.  $\square$

Second, similarly to Section 4.1.2 we work on the estimates on  $\partial_t(\vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t)) + \operatorname{div}(\theta_0(t, x)w(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x)u_0(t, x + B(t))) - \Delta(\vartheta(t, x) + q(t, x)) = (\operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{time},2} + \operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{lin}})(t, x)$  of (223). We are able to deduce the analogous identity to (152) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t(\vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t)) + \operatorname{div}(\theta_0(t, x)w(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x)u_0(t, x + B(t))) - \Delta(\vartheta(t, x) + q(t, x)) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d a_j(t, x) \partial_t \Theta^j(t, x) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} a_j(t, x) \partial_t \Theta^j(t, x) dx + \partial_t a_j(t, x) \Theta^j(t, x) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_t a_j(t, x) \Theta^j(t, x) dx \\ & \quad + \operatorname{div}(\theta_0(t, x)w(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x)u_0(t, x + B(t))) - \Delta(\vartheta(t, x) + q(t, x)). \end{aligned} \quad (232)$$

Therefore, we only have to modify  $R^{\operatorname{lin}}$  in (153a) slightly as

$$\begin{aligned} R^{\operatorname{lin}}(t, x) &\triangleq \sum_{j=1}^d \mathcal{D}^{-1}((\partial_t a_j(t, x)) \Theta^j(t, x) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\partial_t a_j(t, x)) \Theta^j(t, x) dx) \\ & \quad + \theta_0(t, x)w(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x)u_0(t, x + B(t)) - \nabla(\vartheta(t, x) + q(t, x)) \end{aligned} \quad (233)$$

and define  $R^{\operatorname{time},2}$  identically to (153b) although with  $a_j$  and  $b_j$  from (210) rather than (106). These definitions allow (154a) with  $u_0(t, x)$  replaced by  $u_0(t, x + B(t))$  and (154b) to continue to hold. By analogous computations to Lemma 4.7 we can prove the following estimates; considering the case  $t \in (\frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T, \Sigma \wedge T]$  on which we will work next, we prove this result for all  $t \in [0, T]$ .

**Lemma 6.5.** (Cf. Lemma 4.7)  $R^{\operatorname{lin}}$  defined identically to (233) and  $R^{\operatorname{time},2}$  identically to (153b) with  $a_j$  and  $b_j$  from (210) satisfy for all  $t \in [0, T]$

$$\|R^{\operatorname{lin}}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \ll \delta \quad \text{and} \quad \|R^{\operatorname{time},2}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \ll \delta. \quad (234)$$

*Proof of Lemma 6.5.* The estimate on  $\|R^{\operatorname{lin}}(t)\|_{L_x^1}$  follows from

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^d \mathcal{D}^{-1}(\partial_t a_j(t, x) \Theta^j(t, x) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\partial_t a_j) \Theta^j(t, x) dx) \right\|_{L_x^1}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
(51) \quad & \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^d \|\partial_t a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|\Theta^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(99b)(171)}{\ll} \delta, \\
& \|\theta_0(t, x)w(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x)u_0(t, x + B(t))\|_{L_x^1} \\
(212)(99b) \quad & \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^d \|\theta_0(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \left(\frac{M}{\mu^a}\right) + \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \left(\frac{M}{\mu^b}\right) \|u_0(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \stackrel{(171)}{\ll} \delta, \\
\|\nabla(\vartheta + q)(t)\|_{L_x^1} \quad & \stackrel{(212)}{=} \|\nabla(\sum_{j=1}^d a_j(t)\Theta^j(t) + \sum_{j=1}^d a_j(t)b_j(t)Q^j(t))\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(99b)(64)(171)}{\ll} \delta,
\end{aligned}$$

for  $\iota > 0$  sufficiently small and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large. Moreover, the estimate of  $\|R^{\text{time},2}(t)\|_{L_x^1}$  follows the proof of (155b) and (183).  $\square$

Third, similarly to Section 4.1.3 we work on the estimates on  $\text{div}(q(t, x)(u_0(t, x + B(t)) + w(t, x)) = \text{div}R^q(t, x)$  of (223). We define  $R^q$  similarly to (160) with the only difference being that we replace  $u_0(t, x)$  therein by  $u_0(t, x + B(t))$ :

$$R^q(t, x) \triangleq q(t, x)(u_0(t, x + B(t)) + w(t, x)). \quad (235)$$

We can estimate for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large and  $\iota > 0$  sufficiently small

$$\|R^q(t)\|_{L_x^1} \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^d \|a_j(t)b_j(t)Q^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} (\|u_0(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \sum_{k=1}^d \|b_k(t)W^k(t)\|_{L_x^\infty}) \ll \delta \quad \forall t \in [0, T] \quad (236)$$

via (212), (99), and (171); considering the case  $t \in (\frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T, \Sigma \wedge T]$  on which we will work subsequently, we stated this result for all  $t \in [0, T]$ .

Fourth, similarly to Section 4.1.4 we work on the estimates on  $\text{div}([\theta_0(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x) + q(t, x)]w_c(t, x)) = \text{div}R^{\text{corr}}(t, x)$  of (223). We can define  $R^{\text{corr}}$  identically to (163) but with no  $z$ , and we can estimate it for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large and  $\iota > 0$  sufficiently small

$$\|R^{\text{corr}}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq (\|\theta_0(t)\|_{L_x^p} + \|\vartheta(t)\|_{L_x^p} + \|q(t)\|_{L_x^p}) \|w_c(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \stackrel{(171)}{\ll} \delta \quad \forall t \in [0, T]; \quad (237)$$

again, we stated this result over  $[0, T]$  for the convenience when we work on the case  $t \in (\frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T, \Sigma \wedge T]$  next.

Fifth, similarly to Section 4.1.6 we work on the estimates of  $\text{div}(R_I(t, x) - R_0(t, x)) = \text{div}R^{\text{moll}}(t, x)$  of (223). We define  $R^{\text{moll}}$  identically to (169) for which the estimate from (170) applies here directly to prove that

$$\|R^{\text{moll}}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \ll \delta \quad \forall t \in [0, T]; \quad (238)$$

considering the case  $t \in (\frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T, \Sigma \wedge T]$  on which we will work subsequently we stated this estimate for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Considering (231a), (231b), (234), (236), (237), and (238) in (224), we conclude (205) on  $(\Sigma \wedge T, T]$ :  $\|R_1(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \delta$ .

Next, we prove (205) for  $t \in (\frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T, \Sigma \wedge T]$ . If  $T \leq \frac{\Sigma}{2}$ , then there is nothing to prove. Thus, we consider  $\frac{\Sigma}{2} < T$  and thus  $t \in (\frac{\Sigma}{2}, \Sigma \wedge T]$ . We see from (197), (207), and (208) that

$$\begin{aligned}
-\text{div}R_1(t, x) &= \underbrace{\tilde{\chi}(t)^2 [\partial_t(q(t, x) + q_c(t)) + \text{div}(\vartheta(t, x)w(t, x) - R_I(t, x))]}_{(\text{div}R^{\text{time},1} + \text{div}R^{\text{quadr}} + \text{div}R^\chi)(t, x)} \\
&+ \underbrace{\tilde{\chi}(t) [\partial_t(\vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t)) + \text{div}(\theta_0(t, x)w(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x)u_0(t, x + B(t)))]}_{(\text{div}R^{\text{time},2} + \text{div}R^{\text{lin}})(t, x)} \\
&\quad \underbrace{-\Delta(\vartheta(t, x) + \tilde{\chi}(t)q(t, x))}_{(\text{div}R^{\text{time},2} + \text{div}R^{\text{lin}})(t, x) \text{ continued}} \\
&+ \underbrace{\tilde{\chi}(t)^2 \text{div}(q(t, x)(u_0(t, x + B(t)) + \tilde{\chi}(t)w(t, x)))}_{\text{div}R^q(t, x)} \\
&+ \underbrace{\tilde{\chi}(t) \text{div}([\theta_0(t, x) + \tilde{\chi}(t)\vartheta(t, x) + \tilde{\chi}(t)^2 q(t, x)]w_c(t, x))}_{\text{div}R^{\text{corr}}(t, x)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (\tilde{\chi}(t)^2 - 1)\operatorname{div}R_l(t, x) + \underbrace{\operatorname{div}(R_l - R_0)(t, x)}_{\operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{moll}}(t, x)} \\
& + \underbrace{\partial_i \tilde{\chi}(t)(\vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t)) + \partial_i \tilde{\chi}(t)^2(q(t, x) + q_c(t))}_{\operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{cutoff}}(t, x)}
\end{aligned} \tag{239}$$

and therefore

$$-R_1 \triangleq R^{\operatorname{time},1} + R^{\operatorname{quadr}} + R^\chi + R^{\operatorname{time},2} + R^{\operatorname{lin}} + R^q + R^{\operatorname{corr}} + (\tilde{\chi}^2 - 1)R_l + R^{\operatorname{moll}} + R^{\operatorname{cutoff}}. \tag{240}$$

First, concerning  $\tilde{\chi}(t)^2[\partial_t(q(t, x) + q_c(t)) + \operatorname{div}(\vartheta(t, x)w(t, x) - R_l(t, x))] = (\operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{time},1} + \operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{quadr}} + \operatorname{div}R^\chi)(t, x)$  in (239), it suffices to take the same  $R^\chi$  in (226),  $R^{\operatorname{time},1}$  from (143) with  $a_j$  and  $b_j$  in (210), and  $R^{\operatorname{quadr}}$  with  $R^{\operatorname{quadr},1}$  and  $R^{\operatorname{quadr},2}$  identically to (145)-(146) with  $a_j, b_j$  replaced by those from (210), and multiply them all by  $\tilde{\chi}(t)^2$ . Because  $\tilde{\chi}(t) \in [0, 1]$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$  by (209), the estimates from (231a) and (231b) from Lemma 6.4 remain valid.

Second, concerning  $\tilde{\chi}(t)[\partial_t(\vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t)) + \operatorname{div}(\theta_0(t, x)w(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x)u_0(t, x + B(t))) - \Delta(\vartheta(t, x) + \tilde{\chi}(t)q(t, x))] = (\operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{time},2} + \operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{lin}})(t, x)$  in (239), we can modify (233) and (153b) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
R^{\operatorname{lin}}(t, x) & \triangleq \tilde{\chi}(t) \left[ \sum_{j=1}^d \mathcal{D}^{-1}(\partial_t a_j(t, x)) \Theta^j(t, x) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\partial_t a_j(t, x)) \Theta^j(t, x) dx \right. \\
& \left. + \theta_0(t, x)w(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x)u_0(t, x + B(t)) - \nabla(\vartheta(t, x) + \tilde{\chi}(t)q(t, x)) \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{241a}$$

$$R^{\operatorname{time},2}(t, x) \triangleq \tilde{\chi}(t) \left[ -\lambda \omega \sum_{j=1}^d \mathcal{R}_N(a_j(t, x)) (\partial_t \varrho_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega e_j}(x), \psi_\nu^j(x) \right]. \tag{241b}$$

Because  $\tilde{\chi}(t) \in [0, 1]$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$  by (209), it is clear that same estimates in (234) from Lemma 6.5 continue to hold for  $R^{\operatorname{lin}}$  and  $R^{\operatorname{time},2}$  in (241).

Third, concerning  $\tilde{\chi}(t)^2 \operatorname{div}(q(t, x)(u_0(t, x + B(t)) + \tilde{\chi}(t)w(t, x))) = \operatorname{div}R^q(t, x)$  in (239), it suffices to define

$$R^q(t, x) \triangleq \tilde{\chi}(t)^2 q(t, x)(u_0(t, x + B(t)) + \tilde{\chi}(t)w(t, x))$$

for which the same estimate in (236) clearly goes through considering that  $\tilde{\chi}(t) \in [0, 1]$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$  by (209).

Fourth, concerning  $\tilde{\chi}(t) \operatorname{div}([\theta_0(t, x) + \tilde{\chi}(t)\vartheta(t, x) + \tilde{\chi}(t)^2 q(t, x)]w_c(t, x)) = \operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{corr}}(t, x)$  in (239), we define

$$R^{\operatorname{corr}}(t, x) \triangleq \tilde{\chi}(t) [\theta_0(t, x) + \tilde{\chi}(t)\vartheta(t, x) + \tilde{\chi}(t)^2 q(t, x)]w_c(t, x) \tag{242}$$

for which the same estimate in (237) applies because  $\tilde{\chi}(t) \in [0, 1]$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$  by (209).

Fifth, concerning  $(\tilde{\chi}(t)^2 - 1)\operatorname{div}R_l(t, x)$  in (239), via (209) and Young's inequality for convolution we bound for all  $t \in (\frac{\Sigma}{2}, \Sigma \wedge T]$

$$\|(\tilde{\chi}(t)^2 - 1)R_l(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0(\tau)\|_{L_x^1}. \tag{243}$$

Sixth, concerning  $\operatorname{div}(R_l - R_0)(t, x) = \operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{moll}}(t, x)$  in (239), we define  $R^{\operatorname{moll}}$  identically to (169), the same estimate in (238) applies.

Finally, concerning  $\partial_i \tilde{\chi}(t)(\vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t)) + \partial_i \tilde{\chi}(t)^2(q(t, x) + q_c(t)) = \operatorname{div}R^{\operatorname{cutoff}}(t, x)$  in (239), we define

$$R^{\operatorname{cutoff}}(t, x) \triangleq \mathcal{D}^{-1}(\partial_i \tilde{\chi}(t)(\vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t)) + \partial_i \tilde{\chi}(t)^2[q(t, x) + q_c(t)]) \tag{244}$$

and separately estimate  $L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ -norms of  $\mathcal{D}^{-1}(\partial_i \tilde{\chi}(t)(\vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t)))$  and  $\mathcal{D}^{-1}(\partial_i \tilde{\chi}(t)^2[q(t, x) + q_c(t)])$ , both of which are well-defined because  $\vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t)$  and  $q(t, x) + q_c(t)$  are mean-zero due to (110). First, for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathcal{D}^{-1}(\partial_i \tilde{\chi}(t)(\vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t)))\|_{L_x^1} \\
& \stackrel{(51)}{\lesssim} \Sigma^{-1} \|\vartheta(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(212)(99)(171)}{\lesssim} \Sigma^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d (\lambda^{(d+1)\iota} \sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0^j(\tau)\|_{L_x^1} + \Gamma)^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda^{-ab} \ll \delta
\end{aligned} \tag{245}$$

because  $\iota < \frac{pab}{d+1}$  due to (185). Second, for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large

$$\|\mathcal{D}^{-1}(\partial_i \tilde{\chi}(t)^2[q(t, x) + q_c(t)])\|_{L_x^1} \tag{246}$$

$$(51) \lesssim \Sigma^{-1} \|q(t)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(212)(99)(171)}{\lesssim} \Sigma^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d (\lambda^{(d+1)\iota} \sup_{\tau \in [t-\iota, t]} \|R_0^j(\tau)\|_{L_x^1} + \Gamma) \lambda^{-\beta} \ll \delta$$

because  $\iota < \frac{\beta}{d+1}$  due to (185). Considering (245) and (246) in (244) gives us

$$\|R^{\text{cutoff}}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \ll \delta. \quad (247)$$

Applying these estimates (231), (234), (236), (237), (243), (238), and (247) to (240) allows us to conclude (205) for  $t \in (\frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T, \Sigma \wedge T]$ .

Finally, on  $[0, \frac{\Sigma}{2} \wedge T]$ ,  $t \leq \frac{\Sigma}{2}$  and thus  $\tilde{\chi}(t) = 0$  by (209). Therefore,  $\theta_1 \equiv \theta_0$  and  $u_1 \equiv u_0$  due to (207) so that  $R_1 \equiv R_0$ ; hence, (205) for this range of  $t$  is trivially satisfied.

Lastly, we prove (206). We have  $t \in (4\Sigma \wedge T, T]$ . If  $T \leq 4\Sigma$ , then there is nothing to prove; thus, we assume that  $4\Sigma < T$  so that  $t \in (4\Sigma, T]$ . Therefore,  $t > 4\Sigma$  so that  $\tilde{\chi}(t) = 1$  by (209). Moreover, as  $4\Sigma < T$ , we have  $[2\Sigma \wedge T, T] = [2\Sigma, T]$ . We also note that (199) is applicable here. Let us compute using (207)-(208)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta_1(t, x) u_1(t, x + B(t)) dx - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta_0(t, x) u_0(t, x + B(t)) dx - \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \chi_j^2(t, x) dx \Gamma e_j \right| \\ & \leq \mathfrak{A}(t) + \mathfrak{B}(t) + \mathfrak{C}(t) + \mathfrak{D}(t) + \mathfrak{E}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (248)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{A}(t) \triangleq \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \vartheta(t, x) w(t, x) - \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j^2(t, x) e_j \Gamma dx \right|, \quad (249a)$$

$$\mathfrak{B}(t) \triangleq \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\theta_0 w)(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x) u_0(t, x + B(t)) dx \right|, \quad (249b)$$

$$\mathfrak{C}(t) \triangleq \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} q(t, x) (u_0(t, x + B(t)) + w(t, x)) dx \right|, \quad (249c)$$

$$\mathfrak{D}(t) \triangleq \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\theta_0 + \vartheta + q)(t, x) w_c(t, x) dx \right|, \quad (249d)$$

$$\mathfrak{E}(t) \triangleq \left| (\vartheta_c + q_c)(t) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u_0(t, x + B(t)) + w(t, x) + w_c(t, x) dx \right|. \quad (249e)$$

When defining a new defect  $R_1$  (e.g., (239)), the last term  $\mathfrak{E}(t)$  typically vanishes because  $\text{div}((\vartheta_c(t) + q_c(t))(u_0(t, x + B(t)) + w(t, x) + w_c(t, x))) = 0$  but not here; hence, we need to estimate this term as well. Now the most difficult term in (249) is  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Importantly, we furthermore split it from (249a) by relying on an orthogonality relation (100) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{A}(t) & \stackrel{(212)(100)}{=} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{j=1}^d a_j(t, x) b_j(t, x) \Theta^j(t, x) W^j(t, x) - \chi_j^2(t, x) e_j \Gamma dx \right| \\ & \stackrel{(211)}{=} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j^2(t, x) (R_l^j(t, x) + \Gamma) \Theta^j(t, x) W^j(t, x) - \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j^2(t, x) \Gamma e_j dx \right| \\ & = \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j^2(t, x) R_l^j(t, x) [\Theta^j(t, x) W^j(t, x) - e_j] + \chi_j^2(t, x) R_l^j(t, x) e_j \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \chi_j^2(t, x) \Gamma [\Theta^j(t, x) W^j(t, x) - e_j] dx \right| \stackrel{(71)}{\leq} \mathfrak{A}_1(t) + \mathfrak{A}_2(t) + \mathfrak{A}_3(t) \end{aligned} \quad (250)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{A}_1(t) \triangleq \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j^2(t, x) R_l^j(t, x) [(\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j} (\psi_\nu^j)^2 e_j - e_j] dx \right|, \quad (251a)$$

$$\mathfrak{A}_2(t) \triangleq \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j^2(t, x) R_l^j(t, x) e_j dx \right|, \quad (251b)$$

$$\mathfrak{A}_3(t) \triangleq \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j^2(t, x) [(\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j} (\psi_v^j)^2 e_j - e_j] dx \Gamma \right|. \quad (251c)$$

**Remark 6.5.** Subtracting and adding terms in (251) is crucial. Indeed, estimating e.g.  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} R_l^j(t, x) \Theta^j(t, x) W^j(t, x) dx$  by simply  $\|R_l^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \|\Theta^j(t) W^j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty}$  in hope to make use of (199) on  $\|R_l^j(t)\|_{L_x^1}$  will not work because  $\|\Theta^j W^j\|_{L_x^\infty} \stackrel{(71)}{=} \omega \|Q^j\|_{L_x^\infty}$  and this is too large (see e.g.,  $\|Q^j(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \frac{M\mu^p}{\omega}$  in (99a)). Within (251a) and (251c) we will further split

$$(\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j} (\psi_v^j)^2 - 1 = (\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j} ((\psi^j)^2 - 1)_v + (\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j - 1)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j} \quad (252)$$

identically to the derivation of (142) and take advantage of the mean-zero property of  $(\psi^j)^2 - 1$  and  $(\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j - 1) \circ \tau_{\lambda \omega t e_j}$  due to (69) and (65) so that we can employ (46), which was never used in [47]. On the other hand, we can handle  $\mathfrak{A}_2$  in (251b) by (199).

Using (252) we further split

$$\mathfrak{A}_1(t) \leq \mathfrak{A}_{1,1}(t) + \mathfrak{A}_{1,2}(t) \quad (253)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{A}_{1,1}(t) \triangleq \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j^2(t, x) R_l^j(t, x) (\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j} ((\psi^j)^2 - 1)_v e_j dx \right|, \quad (254a)$$

$$\mathfrak{A}_{1,2}(t) \triangleq \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j^2(t, x) R_l^j(t, x) (\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j - 1)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j} e_j dx \right| \quad (254b)$$

similarly to (146). Now we estimate using that  $(\psi^j)^2 - 1$  is mean-zero due to (69) and  $W^{d+1,1}(\mathbb{T}^d) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ , for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{A}_{1,1}(t) &\stackrel{(46)}{\lesssim} \sum_{j=1}^d \nu^{-1} \|\nabla(\chi_j^2(t, x) R_l^j(t, x) (\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j})\|_{L_x^1} \|(\psi^j)^2 - 1\|_{L_x^\infty} \\ &\stackrel{(44)(63)}{\lesssim} \nu^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d [\|R_l^j(t)\|_{W_x^{d+1,1}} \|\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{L^1} + \|R_l^j(t)\|_{W_x^{d+2,1}} \|\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{L^1} + \|R_l^j(t)\|_{W_x^{d+1,1}} \lambda \|\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{W^{1,1}}] \\ &\stackrel{(64)(60)(199)}{\lesssim} \nu^{-1} \delta l^{-d-1} (l^{-1} + \lambda \mu) \stackrel{(171)}{\approx} \lambda^{-\gamma} \delta \lambda^{(d+1)\iota} (\lambda^\iota + \lambda^{1+\alpha}) \ll \delta \end{aligned} \quad (255)$$

because  $\iota \stackrel{(173)}{<} \frac{\gamma-1-\alpha}{3d+5} < \frac{\gamma-1-\alpha}{d+1}$ . Next, we estimate  $\mathfrak{A}_{1,2}$  from (254b) using  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j - 1 dx = 0$  from (62b) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{A}_{1,2}(t) &\stackrel{(46)}{\lesssim} \lambda^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d \|\nabla(\chi_j^2(t, x) R_l^j(t, x))\|_{L_x^\infty} \|(\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j - 1) \circ \tau_{\lambda \omega t e_j}\|_{L_x^1} \\ &\stackrel{(63)}{\lesssim} \lambda^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d \|R_l^j(t)\|_{W_x^{d+2,1}} (\|\varrho_\mu^j\|_{L^2} \|\tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{L^2} + 1) \stackrel{(64)(199)}{\lesssim} \lambda^{-1} \lambda^{(d+2)\iota} \delta \ll \delta \end{aligned} \quad (256)$$

as  $\iota \stackrel{(173)}{<} \frac{1}{3d+5} < \frac{1}{d+2}$ . Second, we estimate

$$\mathfrak{A}_2(t) \stackrel{(251b)(200)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |R_l^j(t, x)| dx \leq d \sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0(\tau)\|_{L_x^1} \stackrel{(199)}{\leq} 2d\delta. \quad (257)$$

Similarly to  $\mathfrak{A}_1$ , we make use of (252) and split  $\mathfrak{A}_3$  from (251c) by

$$\mathfrak{A}_3(t) \leq \mathfrak{A}_{3,1}(t) + \mathfrak{A}_{3,2}(t) \quad (258)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{A}_{3,1}(t) \triangleq \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j^2(t, x) \Gamma (\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j} ((\psi^j)^2 - 1)_v e_j dx \right|, \quad (259a)$$

$$\mathfrak{A}_{3,2}(t) \triangleq \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j^2(t, x) \Gamma(\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j - 1)_{\lambda} \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j} e_j dx \right| \quad (259b)$$

and estimate for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{A}_{3,1}(t) &\stackrel{(46)}{\lesssim} \Gamma \sum_{j=1}^d \nu^{-1} \|\nabla(\chi_j^2(t, x)(\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j)_{\lambda} \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j})\|_{L_x^1} \|(\psi^j)^2 - 1\|_{L_x^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \Gamma \nu^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d \|\varrho_\mu^j\|_{L^2} \|\tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{L^2} + \lambda(\|\varrho_\mu^j\|_{W^{1,2}} \|\tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{L^2} + \|\varrho_\mu^j\|_{L^2} \|\tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j\|_{W^{1,2}}) \stackrel{(64)}{\lesssim} \Gamma \lambda^{-\gamma} [1 + \lambda^{1+\alpha}] \stackrel{(171b)}{\ll} \delta \end{aligned} \quad (260)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{A}_{3,2}(t) &\stackrel{(46)}{\lesssim} \Gamma \lambda^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d \|\nabla \chi_j^2(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|(\varrho_\mu^j \tilde{\varrho}_\mu^j - 1) \circ \tau_{\lambda \omega t e_j}\|_{L_x^1} \\ &\stackrel{(64)}{\lesssim} \Gamma \lambda^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d (\mu^{a-\frac{d}{2}} \|\varrho\|_{L^2} \mu^{b-\frac{d}{2}} \|\varrho\|_{L^2} + 1) \stackrel{(60)}{\approx} \Gamma \lambda^{-1} \ll \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (261)$$

Applying (255) and (256) to (253) for  $\mathfrak{A}_1$ , as well as (260) and (261) to (258) for  $\mathfrak{A}_3$ , and considering (257) imply that for all  $t \in (4\Sigma, T]$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large

$$\mathfrak{A}(t) \stackrel{(250)}{\leq} \mathfrak{A}_1(t) + \mathfrak{A}_2(t) + \mathfrak{A}_3(t) \leq \delta d \left(\frac{5}{2}\right). \quad (262)$$

Next, utilizing (218a) we can estimate  $\mathfrak{B}$  from (249b) similarly to (157) by taking  $\iota > 0$  sufficiently small so that

$$\iota < \min\left\{\frac{\alpha a p'}{d+1}, \frac{\alpha b p}{d+1}\right\} \quad (263)$$

and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large, for all  $t \in (4\Sigma, T]$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{B}(t) &\stackrel{(212)}{\lesssim} \sum_{j=1}^d \|\theta_0(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|W^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} + \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|\Theta^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} \|u_0(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \\ &\stackrel{(218a)(99b)}{\lesssim} \|\theta_0(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lambda^{\left(\frac{d+1}{p'}\right)\iota} \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} \lambda^{-\alpha a} + \lambda^{\left(\frac{d+1}{p'}\right)\iota} \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} \lambda^{-\alpha b} \|u_0(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \stackrel{(171c)}{\ll} \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (264)$$

Next, similarly to (161) we can estimate  $\mathfrak{C}$  from (249c) for all  $t \in (4\Sigma, T]$  by taking  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large and  $\iota < \frac{\beta - \alpha b}{(d+1)(1+\frac{1}{p'})}$  (which is possible thanks to (171c))

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{C}(t) &\stackrel{(211)(212)}{\lesssim} \sum_{j=1}^d (\|R_l^j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \Gamma) \|Q^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} (\|u_0(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \sum_{k=1}^d \|b_k(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|W^k(t)\|_{L_x^\infty}) \\ &\stackrel{(199)}{\lesssim} (\lambda^{(d+1)\iota} \delta + \Gamma) \lambda^{-\beta} (\|u_0(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \lambda^{(d+1)\iota} \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} \lambda^{\alpha b}) \stackrel{(171c)}{\ll} \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (265)$$

Next, similarly to (164) we can rely on the proofs of (219a)-(219b) and estimate  $\mathfrak{D}$  from (249d) for all  $t \in (4\Sigma, T]$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{D}(t) &\stackrel{(219a)(219b)(221a)}{\lesssim} (\|\theta_0(t)\|_{L_x^p} + M[(2\delta)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \Gamma^{\frac{1}{p}}] + \lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}} \Gamma^{-d-2} + \Gamma^{-d-1} \delta \mu^b \omega^{-1}) \\ &\quad \times \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \frac{\lambda \mu t^{-d-2}}{\nu} \right)^k + \frac{(\lambda \mu t^{-d-2})^{N+1}}{\nu^N} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(171)}{\approx} (\|\theta_0(t)\|_{L_x^p} + [2\delta + \Gamma]^{\frac{1}{p}} + \lambda^{-\frac{1}{p} + (d+2)\iota} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}} + \lambda^{(d+1)\iota} \delta \lambda^{\alpha b - \beta}) \\ &\quad \times \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda^{(1+\alpha+(d+2)\iota-\gamma)k} + \lambda^{(1+\alpha+(d+2)\iota)(N+1)-\gamma N} \right] \ll \delta \end{aligned} \quad (266)$$

due to (173) which guarantees

$$\iota < \min\left\{\frac{1}{p(d+2)}, \frac{\beta - \alpha b}{d+1}, \frac{\gamma - 1 - \alpha}{d+2}, \frac{1}{d+2}\left(\frac{\gamma N}{N+1} - 1 - \alpha\right)\right\}.$$

At last, we estimate  $\mathfrak{C}$  from (249e) as follows. Using (211), (221a), (99b), (263), and (172)-(173) that implies

$$\iota < \min\left\{\frac{p\alpha b}{d+1}, \frac{\gamma - 1 - \alpha}{d+2}, \frac{1}{d+2}\left[\frac{\gamma N}{N+1} - 1 - \alpha\right]\right\},$$

as well as  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large

$$\mathfrak{C}(t) \leq (\|\vartheta(t)\|_{L_x^1} + \|q(t)\|_{L_x^1})(\|u_0(t, x + B(t))\|_{L_x^1} + \|w(t)\|_{L_x^1} + \|w_c(t)\|_{L_x^1}) \quad (267)$$

$$\stackrel{(212)}{\lesssim} \left(\left\|\sum_{j=1}^d (a_j \Theta^j)(t)\right\|_{L_x^1} + \left\|\sum_{j=1}^d (a_j b_j Q^j)(t)\right\|_{L_x^1}\right)(\|u_0(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} + \left\|\sum_{j=1}^d (b_j W^j)(t)\right\|_{L_x^1} + \|w_c(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}})$$

$$\stackrel{(218a)}{\lesssim} \left(\lambda^{-\frac{d+1}{p}} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\frac{M}{\mu^b}\right) + \left(\sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0^j(\tau)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \Gamma\right) \left(\frac{M}{\omega}\right)\right)$$

$$\times (\|u_0(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} + \lambda^{-\frac{d+1}{p'}} \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} \frac{M}{\mu^a} + \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left[\sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{\lambda \mu t^{-d-2}}{\nu}\right)^k + \frac{(\lambda \mu t^{-d-2})^{N+1}}{\nu^N}\right])$$

$$\stackrel{(171)}{\approx} \left(\lambda^{\left(\frac{d+1}{p}\right)\iota - \alpha b} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\sup_{\tau \in [t-l, t]} \|R_0^j(\tau)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \Gamma\right) \lambda^{-\beta}\right)$$

$$\times (\|u_0(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} + \lambda^{\left(\frac{d+1}{p}\right)\iota - \alpha a} + \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left[\sum_{k=1}^N (\lambda^{1+\alpha+(d+2)\iota-\gamma} k + \lambda^{[1+\alpha+(d+2)\iota](N+1)-\gamma N})\right]) \ll \delta.$$

Considering (262), (264), (265), (266), and (267) into (248), we finally conclude (206):

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta_1(t, x) u_1(t, x + B(t)) dx - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta_0(t, x) u_0(t, x + B(t)) dx - \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \chi_j^2(t, x) dx e_j \Gamma \right|$$

$$\leq (\mathfrak{A} + \mathfrak{B} + \mathfrak{C} + \mathfrak{D} + \mathfrak{E})(t) \leq \delta 3d.$$

The facts that  $(\theta_1, u_1, R_1)$  are  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted and has regularity listed in (198) can be shown identically to the proof of Proposition 4.2. Finally, it is clear that  $\tilde{\chi}(0) = 0$  from (209) implies

$$\theta_1(0, x) \stackrel{(207)}{=} \theta_0(0, x) = \theta^{\text{in}}(x), \quad u_1(0, x) \stackrel{(207)}{=} u_0(0, x) = u^{\text{in}}(x). \quad (268)$$

□

With Proposition 6.1 in hand, we are ready to prove Theorem 2.5.

*Proof of Theorem 2.5.* We take  $\theta_0 \equiv 0, u_0 \equiv 0$  and  $R_0 \equiv 0$  so that the hypothesis of Proposition 6.1 with  $\theta^{\text{in}} \equiv 0, u^{\text{in}} \equiv 0$  are all trivially satisfied. For the fixed  $\xi \in (0, T)$  from the hypothesis of Theorem 2.5, we can take e.g.,

$$\delta_n \triangleq 2^{-n}, \quad \Sigma_n \triangleq \frac{\xi}{4} 2^{-n}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_n \triangleq \begin{cases} 2\delta_n & \text{if } n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{3\}, \\ K \gg 1 & \text{if } n = 3. \end{cases} \quad (269)$$

Note that this choice satisfies “ $\frac{\xi}{\delta} \leq \bar{C} < \infty$ ” from the hypothesis of Proposition 6.1. Then clearly  $\Sigma_n \searrow 0$  as  $n \nearrow +\infty$  so that for any  $t \in (0, T]$ , there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large such that  $N \geq 4$  and  $4\Sigma_n \leq t$  for all  $n \geq N$  so that  $t \in (4\Sigma_n \wedge T, T]$ . Due to (201) and (203) this implies

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)(t)\|_{L_x^p} \stackrel{(269)}{\leq} \sum_{n=0}^N \|(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)(t)\|_{L_x^p} + 4^{\frac{1}{p}} M \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} 2^{-\frac{n}{p}} < \infty \quad (270)$$

and

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \stackrel{(269)}{\leq} \sum_{n=0}^N \|(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} + 4^{\frac{1}{p'}} M \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} 2^{-\frac{n}{p'}} < \infty. \quad (271)$$

On the other hand, for any  $t \in [0, T]$ , we deduce immediately from (202) and (204) that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)(t)\|_{L^v_x} \stackrel{(269)}{\leq} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-n} < \infty, \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)(t)\|_{W^{1,\tilde{p}}_x} \stackrel{(269)}{\leq} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-n} < \infty. \quad (272)$$

Therefore,  $\{\theta_n(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  and  $\{u_n(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  are Cauchy respectively in  $C((0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C([0, T]; L^v(\mathbb{T}^d))$  and  $C((0, T]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C([0, T]; W^{1,\tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d))$  so that there exists unique  $(\theta, u)$  in  $[C((0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C([0, T]; L^v(\mathbb{T}^d))] \times [C((0, T]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C([0, T]; W^{1,\tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d))]$  and a deterministic constant  $C$  such that

$$\|\theta\|_{C((0,T];L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))} + \|\theta\|_{C([0,T];L^v(\mathbb{T}^d))} + \|u\|_{C((0,T];L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d))} + \|u\|_{C([0,T];W^{1,\tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d))} \leq C < \infty. \quad (273)$$

Moreover, because  $(\theta_0, u_0, R_0)$  are  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted, so are  $(\theta_n, u_n, R_n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  by Proposition 6.1; consequently, so are  $(\theta, u)$ . Next, for all  $t \in (0, T]$ , because  $\Sigma_n = \frac{\xi}{4} 2^{-n} \searrow 0$  as  $n \nearrow \infty$ , we see that there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large that  $2\Sigma_n \wedge T \leq t$  for all  $n \geq N$  and therefore  $\|R_n(t)\|_{L^1_x} \leq 2\delta_n = 2^{1-n} \searrow 0$  as  $n \nearrow +\infty$  due to (199). Moreover, from (202) and (204) we deduce that  $(\theta, u)|_{t=0} \equiv 0$  because  $(\theta_0, u_0)|_{t=0} \equiv 0$ . We can now deduce that  $(\rho, u)$  where  $\rho(t, x) = \theta(t, x - B(t))$  from Section 2 satisfies (8) forced by transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation analytically weakly as follows; i.e., (37). Because  $(\theta_n, u_n, R_n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy (197) strongly (recall (198)), we may take an arbitrary  $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$  and deduce from (197)

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s \theta_n(s, x) \psi(x + B(s)) + \operatorname{div}(u_n(s, x + B(s)) \theta_n(s, x)) \psi(x + B(s)) \\ - \Delta \theta_n(s, x) \psi(x + B(s)) = -\operatorname{div} R_n(s, x) \psi(x + B(s)). \end{aligned}$$

We may integrate over  $[0, t] \times \mathbb{T}^d$  for any  $t \in [0, T]$ , integrate by parts considering the smoothness of both  $(\theta_n, u_n, R_n)$  and  $\psi$ , pass the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$  considering the convergence results we have obtained already, apply Itô-Wentzell-Kunita formula (e.g., [44, Theorem 3.3.2 on p. 93], also [42, 43]) on  $\int \theta(t, x) \psi(x + y) dx$  which is smooth, and translate  $x + B(t) = y$  to deduce the claim. At last, to prove non-uniqueness in law of (8) forced by transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation, we rely on (206). First, we denote the  $n$ -th repetition of the cut-off function  $\chi_j$  in (200) by

$$\chi_{n,j} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto [0, 1] \text{ such that } \chi_{n,j}(t, x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |R_{n,l}^j(t, x) + \Gamma_n| \leq \frac{\delta_n}{4d}, \\ 1 & \text{if } |R_{n,l}^j(t, x) + \Gamma_n| \geq \frac{\delta_n}{2d}, \end{cases} \quad (274)$$

where  $R_{n,l}$  is  $R_n$  that is mollified in space-time. It is easy to see that due to our choice of parameters from (269), for any  $t \in (4\Sigma_n \wedge T, T]$ ,  $\sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \chi_{n,j}^2(t, x) dx e_j \equiv 0$  is impossible. Now  $\xi < T$  by hypothesis of Theorem 2.5 while  $4\Sigma_0 \wedge T = \xi \wedge T$  by (269); thus,  $(4\Sigma_0 \wedge T, T] = (\xi, T]$ . For such  $t \in (4\Sigma_0 \wedge T, T] = (\xi, T]$ , using our choice of  $(\theta_0, u_0) \equiv 0$ , we can find a finite constant  $\tilde{C}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u(t, x + B(t)) \theta(t, x) dx - \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \chi_{3,j}^2(t, x) dx e_j K \right| \\ & \stackrel{(269)(274)}{\leq} \left| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u_{n+1}(t, x + B(t)) \theta_{n+1}(t, x) - u_n(t, x + B(t)) \theta_n(t, x) - \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_{n,j}^2(t, x) e_j \Gamma_n dx \right| \\ & \quad + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0: n \neq 3} d \Gamma_n \stackrel{(206)(269)}{\leq} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \delta_n 3d + d \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0: n \neq 3} 2(2^{-n}) = \tilde{C}. \end{aligned} \quad (275)$$

We take two distinct  $K, K' \gg 1$  such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \chi_{3,j}(t, x)^2 dx e_j |K - K'| > 2\tilde{C}. \quad (276)$$

For such  $K, K'$ , we can get a corresponding  $(\theta^K, u^K)$  and  $(\theta^{K'}, u^{K'})$  so that for  $t \in (4\Sigma_0 \wedge T, T] = (\xi, T]$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u^K(t, x + B(t)) \theta^K(t, x) dx - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u^{K'}(t, x + B(t)) \theta^{K'}(t, x) dx \right| \\ & \geq \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \chi_{3,j}^2(t, x) dx e_j |K - K'| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u^K(t, x + B(t)) \theta^K(t, x) dx - \left( \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \chi_{3,j}^2(t, x) dx e_j \right) K \right| \\
& - \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u^{K'}(t, x + B(t)) \theta^{K'}(t, x) dx - \left( \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \chi_{3,j}^2(t, x) dx e_j \right) K' \right| \stackrel{(276)(275)}{>} 0. \tag{277}
\end{aligned}$$

By a change of variable  $y = x + B(t)$  and  $\theta(t, x) = \rho(t, x + B(t))$ , we deduce that we have constructed at least two pairs  $(\rho^K, u^K)$  and  $(\rho^{K'}, u^{K'})$  that satisfy (8) forced by transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation analytically weakly,  $\rho^K, u^K, \rho^{K'}, u^{K'}$  all vanish at  $t = 0$  and for all  $t \in (4\Sigma_0 \wedge T, T] = (\xi, T]$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u^K(t, y) \rho^K(t, y) dy \neq \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u^{K'}(t, y) \rho^{K'}(t, y) dy \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \tag{278}$$

I.e., (40) has been proven. At last, non-uniqueness in law follows immediately. As (278) implies that one of the integrals is non-zero for some  $t_0 \in (\xi, T]$ , without loss of generality we assume  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u^K(t_0, y) \rho^K(t_0, y) dy \neq 0$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and hence  $\rho^K(t_0) \neq 0$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.; we let  $P$  denote the law of  $\rho^K$ . Next, we take this  $u^K$ , construct an analytically weak solution  $\tilde{\rho}$  to (8) forced by transport noise in Stratonovich's interpretation via Galerkin approximation with same initial data  $\tilde{\rho}|_{t=0} \equiv 0$ , namely  $\tilde{\rho} \equiv 0$ . Therefore, if we denote  $\tilde{P}$  the law of  $\tilde{\rho}$ , then we see that  $P$  and  $\tilde{P}$  are distinct, allowing us to conclude the non-uniqueness in law.  $\square$

## 7. APPENDIX A

**7.1. Proof of Theorem 2.1.** The purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 2.1. In fact, it follows immediately from the following more general result.

**Theorem 7.1.** *Let  $\epsilon > 0, T > 0$ , and  $\bar{\theta} \in C^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d)$  such that  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \bar{\theta}(t, x) dx = 0$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $\bar{u} \in C^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d)$  such that  $\nabla \cdot \bar{u} = 0$  on  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d$ . Set*

$$E \triangleq \{t \in [0, T] : \partial_t \bar{\theta} + \operatorname{div}(\bar{u} \bar{\theta}) + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\theta} - \Delta \bar{\theta} = 0\}. \tag{279}$$

*Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$  and  $\tilde{p} \in (1, \infty)$  such that (14) holds. Then there exist deterministic  $\theta : [0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  and  $u : [0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$  such that*

- (1)  $\theta \in C([0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))$  and  $u \in C([0, T]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C([0, T]; W^{1, \tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ ,
- (2)  $(\theta, u)$  satisfies (11) analytically weakly,
- (3)  $(\theta, u)(t, x) = (\bar{\theta}, \bar{u})(t, x)$  for all  $(t, x) \in E \times \mathbb{T}^d$ ,
- (4)  $\|(\theta - \bar{\theta})(t)\|_{L_x^p} < \epsilon$  or  $\|(u - \bar{u})(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} < \epsilon$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ .

*Proof of Theorem 2.1 assuming Theorem 7.1.* We take  $\Upsilon \in C^\infty([0, T])$  such that

$$\Upsilon(t) \in [0, 1], \quad \Upsilon(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{on } [0, \frac{T}{3}], \\ e^{-\frac{t}{2}} & \text{on } [\frac{2T}{3}, T]. \end{cases} \tag{280}$$

Define

$$\bar{\theta}(x) \triangleq c \left( \frac{1}{2} - x_d \right) \quad \text{for } c \neq 0 \tag{281}$$

so that  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \bar{\theta}(x) dx = 0$ . Then  $\Upsilon(t) \bar{\theta}(x) \in C^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d)$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Upsilon(t) \bar{\theta}(x) dx = 0$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . We take  $\bar{u} \equiv 0$  so that it is smooth and divergence-free. Now  $(\Upsilon \bar{\theta}, \bar{u})$  satisfies

$$\partial_t(\Upsilon \bar{\theta}) + \operatorname{div}(\bar{u} \Upsilon \bar{\theta}) + \frac{1}{2} \Upsilon \bar{\theta} - \Delta(\Upsilon \bar{\theta}) = 0 \tag{282}$$

on  $[0, \frac{T}{3}] \cup [\frac{2T}{3}, T]$ . Consequently,  $[0, \frac{T}{3}] \cup [\frac{2T}{3}, T] \subset E$ . By Theorem 7.1 we find functions  $\theta \in C([0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))$  and  $u \in C([0, T]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C([0, T]; W^{1, \tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d))$  such that  $(\theta, u)$  satisfies (11) analytically weakly and  $(\theta, u)(t) = (\Upsilon \bar{\theta}, \bar{u})(t)$  for all  $t \in E$ . As a result,  $\rho(t, x) = \theta(t, x) e^{B(t)}$  solves (17),  $\rho \in C_t L_x^p$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.,  $\rho(t)|_{t=0} = \Upsilon(0) \bar{\theta} e^0 = 0$  due to (280), and  $\rho(t) = \theta(t) e^{B(t)}$  is  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted. Therefore, given  $B$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , for all  $T > 0$  and  $c \neq 0$ , we constructed  $\rho$  such that  $\rho|_{t=0} \equiv 0$  and  $\rho|_{t=T} = e^{B(T)} e^{-\frac{T}{2}} c (\frac{1}{2} - x_d)$  so that  $\mathbb{P}(\{\rho|_{t=T} \equiv 0\}) = 0$ . Due to an arbitrariness of  $c \neq 0$  in (281) we obtain infinitely many  $(\theta, u)$  and therefore  $(\rho, u)$  that satisfy these properties. Because  $(\tilde{\rho}, B)$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  where  $\tilde{\rho} \equiv 0$  is another analytically weak solution with same initial distribution, we conclude that non-uniqueness in law holds on  $[0, T]$ .  $\square$



The proof of Theorem 7.1 follows from the next proposition concerning the following damped transport-diffusion defect equation

$$\partial_t \theta + \operatorname{div}(u\theta) + \frac{1}{2}\theta - \Delta\theta = -\operatorname{div}R, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0. \quad (283)$$

**Proposition 7.2.** *There exists a constant  $M > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$  and  $\tilde{p} \in [1, \infty)$  such that (14) holds. Then, for any  $\delta, \eta > 0$  and any smooth  $(\theta_0, u_0, R_0)$  that satisfies (283), there is another smooth  $(\theta_1, u_1, R_1)$  that satisfies for all  $t \in [0, T]$  (283) and*

$$\|(\theta_1 - \theta_0)(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq M\eta \|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}, \quad (284a)$$

$$\|(u_1 - u_0)(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \leq M\eta^{-1} \|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}, \quad (284b)$$

$$\|(u_1 - u_0)(t)\|_{W_x^{1,\tilde{p}}} \leq \delta, \quad (284c)$$

$$\|R_1(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \delta. \quad (284d)$$

Furthermore,  $R_1(t) \equiv 0$  and  $(\theta_1, u_1)(t) \equiv (\theta_0, u_0)(t)$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$  such that  $R_0(t) \equiv 0$ .

*Proof of Theorem 7.1 assuming Proposition 7.2.* We take  $(\bar{\theta}, \bar{u})$  in the hypothesis of Theorem 7.1 and define

$$(\theta_0, u_0) = (\bar{\theta}, \bar{u}), \quad R_0(t) \triangleq -\mathcal{D}^{-1}[\partial_t \bar{\theta} + \operatorname{div}(\bar{u}\bar{\theta}) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\theta}](t) + \nabla \bar{\theta}(t) \quad (285)$$

where  $R_0$  is well-defined by Definition 3.1 because  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{1}{2}\bar{\theta}(t)dx = 0$ . The rest of this proof follows very closely the ‘‘Proof of Theorem 1.2, assuming Proposition 2.1’’ in [47, Section 2] and thus is omitted.  $\square$

Therefore, the proof of Theorem 2.1 is complete once Proposition 7.2 is proven. In fact, we can adhere to the convex integration setting from Section 3.2 and Proposition 7.2 can be proven similarly to the proof of [47, Proposition 2.1] with only a few necessary modifications. We actually already addressed all such modifications. First, we need to choose  $\epsilon$  in (97) rather than  $\epsilon$  in [47, Equation (4.11)]. We prove in Appendix B that with such a choice of  $\epsilon$ , we can still retain Lemma 4.3, which is [47, Proposition 4.4]. Using the same observation in the proof of (121b), specifically (129), we can also retain Lemma [47, Lemma 4.12]. Finally, concerning the definition of the new defect  $R_1$ , in the proofs of Theorems 2.2, 2.4, and 2.5, we added the diffusion  $-\Delta(\vartheta + q)$  within  $R^{\text{lin}}$  (see e.g., (131) and (153a)). Because the only difference from our current proof and that of [47, Proposition 2.1] is the diffusive and damping terms, let us define

$$R^{\text{diff}} \triangleq \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}^{-1}[\vartheta + \vartheta_c + q + q_c] - \nabla[\vartheta + q] \quad (286)$$

which is well-defined as  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \vartheta + \vartheta_c + q + q_c = 0$  by definitions of  $\vartheta_c$  and  $q_c$  on [47, p. 1093] (see (110)) so that we have

$$-R_1 \triangleq R^{\text{time},1} + R^{\text{quadr}} + R^\chi + R^{\text{time},2} + R^{\text{lin}} + R^q + R^{\text{corr}} + R^{\text{diff}} \quad (287)$$

where  $R^{\text{time},1}$ ,  $R^{\text{quadr}}$ ,  $R^\chi$ ,  $R^{\text{time},2}$ ,  $R^{\text{lin}}$ ,  $R^q$ , and  $R^{\text{corr}}$  are defined identically to [47]. Then the rest of the proof of [47, Proposition 2.1] completely goes through with same choice of parameters in (171) ([47, Section 6.1]) leaving us an only task to show that  $\|R^{\text{diff}}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \ll \delta$  to conclude (284d). The estimate of the diffusive term  $\nabla[\vartheta + q]$  is described on [47, p. 1106]; in fact, simplification of how we handled this term in (158) already shows that  $\|\nabla(\vartheta + q)\|_{L_x^1} \ll \delta$  in our current case. The estimate of the damping term  $\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}^{-1}[\vartheta + \vartheta_c + q + q_c]$  is even easier as follows: as  $\vartheta + \vartheta_c + q + q_c$  is mean-zero,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{D}^{-1}[(\vartheta + \vartheta_c + q + q_c)(t)]\|_{L_x^1} &\stackrel{(51)}{\lesssim} \|(\vartheta + \vartheta_c + q + q_c)(t)\|_{L_x^1} \lesssim [\|\vartheta(t)\|_{L_x^1} + \|q(t)\|_{L_x^1}] \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^d [\|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|\Theta^j(t)\|_{L_x^1} + \|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|b^j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|\mathcal{Q}^j(t)\|_{L_x^1}] \stackrel{(99b)}{\lesssim} \frac{M}{\mu^b} + \frac{M}{\omega} \ll 1 \end{aligned} \quad (288)$$

for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1.

**7.2. Proof of Theorem 2.4.** The following result is the key proposition, analogous to Proposition 4.2.

**Proposition 7.3.** *There exists a constant  $M > 0$  such the following holds. Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $\tilde{p} \in [1, \infty)$  such that (14) holds, and  $\varpi \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ . Then for any  $\delta, \eta > 0$  and  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted  $(\theta_0, u_0, R_0)$  in the regularity class (198) that satisfies (197) such that for all  $t \in [0, T]$   $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta_0(t, x) dx = 0$  and*

$$\|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq 2\delta, \quad (289)$$

*there exists another  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted  $(\theta_1, u_1, R_1)$  that satisfies (197) in same corresponding regularity class (198) such that for all  $t \in [0, T]$   $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta_1(t, x) dx = 0$  and satisfies*

$$\|(\theta_1 - \theta_0)(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq M\eta(2\delta)^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}, \quad (290a)$$

$$\|(u_1 - u_0)(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \leq M\eta^{-1}(2\delta)^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}, \quad (290b)$$

$$\|(u_1 - u_0)(t)\|_{W_x^{1, \tilde{p}}} \leq \delta, \quad (290c)$$

$$\|R_1(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \delta. \quad (290d)$$

Finally, if  $(\theta_0, u_0, R_0)(0, x)$  are deterministic, then so are  $(\theta_1, u_1, R_1)(0, x)$ .

*Proof of Theorem 2.4 assuming Proposition 7.3.* The following proof has much similarity with the proof of Theorem 2.2 assuming Proposition 4.2; in fact, it's much simpler. For the  $K > 1$  fixed from hypothesis, we can define  $\theta_0(t, x) \triangleq Kt(x_d - \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $u_0 \equiv 0$  and  $R_0 \triangleq -\mathcal{D}^{-1}\partial_t\theta_0$  similarly to (80). By construction,  $(\theta_0, u_0, R_0)$  satisfies (197), and  $\theta_0 \in C_{t,x}^\infty$ ,  $u_0 \in C_t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\varpi} C_x^\infty$ ,  $R_0 \in C_t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\varpi} C_x^\infty$ . From (81) we see that this new definition of  $\theta_0$  gives

$$\|\theta_0(t)\|_{L^p} = \frac{Kt}{2(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}}. \quad (291)$$

Similarly to the proof of Theorem 2.2 we set  $\delta = \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1}$  so that Proposition 7.3 is applicable. For the fixed  $T > 0$  from hypothesis of Theorem 2.4, we choose similarly to (82)-(83)  $\delta_n = \delta 2^{-(n-1)}$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $\eta_n$  so that  $\delta_n^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\eta_n = \sigma\delta_n^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}$  for  $\sigma > 0$  such that

$$\sigma 4(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}} M \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\delta} 2^{-\frac{n-1}{2}} < T \quad (292)$$

similarly to (84). We note that at first sight, the proof of Theorem 2.2 assuming Proposition 4.2 seems to rely heavily on  $L$  (e.g., (90a), (90b), (91), (92)) and hence seems to suggest difficulty in our current proof; this is somewhat compensated by the fact that we can choose this  $\sigma$  freely and we included  $T$  in its range. Now we apply Proposition 7.3 repeatedly, similarly to (85), and deduce that there exist unique  $\theta \in C([0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))$ ,  $u \in C([0, T]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C([0, T]; W^{1, \tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d))$  which are both  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted, satisfies the same deterministic bound in (88) over  $[0, T]$  such that

$$\theta_n \rightarrow \theta \text{ in } C([0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)), \quad u_n \rightarrow u \text{ in } C([0, T]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C([0, T]; W^{1, \tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d)), \quad (293a)$$

$$R_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } C([0, T]; L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)). \quad (293b)$$

Consequently, by similar computations to (89) and the proof of Theorem 2.5,  $(\theta, u)$  satisfies (12) analytically weakly and hence  $(\rho, u)$  satisfies (8) forced by transport noise analytically weakly, i.e., (37). Now we fix such  $\rho$  and  $\rho^{\text{in}} = \rho|_{t=0}$ . Due to our choice of  $\sigma$  in (292), identically to (91) we can deduce

$$\|(\theta - \theta_0)(t)\|_{L^p} \stackrel{(290a)}{\leq} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} M\eta_n(2\delta_{n+1})^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}} \stackrel{(292)}{<} \frac{T}{4(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}}. \quad (294)$$

Then (38) follows immediately by using the fact that  $\|\theta_0(0)\|_{L_x^p} = 0$  from (291):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho(T)\|_{L_x^p} &= \|\theta(T)\|_{L_x^p} \geq \|\theta_0(T)\|_{L_x^p} - \|(\theta - \theta_0)(T)\|_{L_x^p} \stackrel{(291)(294)}{>} \frac{KT}{2(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}} - \frac{T}{4(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}} \\ &\stackrel{(294)}{>} K\|\theta(0) - \theta_0(0)\|_{L_x^p} \stackrel{(291)}{=} K[\|\theta(0) - \theta_0(0)\|_{L_x^p} + \|\theta_0(0)\|_{L_x^p}] \geq K\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L_x^p}. \end{aligned}$$

Identically to the proof of Theorem 2.2, because  $(\theta_0, u_0, R_0)(0, x)$  were deterministic, Proposition 7.3 implies that  $(\theta_n, u_n, R_n)(0, x)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  are deterministic and consequently so is  $\theta(0, x) = \rho^{\text{in}}(x)$ . Lastly,

we deduce the non-uniqueness in law from (38). Let  $P$  denote the law of  $\rho$  that we constructed. On the other hand, by Galerkin approximation we can construct a martingale solution  $\tilde{P}$  such that  $\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{P}}[\|\xi(T)\|_{L^p}] \leq \|\xi^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p}$ . In observation of (38), we conclude that  $P$  and  $\tilde{P}$  are distinct. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.4.  $\square$

The rest of the proof of Theorem 2.4 is devoted to the proof of Proposition 7.3. Except several crucial modifications, we can follow the steps in the proof of Proposition 4.2.

*7.2.1. Proof of Proposition 7.3.* We define  $l \triangleq \lambda^{-t}$  identically to (94). Given  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted  $(\theta_0, u_0, R_0)$  in the regularity class (198) that satisfies (197), we extend  $R_0$  to  $t < 0$  with its value at  $t = 0$  and mollify it identically to (96). For the fixed  $p \in (1, \infty)$  from the hypothesis of Proposition 7.3, we again define  $a \triangleq \frac{d}{p}$  and  $b \triangleq \frac{d}{p'}$  so that  $a + b = d$  as in (60). We continue with same convex integration settings identically to the proof of Theorem 2.2:  $r$  from Lemma 3.8,  $\varrho$  from (59),  $\psi$  from (67),  $\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu$  from (70),  $\Theta_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j, W_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda, \mu, \omega, \nu}^j$  from (71). We define  $\epsilon$  to satisfy (97) again so that Lemma 4.3 remains valid for us. We write  $R_l(t, x)$  in components again as in (102). Next, we define  $\theta_1$  identically to but  $u_1$  differently from (103) as follows:

$$\theta_1(t, x) \triangleq \theta_0(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t) + q(t, x) + q_c(t), \quad (295a)$$

$$u_1(t, x) \triangleq u_0(t, x) + w(t, x - B(t)) + w_c(t, x - B(t)) \quad (295b)$$

(recall Remark 6.4) where we identically define  $\vartheta(t, x), w(t, x), q(t, x)$  in (104), and  $a_j, b_j$  in (106), but with slightly modified  $\chi_j$  from (105):

$$\chi_j : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto [0, 1] \text{ and } \chi_j(t, x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |R_l^j(t, x)| \leq \frac{\delta}{4d}, \\ 1 & \text{if } |R_l^j(t, x)| \geq \frac{\delta}{2d}. \end{cases} \quad (296)$$

(recall (207)). We observe that the identities (107)-(108) and the estimate (109) all remain valid. We define  $\vartheta_c$  and  $q_c$  identically to (110) so that  $\theta_1$  is mean-zero. Moreover, similarly to (111) we can compute

$$\nabla \cdot w(t, x - B(t)) \stackrel{(108)(71)(68)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^d \nabla(b_j(t, x - B(t))(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{\mu}^j)_{\lambda} \circ \tau_{B(t) + \omega t e_j}) \cdot \psi_{\nu}^j(x - B(t))e_j \quad (297)$$

due to  $\nabla \cdot \psi^j(\nu(x - B(t))e_j) = 0$ . We define  $w_c(t, x)$  and  $f_j(t, x)$  identically to (112) so that

$$w_c(t, x - B(t)) = - \sum_{j=1}^d \mathcal{R}_N(f_j(t, x - B(t)), \psi_{\nu}^j(x - B(t))e_j), \quad (298a)$$

$$f_j(t, x - B(t)) = \nabla(b_j(t, x - B(t))\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{\mu}^j(\lambda(x - B(t) - \omega t e_j))). \quad (298b)$$

Similarly to (113) we see from (298) that  $\nabla \cdot w_c(x - B(t)) = -\nabla \cdot w(t, x - B(t))$ . Therefore, we conclude from (295b) that  $\nabla \cdot u_1 = 0$  as desired. Next, due to our choice of definitions thus far, it is clear from (289) and (296) that Lemmas 4.4-4.5 remain valid with “ $M_0(t)$ ” therein replaced by “1.” For completeness, we list these estimates here: analogously to (115a), (115b), (115c), we have for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  and  $t \in [0, T]$

$$\|a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lesssim \eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}^{\frac{1}{p}}}, \quad \|b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lesssim \eta^{-1} \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}^{\frac{1}{p'}}}, \quad (299a)$$

$$\|a_j(t)\|_{C_x^s} \lesssim \eta l^{-(d+2)s} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \|b_j(t)\|_{C_x^s} \lesssim \eta^{-1} l^{-(d+2)s} \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}} \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (299b)$$

$$\|\partial_t a_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lesssim \eta l^{-(d+2)} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \|\partial_t b_j(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lesssim \eta^{-1} l^{-(d+2)} \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}}, \quad (299c)$$

which lead to, analogously to (119a), (119b), (119c), (119d), (119e), (120), (121a), (121b):

$$\|\vartheta(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \frac{M\eta}{2} (2\delta)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \frac{C}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}} \eta l^{-(d+2)} \delta^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (300a)$$

$$\|q(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq C l^{-(d+1)} \delta \mu^b \omega^{-1}, \quad (300b)$$

$$|\vartheta_c(t)| \leq C \eta \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}^{\frac{1}{p}}} \mu^{-b} \quad \text{and} \quad |q_c(t)| \leq C \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}} \omega^{-1}, \quad (300c)$$

$$\|w(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \leq \frac{M}{2\eta} (2\delta)^{\frac{1}{p'}} + \frac{C}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p'}}} \eta^{-1} l^{-(d+2)} \delta^{\frac{1}{p'}}, \quad (300d)$$

$$\|w(t)\|_{W_x^{1,\tilde{p}}} \leq C\eta^{-1}l^{-(d+2)}\delta^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\frac{\lambda\mu + \nu}{\mu^{1+\epsilon}}, \quad (300e)$$

$$\|\mathcal{D}^k \mathcal{D}^h f_j(t)\|_{L_x^r} \leq C\eta^{-1}\delta^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\eta^{-(d+2)(k+h+1)}(\lambda\mu)^{k+h+1}\mu^{b-\frac{d}{r}} \quad \forall k, h \in \mathbb{N}_0, r \in [1, \infty], \quad (300f)$$

$$\|w_c(t)\|_{L_x^{p'}} \leq C\eta^{-1}\delta^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\left[\sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{\lambda\mu l^{-(d+2)}}{\nu}\right)^k + \frac{(\lambda\mu l^{-(d+2)})^{N+1}}{\nu^N}\right], \quad (300g)$$

$$\|w_c(t)\|_{W_x^{1,\tilde{p}}} \leq C\eta^{-1}\frac{\delta^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\left[\lambda\mu l^{-(d+2)} + \nu\right]}{\mu^{1+\epsilon}}\left[\sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{l^{-(d+2)}\lambda\mu}{\nu}\right)^k + \frac{(l^{-(d+2)}\lambda\mu)^{N+1}}{\nu^N}\right]. \quad (300h)$$

The next step is to define the new defect  $R_1$ ; in fact, we observe that it is same as (223a)-(223b) and (224) due to (197) and (295).

7.2.2. *Estimates on  $\partial_t(q(t, x) + q_c(t, x)) + \operatorname{div}(\vartheta(t, x)w(t, x) - R_l(t, x)) = (\operatorname{div}R^{\text{time},1} + \operatorname{div}R^{\text{quadr}} + \operatorname{div}R^\chi)(t, x)$  in (223b).* The estimates here follow Section 4.1.1 completely. Specifically, the identities (133) and (134) go through identically. We define  $R^\chi$  identically to (135), although with  $\chi_j$  in (296). The identities (136)-(142) follow. We define  $R^{\text{time},1}$ ,  $R^{\text{quadr},1}$ ,  $R^{\text{quadr},2}$ , and  $R^{\text{quadr}}$  identically to (143), (145), (146) so that identities (144) and (147) hold. It follows that Lemmas 4.6 holds with “ $M_0(t)$ ” therein replaced by “1,” specifically

$$\|R^\chi(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad (301a)$$

$$\|R^{\text{time},1}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq C\omega^{-1}l^{-(d+2)}\max\{\delta^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}, \delta^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\}, \quad (301b)$$

$$\|R^{\text{quadr}}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq C\left(\frac{\lambda\mu}{\nu} + \frac{1}{\lambda}\right)l^{-(d+2)2}\max\{\delta^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}, \delta^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\}. \quad (301c)$$

7.2.3. *Estimates on  $\partial_t(\vartheta(t, x) + \vartheta_c(t)) + \operatorname{div}(\theta_0(t, x)w(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x)u_0(t, x + B(t))) - \Delta(\vartheta(t, x) + q(t, x)) = (\operatorname{div}R^{\text{time},2} + \operatorname{div}R^{\text{lin}})(t, x)$  in (223b).* The only difference here from Section 4.1.2 is  $u_0(t, x + B(t))$  rather than  $u_0(t, x)$ . The identity (152) continues to hold with  $u_0(t, x)$  therein replaced by  $u_0(t, x + B(t))$ . We define  $R^{\text{time},2}$  identically to (153b) and  $R^{\text{lin}}$  identically to (233) except with  $a_j$  from (106) instead of (210) and  $w, \vartheta$ , and  $q$  from (104) instead of (208). This new definition allows (154a) to continue to hold, only with  $u_0(t, x)$  replaced by  $u_0(t, x + B(t))$  while (154b) also holds. With “ $M_0(t)$ ” therein replaced by “1,” (155a) continues to hold while (155b) also remains valid; i.e.,

$$\|R^{\text{lin}}(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq C(\mu^{-a}\|\theta_0\|_{C_{t,x}}\eta^{-1}\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}} + \mu^{-b}\eta\|\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\|u_0\|_{C_{t,x}} + \delta^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}l^{-(d+2)}) \quad (302a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ [\eta\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\mu^{-b} + \|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}\omega^{-1}][\lambda\mu + \nu] + l^{-(d+2)}\max\{\delta^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}, \delta^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\|R_0\|_{C_{t,x}}^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\}\omega^{-1}, \\ \|R^{\text{time},2}(t)\|_{L_x^1} &\leq C\left(\frac{\omega}{\mu^b}\right)\eta\delta^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\left(\sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{\lambda\mu}{\nu}\right)^k l^{-(d+2)(k-1)} + \frac{(\lambda\mu)^{N+1}}{\nu^N}l^{-(d+2)N}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (302b)$$

7.2.4. *Estimates on  $\operatorname{div}(q(t, x)(u_0(t, x + B(t)) + w(t, x)) = \operatorname{div}R^q(t, x)$  in (223b).* Again, the only difference here from Section 4.1.3 is  $u_0(t, x + B(t))$ . We define  $R^q$  identically to (235) except with  $q(t, x)$  from (104) rather than (208). Then Lemma 4.8 remains valid.

7.2.5. *Estimates on  $\operatorname{div}([\theta_0(t, x) + \vartheta(t, x) + q(t, x)]w_c(t, x)) = \operatorname{div}R^{\text{corr}}(t, x)$  in (223b).* Our current situation is even simpler than Section 4.1.4 because we can define  $R^{\text{corr}}$  identically to (163) but with no  $z$ . This implies that following the proof of Lemma 4.9 identically, we can bound  $\|R^{\text{corr}}(t)\|_{L_x^1}$  by the r.h.s. of (164) without “ $L^{\frac{1}{4}}$ ” and “ $M_0(t)$ ” replaced by “1,” i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \|R^{\text{corr}}(t)\|_{L_x^1} &\leq C\left(\|\theta_0\|_{C_{t,x}} + \eta\delta^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\left[1 + \lambda^{-\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}l^{-(d+2)}\right] + l^{-(d+1)}\delta\mu^b\omega^{-1}\right) \\ &\quad \times \eta^{-1}\delta^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}\left[\sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{\lambda\mu l^{-(d+2)}}{\nu}\right)^k + \frac{(\lambda\mu l^{-(d+2)})^{N+1}}{\nu^N}\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (303)$$

7.2.6. *Estimates on  $\text{div}R^{\text{moll}}$  in (223b).* We define  $R^{\text{moll}}(t, x)$  identically to (169) and the estimate from Lemma 4.11 directly applies for us here as well.

Next, we choose parameters identically to (171) and  $\iota$  sufficiently small to satisfy (173). By construction,  $(\theta_1, u_1, R_1)$  solves (197). Due to cut-offs  $\chi_j$ ,  $\theta_1$  and  $u_1$  defined in (295) satisfy  $\theta_1 \in C_{t,x}^\infty$ ,  $u_1 \in C_t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\varpi} C_x^\infty$  while  $R_1 \in C_t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\varpi} C_x^\infty$  due to  $w(t, x - B(t)) + w_c(t, x - B(t))$  within  $u_1(t, x)$  and  $u_0(t, x + B(t))$  within  $R_1(t, x)$ . We can now verify (290a)-(290d) very similarly to our proof of (79) with “ $M_0(t)$ ” therein replaced by “1.” Lastly, the proof that  $(\theta_1, u_1, R_1)$  are  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted and that  $(\theta_1, u_1, R_1)(0, x)$  are deterministic if  $(\theta_0, u_0, R_0)(0, x)$  are deterministic is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.2 and thus omitted.

7.3. **Proof of Corollary 2.6.** Following the appropriate modification of [47, Proposition 2.1] in the case with diffusion  $-\Delta\rho$ , we are able to deduce this key iteration scheme:

**Proposition 7.4.** *There exists a constant  $M > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$  and  $\tilde{p} \in [1, \infty)$  such that (14) holds,  $f \in L^1(0, T; L_0^p(\mathbb{T}^d))$ . Then for any  $\delta, \eta > 0$  and any smooth  $(\rho_0, u_0, R_0)$  that satisfies*

$$\partial_t \rho + \text{div}(u\rho) - \Delta\rho = f - \text{div}R, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad (304)$$

there exists another smooth  $(\rho_1, u_1, R_1)$  that satisfies (304) and for all  $t \in [0, T]$

$$\|(\rho_1 - \rho_0)(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq M\eta \|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \|(u_1 - u_0)(t)\|_{L_x^{\tilde{p}}} \leq M\eta^{-1} \|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1}^{\frac{1}{\tilde{p}}}, \quad (305a)$$

$$\|(u_1 - u_0)(t)\|_{W_x^{1,\tilde{p}}} \leq \delta, \quad \|R_1(t)\|_{L_x^1} \leq \delta. \quad (305b)$$

**Remark 7.1.** *We may furthermore prove that if  $R_0(t) \equiv 0$  for some  $t \in [0, T]$ , then  $R_1(t) \equiv 0$  and  $(\rho_1, u_1)(t) \equiv (\rho_0, u_0)(t)$  following [47, Proposition 2.1]; however, that result will not help in proving non-uniqueness for our case with non-zero force anyway.*

*Proof of Proposition 7.4.* The proof of Proposition 7.4 follows that of [47, Proposition 2.1] very similarly except that one needs to take the diffusion  $-\Delta\rho$  into account as in [47, Section 7.2]. Indeed, although the external force  $f$  is not smooth, it cancels out in the definition of  $R_1$  because it appears in (304) for  $(\rho_0, u_0, R_0)$  and  $(\rho_1, u_1, R_1)$  (i.e., at the step of (131)). Thus, the same definition of  $R_1$  in [47, Equation p. 1096] added by  $\nabla(\vartheta + q)$  suffices for us. We omit details due to similarity to the proofs throughout this manuscript.  $\square$

We now conclude the proof of Corollary 2.6 following those of Theorems 2.2 and 2.4.

*Proof of Corollary 2.6.* By hypothesis  $K > 1$ ,  $T > 0$ , and  $f \in L^1(0, T; L_0^p(\mathbb{T}^d))$  are fixed. Thus, we can take  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large so that

$$\frac{K^N T}{2(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}} > K \left[ \frac{T}{2(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}} + \int_0^T \|f(s)\|_{L_x^p} ds \right]. \quad (306)$$

Then we choose  $\rho_0(t, x) \triangleq K^N t(x_d - \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $u_0 \equiv 0$ ,  $R_0 \triangleq \mathcal{D}^{-1}(f - \partial_t \rho_0)$  which is well-defined because  $f$  is mean-zero by hypothesis. Then by definition,  $(\rho_0, u_0, R_0)$  satisfy (304),  $\rho_0$  has mean-zero for all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $u_0$  is trivially divergence-free, and  $(\rho_0, u_0, R_0)$  is smooth. Moreover,

$$\|\rho_0(t)\|_{L_x^p} = \frac{K^N t}{2(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}}. \quad (307)$$

We set  $\delta \triangleq \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|R_0(t)\|_{L_x^1}$ ,  $\delta_n = \delta 2^{-(n-1)}$  so that  $\delta_{n+1} = \delta_n 2^{-1}$  identically to (82) and  $\eta_n \in (1, \infty)$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\delta_n^{\frac{1}{p}} \eta_n = \sigma \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}}$  identically to (83) where  $\sigma > 0$  and

$$\sigma 4(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}} M \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\delta} 2^{-\frac{n-1}{2}} < T. \quad (308)$$

Then using Proposition 7.4 iteratively, analogously to the proof of Theorem 2.2 we can find  $\rho \in C([0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))$  and  $u \in C([0, T]; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C([0, T]; W^{1,\tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d))$  that satisfies (41a) analytically weakly. We fix this  $\rho$  and define  $\rho^{\text{in}} = \rho|_{t=0}$ . We can compute for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\|(\rho - \rho_0)(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|(\rho_{n+1} - \rho_n)(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} M \sigma \delta_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \stackrel{(308)}{<} \frac{T}{4(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}}. \quad (309)$$

Finally, this leads to (43) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho(T)\|_{L_x^p} &\stackrel{(307)}{\geq} \frac{K^N T}{2(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}} - \|(\rho - \rho_0)(T)\|_{L_x^p} \stackrel{(306)(309)}{\geq} K \left[ \frac{T}{4(p+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}} + \int_0^T \|f(s)\|_{L_x^p} ds \right] \\ &\stackrel{(309)(307)}{>} K [\|(\rho - \rho_0)(0)\|_{L_x^p} + \|\rho_0(0)\|_{L_x^p} + \int_0^T \|f(s)\|_{L_x^p} ds] \geq K [\|\rho^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} + \int_0^T \|f(s)\|_{L_x^p} ds]. \end{aligned}$$

□

## 8. APPENDIX B

**8.1. Further preliminaries.** The following Lemma 8.1 is a slight generalization of [30, Proposition II.1] concerning existence of solution to the non-diffusive transport equation with an external force to the diffusive case. We note that the precise statement of [30, Proposition II.1] does not include an external force; however, [30, Remark on p. 514] states that such an external force  $f$  can be added if  $f \in L_t^1 L_x^p$ .

**Lemma 8.1.** *Let  $T > 0$ ,  $p \in (1, \infty]$ , and  $\theta^{\text{in}} \in L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)$ . Assume that*

$$u \in L^1(0, T; L^{p'}(\mathbb{T}^d)), \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad c \in L^1(0, T; L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)), \quad f \in L^1(0, T; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)). \quad (310)$$

*Then there exists an analytically weak solution  $\theta \in L^\infty(0, T; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))$  to*

$$\partial_t \theta + (u \cdot \nabla) \theta + c \theta = \Delta \theta + f; \quad (311)$$

*i.e., for all  $\phi \in C([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d)$  with compact support in  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta(t, x) \partial_t \phi(t, x) dx dt - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta^{\text{in}}(x) \phi(0, x) dx - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (u(t, x) \cdot \nabla) \phi(t, x) \theta(t, x) dx dt \\ + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} c \phi(t, x) \theta(t, x) dx dt = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \theta(t, x) \Delta \phi(t, x) + f(t, x) \phi(t, x) dx dt. \end{aligned} \quad (312)$$

*Proof of Lemma 8.1.* The proof follows that of [30, Proposition II.1] completely with only a care about the additional diffusive term in case  $p \in (1, 2]$ , partially following the argument of [15, Lemma 3.1]. We start with  $\psi$  that is smooth with compact support, non-negative, and has mass one, define  $\psi_\epsilon(x) \triangleq \epsilon^{-d} \psi(\frac{\cdot}{\epsilon})$  and mollify to obtain  $u_\epsilon \triangleq u *_x \psi_\epsilon$ ,  $c_\epsilon \triangleq c *_x \psi_\epsilon$ ,  $\theta_\epsilon^{\text{in}} \triangleq \theta^{\text{in}} *_x \psi_\epsilon$ , and  $f_\epsilon \triangleq f *_x \psi_\epsilon$ . Thus, we obtain a corresponding solution  $\theta_\epsilon \in C_t C_x^1$  to

$$\partial_t \theta_\epsilon + \text{div}(u_\epsilon \theta_\epsilon) + c_\epsilon \theta_\epsilon - \Delta \theta_\epsilon = f_\epsilon \quad \forall t > 0, \quad \theta_\epsilon|_{t=0} = \theta_\epsilon^{\text{in}}. \quad (313)$$

Now for all  $p \in (1, \infty)$ , as the function  $r \mapsto r^p$  is  $C^1$ , we multiply (313) by  $|\theta_\epsilon|^{p-2} \theta_\epsilon$ , integrate over  $\mathbb{T}^d$ , use the fact that  $\nabla \cdot u_\epsilon = 0$  to deduce

$$\frac{1}{p} \partial_t \|\theta_\epsilon\|_{L_x^p}^p - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Delta \theta_\epsilon |\theta_\epsilon|^{p-2} \theta_\epsilon dx = - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} c_\epsilon |\theta_\epsilon|^p dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f_\epsilon |\theta_\epsilon|^{p-2} \theta_\epsilon dx. \quad (314)$$

If  $p \in [2, \infty)$ , then the function  $r \mapsto r^{p-1}$  is  $C^1$  and thus we can integrate by parts to deduce

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Delta \theta_\epsilon |\theta_\epsilon|^{p-2} \theta_\epsilon dx = -(p-1) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla \theta_\epsilon|^2 |\theta_\epsilon|^{p-2} dx. \quad (315)$$

On the other hand, if  $p \in (1, 2)$ , then we can use

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Delta \theta_\epsilon (|\theta_\epsilon| + \delta)^{p-2} \theta_\epsilon dx = - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (p-2) |\nabla \theta_\epsilon|^2 |\theta_\epsilon| (|\theta_\epsilon| + \delta)^{p-3} + |\nabla \theta_\epsilon|^2 (|\theta_\epsilon| + \delta)^{p-2} dx,$$

to deduce (315) by monotone and dominated convergence theorems. Having obtained (315) for all  $p \in (1, \infty)$ , we can deduce in a standard manner

$$\|\theta_\epsilon(t)\|_{L_x^p} \leq \|\theta^{\text{in}}\|_{L^p} e^{\int_0^t \|c\|_{L_x^\infty} ds} + \int_0^t e^{\int_s^t \|c\|_{L_x^\infty} d\tau} \|f(s)\|_{L_x^p} ds; \quad (316)$$

the case  $p = \infty$  follows by taking limit  $p \nearrow \infty$  in (316). Extracting a subsequence if necessary that converges to some  $\theta$  and showing that it satisfies (312) is also standard; we refer to [30, Proposition II.1] for further details. □

8.2. **Proof of second inequality of (99c) in Lemma 4.3.** We estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\|W_{\lambda,\mu,\omega,\nu}^j(t)\|_{W_x^{1,p}} &\stackrel{(71)}{\leq} \|(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j}\|_{L_x^{\tilde{p}}}\|\psi_\nu^j\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\quad + \|D((\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j})\|_{L_x^{\tilde{p}}}\|\psi_\nu^j\|_{L^\infty} + \|(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\mu^j)_\lambda \circ \tau_{\omega t e_j}\|_{L_x^{\tilde{p}}}\|D\psi_\nu^j\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\stackrel{(44)(63)(64)}{=} \mu^{b-\frac{d}{\tilde{p}}}\|\varrho\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}}\|\psi\|_{L^\infty} + \lambda\mu^{b-\frac{d}{\tilde{p}}+1}\|D\varrho\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}}\|\psi\|_{L^\infty} + \nu\mu^{b-\frac{d}{\tilde{p}}}\|\varrho\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}}\|D\psi\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\stackrel{(60)(98)}{\leq} \mu^{\frac{d}{p'}-\frac{d}{\tilde{p}}}\frac{M}{2d} + \lambda\mu^{\frac{d}{p'}-\frac{d}{\tilde{p}}+1}\frac{M}{2d} + \nu\mu^{\frac{d}{p'}-\frac{d}{\tilde{p}}}\frac{M}{2d}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now  $\frac{d}{p'} - \frac{d}{\tilde{p}} < -1 - \epsilon$  due to (129) and  $\mu \gg \lambda$  due to (70) imply

$$\|W_{\lambda,\mu,\omega,\nu}^j(t)\|_{W_x^{1,p}} \leq \mu^{-1-\epsilon}\left(\frac{M}{2d}\right) + \lambda\mu^{-\epsilon}\left(\frac{M}{2d}\right) + \nu\mu^{-1-\epsilon}\left(\frac{M}{2d}\right) \leq M\left(\frac{\lambda}{\mu^\epsilon} + \frac{\nu}{\mu^{1+\epsilon}}\right)$$

for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large which is the desired result.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The second author would like to thank Prof. Carl Mueller for valuable discussions. The first author acknowledges the support of the Department of Atomic Energy, Government of India, under project no.12-R&D-TFR-5.01-0520, and DST-SERB SJF grant DST/SJF/MS/2021/44.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] L. Ambrosio, *Transport equation and Cauchy problem for BV vector fields*, Invent. Math., **158** (2004), 227–260.
- [2] L. Ambrosio, *Well posedness of ODE's and continuity equations with nonsmooth vector fields, and applications*, Rev. Mat. Complut., **30** (2017), 427–450.
- [3] L. Ambrosio, M. Colombo, and A. Figalli, *Existence and uniqueness of maximal regular flows for non-smooth vector fields*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., **218** (2015), 1043–1081.
- [4] L. Beck, F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, and M. Maurelli, *Stochastic ODEs and stochastic linear PDEs with critical drift: regularity, duality and uniqueness*, Electron. J. Probab., **24** (2019), p. 1–72.
- [5] R. Beekie, T. Buckmaster, and V. Vicol, *Weak solutions of ideal MHD which do not conserve magnetic helicity*, Annals of PDE, **6** (2020), p. 1–40.
- [6] S. Bianchini and P. Bonicatto, *A uniqueness result for the decomposition of vector fields in  $\mathbb{R}^d$* , Invent. Math., **220** (2020), 255–393.
- [7] D. Breit, E. Feireisl, and M. Hofmanová, *On solvability and ill-posedness of the compressible Euler system subject to stochastic forces*, Anal. PDE, **13** (2020), 371–402.
- [8] T. Buckmaster, C. De Lellis, P. Isett, and L. Székelyhidi Jr., *Anomalous dissipation for 1/5-Hölder Euler flows*, Ann. of Math., **182** (2015), 127–172.
- [9] T. Buckmaster, M. Colombo, and V. Vicol, *Wild solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations whose singular sets in time have Hausdorff dimension strictly less than 1*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), to appear.
- [10] T. Buckmaster and V. Vicol, *Nonuniqueness of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equation*, Ann. of Math., **189** (2019), 101–144.
- [11] T. Buckmaster and V. Vicol, *Convex integration and phenomenologies in turbulence*, EMS Surveys in Mathematical Sciences, **6** (2019), 173–263.
- [12] J. Burczak, S. Modena, and L. Székelyhidi Jr., *Non uniqueness of power-law flows*, Comm. Math. Phys., **388** (2021), 199–243.
- [13] L. Caravenna and G. Crippa, *Uniqueness and Lagrangianity for solutions with lack of integrability of the continuity equation*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. 1, **354** (2016), 1168–1173.
- [14] P. Catuogno and C. Olivera,  *$L^p$ -solutions of the stochastic transport equation*, Random Oper. Stoch. Equ., **21** (2013), 125–134.
- [15] J.-Y. Chemin and P. Zhang, *On the critical one component regularity for 3-D Navier-Stokes system*, Annales Scientifiques de L'ens, **49** (2016), 131–167, arXiv:1310.6442 [math.AP].
- [16] A. S. Cherny, *On the uniqueness in law and the pathwise uniqueness for stochastic differential equations*, Theory Probab. Appl., **46** (2003), 406–419.
- [17] A. Cheskidov and X. Luo, *Nonuniqueness of weak solutions for the transport equation at critical space regularity*, Annals of PDE, **7** (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40818-020-00091-x>.
- [18] E. Chiodaroli, E. Feireisl, and F. Flandoli, *Ill posedness for the full Euler system driven by multiplicative white noise*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **70** (2021), 1267–1282.
- [19] F. Colombini and N. Lerner, *Uniqueness of continuous solutions for BV vector fields*, Duke Math. J., **111** (2002), 357–384.
- [20] F. Colombini, T. Luo, and J. Rauch, *Uniqueness and nonuniqueness for nonsmooth divergence free transport*, Séminaire É. D. P. (2002-2003), Exposé n° XXII, 21 p.
- [21] M. Colombo, C. De Lellis, and L. De Rosa, *Ill-posedness of Leray solutions for the hypodissipative Navier-Stokes equations*, Comm. Math. Phys., **362** (2018), 659–688.
- [22] G. Crippa, N. Gusev, S. Spirito, and E. Wiedemann, *Non-uniqueness and prescribed energy for the continuity equation*, Commun. Math. Sci., **13** (2015), 1937–1947.
- [23] G. Crippa and S. Spirito, *Renormalized solutions of the 2D Euler equations*, Comm. Math. Phys., **339** (2015), 191–198.

- [24] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk, *Stochastic Equations in Infinite Dimensions*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.
- [25] C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi Jr., *The Euler equations as a differential inclusion*, *Ann. of Math.*, **170** (2009), 1417–1436.
- [26] C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi Jr., *On admissibility criteria for weak solutions of the Euler equations*, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **195** (2010), 225–260.
- [27] C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi Jr., *Dissipative continuous Euler flows*, *Invent. Math.*, **193** (2013), 377–407.
- [28] L. De Rosa, *Infinitely many Leray-Hopf solutions for the fractional Navier-Stokes equations*, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, **44** (2019), 335–365.
- [29] A. Debussche, *Ergodicity results for the stochastic Navier-Stokes equations: an introduction*. In P. Constantin, A. Debussche, G. P. Galdi, M. Růžička and G. Seregin (Eds.) *Topics in Mathematical Fluid Mechanics*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **2073**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg (2013), 23–108.
- [30] R. J. DiPerna and P. L. Lions, *Ordinary differential equations, transport theory and Sobolev spaces*, *Invent. Math.*, **98** (1989), 511–547.
- [31] D. Faraco, S. Lindberg, and L. Székelyhidi Jr., *Bounded solutions of ideal MHD with compact support in space-time*, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **239** (2021), 51–93.
- [32] F. Flandoli, *An Introduction to 3D Stochastic Fluid Dynamics*: In: G. Da Prato, M. Růžička (Eds.) *SPDE in Hydrodynamic: Recent Progress and Prospects*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **1942**, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, (2008), 51–150.
- [33] F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, and E. Priola, *Well-posedness of the transport equation by stochastic perturbation*, *Invent. Math.*, **180** (2010), 1–53.
- [34] B. Goldys, M. Röckner, and X. Zhang, *Martingale solutions and Markov selections for stochastic partial differential equations*, *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **119** (2009), 1725–1764.
- [35] M. Gromov, *Partial Differential Relations*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1986.
- [36] M. Hofmanová, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu, *Non-uniqueness in law of stochastic 3D Navier-Stokes equations*, arXiv:1912.11841 [math.PR].
- [37] M. Hofmanová, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu, *On ill- and well-posedness of dissipative martingale solutions to stochastic 3D Euler equations*, arXiv:2009.09552v2 [math.PR].
- [38] M. Hofmanová, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu, *Global-in-time probabilistically strong and Markov solutions to stochastic 3D Navier-Stokes equations: existence and non-uniqueness*, arXiv:2104.09889 [math.PR].
- [39] M. Hofmanová, R. Zhu, and X. Zhu, *Global existence and non-uniqueness for 3D Navier–Stokes equations with space-time white noise*, arXiv:2112.14093 [math.AP].
- [40] P. Isett, *A proof of Onsager’s conjecture*, *Ann. of Math.*, **188** (2018), 871–963.
- [41] N. V. Krylov, *Itô’s formula for the  $L_p$ -norm of stochastic  $W_p^1$ -valued processes*, *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, **147** (2010), 583–605.
- [42] H. Kunita, *First order stochastic partial differential equations*, *Taniguchi Symp. SA Kfatata* (1982), 249–269.
- [43] H. Kunita (1984), *Stochastic differential equations and stochastic flows of diffeomorphisms*. In: Hennequin P. L. (eds) *École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XII-1982*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **1097**, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- [44] H. Kunita, *Stochastic Flows and Stochastic Differential Equations*, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [45] T. Luo, T. Tao, and L. Zhang, *Finite energy weak solutions of 2D Boussinesq equations with diffusive temperature*, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **40** (2020), 3737–3765.
- [46] T. Luo and E. S. Titi, *Non-uniqueness of weak solutions to hyperviscous Navier-Stokes equations - on sharpness of J.-L. Lions exponent*, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, **59** (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00526-020-01742-4>.
- [47] S. Modena and G. Sattig, *Convex integration solutions to the transport equation with full dimensional concentration*, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, **37** (2020), 1075–1108.
- [48] S. Modena and L. Székelyhidi Jr., *Non-uniqueness for the transport equation with Sobolev vector fields*, *Ann. PDE*, **4** (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40818-018-0056-x>.
- [49] S. Modena and L. Székelyhidi Jr., *Non-renormalized solutions to the continuity equation*, *Calc. Var.* **58** (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00526-019-1651-8>.
- [50] S. Müller and V. Šverák, *Unexpected solutions of first and second order partial differential equations*, *Proc. of ICM - 1998*, Vol. II, p. 691–702, Berlin, 1998.
- [51] S. Müller and V. Šverák, *Convex integration for Lipschitz mappings and counterexamples to regularity*, *Ann. of Math.*, **157** (2003), 715–742.
- [52] J. Nash,  *$C^1$  isometric imbeddings*, *Ann. of Math.*, **60** (1954), 383–395.
- [53] L. Onsager, *Statistical hydrodynamics*, *Nuovo Cim*, **6** (1949), 279–287.
- [54] M. Rehmeier and A. Schenke, *Nonuniqueness in law for stochastic hypodissipative Navier-Stokes equations*, arXiv:2104.10798 [math.PR].
- [55] D. W. Stroock and S. R. S. Varadhan, *Multidimensional Diffusion Processes*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1997.
- [56] K. Yamazaki, *Remarks on the non-uniqueness in law of the Navier-Stokes equations up to the J.-L. Lions’ exponent*, *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **147** (2022), 226–269.
- [57] K. Yamazaki, *Non-uniqueness in law for two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations with diffusion weaker than a full Laplacian*, arXiv: 2008.04760 [math.AP].
- [58] K. Yamazaki, *Non-uniqueness in law for Boussinesq system forced by random noise*, arXiv:2101.05411v2 [math.AP].
- [59] K. Yamazaki, *Non-uniqueness in law of three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations diffused via a fractional Laplacian with power less than one half*, arXiv:2104.10294 [math.PR].
- [60] K. Yamazaki, *Non-uniqueness in law of three-dimensional magnetohydrodynamics system forced by random noise*, arXiv:2109.07015 [math.AP].



CENTRE FOR APPLICABLE MATHEMATICS (CAM), TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH, PO Box 6503, GKVK Post Office,  
BANGALORE 560065, INDIA

*Email address:* [ujjwal@math.tifrbng.res.in](mailto:ujjwal@math.tifrbng.res.in)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY, LUBBOCK, TEXAS, 79409-1042, U.S.A.

*Email address:* [kyamazak@ttu.edu](mailto:kyamazak@ttu.edu)